TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 7

Marcel Erdal

Old Turkic Word Formation

A Functional Approach to the Lexicon

Vol. I

1991

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

Marcel Erdal

Old Turkic Word Formation

A Functional Approach to the Lexicon

Vol. I

1991

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Erdal, Marcel:
Old Turkic word formation : a functional approach to the lexicon / Marcel Erdal. – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz.
(Turcologica ; Bd. 7)
ISBN 3-447-03084-4
NE: GT

Vol. 1 (1991)

© Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1991.
Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb des Urheberrechtsgesetzes bedarf der Zustimmung des Verlages.
Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen jeder Art, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und für die Einspeicherung in elektronischen Systemen.
Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung.
Gesamtherstellung: MZ-Verlagsdruckerei GmbH, Memmingen
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier der Fa. Nordland Papier, Dörpen/Ems
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743
ISBN 3-477-03084-4

For
AYANÁ and ITTAI
who are as they
are in spite of
this book

Contents

VOLUME I

PREFACE XIII

I INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 The Corpus 3
1.2 Special signs and letters, transliteration and transcription, and phonological problems 15
1.3 Terminology 20
1.4 Old Turkic, Proto-Turkic, Common Turkic 21
1.5 Describing creative competence in a dead language 23
1.6 The delimitation between formatives and other morphemes, and formative classifications 29
1.7 'Etymology' 31
1.8 Formative sequences and combinations 34
1.9 Binomes and biverbs 36

II THE FORMATION OF DENOMINAL AND DEADJECTIVAL NOMINALS 37
2.1 Diminutives and caritatives; proper name formations 39
2.11 *+Ak*, *+Ik* and *+tIk* 40
2.12 *+(X)ç*, *+çAk* and *+(X)çUk* 44
2.13 *+kIñA* 47
2.14 *+A* and other formatives for proper names 56
2.2 Intensification 59
2.21 *(O)k* and *kAn* 60
2.22 *+rAk* 62
2.23 Reduplication 65
2.3 Similatives 67
2.31 *+dAm* 68
2.32 *+sIg* 70
2.33 *+mAn* 73
2.34 *+gAk* and *+Ak*: metaphorical names for body parts 74

2.4 Class markers 76
2.41 +kAn 76
2.42 +(X)r and +AgUr: Social grouping and position 78
2.43 +gAf and +gA: Animals and plants 83
2.44 +gAn: Animals and plants 85
2.45 +LAk: Birds 89

2.5 Collectives 90
2.51 +(A)n 91
2.52 +(A)gU 93

2.6 Colour names and their derivates 97
2.61 +Kll, +gXl and +sll 98
2.62 +(A)mUk (and -mXk) 100
2.63 +Xş 102

2.7 Functional and local formatives 103
2.71 +dUrXk 104
2.72 +çU and +çUk 106
2.73 +lAg 108
2.74 +mAk 110
2.75 +çl 110
2.76 +dAş 119
2.77 +lXk 121

2.8 Lack and negation: +sXz 131

2.9 Formatives indicating characterisation by the base noun 139
2.91 +lXg 139
2.92 +dXŋ 155
2.93 +sOk 157
2.94 +gOk 158
2.95 +(A)ŋ 160
2.96 +AgU, +AŋU and +gU 162
2.97 +gAy 165

III The Formation of Deverbal Nominals 167
3.1 Ergative formations 172
3.101 -(X)g 172
3.102 -(O)k 224
3.103 -Xş 262
3.104 -(X)nç 275

3.105 *-(X)nçU* 285
3.106 *-(X)m* 290
3.107 *-Xn* 300
3.108 *-(U)ı* 308
3.109 *-mA* 316
3.110 *-gI* 320
3.111 *-(X)z* 323
3.112 *-gXn* 327
3.113 *-(X)l* 330
3.114 *-dU* 332
3.115 *-vI* 334
3.116 *-(X)η* 337
3.117 *-(X)ndı* and *-dI* 339
3.118 *-I* and *-şI* 340
3.119 *-(X)glXg* 344
3.12 *-(X)nçsXz* 349

3.2 The instrumental formations 356
3.21 *-çUk* (*-çUg*) and *-gUç* 357
3.22 *-gOk* 359

3.3 The non-ergative formations 362
3.311 The modal oblique: *-(X)nçIg* 363
3.312 The negative modal oblique: *-gUlXksXz* 368
3.32 Formatives for the agent 371
3.321 *-(X)gçI* 371
3.322 *-(X)mlXg* 374
3.323 *-gA* 376
3.324 *-gAn* 382
3.325 *-mAn* 387
3.326 *-mXr* 389
3.327 *-gAk* 391
3.328 The non-agent: *-mAksXz* 396

IV The Formation of Adverbs 401

X 413
. 418
. 429
. 455

V THE FORMATION OF DENOMINAL VERBS 458
5.11 +A- 465
5.12 +lA- 465
5.13 +tA- 469
5.2 Verba sentiendi: +(X)(r)kA- and -(X)(r)kA- 474
5.3 Onomatopoeics and synaesthetics 474
5.31 +klr- and +kl- 479
5.32 Onomatopoeics and synaesthetics ending in °rA- 485
5.4 Intransitive denominals 492
5.41 +U- 499
5.42 +l- and synaesthetics in °rl- 507
5.43 +(A)d- 509
5.44 +(X)k- 521
5.45 +(A)r- 525
5.5 The verbal expression of lack and loss: +s(l)rA- 531
5.6 +lAn- 535

VI TYPES OF ACTION AND INACTION 543
6.1 The desiderative 552
6.2 The simulative 552
6.3 -(l)r-, -çlr- and -glr- 574

VII DIATHESIS AND VOICE 578
7.1 Verbs of vying and cooperation 583
7.101 -(X)s-: Lexical material 584
7.102 Morphology 632
7.103 Syntax and semantics 632
7.2 Medial, reflexive and anti-transitive verbs 634
7.211 -(X)n-: Lexical material 639
7.212 Petrified converbs 641
7.213 Morphology 643
7.214 Syntax and semantics 645
7.221 -lXn-: Lexical material 650
7.222 Grammar 652

7.23 Medial verbs in -(X)d- 642
7.241 -(X)k-: Lexical material 645
7.242 Grammar 649

7.3 Passive verbs 651
7.311 -(X)l-: Lexical material 651
7.312 Morphology 689
7.313 Syntax 691
7.321 -tXl- (~ -(X)tXl- ~ -tUrXl-: Lexical material 694
7.322 Morphology 698
7.323 Syntax 699

7.41 The transitive passive formative -sXk- 700
7.42 The causative passive formative -tXz- 706

7.5 Causative verbs 709
7.511 -Ur-: Lexical material 710
7.512 Petrified converbs 726
7.513 Morphology 733
7.521 -Ar-: Lexical material 734
7.522 Petrified converbs 740
7.523 Morphology 741
7.531 +gAr-: Lexical material 742
7.532 Petrified converbs 746
7.533 Morphology 746
7.541 -gUr-: Lexical material 748
7.542 Petrified converbs and morphology 755
7.551 -Xz-: Lexical material 757
7.552 Morphology 759
7.561 -(X)t-: Lexical material 760
7.562 Petrified converbs 797
7.563 Morphology 799
7.571 -tUr-: Lexical material 799
7.572 Petrified converbs 830
7.573 Morphology 830
7.581 Phonological and morphological distribution 831
7.582 Syntax and semantics of verbs with causative formatives 834

BIBLIOGRAPHY 849
INDEX OF VERB STEMS 855
INDEX OF LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA AND MORPHEMES 86
INDEX OF CORRECTED OR REINTERPRETED PASSAGES 87

Preface

This book took a rather long time to write. The fault is not mine, of course: I blame, firstly, the quite unusually rich structures which this language has created at the interface between its grammar and its lexicon; secondly, my philologist colleagues, who went on publishing undisregardable source material with ever growing zeal. Non-linguists interested in Old Turkic material for its content need to be convinced that language structure is a sort of behaviour to which writers *will* adhere; no interpretation can be imposed upon a text just because of the meaning a scholar expects to find in it. The discovery of Old Turkic grammar should therefore be of concern not only to linguists. Looking at other areas of the language, e.g. at the verbal system, promises to be just as fruitful for the simple aim of understanding correctly what the text actually says. Grammatical considerations have led me to suggest new readings for quite a number of passages. I invite colleagues who find them convincing to follow in the search for rules behind the chaos.

The contents of our description should be backed up by investigation into data offered by the modern Turkic languages. Doing that here was beyond my present scope and would have delayed publication even further. In any case, my aim was the presentation of a system. The comparative – contrastive word-formation of the Turkic and of the Altaic languages still lies ahead. Working on Old Turkic grammar has been a lonely occupation. I hope the present book will attract further linguists to this language; many of its undescribed traits will surprise them. Understanding grammatical interference between unrelated languages in medieval Central Asia will also only be possible through scholarly cooperation. Above all, I consider my work to be a case study in the theory of derivation and its uses.

Early versions of parts V-VII of the present work were read and helpfully commented upon by my teacher H. J. Polotsky and by Prof. V. Ménage; R. Dankoff went through parts I-IV and G. Doerfer – at various stages – over the whole book. I am particularly grateful to Peter Zieme, who contributed to it all through his deep knowledge of the mss.. I owe my outlook in matters Turcological to Kaare Thomsen Hansen and Iben Raphael Meyer. I enjoyed their hospitality, and that of Profs. Doerfer and Johanson, for years on end. Lars Johanson, whose linguistic views I share, was kind enough to include the present study in the series he edits. My warmest thanks go to Yona for preparing indices, and for encouraging

[illegible]

Part I

Introduction

1.1 *The Corpus*

The aim of this study is the description of a part of Old Turkic grammar, that part by which speakers of the language created new lexemes and recognised the transparency of lexemes created by others. 'Old Turkic' is a rather vague term, referring mainly to the language of the inscriptional, manuscript and block-print texts written down between the eighth and the middle of the fourteenth century in Western Mongolia, the northeastern and eastern parts of the Tarim basin and elsewhere in Chinese Turkestan. The language of the Turkic texts (mss., block-prints and very few inscriptions) written under Mongol rule does differ in a few respects from Old Turkic es delimited above, but does not have many novelties to offer in the domain of lexeme formation. Moreover, many of the texts of this period are copies from earlier mss. or successfully mimic archaic language; such texts have been included in our treatment. The texts in so-called runic script constitute only a fraction of Old Turkic texts, and our corpus for the most part coincides with Uigur as defined in the *UW*. Most runic texts do not seem to me to offer very many problems in addition to the ones found in Uigur texts, although the script is, of course, a bit more ambiguous. The *Lieder aus Alt-Turfan*, which the *UW* includes in its corpus, and the *Oghuz Kaghan* epic included by the *DTS*, are very late and are excluded here. Although Qarakhanid Turkic is not included in our corpus, Qarakhanid documentation has been referred to in practically all the sections. The lexical material of this form of Turkic was strongly influenced by the fact that its authors were Muslims and it, too, has some grammatical peculiarities of its own; but no writer on Old Turkic grammar can afford to ignore it: Kāšġarī is an important authority on Old Turkic, and the QB often contains valuable material able to substantiate our explanations. It should be added that these texts, which lie within the temporal limits which we have set ourselves, have recently become much more accessible to the linguist than before, due to the work of Robert Dankoff. The corpus of texts called 'Uigur' is by no means homogeneous: It reflects the speech of a number of tribes as *partially* converging into the koiné of city and monastery dwellers. Grammatical variation within Uigur can, in certain cases, be greater than between such language and, say, that of the runic mss. (if such variation can at all be measured). Some Uigur texts not included in the hitherto published fascicles of the *UW* but included by us are mentioned below. The first fascicle of the *UW* appeared in 1977, its preface signed in 1975. Even the third fascicle is now eight years old, and the Uigur texts published in this period alone constitute quite a corpus. It will clearly take some time before the whole of the *UW* is in our hands. Until that happens, our study should be even more handy

as a supplement for the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Those dictionaries are incomparably more detailed, both the temporal and the coverage of Uigur texts is concerned. As a supplement as far as the temporal and the geographical delimitation of our corpus is concerned, both dictionaries fit to each other perfectly, but our texts were not synchronic by any standard, and our texts were distributed over centuries, lying thousands of miles apart. Nevertheless, it is rather wide, Six centuries would have been undesirable. A diachronic corpus would have been undesirable, it seems to me that any narrowing of our corpus necessarily corresponds to dialect distribution. Geographical distribution, dialect differences being, in any case, not very pronounced within Old Turkic, diachronic developments can be observed also within Uigur. Ercilasun, 1979 has tried to find criteria for dividing Old Turkic texts into four periods. Uigur texts being found in all four groups. Nor do the runic texts belong to any one period. Grammars of the Yenisei inscriptions are early, some of the runic mss. and at least some of the Manichaean texts and of Orkhon Turkic much later period. Grammars of the same shortcomings: The smallness of their have been written, and suffer from the non-appear- much later, and suffer from the same shortcomings: The smallness of their respective corpuses makes it impossible to determine whether it has systematic ance of a certain form or construction is a coincidence or whether the inscriptions makes them valuable in value. On the other hand, the antiquity of the inscriptions were no doubt written down in a point from a limitation of grammatical treatment to any one particular script, all aspects of Old Turkic as defined above, and religion, geographical area or civilization within Old Turkic as defined above, and much to be lost: the evidence offered by the differences between these various classes of texts seem to be small indeed; where they do exist, they are best discovered and lexeme formation is concerned, the differences between these various classes of described in such an inclusive work. This is done, for instance in the discussion of the passive, which offered different possibilities of expression to writers of different periods. Juxtaposition makes the development stand out clearly.

Unlike e.g. the *UW*, our work is based exclusively on *edited and transcribed* texts or text portions. Quotations are usually, but not always, accompanied by a translation. The editors' interpretations have not been taken over uncritically, and I have had to deal with various problems of textual interpretation. Knowledge of Old Turkic has gradually been growing since the turn of this century, when the first Uigur texts were published. False interpretations and even false readings are common in those texts, and also in some other sometimes quite recently published ones. In cases of doubt we consulted facsimiles. Some texts have been reedited, often based on a deeper knowledge of Buddhism; the interpretations of the *EDPT* and the *UW* are always noteworthy. The fragmentary state of some texts is a problem factor which cannot be eliminated. However, the source texts of Uigur translations are getting consulted more and more; also,

since the volume of published Old Turkic material in particular domains is steadily growing and often contains repetitions and fixed terminology and phrasing, lacunae can often be bridged. This has done much for understanding the texts. We do not, however, treat conjectures in lacunae as text portions, of course, and expressions containing them are not used to substantiate any arguments. Nor is this done with texts which we have not been able to interpret and understand, or with the existing interpretations of which we have not, for some reason, been satisfied. The Turkic text is sometimes a misinterpretation or a mistranslation of a known foreign model; what counts for us is the Turkic text as we have it and not as it might have been: even if it does not make good sense from a theological or cultural point of view. A case in point is the verb *arıgla-*, which is given two distinct meanings in the *UW*: 1) "auslesen, das Schlechte entfernen" and 2) "trainieren, disziplinieren". The second meaning is documented by one passage in the Ht text where, as Röhrborn shows, the Uigur translator confused one use of a certain character in the Chin. original for another use. This does not mean, however, that 'to train' would have been one of the meanings the translator could have assigned to *arıgla-*. 'picking out the best (soldiers)' makes perfect sense in the given context, and this is what the person who formulated the Uigur text (unaware of being misleading) intended us to understand.

Most of the texts we are dealing with are listed in the bibliography of *UW* 1-4 if they are in Uigur, in the *EDPT* if they are in 'runes' (the latter including the early Uigur runic inscriptions). An up-to-date listing of the runic sources discovered in Mongolia and of some of the studies concerning them is Sertkaya, 1984. Wherever possible, we refer to Uigur texts by the *UW*'s title abbreviations; otherwise, we use our own set of references, listed below in alphabetical order. This list includes a) texts in runic script or in Qarakhanid Turkic, the lexical material of which is not extracted by the *UW*; b) Uigur texts not included in the first four fascicles of the *UW*; c) texts appearing in larger collections, referred to in the *UW* by page number and line but treated in this work as distinct sources. d) Scholars have been editing some long texts piecemeal and in different publications over the years. Such part-editions have sometimes been renamed here, to make clear to what text they belong. For the runic inscrs. of Mongolia, the number given to them in the Sertkaya, 1984 list has been added.

Abhi — The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkātattvārtha-nama*, facs. edition Ş. Tekin, New York, 1970, is not directly referred to. Ls. 1-2583 are edited in M. Shōgaito, *The Uigur translation of Sthiramati's Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkā Tattvārthā ⟨Text in Transcription⟩ 1*, Kobe, 1988. We quote passages mentioned in notes to various

AbhiCaCo	publications by K. Kudara, the passage Abhi 118 a 8-119 b 3 edited in TermBuddh, and the following paper: Kudara, K., 'On the Uigur translations of the eight cases and the six compounds in Sanskrit grammar'. Unpublished lecture and handout, read at the symposium 'Neue Ergebnisse der Zentralasienforschung' in Hamburg, 1981. Includes an edition of Abhi A 64 b 3-66 a 3.
Adams	Refers to a document reedited in a paper listed in the *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 1,16.
Akgür	Akgür, E. N., *Uygur Hukuk Vesikaları* (*Kişi ile ilgili belgeler*). Istanbul, 1982. Unpublished Mezuniyet Tezi presented to the Istanbul Univ. Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü (based on facss. otherwise unavailable).
Asxete	The runic inscription published, among other places, in Orkun, 1936-41 II: 121-127. Sertkaya IV.
ĀṭSū	Maue, D., 'Sanskrit-uigurische Fragmente des Āṭānāṭikasūtra und des Āṭānāṭihṛdaya'. *UAJb* N. F. 5 (1985): 98-122.
AvStava	Zieme, P., 'Ein alttürkisches Avalokiteśvarastava'. *AoF* 14 (1987): 221-223.
Baguettes	The ms. Ōtani 1414 b, published by Haneda Akira in 'Le thé et les baguettes', *JA* 269 (1981): 69-75.
Bhaiṣ	Zieme, P., 'Ein alttürkisches Fragment aus dem Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra'. *AoF* 13 (1986): 185-188.
BlattRun	Thomsen, V., 'Ein Blatt in türkischer "Runen"schrift aus Turfan'. *SEddT-F* I, pp. 605-615.
BodhiAvaKomm	Raschmann, S., and P. Zieme, 'Ein *Bodhicaryāvatāra*-Kommentar in alttürkischer Überlieferung'. *AoF* 12 (1985): 309-318.
BQ	The epitaph of Bilgā Kagan, in T. Tekin, *Orhon Yazıtları*, Ankara, 1988. Sertkaya VII.
BT VI	Schmitt, G., and Th. Thilo, *Katalog chinesischer Buddhistischer Textfragmente* (Berliner Turfantexte VI), Berlin, 1975. Contains also some Uigur texts.
BuddhLett	Moriyasu, T., 'An Uigur Buddhist's letter of the Yüan dynasty from Tun-Huang'. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 40 (1982): 1-18.
BuyKāl	Raschmann, S., 'Das Gelöbnis des Buyan Kälmiš'. *AoF* 14 (1987): 160-174.
ChristManus	One of the two mss. published as nr. 37 of the *UW* bibliography, the Christian one.
Chuast	*UW* bibliogr. nr. 1; cf. also the critical edition of L. V. Dmitrieva,

'Xuastuanift', *Tjurkologičeskie Issledovanija* (Festschr. Malov), Moskva, 1963: 214f.

ChuastBeitr — Refers to *UW* bibliogr. nr. 80.

ChuastBT V — The first text in BT V (*UW* bibliogr. nr. 83), a further fr. of the Chuast.

CYK — Refers to the publication listed in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 2,12, there quoted as AtülInschr.

DLT — Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī's *Dīvān Luġāti 't-Turk* in the edition referred to as DankKelly in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,50.

DreiPrinz — Geng S., Klimkeit H.-J. and J.P. Laut, 'Die Geschichte der drei Prinzen. Weitere neue manichäisch-türkische Fragmente aus Turfan'. *ZDMG* 139 (1989): 329-345.

Ehlers — Ehlers, G., *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 2. Das Goldglanzsūtra und der buddhistische Legendenzyklus Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* . . . Stuttgart, 1987 (*Verz. d. orient. Hss. in Deutschl.* XIII,10).

EhlersNotab — Ehlers, G., 'Notabilia zur alttürkischen Oberstufenzählung'. *UAJb* N.F. 3 (1983): 81-87. Pp. 85-87 contain an ed. of a fr. related to the text appearing in U III pp. 62-74.

Ernte II — Molnár, A. and P. Zieme, 'Ein weiterer uigurischer Erntesegen'. *AoF* 16 (1989): 140-152.

ETŞ — ETS in the *UW*'s bibliography. We quote only texts 8-17 and 21. 19 and 20 are reedited (with additional frs. etc.) as UigKan (q.v. below). 18 and 22-27 appear again in BT XIII.

Forf — Appears as UmemIyaku in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,32.

Gebet — Text appearing on pp. 23-29 of M I.

GeistDrog — Zieme, P., 'Ein geistiges Drogenbuch der türkischen Manichäer'. Pp. 221-8 in: *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund, 1988.

GengContr — Geng Shimin, 'A study of two Uigur contracts of the Yuan dynasty (1271-1368)'. *ZaS* 17 (1984): 7-17. Translation of the paper quoted as KêngLiang in the *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 2,31.

Gleichn — Text appearing on pp. 17-18 of M I.

Halén — Paper quoted in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 2,3.

HamTouen — The work referred to as HamTouHou in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,6.

Ht — Three mss. contain Uigur translations of the biography of Xuandzang. The abbreviation Ht refers to the ms. which is by far the most extensive one; two further ms. frs. are edited in HtFragm. The introduction to HtFragm gives a conspectus of all the publica-

tions containing parts of Ht. We refer to *UW* bibliogr. Nachtr. 1,34 as Ht IV; to *UW* bibliogr. nr. 25 and *UW* bibliogr. Nachtr. 2,17 (which contains the end of the fifth chapter) as Ht V; to *UW* bibliogr. nrs. 18 and 216 and to Geng Shimin's edition of this chapter (*Huei-hu wen "Xuan-dzang chuan" di zhi zhüan yan chu*, Zhuang yang min dzu xue yuan min yü xi 1978; 63 pp.) as Ht VII; to *UW* bibliogr. nr. 76 and Nachtr. 1,33 as Ht X. Frs. quoted in ns. to other works or in the *UW* are referred to as HtPar or HtPek as in the *UW* (i.e. preserved in Paris or Beijing).

HtFragm Kudara, K., and P. Zieme, 'Fragmente zweier unbekannter Handschriften der uigurischen Xuanzang-Biographie'. *AoF* 11 (1984): 136-148. Fr. I is practically identical to Ht X 740-746 and 771-778; II is closer to the Chin. original than the other translation. Parallel to fr. II, the eds. bring the previously unedited HtPar 129,21-131,9.

IrqB The *Irk Bitig*, the second runic text published by V. Thomsen in the *JRAS* 1912: 190-214. Erdal, 1978, sums up some of the subsequent work on this. Quoted by sections referred to by Roman numerals.

IXu Runic inscr. as edited in Clauson, Sir G., and E. Tryjarski, 'The inscription at Ikhe Khushotu'. *RO* 34 (1971): 7-31. Sertkaya III.

Karti Moerloose, E., 'Uighur *karti*'. *AoF* 12 (1985): 301-8. Reinterprets passages in some published texts.

Khot The Turkic-Khotanese word list excerpted in E. Hovdhaugen, 'Turkish words in Khotanese texts. A linguistic analysis'. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 24 (1971): 163-209, and dealt with by A. Róna-Tas in a lecture held at the 32nd PIAC (1989).

Kõbunsho Refers to the paper quoted as UmemKõbunsho in *UW* bibliogr. Nachtr. 3,33.

Kosm Text appearing on pp. 19-20 of MI.

KõktüTurf Refers to the ms. frs. in runic script found at Toyok and Khocho and published by Le Coq. They are collected in *SEdT-FI* pp. 532-564. The *EDPT* quotes them as *Toyoq* etc., followed by the page in Orkun's reedition (quoted as ETY II): See *EDPT* p. xiv, par. (2)(d).

KPZieme Refers to *UW* bibliogr. nr. 88.

KT The runic epitaph of Kõl Tegin, in T. Tekin, *Orhon Yazıtları*, Ankara, 1988. Sertkaya V.

KudJunshõ is the text referred to as Junshõ in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,14.

KudGojüni Kudara, K., 'A fragment of an unknown Abhidharma text in

Uigur'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 26/2 (1978): 1003-1000.

Lalita — A fr. of a translation of the Lalitavistara, appearing on pp. 4-7 of UII.

Legende — Text appearing on pp. 5-7 of MI.

Magier — Text appearing on pp. 4-10 of UI.

MaitrGeng — does not refer to the entry of *UW* bibliogr., Nachtrag 2,8, referred to as KêngMaitr, but to the following: Geng Shimin, 'Qādımqı Uygurcā iptidayi drama piyesası "Maitrisimit" hāqqıdıqı tātqiqat'. *JTS* 4 (1980): 101-156. Corresponds to MaitrH II referred to in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,3.

MaitrH X — Geng Shimin, H.-J. Klimkeit, J.P. Laut, "Der Herabstieg des Bodhisattva Maitreya vom Tuşita-Götterland zur Erde". Das 10. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit'*. *AoF* 14 (1987): 350-376.

MaitrH XI — Geng Shimin, H.-J. Klimkeit, J.P. Laut, "'Das Erscheinen des Bodhisattva". Das 11. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der Maitrisimit'. *AoF* 15 (1988): 315-366.

ManManus — One of the two mss. published in nr. 37 of the *UW* bibliogr., the Manichaean one.

Mängi — Zieme, P., 'Mängi bulzun! – ein weiterer Neujahrssegen'. *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* XXIV/1 (1986): 131-139.

Mojak — The text appearing on p. 31 of MI, = MIII text 17.

MytholSchr — The text appearing on pp. 21-22 of MI.

OdaŌtani — Oda, J., 'Uiguru-bun hachiyōkei "Ōtani-shi shozō danpen" tsuiko' (A note on the fragment of *Säkiz yükmäk yaruq sūtra* preserved by Mr. Ōtani), *The Bulletin of Toyohashi Junior College* 1984 (shōwa 59)/1: 91-100.

OdaUigh — Oda, J., 'Uighur fragments of the block-printed text, "Säkiz törlügin yarumış yaltrımış nom bitig".. *TDED* 24-25 (1986): 325-346.

OdaVes — Oda, J., 'Eski Uygurca bir vesikanın Budizmle ilgili küçük bir parçası'. *TM* XIX (1980): 183-202. This is the Turkish translation of OdaMonju (*UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,24).

Ongin — Runic inscr.: Sir G. Clauson, 'The Ongin inscription'. *JRAS* 1957: 177-192. Sertkaya II.

Pañcarakşa — USp 103 with the reedition of Aalto, *UW* bibliogr. nr. 91.

Pfahl — *UW* bibliogr. nr. 56. Pfahl II is not the second inscr. published there (which is Chin.), but one edited as 'Anhang'.

Pothi — Clark, L.V., 'the Manichean Turkic Pothi-Book', *AoF* IX

Profan (1982): 145-218. A reedition of TT III, TT IX and story IV in W. Bang's 'Manichäische Erzähler', which belong to one work.

Zieme, P., 'Einige Bemerkungen zur Profanliteratur der Uiguren'. Beşinci Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi; Tebliğler. I. Türk Dili, cilt 1, Istanbul, 1985, pp. 277-282.

QaraBalg The runic inscr. found at Qara Balγasun. Edited, among other places, in Orkun, 1936-41; II 31-54. Sertkaya XV.

QB The Kutadgu Bilig of Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥāǧib is quoted according to the Arat edition, mentioned in EDPT p. xviii. R. R. Arat's *İndeks* to the QB (Istanbul, 1979, posthumous) should be consulted together with: S. Tezcan, 'Kutadgu Bilig dizini üzerine'. *Belleten* 45/2 (1981): 23-78. This review does not exhaust the *İndeks*'s imperfections.

R. Dankoff, Wisdom of Royal Glory (Kutadgu Bilig). A Turko-Islamic Mirror for Princes. Translated, with an introduction and notes, by English version, with critical appendix of ms. variants: Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib. Chicago and London, 1983.

Outlug Text appearing on pp. 84-89 of U II.

Sandel Zieme, P., 'Sandelholz in den uigurischen Texten'. *AoF* 11 (1984): 371-380.

Scharl Scharlipp, W., 'Fragmente eines uigurischen Kommentars zur Triṃśikāvijñaptimātratāsiddhi des Vasubandhu'. *UAJb* N.F. 6 (1986): 122-136.

Schwitz Kudara, K., and P. Zieme, 'Chinesisch-alttürkische Fragmente des "Schwitzbad-Sūtras"'. *AoF* 15 (1988): 182-191.

SktUigBil Maue, D., Sanskrit-uigurische Bilinguen aus den Berliner Turfan-funden. Giessen, 1983. Unpublished ms.

Suci The first runic inscr. in: G.J. Ramstedt, 'Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei'. *JSFOu* XXX/3 (1913). Sertkaya XIX.

Suv Refers to UW bibliogr. nr. 58, quoted by page and line of the Radlov-Malov edition (also when our source for the text is some other publication, containing part of it). Our abbreviation SuvBew refers to UW bibliogr. nr. 200, SuvBangGab to nr. 12, SuvÇag to nr. 134, SuvCaitya to UW bibliogr., Nachtr. 1,29 (there quoted as Caitya), SuvMüll to pp. 17-35 in UI, SuvZieme to *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 1,12. The ls. 678,1-686,21, quoted in the *UW* as TekinBuyan and mentioned in the bibliogr. under nr. 199, are excluded by us, as they are a 17th century addition. The following six publications do not appear in the bibliogr. of the *UW*, or appear under a different name:

SuvBT XIII On pp. 88-91 of BT XIII there is an ed. of a section of Suv corres-

ponding to 134,1-147,2 of the Radlov-Malov ed., collated with Turfan mss.

SuvDrog — Maue, D., and O. Sertkaya, 'Drogenliste und Dhāraṇī aus dem "Zauberritual der Sarasvatī" des uigurischen Goldglanzsūtra (Teil I)'. *UAJb* N.F. 6 (1986): 76-99. Corresponds to 475-6 of the Radlov-Malov edition.

SuvGeng — Geng Shimin, *Kədimki Uyoɣurqə "Altun Yaruḳ"ning 27-bəlümi "Bay ooɣli Udakanisyanda hikayəsi" tooɣrısındiki tətḳiḳat*, 1980. Contains the passage 598,6-606,16.

SuvLeg — Referred to as ZiemeLegenden in the *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,45. Edition of Berlin frs. corresponding to 7,16-16,9 of the Radlov-Malov edition.

SuvRezTerm — The passage 218,2-219,2 as edited on p. 180 of the paper listed in the *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3, as RezTerm.

SuvSchul — The passages 65,19-67,17, 70,13-71,2 and 165,10-16 as edited in ŚūnVijñ (*UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,55).

SuvTrin — Tekin, Ş., 'Buddhistische Trinitätslehre in der (thus!) Goldglanzsūtra'. *UAJb* 33 (1961): 187 ff. Contains the passage 40,14-47,12.

Şu — The Shine Usu inscr., published by Ramstedt in the publication mentioned above under 'Suci'. Sertkaya XIII.

Tariat — Runic inscr. quoted according to S.G. Kljaštornyj, 'The Terkhin inscription'. *AOH* 36 (1982): 335-366, and T. Tekin, 'The Tariat (Terkhin) inscription'. *AOH* 37 (1982): 43-68. Sertkaya XII.

TeilBuch — Text appearing on pp. 7-17 in MI.

Tes — Klyashtorny, S.G., 'The Tes inscription of the Uighur Bögü Qaghan'. *AOH* 39/1 (1985): 137-156. Runic inscr. not mentioned by Sertkaya.

ThS I — The first of the runic mss. published by Thomsen in *JRAS* 1912, the second one being the IrqB (q.v. above). In the *EDPT* mentioned as Mir A.

ThS III — Runic ms. which first appeared in the same collection. Here quoted according to J. Hamilton and L. Bazin, 'Un manuscrit chinois et turc runiforme de Touen-Houang'. *Turcica* IV (1972): 25-42.

ThS IV — Fourth runic ms. in the same collection, mentioned by the *EDPT* as Tun IV.

TibStud — Refers to a list of Turkic words extracted from mss. in Tibetan writing by Clauson, pp. 97-100 in *UW* bibliogr. 139.

Toñ — The runic inscr. of Tonyukuk, quoted according to G.J. Ramstedt, J.G. Granö and P. Aalto, 'Materialien zu den alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei', *JSFOu* 60 (1958): 30-49. Sertkaya VIII.

Töten Text appearing on p. 37 of *UI*.

TT V BKud Refers to what appears in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 2,32, there quoted as Kudara TT V.

TT VI Various papers by J. Oda complement the normalizing ed. of Bang and Gabain, among them OdaŌtani and OdaUigh mentioned above and TT VI New and TT VI Ryū mentioned below. Also OdaRemarks as referred to in *UW* bibliogr., Nachtr. 3,52. We have the facs. of the London scroll in HamTouen p. 331 ff.

TT VI Coloph Zieme, P., 'Colophons to the *Säkiz yükmäk yaruq'*, *AoF* 10/1 (1983): 143-149. We quote the third colophon from BT XIII 49, where it was reedited.

TT VI New Oda, J., 'New fragments of the Buddhist Uighur text *Säkiz yükmäk yaruq'*, *AoF* 10/1 (1983): 125-142.

TT VI Ryū Oda, J., 'Ryūkoku Daigaku Toshokan zō Uiguru-bun hachiyōkei no danpen shūi (= 'Fragments of the Uigur version of the Pa-yang-ching preserved at the library of Ryukoku University'). Pp. 161-184 in M. Mori, *Nairiku Ajia, Nishi Ajia no Shakai to Bunka*, Tokyo, 1983.

TuoLuoNi Kara, G., and P. Zieme, 'Die uigurische Übersetzung des apokryphen Sūtras "Fo ding xin da tuo luo ni"', *AoF* 13 (1986): 318-376.

UigBunken Moriyasu, T., 'Uigurugo bunken (Uigurica from Tun-huang)'. *Kôza Tonkô* 6 (1985): 3-98. The work referred to as UK in the *UW*, bibliogr. Nachtr. 3,49.

UigKan Kara, G., 'Weiteres über die uigurische Nāmasaṃgīti'. *AoF* VIII (1981): 227-236. Ed. of some additional frs. of BT VIII B.

UigNām Zieme, P., 'Materialien zum uigurischen Onomastikon III'. *TDAYB* 1984 (1987): 267-283.

UigOn III Ščerbak, A.M., 'Nadpis' na drevneujgurskom jazyke iz Mongolii'. *EV* 14 (1961): 23-25 as corrected by: P. Zieme, 'Uygur yazısıyla yazılmış Uygur yazıtlarına dair bazı düşünceler'. *TDAYB* 1982-3 (1986): 229-237.

Ulaangom Referred to by text and line, and not by page and line as in the *UW*.

USp Many texts of this collection have been reedited, the Radlov readings not being quite dependable even with Malov's corrections.

UşnViç Text appearing on pp. 27-50 of *U II*.

Utsuqm Text appearing on pp. 50-75 of *U II*.

Üdrāt Text appearing on pp. 76-81 of *U II*.

Weih Tekin, Ş., 'Die uigurische Weihinschrift eines buddhistischen Klosters aus den Jahren 767-780 in Tuyoq'. *UAJb* 48 (1976): 227-230. The dating is dubious.

Wettkampf	Geng Shimin, H.-J. Klimkeit and J.P. Laut, 'Manis Wettkampf mit dem Prinzen. Ein neues manichäisch-türkisches Fragment aus Turfan'. *ZDMG*, 137 (1987): 44-58.
WoodFr	Umemura, H., 'A wooden fragment with Uighur inscription preserved in the Tokyo National Museum'. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, no. 41, pp. 63-82. Tokyo, 1983.
Yarkand	Erdal, M., 'The Turkish Yarkand documents'. *BSOAS* XLVII/2 (1984): 260-301. Six Qarakhanid land sale contracts.
YE	The Yenisei inscrs., quoted according to D.D. Vasil'ev, *Korpus Tjurkskix Runičeskix Pamjatnikov Bassejna Jeniseja*, Leningrad, 1983. Reference by inscr. number and line. This work contains transliterations, bibliography for each inscr., facss. etc., but not transcriptions or translations.[1] The interpretations are mine. I also used unpublished material collected by V. Thomsen and K. Wulff.[2]
Yetikän	TT VII text 14 + a passage in the n. thereto + TT VII 40. Part of this reedited as ETŞ 26.
Zerst	Geng Shimin and H.-J. Klimkeit, 'Zerstörung manichäischer Klöster in Turfan'. *ZaS* 18 (1985): 7-11.
ZiemeGuan	Zieme, P., 'A new fragment of the Uigur Guanwuliangshoujing'. *Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyū-sho Kiyō Dai Hijū Shū Bassatsu*, 1982 (shōwa 57): 20-29.

The following abbreviations refer to names of journals, collective works, dictionaries or text collections. Note that they are in italics whereas, when referring to texts like ŞU, DLT or TT VI, we use roman type.

AoF	*Altorientalische Forschungen*
AOH	*Acta Orientalia Hungarica*
CAJ	*Central Asiatic Journal*
DTS	See Nadeljaev et al., 1969 in the bibliography.
EDPT	See Clauson, 1972 in the bibliography.
EV	*Epigrafika Vostoka*
Fundamenta	See *Philologiae Turcicae* . . . in the bibliography.
JA	*Journal Asiatique*

1 This is one reason why the work of S. Ye. Malov, *Jenisejskaja Pis'mennost' Tjurkov* (Moscow, 1952) is not made obsolete by it. Moreover, some texts (e.g. YE 24) were no longer available to Vasil'ev, and others (e.g. YE 28, mentioned in n. 47 in vol. 2) were more complete in Malov's time.

2 I would like to thank Kaare Thomsen Hansen and Iben Raphael Meyer for allowing me to use this material, preserved at the Centralasiatisk Institut of the University of Copenhagen when I was there in 1970-73.

JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JSFOu	*Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*
JTS	*Journal of Turkish Studies*
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
PFEH	*Papers on Far Eastern History*
RO	*Rocznik Orientalistyczny*
SEddT-F (I, II, IV)	*See Sprachwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse . . .* in the bibliography.
TDED	*Türk Dili ve Edebiyat Dergisi*
TM	*Türkiyat Mecmuasi*
TMEN	See Doerfer, 1963-1975 in the bibliography.
TP	*Toung Pao*
TTS	See *Tanıklarıyle Tarama . . .* in the bibliography.
TUBA	*Journal of Turkish Studies (= Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları)*
Turcica	
UAJb	*Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*
UAJb N.F.	*Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher. Neue Folge*
UW	See Röhrborn, 1977ff. in the bibliography.
ZaS	*Zentralasiatische Studien*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

Further abbreviations (plurals in brackets):

Ar.	*Arabic*
Chin.	*Chinese*
Chuv.	*Chuvash*
ex.	*example*
facs.	*facsimile*
fn.	*footnote*
fol.	*folio*
fr.	*fragment*
inscr.	*inscription*
intr.	*intransitive*
Kaz.	*Kazakh*
Khal.	*Khalaj*
Kirgh.	*Kirghiz*
l.	*line*
Mo.	*Mongolian*
ms.	manuscript
n.	note
N. Pr.	proper name
par.	paragraph
Pe.	Persian
q.v. (qq.v.)	see that (those)
Skt.	Sanskrit
s.v. (s.vv.)	*sub voce (vocibus)*
Tat.	Tatar
Tib.	Tibetan
Tkm.	Turkmen
tr.	transitive
Uzb.	Uzbek
v.l. (v.ll.)	*varia(e) lectio(nes)*
Yak.	Yakut

1.2 *Special signs and letters, transliteration and transcription, and phonological problems*

We render Old Turkic in three different ways: We transliterate it, transcribe it, or give it in archphonemic transcription. *Transliteration* is in ROMAN CAPITALS. The vowels /i/ and /ı/ (the unrounded narrow back vowel) appear as I, /o/ and /u/ as W, /ö/ and /ü/ as Ẅ in runes, WI in Uigur writing (a variant of the most common Sogdian script) and Manichaean writing in the first syllable, etc. A refers to the runic letter used both for /a/ and /ä/ and occasionally also for /e/. *Alif* is transcribed as ′, with ″ being usually used initially to write /a/ in the Semitic alphabets. A few runic characters refer to sequences of two phonemes; these are transliterated by pairs of letters joined by ˆ, e.g. in NÇ. After /n/, the opposition between /d/ and /t/ appears to have been neutralized, the resulting cluster being written by a single character which we transliterate as NˆD/T and transcribe as *n*D. It was probably realised as [nd]. With most consonants, runic writing distinguishes between back and front harmony. We transliterate the former with the help of ^{1}, the latter by superscribing ^{2}. Thus T^{2}A is /tä/, /ätä/ etc., K^{2}I /ki/, /äki/ or /eki/. Note the vowel-consonant ligatures WˆK^{1} = 'unvoiced velar adjacent to rounded back vowel' etc. In transliteration, the hyphen marks the connection between stems and suffixes written separately in the ms., as in 'WRI-TIN = /urıtın/ with the ablative suffix. When transcribing, the hyphen has a different function. In transliteration we distinguish between K and Q and between G and Γ for Uigur and Manichaean writing. Brāhmī texts are transliterated in the way usual for Sanskrit.

Our usual mode of rendering the sources is by transcribing them, which is done in *italics*. We usually quote in a *transcription* which tries to be phonemic as best as possible, but mention morphemes in *morphophonemic transcription*. We hardly ever mark vowel length, although it must have been phonemic in some stages and variants of Old Turkic at least in the first syllable: At least two degrees of vowel length can be reconstructed for Proto-Turkic by comparing certain modern Turkic languages; the author of the QB appears to have been aware of the distinction and to have used it for his metric purposes; in the IrqB, /ā/ of the first syllable is consistently written as A while /a/ is not spelled out at all. Sources in Brāhmī and Tibetan writing show no signs of the distinction, however, although the script itself definitely presented the possibility for doing so. We do not know in what words and what texts to mark it, then, and prefer to leave it out altogether. We hope not to have made mistakes in distinguishing between broad and narrow rounded vowels, which Uigur writing, the most common Old Turkic writing system, does not distinguish. A few single syllable lexemes and foreign borrowings appear to have been pronounceable either with /i/ or with /ı/, as shown in the suffix forms of both Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic. *inçä* and *ınça* may also have existed

side by side. Arbitrary choices may have been made in some of these cases. The phoneme /e/ is transcribed as such also when it is written as *ä* or *i*, as it usually is; only a few Yenisei inscriptions have a special character for this phoneme. It mostly appears in the first syllable, but also finally, e.g. in *yete* 'seven' and *täbe* 'camel'. /e/ is a front vowel, which perhaps comes from **ä*; the long counterparts of /i/, /ü/, /ä/ and /a/ would thus be /ī/, /ū/, /e/, probably long, and /ā/. Being a front vowel, /e/ cannot be followed by back vowel allomorphs of suffixes. In the *UW* we find forms written as *asanke+lar+ıg*, *abişek+lig* (an ex. from TuoLuoNi 54 = 62 can be added to the entry), *akaşapuşpe+lig* and *apiramane+lar+ıg*. The sound spelled as *e* by the *UW* comes from Skt. *a via* the Tokharian sound spelled as *e*. This latter might have been a central and not a front vowel, like the lexeme-final central unstressed vowel in German (also spelled as *e*). In the Old Turkic phonemic system, this sound is clearly closest to /ı/, which, in any case, turns out to represent it here: Only /ı/ is followed by the alternants *+ıg* and *+lıg* of the respective suffixes. We therefore write *asankı* etc., in phonemic spelling. *asankı* and *abışık* are spelled with front K which, we take it, has no phonetic significance. Learned spelling of foreign words is much more wide-spread and likely than that foreign bases should consistently receive formatives and suffixes in the back-vowel series: The choice against front allomorphs could have no explanation.

The *UW* transcribes /I/ occurring in foreign borrowings as *i*. Thus e.g. *bavagirtın* ... *aviş tamukatägi* (Suv 133,16), quoted in *UW* 279 b. *bavagırtın* is probably preferable. This word comes from *Bhavāgra:* After the /r/ had absorbed the reduced final vowel, anaptyxis was called for to break the cluster. It is quite unlikely that an anaptyctic vowel should have had front quality between two back vowels.

We assume that the harmony of the suffixes shows us the quality of the phonemes of the last syllable of the stem. This has not actually been proven for borrowings as yet, but is likely in view of the treatment given to borrowings in Turkic languages in general. What else could determine this harmony if not the stem? We read e.g. *sängräm* and not *sangram*, as the suffixes added to this lexeme are *+ig*, *+kä*, *+däki* etc. As the giver languages did not have the oppositions /i:ı, ü:u, ä:a, ö:o/, any lexeme lent into Old Turkic could, in principle, follow either harmony. It is interesting to note, in this respect, that short Arabic /i a u/ borrowed into Ottoman Turkish was generally rephonologised as Turkish /i ä ü/, the vowels /ı a o ö (thus) u/ appearing in Turkish only if they were close to emphatic consonants in Arabic. Similarly, Skt., Tokharian etc. /u o/ may have sounded to Old Turkic ears as being closer to their front vowels /ü ö/ than to their back vowels /u o/. We should not, I believe, hesitate to write *küjäl* ≪ Skt. *kuśala*, *säŋräm*, *Gödäm* ≪ Skt. *Gautama* or *şlök* ≪ Skt. *śloka* (cf. the accusative *şlöküg* with final front K in ShōAgon 1,214 and note the Tokh. form): The value of Old Turkic /a o u/ can in

any case by no means be equated with the sounds represented by the same characters in other languages.

With the velar consonants, several of the scripts used by the Old Turks write back and front allophones differently. Since our transcription represents phonemes and not allophones, I transcribe both [q] and [k] as *k* and both [γ] and [g] as *g*. In foreign words, the characters *g* and *k* are sometimes used also in back vocalic words, something which cannot be represented in phonemic transcription. If we want to be explicit about this point, we have a system of transliteration at our disposal. As a further concession to Republican Turkish orthography, the voiced counterpart of /ş/ (found only in foreign words, as far as we know) is written as *j* and not *ž*.

In Uigur and Manichaean writing, certain words starting with /a/ are spelled with initial *ä*; this is transcribed as *a*. Initial /ā/ spelled as *a* is transcribed *'ā*.

In Maitr,(listed in Laut, 1986: 71-74), in HamTouen text 18, in some rare Manichaean texts and in the DLT, /ŋ/ is sporadically spelled with (front) K. This is a purely graphic and not a phonetic phenomenon, as K appears in back-vowel words as well. The instances are marked as ṅ (cf. *UW* 14 footn.).

The non-nasal velar, dental and labial consonants of Old Turkic pose special phonological problems which cannot be dealt with here. We assume there were two phonemes for each point of articulation, viz. /k/ and /g/, /t/ and /d/ and /p/ and /b/. The distinction within each pair may have been primarily one of voice, or of energy (fortis – lenis) or of mode of articulation (stop – spirant). In any case, /k/, /t/ and /p/ may have had the allophones [g], [d] and [b] after vowels, whereas the phonemes /g/, /d/ and /b/ apparently had the spirantic allophones [γ], [δ] and [v] in this position. [γ] and [δ], not being phonemes, are here written as *g* and *d* respectively, even when transcribing Qarakhanid texts, where they are written with the Arabic letters *ghain* and *dhāl* respectively. In conformity with general practice, we do transcribe [v] as *v*, however, departing in this form the phonemic principle. According to the view presented, the voiced and the voiceless non-nasal consonants overlap by having the phones [g], [d] and [b] in common. Nowhere is there any neutralisation, however, as the overlapping allophones of the respective phonemes are in complementary distribution. This view will serve us as a convenient base for our transcription; we do not maintain it to be the only possible, or the correct one. With the publication of BuddhKat, we now have a broader basis for the solution of these problems, which, indeed, appear to be in good hands: A good start has been made by Johanson, 1979, Sims Williams, 1981, Maue, 1983, Maue, 1984, and Hitch, 1984, and we can hope that Old Turkic phonology will soon emerge from the mists.

When transcribing texts, ideograms, as a rule Chinese, are interpreted with Turkic words, which we write in italic capitals. Thus, where the ms. has 山, for

instance, we write XONGUL. These words must have been pronounced in Turkic, as the harmony of the suffixes added to them follows the harmony of the Turkic words (which is one of the clues for identifying them). In the UW, such ideograms are tacitly transcribed: ʌ L'R (ShöAv 20), e.g., appears in UW 298 b as kiŋlär. This is an unwelcome practice, since correspondences are not always one-to-one. In morphophonemic transcription, used for referring to suffixes, single archphonemes are also marked by italic capitals, e.g. -dIm or +nXŋ. Here, A = /a ~ ä/, U = /u ~ ü/, I = /ı ~ i/ and X = /ı ~ i ~ u ~ ü/. My views on the archphoneme X, summed up in Erdal, 1979b, were attacked by Doerfer, 1981-82. The last word on this chapter of Old Turkic phonology, as on so much more, has not yet been written. My view is now confirmed by BuddhKat, where X is spelled in accordance with fourfold harmony, with the exception of /i/ for which Tibetan writing does not have a special letter. For this phoneme (in general, and not only where it belongs to the archphoneme X), the scribe writes the letter *i*, with the following exceptions: He writes *ya* or *a* before velar consonants and in the word *yapırgak*, where it is followed by a cluster containing a velar. It is a universal of assimilation that velars retract vowels, and /i/ is here understood to have had a more backward allophone when preceding them. It is this allophone of /i/ lying further back which the scribe deemed inappropriately transcribed by *i*. According to the Manichaean data to be found in Zieme, 1969: 174-6 and the Maitr data discussed in Laut, 1986: 66-69, /X/ was written as *A* only when unrounded, practically always when back-vocalic. I maintain that, in general as in BuddhKat, *a* was used to render /i/ only because the writing systems had no letter for this phoneme.[3] An ex. like *toyınlar* 'monks' written as *toyanlar* in Maitr 79 v 5, e.g., shows that this spelling has nothing to do with the phonetic characterisation of /X/: This lexeme, borrowed from a Chin. phrase, definitely had no /X/. /i/ shares narrowness and illabiality with /i/ but, on the other hand, backness and illabiality with /a/: *two traits*, that is, in each case. Backness is left unmarked if *i* is used, narrowness if *a* is used. There is no reason to assume that the marking of narrowness was more important than the marking of backness, and one can, in principle, make do with either letter equally well. In some languages, e.g. Arabic and English, short /i/ has a retracted allophone closer to what we refer to as [ı] in certain surroundings; however, it would be ethnocentric to transfer this affinity to Old Turkic. It is precisely because of this characteristic of the Arabic vowel system that /i/ and /ı/ are written the same way in Ottoman orthography. This, then, is the crypto-Osmanic view, to use Doerfer's term, and not ours. Assimilation is probably responsible for the exs. where *ä* is written for /i/. Such exs. (supplied to me by Dr. Laut) are *biligliglärnän* (38 r 21),

3 A similar case is that of *shva mobile* in proper names of the Hebrew Bible, which is found transcribed by *alpha* in the (Greek) Septuagint (translation).

sätlärnäŋ (33 v6, mistakenly marked as recto on the facs.), *t(ä)ŋrilärnäŋ* (137 v7-8; also MaitrH XS b22) and *yedäçilärnäŋ* (72 r1), all in the Maitr.

We use the following signs in transcription:

- Marks the juncture between the end of a verb stem and a suffix, e.g. *aç-mak*. Appears also at the end of suffixless verbal stems and before verbal or deverbal suffixes, e.g. *aş-*, *-mak*, *-gU* or *-Xl-*.
+ Marks the juncture between the end of a non-verbal stem and a suffix, e.g. *äv+i*, *är+däm*, *kagan+sıra-*. Also used before nominal or denominal suffixes, e.g. *+lAr*, *+k(ı)ya* and *+lA-*, but not to mark the *end* of non-verbal lexemes or morphemes as *köz* or *birlä*.
° The degree sign marks any abbreviation, as in transcriptions of Sanskrit, and not the morpheme border. °*t*, for instance, means '*t* at the end of a word', °*mlş-* the beginning of a word'; *t*° '*t* at the end of any verb base ending in either /mış/ or /mış/, e.g. *äm-iş-*, *komı-ş-* or (the opaque) *kämiş-*.
* Starred forms are reconstructable, and not wrong or for any reason impossible; the latter are put in single quotes, as '*ülaşik*' (see p. 22 below).
$_2$ We write a subscribed $_2$ after translations of binomials and of pairs of verbs which are to be translated by one lexeme.[4]

Translations of Old Turkic passages, lexemes etc. which we propose are placed in single quotes, while double quotes mark translations of other scholars which we may or may not have adopted.

In archphonemic transcription, round brackets are put around parts of lexemes or morphemes which are omitted under certain morphophonemic conditions, e.g. in *+(s)I(n+)*, the 3rd person possessive suffix. In this case, the allomorphs are *+i*, *+ı*, *+si*, *+sı*, *+in+*, *+ın+*, *+sin+* and *+sın+*. The + sign after the *n* symbolizes the fact that the *n* appears only if there is another suffix following this one.[5] These brackets are *not* obligatory: The passive suffix is written both as *-Xl-* and as *-(X)l-*, the former if the unstable nature of the vowel does not need underlining. In normal transcription of text passages, round brackets do not mark optionality: They are put around letters which the scribe has omitted for some reason, although they were presumably pronounced, e.g. in *al(ı)nmamak*. In some cases, e.g. *t(ä)ŋri* and *+l(ı)g* in Uigur script or medial °*a*° and °*ä*° in runes, this is demanded by standard orthography. Square brackets mark lacunae and sometimes conjectures for what is taken to have stood in

4 See section 1.9.

5 For the accusative case, this further suffix is *+Ø*; for the nominative case it is subtractive.

them. They can also appear singly, if the quotation does not cover the whole lacuna, e.g. i]lıasär.

If a text is given run-on line numeration by the editor, or has numbered parts with run-on line numeration in each part, we quote it by the abbreviated title of the text (often different from the name of the publication),[6] followed by the number and letter of the part if there is one, followed by the line number. Texts with no run-on line numbering are quoted by abbreviated title, followed by page and line as given by the editor. If a line number appears more than once on a page, the different appearances are distinguished by consecutive subscribed numerals. Thus, '78,5$_3$' signifies: 'page 78 of the publication, third instance of a line bearing the number 5'. If a quotation runs through several lines, the number given is that of the word being discussed, for which the passage is being quoted. 'r' and 'v' always refer to the recto and verso of mss., even if the editor uses the expressions 'Vorderseite' and 'Rückseite'.

A single slash (/) marks the end of a verse.

1.3 Terminology

'Nominal', 'adnominal' and 'adverbal' describe the use of particular lexemes within concrete syntactic structures: *Nominal expressions* are used in sentences, clauses or participial phrases as arguments or, to use a term from valence theory, as actants. Anything qualifying a nominal expression is an *adnominal expression*; anything qualifying a verb phrase is *adverbal*. The distinction between verbal and other lexemes is morphological in Old Turkic. In principle, lexemes are not used both as verbs and as something else: See Erdal, 1979b: 84, countered by Doerfer, 1982. The division of the non-verbal part of the lexicon into nouns, adjectives and adverbs is a much more complex matter, not to speak of postpositions, conjunctions etc. This latter problem has not really been considered for Old Turkic, and cannot be taken up here. Many Old Turkic lexemes fall under more than one of these headings. Our use of these terms is intuitive and pre-scientific but hopefully still useful in some ways: Lexemes are usually used primarily in nominal, adnominal or adverbal fashion; content, moreover, is often a helpful factor. We are primarily interested in the following fact: Particular formatives often exclusively or primarily form nouns, or adjectives, or adverbs, thus making the derived part of the lexicon rather transparent as to function. Old Turkic does not, of course,

6 Often, texts of different age, nature, religion or script are found together in one publication. Quoting them separately, we enable the reader to determine the distribution of grammatical phenomena by any of these criteria.

characterise nouns or adjectives inflexionally, as certain Indo-European languages do.

The term 'primary verb' is used to refer to simple or to denominal verbs; 'secondary verbs', on the other hand, are the ones derived from verbs. A deverbal formative is said to be used secondarily if it is added to a secondary verb, i.e. if it is added to another deverbal formative. This distinction is meaningful only within verb formation, which may be a recursive category.

Nominal formatives are sometimes said to be 'endocentric' or 'exocentric'. The first term means that they qualify the lexeme to which they are added; the second, that they qualify another one.

The nominal or pronominal expression which co-refers with the person of finite verbs is called 'subject'. The terms 'agent' and 'patient' refer to the subject and object of underlying propositions; such, that is, that descriptively precede passivisation, relativisation and so forth. See more on actantial terminology in part VII.

1.4 *Old Turkic, Proto-Turkic, Common Turkic*

Old Turkic is not, of course, identical with Proto-Turkic. Being attested earlier than other dialects, e.g. Oguz or Bolgar, it has, however, a central place in the reconstruction of Common Turkic. Common Turkic, which one should, in principle, be able to reconstruct, is not necessarily identical with Proto-Turkic, in so far as Turkic dialects spoken at early times and containing vital information on Proto-Turkic may not have survived in any form. Any modern Turkic language can easily have retained an archaic trait which no longer exists in Old Turkic. For instance, Orkhon Turkic lost the *-gAy* future retained elsewhere, and the early Old Turkic *koiné* lost the participle in *-gAn* readmitted later.[7] Both forms were, however, preserved in word formation, as so often happens with obsolete morphemes.[8]

For a comparison of Turkic languages among themselves and for determining their relationship to other Altaic languages, it is of extraordinary importance that an independent description of Old Turkic be supplied, which should not be influenced by whatever hypotheses one may have about Common or Proto-Turkic. One cannot, for instance, ascribe the presence of initial aspiration to Old Turkic, as there is no evidence for it in any Old Turkic text. As Khaladj, the Tibetan account of the northern countries etc. show, Proto-Turkic must have had initial /h/

7 See section 3.324 below.

8 See Erdal, 1979b: 89, which proposes that *-gA* (section 3.323 below) may have been an abbreviation of *-gAy*; note also the *-gA* form of the future morpheme in Qarakhanid Turkic.

in some lexemes. The alternation *#yV° and consistent *#V°) appears to be a dependable reflex of *#hV°, and is so dealt with in the verb (-atem) index. It is quite unlikely for this sound to have been retained in Old Turkic, however, as recently confirmed by BuddhKat. Note, moreover, that no irreducible trait of a Turkic language can automatically be ascribed to Proto-Turkic, which is in any case an abstraction. It may be that the Oguz, for instance, originally spoke an other, non-Turkic language, as French was born from the attempt of the Celtic Gauls to speak Latin; not every aspect of French can be ascribed to Latin. This is precisely what the historical sources teach us about the origin of the Tatars and the Kirgiz. The situation is even more complicated when one tries to use other Altaic languages for such comparison.

This work also aims at reconstruction, but only at internal reconstruction. The latter follows from the need to 'make sense' of the data, from the quest for the pressures and drifts lying behind the phenomena and their internal chronology. Old Turkic is a set of closely related and without doubt mutually intelligible dialects. This must be the case even though the isoglosses between these dialects and their characteristics have not been worked out, and even though we cannot even tell how many there were. This situation may be the result of diversification, but equally well also of a convergence. One of the reasons why it turns out to be difficult to discern dialects may be that the scribes tried to write in the same *koiné*, but inadvertently admitted traces of their respective dialects into their text. Moreover, at the time Old Turkic was written there were dialects of more remote tribes which did not influence it.

In this work we assume diversity within Old Turkic only where there is positive evidence for it in the sources. As an example: Kononov, 1980 mentions an affix *-(a)q, -(ā)k, -īq, -uq, -ik, -ūk*. His example for *-īq* is *barq* < **barïq*, for *-ik üläšik* (*KTS 7*). There is positive evidence in all forms of Old Turkic for the suffixes *-Ok* and *-Xg*, discussed below, but not for unrounded narrow vowels with voiceless velars added to verbal stems. Both **bar-ok* and **bar-ıg* could be the source of *bark*,' however. *'ülāşik'* would be a possible *reading* but not a possible *form*, assuming that Orkhon Turkic does not differ in this aspect of word formation from Uigur. We have positive Old Turkic evidence for a suffix *-sXk*, giving *öl-sük+*, which we have to read here. There *are* evident grammatical and other differences between Orkhon Turkic and other forms and stages of the language, but the existence of non-evident and unlikely differences cannot be assumed. Had he been willing to assume anything for Orkhon Turkic, Kononov needn't have added a star to *barıq*, a possible *reading* in itself.

9 Cf. p. 224f. below.

1.5 *Describing creative competence in a dead language*

The aim of the present work is to investigate how and for what purposes the Old Turks created nouns, verbs, adjectives (if there is such a class in Old Turkic) and adverbs. We would like to give a synchronic description of the competence of the Old Turkic writer, hearer and reader in creating lexemes and in analysing already created but still transparent ones. We hope that this corresponds, more or less, to the creative competence of the Old Turkic speaker. There will, of course, never be any way of ascertaining this hope. Even for a living language, it is nearly impossible to determine whether a given derived form is really transparent to a hearer, and if a speaker really created it; they might, after all, also have learned it as an opaque whole, and used it as such. On the other hand, it is possible even for a derivate learned as a whole building-block to be reanalysed and re-created by the speaker-hearer; in this process, he gives it a more regular meaning, one more in accord with the function of the formation in question. It may seem hopeless to attempt to write a *functional* word formation for a dead language. As distinct from other domains of grammar, much that is often termed word formation is simply not functional and should be left to etymology. Our description tries to be functional in that we consider formation to be an activity, the particular motives for which are to be determined in each case. We take it that readers, or understanding listeners of texts read out loud, had to be aware of such motives to understand the content fully. Why did the creating speaker or writer prefer one formation to another? Did he reanalyse already existing lexemes, leading to an hypostasis of formatives? Such questions cannot always be answered; they should, however, be asked.

Linguistic competence consists of a lexical repository and of a grammar; the latter enables the speaker to use lexemes for producing understandable texts and the listener to analyse such texts into what was meant to be understood in the first place. Lexical elements need not all come from the mentioned repository, however, but can be created afresh by grammatical means. Such new elements are then usually understood by the listener, although he cannot usually identify them with any stored element of his; as a rule, contextual and extra-linguistic clues are of much help to understanding. Beside this introduction of new lexemes, which we might call the analogical way, all languages also of course borrow from other languages and dialects, transfer lexemes from one meaning to another, widen or narrow meaning, join lexemes into idioms and compounds etc. All that will not be treated here, but only the widening of the lexicon by the use of formatives.[10] Word

10 I know of no language which regularly uses an inflexional morpheme both for morphology and derivation. A few possible instances are laden with theoretical and practical problems.

formation seems to me to be the most interesting domain of language, among other reasons because of the most frequent war between analogy and anomaly that occurs in it. Creative speakers and underg- the incessant transparent lexemes, which are all the time dismotivated by being absorbed into the lexicon of other speakers and undergo- various semantic shifts. Distinctions between synchrony and diachrony, the competence and performance, etc. Distinctions and learning, individual and society are most difficult to keep up in the domain of word formation.

If it is in this domain, also, that one disregard formatives like Old passive competence constantly produces difference exists between active and passive, creation, and that the greatest difference exists between active and that every speaker

no longer be ascribed to a formative, the fact that its products belong to one semantic class is reason enough for its documentation.

There are intermediates between a productive formation and an unproductive one: Some formations are weakly productive to different degrees; they cannot be considered dead, even if they only rarely produce a new lexeme. The number of new creations using a given formative in a particular period is often connected with its content, or with non-linguistic circumstances. In other cases, there is a competition between different formatives having a similar content, which thus limit each other's activity. It then happens that such formatives show different degrees of productivity in different semantic domains, often leading to specialisation in one domain; but in this too there can be fluctuations.

Real formatives are morphemes which form lexemes. Not less than other morphemes and lexemes, they have a constant and/or determinable phonological form, carry out certain syntactic tasks and have a more or less formulatable meaning or set of interrelated meanings. If a phoneme sequence falls outside of what is expected in any one of these matters, it cannot be assigned to the formative in question. When dealing with rare or semantically not quite unitary formations, we also mention forms which are dubious in these respects; this is only for the sake of the fullness of documentation, hoping that as yet unkown instances might change the picture altogether. For well documented formations, such cases have been left out altogether. E.g. we mention neither *yarlıg* 'pitiful' nor *yarlıg* 'decree', as their suggested assignment to the formation *+lXg* is quite uncertain, and as we have more than enough examples for this formation. The not less problematic *yintäm*, on the other hand, *is* discussed with the formation using the formative *+dAm*, which is much rarer and semantically much less clear.

It is by no means easy to guess whether an 'understander' of a regular derivate is always aware that the lexeme is in fact a derivate; this may differ from person to person and may depend on any change in meaning which the derivate has undergone. Few French speakers are aware that *beaucoup* comes from *beau coup*, even after having studied linguistics. Nor can we ever be sure that Old Turkic speakers felt e.g. *arıgsız* 'excrements' to be analysable as *arı-(X)g+sXz*, from *arı-* 'to be or become clean', even though this analysis seems evident to us. Even more so with rarer formations like *+gAk*, *+gAç* or *+dAm*; but then grammar is, in principle, an internalised affair which may never come up to the speaker's consciousness. Note the evidence of Abhi A 41 b 4 (quoted and translated in *UW* 268 b): *tutyak tegüçi savta adkanmak tutyaklanmak tep yörüg ol* "im Wort 'tutyak' liegt die Bedeutung das 'Greifen', das 'Nehmen'". This does not, to be sure, attempt to be an etymology of an Uigur term, but is interesting as an 'inverse' account of semantic relationship. Cf. Kāšġarī on *+lAn-* at the end of this section.

By the rarely perfect written medium in which dead languages present them-

selves to us, an additional factor of uncertainty is introduced. We might, for instance, read *küjäl* (attested several times in Uigur and written with both W and WI in the first syllable) with *ö*, assign it to the formation with *-(X)l* and derive it from a verb *köz+ä-*; such a verb would semantically well accord with *kör-k+lä* and *kör-k+lig*, both 'beautiful', which come from *kör-* 'to see'. All this, in turn, would tend to confirm the view connecting *köz* 'eye' with *kör-*. *küjäl* happens to have given Ottoman *güzäl* 'nice, beautiful', however, and we learn from the n. to Suvarnabhāsottamasūtra Caitya 32,13 that it comes from Skt. *kuśala* 'well, suitable, fit'.[11] Popular etymology does indeed appear to have made the connection with the 'eye' for, in East Anatolian and Az., the word is in fact pronounced as *gözäl*. Such cases may be commoner than we think; had the word not survived to this day, and had we not known its foreign etymology, this one would not have been detected either.

In Old Turkic, it is particularly difficult to distinguish between word formation and 'word-formedness': On the one hand, of course, because the competence of speakers of a dead language is not directly accessible to the linguist; on the other hand, because the morphemes and lexemes of this language appear hardly ever to get phonetically worn out with time. Nevertheless, it seems to me that we can use the following criteria to get at some sort of distinction:

Firstly, material formed synchronically can be expected to be fully regular both in form and content; otherwise it can be expected to have been pre-formed. *ulug* 'great', for instance, may come from **ul+lug* and be derived from *ul* 'base; sole of the foot'; as, however, it is always written with one *l* and semantically never has anything to do with bases and feet, it cannot have been joined and re-joined together each time by the writers of the language, but must have been learned as one unit.

Secondly, both base *and* suffix of synchronous formations have to be attested. *karkın* 'maiden, young woman, maidservant' can not be a derivate, at least not a living one, from *kız* 'girl, unmarried woman', as there is no denominal suffix *+kın* or *+gın*. The collocative use of the two lexemes may be due to assonance, and rhotacistic phenomena (*z* ~ *r*) are not clear at all either.

Thirdly, a synchronous relationship between base and derivate can often be substantiated by parallel collocations. Thus, e.g., we know that *tümäg* is to be read with *ü* and not *ö* and that it belongs to *timä-* because it is used together with *etig* just as *timä-* is used with *et-* and *timän-* with *etin-*.

Fourthly, if there are many lexemes belonging to a formation, this should show

11 See U III 5,5$_1$-6$_1$, where it stands in opposition to *akujal* from *akuśala*. Being foreign words, both *kujal* and *akujal* are written with K and not Q, which makes their first letters look so similar to *köz*. On the phonic circumstances of the borrowing, cf. Shōgaito, 1978: 79-110, and in particular pp. 82 and 104.

that it was alive.[12] For the lexicon is in a process of constant renewal. If a formation is no longer in use, its products will disappear in time just as the bases. The remaining examples develop semantic peculiarities and the relationship between them and the base lexemes is blurred. A small number of lemmata, on the other hand, is not necessarily a sign of morbidity. There may not have been too frequent need for the desiderative in *-(X)gsA-*, for instance, but it has stayed alive right into late Old Turkic.

Fifthly, one can consider formatives which can be added to foreign bases to be alive. We have *pahuayçı* 'inciter, rebel' from Chin. *pó huài*, or *nom+daş*, for instance, but nothing like that with *+gAk*.

Sixthly, we can ask whether formatives can be added to derived bases: *+tA-* cannot but *+lA-* can, the rather common *-Ur-* cannot but *-tUr-* can, *+(X)ç* cannot but *+kIyA* can.[13]

* * *

This work by no means claims to be a list of all derived lexemes of Old Turkic. Practically all texts edited and published before 1989 have been gone over, but many lexemes may have gone unnoticed, or I may have overlooked the connection between them and their respective bases. A few probably derived lexemes have in fact been left out on purpose, because suggested etymologies seemed unconvincing but could not be actually disproved within reasonable space, and/or because I had no better suggestion.

It should further be mentioned that the Old Turkic corpus is by no means closed, and will hopefully not be closed for the foreseeable future. Every new text brings some new lexical material, hitherto unknown meanings and uses and new reasons for assigning lexemes to this or that formation. All this gets less with time, but not too much as yet. I have gone on incorporating new material while the formulation of the work was in progress, which may possibly have led to a few inconsistencies. Disregarding recently published texts would, I feel, have meant a much greater loss for the description.

In fact, a description of a language *cannot* be exhaustive in the generative sense, in that the speakers all the time had the possibility to apply their formations to ever new bases, something which they could never have fixed in writing. It is our task to list lexemes exemplifying this, not everything they *could* have produced.

12 Note, on the other hand, that a wealth of actual examples are needed to *keep* a formation alive in the linguistic sub-conscious of the speaker-hearer, and not just a number of (rarely used) lemmata.

13 *-Ur-* must have been quite active before the time of our texts, however, as the great number of examples show, and also the fact that we do have petrified converbs of this formative as added to derived bases. *-Ur-* forms are of course transparent to this day.

What has been produced is only a random selection of what could have been, had the circumstances demanding it presented themselves, and given the particular world the speakers happened to live in. Our listing of derived lexemes is intended as a justification for our generalisations on the one hand, and as a presentation of the applications of these generalisations on the other; it is in this latter domain that we can contribute to the understanding of Old Turkic. On this subject, we can profitably quote the DLT. After having listed the various uses of *+lAn-*, Kāšgarī writes:[14] "You will not go wrong if you form the remaining cases by analogy with these, and pronounce them in the meanings mentioned, since there is nothing to prevent any noun from being declined by adding the suffix in question. However, not every noun in all the dialects may be formed into a verb in this way. It is not permitted, for example, to say: 'AR° SA'W°LAN°DIY *'är savlandı'* to mean 'The man coined a proverb (*daraba . . . maṯal*[an])'; or: 'AR JA'W°LAN°DIY *'är çavlandı'* to mean 'He became famous (*šāra lahu ṣīt*)'. But all of these are permitted on the basis of analogy, so no one will blame you if you use them." Elsewhere: "Know that verbs cannot be formed from every noun, even though this is permitted by the rule. Example :: QUSỤQ (*kusık*) 'hazel'; one may not form a verb from this and say: QUSỤIQ°LA'DIY *'kusıkladı'* in the way that one may say QAŞUQ°LA'DIY *kaşukladı* meaning 'He spooned the thing' from the root: QAŞUQ° *kaşuk*. Also one may not say: 'AT° QUNQLA'DIY *'at konakladı'* to mean '[The horse] at the millet', though one may say: 'UL MANY QUNỤQ°LA'DIY *ol māni konukladı* meaning 'He treated me as guest'. Even though both of them are triliteral, QUNAQ *konak* 'millet' and QUNUQ° *konuk* 'guest', it is permitted to form a verb from one but not the other. However, if someone, following the rule, were to form verbs from these nouns and use them in speech one would permit him to do so,[15] since he is not prevented from following [the rule], and he would not be held in error; he has the right to do it!" *Our* main objective is the creative procedure, then, and not its particular results. Admittedly, though, these last are the only base for our researches, and a single error on our part is liable to distort a grammatical model.

The word formation of no dead language has ever been given quite this treatment. The problems mentioned here are merely a more extreme version of what the linguist meets in any language; they are more highlighted here.

14 Fols. 532 and 596. Kāšgarī's text should of course be read in the light of the famous polemic between the analogists and the anomalists, which can be said, in a sense, to have been renewed in our days by the generative semanticists on the one hand and all the other linguists on the other.

15 The ms. has *ajzat*, by the editors emended to *ajaztu*; but a passive form would do even better.

Old Turkic being an agglutinative language, all morphemes are represented by chains of phonemes; there is thus always a surface realisation, in this case reflected by writing. We are interested in lexeme formation which is not only semantic but also grammatical, hence excluding e.g. binomials, q.v. in section 1.10 below. As it turns out, formatives are clearly distinguishable from other morphemes neither semantically nor syntactically. Vowel harmony also covers both sets to the same degree, and in addition also particles like *Ok*, perhaps the vocative particle (*y*)*A*, etc.

In the verbal domain, the negative suffix *-mA-* is a handy border between the formatives before it and the flexional elements after it. The distinction between deverbal nouns and participles (which belong to verbal morphology) is discussed below, in our introduction to the treatment of the former. That distinction is not clear at all, but rather, gradual and multi-faceted.

Concerning the derivation of nominals from nominals there is, first of all, the distinction between them and case suffixes. There appears to have been an orientational locative suffix *+dXn* and an ablative suffix which appears both as *+dXn* and as *+dIn* possibly varying with dialect. As the form *içtinsiz* (TT VIII A4), among other things, shows, the former was in fact used as a formative. Nevertheless, it seemed advisable to relegate its treatment to the grammar of Old Turkic case: Firstly, because the suffixes are so difficult to distinguish; secondly, because local expressions should, in any case, be covered by case grammar and thirdly, because the two suffixes *may* nevertheless have had a common origin.[16]

The delimitation towards conjunctions is clear intuitively but poses a few theoretical questions. They concern mainly the formative *+lXg*, which sometimes functions like a conjunction. The fact that it follows vowel harmony is not enough of a criterion, as enclitics do that too. The fact that it is added to whole phrases, that the syntagms which it forms are so rarely lexicalised, that it hardly adds any content at all, make it unlike what we are used to call a formative. It is discussed in detail below.

There is, then, the fact that some formatives are added to verbal inflexional suffixes, forming, among others, the sequences *-gU+çI*, *-gU+lXk*, *-mAk+lXg*, *-mAk+sXz*. In some of these cases, the result belongs to morphology; in others, however, that assignment is not so clear. In the domain of nominals derived from verbal nouns, at any rate, morphotactic criteria appear to be useful for distingu-

16 Concerning *+dXn* see, for the time being, Zieme, 1969: 87-8. Ablatival *+dXn* is found e.g. in *Kanyudun kältig?* 'Whence have you come?' (PañcFrag).

falling between formatives and other formatives; formatives can very well be placed after flexional elements in the derivational verbs, flexional morphemes and formatives is that the chain of suffixes. structured paradigms, showing complex and structured and respective categories. Formatives hardly A typical difference between closed and respective voice suffixes. +sXz and +sIrA- themselves within their categories. their respective formatives are one possible instance of structural present distribution within their grammaticalised voice suffixes. +sXz and +sIrA- other, are one possible instance of structurplementary distribution on the highly grammaticalised ever do this, not even the other, are one possible instance of struc- +LXg and +LAr- on the but here, too, only a small part of the respective on the one hand, +LXg and +LAr- on the lexicon but here, too, only a small part of the respective suffixes is covered. on the one hand, within the lexicon is covered.

Pronouns refer by definition. If a derivational suffix appears to be nalisation within the most meaningful criterion appears to be stem, as in angak(ı)a, '(just) a little'; a content suffixes, the most meaningful criterion appears to be functions of these suffixes can receive possessive, number and case angα here signifies '(just) a little' as a whole which has functions of these suffixes can receive possessive, number and case dear mum!' it is the word as a characteristic of particular nouns, but a task angα here signifies '(just) a little' as a whole which has referential power, not the base by itself. Reference, of course, is not a characteristic of particular nouns, but a task 'dear mum!' it is the word as a whole which has referential power, not the base by which they receive in particular contexts actually used for communication. itself. Reference, of course, is not a characteristic of particular nouns, but a task which they receive in particular contexts actually used for communication. sometimes added to nouns with plural or possessive suffixes. In +LXg, again, is sometimes these suffixes only when referring, and need not most Turkic languages, one uses these suffixes only when referring, and need not mean 'singular' even if one has not added the plural suffix. Counted and posmean 'singular' even if one has not added the plural suffix. Counted and possessed entities are generally actual and particular ones, as one would not otherwise have been able to count them or to assign them to a possessor. It will be shown in the relevant section below that the Old Turkic instances in question are wise have been able to count them or to assign them to a possessor. It will be not referring in the sense of speaker/writer reference. The plural bases denote shown in the relevant section below that the Old Turkic instances in question are entities which are inherently plural, as the seven dwarfs or the forty thieves or the not referring in the sense of speaker/writer reference. The plural bases denote trinity, and not such as have been counted by the speaker/writer. Nor are the entities which are inherently plural, as the seven dwarfs or the forty thieves or the possessive suffixes referential as used before +LXg: In practically all instances trinity, and not such as have been counted by the speaker/writer. Nor are the they consist of the compound-like phrase N_1 N_2 +(s)I, in which +(s)I does not possessive suffixes referential as used before +LXg: In practically all instances refer to a real possessor but only marks the juncture between the nominals. The they consist of the compound-like phrase N_1 N_2 +(s)I, in which +(s)I does not only exception to this does not contain a real reference either. refer to a real possessor but only marks the juncture between the nominals. The +kI, on the other hand, belongs to morphology, and is freely added to referring only exception to this does not contain a real reference either. expressions. Nor do we ever see Old Turkic +kI forms going over to the lexicon. +kI, on the other hand, belongs to morphology, and is freely added to referring Note, finally, that suffixes can fluctate between morphology and formation. expressions. Nor do we ever see Old Turkic +kI forms going over to the lexicon. -gAn, for instance, is a participle in some dialects (Proto-Oguz among others), Note, finally, that suffixes can fluctate between morphology and formation. but see its discussion below. -gAn, for instance, is a participle in some dialects (Proto-Oguz among others), but see its discussion below.

Lexeme forming activity can be classified in the following ways: Lexeme forming activity can be classified in the following ways:

a) Firstly, by target group: One forms verbs, adverbs, etc.
b) Secondly, by the base group: One uses nouns, verbs etc. for one's derivation.
These two are the general criteria by which we have organised our work. Within each part, formatives are grouped by the following criteria:
c) The function of the derivation. A central matter here is the distinction of Kuryłowicz, 1960 between 'dérivation syntaxique', where the derivation has syntactic aims and/or results, and 'dérivation lexicale'. The latter we would like to subdivide into semantic and pragmatic derivation. Only semantic derivation in the narrow sense transfers the derivate into a new class of objects, processes, concepts etc. of the observable world. If the speaker uses a formative to indicate to the hearer his momentary attitude towards the object being named, the derivation is called 'pragmatic'. This distinction is particularly clear with diminutives. These functions only rarely appear singly, however. The two common formatives *+lXg* and *+lA-* may be the only primarily 'syntactic' ones. Formatives are usually predominantly semantic or syntactic but not purely so. Conjunctions, for instance, also join these three functions to varying degrees. *-tUr-* and *+lA-* are syntactic in rather different sense, since *+lA-* has distinct lexical classes as source and target groups.
d) Fourthly, formations are productive, partly productive in various ways or unproductive, as discussed above.
e) A phonological or phonotactic classification of formatives does not appear to me to be necessary here. We have presented such a classification for all Old Turkic morphemes in Erdal, 1979b, to which the reader is hereby referred. In these respects, Old Turkic formatives do not differ from other morphemes of that language.

1.7 *'Etymology'*

This work is mainly concerned with the description of certain relationships between lexeme classes. Discussions of particular lexemes are only undertaken as part of our general discussion, and could easily turn out to be erroneous from the Proto-Turkic or otherwise comparative point of view. Our preoccupation with whole classes makes us more concerned with strongly documented formations than with weakly documented ones, whose relevance for the overall structure of the language is only marginal. We do not attempt to present the reader with a compendium of Old Turkic etymology in the grand Bang style, where every word is chopped up and thereby 'explained'. Nor was there space enough to refer the reader to etymologies hitherto suggested by other scholars. I hope that the lack of all this will not be felt too badly by the reader, as most of the formal and semantic

classes discussed here are not too problematical in this respect. The etymological connexions suggested by Bang and by some others in his vein are often rather daring and far-fetched. In particular, I believe that they have nothing to do in notes to text editions, if they contribute nothing to the understanding of the text or of its language. Tureological and particulary Altaistic comparison will not be furthered by more starred forms. I strongly object to the arbitrary methods of some comparative and etymological dictionaries of the recent years. It will not do to introduce unattested forms into our discussion only because something similar appears in Manchu or Japanese or even Chuvash. We are interested in relationships within Old Turkic.

Phonetic developments cannot be taken ever to have occurred outside the period for which they are attested. This seems to me to be an elementary tenet of historical linguistics, which is nevertheless not always observed even in very recent work on Turkic etymology. *yazı* 'a plain', attested from the Orkhon inscriptions on, is a case in point. It cannot come from *yaz-ıg*, as final /g/ does not disappear in Old Turkic; there is no reason to assume an exception here. This might have happened with *ayı* 'very' from *ayıg* < *añıg*; but that is an expressive particle split off both sementically and formally from *ayıg*, which continues to exist: These are special circumstances not necessarily directly related to the loss of final /g/, which occurred elsewhere. For the same reason, *-dUk* and *-yUk*, which co-occur in some texts, cannot be different stages of each other.

Lexeme chopping often has a rather 'theoretical' motivation: There appears to be a common but not always explicitly formulated assumption that polysyllables have to be either borrowings or made up from smaller elements. Occasionally we even hear of a Turkic 'root', e.g. in Menges, 1962; it is, of course, taken to be monosyllabic. Many polysyllables in fact look as if they would belong to some formation or other: *adıg* 'bear' looks like an *-(X)g* derivate from a verb '*ad-*' or *'adı-'*, *āvin* 'grain, seed' like an *-Xn* noun from a verb '*äv-*' or an *+(X)n* collective from a noun '*āvī*'. *kāmiş-* 'to throw down' could be an *-Xş-* derivate from an unattested '*kām-*' and *tāgil-* 'to lose one's eyesight' an *-Xl-* passive. It is then no great problem for a trained linguist to find appropriate bases or cognates, with a little semantic and comparative manipulation: Saying, for instance, that *adıg* is a taboo word originally signifying 'the changeling', from a base signifying 'to change' and related to *adın* 'different', etc.; this could then be compared to *kurt* 'worm', which the Oguz used as taboo word for 'wolf' and, above all, to the Russian taboo word for the bear, the 'honey eater'. One could even evoke totem animals etc. The fact is, however, that *kāmiş-* has no cooperative-reciprocal content and *tāgil-* no passive one. Neither *adıg* nor *āvin* give any hint as to verbal origin, nor is the latter used as collective. It should be realised that there is only a limited number of phonemes, that phonotactic rules barring consonant clusters

etc. severely limit the possibilities of cooccurrence of these phonemes, and that it can easily be pure coincidence that a certain phoneme sequence occurs both in some formative and at the end of some lexeme. Basic for us is the principle that linguistic units have constant functions and meanings.

If, however, a lexeme accords with both the phonological and the semantic constraints imposed by a formation, the situation is rather different. We discuss such a lexeme together with the formation in question even if there is no base for it, but, in the verbal sections where the listing is alphabetic, put the whole lemma into round brackets. An example for this would be the pair *ögrän-* 'to get used to, to practise, to exercise' and *ögrät-* 'to teach a certain behaviour, to instruct'. The common base must be **ögrä-*, which *might have* signified something like *'to socialise (tr. or intr.!)'; this, in turn, *could be* an *+A-* derivate from *ögür* 'herd'. Now *ögrän- is* reflexive or recessive, *ögrät-* is causative, and nothing in this explanation contradicts the function of *+A-*. *ögrän-* and *ögrät-* must be transparent towards each other though probably not towards *ögür*; they therefore have to be mentioned in the sections on *-(X)n-* and *-(X)t-* respectively. Menges, 1968: 158-9 can, I think, serve as example of what should not be done: He says that the base of these verbs is "a denominal derivative in *-ra-/rä-*" from *ög* "reason, mind". There is no formative '*+rA-*', however; conjuring up one for the purpose of one instance alone is against the rules of this science.

The phonological system should be taken seriously particularly when dealing with formatives. Here is one example: Some scholars take the causative suffixes *-tUr-* and *-tXz-* to be variants of one and the same suffix. However, /X/ and /U/ are distinct archphonemes, which are opposed e.g. in the minimal pair *altın* 'below' (with *+dXn*): *altun* 'gold'. The validity of this opposition is not weakened by its neutralisation after rounded vowels. The phonemic opposition between /r/ and /z/, exemplified for instance with the verbs *ar-* vs. *az-*, cannot be disregarded either, in spite of the fact that it is cancelled in Bolgar-Chuvash and in the cognates of Turkic words found in Mongolian. Occasional, seemingly chaotic alternation between /r/ and /z/ *within* the same Turkic language still awaits full documentation and explanation; in any case, it appears to be phonologically conditioned, whereas /r/ and /z/ in *-tUr-* and *-tXz-* appear in practically the same surrondings. On the other hand, the hypothesis that *-tUr-* consists of *-(X)t-* and *-Ur-* but *-tXz-* of *-(X)t-* and *-Xz-* does not contradict any phonological, morphological or semantic insights and seems to be a likely historical explanation.

Note that *-Ut* looks like *-Xt-*, *-Xn* like *-Xn-*, *-Xl* like *-Xl-*, *-Xş* like *-Xş-*, *-Xz* like *-Xz-* and *-Ok* like *-Xk-* and *+Xk-*, but that no functional or semantic connection is discernible in any of these cases. The sound similarities are probably coincidental. Nor can one formative be both denominal and deverbal; the identity of *+(X)(r)kA-* and *-(X)(r)kA-* is an isolated case.

Even evident etymologies are here left unmentioned if the way of forming them did not receive general acceptance in the language. *yemiş* 'fruit', for instance, is not discussed here even if the assumption that it is derived from *ye-* 'to eat' with the well known suffix *-miş* should be correct: The perfect participle suffix does not otherwise have the function it would need for *yemiş*. In *barça* and *tolp* we see how the equative suffix *+çA* and the gerundial suffix *-(X)p* are used to express totality. These forms were clearly frozen into the lexicon by extensive use, and not through the backing of whole series of similar derivates. In all languages we see occasionally that inflected forms are introduced into the lexicon; this is a matter for etymology but not for formation, the domain of which is by no means coextensive with that of lexicalisation. Although practically all of *inflexional morphology* consists of free syntagmatics and although a great part of the products of *formation* eventually gets introduced into the lexicon, the border between what is produced *ad hoc* and what is learned as a unit does not coincide with the border between these two domains of grammar. The adnominal use of *tolp* possibly documents the prehistoric function of *-(X)p* as participle suffix, as still retained in some dialects; but that, again, is a matter for historical inflexional morphology. Our work does not deal with the fusion of such suffixes.

1.8 *Formative sequences and combinations*

Units which function like simple formatives but are evidently composed of two (or more) formatives are called combinations. Both unfused sequences of formatives and combinations are quite common. Here are a few examples:

1) Deverbal verb – deverbal noun: *yara-t-ıg*
2) Deverbal verb – deverbal verb: *kar-ın-tur-*
3) Deverbal noun – denominal noun: *sat-ıg+lıg*
4) Deverbal noun – denominal verb: *käl-ig+sä-*
5) Denominal verb – deverbal noun: *al+ta-g*
6) Denominal verb – deverbal verb: *al+ta-n-*
7) Denominal noun – denominal noun: *bel+dürük+lüg*
8) Denominal noun – denominal verb: *yer+çi+lä-*

Examples for longer sequences are *arı-g+sız+lıg*, *küsänçigsiz* from *küsä-nç+sig+siz*, *säv-ig+lig+räk* and *yeg+äd-mäk+lä-ş-ü*. Those acquainted with the language will have noticed that these are not free chains of three or more elements: In each case, pairs of elements show a stronger internal cohesion. *yaratıg*, for instance, is a verbal noun from *yarat-* 'to create' and not a derivate in '*-tıg*' from *yara-* 'to be useful'. *yerçilä-* comes from *yerçi* 'guide' and denotes his action, and

not from *yer* 'place'. With combinations, on the other hand, the first cut is not after the first formative but before it. *käl-ig+sä-*, for instance, is a desiderative from *käl-* and is not derived from *käl-ig* 'supernatural appearance'. It is clearly of prime importance in word formation to be aware of the immediate constituents of a lexeme.

The composite nature of a formative cannot always be actually proven, particularly not if the function of the whole has moved away from the function of its parts. It seems probable, for instance, that *+lAg* comes from *+lA-(X)g*, and likely that *+sIg* is from **+sI-(X)g*, but the putative origins of *+AgUt* and *+AçOk* seem less certain; see these formatives in their respective sections below.

Combinations are common in verb formation: *-tUr-* < *-Xt-Ur-*, *-lXn-* < *-Xl-Xn-*, *+gAr-* < *+Ak-Ar-*. The phonological discrepancy between *+gAr-* and its parts is discussed on p. 746f. The sub-elements are 'parts' historically and not synchronically. Synchronically, *-Xt-* is added to *-Ur-* to give *-Urt-*, for instance, but not the other way around. The speaker uses combinations as simple indivisible units: *al-ıız-* is attested, but not '*al-ıt-*' or '*al-t-*'; verbs as the latter may in fact *never have existed*. *-Ur-* and *-Xz-* are, in our texts, practically never added to derived stems; this does not weaken our view of *-tUr-* and *-tXz-* as compound formatives, however: On the one hand, *-Ur-* and *-Xz-* may very well have been in more extensive secondary use prehistorically; on the other, *-tUr-* and *-tXz-* were used as simple units. Therefore, we also treat combinations (like *-lXn-*, e.g.) as simple; their products are not mentioned among the derivates formed with their parts.

If a compound formative is added to a verbal base ending in a vowel, this final vowel is often dropped: *ärgür-* from *ärü-gUr-*, *boşlun-* from *boşw-lXn-*, etc. This recessive influence is an unusual phenomenon in Old Turkic phonotactics.

A sharp line cannot always be drawn between formative combinations and sequences of two formatives. Firstly in phonological matters: Beside the combination *-tXl-*, which has its own life, we have, rarely, unsyncopated *-XtXl-*, and the two chains cannot be treated separately. *-tUrXl-* functions like *-tXl-* and is discussed together with it, but does not have the phonological characteristics of a combination. Secondly in meaning: *+lAş-*, for instance, functions like a combination, among other things in being added to nouns from which there is no *+lA-* derivate. Nevertheless, the semantic affinity between *-Xş-* and *+lAş-* is very great. Generally, the content of a combination is closer to that of the second element, as in *-tXl-*. The negative content of *-(X)nç+sXz* can clearly not disappear, although the meaning of the combination is not really predictable from that of its parts.

1.9 Binomes and biverbs

These terms are used in referring to sequences of two lexemes of similar but by no means necessarily identical meaning used together to denote *one* content. The two lexemes may receive the same inflexional suffixes or, with binomes, the first lexeme may bear no such suffixes which the second one will then have in common for the two. This is a phenomenon found throughout Asia from Persia to China and, less commonly, in European languages. Literature on this semantically and grammatically interesting subject has been growing recently, but cannot even be mentioned here; for Old Turkic, note pp. 5-6 in the introduction to the *UW*.

If a lexeme appears only within a binome or biverb it cannot be assigned any meaning by itself, as it in fact has none. We know what *täv kür* signifies, for instance, but not the meanings of its parts; historical development has made *täv* and *kür* into one word semantically, though not formally. *ämgät- tolgat-* signifies 'to cause suffering', but *tolga-t-* by itself has a different meaning. *buŋad-* signifies 'to worry', but, together with *taŋla-*, 'to be astonished'. The main reason why two terms are used instead of one appears to have been expressive. The two lexemes may be related, as e.g. *buş- buş-(u)r-ul-* in the Suv.

Expanding formatives are added to each of the terms: *tävlig* and *kürlüg* always appear together, for instance. Mutual *biç- os-* is *biçiş- osuş-*, the passive of *aş- üstä-* is *aşıl- üstäl-*.

The reader should be warned against taking every parallelism to be a binome or a biverb. In *tökünürmäzün karıntırmazun* (Zieme Texterg II 1-2), for instance, each verb has an independant meaning.

Parallelism has its most interesting results when the derivational status of members of a pair is different: *käd-im* usually comes together with *ton* 'dress', e.g., and *käd-* 'to wear' with *ton+a-*. Both in the binome and the biverb there is one simplex and one derived lexeme, but the tasks alternate. In a different domain of grammar, deverbal lexemes show a similar switching: *as- ükli-t-* 'to augment, further' is about as common as *as-ıl- ükli-* 'to become more'. Taking the pairs as whole units of usage, we have derivational symmetry: *käd- tona-* might come from *ton kädim* just as well as the other way around; *as- üklit-* might be the causative of *asıl- ükli-* just as well as *asıl- ükli-* the passive (recessive, single-participant) counterpart of *as- üklit-*.

The converb and aorist vowels of biverbs often influence each other, the earliest ex. being *ärür barur ärkli* (KT and BQ). A comprehensive grammatical, semantic and stylistic study of binomes and biverbs would be very welcome. This domain is a weakness of (what we hitherto have of) the *UW*, which we cover only partially: As it is, far too much of the lexicon has already crept into this work.

Part II

The Formation of Denominal and Deadjectival Nominals

2.1 *Diminutives and caritatives; proper name formations*

In this section, we have to distinguish between pragmatic and semantic formations: A word characterised by *+(X)ç* with possessive suffix or by *+klñA* would not denote a different entity or a different class of entities if this suffix were deleted. It appears to have been the only living task of *+(X)ç* to show the person whom one was addressing in using the referential term marked by this suffix that one felt love and care for him. *+klñA* does imply the smallness of the entity denoted by the term to which it is added, but not so as to distinguish between it and other less small entities. In our texts, the first always formed terms of endearment, while the second also formed diminutives; both were in pragmatic use. *+Ak*, *+Ik* and *+lIk*, on the other hand, classify semantically. When using *+klñA*, the speaker intends to show how little and sweet, tiny and/or puny and therefore perhaps in need of protection etc. he finds the thing to which he is referring. *+Ak* etc., on the other hand, mark the objective smallness of an object by distinguishing it from what it would be called if it were bigger. A noun with *+klñA* refers to things which would be appropriately denoted also without using this suffix;[17] *+Ak* etc., however, does not. Rather than classifying, *+klñA* transmits a feeling; *+Ak* etc. form lexemes (whenever their products are not pre-formed, as is often the case).

The liveliest among the formatives of this section is *+klñA*; *+Xç* is sharply delimited in its use. It is not clear, on the other hand, what the differences between the various formatives ending in /k/ might be. One can perhaps expect help from comparison with other Turkic languages including Chuvash, which often has unusual *°k* expansions from lexemes which appear in unexpanded form in other Turkic languages. Full productivity of the *°k* formations belonged perhaps to pre-Old Turkic times; nor was the use of *+Xç* at that time limited to reference to dear relatives. On the other hand, one should perhaps reconstruct no Proto-Turkic **+Xç*, **+°k* or **çAk* at all, as these suffixes may well be borrowed from Iranian. Justi, 1895 mentions Armenian nicknames as *Wahrič* and *Maneč*, the suffix of which is also Iranian. The Middle Persian suffixes *+čak* and *+īčak* (> New Persian *+čah*, *+īzah*), *+ak* and *+ōk/ūk* also form diminutives. Chuvash *°k* may not come from Proto-Turkic, but may possibly have been inherited by the Bolgarians from their Iranian predecessors in Southern Russia. Only *+klñA* is sure to have been a genuine Turkic diminutive suffix; its particular liveliness is thus not a coincidence.

17 *+klñA* is very often added also to bases which are not nouns.

#0 Diminutive +çUk is discussed together with +çU; see the end of section 2.72.

Proper names are hardly a syntactic category in Old Turkic and, as such, have no meaning. Suffixes exclusively forming proper names can therefore not be classified either semantically or syntactically. +(A)çOk and its alternant +Aç are added both to nouns and adjectives; like the dimunitive formatives, they are endocentric.

2.11 +Ak, +Ik and +lIk

As has been stated on the previous page, the suffixes to be discussed here are active only within the lexicon and do not form forms of endearment. An exception is the name by which one called one's 'dear elder brother or junior paternal uncle'. This is discussed in section 2.12 below.

+Ak and the rarer +Ik[17] are weakly productive in the language of our texts. This may contrast with other dialects attested only from later times, which have more +Ak and +Ik forms. Cf. *nikänäk* 'thorn' in the Codex Comanicus and in Houtsma and Chuvash *uydx* and Bolgar *ayx+* 'moon, month' < **ay+ık*, only *ay* being attested elsewhere. *kumak* 'grain of sand', discussed in *TMEN* 1525, comes from *kum* 'sand'; it is attested in a number of Turkic languages, has come into Mo. (hP'ags-pa script!) and, over Bolgarian, into Hungarian, but is not found in Old Turkic.

There is much metaphorics in the use of +Ak, when names of objects are derived from names of others, similar to them in some way. *kāpak* 'vessel, pumpkin' (Ht V a 17 and 22; Heilk II A 1,92 and 107, DLT ff.) comes from *kāp* 'a wine skin or some other container'. *başak*, from *baş* 'head; beginning', denotes 'the iron head of an arrow or lance' according to the DLT, but 'an ear of corn' in Middle Turkic. *çanak* 'a little bowl' (Maitr 71 r 1, HamTouen 34,2 and DLT ff.) comes from Chin. *zhân* 'a cup', in Turkic attested in Heilk I 64 and 122-3. *käsäk* 'a little piece' comes from *käs* and should not be connected directly with *käs-* 'to cut'; see exs., arguments etc. in *TMEN* 1634.[19] A further ex. appears in Ernte II 50.

Some +Ak nouns denote features of the countryside. It is said about *yul+ak* in the DLT that it is 'a spring with little water'; we find it in Maitr 139 r 12 and v 20, TT VIII I 15 and Suv 529,2 together with *yul*. The DLT's *yol+ak* < *yol* 'way, road' is 'a small track in the desert', *boyn+ak* < *boyın* 'neck' 'a narrow pass in the

18 I don't think we can speak of one +Vk suffix with varying vowel. Old Turkic has no vowel alternations except in the pronominal system; nor are +Ak and +Ik freely interchangeable.

19 Cf. also *kās+lā-* and *kās+lā-ş-* in the DLT.

mountains'.[20] Even a very narrow pass is not smaller than an animal's neck; the metaphorical use of *+Ak* is here the foremost one. *öz+äk*, which appears in Yarkand I 20 and, in a binomial with *öz* 'valley' in TT V B 122, is 'a little water way, a brook'; it lives on in modern languages. DLT fol. 48 has a phrase *özök suv* which is translated as *xālij min al-awdiya*. For this, Dankoff and Kelly give "an arm of a river". *xālij* is a rather broad term applying to irregularly flowing water connected to rivers or seas, like straits or canals. This is evidently the same lexeme as *özāk*, with secondary rounding. The second vowel character of the Yarkand ex. in fact consists of a small and flat loop: It *may* have been meant to represent a *wāw*, i.e. a rounded vowel. *özök* appears also in TuoLuoNi 31 = 40: *burxanlarıg yug[ārū] köz üzä özökdäki täg körür* is translated as "(er) sieht . . . die Buddhas gegen[wärtig] vor Augen wie das im *özük* befindliche", and a n. connects *özük* with *öz* 'self'. I think the text says that 'one will see Buddha present before one's eyes, as one sees something (a reflection) in a brook'. This *özäk/özök* should not be confused with *öz+äk* 'the spinal cord, the core of a tree' in the DLT; that is discussed in section 2.34, which deals with the metaphorical formatives *+gAk* and *+Ak*.[21]

irkäk 'male' cannot be derived from *är* 'man', as its derivate *irkäk+lān-* is clearly written with *i* in TT VIII P 19 (Brāhmī).[22] It can, however, be connected with *irk*, according to the DLT 'a ram approaching his fourth year'. To this day, *ärkäk* is a 'two year old ram' in some Anatolian and Azeri dialects; in UigTot 384, *irkäk közi* translates a Tib. expression which corresponds to Chin. 'bull's or ram's eye'. In the oldest Old Turkic sources (twice IrqB and in M I 36,10-11), *irkäk* denotes a male animal. It was subsequently transferred to humans (M I 17,9; M II 7,19; M III 39,2$_1$, U III 75,6$_2$, FujYūr r 6 ff. and Warnke 260 and 261) and even ghosts (Suv 425,1 and DvaKol I 4) in a semantic development similar to that of English *kid*. Contamination with *är* and perhaps *ärk* 'power' is probably responsible for the form *ärkäk*, common in the DLT and the QB and found also (with short vowels) in Tkm. In *oglak* 'kid, young goat' (Maitr 12 r5 and DLT ff.) we meet the same semantic connection in the opposite direction, taking it to be the diminutive of *ogul* 'child, son'. Cf. this with the DLT's *märdāk*, where it is said that *adıg märdäki* is a 'bear cub', '*toŋuz märdäki* 'a sucking pig'. This has been rightfully connected with Persian *mard* 'human being'; that the word is of foreign origin is shown by the initial /m/ not followed by any other nasal. *kamıçak* 'tadpole' in DLT fol. 245 no doubt got its name from the fact that it looks like a 'ladle', *kamıç* in Old Turkic.

20 Cf. the corresponding two meanings of Uigur *art*, in the *UW*.

21 The possible connection between the two *öz* is a different matter.

22 Cf. *här* : *hirkäk* in Khal. Reading *irkäk* as '*erkäk*' would not necessarily have solved the problem either.

+Ak appears not only to transfer nouns from the human to the animal domain and vice versa, but also to derive names of animals from the names of other animals. *adgırak*, attested in Maitr 75 r13, is thought to come from *adgır* 'stallion'. This etymology is corroborated by the meaning 'young stallion' which the word has in some Altay and Kırgız dialects mentioned in the *EDPT* entry. The *DLT fol. 84*, on the other hand, defines *adgırak* as follows: 'white-footed antelope; it corresponds to the *kabs*. *kabs* signifying both 'ram' and 'wild sheep', it is not clear whether, under this definition, *adgırak* is to be taken to denote the male animal or to be sexually neutral. The *EDPT* entry for *ıvık* quotes a form *ayrak* from Ottoman sources and from the Sanglax, which defines it as 'male antelope'. This, of course, is the regular Oguz form of *adgırak* and not a misreading of *ıvık*. A split in the meaning of *adgır+ak* appears to have occurred quite early, then. *ıvık*, attested in QB 5374, is defined in DLT fol. 46 as "she-antelope which frequents stony tracts and deserts". The term 'antelope' being applied to a number of ruminant mammals resembling the deer in general appearance (but not concerning the horns), it is unclear to me whether the relative clause in Kāšgarī's definition is to be taken as limiting or explanatory. Middle Turkic sources which have the word all translate it as 'gazelle', a species of antelope with long, slender limbs. *ıvık* also belongs to this formation: *yıvı* refers to some animal in Suv 599,16; Tatár, 1985: 247 f. quotes Tuba and Tofalar *ibi*, *ivi* 'deer', 'reindeer' and related lexemes in other Siberian languages.[23] *yundak* 'dung, especially of a horse', a *hapax* in the DLT, also comes from the animal domain, although, by its content, it can hardly be said to be the diminutive of *yunt* 'horse'. Still, it seems beyond doubt that it belongs to this formation. Really small creatures are the *örümçik* 'spider' and *siŋāk* 'fly or some other small flying insect'. *siŋäk* (U II 35,23 and DLT ff.) is in the *EDPT* derived from *siŋ*, an onomatopoeic for a buzzing sound noted and documented in the DLT. *örümçik* is written with /i/ in the third syllable in Middle Turkic (Muhenna) and this is how we should read it also in the DLT, our only earlier source for it: No vowel has been marked on the ç in the ms.. *ör-üm+çi+k* would then originally have been the 'little plaiter/weaver'.[24]

23 Another horse term, *kısrak*, has been connected by *TMEN* 1491 and by the *EDPT* with *kısır* 'sterile, barren (of a woman or an animal)'. The word is defined by the DLT, our earliest source for it, as 'a young mare' and, it adds, 'a mare of any kind' in the dialect of the Oguz. Clauson himself admits that, in some of the contexts in the DLT, it clearly denotes a mare which has already foaled. The *EDPT*'s translation of the lemma as "originally 'a young mare which has not foaled'" appears to have been demanded only by this etymology, which is unfounded and unconvincing: The great conquests of the Turks would have been impossible if their young mares had been generally sterile and barren.

24 In case *örümçäk* should nevertheless turn out to be the correct form, it would have to be from *örüm* with the rare formative *+çAk* discussed in the next section. Old Turkic *-Xm* derives object and not subject lexemes from transitive verbs, but in very few and mainly Qarakhanid instances,

As neither *+Ak* nor *+Ik* is dominant,[25] they would have the same form when added to bases ending in vowels. *örümçik*, *ıvık*, and also *alaçuk* from *alaçu* 'tent' (qq.v. in the *UW*) could therefore, in principle, belong to either formation. This is true also of *eçi+k*, discussed in section 2.12. So could *sasık* 'earthenware' from *sası* 'clay',[26] a *hapax* in the DLT said to be in the dialect of Uç; as with other *+°k* forms first attested in the DLT, it has no diminutive content. If *karak* (attested also in BuddhKat 23) could be derived from *kara* 'black, dark',[27] it would be the only *+Ak/+Ik* derivate from an adjective. Unlike *+kIñA*, none of the semantic diminutive suffixes appears with adjectives. A connection of *karak* with Mo. *kara-* is much less likely, however.[28]

In *top+ık* 'ankle bone or wrist bone' (BT VII A 75 and exs. in the *EDPT*) we have a body part, like the ones in *+Ak* mentioned in section 2.34. Three other *+Ik* nouns belong to one semantic domain: They characterise refuse, worthless parts of plants and similar matter. *kasık* (Heilk I 26, 38, 44, 109, 190 and 191) signifies 'bark, peel, snake-skin'. In the DLT we find *kasuk* 'bark', in which the second vowel (written without a *mater lectionis* in the ms.) might be an error or a variant. *beş çöpik* are the 'five impurities' of Buddhist terminology. Beside the instances mentioned in the *EDPT*, the expression appears in B T II 116, Warnke 537 and thrice in the Maitr. Maitr 194 r8 (BT IX 243) and Ht VII 2011 have *çöp* in this particular sense. For the DLT, *çöp* are the 'sediments, dregs or residue' of a liquid, *çöpik* and *şöbik* (which is said to come from *çöpik*) 'the remainder of a fruit which is discarded after eating'. All these meanings are clearly related.[29] A 'twig' is called *çıpık* (Suv 637,20, Ht IV 478, Maitr 37 v9 and MaitrH 8a 24 and b4 etc. in binomials with *budık* 'branch'). The DLT maintains that *çıp* 'a thin slender branch', for which it is the only source, is a shortening of *çıpık*, as *topık* is said to have been abbreviated to *top*; in both cases the development is likelier to have been the other way around. *budık* 'branch' (spelled with D and not T in Maitr 57 v2, MaitrH XI 6 b29, 8 a22 and b4, 9 a5 and 12, 11 a29 (misread and given an impossible translation) etc., LautHöllen 82, ms. T III 84-80 v3 quoted in the n. to TT III 71, TT I 163 and 165 and with DH in Brāhmī TT VIII K) hardly comes from

the derivate is the subject. Note, on the other hand, that *örüm is* attested, but with object meaning.

25 See Erdal, 1979b: 87 for the term.

26 Not in the *EDPT*; see the n. to BT VII A 148.

27 This etymology has been suggested, among others, in Zieme, 1969: 89; cf., by the way, *köli kızlak* mentioned on p. 89 below.

28 *karap* in ManMsFr is a mistake for *kazap*: See *kaz-guk* in section 3.22, where the verb *kaz-* 'to attach one's horse' is discussed.

29 *çöbäk* or *çöbäg* 'boy's penis' in the DLT probably has no connection with this, but comes from Middle Persian *čōb* 'wood, stick' and *čōbag* 'wand, arrow, shaft' as a loan. These two Persian lexemes show the suffix which, I maintain, was borrowed into Old Turkic as *+Ak*.

but 'thigh, leg'. The DLT's but- appears to be a grammarian's invention: The regular Turkic verb for 'pruning' is but+a-, a regular transitive derivate from but 'thigh, leg', an +l- derivate would have been intransitive. buta- did influence budik subsequently: The DLT knows the form butak from "one dialect", and it later became the only form in all dialects. There is nothing metaphorical about +lk nouns, as there is about so many of the ones formed with +Ak. Many of the +Ak nouns belong to the human domain, which +lk nouns, with the exception of top+ık, do not. It therefore seems unlikely on semantic grounds that ıvık, örüm-çik, alaçuk, sasık or karak should belong to the +lk formation.

*çöpük (Suv 23,23 and 343,7 and ShōAv 328) signified 'impurity' (the abstract, whereas çōpik is an object of impurity). In Suv 379,22, çöptük and çöpik alternate in the mss. This makes it possible that there was a suffix +tlk. yalıntık translates a Chin. word signifying 'orphan' in BT II 251 and 1010. In yalŋuş yalıntık erinç çıgay busıŋı koliguçılar (ShōAv 265) it would rather mean 'destitute'. I would suggest yalıŋ 'bare' to be the source of this lexeme, and *yalıŋ+tık to have been its original shape. In all three instances, the word is associated with yalŋus 'lonely', no doubt another derivate from the same base. The DLT's yalındak är 'a naked man' should be the same word, possibly wrongly vocalised in the ms. Then there is tägimlig ārmāz yalınık aṭ üzā ukıtgalı burxan tep "es ziemt sich nicht, ihn mit dem bloßen Namen 'Buddha' (sc. ohne Beinamen) zu bezeichnen" (Abhi 536 translated in UW 248-249). Here, the abstract use of English 'bare' would suit best. The relationship between koltuk 'armpit' (Heilk I and DLT as quoted in the EDPT under 'koltuk' and Maitr 198 v 19, 72 r 15 and 131 v 10 = MaitrH IV 3 a 20-21, Ernte 110 and UigFalt 72; kolŋuk in BT VII A 50 and thrice koltukla- in the DLT) and kol 'arm' would give still a third use for a putative formative +tlk.*

2.12 +(X)ç, +çAk and +(X)çUk

The evident task of +(X)ç in Old Turkic is to form terms of endearment. The only exception appears to be ākāç ıı in BT VIII A 91, which refers to 'a bitch'. This word is attested also in DLT fol. 38, where we read "a little girl who acts sagely, as though she were 'mother of the people'; she is given this name as a sign of affection". The base is ākā 'older sister' or 'aunt younger than the mother'.[30] On the same page of the DLT we also find the following: ata+ç ogul "a boy who acts like an old man, as though he were 'father of the people'"; ana+ç "a little girl who acts sagely, as though she were 'mother of the people'; she is given this name as a sign of affection"; oluç "a particle of affectionate address for sons; (oluçum 'my dear

30 *The Old Turkic system of kinship terms is arranged by absolute age classes within the family, and not only by relationship to the person of whom one is said to be a relative.*

son!") Qarluq dialect". The second vowel of *oluç* < **ogul+uç* and *oluçum* is unvocalised in the ms.; if Qarluq also realises /X/ as /u/ after rounded back vowels like Uigur, it should not be read as *oluç* or *oliç*, as done hitherto.[31] That the suffix has an /X/ and not /A/, /I/, /U/ or /O/ can be seen from *ög+üç+üm(üz)* 'dear mother' (six times in BT XIII 12), *ögüçüm* (Maitr 91 r2 = BT IX 219,2$_3$) and *kaŋ+ıç+ım a* (ETŞ 15,53) from *kaŋ* 'father'. The terms *äkäç*, *ataç* and *anaç* of the DLT all denote children behaving like grown ups, reminding one of Republican Turkish *bilgiç*, which has a similar meaning. Cf. also Turkish *anaç*.

+(X)ç is always added to kinship terms, which always denote blood relationship except *yäŋä+ç+im* 'my dear sister in law' in FamArch 126 and *y(ä)ŋäçimiz* in HamTouen 20,2. The near-limitation to blood relatives may not be a linguistic constraint, however, but a psychological one: People often don't love their in-laws.

With the exception of *äkäç ıt* and what is quoted above from DLT fol. 38, all our instances of the *+(X)ç* formation appear with the possessive suffix. The form *oluç* quoted in the DLT may be a grammarian's abstraction; the Qarluq may in fact always have said *oluçum*, which Kāšġarī also quotes. This limitation means that *+(X)ç* expressed the *speaker's* feelings toward the person referred to, and that it could not be used to indicate another person's warm feelings. DLT fol. 44 describes this situation as follows: "The Khāqāniyya address an elder brother by saying *açıkım* inserting a *qāf*, but only when joined to the first person suffix; it is not permitted to say *açıkıŋ* in the second person". The usual term for 'elder brother, junior paternal uncle' is *eçi* and not '*açı*', *eçi* getting mentioned also in DLT fol. 56. The endearment form of *eçi* is attested in HamTouen 20,7 as *biziŋ eçik* (good facs.). The DLT's *açıkım* may be some dialect variant of **eçikim*.[32] *eçik* is unique in using *+(A)k* and not *+(X)ç* as formative of endearment; this may be due to the dissimilatory effect of the base's /ç/. Although the two have different vocalism, the HamTouen form gets support from "Khāqānī" *açıkım*. This dissimilation evidently did not (yet ??) apply in the dialect of the Yenisei inscr. mentioned in the next paragraph. HamTouen 20,7 is unusual also in having the first person possession expressed analytically and not as a suffix. This *may* be connected with the fact that the suffix employed was *+(A)k* and not *+(X)ç*: The same text also uses the synthetic *yäŋä+ç+imiz*. The second person possessive suffix is found in *atayım*, *kaŋıçıŋka amranmak köŋülüŋ bar ärsär*... (MaitrH XI 12 a13).

31 From this we also learn that, in this vocative term at least, Qarluq dropped [γ] between vowels and /I/.

32 The velar variant is shown to be real enough by being twice written with *q*, explicitly called *qāf* and not *kāf* by Kāšġarī; also by the Kipchak form *açġı* mentioned in the *EDPT*. This Kipchak form is not sufficient reason for altering *açık* to '*açkı*', as Clauson did: Rather, the *+I* is the 3rd sg. possessive suffix, incorporated into many lexemes denoting inalienable entities like body parts and persons' relatives throughout the history of the Turkic languages.

+(X)ç forms are mostly used vocatively, and we often find them with the voca-
tive particle a. In this function, +(X)ç was alive from the oldest to the latest texts.
According to unpublished material in Copenhagen, three instances of eçi+ç+im
can clearly be read in YE 32,1 and 16 instead of 'aç eçim' of the editions.[33] *This*
appears also in YE 69,1. eçiçim is either 'my dear elder brother' or 'my dear young
uncle' (see n. 30). Inscriptional instances of ata+ç+im 'my dear father' are men-
tioned in the EDPT; Uigur exs. of this appear in BT XIII 1,15 and 21,58; several
further ones are quoted in the UW. Exs. of ana+ç+im 'dear mother' which came
too late to be included in the UW appear in ShōKenkyū III 19 and BT XIII 12,104.
The function of the final vowel in kanïçï and ataçï (BT XIII 2,74 and 76 respec-
tively) is not clear, as the context is fragmentary. The editor would prefer the
translation "O Väterchen!", taking it not to be the possessive suffix; he might be
right, in view of the near limitation, mentioned above, to first person possession
in vocative use. One is reminded of the names Isḥaq Narsiçi and ʿAli Muḥmadçı in
Yarkand III,2 and 1,27, whose suffix looks similar to the Indo-Aryan proper
name component ji probably only by coincidence. Most likely is a metanalysis of
the possessive suffixes.

There are few expansions of +(X)ç in Old Turkic. A suffix with a caritative
function appears in U III 64,13: iki kolıçakın atasın boyn[ın] kuçup . . . '(the poor
child) embraced his father by the neck with both his little arms, and. . . . The
second vowel is clearly I on the facs. in SEddTF IV 135, but would have had to be
U if this had been an instance of a sequence +(X)ç+Ak. It may, instead, be the
Middle Persian and Sogdian diminutive formative +īčak borrowed into Turkic, or
at least a cross between that and the suffix sequence mentioned. Other exs., how-
ever, point towards Middle Persian diminutive +čak, which became +ča(h) in
New Persian. One is kulunçak from kulun 'foal', attested in HamTouen 14,7. It is,
further, used in BT XIII 12,101 by a mother for endearing address to her child.
She also uses ōgō(k)+kāyā in this function, while the child in this passage address-
es its mother with ōgüçüm and anaçım. This opposition shows that +(X)ç is
reserved for kinship terms which, on their part, do not appear to receive other
suffixes of endearment than +(X)ç. Another ex. is found in BT XIII 2,39:
botuçaklarınınŋ karnı açmış, translated as "Der Magen meiner Kinderchen ist
hungrig". This is a good translation although botu is a 'camel colt': We have here
another case of metaphorical endearment, as with atay+kıya+m in the next sec-
tion.

The very common urunçak 'deposit, security, pledge', *bilinçäk näŋ* "anything
stolen which is later found in the hands of the stealer or someone else" (DLT) and

33 The difference between the two readings consists of a small line on the first letter, which is said to have been part of the rock's original surface.

tärinçäk "a thin cloak"[34] (DLT, said to be Oguz) are probably *+çAk* derivates from *-(X)nç* bases q.v. in section 3.104. Cf. *tägzinçük* below for */çç > ç/* and cf. *urunç* 'a bribe' in the QB. Further: *alçak* 'friendly, gentle', exs. quoted in the *UW* 92b and in the *EDPT*, might come from the base of *al+ın* and *al+dırı* (qq.v. in the *UW*). There is nothing endearing about *biçäk* 'knife'; it should nevertheless be a *+çAk* or *+(I)çAk* or *+(X)ç+Ak* derivate from *bi*, same meaning. Attested in U III 64,9 and 12, Heilk I 117 and II 3,67, BT VIII A317, BuddhUig II 583, ShōAgon 1,230, Mängi 24, four times in Maitr, DLT and QB, it does not belong to *bıç-*.[35] In his n. to Ht X 1074, Tezcan connected *kapız*, appearing there, with the DLT's *kapırçak*; both signify 'coffin'. He elsewhere connected *sōz* with *sörçük / sörçäk* 'story' (DLT and later). Cf. *çıŋırçak* (section 5.33).

In MaitrH XI 14 b22, the father of the still little but already erudite and venerable *bodhisattva* Maitreya addresses his son endearingly as *sän*, *bägiçüküm*. The use corresponds to what Kāšġarī writes about *äkä+ç*, *ata+ç* and *ana+ç*. DLT fol. 180 has an entry to be read as *bägiç* (in spite of the *second hand fatḥa* in the second syllable) and translated as "O little emir"; the text adds that it is "a diminutive of 'emir' used as a term of endearment". *+(X)çUk* has the first person sg. possessive suffix like most instances of *+(X)ç* and is used vocatively like them but, unlike them (and similar to *+çAk*), does not have a kinship term as base. The DLT says that *bakaçuk* 'muscle of the arm' is a diminutive of *baka* 'frog'. Comparable *in form* is *saç tägzinçük* 'the *uṣṇīṣa*, rolled bun or topknot of hair' (BT VII A 91-2 and 102). *tägzinç* (q.v. in section 3.104) denoting whirlpools etc., a diminutive would be appropriate for a bun. *tägzinç+län-* also has hair as subject. Whether the added element in these two instances is *+çUk* (with simplification of double /çç/) or (otherwise unattested) *+*Uk* is an open question. Cf. also *köçük*, *kapçuk* and *küpçük* in section 2.72 and the proper names in *+(A)çUk*: especially the N. Pr. *Kulunçuk* (section 2.14), comparable to *kulun+çak*.

2.13 *+klñA*

A lively diminutive, whose products are very rarely lexicalised; therefore, not all the instances can or need be mentioned here. The original form *+klñA* appears as *azkıña* in Toñ 9 and KT E 34 and as *birkinyä* in M I 23,32, in a text which also has

34 This is from *ter-*; cf. the DLT's *täril-* for the aberrant vowel.

35 '*bıçak*' has been read only in U IV C7 and must be a mistake, as the context is fragmentary: A verb '*eliglä-*', which is there taken to govern '*bıçak*', has not appeared anywhere else. The words are rather illegible in the facs. and could be interpreted in several different ways. *bıç-* does not appear to have had any front vowel alternant in Old Turkic.

...ubiquitous characteristics. ... The usual Uigur form is *+klyA*, which also appears in the DLT. Beside that, we also have *+klnA*, however, and that in texts which are not necessarily written in the *n*-dialect, and also contain /y/ for original **n*. In mit. U 139 v 5 = Zieme, 1969 nr. 36 (in Manichaean writing), in KP 7,6 and in QB 3964 and 5440 we find *azkına*, in QB 6633 *az+rak+kına*. In Suv 633,20, the Radloff ms. has a dotted *n* in this suffix: *'ən kiçigi balakınag kiçigi oglum sakınur mən* 'I see my little son as the smallest among them (i.e. the doves), the sweet little nestling.' In these same texts we also find lexemes as *koy* 'sheep', *çıgay* 'destitute', *kayu* 'which' and *ayg* 'bad', which originally had /ñ/; the same texts also have numerous *+klyA* forms, quoted below. It appears that these are instances in which a feature peculiar to Middle Turkic crept into mss. copied at a late date. From Chagatay through Old Ottoman all the way to the Codex Comanicus, and in the modern languages from New Uigur all the way to Karaim, it is only the *n*-form of this suffix which has been retained.[1] The *same words* documented above from Uigur with *+klnA* live on to this day: We find *azġına* in Eckmann, 1966: 55, *bdlāginā* in *Fundamenta I*: 495 and *endigina* in Gabain, 1945: 33, the first in Chagatay and the latter two in Özbek. Therefore, *+klnA* forms in Uigur texts cannot serve as a sign for their being in the *n*-dialect. Why the *n*-variant of this suffix had such an unexpectedly wide diffusion is a question for historical dialectology and not for us.

+klñA is added to lexemes and to whole phrases, which can have nominal, adjectival and adverbal function; under the latter heading we also find instrumental and equative case forms. We shall deal with the *+klñA* forms according to their bases, and in the order just mentioned.

It is difficult to find cases in which the smallness contained in *+klñA* is not expressive. After all, there were the adjectives *kiçig* and *uvşak* for describing things as 'small', and the formative *+Ak* to create names for objects which were, in some way, the counterparts of other, bigger ones. *kiçig* and *+klñA* are also used together, e.g. in *kiçig oglank(ı)ya* in Suv 446,5 and Genzan D r 6-7. Here is an example for the expressivity of *+klñA*: *kalın bir oxşagu biliglig işilär[ni]ŋ amrak ogulk(ı)yasın kadır bars tutmış bolsar, ol işilär sekriyü tägip bars agzınta käńk(i)yäsin suçulu alsar, balıg başlıg kanlıg yinlig käńçk(i)yäsin iki ämigi ikin ara kuçup sävär amrayur ärsär, ...* (Maitr 33 v 17-21 = BT IX 102-3) 'Just as, when a grim tiger has gotten hold of the dear little son of an affectionate woman, that woman gets there in leaps and wrenches her dear little baby from out of the mouth of the tiger and hugs and fondles$_2$ between her breasts her injured$_2$, bloody and

[1] See Erdal, 1979: 160. *birkinyā* was suggested already in Gabain, 1950: 155, against the interpretation of Le Coq.

[2] See the respective language descriptions in *Fundamenta I*.

wounded little baby, so . . .'. The mother's strong feelings of pity and affection are reflected in the author's description, although the little story is only used as a simile. The story of the three princes in the Suv, where a mother's suffering is described at much greater length, is full of these tender diminutives,[38] e.g. *ögük-+k(i)yä+m* (622,15; 626,9 and 20 and 636,8) and *atay+k(ı)ya+m* (641,5). In U III 21,11 the queen bewails her sacrificed son with the words *Vipulaçantrı özk(i)yäm a!* 'Oh my dear little own, V.!' Metaphor is a particularly expressive device: *sintidä öŋrä ölmäkig bulayın – ay künk(i)yäm – körmäyin ärti munı täg ulug açıg ämgäkig!* (Suv 626,6) 'I wish I had found death before you, oh my sweet little sun; I wish I had not seen such enormously bitter misery!' In ShōAv 32 there even is *ulugk(ı)ya* referring to the 'eldest' son.

Beside pitying and affectionate reference to children, *+kIñA* is applied also to animals; e.g. *irinç yarlıg balıkk(ı)yalar* 'the poor$_2$ little fish' (Suv 600,16-17), *sämirgük atl(ı)g kuşgaçk(ı)yalar* (Suv 694,12) and *kuşk(ı)yalar* (BuddhUig II 94 and 333; ETŞ 8,5 and TTVIII C14). Sometimes it is added to names of animals towards which non-Buddhists would hardly be expected to develop warm feelings: *çaluk atl(ı)g kurtk(ı)ya* (Suv 692,10), *sıçgank(ı)ya* (ib. 21), *siŋäkkäyä* (ib. 693,5) 'a little worm named *jalūka* / a little mouse / a little fly'. Now a metaphorical little ruddy goose: *bramanlar . . . tuta alıp ät' özlüg kölindäki isig özlüg aŋıtk(ı)yasın uçurup adın ajunka ıdıp . . .* (BT III 224) 'The brahmins caught her and drove off her little ruddy goose of a soul from her lake of life[39] to another world and . . .'. The limbs of sweet little animals and other parts of their body are equally lovely: *kulgakınta bo sudurug yeti kata sözläzün kim ol irinç y(a)rlıg muygakk(ı)ya ol ämgäkintin ozsun kutrulzun tep, anta ötrü anant barıp ol muygaknıŋ başk(ı)yasın tutup yeti kata sözlädi. antak(ı)ya ok*[40] *ol tuguru umamaklıg ämgäkintin ozup köz-k(i)yäsi [yarup . . .* (USp 102c) "One must recite this sūtra seven times into her ear, for that poor$_2$ little female maral deer to be saved and released from those throes of hers" he said. Thereupon, Ānanda went and held the sweet little head of that female maral deer und said (it) seven times. Straight away she was saved from the difficulty of not being able to give birth, her lovely eyes shone, and . . .'. Note that the same animal is referred to once with and once without *+kIñA*, without impairing co-reference or any syntactic or semantic consequences.

Not only living creatures are referred to with *+kIñA*: *ütk(i)yätä kök kalıkıg keŋ boş sıgurur* (ETŞ 12,45) 'He easily$_2$ fits the sky$_2$ into a littel hole.' *k(ä)ntü özümin särgürü tutguluk küçk(i)yäm yok* (Warnke 51-2) 'I don't have even the least strength to hold my patience.' Cf. also *ögänk(i)yälär* (UigKan 167 and 169).

38 The form *balakına* quoted above is also from this passage.
39 Metaphorical *+lXg* is discussed on p. 145 ff. below.
40 Discussed on p. 60 below.

4.1 Diminutives and caritatives; proper names

*-CIK is in the service of modesty: on kuonin m(ä)n Nom Kulı şabık(ı)ya köz-
gäpäsiŋä (r62) in a colophon published in FuJYür p. 76) 'I the modest monk
[. . .]; bunıŋ yarlıkazun bo mäniŋ ünäk(i)yämin (BuddhUig II 283) 'May he
deign to accept this modest request of mine'; yaragsız ärsär ymä biznıŋ bo tapıg-
a(ı)mızıntı)yarlamadın alu yarlıkaŋ (BT II 1091) 'Even though it is useless, do
not think badly of this little present of ours but deign to accept it.' başk(ı)yamnı
yetirü ülgürüp . . . (ShöKenkyū III32) 'bringing my worthless head to the
ground . . .'; ärk(i)ymn and özk(i)ymız appear to replace the pronouns of the
first person in ShöKenkyū II30 and III12 and 32 with some similar function of
modesty.*

*-tAnUk(i)yä (Shö XII b4 and XIII a3) signifies 'whatever insignificant
things': bunıŋ kolıŋuçlarka tägi kolup koligulap nä nägük(i)yä bulmış tapmışların
alıp yügüp . . . and öz küçünüzlär yetmişinçä nä nägük(i)yä ärsär anutunlar simäk-
lär. Further: näşmış salkamk(ı)ya taluy öguzkä üstäp t(ä)ŋiz köl kılgalı ugramış
täg . . . kog kıçmıkk(ı)yag tag basgukınta yoläp[41] ulug tag kılgalı ugramış täg . . .
(Ht VII 12 b19-23) 'As if one attepted to make a great lake by adding the little
dew that falls to a river, or attempts to make a great mountain by placing bits of
dust and filings on a promontory . . .'. Note that +klıñA has here been added to the
phrases nä nägü and kog kıçmık. Bases are often quite complicated syntagms: takı
nä ayutmış kärgäk bizni täg yüz yaşlıgk(ı)yalarıg! biz yana ol uzun yaşnıŋ yarımta
yarımık(i)yasın ymä bulmadın bo kısgak(ı)ya yaşta işläşip nätägin k(ä)ntü özüm
kepätgäli boşungalı ugay biz? (BT II 936ff.) 'All the more so with (people) like us
who (only) have a miserable hundred years (at their disposal)! Having reached
not even the half of the half of that great age and working away with each other in
this so short life, how will we then be able to develop and liberate our own self?'
By content, the first +klıñA belongs to yüz yaş and not to yüz yaşlıg or yüz yaşlıg-
lar, as it is the span of human life which is disparaged, as compared to the length of
the world ages, and not human beings themselves. In the second case the scope of
+klıñA is not just yarım but yarımta yarım.*

*In the third instance in the example quoted above, our suffix is added to the
adjective kısga 'short', underlining its content. Most of the adjective bases of this
formation denote shortness, smallness of size or quantity, nearness and other
contents on the negative end of quantitative spectra. Further examples: Ulug
erkin azkaña ärin täzip barti. (KT E 34) 'The erkin Ulug[42] escaped with very few
men.' öykälig käklig köŋüli turup, ädgü ögli köŋüli olarnı üzä azk(ı)ya yukak(ı)ya
bolur. (Warnke 203) 'There arises a state of mind of fury and hate, and their well-*

41 *The scribe apparently forgot to add the hook of the l, as Arlotto writes this as YWR'P; writing the first vowel as W and not WY even though the word is front-vocalic is common after /y/.*

42 *Or 'the Great Erkin', possibly a composite title.*

meaning state of mind becomes quite little and thin because of them.' A further instance of *yukak(ı)ya* appears in Maitr 128 v 14 qualifying *bóz* 'cotton'; misread and misunderstood by the editor. *azrakçak(ı)ya sü işinä ämgänip . . .* (HtPar 6 r 3, quoted in Gabain, 1974: 154) 'suffering just a very little through military matters'. *kiçigk(i)yä çimäli ölürüp utgurati tamuda tugar.* (Maitr 59 r 6) 'He killed just a minute ant and is (nevertheless) to be certainly (re)born in hell.' *bognık(ı)ya kiçig üçün . . .* (Ht V 3 a 19) 'as (you) are quite lowly[43] and small . . .'. Additional exs. of adjectival *kiçigkiyä* can be found in Ht IV 497 and M III 43,11₁.[44]

Sometimes *+kIñA* appears to be transferred from a kernel to a sattelite: In a passage containing four instances of *ogük+k(i)yä*, we also once find, in Suv 626,3, *körkläk(i)yä ögüküm*; I can only translate this as 'my beautiful little child'.[45]

Among the adnominal phrases of this formation we should first mention (*bir*) *agızk(ı)ya* and *onar agızk(ı)ya*, discussed in *UW* 70 b; instances from Warnke 334, 484 and 784 should be added to those of that entry.[46] *agızkıya* evidently belongs to the particular meaning of *agız* singled out in par. A,e of the *UW* entry for that lexeme, but was degraded to be a mere count-word. *evin*, another count-word, accompanies an adnominal *+kIñA* phrase in the following instance: *bir evin saç tü täŋinçäk(i)yä ärsär ymä buyank(ı)ya kılgalı küsäsärlär . . .* (BT II 988-9) 'Should they wish to perform even just a meritorious deed equivalent merely to a single hair₂, . . .'.[47] *inçgäkyä* (TT VIII F 14 and ETŞ 8,14) corresponds to Republican Turkish *incecik*.[48] *Tişi atlag* (for /atlıg/) *urı yaşrukı(y)a köŋlin sezik ayıtdı* (Maitr-Geng 12 a 17, wrongly read as '*yaşruqın*') stresses the *innermost* secrecy. Further: *bütürü oŋayk(ı)ya iş üçün . . .* (BuddhUig II 278) 'as this is a perfectly easy little matter . . .'; only a language as rich in diminution as Spanish could adequately

43 Thus and not '*bukay*'; borrowed into Mo. as *boyoni*. Cf. also *ediz+i bognı+sı* (Ht VII 2091), where the second word can clearly not be read as '*bokay*'; that would have had the suffix without an *s*.

44 Translation incorrect. *barmış üzüt kiçigk(i)yä oxşagu amrak oglı Yorçuk Inal atıŋa* signifies 'in the name of the departed soul, his little tender dear son Y.I.'.

45 *ög-ük* is discussed on p. 241.

46 In BT III 859 quoted there, the text has *onar* and not *oŋar agızk(ı)ya*.

47 Cf. also *az älüşçäk(i)yä* in 1.9 of the fr. quoted in the n. to BT V 438 and *azk(ı)ya täŋinçä* in TT VIII F 12.

48 In TT VIII F 14 we should, by the way, probably also read *siŋirkyä* and *yipkyä* with the formative described here, and not *siŋirkǟ* and *yipkǟ*, as read by the editor: Brāhmī orthography permits both readings. In these instances, the suffix is evidently monosyllabic, whereas Röhrborn states in the *UW* that the metre several times demands a bisyllabic reading of *+klyA*. These two facts are not necessarily contradictory: Depending on the tempo of speech, word order, syntactic use and no doubt other factors, many language elements often have allegro forms on the one hand, stretched and pausal forms on the other. In particular, such variation can be individual or be determined by metre. No more than this is meant by our spelling of the formative as *+k(I)yA*.

render such phrases. *birk(i)yä*, which is very common[49] but found neither in the *EDPT* nor the *DTS*, corresponds in English to adjectival 'only, single': *tınl(ı)g-larıg inçä k(ə)in yalnuz birk(i)yä sävär amrak ogulça sakınıp* . . . (Warnke 184) 'Considering (all) the human beings to be (his) only and single beloved$_2$ children, . . . Not very far from that in content is *yalnusk(i)ya* (KP 40,3): *siz yalnus-k(i)ya kalır siz* 'As for you, you remain quite alone.'

Concerning *ançak(i)ya* 'just a little'; see the *UW*.[50] Considering its etymology, we might want to think of this word to have been originally accompanied by something like a gesture with one's thumb and index finger held in front of one's eye, as if saying 'only just this much'; cf. Republican Turkish *şu kadarcık*. In *Maitr* 85 v 24 we find it in a binomial with *azk(ı)ya*, which is a further indication that its for us rather transparent etymology was no longer felt. This *ançak(ı)ya* must be taken to have come from the use of *ança* noted in the *UW* entry under A,b.[51] Pragmatically similar to this, but diametrically opposed semantically, is the way taken by *so* in English and by *ança* in Old Turkic as documented in *UW* s.v., par. B,a: Beside their demonstrative function, they have come to signify 'very'. As all other Old Turkic adjectives, those expanded with *+klıñA* can clearly also be used as abstract nouns; the persons said to be bearing the qualities in question are then referred to by possessive suffixes added to these forms. Thus we have the temporal locatives *kiçigk(i)yämtä* (Ht VII 14 b3) 'when I was quite small', and the corresponding *kiçigk(i)yäsintä* quoted from a Ht fr. in Gabain, 1950: 155.

Temporal expressions as the ones quoted are not adverbal in the narrow sense, but qualify whole clauses. Really adverbal *+klıñA* forms are usually in the nominative, with no overt morphological indication of this syntactic function. With very few exceptions, all *+klıñA* forms used in this way have bases semantically characterised as +LITTLE in themselves. The following are such exceptions: *ädgük(i)yä barıŋlar* (U I 5,4);[52] *balıklı kuşlı uçguta batguta tapınçak(ı)ya uçgalı batgalı bolurlar; biz ymä* . . . (Ht VII 12 b6-7) 'When they dive and fly, fish and birds can (respectively) dive and fly just as they wish; we, however, . . .'.[53] *+klıñA* is here apparently meant to transmit something like the content 'just this

49 U III 36,3-4 and 5; KP 25,4; Ht VII 1866 and 15 b1; fol. T III 84,82 of the Berlin ms. of Suv; M I 23,32 (Gebet).

50 Further instances for par. A,b appear in Warnke 312, 320 and 502; as to be expected, all three show postposed *ymä*.

51 The meaning assigned to *ança* in that paragraph is identical to that of *ançakıya*, but 'to a certain degree' appears to me to be more appropriate in the contexts concerned: These by no means demand insistance on quantitative smallness.

52 This happens to be one of the earliest known instances of *+klıñA*, which made Müller think at the time that it was a formative used to create adverbs.

53 Read correctly by Geng but incorrectly by Arlotto.

way and no other'. Thus *munı tägk(ı)yä kılınu* (BT XIII 12,223) 'behaving just this way'. In other cases, however, the bases of adverbial *+kIñA* do contain the semantic component +LITTLE: *otурasın azk(ı)ya oyup . . . künçü yagı yıpar birlä dle, . . .* heat up sesame oil together with musk a little, and . . .'. The adverbial instances of *ançak(ı)ya*, also treated in the *UW* entry, are not far from this semantically; *munçak(ı)ya* (Weih 17 and ETŞ 15,56), on the other hand, appears not to have lost its demonstrative force. Further: *samıso açarı kertö kut kolu kavırak(ı)ya inçä tep tedi*: (Ht VII3 b6): 'Praying for true blessing, the Tripiṭaka Master said, in short, the following:' If one says 'as good as a certain person can', this is by the speaker also meant to imply 'not too much'; hence *+kIñA* in the following two instances: *kūçūm yetmişçāk(ı)yä etip . . .* (Zerst 11) 'I put it in order as well as I could, and . . .'; *buyançı t[. . .] t(ä)ŋrim kutı bügülāyü y(a)rlıkap nätäg intkisi ärsär uzınçak(ı)ya kılu y(a)rlıkazun* (NesTex T III B 99 c (U 321) 12, also *CAJ* 14 (1970): 232) 'May his divine majesty of the meritorious deeds deign to perform magic and, if he is so inclined, deign to carry it out just to the best of his ability.' The beseecher presumably uses *+kIñA* to imply that he does not demand from the addressee any unusual effort.[54] Easiness of action is expressed by *uçuzk(ı)ya* (also in HtPar 29 r23-25) and *oŋayk(ı)ya*: *olartın uçuzk(ı)ya ärtgäli bolur ärip . . .* (BT II 924); *ol burxannıŋ nomlug toyınta uçuzk(ı)ya lenxua içintä tugup bälgürüp . . .* (ETŞ 16,58); *gantamadin atl(ı)g ulug tagıg tumşukı üzä kötürüp oron oron sayu oŋayk(ı)ya eltü kötürü uçdukta . . .* (Suv 694,15). *akuru+k(ı)ya* 'quite silently' discussed in the *UW* (further ex. in BT XIII 8,19 mentioned in *UW* s.v. *'ašnukı(y)a'*) also belongs to the same end of the quantitative spectrum, as does *oposalk(ı)ya* in BT III 219: *sundari kız . . . oposalk(ı)ya kälir ärkän . . .* 'As the girl Sundarī was coming along quite free of care, (she was attacked by the brahmins).' The form *azrakçak(ı)ya* quoted above shows that the presence of *+rAk* does not make *+kIñA* unnecessary;[55] here we see, not unexpectedly, that reduplication is not in complementary distribution with *+kIñA* either: It is not, after all, applied only to adjectives characterised for smallness. Other instances of adverbial *+kIñA* forms concern nearness and shortness of time: *Vayşıravanı m(a)xaraçnıŋ Tanavatï atl(ı)g balıkıŋa yakınk(ı)ya Supuşpı atl(ı)g yemişlikintä . . . turu täginür m(ä)n* (Suv 518,19) 'Quite near to the city named Dhanavatī of the mahārāja Vaiśravaṇa, in his fruit garden named Supuşpa . . . I have the honour to stay.' A synonym of this is *yaguk+kıya* (U IV A 279 and Ht IV 168).

54 This is clearly so in two instances in letters, in HamTouen 5,70 and 20,14 respectively: *Täŋrim, ögümin uzkıya açınzun* "Monseigneur, qu'on prenne très habilement soin de ma mère"; *av bark uzkıya başlap turuŋ* "Continuez de mener habilement la barque (thus!) familiale".

55 That instance is also adverbial.

There are rich means for expressivity in referring to shortness in time. We distinguish, first of all, between descriptions of actions which refer them to points in time which are outside them, and descriptions which do not include any such outside reference. Among the latter, Old Turkic has *bir üdünk(i)yä*, i.e. (*bir üd)+Xn+klyA*, to describe very short states or very short cases of inaction: *bir üdünk(i)yä nägü ärsär temädin yük bolup . . .* (U II 31,50) 'For a very short moment they stayed quiet and didn't say anything at all.' *bir üdünk(i)yä ymä adın amrakın amranguka anı tıdılmazlar* (U III 75,8$_2$) 'In no case are they ever kept away from their love by any extraneous affection, be it even for a little moment.' Further exs. of this appear in U III 88,3$_3$ and TT X 503. In BuyKäl 32 and 35 we have a synonym, from Skt. *kṣaṇa* 'moment': *bir kaşantak(ı)ya ymä yugärü bolmış buyanlarım* "meine . . . in einem Momentchen gegenwärtig erlangten (sic) Verdienste": *bir kşantak(ı)ya ymä eşilmäzün koramazun* "mögen (sie) . . . sich auch nicht in einem Momentchen vermindern". For real actions we find, instead, *tärk-k(i)yä* (TT VII 17,22), *ayı tärkk(i)yä* (TT III 120) or *tärkin tavratık(ı)ya*: *katunı birlä ikägü koşuglug kaŋlıta olorup t(ä)rkin tavratık(ı)ya bartılar* (Suv 636,22) '. . . and got there right away.'

If the described event is referred to an external point in time, this point can be shortly after the event, shortly before it, or lie within the span of time within which the event takes place. For all three temporal relationships, the language distinguishes between the case that this point of reference consists of the *hic et nunc* of the speaker, and the case in which it is transferred to the *illic et tunc* of the story, giving six possibilities in all. For an action taking place shortly before a narrated point of reference, *yaguru+kıya* is used: *ötrü ol yaguruk(ı)ya twgmış arslan änükk(i)yäsi anasınıŋ ämigin ämgäli ugradı* (PañcFrag 118 and 136) 'Then that tiny lion cub, which had just been born, went about to suck its mother's teat'. The heaping up of more than one *+klñA* form in one sentence has been met with before, and is not a coincidence, although one of the forms here refers to time and the other to the cub: Both instances of the suffix serve to transmit the feeling of the helplessness of the tiny newborn. *yaguruk(ı)ya* is also found in BT III 586, MaitrH II 5 b26 (quoted in *UW* 259a) and Maitr 7 v 14. *bayak(ı)ya* and *temin-k(i)yä* (attested also in Suv 619,1) also correspond to English temporal 'just', but have the speaker's present as the secondary point of reference: *bayak(ı)ya twgmış kün t(ä)ŋri amtı sön ün'ti, tıŋ ürk(i)yä tugmış özümüz amtı sön yılımız yaşımız yetdi* (U II 88,77). A similar justification for a pious *carpe diem* is found in Warnke 476-7: *bayak(ı)ya bar ärip amtı yok bolmakları, temin[k](i)yä bar ärip amtı artamakları üzä . . .* 'by the fact that they were just present and don't exist now, that they were present a while ago and have now gone bad, . . .'.

To what happens 'in this very moment', the speaker can refer with *amtılık(ı)ya*, which is treated in *UW* 128b. If there is a narrated 'on the spot', however,

antak(ı)ya ok (*UW* 155-6; also ShōAgon 1,210 and TuoLuoNi 105, 210 and 242) is used, being the fourth possibility.

Concerning an event which lies shortly *after* the temporal point of reference, the distinction between objective and speaker-subjective description is not as clear cut as with the other two temporal relationships. In Suv 618,6, the point of reference is the speaker's time: *twgmak ölmäklig b(ä)k bagın t(ä)rkk(ı)yä tüdün täggäy siz taŋgäşisiz burxan kutnŋa* '. . . in a very short time you will attain the . . .'. Thus also *unak(ı)ya: ogli tegin mahasatvı, bulmadılar ärsär ymä amtıkatägi tilägü, unak(ı)ya keçmädin kälip täggäy seziksiz* (Suv 638,5) 'Even though they have looked for him till now and not found him yet, his (majesty's) son the prince Mahasattva will no doubt not be late but come and turn up any moment.'[56] *unak(ı)ya* is, however, used also for the objective representation of imminent future, e.g. in Suv 603,11 and 609,22: *küçi küsüni üzülüp unakıya ölgäli yatur ärti*; this may here be due to the lively tone of the narrative.

In the following example, *+kIñA* is added to the *bir* which is part conjunction and part particle, and is still alive today in some Turkic languages: *birk(i)yä adrılmışdın bärü anıŋ ara on yıl boltı* (Ht VII 1866) 'We just parted and then ten years went by (just like that).'

We find *+kIñA* added to numerous derived lexemes, among them petrified converbs[57] like *yaguru, kavıra, ak(u)ru, sıguru, yaşru, ötürü*, and *tavratı*, and various deverbal nouns and adjectives: *ülüş* from *ülä-, yak-ın, yar-ım, kat-ıg, yılıg, tap-ıg* and *öt-üg, yaro-k, yagu-k* and *ög-ök*, etc. Interesting is the participle base of *u-mış+ça+kıya*. Among denominal and deadjectival bases we can mention *kuş+gaç, op+osal* (*op+osa-l*) and particularly *yaş+lıg* and *az+rak/az+rak+ça*. The *+lXg* and *+rAk* bases point to *+kIñA* as the suffix which was the last one in the chain of denominal formatives, hence presumably the loosest one.[58]

+kIñA stands before possessive suffixes (*ögökkiyäm, känçkiyäsi* etc.), before the plural suffix (*yüz yaşlıgkıyalarıg*) and is attested before the accusative ending (in the form just mentioned and in *ogulkıyag, kuşkıyag*, etc.) With possessive suffixes we find it before the locative ending, in *kiçigkiyäsintä* and *kiçigkiyämtä*; the place of *+kIñA* after the locative suffix in *antakıya* is not very significant, due to the hypostasis and lexicalisation of *anta* documented in *UW* 146b-150a. In *bir kşantakıya ymä*, quoted above from BuyKäl 32 and 35, however, we do meet the

56 The unusual word order need not necessarily be due to Chin. influence but could equally well be connected with the expressive demands of the context, thus being an early example of the 'devrik cümle' so hotly disputed in Turkey. It is, after all, the iconic order to put the concessive clause first, to add *seziksiz* at the end as an additional strengthener, etc. Emotive speech is always freer in such matters.

57 See p. 403 for this concept.

58 See p. 29 above.

locative suffix before *+klñA*. *+klñA* does not qualify *kşan*, here, but the adverbial phrase *bir kşanta*. In *kiçigkiyāsintā*, on the other hand, *+klñA* qualifies *kiçig*: 'When he was a mere child . . .'. The formative appears also after the instrumental suffix (in *bir üdünkiyā*) and after the suffix of the so-called equative: *tapınçakıya*, *az ülüşçäkiyä*, *uzınçakıya*, *bir tamızımçakıya* (InscrOuig V45), *bir ävin saç tü täŋinçäkiyä*, *azrakçakıya*, *umuşçakıya* and the pronominal *ançakıya* and *munçakıyä*. *+klñA* is not attested before the instrumental suffix: Neither in TT I 152, nor in ManManus 1211,13-14, where Le Coq writes *qaı(ı)γ[q?]ïyan*. In the first ex. *amıkana*, given by the editors, is to be preferred; if we read this as *amıkıça* with *UW*,4, the problem disappears altogether. The context does not, in any case, demand an instrumental. Le Coq's reading is a weak possibility because *+klyA* is always spelled with one *Y* in Uigur.

+klñA can also apply to postpositions together with their bases. In BT XIII 12,75 we find two believers expressing their modesty in this manner: *ançulayu ymā biz Yuŋurmış Bütür birläk(i)yā . . . kşantı kılu täginür biz* 'Thus now we the modest ones, Y. together with B., . . . presume to perform *kşantı*'. The editor leaves this aspect of the subject phrase untranslated, and enters *birläkyä* into his glossary with the incorrect translation "und auch".

As distinct from particles, *+klñA* is not added to finite verb forms. It *is* added to whole phrases, as are the case suffixes and, among the formatives, *+lXg*. Unlike those, however, it is very strong on the content side and very weak in grammatical function.

2.14 *+A* and other formatives for proper names

+A is mentioned in *UW* 35 s.v. *a* par. 1,3 and called "hypostatischer Nominativ von Eigennamen (?)". The entry contains only one ex., but we can mention quite a number of additional ones: the dative *kālinim Togan+a+ka* in UigOn I r 4 and the six other instances in the n. thereto; *Yolug+a* in ZiemeFam 9; 15; 24 and the female name *Arıg+a* ibid. 3; *Sävinä* in BT XIII 53,3 and UigOn II B 11 and, according to the reedition of Akgür, *Tükälä* in USp 78 r 18 and *Äsänä* ibid. v 2 and 61 r17 and r23. The assumption by the editor of U II 86,38 (*Qutlug*) that the proper name *Kutad+a* attested there is an error for *Kutad* is, I think, unjustified: The bases of *Sävin+ä* (mentioned above) and *Kutada* have similar content and are both imperative forms. Exs. for imperative names not expanded with *+A* are *Üdrät* (U II 76,2 and 77,21),[59] *Asıl Bay* (ZiemeSklav II 2 with unlikely Arabic etymology), *Kantur Saŋun* (ib. 1; a further ex. in the n. thereto), *Üklit T(ä)ŋrim* (BT II 110) and *Tuşul T(ä)ŋrim* (ZiemeSklav III 5); their literal meanings are

59 Written as *ürät*, like e.g. *yütä* for *yüdä* in the same text.

'Increase, multiply (tr.)!', 'Increase, multiply (intr.)!', 'Make glad, satisfy!', 'Make numerous!' and 'Be beneficial!' respectively. *sävin* 'be glad' and *kutad* 'be blessed' are not attested as proper names but belong to the same semantic domain. In *Kädir+ä* (USp 48,2), the suffix appears to have been added to an aorist form. Its base *Kädir* (q.v. on p. 480) is by itself used as a proper name, in ETŞ p. 218, 1.5 and USp 84,2. We have, finally, a proper name *Altmış+a* quoted in the *UW* s.v. *altmış* II from an unpublished ms. The lemma *altmış* II, ibid., also refers to a proper name, reminiscent of *Otuz* in USp 73.[60]

As a further expansion from *Altmışa* we now have the proper name *Altmışak* in ShōBeicht 17 and 25.[61] The secondary expansion with *+k* (or should one call this a formative sequence?) is attested also in *Sävinäk* (UigOn I, p. 74, r10); *Sävin+ä* was mentioned above. It can be taken to be related with *+(A)k* (par. 2.11).

Originally, *+A* may have come from the vocative particle *(y)A*, as its definition in the *UW* appears to imply. However, in our texts, it had clearly already become a formative for proper names, as proven by the suffixed forms *Togana+ka* and *Yoluga+nıŋ* and the expansions with *+k* and *+çUk*.

The presumably composite formative *+AçUk* also exclusively forms names of persons,[62] and is attested from the earliest texts on: In Tariat W9 and N2 there appears a certain $K^1G^1S^2$ *Ataçuk*.[63] It has a variant *+çUk* after vowels, e.g. in *Bala+çuk* (ETŞ p. 218 1.2), and often after dentals; otherwise, it is always *+AçUk*, as in *Yeg+äçük* (Ht IV 1748) or *Bay+açuk* (FenTen II 12). One should not dismiss the idea, however, that, at least in some cases, this is the adjective *açok* and not a suffix; according to the *UW*, *açok* signifies not only 'open' but also 'friendly'. This idea, suggested by Hamilton in *Turcica* 7 (1975): 18 with reference to *It+açuk* of the colophon of the IrqB, is taken up by Zieme in the n. to *Ila+çuk* in UigOn I r5. The latter would not belong to the name of the river *Ila*, then, but be a sentence name of the Old Semitic type: *El açok* 'The realm is open, friendly.' A footn. thereto quotes the proper name *Kut+açuk*, which is said to have signified "Glück offen". *Kutaçuk* appears also in NesTex T III B 500

60 The latter is unlikely to have been an imperative name from *ut-uz*, a verb which has a negative content.

61 The back-vocalic *k* disqualifies the hypothesis that *altmış* II could be a variant of *eltmiş*, which is made unnecessary also by the semantic similarity with *Otuz*. Number symbolism in proper names is a subject which cannot be broached here. Ramstedt II 11, on the other hand, might contain a different *Tirig Altmiş+ä*; cf. ZiemeSklav p. 162, footn. 54.

62 A place name *Karaçuk* is first attested in DLT fol. 244 and in Baguettes 1. It can not be read in Toñ 45 in spite of Giraud, one of the scholars who edited this inscription.

63 Perhaps to be read as *Kagan Ataçuk*? S^2 and N^1 are distinguished only by the slight curvature of the latter sign.

(U-9837) 1 and DvaKol II b9.[64] Finally, we should mention the personal name (Ä)rdk in the recently discovered Tes inscription. This may be an +(A)k diminutive from ärä 'ancestor' and could have become part of proper names.[65] Örn+çuk from orun 'seat' in DvaKol II b10 has +(A)çUk in its full shape also after /n/. In Kulunçuk from kulun 'foal' (TugDvaUjgDok I4 and 8), on the other hand, there is no +A. Cf. caritative kulunçak, mentioned in section 2.12. A similar relationship may have existed between the proper names An and Ançuk (both documented in the UW).

In ETŞ, p. 218, l.4 the writer mentions his mother, as *anam Säviçük*. This comes from the imperative name Sävit (UigOn II n. and the name of Venus in QB 135). "Apiçuk may come from Apiç with some haplological simplification; both names are to be found in the UW. In DvaKol I there is perhaps another divergence from the norm, which the blurred facs. does not permit us to check. In Kädıçük (l.11) from käd 'tough, firm', the suffix has a narrow vowel instead of the usual wide one; in ms. Ch/U 6854 r2, quoted in BT VI p. 176, this name appears regularly as Kädäçük. If the EDPT's connection of käd with Sogdian k'dy 'very, extremely', which seems likely, is correct, it can explain Kädiçük as *kädi+çük; käd would be the result of a subsequent loss of the final vowel. Bägiçük in DvaKol I 10 does not belong with bäg or bäk but comes from Bägi, attested in Familienreg 12 and 22 and as the first name in Bägi Taş Karaçuk, scribbled into the margin of fol. 52 of KP; it is also mentioned in DLT fol. 546. Cf. also the name of Toqta Bägi, who was khan of the (Mongolian) Merkits in the year 1218, and Öŋ Tegin Bägi in InscrOuig II 13.

We know of no instances in which +(A)çUk is added to bases containing the consonant /k/ in the last syllable. We do have three instances of a suffix +(A)ç being added to such bases to form proper names, however: Artok+aç is discussed in UW 212b, and we also have Kök+äç in HazaiAval 10 and Bäk+äç Arslan tegin in the DLT fol. 180. After stating that Bäkäç is 'an honorific for princes', Kāšġarī adds: "If this word is pronounced with the thin *kāf* [i.e. *g*] it means 'O little emir'. It is a diminutive of 'emir' used as a term of endearment." Although Kāšġarī does not tell us what the second vowel of the term of endearment would be, Dankoff and Kelly write 'begäç'; I would expect it to be bägiç, as the suffix of endearment has the form +Xç. Bökä+ç may also have existed, and should perhaps be read in USp 115,21 instead of 'Bökçä' and in KobunSho I 4, II 3 and III 3 instead of 'Burınç'; the editor there also considers 'Bögän'. A proper name Bökä is attested in DLT fol. 545, the word itself signifying 'wrestler, warrior'. One could, finally,

64 This side is called "recto" on the facs. but "verso" in the text.
65 Cf. apa in proper names, par. C of UW 166b.
66 The verbal noun in -Ut would have been 'säv-üt', of course.

add the proper name QUILUJ' in DLT fol. 180. The vowel of the second syllable being by a later hand, one could also read this as *Kul+aç*; this would be from *kul* 'slave', reminiscent of both *Nom kulı* and *'Abdu 'l-lāh*.

It would be plausible to explain the complementary distribution of *+(A)çUk* by the dissimilation of /k/. But *+Aç* most likely also consists of *+A+(X)ç*, thus making *+A* the main marker for proper names.

2.2 *Intensification*

Under this heading we discuss two enclitic particles, one suffix and the reduplication. *(O)k* is here not discussed as to its functions; we only try to clarify the phonological conditions of its addition to simple bases ending in vowels. In any case, *Ok* does not necessarily intensify the content of the segment to which it is added but rather stresses the fact that this segment, and not an other one, has been selected for use. It is used with all lexeme classes and with all classes of larger expressions which can replace them in their syntactic content, and appears to have no influence either on their content or on their function.

kAn is added only to sentence adverbs, or to larger structures used adverbally. It appears to stress the content of its mostly temporal bases.

Reduplication is the only Old Turkic morphological process which is not suffixal, while *+rAk*, which has a similar content, is. One other difference between these two is the fact that *+rAk* is also used as comparative, while reduplication was always elative. That is perhaps why reduplication appears to have been more appropriate for colour adjectives. Both are applied practically exclusively to adjectives. Comparing minimal pairs like *aparıg* vs. *arıgrak*, *süpsüzök* vs. *süzök-räk* in their contexts, one gets the impression that the former are more expressive.

Intensification is always endocentric, and has nothing to do with syntactic functions (except the fact that *kAn* is limited to one syntactic class and could therefore serve as marker for it). While *Ok* and *kAn* can be added to complex syntactic structures, *+rAk* and the reduplication only have lexemes as bases. Such lexemes are often denominal or deverbal derivates, however. Intensives are not expanded, as the content of their morphemes cannot be incorporated into lexemes; if, in one case, *+kIyA* is added to *az+rAk*, it is only to heighten the stress on the smallness of the quantity.

There is also a syntagmatic means for intensifying adjectives, which is very common: It follows the pattern A *+dA* A, as in *täriŋdä täriŋ* (ShōAgon 1, 100). This lies outside the domain of this work.

These are not formational or inflexional affixes but enclitics: Old Turkic affixes are only added to members of specific morphological classes, i.e. only to verbs, only to numerals etc.; they have their particular slots in morpheme sequences in vowel harmony; they are unlike them in getting added indifferently to nominals, finite verbs and so forth. They are added to whole words *after* all obligatory or optional morphology; they are never followed by morphological affixes. There are two reasons why *Ok* and *kAn* are nevertheless discussed here: Some scholars have taken certain instances of these particles to be formatives; in certain cases, they get lexicalised together with their bases, thus undergoing the process to which derived forms are prone.

2.21 *Ok* and *kAn*

Ok appears nine times in Orkhon Turkic in its full bi-phonemic variant: after demonstrative and personal pronouns, nominals and finite verb forms. In all these cases, the words preceding *Ok* end in consonants. Variants after vowels appear four times in the Toñ inscr., only after verbs: they are spelled $^{w}K^{2w}K^{2}$ (ls. 9 and 21), $K^{2w}K^{2}$ (l. 30) and just K^{2} (l. 11, undamaged and well visible). In Erdal, 1979: 90 (with footn. 15) I stated that Toñ 11 can only be read as *ölürtäçik*, i.e. a future form with non-dominant enclitic *(O)k*. The variants of the other three post-vocalic instances should both be read as *kök* and considered the result of reduplication: *(O)k Ok*. Orkhon Turkic, then, shows complementary distribution: *Ok* after consonants, just *k* or a strengthened variant *kOk* after vowels.

Uigur often leaves vowels unelided in such circumstances: Exs. of *bo ok*, *munta ok*, *sanga ok*, *ymä ök*, *yänä ök*, *antak(ı)ya ok*, *körmiştä ök*, *yarlıkamışta ok* etc. are easy to come by. Brāhmī instances show that non-elision has phonetic reality: *bo ok* (TT VIII H3), *anı ok* (TT VIII D18) and *inçgäkyä ök* (TT VIII F14).

In some other cases, the vowel of the particle is elided. *ançulayuk* in Laut Bemerk 29 comes from *ançulayu ok*; this not uncommon sequence is attested even in l. 43 of the same text. Laut suggests in his introduction that such elision of the initial vowel of *Ok* is late; our evidence shows that it is archaic, if we really are to link its appearance to a development in time. Similarly, *ançulayu ok* in BuyKäl 10, *ançulayuk ibid.* 28. *nägük* in Warnke 454 comes from *nägü ök*. *küntämäk* (e.g. in Wettkampf 3, Maitr 169 r9 and 25 v6, Suv 120,17, M III 22,13$_2$ (text 8) and TT III 96) is from *kün+tä (y)mä (ö)k*.[67] *yaraşık* (QB 1053, 1068, 3213, 4088, 4621, 4634 and 4635) is not an *-(O)k* nor an *-(X)g* form but comes from *yaraşı*,[68] with

67 An analysis as '*kün+täm+äk*' is excluded, as *kündäm* signifies 'sun+like'; *+dAm* forms similatives and *+Ak* forms diminutives, and there is no trace of either content in *küntämäk*.

68 See this in section 3.118 below.

which it is synonymous. In QB 3210 we even find the abstract *yaraşıklık*, our only 'further expansion' from an *Ok* sequence; but the QB is not Old Turkic (which never, by the way, uses *+lXk* to form abstracts).[69]

The *UW* treats *anta*, *antak* and *anta ok* in separate entries. The last mentioned entry includes the connected spelling ''NT''WQ (both with and without dots on the velar), which is, in a sense, intermediate between *antak* and *anta ok*.[70] The elided and the unelided sequences have the same meaning; they are both well attested, but *anta ok* is more common. We already noted the single ex. of *ançulayuk* as against several of the longer variant. The *UW* entry for *ança+k*[71] also includes the variant with unelided vowel. This is very rare as compared with *antak* – *anta ok*. *inçä+k* and *inça+k*, finally, show the same elision.[72]

Uigur and Qarakhanid instances showing such losses of vowels should, at least in part, be the result of sporadic 'Zusammenrückung'. There is no doubt that, in spoken language much more than in written, vowels of words get elided if they happen to be uttered adjacent to vowels opening or closing other words. Old Turkic texts rarely reflect such sandhi phenomena unless grammaticalised (as in Orkhon Turkic) or of high textual frequency (as with the pronouns). The fact that, in Old Turkic metric texts, final vowels and initial vowels adjacent to them are often (but not always!) to be counted as one syllable is another aspect of this phenomenon invisible in our written data. In some cases in Uigur, in which the words ending in vowels were habitually followed by *Ok*, the cohesion of the sequence was reflected by writing. *Ok* cannot, merely because of this habit, be called a suffix.

taşıkgınçakan 'the moment (you) have gotten out', in the fr. quoted in the n. to BT V 521 contains the gerund suffix *-gInçA* followed by an element *kAn*. I take *kan* to consist of the post-vocalic variant of *(O)k* together with *+An*, which has temporal ablative content. It is attested in the gerundive suffix *-(X)p+An*, in *an+tır+an* (*UW* s.v. *andıran*), *muntıran*, *kantıran* etc., and has hitherto not been treated adequately. *yaŋırṭukan* 'from recent times' in BuddhUig I 227 has *kAn* added to (a late variant of) a petrified converb, *yaŋırtı*. *ançagınça*[73] (q.v. in the

69 Cf. also *näk* 'why?' < *nä ök* twice in the Codex Comanicus. *näçük* 'why?' and *kançuk* 'wherever' are discussed in section 2.72.

70 Cf. *yerintä'ök* in MaitrH X 6 a 12, mistakenly read as '*yirintänök*' and given a wrong translation.

71 Appears also in the Tes inscr., and all the way to the Codex Comanicus.

72 The texts have both *inçäk* and *ınçak*, the former e.g. in TT II A 29, the latter e.g. in M I 7,17. This makes *inçä* and *ınça* equally legitimate transcriptions of 'YNÇ', unless some semantic or syntactic difference between the two is discovered.

73 This word is written with a voiced velar in Manichaean script in M I 6,19. If one disregards that and considers as meaningful the three Uigur script exs. which mark the velar with double dots as voiceless (quoted in the *UW* entry), one can instead explain it as *ançak+I(n)+çA*, i.e. with possessive suffix.

UW) is also followed by *kAn* in a Manichaean text, mentioned in the *UW*. Both bases and *kAn* sequence denote and refer to time.

kAn is added to the time adverbs *amn* and *agnu* (see the *UW* for both), *ertä* (TT 1171, Ht V I 3 a 24, Ht Par 150,17 and 161,23 *apud UW* 124 a, BT II 1079) and *önrä* (in TT I 209, BT I D (24) and Ham Touen 30,2), all of which end in vowels. It appears, all in all, to have strengthened their meanings. Because of its appearing only after vowels, its use in discourse and its being an enclitic, this etymology of *kAn* seems the most likely.

I don't believe that the form in *-mAzkAn*, discussed in Bang, 1915: 631-2, contains this enclitic. This form may also have been formed as negative counterpart of *är-kän*, q. v. on p. 383 below. *-mAzkAn* does have temporal meaning like the sequences containing the enclitic *kAn*; note, however, that there is nothing temporal about the form in *-mAz*, whereas the bases of *kAn* denote concepts of time by themselves. The bases to which the enclitic is added are adverbial in themselves, whereas *-mAzkAn* becomes adverbial through the addition of *kAn*.

Schulz 1981 would like to derive *-mAzkAn* from *-mAz ärkän*, which is possible. It is not too likely, however, seeing that one and the same text contains both *-mAzkAn* and the only Uigur ex. of *-mAz ärkän* which Schulz has found. It is not easy to explain why the stem *är-* should be dropped only in this sequence but not, for instance, in *-Ar ärkän* (which would certainly be more prone to haplology). Schulz's syntactic treatment of *-mAzkAn* (pp. 101-106), on the other hand, is full and exceedingly useful.[74]

The UW suggests *+klyA+n* as etymology of *kAn*. This does not seem too likely in view of the mutual distribution of *+klyA* and the instrumental suffix, noted on p. 56.

2.22 *+rAk*

This suffix forms elatives and comparatives. It appears to have been spontaneously productive, but still not too common: Only *artokrak*, *yegräk* and, in the QB, the latter's antonym *yavuzrak* are met with several times; most *+rAk* forms appear no more than once or twice. *+rAk* is well represented in all types of Uigur texts, but the only runic example may not be too early: *bägräkim a! äsizim a! ad(ı)rıldım* (YE 5,3). The formative appears to have been excluded from the lemmata of the DLT, presumably because it does not really create new lexemes: Lexemes with and without *+rAk* do not differ in content in any unpredictable

74 *taka* which, often appearing with it, seems to puzzle Schulz, here has a function identical to that of Republican Turkish *daha* in negative temporal clauses.

manner, but only in the degree to which the content is stressed. The OB does have very many instances of *yegräk* 'better', and another five forms attested in ten exs.. *+rAk* is added only to adjectives and to adverbs, with the exception of *bägräk*, which evidently comes from *bäg* 'lord, master'. All four Uigur instances of *bägräk* (*KP* 66,5 M II 7,6 and 8 and r 13 in the text quoted in the n. to ChuastBeitr) are in Uigur writing, which would make possible the reading *bäk+räk* advocated by Arat in *ETŞ* p. 308.[75] The runic inscrs. YE 98 (not mentioned in the dictionaries) and YE 5 speak against this, however,[76] and a meaning like 'tougher, toughest' in no way fits the KP instance in particular. 'gentlemanly' would fit all the instances, on the other hand, and reminds one of the adjective use of *efendi* in Republican Turkish. Khotanese sources quoted in Hovdhaugen, 1971: 185 also demand a voiced velar.

In content, *+rAk* forms can be characterised as follows: The adverbs *aŋnurak* (*KP* 32,4), *ertäräk* (Warnke 565) and *öŋrärāk* (TT VIII E 42, PañcFrag 55 and Maitr 103 r 5-6) all three signify 'before, earlier'.[77] In *barçada içgärürāk barçada üzäräk* (BT V 10,171, translated "innerer als alles und höher als alles"), *+rAk* denotes relative location. *kenräk* (BT V 19,424) is 'later'. Then we have the common *artokrak* 'quite, exceedingly etc.', q.v. in the *UW*, and *yetrürāk* and *bütrürāk* in *QB* 507. Base adjectives denote quantity (e.g. *üküşrāk* in HtPar 13 r 14, Suv 366,4 and M III 31,1$_2$ and *tälimräk* in Maitr 131 r 27), size (e.g. *keŋräk* in U IV D 143), distance (e.g. *tärinräk* in Maitr 131 r 15), weight, quality (e.g. the common *yegräk*[78]), texture, taste and so forth (e.g. *yarprak sav* 'quite difficult phrases' in Ht X 168 and *burkırak yüz* in Maitr 117 v 18). Not, however, colours: These appear to have been conceived of as ungradable (which they are not in terms of wavelength).

+rAk is not very often added to denominal bases, but expansions from these are rare in any case. We have *küç+lüg+räk* 'stronger' (Wettkampf 43-4) and *küç+süz+räk* 'weaker' (BT V 6,93), *öŋräkidä öŋisigräk* 'more original than before' (Ht X 800-1) and *adınsıgrak*, q.v. in the *UW*. On the other hand, *+rAk* derivates from verbal nouns and verbal adjectives are rather common. Many of them represent the sequence *-(O)k+rAk*: *adrukrak* (thus and not '*adrokrak*'; cf.

75 Le Coq already appears to have thought about this, as he writes in a n. to M II: "*bägräk* fürstlicher; auch festerer, härterer (härtester)". The latter meanings could only have been connected with *bäk*.

76 Malov's interpretation as '*bäg ärkim*' makes no sense.

77 Note that these are matched by *aşnukan*, *ertäkän* and *öŋräkän* respectively. The meaning difference between the two sets is not really clear to me.

78 Beside the instances mentioned in the *EDPT* we find this in Hochzeit 23, Maitr 33 v 23, 58 v 7 and 9 and 100 r 7 and Suv 488,1.

the base in section 3.102) and *artokrak* are discussed in the *UW*;[79] further, we have *sazokrak y(ā)rokrak* 'purer and more radiant' (BT V 6,92), *tüşükrāk* 'rather dejected' (OB 5686), *yagukrak* (Maitr 101 r19) 'nearer', and *yumşakrak yig bōz* 'particularly soft raw cotton' (Heilk II 2,13). With the partly dominant formative *-X)g*, we find *üzünrāk* (PañcFrag 45 and 106, UIV A240), *būtūnrāk* and *yakınrak* (both in the QB); with *-(X)g*, *arıgrak* (BT V 6,92), *vajırda ymä katıgrak* 'harder than a diamond' (U III 26,14) and *yenigräk* (ms. U 313b r1 quoted in Zieme, 1969: 90). *yigvırak ayu ber-* (Maitr 13 v10-11 and MaitrH XI 3 a16) is 'to tell it quite concisely'; one other instance of *yıgvı* is discussed below. A bit surprising is the sequence of suffixes in *noşda tataglagrak t(ā)ŋridäm bilgä bilig* 'divine wisdom tastier than nectar' (M I 26,19), *ay t(ā)ŋri tilgänintä sävigligrāk* (U IV B 48) 'lovelier than the moon disc' and *sasıglıgrak ol* (PañcFrag 150), translated as "sehr grob ist es", to be read as *s(a)rsıglıgrak* if translated correctly. These instances add likelihood to the view that *-(X)glXg* (q.v. below) was a compound suffix.

We saw the *+rAk* forms translated above in their context to denote either absolute degree or comparison. The instances in HtPar 13 r14 also denote degree: *idok nomug üküşrāk taki bilmāzkän süü yarattım artokrak ädsiz* 'Not yet quite knowing the holy teaching, I wrote an exceedingly worthless introduction.'

The five comparative instances of *+rAk* quoted above can all be seen to govern the case form in *+dA* which one might, in this context, call 'ablatival locative'. Other instances of comparative *+rAk* also govern *+dA*: *yagız yerdä ag(ı)rrak* (U IV D 143) 'heavier than the brown earth'; *t(ä)ŋri t(ä)ŋrisi burxanta öŋrärāk yalaŋuk ätözin ıdalap . . .* (Maitr 103 r5-6) 'discarding his human body earlier than Buddha the god of gods'; *ämgäklig tınl(ı)glar ögintä kaŋınta takı yegrāk adasınta tudasınta ara kirür* (Kuan 186) 'He intercedes for suffering creatures in trouble$_2$ even better than their mother and father.'[80] Similar to this last is *antada taka yegrāk* (MaitrH X2 b2). *+dA* appears to have been the form of the case ending in this construction also in the archetype of the QB: B, the best ms., retains it; A, the latest, writes *+dIn* while C, the one of intermediate age, has *+dA* with *n* added subsequently above the line. I know of only one ex. in which comparative *+rAk* governs *+dXn/+dIn*: It is the instance with *agırırak* (discussed below) in the passage quoted in *UW* 66 a on mid-page s.v. *agır*, par. A,d,1, which becomes partly intelligible only after a tentative emandation. In general, then, *+rAk* governs the case form *+dA*; giving a label to this form in this function remains the task of Old Turkic case grammar.

79 An adverbial instance of *artokrak* not mentioned in the *UW* occurs in EhlersNotab 17. *artokrak mänjilig* 'of exceeding happiness' can be added from AbitAnk 8, 35 and 43 and AmitIst 63, 87 and 102.

80 This use of *taki* reminds one of comparative *daha* in Republican Turkish; *taki* and *+rAk* are used concurrently also in Suv 563,1.

As expansions of *+rAk* I can only mention *azrakçak(ı)ya* from HtPar 6 r3, quoted in Gabain, 1974: 154, and *azrakkına* in QB 6633, which is in fact the same word. Smallness of quantity is, of course, the type of meaning which lends itself to stress both by *+rAk* and *+kIñA*.

In one or two cases, comparative *+rAk* appears to be added after a 3rd pers. possessive suffix possibly referring back to what is being compared. One case is *munṭaḍa takı yegirāk tayçuŋlug tapıgın tapın- udun-* (ShōAv 234) "mit noch vor-züglicherer *Pañcavārşika*-Bewirtung bewirten$_2$". The other appears only in the Leningrad ms. in Suv 563,2 (cf. the reedition of the passage in *TUBA* 11 (1987)): *takı agırırak ıçgınmaktın el oronın* 'It is even worse than losing the throne of a realm'. *+lXg* is also added after the third person possessive suffix, but that in texts where it has practically become a conjunction. The two sources with *+I+rAk* are certainly late as well. An early text (DreiPrinz 26) shows *t(ä)rkinräk k(ä)l-*, with *+rAk* after the instrumental suffix.

2.23 Reduplication

This is used for the expressive intensification of the content of adjectives, among which the colour names form a distinct group. What is repeated is the initial consonant, if there is one, and the first vowel, and a /p/ is placed between the repeated phoneme sequence and the base. Therefore,

$$(C_1)V_1 \ldots \rightarrow (C_1)V_1p(C_1)V_1 \ldots$$

could symbolise the process. According to the DLT, the Oguz sometimes introduce /m/ into the sequence instead of /p/, and, with *tägirmi*, /s/. In DLT fol. 170 we actually find Oguz *süm süçig* 'something very sweet'. The Oguz languages use these three consonants to this very day; in Old Turkic sources, however, we find only /p/. We also have *täp tägirmi* (or *tägirme*), e.g. in MaitrGeng 5 a23 and 11 b25, UigTot 357 and ETŞ 9,18.

Among the reduplicated colour names we find *kara* (e.g. six times in Maitr), *(y)ürüŋ*, *kızıl*, *yaşıl*, *kök* and *sarıg*, i.e. the couple 'black – white' and the four basic colours 'red', 'green', 'blue' and 'yellow'. The fact that colour names are not expanded with *+rAk* at all cannot be a coincidence; nor can this be a meaningful case of complementary distribution, as quite a number of lexemes are expanded both ways. It appears that *+rAk* intensifies in terms of grade and degree, which reduplication does not: That is why reduplication never serves comparison.

Other qualities intensified by reduplicating the adjective denoting them are form, as with *tüz* 'flat, level, straight', *kötgi* 'protruding', *köni* 'straight', *uzun* 'long', *yazı* 'flat', *tägirmi* 'round'; also other visible characteristics, as *karaŋu* 'dark', *süzök* 'pure' (in Suv 646,9-12), *arıg* 'clean', *yumşak* 'soft', *tolu* 'full'. Further, we find *op osalkıya* 'quite without care' (BT III 219), which heaps up two

emotive elements, and *äp ädgü* (DLT), *üp nuŋa* 'quite uninterruptedly' (*BT XIII* 1,82). Like other markers of emotional involvement, reduplicated forms sometimes appear in series. Thus MaitrGeng 11 b 19-29 mentions 'Buddha's *tüp tüz tişläri, köp köni bodi sını, täp tägirmi ät'özi, up uzun torlug eligi adakı* and *bantatu käpäz tüg yup yumşak ulı ayası*. In BuddhUig II 78 we read: *bo balıknıŋ TÖRTtin SINGAR yüzläri on ikirär yoçan ülgülüg ärip oronı yeri yap yazı tüp tüzdäm ap arıg süp süzök ärip . . .* 'The faces of this city measure twelve *yocana* on each one of its four sides, and its ground is quite level$_2$ and clean$_2$.' BT VII G9 has the same couple of reduplicated adjectives as the last two quoted, while, in Suv 293,21, we find the series *kõŋüllärin . . . ap arıg süp süzök tüp tüz kılurlar* and in 312,20 *yap yazı tüp tüz*.

It may have been noticed that the derived bases are not less common than the simple ones, denominal bases (e.g. *yaş+ıl, tüz+dām*) being represented as well as deverbal ones (e.g. *uzun, tolun, tutçı, kõtgi, süzõk* and *yumşak, arıg, süçig* and *tirig*). All bases are adjective lexemes, but all Old Turkic adjectives can equally be used as abstract nouns. The only possible exception is *yap yavışgu* in Maitr 37 v 9. However, in his n. thereto in *BT IX* 109, Ş. Tekin rightly points out that one might complete this as *yap(ırgak) yavışgu*, since *yap* is written at the end of the line, and the rest of the word may have been omitted inadvertently in writing on in the next one.[81] This reduplication has been borrowed into Mongolian, where its use is also limited to adjectives, most of them denoting colours.[82]

81 *keŋ tüp* in *bir berä keŋ tüp törtKil* (Maitr 30 r 9) is correctly understood to signify 'breadth and depth' in the Turkish edition of the text while, in *BT IX*, Tekin wrongly takes *tüp* to be the reduplicating syllable.

82 The epithet *Teb Tenggeri* in par. 244 of the *Secret History* has, I believe, been misunderstood. This is not an instance of the reduplication discussed here, as still stated in Rachewiltz, 1982: 75-76. Pelliot's view (q.v. in *TP* 37 (1944): 182-4) is based on the far-fetched 'emendation' of the N.Pr. *Sundari tArI tārim* in a colophon of Suv into '*tāp tārim*'. I think *tArI* may have been a 'correcting' repetition of the second and third syllables of *Sundari*: In a subsequent occurrence of the name, there is just *Suntari* (thus) *tārim*. Pelliot writes about *Teb Tenggeri*: "Mon opinion est qu'il s'agit ici d'une expression, toute faite, passée du turc en mongol". But in Turkic there is no reduplication of nouns. Nor is *Teb* likely to be the first element of the binomial *tāv kūr* 'trick, guile', as Cleaves suggested in *UAJb* 39 (1967). I agree with Clauson in *JRAS* 1956. Iranian *dēv* 'demon', which was borrowed also into Turkic, is the likeliest source: *Kökočü Teb Tenggeri*, 'Kökočü the lord of the demons', was, after all, the chief shaman of the Mongols.

2.3 *Similatives*

Three formatives are used to create adjectives which express similarity to the base lexeme: One of them, *+sIg*, is weakly productive, the others, *+dAm* and *+mAn*, hardly productive at all. *+mAn* is rarest among the three in Old Turkic, but could also form nouns. *+sIg* is added to adjectives in Uigur and to nouns in Qarakhanid Turkic. Among the eight *+dAm* lexemes, six are denominal, two deadjectival; *+mAn* also has been found both with noun and adjective bases: No complementary distribution in matters of function can be shown to have existed, then. As for content, something like 'as if' comes through in some of the examples with *+sIg* but not with *+dAm* or *+mAn*. There are no significant limits on further derivational expansion for either *+sIg* or *+dAm*. Metaphor is also a type of comparison; the wholly unproductive *+gAk* is therefore also included in this chapter.

Similative content is commonly expressed with the postposition *täg* 'like'. This postposition acquired suffix status with the demonstrative bases *an+* and *bun+*; see the *EDPT* and, for *antag*, the *UW*. In these cases, *täg* submits to vowel harmony already in the Orkhon inscriptions, but with curious fluctuations; these include backward assimilation, for which see Tekin, 1968: 165.[83] Quite independently from that phenomenon, we find in Uigur some fixed collocations of adjectives or nouns with *täg*. Noteworthy among these is *bälıŋ täg* 'frightful' (U II 25,16-17 (*Bhadrā*), U IV A 235 and Suv 188,12), in the *EDPT* changed to '*beliŋdek*'. In meaning, this reminds one of *korkgu täg* (TT X 362), itself formally similar to *sözlägü täg* (TT II A 55). Here, *täg* is neither formative nor inflectional ending.

With the case suffix *+çA* also entering the similative semantic domain under some circumstances, productive liveliness was not demanded of *+sIg* or *+dAm*, not to speak of *+mAn* or *+gAk*.

83 Languages often have a more complex functional (i.e. case) paradigm with pronouns than with nouns. Concerning early Indo-European languages it is often assumed that such additional forms are survivors from earlier periods. With *+tAg* we have an example for such a case suffix being secondary.

2.31 +dAm

A practically unproductive formation, some products of which are nevertheless perfectly transparent. It forms only adjectives. *ār+dām*, too, is still adjectival in the inscriptions: *alpın ārdamın üçün* in KÇ 7 and 12 (similar expression ibid. 4) signifies 'because he was sturdy and virtuous'. This instance also shows how nominalisation might have come about, for one can also say 'because of his sturdiness and virtue'. Whereas, in Uigur, *alp* both qualifies the warrior and denotes his quality; only the abstract use of *ārdām* was retained.[84] *ārdām* was then used more generally in the sense of 'quality' and even just 'characteristic', and was applied also to objects. This transfer has a perfect semantic parallel in Latin *vir+tus*; the functional transfer from adjective to corresponding abstract is quite automatic in Old Turkic, possessive suffixes being added to refer to the bearer of the quality in question.

+dAm is generally added to nouns. Once *+dAm* had died out, its function appears to have been transferred to *+sIg* which, in Qarakhanid Turkic, is added to nouns instead of it.

tāŋridām 'divine' is amply attested (see the *EDPT*), and could count as the clearest instance of this formation. *kündām* 'sunlike', on the other hand, has been found only in M III 17,21 before a lacuna and in Maitr 191 r 1 (BT IX 241,1_4) after one.

HamTouen 7,2-3 has the noun phrases KWYLYKDM' *küç yāk* and B'T'XD'M' VXTY *yāk*, the first nominals of which are taken by Hamilton to be compounds with Sogdian *dm'n* as second element. Zieme (lecture held at the 1989 PIAC meeting, Oslo) found the same song-fragment in a Turfan ms. with the first word written not as *kölikdāmā* but as *köligādāmä*. He takes the final *alifs* to be merely graphic and the two words to belong to the *+dAm* formation. He translates *köligādāmā kōç yāk* as "Dämon 'Schatten-Stunde'", *b[atıg]dam[a] vxtı yäk* as "Dämon 'Un[tergang]s-Zeit'". Cf. *bat-ıg* and *köli-k* in sections 3.101 and 3.102 respectively.

bir+dām usually appears as *birtām*, with /t/ following /r/. Being derived from *bir*, it should originally have signified 'as one'. It is used adverbially to describe actions which apply to a number of objects, or to different parts of an object, as if they were one, i.e. 'wholly, completely, uniformly'. There are additional conno-

84 *çigidām* in TT V B 123 (see now facs. published by Kudara) may not be equivalent to Ottoman *çiğdem* 'crocus' at all, as assumed hitherto. The text has *özlärdäki özäklärdäki yava çigidäm suvlardaki ögänlärdäki sargan otı*. Although *yava* and *sargan otı* are names of plants, *çigidäm* may be an adjective qualifying *suvlar ögänlär*. The arguments are irrelevant, however, as long as no certain base is known for this.

85 See *alp* in the *UW*.

tations, however, only partly captured by the ex. of DLT fol. 243, *ol yumuşka birtäm bardı*. This is rendered as follows: "He went off on the mission wholeheartedly and for a long time, as if he did not intend to come back." Most Uigur exs. of *birtäm* also qualify verbs of seperation like the DLT one: Intransitives like *bar-*, *ket-*, *tarık-* and *ädrül-* in Ht IV 1261 and VII 1962, U III 42,20, BT II 686, ETŞ 10,98, Suv 618,4, or transitives like *tarkar-*, *ketär-* and *üzmälä-*, in Suv 49,1 and 614,17, U III 76,20, Warnke 416 and TT IV B 59. 'complete salvation' (TT IV B 50), 'complete pacification' (TT V B 78) or 'complete purification' (ETŞ 20,125) are also close to this, as one parts from one's sins (or whatever). Other contexts appear in BT VIII A 180, Warnke 792, TT IX 23 (= Pothi 259), ETŞ 12,22 and 20,43, Suv 629,10 and QB 339 and 4349 (*birtäm ök*, as in the fragmentary M III 32,2$_5$). Cf. also *birtäm+läti*, discussed on p. 406 below. An expansion of *birtäm* probably to be read as *birtämlik* is found several times: *azmışlarka bir täk köni yol körkitü berip birtämlik tuşka tägürdäçi . . . yerçikä yükünür m(ä)n* (ETŞ 10,77); *ol kamag [tınl](ı)glar yumgı barça ozup kutrulup birtämlik üzäliksiz üstünki tuyunmakka tükällig bolup . . .* (Warnke 409); *[ä]rkli[g]lärniŋ iş[i] küdü[ki] barça birtämlik bolur* (FujYūr v21); *bulu yarlıkap birtämlik yöründäkin . . .* (Abhi 609); *birtämlik tıdılmaktın ken twgdaçı nomlarıg* (Abhi A 117 a14-15 in UigKan p. 151) and *yana kut buyan üzä birtämlik kalpkatägi ayagulukumuz agırlagulukumuz yalŋuz Şakimuni burxan nomı ärür* (Cleft sentence, HtPar 47 v11-14). In all these sentences, the subject or the object is plural, and all of them are in prospective context. All this is not enough to determine the exact meaning of *birtämlik*, and the sentences have been quoted to help the reader do so. What is common to *birtäm* and its derivates is the suddenness, completeness, force and irreversibility of the event described.[86] Whereas *birtäm* thus qualifies the mode of action, *yintäm* and *bir yintäm* appear to focus on duration. This opposition between the two becomes clear in a sentence in Suv 17,13, where both adverbs are used together: *ävintäki ulugı kiçigi barça bir ajunta özlüg ölürgü sav birtäm kodup bir yintäm bo nom ärdinig boşguntılar tuttılar*. *birtäm* describes the comprehensive change of attitude, *bir yintäm* the perseverance in one. *yintäm* signifies 'continuous', as adverb 'constantly' or just 'only'. I take *yintäm* to be subsequent to *bir yintäm* 'exclusively', attested in BT II 885, Suv 17,13, Abhi A 119 a9 (quoted in TermBuddh), BT XIII 38,8 and 58,11, BT VIII A 452, KudJunshō B r14 and Shō IX b14: A connection with *yin* 'member' (also in the sense of 'part of the body') becomes plausible only over the immediate constituents (*bir yin*)*täm*. *yintäm* appears also in Abhi (TermBuddh) 120 b7 and Abhi B 48 a11.[87]

86 The addition of *+lXk* (q.v. below) makes this content prospective.

87 Not far in content from *yintäm* is (*y*)*isdäm* (the second-fifth phonemes may also be /e/, /ş/, /t/ and /l/ respectively), a lexeme discussed in the n. to ETŞ 9,34. Beside several times in ETŞ, we find it in

Concerning the second word in *ölüm käsdämi ämgäk* 'a suffering similar to death' (ShsAgon 1,215), the n. to ÄgFrag I F 1-4 suggests this formation. The base would be *käs* 'a piece', *+dAm* here having a metaphorical connotation: *ölüm käsdämi* as German 'ein Stück Tod', as it were. A connection with *kästäm* in DLT fol. 244, "a feast which one prepares for drinkers who come to one without formal arrangements", seems quite impossible."

nöz+däm is derived from an adjective and not from a noun. For *köŋüli biligt ornagla, ir'öri näsdäm* "engilg ärip, *yinçürü adıra billäçi ärip* . . . (Suv 594,14), Nobel, 1958: 321 has: "Wessen Sinn fest ist, wessen Körper *ebenmäßig* und in rechter Verfassung ist, wer genau überlegt, . . . ". This makes it clear that the base is not any of the nouns *töz, töş* or *tüş*. This lexeme is attested also in Schwitz 17: *tişi törtKül yurun näzdäm* 'His teeth are rectangular, white and regular'. *birtäm* also has a (quantifier) adjective as base.

It is possible that *+dAm* consists of *+dA-(X)m*. There is no clear connection between any existing *+dA-* verb and any lexeme of the *+dAm* formation, however, nor do the meanings of the formations speak for this.[90]

Whereas *ärdämlig* and *ärdämsiz* are well attested, the derivate of *birtäm* is better read with *+lik* than with *+lig* because of its meaning. From *tüzdäm* we have *nïp nüzdäm* (BuddhUig II 78), q.v. on p. 66 above.

2.32 *+slg*

This formative is not too lively, but appears in all stages of the language. Lexemes as well as their attestations are not numerous: Except *adınsıg* and *öŋisig*, no lexeme appears more than once or twice.

All instances are adjectives, which can, of course, also be used adverbially. Nominal use is also attested, e.g. in ETŞ 13,132: *ögtin kaŋtın öŋisigig öggülük üd*

BuddhUig II 556, BT II 181 and CYK 114. The last ex. is translated as "gemeinsam(?)"; which probably means that the ed. wants to connect it with *eş* 'companion'. It appears also in BT XIII 13,135, translated as "ständig" and tentatively given a Skt. etymology. This last seems to be the best explanation suggested.

88 I have no etymology for *wktäm* 'wilful, proud, vainglorious, boastful', discussed in the *EDPT*. The */t/* in this lexeme is secured by the QB, the */k/* by the Codex Comanicus (beside being deducible from the presence of */t/* in case *wktäm* belongs to this formation). This */k/* excludes a connexion of *wktäm* with *ö-g* (q.v. below), e.g., beside the semantic difficulties. Our only Uigur ex. of *wktäm* is in Kinkashô śloka A,d: *özin wkdämin* there corresponds to Skt. *svairam* 'freely, willfully, unconstrainedly'. The sentence is discussed under *yori-l-* below. In it, *amti* is the counterpart of *ihädya* and not, as Kudara appears to think, *özin* of *svaira*, *wkdämin* of *iha* and *amti* of *adya*.

89 Thus, but */s/* and */z/* are confused very often in this text.

90 Moreover, the original shape of that formative (discussed in section 5.13) may have been *+lA-*.

ārip . . . 'It being the time to praise those who are unlike father and mother, . . .'. *+sIg* is combined with *-(X)nç* to give the combination *-(X)nçIg*, discussed in section 3.311 below. There are also another few cases in which *+sIg* is added to verbal nouns, in one text even to participles. *+sIg* is expanded by *+sXz* and *+rAk*, and in QB 2085, 2459 and 3414 we find the abstract *ārsiglik*.

According to DLT fol. 499, *+sIg* is "a particle of comparison, suffixed to nominals; the object named is compared to the suffixed nominal. E.g. *kulsıg ār* 'a man whose character resembles that of a slave'; *bo kan ol oglansıg* 'This is an old man whose character is like that of a boy.' . . . *bo är ol bägsig* 'This is a man whose character resembles that of emirs.'; *bo ogul ol ärsig* 'This is a young boy who is like a man in character.'" The QB uses *+sIg* in exactly this manner. In addition to *bägsig*, *kulsıg* and *ärsig* mentioned in the DLT, we also find *yıparsıg kara baş* (QB 6530, in the ode), translated as "musk-black head", and *titigsig bo bärk*[91] *äv* (3723) 'this sealed up house of clay' – a metaphor for the earth. *bägsig* appears as proper name in two Uigur mss., in HamTouen 1,15' and 7,6.

The possibly earliest ex., in BlattRun 15-16, has an adjective base: *yürüŋ taşıg alsar, kızılsıg suv yünsär* . . . 'If one takes the white stone a reddish liquid comes out from it . . .'. *çöksig* (TT X 449 and Ht IV 1210) comes from the base of *çöklä-*, q.v. below. It appears to have described the bright-red appearance characteristic of meat offerings. *adınsıg*, the most common *+sIg* lexeme, is documented and explained in the *UW*. *öŋisig*, which has a meaning similar to it, appears in ETŞ 13,132, CYK 79, Suv 621,8 (read thus!) and Ht IV 35, 484 and 1241, V 4 b 6 and X 241 and 399: It signifies 'other, different, strange, unusual, extraordinary' and even 'exquisite'. In Shō XII a 3 we find the binomial *öŋisig säçmä* 'excellent$_2$', read correctly only in the reedition (verse 251). The antonym of *adınsıg* and *öŋisig* is *okşatısıg* (KudJunshō B v 15; see facs.). *ikisigsiz* (BT XIII 20,16) "zweifelsfrei" is from *iki*. *UW* 78 a quotes an expression from HtPek which he reads as *öŋi yersik ak-* and translates as "kreuzweise fließen". I can only interpret this as (*öŋi yer*)*sig*; see 'bracketing' in index II. A similar case of bracketing can be found in QB 829: in *çeçäk yazlur anda, tümän miŋ tüsig*, misquoted and misinterpreted in the *EDPT*. The immediate constituents of this are (*tümän miŋ tü*)*sig*, the underlying phrase being attested also in *tümän miŋ tü ärdäm* (ib. 304). *tümän tü* qualifies *çeçäk*(*lär*) also in QB 70, 1808 and 6531 (ode). QB 829 does not signify "myriad flowers bloom", as translated by Dankoff, but 'flowers bloom in a myriad of shapes-and-colours'. These exs. are discussed at length because of their importance: We do not expect such syntagmatic freedom from a rare formative. But then, in Ht V 4 b 11, *+sIg* is also added to a case form: *öz ujikläri ymä änätkäkçäsig*

91 Arat reads *börk*, which signifies 'cap', and Dankoff translates this as 'domed'. One of the three mss. has a *fatḥa*, however, and *bärk* (> *bäk*) seems to me more appropriate.

ök arïp . . . 'Now their own letters being actually quite similar to the Indian ones, . . .' The *+çA* form corresponds to the derived adjective *India+n*,[92] *yogunsïg* (UigBrief B$_1$ 3), finally, comes from *yogun* 'coarse' and signifies 'gross' and perhaps 'impolite'.

+sïg expresses not only similarity, but also make-believe. E.g. in Scharl 71: *bar ärmädin barsïg, ol ärmädin çïnïg közünmäklärï üzd . . .*, translated as "Ohne zu existieren, scheinen sie existenzhaft, ohne wahr zu sein, wahrhaft. Dadurch . . .". The relationship denoted by *+sïg* is more imaginary than that made possible with German *+haft*. The translation in BT III 308 is more explicit in this: *yarlïkançuçï . . . sundarï kïzïg yölämsinip . . . orlamsïnu . . . yïglamsïnu bütün balïk uluş içintä ulug tïgïrt sogurt turgurdilar. anda munda tïläp tapmamïşsïg bolup . . .* 'they made as if they were helping the girl Sundarī . . . with fake shouting and weeping . . . they brought about a great hullaballoo in the whole city and country. They kept on looking here and there and doing as if they had not found her . . .' (BT III 230-246). *-mAmIşsIg bol-* is here used as a mark for a periphrastic negated perfect, in suppletion, as it were, to *-(X)msIn-*, a formative discussed below. In one case, *+sïg* and *+sIn-* are even added to the same base: With *ärsig*, discussed above, and *ärsin-* 'to show manliness (of a boy)' in DLT fol. 131. This last one is a case of similarity and not make-believe. Thus, the circle is closed again: *-mIş+sIg* and *-Xm+sIn-*, *+sIg* and *+sIn-* all presumably contain the obsolete formative *+sI-*, the former as an *-(X)g* noun,[93] the latter with medial-reflexive expansion. What is strange is that a semantic and collocational connection between the formatives can only be documented from Qarakhanid or late texts, or from prehistory: *süçig* 'sweet' can be analysed both as *süçi-g* and as *süt+sig* (discussed in section 6.2). *+sI-* may therefore possibly have remained more lively in some undocumented dialect. In Old Turkic, at any rate, *+sIg* is hardly a transparent suffix. Eraslan, 1980: 129 is therefore wrong in calling *yogunsïg* an "isim-fiil".

92 *+çA* should perhaps also be considered a formative in Old Turkic (which it definitely is not in Proto-Turkic). Note that *+klïkA* is also added *after* *+çA*.

93 Thus e.g. Gabain, 1950: 66.

Until recently, scholars confused the denominal *adınsız* 'different' with deverbal *adınçız* 'excellent'. We now find the passage *adrokçız tuyu ıstäyü* in BT XIII 24,17, translated "ausgezeichnet verstehend und erforschend". Morphologically, the form (if interpreted correctly) must have arisen from a similar confusion. Semantically, *adrokçız* joined *taŋlançız*, *muŋadınçız* and particularly *adınçız* in expressing 'excellence'; the author metanalysed *+çIg* out of such forms. *adrok* has this meaning also by itself, e.g. in *adrok säçmä sukançız yeg tözlügünün* (ETŞ 15,62); the additional 'suffix' makes its appurtenance to this semantic field more transparent.[94]

2.33 *+mAn*

In the few lexemes in which it has been used in Old Turkic, *+mAn* is added both to nouns and to adjectives, and indicates similarity to the content of the base.

The only Uigur *+mAn* noun is *kölmän* 'pond', evidently derived from *köl* 'lake'. It is attested in SuvStockh 80 with accusative suffix, as *kölmän suvlar* in Suv 314,4 and as *kölmän suvluk* in ETŞ 8,28. DLT fols. 623-4 says that the *Türkmän* are the Oguz, and recounts a story about how Alexander the Great gave them their name. Although his etymology, based on New Persian, is of course quite unacceptable, Käšġarī's translation of the name as signifying "they look like Turks" might be retained: It probably does signify 'Turk-like'. I have no explanation, on the other hand, of why *közmän* "bread baked in hot ashes" (DLT fols. 223 and 278) should have been derived from *köz* 'burning embers' using this suffix. A later ex. of denominal *+mAn* is *kölämän*, the Ottoman name for the Mamlük; it comes from *kölä* 'slave' as a calque on the Arabic term. Cf., further, the Cossack title *ata+man*.

An Uigur text contains a *+mAn* form derived from an adjective and used in a binomial: *köni könimän bolmak* in ShōAgon 1,234 and *kōni könimän köŋülintä* [ibid. 343. *kökmän* is a hap. in M III 23,9_2: *yana kaya kördüm, taŋ b(ä)lgürmiş ärti; kün t(ä)ŋri yarokın kökmän tagda tuga kälir ärti* 'I looked back. Dawn had broken; it was rising and coming together with the light of the sun over the bluish mountain'. Taking *kün täŋri yarokın* to be adnominal, we get 'It was rising and coming over the mountain (which was) bluish from the sun's rays'. *kök* can also signify 'sky', which would demand the translation 'sky-like' for *kökmän*. The word still exists in the former meaning, however: Laude-Cirtautas, 1961 mentions *gökmän* "aschenfarbig (in Bezug auf Tiere)" from Anatolia; *kökpän* „Turteltaube" in Radloff II 1219 probably has the same origin. Laude-Cirtautas also has

94 '*karsıg*' "schneeig" in M III 8,14 is to be read as *sarsıg* (q.v. among the -(*X*)*g* lexemes) with *UW* 217b.

other +mAn adjectives from colour names: *ak+man* 'pure' and *kara+man* "ein Mensch von dunkler Hautfarbe", both from Republican Turkish. There was an *Aktmen Bahadur* in Central Asia at the time of Shaybānī Khan, and *Karaman* is also the name of the Turkish tribe which settled in southern central Anatolia. Finally, Laude-Cirtautas explains *karcuman*, "grauhaarig" in Anatolia, as coming from **kır+gı+man*. In their edition of the Manichaean text, both Le Coq and Bang (in ManErz) refer to the "Kögmän-Gebirge". The place-name *Kögmän* or *Kägmän* appears thrice each in the KT and BQ inscriptions and twice in Toñ, where we understand it to be near the homeland of the *Kırkız*; Tariat W5 mentions a *K/ägm(ä)n (e)li*. It is quite unlikely that an area in the north of Mongolia should be a single concrete place reference in an account of Manichaean mythology. There can be no connection between the two words, one of which has a /k/, the other a /g/.

yasıman in DLT fol. 460 is translated as 'a jug which gurgles', perhaps because it is *yast* 'flat, flattish'. Cf., finally, Ottoman *kocaman* 'huge' from *koca*, which has a related but wider and sometimes metaphorical meaning. With the exception of Kāšgarī's *közmän*, it turns out, general Turkic conforms with Uigur in using +*mAn* with the meaning '-ish'. The rare deadjectival nouns (e.g. *yasıman*, q.v. in the *EDPT* for later instances) come to denote entities characterised by the base adjective. In general, however, there is some (limited) unity to the formation.

2.34 +gAk and +Ak: metaphorical names for body parts

An unproductive formation for metaphorically motivated names for parts of the body.[95] Most exs. for the lexemes in this formation can be found in the *EDPT*; a few additional ones are mentioned here: According to the n. to UigTot 430, *tirsgāk* 'elbow' belongs to *tiz* 'knee'; it is there compared to Hungarian *térd* 'knee', which would thus have been borrowed from some archaic Turkic language. Prof. Doerfer (personal communication) finds this connection unlikely. *kadızgaklıg eligin* (U III 17,18) 'with callous hands' has rightfully been connected with *kadız* 'bark of a tree', which gives the meaning 'callosity' for *kadızgak*. DLT fol. 502 translates the word as 'a blister on the hand, from working' but, by etymology, it should refer to the later stage.[96] For the DLT, 'hard skin on the hand, which results from manual labour' is *mūŋūzgāk*, from *mūŋūz*, the DLT variant of the word for 'horn'; this reminds one of German 'Hornhaut'. *başgak* 'what is above

95 *äggäk* 'donkey' cannot be derived from *eş* 'companion', whose vowel is an /e/; it belongs to the -*gAk* formation, q.v. below. The only exception is *kidiz+gāk kagun* 'a melon that has lost its freshness and has become like felt' in DLT fol. 411. The last syllable has both *fatḥa* and *alif*.

96 The *EDPT* wrongly *kadırgak* with wrong explanation; Dankoff and Kelly correct.

the hips' in DLT fol. 236 is in the *EDPT* changed to *sapgak*, which Dankoff and Kelly follow. *sapgak* is attested in Khot 97 and preferable because of the alphabetical order; it possibly belongs to *sap* 'handle'.

kulkak 'ear' (also in BT VII A 38 and 42 and BT VIII A 237) could perhaps come from *kul* 'slave', although the connection can only go over folk stories about dwarfs sitting in one's ear and whispering. The original may have had a voiced velar, found under certain conditions in the QB. Old Turkic proper, however, replaces /g/ by /k/ after the sonants /l n r/ and perhaps /z/: *kulkak* is the general Old Turkic form in Uigur, runic (BQ N11 and S12), Brāhmī (TT VIII I 5), Manichaean (Pothi 456 and Chuast 313) and Tibetan (BuddhKat 19) scripts; the last is written GOL.LKAG.KIN (poss. 3. pers. sg. accus.). The etymology suggested for *kulkak* is supported somewhat by the anthropomorphic explanation of *ärŋäk* 'finger' (also in Ht IV 1158, ShōKenkyū III 2, BT VII 329-30) from *är+än*, q.v. on p. 91 below. The latter is a collective, and the fingers do form a group, needless to say. /n/ and /g/ must here have been contracted to /ŋ/ prehistorically, when the post-sonantic neutralisation between /g/ and /k/ had not yet taken place; in historical times, /n/ and /g/ are *not* contracted. Another *+gAk* form showing the same contraction is *yaŋak* 'cheek-bone' from *yan* 'side'. The *EDPT* quotes it only from the DLT on but we find it also in Khot 45. Together, these two cases of contraction might support the view that *+gAk* was a particularly archaic suffix, corroborated by its obsoleteness. See Erdal, 1981 for further justification of this etymology for *ärŋäk*. In ETŞ 12,49, AbitAnk etc., the word appears in the metathesised form *äŋräk*, which is later attested with the meaning 'viper'.

The word for 'finger' appears only once in the QB, in couplet 3578: It has the form *ärnäk*. A similar variant is found in Qarakhanid Turkic with *kulkak/kulgak* 'ear': The DLT says that *kulak* is more correct than *kulkak* and *kulxak* and, in the QB, *kulak* is the normal form; *kulgak* only appears there when demanded by the metre. These forms cannot be phonetic variants of original *+gAk* derivates, as this is not regular for Qarakhanid. One may take *kul+ak* to signify 'little slave' and *ärn+äk* 'little men' with the diminutive suffix *+Ak* described in section 2.11. *tılak* 'clitoris' (Khot 77, DLT etc.) from *tıl* 'tongue' may be another such diminutive. The fact is, however, that not all Qarakhanid or later *+Ak* derivates denoting body parts can be interpreted as diminutives: *taşak* 'testicles' is attested from the DLT on; according to the *EDPT*, it comes from *taş* 'stone'. Another possible base for it is *taş* 'outside': Most other body organs are, after all, inside. Another name of a part of the body which may come from a term of orientation is *solak* 'spleen', from *sol* 'left' (which is where the spleen is). DLT fol. 207 says that *solak* is the "Qıfčaq" counterpart of *talak* (according to Doerfer in *UAJb* N.F. 4 (1984): 277 rather Bolgar-Chuvash). Arat believes that *talak* 'the spleen' (DLT ff.) also belonged to this formation, as he takes a word he reads *tal* in Heilk II 1,2 and 85 to

have the same meaning; but that is only a hypothesis. A connection with *tal* 'branch' is excluded because of Tkm. *tal* vs. *dälaq*. *bögräk* 'kidney', attested from Houtsma on, comes from *böglär* 'kidneys, loins'. *stçganak* 'muscle' (UigTot 650 and twice UTV) comes from *stçgan* 'mouse'. The Latin lexeme from which *muscle* comes is connected with the word for 'mouse' by the same metaphor. A similar metaphor is the DLT's *bakaçuk* 'the muscle of the arm', there said to be a derivate from *baka* 'frog'. *ödäk* 'the spinal cord (also the core of a tree)' in the DLT is derived from *öz* 'self, the innermost part'; it cannot be said to be a diminutive in the sense that the other *öz+däk* 'a *little* water way' is one. Rather, the formative *+gAk* appears to have had an alternant *+Ak* distinct from the diminutive suffix of the same form.

2.4 Class markers

Several formatives are limited to particular lexical classes. Most instances are denominal, but some are derivates from adjective bases; *+AgUt*, in particular, is apparently added only to adjectives. We discuss three formations of plant and animal names. Originally there were no doubt more of them, as many animal names end in *°lAn* or *°gA*, for instance; but none of those is transparent in the language of our texts. Two evidently related formatives mark members of social and professional classes, while names for venerated figures end in *+kAn*.

All these formations do not add up to a hierarchical view of the world, as only a vanishingly small part of the lexicon is involved: Old Turkic is very far from having a system of nominal classification like German or Chinese, where all nouns are covered. Most Old Turkic derived and simple nouns are not in any semantic-morphological class. The formatives here united under one heading are clearly of heterogeneous origin: The animal and plant formatives no doubt originally denoted similarity; *+AgUt* comes from the collective affix, and *+kAn* can well be taken to have been a lexeme. At best, therefore, section 2.4 is the result of convergence.

2.41 +kAn

This is a formative for names of divine beings, honorifics and the like; cf. Bang, 1925 a: 249-250. The clearest and most transparent member of this formation is *täŋrikän* 'divine', which is attested already several times in the Ongin inscription. It is documented in the *EDPT* and is found, in addition, in Weih 21 und 22, BT V 20,434, HamTouen 5,57 and 7,6 etc. Equally transparent is *yetikän*, the name of the Ursa Major, which consists of seven stars; it is attested several times in TT VII

40, in the DLT and the QB, and elsewhere. *bodun başganı* 'chief of the people' in DLT fol. 220 no doubt also belongs here, although the voiced velar is against the rules; it may be a hypercorrection. Runic *täŋrikän* documents the fact that the velar was /k/ and not /g/.

Two mountains which were sacred to the early Turks also bear names ending in *+kAn*: *Ötükän* and *Kadırkan*. I dare not relate the former to *ötüg* 'prayer', but the latter no doubt does come from *kadır* 'harsh': Cf. the explanation of *kadır yer* in DLT fol. 183 as 'a place in the mountains that is very cold and snowy'. Kāšgarī there states that the Qarakhanids use *kadır* as honorific, in *kadır xan*. It is presumably in both these capacities that *Kadırkan* refers to a mountain in the inscriptions. Note further, that Runic Q stands for foreign [x] e.g. in *Maxaraç* from Skt. *maharāja*, written with this character. The back-vocalic allophone of /k/ may in fact often have been pronounced as a spirant in Old Turkic. The mountain may therefore also have been called *Kadırxan*. *Burxan*, the Old Turkic name of the Buddha, should not be forgotten in this connection. As has often been explained, the first syllable of this name comes from a Chinese form of *Buddha*, also found in Old Turkic *bursaŋ* 'religious community', from *buddhasaṃgha*.

The idea of connecting this formative with the title *kan/xan* seems evident. All this is put into a very interesting light by the Mongol circumstances, as set forth by I. de Rachewiltz at the 1981 P.I.A.C. meeting:[97] In Classical Mongolian, *qan* is often used as an enclitic element in compound titles and often added to names of natural features venerated by the Mongols, as mountains, rivers etc. Mongolian here supplies us with the 'missing link' between the free *kan/xan* and the suffixal *kan/xan* of Turkic: The latter is a result of so-called 'Zusammenrückung', as in *+tAg* < *täg*, *+mA* < *ymä*, *-gWl* < *-gU ol*, *kaywl* < *kayu ol* and so forth. An Uigur intermediate case appears to be *elig xan* 'king': This is written as two words in normal Uigur orthography, but may nevertheless have been felt to be one lexeme, to judge from the spelling 'E.LE.HAN in BuddhKat 31. In connection with the elision or assimilation of /g/ in this sequence, note that *Burxan* is also twice written as PU.HAN in that text.[98]

The reader should be warned not to draw pre-Turkic titles like *tärkän* (DLT) and *tarxan* into this formation. The later is attested in the Bugut inscription as *tryw'n*, which should probably be read as *tarxwan*, and was assimilated to *+kAn* forms only secondarily.[99]

+kAn appears not to have been productive in historical times.

97 This information is not included in the summary of this lecture in Rachewiltz, 1982: 77-78.

98 These spellings cannot be compared to the alternation *-sA* ~ *-sAr* and the occasional loss of final /r/ in the aorist suffix, which indicate word-final weakening of this sonant.

99 Zieme, 1969: 87 was able to show that there is no Old Turkic '*pärikän*' signifying 'fairy queen'.

2.43 +(X)t and +AgUt

Old Turkic has a plural suffix +t in common with Mongolian and Sogdian. Prof. Doerfer (personal communication) thinks that the Turks borrowed it from the Mongols. I would assume the ultimate source to be Sogdian, if the Iranian origin of the suffix could be proven conclusively. The Bugut inscr., by far the earliest text which the Turks produced, is, after all, in Sogdian, and contains several +t plurals. N. Sims Williams (BT XII p. 159 n. 54) states that "the pl. in °t-/°t lies on the border between inflexional and derivational morphology". This is true also of the earliest Turkic exs. of +(X)t, in the runic inscrs. Most early exs. add it to stems ending in /n/, which drop this /n/ when receiving the suffix; see Erdal, 1979 b: 85-6 for details. In Turkic, a plural content can be detected best in royal inscriptions of the first Uigur kingdom: *Çık bodunka totok berdim, işvaras tarkat anta anfolad[ım]* (ŞU S2) 'I supplied the *Çık* people with *totoks* and sent them *işvaras* and *tarkans*.' *tarkat* is found also in *tarkat buyruk bäglär* in KT S1. In Tariat S4 and N2, the rather common *sänün* 'general' appears with this suffix: *tok(u)z buyruk [b]e[ş]*[100] *s(ä)nüt k(a)ra bod(u)n tur(a)y(ı)n* . . . 'The nine *buyruks*, the five generals and the common people having stood up (in front of him), . . .'; *s(ä)nüt birŋa uygur* 'The generals and the *birŋas*[101] are (from) the Uigur (people).' Thomsen, 1896: 149 identifies this word with a Chinese expression having the same meaning; in this case, at least, the word is unlikely to have been borrowed from some Iranian or Proto-Mongol language together with the /t/. If the conjecture *[b]e[ş]* in Tariat S4 is correct, the +t form can appear with numerals, a thing regular Turkic plurals do not do. This *may* be a further indication of the foreign origin of the suffix; it can also help to explain why nouns characterised with +t had, in later language, +lAr added to them as a further characterisation. There is no particular reason to doubt the reading *t(e)g(i)t(i)m(i)n bo bit(i)dükä* in Tariat N2, whatever the wider context.[102] We find that, in *tarkat*, *sänüt* and *tegit*, +t is a dominant suffix; cf. also *kırgıttar*, the plural of Old Turkic *kırkın* 'concubine, mistress, paramour' as attested in Yakut. The expression *ögä tegit* is attested in BT XIII 16,6 and QB 1868; DLT fol. 179 knows it, interprets its content as referring to a class of persons and calls it a 'paired expression'. In post-inscriptional Uigur, *tegitlär*, attested at least 17 times, takes over the task of earlier *tegit*; it appears e.g. in DreiPrinz 102 and 118. *teginlär* in Suv 609,14 is late

100 Thus likelier than Tekin's *[b]ı̈[ŋ]* '1000' on material grounds.

101 Some military unit.

102 There are no lacunae at all in the vicinity of this stretch, but its interpretation is not free of difficulties. Tekin translates "When I inscribed this (monument) together with my princes,...". The form can only be the instrumental plural of *tegin*, with first person possessive suffix.

and isolated. The use of a foreign plural form to designate groups and classes of persons and then also individuals is known also from Ottoman, e.g. in *'ulämä, ṭalābā, tüccār* etc.[103]

+(X)t seems to appear *with* its vowel in KT E 5 = BQ E 5, in *oglu kagan bolmış äriŋ* 'No doubt their sons became rulers'. Whether this really is an ex. of the present suffix is not certain: The final I is missing in BQ. The difference between *oglu* and *oglan could* be that the first referred to 'princes' as status.

In Uigur, this suffix appears also with monosyllables, where it has its full form. An *+XtlAr* derivate from *bäg* appears in MaitrH XVI 11 a25: *talım kara kuş bägläri, luu xanları, sagarı b(ä)gitlär xanı, ärklig xan alko munta yıgılmış ärürlär* ". . . die Drachenkönige, die Könige der Sägara-Herren und Yama, alle sind hier versammelt". The use of *+Xt* was, moreover, extended to the lower end of the social scale: to *kul* and *kün*, 'male' and 'female slave' respectively. While *küŋüt* is attested only in ms. TM 150 = Mz 695 (quoted *via* Zieme in a n. to BT III 758), *kulut* is very common. It appears e.g. in TT I 184[104] in parallelism with *tapıgçı* 'servant': *tävlig kürlüg tapıgçı tagdın turup og tilär; t(ä)ŋrï xannıŋ kulutı küntün turup yık tilär*. The translation should be as follows: 'The deceitful$_2$ servant rises up from the north, looking for an occasion; the slave of the divine ruler rises from the south, searching for a fitting moment.' Usually, *kulut* is used for polite reference to the first person: *adaktakı kulut m(ä)n Buyan tümän bägi* (BuddhStab II 2) 'I, the most lowly slave *Buyan*, commander of ten thousand, . . .'. It also correlates with pronouns and verbal or possessive morphemes of the first person: *kulutı It Bars ymä köŋül ayıtu täginür män* (HamTouen 29,9); *yarlıg üzä kulutı Saŋgaşiri yaŋırtı Tüpüt tilintin ävirdim*. (OdaVes b3); *kulutlarnıŋ yogun inçgä kılmışımızni särïŋ*. (MaitrGeng 4 b3) 'Forbear with what we, the slaves, have made too coarse or too thin.' This use of *kulut* is probably calqued on Chinese, but cf. New Persian *banda* 'slave' referring to the first person sg. in Ottoman. Similar exs. of *kulut* appear e.g. in NesTex T III B 99 c4 and 13, HtPar 67 v23-26, ms. PelliotOuigour 203 r2 (UigBunken p. 76) etc. Note that there is here nothing plural about the formative. Its only remaining quality is that it marks persons as belonging to certain social groups (in the case of *kulut* for pragmatic and not for semantic ends). These and the earlier *+(X)t* forms all consist of two syllables.

Another *+(X)t* form referring to individuals as members of a class is *ornut* 'army commander, general'. The earliest exs. do indeed have only two syllables, as the *+(X)t* forms mentioned before: *Ḍrıt(a)raştrı maxaraç ärüş üküş g(a)ntarvı-*

103 Thus, Republican Turkish *beatles'lar* follows Uigur *tegitlär*. Old Turkic *eşitlär*, attested at least since Maitr 33 v16 and 18, also bears the singular meaning 'lady'.

104 As correctly read by Arat and Tezcan. The picture conjured up in the passage could be interpreted from out of the Chinese or Iranian historical context. Dividing the binome *og yık* into two sentences adds to their chiastic content.

lar ormuları birlä tägrigläp . . . (MaitrH XVI 11 a 14) ". . . von zahlreichen vielen Gandharva-Kriegern umgeben"; *Virudakı maxar(a)ç Kumbanḍılar ormutları birlä tägrigläp . . .* (ibid. 11 b 14) ". . . umzingelt von Kumbhāṇḍa-Kriegern" and *Vaiśravanı maxaraç yäklär ormutları birlä tägrigläp . . .* (*ibid.* 12 a 29 = Maitr 161 r 20) ". . . umgeben von Dämonen-Kriegern"; *Şudoḍan xa[n]ımız alpagut ormu ärdnlärin balık kapıg[ınta tu]rgurup oglın küzādür* (BuddhBio 21) 'Our king Śuddhodana stations his warrior and commander men at the city gate to guard his son' (read and translate thus). In the U IV, Suv and Tiš exs. of this form quoted in the *EDPT* and in a further ex. in ShōAgon 3, p. 207,5, the consonant sequence /rm/ had already brought forth a parasitic vowel, giving three syllables. The base has practically the same meaning in Maitr 120 v 23 (BT IX 65): *M(a)xanamı ormu n(ā)mri n(ā)mrisi burxannaŋ kälgüsin maŋa aydı* "Der Krieger Mahānāman hat mir mitgeteilt, wann der Göttergott Buddha kommen wird". The various *Külüg ormu, Kuuz ormu, Inal* (thus twice with N^2) *ormu, Küräbir ormu, Bars ormu, Kul Apa ormu* etc. in (runic) ThS I a 2, 7, 12, 17, 20 b r 1, 9, b v 3, 5, 7 and c 4, in a list of military equipment handed out to officers, probably also had just two syllables to their title; in none of the exs. is there an explicit middle vowel. Thus also *Alp ormu totok b(ā)n* in YE 16,1 and a further *ormu* in YE 10,5. I take the vowel of *alp orunu tegin* (PrièreMan 5) and perhaps of $:R^{1}W\eta W:$ (thus!) in YE 62 to be anaptyctic. Another meaning of *ormu* was 'flag', possibly attested in a fragmentary passage in Maitr 36 r 5 (*ormu uçr[ug?*); *orunulug* 'having a flag' in TT VI 93 is certain in any case. It is this latter, trisyllabic, form with the meaning of 'flag' which lived on in Mo.: Mo. *oroŋγa* 'banner' is a proof that the first vowel was /o/ and not /u/. The relationship of banners with commanders is particularly evident in the Central Asian military and administrative context. In Turkic, at any rate, the meaning 'banner, standard' does not appear to have been the original one. A connection with *ur-un-*, postulated in the *EDPT*, seems to be excluded not only because of the vowel(s) but also because of the meaning.

The slightly more common formative *+AgUt* clearly has this *+(X)t* as second and one of the two *+AgU* formatives as first element. In section 2.52 we discuss collective *+AgU*, in section 2.96 the *+AgU* formative which serves the characterisation of individuals by type. There is nothing collective at all about *+AgUt*, which brings it close to the second formative. *+AgUt* nominals denote individuals worthy of respect. All five *+AgUt* forms are derived from bases ending in consonants. From our earliest texts on, *+AgUt* is a petrified combination: We have no ex. for *+AgU* and *+AgUt* being added to the same base, nor is there any similarity between their actual functions and meanings. We cannot agree with the n. to Maitr 186 r 7 (Beiheft II), which maintains that "*bayayu+t* ist der, wahrscheinlich zumal für Menschenkategorien verwendete Plural des auch belegten *bayayu* 'Wohlhabender' (*śreṣṭhin*)": We know of no '*bayagu*', and the fragmentary Maitr

186 r 7 gives no evidence for any plural meaning. *alpagu* in a runic passage appears to be an error. The passage (KT N7) reads: *oza kälmiş süsin Kök Tegin agıtıp Toŋra bir uguş alpagu on ärig Toŋa Tegin yogınta ägirip ölürtümüz.* The parallel passage BQ E31 has the following: *oza yaña käligmä süsin agıttım. . . . anta Toŋra yılpaguti*[105] *bir uguşug Toŋa Tegin yog[ınta] ägirä tokıdım.* There is no other evidence for '*alpagu*', and I believe '*alpagu on*' in the quoted passage to be an error for *alpagut*. *on* and *t* look quite different in runes but identical in the so-called Uigur script. This is possible evidence that the text of the Kök Tegin inscription was first written down in the latter; or in cursive Sogdian letters, of which the 'Uigur' ones are merely a variant.[106] The quantifier of *alpagut är*, as I believe we should read, and of *yılpagut* in the other inscription, is *bir uguş*; *on* 'ten' fits neither the syntax nor the content of the passage.[107]

The two *+AgUt* nouns attested most widdely are *alpagut* 'warrior' etc.[108] and *bayagut* '*śreṣṭhī*, well-to-do person of strong social position'. They are also attested with the plural suffix *+lAr*, the former e.g. in U III 65,8$_2$, U IV C 55 and Suv 636,11, the latter in U II 36,37, BT III 318, ZweiFrag 8, Maitr 3 r 21 and 218 T III M 111 v 20 and Shō IX b 12; these forms speak against the purported pluralising content of *+AgUt*. *ata+m bayagut* (Suv 605,5) is certainly proof for the singular.

A trait which *+AgUt* has in common with *+AgU* of section 2.52 is the creation of binomial sequences with the simplex as *figura etymologica*. *alp alpagut* appears in U III 62,2$_2$, U IV C 64 (damaged) and Suv 636,11, for instance, and *bay bayagut* in MaitrGeng 10 a 12. Three further *+AgUt* forms have turned up only in this pattern: *baş başagut* in . . . *atl(ı)g iki baş başagut tıtsı* 'the two main$_2$ pupils named . . . and . . .' (Maitr 160 v 2 and 9); *uz uzagut* 'expert' in Maitr 61 v 4 and ManMon 30 and the following: *t(ä)ŋridäm oyunçılar birlä Vişvak(a)rmı t(ä)ŋridä ulatı t(ä)ŋridäm uz uzagutlar birlä* . . . (Maitr 89 r 6). *kadın kadnagut* in MaitrH XVI 16 a 4 signifies 'inlaws': *kim . . . kadan kadnagut ög [kaŋ] köŋülin bärtmädin* (read

105 The problematic alternation *#a° ~ # y°* is attested e.g. with *amrak* 'dear' and the variant *y(ı)mrak* (HandschrReste II 75 m.); cf. *ımrak* (TT X 346).

106 The runic script may well have been invented to serve as monumental script for the second Turk kaganate, like the ḥP'ags-pa writing with the Chingizid dynasty. Although our earliest Old Turkic sources are in runes, there is no doubt that the other system of writing was known to the Turks at an early date: The Sogdian Bugut inscription, set up at the time of the first Turk kaganate, uses it, and it must have been employed by the Turks for private purposes. It would be natural for a first draft to be written in an early variant of the so-called Uigur script and not in 'runes'.

107 Thomsen had quite a difficulty in translating it and, in n. 57 (1896: 162-3), discusses its problems.

108 See the *UW* s.v. (new instances in Wettkampf 20, BT VIII A 213, BT XIII 14,19, 33,3 and 36,13 and BuddhBio 21). It is attested also in Khotanese sources, which document the /u/; see Hovdhaugen, 1971: 179 and 180.

(thus) *öpünsär üdün[sär], . . . 'whoever . . . does not break the heart of his parents-in-law (?) and of his parents$_2$ but respects$_2$ them . . .'*. Note that the Maitr is especially well represented with this pattern. Instead of the last mentioned expression, the DLT has *kadur kadnagur* with the same meaning.

An ending *+At* appears in two nouns, one attested only in XIIIth-XIVth century Uigur sources, the other only in Muslim texts. We meet again the binomial pattern just discussed in *bäg bägät* (InscrOuig II 8 and III 4 and 12). Otherwise, we never have the simple *+At* form from *bäg* 'lord', but only *bägätlär*; in CYK *in extenso*, quoting three further exs. for *bäg bägät* and *bägätlär*; it also proposes, with arguments unconvincing to my mind, that it be read with final /d/ and not /t/. One might, in this connection, think of influence from the Mo. plural suffix written with °*d* in Mo. orthography, in view of the lateness of the text; but Mo., in any case, neutralised the voice opposition in word-final position. *bägärlär* in USp 73,5, p. 125 (quoted in *UW* 53b) should perhaps also be read as *bägätlär*: Thus Akgür, 1982: 51 following the ms. Zieme shows the expression *el bägätläri* of UigSteu B to be practically equivalent with *el bägläri* of an other text, comparing it with *el bägi* of QB 1076. While *bäg bägät* points towards the *+AgUt* formation, *bägätlär* reminds us of the common *tegitlär* and, of course, of the hap. *bägitlär*. *bäg bägät* lived on in Chagatay. Brockelmann, 1954: 150, who notes the exs., considers them formed with the Arabic feminine plural suffix *+āt* taken over through Persian. While this may be true for other such cases quoted there, it is unlikely to hold for *bäg bägät*: Arabic-Persian influence is, in Yüan Uigur texts, limited to the lexicon and rare in any case.

bayat 'God' is attested about 270 times in the QB and the DLT and, already, in an Arabic work written in A.D. 966. See Erdal, 1982 a for details, and for an explanation of why it should be connected with *bay* 'rich'. One can account for its form in two ways: Either we posit Proto-Turkic **baya*, the final vowel of which is retained in Mo. *bayan* 'rich' and before a suffix *+(X)t*; this is not very likely if Proto-Turkic **/X#/* but not **/A#/* falls off. (A connection with *baya* 'recently, previously, a short while ago' seems excluded on semantical grounds.) The other possibility is to take *bägät* and *bayat* to be contracted from **bägägüt* and *bayagut* respectively. This second hypothesis is supported by the contraction of *nälük* from *nägülük* (i.e. *nä+(A)gU+lXk*), in which the sequence *°AgU°* has become *°A°*. The synonyms *nälük* and *nägülük*, both very well attested, are discussed in section 2.77. See also n. 173.

A semantically aberrant *+(X)t* derivate is *tarmut*, in DLT fol. 227 defined as 'mountain ravines and streams'. It is attested in *tarmut tama tümänin tükäyür* (BT XIII 18,12), hesitantly translated as "Der Bergstrom tröpfelt und geht zu Ende in Zehntausendern." We have, further, *tarmutlan-* 'to form tributaries and chan-

nels' in DLT fol. 402, and the metaphorical *yalınlar tarmutlug saçılu ünärlär* in Höllen 38, in a description of the many-coloured flames of hell. *tarmut* clearly comes from *tarım* (DLT fol. 199) 'river channels that flow into swamps and quicksand'. This connection cannot be made over *tarma-*, which signifies 'to scratch with nails or claws', *tarma-k* being the bird's 'talon'. The Maitr has the derivates *tarma-ş-* and *tarmaklag*, which accord with this latter meaning. *tarma-* is quite unlikely to be the base of *tarmut* both because *-(U)t* is not dominant and particularly because the meanings of *tarım* and *tarmut* are much closer to each other than to *tarma-*. The rounding of the formative's vowel is here due to the /m/: As *bägitlär* shows, *+(X)t* had fourfold harmony.[109] Under *-(U)t* (section 3.108), the reader will find some further lexemes (mainly ones ending in *°gUt*) which may or may not be deverbal. In general, however, the living products of the formations in *+(X)t* and *+AgUt* show a remarkable semantic coherence.

2.43 *+gAç* and *+gA*

A few terms denoting animals or plants are formed with *+gAç*. The clearest among them is *kuşgaç* 'sparrow', found in TuoLuoNi 111, BuddhUig II 98, Suv 694,12, SuvZieme r 1 and DLT. The *+k(I)yA* expansion of the two Suv instances does not indicate that the sparrows in question are smaller than other sparrows, but serves expressivity. As the sparrow is a small bird (*kuş*), *+gAç* has been taken to be an 'unusual' diminutive suffix. Diminutive content may have been borne by the *+ç* alone, however, for which see section 2.12. There are quite a number of insect, bird and small animal names ending in *°gA*, like *torıga* 'lark', *karga* 'crow', *koburga* 'owl' (now also in OdaNewFrag 5 r4 and 6 r2), *kösürKä* 'a type of rat', *sarıçga* 'locust', *çäkürkä* 'a locust before it flies' and *kumursga* 'ant'. Sagay and Kirg. *kartıga* (Shor, Koib. and Karag. *kartaga*), translated "Habicht" by Radloff, has no early documentation but was at an early date lent to Mo. to give *qarčiγai* there. Cf. *TMEN* 278. From Denison Ross, 1911 we can add the modern *tuzlaga* 'wild dove' and *torolga* 'turtledove'. *sirkä* 'nit' probably also belongs here, showing the conditioned appearance of the stop alternant after /r/. That is also why we read *çäkürkä* and not *çäkürgä*, against the *EDPT* and the editors of the DLT. The second velar of *karga* being documented as voiced, it is likely to be syncopated from **kara+ga*; the *EDPT* notes that the word sometimes also denotes other *black* birds. The DLT quotes the Oguz word for 'ant' as *karınça* and *karınçak*, the

109 *yulat* in *ögüz suv kamag tuş başı yulat suvlar* (ms. T I D 200,17 in the n. to TT V A 23 and in UigSteu n. 46) is translated as "Rinnsale". It is thus a semantic parallel to *tarmut* and, obviously coming from *yul*, shaped like *bäg+ät*. Although a hap., it lives on in modern languages (quoted by Bang and Gabain). We have no explanation for it. The text is early, because it has the forms *kanyu+garu* (twice) and *ayyur* (aorist) and for other reasons.

latter adding the diminutive suffix discussed in section 2.11 above. Similar to *karınçak* is Arşu *muguzgak* 'a bee-like fly' < **muŋuz+ga+k*. As later forms from other dialects show, *karınça* comes from *karıngga*: Not appearing after a sonant, the velar of the ending remains voiced and disappears in Oguz. *çäkürkä*, on the other hand, is quoted in the DLT from Oguz *with* velar, and this velar is retained to this day. *bürgä* 'flea'; *pire* in Republican Turkish, can only be explained if the source form was **birigä* or **birägä*; if the velar had been voiceless, it would have been retained in Turkish. *kumursga* possibly has a borrowed base, and would then be from **kurmus+ga*: Skt. *kṛmiḥ* 'worm' has a good Indo-European etymology, and is said to have also signified 'ant' according to the lexicographers. The rounded vowels of *kumursga* may be due to the /m/.[110] The only noun in this formation with an unexplained /g/ after /r/ is *çınçırga* in DLT fol. 552, a hapax also translated as 'sparrow'. The editors transliterate it as *JNJRΓ* but transcribe it as "*çıpçırγa*", no doubt because of possible etymological connections mentioned in the EDPT entry. Had *çäkürkä* also had a /g/ in the last syllable, it would have disappeared in Ottoman, which is not the case. *EDPT*, xlvii adds *avıçga* 'old man' and *kurtga* 'old woman' to the list of *°gA* nouns, but these do not fit in semantically. Cf., on the other hand, the animal description *kaşga* discussed on p. 99. *karga* being the only transparent member of this formation, it looks like a very old and obsolete one.

Other *+gAç* nouns have no diminutive content at all, as would have been fitting for lexemes formed with *+(X)ç*: *ıgaç* 'tree, wood, a piece of wood' is very common from Toñ and BQ and from the IrqB on and is attested also in BT I A_1 8 and 9 and BT V,220. It is no doubt derived from *ı* 'plant', which is appended suffixes of the back series already in the inscriptions.[111] Another bird name in *+gAç* may be *karlıgaç* 'swallow', if this and not *kargılaç* is the original form; the DLT has both variants, but the only two Uigur exs. end in *°gaç*.[112] The Old Turkic name for the 'he-goat' is taken to be *ārkāç*, which is what we find in QB 4353. Ernte 61 reads *irkāç*, however, and this *may* also have stood in Heilk I 16 instead of *'ärkäç* of the published text. Concerning *ārkāç* of DLT fol. 60, the editors mark the first vowel as added by the second hand. This makes it possible to connect the word with *irk* 'ram' instead of *ār* as done hitherto; *är* must, however, have influenced the word secondarily in Qarakhanid Turkic. A similar influence of *är* on *irkäk* is better documented. Names of different animals often appear to be related in Old Turkic: *kösürKā* 'a kind of rat' vs. *kösürKān* 'a type of mole' in DLT fols. 245 and 260,

110 Before the Sanglax (XVth century), *kumursga* is attested only in the IrqB, where a meaning 'worm' would fit equally well. *kṛmiḥ* is related to *crimson*, perhaps to *worm*, etc.

111 *ı+kā* in Ht V4 a23 is surely due to a secondary development.

112 The name of the 'bullfinch' in DLT fol. 262 and in later sources, *sondılaç*, speaks for *°laç*; this form is isolated, however, and opaque.

ingän 'female camel' vs. *ingäk* 'cow' and *tay* 'a one or two-year-old foal' vs. *taylak*, in Republican Turkish 'a one or two-year-old young camel'. In the last two cases, as in *irk: irkäç*, some obsolete age and sex classes appear to have been at work.

DLT fol. 229 knows of *kısgaç* as 'pincers', but adds that the Oguz use the word to denote 'a small black animal that bites people'. This latter meaning would go very well with those of *bürgä*, *sarıçga*, *çäkürkä*, *sirkä* and *karınçga*, but we know of no nominal '*kıs*'. Since there is a verb *kıs-* 'to pinch', *kısgaç* could come from **kıs-ıg+gaç*; the syncopation of /X/ is normal, and the simplification of the velars has its nearest parallel in *irkäç* < **irk+gäç*. With the meaning 'pincers', *kısgaç* is attested in M I 8,10, Maitr 182 r31 and 82 r17, LautHöllen 132 and UigTot 472 while, in *kiçig kaŋlınıŋ kısgaçı boguz bagı* (TT V B 116), the last three words translate a Chin. term signifying 'the cross-bar used to tie a yoke to the end of the shaft of a small cart'.[113] For such meanings one would definitely have expected the deverbal instrumental suffix *-gUç*, q.v. below. Perhaps the insect form in *+gAç*, documented in the DLT from Oguz, attracted **kıs-guç*; an explanation of the Uigur lexeme as '*kıs-gA+(X)ç*' is not too likely as long as there is no other ex. for such a sequence and no diminutive content to 'pincers'.

+gAç and *+gA* shared their meaning with *+gAn*, with which they can be taken to have been related prehistorically.

Names of plants ending in °*gA* are *yuldurga*, the name of a thistle quoted in the *EDPT* from Heilk I and the DLT, and *yorınçga* 'clover' quoted there from Heilk II (twice) and the DLT and living on in many languages today.

2.44 *+gAn*

A number of plant names show a suffix *+gAn*. In Old Turkic, *çim+gän* 'meadow' (Maitr 55 v14 and 101 v4 and *çimgän* in BT III 281 and in the DLT, due to the influence of the /m/) is transparent; it belongs with the more or less synonymous *çim*, attested since the DLT.[114] Also in the Maitr (70 v11 and 104 v12), we find *çupagan ävini* 'jujube seed', in Heilk II 3,39 *çupagan*, and in HamTouen 29,11 *çupugan*. We read this lexeme with /g/ in spite of *çıpıkan* in DLT fol. 225: The voicedness of the velar is guaranteed by its disappearence in Ottoman *çıban* and Tkm. *çīban*, the Tkm. long vowel explaining the modern appearance of voice in the labial consonant. In the DLT's dialect, other nouns of this formation also show /k/, viz. *kara+kan* and *yakrı+kan*; the *EDPT* quotes the DLT's etymological

113 All this is well visible on the facs. published by Kudara. The translator inexactly uses *boyunduruk* 'yoke' to refer to the analogous implement of a large cart.

114 New Persian *čaman* is probably a cross between this lexeme in its Oguz, *g*-less, form and the etyma of Pahlavi *čār* 'pasture'.

explanation of the latter. *karagan*, the modern form of the former, is mentioned in Laude-Cirtautas, 1961: 36. According to her, a great many plant names are formed from *kara*, which is here not to be translated as 'black' but as 'common'. On the other hand, 'a plant with the appearance of barley (*arpa*)' is *arpagan* in the DLT, showing the expected velar. *futurkan* 'rice' is common in Old Turkic; see the *EDPT* for some of the exs. The /k/ of this opaque lexeme, which fits well into this formation semantically, is regular, as the opposition /k:g/ is replaced by /k/ after sonants; it is attested also in Brāhmī writing. For the same reason, the DLT's *küvürkän – kümürkän* 'wild onion' should probably be read with /k/ and not /g/, as e.g. in the *EDPT*. Its *üyür+kän* in Heilk II 3,136 has there been left untranslated, is not mentioned in the *EDPT* and rendered in the *DTS* with 'name of a plant'. It is no doubt derived from *üyür* 'millet' and probably denotes some wild plant in some way similar to millet. *çimgän* and *arpagan* are also names of wild plants derived from names of cultivated ones; probably also */kübürgän/*, whose base is found in its Mo. synonym *kümeli*.[116] *katırgan* in TT VIII A 39 also corresponds to a Skt. plant name. The unexpected appearance of *g* after /r/ does not deserve attention: Two lines before, the dative of *kut* is written as *kutga*. *sınçgan kan* in DLT fol. 508 is the 'berry of the acacia'. This word lives on in Ottoman where, according to the *EDPT*, it denotes the 'box-thorn'. The spelling of the word with *a* in the first syllable, which we find in the *EDPT* entry, is due to a wrong etymology. *azgan*, the name of a plant about which the DLT has a lot to say in fol. 221, is by Tezcan considered to be the 'wild rose'. *azgan* appears also in Suv 137,18 qualifying *çäçäk* 'flower' as part of a lady's proper name and in QB 2573; it can hardly be connected with the verb *az-*. *bükän* or *bökän* or *bügän* or *bögän* in DLT fol. 201 is translated as 'watermelon'. *sargan ot*, finally, appears in TT V B 123, and is in the DLT said to be a plant which grows on salty ground. Like *karagan*, this name could come from the name of a colour, *sarıg*: from **sarıg+gan*, with simplification of the double consonant and syncopation. A similar case of simplification of velars is found in *kökän* 'plum', not attested before Houtsma, from *kök* 'blue, bluish': this word

115 The "m" variant is said to be Oguz. The only *partly* dialectal variation /b/ [v] ~ /m/ has not yet been sufficiently explored.

116 The 'wild onion' is *not* a free-growing variety of the edible onion, its botanical names being *scilla* and *urginea*. In Southern Europe, it grows by the sea, whence its name 'Meerzwiebel' in German. The Mo. word has exactly this meaning in the modern languages: Kowalewski's translation as "le fenouil, anet" can only be accounted for as the result of a confusion between *kümeli* and German *Kümmel*, which sound similar by coincidence; there is no botanical connection between these plants on the one hand, and the wild onion on the other. The second syllable of the Turco-Mongol lexeme contained the phoneme */X/ which, as expected, gives /A/ in Mo. and in this position [u] in Turkic.

lives on in Balkar. A suffix '*+An*' to form names of plants or animals is not attested.[117] In his note to Ht X 799, at the top of p. 108, Tezcan mentions some further modern lexemes belonging to this formation.

This *+gAn* corresponds to the Mo. suffix *+gAnA*. The plant which in Turkic is called *karagan* is, in Mo., *karayana*. Mo. also has a derivate from a Mo. colour name, viz. *ulayaljiyana* '*ribes rubrum*' from *ulayan* 'red'. As in Turkic, in Mo. too the base sometimes denotes a different plant, e.g. the shrub *boruljiyana* from *boruljin* 'a type of birch', and *qajayaryana* from *qajayar*, both being types of '*cleistogenes*'. In his paper 'On some suffixes of plant names in Mongolian', *ZaS* 15 (1981): 383-390, and specifically on pp. 384-6, N. Poppe describes this formation in detail, and supplies etymological explanations for many of the instances. According to him, "the words ending in *-yana* and *-gene* denote mostly such plants (or animals) which occur in large numbers in one place and are relatively small and difficult to separate from each other, e.g. bushes forming a thicket, insects swarming all over a place." This collectively homogeneous aspect may be the only difference between *çimgän* and *çim*.

There are a number of insects belonging to the Mo. formation, e.g. *küreljegene* 'cricket', *ketegene* 'gadfly, wasp', *batayana* 'midge', *qubiljayana* 'bovine tick'. Other relatively small animals whose names belong to this formation are *qairayana* 'gull' and *alayana* 'perch'. Mo. *čügürgene* and Tu. *çäkürkä*, both apparently 'grasshopper', are connected. So are Mo. *kegürjigene* and Tu. *kökürçgän* (Suv 299,6 and 620,20 and Heilk I 40), both 'dove'; thus also Poppe, *op.cit.*, p. 384. The difficult thing about this lexeme is the fact that its last vowel is rounded in Maitr 5 r 26 and DLT fol. 626 (spelled with *wāw*) and that this vowel is /ä/ in all of Middle and modern Turkic. Both Maitr and the DLT are early texts definitely outside the range of Mo. influence. The original shape must have been *kökürçgün* and the /ä/ introduced under Mo. influence.[118] Cf. also *kökägün* "blue fly" in DLT fols. 103 and 409. According to Poppe, Mo. *temegeljigene* 'dragonfly' comes from *temegen* 'camel', and *kulayana* 'mouse' no doubt comes from Turkic and Mongolian *qula*, which denotes brown to black colour tones.

Turkic *kuzı* 'lamb' and Mo. *kuriyan*, which has the same meaning, are clearly related. In Mo., *+gAn* (distinct from *+gAnA*) is a common formative found in names of various animals. In Turkic, too, *+gAn* occasionally formed lexemes denoting animals. Radloff quotes *kara+gan* from Kazakh as 'a kind of fox'. *kül-*

117 On p. 110, Laude-Cirtautas suggests connecting *arslan* 'lion' with *ar+sıl*, discussed on p. 100 below; but such a relationship would be quite isolated. Rather, *arslan* belongs to the group of animal names ending in °*lAn*, of which there are quite a number: See n. 125.

118 Are we to connect *kökürçgün* with the rare Mo. formative *+GUnA* mentioned by Poppe on p. 383 and n. 12? *kuzgun* 'raven' may have had such an ending.

gen. (1) is said by the same dictionary to be a 'type of lark' in the Bosnian Ottoman dialect, again probably because of its ash colour. Republican Turkish *papağan* 'parrot' is a source of analogy, to Uigur we find, e.g., *idğugän* "Aasgeier" (Maitr 78 f.21; not in the EDPT) which has some further lexemes ending in *+gAn* which denote animals, among them the name of a large fish in modern languages. mole', *begsen*, the name of a 'sea eagle' discussed in *TMEN* 1666. *ingän* 'female camel', *sıŋgan* 'mouse', *sagızgan* 'magpie'[120] and *sıkırkan* 'a kind of 'to fall'; not is the activity described by the verb *sıŋ-* a speciality of mice. Among *it, ay-* never signifies 'to slip by', but always 'to glide along' but *köstebek* (same meaning), the source of *+sXz* or zetacism. *tavışgan* can also be *sebek* bearing the same meaning), the source of *köz+süz* or *közsüz* with *tebek/temek/* *s.v. közsüz* mentions this, and also a combination of *közsüz* with *tebek/temek/* the *'pAn* nouns denoting animals, itself used in Comanian Turkish *közsüz* come from *köz+süz* 'eyeless', itself used in Comanian Turkish *közsüz* above), and *taygan* can be explained deverbally, which has been done by most *ıŋğan* 'female camel', *sıŋgan* 'mouse', *sagızgan* 'magpie'[120] and *sıkırkan* 'a kind of *ral'* in the DLT, with */k/* because of the *'r+*. We could add *kökürgän* (mentioned

119 From regular **kül+kän*, */l/* being a sonant. Had the suffix had *[g]* here, it would, in Ottoman, have disappeared altogether in this position.

120 Thus *TT VI 95*, but the London scroll in fact has *sagzgan*. The DLT's *sagzgan* should not be 'emended' away as the *EDPT* does, for Ottoman Turkic also has a metathetic form.

121 *TMEN* 144 offers an explanation of the additional */a/* in Mo., mentioning the Mo. animal names *noqai, yaqai* and *moγai*; we could add *čaqulai* 'gull' and *degelei* 'heron', which both have */l/* like *uolai*.

and Mongol-Kıtañ lexemes, which has its phonological parallel in the name of the 'wild onion' (discussed earlier in this section). In another case, Mo. *deresün* = Tu. *yez* (q.v. in the *EDPT*), it is Mo. which added an individualising affix. As one language could have *çim* and *çimgän*, *üyür* and *üyürkän*, *temegen* and *temegel-jigene* to denote various plants or animals, such correspondences apparently existed also between Turkic and Mongolian. The circumstances do not permit us to make a solid decision about whether the facts represent genetic relationship or borrowing, as the Altaic languages can be shown to have borrowed even morphemes and formatives from each other. At the end of his article mentioned above, Poppe writes: "Of all languages known to the author of these lines only Tungus and Finnish possess suffixes forming exclusively plant and animal names." He would be glad to hear of the formative with this meaning which Turkic and Mo. share.

In Ht X 799 we read about the monk who just died: *ayagka tägimlig samtso açarınıŋ öŋi kır[t]ışı ärtiŋü kızgan sazgan* [. .]*ug* [*kör*]*klä bolup öŋräkidä öŋisigräk bolu yarlıkadı*. 'The colour and complexion of the honourable Master Tripiṭaka became exceedingly rosy-coloured . . . and beautiful, and graciously turned more special than before.' In his n. to the passage, Tezcan derives *kızgan* and *sazgan* from the bases of *kızar-* and *kızıl* and of *sarıg*, to my mind correctly. We need not repeat his discussion, which is very interesting particularly concerning *sarıg*. Tezcan would like to connect these two lexemes with the *+gAn* forms denoting plants and animals and, tentatively, with Mo. *ulayan* 'red' and *čayan* 'white'. The first of these is no doubt derived, as it must be connected with *hulal-ḫu* 'to be red-hot' of the *Secret History*. The first is written *hula'an* in that text; the second as *caḫa'an* and rarely as *caḫan* and *cahan*, which should be results of contraction. Their suffix is therefore *+'An* in the *Secret History*, whereas the suffix forming names of plants and animals is *+ḫAnA* with a hard onset and a final vowel, e.g. in *huluḫana* 'mouse, rat'. Since Mo. thus has two different suffixes for two different contents, this may have been the case for Proto-Turkic as well, seeing that, as far as *+gAn* is concerned, the two languages are so much in accord. *kızgan* and *sazgan* should, therefore, not be in this chapter.

2.45 *+lAk*

kaşgalak is defined in DLT fol. 263 as 'a type of water bird, smaller than the duck', and is used in Ernte 128. *kaşga* is attested from the DLT on, is discussed in *TMEN* 1495 and mentioned in section 2.61 below. Further names of birds ending in *+lAk* are *köti kızlak*, the name of a red-tailed bird in DLT fol. 238, and *bagırlak* 'sand grouse' in DLT fol. 251, attested to this day in New Uigur and Ottoman. *köti kızlak* should probably be analysed as (*köti kız*)*lak*; no **kız* 'red' is attested, but it

*did serve as base for kızgul, kızıl < *kız+sıl, kızgan and kızar- < *kız+ar-. kızlak is unlikely to have been an +Ak diminutive from kızıl, as written in the EDPT, as the content does not constitute the diminution of a colour lexeme but the name of a bird. Nor could there be any justification for +lAk being added to *kız by itself, and not to the whole phrase. yapakulak is mentioned in DLT fol. 468 as the name for the 'owl' in some dialect. This may also belong to the +lAk formation, although yapaku is translated in DLT fol. 460 as 'refuse of wool'. A form *yapakulak must have come up quite early however, as a contracted yapalak is attested from New Uigur all the way to the Turkish of Turkey, and already in the Codex Comanicus. Whether there really ever was a connection between yapaku and yapakulak I am unable to say; the bagırlak had a black breast/belly – bagır in Turkic.*

The formation lives on in Republican Turkish çaylak 'kite' from çay, which also refers to some birds, and toylak 'little bustard' from toy 'bustard'. It would be interesting to find out whether other +lAk nouns also refer to small birds. Turkish dictionaries also list toygan 'falcon'; +gAn and +gOk are other suffixes which form bird names.

*Anatolian also has a bird name formative +AlAk: bozalak < boz is listed in Laude-Cirtautas, 1961: 92, translated 'ötleğen kuşu'. The original form may have been *bozgalak which, together with kaşgalak mentioned above, would give a formative sequence +gA+lAk. +gA as an old formative for animal names was already considered in section 2.43.*

2.5 *Collectives*

The only collective formation productive in Old Turkic is +(A)gU. It is therefore impossible to say what Proto-Turkic may have needed several collective formatives for. +lAr was originally probably another such collective formative, and may have become a plural suffix only after the speakers of Bolgaro-Chuvash left the fold of Common Turkic. In Orkhon Turkic it was clearly still in limited use. Proto-Turkic nominals may have had only possessive and case morphology and the coordinative suffix +ll, with number perhaps added only under Indo-European influence. For non-referring nominals the plural is, after all, optional in Turkic dialects to this day.

In post-inscriptional Turkic, the unproductive suffix +(A)n, which was no longer felt to be collective, could be joined with +lAr. +AgU is also often added to bases which denote a plurality by themselves.

Collective suffixes are added only to simple bases and are themselves rarely expanded. In nägülük, +lXk is added to +(A)gU, which can occasionally be found

also with *+sXz* as expansion. It should be added, however, that *+sXz* and particularly *+lXg* can in late texts be added even to the plural suffix *+lAr*, when this marks a collectivity. Number is, like collectivity, an endocentric category, and has nothing to do with syntactic function.

2.51 +(A)n

An old, easily identifiable but no longer productive collective suffix. The best attested instances are *oglan* 'sons, children' and *ärän* 'men'. Concerning the inscriptions, *ärän* appears to be certain only in BQ S 11 and Ongin front 5; according to V. Thomsen's unpublished edition, the latter reads as follows:] *bo Tavgaç ara, yırıya δg*[122] *Oguz ara yâti ärän yagı bolmış*. In KT N 9, the text can also be interpreted as *är+in* or even as *är+i+n*. *og(u)lan* is, in the inscriptions, used in parallelism with plurals and collectives, e.g. in KT N 11: *āki şad ulayu iniyāgūnūm og(u)lanım bäglärim bodunum* . . . In IrqB LXV: *amtı, amrak og(u)lanım, ança bilinglär* "Now, my dear sons, know ye this." In Uigur, cf. e.g. U III 80,22-23: *ol bayagutnuŋ bir* [*Sene at*]*l(ı)g, ikinti Upasene atlag ogulanı bar ärti* 'That well-to-do gentleman had two sons, one named Sena and the other Upasena.' In the following, too, *oglan* refers to a plurality: *kamag tınlıg oglanı üküş türlüg ämŋäk ämŋänürlär*[123] (BuddhKat 3) 'All sons of living beings suffer many sorts of suffering.' As can be seen, *oglan* here accords with the plural verb. The *EDPT* entry has other such examples.

In U III 65,5$_2$, one ms. has *ogulanıg* while the other writes *oglanlarıg*. As with other collective suffixes, *+lAr* is by no means excluded from appearance with *+An*. *ärän*, which in all its instances in the KP is qualified by a numeral, otherwise appears at least 15 times as *äränlär*; exs. of *äränlär* in recently published texts include the ones in ShōAgon 1,152 and 158 and *alpagut orŋut äränlär* in BudhBio 21. In Manichaean texts, *+An* is used as singular, *+An+lAr* as plural, according to Zieme, 1969: 86-7.

ärŋäk has been derived, above, from *är+än*. As the fingers form a group, *ogul +an* and *är+än* must have referred not only to groups but to members of a natural group: This is a category also found in other languages; it may have had its parallel in a body-part suffix °z, which could have denoted members of pairs as *+An* denoted members of groups larger than two.

122 *δ* is probably the ligature of some consonant with the vowel *ŭ* (i.e. *ŏ* or *ŭ*).

123 In Tibetan writing, these words are written as 'AM.HÑAG 'AM.ÑAN.NUR.LĀR. The nasalisation of /g/ after /m/ represents a phonetic and surely not just a graphic phenomenon, and should not be normalised away even in transcribing. I would also hesitate to write *törlüg* for DUR.LYUG of the ms., in spite of p. 297 of the Maue-Röhrborn paper (part I): Cf. Clark's remarks on this word in his n. to Pothi 19.

sar+sa, attested only in two passages of the Maitr, signifies 'system of nets', and also belongs to this formation. *kopun sınar ol sögütlär ärdnilig toranların torlamış ärdnilig kogregular asmış bolur* (139 r9) 'Those trees have been covered on all sides with nets adorned with jewels and bells with jewels have been hung on them'. Other exs. of *toran* can be found in Maitr 138 r25 and MaitrH X1 a4 and 2 b21. *toran* should not be confused or connected with *tura* 'breastwork', as Kara, 1983: 47 appears to do; such a confusion *may* have taken place when *tor* and *tura* were borrowed into Written Mong. (whose authors may have known the Uigur lexemes in writing).

bodun 'people' comes from *bod* 'tribe', the former being understood as a collection of the latter. The derivate is attested with /o/ in the first syllable in Khotanese sources (Hovdhaugen, 1971: 182-3); the base lives on in Turkic languages with /o/ to this day. The second vowel of *bodun* can only be explained under the assumption that the original form of *bod* was **bodX*; in word final position, /X/ regularly falls off. This assumption is supported by *boda*, the Mo. form of the word; cf. *TMEN* 812. *bodun* also contains (non-dominant) *+(A)n*, then.

özän 'innermost parts; the heart of a matter' in U II 44,32, BT XIII 47,1 and 59,2 and as quoted in the *n.* to 5,130, UigTot 1343, 1346, 1353 etc., Khot 88, ĀṭSū 1 v7 (rendering Skt. *hṛdaya*) and BT VII A 316 is possibly also a collective; cf. *öz+ägü*. [124].

It is semantically impossible to assign the conjunction *kaçan* 'when' to this formation; it should rather be an instrumental form of a hypostasised 'equative', i.e. **ka+ça+n*. The same must be said about *arslan* 'lion', which Bang, 1916/7: 127 would like to connect with *arsıl* 'auburn' (with some other, even less likely, explanation). [125]

ot örtän in M I 9,13 (TeilBuch) presumably also contains an *+An* form, but we can't be sure until we have a further ex.: This particular ms. has some vowels which are quite aberrant when compared with standard Uigur orthography.

124 For the Khotanese context, see Hovdhaugen, 1971: 181.

125 On p. xlviii, the *EDPT* gives a list of animal names ending in the phoneme sequence *lAn*; we can add *ablan* 'a small animal of the rat genus' from DLT fol. 72; *yamlan* 'a type of rat' (DLT fol. 460) may have been a variant of this. In modern languages (quoted from Bang's paper mentioned above) we find, in addition, *ärlän* 'hamster' (also in Chuvash, as *arlan*) and (Ottoman) *domuzlan* 'dung beetle'. However, the DLT proper names *Bäklän/Bäglän* and *Çoglan* do not belong here: These are imperative names (as discussed in section 2.14) from denominal verbs. All the Old Turkic **lAn* forms being opaque, the sequence is not discussed in this work.

2.52 +(A)gU

This is the only productive formation for collective[126] nouns and adjectives. Classifying them by their bases, we can distinguish between three types: *+(A)gU* is firstly added to numerals, secondly to adjectives which denote a multitude by themselves, and thirdly to other lexemes. The accusative form of *+(A)gU* is at first the one with *+(X)g*, e.g. in Maitr 159 v21 (*adnagug kāçūrdāçi* 'somebody who conveys others') and 176 v5 (*adnagug . . . id-*). Soon, however, e.g. in Ht IV 748 (*ikigūni birlä*), Ht X 224 (*kamaguni*), BT I A_2(33) (*ikigūni*) and U III 4,3$_1$ (*adınaguni ölür-*), we find the pronominal accusative suffix *+nI*, which just begins to extend its use to collectives and plurals at this period.[127]

The formative is attested with numerals from one to ten. Beside *alu+gu* (Ht IV 1572), *iki+gü* and *yeti+gü* we find, e.g. in Ht V 182, Suv 636,22 and 693,17 and UjgRuk II 18 and III 19, *ikägü* and, in TT V B 61-2, *yetägü*. Otherwise, however, the formative *+(A)gU* is never dominant, although we often have it with bases ending in vowels.[128] We find an inscriptional ex. in Toñ 12: *bo üçägü kavı(ş)sar . . .* 'If these three get together . . .'. In Toñ 21 in the instrumental, used adverbially: *üçägün kavışıp sülälim* 'Let us all three get together and fight (them)!' Scholars have often failed to understand the nature of this *+(X)n*, considering the form with *°n* to be some expanded variant of *+(A)gU*. That it is the instrumental suffix was seen already by Le Coq, who translates as follows: *anvamıg yutuzluk al(ı)nınŋ; k(a)magın ögrünçün m(ä)ŋin olorsar anıg kǫrtlä bolgay. äkigün*[129] *antag kǫrtlä bolgay sizlär* (M III 14,6$_1$) "Anvam nimm dir zur Gattin, wenn du dich mit aller Freude und Seligkeit niedersetzest, sehr schön wird es sein! Zu zweit möget (werdet) ihr so schön sein, wie wenn . . .". We have another instance of numeral with *+(A)gU* in MaitrGeng 13 a 12: *kalmış onagu urılar* 'the group of ten boys left behind'. Concerning the content, one is reminded of plural nouns with numeral in Republican Turkish (e.g. *kırk haramiler*, *üç silâhşörler*) to denote groups of individuals well known as groups.

It is remarkable that *+AgU* is added also to *bir* 'one': *maŋa törт yäklär yakın kälti. birägüsi bädük bärgä tutmış, ikintisi . . .* (Suv 5,22). In the following instance, too, *birägü* refers to the first individual singled out from out of a group: *ürtin ünmiş beş tegitlärtä bir(ä)güsi oy içiŋä kirip yanmadı . . .* (InscrOuig III 12) "L'un

126 Cf., however, *bir+ägü*, discussed below.

127 See Erdal, 1979: 156.

128 *äkün* in ChristManManusFr B v9 (p. 1211) and HamTouen 15,2 appears to be a truncated variant of *äkigün* ~ **äkägün*.

129 This text also writes *äkinti* with /ä/, in 15,17$_1$; thus also the runic inscriptions KT, BQ, Toñ, Ongin, ŞU etc. in about 30 instances, without exception. This must be a dialect characteristic and *not* an expression of /e/: The Brāhmī texts write *iki*, and there is no alternation *ä* ~ *i* in this word in any text.

parmi les cinq princes qui s'étaient manifestés il y a bien longtemps est entré dans un
trou (caverne?) et n'en est pas retourné." Such exs. of *birägü* can be found also
among the Middle Turkic glosses of the Rylands interlinear Koran translation,
birägäri may perhaps have been formed by analogy with anaphoric *ikigüsi*; note
that entities referred to in this way are always members of groups. BT XIII 5,51
translates *birägü* as "gemeinsam".

From counted groups it is no great distance to uncounted ones; cf. the following
anaphorical +*AgU* form used in parallel with *amarıları* 'a few of them' and *kayuları*
'some of them': *taki adan tükülüg tümänlig t(ä)ŋri yalŋok sordapan kutın bultılar;*
amarıları sakındagun kutŋa tägintilär; kayuları ymä anagam kutın bultılar;
ükügügü ymä agınçsız pratikabut kutŋa köŋül turguzdılar[130] (MaitrGeng 13 b 10).
The instrumental of such +*AgU* forms is also used adverbially: *kamag kara bodun*
bokun t(ä)ŋrilär, luulug säkiz bölök terin kuvrag yäklär vaxşiklärdä ulatılar birlä
barçagun kälip . . . (Tug 100) 'they came all together and . . .'. All the following
lexemes also signify 'all': *biz yumgıgunuŋ ögümüz kaŋımız ärür* (BT VIII A 260)
'He is the father and mother of all of us.' In the instrumental case in adverbial
function: *alko burxanlar bodis(a)tvlar birgärü yıgılıp yumgıgun kälip . . .* (*ib.* B
Nachtr. 2+3,10). As with *yumgı*, the *A* of +*(A)gU* of course falls off also with other
bases ending in vowels: *yäklär alkınçsız kılınlar ayıg kılınçıg; kenintä yana bilinip*
kşanın kılınlar nizügün (ShōKenkyū II 26) 'The demons carried out evil deeds
endlessly; finally they all together understood and confessed.' Similarly *tüzügün*
kälip tapınurlar (ShōAgon 3, p. 207 l. 12). The nominative *tüzügü* appears in *kut]*
koluntılar tüzügü (TT III 141 = Pothi 181) 'They all asked for divine blessing.' The
rare *alkogu* did not come about "durch falsche Abtrennung aus *alkugun*, das als
Instr. verstanden wurde (vgl. *alkugun yumgın*), oder Dittogr.?", as the *UW* writes
s.v. *alkugu*,[131] but can regularly be analysed as *alko+(a)gu*; the °*n* is the instrumen-
tal suffix, and has not just been 'understood' as such. Add to the *UW* entry exs. in
HamTouen 1,50, in a ms. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 46,1 and in Neujahr 85.
yumgıgun, quoted above from BT VIII B Nachtr. 2 + 3,10 and attested also in USp
59,10, ĀgFrag E6 and BT II 1290 and 1308, is also such an instrumental form, as
yumgıgu+nun, also quoted above, is a genitive; see p. 322 below for *yum-gı*, a
deverbal noun in -*gI*. *kamagu* (U III 65,27) is probably a haplological simplification
from *kamag+agu*, *kamagun* from *kamag+ agu+n*. This is attested in KP 24,7, TT
III 125 and Suv 6,14 and 634,20, and in Pfahl I 20: *kamagun burxan kutın*

130 Thus or *turgur-* (q.v. in section 7.54 with *kōŋūl*)?

131 I prefer to read *alko* and not *alku* because of the /o/ in BuddhKat 44 and in the text in Tibetan script excerpted by Clauson. *alko* is attested also in two instances in Brāhmī script, the lone *alku* in TT VIII I 16 then probably being an error. A further instance in the TT VIII glossary is a conjecture. Röhrborn, too, appears to have changed his mind, as the (1985) glossary to BuddhKat also writes *alko*.

bulzunlar 'May they all attain Buddhahood!' *kamıgunı kutgartıŋız* in TT III 61 shows the same *+AgU* form with the pronominal accusative suffix; cf. *adınagu+nı* (vs. *adınagu+g*) above. *kamagunı* in ShöAv 99 should not be altered to '*kamagunnı*', as the editor does: The instrumental and the accusative suffixes are, of course, incompatible. *kamagurtnıı üzä* in M III 42,18 (text 27) should probably be emended to read *kamaguŋuznı üzä* 'over all of you'. Text 27 is said to be in Manichaean script and will hardly have been misread by Le Coq; it is very well possible, however, that the ms. was copied from an original in Uigur writing, in which the two readings would be quite similar. This multitude of linguistic means to express totality and encompassment is no doubt due to expressive needs.

The third group of *+(X)gU* nominals concerns bases with no inherent plural content. We start with the pronominal domain. Unlike the great European languages but similar to *ne+ler* in Republican Turkish, Old Turkic has an *+(A)gU* collective also with *nä* 'what?' as base. *nägü üçün* (Ht V 182-3; PañcFrag 25), for instance, does not signify 'why?', but 'for what reasons?'; the plurality of the reasons is presupposed. Here are further exs.: *nägü kılur siz?* (Ht V 9 b3) 'What things are you doing?'; *tört ujıklarıg tıltaglıgın urmış ol; tıltagsız ärmäz. tılt*[*agı*] *nägü ol tep tesär, . . .* (Warnke 138) "Die vier Akşaras sind aus (bestimmten) Gründen hingeschrieben worden, ihr Auftreten ist nicht unmotiviert. Wenn man nach den *Gründen* fragt, . . .". In BT I A_2(34) and D (224), KP 4,8 and 66,6, TT X 265, PañcFrag 15 and Suv 620,4, there is a *+lXk* expansion of *nägü* which has a final content very well attested with *+lXk* forms: *nägülük titdiŋ özüŋin bizni birlä barmadın?* 'For what reasons did you not go with us but gave up your life?' *nägü* appears also in a binome with its own base, a *figura etymologica* attested also with some other *+AgU* forms. However, *nä nägü* (U II 23,26 and 61,14) has indefinite and not interrogative content, as e.g. Latin *quisquis*, *quidquid* etc.: It is translated with "irgendwelche" and "alles Beliebige".

adınagu, well documented in the *UW*, can also count as pronominal. The distinction between *adınagu* and the also well attested *adınlar* (q.v. in *UW* 49 s.v. *adın*) will be easier to clarify once more light is thrown on the functions of *+lAr*; it was Grönbech, 1936 who already pointed out that the plurality of *+lAr* is of a rather expressive nature. Therefore, *adınagular biligi* is not necessarily an error, as suggested in *UW* 51 b s.v. *adınagu* C: *+lAr* and *+AgU* certainly belong to different paradigms and must have had differing meanings or connotations. *+(A)gU+lAr* appears also in UigBlock 20 (*alkogularka*) and Warnke 633 (*yüz yüzägülärintä*); cf. further *är+än+lär* etc. Number is an uncompulsory category in Old Turkic, like the expression of ownership and reference to the owner by possessive suffixes; overcharacterisation, on the other hand, is by no means prohibited. In *alkogularka* plurality is even expressed thrice, viz. by the base and by the two suffixes. *ternägü+si* in Chuast 6 has for many years mistakenly been read as '*tirnägüli*':

yerekmeg Mrt yılnı termägüsi tanrı yerinärü barsar . . . 'when the element and root and aggregates go to the divine place'. This comes from *ter-in* 'assembly', q.v. in section 3.107.

içägü and *yüzägü*, derived from *iç* 'inside' and *yüz* 'surface' respectively, constitute an antithetical pair: The first refers to the 'internal organs', the latter to the 'external organs'; both taken as a set. PañcFrag 116 should be read as *içägüsin ägip* . . . and not 'ıagıp'; *ıay-* denotes the overflowing of liquids and is intransitive; cf. *kıd içdgüsi ıasıl-* in U III 78,2 and TT X 548. In HamTouen 1,54 *iç içägü* appears in a synonym series with *kõŋül kõkũz*. Further: *içimizni içägümüzni* . . . *köyürür örüyürlär* (Maitr 172 r16). As these instances (and some others mentioned in the *EDPT*) show, *içdgü* is used both with and without *iç*. *yüzägü*, on the other hand, is attested only in the binome with *yüz*, similar to some of the *figurae etymologicae* quoted under *+AgU*. See the instances of *yüz yüzägü* quoted in the *EDPT* entry for *yüzägü*, which quotes Ligeti on the expression; an additional instance is found in Warnke 633.[132] Cf. also *yüzägüsüz vaçır* (BT VIII A 92) "gliedmaßenloser Vajra", without *yüz*. In Maitr 201 v9 there is a binome *öz özägü*: *orgaklar kälip bizni tüprä orarlar. öz özägümüz sayu ot yalınar; ünüp tolp ät'özümüzni kurug kamışça örtäyür köyürür* 'Sickles come and mow us off our roots. Fire flames up in all[133] our pith and marrow; it rises and burns$_2$ up our bodies like dry reeds.' This *hapax* binome in presumably the vegetal counterpart of *iç içägü*.[134] *iki äyägü* in Heilk II 3,29 clearly refers to the two *sets* of ribs, and not just to two single ribs. *äyägü* therefore also belongs to this formation, and its base is in fact attested in Khot 95. In Maitr 156 v1 and 6 = MaitrH XVI 2 b4 and 9, *ąyägü* and *ąyägülär* respectively (misunderstood as *'äningü'*) denote the 'spokes of a wheel'. Similarly misread is *karnımızni uçamızni ąyägümüzni butumuzni* . . . (Maitr 61 r4) and *ąyägümüzni sökärlär* (172 r14), which refers to the 'chest, thorax' (not "Schulter"). DLT fol. 81 translates it as 'rib', but gives the secondary meaning as 'the ribs of a tent'. The *äyägü* originally belonged to the same semantic set as *içägü* inside and *yüzägü* outside, marking the border between the two: The DLT's translation for *içägü* is 'what is within the ribs'.

kavagu 'tinder' in U II 10,23 (from Maitr 151v) comes from the synonymous *kav* in the DLT and later sources, and must also be an *+AgU* form. Thus also *toyagu* 'pieces of dried clay, clay figures' in U III 17,12 and 60,10$_2$, BT V 15,292 and DLT fol. 521, in the latter wrongly vocalised with *a* in the first syllable. The collective content must here be related to use and function of the objects in daily

132 The *EDPT* translation of TT III 5 is much better than the loose one given by Clark: *yüz yüzägü* does not signify 'insides' or 'everything within'.

133 The local meaning is contained in *sayu* which, interestingly, unites the functions of adjective and postposition.

134 One would nevertheless wish to check in the ms. whether it is not a misreading of *yüz yüzägü*.

life. *ır+agu* in BT VII A 162 and 629 corresponds to Skt. *gīta* 'song'; according to a footn., it appears also in Mo., where it signifies 'melody; melodious, harmonious'. Cf. *yıragu* in DLT fol. 459, translated as "musician, singer". The verbal derivate from (y)*ır* 'song' is (y)*ırla-* (q.v. below); (y)*ıragu* is therefore not a *-gU* form. *kıragu* 'frost which drops from the sky when it is cold' (DLT fol. 224), finally, lives on also in Mo. It *may* come from *kır* 'grey', but a base more likely by meaning may appear in BT III 159: *kõŋüllüg kõk kalıklarınıın künilig buz bwr kıra bulıtları örläyü . . .* is obvisously a double metaphor: 'Jealousy rises in people's hearts as clouds of ice, *bwr* and *kıra* (hoary frost drops) rise in the sky'. *bwr* is found also in KT E 37 and BQ E 27.

The phrase *kadın kadnagun* 'inlaws' (DLT) mentioned in section 2.41 may contain a remnant of a very early group of *+AgUn* nominals denoting family relatives. Attested are *in(i)y(ä)gün(ü)m* (KT N 11 and KT S 1 // BQ N 1) < **iniy+* > *inī* 'my younger brothers' (discussed in Erdal, 1979 b: 88 footn. 14) and perhaps *käliŋünüm* (KT N 9) 'my daughters in law' (if contracted from **kälin(ä)günüm*). *taygunuŋuz* (KT SE), sometimes also mentioned in this connection, is quite unlikely to belong here; see the *EDPT* s.v. It is unclear whether *iniyägünüm* and *käliŋünüm* have a (pronominal?) *n* archaically retained before possessive suffixes, or whether there here is an independent suffix for sets of relatives, *+AgUn*.[135] The two Orkhon Turkic lexemes are collectives which appear in a series with *öglärim*, *äkälärim*, *kunçuylarım* and *bäglärim* on the one hand, *oglanım* and *bodunum* on the other. Two morphologically problematical forms and one hapax in the DLT are no base for a theory, however.

The similarity in appearance between the present *+(A)gU* formative and the one discussed in section 2.96 appears to be a coincidence.[136]

2.6 *Colour names and their derivates*

None of the formations discussed below appear to have been really productive in Old Turkic; *+gXl*, which had various functions in Old Turkic, may have become productive with colours outside Old Turkic proper. That this domain is a very rich one in the Turkic languages in general is shown by the book of Prof. Laude-Cirtautas. Not much of that appears to have come into our Uigur texts, however:

135 A third possibility, that *+AgUn* was the original shape of *+AgU* retained only in this semantic domain and outside Uigur, is even too hypothetical to be discussed.

136 Bang wanted to 'explain' *+AgU* as coming from *+A-* and the verbal inflexional suffix *-gU*. While this is just possible with *+AgU* of section 2.96, it is highly unlikely here: No *+AgU* lexeme has a corresponding *+A-* verb in early Turkic, *-gU* in no sense has a collective meaning to it and collective *+AgU* lexemes show no hint of the prospective uses to which *-gU* forms are put.

These mostly reflect the life of other cultures, and colour expressivity belongs to the popular and oral domain.

Only +(A)mUk forms nouns. The other formations, although attested rather scantily, compete occasionally: The difference between *kızıl* < **kız+sıl* and *kız+gıl* must be one of tone. Perception of colour tones must have set a natural limit to the productivity of these formations.

All colour name formatives are endocentric.

There is a productive verb formation for saying 'to turn into (this and that colour), to be (a particular colour)': +(A)r- (section 5.45) forms seven or eight such verbs, a lot for the lexically limited domain of colour. +(A)r- is used also for other purposes, however, whereas some of the adjective formations of part 2.6 do appear to be constrained in this way.

2.61 +Kll, +gXl and +sll

Lexemes formed with suffixes like +*Kl* and +*gXl* can, by content, be divided into four groups. First, we have a group which denotes geometrical figures and not colours. It includes *üç+Kil* 'triangle' (BT VII A 25, 664 and elsewhere) and *tört+Kil* 'rectangle, rectangular' (Schwitz 16, BuddhUig II 351, Baguettes 3, Maitr 30 r9 and 86 v7 etc.). This is also what the first hand wrote in DLT fol. 625, while the second hand added a *damma* over the *kāf*.[137] Presumably, one could also form names of polygons with more sides.[138]

On the other hand, there are a few adjectives formed with +*Kl* from bases denoting colours, which appear to describe colour tones. According to a n. to Hochzeit 23-24, ms. Mz 724 v35 writes that the Bodhisattva *Cuṇḍī* should be painted *yuruñKil sarıg öŋlüg*, i.e. 'with whitish yellow complexion'. *kızKıl* (TT VIII I 6, Ht IV 55 and DLT) 'reddish' has no *attested* base, but must have it in common with *kız+ar-*. *kızKıl* is written with *q* in Brāhmī script in TT VIII, but as *qızgul* in DLT fol. 242 (emended to *kızgıl* in the *EDPT* and by Dankoff and Kelly). I would prefer the DLT's variant in this case, as TT VIII I does have some voice confusions with the velars, which would make us write the whole formation as +*gll*. This is corroborated by the *g* of *kır+gıl* in both QB and DLT. /k/ vs. /g/ in this formation may also be a dialect opposition. *kırgıl*, which describes grey-haired persons, is also the base of *kırgıl+ad-* in U III 55,15-16. With the exception of the DLT's *kızgul* (thus), which describes horses, adjectives of this group all qualify human traits: Hair, complexion and eyes.

137 Cf. also what is quoted in Bang, 1918: 531-2.

138 One wonders what figure is meant by *ikigül*, quoted from a XVth century text in the *EDPT* s.v. *üçgil*. Strictly speaking, it should be a line segment.

A third group of lexemes, showing *+gXl* as suffix, contains nouns attested mainly in the DLT and in modern languages; by content, the persons who would use them would hardly make use of writing, which explains this distribution. Here, animal designations are formed from names of parts of their body, where that particular body part is *white* or has, at least, a white spot. If the base is bisyllabic, the second vowel of the base noun is syncopated and the suffix loses its /g/. The DLT, then, has *başgıl* 'an animal with white head', *yalgıl* 'a horse with white mane (*yal*)'. The mentioned phonetic simplification is found in *bögrül* 'an animal with white flanks (*bögür*)' and *bogrul* 'an *boguz* with rhotacism. Further, *boymul* in IrqB LXIV and the DLT, refers to animals which have white on their neck. Since 'neck' is *boyun*, the connection between the two words seems almost certain. *boyun* may originally have had a final /m/, along the lines of Doerfer, 1967; but cf. also *kömüldürük* from *köŋül*, etc.. *targıl* 'an animal with narrow (*tar*) white and black stripes on its back' is aberrant as to its base, which does not denote a body part. The *EDPT* quotes *targıl* from the DLT and from Ottoman; it is found also in Rabġūzī. *targıl öküz* appears both in Ernte 103 and Ernte II 6. Laude-Cirtautas, 1961: 114 quotes from modern languages: Anatolian *yuyrul* 'cow, ox etc. with white on the tip of its tail', from **kudruk+gul*, and East Turkic *yalyıl* 'an animal with white in its mane'. *+gXl* differs from the second *+KII* both in its vowel (which follows fourfold harmony) and in its behaviour with bisyllabic bases; moreover, although both have to do with colour, they differ in the syntactic function of the derivate and in the particular association of *+gXl* with 'white'.

kaşga at is translated in DLT fol. 214 as 'horse with a white blaze except for black around the eyes'. 'around the eyes' not being far in meaning from 'eye-brow', which is *kaş* in Old Turkic, one gets the idea that *+gA* must be a suffix analogous to *+gXl* in meaning, with 'black' substituted for 'white'. Unfortunately, the rest of the entry is inconsistent with this, assuming that Kāšġarī knew the correct and usual meanings of Arabic *arxam* and *aşqaʿ*, which denote animals with 'white head' and with 'a white spot on the head' respectively.[139] *kaşga* may then just be unanalysable, as so many such terms are in other languages, or may in some way be related to the class of animal names ending in °*gA* mentioned in section 2.43.

Together with *başgıl*, the DLT mentions a variant *başıl*. Because of its content, this form should hardly be compared with *yaşıl* 'green' and *kızıl* 'red'. *yaşıl* is no doubt derived from *yaş* 'fresh, moist', with the colour of fresh and moist plants in mind. *kızıl* comes either from the common base of *kızgan*, *kızar-* and *kızgıl* or from the verb 2 *kız-* 'to be or become red-hot', of which a metaphorical ex-

139 See also *kaşga+lak* in section 2.45 above.

appears in Ton 40. See the EDPT entry for it. We might then, with Bang, 1930, 30, analyse the two as *yaz+sI-(X)I* and *kız+sI-(X)I* (or *kız-XI*) respectively. The (unattested) *+sI-* verbs would be simulatives to what is 'moist' or 'glowing' respectively: **kaz. agsıl* 'weißlich"', which Bang there quotes (probably from Radloff, 1893-1911), can be found in modern dictionaries as *akşıl*, and should be derived from **ak+sıl*.[138] Concerning *yaşıl* and *kızıl*, the existence of *+sIl* is no more than a hypothesis. It is, however, attested in *arsıl* 'chestnut coloured', which comes from ar, same meaning, as we read in DLT fol. 52. The second syllable of *arsıl* is written with a *fatha* in fol. 65 and has both a *fatḥa* and a *kasra* in fol. 52, but still existed in Altai Turkic in the XIXth century with *ı*: *arsıl ayu* in Radloff, 1866: I 41, 388 and 47,590 should not be translated as "Löwe" but as 'chestnut-coloured bear'. As proper name we find the word in Khotanese sources (Hovdhaugen, 1971), in the Uigur fragment TürkErz[139] and possibly even in a VIth century Byzantine source.[140] Reading the DLT instances as *arsal*, as both Dankoff and Kelly and the EDPT do, makes the word morphologically unexplainable. *yok+sıl* 'poor, destitute' is widely attested in Middle and Modern Turkic sources and languages; see the EDPT s. v. *yoksuz*. It can hardly be "clearly a corruption of *yoksuz*", as Clauson writes, but must be an independent creation from **yok+sı-*. This lexeme shows that, outside Uigur, *+sIl* was not confined to the denotation of colours. There are, then, at least three colour-related suffixes ending in /l/. These are hardly ever expanded; we can just mention *kızl+amuk* from the DLT (discussed below) and the early *kızıl+sIg* (section 2.32).[143]

2.62 *+(A)mUk* (and *-mXk*)

This suffix is added mostly to names of colours. It forms names for creatures or objects for which these colours are characteristic, or denotes the characterisation itself. In the DLT we find *kızl+amuk* 'measels' and *kara+muk* 'corn cockle' (a black plant which grows among wheat) with the non-dominant initial vowel of the formative falling off. In DvaKol I 20 there is a certain *Karamuk Inal* and a boy in

140 A suffix *+çIl* is attested already in *tüpiçil yer* 'a windy place', *yagmurçıl yer* 'a place where there is much rain' and *igçil* 'a man who is always sick', all in the DLT, and *igçil* in OB 4672. Kāšġarī writes that *+çIl* adjectives 'indicate abundance'. A few Middle Turkic forms with this suffix can be found in Brockelmann, 1954 par. 30.

141 The word, there written as *arsl*, appears at the end of the line; it is unlikely to be a damaged *arslan* because a brother of the person called *Ars(ı)l* already bears the name *Arslan*.

142 'Αρσλας, quoted in Moravcsik, 1943. If the name is accented on its second syllable, as marked by Moravcsik, it is unlikely to reflect *Arslan*. Endings such as *-ας* are added to foreign names in Greek to this day, to enable them to receive case suffixes.

143 In runic BlattRun 15-16. The word-divider, which appears between *kızıl* and *sig* is clearly there by mistake.

ActeQuig 17 also bears this name; their skin may have been unexpectedly dark as babies, or they may have had the dangerous black pimple mentioned in the *EDPT* entry. *borsmuk* 'a badger' appears in DLT fol. 625; it is written as *borsmak*, but all the Middle Turkic and modern variants point towards a rounded second vowel. If it comes from *boz* 'grey', as suggested in Tekin, 1986: 157, it should belong to this formation. *borslan*, which is on the same page as *borsmuk* in the DLT and said to be used in a binomial with *arslan* 'lion', presumably comes from the same base. (See n. 125 for names of animals ending in °*lAn*.) The lexemes appear in a section devoted to such as have clusters of three consonants. The original form is unlikely to have been '*bors+AmUk*', as the /A/ would not have gotten syncopated; since there is no *+A°*, the original base may have been **borsX*. Cf. also *tirsgäk* 'elbow' < *tiz* 'knee', mentioned in section 2.34.

This rare and weak formation appears to live on to this day: *alamık kar* in Kirghiz (Yudakhin) and Teleut (Radloff, 1866: I 147,31) denotes 'grey snow' and should be from *ala* (not *al* 'red'). Antolian Turkish has *bozamık* "boz renkli ve yakılır bir cins ot" and *karamuk*, which is 1) wild plums, 2) a black rash on the body. Such divergent meanings as with *bozamık* (quite different from *borsmuk*) and *karamuk* are a sign of creativity in this formative.

kızamuk in TT VII 22,16 need not be identical with *kızlamuk*, as the *EDPT* entry takes it to be: *kızamuk ünüp karını ötmäsär ingäk yagın säri[ip] aŋa bergü ol; ötär* 'If one develops *kızamuk* and becomes constipated, . . .'. This could come from **kız*, whose existence has to be assumed to explain *kızar-*, *kızgıl* and probably also *kızgan*. In Republican Turkish, *kızamık* and *kızamıkçık* denote two different illnesses; something similar *may* also have been the case with *kızlamuk* and *kızamuk*. The DLT's *sol+amuk* 'left-handed' and *oŋ+amuk* 'right-handed person' are not derived from colour names. Nor is *yası+muk* 'lentil' (Heilk I 119, ETŞ 12,42 and DLT), which no-doubt comes from *yası* 'flat'.

All Old Turkic *+(A)mUk* forms are nouns, and their bases are all adjectives. Cf., on the other hand, *at+muk* 'on horseback' and *ton+muk* 'dressed' in the Middle Turkic of Ibn Muhennā.

Republican Turkish has a deverbal suffix *-mXk*, attested in *çiğne-mik*, *il-mik*, *kes-mik*, *kus-muk*, *kıy-mık* and *soy-muk*. In its entry headed *ügrümük*, the *EDPT* quotes *ügrümük* 'cradle' from the Kitābu 'l-Idrāk. This is clearly the object nominal of *ügri-* 'to rock (a cradle)' attested from the DLT and the QB on. The DLT says that the Oguz call a 'camel litter' *ügürmäk*.

kıçmık (Ht V 323 and VII 12 b 22, BT XIII 35,8, Suv 113,22 (*kıçmuk*) and U IV A 254) appears only in a binomial with *kog* 'dust', and seems also to belong to this formation. The base is not '*kıç-*', however, but *kıçı-* 'to scratch'. By its etymology, *kıçmık* should therefore signify 'something scratched or scraped off a surface', or perhaps 'filings'. In the Ht VII instance it is further expanded by the 'subjective'

diminutive suffix +kIAA. The Ht text has a further °*mik* form in V 5 a 17: *olar yma [. . .]ag eg tegdinma [. . .]Up kasıl kasmıklarta [y]orıdılar*. 'They, however, . . . -ed to the north of the . . . -y mountain and went through gorges$_2$.' The word lives on in the Şor language as *kıspak*, with the same meaning, and is mentioned by Rad. loff. In view of the vowel in the Şor word and the DLT's *kısmak* (which has a different meaning q.v. in the *EDPT*), the DLT's Oguz variant *ügürmäk* appears to have come from **ügri-mäk* or **ügri-mik*. There would appear to have been a deverbal nominal formative *-mXk*. The vowel of this formative would have been rounded at a very early date due to the adjacent /m/, except where the base had /ı/ in its last syllable.[144] In Republican Turkish *-mXk* could go back either to *-mXk* or to *-mUk*.

Old Turkic *+(A)mUk* may have come from *+A-mUk* ~ *+A-mXk*, with the verb formative *+A-* discussed in section 5.11.

2.63 +Xş

This formative is added to colour names and supplies them with the content '-ish'. It lives on in Özbek and is represented in A. v. Gabain's Özbek grammar and in Wurm's description of the language in the *Fundamenta* with the forms *sarg+ış* 'yellowish', *ak+ış* 'whitish' and *kök+iş* 'bluish'. In QB 74 we find *kökiş turna* 'bluish crane', also with /I/ in the suffix. This is also the only lexeme which represents the formation in Old Turkic: *köküş öŋlig* (sic) *tıŋü* (BT XIII 1,100) 'bluish-coloured hair' is rounded in the second syllable (see facs.). A number of Maitr instances are also spelt with °*üş* by the editors. We quote them all, as one of them was changed by Ş. Tekin in his last edition (BT IX 98,3$_2$) to '*kümüş*', and the others appear in the little-known Hami version. *amarı köküş öŋlüg, amarı yüpün öŋlüg, amarı kızgul öŋlüg, amarı äsri kusrı . . . ton ätükläri . . . birlä [ö]grünçülä-yürlär* (140 v 3, read and translated with *UW* 116b, mid-page) "einige vergnügen sich mit blauen, andere mit violetten, andere mit roten, andere mit bunten . . . Kleidern, Schuhen . . .", *köküş öŋlüg körtlä közin Badari bramanag titirü körüp . . .* (MaitrGeng 2 a 21) 'He looked straight at the brahman Badhari with his beautiful bluish eyes, and . . .'; *köküş öŋlüg közi ärür* (*ib.* 5 b 22) 'He has bluish eyes.'; *köküş öŋlüg tokır* (*ib.* 9 b 7 and MaitrH XI 12 a 5) 'bluish-coloured bun'; *köküş öŋlüg körklä közin . . . körür* (*ib.* 9 b 9) 'He looks with his beautiful bluish-coloured eyes . . .'. *göküş/göyüş* lives on in Anatolia, where it denotes both 'persons

144 Cf. also *çıçamuk*, the name of the little finger, attested in the DLT and elsewhere (see the *EDPT*). This might come from *sıç-*, with assimilation of the first consonant to the second; cf. Mo. *čičeya* 'diarrhoea'. Other Turkic languages have similar names for this finger. This is hypothetical, however, and in any case baby-talk or some other expressive domain.

with blue eyes' (Laude-Cirtautas, 1961: 80) and, in many areas, also 'lizard' (*ib.*: 80). Interestingly enough, the formative was inherited in Standard Turkish in the first meaning by the borrowed *mâvi*: *mâviş* is 'a blonde and blue-eyed girl'.

As expansion of this formation Laude-Cirtautas, 1961 mentions Republican Turkish *sarışın* 'blonde' which she believes to come from **sar(ı)g+ış+çın*. It is likelier for *+şIn* to have become *+çIn* after consonants than the other way around, however, as happens often from Qarakhanid Turkic on in this situation: Cf. the DLT's *kırça-l-* < Old Turkic *kırşa-l-* < *kır-ış+a-*, DLT *yapçın-* and *yapçur-* from *yap-ış-*, inscriptional *kik-şür-* > DLT *kikçür-*, the adverb *tutçı* from *tut-şı*, etc. The DLT still has *kökşin näŋ* 'anything the colour of the sky' and *kökşin bulıt* "a green cloud" (fol. 102 in verse); this was borrowed also into Mo. and elsewhere: See *TMEN* 1679. This lexeme clearly contains the same expansion of *+Iş/Xş* as Turkish *sarışın*. In the QB, however, we find it six times as *kökçin*; it is there used either by itself or as an attribute to *sakal* 'beard' for referring to the figure of an old man, as *pars pro toto*. In later Turkic, this expanded suffix comes under the influence of the Mo. suffixes *+gčIn*, *+žIn* and *+lžIn*; a few of the results of this development can be found in Laude-Cirtautas, 1961. Mo. word patterns are probably also responsible for changes in the name of the dove.

2.7 *Functional and local formatives*

In the formations united under this rather confusing heading, the derivate always has a concrete, real relationship with the base. *+lXk* forms, e.g., often denote things which *exist for* what is denoted by their bases. With *+çI* the base denotes the profession or habitual activity of the content of the derivate, with the bivalent suffix *+dAş* the domain which the two or more referents of the derivate have in common, with *+dUrXk* the place on the body to which the derivate is assigned and so forth. The main object of these formatives does not appear to be classification, as with the ones in section 2.4, nor the expression of personal attitudes of the speaker, as in sections 2.1 and 2.2, nor measure and quantification, as with caritatives or collectives, nor comparison, as with section 2.3, but some concrete relationship between the entities denoted by base and derivate respectively. Most of these formatives are productive.

2.71 +dUrXk

+dUrXk mainly forms names for objects which, because of the use to which they are put, are connected with certain parts of the body of humans and animals; the base lexemes denote these points on the body. Bang, 1918a: 289-310 and particularly 289-294 and 301-306 devoted some work to this formative. Uigur only has boyunduruk 'yoke' (TT V B 115, TT VIII A 33 and ĀgFrag (1) G a4; also DLT) from boyun 'neck'; and the expansion beldürüklüg. beldürük, itself attested as place name in Khotanese documents (Hovdhaugen, 1971: 185), comes from bel 'waist'. In Uigur we find äsri torku beldürüklüg/beltürüklüg 'having a belt of tiger skin' (BT VII D 14).

Where two /r/s got dissimilated, +dUrXk appears to have become +dUk at a very early date. Although Ottoman 'nose rope' is both burun+duruk and burun+duk (attested in the TTS s.vv.), Old Turkic only has burun+tuk: Thus in Maitr 110 r6 (BT IX 234,6₂), QB 159 and 5337 and DLT. Ottoman Turkish appears to have been archaic in this matter: 'womb' etc. is still oğulduruk there; in the Codex Comanicus, on the other hand, this lexeme is found as *ovuldux*.

sakaldruk of Khot 16 (thus in Brāhmī script) is said to denote the "throatstrap of a headstall". In the DLT, sakalduruk is 'the thread woven from silk which is attached to caps in order to fasten the cap underneath the chin so it does not fall off' from sakal 'beard'. The DLT's kömüldürük 'The breast-strap of a saddle' corresponds to kömüldrüh in Khot 21, with syncopated formative as in sakaldruk. The probable connection between köŋül and kömüldürük reminds one of köŋläk 'shirt', also attested since the DLT. The °ŋ° of köŋläk also changed to /m/ in Republican Turkish, giving gömlek. Cf. J. Hamilton, 'Nasales instables en turc khotanais du X^e siècle', BSOAS XL (1977): 508-521.[145] Although köŋül was usually only an abstract term, it appears to have been used to denote the biological heart by the speakers who formed these nouns. Perhaps in analogy with beldürük, sakalduruk and kömüldürük, we find that +dUrXk becomes +(X)ldUrkXk in the DLT, with the /l/ even being dominant: köz+üldürük is 'something woven from horse tails and put over the eye if it is bleared or dazed', yaŋ(a)lduruk 'a felt hood sewn on to the shoulders of a felt coat to protect the head from snow-storms and rain'. The latter presumably comes from yaŋak 'the cheek, the cheek bone'. sakalduruk could possibly come not from sakal but from sakak, then, if we can take it to have been formed after the expansion with +l°. sakak 'the chin, the part between the chin and the chest' seems slightly more appropriate, seeing that horses and ladies could also use a sakalduruk. Mo. egeldürge 'shoulder strap'

145 /ŋ/ ~ /m/ alternation between rounded vowels is attested also e.g. for sünük, tonuz and ogurka, though much later.

presupposes the same phenomenon, as it comes from *āgin+dūrūk*, formed with *āgin* 'shoulder'; for the final vowel of this Mo. lexeme cf. Mo. *sayaldurya* from Turkic *sakalduruk*, and Mo. *kömüldürge* from *kömüldürük*. The syncopation of the final vowel of the suffix in Mo. is the reason for our writing *+dUrXk* with /X/ in this suffix and not with two /U/s. A late ex. of this dominance of /I/ is *çimildürük* "rideau" in Pavet de Courteille which, like *cibinlik* in Republican Turkish, originally probably signified 'mosquito net': *çıbun* or *çıpun*, first attested in QB 3399 and 5215 and in the ode, in 6601,[146] signifies 'gnat'. As can be seen, the constraint that the base lexeme be a body part has been relinquished in Chagatay. Thus also in a further entry of Pavet de Courteille quoted in *TMEN* 591, which also shows shortening due to *r*-dissimilation: *orun+duk* 'pillow for sitting on a chair or throne'. On the other hand, *yarımduk labay* "Halbmuschel" (BT VII A 188 and 736) must be a borrowing from Mo. *jarimduy*.

Only *+lXg* appears to be added to *+dUrXk*/*+dUk*: Beside *beldürüklüg*, discussed above, we can only quote *burunduklug* from QB 206.

In the *EDPT* list of suffixes, on p. xli, we find *-dak*/*-dek* listed together with *-duk*/*-dük*, *bağırdak*, *beliŋdek* and *burunduk* being listed as examples. The last one of these I discussed above, and the second one has been correctly interpreted as the postpositional phrase *bäliŋ täg*. I don't think *bagırdak* 'a woman's bodice', documented in the DLT and in later sources, is connected with the formation discussed here, although it must be derived from *bagır* 'belly, liver'. I take it to be metanalysed from *bagır+dAkI* 'what is at one's belly'; since bodices usually belong to people, the final vowel may have been reinterpreted as the 3rd person possessive suffix.[147] This is also my interpretation of what appears in BT XIII 3,9 as *bodtaklarıŋ bi[r]lä*, translated "mit deinen Stammesangehörigen(?)". *bod-+takı* 'somebody who is in *the* clan, *i.e.* in one's clan' may by metanalysis have been conceived of as having the possessive suffix. 'being in the same clan as . . .' is, after all, a relational or bivalent notion, the possessive suffix referring to whomever the 'co-clanite' is in the same clan with. The new noun could, of course, now be inflected for number and could receive other possessive suffixes. Cf. also Middle Turkic *bogurdak*, *käkirdäk* and *boguzdak*, mentioned in Tekin, 1986: 156.

146 But not 4499, as written s.v. *siŋek* in *EDPT* 838b, the only place where '*çıbın*' (as written there) is discussed.

147 I cannot agree with *TMEN* 750, which considers *bagırdak* to be an "Abschleifung" of *bagırtlak*; rather, *bagırtlak* appears to be a variant of *bagır+lak* (q.v. in the *EDPT*), with the dental stop propped in between the two continuants /r/ and /l/.

2.72 +çU and +çUk

This rare formation can be seen best in *art+çu* 'saddle bag', discussed in *UW* 210a. This lexeme appears once in Maitr and, as *arçı* (< **artçı* < *artçu*), in DLT fols. 74, 122 and 130. When referring to humans, *art* denotes the 'nape of the neck'; Middle Turkic evidence quoted in the *EDPT* shows that, when referring to animals like the horse or the wolf, it denoted the 'hind quarters'. The *UW* takes the original form of *artçu* to be **art+çı*, which it sees as an instance of the *+çI* formation. This is unlikely both phonologically and semantically: Such a spontaneous rounding of the vowel would be unexplained and unparalleled; *+çI* is only added to names of professions and activities, and its products denote living beings, mostly human, who follow these activities consciously. A second instance of the formation is *yer+çü* 'grave' in the DLT. Both are denominal nouns. In both cases, the base denotes the *place* where the derivate is; but this derivate is also a *place*. There does not seem to be any good reason not to analyse in this way also *yertinçü* 'this concrete world': through *+dXn* (allomorph *+tXn* after sonants, where the dental is a stop and not a spirant), which forms names of areas by characterising them as being in certain directions, and this *+çU*. Brāhmī texts show this lexeme four times with [e] as second vowel but, in those texts, /X/ is frequently written as [e] after /e/ in the previous syllable. If the consistent Brāhmī spelling of this word with final *ō* can claim originality, our suffix should be written as '*+çO*' instead; note, however, that BuddhKat (Tibetan writing) has the word twice with /ü/. *yertin* is really attested, and another derivate from a *+tXn* form is *içtinsiz*, q.v. below. The BuddhKat 24 and 42 spelling as YER.RTUN.CU with a rounded second vowel has its parallel in the *KP* 14,8; 47,6 and 78,3 spelling *yertẅnçẅ*, and *TT VIII N4* reads *yertônçô*; these are quite isolated instances, however, and could possibly reflect a dialect feature. The glossary of *TT VIII* gives Tibetan *'jigrten* as etymology for the first two syllables, an idea objected to by Clauson in his *EDPT* entry. Whether the Tibetan etymology is correct or not, whether it was helped by a popular etymology connected with *yer* 'earth' or whether the latter is the only explanation, it seems clear that the third syllable must be the suffix *+çU*. Note that, in this case as in the previous two, both base and derivate are 'places'.

Expanded instances of *+çU* are easier to come by. *yançuk* 'a purse' (Maitr 105 v2, thrice DLT and ff.) is semantically close to *artçu*. *yan*, like *art*, is a particular side of the body; since a purse is small, *yançuk* also contains the diminutive formative *+°k*. Dankoff (personal communication) is reminded of Persian *hamyān* 'belt, girdle', which has a good Iranian etymology. *bagır+çak* 'pack saddle for asses' in DLT fol. 251 is in the same semantic domain both with its base and the derivate, but is spelled with the 'wrong' vowel. *yançuk* is not a diminutive of *yan*, since a 'purse' is not a little 'side'. DLT fol. 522-3 writes about *kayaçuk*: "A sweet-

smelling mountain plant; I think it is saffron". Since there are rocks on mountains, this *could* be derived with the same suffix combination from *kaya* 'rock, boulder', with *+çU* again in locative use. *agırçak/agırşuk* 'spindle whorl', *EV* VIII (1953): 86 ff. and DLT fol. 85, should have **agır+çuk* as its original form; how the lexeme fits in among the semantic patterns of this formation is not clear, however.

Another secondary expander of *+çU* forms is *+lA*, described in part VI below. We have this in *an+çu+la* and *tün+çü+lä*, with adverbial *+yU* in *ançulayu*, *munçulayu*,[148] *munçulayu* and *bulıtçulayu* (Ht V 320). The latter is written as *bulıtçılayu* in ETŞ 9,4, which shows the same unrounding as happened to *artçu* in the DLT. Thus also *munçılayu* in AbhiKār 10 and *bizinçilāyü* 'as at our place' in Suv 425,15. Further, cf. the Old Ottoman suffix *+cIlAyIn*, which is added to all demonstratives and personal pronouns, e.g. *buncılayın*, *şunlarcılayın*, *sizcileyin* etc. (*TTS* VII s.v.).[149]

näçük 'why?, how?, to what degree?' is attested with /ü/ in the second syllable in Brāhmī script, in Mz 648 ([T II] S 19) + I M 8 II (ms. edited in SktUigBil). It should therefore be analysed as **nä+çü (ö)k*: See section 2.21 for the elision of the vowel of this enclitic. *näçük* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) is quite common and found already e.g. in the IrqB. *kançuk* < **kan+çu (o)k* is a hap. in DLT fol. 106, spelled without *mater lectionis* in the second syllable: *kançuk kaçar ol tutar* "Whither he flees, he catches him".

One sees that, with the expansions of *+çU*, pronouns are much better represented than other stems. It is well known that pronouns tend to have much richer case systems than nouns; this is so in Romance languages, in English and elsewhere. Since derivational morphemes are otherwise not very common with pronominal bases, it may perhaps be the case that *+çU* represents the *débris* of some old case suffix. The Khaladj locative suffix *+çA* may have absorbed this *+çU* (or *+çO*?) as well – note that *+dA* is not a pure locative at first.

* * *

In *art+çu*, *yan+çu+k*, *yer+çü*, *tün+çü+lä* etc., the base is the place or time *in* which the derivate is found. The derivate also has local meaning and is in fact, in the first three cases mentioned here, a receptacle. In two DLT nouns which are, no doubt, also connected with this formation, the base is not a receptacle although the derivate is: *yämä+çük* 'a small sack for carrying wheat' is explained in the *EDPT* through **ye-mä*, and *ogul+çuk* 'the womb' no doubt comes from the

148 The form is discussed on p. 410.

149 It has sometimes been maintained that the second vowel of *ançulayu* etc. is the suffix *+çA* with "Mittelsilbenschwäche": I don't see why such a 'weakness' should change *A* into *U*; it even can't be maintained that *U* represents /X/ here, as it stands after an unrounded vowel in this case.

word for 'son'; *+çUk* is not diminutive here, as a small sack is not little food, and a womb not a little son; rather, the suffix is once again *+çU+k*, this time with what is to be contained in the receptacle as base. *oçuk* (*TT VI 86*) is derived from *ōt* 'fire', as *ofçuk* (*BT III 275*)/*otçuk* (*BT VII A 333*) show; the *EDPT* still considered it a simplex. [150] The *TT VI* archetype must also have had *otçuk*, as one ms. shows *ootl*, *OdaNewFrag* ms. 9, v.3 writes *olçuk* and *OdaNewFrag 10* v4 *ootçuk*. *otçuk* is not 'a small fire' but 'a small place for a fire'; *ot+çu+k*. *köçük* 'the fatty tail (of a sheep); buttocks (of a man)' in *DLT* fol. 196 is the result of a similar crasis, from **kōt+çūk*. *DLT* fol. 161 defines *köt* as *dubur*, i.e. 'back; posteriors; hinder, latter part'; and a tail and/or one's buttocks are what one generally has *there*. Again, the content is local but not diminutive.

kapçuk (Heilk *I 99* and *Suv 446,8*) and *kūpçūk* (ManMon 63), finally, are both derived from names of receptacles and refer to receptacles themselves. See the *EDPT* for Middle Turkic and for modern evidence for *kap+çuk*, for *kap* and for *kūp* 'earthenware jar' (attested already in runic script). The three lexemes discussed last could, on the other hand, also have been mere diminutives (cf. section 2.12).

* * *

Let us sum up: The local content is normally present in the *+çU* derivate but not necessarily in its base. This is as it should be, for *+çU* is after all supposed to supply this meaning component. The local content is carried over to *+(V)k* and *+lA* expansion of *+çU*.

2.73 *+lAg*

This formative consists of *-(X)g*, the common suffix for forming deverbal nominals, added to *+lA-*, the equally common denominal verb formative. There is no locative meaning in either of these, and no good reason why there should be any in their combination. Nor does the sequence *+lA-g* always have local meaning, not, for instance, in *tap+la-g* (q.v. among the *-(X)g* forms). The main justification for this section is *tarıglag* 'a cultivated field', attested since the Tariat inscr. (W 4), and then also in *Ht V 4 a23*, *HtPar 130,15*, *ShōAgon 1,151*, Ernte 27, BT I B 19, *Maitr 73 v8, 167 v29* and *109 r6* and *7*, BT VII A 57 and BT VIII B 246. Its absence in economical documents (including the relatively early Yarkand texts) is conspicuous. As there is no *+lA-* derivate from *tarıg* 'grain', *tarıg+lag* must have been felt to be directly associated with it. The sequence *-(X)g+lA-* (as in *tarı-g+la-*

150 We find the inverse, *yerçi* written as *yertçi*, in *TT III 69*. Most significant for this connection are Khal. *hu.^{o}ot* 'fire' and *hu.^{o}tag* 'stove', both with both initial *h* and long vowel.

g) is attested in Old Turkic, by the way, e.g. in *bagla-* and *ältägä-*. *turuglag* 'place of residence', found in the DLT, the QB and one later text, does not have any related *+lA-* verb either. It should, therefore, be derived directly from *turug*. *tur-ug*, q.v. in the *-(X)g* section, has several meanings, one of them being quite close to that of *turuglag*. It is for the sake of disambiguation that *+lAg* appears to have been added in this case. *borla* 'vineyard' in the Codex Comanicus should come from **bor+lag*; *bor* is 'wine'.

Our criterion for the inclusion of *+lA-g* forms in this section is semantic: They are included if they have a local meaning. For some such *+lAg* lexemes a *+lA-* form is well attested. The *+lA-* verbs related to *kışlag* 'winter quarters' and *yaylag* 'summer quarters' even appear in the earliest texts: *kışlag* since IrqB 51 and 56 but *kış+la-* since the Orkhon and ŞU inscriptions; *yaylag* since Tariat W 5 and the IrqB, *yay+la-* since the Tariat and ŞU inscriptions and the IrqB. *yaylag* and *kışlag* are found also in Maitr 218 r4, *yaylag* also in BT XIII 39,23 (cf. n. 382 in vol. 2; quoted at the end of section 3.103). Otherwise, these four lexemes are quite absent from Uigur, presumably because they are so closely associated with nomadic life. All four reappear in the DLT. *kuş+la-* 'to hunt birds' shows a similar distribution: The IrqB, in Uigur only in Maitr 5 r25 and then only in the DLT. *kuşlag*, on the other hand, is only attested in the DLT, where it signifies 'bird grounds', and is probably deverbal. *suv+la-* and *suvlag* 'to water animals' and 'watering place', appear in Qarakhanid Turkic but not in Old Turkic proper. From Schmitt, 1971 it follows, however, that *suvlag* was in use quite some time before the earliest Old Turkic texts. DLT fol. 233 also knows the word as place name, as in Schmitt's source material. The distribution of the local *+lAg* forms which emerged from the above discussion also proves that the combination must have been of great age, in spite of its transparency and the small number of lexemes formed with it.

DLT and QB have a noun *üd+läg*[151] which, like *üd*, signifies 'time'. As no *+lA-* verb is attested, this appears to be another directly denominal noun. The content is not local, in this case, but temporal; but the contiguity of these two domains is well-known. In Middle Turkic, *üdläg* changed its meaning to 'noon'.

+lA is often also local, like *+lAg*; still, there is no connection between the two formatives. In Ottoman, *+lAg* becomes *°lA*, e.g. in *tarla* 'field'. It can be shown, however, that the formative which stayed alive in Ottoman continued *+lA* and not *+lAg*. Functionally, the two formatives are very easily kept apart in all stages of the language, and particularly Old Turkic. See *+lA* in part IV.

151 Wrongly written with *°k* in the *İndeks* to the QB. Among the 18 instances of that text, none appears in rhyming position. One further instance mentioned there belongs to the prologue and not to the QB, and five additional ones in fact refer to other words and not to *üdläg*.

2.74 +mAk

köksürmäk in ThS I c6 (clear and with explicit A in the third syllable, unusual in runic orthography) denotes something worn on the body. Thomsen assumed it to be a 'breastplate' because of the military context. In UjgRuk I 10, however, the lexeme refers to something worn by a small boy: *bo ogulk(ı)yaka bir yulta bir ōm, köksürmäk, bir kaγ bir oyok ҫaruk, iki yılta bir ҫākrāk bilā berūr mān.* One lexeme which goes with this from the derivational point of view is *artmak* "besatie" in the Codex Comanicus. Translated as "Quersack" by Grønbech, this must have been some bag to load on the back of a pack animal: The base is no doubt *art* 'back', *baγmak* 'slipper, low shoe' is, in the DLT, said to be Oguz and Kıpçak, and is also found in the Codex Comanicus. This has no base in Turkic but is by Ramstedt connected to a Korean lexeme said to signify 'foot'. A fourth possible +*mAk* lexeme connected with 'wearing' is *käm(ā)k* in DLT fol. 197: It is defined as "a fabric of cotton, embroidered and striped, used for mantles and, by the Qiftaq, for raincoats". This is utterly opaque. Finally there is *içmäk* "fleece, sheepskin" in DLT fol. 64. This *may* be related to *iç* 'inside' in case the lexeme denotes something on wore inside one's clothing. DLT also has the derivate *ār içmäkländi* (fol. 158).

The scarcity of +*mAk* in Old Turkic is due to the fact that it evidently was hardly in use in Uigur. One early dialect in which it was alive appears to have been Kıpçak (which includes the language of the Codex Comanicus). Derivates denoted things one wore, the bases being names for limbs or for parts of the human body. This would be a locative and/or functional formation, then.

Another two DLT derivates in +*mAk* cannot be connected with the present formation for semantic reasons. One of them (fol. 241) is *käkmäk ār* 'a man hardened by troubles'. Kāšγarī goes on: "Its root is *k(ä)k* meaning 'hardship'. Adjectives of this sort are exceptions to the rule, according to which this word should be *käkmān*'." Another 'exception to the rule' (fol. 509) is *çar çarmak* translated 'children'. Here, neither base nor derivate are known from any other source.

For 'functional' +*mAk*, however, we at least have *köküz+mäk* in Old Turkic proper.

2.75 +çI

+*çI* has been fully productive throughout Old Turkic and all the way to this day. There is no point in trying to be exhaustive about examples, as every newly published text contains new, unattested +*çI* forms. This was the case also in Pre-Old Turkic, as is shown by the liveliness of the combinations -*gU*+*çI* and -(*X*)*g*+*çI* already in the earliest sources. The +*çI* form practically always denotes humans,

whom it characterises through their fixed, habitual or professional activities. I have only one ex. for non-human *+çI*: *kançı kurt* 'blood[-drinking] worm', which Maue, 1981: 115 documents twice, was forced into existence by the need to find an equivalent for Skt. *jalāka-*, and does, after all, refer to a living creature.[152] The fact that the use of *+çI* is practically limited to human beings explains the great success it has had in the two verbal nouns mentioned above, and in the now opaque *-dAçI*. The original verbal nouns like *-mIş*, *-Ar*, *-dUk* and *-gU* could apply to any participator in the action, and can, throughout Old Turkic, refer indifferently to agents, patients, instruments, places or any other term. Through the younger *+çI* sequences, the language was given the possibility of forms referring exclusively to agents. Even when *+çI* is added to simple nouns and not to verbal nouns, the derivates denote instigators of events, as derivates from verbal nominals denote subjects. *tamga+çı* (earliest in KT N 13), for instance, is somebody who bears the seal and uses it, not, say, the object to be stamped; *aş+çı* (the *EDPT* instances and Maitr 72 r 8) is the 'cook' and not the 'kitchen'; *kämi+çi* (KP 22,4-5 and M III 6,6_2) and *kaŋla+çı* (TT VIII A 34) are the people who sail or drive these vehicles, not the 'passengers'; *tıŋ+çı* (TT IV A 21 and U II 78,37; *EDPT* 785a s.v. *sa:vçı:*, misunderstood) is not a 'listener' but the person who communicates things to be listened to; *baş+çı*[153] one who *is* the head, and carries out this intransitive *being* by leading and commanding actively. *kapag+çı* (KP 42,5ff.) is a 'doorkeeper', and not somebody locked out or locked in by the door. The limitation to one single actant function, the agent in this case, may be common with deverbal nominals in many languages but must be quite rare for denominal formations.

+çI nouns are often derived from the name of the activity whose agent they represent. This means that *sıgıt+a-guçı* is made superfluous by *sıgıt+çı* 'mourner' (in *yogçı sıgıtçı*, KT and BQ), *bäd(i)z+ä-güçi* by *bädiz+çi* 'decorator' (*ibid.*; also in the treatise on how to paint *Cunḍī*, in the n. to Hochzeit 23-24). *av+çı* 'hunter' (*UW*), *oyun+çı* 'player', *yelvi+çi* 'sorcerer' are all derived from nouns which denote activities.

Here is a passage, TT IV A 56-61, with a lot of *+çI* forms: *toŋuzçı balıkçı käyikçi 'äŋçi tuzakçı boltumuz ärsär, torçı, çıvgaçı, kuşçı, eḍärçi, uçugma, bagrın yorıgma tınl(ı)glarıg ölürgüçi boltumuz ärsär, it ätin satguçı boltumuz ärsär, açag(a)ram yılan ölürgüçi boltumuz ärsär, luu üntürgüçi yadçı boltumuz ärsär, [. . .]larıg kınaguçı bukaguçı boltumuz ärsär, . . .* 'If we have been hunters of wild

152 *älgürçi bor* in Hochzeit 19 is discussed on p. 536.

153 *açarılarnıŋ başçısı* (Ht X 385) "üstatların yöneticisi"; *v(ı)rhar başçı* (*ib.* 279) "manastır başrahibi"; *iş başçı bäglär* (Ht VII 1 a 4) 'the masters in charge of the matter'; *lokadatunuŋ başçı idisi* (ETŞ 10,207) 'the prime lord of *lokadhātu*'; *başçı uduzgak* (*ibd.* 150) 'leader$_2$'. Further exs. appear in Suv 562,11 and USp 38,14. The *EDPT* only mentions an instance from the QB.

boars,[154] fishermen, wild game hunters, trappers, if we have been netters, bird-snarers, wild-fowlers or trackers[155] who kill flying and crawling creatures, if we have been snake charmers or rain stone magicians, if we have been jailors who tor-ture . . .'. A very similar passage appears in U II 84,9ff., in the confession of *Kulïkg*. Note that, from the *Aktionsart* point of view, *+çï* has its verbal counter-part in *-gUçï*. Another important matter to be noted is that the implicit verbs underlying the *+çï* derivates change from lexeme to lexeme. In the quoted sec-tion, *toŋuzçï*, *balïkçï* (also in Suv 602,6), *käyikçï* (also Wortlisten A 5, Maitr 58 v31 and several times in U III), *äŋçi* (cf. *'äŋçi mäŋçi käyikçï* in Maitr 75 r5) and *kuşçï* are people who *hunt* the content of the base noun; if one follows the EDPT for *toŋuzçï*, that is somebody who *breeds* pigs; *tuzakçï* (also in ShōAgon 1,289), *torçï* and *çïvgaçï* are those who *place* or *set* their respective objects; *yadçï* is some-body who *performs magic ceremonies* with the denotees of the base; the *bukaguçï*, *finally, attaches* the objects denoted by the base on to people's bodies. Other base nouns denote material which the denotee of the derivate *works with* or *forms* when carrying out his profession, e.g. *altun+çï* (*UW* and HamTouen 34,2) 'gold-smith', *sasï+çï* 'potter' (*USp 61,18* = YamSlaves p. 202 etc.), *ïgaç+çï* 'carpenter' (*EDPT*), *tïŋ+çï* (EDPT and ManMon 111) 'a man who makes mud walls' and *tämïr+çï* (U III 47,6 and 10; HukVes II 2). A *targakçï* (HamTouen 34,18) *makes* or *sells* combs. With *tuz+çï* (TT VIII C 3) and *bōz+çï* (HukVes II 4), the derivate denotes somebody who *sells* the content of the base whereas, with *āv+çï* 'the housewife'[156] (YE 66,1, Heilk II 2,65, Kuan 137 and 138; HukVes II 5 etc.) and *borluk+çï* 'the vine cultivator' (*EDPT*), the base is the *place* where the person in question works. A *kalançï* (USp 14) is somebody who does agricultural work for the state instead of paying the *kalan* tax. The base is here *what his work is meant to compensate for*. The *yultuz+çï* (*EDPT*; also Ht V 5 b10) *looks at* his object to predict the future, but the *yunt+çï* (*EDPT*; Wortlisten A 8), *koñ+çï* (*EDPT*), *ud+çï* (*EDPT*; Ht IV 39; 45 and 48) and *yaŋa+çï* (EDPT; Ht IV 22) have more down-to-earth roaming objects to *watch and tend*. The *agï+çï* (*UW*) and *kapag+çï* also *guard*, although their objects are inanimate. The denotees of another group

154 The *EDPT* prefers to translate this as *'pig keeper'*. That is also an excellent translation of *toŋuzçï* but, it seems to me, slightly less appropriate to the context.

155 *edārçi* from *edār-ï+çi*, with the crasis /tç/ > /ç/ mentioned several times in section 2.72. Cognates are *edāriş-*, *edārt-*, etc.

156 The terms for 'married woman' are all derived from *āv*: The most common one is *āvçi*, in the Codex Comanicus defined as 'mulier, uxor'. The *EDPT*, which collects the examples, says that the word does not occur in Qarakhanid, but we do have it in QB 4496. In the QB, the more common term is *āvlik*. *āviŋ yutuzï*, spelt 'YE.VIŃ YUL.TU.ZḶ in BuddhKat 11, clearly has the same semantic motivation and should not be translated as "die Frau eines anderen".

of *+çI* nouns *believe in* what the content of their base nouns means to them and *preach about* it: *täŋriçi nomçı* (Chuast 135-6 and 324-5) and *nomçı törüçi* (Kuan 127 and 128). If, as with *toŋuz*, which denotes both an animal that is hunted and one that is kept, the base is not enough to make clear the nature of the activity, the verb could, of course, be made explicit: *toŋuz igidgüçi* (BT VIII A 92-3) is not equivocal like *toŋuzçı*. The passage reads *yuntçı toŋuz igidgüçi*: The horse, which was not hunted but only kept, did not need to have its verb surfaced. Since all such *+çI* nouns were perfectly transparent and since many of them must have been *ad hoc* creations, the particular activity associated with every *+çI* form would not need to have been memorised by the hearer for him to identify it; he would only have to exercise his knowledge about division of labour and people's activities in his particular society. Take *suv+çı*: In KP 22,4-5 and in a maritime context, this is a 'pilot', just as *yer+çi* (Toñ 23 and 26, ThS III a 8-9 and 10-11, U III 57,11, KP 22,5; 35,8 and 36,2, U IV C 62) is a 'guide' in general; cf. *yol+çı yerçi* (ETŞ 9,27, BuddhStab IV 13, BT XIII 47,4 and n. to 1,2, U III 61,2 and TT VI 154). Here, the implicit verb is 'guiding at/on/in . . .'. In USp 88,45 in farming context, on the other hand, *suv+çı* is the 'water superintendent', called *mīr āb* in Persian. Had we had the word in Old Turkic in a courtly context as well, it might there have had the meaning of 'cup bearer', which is how the Sanglax translates it. There is no single lexeme *suvçı* which split up into different meanings; only the lexeme *suv* with the morpheme *+çI* and omitted implicit verbs reconstitutable through the context. Here are a few other such cases: Dankoff correctly translates *ok+çı* as 'archer' in QB 2370 but as 'arrow maker' in QB 4458. *sav+çı*, a glorious title in *Kül Savçı T(a)rkan* in PrièreMan A 9, has a clearly negative meaning in TT IV B 21, perhaps 'informer'. *yagı+çı* is evidently just a 'quarrelsome person' in Maitr 82 r 26 but refers to the profession of the 'soldier' in its eight QB instances. In HamTouen 14,8 and 9, 'warrior' is *sü+çi*.

The one important group of *+çI* nouns which does not indicate professions is that which classifies people according to their character and temper: *yagıçı*, just mentioned, and *küni+çi* 'a jealous person' which appears together with it (and also in Maitr 57 r 3 and 82 r 9 and 26), *buyan+çı* 'meritorious' (Chuast 66-67, BT V 13,264, Maitr 25 r 3 and 75 r 18, NesTex U 321,9, the letter fr. U 6251, l.1 (in the n. to the latter) and in the text published by Adams (*UW* Bibliogr., Nachtr. I nr. 16)), *övkä+çi* 'bad tempered' (*EDPT*).

+çI is often added to foreign terms like *boşı* (KP 67,4, U III 10,4-5 and 15,18), *kuŋxau* (Maitr 4 r 4 = BT IX 34,4, Pfahl I 20), *darni* (BT VIII A 124), *nom* (Chuast 121, Kuan 127 and 128). In some of these cases, the base is not even attested in Turkic. The base of *bitkäçi* or *pitkäçi* (*EDPT*; also PrièreMan B 4 and Warnke 101) is Syriac, while it is the Chinese binome *pó huài* in *paxuayçı* (U II 78,34). This is a proof of the liveliness of this formation.

In U III p. 91, Müller would like to translate the professional designation yakşıçı as 'locksmith', connecting it with the Chinese term *yò shí* 'key'. In the ex. in Maitr 73 v28 = BT IX 186, which reads *bir aykı yarım aykı yakşıçı iş aygucı bolurmus*, at any rate, it rather denotes a 'key keeper'. *yakşıçı iş aygucı* would be the head of the key keepers or jailers, who allots work to them. In HamTouen 29,6, somebody is told in a letter to give a document to *Yakşıçı Oŕok* (reading not certain).

As other formatives, *+çI* can also be added to noun phrases. Here is one ex.: In bracketed as (*tärs tätrü törüçikä bilig aytıp* . . . (TT VI 331), *tärs tätrü törüçi* is to be of wrong teachings' and not 'a wrong teacher': Cf. *tärs körüm, tärs tätrü nom*, etc. The only *+çI* derivates from denominal nouns are *bukagu+luk+çı* and *bor-lukçı*. The former, found in U I 9,17 (Magier), probably signifies 'jailer', assuming **bukagu+luk* to be the place where fetters are put on people. *bor+luk+çı* has the expected meaning 'vine cultivator' in the five instances in USp but, in its four instances in KP, the *borlukçı* is in charge of the fruit trees. This is to remind us that one should not treat derivates too syntagmatically: Not only a vine cultivator can be put in charge of fruit trees, after all, but also a violin player or a goldsmith.

+çI derivates from deverbal nouns are exceedingly numerous. Here are some of them: *äş-gin+çi* 'a mounted express courier' comes from *äş-gin* 'a journey at high speed', both in the DLT. *armakçı* in *Tavgaç bodun armakçısın üçün* . . . (KT E6) 'because the Chinese people is deceitful . . .' comes from the noun *ar-mak* 'deceit' (UW 200b). The very common *yarlıka-nçuçı* 'compassionate' is accompanied in Maitr 106 r10 (BT IX 232,10$_1$) by the synonymous *irinçkä-nçüçi*. No *-(X)nç* or *-(X)nçU* forms are attested from these verbs; the first of them is therefore probably petrified, and the second was created by analogy with it and not directly from a base: *irinçkä-* and *yarlıka-* together are a common biverb. Another hapax, *sakınçuçı* in AmitIst 66, is probably also the result of analogy: *ol [kişin]ıŋ öz ät'özintä sakınçuçı abita burxa[n . . .]rsAr käntü özinin arıg süzök koŋül[i . . .* 'If the mindful (or: considerate) Buddha Amitābha X-es in that [person']s own body, he [is?] the 'pure$_2$ heart' of the own self.' The editors of this text assume *]rsAr* to be *'ärsär'* (although there may well be place for more than one letter at the beginning of the line), which they take in its particle use, signifying 'as for . . .'; they further assume the kernel of *sakınçuçı* to be the object of *sakın-* and not its subject. The first part of the quotation is therefore wrongly translated as follows: "Was den Buddha Amitābha betrifft, der im eigenen Körper dieser [Person] vorgestellt wird(?), so . . .". *Ibid.* pp. 103-4 'explains': "Die Nomina auf *+čı/+či* werden gewöhnlich als Nomina agentis characterisiert. Aber sie beinhalten nicht immer das, was wir von einem Nomen agentis erwarten. So ist *ölümči* in *ölümči tınl(ı)g* kein "Mörder", sondern ein "dem Tod geweihtes Wesen". *sakınčučı abita*

burhan in unserem Text heißt nicht "meditierender Buddha Amitābha", sondern "durch Meditation entstandener Buddha Amitābha"." Now since *öl-* is an intr. verb, *ölümçi is*, of course, its *subject*: 'murderer' is the agent noun of 'killing' and not of 'dying'. All the deverbal *+çI* forms I am aware of, both the ones discussed here and the ones in the deverbal sections, denote agents. Besides, *sakınçuçı* belongs to the same semantic domain as *yarlıkançuçı* and *irinçkänçüçi*, unsurpris-ingly. Like *armakçı* but unlike the Qarakhanid lexeme, the three qualify their denotees by their human qualities, not by profession.

I can mention about ten *-Xş+çI* forms, three among them (*igd-iş+çi*, *kenāş+çi* and *sak-ış+çı*) from the QB. There is the *arvış+çı* 'spell-binder' and the *alkış+çı avıtadan*, both of which are discussed in the *UW*. All the other *-Xş+çI* forms are about fight and strife. *tütüşçi* (U III 88,8$_1$) and *öçäşçilär* (TT IX 89) appear in fragmentary context. Then we have: *amtı anıŋ turuşçıların okıŋlar, savların ayıtalım* (Suv 13,9 from the introduction) 'Now call his opponents; let us inquire what they have to say'. TT X 205 might be read as *burxanlıg* [*sün*]*güşçi alp katıg är* and not . . . *tarınç*[*sız*, which does not seem to me to make much sense; see facs.

-Xş forms corresponding to all these *-Xş+çI* are attested, there is no reason to assume the existence of cohesion between *-Xş* and *+çI*.[157]

The same can be said also about *-(U)t+çI*: With the exception of the hapax *(y)etiṭçi* (thus?!) 'killer' in Warnke 436, no Old Turkic *-(U)t+çI* is attested without a corresponding *-(U)t* form. *(y)etiṭçi* may have been created in analogy to its com-mon synonym, *ölütçi*. For its content, cf. *yetlin-* and *(y)ettür-* below. *eḍārçi* in TT IV A 57 comes from *edär-t+çi*, with the common contraction of /t/ and /ç/: Cf. *edärtçi* in QB 2395, same meaning. To all this we can add, from Qarakhanid Turkic, *ögi-t+çi* (DLT), *okı-t+çı* 'summoner', *kwtçi* 'shepherd' from *küd-* or *kö-* and *köç-üt+çi* (all three QB). *kwçi* in Wortlisten A v ii 9 stands between *käyikçi*, *yuntçı* and *koynçı* and should be a contraction of *kwtçi*. Four among the Uigur *-(U)t+çI* nouns are strongly attested and must be fully fused. They are *küzätçi* 'guardian' in Ernte 54, Ht IV 681 and X 1116, BT II 1342 and 1351-2 and Suv 549,21 mentioned in the n. thereto, Warnke 352, the instances mentioned in the *EDPT* and the ones quoted a bit further on in this section; *boşgutçı* 'student' in the *EDPT* exs. and in Ht VII 8 b5-6, UigTot 1009, LautBemerk 41[158] and Abhi(TermBuddh) 64 b8 and Abhi A 52 a10 (1546). The last is given by Kudara in the n. to his ed. of TT V B 56, where he also shows that *boşgutçı* does not signify 'teacher', as thought hitherto. This last ex. has the lexeme in a binomial with *titsi*.

157 It cannot be shown that *yumuş* is an *-Xş* noun. *yumuşçı* 'somebody entrusted with an errand' (*EDPT* and the additional instances of Suv 13,5, 12 and 19 and 14,8 and Ht X 977) is therefore not an instance of this sequence.

158 Read *ukuşlug boşgutçılarda tärin*[and not . . . *tarınç*[*sız*, which does not seem to me to make

basuŋ 'helper' appears, beside the *EDPT* exs., in Abhi 48, UigTot 329, BT III 466, frequently in BT VIII A and in Maitr 27 r9. The exs. of *basutçı* in Abhi render the Skt. term *pratyaya* 'secondary cause'; for this see TermBuddh and Kudara's n. to his reedition of TT V B 20, where an instance of this equation is quoted from Abhi A 117 b3 (3601).[159] Thus also *tıltag basutçı* in TuoLuoNi 4, *ölüŋçi* 'habitual or professional murderer, executioner' is found in Höllen 31, Maitr 122 r13 and 58 v25, LautHöllen 44, 64 and 100 and TuoLuoNi 179, beside the *EDPT*'s exs. *In ay ölütçi* (TT VI 92), *ay* appears to be the object of *ölür-*, the verbal base of *ölütçi*; but the ms. TT VI Oda 13 r5 has *ay ölütçisi* instead, making the syntagm a nominal one. With *küzätçi*, on the other hand, verbal accompaniment is rather common. The lokapālās are called *yertinçü küzätçi t(ä)ŋrilär* in U I 24 and *yertinçü yer suv küzätçilär* in U I 25 (both of these from the Suv). We have, further, *ordo kapag küzätçi* (KP 43,5-6) and, with accusative form, *darnı arvış tutdaçılarıg kögçi küzätçilär üçün* (Warnke 166). That the internal government of the syntagm is verbal and not nominal can be seen also by the accusative suffix of *yert[i]nç[ü küzätçilä]rig* [b]öl- adırtla-, which is used for glossing Skt. *loka[p]ālā prati-cchid-* in ĀṭSū 1 v5. It can be seen on the facs. of LautHöllen 21 that *tamu küzätçilärin* (*n* marked as problematic; damaged) is better read as *küzätçilärig*. As a further illustration of the use of the *-(U)tçI* form we quote Warnke 164-166: It has, one beside the other, *yertinçü küzätçi tört maxaraçlar* with *ädgüg küzädtäçi ayıgıg kınadaçı ärkliglär* and *darnı arvış tutdaçılarıg kögçi küzätçilär üçün*.[160] The first and the third of these terms refer to certain 'guardians'; the second instance, on the other hand, is about certain rulers who merely behave in a particular manner during a certain period of time. *küzätçi* is used for labelling, *küzädtäçi* is not.

-(X)m+çI forms belong to several semantic areas. First there is *alımçı* 'creditor', discussed in the *UW*, and *berimçi* 'debtor'. In religious texts, e.g. in Chuast 308, the latter is used in a moral sense. Unlike the other *+çI* lexemes, the application of these two is contingent upon the situation both in the economic and the spiritual sense: The *alımçı* mentioned in *sänin alımçı är käldi* (UigBrief D 6) is presumably demanding to be released from the situation in which he is correctly referred to as such. Nouns are often more stable labels than adjectives, but *alımçı* and *berimçi* are both often used nominally. In Suv 8,12 and in several other instances in that text, *alımçı* has verbal government: *isig öz alımçılar* are the per-

159 Kudara's rendering of the TT V B 20 expression as "extremely helpful cause" is misleading, however, as *basutçı* never means 'helpful'; cf. "sekundäre Hilfs-Ursache" in *UW* 215 a s.v. *artokrak* B,b.

160 Note the accusative government and cf. Ernte 53-54, Warnke 352 and BT II 1351. *darnı arvış tutdaçılar* is governed by *kö-g+çi* (q.v. on p. 373) and *küzätçi* in common.

sons to whom one owes a life.[161] *ölümçi* is not, like Greek βροτός or English *mortal*, an immutable attribute of a person from the moment of his birth, but, like *moriturus*, points towards an imminent future. The *irinç ölümçi tınl(ı)g* in U I 37,7 is expected to die shortly, as also *kayu näçä ulug eliglärkä kanlarka yazmış ölüm-çilär ärsär* . . . in Suv 117,6; the following sentence corresponds to it in Nobel, 1958: 90: "Wenn (Wesen) des Königs Gesetz übertreten haben und (dafür) *hinge-richtet werden sollen*, . . .". This group, then, stands apart from general *+çI* semantics.

yol tozumçı 'highwayman' in Maitr 58 r 27 and 203 r 16 may be derived from the unattested verb **to-z-* which here governs the noun *yol*; seed *to-d-* in section 7.23 for other cognates. Qarakhanid *basımçı* and *küçämçi* are somewhat close to it semantically. *körümçi* 'soothsayer' (exs. in the *EDPT*), finally, is firmly related to *körüm*, which signifies not only 'view, opinion', but also 'omen'. These *-(X)m+çI* nouns evidently do refer to professions.

-(X)gçI is discussed among the verbal nouns, and shows verbal government. That is the case also with *-gUçI*, which can be said to belong rather to morphology than to formation.[162] *-(X)nç+çI* does not appear to have existed at all, and *-(X)n+çI* is exceedingly rare in early Turkic: For Uigur we can only mention a single instance of *kıy(ı)nçı* which, in TT VI 89, appears in a binome with *ölütçi*; for the DLT only *akınçı* 'night raiding party' (fols. 79, 51 and 114).[163] The non-existence of *-mA+çI* may be connected with the fact that there is a negative participle suffix which contains exactly the same sequence of morphophonemes. *-(O)k+çI* is found only in the QB: *töşäkçi*, *uşakçı* and *yükçi* can be found in the *İndeks*. Within Old Turkic grammar, *-(O)k* forms may have been inappropriate bases for *+çI* because they often contain perfective aspect in their meaning, whereas the aspect of *+çI* was practically always durative or at least imperfective.

The most interesting fact about these very different sequences of verbal noun suffixes plus *+çI* seems to me to be that their products always refer to the *agents* of the base verbs, and never to any other participant in the action.

yer+çi+lä- (*EDPT* and *DTS*; ETŞ 9,61, SuvStockh 41, Weih 5 and Ht VII 9 a 22) 'to guide' appears to be the only verbal derivate from our formative in Old Turkic. *yertçilä-* (ManErz IV 19) does not represent a different pronunciation: Cf. *edärçi* for *edär-t+çi* above. *yol+çı+la-*, a synonym, was discovered by Tezcan (review of the QB İndeks) in QB 4454. *yerçi* and *yolçı* serve as bases for other expansions as well: *tört twgum beş ajun tınl(ı)g oglanı yolçısız yerçi[siz ka]ltılar* (Ht

161 See the *UW* s.v. *alımçı*, pars. A,b and B,b.

162 See Eraslan, 1980: 91-93, among others.

163 The word appearing as *uzunçı* in the *EDPT* should best be read as *ozunçı*, as Tezcan makes likely in his review of the *İndeks*. At any rate, 'slanderer' does not have much semantic relationship to 'length'. In Ht VII 5 a 21 Arlotto read *körünçilär*, but *körtäçilär*, Geng's reading, is preferable.

X 1014) is in contrast with yerçillig azmaz (ThS III a 11-12). This latter, part of a collection of maxims written in runes, signifies 'He who has a guide does not err,' arıçsız (Maitr 85 r6) is also an expansion of a +çI form: As the UW writes s.v., arıç 'intercessor' comes from ara; cf. arıla-. A similar form is nom+çı+sız+ın (Suv 218,7). +çI+lXk is also attested: See the ex. from Sklavendok III 12 quoted and discussed under B_1) in section 2.77.

ör-üm+çi+k, q.v. on p. 42 above, is a rare expansion of +çI; cf. the 'professional' uses of -Xm+çI above. balık+çın 'heron', attested since the DLT, may also contain an expansion of +çI: The heron, of course, hunts fish. Some other +çI expansions have verbal bases. The first word in ötügçisiz adınlarka umug bolayın (ETŞ 9,108) 'Let me be a source of hope for others (than myself) who have no intercessors.' is a synonym of arıçısız; see the section on -(X)g+çI for ötügçi. The following three cases of -(U)t+çI+lXg could be called 'denexal'; their base is the nexus between subject and predicate: köktäki friştilär küzätçilig ärip . . . (Hochzeit 10) can be loosely translated as 'being guarded by the angels who are in heaven'. In fact, however, küzätçi is predicated upon köktäki friştilär, the whole nexus then being related to the (here not mentioned) bridegroom. This means that +lXg is not really added to +çI or to küzätçi but to the sentence 'The angels in heaven are his guardians'. Thus also turkaru üdün könül bilig basutçılıgın . . . ärtär kaçar (ETŞ 9,33) 'He escapes$_2$ . . . all the time, consciousness being (his) helper.' Further, in Ht IV 339: ol tagta avaraşaylak atl(ı)g säŋräm ol. . . . tükätmiş sögüt-[lü]g yuullug saçılıp ünmiş körklä ol. t(ä)ŋrilär v(a)xşiglär küzätçilig ärür 'On that mountain is the saṃghārāma named Avaraśaila . . . Gods and guardian spirits keep watch over it.' +lXg is again added to a nominal sentence, but there is no subordination in this case. Why did the translator not write küzädür but küzätçilig ärür? Perhaps because he was following the Chinese original too closely; perhaps also because this enabled him to make täŋrilär vaxşiglär the focus of the sentence instead of the verb.[164] Note, finally, ol basutçılıg süzük kertgünç twgmış üdtä . . . 'When that pure faith that is the 'helper' is born, . . .' in UigTot 719. This is to be read with +lXg under the assumption that basutçı is in apposition to kertgünç, as I have translated.[165] If, on the other hand, one is to translate 'that pure faith that is to serve as helper' or '. . . is to serve as secondary cause', the word is basutçılık. Note that in none of these cases do +sXz, +lXg or +lXk have any uses other than their usual ones.

164 Similar ways of defocalising the verb have been observed in New Testament Greek, Coptic and elsewhere.

165 Discussion of this function of +lXg on p. 145 below.

2.76 +dAş

This is a very lively formative, which even has a borrowed base in *nom+daş* 'some-body with whom one has one's religion in common' (Warnke 616, UigSteu A 17, LetterTunHuang 4 and 8, UigTot 129 and UigFalt 169-170; not in the *EDPT*). In practically all instances, *+dAş* lexemes denote persons who are companions to the entity denoted by the base noun or have the entity denoted by the base noun in common. The only clear exception to this is Qarakhanid: *tü+dāş tonlar* 'clothes of one colour' in DLT fol. 535. The six exs. of *tüdāş* in the QB all refer to humans, however, and Kāšġarī's lemma is probably just made up. *körk+dāş*, which is very common in Uigur, does not denote human beings either, but their double, as it were: It denotes the human figure in drawing or in a mirror, the 'shadow-soul', a person's 'shape-fellow' or 'duplicate', in Suv 64,6 and 8 in fact the Buddha's forms of appearance. Some of the other instances of this lexeme can be found in BT I 16, BT II 1010, six times in UigTot, BT VII A 421, HtPar 213,13 in *UW* 58 a and in an unpublished text quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 23-24, beside the *EDPT* exs.

Final /t/ of the base is deleted before *+dAş*: *ardaş*, which appears eight times in the QB, comes from *art+daş*, as shown by Tezcan in his review of the *İndeks*.[166] *ādaş* is in *TMEN* 437 and by others taken to come from *āt+daş* und given the 'primary' meaning 'name-sake'. This meaning is not attested before Middle Turkic. As the Uigur exs. mentioned in the *UW* and the runic and Qarakhanid ones mentioned in the *EDPT* show, the only early meaning was 'comrade'. **at+daş* 'having a horse/horses in common' would be just as good an explanation. Exs. of Hochzeit 5 and 23 and BuyKäl 5 to be added to the *UW* entry. Both etymologies presuppose the simplification of dentals. Concerning the meanings of *ardaş* and *adaş* cf. *köŋüldāş* 'like-minded' and *koldaş* 'associate', both in DLT and QB. In fol. 232, the DLT adds that *koldaş* is only used among 'servants of the nobility', which suggests to us the possibility of reading '*kuldaş*', from *kul* 'servant'. This should be rejected, however, as the bases of the *+dAş* formation never denote what people *are*, but what they *have in common*. The *EDPT* mentions only three among the twenty-two instances of *koldaş* appearing in the QB. *TMEN* 437 considers connecting *kadaş* 'kinsman' with *kat*, which is to signify 'side', but a derivation from *ka* 'family' seems much likelier. *kadaş* would then be somebody with whom one has relatives in common.[167] *kudaş*, Chuast 151, BT XIII 46,16 and UigFalt 169-170, on the other hand, *can* be explained through the loss of /t/: It would come from *kut+daş*, 'some-body with whom one has one's fortune in common'.[168]

166 See *art* 'help' in the *UW*.

167 The suggestion to connect *kadaş* with *ka* 'vessel', reiterated e.g. by Tezcan on p. 45 of his review of the *İndeks*, seems semantically far-fetched.

168 The discussion in the footn. to BT XIII 46,16 does not exclude this interpretation. The etymology

bir ışdaş = (bir iş)däş is interesting. It is particularly common in BT II, in the *expression bir ışdaş kamag ulug kuvrag* 'the whole great community which has one *karma in common'*, and also in Warnke 149 and 286 and WarnkeFragm 67, which all belong to the same text. This means that, like many formatives, *+dAş* can also be added to whole noun phrases.

DLT fol. 205 devotes some explanations to *+dAş*, which it calls 'a particle of close association'.[169] It then mentions, among others, *karındaş* 'womb-fellow', *yerdäş* 'two people who come from the same place' and *ämigdäş* 'breast-fellows', i.e. 'two babies sucking at the same breast'. This last-mentioned hapax is the only *+dAş* form in early Turkic which has a derived base. Since it is only used to serve as grammatical example, it can be said that, in Old Turkic, *+dAş* was only put to primary use. *DLT fol. 611* also quotes a proverb containing *kaŋdaş* and *ögdäş*, 'half-brothers of the same father' and 'half-brothers of the same mother' respectively. The similarity between the first syllable of *kirdäş/kerdäş* "a neighbor who resides with you in a single dwelling" in *DLT* fol. 232 and Mo. *ger* 'house' can hardly be a "mere coincidence", as suggested in the *EDPT* entry for the former.

+dAş forms are very rarely expanded in Old Turkic; one instance is *nomdaşlug yagız yer yüzi* in *BT XIII 19,54*.

There have been a number of attempts to 'explain' or 'etymologise' the formative *+dAş*, which are mentioned in *TMEN 1173*. Its last phoneme, /ş/, is found also in *-Xş-*, the verbal and deverbal suffix of mutuality and reciprocity. Some similar content can also be found in the nouns *eş* and *tuş*, however, which both signify 'fellow, companion'. Doerfer himself claims that the suffix originally sounded *daş* and was not submitted to vowel harmony. In Uigur, two forms, *bir işdäş* and *körkdäş*, have front-vowel bases; but I know of no instances which could, e.g. through a dative suffix, prove or disprove this hypothesis. Persian has a lexeme *däş* 'fellow, companion', which was, according to Doerfer, borrowed from Turkic as a lexeme. I would, however, take it to be simply hypostasised within Persian.[170] *+dAş* has remained lively throughout history. Worth mentioning is the phrase *ata ovul bilä bir mäŋüdäş täŋri* in the Codex Comanicus. Grønbech translates this as "ein Gott, der mit dem Vater und dem Sohne zugleich ewig ist".

which Choi, 1988 suggests for this does not seem as likely as this one, as bases of +dAş nominals denote what one has in common.

169 *In Arabic grammatical terminology, the term 'particle' applies also to affixes.*

170 *The Persians appended the suffix also to bases of their own, and also otherwise used it productively. Note, however, that ḫailtäš, which TMEN 1137 quotes from Vullers' dictionary, is merely a misreading for ḫailbäš, < ḫail baş+ı; b and t are easily confused in Arabic writing.*

2.77 +lXk

This is a quite common suffix, which has remained fully productive from the earliest texts to the modern languages. Throughout this period, its varied functions do not appear to have changed significantly, with one important exception.

In the Uigur script, with which most of the Old Turkic texts are written, front-vowel /k/ and /g/ are not distinguished, and back-vowel /k/ and /g/ are only distinguished sporadically and inconsistently. Texts written in the Brāhmī and Manichaean scripts do not always make use of the means they have for distinguishing between the voiced and the voiceless velar phonemes.[171] In BuddhKat, our only continuous Old Turkic text using Tibetan writing, /k/ and /g/ are practically always distinguished within words, but not in word-final position; that is what we would have needed to distinguish *+lXk* from *+lXg*. Qarakhanid usage appears to differ at some points from that of Old Turkic as far as these suffixes are concerned, and is therefore undependable for our purposes. In this case, therefore, the runic texts, which happen also to be the oldest group, are the most important. Unfortunately, *+lXg* and *+lXk* cannot be distinguished by contextual means in all cases, as contexts can be ambiguous; the attempt, however, is always necessary.

Sequences like *-Xm+lXk* or *+çI+lXk*, in which *+lXk* appears as second element, will also be treated here, with the exception of *-gU+lXk*. *-gUlXk* is not only a fixed combination constituting a single choice on the part of the speaker-writer, but, from the earliest texts on, has its place and function in the conjugation system. Both *-gU* and *-gUlXk*, each one separately, belong in fact to morphology. The other suffix sequences with *+lXk* in the second place are not too common, and *+lXk* retained its full semantic independence in them. Only *-(X)g+lXk* is treated apart below and at the end of section 3.101.

+lXk forms can be assigned to different semantic classes. Sometimes, derivates in different classes are formed from the same base. *aşlık*, e.g., appears both in type B_2 and type C_3. Interestingly, forms belonging to different classes tend to get lexicalised to different degrees; i.e., we find that ad-hoc *+lXk* derivates not intended for the lexicon but having a case value appear in *some* of the sections below, but not in others. All the classes of *+lXk* forms have the relational element of 'purpose, designation' in common, or, if one so prefers, the sememe 'for',[172] This content can be detected most clearly in the interrogative element *näg(ü)lük*: *nägülük titdiŋ özüŋin bizni birlä barmadın?* (Suv 620,4) 'To what purpose have you, not going with us, given up your own self?' In the following passage, the distinction between *nägülük* on the one hand and *nä üçün* and *näkä* on the other is

171 They are confused, e.g., in TT VIII I and TT III.

172 The postposition *üçün*, on the other hand, can, with factive sattelites, also have the meaning 'because (of)'.

evident: "amrak oglum, nä üçün buruqlug kältiŋiz?" tegin kaŋı kanka inçä tep ätrdi (HtPar 232,14). Therefore, we should not, I believe, read *apamulug*, but translate as follows instead: 'Had he (the emperor) written even the letters on the stone himself, the introduction would have been a mark and seal *for eternity*.' The word is written with dotted Q̈ in this place in the ms., and, as Röhrborn adds, "Ht [ist] ein Text, der in signifikanter Weise gutturales *-k-* durch Punkt. von *-g-* unterscheidet." As the entry "*abamuluk* → *apamuluk*" in *UW* 35b shows, the reading with *k* had at first been considered; it was subsequently discarded "wegen der volksetymologischen Fehlschreibung (?) "P'M 'WLWQ [in Suv 614,15], die unser Wort offenbar zu → *ulug* "groß" stellt." The entry should, I believe, have been split into two lemmata, *apamuluk* and *apamulug*. A phrase like *apamulug uzun üd* (BT I (B(12)) is covered better by the appositive function of *+lXg* than by any of the functions of *+lXk*, unlike the HtPar 232,14 context. A further adverbial ex. of *apamuluk* (to be added to the *UW*) appears in BuyKäl 7. There is no reason to deny the possibility that both formatives could be applied to this base, and several independent reasons speak for this; note also that *+lXg* and *+lXk* are both highly productive in Uigur, and that their products often fall short of being lexicalised. In ETŞ 10,100 we find *tüz ürlük* as a gloss on Skt. *nityā* 'permanent, everlasting'; the two exs. quoted from Suv in the *EDPT* s.v. '*ürlüg*' should, no doubt, also be read with *°k*. The word serves as base for *ürlüklüg* and *ürlüksüz*, whose phonic shape is guaranteed by Brāhmī. *ürlük* is used very much like *apamuluk*. The following should also have been read with *+lXk*: *bir agızk(ı)ya*

ätmiš/näglük tıŋgdum m(ä)n!' kaŋı kan inçä tep inquire about the reason, the second about the purpose. In KPZieme 10, in Hamtouen 1,39, 22,8, 25,3 and 28,19 and in the exs. quoted in the EDPT entry, näglük has been contracted to nälük.[173] *In the meaning classes treated one by one below, the content of 'purpose' is present in one form or another, but never in its pure state.*

A) Adjectives and adverbs derived from lexemes which refer to a future time, for which something is said to hold: biŋ yıllık tümän künlük bitigimin bälgümin anta yazsar taşka yarantım (SU E9) 'There have I had my written words and my mark affixed to a flat stone for a thousand years and ten thousand days.' Tariat W2 has the same sentence. The idea in the following passage, quoted from UW 168a, is the same: bi taşka ujikin ymä özi ök bitisär, sü apamuluk b(ä)lgü tamga bolgay

[173] *Had nägü+lXk not been the source of nälük, we would have obtained 'nälik' (or 'nälig'), or 'nälük' from a hypothetical 'nä+lA Ok'. The intermediate näglük is attested in KP. The sequence °AgI° was probably contracted to °A° also in bägät and bayat, discussed above.*

[sav] sözläşgüçä üdtä tümän k(a)lplık adrılurlar (Warnke 484) 'In the time it takes to say a few [words] to each other, they get separated for ten thousand kalpas'; *bir kişanlıkça ymä* (BuyKäl 45) 'just for as little as a moment'; *maŋa Kaytsu tutuŋka yoŋlaglık kümüş kärgäk bolup özümtä twgmış Tıtsu atlıg oglumnı Çıntsu Şilaka üç yıllık tutguk bertim* (UjgRuk I 4) '. . . I have given my son, whom . . ., as a slave to Ç.Ş. for three years.' *5 künlük*, written in Brāhmī script in TT VIII C 1, reminds one of *šičä kunläh šime* 'food for 7 days' in Chuvash (*Fundamenta* I, 717) and *altı γwůllůk iş* 'a job for 6 days' in Kümük (*ibd.*, 398). This *+lXk* of duration is well preserved in other Turkic languages as well, always unlexicalised as in Old Turkic.

B_1) Attestations for this type also start with the inscriptions. It deals with a task or status assigned, to be assigned, or which should have been assigned, to a person: *bäglik urı oglun kul boltı; esilik kız oglun küŋ boltı* (KT E34) 'Your sons, who should have been lords, became slaves; your daughters, who should have been ladies, became maid-slaves'. KT and BQ E7 are similar to this. The following instance, in a sentence uttered by a father to his daughter, should alsó be read with °*k*: *k(ä)ntü özüŋ bäglik är taplagıl* (U II 21,14) 'Choose yourself a man for lord and master'. The next sentence is written in Manichaean script, with °*k* in our suffix: *anvamıg yutuzluk al(ı)nıŋ* (M III 14, 4_1) 'Take yourself *anvam* as wife'. Thus KP 23,3: *ädgü ögli teginkä kulluk barır biz* 'We are going to the well-minded prince to serve (him) as slaves.' Reading this as *kullug* would have signified that the speaker is accompanied by slaves, which does not fit the context. Similarly, in U II 21,14 quoted above, '*bäglig är*' would have meant 'a man who has a master'. This is exactly the distinction drawn in DLT fol. 86-87 between *egätlik karabaş* 'the maidservant who is to be sent with the bride on the night of the nuptial procession' and *egätlig* referring to the bride. Kāšġarī explains: "This is a general rule. When the suffix is with the hard *kāf* [i.e. *+lXk*] the meaning is the place where the noun is, or that it is something stored up or made ready for the [base] noun, or an infinitive. When it does not have any of these threee senses, but the intended meaning is the possessor or companion of the [base] noun, then it is with the fine *kāf* [i.e. *+lXg*]. Thus *egätlik*, with the hard *kāf*, means that the slavegirl is made ready to be sent as the bride's maidservant; and if the *kāf* is made fine [i.e. *egätlig*], the meaning is that the bride has or is the possessor or companion of the maidservant. The meaning is thus in all of these cases." Sklavendok III 12 should, I think, be transcribed and interpreted as follows: *arslanka inçä y(a)rl(ı)g bolmış, bi[r] bagçıl(ı)k karabaş berg[äy sän] tep.* '*Arslan* was given an order, saying that he should supply a slave to serve as gardner.' '*bagçılıg*' of Zieme's interpretation would not have signified "für den Gärtner" either, as we read in his translation.[174]

174 *ber-* cannot signify 'kaufen', as Zieme writes, although it does, of course, often signify 'ver-

In Pacht A 10 we should, I think, read *arkalık* as 'guarantor, supporter', and not 'arkalığ': *ulug berim kälsä ol arkalık bolur* 'If large taxes are imposed, he (i.e. the owner of the land leased) will be guarantor.'

Adoption was also a relationship covered by this *+lXk*: *Titsu atl(ı)g oglumnu Çıntsu ayagka tägimligkä . . . yarım yastuk alıp ogulluk bertim* (UjgRuk II 3-4); '. . . *yigirmi sar kümüş alıp ogulluk bertim* (*ib.* III 5). The status and tasks of the adoptee appear to have been quite similar to that of the *evlatlık* still found in Turkey today.

B2) Not only persons fill certain functions and serve certain purposes or, as Kāšgarī says in the passage quoted above, "are stored up or made ready for the [base] noun", but also 'things', or objects. The *boşılık ärdinilär* in U III 12,15-16 are to serve as 'alms'; and the objects referred to as *bilik* are to serve as 'knives', or *bi.*[175] In UjgRuk IV 12 we read about *iki tonluk böz*, or 'cotton cloth for two dresses', as, in DLT fol. 466, *yamaglık böz* (written with *qāf*) is 'a patch of cloth prepared to be a gusset'. *yamaglıg böz* would, of course, have been 'a patched piece of (cotton) cloth'. The merchant in HamTouen 34 mentions *bir*, *üç*, *tört*, *beş* and *altı tonluk kars*, twice each in his list: 'the amount suitable for making one garment' appears to have served as a unit for quantifying fabrics. These instances are particularly similar to Chuvash *sähmanlăh* 'für einen Kaftan bestimmt/ausreichend (Stoff)', mentioned in *Fundamenta* I, 717. *käsmälik ät* (U III 65,10$_1$) is 'meat for preparing *käsmä aş*, a dish of cut up meat', this being mentioned in the following line. '*käsmälig*', the reading of the editor and of the *EDPT*, should be abandoned. *aşlık tarıg* in ETŞ 24,11 is 'cereal; wheat'. The same phrase appears in verse in DLT fol. 369, translated simply as *ṭa'ām*, 'wheat'.[176] This, according to DLT fols. 70 and 187, is the meaning of *aşlık* itself in the Oguz dialect and, we add, in Ernte 85. See *aşlık* par. b in the *UW*.

If this type of *+lXk* can be applied to objects as well as to human beings, animals should also be eligible for it. IrqB V reads as follows (in runes): . . . *ak bisi kulunlamış; (a)laun tuyuglug (a)dg(ı)rl(ı)k y(a)rag(a)y. . . . ürüŋ ing(ä)ni botolamış; (a)laun budl(a)l(ı)g bugral(ı)k y(a)rag(a)y. . . . üçünç, kunçuyı urul(a)nmış; b(ä)glik y(a)rag(a)y.* 'His white mare had brought forth a colt; the

kaufen'. That is also why the lacuna can't have had mān, as in the published text, but only *sān*. The verb phrase should perhaps better be completed as *berg[ū ol]* or *berg[ülük ol]*, if space permits, or, best, *berg[il]*. My interpretation also goes better with the subsequent passage, in which El Bugra is asked for a man fit for field work.

175 Cf. also *bi+çāk*, discussed at the end of section 2.12. *bilik could* instead, signify 'scabbard', as suggested by Tezcan in *TDAYB* 1978-9 (1981): 303 because of the meaning in Ottoman; it can be found in Shō VII b13, BT VII D 15 and a block-print quoted in the n. thereto and in BT VIII B87.

176 *ṭa'ām* can also signify 'food, dish', but that common meaning does not fit the Turkic context.

golden-hoofed stallion-to-be will thrive. . . . His white female camel had brought forth a foal; the camel stallion-to-be with the golden nose-ring will thrive. . . . Thirdly, his lady had brought forth a male child. Growing up to be a lord, he will thrive.'

yok m(ā)n, yok mäniŋlik (BT I D 33) comes from a rather more abstract context. °*lig*, as the editors read, would have been redunant after the genitive case suffix, and *zhe*[3] is hardly a possessive particle, which they are forced to take it to be according to their n. Rather, °*lik* here denotes the same 'taking on a role' which we have already met: 'There is neither me nor anything which could be taken to fill my place in the world.' Note that *+lXk* is here added to a case form. This is probably possibly only because it is used metalinguistically, both 'I' and 'mine' being quoted thoughts.[177]

B_3) I mention here a few forms which should, I believe, be read as *-Xg+lXk*. Whereas *-Xg+lXg* forms in general denote entities which 'possess' an activity and are characterised by it, *-Xg+lXk* is employed for naming things which are to *serve* the particular activity and *lead to* it. Ht VII 2026 should, I think, be read as *azkı(y)a tapıglık tavar ıdtımız*, since the presents were sent as a token of respect. The expression *yoŋlaglık kümüş / kunpo / tavar* etc., which turns up in many economical texts, should also probably be read as *-(X)g+lXk*: It refers to merchandise which is *meant for* use, not such that is already in use. *-(X)glXk* is further discussed at the end of section 3.101.

B_4) The following ex. can serve to show how the language may have started off from type B_2 and thereby have reached the abstract use of *+lXk*: *är kişi är işiŋä käd bolayın tesär adgırnıŋ siŋirin alıp uşak tograp . . . böri öti birlä katıp uvut içiŋä sürtsär ärliki käd bolur* (Heilk I 78). Rachmati translates this as follows: "Wenn ein Mann recht potent sein will, so soll man die Sehne eines Hengstes klein zerstückeln, . . . mit Wolfsgalle mischen und damit die inneren Schamteile schmieren, so wird seine *Mannhaftigkeit* tüchtig sein." What matters, however, is clearly not an abstract matter, but the limb which serves a man's being a man, or, alternately, the biological process which makes a man into a man, *ärlik* has, in this passage, in fact been used as paraphrase for *är işi*.

177 Our discourse reaches record depths here, constituting meta-meta-meta-language: *bo mäniŋ ol* says the layman; "*mäniŋ"lik näŋ* or "*mäniŋ"lik* is how the Buddhist refers to the entity referred to by *bo* by the former. Zieme and Hazai produce this as 'text', which I comment upon. BT I D 78 shows the metalinguistic accusative of *män*: It is not *meni* but *mänig*, i.e. "*män*" *+Xg*. Cf. 'my ego' etc.

B) Abstract *+lXk* is found neither in the language of the inscriptions nor in classical Uigur. We have one problem in this matter: In Wettkampf 32 *t(ā)ŋri y(a)rok küčlüg bilgā* is read as *t(ā)ngri y(a)ruq kāčlāk bilgā* and translated as "Gott, Licht, Kraft, Weisheit". The grammatical reading and interpretation is that of Le Coq in M II 10,2₁, where this series also appears: "Gott, der Lichte, Starke, Weise". Note that *bilgā* is never used as abstract either ('wisdom' being *bilgā bilig*), as the eds. of Wettkampf take it to do. There is a real exception in UigBrief C5, though: *irak yertin y(a)kın köŋülin ençlik äsänlik ayıdu ıdur biz* 'From a far place but near at heart we ask about (your) well-being$_2$'. The variant *kaygu* for *kadgu* shows how late this text must be. In Kinkashō D,b (also in the reedition of Laut and Röhrborn, 1988: 32), the Old Turkic term corresponding to Skt. *nirātmatā* has been read as *'m(ā)nsiz tözlüg'*. I don't think any of the uses of *+lXg* can be applied here. Skt. *+tā* does, however, correspond to the abstract forming function of *+lXk*. The Old Turkic term reflects the bracketing of the Skt. one as *(nir+ātma)tā*. *+lXk* here applies to the noun *mānsiz töz*, where *töz* has also been added as nominaliser. Note that abstract *+lXk* forms typically come from adjectives whereas, in Old Turkic proper, *+lXk* is very rarely added to adjectives in any function.

In Old Turkic, every 'adjective' or even 'noun' can serve as abstract. Thus e.g. *keŋin tārinŋin nŋpkārgāli . . . bolmaz* (*BT I A$_2$ 12*), which signifies 'One cannot fathom its breadth or its depth.' *ādgü* is not only 'good' but also 'goodness', Orkhon Turkic *armakçısın üçün* not 'for his deceiver' but 'because of his deceitfulness'. In such abstract use, lexemes would usually be marked with a possessive suffix referring to the bearer of the quality in question. Where one needed abstracts from nouns, one could also use phrases such as the one with *kut+ı* discussed on p. 150; this one gave *arxant kutı*, *nom kutı* etc., and particularly the common *burxan kutı*, corresponding to Sogdian abstract forms. Apart from these, the Old Turks apparently did not have much use for abstracts unmarked for bearer. They may have been unable to conceive of pure ideas, like the Homeric Greeks;[178] or, alternately, they may have shared with other languages of the Chinese 'Sprachbund' the typological trait of having one form for abstract and adjective. This last hypothesis seems much likelier to me: The Qarakhanid Turks, who were outside the influence of Chinese, had very much use for abstract forms, although the age of their documentation falls right into the middle of that of Uigur, and the Uigurs can hardly be said to have been more 'primitive' than the Qarakhanids.

178 It has been said of the post-Homeric Ionian Greeks that they invented or created abstract thought, one major symptom of this spiritual revolution being the new use of some derived nouns as abstracts.

There are innumerable abstracts in Qarakhanid sources, including *saklık* 'wakefulness', *tarlık* 'narrowness', *tözünlük*, *uçuzluk*, *ulugluk*, *kurugluk*, *yigülik*, *saranlık*, *yarukluk*, *alplık*, *arıglık* etc. They are particularly common in the QB; cf. also DLT fols. 252-255. Further we have, from privative bases, *biligsizlik* in the DLT,[179] *uyutsuzluk*, *tänsizlik*, *körksüzlük* etc. in the QB.

C_1) A domain of *+lXk* forms which was productive since the earliest texts and has given us also some (petrified) lexemes is the naming of cultivated land; the base noun denotes the product. We need no exs. for *borluk*, *çāçāklik*, *ügürlük* (DLT), *yemişlik* (also in ShōAgon 2, p. 196, 9), *kalvalık* etc.; cf. also *murutluk* in UigSteu pp. 240-243. The class is well-known to scholars, and it is well-represented to this day. Among the unlimited number of modern exs. we quote again from *Fundamenta* I, 398: *budaylık* 'wheat field' in Kümük. A *borluk* produces wine, is planted for the production of wine; interestingly enough, a 'vineyard' is not called '*üzümlük*'.

C_2) *yaylık* also denotes a place; its base does not denote what grows or is produced there, however, but the season during which one stays in the place: *yaylık*, attested in Ht VII 1 a 7, 6 b 4-5, 7 b 19 and 24, TT X 309 and 311, BT III 932 etc., is a 'summer hall'. Opposed to it is *kışlık*, attested in Maitr 101 v 14 and 218 r 4. *yaylag* and *kışlag*, discussed in section 2.73 above, should not be confused with these two: The two former are parts of residences, while the latter two belong to nomadic life.

C_3) The classes C_1 and C_2 are just special cases of a wider category, whose members denote places existing for what is denoted by the base noun. We have e.g. *agılık* 'treasury', documented in *UW* 63-65 (found also in HtFragm II 15, where HtPar writes *kizläglik* instead, in HamTouen 1,32 and TuoLuoNi 160 and 167). *barımlık* (M III text 6, 11,3_2) and *xömsölük* (TT VI 86) are hapax legomena which appear in binomials with the exceedingly common *agılık*; *agılık* is often associated with *xömsö* and *tsaŋ*. In the case of *xömsölük*, the suffix *+lXk* is pleonastic, as the Chinese phrase which serves as its base is a synonym of *agılık*; *+lXk*, however, makes it functionally transparent in Turkic. *yıgımlık* in M III text 30, 43,2_4 is mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS*. It is used in the sentence *ol yıgımlık kurug kalır* but need not signify 'cistern', as *kurug* can also signify 'empty'. The description of a house in TT VI 83-88, which contains the binomial *agılık xömsölük*, also has the sequence *aşlık küdänlik. küdänlik*, a hapax, should

179 The form which the *EDPT* entry for *biligsizlik* quotes from Suv should be read as *biligsizlig*, however: This is an ex. for 'metaphorical' *+lXg*.

be a 'guest room', whereas *aylık*, documented in the *UW* and found also in the *DLT* is the 'kitchen'. In TT IV A 45-46 the penitent says *ölütlük ätlik etdimiz nurgurdumuz ärsär, yagıglık tañrilik*[180] *etdimiz ärsär, . . .*, the respective terms being translated as "Schlachthöfe und Fleischläden . . . Schlachtopferplätze und Götzentempel". In Ham 5,9, *tañrilik* is not translated as 'sanctuary' but as "demeure des dieux", theological backing for this is proposed in a note. *tänrilik* is attested also in M I 27,33; 33,17-18 and 34,13 and 16; Ht IV 260, 750 and 1033 and *V6 b20, yagıglık*, which the *EDPT* confuses with *yagıglig*, also in U III 11,12₁ and 13₁. *+lXg* would make no sense in the phrase *yagıglık orun* of the latter two instances. We have, further, *bukaguluk* (BT II 1092, 1161 and 1172 and UigFalt 105-6) and *kunluk/kuy(ı)nlık* (the *EDPT* instances, ATSS II c r2 and Maitr II r5 and 58 v18), which both refer to prisons. Note that *ölütlük* 'slaughterhouse'[181] and *kunluk* 'penitentiary' are derived from the name of the activity going on in them, and not from the names of the characteristic objects to be found there; in this they differ from *ätlik* or *bukaguluk* and from the other nouns discussed above. Another such case is *körünçlük* 'tribune' (U II 22,3, BT III 949 and probably also Halén J2). *atlık* 'stable' from *at* 'horse' is a hap. quoted in the *UW*.

A third subgroup of C_3 is constituted by *ögänliklär* 'a canal system' (Ernte 41), *ölänlik yer* 'a marshy stretch of land' (TT V A 123), *kidinlik* 'an urban structure' (Maitr 138 r2 and 3 and 32 v6) and *akar suvluk* 'an area or place with flowing water' (ETŞ 8,4). These denote local groupings or arrangements of the entities denoted by the base nouns, rather than being places *in* which they can be found, or which have been set up to contain them.[182] By itself, *suvluk* (Ht IV 1034 and U III 38,28) signifies 'water vessel'; here, *+lXk* has a meaning closer to the nouns listed first under C_3. The only explanation I can suggest for *irklik* 'cooking pot' (Maitr 72 r9 and BT II 226) is to connect it with *irk* 'young ram', although cooking young rams is not the use to which the object is put in the descriptions of hell in which the term has been used.

kanlık 'kingdom' (IrqB LXIII) and *otaçılık* 'place of healing' (M I 27,33), finally, define the domains of activity and authority of the denotees of their bases. This type is also still productive today.

C/D) The 'arch of the foot' is *izängülük* in MaitrH II 5 a 10.[183] This is the part of one's foot *where* the stirrup (*üzängü*) comes, the part *reserved for* the stirrup, as it were. The *EDPT*, which has *üzängü* from the QB on, mentions modern north-

180 One of the two mss. writes this as *tänirlik*, taken into the text by the editors.
181 Entry missing in the *EDPT*.
182 *akar suvluk* is noteworthy also for having *+lXk* added to a participle-sattelite with kernel.
183 The translation of this as "Fußflächen" in *UW* 290 a top is inexact; that meaning is rendered by *ul* in Old Turkic.

east Turkic variants with an unrounded vowel in the first syllable. In *äligintä tütsüklük tuta bo tütsüküg urup mini okızun* (Suv 129,7-9), *tütsüklük* is an 'incense burner'. One can consider this to be a 'place for incense', but it would be more to the point to call it 'something *for* using incense'. The local meaning, which was in the foreground under C), is much weaker here. We thus come to the instrumental function of *+lXk*, found e.g. in *tärlik* 'sweat cloth' (Maitr 105 r4). In DLT fol. 240, *tärlik* is translated as 'the saddle felt which is put under the saddle cloth'. At least for the coiner(s) of this term, its main purpose must have been to absorb the horse's sweat; once the term had been coined and was of fixed application, however, this motivating idea might easily have crept out of sight. Another *+lXk* noun with functional motivation is *köligälik* 'parasol, sunshade' in Maitr 35 r10, 140 r2 and 30 and 224 r14; Suv 693,24 and 394,2. Before getting lexicalised, such functional *+lXk* forms could, of course, also be used adjectivally. Nor is lexicalisation a reason for the unlexicalised use of a term to disappear: *köligälik äd tavarlar* (Maitr 18 v3) are 'objects used for giving shade'.

D_1) In a group of *+lXk* forms signifying 'meant for X', X, the base, refers or at least alludes to persons. Most of the examples are adnominal. Attestation is again early. *özlük at* in BQ S12 and N11 and the equally runic IrqB XVII probably referred to the horses *reserved for* the private (öz) use of the king. Similar is *içgärülük ädgü yemiş* (read thus in KP 72,7) 'good fruit reserved for the (royal) court'. According to Tezcan's review of the *İndeks*, the instances of *täŋrilik* in QB 4202, 4204, 4225, 4581, 6475 and 6479 do not signify 'divinity, godhood' but 'for God, for the sake of God', as translated also by Dankoff. These instances therefore fit into this section, and are not to be confused with *täŋrilik* 'sanctuary'. This function of *+lXk* is clearly opposed to that of type B_1, although the bases come from the same domain: In that sense, *bäglik* is somebody one expects to become a *bäg*, somebody intended to be *bäg*; in this sense, on the other hand, *bäglik* would be something meant or intended to be for the *bäg*, i.e. for the use of somebody who already is a *bäg*. *kanlık böz* is 'cloth for the king', *tonluk böz*, on the other hand, 'cloth for making clothes' (par. B_2 above). *kamaglık bo buyan ädgü kılınç* (BT XIII 46,7; not '*kamaglıg*' as written there) is 'this good deed$_2$ meant for everybody'; the deed referred to is the printing of sūtras and their distribution to the public. Even more evident is the Suv 260,6 instance.

D_2) Living creatures and objects can, of course, also be assigned to places and not only to persons. This is the case with *içgärülük*, quoted above, if taken literally. This is also how I understand Höllen 19-20, *tumlug yüzlüg yäklär rakş(a)slar [. . .] tamuluklarıg kayınar eşiç içintä kämişürlär*: For, these are the sinners who have just arrived in hell; they are the souls who have been *consigned* to hell.

Ibid. 55, on the other hand, may perhaps be read as anta tüşmiş tamulug trinç an(t)glar, as the poor souls already belong to hell,[184] *yertünçülükçä* (BT I B 128) can mean 'according to what is *for* the (i.e. this) world', if read with °*k*°; 'according to what is worldly' would be *yertünçülügçä*. This type of *+lXk* forms appears to be the most difficult to distinguish from *+lXg* derivates, as context and base class are often of little help. Should we read Suv 693,18 as *bir uyalıg* with Zieme, e.g., or as follows: *kargalı ügili ikägü kayu üddä tüzülüp bir uyalık bolsarlar*... In the first case, the translation would be 'belonging to one nest'; according to my suggestion, 'so (friendly that) they would be fit to be in one nest'.

E) UW 115a has a single instance under altunlug B,b; I would like to read this as *altunluk* and understand it as *+lXk pretii*. The context is *satıgı yüz altunluk ol* (HtPar 158,1) 'that monk's dress worth 100 gold coins'. This would correspond to Republican Turkish *yüz liralık elbise*.

+lXk forms are expanded in several different ways. From those of types C_1/C_3 we have, first, *+çI* derivates. They denote persons working in the place characterised by these *+lXk* forms: *borlukçı* (KP 72,5; 78,7-79,1 and 79,2-3 and several times in USp) 'vine cultivator' (not the owner of a vineyard); *bukagulukçı*[185] (U I 9,17-18) 'jailer' and *yemişlikçi* (KP 75,4-5) 'orchard worker'.

Other +lXk forms are expanded by the couple +lXg/+sXz. The /k/ of *ürlüklüg* and *ürlüksüz*, which are particularly common in Buddhist contexts, is justified by Brāhmī writing in TT VIII F6. We have e.g. *ürlüklüg mäŋü* 'eternal$_2$' in Suv 62,15, *yertinçünüŋ ürlüksüzin bilmiş ukmış k(ä)rgäk* 'One should know and understand that the world is transient' in BT II 915. Further exs. of *ürlüksüz* can be found in Maitr 103 v3, BT II 175, TT X 540, Warnke 475, Suv 366,1-2, Ht X 344-5, ETŞ 10,255; 7,365 and 20,148; the word is discussed in the n. to the last-mentioned instance. Other cases, as the even more common *üzäliksiz* 'unsurpassed/unsurpassable', *ädliksiz* 'worthless' (Suv 612,2, M III text 8, 22,9$_1$ and HtPek 71 b5 quoted in UW 252b), *tämir orunluklug* (Tug 24) etc. are less important for us, as they do not fit into any grammatical pattern. *üzäliksiz* appears to be a literal loan translation of Skt. *anuttara*, and is used in a biverb with it in ETŞ 13,16.

There are very important differences between +lXk and +lXg: The former has a few quite clearly circumscribed semantic functions, the latter practically no meaning at all; the former tends much more strongly towards lexicalisation than the latter; the former is morphologically much less versatile than the latter.

184 Cf. *cehennemlik olmak, mahkemelik olmak* in Republican Turkish.
185 Not *bukagulugçı*, as the EDPT writes.

+lXg has key tasks in Old Turkic micro-syntax, whereas the functions of *+lXk* are mainly case-syntactic. It is therefore very important to support the differences emerging here through historical and comparative studies.

2.8 *Lack and negation*

+sXz, an exceedingly wide-spread and lively suffix, is added both to A) nouns and noun phrases and B) to adjectives.

A) We find *+sXz* with nouns of abstract content (e.g. *sansız* 'countless' in KT S12, Suci 5 etc.) as well as with concrete content (e.g. *suvsuz* 'without water' in BQ SW etc.). Denominal *+sXz* is opposed not only to *+lXg* (here treated in section 2.91) but also to *birlä*: *xrwx'nlar iş ayguçısız kirmäzün. xrwx'nlar iş ayguçılar birlä turup ötünzünlär* (ManMon 55-58) 'The x. should not enter without the foremen: the x. should stand forth together with the foremen and make their address.'

Denominal *+sXz* is used a) adnominally, b) adverbially and c) nominally. As the first-mentioned syntactic task is the most common one, one can say that denominal *+sXz* forms are adjectives.

a) Adnominal *+sXz* adjectives can be attributive or predicative. Attributive use: *içrä aşsız taşra tonsuz yavız yavlak bodunta üzä olortum* (KT E 26); predicative use: *buyrukı ymä biligsiz ärinç* (KT E 5); *buŋsuz boltaçı s[än]* (BQ N 14) 'You will be carefree'. Instrumental forms as the following remind one of the Russian predicative instrumental: *adasızın tudasızın ärzünlär* (TT VI 370); they do appear with full verbs as well, however. *+sXz* cannot automatically be translated as 'without' or '+less' and sometimes has more varied content. Note the translation of *nomsuz törösüz* as "dharma*feindlich*" in *UW* 195a, in *arıtı ymä kılmagu ol nomsuz törösüz kılıkıg* (Suv 562,20). In BT VIII A 98, *törösüz* is not just privative either: *tirig balık sögülmäktä ulatı törösüz işig işlädäçi kal kişi* is translated "ein verrückter Mensch, der lebendige Fische brät und andere gesetzes*widrige* Dinge verrichtet."

b) Adverbal *+sXz* forms are also common from the inscriptions on. They appear both in the instrumental and the base form, apparently indifferently. *buŋsuz*, *kärgäksiz* and *sansız* appear several times in the inscriptions in their simple form; in Uigur we have e.g. *üdsüz kolosuz adrılıp* . . . (TT VI 314). We thus find both *ärksiz* and *ärksizin* in adverbal function: *ıdu umadam, ärkim tükämädi; ärksiz ıdur m(ä)n* (KP 27,4) 'I have not been able to keep him back. My authority was not sufficient and I am letting him go against my will'. On the other hand, U IV A 160: *anıŋ yarlıkıŋa, ärksizin m(ä)n bo muntag yavlak ada kılur*

m(ā)n 'I bring about these so evil dangers by her command and unwillingly'. The following is also interesting: *uy kazıp tolu ört yalın koz kodup bälgüsüz agzın ürdi* (Maitr 58 r 17) 'He dug a hole, filled it with fire, flames and embers and covered its top, leaving no sign'.

The earliest instrumental form appears in Toñ 35: *Altun yışıg yolsızın aşdım,*[184] *Arıg ögüzüg käçigsizin käçdimiz* 'We climbed over the Altai mountains without any roads; we crossed over the Irtish river without any ford'. *yolsızın* can definitely not have had rounded vowels in its suffixes: They are written with front-s and front-n which, in back-vowel words in runic texts, are indications for adjacent /ı/. Cf. also *umugsızın inagsızın* in Suv 19,17 and *arıg ıdok umugsızın* in TT VII 40,18, which shows our suffix sequence added to a three-lexeme noun phrase. To judge by these forms, the suffix sequence appears to have gotten hypostatised in its unrounded variant, perhaps helped by an unrounded *+In*. On the other hand, seeing that *+sIzIn/+sIzXn* appears in the *earliest* attestation of the sequence and in one of the earliest Old Turkic texts, it seems possible that *+sXz* originally had /I/ instead of /X/; cf. also the evidently composite suffix *+sIrA-*, discussed below. In Uigur, we find not only *+sIzIn* or *+sIzXn* but also *+sXzIn*: *üzüksüzin* in U I 21,11 from the Suv, *ünsüzin* in BT III 204, Ht IV 282 and U II 76,3 (*Üdrät*) etc. These may, or may not, have submitted to the analogy of rather common simple forms like *üzüksüz* (q.v. on p. 259 below) and *ünsüz*. Uigur also has *+sXzXn*, as in *tuyumsuzun* in M III text 5, 11,8$_1$, Manichaean script. This, again, may or may not be an archaism (or, possibly, a dialect variant).

Adverbial *+sXzXn/+sIzXn* is common in Manichaean as well as in Buddhist texts. The gerund *-mAksXzXn*, discussed in Schulz, 1978: 81-82, is a special case of it.

Like any adjective in Old Turkic, *+sXz* adjectives can also be used nominally: Only *ilkisizdäbärü* (TT IV A 23) and *ilkisizdäbärüki . . . tsuy kılınç* (TT U 62) are in need of any explanation: They signify 'from time immemorial', literally 'since that which has no beginning'.

In Old Turkic, adjectives are often used as abstracts where, in Qarakhanid

singular is probably due to attraction by the previous sentence, *sü yorıtdım*, where it is read. Tacitly emended to *asdımız* in T. Tekin, 1968: 251, but not in his glossary.

Among Old Turkic and other typical Turkic languages, the distinction between nouns and adjectives must be relegated to pragmatics. Nouns are such lexemes as are primarily and most frequently used for referring, whereas adjectives mainly describe, qualify or predicate. It does not seem possible to carry out a clear delimitation of the two lists; rather, there is a continuum with intermediate stages and uncertainties. The question is not whether a given lexeme can be applied to nominal or solely to adjectival use, but as what the addressee or reader takes it to be if the text gives him no clues for his choice. This is, in short, a question of marked vs. unmarked construction. Such a distinction can hardly be verified with a dead language. We *can* find it in many, but by no means in all cases.

Turkic, *+lXk* is added to them. Nominalised *+sXz* adjectives are usually abstracts, e.g. *idi tigisizdä . . . olorguluk ol* (ETŞ 8,12) 'One must sit in perfect silence', literally 'in no-sound-at-all-ness'.[188] Further *kirsiziŋ nomoŋa* (TT VIII A 20) 'in the dharma of purity'. Concrete adjectival and abstract nominal *+sXz* forms can appear one beside the other: *ögsüz yatu. ögsüzi arasınta laylag sözläp yana agrıkanıp . . .* (Suv 17,21-22) 'She was lying unconscious. During her unconsciousness she muttered and whimpered . . .'. A possessive suffix added to such an abstract can refer to a person or to a place; this creates nexus-nouns expressing non-existence: *toyınsızı dintarsızı üzä . . .* (Ht IV 349-351) 'because there are no monks or priests there'.

Nominalised abstracts in *+sXz* can also qualify nouns. *ürlüksüz sakınç* (Ht X 344-5) is not 'an unstable thought' but 'thought about the transience (of things)', *kertgünçsüz töz* not a 'belief-lacking root' but 'the root (or germ) of disbelief'. In translations of Buddhist doctrine, the complementary set is also expressed through *+sXz*: *çın kertü m(ä)nsiz ärür* (BT VIII B 151) 'It is the true non-I'. *m(ä)nsiz sakınçlar* (Maitr T III 118 β // 79 v14), on the other hand, has been translated as "Gedanken der Ichlosigkeit". This diversity can be explained through the need of translating all the *a(n)-* compounds of Skt. by the same means; still, this couldn't have happened against rules of Old Turkic grammar.[189]

B) When *+sXz* is added to adjectives, it forms antonyms; here the opposite of *+sXz* is *+Ø*, not *+lXg*. Exs.: *ät'öz ärsär bäksiz mäŋüsüz tetir* (Suv 613,14-15) 'As for the body, it is said to be infirm and not eternal'; *kayu sözlägülük savlarda çınsız kertüsüz savlıg bolmak* (BT II 258) 'to be a person of unreliable and untruthful words in any matters one is to discuss'. *äzüg çınsız y(a)rpsız ärürlär* (Warnke 289-290) is translated as "Sie sind trügerisch, unwahr und unbeständig".[190] See the *UW* for *adınsıgsız* 'immutable'; it comes from the adjective *adın+sıg* 'different' but signifies 'something which will never be different', as it were, and not 'not different'. Deadjectival *+sXz* often corresponds to the English or German prefix *un-*; cf. also *udgurak udguraksız* (Buddhāv H 33), = Skt. *niya-ta-aniyata*. One could stop with this description, or subordinate type B) to type A) by declaring the bases here to be in fact *nominalised* adjectives. Indeed, e.g. *çın*, whose derivate was quoted above, signifies not only 'true' but also 'truth' and

188 Already in Old Turkic, not only negating words but also *+sXz* is intensified by *idi*: *idi oksuz Kök Türk* (KT E 3 and BQ E 4) does probably signify 'the K.T. who are not divided into any sub-tribes at all'.

189 Thus, *ürlüksüz sakınç*, just quoted, is the equivalent of *anitiyat sakınç*, (Abhi 1441, quoted *UW* 145a s.v. *anitiyat*), from Skt. *a-nitya-tā*. Interestingly, the translator of Abhi first wrote *ürlüksüz körüg*, which he then decided to delete and replace by the expression mentioned.

190 Cf. *baka tüsi çınsızı* 'the irreality of frog's hair' in BT I D 137.

'veracity'. One might add that *çın* was borrowed from Chinese, which also has these different possibilities; *kertü* and *yarp* are Turkic adjectives, however. Deverbal adjectives, moreover, show the same semantic-functional patterns. An example: *sımla-g*, q.v. in the chapter on *-(X)g*, signifies both 'careless' and 'carelessness'. When *sımtagsız* (three times in Pothi; Suv 247,14-16, Maitr etc.) is translated as 'free from neglectfulness', this can be considered to be a privative antonym-forming function of *+sXz* is well represented in the inscriptions. In KT E3, e.g., we find the sentence *bäglärı ymä bodunı ymä tüz ärmiş*; ib. E6 we read: *bäglärı bodunı tüzsüz üçün, Tavgaç bodun tävligin kürlüg<in> üçün . . . Türk bodun ellädük elin ıçgınu ıdmış*. 'Since the lords and the people were in discord . . .' is the opposite of their being in 'concord'. Consider the passage *tört bulunǰaku bodunug kop baz kıldım, yagısız kıldım, kop manǰa körti* (KT E30, BQ E24). Clauson translates *yagısız* as 'free from hostilities', dealing with *yagı* as an abstract. The sentence should be considered a sequence to *kop bulun kop yagı ärmiş* (KT E2, BQ E3), however. T. Tekin correctly translates *yagısız* as 'unhostile, harmless'; enmity might have been expected from the subjugated peoples themselves, not from third parties. In other contexts, *yagısız* might presumably have been used to describe somebody as having no enemies. In the first case, the base would have functioned more like an adjective, in the second case more like a noun. It is attested in these two functions, the former in the sentence from KT E2 quoted above, the second in *süsi böri täg ärmiş, yagısı koñ täg ärmiş* in KT E12 and BQ E11.

One could not do all this with numerals, apparently, to judge by the term *iki ärmäz nom kapıgı* 'the gate of *dharma* which is not double' in TT VI 430. The reason one did not add *+sXz* to number words might have been that one did not think of the number concept as abstract. In any case, we here see the unbound counterpart of antonym-forming *+sXz* to have been *ärmäz*, which was used also whenever such negation bore full predicativity. The fully predicative counterpart of denominal *+sXz*, on the other hand, is *yok*.

+sXz is added not only to lexemes but also to lexeme strings. If the parts of a string are in coordination, *+sXz* can be 'divided among them' and appear twice. This is the case with *çınsız kertüsüz*, quoted above from BT II 258, which comes from the binomial *çın kertü*. If *+sXz* is to be added to a predicative or attributive hierarchical structure, it can only appear once. In the following ex. we find the just mentioned binomial *çın kertü*: *nomlarnıŋ çın kertü tözsüzin tüpsüzin adırtlıg bilirlär* (Suv 386,7). According to *UW* 137a, this is to be translated as "Sie wissen genau, daß alle Dharmas ohne wahrhaftige Wurzel und Grund sind", which means that the bracketing should be *nomlarnıŋ* (*çın kertü töz*)*süzin*. In the following ex., *+sXz* is added to a noun with a relative construction: *ançak(ı)ya münägülük mün-*

süz ärip . . . (ETŞ 15,30) 'You are free from even the smallest fault one might blame on you, and . . .'. The focus is on *ançak(ı)ya*, which also qualifies *mün*; one would have used *yok* instead of *+sXz* if the negation had been fully predicative. Here, now, is *+sXz* added to an infinitive with adverb: *yanala tugmaksız nom* (BT I D 216) 'the dharma of not being born again'.

Noteworthy is the application of *+sXz* to verbless clauses, presumably by nominalising their nexus: *bo on satır kümüşni bitig kılmış kün üzä m(ä)n Kaytsu Tu tükäl tartıp alum. m(ä)n Çıntsu Şila ymä bir ägsüksüz tükäl bertim* (UjgRuk FenTen II 5. *+sXz* has been added to the sentence *Bir ägsük* 'One is missing'; I 19) '. . . I have given all, not one missing'. The same expression appears also in subordinating this in the form '*bir ägsük ärmäzkän*' would, I think, have given too much prominance and independence to its content by making it into the description of a concomitant state of affairs.

+sXz sometimes appears to interact with morphology. Its relative looseness within the juncture hierarchy of bound morphemes is evidenced e.g. in the form *içtinsiz* (TT VIII A 4), which corresponds to Skt. *bāhya* 'external'.[191] We have *+lAr+sXz* in BuddhUig II 641-2, in the phrase *beş paramıtlarsız* 'without the five *pāramitās*'. Actually, of course, *+sXz* has only been added to the whole fixed phrase *beş paramıtlar*. Their number (and hence their plurality) is a *characteristic* of the pāramitās, as of the *three musketeers* or the *heiligen drei Könige*. In Maitr 48 v 7, *+sXz* is added to an ordinal form: *kop kamag nomlar üzä ikintisiz ärklig türklüg* 'ruling$_2$ over all$_2$ the *dharmas* in a way which has no second'. *ilkisiz* is also based on an ordinal, but that was probably less transparent even to Old Turkic consciousness than *ikinti*. In one rather late text, *+sXz* fulfills an important condition for being considered a postposition: It governs a pronoun in its accusative form. *3 uguşta munısız näŋ 1 nom orun yok ärür* (ETŞ 12,47) 'In all three sets there is not a single place of doctrine without this'.[192] In Qarakhanid Turkic, the accusative governed by postpositions is replaced by the genitive. Accordingly, we also have *anıŋsız* 'without him' (QB 19). Another pronominal derivate is *mänsiz* *bolmak* in Kinkashō śl. C,c, which corresponds to Skt. *nir-ātmatā* but is by no means a loan-translation. The sentence *yok män, yok mäniŋlik* was discussed above, s.v. *+lXk*, type B_2). Nominalising the nexus, one gets *m(ä)nsizin mäniŋliksizin ymä* (ShōAgon 1,95), in the accusative. Since the two terms fit together into one concept and are in coordination, they can be group-negated: *ken käligmä ädgü üdtäki kutlu[g tın]l(ı)glar m(ä)n mäniŋliksiz bolga[yla]r* (Maitr

191 *içtin* here being the adjective 'internal', *+sXz* has been used to form its antonym. *+tin* is not the ablative ending, here, but a deictic formative (not dealt with in this work).

192 Cf. on the other hand *täg* which, although a real postposition, governs a form with pronominal *+n* in some cases like *antag*.

134 v10 = BT IX 84,10₁) 'The blessed creatures of good times to come in the future will be without "I am" or "is for me"'. Cf. *mänsiz sakınç* in Maitr 79 v17 and the n. in BT IX 201.

In TT VIII E48, the editor takes *+sXz* to have been added to an expression after the particle *Ok*. The word so read is probably *ogsuz* 'without occasion or chance'.

The addition of *+sXz* to denominal bases differs in nothing from its addition to simple ones. Cf. *ädrämsiz* (BT VIII A 401) 'unvirtuous' from **ärdämsiz*, which is no longer transparent with relation to *är* 'man'; or *adınsıgsız* (interpreted above), which, together with the *hapax ikisigsiz* (BT XIII 20,16), is an ex. of *+sIg+sXz*.

The so common *+çI* has very few *+sXz* derivates, mentioned on p. 118 above. *+lXk+sXz* forms have been mentioned in the chapter on *+lXk*; cf. also *mäninlik-siz* just discussed. *+lXg+sXz* is rare, *+lXg* and *+sXz* being, in a sense, opposed members of the same paradigm: They can describe derivates as having, or as not having, what the base denotes. There is also the antonym-forming *+sXz*, however, found e.g. in *kamaglıgsız* 'distinctive; extraordinary' (Suv 61,19, 69,21 and 311,3, BT III 90, Abhi 94 b8 and BT XIII 37,3, in the n. to which the word is discussed). This is the opposite of *kamaglıg* 'common, not special' (Suv 274,5).

With deverbal nouns, on the other hand, *+sXz* expansion is both common and productive. Let us first mention the simple cases, in which the derived base is devoid of verbal force. *tamga in altun t(a)mgasız ıdok kut . . . ad* (Princes V 18) "le titre de Iduq Qut . . . sans le sceau d'or", for instance, must have been barely transparent. It is doubtful whether the base of the second word in *bulunsuz buç-gaksız* (TT VI 427) 'angleless and cornerless' is derived from *bıç-* and belongs to the formation with *-gAk*. It is shown below that *kötgi* comes from *köt-*; in the following sentence it is expanded with *+sXz*: *törtünç, uysuz kötgisiz tüz sünüki ärür* (MaitrGeng 5 a13)[193] 'Fourthly, he has smooth bones, without holes or protuberances'. The bases of *sakıgsız* and the commoner *sansız*, which it often accompanies, are not too transparent either. This binome is discussed at the end of section 3.103 together with other exs. of the sequence *-Xş+sXz*. For all four attested *-XşsXz* forms we have the corresponding *-Xş* bases and *-Xş+lXg* derivates. *yetinsiz* in Hochzeit 23 is dubious, and *tütünsüz* appears in a proverb in the DLT: *ot tütünsüz bolmas, yigit yazoksuz bolmas*. ThS III b 3 is probably to be read as *tütünçs[üz ot yok]* with Hamilton and Bazin. The two proverbs do not have identical content, as *tütün* is 'smoke' and *tütünç* the 'emission of smoke'.

The base of *ögdisiz*, attested in *ögdisiz bizni täg nomçı* (Shö II b 15) belongs to a rare formation but is transparent. In their translation of an other ex., Bang and Gabain transfer the negative content of *ögdisiz* onto the verb base: *aşnukı ikigükä*

193 *uysuz* wrongly written as '*ösüz*', *sünüki* as '*sünäki*'.

tayaklıg tirig bolmak ögdisiz ol. kertü köŋülin b(ä)k turup ölmäk ögdülüg tetir (TT V B 110-111) "Sich auf die ersten beiden stützend leben ist tadelnswert; seinen Glauben festhaltend sterben ist lobenswert". *täŋäşisiz*, attested several times and discussed together with *täŋäşi*, indicates that the *+şI* formation was adjectival and not adverbial. Another instance of *+şI+sXz* is *kerşüsüz*, where, however, the first suffix has been assimilated to the converb forms. *täŋgäşigsiz kutlug idok Babaça* *aga* (InscrOuig IV 11) 'the peerless, blessed and saintly princess Babaça' is just a misspelling of *täŋäşisiz* in a very late text; '*täŋ käzigsiz*' would be meaningless in this context.

adırtsız, which is treated in the *UW*, is very common; not less common, however, are *adırt* and *adırtlıg*. *adırtsız* should be seen in the functional and semantic context of these two, and can by no means be considered a direct derivate from *adır-*. The same can be said about *irtsiz bertsiz ... känt* (Maitr 3 r19), where *bertsiz*, at any rate, is transparent: The binomial *irt bert* refers to some taxes, and the latter no doubt comes from *ber-* 'to give'. The semantic relationship between *boşgutlug* 'śaikṣa', q.v. below in chapter on *-(U)t*, and *boşgutsuz* corresponding to Skt. *aśaikṣa*, is more complicated, although *+sXz* here has the clear Skt. counterpart *a-*. *boşgutsuz*, attested thirteen times in Maitr, in Ht VII 2 b25 and in Abhi B 52 a6 (5416), refers to 'one who *no longer needs* religious training', as distinct from the *śaikṣa*, 'one who is undergoing training, disciple'. *+sXz* does not otherwise denote 'discontinuation of need', but appears to have been chosen here as a calque on the Skt. form.[194] *täpirtsiz*, *tigirtsiz* and *käŋirtsiz* are discussed in section 3.108; their *°t* bases have not appeared. The instances of the sequences *-Xg+sXz* and *-Ok+sXz*, discussed under *-Xg* and *-Ok* respectively, are very common; they can practically always be shown to come from the respective *-Xg* and *-Ok* forms, however, and not directly from the base verbs. They are numerous only because there are so many deverbal *-Xg* and *-Ok* nouns and adjectives. The same can be said about the other classes of *+sXz* derivates from deverbal nouns and adjectives mentioned above, viz. that they do *not* come directly from the verbal bases.

We might here also mention some triple-formative forms appearing in the late verses of ETŞ: *ötügçisiz adınlarka umug bolayın* (9,108; *-Xg+çI+sXz*), translated in the chapter on *+çI*; *küsänçigsizin mäŋi tägingülük ol anı täg orunlarta* (8,31; *küsä-(X)nç+sIg+sXz+Xn*).

As *+sXz* can be added to purely nominal binomials, it can equally well be added to deverbal ones; e.g. *tiliksiz küsüşsüz bol-* (Ht V 12 a18) and *ämgäksiz tolgagsız* (TT VI 280). The exs. are innumerable.

The sequences *-mAk+sXz*, *-Xnç+sXz* and *-gU+lXk+sXz* are discussed in special chapters: They serve as negative verbal nouns, *-gUlXksXz* and *-mAksXz*

194 Based on information found in the n. TT V BKud 56.

being rather close to participial function. Since *-gUlXk* and *-mAk* belong to morphology and not to formation, these forms give further evidence for the versatility of *+sXz*. *-XmsXz*, which is not discussed separately but under *-Xm*, is rather rare but also appears to have functioned rather independently. *-gU* also comes from morphology and not from formation, and is also occasionally expanded with *+sXz*. Such forms are used adnominally as in *bilä ugusuz indraçal tor* (ETŞ 9,47) 'the unknowable net of indräjala';[195] nominally, as in *akıgsızıg işlätgüsüzüg bu-run-* (Suv 317,20 *ap.* UW 80b) "sich üben . . . im Sein ohne Āsrava, im Sein ohne Empirie, . . ."; or predicatively, as in *sözlägüsüz ol* (Ht VII 1880 = 18 b17).

Expansions of *+sXz* are not too common in Old Turkic. *+sXz+lXk* is found not in Old Turkic, but in the QB, and there only with abstract-forming *+lXk*: E.g. *uvutsuzluk* 'shamelessness', *täŋsizlik*, *körksüzlük* 'ugliness', *igsizlik* 'health'. This corresponds to the abstract use of denominal unexpanded *+sXz* in Old Turkic. The only attested expansion in inscriptional and Uigur Turkic is *+sXz+lXg*; most of the exs. are actually *-Xg+sXz+lXg* forms: *]änsizlig [* (M III text 9, 25,5s) in fragmentary and obscure context;[196] *biligsizlig* (ShōAgon 1,233, Suv 101,16 and BT XIII 13,94 and 126 and 17,11); *arıgsızlıg* (TT VIII D 34, 35 and 36, Ht IV 1544; BT III 301-2, Suv 613,17 and Maitr 202 v12) and *tapsızlıg* (Warnke 562). Among these, *arıgsızlıg*, the most common one, should be excluded: *arıgsız* is a euphemism for 'excrement', *arıgsızlıg* therefore 'soiled by, or characterised by excrement (or the like)'. The others appear to be derived from abstract *+sXz* nouns of the type A,c, e.g. *biligsizlig kılınçlarım öçzün alkınzun* (BT XIII 13,126) "Meine Taten aus Unwissenheit mögen erlöschen und verschwinden". The *+lXg* can also be the one used for metaphor and appositions: *biligsizlig karangu üzä kōŋülüm ürtülü . . .* (Suv) 'My heart is covered by the darkness of ignorance and . . .'. In all cases, both *+sXz* and *+lXg* have their normal tasks. *+sXz+lXg* is no sequence with an independent semantic development.

+sXz is one of the loosest formatives; it is sometimes like a postposition in juncture, sometimes like a conjunction in its functions. Why can't it be considered a case suffix? Because it is endocentric both in function and meaning: The function of a lexeme in a sentence or in a phrase is not determined by whether it ends in *+sXz*. *+sXz* only modifies its bases in meaning: *igsiz* is semantically equivalent to *äsän*.

+sXz is probably related to the denominal verb formative *+sIrA-*, q.v. below.

195 Together with the vowel converb, the old verb *u-mA-* got fused very early into the impossibilitative form. Nominalising the verb, this *-mA-* is transformed into *+sXz*.

196 If the second letter is damaged, this might be *ädsizlig*.

As the title indicates, the formatives discussed here do not add to the contents of their bases any meaning which lends itself to uniform formulation. The section comprises *+lXg*, the exceedingly productive and syntactically important morpheme of pure concatenation, and a series of poorly documented derivative elements; those may in the future get to be transferred to other sections, if we come to understand them better.

2.91 *+lXg*

This may be the most common suffix of formation. One hesitates to call it a formative, as its products are usually not meant to be lexemes by the speaker/writer and not understood as such by the addressee. It can be added to whole constructions and often corresponds to conjunctions of other languages.

+lXg and *+lXk* practically always look identical in Uigur writing, and their front vowel variants are written in the same way in Arabic script; neither does Tibetan writing distinguish between final /k/ and /g/. This can be a source of confusion.

+lXg always shows fourfold harmony. The word written as *kuinlüg* in Warnke 105, for instance, should therefore be read either as *künlüg* or as *kuynlüg*. Although being one of the loosest formatives, *+lXg can* form lexemes, like *uzun-tonlug* 'woman'. In some such instances and where the base ends in /l/, the resulting geminate gets simplified: Forms like *tükälig* (six times in Maitr and ManTürk-Frag 24), *bäçälig* (BT V 21,456), *tugılıg* (Shō VII a5) and *köŋülüg* (U III 39,25 and UigOn II A 1) have no doubt lost their *l* not only graphically, but phonetically as well.[197] Thus, the suggestion made long ago to connect *ulug* 'great' with *ul* 'realm' with the formative *+lXg*.

The general function of *+lXg* appears to have been the simple concatenation of two noun phrases. It should be noted, however, that Old Turkic has four to five other means to do this. Not all of these need have been available to users of the language simultaneously, nor need they all have been in competition with *+lXg* for all contexts and uses. They are the following:

1) Genitive of the first member, possessive suffix added to the second: *tonnuŋ biti* (M I 8,14) 'clothes' louse'; the context makes it clear that the louse is a generic one.

197 The context does not permit any of these to be interpreted as accusative forms.

2) Base form of the first member, possessive suffix with the second one: *kelän käyik muyuzï* (TT I 42) 'the horn of a unicorn'; *sansar ämgäki* (U II 81,68) 'the sufferings of saṃsāra'.

3) Base form of both members. E.g. *at köz* 'carnal eye', to which we return below; *kutrulmak küç* (ETS 13,10).

4) In the earliest and in the latest texts but not in 'classical' Uigur we find instances in which the first member is in the genitive case without the second one bearing any possessive suffix: *yegän Silig bägiŋ kädimlig torug at* (KT E 33) 'the armoured bay horse of (the royal) nephew *Silig bäg*'; *Tavgaç kaganıŋ içräki bädizçlg ï(d)ï* (KT S 12) 'He sent the court decorators of the Chinese emperor'; *kaŋnıŋ agïznn ünüp ögnüŋ agïzça kirip* . . . (BT VII A 262-3) 'coming out from the father's mouth and entering by the mother's mouth . . .'.

5) In a few instances we apparently have a determiner with *+lXg* qualifying a kernel with the 3rd person possessive suffix. The only more or less certain example of this construction occurs in UigTot, a very late text: In UigTot 254 we have the following: *'äŋilki bilgülük uguşnıŋ käzigi, ikinti bışrunguluk darnılıg käzigi, üçünç ulug bilgä bilig twgguluk ulug bilgä bilig käzigi, üzlünçütä kizläkligniŋ käzigi ärür.* The second member of this list, which the editors translate as "die Reihe der zu verwirklichenden Dhāraṇīs", appears in parallel with two constructions of type 1) and one of type 2). The other instances are just as well, or perhaps better, read with *+lXk* instead of *+lXg*. In *ν(ι)rhar sanl(ι)g sagdıçl(ι)k t(a)varın alnm(ι)z* (TT IV A 44), *sagdıçlık* has been read with °*g*. *sagdıçlık tavarı* should, however, probably be translated as 'community property', with the first word representing *+lXk* of type C_3, as *kanlık*, *otaçılık* and *küdänlik*. Note, on the other hand, that two of the mss. attested for the passage have *sangik* from Skt. *saṃghika* instead of the word we are discussing.[198] In case this and not the Turkic word constitutes the original reading, *sagdıçlıg* (and not *sagdıçlık*) may have been created as a loan-translation, to reflect the derived adjective nature of *saṃghika* < *saṃgha*. *dyanlıg suvı* (Warnke 224), translated "Wasser der Versenkung", finally, might also be read with *dyanlık*, giving '. . . zur/für die Versenkung'.

Detailed treatment of the above four or five constructions should be left to the syntax of case and determination. Where a genuine possessive relationship between kernel and sattelite can be made out, the *+lXg* construction usually represents the case where the kernel is the possessor, the sattelite the owned thing; the constructions 1) and 2), where the kernel is marked with a possessive suffix, on the other hand, the case where the kernel is the possessed, the sattelite the possessor. The rare examples of type 4) go with 1) and 2) in this, while type 3) is

198 The editors misunderstood this word and gave it a Turkic etymology.

normally reserved for apposition. We have already seen from the UigBot 254 passage, however, that the different types can alternate; here is one more example for such an alternation: BT I D 143-149 lists the five classes of eyes; these are, with their Skt. equivalents,

āt köz	*māṃsacakṣus*
tāŋridām köz	*divyacakṣus*
nomlug köz	*dharmacakṣus*
bilgä biliglig köz	*prajñācakṣus*
burxanlıg köz	*buddhacakṣus.*

In Skt., only the first element in *divyacakṣus* is a denominal adjective, and corresponds to such a one in Turkic as well. In three other cases, the Skt. compound is rendered by a *+lXg* syntagm, and only in one case by the term *āt kōz*. Why? Perhaps because, since 'flesh' and 'eye' both come from the domain of the 'body', one might have interpreted **ätlig köz* not as 'carnal eye' but as 'fleshy eye' or 'eye containing flesh'. The choice may thus have been lexical. We find free alternation with the same lexeme as well: Both *ünüşlüg yol* (Suv 244,21) and *ünüş yol* (same text, 361,5) signify 'the road of ascent'.[199] One gets the impression that a genitive qualifier refers to an actual and individualised possessor, whereas a *+lXg* form classifies and assigns characteristics. Even Buddha himself is made to say in TT X 199: *ämti muna burxanlıg küçümin taşgaru üntürüp* . . . 'Behold me now bringing forth my Buddha-mightiness and . . .'. The context makes clear enough that Buddha is referring to his own might; *burxanlıg* serves to remind us what *kind* of might that is.

Here a few examples of how *+lXg* forms have been translated into German: *nom ärdinilig käzig* (TT V B 57) "die Reihenfolge *der* Gesetzes-Kleinodien"; *burxan kutılıg küsüş* (U IV A 271) "der Wunsch *nach* der Buddhaschaft"; *maytrılag ädgü üd* (Maitr 100 r 10-11) "die gute Zeit, *in der* Maitreya erscheinen soll" and so forth. Such semantic versatility is otherwise known from compounds in old Indo-European languages, and from modern German as well. Exceedingly interesting is the formational, syntactic and semantic similarity between *+lXg* and Tokharian *+ṣi/ṣse*, exhaustively described by Zimmer, 1982-3. The parallelism between the two conjunction-formatives, which is maintained in details like the metaphorical use described below, has no likeness in other Indo-European languages. Zimmer, 1982-3: 285 considers that these might be "weitere Indizien für die starke Beeinflussung des Tocharischen von seiten einer (oder mehrerer?) nichtidg. Sprache(n) (vgl. Gruppenflexion, sekundäre Kasus)". As Uigur is also isolated among the Turkic languages in the extraordinarily rich use which it makes of

199 Unless, again, the former is to be read with *+lXk*, to be translated 'the road leading to ascent'.

+lXg, all we can say is that it must be an areal phenomenon common to Uigur and Tokharian. An Uigur-Tokharian constrastive grammar would doubtlessly be of immense interest.

We can discern the following uses to which +lXg is put:

A_1) In many cases, the content of the sattelite is ASSIGNED to the content of the kernel, e.g. *didımlıg başlar* (Maitr 2 v23) 'crowned heads'. This assignment is usually closer than that of acquired possessions; among the innumerable examples, we might just add *adalıg orunlar* (TT III 139) 'dangerous places' and the sentence *tokuz yaşıŋa azıglıg toŋuz ölürti* (KÇ 18) 'At the age of nine he killed a tusked boar'.

A_2) Often, the sattelite is further qualified; such qualifications are often more important for communication than the sattelite itself. *ala atlıg yol* (or *yul*) *tâŋri* (Irq B II) 'the god of the road/luck/the spring with a dappled horse' is one example. We distinguish between five subtypes, here:

Subtype 1: The sattelite is qualified by a numeral, as e.g. *tokuz älig şloklug Kimxoki nom* (BT I A_2 3) 'the Vajracchedikā sūtra, which contains 49 gāthas'.

Subtype 2: The sattelite is inalienably owned by the kernel: *altun kanatlıg talım kara kuş* (IrqB III) 'golden-winged *garuḍa*'; *altun öŋlüg . . . sıgun* (U IV C58) 'the deer with the golden colour'. Sattelites containing *atlıg* 'named' are particularly common. The qualifying lexeme can be an adjective (e.g. *sukançıg tözlüg nom* (BT I D 197) 'a pleasant-natured doctrine') or a noun (e.g. *v(a)çır lakşanlıg* (U II 60,1_1) 'having the *vajra* as a characteristic mark'; *urı oglanlıgävçi* (Heilk II 2,65) 'a woman with male offspring').

Subtype 3: The sattelite is a verbal abstract whose agent is the kernel, e.g. *tärs biliglig tınlıglar* (TT VI 24); *ayıg kılınçlıg tınlıglar* (ib. 45); *yavlak sakınçlıg rakşas* (U IV A 66).

Subtype 4: The sattelite is one of a small group of elements serving as prop-words. Thus *täŋlig*, e.g. in *bo balıklar sanı näçä täŋlig ärür?* (Suv 601,3) 'How is the quantity of these fish?' and *nomlagu idiz orun näçä täŋlig k(ä)rgäk?* (BT I A_1 7) 'How should the pulpit for sermons be?'. Thus also *yaŋlıg* and its near-synonym *türlüg*: *muntag yaŋlıg kamag türlüg yazoklarım* (BT XIII 13,111) 'my various such sins'. In TT VIII A 2, *nä yaŋlıg ymä* corresponds to Skt. *yavac ca*, i.e. to a purely pronominal form. *bir yaŋlıg* 'uniform (adj.)' is attested a number of times.

Subtype 5: Few expanded *+lXg* constructions do not belong to one of the above-mentioned types. One example would be *agulug yılanlıg tamu* (Tug 41) 'the hell of poisonous snakes'. Some of these instances might nevertheless belong there, if the subtypes are defined accordingly. Thus, *ton* in *yūrūŋ tonlug duntar* (M III 30,10) 'a white-clothed elect' and *eş* in *b(i)ligsiz eşleg bolmak* (TT VIII B 6) 'to have a foolish companion' are semantically bivalent: One is always *somebody's* companion, and clothes are thought of as *somebody's* clothes. These instances might therefore belong to subtype 2.

Type **A)** of the use of *+lXg* stands in competition with the 'başıbozuk' construction, what might be called the Old Turkic *bahuvrīhi*, of which the following may serve as examples: *savı sūzūk köŋüli katıg tetmiş siz* (Ht VII 2103) 'Your are said to be of clear discourse and of firm heart.' *közi yarok ıdoklarka bargıl yakın* (ETŞ 12,18) 'Go close to the bright eyed saints.' As far as we can tell, the same content might also have been expressed by **sūzūk savlıg*, **katıg kōŋüllüg* and **yarok közlüg* respectively. In the following Buddhistic *cui bono*, the recurrent chiastic opposition between the constructions hightens the rhetorical effect: *ç(a)xşapatıg ayayu tutdaçılar uzun yaşlıg bolgu ārip inçip yana özi kısga bolmışları közünür; yavız y(a)vlak [ölü]tçi etitçi kişilär kısga yaşlıg bolgu ârip özi uzun bolmışları közünür; arıg süzük köŋüli yıgıglıg [kişi]lär artiŋü bay barımlıg bolgu ārip inçip yana çıgay [. . .]glig bolmışları közünür* (Warnke 434-439).

B) In the very numerous examples of Type **A)**, it is the content of the sattelite which is 'assigned' to that of the kernel. In a few other cases, this directionality is not so evident. Take *tınl(ı)glarıg buyan ādgü kılınçlıg ulug asıgka tägürgälir üçün* . . . (SuvStockh 4), translated ". . . alle Lebewesen zu einem großen *Puṇya*$_2$-Gewinn gelangen lassen". The content of the kernel obviously follows and comes from the content of the sattelite, but there is no possession or assignment as with type **A)**. *yertinçülüg suv* 'worldly water' in Maitr 21 r 11 shows INVERSE assignment, since water belongs to this world and not the world to the water. *+lXg* has clearly been added to the base noun as the need for an adnominal counterpart for it arose; *+lXg* is here a contentless adjective suffix, like the *nisba* in Arabic.

C) *yertinçülüg suv* is not very far from the LOCAL use of *+lXg*. First the following: *Samtso açarı birlä [bir] çambudvıplıg*[200] *ärip* . . . (Ht V 172) 'belonging to [one] *jambudvīpa* together with Master *Tripiṭaka* . . .'. *balıklıg bodun* or *balıklıg kişilär* meaning 'the people of the town' is common, appearing, among other

200 The editor wrote the word in the lacuna as *bu*, but *bir* fits Old Turkic phraseology better.

places, in Ht IV 540 and four times in the Maitr. *tamuluglar* (Maitr 68 r 8 and 69 v 9 and elsewhere) are the 'dwellers of hell'. This *+lXg* is added also to the proper names of places, as it is to this day: in Ht IV 1736, the translator describes himself as *Beş Balıklıg*, i.e. from the well-known town of *Beş Balık*; the Byzantines are *Vromluglar* (Ht IV 966), the elite of Benares (Maitr 7 v 2) *Bar(a)nasl(ı)g bay bädük kişilär*. PrièreMan mentions a *Solmıl(ı)g Alp Totok Ögrünçü y(e)gän* and a certain *Küsänlig iç buyruk*, and somebody refers to his (or one of his) son(s)-in-law as *Kam(ı)ll(ı)g küdägümüz*. These designations could identify either where one lived or where one was born.

D) A TEMPORAL +lXg is also attested, but weakly: *tavışgan yıllıg takıgu yıllıg kişi* (TT VII 14,36-38) is 'a person born in the year of the hare or one born in the year of the hen'. Cf. *kutlug tiŋ şıpkanlıg to[ŋ]guz yıl yetinç ay* (UigFalt 135) 'the seventh month in the blessed year of the swine, which is *ding* in the Shigan series'. This, however, is primarily an apposition, as in type G.

E) In TT VIII A 10, ayıg atlıg korkınç signifies 'fear of a bad name'. The bracketing being *(ayıg at)lıg korkınç*, the SOURCE of fear is *ayıg at*. This abstract relationship is also expressed by *+lXg*.

F) Some +lXg forms refer to the MATERIAL of which something is made, e.g. *kümüşlüg tirgüklär* (Maitr 138 r 11) 'silver pillars' and *tämirlig tag* (U II 25,26), an 'iron mountain'. Further exs. show that this is not a mountain containing iron among other substances, but one *consisting of* iron: *altunlug lenxua* (BuddhStab II 23) is a 'lotus of gold', *tämirlig sışlar* (Höllen 51) are 'iron spikes'. The accusative *suvlug kälkinig* is used in TT VIII A 32 to render Skt. *udaka-vāham* and signifies 'a flood of water'.[201] ETŞ 10,225 has *suv kälkini* instead. Thus both *çatırlıg ögüz* and *çatır ögüz* are used to refer to the 'ash' or 'lime' or 'sal ammoniac river' of hell; see some of the instances in the *EDPT*.

G) MATERIAL shows the way to the semantically open use of *+lXg* in the service of APPOSITION. We find this, e.g., in *takşutlug şloklar* (BT I A_2 40), where the combination of an originally Turkic and a borrowed lexeme could be rendered as 'poem-gāthas'. The 'multitude$_2$' in *t(ä)ŋri kızlarılıg terin kuvrag* (U II 30,29) consists of 'god-maidens' as the 'flood' in *suvlug kälkin* consists of 'water'. In the

201 Skt. *uda-vāha* is a Ṛgvedic epithet of the water-*bringing* Maruts. The Skt. adjective suffix in *udaka* disambiguates the valency function of the water. Uigur *+lXg* has no such value as *kälkin* is always and only a 'flood', and its addition seems only to mirror the structure of the Skt. word. In any case, however, it would not have been there if Turkic grammar and semantics had not permitted its presence.

following two instances the kernel also denotes the group as a whole, while the qualifier marked by *+lXg* tells us who the members of this group are: *mäniŋ tusılıg kuvragım* (BT III 418-9) 'my gathering of pupils'; *luulug säkiz bölök terin kuvrag* (Tug 98) 'the eight-section multitude$_2$ of dragons'. Often, Skt. compounds are rendered by appositional *+lXg* sequences, as *nirvanlıg balık* = *nirvāṇapura* in KinkaShō śl. C,a.

'Apposition' means that kernel and sattelite are referentially identical, refer to the same entity. This does not seem to be certain with all our examples. Does the author using *sansarlıg tägzinç* (Suv 430,7) mean that being a 'whirpool' is a characteristic of *saṃsāra*, which would perhaps make us place the syntagm in group B), or does he mean that the whirlpool *is saṃsāra*, in the sense of being its translation? Similar cases are easy to find. The distinction may be artificial and basically wrong, in that we may be trying to impose distinctions where the language itself does not make them. The present division is not meant to be structurally relevant, however, but merely presents some of the uses of *+lXg* in an orderly manner. It should not be forced where it does not come naturally.

bodisatavnıŋ kalmış sümüklüg şariri (Suv 627,16) 'the remaining bone relics of the *bodhisattva*' must be understood as an apposition, as the bones *are* the relics and vice versa. Both in *takşutlug şlok* mentioned above and in *sümüklüg şarir*, the foreign term is the kernel. The opposite order is also attested: In *abışıklıg alkış* (BT III 1008), Skt. *abhişeka* also helps one chose the particular meaning in which *alkış* is used in this case.[202] The clearest case of pure apposition I have met is *biznilig erinç tınl(ı)glar* "wir, die elenden Lebewesen" in UigOn III B r3.

H) In most instances of appositional *+lXg*, the kernel of the syntagm fits into the context only due to some analogy between it and the base from which the *+lXg* form is derived. I call this the METAPHORICAL use of *+lXg*.[203] *suk yäk* in the following passage, for instance, is a metaphor for old age: *ançama yarsınçıg utun karımak s(ä)n,*[204] *kim twgmışta bärü alt[mış] yaşka tägi küç küsün ät kan üstälü ükliyü turdı, yetmiştä ınaru yüz yigirmi yaşka tägi kün küniŋä sän karımaklag suk yäk sora sora sugurduŋ* (Maitr 12 v 16) 'You, Old Age, are so revolting and insolent! For, from birth till one is sixty years of age, strength and vigor, flesh and blood have steadily increased$_2$; (but) from the seventies on till a hundred and

202 Translated in *UW* p. 100b top. Röhrborn's reading of the sattelite as '*abišeklıg*' is unacceptable to me; I explain my view in section 1.2.

203 The essentials of this section were presented at the symposium *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*, which took place in Hamburg in July, 1981 in honour of A. v. Gabain.

204 *UW* 134a s.v. *ançama* par. A,b writes this as *karımak su[k]* and translates it as "der Dämon des Alters". *suk*, however, does not signify 'demon' but 'greed'; the apostrophic nature of the passage comes forth also in what follows these words. The ms. should be reexamined.

twenty, day by day, you, o greed-demon of old age, have sucked it up and drained it off!' The effect of the metaphor gets strong support from the concrete content of the verbs, which, themselves, are also metaphorical. This is a literary figure and not real (i.e. e.g. religious) hypostasis. A further example: *keniŋä burxan kutnlıg kölök üzä nirvanlıg konoklukta konar* (Pfahl I 8) 'In the end he will settle in the resting place that is *nirvāṇa* (which he will reach) with the vehicle that is Buddhadom.' This contains the life-as-wayfaring metaphor known also to Christianity. I have noticed more than a hundred such metaphorical passages in Old Turkic literature, practically all in Buddhist texts. The only Manichaean ones which I have come across are in TT III 29, 47, 54 and 163 and ManErz IV 17-21, all in the same Pothi book which has been found to have been influenced by Buddhism in many respects. +*lXg* metaphors are not metaphors in the narrow sense, as the term denoting the literal entity appears beside the metaphorical one; nor similes, as the counterpart of the preposition 'like' does not appear; but something in between. It is this special type which is so common in Skt., as we learn from Porcher, 1982; one example would be the compound *mukha-candra* 'a moon-(like) face'. Such metaphorical syntagms are common also in Tokharian: "Der buddhistische Stil liebt die Ausschmückung des Gedankens durch mannigfaltige Vergleiche und Personifikationen abstrakter Begriffe. Hier im Tocharischen werden dabei häufig zwei Begriffe, die im jeweiligen Kontext einander logisch gleichgesetzt sind, so verbunden, daß das Bezeichnete in Form eines *-ṣi/ṣ(ṣ)e-* Adjektivs vor einen Über- oder Vergleichsbegriff tritt" writes Zimmer, 1982-3: 282. In Skt. und in Tokharian as in Turkic, the literal term is the first, the metaphorical one the second. However, Uigur and Tokharian go together against Skt. in having the first term qualify the second with the help of an adjective formative. This despite the fact that many of the relevant Uigur texts are not translations from Tokharian, nor, of course, vice versa. This Tokharian-Uigur construction is a remarkable rendering of Sanskrit compounds, but by no means the only one in either language, particularly not if the compound is not a metaphorical one. In Kinkashō śl. C,b, for instance, Skt. *tathāgatādityavaco'mśu* (i.e. *tathāgata – āditya – vacas – aṃśu*) is translated by *ançulayu kälmişlig kün t(ä)ŋrinin savlıg y(a)roka*. *āditya* is a metaphor for *tathāgata*, *aṃśu* for *vacas*; therefore Turkic has +*lXg* between the first and the second and between the third and the fourth element. The relationship between Buddha and his voice demands a genitive in Turkic, however. Nor were all Uigur metaphors +*lXg* constructions: *Yaşovati kunçuylar ärdinisi* (Maitr 51 r31) 'Yaśovati, the jewel of ladies' is also a metaphor with explicit components, the metaphorical one, again, in the second place; the construction, however, is an apposition.

The reader might expect the meaning of metaphorical +*lXg* to be associated with +*lXk* (of type B perhaps). There is, however, one Brāhmī instance of

metaphorical meaning with voiced velar, and also sufficiently dependable exs. in Uigur mss. with undotted back-series velars. Moreover, it is the base of the satellite *+lXk* form which one would take to denote the metaphorical entitiy, not the kernel as in our construction.

Metaphorical *+lXg* syntagms could be simple, as *nizvanılıg kir* (TT VIII E47) 'the filth of passion', or form complicated series. Some such metaphors were conventional, like the one just mentioned and *koş lenxua* 'double lotus' to describe the feet of Buddha; others are products of creative imagination on the part of the author. I would like to mention two fourfold metaphors, which are not the most complicated ones we have. *ayıg kılınçl(ı)g ka[pkara] tünlä ölümlüg ogrı kälip ät[öz]lüg ag(ı)lıkıŋızlardakı isig özlüg ärdiniŋizlärni ogrılayu eltgäy* (U III 14,9-12$_2$) 'In the pitch-black night (i.e. when practising evil) the thief (i.e. death) will come and steal away your jewels (i.e. your life) from your treasury (i.e. your body).' What has been put into brackets above translates the bases of the *+lXg* forms. In all the exs., by the way, the verb, which cannot, of course, be expanded adnominally, expresses only the metaphor and not the literal content. This is related to the fact that literal nominal terms are only the satellites of the metaphorical nominal terms. *köŋül tözilig akaş yüzindä / körmäk bilmäklig bulıt örüŋüp / küsüşlüg kün çogın kölüŋü tuŋup / küsänçig nomlug yagmur yagıŋıp* . . . (ETŞ 10,34). I quote Arat's translation, putting the metaphorical elements in italics: "Gönül kökünün *semâsında* görmek bilmek *bulutunu yükseltip* arzu *güneşinin parıltısını gölgelendirip iştiyakla beklenen* töre *yağmurunu yağdırıp* . . .".

The phenomenon deserves study by a literary theoretician, who might also compare it to similar figures in other languages. Porcher, 1982 would be a good example for such a study.

* * *

+lXg is added to all types of nominals, but hardly ever to adjectives as such.[205] The base of *ädgülüg* (Warnke 622, U III 26,19 and 39,26, BT XIII 1,2, 2,125, 13,43 and 116, 20,67, 38,5, 40,42, 41,21, 46,23 and 55,7, Suv 152,4, TT I 160, U IV A 289 and B 32, Pfahl III 11) can be taken to be the noun *ädgü* 'goodness', quoted e.g. below from Maitr 5 v25. Other rare cases could come from similar nominalisations: *agılıkta b(ä)klig turup* . . . (Warnke 127), *miŋlig tümänlig kuvrag* (TT II A 57) 'a multitude of thousands and ten thousands'.

When added to binomes, *+lXg* is usually repeated, e.g. in *örtlüg yalınlıg yerlär* (U II 79,45-46, *Üdrät*). Occasionally, however, the two terms do receive it in

205 Zieme, 1982: 177 mentions '*uluglug yılan*' which, he says, appears in two variant mss. in Suv 366,3. This can be an error for **olı-glig yılan* 'writhing snake' formed with the compound formative *-(X)glXg* discussed below.

common: *korkınç ayınç/(ı)g ädgü töz yılnız* (Maitr 4 r 18); *asıg tusulug ädgüsin öp sakınıp* . . . (Maitr 5 v 25); *y(a)rok yalınklıg kopda* [*körülmiş nom eligi*] (UigOn II B 1 and elsewhere). We have already had instances (particularly in A_2) in which *+lXg* is added to nominals expanded by adjectives, quantifiers and other nominals. One ex. for quantifier expansion would be *mıŋ yap(ı)rgaklag lenxua* (TT V A 18) 'thousand-leaved lotus', one with participle expansion *açılmış utpal lenxua közlüg* . . . *burxan* (U II 57,1$_2$) 'Buddha of the open lotus$_2$ eyes'.[206] In the following rather typical ex., two different types of *+lXg* are added to four variously structured expressions; *ärtinü*, on the other hand, qualifies *mäŋilig* and not *mäŋi*: *üküş tavarlıg [ük]üş yem içimlig törümä toŋ altunlug üküş tälim äd tavar yevig tiziglig ärtinü mäŋilig ulug kölök* (ms. T III TV 59 (U 4313) ls. 1-8 in the n. to Hochzeit 13) has been translated as follows: "das *mit* vieler Habe *ausgestattete, aus* gediegenem, kompaktem Gold *bestehende, mit viel*$_2$ *Habe*$_2$ *und* Ausrüstung$_2$ *versehene* äußerst selige Große Fahrzeug"; I have put the German equivalents of the various *+lXg*s into italics. In many other cases, the qualifiers of the bases of *+lXg* forms also contain the formative *+lXg*; then analysis becomes impossible without good knowlege of Old Turkic phraseology and of the subject matter. In *burxanlıg ärdnilig otrug* (TT V B 94), for instance, *ärdnilig otrug* 'jewel island' is a metaphor for Buddha, as the further context makes evident; the second, 'inner' *+lXg* denotes limiting assignment. Without the context, we might think that the two *first* terms should be bracketed together, that the 'jewel' is by itself a metaphor for Buddha, and that the content of this syntagm is (concretely) assigned to the island. *ärdinilig v(a)jirlıg tag* (BT I A_2 16), on the other hand, has been translated as "kostbarer Diamantberg": The editor takes the first *+lXg* to form an adjective qualifying a syntagm. Here are some further exs. for complex bracketing: *çatırlıg ügüzlügdä ulatı tamularda* (BT II 457) 'in various hells and particularly in the one with the sal ammoniac river'; *az nızvanılıg ämgäklig taloyda uzatı* [*ärkä*]*çlänürlär* (Warnke 295). In this last ex., *az* and *nızvanı* get their *+lXg* in common, and are connected by it to their metaphor, which has *taloy* as kernel; the *+lXg* of *ämgäklig*, on the other hand, is not metaphorical. To judge from this instance and from general impression, the metaphorical *+lXg* juncture appears to be the loosest one. The following bracketing, from BT VIII B 148, is the most involved I have met: *kök kalık ugusı üzlünçülüg tigilig yaŋkulug ärür*, by the editor translated "(Er) hat ein Geräusch$_2$, das bis zum Ende der Himmels$_2$-Gegend (dringt)." *üzlünçü* could be taken temporally, here, giving the translation: '(He) possesses the din$_2$ of the end

206 The relationship between the eyes and the flowers is metaphorical but not expressed by *+lXg*: To have done so would have meant bringing *köz+lüg* to the front and adding the exocentric *+lXg* to *lenxua*, clearly quite awkwardly.

of the celestial$_2$ realm.' In TT VIII A 47, *bilgä bilig artoklug* corresponds to the Skt. endocentric compound *prajñottara*. *+lXg* is here added to the nexus having *bilgä bilig* (*prajñā*) as subject and *artok* (*uttara*) as predicate.

Sometimes, different bracketing goes with a different content. Take *arazan* (or *äräzän*) *atlıg satıgçı* in ManErz IV 25; 28 and 34. The authorities, including *UW* 177a s.v. *arazan* and Clark's reedition (passim), divided this as (*arazan at*)*lıg satıgçı*; accordingly, their translation was "the merchant named Arazan". If *+lXg* is taken to apply to *at* alone, however, we get 'the honoured and famous merchant': *atlıg* is well-attested as 'famous, distinguished' in runic, Manichaean and Buddhist sources, e.g. in *ayaglag tapaglag*[207] *atlag t(ä)ŋri* . . . (M I 27,2) 'his honoured, respected and famous holiness Pr.N.' and *atlıg yüzlüg bäglär* (M III 10,3$_1$) 'famous and distinguished lords'. *ayaglıg atlıg kaŋım* (TT III 2) is translated by Clark himself as "my respected and famous father". The bracketing I suggest, connected with the surely not too odd assumption of taking *arazan*/*äräzän* to be a loan-word from Middle Persian, has important implications: There is no longer any "parable" in the midst of which "the donor inserts a statement about himself", as Clark writes on p. 155, but simply the donor's account of how his community and he himself were converted to Manichaeism by some merchant whom the donor holds in high esteem.[208]

At least in some cases, there appears to be a morphological difference between appositional *+lXg* and the other uses to which this suffix is put; we can give the following ex.: The sequence *ögrünç(ü)lüg sävinçlig* is found in U III 10,7; 26,9 and 48,9, TT VII 7 v (in the n.), TT VII 40,47-48, Suv 391,17 and 530,6, M I 11,7-8, TT VI 457-8 and 463, Maitr 10,11; 12,15-16 and 16,1 and MaitrGeng 17 a18 with the meaning 'joyful$_2$'. In *ulug ögrünçlüg sävinçlig bolu tägin-* (Suv 568,1) 'attain a state of immense joy$_2$', *ulug* is not repeated; but *+lXg*, which applies to *ulug ögrünç sävinç* as a whole, is. In ZiemeTārā 20c we have the appositional syntagm *ögrünç sävinçlig çog yalın* 'the splendour$_2$ that is joy$_2$'; only here do the two members of the sequence *ögrünç sävinç* receive the suffix in common. The kernel could not have been qualified by *ögrünç* and *sävinç* separately, but only by the concept which they represent in common.

+lXg is repeatedly added to plural forms and to nouns with possessive suffix. It would be wrong to call these forms "ungrammatical", as scholars have done even recently, in so far as they correspond to real grammatical needs of the language. Something which an Uigur *meant* to write down and did not cross out as an error must be grammatical *by definition*: Grammar is based on what is attested, not

207 Thus with the *EDPT*.

208 What has been written about the transmission of culture and religion by Iranian merchants in Central Asia need not be repeated here.

formulated according to *a priori* considerations. In Old Turkic, formatives can be added to inflectional morphemes, as we see also in *az+rak+ça+k(ı)ya* 'just about a little bit' or in *mān mānimliksiz* 'without "I am" or "is for me"' and *beş p(a)ramularsız*. With the conjunctional functions that it has, *+lXg* is particularly prone to loose juncture. The sequence *+lAr+lXg* usually appears when the plural form denotes a set of entities commonly known to form a group, and when the *+lXg* is appositional. In such cases, *+lAr* has become part of the lexeme. All our exs. appear in texts written down in the Yüan period, so the phenomenon is regular late Uigur: *amrılmış turulmış arxant ntsılarlıg ayagka tägimlig bursaŋ kuvrag* (Shō VII a1); *alko arnlarlıg keyiklär kuvragı . . . täztilär*[209] *kaçtılar* (BT III 129); *daşabal on küçlüg tuyunmışlarlıg danı şireşti baylar ornagı* (ETŞ 10,211); *üç köšünülärlig ünüş [yol]un ünüp . . .* (BT VIII B 192); *ançulayu ok bodis(a)t(a)vlar pränkabutlar şiravaklar pırtagçanlarlıg sakınç twgsar . . .* (BT VIII A 295). Such cases are similar to the phenomenon of numeral + plural form in e.g. Republican Turkish, e.g. *Kırk Haramiler*, *On iki Adalar* (the Dodecanese islands in the Egean), *Yedi Cüceler* etc.[210] Republican Turkish (as distinct from Old Turkic) does this only when the entity referred to is commonly known to constitute a group.

The possessive suffix which appears before *+lXg* is of the third person, with a single exception known to me: *atı kötrülmiş kaŋımazlıg m(a)hasamudar ulug taloy ögüz* (BT III 122). 'the great ocean, *mahāsamudra*' is here a metaphor for 'our eminent father', itself a metaphorical way of referring to Buddha.[211] Most of the cases where *+lXg* is added to the third person possessive suffix are also related to Buddha. In most of them, the base is the expression *burxan kutı*, where *kutı* is less than a word: See part B_5 in section 2.77 above. Cf. also *t(ä)ŋrim kutıg kün t(ä)ŋriçä sak(ı)nu täginür m(ä)n* in ZiemeSklav III 19, with the nominal accusative suffix instead of the accusative form *+In* otherwise attested in third person possession. These, as well as *nom kutı* and *arxant kutı* of Maitr 162 r14, USp 106,87-88, TT III 121 and elsewhere, correspond to denominal abstracts in Sogdian: Cf. Henning, 1940: 62. *burxan kutılıg* originally had the form *burxan kutınlıg*, which was quoted above in an ex. for the metaphorical functions of *+lXg*. In

209 Written with *s*, as so often in late texts, and therefore mistakenly read as '*taşılar*' by the editor. The meaning of that verb does not fit the context at all, however.

210 As Goethe writes in *Epiphanias*,

Es sind ihrer drei und sind nicht ihrer vier;
Und wenn zu dreien der vierte wär',
So wär' ein heil'ger drei König mehr.

m(a)hasamudar and *ulug taloy ögüz* are related in another type of apposition typical of Uigur, the latter being in fact a translation of the former. I do not recall such syntagmatic translation being marked by *+lXg*, even in cases where it would not have led to any awkwardness.

this sequence, *+lXg* was treated like a postposition: As shown in Erdal, 1979, it is a characteristic of the earliest set of Old Turkic texts that their postpositions govern the accusative form of nouns bearing the possessive suffixes. The fact that the /n/ later disappeared with *+lXg* does not signify that this suffix stopped being treated like a postposition in this matter, since the postpositions themselves come to govern the nominative form in later texts. Was *+lXg* a postposition, then? It must have had the same semi-independent juncture status as the postpositions, at least in the later language: For, *kun* being set aside as a special case, our other instances of *+(s)I+lXg* all come from later sources. The growing independence of *+lXg* as a syntactic particle thus appears to have been mirrored in its morphological behaviour. We have: *yelvi barıgılıg kutrulmak küç* (ETŞ 13,179), *ay tilgänilig orun* (BT VII A 324 and 400), *takinilär kuvragılıg taloy* [ögüz] (BT VII B 3) and, with both morphological suffixes, *täŋri kızlarılıg terin kuvrag* (U II 30,29) 'the assembly$_2$ of divine maidens', mentioned under **F)** above. Another form which speaks for the transfer at least of appositional *+lXg* into the status of a postpositional conjunction is that found in the juncture *biznilig erinç tınl(ı)glar* 'us poor creatures' in UigOn III B r3. Firstly because the shape of the base is that found before postpositions such as *üçün* or *birlä* (and also before case suffixes such as *+dA*); secondly because derivational formatives (with the possible exception of *+k(I)ñA*, which does not create lexemes) are not added to pronouns. This idea should follow also if one considers the syntactical function of *+lXg*.

It seems useful to compare the morphological involvement of *+lXg* with that of the diminutive formative *+kIyA* precisely because, both being juncturally so independent, they differ in every other respect: It turns out that the two are in complementary distribution, *+kIyA* being attested after case suffixes, *+lXg* never so. We do, on the other hand, find *+lXg* after number and possessive suffixes, where we never find *+kIyA*. This must be connected with the fact that the tasks of *+kIyA* are endocentric, those of *+lXg* exocentric; *+kIyA* has an extremely strong speaker significance, *+lXg* an exceedingly pale one; *+kIyA*, on the other hand, does not interact with syntactic behaviour, while *+lXg*, of course, does. In making nominals (including plural and possessed ones) into adnominal expressions, *+lXg* can be compared to the genitive (as I have done above). This, again, reminds us that *+kIyA* is practically the only formative which is placed *after* *+lXg* in the formative sequence:[212] Thus in *bizni täg yüz yaşlıgk(ı)yalarıg* (BT II 936), which the editor translates as "... Leute von 100 Jährchen". If, however, *+kIyA* is to stress the shortness of life, one would have expected **(yüz yaş)kıyalıglar* instead; one should better translate 'Leutchen von 100 Jahren', where *+kIyA* is added to

212 Not counting the few instances of *-(X)glXg+rAk* mentioned under *+rAk* (par. 2.22): The *+lXg* part in them is not an independent formative.

the whole (nominalised) phrase *yüz yaşlıg* and transmits the message of (self-) pity. There are hardly any examples of real diminutive or intensive forms expanded with *+lXg*; perhaps their content was too subjective or pragmatic to be subordinated in this way.

Actually, the denominal forms expandable by *+lXg* appear to be mostly of the 'functional' class discussed in part 2.7: *ança+k(ı)ya+lıg* in ShōAgon 1,98 appears in a very late text strongly leaning on its Chin. source. In a case like *ärdämlig*, one should remember that *ärdäm* has become semantically quite independent from its base, and that *+dAm* here no longer has its original function. With the *+dUrXk* formation we find *beldürüklüg* '. . . belted' in *bars tärisi beldürüklüg* (BT VII D14) and *äsri torku beldürüklüg* (ib. C17). The latter expression can be found also in four additional parallel texts (two published), mentioned in the note. *baş-nıŋlıg* 'with X as leader' appears in Shō XII b5 and four times in ETŞ 10, collected together in the n. to ETŞ 10,138. The *+lXg* derivates of simple *+çI* forms and of *+çI* derivates from verbal nouns have already been treated in some detail among the expansions of that formative (section 2.75). Similarly, instances of *+lXk+lXg*, the positive counterpart of *+lXk+sXz*, are mentioned at the end of section 2.77. Perhaps surprisingly, the most common denominal formative to be further expanded by *+lXg* is *+sXz*. Examples are, again, discussed near the end of the appropriate chapter. Cf. also *ärkliglig* 'having (dull or bright) senses' in AmitIst 6, 7, 8 and 39.

Incomparably more numerous and varied, however, are the *+lXg* derivates from deverbal nominals. Some of these have to be treated as independent sequences. We shall start, however, with the formations which are less strongly attested: *ög-di+lig nirvanka eltäyin* (ShōKenkyū III 27); *isi-ndi+lig* (Ernte) 'heated' and *köŋüldäki . . . yer-inti+lig [mün] kadaglar* (U III 73,26). *-gA+lXg* is attested in runic sources: *yerdäki tamgalıg yılkı buŋs[uz] är[ti* (YE 26,6), *tamgalıg bitig* (ThS III a2) and *bilgälig yaŋılmaz* (*ibid.* 11). Hamilton and Bazin translate the latter as "Qui a un conseiller ne se trompe pas". In *kızartmış tämir yum-gak+lıg aşıg yep . . .* (BT II 202), *+lXg* serves the purposes of apposition; the editor therefore correctly translates this as "(sie) essen glühende Eisenkugeln". *bir kölün-gü+lüg ıdok yol* (BT II 5) is = Skt. *eka-yāna*; from another instrument noun in *-gU* we have *bı bıç-gu+lug tamu / taglar* (BT II 542, 556 and 618). Having important functions in the verbal system, *-gU* could not be treated here; there is no doubt, however, that *kölüngü* and *bı bıçgu* are pre-formed nominals with no verbal status at all, like *tamga* or *kömür*. From the *-gUk* formation: *kayalıg bas-uklug* (ETŞ 8,11); *tirgüklüg* (BT II 398; HtPek 86 r 6-8 and HtPar 9 r 13). *tükä-l-g* is very common; the variant *tükälig* mentioned at the beginning of this chap-much less so. Even rare formatives like *-gI* and *-mXr* are attested with *+lXg*: have *kötgilig ätözi* (MaitrGeng 11 b21) and *kömürlüg tamu* (BT II 468).

With -(X)n, +lXg expansions are much more numerous: See *UW* 81 b for *akınlıg*; *sanlıg* is very common and usually signifies 'belonging to X'. Further, we find *kurunlug kapkara tütün tokımış* (Maitr 101 v 15), *terinlig kuvraglıg* (BT VIII B 262), *tügünlüg* as early as Toñ 54, *ätinlig* (Maitr 81 r 3, MaitrGeng 11 b 14 and BT VIII B 146) and *yalınlıg* (Maitr 61 r 2, TT V A 44, 65 and 118, TT VIII F 16, U III 23,3$_1$, ETŞ 10,23 and BT VIII B 90). All these -(X)n are transparent, but functionally nevertheless just nouns; their combination with +lXg therefore has purely denominal character. The same can be said about the derivations from deverbal nouns mentioned before, and also about -Xnç+lXg, -XnçU+lXg, -Ok+lXg, -Xş+lXg and -Ut+lXg, which are discussed under -Xnç, -XnçU, -Ok, -Xş and -Ut respectively.

There appear, on the other hand, to be two sequences -XmlXg: One shows +lXg added to -Xm forms as it is added to any noun. The exs. for this are as old as the oldest texts: *kädimlig torug at* (KT E 33) and *beş yüz kädimlig yadag* (ŞU S 9) refer to coats of mail on man and beast; *kädim* usually denotes 'clothes' in general, but may have referred to 'coats of mail' in military contexts.[213] In *yeti tutumlug mandal* (BT VIII A 62) and *tört twgumlug tınlıglar* (BT II 776), it is not the +lXg derivates which are quantified, but the -Xm forms themselves. When the expression *yem içim* is to receive our suffix, it can do this either singly, as *yemlig içimlig* (BT VIII B 260-1), or with the loose addition of the suffix, as in [ük]üş *yem içimlig* . . . *ulug kölök* (ms. T III T V 59 (U 4313) ls. 1-8 quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 13). *barım+lıg* is used in a binomial with *bay* 'rich' in TT VI 024 and 313, TuoLuoNi 154, Maitr 3 r 20 and ShōAgon 1,242 and 243, etc. *ölüm* 'death' rather frequently receives apositional +lXg, sometimes with a metaphor following: *ölümlüg sakınç* (M III 19,5$_1$, text 8), *ölümlüg şımnu* (ETŞ 10,251), *ölümlüg ogrı* (U III 14,9-10) or *ölümlüg madar* (BT II 960). Cf. further *twgumlug alp tagıg uşat[daçı* (BT VIII B 106) 'crumbling the arduous mountain of births', *berimlig ayıg* 'the evil of debt' (TT III 160), (metaphorical) *ötäg berimlig suu çärig* (BT VIII B 135) 'the army of debts' and *tört twgumlug kısıg tanıg* (Maitr fr. 504 quoted in the n. to TT IV A 20). Another -XmlXg, derived directly from verbal bases and having a non-ergative meaning, is discussed in section 3.322. There are also two sequences -(X)glXg: One, with +lXg added to existing -(X)g nouns, is discussed together with them; the other, a compound suffix forming something like passive participles, we have in section 3.119.

-mAklXg, on the other hand, will be discussed here, and that for two reasons: Firstly, because the infinitive suffix -mAk does not appear in this book (unlike the other deverbal suffixes to which +lXg is added, disregarding the two cases of -gU+lXg mentioned above). Secondly, because this sequence itself supplies us with the whole gamut of verbal structures which can be subordinated by +lXg.

+lXg is added to simple -mAks as well as to pairs. Such pairs are usually biverbs,

213 In ThS I a 12, *kädim* is the direct object, *ornu*, the dative object of the sentence.

as in ädrtmlig ehnmäk yarannmaklig törösindä (TT VIII D 8), which translates Skt. ādṛṣya mandanavidhau. The biverb corresponds to a single Skt. deverbal noun, mandana, and +lXg takes the place of the compounding structure of the Skt. term. Similarly, +lXg is added to synonym sequences like *ozmak kutrulmak* (Buddhāv Y 9-10, Suv 22,4), *utmak yegädmäk* (Ht VII 2062-3), *ömäk sakınmak* (Tug 46), *ayamak amranmak* (HtPek 3 a 7 in *UW* 123 a), *isinmäk amranmak* (Ht VII 1904) and *tiṣmäk amraṣmak* (ÄgFrag (1) B 18), or to sequential antonyms, as *nvṣmak ölmäk* (Suv 368,18; 430,7 and 614,17 and ManErz IV 17-18). Note that +lXg appears not to have been obligatory in this grammatical relationship; it can be omitted, as e.g. in *açmak suvsamak ämgäk* (Suv 118,4-5) 'the suffering of hunger and thirst'.

-*mAk* forms subordinated by +*lXg* have normal verbal government, both adverbial and nominal; *öŋi adrılmaklıg busuşum ymä yok* (Suv 609,9) 'Nor am I grieved by separation (i.e. death)'; *Br(a)xmadatn elig tapa tetrü körmäklig yarokın tıdı* (U II 23,11) 'She sent the rays of her glance towards king Brahmadatta'. *öŋi adrıl-* and *tetrü kör-* are attested elsewhere, but are by no means fixed or fused sequences. In *bütmiş katıglanmaklıg şımnu* (TT VIII A 5), a -*mAk* form qualified by a participle serves as base for +*lXg*. More striking for us here are nominals filling valence slots, as *siziŋdä adrılmaklıg isig suv* (Maitr 90 v 12 *ap. UW* s.v. *adrıl-*) with ablatival locative, and local (if abstract) locatives like *ridi taşgarmakta ärksinmäklig küçi küsünü üzä* (ZiemeGuan 47), *şastrlarda ärksinmäklig bramanlar* (U III 28,4) or *vidis bermäk yerçilämäk ädrämtä uzanmaklıg ärür* (Ht VII 1786-7). In the last instance, the relationship between *bermäk yerçilämäk* and *ädräm* has been realised without recourse to +*lXg*, which would, presumably, have made the expression too awkward. +*dA uzanmaklıg* is attested also in BT II 564 and BuddhUig II 631, in *alkonuŋ sezikin üzmäktä uzanmaklıg ATI KÖTRÜLMİŞ t(ā)ŋri t(ā)ŋrisi burxan* and in *şastrlarda uzanmaklıg bramanlar* (U III 28,4). *uzanmak* being the only attested form of *uzan-*, it must in fact have become lexicalised; note, on the other hand, the similarity to the expression with +*dA ärksinmäklig* quoted above: *uzanmaklıg* is consistently agentive because **uzan-* was no longer free to form participles, or agentive nominals with -(*X*)*gçI*, -*gAn* etc. With a dative we have *tınlıg uguşıŋa umug bolmaklıg könül* (BT II 285), or *kılınçıŋa ögünmäklig örtü üzä örtän-* (U III 5,1); with ablative, *oglıntın adrılmaklıg ämgäkin kogşap . . .* (U III 47,28) 'getting weak with the pain of being separated from her son, . . .'. Most common are direct objects accompanying -*mAk*+*lXg*: *adu temäklig sav* (U II 48,5), *ärgürmiş kızıl bakır içürmäklig . . . tamu* (BT II 58), *boşı bermäklig ıdok nom* (Suv 22,9); cf. also *kut kolunmaklıg* in Buddhāv 12, Warnke 300-301 and Tug 51-2, in which *kut* is fused with the verb. Where there is an accusative suffix or where, moreover, the object is pronominal, fusion certainly not have occurred. E.g. *twgumug a[jun]ug unıtmaklıg toz tuprak*

(TT III 27) and *nomlug [kuvr]agıg*[214] *başlamaklıg yarık* (Ht VII 3 a 16), both with metaphorical *+lXg*, *baxşını uçuzlamaklıg sakınç* (BT VIII A 9), *nızvanının işin küdügin ketärmä[k]lig ädgü* (Ht VII 8 b 16-17), *alkonı ozgurmaklıg köŋül* (BT II 283 and 1269) and *sizin mini amramaklıg ädgüŋüz* (Warnke 60), translated "Eure mir erwiesene liebevolle Güte".[215] Interesting are those cases in which thus subordinated infinitives are accompanied by their subject, as *yarım* (final M!) [. .] *ätözi agrımaklıg ig* 'the ailment of having one side of one's body ache' in U II 68,1$_3$, and a fragmentary ex. in ManErz IV 17: *ayıg kılınç arımaklıg adg[ü . . .] tüş ulı berzün* 'May the benefit of the vanishing of evil deeds bear . . . fruit$_2$'.[216] Accompaniments need not, of course, occur singly. *ädgü kılınçlarıg öŋin öŋin adınlarkaävirmäklig köŋül* (BT II 1189) is translated by the ed. with a relative clause: "eine Gesinnung . . ., in der man, jeder für sich, . . . die guten Taten anderen zuwendet".

Such exs. show that the sequence *-mAk+lXg* was used as a general relativiser of (non-factive) actions, processes and states, corresponding in verbality to participle relativisation. The sequence is not attested in runic texts; among Manichaean texts, I have found it only in the Pothi book, which also has other Buddhist traits. It *may* therefore have been calqued on foreign models, or, at least, may have come up as a handy translation equivalent of some foreign syntactic structure. The fact that *-mAksXz* shows a similar textual distribution need not be relevant, as that has a very different functional status, and is a fused suffix. Remembering that *-mAk+lXg*, which we have here treated at length, is only one of the deverbal sequences with *+lXg* as second element, we can say that *+lXg* was one of the most productive agents in the renewal of relativisation.

2.92 *+dXη*

An old and evidently no longer productive formation of which only vestiges remain. It forms denominal nouns which more often denote appurtenance than similarity to the base noun. All *+dXη* lexemes come from monosyllabic bases: *aydıŋ* 'moonlight' (BT I (B) 241, DLT etc.) comes from *ay* 'moon'. Cf. also *ikägünüŋ adırtların adrokların kim ymä näŋ ay täŋrili aydınlı täg adırmazlar* (ETŞ

214 Wrongly completed by Arlotto as '[*kam*]*agıg*'.

215 The *UW* entry for *amramaklıg* does not have this ex., as Warnke was included only from the third fascicle on, and (to my mind unnecessarily) considers emending the only instance of this form quoted there to *amranmaklıg*.

216 Clark's translation of this as 1.346 is untenable because of its content: Taking *arımakl[ı]g* evil deed give the reward (Hend.) . . . of purity and good." The use of nominal *ädgü* in Old Turkic accords much better with my rendering, I believe; moreover, evil deeds hardly lead to good rewards in Manichaeism.

15,13) 'They do not make any distinctions$_2$ between the two, as moon and moon-light', *kordun* in M III 8,10$_1$, text 2 has probably correctly been connected with *kor* 'residue of sour milk'; *ol küçlüg yäklärdä y(a)rok küçi kordun täg kalzun* "In jenen starken Dämonen soll des Lichtes Kraft (seine lichte Kraft??) (trübe?) wie Bodensatz bleiben"; or is the metaphor based on the triggering action of the residue when making yogurt? *otun* 'firewood' comes from *ot* 'fire', as proven also by the fact that both have long vowel and /h/ in Khal., *hōtun* and *hōt* respectively. See exs. of *otun* in the *EDPT*; further ones appear in Maitr 201 r 8, BT VIII A 76 and 134 and in an unpubl. fr. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 5,130. In M III 28,2$_3$ (text 11) we have *otun+layu* 'like firewood', in Ht V2 b12 *otun+çı*. *otun* probably comes from a simplification of **ot+dun*. A weaker possibility is to take it to come from an unattested *+U-* derivate from *ot*, which would also have served as base to a hap. *otun-* (q.v. among the *-(X)n-* verbs).

A number of *+dXŋ* nouns have variants in *+dAŋ*. DLT fol. 70 has twice *uldaŋ* "the sole of a shoe", which the *EDPT* quotes from two Middle Turkic sources as well. As *ultunlug* in TT VIII G57 and Suv 450,18 shows, however, the Old Turkic form had /X/. In the modern Turkic languages mentioned in the n. to the TT VIII instance and in the *EDPT* there is an interesting variation: The South Western and Eastern languages have *+tAŋ*, the North and Eastern *+tUŋ*. *izdäŋ* in DLT fol. 71 might also follow this pattern: It denotes a kind of net for catching fish; the way it functions, described in the DLT entry, might make a connection with *iz* 'trace' possible. *yataŋ* (DLT fol. 607) denotes the bow-shaped implement with which raw wool is worked (still in use in Turkey today). Kāšġarī himself calls this *ḥaniyya*, making the connection with *ya* 'bow'. *baştıŋ/başdaŋ* 'leader' comes from *baş* 'head; beginning; pinnacle' and is, in a way, the opposite of *ultuŋ/uldaŋ*. We find *baştıŋ* in BT VIII A 699, Warnke 777, BT VIII B 149 and 263, *baştınlıg* in UigTot 1183 and ETŞ 10,138; 161; 226 and 242; cf. also *burxan başdınlıg bursaŋ kuvrag* in ShōAv 267. ShōAv 275 and 292 have the binome *baş başdın*. BT II 665 writes *baştıŋ+ı* as '*baştïnki*' and considers it an error for *baş+tın+kı* (cf. also BT V 56, footn. 14). *başdaŋ*, on the other hand, is attested in M I 27,8 and 28,14 and in a fr. quoted in the n. to BT V 532; cf. also the n. to ETŞ 10,138. These three Manichaean instances of *+dAŋ* should be distinguished from the ones mentioned above: They appear in texts which elsewhere also write /ı/ with the letter *a*, e.g. *ayaglag tataglag atlag* in M I 27,2, *tatglarıntan* in the n. to BT V 214 (from the same text as the one quoted in the n. to BT V 532). One might choose to consider the Manichaean variants as mere graphic peculiarities, or set up the hypothesis that the form which spread from the DLT on and then in some of the modern languages belonged to the A-dialect.[217]

217 *kövdüŋ* 'the trunk of the human body' has a variant *kövtäŋ* in Suv 631,15, a Buddhist text. This is

Such an element can and should be isolated, first of all, in *taŋsok* 'wonderful, marvellous, wondrous, precious'. It is attested in Ht IV 502, ETŞ 10,112 and 268 and 12,61, Suv 118,7 and 574,16-19 and QB 794 as *taŋ taŋsok*, in Ht VII 1903 as *tat]ıglıg taŋsok ulug ädrämlig* . . . and in QB 4424 as *ajun taŋsokı*, and is mentioned by the DLT. In ShōAv 253-4 it appears as *adınçıg taŋısok* and 345 as *kaşınçıg taŋısok*, in BT XIII 58,13 as *adıl taŋısok*; BT XIII 46,35 has *Taŋgusok* (thus!) as proper name. The hap. *yarsok kılınç* (Maitr 198 r15-16, "ekelhafte Taten") is probably an instance of this formative, the opposite of *taŋsok*. *sıŋarsok* is, in BuddhUig I 46, evaluative like *taŋsok* and *yarsok*: *sıŋarsok tuyunup kiçig kölüngü üzä ozarlar* "werden einseitig erkennend durch Hīnayāna erlōst". A n. explains that Hīnayāna is often called 'the one-sided teaching'.

The DLT, on the other hand, defines *sıŋarsok* as the "hindquarters of a horse, i.e. the place where a second rider sits". This appears to be the meaning of Khot 66, spelled as *saŋırsax*. The third vowel of Khot 66 may nevertheless be /o/, if we take the length mark of *ā* to have been dropped by mistake: ā would represent /o/. *sıŋarsok* connects easiest with *sıŋar* 'one of two (occasionally more than two) sides' in BuddhUig I 238, where it qualifies one of the two eyes (*kōz*), and HtPar 187,24 *ap. UW* 61 a fin., where it qualifies one of the two palms of the hand (*adut*). In these cases, *sıŋarsok* is a term defining a domain of the body. So is *bagırsok* 'entrails' (with /o/ in Khot 86; Uigur, DLT and other exs. in the *EDPT*) from *bagır* 'liver, belly' (q.v. in the *EDPT*). Cf. also twice *bagarsok* in MaitrH XVI 15 b1.

Most interesting are the instances in which *+sOk* is added to the finite future form in *-gAy*. They have not been collected as yet, and function as verbal nouns of the future. First of all, we mention three forms connected with death: *ölgäysökdä* (UigTot 173 and 257) signifies 'when one dies'; further exs. ibid. 287 and 288-9. Some of the instances have ş-dots, which appears to be the case also in *ölgäşök* in DvaKol I 25. Thus also ms. T II S 135 (U 5678) 1.65: *ölgäyşök üdümüzni öŋräkän bilälim* 'May we know the time of our death beforehand'. We read *ölgäyşök üdtä* also in AbitAnk 4 and 25 and UigTot 165; finally, Suv 85,19-20: *ol kunçuy ölgäyşöktä tişi ät'özin kodup* . . . 'When that princess died, she abandoned her female body and . . .'. Synonymous with this is *ät'öz koḍgay-sok üdtä* . . . (Suv 190,23) 'at the time one leaves one's body' (mistakenly written '*kotgarsok*' by the editors). Maitr 123 v21 does not write *-gAysOk*, but *-gAsOk* like the DvaKol instance quoted above: *nirvanka bargasokta* 'when one goes to

not a counter-example, though, because the word may not belong to this formation at all. A connection with *kövrä* 'corpse' (attested also in Maitr 75 v28 and 196 v32) cannot be kept up, as we know of no formative '*+rA*'.

nirvāṇa'. MaitrH III 1 b5 should be emended to read *käpäz tarıgasok üdü*. Further exs. are mentioned in the n. to BT VIII B271.

Similar in shape but referring neither to death nor to anything else in the future is *ilgäysök* 'knowledgeable, erudite', the equivalent of Skt. *paṇḍita*. We find it in TT VIII A 20, BT VIII B271, BT XIII 21,59, BuddUig II 90 and as base of the verb *ilgäysöklän-*, q.v.. *ozgurguta ilgäysök* (BT XIII 21,59) is translated as "im Erlösen erfahren". In Maitr 137r13, this word appears as *ilgäzök*, i.e. lacking the /y/ like *bargasokta* quoted from the same text above. In TT VIII A, the word is written as *ilgåsök* in Brāhmī characters, without /y/ but with long /ä/. This length may explain the alternation between forms with and without *y*; it does not, however, offer the solution to the relationship between *-gA* and *-gAy*. The n. to BT VIII B27 proposes *ilgäy* as the base of *ilgäysök*: This is a hap. in ETŞ 9, discussed in section 2.97: It is not formed with *-gAy* but with a denominal formative, *+gAy*. We take *ilgäy* to have signified 'pioneer'. Although it *looks* as if it were a *-gAysOk* form, *ilgäysök* should be taken together with *tanṣok* and *yarsok*. The ultimate base is **il* 'front, foremost'.

+sOk was possibly added to aorist forms as well: *ilärsök* 'waistband of trousers' (DLT fol. 88) may be analysed as *il-är+sök* and connected with the verb *il-* 'to catch something on to something else (with a noose, button, etc.)'. This may also be the explanation of *bilärzök* 'bracelet' in BT II 1008, *bilärsök* in Suv 71,18, while MaitrGeng 10 b27 and the DLT have *biläzök*. The common base of this and *biläk* 'wrist' may have been **bilä-*, possibly *belä-* 'to wrap'; cf. *bel* 'waist'. *bilärzök* is still attested with *r* in some modern dialects.

We distinguish between three groups of *+sOk*, then: The evaluative triple around *tanṣok*, the two anatomical terms and, thirdly, *+sOk* added to agentive verb forms. The vowel of the formative is documented in Brāhmī writing as /O/ for the first two groups, in Khot and in TT VIII A. The deverbal forms *could* be a different formation altogether; with them, /O/ as the last vowel is purely hypothetical. Perhaps the clue to the function of *-gAysOk* lies in its association with death.

2.94 +gOk

The lexeme belonging most clearly to this formation appears only in the DLT: *çamgok är* 'a slanderous man' (in fol. 236) surely comes from *çam* '(groundless) objection', attested in the late legal documents. It usually appears in the expression *çam çarım kıl-* and also serves as base for *çamla-* and *çamsız*. The DLT also has the verb *çamgoklan-* 'to be a slanderer who criticizes everyone'.

başgok, hitherto connected with *bas-* 'to tread on, etc.', probably also has this suffix. The *ş* is evident in TT IX 67 in Manichaean script, in which *s* has a wholly different form. The passage should be read as *tag]larıg başkoklarıg konu[r-* and

translated 'to uproot the mountains and promontories'. Clark (Pothi 450) still has harps and hymns in his translation, but the context describes the deeds of demons with copper eyes and terrible teeth. Cf. also *ar]kulug tagıg kōt[ūr]ū[p*, 13 lines further down. The instance can also be interpreted as *başgok* and not as '*başkok*', for the ms. frequently interchanges *g* and *k*. *başgok* is practically always used together with *tag*, in Weih 9, ETŞ 8,11, TT X 366, BT III 363, Shō IV a7, Ht VII 12 b23, Suv 493,9 and 680,12, U IV C166 and LautHöllen 134. F.W.K. Müller insisted on *ş* in an unpublished Suv transcription of his. 'summit' is one of the meanings of *baş* found particularly in the inscriptions, e.g. *Ötükän yış başı* (ŞU E9).

sämirgök or *sämürgök* (Suv 694,12, DLT and QB) could be formed from the name of *Sīmurγ*, the mythical bird of the Iranians, as Zieme writes in his note to the Suv passage. The Suv instance appears to correspond to 'sparrow' in the original, but DLT fol. 411 writes that it is 'something resembling the nightingale' in the Balasagun dialect. For Kāšġarī, at least, 'sparrow' is *säçä*. The QB 6609 instance (which Dankoff translates as 'swallow'!) may imply a play on words with *simür-* / *simir-* 'to swallow', for the line says: 'How much water (compared to the boundlessness of the sea) can the *sämürgük* carry by sucking it up?' However, a connection between the two lexemes is made impossible by the first vowel and not supported by the meanings. A derivation from *sämiz* 'fattened', while being the most satisfactory from the phonological point of view, has no semantic base either. Other bird names also end in °*gOk*, among them *çwmgok* 'the white-footed crow' (*DLT* fol. 236 and QB 77) and *üpgök* 'the hoopoe', attested in the IrqB, the DLT etc. The first is surely not derived from *çom-* 'to sink in water', an act which is not typical of crows; *üp*, the base of the second, is an onomatopoeic, as also shown by the reduplicating alternant *üpüp* (TT VII and DLT). *çımgok* 'cymbal' (BT III 973 and the ms. T III Kurutka 1857 (Syriac script) quoted in the n. to BT VII A 164) is another °*gOk* lexeme with an onomatopoeic base.

yalŋok 'human being' is probably connected with *yalıŋ* 'naked', calling to mind the helplessness of the human condition; *ŋ* and *+g°* would get contracted. The *o* appears in most of the Brāhmī instances of this lexeme, which is why we write the suffix as *+gOk* and not as *+gUk*. *yalŋok* is attested only in Uigur and in Qarakhanid Turkic, and is particularly common in the former. A verb *yal(ı)ŋ+u-*, the existence of which the *EDPT* assumes for QB 5972, is a chimaera as long as there is no other documentation for it.

Nothing systematic comes out of the lexemes discussed here.

2.95 +(A)ŋ

Residual formation whose derivates denote things to which the base lexeme belongs. The formative is added to nouns and adjectives and forms nouns and adjectives of related meaning. The most transparent forms are the ones ending in -(X)nç+Aŋ, *ayançaŋ* 'reverence, reverent' is discussed in the *UW*. There are quite a number of exs., practically all of the adnominal ones qualifying *köŋül* 'state of mind'. One further such instance to be added to the *UW* entry is *agır ayançaŋ kerigünç köŋül* (TuoLuoNi 148). *ayançaŋlıg* (*UW ibid.*) presumably comes from the nominal use of *ayançaŋ* as 'reverence'. The *UW* records also an ex. of *ayançaŋsız*, translated as "ohne Ehrfurcht". Note, further, the etymologising binomial *ayaguluk ayançaŋlanguluk* in BT VIII B219.[218] In spite of this, the *UW* is right in considering the possibility of a derivation not from unattested 'ayanç' < *aya-*, but from *ayınç* < *ayın-* 'to fear' (q.v. in section 3.104). The other -(X)nç+Aŋ lexemes come from attested -(X)nç forms. First *küvänçäŋ*, in *biligsiz gururlar* (Maitr 106 v6). The opposition between *küvänçäŋ köŋül* is 'a proud and arrogant state of mind', *küvänç köŋül* is just 'pride, arrogance', *köŋül* serving as prop for the abstract in the second phrase. Finally we have the following passage, completed by Ş. Tekin: *kim ymä [ögrünçä]ŋ sävinçäŋ köŋülüg* (thus!) *ärsärlär* . . . 'whoever is jolly and glad at heart, . . . ' (Maitr 83 r17). All three -(X)nçAŋ forms denote states of mind, then. Along the same lines we find, in the Codex Comanicus, *yuvançaŋ* 'sluggish': *yuvanç* 'sluggishness' is known from Kazakh. +Aŋ thus forms adjectives from -(X)nç abstracts. From *unutçaŋ* 'forgetful' in the Codex Comanicus we understand that the Comans metanalysed -(X)nçAŋ to -(X)n-çAŋ. *öl+äŋ* appears to denote 'a stretch of land which is marshy, or interspersed with lakes and ponds', according to Chinese sources of the Uigur texts. The weakness of this etymology is that *öl* has a long vowel in Tkm., *öläŋ*, however, a short one. Doerfer (personal communication) thinks *öläŋ* may have been borrowed back from Mo.. *kurug ölāŋ* (Suv 599,13) is probably not a "trockener Teich", nor "a dry meadow", as the *EDPT* writes, but 'a bleak marsh': *kurug* often signifies 'empty' rather than 'dry'.[219] According to Röhrborn's n. to Suv 31,19, *öläŋ* should be "Land mit Gewässern dazwischen", but that is not what his translation gives. In Maitr 55 v14, finally, *ölāŋ çimgān* is apparently a binomial to be translated as 'a

218 Two of the instances of *ayançaŋ(lıg)* in Shō are actually written as *aya'nçaŋ*. The editor reads them as *ayagçaŋ* and thinks they may be the result of contamination with *ayag*. The TT III 2 instance (q.v. in the *EDPT*) is printed in fat letters by Clark (Pothi 2) as if it were a conjecture; however, it does appear in the ms.

219 In Suv 600,5 we learn that the *ölāŋ* has a lake in it.

watery meadow': *tag töpösintä m(a)r(a)k(a)t ärdni öŋlüg yılınçga yumşak ärdnilärig töşäp urmış täg öläŋ çimgänläri ärür*. Cf. also the Middle Turkic and modern evidence mentioned by the EDPT.[220] Ottoman *kıraŋ* 'shore, edge' no doubt also belongs to this formation, being related to the DLT's *kır* 'dam'; this should just be a special meaning of 'mountain formed of one mass of rock', another one of the DLT's translations for *kır*. *öläŋ*, Ottoman *kıraŋ* and *kölüŋ* (DLT), which is mentioned below, belong to one semantic domain, forming a second group within this formation.

kaŋ 'father' possibly belongs to this formation, *if* it can be related to *ka* 'family'. This is attested only as a binomial with *kadaş* (a presumable cognate), but cf. the *EDPT* on it. The connection of *tüzäŋ* with *tüz* 'straight, flat' is also tentative; the contexts are quite fragmentary and are quoted here only in the hope that some better ones turn up in the future:]*urtum tüzäŋ* [(Maitr 26 r 19) and]*lar ymä tüzäŋ kogşak* [(Maitr 179 v 2). In the case of *taşaŋ*, the meaning should be clear but questions arise about the derivation. We find it in BT III 775: *yarlıkançuçı kõŋülüg köküzüŋüztä keŋ taşaŋ terä yıga alu y(a)rlıkap* .... *UW* 89 b translates this as follows: "in Eurem barmherzigen Sinn geruht ihr, in weiter, überströmender (?) Weise die Bitten völlig$_2$ zu erhören". The binomial *keŋ taşaŋ* is attested also in ShōAgon 1,91 in similar spiritual context. To judge from the translation, Röhrborn must be deriving *taşaŋ* from *taş-* 'to overflow'; Shōgaito compares it with *tälim taş-ım* (q.v. below), a binomial. The deverbal formation has the vowel /X/, however. So the word must nevertheless be from *taş* 'outside' and the metaphor be connected with the 'ingathering of the ones roaming wide'.

Two transparent denominal °*ŋ* nouns defined and used in the DLT have an aberrant vowel: In fol. 607, *köl+üŋ* 'a pond of stagnant water where birds nest' is not vocalised in the second syllable, but in verse in fol. 49 it is both vocalised and written with *wāw*. *yälïŋ* in fol. 607 is defined as 'a place in which the wind blows a great deal' and used in *bo yälïŋ kün* 'This (is) a windy day'. The entry immediately follows upon that of *yalıŋ*, which may have influenced the scribe: *yalıŋ* and *yälïŋ* look identical in Arabic script. The second vowel is confirmed by *yelin*[g] *taş tag* 'a windy and stony mountain' in Ht IV 352, however, which was not known to Clauson; this has the correct first vowel, as 'wind' is *yel*. The *EDPT* quotes the Sanglax as writing *yeläŋ*, the expected form for this formation; but there the meaning is different.

Thus, outside the sequence -(*X*)*nç+Aŋ*, practically all the *+Aŋ* forms are prob-

220 In case Ottoman *çayır* 'meadow' can be connected with *çay* 'middle-sized river' this would be a similar case semantically. *öläŋ* appears also in Ramst 9,4 and 9,9 ap. *UW* 38 a s.v. *aç-* II and in DhāSū 8, *tuz öläŋ* 'a salty marsh' in Ht V 1 a 10 and *öläŋlik yer* 'a marshy stretch of land' in TT V A 123.

lematical in some way or another. Two semantical groups can be discerned: the spiritual group of the *-(X)nčAŋ* forms and of *taşaŋ*, and the landscape lexemes *ölāŋ*, *yeliŋ*, *kölüŋ* and the late *kıraŋ*. This leaves *kaŋ* by itself, a simplex unrelated to the borrowed *ka*.

2.96 *+AgU*, *+AŋU* and *+gU*

A formative *+AgU* forms nominals denoting individuals whose characteristic quality 'inhabits' the body part denoted by the base noun. Thus, *karn+agu* 'a fat man' in the DLT comes from *karın* 'belly'; in Rabġūzī and in the Rylands ms., *boyn+agu* is 'obstinate, stubborn, arrogant, haughty', from *boyun* 'neck'. The connection between stubbornness etc. and the neck is a calque on Persian; cf. also *boyun bādūt* in QB 6369 (quoted under *bagragu+r-* in section 5.45) and *boyn+a-* 'to be obstinate, refractory' in the Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab (N. Yüce) and the DLT. The opposite of this in the Muqaddima is *boyun su-/sü-*. According to DLT fol. 181, "a man who obeys no one is called *bädük bagırlıg* meaning 'big livered'". This i.e. 'refractory', is exactly what *bagr+agu* signifies in QB 1126, 6166 and 6367. Arat writes all three instances as *'bugragu'* and is followed in this by the *EDPT* (which does not mention QB 6367). The *EDPT* suggests the translation "a character like a camel stallion's, hence 'violent, aggressive'", reflected also in Dankoff's version of the QB. Of the QB mss., A, the only extant one in 6367, writes *bagragu* in all three places. In 6166, B and C do not mark the first consonant with any vowel sign. A form *'bugra+gu'* would not fit any derivation pattern. Beside being supported by the DLT phrase, *bagragu* is attested also in Uigur: We find it in BT XIII 4,51 and, in identical context but written *bagıragu*, ibid. 5,229; the latter is, of course, the original unsyncopated form. It appears in the expression *bagragu nızvanı*, found also in a ms. quoted in the n. to the first-mentioned instance. Zieme further quotes *bagragu kılınç* (Maitr 73 v 30) and corrects ShōKenkyū III 29 to read *bagragu yavız kılınç*. As the use of *bagragu* in the QB shows, it corresponds to one of the *kleśas* of Buddhist thought, perhaps *dveşa*. *bagragu nızvanı* is therefore not a binome (as Zieme thought), but an attributive sequence like *az nızvanı* and *övkä nızvanı*. *bagragu+r-* also appears in ShōKenkyū III. A fourth lexeme in this group is *säŋr+āgü* of DLT fol. 613, defined as follows: *säŋrägü at* "a horse that has glanders; there is a flow of mucus from its nose like pus. This word may be used to curse out a boy whose nose is always running". *säŋir* denotes projecting parts of mountains and not of faces, but the analogy is clear. Note its translation by Ar. *anf* 'nose' in DLT fol. 601-2. Closest to this last ex. is *kärşägü at* "a horse which has a sore on its withers" in the DLT, from *käriş* "withers" (DLT). T. Tekin, 1986 has connected Old Turkic *ıŋ* (which soon went over to front vowels) and Chuv. *šăl* with Mo. *šidün* < **šil+dün*, all three 'tooth'. Accordingly, Mo. *šilegü*

'two year old animal' might have had **tış+agu* as Common Turkic counterpart. Such a lexeme, signifying 'animal at an age characterised by its (getting) teeth' would also belong here.

According to the DLT, 'a man with a big belly' is called *karnak*, clearly < *karın* and a synonym of *karnagu* mentioned above. Similarly, the DLT's *tiş+āk* 'a two year old sheep' corresponds to **tişägü* > Yak. *tisege*, same meaning. In the DLT, then, this *+AgU* has an alternant *+Ak*.

On the other hand, there is some functional similarity and perhaps some connection between this formative and the lexemes *alpagut*, *bayagut*, *başagut* and *uzagut* discussed in section 2.42. While, however, the *+AgUt* forms have more or less the same meaning as their bases applied to classes of persons, the bases of *bagragu*, *karnagu*, *säŋrägü*, *kärşägü*, *boynagu* and **tışagu* denote parts of the body. Another difference, viz. that all *+AgUt* lexemes have positive connotations whereas the four *+AgU* forms actually attested are negative in content, can hardly be a coincidence. This last bit of behaviour did not apply to Proto Turkic, as Mo. *šilegü* etc. shows. *+AgUt* could (like *+(X)t*) be used in connection with persons, (this) *+AgU* also with animals.

One aspect of the matter is the possibility that *+AgU* may actually be compounded from *+A-* (section 5.11 below) and the verbal morpheme *-gU*. This possibility is suggested by the existence of both *boynagu* and *boyn+a-*, still alive in Kirg.

tıl+aŋu 'eloquent' comes from *tıl* 'tongue, word'. It is a hap. in Suv 505,6, but cf. the common *tılaŋu+r-mak* (spelled with *u* in Brāhmī script). *tıl* being a body part and 'eloquence' a human trait, *+AgU* appears to have had a variant *+AŋU*. An unattested *+AŋU* derivate may have served as base for *yaşaŋur-* from *yaş* 'tears', a DLT hap. (like *tılaŋur-* discussed in the section on *+(A)r-*).

äsri+ŋü 'motley, checkered, sundry, various' has exs. in the *EDPT* and additional ones in UigTot 687 and 972, ShōAv 163, Ht IV 1029, HtPek 119 b6-10 (quoted in the n. to Ht X 60), Suv 384,19 and 574,16-19, BT VIII B 134, ETŞ 16,66 and 20,12 and 121, BT VII C15, BuddhUig II 76 and 390, BT XIII 46,7 etc.; it is thus much better attested than *äsri*. In the IrqB *äsri* describes all sorts of spotted animals; but its central meaning, noted by the DLT and later sources and the only one found in the QB, was 'leopard'.[221] The etymological connection is clear, but the meanings of base and derivate make it impossible that *äsriŋü* should belong to this formation unless we take both to have undergone some extreme semantic shifts.

221 Note that the Hebrew word signifying 'spotted, dappled' also comes from the name of the 'leopard', *namer*. While *äsri* and *kaplan* are Turkic for 'leopard' and 'tiger' respectively, *bars* is borrowed.

Another lexeme here is *karagu*, in DLT fol. 224 translated as "blind"; this is also what the word appears to have signified in the QB, Rabġūzī etc. Concerning an ex. in Saddh 22, Maue and Röhrborn translate "trübe" and "getrübt" (as describing the eyes): The n. thereto quotes another ex. from ms. Mz 244 v7, where a medicine against *k(a)ragu bolmak* is prescribed. *karagu* must, however, denote the patient and not his eyes, and can thus be related to the present formation. The problem in this case is the fact that deriving this lexeme from *kara* 'black' (or *kar* 'snow') does not locate its base in the semantic domain in which we found the bases of the other *+AgU* lexemes to be.

A small group of lexemes formed with *+gU* and denoting states of mind may also have something to do with the above: *enç+gü* 'peace, tranquillity' appears in Suv 618,9, Tug 34, BT XIII 24,10 and HazaiAval 26 beside the exs. quoted in the EDPT and the DTS. An expansion of *ençgü* with *+lXg* can be found in a number of exs. mentioned in the EDPT entry and also in Suv 87,14, 353,9 and 410,14, SuvStockh 38, Maitr 156 r2, BT II 1124-5, Warnke 183 and 393, in an unpublished ms. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 14,17 and, as *ençgölögkä* in the Brāhmī TT VIII A. This last ex. does not prove that the formative had /O/, as there appears to have been some harmony of vowel wideness as well. *enç* 'at peace, at rest' is just as well attested. A very similar case is *äsängü* 'well-being', which is attested also in BT V 22,504; the EDPT also has several exs. *äsängü bitig* (not *es*° as in the printed text) is found seven times in the letters of HamTouen, correctly translated as "lettre exprimant des voeux de salut"; also in MaitrH XVI 5 b 10. A HamTouen ruler calls his letter *äsängü yarlıgımız*, and the authors of two other letters in that collection abbreviate *äsängü bitig* to *äsängü* (same meaning). *äsängülüg* are quoted in the cussed at the end of section 5.12, and several exs. of *äsängülüg* are quoted in the DTS and the EDPT. Some of them appear together with *ençgülüg*, a binome found also in ShōAgon 1,216, 304 and 317 and Schwitz 3.[222] *ençgü* and *äsängü* are in Qarakhanid Turkic replaced by *ençlik* and *äsänlik* respectively, which, in turn, are not attested in Old Turkic; this indicates that *+gU* had an abstract-forming function like Qarakhanid *+lXk*. *ikirçgü* 'doubt(s)' is attested with °*ü* in Brāhmī script. It is related to *iki* as *doubt* comes from the Latin word for 'two' and German *Zweifel* from *zwei*, but it has no directly attested base.[223] Other °*gU* lexemes like *karaŋgu* 'darkness', *ädgü* 'good, goodness' and *bäŋigü* / *mäŋigü* / *mäŋgü* / *māŋū* 'eternal, everlasting, eternity, memorial' are even more idiosyncratic as far as their derivation is concerned.

222 *ençgülüg mäŋülüg* 'at peace and eternal' (TT IV B 60) < . . . *māŋigü +lüg* should not be confused with (*ençgülüg māŋi*)*lig* 'possessing peaceful happiness'.

223 Bang, 1918: 527 suggested deriving it from an ordinal form **iki+r*, the existence of which is postulated in Erdal, 1979b: 103-4 for other reasons. Deriving *ikirçgü* from **iki+(A)r+çA+gU* is one of the possibilities for an etymology.

Several of the lexemes discussed above give verbs in *+(A)r-*, as *bagragu+r-*, *ılaŋu+r-mak*, *yaşaŋur-* and *karagu+r-*.

2.97 *+gAy*

This formation has mostly directional terms as base and mostly human qualities as target group. Since it is so rare in Old Turkic, we complement our material from Mo. and Middle Turkic.

In BT II 333, Warnke 401 and BT VII A 70S we have the expression *küvänç yokay köŋül* signifying 'haughtiness', and *yokaylanmaksız* in BT II 660 is 'he who does not get haughty'. The base of *yokay* is attested only as *yok yer* 'high ground' in the DLT; since the inscrs. we have, however, *yokaru* 'up' from **yok+gArU*. *yokay* must be from **yok+gay*, with the same assimilation of the velars. We guess that this is so because of Ottoman and other *iläy* 'front', which comes from *il+gäy*, a cognate of *il+gärü* 'forward(s), west' and *il+ki* 'the first' (< 'foremost'). *ilgäy* is attested in ETŞ 9,56: *nom tilgänin / . . . / oŋay ilgäy kuvrag ara oŋaru ävirür* 'He turns the . . . wheel of *dharma* to the right, easily and as a pioneer of the community'. *ilgäy+sök* 'erudite' (section 2.93) comes from this; it is much better attested, from the Maitr on. *yüggäy*, quoted by Brockelmann, 1954 par. 51 from the (Middle Turkic) Naḥju 'l-Farādīs, is no doubt related to *yügärü* 'facing', < **yüg+gärü*. Ottoman *kuzäy* 'north' and *günäy* 'south' also belong here: The latter is related to Kirg. *kün+göy* 'the sunny side'.

While some of the *+gAy* derivates thus remain in the orientational domain, the two Uigur lexemes *yokay* and *ilgäy* apply them to human qualities. Qarakhanid Turkic participated in this use and, moreover, loosened the limitation on the bases: *öz+gäy* 'faithful' (QB 2237, 2571 and twice 2767) and *küç+gäy* 'violent' (nine times in the QB) also denote human qualities. So does *bos+gay* in the Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab as reported on by N. Yüce. He translates it as "unerfahren", its base *bos* as "unwissend, dumm, unverständig", both on the base of Arabic and Persian parallels. A n. to the BT VII instance of *yokay* compares the semantics of this lexeme with Mo. *degerükei* 'haughty, arrogant' from *degere* 'above, over'. Mongolian has a common suffix *+KAi* which is added to nouns and adjectives and forms descriptions. We find it e.g. in *üsükei* 'dense (of forests and grass)' from *üsün* 'fur, hair', *šilükei* 'sticky, clammy' from *šilün* 'soup', *seziglemkei* 'suspicious, incredulous' from Tu. **sezi-k+lä-m*, *balarqai* 'dark, unclear' and *qoŋqorqai* 'scabrous, uneven, pock-marked' from the more or less synonymous *balar* and *qoŋqur* and so forth.

oŋay 'easy' (exs. in the *EDPT*; also in BT VIII A 11, ETŞ 9,56, 16,55 and 108, TuoLuoNi 106, AbitAnk 15, DhāSū 16) belongs to this formation if it comes from *oŋ* 'right (in both meanings)'. *oŋ* is certainly orientational, but *oŋay* is in neither

Part III

The Formation of Imperial Networks

The deverbal noun and adjective formations can be roughly divided into two groups: One group (here treated last) consists of forms which generally represent the agent of the verb (under 3.3) or otherwise only oblique expressions (under 3.2), whether this verb is transitive or intransitive. The members of the other group (here treated first, under 3.1) refer to the object of transitive verbs and to the subject of intransitive ones, or to the action or state itself. Some members of the group treated first are predominantly objective/subjective, i.e. concrete, while others are predominantly abstract, but abstract and concrete reference is generally served by the same formations. The formations described first correspond to ergative language structure, which is not that of the Turkic languages as we know them throughout their history; we shall call them the *ergative formations*. The term 'ergative' has hitherto, as far as I know, been applied only to verbs in terms of the nominals they actually govern, and has never been used in the domain of derivation. I know no better name for the relevant distinction which I would like to capture. The functional set-up of the formations treated last (which are much less numerous) does correspond to the operative grammatical structure of Old Turkic; consequently, we find that there was an exchange of forms between that group and the verbal systems of the Turkic languages. Those are called *non-ergative formations*. With the non-ergative formations it is sometimes difficult to say whether a form was at first morphological and gradually crystallised into a formation, or whether the process happened the other way around. This may have been different with different formations.

The ergative orientation of the larger group of verbal nouns might be explained by the assumption that Proto-Turkic was, at some earlier stage, a language of the ergative type. This is pure speculation.

Within the set encompassing agent nouns, attributive participles and predicative verb forms (which also accord with the agent) two layers are discernible: The older layer based on *-gA(y)* and *-gU* and the secondary layer making use of the denominal suffix *+çI*. An offshoot of the old layer are the *nomina instrumenti* (treated under 3.2 below), which make use of diminutive suffixes. Delimitation between the agent nouns and the participles is not very easy.

To a certain extent, the dichotomy among the deverbal nominals is mirrored by a slightly different dichotomy in the systems of Turkic participles. Some verbal nominals, like the attributive *-(y)An* of Republican Turkish or the predicative *-gAy* in Old Turkic, can refer only to the agent. Others, which enable pronominal reference to the agent through possessive suffixes, can refer to anything else. This is not the place to analyse the Old Turkic verbal system; when that is done, however, it will have to be looked at in the light of the functions which the verbal nouns could originally take upon themselves with respect to the representation of object, action, transitive and intransitive agent and oblique participants. The

small group of agent nouns clearly did not suffice for the relatively new agentive structure of the Turkic predicative verbal system. The ubiquitous suffix *+çI* was therefore called in to create a new generation of nominals limited to the agent, like *-Xgçı, -gUçı* and the opaque *-dAçı*. *-dAçı* belongs wholly to morphology, *-gUçı* is on the way to doing so, and *-Xgçı* forms governing nominals are discussed in section 3.321. One gets the impression that all three forms can be constructed freely. *+çI* derivates from other verbal nouns also function as agent nouns and alternate with the mentioned forms. They are listed among the *+çI* forms, on p. 116. The Old Turkic agent nouns deserve a more detailed discussion than can be offerred here.

Schulz, 1978: 8-16 suggests six criteria to distinguish between-"deverbale Lexeme", what we here call 'verbal nouns', and "Verbalnomina"; our 'participles' and 'infinitive':

1. Deverbal nominal formatives cannot be added to *any* verbal stem, but are "lexikalisch festgelegte Bildungen". This point concerns the distinction between creativity and productivity and is no doubt, in a general sense, correct. Even when "deverbale Lexeme" are spontaneously created, they are meant to be 'new labels', as it were, and not to sum up an already known lexical content in a new form.

2. If I understand this point correctly, it refers to the fact that "deverbale Lexeme" lack some verbal categories, such as negation in *-mA-*, and voice, such as expressed by the passive and causative suffixes. "Deverbale Lexeme" are indeed never negated by *-mA-*; but, on the other hand, some "Verbalnomina" are not always negated with *-mA-* either: *-gUlXksXz* is quite common, and *-gU* and even *-mIş* and *-mAk* are not, in the earliest texts, negated by *-mA-*; see Erdal, 1979: 156. As far as the passive and the causative are concerned, the statement is clearly incorrect: *üzlünçü* comes from *üz-ül-*, *övrilinçsiz* and *yuklunçsuz* come from *övr-il-* and *yuk-ul-* respectively, *yürök yarılınçıg* from *yar-ıl-*, etc. Deverbal nouns derived from causatives are even commoner: Most of the *-Ut* nouns, q.v. below, are derived from causative verb forms. We also have e.g. *yöläş-ür-üg*, *ogşa-t-ıg*, *tam-ız-ım*, *bälgür-t-mä* and *tükä-t-inçsiz*, to mention, again, some of the exs. for which both simple and derived verb are well attested. Admittedly, derivates from causatives and passives are very much rarer than causatives and passives among finite verb forms or participles and infinitives, but still: the possibility exists and was made use of throughout the history of the language. On p. 12, par. 6,1, Schulz adds the reflexives to the "Intransitiva" and "Faktitiva". These are also common enough; one need only mention *sı-n-ok* and *tüg-ün-ük* of the IrqB.

3. "Deverbale Lexeme" cannot be joined by auxiliaries and other verbs of reduced predicativity to form composite verb forms: This is correct.

4. Like Latin *amor patris* which can signify both 'the love a father feels for his offspring' and 'love for one's father', nouns joined to action nouns can refer both to subjects and objects: I haven't checked this, but it would appear to be correct as well.

5. "Deverbale Lexeme" do not tolerate verbal government in the form of direct objects: This is correct in general, but there are some exceptions; they are discussed where the formatives in question show such cases, e.g. *-XgçI* mentioned above. On p. 15 par. 5,a), Schulz notes that morphological verb forms can receive a nominal agent. Deverbal nouns could be considered to do that, too: In *but kötürmä tınlıg* (q.v. on p. 319), *but* is subject of the verb *kötür-* 'to carry, to lift'. In *kut kolunç* (also discussed below), *kut* is the object of *kol-*. But here, the bracketing should be (*but kötür-*)*mä tınlıg*, (*kut kol-*)*unç*, etc. Such 'incorporated' nouns do not show the nominal categories number, possession and case. In the sentence *bildi öŋräki tözünlär bilmäyüküg* (HtPar 50 r22-23, quoted by Schulz) 'He knew what earlier *äryas* did not know', for instance, the subject is in the plural; this would have been impossible with a deverbal noun. The point is that participles can have actual, referring nouns as arguments, whereas deverbal nouns can have only non-actualised, generic ones. The subject can, of course, be referred to by possessive suffixes with all nominal forms of the verb as well as with deverbal nouns.

6. "Deverbale Lexeme" behave like nominals in receiving their expansions as adjectives, demonstratives, etc. This, also, is no doubt correct.

Note that points 1, 2, 3 and 5 are negative, i.e. they say what "deverbale Lexeme" cannot do. Among these, point 1 would be rather difficult to check: Our corpus being limited, none of the verbal forms can be documented for all verbal bases, and the absence of an *-Xg* form, say, for a certain base might be a mere coincidence. Point 2 was shown to be incorrect; point 3 is not true of all participles, not, e.g., for *-yUk* as far as I know. Point 5, which showed itself to be most useful, has its exceptions. Among the two 'positive' points, 4 applies only to the use of deverbal nouns as verbal abstracts, which are the counterparts of infinitives, and not to agent, object, instrument etc. nouns, which are the counterpart of participles. Point 6 is just as true for participles and infinitives as it is for deverbal nouns. (On pp. 10-11, Schulz shows this to be the case for the *-mAk* form.) Point 1, then, is true by definition but not always easy to check; point 5 is the most operative one, and will be kept in mind throughout this part of the book.

Among the so-called 'ergative' formations, *-Xş*, *-(X)nç* and *-(U)t* mostly but not exclusively denote the action itself. With *-(X)g*, the task of action noun is still the best-represented, while it is in decreasing proportions for *-(O)k*, *-(X)nçU*, *-(X)m*, *-dU* and *-(X)ntI*. *-(X)m* also serves for quantification. *-Xn*, *-mA* (which also governs nominals), *-gI*, *-(X)z*, *-gXn*, *-(X)l*, *-vI* and *-(X)ŋ* only denote the object of their base if it is tr., its subject if it is intr., but not the action.

The deverbal nominals formed with *-Xş*, *-(X)nç*, *-(X)m*, *-Xn*, *-(U)t*, *-(X)z*, *-(X)l*, *-I* (but not *-şI*) and *-(X)ŋ* on the one hand, with *-gI*, *-gXn* and *-vI* on the other, practically always have one or two but not three syllables. *-(X)g* and *-(O)k* do have trisyllabic members, but these are a vanishing minority of the nominals formed with these formatives. *-(X)nçU* lexemes practically always have three syllables. All of these are ergative formatives. There does not seem to be any such limitation on other formations in part III; the formatives of these 'unlimited' formations all start with consonants (e.g. *-mA*).

3.1 Ergative formations

3.101 -(X)g

This suffix is not always easy to distinguish from *-Ok* ~ *-Uk*, the other common suffix for forming deverbal nouns and adjectives. In general, both *-Xg* and *-Ok*, q.v., form subjects for intransitive verbs and objects for transitive ones, action nouns for both verb classes and some oblique nouns referring to place, instrument etc. The two formations differ both in their vowel and consonant phonemes, but still cannot be distinguished in quite a number of cases. This mostly depends on the type of attestation we have. If the stem ends in a vowel, the velar alone remains for distinction, as neither suffix is dominant; but not all scripts used by the Old Turks distinguish /g/ and /k/, as do the runic, Manichaean, Brāhmī and Tibetan writing systems. Moreover: With the Manichaean script, existing distinctions are not always correctly applied by the scribes, particularly not in the Pothi-Book (TT III, IX etc.). Tibetan writing does not distinguish word-final /k/ from /g/. In Arabic script, used for Qarakhanid Turkic, /g/ and /k/ are distinguished only in back-vocalic words. Uigur script, the most common one for Old Turkic, does not distinguish between front-vowel /k/ and /g/, and not always between the back-vocalic allophones of these velars: In some mss., *q* is carefully distinguished from *γ* by having two dots over it, while in others these dots are used in what seems to be an utterly confused fashion. For want of published systematic research on this matter, I have not been able to assess the dependability of different Uigur mss. for this purpose. In this matter, comparative evidence should also be of use since, in

some modern Turkic languages, final voiced velars have disappeared while voiceless velars are retained. Such evidence should, however, only be used as a *last* resort: There could have been both *-Xg* and *-Ok* derivates from a single base, the former, say, living on in particular modern languages, the latter attested in Old Turkic. More detailed research will have to go into this matter as well. Where the stem ends in a consonant, *-Xg* and *-Ok* are easily distinguished if the last vowel of the stem is unrounded. After stems with rounded vowels, however, /X/, /U/ and /O/ appear identical even in Brāhmī writing in the formation we are concerned with here: The distribution of *ö/o* and *ü/u* is the same with *-Xg* as what we find for *-Ok* below. We have seven Brāhmī exs. in all, on the one hand, of *çōk-ōg*, *odog*, *ōl-ōg*, *öt-ög* and *yör-ög* and, on the other hand, one each for *sür-ūg*, *um-ug*, *yul-ug* and *yöläştrüg* < **yöläştür-üg* or *yöläşürüg*. The only unexpected form is *yör-ūg* in TT VIII H6, which is counterbalanced by *yör-ög* in TT VIII A 43 and 45.

For some derivates, evidence concerning their assignment to one of the two formations is conflicting: 'a religious fast' is clearly *baça-k* in the DLT and seven times in Chuast, but equally clearly *baça-g* in ms. TM 183,6 of the Chuast in Manichaean script (published by Le Coq), in M III 13,10$_4$ (text 6 a) and four times in M III text 20, including the complementary fragments found by ZiemeTexterg II. All this not counting exs. in Uigur writing, which include both Manichaean and Buddhist texts like Maitr, and proper names. The latter are documented in UigOn I v 2 and 7 and in footn. 55 thereto, on p. 82. Zieme writes *baçak* there, but *baçag* in Maitr 27 r 14, which he quotes in the n. to ZiemeGuan 2-3. Cf. *poşat* dotted.

A great difficulty in distinguishing between *-Xg* and *-Ok* resides in the fact that both derivates may have existed side by side. In Republican Turkish, *örtü* is 'covering' whereas *örtük* signifies 'covered'. The first comes from **ürt-üg*, which would look exactly like *ürt-ük* in Uigur writing. The word/words is/are attested in U II 33,5 and 42,9; BT II 591; BT VII A 441; BT VIII B 408, Maitr 31 v 5 and 83 v 11, USp 79,11-12, Suv 72,21-2; 78,23 and 86,15 etc., all in Uigur script; in QB 1897, twice 3919, twice 5818 and twice 5663 and DLT fol. 64 in Arabic writing. I know of no instances in runic, Brāhmī or Manichaean letters, either for this or its derivates in *+lXg* and *+sXz* (not quoted here). Old Turkic need not have distinguished these two by using different forms. *ba-g*, for instance, is both the means for binding things together in a concrete or metaphorical sense, 'a tie, bond or connection', and the things or matters thus bound together, 'a bundle, bale or confederation'. *yorı-k* signifies both 'gait, movement, course, behaviour, conduct' and 'functioning, progressing' as adjective. Thus, there may have been two Old Turkic derivates from *ürt-*, or just one, either *ürtüg* or *ürtük*. In Buddhist and Manichaean usage, the term makes sense only as part of religious terminology,

been burned, emitting a smell'. küläşügin or *külüşükin oloralım* (M II 9,19-20, text 3) is also quite transparent semantically ('mutual laughter') but isolated. Abstracts can be both *-Ok* (e.g. *ämgäk* 'suffering') and *-Xg* (e.g. *bödig* 'dance'). The *hapax op-ug* 'a gulp' (ZiemeSklav III 30) could possibly be an *-Ok* form, although *-Xg* is more often used for nouns, *-Ok* for adjectives. *kana*-K 'bloodletting' (TT VII 42,3) is another action noun *hapax* which has an either voiced or voiceless velar suffix. *salınduruk* or *salındurug* in BuddhUig II 347 is not a *+(n)dUrXk* noun but must be an adjective derived from *salın-dur-* 'to be made to dangle': *anıŋ arasında yana KÖRÜRlär yol yanında . . . adrok ÄRDİNİlig koŋra-gular, baş bındävirlär asıglıg salınduruK adınçıg körklä bir kurekarıg*. The *-Xg/-Ok* lexeme is here parallel to (*adınçıg*) *körklä* and to *as-ıglıg*. In ls. 349 and 353 of the same text we find the expansion *salınduruKlug* used as a predicative adjective accompanying *ärti*, whereas *salınduruK* is in attributive position. A similar case is that of *bütüg* or *bütük*, which appears in one and the same passage repeated in the two additional leaves of the KP found by Hamilton and Zieme respectively, A r4 in the first, I.15 in the second. The binomial *bütüK tolu* is used for describing the eyes of the good prince when he is again able to see: *ötrü teginniŋ bir közi yarodı, bütüK tolu boltı*. The base clearly is *büt-* 'to become perfect, etc.', frequently used in medical texts with the meaning 'to heal (intr.)'. *tir-ig* or *arı-g* would be of comparable meaning for the *-Xg* formation, *tägl-ök* 'blind' or *yaro-k*, derived from *yaro-* of the passage, for *-Ok*. The third word in the series *bäglär buyruklar bütürüKlär kunçuy katunlar* (Maitr 163 r9 and 167 v1) and *eliglär bäglär atlag yüzlüg buyruk bütürüK ınanç tayanç ạv edisi bolup* . . . (MaitrH XVI 8 b24) must have been some title, and we can take it to be connected with *büt-ür-* 'to carry out'. Because of its parallelism with *buyruk*, one can perhaps take it to have had a °*k*, but that is not certain: Cf. *başla-g* in *iş başlagları kanka ötüg ıdt*[ı] 'the directors of the project sent a petition to the emperor' (Ht VII 13 b7). *In case* this is the same lexeme as the very common *başlag* 'beginning', it should be a title with *-(X)g*. But, here as in some other cases, we may have two lexemes disguised as one.

One can take *erpä-K* 'a saw' (Maitr 68 v16-17, 68 v3 etc.) not to have had a °*k* because instrument nouns like *üt-üg*, *tuşa-g*, *sanç-ıg*, *süŋ-üg*, *ba-g*, *il-ig*, *sal-ıg* and *ırga-g* all have °*g*. Another possible name of an implement with an unclear velar is *olıK* 'wrench (?)' in Maitr 198 r25 (= BT IX 248,25$_1$): *yalŋok ajunta tugguluk tınl(ı)glar ög karnı içintä . . . tämirlig olıgın olınmış osuglug tokuz ay o*[*n*] *kün ämgäk körürlär* 'The creatures who are to be born to a human existence suffer in the belly of their mother during nine months and ten days, as if they were being twisted with an iron wrench'. A word read *wlıK* also appears in TT VII 30,3 (a part of the text of TT I), but is difficult to reconcile with the meaning reached for the Maitr lexeme.

DLT fol. 72 has *istä-g* or *istä-k* 'inquiry, prosecution, investigation of a thing'.

This is exactly the meaning demanded for *istig* in M II 12,12: *trazuk içintä olgurtur, teyür, t[razu]k ag[sar] k[ıl]ınçı aytıg bolur; [i]rinçü kılmış kılınçı istig bolur.* 'It is said that he places them on scales. If the scales rise, there is an enquiry about his deeds. The sins which he has committed are investigated.' The word in question has been thought to be an *-Xg* noun from *äşid-* as stated both by Bang (*Le Muséon* XXXVI p. 228) and Arat (ETŞ 6,10); but that is not attested elsewhere and would not fit the meaning. The second *i* should therefore be considered a mistake. This is a text in Manichaean script, which would seem to demand a *voiced* velar also for the DLT instance. Here too, however, we would need at least further proof, as the velars could be confused: Cf. *ıkaç* in l.5 for *ıgaç* (not rechecked in the ms.). Dankoff and Kelly write the DLT instance as *istäk* as in Republican Turkish; the *EDPT* writes *istäg*, however, the existence of which follows from the velarless Kirghiz cognate quoted there.

Both *suvıg* and *suvık* may possibly have existed side by side for 'slush(y), ooze(y), muddle(d), semiliquid(ity)', although the existence of neither has been recognised for Old Turkic by the authorities. The DLT has both derivates, the first only as a base of a denominal verb: *ol balıg suvıg+lan-dı* "He reckoned that the honey was runny". The second is given with both a *kasra* and a *ḍamma* in the second syllable, among which the *kasra* would seem to be the original: *suvık yogrut* "runny yogurt"; also "anything liquid and runny like clotted cream and thick fruit juice". Houtsma also notes *suvık* (mistakenly written '*savık*') 'soft', with *yā* in the second syllable. The base must have been **suv+ı-* 'to be or become watery'. This is unattested, but the DLT has *suvı-ş-*, with the ex. *yugurmış un suvışdı* "The dough was flabby owing to the excess of water in it". This is also used, he says, "of any substance that is thin owing to an excess of water". Ottoman Turkish had both *sıvık* 'liquid (adj.), runny' and *sıvı* < **sıvı-g* 'a liquid'; in Khal. we also find *sıvık* with the appropriate meaning. The vowel of the first syllables here is probably not the result of unrounding: As the sibilant of Chuvash *şıv* shows, *suv* 'water' must originally have had an *unrounded* back vowel, subsequently rounded by the /v/. In the Ottoman bisyllabic forms, the second vowel helped retain the original first vowel. Among the Uigur exs., this original vowel has been found only in BT VII A 326, in *sıvıklı yumgaklı dıravılar* 'liquid and solid substances'. The editors write '*sıyıklı*', but the ms. hardly distinguishes *v* and *y*, as *dıravı* and *devata* in l.331 show. Further: *v(ı)rxar içintä kovuk suvık arıgsız kämiştimiz* (Maitr 174 v29 = BT IX 175), translated in *UW* 190b top as "wir haben Abfälle$_2$ und Unrat/Exkremente auf [das Gelände des] Klosters geworfen". Röhrborn writes our word as '*soyıg*', presumably connecting it with *soy-* 'to skin, peel, strip', but that would give a rounded vowel in the second syllable. In *ınça kaltı çug suvık turgurup artokrak särgürsär, . . .* (Suv 74,23) 'just as, if one has a turbid liquid stand for a long while, . . .', *çug suvık* corresponds to Chin. *cho*

sāser 'slowly water'. The same binomial should no doubt be read also in TT V p.100: (Just as the water-clarifying jewel *udakaprasāda*) *çug suvikig sāzgali umaz* &c. (so also faith clarifies the mind which has become muddled,) &c.[227] Further instances of *suvik* probably appear in Heilk 185, 135 and 186, wrongly taken to be variants of *sogi-k*; the passage of *VgV* to *VvV* is unknown to me from Old Turkic. An ex. of *suvik* with dotted Q occurs in Yosipas 109, where the dotting is dependable; but the context is utterly hopeless.

yuŋla-g or *yuŋla-k* comes from *yuŋ+la-* 'to use', discussed below. It is attested only in HamTouen 22,14, in the sentence *anta yuŋlaK bolu* or *buln*. This is translated as "il en a trouvé là-bas (de cela?) l'utilisation", but the n. adds that other interpretations are possible, e.g. "là-bas ou de cela il y a eu consommation" or "là-bas il a été consommé". What is common is the expansion *yuŋlaKlik*; it should be read with *+lXk* and not with *+lXg*, as it signifies 'for use'. This expansion appears, e.g., in HamTouen 28,17: *mäniŋ üç tört torkuluğ yuŋlaKlik tavar alyuk* 'of "il a pris de mes marchandises pour utilisation trois ou quatre pièces de soie". Economical documents show *yuŋlaKlik* qualifying *tavar*, *kümüş*, *çao*, *böz* or *kunpe*, always in similar contexts. As all this documentation (some of it mentioned in the *EDPT* s.v. *'yuŋlağlığ'* and some in the *DTS* s.v. *'juŋlaqlïγ'*) is in Uigur writing, we have no way of knowing whether the suffix is *-(X)g* or *-(O)k*; I know of no modern evidence for either *yuŋlaK* or *yuŋlaKlık*.

adkaK 'attachment' and its derivates *adkaKlıg* and *adkaKsız* are (like *adkan-*, q.v. in section 7.2) key terms in Buddhist psychology. They needn't be documented or interpreted here, as this is done adequately in the *UW* s.vv. *aŋkak*, *aŋkaklıg* and *aŋkaksız*. Concerning shape and etymology see *adkaş-* (section 7.1). Uigur *adkaK* is always spelled with D except in the Leningrad ms. of Suv. It lives on in its original concrete sense in Teleut, quoted by Radloff as *atkak* translated as "Widerhaken (der Angel)". The */t/* in this form presupposes that *d* was voiceassimilated to *k* before it could turn to *y*. *argag* "fishhook" in DLT fol. 82 should probably be emended to *adgag* or even *adkag*: *dāl* and *rā'* are easily confused, and so are *ghain* and *qāf*; see also *ırga-g* below. The TT III ex. of this lexeme (Manichaean script) is also spelled as 'TQ'T, for all it is worth. Most exs. in Uigur script leave the final Q undotted. Uigur *adkaK* has the metaphorical meaning 'the wrong concepts which capture and impede us'.

We shall now list the *-(X)g* forms and leave *-(O)k* for the next section. The reader should keep in mind that membership in one of the two lists can be tenta-

227 The facs. shows *suvik* to have been written with a rounded vowel in the second syllable and an *l*-hook mistakenly appended on to the end of the *q*. This vowel has been emended here, as the accusative suffix, which always has fourfold harmony, is written with *I*. The same error has occurred with *u-mlq+I*, which should not have been written with two *u*'s.

tive in some additional cases. We have not attempted to structure the presentation along any semantic or functional lines: As the forms are very numerous, we list them alphabetically, to make it easier for the reader to find them. -(X)g lexemes are usually bisyllabic. There are at least three monosyllabic ones, however, and at least ten trisyllabic ones, most of them well attested.

Among the -Xg forms, *abı-g*[228] 'covering, covered', 1 *açı-g* 'bitter(ness), grief', 2 *açı-g* 'gift, favours', *agrı-g* 'pain(ful), a painful disease', *ak-ıg* 'influence (a Buddhist term); bodily liquid', *alkıg* 'wide, broad; freedom etc.', *alta-g* 'means, cunning (noun; used with *al*)', *arı-g* 'clean, cleanth', *arka-g* 'the woof of cloth', *asıg* 'profit, advantage' and *aya-g* 'respect, homage' need not be discussed here in detail, as that has already been done in the *UW*. A few instances of these lexemes can be added from texts which were published after the relevant fascicles of the *UW* appeared: *abıg* in BuddhKat 20 ('A.HBÄG in Tibetan characters): *koyın*,[229] *yılkısın, abıg yutuzın, yinşkä* (thus!) *kırkının, kändü ätüziŋä tägi idalayur* '(A bodhisattva) gives up his sheep and cattle, his protected wife, his delicate concubines and even his own body'. A further ex. of *abıg* appears in BT XIII 49,65, quoted s.v. *yap-ıg* below. TT VIII I21 can perhaps be completed as *agla]k abıg yerlä(r)tä*. This (Brāhmī) instance is also written with *a* in the second syllable, a pronunciation which is now confirmed by BuddhKat. *açıg tarka ämgäk* (Warnke 55 and 208 and BT VII B 120) 'bitter suffering' and *açıgı käl-* (Warnke 67) should be added to par. A,a of the *UW* entry *açıg* I. An additional instance of 2 *açıg* appears in HamTouen 16,6. On the other hand, the word written *açuk* in ETŞ 11,5 clearly does not belong to *açıg* II, but should be transferred to the *UW* entry *açok*, being close in meaning to that entry's par. A,b (and of course identical to the latter in form): Röhrborn was misled by Arat's translation. Par. A,a of the *UW* entry *açıg* II, which does not fit in with the general meaning of that lexeme, can then be deleted. The ETŞ passage *anı täg savlarnıŋ açokın bilsär*, . . . signifies: 'If he knows the elucidation (or perhaps: revelation) of such matters, . . .'. In *UW* 216a s.v. *artut*, the U I 6,12 instance is reread as *açıg*; this means that "Var.: ''ČWQ" which appears at the top of the entry *açıg* II can also be deleted. To the *UW* entry for *agrıg* we can add three binomials: *agrıg sızlag* in Warnke 462, *agrıg tükig* in BT XIII 12,127 and *ig agrıg* in BT XIII 16,13. As shown in the n. to HamTouen 16,6, we have to assume the existence of a second *agrıg*, parallel to the second *açıg*: In U III 55,10 and HamTouen 16,6, the binome *açıg agrıg* sig-

228 The [b] belongs to the phoneme /p/. A cognate is discussed in section 7.56 as *apı-t-*, the phonemic spelling. We here write *abıg* because of the Brāhmī and Tibetan sources, which show that intervocalic /p/ was pronounced as [b].

229 Both Moriyasu and Maue-Röhrborn introduce '*koyın*' into their glossary as if it were the stem form. The text has the accusative of the possessive 3rd pers. sg., however, the stem being *koy*. This is the regular *y*-dialect form of original *koń*.

180

ağız 'mouth'. In *UW* 41a top s.v. *açıg* (I) par. C it had been noticed that a negative meaning does not fit the context, and it had been proposed to delete *agrıg*. The HamTouen 16 text now shows that 'emendation' to be unnecessary. Hamilton thinks that 2 *agrıg* "serait dérivé du verbe *ayrı-*, 'être lourd, important, considérable, respecté'." I know of no such verb, but only of *agrı-* as discussed in *UW* 72a and of *agr+u-* as appearing below. The *-(X)g* derivate of *agru-* would be 'agrıg', with rounded vowel. Rather, the whole binome *açıg agrıg* shifted in meaning together with the shifting of *açı-n- agrı-n-* (q.v. in section 7.21 below).

For the *UW* entry *akıg* we have the following additions: *akıgta alkmış arzanı* (ShōAgon 1,151), *akıgın alkıp . . .* (*ibid.* 257) and a further ex. *ibid.* 68; *öŋtün kedin akıg üzülür* "Vorn und hinten hören die Ausflüsse (eines Kranken) auf" (ms. T II y 15,501 (U 3088) r5, quoted in the n. to UigTot 895). *keŋ alkıg* appears, in addition to what we find in the *UW*, in BT VII A 297, 372 and 384, HamTouen 4,9, BT VIII B 86 and 153, UigKan 209 and Buddhāv Y 4 and 157. Additional exs. of *al altag* can be found in ShōAgon 1,243 and Warnke 93. In *al altaglıg*, the suffix +*LXg* is added to the whole binomial. The *UW* quotes this only from Buyan, a text not included in our corpus; in addition, we have *a]l altaglıg uzanmak* 'resourceful mastery' in ShōAgon 3, p. 207,3. *arı-g* is now attested in Tibetan writing in Buddh.Kat 2 (written 'A.REG) and 14 (written 'A.RAG). Additional exs. of the binome *arıg nüzök* appear in Buddhāv H 53, FujYūr v19, Tenri A I and IV, AbitAnk 35 and 91 and AbitIst 15 and 67; of *arıg turug* in HamTouen 1,39', 2,13 and 4,10. We further find *tözün arıg* in HamTouen 3,2 and 18, *tāŋridām arıg ibid.* 5,3 and *arıg yarok* 5,17 and *arıg silig* in Schwitz 5.

The damaged word in *t(ā)ŋrikā yagış ayı[k] bermāyūkkā* (TT VII 25,1) should perhaps be taken to be an instance of *aya-g*; it should then be understood as 'as a consequence of not performing the obeisance of sacrifice to the god' or 'of not giving sacrifice and homage . . .' (and not as translated in *UW* 73b bottom). In the *QB*, *ayag* appears in 5771, in addition to the two instances mentioned in the *EDPT*; in accordance with Tezcan's review of the İndeks, also in 3357.

I don't think that meaning permits us to connect *alkıg* with *alk-* 'to destroy'; instead, the source must be a verb still alive in Khakass and Tuvin, *alğı-* 'to expand, become wider'. *alkıg* itself is, after all, attested only in the north-west languages at present, so that there is nothing surprising in the distribution of the base verb. Originally, of course, the verb would have been **alkı-*.

The *UW* lemma '*abınıg*', which the author presumably assigned to the *-Xg* formation, has been shown to be an error for *abiyaz*, a borrowing; that entry should be deleted.

We add the valency functions of these lexemes with respect to their base: 1 *açıg*

is action noun and subject, the base being intr.[230] 2 *açıg* is abstract and object. Note that 2 *açıg* is semantically much closer to the (trans.!) *açı-n-* II (q.v. in the *UW*) than to the *UW*'s *açı-* II, from which it is derived. *açı-* II can be expected to have had a greater variety of meanings than what can be established on the base of the only two exs. which have turned up till now. *agıg* is only action noun, *akıg* only subject, being from an intr. base. *alkıg* is action noun and subject with respect to the intr. **alkı-*. *altag* is action noun, evidently denoting also the means of cunning, an instrumental notion. *abıg* is action noun and object with respect to *abı-*, *arıg* action noun and subject, the base being intransitive. *asıg* is the resultative object of *as-* 'to increase, benefit (tr.)', while *ayag* is action noun of *aya-*.

The *UW* also has the expansions of the mentioned *-(X)g* forms: *agrıglıg* and *agrıgsız*, the Buddhistic terms *akıglıg* and *akıgsız*, the hap. *altagsız* and the very common *arıgsız*, which often signifies 'excrement'; *asıglıg* 'advantageous, beneficial, profitable' and *asıgsız*, its opposite. One ex. of *asıglıg* quoted in *UW* 230b appears in BT XIII 55,11; not '56,11' as stated. *ayaglıg* and *ayagsız* are also discussed in the *UW*; the former, however, is there confused with *ayık+lıg* (q.v. in section 3.102). The hap. legomena *açıglıg* and *arıglıg I* (as distinct from Röhrborn's *arıglıg* II, which is derived from *arıg* 'forest') are dubious. Instances of *akıgsız* to be added to the *UW* entry can be found in BT XIII 12,57 and 42,4, additional instances of *akıglıg* in Buddhāv H30 and Abhi 49. The *UW* has two nominal exs. of *akıgsız*; further ones appear in Abhi 94 b8 (quoted in Tenri p. 174) and 50.

adıg 'sober', well-attested from the DLT on, is now found also in Yarkand III.[231] It is no doubt connected with *adıl*, *adın-*, *adın* and *adır-*, being closest in meaning to the *UW*'s *adın-* I. **adı-* or **ad-*, the base, is taken to be tr.;[232] *adıg* would therefore be its object.

añıg 'evil, bad; extremely' will no doubt be discussed in the *UW* under its usual Uigur forms *ayıg* and *ayı*. One would at least have expected a reference of the type *anıg* → *ayıg*, however, as *anıg* also perhaps appears in some Uigur texts. The lexeme is very common, and doesn't need our documentation. Let us just mention *tut ayıg sav* written TU.DAḤ.YAG ZAB in BuddhKat 28, translated as "herabsetzende, schlechte Worte"; further, that the QB has *ayıg* 'bad' just once, but *ayı* 'very' ten times. The word may have died out because of the polysemy pointed out in the DLT, which calls it "a particle which represents both 'good' and 'bad'". *añıg* belongs to this formation only if it can be derived from *ayın-* 'to fear',

230 The 'taste' meaning of 'bitter' is the secondary and transferred meaning of 1 *açıg* in Old Turkic; not the sentimental one, which the *UW* entry calls "übertr[agen]".

231 Not, however, in TT VII 42,5, as suggested in the n. to BT XIII 60,6: See *atık-ımsın-*.

232 See *adır-* 'to separate', discussed in section 6.3.

q.v. among the *-Xn-* verbs. Old Turkic /ñ/ may have been a nasalised [j] and not a palatalised [n], like its Yakut cognate; Ottoman *koyun* (and not '*konuy*') also speaks for this. **ayn-ıg*, which could subsequently have been contracted to *añıg*, would refer to the indirect object of this base.

The *UW* has not yet gotten around to the following *-(X)g* nominals: *ayt-ıg* in M II 12,10, BT XIII 3,20, DLT and QB 3907, 5273 (twice), 5275, 5740 and 6120 and *ayt-wK* in Suv 10,17 are clearly the same lexeme; the instances of M II, Suv and QB 5273 (both), 5275, 5740 and 6120 all refer to the last judgement: I therefore take the Suv instance to be an error, and would suggest reading *ärklig xan üskintä ayngıa tägdüktä*. *ayt-ıg* 'enquiry, inquisition' is action noun, in the M II ex. perhaps the object noun, of *ay-ıt-* (q.v. below, in the section on *-(X)t-*). M II 12,10 has been quoted above, in the discussion of *istäg/istäk*. The *EDPT* lemma should have been *aytığ*, of course, and not *aytığ*.

ba-g represents the object of *ba-* 'to bind, tie, fasten', be it the (near-instrument) 'bond, tie', or the thing bound together, a 'bale or bundle (also of mss., i.e. in a volume)' or, metaphorically, 'a confederation or organisation; a clan'. From this last use comes the meaning 'family name', attested e.g. in BT I A_2 23 and BuddhUig II 55. An ex. in BT V 21,462 should be read as *bag(ı)n* and the sentence translated as follows: 'That man had tied firmly his own arms and legs with sharp-edged iron bonds'. Other exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in Ernte 57, Kōbunsho I 2, ETŞ 10,249, UigKol 22, U III 83,1 and UigTot 383, the last two as *bag tügün*; add also *bag çug* in AgFrag (1) F 12, TuoLuoNi 7 and BT XIII 15,26. *balıg* 'wounded' appears in the DLT and in QB 5430, and in the passage *yavız igliglärig, kartka bal(ı)glarıg igintä agrıgınta öŋädtürtäçi* in NesTex T II B 28 (U 4910) 10. *balıg başlıg bol-* (Chuast I 9) is the intr. counterpart of *balıg başlıg kıl-* 'to wound' (Maitr 78 v 1). Cf. *balık-* among the deverbal *-Xk-* verbs for cognates.

The *EDPT* and the *DTS* quote several times a binomial *är-ig bar-ıg* 'behaviour' (listed under *ärig* below). *barıg kälig* in Ht IV 896 may have had a similar meaning. In a n. to Genzan A r 3 and v 8, Kudara states that *barıg*, which appears there, is equivalent to a Chin. lexeme signifying 'effect, purport, import': *sözlämiş nomlamış nomlarnıŋ yörügläri barıgın alp bilgülük tetir* 'The interpretations of the doctrines are said to be hard to know in purport (instr.)'. Add also *köŋüllärinin barıgları öŋin öŋin ol* (ĀgFrag (1) b 8) 'The ways (?) of their hearts are all different.' *barıg* seems to have a spectrum of meanings similar to that of *är-ig* (q.v.), but the exs. are too few to make them out. In any case, the lexeme is an action noun.

DLT fol. 186 says that *bas-ıg* is 'the place of a night raid' (local) or 'a taking by surprise' (action). Uigur economic documents have a tax with this name: See UigSteu A 44 and further exs. collected in the n. thereto. The Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab (N. Yüce) has a number of exs. of *basıg* as 'stamp mark; coin imprint'. This may explain the Uigur tax name (cf. *damga pulu* in Turkey). Both this and *bas-gak*

come from a use of *bas-* given in the DLT: "of an *amīr*, to subject and organise a province"; see *basgak* in section 3.327, with n. 458.

başla-g denotes both the subject of *baş+la-* as 'leader' and the action 'the beginning', from a slightly different meaning of the base. In the sense of 'introduction (to a book)' (in HtPar 124,1, quoted in *UW* 250a s.v. *at*, par. A,f,1), *başlag* is resultative (so-called internal) object. Instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in BT I D(75) and (190), Suv 377,11, Ht V 12 b 13 and VII b7, BT VIII A 51 and 195 and B 25. The latter meaning of *başlag* has served as base for *başlagsız uzun sansar* (ETŞ 10,40 and 144), *başlagsızın* 'from the absence of a beginning' (BT VIII B 120) and *başlagsızın bärü* 'since times immemorial' (BuddhUig I 36 and 39, BuyKäl 31 and BT XIII, 5,228).

The only unexpanded Uigur ex. of *bat-ıg* is in *batıgdakı agulug lölär* (TT VI 96), where *batıg* might signify 'swamp' or 'gorge'. DLT fol. 186, at any rate, translates it as 'the deep of a canal, or other'. This, or similar, must be the meaning of *batagdama* in HamTouen 7,3. See *kölikdämä* under *köli-k* below for the second element of this word. Front vocalism of this element may appear in *bäg+d(ä)mä+kä*, in BlattRun 25. The reading *batagdama* depends on the assumption that vowel harmony does apply to this suffix; this is not the case e.g. with Ottoman *+hane*. Another interpretation of the passage is mentioned in section 2.31. *batıg* is 'the bottomless pit' in QB 1140, 4771 and 5261. In QB 1087 and 6121, *batıg* is the opposite of *ädiz* 'high, lofty'; ib. 2786, 4394, 4704, 4928, 5713 and 5899 '(positively) profound'. Old Turkic must also have had a more prosaic use for the word, as 'toilet, lavatory', understandably not attested in our texts. We meet it through the derivates *batıg+lan-* 'to defecate' and *batıg+lık* with the local or collective *+lXk*, presumably denoting the whole facility. Since *bat-* is 'to go under', Uigur and DLT *batıg* must be a locative noun.

bış-ıg 'ripe, mature, cooked' is the subject of the intr. *bış-*. It can also signify 'ripeness, maturity'; here, the word is not an action noun, however, but the abstract use of which any adjective is capable. (The action noun of *bış-* would have signified 'cooking (intr.), the reaching of maturity'.) In Maitr 198 r 24 *bışıg aş ornı* refers to the place of *digested* food, i.e. the intestines. In HamTouen 18,11 and 35,6 *bışıg torku* may signify 'silk ready for use': It is the opposite of *yig torku* 'raw silk', attested eleven times in that collection of documents. This is similar to the *yig aş ... ornı* of the Maitr ex. just quoted (which probably refers to the stomach). Other exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* are *bışıg bışgut* "herangereift" (UigTot 1221 and 1240) and *könin bışıgın tapın-* 'to serve truthfully and maturely' (UjgRuk II 5). For this last cf. *ölginçä köni bışıg tapınzun* (USp 98,7-8) 'He should serve him truthfully and maturely till he die'.

bil-ig is an action noun, signifying 'mental process' in general. It also forms abstracts from other members of the inventory of mental functions, e.g. *öpkä*

bilig, tuymak bilig, uvutsuz bilig, az bilig, bilgā bilig etc. It is attested already in the KT, BQ and Tbñ inscrs., for which cf. the *EDPT*. See also the *DTS*, which has some different exs. Appears in Tibetan writing in BuddhKat, written as HBIH.LIG, BYI.LIG and BYI.LIG. *biliglig* and *biligsiz*, qq.v. in the *EDPT*, are also common, the latter from the Orkhon inscrs. on. The *EDPT* does not have the BT I D(21) ex. of *biligsiz*, nor, curiously enough, the five Brāhmī instances of this form.

bitī-g 'anything written' denotes, of course, the object of its base. It is found in the inscriptions (now also in Tes 20) and is very common in the Uigur and in the later stages of the language.

bodu-g 'paint, dye' is the means for painting and dyeing, an instrument (and also an object) noun. Old Turkic exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* are found in Maitr 54 r3, 104 v7 and 28 v4, in HamTouen 24,8 and 30,7 and 8 and in an unpublished text quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 23-24. *boduglug karaja ton* quoted in the *EDPT* from USp 105,10 refers to the 'dyed monk's robe', but cf. Spanish *colorado* 'red'.

bōdi-g 'dance' is an action noun. The *EDPT* only quotes the DLT ex., the *DTS* also the one from QB, but we also have it from Ht VII 5 b5: *oyun ätizdürti. ba çın lag bōdigin bōditip, ul(a)tı kamag miŋ beş yüz türlüg oyun oyn[a]tıp* .... We know that the velar was voiced from some modern forms which end without it, and from the rhyme with *kāz-ig* in QB 6025. To judge by *beyi-* in the Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab (N. Yüce) and the Codex Comanicus, the rounding of the first vowel may be secondary.

boşw-g is also an action noun. The *EDPT* has one Uigur ex. for the religious meaning, 'forgiveness', and one for the civil one, 'a permission to leave'. We can add six further exs.: *tsuy irinçülärimtä boşwg bul-* (ShōUigFrag 8) can be compared to *irinçülärimin boşwg kol-* (TT IV B 50) and to *münin] kaḍagın boşwg kol[* (TuoLuoNi 375); *m(ä)n boşwg y(a)rlıgka tägip ol balıktın ündüm* (Suv 16,13) is similar to *elig bägtin boşwg bulup* ... (U III 67,1). The Qarakhanid exs. also belong to this second sense. The word was borrowed into Ordos, where it signifies 'an order'. This may perhaps have been the meaning of the binomial in UigTot 1005: *isdonpa baxşınıŋ boşwg yarlıgı üzä ävirü agṭaru tägindim* 'I have presumed to translate$_2$ it on the order$_2$ of the guru Ston-pa'. *boşwg kolayın* (BT XIII 28,8) signifies 'I would like to beg for forgiveness', as in TT IV. Cf., finally, *boşwg y(a)rlıka-* in Maitr 19 r17.

bul-ug is not attested in Uigur. The *EDPT* suggests connecting a rather obscure clause of IrqB XIX with a not too clear sentence in QB 2544. He writes both with *o* in the first syllable, but *bul-* gives a more satisfactory meaning than *bol-*. The first: *ak at karşısın üç bulugta talulapan* ... 'a white horse chose its adversary in three *quests*, and ...'. The latter, *bulugluk kayu ol, tusuluk kayu*, is now trans-

lated by Dankoff as "Who has potential for future benefit?". More exs. are needed if the IrqB interpretation is to be more than a mere guess.

(*burkug* 'a wrinkle in the skin' in DLT fol. 232 comes from **bur-(u)k-* and is related to the DLT's *bur-k-ıt-*. The ms. does not have any vowels in the noun, and definetely not a variant of *bur-kı*, q.v. among the *-gI* forms.)

buş-ug in the *figura etymologica buşug buş-* 'to be intensely annoyed' is found in DLT fol. 187. *buşug turur nızvanıl[ar]nıŋ buusı siksili* "der Betrübung seienden[233] Leidenschaften Wirkungskraft$_2$" (BT XIII 12,44) is by Zieme compared to *busan-turdaçı nızvanılarnıŋ . . . küçlāri* (ETŞ 10,176). Shōgaito mistakenly reads *boşug*, q.v. above.

The action noun *bürt-üg* 'touch' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*, although *bürt-üg+lüg* (U III 17,14) is. The fact is that (*lenxua tāg yumşak bürtüg*)*lüg oglagu äligi* 'his delicate hand which is as soft as a lotus to the touch' is an ex. for *bürtüg*, as our bracketing shows. *bürtüg* appears also in UigTot 154-5 (twice) and 1408. In UigTot 40, BuddhUig I 102, BT VII A 204 and TermBuddh 118 b6 we find *büritig*. Cf. also *bürtiglig* in ETŞ 10,156 and (*yumşak büriţig*)*lig eşgirti* in BuddhUig II 123. The latter forms appear to be based on a speakers' assumption that *bürt-* is an *-(I)t-* causative; in fact, it is a simplex, as the aorist *bürt-är* shows. The forms with /i/ are hypercorrections, then.

The *EDPT* does not have any Old Turkic exs. of the action noun *çal-ıg*. We find it in ETŞ 10,155: *çalıg sezikkā çalsıkmışlarka . . . mäŋi berdāçi*. This is not easily explained through the meanings given to the word in DLT fol. 188, which are: "'seeking a stray'; also 'the urgent news which one of the emirs sends out to the populace, calling them to him'". The first of the DLT renderings, i.e. 'a search', is chosen by Arat for the ETŞ instance, but Middle Turkic *çalık* 'violent, impulsive, quick-tempered, restive, careless' should also be given consideration.

çız-ıg denotes the object of çız- 'to draw (lines, characters etc.)'. Not mentioned in the *EDPT*. The literal meaning is encountered in *ujaklar çızıgın çızar* (MaitrH XI 14 b28) and *ujıknıŋ çızıgı tartıgı* (HtPek 39 a4 ap. *UW* 71b s.v. *aglan* par A,b), roughly 'the way the characters were drawn'. *altun çızıg* in HtPek 79 a8 (quoted in *UW* 114a bottom) is a literal translation of a Chin. phrase also referring to writing. Then we have *til agız kurıp tiltä kara çızıg bolur* (UigTot 264) 'Tongue and mouth dry up and black lines appear on the tongue'. An extension of the meaning to 'border, edge' is encountered in the Suv ex. *taloy ögüz çızıgı* quoted in the *DTS* s.v. '*čïšïq*'. This is found also in *ögüz çızıgı* 'the sea coast' in ms. T I TM 466 (U 3394) r2 and in an unpubl. ex. quoted in *UW* 205a s.v. *art* (I) par.

233 The editor translates *turur* as if it were the copula, but the likelier translation of *tur-* is here 'to arise'. "Leidenschaften aus denen Betrübung hervorkommt" would be better.

B,a. Cf. 'çıçınlıg' at the end of section 3.107 above. Next comes the metaphorical use of *çızıg*, which could be rendered as 'rule of conduct' in U III 85,7 and BT III 514.[234]

The action noun *çiltā-g* appears only in a binomial with *aya-g* (q.v. above), as *çiltā-* appears only with *aya-* (MaitrH II 7 a18 and 12 a15 and HtPek 118 (all quoted in *UW* 292), Suv 195,21 and Kuan 59) and *çiltā-ş-* (q.v. below) with *aya-ş-*. To the *EDPT*'s exs. of *çiltāg* add further ones from Suv 463,7 and 572,23, Ht VII 2074 and HtPek 73 b4 and Maitr 35 r16, 57 r7, 183 v22 and MaitrH I 6 b3 (all mentioned in the *UW* s.v. *ayag*), and Maitr 80 + 59 v23 (Laut, 1986: 205) and Schwitz 9 (not mentioned there). Cf. *ayaglıg çiltäglig* in HtPar 70,13 (damaged) and Suv 380,13. *çiltāg* appears only in Uigur writing; the voicedness of the velar is therefore hypothetical, and is based only on the parallelism with *aya-g*.

çök-ūg appears only in TT VIII A 18 and the context does not permit us to decide whether it is an action or a subject noun. The *EDPT* writes *çökük* (which does not accord with the Brāhmī spelling) and connects it with *çökäk* from the Sanglax and from Ottoman Turkish; this, however, could also come from **çök-gāk*.

āgr-ig is not only 'anything twisted', as the *EDPT* writes, but also 'encircling, constriction'. Beside Qarakhanid and later Muslim exs., the *EDPT* only quotes *āgrig* from TT V B 78. We have further exs. in ShōAgon 1,354 and 357, Ht V 12 a14 and HtPek 99 a6; the last has been translated as "Verstrickungen". Some of the exs. are spelled in a way which can be read either as *āŋrig* or as *ągrig*, and cf. *āgir- ~ āŋir-* in section 6.3.

ām-ig 'breast, udder, nipple, teat' is the object noun of *äm-*. Attested in the IrqB, which fixes the voicedness of the velar. Exs. not mentioned either in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in PañcFrag 119 and 125 (referring to an animal), Maitr 77 r8, 33 v21 and 125 r5, Suv 633,9 and Ht V 4 b25 and 7 a13. *ämz-ig* in the Khotanese source quoted in Hovdhaugen, 1971: 189 also denotes the nipple, but this time as the means of *ām-iz-* 'to suckle' (q.v. below). While both nouns denote the same entity, the denotation is conceived of through the child in the first case, through the mother in the second.

ār-ig has several uses which can hardly be called 'one lexeme'. First, as a local noun, signifying 'abode', or more generally 'the place in which something is', in the binomials *ārig yer* (twice in KT S 13) and *ärig ornag* (Suv 682,17 and Ht IV 611), in *ārig terkin* (UigOn III C5) 'abode and summary' referring to the place of the *Säkiz Yükmäk Yarok* within the *tripiṭaka* and in *ārigintin taşıktı* in BT XIII 6,13. Secondly, as action noun, 'one's manner of being', in the binomials *ārig*

234 The last-mentioned instance, spelled with *s* instead of *z*, should not be read as '*çasak*' with the printed text; thus now also Tezcan (personal communication).

barıg (M III 20,1$_2$ and 7$_2$ (text 8), U II 25,2, TT X 347, Maitr 4 r29 (damaged), LautHöllen 65 and U III 63,5), *kılınç ärig* (Maitr 4 r13 and 149 v19 and Ht VII 2 a25), *kılık ärig* (Ht IV 696), *töz ärig* (Suv 593,22) or by itself: *çın kertü ärigin* (Warnke 232), *amrılmış ärigin* (U III 7,4). In (*ädgü ärig*)*lig* in TT VIII C1, *+lXg* is added to the sequence *ädgü ärig*. *ärig barıg*, the most common among the binomials, is found expanded with *+lXg* in *yeg adrok . . . äriglig barıglıg* (Suv 124,21) and *ärigligin barıglıgın* (BT III 216-217). The four modes of being (*tört türlüg ärig*) mentioned in Suv 293,8 are listed in TT VIII F10. A third use of *ärig* is the one of the binomial *üt ärig* 'advice', found in TT VIII N10, Suv 136,5, Ht VII 2004 and 2018, ETŞ 10,10 and 13,167, BT II 247, Pothi 369, TuoLuoNi 158, Maitr 88 v6 and 11 (damaged) and 170 v22, and a number of times in the QB. From this we also get the common biverb. *ütlä- äriglä-* 'to give advice'. *üt*, which has an explicit *ü* in TT VIII H5 and N10,[235] signifies 'advice' also when it appears by itself (TT VIII H, Chuast 327, Ht V4 b3, ms. M 865 r(?) 3 in the n. to BT V375 and QB 5121) or in a binomial with *sav* (IrqB LVIII, TT II A77-8, U II 49,31-2, QB 1356). Note also the trinomial *üt sav ärig* in QB 1548, 3670, 3984, 5136, 5861 and 6265. Since this is so, the third *ärig* may perhaps be considered to be a special use of the second, with a semantic development not unlike that of English *manner* > *manners*.

ärü-g näŋ is how I read the word translated 'anything that melts, like butter or the like' in DLT fol. 47, following the etymology. DankKelly write '*ärig*' because the *rā* is dotted with a *kasra*, but add that this is by a later hand. *ärüg* is a subject noun of *ärü-* 'to melt (intr.)'. See 4 *erig* in the *EDPT* for the velar.

er-ig, a subject noun from *er-* 'to reach', is attested in the DLT and the QB, (and the Codex Comanicus). The QB exs. were obscured, and have first been identified in Tezcan's review of the İndeks, p. 43, s.v. *irig*. We have DLT fol. 47 *erig yılkı* 'a lively pack-animal' and *erig är* 'a man who is steadfast and resourceful'. In the ms., the first of these is written with a *fatḥa* in the first syllable, which Dankoff and Kelly have noted to be by a later hand. In the second instance, the first vowel is not marked at all; DankKelly take it to be an /i/, presumably confusing this lexeme with *äyrig* 'coarse, harsh' (which we are unable to analyse). In the QB, the couplets 1329, 1380, 2543, 4039, 4040 and 5590 also have this word, translated by Dankoff as "tough, steadfast, prompt".

et-ig is, in many exs., 'anything made skilfully and/or artfully', the object noun of *et-*. See the *EDPT* for some miscellaneous uses. Often, usually together with *tümäg* or *yaratıg*, it signifies 'ornaments, adornments', and a few instances of these binomials not found in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* will be quoted under *tümäg* and *yaratıg* respectively. *yok etig* in UjgRuk I 14 and 15-16 signifies 'a useful

235 It therefore cannot be read as '*öt*', which is what both the *EDPT* and the *DTS* have.

deed'.[236] In BT XIII 28,14, *etig* is translated as "Tun", i.e. 'action, deeds'. The *EDPT* discusses *etiglig* and *etigsiz* at length; they sometimes translate Skt. *saṃskṛta* and *asaṃskṛta* respectively. We should add the form *etigsizlärniŋ* from AbhiKār 11 and a further Abhi ex. of *etigsiz* from the n. thereto. Some of the instances of *etiglig* show it together with *yaratılıg*, as *etig* and *yaratıg* are also coupled. In some exs., *etiglig* signifies 'constructive', which links up with those cases where *etig* denotes 'a useful deed'. In this use, *etig* may not be an object but an action noun. In Ht V 132, HamTouen 29,19 and perhaps elsewhere, *etig* signifies 'implement', an instrument noun.

There is no base for *ınag*, but *ınan-* 'to believe (in)' is a well-known cognate. There are a few instances outside the very common binomial *umug ınag* which were not known to the authors of the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *alkolarka ınag tāginūr m(ä)n* (UigBlock 21); *üç kata ınag tāginip* . . . (BT VII J7) "Man nimmt dreimal (zum Triratna) Zuflucht" and *üç ınag tāginip* . . . (same meaning) ib. C2. *ınag* appears also in ATSS VI v6. Written with a voiced velar in Manichaean script in TT III 4 and in Brāhmī in TT VIII E 46; later evidence also exists for this. The Middle Turkic forms with *°k* were created in Mongolian and reborrowed (with the new Mo. uses and meanings). *umug ınag* is expanded to *umugsuz ınagsız*; beside the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, this expansion is attested in Suv 19,17, U III 6,9; 15,6; $41,2_1$ and 9_1, LautHöllen 31, TuoLuoNi 87, BuddhStab IV 13 and ETŞ 10,44.

ırga-g, an instrument noun, appears in DLT fol. 82 with voiced velar, translated 'grapnel, used to drag ice from the source to the icebox'. This appears to have been a long and strong hook, essentially: It could no doubt be used for the purpose mentioned in the DLT but, as the Uigur instances show, primarily for shaking fruit off the branches of trees. The DLT's *argag* 'fishhook' does not belong here, and should not be changed to *ırgag*, as the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly do: *ırga-* is 'to shake (a tree)' and the use of *ırga-l-* shows that it could be applied to other large rooted objects as well. There is one ex. of *ırgag* in TT V A 118 and others, not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, in U IV A 150 and Maitr 110 r 4. BT VIII B 88 has the metathesised variant *ıŋrag*, found again in *ıŋragsızlar üzä* = Skt. *nir-aṅkuśaiḥ* (Kinkashō śloka A,d). These two exs. suggest that *ırga-* (q.v. under *ırga-l-*) may have come from **ırŋa-*, the second consonant losing its nasality because of assimilation to /r/. One way to get rid of the difficult cluster /rŋ/ was for it to undergo assimilation to give /rg/; a second way was metathesis, leading to /ŋr/; a third one was an anaptyctic vowel to break the cluster apart: We find *ırıŋag* in BT XIII 25,8.

ışıg 'a cord or cable' is attested in KP 33,4 and 80,1 and USp 88,46-47; written

236 This *yok* appears also in ZiemeSklav III 18, UigBlock 144-5 and BT VIII A 73, in the last two as *yoklug anglig*; cf. also the instances of *yoklug* and *yoksuz* quoted in the n. to the last instance mentioned. It does not appear in the *EDPT*.

yışıg, it is found several times in DLT and in QB 1719. Related to *ışın* 'a plait of hair' (q.v.). The base 'to plait, to roll together' is attested only in modern languages; it must have had an original **h°*, to judge from the initial alternation y ~ Ø. *ışıg* would be its object noun.

il-ig 'attachment' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from USp 105,7-8; it appears also in Maitr 116 v 18 and 226 v 7, ETŞ 13,150, BT VII A 339 and BT VIII A 306, 309 and 339. In ShōAgon 1,143 and Maitr 7 v 26 and 219 r 5 we find the variant *yilig*. All exs. are binomial: *ilig* appears either with *adka*K or with *tutug*. The word is a part of Buddhist terminology and is attested only in Buddhist texts in Uigur writing. *iligsiz tutugsuz köŋülin* in Maitr 117 r 16 and 12 r 24 comes from the common binomial *ilig tutug* attested also (but not only) in Maitr. In TT VIII A 40, Skt. [*asa*]*jyamānakayena* was given two parallel glosses: verbal *ilinmāyū ātöz ūzā* and nominal *iligsiz ätöz üzä*.[237] While *ilinçsiz* (q.v. below) presumably comes directly from the verb, *iligsiz* is meant to be the privative of *ilig*.

isi-g 'hot; heat' is attested in runes, in the proper name *İsig Saŋun* of the IrqB colophon; in Manichaean script, in Pothi 371, M III 45,6 (text 32) and Windgott 46 and 48-9. These fix the velar as voiced. *isik kuyaş* in TT VIII I 10, a Brāhmī text, has no significance, as it appears in a text consistently using *k* for front [g]. *isig kuyaş* is, by the way, attested also in Warnke 467. Another proper name with *isig* is that of *İsig Ādgū totok* (Pfahl I 15). Exs. of *isig ōz* 'life' not quoted either in the *DTS* or the *EDPT* occur, e.g., in U IV A 44 and B 18. *isig* is subject of intr. *isi-* and, being an adjective, is used also as abstract: One abstract instance not mentioned in the dictionaries is *tumlıgta isigtā* 'in cold and heat' (HtPar 129,23). While *isin-* and *isiş-* are only used metaphorically and *isi-* is attested in the DLT and then only in the XIVth century, *isit-* is of wider use. *isiglig* 'feverish' is quoted in the *EDPT* from two medical sources.

kaç-ıg is any one of the six senses, in Skt. the *ṣaḍ-āyatana*. Exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in BT I B 38, BT XIII 19,64, UigBlock 49 and 52, Warnke 223, ETŞ 8,29, fourteen times in Maitr, Genzan D r 9 etc. BuddhKat 35 has a reference to five and not six *kaçıg*, spelt ḤBĒS GĀ.CAG: *ol⟨r⟩ur yatur ugurda beş kaçıg eyin barmaz* 'Whether he is sitting or lying down, he does not follow the five sense organs'. Old Turkic has no other meanings for this lexeme.[238] DLT fol. 194 does have *kaçıg* as abstract of *kaç-* 'to flee', but only in a grammatical example. *kaçıg* is probably a loān-translation of Chin. 入 'entrance, to enter' (*ru*), which, in its turn, is meant as a translation of Skt. *viṣaya* 'domain'. *viṣaya*

237 In the first case, *ūzā* may come to show that the attachment was *caused* by the body, while, in the second case, it merely translates the Skt. instrumental. At any rate, this is not normal functional use of the language for communicative purposes, and can be only of limited value for Old Turkic grammar.

238 The U III 73,17 instance should be read as *kınıg* and not as corrected in the n. to U IV A 268.

also signifies 'object'; in particular 'sense object', in plural 'the world of the senses or sensual pleasures'. Note that Mo. *bilay/viλay* is not only 'lieu, demeure' but also 'refuge, asyle'; the etymological meaning of *kaç-ıg*: It should be interpreted as 'the place one flees to', i.e. a 'refuge'. The 'regular' translation of *viṣaya* into Uigur should be *kaçıg ornın*, the regular referents the *objects* of perception, i.e. *öŋ kövk, sïn, yıd, tatg, ẽärmäk* and *törü*. In Uigur usage, however, *kaçıg* corresponds both to this and to Skt. *indriya* 'sense organ'. The n. to HamTouen 8,6 offers another (agentive) explanation for this lexeme, there written as *kaçug* (see facs.). Note that HamTouen 8 is a Manichaean text.

kakı-g 'anger' is an action noun from *kakı-* 'to be angry with (abl.) somebody'. The *EDPT* quotes only the entry of DLT fol. 189 translated 'anger, spite', the *DTS* an ex. from Suv 102,14, *övkä kakıg*. *övkä kakıg* appears also in BT III 676 and Warnke 43; cf. also *övkäsiz kakıgsız* in Suv 417,2. In SuvStockh 58, *kakıg* is alone as *kakıg köŋül* 'angry state of mind'.

kamşa-g is a hapax in KT N3, although intr. *kamşa-* and *kamşa-t-* are well attested. It is a subject nominal signifying 'shaky'.

kar-g 'joy' appears in DLT fol. 189, an action noun with no further attestation. The IrqB LVII passage quoted in the *EDPT* entry is quite obscure.

kapıg or *kapag* 'gate, door' is attested already in the inscriptions, 11 times in the name of the *Täŋür Kapıg/Kapag*: The second vowel is never explicit. Uigur has three variants: *kapıg* e.g. in TT I 144, TT V B 82, Suv 601,10, BT XIII 46,24, BT III 263, 278, 319 and 443, DLT and QB and *kapıgçı* in KP 41,5; *kapg+* before vowel in Chuast 126, TT II A 65 and BT V 452 (all three Manichaean texts); *kapag* in TT X 437 and M III 23,2 (*kapagı açal-*, graphic variant of *açıl-*), KP 42,1 and 64,7, *kapagçı* in KP 41,5. In the Maitr the spelling *kapag* is much more common than the spelling *kapıg*. Let *kapap yé-/tüzgür-* (DreiPrinz 46 and 49) be quoted for what it is worth. *kap-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) can be connected with *kapgak* 'a leather stopper, cover for a quiver' and *kapga* 'a great gate', both quoted from the DLT. The forms of *kapıg* with *a* in the second syllable may just be dialect variants, then. On the other hand, *kapak* 'lid' (attested also in Uigur as documented in the *EDPT*) would demand a base **kapa-*, since there is no suffix '*-Ak*' in Old Turkic. In that case, *kapgak* and *kapga* would be post-Uigur syncopated forms.

kar-ıg 'something one chokes on' is a hapax in QB 2855, misunderstood in the İndeks but corrected in Tezcan's review of it. Oblique noun related to the DLT's 2 *kar-*, 'to choke with (dat.)'.

Exs. of *karar-ıg* 'dark, murky; darkness' not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in BT II 306 and 874 and Warnke 244 (in the common binomial *karaŋgu karaŋg*), ms. K40 v4 published in the n. to BT V 104, BT III 108, HamTouen 3,17, ShōKenkyū III 12, BT V 560 (damaged), ms. T I X (U 133c) in the n. to BT V 97, BT XIII 12,208, M III 17,7 (text 8), Maitr 198 r 20 (with *tünärig*) and ms. TM

151 (U 128a) (Manichaean writing, with *tün(ärig)* in the n. to BT V 574. The intr. *kara+r-* is well attested. *kararıg* denotes its subject and is also used as abstract, like all adjectives: Thus e.g. in *alko adkangularlaka karaŋgu kararıglar* in Abhi 605 and 610.

kaşan-ıg 'urine' is the object noun of *kaşan-* 'to urinate'. An instance of *kaşanıg* in U II 67,1$_1$, for some reason not included in the word list of U II, is not mentioned by the *DTS* or the *EDPT* either. *kaşan-* is discussed among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

kat-ıg 'hard' is the subject adj. of *kat-* 'to be hard'. Some of the exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in Warnke 255, 308 and 606; Ernte 46, 'severe' in TuoLuoNi 186, qualifying *kart* 'an ulcer'.

kavış-ıg is attested only in the phrase *kaş kavışıg(ı)* 'the meeting point of the eyebrows'. Not quoted in the *EDPT*, but the *DTS* has an ex. from Suv 347,12. Further exs. in Suv 46,16 and 652,13-15, UigTot 827 and 832 and ZiemeGuan 33. This is a local noun.

kavr-ıg 'confinement' would also be a local noun, from *kavır-* 'to bring together, constrict'. Not mentioned in the *DTS* or the *EDPT*. Found in ManMon 13 and 49. The binomial *kısıg kavrıg* of TT VI 111 has an expansion *kısıgsız kavrıgsız* in Maitr 3 r18.

käç-ig 'ford' is another local noun. Earliest attestation as *käçigsizin* in Toñ 35. Uigur exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in ShōAgon 1,43 and BT VII A 704, the latter used metaphorically for 'dogmatic school'. QB exs. not mentioned by the *EDPT* in couplets 1541, 1793, 1851 and 2889.

käl-ig signifies 'a coming, an approach' for the DLT, which has it a number of times; in Uigur, however, *kälig* is always 'a magical appearance, metamorphic birth'. Uigur exs. not quoted in the *DTS* or the *EDPT* are attested in Ht IV 372 and 897, eleven times in Maitr and are particularly common in BT II; see Ht X 265 and BT II 293 and the notes to each of these. In BuddhKat 5 (Tibetan writing) the second vowel is syncopated before the instrumental suffix, in [*küü*] GAL.GÎN DOG.MAG. *küü kälig*, which Maue and Röhrborn have reconstituted for this passage, is the normal binomial; it is not beyond doubt, however, as e.g. ShōAgon 1,160 has *bügü kälig* instead.

kär-ig is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but we have three examples. One cannot really take these together as one lexeme, as their meanings are so different. The Maitr 83 r11 and HamTouen 20,8 instances refer to a torturing instrument, presumably a 'rack'; in UigKan 248 *bintävir käriglär* are some sort of curtains or, at any rate, sheets of fabric stretched out. For DLT fol. 59, finally, *kärig* is just a 'stretching road'. The ed. of the HamTouen ex. writes it as '*kärik*', but *-(O)k* never has unrounded vowels.

käz-ig is 'a turn of duty, a list, the order in which things happen, the succession, a round'; also 'fever', because it comes and goes. All these could not have been guessed knowing the meaning of *käz-* 'to walk about in a place, circulate or travel around'; but they are easily connected with the petrified converb *käzä* 'in turn, in due course', q.v. in the *EDPT*. *käzig* is quite well attested, as the *EDPT* and *DTS* exs. show (in the latter wrongly spelled as *käzik*). To their exs. add *käzig üzig* (BT II 1106, Ht VII 8 a 26-7 and BT I D (40). *yarutguluk käzig* (Ht IV 301), *sözläguluk käzig* (ShōAv 3 and 78), *alguluk käzig* (ShōAv 58) etc. is 'one's turn in doing X'. Further exs. Maitr 8 r 14, Abhi 1920, BT I A_1 (5) and C(4), Genzan A v 1 etc. Adnominal *käzig* appears in *käzig aş* (HukVes p. 46), in *UW* 239b, par. A_2e translated as "reihum gehende Bewirtung von Beamten". The adverbial binomial *eyin käzigçä* 'one after another' appears in U II 22,8, U III 1,10, and 35,16, BT II 490, TT VIII B 11 (Brāhmī), etc. *käz-ig* seems to be an action noun. *käziglig kişi* in QB 4890 is probably 'a man who has fever' as demanded by the *EDPT* and the context, less likely a 'sentry' or 'watchman', as Dankoff translates.

käŋrägü 'a drum' might be connected with *käŋrän-* 'to grumble', q.v. below; Shor has a verb *käŋrāt-* 'to sound out loud'. IrqB XXII writes no vowel in the first syllable of *käŋrän-*, which must be interpreted as an /ä/. *käŋrägü* is attested in BT VII A 148, 149 a, 376, 386 and 455 and as *käŋirägü* with an anaptyctic *i* before /r/ in BT III 972. The word, presumably a subject or instrumental noun, is discussed in the n. to BT VII A 148.

kıdı-g 'edge, border, frontier, shore, bank' is found in BuddhUig II 104, BT I A_2(19), Warnke 532, ETŞ 8,14, Maitr 132 v 4, HamTouen 3,6; 3,22 and 19,3, HtPar 131,8 etc., in addition to the exs. mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. *kıdıgka ündür-* in Ernte II 51 signifies 'to bring out to the side' and not as translated. *kıdı-* is attested in KT S 6,[239] ETŞ 13,111 and Maitr 32 v 4. Mongolian has a verb *kidu-* 'to fight, combat, destroy'; this must be related to the Turkic verb, because it fits perfectly with the meaning *kıdı-* must be taken to have had in the Uigur instances: *nızvanı küçin kıdıyu . . . şımnu küçin kısgaru . . .* (ETŞ 13,111) and *käkük kıdıguluk kalvink yuy kuşlar* (Maitr 32 v 4). The *käkük* is a bird of prey, by which the *kalavinka* (Indian cuckoo) and the peacock are here said to get attacked. Connecting *kıdı-* with the Mo. verb would mean assigning its final vowel to the archphoneme /X/, in Turkic realised as /ı/ after /ı/. The inscriptional instance has till now been read as '*kıd-*', due to a confusion with '*kıy-*' (see *kıyıl-* etc.). This connection is impossible, as /d/ could not have become [y] either in Uigur or in Qarakhanid. The passage could perhaps be interpreted as follows: *bir kişi y(a)ŋ(ı)ls(a)r, ug(u)şı bod(u)nı bişükiŋä t(ä)gi kıd(ı)m(a)z (ä)rm(i)ş* 'If a person errs, his clan and tribe do not fight (i.e. are unable to fight) all the way down to his

239 The parallel passage in BQ N4 is damaged, but must have had the same verb.

grandchildren, they say.' Cf. *kıdıg* in Ht V 99: *yana ı(a)vgaç el(i) ärsär, märiçi ail(ı)g uç kıdıg türk türgeş yer ol* "Ferner, das chinesische Reich, das ist ein *Mleccha* genanntes, an der äußersten Grenze (gelegenes) türkisches türgischesches Land". Negated, this binomial signifies 'unlimited in space', found a.o. in Suv 584,12, BT II 6 and InscrOuig V 44. In TT VI 138, on the other hand, *kıdıgsız* is associated with *buluŋsuz*. The uses of *kıdıglıg* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) are homely: Attested in USp and DLT, it describes coverlets with (sewn) edges in one case, hats with brims in the other. *kıdı-g* might be an object or place noun.

kın-ıg is used both nominally and adnominally, and signifies 'urge, impulse' and 'impulsive, striving, purposeful, intent, urging'; the *EDPT*'s rendering does not quite hit the mark. One nominal instance occurs in ETŞ 13,112, where *kınıg üzä* should probably be translated as 'purposefully'. *kınıg* appears together with *katıg* in Suv 426,12, U III 73,17 (read thus!), U IV C 132 and D 83 and ms. Mz 671 (T III 84-61, Ehlers 188, from the same text as the three preceding instances) v 1; with *katıglanmaklıg* in ETŞ 10,46; with *yiti* 'sharp' in SuvStockh 13, Suv 613,6 and 617,21 and Warnke 341; in fragmentary context in TT IX 63 (Pothi 446). It qualifies *köŋül* 'state of mind' in U IV A 268, C 132 and D 83, Suv 617,21 and 426,12 and Warnke 341. The SuvStockh ex. *y(ï)ti kınıgta tur-*, and *y(ï)ti kınıg tülüKıä tur-* in Suv 613,6 are definetely nominal. *kınıg* is the subject and action noun of *kın-* 'to have an urge for something'. *agınçsız kınıglıg vikirantagamini ataçım* (ETŞ 10,262) should be 'my dear father [Buddha] Vikrāntagāmin, whose striving is unswerving'; not "der unerschütterliche und mutige [Buddha] Vikrāntagāmin" as suggested in *UW* 65a bottom: I believe in bracketing (*agınçsız kınıg*)*lıg*, where *+lXg* is added to the attributively qualified nominal *kınıg*; adjectival *kınıg* would not have needed the suffix *+lXg*.

kırgag 'the selvedge of a garment and its edge' is found in the DLT. The expression *kırgag+lıg kutay* in BQ N 11 appears together with *ürüŋ kümüş* and *kinlig eşgiti*; *kutay* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) appears to be some precious fabric. I take *kırgag* to be from **kır-ıg+a-*, < *kır-* 'to scrape etc.'. *kır-ıg* itself appears in Khot 26 with the meaning 'selvage of the saddle", and in the Sanglax (translated *kanār*, quoted in the *EDPT* under *kıruk*).

kıs-ıg 'constriction, confinement' is a local, action or instrument noun from *kıs-*. See the *EDPT* for exs.; found also in Maitr 23 r 18 and 114 v 6. We have *kısıgsız* in Maitr 3 r 18, together with *kavrıg+sız* (q.v.). In one case in a binome with *taŋ-ıg*, as *kıs-ıl-* goes with *taŋ-ıl-*.

kora-g 'loss, bereavement' appears in Ongin 12 together with *yog* 'funeral feast'. It is a hapax but should nevertheless not be identified with *korıg*, as the *EDPT* does. It appears to be an action noun.

korı-g, in DLT fol. 189 translated 'the protected place or reserve of emirs or others; any enclosed place' fits the meaning of *korı-* as given in the DLT itself; it

would be its object noun. A place name mentioned in KT N8 and BQ E31 and discussed in the *EDPT* s.v. *unga* also contains this word, as suggested there, but there is a problem with the second vowel: K¹WR¹G¹N¹ should not usually be read as *korgın* but, say, *korugun*. Occasional exceptions to this are e.g. *süç(i)g* thrice in BQ, *yüz(i)ıġ* in KT, *ud(ı)-* in Toñ and BQ; *yor(ı)t-*(twice in KT) should be read as *yorı-*. See *yorı-t-* in section 7.47. That the omission of explicit /ı/ in the instances of the form discussed here is not a coincidence is shown by its reappearance in Tes 19: K¹S¹R¹ *kor(ı)g konıp, çıt tikdi, örgin yaratdı*. The editor translates this as follows: "He settled at Qasar Qorugh, he put up fences, built his camp . . .". The base is attested only in the DLT and then Middle Turkic; what the *EDPT* tries to read as *korı-* in Ongin 12 has its second vowel in a lacuna and should, moreover, be assigned to *kor+a-*.

koş-ug 'verse, a poem' is the object noun of *koş-* 'to conjoin, unite'. The *DTS* and *EDPT* only have Qarakhanid exs., but we find this lexeme also in l.5 of a fr. quoted in Samanta p. 601, in BuddhStab III 9 and in ETŞ 16,111. The original meaning, 'binding, fixation', appears in KudJunshō C r2 and Abhi B 48 a1 ff., which are partly identical, and in ShōAgon 1,355 and elsewhere in that text. The binome *bag koşug* (ETŞ 10,202) has been misread by the ed., interpreted as "Bindung, Anknüpfung" by Zieme (personal communication). The 'QB' instance occurs in the prologue, which is not a part of the text and was composed later by somebody else. *koş-uglug kaŋlı* (Suv 636,21 etc.) is not a derivate from this but belongs to section 3.119.

kō-g yulkı "any animal that is driven to pasture" is a hap. in DLT fol. 500. It should not be spelled with *ū* as DankKelly do: *kō-* 'to guard' is probably the base of *kōr-*, *kōz* etc.

kud-ug 'a well' is a rather opaque derivate of *kud-* 'to pour out or in'. In addition to the instances quoted in the *EDPT*, it appears in Ht VII 11 a6, HamTouen 16,10 and Maitr 182 v4 and 186 v6.

kurug is a bit irregular: It should have been '*kurı-g*'. But *kurı-* appears as *kuru-* at least in Ernte 119: *aşadaçı bāglār adasız bolzun; alko māŋilār kurumasun* 'May the gentlemen who are to have the profit be free from distress; may no joys get hollowed out'. *kurı-l-* (q.v.) also has a variant *kuru-l-*, and *kuru-t-* (q.v.) appears with /u/ as well. One could have thought that the instances with °*u-* are in fact *+U-* derivates of *kor* 'damage, loss', like the verb *kor+a-*, q.v. below. Compare the Ernte sentence just quoted with the following: *artu sukluk, koradı sevinç* (QB 6486) "Greed increased and joy diminished'. But the fact is that a *u* in the second syllable is found both in instances of *kurug* to be connected with the meaning 'to dry' and in such as are to be connected with the meaning 'to become absent'. The situation is similar with *kurıl-* ~ *kurul-* which bears the meaning 'to be brought to nought' in both alternants. Again with 'hapiness' as above, we can quote ETŞ

13,72: *kurılmaksız çın mäŋi* 'true happiness which is not destroyed'. *kurı-ı-* usually signifies 'to dry', but in QB 2515, for instance, to deprive (of one's head)'. In QB 1558 there even is a pun on *kurı-* and *kor: kapugum kuruttıŋ kor ettiŋ orun* 'You have left my gate lacking and (your own) place empty'. Note that *kurı-* itself is written with [u] in the first syllable in TT VIII I 2, 6 and 7 (Brāhmī) and has a [u] in the modern languages as well. *kurug* has the meaning 'dry' in Chuast 58 and 316, M I 17,12, U II 10,23 (Maitr), KP 1,3 etc.; *kurug üzüm* are 'raisins' in HamTouen 29,7 and several times in Heilk I and II. The meaning 'arid' appears in HamTouen 16,10. DLT fol. 188 tries to connect between the two meanings: "*kurug äw* 'a house that is empty of people or of furniture'; *kurug olma* 'a dry jar'. The basic meaning here is that any container that is empty is called *kurug*." Then, as a separate entry, there is "*kurug* 'dry' of anything. The previous word goes back to this one." *kurug* is more widely attested in our texts with the metaphorical meaning 'nonexistent, nonexistence, void, coming to nought'. This appears in BT I B (82), in a binomial with *yok* in Ht IV 1304, HamTouen 2,28, UigStud 22 and 1,6; together with *asıgsız* 'unprofitable' in Warnke 547 and ms. T II S 32 a-49 a quoted in the n. to TT V B 90; with *tüşsüz* in TT V B 96; further, in BuddhUig I 35, BT VII 393 and 394, ETŞ 15,5, TT III 159, TT V B 93 and Suv 599,13. The last mentioned ex. has the expression *kurug ölāŋ* 'barren marshland'; marsh cannot be dry by definition. 'hollow thought' is *kurug kovuk . . . sakınç* (Maitr 79 v 17). The opposite of metaphorical *kurug* is *kurugsuz*, which appears in a binomial with *yeg* in ETŞ 9,22. *kurug* is a subject noun; in the metaphorical meaning also its abstract, i.e. an action noun.

In DLT fol. 234 we find a lexeme written QRQAT and translated 'barren desert; a desert that has no water and no vegetation'. Dankoff and Kelly read this as *qirqāy*, without explanation. They may have been thinking of *kır*, q.v. in the *EDPT*, but there is no appropriate suffix '*+kAg*' or '*+gAg*'. The *EDPT* hesitatingly incorporates this into the entry *kurga-k*, although the final consonant and the meaning are different: See that lexeme below, among the *-(O)k* forms. In Maitr 55 v 16, BT II 778, Warnke 170, TT IV B 9 (twice), U II 77,28 (twice) and U II 86,45-46 (twice) we find a noun which can be read as *kurkag*, *kurgag*, *kurkak* or *kurgak* and signifies 'dry ground', opposed to *suv* 'water' as a medium to be alive in. This is close in meaning to the DLT lemma, but quite distinct from that of *kurga-k yıl* 'a year of drought' (DLT fol. 473, verse). This latter cannot be a *-gAk* derivate from *kurı-* as *-gAk* (section 3.327) is agentive and does not syncopate base-final vowels. It is likely that the Uigur lexeme is to be read as *kurga-g* or, with a stop instead of a continuant after /r/, as *kurka-g*; this latter form is also what the DLT had. The base common to both lexemes, of course, is *kurug+a-*, q.v. below.

kuvrā-g 'gathering, crowd' is the subject noun of *kuvra-* 'to assemble (intr.)'. Some of the exs. are collected in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. HamTouen 1,27, 2,20, 3,3 and 3,20 for some reason spells this lexeme with /o/ in the first syllable. Beside appearing in a number of modern languages as quoted in the *EDPT*, the /u/ is directly attested in 'A.REG KUB.RAG (Tibetan writing) = *arıg kuvrag* in BudhKat 2. In Buddhist texts, *kuvrag* usually refers to a monastic community, and often appears in binomials with *bursaŋ* (< *buddhasaṃgha*) or *ter-in*. Not attested in Qarakhanid Turkic.

küçā-g 'violent, vehement, coercive' is mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* as *küçäk*. The TT VIII I 10 instance, which they quote, is not indicative of what the final velar might have been, however: The text always writes *k* for front /g/. br 6 in Mz 648 ([TI] S 19) and I M 8 II, a Brāhmī ms. to be published by D. Maue, has the passage *a]ğır boln küçāg boltı* with explicit [g]. The word is attested also in M III 17,14$_2$ (text 8), ZiemeSklav I 13 and QB 3108, and is a subject adjective from *küç+ä-*, q.v.

küd-üg, we read in DLT fol. 197, "is never used alone but only in the paired expression *iş küdüg* 'business, undertaking, task, work'". Written with °*g* in Chuast 267 and with °*k* in TT II B 45 (both in Manichaean script), but the former is more dependable: TT II B has forms like *täksin-* and *täk-miş* and, on the other hand, e.g. *ämgätgülüg* for *ämgätgülük*. The quite numerous instances in *EDPT* and *DTS* are all of the binomial *iş küdüg*; so are additional ones appearing in BT II 184, Ht IV 1190, HtPek 96 v3, HtPar 130,13 and 23 (both for some reason written as *ködüg* by Kudara and Zieme), Suv 447,15, 598,9 and 613,18, UigBlock 30 and several times in the QB. These latter appear in couplets 161, 1038, 2220, 4385 and 6451 all rhyming with *ödüg*, 4324 (in the İndeks wrongly written as *ködüg* and given a separate entry) and 3804. *küdüg* is an object noun of *küd-* 'to wait (on), attend to'.

kürä-g 'deserter, fugitive' is read correctly by the *EDPT* but with *-k* in the *DTS* and the QB İndeks, which quotes the lexeme from couplets 1118 and 5710. We also have Uigur exs.: *Basmılın küräg ymä kälti, T(a)rkan Apa It K(a)ya* (ThreeLett 22) 'From the Basmıls a deserter also came, (viz.) T.A.I.K.'. Further, *küräg kişi kälip* ... (HamTouen 20,7) "Une personne en fuite est arrivée, ..." and *küräg [a]gzınta muntag sav eşidip* ... (*ibid.* 12). As the n. to HamTouen 20,7 states, this is the word appearing also in Toñ 8, 9, 29 and 33, hitherto transcribed as *'körüg'*: *Oguzduntun / Türgeş kaganta küräg kälti* or *üç küräg kälti* are sentences very similar to the one from the letter quoted above. The persons coming from the domain of the Oguz or from the *Türgeş* king are deserters from the enemy army. These instances fix the voicedness of the velar. *kör-üg* in QB 5996 signifies 'interpretation'. An *-(X)g* derivate from *kör-* could not have had an /ä/ in the second syllable. *küräg* is a subject noun of *kür+ä-*, q.v. below.

küzād-ig is a hapax in UigTot 1311, not mentioned in the *DTS* or the *EDPT*: *anta basa küzādig çakır kılınıp ḍarnısın sözlāgül*. According to Zieme, the expression *küzādig çakır* corresponds to Mo. *sakiyan čakra* and Skt. *rakṣacakra* 'amulet'. This gives the translation "Then one should make an amulet and pronounce its *dhāraṇī*". *küzādig* is the action noun of *küzād-*, q.v. at the end of section 5.43; it was, I think, especially created for this loan translation. *küzād-iglig* comes directly from the verb, and not from the present form.

There is no base for *odug* 'awake, alert' in the texts; however, *odgur-* and *odun-*, qq.v., also come from it. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in M III 9,7 (text 4) and 31,2_3 (text 13) both of these *odugun är-* 'to be awake'); LautHöllen 25; ShōAgon 1,254 and 263, BT II 174, Warnke 32, Maitr 13 v 14 and 19 v 11, M III 5,1_3 (text 1) and ms. T II Y 15,501 (U 3088) r 6 quoted in the n. to UigTot 895. The six last ones show the binomial *odug sak*, which Tekin, the ed. of the Maitr, took to be one word. Various collocations of *sak* with *odug* appear also in QB 1452, 2014, 2236, 2273, 2761 and 2813. '*odug+sa-*' or '*ud-ugsa-*' would not give appropriate meanings at all. In the ex. from M III 9,7 (text 4), we have the related *odugun saklanmakan*, in which *odug* is used as an abstract. As we don't know what the meaning and status of **od-* or **odu-* was, we can't state the function of *odug* with respect to it. The form *odog* of the two Brāhmī instances is irrelevant for the etymology, as these texts have a rule of assimilation for vowel openness.

ogşa-g 'resembling' is the subject adjective of *ogşa-*, attested in QB 16 and 3720 and the DLT. This is in complementary distribution over dialects with the next lemma: *ogşatıg* is not attested in Qarakhanid Turkic.

ogşat-ıg appears in BT I D (304), ETŞ 12,36 and FujYūr r 14 and is not mentioned either in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. FujYūr r 10 has the binomial *kōrk ogşatıg*. *ogşatıgsız* of Suv 354,5 is misinterpreted in the *EDPT* but translated correctly in the *DTS*. In Suv 377,10 it is found in a binomial with *yōläşürügsüz*. *ogşatıg* signifies 'semblance, likeness', which makes it the object noun of *ogşa-t-*. *ogşatıgsız körklä* (BuddhUig II 394) signifies 'peerlessly beautiful'.

olr-ug is a hapax in MaitrGeng 12 a 11, not mentioned in the dictionaries: *ançama ärim barım olrugı turugı* 'What manners$_4$ he has!'. *oldrug* is attested seven times in the QB and presumably comes from *oldur-/oltur-*, the Qarakhanid variant of *olor-*. Among these, *oldrug turug* appears in couplets 2547, 2588, 3998 and 4585. But both these and *oldrug* in QB 647, 787 and 4897 refer to *places* for sitting (and standing) and not to action as the Uigur example.

orna-g 'a base, a place to settle and establish oneself' is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, and appears also in U III 48,17, BT VIII B 248 and Shō VII b 5 (changed to *arnag* by poetic licence, for the sake of alliteration). *ornag* is found only in Uigur writing, but *ornaglıg* appears in TT VIII A 18 in Brāhmī script; there are also some

modern forms coming from *ornag* which point to Old Turkic *-g* not *-k*. The BT VIII ex. of *ornag* has it in a binomial with *tayak*. The Shō instance is quoted also in *UW* 201 a middle, which offers an etymology involving an *-ag* (thus!) derivate from an unattested verb *'ar-ın-'*. Instead, the translation should be: 'If there would just be a base and a reason for slaves such as us to convert$_2$ to your teaching and discipline . . .'; *ornag* is the local noun of the rather rare *or(u)n+a-*, q.v. below; cf. also *orna-ş-* and the rather common *orna-n-*. See the *EDPT* for *ornaglıg* 'stable, durable' and *ornagsız*, its opposite; this latter is attested also in Weih 11. In HamTouen 2,35, *ortun ornaglıg* corresponds to a Chin. term which Hamilton renders as "de la Station Intermédiaire"; this means that we have to apply the bracketing (*ortun ornag)lıg* and dissociate the instance from the lexeme *ornaglıg*.

oy-ug, attested in QB 3382, signifies 'a mark', presumably made by hollowing out, making a hole or engraving. The first word of *oyug alı bermiş* in IrqB XXIX may mean the same.

ö-g 'mind, understanding, intellect, intelligence, thought' corresponds to Skt. *smṛti*, and is action or subject noun of *ö-* 'to think of, to understand after thinking'. The fact that the velar is voiced is shown by Manichaean mss. quoted in the *EDPT*, and by TT VIII A 34, E 34 and F 9. One further ex. among many is found in BT II 964, the binomial *ög köŋül* e.g. in AmitIst 35. *öglüg* appears only in the QB (about 16 instances), whereas *ögsüz* 'witless, confused etc.' is quite common in Uigur. The *EDPT* has collected most of the (Manichaean and Buddhist) exs. of *ögsüz*; it appears also in BT V 12,222 and several times in Suv, e.g. 19,8.

ögrät-ig 'exercise, habit, practice' is the object noun of *ögrät-*. In addition to the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* we have it in Warnke 401 and 519, Suv 24,17, ShōAgon 2, p. 193,5$_1$, BT XIII 35,4, 55,2 and 55,3; BuddhUig II 25, TT X 521 and 533, BuyKäl 9, Maitr 64 v 9, 65 v 6, 70 v 4, 71 r 29 and 176 r 25. This is one of the few *-(X)g* derivates from a derived base. But then, no base is actually attested for *ögrät-* and *ögrän-*, qq.v. also for the semantics.

öl-üg 'dead, a corpse' is the subject nominal from *öl-* 'to die'. Exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* include *ölüg mişkiç* 'a dead wild cat' (Heilk I 57), *tirig ölüg* 'a living corpse' (Maitr 8 v 22), *ölüg b(ä)klägü Kuen şan atl(ı)g tag* (Warnke 482), *ölügüg tirgürti* (BT VII O 6) and *]ŋ ölügi* (U III 21,4$_2$). The earliest exs. are from the inscriptions. In the QB, *ölüg* rhymes with *kü+lüg*, *bälgü+lüg* etc. *ölügsüz* 'immortal' is attested in HamTouen 2,4: *ölügsüz kolosuz alkınçsız yaşar Amita Burxan* 'Buddha Amitābha, who lives immortally, timelessly and inexhaustively'. It was also applied to *puŋya*: In TT V A 40 and 74 we have *ölügsüz buyan ädgü kılınç*. *ölgüsüz* in *ölgüsüz buyan ädgü kılınç* of Suv 584,12 should not necessarily be read as *ülgüsüz* 'immeasurable, innumerable' both because of the identical context, and because QB 180 and 3756 has *ölgüsüz* clearly with the meaning 'immortal'; in the QB contexts, no other meaning is admissible.

ötä-g is written with *-k* in TT II B23 in Manichaean writing, but that text sometimes confuses the voiced velars with the voiceless ones. Chuast 92 and 309 write *ötägçi* with *g*. The *EDPT*'s evidence for *-k* is from the XVIIIth century. The central meaning of *ötäg* is 'debt', but even this specific meaning appears to be attested only metaphorically: *amtı kılmış yazokumuznı açar biz, yadar biz; kşantı kılu ötünür biz, ötägimiz tolzun* (Maitr 115 r13) "Unsere Schuld möge beglichen sein!". Cf. *ötägimiz tolmaz* (*ibid.* 174 r25). Like German *Schuld*, *ötäg* has a second use: It often signifies 'guilt', particularly in binomials with *berim* (TT II B85, BT VIII B135, TT VII 40,72, BT XIII 13,65 and 28,4, Suv 6,17) or *ısuy* (BT I D(109)). The original meaning of *ber-im* must also have been 'debt', 'guilt' being the transferred one. *ötäg ämgäk* in M I 9,7-8 and Suv 7,5 is 'suffering'. If the first word in BT XIII 16,32 is *ötäg* (cf. Kara in *OLZ* 84 (1989): 355), then ... *ämgänip / ötägin bolmış ät'öz* is 'a body which came into existence under suffering'. One secular instance of *ötäg* is closest to this last meaning: *sän yämä Akunıl/Akuyni balık*[240] *arkasındakı iş küç ugrındakı bodunka küç ötägi kılur ärmiş sän* (ThreeLett 62, lines xxxi and 33 of the TUO version, which I follow) 'I have heard that you are inflicting coercive suffering upon the people of the community of A., who are peacefully following their occupations' (or *köç ötägi* 'forced relocation'?).

ötüg 'a humble request, an address to a superior' is related to *ötün-* both etymologically and pragmatically; see that for a possible base. Some of the instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in LeCoqSchriftk 102,1_1, M III 12,0_1 (text 6) and 44,3_2 (text 31), Ht VII 13 a15, HtPek 54 r5-7 and 48 v3-5 (*sävinç ötüg bitig*), InscrOuig II 9 and 15, HamTouen 1,51 and 59, 5,24, 60,72 and 78, 10,2 and 3 and 12,7, ManMon 55 and ShōAgon 1,50. In NesTex T II B28 (U 4910) 2, *ötüg* is used in parallelism with *kolunç*. *ötüg* must be the subject noun of the base (in its original meaning). It should not be confused with *ötü*K 'record, memorandum', q.v. under *ötü*K*+lä-*.

DLT fol. 46 has a second *öt-üg* 'dysentery', which does come from *öt-* 'to pass through, to pass to the other side', more specifically from *karın öt-* 'to move one's bowels' (Heilk I and II, TT VII and DLT fol. 95).

The exs. of *saç-ıg* 'scattered offering, offering for scattering' are collected in the *EDPT* entry; it appears also in MaitrH XI 3 b16 (with *yagış*). This is the object noun of *saç-*. *saç-ok*, q.v. below, is not lexicalised as *saçıg* is, and signifies 'scattered'.

The *EDPT* has several Qarakhanid exs. of *sakı-g* 'mirage', the *DTS* also an Uigur one. We find it also in Warnke 413, Suv 382,7, UigTot 265, ETŞ 11,36

240 This word has inadvertently been omitted from the quotation of the sentence in *UW* 197a s.v. *arka* II, par. B,a; it appears in both versions of the text.

modern forms coming from *ornag* which point to Old Turkic *-g* not *-k*. The BT VIII ex. of *ornag* has it in a binomial with *tayak*. The Shō instance is quoted also in *UW* 201 a middle, which offers an etymology involving an *-ag* (thus!) derivate from an unattested verb *'ar-ın-'*. Instead, the translation should be: 'If there would just be a base and a reason for slaves such as us to convert$_2$ to your teaching and discipline . . .'; *ornag* is the local noun of the rather rare *or(u)n+a-*, q.v. below; cf. also *orna-ɣ-* and the rather common *orna-n-*. See the *EDPT* for *ornaglıg* 'stable, durable' and *ornagsız*, its opposite; this latter is attested also in Weih 11. In HamTouen 2,35, *ornun ornaglıg* corresponds to a Chin. term which Hamilton renders as "de la Station Intermédiaire"; this means that we have to apply the bracketing (*ortun ornag)lıg* and dissociate the instance from the lexeme *ornaglıg*.

oy-ug, attested in QB 3382, signifies 'a mark', presumably made by hollowing out, making a hole or engraving. The first word of *oyug alı bermiş* in IrqB XXIX may mean the same.

ö-g 'mind, understanding, intellect, intelligence, thought' corresponds to Skt. *smṛti*, and is action or subject noun of *ö-* 'to think of, to understand after thinking'. The fact that the velar is voiced is shown by Manichaean mss. quoted in the *EDPT*, and by TT VIII A 34, E 34 and F 9. One further ex. among many is found in BT II 964, the binomial *ög kōŋül* e.g. in AmitIst 35. *öglüg* appears only in the QB (about 16 instances), whereas *ögsüz* 'witless, confused etc.' is quite common in Uigur. The *EDPT* has collected most of the (Manichaean and Buddhist) exs. of *ögsüz*; it appears also in BT V 12,222 and several times in Suv, e.g. 19,8.

ögrät-ig 'exercise, habit, practice' is the object noun of *ögrät-*. In addition to the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* we have it in Warnke 401 and 519, Suv 24,17, ShōAgon 2, p. 193,5$_1$, BT XIII 35,4, 55,2 and 55,3; BuddhUig II 25, TT X 521 and 533, BuyKäl 9, Maitr 64 v 9, 65 v 6, 70 v 4, 71 r 29 and 176 r 25. This is one of the few *-(X)g* derivates from a derived base. But then, no base is actually attested for *ögrät-* and *ögrän-*, qq.v. also for the semantics.

öl-üg 'dead, a corpse' is the subject nominal from *öl-* 'to die'. Exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* include *ölüg mişkiç* 'a dead wild cat' (Heilk I 57), *tirig ölüg* 'a living corpse' (Maitr 8 v 22), *ölüg b(ā)klägü Kuen şan atl(ı)g tag* (Warnke 482), *ölügüg tirgürti* (BT VII O 6) and *]ŋ ölügi* (U III 21,4$_2$). The earliest exs. are from the inscriptions. In the QB, *ölüg* rhymes with *kü+lüg*, *bälgü+lüg* etc. *ölügsüz* 'immortal' is attested in HamTouen 2,4: *ölügsüz kolosuz alkınçsız yaşar Amita Burxan* 'Buddha Amitābha, who lives immortally, timelessly and inexhaustively'. It was also applied to *puṇya*: In TT V A 40 and 74 we have *ölügsüz buyan ädgü kılınç*. *ölgüsüz* in *ölgüsüz buyan ädgü kılınç* of Suv 584,12 should not necessarily be read as *ülgüsüz* 'immeasurable, innumerable' both because of the identical context, and because QB 180 and 3756 has *ölgüsüz* clearly with the meaning 'immortal'; in the QB contexts, no other meaning is admissible.

ötä-g is written with *-k* in TT II B23 in Manichaean writing, but that text sometimes confuses the voiced velars with the voiceless ones. Chuast 92 and 309 write *ötägçi* with *g*. The *EDPT*'s evidence for *-k* is from the XVIIIth century. The central meaning of *ötäg* is 'debt', but even this specific meaning appears to be attested only metaphorically: *amtı kılmış yazokumuznı açar biz, yadar biz; kşantı kılu ötünür biz, ötägimiz tolzun* (Maitr 115 r13) "Unsere Schuld möge beglichen sein!". Cf. *ötägimiz tolmaz* (*ibid.* 174 r25). Like German *Schuld*, *ötäg* has a second use: It often signifies 'guilt', particularly in binomials with *berim* (TT II B85, BT VIII B135, TT VII 40,72, BT XIII 13,65 and 28,4, Suv 6,17) or *tsuy* (BT I D(109)). The original meaning of *ber-im* must also have been 'debt', 'guilt' being the transferred one. *ötäg ämgäk* in M I 9,7-8 and Suv 7,5 is 'suffering'. If the first word in BT XIII 16,32 is *ötäg* (cf. Kara in *OLZ* 84 (1989): 355), then ... *ämgänip / ötägin bolmış ät'öz* is 'a body which came into existence under suffering'. One secular instance of *ötäg* is closest to this last meaning: *sän yämä Akunil/Akuyni balık*[240] *arkasındakı iş küç ugrındakı bodunka küç ötägi kılur ärmiş sän* (ThreeLett 62, lines xxxi and 33 of the TUO version, which I follow) 'I have heard that you are inflicting coercive suffering upon the people of the community of A., who are peacefully following their occupations' (or *köç ötägi* 'forced relocation'?).

ötüg 'a humble request, an address to a superior' is related to *ötün-* both etymologically and pragmatically; see that for a possible base. Some of the instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in LeCoqSchriftk 102,1_1, M III 12,0_1 (text 6) and 44,3_2 (text 31), Ht VII 13 a15, HtPek 54 r5-7 and 48 v3-5 (*sävinç ötüg bitig*), InscrOuig II 9 and 15, HamTouen 1,51 and 59, 5,24, 60,72 and 78, 10,2 and 3 and 12,7, ManMon 55 and ShōAgon 1,50. In NesTex T II B28 (U 4910) 2, *ötüg* is used in parallelism with *kolunç*. *ötüg* must be the subject noun of the base (in its original meaning). It should not be confused with *öti*K 'record, memorandum', q.v. under *öti*K+*lä-*.

DLT fol. 46 has a second *öt-üg* 'dysentery', which does come from *öt-* 'to pass through, to pass to the other side', more specifically from *karın öt-* 'to move one's bowels' (Heilk I and II, TT VII and DLT fol. 95).

The exs. of *saç-ıg* 'scattered offering, offering for scattering' are collected in the *EDPT* entry; it appears also in MaitrH XI 3 b16 (with *yagış*). This is the object noun of *saç-*. *saç-ok*, q.v. below, is not lexicalised as *saçıg* is, and signifies 'scattered'.

The *EDPT* has several Qarakhanid exs. of *sakı-g* 'mirage', the *DTS* also an Uigur one. We find it also in Warnke 413, Suv 382,7, UigTot 265, ETŞ 11,36

240 This word has inadvertently been omitted from the quotation of the sentence in *UW* 197a s.v. *arka* II, par. B,a; it appears in both versions of the text.

and BuddhUig II 474. The QB 5425 instance is not mentioned in these dictionaries either. *sakıg* is the subject noun of *sakı-* 'to appear faintly'.

sal-ıg has four distinct meanings, three of them nominal. The use referring to 'taxes' is the only one documented in the *EDPT* and *DTS* entries. The second use is closest to the central meaning of *sal-* 'to shake' and denotes the object of this verb: 'a weapon one shakes about for self defense'. This latter use is attested in BT VII D 15 (see also the n. thereto) and BT VIII B 87 (metaphorical). In BT III 629 and 631, *salıg* (not '*salık*', as an *-Ok* derivate is excluded) signifies 'mark'. *bilik salıg* may possibly be, rather specifically, a 'war club' or 'bludgeon with spikes'; in this case the first word would be *bi+lig*. The third, adjectival, use of *sal-ıg* is attested in Maitr 70 r 18 and 71 r 11 as *sarsıg salıg tävlig kürlüg* and [*sar*]*sıg salıg kõŋüllüg tävlig kürlüg kılınçlıg ärsärlär*; in *sarsag salag sözlämäk* (Maitr 122 v 22), the /t/ is spelled with *aleph*. See *sars-ıg* below. *sarsıg salıg sözlämäk* refers to the sixth *karmapatha*, 'to speak harshly'.

sanç-ıg is a 'lance' or a 'spike' in Höllen 102 and U III 37,7. The *EDPT*'s translation (the word is not mentioned in the *DTS*) is influenced by modern uses of the word; *yürākimtā sançıg kirip siŋirim* [. . .] *barça bıçılmış täg ag*[*rıyur* (U III) signifies '[It] hurts as if a sharp lance were stuck into my heart and my nerves were all slashed'. This, then, is an instrument noun.

sap-ıg is quite common in Uigur, but only in the binomial *ula-g sapıg* which signifies 'endless succession'. Instances not mentioned in the *DTS* and *EDPT* entries for either word are found in Maitr 1 r 9, 43 r 5, 150 v 29, 153 v 13 and 154 r 14 and UigTot 997. This is an object noun of *sap-* 'to graft, join on'.

sars-ıg is the subject of *sars-* 'to be rough or harsh, to behave harshly'; see *sarsıt-* below. Exs. are mentioned in the *EDPT* entry and also there s.vv. '2 *irig*' and *kadır*; I have additional exs. above, s.v. *sal-ıg*. M III 8,14 (text 3) is correctly read as *Wadjiwanta t(ā)ŋriniŋ ulug küçlüg sarsıg arvışı* in *UW* 217 b top, s.v. *arvış* A,1, with *sarsıg* translated as "schrecklich". Further exs. appear in HamTouen 1,36 and 48. *sarsıg* is sometimes confused with *sası-g* 'stinking', q.v.. *sasıglıgrak* in PañcFrag 150, translated "sehr grob", is probably rightfully taken to belong to *sarsıg*; it must be an error on the part of the scribe. *bo yıdıg sarsıg kanlıg yiriŋlig . . . āt'ōz* (Suv 613,1), on the other hand, should be read as *sasıg*. The QB has this confusion in the verbal domain: In QB 4756, *sasıt-* is used together with *sök-* in the sense which would be appropriate to *sars-ıt-*. We further have *sarsıg savlıg* in Maitr 64 v 4, *uvutsuz tyatsız āyrig sarsıg bramanlar* in BT III 192-3 and *āyrig sarsıg sav* in Warnke 643. *āyrig* 'rough, harsh', to my knowledge unanalysable, is used together with *sarsıg* also in TT IV A 71, Suv 219,23, U II 76,6 (*Üdrät*), HamTouen 1,28, U II 85,23 (*Kutlug*), Höllen 18, Maitr 57 r 3 and BuddhKat 12.[241]

241 *āyrig* was hitherto read as '*irig*'; but 'YEḤI.RIG ZAR.SĀG ZAB = *āyrig sarsıg sav* of the last

sası-g 'stinking' is the subject of *sası-* 'to stink'. It appears with *yıdı-g* in TT VI 445; another possible instance of *yıdıg sasıg* was quoted above. *sasıg* is attested also in Maitr 101 v1 and 111 r7; M III 36,12$_2$ (text 18) and HtPar 135,19 ap. *UW* 189a. DLT fol. 186 mentions *sasıg* together with *bırıg*, which it translates as 'something stinking'.[242]

The *EDPT* has quite a number of exs. of the action noun *sat-ıg* 'selling, trade', also used for 'sale price'. Part of the instances have it in a binomial with *yul-ug*, q.v. It also appears in HamTouen 27,7, 28,21 and 35,4 and in Maitr 1 v16, 61 v7 and 10, 31 r4, 99 r4 and 169 v7. *agır satıglıg* in U III 12,15, 47,26 and presumably also 51,11 and Maitr 138 v5 signifies 'highly valuable'; it should probably be bracketed as (*agır satıg*)*lıg*. Cf. also *UW* 66b s.v. *agır*, B,d. Practically synonymous with this is *satıgsız*, which reminds one of the semantic development resulting in English *priceless* and *invaluable*. *satıgsız* appears in Kuan 19 and 156-7, ETŞ 11, HtPek 81 b8 (quoted in *UW* 240b s.v. *aş-*), BuddhUig II 126, UigSukh 28 and in an unpubl. fr. from the same book as Warnke and BT II which is quoted in Sandel p. 378. On the other hand, *satagsız tārsiz* in Maitr 51 r5-6 signifies 'without payment$_2$' and uses *satıgsız* literally.

satga-g is attested only in the QB and signifies 'ill-treated, oppressed'. The instance in couplet 6441 is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. It is an object noun. *satgagsız* is a hapax in Suv 477,1: *satgagsız arıg orun* 'an untrodden clean place' presupposes the existence of an action noun *satgag* not attested as yet. Cf. also *satga-n-* below.

säv-ig denotes 'love' in all its variations and manifestations, and serves as subject noun ('loving') and object noun ('beloved') as well. An ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appears in NesTex U 323,11 (*tapınur biz sävig kŏŋüldin* 'we pray out of love'); we have the proper names *S(ā)vig* in HamTouen 1,16', *Sävig Tiräk ibid.* 35,3, *Sävig Saŋun* in PrièreMan A4 and *Sävig Täŋrim* in DvaKol II 2 and 8. *Bayat sävgi çın* 'His love of God is true' (QB 4808) also contains the abstract. The syncopation before the possessive suffix is regular: See Erdal, 1985. In the QB, the unsyncopated form is always *sävüg* and not *sävig*. The *EDPT* has two lemmata, *sävig* and *sävük*, and assigns all forms with rounded second vowel to the second. I think there was only one lexeme, however, and that it had a voiced velar: In QB 1854 *sävüg* rhymes with *ülüg* 'share', and in the verse in DLT

mentioned instance (which is in Tibetan script) now shows us the correct form. In Suv 411,12, TT X 13, 269 and 278 and probably U III 17,12, *äyrig* is used with *yavgan*, in Warnke 216 and 488 with *yogun*, in BT VIII B 136 and ETŞ 10,66 with *kadır*, etc.

242 This appears as BAIRIG twice in the ms.; not as '*burıg*', as Clauson writes in the *EDPT* to suit his etymology. *bırıg*, wrongly written as '*bırık*' in *UW* 191a (twice), is attested also in Maitr 131 v1 and 174 r5 together with *arıgsız*(*lıg*). *Cf. bırıglıg tamu* "Unrat-Hölle" (BT II 311). We have no etymology for this lexeme, but the voicedness of its velar is made certain by the DLT instance.

fol. 59 *sävig*, translated 'beloved', rhymes with *kärig* 'stretched out'.[243] *sävüg* is not only the Qarakhanid variant but appears also in M I 23,6, 7 and 28. The *EDPT* would like to translate *sävig* as subject noun and *sävük* as object noun. But the M I 23 instances, which he incorporates in his entry *sävük*, clearly signify 'loving' and not 'beloved'. The passage says that an elect should have a *loving* heart, as the eye loves the foot (in guiding it) and the hand loves the mouth (in feeding it). *sävüglärimä* in ManTürkFrag 17, on the other hand, signifies 'to my beloved (pl.)'. Vowel rounding in the vicinity of labial consonants is found in quite early texts like the IrqB, and may have spread in some dialects earlier than in others. The QB has more than 50 instances of *sävüg*. Not only the Uigurs used *Sävig* as proper name. From the realm of Islam we have *Sävüg tegin*, who became the ruler of Ghazne in A.D. 977. *säviglig* 'lovely' is also quite common, most of the exs. being collected in the *EDPT* and *DTS* entries. What, exactly, the *adrok adrok alkınçsız säviglig bürtmäk* (TT VI 178), translated "allerhand unerschöpfliche angenehme Berührungen", are, I find difficult to tell. *sävigsiz* has been mistranslated in BT VII D 13: *yılanlar üzä, sävigsiz etig tümäglär üzä etiglig tümäglig* signifies: 'He is adorned$_2$ with snakes and with odious adornments$_2$'; 'odious' is also the translation supplied for this lexeme in the DLT. The editors of BT VII translated "von den Schlangen unbeliebt", which makes no sense in the context.[244] One does not expect *sävigsiz* to have verbal government; it turns out just to be the antonym of *säviglig*.

sık-ıg appears by itself in Warnke 264, with *taŋ-ıg* (q.v.) in U II 11,7 (a Maitr passage) and Suv 706,15, and with *ämgäk* in Warnke 440 and Suv 109,4. In BT II 301 and 1019 and Warnke 582 we find the expansion *ämgäklig sıkıglıglar*, with *+lXg* repeated but the plural suffix in common. *sık- taŋ-* is also a biverb, twice attested in Suv (see *DTS* s.v. *sık-* and *sıkmamak*). *sıkıg* is an action noun signifying 'suffering, torment'.

sımta-g signifies both 'careless, neglectful' and 'neglect, carelessness'. The former is attested in TT VIII A 2 (Brāhmī, showing the quality of the velar), Warnke 681, ETŞ 15,43 and BT XIII 15,28 (with *osal*), KudGojūni B 12 (with *ärmägü*), Suv 300,4 (with *kogşak*); further exs. appear in Maitr 88 v 11 and 101

243 The rhyme pattern of this quatrain is a b a b; this is obscured by Dankoff and Kelly's transcription, which writes *säwük / nälük / kärik / bädük*. The third of these cannot have belonged to the *-Ok* formation, however, as it has an unrounded second vowel: It should therefore be *kär-ig*. The first is written as SA'WUIK: *säv-ig* is what the verse (which, after all, antedates the DLT text) demands; *sävüg* is what the copyist changed it into, in accordance with Kāšġarī's lemma. He did not suppress the original vocalisation, however, which the adoption of the modern editors' version would lead to.

244 The comma after the first *üzä*, which underlines the parallelism of the two *üzä* phrases, is mine, of course.

r16-17. The abstract, on the other hand, can be found in BT II 1016 and ShōKenkyū III 18. *simtagsız köŋül* (AbitAnk 16, BT II 1261, TT III 131 = Pothi 171, TT III 148 = TT IX 46 = Pothi 188, Warnke 151) is the opposite of *simtag köŋül* (U IV D34) whether *simtag* is here taken nominally or adjectivally: *köŋül* is merely used as a prop for denoting a mental attitude. In the Maitr fr. T II S2 nr. 29 v26 quoted in the n. to TT III 131, we find *simtagsız köŋüllüg bol-* alternating with *simtagsız bol-*, attested also in ĀgFrag (1) B3. Cf. also *simtagsız dyan* (Suv 217,16-18). Cf. *simta-l-*, also for the base.

sına-g signifies 'test' in QB 3395 and 3963, and not as translated in the QB İndeks. The *EDPT* does not mention the word, and the *DTS* has one QB instance. It is attested also in Shō VI b8 and 13 and VIII a6 referring to the 'gathering of information about an enemy', while *sınagçı äränlär* (ibid. VII b2) are 'spies'. *sınag* is an action noun from *sın+a-*, q.v.

DLT fol. 233 defines *sızla-g* as "the word for 'setting the teeth on edge from drinking freezing water or biting ice and feeling the cold'". *sızlag* 'a smarting pain' is attested also in Heilk I 165 and, in a binomial with *agrı-g*, in Warnke 462. It is an action noun.

(*sig* 'urine' is a cognate of *sid-* 'to urinate' (section 7.23), *sik* 'penis' etc., and the base of *sigä-* (section 5.11). It appears in Heilk II 1,97, 105 and 106, of the urine of goats and rams. Further exs.: *böri mayakı ud sigi birlä içürsär...* (Heilk I 102) and *känç oglan sigi birlän kayındurup* (Heilk II 1,87). It lives on in the Codex Comanicus, spelled *szi*. That source also has a lexeme spelled *sidic*, which comes from *sid-ök* (q.v. below).)

sili-g 'clean, pure' is attested in the binomial *arıg silig* in Weizen 3 and 5, Suv 488,1, BT III 344, 387 and 473 and elsewhere. DLT fol. 196 defines it as 'a man who is graceful, clean, handsome and fine-spoken'; this is also the meaning to be assigned to the very numerous QB exs. (see İndeks) which, as the *EDPT* remarks, consistently rhyme with words ending in /g/. $S^2L^2K^2$ in KT E7 and 24 and BQ E7 can not belong to this lexeme, as maintained even in the *EDPT*: it might be *sili-k* from the *-(O)k* formation, or, much more likely, *äsi+lik kız oglı* 'their daughters who should have become ladies'. As a male and female proper name, *Silig* appears in Pfahl I 4 and HamTouen 1,11', 20,3, 21,3 and 10, 22,4, 29,1 and 30,1. *Yegän Silig bäg* of KT E33 has the same name as the person mentioned in HamTouen 22,4. We have one Uigur ex. of *sili-* quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *sil-* (thus), and *arımak silimäk* in Neujahr 39; cf. also *sili-t-* below. *UW* 181b middle can not be followed in completing the SuvUigStud ex. as '*arıyu sili*[*nü*]'; we should read *arıyu sili*[*yü*] with the *DTS*: cf. the same parallelism in *arıg silig*, *arımak silimäk* and *arıt- silit-*. *sili-* is intransitive, *silig* being subject nominal. In the U II ex. *sili-* has the concrete sense 'being wiped and cleansed' found also in *silit-* and in the Weizen instances of *silig*, but the metaphorical use can be

taken to have been the base for the very early exs. of the word as a proper name.[245] *silkin-ig in arslan silkinigin silkindäçi* (BT II 1052) is the action noun of *silk-in-*. This form alternates with *-mAk*: Line 355 of the same text has *arslan silkinmäkin silkindäçi*. This hesitation is presumably related to the fact that *-Xg* derivates from deverbal derived bases are rare. Similar *figurae etymologicae* (or should we say instances with internal object?) are *arslan yatgışın yat-* (UigTot 1194) and *arslan ilinçüsin ilinçülädäçi* (BT II 353), with different but evidently grammatically equivalent verbal nouns.

kü sor-ug in l.4 of the Suci inscr. (second W explicit as well) signifies 'fame'. Cf. *sorukmış* and *küsi sorulmış* (M I 26,28, Gebet), both 'famous'. DLT fol. 188 defines *sorug* as 'seeking a stray animal'; in both cases the word is an action noun. What is quoted above is the only ex. of *sorul-*. *sor-* 'to inquire about' is not really found in Old Turkic either.

süçi-g is attested in the KT and BQ inscriptions, in the DLT and more than thirty times in the QB; among Uigur sources in BuddBio 23, Maitr 92 r1, 71 v25 and 72 r16, ManTürkFrag 22 and in a few economical texts published in the USp. In QB 2475 it rhymes with *kiçig*. The Orkhon inscrs., BuddhBio, ManTürkFrag and the Qarakhanid sources have it in its original meaning, 'sweet'. In *süçig suvsuş ülä-* in Maitr 72 r16 it may have been either adnominal or have been used practically as a synonym of *suvsuş*, but *süçig ülädäçi . . . ärdilär* in 71 v25 is a clearly nominal use. In the USp texts it denotes 'wine' (perhaps 'sweet wine'?), a transferred use mentioned also in the DLT. The Uigur do not appear to have used the base, which means that *süçig* perhaps came directly from **süt+sig*. We do find it, however, in the DLT and in QB 813.[246] We also have *süçi-n-* (DLT and QB 618, 2092, 2836, 2905 and 3783), *süçi-t-* (DLT and QB 582 and 5777 and, in the ode, 6556) and *süçi-ş-* (DLT). The etymology of *süçig* and *süçi-* is discussed at the end of section 6.2.

245 On the other hand, there is a lexeme *sılıg*, attested in TuoLuoNi 94: *bilgä biliglig kutlug buyanlıg ogul, sılıg törülüg körklüg mäŋizlig kız tugurur* 'She will bear wise, blessed and righteous sons and/or *honest*, well-behaved and beautiful$_2$ daughters.' Cf. also the female proper name *Sılıg Tegin* in TT VII 40,118, 133 and 140. *sılıg* in BT III 964 is of unclear use. The lexeme is also attested in later Muslim sources including the Sanglax, as quoted in the *EDPT* entry for *silig*. In the n. to BT III 964, *sılıg* is shown to be composed of *sı+lıg*, the base being attested in the Codex Comanicus as *sıy*. Shō I a9 (q.v.) has *tsılıg iryapatlıg*, which probably contains a variant not yet adapted to Turkic phonotactics, and the n. thereto mentions an instance of *sı iryap(a)t* in an as yet unpublished Uigur text. Like other monosyllables containing an unrounded narrow vowel, this Chin. lexeme too may have shown an alternation **sı ~ *si*, its *+lXg* derivate possibly getting contaminated with *sili-g*. We, however, should make sure we don't confuse the two lexemes.

246 The QB Indeks mentions *süçi-p* from couplet 3346, but that couplet does not contain the verb. *süçi-* is intransitive.

sūŋ-ūg 'lance, spear' is beyond doubt related to *sūŋ-ūš* 'fight' and *sūŋ-ūš-* 'to fight', both dealt with below. It is likely to come from *sūŋ-* as discussed under *sūŋūš-*. It is attested as S²W̄ŋG²N² *aç-* (Toñ 28), S²W̄ŋG²L²G² (= *sūŋūglūg*, KT E23 and BQ E19) and S²W̄ŋG² *batımı kar* 'snow as deep as the length of a lance' (BQ E26). Doerfer, 1983a would like to read the first two as *sūŋ-gū+n aç-* and *sūŋ-gū+lūg* respectively, and suggests that the third might be a genitive of *sūŋū* (contracted from *sūŋ-gū*) using an alternative genitive suffix *+G*. From this one would gain the unity of the Turkic names for 'lance': *sūŋ-ūg* is not attested anywhere else, and *sūŋū* (< *sūŋ-gū*) is the word for 'spear, lance' both in Uigur and in later and recent Turkic languages. This seems unlikely to me for the following reasons: 1) Lexeme-final /ū/ *would* normally have been written explicitly before *+lXg*; 2) the suffix *-gU* would have been written with /g/ in the third as in the first two instances; 3) a genitive suffix is not needed for the last expression, as *är turumı suv* (q.v. among the *-Xm* forms) shows; 4) there is nothing peculiar about Orkhon Turkic having a divergent derivate from *sūŋ-*: this is a distinct dialect which has a number of lexical and morphological peculiarities; 5) the existence of a '*+G*' as genitive suffix seems unlikely to me for comparative reasons. *sūŋ-ūg* is an instrument noun like its near-synonym *sanç-ıg*.

sür-ūg 'a flock, herd' is the object noun of *sür-*. The *EDPT* has most of the examples. The word is metaphorically applied to human beings in *urılarıg kızlarıg sürügin toyın bōditip* . . . (BuddhUig II 90), which may also be the case in M 657 r2, quoted in the n. to BT V 521: *içtin taştın k(a)mug m(ä)niŋ sürügüm* (Manichaean writing).

tankar-ıg 'a vow, a pledge' is attested in Shō 297, BT VII A 134 and 360 and B 48 (this in *tankarıglıg nom şazın*), BT VIII A 396 and 398, UigTot 319, 606, 1170 and 1308 and BT XIII 28,32 (written *tankrıg*) and 33,2. It is also found in Mongolian with this meaning, and survives in Sarıg Uygur, as discussed in the n. to BT VII A 134. The *EDPT* and the *DTS* do not mention this action noun; cf. *tan(ı)k+ar-* and *tankar-ış-* below.

Two exs. of *taŋ-ıg* 'constriction', one with *sık-ıg* and the other with *kıs-ıg*, are quoted in the *EDPT* entry. In *twgmak ölmäk taŋıg* (Ht IV 1117) it appears by itself. The lemma '*taŋığla-*' in the *EDPT* should be deleted: The [*la*] part of the instance is in a lacuna and the verb is probably *taŋ+ırka-*, q.v. See *taŋ-ıl-* and *taŋ-ış-*.

tap-ıg 'respectful service, worship' is common from the inscriptions on. See the *EDPT* and the *DTS* for some of the exs. for this action noun. Instances not mentioned there occur in U IV B22 and D69, Ernte 80, BT II 894, TT VII 14,3, ZiemeGuan 15 and 45-46, Maitr 83 r19, Ht V 2 b18-19, HtPar 205,17, BuddhUig II 36, 158, 376 and 508, BT VIII B 217, Suv 413,21 and 572,23 etc., most of them in the common binomial *tapıg udug*. In the fr. T III 84-75 r32 published in the n. to

U IV D 76-77, *tapıg udug* denotes the treatment given to the sick: *elig bäg igliglär yatguluk ävlärdä käzä yoryu igliglärkä tapıg udug kılgalı ugradı. anı täg tapınıp udunup ön ämläp . . .* Buddhist offerings are also called *tapıg*, as *bali tapıg* (BT VII A 293), *iç tapıg* 'the inner offering' (ibid. 295) and *yagışlıg tapıg* 'libation offering' (ibid. 372 and Suv 29,8-9). *tapug* (thus) occurs in DLT fol. 187 (translated as 'obedience') and hundreds of times in the QB (q.v. in the İndeks).

tapıg+çı 'servant' is common as well.

tapla-g 'consent, acceptance, approval, adoption' is, beside what is quoted in the *EDPT*, attested also in Ht IV 1410 and VII 15 a 4, Maitr 115 r 1, FujYūr r 5 etc. and BT I D (170) and (272). In n. 86 to his reedition of TT V B, Kudara lists as follows the equivalents of *taplag* in Abhi: (1) satisfaction, pleasure, (2) permission, acceptance, endurance, patience = Skt. *kṣānti*, (3) determination, application = Skt. *adhimokṣa*, (4) proposition = Skt. *pratijñā*, (5) opinion, tenet, doctrine, (6) sect, school = Skt. *nikāya*. *taplag* = *kṣānti* appears also in Scharf 19. Note that Arabic *riḍa*', which DLT fol. 232 uses to translate *taplag*, signifies not only 'satisfaction' and 'gratification', as Dankoff and Kelly and the *EDPT* write, but also 'approval, consent, obedience etc.', which belong to Kudara's second meaning. See *tap+la-* below.

tarı-g 'crop, cultivation, agriculture, cultivated land, grain, millet' is common both by itself and in binomials like *ı tarıg* and *urug tarıg*. See the *EDPT* for *tarı-*, which is attested in Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic through Middle Turkic and in some modern languages. Doerfer, 1982: 114 wants to derive *tarıg* from *tar-* "verstreuen", because it is written as *tarag* in M III 13,6$_2$. See p. 18 above for the weakness of this argument. *tar-*, moreover, signifies 'to disperse, scatter' in the sense of 'doing away with, removing, destroying'; thus e.g. in ETŞ 11,22 (with *nizvanı* as object) and QB 2268 (with *yagı*).[247] Cf. also the meanings of *tar-ık-*, *taral-* and *tarkar-* below. *tarıgçı* and *tarıglag*, *tarıt-* and *tarıtdur-*, on the other hand, all refer to agriculture. Among the exs. of *tarıg* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, UigFalt 159, Ht V 4 a 24, BT XIII 27,27 and BT VIII A 74 and 95 have the binomial *ı tarıg*; in the Ht ex., the dative *ikä tarıgka* shows that *ı* 'vegetation' had a front variant. Ernte 112 has an additional instance of *urug tarıg*. *aşlık tarıg ädgü bütüp . . .* (ETŞ 24,11) can signify 'the millet intended for eating is growing well and . . .'. However, one is reminded of the statement in the DLT that the Oguz (and only they) called 'wheat' *aşlık* and 'millet' *tarıg*. So, *aşlık tarıg* could also signify 'cereal$_2$', as translated in the reedition in Samanta 17. *tarıg* is both action and object noun.

The *EDPT* and the *DTS* only give one Uigur ex. for *tart-ıg*; it fits the first

247 *targu* in couplet 4139 of the QB edition and İndeks should be read as *yazgu* with Dankoff; '*targu*' is written in none of the mss. and *yazgu* is explicit in two of them.

meaning given to it in DLT fol. 232, namely 'a man's plait of hair and ribbon for it'. Dankoff and Kelly's rendering of the DLT's translation as 'saddle girth' is based on an 'emendation' and needn't be accepted. While this first meaning may denote the object of *tart-* 'to pull, to draw', the DLT's second meaning, 'a summons from the king to his retinue, etc.' is an action noun. A third use, attested in HtPek 39 a4 (as quoted in *UW* 71 b s.v. *aglatı* A,b) and 40 a6 (as quoted *ibid.* 61 a s.v. *adru-*) refers to the style of drawing Chinese characters, and is also an action noun.

tatıg has three related meanings: It signifies '(good) taste, flavour'; 'the sense of taste' and '(tasty) food'. Exs. in TT VIII A 38 ('the taste of earth', with Skt. original) and G 68, Maitr 93 r(?)6, 122 r9 and 129 r16 and Suv 16,7, 592,2 and 596 (bottom) are not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *tatıg* could be object nominal to *tatı-* 'to be appealing, savory, relishable', and the action noun of either. See the *EDPT* for *tat-*, which has /A/ and not /I/ as aorist vowel (e.g. in TT VI 174); cf. *tat-ur-* below. *tatı-r*, on the other hand, is attested in TT VIII 16, DLT and QB 4466. *tatı-* is found also in ETŞ 11,8: *amrılıp olorup adkaKsız bolsar, ançata tatıgay yiliktä*. This is quoted in *UW* 134 b s.v. *ançata*, translated "wird man im innersten erquickt werden". It should better be rendered as 'Then it (*sc.* life) will be relishable to the marrow'. Cf. *tiriglik tatımaz / tatır / tatıdı* in QB 4169, 4466 and 5627.[248] One of the possible explanations for the relationship between *tat-* and *tatı-* is that the latter is a back-formation from *tatıg*, which is, after all, better attested than both verbs taken together. *tatıglıg* 'delicious' is common in Manichaean, Buddhist and Qarakhanid texts: See the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, the latter also s.v. '*soγančïγ*' (which should be read as *sukançıg*; see below). *tatıglıg* appears also in Maitr 31 r14 and v16, 122 r11, 163 r19 and 92 r1, Abhi 1079 and HamTouen 1,53, 5,34 and 6,7.

täz-ig 'fleeing, flying, shying away, flight' is documented in the *EDPT* from a Yenisei inscr. and from DLT and thrice QB. DLT translates it not only as subject (as above) but also as action noun.

ter-ig 'an accumulation' is the object noun of *ter-*. In the *EDPT* it is quoted from the DLT; attested also in BT V 13,237: *biziŋ bo kamag y(a)rok uguşnuŋ t(e)rgin tavranu tutzun*. *ter-ig* is the object of *tut-*, here, and not, of course, of the gerundial *tavranu*. In M III 21,13, '*tir*[*ig*] *kuvrag*' should probably be *ter*[*in*] *kuvrag*.

(*tetig* 'intelligent, bright' has no known base, but is no doubt related to *tetrü* (q.v. among the petrified converbs of the *-Ur-* formation) and to the DLT's *tetil-* 'to become intelligent', q.v. in the *EDPT*. It ends in /g/ and not /k/, as it rhymes in QB 475, 483, 777, 1188, 1221 etc. with *et-ig*, ibid. 755, 1342, 1354, 1557 etc. with *biti-g*, 883 with *ögrät-ig*, 2930 with *yeg*, and so forth. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* s.v. *té:tik* nor in the *DTS* occur in BT II 1347, in Abhi 2486 etc. The latter

248 The 4466 instance is wrongly assigned to *tat-* in the İndeks.

appears in a series of near-synonyms: *teŋig*[249] *yarok bilgä biliglig keŋ bilmäklig* 'intelligent and bright, possessing wisdom and general knowledge'.)

tıd-ıg 'hindrance, obstruction' is common in Uigur, often in binomials with *antıray, ada, apıg, ärtüK* or *tutug*. In addition to the exs. mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* it is found in Maitr 57 r17 and 148 r21 and v13, AbitAnk 72 and 90, TuoLuoNi 83 and 92, BT I B(39), BT II 531-2, Warnke 225 and 603, Suv 87,12 and 615,11 and ETŞ 12,31; further exs. can be found in the *UW* s.v. *antıray*. It should be an agent or action noun. While *tıdıglıg* 'obstructed' is attested only in TT I 161 and 185, its antonym *tıdıgsız* is very common: Exs. mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS* occur in QaraBalg e,2, BT II 1, 91-2 and 836, BT I D(5), Warnke 592, BuddhUig II 423, ETŞ 9,55 and 10,84 and so forth. Particularly common is the phrase *tıdıgsız bilgä bilig* 'unimpeded wisdom'; *tıdıgsız* appears also in several binomials.

tılta-g 'motive, cause' is exceedingly common. A few of the instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* and *DTS* entries are found in Ernte 83, BT I A_2(41), Maitr 42 + 152 v27, BT II 238, Suv 599,21, ShōAv 124 and Warnke 463. The notion of pure causation must originally have been absent: the primary etymological meaning of *tıltag* is rather 'pretext, excuse', found also in Qarakhanid usage. *tılta-g* should be the instrument noun of *tıl-ta-*, q.v. below. One ex. of *tıltaglıg* is quoted in the *EDPT* and another one appears in TuoLuoNi 366. In Warnke 138 we find both *tıltaglıg* and *tıltagsız: tört uju̇klarıŋ tıltaglıgın urmuş ol; tıltagsız ärmäz. tılt*[agı] *nägü tep tesär, . . .*, which can be translated as 'motivated' and 'unmotivated'. Although *tıltagsız* 'without reason' is also attested in U II 8,15 (corresponding to Skt. *a-hetu*), U III 81,1 and TT VIII F15 (= Skt. *akasmika*), it is not mentioned in the *EDPT*.

tik-ig is an action noun appearing with *agrıg* in BT XIII 12,127, Suv 585,14 (as *agrıglıg tikiglig*) and 590,17: *agrıgsız tiksiz* in Suv 529,20 could therefore be a haplological or haplographical error for *agrıgsız tikigsiz*; U III 38,35 is correctly completed to *ät'özindäki a*[grıgı] *tikigi sönüp . . .*. The *EDPT* suggests translating it as 'itching' or 'pricking'; alternately, one thinks of stings of scorpions and snake bites, for which the verb *tik-* is used from Qarakhanid Turkic on.

tir-ig 'living, alive' is the subject noun of *tir-*, *tirig öz* (U III 41,4[1] and Suv 9,10) being one's life. Very common from the inscriptions on, through Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic and and all the way to the present day. To the *EDPT* and *DTS*'s instances add *tirig ärkän* (Ht IV 864) 'being alive'; *ol teginniŋ ölügi tirigi nätäg ol?* (Suv 635,11) 'What about that prince's being dead or alive?'; *näŋ biziŋä kärgäksiz bo ät'özümüz tirigi!* (*ibid.* 620,9) 'It is quite useless to us, the livingness of this body of ours!'. Further exs. appear in HamTouen 5,18 and 19.

249 By the ed. wrongly written with °*k*.

tiz-ig 'row, line, string' is the object noun of *tiz-*. Exs. can be found in the *DTS* s.v. *jevig tizig* and *kezik tizik* (thus), in the *EDPT*, and in BT I D (40-41), BT II 1106, Ht VII b24 and X47, Maitr 31 r2, 9 r13 and 13 v16, BT XIII 19,77 and Shō XIII a7. Ms. T III TV 59 (U 4313) quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 13 has the expression *ükü̆ş tälim äd tavar yevig tiziglig* 'with a lot$_2$ of goods$_2$ and furnishings$_2$', where the suffix *+lXg* is added to the two binomes as one unit. The same binomial with *+lXg* repeated is attested in TT VIII A 35: *çaxşapat üzä y(e)vigli(g) tiziglig*, corresponding to Skt. *śilapariskārah*. The editor wrongly took *tisiglig*, as the word is written, to be an error for *etiglig*; but this is clearly a case of the *g* part of the *t* – *akşara* being overlooked and omitted by the copyist. *yeviglig tiziglig* is attested also in Suv 627,14-15 and possibly in TT VIII I17 as well.

tolga-g should not be read with *-k*, as it has a voiced suffix velar in the DLT; see the *EDPT* for that. Uigur exs. not mentioned in the *DTS* s.v. *tolγaq* and *emgäk* *tolγaq* (thus), nor in the *EDPT*, appear in BT II 209, 229, 983 and 993, eleven times in Maitr, Suv 7,6, 367,16, 612,15 and 614,17, Warnke 317, BT VII A276 etc., usually in the binomial with *ämgä-k*. *ämgäk* should probably be reconstituted for the lacuna before *tolgag* in U II 74,3$_1$ (Utsukmaksız Darni). U II 11,7 should be read as *ämgäk tolgag* instead of '*ämgäk tutgak*' as the dictionaries do, following the editor. The text is read correctly in the reedition in LeCoqSchriftk 103,7, who also has a facs. showing this clearly. *ämgäksiz tolgagsız*, an expansion of this same binomial, appears in TT VI 280, *ämgäklig tolgaglıg* in MaitrH X 3 b2, Maitr 165 v22. *tolga-g* itself is an action noun presumably signifying 'pangs' and sometimes, more literally, 'colic'; it is close in this to *tolga-n-* and *tolga-t-*, qq.v. below. The DLT has *tolga-* about writhing in one's stomach, and cf. the Maitr exs. of *tolga-* quoted under *tolga-t-*.

tök-üg appears in TT VI 265 in a binomial with *saç-ıg*, q.v., and in TT VII 25,7 as *saçıg tö*[*küg*]. The *DTS* and the *EDPT* both read this lexeme with *-ük*, but the Turkish adj. quoted in the *EDPT* is irrelevant. I write *-üg* because I assume parallelism with *saçıg*; I may be wrong, as *ämgäk* and *tolgag* show. *tök-üg* is object to *tök-* and refers to libations.

tumlı-g 'cold' (noun and adjective) alternates with *tumlug* although the base is *tumlı-*; this may be due to influence from /m/. The following instances are not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* s.vv. *tomlıγ* and *tomluγ*: *tumlıg* in BT V 15,289, 16,345 and in a fr. quoted in the n. to the first, Ht IV 988, HtPar 129,23, Ht VII 3 a11 and 13 a11, BuddhUig II 21, UigSün 15 and Warnke 464; *tumlug* in Höllen 18, Maitr 88 r11, ShōKenkyū II 31 and Ht V2 a21. DLT and QB also have both forms. Adjectival *tumlıg* denotes the subject; nominal *tumlıg* is an abstract noun. See the metaphorical cognate *tumlı-t-u* below. Since the *EDPT* and the *DTS* only quote one (and the same) Uigur instance of *tumlı-*, we might add that this verb has appeared also in BT I B (235) and BT II 171.

There are several distinct *tur-ug* lexemes, all from *tur-* 'to stand': First, the expression *olrug turug* 'behaviour', attested in MaitrGeng 12 a 10 and thrice in the QB, and discussed under *ol(o)r-ug* above. This is an action noun. Secondly, a local noun *tur-ug*, attested in USp 36,3 and the DLT and in the sentence *kop ādgülārniŋ turugı ornı bolmış kop kamag nomlar* (Maitr 48 v 6), and signifying 'a place to stand or stay, a shelter'. Similar to this is *ög turug* "die Verweilungsorte des Verstandes" (MaitrH X 4 b 18 = Maitr 156 v 11): *turug* corresponds to *upasthāna* (a cognate of the verb *to stand*). *turug* in *marıma yüz är turug bertim* (Suci 7) is by the ed. translated as "Wohnplatz".[250] Thirdly, 'clear, pure' is also *tur-ug*, originally referring to the limpidity of a liquid which has stood for a while, letting the sediments settle. This is written with *ghain* in QB 1521, in the binomial *süzük turug* 'pure', which qualifies the soul. The Ottoman cognate of this is *duru*, and not *durak* (< **tur-gak*) as the *EDPT* writes s.v. '1 *turuk*'. The two instances in Manichaean writing, in TT IX 88 and (not mentioned in the *DTS* or the *EDPT*) M III 39,4$_3$ (text 22) also have *turug*. The only runic ex., in KöktüTurf TM 342 1 r 1-2, writes the word with the voiceless velar, but that is a text with several errors: *koluladurum* for *koluladukum*, *ögügäli* (with explicit A) for *ögügli*, *al(ı)g* for *kalıg*, *t(ı)gdı* for *kaŋgdı*. Curiously, three of these four errors involve back-vocalic /k/. With the *UW* but against the *EDPT*, then, I read this also as *turug* with a voiced velar. It appears rather frequently in the binomial *arıg turug*, e.g. in Maitr 27 r 15, 150 v 9, 177 v 17 and 217 v 9, TT VI 136 and 242, M III 21,4$_1$ and 6$_1$ (text 8), Suv 134,14 and 495,20, Kuan 193 and 197, U II 77,22, M I 24,2, 27,35, TT IX 88 etc. We also have *turug yarok* (M III 35,1$_1$, text 16) or *turug süzök* (TT VI 361, like *arıg sūzōk*) or *turug* by itself, used in Suv 492,8 for 'clarity, clearness', i.e. as adjectival abstract.

turkıg 'shame, diffidence' is attested only in DLT fol. 232, but we have *turkıg+lan-*, q.v., both there and in Uigur examples. **turkı-* has not turned up, but the DLT's *turkın-* 'to be diffident, shy' shows the same vowels and is no doubt related. *turkıg* is an action noun.

tut-ug carries out several syntactical tasks for *tut-* 'to hold, grasp, seize'. As subject noun it is attested with *tıdıg* (U III 28,8, Warnke 225). A binomial *tıdıgları tutugları* is found also in ShōAgon 1,359, misread as '*tıdıgları tuttaları*': °*ug*° and °*ta*° do look rather similar in cursive Uigur writing. Cf., further, *tıdıgsız tutugsuz* in Maitr fr. 115 v 4 and, used adverbially, in UigSukh 1. The opposite of *tutugsuz* is *tutuglug*, perhaps attested in BT XIII 18,6: *tuymak tözi tutuglug tetir* 'It is said that perception has restraint at its root'. If, on the other hand, we translate this with the sentence 'The root of perception is said to be restrained', we are taking *tutug-*

250 The interpretation in *EDPT* 538 a hinges upon the unacceptable translation of *mar+ın* as a plural (beside the question of whether the gift is a likely one).

lug to be formed with the independent suffix *-XglXg*, discussed below. *tutug* is a subject noun also with *ilig*, again in the sense of 'restraint, something which holds one back'. Exs. for this can be found in ETŞ 13,150, Maitr 219 r5, 7 v26, 116 v19 and 226 v7. From this comes *iligsiz tutugsuz köŋülin* (Maitr 117 r16). In TT VIII A 4, *tutugsuz* (this time by itself) is one of the two glosses on Skt. *anādhāraka*, from the root *dhar-* 'to hold, hold back, restrain, suppress; bear, support etc.'. The word is wrongly written as *tutuksuz* (Brāhmī script); cf. *tayag* in the same line, which confuses the velars the other way around. As object noun, *tutug* can refer to inanimate objects or to humans. In IrqB XXIX it signifies 'a stake (at gambling)', in DLT and USp 51,4 'security for a debt': *yarım yastwk kümüşüg tutug [bertim]. bo tutug kümüşüg tutug bermiş kün soŋ . . . sanap altım*. It refers to a 'hostage' in QB 1211, 3047, perhaps 4180. In QB 4717 it is best translated as 'prisoner'. Cf. the Yenisei instance, to be read as *otuz ārig başlayu tutugka ba[r]dı*: 'Being a commander of thirty men, he was taken into bondage' (YE 32,12).[251] In this last case, the lexeme is being used as an abstract.

tutz-ug is 'a will, testament' in the DLT. In the main entry for this in fol. 232, it is written as *tutsug*; but in fol. 52, in a different lemma, the text has *tutz(u)g* (z unvowelled). The two appear in distinct lemmata in the *EDPT*, as *tutsug* and *tutrug* (thus) respectively. *tutsug* is, of course, the result of assimilation: *tutzug* is an action or object noun of *tut-uz-*, q.v. below.

tümäg from **timä-g* is used as a binomial with *et-ig* in U II 40,108, ETŞ 10,266 and 20,10, BT II 947 and Suv 312,23. *tümäg* is found without *etig* only in *ārdini tümäglig* "juwelengeschmückt" in BT XIII 20,11 (three mss.); but that form is in fact likelier to have belonged to section 3.119. An ex. of *etigligin tümägligin* from BT III is quoted under *kaxşaş-* in section 7.1. The *EDPT*, which only has the U II instance, wrongly changes the word to '*timeg*'; but the rounding of the first vowel, caused by the /m/, must have been quite real. *et-* and *timä-*, *etin-* and *timän-* are also used parallelly, as *etig* and *tümäg*. *tümäg* is either an action noun signifying 'preparation(s)', or it denotes the object of the activity.

tünär-ig 'dark, dim, murky; darkness' is the subject nominal of *tün+är-*, q.v. below. It is occasionally used as abstract. The *DTS* and the *EDPT* mention a number of Manichaean and Muslim exs., but no Buddhist ones. Buddhist instances of this word can be found in UigBlock 108, Maitr 11 r5, 114 r18, 83 r31, 198 r21 and lost fr. nr. 260 r5 (read thus and not '*künärig*'!) and ETŞ 10,270. Additional Manichaean exs. appear in BT V 32, 732 and 733, HamTouen 7,6, ms. K 40 v4 in the n. to BT V 104, ms. T II K (U 15) r5 and 7 in n. 3 in ChuastBeitr, M II 11,9 and 11 (text 4) and $12,3_2$ (text 5) and M III $25,6_2$ (text 9).

uçrug 'flag pole final, banner' could have had a metaphorical connection with

251 Misunderstood also in the *EDPT*.

uç-ur- 'to cause to fly'. See the *EDPT* and *DTS* entries and MaitrH XI 4 a3 and 13 a3 (both binome with *orŋu*) and ETŞ 10,233 for exs. and E. Esin in *CAJ* XVI/1: 14-36 for a description of the object. IrqB XXXVI has *uçrug+lug*; this shows us that the velar of *uçrug* was voiced (against '*uçruk*' in *UW* 283 a, quoting from Suv 490,22).

ud-ug is attested only together with *tap-ıg*, q.v.; consequently, it cannot be distinguished from it in meaning. See that for examples. In view of the constant joining of the two, the reconstruction suggested for Ht VII 4 b16 as '*näçä . . . bäg[lär] ärsär, öŋin öŋin tapıg[çılar] udug tuta, kurınça käzigi[nçä] tiziltilär*' is unlikely: The "lords" are probably the subject also for *tuta*, the binomial *tapıg udug* being the direct object of this form. *ud-* appears to have been obsolete in Old Turkic as finite verb, but *udu* is well-attested as adverb and conjunction. *ud-* does appear in Qarakhanid Turkic; cf., further, *ud-un-*, *ud-uş* and *ud-uz-* below. *udug* is an action noun.

ugra-g 'aim, intention' is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* only from the DLT; that evidence proves the voicedness of the velar. Ottoman *uğrak* cannot, therefore, come from this. Nor can *ugrag* be the base of the runic verb which *EDPT* 93-4 reads as '*ugraklat-*', T. Tekin, however, in a quite different manner. This noun is attested also in ETŞ 13,30 in the sentence *äŋ kenintä nirvan bulgu ugragıg turgurmış* 'Finally he made it [his] aim to find *nirvāṇa*'. *ugra-* < *ugur+a-* is discussed below. *ugrag* must be the target of aiming and intention, i.e. the object of the verb.

ula-g is, in our texts, most common in the binomial *ulag sapıg*, which has been discussed s.v. *sap-ıg* above. In late texts, *ulag* is attested also by itself, signifying 'chain, series, concatenation, sequence': *siŋirin tamırın yörgälmiş süŋüklär ulagı üzä tutuşmış . . . ärür* (Suv 614,12). From this came the even later reference to the concatenation of Chingizid succession: *Çiŋgiz kagannıŋ ayaglıg kanlar ulagı altınç käzigintä . . .* (DruTur 4) 'in the sixth generation of the venerated royal succession of Chinggis khan . . .'; *abamuka tägi urug uruglarıŋa ulag kılıp . . .* 'engendering a succession of his progeny for all eternity' (InscrOuig III 52). The same text has in IV 47 an ex. for the even commoner use to which the word was put in Mongol times: *ulag birlä körü uzatıp . . .* 'he got him accompanied by *relay horses*'. This last use, quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *2 ulag* from a number of economical texts of the Mongol period, was already known to DLT fol. 73: It is there translated as 'a horse which an express courier takes by order of the emir and rides until he finds another'. In addition, we find *ulag atlar* in Kōbunsho II 2. I think it follows from the semantic development which this word took that such a horse was not called *ulag* because it was a "festgebundenes Tier" (*TMEN* 521), but because it represented an element in a chain (as *pars pro toto*). Thus, the grammatical task of *ulag* with respect to *ula-* could be as action noun (the 'connection'), subject noun

('what connects'), object noun ('what is connected') or as instrument noun ('what one uses for connecting').

um-ug 'what one hopes for and puts one's trust in' is often attested together with *ınag*, q.v. above. It appears without that in BT I B(118), BT II 284 and ETŞ 9,109 in the phrase *umug bol-*, and in *tınl(ı)glarnıŋ umugı Maytrı bodis(a)tv* (BT I A_1(16)). *um-* is obsolete in Old Turkic but found in QB 5062 ('to hope for something') and 5612 ('to have hopes about something') and in the DLT. In Uigur, *um-un-* is common, often used together with *ınan-*, while the action noun is *um-unç*, q.v. below. *um-du* (section 3.114) is closest to the meaning "to covet" given for *um-* in the DLT, whereas the other derivates have a positive content. *umugsuz* often appears with *ınagsız*; see *ınag* also for exs. of this binomial. *umugsuz* is used both nominally and adnominally. Qarakhanid Turkic does not have *umug*.

According to the *EDPT*, *ur-ug* in the sense of 'seed' (as opposed to *ur-ug* 'beating' in a grammatical ex. in the DLT) is unlikely to be a deverbal noun from *ur-*. One of the meanings of this verb being 'to put', however, and *urug* being an object noun, I see no particular problems for the relationship. The semantic connection of *ur-unç* 'a bribe' with this base does not seem more obvious to me. It is in the nature of word formation that its results remain open to lexical developments which often stretch semantic relationship. As the result of a further, in this case metaphorical, development, *urug* also comes to denote 'progeny, descendants'. In both the original and the metaphorical sense, it is often used in a binomial with *tarı-g*, q.v. above; to my mind, this proves that the agricultural use of *urug* was the primary one and the human use secondary and, as I said, metaphorical. Concerning *tarıg*, this way of seeing the matter is even more obvious. Cf. *ogulı kızı urugı tarıgı bagrı böşüki ükü bolur* (TT VI 105) 'His sons and daughters, progeny$_2$, blood relations and relations by marriage become numerous'. Some exs. of *urug* not mentioned in the *DTS* or the *EDPT* appear in Hochzeit 15 (with *tarıg*), BudhStab I 4 and II 13 (both *altun uruglar* 'royal progeny') and ShōAv 302 (*urug äk-* 'to sow').

ülüg 'share, part; destiny, fate' could perhaps be the object noun of *ülä-* 'to share out'. However, *-Xg* is not a dominant suffix, as e.g. *ötä-g*, *çiltä-g* and *ula-g* show. One (unconvincing) way to connect the two (and also *ülüş*, q.v. among the *-Xş* forms below) would be through a noun **ül*; this could have given *ül+ä-* on the one hand and *ülüg* < **ül+lXg* on the other. Comparing *tilik* < *tilä-* one gets the idea that /l/ might narrow subsequent front vowels, but cf. *belük*. Assuming, with Doerfer, 1982: 116, the existence of a deverbal suffix '*-A-*', here to have been attached to a verb '*ül-*', seems to me to be a hardly satisfactory *ad hoc* explanation: no such suffix is ever found in Old or Qarakhanid Turkic. *ülüg* is attested from the inscriptions on with both the concrete and the abstract meaning; see exs. in

the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. The binomial *kut ülüg*, which appears already in the inscriptions, is expanded to *kutlug ülüglüg* and *kutsuz ülügsüz*, documented in these dictionaries.

üt-üg 'a flat iron' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT; attested also in Maitr 84 v 23 (= BT IX-209,24$_1$) as *örtlüg yalınlıg ütüg*. Instrument noun from *üt-* 'to singe', or perhaps its object. Although the second vowel is unmarked in the DLT and noted as unclear or uncertain in BT IX, it is unlikely to be an /i/ on comparative grounds. Should it turn out to be nevertheless attested with an /i/, this lexeme would have to be derived from the DLT hap. *üt-i-* 'to iron' discussed at the end of the introduction to part VI.

yan-ıg, the OB's *-Xg* derivate from *yan-* 'to turn back', signifies 'a return, recompense, repayment' or 'a setting right' (couplets 858, 1635, 3020, 3581 and 6016). In 1635, 3581 and 6016 (all three *anıŋ yangı*), the second vowel is syncopated when the possessive suffix is added to this noun. This is also the form in LetterTunHuang 10, which reads *]nıŋ küçün yangı nätäg ärsär, . . .* 'however high his/its recompense by force may be, . . .'. It is unlikely that this should be *yankı*, q.v. below among the *-gI* lexemes, because the possessive suffix is demanded by the genitive. *y(a)nıgın çaşgarıp, utl[ı . . .* in ShōAgon 1,146 may also belong here. *yanıg* and *yankı* appear to have similar meanings. This *yanıg* is not the base of Uigur *yanıgsız*, which signifies 'unswerving': *yanıgsız KÖŋÜLİN öŋdün SIŋAR yoryu başladılar* (BuddhUig II 328); *ker]tgünçi yanıgsız* (and not 'yarıksız') *ärip . . .* (LautBemerk 41); *ävrilinçsiz yanıgsız burxan kutıŋa köŋül öritdilär* (Shō X b 7). The last instance reminds one of the sentence *burxan kutındın yanmaksız ävrilmäksiz ärür* (U II 40,103). *burxan kutıntın ąvrilinçsiz yanıgsız bolayın* (Buy-Käl 41) and *burxan kutıntın yanıgsız bolzunlar* (ibid. 44) are equally remarkable for governing the ablative case. We further find *yanıgsız* in *yanıgsız çın köŋül* (BT XIII 33,7) and *yanıgsız köŋülüŋ* 'your unswerving heart' (ibid. 21,39). Cf. also *yanınçsız*, attested also in Manichaean writing (TT III 116).

yanç-ıg 'a mash' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but appears in Ernte 87 and 90: *yanç(ı)g turulduru, saçmışta ok tagdın enmiş esiniŋizlär tıdılmadın tutçı esināsūn. yanç(ı)g yügürü örü kötürüp saçmışta ok öŋdürdin kälmiş esiniŋizlär üzülmädin tutçı yeldirsūn* 'Just when you press down the mash and scatter it, may your breezes, which come from the north, not get held back but blow continuously. Right when you run and lift the mash and scatter it, may your breezes which come from the east not stop but blow continuously.' *yançıg* is the object noun of *yanç-* 'to crush, trample on', presumably not otherwise attested because of the specific semantic field of agriculture to which it belongs.[252]

252 The clause immediately preceding the ones discussed here is dealt with in section 3.107, under *suvsun*.

yaŋza-g 'a likeness; a simile, metaphor, parable' is attested in QB 17,661, 1651, 2255, 2820, 4983 and 4985. The base and *yaŋza-t-* are also only attested in the QB. *yap-ıg* signifies 'covering' or 'building' in accordance with the different meanings of *yap-*, and is also used to translate Skt. *upādāna*. The *EDPT*, q.v., only has two Uigur instances, in Suv 704,13ff. and U III 37,33-34. Maitr 31 v6 describes a palace: *alko üstün ürtüKi altın yapagı yeriŋä tägi altunlug . . . bolur* 'All its roof above and building below are of gold down to the ground'. In *amrılmış enç nirvan-ıŋ apıg yapıgı açılzun* (BuddhStab II 17), *yapıg* is rather a 'covering'. Zieme, with "das versperrte Schloß des friedevollen Nirvāṇa" may be a bit too specific; but this is much closer to what the context demands than the translation in *UW* 36a: There, *nirvannıŋ abıg yapıgı* is "das ruhige Haus des Nirvāṇa (?)". The structure of the passage is chiastic, and there is an opposition between *açıl-* and *açok* on the one hand and *yapıl-* and *yapıg* on the other. Cf. the further remarks and modern cognates of *yapıg* in the n. to the reedition of the passage in BT XIII 49,65. Röhrborn assumes *apıg* to signify "ruhig" here; to me, the adjectival instances collected under *abıg* B) appear to be better translated partly as 'hidden, concealed', and partly as 'concealing'. *beş yapıglar* 'the five *upādāna* (*skandhas*)' (Maitr 43 r6) is similar to the U III entry, where it refers to the 'outside'. Cf. also *öŋ yapıg yok kurug ärür; tāginmäk sakınç . . . yapıg ymä yok kurug ärür* (Ht X 668-70), *iki y(e)g(i)rmi uguşlarıg beş yapaglarıg adır-* (Maitr 160 v29 = MaitrH XVI 10 a 10-11 quoted in Laut, 1986: 57-8) and *tınl(ı)glı yapıglı uguşlı üçägü atları üzä öŋi ol; tözläri näŋ öŋi ärmäz* (BT I D (68)) 'living beings, *upādāna* (*skandhas*) and *dhātus*, these three are different only in name; in essence they are not distinct at all.' Further, *yapıgımız ämigimiz ör[tlüg yalınlıg]* in Maitr 77 r8. According to its editor, *beş yapıglıg äv bark* (U II 21,2, a Suv passage) metaphorically refers to the body. Cf. the expression *beş yapıg* above, however, to which the suffix *+lXg* is here added as one unit. As a Manichaean term, *yapıg* is attested in HamTouen 8,6.

The *EDPT* and the *DTS* have only two Uigur exs. for *yara-g* 'opportunity, possibility, suitability, opportuneness', similarly defined in the DLT. We also find it in ShōAgon 1,182 and Ht VII 7 a24 in a binomial with *yon*, as in Suv 590,8 quoted in the *EDPT*. Add *kadgulugnuŋ ämgäkligniŋ yaragı iyin* (ETŞ 9,83) and *[ön]gin [ön]gin yaraglarınça isinü yilinü* (Warnke 150). There are also 17 exs. in the QB, a text in which exs. of *yaraglıg* and *yaragsız* are even more numerous. *yaraglıg* 'useful, suitable, satisfactory, appropriate' and its opposite *yaragsız* 'useless etc.' are also attested in Uigur: In HamTouen 21,1 we find the phrase *kopka yaraglıg* "bénéfiques pour tous" in parallel with *alkoka säviglig*. The *EDPT* quotes the phrase *yägükä aşaguka yaraglıg* from Suv 529,12-13, translated "suitable for eating". *t[o]k boşı tuyunmakıg bulguka bertim yaraglıg* (BT XIII 55,9) has been translated as "Ich habe geziemende, reichliche Almosen gegeben, um

die Erleuchtung zu erlangen". This text is in rhyme, which explains the place of *yaraglıg* at the end of the verse. Zieme takes this word to qualify *boşı*, but I think it should be taken to govern *-gUkA*: 'useful for finding enlightenment'. The construction is then parallel to the Suv instance just quoted, and more appropriate, I feel, to the meaning. *yaraglıg* thus governs the dative as *yara-* does, and may as well be interpreted as an *-(X)glXg* form. In M I 26,29 we should possibly read *ulug y(a)raglag* instead of *uluş y(a)raşlag* as still done in *UW* 178 a bottom: As the facs. shows, final *ş* and back *g* are quite similar; moreover, there is a stain straight through the medial *s/ş/g* of the second word, making all three consonants possible (but not back-vocalic *k*, which would have been dotted in this ms.). Ht VII 2 a25 should probably be read as *kılınçım ārigim yaragsız* with Geng instead of Arlotto's 'yaroksuz', which does not fit the context very well: In the exs. which we have of it, it refers to eyesight being dim. *yara-g* is the abstract of *yara-*, q.v. in the *EDPT*.

Both the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quote *yarat-ıg* under *et-ig*, together with which it appears in all the instances mentioned by them. U IV C78, Buddhāv Y 6 and 158, Ht X 71-73, U II 71,3, BT VIII A 164, 175, 462 and 491, BT VII 312, 335 and 344 can be added to those. The Maitr mss. spell this word as often with ' in the third syllable as with Y. The binomial *etig yaratıg* usually signifies 'ornaments'; it does not do so in U III 33,15, to be translated as 'created thing, thing of the material world', and in the two TT VI instances, where it signifies 'act, deed, venture'. Cf. this with *etiglig yaratıglıg iş küdüg* in TT VI 79. The last mentioned meaning is that of *yaratıg* where it appears without *etig*, in the four exs. from U II and BT VII mentioned above. *baxşı yaratıgı* in the four BT VIII instances is translated as "Beschaffung des Gurus". *yaratıg*, then, is most often an object noun of *yarat-* (q.v. below) but can also be an action noun.

yelpig has a *-g* and not a *-k* as written in the *EDPT* and by some of the editors: in TT VIII O4, containing the text of TT VI 59 in Brāhmī writing, the editor writes '*]lpa glār*'. The fact that the first preserved *akşara* is here written with an *a* and not an *i* does not signify, however, that there is an explicit *a* in the ms. instead of an *i*: As short *a* was not marked at all in Indian writing systems, it only signifies that the diacritic for *i* had also disappeared in the tear. We can therefore write the word here as *ye]lp(i)glār*. Ms. TT VIII O does not confuse /g/ and /k/. Some of the mss. of this passage have *oŋjin yelpig yäklär* with the ms. chosen to be the main one by the editors of TT VI; others, including the Brāhmī ms. and two additional mss. edited as OdaNewFrag 4 and 5, write *oŋjınlar yäklär yelpiglär*. *yelpi-k* 'asthma', discussed in *TMEN* 1882, is a different lexeme. DLT fol. 464 defines *yelpig* as a 'demonic stroke' while, in DhāSū 11, *oŋjin yelpig yäk içkäklär* corresponds to a Chin. series translated by the editor as "Kobolde, Feen und Dämonen". In the translation of the DhāSū passage itself, *yelpig* is rendered by "Gespenster", i.e.

'ghosts'. The DLT's sentence *ārkā yelpig tägdi* could of course be translated not only as 'The man was seized with a demonic stroke' but also 'A ghost visited the man' (if the two are at all to be distinguished). There is, further, a binomial *uçıK yelpig* in Suv 475,7, quoted under *učīg* in the *DTS*, and in a section of the ms. of TT VII 27 quoted in the n. to that text.[253] The base *yelpi-* is attested in the meaning 'to fan' only, in Suv 625,20 (mentioned in the *DTS*); we find *yelpi-gü* 'fan' in that same passage and in BT II 786-7. The DLT's *yelpit-* is also related to 'fanning', and so is *yel yälpirdi* and *ol öziŋä yel yelpindi* of the same source. However, in DLT fol. 489 we have *oglan yelpindi* translated as 'The boy was seized by a demonic stroke' and, in fol. 483, *är yelpirdi* (~ *yelpärdi* etc.) translated 'The man turned right and left as though he were struck with a demonic stroke'. We cannot know whether any *yelpi-* other than the one signifying 'to fan' ever existed; the hypostasis may have occurred not with the base but with *yelpig* itself; this may originally also have had another, less otherworldly if not much more tangible, meaning as well. Consider also the contents of n. 383.

yeni-g 'light (not heavy)' has hitherto generally been written as *yenik*, but Ottoman *yeynı/yeğni* speaks for *-g*. The *-k/g* variant also found in Ottoman could be a borrowing from some other dialect where the voiced velar was retained or even devoiced. There is also the evidence of *yengil/yeŋil* 'light, easy', attested in TT VII 42 (a very late collection of proverbs) and in Middle Turkic. The Codex Comanicus has the forms *yeŋil / yeŋül / yüŋül*, and *yüŋül / yöŋül* appears to be the common variant in Middle Turkic. As there is no rounding consonant and as there is no deverbal formative '*-gil*', it appears that *yengil / yeŋil* comes from the phrase *yenig ol*, or perhaps *yen(i)g+i ol* with elided/merged *o*. Although *yeni-* is, as far as I know, attested in Uigur only in BT I F(9), *yenig* is very common there. Qarakhanid Turkic has both *yeni-* (DLT) and *yenit-* (four times in the QB), and *yenig* (DLT and QB). The following instances of *yenig*, the subject adjective of *yeni-* 'to be or become light', are not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: U II 77,17 and 86,35, Warnke 623, U III 71,1, Suv 364,13, Ht IV 384 and 1699, HtPek 150 a4 and HtPar 129,26, ETŞ 9,63, AbitAnk 90, HamTouen 5,12, Wettkampf 69, Maitr 200 v5 and 170 r10, a number of them in the binomial *uçuz yenig*. *yenig kör-* of HtPar 129,26 corresponds to *uçuzla-* 'to disparage' in HtFragm II 3, a different translation of the same Chin. text. In the Suv and ETŞ exs. and in TT VII 25,7, *yenig* is opposed to *agır*. Cf., in this connection, *bagı kölöki bukagusı agırlıg yeniglig bar* (M III 12,19$_1$, text 6) 'His bonds, fastenings or fetters can be heavy or light'. The epistolary expression *yini / yiniŋ / yiniŋiz / yiniŋizlär yenig mü?* appears

253 Cf. *uçın-* in section 7.2 for *uçıK*. This word is unlikely to be a variant of *ujık* 'letter', which is always written with the character Z. A connection with *uç-* 'to fly' seems unlikely both for phonological and semantic reasons.

in BT V 30, 704, HamTbuen 22,3, 23,5, 31,6 and 32,1, in HuangWenbi nr. 811.4-5 quoted in the n. thereto and in the ms. T IV Xusup (U 5929) l.5, ibid.; alliteration must have helped in its creation.

yevā-g 'supplies, equipment' is the object noun of *yevā-*. Cf. also *yevār-* below. The joined effect of /y/ and /v/ was possibly responsible for the variants *yevig*, *yevin-*, *yevir-* and *yevil-*, in concurrence with analogy from the vowelled forms of the suffixes involved. This narrow second vowel is attested in Brāhmī writing in *y(e)vägä(g)* in TT VIII A 35,[254] which also fixes the voicedness of the /g/ for this lexeme.[255] The forms vary in two parallel mss. of the same text: *yevigin yevit-* in Maitr 3 r 3-4, *yevägin yevät-* in MaitrH Y 11 b 28 (quoted in Laut, 1986: 55). I write the first vowel as *e* and not *i* because it fluctuates between *kasra* and *fatḥa* in *yevil-* / *yevül-* of the DLT ms., and is apparently written as *yävil-* in Suv. In addition to what is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* and in the n. to TT V B 103, *yevāg* ~ *yevig* is also attested in Suv 127,20 and 377,17, ms. T III TV 59 (U 4313) quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 13, Scharl 97, BT II 895, 899 and 910, Maitr 3 r 4, 9 r 13, 21 r 3, 31 r 2 and 228 v 3, CYK 7, Ht VII 15 b 5 and X 658, Shō XIII a 6, FujYūr v 17 and BT XIII 49,34 and 56,5. Its use in spiritual matters is calqued on Skt. and Chin. usage, for which see primarily the n. to TT V B 103; it is particularly common in a binomial with *tiz-ig*.

yıdı-g 'smell, smelling' is both subject and action noun of *yıdı-*, q.v. under *+I-* below. It more often refers to a bad smell than to a good one. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in U III 78,4, Heilk II 1,114, Maitr 178 r 2, 198 v 20 and 202 v 12, SP 23 (written *ıdıg*!) and Suv 612,5.

yılı-g signifies 'warm, lukewarm' in DLT, Heilk II 4,21 and in *yılıgk(ı)ya* in Ht X 796. The last ex. is written with two dots over the *g*, which may indicate an assimilation in the velar to give *yılıkk(ı)ya*. The binomial *yılıg yumşak*, attested in TT I 178, MaitrH Y 4 a 17 (quoted in *UW* 279 a s.v. *avıt-*), and BT II 1260, has the meaning 'gentle'. *yılıg* is a subject nominal. Cf. the cognates *yılı-n-* and *yılı-t-* below.

The *EDPT* is right, I think, in reading *yılışıg* in KT E 26 (fragmentary parallel in BQ E 21); I'd agree with Clauson's translation as "comfortable, prosperous or the like". The base *yılı-ş-* is attested in the DLT, mentioned e.g. in the *EDPT*. The passage reads as follows: *nāŋ* Y[1]I L[1]S[2]G[1] *bodunka* (BQ: *bodun üzä*) *olormadım; içrā aşsız, taşra tonsuz yavız yavlak bodunta üzä olortum*. The fact that the DLT gives only a concrete translation for *yılış-* should not deter us from this interpretation: That is the case also for *yılı-*. *yılışıg* should be a subject noun.

yiri-g (Ht IV 1537) ~ *iri-g* twice in the DLT signifies 'rotten'; it must be a

254 The passage is discussed under *tiz-ig* above.

255 Tezcan in Ht X 565 writes '*iki yivāklärdä*' with *k*.

cognate of *yiri-ŋ* ~ *iri-ŋ* 'pus', q.v. below. See this latter for Qarakhanid *iri-* 'to decay, rot' corresponding to Uigur *yirü-*, and for an explanation for the *ü- in this alternant. Note that Uigur has initial /y/ for all three lexemes where Qarakhanid Turkic has Ø. *yirig* ~ *irig* is a subject adjective. *iri-g* should not be confused with *äyrig*, discussed in footn. 241 above.

yod-ug 'disaster, calamity, undoing' is attested 24 times in the QB; see Tezcan's review of the İndeks for the correct translation. This fits in well with the meanings of *yod-*, *yod-un* and *yod-ut*, qq.v. The DLT's definition (quoted in the *EDPT*) can be accomodated with this meaning. *yod-ug* is an action noun.

The action or object noun *yoŋa-g* 'false accusation' is written with *ghain* in the DLT and, in spite of the entries *yoŋgak* and *yoŋgakçı* in the İndeks, also in QB 4272, 5860, 5863 and 5864. TT I 74 and U II 76,6 have the binomial *çaşut yoŋag*.

yoläşür-üg / *yöläşrüg* / *yöläştrüg* is the action noun of *yöläş-ür-* / *yöläş-tür-*, qq.v. below. The first form is attested in Suv 177,17, 345,7, 346,5,[256] 375,1-2, 386,5 and 394,22, AbhiKārKomm 10, Abhi B 32 a1 and BT VII A 246, 247 and 248. The second form, with a syncopated unstressed vowel, appears in KudJunshō B r17 and v9. It would explain the third form, attested only in BT VIII A 8, through a universally documentable phonetic process, were it not that *yöläştür-* is much better attested than *yöläşür-*: The relationship between these two verb forms can only be morphological and not phonetic. Cf. also *oxşaŋsız yöläşürügsüz* (Suv 377,10).

yör-üg 'explanation, interpretation' also signifies 'meaning' on the one hand, and 'formulation, putting into words' on the other. It is an action and object noun of *yör-*, which signifies both 'to unwrap' and 'to explain, interpret'. Written with a voiced velar both in the three Brāhmī instances TT VIII A 43 and 45 and H 6, and in Manichaean script in M III 15,11$_1$. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in TT V B (eleven times), Suv 202,22 and 513,20, ms. T I T 301 (U 2378) ls. 2-3 in the n. to Hochzeit 12, ShōAgon 1,255, 2, p. 190, 2 etc., BT XIII 53,2, UigFalt 27 (Skt. *pāramita* 'explained' as *pāram* + the root ī-), 116 and 122, ATSS VI r4 (twice) and v6, at least ten times in Ht, BT II 270, ĀgFrag B 11, 15, 22, 25 and 26, KudGojūni A 6, 7, 12, 13 etc., Genzan A r2, v7 and 8 etc., Hamtouen 5,29, 6,3 and 12,4 and BodhiAvaKomm 30. Correctly defined in the DLT and quite common in the QB. Cf. *yörüglüg* 'having or providing certain explanations' in the *EDPT*.

yul-ug signifies 'commerce' in the binomial *satıg yulug* (KP 13,8, Maitr 61 v10 and 1 v16, U II 77,25 and 86,42, TT VII 40,68, TT VI 104, BT VIII A 75), but 'ransom, hostage' when it appears by itself, in Maitr 40 v5 (*yulug ber-*), InscrOuig II 50, DLT, 28 times in the QB and in later texts quoted in the *EDPT* entry. *yulug*

256 As (*lenxua çäçäk yöläşürüg*)*lüg ögdi*.

by itself never signifies 'commerce', and I disagree with Tezcan's interpretation of *QB* 1736*b*: Dankoff correctly translates the line as follows: "Others grow old as hostages in the fortress." This second use is the nearer one to the central meaning of *yul-* 'to pull out; to redeem'; but the use of *yul- al-* or *al- yul-* in contracts of USp makes it understandable how the binomial *satıg yulug* came about. The binomial is an action noun; the 'hostage' is one who hopes that being the object of *yul-*, i.e. to be redeemed, will apply to him.

yunçı-g 'in a bad, deteriorated state' is applied both to people and to affairs in the DLT. It is attested also in QB 413, 704, 736, 2089, 3117 and 3328, in the first two in a binomial with *yavuz*. The base is attested in Suv 553,20 and DLT, qq.v. in the *DTS*; *yunçıg* is its subject noun.

The QB has a lexeme *yülüg* in couplets 2083, 2208, 2217, 2298, 2458, 2460, 2663 and 2854. In some of these it rhymes with *ülüg* 'fortune', *kü+lüg* and *bälgü+lüg*; it therefore ends in /g/ and not in /k/, as the *EDPT* writes it. It is there translated as "clean-shaven, smooth", by Dankoff only once as "clean-shaven" and otherwise as "trim", "well-kempt", "neat" or "neat-looking". In most of the contexts, its meaning can by no means have been as narrow as to permit us to derive it from *yüli-* 'to shave', and it is in several cases collocated with *kaşıg* 'impressive'. Moreover, the regular *-(X)g* derivate from *yüli-* would have been '*yülig*', which appears in none of the mss. in any of the instances. Some meaning like 'handsome, personable, charming' would fit the contexts. Possibly, this is the same lexeme as Uigur *yülüg*, attested with *g* in Brāhmī script (but fragmentary context) in TT VIII N14. We find it twelve times in UigTot 372 ff. as *yülüg bol-* 'to meet', in ms. T II Y15 (U 5729) v8 quoted in the n. thereto with the directive, as *+garu yülüg bol-*. The other instances, BT III 1100, Warnke 27-28 and Suv 399,5-6 show it coupled with the dative, signifying 'facing . . .'. Particularly useful is the Warnke instance *+kA yülüg utru tur-*, with the binomial *yülüg utru*. The editors of UigTot would like to derive it from a hypothetical **yü* "Gegenwart (o.ä.)", deriving *yülüg* < **yü+lüg*. But this does not seem to me to fit too well into the uses of *+lXg*. Another possibility would be to assume a verb **yü-* 'to face (towards)', making *yüz* 'face' a deverbal noun, and *yülüg* analysable as **yü-l-üg*. *yügärü* might perhaps be a simplified **yü-g+gärü*. The QB's *yülüg* should, in any case, be connected with these lexemes.

yünt-üg is a *hapax* in BuddhKat 28 which the various eds. were unable to interpret: *sārinmāk antag ol: üç ago nızvanısı tükäl arıp*[257] *esiz yavız kişiniŋ* 'ED.TIG

257 I emend the text, which reads 'ERIB. Maue and Röhrborn understand this as *ärip* from *är-* 'to be' and translate "Selbst wenn (ein Bodhisattva) die drei Gift-Affekte alle hat, . . .": But *är-* is five times written with *a* in this text, a *bodhisattva* is not expected to have *kleśas*, and *tükäl* does not signify "alle". Moriyasu reads *ir-* and translates 'to crack, to fissure, to cleave', but this fits neither

yüntüg tut ayıg sav tıŋlayur särinür 'Patience/Forbearance is as follows: His (i.e. the *bodhisattva*'s) three poison-blemishes of character all being removed, he hears the . . ., insulting, disparaging and evil words of worthless and bad persons, (but) has forbearance'. *yüntüg*, written as YUN.TUG, was not understood; but, it clearly fits in with *yünt-üş-* (q.v. below also for the base) in both meaning and form. The orthography of one of the *yüntüş-* forms shows that it and *yüntüg* have front vocalism. The word before this follows the reading of Moriyasu, who had direct access to the ms.; Maue and Röhrborn saw only the letters *yı*[. . .]*ig*. It has not been satisfactorily interpreted as yet.

-(X)g being a very common suffix, the expansions of this formation are also very numerous. In some cases, as in the DLT's *ām-ig+dāş* and in *tarı-g+lag*, whose attestation is quite early, the *-(X)g* form functions like any other nominal lexeme. This is true also where *-(X)g* forms receive expressive formatives, as in the nouns *ōt-üg+k(ı)yā* and *tap-ıg+k(ı)ya* and the adjectives *kat-ıg+k(ı)ya* and *yılı-g+k(ı)ya*, *kät-ıg+rak* and *arı-g+rak*. Expansions with *+lXk* show the typical functions of this suffix: We find the local function of *+lXk* in *bat-ıg+lık* 'lavatory', attested in two Uigur exs. (one of them Brāhmī) quoted in the *EDPT*. Another local *-(X)glXk* form appears to be *kor(ı)glık*, which is a member of a list of places on the human body in TT VII 20,13-14. It should refer to the 'pudenda', in the sense of 'a place one conceals and guards'. This appears likely in view of the connection between *korı-* and *kork-* (q.v. among the *-(X)k-* verbs), and the meaning of *kor(ı)-g+lıg*, q.v. The QB, as expected, has *+lXk* in the abstract-forming function also after *-Xg*: e.g. *tiriglik* 'life' from *tir-ig* 'alive'. The instrumental *+lXk* is also well-known. E.g. 'a censer', which is transparently called *tütsüglük* in Suv 129,7: *elgintä tütsüglük tuta, bo tütsügüg urup mini okızun* 'He should hold a censer in his hand, put this incense (in it) and call on me'.

DLT fol. 582 writes the following about the use of *-XglXk*: "The participle describing that one ought to perform that [i.e. the action]. Ex.: *ol ät togr(a)glık ärdi* 'He should have cut the meat.' and *ol saŋa ugraglık ärdi* 'He should have gone to you.'" According to DankKelly, the vocalisation of the forms *togr(a)glık* and *ugraglık* is by the first hand, including a *sukūn* on the second *ghain* of *ugraglık*; still, that same edition changes the forms to '*tograguluk*' and '*ugraguluk*' respectively. *-gUlXk* is indeed more of a participle than *-XglXk*, and is certainly more common. It cannot be said for certain that Dankoff and Kelly were wrong in changing the text the way they did. Still, Uigur has some instances of *-XglXk* which remind one of the DLT's exs.: *yana azk(ı)ya tapıglık tavar ıdtımız* (Ht VII 2026) 'We have also sent a few things for honouring (you)'. The phrase *yoŋlaKlık*

the form nor the meaning. I take the verb to be *arı-*, which should then be added to *UW* 181, par. 5).

tavar / kümüş / çao / bŏz / kunpo 'money / fabric (etc.) for spending / use' is found in many economical documents; also, e.g. in TuoLuoNi 346-7. *alu y(e)g(i)rmi türlüg bolmaguluk, yŏläşürüglük, bütmägülük savlar* (Suv 694,19) is quoted and translated in *UW* 110a.[258] It contains an *-(X)glXk* form among two ending in *-gUlXk*. What distinguishes the DLT instances from all the Uigur exs. is the fact that the former are used predicatively and have verbal government while the latter do not, and are used attributively. More important still, Kāšġarī's *-(X)glXk* forms are predicated upon the *agents* of the base verbs (at least one of which is transitive), while the Uigur forms all qualify their *objects*. For the time being, therefore, we cannot speak of a combination *-XglXk* with any grammatically defined function and meaning of its own and distinct from that of the sum of its parts, whatever we think of the DLT instances. See also section 2.77 under B_3.

Most of the exs. of *-(X)g+sXz* were discussed together with the *-(X)g* lexemes from which they come. The following verbs are derived from *-(X)g* forms: *kurg+a-*, *sig+ā-* and *tatg+a-*, *bag+la-*, *batıg+lan-*, *isigläş-*, *katıg+lan-*, *turkıg+lan-*, *ülüg+lā-* and *yenig+lä-*; *tägriglā-* with incertain base and *yulug+la-*, appearing several times in the QB. Noteworthy are *ögsirā-*, *tatıgsıra-*, *umugsıra-* and *urugsıra-*. The sequence *-(X)g+I(n)+çA* leads us into the domain of morphology, to the gerundive suffix *-gInçA*. *-(X)g* also participated in some composite suffixes: *-(X)glXg* (section 3.119), the agentive *-(X)gçI* (section 3.321) and *-(X)gsA-* < *-(X)g+sA-*, the desiderative formative (section 6.1). The fact that *-(X)glXg*, *-(X)gçI* and, of course, *-gInçA* are able to govern nominals as a verb does not mean that *-(X)g* itself ever had this ability.

Let us now return to the members of the formation with *-Xg* and to their valency functions. These functions are not easily determined for all the forms discussed here, and not for all of them is a base actually attested in Old Turkic. Many of them actually represented more than one such function: The different meanings of *ulag*, e.g., show that it could be understood as an abstract noun denoting the *action*, or as the *means* for carrying out the content of the base verb *ula-* 'to join', sometimes as the *direct object* of this verb, or even as its *subject*, 'what connects things'. 'What connects', it turns out in the actual passages, is not the ruler sending a courier, nor even the courier himself, but the relay or the relay horses. This, however, is a typical INSTRUMENT, speaking in case-theory terms, and not a SUBJECT. One should be careful not to base case function on translation equivalents.

258 Although Röhrborn translates this correctly as "die 16 Arten von Dingen, die nicht vorkommen, [nur] *zum Vergleich dienen* und nicht zustande kommen", he transcribes the word we are dealing with here as '*yŏläşürüglüg*'. 'zu . . . dienen' seems to me definitely to demand the suffix *+lXk*, however.

Leaving real problems aside but including not too unclear lexemes, we find that 73 among the *-Xg* forms have it as their only task, or as one of their tasks, to denote the action itself. 52 among them can denote the object of transitive bases, 43 the subject of intransitive ones. The number of *-Xg* lexemes which are able to refer to the subject of transitive verbs, on the other hand, is exceedingly small. We said above that *tıdıg* and *tutug*, which are often used together, denote the subject of (tr.) *tıd-* and *tut-* respectively: They signify 'obstruction, hindrance, restraint' or, as I wrote above, 'something which holds one back'. Such 'impediments', however, are abstract entities; they are in fact aspects of one's (i.e. the victim's) self, if I understand the matter correctly. The only *-Xg* lexeme I know of, which can refer to a concrete agent of a transitive verb, is *sävüg* in M I 23: *nätäg ymä köz ad[akka] s(ä)vüg, nätäg ymä älig agazka s(ä)vüg ärür, ançulayu ymä dıntar kişikä s(ä)vüg kǫŋül y(a)raşur* (translated s.v. *säv-ig* above). This is a metaphorical context, in which eye and hand are depicted as if they were capable of love. The fact remains, however, that we still do not have a single ex. in which a real living agent possessing volition and the power to independent action is referred to as *sävig/sävüg*. But even this one lexeme would not count when compared to 43 subjects of intr. bases and 52 objects of tr. ones. We shouldn't forget that the activity of formation takes place within the lexicon: Metonymy, e.g., may have played a part in expanding the applicability of *sävig* which, after all, belongs to the most emotional of semantic domains. It is this quite neat pattern in which the case-theory functions of *-Xg* forms are distributed that makes us call it an ergative formation.

In addition, *-Xg* lexemes can also denote indirect objects (*ugrag*, *umug*), the sources of events (*karıg*, perhaps *añıg*), instruments or places for the activity. Nouns used to denote typical INSTRUMENTS are *sançıg*, *sünüg*, *ütüg* and *kärig*, less typical ones *bodug*, *yapıg* and *ulag*. There are slightly more LOCAL nouns: *batıg*, *ärig*, *kaçıg*, *kavışıg*, *kavrıg*, *käçig*, *kıdıg*, *kudug*, *olrug*, *ornag*, *tayıg* and *turug*. For some of these (like *ärig*), the local use is only one of the functions, while others (like *kaçıg*) should perhaps be classified otherwise. Still others (like *tayıg*) have not turned up in Old Turkic proper. Even including all of these, however, the overall fact remains the characterisation of *-Xg* as abstract on the one hand, and (ergatively) object/subject on the other: All the rest may be due to secondary shifts within the lexicon.

3.102 *-(O)k*

A rather common suffix, forming nouns and adjectives. They usually denote the object of tr. verb bases or the subject of intr. ones. It is not always easy to distinguish between *-Xg* and *-Ok* lexemes, as has been set out in detail in the chapter on *-Xg*. The vowel of *-Ok* (as well) is present only with bases ending in consonants. Clauson, 1967: 17 found out this vowel to have been /O/ and not /U/. This is shown in two writing systems: The Tibetan and the Brāhmī. For the former, we now have the evidence of BuddhKat 35, where *altmış artokı tört* '64' is written 'AL. ((TI.))MIS 'AR.RTOG.KE TYOR. No other published or excerpted text in Tibetan writing contains any instance of this suffix after a consonant. BuddhKat does have /U/ in non-initial syllables, in several instances after /A/: *altun*, *asKançula-*, *ātūz* (thus for 'body'!), *käntü*, *çaşur-* and *äzüg*. In the last of these – clearly not from *äz-* 'to incise'! – we even find it before a velar, as in *artok*. In Brāhmī writing we have more than twenty exs. in all of postconsonantal *-Ok*, in *arok*, *artok*, *bölök*, the possibly transparent *ıdok*, *kölök*, *sönök*, *süzök*, *yaŋlok* and *yazok*. There are very few counter-examples: Once *bölük* in text L against four times *bölök*, and the archaic title *buyruk*, q.v. below. *tutuksuz* in A 4 should be read as *tutugsuz*, as *tayag ūzā* of the same line is in fact *tayak üzä*. There is no '*tutwk*' from *tut-*, whereas *tut-ug* with *-Xg* (q.v. above) is well attested. Real evidence for /-Uk/ comes from BuddhKat 31, which has 'U.[[S]]ZUG.SUS, to be read *ūzūksūz*; see below for *ūz-ūk*. Both *buyruk* (found also in Khotanese texts, where the vowels are also fully explicit) and *üzüksüz* shew the *-Uk* allomorph after /u ü/; this would also be the case for *tutuksuz*, should it prove to be correct after all. On the other hand, the only evidence for *-Ok* after /u ü/ is *süzök* in TT VIII C4. This means that our suffix has the sporadic allomorphs *-uk*/*-ük* after narrow rounded vowels, no doubt a case of assimilation. Since *süz-ök* of TT VIII C6 is a lone exception, we spell the suffix as *-Uk* after syllables containing /U/ also where there is no explicit documentation for the quality of the suffix vowel. The same distinction appears with the formative *-gOk* ~ *-gUk* (section 3.22).

When the base is monosyllabic, has a rounded vowel and ends in /r/, the suffix vowel is syncopated: The lexemes *kör-k* 'appearance, shape, form, visual characteristic, beauty', *ör-k*, and *tur-k* 'length' fall into this category. We do not have a single case of the full suffix *-Ok* being added to such a stem, whereas *-Xg* does do this in *sor-ug*, *sūr-ūg*, *tur-ug*, *ur-ug* and *yör-ūg*.[259] Complementary distribution therefore demands the assignment of these three lexemes to the *-(O)k* formation. The *qāf* in *turk* of DLT fol. 176 is in itself not an indication for their classification as *-(O)k* and not *-(X)g* forms, as /g/ is replaced by /k/ after /r/ in derivation (and also

259 The syncopation of the vowel of *-(X)g* in the QB under certain morphological conditions is a different matter, discussed in Erdal, 1985.

in early morphology). To the *DTS* and *EDPT* entries for *turk* add *tört y(e)g(i)rmi 'äŋrāk turkı* (UigTot 557) and *tört 'äŋrāk /// turkınça yer* (AbitAnk 82). UigKan 90 should, I think, be read as *turkın süzök ol suv* and translated 'that water pure all the way to the bottom', "standing water" would have had '*turkun*' with a rounded second vowel. *sögüt turkınta idiz* (Maitr 197 r 7) is 'as high as a tree'. The editors of the AbitAnk instance write *turk+I(n)+çA* 'a distance equivalent to the length of . . .' as '*turgınça*', which would have signified 'as long as (or 'till') he stands' (from *tur-*): See Gabain, 1974: 125 and 181 for this gerund suffix, which comes from *-(X)g+I(n)+çA*. The fact that relatively early texts like Maitr and Ht have *-mA-gInçA* (while *-(X)g* is, of course, never negated verbally) indicates that the fusion of *-gInçA* took place prehistorically. Where the context is fragmentary and gives no help as to the content of the form, both interpretations are, of course, possible. This is the case with *körgingä* in TT III 114, which was assigned to *körk* in the analytical index to TT I-V but to *kör-* by Pothi (actually already in Zieme, 1969: 149, probably correctly). TT III utterly confuses front-vowel *k* and *g* even though Manichaean script, in which it is written, does have the means to distinguish between [k] and [g]. *körk* is there written the right way in ls. 127 and 81 (*körglä körk*[*ü*]*ŋüzni*, thus!) but with °*g* in ls. 95, 124 (*körg täkşürüp* instead of *körk tägşürüp*) and 125. But again, neither these nor any other forms of *körk* or, for that matter, *körklän-*, *körkäd-*, *körklüg*, *körksüz* ('ugly'), *körklä* and *körkdäş* (all discussed in the appropriate sections of this work), can be of any significance concerning the quality of the second velar: The opposition between /g/ and /k/ is in any case neutralised after /r/. Cf., on the other hand, *kör-üg* in QB 5996, like *tur-k* vs. *tur-ug*.

ör-k from *ör-* 'to rise' appears in Ernte 21, in *tüz yagız yer üştäŋiniŋ örki* "der Höchste der Vortrefflichen auf der ebenen braunen Erde". The final vowel of *örki* must here be the possessive suffix both because of the construction and because the last two words are in parallelism with *ögüznüŋ türki* and *taglarnıŋ börki*. A n. compares *örk* with Khwarizm-Turkic *örk* "Auswahl, Rettung" and with "uig. *örki* 'erhaben, hochstehend'". The latter is translated as 'high, lofty' in the *EDPT* entry for it, and quoted from TT I 65 and TT IV B 32. Uigur *örki* has been amply described and documented in EhlersNotab; the paper shows that the only use of *örki* is for counting in the nineties, i.e. in the last decade of any hundred. E.g., *bir örki* = 91, *yüz beş örki* = 195. *örki* "erhaben, hochstehend" is a ghost: The TT I ex. is found to be a misreading of *öŋi*. Ehlers also mentions a few cases where the same content is expressed by other means, and further quotes TT IV B 32 (hitherto translated wrongly), in which two systems of counting are joined: *tört yüz tokuz on altı örki b(a)dr(a)kalpıkı bodis(a)tvlar* 'the 496 *bhadrakalpika* bodhisattvas'. The possessive suffix of *örk+i* reminds us of the one in *artok+ı* 'plus'. *beş örki* signifies 'five units through the decade which is the highest

one of them, i.e. of those ten decades which constitute the particular hundred'. A derivation with the suffix *+kI* (mentioned as a possibility by Ehlers) is unlikely, as *ör* is not attested in Old Turkic: The earliest instances mentioned in the *EDPT* entry are from the 15th century. *örlä-* 'to rise', q.v. among the *+lA-* verbs below, no doubt comes from *örü*, the frozen converb of *ör-*; *örü+ki* (q.v. in *EDPT* 227-8) has a different meaning.

We now come to the other *-(O)k* forms; we will list them alphabetically, as we did with *-(X)g*. The great majority are bisyllabic, but there also are several trisyllabic *-(O)k* lexemes. *yok* is monosyllabic (but, in any case, has no attested base). *aç-ok* 'open' is discussed in the *UW* and the *EDPT*. Par. B,b of the *UW* entry should be deleted, as *açok* never signifies 'dew': The ex. from HtPek 86 a12 quoted there contains a misunderstanding on the part of the translator of a polysemic character in the Chin. original. The transferred meaning 'friendly', par, B,c of this entry, is also attested in the QB, for which see the *EDPT*. We find this meaning also in U I 6,12, which should not be transferred to the lemma *açıg* (as both the *EDPT* and the *UW* do): *ärtüftin açokın ötüntilär* means 'They addressed him with presents, in a friendly manner'; the adjective has been used as abstract, as often done in Old Turkic.[260] Add the instances from HamTouen 11,3, BT XIII 16,24 and AbitAnk 19 to the *UW* entry. UigTot 919 (not included in the *UW* entry either) should, I think, be translated differently from what the editors give: In its context, *açok yarok körmäz* should be 'One does not see (them) clearly or brightly' rather than "Das offene Licht sieht man nicht"; 'them' are 'the inner and outer classes of sense-objects'. *açok* is object to its base.

adr-ok 'different, distinct, various; difference' and *adru-k* 'excellent, superior, best; virtue, excellence' may be two different lexemes, although the writing does not enable us to tell them apart in any of the instances: Neither is attested in Brāhmī or Tibetan writing, as far as I know. *adr-ok* comes from *adır-* 'to separate, distinguish, isolate', while the base of *adru-k* is *adr+u-* 'to excel', discussed in section 5.41 below. Like all the authorities, the *UW* deals with the two together: Pars. A,a, A,d and B,a of the *UW* entry belong to *adr-ok*, denoting the object of *adır-*; A,b, A,c, B,b and B,c to *adru-k*, denoting the subject of *adru-*. *adrok* in BT XIII 41,6 and four times in Genzan B v2-3 should be added to the *UW* entry. The following exs. of *adruk* do not appear there either: *adrukı tüpsüz* "dessen ... Tugenden endlos sind" (CYK 4), *adruklarınta* "an ihre ... Vorzüge" (BT XIII 13,103, two mss.), *adruk* "ausgezeichnet" (*ibid.* 24,2). *adruk törümiş ... xagan xanımız* (BT XIII 46,11) is perhaps better translated as 'our emperor of excellent birth' rather than "unser außergewöhnlich ... enstandener Kaiser". *adroksuz*,

260 *ötün-* denotes humble and respectful *utterance*; it cannot be translated as "brachten dar", as the *UW* does on p. 41a.

sometimes indistinguishable in meaning from *adırtsız*, is spelled correctly in the *UW*. '*adrokrak*' and '*adroklug*', on the other hand, should be written as *adrukrak* and *adruklug*. *adruklug* comes from the nominal use of *adru-k*, the one signifying 'excellence'. The *UW* quotes it only from ETŞ 10,166; *ädgü adruklug*, the binome found there, appears also in UigBlock 18. Additional exs. of *adruklug* appear in BT XIII 39,7 and 20, the text which also has *adru-l-*.

See the *EDPT* for the (intr.) base of *agla-k* which, itself, is discussed best in the *UW*. To this entry add *aglak orun* in AbitAnk 30 and TuoLuoNi 21 and *aglak ärip könülkä yaraşı orunta . . .* in BT VII A361. *aglak yer* of SuvDrog 476,24, U III Wulff). *aglak* signifies 'lonely, uninhabited, desolate, quiet'. Cf. also *agla-t-* below.

agru-k is a subject nominal from the intr. *ag(ı)r+u-*, q.v. below. It signifies 'something burdensome, a nuisance' in KP 68,3 and QB 3667 (twice) and 5095, none of which are mentioned in the *EDPT* entry. This is also the meaning on which *agruk+la-*, q.v., is based. DLT fol. 62 defines *agruk* differently, as 'heavy merchandise', and translates *agır agruk* as 'baggage'. This last expression may also be the one quoted in par. B of the *UW* entry for *agruk*; it therefore needn't be a mistake for *akruş*, as suggested there.

axsa-k 'lame' is written thus in the DLT; I don't think we should read the Uigur instances as *aksak*, as the *UW* does: According to that entry, none of the exs. marks the first velar with double dots. Attested also in QB 3238 (not mentioned in the *EDPT*), where both mss. extant for this passage write *axsak*; the editor is therefore wrong with the form '*aḳsaḳ*' of his edition. The *UW* lists all the Uigur exs. In his review of the fascicle in *OLZ* 77 (1982): 176, Zieme completes the Suv 118,10 instance as *aqs[aq adaqlıγ]lar*.

alı-k 'habits' is attested in QB 1490, 3629 and 4757; cf. Tezcan's review of the İndeks for the translation, and Osm. *alışkanlık* for the meaning. The base, the verb *al-* 'to take', appears with this additional vowel in the aorist *alı-r* and in derivations, e.g. *alımır* (section 3.326); cf. Erdal, 1979a: 113. *alık* must have been an object noun, with a serious narrowing of meaning under derivation. The *EDPT* quotes this lexeme also from one early Ottoman text.

See the *UW* for the various meanings and uses of *amra-k*, evidently both subject and object nominal of its (tr.) base.[261] The IrqB and DLT instances can be found in the *EDPT*. *Additional* Uigur exs. appear in BT XIII 3,74, 12,04 and 46,16, BuddhLett 21, BuddhBio 24 and TuoLuoNi 96. In Ernte 30, this lexeme is

261 It must be important that the only *-Xg* noun clearly bearing these two functions is *sävig*, practically a synonym of *amrak*. The subject use of these lexemes is unexpected, and must have something to do with their content.

taken to govern a noun in the dative, *kätmän+kä*: Zieme translates "die der Hacke sehr geneigt sind", Röhrborn "die die Hacke lieben". Here, we could take *ädgü amırak tarıgçı bäglär* together, and translate *ädgü amırak* as 'good and dear'. The dative would then be governed by the verbal phrase preceding it. Even clearer dative government is attested with the following ex. of *amrak*, also to be added to the *UW* entry: *m(ä)n sizlärkä ança amrak m(ä)n kaltı ogul kız öginä kaŋıŋa amranurça* "Je suis autant aimé de vous qu'un fils ou une fille est aimée de sa mère et de son père" (HamTouen 1,45).

anu-k 'ready etc.' is amply documented in the *UW*, with the *EDPT* supplying the Qarakhanid instances. The DLT *hapax anu-* is intr., thus making *anuk* its subject; *anun-* and *anut-* (qq.v.) are much better attested. '*anuk tonmış bolur*', quoted in the *UW* entry from Maitr 139 r27, is perhaps better read as *anuk turmış bolur*. *anuk tur-* is otherwise attested in MaitrH X3 a12, Höllen 16, U III 28,16 and 29,9, e.g. and, not mentioned in the *UW*, LautHöllen 31. For the use of *anuk* as economical term see UigPacht, *passim*, which the relevant fascicle of the *UW* could not cover. Other exs. not found in the *UW* appear in BT XIII 19,42 and Schwitz 14.

ar-ok 'exhaustion, tiredness, exhausted' is abstract and subject noun of *är-*, 'to be or get tired'. To the *EDPT* and *UW* exs. add a further nominal one from BT XIII 12,145. A new, inscriptional, ex. is *k(a)n (a)rok Og(u)z bod(u)n (a)ltı* 'The khan captured the exhausted Oguz tribes' (Tariat N1). The second syllable of *arok* is written with the arrow-like ligature.

art-ok 'more, very, much etc.' is well attested in Orkhon Turkic (see the *EDPT*), Uigur (*UW*) and Qarakhanid (*EDPT* again). Instances in Brāhmī and Tibetan writing are mentioned above. Exs. from BT XIII 28,51, HamTouen 1,24 and 5,63 and BodhiAvaKomm 10 and 13 should be added to the above. This is a subject nominal from *art-* 'to increase (intr.) etc.', attested in Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic and in modern languages.

arta-k 'spoiled, rotten, decayed, corrupt' is in Uigur always used together with *yavız*, either before or after it: See the exs. in the *UW*. The DLT and the QB have no such limitation on the use of this lexeme, which is the subject noun of intr. *arta-*.

DLT fol. 54 defines *ayı-k* as 'promise' and elsewhere uses it himself with this meaning. It comes from **ayı-*, whose object noun it is. Cf. Erdal, 1979a: 113-4 for the shape of this verb, otherwise documented and discussed in *UW* 286-9. The *EDPT*'s lemmata *ayık* and 1 **ayığ* should be joined: None of the instances quoted under the latter are in Manichaean writing (although all of the exs. are Manichaean), which means that they can be read with *k*. The Manichaean (as distinct from the Qarakhanid) lexeme signifies 'command', as stated in the *UW* entry for it; note that *ay-* also combines the meanings of 'commanding' with 'declaring,

telling, predicting etc.'. The variant ''Y'Q, chosen as the central one in the *UW* (which therefore lists this noun under '*ayag* (II)'), is attested only once: It should be considered as another instance of the Manichaean practice of spelling /ı/ as *a*. Elsewhere, the mss. have the syncopated variant ''YQ (+ suffix vowel; in TT II A 25 before a lacuna). *UW* 295-6 confuses *ayık+lıg* (InscrOuig II 9 and IV 51, DruTur 4 and the text published by Sertkaya in *AoF* 16 (1989) p. 190) with *aya-glıg* / *aya-g+lıg* in spite of the spelling ''YYQLYQ / ''YYQ̄LQ in the former. *ayıklıg xan* of these four exs. is 'a ruler who has the authority of command'. The specific meaning of *ayık* as 'command' is purely Manichaean, but these late *Buddhist* texts use the derivate in the sense found in the DLT. In QB 2286, *ayıklıg* (with *qāf*!) is metaphorically said of Death: either as 'having absolute authority', or as 'keeping his promise' not coming before the appointed time.

The Qarakhanid *az-ok* can unfortunately not be collapsed with the etymologically difficult *azag*, discussed among the *-Xg* forms. DLT fol. 45 defines *azok ok munuk* 'a runaway, stray'. This lexeme appears in the QB as well, for which see the *EDPT*. It is a subject adjective from an intr. base.

The *EDPT* quotes *basrok* from the DLT and from later Muslim sources. The DLT instance appears in a section with bisyllables, but ShōAv 317 has a trisyllabic ex.: *Koço uluşnıŋ kutı kıvı, balıknıŋ uluşnuŋ bat başka basurokları, elniŋ bodunnuŋ etiglări yaratıgları bolmış elçi yalavaç tarugan basgakan başın arka kamag Koço uluş içintäki bäg işi* . . . . The variant with two syllables is attested also in BT XIII 59,4: *On Uygur el uluşnuŋ ugrayu soka basrokı*. Thus also HtPek 101 b 4 quoted in the n. thereto: *kedin Äntkāk elintäkilär el basrokı tep teyürlär* 'Those who are in western India call it[262] "the *basrok* of the state"'. The extra vowel in the ShōAv ex. does not come from *-Ur-* but is the result of anaptyxis between /s/ and /r/. The positive sense of *basrok* is in evidence particularly in HtPar 190,10, quoted in *UW* 251 b top: *yagız yer basrokı ärdükläri üzä yeg adrok at küülüglär ol*, there rendered as "[diese Begs] haben den besten$_2$ Ruf$_2$ als 'Bedrücker' der Erde$_2$". The DLT's explanations do not imply 'oppression' either. Cf. the DLT's example for *bas-ur-*: *täŋri tag birlä yerig basurdı* 'God pressed down, fastened, strengthened the earth with the mountains'. After defining *basrok* as 'what keeps anything weighted down', DLT fol. 235 goes on with a proverb: *yer basrokı tag, bodun basrokı bäg* "The underpinnings of the earth, what keeps it weighted down are the mountains; similarly, what keeps people down are emirs. This means that the stability of the earth depends on the mountains, and similarly the stability of men depends on the rulers, who restrain them". BT XIII 39,22 reminds one of this proverb: *taglar xanı täg agırlıg / tavç(a)ŋ basuroklug xanımız – a*. This is translated

262 Not "heißen".

"O unser Xan, dessen Stütze der Daochang[263] ist!". This expansion also has the anaptyxis mentioned above. Zieme translates *basrok* as "Stütze"; 'stabilizer' may be better.

bädü-k 'big, great; greatness' is documented in the *EDPT*, and additionally found in Ht IV 57 and V 6 a 17, Ernte 44, Suv 46,17, Maitr 7 v 2, 70 r 8 and 74 r 1, TuoLuoNi 21 etc. Sometimes used with *ulug*. Subject adjective and abstract, the first being more usual. The velar is voiceless in the Ongin inscr., in the Codex Comanicus and in modern Turkic languages.

bärt-ök 'injured' is not mentioned in either the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but is found in Maitr 52 v 24 and BT V 21,455. In the first of these it is followed by *bäçäl*, in the second by (nominative) *b(ä)çälig*. *bärt-* and its cognates are discussed under *bärtin-*.

belä-k 'a gift sent to somebody' from *belä-* 'to wrap up' documented in the *EDPT*. I read this object noun with *-k* instead of *-g* as Clauson does, because the final velar is retained in Ottoman Turkish and pronounced voicelessly in Kazakh. Mongolian *beleg*, a borrowing, also represents a pronunciation with final [k]. Additional exs. appear in letters, 14 times in HamTouen.

bog-ok kün t(ä)ŋri is attested in M III 23,1_2 (text 8) and BT V 15,274, in the latter translated as "der eingeschlossene (?) Sonnen-Gott". This would be an object nominal of *bog-* 'to choke (intr.), to strangle' used metaphorically. This lexeme does not appear in the *EDPT*. The *DTS* s.v. *boyuq* has exs. from Heilk II 3,83 and 90, which should be read as *bokok* 'a bird's crop; goitre; bud'.[264]

böl-ök usually signifies 'part, section, class'. *yagım bölök yok boltı* (Tariat W4), however, should probably be translated as 'My enemy became divided and destroyed'. This last is the only runic ex. of this word, which thus refers not to the part cut off but to the divided whole. In both cases it is the object nominal of *böl-*. This verb is not too common in Old Turkic but still not as rare as the *EDPT* entry for it would lead us to believe: It mentions a quite dubious ex. from the Toñ inscr. and then jumps to the Sanglax. See also *böl-ün-* and *böl-ül-* below. Exs. for *böl-ök* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in Suv 342,26, 598,10 used in reference to chapters of the text, in Suv 252,6 quoted in *UW* 80 a s.v. *akıglıg*, B, Ht IV 1566 and 1567, Ht V 1 b 3 and HtPar 130,14 and 21, BT II 978, Warnke 167, BT VIII A 123 and 182, Tug 12 and 98, BuddhStab III 9, Buddhāv H 8, KudJunshō Cr 4 etc., and, in Manichaean writing, in ChuastBT V 10. '*bö*]*lüg*' in the Berlin Chuast in Manichaean writing, mentioned in the *EDPT* entry, is better completed as *beş ye*[*girmi bölök*]*lüg xwastvaneft*: There is no reason to assume that an *-(X)g* derivate from *böl-* ever existed, and a *+lXg* construction is appropriate in

263 *Taoçaŋ* 'throne' appears also in M III 34,21 (text 15).

264 The context of these passages and the description point in the direction of 'goitre'.

the context. In the colophon quoted on p. 77 of FujYûr1.56 we find the expression *alko kişilär içintä asra adaktakı bölöklüg biz üç kişilär*; it signifies 'we three small (i.e. insignificant) persons who belong (*+lXg*) to the lowest section (*bölök*) among all human beings . . .'. *ku(ä)nşi im bodis(ä)tv bölöklüg . . . nom bitig / ärdini* in TuoLuoNi 68 and 194 respectively is translated by the eds. as "das . . . Sūtra mit dem Kapitel des Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara"; this instance of *+lXg* should, however, also be understood as denoting assignment rather than possession.

bulga-k is attested in runic Turkic, Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic signifying 'confusion, civil, political or military disorder, anarchy', or the corresponding adjective. This is the object nominal of *bulga-*. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in Ht IV 437, HtPar 6 v 20-22, InscrOuig V 11 and QB 221, 1313, 4213 and 4271. *bulgan-ok*, an *-Ok* derivate of broader meaning, appears in QB 1856, 2131, 3632, 4940, 5201, 5512, 5646 and 5951. It should not be confused with *bulgan-yuk* > the DLT's *bulgayuk*, as the *EDPT* does; in this, incidentally, Clauson follows the late A ms. of the QB, which changes most instances of *bul-ganok* to *bulgayuk*. Neither of these two exists in Old Turkic.

mun-uk 'mentally confused' appears in ETŞ 15,42, in the sentence *ukmaz tuymaz munuklarıg korkıtur siz*, and in the binomial *azok munuk* 'a runaway, stray' in DLT fol. 45. Cf. *mun-* in the DLT and the QB, and the Manichaean *mun-tur-* below. *munuk* is a subject nominal.

buyruk is always a title in Old Turkic, translatable as 'minister, wazīr, governor' and so forth. It cannot have been a living derivate, as its base, *buyur-*, is not attested in Old Turkic. Our earliest source for this verb is Kāšġarī, who says that it is Oguz. We find *buyruk* with /u/ in both syllables in TT VIII A 12. Khotanese sources also have a number of instances of this term in this form (i.e. with *-Uk*), which makes its documentation quite solid. *buyur-* is tr., but *buyruk* cannot be classified as subject or object noun: A *buyruk* presumably gave orders to the populace but received orders from the ruler. Suv 622,21 and 624,4 and 5, TT I 64 and M II 12,6 have metathetical *buryuk*. Otherwise, instances of *buyruk* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in YE 71,4, Tariat 6 and Tes 21 (runic), PrièreMan A 15 (Manichaean), Ht IV 1101, Maitr 50 r2, BT V 27,616 (Manichaean), U III 68,18 and QB 1163 and 2941. *buyruk t(ä)ŋri* in HamTouen 11,8 is not "le Dieu du commandement", and Hamilton's translation of *buyruk* as "commandement" in the glossary is misleading. *buyruk* and *täŋri* are probably in apposition in this passage. "le Dieu chargé du commandement", given in the n. as the translation of an Iranian expression, would be best for Uigur as well, since *buyruk* is somebody 'chargé du commandement'.

çalpa-k is quoted in the *EDPT* from DLT: 'dirt', filth'; *çalpak iş* 'a confused affair'. It appears also in ETŞ 13,91 in *çandik çalpak ävig titip ünüşüg tiläyü* . . .

'give up the filthy house and seek the ascent'.[265] We have *çalpaş* (and *çalpaşlan-*), *çalpaŋ* 'liquid mud' and *çalpaş-*, qq.v.; The base was in use in Az-Zamaxšarī. *āgsü-k*, signifying 'deficient, defective, lacking, minus' or denoting the corresponding abstracts, is the subject adjective/noun of *āgsü-*. It is attested also in a Yenisei inscription. Instances not mentioned in the dictionaries appear, among other places, in BT XIII 56,8, Kuan 223, Maitr 57 r1, 142 r7 and 120 r23 (all three with *kārgāk*) and 58 r29 (*tümänkä bir āgsük* should have been translated as '9999'), HamTouen 1,50', ATSS VI v8, HtVII 1 b11 and 15 b6, HtPar 130,27 and 252,6, DhāSū 3 and QB 3743 and 4978. In BuddhKat 33, in Tibetan script, it is written 'AG.SUG. This fixes the second vowel as /ü/. I take the vowel of *āgsömäz* in TT VIII O7 to be a secondary result of assimilation.

There is no need to list exs. for the exceedingly common *āmgä-k* 'pain, agony, toil etc.'. The first *k* of *āmkāk* in TT III 39 has no phonetic significance. In BuddhKat 33 there is a nasalisation of this first velar: YUS KALB 'E.MŃAG 'EM. ŃAN.MIS.TA = *yüz kalp āmŋāk āmŋānmiştä* 'When he had suffered a hundred kalpas, . . .'. Uigur has very many exs. of *āmgān-* but practically no *āmgä-*; the QB has more than 20 exs. of *āmgā-* but no *āmgān-*; in the DLT we find both. We have, in NesTex T II B17 (U 5538) 6-10, *arıg kız mada maryam . . . āmgāk āmgādi bizni . . . üçün* 'The pure virgin mother Mary . . . suffered for us'; this must be a special dialect, or the use of *āmgā-* could be due to the presence of the internal object *āmgāk*. The affective meaning of *āmgä-* was strengthened by medial *-Xn-* in Uigur. *āmgāk* is always an action noun, the 'sufferer' being *āmgāklig*: Thus e.g. *āmgākliglār* in Kuan 12. *āmgāklig* also appears in BT II 1019 and 1164 and Maitr 117 v3, *āmgāksiz* in TT VI 280 and TT VIII C19 (voiced and voiceless velars explicit in Brāhmī writing). We have, further, *āmgāksizin* 'toillessly' in Suv 447,15 and Ht V 67.

āsr-ōk 'intoxicated, intoxication' is the subject and action noun of the intr. simplex *āsūr-*. To the *EDPT*'s Uigur and Qarakhanid exs. can be added a further one from BT II 986.

The *EDPT* has *āşü-k* 'blanket, cloth covering' only from DLT and QB 54; we also find it in QB 5003, BuddhBio 8 and Maitr 12 r5: *tölt oron āşük töşāk ton ātük . . .* The *-k* of this lexeme (which could also have been read as '*äşü-g*') appears in Tkm. as quoted in the *EDPT* entry, and also in the two QB couplets: It rhymes with *kōk* ('root'; here 'foundation') in one sentence and with *tüş-ük*, q.v. below, in the other. While Yūsuf has narrow and wide rounded vowels rhyme with each

265 As corroborated by Arat's n. to the passage, *çandik* has front *k*, but has to be read with back-vocalic first syllable because of alliterating line initials: This by itself would make it a foreign word. It is probably also identical with the word written with back-vocalic velar in BT II 420, in *çantıK tügdin ünmiş* 'he who has risen from the . . . mud of saṃsāra'. Röhrborn has a dubious Turkic cognate, Arat an equally dubious Skt. one.

other, there are no instances known to me in which /k/ and /g/ are used in rhyme.
äşü- 'to envelop, wrap in' is said of the person doing the wrapping, with the cover as direct object; *äşük* is therefore an object noun. *äşü-*, *äşül-* and *äşüt-* are attested in Qarakhanid but not in Old Turkic, but cf. *äşü-n-*.

ıdok is 'sacred'. Dankoff calls my attention to DLT fol. 45: "Its root-meaning is that any animal that is set free is called *ıdok*. One does not burden its back nor milk its udder nor shear its wool, because of a vow which falls on its owner". Although *ıdok* is well-attested in Orkhon Turkic and Uigur and also found in Qarakhanid, none of the instances gives evidence for such an etymology from *ıd-*. We cannot, at present, exclude the possibility that Kāšġarī got this idea from the meaning of *ıdma yılkı*, which he documents with the meaning "an animal which is allowed to go free". The second vowel is /o/ in TT VIII A 32, an ex. not mentioned in the dictionaries. The double *d* in ManErz IV 3 = Pothi 283 has no significance, as that text frequently writes *dd* both for /t/ and for /d/.

(y)ıra-k 'distant, far', also 'great distance, great length (of a road)' is a subject adjective and abstract from *ıra-*. Instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* (with runic exs.) or the *DTS* occur in Suv 601,21, TT VI 99, Ht IV 526, V 12 a 17, VII 1846, 1868 and 2028 and VII 2 b 3 and 3 a 22, HtPar 16 v 19, BT I D (53) and (219), Warnke 556, U III 46,12 and 70,3, BT XIII 5,138, Shō I a 5, Einf IV 13, BuchFr II 1, 1, 1 and Maitr 11 r 2; there are many more. The QB has 65 exs. of *yırak* (only three of them in the *EDPT*) but none of *ırak*. *yırak*, the form used also by the DLT, appears in TT I 78 (no facs.!) but not TT I 139, and nowhere else either in Orkhon Turkic or Uigur. We find *yıra-t-* in Heilk II 3,159, but otherwise the verbal forms and derivates of *ıra-* show the same distribution: *yıra-* in Qarakhanid, *ıra-* in Old Turkic. Note that both Heilk II and TT I are *late* Uigur sources.

ir-ök is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT, which translates this word as "a breach or crack in a wall, or other". Dankoff and Kelly transcribe this as *erük*, for which I can find no justification. The base is discussed in the *EDPT* s.v. 2 *i:r-*, and *irök* must be its object noun. Both *ir-il-*, q.v., and *irök* are attested in the QB: *irök* in QB 1576, 2075 (*iröksüz*) and 2206; see Tezcan's review of the QB İndeks for these. We also have four Uigur exs. of *irök*, one in the sequence *irök ägri* describing defective and crooked teeth in SP 21, and two others, used together with *ägsük*, in HtPar 252,6 and 130,27. HtPar 252,6 is quoted in a n. to SP 21. HtPar 130,27 (quoted in HtFragm) has the binomial in abstract use. A fourth instance is quoted under *kämr-ök* below. 'flaw, defect; defective' suits the Uigur as well as the QB exs., an also the DLT's proverb *kündä irök yok*, etc. Several of the exs. apply to teeth, as does *iröksüz sädräksiz tışlar* in MaitrGeng 11 b 18.

kadrak in the binomial *kat kadrak* 'windings and folds of mountains' is attested not only in the DLT, as quoted in the *EDPT*, but also in Maitr 39 v 2, 140 r 9 and

148 v 4. Presumably, it belongs to *kadır-* 'to twist back', being its object noun. The aorist of *kadır-* is *kadırar*, and **kad(ı)ra-* may have been the original form of the base: Other deverbal nouns also retain original stem-final vowels otherwise retained only in the converb and the aorist. This may or may not be etymologically identical to the lexeme *kadrak* 'whetstone' which the *EDPT* quotes as *kayrak* etc. from a number of modern dialects. It appears in the runic inscription on a spindle whorl consisting of the two words *kadrak agırçak* mentioned in the *EDPT* s.v. *agırçak*. There is no reason to read *kadrak* as '*kadırık*', as Clauson does there (92b). *agırçak* too could apparently refer to millstones, spindle whorls and other such objects. All this is tentative: Note that two of the Maitr exs. are spelled with T and not D (in a text which hardly ever confuses the velars), and that the DLT spells *kadrak* with *dāl* and not *dhāl*.

kalı-k is both 'upper storey, tower, balcony in an upper storey' and 'sky, higher atmosphere'; the latter is usually called *kök kalık*. The word ends in *qāf* in DLT fols. 178, 193 etc., where it is simply translated as 'air', and 21 times in the QB, where it refers to the 'sky'. The fact that it is written with a voiced velar in Pothi 35 and 169, on the other hand, is of no significance: That text constantly confuses the two velars. The word appears also in ĀṭSū 3 r1 in Brāhmī script, written with voiceless velar fricatives both initially and finally. Other Uigur instances of *kalık* not mentioned in the *DTS* and *EDPT* can be found in BT I B(123) etc. (see glossary), BT II 17, 603 and 638, AbitAnk 100, BT III 939, BuddhUig II 227, Maitr 101 v 17, 138 r 20, 140 r 20, 218 r 5, M III 23,6-7_2 (text 8) and so forth. This is presumably a subject or local noun of intr. *kalı-* 'to rise up in the air' with lexical specialisation.

katık has appeared only in DLT fol. 192, where it is translated as "a condiment that is added to *tutmaç*, such as vinegar or churned milk; something mixed in anything". *katıksız* 'pure' appears in the QB, *katıklıg* 'impure, having an admixture' also several times in Uigur, both as quoted also in the *EDPT*. For the passage in M III 14,8_3 cf. also Zieme in *OLZ* 77 (1982): 176. Cf. *kat-ıglıg* above. *katık*, like e.g. *kadrak* above and *kılık* below, retains an original final vowel of the base: This base appears as *kat-* 'to mix, to add on to' in historical times, which shows the otherwise unexplainable converb vowel /ı/. *katık* must be its object noun. *katık* and *katıg* (which has a different, intr., base), are easily kept apart through their content.

DLT fol. 196 translates *käd-ök* as 'felt cap; feather head-dress (since it resembles a felt cap)'; the ex. given for *kädöklüg* suggests that it must have been waterproof. QB 299, which also has this lexeme, is attested only in ms. B and not ms. A, while couplets 298 and 300 are attested only in A but not B; C here lacks a stretch of several hundred couplets. In QB 299, our word appears at the end of l.a; this should rhyme with the end of l.b, correctly read as *aṣlı käd ök* (with the particle

Ok) by Arat and wrongly as *käd ög* ("a very good intellect") in the *EDPT*. Dankoff's convincing translation renders this as "true nobility", corresponding to Arat's reading. Dankoff's translation of *käd-ök* "cloak of honor" is rather free, reminding one, however, of the DLT's feathers. *kädök* is object noun of *käd-* 'to wear'.

kämr-ök has been assigned to this formation because of the suffix vowel; it may actually be *kämrüg*, however, if an intermediate stage **kämür-üg* can be assumed. There are a number of instances of syncopated vowels leaving harmony reflexes before they disappear. The assignment to this formation is made likelier by the two binomials the lexeme is used in: *çaxşaputı irök kämrök ärsär ymä* . . . (Maitr 217 v12 = BT IX 165,12$_2$) 'even if his (observance of the) precepts is defective$_2$', and *kärtök kämrök* in DLT fol. 241, translated as "notches and furrows". DLT fol. 311, apparently our only early source for *kämür-*, translates it as 'to suck the marrow from the bone'; however, 'to gnaw', the otherwise common meaning of this verb, fits the meaning of *kämrök* better. *kämrök* must be its object nominal.

kärgä-k 'necessary, necessity' is attested from the Orkhon inscrs. on, and is exceedingly common in Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic. The base is attested in verse in DLT fol. 182, where *kärgäyür* rhymes with *ämgäyür*. We also have *ägsütümüz kärgätimiz* in Chuast 203 and 333, but these should possibly be read as *ägsüt(t)ümüz kärgät(t)imiz*. MaitrH XVI 12 a26 has *körgäli küsäyü kärgäyü* 'wishing, needing to see (Buddha)' where the parallel text in Maitr 161 r16 has *körgäli küsäyü kärgäkläyü*; cf. the latter among the *+lA-* verbs below. *kärgäk* changed to *käräk* at a very early date: This is the only form known to the DLT, and it is found hundreds of times in the QB. The variant *kärak* must have existed also in certain varieties of Uigur: BuddhKat, the text in Tibetan writing, writes GA.RAG (l.37), although a *g could* have been written in this position in this writing system: Cf. the spelling of *adgır*, *as*Kançula-, *bilgä*, *äsirkä-*, *inçgä*, *kırkın*, *kulkak*, *övkä*, *tilgän*, *turgur-* etc. in that text. In Brāhmī writing, the medical text TT VIII I has about 8 instances of *käräk*, but other Brāhmī sources use *kärgäk*. Typical of some non-religious texts is TT VII 28, which has thrice *kärgäk* but once *käräk*. A verb '*käräk-*' does not appear to have existed even in Qarakhanid Turkic: The QB İndeks mentions such a verb with reference to two places, but one of them occurs in the (much later) prologue. The other appears in ms. B in 925, where C is absent and A has the appropriate and well-attested *käräksiz*. The reading of A should have been preferred in this case. *kärgäk*, in Uigur writing usually spelt *krgäk*, is practically always used as impersonal predicative: Its attributive counterpart is *kärgäklig*, attested, beside what is quoted in the *EDPT*, in Suv 546,1, HtPar 40,23, 130,20, 196,7, 219,7, Ht VII 1848 etc. A sentence like *nä kärgäkin barça bergäy biz* (KP 22,3-4) 'We will give everything he needs' does

not show it in nominal use, but rather as predicate of a relative clause in object function. The widely-used *kärgäksiz* was the negative counterpart of both *kärgäk* and *kärgäklig*. In the former capacity, we find it e.g. in Ht V 232: *kamag kişiniŋ ämgänip [kolun]maκı kärgäksiz* 'It is superfluous that all the people should tire themselves beseeching'. When *kärgäksiz* signifies 'unnecessary' as referring to the unnecessary entity, it can serve both attributively and predicatively. It is attributive e.g. in *ölüg kärgäksiz yıdıg ätöz* (TT VI 229) but predicative in *taşıg kärgäksiz kıl* 'Make the stone superfluous!' (TT VIII L 18, Brāhmī). *kärgäksiz* appears also in BT I A_1(8) and M I 9,12. It can also be used nominally: In a colophon quoted on p. 77 of FujYür, we find the following sentence: *kärgäksiz yana ägsük bolmış ärsär, biziŋ tümgä ärkliglärimiz ugurınta ärür* 'Should there turn out to be anything superfluous or lacking, it is because of our dull senses'. Very different from this is the expression *ägsüksüz kärgäksiz bol-* in ShōAgon 3, p. 205,19; here, *ägsüksüz* and *kärgäksiz* are not antonyms but synonyms, and signify 'without anything lacking, perfect'. Quite similar also *aşka tonka kamagun ägsüksüz k(ā)rgäksiz* (Suv 578,2). This last use is parallel to the biverb *ägsütkärgät-* quoted here from Chuast, to *bo nom içintä ägsük kärgäk boltı ärsär* . . . in HamTouen 1,51′ and to *ägsüklüg kärgäkliglär* 'the needy$_2$' in ShōAgon 3, p. 207,9. We are also reminded of *kärgäk bol-* or *kärgäk bul-*, a euphemism for 'to die' in Orkhon Turkic. It is in the light of these that KT N 12 and BQ S 11 should be considered: These passages say that envoys from the Chinese emperor *altun kümüş kärgäksiz kälürti*, 'brought the full amount (expected), i.e. with no deductions, of gold and silver'.

kävrä-k 'brittle, fragile' ends in a *-k* and not a *-g*, assuming Ottoman *gevrek* to come from it. *The EDPT* and the *DTS* have both the *-(O)k* derivate and the base (and *kävrä-t-*) only from the DLT and from later Muslim texts, but *kävräk* is found also in Uigur: *äzüg igid [. . .]dlıg kävräk üçün* in Warnke 292 and *iki sıçgan yeyü turdaçı kamış täg adalıgın käv[r]äkin* in HtPek 99 b 7 as reconstructed in *UW* 47a s.v. *adalıg*. Taking this reconstruction to be correct,[266] we might perhaps complete the Warnke text with the same binomial, as *[a]d[a]lıg kävräk*. *kävrä-* could be connected with *käv-* 'to weaken (tr.)' if one could take it to be derived from the aorist, as **käv-är+ä-*; this is dubious, however, as no (other) such derivations are known to me. *kävrä-* is intr.

kävşä-k 'soft, pliant, gentle, tender' is attested in this form only in two of the DLT's exs. The other two exs. of this source and Uigur texts round the first vowel, as *kövşäk*. This rounding is, of course, due to the /v/: Dankoff and Kelly are wrong, I believe, in dividing the entry of DLT fol. 241 into two distinct ones, one with a rounded and another with an unrounded vowel. The base, q.v. among the

266 *kävşäk*, e.g., would hardly fit the context.

+A- verbs, has not come up in Uigur, but cf. *kāvşā-n-*. The *EDPT* mentions two Uigur exs. of *kövşäk*; the *DTS* has the Suv 619,22 instance both under *kövşäk* and *'kāvşāk'*. In addition to those two, we have *ediz ädrämlig . . . bilgä kövşäk* (Ht IV 832), *savı kövşäk* (Ht X 851), *ädgü kılınçlıg kövşäk* (HamTouen 1,53), *tözün kövşäk kılıklıg* (HtPar 59,11) and *säviglig kövşäk äzrua üni* (Maitr 145 v2). Our evidence for the voicelessness of the final velar of this lexeme comes from modern languages only.

kılık 'character, behaviour' has its *-k* well attested in DLT and QB, its second vowel in all sources. **kılX-* changed to *kıl-* prehistorically, but we still have the aorist *kılı-r* in M I 8,9 (TeilBuch). This was replaced by *kıl-ur* in all other Uigur sources; see Erdal, 1979: 114 with footn. 34 for details. DLT mentions both *kılk* and *kılık* while, in 90 % of the QB's 283 instances of this noun, *kılk* is used before vowels and *kılık* before consonants. Uigur instances of *kılık* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* are found in Suv 562,20 *ap. UW* 195 a, top, BT I D (92), Ht IV 570 and 896 and X 78 and Maitr 67 v14.

DLT fol. 192 defines *kır-ok är* as "a disabled man" and *kırok adak* as "a lame foot". In QB 1737, however, *kırok* is parallel to *basımçı* and *ölütçi*, and Dankoff translates it as "(somebody who) cripples (others)". The QB instance is a *crux*, as we would in fact expect the *-Ok* derivate of a transitive verb to denote its object and not its subject. Our assignment of *-Ok* to the ergative formations is not put into doubt by this, however, as the QB is not Old Turkic proper. *kıkırıp kaçar kırık* (thus?!) in Ernte 133 is by Zieme translated as "Zerbrochen, entflieht er schreiend", but 'lame' would be more appropriate here as well. Alliteration must have encouraged the use of this lexeme here.

No base is attested for *kıvırkak* 'grasping, miserly', but cf. *kıvırkan-*. The two dictionaries mention four Uigur exs. One of these only appears in two among nine mss. in TT VI 5 (Oda's Ōtani ms. omitting the sentence altogether): *kız kıvırkak saran* for the others' *kızgak*. The binome *kız kıvırkak* is further attested in Maitr 80+59 v23-24 (edited in Laut, 1986: 205). In addition to those we have *küni kıvırkak övkä kakıg köŋül* in Warnke 42. Written with voiceless velars in TT III (Manichaean script) which, although frequently confusing the velars, rarely does so in word-final position. The voicelessness of the second velar (which the *EDPT* does not believe in) is in accordance with other instances of the formative *+(X)rKA-*. Cf. also *kıvırkaklan-*.

kıyık näŋ is defined by DLT fol. 518 as 'anything cut obliquely, such as the tip of a stylus'. This suits the instance of *kıyık* found in Heilk I 124, best translated in *UW* 70 a top as "schief". This is also the meaning of *kıyık yorıglıg* 'having a slanting gait' in BT XIII 21,75. DLT and QB also have metaphorical uses of this term, mentioned in the *EDPT*; a further one is *kılmış işi kıyık* (Ernte 132) "Seine vollbrachten Taten sind verkehrt". This metaphorical use is inherited by the derivate

kıyıksız (QB 482, 608, 615, 952, 1605, 3069 and 5079). Both the quality of the second vowel and the voicelessness of the final velar being clear in Qarakhanid, the base must have been **kıyı-*, or, better, **kıyX-*: The development of this into *kıy-* in Old Turkic is regular. See *kıyı-l-* for the base and cf. *kıyı-n*. DLT fol. 517 has a lexeme spelled as QAYT *yer* and translated as "ground that slopes away from the main road". If DankKelly are right in reading this as *kıyıg*, some of the Uigur forms mentioned could also have had a voiced velar.

kızgak 'stingy' (TT VI 5 and UigTöt 820-1) has no attested base but is related to *kızgan-* (section 7.21).

kogşa-k 'lax, limp' is quoted in the *EDPT* from a Brāhmī text and from the DLT, in the *DTS* also from Suv 300,4. We also find it in Maitr 179 v2 in rather fragmentary context and in Mz 625,12, another Brāhmī ms., quoted in footn. 15 in Maue, 1984: 93. *kogşa-* 'to become limp', q.v. in the *EDPT*, is attested also in Ht X 508 and LautHöllen 58.

öz konok is that part of the body in which the soul resides temporarily, its place alternating as explained in TT VII 21,3-15. DLT fol. 35 defines *öz konokı* as "a part of the body that palpitates. It is said to be the spirit (*rūḥ*)". He also quotes a quatrain where the beloved is said to have 'taken away the poet's spirit (*aldı özüm konokı*). *öz konok* is probably to be analysed as (*öz kon*)*ok* 'the residence of the ego'; it is also attested in U III 64,2, TT VII 19,1, Maitr 68 v 9 and 75 r15, ShōKengyō II 20 and BT XIII 12,60. *konok* does not appear by itself in Old Turkic; it is unlikely that *kona(k)a olor-* in M III 12,6_3 (text 6) has anything to do with this, as written in the *EDPT* entry. Qarakhanid Turkic has a lexeme *kon-ok* derived independently, defined in DLT fol. 193 as 'guest'. With this meaning, we find it eight times in the QB and in several verse instances in the DLT text. There need not have been any connection between the Uigur term, known also to Kāšġarī, and the Qarakhanid lexemes, attested also in later Muslim sources. Although both come from intr. *kon-* 'to stop or settle somewhere', *konok* represents the subject, (*öz kon*)*ok*, on the other hand, the *place* where the 'self' happens to settle. In view of the use of *konok+luk* in Pfahl, Maitr and QB, it seems likely that *konok* 'guest' was known to the old Uigurs as well, although unattested in our published sources for their language.

kōl-ōk is an object noun of *kōl-* 'to harness'. In TT VIII A 37 we have two exs. of it, spelled with *ō* in the second syllable and translating Skt. *yāna-* 'vehicle'. In Suv 613,4 we find the binomial *kaŋlı kölök* and Suv 41,4 has the sequence *m(a)x-ayan ulug kölök*; this latter is just *mahāyāna* followed by its Turkic translation. *yeg sukançıg kölök* (ShōAgon 1,238) refers to the same 'vehicle'. The three instances of *kölök* in ĀgFrag (1) G a2-3 also translate a Chin. term which, in its turn, translates Skt. *yāna-*. DLT fol. 197 defines *kölök* as 'a beast of burden', and this (and not 'vehicle') is clearly also the meaning of this lexeme in QB 4441: In

this passage, stockbreeders are said to be useful because they breed horses for the army and pack-animals for transport. Later Muslim sources also translate this as 'baggage animal'. In QB 4441, *kölök* rhymes with *sü+lük* 'for the army': Although Yūsuf is careful about not letting /k/ and /g/ rhyme, broad and narrow vowels are often mingled in this way in the QB. It is not certain whether the meaning 'pack-animal' can at all be ascribed to Uigur. Instances in Ernte 53, KP 28,3, Ht V 13 a21, 14 a3 and 15 a18, BT VIII A 129 and Pfahl I 8 can be interpreted both ways; so can *mingü kölök* in Maitr 140 v7, 146 r8 and 160 r3 and 8. The Pfahl instance, translated among the exs. of metaphorical *+lXg* above, was misunderstood by Müller: *külüg*, as he reads, does not fit the passage. The exs. from Ht V are better interpreted as *köç kölök* than as *küç k°*, as the editor understands. The lexeme is attested also in Toñ 15, which shows a /k/ like the Brāhmī and Qarakhanid exs.: *ing(ä)k köl(ö)k(ī)n Twgl(a?)da Og(u)z k(ā)lti* 'The Oguz came in/from Twgl(a?) with carts drawn by cows'. Tekin is probably right in translating *kölök* as 'cart' and not as 'baggage animals', as the *EDPT* does.[267] There *may* have been a different use of *kölök* in M III 12,18$_1$ (text 6, Uigur script): *yazoklug ärn(ī)ŋ bagı kölök'i bukagusı agırlıg yeniklig bar, . . .*, in *UW* 68b s.v. *agırlıg* A,a translated as "... die Fesseln, *Bande* und Fußeisen eines sündigen Menschen schwer oder leicht sind". I don't think we should posit a further *köl-ök* for this one ex., however (nor, for that matter, a hap. '*köl-üg*'); this is probably some kind of a cart or rickshaw which sinners were harnessed to. What is certain is that Old Turkic had a lexeme *kölök* 'harnessed vehicle', and that Qarakhanid Turkic had it, instead, with the meaning 'beast of burden'.

köli-k is 'a shadow' for DLT fol. 206, whereas *köligä* is 'deep shade'. The rhyme in QB 173 of this word with (Arabic) *malik* documents for us the voicelessness of the final velar. The word clearly has this meaning in BuddhUig II 93. *kölikd(ā)mā* in HamTouen 7,2 is translated as "la demeure de l'ombre". This may be a compound with a foreign second element; it could have been created under the influence of a Sogdian language system. *batıgdama* (q.v. above) and *bägdämä* (discussed in the n. to HamTouen 7,2) are similar. Cf. the *+hane* compounds of Ottoman. A different interpretation of the two HamTouen forms is offered in section 2.31. See *köli-t-* below, also for the base (which is intr.).

köpik 'foam, froth' is attested in M III 10,11$_1$ (text 4) (not noted in the *EDPT*) and Heilk I 35, while IrqB XX and Heilk II 1,103 have the variant *köpük*. In his lemma in fol. 196, Kāšġarī writes 'foam' as *köpik* but 'overflow of a kettle' as

267 He should have known, though, that *ingäk* is a 'cow' and not an 'ox'. The Ramstedt – Granö – Aalto edition also has *köl^{a}k^{i}n* with an *n* at the end, but their translation takes this to be part of a toponym. Orkun, on the other hand, writes *k^{a}lkā* both in runic types and in his transliteration/transcription, but gives the translation "inekler (ve) yük hayvanlarile".

köpük; a second hand then changes also the first instance to *köpük*. In two further instances in fol. 503, the second hand again marks the second letter (which the first had had left unmarked) with a *ḍamma*. Cf. *köpir-* (ETŞ 8,19) and *köpir-t-* (q.v. below; ETŞ 10,37 and QB) vs. *köpür-* and *köpürt-* several times in the DLT. The function and meaning relationships between noun and verb are unclear here, the verbal base which the two have in common being attested only from the Codex Comanicus on and in Mo. *köye-* but not in Qarakhanid nor in Old Turkic.

köşi-k 'screen, curtain' appears in Shō XI b13, UigTot 930 and 943 and BT II 591, none of which are mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. We also find it in DLT fol. 206, which supplies the above-mentioned definition, and in QB 451. There it rhymes with *eşik*, showing that it ends in *-k* and not *-g*; accordingly, the editors who write '*köşig*' are wrong. A Mo. cognate quoted in the *EDPT* entry for *köşigä* and Khal. *kʻšši-*, *kʻūᵒşū-* < **kᵒ̄şi-* (personal communication of Prof. Doerfer) fix the first vowel as *ō*. *köşik* comes from *köşi-*; cf. *köşi-t-* and *köşi-gä* below. The instances mentioned above make it an instrument noun of its base. We also have *köşiklig*, defined as 'shady' in the DLT; it is attested as] *tıdıglıg köşiklig*[in Warnke 732, who translates it as "Hindernisvolles und Bedecktes". This corresponds to the binomial *tıdıg köşik ~ köşik tıdıg* of three of the exs. referred to above. Interesting is M III $6{,}2_4$ (text 1, Uigur script), which has not really been interpreted till now:] *t(ā)ŋri tirig öz ol. y(a)rok köşiklig kam(a)g küçlüglärdä eliglärdä üzä ärür* 'The god (Zerwan) is the living spirit. He is above all the potentates and sovereigns of light and darkening'. It is clearly the antithetical pair *yarok köşik* which has here been added the suffix *+lXg* jointly, referring to those who give light and to those who lull it, respectively. The BT II ex. referred to above uses *ürtü*K *köşik* as a binomial couple, and in M III $7{,}6_5$ (text 2) we find *y(a)rok* and *ürtü*K similarly used in antithesis.

köy-ök näŋ in DLT fol. 519 is "something burning". This is also the meaning of adnominal *köyök* in Maitr 74 r5 and 201 r22, BT XIII 12,05 and Heilk II 1,37. The meaning of a nominal instance in BuyKäl 39 is not clear; this may be a different lexeme altogether. I take *köyök*, a subject nominal from an intr. base, to have ended in /k/ because all later forms quoted in the *EDPT* entry do so too.

opra-k 'decrepit, worn out' appears in BT XIII 16,9 and in Maitr 194 v24 (in the sequence *irinç yarlıg oprak täpräk*) and 28. In Forf V7 it is metathesized, as *orpakı tälöki bilän*. Similarly in another economical text, USp 98,15: *orpak ayıg sınok barım* 'my shabby, poor[268] or broken property'. *oprak* is attested also in QB 3923, 4527 and 2564 and in two passages in the DLT. It can describe both a person and his garments, possessions etc.; it is the subject adjective of *opra-* 'to

268 See n. 271 for my interpretation of this word.

grow old, decay', q.v. in the *EDPT*. DLT also has the expansions *oprat-* and *opraş-*. Instances of *opra-* from QB 5416 and 5919 are not mentioned in the *EDPT*.

wy-ok 'felt boot or stocking' appears in UjgRuk I 10 in a list of items of clothing. A *+lXk* derivate is *wyokluk kidiz* in USp 79,11-12, clearly 'felt for making boot-stockings'. The latter is quoted in the *EDPT*; that also adduces "*uyuk* 'felt boot, woolen stocking' which exists in some NC and NW languages". Related is *wy-ma* (section 3.109 below), used in the sentences *ol maŋa wyma basışdı* "He helped me mat the Turkman felt from which boots are made" (DLT fol. 319) and *ol maŋa wyma talkışdı* "He helped me twist the felt used to make boots" (fol. 370). *wyma* could be the "Turkman felt from which boots are made", but it could also be a resultative object (ex. German *Riemen schneiden*) and then denote the boots. Alternately, *wyma* or *wyuk* could denote any of the intermediate stages of the process. *wy-* 'to press, to squeeze' appears in DLT fol. 97 in the sentence *ol unug wydı* "He pressed the flour (or other) [in the sack] so that it remained firm and wholesome" and not as translated in the *EDPT*. Cf. also *wyuş-* and *wytur-* (fol. 138), which complement this meaning.

BT VIII B 239 has the phrase *oynak urmak kıltaçı* which corresponds to something like 'the one who gives pleasure'. Both there and in UigNām 3,8, which contains the same text, the word *oynak* has two dots over the velar. There is therefore no reason to transcribe it as '*oynag*', as the editors do. DLT fol. 73 has the phrase *oynak eşlär/işlär*, which he translates as 'a coquettish woman'. He does not mention *oynak* by itself, however, and we can't know how he would have defined it if he knew it and mentioned it. I don't see why the two lexemes should be kept apart, as Kara and Zieme do. I take Uigur *oyna-k* to be an action or subject noun from *oyn+a-*, q.v. below.

oz-ok 'excelling, superior' is used in DLT fol. 45 of a horse and QB 2635 of a man. This is a subject nominal. The basic primary meaning of *oz-* is "to run ahead".

I interpret *ög-ök* as the object nominal of *ög-*, which gives it the meaning 'praised'; this appears to me to be better than other possible etymologies. The term appears in KP 5,8, 6,6, 9,16 and 16,3, Suv 622,10, 15 and 20, 623,18, 626,3, 633,15, 635,9, 638,4 and 21, BuddhBio 24 and elsewhere, and is often accompanied by *amrak* 'dear'. It always refers to sons of rulers, very often in addressing them.

saç-ok 'scattered' appears in its physical meaning in DLT fol. 192. For the instance of TT VI 023 quoted in the *EDPT* entry, only 3 among 8 mss. write *saçok*; cf. OdaNewFrag 3,14 and OdaŌtani 12. Three others instead have *buşı* (q.v. among the *-şI* lexemes). What mss. B 2 and B 12 have is not clear to me; perhaps they are damaged. The archetype may not have had *saçok* after all. Yet,

saçok kõŋüllüg . . . nnlg (as the TT VI instance reads) must have been an authentic Uigur expression: It is matched by the adverbial phrase *saçoksuz kõŋülin* in UigKan 73, *saçoksuz KÕŊÜLin . . . tilä-/äşid-* in BuddhUig II 18 and 127 respectively; *+sXz* is not privative, here, but negates the attribution of the adjective *saçok*. Cf., further, *kõŋülnüŋ saçokı üzä tälvä bol-* 'to become insane through the heart's commotion' in Suv 109,17, with the adjective used as abstract; *saçok luklan savlar* (I.33 in the *Baxşı ögdisi* quoted in the n. to BT XIII 13,98-99), *saçok luklan kõŋülümüz* (*ib.* 1.68) and *saçok kõŋül*, again, in BT XIII 60,2. Cf. *saç-ıg*, which is lexicalised in a different direction.

sädrä-k 'rare, sparse, showing gaps, thin' is written with *-k* (not *-g*) in TT VIII A (Brāhmī writing), survives with this ending in modern languages and has been borrowed with it into Mongol. Instances of *sädrāk* not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in ETŞ 12,8 and UigTot 918 (both with an anaptyctic *i* before the *r*) and in ĀgFrag (1) G a 4. *tişi sadrak* in SP 21 apparently corresponds to 'gappy-toothed' in other versions of this text. Being rather clearly visible in the facsimile, it appears to alternate with *sädrāk*. This is shown also by the correspondence between *iröksüz sadraksız tışı ärür* (MaitrGeng 5 b 13) and *iröksüz sädräksiz tışları ibid.* 11 b 18.[269] Cf. also *sädrāksiz* in TT III 40 = Pothi 20 and Suv 347,4, the last also referring to teeth. The intr. base, *sädrät-* and *sädräş-* are only attested in the DLT, and there is one rare survival of *sädrä-* in a modern language (mentioned in the *EDPT*). *sädrāk* is a subject adjective.

We only have two early instances of *sekri-k*: One in DLT fol. 240 translated 'any place in the mountains that is crossed by jumping', and the other in TT II 2,59, in fragmentary context. The latter is in Manichaean writing and spelled *sigrik*, but the velars of this ms. are undependable. Cf., on the other hand, *sikrik* "Kurier" in the Codex Comanicus. Kāšğarī makes the lexeme a local noun; what function it had in our only Uigur ex. cannot be made out. *sekri-* is discussed among the *+I-* verbs in section 5.42, *sekri-t-* among the *-(X)t-* causatives.

sezik 'doubt, apprehension, suspicion, questioning' has a *-k* in TT III 130 (Manichaean writing) and in the Brāhmī instances TT VIII A 18 and 36, twice H 6 and H 10 (including instances of *seziklig* and *seziksiz*); there is no counter-evidence. ZE.ZIG in Tibetan writing (BuddhKat 39) does not speak against this (although the glossary to that text transcribes the word as '*sezig*'): Cf. the way *balık*, *bäk*, *āgsük*, *kārāk* etc. are spelled there. This being the case, the base cannot have been *sez-*, attested from Middle Turkic on, but has to be **sezi-*. The common *sezin-* can come from **sezi-* as well, as can *sezinç* (q.v. below) and the DLT's *sezik-*. Other instances of *sezik* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in Ht IV 356-7, 1226 and 1497 and Ht VII 8 b 7 and 9, BT I B (32), BT II 236 and 237-8, PañcFrag

269 That it should be a different lexeme altogether is not very likely.

68 and 91, KudJunshō B v8, Abhi 94 b7, B 31 b7 and 67 b9, Warnke 247, 413, 414 and 518, Maitr 157 r8 etc. *seziklig* and *seziksiz* are also quite common, and discussed in the *EDPT*. Exs. of the latter not quoted there nor in the *DTS* occur in U IV A 250, ChristManus v3, TT VI 83 and 305, PañcFrag 71 and ĀgFrag (1) B 19. U I 7,14-15 (Magier), where it also appears, has the wrong translation: Not "kummerlos", in this case, but 'free from doubt'.

sın-ok, the subject nominal of *sı-n-*, occurs in IrqB XLVIII and QB 1858 in practically the same phrase: *sınokınıŋ sapar*[270] *män* in the former, *sınokug sapar ol* in the latter. Since *sınok* is attested also in USp 98,15,[271] the statement in DLT fol. 604 about its being the Oguz way of saying 'broken' is a bit surprising; Kāšġarī mentions *sıŋuk* (a *-gUk*, derivate) as the usual form.

sid-ök 'urine' is attested in Heilk I 54 as *sūdük* and DLT as quoted in the *EDPT*, and is the object noun of *sid-*. Cf. *kaşanıg* and *sig* (section 3.101).

sogı-k 'cold; coldness' refers to subjects of *sogı-* 'to be cold', or to the state such subjects are in. In addition to the instances mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, it is attested in Suv 314,3, 591,20, 625,19 and 632,9, Shō 2 a5 and DhāSū 7. An. ex. appearing in TT I 104 is in the *DTS* mistakenly assigned to TT I 11. Three Heilk I exs. of *suvık/suvuk* are by the *EDPT* wrongly assigned here. In the 9 instances in which this lexeme appears in the QB, the mss. alternate between *sogık* and *soguk*.

küçi sön-ök in TT VIII M21 signifies 'of flagging strength'. *sönök* is a *hapax* in a not very clear context, but is a likely qualifier of *küç* when this represents the subject of *sön-*. Cf. *armaksızın sönmäksizin* 'without wearying or flagging' (Suv 211,5-6 and 236,11), and particularly *sönöksüz* (Ernte 29), discussed with the *-(O)k+sXz* forms.

süyäk 'support' appears in Maitr 52 v21 (= BT IX 147,21) in a binomial with *taya-k*. See that and *süyäş-* below. Base not found in Old Turkic, but well-attested otherwise; cf. Räsänen, 1969: 435. I tentatively read this with *-k* and not *-g* in view of parallelism with *tayak*.

süz-ök 'pure' is written this way in TT VIII C6; several times in the QB it rhymes with lexemes ending in /k/. *süzwg* in Pothi 282 and 503 need not be taken

270 Emend thus instead of *säpär*.

271 Quoted and translated under *opra-k* above. Radloff here adds: "Ganz unverständlich sind die[se] Worte, die sehr undeutlich geschrieben sind, denn man kann statt *urpak* auch *urpas*, statt *anık sıyuk* auch *anık sıvuk* und statt *püyüm* auch *purım* oder *pükim* lesen. Offenbar handelt es sich um im Hause befindliche bewegliche Habe." In *EDPT* 182 b s.v. *anuk* we find: "*orpak* (metathesis of *oprak*?) *anık sınuk barım* '. . . property of mine, clothing (?) and household goods, fit for use or broken". *UW* 160 b also quotes the passage under *anuk*, par. B,a: "*anuk sıyuk barım* 'meine intakte und zerbrochene Habe' (?)". The (active!) *-yUk* form of *sı-* does not fit the context particularly because of the aspectual content of this suffix, and the *-(O)k* derivate of *sı-* would have been '*sı-k*'. '*anık*' is better interpreted as *ayıg* (or *anıg*, a variant) than as *anu-k*, because of its position after *oprak/orpak*.

seriously. This very common adjective denotes concrete or metaphoric objects of *süz-* 'to strain, cleanse, purify'. Instances not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in Ht X 850, ETŞ 20,21, Suv 3,2 and 607,2, BuddhStab III 15, Shō XII a7, ShōUigFrag 24, Buddhāv H53 and so forth. Cf. also *arı-g*, with which *süzök* often appears together. Just as *süzül-* often signifies 'to have faith' and appears together with *kertgün-*, so *süzük [ker]tgünç* in Ht IV 1359 signifies 'faith$_2$'. Note that this instance uses it as an abstract.

şaş-ok is known to me only from ShōAgon 3, p. 205,25: *kõŋültintä tugurup bo sakınçıg, şaşok yaŋlok kõŋülüg birtämlädi kalısız kılsar, . . .* 'If he produces this thought in his heart and leaves no trace at all of *perplexity* and error, . . .'. The *EDPT* has neither *şaş-* nor any of its derivates as lemmata, but cf. *şaş-ıt-*, *şaş-ur-* and *şaşmaksız* below, and *şaş-* in the *DTS*.

tanu-k signifies 'witness, evidence' and is used as subject, object or action noun. There are numerous exs. in economical texts, including the Yarkand documents. The dictionaries mention only these and one Manichaean instance. Buddhist exs. can be found in Ht IV 514, Warnke 587, Shō VI a2 and XI b7 and in BT VIII A 46. The DLT is the only early source for *tanu-*, *tanul-*, *tanuş-* and *tanut-* and, in fol. 564, defines *tanu-* as 'to enjoin with words' and 'to commend'. Meyer, 1968 has sorted out the history of *tanu-* and that of the borrowings from unrelated Mo. *tani-*. Osm. *tanı-* 'to be acquainted with', which comes from the latter, cannot be connected with *tanuk* as the *EDPT* says; nor do I know of any distinction between "a Dev. N. in *-k* (Active)" and "*-uk* (Passive)", which Clauson thinks he can find here: Whether the suffix has a vowel or not is evidently determined by whether the stem ends in a consonant or in a vowel. *tanuk* can refer to the person who bears witness, to texts, signs or the like used as evidence or to the act of bearing witness. The proverb *tanuklug sav tamgalıg bitig* (ThS III a2-3) is by Hamilton and Bazin translated as "Une parole devant témoin, c'est (comme) un écrit avec un cachet". Cf. *tanuk tamga ur-* "frapper d'un sceau témoin" in HamTouen 22,11. For the *EDPT*, too, *tanuklug sav* is 'a statement in front of witness'. Equally well, however, *tanuklug sav* could be understood to signify 'words supported by a witness' or, taking *tanuk* as abstract, 'words supported by evidence'. In legal practice, documents not validated by stamps or signatures of the parties concerned could, of course, still be supported by persons who had been witnesses to the matter in question.

The *EDPT* and the *DTS* mention several exs. of *tapıgsak* 'devout, dutiful, willing to serve'. Instances not mentioned there have appeared in Ht V 121 and VII 3 a5, BT XIII 12,012 and ShōKenkyū-III 7. The DLT and the QB (eight exs.) both consistently write *tapugsak*; the *EDPT* is misleading in ascribing to the DLT the form *tapıgsak*. The word is there used twice, once with a *ḍamma* of the first hand in the second syllable and once with a *ḍamma* of the second hand and nothing of

the first. The vowel rounding is, of course, caused by the /p/. No base verb is attested for this, but it must have had the form **tap-ıgsa-*: The sense also fits that of the *-(X)gsA-* formation, q.v. below. *tapıgsak* must be an agent adjective.

tarma-k 'a talon' is attested in Maitr 85 r5 in *tumşukın* [. . .] *tarmakın tarmayu tan*[*çulay*]*urlar*. It appears also in DLT (who also mentions a plant called *karga* ical phrase *ölüm tarmakı*. Further, cf. *tarmaklag* in Maitr 107 v2-3 and nr. 450 v23 and *bala tarmaklandı* 'The nestling grew claws' in the DLT. The base verb is mentioned below, and the Maitr also has *tarma-ş-*. *tarmak* is an instrument noun.

tavrak 'quick, fast, speedy' is also used as abstract and as adverb. We have no base for this lexeme, but see *tavran-* and *tavrat-* below. Instances of *tavrak* not mentioned in the dictionaries appear in Suv 599,18 and 635,5, BT VII M2, Ht IV 897 etc., BT VIII A 43 and 301, BT XIII 28,31, BuddhStab II 5, ETŞ 16,80, OdaÕtani 2695 a1, HamTouen 29,11, ms. Pelliot Ouïgour 203 v9 (UigBunken p. 85) and Buddhāv H 51; also in QB 4132 and 5954. *tavrak* is more often used in a binomial with *tärk* than otherwise.

taya-k is written with a voiceless velar in the DLT and in QB 4715, 6322 and 6325, which are not mentioned in the *EDPT*, and *ibid.* 5633. It is an instrument and action noun of *taya-*; see *taya-n-* below. *tayak* is defined as 'a staff' in the DLT; this is also what the lexeme signifies in the QB and e.g. in Töpfer 41 and Maitr 131 v 10 = MaitrH IV 3 a20-21 (quoted in Laut, 1986: 121 footn. 3). In most Uigur exs., however, *tayak* signifies 'support, help; base' and even just 'abode'. This last meaning is found in Suv 31,4 and 364,4, BT VII H2 etc.; it is most evident in the binomial with *ornag* found in Ht IV 726 and BT VIII B 248. Exs. to be translated as 'support (also in the abstract use of this lexeme), something to lean on' are found in Suv 252,6 f., CYK 32, TT V B 43 and 80, BT I B (94), FujYūr v5 etc., beside what is mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Cf. also the instances in Maitr 52 v21 and AbhiKār 16. The proper name *Tayak Tämür* (BuddhStab II 7) is no doubt also connected with this. Since this meaning is found in TT VIII A 4 (Brāhmī), where the word is written with *-g*, one might get the idea that there are, in fact, two lexemes: *taya-k* 'staff' and *taya-g* 'support, base, abode'. This is very unlikely, however: TT VIII A is not free from errors connected with the velars (e.g. *tutuksuz*, *bilkä*), and I know of no modern evidence for early '*tayag*'. Maue and Röhrborn (n. to Suv 31,4) have proposed to explain the Buddhist uses of *tayak* by Skt. *niśraya* (presumably to be read also in TT VIII A 4) and *āśraya*, which unite the various meanings mentioned. While uses like 'seat, base, abode' can only be explained through Skt. derivates of the verb *śri-*, the general metaphorical use of *tayak* appears to be good Turkic: Cf. DLT fol. 518: "*küdägü tayak berdi* 'The groom gave a slavegirl or a slaveboy for the bride to lean upon when dismounting'. This is a custom of the well to do, and he becomes her per-

sonal property."[272] Note that this too is written with a voiceless velar. Typical for Uigur is an expression consisting of adnominal *tayaklıg* with dative or adverbial *tayaklıgın* with dative. This signifies 'leaning on (something)', 'with the support of . . .', 'helped by. . . .' or, following the semantic development of *tayak*, also 'living in . . .'. The *EDPT* quotes five exs. and translates them all in similar manner, but, for some unexplained reason, writes the adjectival ones as *tayaklıg* and the others as *tayaklıkın*. The following are not quoted there: *antakı yeg yörüglär aŋar ymä tayaklıg üçün* . . . (Abhi 1929) 'because . . . depend on that'; *iki samazlarka tayaklıg ärür* (*ibid.* 1960) 'It depends on the two (grammatical) cases'; *maŋa tayaklıg ärür sizlär* (*ibid.* 79 a11-14, quoted in TenrïTo p. 173) 'you rely on me'; *s(a)ns(a)rka tayaklıg* . . . *öglärim kaŋlarım* (BuyKäl 4) "Meine im Saṃsāra angesiedelten Mütter und Väter" is local. *sansarka tayaklıg* vs. *nirvanka tayaklıg* (KudGojūni A 3). With similar local use: *näçä bar ärsär kuş käyik arıgka sakɣaka tayaklıg, öz orunların kämişip oztılar kaçtılar öŋi öŋi* (Suv 629,21, 'birds and wild animals living in forests and valleys'). Further exs. appear in BT I D(95) and (155), BT XIII 40,17, 42,6 and 46,8 and ShōAgon 1,289. In adverbial use we find, beside what is quoted in the *EDPT*, *tokıguka eligkä tayaklıgın* (Suv 375,7), *yolka tayaklıgın* (ÄgFrag (1) B12, *yol* being metaphorical), *kamgak käntirkä tayaklıgın* (Ht VII 1949), *äşidmäkkä tayaklıgın* (UigFalt 120), *täŋri burxannıŋ yarlıgıŋa tayaklıgın* (Warnke 528), *nomka tayaklıgın* (AbitAnk 20 and 22), *dyan yaŋıŋa tayaklıgın* (AmitIst 45) and, with local meaning, *arıg semäkkä tayaklıgın* (HtPek 102 a7 *ap. UW* s.v. *arıg (II)*). The *EDPT* entry also contains the QB 4263 phrase *tayaklık yagıka tämür kalkan et*, translated by Dankoff as "Defend yourself with an iron shield". The *EDPT* writes "Make an iron shield your support against the enemy'. This is a line difficult to interpret, because *tayak* signifies 'staff' in the QB. Otherwise, we could also translate 'Make (your) place of abode into an iron shield against the enemy'. *If* the exs. quoted above are to be taken as identical to this, *all* of them should be written with a voiceless velar (explicit in Arabic writing in the QB), and not just the adverbial ones. As a third possibility, all the forms quoted above as *tayaklıg* could in fact be direct *-(X)glXg* derivates from *taya-* (as described in section 3.119). Uigur *tayaklıg* became a sort of postposition; as *-(O)klXk* appears to be rather rare, it does not seem too likely that it should be in use here.

tägl-ök 'blind' is the subject nominal of the simplex *tägil-* 'to be blinded'. The *DTS* wrongly writes this with a *°g*: The voiceless velar is documented in the IrqB. Exs. of *täglök* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in U II 31,41, U III 77,20, BT V 21,455 and UigKol 1. *tägülök* in KPZieme 1 is hardly the uncontracted form, which would be **tägilök*, but, rather, stretched from *täglök*

272 The slave would, of course, be useful not only when dismounting.

with an anaptyctic vowel to break the liquid cluster. *twga täglök* in Maitr 43 v6, 174 v3 and 85 r24 is 'blind from birth'.

täl-ök 'a hole' is the object noun of *täl-* 'to pierce'. The *EDPT* has this from the DLT and from Middle Turkic, the *DTS* (s.v. *orpaq*) also from two economical texts. It is also found in UigTot 833, 1033, 1067 and 1085.

tälgä-k appears only in Uigur writing, which does not distinguish between g and *k*. Only because of its parallelism with *bulga-k* has it been taken into this chapter. It is only used in a binomial with *bulga-k*. The exs. (one of them mistakenly written as '*tilägääk*') are listed in the *EDPT*. The adherence of *tälgäk* to *bulgak* is parallel to what Kāšġarī had already noticed about *tälgä-* and *tälgän-*: While *bulga-* and *bulgan-* can be used by themselves, *tälgä-* and *tälgän-* appear together with them; see *tälgä-n-* below. *bulgak tälgäk* is an action noun.

täprä-k is a *hapax* in Maitr 194 v24: *ol balıkta ārigmä kiçig yavız āt' özlüg irinç yarlıg oprak täpräk tınlıglar*. In BT IX 244,24 this is wrongly translated as "in jener Stadt sich befindende elende, armselige, geschlagene, getretene Lebewesen", presumably because Tekin connected *täpräk* with *täp-*. The base being intr., *täpräk* should be an agent noun, 'shaking, quaking'.[273] The suffix is here supposed to be *-(O)k* and not *-(X)g* solely because of parallelism with *oprak*, q.v. above. *täprä-* is discussed on p. 618 below.

Several exs. of *tıgra-k* 'firm, tough' are mentioned in the *EDPT*. It has been read also in Ht IV 1117, before a lacuna. Subject adjective of *tıgra-*, defined in DLT fol. 566 as 'to be hardy'.

tilik 'request, wish, desire' is written with *-k* and not *-g* here because of modern forms which point at this velar unequivocally. In 23 exs. of the QB and in several ones of the DLT, this is clearly written as *tiläk*, the form to be expected in a derivate from *tilä-*. In BT I B (49),[274] Warnke 68, DvaKol I 13 (proper name), BT V 409 and 413, BuddhUig II 209 and ETŞ 13,39 and 22,57 we find the word written as *tilik*, however; further, we have *tiliklig* in BT XIII 24,6 and Ht V 204 and *tiliksiz* in Ht V 12 a18 and VII 10 a11 and BT III 132. Cf. also *tilik+lä-* below. The only Uigur counter-example is *itüg tiläk* in TT I 221: This is presumably an error for *ötüg tilik*, or else, a further proof of the lateness of this text. Cf. also *tilän-/tilin-* below. It looks as if *tilä-* came from an earlier **tili-*; since, however, *tilä-* is documented already in the IrqB,[275] the two were probably dialect variants. **tili-* or **tilX-* must then have been eliminated following the regular loss of its final vowel. 'Assimilation', which is offered as an explanation for the second-syllable *i* in the n. to the BT III instance, cannot be used *ad hoc* for an isolated case (even if

273 Ş. Tekin's translation of *opra-k* is also rather inexact.

274 Ms. now lost, but *tilik* would, at that time at any rate, have been the *lectio difficilior*.

275 The Toñ 23 ex. can be read either way.

ühüg, *ühüg* < *ülä-* is also taken into account). *ülä-* is spelled without explicit vowel in the first syllable in Toñ 23, which normally signifies that there was an /e/ there and not an /ä/. The Brāhmī exs. of TT VIII A 18 and 25 are spelled as *telä-*, whereas D 32 and F 11 write *ilä-*. Since Uigur and Qarakhanid spelling is ambiguous in any case, *telä-*, **teli-* or **telX-* would have been the original shape of the base. The reason for the variation remains unclear.

to-k 'satiated, full' is found in Toñ 8 and in Qarakhanid Turkic as quoted in the *EDPT*, in Heilk II 1,13 quoted in the *DTS* and in ShōAv 18. See *toş-* in section 7.1 for the base and *tod-* 'to be satiated' in 7.23 for other cognates. The fact that *tok* has a short vowel both in Tkm. and in Khal. and that its velar does not become voiced in Ottoman when followed by a vowel speaks against this etymology but does not, I think, quite disprove it. The KT and BQ instances quoted in the *EDPT* should probably be read as *tokurkak*; that is presumably formed as an *-(O)k* lexeme from **tok+(X)rkA-*. This proposal of T. Tekin is more convincing than the *EDPT* on this. Cf. also *kıvırkak* and *kişirkāk*, also mentioned in connection with the *-(X)rkA-* verbs.

topl-ok appears in DLT fol. 235, translated 'cracks in the ground'. Ms. mistakenly with *fatḥa* in the first syllable, corrected by Dankoff and Kelly. This is no doubt an object noun of *topol-* 'to pierce', discussed under *topl-un-* below. The DLT lemma *toplo* (fol. 217) may have been invented to account for the phrase *toploka tol!* 'May you fill the grave!', which could in fact contain the same noun with the geminate velar simplified. For the meaning, cf. *tāl-ōk* and *täş-ōk*. *toplok* appears in the *EDPT* under the lemmata *toplu* and *tabluk*. *toplo* may, on the other hand, also be the original form, with *toplok* created in analogy with this formation to replace the morphologically opaque *toplo*: Tătár 1985: 248 mentions Yukaghir *tubula* "Grube, Höhle, Vertiefung", Ket *towlol*, *tòulol*, *toulol* "Grube im Schnee (um Schnee zum Schmelzen hervorzugraben)" and numerous other related lexemes from Siberian languages. These suggest that both *toplo* and perhaps *topol-* itself may be loan words from those languages. *topol-* is, after all, irregular in looking like an *-Xl-* passive but being transitive. Cf. also *topolgak* in section 3.327.

(*tōlāk* 'tranquil, quiet' is attested in the DLT, where it is said to be Oguz, and then in Middle Turkic (quoted in the *EDPT*). The Uigur Nn. Pr. *Tōlāk Tāmūr* (quoted in the *DTS*) and *Tōlāk Kara* (BT III 5 and 6) come from this lexeme. *tōlāK in tapmaz mān tōlāK* (ETŞ 11,90) is correctly translated in the n. to BT III 5 as "Ich finde keine Ruhe". This is an abstract and not an epithet, and could as well be a cognate in *-(X)g*. Cf. *tōlāk+lān-* below. The base of *tōlāk* has not turned up, but Anatolian Turkish and Middle Turkic have a verb *tōlān-*, attested e.g. in Rabġūzī's Qiṣaṣu 'l-Anbiyā' (Pam p. 329 first l.): *Loṭnı körsām erdi köŋlüm tōlānur erdi* 'Had I seen Lot, my heart would have calmed down'. Another ex. of

tōlān- is quoted from the Mu'īnu 'l-Murīd, another Middle Turkic source, by Bodrogligeti in *JAOS* 104/3 (1984): 460. He misreads both instances as *tolan-*. There is, of course, no connection between *tōlān-* and *tol-* 'to fill (intr.)'. We know that *tōlāk* ends in a *-k* and not a *-g* because of Anatolian *dölek*, same meaning.)

The voiceless velar of *tōşā-k* 'mattress, bedding, pillows' is documented in the Codex Comanicus and in modern languages; in QB 4645 (not mentioned in the *EDPT*), the word rhymes with *kārāk* (< *kārgāk*). The *EDPT* has several instances of *tōşāk*; further Uigur exs. are mentioned in the *DTS* s.vv. *tōlit* and *orun*, with which the word is used in binomials. Additional instances can be found in U III 53,7$_1$, Kuan 87, thirteen times in Maitr, BuddhUig II 121, USp 84,3 and 4, Baguettes 2, twice 3 and twice 4, BuddhBio 5 and in the QB. This is an object and/or instrument noun of *tōşā-*; cf. also *tōşā-n-* below.

tupra-k 'earth, soil' must be a subject noun of *tupra-*. That verb, like *tuprat-*, is in the DLT applied only to plants; but for *tupraş-*, DLT fol. 369 has the following ex.: *yer kurup tupraşdı* translated 'The ground dried up from lack of rain and reached the point that dust rose up'. The verb appears to have applied to territory whose vegetation has dried up. Cf. also *tupurgan* or **tupra-gan* below, in the section on *-gAn*. We write all these with *u* in the first syllable and not with *o*, as the *EDPT* and the *DTS* do, because of the spellings *tupraklıg* in TT VIII A 7 and I 18 (Brāhmī) and TUB.RHAG (Tibetan writing) in TibStud. *tupraklıg* is unlikely to be a simple error, as the *EDPT* entry on p. 445 a says, because the adjacent *toz* is written correctly in both instances. The instance in Tibetan writing bars the possibility that the Brāhmī spelling represents a dialect variant. Some of the instances of *tuprak* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in TT VI 81, Pfahl I 1, Maitr 101 v 17, 38 r 27, 112 r 17 and 51 r 2 and QB. BT XIII 15,49 has metathesised *turpak*.

twru-k 'emaciated' is attested in runic, Manichaean, Buddhist and Muslim sources, mostly documented in the *EDPT*. It appears with its antonym *sämiz* in Toñ, e.g. with *küçsüz* in TT III and with *kövrü* 'weak' in BT XIII 1,7 (not in the *EDPT*). The base has the shape *turu-* in Khal. and in Suv 116,22, in the series *küçsirämiş yavrumış twrumış umugsuz ınagsız*, but *twr-* in DLT fol. 524. It was lent into Mo. as *tura-* or *turu-*.

For the *EDPT*, *tutruk* is a *hapax* in QB 2132. In fact it appears also in QB 2716 and 3039, twice as *el tutrukı* and once as *ajun tutrukı*. Dankoff translated these as "cement of state", "that hold the state together" and "what holds the realm together" respectively. Cf. also *tutrux* in the Dīvān of Kadı Burhaneddin (XIVth century). Dankoff's translation is corroborated by *tutturuk* (written *tuttruk* but scanning as four syllables) in the Codex Comanicus: *glutinum nostrum coamicionis*, i.e. 'our glue of mutual love' is there rendered in Turkic as *söyüşlixniŋ tuttrukumuz*. The *EDPT* connects *tutruk* with a verb '*tut-ur-*', but that does

not exist: The verb so spelled in the *EDPT* is in fact *tōtūr-*, discussed below among the *-Ur-* verbs. A supposed connection with such '*tutur-*' appears to have determined also Dankoff's translation. There is, however, a verb *tut-tur-*, with which *tutruk* can well be connected over **tuttur-uk*. In both of its Uigur exs., *tuttur-*, q.v. below, has *nom* 'the doctrine' as object: The Uigur exs. of *tutruk*, not mentioned in the dictionaries, are also in some way connected with *nom*. Three exs., one of them unpublished, are quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 12: *arıg yer orunlar sayukı darni tegmä tutruk nomlarıg bodi tegmä tuyunmak köŋülüg ukıtmak atlıg altınç bölök* (Suv 342,24) 'the sixth chapter, named "The teaching of the *tutruk noms* called *dhāraṇī* which are present in all pure places, and of the enlightenment called *bodhi*"'; *uşnişa viçaya atlıg darni tegmä tutruk nom* (ms. T I T301 (U 2378) 1.2-3) 'the *dhāraṇī* i.e. *tutruk nom* called *Uşnişavijayā*'; *alkınmaksız esilmäksiz alko nomlarnıŋ tutrukı atlıg darni nom* (Suv 338,24-25) 'the *dhāraṇī* named "The *tutruk* of all the undestructible and undiminishable teachings"'. The last-mentioned is similar to the following: *oŋ tägzinçlig yaltrıtur tutruk tegmä . . . nom tilgäni* (*ETŞ* 9,53). In the first two exs., *tutruk nom* appears as the synonym of the term *dhāraṇī*, while in the last two exs., the names of the *dhāraṇīs* contain the term *tutruk*. *tutruk nom* is therefore here likely to have been a loan translation of *dhāraṇī*, which is the feminine form of a Skt. noun signifying 'bearing, keeping, holding' derived from the root *dhar-* 'to hold, keep, bear'. This, however, is a use of the lexeme limited to Buddhist terminology. As for the non-Buddhist instances mentioned above, *tutruk* denotes 'a substance to glue things together', but has been used metaphorically in all the ones we have: It refers to Jesus in the Coman ex. and to sword and pen, sword, gold and justice and justice and silver respectively in the QB instances. The objects are the 'community of love' in the first case, society and the state in the second. In his interpretation of Hochzeit 12 (a Christian text), Zieme was misled by the *EDPT*'s wrong rendering of QB 2132, which he quotes. In fact *tutruk* does not, in the Hochzeit passage, signify "Vorsteher" at all: It is used in a binomial with *tōz* 'root, principle'. The binomial translates Syriac *šrārā* 'firmitas, veritas'. *alko ançmannıŋ tutruxı*, which we find there, is syntactically and semantically similar to the Muslim and Christian exs.: *ançman* is the 'community'. As in the Coman instance, *tutruk* refers metaphorically to a person. A historical connection between the two texts is, of course, out of question. All this is in complete accord with the use to which *tut-tur-* is put; non-Buddhist *tutruk* is not an agent but an instrument noun. Some of the Uigur instances have occasionally been transcribed as '*tutrug*' and connected with such a form said to be found in the DLT. That, however, is an error for *tutz-ug*, q.v. above. The quality of the velar of *tutruk* is documented in the QB.

(*tūgūn-ūk* in IrqB XVIII, *tūgl-ūk* in Maitr 138 r 8 and 9, and *tūŋlūk* in Maitr 172 r4 and 12 and DLT fols. 273, 495, 498 and 611 and in Rabġūzī all refer to the

window(s) or smoke hole(s) of a tent. The first could be an *-(O)k* form from *tūg-ūn-* and the second from *tūg-ūl-*, both signifying 'to get knotted'; but **tūg-ūn+lūk* 'a system of knots' is another possible source. The numerous modern survivals are correspondingly varied. The Turkic tent had a round roof the form of a spoked wheel and a latticed wall. Windows serving as smoke holes were left at the upper edge of the wall, where it was knotted to the roof. Hence the connection between windows or smoke holes and knotting. *tūgūn-* (DLT) and *tūgūl-* (DLT, QB and ff.) being intr., the lexemes here discussed would be subject nouns. The variation would be due to dialect.)

tūş-ūk is defined as 'a sluggard' in DLT fol. 195, but in QB 1111, 1563, 5686 (*tūşūkräk*) and 6226 it is predicated upon the heart (*köŋül*) and signifies 'downcast, dejected'. In QB 5003 (left untranslated by Dankoff) the meaning is not clear to me: Could *ay äski tūşūk!* have been said of the ruler? It rhymes with *tūgūk* in couplets 1111 and 1563 and with *äşūk* in 5003 and retains its voiceless velar in modern Oguz languages. In any case, it is the subject nominal of intr. *tūş-* 'to fall'.

tūşnä-k 'a resting place' is attested once in runes and once in Arabic writing, both quoted in the *EDPT*, and in Uigur in Ht VII 7 a12: *kan yarlıgı kälip Samtso açarıg tagdınkı orduka eltdi . . . kan tūşnäki içiŋä* [*or*]*duka yarlıkadı* 'The royal decree came, leading Master *Tripiṭaka* to the Northern Palace . . . ordered him into the royal resting place of the palace'. The IrqB ex., where the lexeme is used of a bird's nest, fixes the velar as voiceless. It cannot be connected with '*tūş-ūn-*', which does not exist in Old Turkic, nor with *tōşā-n-*, as Old Turkic proper has no suffix *-Ak*. Probably to be derived from *tūşn+ā-* 'to settle', q.v., of which it would be a *nomen loci*. A surviving modern form would have given us the first vowel, showing us whether this in the correct choice.

tütz-ük 'incense (stick)' is attested in this shape in Windgott 36, in Manichaean script (which distinguishes front G and K). The *EDPT* is therefore wrong in writing this lexeme as '*tütsüg*'. The Z, on the other hand, appears only in the ex. quoted. This is archaic: *tützük* comes from *tüt-üz-* (q.v. in section 7.55) but the /z/ changed to /s/ everywhere else. A similar assimilation with the formative *-Xz-* comes about in *-sXk-* < *-(X)z-Xk-*; cf. also the variants of *tutz-ug* above. Exs. of *tütsük* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in CYK 51, BT VII A 454, BuddhUig II 364 and Maitr 54 v3, 92 r6 and 51 r4. *tützük* denotes the object of *tütüz-*.

tüz-ük appears in QB 3085 and 4464 in the phrase *köŋli tüzük* 'in accord with oneself', literally 'level-hearted'. *Ibid.* 5114 (*içiŋ mä taşıŋ birlä barça tüzük*) this meaning is made more explicit. In all three instances (mentioned in the *DTS* but not in the *EDPT*) the word rhymes with *süz-ök*, q.v., which fixes the velar. *tüzük* is the object nominal of *tüz-* 'to set straight etc.'. In ms. TM 222 D 51, edited in LeCoqSchriftk p. 107 l.2, we find the sentence *kişim tüzük köni* [*b*]*erzün* trans-

lated "Mein Weib Tüzük soll es richtig bezahlen (geben)". One might alternately take *tüzük* here to be not the name of the wife, but an adjective in a binomial *tüzük kŏni* 'in upright manner', perhaps 'straightway'. Most likely, however, may be a reading *tüşüg kŏni [b]erzün* 'Let her pay the interest (accusative) honestly'. The QB expressions correspond to Uigur *tüz-üglüg*, attested in *ätözüm birläm tüzüglüg bolu* (BT VIII A 180) 'My body got perfectly well', [*ay*]*tu täginür biz, [kŏ]ŋ[üli] tüzüglüg [mü]?* (ms. quoted in the n. thereto) 'We respectfully ask, does his honour feel well?' and *beş türlüg buyanlar üzä tüzüglüg ögrünçülügin yorımak barmak* (Warnke 541). This is probably an *-XglXg* form and not to be read as *-(O)k+lXg*, as *tüz-ük* itself is an adjective which can be applied to one's state of mind (*kŏŋül*). *-(X)glXg* is discussed in section 3.119.

uç-uk in *yagımız tägrä uçuk täg ärti* (Toñ 8) surely signifies 'Our enemies around [us] were as if flown away'. The passage describes a state of apparent peace in which the *Türk* were living. Immediately after that, as described in the subsequent four lines, it turns out that the Chinese, the Qıtañ and the Oguz were in fact plotting an attack on them. Other interpretations of this passage are unsatisfactory. *uçuk* would just be denoting the subject of *uç-* 'to fly (off)'. This is a *hapax*, apparently a spontaneous creation.

udı-k är in DLT fol. 45 is 'a sleepy man'. The word is attested also in TT VIII A 13 and ShōAgon 1,351 in a binomial with *u* 'sleep'; see also *udık+la-* below. The *EDPT* entry for this lexeme confuses it with *odug* 'awake', discussed above in the section about the *-(X)g* formation: The instances from M III 9,6-8 and KP 17,1 belong there, as the meaning also demands. *udukluk* (with unvowelled *l*) in DLT fol. 86, on the other hand, has to belong here both because of the voiceless velar and the meaning. It signifies 'a person's neglect, unawareness of a thing'. This meaning is particularly close to that of the Skt. word which the TT VIII instance of *udık* translates. The *EDPT* entry for *udık* also quotes '*udkuŋ*' from QB 1069; this, however, is something not found in any of the three mss. but invented by the editor. *udı-k* is a subject nominal of *udı-* 'to sleep' in the DLT and an abstract in the Uigur instances.

uvşak 'small, petty' has no attested base, but cf. *uvşal-*, *uvşan-* and *uvşat-*. The base was no doubt derived from *uvuş*, attested in the DLT; we have no way of knowing whether it was tr. or intr., however, and therefore cannot say what function *uvşak* had with respect to it. An ex. of *uvşak* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occurs in Maitr 58 r3 as *yinçgä uvşak*, a binomial attested also in Suv 370,4. In some of the exs. quoted in these dictionaries, the word has the form *uşak*, additionally attested in Ht IV 841 and BT VII A 222. In InscrOuig V 43, *urug uçakları* corresponds to Chin. 'their children and grandchildren'; if read correctly and not a spelling mistake either, *uçak* should be a late variant. Qarakhanid sources (QB 4108, 4301 and 4601 and several times DLT) have *uşak*.

Kāšgarī also knows of *uşak* used to refer to small boys. *uşak sōz* 'slanderous words' is not "an obscure metaph. meaning", as Clauson writes, but akin to the semantic development of *petty* in English.

uza-k signifies only 'long-lasting' in Old Turkic, and always denotes time and not distance. The instances in TT VII 28,40 and 51 are not mentioned in the dictionaries. This is a subject adjective of *uza-*, q.v. in the *EDPT*. Cf. also *uza-t-* and particularly *uzatı* below: This common verbal adverb also always refers to the length of time.

ūk-ūk in *köŋli kadgun ūkūk* (QB 6198) rhymes with *tügūk* and is derived from the base of *ūk-ūş*, *ūk-ūl-* and so forth (qq.v.). Dankoff translates the expression as "his heart burdened with care". Interesting because the bracketing is (*kadgun ūk*)*ūk*, whereas 'heap' is *ūk-mā* or *hūk-ūn*. *-(O)k* forms do not appear to have verbal government in Uigur.

üz-ūk from *üz-* 'to tear, to interrupt' is rather rare in Old Turkic, although common. *üzükiŋin ulayur mān* appears in IrqB XLVIII in parallelism with *sınokı-ŋın sapar mān*, with the two initial rounded vowels perhaps chosen for (visual?) alliteration like the two initial *ss* in the other sentence. The *EDPT* translates this as "I join together your torn things". What the *EDPT* entry quotes from the DLT as '*üzük*' is better derived from *öz*: See *öz+āk* in section 2.11. I have only one Uigur ex. of *üzük*, in BT I D (75), where it signifies 'end'. This is the use connecting best with *üzüksüz*. *üzükdäki bäglär* in TuoLuoNi 350 and *tōrü üzükçi bäglär ibid.* 345-6 correspond to a Chin. term used for referring to high officials. The latter ex. is no doubt to be analysed as (*tōrü üzük*)*çi bäglär*. The eds. suggest deriving *üzük* "*oben" (< *üz- "oben befindlich sein"), but the existence of the postposition and adverb *üzā* is not sufficient justification for the existence of such a verb. Cf., on the other hand, *üzlünçü* for the semantic development end > extremity > exaltedness. In all cases, *üzük* is an object nominal of *üz-*. The second vowel of *üzük* is determined by 'U.ZUG.SUS in BuddhKat 31 (Tibetan writing), the velar by the IrqB (runes).

The basic meaning of *yagu-k* is 'near' and 'what is near', but there are a few extended meanings like 'neighbour(hood)' and 'relative'. It is, then, a subject nominal from *yagu-* 'to come or be near', also used as abstract. It is attested from Orkhon Turkic, q.v. in the *EDPT* entry. Instances not quoted either in the *EDPT* or in the *DTS* are found in U IV A 279 (*yagukkı(y)a*), Suv 638,10, PañcFrag 192, Maitr 7 v 29 (= MaitrGeng 9 b 4), 135 v 18 and 149 v 5, UigFalt 114, BT VIII B 251 and Ht V 11 b 26. Phrases like *ırak yerdän yaguk köŋlin* are attested in letters, HamTouen 17,13, 20,3, 22,1, 29,2 etc. Among the 17 instances of the QB, the *EDPT* mentions only four. Particularly common is the binomial *yakın yaguk*, which appears also in ShōAgon 1,12 and 185.

yaltrı-k 'gleam, gleaming' has a voiceless velar in the DLT. Exs. are quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, in the latter also under *yaruq* (i.e. *yaro-k*), which appears frequently in a binomial with *yaltrık*. In addition to the dictionaries' exs., *yarok yaltrık* is attested in Ht IV 1150, Maitr 33 r30 = MaitrH X 2 b10 and in six other exs. in Maitr, AbitAnk 71, AmitIst 18, 21, 22, 24 und 26, Suv 92,19, BT VIII B75, ETŞ 10,174, Buddhāv H31 twice and ZiemeGuan 16 and 39-40. In *yarok yaltrıklıg, +lXg* has been added to the binomial as a whole. This is attested in AmitIst 27 and Suv 342,20 and 2,7 in the title of the text, *yarok yaltrıklıg kopda kōtrülmiş nom eligi*. Other unmentioned exs. can be found in TT VI 405 (*ay yaltrık* as the name of a Buddha), Ht V 12 b9 (*suv yaltrıkı*), UigSukh 5 (*yaşın yaltrıkı*) and Ht VII 6 b18-19 (*yaltrık altun*). The last two exs. show how the lexeme is used both adjectivally and, as an abstract, nominally. Since *yaltrık* does not have any variant with rounded vowel in the second syllable in Uigur, it seems unlikely that *Julturukın etiglig eligi* [in TT X 491 should be an ex. of it, as assumed by the editor and by the *EDPT*. Nor do I know of any instance of *yaltrık* to refer to a particular object, as demanded by the context here.[276] In DLT fol. 631, the first hand wrote *yaldrık* (with *d*, not *dh*; may belong to the phoneme /t/!) but the second hand obscured this by adding a *ḍamma* onto the *r*. The first syllable was vocalised by the first hand with *fatḥa* in one of the two instances, with the second hand adding a *fatḥa* to this syllable also in the second instance. Kāšġarī says that the *yā'* may also have a *ḍamma*; this, however, should not be taken to imply that *yaldrı-k* and *yuldrı-k* are variants of one and the same lexeme. *yultrı-* is a *+I-* verb related to *yultuz* 'star', *yaltrı-* to Ottoman *yaldız*. The synaesthetic relationship between the two stems is discussed in section 5.42. The QB form *yıldrık* (discussed there as well) could be a variant of *yaltrık*. *yaltrık* denotes subjects of *yaltrı-* or the quality of being an entity so described.

yaŋl-ok 'error, fault, sin, wrong (noun and adjective), wrongly' is attested in all domains of Old and Qarakhanid Turkic. Uigur instances not quoted in the *DTS* or the *EDPT* are found in BT I D(40) and (91), Warnke 452, BT III 617b, Ht X 230 and 232, BT VIII A410 etc. and ShōAgon 3, p. 205,25 and so forth, frequently in the binomial *t(ä)rs yaŋlok*. Suv 595,7 has the binomial *tätrü yaŋlok* 'in distortion'. The Brāhmī ex. in TT VIII H2 fixes the suffix vowel. Our only instance where the second vowel of *yaŋıl-* is not syncopated occurs in U II 87,54, but that may be an anaptyctic vowel connected with the stretching tendency of clusters containing /l/. The runic ex. is likely to have been some error, as the *EDPT* also notes: *-(O)k* lexemes don't usually govern case forms (but cf. *ük-ük* above). *yaŋlok* is mostly used as an action noun but is the adjective 'wrong' in a colophon

276 Rather, this is an instance of the suffix *+dUrXk*, q.v. above. It is found e.g. in *bel+tūrūk* 'a belt'. *Julturuk* appears at the beginning of a line, but this ms. frequently divides words between lines.

quoted in FujYūr p. 76, r62. The phrase *yaŋlok sakınç* can be translated as 'erroneous thought', which need not preclude the possibility that the formal relationship was one between two nouns ('thoughts of error'). Accordingly, *yaŋlok-suz* (Suv 388,12 and 13 and 659,3) is either (or: both) 'errorless' or (and) 'unerroneous'. *yaŋıl-* is a tr. simplex; it governs *köŋül* in BuddhUig I 6, e.g., and the phrase *yol yaŋıl-* is common.

yaŋşa-k signifies 'chattering', both as agent and as action noun. It is attested in TT VIII C 16 (not A 16 as written in the *EDPT*), DLT fol. 612 ('a garrulous man') and 235 ('vain talk') and QB 1027 and 1028. The *EDPT* quotes the base only from Qarakhanid Turkic and later Muslim literature. It appears also in BT XIII 12,103. BT I B (236) possibly has the form *yaŋşayur*, in fragmentary and unclear context.

yar-ok 'a crack or cleft', the object noun of *yar-*, is attested in DLT and in later Muslim sources and discussed in the *EDPT*. It was not homophonous with the next lemma if and where vowel length was phonemic in Old Turkic: *yar-* 'to split, cleave' has a long vowel in Tkm., whereas *yaro-* must always have had a short one: Cf. the consistent spelling of *yaro-*, *yarın* and *yarok* with implicit first vowel in the IrqB.

yaro-k 'light, bright, brightness, gleam' is attested with *o* in the second syllable both in Tibetan (BuddhKat 32) and Brāhmī (ĀṭSū 1 v 8 and TT VIII C 13 and I 18) scripts. This also gives us the second vowel of *yaro-* 'to be or become bright'. *yarok* is subject nominal of this base, also serving as abstract. There are several runic instances all mentioned in the *EDPT* entry and dozens of exs. in the QB, only three of which are mentioned there. Uigur exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found, among other places, in Suv 342,20, Hochzeit 8, Weih 3, Warnke 336, BT II 1224-5, Pfahl I 2 (used metaphorically of a ruler) and Maitr 171 r 10; cf. also instances of *yarok yaltrık* mentioned under *yaltrık* above and of *yarok yaşo-k* below. AmitIst 15 has *y(a)roklug*.

yastok or *yastuk* 'pillow' should be the object noun of *yasta-* 'to prop up on a pillow'; see *yasta-n-* below. In this meaning, the word was known to the *EDPT* and the *DTS* only from the DLT and from Middle and New Turkic sources; we have 'pillow' *yastwk* also in Uigur, in BuddhBio 6-7 and TuoLuoNi 123 = 125. Exs. of *yastuk/yastok* as a means of payment are mentioned in the dictionaries; this occurs in economical texts and may have its explanation as suggested in the *EDPT*. Pelliot (*TP* XXVII) and Müller, 1920: 322 discuss the analogy with Pers. *bāliš*, which has the same two meanings. *-Ok* is not otherwise a dominant suffix, but we don't know of *yasta-* to have had a variant '*yastw-*' either. Such a verb could have existed if *yasta-* were denominal, with *+U-* forming another derivate. *yastok/yastuk* remains a morphological puzzle.

yaşo-k is written with /o/ in the second syllable in ĀṭSū 1 v 8, in Brāhmī characters. /o/ should therefore also be the vowel of *yaşo-*. All our exs. of *yaşok* appear in

a binomial with *yarok*, which does not seem to have differed in meaning from *yarok* used by itself. *yaşo-* and *yaşot-* are also nearly exclusively used in biverbs; but, to judge from the meaning of *yaşın* (q.v. among the *-Xn* forms), *yaşo-* (by itself) would originally have signified 'to flash'. Exs. of *yarok yaşok* are mentioned both in the *EDPT* and in the *DTS* s.v. *'yaruk'*; additional ones can be found in BT V 10,187 and M III 17,14$_1$ (Manichaean), Maitr 9 r15, BT VIII B 71, Ht IV 425 and VII 1932, AmitIst 40 and 41, TT V A 12 and 17 and B 121 and ShōAgon 2, p. 192,3 (Buddhist). *yaşok* does not occur in the DLT. The QB has a variant *yaşık* about 20 times referring to the 'sun'. This comes from a variant of the base attested in M III 35,13 (text 15) and BT V 20,435, *yaşı-*: In view of the distribution, it may belong to the west.

yaz-ok from *yaz-* 'to relax (tr.), untie' is quoted in the dictionaries only from the DLT, but appears also in QB 6114. This was noted by Tezcan in his review of the QB İndeks. The QB ex. has the phrase *kaş yazok tut-*, the antonym of *kaş tüg-* 'to frown'. *yazok yüzin* 'with relaxed face' (Maitr 13 r27 = MaitrH I 14 b10; cf. Laut, 1986: 49 n. 2) corresponds to the QB expression. In DLT fol. 451, *yazok at* is a 'horse untied from its fetter'. In both senses *yazok* denotes the object of *yaz-*.

The incomparably commoner *yaz-ok* is that signifying 'fault, offence, sin', derived as action noun from the intr. *yaz-*. The *o* of the second syllable is documented in a Brāhmī instance in TT VIII A 45 (not mentioned in the *EDPT*), where *yasok* (thus!) translates Skt. *avadya* 'fault, shameful act'. In BQ E 36 (runes) we find what may be *yazok* or a derivate of it in fragmentary context: JY^{1}Z^{W}K^{1}L^1[could be either *yazok+la-* (q.v.), *yazoklug* etc., or *yazok* followed by a word starting with *a*^{P}. A few of the numerous exs. of *yazok* not mentioned either in the *DTS* or the *EDPT* are found in KP A r2 and KPZieme 14, Maitr 65 v11, 73 r18 and 19 and ETŞ 13,140. We sometimes find it in binomials with *tuyı/suy*, *irinçü* or *mün*.

yer-ök 'split, cleft' is quoted in the *EDPT* from an economical text, from the DLT and from Middle Turkic. It is the object nominal of *yer-* 'to split'.

yumşa-k 'soft' of Orkhon Turkic is rounded to *yumşak* subsequently. The base is attested in the DLT and the QB but not in Uigur, but cf. *yumşa-t-* below. Instances of *yumşak* not noted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in U IV A 126, TT X 282, nine times in Maitr, U III 10,10$_2$ and 73,16, BT II 1260, Heilk I 168, M III 20,7$_1$ (text 8) and BT VIII B 146. *yımşak/yumşak* is a subject of its base. There are many abstract uses of this adjective, usually in the binomial *tözün yumşak* 'gentle, mild'; this is possibly to be read also in U II 24,1-2 instead of

'özün yumşak'.[277] What the noun read as *yumşak* in Suv 610,4, used in a binomial with *mäŋ*, might have been, is not clear to me; it refers to food or drink for a tigress.[278]

yok 'nothing(ness) etc.' is common from Orkhon Turkic on. It should be related to *yod-* 'to wipe away, obliterate'; cf. the common binome *yok yodun* (section 3.107) and Qarakhanid *yodug* 'disaster'. This etymology is made likelier by a binomial like *yok kurug* 'empti(ness)' (Ht IV 1304 and 1648, BT I B(72) and D(77) etc.), where the second member is also related to the disappearance of a liquid. As no base is attested, the syntactic and valency relation of *yok* to it cannot be known.

The nominal and adjectival uses of *yorı-k* are rather different from each other. We write them both with a voiceless velar since both are consistently written this way both in the DLT and the QB. The noun *yorık* appears in DLT fol. 451 signifying 'gait; manner of flowing' and, with extended meaning, 'course; behaviour, character'. 'way of progressing, life' is a common meaning in Uigur; exs. not mentioned in the *DTS* nor in the *EDPT* appear in BT I D(65), BT II 4, Suv 150,13, 289,1, 376,16 and 412,5, HamTouen 2,35, Samanta 4, ShōAgon 1,41, 156, 329 and 336 and 3, p. 205,21, Buddhāv Y 12, Ht IV 1182 etc. *yorıkın ukıtmak* signifies 'biography', as Ht V 3 shows; cf. the n. thereto. The adjectival use of *yorık* is in the DLT entry applied only to language: Kāšġarī translates *yorık tıl* as 'good/clear/eloquent language'. The QB has more than 60 instances of *yorık* in both the noun and the adjective meanings and uses. There too, as in Old Turkic, the noun *yorık* is much more common than the adjective *yorık*. The adjective is applied either to *tıl* as in the DLT, or to *sōz*, with much the same meaning. In the following, adjectival *yorık* is used of something else: *ymā nā iş yarlıg yarlıkasar, kop[ta] işi yorık bolgay* (BlattRun 20) 'Further, whatever matter he orders to be done, in everything his business will be successful'. The text being runic, this is further evidence for the voicelessness of the velar. Translating this as '. . . will become an accepted course' or '. . . a habit' would have taken the use of *yorık* to be nominal. Some of the QB's uses of nominal *yorık* are not far from this. The adjective *yorık* qualifies the subject of *yorı-*, whereas the noun *yorık* is an abstract, denoting the action or the mode of action. The latter is expanded in *kıyık yorıklıg* (BT XIII 21,75) and in *bāk katıg yorıklıg* (BT II 1122), where *bāk katıglıg* qualifies *yorık* before the addition of *+lXg*.

We know that *yölä-k* 'support' has a *-k* and not a *-g* because it rhymes 23 times with *tilāk* 'wish' in the QB. The DLT has *yölä-glig* (the form discussed in section

277 According to the 'Tabelle der Texte' published together with *SEddT-F* IV, the original ms. is now lost.

278 The glossary of Gabain, 1974 translates it as "Trinkbares".

3.119) and *yölak+lik*, but Kāšğarī appears to have forgotten to mention *yölak*. Both the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly are, I think, wrong in transcribing *yöla-ğlıg yıgaç* (fol. 467) as '*yölāklig*': Kāšğarī's rendering of the verbal form by Arabic *murajjab* shows that he was thinking of the passive participle 'propped' and not of something as having a prop. In ZiemeFam 2, 14, 20 and 22 we find *Yölak* as a proper name. Otherwise, the only Uigur ex. I know of is in ETŞ 11,92. This is a subject noun of *yölā-*, attested, among other places, in BT II 975. Other derivates of this verb are common in Uigur.

yük 'a load, burden' is no doubt connected with *yüd-* 'to load', but we don't have the common base. Uigur and Qarakhanid exs. are listed and quoted in the *DTS* (s.v. *jük I*) and the *EDPT*, including two Brāhmī instances.

yügrük, *yügürük* 'fast-running, swift' is applied to domesticated animals (horses, dogs, elephants) in all the Uigur and Qarakhanid instances quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, and in Suv 555,8 quoted in *UW* 48b s.v. *adgır*, A. *yügrük bolmak* 'to get into swift movement' in UigTot 894 presumably applies to human beings, however. In any case, this is the subject adjective of *yügür-* 'to run'. *yügrük* ends in a /k/ in Ottoman and therefore, I assume, also in Old Turkic.

yüksä-k 'eminent, lofty' is the subject adjective of *yüksä-* 'to be high, tall', attested in QB 1809. In both of its Uigur exs., in KP 61,5 and Maitr 171 r5, *yüksäk* appears in a binomial with *ediz*, and is predicated of thrones. In QB 4998 we also have *yüksäk ediz*, but in the DLT and in QB 308 we find *yüksäk* by itself.

There are quite a number of *+lA-* verbs derived from *-Ok* forms, e.g. *agrukla-*, *arokla-*, *bādūklā-*, *āmgāklā-* etc.; see *+lA-* below for exs.. *tankar-* (discussed in the section on *+(A)r-*) is a derivate from *tanu-k*. *-(O)k* is also quite often expanded with expressive formatives, as *+kIñA* and *+rAk*; the expansions are mentioned in the respective sections. With functional formatives, on the other hand, expansion is rather weak: *-(O)kçI* is absent from Uigur, and only a couple of exs. come up in the QB; they are mentioned under *+çI*. Forms in *-(O)k+lXk* are also quite rare; *ıdokluk* in IrqB XLI, translated in the *EDPT* as 'suitable for dedication to heaven', can be said to be one only if *ıdok* 'sacred' really is an *-Ok* form. The QB has the abstracts *yagukluk* 'nearness' (3296, 3297, 5045 and 6468) and *yarokluk* 'brightness' (ten exs., all written, of course, with a voiceless velar in the second syllable and not as '*yaruğluk*' as in the İndeks). Finally we have, in QB 4574 and DLT fols. 140 and 252, *konokluk*; although this may mean 'hospitality' (an abstract) in the QB instance, the DLT lemma defines it as 'guest-house'. This is the only *-Ok+lXk* form attested in Uigur, namely in Pfahl I 9 and Maitr 54 v5. The Uigur instances also have *+lXk* in its local use here, well known as one of the early functions of this formative.

The suffixes most commonly added to *-(O)k* are *+lXg* and *+sXz*. The sequences *-(O)k+sXz* and *-(O)k+lXg* are not fused, however, and are therefore

discussed here; some exs. have already been mentioned together with their respective *-(O)k* forms. As, then, *+lXg* and *+sXz* are added to *-(O)k* bases and not the suffix sequences directly to verb stems, we expect the various bases corresponding to *-(O)ksXz* or *-(O)klXg* to be attested as well. This is always the case, with one single exception: *ärinöksüz* 'untiring'. In Warnke 186, *ärinöksüzin turkaru* corresponds to Chin. *wu xie juan*, and this form may just be a calque on the Chinese. The same binomial is found in ETŞ 16,35, while Ht IV 663 should no doubt be completed as *ärinök[süz] ärinmäksiz*. We further have *tünlä küntüz ärinöksüz* (Ht VII 1939) and *ärinöksüzin kauglan-* (Suv 396,10). As *erin-* (q.v. below among the *-Xn-* forms) alternates with *ärin-*, this lexeme also has the variant *erinöksüz*: In Suv 488,13, we should read *erinöksüzin, agınçsızın, kaŋ çın köŋülin* . . . and not '*ävrinügsüzin*' or '*ävrilinçsizin*' as suggested in *UW* 65a. Nor can *ärinöksüz* have a *g* instead of a *k*, as it has often been read: *-(X)g* would not have given a rounded vowel here.

-(O)ksXz is non-verbal and static in use, while *-mAksXz*, for instance, is dynamic. Thus, *bölöksüz ülüşsüz* (UigNäm 1,3) is 'something which has no parts', whereas *bölmäksiz* (twice in BuddUig II 607-8) signifies that something is 'indivisible, does not fall into parts'. Not everything that is dynamic is necessarily verbal: The more verbal counterpart of the above is *bölülmäki yok är-* (BuddhUig I 134). The opposition between *amraksız* and *amramaksız* (see the *UW* for both) should be along the same lines. From *yaro-k* 'light, bright' we have both *yaroksuz* 'dim' (Heilk I 65 and 85) and *yaroklug* (Ht IV 852, BT II 438, 559, 645, 787 and 797, ZiemeGuan 6 and 8). *yaltrıklıg* corresponds to Skt. *bhāsvant* in Kinkashō §1. C,b; cf. *nom yaltrıklıg burxan* and *ulug yaltrıklıg burxan* in TT VI 188 and 413 respectively. *sönöksüz* in Ernte 29 signifies 'unflagging' and reminds one of the phrase *aroksuz köŋülin*, in the *UW* translated as "ohne Ermüdung, unermüdlich, mit Unermüdlichkeit". Not very far from either *in meaning* is the biverb *armaksızın sönmäksizin* appearing twice in Suv, quoted in the *UW* 169b s.v. *ar- I*.[279] Again, the *-OksXz* forms are meant to describe qualities of persons, the *-mAksXz* forms of events and activities.

üzüksüz is very common. It is usually used adverbially and often together with *tutçı, amru, uzatı, turkaru* or *kün küniŋä*. Exs. from BT I B(86), DhāSū 17, BT XIII 28,48 and 58,22, ETŞ 10,54, TuoLuoNi 253, BuyKäl 14, 21, 25 and 34-35, Ht *EDPT. käs-* is used in some dialects instead of the verb *üz-* of others. Accordingly, in QB 31, 61, 1348 and 3906 we find *käsöksüz* instead of *üzüksüz*, together

279 Note that the *armaksız* made into a lemma in the *UW* comes from the noun *armak* which, in turn, is an early derivate from the *UW*'s *ar- II*. There might, I think, have been a reference to *ar- I* for the benefit of those coming across the *armaksız* form I am dealing with here.

with the synonymous *ula-m* and once also with *tutaşı* (thus). On the other hand, *açoksuz* (*a hapax* in Suv discussed in the *UW*), *sädräksiz* (TT III 40, ETŞ 20,39 and MaitrGeng 11 b18) and *iröksüz* (in the MaitrGeng ex. together with *sädräksiz*) are all used non-adverbially: They negate the *-(O)k* form as adjective or as privative of the abstract: *e.g. sädräksiz* is either 'gapless' or 'non-gappy'. All have well-attested bases. The lexicalised adverb *üzüksüz* is clearly different, both in this respect and by being descriptive, from *üzülmäksiz* (Suv 67,10), which contains a reference to a process.

artoklug and *artoksuz* are discussed in the *UW*. In a different sense, the opposite of *artoksuz* is *ägsüksüz*, in Ht VII 8 b27 used together with *kärgäksiz*. Some instances of *ägsüksüz* are quoted in the *EDPT*. In other cases (Suv 601,5, Ht IV 905, BT II 1073, InscrOuig II 3), *ägsüksüz* is accompanied by *tükäl. bir ägsüksüz* (ETŞ 10,267, UjgRuk I 9 etc.) 'with not one missing' is worth noticing because of the bracketing, which must be (*bir ägsük*)*süz*. *ägsüksüz* refers to static completeness, and is thus opposed to the dynamic and more verbal *ägsümäksiz alkınmaksız* (Suv 338,5), which describes something as 'not diminishing'. While *ägsüksüz* turns out to be a member of Old Turkic phraseology, *ägsüklüg* is attested sporadically: In Chuast 308 and 319 (and also in HamTouen 8,2), *ägsüklüg yazoklug biz* corresponds to *knpy ZY yw'nkry* in the Sogdian Xwāstwānēft. *knpy*, and therefore *ägsüklüg*, are here synonyms of adjectival *ägsü-k* 'deficient, defective, lacking'. Since, however, *ägsük* could also serve as abstract, it is that nominal use that must have served as base for *ägsüklüg*. Parallelism with *yazoklug* may have been the reason for the use of the form. Similar things can be said about *irinç çıgay ägsüklüg kärgäkliglär* 'poor$_2$ and needy$_2$ ones' in ShōAgon 3, p. 207,9. The meaning, however, is different, for the base *ägsük* here signifies 'need' and not 'deficiency'. *yazoklug* appears also in TT VI 44 and 447 and TT IV A 65; cf. T I D 20, a ms. quoted in the n. to TT V A 23. Its negated counterpart is *yazoksuz* 'sinless', found in U II 78,32 and 87,49, TT IV B 14, HamTouen 5,38 and 6,11, BT II 1162, Kuan 37 and Chuast 105. *yazoksuz* is distinct from *yazmaksız* 'without going amiss' (ETŞ 12,3); the latter comes directly from *yaz-* 'to err'.

In short, there is nothing verbal in the behaviour of either the *-(O)k* forms or in that of any of their derivates.

We now turn to the semantic and functional participant classes to which the *-Ok* forms we have belong. As with *-Xg*, there are some indeterminate cases, which we need not discuss in detail here. The very great majority of *-Ok* nominals are 'ergative', first of all, in representing the subject of the verbal base if this base is intr. (about 54 items) and its object if this base is tr. (about 40 items). Subjects of tr. bases are exceedingly rare: They are *amrak* and perhaps *basrok*, not counting the QB lexeme *sakınok*. Both of those appear to have resulted from metonymic extension of their semantic domain, *basrok* from an instrumental use, *amrak*

from the objective one. *amrak* has this development in common with its synonym *säv-ig*, the rationale apparently being that sympathy and love are best when mutual.

An important difference between *-Xg* and *-Ok* is the following: While being an action noun is the only use or at least one of the common uses of a majority of the *-Xg* forms, this is rather rare with *-Ok* nominals. Exs. for *-Ok* forms which do denote the event, process or action are *ämgäk* 'suffering' and *yazok* 'fault, sinning'. One might try to distinguish between abstract nominals on the one hand, and subject or object adjectives in abstract use when not applied to any entity, on the other. Thus *arok*, the subject of intr. *ar-* 'to get tired', can also signify 'the state of being a tired creature' i.e. 'tiredness', but not 'the process of getting tired'. Now this can also look like a matter related to aspect, a line of research not to be followed here. In cases like *yorı-k* (q.v. above) there is a real duality of functions, but in others such functions are really difficult to tell apart (which is why the present paragraphs have remained so vague): Is *tilik* 'wish' the object of one's wishing or is it the act of wishing itself? Even in languages in which this distinction is made, it is blurred again by metonymy. The same can be said about 'doubts' (*sezik*) and *kılık* (abstract or the object of *kıl-*?). The border to other domains can also be blurred: Is *kölik*, e.g., local, i.e. does it denote the PLACE where there is shade, or is it the OBJECT, a 'shaded' place? It seems artificial to try to distinguish between the two aspects of the matter if grammar doesn't do so. In other cases the distinctions are clear-cut: *kon-ok*, e.g., denotes the SUBJECT of *kon-*, *öz konok* the PLACE (the subject being incorporated in the phrase). *köli-* and *köşi-* are similar in content but differ in valency patterns. So do *kölik* and *köşik*: *köşik* denotes the INSTRUMENT, which *kölik* never does.

Even if one is as liberal as one can be about membership in such functional classes for the *-Ok* lexemes, their local, abstract and instrumental uses are only a fraction of their uses as subject/object. The use of verbal nominals to denote TARGET or ORIGIN has not been observed here, which it has with a few *-Xg* forms.

-(O)k is rarely added to deverbal verbs: We have *basrok* and *tutruk* perhaps created in analogy to the title *buyruk*, the weakly attested *sınok*, the questionable and at best half-opaque *tügünük* and the composite *ärinöksüz*. The QB adds only *äymänök* and *sakınok*, both from fused bases.

3.103 *-Xş*

A suffix which was quite productive from the first texts on and clearly has remained so throughout Old Turkic and until our days. The suffix is dominant, as shown in Erdal, 1979b, q.v. also for what I mean by this term. I had there mentioned *'agruş'* as the only exception. This has been shown not to be an exception: As proven in *UW* 82b on good semantic and collocational grounds, the lexeme should have been read as *akruş* and connected with *akru*, q.v. there. The unattested base must have ended in *°ur-*, the roundedness of the suffix vowel being the reflex of the syncopated stem vowel. I shall here give a corrected and more complete list of the *-Xş* lexemes in which the suffix shows its dominance, the actual exs. following further on:[280] *alkış* < *alka-* (qq.v. in the *UW* and the *EDPT* s.vv.; attested also in Hochzeit 4, 5 and 14 and HamTouen 5,42 and 6,14), *küsüş* < *kūsā-*, *kargış* < *karga-*, *suvsuş* < *suv+sı-* and once perhaps < *suv+sa-*, *tokuş* < *tokı-*, *ülüş* < *ūlā-*, *arvış* (q.v. in the *UW* and the *EDPT* s.v.) < *arva-*, *ekiş* < *ekā-*, *yagış* < *yag+a-*, *uluş* < *ula-*, *ikiş* < *ikä-*, *çalpuş* < *çalpa-*, *keŋiş* < *keŋ+ä-*, *busuş* from the base of *busan-* and *terkiş* from the base of *terkäş-*.

akruş 'quiet (both as noun and as adjective)' is syncopated from **akuruş* < **akur-*, the base of *akru/akuru*. This syncopation is not at all isolated but occurs also in *igdiş* < **igid-iş* and *āvriş* < **āvir-iş*, both discussed below, and also in the *-(X)nç* formation. Quite a different thing is the rounding which takes place sporadically in Qarakhanid Turkic after labial consonants. Due to it, *kap-ış* appears as *kapuş* in QB 6482 but not in the DLT, *arvış* once as *arvuş* in the DLT. *çalpuş* in DLT fol. 231 would have been **çalpış* in Uigur; it is related to *çalpaş-* and *çalpaŋ*, both *hapax legomena* in the DLT, and to *çalpak* 'dirt, filth; muddled' (DLT) which has survived into the modern languages.[281]

The dominance of *-Xş* breaks down in Qarakhanid Turkic. Instead of *terkiş* and *keŋiş*, the DLT has *terKäş* and DLT and QB 3482-3, 3484, 3493 and 5650ff. *keŋäş*. The meaning of the only ex. of *keŋiş* in TT VII 35,5 is not clear, but *keŋäş* means 'advice'. The meanings of *terkiş* and the DLT's *terKäş* are clearly different, although they, equally clearly, come from the same base. In a number of lexemes attested in the DLT but not in Old Turkic, the suffix is non-dominant: *bulgaş* and *oynaş* with *alif* in the second syllable, *irtāş*, *sarmaş* and *öçäş* without *alif*. The *fatḥa* of *irtāş* (fol. 61 'the inquiry, claim, calling to account that occurs among a people over a certain matter') is said to have been added by a later hand. The *-Xş* derivate of *tokı-* is attested several times as *tokış* in the DLT, but once, at the beginning of the work, as *tokuş*. The original text of QB 2359, 2363, 2365 (twice) and 2366

280 A few of the additions come from Semih Tezcan's lecture at the 22nd PIAC meeting.

281 Clauson reads *çalpuş* and 'emends' to '*çalpaş*', while Dankoff and Kelly read *çulpuş* and emend to *çalpuş*.

apparently had *tokış*, but the mss. fluctuate. To this we can add, as exceptions, *bagdaş* in UigTot 750 and QB 4114, the dubious *oxşaş* in ETŞ 13,81 and *külăş* 'praise' in HamTouen 7,10. UigTot and ETŞ 13 are very late texts.[282] The hap. *külä-ş* may have retained its stem vowel so as not to give the impression that it came from *kül-* 'to laugh'.

This view of the morphophonology of *-Xş* has been contested by Doerfer 1981-82: 115-116 under five headings. His point 5° is about non-dominance of the suffix in the DLT, with which I agree. Point 4° states that the only derived bases of dominant *-Xş* are *suvsa-* and *agru-*, the derivate from the latter being an exception. That *akruş* (as we should read) does not come from *agr+u-* and is no exception has already been stated, and we can now also mention the base *yag+a-*. It is not clear why the lack of a great number of *derived* bases should weaken my description.[283] Doerfer deals with *suvsuş* more explicitly in his point 1°, where he states that *suvsa-*, *suvsı-* and *suvsâz* (thus) might have a common base '*suv-s-*'. But there is no evidence for a formative '*+s-*'; nor do *+sA-* and *+sI-* (q.v. under *+sIn-* below) have any content in common. There are no deverbal formatives '*-A-*' or '*-I-*' known to me from Old Turkic; nor can or need any such formatives be postulated for Proto-Turkic. Cf. the introduction to part VI, below. This is my central objection to Doerfer's points 1°-3°: Following Brockelmann, 1954: 199 ff., he there assumes the existence of Old (or Proto?) Turkic deverbal intensive suffixes which, he says, might have been used to form the stems *alka-*, *busa-*, *kūsā-*, *ūlä-* etc. He finds that they sound (thus: "klingen") "in ziemlich hohem Grade affektbehaftet (heiß loben, tief trauern, innig wünschen, fein zerteilen usw.)." But *alka-* does not signify "heiß loben" but just 'loben', and any speaker/writer who meant to say 'heiß' presumably had to add some such adverb. *Any* verb whatsoever can connote deep feeling if the context demands it. *ülä-*, for instance, is not "fein zerteilen" at all, but rather 'to deal out, distribute'. Concerning his constructed roots (thus, "Wurzeln") **arv-*, **qarγ-* and **suvs-*, Doerfer has a further justification for expansion: That they do not accord with Old Turkic sound patterns. But this is a circular argument: Old Turkic sound patterns would very well have permitted such phoneme sequences if Proto-Turkic sound laws would have created them.[284] As stated in section VI, no 'intensive' formatives at all can be posited for Old Turkic or for the language stages leading to it. The existence of verbs like '*küs-*' or '*ül-*' can not, of course, be ruled out for Proto-

282 *bagdaş* and *oxşaş* could, on the other hand, also have come from **bagda-ş-ış* and **oxşa-ş-ış* by syncopation.

283 No language, not even an agglutinative one like Old Turkic, likes long series of formatives. The number of *-Xg* forms from derived bases, e.g., is small indeed when compared to the overall number of *-Xg* forms.

284 As it is, the sequence /karg#/ would probably have been realised as '/kark/'.

Turkic, as everything else concerning such a hypothetical language is hypothetical; but our connection of *kūsā-* with *kūsūš*, *ūlā-* with *ūlūš* etc. is synchronic and does not concern the millenia preceding our texts.[285]

The DLT's view of *-Xš* forms is misleading in another way: It appears to define their meaning as cooperative or reciprocal, as if they were connected with the *-(X)ş-* verbs. In this to my mind groundless assumption it is followed by Clauson; the *EDPT* translations of *-Xš* lemmata should therefore be checked in each case.

One should try not to confuse the Qarakhanid trend to make *-Xš* lose its dominance (of which there *may* have been sporadic exs. in late Buddhist texts) with haplological loss of the suffix. A certain ex. for this is *tūš* 'place or time of a halt', therefore sometimes 'midday', < **tūš-ūš* (DLT fol. 166 etc. and QB).[286] *tuş* has quite a number of different meanings, among them 'meeting', 'meeting place' and 'occasion'. Warnke 17, ETŞ 10,9 and 19,3 and BT VIII A 318 have exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT*. Further, cf. the phrase *tuş tulum bol-* 'to meet' discussed among the *-(X)m* lexemes. *tuş* apparently comes from **tuş-uş*, < *tuş-* 'to meet'. *toş agızı* (Suv 602,10 *apud UW*) and *toş başı* (exs. in the *EDPT* s.v. *toş*) contain the lexeme *toş* which can be derived from *to-ş-* 'to fill up' over **toş-uş*.[287] *sış* 'a swelling' is from **sış-ış*; see the *EDPT* entries for both the noun and the verb. (Connecting *sış* with *sı-* 'to break' is clearly out of the question.) *koş* 'a pair', found e.g. in BT I B 6 = C 9, Warnke 336, BuddhUig II 541 and SuvCaitya 32,15, may come from *koş-* 'to join or combine in parallel fashion' over **koşuş*. We would add the two bisyllabic *°ş* lexemes mentioned in n. 282. Some of these may possibly be direct derivates from unattested vowel bases and not the result of haplology applying to longer forms. The basic fact, however, is that not a single full form of an *-Xš* derivate from a base ending in /ş/ is attested in Old Turkic.

In Old Turkic, no *-Xš* forms are derived from deverbal verbs, but the DLT has a few such instances: *aytış* (fol. 69) 'the inquiring after one another's health' from *ay-ıt-*; *katlış* (fol. 231) 'the place where channels of a river come together' from *kat-ıl-* 'to mix (intr.)'; *batruş suv* (*ibid.*) 'muddy water; also noodles that have too much dough and too little water' presumably from *bat-ur-*: According to Kāšġarī, this verb can also be used of anything 'that one puts into something liquid or soft, e.g. candied sugar into fruit juice'. In other cases, this formation dispenses with voice suffixes in its base even in the DLT, even in cases where the meaning might

285 Note, by the way, that *alk-* and *alka-* (qq.v. e.g. in the *UW*) are two quite distinct verbs.

286 An instance in QB 630, which in the *EDPT* appears in the entry for *tüş*, should in fact be read as *tuş*, as the meaning makes clear. In the *apparatus criticus*, Arat actually quotes the word as *tuş°* from both mss. extant for this passage but, for some reason, has *tüş°* in his text. *tūş* in BT III 144 does not belong here but should be translated as 'result'.

287 Deriving *toş* directly from *to-* is less likely because of the meaning.

have demanded it. Cf. e.g. *adrış* (DLT fol. 61) 'fork of a road'; this comes from *adır-* 'to separate (tr.)' although no 'separator' is involved. In the DLT, such a phenomenon occurs only when an explicit form such as '*adrılış*' would have been trisyllabic: Trisyllables are absolutely absent from our Old Turkic and Qarakhanid *-Xş* list.[288] Since Kāšġarī does have *-Xş* lemmata derived from *-Xl-*, *-Ur-* and *-It-* verbs, it seems reasonable to assume that he knew derivates from *-Xş-* bases as well. It is likely that at least some *-Xş* forms with seemingly dominant suffix are in fact such derivates, with the application of the described haplology: *bulgaş* 'civil disorder that befalls a people at the approach of an enemy', *terKäş* 'the press of a crowd preventing movement' and *sarmaş* 'the involvement of one thing in another' and 'the involvement of the members of a tribe with one another in rioting' (all three in DLT fol. 231) definitely have cooperative-reciprocal content and would be examples for such a development. *öçäşçi* (mentioned above, among the *+çI* forms derived from deverbal bases) would not be someone who desires revenge (*öç+ä-*), but 'somebody who participates in a dispute' (*öçä-ş-*). *oynaş* 'a concubine' must then be 'somebody one plays with reciprocally'. *bagdaş* 'sitting cross-legged' could also have such 'mutual' content, thinking of the mutual position of the two legs one versus the other. The existence of **bagdaş-* can be inferred from *bagdaşınu* (q.v. below); notice that the semantic affinity of *bagdaş* is with this latter rather than with *bag+da-*. The fact that the application of *-Xş* to cooperative-reciprocal bases led to the haplological loss of the morph *-Xş-* but not to the loss of its content may have been the main cause for Kāšġarī's view of *-Xş* as basically denoting cooperative-reciprocal content. With the *possible* exception of *öçäşçi* (once in TT IX, from the Pothi book), the late *bagdaş* (once each in UigTot and QB) and the late *oxşaş* (once in ETŞ), the addition of *-Xş* to deverbal bases appears not to have been practised in Old Turkic.

Old Turkic *-Xş* derivates from denominal verbs, on the other hand, are common enough: Cf. *atış* below; *yagış* 'meat sacrifice' comes from *yag+a-* (q.v. below), with which it is associated in all the instances of *yaga-* known to me;[289] cf., however, *boşıl(ı)g yagış turgur-* in Maitr 45 v 4. *yatgış* appears in ShōAv 41 in the form *yatgış+ım+dın*, and in UigTot 1194.[290] Signifying 'lying posture', it probably

288 Notice, incidentally, that '*taşıkış*' could not have existed for this reason; but once *taş+ık-* became *çık-* in Qarakhanid Turkic, the *-Xş* derivate *çıkış* was also created (DLT and frequently in the QB).

289 Instances of *yagış* not mentioned under *yag+a-* below appear in U II 61,4, 65,14 and 66,36, TT VII 25,1 and 25,20, Ht V 7 a 8, BuddhUig II 213 and DLT. As Ligeti explains in *AOH* 27 (1973): 155, the translation 'libation' is unacceptable. Nor is *yagış* to be translated as 'Streuopfer', as done in TT VII 25,20; that is *saç-ıg*, q.v.

290 In both cases the ms. actually has *yadanış*; but that does not look too different from *yadgış* and

comes from **yat-ıg+a-*, which also gave *yatgak* 'bed' and the DLT's *yatgaş-* 'to lie down beside somebody'.[291] *keŋiş* 'advice' must be connected with *keŋ+ä-*, q.v., and not with *keŋ* 'wide', as the meaning shows. *keŋiş* (TT VII 35,5) is the original form of this lexeme, and not *keŋäş*, the Qarakhanid variant. *oyna-*, the base of *oynaş* (DLT ff.) 'a woman who has an illicit lover' (unless that comes from *oyna-ş-* with syncope) is also denominal. *suvsuş* 'a watery drink, a drink made by steeping or scalding with water' is applied to a number of beverages. According to DLT fol. 231, it is 'what remains of beer after its alcoholic strength has gone out', and also 'churned milk that has been watered down'. We find this lexeme in Suv 156,2, 588,8, 590,9 and 606,2, TT VIII I 16, Ht VII 1942, ManMon 52 and 69-71, Heilk II 1,31, Maitr 72 r16 and 177 v21 and 161 r3, BT III 99 and M III 12,8$_2$ (text 6).[292] *suvsuş* is derived from *suv+sı-* 'to become or be like water', attested only in the DLT. In case *suvsuş* in ETŞ 10,141 (*avantlıglarnıŋ suvsuşın kandurup ögirt-*) signifies 'thirst', it comes from *suv+sa-* 'to be thirsty', and is a different lexeme. Perhaps the first word should be emended into an accusative, however, which would restore to *suvsuş* (in the instrumental) its usual meaning: The genitive is at the end of a line, and the two previous ones also end in *°nıŋ*.

Members of this formation are mostly used as abstracts. Less often, they refer to the object of their base verb if this is transitive and even less often to its subject if the verb is intransitive; the same lexemes can cover both the former, abstract, function, and the latter, concrete ones. *kargış* (TuoLuoNi 182, QB 246, 3379, 4915, 5726 and DLT), e.g., signifies both 'a curse' and 'an accursed person'. In a few proper names, *-Xş* nouns would appear to denote, hypothetically, the agents of transitive verbs. I say hypothetically, because proper names *as such* have no meaning, and are not used to denote anything. The DLT has the proper names *Atış*, *Sünüş*, *Tokış* and *Utuş* from *at-* 'to throw, to shoot', *sün-* from a base discussed under *sün-üş-*, *tokı-* 'to hit' and *ut-* 'to win' respectively. The other name of *Kutlug*, the founder of the second *Türk* state, was *El Teriş*; this would be 'The Assembler of the Realm'. This name is attested in the KT, BQ and Toñ inscrs., *passim*. *Eltüzär Khan* from the beginning of the 19th century had a semantically very similar name. Abstract nouns could also have been used as proper names, however, as e.g. *Sävinç*, *Ögrünç*, *Kut* or *Asıg* (pointed out to me by P. Zieme).

There are a few concrete lexemes denoting the agents of intransitive verbs. *yälış* in *bir övgä* (i.e. *ev-gä*?) *yäl(i)ş at* (ZiemeSklav I 4) 'a fast trotting horse' is not quite certain. Another hapax is *ogşaş* in ETŞ 13,81, which appears in a binomial

may in both cases be a copyist's mistake. In Uigur, *-Xş* is never added to *-Xn-* verbs; moreover, the *-Xn-* derivate of *yat-* would normally be '*yatın-*' and not '*yatan-*' in these texts.

291 *arslan yatgışın yatıp . . .* (UigTot 1194) reminds one of *arslan silkinigin silkin-*, q.v. under *silkin-ig* above.

292 *aş suvsuş*, similar to *aş içgü*, *ibid.* 2$_1$.

with *bir tăg* 'as if one and the same', and clearly signifies 'similar'. It is probably simplified from **ogşa-ş-ış*, from the hap. *ogşa-ş-*, q.v. On the other hand, *suvsuş* from *suvsı-* 'to become watery', which was discussed on p. 266, is a rather common subject nominal. *ikiş* 'an unruly, uncontrollable animal' (DLT) is from *ikă-* 'to be obstinate and insolent' (*ibid.*). Cf. also *ikă-ş-* below. *arış* from *arı-* 'to be clean, pure' must also denote the subject, as it is usually used together with *arıg* 'clean, pure'. See the *UW* for many of the exs., and for the meanings of these three lexemes. *arış arıg* also appears in TT VIColoph III and in twelve exs. in BT III. *UW* 192a writes: "Eine . . . von RAHMETI . . . erwogene Möglichkeit (*arış* Var. von → *arvış*) kommt kaum in Betracht, da *arış* nur verstärkend vor *arıg* gebraucht wird (für die beiden isolierten Belege aus BuddhStab und AbhiKārKom s.u.) . . . *arış* in BuddhStab 201 o. 25 [now reappearing as BT XIII 49,77] alter Fehler für → *arıg*? *arış* in AbhiKārKomm 10 Lesefehler (für welches Wort?)." I am unable to see the connection between Rahmeti's suggestion (unacceptable for phonological reasons) and the 'strengthening' use of *arış* before *arıg*: Such sequences are not necessarily *figurae etymologicae*. Moreover, while the AbhiKārKomm instance may be read as *agrıg* (suggestion of P. Zieme) or as *agır nom* (cf. several instances of *agır ig* in *UW* 66b, par. e), there is no need to alter *arış* of the other passage: This same expression (without *arıg*) is now attested also in BT XIII 42,4 and 22; we find *arış mandal* in BT XIII 28,52 and *arış m(a)xayan* in UigKan 331.

A number of *-Xş* forms denote the object of the transitive base verb. *üküş* 'many' must be the earliest and best attested among these, found already in all the major runic inscriptions. In BuddhKat 3 is written as 'U.KUS. This adjective comes from *(h)ük-* 'to heap up'; cf. *ük-ül-* 'to get heaped up' (DLT, QB and later), *ük-(ü)ş-ür-ü* (p. 731), *hük-ün*, *ük-ün-* etc., and *ük-ük* above. The noun *uluş* 'state, city etc.' is according to Tezcan, derived from *ula-* 'to join'. This common lexeme also appears with the Orkhon inscrs. and e.g. in BuddhKat 22 (Tibetan writing, 'U.GLYUS). It evidently denotes what is joined and not the action of joining. The connection of *igdiş* to *igid-* 'to feed, to rear' is certain; so is the fact that it denotes the object of this verb, both human and animal. In UigSteu B2, Zieme translates *yigdiş* (thus) as "Halbbruder", perhaps following DLT fol. 611. As the *EDPT* s.v. *igdiş* makes likely, the DLT passage is much better understood as containing an instance of *ög+dăş*. According to DankKelly, the second hand is responsible for this wrong vocalisation. *igdiş*, on the other hand, signifies 'adopted child' or 'child taken to be reared' when referring to humans[293] as in QB 1554; with reference to animals (QB 5590 and in *igdişçi*, ibid. 4439) it signifies 'animal specially bred' or (perhaps in practice always) 'cross-bred'. *ekiş* 'filings'

293 Perhaps with a status somewhat inferior to a person's own children, as the *evlatlık* in Turkey.

comes from *ekā-* 'to file (a solid object)'; for the voicelessness of the velar cf. *ekäk* 'file (the implement)' in Eastern Turkic. The *EDPT* quotes *égi:ş* (as he spells the noun) as a hapax in the DLT. Laut, 1986: 122 par.d shows it to have stood also in Maitr (BT IX p. 59) in the phrase *çıntan ekişi* 'sandalwood filings' (there spelled as *čintan egiši*). *biliş* is 'an acquaintance' in ĀgFrag (1) E11, TuoLuoNi 157 (with *bōšük*), the DLT and a number of times in the QB; the ex. in TT VIII A 3 is not too clear but *can* also be interpreted this way. The DLT's *bıç-ış* (also found in the QB), *bul-uş* and *uv-uş* all denote the objects of the base verbs. *ülüş* 'part, share' and therefore 'fate' is very common and is no doubt related to *ülā-* 'to share out, distribute'. Some of the exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in BT II 268, in the colophon of Ht IX quoted on p. 11 of Tezcan's edition of Ht X and in Ht X 6, Maitr 55 r4 and 91 r3, ĀgFrag (1) E3 and UigPacht L14-15. *ülüş bitig* 'inheritance document' is discussed in Clark, 1975: 246. *koş* 'a pair' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT and from later Muslim texts. We also find it in BT I B6, Warnke 336, SuvCaitya 32,15 and elsewhere. It can be taken to come from *koş-* 'to join, unite' as simplified by haplology, if not from the hypothetical base of this verb. *arkış* 'envoy' is discussed in the *EDPT* (with inscriptional, Qarakhanid and later exs.) and the *UW* (which cites Uigur material). Additionally, *arkış* appears eleven times in letters in HamTouen. In the n. to HamTouen 5,73 it is suggested that *arkış* comes from "un verbe **arq-* au sens de 'traverser, aller traversalement, faire la navette'." I do not think that the lexemes *arkuk*, *arkun* and *arkuçı*, which Hamilton also mentions, really belong to this base. The *UW* rejects the etymologies of Gabain and of the *EDPT* but does not bring any of its own. It must have been **arka-* 'to send through', the base of *arkaş-* and *arkag* (postulated in the *UW* s.vv. and living on in Çag. as *arġa-*), which also gave *arkış*. The *EDPT*'s 1 *arka-* and 2 *arka-* may possibly represent special uses of this etymon. In KT S8, BQ N6 and U III 29,3 and 11, *arkış* is used in a binomial with *terkiş*. This latter noun must be related to the DLT's *terKäş-* 'to walk in a line', used of camels, warriors etc. The *EDPT* reads this verb with °*g*° so as to connect it with *ter-ig* (q.v.), but notes that the Sanglax has an explicit *k*. Another cognate is *terKāş* in DLT fol. 231, translated 'the press of a crowd preventing movement'. See **terkā-* among the *+A-* verbs, the base of all these. In Ht IV 497, TT VII 17,7 and 25,6 and M III 17,14$_2$ and 19,2$_1$ (both text 8) there is a lexeme which can be read as *tārkiş* or *tārgiş*.[294] It appears together with *yavlak* or *kişini todagan* or *kişi birlā eltişgūçi* or *kūçāg* or *uvu[tsuz]* and could signify 'quarrelsome, bullying, menacing'. This different lexeme is probably not formed with *-Xş*. *tärkiş+län-* (q.v. below) comes from this latter. *tuyuş* in *[taş]urtın bir tavış tuyuş ün āşidilti* (Warnke 23) also denotes the object of the verb from which it is derived, if read

294 As with *teng* in BT V, the first vowel of this lexeme is usually left unwritten.

correctly: This is a hap. and the ms. is lost. The DLT's *koguş*, basically signifying 'a groove', is adequately discussed in the *EDPT*. This must be a hypercorrect spelling of **kovuş*, since we have the derived verb *kov(u)ş+a-*, q.v., wrongly entered in the *EDPT* as '*koğşa-*', and the cognate *kovuk*.

Among the *-Xş* forms used as abstracts, there are many derivates from intr. verbs. Naturally, most of these are verbs of motion. *eniş* (e.g. in Shō II b15, IX a7 and XIV b7, ETŞ 15,91 and several times in the QB) is the 'descent'; *agış* (QB 903, 905, 1087 etc. and DLT) the 'rise' or 'ascent'. In the DLT and perhaps also in QB 2495, *tāg-iş* refers to an exchange of gifts; in KT N 5, however, *sū* [*tā*]*gişi* is a 'melée, the meeting the enemy in battle'. Note that *tāg-iş-* has the corresponding two meanings. *ünüş* 'exit' appears in Suv 244,21, 361,5 and 371,13, BT I D(331), ETŞ 13,91 and 152, 16,39 and 17,11, BT VIII B32 and 192, BuddhStab I 7, Halén J5 and ShōKenkyū III 24. In TT V B68 and 78, *ünüş* has been misread as '*örüş*', corrected in Kudara's reedition. Most of the instances of *ünüş* occur in the phrase *ünüş yol*, referring to the way out of *saṃsāra*. Instead of *ünüş yol*, Suv 244,21, Abhi 1976 and ĀgFrag (1) B340 have the phrase *ünüşlüg* (or better *ünüşlük*) *yol*; the last-cited instance has been misread as '*örüşlüg*'. In ShōAgon A 324, *ünüş kutrulmak küsüş* is 'the wish for salvation'.[295] Like Republican Turkish *çık-*, *ün-* evidently signified both 'to come out' and 'to climb on top of, to rise onto', and it should be difficult to distinguish between the two meanings in all instances. In DLT and QB, 'exit' is *çıkış*; this comes from *çık-*, the (western) contraction of *taş+ık-*. DLT and QB, which do not have *ünüş*, also use *kiriş*, the antonym of these two terms. *kiriş* and *çıkış* also signify 'income' and 'expenditure'. *kāliş* 'a coming' and *barış* 'a going or leaving' appear together in Ht IV 1478, V 293, VII 2089, in the colophon of Ht IX quoted on p. 11 of Tezcan's edition of Ht X, DLT and QB.[296] *yanış* 'return' from *yan-* 'to return, come back' appears in QB 1471 and 6552 and perhaps also in l.2 of an unpublished Yenisei inscr. in Yar Khoto.[297]

tur-, the verb for describing non-motion, gives *turuş*. Used by itself, in UigTot 439 and 443, this noun signifies 'position, configuration'; in TT I 48-49, on the other hand, evidently 'confrontation'. *akruş* 'calm', discussed in *UW* 82-83, is used both as abstract noun and as adjective describing the 'calm person'. The *UW*'s etymology is no doubt correct.

-Xş forms from tr. bases are also often used as action nouns. A proverb in HamTouen 16,15 reads: *agal* (i.e. *agıl*) *iti alış(ı)g bulsa böriliki töz* 'If the sheep-fold dog finds an occasion for grasping, wolfishness (will turn out to be) his (real)

295 In the first edition of this text in Shō XIV b2, the word *ünüş* was misread in a way which fits neither the content nor the grammar.

296 Some of the instances are a calque on a Chinese expression; see the n. to Ht V 293.

297 Material on this inscription from a Finnish expedition of the previous century is kept in Copenhagen.

nature'. *alış* 'a taking' and *beriş* 'a giving' appear together in two Uigur exs. mentioned in the *UW* s.v. *alış*, and in QB 4421, quoted in the *EDPT*. ÖDLT fol. 43 defines *alış beriş* as 'taking and giving what is due' and this may well be the meaning of this expression elsewhere. These instances denote mutual action, and so do a number of *-Xş* forms mostly from the semantic domain of fight and quarrel: *sünüş* 'battle', connected with *sün(g)ü* 'lance' and *sünüş-* (q.v. below) is attested from the inscriptions on; we also find it in Ht IV 1710 and V b 16, beside exs. mentioned in the *EDPT*. *uruş* 'fight' appears in Ht V b 12 and then in the DLT and a number of times in the QB. The instance in Ongin 10 cited by the *EDPT* occurs in a very fragmentary passage and is unreliable. An instance in DLT fol. 10 brings it together with *tokuş*, and the binomial is translated as 'war and strife'. Then there is *kapış* 'plundering' in DLT fol. 185. *sökü̈ş* is attested in DLT fol. 185 and translated as 'cursing, mutual reviling'. The DLT distinguishes between this and *sögüş* ("with the thin *käf*"), which does not belong to the present formation: See *sögl-ün-* below. Neither *sök-* 'to curse, revile' nor *sökü̈ş-*, q.v. below, are attested in runic script. The Uigur exs. are in Uigur script, which does not distinguish between [g] and [k]. The earliest text which does explicitly distinguish these two sounds, the Codex Comanicus, cites the two lexemes with this meaning as *sök-* and *sökü̈ş* respectively. Brockelmann and Dankoff and Kelly transcribe the DLT's velar correctly, but Le Coq, the *EDPT* etc. wrongly write *'sög-'* and *'sö:g-'*. The Oguz group of languages and some other sources do have /g/ in this verb, but the voicedness is a (secondary) reflex of vowel length. There are about 20 instances of *sökü̈ş* 'abuse etc.' in the DLT and one in M I 10,19. As no *-Xş* derivate of short-vowelled *sök-* 'to rip apart' appears to be attested, *sökü̈ş atış kılguçı, sünüşüp tınlıglarıg ölürgüçilär* (Maitr 81 v 10) should probably be read as *sünüş atış*: This same binomial is found also in Suv 475,5, where we have *sünüş atış adası* 'the hazards of battle and shooting', and in Suv 411,11. Cf. DLT fol. 42 *atış* 'shooting at one another'. On the other hand, (short) *sök-* 'to rip apart' is also used as a military term, a use from which *sök-män* (q.v. below) is derived. Notice, further, that *yüntüş-* (q.v. below), derived from a base signifying 'to hit with something sharp', also comes to refer to something like mutual abuse. As mentioned above, *tur-uş* signifies 'position' by itself, but is used in two TT I exs. together with *tötüş* 'quarrel', an itself rather opaque *-Xş* lexeme (cf. *tötüş-*; the vowel of the unattested base is fixed by *tötöşlüg* in Brāhmī, mentioned in this section below). In TT I 195 and TT VII 33,16 and 36,5 we find *tötüş* by itself, but it usually appears in binomials: *sünüş tötüş* (Suv 554,4 *apud UW* 200 b) and *tötüş käriş* (TT I 48, 177 and 180, U II 58,5$_1$, BT XIII 15,61, TT VII 28,5, ATSS IX b r 6 and ZiemeTārā 20 d. In Uigur, *käriş* 'quarrel, fight' appears to occur only together with *tötüş*. It probably comes from *kär-* 'to stretch'. Other *-Xş* forms denoting physical or other violence are *kun-uş* (SuvStockh 72) 'robbery', *sandrış*

'mutual abuse and quarrelling', *çalış* (or *çäliş*??) 'wrestling', *tıdış* 'hindrance' and *itiş* 'two people pushing each other with the hand'; the last four are from the DLT and quote its definitions. *sık-ış* 'constriction, anxiety; constraint' occurs in Suv 586,14, UigSteu B 15, ETŞ 10,117 and DLT and, together with *taŋ-ış*, in U II 73,2₃ and Sitātap 5,3 quoted in *UW* 45 a bottom.

-Xş abstracts from transitive bases do not all have negative content, however. *ävriş*, from *ävir-* 'to turn (tr.)', is 'behaviour' in Suv 152,4 and 525,12, TT VIII C3 (Brāhmī), ETŞ 13,36 (thus against the ed.), Maitr 38 v 17, BT XIII 27,15 and Abhi 1941. I have not found this lexeme in the *EDPT*. *äriş* in ETŞ 9,88 has the same meaning and, although very well connectable with *är-* 'to be', might be a mistake or an error for *ävriş*. The DLT has *üdr-üş* 'a choosing among things', *yarış* 'a division of property between two men' but also 'horse race', and *uk-uş* 'intelligence'. Hochzeit 13 should probably be read as *ärk ukuşlug ärip* 'having power and intelligence' and not as interpreted by the ed. The QB has both *ukışlug* and *ukuşsuz* but, instead of *ukuş*, only (twice, at the end of verses 147 and 148) *ukug*. This may have been created only for the rhyme. *yuluş* 'ransom' is attested only in QB (1113, 1114, 1190, 3027 and 6106), whereas *käçiş* 'a passage' (QB 3665 and 6076) is also found in the DLT. *sakış* 'counting, computation' is very common in Uigur as well; instances not quoted in the *EDPT* appear, among other places, in Suv 589-90 and BT II 206. For base and cognates see *sak-ın-* below. *bögüş* (Maitr 151 v 12, ShōAgon 1,61, Ht VII 2058, ETŞ 11,133 and 12,17) signifies 'to concentrate one's thoughts on something'. The *EDPT* must be right in connecting it with (a metaphorical use of) *bög-* 'to gather together (tr.)'. The expression *bögüş ur-* of the Maitr and ShōAgon 1 instances can be compared to *sakınç ur-* of the fr. T II s21 a v1, quoted in Röhrborn's review of BT V (*CAJ* 24 [1980]: 155). A connection between *bögüş* and *bügü* 'wizard; wisdom', accepted in the n. to ETŞ 11,133 (q.v.), is not easily justified. Beside the documented difference of the first vowels, there is the fact that *bügü* appears to imply 'mystic', which *bögüş* does not; not, e.g., by the context of *bögüş urup sakınur bögünürlär* (ShōAgon). 'magic' is called *arvış* in Old Turkic, from *arva-*. This lexeme denotes both the activity and the means of *arva-*, i.e. the magic formula. It is documented in *UW* 217-8; further exs. appear in USp 103,5 (as pointed out in *UW* s.vv. '*asvık*' and '*ašvık*'), ĀgFrag (1) F8, Bhaiṣ 6 and BT XIII 48,2. *söz]lädi arvış savış ślökü̈g* (ShōAgon 1,214) should also be added to that entry: It appears to contain a binome. *sav-ış* is not mentioned in any of the dictionaries, but may come from *sav-* and signify 'exorcism': The *śloka* in question is pronounced against Rāhu. *sav-* was replaced by *tarkar-* in Uigur, but cf. *sav-ıl-*. Par. B of the *UW* entry for *arvış* quotes *arvış sarvış ot* from Abhi A 87 b 12, which refers to an antidote against some poison. As there does not appear to be any etymology for *sarvış*, it may be an error for *sav-ış*, or possibly the (real) result of assimilation to the phonological shape of *arvış*, its

binomial companion *ıṅ il-iġ* 'bond, bondage' appears in BT I B(22), Warnke 236, MaitrH XVI 15 b7 (biverb with *tutuq*) and Suv 614,19 (none in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*). All four instances use it of a person's subjection to evil.

See the *EDPT* for *küsüg* 'wish, desire'. Exs. not cited there appear in TT I 175, Suv 11,7, 11,20 and 603,12, TT VIII E2, UigFalt 165, Ht V 149, Maitr 47 v7, Warnke 63, Tüg 52, AbitAnk 40,69 and 70, ETŞ 9,8, BuddhStab II 34, BT II 25 and 272 etc. In BT XIII 21,23, in a fragm. quoted in the n. thereto and in TT IX 116 (Manichaean writing)[298] the word is written in the assimilated form *küggüg*. There is *küsüg turgur-*, *küsüg örit-* and *küsüg küsä-*, and also *küsämiş küsüg*. Interestingly, *küsüg* can be qualified by the object of the desire: *burxan kun küsügin* (U III 70,17) is translated as "im Streben nach der Buddhawürde". This comes from the fact the sequence *küsüg örit-* can take the circumstances desired by the subject as direct object: *abita burxan uluşınta . . . tugguluk kut küsüg örüip . . .* (AbitAnk 39) ". . . ein Gelübde leisten, um . . . im Land des . . . wiedergeboren zu werden". *mini . . . körgäli küsüşlärı bolsar . . .* (Suv 534,12) is not very different, in content, from *mini . . . körgäli küsäsärlär . . .* 'if they wish to see me'. *bakış* (DLT and OB 1855) is 'a glance', *körüş* (DLT) 'a looking (without speaking)', *tapış* (DLT) 'mutual trust between two persons', *boluş* (DLT) 'aid in words', *kuçuş* (DLT) 'an embrace', *öpüş* (DLT) 'a kiss', *sikiş* (DLT) 'copulation' and *sävişg* (ChristManus v13; not in the *EDPT*) 'love'.

There are not many verbs derived from *-Xş* nouns. They use the formative *+A-*, which is particularly common with *-Xn* forms but otherwise practically never added to verbal nouns. Here we have *keŋşäş-* from *keŋiş+ä-ş-*, *kävşä-* from **käv-iş+ä-*, *kurça-* and *kurşa-l-* from **kır-(ı)ş+a-* and the DLT's *çaxşa-* < **çak-ış+a-* with Uigur *çaxşaş-*. Notice that the related *-Xş* form is in fact attested only for the first-mentioned of these verbs.

The nominal expanders of *-Xş* are the most common ones: *+lXg* and a few *+sXz*, *+lXk* and *+çI*. The Uigur *-Xş+çI* nouns are all hapax legomena with the exception of *arvışçı*; this is quoted thrice in the *UW* and found also in BT XIII 12,136: *arvışçı otaçı kälürüp . . .* is perhaps better translated as 'he brought spell-binders and doctors' rather than "hast einen zaubermächtigen Arzt gebracht". *-Xş+çI* forms which appear in the OB are rather solidly attested in that text; the DLT, on the other hand, does not cite any exs. for the suffix sequence. See p. 115, among the *+çI* derivates, for the *-XşçI* forms themselves. Exs. for *-XşlXk* are *azk(ı)ya sıkışlıkın* (TT VIII B 6-7) and *yagışlık* (*orun*) 'a sacrificial site' (TT IV

298 In the n. to ÄgFrag (1) F, Kudara and Zieme, quoting the ShöAgon passage, write *savıg* (the accusative of *sav*) instead of *savış*. Zieme (personal communication) now states that Shōgaito's text is correct.

299 As Clark notes in Pothi p. 201, "there are no mistaken writings of *ś* for *s* in the Pothi-book".

A 46, U III 11,13$_2$ and perhaps also 11,12$_1$), which the *EDPT* wants to read with *+lig*. In the TT VIII B case, to be translated as 'with a little anxiety', one would have expected *+lXgXn*, and the text does not distinguish very well between voiced and voiceless consonants. A possible *ün-üş+lük* was mentioned above. *şomuşluk* (fol. 251 in the DLT) is a synonym of *batıglık* 'privy'; but no **şom-uş* is attested.

sakışsız appears in Suv 9,3, ZiemeGuan 41 and 44-45, AvBtava 1, TT VI 431 etc. in a binomial with *sansız*, signifying 'innumerable'; similarly, *sakış* is used together with *san*, also, e.g., in *sanı sakışı (idi) yok* (TT IV A 25 and VI 54 and BT II 225). The other three *-Xş+sXz* forms, *ülüşsüz* (BT VIII B 165 and UigNam 1,3), *küsüşsüz* (Ht VII 10 a 11, ShöAgon 1,89 and 372 and TT VIII A 35) and *busuşsuz* (U III 57,9$_1$, TT X 324, Maitr 72 v 1, Warnke 740, HamTouen 1,25' and ETŞ 10,182), all have positive counterparts with *+lXg*. *ülüşsüz*, used in metaphysical contexts, may signify 'not having any parts' or 'not being a part in anything'; *ülüşlüg*, on the other hand, appears in economical texts: *aka inilär birläki ülüşlüg borluk* (MoriContract 3) is 'the vineyard which (we) have in common with (our) brothers'; *tüz ülüşlüg* (UigRuk III 6 and YamSaleLoan I 4) signifies 'in equal parts', i.e. 'half and half'. *busuşlug* can be found in BT I B (7) and C (10), U III 9,7, BT II 1093, Warnke 20 and 481, M III 35,11 (text 15), ShöAgon 3, p. 203,3 and 13 and Suv 621,2 and 634,2, beside the passages cited in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. *busuşlug* and *busuşsuz* are real opposites, signifying 'sorrowful' and 'free from sorrow' respectively. Except, of course, where the *+lXg* of *busuşlug* is metaphorical: *busuşlug otun örtänü* (Suv 638,14) and *busuşlug otun köymäki* (Suv 640,23) is 'burning with the fire of sorrow' and not '. . . with the sorrowful fire'.

Whereas *küsüşsüz* only signifies 'without desire', *küsüşlüg* has a varied usage. Like *küsüş*, *küsüşlüg* can also govern either nominals or the *-gAlI* form, thus behaving like a participle. *nom küsüşlüg tınlıglar* (T II S 32 a-49 a in the n. to TT V B 90), e.g., are 'creatures with a desire for the doctrine'; *kut* is the object in UigTot 1300 and ETŞ 9,31, the infinitive phrase *munta kutrulmak* 'to free oneself from here' in UigBlock 95, *burxan kutı* the object of *küsüşlüg* in UigOn III C 7. M III 34,13 (text 15) has a strange expression *[b]o kutlug künüg küsüşlüg täginür ärtimiz* "Wir haben diesen Glückstag ehrerbietig herbeigewünscht",[300] *küsüşlüg öŋlüg* (U III and TT X, quoted in the *EDPT*) is a loan translation from Skt. *bir kün içintä mıŋ tümän kata körgäli artok küsüşlüg kulı Alp Kara* (HamTouen 5,64) "(Nous) son esclave Alp Qara . . . qui sommes excessivement désireux de le voir dix mille [should be: millions] fois dans une journée" shows *küsüşlüg* not only

300 *küsüşlüg* appears to have been used as a predicative adjective. The more usual expression would have been *'küsäyü täginür ärtimiz'*. The grammar of Old Turkic verbal politeness is still quite unknown.

governing a gerund in *-gAlI* but also accompanied by adverbial qualification. It is against linguistic common sense that a single *-(X)şlXg* lexeme should have gone the way of *-(X)glXg* and *-(X)mlXg* (discussed in sections 3.119 and 3.322 respectively), interesting as an instance of morpheme genesis. *tug-uşlug*, q.v. below, may show that the 'initiative' of *kūsūşlūg* did not fail to arouse analogy.

The other *-Xş+lXg* adjectives are less common. *tōtūşlūg* (TT VI 65 = TT VIII O 8, and TT I 38) appears to signify 'quarreller'; it is, in the TT VIOda ms. 5, r5, and in Suv 169,1, accompanied by *kārişlig*, as *tōtūş* frequently appears with *kāriş*. *ünüşlüg* 'related to rising or exit' qualifies *nom* 'the doctrine' in BuddhUig II 39; see *ün-ūş* for *ünüşlüg* or *ünüşlük yol*. *turuşlug* in Suv 14,3 is between lacunae. The context of *ilişlig tartışlıg* is fragmentary in both TT III 42 and BT XIII 26,16. Still, the association of the binomial with *adkan-* in the TT III passage proves that it must be connected with the Buddhist notion of 'attachment'.[301] The footn. to BT XIII 26,16 quotes the binomial expression *ilişlārin tartışların üzmiş kāsmiş* 'having severed$_2$ their attachments$_2$' (Suv 690,12-13), as corrected by Zieme. *Jatışlıg* in Schwitz 11 can have had additional characters before what has been read as *a* (see facs.). Nor is the meaning certain: Chin. *wei* "majestätisch" is probably translated by the biverb *çoglug yalınlıg* which follows this word, leaving *Jatışlıg* as translation of a part of Chin. *ru ze* 'moist'. *yagışlıg in yaylagda*[302] *sämrimiş yagışlıg Uygur elimiz* (BT XIII 39,24) is by the editor translated as "unser Uigurisches Reich mit Opfertieren, fett geworden auf der Weide". Similarly *yagışlıg yer* in Maitr 117 r7. The second suffix of *yagışlıg* in Suv 29,8, Maitr 117 r3 and BT VII A 372, on the other hand, is the appositional *+lXg*. See the *UW* for *v(a)çır arvışlıg* (U II 60,4$_2$). *alkışlıg* (ShōKenkyū II 9 = BT XIII 12,35) is not included in the *UW* because the texts appeared after the relevant fascicle. *+lXg* is here added to the whole binome *şap alkış* 'blessing$_2$'; it is attested as such in U II 53,4 and 5 and discussed in the n. to BT XIII 12,35. In the sequence *-(X)ş+lXg*, then, each suffix stays within the limits of its usual tasks. This applies also to *kūsūşlūg*, whose uses, however, serve to stress the special status of *kūsūş*. All bases of *-XşlXg* forms are attested in Old Turkic, with the exception of the hapax *twguşlug*: *keŋ [l]enxuata twguşlug . . . kaŋım* (BT XIII 28,18) 'my father . . . whose birth took place on the wide lotus'. This is found only in one of the two mss. for the passage, the other being damaged here. It appears to be participial, like *kūsūşlūg*.

-Xş fits well into the group of 'ergative' formatives, since its products are either abstracts or accord with the ergative distribution: If concrete, they either denote the object if the verb is tr. or the subject if it is intr. One single proper

301 The Pothi 22 translation ". . . which fasten and drag . . ." is beside the point.
302 See n. 382 in vol. 2 for my interpretation of this word.

name in Orkhon Turkic and a few names cited by Kāšġarī cannot even be said to be exceptions.

3.104 -(X)nç

This suffix mostly forms action nouns. In several cases, -Xnç nominals denote the subject of intr. verbs, and in two titles the indirect object. The formation consists of bisyllabic and of a few monosyllabic lexemes. There do not appear to have been any longer ones.

Bang, 1930: 17 was the first to suggest that the /ç/ in -(X)nç might be from the formative -Xş. This hypothesis is made likely by the fact that a great many -Xnç nominals are semantically connected with verbs ending in °n-, as we shall see. The vowel of -Xş is dominant with respect to final vowels of stems to which it is added, which means that it prevails over such vowels. Dominance does not imply, however, that the vowel is not syncopated after sonants or consonants. In fact, -Xş *is* syncopated after stems ending in °ş-. The suggestion is possible if it is assumed that the suffix vowel was syncopated also after /n/. The phonotactically impossible sequence *°nş# would then have given /nç/: The introduction of a homorganic stop between a nasal and a sibilant is a universally documented phonetic process, /ç/ being, of course, [tš]. Notice, however, that -Xş derivates from monosyllabic verbs ending in /n/ do exist without syncopation: There are quite a number of exs. of *ūn-ūş* and of its part-antonym *en-iş*; *yan-ış* occurs in the QB and perhaps also in an unpublished Yenisei inscr., and *kun-uş* 'robbery' in SuvStockh 72. On the other hand, there also exist -Xnç lexemes related to monosyllabic °n- verbs. This *may* be the case with *unç* in Toñ 24, with the rather common *unçsuz* (discussed below), *if* they come from *u-n-*. Further, the binomial *enç tınç* 'tranquillity' occurs in Suv 438,7 and USp 100,4-5. The second word has the dative suffix in its back-vocalic form in the Suv passage; it is no doubt derived from *tın-* 'to be at rest, to be tranquil', a simplex as far as we know. *tınç* survives to this day in a number of Turkic languages. Warnke 45 reads *ükūş tālim kişilārig korlug kunçlug kılıp* . . . , translated "fügte (ich) vielen Menschen Schaden zu". She connects the second element of the binomial with *kun-*, making **kunç* a possible doublet of the noun *kunuş* cited above. Such forms can perhaps be maintained to be the result of haplology applying to '*tın-ınç*' and '*kun-unç*', as, indeed, we propose below that *kazganç*, say, comes from '*kazgan-ınç*', *sävinç* from '*sävin-inç*' and so forth. Both -(X)nç and -Xş, we thus find, occasionally turn up to be related to one-syllable stems ending in /n/. The absence of -Xş with monosyllabic -(X)n- bases is not surprising: -Xş is very rarely ever added to deverbal bases in Old Turkic proper, and the number of monosyllabic derived °n- verbs is exceedingly small in the first place. *si-n-ok*

'broken; fracture' (section 3.102) is one ex. of a different deverbal nominal formed from such a base.

The situation is quite different with polysyllabic verb stems ending in °*n*-. Nowhere in Old Turkic or in Qarakhanid sources is an *-Xş* form ever associated with such a verb. Other verbal nominals derived from such *-Xn-* verbs are occasionally, though quite rarely, met with. Such are the hapax *silkinig* (BT II 1052), a verbal abstract, and *äymänök* (twice in the QB). *Most* of the polysyllabic *-Xnç* forms we shall meet, on the other hand, are associated with °*n*- verbs. This does look like a complementary distribution between the formatives *-Xş* and *-(X)nç*. The difference emerging here between bisyllabic deverbal nominals and such that would have more than two syllables makes sense phonetically: Long lexemes are much more likely to get a vowel syncopated than short ones. In fact there are no *-Xş* forms of more than two syllables either in Old Turkic or in Qarakhanid. It is important to notice, however, that not *all -Xnç* forms can be shown to come from verbs ending in °*n*-. The most important counter-example is *kılınç* 'deed, act, action', found in the ŞU inscr. and exceedingly common in all types of Uigur texts and Qarakhanid sources. It should be connected with the verb *kıl-* 'to do, to make one thing into another, etc.', and not with *kılın-* 'to grow up; to behave or make as if . . .', perhaps 'to make oneself do something, to do something for oneself'. The modal particle *ärinç* no longer belongs to this formation functionally, but must originally have been an *-Xnç* form. Like the vaguely equivalent *ärki* (q.v. in the section on the formative *-gI*), it comes from *är-* 'to be'. A reflexive derivate of *är-* is not attested; if it did exist, one would not expect it to lead to any use like that of *ärinç*. Another very common *-Xnç* form is *ögrünç*. Most of the exs. for this lexeme come together with *sävinç*, with which it is practically synonymous; both signify 'joy'. A recently published ex. for the common expansion *ögrünçlüg sävinçlig* is found in ShōAgon 3, p. 207, l.15. While *sävinç* comes from the °*n*- verb *sävin-*, *ögrünç* is quite definitely related to *ögir-*. A reflexive derivate of *ögir-* is not attested at all.[303] *sävin-* and *ögir-*, themselves practically synonyms, also often appear together. Some exs. of *ögrünç* not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in Ernte 123 and 125, BT VIII A 119, BT II 1268, TT VIColoph III (proper name), BT XIII 46,35 and 49,30 (both proper names), QaraBalg c10, Ht VII 15 b9, BuddhUig II 136 and 341 and Hochzeit 27. In the case of *ögrünç* one could make parallelism with *sävinç* responsible for the word but, in the former two cases, there is no such explanation.

Let us sum up the hypothesis in the form which seems most viable: One can take it that *-(X)nç* was hypostatised from a syncopation of °*n-Xş*, the °*n*- belong-

303 The *EDPT*'s *ögrün-*, in fact written as '*ögirün-*' by the editor of the text, should have been read as *ögir-*, q.v. below. Cf. also *ögrünçü* in the section dealing with *-(X)nçU*.

ing either to *-(X)n-* or to an unanalysable stem. This happened with bases of more than one syllable, where the vowel of *-Xş had* to be syncopated. Subsequently (but still prehistorically), the use of *-(X)nç* was extended to monosyllables as in *ınç* and *unç*, some of which, like *kıl-*, did not even end in /n/. The /n/ of *kılınç* was justified by the analogy of the *-(X)nç* formation though no longer by etymology. Moreover, *-Xş* went on being applied to monosyllables even when they ended in **n-*, and the extension of *-(X)nç* to such cases remained marginal throughout Old Turkic.

Two *-(X)nç* forms denoting only indirect objects are *ınanç* and *tayanç*: In view of their meanings and uses, it is likely that these two should be connected with *ınan-* and *tayan-* respectively, qq.v. below. *ınanç* is found as title ('minister'? 'counsellor'?) in TT I 188, U III 62,2$_2$ and TT VII 40,52 (these two together with *tayanç*), KP 8,7 and Maitr 7 r6 (these two with *buyruk*), Ht X 104, Suv 17,11, Ht VII 5 b19 (with *tapıgçı*),[304] YE 32,15, HamTouen 1,35 and 59 and so forth. In HamTouen 7,4 and 15,8, PrièreMan A 2, BT II 112, and Pfahl I 5 *Inanç* appears to be a proper name. Two exs. of *tayanç* ('somebody one relies on') have just been mentioned; a further one appears in Warnke 72. An insance in M III 5,4$_3$ (text 1) is in quite fragmentary context. For USp 78 r19, *Tavgaç* has been suggested as proper name instead of Radloff's '*tayanç*'. Whereas *ınanç* has a counterpart *ınançu*,[305] I know of no '*tayançu*'. For the author of the QB, *ınanç* and *tayanç* are lexemes and not just titles or proper names: *muŋumka tayançım* (3773) signifies "the refuge when I am woeful" and refers to God; *ınanç* in 2683 and in the ode, in couplet 6586, signifies 'confidant, trusty (companion)'. More noteworth are the abstract exs. of *ınanç*, in QB 1091 and 1337. *ınanç* is a verbal abstract also in a Manichaean text, in HamTouen 5,21: *ınanç kälürügli* is correctly translated as "(vous) qui apportez la foi". This text not having any characteristics which might be taken to show that it was a late one, this use of *ınanç* (living on to this day in Republican Turkish) must be a matter of dialect. A cognate of *ınan-* also serving as title and proper name is *ınal*, q.v. among the *-(X)l* forms. A lexeme *ödkünç* has been read by T. Tekin (*AOH* XLII (1988): 115-6) in Tes 13 instead of Kljaštornyj's unacceptable interpretation: (a)*nta* (*a*)*d*(ı)*n*, *ödk*(ü)*nç k*(*a*)g(*a*)*n* (*ä*)*rm*(*i*)ş is 'He was a different kagan, a fake one' or 'He was a fake kagan, distinct from him (i.e. from the real one)'. The base is, in Old Turkic, attested as *ötkün-* (discussed below among the *-(X)n-* verbs), but must originally have been **ödkün-*. For intr. *ötkün-* 'to feign' cf. *karga kazka ötkünsä* . . . in the DLT; *ödkünç* must have represented its subject. Concerning Qarakhanid *ötkünç* 'story' we can compare the double use of *ınanç*: The function of *-(X)nç* as action noun formative

304 Passage read correctly by Geng but not by Arlotto.

305 The *EDPT* confuses the two.

came to dominate after the earliest stage: Other uses were eliminated, unless they got petrified in titles.

There are only few other purely concrete *-Xnç* lexemes. The DLT has two near-synonyms: *yörgänç* 'bindweed' and 'curves and bends in the road'; *olınç* (*yol*) 'a road (or anything else) which is winding and not straight', from *olı-n-. kwzünç* 'valuable object, treasure' is attested in U I 6,14 and 7,8, Rāma 26 and M II 8,17. Connecting this with *közün-* does not seem too satisfactory semantically. Its derivation from '*kü-z+ä-*' (attested in modern dialects), as suggested in the n. to Pothi 78, or a relationship with *küsä-*, advocated in the *EDPT*, does not seems too likely either: *-(X)nç* is not a dominant suffix, and the /ä/ would have prevailed. One might posit a causative **kö-z-*, giving a sense like **'something one causes to be guarded' for *kwzünç*. One is reminded of Republican Turkish *gözde* 'dearest, coveted' < Persian-Ottoman *guzīde*. *erinç* 'wretched, miserable' may be connected with *er-ün-*; it is semantically even closer to *erintür-*, q.v. below. Exs. of *erinç* not cited in the *EDPT* occur in YE 29,4 (runic passage quoted under *äsirkä-* below), 19 times in Maitr, Suv 368,23, 610,2 and 612,7, Ht X 115, LautHöllen 84 and 128, TuoLuoNi 142, HamTouen 1,18, BT III 783, ETŞ 7,52 and 7,107, BT V 15,312 and U III 9,5, in the last two written as *yerinç*. A n. to ETŞ 7,52 discusses the lexeme.

A number of abstracts like *ökünç*, *küvänç* and *kertgünç* are used to qualify *köŋül* 'state of mind'. Although being thus in adnominal use, they need nevertheless not be regarded as adjectives in this function; not 'a repenting state of mind' (which would have *ökünç* denoting the agent of *ökün-*!) but 'the state of mind of repentance'.

tarkınç (Toñ 22 and perhaps UigSteu A 10), *kıskınç* (BT II 567; "fear" in the Chin. original. The ms. is lost, and the ed. considers reading *korkunç*.) and *kaṭk(ı)nç* (BuddhUig I 227; the ed. reads this as '*q'dq'c*', translating it as "Gemeinsamkeit") possibly come from *tar-ık-*, **kıs-ık-* and **kat-ık-* respectively. *kıskınç* and *katkınç* are used as abstracts, but *tarkınç* apparently denotes the subject of *tar-ık-*: I suggest translating it as 'prone to dissolution'. The Toñ inscr. has another *-(X)nç* form which is found only there and does not denote the action: "*ol yolun yorısar unç*" *tedim* (l.24) '"If one goes by that way it is possible", I said'. This refers to the indirect object of the verb. The antiquity of these two instances together with the institutionalised status of the lexeme *ınanç* (see above) invites a historical approach, whereby the near-limitation of *-(X)nç* forms to serve as *nomina actionis* came up only gradually. Originally, the products of *-(X)nç* may not have differed from those of the other 'ergative' formatives in their actantial tasks.

In our corpus, most *-(X)nç* derivates are best understood as primarily denoting the action itself. These are practically always associated with verbs ending in /n/.

Thus *yükünç* 'an act of worship' is clearly related to *yükün-*, q.v. among the *-Xn-* verbs, and not to a hypothetical shorter base. Exs. of *yükünç* not cited in the *EDPT* appear, among other places, in BT II 148, 153 and 156, Warnke 90, ZiemeTārā 1d and 23b, NesTex U 321,14, HamTouen 1,44', BT VIII B241, Hazai 1, BT XIII 34,8, ETŞ 9,98, Ht VII 8 a21 and BT VII M17. Note the binomial *yükünç alkış* e.g. in the NesTex ex.; another binomial is *ögdi yükünç* 'stotra' in ETŞ 15,77. *yazınç* 'sin' has been read in TT IV A 11, following one of the two mss. extant for this. The *-ınç* being marked as uncertain, the instance must remain questionable as long as it is a hapax legomenon, in spite of several instances of *yazınçsız*, q.v. in the appropriate section: It may be an error for *yazok*, which is what the other ms. has.[306] *kurınç* 'drought' (U IV D 23) is also attested only once, but that may be because the term could have been limited to real agricultural contexts. The instance is part of an extended metaphor: *közlüg kurınçumuzı sini körmäklig yagmur üzä kanturalım* 'May we quench the drought, i.e. (our) sight, by the rain, i.e. by seeing you.'[307] *umunç* (TT V B 69, Suv 605,1 and 637,7 and a number of times in the QB) might be associated with *umun-* 'to hope for oneself', whereas *um-ug*, q.v., is derived from *um-*. *umunç* is an action noun while *umug* denotes the object of one's hopes. *tägzinç* can only be connected with *tägzin-*, for which no base is attested. Primarily, it appears to have denoted the 'whirling around' itself, but its use in our texts can be summed up under four headings: The 'whirlpool' is in a liquid, as in U III 44,3$_1$, KP XVII 8 and Höllen 54; metaphorically, 'whirling around' in *saṃsāra*, as in Suv 430,8-9; thirdly, 'a manuscript scroll' and hence 'a section of a book', as in HamTouen 1,45' and 2,6, several times in TuoLuoNi, Suv 342,26 and ATSS XII r6. Particularly in the last meaning, *tägzinç* can be considered to represent the *subject* of *tägzin-*. *tägzinçük* 'topknot of hair' and *tägzinçlän-* (q.v. in section 5.6) are derivates of *tägzinç*, and both refer to hair. *täginç* is attested in TT VIII D 16, BT VIII A 27, Maitr 164 r5 and 195 v2 and Suv 610,4. In BT VIII it signifies 'attainment'; this should come directly from *täg-*. The last ex. has it in a binomial with *og*. *og*, discussed in connection with *og+ad-*, signifies 'free time'; in that context and the two Maitr instances, *täginç* may have been something like 'an experience' or possibly 'an occasion'. In TT VIII D 16, it should mean 'a short while'.[308] This could be connected vaguely both with *täg-* 'to reach' and *tägin-* 'to experience', but the latter appears to me to be more satisfactory.

sezinç is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but appears in M III 12,12$_3$

306 *'yalnınç'* in MaitrGeng 2 b18 is a mistake for *yalavaç*, q.v. in the *EDPT*.

307 The pivot of the metaphor is the verb, which means 'to 'satiate' in general, but also specifically 'to quench a person's thirst'. The metaphor vividly expresses the intensity and urgency of the yearning.

308 Taking it to translate *kṣaṇa*, as it fits the other elements of the Skt. source even less.

(text 6) and in two other Manichaean texts: BT V 13,247-8 and 19,418. The first-mentioned ex. signifies 'doubt', like the much more common *sezik*, and is used as object of *ay(i)-*, like that form.[309] The other two exs., however, are used together with *korkunç*, and signify 'apprehension' or 'suspicion'; cf. the meaning of *sezinç* below. The three exs. of *sezinçsiz* (BT V 13,262 and 14,271 and M III 24,11$_2$ (text 9)) are also Manichaean. On the other hand, there is only one Manichaean instance of *sezik* vs. at least 20 Buddhist ones. The situation is similar with *sezinçsiz* vs. *seziksiz*. *sezinç* must therefore have belonged to a 'Manichaean' dialect.

sävinç, usually meaning 'joy', is one of the cases for which the connection with the *-Xn-* base is most evident: *sävin-* signifies 'to rejoice' but *säv-* 'to love'. Some of the instances of *sävinç* which appeared recently are found in Hochzeit 27, Ernte 13 and 124, Ht V 13 b 15 and MaitrGeng 9 a 24. In TT I 13, 52 and 130, TT II A 83, TT III 17, HtPek 48 v 3-5 and U IV D 38, 52 and 57, *sävinç* signifies not 'joy' but 'gratitude'; in this sense it appears together with *utıı. sävinç ötün-* (HtPar 56 r 2) is 'to express gratitude'. *sävinçsiz* 'ungrateful' (Suv 613,13 and KP A r 9) is derived from *sävinç* only in this particular meaning. *This sävinç* cannot be connected with *sävin-* except in a wider sense derivable from *säv-*. The following sentence comes even closer to denoting 'love': *siz sävinç bilmäz siz* (KPZieme 19) is said to translate a Chin. sentence rendered in French as 'Vous n'avez pas confiance en moi". The other exs., many of them in the *EDPT*, should be reconsidered with this sentence in view. Proper names like *Sävinç Kaya* (ms. Pelliot Ouigour 203 v 2 and 9) can have been given with either meaning in mind. Adding *ögrünç* (q.v. above) to *sävinç* may therefore not have been just for expressive purposes, but also to make clear which meaning of *sävinç* was intended.

sakınç 'thought' is connected with *sakın-* 'to think' and appears, among many other places, in ATSS IV r 1 and Warnke 247. *dyan sakınç* in BuddhKat 17, 34, 35, 40 and 43 is equivalent to the Buddhist term *dhyāna*. In U III 75,10$_2$ *sakınç* governs a gerund in *-gAlI: kunçuylarka yarangalı sakınçın . . . bitig bititsär . . .* 'If he has letters written with the intention of pleasing the women, . . .'.

kolunç seems to govern the noun *kut* in Suv 29,17 and 15 times in ETŞ. That is only apparent, however, as the bracketing in fact is (*kut kol*)*unç*.[310] Note, however, that it is not self-evident that one should be able to add a deverbal formative

309 *aytılar* is probably a simplification of *ayttılar* as the same text also has *konaka* instead of *konak+ka* and *tıtsılār* instead of *tıtsılār*. *sezik ayt-* is quite common.

310 Exs. of *kut kol-* and *kut kolun-* are listed in the *DTS* s.v. *kut*, and are attested since the IrqB. In M II 13,12 the sequence even has an object, in the phrase *ölüm kut kolupan* 'asking for the favour of death'. Both this phrase and the expansion of *kut kol-* by the formative *-Xnç* are evidence for the fact that *kut* is incorporated into the verb. The M II instance is remarkable even as an incorporation; in many incorporating languages, the incorporated noun blocks the slot which it occupies for any additional nominals. See also (*kut kol*)*-un-* under *kol-un-*.

to a verb + object sequence. NesTex T II B 28 (U 4910) 2 has an instance of *kolunç* in parallelism with *ötüg*.

korkınç 'fear' usually has an /ı/ in the second syllable, which we also *usually* find in the cognates *korkız-*, *korkıt-*, *korkın-* and *korklık*,[311] and in the derivates *korkınçlıg* and *korkınçsız*. This is evidence for an original unrounded vowel before the velar, which was syncopated apparently after our earliest texts.[312] In addition to what we find in the *EDPT*, we have *korkınçsız* also in BuyKäl 19 and Suv 359,3 (quoted in *UW* 252 a), *korkınç* also in MaitrH, in the title of the 12th chapter. The exs. with /u/ in the second syllable are less numerous: They are *korkunç* in BT V 13 (247) and 19 (418), *korkunç* in U IV A 73 and LautHöllen 140 and *korkunçsuz* *ibid.* 80 (all three from the same work, and checked in the facs.), *korkunçsuz* in Chuast 253 and Kuan 52 and *korkunçlug* in Kuan 43. In the Maitr mss. the variants with W and Y alternate, but the latter are more common. See *kork-* on p. 646 for the question of how to read *K'WR'K'NÇINĠ yok* in IrqB XXXVI. Cf. also *korkun-* in section 7.2. The rarity of *korkun-*/*korkın-* might speak for a direct connection of *korkınç* with *kork-*.

kazganç 'gains, earning', on the other hand, is to be connected with *kazgan-*, for which there is no base in sight. This common lexeme denotes both the abstract, the earning of money and goods, and the resulting object, the sum or entity earned.

ötünç in *ötüntük ötünçümün*[313] *eşidü berti* (Toñ 15) has its base adjacent to it; see *ötün-* among the *-Xn-* verbs: The meanings of *öt-* are quite different from those of these two lexemes. The DLT's *ötünç* 'loan' must also be derived from *ötün-*, whose primary meaning was 'to request something'; 'to address a superior', another common sense of the verb, is the result of a metaphorical widening of this meaning. It is unlikely that the DLT's lexeme should be read as '*ötänç*', as suggested in the *EDPT*, as the form with a rounded second vowel is found in a number of modern languages and Middle Turkic sources, Clauson's suggestion, on the other hand, nowhere.[314]

The *EDPT* cites *ökünç* 'repentance, regrets for one's deeds' only from Yenisei

311 'meek, faint hearted; fearful'. Attested in TT VII 20,13 and Heilk I 103; mss. T II S 19 b (Mz 652), T II Y 59 quoted in the Anhang to Le Coq's Chuast and K 40 l.3 in the n. to BT V 104; QB 1986 and 2292. In DLT fol. 625, the second hand changed *korklık* to *korkluk*.

312 The stem did *not* have the form '*korkı-*', as the aorist form of this verb ends in °*kur* even in the Toñ inscr., and as a stem-final /ı/ would not have dropped after a rounded vowel in the previous syllable. (The aorist suffix retains final vowels elided in other morphological contexts.) The original stem is less likely to have been *korak-* than *korık-*; see *kork-* among the *-(X)k-* verbs for further details. *korkunç* is the result of analogy, after the syncopation had been 'forgotten'.

313 Etymological figure similar to the common *sakınç sakın-*.

314 *ödeniş*, which the *EDPT* cites from Âzerī, belongs to the *-Xş* formation. The DLT has twice *ötünç* with explicit rounded vowel written by the first hand in fol. 637 whereas, in fol. 78, the word

and Qarakhanid sources; the *DTS* only has QB instances. We find it also in YE *68,18*. Uigur exs. appear in Suv 10,23, ten times in Maitr, Genzan B r1 (*seziklä-rin ökünçlärin [ï]arkar-*) and ShōKenkyū II 20. 'to repent' is *ökün-*, any further etymology being questionable. Cf. also *ökünçlüg* in Maitr 118 r16.

küvänç 'pride, haughtiness' is another abstract connected with an °*n*- verb: The common base of *küvän-* and *küvāz*, q.v. among the -(*X*)z lexemes, is not attested. *küvänç* appears together with *yokay*, a synonym, in BT II 333, Warnke 401 and BT VII A 705. Further exs. include Maitr 4 r27, 59 v17, 106 v6 and 217 r13, ShōAgon 1, 197 and 199, BT III 995, MaitrGeng 9 a24 and, in BuddhKat 39, *küvänç köŋül*, spelled GU.BAN.

körünç appears to have signified 'an appearance, a display' and perhaps 'a pageant'. This meaning seems to follow from exs. in Maitr 104 r9, 27 r11 and 133 v2 and from those of the derivates *körünçlä-* and *körünçlük*. In BT XIII 13,17, *körünç* is followed by a lacuna. *vid körünç* (SuvCaitya 31,15 and Ht VII 1831) is a 'wonder'; *eliglär xanlarnı körünç üdlärkä tägi küzädgil* (BT XIII 29,10) 'Protect the rulers$_2$ till (the coming of) ages of wonder'(?).

kertgünç 'faith', is another verb lacking a straightforward *kertgün-*, the base of *kertgünç*, although evidently related to *kertü*; it is discussed among the -(*X*)*n*- analysis, verbs below. Recent exs. of *kertgünç* include ShōI a3-4, ShōAgon 2, p. 190,4, TuoLuoNi 149, Warnke 115 and UigSukh 38, the last-mentioned written *kwrtgünç*. We find *kertgünç* in TT VIII O2 but *kertgönçlög* in A 33.

kiKinç usually appears in the phrase *kiKinç ber-* 'to answer' (additonal exs.: TuoLuoNi 228 and BT I B42) but e.g. in Yosıpas 9 as *kïKinç k(ä)lür-* 'to supply an answer'. It is well attested; see the *EDPT*. One possible cognate of this is *kikşür-*, q.v. among the -(*U*)*r*- verbs for further explanations.

iy(ï)nç appears together with *basınç* in TT II A 6 and 15, as *iy-* appears with *bas-* and *ïyïn-* (q.v. in section 7.2) with *basın-*. Therefore, M III 37,14$_2$ (text 18) has to be read as *[iy]lınç basınç* and not otherwise. The binomial signifies 'oppression', as in BuddhKat 42: *mün kadag üzä köŋli täprämäz, basınç i(y)ınç (BAS.SIN 'IN) kötürür* 'His heart is not moved by sin$_2$ (and, on the other hand), he bears oppression$_2$'.[315] *basınç* alone can be found in Maitr 2 r4 and several times in the QB.

appears twice with no vowel mark on the /t/. The evidence of the fol. 637 is not wholly conclusive by itself, because Kāšġarī there (and only there) mentions it as an Oguz lexeme.

315 Maue and Röhrborn hesitatingly took *'IN* to be *enç* with their translation as "friedvoll", but that would have been written with a different vowel (as also in Brāhmī script). Besides, the context of the binomial here is quite similar to other instances, especially *ükü*ş *ï[ür]lüg [iy]ınç basınç k[ör]ürdi* in M III 37,14$_2$. The (later published) *n.* to the passage considers *ıyınç* (thus!) a possibility, *enç* being marked as "fraglich" for this passage in the glossary. Moriyasu was unable to interpret the whole passage and misinterpreted also the adjacent words.

busanç 'grief', a hapax in IrqB LII, is clearly related to *busan-*, an *-(X)n-* verb.

alınç is discussed in the *UW*; instances from BuddhUig II 17 and 37 should be added to the entry. It always appears together with *bulunç*, the binomial signifying 'gain, acquisition'. In *bulunç alınçıg küsäyü* . . . (BuddhUig II 37) we find that the pair has an accusative suffix in common, and in TT VIII A 3 the formative *+lXg* is added to the binomial as a whole. The passage in Maitr 227 r3 = BT IX 264,3$_1$ can therefore be completed as *toyınlarnaŋ* [*bulunç*] *alınçıŋa ayagıŋa çilt*[*äginä*] *nomıŋa törüsiŋä künilär*[*ü* or as . . . [*bulunçıŋa*] . . . . *bulunç* does appear without *alınç*, e.g. in TT VIII E 9 and 10, M III 11,14$_2$ (text 6), HamTouen 5,41 and 43 and 6,13, Maitr 89 v 17 and Ht VII 10 b 3, in roughly the same meaning.

The verbs *ayın-* and *ayman-* (qq.v. among the *-Xn-* verbs) alternate with front-vocalic forms, *äyin-* and *äymän-*: Both are attested both with front and back vowel suffixes using front and back /g/, /k/. There are at least two certain instances of *äyinç* with front-vocalic suffix: *korkınç äyinçkä korkıp* . . . (UigTot 108); *alko kamag korkınçıg 'äyinçig ketär-* (TuoLuoNi 8). An early text, however, has back vowels: We find *korkınç ayınçka tägmiş* in Maitr 171 v 6-7 and *korkınç ayınçl*(*ı*)*g ädgü töz yıltız* in 4 r 18. Other instances of *AyInç*, in Maitr 5 r 1 and 178 r 15, U IV A 73, ShōAgon 1,47 and 176, U II 39,94, U III 57,1$_1$, Tiš 18 a 2 and Suv 609,8, also appear in binomials with *korkınç*. Opposed to *äymänçsiz* (TT VIII A 48, Brāhmī writing) and *ärtiŋü äymänçlig* (Ht VII 3 b 10) we have *aymançıg* (from the *-(X)nçIg* formation treated below) in Suv 614,5: *igig agrıgıg korkınçıg aymançıg barçanı ıtmış ıdalamış bolur män* 'I shall have gotten rid of illness and disease and everything frightful and shameful'.[316] Here, again, the relationship is with °*n-* verbs which have no bases in sight.

tüpKärinç tuyayın çınju töz[*in* in BT XIII 22,14 is translated as "Gründlich will ich erkennen die Tathatā-Wurzel". Such a derivate of *tüp+Kär-* 'to fathom, get at the roots of a matter' is not attested anywhere else. The editor takes it to have been used adverbially, like *ärinç*. What makes this odd is not so much this side of the matter,[317] as the fact that such a derivate would be taken to denote the subject and not the object of a transitive verb; this does not happen with *-(X)nç* forms. Nor would a trisyllabic *-(X)nç* form be usual among dozens of mono- and bisyllabic ones. The scribe may have wrongly copied '*tüpKärip*';[318] cf. *tüpKärü tuymış* in ETŞ 10,171. A weaker explanation would be to consider it a back-formation from (unattested!) '*tüpKärinçsiz*'.

316 *korkınçıg* and *aymançıg* look like nouns in the accusative case, like *igig* and *agrıgıg* just preceding them; it seems more appropriate to the sense, however, to make them adjectives qualifying *barça*. '*AymAnç*' itself does not appear to be attested as yet.

317 *ärinç* is a much likelier candidate for a special use, as it comes from the copula, a 'special' verb; note that the specialisation of *ärinç* was a *fait accompli* already in our earliest texts.

318 The letters °*nç* are well visible on the facsimile.

The *-(X)nç* formation being adequately documented in Old Turkic, we can dispense with the forms attested only in Qarakhanid Turkic, of which there are also quite a number.

The only verbal derivates of *-(X)nç* forms are *körünçlä-*, *sävinçlän-* and *tägzinç-län-* (the last two attested only once each), and *erinçkä-* (discussed in section 5.2). Nominal derivates from *-(X)nç*, on the other hand, are numerous. They include one probable instance of *-(X)nçlXk* (in BT III 949), many exs. of *-(X)nçlXg* and among the *+Aŋ* forms (section 2.95), while *-(X)nçlg* and *-(X)nçsXz* are described below. Three *+çAk* derivates from *-(X)nç* forms are mentioned in section 2.12. Although *+çAk* generally forms diminutives, none of these lexemes has diminutive content. Two among them are hap. legomena in the DLT, however; they can not, therefore, be dealt with as if they were a group.

-(X)nçsXz and, further, *-(X)nçlg* and *-(X)nçAŋ*. *-(X)nçAŋ* was discussed above

-(X)nç+lXg is mere sequence of suffixes, where *+lXg* has its usual tasks. The *-(X)nç* bases of most *-XnçlXg* forms are attested, which cannot be said for *-XnçsXz*, for instance. We shall mention a few hapax legomena ending in *-(X)nç+lXg*, for which no corresponding *-(X)nç* forms have appeared. The relevant form in *üç ärdinikä kertgünçlüg*, *burxan şazınıŋa tutınçl(ı)g* (thus?) *buyan algalı küsüşlüg . . . tınlıglar* (Weih 8) is translated by Tekin as "zur Lehre Buddha's (sic) verbunden waren". He must be deriving it from *tut-*; cf. the meaning of *tutum* below and *igid nomug törüg tut-* in Chuast 128-9. While no connection with an *-Xn-* verb can be shown to have existed in the previous case, such a connection imposes itself with *tartınçlıg kaŋımka yükünür m(ä)n* (ETŞ 10,119). This should be rendered as 'I bow before my tenderly loved father', and not as translated by the editor. *tartın-*, q.v., denotes love one feels towards close relatives, whereas *tart-* has meanings unconnectable with our context, as 'to pull, to drag, to draw', later 'to subtract' and 'to weigh'. In *toyın ş(a)mnançlarka köŋülin yerintürdäçilär*, *yerinçlig karınçlıg kılıtaçılar* (Maitr 81 v18), both *-XnçlXg* forms are hapax legomena. The base of *yerinçlig* is a variant of *erinç* 'wretched' and is clear also because of the adjacent *yerintür-*, but *karınçlıg* is difficult. It probably comes from *kar-* which served as base for *karış-* and in a meaning related to the hostile uses to which that derivate is put. WarnkeFragm 116 has the following passage: *säkiz türlüg tägingçsiz o[ru]nlardın öŋi üdrülüp [säkiz türlüg] tägingçlig buyanlıg tugumlarıg täginip . . . tägingçlig* does not appear in the Chin. original and has been created by the Uigur translator as an opposition to the common *täg-inçsiz*; see that in the section devoted to *-(X)nçsXz* adjectives. *äymänçlig* and *äymänçsiz* have just been mentioned. *kunçlug*, from an underived *°n-* base, was also discussed above. *yegädinçlig kut buyan* 'blessing and good deeds leading to triumph' is quoted in the *DTS* from Suv 453,18. *'yegädinç'* is not attested, nor can *yegädinçlig* have been created under the influence of *yegädinçsiz*: The latter qualifies the

indirect object of *yeg+äd-* as kernel, whereas the former, at least in the present instance, has a kernel described as being characterised by the abstract of this verb.

I don't believe that an *-(X)nçlXg* form could have verbal government. Therefore, in the following sentence, *sizin[ä]* is either governed by *käl-*, or it belongs to the previous (fragmentary) sentence: *sizin[ä] umunçl[ug] ayıg ırak yol[ta] ämgänü kälmiş m(ä)n* (Maitr 11 r1-3) 'I have come to you (?) toiling on the bad and long road of hope' or, if we read *umunçlugın*, 'in hope'.

Disregarding '*tüpKärinç*' of BT XIII, we find that *-(X)nç* wholly accords with being an 'ergative' formative.

The present formation has a semantic characteristic distinguishing it from all the other formations in this chapter. In the task schemes associated with *-(X)nç* lexemes, the agents are always human. The only exception for Old Turkic appears to be *tägzinç*: Anything which whirls around or rolls up (*tägzin-*), from liquids and paper to *saṃsära*, can (in principle) be referred to by this lexeme. The DLT has a few other entries aberrant in this respect. All other *-(X)nç* forms have their specific meanings such that the agents of their base verbs are human. Many of them relate to feelings or mental activities: *enç*, *tınç*, *ögrünç*, *sävinç*, *umunç*, *kertgünç*, *küvänç*, *ökünç*, *äyinç*, *äymänç*, *sezinç*, *korkunç*, *sakınç*, *busanç* and *erinç*. Human activity in general is associated with *kılınç*, sinful in *yazınç*, verbal in *kolunç*, *ötünç* and *kiKinç*, gainful in *kazganç*, *alınç* and *bulunç*, oppressive in *basınç* and *iyinç*, worshipful in *yükünç*. The possibilities envisioned by using *unç* and *ärinç* are also human. The meanings of *ınanç* and *tayanç* presuppose human reliance, while *körünç* is connected with human viewing and discerning (and not with the faculty of vision in general).

The fact that so many *-(X)nç* verbs have medial-reflexive bases has something to do with this (near-)constraint on the formation: Human activity is typically self-conscious; self oriented human action is more likely to be classified as such by empathetic speakers than non-human action.

This is one matter in which *-(X)nç* differs from *-(X)nçU*, the formative discussed next.

3.105 *-(X)nçU*

-(X)nçU and *-(X)nç* were distinct formatives, although contaminations and neutralisation of the opposition between them clearly took place already in early times. While *-(X)nç* forms are usually associated with verb stems ending in /n/ and may come from the *-Xş* formation, such connections can hardly be detected with *-(X)nçU*. *-(X)nçU* is not a phonetic or morphophonemic alternant of *-(X)nç*, as has often been assumed, except in one and perhaps in two cases. It

might, for all we know, have a quite different origin, e.g. be from -(*X*)*n* with the denominal suffix *+çU* discussed in section 2.72.

Seemingly free alternation of an -(*X*)*nç* form with an -(*X*)*nçU* form occurs in the case of *ögrünç* and *ögrünçü*, which both signify 'joy'. Some exs. of *ögrünçü* ~ *ögrinçü* not mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* occur in BT V 9,149 and 13,242, BT I B(113), MaitrGeng 17 a30, DreiPrinz 101, MaitrH X 5 b3-4, HamTouen 5,28 and 68 and 6,2 and several times in Maitr (with *sävinç*, with *mäṇi*). *Badarıka ol savlarag ögrünçü eştür-* (Maitr 19 r19) reminds one of the formation of Greek *eu+angĕlion*. The same phrase occurs in the three HamTouen exs., BT V 11,204 and DreiPrinz 74 and 87, all Manichaean. Worth noting is YOG.RUN.CU in Tibetan writing (TibStud). I believe that *ögrünç* may have been shortened from *ögrünçü* under the analogical influence of its synonym *sävinç*, with which it usually appears in a binomial. *ögrünç* is a bit unusual as an -(*X*)*nç* form in that *ögir-*, its base, does not end in /n/; an -(*X*)*n*- derivate of *ögir-* apparently never existed, nor was there ever a semantic need for it, as *ögir-* is intransitive. Manichaean texts, which are, in a number of ways, more archaic than many Buddhist texts, have only *ögrünçü* or the descriptively older *ögrinçü*[319] but not *ögrünç*. They do have *ögrünçlüg* beside *ögrünçülüg*, *ögrinçlig* etc., and here is the third point: -(*X*)*nç* tends to replace -(*X*)*nçU* under adjectival expansion, as we see in *alkınçsız* connected with *alkınçu*, in *kanınçsız* related to the hapax *kanınçu* and in *yarlıkançsız* connected with *yarlıkançu+çı*, all three discussed among the -(*X*)*nçsXz* forms. The hapax *bulunçusuz* may be the original form of the more common *bulunçsuz*, the near-hapax *alkınçusuz* of the common *alkınçsız*, although these particular exs. of *bulunçusuz* and *alkınçusuz* as attested may have been re-generated by analogy. In general, -(*X*)*nçU+sXz*, which is not attested with any other base, may have come to coincide with -(*X*)*nçsXz*. *ögrünç*, then, may also have been back-formed from *ögrünçlüg*, a shortened variant of *ögrünçülüg*, and all this under parallelism with *sävinç(lig)*.

The -(*X*)*nçU* ~ -(*X*)*nç* alternation in the unexpanded verbal noun is practically limited to the base *ögir-*; the only other candidates for such behaviour are *ınanç* and *ınançu*. Here we are on the slippery ground of titles and proper names of high officials. There does not seem to be much doubt that both are related with *ınan-* 'to believe, trust', and that they denote the object of the ruler's trust. Most instances of *ınanç* are titles, while most instances of *ınançu* are proper names, which speaks for the greater antiquity of the latter: Proper names are often more archaic and are often skipped by particular changes in the language. *ınançu* can be found in KT N 13 and W 2, in Turfan W 6 and 7, in YE 24,5, YE 26,1 (apparently wrong

319 The /i/ is a fourfold-harmony reflex of the second vowel of *ögir-* before it gets syncopated. *ögür-* in SP 39 is pretty isolated and should be compared to *toyun* 'monk' in that text.

in Vasil'ev, 1983: 24 but correct in the earlier editions) and YE 68,3. A certain *Inançu Bilgä Türük* is mentioned in Müller, 1912 (nr. 174 in the *UW* bibliography), reminding us of *Inanç Türük* in PrièreMan. The only late instance of *Inançu* is as the name of a grandfather who appears several times in FamArch (quoted in the *UW* s.v. *apa*). There is no *ınançu* in any Buddhist text; most of the numerous instances of *ınanç*, on the other hand, appear in Buddhist texts, with the Manichaean PrièreMan contributing four *Inanç* as proper names. The replacement of *ınançu* by *ınanç* is not a phonetic shortening, presumably, as *-(X)nçU* forms are not generally shortened. Rather, *ınançu*, like *ınal*, has the obsolete **ına-* as base, while *ınanç* must have been created from *ınan-* later: It was stated above that *-(X)nç* forms are usually related to *°n-* verbs. Cf. also *TMEN* 669 and the Chin. transcription in the n. to PrièreMan, A, l.2. '*inänç*' of the Khutuk Ula inscr. (*JA* 1975: 174) is a ghost: The name appearing there is best read as *At Yegän çor*, there considered in n. 9: A°N.Pr. *At* is quoted in *UW* 253 b, and could also come from *at* 'luck' (*UW* 252 a).

-(X)nçU and *-(X)nç* forms are etymologically related in three other cases; in these three cases, however, the two forms are independent both historically and semantically. The abstract *avınç* is attested in the DLT and at least 18 times in the QB. Most of the QB exs. have it in rhyme and parallelism with *sävinç* or *küvänç* or both, and as something rather positive. In couplets 3629 and 6533, where it is used by itself, it signifies 'pleasure-seeking' and has a negative connotation.[320] The DLT takes the word positively, translating it with the abstract 'friendliness'. *avınçu*, on the other hand, is very concrete: The DLT defines it as 'something with which one enjoys pleasure and familiarity, hence slavegirl-concubine'. This is the sense in which the lexeme is used also in QB 1427 and IrqB XXXVIII, which makes *avınçu* an indirect object of the verb. *yörgänç* and *yörgänçü* are both attested only in the DLT, discussed in the *EDPT*: While the first denotes 'bindweed', i.e. the subject of intr. *yörgä-n-*, the second is a 'bandage', the direct object or instrument of tr. *yörgä-*. *erinç* 'wretched' and *erinçü* 'sin' also look as if they were connected, but have very different content. While *erinç*, q.v. above, comes from *er-in-*, *erinçü* may be explained directly from *(y)er-*, taking one of the original meanings of this verb to be 'to find something loathsome'. *er-in-* (and, because of it, also *erinç*) moved away semantically from *(y)er-*. *erinçü* (very frequently used in a binomial with *tsuy*) is an object nominal, then, originally signifying 'something loathsome, a thing to be condemned'. The alternation *yer- ~ er-* is matched by *yerinçülüg ~ erinçülüg* (q.v. below in this section). Exs. for it can be found in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. The similarity in content between *tsuy*, *erinçü*

320 *avınçı sakınç ol* in QB 3629 might be emended to read *sakınçı avınç ol*, taking Dankoff's translation to be correct.

and *yazok* is discussed by Bang in *Muséon* 36: 227, with examples. Further exs. are found in Warnke 536, Maitr 79 r5 and v3 and 11 and fr. T III β r20 (all in one passage edited in Laut, 1986: 202-3), ETŞ 13,140 and DhāSū 23 together with *tuy*, and also in Maitr 5 r9, 74 v8-9 and 173 a329 v4.

In view of the specialisation of *-(X)nçU* forms in these three cases, it seems questionable to try to understand the obscure hapax *tāginçülä-*, q.v. among the *+LA-* verbs, through *tāginç*, discussed in section 3.105.

An important difference between *-(X)nç* and *-(X)nçU* is the fact that *-(X)nç* is associated with simple and with reflexive verbs, whereas *-(X)nçU* can be added to passive stems as well: Beside *käslinçü* 'lizard' in the DLT and in modern Turki, we have *üzlünçü* 'end' from *üz-ül-* 'to be cut, to cease, come to an end'. Curiously enough, *üz-* and *käs-* are practically synonymous. Nothing much appears to happen to a lizard if its tail is cut. *käsilgü* (ms. Mz 121 = T III 84-63 v1, Ehlers 199), the Uigur name of the 'lizard', comes from the same base; see the *EDPT* for later synonym-cognates. *üzlünçü*, on the other hand, has a solid attestation in Uigur: Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* appear in BT I D (171) and (190), ShōAgon 1,158 and 2, p. 190,9, BT II 943, Ht V 154 and 12 b14-15, BT VIII B25, BT III 406, Suv 366,22 and 377,11, Shō III a2 and X b3, BT XIII 47,22 and 26, ETŞ 10,107 and 251 and 25,10 and 14 and ms. T II Y58 (MZ 713) l.23 (in the n. to UigSteu B8).

alkınçu, another rather common *-(X)nçU* form with a meaning close to *üzlünçü*, is documented in the *UW*; further exs. appear in ShōAgon 2, p. 193,2$_2$ and UigSukh 65. Cf. *alkınçsız* in section 3.12 and *alkınçusuz* at the end of this section. *alkınçu* 'end' appears to be an action noun. *ilinçü* 'game, recreation' is another action noun or abstract, from *il-* 'to catch on'. Exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* can be found in BT I B (112), BT II 353, Suv 608,8, 630,1 and 632,16, Shō IX b4 and BuddhUig II 117, a number of them together with *mäŋi*. Among the *-(X)nçU* lexemes there are fewer abstracts than among the *-(X)nç* nouns.

kalınçu 'remaining, residue, rest; refuse' is from *kal-* 'to remain'. We find it in BT I B (137), ĀgFrag (1) B5 and Ht V 10 a13, b2 and 9 and 12 a21, VII 14 b9 and HtPar 188,20 *apud UW* 175 b, in addition to what is quoted in the *EDPT*. This is the only *-(X)nçU* form representing the subject of an intr. verb, and cf. *üzlünçü* and *käslinçü* above. '*kanınçu*' appears in HamTouen 23,10, there translated as "satisfaction". Zieme (*OLZ* 84(1989): 65) plausibly suggests reading the sentence as *kanınçuda* or *karınçuda kazganmış tavar ol* instead of '*kan kanmış*' of the editor. Zieme thinks the first word may be a place name, which would make the sentence signify 'merchandise bought in *Kanınçu*'. Another possibility would be to take *karınçu* to be an error for *kalınçu* (L hook forgotten as often elsewhere).

Objects of tr. verbs, on the other hand, are solidly attested with this formation, unlike *-(X)nç*. The DLT has *at-ınçu näŋ* and *it-inçü näŋ* 'a thing which is thrown

away / pushed', *ıd-ınçu* qualifying hair which is let loose, an animal which is allowed to go free etc., and *tut-unçu ogul* 'an adopted boy'. *sögläŋçü* 'roast meat', documented in the *EDPT* as far as Qarakhanid and later sources are concerned, comes from tr. *sögül-* 'to roast'. There are three instances of this noun in the text edited in Gabain, 1974: 21. *alınçu xatunlarım* (BT XIII 42,23) is a hapax translated "meine angeheirateten Frauen". Whether derived from *al-ın-* 'to marry', attested in a Yenisei inscr., as the footn. says, or from *al-*, it obviously refers to the object of the verb. *al-* 'to marry' is discussed in *UW* 88 b par. 12, but *alınçu* should be added to the *UW*. It may be a calque on the Mo. lexeme mentioned in the n. to the text. *kizlänçü* 'hidden treasure' (M III 11,7 (text 6), Suv 461,18 and DLT) comes from *kizlä-* 'to hide (tr.)'.

The suffix *-(X)nçU* did not die out, since the Rylands Coran translation has *korınçu* and *sıgınçu* both signifying 'asylum'. *sävünçi*[321] 'good and joyful news' is well distinguished in that source from *sävünç* 'joy, gladness, cheerfulness'. Good news is something to be joyful *about*: This last pair has a parallel in the meanings of the action noun *avınç* vs. *avınçu* 'somebody one frolicks and is familiar *with*'. *to-nçu* is 'a stopped up hole in the earth', as the ones of hibernating animals. We find it in TT I 91:] *yerdä tigi ünti. tonçudakı k*[. . .] *kutruldı* 'A sound rose from the earth. The [. . .] in the pit got free'. An instance in Ht IV 480 is a bit clearer: *yılan kış bolup tonçu*[*ka*] *kirtükdä temin ök çıntan sögütlärdin öŋi adrılur* 'When winter comes and the snake gets into (its) den, just then does it/he separate from the *caṇḍana* trees'. Even more revealing for the etymology of *tonçu* are the two translations given in the DLT for the derivate *tonçu+k-*; it is discussed among the *+Xk-* verbs. In a paper read at the 31st. P.I.A.C., S. Tezcan mentioned the existence of *tonç* with this same meaning in the district of Silifke (Anatolia).

Other verbs derived from *-(X)nçU* forms are *ilinçülä-*, *ögrünçülä-* and *tägin-çülä-*, all to be found among the *+lA-* verbs. The sequence *-(X)nçUçI* is discussed under *+çI* (section 2.75).

+lXg is added to *üzlünçü* in BT VIII B 148, BT I B (28-9) and TT VIII D 7, to *erinçü* in TT VI 332, ETŞ 10,66, Chuast 199, ms. K 40 v 3 in the n. to BT V 104 and Maitr 5 r 5-6 (written as *yerinçülüg* in this last instance). *erinçülüg* signifies 'sinful', while *üzlünçülüg* qualifies things as being connected with an 'end'. Some other expansions of *-(X)nçU* are mentioned above, among them *ögrünçülüg*. As *ögrünçü* alternates with *ögrünç*, so *ögrünçülüg* freely alternates with *ögrünçlüg*: The former can be found in IrqB LV, M I 6,17 and 11,7-8, M III 17,2$_2$ (text 8), HamTouen 5,20 and BT V 18,390 (the last five certainly Manichaean); MaitrGeng 17 a 18, seventeen times in Maitr and Maitr fr. 465 r 4, LautHöllen 10, U II 21,12, KP 46,5, HamTouen 1,22 and 26', Kuan 65, Warnke 541, U III 10,7,

321 The *ü* is the result of the rounding effect of /v/; final *i* as in *kizlänçi* < *kizlänçü* in Qutb.

16,1, 26,9, 34,24 and 48,9 and TT VI 313 (wrong in the edition but correct in the apparatus), 457 and 463 (this last wrong in the edition). *ögrinçlig* appears in M II 10,7, *ögrünçlüg* in M III 28,5$_2$ (text 10) and M I 11,20 (both Manichaean), TT VII 7 v (in the n.) and 40,47-8, BT VIII A 86, B 131 and 167-70 (thrice), TT VIII A 6 (*ögrönçlög* in Brāhmī writing) and Suv 391,17, 530,6 and 617,22 (all three in the Leningrad ms.). The archetype of the Suv, however, appears to have had *ögrünçülüg* in Suv 15,8, the Leningrad ms. writes *ögrünçlüg* (as mentioned also from three other places in that ms.), while the fr. T I D 129 (U 998) v 16 quoted in SuvLeg p. 155 has *ögrünçü[lüg] sā[vinç]lig*. In an other Turfan ms. of the Suv, T III M 56,1 v 35 in U I 19,11 (passage lost in the Leningrad ms.), the form is also *ögrünçülüg*. In Wettkampf 73-85, twice *ögrünçülüg bol-* alternate with one ex. of synonymous *s(ā)vinçlig bol-*.

The hapax *bulunçsuz* is a chance variant of *bulunçsuz* (q.v. in section 3.12) since there is no '*bulunçu*'. The only instance of *+sXz* getting added to *-(X)nçU* is *alkınçsuz* in HamTouen 4,1 and 2-3, very clear in the facs. (lemma to be added to the *UW*). *bilgā biliginiŋ ymā alkınçsuz tūkātinçsiz tetir* (Suv 163,4). The first is pared to *nom boşınıŋ tōzi . . . alkınçsız tūkātinçsiz tetir* (Suv 163,4). The first is translated as "votre sagesse merveilleuse aussi s'appelle inépuisable" while the second is rendered in *UW* 98 b with "die Wirkung des Dharma-Spendens ist . . . unerschöpflich[2]". I would prefer to understand *alkınçsuz* nominally, i.e. as 'without limit, without exhaustion'. The author of HamTouen 4 must have had the (correct) feeling that *-(X)nçsXz* is added directly to verb stems and does not constitute the negation of a noun: It is shown below that the behaviour of *-(X)nçsXz* differs sharply from the sum of the behaviours of its parts. The creation of *alkınçu+suz* is therefore 'justified' and understandable.

The verbal nominal ending in *-(X)nçU* exhibits what we have called ergative behaviour even more clearly than that ending in *-(X)nç*. Unlike *-(X)nç* lexemes, the lexemes formed with *-(X)nçU* are not necessarily associated with activities having human agents: Not, e.g., in *üzlünçü*, *alkınçu*, *kalınçu* or *tonçu*. *tonçu* is the only bisyllabic *-(X)nçU* lexeme; all others have three syllables.

3.106 *-(X)m*

This suffix is added to simple and sometimes to derived bases. *-(X)m* forms tend to be bisyllabic: The only monosyllabic one is *ye-m* 'food' (TT I 184, TT IV A 38, UigSūn 38, perhaps USp 3,15, DLT and QB), the only trisyllabic one *tamuz-um* (q.v. below).[322] This is connected with the fact that the bases of all (the other) early

322 *'olurum'* in ShōKenkyū III 35 is not a counter-example; the passage should, with Zieme (personal communication) be read as: *tōrt ulugumun çōkiţip . . .* "ich möchte mich mit den vier Gro-

and well-attested *-(X)m* lexemes are of one syllable. Then there are a few (*bagda-m*, *sukı-m* and Qarakhanid ones) which end in vowels. All the others contain liquid phonemes, which make syncopation possible: /l/ in *ötl-üm* < *ötä-l-*, /r/ in *yarğ-ım* (DLT), *uçr-um* < *uç-ur-* (TuoLuoNi), *yätrüm saç* < **yet-ür-* (*yät-ür-*eme hitherto read as *tütrüm may* also be the result of such a syncopation: It can also be read as *tuytrum*, < *tuy-tur-* 'to cause to feel', q.v. below. *tuytrum* always appears together with *tärin* 'profound' and often qualifies *nom* 'the doctrine'. We find it in Ht V 214, VII 1958 and X 248, SuvStockh 29, Suv 87,20, 88,16, 146,1, 306,23 and 371,3, TT V B 18, TT VI 383[324] *v.l.*, BT I D (252), MaitrH X 2 b 12 (qualifying *dyan*) and 3 a 4. For a connection between *nom* and *tuytur-* cf. the BuddhUig I 122 passage. *tuytrum*, then, would have been something which one is made to perceive or to sense. Note that /A/ and /U/ are among the syncopated vowels together with /X/.

This formation has three main tasks, all three present from the earliest texts on: It forms action nouns; it forms nominals denoting the objects of tr. verbs or the subjects of intr. ones (the ergative distribution); finally, it serves for quantification, as we shall see below. Perhaps under the influence of statements in the DLT, the *EDPT* takes the third function to be basic or primary.

-(X)m forms which denote the agent and not the object of tr. verbs can be shown to have existed only in Qarakhanid Turkic, and are rare even there: *ısrım kişi* (DLT fol. 66) 'a man who clenches his teeth and scowls'[325] is from *ısır-* 'to bite', *ötrüm* 'purgative' in DLT fol. 66 and QB 1059 from Uigur 'to pierce' but in this connection no doubt 'to free the bowels'. Cf. *öt-üg* II 'dysenteria' for the Uigur *ötürgā*, q.v. in the section on the mainly agentive suffix *-gA*. *atım*, finally, is defined in DLT fol. 50 as 'a man skilled at shooting, a marksman' and used in DLT fols. 470 and 610 in two proverbs in the phrase *yazmas atım* 'a marksman who does not miss'. This is the meaning of *atım* also in *atım ärsig ärsä bolur ok yaçı* (QB 4046), "If he is a stalwart marksman, he will be made an archer" in Dankoff's translation. The QB has seven instances of the binomial *alp atım*, in one of these

Ben (*mahābhūta* = Körper) auf die Knie werfen". **olrum* must have existed in agentive meaning, and given Qarakhanid *oldrum*. The *t* need not have been dependent on a base like *oltur-* (cf. *oltrup* in M II) but could be a parasitic breaking of the cluster °*lr*° resulting from syncopation. Qarakhanid *oltur-*is quite unlikely to be a causative back-formation.

323 The meaning given to this in the DLT appears to fit with the uses to which *yätür-* is put in the QB. The *EDPT* writes '*yatrum*' instead of *yätrüm*, but the causative of *yat-* is *yatgur-* and not '*yat-ur-*'.

324 And not 283 as written in the *EDPT*. The word is spelled as *tatrum* in this instance and as *ıtrum* in some others.

325 Mistranslated in the *EDPT*.

inverted to *anm alp* for the sake of the metre. *This* is predicated upon men in general, who are in no case employed as marksmen; the contexts demand its translation as 'valiant'. This binomial (and not the nominal *atm*) is attested four times in Suv (and documented in the *UW* entry for *atm*). The glosses "treffsicher" and "Treffsicherheit" for *atm* in the *UW* are misleading: *atm* itself had become obsolete as there were no (longer any) agentive *-(X)m* forms from tr. verbs in the language. Yet an Uigur named *Bägrāk Atm ügä* appears in several late 10th cent. Khotanese documents quoted in *JA* 1977: 367 and 373, by J. Hamilton, 'Le pays des Tchong-yun, Čungul, ou Cumuḍa au X^e siècle'.

Action nouns with *-(X)m* are attested in Old Turkic, but not in great numbers. We have the often-met opposites *ölüm* 'death' and *twgum* 'birth', the former e.g. in the phrase *ölümdä ozmış* 'he/she escaped death' appearing several times in the IrqB, the latter often in the binomial *twgum ajun*. Exs. of *twgum* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found, among other places, in Buddhāv H 45 and BT I B (44) and D (52), exs. of *ölüm* in PañcFrag 106, BT III 1100, LautHöllen 48 and 54, Maitr 146 r 25 and ms. PelliotOuigour 203 r 5 quoted in UigBunken p. 77. Both *tugum* and *ölüm* are rather common in BT XIII. The abstract *tut-um* is discussed below. MaitrGeng 12 a 10 has a binomial of abstract *-(X)m* forms not quoted in the dictionaries: *grim barım olrugı turugı* is to be translated, roughly, as 'his manners', the related verbs being *är-* 'to be', *bar-* 'to go', *olor-* 'to sit' and *tur-* 'to stand'. *ärim* does not appear to be attested elsewhere; *barım* is very common in a different meaning.

A lexeme *barım* is attested in inscriptional Turkic and in Uigur but not in Qarakhanid, nor in later Turkic. All the exs. can be found either in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, or in the *UW* s.v. *agı*, with which *barım* often appears together in Uigur and in Orkhon Turkic; Add 'A.GĒ BAḶ.RIM from BuddhKat 21. When it does not appear as binomial with *agı* 'valuable textiles, treasure', we find it with *yılkı*: Thus in BQ E 24 and S 3, ŞU E 3, YE 10,11, 11,3 and 41,7 and, in Thomsen and Wulff's Yenisei materials, Ili Kem D 1,22, and Chuast 200 and 250. In some Yenisei instances *barım* is qualified by the hitherto unexplained phrase *säkiz adaklıg* 'eight-footed', whereas *yılkı* is called *törт adaklıg*. It may be that *barım* originally denoted livestock with split hooves, like sheep and cows, *yılkı* livestock with unsplit hooves, like horses, donkeys and camels. The latter are, in fact, the animals referred to by *yılkı*, where it has any specificity at all. A nomadic society would have good reason for distinguishing these from sheep, goats, cows etc., as the former were used for riding, carrying loads etc., which the latter were not. P. Zieme (personal communication) notes, in this connection, the Hungarian loan *barom* "Hühner etc.". As the original meaning of *agı* widened from 'precious textiles' to 'precious objects', so did that of *barım*, until both came to be used to refer to valuable possessions in general. Thus, *bay barımlıg* (exs. mentioned

under *+lXg*) is 'rich'. *barım* can well come from *bar-* 'to walk', then, originally denoting walking things of value, as opposed to such as need carrying (denoted by *agı*). In this sense, it must have been a subject noun.

ötlüm ötlüm tägzintürü appears in TuoLuoNi 236; the n. thereto mentions further exs. of *ötlüm ötlüm* in Abhi 36 b3 (thus? 1058 = 36 a3 in Shōgaito's ed.), B 27 b13 and B 80 b7. The TuoLuoNi passage was previously published as USp 102b, and *ötlüm* can be found also in the *EDPT*. The *EDPT* translates it as "continuously (?)", while the present editors write "'wiederholt', ohne direkte Chin. Entsprechung". Not etymology for the lexeme was suggested by anyone. I derive it from *ötäl-* (q.v. below), a verb which the DLT translates as 'to exert oneself, to go to great pains'. *ötlüm ötlüm* is therefore 'strenuously, unflaggingly'.

An old *-Xm* form perhaps derived from an intr. verb is *karım* 'moat'; it is found in Maitr 29 r6, 140 r21 = 224 r5, 101 v2 and 104 r15-24, KP 39,5, BT III 197, QB and so forth. According to the DLT, *kar-* denotes the overflow of water from a canal, but in modern Anatolian dialects, e.g., the piling up of water behind an obstacle, as is done when filling a moat; cf. also *taş-* below. If, on the other hand, *karım* is (rhotacistically) derived from *kaz-* 'to dig' (in the DLT with *arık* 'canal' as object), it would represent an object of its base. *kaz-ok arık* 'a canal that is dug out' in the DLT need not, of course, have been old. The choice between these two etymologies depends on what one is prepared to make of rhotacism.

tälim taşım qualifies *bay barımlıg känt* 'a rich$_2$ town' in Maitr 3 r20 and *çog yalın* 'splendour$_2$' *ibid.* 7 r13. There is no doubt that *taşım* comes from *taş-* 'to overflow', here metaphorically 'to be abundant'; it thus strengthens the meaning of the well-known *tälim*. In some other cases we find the opaque *tälim* together with *ükūş*.

tuş tolum bol- (BT III 798-9 twice, Suv 125,4, Maitr 223 v7, BT XIII 55,1 and DhāSū 17) signifies 'to meet', like *tuş bol-*. Then there is a general term for 'weapon' of the shape *tulum* in DLT fols. 115, 200 and 279 and QB 1381, 1537, 2339, 2355, 3623 and 5485. The *EDPT* confuses this lexeme (apparently not found anywhere else), with *tolum* 'a skin container' (not attested before the XVth century). I take both *tolum* to come from *to-l-*, the first in a sense more closely connected with *to-* than the usual one; cf. *tamuda tolu tıkıl-* in Hōllen 105. *tulum*, on the other hand, probably comes from *tul-* 'to strike (a ball)' in DLT fol. 275-6 (two of the four exs. misvocalised with *fatḥa*): Cf. *atlıg anı tulturdı* "The horseman knocked into him" in DLT fol. 354. Qarakhanid *tulum* appears to be the only instrument nominal with *-(X)m*. *tägim* has been read in two USp instances and appears in Maitr 38 v9 as *-gAlI tägim är-* 'to deserve to do something'. This is related to a practically synonymous use of *täg-*, which has the 'deserver' represented by a dative object. The USp instances, on the other hand, refer not to the 'deserver' but to the thing due, which is the subject of *täg-*. *bagtam bol-* (Warnke

21), translated "saß . . . danieder", must be related to *bag+da-*; this is a loose translation: Both the Warnke ex. and a word read as *bogdam* in TT I 118 *may* have signified something like 'fettered, thwarted, restrained'.[326]

Qarakhanid *-(X)m* forms denoting subjects of intr. verbs ar *sumlı-m* (DLT fol. 244) 'anyone who does not know Turkic', *oldr-um* 'crippled' in the DLT and in QB 3238, *tet-im* 'steadfast' in QB 1961 (not mentioned in the *EDPT*) and 2043 (rhymes with *alp anm* in both instances),[327] *kon-um* in the DLT and QB 1347 referring to people living together or as neighbours (cf. *kon-şı*) and *sakım* in two among the three mss. in QB 4759, evidently synonymous with the common *sakıg* 'mirage'. *imrām* in DLT fols. 56 and 66, translated 'all the groups of a realm when they embark boldly on a matter', probably comes from *imā+r-*, q.v. below. One would have expected to find **imrim* (with the regular syncopation), but the three exs. have *fatha* in the ms.

-(X)m forms quite often denote objects of tr. verbs; the expansion *kädimlig* is found already in the inscriptions. *käd-im* 'dress' is usually used together with *ton*, in U II 42,32, TT VIII D 38, Warnke 463 and 471, Maitr 94 r 3, BT VIII A 128, Suv 102,18 and 613,4, CYK 52, TuoLuoNi 144 and 153, Schwitz 8, BT VII A 203 and 204 and ShōAgon 3, p. 206,19. *ōr-ūm* 'something knitted' (Maitr 165 r 13 = BT IX 149,13$_2$, QB 4768, 6157 and 6334) also denotes dress. Thirdly, *tona-m* in NesTex T III B 99 c (U 321) 9 is 'clothing': *anta küdän kişiniŋ sözlägüçi ark*[*asɪ*] *tonam tägінmāz* 'There, the pray-group (?) of a pilgrim is not entitled to clothing'. *äg-im/äŋ-im* 'fold' is found in Suv 133,17, Maitr 151 r 24, the ms. T II S 2 v 18, BT III 733 and perhaps TT VIII K 8. The adnominal *tik-im* signifies something like 'protruding upright' in *tikim [or]un* (Ht V1 a 7), *ediz tikim kayalık* (ETŞ 8,11) and *tikim ediz säŋir* (Suv 490,5). The DLT's noun *tikim* 'a piece of stuffed meatball' is a different derivate from the same base in an other meaning it has. *uçrum ediz* in TuoLuoNi 335 may have had a meaning similar to that of *tikim ediz*. The eds. change *uçrum* to *'uçrug'* (q.v. among the *-(X)g* lexems above); that, however, has a meaning quite inappropriate in this context. *uçrum* < *uç-ur-* 'to cause to fly' has not otherwise come up in Uigur, but cf. *uçurum* 'precipice' in Republican Turkish.

In BuddhKat 22 we find the sentence *bayıg çıgayıg adırmaz; tuş kolum berür.* This appears to signify 'He does not make distinctions between poor and rich; he fulfills wishes equally for both'. *kolum* is rather appropriately translated as "Gabe" by Maue and Röhrborn, while Moriyasu changes the word to *'körüm'* and translates accordingly. Cf. *bir kolumlug köŋlin* below. *yem içim* 'food and drink' is found in TT IV A 38, thrice in QB and perhaps elsewhere, and hardly

326 Unless the *+dAm* etymology suggested for the latter in the *EDPT* is correct.
327 See *tetimlig* below.

differs in meaning from *aş içgü. ulam* 'irrevocable, permanent, lasting' is found in UigSteu A 9, USp 56,4-5 and 13 times in the QB, mistranslated in the İndeks but rectified by Tezcan's review. This and the even wider later meanings should be considered in the light of Rachewiltz' n. 189 in *ZAS* 16 (182): 73. *üstüm* 'the inlay of gold and silver in the buckles of belts or saddle straps' (Maitr 144 v7, DLT fol. 66 and QB 1766, 2280, 2385 and 3439) comes from *üstü-* 'to add an additional piece to something'. *moyum*, quoted and translated in the *UW* s.v. *adırtsız*, is a cognate of *moy-ga*, q.v., and the base of *moym+a-l-*, q.v., and *boym+a-ş-*. *kör-üm* appears to signify both 'view' in extended senses and 'omen': Exs. of this noun not quoted in the dictionaries appear in U IV B 39 and 40, ms. T III 73 v13 in the n. to TT IV A 11, Maitr 182 r24 and 183 r4, Suv 136,17, Ht IV 1427, TT X 520, BT I B (48) and (127) and D (22), UigFalt 29 and KudJunshō C v11. In the *EDPT*, *yartım* is considered to be a secondary form of *yarım* 'half', "with an intrusive *-t-*". An intrusive *t* sometimes appears after /r/ and before a consonant, between /l/ and /r/ etc., but in no case before a vowel. **yart-* is phonetically intermediate between *yar-* and *yırt-* (attested also in M I 7,16) and may have existed too, beside *yer-*, which has a related meaning. *yartım* 'faction' may, however, also have a quite different origin. Except for the DLT lemma, it appears only in the phrase *iki yartım kıl-* 'to split (the community) into two factions'; to the *EDPT*'s three exs. we can add further ones from Maitr 182 r21 and UigSün 27.[328]

The very common *yarım*, on the other hand, is clearly from *yar-*. It usually means 'half'; exs. from Ht IV 1314, BT XIII 33,5, Suv 370,23, UjgRuk II 3, UigTot 98, BT VII K 16, Maitr 31 r9 (twice) and v9 and 10, 73 v27, 170 r1 and 60 v10, UigPacht C 3 and a text quoted in the n. thereto as well as the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* can all be translated in this way. *bir yarım ş[lōk* in BodhiAvaKomm 29 is "anderthalb ś[lokas]", i.e. one *śloka* and a half; three ślokas (Ht X 709) 'at *mid*night'. In the following passage *yarım* signifies 'part', a meaning wider than the above and closer to its etymology: *säkiz yüz bärä [ye]r yorıp Odonka tägdi. [Od]on yeriniŋ ükü̈ş yarımı [ku]m say*; *tarıglag yeri ikä tarıgka yaraglıg* (Ht V 4 a 22) '. . . Many parts of the country of Khotan are sandy and/or strewn with rocks'. *yarımları* in UigTot 1280-81 also signifies 'a part of them' and links in meaning with Mo. *ǰarim*. Add also *yarımça partagçanlar* (Abhi B 32 a 5 in n. 16 to KudJunshō) 'part of the simple folk (?)'. In view of such cases, we cannot be sure that the instances which seem compatible with a translation as 'half' should all

328 The sentence *yartımlık ārūr* in ThS IV 6 may have signified 'Intended for distribution', to judge by the context. *If* this is correct, *yartım* may also have had an unattested use as action noun, but 'Intended for the faction' cannot be excluded as an interpretation.

be understood this way. The same semantic development from 'section' to 'half' occurred also with *biç-ok*, attested in QB 4020, DLT and later Muslim sources. *suŋar*, which moved into the same semantic domain, may have had a deictic origin.

alım is used together with *berim*, in either order: See UigPacht footn. 122. They are used as a binomial, denoting the 'debt' from the point of view of the creditor or the state on the one hand, from the point of view of the debtor on the other. This does not mean that they are synonyms, of course, as QB 309 makes clear: *bo tāgmā birl asgı yası tālim; / kayusı berim tāg kayusı alım*. "Each one may result either in much profit or much loss, like a debt that is owed or a debt that is due". Cf. also DLT fols. 359 and 570. Elsewhere, the DLT uses *alım* in sentences without *berim*, e.g. in *ol anıŋ alımın ötādi* 'He payed his debt for him'. The entry *alım* in the *UW* should be brought up to date with the instances from UigPacht, which reedits the USp documents mentioned in that entry, adds some further instances and interprets this material. The phrase *berim alım* (or *alım berim*) *kāl-* appears always to refer to taxes due to the state; in *berim alım bol-* as quoted in *UW* 92 b bottom, the expression is probably not an action noun either (in view of the clause following it), but refers to private creditors. Par. A, a of that entry should then be deleted: The gloss "Geschäfte, Handel" is best left to *alış beriş*. The use in Maitr 164 r11 remains obscure in spite of the reedition in BT IX 148,11$_1$ and Zieme's contribution in *OLZ* 77 (1982): 176 middle. *alım berim* is found also in QB 2804 and 4539. While, in Old Turkic proper, *alım* always appears together with its antonym *berim*, *berim* itself is sometimes used together with its synonym *ötā-g-*, in TT II B 86, TT VII 40,73, Suv 6,17, ETŞ 18,25 and BT XIII 28,5. The former couple always refers to material debt, with the possible exception of the Maitr instance; the latter to spiritual debts, obligations and liabilities. Cf. also *yazım* 'faux pas' from *yaz-* 'to err in something' in QB 2497.

yilim yı 'creeper plant' in Hochzeit 24 comes from *il-* ~ *yil-* 'to catch on to something'. Initial ≠y° is often found also in *(y)il-in-* (discussed below); *yı* is, after all, the less common variant of the lexeme *ı*. *yilim* is presumably an abstract, perhaps signifying 'adhesion'. *yilim yı* would thus be a 'plant of adhesion'. *yilim* 'glue' (Heilk II p. 32 l.13) cannot be kept apart; it must be the same form as instrument noun. In the DLT, the spellings *yilim* and *yālim* 'glue' alternate, as they do in later sources. How the latter variant came up is unclear to me. The DLT is our only source for several *-(X)m* forms like *kötr-üm* 'bench', *kādr-ım* 'meat which has been skinned', *biç-ım* and *til-im* 'a slice', *sıdr-ım* 'a strap', *āgr-im* 'whirlpool; a place where water collects', *bog-um* 'the knuckles of the fingers, the knots in a cane, etc.', *yıg-ım tuprak* 'a heap of earth' and *kär-im* 'an embroidered curtain, a wall covering, kelim'. *yad-ım* 'carpet, matress', *tokı-m* 'an animal for

slaughter' and *ūdr-ūm* 'the choicest of things' are attested both in the DLT and the QB.[329]

tamızım 'drop' from *tam-ız-* 'to drip' is attested in Suv 113,6, 114,2 and 583,5-6, USp 89,12 etc., denoting the object of the activity denoted by the base. In BT III 658[30] it has been used as action noun; the clause in which it appears should be translated as follows: 'Just as a drip/dripping of water bye and bye fills large vessels even if it is a small dripping, . . .'. On the other hand, a drop is also a *quantity* of liquid, as we see e.g. in *bir tamızımçak(ı)ya alıp* . . . (InscrQuig V 45) 'en prenant juste une petite goutte'.

Most of our exs. for such -(*X*)*m* of measurement come from the DLT. In the domain of liquids, e.g., it has *bir öp-üm mūn* 'a sip of soup', *bir sag-ım sūt* 'the milk of one milking', *bir ak-ım suv* 'one flowing of water'. Food is naturally measured by fills: *kamug bir todum yem aş içgü üçün / özüŋni uçuz kılmagıl sān küçün* (QB 4587) 'Do not cheapen yourself willy-nilly for the sake of one fill of food$_2$ and drink'. The DLT also has *bir or-um ot*, *bir ük-üm yarmak*, *bir yogr-um un*, *bir kuçam näŋ* etc. *kuçam*, a hapax in DLT fol. 200, comes from *kuç-*, but may have received its second vowel by analogy from *kuç-ak*; cf. n. 463. *kuçak* is much better attested, but is not found outside Muslim texts either. *bir āk-ım yer* is 'land of an amount that can be sown at one time', *bir ag-ım yer* 'an elevation in the ground that can be climbed in one step'. Horizontal distance is also measured in this way, as *bir yügr-üm yer*, *bir yarş-ım yer*, *bir okıa-m yer*. *maŋ-ım* (QB 1389) is not necessarily 'a step', but perhaps better 'one stretch of striding'. Dankoff translates QB 3706 as "From east to west is *a single leap*". Tezcan, in his review of the İndeks, suggests reading the relevant word as *orla-m* instead of '*örlä-m*' and is no doubt right: *örlā-*, q.v. below, is 'to rise, e.g. of the sun and the moon', but not 'to leap'; 'a distance coverable by a shout' fits the context much better.

Quantitative -(*X*)*m* is attested also outside Qarakhanid Turkic: Heilk II 2,85 has *bir tut-um krüç* 'a handful of rice', TT VII 25,10 *yeti tutum talkan* 'seven handfuls of crushed parched grain'. Thus, metaphorically, *tutamça tiriglik* 'a handful of life' in QB 5265. The /a/ in the second syllable of this last ex. is not an error, being the usual vowel here in later Muslim texts. It may be the result of some analogical effect; cf. *kuçam* above. In Warnke 601 we find an adjectival *tutum* not serving for quantification: *b(ä)k katıg tutum kertgünç[kä] barmak yoläntmäk* translated "in dem fest$_2$ zu haltenden Glauben zu wandeln und sich auf ihn zu stützen". This content would usually be expressed by the *participium neces-*

329 *kwdrūm*, which appears fourteen times in the QB and is often associated with *ūdrūm*, is etymologically obscure to me.

330 Wrongly transcribed as '*tamışım*'.

sitatïs in *-gU. tutum* is probably a verbal abstract here, and signifies 'constancy'.[331]

tutumsuz (q.v. below) comes from this *tut-um*.

Most quantifying *-(X)m* forms are accompanied by *bir*, as also in the phrase *bir tamızımçak(ı)ya* quoted above. In the following instance, *+lXg* is added to the whole expression *bir kolum*: *bir kolumluğ köŋlin bo darnı boşgutup* (?) (TT VIII K 7) 'teaching this magic formula with a state of mind characterized by a single wish'. Objects and subjects are joined to quantifiying *-(X)m* forms in *izafet* constructions. Thus *äŋrāk sukımı içintä* means 'in (the time it takes to) snap one's fingers': See *suk-* in section 5.31 for the interpretation. *är turumı suv* (DLT) is 'water the depth of a man standing upright'. The DLT defines *turum* as 'the height of a man'; but in Uigur, *turum* is attested only in the fixed phrase *turum ara* 'immediately, on the spot'; it is documented in the *UW* 172 b s.v. *ara* par. B, e, and found also in a passage quoted in Profan p. 282. *bir aş bışımı üd* (HtPar 134,1, quoted in *UW* 239, b, par B, a, 1) is 'the time it takes for a meal to get cooked'. The structure of *är turumı suv* is identical to that of *süŋüg batımı kar* 'snow as deep as the length of a lance' in KT E35 and BQ E26, which shows that quantifying *-(X)m* existed already from the beginning of our sources on.

Verbal derivates from living *-(X)m* nominals are, for some reason, unknown. The only candidate for this is *koldamla-* in Suv 75,12 and Ernte II 52, probably 'to heave up'. **kol+da-m* (discussed also in the section on *+tA-*) can have denoted 'what is lifted in one heave'. The formative sequence *-(X)msIn-*, dealt with in section 6.2, was on the way to becoming a full-fledged formation in its own right. This monopoly of the rare suffix *+sI(n)-* (q.v. *ibid.*) on *-(X)m* must have had something to do with the original central meaning of *-(X)m* which does not seem retrievable now. *-(X)msIn-* denotes pretended action. Among the nominal expansions, *tamızımçak(ı)ya* has already been mentioned, and the suffix sequences *-(X)mçI* and *-(X)mlXk* have been discussed under *+çI* and *+lXk* respectively.

This leaves us, as often, with the *+sXz* and *+lXg* derivates. We find that some of these (mentioned below) have no corresponding *-(X)m* forms. The *+sXz* expansion with *-(X)m* base attested best is *ölümsüz* 'immortal' in U II 60,2$_2$ and BT XIII 28,2 and 58,4. *tuţumsuz anityat* in BT XIII 38,31 is "die haltlose Unbeständigkeit". This is clearly not derived from *tut-um* 'a handful' but from the verbal abstract of the same form attested in Warnke 601. *todumsuz* 'insatiable' in QB 2001 comes from *tod-um* attested in QB 4587. *todunçsuz* and *todumsuz* both signify 'insatiable'; whereas *todunçsuz* is well-attested in Uigur, *todumsuz* is cer-

331 According to Warnke's translation, one would have to take *b(ā)k katıg* to qualify the base of *tutum* in adverbial function; this would be unusual in a formation which hardly ever shows verbal behaviour. Similar, on the other hand, is what has been read as *tutınçlıg* in Weih 8.

tain only in this single Qarakhanid instance. Therefore, Buddhāv H14 is much better to get completed as *to]d[unç]suz kanmaksız* than as '*to]d[um]suz . . .*' as suggested there. The instance from ms. T II 753 (Ch/U 6708) v25 quoted by Kudara and Oda in their n. to the latter is more likely to be read as *tutumsuz*, the (unquoted) context permitting. We also prefer to read ShōAgon 2, p. 192,13_2 as *]mak üzā tutumsuz* ['elusive through . . . ing' than as '*todumsuz*' with the editor. Whereas *todumsuz* and *todunçsuz* would thus appear to belong to different dialects, the difference between *tutunçsuz* and *tutumsuz* is semantic: *tutunçsuz* signifies 'ungraspable' in the metaphorical sense of 'something which cannot be understood, conceived of etc.'; *tutumsuz* has to do with the transience of things which one cannot hold on to. In Magier 9, Maitr 73 v32 and 161 r4, U IV D 64-5 and several times in the QB we find *tāgimsiz* 'unworthy'. *tāgim* is not as common as *tāgimlig*, but does exist in Uigur. *tāgimsiz* is the negative counterpart of *tāgimlig*, as we see in the U IV instance: *anı . . . ādgü ögli üzā atagalı tāgimlig bolur . . . anı adaş bōşūk atun [a]tagalı tāgimsiz bolur. sārimlig* 'patient' (QB 1310, 1317, 1867, 2170 and 2480) and *sārimsiz* 'impatient, unable to endure' (QB 3568) are a similar couple.

tuyumsuzun (M III $11,8_1$, text 5) signifies 'without anybody hearing or noticing', *saşımsız* ~ *şaşımsız* (BT XIII 60,1 and ETŞ 9,31, 11,146 and 11,149) 'unerring(ly)'. *yetimsiz ikinçsiz tülüksüz [küç]süz küsünsüz bolurlar* in Suv 558,20-559,3 is translated by Zieme (BT XIII p. 9, footn.) broadly, as: "macht(?) – und kraftlos werden sie sein". Connecting the first term with *yet-* 'to reach', we could translate it as 'ineffectual'. From QB 1715 we can add *bolumsuz*, translated as 'unworthy' in the Turkish translation but as "wicked" by Dankoff. Note that no '*tuy-um*', '*saş-ım*', '*yet-im*' or '*bol-um*' are attested. Whereas *sārimsiz* was probably created as the negative of *sārimlig* and *tāgimsiz* perhaps as the negative counterpart of *tāgimlig*, the same thing cannot be maintained for *tuyumsuz+un*, *saşımsız* or *yetimsiz*: No *+lXg* form corresponding to these has turned up in Old Turkic. It could be, therefore, that the suffix sequence *-(X)m+sXz* was here added to the verbal base as a whole, that it was on its way to becoming a formation in its own right, like *-(X)nçsXz*. While *-(X)nçsXz* is rather common, however, *-(X)msXz* is quite rare and bears no characteristic content. Nor should we forget that *tuyumsuzun*, *yetimsiz* and *bolumsuz* are all three hapax legomena, whose *-(X)m* bases may be unknown by coincidence. The following difference between *-(X)nçsXz* and *-(X)msXz* may, nevertheless, be systematic: *tāginçsiz*, *sārinçsiz* and *yetinçsiz* denote the indirect object of the verb, whereas *tāgimsiz*, *sārimsiz*, *yetimsiz*, *saşımsız*, *ölümsüz*, *todumsuz* and *bolumsuz* all denote its subject. This difference is grammatical, as distinct from the semantic difference whereby *-(X)nçsXz* adds the content 'un-VERB-able'. The grammatical status of whatever independent *-(X)msXz* forms there may be presents us such a suffix as being intermediate

between *-(X)nçsXz* and *-mAksXz*: *-XnçsXz* can denote indirect objects as well as direct ones; *-(X)msXz* can occasionally denote direct objects (e.g. *tuyumsuzun, tuumsuz*) but not indirect ones; *-mAksXz*, finally, denotes only subjects and never objects of any kind.

Like *-(X)m+sXz*, *-(X)m+lXg* also is on the border between being a formative sequence and a composite formative: On the one hand we have instances in which *+lXg* is added to an *-(X)m* form as it would be added to any noun; such cases have been discussed on p. 153, among the exs. for *+lXg*. On the other hand, we have the suffix *-(X)mlXg* added directly to the verb stem. The result can look identical, as in the instances from Ht VII 1912 and Suv 603,2: *çalmış ördi yalın oɔuɣ ıd(ā)rs körümlüg tagda* has *tag* 'mountain' in metaphorical apposition to *tārs körüm*, attested in U IV B 37, 39 and 40, U II 76,8, Suv 136,17, TT IV A 74 etc.[332] *+lXg*, that is, is added to the expression as a whole. Another ex. of *(tārs körüm)lüg* is quoted from an unpubl. ms. in *UW* 298 b s.v. *ayançaŋsız*. *In eliŋiz uluşıŋız içintäki siziŋä körümlüg boduŋuŋuzŋı karaŋızŋı* (Suv 603,2) 'your people$_2$ who are subjected to you in your realm$_2$', on the other hand, it is the verb *kör-* which governs the dative of *siziŋä*: *kör-* + dat. is attested with this meaning in KT E 30 and S 11, BQ E 24 and so forth. The compound formative *-(X)mlXg* is treated in section 3.322.

3.107 *-Xn*

This suffix forms object nominals for transitive stems and subject nominals for intransitive ones, thus according with the pattern we have called 'ergative'. It is usually dominant: *uzun* is connected with *uza-*, *yarın* with *yaro-*, *tükün* with *nükä-*, *ulun* no doubt with *ula-*, *suvsun* with *suvsı-* and so forth. *yarın* is in fact found only in Manichaean and Qarakhanid sources, while all Buddhist texts have *yaron*. This may show that an archaic trait (as found also in the IrqB) was retained in Qarakhanid Turkic. Another interpretation would be to consider this to be an isogloss between western and eastern Old Turkic: Muslim and Manichaean influence came from the west, Buddhism from the east. In *kişän* and the very common *san*, on the other hand, the /X/ of the suffix is absent after vowels. Actually, *kişän* is problematic both grammatically and semantically, and may not have belonged to this formation; it is discussed below. The base of *sa-n* appears to have retained its vowel because of its shortness: Dominance can elsewhere as well be shown to be relinquished in such cases, in which the base becomes unrecognisable. Practically all *-Xn* forms are bisyllabic, the exception

332 *körüm* appears also in Nyūabi (7) v 9 and 17, after lacunae. The opposite of *(tārs körüm)lüg* is *(könl körüm)lüg* in BT XIII 55,5, correctly translated as "die eine rechte Anschauung haben".

being, again, *san*. Their bases are all underived, with Kāšgarī's *içkin* < *iç+(ï)k-in* the only exception (outside Old Turkic proper).

-Xn lexemes are either nominal, as *san* 'number', *āsin* 'breeze' or *yaşın* 'lightning', or basically adjectival, as *bütün* 'complete, whole' or *adın* 'other'. We deal first with derivates from intr. bases and then with those from tr. ones, subdivided into nouns and adjectives. Doerfer (personal communication) notes that, in Tkm., this formative has long vowels in adjectives (e.g. *yaqîn*, *uzîn* [uðu:n] etc.) but short vowels in nouns, e.g. *tütün*, *gälin*, *äkin*. This may, I think, be due either to originally subphonemic sandhi conditions or reflect two originally distinct formatives.

āsin 'breeze, light wind' appears in Maitr 153 v30 and 151 v5 (= BT IX 122,5 and U II 9,5), MaitrGeng 2 a 16, ms. T III M 229 (U 5884) l.18 quoted in the n. to ÄgFrag (1) B 24, Suv 209,17, Ernte 89 and 92 (both spelled *esin*), the DLT and QB 65, in all instances understood to be something giving pleasure. *akın* 'flow, current' or even 'torrent' is found in TT VIII D 35, BT I B (110), BT XIII 27,6, Ernte 23, BT III 127 and 679 and QB. In the DLT we also find it with the metaphorical meaning 'raid', which becomes the only one in later Muslim texts. YE 41,8 has this metaphorical use: . . . *(a)vda* $G^2Y^2\eta$ *(a)tm(a)k n(ä)rgäy*? . . . *(a)k(ı)nta (ä)r s(a)nçm(a)k n(ä)rgäy*?[333] '. . . What will become of routing (or stabbing/spearing) the (enemy's) men in raids?' This passage shows that the meaning 'raid' was Common Early Turkic. In ShōAgon 1,366 we find the series *köllär*, *kiçig akınlar kudunlar*, in which the last lexeme is a hapax. It is no doubt some sort of synonym of *ak-ın* derived from *kud-* 'to pour', being this verb's object. *yarın* 'dawn, the morrow' comes from *yaro-* 'to be or become bright', and is attested in IrqB I, II and XXII, M I 6,19 (Legende), M III 7,16$_3$ (text 1), 36,5$_3$ (text 17) and 43,1$_4$ (text 30), TT II A 59, the DLT and the QB. On the other hand, Maitr 15 r5, *yaron*, i.e. without dominance of the suffix. This may be a matter of dialect differences: All the texts with *yaron* are Buddhistic, which none of the texts with *yarın* are. In view of *yarınkı kün taŋ . . . twga yarlıkagay* in Maitr 143 v3, *yarın* may have been the more archaic variant. *yaşın* 'lightning' comes from *yaşo-* ~ *yaşı-*

333 *närgäy* is a crasis of *nä är-gäy*, by no means isolated in the Turkic languages but interesting because it occurs so early in their history. Note that *ärgäy* would not have been possible in the Orkhon dialect of Old Turkic, which has the *-dAçI* form instead. g for /g/ after /r/, moreover, is not 'classical' runic spelling: There, the letter *k* would have been used. $G^2Y^2\eta$ is a *crux*, perhaps a misreading for *käyik*, but in any case the object of *at-* 'to shoot' (in hunting). In *sanç-*, /nç/ is written with the sign used for /ñ/ in the Orkhon inscrs., and not with the letter normally employed to mark this phoneme sequence. The Yenisei inscrs. often use letters interchangeably to mark the /n/ + consonant clusters. On the other hand, the spelling *ñç* makes sense phonetically, ç being palatal like *ñ*. One dare not maintain, on the force of this one ex., that Old Turkic (similar to Skt.) neutralised the opposition /n/ : /ñ/ before /ç/ in favour of /ñ/.

'to flash', and is attested in M I 25,34 (Gebet), M II D 10,3, HamTouen 5,14, UigSukh 4, TT VIII A 8 (Brāhmī!), BT I G(9), Warnke 26, BT VII A 182, DLT and QB etc.[334] In BT VII A 182, *yaşın* is translated as "Flamme"; that, however, is usually *yalın*, from *yal-* 'to flame'. *yalın* is even more common than *yaşın*, exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* appearing in BT I D (42), BT II 951, Maitr 160 r 1 and 75 r 29, BT XIII 1,51, Māngi 16 and 17, Ht VII 15 a 17 and ShōUigFrag 28. *tüt-ün* 'smoke' is found in Maitr 68 r 5, 194 v 27, 101 v 15 and 113 r 8, UigTot 52 and 262, Ht VII 6 b 13, BT VII A 178 and ManMon 23. We are back in the ethereal domain, closing the *-Xn* cycle of the elements' activities which we started with 'breeze'.

kälin 'bride' must be very old, appearing in KT N 9 in the collective form *kälin ŋün*. In YE 3,6 we find the series *oglan är küdägülärim, kız kälinlärim*; cf. *kız mu taşgarur s(ä)n? kälin mü alır s(ä)n?* (ShōAgon 1,276). It is no doubt to be analysed as *käli-n*, with the base 'to come' as discussed in Erdal, 1979 a: 112: According to Doerfer and Tezcan, 1980: 147, the second vowel of this noun was /I/ and not /X/. This would mean that the suffix was not (yet) dominant in the (prehistoric) times in which *kälin* was created. *tüş-ün* 'lodgings, inn' appears a number of times in QB but not in Old Turkic. It doesn't denote the agent of the intr. verb *tüş-* 'to dismount', a point in which Qarakhanid formation differs from that of Old Turkic. Dankoff (personal communication) plausibly suggests that *tüşün* may be based on Ar. *manzil* from *nazala* 'to go down': The two have the same meaning and etymology. *hük-ün* 'a heap' appears in Brāhmī writing in TT VIII K 3: *töhödän hükün bälgürmiş* 'from the millet there emerged a heap'. This is related to *ükmä, üküş* etc., qq.v. The variation of initial *y°* with Ø also points towards an original **/h°/. suvsun* should probably be read in Ernte 87 instead of '*süsün*' (V mistaken for Y): *bir tagarka mıŋ tagar tüş suvsun tarţıp* . . . The binome *tüş suvsun*, literally 'fruit and juice', may here have signified 'produce' in general. *suvsun*, from *suv+sı*-like *suvsuş* (section 3.103), lived on in Chagatay and Kazakh.

A number of *-Xn* forms from intr. bases are used adjectivally. *yakın*, from *yak-* 'to be near, to approach', is exceedingly common. We find it, among other places, in BT VIII B 251, BT I C(11), EhlersNotab 6, Neujahr 31, Ht IV 224, Maitr 70 r 17 and 24, LautHöllen 48, AmitIst 19, UigBrieffr C 4 and BuddhUig II 162. As the *EDPT* writes, *uza-* 'to be or become long and drawn out' is, in Old Turkic texts, found to refer more often to time than to space. This is the case also with *uzun* 'long', attested in a binomial with *turkaru* in U III 4,10, 42,11 and 54,12, LautHöllen 8-9, BuddhKat 34 and elsewhere. Another ex. in Tibetan script is 'U.ZU.NIN in TibStud. There is no reason to think that the rarer spatial meaning is secondary, however; it appears in the common and perhaps petrified expression *uzun tonlug*, which refers to women as well as to monks (both wearing long clothes).

334 See *yaşok* (section 3.102) for two exs. of the variant *yaşı-*.

kalın and *yogun*, both with meanings like 'thick, massive, dense', are possibly derived from *kalı-* and the base of *yogur-* respectively; but this is too uncertain to deserve discussion. *yogun* is opposed to *yinçgä* in Warnke 426, MaitrGeng 4 b3,[335] UigTot 32 and 942 and Toñ 14 but to *kalın* in Warnke 468; this fact may help to determine its meaning. In ShōAgon 3, p. 206,22 it is said about an ugly lady that she was *körki mäŋizi yogun yavız* and *körgäli aklançıg*, which suggests a meaning like 'coarse' for *yogun*. It appears, finally in BT XIII 13,70 and LautHōllen 130. *tolun* is in the *EDPT* documented only from Muslim sources, but is actually very common in Old Turkic. Whereas *tolu* is the normal word for 'full', *tol-un* is metaphorical: 'full (of the moon or the sun), full (of the voice), complete'. It refers to the moon in Maitr 28 r1, U III 46,14, HamTouen 7,20, Suv 394,15, 492,8 and 496,11 and BT III 568, to the sun and the moon in ZiemeTārā 21 a. In ETŞ 9,93, *tolun* describes somebody's voice while, in BT I B (96), D (3), (46), (114), (328) and F(15), ETŞ 9,55 and 16,22, it denotes 'perfection'. 'the moon in its fullness' is *toluntakı ay t(ä)ŋri* (BT XIII 19,45) or *ay tolunı* (Suv 344,24), *tolun* serving as stative noun. From this lexeme comes the proper name *Tolun Toġrıl* found in UigOn I p. 74, v4. The name of the Tūlūnid dynasty is derived from this proper name: Its founder was *Aḥmad b. Tūlūn*, a Turkish slave born in A.D. 835, who became the first Muslim governor of Egypt to annex Syria. His father, in Arabic called *Ṭūlūn*, is said to have been part of the tribute sent by the governor of Bukhārā to the caliph in 815-6 A.D. This constitutes a very early indirect transmission of a Turkic proper name and grammatical form. The expression *tolun būtmiş . . . tōz* of Suv 218, 18 and HtPar 79,14 is discussed in the n. thereto in SuvRezTerm; it is a calque on Chinese. *būt-ün* signifies 'complete, entire, whole', thus being a near-synonym of *tolun*. A few of the exs. of *bütün* not mentioned in *EDPT* or *DTS* appear in Ht IV 1313, UigTot 302, LetterTunHuang 16 (*bütün tükäl*), CYK 85, BT VII A 126 and BT III 640. *tükün* occurs in the Rylands interlinear Coran translation: *aydı*: *kurtga*, *kısır tükün* is translated by Eckmann as "She said: 'I am an old woman, barren and sterile'". The lexeme denotes aged women who can *no longer* bear children; it is thus most appropriately connected with *tükä-* 'to come to an end, finish'. The first lexeme in *tükün nızvanılarka agokup / tüşgälir män una tamuka* (ETŞ 17,17) is translated as 'bütün'; it should have the same etymology if read correctly (no facs. is offered). *tükün* should not be confused with *tüg-ün* 'a knot' which is never used adjectivally, even though a certain affinity in meaning may be perceived between the two. In TT I 126 and ETŞ 10,264 we should probably read *tük(ä)ti* with *alif* omitted, not *tükün* with possessive suffix: The meaning of *tükün* does not fit the context, but see the frozen converb *tükäti*. BUKN 'impotent' in DLT fol. 201 should probably be read as

335 Not '*yogan*', as Geng reads.

bökün (from *bök-* 'to have had enough, to be fed up').[336] *içkin är* (DLT fol. 67) 'a man who has come over from the enemy and whom they grant safe conduct' no doubt comes from *iç+ik-*, q.v. among the *+(X)k-* verbs. This lexeme of the DLT is the only form coming from a derived (denominal) base. Concerning Old Turkic proper it can be said that *-Xn* is added only to simplicia.

-Xn derivates from tr. verbs are no less common than those that come from intr. ones; none of them denote the verb's agent. *äkin* is both 'sown land' and 'the crop growing on it'; it comes from *äk-* 'to sow'.[337] See Hochzeit 3, UigPacht A 7, C 4, F 6 and J 5 and 7 for *äkin*, in addition to what the *EDPT* quotes and discusses. *täp-in* in Ernte 75 is probably the action noun 'threshing'; see the n. to Ernte II 38. *ışın* 'plaited, a plait of hair' is attested only in U IV A 11, there wrongly written '*işin*'. Base and cognates are known from a number of modern languages as mentioned in the n. to the passage; modern *iş-* signifies 'to plait'. An ancient cognate is *(y)ış-ıg*, q.v. above, which fixes the words as having back vowels. *adın* 'other, different' is related to *adır-* 'to separate'. Their common base probably being tr., *adın* should be its object.[338] Exs. for it can be found in the *UW*. *ätin* 'the voice of an animal' is attested in M III 45,5$_1$ (text 32), which the entry in the *EDPT* tries to emend away, in MaitrGeng 13 a 6 and in Suv 363,23. Two Old Turkic exs. of *ät-* are mentioned under *ät-iz-*, q.v. below; see also *ätin+ä-*.[339] *tügün* 'knot' is common and comes from *tüg-* 'to bind a knot'. Instances include UigTot 371, 383 and 803 and Maitr 116 r 16. *tügün nızvanılar* (ETŞ 17,17 and BT XIII 21,48) are the 'passions of attachment'. *ter-in* 'assembly, assemblage of people' is attested, among other places, in TT VI 09, U II 30,29, BT II 18, 74, 365 and 781, Ht VII 2080, Suv 2,13, Warnke 41, 472 and 846, ShōAgon 1,275 and BT XIII 42,7, usually in a binomial with *kuvrag*. In Suv 198,14 there is a word *käsin*, which appears to refer to a section of a *sūtra*. This no doubt comes from *käs-* 'to cut'. In Suv 589ff., 590,13 and 596,20 there are several instances of a word written *käşin*, denoting periods of two months: The Suv passage quoted in the n. to Ernte 8 defines them clearly. This could conceivably be the same lexeme in spite of the *ş*; cf. the etymology of 'section' in English.[340]

kıyın signifies 'punishment' in general. Countable *kıyın*, however, appears to

336 Not as "*büken* (? *bükin*)" (*EDPT*) or *bögän* (DankKelly). The fact that *bükän* "watermelon", a subsequent entry, has a *fatḥa* in the second syllable is no reason to do the same with *bök-ün*.

337 The *EDPT* has this verb only from DLT and QB 1394 onwards; it is attested also in ShōAv 331. The derivates *äkil-*, *äkin-*, *äkü-*, *äktür-*, *äkim* and *äkindi* are all given by Käšġarī, but even in later periods not all of them turn up in real texts.

338 See *adır-* in section 6.3. for the reason for this.

339 *ät-* and the *EDPT*'s 2 *öt-* appear to have been dialect variants within Proto-Turkic.

340 *käs-* was probably borrowed from an Indo-European language, the original verb with its meaning being *üz-*. A fluctuation /s/ ~ /ş/ would be a predictable mark of a borrowing.

refer to 'beatings': Thus e.g. *üç yüz kı(y)ın* in ManMon 108-109 and 119, in Geist-Drog translated as "300 Prügel". The word is common from the Toñ, ŞU and Tariat inscrs. on. It can't be connected with *kıdıg*, *kıdıt-* etc., as the *EDPT* would like to do, since no passage of [d] to [y] had occurred at that time in Old Turkic, but comes from *kıy-* or *kıyı-*.[341] *tutun* is a hapax in one ms. in ThreeLett, where the other one has *tut-gun*, q.v. among the *-gXn* forms. *tutun* must be taken to be an error unless additional exs. appear. *ulun*, 'stalk' in Maitr 55 v 22, Suv 529,7-9 and ETŞ 20,2, 'the shaft of an arrow' in the DLT, can easily be connected with *ula-* 'to join'; the stalk joins the leaf to the stem. *bulun* 'captive' can be connected with *bul-* 'to find' under the assumption that the person made captive had tried to hide before he was caught. It appears already in IXu 5, M III 24,11$_1$ and 25,9$_3$ (text 9), the Ulaangom inscr., InscrOuig II 31 and the DLT. The normal meaning of *äginl aŋın* is 'shoulder', but in IrqB XVIII it refers to a part of a tent, by Clauson translated as "curved stay(s)". See the dictionaries for other exs.. *äg-/äŋ-* being 'to bend', *äginl äŋın* can originally have denoted anything bent. *bogun* 'articulation (in the limbs of a person or in the trunk or stalk of a plant)' appears in BT VIII A 242, UigTot 366, DLT and as a foreign word in Khotanese texts. It comes from *bog-* 'to strangle', used in a metaphorical sense. *kişän* 'fastening', often 'fetters, leg irons' is attested in BT II 1098, BT VII A 258 (written *käşän*), TT VII 36,15, DLT and about ten times in the QB. *kişä-* 'to hobble a horse' appears already in IrqB XXXIX. *kişän* is irregular both in denoting not the hobbled creature or object but the instrument, and in the formative's juncture being non-dominant. Perhaps it does not belong to this formation at all, but is an *+An* derivate (section 2.51) from the base of *kişä-*.

küsün practically always appears in a binomial with *küç*, in which it cannot be assigned an independent meaning. It is found alone only once: Ms. T II D 523, a fragment of an oracle book quoted in the n. to TT VII 30, reads in l.6: *küsämiş küsünüg bütgü* ['[bringing] what [they/you] desire [to] realisation'. This *küsün* must be a verbal noun from *küsä-*[342] and could be the lexeme commonly joined to *küç*.[343] The second word in *küçi küsi* in UigBrieffr p. 456 n. 5 is better left with *kü*

341 *kıy-*, *kıyış-*, *kıytur-* and *kıyma* are attested from DLT and QB on. *kıyıl-*, q.v. below, is also found in Uigur, another proof that its base had *y* and not *d*. Because of *kıyık*, also found in Heilk I and the DLT, *kıyıma* in Heilk II 3 and *kıyıt* from Suv, qq.v., we have to take the base to have originally been **kıyı-* and not *kıy-*: The loss of this final vowel would be expected particularly after /y/.

342 It could also, of course, be an error or a mistake for the common *küsüş*. We have e.g. *küsämiş küsüş ... kan-* in TT I 175 and Maitr 47,19.

343 This is only a hypotheses as long as no second instance of a solitary *küsün* is found. The oracle fragment *could* have joined *küsä-* to *küsün* for the sake of assonance and not as a *figura etymologica*.

'fame' in spite of Tezcan's suggestion. *'kūs'*, if proven to exist, could be the base of *kūsā-*. Semantically, cf. the derivation of *potential* from *potence*. A direct connection between a hypothetical *'kūs'* and *kūsūn* would be impossible, as the only suffix which could be thought of has the form *+(A)n* and not *'+(X)n'* or *'+(U)n'*. This is also the reason why the exceedingly common *tōzūn* 'noble, well-behaved, ārya' should not be directly connected with *tōz* 'root, origin etc.', but might, instead, be an *-Xn* derivate from an unattested verb **tōz+ū-/tōz+ā-* (intr.).[344]

yok yodun kıl- 'to annihilate' is attested in U III 55,12, 85,10 and 86,10, Hamtouen 1,33, TT X 314, 321 and 410, M III 13,10$_3$ (text 6a) and MaitrH Y 6a 27 = fr. 464 r4; *yok yodun bol-* 'to be annihilated' in M I 9,11 (TeilBuch) and in Borovkov's *tafsīr*, quoted in the *EDPT*. The *EDPT* rectifies the text, mistakenly written as *bodun*. The same mistake of confusing *y* and *b* (which are very similar in Arabic writing) was made also in the ms. of the Rylands interlinear Coran translation, extracted by Eckmann; that has *'yok bodun bol-'* and *'kıl-'* instead of *yok yodun bol-* and *kıl-*, of which we quoted eight instances above. This mistake was corrected by Dankoff in his review of Eckmann's work, in *JAOS* 98 (1978): 135-137.[345] *yodun*, which does not seem to be attested by itself, clearly comes from *yod-* 'to wipe off, obliterate', with a well-known metaphoric extension of its meaning.[346]

san 'number, the set of things counted' does not need documentation here; nor need its connection with *sa-* 'to count' be specially defended, although this verb has not turned up in Runic Turkic or in Uigur. In the QB and the DLT, *sa-* clearly has the meaning mentioned; cf. also *sa-n-*. The postposition *sayu* joins the adjectival meaning 'every' with a dative or locative content. This peculiarity, together with the fact that, unlike other adjectives, it follows the noun it qualifies and does not precede it, can be explained only by its being a petrified con-

344 This also fits the meanings and uses of the suffixes, as *+(A)n* forms collectives. *tōzūn* does not belong to *tūz-* 'to level, straighten, put in order' because it appears with /ō/ in the first syllable both in Brāhmī and Tibetan writing: *tōzōṃ* in TT VIII A 15, TYO.ZUN, TYO.ZON and TO.ZON in TibStud and *tōzūnūm* in ZweiFrag 4. Nor would a joining of *tūz-* and *tōzūn* be particularly satisfactory semantically. Nevertheless, many scholars (including the *EDPT*) have read *'tūzūn'*, the most recent defender of this reading being Hamilton in the n. to HamTouen 1,2.

345 Dankoff's emendation is attacked by Bodrogligeti in *JAOS* 104/3 (1984): 456. Bodrogligeti believes in the existence of a lexeme *'bodun'* 'deceased', and derives it from *bud-* (q.v. in section 7.23 below). He compares *'bodgu ol'* of ETŞ 11,110. *bud-* has a much narrower meaning, however, and the ETŞ ms. should be read as *pudgul* 'pure' as attribute to *bodis(a)tav* (< Skt. *pudgala*). It is also unlikely that Uigur *yok yodun bol-/kıl-* should have such a similar-looking synonym.

346 The verb which appears as *'yoy-'* in the *EDPT*'s entry for *yod-*, quoted from U III 64,21, is to be read as *yuv-*; the development of *y* from *d* did not happen in Uigur.

verb of *sa-* 'to count'; the verb itself had become obsolete in the dialect(s) in question.[347]

The DLT adds the following three items to this collection: *irkin suv* 'stagnant water' from *irk-* 'to collect or assemble (tr.)', *yıgın tuprak* 'a heap of earth' from *yig-* 'to heap up' and *tartın* 'provisions' no doubt from *tart-* 'to carry'. A quite large number of what may have been *-Xn* forms have not been mentioned because their connection with their putative bases is fraught with difficulties: The formation is sufficiently well documented without them.

-Xn is expanded with *+AgU*, *+lXg*, *+sXz* and *+lXk*. In Yarkand II c1 and several times in the QB we find the abstract *bütünlük*. The abstract-forming *+lXk* is not Uigur however: *terinlik kuvraglık* (ETŞ 8,6) and *kınlık* (ShōKenkyū II 2) are local. *sansız* is attested from the Orkhon inscrs. on, and is the most common *-Xn+sXz* form. Others are the hapax legomena *çogsuz yalınsız terinsiz kuvragsız* (Suv 299,10-11), *yetinsiz, äsinsiz* and *tütünsüz*, the last one from the DLT. Only *yetinsiz* (Hochzeit 23) calls for comment: Its first two letters are marked as uncertain, and a footn. adds: "Lesung unsicher, vielleicht *yitinsiz* für *yitinçsiz*". This last is a reasonable suggestion, as there is no '*yetin*'; the bases of the other *-Xn+sXz* forms are well-attested nouns. See *tern+ägü* in section 2.52.

+lXg is often added to *-Xn*, *sanlıg* being the most common expansion. *sanlıg* signifies 'subject to . . ., belonging to . . ., related to . . .' and is, among other places, attested in two Brāhmī texts. *sansız* is by no means its antonym. *nom akınlıg suv* is discussed in the *UW* s.v. *akınlıg*; this is an instance of metaphorical *+lXg*. *örtyalınlıg, çoglug yalınlıg, yalınlıg yaşınlıg* and *yalınlıg çoglug* are some of the binomials containing the frequently attested *yalınlıg*. This signifies 'flaming' where it does not go with *çoglug*, the binomial *çog yalın* having the metaphorical meaning 'splendour': Instances not quoted in the *EDPT* appear in TT V A 118, TT VIII F 16, U III $13,10_2$ and $23,3_1$, Maitr 61 r2, BT VIII B 90, ETŞ 10,23 and Buddhāv H 100. *çog yalınlıglar* (ĀṭSū 1 r9, Brāhmī script) shows *+lXg* added to the binome as one whole. The antonyms of *çoglug yalınlıg* and of *terinlig kuvraglıg* are quoted above from Suv 299,10-11. *terinlig kuvraglıg* 'with an assembly' is also a hapax, found in BT VIII B 262. It is said about Buddha that his voice is *ulug ätinlig* (BT VIII B 146) or *äzrua ätinlig* (MaitrGeng 11 b14); cf. *ätinlig säviglig äzrua üni* in Maitr 81 r3 and *kesari arslan ätinlig . . . kaŋım* in BT XIII 28,21. In UigKan 174 we read of *amrançıg ätinlig kuşlar* (misread in ETŞ 20,145), and in BT XIII 5,23 three maidens are said to be *kalavink kuş ätinlig*. *ł[a]kşanlıg çızınlıg bol-* appears in a ms. as a variant of the main ms.'s *tokılıg körklä bol-* in TuoLuoNi 291. Although the second word is spelled with S, the eds.' etymology < *çız-* is

347 Thus *yer sayu bardıg* (KT S 9) 'You went everywhere' is as if it had originally signified 'Counting the places there were, you went there'.

plausible. No *'çız-ın'* has turned up, however; this might also be an error for *çızıg+lıg*: Cf. *çız-ıg* above. *tägünlüg at* in Toñ 54 may show how early the suffix sequence *-Xn+lXg* is attested. The expression can be translated as 'horse with (mane bound into) knots', a practice which the Central Asian nomads are seen to have had on illustrations of the period. Scholars have usually read *tögünlüg* instead of *tägünlüg*, translating "branded". That is possible as well, but *tögün* is not met with before the DLT.

In all these cases, the *-Xn* form has nothing verbal about it, and the sequences formed with additional formatives are not more than nominal derivates. Thus e.g. *top tolun* in ETŞ 12,38 (misread as *'top tolup'*).

One peculiarity of *-Xn* is that it is very often expanded with *+A-*. *-Xn+A-* forms (all of them discussed below, among the *+A-* verbs) are: *äs-in+ä-* 'to blow (of a breeze)', *bul-un+a-* 'to take as prisoner' (already in the runic inscriptions), *tütün+ä-* 'to emit smoke', *ät-in+ä-* 'to roar, shout, sing etc.', *katın+a-* 'to return to a matter repeatedly', *sa-n+a-* 'to count' (replaces *sa-*, which had become obsolete in Old Turkic), *kıyn+a-* 'to punish, torture', *tögn+ä-* 'to cauterise'[348] *tüşn+ä-* and its derivate *tüşnä-k* discussed above, *yal-ın+a-* 'to flame' and *yaşın yaşna-* 'of lightning, to flash'. We can add the DLT's *ad(ı)n+a-* 'to change (intr.)', found also in Middle Turkic. As is to be expected, these verbs follow the semantic specialisations undergone by the *-Xn* derivates with respect to their bases. On the other hand, although *+lA-* is the most common denominal formative, there is only one *+lA-* verb from an *-Xn* base: *yalın+la-*, a rare synonym of *yalına-*. Since *+lA-* became more common than *+A-* with time, the association of *+A-* with *-Xn* might indicate that *-Xn* may have been more active in early pre-Turkic stages than in later ones. *buln+uk-*, a hap. in the QB, is an *+(X)k-* derivate from *bulun*, while *san+gar-* comes from *sa-n*. *yogun+ad-*, finally, appears in two mss. in TT IV B 43, while a third ms. (edited by Shōgaito) has *yogun+a-*: In view of the great number of *-Xn+A-* verbs, I take *yogunayu* to be the (less preferable) *lectio facilior*.

3.108 *-(U)t*

-(U)t mostly forms action nouns, but also lexemes denoting objects of tr. verbs, subjects of intr. ones and even a few place and instrument nouns. A class of names for audible activities ending in *°rt* are included.

The suffix undergoes no change after consonants except /r/. It loses its vowel with stems ending in vowels. Apparent exceptions: *kurut* 'cheese made from

348 Although *tögün* 'brand' is attested only in the DLT and in later Muslim texts, this verb is Uigur as well. It seems possible that *tögün* comes from *tög-* 'to pound' in spite of the semantic discrepancy. *tögi* < **tög-gi* (discussed among the *-gI* lexemes) is also found in Uigur.

dried curds' is explicitly written with *w* in the second syllable in QB 4442; it no doubt comes from *kurı-* 'to dry (intr.)'. But then *kurı-* itself has a variant *kuru-* in Uigur, and derivates like *kurug*, which show that *kurut* is not too unexpected. Two words read as '*kurut*' in USp (reading adopted by the *EDPT*) have now been corrected to *kavıt* (q.v. below). *öçüt* in DLT fol. 37 is translated as 'revenge', like *öç*. It must be an action noun from *öç+ä-* (q.v. below), with dominant *-Ut*; a denominal **t* formative (as in section 2.42) is excluded on semantic grounds. DLT fol. 37 writes *okut* < *okı-*, 'an invitation or summons to a meal or a sultan', with a rounded vowel in the second syllable; but in the QB, *okıt+çı* is five times written with /ı/. The DLT's entry *ögit* 'grinding wheat etc.' has an *i* in the second syllable instead of the base's original vowel *ögü-*, and may be a hypercorrection. All this shows that there was some uncertainty as to this vowel in Qarakhanid Turkic, at any rate.

-(U)t derivates from bases ending in *°rA-* elide the final vowel of the base: *täpirtsiz* 'without stirring' appears in Suv 166,6, in a binomial with *tigirtsiz*; the passage is quoted in *EDPT* 486b, and cf. the footn. 94 to the n. to CYK 84. The Chin. original quoted in this footn. having this same meaning, the connection with *täprä-* 'to stir (intr.)' seems beyond doubt. Röhrborn and Sertkaya are right in calling the forms the result of metathesis; whether the intermediate derivate was **täprüt* with dominant *-Ut*, or **täprä-t* as they suggest, cannot be determined now. It seems quite unlikely that both *täpirtsiz* and *tigirtsiz* should be misspellings, as suggested in the *EDPT*: There is a whole set of *-(U)t* derivates from such bases, which all show exactly the same behaviour; all of these bases are onomatopoeics, discussed in section 5.32. *täpitsiz* in CYK 84, on the other hand, I take to be an error for *täpirtsiz*.

We just mentioned an instance of *tigirtsiz*. Another one appears in ShöAgon 1,96, and *tigirt* itself is found in *ulug tigirţ sogırt turgurdılar* (BT III 233-4). It comes from *tigrä-* 'to resound'. *sogırt*, perhaps to be read as *şogırt*, appears to be a variant of *çogurt* (ETŞ 8,13); see section 5.32 for their derivation. Then there is *maŋırt* 'shouting', from *maŋra-*. This is attested in Ht IV 551 and 704 and V 6 a13 before lacuna and in Maitr 35 v 14 and MaitrH X 7 a 18 and XVI 4 a 1 in the *figura etymologica maŋırt maŋra-*. In ShöAv 274 the facs. has *kay kay sayu maŋırt maŋırantdılar* (with a superfluous dental): Cf.] *kay say⟨u⟩ maŋırt* [*maŋra-* in Ht IV 551. *käŋirtsiz* in *ymä* [*nän*]*g ökünçsüz käŋirtsiz* 'without any regret or grumbling' (ShöAgon 3, p. 207,19) is related to *käŋrä-* 'to nag' and *käŋrän-* 'to grumble'. *kükürt ünlüg* 'he with the thundering voice' in ETŞ 10,39, finally, must be related to *kükrä-* 'to roar, thunder': Cf. Abakan-Tatar *kügürt* 'thunder'. In all these cases, an anaptyctic or metathetical vowel appears before /ɪ/.

With bisyllabic underived bases *ending in* /ɪ/, *-(U)t* loses its vowel. Exs. here are *adırt* and its near-synonym *üdürt*, both of which are documented in the entry *adırt*

of the *UW*; additional exs. appear in AbiShotan r11 and v11 and 12, Scharl 67, 68 and 117 and BT XIII 38,4. In DhāSū 17 we find the hapax *āgïr-t* 'siege, encircling'. *edārçi* in QB 2395 is a 'pursuer, chaser' and comes from an unattested **edār-t*. This word must also be the source of the hitherto unexplained *edārçi* (spelled *itārçi*) in TT IV A 57, which appears in a list of classes of hunters.[349]

With monosyllabic bases, the suffix vowel usually also disappears. In a n. to Ht X 63, Tezcan suggests connecting the DLT's *urt* 'eye of a needle' with *ur-* 'to put, to place' and *yurt* 'camping place' with Khaladj *yuor-* 'to sit or stay somewhere'. (The form *ärt* appearing in Ht X 63 is in *UW* 210 b taken to be an error for *artok*.) *kırt* in the DLT and in ms. T I D 596 as quoted below under *kır-t-* refers to grass and to hair and presumably comes from *kır-* 'to scrape'. *bert* always appears in a binomial with *irt*, together with which it denotes taxes. We find it in UigPacht D 6, with other exs. in the n. to the passage. It seems reasonable to derive it from *ber-* 'to give'. **kör-t* is not attested but must have been the base of *körtlä* and *körträk*. The exceedingly common *örtü* often appears together with *yalın* and, like it, signifies 'flame'. *yalın* has a clear etymology; *örtü*, for its part, may come from *ör-* 'to rise', since flames always rise upwards. The etymologies suggested for *art* 'mountain pass' and *kart* 'ulcer' not being quite convincing, we pass on to *orut*, the only exception in this paragraph. It appears only in the DLT and in QB 5639, 5697 and 6011, refers to grass and signifies 'withered'; since reaped (*or-*) grass withers, it should come from the monosyllabic °*r-* base *or-*. This lexeme must be a Qarakhanid creation, where the rules governing the juncture of *-(U)t* were apparently no longer quite operative.[350]

Where *-(U)t* is connected to *derived* bases ending with the phoneme /r/, not only the vowel disappears, but also this °*r-*: *ölüt* (DLT and *ölüt ayıg kılınç* in U III 4,12; cf. *ölütlük* and *ölütçi*), for instance, is never 'death' but, rather, 'slaughter'. It should therefore not be derived from *öl-* 'to die' but from *öl-ür-* 'to kill'. The *figura etymologica ölüt öltür-* is attested in BuddhKat 11, TT IV A 68, U III 4,13-14 and probably also 6-7, Ht IV 844 and U IV C120, *ölüt* serving as dummy object. *ölüt ölürmäk* of Maitr 122 r28 is taken up by *ölüt* alone in ls. 29 and 31. *şaşutsuz*, quoted in the *DTS* from Suv 94,2, is embedded in phraseology similar to that of *saş-ur-* (q.v. below); it should therefore be connected with it rather than

349 The simplification of *ış* to *ç* is well-attested, and also found in *okıçı* < *okı-t+çı* in QB 36, a text which has five instances of *okıtçı*. In TT IV A 57, the cluster is of course further complicated by the *r*.

350 Suffix dominance never applies to single-syllable vowel bases and would not be expected to apply with this formative. In this case, though, the instances do not enable us to check the matter: The only such derivates known to me are *çu-t* 'pickaxe' in BT III 288 (surviving in modern languages) from *çu-* 'to smite', discussed on p. 646, and perhaps *kö-t+çi* 'shepherd' in QB 1442. Both already have a rounded vowel in the base.

with *saş-*. The proper name *Kötüt* (TT IX 113) comes from *kötür-* 'to raise', for which no base is attested in Old Turkic. *takşut* 'verse' (Ht VII 1832, Kuan 171, Tug 7, 26 and 65, ETŞ 15,89, 16,112 and 19,14, Maitr 32 r3 etc.) is related to *takşur-*, a direct derivate from *tak-*; '*takış-*' is not attested. *yapşut örüm kars* (Maitr 165 r13) is in BT IX 149,13 translated as "verzierte, gestrickte Schals". A n. compares *yapşut* to KYMP'Q Y'PŞWR- "Goldblatt bekleben"; it is indeed better connected with *yapşur-* 'to stick or fasten on to' than with *yapış-* 'to adhere or stick to (intr.)'. *kagut*, the name of a dish described in the DLT, probably comes from *kagur-* 'to parch' and not from its unattested base. *çaşut* 'calumny' (TT I 74, U II 76,6, Maitr 122 v18) is related to *çaşur-* 'to make false accusations': The *figura etymologica çaşut çaşur-* appears in Suv 219,22 and in ms. H of TT IV A 71. *çaşut* is, again, dummy object here, and other mss. of TT IV A just have *çaşur-* instead. In TT VI 119, one of three mss. (TT VIOda 15 r3) has *çaşut* where the other two write *çaşı*. *çaşı* < **çaş-şı* should come directly from the unattested base, whereas *çaşut* comes from *çaşur-*. *batut* and *batutlug* 'secret' alternate in Maitr 74 r10, MaitrGeng 5 a21, HtPar 141,7, BT V 28,657 and in ms. T III M 56-2 v20 quoted in the n. to the latter. *batut* must be related to *batur-* 'to keep secret' and not to *bat-*, which always refers to *physical* submersion. The *EDPT* unnecessarily confuses *yantut* and *yanut*. The former, found in U II 77,24, Ht V 13 b15 and Ht VII 1857, Warnke 154 and BT I B(41), must come from *yan-tur-*, q.v. below, and not from a nonexistent '*yan-ıt-*', as Clauson assumes following Gabain. *yan-ut*, which is derived from the base *yan-* 'to come back, return (intr.)' is found in the QB, where it is very common, and in the DLT. A further ex., in USp 5,4, is very intelligently discussed by Clark, 1975: 232-3 and 235-8. Clark thinks that *yanut* and *yantut* are synonyms, but from his explanations it follows that they are not.[351] *kaçut*, in the DLT twice translated as 'a pursuit in battle', must be from *kaçur-* and not from *kaç-* 'to flee'; this is demanded by the meaning.

If the attested verbal expansion of the base is just *-Ur-* (and not *-tUr-* or *-gUr-*) and if the meaning and use are of no help, it is impossible to know whether an *-Ut* form is derived from a simple verb or from its causative. Thus, *kavşut* 'a place of coming together' (UigTot 1061, 1077 and 1093, MaitrH XVI 10 a4 and Maitr-

351 Ht VII spells *yantut* with final D, whence the ed. thinks it is "eines des ziemlich seltenen Nomen auf *-d*" (thus). Of the other lexemes mentioned, however, *yıd* cannot be connected with *yıpar* as there is no formative '*-pAr*'; *kid* is at best a back-formation from *ke+din* and *tod* does not signify "satt". Afghan Özbek *iskā-* probably comes from *yıdıṣka-*. *kūzād* 'night watch, guarding, hour of the night' does end in /d/ in Maitr 148 v12, 149 v21 and 150 r29, Ht IV 1218, VII 8 a18, 22, 23 and 25 and ShōAgon 1,284 and in *kūzādçi* in Ht X 1116 and ms. T III M 183 1.21 quoted in the n. to TT V A 99. Evidence for /t/ (which includes *kūzātlig* in DLT fol. 252, where /d/ and /t/ are kept strictly apart) is much weaker. *kūzād* has the same shape as *kūzād-* (q.v. on p. 491); it appears one of the rare cases of Ø derivation (like *karı-* and *karı*).

Geng 5 *b* 28 and 1.8 of a Manichaean ms. from Istanbul quoted in the n. to SP 30) or 'agreement' (DLT) could be from *kavış-* or from *kavşur-*, both of which are well attested. *boşgut*[352] 'instruction, teaching, codified knowledge' could be either from *boşgur-* 'to give instruction' or from the base common to this and to *boşgun-*. We find *boşgut boşgur-* in M III 21,2$_2$ (text 8, Uigur writing but *°r-* in any case supported by the context) but *boşgut boşgun-* in Warnke 496 and 563 and TT V B 46 and 52. Cf. also *boşgutçı*, *boşgutlug* and *boşgutsuz* discussed at the end of this section. *boşgur* is sometimes used together with *nom*, and cf. *boşgut tegli nom* in ShōAgon 2, p. 193,3-4$_1$. In HtPar 130,10 we find *boşg[undı] kōni oŋaru boşgutlug* where the parallel text, HtFragm II 11, has *boşgun]dı kōni kertū nomug*. Therefore *boşgut* is, at least in some contexts, equivalent to *nom*, a lexeme obviously neutral as to voice and participant interference. *tägşüt* signifies 'exchange' in the DLT but something like 'converse' in *bo yörügnüŋ tägşütinçä* (Suv 47,9) and *munuŋ tägşütinçä ärsär* (Ht VII 12 a 7-8, reading determined by P. Zieme). The term *tägşüt är'öz* should probably be reconstructed in BT XIII 34,2; it appears in an unpublished fr. quoted in the n. thereto. *täşgüt* in Ernte 56 may possibly be the metathesised variant of this lexeme, and not related to *täş-*. The passage reads as follows: *tägirmänkä barıp m(e)n ögüp täşgüṭkä barıp är kılıp tämürçikä barıp orgak sokdurup, bag baglaguçı kişi aş kılguçı tişikä tägi barça anda kılıp* . . . to be translated 'He goes to the mill to ground flour, then goes to exchange (it), then recruits (?) men, then goes to the smith, . . .'. The meaning of the first and third *kıl-* seem to me to be identical. *tägşüt* can by no means be related to the attested verb *täg-iş-* 'to attain each other', but must be connected with *tägşür-* 'to alter, change (tr.)'. Now the intr. counterpart of *tägşür-* is *tägşil-* (both verbs are discussed below), and the two must come from an unattested **tägiş-*. The base of *tägşüt* could be either this other *tägiş-* (surviving e.g. in Republican Turkish as an intr. verb) or *tägşür-*. Beside being an action noun, *tägşüt* is used either as subject or object of whichever base one chooses to believe in. *yaşut* 'hidden, secret' (Maitr 74 r 10, DLT and QB) could be either from *yaş-* 'to hide (intr.)' or from *yaş-ur-*, q.v.; in the first case it would denote the subject of the verb, in the latter its object, both of which are possible with this formation. Looking at *yaşut batut kılınçlıg* in Maitr 74 r 10 one would tend towards the second hypothesis both because of parallelism with *batut* < *batur-* and because evil deeds do not hide but are concealed. The DLT has *yaşut bākūt* as binomial.[353] *bākūt* may either come from *bāk+ū-* or from **bākū-r-*, only the converb of which survives; *bākrū* is discussed on p. 727. *kavut*, the name of a tax, probably comes from *kavır-* 'to encircle and collect (tr.)'.

352 HtPek 14 v 17 should be completed to *videş boşgut* and not read as '*vidiş boşgun*', as done in the n. to Ht VII 1785.

353 In the *EDPT*, *bākūt* appears only under *yaşut* but not as an entry.

This lexeme is discussed in UigPacht p. 219, and documented there. *kavır-* is likely to be derived with *-(U)r-* (q.v. below) from the base of *kavış-*. It is commonly thought that *yogrut* (thus in TT VIII I 21, Heilk II 1,42, Maitr 68 v 14 and 60 v 9, U IV D 122, UigTot 352, several times in the DLT and QB 442) ~ *yorgut* (Heilk I 169) ~ *yorgurt* (thus in Heilk I 45? The n. to the passage writes *yorgud*) comes from *yogur-* 'to knead'. This is indeed possible, since **yog-*, the base which this and *yogun* 'thick' (q.v. above) have in common, may have signified 'to become dense or thick'. If *yogur-* is really such an *-Ur-* derivate, the form *yogrut* is irregular, and one expects '*yogut*'; if, on the other hand, *yogur-* was, or was felt to be, underived, the modern variant *yogurt* would have appeared in our texts. So perhaps *yogrut* is just a metathesis of what is not only the modern but also the oldest form.

The late *äşid-üt* in *ırakta sav äşidüti ädgü* (TT I 139) 'The tidings one hears from far away are good' is the only *-(U)t* lexeme with more than two syllables. *uyat* 'shame' is either from *uya-* 'to put to shame' (q.v. under *uyad-* in section 7.23), or a cross between *uyad-* 'to be ashamed' and an original, underived, word for 'shame', *ıyat*. *ıyat* can hardly be a misreading in all cases, in ZweiFrag 1 (Brāhmī writing!), TT V B 61, HtPar 191,18, Warnke 234, BT III 192 and Maitr 60 v 4 (*uvut 'ıyat*). Only in Suv 489,12 and Maitr 59 v 8 = 217 r 3 does the printed text have *uyat*. '*ąvyat*' is just an (occasional) misreading for *ıyat* (or for *avınt*, a variant of *avant* discussed in the *UW*).

kızgut 'punishment' appears with *kıy(ı)n* in U II 20,1 and 26,14, U III 56,7$_1$, BT II 1095, Warnke 66, Sitātap 4,2 (instead of '*qaqut*' of the text) and Maitr 81 v 2, 82 r 25 and v 25 and 66 v 5 and, with *yazok* 'misdeed, sin', in Ht IV 784. In UighDoc 20, *bägätlärkä birär ... at kızgut ber-* refers to a punishment which consists in 'giving the lords a horse each' if the undersigned does anything contradicting the accord he is about to sign. *kızgut* must be related to *kız-gur-*, discussed in section 7.54 below. The /g/ in *kızgut* should remain unexplained if the base were taken to be *kız-* itself. Note, on the other hand, that in several cases there are, in fact, such unexplained /g/s: *ögüt* 'advice' (DLT fol. 37 and twice as v.l. in the QB; also in later and modern texts) is no doubt related to *ö-* 'to remember', but no verb '*ö-gür-*' 'to remind' is known. *bışıg* and *bışgut* appear as a binomial in UigTot 1221 and 1240; the former reads as follows: *munı täg kılıp bışıg bışgut bolsar...* 'If one acts thus and is quite matured, ...'. This is, of course, related to *bış-*, but there is no '*bış-gur-*' to go with *bışgut*. Nor is there any '*yap-gur-*' to serve as base for *yapgut* 'stuffing or matted mass of hair or wool, for pillows and the like' in Ernte 48 and DLT. A binomial showing at least superficial similarity with *bışıg bışgut* is *ürüg ürgüt* in Suv 517,3: *yer tatıgı küçädip ürüg ürgüt üstälür, özgän yagmur üḍinçä üsdürti kudı tökülür. ürgüt* appears to signify something like 'evermore' or 'increasingly'. It should be related to *ürüg*, with which it seems to show

some semantic affinity. *ürgüt* also appears in CYK 5, 18 and 31 and ETŞ 14,27 and in a binomial with *tutçı* (a *-gI* derivate discussed below) in ETŞ 13,139 and 192, 9,106, BT XIII 9,4 (spelled *ürkütr* by the editor) and BT III 172. The positing of an independent suffix *'-gUt'* for these lexemes does not seem sufficiently justified.

After having dealt at such length with the morphophonological aspects of this formation, we turn to its uses and functions. Most of the *-(U)t* lexemes unequivocally denoting subjects of intr. verbs appear in Qarakhanid Turkic. Such are *çök-üt, karş-ut, ol-ut, kaçut, konat* and *köç-üt*, all mentioned in the *EDPT*. *kül-* is also intr. but the DLT's *külüt* 'a laughing stock' denotes its indirect object. Other *-(U)t* derivates from intr. bases serve as abstracts: *yaguktakı iş bütüti ädgü* (TT I 140) 'Some matter pertaining to the near future will have a positive outcome'; *kälüţin bilmäţin kävşänsär. . .* (ETŞ 11,61) 'If he is unaware of its coming and lets himself become weak, . . .'. *kurut, örţ* and Qarakhanid *yanut* also denote subjects of intr. bases, whereas the probably already opaque *yurt* and perhaps *kavşut* are local in meaning; all of these were discussed above. *kon-ut* 'dwelling' in QB 4471 is also local. On the other hand *konat* "any group of people who bunch together with one another" (DLT fol. 180) is a subject noun; it cannot be a variant of *konut*, as the *EDPT* says, but must be a different lexeme. *tüşüt* 'thought' may come from *tüş-* 'to fall': Cf. Azeri *başa tüş-* 'to understand', Oguz Turkic *düşün-* 'to think' and German *ein+fallen* with dat. 'to remember something, get an idea'. It appears in BT XIII 35,4 and 55,2 and BuyKāl 9, in all three instances together with *ögrätig* 'practice' and complementing its content. HamTouen 15,22 has *bo kiwen savda tüşütümüz: kutlug kıvlıg bolmakı bolgay ärdi*, which should have been translated as: 'our thoughts in this scroll: May its (our visit's) outcome turn out to be fortunate'. We also have *tüşütlän-* (and *tüşütlänil-*) and *tüşüt+lüg*, all three discussed below. *tüşüt* cannot be from *tüş+ä-* 'to dream', since *-(U)t* is not dominant.

-(U)t derivates from tr. bases can, of course, also serve as abstracts. *basut* 'help' and *basutçı* 'helper; secondary cause' (discussed in section 2.75) are exceedingly common, but are difficult to relate to *bas-* 'to press etc.'. The action nouns *ölüt, küzät, äşidüt* and *okut* have been discussed above together with their bases. Lexemes like *kızgut* and *adırt* 'difference, distinction, particularity, characteristic; detailed'[354] serve both as action nouns and to denote objects. Other object representatives mentioned above are *takşut, çaşut, batut, yantut*, the Qarakhanid *orut* and *kagut* etc. The DLT's *kat-ut* 'a liquid mixture' is another ex. for this. *artut* 'a gift presented to a prince etc.' is quoted in the *UW* from two Uigur exs., in the *EDPT* also from the DLT, the QB and the Atabatu 'l-Ḥaqā'iq. The Uigur exs. are spelled with one initial alif; hence the *EDPT*'s spelling *'ärtüt'* and Clauson's

354 None of the exs. listed in *UW* 54 under *adırt* A, a and glossed as "Unterschied, verschieden" signifies "verschieden"; only "Unterschied".

etymology from *ärt-* (disproven in the *UW*). A further Uigur instance (in HamTouen 18,12) is spelled the same way: *tayaŋuka ąrtut kötürdi* '(El Tirāk) brought a gift for the chamberlain'. If the *UW*'s suggestion to derive *artut* from *art-* 'to load something onto a person's or an animal's back' should be correct, this would be an object nominal. This *art-* is quoted in the *EPDT* only from XVIth century Ottoman on, but there is an Uigur ex. in the *UW*. Cf. also the DLT's *artıl-*, *artun-* and *artış-*.

Abstracts whose bases may be either (tr.) causatives or (intr.) simplexes are *boşgut* and *tägşüt*. In quite a number of cases, the assignment of valency tasks like subject or object to *-(U)t* lexemes seems problematic because it is not clear whether they are derived from causatives or from their bases.

The usual common expanders, *+çI*, *+lXg*, *+sXz* and *+lA-* are well attested with *-(U)t* bases. *-(U)t+sXz*, *-(U)t+çI* and the doubly expanded *-(U)t+çI+lXg* are discussed on pp. 137, 115-6 and 118 respectively. Verbal expansions of *-(U)t* nouns are *adırtla-* and *basutla-*. The *-(U)t+lXg* forms appear to be occasional and do not have much in common: *küzätlig* and *katutlug* in the DLT, *küzätlig* in Maitr 132 v13, *yaşutlug iş* in QB 5109 and *yogrutlug aş* in TT VII 16,5 are exs.. *batutlug*, a synonym of *yaşutlug*, appears with *kizläglig* in HtPar 141,7 and with *yaşru* in MaitrGeng 5 a21. *üdürtlüg* is found in M I 26,16 (Gebet) in a binomial with *adırtlıg*, a very common adjective and adverb documented in the *UW*. Further instances not yet included there occur in HamTouen 23,11, UigKan 217 and 291, AmitIst 69, ms. PelliotOuigour 203 r8 (UigBunken p. 78), ShōAv 207 and 335, InscrOuig V 17 and BT XIII 1,30 and in eight other instances in that collection. QB 2775 has a Qarakhanid ex.. *takşut* 'verse' receives the appositional *+lXg* in BT I A_2(40) (*takşutlug şloklar*) and ETŞ 13,11 (*takşutlug taloylar*, in metaphorical sense). *körtlüg* 'beautiful' is a hap. in HamTouen 7,20.[355] *boşgutlug*, finally, is found in TT IV A 36, TT VIII A 46, Ht IV 831 and 898, HtPek 117 v7-9, Abhi B 53 a11 (541), BT II 117-8, Buddhāv Y 150 and UigTot 35; it denotes the *śaikṣa*, 'one who is under instruction or training'. In TT VIII the Skt. and Uigur terms are equated. Cf. the n. to TT V BKud 56 for the terminological relationship between *boşgutçı*, *boşgutlug* and *boşgutsuz*.

It is not always easy to tell apart forms of *-(U)t*, *-(X)ntI* (q.v. below) and the perfect. What we discuss in section 3.117 as *ur-untı* was considered by Gabain in her grammar to belong to the *-(U)t* formation with the possessive suffix added. Next consider the passage Ht V 13 b21: *äşidtimiz, Samtso açarı nomlug el uluşlarıg käzip amtı yana yanturu ävrilti tep. ögirtimiz sävintimiz ülgüsüz bolgay t(ä)rk kälip bizni birlä körüşsär. yana* . . . 'We have heard that the master Tripiṭaka has

355 As the n. thereto says, "apparemment, *körtlüg* est à *körklüg* ce que *körtlä* est à *körklä*". Another cognate is *körträk*; cf. n. 474 below.

travelled through the countries$_2$ of the law (i.e. India) and that he has come back again'. Taking *ögirtimiz* and *sävintimiz* to be perfect forms, we understand the rest of the passage as follows: 'We are filled with joy$_2$. It will be invaluable if (his honour) comes quickly to meet us. Further, . . .'. *ögirtimiz* and *sävintimiz* could also be interpreted as *-(U)t* derivates from *ögir-* and *sävin-* respectively, + possessive suffix; we would then translate 'Our joy$_2$ would be without bounds if he came quickly. . . .'. The reasons for us not to do this would be the fact that '*ögirt*' and '*sävint*' are not attested and that – assuming our interpretation of *urunti* to be correct – there are no *-(U)t* derivates from passive or reflexive verbs. Even *äşid-timiz* in the first sentence could be a syncopated *äşidüt* (which appears in TT I 139!); the translation would then start with the words 'What we have heard is that . . .'. It has been suggested that the perfect originally was a verbal noun in *-(U)t* with the possessive suffixes added for agent reference. This looks convincing in view of Yakut tense morphology, which seems to be particularly archaic: In Yakut, the addition of predicative pronouns serves for the non-past, whereas possessive suffixes referring to agents are an indication of the past. The problem with connecting *-(U)t* noun and perfect is the fact that the perfect consistently has a /d/ except after /r l n/ and perhaps /z/. We notice that in most Old Turkic instances (as distinct from Qarakhanid Turkic) *-(U)t* either appears after /r/ or after an original /r/ which disappeared. The perfect and the *-(U)t* formation could be joined if it could be shown that the latter originally was **-(U)d*; this does not seem feasible at present.

3.109 *-mA*

This formative is added to simple verb stems, and to some derived ones: *bälgür-t-*, *te-t-*, *köç-ür-*, *kötür-*, *udı-t-*, *amrıl-*, *kötr-ül-*, *közün-* and the denominal *ärk+sin-*, *kap+ar-* 'to form a bubble or vesicle' and *bälgü+r-* 'to appear'. *-mA* forms serve both nominally and adnominally, and denote the subject of intr. verbs and the direct object of tr. ones. Some exs. appear to have verbal rection, which we will mention when quoting them. The formation appears to become popular in late texts both Qarakhanid and tantric, but is found already in the earliest ones.

Derivates from intr. bases are slightly less numerous than from tr. ones, and we shall mention them first. *yälmä* 'a reconnoitring patrol' in the ŞU and Toñ inscrs. is from *yäl-* 'to trot or amble'. *kaparma* 'bubble' appears in BuddhUig I 4, UigTot 1180, BT VII A 243 and in a fr. quoted in the n. to the latter. *öçmä amrılma nirvan* 'the Nirvāṇa of being extinguished and at peace' (Hazai 32) can be compared to *amrılmış enç nirvan* (BuddhStab II 17) on the one hand, to *öçmiş amrılmış köŋül* (BT II 1262) on the other. A parallel use of *öç-* and *amrıl-* is documented in the *UW* under *amrıl-*; I mention further exs. in my discussion of

amrıl- in section 7.31 below. Thus also *öçmä amrılma yıntım tözi* (ETŞ 12,44). In *öçmä yarok* (ETŞ 12,38), the *-mA* form is shown to refer to the subject of intr. 'extinction', what one might call 'cool light'. *törü-mä* is 'what comes into existence of itself', be it *toŋ altun* 'solid gold' as in the fr. quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 13, or living beings as in ETŞ 13,198: *törümäniŋ ozgusıŋa swka al altagı* 'the special means for the salvation of creatures'. In ShōAgon 2, p. 194,4, *ṭ[ō]pōdā törümä uguşlug kanlar* corresponds to Skt. *mūrdha+ja-rāja* (pointed out to me by P. Zieme). *törümä* renders the verbal root *ja* 'to become' (the kernel of the first part of the compound). Another instance of *törümä* is found in Hochzeit 13. A mere 'appearance' is *közünmä* (BT VII A 337 and 393). *barma yıl* (Ht VII 1885) is translated as 'last year'. *yezämä* in BT III 993 must be an abstract, rare in this formation: *küzki yezämä iş küçtä küdän öz äviŋä barırça küsäp . . .* 'As if, during the patrolling activity$_2$ of autumn, somebody comes to his own home as guest . . .'[356] *yezä-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) and *yezäk*[357] are attested in Qarakhanid Turkic. *kötrülmä agır ärdini tözlüg . . . kötitmiş çoglugka yükünür m(ä)n* (ETŞ 10,273) is not 'like a diamond which is heavy to lift' or '. . . hard to carry', as Arat and *UW* 66 a top understand it: Rather, *agır* and *kötrülmä* are used in parallelism, signifying 'honoured' and 'elevated, exalted' respectively. This meaning of *kötrül-* is found also in expressions like *atı kötrülmiş* and *kopda kötrülmiş nom eligi*. Besides, the previously suggested rendering would have demanded *-gU* and not *-mA*. *ärksinmä* is found in Abhi 118 a 16 and 120 b 11 (TermBuddh) in the phrase *ärksinmä atl(ı)g basutçı* 'the causal factor called "the dominant"'. This is a translation of *adhipatipratyaya*, whence we know that *ärksinmä* refers to the agent of the verb. Although intr. in shape, *ärksin-* is a tr. verb; but the conception of it which was at the base of *ärksinmä* may have been intr., something like 'to be authoritative'.

The DLT has several *-mA* forms not found elsewhere: *çokra-ma yul* is 'an abundant spring spontaneously flowing with water', *kalı-ma* 'a balcony' and *kutur-ma börk* 'a cap which has two flaps, in front and behind', from *kutur-* 'to exceed' and thence 'to overhang'. In Uigur, 'a balcony' is *kalı-k*, a rather polysemic lexeme from the same base (discussed above). In the DLT we also find a number of *-mA* forms which are derived from tr. verbs and do not appear either in Uigur or in Orkhon Turkic. They are *äg-mä* 'an arch (in a house)', *bıç-ma yorınçga* 'reaped lucerne', *bulga-ma* 'a gruel which contains neither sweetening nor oil', *bür-mä* 'a waist band', *ıd-ma yılkı* 'an animal which is allowed to go free', *köçür-mä oçuk* or *oyun* 'a fire-place/game which is transported from place to place', *ör-mä saç*

356 The text is difficult and other interpretations are possible.

357 Probably with °*k* and not °*g* because it rhymes with *bäzä-k* in QB 128, and this noun retained its velar in Ottoman.

'plaited hair', *kat-ma yuvga* 'folded bread cooked in butter', *kuy-ma* 'type of bread ("the dough is . . . poured into a kettle . . .")'; tool manufactured by casting', *süz-mä* 'curds', *tik-mä näŋ* 'something sewn' and *tik-mä üzüm* 'grapes that are densely clustered', *tut-ma* 'a chest or coffer' (which one can presumably hold by its handles), *tüg-mä* 'a button' and *udıt-ma* 'moist curd cheese' (from a metaphorical use of *udı-t-*). All of these denote the objects of their base verb. *wy-ma* "felt from which boots are made" is attested in DLT fol. 319 and 370 as object of *basıq-* and *talkış*-respectively; this describes the process by which such felt was prepared. *wyma* was lent to other Altaic languages before it lost its initial /h/. See *wy-ok* for the base. Some other tr. *-mA* forms are also rare. The word written '*idimä*' in Tug 53 should be read as *äydimä*, from *äydi-* 'to gather, pick up': *tutar m(ä)n bo kimxoki sudurnuŋ äydimäsin.*[358] *kır-ma* is attested only once, in SuvStockh 72, but we also have the derivate *kırmalaş-*: *kunuş kırma kılurlar* should be translated as 'they practise robbery and pillage' and not "Raub und Gewalt" as the editors do. The Chin. text just has 'robbing' in this passage, and 'pillaging' is also the translation given for *kırmalaş-*. The base signifies 'to scrape off', and our derivate clearly comes from a rather violent special meaning of this verb. There is a variant *karma* (DLT fol. 218), which is probably the result of contamination with *karak* 'brigandage, pillage'. From this variant comes *karmala-* (Maitr), q.v. among the *+lA-* verbs. *ük-mä* 'heap', listed in the DLT, no doubt appears also in Ht V 2 b20: *saçmış xuaları ulug ükm[ä] boltı. säç-mä*, literally 'excellent', is attested in the binomial *öŋisig säçmä* (ShōAv 251), in *adrok säçmä sukançıg yeg tözlüg* (ETŞ 15,62) and in *ya[r]aşı säçmä tılaŋurmaklıg* (ĀgFrag (l) E 4). Instead of the usual *te-gmä* or *atl(ı)g*, ETŞ 11,55 has *te-t-mä*; this corresponds to *te-t-ir*, the predicative or at least non-attributive counterpart of these two expressions: *yalaŋok tetmä yapa tınlıg yarışu küç berzün saŋa*. Whereas *äydimä*, *kırma* and *säçmä* denote the objects of their tr. bases, *tet-* is intr., and *tetmä* denotes its subject.[359]

The most common *-mA* form in Old Turkic is *bälgürtmä*, which is due to the place of this term in Buddhist terminology. It usually appears in the expression *bälgürtmä ät'öz*, which corresponds to Skt. *nirmāṇakāya*. In general, everything which has *lakṣanas* is *bälgürtmä*. Here are a few of the exs.: *Maytrisimit nom bitigdä bälgürtmä balık uluşug körüp korkmak aymanmak atl(ı)g säkiz y(i)girminç ülüş nom* (Maitr 55 r2); *kılmış b(ä)lgürtmiş b(ä)lgürtmälär* (BT II 205) "das erschaffen$_2$ existierende". Appearances of the Buddha: *burxan bälgürtmäläri üzäki etig yaratıgka tükällig ärür* (BT VIII B 178); cf. *bälgürtmä arıg süzük burxanlar uluşı* (Suv 41,2); *b(ä)lgürtmä tılgän* (BT VII H26) and *yelvi bälgürtmä arvış* (Suv 491,15). This form, too, denotes the object of its base, *bälgür-t-*.

358 Or perhaps rather *äydi-miş+ı+n* instead?

359 *tetmä* could, of course, just be an error for *tegmä*.

sorma 'wheat beer' in Heilk I 164, Ernte 68 etc. is by *TMEN* 1241 connected with the verb *sor-* 'to suck in'. *kıyı-ma* should probably be read in Heilk II 3,48 and 51 instead of the ed.'s *kayıma*: In *süglün äti kıyıma kılıp yesär* (51) it probably refers to a dish prepared from meat cut into shreds; the other ex. is *burçak üzä kıyıma bışur[up . . .* See n. 341 and *kıyı-k* (section 3.102) for the base. The same lexeme appears in the DLT in *kıyma ügrä* 'the name of a kind of noodles for which the dough is cut at a slant'. *yarma* 'groats' appears in Heilk I 72 and 149 and in later texts; the DLT only has *yarma yuvga* 'a kind of puff pastry'. Both meanings are derivable from *yar-* 'to split (open)'. In Warnke 50 (quoted below under *sıg-ur-*) *yar-ma* is 'a crack'; this is the most transparent derivate from *yar-*. *käsmä aş* (U III 65,1$_2$) is 'a dish of cut meat', but in the DLT *käsmä*, attested several times, is 'a forelock'. The DLT does not have *yarma* 'groats', *sorma* 'wheat beer' or *käsmä aş* (all three of which denote the objects of their tr. bases), but several of its culinary *-mA* forms have been quoted above: *katma yuvga*, *udıtma*, *süzmä*, *kuyma*, *bulgama*. *bulgama* 'gruel' looks suspiciously similar to *bulgamaç*, which is found in several post-Qarakhanid texts with the same meaning, and survives in Republican Turkish to this day. The DLT has a number of names for dishes which end in *-mAç*: *yörgä-mäç* 'paunch and intestines folded and wrapped in the smaller intestines and then cooked by roasting', from *yörgä-* 'to wrap around'; *kagur-maç* 'parched wheat' from *kagur-* 'to parch (grain and the like)'; *tut-maç*, the name of some kind of soup containing dough, presumably from *tut-* in the sense 'to cling'. Finally, *kömäç* 'a round loaf which is buried in hot ashes'; this comes, no doubt, from *köm-* 'to bury' with assimilation of the /m/. *umaç*, the name of a kind of pastry appearing at a later date and discussed in *TMEN* 551, would be from *uv-* 'to crumble (tr.)'.[360] The suffix *-mAç* specifically denotes dishes and is not attested before Qarakhanid Turkic. It is strange for the meaning of a suffix to be limited in this way. I suggest that *-mAç* comes from the sequence *-mA aş* with *aş* 'food', which is in fact attested as *käsmä aş* in U III. Only the replacement of /ş/ by /ç/ lacks an explanation. This contraction does not seem to have taken place in Old Turkic proper.[361]

In a few cases we find, or appear to find, nouns governed by *-mA* forms. Verbal forms which govern referential (i.e. in a sense definite) nominal expressions are beyond the limits of derivation proper. It turns out that is not the case with the *-mA* derivates. *but kötürmä tınlıg* 'a living being lifted up by (its) legs' (or some similar phrase) appears in TT VII 40,141, ETŞ 16,96 and BT XIII 20,44, 21,45,

360 The passage *uv-* > *u-* is nearly regular even in Old Turkic.

361 I have no explanation for *tılmaç* 'interpreter', found in a number of Turkic languages and in the QB but not in Old Turkic; it *looks* as if it were derived from *tıl* 'informer; tongue'. *kıymaç börk*, a kind of hat mentioned in the DLT, cannot be assigned to this *-mAç* either; cf. *sokarlaç börk*, the name of another kind of hat which occurs in the DLT.

39,16 and 47,25. The first word is not *kod* 'stature', because that does not mean 'body'; the difference may not seem great but is significant. Moreover, *körür* being a tr. verb, *anïg* should represent its object and not its subject, as would be demanded by a rendering as, say, 'a creature lifting up its body'; that would make it a lone exception to the functioning of the formative *-mA*. *kur*, then, is the subject of *körür*. — [362] A fragmentary passage in BT I D (333) has an instrumental with a *-mA* form: *] kögen b[a]lgärmä ŋ*, translated as "Erscheinung". Whereas *körür* is tr., *bälgür* 'to appear' is intr.. *ŋgma* in Uig Bst 103, which is accompanied by a noun in the locative case, is probably an error for *ŋgmak*: An instance each of *ŋgmak* and *ŋgmä* (thus, for *ŋgmak*) are found in parallelism with it. *odug sak koyŋçïça*[363] *igidmälä[r] amrak kuzılarg* in M III 5,1, (text I) is to be translated 'the ones who feed the lovely lambs, like wakeful, shepherds'. The form *igidmälä[r]* is parallel to *ber igmälär* and to a damaged *]gmalar*, and probably represents a dissimilatory shortening of **igidigmälär*. Summing up this aspect of the formation, we can state that *-mA* only very rarely forms derivates with verbal government, which then only govern non-specific nouns. Nevertheless, these rare exs. of government, taken together with the fact that *-mA* forms not seldom come from derived verbs, indicate that this formation had not quite lost its verbiness.

The only verbal derivate from an attested *-mA* base is *karma+la-*: *yars(ı)mal-ayu* (q.v. in section 7.102) is attested four times, but there is no **yarsï-ma* in sight. There is, finally, the rather common *äzmälä-*, presumably from **äzmä*. Nonverbal derivates from *-mA* are also rare: *kärmälük ät* (U III 65, 10,) is an ex.; 'meat for the dish of chopped meat' should have a *k* at the end and not a *g*, as Müller writes. *kärmä ay* being documented above, *+lXk* fits the meaning demanded by the context better than *+lXg*. The poverty in expansions may be another indication of 'verby' status.

3.110 *-gI*

The existence of this suffix was not noticed till now, although some of the lexemes belonging to it are common enough. It appears with an allomorph *-kI* when the base ends in sonants like */n/* and */r/*, best visible with the particle *ärki* and with *barkï*. All *-gI* lexemes have two syllables.

-gI basically forms nouns and adjectives denoting the object of tr. verbs and the subject of intr. ones.

362 The BT XIII instances are translated as "den Körper tragende Lebewesen"; "nach G. Clauson *ED* 297 b", as the footn. to 20,44 says. My interpretation agrees with the translation given in TT VII 40,141.

363 The edition writes *'känçiçä'*, which makes no sense. In Manichaean script, back and front *k* differ only by two dots, and *ä* is identical with *oy*. *koyŋçı* is demanded by the context.

The modal particle *ärki* and the DLT's abstract *täzgi* 'flight from the enemy, in panic' are the result of secondary and sporadic development. *ärki*, corresponding to Latin *num* and German *wohl* in interrogative sentences, is found only in Uigur and Qarakhanid texts. It indicates that the questioner has no hope of receiving a clear-cut and authoritative answer, either out of genuine doubt or out of politeness. It is also found in declarative sentences, e.g. in U III 29,5, where it also corresponds to the German dubitative particle *wohl*. In this sense, it comes quite close to *äräŋ*; that, however, expresses uncertainty concerning the past or the present but not the future, and does not seem to appear in questions. The two particles have the base *är-* 'to be' in common, and both transcend the usual functions of their respective formations.

We now come to the derivates of this formation which are regular in content, and start with those coming from tr. bases.

tergi or *terki* is attested in ms. T I 526 (U 2332) v6 quoted in the n. to BT XIII 5,77 and appears frequently in the DLT and the QB. The lexeme denotes 'a portable table brought in with the meal set on it' and comes from *ter-* 'to arrange'. *ötägi* is written as *ötägi* in DLT fol. 77 but appears in a section with bisyllables. It may represent a syncopated derivate of *ötä-* 'to pay'. It signifies 'a compensatory gift', i.e. one given in exchange for something. *kamgı* is in DLT fol. 214 said to denote anything "twisted or crooked", but the ex. makes clear what, exactly, Kāšgarī means: He says that one calls 'a person with palsy of the mouth' *kamgı yüzlüg*. *kamgı* is attested also in SP 22 as *kamgı äliglig* and 23 before a lacuna. The Skt., Tib. and Chin. versions of the SP text are equivalent to German "verdrehte/verkrüppelte Hände", which must be the content of the Uigur phrase as well. *kamgı* probably comes from *kam-* 'to strike down' and denotes, like the other *-gI* derivates from tr. verbs, the object of the activity. *bur-kı* is attested in Ht VII 12 a20, TT VIII I4 and DLT fol. 215; the latter's ex. again speaks of a face, in this case 'frowning' and 'wrinkled'. *burkırak yüzin* "mit ganz verzerrtem Gesicht" (Maitr 117 v18) is a *+rAk* expansion from this. Cognates are *bur-uš-* and *bur-uš*, qq.v.; *burkug* and *burkıt-* should come from an unattested *-(X)k-* derivate of the base. Cf. also *buşrı* among the *-I* lexemes.

-gI derivates from intr. verbs are a bit more numerous. *yan-kı* (with two dots to mark the *q*) appears in *yankısın yantutun ber-* in U II 77,24. The *EDPT* entry adds: "*-ğı* is unusual; *-ğu* would be expected", but the facs. (q.v.) is clear. *yankı* comes from *yan-* 'to come back' and here (like *yan-ıg*) signifies 'recompense', i.e. 'something given in return'; the meaning of *yantut* is discussed above, among the *-(U)t* forms. Similarly *uflılıg yankılıg törü* "das Gesetz der Dankbarkeit," in ŠhŌAv 45, ⌊ *anın bärü yan*Kı *yan*Kı ⌋ (BT XIII 31,5) appears in fragmentary context; because it is repeated, Zieme suggests translating it as 'again and again, repeatedly'. Two further exs. refer to speech: *kızlāk eliginä yankı sözlädi* "zum

. . . König erwidernd sprach er" in BT VIII B 45 and, in the n. thereto, *bo savın äşidip yankı kiKinç berü umadın . . . ünsüz şuk bo[lup]* "als ich die Worte des . . . vernommen hatte, wurde ich, ohne eine Erwiderung und Antwort geben zu können, lautlos und still" (ms. T I D 118 (U 1043) v 5-9).

The base of *yumgı* is not attested, but *yumdar-* and *yumut-*, *yomuk-* (thus!) *EDPT* an error for *yomut-*), *yumur*, *yumurla-*, *yumuz*, *yumzug*, *yumgak* and "conuenire" i.e. 'to meet (intr.)' in the Codex Comanicus (according to the *yumurtqa* must all be related. See also the expansion *yumgı+gu+n* in section 2.52. *yumgı* 'all; assembled in great quantity' is very common; exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* can be found, among other places, in Suv 365,17, 622,21, 623,1, 627,15, 630,1, 634,14, 635,5, SuvStockh 69 and SuvZieme 8, Heilk II 1,27 (written *yumgu(?)*), BT II 465, 616 and 1313-14. In HtPar 130,19 the lexeme is written with two dots over the velar, and accordingly transcribed by Kudara and Zieme as *'yumkı'* (in HtFragm p. 143). But the same passage also has *T(a)vgaç* written with such dots, a name for which the voicedness of the velar is beyond doubt.[364] In stances in BT XIII 1,116 and 35,7 are not dotted, but are nevertheless transcribed with *q*. Nor does *yumkı* in TT III 101 (Manichaean script) prove anything, for that text freely confuses the velars. But *yumgı* is written with *ghain* seven times in the QB, and DLT fols. 459 and 551 both write *yumgı*. *kamgı* is another lexeme in which the velar of *-gI* remains voiced after *°m-*.

katgı 'harsh, hard-tempered' appears as a binomial with *katıg* in Maitr 171 r 7 and TT I 14, in both cases used adnominally. DLT fol. 221 uses *katgı* in verse, while his lemma (fol. 215) has the assimilated form *katkı*. The variant retained in verse must have been the traditional one, whereas Kāšğarī himself can be taken to have said *katkı*. *katkı* is also the form in QB 2232 and 2233, but Uigur is *not* characterised by voice assimilation in the consonants. *kat-* 'to be hard, tough', the base of *katıg* and *katgı*, is not too common, but *is* attested.

kötgi, finally, is a 'swelling or protrusion' and usually 'hillock or mound'. No base for it is attested in Old Turkic, but *kötür-* 'to lift up, raise' comes from such a base. Both *kötüt-* and *kötür-* are likely to be the causatives of the verb living on in Yak. as *köt-* 'to fly, skip, jump', in Azeri as *göt-* 'to lift up'; see n. 424 in vol. 2. *kötgi+r-*, q.v. below, also helps us understand the central meaning of *kötgi*. *kötgi* appears in Maitr 78 r 19 (*āt kötgilār* 'mounds of meat') and 131 r 30, DLT fol. 216 ("mound of earth") and QB 21, 3527 and 6069. It has several derivates: The verb *kötgir-* just mentioned; *uysuz kötgisiz tüz sūŋūki* (MaitrGeng 5 a 13)[365] 'his smooth bones which had no holes or protrusions' and, on the other hand, *yeti yerdā kötgilig ātözi* (MaitrGeng 11 b 21) 'his body, which has seven swellings'.

364 They transcribe this as *Tvÿač*. Cf. also their *q̄arangǰu* in HtPar 131,6.
365 Not '*ösüz*', as written there.

There is one instrument noun in this formation. *kärki* 'adze' (LautHöllen 116 and DLT fol. 216) perhaps comes from *kärt-* 'to gash, cut a notch in', the cluster °*rtg*° getting simplified. The Codex Comanicus shows the second velar to have been voiceless like the first: After the /t/ was dropped, the /g/, which became adjacent to /r/, was regularly replaced by /k/. Note that the DLT's ex. of *kärt-* takes 'a piece of wood' as object, and that Ar. *qaddūm*, the DLT's translation for *kärki*, denotes a carpenter's implement. As another possibility, *kärki* may come from the unattested °*r-* base of *kärt-*; cf. *käz* in the next section.

Instances like *ärki* and *yumgı*, which present themselves as idiosyncratic fusions already at an early date, testify to the antiquity of this formation; it appears to have died out after Qarakhanid Turkic, on the other hand. This, together with its relative rarity, may have been the reasons why scholars did not identify it. Yet, its functions come out clear enough. All *-gI* forms are bisyllabic, or become so, as in the case of *ötgi*. Expansions include the verbs *kötgir-* and *kamgır-*. The first is discussed among the *+(A)r-* verbs; see section 6.3. for the second. *sürgilā-* "to make (deer) run while following in its tracks to catch it" (DLT fol. 599) has a *kasra* and *yā* in the second syllable in the perfect form. The aorist and infinitive were not marked for second syllable vowels by the first hand. The second-hand *fatḥa* (which Clauson saw as a *ḍamma* and took as the base for his interpretation) must therefore be rejected. The unattested **sürgi* is clearly a *-gI* derivate from *sür-* 'to drive (on/away)'.

3.111 -(X)z

This suffix is added to both tr. and, more commonly, intr. bases and denotes the object of the verb in the first case but its subject in the second. Bases are typically simple, but at least one deverbal base (*ärgür-*) does appear to exist. -(X)z forms are either mono- or bisyllabic.

An obscure relationship exists between nominals ending /z/ and verb stems with /r/ in their last syllable. It can perhaps be described as the loss of this /r/ under derivation of nominal from verb: *kütuz* 'a mad dog' < **kütur-(u)z*, *ärgüz* < **ärgür-(ü)z*, *munduz* < **mun-dur-(u)z* and perhaps *adız* < **adır-(ı)z*; *yavız* 'bad' < **yavrı-z*, *sämiz* 'fat' (adj., of an animal) < **sämri-z*.

While the first four instances remind us of the derivation of -(U)t forms from °*r-* bases, the last two can also be described the other way around: *sämri-* can be a rhotacistic derivate from *sämiz*, and so forth, using the formative *+I-* (q.v. below): The existence of *+I-* has to be assumed for *yıd+ı-*, for instance. Where the first syllable of verb and °z form are rounded, the verb's shape is more revealing. In one case, this shape speaks for the second account: *yultuz* 'star' > *yuldrı-* 'to gleam' in the DLT and subsequently, and not '**yultrı-z* > *yultız*'. Parallel to this,

the relationship between *ākūg* and *ākli-* can only be **āk(ā)ɣ+i- > ākli-* and not **ākli-ɣ > ākg*'; the latter form is nowhere attested. On the other hand, *tōz* 'root, origin, element' probably comes over **tōrū-z* from *tōrū-* 'to come into existence'. We come to need two different explanations; one for the first four verbs mentioned above and for *tōz*, an other one for the rest: It seems quite unlikely that *sāmiz* and *yavız* belong to the *-(X)z* formation; these must be the *bases* of *sāmri-* and *yavrı-* respectively, not their derivates. In any case, the matter will not get completely clarified before Turkic rhotacism is exhaustively described. Among the four *-(X)z* lexemes mentioned first, *munduz* could perhaps be considered a derivate from *mun-* and not from *mun-dur-*, assuming the *d* to be parasitic: This would in fact better accord with the meanings of the lexemes. *adız* is *perhaps* better connected with *adır-* (discussed in section 6.3 below) than with its hypothetical base. For *kuluz* and *ārgüz*, however, there is no alternative to the first explanation. Another such nominal is *käz* 'the notch of an arrow', attested more than once in the DLT and a number of times in Middle Turkic. It presumably comes from the unattested base of *kārt-* 'to notch', possibly found also in *kārki* (mentioned in the previous section).

bäkiz 'clear, manifest' does *not* belong to this formation but is a borrowing from an Iranian language: See the *EDPT*, which quotes exs. of the binomial *bäkiz bälgülüg*. In ShōAgon 1,51, this binomial is changed to *bālKiz b(ā)lgülüg*; this probably comes from a mistaken and spontaneous 'popular etymology' connecting the first lexeme as well with *bālgür-*, and assigning it to the *-(X)z* formation. This adjustment is not sufficient camouflage for us, however: An *-(X)z* derivate from *bālgür-* would have had the shape '*bālgüz*', with rounded second vowel.

-(X)z appears to have been rather obsolescent in Old Turkic: A number of lexemes evidently of this formation have no living bases, or have lost semantic contact with them. *küvāz* 'proud, pride', e.g., is related to *kūvān-* 'to be proud', and **kūvā-* must also have been intr. Exs. of *küvāz* are quoted in the *EDPT*; others appear in Maitr 106 v10, BT VII A 157 and BT XIII 28,14. *yavız* 'bad', *passim*, has no base either; taken together with *yavgan* (q.v. in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*), however, we should assume one to have existed. We find it also in Buddh-Kat 27, written YA.BİS. *uçuz*, whose first and most dominant meaning is 'easy', *may* have come from *uç-* 'to fly', taking the latter in an (unattested) metaphorical sense. It appears also on l.9 of the Tes inscr., in a difficult context. We often find it together with *oŋay*, e.g. in AbitAnk 15.

kokuz signifies 'empty, lacking' in QB 617, 1626 (twice), 4718, 5448 etc., but 'loss, waste, perdition' in ZiemeTārā 15 d and in Suv 342,6-8 quoted in the commentary to the latter, on p. 586. Since it is written with *q* in the QB, it must be derived from *kok-* 'to diminish, decrease (intr.)'; this is a verb found in TT I 59 and the DLT. The Middle Turkic evidence is also partly adjectival and partly

nominal. In view of the QB spelling, the Uigur exs. cannot be read with a voiced intervocalic velar, as Zieme does: There can be no doubt that all this is one lexeme. *uz* 'master, masterly, skilled, skilful(ly), craftsman' is related to *u-* 'to get on, to manage, to be capable'. *u-* appears to be an intr. verb: At least, I know of no exs. with object. Beside the passages mentioned in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, *uz* appears e.g. in Suv 487,7 and 574,19 (quoted in the n. to BT XIII 5,75), Ht IV 1030 and 1329 and VII 7 a 27, KP II 5-6, BT II 59 and 652, BuddhStab I 16, ETŞ 9,80 and 94 and 20,43, BT VII A 710, ManMon 90 etc. Although *uz* has developed special meanings, the semantic connection between it and *u-* is unmistakable. *yumuz är*, 'a short, stout, fat man' in the DLT, is connected with *yumgak*, *yumgı*, *yumıt-* etc.

The bases of the remaining *-(X)z* forms are tr., and they denote the object of the activity represented by these verbs. *baz* 'pacified', i.e. 'peaceable or subjugated', is in the *EDPT* documented only from the Orkhon inscrs. and in Qarakhanid Turkic, but in the *DTS* s.v. *tüz* there is an Uigur ex.: *tütüşlüg kerişlig tınglıglarıg tüz baz kılmış* (Suv 169,2) 'He made quarreling and fighting creatures in harmony and at peace with each other'. Other Uigur instances of *baz* can be found in Suv 411,15 and in an unpublished Brāhmī text (communication of Dr. D. Maue). In *UAJb* N.F. 2(1982): 288, Tezcan has suggested connecting it with *ba-* 'to bind', which has metaphorical uses as well. Cf. also *bag* 'confederation'. *öz* 'self, own, the ego' may be connected with *ö-* 'to remember, to think': Cf. the relationship between *γrēw* and *γrβ* 'to know' in Iranian. *bög-üz* or *bük-üz* appears in ThreeLett 29, but has not been identified till now: *Basmılıg ögüz bw̄Küzintin köçüp Ila kudı barıı tesär* . . . 'When they recounted about the Basmıls that they had migrated away from the river bend/basin and gone down the Ili (river) . . .'. *bük-* 'to double over (intr.)' (attested also in BT III 214) is perhaps less suited to the context than *bög-* 'to collect (tr.)', often used with reference to water.[366] *tikiz kōni* in Suv 347,19 and 658,14-16 signifies 'lofty, erect' (with reference to Buddha's nose), as the Chin. and Tib. versions of the text show. It is probably connected with *tik-* in its meaning 'to erect'. *iz* or *īz* 'footstep, track, trace' (Ht V 92 and 211-12, DLT and QB) must be related to *iy-*, the central meaning of which appears to have been 'to follow'. *ärgüz* occurs in the DLT both as lemma and in verse, denoting 'the melting of snow and ice at the beginning of spring'. I can only connect the lexeme with *ärgür-* 'to melt (tr.)', q.v. among the *-gUr-* verbs. A direct connection with *ärü-* 'to melt (intr.)' appears morphologically impossible. *adız* 'branch of an irrigation canal; arable land delimited by such' is discussed in the *UW* s.v. *atız*. It could come either from *adır-* 'to separate' (q.v. in section 6.3 below) or from its hypothetical base, and in any case belongs into this section.

366 *böggün*, discussed in the next section, poses a similar problem. Perhaps *bw̄Küz* is a mistake for *bögün*?

boguz 'throat' comes from *bog-* 'to strangle', the throat being the only part of a person's body by which he can get strangled. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS* occur in Maitr 198 r3, 2 r8 and 127 r17, U II 71,1, and BT XIII 3,8. '*bogazı*' in TT VI 14 is an Osmanistic 'normalisation' of the editors: The ms. published in OdaÔtani writes the instance as *bogzı*, and the London scroll (damaged) can be seen to have written *boguzı*. The sequence *aş boguz* in ManMon 43, 45 and 47 signifies 'meals'. In Kinkashō śloka B, a, *boguzta barmış isig özlüg* is a slavish translation of the Skt. bahuvrīhi *kaṇṭha-gata-prāṇa-*: When predicated upon 'life' (*prāṇa-* = *isig öz*), 'gone in the throat' in Skt. metaphorically signifies 'about to flee'. *yüz* 'face' may come from an unattested **yü-* 'to face in a certain direction' and may have *yügärü* < **yü-g+gärü* 'present, in front of'[367] and *yü-l-üg* (q.v.) as cognates. *köz* 'eye', if also a derivate, may be related to *kö-* 'to guard' or *kör-* 'to see', or to both. The meanings of *köz*, *kö-* and *kör-* and the transitivity of the verbs do not permit us to see *köz* within the existing framework of this formation, however, as *-(X)z* forms otherwise denote *objects* of tr. verbs. Note that *boguz*, *yüz* and *köz*, like *kögüz* 'breast', *tiz* 'knee' and *agız* 'mouth', are names for parts of the body, but no convincing etymologies for the latter group are forthcoming.[368] The six lexemes (including *köz*) may indeed be members of a dual formation for body parts.

es-iz 'bad, useless' is rightly connected by Tezcan, 1981: 44 to *es-* 'to make less', with explanations. This is the word written *ısiz* in the *EDPT* and correctly distinguished from *äsiz*, q.v. there. The binomial *esiz yavız* appears in BuddhKat 27 in 'YE.SIS YA.BĪS KHI.ŚI, and in two other instances of *esiz* quoted in the *EDPT*. Tezcan, *ibid.*, correctly assigns the QB's *ısizım* to this lexeme. *äsizim ä*, a very common interjection of bereavement in the Yenisei inscrs. (sometimes wrongly interpreted as *siz+ım+ä*, a form morphologically impossible) comes from *äsiz*, not from *esiz*. There is an Uigur ex. of *äsiz* in HamTouen 1,30. This is written as 'SYZ and correctly translated as "malheureux"; the n. to the passage, however, confuses *äsiz* and *esiz* and spells the word as *essiz*. Nor is either of the two likely to come from "**äd+siz*" as suggested there: *ädsiz* is a real lexeme attested at least four times in Uigur with a meaning not too far from *esiz* (but not *äsiz*). *äsirkä-*, q.v. below, is once (in KP 71,3-4) wrongly written as '*esirkä-*'. Semantically, *esiz* fits in well with *yavız* and *küväz* and, on the other hand, *uz*; further, *es-il-* is of rather similar content to *kok-*, whose *-(X)z* derivate was discussed above. *kıduz* 'a woman left without a husband', finally, clearly comes from *kod-* 'to abandon, to

367 The *EDPT* has a different etymology, because of which all the instances mentioned there have been mistranslated. For *yüz yügärü* 'manifest(ly), before (one's) eyes' we just add the most recently published instances, AbitAnk 45 and AmitIst 28, 34, 42 and 70. Our account follows the n. to TT IV B36. In *ĀṭSū* 1 v3 (Brāhmī) it corresponds to Skt. *sammukham*; cf. the n. to this.

368 Cf., for *agız*, Menges, 1980: 78.

leave'. This lexeme is attested in DLT fol. 184 with this definition, and evidently also in Toñ 48 and ŞU E3.[369] Additional members of this formation are too dubious to be even mentioned.

Derivates of *-(X)z* forms include *boguzla-*, *yavuzla-*, *esizlän-*, *küväzlän-* and *uzlan-* and, several times in QB, *uzluk*.

3.112 *-gXn*

This suffix appears to have a voiceless velar after /r/ and /l/ and a voiced one elsewhere. This can be seen only in the Brāhmī ex. of *kälkin* in TT VIII A 32 and, with back-vowel stems, in the DLT; it can sometimes be deduced from modern evidence. *turkun taloy* 'a calm sea' appears in Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) r3, a Brāhmī ms. reported on by Dieter Maue. The DLT and the QB have *barkın* and *turkun* on the one hand, *yadgun*, *todgun* and *tutgun* on the other. Note that the Ottoman forms of *kälkin*, *bilkin* and *kırkın* have /g/ and not ∅ after the *l* or *r*, which, again, means that Old Turkic must have had /k/ in this position. This is the same distribution as the one found in the dative endings in the Orkhon inscrs., and in numerous other suffixes in Old Turkic. The main (unconditioned) allomorph can be said to be *-gXn*, which we have used as heading. The vowel of this suffix is rounded whenever the vowel of the base is, with the exception of *turkın* in UigKan 90: But *turkın süzök* could perhaps signify 'pure all the way to the bottom'; the first word *could* be the instrumental form of *turk* 'height, depth'. We write -g° or -k° according to the above rule, even when the choice between them is not evident from the writing.

-gXn denotes the agent of intr. verbs and the object of tr. ones. All bases are monosyllabic simplicia, so that all forms are bisyllables. We start with the passive exs., i.e. those denoting the object.

terkin 'heap, concentration' comes from *ter-* 'arrange together, collect etc.'. Exs. can be found in BT I D (313) and frequently after that, UigFalt 56 and 97, Suv 614,10, in ms. T III 84-74 (Mainz 752) v23 etc. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 18,31 and in Maitr 146 r3 = BT IX 114,3. In this last ex., the binomial *ükgün terkin* is less nominal than otherwise: *ötrü ükgün terkinin bodis(a)vtnıŋ kälgüsin küdügli Ketumati känt uluştakı bodun bukun* 'the people$_2$ in the city$_2$ of Ketumati, which was assembled together waiting for the coming of the bodhisattva'. There are two exs. of *asgın* 'hung up', discussed in the *UW*. We find *tutgun* 'prisoner' in ThreeLett 4,[370] QB 373 and 3345 and DLT. In Höllen 53, *ol çad(ı)rlıg [ögü]z suvı*

369 Cf. L. Bazin and J. Hamilton, 'Remarques sur l'expression *ḳīz ḳoduz* en turc ancien' in *Turcica* XI (1979): 187-189.

370 The parallel text has *tut-un*!

böggün bolup ulug tägzinčlär tägzinür is preferable to reading '*bükgün bol-*': *bög-* 'to collect, dam up' is likelier to apply to water than *bük-* 'to bend, bow'. TT VI 255 has a binomial *kıyn kırkın* translated as "Pein und Qual". This is the reading of 7 among 8 mss., the reading of the 8th mss. being unacceptable in the given context. This *kırkın* is otherwise attested only in modern Turkic languages.[371] Concerning the meaning cf. *kır-ıl-* applying to 'death' in Suv 638,18. *ürtgün* 'hay-stack, stackyard etc.' (attested also in ShōAgon 1,87) should come from *ürt-* 'to cover, to cover up' although the semantic connection is not at all evident: *yurtgün* in Maitr 167 v 31 shows that its origin must have been **hürtgün*, and cf. *yürt-ül-* in Brāhmī ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) v 4 in SktUigBil.[372] The DLT's *āşgin tuprak* 'earth and sand which is poured out' belongs to *āş-* 'to pour out a dry substance'. *bilkin* in ETŞ 10,79 and 231 is passive, i.e. signifies 'known, famous' and not "bilgin, bilge" (i.e. 'erudite, wise') as translated by Arat: In the second case it appears in a binomial with *sorukmış* 'sought after, inquired for'.

There are no active derivates of this formation from tr. bases in Old Turkic. We have one exception in Qarakhanid Turkic: *kāvgin aş* in DLT fol. 222 is "unwhole-some food", the opposite of *çivgin aş* "food that is wholesome and fattening". It cannot come from *kāv-* 'to chew', probably borrowed from some Indo-European language and with unsuitable meaning; it is probably derived from *käv-* 'to weaken (tr.)' which, together with *käv-il-* (q.v. below) is attested in Old Turkic a number of times. *kāvgin* should denote either its subject or instrument.

-gXn is used also with intr. verbs, but the non-Qarakhanid exs. are few. *käl-kin* 'torrent, inundation of large rivers or seas' is attested in TT VIII A 32 (Brāhmī), Warnke 294 (Cf. WarnkeFragm 34), ETŞ 10,225, ShōAgon 1,88, 89 and 320 and in the DLT. Its opposite, *turkun suv* 'quiet waters' is found in the DLT, *turkun taloy* in Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) r 3 (Brāhmī). In the semantic domain of *kälkin* and *turkun*, and of *yadgun* and *todgun* mentioned below, is *taşgın*. I know it from Republican Turkish, but the only Old Turkic instance is in BT XIII 27,8: *tägr]ig-länip*[373] *ak(a)r taşgın suvları ǫg(ā)nı[ā* 'their overflowing waters form eddies and flow in the river . . .'. In *kkül kǫygün bolmışın sakıngu ol* (BT VII G 8), *kül köy-gün* is probably a binomial, signifying 'ashes and burnt matter'. The editors' trans-lation, "zu Asche verbrennend (?) geworden (?) ist" probably comes from the wrong belief that *-gXn* is a morphological form related to *-gInçA*, and not a for-mative.

371 *kırkın* 'maiden' is not connected with these lexemes, of course.

372 Khal. *irt-* is, in this case, against the evidence for initial **h*.

373 My suggestion; Zieme considered connecting this with *iglän-* 'to get sick'. He writes *taşgın* as *'taşğın'*, perhaps both because of modern *taşkın* (which is the result of voicelessness assimilation in early Oguz) and because the velar is dotted. Note, however, that the same ms. does not dot the velars of *yalnok* and *akın* but does dot the ones of *oglan*, *burxan*, *baxşı*, *yarlıg*, *tarıg*, *yag-ıt-* etc.

The QB has several exs. from this formation: *barkın* (817, 4727 and 4326, from *bar-* 'to go') 'a determined traveller', *yadgun* (thus!) *öğüz* (4546, an object adjective from *yad-* 'to spread out') 'an overflowing river' and *köçgün* (6112) 'a migrant'. In the DLT we have noted: *todgun* 'a constantly flowing river, like the Euphrates', no doubt metaphorically from *tod-* 'to be full, satiated', *kaçgın* 'a fugitive', *yälkin atlıg* 'a rider who hurries his horse' and *kälkin*, *turkun* and *barkın*, which we have already discussed. All these derivates from intr. verbs denote subjects and agents, as derivates from tr. verbs denote objects.

The DLT also has three action nouns in this formation: *bugra kirkini* is said to be 'the rutting season of camel stallions', from *kir-* 'to enter', and *äşgin* (the second lexeme written thus) 'a journey at high speed', from *äş-* 'to amble'. The fact that the latter is an action noun is further underlined by the existence of *äşginçi* (DLT ff.) 'a fast mounted courier'. *ürkün* 'the panic that befalls a people because of the enemy so that they flee to forts and castles (DLT fol. 67) probably comes from **ürk-gün* through assimilation and cluster simplification. This is more likely than assigning the lexeme to the formation *-Xn*, which has no abstracts at all. One of these action nouns is attested in Uigur: *kirkini kirmiş bugra tāg kükrāyü* (Māngi 22) 'bellowing like a camel stallion in his rutting season'. Note the *figura etymologica*.

The -gXn formation appears to be aspectually characterised, referring to states for stative verbs and to what one might call perfect states for action verbs. *tutgun*, e.g., is 'a prisoner' and not 'somebody getting caught', *terkin* 'a heap' and not 'something getting heaped up'; *asgın* is something hung up in the past and now hanging.

With the exception of Qarakhanid *äşginçi* just mentioned, I know of no verbal or nominal expansions of *-gXn* forms. What the reason for this may be is not clear to me. The common gerundial suffix *-gInçA* is definitely not derived from *-gXn*. Firstly, they have different vowels: The vowel of *-gInçA* remains unrounded after rounded stems, e.g. in *olorkınçakatägi* (BT II 287), *bulkınçakatägi* (*ibid.* 1360) and *tüpükginçä* (ETŞ 9,32), all visible on the facss.; *-gXn*, on the other hand, is well enough attested with rounded vowels. Secondly, *-gInçA* belongs to morphology and not to formation; it can, e.g., be added to negated bases, as in *bulmagınçakatägi* (BT II 1327). I take it to come from *-(X)g+I(n)+çA*: the equative case form of the verbal nominal in *-(X)g*, with the 3rd person sg. possessive suffix (originally referring to the subject) added.

3.113 *-(X)l*

All *-(X)l* lexemes are bisyllabic. Most of them are adjectives, occasionally used adverbially: The only certain *-(X)l* forms which are natural nouns by content are *kısıl* 'gorge, ravine' and *ıdıl* 'foray, expedition'. As all adjectives, *-(X)l* adjectives can equally well be used as adjectival abstracts (which function as nouns). This is the case e.g. with *amıl*, q.v. below. An action noun possibly formed with *-(X)l* is *ötül ~ yötül* 'cough'; this is evidently related to *ötül-* 'to cough', discussed among the *-(X)l-* verbs. Exs. of the noun are mentioned in the *EDPT* s.vv. *ötül* and *yötül*.[374] The bases of *kısıl*, *ıdıl* and probably *adıl* must have been tr.; cf., however, what we have to say about *kıs-ga* in section 3.323. Usually, *-(X)l* forms come from intr. verbs and represent their subject. There apparently is one derivate of this formation which has a denominal base, but no *-(X)l* nominals are derived from deverbal verbs.

This formation has few members, but some of them are very well attested. *tükäl* 'complete, perfect, entire' is the most common one, found in the IrqB, in Manichaean, Buddhist as well as Qarakhanid texts. It also appears in BuddhKat 27, written THU.KÄL, and e.g. in AmitIst 47 and 59.

No base is attested for *osal* 'negligent, careless'; beside what is quoted in the *EDPT*, we find it in BT III 219, BT XIII 15,28, ETŞ 12,54 and 15,43, Genzan (*altı kaçıgların osal kılmakları üzä*) and BuddhLett 11. *osan-* 'to be negligent', a cognate, is common in the QB and later texts and is still in use in Republican Turkish. *adıl* 'excellent' is found in Shō XII a 5 and BT XIII 56,3 and 58,13. It is, further, written as *atıl* in BuddhUig II 244, 296 and 346, there misread as '*artıl*'; for these last instances see also the *UW* s.v. '*artıl*', quoting Zieme, 1978: 329. It is related to *adır-* and *adın*, which explains the meaning. The hypothetical base may have been tr., *adıl* being its object. See *adır-* 'to separate (tr.)' (section 6.3) and *adın-* (section 7.2.). *amıl* 'calm etc.' need not be documented here, as that is done in *UW* pp. 117-18; it is also found in the DLT and the QB and attested, additionally, in HamTouen 2,32, 5,36 and 6,9 and UigKan 85. Like *adıl*, its base is not attested, but must have been **amı-*: Cf. *amrıl-*, *amırtgur-* and the frozen converb *amru*, all already discussed in the *UW*. *egil* 'layman' can't be connected to *igid-* 'to rear, to educate', as Ş. Tekin maintains in a n. in his edition of the Maitr; the vowels differ and the meanings are not too close. *muŋkul* 'out of one's senses, distressed, distracted' comes from *muŋ+uk-* 'to be distressed', q.v. below. *muŋkul* is found thrice in TT III, undamaged only in one case (written *munkul* in Manichaean script); further, in Suv 624,18, 632,3 and 634,17 and TuoLuoNi 292 = 312 and

374 The *EDPT* wrongly translates *ötül* as "diarrhoea", following Arat's translation of Heilk II. In the n. to that same passage Arat, strangely enough, gives the correct meaning. The alternation of initial /y/ with Ø is indicative of original **≠h°*.

360. Appears also in BT XIII 26,1 as *munkul* with back-vowel velar (thus on the facs. against the editor). What we take to be the original form is therefore attested in the Suv and in TuoLuoNi. See the *EDPT* for *mayıl*, an *-(X)l* lexeme attested only in DLT fol. 519;[375] the *EDPT* discusses also *mayıl-* and other possible cognates.

ınal is both 'a young prince or well-born boy' (as defined in DLT fol. 73) and 'somebody trusted by the ruler (an office at court)'. The rather common use of *ınal* as proper name can have evolved from either meaning. We have no indication that there was a lexeme '*ınäl*': *Inalka* appears with back-vowel /k/ in UigOn I r7 and 8 and v4 in proper names. In HamTouen 32,7 we find *āvdā* [. . .] *kiçig ınallarka* [, again with back-vowel /k/. This probably refers to young princes: *kiçig* is usually applied to children, and the letter appears to be addressed by a ruler to a fairly high-placed subordinate, presumably a chamberlain. Worth noting is also *(ä)siz(i)m yüz ın(a)l k(a)d(a)ş(ı)m* in YE 65,2 (runic, with back-vowel characters). Here, both *ınal* and *kadaş* must be attributes referring to comrades of the deceased. The third character in the proper name IN^2L^1 *orŋu* in ThS I b r1 is not very well visible; what is clear, however, is that it is not L^2. IN^2L^2 *kagan* in Toñ 31 cannot, therefore, be an instance of this word (as already observed by O. Sertkaya). If the *ınal* referring to high-born youths and the proper name *Inal* have back-vocalism, so much so the use referring to royal confidants, for it is this latter that can be connected semantically to *ınan-* 'to believe, trust' and *ınag* 'a trustworthy person, the object of trust'. Additional exs. of *ınal* not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in HamTouen 4,4, 7,10 and 28,4, ZiemeSklav III 8, BT III 19, 20 and 1020, Maitr 112,46 etc., BT V 715, PrièreMan B7 and a number of times in DvaKol I.

kızıl and *yaşıl*, 'red' and 'green', may also have been formed with this formative, on assumption that they come from **kız+sI-(X)l* and **yaş+sI-(X)l* respectively, or, the former, from *kız-Xl*. See details in section 2.61, and *kız-gur-* below for a different verb *kız-*.

yeväl and *yaval* belong to this formation if the former is derived from the unattested base of *yevät-* ~ *yevet-*, the DLT's *yevil-/yevül-* and *yevāK* ~ *yeveK*, and the second connected with *yaval-* and *yavaş*. *yaval* appears in ÄgFrag (1) B24 together with *yavaş* and *ädgü ögli* and has an identified Chin. source, which all fix its meaning as 'gentle'. The n. thereto quotes another ex. from an unpublished text, as *yıval äsin*; it must have the same meaning and could therefore be a mistake for *yaval*. The other ex. in the same n. should be a different lexeme: *yeväl [ä]sriŋü körklä* [, which the eds. quote from another unpublished ms., connects better

375 Note that pp. 236 and 237 in part II of the Dankoff-Kelly edition have inadvertently been interchanged.

with bir yevāl (facs. thus rather than the ed.'s *'jivil'*) *ton berzün* (TugDvaUjgDok I 14). *yevāl* could apply to quality as well as to appearance, but no specific meaning can be proposed.

ıd-ıl 'foray', literally 'expedi-tion', has been proposed by S. Tezcan at the 31st P.I.A.C., 1988, for ManBuchFrag II 2,2,2: *yana ıdıl bolu* 'There was another foray'. The subsequent sentence (which makes this reading likely) is quoted below s.v. *yayı-l-*.[376] *ıdıl* must be the object noun of *ıd-* 'to send'. *kıs-ıl*, finally, is a 'narrow gorge'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in BQ E37, Ht IV 473 and V 5 a 17, HtPek 69 a 13 (in *UW* 271 a), Maitr 85 r 12 and Suv 382,10; see *UW* 176 b s.v. *aranyadan* B, 2 for two further ones. All the attestations of *kıs-* 'to constrict etc.' are tr., which is also what we expect by the well-documented existence of *kıs-ıl-*. On the other hand, *kıs-ır-* 'to abbreviate' and *kıs-ga* 'short' (qq.v. below) demand the starred existence of an intr. use of the verb with the meaning 'to be short'. Since *kısıl* goes better with constriction than with shortness, it should denote the object of the attested *kıs-* rather than the subject of the other one.

Derivates from *-(X)l* lexemes are not numerous at all. The illness *kızl+amuk* has its name from *kızıl*, of course, and *osal+lık* 'carelessness, negligence' is particularly common in the QB. Most common of all is *tükällig*, sometimes simplified to *tükälig*, the meanings of which include 'perfect' and 'completely'. In AbitAnk 46, *tükällig bol-* with dative is translated as "mich hingeben dem . . .". In BuddhKat 41, GÖB.KÄ THU.KAL.LIG BÖ.L- = *kopka tükällig bol-* is 'to partake in everything'. Further instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* can be found in Hochzeit 6, BT I D(246), BT II 388 and 1154, AmitIst 57, eight times in HamTouen and so forth.

3.114 *-dU*

This suffix forms nouns which denote the resultative object of tr. verbs and the subject of intr. ones. *ägdü*, e.g., is defined in DLT fol. 75 as "a crook-headed knife, used to hew out sheaths for swords, or other", and appears to have this meaning also in TT V A 20. It also forms abstracts, like *umdu* 'coveting, begging' in DLT *ibid.* Beside *umdu*, the QB has *umdusuz* 'without covetousness', and DLT *ibid.* also has *umduçı* 'beggar'. *umduçı* also appears a number of times in the QB, and also in ShōAv 21, with dotted *n* clear in the facs.: *uuntuçı*, as the word is written, can surely not be anything else, since *koltguçı*, with which it appears in a binomial, has exactly the same meaning. The nasal has presumably been assimi-

376 In IXu 19, the transliterated word in *Küli Ç[or] . . . sünüş[dük]tä* I D^2L^2 *akın binip oplayu tägip sança ıdıp . . .* has been taken to be a horse name. *'idil bultı'* of the ManBuchFrag editor is unlikely.

lated to the dental stop following it. Although *umdu* generally has negative content, the proper name *[O]gul Umdu T(ā)ŋrim* (UigOn III A v5) is well paraphrased as "diejenige, die auf einen Sohn hofft". In *umdusın bulsa ol umduçı* (OB 4215), *umdu* refers to the object of the verb. See *um-ug* for this verb and for cognates. Whether the *umdu* which has been read in USp 14,12 among various names for taxes has anything to do with this is an open question.

tamtu 'blaze, kindling', related to *tamıt-* and *tamdur-*, is attested in BT XIII 19,24,[377] 26 and 38 and, as *tamdu*, in DLT fol. 210. I take the form with /t/ to be the original one, as the lexeme should be a crasis from **tamıt-du*. Kāšġarī says that *tamdu* can also be pronounced as *tamduk*, and we actually find *tamtuksuz* (again with °*t*°) in TT VIII A 29. This makes it possible that *-dU* was in some way related to *-dUk*, or that it was the reborrowed variant of some dialect, or a *sandhi* alternant. In translating *ol tāgdākıtā* as "dans cette attaque", e.g., Thomsen must be taking this form of KT E 36 to have a purely nominal function. A short glance at Zieme, 1969: 83-84 will show that *-dUk* can do anything a noun a can do. The reason it has been excluded from this work is that it can do much *more* than a deverbal noun: It shows free government of nouns. Since its agent is referred to by possessive suffixes, it *qualifies* its object, as *-dU* nouns do, among others.

kötü 'roof' appears thrice in the DLT. *igtü* 'a stall-fed animal' is also attested only in that source, but *igdü+lä-* and *igdülä-n-*, qq.v. below, are Uigur as well. These nominals no doubt come from the base of *kötür-* 'to lift up' and from *igid-* 'to feed, to nourish' respectively. For the former cf. *kötgi* 'hillock, mound' (section 3.110 above). They must have been formed with *-dU*, the two dentals getting simplified and the second vowel of *igid-* getting contracted: Such a process is attested with *tamtu* and is quite common in derivation. The variants of the 'stall-fed animal' show that the sequence °*d-d*° gave either /d/ or /t/, probably [d]. The *d* in Kāšġarī's *tamdu* may be due to analogy with the rest of the formation. *ülätü* 'silk handkerchief' is found in FamArch 55 and 144 and in DLT fol. 80. *ilätü* in Hamburg 14,17 and 21 and 25,11 is by the ed. assigned to the same lexeme. He seems to be right at least as far as the first text is concerned: It also writes *yular* as *yılar*, *ögür* as *ögir* and *azuk* as *azık*. *ülätü* is from **ülä-t-dü*, if Clauson is right in connecting it with *ülä-t-*; at any rate, there is no better way to explain it than by

377 Read as *tuyunmaks(ı)z tamtu t(ā)g tu[g]s[a]r* and translated "Wenn einer ohne Verstand geboren wird, ist es wie ein Feuerbrand(?)". The footn. adds: "Der Vers ist nicht klar". I would like to read *tuyunmaks(ı)z tamtu t(ā)k tu[tu]ş[u]r* 'The blaze of anti-enlightenment catches all by itself'. The *EDPT* has exs. for *tutuş-* in the sense of 'catching fire' from several Middle Turkic texts of various dialects and it is used today in Republican Turkish with this meaning. We also find it, I believe, in UigTot 1147: *oot tamır içindä üstün tutuşu barıp* . . . translated "das Feuer . . . strebt weiter aufwärts in den Adern". In the context of BT XIII 19,38, *teyür* has been translated as if it were *tetir*.

translating it as 'section of a large piece of silk fabric divided into equal parts'. As in *tamnu*, "*t-d*" gives "*t*".

The *DLT* assigned to *yar-* 'to split', probably correctly. The *-r* is here writes" is in the *EDPT* not due to any contraction, but to phonotactics: In many domains of morphology and derivation, the soft stops are replaced by the hard ones after /r/, /l/ etc.

The very common lexemes *ögdi* 'praise' and *ögdir* 'reward' have a different vowel after their dental and cannot therefore belong to this formation; they are discussed in the section on *-(X)ntI*.

ïgdü and *ülâtü* look like converb forms, but are quite unlikely to be such: They are pure nouns and denote the objects and not the subjects of their base verbs. Converbs practically never go over to nominal use;[378] the only exception I know is *tolu* 'full' from *tol-* 'to fill (of the filling substance), to get filled'. *tusu* 'benefit, advantage', e.g., could not be a nominalised converb, because the converb form of a stem ending in /s/ would quite certainly end in *-A* and not *-U*.[379] This is also the reason why *köni*[380] 'straight', e.g., cannot be the converb of *kön-* 'to be or become straight'.

The few expansions from *-dU* forms have already been mentioned.

3.115 *-vI*

This formation was identified by Arat in a long n. to ETŞ 3,7, which also quotes most of the instances. *ötvi*, one of the relatively common products of this formation, shows the suffix to be *-vI* and not '*-vX*'; cf. also *kurvı* and *tulvı* below. In all our exs., *-vI* is added to monosyllabic consonant bases, so that all *-vI* derivates are bisyllabic. Bases are either intr. or tr.; in the former case, the *-vI* form denotes the subject of the action, in the latter the direct object.

yatvısınça tikvisinçā (ETŞ 13,5) appears to refer to horizontal and vertical position, but the exact use of these hapax legomena in their context escapes me. Similar in form is another hap., in *yıgvısınça kolola-* (UigKan 213) 'to contemplate A, B and C in accumulation'. Both of these occur in verse. Cf. also *yıgvırak* 'concisely' in the Maitr. Other words which might be read as *yatvı* should rather be considered to be derivates of *yad-* 'to spread out (tr.)'. *yad-vı*, which qualifies the direct object of its base, is attested in *keŋ yadvı tili* 'his wide and spread-out tongue' (Maitr 11 b15). The tongue of Buddha is described as *keŋ yadvı* also *ibid.* 5 b20 and in BT VIII B41, while in MaitrGeng 5 b5 *yadvı* qualifies *yarın* 'the

378 Beside the construction described in vol. 2, footn. 506.

379 Erdal, 1979 b explores the rules which govern the choice of the converb vowel.

380 This is an *-I* lexeme, discussed in section 3.118.

shoulder-blade'. According to UigTot 819, anybody's tongue can become 'thin and wide', *yuka yadvı. tut tulvı açıg ämgäk* (Suv 39,1), probably also contains a *-vI* form, which is not attested in any other context: The binomial *tut tulvı* is found in UigOn III B r1 and in Maitr 218 v27 (hitherto read as '*tod toli-t*').[381] I take *tulvı* to be derived from *tul-* 'to strike, knock', discussed together with *tulum* 'weapon' in section 3.106; a connection with the second word in *tuş tolum bol-* (q.v. *ibid.*) is unlikely. *yetvi* appears in HtPar 166,13 as quoted in *UW* 214b *top.* It qualifies *sav*, here perhaps 'formulation', and signifies 'accessible'. *yetvi* thus denotes the oblique object of *yet-* 'to reach', as *tikvi*, *yadvı*, *tulvı* and *yıgvı* denote the objects of their respective bases. ETŞ 12,38 reads *ötvi yetvi öçmä yaruk*, where the second lexeme might come from a different verb: the intr. *yet-* 'to disappear'. The expression would then signify 'the radiance of permeability, oblivion and extinction' or 'the permeable, disappearing and dying-down radiance'. Elsewhere *ötvi*, an object nominal from *öt-* 'to move through', is used by itself. Closest to the above is the binomial *kurug ötvi*, used in BuddhUig I 35, 235 and 255: This describes the omnipresent physical emptiness of space *per se* and of the universe of ideas, called *xin* in Chin. and *kōŋül* in Uigur. In M II C $8,10_1$ and again 12_1 it appears in the expression *vajırda ötvi biligligim*. Since the *vajra* is seen as the model of hardness, this should signify 'O my (dear), whose consciousness is more penetrating than the *vajra*'. That, however, would make *ötvi* subject and not object nominal. Similarly in *ötvi vayḍurlıg yagız yer* (UigKan 100) 'the brown earth which is like the adamant *vaiḍūrya*'. This last is translated by the eds. as "the earth of translucent *vaiḍūrya*", which accords with 'objective' *ötvi*.

kurvı is used in DLT fol. 106 of a royal tent (*çovaç*) and fol. 550 of a bow and, metaphorically, of eyebrows. As tents and also bows are in Turkic always associated with the verb *kur-* 'to set up, to string', I take this to be the base of *kurvı*.[382]

The *UW* suggests assigning *arvı* 'doubt' (which has a derivate *arvıla-*) to this formation. Röhrborn is unable, however, to connect this with any of the known verbs consisting of the phoneme sequence *ar-*. A string of phonemes does not qualify any lexeme for membership in a formation: /vı/ is a possible syllable of simple (unanalysable) nouns or adjectives, just as /vu/ is in *çulvu* 'blasphemy' or /vä/ in *tälvä* 'mad' or /pı/ in the DLT's *yalpı näŋ* 'something broad': None of these

381 *tut* is otherwise only found together with *uçuz*, together with which it is translated as 'worthless', or with *ayıg* 'bad'; cf. *tut+a-* below.

382 The *EDPT* entry for *karwı* (thus!) writes: "There is hardly any doubt thas *Kaş.* is right in describing this as an Ar. l.-w." But the DLT only says that the lexeme "*corresponds* to Arabic *qarwā*', the word for anything curved". In the sense that Kāšġarī means it (and when the entities referred to happen to be bows or tents of Turkish nomads), *kurvı* happens to correspond also to English *curve*!

need be derived, certainly not associated with the formation discussed here. Nor do their putative bases (e.g. *çu-l-* 'to be smitten, crippled' for *çulvu*) fit in easily with their meaning. Lexemes like *kuvı* 'unlucky, unfortunate' or *arvı* mentioned above perhaps only *look* similar to lexemes from this formation. Nor is the very common *yelvi* 'sorcery, magic' (with derivates *yelviçi* in the DLT, *yelvi+lä-* and *yelvi+k-*) likely to have belonged to this formation: It can certainly not be connected with *yel* 'wind', as *-vI* is a deverbal and not a denominal suffix.[383]

-vI is expanded by *+lXg* and *+sXz* and by *+rAk*. *ötviliK* 'translucent' appears to be attested in Abhi B 88 b 13-14 and 89 a 7-8 (quoted in the n. to UigKan 92) in a binome with *süzök*, and in UigKan 92: *tupulur yarok ötviliK . . . buz*, with *tupulur* and *ötviliK* presumably rather similar in meaning.[384] In BT I D (145-6) and (143), *ötviliK* denotes a quality found in the divine eye but not in the carnal one; in both instances it is opposed to *tıdıglıg*, from *tıd-* 'to hinder or check': *ät köz tıdıglıg ol, ärmäz ötviliK* vs. *t(ä)ŋridäm köz ötviliK ol, ärmäz tıdıglıg*. Taking the suffix to be *+lXg* in one of its usual functions, *ötvi* would, under this derivation, serve as an abstract signifying 'penetration'. Adjectives are commonly used as abstracts in Old Turkic; another possibility is to read the form as *ötvi+lik*, with *+lXk* signifying 'destined to . . . '.

Two hypothetical *-vI* forms are only found in expansions: in ETŞ 10,283 we have the sequence *çimsiz silvisiz münsüz kadagsız* equivalent to 'without blemish'. *çimsiz* is found also in TT VII 23,1. I take *silvisiz* to be derived from *sil-* in the sense of 'smearing', attested in the Uigur ex. of this verb quoted in the *EDPT*. *silvisiz* could then be 'unsmeared'. *kayvısız* is found in BuddhUig II 65 and Ht V 12 b 3 in the phrase *ät'özintä isig özintä kayvısız bolup / ät'özümkä isig özüm kayvısız bolup . . . . kayvılan-* and *kayvılanıştur-*, other derivates of **kayvı* discussed in the appropriate verbal sections, help us understand this; *kay-* signifies 'to turn or tend towards something', metaphorically 'to pay heed to'. In HtPar 231,13 (quoted in *UW* 293 a) **kayvı* is used with appositional *+lXg*: *tägindim kayvılıg açıgka ayagka* 'I was accorded the favour and honour of being heeded'. *kayvısız*

383 Rather, *yelvi* must have been borrowed from what appears in Early Mo. as *elbe(+sün)* and in Written Mo. as *ilbe*, *ilbi*, with the initial *y** added by *analogy* with *yel*. In Old Turkic, [b] is an allophone both of /p/ and of /v/ in different positions. After /l/, however, /p/ appears as [p] and /v/ as [v] and there is no [b]. In this word, foreign [b] was adapted to Old Turkic phonological patterns by being replaced by the fricative, [v]. In Proto-Turkic, a noun-verb **yelbi* with [b] must already have existed, however, since we also have the equally sensible 'reinterpretation' of [lb] as /lp/. This occurs in the base of the verbs *yelpi-t-*, *yelpi-n-* and *yelpi-ş-*, all attested in the DLT, in *yelpi-g* discussed above (q.v.) among the *-(X)g* lexemes, etc. All these cannot be etymologically connected with *yel* either, as there is no suffix *'+pI-'*. Early Turkic *yelvi*, **yelbi* was borrowed back into Written Mo. as *yilbi* [jilbi], *yelbi*, *yilvi* [jilvi].

384 Another way is to take *yarok* to be the subject of *öt-*, getting the translation 'pierceable ice, penetrable to light'.

should be 'heedless' or, remembering the use of *+sXz* when added to adjectives, 'unheeding'.

-vI derivation emerges as another typical ergative-abstract formation. *-vI* lexemes do appear rather consistently to be adjectival. This is a further reason for not taking the noun *yelvi* to be one of them.

3.116 -(X)ŋ

This non-dominant suffix forms subject nouns and adjectives from intr. bases and object nouns and adjectives from tr. ones. Exs. are rather scanty for this formation, most of the lexemes being hapax legomena. It has therefore rarely been recognised as such and is, indeed, problematical. All -(X)ŋ lexemes are bisyllabic.

üstäŋ 'superior, excellent' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the QB. It denotes an object of *üstä-* 'to increase (tr.)'. We also have it in *tüz yagız yer üştäŋiniŋ örki* (Ernte 21), translated "der Höchste der Vortrefflichen auf der ebenen braunen Erde", and in *üştäŋ yalaŋuz ärsär ymä . . .* 'even though what is superior is lonely, . . .' in ETŞ 15,35. A proper name *Üsı(ä)ŋ T(ä)ŋrim* is attested in DvaKol 120 and UigOn III A v10 and 11. No base is attested for *çalpaŋ* 'liquid mud', found in the DLT and in BT III 302.[385] However, we have *çalpuş*, *çalpak* and *çalpaş-* (qq.v.) as cognates. According to N. Yüce, *çalpa-* was used by Az-Zamaxšarī with the meaning 'to muddle up': *çalpaŋ* is therefore an object nominal. Several hapax legomena in the DLT can be assigned to this formation: *çıvşaŋ çagır* 'sour wine' from *çıvşa-* 'to be or become sour, to ferment';[386] *yadıŋ suv* 'shallow water which spreads over the surface of the ground'; *bür(ü)ŋ* 'a whirlpool' in fol. 606 from *bür-* (to draw together (tr.)' and *üşäŋ* or *yüşäŋ taş* 'a smoothed stone' from *üşä-* 'to scrape'. *yadıŋ*, *bür(ü)ŋ* and *(y)üşäŋ* denote the objects of their bases, like the two lexemes mentioned first. *alıŋ*, the base of *alŋu-*, *alŋad-* etc., *may* also belong to this formation, in case it is related to *alıg*; see both in the *UW*. Although a hapax (in ManErz IV 32), it survives in modern Turkic languages. The DLT says (fol. 605): "To curse a slave they say *kaşaŋ* 'You vile one'." Such a word might well come from the unattested base of *kaşan-* 'to urinate', mentioned

385 The last-mentioned is mis-translated: The passage reads *a näçä ymä sansarnıŋ uṭunı yavızı ya arıgsızlıg çalpaŋ täg kaltı*, to be translated 'O you wickedness$_2$ of *saṃsära*, who are like$_2$ mud with excrement!'. The editor took *kaltı* to be the pf. of *kal-* 'to remain'.

386 A cognate, *çıvşagun* 'acid (adj.; of food and drink)' is quoted in the *EDPT* from three Uigur instances and also appears in BuddhUig II 89. Cf. also *UW* 66 b s.v. *agır* B, e. '*-gun*' is not otherwise attested as a deverbal suffix; nor is there a denominal suffix '*+agun*', assuming the existence of a base '*çıvış*'. There is the possibility, therefore, that *çıvşa-*, *çıvşat-* and *çıvşaŋ*, all isolated in the DLT, are some sort of back-formations.

among the *-(X)n-* verbs below. **kaya-* may have been tr., making its object in *-(X)ŋ* signify 'something one urinates (on)'. Mo. and modern Turkic lexemes of the shape *kayaŋ* (mentioned in the *EDPT* entry) may be connected with this, but the similarity to Pe. *qaṭang* 'slim, elegant' should be a coincidence.

yalıŋ 'naked', common since the Orkhon inscrs. and also used metaphorically, must be related to *yalın-* 'to strip oneself, to go naked'; see that below among the *-(X)n-* verbs. The rarity of *yalın-* is a problem. *yalt* and *yalım* (discussed in the *EDPT*) are also rare; both are used of cliffs. *yalıntık* 'destitute, orphan', q.v. on p. 44, must be related. On the possibility that *otuŋ* 'firewood' should be an *-(X)ŋ* derivate see that lexeme in section 2.92 above. *yalŋus* 'alone, solitary' is hard to explain otherwise than as a compound of *yalıŋ* with *us* 'intelligence'.[387]

A very common noun which apparently belongs to this formation is *yiriŋ/irıŋ* 'pus'. Its base is *ïrï-* 'to decay, to rot', which is attested thrice with explicit *ï* (with *yā*) in the second syllable in the DLT. A bit disconcerting is the Uigur variant of this verb, *yirü-*. This is attested with the same meaning as *ïrï-* in the DLT, once in *TT II B* and twice in the Suv (as quoted in the *DTS* and the *EDPT*).[388] *yirü-* may be the result of contamination with *ärü-* 'to melt'. The instances can hardly be misread, in any case, considering synonyms like *çirü-* which appear in quite a number of Turkic languages. In case *(y)irü-* really *is* the older variant, it cannot have been the base of *(y)iriŋ*, which could then be a simplex. *(y)iriŋ*, attested widely and solidly in Old Turkic, is unlikely to come from a late variant of the base with an unrounded second vowel.[389]

387 The latter noun is said in the DLT to have been in use in the Oguz dialect; it is not attested in Old Turkic, where it must have been obsolete. The earliest instances of *yalıŋus* show **s* as final consonant: The runic texts IXu (23), the Yenisei inscrs. and IrqB (XL). This is also what is found in all three Brāhmī exs. and consistently in the DLT, and at least in part of the instances in Uigur script. Final **z*, which is used by most modern languages, *may* appear sporadically in Uigur, but is not common before the QB mss., which use it consistently.

388 *TT II B* 14-15 reads *aguı küçädip ad//ı//nii yirüp äŋäki//gaku aprap* [. A n. suggests cautiously that the third word quoted here might be completed as a noun **adurı+ı* and proposes taking it to be an object of *yirüp*. This suggestion is included in the *UW* as a lemma with question mark. There is no trace of such a lexeme in Old Turkic, nor any evidence that the word for 'cheek-pouch' (documented in the *EDPT* s.v. *adurı* from Middle Turkic on) ever had a dental after the first syllable. I therefore suggest that this is a form of the verb *adar-ı-* 'to harm', q.v. below; It is likely to have had *agu* as subject and to have governed the gerund *küçädip*.

389 A derivation from *yer-* 'to loathe, criticise, blame' appears unlikely on semantic grounds (although *yiriŋ* can also be read as *yeriŋ*). Any connection with *yeriŋü-* (mentioned among the *+Ü-* verbs) also seems against common sense.

3.117 *-(X)ndı* and *-dI*

-(X)ndı — *-(X)ntI* is quite rare in Uigur but much better attested in Qarakhanid Turkic: The DLT exs. (in fols. 82, 84, 225-6 and 247) are numerous, and Kāšġarī presents the formation as being productive.

In U III 75,8_2 we find *yerinti* '(something) loathsome', *ibid.* 73,26 its derivate *yerintilig* [*mün*] *kadag*. *+lXg* here expresses apposition, a relationship which can also be expressed by simple juxtaposition: The phrase appears as]*erinti mün* [*kadag* in BT XIII 13,60. This passage constitutes a paraphrase of Suv 135,7, where *mün kadag* 'fault, sin_2' appears without this expansion. *erintisiz ätözlüg* (LautBemerk 46) signifies 'having a body without blemish'. The lexeme is attested also in QB 5327: *yerindi ajunug süründikä kod* is by Dankoff translated as "Leave the vile world to the banished here". Another Uigur *-(X)ntI* lexeme probably appears in Ht VII 2095: *munı*[*ır*]*ın turmış bir ikintişkä* [. . .] *örlätişmäk öçlüg urunta*, translated as "Daher entstand jene erregte, zornerfüllte Schlägerei". The editor thought the lexeme which interests us here should be taken to be '*urunt*', but that would leave the possessive suffix unexplained. The last Uigur ex. we can mention is the expansion *isindilig* 'hot, heated' in Ernte 68.

In QB 2598, the edition writes *üdründü+si* and does not mention any variants, but we would expect *üdründi+si*. Note that, like the QB's three instances mentioned, all of the DLT's 20 exs. have *d* and not *t* in the suffix; Kāšġarī in fact explicitly mentions *dāl*. The Uigur instances with °*t*° could therefore represent either the sound [d] as opposed to both [t] and [ð] or the replacement of /d/ by /t/ after sonants, a phenomenon we have mentioned a number of times already. Note, incidentally, that this formation appears with *t* in Republican Turkish: The DLT's *akındı* there turns up as *akıntı*, DLT's *süpründi* 'sweepings' as *süprüntü*.

However the case may be, the above appear to be a collection of *-dI* derivates from *-(X)n-* stems: *yer-in-*, *ur-un-* and *isi-n-* are discussed below. The only common *-dI* nominal is *ögdi* 'praise, song of praise, *stotra*'. The Brāhmī text TT VIII H writes *ögði* in l.8 but *ögti* in l.10; DLT and QB are consistent about the /d/, however. Uigur exs. not mentioned in the dictionaries appear in BT II 45-6, BT VIII B 150, Mängi 19, Maitr 19 r5, 122 r30 and 194 r14 in the phrase *ögdisin* ög-, ETŞ 15,77, BT VII A311, HazaiAval 13, SuvCaitya 30,17 and ms. Ōtani 2695 a6.[390] The expansion *ögdisiz* appears in Shō II b15, *ögdilig* in UigBlock 18, Suv 583,16-17, BT XIII 15,12 and ShōKenkyū III 27. In Schwitz 11-12 we find the sentence *kam*[*a*]*gd*[*ın ö*]*gdi yıvdı altaçı*, translated as "Von allen wird er Lob und Preis empfangen". The binome *ögdi yıvdı* corresponds to Chin. *jing tan* and comes from the common biverb *ög- yıv-*.

390 What Arlotto writes as *ögdi+g* in Ht VII 6 a20 is in fact *ögdir* 'reward'.

There seems to be no reason to connect this formative with the 3rd pers. sg. perfect suffix, although the two look identical: Both their functions and their meanings are different.

3.118 *-I* and *-sI*

There are quite a number of deverbal nominals for which we have to assume the existence of a formative *-I*. The present formation cannot have been identical with the vowel converb, for several reasons. Firstly, the verbs which are here found expanded with *-I* form their converbs with other vowels: *-A* if they are simple (with the exception of *kal-* to be discussed below) or *-U* if they are derived. Secondly, *-I* lexemes are used nominally or adjectivally, whereas converbs consistently have adverbal function. Thirdly, lexemes formed with *-I* denote the object of tr. bases or the subject if their bases happen to be intr. and thus show ergative behaviour. There is nothing ergative about the converbs. What shape *-I* may have had with bases ending in vowels is an open question.

We come first to the *-I* derivates from tr. bases. *tōgi* 'cleaned and/or crushed cereal' comes from *tōg-* 'to pound, crush' and is attested in TT VII 14,8 and 17, twice in TT VIII K3, in USp 91,5 and 24 (reedited by Zieme), in the DLT and so forth. There is an *üyür tōgisi* as well. *takı* 'more, yet, and, too, also' is exceedingly common but does not yet appear in the Orkhon inscriptions. The reasons which the *EDPT* gives for not connecting it with *tak-* 'to attach' do not hold, as neither lexeme had a voiced initial in Old Turkic; the /d/ in Ottoman *daxı* etc. must be secondary. The original meaning of *takı* might have been *'what is added or connected (is) . . .' or, in the case of 'more', *'additional'. *adrı* 'forked' is discussed in the *EDPT*. There does not seem to be much doubt that it represents the object of *adır-* 'to separate (tr.)'. There are two Uigur exs., both quoted in *UW* 58 a: Both appear as *üç adrı* 'trident', a term found also in the QB.[391] *adrı* appears also in the DLT and in later Turkic, including the Codex Comanicus. *ayrı agaç* in the latter source corresponds to *adrı yıgaç* in the DLT. *yapı* 'horse-blanket' in Khot 19 and in the DLT comes from *yap-* 'to cover'. It cannot come from *yapıg*, under which it is listed in the *EDPT*, as final /g/ is not dropped in Khot. The DLT mentions it as Çigil.

āgrı 'bent, crooked' can only be an object nominal of *āgir-*. This is the only possibility, as an *-Ur-* causative of *āg-* 'to bend' is not attested and would not be called for: *āg-* is tr. by itself. *āgir-* signifies 'to surround, encircle' but also 'to spin

391 A form 'DRW quoted in the *UW* entry from TugDvaUjgDok can hardly belong to this lexeme both because of its form and of its meaning. It could well be an error for *ādgū*, a possibility considered by Röhrborn.

thread' and 'to spin something around'. Nevertheless, the semantic relationship remains problematic, as the earliest exs. of *ägri* describe the hunch-backed form of camels. See *EDPT* 115 a for these latter, runic, instances. *ägri* is found also in TT VI 31 (with its antonym *köni*), Maitr 131 v9 = MaitrH IV 3 a21, SP 21, TT I 110 and Qarakhanid Turkic. *bükri* 'hunchbacked, bent over, with a bent back' is attested in DLT fols. 117 (verse) and 212 and perhaps in Maitr 101 v7 (fragmentary context). *bük-* was intr. (unlike Republican Turkish), so that an (unattested) *-Ur-* causative derived from it could have been the base of *bükri*. On the other hand, it may also have been created in analogy with *ägri*, for *ägril-* and *bükül-* (qq.v. below) are also used together. *yaprı yer* 'smooth, wide land' (DLT fol. 457) comes from *ol yerig yapurdı* "He levelled the ground" (DLT fol. 473); this is hap. but clear by itself. *kudı* 'downwards' is a postposition and adverb documented in the *EDPT* under '*kodı*'. See the derivate *kudıKar-* in section 7.53 for the first vowel and about this confusion. It comes from *kud-* 'to pour' and the inscriptional exs. preserve this connection: *ol suv kudı bar-* (Toñ 27), *Sälängä kudı yorı-* (BQ E 37) and *Sälängä kudı* (ŞU E 4) all have to do with rivers. Uigur then generalised the directional component; this development did not, however, take place in Oguz. Cf. also Brāhmī *kuḍıkı* for the first vowel.

köni 'straight' is the best-attested *-I* derivate from an intr. verb: *kön-* signifies 'to get or be straight'. The *EDPT* quotes runic, Manichaean, Buddhist and Muslim instances of *köni* and documents its presence in Middle and modern Turkic. The transcription '*köne*' in BT III 777, 880 and 910 is unacceptable in spite of Yak. *könö* as quoted there. *çaşı* appears to be attested only in TT VI 119 (well visible on the facs.). We there find *çaşı savlıg* coordinated with *igid savlıg* 'lying' and *sarsıg savlıg* 'using ill language'. *çaşı savlıg* should signify 'slanderous': Its base is not attested; cf., however, *çaşur-* 'to slander', discussed among the *-Ur-* verbs below.

Two other *-I* derivates from intr. bases are found only in Qarakhanid Turkic. They also denote the subjects of their bases. They are *siŋi* 'easily digestible' in the DLT, < *siŋ-* 'to be absorbed or digested, to penetrate' and *buşı*, attested 12 times in the QB. *buşı* signifies 'bad-tempered, irritable', and comes from *buş-* 'to be irritated, annoyed' (q.v. in the *EDPT*).

kalısız 'without remainder, without exception' is attested in Orkhon Turkic and in Uigur. Its unattested base could be identical to the vowel converb of *kal-* 'to remain', which also ends in *-ı*; but this is not very likely: As already stated, the converb does not even show traces of prehistorical nominal behaviour. A sibilant cluster as in '*kalış+sız*' would not get simplified, as exs. show. **kalı* is therefore likely to have been another deverbal nominal of this formation.

kavşı kaş in the DLT are 'conjoined arched eyebrows'. Like *kön-i* or *buş-ı*, *kavş-ı* denotes its subjects. *kavış-* is not an *-Xş-* verb in the strict sense, in that *kavı-* was, at best, obsolete. Nevertheless, it is clearly reciprocal in both content and form.

Most lexemes of this section happen to be derived from cooperative-reciprocal verbs, and retain this content also under *-I* derivation. We know that these are not converb forms as the converb and aorist vowel of *-(X)ş-* verbs is consistently /U/,[392] Some of the 'petrified converbs' discussed under *-(X)t-* might, however, in fact be *-I* lexemes, as the original converb and aorist vowel of that formation happens to have been /U/.

The most common lexeme here is *karşı* 'opposite, opponent; opposition'. It is clearly connected with *karış-* (q.v. below) semantically, and not with *kar-*. See the *EDPT* for exs.; *karşı* with dative is attested e.g. in BT XIII 46,19. *için karşı* (Suv 365,17-19) is 'opposites of each other, mutual opposites'. Further exs. appear in Abhi A 130 a 2 and B 56 b 3-4 (= 5549).

In its entry for *arşı*, the *UW* confuses it with *erşi*. Although they show a certain similarity and are both used together with *karşı*, these two *-ş-I* forms can't be collapsed: One should come from *ar-ış-* 'to deceive each other', the other from *er-ış-*, q.v. below. *er-iş-* appears in TT III apparently in a biverb with *kar-ış-*; hence the parallelism in the *-I* derivates. There are two (Maitr) exs. for *arşı karşı*, one for *erşi karşı* (SuvCaitya 32,2); in Suv 90,6 and 410,19 *erşisiz* and *karşısız* appear as a binomial. What may be reasonably assumed (since *arşı* and *erşi* are so much rarer than *karşı*) is that analogy from *karşı* was at work in their creation. *erşi* probably comes from *(y)er-* 'to despise'. I believe the instance from a Kipchak source read as '*erşi*' (i.e. '*ārşī*') in the *EDPT* entry '*ersü*' and translated as "one who incites perjury" should be read as *arşı* and joined to what is discussed here. *arsu* 'vile, depraved' in DLT fol. 76 (also spelled as *ārsū* in the EDPT and by Dankoff and Kelly) is probably a variant of *arşı* (with analogously rounded final vowel) and should then be read as *arşu*.[393] From the same semantic domain as *karşı*, *arşı* and *erşi* we have, in the Codex Comanicus, *urşu* 'resistance', < *ur-uş-*.

For *yara-ş-ı* 'suitable, beneficial' see both the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, the latter also s.v. '*jaraş*' (thus!). Further exs. can be found in BT I D (82), BT II 790, ETŞ 8,26 and 10,114, ShōAv 210, 242 and 252, ShōAgon 3, p. 204,5 and 14, HtPek 82 a 5 (*apud UW* 90 a), UigStab I 16 (binomial *uz yaraşı*) etc. For *ädärkä yaraşu at* in AmongUigDoc 20, *UW* 253 b proposes reading '. . . *yaragu at*'; cf. *ädärkä yaragu at* in UmemIyaku *apud UW* 253 a. *yaraşu* is, however, very clear on the facs. *yarışu küç bergü saŋa* (ETŞ 11,56) may also come from *yaraşu* over syncopated

392 *UW* 204 a top assumes that *er-ş-i* (discussed below) was an "ursprünglich erstarrtes Konv. von *eriş-* 'sich beschimpfen' . . . mit . . . assimilatorischer Auslautveränderung". As distinct e.g. from Republican Turkish, however, Old Turkic does not show any signs whatsoever of labial assimilation. In Maitr 176 r 2 we find the sequence *arşı [k]arşı tōtūşū [kā]rişū kāl-*, which shows both forms together.

393 *arşu* 'hermaphrodite' (q.v. in the *UW*) does *not* belong here, however; it is related to what has been read as *arsalık* in DLT fol. 90, and also signifies "hermaphroditic (of an animal)".

**yarşu* and anaptyxis. The final /U/ may have come up under the analogy of the converb; cf. the DLT's *arşu* above, possibly *kerşüsüz* in Laut 40, once *yölāşü* for *yölāşi*, etc.

Not to be confused with *yara-şı* is *yarşı* 'dividing, divergent etc.', < *yar-ış-* 'to divide (property) with somebody'. It is attested only in DLT and QB, discussed in the *EDPT*.

tāŋāş-i 'fitting, equal' is found in MaitrH XI 16 a14 and QB 4193 and 4528. In ETŞ 11,94 it looks as if *tāŋāşū* had been changed to *tāŋāşi* or vice versa, and in Maitr 126 r16 the lexeme is spelled as *t(ā)ŋāşi*. The *EDPT* discusses this under *'teŋeş'*; if such a lexeme existed, it is not the base of *tāŋāşi*. *tāŋāşisiz* is attested also in BuddhKat 18, Suv 618,8 and 652,12, Maitr 154 r22 and InscrOuig IV 11; in some of these it is spelled as *tāŋgāşisiz* or even *tāŋgāşigsiz*. The word spelled as *tikāşi* in BT III 47 could be *tāŋāşi* or *tegāşi*; cf. Coman *tekşi* and Mo. *tegši* quoted in the n. to BuddhKat 18.

körşi < *kör-üş-*, 'with a view on . . ., in view of' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is attested in BT III 940 and 956 and ETŞ 10,11 and 13,107.

yölāşi 'similar (to)' is attested only in Maitr: 3 r30,[394] 13 v20 (*yolāşü*!), 19 r30 and 139 v25 and MaitrGeng 2 a27 and 5 a12 and MaitrH XVI 11 a27. It is mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor the *DTS*. It can be semantically connected only with *yölāş-* 'to resemble' and not with *yölā-* 'to support'; see *yölā-ş-* in section 7.1.

tutşı 'continuous' comes from *tut-uş-* 'to hold each other'; the semantic point of contact between the two lexemes is not difficult to see. The form as quoted here is found in Ht IV 961 ('adjacent'), DhāSū 20 and ms. T II D 177 (Mz 311) v9-10 quoted in the n. to Ht X 46 (misspelled by all three scholars). The normal spelling of the sequence [tş] = [ç] appears to have been *tç*, phonetically an equivalent. As we read in the DLT entry headed *tutşı* in fol. 213: "The *šīn* here is related to *jīm*; one may say *tutçı*." *tutşı* is, accordingly, spelled as *tutçı* in Ernte 75, 90, 93 and 125, BT VII H 4, TT III 26 and 41, ETŞ 10,277 and 12,4, BT XIII 55,12 and elsewhere. Another (phonetically equivalent) variant spelling of *tutşı/tutçı* is *tuçı*, which appears in the QB. There is yet another variant mentioned by Kāšġarī, *tutaşı*. This reminds us, on the one hand, of *konaşı* ~ *konşı* to be discussed below. On the other hand, there may somehow have existed a variant of *tut-* of the form **tuta-*: Cf. *tutam*, the alternant of *tutum* first found in QB 5265. In the QB there are 26 exs. of *tuçı*, 32 of *tutçı* and 5 of *tutaşı*, alternating purely for the sake of the metre. *tutşı/tutçı* is often used adnominally, sometimes together with *üzüksüz*, *üzäliksiz* or adverbially with *turmadın* etc. Cf. *tup tutçı*.

394 The initial *yōdh* is lost in a lacuna. The ed. first 'reconstructs' it as *alef* but gives it a correct translation, then lists the resulting '*ʾlāşi*' as if it were a variant of *yölaşi* (in the glossary, where conjectures are not marked as such but look as if they were in the ms.).

saŋsı 'appropriate to' (with the dative) appears in Suv 108,20 (quoted in the *DTS* as *'saŋsıŋ'*); the expansion *saŋsıŋg* is discussed in section 2.32. It is no doubt related to *saŋ-* 'to join onto'; cf. *sap-ıl-* for the meaning.

kon-ŋı 'neighbour(ing)' appears in this form only in USp 102 b 9.[395] DLT fol. 219 considers *koŋsu* to be the base form and *konşı* (which for him is the Oguz variant) a metathesis. Cf., further, *konaşı eliglär* in Ht VII 2009. Note that there is no *-Xş-* derivate from *kov-*: *konşı* and *saŋsı* are the only *-şI* lexemes for which no related *-(X)ş-* verbs are found, as against eleven *-şI* lexemes for which such verbs do exist. For the variant *konaşı* cf. the DLT's *konat* and *konat-*; all the early evidence, however, is in favour of *kon-* (e.g. *kon-ok*), and not of '**kona-*'. *konaşı* therefore reminds us of *tutaşı* < *tuşa*.

yuaşı 'fine, appropriate' is attested only from DLT and QB on, but is still in use.[396] It must be an *-I* derivate from *yak-ış-* 'to draw near each other'.

There is a lexeme *buşrı* im ZiemeTärä 15 c: *yüzin sor buşrı kılıp* . . . The editor translates it as "ihr Gesicht runzelnd und zornig machend". 'zornig' is what appears in the Tib. and Mo. versions of the text, suggesting that *buşrı* is an *-I* derivate from *buş-ur-* 'to annoy'. 'angry' does not appear in the Skt. or Chin. versions of the text, however. There may therefore be the additional possibility that *buşrı* is a metathesis of **bur-(u)ş-ı* from *buruş-* 'to get wrinkled'; in that case, *buşrı* and *sor* would constitute a binomial.[397] But such metathesis never occurs in *yarşı*, *arşı*, *erşı*, *körşı* or *karşı*. Note also that *buşur-* is not too weakly attested in Uigur, whereas *buruş-* (q.v. among the *-Xş-* verbs) is attested first in the DLT. A further instance of *buşrı* would not necessarily clarify the matter: *burkı* in the DLT signifies both 'wrinkled' and 'frowning'.

-sXz expansions of *-I* forms have already been mentioned; we have the reduplication *tıp tıtçı* in BT XIII 1,82 and *sapşı+sız* in BT III 308.

Bang, 1917-21, *Mitt.* II: 29-32 deals with various *-şI* lexemes.

3.119 *-(X)gIXg*

DLT fol. 255 says that *+IXg* has two uses. We have described the first of his two uses at length above, in the section on *+IXg* (2.91). The second use, he says, is to form passive participles. He gives two exs. for this second use: *bilig, kişi ara ülüglig ol* "Intelligence is divided (*maqsūm*) among people". The word in question, written as *'ULK"LK* in the ms., is read as '*ülüglüg*' by Dankoff and Kelly,

395 Not '109 b 9' as written in the *EDPT*.

396 Ottoman *yakış-* 'to suit etc.' looks to me like a back-formation from *yakşı*.

397 Cf. *DLT* fol. 184 *burų* (thus instead of *buruų?*) 'wrinkle in skin or clothing'; read correctly in the Dankoff-Kelly edition but as '*bürü*' in the *EDPT*.

the *EDPT* etc.; that, however, signifies 'fortunate', a meaning which does not fit the context. The DLT's second ex. is *tōşāglig tōşāk*, translated "bedding that is spread out". Dankoff and Kelly mistakenly write '*tōşāklig*'. In both cases, their mistake is their assumption that these are instances of *+lXg* added to attested nouns. But participles are derived from verbs and not nouns, the bases here being *ūlā-* and *tōşā-* respectively. The forms '*ūlā-g*' and '*tōşā-g*' need never have existed, as *-XglXg* is evidently a fused suffix. It is attested already in IrqB LV, in predicative position and in parallelism with a perfect participle: *(ā)vïŋ(ā)rū k(ā)lı(ā)r, ōzi at(a)nmış, ögr(ü)nçülüg, (a)tı yetiglig k(ā)lir* '(A man went to the army...) When he comes home, he comes a famous man, happy, his horse being led (for him)'. *at* with implicit (i.e. short) *a* necessarily being 'a horse' and not 'one's name', the *EDPT*'s rendering as "with a reputation for alertness(?)" cannot apply.[398] Again, '*yet-ig*' (or, for that matter, '*yit-ig*') is not attested in Old Turkic, and *yet-iglig* is derived directly from the verb. The meaning is that of a passive participle. The existence of *-XglXg* in Manichaean texts is hard to prove, but it is not rare in Buddhist texts.

The compound suffix *-(X)glXg* is not very easily distinguished from the suffix sequence *-(X)g+lXg*, for which numerous exs. have been mentioned together with the *-(X)g* forms. Indeed, it is not certain that a sharp line *can* be drawn between the two. *-(X)glXg* must, however, be assumed to have existed because some of the instances have verbal government, which *-(X)g* never does; corresponding *-(X)g* lexemes are not attested, or are attested with rather different meanings. This is the case with the exs. already quoted and the ones to be quoted below. Many other instances can be interpreted either way.

A construction similar to that of the IrqB instance quoted is found in Ht VI 2 b9: *kōzi yūmūglūg olorur ārti* 'He used to sit with closed eyes'. No *-Xg* form is known from *yūm-* 'to close one's eyes'. Further we have *çıntan ekişi birlā katagl(ı)g ... xua çāçāklār* (Maitr 18 v5) 'flowers$_2$ ... mixed with sandalwood filings' and *kāk birlā katıglıg savlar* (BT II 990) "mit Haß vermischte Bewußtseinsinhalte" with no attested '*kat-ıg*' from *kat-* 'to mix'.[399] Note that *kat-* is tr., and that *savlar* and *çāçāklār* are its objects. *kāntirin örmiş panşukul yamaglıg ton* 'patched garment ...' (Maitr 170 r16) comes directly from *yama-* 'to patch' (q.v. in the *EDPT*). *arıg sūzōk, kōŋüli yıgıglıg [tınlıg]lar ārtiŋū bay barımlıg bolgu ārip ...* (Warnke 437) 'Pure$_2$ people with collected thoughts should have been very well-to-do, but ...' can be compared to the phrase *kōŋül yıg-* of TT III 31, TT I 222,

398 The IrqB writes Proto-Turkic long vowels with explicit A. Besides, the form *yitig* used by the *EDPT* is only a very late variant of *yiti* 'sharp'.

399 The existing *kang* comes from *kat-* 'to be hard'. From the base of *kan-glıg* we have *kan-k*, q.v. above; it has a rather specific meaning.

sapşı 'appropriate to' (with the dative) appears in Suv 108,20 (quoted in the *DTS* as '*sapsı*'); the expansion *sapşısıg* is discussed in section 2.32. It is no doubt related to *sap-* 'to join onto'; cf. *sap-ıl-* for the meaning.

kon-şı 'neighbour(ing)' appears in this form only in USp 102 b 9,[395] DLT fol. 219 considers *koşnı* to be the base form and *konşı* (which for him is the Oguz variant) a metathesis. Cf., further, *konaşı eliglär* in Ht VII 2009. Note that there is no *-Xş-* derivate from *kon-*; *konşı* and *sapşı* are the only *-şI* lexemes for which no related *-(X)ş-* verbs are found, as against eleven *-şI* lexemes for which such verbs do exist. For the variant *konaşı* cf. the DLT's *konat* and *konat-*; all the early evidence, however, is in favour of *kon-* (e.g. *kon-ok*), and not of '**kona-*'. *konaşı* therefore reminds us of *tutaşı* < *tuşı*.

yaxşı 'fine, appropriate' is attested only from DLT and QB on, but is still in use. It must be an *-I* derivate from *yak-ış-* 'to draw near each other'.[396]

There is a lexeme *buşrı* im ZiemeTārā 15 c: *yüzin sor buşrı kılıp* . . . The editor translates it as "ihr Gesicht runzelnd und zornig machend". 'zornig' is what appears in the Tib. and Mo. versions of the text, suggesting that *buşrı* is an *-I* derivate from *buş-ur-* 'to annoy'. 'angry' does not appear in the Skt. or Chin. versions of the text, however. There may therefore be the additional possibility that *buşrı* is a metathesis of **bur-(u)ş-ı* from *buruş-* 'to get wrinkled'; in that case, *buşrı* and *sor* would constitute a binomial.[397] But such metathesis never occurs in *yarşı*, *arşı*, *erşı*, *körşı* or *karşı*. Note also that *buşur-* is not too weakly attested in Uigur, whereas *buruş-* (q.v. among the *-Xş-* verbs) is attested first in the DLT. A further instance of *buşrı* would not necessarily clarify the matter: *burkı* in the DLT signifies both 'wrinkled' and 'frowning'.

-sXz expansions of *-I* forms have already been mentioned; we have the reduplication *tup tutçı* in BT XIII 1,82 and *sapşı+sız* in BT III 308.

Bang, 1917-21, Mitt. II: 29-32 deals with various *-şI* lexemes.

3.119 *-(X)glXg*

DLT fol. 255 says that *+lXg* has two uses. We have described the first of his two uses at length above, in the section on *+lXg* (2.91). The second use, he says, is to form passive participles. He gives two exs. for this second use: *bilig, kişi ara üläglig ol* "Intelligence is divided (*maqsūm*) among people". The word in question, written as 'ULK°LK in the ms., is read as '*ülüglüg*' by Dankoff and Kelly,

395 Not '109 b 9' as written in the *EDPT*.

396 Ottoman *yakış-* 'to suit etc.' looks to me like a back-formation from *yakşı*.

397 Cf. DLT fol. 184 *buruş* (thus instead of *buruş*?) 'wrinkle in skin or clothing'; read correctly in the Dankoff-Kelly edition but as '*būriş*' in the *EDPT*.

the *EDPT* etc.; that, however, signifies 'fortunate', a meaning which does not fit the context. The DLT's second ex. is *tōşāglig tōşāk*, translated "bedding that is spread out". Dankoff and Kelly mistakenly write '*tōşāklig*'. In both cases, their mistake is their assumption that these are instances of *+lXg* added to attested nouns. But participles are derived from verbs and not nouns, the bases here being *ūlā-* and *tōşā-* respectively. The forms '*ūlā-g*' and '*tōşā-g*' need never have existed, as *-XglXg* is evidently a fused suffix. It is attested already in IrqB LV, in predicative position and in parallelism with a perfect participle: *(ā)vin(ā)rū k(ā)ls(ā)r, özi at(a)nmış, ögr(ū)nçülüg, (a)tı yetiglig k(ā)lir* '(A man went to the army . . .) When he comes home, he comes a famous man, happy, his horse being led (for him)'. *at* with implicit (i.e. short) *a* necessarily being 'a horse' and not 'one's name', the *EDPT*'s rendering as "with a reputation for alertness(?)" cannot apply.[398] Again, '*yet-ig*' (or, for that matter, '*yit-ig*') is not attested in Old Turkic, and *yet-iglig* is derived directly from the verb. The meaning is that of a passive participle. The existence of *-XglXg* in Manichaean texts is hard to prove, but it is not rare in Buddhist texts.

The compound suffix *-(X)glXg* is not very easily distinguished from the suffix sequence *-(X)g+lXg*, for which numerous exs. have been mentioned together with the *-(X)g* forms. Indeed, it is not certain that a sharp line *can* be drawn between the two. *-(X)glXg* must, however, be assumed to have existed because some of the instances have verbal government, which *-(X)g* never does; corresponding *-(X)g* lexemes are not attested, or are attested with rather different meanings. This is the case with the exs. already quoted and the ones to be quoted below. Many other instances can be interpreted either way.

A construction similar to that of the IrqB instance quoted is found in Ht VI 2 b9: *közi yümüglüg olorur ärti* 'He used to sit with closed eyes'. No *-Xg* form is known from *yüm-* 'to close one's eyes'. Further we have *çıntan ekişi birlä katag-l(ı)g . . . xua çäçäklär* (Maitr 18 v5) 'flowers$_2$ . . . mixed with sandalwood filings' and *käk birlä katıglıg savlar* (BT II 990) "mit Haß vermischte Bewußtseinsinhalte" with no attested '*kat-ıg*' from *kat-* 'to mix'.[399] Note that *kat-* is tr., and that *savlar* and *çäçäklär* are its objects. *käntürin örmiş panşukul yamaglıg ton* 'patched garment . . .' (Maitr 170 r16) comes directly from *yama-* 'to patch' (q.v. in the *EDPT*). *arıg süzök, köŋüli yıgıglıg [tınlıg]lar ärtiŋü bay barımlıg bolgu ärip . . .* (Warnke 437) 'Pure$_2$ people with collected thoughts should have been very well-to-do, but . . .' can be compared to the phrase *kōŋül yıg-* of TT III 31, TT I 222,

398 The IrqB writes Proto-Turkic long vowels with explicit A. Besides, the form *yitig* used by the *EDPT* is only a very late variant of *yiti* 'sharp'.

399 The existing *katıg* comes from *kat-* 'to be hard'. From the base of *katı-glıg* we have *katı-k*, q.v. above; it has a rather specific meaning.

USp 43,6 etc., in which *kōŋül* is the object of *yıg-*. Again, there is no '*yıg-ıg*'. Nor is there any '*töltäg*' or '*töltäk*', although we find *töltä-glig* in BT I C6 (*töltäglig orunta* "auf den mit Matten ausgestatteten Platz") and in BuddhUig II 352-4 (*sunçuklar yadıglıg töltäglig ärip . . .* 'the matresses are spread$_2$ and . . .'). UigKan 172 should be read as *ögänki(y)älar tüpintä üküş tälim v(a)jırlıg / öŋi öŋi öŋlüg kumları özin ök uzkı(y)a töltägl[ig]*/ and not *töltäkl[är]*, as the eds. write: '*töltäk*' is not (otherwise) attested, and *uzkıya* is not an adjective signifying "beautiful" but an adverb, meaning 'masterfully'; it here qualifies a participle, a form belonging to the verbal system. A further ex. of *töltä-glig* with the instrumental case is mentioned below. In that instance, the cushioning agent is also sand. *töltägl[ig]* is here used metaphorically, and so is *töl+ä-* (q.v. below) in Windg 34-5. *xua yavışgu töltäglig* in MaitrH XI 6 b22 is not "mit Blumen, Laubwerk und Kissen ausgestattet" but 'spread with flowers and greenery'. *yad-ıglıg*, quoted above from BuddhUig II, is another instance of this formation. *koş-uglug* in Suv 625,5 and 636,21 qualifies *kaŋlı* 'carriage' and is not related to *koşug* 'verse, poem': *koşuglug kaŋlıta olorup t(ā)rkin tavratıkı(y)a bartılar* (Suv 636,21). *yügrük atların koşuglug kaŋlı* (Suv 625,5) shows us an instrumental governed by *koş-*, something which would have been impossible with *koşug* or with a *+lXg* form derived from it. In ŠhōAgon 1,292 it is said about a *kaŋlı* that *agır katıglıg ärdinilär üzäsintä yütürüglüg* 'heavy assorted diamonds are loaded upon it'. The diamonds are attributively the object of *kat-*, predicatively the object of *yü(d)tür-*, in both cases with the *-(X)glXg* form. A sentence with *as-ıglıg* governing *koŋragular* and *bag bindävirlär* and qualifying *kürekar* as dative object is quoted (from BuddhUig II 347) in the introductory part of section 3.101 (where *salınduru*K is discussed). This comes from *as-* 'to hang up' and signifies 'hung with'. An *-(X)g* derivate from this verb is not attested. *UW* 229 b, dealing with *asıg+lıg* 'profitable', writes: "Ein zweites *asıglıg* mit der Bedeutung 'hängend' halten wir nicht für gesichert, da nur ein Beleg mit unklarem Kont. existiert". *as-ıglıg* is, however, an ergative partîciple and therefore does not signify "hängend". As for its being a hap., this is true for practically all of the *-(X)glXg* forms: They all appear to have been created spontaneously. Now take the sentence *ämiglig mäŋ üzä igidtiŋ* (BT XIII 12,106) translated as "durch Brust-Nahrung hast du aufgezogen". *ämig+lig* would signify 'having breasts (or teats)'. We might here take the suffix *+lXg* to take care of the simple juncture between 'breast' and 'feeding' which one has in German and English. Another way, however, is to derive *ämiglig* directly from *äm-* (not letting oneself get influenced by these European languages) and translate the phrase as 'sucked nurture'. *ädgü unaglıg işlär* 'good and acceptable actions' (BT III 713) comes directly from *una-* 'to consent, agree': No *-(X)g* derivate from *una-* appears anywhere (nor, in fact, any other derivate). *suva-glıg . . . yer* appears in Murtuq 3. The n. thereto quotes a further fr. from Murtuq, T III M 205 d (U 5241), which

has two instances of a similar expression. Thus also ms. TM 104 (U 5247) l.21. Thrice *ögän üzä* and once *köl üzä suvaglıg yer* signifies 'land irrigated by water from a brook / a lake', and is interesting because of the phrase with *üzä*. Such a construction is, ägain, possible only with a verbal form such as a participle, but not with an *-(X)g* or *-(O)k* nominal or with a *+lXg* expansion from it. In the following ex. (from ShöAv 145), *-XglXg* is clearly used as passive participle or rather, in its instrumental form, as gerund: *yaŋı ayagka tägimliglär atı kötrülmiş üzä boşuglugın Sudarşan balıkka bardılar.* Laut's translation "aufgrund der Freistellung durch den Bhagavat" also has passive verbal government; "aufgrund" translates the instrumental suffix.

Some of the instances of some *-Xg+lXg* forms mentioned under *-Xg* may in fact belong here. We can think of *küzädiglig* in TT VIII A34; of *kizlägliglig* e.g. in *ürtüglüg kizlägliglig iz oruklar* (Ht Pek 81 b8 quoted in *UW* 240 b) and of *ürtüglüg kizlägliglig agır ayıg kılınçımız* 'our hidden, grievous misdeeds' (USp 101,20-21). Other exs. of *kizlägliglig* 'hidden, secret' can be found in Suv 699,15, AbitAnk 21, BuddhUig II 27, Buddhāv H 19, HtPar 130,16, AmitIst 71, ms. T III M 56-2 v 20 quoted in the n. to BT V 657 and so forth. Most exs. of *ayaglıg* in the *UW* entry for it have passive sense, and are translated as "verehrt, angesehen, Verehrter, Angesehener". *agır ayaglıg akın suvlar* (BT III 127), quoted in par. B, b, has the metaphorical *+lXg* added to *agır ayag* as a whole: It does not belong here. *ayaglıg* does not signify „Ehrerbietung, Andacht", as translated par. A, c. Rather, in the three Ht. exs. quoted there, *ayag+lıgın* serves as adverbial to *aç-*, *al-* and *büt-*. In taking only the instr. suffix to correspond to German *in* and *mit*, one is erroneously left with this translation to correspond to *ayaglıg*. *aya-glıg* is an adjectival (predicatively with *bol-*, or attributively). The very common *etiglig* and *yaratıglıg* can also come directly from the verb: *anıŋ içintä mäniŋ körgümin adrok adrok yevig tizig etig yaratıg üzä etiglig uz bädizätzün* (U I 29,9, Suv); a similar case, this time from the biverb *et- tümä-*, appears to have stood in] *üzä etiglig tümäglig* (BT VII B 1). *nipur etigin etiglig adakın maŋlap yorısar*... (TT X 439) is translated in the *UW* s.v. *adak* as "wenn sie mit ihren mit Fuß-Schmuck versehenen Füßen schreitend geht", where *etiglig* c. instr. = 'mit ... versehen'. We also have *yaratıglıg* accompanied by instrumental: *säkiz türlüg ädgün yaratıglıg säviglig ünin* (TT X 224-5) "mit seiner mit den acht Arten von Vorzügen ausgerüsteten lieblichen Stimme". In Suv 313,18, *yeti ärdinin eṭ-iglig* and *alṭun kumın tölä-glig* are followed by *lenxua çäçäklärin yarat-ıglıg*, all qualifying *kölmän suvlar*. Some of the exs. of *säviglig* may also be *säv-iglig*, among them *kuvragka säviglig* "der von der Gemeinde begehrt wird" (BT II 1032), *tınl(ı)glarka qmrak säviglig* (TuoLuoNi 96) and *alkoka säviglig ayaglıg* ... *inimiz* (HamTouen 21,2). In *nomlagalı säviglig atlıg t(ä)ŋri burxan kutı* (BT II 561) "über den man gern predigt", the suffix *-XglXg* appears to have been added to the whole sequence *-gAlI säv-*.

The sentence *sunçuklar yadıglıg töltäglig ärip . . .*, quoted above from Buddh- Uig II, was translated as if it were an analytical present perfect. That it may well prove to be, if such a form can be further documented. Compare the following, from the same text (I.382): *yalpurgakta vayduri suvı birlä bitiglig ärip . . .* 'it is written on leaves with *vaiḍūrya* water'.

-(X)glXg can be easily kept apart from the participle suffix *-(X)glI* although the two look rather similar: *-(X)glI* forms always refer to the subject of the verb, while *-(X)glXg* forms hardly ever do. Final /G/ is, of course, never dropped in Old Turkic, which makes distinction between the two an easy task. On the other hand, the special passive sense of *-XglXg* should, perhaps, be explained by polarity between the two forms.

There is a single ex. of *-XglXg* in agentive use, in the following verse of a poem which describes Avalokiteśvara: *açılmış lenxua tutuglug* (BT XIII 20,21). This has to be translated as done by Zieme: "Er hält einen geöffneten Lotos". The possibility of *-XglXg* to serve thus as active and not passive participle may have been offered by poetic licence: The verse is practically a translation of Skt. *Padmapāṇi*, the name of one of the incarnations of Avalokiteśvara. The poet may have wanted to get this into one line, and in a nominal form to suit the Skt. source. Line 2 of the stanza (ours being 1.4) ends in *munçuklug*, and the sound parallelism may have been attractive as well.

Note, however, that all instances of *-(X)glXg* we have met hitherto come from tr. bases. Now, whether a formative forms passive or ergative 'participles' can only be decided if there are any derivates from intr. bases. Such are very few and late. *çınju nom tözintä uz ornaşıglıg çın şala sögötkä yükünür män* (ETŞ 10,285) has an *-(X)glXg* form qualify its subject: *orna-ş-* (discussed among the *-(X)ş-* verbs) is intr.; as an exception, it has no mutual or cooperative content. Secondly, from an otherwise unattested intr. *olı-* (the base of *olın-* and *olıt-* discussed below): According to Zieme, 1982: 177, two ms. variants of Suv 366,3 have the expression *'uluglug yılan'*. This might be an error for *olıglıg yılan* 'a writhing snake'. Thirdly, I can translate *karşınızka kavzatıglıg sögötlär* (BT III 938) only as 'trees surrounded by your palace' (i.e. presumably 'in the courtyard of your palace') and not as "Euren Palast umgebende Bäume". *kavza-t-*, q.v. below, exclusively gets passive subjects, in the phrase being discussed here *sögötlär*. An instance where *kavzat-* is accompanied by a dative case form referring to the agent appears in Suv 609,19. *kavzat-* being passive is intr., and *kavzatıglıg* here qualifies its subject.

In late Uigur, at any rate, *-(X)glXg* is ergative, then. Since there is not a single ex. where an *-(X)glXg* refers to an oblique participant when the verb base is intr. (in the manner of *-(X)nçIg*, section 3.311), it could not be assigned to the 3.31 part of this book for any stage of Old Turkic. We could define *-(X)glXg* as a 'mainly

passive' formative (agreeing with Kāšġarī) but ergative when *all* instances are taken into consideration. This function is not explainable from what we know about -(*X*)*g* and about +*lXg*; it must have emerged to meet some as yet mysterious need of the system of verbal nominals.

-(*X*)*glXg* lives on in the Republican Turkish verbal adjective formative -(*X*)*lX*.

3.12 -(*X*)*nçsXz*

Here we have to distinguish between cases in which the formative sequence creates verbal nominals, and cases in which -(*X*)*nç* nouns are negated. The existence of the latter is to be expected *a priori*, as privative +*sXz* can, of course, be added to all nominals including deverbal ones.

The following two passages are an ex. for the addition of +*sXz* to a couple of existing -(*X*)*nç* lexemes: *açsız kızsız kısıgsız kavrıgsız yagısız bõrisiz basınçsız iy(i)nçsiz ertsiz bertsiz muŋsuz taksız . . . kānt* (Maitr 3 r18-19)[400] and *iyinçsiz basınçsız bolmak* "unbedrückt$_2$ fest sein" (Neujahr 69). *basınç* and *iyinç* (qq.v. above) also usually appear together, and their +*sXz* expansion signifies 'without suppression'. The hapax *alınçsız*, discussed in the *UW* s.v., does not come from *al-* 'to take' but from *alınç* 'income'; the *UW* interpretation is correct. *busuşsuz sakınçsız bolgıl* (U III 57,9$_1$) is clearly derived from the collocation *busuş sakınç*, attested, e.g., in Suv 614,17.[401] In the same semantic domain, we find the rather common *korkunçsuz* ~ *korkınçsız* 'fearless'; see *korkunç* ~ *korkınç* for the two forms. In U IV A 16, 81 and 284, UigTot 108, Tiš 19 a3 and Maitr 101 r16, this lexeme appears in a binomial with *ayınçsız*, from *ayın-* (an -(*X*)*n-* verb). *äymänçsiz* 'shameless, unshy' from *äymän-* (another -(*X*)*n-* verb) is attested in TT VIII A 48, Maitr 23 v2 and 65 v2 and U III 82,20., The two last-mentioned exs. are spelled with an additional initial *alif*. The lemma '*kalınçsız*' in the *EDPT* should be deleted: The form appears in one ms. of TT IV B 60 instead of *kalısız* 'without exception' and, as the Chin. original shows, is an error. *kertgünçsüz* 'unbelieving' is attested in BT V 15,276 (cf. *UW* s.v. *ärıl-* I), TT VI 339 (*kertgünçsüz tınl(ı)g* opposed to *kertgünç köŋüllüg tınl(ı)g*), BT III 707 and 711 and Warnke 225-6, 228 and 230.

tägінçsiz qualifies the eight types of places where one has no chance to attain salvation, and where Buddha's word does not reach (BT II 230, Suv 138,10 and ShōUigFrag 31); in Suv 210,46 and BT XIII 13,135, *tägінçsizlär* is used with this

400 Ş. Tekin wrongly read *kısıgsız* as if it were '*kısıksız*' and *iyinçsiz* as if it were '*unçsız*' (thus).

401 *sansız sakınçsız*, qualifying *kalplar* 'kalpas' in BT III 1116, is an error for the very common collocation *sansız sakışsız*: The passage is part of a text edited in AvStava from four mss., and the only ms. with '*sakınçsız*' is the one of BT III.

meaning. In Maitr 23 r2, these same places are called [*sākiz*] *türlüg tägінçsiz ogsuz yer orun*. In Maitr 67 r8, 75 r15, 78 v29, 82 r1, 84 r9, 83 v14, 202 v25, 203 v7 and MaitrGeng 10 a6 we find the expression *ogsuz tägінçsiz* apparently used to mean 'without occasion'; this is also the meaning of *ogsuz* by itself. This expression comes from the binomial *og tägінç*, attested in Suv 610,4 with the meaning 'a free moment, an occasion to do something'. The positive counterpart of *ogsuz tägінçsiz* is attested in ShōAgon 3, p. 206,10-11: *anılayu ok oglug tägінçlig turur sizlär. . . sözlägäli bo şloklarıg. tägінç* corresponds to Skt. *kṣaṇa* 'moment'[402] and *tägінç kıl-* (Maitr 164 r5 and 195 v2) is 'to find an occasion' or 'set a particular stretch of time for a purpose'. *tägінçsiz* is therefore likely to come from *tägінç* and not to be directly derived from *täg-* 'to reach'.

sezінçsiz 'free from apprehension, suspicion or doubt' is attested in BT V 13,262 and 14,271 and M III 24,11$_2$ (text 9), i.e. like *sezінç* only in Manichaean texts. *sezin-* signifies 'to have an apprehension etc.' and, to judge by the meaning alone, both *sezінç* and *sezінçsiz* could be derived directly from it. As distinct from the latter two, however, *sezin-* (like *sezik*) is common in Buddhist texts and is found in Qarakhanid Turkic but *not* in Manichaean sources. This distribution makes us take *sezінç* and *sezінçsiz* together.

sävінçsiz 'ungrateful', finally, is attested in KP A r9, Suv 613,13 and DLT fol. 608 and appears to come from *sävінç*. It is not related to the usual meaning of *sävінç* as 'joy', however, but to a rarer use as 'gratitude', attested in TT I 13, 52 and 130, TT II A 83, TT III 17 and U IV D 38, 52 and 57. In the last four exs., *sävінç* appears in a binomial with *utlı*, which is the source of *sävінçsiz utlısız* in Suv 613,13. 'joyless' is *ögrünçsüz* (ShōAgon 1, 225, 226 and 228) from *ögrünç*, a synonym of *sävінç* in the sense 'joy'.

alkınçsız 'endless(ly)' is very well attested and adequately discussed in the *UW*. Worth quoting is the fr. in Tib. script extracted in TibStud and containing the text of TT VI 142-161. It shows the instance of TT VI 151, written 'AL.GRIN.SIS. To the *UW* entry we can add *alkınçsız kıltılar ayıg kılınçıg* (BT XIII 12,70), where the lexeme has been used adverbially, and *alkınçsız tälim alko kamag kut vaxşig nayvasiki täŋrilär* (ms. PelliotOuïgour 212,9 quoted in UigBunken p. 67). This last is similar to the TT VII 48 instance. *alkınçsız* has no related *-(X)nç* form: The *EDPT* entry *'alkınç'* has only exs. of *alkınçu* and should be deleted. Had only the meaning been relevant, *alkınçu* 'end' could have been its base. There is no rule demanding the deletion of final vowels before *+sXz*, but see section 3.105 for the whole matter. A similar case is that of *yarlıkançsız* 'pitiless', presumably related to the unattested *-(X)nçU* base of *y(a)rlıkançuçı* 'compassionate'. It appears in

402 In TT VIII D 16, *kṣaṇa-saṃnipataṃ* has been slavishly rendered as *tägінçniŋ yıgılmakın*, where each element of the Skt. compound is isolated from its context and translated separately.

yarlıkançsız tamu ärkligläri (Maitr nr. 51/116/174 r 16), *yarlıkançsız bilig* (Maitr 83 r 13) and *yarlıkançsız kõŋül* (U IV A 69, TT IV A 63, U II 85,16, Maitr 74 v 25, Höllen 6 and LautHöllen 121). *yarlıkançuçı* is usually attested with *kõŋül*,[403] which makes its distribution similar to that of *yarlıkançsız*. Note that -(X)nçU hardly ever receives +sXz as suffix: An isolated *bulunçusuz* in KP 14,7 is equivalent to the rather common *bulunçsuz* discussed below. *alkınçusuz* in HamTouen 4,1 must be an ad-hoc creation. Since -(X)nç+çI, on the other hand, is not attested either, there is a suppletion between -(X)nç and -(X)nçU concerning these expansions. *alkınçsız* and *yarlıkançsız*, then, must also be said to be expansions of nominal forms and not of the verbal base.

In other cases, the combination of the suffixes -(X)nç and +sXz clearly had a function and meaning of its own, and was added to the verb bases as one unit: Most of the numerous -(X)nçsXz lexemes have no corresponding -(X)nç forms attested at all, and these may never have been created. Even if both forms (the one with +sXz and the one without) exist side by side, one may not necessarily come from the other; the description of the derivational relationships must depend on semantic and collocational criteria. There is an important distributional difference between -(X)nç and -(X)nçsXz: The only derived verbs with which the first formation is related are reflexives, whereas -(X)nçsXz is freely added also to causatives and passives. This is understandable: Whereas -(X)nç shares its functions with -Xş, -(U)t etc., -(X)nçsXz has a task and meaning all of its own; only under some circumstances can it relegate these to -mAksXz, and otherwise only in a very few and isolated cases (to be mentioned below) to -(X)gsXz and -(X)msXz.

About half of the verbal -(X)nçsXz forms denote subjects of intr. bases. *agınçsız* is adequately discussed in the *UW* s.v., translated "ohne Umkehr" and "unerschütterlich". We also find it in Pothi 503 (= TT IX 95), qualifying *sūzōk kõŋül*. It is often quoted in the *UW* together with a synonym, *āvril-inçsiz*. Exs. of this latter not mentioned in that entry can be found in TT V B 35, HtPar 155,25 *apud UW* 76 b 7. In the last two exs., *āvrilinçsiz* appears in a binomial with *yanıgsız*; both lexemes signify, roughly, 'unswerving, not tending to go back'. Two other exs. for *yanıgsız* are mentioned among the -(X)gsXz forms. One wonders about the difference between this latter and *yanınçsız*, attested in TT III 116 and ETŞ 10,16. The ETŞ ex. of *yanınçsız* is quoted in *UW* 208 b s.v. *artançsız*, b, and *yanınçsız tözlüg* is hesitatingly translated there as "dessen Wesen darin besteht, daß . . . er [auf dem Heilsweg] nicht umkehrt". This would make *yanınçsız* synonymous with

403 In 27 among the 36 instances I have noted. Most of the exs. in which the kernel is not *kõŋül* are Manichaean.

yanıŋsız, as may well be. With the TT III instance of *yanınçsız*, at any rate, Bang and Gabain translate *yanınçsız [a]jun* as "eine Existenzform ohne Wiederkehr".

The just mentioned *UW* entry reads ETŞ 10,16 as *yad* (thus!) *üzä artançsız yanınçsız tözlüg*, although the first *-(X)nçsXz* form is written as *ärtänçsiz*: Writing initial /a/ with a single *alif* may not be very unusual; *arta-* with an *üzä* phrase to mark whatever brings about destruction is attested e.g. in Suv 464,6. Cf., further, *artançsızta turmış* (Buddhāv H 102), to be added to the *UW* entry. A form written *artınçsız* in BT II 713, assigned to this same entry in the *UW*, is a more difficult case: It may in fact stand for *ärtinçsiz*, found in BT II 207 in a binomial with *tükätinçsiz*. *arta-* and *ärt-* are near-synonyms in certain contexts, and are, e.g. in Warnke 475, used together as a binomial. Which of our three instances is to be assigned to *arta-* and which to *ärt-* remains an open question. Both *arta-* and *ärt-* are intr., whereas *tükät-* is tr. (and no *'tükätin-'* is attested). This means that *artançsız* and *ärtinçsiz* denote the subjects of their bases, whereas *tükätinçsiz* denotes the object of *tükät-*. In Suv 172,13, *tükätinçsiz* appears with *alkınçsız* (discussed above), which is probably connected with *alkın-* and not with *alk-* (qq.v. in the *UW*). A third ex. of *tükätinçsiz* is found in ETŞ 9,29.

In Maitr 149 r24, *agınçsız* (also discussed above) appears together with *täprängçsiz* 'immovable'. Exs. of *täprängçsiz* not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in U IV A 284, BT II 46, ÇYK 83, Maitr 2 r17 and 39 r5 and 12, Suv 144,12, 286,15, 616,1 and 626,19. A further instance of *täprängçsiz* should, I believe, be seen in M III 31,8$_3$ (text 13), there read as *'taplançsız'*: The difference between the two forms is only in the hook of an *l*, which may in fact have been the flourish of some other letter or a simple error. I read the passage as follows: *ymä kötürüŋ täprängçs(i)z kamşançs(ı)z [t]urag* 'Raise up, then, the immovable$_2$ breastwork'.[404] *ögdikä täprängçsiz* 'he who cannot be moved by praise' is the name of a Buddha in WarnkeFragm. 90.[405] The dative is here governed by the verbal base, a piece of behaviour on the part of *-(X)nçsXz* which would not have been possible with *-(X)nç*. In BuyKāl 41 we find the words *burxan kutıntın 'āvrilinçsiz*, again with verbal government.

The following are also from intr. bases: *yuklunçsuz* in ETŞ 13,65 from *yuklun-*, q.v. below; *ilinçsiz* 'unattached' in BT II 638, Suv 253,13, 377,12, 451,11 and 655,1, six times in BuddhUig I 323-333 and ETŞ 13,66 (read correctly in *UW* 281 b: the *UW*'s lemma *'alınçsız'* should be deleted) from *il-in-* (*il-* not having the metaphorical meaning we need). *āsirkāŋçsiz* 'ungrudging' in TT III 109, U III

404 In the dictionaries, this *tura* is quoted from Qarakhanid but not Old Turkic. GeistDrog now also reads the passage this way.

405 The Skt. *bahuvrīhi* compound *akṣobhyavarṇa* signifies 'he who has an imperturbable nature'. One of the meanings of *varṇa* is 'praise', however, which the translator mistakenly thought he had to incorporate into the name.

16,15, 42,18 and 45,19, BT II 1265, Maitr 117 r14 and v13 and 164 r3, Suv 169,13-14, 369,11, 395,8-9 (*äsirkänçsizin tit- tdala-* like Suv 219,1), 617,22, 629,11 and 629,19 and DruTur 14 comes from *äsirkä-n-*, q.v. below. *ökünçsüz* 'unrepenting' from *ökün-* 'to repent' appears in Suv 169,14 (together with *äsirkänçsiz* in positive sense), Maitr 118 β/79 r3 and v3, ShōAgon 3, p. 207,19 and QB 348 and 920. *todunçsuz* 'insatiable' from *tod-* is found in ms. T II Y 59,7, Chuast 11, 178 and 202, U IV A 72 and Maitr 218/T III M 111 v14; the last two together with *kanınçsız*. *tod-* denotes the alleviation of hunger, *kan-* the alleviation of thirst, but the metaphorical meaning found in their two derivates in *-(X)nçsXz* should be roughly equivalent: While the Maitr instance has *todunçsuz kanınçsız köŋülin*, BuddhUig II 39 and U III 66,8$_1$ content themselves with *kanınçsız köŋülin* alone. Cf. also *kanınçsız közin* 'with insatiable eyes' in TT X 152. In TT VI 362, the archetype probably had *adkançsız dyan* and not *alkınçsız dyan* as written in the published text.[406] *yazınçsız* 'unsinning' (TT III 134, TT VI 242 and Suv 205,15 and 207,11) does not come from '*yazınç*'; such a form only appears in italics, i.e. as a dubious v.l. in one of two mss. of TT IV A 11 replacing *yaz-ok* of the other ms.; it comes directly from *yaz-* 'to err' in its metaphorical extension 'to sin'. The meaning of *yaŋgarınçsız işlig . . . vajır* in ETŞ 10,17 is not clear to me. *tütünçs*[*üz*], from *tüt-* 'to emit smoke', should be read in ThS III b3, according to Bazin in *Turcica* IV (1972): 39. In MaitrGeng 1 b28 we find the passage *kamag üdün ençsizin turançsızın alko tınlaglarnıŋ ämgäkin tolgagın tarkargalır üçün* 'because they endeavour all the time, without resting and without stopping, to relieve the suffering$_2$ of all creatures'; this assumes '*turançsızın*' to stand for **turunçsuzın* or some such form. *yetimsiz ikinçsiz tülüksüz* [*küç*]*süz küsünsüz* (Suv 558,20-559,3) is quoted in the footn. in BT XIII p. 9 and translated as "machtlos und kraftlos". The second word here probably signifies something like 'defeatist, acquiescing, nonresistant': I connect it with the base of *ikäş-* 'to quarrel', q.v. below; the second vowel can be explained through haplology from **ikä-n-inç+siz*. Since, however, the broad second vowel is attested only in verbs in the DLT (including the base *ikä-* q.v. in the *EDPT* s.v. '*igä-*'), the original stem *may* possibly have had an /i/ or an /e/ in this position. Cf. *ikiş* in section 3.103.

The *-(X)nçsXz* derivates from tr. verbs all refer to the objects of their bases. *boşwnçsuz yazok yazıntımız* (Chuast 35)[407] comes from *boşw-* 'to release from

406 The latter appears in the ms. followed by the editors, but another one has *adkançsız*. A third one, published as TT VI New 19 v3, has *adkangsız*, an obvious error for the same thing. The contents of the Mo. version also point in this direction. *adkançsız dyan* also fits the Chin. original *wu yüan guan* "ursachloses Betrachten", taking into consideration the meaning of *adkan-* determined in TermBuddh.

407 See n. 408 in Zieme, 1969 for the reading.

sin' or from *boşw-n-* 'to release oneself from sin', but in both cases 'sins' are the objects of the process.

kötrünçsüz, *särinçsiz* and *unçsuz* all signify 'unbearable' and appear in binomials: The last two in U II 32,61, the first with the third in ETŞ 10,218: *ugusuz kötrünçsüz ... ämgäk*. *-gUsXz* is a rare sequence: I have otherwise met it only in *işlätgüsüzüg ... bışrun-* (Suv 317,20, passage quoted and translated in *UW* 80 b s.v. *akıgsız*, A), *bilü ugusuz Indraçal tor* (ETŞ 9,47) and *sözlägüsüz ol* (Ht VII 18 b 17 = 1880). The modal participle *-gU* is negated verbally (as *-mAgU*) in all but the earliest Old Turkic texts, and *-mAgUlXk*, expanded from it, is a very common inflexional form. Like *-gU* itself, these belong to morphology and not to formation. Our exs. of *-gUsXz* come from texts in which *-mAgU* is a perfectly possible sequence; we need more exs. of *-gUsXz* to determine whether it has a modal content like *-mAgU*. The difference between *ugusuz* and *unçsuz*, *särgüsüz* and *särinçsiz* remains unclear at the moment; both sequences have in common the projection of their content into the future. The difference between the hapax legomena *särimsiz* 'impatient' (QB) and *särinçsiz*, on the other hand, is clear: The latter denotes the object of the endurance whereas the former denotes its subject. *unçsuz* appears by itself in *unçsuz ırak yollar* in ShÖAv 176; note that *unç*, which we have from Toñ 24, is also predicated upon *yol* 'a road'. Why it is translated as "aussichtslose weite Wege" is unclear; it is wrongly spelled as '*onçsuz*' in all three editions of the text.

While roads are *unçsuz*, seas are *käçinçsiz* and deserts are *yogurunçsuz*; the latter two forms appear in ms. TM 269, quoted in the footn. to the n. to TT VI 115. Impenetrably fortified towns are *ötgürünçsüz* (Ht V b 8), wide expanses *yetinçsiz yetiz* (Rāma 11, U IV A 116 and D 91). *yetinçsiz* 'unreachable' also qualifies 'wisdom', in M III $31,1_3$ (text 13). Jungles and the like (*bärk yigi arıg*) are *topolup ününçsüz* in ETŞ 10,57, which means that one cannot penetrate them and get out on the other side. *ün-* is an intr. verb, but the suffix *-(X)nçsXz* is here appended to the verbal sequence *topolup ün-* which, because of the first verb, is transitive.

A slightly similar case is that of *körü kanınçsız* (TT III 81, U III 71,9, Maitr 9 r14, 138 v16, 31 r16 and fr. 464 r5 = MaitrH Y6 a28 (see Laut, 1986: 200), ZiemeGuan 30-31, ETŞ 10,192 and 20,43), *eşidü kanınçsız* (Maitr 17 v2, 55 v2, 55 v10 wrongly spelled as *kanınsız* like *körü kanınsız* in three other Maitr passages, and MaitrGeng 9 a 14) and *körü eşidü kanınçsız* (BT III 1106). *kan-* is intr., which means that *kanınçsız* by itself (discussed above) denotes the insatiable person or insatiety as a quality. The present phrases, on the other hand, denote whatever entity one has never had enough of seeing and/or hearing: They refer to the objects of *kör-* or *eşid-*, and the suffix can be considered to have been added to

the two verbs together."[408] In *körgäli kanınçsız ät' özünüz kurudı* (EhlersTöpfer 4) "Euer Körper, an dem man sich nicht sattschauen kann, verdorrte", the sequence still refers to the object of *kör-*, but one gerund has been replaced by another.

Grammatically comparable are, further, the expressions *sakınu yetinçsiz* (UigSukh 73, UigKan 72, Suv 363,12 and Maitr 13 r12) and *sakınu sözläyü yetinçsiz* (Maitr 54 r12 and 140 r23, Warnke 390, BT VIII A 298 and 435, BT II 676 and BruchGeb 138). In Maitr 138 r21-22, *sakınu yetinçsiz* is parallel to *sözläyü alkınçsız*. BT I B (233) should probably be completed as *sözl[äyü] ye[ti]nçsiz*; ETŞ 9,29 should be read as *sözläp yetinçsiz* instead of '*sözlüg yetinçsiz*'. Whether [. . . y]*etinçsiz ädgülüg* in LautBemerk 42 is 'inconceivable goodness' or 'undescribable goodness' does not appear to matter very much. The kernel of all these terms is something which cannot be attained either in thought or with words. In Ht V 11 a 18, *yetinçsiz tuṭunçsuz* qualifies 'ungraspable$_2$ magic', in Suv 51,5 (translated in *UW* 150 a s.v. *antada*, B) 'ungraspably difficult tasks'. It seems likely that the form *yetinçsiz* of this binomial has been shortened from the expressions just mentioned, as we found *eşidü kanınçsız* to be shortened to *kanınçsız* (footn. 408).

If some things are 'inconceivable' or 'undescribable', others are 'incomparable': *ogşatınçsız* (ETŞ 9,52, BT XIII 28,36 and BuddhUig II 120) or *täŋlänçsiz* (ETŞ 15,16, BT XIII 34,6, Suv 45,3, 151,6 and 398,9, ZiemeGuan 41, TuoLuoNi 384, Warnke 180 and 182, BT III 726 and BT XIII 28,44). In the nine last-mentioned exs., *täŋlänçsiz* is found together with *ülgülänçsiz* 'beyond measure'; it would no doubt have done so also in ETŞ 15 and BT XIII 34 if the metre had permitted it. *ülgülänçsiz* is, however, often found by itself, sometimes signifying 'uncountable': ETŞ 13,59, 16,37 and 59 and 18,20, TT VIII A 42, UigBlock 17, Ht VII 2041, BT VIII B 187, CYK 21, BT XIII 46,40, ZiemeGuan 13-14, BT VII D 12, ShōAgon 1,161, HtPek 91 b9 *apud UW* 194 a, Abhi 2251, Schwitz 38, UigTot 902 and TuoLuoNi 32 = 40. Suv 45,3 has the series *ülgülänçsiz täŋlänçsiz ogşatguluksuz yöläşdürgülüksüz arıg süzök*: We don't see why the first couple has a different suffix from the second; nor in what the first couple differs from *köŋül bilig üzä ülgülägülüksüz täŋlägülüksüz* "unermeßlich und unvergleichlich" in BT I D (242) or the second couple from *ogşatıgsız yöläşürügsüz* (Suv 377,10). Indeed, *ülgülänçsiz täŋlänçsiz* can't have been very different, semantically, from what we have in *täŋsiz ülgüsüz ädgü adroklug täŋrim* (ETŞ 10,166). Cf., finally, *ogşatguluksuz ädgülüg umug ınaglar* (ETŞ 18,33), *ogşatguluksuz* (UigTot 240), and *öŋ körk aṭ küü üzä ogşatguluksuz bol-* 'to become incomparable in . . .' (Suv 121,20).

tüzKärinçsiz and *tüzKärgülüksüz* both appear to signify 'something which can-

408 In Ht X 852 we find *kanınçsız* alone used with the meaning of *eşidü kanınçsız*: The need for the first verb is not felt as the verbal adjective is predicated upon 'words'.

not be equalled'. The latter is found in Schwitz 12, Buddhāv H 100, ms. Ōtani 2695 a 11, ETŞ 10,269 and BT II 509 and 578, while *tüzKärinçsiz* appears in U III 44,1$_4$, Maitr 197 r 12, 3 r 4, 51 v 32, 154 (+ 46) v 16-17, MaitrGeng p. 105, MaitrH X 1 b 16, Maitr 145 v 11, 200 r 2, 167 v 27, 1 r 27, 159 v 24 and 103 r 15, Schwitz 35, BruchGeb 31-2, BT XIII 21,50, Genzan B v 5, BT VIII B 24, ATSS r 9, Kuan 210 and 220, ETŞ 136,34 and BT I F (22-23) in addition to the instances quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. They have been discussed in OdaRemarks p. 66, who mentions Skt. and Chin. equivalents. Oda shows that these lexemes come from *tüz* 'level, equal'. BT XIII 21,50 writes *'tözgärinçsiz'* and translates "Unergründlicher"; but that, I think, is *tüpKärinçsiz*.

bulguluksuz appears in *kololayu ülgülläyü bulguluksuz kurug bilgä bilig* (ETŞ 15,4) and *ülgülāp nāŋ bulguluksuz ädgü nom* (ETŞ 16,36). It is difficult to tell apart semantically from *bulunçsuz* in *bulunçsuz nom* (TT VI 140 and BuddhStab II 34); other exs. of *bulunçsuz* can be found in TT VI 427 and 428, M II 8,18 (text 3), UigOn III B r 2, BT XIII 15,16 and 49,86 and ETŞ 9,6. *bulunçusuz* (KP 14,7) has the same meaning and use, but there is no *'bulunçu'*.

yegädinçsiz 'unsurpassable' is exceptional in qualifying indirect objects. E.g.: *açarı yegädinçsiz ögirmäkkä tägip xanka sävinç ötüg bitig kıldı* (HtPek 48 v 3-5) 'The master attained unsurpassable joy and presented a letter of gratitude to the khan'. *yeg+äd-* (discussed in section 5.43 below) is intr. in the strict sense: I have not found it to govern direct objects. The hap. *yegädinçlig* (quoted at the end of section 3.104) was probably created in analogy with *yegädinçsiz*.

It may have been noticed that the *-(X)nçsXz* forms are usually translated with English adjectives of the form 'un . . . able'; there is a (negative) prediction involved. This aspect of the content of the formation seems to be related to the nominal and not particularly verbal nature of the products, indicating that the denoted quality must be a permanent one. This specific meaning is apparently not shared with grammatically comparable forms, e.g. *-gUlXksXz*, just discussed, or *-mAksXz*. In fixed phrases, however, the semantic difference may have been practically negligible.

3.2 *The instrumental formations*

The formations *-çUk* ~ *-gUç* and *-gUk*, in part also the formation *-gAk* discussed in section 3.327 below, denote a class of entities which we have called INSTRUMENT. In most cases these are real instruments, concrete objects which serve certain ends; some are not concrete objects, but still means to an end. The lexemes formed by the two formatives treated here do not denote persons. See diminutives in *-(X)çUk* in section 2.12, proper names ending in *°çWk* in section

2.14). They differ from both the ergative and the agentive formatives in not creating action nouns. The products of *-çUk ~ -gUç* and *-gUk* are not used adjectivally, unlike other Old Turkic nominals. They rarely serve as bases for further expansion. They may possibly have ended in diminutive +(A)*k* and +(*X*)*ç* respectively, but they quite certainly have no diminutive content at all in our texts. Although it often forms instrument nominals, *-gU* is not dealt with in the present work. This is because it in fact is a modal participle which is part of the verbal paradigm of categories. Lexicalisations like *bi bıçgu* 'cutlery' cannot change this fact.

The products of ergative formations denote subjects of intr. bases but objects of tr. ones; the products of non-ergative formations consistently denote either agents or entities filling oblique case slots, depending on the formation but independent of whether the base is tr. or intr. The products of instrumental formations do neither but are ambiguous in this respect, corresponding to the ambiguous status of INSTRUMENT in deep case theory: *One uses the knife to cut the bread* and *the knife cuts the bread*; the knife is OBJECT in the first presentation of the event but SUBJECT in the second.

3.21 *-çUk* (*-çUg*) and *-gUç*

From several stems ending in /n/ and /r/, the suffix *-çUk*/*-çUg* forms nouns mostly denoting 'instruments'. The best attested lexeme of this group is *sunçuk* or *sunçug* 'mattress, mat': We find it in TT X 124-5, Ht X 522, Maitr 73 r24 and v1 and 128 r18 and BuddhUig II 121. The TT X instance, the first one to get published, shows the word together with *batır* (< Skt. *pattra*) 'a begging bowl', and the editor thought that the two words were synonyms. Other exs., particularly the BuddhUig II one, show the real meaning quite clearly. *sunçu*K comes from *sun-* 'to stretch out (tr. and intr.)', denoting the object one stretches out on. The TT X instance writes it with °*g*, and a n. to Ht X 522 states that this text correctly distinguishes between back-harmony /g/ and /k/. So does the equally dependable Maitr. *man-çuk* in DLT fol. 239, on the other hand, is written with *q*, i.e. /k/. It signifies 'anything that is hung on a saddle, such as a provisions bag or nose bag' and comes from *ba-n-* 'to fasten or tie something for oneself'. Whether *togurçuk* 'bud' also belongs here is difficult to say; it appears in BT XIII 5,20 and cf. the n. It *may* come from *twgur-* 'to bear'. *olorçuk* 'a seat', attested only in Töpfer 41, is also clearly written with two dots; its derivation and meaning is parallel to that of *sunçuk*. It may be, then, that the scribes of TT X and Maitr exceptionally forgot to put the dots on the final velar of *sunçuk*, or that they were not, for some reason, visible to the editors. Finally we have *ba]şı bürünçüKlüg . . . bir toyın* 'a monk with a veil over his head and . . .' in Maitr 128 r21. This comes from the DLT's *bürünçü*K "a woman's veil" (fol. 254), from *bür-ün-* 'to wrap something around

oneself'. The bases for the *-çuk/-çug* suffix are either simple or in the reflexive-medial voice, and consider *togurçuk*.

olturguç 'a seat' of the Codex Comanicus (thrice) looks like a metathesis of *olorçuk: oltur-* is a Qarakhanid and late variant of *olor-* and not an independent derivate from a common base. A similar relationship can be seen between the DLT's *ör-Küç* 'a woman's braid or tuft' (fol. 60) from *ör-* 'to plait' and *ör-çüK* (*ibid.*, fol. 64), said to be a metathesised variant of the former in use in the Oguz dialect.

Other *-gUç* nouns in the DLT have no counterparts ending in *-çUk/-çUg*. They are *ar-guç* (fol. 60) 'anything by which one is deceived'; *bıç-guç* (fol. 227) 'shears'; *tāŋüç* 'anything which stands to the height of half a cubit like a tripod for a cooking pot' from *tāŋ-* 'to rise in the air', by the *EDPT* emended to *tāŋgüç*;[409] *tikügüç* (fol. 180) 'a pastry-cook's prick'; *yogur-guç* (fol. 247) 'pastry roller for flattening noodle dough etc.'. *saraguç* 'a woman's veil' (DLT fol. 244) comes from **sara-*, a verb attested only in Turkmen: The DLT has *saru-* and *sarla-* instead of it.[410] We can add *agın-guç* 'ladder', *aç-xuç* 'key' and *tŏv-güç* 'mortar and pestle' from the Codex Comanicus; these come from *ag-ın-* 'to rise', *aç-* 'to open' and *tög-* 'to pound, beat' respectively.

Two lexemes of this form are attested in Uigur. One of these is *os-guç* in Höllen 41: *yüligü osguç ulatı bi bıçgu* 'razors, *osguç* and other sorts of knife$_2$'. From this context we learn that *osguç* is an implement used to carry out the action denoted by the verb *os-*. Exs. of this verb (q.v. also in the *EDPT*) are mentioned under *os-uş-*, and cf. *os-ul-* below. It is significant that Uigur *yüligü* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) appears in the Codex Comanicus as *yülügüç*. Like the other *-gUç* lexemes, *osguç* is an instrument noun. So is the second Uigur *-gUç* form, *kö-güç*. This denotes 'the shell of a tortoise', and comes from *kö-* 'to guard': *inçä k(a)ltı müyüz baka uz alın altagın kögüçintä käntü öz[in . . . -ürçä . . .* (ShöAgon 1,362).[411] It must be a coincidence that no further nouns in *-gUç* have turned up in Old Turkic.

arguç, bıçguç, yogurguç and *saraguç* in the DLT show that *-gUç* has a voiced velar, and that we should not read *'oskuç'*, as Bang and Rachmati do in Höllen, nor *'kükü̇ç'*. In Old Turkic, *-gUç* must have had the allomorph *-kUç* after sonants

409 It appears in a list of lexemes containing four consonants of which the second is /ŋ/ (fol. 610-611).

410 In the DLT, one and the same sentence serves as ex. for the use of both these verbs: *ol suluk / suvluk sarudı / sarladı* 'He wrapped a turban round his head'. In view of the meanings of *saraguç*, *saru-* and *sarla-* it appears that Qarakhanid Turkic created three alternate denominal verbs from Persian *sar* 'head'. West Turkish *sar-* 'to wind or wrap round' (Middle and Modern Turkic) may be a shortening of *sar+u-* or **sar+a-*, with its meaning presumably widened through the influence of *sarmal-* / *sarmaş-*, qq.v. in the *EDPT*.

411 Reading confirmed by Zieme (personal communication), who excludes a mistake for *kökü̇z* 'breast'.

like /r/ and /n/: In that position, /g/ is replaced by /k/ in Old Turkic but not in Qarakhanid. *-kUç* was apparently metathesised to *-çUk* in Old Turkic and in the Oguz dialect (*ör-çük* as reported in the DLT); as *bürünçük* and *mançuk* show, also in Kāšġarī's dialect, *if* the stem ended in /n/. *sunçuk*, *olorçuk*, *mançuk* and *bürünçük* are all instrument nouns like the *-gUç* lexemes. The only exception is the DLT's *örçük* as quoted from the Oguz dialect, certainly not Old Turkic proper. *örçük* may there have received the meaning it is attested with by metonymy; perhaps it primarily denoted ribbons, pins etc. used for fixing the braid. A similar metathesis may be found in *çıŋırçak* 'cymbals' from **çıŋırkaç*, in a different domain of word formation.

Let us sum up: We have, in Old Turkic, *-çUk* after the sonants /r/ and /n/ and *-gUç* otherwise; in the DLT's language *-çUk* after /n/ only and *-gUç* in other positions, with Kāšġarī aware of the fact that, at least in one other dialect, *-çUk* appears also after /r/. This complementary distribution confirms the hypothesis that *-gUç* and *-çUk* were metathetical variants of one suffix. *-gUç* was the original and main variant (although it happens to be more weakly attested in published Uigur texts).

-gUç might be an *+(X)ç* diminutive of *-gU*, the verbal nominal of purpose. This would explain the instrumental function of *-gUç*. *-gU* nouns like *bıç-gu* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) which corresponds to *bıç-guç*, *yüli-gü* (exs. mentioned in the *EDPT*; also in Maitr 182 v13, 58 v19 and 2 r8) corresponding to Coman *yülügüç* 'razor' and *yelpi-gü* (Suv 625,20 and BT II 786-7) which corresponds to Middle Turkic *yelpigüç* (both 'fan') also denote instruments, after all.

The DLT has an expansion of a *-çUk* lexeme, *mançuklan-*, and cf. *bürünçüKlüg*.

3.22 *-gOk*

This formative does not create abstracts nor names for living creatures. We know that its vowel is /O/ because of *yıgır-gok* in Khot 6, in a script which distinguishes between this archphoneme and /U/. *yıgırgok* signifies "something which draws together the quiver" and is related to *yıgr-ıl-* (section 7.31 below). It shows that the base is not '*yıgur-*' (as Clauson thought).

-gOk is further found in *asgok* 'banner, flag, awning', in the *UW* quoted five times from Maitr and found also in MaitrH XI 12 b25, from *as-* 'to hang up', and in *tolkok* 'an inflated skin container' (Windg 23; DLT fol. 410 with *wāw* in the second syllable) from *tol-* 'to get filled'. In *tolkok* the formative has the allomorph *-kok* (documented in Arabic script in the DLT) because of the sonantic /l/ before it. *tolkok* is also the name of the object which the third *yäk* is holding in his hand in Suv 6,1. In Suv 7,20, this same *yäk* uses his implement to take away the breath,

i.e. the life, of the person speaking. Here, however, the word is written as *tolkak* both in the Leningrad ms. and in the Berlin ms. edited in SuvLeg: *birisi tolkakta nnumun alın. tolkok* must here have been transferred to the *-gAk* formation (section 3.327), which also forms names for utensils.

kazgok 'a peg driven into the ground' (TT I 186, TT IV B 42, Maitr 107 r 10 and 450 r 10-11, M II 11,18 (text 4), U II 61,18 and 62,19) comes, I think, from *kaz-* 'to attach one's horse to something so that it can't wander away'. As S. Tezcan explained at the 31st PIAC (1988), this verb is not related to *kaz-* 'to dig (out, up, at) the ground'. Tezcan showed that the present *kaz-* should be read in the Kitābu 'l-Idrāk (quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *kaz-* 'to dig') and in the following: *bodis(a)v t(e)gin [kanı]ik ann tinin tartap turdı. kazap çinäkkä InçA tep ayıtı* (ManManus r3) '. . . and stopped. He attached his horse and asked Chandaka as follows:' This *kaz-* should perhaps be read also in Tes 9: Kljaštornyj's interpretation is impossible because of the reasons given by T. Tekin in *AOH* XLII (1988): 113, and Tekin's interpretation is impossible because *-(X)z-* verbs do not have /A/ as connverb vowel (I take the *baş* to be a place name). A *kazgok*, then, was primarily driven into the ground for this particular purpose. There were pegs for other purposes: *talgok* (thus in DLT fol. 236) is translated as "a peg that is inserted in the handle of a spade or a pickaxe in order to fasten the blade to it". It has to be called *tämir talkok* (U III 47,9 and Maitr 115 v 11) to be more like a 'nail' (the translation in U III and cf. *talkok+la-* below). I take *talkok* ~ *talgok* to be a phonetically simplified *-gOk* noun from *talk-*. *talk-* is not attested before the DLT and there only in a metaphorical sense. From the meanings of *talku*, *talguç*, *talkıg*, *talkış-* and *talkıt-* (all discussed in the *EDPT*) it appears that its primary meaning was 'to twist cords so as to augment their tension' or 'to twist leather for stretching'. This was apparently what a *talkok* was made for, although it could, of course, be used for torture or for fastening blades onto handles.

tirgōk 'pillar, post' (Hochzeit 11, BT II 398, Ht VII 1026 and 1921, UigKan 247, BT VII H 1, Maitr 138 r11 and 13 and 132 r3, 12 and 13, M I 27,8 (Gebet) in the proper name or title *El Tirgōk*, UigSteu A 42, QB etc.) comes from *tirä-* 'to prop up'. There is syncope in phonetically very similar surroundings in *targak* from *tara-g°*, *kürgäk* from *kūri-g°* and *ärgür-* 'to melt (tr.)' from *ärü-* 'to melt (intr.)' with *-gUr-*. As none of the texts in which *tirgōk* is attested makes an evident distinction between front-vocalic /g/ and /k/, *tirgōk* could also be read as *tirkōk*. /k/ should appear instead of /g/ after /r/ as it does after /l/, in case the rule connected with this was operative also after the syncopation *tirā-* > *tir°* occurred.

tapuzguk 'a riddle' appears several times in the DLT, where we also find *tapzug* with this meaning. Both come from *tap-uz-*, a causative of *tap-* 'to find'. This too, like the other mentioned instances of the *-gOk* formation, is an INSTRUMENT: It is something one *uses* to have people make guesses at funny answers. We

have spelled *tapuzguk* and *tutguk* with *u* because *yunguk* is written with *u* in the second syllable in Brāhmī script. This appears to be the same process as makes the vowel of *-(O)k* into *-Uk* after /U/ (as described above).

tutguk is found only in UjgRuk I 4-6, a late economic text: *oglumnı Çıntsu Şilaka üç yıllık tutguk bertim. Tutguk kümüşin inçä tep sözläştimiz: . . . on satır kümüşkä tutguk bertim.* The son has been given into presumably temporary slavery as a security for the borrowed silver. This meaning is very close to those of *tutug*, but still not identical with any of them. '*tutgak*' would not have been appropriate here, as *-gAk* forms subject and not object nominals. The person in question has indeed become a human instrument.

yunguk, finally, is attested in TT VIII D 12 and 38, ShōAgon 2, p. 190,13 and DLT fol. 463. Kāšġarī defines it as 'potash, alkali' and adds: "Know that *qāf* is suffixed to verbal stems to make a noun of instrument, as in *orgak* 'scythe' . . . The same holds for this word, since *yudı* is the verb meaning 'he washed' and this word is 'that which washes clothes'. The *qāf* is suffixed to verbal stems, as you see." It is correct that both *-gOk* and *-gAk* form names denoting instruments, but their different vowels do not permit us to treat them together: In Turkic grammar, unlike Arabic on which Kāšġarī was educated, vowels are fully distinctive in all morphological contexts, including derivation. Moreover, *-gAk* is shown below to have had other functions beside the instrumental one. The editor of TT VIII translates the lexeme as "Bad", as it corresponds to Skt. *snāna* in both TT VIII instances. The ShōAgon ex. runs as follows: *yunguk üzä yunup* [. . .] . . . *yıd yıpar üzä tü*[*rtünüp . . .*; *yunguk* here signifies 'soap'. Similar to the ShōAgon instance, TT VIII D 12 has *yunkuk* parallel to *türtüngü* 'ointment', the two together corresponding to Skt. *snānānulepana* (i.e. *snāna* + *anu-lep*°). We conclude that *yunguk* always signified 'soap' and never 'bath' and that the Uigur translator just displayed a bit of freedom, translating *ad sensum*. 'bath' is *yungu*, e.g. in SuvDrog 475,18. In TT VIII D 38, too, the Uigur is simply a bit more concrete where the original has 'bath' in a series with 'clothes' and 'jewellery'. Kāšġarī derives *yunguk* from *yu-* 'to wash (tr.)', disregarding the *-(X)n-*. Accordingly, he has the washing of clothes in mind when mentioning the use of the term. It comes from *yu-n-* 'to wash (intr.)', however, and must have been created with the function of soap in personal hygiene in mind. Once created, the term could, of course, be applied to soap as serving other purposes as well. See Maue, 1984: 94, section 4 for the spelling of the two Brāhmī instances as *yunkuk*.

sıŋok näŋ 'something broken' cannot be from this formation. DLT fol. 604 writes: "The Oguz say *sınok* without *ġunna*, and they are correct according to the rule, since the word derives from *sındı* 'it was broken', and there is no *ġunna* in the verbal stem." *sıŋok*, which belongs to Qarakhanid Turkic, remains unexplained: Like *sınok* but unlike *-gOk* forms, it is an adjective qualifying the object, and not

a noun referring to an instrument. Moreover, /ŋ/ cannot be regarded as the result of /n/ + /g/, a contraction which does not take place in *yunguk* either. /ŋ/ is a velar nasal where /m/ is a labial nasal, /n/ a dental and /ñ/ a palatal one, and /g/ is a velar stop. Such a passage would not be more natural than '/m/ < /nb/'. In some European languages, [ŋ] is only an allophone of /n/ and not a phoneme in its own right, while /m/ is a phoneme. Nor do European or Semitic languages use a grapheme for [ŋ]. That is why wrongly equating /ŋ/ with /ng/ may seem more natural to some of us than equating /m/ with /nb/. In /ŋ/, nasality and velarity are simultaneous features while, in /ng/, they are consecutive.

-gOk forms instrument nouns from both tr. and intr. verbs, then. It could possibly be a combination from *-gU* and *+(A)k*, but no particular likelihood is apparent in this at present.

Expansions of *-gOk* forms are not too common. *kāsgöklä-*, discussed among the *+lA-* verbs, no doubt comes from *kās-gök*; this is known to DLT fol. 410 in the rather limited use of "iron collar for dogs", but must originally have had a wider meaning related to *kās-* 'to cut'. *talkok+la-* is a hap., and the DLT mentions *tolkok+lan-*. We find *tirgöklüg* 'provided with pillars' in BT II 398 and HtPek 86 a 6-8 (quoted in the n. Ht X 59). An instance in HtPar 9 r 13 should, I believe, be read as *tirgöklük* and not '*tirgüklüg*' (as done in *UW* 76 b s.v. *agtur-*, 2): *çarun ıgaçları üz[āki] tirgöklük üzā agturmış limlāri. tirgöklük* should belong to the use of *+lXk* discussed above under C_3; it would denote 'a system of pillars'.

3.3 *The non-ergative formations*

Whereas, in ergative languages, the object of a tr. verb and the subject of an intr. one are marked by the same means, the configuration is different for so-called accusative languages like Latin or German or Russian: In these, the object of verbs is marked one way, the subject of both tr. and intr. verbs in another. We therefore have two classes of non-ergative formations: One class for formatives marking objects, a second class for marking subjects. 'Object' should here be understood in the wide sense of both direct and indirect object; *korkınçıg* from *kork-* 'to be afraid', e.g., denotes 'what one would be afraid of', i.e. something 'frightful'.

It will be seen that several of the non-ergative formatives are composite: This is true of both *-(X)nçlg* and *-gUlXksXz*, which mark objects, and of *-(X)gçI* and *-(X)mlXg*, which mark subjects. *-gA* probably came over from morphology as *-gAn* (section 3.324) did in a later time, and *-gAK* may be an expansion of the former. It would seem, all in all, that the non-ergative group is younger than the ergative one.

3.311 The modal oblique: *-(X)nçIg*

All fully transparent members of this formation denote direct or indirect objects. This distribution of functions is clearly distinct both from that of *-(X)nç* and of *-(X)nçU*, and from that of their derivates. This suffix probably comes from *-(X)nç+sIg*, as is made likely by the meaning; also by the fact that *-(X)nçIg* derivates have the same type of haplology as the ones with *-(X)nç*: *adınçıg* comes from *adın-(X)nçIg* and *olınçıg* from *olın-(X)nçIg*. *+sIg* is discussed in section 2.32 above. The coalescence of *-(X)nç* and *+sIg* must have occurred prehistorically: Among the 22 lexemes to be discussed in this section, only one really has a related *-(X)nç* form attested: *korkınçıg* 'frightful', cognate of *korkınç* 'fear, fright'.[412] No common *-(X)nç* base is attested for *äymänçlig* and *äymänçsiz* on the one hand, *aymançıg* (thus!) on the other. The same is true of *äsirkänçig* 'lamented after' and *äsirkänçsiz* 'ungrudging'. The *-(X)nçsXz* form denoting subjects of intr. verbs, *äsirkänçsiz* must come from *äsirkä-n-* 'to be sorry for oneself at having to give up something'. *äsirkänçig*, on the other hand, denotes the object of *äsirkä-*, an *+(X)rkA-* derivate from *äsiz*; see both verbs below. Synchronically, then, it must be stated that *-(X)nçIg* is added directly to the verbal stem, and no intermediate *-(X)nç* form need ever have existed as base for any particular *-(X)nçIg* lexeme. This is evidently so in practically all cases, and therefore likely to have been true of *korkınçıg* as well.[413] *-(X)nçIg* (< *-(X)nç+sIg*) should not be confused with *-(X)nsIg* (< *-(X)n+sIg*); this has happened to many scholars (but not to Röhrborn) with *adınçıg* and *adınsıg*, qq.v. in the *UW*.

Using an *-(X)nçIg* adjective, one states that the noun qualified by it is likely to induce in anybody the state of mind described by the verb from which the *-(X)nçIg* form is derived. It is to express this content of induction that the similative suffix *+sIg* has been used. *korkgu täg*, which means 'frightful' like *korkınçıg*, contains the common postposition likewise denoting similarity. The base verbs of our formation denote states of mind such as hate and love, pity and fear, disgust and admiration.[414]

akla-nçıg 'hateful' and *amra-nçıg* 'lovable, lovely' are both described in the *UW*. *aklançıg sansar* (BuddhUig II 409 and BT XIII 52,6) should be added to the

412 *olınçıg* 'tortuous' cannot very well be connected with the DLT's *olınç yol*, q.v. in section 3.104.

413 *aklançıg* (discussed below), e.g., does not come from a "Krasis aus **akla-n-č-+sıg*, dev. Nom. von **aklan-*, Intrans. von *akla-* 'nicht mögen'", as stated in *UW* 82: '*aklan-*', '*aklanç*' and '*aklançsıg*' may never have existed.

414 Zieme, 1969: 89 quotes *yalınçıg* 'glänzend' out of Henning, 1940: 29, l.4, from ms. M 146 b II r5. This text is a Middle Persian – Sogdian glossary, the Middle Persian counterpart of our word being ['*brw*]*j'gyn*. In case Henning's reconstruction is the only possible one, '*yalınçıg*' could be an error for *yalın+lıg*, if that was borrowed into Sogdian. It could also be *yal-ın* (which was, after all, borrowed into Mongolian as well) + the Iranian denominal suffix *-cyg*.

UW entry; the same collocation is found also in ETŞ 10,41 and BT III 903. Add also *körgäli aklançıg* 'hideous' said about an ugly lady in ShōAgon 3, p. 206,23 and *aklançıg yavız yılkı* 'the hateful and bad animal existence' in BT XIII 49,5.

An instance of *amrançıg* to be added to what we have in the *UW* can be found in BT XIII 5,27: *amrançıg oxşançıg kdınu . . .*, translated as "lieblich und schmeichelnd betragt euch". In the footn. to this, Zieme quotes *oxşançıg amrançıg* from the Buyan Āvirmāk. His translation of both instances of *oxşançıg* as "schmeichelnd" shows that he took it to be active in content. However, *oxşançıg* appears also in the DLT (as quoted below), and is there given the translation which we expect it to get through our grammatical considerations: 'something which makes one wish to fondle it'. Inducing such wishes was exactly what Māra would want the maidens to do in the BT XIII instance referred to. Desirability is more commonly expressed by the adjectives *kūsā-nçíg* and *suka-nçıg*. *kūsā-* is well-attested, but an *+A-* derivate of *suk* 'greed' has not yet turned up. *suk+lan-* and *suk+sın-*, qq.v. below, have negative connotations, but that need not have been the case with **suk+a-*. Mss. which distinguish between voiced and voiceless back-vowel velars write *sukançıg* with a *q*, which alone should be enough to show that Bang's connection of this with onions, accepted for a long time, cannot be correct; besides, 'onion-like' would have been *'sogun+sıg'*, with an *s* after the *n* and a rounded second vowel. Exs. of *kūsāñçíg* not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in Maitr 13 v 13, 70 r 9 and 104,9, UigTot 1410, BT II 932, CYK 40, ShōAgon 1,268 and 371, Shō IX a 11, Suv 641,4, M III 45,1_6 (text 34), ETŞ 10,35 and 195, HamTouen 2,32, BT VII A 781, BT III 995, BuddhUig II 167 and BT XIII 3,77 and 55,8; of *sukançıg* four times in BT I and six times in BT II, Ht VII 1813, X 267 and HtPar 208,20 and 220,10 quoted in the *UW* 52 a s.v. *adınçıg A*;[415] Suv 218,22, 359,9 363,10 and 501,14, SuvStockh 27, CYK 53, ShōAgon 1,238, 298 and 339, BT VI p. 83 ms. ChU 6414 (TM 262) r 2, Shō VI b 1, M III 40,8_2 (text 23), SP 10, ATSS VIII b v 3, Buddhāv H 84, Neujahr 61, ShōAgon 3, p. 206,18, HamTouen 1,43 and 3,1″ (this last wrongly written as *suk*Wnçıg), Tug 106, ETŞ 10,142 and 229, 15,21 and 62, UigKan 162 and BuddhUig II 330. *kūsāñçíg* appears a number of times with *körklā*, *sukançıg* with *ādgū*, *yeg* or *körklā*, and they have a more general meaning than would be delimited by their etymology: *sukançıg* 'fine, wonderful, exquisite, subtle', e.g., often qualifies *nom* 'the doctrine'; UigKan 158 has *amrançıg yullar*, UigKan 162 *sukançıg yullar*.

Things which induce fear or terror are said to be *korkınçıg*. This lexeme is attested in TT VIII O 4, UigFalt 106, M III 10,2_2 and 10,5_3 (both text 5) and 45,4 (text 32), BT XIII 23,1, BT VII M 3, Maitr 68 r 7 and 82 v 22, Warnke 47, BT VIII B 9, 13 and 103, Ht X 174 and DhāSū 14, in addition to the exs. quoted in the

415 Wrongly written as *'sogançıg'*. The correct spelling *sukançıg* appears in AbitAnk 36.

EDPT and the *DTS*. Suv 614,5 has *korkınçıg* accompanied by *aymançıg*, from *ayman-/äymän-*: See the discussion of *äyinç* in section 3.104, where Suv 614,5 is quoted and translated. In the instances in TT VI 91, BT VIII B 13 and 103 and Suv 172,17, *korkınçıg* is accompanied by *kaşınçıg* either preceding or following it. In some mss. in TT VI 89, *kaşınçıglar* and *korkınçıglar* alternate. Perhaps like *terribly* in English, *kaşınçıg* can also qualify beauty (*kaşınçıg körklä* in BT III 936, BuddhUig II 83 and 120), sanctity (*kaşınçıg ıdok* in BT III 45), greatness (*kaşınçıg ulug* in Weih 10 and Kuan 60) or wondrousness (*kaşınçıg tanısok* in ShōAv 345). In M III 40,2$_1$ (text 23) and M II 8,5, the context is quite fragmentary but must also have expressed something positive; this instance has the form *kaşınçıgımın*, showing the lexeme in nominal use. In LautHöllen 57, *kaşınçıg* is adverbial: It qualifies the verb *kogşa-* 'to weaken (intr.)'. Like *kaşınçıg*, *kaşı-g* (thrice in the QB as quoted in the *EDPT*) also has the double meaning of trimness on the one hand and imposingness towards the wicked ones on the other. This similarity in content and appearance between the Uigur and Qarakhanid lexemes is the reason for our reading *kaşınçıg*, and not '*kasınçıg*' as has been usual. A n. to BT III 45 derives *kaşınçıg* from *kaşı-* 'to scratch', comparing the semantics of German 'reizend'. The idea is well possible and followed here, but could use further justification. *kaşıg could* come from some Iranian lexeme related to Pe. *kašaŋ* 'trim, elegant', or may have been influenced by such a lexeme. *kaşı-* (with derivates *kaşın-* and *kaşıt-*) is not attested before the DLT; might it have had a wider meaning in Old Turkic?

In Ht X 1010 and 1048, Xuandzang is, after his death, 'yearned for or lamented after', the term being *äsirkänçig*. 'what induces pity' is *erinçkänçig* (Maitr 164 v6, TuoLuoNi 142 and BT II 231) or *käyirkänçig* (Suv 620,10, 633,5, 640,19 and 642,3). While *äsirkä-* and *erinç+kä-* (qq.v.) are attested, there is no corresponding '*käy+irkä-*'. We do, however, have *käy* 'sorrow', attested in BT XIII 12,131 and 13,113 and InscrOuig II 23 in a binomial with *muŋ* and in Suv 610,8 together with *erinç*. The n. to BT XIII 12,131 documents this. A verb '*käyirkä-*' may never have existed: *käyirkänçig* may have been created on the analogy of *erinçkänçig*, *erinç*, the ultimate base of the latter, being used as a synonym of *käy*. Note that all our exs. for *käyirkänçig* appear in the same text, the Suv, which has supplied us with the binomial *käy erinç*. The *yalbarınçıg savım* "meine flehentlichen Worte" of BT XIII 29,8 are, of course, also uttered with the induction of pity in mind. No '*yalvar-ın-ç*' need be reconstructed for this word (a hap.), as Zieme does in the footn.: *-(X)nçIg* is an independent suffix added directly to verbal bases. Suffering from which your heart breaks is *yüräk yarılınçıg ämgäk* (Maitr 40 v8-9 and 81 r1 and Höllen 135). Note that the suffix *-(X)nçIg* is here applied to the phrase *yüräk yarıl-*, which has *yüräk* as subject and is attested e.g. in TT X 38. The expression also shows the morphological juncture of *-(X)nçIg* with a passive verb form. Suf-

fering, *ämgäk*, is said to be *ugusuz särgüsüz unçsuz kötrünçsüz olınçıg* in ETŞ 10,219: Anybody would *writhe* from such pain. *olınçıg sansar* (TT III 46) and *olınça a [jun]larnn kutgar-* (*ibid.* 119) might mean that these places are 'tortuous'; more specifically, we can say that they 'induce writhing in their inmates'. It is not likely that the connection is with 'howling' (*ulı-*); therefore, the base verb is probably *olın-*, q.v., which appears in similar contexts. What has been read as *ulınçak* in BT XIII 12,159 (in a fragmentary block-print and before a lacuna) is likelier to have been a slightly miswritten form of this lexeme than an analogue to the DLT's *basınçak är* 'an oppressed man'.

Disgust is another feeling conveyed by *-(X)nçIg* forms, 'revolting' things being qualified as *yarsı-nçıg*. Exs. are quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, and can be found in Ht IV 1546, Maitr 12 v 11, 111 r 8, 194 v 29, 174 r 6 and fr. 218 T III M 111 r 14-15, BT XIII 16,18 and 21,15, SP 23 and Suv 613,16. In Suv 614,13, *yarsınçıg* appears together with *yer-inçig* 'displeasing', which goes together with *irinçig* in QB 687. *irinçig* also appears in QB 65 and 3938, and the context of the latter suggests translating it as 'boring' rather than as 'annoying'. This should be connected with *ir-*, a verb attested in DLT fol. 96 and signifying 'to be lonely', while *yerinçig* comes from *yer- ~ er-* 'to loathe, criticise, despise, oppose'.[416]

DLT fol. 547 has the rhyme *kuş balası kusınçıg, ıt balası oxşançıg* 'A nestling before it is fledged is something by which whoever sees it is revolted; a puppy makes one want to fondle it'. The generalising formulation in the first part of the translation is Kāšġarī's, and our definition of the content of the suffix *-(X)nçIg*, beside being based on otherwise observable usage, echoes it. Since the first (unstable) vowel of the suffix is said to be /X/, one would have expected the first instance in the DLT verse to be '*kusunçıg*'. Whether this vowel is indeed /X/ or /I/ can only be seen after a rounded vowel. Our only test cases for this formation are the derivates from *kork-* and *kus-*, and both have /I/ and not /X/ in the first suffix syllable. To judge by this, the suffix should have been *-(I)nçIg* and not *-(X)nçIg*, and then the connection with *-(X)nç* should have to be relinquished. *korkınçıg* and *kusınçıg* cannot be taken as conclusive evidence, however: It has been shown that *kork-* most probably comes from **korık-*, and the *-(X)nç* derivate from this base is usually *korkınç*. Kāšġarī, our only source for *kusınçıg*, also writes *kusıg* (fol. 189, twice), and his evidence need not have been relevant for Old Turkic.

Something which is said to induce wonder and admiration is usually described as *taŋlançıg*, *muŋadınçıg* or *adınçıg*, and sometimes qualified by two of these at a time. Exs. of *taŋlançıg* not mentioned in the *DTS* or the *EDPT* occur in Ht IV 221 and 851, V 13 a 6, VII 1918-19 and HtPar 130,7, ShōKenkyū II 18, ETŞ 20,40 and 224, BT III 1002, BuddhUig II 114, BT XIII 12,55, 13,30, 39,19 and 52,33 and

416 See *er-in-* below.

SuvZieme r 7; of *muŋadınçıg* in BT XIII 21,21 and 27,10, ETŞ 15,57 and 80, Ht IV 318 and VII 7 a 5, Maitr 8 v 24, 52 v 4, 31 r 17, 186 r 6 and 135 v 28, AmitIst 27, ĀgFrag (1) F 5, Suv 389,9, 392,20 and 420,20, Warnke 794 and ShōAgon 1,216, the last six together with *taŋlançıg*. As Kudara states in his n. to his edition of TT V B, *muŋadınçıg* corresponds to Skt. *adbhuta* 'marvellous'. He quotes Abhi 2336 *adbuda darma muŋadınçıg nomlar*, which gives *adbhutadharma* with its Uigur translation. *muŋadınçıg* appears together with *adınçıg* in BT XIII 1,117 and 46,5, TT V B 9, M III 39,2_2 (text 22), BuddhStab I 12, TT VIColoph I a 6, Ht X 284 and HtPar 208,20 (mentioned in *UW* 52 a). We find *adınçıg taŋlançıg* in BT XIII 26,11, the commoner phrase similar to this being *taŋ adınçıg*. HtPar 220,10 (quoted in *UW* 52 a 2.v. *adınçıg*, A) even has all three together: *adınçıg muŋadınçıg taŋlançıg*. While *taŋlançıg* and *muŋadınçıg* come from *taŋ+la-* and *muŋ+ad-* (qq.v.) respectively, the direct source of *adınçıg* has not been determined till now. In the *UW* entry we read: "Wahrscheinlich ist *adınčıg* ein den. Nom. auf *+sıg* von einem dev. Nom. **adınč* 'Trennung' (von **ad-* 'teilen, trennen')"; this is an etymology based on nothing but starred forms. It seems very much preferable to derive *adınçıg* from *adın-* II as discussed in *UW* 51 a. This is attested only together with *muŋad-*, the couple having meanings like 'to be impressed, surprised, shocked'. The uses of *adınçıg* can be easily accomodated with this etymology. *adın- muŋad- / muŋad- adın-* is perfectly parallel to *adınçıg muŋadınçıg*. The *EDPT* entry confuses *adınçıg* and *adınsıg* but can be consulted for the two inscriptional exs. of this word, not found in the *UW*. Several Uigur exs. of *adınçıg* which came too late to be included in the *UW* are quoted above; some further ones are found in BT XIII 5,55, 28,27, 46,43 and 56,4. The *UW* has a number of exs. for the phrase *adınçıg ıdok*; in ETŞ 10,30 we read *äŋinçig ıdok* instead. This is no doubt derived from *äŋ-* 'to be bewildered' (BT III 280, DLT fols. 97 and 131 with front velar and QB) and is semantically closest to *äŋıt-* in DLT fol. 404. Why *äŋ-* acquired a back vowel in the modern forms quoted in the n. to BT III 280 is not clear. *äŋinçig*, then, is of the same semantic domain as the other three lexemes discussed in this paragraph.

The same must also be the meaning of *muŋançıg antag m(ä)n* in ms. T I α (Mainz 435) v(?) 8, quoted in the n. to BT V 26,604. Two fragmented words, in BT V 26,589 and 590 respectively, should probably also be identified with this; cf. the facs.:]*ŋraçıgdı*[should be *mu*]*ŋançıgdı*[and *muŋraç*[should be *muŋanç*[*ıg*. *muŋançıg* must be similar in content to *muŋadınçıg*, but there is no '*muŋ+a-*' or '*muŋ+an-*' attested. Comparing *muŋançıg* with *suk+ançıg*, one should consider the possibility that a denominal suffix *+AnçIg* was on the way; it would signify 'arousing what is expressed by the base noun'.

The only expansion of *-(X)nçIg* I have come across is in *küsänçigsizin mäŋi tägingülük ol* (ETŞ 8,31). The lack of expansions may partly be connected with the fact that *-(X)nçIg* forms are adnominal, and partly with their modal content.

3.312 The negative modal oblique: *-gUlXksXz*

This suffix forms a sort of modal participle, used mostly adnominally but also nominally. We find it as SA.NA.GU.LUG.SUS in Tibetan writing in TibStud. It properly describes things as connected with an action which should not be done or, when used predicatively, says about certain things that they are such that, in connection with them, certain actions should not be carried out. The suffix described here differs from *-mAgUlXk* in not reflecting the wish of the speaker/writer but rather his opinion concerning prohibitions; *-mAgUlXk*, on the other hand, is impersonal but modal, as the expression 'One should not . . .' in English. With *-gUlXksXz* forms, this prohibitive content is presupposed and relativised. Note that such a distinction is absent from *-gUlXk*, which is used both ways. Sometimes, *-gUlXksXz* was mistakenly translated as if it were *-mAgUlXk*; e.g. in BT I D(133-4), which I take to contain two parallel characterisations: *tınl(ı)g kurug ol; nom ymä yapşınguluksuz ol*. This is rendered as "Mensch ist leer – am *dharma* soll man nicht haften". Rather than demanding from us the obligation of non-adherence, the text here *states* that *dharma* is an entity which does not impose the obligation of adherence. Cf. *tayanguluksuz nom* (*ibid.* 247) and *yapşınguluksuz nom* (*ibid.* 275).

We have several dozens of exs. of *-gUlXksXz* forms, some of them from intr. bases; nevertheless none of them denote subjects of the verbs. Note, e.g., the translations of the *UW*: the objective *adkanguluksuz* as 'was nicht (mit illusionären Konzepten und Begriffen) 'ergriffen' werden kann, nicht 'ergreifbar'", vs. *adkanmaksız* "ohne (falsches) 'Greifen' (nach illusionären Wesenheiten)". I called the form a participle and not a verbal nominal, as it clearly has verbal government. It governs gerunds, for instance: *kololayu ülgüläyü bulguluksuz kurug bilgä bilig* (ETŞ 15,4); *ülgülāp nāŋ bulguluksuz ädgü nom* (ETŞ 16,38). It can be accompanied by an adverb, e.g.: *arıtı titgülüksüz nırvan* (BT XIII 26,8) 'the *nirvāṇa*, which by no means invites renouncement, . . .'. In ETŞ 15,7, an ex. is accompanied by its subject: *ujik äkşär tapguluksuz . . . burxanlar* 'Buddhas not to be found by (magical) characters and *akşaras*'. The suffix is added to the phrase *adırt kör-* in Ht VII 12 a 26, in *adırt körgülüksüz ärsär ymä* 'even if it is such that it is not to be distinguished . . .', and to *yakın bar-* in BT II 210: *ämgäklär tolgaglar yakın barguluksuz ärip . . .* 'although these tortures$_2$ are such that one should not (of one's own free will) come close to them . . .'. We find *tep tegülüksüz bol-* 'to be something not to be uttered' twice in Suv 375,24-376,1-2. In BT VIII A 342 (which should be added to the entries of *UW* 52-54) the suffix is added to a verb accompanied by a postpositional phrase: *. . . t(ā)ŋri birlā adırguluksuz bolmakı* 'its being such that it should not be separated from the god . . .'. Cf. *olarnıŋ tözi adırguluksuz bolmak ärsär* (*ibid.* 345) 'if it is their nature that they should not be

separated, . . .'.[417] *-gUlXksXz* forms can also be accompanied by *üzä* phrases: *kõŋül bilig üzä ymä ülgülägülüksüz täŋlägülüksüz [ol]* (BT I D(242)) 'It is such that it should not be measured$_2$ by . . .'. There is an ex. of *adkanguluksuz* with *üzä* in Suv 60,8.

With the exception of *tüzKärgülüksüz*, most of the products of this formation appear only once or twice in the published literature. This also shows that the sequence *-gUlXksXz* does not really lead to lexicalisation and was not meant as a lexeme-forming suffix or suffix sequence. This is an important point in which it differs from *-(X)nçsXz*.

Coupled with the analytical sequence *-gAlI bol-*, the content of *-gUlXksXz* appears to have gotten blurred. We find this in *kõrgäli bolguluksuz uşnir lakşan* (BT VII F6) and *sözlägäli bolguluksuz yertinçülär* (Buddhāv H90 and, damaged, 88 and 92). According to Gabain, 1974 par. 233, the sequence *-gAlI bol-* expresses ability; *ibid.* par. 240 she quotes finite exs. of *-gAlI bolma-* expressing inability. *-gAlI bolguluksuz* may perhaps just have been the relativised counterpart of this construction. The editors' translation of BT VII F6 as "das nicht sichtbare Uşnīşa-Merkmal" *may* then be correct. Perhaps *-gUlXksXz* was useful as being the only deverbal nominal suffix specifically to qualify objects.

When the base was tr., *-gUlXksXz* and *-(X)nçsXz* apparently came to have roughly the same content. The exs., discussed above under *-(X)nçsXz* include *tüzKärgülüksüz* and *tüzKärinçsiz*, the biverb sequences *ülgülägülüksüz täŋlägülüksüz* and *ülgülänçsiz täŋlänçsiz*, *ogşatguluksuz* and *ogşatınçsız*, *bulguluksuz* and *bulunçsuz*. One difference determining the choice between the two may have resided in the fact that the former can freely be given verb-like accompaniment, which the latter cannot: We have already mentioned exs. of *bulguluksuz* accompanied by gerunds, of *ülgülägülüksüz täŋlägülüksüz* accompanied by an *üzä* phrase. In some other cases the choice may have been determined by the metre. *ülgüsüz sansız* (BT II 624) and *sanaguluksuz ülgülägülüksüz* (U II 73,3$_1$-4$_1$) cannot but have meant 'uncountable, innumerable', no doubt also the content of the common *sansız sakışsız*. *sanguluksuz sansız kalp üdlär*, as has been read in Suv 83,21, might be a mistake for *sanaguluksuz sansız*. The variation is clearly meant to serve expressivity. In ETŞ 10,165, parallelism may have been responsible for the appearance of *täprätgülüksüz*, where the language otherwise uses *täprängsiz*: *täŋKärgülüksüz çoglug yalınlıg, täprätgülüksüz küçlüg küsünlüg . . . täŋrim* 'my god, who has . . . unshakable power$_2$'. It would be hardly appropriate, here, to say that the god's power *should not* be shaken, instead of stating that it *can not* be shaken. In such cases, then, all modal content is absent from

417 Had the form been *adrıl°* and not *adır°*, it would have denoted the subject; but that does not happen with *-gUlXksXz*.

-gUlXksXz. In still other cases, use of a suffix other than *-gUlXksXz* could have led to misunderstandings: One could not have used *basınçsız* instead of *basınguluksuz bolmak* (BT VIII B, Nachtr. 2+3,25) "das Nicht-Bedrückt-Werden", for instance: That is attested as the privative derivate of *basınç*, i.e. representing a non-verbal suffix sequence (Maitr 3 r18-19).

With a number of other verbal lexemes, however, *-gUlXksXz* has no competition from other formatives or formative combinations. Exs. derived from *adır-*, *bar-*, *kör-*, *tap-* and *te-* have already been mentioned. One other epithet expressing excellence and incomparability is *tāŋKārgülüksüz*; it qualifies *çog yalın* 'splendour' in ETŞ 10,164 and the *puŋya* of a ruler in InscrOuig IV 12. *tetingülüksüz ayıg yavız çulvu sözlā-* (BT III 315) has probably been mistranslated: *tetin-* is not the *-(X)n-* derivate of *te-t-* 'to be named', I believe, but of *tet-* 'to dare'. *tetingülüksüz* should then not be "unsagbar", as translated by the editor, but 'something which one should not have the impudence to do'. *sakınguluksuz sözlägülüksüz* as a translation of a foreign name also contains *-gUlXksXz* forms in adnominal use, the most common use to which verb forms with this suffix are put. The same sequence appears also in Suv 144,11, in *sakınguluksuz sözlägülüksüz bilgā bilig*.

-gUlXksXz forms also describe what something is (*ār-*) or becomes (*bol-*), as, e.g., *yölāştürgülüksüz ürlüg ärip* . . . SuvCaitya 33,3) ". . . ist unvergleichlich und ewig". *-gUlXksXz* forms are used predicatively as well: Attributive *tüzKārgülüksüz ulug bilgā bilig* (ms. Ōtani 2695 a 11), e.g., has its predicative counterpart in *bilgā biligi tüzKārgülüksüz* (BT II 509 and 578). Such a predication can become the object of a *verbum sentiendi*, which demands the accusative form of the predicate: *adırtlayu kololagıl alko nomlarnıŋ yok kurug bolguluksuzın* (BuddhUig II 44). Finally, there is the nominal, abstract use of this participle: *tüzKārgülüksüztā turmış* (BuddhāvH 100) translates Chin. *zhu wu deng zhe. anı körüp xan artokrak ürküp korkup ıdguluksuzka yaşguluksuzka tägip k(ä)ntü özin apıtu yupaţu umadın* (Warnke 29) 'When the king saw this, he became exceedingly frightened$_2$, reached what is not gotten rid of and not hidden, was unable to hide and protect himself and . . .'. No modal content can, again, be detected for the *-gUlXksXz* forms of this difficult passage.

Modal content cannot always be detected (when present at all) with the formation described here. Firstly, a rather clear opposition emerges between *-gUlXksXz* and *-mAksXz*, the other freely verbal deverbal noun formed with *+sXz*: *-mAksXz* always denotes the subject of the verb; *-gUlXksXz* never so, and instead, any other entity involved in the action. Both suffixes are easily added to deverbal verbs. Both *-gUlXksXz* and *-mAksXz* create *ad hoc*, unlexicalised forms. They are thus in complementary distribution in their functions. Both together are, on the other hand, opposed to *-(X)nçsXz*. This latter is sensitive to

the transitivity of its bases and, on the other hand, able to form both subject and object nominals. In accordance with the fact that the more deeply formative layer is ergative, *-(X)nçsXz* does not, like a finite verb, govern gerunds, nominals or postpositional phrases and is often lexicalised. *-gUlXksXz* originally inherited the modal content of *-gUlXk*, but the structural oppositions which it found itself in must quickly have made this content irrelevant. The trifold system of the oblique formations by themselves must have had the same influence on *-gUlXksXz*: Being the negative counterpart of both modal *-(X)nçIg* and non-modal *-(X)glXg*, *-gUlXksXz* had to be both modal and non-modal. The fourth system within which the function of *-gUlXksXz* should be considered is that of negative participles like *-mAdUk* and *-mAz*; that belongs to the domain of Old Turkic morphology and micro-syntax.

3.32 *Formatives for the agent*

3.321 *-(X)gçI*

This formative is one in a group of suffix sequences with *+çI* as second element, which are all agent nouns. All of them were mentioned above, among the *+çI* forms in section 2.75. Only *-(X)gçI* is here given a section of its own, because it is not just a sequence of suffixes like *-(X)mçI*, but a compound suffix; on the other hand, it does not seem yet to be part of the morphological system, like *-gUçI*. The transition from agent formative to participle must have been gradual either way. *-(X)gçI* has verbal case government, which could be considered sufficient reason for a form to be counted as a participle. Note the following, however: 1) There are not many instances of *-(X)gçI* in Old Turkic. 2) Practically all *-(X)gçI* forms have existing *-(X)g* bases, with some phraseological similarities between the two sets of lexemes. 3) As heterogeneous suffixes in *kügçi küzätçi* and *ötägçi berimçi* show, the choice of *-(X)gçI* is not dictated by any verbal categories such as aspect, but by object, subject or instrument nominal. *-(X)gçI* is derived from *-(X)g* as an action noun and not as lexical connections. *tarıgçı*, e.g., comes from *tarıg* as 'agriculture', and not as 'crop' or 'grain'. Therefore, *tarıgçı* is not a 'seller of grain', say, but a 'farmer'. It is attested in TT IX 39, Ernte 31, KP I 2, UigBrief D 1 (as proper name?), DLT and several times in the QB. *-(X)gçI* was borrowed into Common Mongolian: It is found in Pre-Classical and classical Mo. and in most Mo. languages with the same function as in Old Turkic. This is another indication for the early fusion of *-(X)g* and *+çI* in Turkic.

aytıgçılar in HtPek 88 a 15 (quoted in the *UW* 89 b top) are 'couriers' (dispatched to enquire about Xuan-dzang). *bödigçi* is a 'dancer' in BT VII A 239 and 241, presumably a professional one. *yoŋagçı kişi* (Suv 563,4 and HamTouen 1,29)

is a 'slanderous person', not just somebody who is slandering; cf. *yoŋagçı* in QB 5860 and 5864: *sınagçı äränlär* (Shō VII b2) are persons sent to collect information about the enemy camp: *iki äränlärig aldırıın sınagka ıdılar. "kanlık süü ärür mü, bilinlär. ... ndıgsız bizinä sözlänlär. ..." ... ünüp balıktın inçip bardılar sınagka. ... ol iki sınagçı äränlär ... "elig bäg ... ıdu täginti ärti bizni sınagka ...".* The term *sınagçı* serves for reference to them, even when they decide to become monks. *ötügçi* signifies 'petitioner' or 'intercessor' (not quite the same thing). This is attested in ThS III a 10 (runic!), M III 49,9$_2$ (text 40, Christian), Suv 159,12, the DLT and thrice in the QB. ETŞ 9,108 has the sentence *ötügçisiz adınlarka umug bolayın* 'May I serve as refuge to others who have no intercessors'. This is the only ex. for the sequence *-(X)g+çI+sXz*. Being expandable with a denominal suffix, *ötügçi* presents itself to us as a formed noun. Yet, we shall quote below an instance in which it appears to be part of a periphrastic verb form.

satıgçı 'merchant' is attested in ManErz IV 25, 28 and 34 (= Pothi 369, 372 and 383), KP 22,8, several times in Kuan from l.43 on, in ShōAgon 1,265, USp 72,67 and 12 times in the QB. KöktüTurf IV (= ms. TM 326) r3 should read *sat(ı)gçı (ā)r* with V. Thomsen's footn. 1 to Blatt (with the facs. but against the editor). Maitr 61 v3-4 has the binomial *sanıgçı yulugçı*, corresponding to the binomial *sanıg yulug* 'trade, trading'. This is our only ex. of *yulugçı*. A word read as *yulugçı/ yuligçı* by T. Tekin in BQ SE and translated as above appears in fragmentary context and is dubious.[418] *satıgçı*, denoting the social class of merchants, is opposed to *satguçı* in the phrase *ıt ätin satguçı* 'seller of dog's meat' (U II 84,11 and TT IV A 59): *satguçı* brings the action itself, the deed into focus. Here the difference between an agent noun and a participle is shown most clearly.

ötä-g 'debt, obligation, default, guilt', q.v., often appears in a binomial with *ber-im*. The binomial *ötägçi berimçi* of Chuast 309 takes up the moral meaning of the base, and signifies 'guilty'. Chuast 92 has the sentence *munça tınlıgka turalıgka öz ötägçi boltuṃuz*, for some reason not mentioned in the *EDPT*.[419] It reminds us of the sentence *üç y(a)blak yolta öz ötäk* (*sic*) *ötäyür* (TT II B 23). *öz* 'soul' would seem to be the object of the verbal base of *ötä-g* and *ötä-g+çi*.

MaitrH X 2 b14 should, I think, be read as *ulug küçlüg t(ā)ŋrilär ... kut buyanıg* (ms. *buyanlg*, with redundant *l*-hook) *okıgçıka okıtıp alko tujit orduka yıgılurlar* 'The gods let the *puṇya* of salvation (brought about by *bodhisattva* Maitreya's loving all creatures of the five existences who had gotten their souls robbed by *kleśa*) be called out by an announcer and gather all together at ...'. This is

418 Besides, *yulugçı* by itself could not have this meaning, as *yulug* alone does not signify 'trade'.

419 The word which the *EDPT* entry for '*ötekçi*' quotes from USp 55,27 should be cancelled. This is some N.Pr. which can be seen on the facs. to end with an /ü/ and to start in a lacuna.

another *-(X)gçI* denoting a profession; cf. *okı-t+çı* 'summoner' in the QB. The editors' reading as *qut buyanly uqïγčï* and translation as "Heils-(Zeichen-)Deuter(?)" also demands an emendation (*uk-* 'to understand' would have given *'ukuggï'* with rounded vowel in the second syllable) and, moreover, a stretching of the context ("Zeichen" not actually present), an unattested use for *+lXg* (it doesn't usually mark underlying objects) and a 'new' divine *ṛṣi*.

In DLT fol. 87-8 we find the proverb *âmiglig uragut küsägçi bolur* "A nursing woman gets food-cravings – so she is given whatever suits her". No *'küsä-g'* (postulated in the *EDPT*) need have existed; *-(X)gçI* is, after all, a formative, and could have been added directly to the base. The proverb declares cravings to be a recurrent characteristic of nursing women.

The binomial *kögçi küzätçi* appears in Ernte 53-4, Suv 434,2 (quoted in the *DTS*), Warnke 166 and 352 and BT II 1351 (Warnke and BT II are parts of the same text). While the Ernte instance is about human watchmen (who are to guard the fields from animals), the other ones refer to supernatural protectors: The Suv ex. to *balık uluş ordu karşı kögçi küzätçi . . . täŋrilär*, the others to *darni arvış tutdaçılarıg kögçi küzätçilär.*[420] What is interesting for us in these last exs. is the fact that these *kögçi küzätçilär* govern direct objects: Towns and forts in the first case, the pious observers in the second. Verbal government again, showing that *-(X)gçI* was on the way to becoming a participle suffix. *kögçi* is evidently related to the verb signifying 'to guard', but scholars have had difficulties determining the direct base. The n. to Ernte 53 (which follows a suggestion by S. Tezcan) considers the DLT's *känd kökı* 'the suburbs of a town'. I would rather think of *kög yılkı* in the same source, signifying 'cattle driven out to pasture in a herd'; the etymology suggested by Kāšγarī for the former may, after all, be correct. An obvious cognate is *ätözi köglüg küzätiglig bolgay* (Suv 537,1-2), which has the same supernatural content which we find in most of the exs. of *kögçi küzätçi*.

tapıgçı in U II 22,2 and 4, TT I 182, TT VI 017, Ht IV 1026, MaitrH X8 a11 (*tapagçı*), Suv 12,5, TT X 249 and USp 91,8 and 10, *tapugçı* in the DLT and nearly 90 times in the QB, *tapıgçı udugçı* in Suv 65,6-7, Maitr 71 v24, Warnke 31 and 41 and U III 83,9 signifies 'servant'. *udugçı* is not attested without *tapıgçı* as *ud-ug* is not found without *tap-ıg*. This fact shows the strength of the connection between the *+çI* forms and their *-(X)g* bases. On the one hand, TT VI 017-018 gives us *tap-ıgçı* with verbal government and with the meaning not of 'serving' but of 'worshipping': *üç ärdinikä tapıgçı tınlıglar az; yäkkä içkäkkä kamka*

420 The ms. of the BT II passage was lost, and the editor bases his text on transcriptions by Le Coq and A. v. Gabain. In this case, he changes their version to *'kütäçi'*. His alteration must be wrong, in view of the identity of the phrase with the two other instances in the text.

tapıgçı anlıglar ükü̈ş, täŋrim. The reading is corroborated by TT VINew 3,9. On the other hand we find *[kün] t(ä)ŋri tapıgçı ärürlär* (Ht IV 1026) with what appears to be a direct object, and the expansion *ükü̈ş tapıgçılıg udugçılıg* (Schwitz 13-14): The *-(X)gçI* formation thus leads a double life.

In the following passage there is a periphrastic verb form *-(X)gçI bol-*, which even governs the gerund *-gAlI*: *k(a)lu m(ä)n öŋrä asankılıg*[421] *uzun yolta bodis(a)tvlar yorıkınta yorıyur ärkän ükü̈ş kurla burxanlarka nom tilgänin ävirtgäli ötün-* quoted below s.v. *ävir-t-* from BT II. The Suv passage is roughly to be translated as 'I beseeched the Buddha to turn the wheel of *dharma*': Note that the dative *burxanlarka* is governed by *ötün-*, from which *ötügçi bol-* differs only in expressing a particular mode of occurrence of the event referred to. Further on in a different construction: *burxanlarıg nom tilgänin ävirtgükä, altı pramıtlarıg toşgurtguka ötügçi bolsar, . . . nom tözin aça yada ukıtguka ötügçi bolsar* (Suv 181,17-23). Similar structures are *-mlş bol-* 'will have done' and *-dAçI bol-*, apparently an inchoative in the future.[422] *-(X)gçI bol-* may possibly signify 'to happen to do', but what we have is certainly insufficient for determining that.

Together with the clearly composite *-gUçI*, the morphologically opaque suffix *-dAçI* and the negative *-mAçI* of Orkhon Turkic on the one hand, and *-(X)gçI*, *-(X)mçI*, *-XşçI*, *-(U)tçI* etc. on the other, all the forms with verbal bases expanded by *+çI* denote agents. This must therefore somehow be part of the meaning of *+çI* itself.

3.322 *-(X)mlXg*

At the end of section 3.104 on *-(X)m* we showed the difference between *kör-* + dative, expanded by *-(X)mlXg*, on the one hand, and *körüm+lüg* on the other. However, *-(X)mlXg* is distinguished from a participle suffix by the durativity and stativity which characterises its meaning, and which distinguishes nominals from verbs. *täg-imlig* 'worthy of . . .' also governs the dative, which in this case marks the noun denoting what one is worthy of. This lexeme often appears in the expression *ayagka tägimlig* 'venerable', also borrowed into Mongolian. *alkışka tägimlig* 'praiseworthy, worthy of blessing' in Hochzeit 5 and 14, *iki dıdımka tägimlig* 'worthy of the two crowns' in HamTouen 5,56 and 5,4′ and *mıŋ ögmäkkä tägimlig* (*ibid.* 8′) are not mentioned in the dictionaries. Particularly the fact that it can

421 To be read thus (although spelled with K and not Q) and not as *asankilıg*, *asankelıg* etc., as the final velar is back-vocalic. If *asankı* had ended in a front vowel in Uigur, *+lXg* would have behaved accordingly.

422 The not rare *-Ar bol-* is used when recounting dreams.

govern -*gAll* forms (e.g. in AmitIst 58 and MaitrH X 4 b 9) shows how near to being a participle *tägimlig* has come.

Another common -(*X*)*mlXg* form is *ärtimlig* 'transient'. Exs. for this not quoted in the dictionaries appear in U II 80,62 and 88,79, Maitr 1 r 1 and 13, 103 v 2 and 168 v 9, BT XIII 38,17 and HazaiAval 10. While the opposite of *tägimlig* is *tägimsiz*, the opposite of *ärtimlig* is *artamaksız* or *artamaguluk*. In Qarakhanid Turkic, which does not have *ärtimlig*, this lexeme is replaced by e.g. *käçimlig* (QB 3782). **ärtim* is not attested, but the following sentence has a form which may have had it as underlying: *utgurak bar ärki ärtimliK artak yavız adalar* (Suv 621,13). This is the last sentence uttered by the princes' mother in the story about the hungry tigress upon seeing an ill-foreboding dream concerning her little son. In *UW* 43 b, in the entry on *ada*, par. A, a, 1, the word we are concerned with is translated as "ungewöhnlich (?)", which does not accord with the etymology. It can either be read as *ärtimlik* and translated as 'leading to transience, having transience as (their) result' or as *ärtimlig*, in which case *+lXg* would add the content 'connected with . . .'. In neither case can this be the lexeme *ärtimlig* discussed above, nor the ending of the form the composite suffix -(*X*)*mlXg* being investigated here.

An -(*X*)*mlXg* form listed in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*, again with no -(*X*)*m* base, is *kanımlıg* 'satisfied, content'. Exs. not mentioned in the *DTS* appear in Maitr 170 v 23 and 9 v 17 = MaitrGeng 1 b 18, ETŞ 11,23, InscrOuig V 15 and, together with *todumlug*, Maitr 170 v 25 and MaitrH XVI 16 r 9. Both *todum* and *todumsuz* being hapax legomena in the QB, *todumlug* evidently comes from *tod-* directly. Hochzeit 7 has *kanımlıg* in a slightly different sense, for which see the n. to the passage.

kınımlıg 'striving, steadfast' is attested in BT III 902 and reconstructed as [*kı*]*nımlıg* in ĀgFrag (1) A 12 with a Chin. correspondence. BT III 902 is probably not to be analysed as (*agmaksız kınım*)*lıg*, as the translation given in the *UW* s.v. *agmaksız* would make us assume, but as a binomial in which both *agmaksız* and *kınımlıg* signify 'steadfast'. This is made likely both by the n. to the ĀgFrag ex. and by the predication, in Suv 190,18, of *agmaksız* of persons. Note also that there is no '*kın-ım*'; see *kın-* e.g. in the *EDPT*. The sequence *bliklik tdimlglarka* (simplified) in TT VIII K 11 (Brāhmī) should perhaps be read as *biliglig tetimliglärkä*: The text has also other exs. of *t* for /d/, *k* for /g/ and *ṃ*[423] for /m/. *tetimlig* is attested also in QB 2311, 2328 and 5905, by Dankoff translated as 'obstinate' and 'brave'. These uses of the QB would make us derive the lexeme from *tet-* 'to resist etc.'. The TT VIII context helps us connect it semantically with *tetrü*, q.v. among the petrified converbs. DLT fol. 412 also makes the connection between *tet-* and *tetrü*.

särimlig küdümlüg in BT XIII 38,21 is translated as "geduldig, wartend", and

423 Indicates nasalisation of the preceding vowel; in Uigur texts usually a transcription of /n/.

tapıgçı tınlıglar ükü̆ş, täŋrim. The reading is corroborated by TT VINew 3,9. On the other hand we find *[kün] t(ä)ŋri tapıgçı ärürlär* (Ht IV 1026) with what appears to be a direct object, and the expansion *ükü̆ş tapıgçılıg udugçılıg* (Schwitz 13-14). The *-(X)gçI* formation thus leads a double life.

In the following passage there is a periphrastic verb form *-(X)gçI bol-*, which even governs the gerund *-gAlI*: *k(a)lı m(ä)n öŋrä asankılıg*[421] *uz̆un yolta bodis(a)tvlar yorıkınta yorıyur ärkän ükü̆ş kurla burxanlarka nom tilgänin ävirtgäli ötügçi boltum* (Suv 163,18). This is similar to *ävirtgäli ötün-* quoted below s.v. *ävir-t-* from BT II. The Suv passage is roughly to be translated as 'I beseeched the Buddha to turn the wheel of *dharma*': Note that the dative *burxanlarka* is governed by *ötün-*, from which *ötügçi bol-* differs only in expressing a particular mode of occurrence of the event referred to. Further on in a different construction: *burxanlarıg nom tilgänin ävirtgükä, altı pramıtlarıg toşgurtguka ötügçi bolsar, . . . nom tözin aça yada ukıtguka ötägçi bolsar* (Suv 181,17-23). Similar structures are *-mIş bol-* 'will have done' and *-dAçI bol-*, apparently an inchoative in the future.[422] *-(X)gçI bol-* may possibly signify 'to happen to do', but what we have is certainly insufficient for determining that.

Together with the clearly composite *-gUçI*, the morphologically opaque suffix *-dAçI* and the negative *-mAçI* of Orkhon Turkic on the one hand, and *-(X)gçI*, *-(X)mçI*, *-XşçI*, *-(U)tçI* etc. on the other, all the forms with verbal bases expanded by *+çI* denote agents. This must therefore somehow be part of the meaning of *+çI* itself.

3.322 *-(X)mlXg*

At the end of section 3.104 on *-(X)m* we showed the difference between *kör-* + dative, expanded by *-(X)mlXg*, on the one hand, and *körüm+lüg* on the other. However, *-(X)mlXg* is distinguished from a participle suffix by the durativity and stativity which characterises its meaning, and which distinguishes nominals from verbs. *täg-imlig* 'worthy of . . .' also governs the dative, which in this case marks the noun denoting what one is worthy of. This lexeme often appears in the expression *ayagka täg̈imlig* 'venerable', also borrowed into Mongolian. *alkışka täg̈imlig* 'praiseworthy, worthy of blessing' in Hochzeit 5 and 14, *iki dıdımka täg̈imlig* 'worthy of the two crowns' in HamTouen 5,56 and 5,4′ and *mıŋ ögmäkkä täg̈imlig* (*ibid.* 8′) are not mentioned in the dictionaries. Particularly the fact that it can

421 To be read thus (although spelled with K and not Q) and not as *asankılıg*, *asankelıg* etc., as the final velar is back-vocalic. If *asankı* had ended in a front vowel in Uigur, *+lXg* would have behaved accordingly.

422 The not rare *-Ar bol-* is used when recounting dreams.

govern *-gAll* forms (e.g. in AmitIst 58 and MaitrH X 4 b 9) shows how near to being a participle *tägimlig* has come.

Another common *-(X)mlXg* form is *ärtimlig* 'transient'. Exs. for this not quoted in the dictionaries appear in U II 80,62 and 88,79, Maitr 1 r 1 and 13, 103 v 2 and 168 v 9, BT XIII 38,17 and HazaiAval 10. While the opposite of *tägimlig* is *tägimsiz*, the opposite of *ärtimlig* is *artamaksız* or *artamaguluk*. In Qarakhanid Turkic, which does not have *ärtimlig*, this lexeme is replaced by e.g. *käçimlig* (QB 3782). **ärtim* is not attested, but the following sentence has a form which may have had it as underlying: *utgurak bar ärki ärtimlig ärtak yavız adalar* (Suv 621,13). This is the last sentence uttered by the princes' mother in the story about the hungry tigress upon seeing an ill-foreboding dream concerning her little son. In *UW* 43 b, in the entry on *ada*, par. A, a, 1, the word we are concerned with is translated as "ungewöhnlich (?)", which does not accord with the etymology. It can either be read as *ärtimlik* and translated as 'leading to transience, having transience as (their) result' or as *ärtimlig*, in which case *+lXg* would add the content 'connected with . . .'. In neither case can this be the lexeme *ärtimlig* discussed above, nor the ending of the form the composite suffix *-(X)mlXg* being investigated here.

An *-(X)mlXg* form listed in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*, again with no *-(X)m* base, is *kanımlıg* 'satisfied, content'. Exs. not mentioned in the *DTS* appear in Maitr 170 v 23 and 9 v 17 = MaitrGeng 1 b 18, ETŞ 11,23, InscrOuig V 15 and, together with *todumlug*, Maitr 170 v 25 and MaitrH XVI 16 r 9. Both *todum* and *todumsuz* being hapax legomena in the QB, *todumlug* evidently comes from *tod-* directly. Hochzeit 7 has *kanımlıg* in a slightly different sense, for which see the n. to the passage.

kınımlıg 'striving, steadfast' is attested in BT III 902 and reconstructed as [*kı*]*nımlıg* in ĀgFrag (1) A 12 with a Chin. correspondence. BT III 902 is probably not to be analysed as (*agmaksız kınım*)*lıg*, as the translation given in the *UW* s.v. *agmaksız* would make us assume, but as a binomial in which both *agmaksız* and *kınımlıg* signify 'steadfast'. This is made likely both by the n. to the ĀgFrag ex. and by the predication, in Suv 190,18, of *agmaksız* of persons. Note also that there is no '*kın-ım*'; see *kın-* e.g. in the *EDPT*. The sequence *bliklik tdimlglarka* (simplified) in TT VIII K 11 (Brāhmī) should perhaps be read as *biligli̇g tetimliglärkä*: The text has also other exs. of *t* for /d/, *k* for /g/ and *m*[423] for /m/. *tetimlig* is attested also in QB 2311, 2328 and 5905, by Dankoff translated as 'obstinate' and 'brave'. These uses of the QB would make us derive the lexeme from *tet-* 'to resist etc.'. The TT VIII context helps us connect it semantically with *tetrü*, q.v. among the petrified converbs. DLT fol. 412 also makes the connection between *tet-* and *tetrü*.

särimlig küdümlüg in BT XIII 38,21 is translated as "geduldig, wartend", and

423 Indicates nasalisation of the preceding vowel; in Uigur texts usually a transcription of /n/.

might in fact be a binomial. After connecting the latter with *küd-* 'to wait', the footn. to the passage adds: "Nach DTS und ED ist allerdings weder das Nomen *küdüm* noch dessen adjektivische Weiterbildung *k.+lüg* vorgekommen". After what we know about the use of *-(X)mlXg*, the absence of '*küd-üm*' should not surprise us. The *EDPT* mentions four instances of *särimlig*, and another one appears in QB 2170. *siŋimlig*, finally, is attested only in the QB.

Wherever a suffix *-(X)mlXg* crystallised, it appears to have been used to describe a durable connection between the bearer of the *-(X)mlXg* attribute and the content of the verbal activity in question. *-(X)mlXg* is added to the intr. base *ärt-*; in the case of *särimlig küdümlüg* to tr. bases in the strict sense (presumably due to semantic analogy from *tetimlig*); in most of the cases to bases which govern datives, as *tüg, kan-, tod-, kın- siŋ-* and *tet-*. In all instances it denotes the subject. Forming subject nominals from the third group appears to have been the main task of this formation. Most of its products are used adjectivally.

3.323 *-gA*

-gA forms agent nouns from both intr. and tr. verbs and also a few object nominals from tr. bases. A few of the members of this formation, like *bilgä, kısga* and *tamga*, were evidently pre-formed already in the earliest stages of the language; they are very common. Others, like *salınga*, may be *ad hoc* creations; many cases are clearly between these two extremes.

The most transparent and perhaps best attested *-gA* lexeme is *bilgä* 'a wise person, a counsellor', found in Orkhon, Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic. It clearly refers to the subject of tr. *bil-*. *bilgä bilig* 'wisdom' is also very common. It appears, among many places not mentioned in the dictionaries, in BuddhKat 17, twice 36, 40 and 43. *ögä ~ ügä*, perhaps a near-synonym of *bilgä*, and *moyga* and *tümgä*, its antonyms, also belong to this formation. *moyga* (TT VI 254) must be related to *moyum*, q.v. among the *-(X)m* lexemes; their common base can be reconstructed as **boñ-*. *ayıg kılınçlıg tosun yavlak moyga tınl(ı)glar* was translated as "die Übeltäter, die wilden, bösen, störrischen Wesen". Considering the meaning of *moyum* and of its derivates, *moyga* should rather signify 'confounding' or 'perplexing'. Whereas *moyga* is a *hapax*, *tümgä* 'dull, foolish' appears pretty often: among other places, in the phrase *tümgä ärkliglig* in a colophon quoted in AbiShotan p. 77 and also under *kärgä-k* above, in ShōAgon 1,267 and in AmitIst 6. In this last instance, *tümgä ärklig[lig]* is opposed to *yiti ärkliglig*, reminding us of the double meanings of the English antonyms *dull* and *sharp*. A n. to this quotes another ex. of the expression *tümgä ärkliglig* 'having dull senses' from a fr. of the Old Turkic translation of the *Saṃyuktāgamasūtra* (a part of which was edited in ShōAgon): it here translates the Chin. phrase *tun gen* "mit stumpfen

Sinnen". The phonetic similarity between this and *tümgä* is striking, particularly since the final /n/ of the phrase was, in the Chin. dialect from which Old Turkic borrowed at that time, pronounced as a mere nasalisation of the vowel preceding it.[424] Even if it has a foreign origin, however, *tümgä* interests us: Its structural-semantic connection with *bilgä* on the one hand and *moyga* on the other may mean that it contains the suffix *-gA* by analogy (or, at least, 'popular' restructuration). We keep in mind, on the other hand, that not every °*gA* lexeme need have belonged to this formation. *ögä* 'counsellor',, e.g., is also a *-gA* lexeme, if it is not to be read with *ü°*. In that case, we follow DLT fol. 9 in connecting it with *ö-*, there translated as "to understand a matter after thinking it over". F.W.K. Müller says in U II p. 93 that the title should be transcribed with initial *ü* because of a Chin. transcription. While the Chin. character in question really is pronounced as [yü], it is not clear to me how a Chinese of that time would transcribe foreign initial [ö].[425] Khotanese shows forms of the title which can be interpreted as *ögä* and such as can be interpreted as *ügä*. Hovdhaugen, 1971: 202-3 is for reading this as *ögä*, which is what we find also in *UW* 36 b and 53 a. Kāšġarī would not have made the connection between the noun and the verb purely because of graphic similarity, presumably. If the etymology is correct, there may also be a phonetic development similar to that of *tog-* ~ *tug-*, in which /g/ appears to narrow the labial in certain dialects.

Three descriptions of horses also use the *-gA* formation. The *hapax* in *bir övgä yäl(i)ş at* (ZiemeSklav I 4) comes from *ev-* 'to hurry'.[426] While *sal-ga at* 'a restive horse' is attested only in the DLT, *yorı-ga* 'a horse that ambles or goes at a jog trot' (DLT and QB 1428) is found also in later sources: cf. *TMEN* 1846.

övkä ~ *öpkä* is 'lung' and also 'anger' which, according to the DLT, is "generated in the lung". The base, usually spelled as *öp-*, signifies not only 'to kiss' but also 'to sip or suck in the air or a liquid'. The alternating spelling *övkä/öpkä* creates the impression that it may have been onomatopoeic *öf-*. The *EDPT* entries for *öpkä* and *öpkälä-* have the °*v*° alternants as well. In TT VI 71, the London scroll writes *övkä*, while the TT VIOda New 7, v 1, has *öpkä*. The labial consonant of 'YOB.KA ~ 'OB.KA of BuddhKat 8, 13, 28 and 30 (Tibetan writing) can be interpreted both ways. In Khot 74 (Brāhmī) "lung" is also *öpkä* (with *p*).

424 The first syllable of *tümgä* also reminds us of Skt. *tamas* '(physical and spiritual) darkness, ignorance etc.' from the Indo-European root which gave Greek *témenos* 'twilight'; also of the etymon represented by German *dumm* 'foolish'. Cf., further, Hebrew *dimdumim* 'twilight'; *timtum* 'idiocity', *tam* 'naive' and so forth.

425 *üge*, the form of the title found in Mongolian, may have resulted from the influence of *üge* 'word'.

426 Vowel rounding is common in the vicinity of labial consonants. The word is damaged, however, and could also be something quite different.

kükrä-gä 'thunder(ing)' (SuvMüll 20 and BT II 632) and *kaldur-ga* "rustling" (DLT) come from onomatopoeic verbs. We find *külçir-gä* 'smiling' in BT III 998 and BT VII A 152 and 621.

In Tariat W4 we find the couple *ılg(a)m t(a)r(ı)gl(a)g(ı)m*, which Tekin translates as "my arable lowlands and cultivations". *ıl-ga* is quoted with this meaning from a number of dialects and from Mo. and derived from *ıl-* 'to descend'. *ıl-* is attested a number of times in the DLT and several of its derivates live on in the various languages. Another cognate may have been *suv kum alıŋa [ı]lınsar, ol balık . . .* (M III 37,5$_2$) 'if the water goes down under the sand, that fish . . .': The interpretation of this passage in *UW* 91 b is even weaker (the third word, a hap., appears to have gotten damaged after Le Coq dealt with it).

köli-gä and *kölgi-gä* are mentioned twice each in the DLT and both times with the same translations: Both in fol. 225 and in fol. 521, *köligä* is translated as 'a deep shade', *kölgigä* as 'a slight shade'. *kölgigä* is otherwise attested only in Suv 602,2 but *köligä* is very common; in AbitAnk 57 we find an ex. in a recently published text. *kölgi-* is a *hapax* in the DLT and *köli-* is not common either, but cf. *kölgi-t-* and *köli-t-* below. With the *-(O)k* derivates from these bases the symmetry ends: Whereas *kölgik* is 'screen, curtain', *kölik* appears to be 'a shadow'; see both above. Kāšğarī makes out *kölgi-* to be tr., but this may be a (re)invention for the sake of etymology; *köli-* is intr.. *köligä*, at any rate, is therefore a subject nominal.

tamga usually refers to a 'seal' in Old Turkic and in Qarakhanid texts, and to the 'printing plate' in Mongol times. In this last use, found e.g. in BT XIII 13,38 and BT VII B 124, the lexeme may have been borrowed back from Mo.: cf. Róna Tas in *AOH* 18 (1965): 136-138. The dative form *tamagaka* in the BT VII ex. would speak for this, as *tamaga* is the shape the lexeme had acquired in Mo.[427] All our exs. for *tamga* in the sense of 'printing-block' come from colophons (all except the BT VII B one appearing in BT XIII), which makes it likely that this was a technical term. In the sense of 'seal', *tamga* is found in HamTouen 22,11 (*tanuk tamga urduŋ mu* "pour peu que tu l'aies frappée d'un sceau témoin, . . .") and 26,12 and BT XIII 1,112 (*tükäl ägsüksüz iziŋiz / tüştilär tamga tägb(ä)lgülüg*) and 49,14. An additional Uigur ex. is CHIG.ŚRA.BŪD DAM.GĀḤ.SE ZI.MAS = *çıxşabut tamgası sımaz* 'He does not break the seal of the *śikṣāpadas* (moral precepts)' in

427 'getting the (wooden) printing-block of a text engraved' is *bitigniŋ/nomlarnıŋ* etc. *tamgasın oytur-* (BT XIII 48,3, 49,33 and 36 and 53,5), with the block as resulting object ('effiziertes Objekt'). In BT XIII 46,7 we have *nomlarıg tamga[. .] oydur-*, where *tamga* might be either in the dative or the locative case. 'to copy a text ('affiziertes Objekt') onto a printing-block' is *nom ärdinig* (or whatever) *tamgaka entür-*, attested in BT XIII 20,65 = Hazai 65 and BT XIII 44,6 = Samanta 6. Therefore, the BT XIII 54,4 instance need not be completed as *'tamgaka [oydur]d[ı'* but should perhaps have been *tamgaka [entür]d[i.*

BuddhKat 25,[428] which reminds us of *ç(ı)xşapat tamga arıg küzädür m(ä)n* (Maitr 18 r9). QB exs. of *tamga* 'seal' not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in couplets 1766, 2902 and 3223. Orkhon Turkic does not have the noun *tamga*, but two high officials of the Türgäş court are mentioned there: *Maxaraç tamgaçı* and *Oguz Bilgä tamgaçı*, no doubt the ruler's 'seal bearers'. *tamgaçı* is attested also in Yarkand V b6.[429] Metaphorical uses of *tamga*, mentioned in the *EDPT*, are no doubt calques on foreign uses of 'seal' both in the east and in the west. The central Old Turkic meaning of the term was perhaps the 'seal' of a ruler or an official primarily as affixed onto a document; it may only later have been transferred to the instrument used for this purpose. The only Old Turkic evidence for *tamga* in the sense of 'brand mark' is in l.6 of YE 26. It reads:] *y(e)rdäki ,, T¹MK¹L¹G¹ y(ı)lkı ,, buŋs[ız] är[ti . . .]I ,, bakın ,, buŋsız* (thus!) *,, ärti ,, kara saçın täg*. Otherwise, the earliest instances which the *EDPT* can adduce for *tamga* in the sense of 'brand (mark)' are from two 15th century lexicographers. 'brand mark' is *tögün*, attested in the DLT and in a 13th century *tafsīr*, and perhaps even in Toñ 54. Cf. also *tögn+ä-* 'to cauterise'. Even assuming the interpretation of YE 26,6 to be correct,[430] a use which is so weakly attested should in all likelihood also be secondary. Although it can be assumed that the Turks brandmarked their animals long before any of them had witnessed the sealing of a document, this particular term went in the opposite direction. Seals are affixed by dripping warmed wax upon a document and stamping it with a stamp. *tamga* should therefore be from *tam-* 'to drip'; it need not be related at all to the intr. *tamıt-*, as maintained in the n. to BT III 998. *tamıt-* and its derivates *tamt-ur-*, *tamt-ul-*, *tamtu* and *tamtuk* all denote flaming, which even a branding-iron would not be expected to do. *tamga*, therefore, is a subject noun interpreted, if it comes to refer to the stamp, as the name of an instrument. Real instrument nouns are hard to find in this formation. *bärKä* 'whip, goad' can be one, taking it to come from *bärt-* 'to bruise' by simplification of the consonant cluster. A number of Uigur and Qarakhanid exs. are quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. '*berge*'; additional ones appear in Maitr 82 r24, Höllen 69, Suv 7,21 and 117,12, DLT, QB 2395, 5218, 5279, 5280 and 5281. USp 55,34 and some of the mss. in the QB exs. have the variant *berKä*. *biçgä*, mentioned in the *EDPT* s.v. *bıçgu*, is dubious.[431] A real subjectoid *tamga* is attested only in the DLT:

428 The base form of a noun can always be used in Turkic languages to serve as direct object, when this is unquantified or indefinite, as here. This is not a phonetic or orthographical omission of /n/, as the editors' commentary implies.

429 In the note thereto, I maintain that the Orkhon instances stood "perhaps for 'brander of animals'". I no longer hold that opinion.

430 The K¹ makes it quite suspicious, and other readings are possible. In ThS III a2-4, another runic source, *tamgalıg bitig* is "a sealed document".

431 This is in the binome *kılıçı biçgäsi*, read by Radloff in one of the two mss. of Kuan 27 where the

Kāšġarī has a lexeme of this form which he translates as 'any affluent of seas, pools, rivers etc. and a narrow arm of the sea'. Thus on condition, that is, that 2 *tamga* also comes from the intr. verb *tam-*.

There are a few *-gA* derivates from deverbal verbs. *ötürkä äm* (Heilk I 190) is a 'purgative', like its Qarakhanid cognate *ötrüm* (mentioned among the *-(X)m* lexemes). *öt-ür-* (q.v. below) is not attested with such a meaning, but cf. 2 *öt-üg* above. *ötürkä* can be considered an agent or an instrument nominal.[432] A lexeme *yılınçga*, probably derived from *yılı-* 'to be or become warm', is attested in the phrase *yılınçga yumşak* in Maitr 51 v 27-8 and 55 v 12 and, as *ılınçga* (thus!) *yanları* in TT X 446. For the Maitr expression cf. *yılıg yumşak* (TT I 178 and BT II 1260), used metaphorically of human beings. The TT X phrase is about the hips of a person. A different meaning is inherent in *yılınçga aş* (DLT) 'fatless, saltless, tasteless food'. This latter, at least, no doubt comes from *yılı-n-ış-*. Maitr 71 r25 should also be read as *yılı[nçg]a yumşak köŋül(l)üg* instead of the ed.'s '*yılıg*': There is a tear in the paper but the end line of A is still there. English 'gentle' appears to cover all the meanings of *yılınçga*. *ılınçga/ılışga yanları* must be 'her gentle hips', while *yılınçga/yılışga yumşak*, qualifying diamonds, should be more idiomatic. A third *-gA* derivate from a deverbal verb is *salıŋa* < *sal-ın-ga* 'dangling'; it appears in an unpublished Brāhmī text, corresponding to Skt. *ālambin-* (information from Dr. Maue). A fourth such derivate may have been *yumurtga* 'egg', q.v. in the *EDPT*.[433] BuddhKat 4 has YU.MUR.HÀ.DA DOG.MAG, which should probably be read as *yumurtxada togmak*.[434] The *t* could not very well have been realised in Tibetan script and the scribe simplifies such clusters. This suggestion is not absolutely certain, however, as we find *yumurka/yumurxa/yumurga* in Heilk I 69. The continuant /r/ and a fricative allophone of /g/ may have caused the ejection of the dental at an early date in certain dialects, with transference of the /t/'s feature of voicelessness to the velar. *yumurtga* is probably related to *yum-gak* and *yum-uz* (qq.v.). Cf., in this connection, *biligsiz bilig yumurtgası* (UigSukh 43), which translates Chin. *hun man an* 'the darkness/withdrawal/

other one has *bıçak*. If read correctly, this could also be analysed as *biçgäs+i*: DLT fol. 231 has a noun *biçgas* 'an agreement or contract between members of a tribe etc.'. The alternation of back and front vowels is no surprise with *biç- ~ bış-*, and the metaphorical use of 'to cut' as 'to come to an agreement' is well-known for Old Turkic: cf. the DLT's *bıç-ıg* 'an agreement' and the verbs *üz-üş-* and *üzül-üş-* below. The morphological obscurity of *bIçgAs* is not an argument in favour of the existence of a hapax '*biçgä*'; *biçgu*, of course, belongs to a different formation.

432 The word is certainly not the dative of a deverbal noun '*öt-ür*'; the aorist of *öt-* has the form *ötär*.

433 Maitr 51/116/174 r8 should, by the way, not be read as '*balakın yumurtgasın*' but as *bala+sın . . .*: The passage is only about birds and not about fish.

434 One dare not emend *togmak* to *tugmak*, although Brāhmī instances of this verb have /u/: This verb has both variants in the dialects spoken today, the ms. has other unexplained *os* and it consistently writes *tog-* with *o*.

eclipse which ignorance is': The semantic relationship with *yum-* is particularly evident here; it shows that *yumurtga* 'an egg' may originally have been thought of as something in the inner darkness of which there is an enclosed creature.

When a verb ended in /k/, the initial *-g°* of our formative may have disappeared already in Old Turkic: *kılguluk çökä yaŋ* (U II 41,21) 'the manner of the kneeling to be carried out' may come from **çök-gä yaŋ*.[435] Further, *yaka* 'edge, collar', then also 'border' (*TMEN* 1802) probably comes from *yak-* 'to draw near'. *swka* 'just (adv.)' appears to be from a metaphorical use of *suk-* 'to thrust in' or from *sok-* 'to hit, beat'. It is used in Ht IV 934, ETŞ 13,198 and BT XIII 32,2 and 36,3. As binomial with *ugrayu* we find it in ShōAv 75 and 239 and BT XIII 20,59 and 65, 49,83 and 59,4 and 7. It appears as a temporal particle in AbitAnk 68 and in ZiemeLegenden p. 152 l.8: This has the same postterminal content which constitutes one of the uses of English *just*. *tikä* in *tikä üçgil* (BT VII A 664), finally, may be from *tik-*, unless we here have the homophonous adjective *tik* written as *tikk*.

One instance where *-gA* forms a *nomen patientis* is the DLT's *tilgä* 'strip' from *til-* 'to cut into strips'. *kısga* 'short' should also be an object nominal, if it denotes the resulting object of *kıs-* 'to pinch, squeeze, reduce'. *UW* 47 a bottom s.v. *adalıg* B, a writes '*kızga özlüg yaşlıg*' (Maitr 167 v9); but the /s/ is documented in *özi kısga* in runic KÇ 23 and in the Qarakhanid instances, e.g. in *yaşı kısga isiz* (QB 348). *kız kısga üd* (Maitr 74 v2 and ShōAgon 3, p. 204,8) refers to a 'time of dearth', reminding us of the DLT's ex. phrase *ol anıŋ tonlukın kısdı* "He reduced his allowance for the purchase of clothing". To judge by the meaning of *kıs-ur-* (q.v. below), *kıs-* may originally (also) have had an intr. meaning like 'to shorten (intr.)'. A third instance of *-gA* as forming an object nominal is *tarka* 'alone, lonely' from *tar-* 'to disperse (tr.), to send away'. This *tarka* (as distinct from the one signifying 'bitter') is discussed and documented in UigSteu p. 247, with footn. 57 of that page. Clear exs. from one published (M III number 21) and four unpublished texts are quoted and discussed. The consistent spelling of this lexeme with *k* shows that, as elsewhere in Old Turkic, /g/ and /k/ are neutralised after /r/, with /k/ representing the two velars. Another object or instrument noun in *-gA* is *tutga* 'handle' from *tut-* 'to hold, to catch', attested in BT VII A 667-8. We also find it in Chagatay and in modern Kazakh and Altay dialects with this meaning.[436]

yinçgä 'fine, delicate, polite' is probably also a *-gA* nominal, but it is impossible

435 The *-A* gerund is sometimes used adnominally; this only happens, however, when the kernel is an inalienable noun in the instrumental case: *tikä kulgakın* (Höllen 93) is one example.

436 *TMEN* 1913 would like to derive the DLT's *yuvka* 'thin' from *yuv-* 'to roll (tr.)'; *yuvka* would be a *nomen patientis* primarily signifying "ausgewalzt". Against this speaks first of all the runic form *yuyka* in Toñ I S6 (which the *EDPT* calls a "mason's error"); secondly the fact that the *-gA* derivate from *yuv-* would definitely be '*yuvga*' and not *yuvka*. There are parallels to *y* > *v* after /ω/,

to know whether it is a *nomen agentis* or a *nomen patientis*: We have no base for it. It does seem to be related to *yinçür-*, q.v. on p. 724. The phrase *yinçürü adıra billäçi* quoted there makes the connection between the two lexemes quite likely. There may have been an */e/* and not an */i/* in the first syllable, since the Toñ inscr. twice writes *yençgä* without explicit vowel there. Cf. also *yinçgälä-* below.

+lXg is added to *tamga* in two runic instances mentioned above, and in Suv 392,14; to *bilgä* in ThS III a 11. *tamga+la-*, on the other hand, is quite common, and cf. *tançgala-* among the *+lA-* verbs. From *övkä* 'anger' we have both *+lXg* and *+lA-* derivates, the former e.g. in HamTouen 1,26, the latter discussed among the *+lA-* verbs below. Cf. also *bärKä+k-*.

-gA forms have been found to be in both nominal and adnominal, and also in adverbial use. Verbal rection is not attested with this formation in Old Turkic. Such rection does appear, of course, with the future form *-gAy*, but that is not a synchronic variant of *-gA*. As distinct from the aorist and from the inscriptional future form *-dAçI*, *-gAy* is not even used as a participle, but only as predicative finite verb. *-gAy* does sometimes have a variant *-gA*: in KP 75,2 and 76,6, in a part of that text which has other late characteristics like *silär* instead of *sizlär*, and in the QB mss. A. v. Gabain writes in Fundamenta I:39: "Das Verbalnomen auf *-ga*, meist durch ein emphatisches *+y* erweitert, bildet in den Hss. das Futurum . . .". I know of no emphatic '*+y*', however; I therefore take the development to have taken place the other way around. See Erdal, 1979 b: 89 for an explanation of the connection between the two forms. I have no answer to the question of whether the verbal noun preceded the predicative future form or vice versa. What is clear is that both denote the subject and not to the object, disregarding the problematical *kısga* and the late *tilgä* (DLT) and *tutga* (BT VII).

3.324 *-gAn*

This formation denotes subjects of both intr. and tr. verbs, with a few exceptions. Mostly in late Uigur it shows verbal government of nominals and thus comes close to the behaviour of participles.

There is an intr. runic instance in IrqB X, which reads: $S^2N^2G^2N^2$ *bars män. kamuş ara başım. antag alp män . . .* Reading the first word as *esnägän*,[437] we get: 'I am a yawning tiger. My head is between the reeds. So tough am I.' All mammals yawn occasionally, I believe. Here however, yawning is, like having its head

as I have noted elsewhere. The Uigur form of this lexeme is *yuka*, which appears also to have served as source for the modern forms. This lexeme needs further clarification.

437 Reading the suffix as *-gin* would not do, as *-gXn* forms nominals denoting (perfect) states and not qualities or actions in process. *eş+än-* 'to trust somebody' would not fit the context.

between the reeds, part of the image of the tiger: It shows his 'nonchalance'. We describe below how Kāšgarī uses the *-gAn* forms: They often indicate habitual or typical behaviour. This is how *esnägän* has been used here.

ärkän, the conjunction for temporal clauses, should also be an original *-gAn* nominal; as expected, K replaces G after /r/.[438] Here is one ex. among many: *siz Antkäkdä ärkän bo açarı uz[a]tu sizni birlä sözläşip . . .* (Ht VII 1790) translated "Als Ihr in Indien weiltet, hat dieser Meister lange mit Euch diskutiert und . . .". This could just have been a *participium coniunctum* from *är-* 'to be', in English 'You *being* in India, . . .'. It is quite unlikely that the second syllable of *ärkän* should be the particle *kAn* discussed in section 2.21, which is added to adverbs of time. A contraction from '*är-ür kän*', which is assumed to have taken place in the n. to Ht VII 1790, is just as unlikely as the idea, proposed there, that *bär* 'there is' comes from *barır* 'it goes'. In the QB we find some additonal nominal sentences turned into temporal clauses through the conjunct participle function of *är-kän*.[439] While the QB has nine exs. of *-mAz ärkän*, only a single one has turned up till now in Uigur (quoted in Schulz, 1978: 199 from HtPar 19 v26-20 r11). What is most common in Uigur is the aorist form with *ärkän*, which thus has a status similar to the locative of the aorist; both constructions are exhaustively described by Schulz. Admittedly, *ärkän* is never found as an attributive participle as *-Ar* or *-dAçI* forms are; but then, the *-gAn* form *was* obsolete within Old Turkic morphology. Moreover, one had the suffix *+kI* to bring some classes of nominal sentences into attributive function, and existence was attributed through *bar*; *är-* practically being an auxiliary, there was not much use for attributing its content unto any noun.[440]

u-gan is documented together with *arjı* = Skt. *ṛṣi* in BT XIII 13,115 and 121 and quoted in *UW* 221 b from several other places; together, they correspond to Skt. *devarṣi. ugan* 'mighty' is applied to persons in Schwitz 3. In Maitr 194 v11, Maitreya addresses the people of Ketumatī as *sizlär uganlar. törт sıŋarkı ugan* (Ham-

438 Thus against Erdal, 1979 a: 124.

439 *kılıç, baldu, ok ya . . . bar ärkän käd är näŋkä korkmaz käräk* (2055), *kiçig ärkän ögrät ogulka bilig* (1493) and *bo kadgu sakınç birlä ärkän özüm, nägü täg iligkä barır män tüzüm* (4851) are representative.

440 The whole situation is similar to that of the suffix *-(X)gll*, which is attributive and nominal in Uigur, but mostly used as *participium coniunctum* in the inscriptions. The instance in Toñ I S6 uses the form as nominal participle serving as object, first without and then with the accusative suffix. This is natural, as one would use an anaphoric pronoun ('it') in European languages. The fact that *ärkli* is written with K and not G comes from the presence of /r/: Sonants demand the stop and not the spirant allophone of voiced consonants after them. This is why *ärkän* is written with K. *ärkli* is therefore /ärgli/. Schulz considers both '*-kAll*' and '*-kAn*' to be completely isolated suffixes, although he joins them to each other morphologically; this is surely not a more satisfying solution than the one I suggest.

Touen 1,32′) is translated as "la puissance divine des quatre points cardinaux". *k(ā)nnā bügü ug(a)n y(a)rl(ı)g* (HamTouen 5,74) "(votre) propre ordre, sage et tout puissant" appears in a Manichaean text. The QB has *ugan* seven times as one of the epithets of the Muslim God, 'omnipotent'. Several other epithets of God are formed in the QB with the suffix *-gAn*; they come from tr. bases and will be mentioned below.

Otherwise, *-gAn* derivates from intr. bases are rare in Uigur. We have *akan* (< **ak-gan*) *suvlar* (MaitrH XI 11 b21) 'constantly flowing waters'. *udıgan* 'prone to sleep' is one of the depravities of the 'poisonous black snake' in MaitrH III 3 a6. BuddhUig II 474 should probably be read as *kōygän kuyaş* 'burning sun'; '*kūrgän*' as a contraction of '*köyürgän*' seems impossible for this stage of the language. *körgän* from tr. *kör-* 'to see' would, of course, be another possibility. *oraka kuymazkan toşgan bolzun* (Ernte 98) signifies 'may the pit be in the process of getting filled up (already) before one pours (the wheat) into it'. *yorıgan* (Schwitz 32) is discussed below.

From the classical Uigur point of view, *ölgändä* 'when / in / from dying' in ATSS XIV r7 is aberrant. The *-gAn* form here serves as a factive infinitive, as a verbal abstract within the verbal system like *ölmiştä* or *öldüktä* in Uigur. It shows that ATSS XIV belongs to a different dialect. The same can be said of *san+ı+ça* and *kut+ı+ga* in ATSS I, X and XII, discussed in my edition of the Yarkand documents. Although such forms appear also in late Uigur, their occurrence in the texts in Sogdian script does not mean that these texts (still unpublished!) are late; only that their speakers anticipated other (more eastern?) speakers in these features. *siz[i]ŋ b(i)tiginizlär kälti; yügürgäntä bultumuz* (HamTouen 20,11) is another *-gAntA* form in a text with special characteristics: A number of times, it writes /ı/ in final syllables as A, and it has *-dän* for normal *-din*. 'We received your letter while we were on the run' would be a possible translation. *-gAn* forms are otherwise rarely ever used as abstracts; *talgan ig* 'epilepsy' in the DLT is one example.

That *-gAn* is a non-ergative formative can be seen with tr. bases. The following proverb (or nursery rhyme or whatever) appears in HamTouen 17,4-9 and again in 17,1′-6′: *ymä savda bar: togan kuş oglı tokuz bolur. . . . toganı üçün tutgan bolur, kadırı üçün kapgan bolur.* In their context, the last two sentences can be translated as follows: 'Since it is a falcon, it will be a grasper; being grim, it will be a snatcher'. Here, as in IrqB X, we find an animal being qualified by *-gAn* forms, and the literary tone is similar. None of the three forms gives the impression of being lexicalised. Rather, they qualify the animal by a recurrent bit of behaviour. When lexicalised, *kapgan* (from *kap-* 'to grasp, snatch') signifies 'a snare' or 'a trap'. We find it with this meaning in Maitr 51/116/174 v5: *kim ymä torın tuzakın kapganın kuşlayu . . .* This lexeme lives on as *kapan* in Republican Turkish, with

the mentioned meaning and the expected form. There is no doubt that the proper name *Kapgan* attested in Toñ 51 (twice), 60 and 61 has the same form. 'snatcher' seems an appropriate name in a society in which martial qualities were highly prized.[441] *Kapgan* shows that *-gAn* was a non-ergative suffix already in Pre-Old Turkic, i.e. one whose products were agentive even when the base was tr.

kapgan 'snare, trap' is a *-gAn* derivate lexicalised in Uigur into an instrument noun. This happened in other cases as well. *tikän* 'thorn, awl, goad; thornbush' comes from *tik-* 'to erect, plant, stick in, sew etc. over *tik-gän*: I agree in this with one should double the *käf* and say: *tikkän*. . . . The first *käf* is part of the root, the second *käf* is added to form an adjectival." Other *-gAn* forms follow as exs., some of them governing direct or indirect objects. *tikän* is also attested in Höllen 51 and 66, Heilk II 1,5,-SuvDrog 476,1, ÄgFrag (1) B 18 and twice in the QB. *bazgan* 'a blacksmith's hammer' appears in M I 8,10 and $18,6_2$, Maitr 82 v17-18 and the DLT and is discussed in *TMEN* 692. It consistently has /z/ in the reliable sources, whereas the /s/ of *bas-* 'to make a surprise attack, to suppress, press down, impress' is quite beyond doubt in all periods. *bazgan* can be assigned to this formation only if this problem can be solved (the semantic relationship between the two lexemes not being ideal either).[442]

There is no phonological problem about *yargan*, attested in U I 9,18 (Magier) and in ManMon 124 (retranslated in *UW* 197 a top). There is the expansion *yarganlıg* in BT XIII 10,12 in a fragmentary and utterly obscure text. In two further instances in runic Turkic it appears as a title together with proper names. The n. to BT XIII quotes Bang on the lexeme: "*yargan*, bestimmter als *är*, muß also etwa '(niederer?) Beamter, *minister*' u. dgl. bedeuten". Müller writes "Schergen", i.e.

441 K¹P G¹N¹ *can* also be read as '*Kapagan*', as some scholars still do, or as '*Kapgın*'. The former would be an opaque name, as there is no reason to think that there ever was a verb '*kapa-*' in Old Turkic. Such a verb could certainly not be derived from *kap-*, as there are *no* early traces of a formative '*-A-*'. '*Kapgın*' would be morphologically O.K. but not too likely: Since *-gXn* forms ergative nominals of perfective aspect, the name would signify 'snatched away'. Under the heading *-yan/-gän*, Tekin, 1968: 112 par. 9 also mentions '*qoryan* 'fort, fortress, shelter'". This is in fact the instrumental *korı-g+ın*; *korı-g* (discussed above) is the Turkic counterpart of Mo. *qoriyan*, which he mentions.

442 *w̄zKän* ~ *yw̄zKän*, which goes with *yagmur* in five Uigur exs. and probably also in the DLT, is in the *EDPT* 241 connected with *üz-* 'to break (tr.)'. The alternation /y/ ~ Ø in word-initial position goes well with the Khal. forms of *üz-*, which have initial /h/. In all known instances, however, the rain concerned is useful and pleasant, contradicting the translation. S. Tezcan has shown in *AoF* 16 (1989): 193-5 that this meaning is impossible and therefore also the etymology: The lexeme survives to this day and appears to have been a noun and not an adjective, 'a strong and continuous rain'. *yw̄ʂ-* "to pour out (beer) from a tap in a vat" (a hap. in DLT fol. 470; thus with the first hand!) would have been a good source by meaning, but has the wrong sibilant.

'helpers at court or during an execution'; this would certainly suit the ManMon context better than 'judge', but not so the runic instances. What we have of *yargu* 'legal tribunal, decision etc.' appears to be borrowed (back) from Mo., to judge by its distribution and by the other information in the *EDPT* entry devoted to it. *yar-* 'to split, to cleave' is attested in the meaning 'to judge' only from the Codex Comanicus on. As long as this latter meaning is not attested in Old Turkic proper and as long as no certain central meaning can be determined for *yargan*, this, also, remains a difficult case. Its creation evidently antedates the earliest texts; it does seem quite likely that it was formed with non-ergative *-gAn*, though.

The *-gAn* form has verbal government: *kişini tutagan tärKiş bolur* (TT VII 25,6) 'He becomes a quarrelsome person who disparages people'; *bolarnı mat bölsär bolur sansarta turgan / bo bir sözni südiräk boldı baxşıda sorgan* (ETŞ 12,6 and 8) 'If one holds *these* apart, one becomes such a one as stays in *saṃsära*' and 'Such as ask the guru for this one concept have become rare'. In the two ETŞ sentences, the appearance of the *-gAn* forms may have been for the sake of rhyme and metre, but also serves clefting: It is resultative *bol-* which is stressed, not the content of *tur-* and *sor-*. *sansarta turgan bolur* is prospective like *kişini tutagan tärKiş bolur* (TT VII 25,6), *tutgan bolur... kapgan bolur* (HamTouen 17,9 and 6') and *savı y(a)rlıgı yorıgan bolur* (Schwitz 17) 'He becomes one whose words and orders prevail'. In this last ex., however, the subject of *yorı-gan* is not identical with the subject of *bolur*. Particularly important is *kalın kuvragag yetgän* (spelled YYTYK'N) *uduzgan buyruklar* 'the commanders who lead$_2$ the dense crowd', because it appears in MaitrH XVI 9a 28-29 (an early text). In a legal document (AmongUigDocc 3) we have: *atamnıŋ maŋa ülüştä täggän Taysaŋdakı ... borlukta ...* 'In the vineyard in Taysaŋ, which was my share from the inheritance of my father, ...'. Among these exs., *turgan* and *täggän* come from bases which do not govern direct objects. The fact that they refer to their subjects is therefore not surprising in any case.

sorgan, *turgan* and *täggän* govern the *-dA* case, *täggän* also the dative. *kişini tutagan* and *kuvragag ... uduzgan* prove conclusively that the nature of *-gAn* is participial at least in some cases.

Ercilasun, 1984: 171-173 is right in including the form *-gAn* in his grammar of the QB verb, and in calling it a participle. See that for exs. from that text and for details of its use of it. We have already mentioned that the QB uses *ugan* as a divine epithet. Others are *törütgän*, *igidgän*, *käçürgän* and *yaratgan*. Although their bases are tr., these words denote their subject and not their object. In fols. 88-90, 256-262, 293-4 and 582, the DLT has long lists of *-gAn* forms. Had Käšgarī thought their generation to be as free as finite verb forms or what we would call participles, he would presumably not have listed them; the sheer quantity, however, shows that their creation must have been practically unlimited. In all four

passages mentioned, he characterises *-gAn* in terms of Aktionsart (mode of action): He says that it denotes duration, continuity, habituality and/or frequent occurrence of an action. His translations of the exs. read as 'one who frequently, often, always X-es' or 'one who X-es much'. The DLT's *-gAn* forms govern direct and indirect objects quite freely, and themselves always refer to their subjects. In fol. 262, Kāšġarī says that one of the functions of *-gAn* is to form adjectivals with the meaning of the passive participle. The exs. he mentions, however, have the *-(X)l-* forms of verbs as bases, so that they still refer to subjects and not to objects. The only DLT lexeme in *-gAn* which I wish to discuss specifically is TUBR°TA'N *yer* in fol. 257; this is translated as 'soft bare ground from which the dust rises when it is trod'. It appears in a section in which all the lexemes have the second radical vowelled, the third unvowelled. This accords with the spelling, and Dankoff and Kelly transcribe '*topurgan*'. The *EDPT*, however, writes *topragan*, connecting the lexeme with the verb it writes as '*topra-*', which I transcribe as *tupra-*. I discuss it under *tupra-k* above. The derivation from *tupra-* 'to dry up' being evident, one should consider the possibility that **tupragan* was misplaced in the ms. and subsequently miswritten. After all, the chapter itself is mistakenly labelled in the ms. as *fa'lalān* (which would correspond to **tupragan*) instead of the correct *fa'allān*, set in by the editors. This is a mistake of the first hand, as is the wrong vocalisation of *tupra-gan*.

-gAn, then, is a rather obsolescent formative in the earlier part of our corpus, but becomes more and more productive with time. No wonder that it now serves as participle in some dialects.

I have already mentioned *yargan+lıg* above; I know of no other expansions of any *-gAn* forms. This is part of the less-nominal, more-verbal profile of this formative, proven also by the fact that it keeps up verbal government of the object at all stages. Some scholars have postulated Proto-Turkic '*-An*' beside *-gAn*, and given *ävrän* as example. That is in DLT fol. 67 translated as "something built in the shape of a furnace and used for baking" and in the QB (exs. mentioned in the *EDPT*) appears to refer to the 'empyrean'. The QB uses the similarity between *ävrän* and *ävir-* for a play upon words, but no etymological connection is possible.

3.325 *-mAn*

A formation using such a suffix appears to have existed, but exs. which are both early and unproblematic are practically absent.

tuman 'mist, fog' is attested in IrqB XV, BT XIII 18,3, HtPar 30 a19-21 in the n. to TT IX 77, DLT, QB 285, 1981, 5028, 5426 and 5951, the expansion *tumanlıg* in M II 11,10 and Suv 74,18. It can't be derived from *to-* 'to block', which has a different vowel. The BT XIII 18 sentence *tıdıgl(ı)g tuman tonmakı tarıkar* "Das

Bedeckt sein durch den Hindernis-Nebel entfernt sich" is merely alliterative. *TMEN* 935 suggests relating this lexeme with *tumagu* and *tumlı-*; **tum-man* would then be possible as an etymology.

ketmän 'a hoe or mattock' has an /e/ in USp 55,10, HamTbuen 23,15, 17 and 18 and BT III 288 but an /ä/ in the first syllable in Ernte 30. The *EDPT* quotes DLT fol. 223 with /ä/ of the first syllable, but that is an alteration of the second hand: The first hand wrote *I*, i.e. /e/. A suitable verb *ket-* is not attested before the XIVth century (*EDPT*), but *ketmän* may possibly come from *kärt-*: There are a number of exs. for the cluster simplification /rCC/ > /CC/ in Old Turkic. *ket-* can be a back-formation from this and related words, or the result of a par-allel development. *tägirmän* 'a rotary mill' (TT VI 86, Maitr 165 r6 and DLT) is also an instrument noun. It has no living base, but cf. *tägrä* 'around' and *täg-riglä-*.[443] A third instrumental *-mAn* form is *ürt-män* 'a flat upper surface of a building etc.' in the DLT.[444]

The only evident case where a *-mAn* lexeme denotes the subject of a tr. verb. is *sök-män* in the DLT, translated as "an honorific title for warriors, meaning 'he who breaks the [enemy's] battle line'". *sökmän* is also the designation of one of the persons appearing in the Yarkand documents. It is on the strength of this lexeme that *-mAn* has been listed among the non-ergative formatives (and also, of course, because nothing contradicts this classification).

The adjective *yaman* 'bad' (TT VII 29,6 and 22, DLT and later) is apparently related to *yavız* and *yavlak*, being rather close to them in meaning. If so, one can take it[445] to come from **yav-man* and tentatively assign it to this formation. TT VII 29 being a very late text,[446] *yaman* is not attested earlier than the DLT either. Even later *-mAn* forms denoting subjects of intr. bases are Ottoman *şiş-man* 'a fat person', *talaş-man* 'a quarrelsome person, bickerer' in the Codex Comanicus and *köç-män* 'refugee, somebody who has migrated', discussed in *TMEN* 1667.

443 *tägirmi* 'round, circular, circle' clearly also belongs to this base. It appears e.g. in Warnke 336, in the second text in TT VII p. 66, l.3, in TT VII 36,3, BT V 22,495, TT I 57-8, at least twice in the Suv., etc. A suffix *'-mI'* is not really known; should such a suffix have existed, the proper name *İstämi* (> *istä-* 'to seek etc.') would be a candidate for it. Cf. further the verbs *yilmir-* 'to become warm' (DLT) and *tälmir-* 'to look intensely at . . .'; they may be from nominals of the form **yılı-mı* 'lukewarm' and **täl-mi* 'a boring or drilling of a hole'. The second would have a metaphor 'to look as if one's glance could bore a hole through one' underlying it.

444 Fol. 622, translated as *saṭh*. This does not signify just 'roof', as Dankoff and Kelly write, and the rare Middle Turkic and modern instances also indicate a wider meaning.

445 With Tezcan, review of the QB İndeks, p. 72. There are indications that the root came from Iranian in one form or another or, indeed, through more than one channel. The lexemes found in Turkic can, however, very well be related among themselves by folk-etymology if not genuine inner-Turkic derivation.

446 *tägärä* for *tägrä*, *igä* for *i(y)ä*, *aŋa* for *aŋar*, *sugun* for *sıgun* are among its late characteristics.

örmän (TT VI 443, Heilk II 3,10, 12 and 17, BT V 21, 456) 'tumour or other skin disease; somebody afflicted with this' may *possibly* come from *ör-* 'to rise'.

sık-man "grape pressing season" in DLT fol. 223 denotes the time of action. *yulı-man* in DLT fol. 460, finally, is the only action noun of this formation. It has been interpreted correctly by Dankoff and Kelly, but not by the *EDPT*, which follows the second hand for the first vowel of the lexeme. No doubt connecting it with *yulı-* 'to pillage', the editors translate *yulıman* as "a devastating raid". The other interpretation would have been morphologically impossible.

kömän 'wizardry, conjuration, conjured' may possibly belong to this formation, if it can be derived from the base of *kör-* 'to see'; cf. *köz* 'eye'. The *EDPT* calls it a hap.leg., but the *DTS* has another ex., and further ones appear in Suv-Drog 475,8, BT I D(71) and (140), BT II 886 etc. Most of these use *kömän* together with *yelvi*. Suv 605,12 should probably be read as *kümä+n aş* 'food in heaps' and does not belong to this lexeme.

Expansions of *-mAn* forms are few. *tuman+lıg* has already been mentioned; the DLT has a verb *sökmän+län-*.

3.326 *-mXr*

This suffix is appendable both to intr. and to tr. verbs; *-mXr* nominals appear to refer exclusively to actual or potential agents, or to their characteristic quality.

The base of the most common *-mXr* lexeme, *almır*, is tr. *al-* 'to take'; *almır* does not refer to what is taken but to the nature of the habitual taker, i.e. 'greed'. This lexeme appears thrice in BuddhKat; in 8 as 'A((S)) 'A.LYIM.MIR GO.ŃOL, in 13 as 'AS 'AL.MIR GOŃ.ŃOL and in 38 as 'AS 'A.LIM.MIR GO.ŃOL. All three, that is, are instances of the phrase *az almır kõŋül*, found elsewhere as well. Two of these are to be read as *alımır* and not *almır*. This goes well with the fact that the base was originally **alı-* and not *al-*: The additional vowel was retained in *alı-k* and in the aorist *alır*.[447]

yagmur 'rain' is the subject of *yag-* 'to rain'. Exs. of *yagmur* not mentioned in the *EDPT* can be found in Maitr 82 v9, U III 13,6$_1$, ShōAgon 1,129 and Suv 397,18-19. The /u/ in the second syllable is presumably due to the /m/ in conjunction with the /g/ before it. *tamır* 'vein, artery' (q.v. in the *EDPT*) has a secondary form *tamur* in the DLT and the QB. *tamır* should come from **tam-mır* and be related to *tomur-* < *tamur-*, *tamız-* etc., qq.v. below. *tam-* 'to drip' is first attested

447 See Erdal, 1979 a: 113 for additional arguments.

in the DLT and the QB; it is used both with the liquid and the source of the dripping as subject.[448]

yumur (DLT ff.) signifies 'the bowels or caecum of an animal', but the DLT's *yumur* (DLT ff.) signifies 'the bowels or caecum of an animal', but the DLT's *yumur+la-* 'to gather, to round up herds' and *yumurlan-* 'of an army, to assemble' must be closer to the central meaning. *yumur* apparently comes from **yum-mur* and is related to *yumgak* and to other lexemes mentioned on p. 322 in connection with this; **yum-* must be intransitive.

kömür 'coal' probably comes from *kön-* 'to burn (intr.)', with assimilation of the nasals and the usual simplification of double /m/. *kömür* 'coal mountain' in ŞU N8 and Tariat E 7 is not mentioned in the *EDPT*; it shows that the original meaning is not limited to 'charcoal', as Clauson thinks. A further ex. occurs in ManTürkGed 9. *UW* 237 a still writes a derivate from the base as '*küyür-*' with '*ü*' in the first syllable, but Osm. *göyün-*, Khal. *köːn-*, *kiːen-* etc. speak for /ö/.

tamır and *yumur* could also be thought to belong to a formation with a suffix '*-Xr*', if such a suffix could be shown to have existed. Another candidate for such a formation would be *kısır* 'barren, sterile (of women and female animals)' (DLT ff.), unless this was borrowed over Persian from a derivate of the Arabic root *qṣr*.[449] Further, *üŋür* 'cave' (TT III 91, UigTot 106, Ht V 2 b 5 and 4 a 3, ÄgFrag (1) D 5, DLT and several times in the QB) *may* come from *üŋ-* 'to dig a hole, to hollow out', attested in the DLT, the Codex Comanicus, etc.[450] Twice attested *bwKur* cannot be connected with *bog-* 'to constrict, strangle': Neither in *kişi ärtiŋü bwKur kõp yigi ärdi* 'The people were exceedingly stuffed and numerous and tight' (Ht IV 247), even less in *bwKur bodunlug . . . Uygur elimiz* (BT XIII 39,14). For the possibility of assigning *üŋür* to a mysterious formation in *-gUr* cf. Räsänen, 1957: 130 and Brockelmann, 1954: 115. *-gUr* is not a living suffix in Old Turkic. Nor, evidently, is '*-Xr*'. *tamır* and *yumur* are therefore best left with *-mXr*.

Derivates from *-mXr* lexemes are, beside *yumur+la-* mentioned above, *yagmur+la-* in ms. HtPek 74 b 7-9, *tamırlıg* (UigTot 460) and *kömürlüg . . . tamu* (BT II 468).

448 *tamar*, the Oguz variant, can have come up by analogy with the aorist form. A further cognate is *tamga*.

449 *kısır* might be a subject noun from an *íntr. kıs-*, whose existence was speculated upon in connection with *kıs-ga* above. Cf. that, the verb *kıs-ur-* and the DLT's *kısmak*.

450 '*üŋürsür*', read in TT I 218, could be an error for *ürgür-* (variant of *ergür-*, q.v. in section 7.54 below). See *öŋ-ür-* in section 7.51 for another possibility.

3.327 *-gAk*

This quite lively suffix has three distinct tasks: It forms agent nominals, instrument nouns and names of ailments. The latter two are circumscribed semantically, which the first can hardly be said to be. The first and the third task are usually connected with reference to humans. As the instrument formatives *-gUk* and *gUç* possibly come from *-gU*, *-gAk* may come from the mostly agent-forming suffix *-gA*. This would explain the double appearance of *-gAk* nominals as denoting agents or instruments. AGENT and INSTRUMENT are conflated in many languages, the *differentia specifica* 'animateness' getting deduced from the context.

or-gak 'sickle' is attested in Ernte 57, M III 13,6_2 (text 6), Ernte II 18 and 19, BT XIII 5,142, Maitr 82 v 16, 83 v 10 and 201 v 8 and in the DLT. *il-gāk*, 'a hook' by etymology, refers to a fighting implement in Maitr 84 r 12; it is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. We find *sus-gak* 'ladle, scoop' in BT VII A 332 and the DLT.[451] *çamgak*, attested in BT XIII 5,77 and in quite a number of additional Uigur exs. quoted and discussed in the n. thereto, clearly denoted a 'big cooking-pot'. Zieme connects it with *çom-* 'to submerge', and may be right: The original base would then be **çam-*, rounded by the /m/ under certain circumstances. A third kitchen utensil in *-gAk* is *ugak* 'mortar' in LautHöllen 133: *tärin̨ ulug ugakta uvşatu sokarlar* 'They crumble and crush them in a deep and big mortar'. This no doubt comes from *uv-* 'to crush, crumble', which often has the form *u°* before suffixes starting with consonants.[452]

In the DLT we have *yap-gak* "a kind of snare for hunting birds", presumably from *yap-* 'to cover': Cf. the sentence *ār tor yaptı*, which Kāšġarī gives as one of the exs. for the use of the verb *yap-*, and translates 'The man threw down the net over the birds'. The DLT is also our early source for *targak* 'comb' from *tara-*; also for *kürgäk* 'oar; shovel' from the base four times written in that text as *küri-* using a *mater lectionis* in the second syllable.[453] Cf. *yulgak* below concerning the loss of the final vowel of the verb before *-gAk*. *tügäk* "a wooden ring at the end of a cord

451 *sus-* is attested in Maitr 72 r 11, among other places.

452 The word is wrongly spelled as 'WQ'QT' in the ms., with misplaced dots. The editor transcribes it as '*okak*' but translates correctly.

453 *küri-* lived on in Ottoman *kürü-* (quoted in the *EDPT*), while *kürā-* '(of a mare) to be on heat' (also quoted under *küri-* in the *EDPT*) belongs to *kür+ä-*. What is spelled as *kürp kaẓıp* in BT III 226 should be completed to *kür(i)p* and not to '*kür(ä)p*'. The derivates of *küri-* appear in the DLT as *kürät-* and *kürāş-*. Dankoff and Kelly emend the first to *kürit-* in their transcriptions, but leave *kürāş-* unchanged. This inconsistency is probably due to their confusion of **küri-ş-* with *kürā-ş-* 'to contend, come to grips with'. Discussing *kürā-ş-* among the *-(X)ş-* verbs below, we note that there are other vowel errors as well in DLT fol. 318. Another explanation for the DLT's *kürät-* and *kürāş-* < *küri-* is also possible: *kürā-* 'to shovel' of the modern Turkic languages is probably a

with which loads are fastened" no doubt comes from *tūg-gāk*. *tol-Kak* is a variant of *tolkok*, q.v. in section 3.22.

Prof. Doerfer (personal communication) suggests deriving *tamgak* 'palate' from *tam-* 'to drip' and reminds me of Tkm. *dam-* : *damaq* (both same meaning as in Old Turkic, both with short vowel in the first syllable). Exs. of *tamgak* not mentioned in the dictionaries appear in BT VII A 59, BT VIII A 351 and 353 and UigTot 45 and 1020. Connecting *tamgak* with *tām* 'wall' via the formative of section 2.34 is made difficult by the long vowel of *tām*.

yumgak 'lump, lumpy or globular object' has no attested base, but very many lexemes are evidence that an intr. **yum-* must once have existed: See *yumgı* in section 3.410. It probably signified 'to grow into a lump, or some other form of conglomerate'. *yumgak* is quite common, being found in Magier 7, BT II 396, Heilk I 162, Heilk II 3,10, 196 and 198, Maitr 67 r9, 74 v18, 21 and 31 añd 85 r1, SP 22, BT VII A 327, UigTot 433 and DLT, all the way to Kipchak and Ottoman *yumak*. It is used both nominally and adnominally.

yapırgak 'leaf' was possibly formed within this formation; exs. appear in the *EDPT* and in UigKan 130, 150 and 235, BuddhKat 26 (ZU.GŪD YAB.PAḪR.-GĀG.KE = *sōgūt yapırgakı*) and so forth. In ManUigFr r 7 and Suv 601,22 ff. this lexeme appears as *yalp(ı)rgak*. A verb '*yalpır-*' is not known to me, but several other verbs of similar shape signifying 'to flutter' are mentioned in the section dealing with the formative *+(A)r-*. Both *yumgak* and *yapırgak* should denote the subjects of their hypothetical bases.

Some other nouns in *-gAk* are agent nominals in a much more limited sense; e.g. the following Qarakhanid military terms: *tut-gak* (DLT) is "a mounted detachment that goes out at night to capture the enemy's patrols and reconnoiterers". It also appears in QB 2343, 1067 etc. (seven times in all).[454] *yatgak* is in the DLT and in QB 608, 952, 1606 and 2533 'a guard or sentry by night', *turgak* (QB 608 and 2536) a 'sentry during daytime'. Rabġūzī's *kaçkak* 'fugitive' is in the same semantic domain. *turgak* is attested already in an early Uigur inscription: *k(a)n(ı)ma turg(a)k b(a)şı* K^{1}G^{1}S *(A)t(a)çuk*[455] *b(ä)g* ZK^{2}R^{2} *Çigşi Bıla B(a)ga t(a)rk(a)n üç yüz turg(a)k turdı* (Tariat N2) 'There was the lord K^{1}G^{1}S *(A)t(a)çuk*, commander of the day sentries, the district magistrate ZK^{2}R^{2}, the *tarkan Bıla Baga* and three hundred day sentries waiting on my king'. *turgak* is translated as "watching posts" by T. Tekin,[456] but there is good Uigur evidence as

back-formation from *kūrāk* < *kürgāk*. This **kūrāk* may also be the source of the DLT's 2 *kürāş-* and 2 *kürāt-*: *°CgAk* > *° CAk* is solidly attested in Qarakhanid Turkic.

454 The Uigur instance mentioned in the *EDPT* entry should be read as *tolgag*, discussed among the *-(X)g* lexemes.

455 There are other possible readings for this name, e.g. *atçuk*.

456 Tekin is misled by his unjustified assumption that *turdı* can, in runic sources, be read as '*turutdı*'.

well for the meaning given above: *künlük turgak* in Maitr 128 r12, *iki turgak äränlär* in ShōAv 102, 103 etc., *okçı turgaklar* in InscrOuig I 17 and *otaçılar turgak turzun* in ManMon 123. This last is in GeistDrog translated as "Die Ärzte sollen ständigen Aufenthalt nehmen!". *üküş tälim yatgak turgak äränlär* (Warnke 32) reminds us of QB 608: *künün turdı turgak tünün yatgakın* "keeping vigil day and night". *udgakı urılar* (MaitrGeng 11 b6) is 'the youngsters in his retinue'; *udgak* is the converse of *uduzgak* (q.v. below).

iç-gäk is always used together with *yäk*; also in the Chuast, a non-Buddhist text. *yäk* corresponds to *yakşa* (and comes from Präkrit *yakkha*) while *içgäk* corresponds to *bhūta*; the two together commonly refer to 'demon'. *yäk* does not come from *ye-* 'to eat' as it is not written *yeK* (q.v. in section 3.101). The derivation of *içgäk* from *iç-* must, however, be based on this popular etymology.[457] *äş-gäk* 'donkey' is well attested in Manichaean and Buddhist sources and in the DLT. It cannot be a denominal derivate from *eş* 'companion', which has a different vowel; besides, *+GAk* forms names for parts of the body. Khal. has *äşgä* instead of *äşgäk* and Prof. Doerfer (personal communication) considers it a *-gA* derivate from the same base: *äş-* 'to amble'. *yu-gak*, some water bird, is mentioned in the DLT and appears in the QB; see the *EDPT* for it.

Except for these few items, agentive *-gAk* remains in the human domain. *käv-gäk* (Warnke 550), *käfgäk* in the DLT, is a 'stammerer'; cf. *är sözüg kävdi* "The man stammered" in DLT fol. 272. Käšgarī may or may not be right in taking the source of this to be *käv-* 'to chew without swallowing'; the relationship may be the reverse. *yarsıgak bramın* (TT VIII D27) is not an "ekelerregender Brahmane", as translated, but a 'disgusted' or a 'squeamish' one: The Skt. source is translated as "ein mürrischer Brahmane", and *-gAk* lexemes never denote objects of their bases. *uduz-gak* 'leader' is attested in BT VIII B216, ETŞ 10,150 and the ms. T I D [TM 269] (Mz 293); note the causative base. *bas-gak* corresponds to the Mo. title *daruga*; it is used in a binomial with it in ShōAv 319.[458] In the Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab (N. Yüce) it still has the general meaning 'leader'. *saçgak kişi* 'a person who throws about his money' (DLT) is the opposite of *kızgak* 'stingy', formed with *-(O)k*.[459] *ö-gäk* 'mindful' is a hapax in M I 15,2 (TeilBuch); the *EDPT* confuses it with *ög-ük*, an *-(O)k* lexeme qualifying the object of *ög-*. In the DLT we

turgak başı is a military title like *sū başı* and *bıŋa başı*, where the first element is a unit of soldiers. A verb '*tur-ut-*' does not exist in Old Turkic; the normal causative of *tur-* is *tur-gur-*, discussed below. *-gAk* does not form any *nomina loci*. Runic Turkic *has* a lexeme signifying 'watch-tower', discussed in the *EDPT* under *kargu*.

457 I have not been able to find out, at any rate, that *bhūtas* have vampiric desires.

458 See *TMEN* 691 for the reason for connecting *baskak* with *bas-* and cf. I. Vásáry, 'The origin of the institution of *basqaqs*', *AOH* 32/2 (1978): 201-6. Cf. also *bas-ıg* above.

459 The *EDPT* entry for *saçgak* also mentions Middle Turkic and modern evidence for *saçak* 'fringe,

have nāz-gāk "a man who shies away from a task" and *yapuş-gak* "a plant having hairy thorns the size of hazelnuts which catch on the tails of horses, or other" and "a man who sticks to an affair", both hapax legomena like *yarsıgak* and *ögāk*. *suç-gak* is, according to the DLT, "somebody who moves his bowels frequently". Kâšgarî thinks that this lexeme should have ended with *-gAn* and not with *-gAk*, as it is *-gAn* that denotes habitual action. In fact, however, *sıçgak* is one of a group of lexemes with this suffix which are related to ailments. Similar in content is *kusgak bolur* 'He will be one who has the tendency to vomit' in TT VII 25,5. If the completion *kusg[akka] ām* (Heilk II 1,109) is correct, this could be either 'a medicine against vomiting' (which is an abstract) or 'a medicine for somebody who suffers from chronic nausea'. Other exs. appear *ibid.* 114, 122 and 130. *kan ötgāk* (Heilk I 83) is 'diarrhoea with blood', *bāzgāk* (Heilk I 102 and Heilk II 1,74 and 76, DLT, Middle Turkic etc.) 'cold fever'.[460] *tın buşgakka içürsār* (Heilk I 60) can be translated as 'if one administers it to an asthmatic person, . . .'. In *tın buşgakka ām* (*ibid.* 162), *buşgak* could denote either the illness or the patient; in . . . *içürsār, tın buşgak ötūr, ig ketār* (ibid. 164), however, *tın buşgak* must be 'asthma'. *buş-* signifies both 'to be annoyed, vexed' and, particularly with *tın* 'breath' as subject, 'to suffer from a short breath' (e.g. in Warnke 491): See *buş-ur-* for more details. The *EDPT* wrongly connects the instances of *tın buşgak* with *buz-* 'to destroy, demolish'. *buşak* 'an annoyed person' is said in DLT fols. 88 and 190 to be Oguz. This is, of course, the expected Oguz form of *buş-gak*, in this case connected with the other meaning of *buş-* (and *buş-ur-*). *topolgak* 'colic', finally, appears in the DLT and comes from *topol-* 'to pierce, go right through'. A homophone of this is 2 *topolgak* 'cyperus (a plant)', found both in Uigur and the DLT. The first vowel of 2 *topolgak* is documented in the Codex Comanicus and in Republican Turkish and can be deduced from the second vowel in [*to*]*polgak* (ms. Mz 202 r1 quoted in the commentary to SuvDrog 476,3); the vowels of *tupulgak* in TT VIII M29 are unexplained.[461] The other Uigur instances quoted in the *EDPT* under *tupulgak* also belong to 'cyperus'. While the etymology of 1 *topolgak* from *topol-* 'to pierce, go right through' seems pretty clear, the origin of 2 *topolgak* remains abscure. *topol-* appears as *toyol-* in Mo., *tobul-* in Yak., *tōpūl-* in Chal. *Cf. topl-un-* below.

One *-gAk* form appears to serve as abstract without denoting an illness: *tōrōsüzin sanik v(t)rxar sanlıg 'ārin atın kızın kırkının işkā küçkā irtkā bertkā ıdtımız yumşadımız, tarıdımız estimiz, tokıdımız toŋladımız, adın kişi ornınta yulKak iş*

tuft, tassel etc.'. That, however, is probably to be analysed as *saç+ak*, from *saç* 'hair', and not related to *saç-*. The use of *+gAk* (section 2.34) does not accord with what *kızgak* signifies, either.

460 Opposed to *ısıma* 'hot fever'.

461 TT VIII M29 should be completed as follows: *bışıg sıŋar patpadi tupulgak ka*[*tıp*] *kayınturup içsār* . . . 'if one adds half a ripe pepper and cyperus, boils it and drinks it, . . .'.

küç işlätdimiz (Maitr 62 v14). *yulgak* comes from *yulı-* 'to pillage' or from *yulk-* "to get some use or profit from" (a secondary meaning of "to scrape something off from"; DLT). In the first case, the stem-final vowel would be syncopated as in *targak* < *tara-*; in the second case one should read *yulkak*, from **yulk-gak*. An assimilation of velars appears, perhaps, also in *sukak* 'male gazelle' (DLT ff.), if this comes from *suk-* 'to thrust (with the horns)'. **suk-gak* would also be an agent noun.

-gAk forms denoting objects are quite rare and late. *tūrgāk* 'bundle' and *yātgāk* 'pouch' have a similar meaning, and both appear in the DLT; *yātgāk* is found also in another, very late text, FamArch 4 and 18. The first comes from *tür-* 'to draw (tr.) together by crumpling'; the latter from a verb *yed-* 'to stitch or sew up a pouch after goods are packed up in it' attested only in the DLT. *yātgāk* appears thrice, the first syllable having vowels both in DLT fol. 632 and in FamArch. The first vowel of *yed-* appears thrice as well and is thus certain enough, but may be due to the influence of the /y/: It is not marked in any way in the derivates *yādil-* (fol. 477) and *yādiş-* (fol. 474). *yādtūr-* (fol. 483) has, on the contrary, a *fatḥa* in the first syllable.[462] *buçgak* 'segment' (discussed in the *EDPT*) presumably comes from *bıç-* with vowel rounding due to the /b/. It must have been good Uigur, for we have *buluŋsuz buçgaksız* in TT VI 427. Similar oblique evidence obtains for *tūrgāk*: *tūrgāk+lān-* in Warnke 26 (and the DLT).

The agent nominal *ev-āk* 'somebody who hurries' is mentioned in the DLT and not said to be Oguz. It is actually attested four times in the QB, and *evāk-+lik* seven additional times in that text. The fact is that, in the sequence °C*gAk*, the /g/ falls off not only in Oguz; the most conspicuous ex. is *kārāk* from *kārgāk*.[463]

Attested derivates from *-gAk* forms are not too numerous. A few have just been mentioned. *yumgak+la-*(*n-*) is discussed below. *yumgaklıg* (BT II 202) and *yalpırgaklıg* (BT VII A315 and B38) could be added, in case the bases really belong to this formation. *aygakla-* 'to denounce' of the Codex Comanicus may

462 Ottoman *yedek*, also discussed in *TMEN* 1831, is a different lexeme: It comes from *yet-* 'to lead'. Original /d/ would have become /y/ in Ottoman Turkic.

463 *kārāk* is attested also in Uigur, e.g. in BuddhKat 37, eight times in TT VIII I, in TT VIII M18 and in TT VII 28,54. The fact that the exs. of this variant are more numerous in Brāhmī and Tibetan script than in Uigur indicates that there was a traditional orthography in the latter system of writing. Note that the base is *kārgā-* with °g° in the DLT, but the derivate *kārāk*. The QB has *kārāk* hundreds of times, and not a single *kārgāk*. Another ex. for the phenomenon is the QB's *karakçı* 'brigand' and the DLT's *karakla-* 'to pillage', both attested also in later texts. These are clearly not derived from *karak* 'eyeball', *may*, however, come from an *-(O)k* derivate of *karga-* 'to curse'. This **karga-k* would then denote 'something accursed'. *kuç-ak*, 'an armful' in the DLT, 'bosom' in later texts, may possibly also come from **kuç-gak*; in case this is correct, the DLT hapax *kuçam* could be an analogical creation following *kuçak*.

have been borrowed back from Mo.: It is already found in the Secret History. *aygak* is not attested in Old Turkic either; cf. *TMEN* 649 for all this.

3.329 *-mAksXz*

There are more instances of this suffix as added to derived verbs than as appended to simple ones. Deverbal bases of *-mAksXz* can be passive, causative, reflexive or reciprocal verbs; as a corollary, the form refers only to the agent of its base verb and never to its object or to any other oblique participant. Oblique reference is thus always explicit, never implicit as with an other verbal *+sXz* form, *-(X)nçsXz*. *-mAksXz* could indeed be considered a negative participle like *-mAz*, while *-mAksXzXn* corresponds to a negative gerund like *-mAtIn*. Note that *-(X)gçI*, an other verbal nominal referring *solely* to the agent and formed with a composite suffix, cannot be negated. For some reason, non-predicative *-mAz* and *-mAçI*, the negative counterpart of the imperfective participle *-dAçI*, appear to be rather rare in Old Turkic; other verbal nominals referring to the present, e.g. *-(X)glI* and *-(X)gmA*, cannot be negated at all. The description of all those belongs to morphology and not to formation. *-mAksXz is* discussed here, because at least some of the exs. of this form appear to have lexicalised.

Whereas verbal nominals like the ones formed with *-(X)nç*, *-(X)g*, *-(O)k* and so forth cannot be negated verbally, *-mAk* can be negated at least in later Old Turkic as *-mAmAk*. While *-mAksXz* is an agent nominal, *-mAk* and *-mAmAk* are action nouns. The second part of *-mAksXz* does not replace the verbal negation *-mA-*, then, but is privative.

As distinct from *-(X)nçsXz*, *-mAksXz* has free government like a finite verb form or a nominal one belonging to the verbal system. *ädläriŋä tavarlarıŋa ilinmäksiz yapşınmaksız bol-* (Suv 218,24) and *nägükä azlanmaksız yapşınmaksız bolzunlar* (BT II 1362-3) 'May they not covet$_2$ anything' have the same government as *kişiniŋ ädgüsiŋä azlanmamak künilämämäk* (Suv 220,4) 'not to covet or be jealous of the well-being of people'. In *kop kamag tınlıgların ämgätmäksiz sakınç* (Maitr 59 v15 = BT IX 164,15), the noun phrase *kop kamag tınlıglar* is object of the verb *ämgät-*. Thus also *bok* (thus probably instead of *bag*) *kusu*K *tigli kir yolatmaksız . . . lokaḍaṭunuŋ başçı edisi* (ETŞ 10,202) '. . . who does not introduce excrement(?), vomit, tears or dirt'. In U II 40,103, the verbs govern the *ablativus separationis*: *burxan kutından yanmaksız ävrilmäksiz ärür. ävrilmäksiz* is a hapax, presumably created through parallelism with *yanmaksız*. The normal negative subject nominal derived from *ävr-il-* is *ävrilinçsiz*, q.v. above. In *Raxu üzä apıtılmaksız ay t(ä)ŋri* (ETŞ 10,90) 'the moon which does not get hidden by Rāhu', the passive base of the *-mAksXz* form is accompanied by an *üzä* phrase referring to its agent. This form is also a hapax. *agmaksız* governs the ablative in

the following instance, to be added to the *UW* entry: *adiçit köŋültin agmaksız, burxan kutıntın ävrilinçsiz yanıgsız bolayın* (BuyKäl 40) "Ich möchte . . . vom Ädicitta-Sinn nicht abweichen und von der Buddhaschaft nicht wieder umkehren". The second part of the last sentence is practically identical with the U II 40,103 ex. just quoted, the verbal nominals here being *-(X)nçsXz . . . -(X)gsXz* instead of twice *-mAksXz*; this comes to show that the functional difference between the forms cannot have been very great where intr. bases are concerned. *alkınmaksız tükämäksiz ençgü mäŋi* (Suv 160,9) 'endless$_2$ calmness and joy' is not mentioned in the *UW* entry for *alkınmaksız*. In *köŋülsüz dyanta korkunmaksız çökmäksiz bolsar. . .* (ShōAgon 1,7), the two *-mAksXz* forms are accompanied by the two Chin. expressions which they translate: Each of these consists of just a negated verbal lexeme. This is basically what the suffix sequence *-mAk+sXz* is.

-mAksXz forms often appear in such parallel couples, as *katılışmaksız bulgaşmaksız* (BT II 1263-4), *tokıtmaksız turkıglanmaksız* (BT II 881-2), *öçmäksiz üzülmäksiz* (Suv 67,10), *buzulmaksız çulmaksız* (Suv 616,4), *aklamaksız amramaksız* (BT VII A 342-3), *adkanmaksız yapşınmaksız* (Suv 387,20), *yanmaksız agmaksız* (BuyKäl 46), *ürkmäks(i)z korkmaksız yalŋuklar* (MaitrH X5 a20-21), *esilmäksiz koramaksız* (Suv 56,3-4), *artamaksız*[464] *buzulmaksız* (U II 80,62 and Suv 55,21), *kılmaksız yorımaksız* (Suv 286, 20), *bulganmaksız tälgänmäksiz* (MaitrH Y b1; should be read also in Maitr 2 r30), *tınmaksızın sönmäksizin* (BT II 389) 'without resting and incessantly', *yermäksizin yalkmaksızın* (Suv 235,10), *alkınmaksız esilmäksiz* (Suv 338,24), *alkınmaksız ägsümäksiz* (Suv 338,5) and so forth.

Not only parallelism can influence the choice between *-mAksXz* and *-(X)nçsXz* with intr. bases.[465] E.g.: The normal negative subject nominal from *ilin-* is *ilinçsiz* (BT II 638, six times in BuddhUig I 323-333, Suv 253,13, 377,12, 451,11 and 655,1). When, however, the verbal nominal is to govern some noun, *ilinmäksiz* is used: *b(ä)lgükä ilinmäksiz . . . bilgä bilig* "Wissen, das nicht an den Merkmalen haftet" (*UW* 56 b quoting Suv). When there are no constraints of parallelism, government or metre, one will usually employ an existing *-(X)nçsXz* lexeme rather than create *ad hoc* a *-mAksXz* form.

Further forms are *kogşamaksız KATIGLANMAKlıg sada bira urudita BODISATV* (BuddhUig II 339), *turkaru tınmaksız bodis(a)tv* (SuvMüll 17), *tür-*

464 The *UW* s.v. quotes in context and translates these two instances of *artamaksız* and three additional ones. *artamaksız bäk yarp kertgünçlüg* (BT XIII 38,10) should be added to that entry under b).

465 *-(X)nçsXz* is an ergative formative: If the base is tr., *-(X)nçsXz* forms denote the object and not the subject, as *-mAksXz* forms would. If the kernel is the object of the tr. verb base and one nevertheless intended to use the *-mAksXz* form, one could transform the verb into an *-(X)l-* passive.

çimäksiz (BT XIII 13,128), *yanmaksız KÖNGÜLüŋüz* (BuddhUig II 264), *tay-anmaksız bol-* (ShōAgon 1,70), *yazmaksız* (ETŞ 12,3), *yermäksiz köŋülin* (TT X 488), *bulgalmaksız* (BT II 719), *buzulmaksız täŋri yeri . . . çulmaksız täŋri yeri* (Suv 143,16-17), *ämgätmäksiz* (Ht IV 580, KudGojūni B 10 and Maitr 59 v 15), *ärinmäksiz* (Ht IV 664 and ETŞ 14,27) and its synonym *ärmägürmäksiz* (BT VIII B 271 and BT XIII 38,16), *kurılmaksız* (ETŞ 13,72 and BuddhUig II 185), *sugul-maksız* (Ernte 22), *tägşilmäksiz* (BuddhUig I 23), *utsukmaksız* (U II 50, title of text, 51,6 and 58,3$_1$, corresponding to Skt. *aparājita*), *utuzmaksız* (TT X 286), *yayılmaksız* (Suv 616,1 and BT XIII 33,6[466]), *yintsikmäksiz* (ETŞ 9,62), *yokaylan-maksız* (unattested as verb, BT II 660), *yuklunmaksız* (U II 37,59 and ETŞ 10,202 and 274 and 15,6), *twgmaksız* (BT I B(59) and D(161), BuddhUig II 40, ETŞ 10,173, Suv 230,14, UigKan 65, Neujahr 42), *ölmäksiz* (BT XIII 28,4, undam-aged in ms. B) and so forth.

A few gerund equivalents in *-mAksXzXn* have already been quoted above. Here are some additional exs. of this form, attested to this day in this function: *tınmaksızın tägzinür* (Suv 367,19); *yanmaksızın tanuklap ençgü mäŋi tapgay siz* (Suv 618,8); *ilinmäksizin dyan olurguluk ol* (ETŞ 8,15); *öçär öçmäksizin, tugar tugmaksızın* (BT I D (160)); *beş adkangug üzüksüz kanmaksızın amrayur* (Suv 365,2, wrongly quoted in *UW* 266 a as '361'). The following ex. is interesting; a biverb receives the *+(X)n* suffix in common, showing that *-mAksXzXn* was not yet quite a composite gerundial suffix completely equivalent to *-mAtIn*: *bo sävä taplayu boşı berdäçi kişi umug ınag bolur irinç çıgay ägsüklüg kärgäkliglärkä azlanmaksız äsirgänmäksizin* (ShōAgon 3, p. 207,9-10) 'This person who gives alms lovingly and with pleasure becomes an object of hope$_2$ for the poor$_2$ and needy$_2$, greedlessly and ungrudgingly'.

-mAksXz forms denote subjects and not objects even when the base verbs are tr.; we have seen enough exs. for this above. I have met one single exception to this conspicuous bit of behaviour: *kök kalık bölmäksiz üçün bilgä bilig pramıt ymä bölmäksiz ärür* (BuddhUig II 607-8); as the context makes clear, *bölmäksiz* here signifies 'undivided'. This is similar in content to the following (BuddhUig I 134): *ançulayu ymä KÖNGÜL tegli kertü töznüŋ bölülmäki yok ärip . . .* . Perhaps **bölülmäksiz* was simplified through haplology.[467]

-mAksXz forms appear to be *ad hoc* creations: Most of the ones we have turn up only once, and only exceedingly few are attested more than thrice. A *-mAksXz*

466 The ed. read *yaylamaksız* but, because of the context, gives the translation "unerschütterlichen Sinnes"; both this and the Suv instance qualify *köŋül* 'state of mind'. The scribe inadvertently placed the *l*-hook under the letter preceding the correct one. Zieme implausibly connects this with *yayla-* "einen Sommersitz beziehen". Even better in the given context may be *yavalmaksız*, suggested by G. Kara (*OLZ* 84 (1989): 355).

467 See *böl-ün-* below for exs. of *böl-* and for cognates.

form seems usually not to have been created if an -(*X*)*nçsXz* form equivalent in meaning and behaviour was available. This can only be the case, we said, if the verb is intr.; then, the -(*X*)*nçsXz* form can denote its subject, which it will not do if the base is tr. Even if the base verb is intr., however, -(*X*)*nçsXz* can nevertheless get an *indirect* object as target: *yanınçsız* [*a*]*jun* (TT III 116), for instance, is not 'the existence which does not go back', but 'the existence *from which* there is no going back'. To denote the agent, a *-mAksXz* form was created from this base; in BuddhUig II 264 it qualifies, in U II 40,103 it refers to 'whoever or whatever does not go back'. There are some exceptional doubles, however: Both *agmaksız* (twice in the *UW*; two further exs. quoted above) and *agınçsız*, e.g., come from the transferred use of the *UW*'s *ag-* (I), mentioned there in par. 2.[468] While, in ETŞ 10,262, *agınçsız* is used in a binomial with *kın-ıglıg*, *agmaksız* in BT III 902 is used in a binomial with *kın-ımlıg*.[469] *burxan kutıŋa agmaksız bolurlar* (Suv 190,18) is quite similar to *burxan kutıŋa agınçsız āvrilinçsiz bolurlar* (*ibid.* 336,22) and *burxan kutıŋa y(a)rp katıg agınçsız bolup ...* (*ibid.* 393,12). Nor does there appear to be much difference between *alkınçsız* and *alkınmaksız*, documented in the *UW*. As long as *amragsız* (*UW* s.v. *amraksız*) and *amramaksız*, *yuklunçsuz* and *yuklunmaksız* are hapax legomena, nothing can be said about what distinguishes them. The cases of *āvrilinçsiz* and the hapax *āvrilmäksiz*, of *ilinçsiz* with *ilinmäksiz*, have already been mentioned. *t(ā)ŋridäm öŋkä ymä täprämäksiz közüŋüz ol* (BT XIII 19,12) is translated "Ihr habt auch vor der göttlichen Schönheit unerschütterliche Augen". The hapax *täprämäksiz* has been created in spite of the existence of *täprānçsiz*, of which we have about 20 instances. In *ögdikä täprānçsiz* (WarnkeFragm 90) we even find it governing the same dative of cause as in the BT XIII sentence we just quoted: The difference may lie in the fact that the latter is the proper name of the Buddha in Skt. called *Akṣobhyavarṇa*, for which the writer needs a purely nominal form; the sentence in BT XIII, on the other hand, is verbal, transformed into a nominal one for the sake of the topic – comment structure with special focus on *täŋridäm* (indicated also by the presence of *ymä*).

-mAksXz forms can occasionally also be synonymous with other negated verbal nominals. In *şaşmaksız köŋülin yükünür biz* (BT XIII 12,38) vs. *saşımsız köŋül öriţip ...* (BT XIII 60,1), e.g., the respective first words certainly have the same meaning. Note, by the way, the *ş*° in the first instance and the *s*° in the second, in each case supported by the alliterative pattern. *şaşımsız* in ETŞ 11,146 and *saşımsız* in ETŞ 9,31 are, however, also supported by alliteration. The differ-

468 *agınmaksız* in *agınmaksız kudulur akınlar* (Ernte 23) can be taken to belong to a recessive derivate from the *UW*'s *ag-* (II) and to signify 'unrising'.

469 See -(*X*)*m+lXg* for my interpretation.

ence between *-mAksXz* and the other *+sXz* derivates form verbal nominals is to be found principally in the greater 'verbality' of the former; this difference need not be actualised in terms of government etc. in every single instance.

-mAksXz does not appear in inscriptional or other runic sources, nor in Manichaean texts; nor, apparently, in Qarakhanid Turkic. It is much more common in later Uigur texts like BuddhUig II or the verse of ETŞ than in earlier ones. The *Suv* may contain more *-mAksXz* forms than all the other published Uigur sources taken together: Some quite extensive Uigur texts do not show any instances at all. The rise of this suffix sequence to become a suffix in its own right will perhaps be better understood when we know more about the distribution of negative present participles like the one in *-mAz*. The lateness of *-mAksXz* is further evidence for the precedence of ergative formation over non-ergative in the deverbal nominal domain.

That *-mAksXz* is a compound suffix and not a suffix sequence is shown, among other things, by the fact that other derivational suffixes are not added to infinite *-mAk*: The base of *armakçı* is not an infinitive but a noun; in *-mAk+lXg*, q.v. above, *+lXg* is actually used like a sort of conjunction which can subordinate whole sentences, not a derivational suffix.

Part IV

The Formation of Adverbs

The syntactic class of adverbial expressions is morphologically amorphous: The base forms of lexemes often function both adnominally and adverbally, and a number of oblique case forms of nominals have mainly adverbial functions. On the other hand, we can observe a tendency on the part of the language to *derive* adverbs from nominal and verbal lexemes. The former is carried out (to a limited extent) through the formatives *+lA* and *+lAyU*, which we describe in detail further on in this section. The latter occurs through what we call petrified con-verbs; these are lexicalised instances of the gerund form which uses the allomorph *-yU* with verb stems ending in vowels, the allomorphs *-A*, *-U* or *-I* with stems ending in consonants.

Petrified converbs are identical to other vowel converbs in shape[470] but differ from them syntactically, e.g. in their government, and semantically, in that they probably were felt as independent lexemes. They function adverbially but are allowed to go over to nominal use, a transition not at all surprising in Turkic languages. More or less detailed functional and syntactic discussions of the phenomenon can be found in Bang, 1917:21; Bang, 1917-21, Mitt. I: 45-46 and 53; Rachmati, 1928; Grønbech, 1936: 20-21 and 40ff.; Korkmaz, 1962 and elsewhere.

I have dealt with the choice between the various allomorphs of the converb and aorist suffixes in Erdal, 1979 a and Erdal, 1986. Erdal, 1979 a also deals with the evident similarity between the specific difference of *+lAyU* and *+lA* on the one hand, and *-yU*, the post-vocalic allomorph of the converb suffix on the other. All those matter will therefore not be discussed here.

Primary petrified converbs I can mention offhand are *aşa*, *basa*, *kāçā*, *oza*, *kata*, *kaya*, *sayu*, *tapa*, *tägi*, *toga* and *yana*. Only the *derived* petrified converbs, which happen to be the majority, are discussed in this work, and that mainly so as to be able to exclude them from the discussion of the syntax of derived verb stems: Petrified converbs from verbs with voice suffixes often do not show the behaviour characteristic of these verbs. Petrified converbs from causative stems do not, as a rule, show causative meaning. Therefore it is even a legitimate question whether these are in fact petrified converbs or whether they are adverbs formed with suffixes which only happen to be similar to those of the converbs of causative verbs. We shall discuss all the exs. we have been able to identify in the sections on the appropriate formations. The petrified converbs we have found have the following endings: *+AyU*; *+lAşU* and *-mAklaşU*; *+gArU*; *-ArU*, *-UrU* and *-gUrU*; *-tI*. Then there are isolated cases, *başlayu*, *aşnu*, *tolu* and *yanturu*. The converbs of medial-reflexive, derived-intransitive and passive verbs do not tend to get petrified, then.

+lA is evidently a very old formation: *bir+lä* 'together (with)', one of its prod-

470 In fact they are often more conservative.

ucts, is a 'real' postposition, i.e. one governing the accusative case of pronouns and possessive forms. *+lA* was productive in Ottoman Turkish well into the XVIth century, when it was replaced by its expansion *+lA+cA*. That, in turn, disappeared a short while afterwards. *+lA* was identified for what it is already by Bang, 1918: 95 par. 7; recently, however, some scholars have not recognised its existence: T. Tekin, 1968, e.g., would like to derive *birlä* from a verb **biril-* 'to join',[471] and the *EDPT* considers all *+lA* forms to be 'shortened' *+lA-yU* converbs from verbs which usually do not exist at all. Such a shortening would be quite unjustifiable; reality may possibly have been the other way around.

+lA forms with local function are not too common. We find this e.g. in *tägirmi+lä* in Maitr 31 v 2: *törт buluŋtın adrok körtlä sarvaklar [b]olur; takı ymä tägirmi+lä kalaklar ısırkalar . . . turur* 'In the four quarters there are extraordinarily beautiful palaces; furthermore, there stand towers and palaces *all around*'. *oŋaru+la* signifies 'clockwise': *kaçan t(ä)ŋri t(ä)ŋrisi burxan üşkintä tägdüklärintä . . . üç yolı oŋarula tägzinip ketip birtin sınar olordılar* 'When they had reached the presence of Buddha, the god of gods, they thrice circumambulated him clockwise, moved away and sat down on one side' (Suv 131,16, quoted in the *DTS*). *uda+la bar-* (QB 5202) 'to follow' is also purely local. So are most of the instances of *üzä+lä* 'over' (10 QB exs. quoted in the İndeks s.v. '*özele*'), although the postposition and adverb *üzä* has abstract uses as well.

basa+la, a third *+lA* form derived from a postposition, is attested in QB 484 in the phrase *anıŋda basala*. It appears to have been created for the sake of the metre, as it doesn't differ in meaning and use from *anıŋda basa*, attested twelve times in the QB. The two signify 'after' i.e. they are temporal postpositions.

The most common use of *+lA* is to form temporal *adverbs*. Several exs. for *tün+lä* 'at night' are mentioned in the *EDPT* under *tün*. Others can be found in Maitr 9 r 1 and v 3 (*tünki tünlä* 'last night', in adverbial use) and r 10 (*tünki tünläki täg* 'as during the last night') and in four additional passages in Maitr. *tün+çü+lä* in *tünärig tünçülä* (M II 11,11) 'during the dark night' should have about the same meaning, *+çU* being a locative formative. *tünlä küntüz* signifies 'at night and day', e.g. in *tünlä küntüz armaksızın sönmäksizin bışrunup* . . . (Suv 211,5-6). When *tünlä* serves as kernel to an izâfet construction, it appears in the locative case form: *tolun ay beş yegirmi tünläsindä kamagun birgärü bir orunda yıgılmış terilmişläri kärgäk* (BT III 60) 'At full moon, on the night of the fifteenth, they should all gather$_2$ at one place'. *taŋ+la* 'at dawn' is quoted in the *EDPT* only from the XIVth century on; it should, however, be the base of *taŋla+r-*, attested already in the IrqB. *udula*, *üzälä* and *basala*, all mentioned above, show how productive *+lA* was in Qarakhanid Turkic. We also find *ara+la* 'in the meantime' (seven

471 Notwithstanding the fact that *-Xl-* forms passives from verbs, not transitives from nouns.

times in the QB), *tirig+lä* 'while being alive, in one's lifetime' (DLT fol. 557 and QB 1559, 6204 and 6209),[472] and *yaŋı+la* 'anew' (DLT fol. 610). Not far by meaning from *yaŋıla* is *iki+lä* 'again', which appears in DLT fol. 553 and QB 5674 and very often in the Maitr; also in MaitrH X1 b4 and MaitrGeng 12 b2 and 13 b18. Another (near-)synonym is *yana+la*, attested in Ht VII 1909 and X 1018 and 1139, BT I D (216) and (293) and Suv 638,8. Some of these may have been meant to read *yänä+lä*, for we find *yänä ök* beside *yana ok*. *yana* 'again etc.' no doubt comes from *yan-* 'to go back'; fronting may have followed the analogy of *yemä*.

When more than two events followed upon each other, the speaker could use a *+lA* derivate from *kur* 'stage, rank': *üç kurla nom yarlıg eş[i]dip* . . . (Maitr 23 v18); *äd tavar mıŋ [mıŋ] tümän tümän kurla . . . berdiŋiz* (*ibid.*, 12 r9) 'You have given out property$_2$ thousands and ten thousands of times'; *ükü̈ş kurla burxan-larka nom tilgänin ävirtgäli ötügçi boltum* (Suv 163,17). Nobel translates the Chin. original of this passage as follows: ". . ., habe ich *inständig* die Buddhas gebeten, das große *dharma*-Rad in Bewegung zu setzen". *mıŋ kurla* is still 'a thousand times' and *köp kurla* 'frequently' in the Codex Comanicus.

In most mentioned instances *+lA* forms appeared in adverbial constructions (including e.g. *tünki tünläki täg*). *birlä* lost the local-temporal meaning of *+lA* but retained the adverbial function. E.g.: *ikägü birlä atlanıp tilägäli arıgka baralım* (Suv 636,18) 'Let us two mount our horses and together go to search in the forest' (Or: 'Let us two together mount . . .'). Another two such adverbial-preverbial instances of *birlä* are discussed in a passage near the end of section 7.1. dealing with syntax. The incomparably commoner postposition *birlä* must have come local and not a temporal one. Another adverbial *+lA* form is *çın+la* 'really' in DLT fol. 55.

körtlä and the equally well attested *körklä*, both 'beautiful', are neither local nor temporal, nor adverbial. In his n. to ETŞ 3,11, Arat maintains that the former is mainly Manichaean, the latter mainly Buddhist. Manichaean texts do usually have *körtlä*, and another ex. not in the dictionaries appears in HamTouen 5,52; *körglä* (thus) in TT III 81 is an exception in a text which is syncretistic in much more curious ways.[473] In Buddhist texts, on the other hand, both *körtlä* and *körklä* are common; in addition to what the *EDPT* and the *DTS* mention, we find *körtlä* in U III 24,11 and HamTouen 1,43 and 52 (all three visible in the facss.). *körk*, the base of *körklä*, is discussed in the beginning of the section on *-(O)k*. *körtlä* comes from the same base as *körträk* (M III 45,4$_2$, text 31), which must have been an

472 This was not recognised as an independent word either by the *DTS* or the *EDPT*; the latter quotes a later Muslim ex. s.v. *yitük* and changes it to '*tiriglär*'.

473 This must be the passage mistakenly quoted in Arat's n. as "U III 7,166".

-(U)t derivate from *kör-*[474] *körtlä* and *körklä* appear as a binomial together in Maitr 13 v29. This is only one of the reasons for rejecting what the *EDPT* writes s.v. "*körkle*: . . .; prima facie . . . fr. *körk*, but there is no other trace of a Den. Suff. *-le:*, and the existence of a syn. word *körtle*: suggests that both may be representations of some foreign word and the semantic connection w. *körk* a co-incidence". How these two lexemes acquired their irregular un-adverbial use is something which cannot be followed up at present.

The *+lA* formation went on into Middle Turkic being productive in adverbial use. In the Codex Comanicus, *ovrula* (< **ogrı+la*) signifies 'secretly', expanded into the synonymous *ogrılayın* in a phonetically more archaic part of the Codex. Early Ottoman has e.g. *uyanıkla* 'in a waking state', *açla* 'on an empty stomach' and its opposite *dokla*, the synonyms *äsrüklä*, *mästlä* and *sarhoşla* and their antonym *ayıkla*; *çokla* is 'frequently'. Ottoman *yäŋilä*, *dünlä*, *taŋla* and *dirilä* continue lexemes discussed as Old Turkic above. We even find *kızmışla* 'when being in a heated state'. Fundamenta, 169 (mentioned to me by Prof. Doerfer) has Ottoman *gözüŋlä* etc.; in spite of their instrumental meaning, Prof. Doerfer is sure that the ending here does not come from *ilä* < *birlä*.

+lA was, before and in Old Turkic, joined by the two adverbial suffixes *+tI* and *+yU*; the products *+lAtI* and *+lAyU* inherited the adverbial function of their components.

The most common *+lAtI* lexeme is *birtämlätı*, the base of which is discussed among the *+dAm* forms above. Not mentioned either in the *EDPT* or in the *DTS*, it is attested in BT I F (17), BT II 374, 377 and 535, ETŞ 9,48, 13,81 and 158 and 15,85, BT XIII 13,11 and 127, Ht X 1019, ShōAgon B (1) 44, 177 and 302, Suv 79,1, AbhīTermBuddh 118 a 11, 119 a 4, 6 and 12. As shown in the n. to BT XIII 13,11, *birtämlätı* corresponds to a number of Chin. expressions, signifying 'in the end, finally, once and for all, absolutely, for a long time'. In BT I F (17) and ETŞ 13,158 we find it in adnominal use, corresponding to Skt. *uttara* 'supreme'.

Instances of *näçüklätı* 'how' are mentioned in the *EDPT* under *näçük*, its base. I discuss *näçük* in section 2.72 above. The *EDPT* is probably right in suggesting '*näçäklätı*' in U III 4,8 (Haricandra) to be a mistake for this lexeme: The facs. now shows that there is a tear in the paper through the relevant letter. A further ex. of *näçüklätı* appears in LautHöllen 46. In Suv 65,22 (quoted in the *DTS*) and 588,16

474 Since *+rAk* is added only to adjectives, **körtı* should also have been one, and signified 'beautiful' itself. It was presumably made obsolete through the adjectivisation of its (primarily adverbial) *+lA* derivate. *körtlä* might at first have signified 'while being beautiful, in (its, her) beauty'. For the semantic connection with *kör-* 'to see' cf. German 'ansehnlich' and 'vorzeigbar'. *körklä* may possibly be the product of a contamination between *körtlä* and *körk+lüg*. The Manichaean texts being in many respects more archaic than many Buddhist ones, such a precedence of *körtlä* over *körklä* would explain the distribution of the two lexemes within the Old Turkic corpus.

(quoted in the n. to UigTöt 686) we find a synonym, *nätäglätı*; this is, of course, an expansion of *nä täg* 'like what, how'. *kaltı*, a third synonym, probably had the same structure, although created at a much earlier stage of the language: Its cognates are *ka+ç*, *ka(n)+yu* > *kañu*, *ka(n)+ta*, *ka(n)+tın*, *ka+ça* etc.; stress on the first syllable can be taken to have been responsible for the syncopation of the second vowel in **ka+la+tı*. *kaltı* or its unsyncopated predecessor may have served as analogical base for the creation of *näçüklätı* and *nätäglätı*. It is well attested; see the *EDPT*.

kõz körüglätı (Maitr 165 r 29 = BT IX 150,29) may also be a *+lA+tI* form if read correctly; it may then correspond to Republican Turkish *göz göre göre*. A verb '*körüg+lä-*', at any rate, is not attested.

The *+lA* forms *ikilä*, *tägirmilä*, *üzälä*, *yaŋıla*, *yanala*, *kurla* and *çınla* discussed above are all attested also with the expansion *+yU*, found also in *ka(n)+yu* > *kañu* (> *kayu*). Whereas the few known *+lAtI* lexemes have no attested *+lA* bases, the much commoner *+lAyU* forms thus have at least six. Any adverbial lexeme ending in °*lAyU* cannot automatically be given this explanation, however. *başlayu*, e.g., obviously comes from *baş+la-*, and is discussed as a petrified converb of the *+lA-* formation.

S.v. "*tegirmile:-*", the *EDPT* mentions five exs. of *tägirmi+lä+yü* '(all) around' and one of *tägirmiläyüki* 'surrounding', all from Uigur. A verb as assumed by Clauson to exist is not attested, however, whereas *tägirmi+lä* is. Additional instances of *tägirmiläyü* can be found in Ht X 44, Maitr 28 r 6 and 8, TT III 93,[475] BuddhUig II 353 and BT XIII 27,13. *üzäläyü* in Suv 266,6 and BT XIII 13,133 has no verbal base either, and is clearly connected with *üzä+lä*. BT XIII is a versification of the fifth chapter of the Suv. Cf. the footn. to BT XIII 13,133, where this sentence adverb is discussed, and translated as "obendrein, zusätzlich".[476]

yaŋılayu is quoted in *EDPT* 952 a s.v. *yaŋıla-* from the Qara Balγasun inscription, and is found also in BT I B 9. Signifying 'afresh', it is likelier to have come from *yaŋı+la* than from the DLT verb *yaŋı+la-* 'to renovate'. Unlike *yaŋılayu*, its synonym *ikiläyü* 'again, anew' is exceedingly common. See the *EDPT* s.v.

475 Bang and Gabain write *täkirm*[*äl*]*äyükl*. . . (with italic, i.e. dubious °*ir*°). The single slash seems to imply that the word was taken to have one further letter. In his reedition, Clark corrects the seventh letter from *ä* to *i* but omits the slash; he translates the word as "when they were surrounded by. . .", presumably taking this to be a *-yUk* form of a verb. But there is no such verb. Since the word should be *tägirmi+lä+yü+ki* as in TT I 58 (and probably also in Ht X 44 instead of what is conjectured there), [*-mi*]*ştä* in the beginning of the following line is rather unlikely.

476 *üzäläyü kılmaz m(ä)n tölāç t*[may end in the expression *tölāç t*[*ogru* 'unconditionally; irrevocably', found in USp 32,19-20. If this is correct, one can't have the (unnecessary) second *m(ä)n* in the lacuna, conjectured by Zieme.

-(U)t derivate from *kör-*[474] *körtlä* and *körklä* appear as a binomial together in Maitr 13 v29. This is only one of the reasons for rejecting what the *EDPT* writes s.v. "*körkle: . . .*; prima facie . . . fr. *körk*, but there is no other trace of a Den. Suff. *-le:*, and the existence of a syn. word *körtle:* suggests that both may be representations of some foreign word and the semantic connection w. *körk* a coincidence". How these two lexemes acquired their irregular un-adverbial use is something which cannot be followed up at present.

The *+lA* formation went on into Middle Turkic being productive in adverbial use. In the Codex Comanicus, *ovrula* (< **ogrı+la*) signifies 'secretly', expanded into the synonymous *ogrılayın* in a phonetically more archaic part of the Codex. Early Ottoman has e.g. *uyanıkla* 'in a waking state', *açla* 'on an empty stomach' and its opposite *dokla*, the synonyms *äsrüklä*, *mästlä* and *sarhoşla* and their antonym *ayıkla*; *çokla* is 'frequently'. Ottoman *yäŋilä*, *dünlä*, *taŋla* and *dirilä* continue lexemes discussed as Old Turkic above. We even find *kızmışla* 'when being in a heated state'. Fundamenta, 169 (mentioned to me by Prof. Doerfer) has Ottoman *gözümlä* etc.; in spite of their instrumental meaning, Prof. Doerfer is sure that the ending here does not come from *ilä* < *birlä*.

+lA was, before and in Old Turkic, joined by the two adverbial suffixes *+tI* and *+yU*; the products *+lAtI* and *+lAyU* inherited the adverbial function of their components.

The most common *+lAtI* lexeme is *birtämlätı*, the base of which is discussed among the *+dAm* forms above. Not mentioned either in the *EDPT* or in the *DTS*, it is attested in BT I F (17), BT II 374, 377 and 535, ETŞ 9,48, 13,81 and 158 and 15,85, BT XIII 13,11 and 127, Ht X 1019, ShōAgon B (1) 44, 177 and 302, Suv 79,1, AbhiTermBuddh 118 a 11, 119 a 4, 6 and 12. As shown in the n. to BT XIII 13,11, *birtämlätı* corresponds to a number of Chin. expressions, signifying 'in the end, finally, once and for all, absolutely, for a long time'. In BT I F (17) and ETŞ 13,158 we find it in adnominal use, corresponding to Skt. *uttara* 'supreme'.

Instances of *näçüklätı* 'how' are mentioned in the *EDPT* under *näçük*, its base. I discuss *näçük* in section 2.72 above. The *EDPT* is probably right in suggesting '*näçäklätı*' in U III 4,8 (Haricandra) to be a mistake for this lexeme: The facs. now shows that there is a tear in the paper through the relevant letter. A further ex. of *näçüklätı* appears in LautHöllen 46. In Suv 65,22 (quoted in the *DTS*) and 588,16

474 Since *+rAk* is added only to adjectives, **körtı* should also have been one, and signified 'beautiful' itself. It was presumably made obsolete through the adjectivisation of its (primarily adverbial) *+lA* derivate. *körtlä* might at first have signified 'while being beautiful, in (its, her) beauty'. For the semantic connection with *kör-* 'to see' cf. German 'ansehnlich' and 'vorzeigbar'. *körklä* may possibly be the product of a contamination between *körtlä* and *körk+lüg*. The Manichaean texts being in many respects more archaic than many Buddhist ones, such a precedence of *körtlä* over *körklä* would explain the distribution of the two lexemes within the Old Turkic corpus.

(quoted in the n. to UigTot 686) we find a synonym, *nätäglätï*; this is, of course, an expansion of *nä täg* 'like what, how'. *kaltı*, a third synonym, probably had the same structure, although created at a much earlier stage of the language: Its cognates are *ka+ç*, *ka(n)+yu* > *kañu*, *ka(n)+ta*, *ka(n)+tın*, *ka+ça* etc.; stress on the first syllable can be taken to have been responsible for the syncopation of the second vowel in **ka+la+tı*. *kaltı* or its unsyncopated predecessor may have served as analogical base for the creation of *näçüklätï* and *nätäglätï*. It is well attested; see the *EDPT*.

köz körüglätï (Maitr 165 r 29 = BT IX 150,29) may also be a *+lA+tI* form if read correctly; it may then correspond to Republican Turkish *göz göre göre*. A verb '*körüg+lä-*', at any rate, is not attested.

The *+lA* forms *ikilä*, *tägirmilä*, *üzälä*, *yaŋıla*, *yanala*, *kurla* and *çınla* discussed above are all attested also with the expansion *+yU*, found also in *ka(n)+yu* > *kañu* (> *kayu*). Whereas the few known *+lAtI* lexemes have no attested *+lA* bases, the much commoner *+lAyU* forms thus have at least six. Any adverbial lexeme ending in °*lAyU* cannot automatically be given this explanation, however. *başlayu*, e.g., obviously comes from *baş+la-*, and is discussed as a petrified converb of the *+lA-* formation.

S.v. "*tegirmile:-*", the *EDPT* mentions five exs. of *tägirmi+lä+yü* '(all) around' and one of *tägirmiläyüki* 'surrounding', all from Uigur. A verb as assumed by Clauson to exist is not attested, however, whereas *tägirmi+lä* is. Additional instances of *tägirmiläyü* can be found in Ht X 44, Maitr 28 r 6 and 8, TT III 93,[475] BuddhUig II 353 and BT XIII 27,13. *üzäläyü* in Suv 266,6 and BT XIII 13,133 has no verbal base either, and is clearly connected with *üzä+lä*. BT XIII is a versification of the fifth chapter of the Suv. Cf. the footn. to BT XIII 13,133, where this sentence adverb is discussed, and translated as "obendrein, zusätzlich".[476]

yaŋılayu is quoted in *EDPT* 952 a s.v. *yaŋıla-* from the Qara Balγasun inscription, and is found also in BT I B 9. Signifying 'afresh', it is likelier to have come from *yaŋı+la* than from the DLT verb *yaŋı+la-* 'to renovate'. Unlike *yaŋılayu*, its synonym *ikiläyü* 'again, anew' is exceedingly common. See the *EDPT* s.v.

475 Bang and Gabain write *täkirm*[*äl*]*äyük*/. . . (with italic, i.e. dubious °*ir*°). The single slash seems to imply that the word was taken to have one further letter. In his reedition, Clark corrects the seventh letter from *ä* to *i* but omits the slash; he translates the word as "when they were surrounded by. . .", presumably taking this to be a *-yUk* form of a verb. But there is no such verb. Since the word should be *tägirmi+lä+yü+ki* as in TT I 58 (and probably also in Ht X 44 instead of what is conjectured there), [*-mi*]*ştä* in the beginning of the following line is rather unlikely.

476 *üzäläyü kılmaz m*(*ä*)*n tölāç t*[may end in the expression *tölāç t*[*ogru* 'unconditionally; irrevocably', found in USp 32,19-20. If this is correct, one can't have the (unnecessary) second *m*(*ä*)*n* in the lacuna, conjectured by Zieme.

"*ékki:le:-" and the *DTS* s.v. "*ikilājū*"; further exs. appear in Suv 604,10,[477] InscrOuig IV 45, LautHöllen 95, Buddhāv Y154 and AbhiTermBuddh 119 a5 and 6. The synonym *ikinṭilāyū*, derived from the ordinal, is attested in SuvCaitya 32,8, quoted in *ÖW* 57. In BT III 456 we find *yanalayu* or *yänälāyū* 'again'. *üç kurlayu* 'thrice' is attested in Tiš, quoted in the *DTS*. Cf. *üç kurla*, quoted above from the Maitr. The DLT's *kur+la-* has an unrelated meaning.

Adverbs of truth and untruth are much better attested with *+lAyU* than with *+lA*. Whereas *çınla* is a hap. in the DLT, *çınlayu* 'real' is rather common. *+lA* forms corresponding to *yelāyū* 'ostensible, apparent' and *äzüKläyü*, the antonyms of *çınlayu*, are not attested at all. Since we have *çın+la-* in the DLT and *äzüK+lä-* twice in Suv with quite appropriate meanings, the three might actually be petrified converbs in *+lA-yU*. *yelāyū* probably comes from **yel+läyü*.[478] One ex. of *yelāyū* is quoted in the *DTS* s.v. "*jīlaju*"; perhaps because of an assumed connection with *yala* 'false accusation, blame', *yelāyū* has often been read as '*yılayu*'. It appears also in ETŞ 9,58 (*yeg yörügli yeläyüli*, a pair of opposites, showing *yelāyū* in nominal status), 15,70 and 78, six times in BT I (all quoted in *UW* 249 b), Nyūabi (7) v 24, UigTot 857, 879 and 911. In Suv 218,16, 265,14 and 272,4 and 12, ETŞ 10,283 and 14,17, ShōAgon 1,201, Scharl 48 and 50, UigTot 851 and Abhi 1956, *yelāyū* is used in opposition to *çınlayu*. This opposition of 'false' and 'true' is often used in the sense of 'worldly' vs. 'real'. *çınlayu* has been used by itself in UigTot 66 and DruTur 6. In instances like the ones in UigTot 912 and 913, it is still conceived of as opposed to *yelāyū*, which appears in the wider context. *äzüKläyü sözlämiş sav* in UigPañc 75 is 'mendaciously uttered words'.

The meaning of *yelāyū* implies the use of the 'wind' as a cognitive metaphor. *yagmur* 'rain', *bulıt* 'cloud', *şı* 'moisture' and *kıragu* 'hoar frost' are other natural phenomena which have served as bases for *+lAyU* forms, but in a more concrete sense. Scholars have mistakenly taken them to be *-yU* converbs of nonexistent *+lA-* verbs. Consider the following: *yagmurlayu ölitü, bulıtlayu şılayu yarutu y(a)rlıkazun ärdi ulug sāŋrāmig* (HtPek 74 b 7-8). In the footn. to UigTot 103, this is translated as "Wenn sie doch das große Kloster zu beregnen, zu befeuchten, mit Wolken zu versehen, feucht werden zu lassen und erstrahlen zu lassen geruhten!". Particularly "mit Wolken versehen" strikes one as being absurd, as nobody is surely to equip the monastery with clouds. *+lAyU* has here become something like a case suffix, corresponding to the English preposition 'like'; such forms are not converbs, nor do they any longer have any connection with the *+lA*

477 Read this as *ol kōl suvı öŋräki ṭā(g) ikilāyū tolı bolmışta* ... 'When the water of that lake had again become full as before, ...', instead of *öŋräkidä*.

478 The simplification of /ll/ to /l/ between vowels is a common phenomenon. In the beginning of section 2.91 a number of cases are mentioned where it happens with the formative *+lXg*. It evidently takes place when juncture is closer than the morphological.

formation. *yel(ſ)äyü* is at present the only link, speaking in terms of the history of functions, between the three *+lAyU*. The above passage signifies, then, 'make it wet like rain and gleaming like a cloud and moisture'. The following contains similar forms (Ernte 94-96): *samançа tın arṭsun, kumlayu kovsun, korum kaya tāg yıgılsun* 'May it suppress breathing like straw (whirling in the air), may the wind drive it away like sand, may it get heaped up like rocks₂'. The interesting thing about this passage is the parallel use of the case suffix *+çA*, of *+lAyU* and of the postposition *tāg*, possibly so as to break monotony. In the most recent text containing such forms which Zieme edited, he recognised *+lAyU* for what it is: *kıragulayu ārüyü, kayımlayu b*[. . .], *kamışlayu şınlalu*, [*ka*]*vıklayu saçılu* . . . (Neujahr 26-29) "wie Reif schmelzend, wie *qayīm* [ ], wie Schilf ? , wie Kleie verstreut werdend, . . .". Note that Ht, e.g., is certainly not a late Uigur text.

In his n. to the Neujahr passage, Zieme compares *kıragulayu* etc. with *arslan+layu* "wie ein Löwe" etc. Sertkaya, 1983 has collected from the DLT and the QB the terms containing *+lAyU* 'like' derived from lexemes denoting animals. These bases are *adıg* 'bear', *arju* 'jackal', *arslan* 'lion', *kaz* 'goose', *us* 'vulture' and *böri* 'wolf'. Sertkaya compares this formation to the expression *oplayu tāg-*, which appears fifteen times in the Orkhon inscriptions, deriving it from the DLT's *op* 'threshing ox'. Bang, 1934: 194 already had exactly the same idea, and adds the explanatory "il attaqua à tête baissée". Animals' names appear to be in phraseological use as similes for their characteristic activities, as *ud+layu ye-*, *arslan+layu kükre-*, *adıg+layu az-*, *bori+läyü ulı-ş-* and, in Orkhon Turkic, *op+layu tāg-*. For *oplayu* cf. also *opla-n-*, however.

We have listed similative *+lAyU* with natural agents, with plants (*kamış*, *kavık*) and with animals. Terms denoting humans also occasionally serve as bases for this suffix: *öṭünür mān kūdānlāyü tınlıgların*ıg (ETŞ 14,26) 'I invite the human beings as if they were my guests'; *barça nomd*[*aş*]*lar kutlarıŋa kulut Taypudu* [. . . *b*]*uyan ortuklayu ıdur m*(*ä*)*n* (ms. PelliotOuigour 203 r2 *apud* UigBunken p. 76) '(I) the "slave" Taypudu send *puŋya* to their honours, all my brethren-in-religion, as if they were my partners'. The 'as if' component in the meaning of *+lAyU* is present in the previously mentioned instances as well. It comes out strongest in Dankoff's translation of QB 6549 (in the first ode): *Rūstāmlāyü mān ajunda çavıktım* "Suppose that I was world-renowned Rustam". The fact that *+lAyU* is thus added to a proper name must be the ultimate proof that, at least in Qarakhanid Turkic, it is no longer a formative but indeed a case suffix. This does not contradict the view that its origin must have been in the sequence *+lA+yU*.[479]

479 A *+lAyU* form attested in BT XIII 21,34 is very similar in context to the two Uigur instances quoted in this paragraph: *busuşlug āmgāklig tınl*(*ı*)*glarıg bodlayu baka y*(*a*)*rlıkar siz* translated "Ihr geruht genau zu betrachten die kummer- und leidvollen Lebewesen". The note justifies this

anılayu and *munılayu* are well attested. The former is documented and discussed in the *UW* s.v.; the latter is attested in Maitr 40 v 7, TuoLuoNi 100 and 362, TT VIII L 45, Suv 10,4 and Ht V 11 b 2 and 13 b 3, VII 1854 and X 171, 276 and 603. It will be clear to the reader by now that *anılayu* does not come from an "erstarrtes Konv. von einem den. Verb von einer aus *ani* (Akk. von *ol* 'jener') hypostasierten nominalen Basis", as we read in *UW* 141 b. Rather, the forms are similar to e.g. *anıça* and *senidin*: Concrete (i.e. local, instrumental etc.) case suffixes are near to the postpositions in demanding the accusative forms of pronouns. Old Turkic is similar, in this, to Tokharian, which has a two-stage case system. Since pronouns (like proper names) refer but do not denote, *+lAyU* can, again, not be considered a formative here. In actual practice, *munılayu* signifies 'thus' and refers backwards, whereas *anılayu ok* (thus all the instances) has a more sentence-adverb-like function.

Both *+lA* and *+lAyU* are added after the local formative *+çU* described in section 2.72. Very rarely, this happens with nouns as ultimate bases. *tünärig tünçülä basar* (M II 11,11, 4th text) is best translated as 'They attack as in the dark of night'. Interestingly enough, the bracketing is then (*tünärig tün*)*çülä*. *yaŋalıg sü bulıtçulayu yıggay män* (Ht V 320) means '. . . as in a cloud'; cf. *bulıtçılayu* in ETŞ 9,4. There are incomparably more attestations with pronominal bases. *ançula* and *ançulayu* are fully discussed and documented in the *UW* (the second with unacceptable etymologies). *an+çu+la* is rather rare, being attested only in Manichaean texts. As with *anılayu* and *munılayu*, *ançulayu* is flanked by *munçulayu*, for which see the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Additional exs. appear in BT II 404, Suv 72,11, 392,8 and 606,2, ShōAgon 1,12, EhlersNotab 20, Genzan B r 2, ms. Mz 212 r 7 quoted in Schulz, 1978: 69 and elsewhere. In ms. Ch/U 6414 r (TM 262) l.4, quoted in BT VI p. 83, we find the words *munçulayu barmagıl*. *mın+* may be an earlier, still unrounded, variant of *mun+*. If this form can be taken as a guide, it would mean that *+lAyU* was active at an early date also with pronominal bases. All this is likely to lend support to Sertkaya's interpretation of Orkhon Turkic *op+layu*.

In Suv 425,14 f., *+çUlAyU ~ +çIlAyU* is added to a personal pronoun, which is in the genitive case form: *ol tütsük barçaka tägip bizinçilägü ök tütsüklüg kuşatrı-*

translation by reference to Ottoman and Azeri *boyla-* 'to look at from head to foot, etc.'. As long as no earlier exs. of such a verb (and no exs. outside the Oguz group) turn up, the following interpretation is to be preferred: 'You graciously look upon distressed and suffering creatures as if they were (your) clan'. Remember that the sentence addresses the compassionate Avalokiteśvara. The only problem is that I cannot, at the moment, find Uigur instances of *bod* in the sense of 'clan'. It is, however, attested in the Runic inscriptions and in Middle Turkic, and appears to have served as base for *bodun*. A verb form '*boylap*', assumed to have stood in Maitr 159 r 25, is probably a mistake; see also the n. to Hochzeit 17, where this is quoted.

lar bälgürüp . . . "Jener Weihrauch wird zu allen gelangen und genau wie bei uns werden die Räucherstab-Schirme erscheinen, und . . .". In Middle Turkic, the accusative was replaced by the genitive as the base form of pronouns for postpositions and loose case endings. *bizinçilärü* is therefore directly comparable to the *+lAyU* forms derived from the accusative and oblique bases, as *munılayu* and *munçulayu*.

The n. to BT V217 quotes a form *yogwçlayu* from the ms. TM 167 (Mz 541) l.10, translating it as "überqueren". This may not be the *-yU* converb of a verb at all, however, but another adverb expanded with *+lAyU*. *yogwç* is better attested: The DLT fol. 448 translates the lemma nominally, as "the other side of a river or canal"; but the ex. supplied, *yogwç käçtim* "I crossed to the other side of the river", shows the form to have been used adverbially. The *EDPT* also quotes the Codex Comanicus for this lexeme, and also U III 88,3. We have a number of additional Uigur exs., and all, U III 88,3 included, have the collocation *Inıl In yogwç*: *InılIn yogwç käç-* in Maitr 159 v28 and 167 r4 and MaitrH XI 13 b21 and Rāma 13, *InılIn yogwç ärt-* in U III 88,3, *InılIn yogwç ö[tüp]* (?) *bar-* in U III 88,11-12$_2$. Clearly related to *yogur-* 'to cross the sea, a desert or some other dangerous area', *yogwç* reminds us of the *-gAç* gerunds of Middle Turkic: The Codex Comanicus variant of this lexeme, after all, is also *yowaç*. *+ç* may be an oblique ending found also in *kaç* 'how much, so much'; further possible connections would be too hypothetical to be mentioned. *yogwçlayu* is closer to the local than to the similative *+lAyU* forms, then.

TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 7

Marcel Erdal

Old Turkic Word Formation

A Functional Approach to the Lexicon

Vol. II

1991

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

Marcel Erdal

Old Turkic Word Formation

A Functional Approach to the Lexicon

Vol. II

1991

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Erdal, Marcel:
Old Turkic word formation : a functional approach to the lexicon / Marcel Erdal. – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz.
(Turcologica ; Bd. 7)
ISBN 3-447-03084-4
NE: GT

Vol. 2 (1991)

© Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1991.
Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb des Urheberrechtsgesetzes bedarf der Zustimmung des Verlages.
Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen jeder Art, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und für die Einspeicherung in elektronischen Systemen.
Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung.
Gesamtherstellung: MZ-Verlagsdruckerei GmbH, Memmingen
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier der Fa. Nordland Papier, Dörpen/Ems
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743
ISBN 3-447-03084-4

Contents

VOLUME II

V THE FORMATION OF DENOMINAL VERBS 413
5.11 +A- 418
5.12 +lA- 429
5.13 +tA- 455

5.2 Verba sentiendi: +(X)(r)kA- and -(X)(r)kA- 458

5.3 Onomatopoeics and synaesthetics 465
5.31 +kIr- and +kI- 465
5.32 Onomatopoeics and synaesthetics ending in °rA- 469

5.4 Intransitive denominals 474
5.41 +U- 474
5.42 +I- and synaesthetics in °trI- 479
5.43 +(A)d- 485
5.44 +(X)k- 492
5.45 +(A)r- 499

5.5 The verbal expression of lack and loss: +s(I)rA- 507

5.6 +lAn- 509

VI TYPES OF ACTION AND INACTION 521
6.1 The desiderative 525

6.2 The simulative 531

6.3 -(I)r-, -çIr- and -gIr- 535

VII DIATHESIS AND VOICE 543
7.1 Verbs of vying and cooperation 552
7.101 -(X)ş-: Lexical material 552
7.102 Morphology 574
7.103 Syntax and Semantics 578

7.2 Medial, reflexive and anti-transitive verbs 583
7.211 -(X)n-: Lexical material 584
7.212 Petrified converbs 632
7.213 Morphology 632
7.214 Syntax and Semantics 634
7.221 -lXn-: Lexical material 639
7.222 Grammar 641
7.23 Medial verbs in -(X)d- 642
7.241 -(X)k-: Lexical material 645
7.242 Grammar 649

7.3 Passive verbs 651
7.311 -(X)l-): Lexical material 651
7.312 Morphology 689
7.313 Syntax 691
7.321 -tXl-(~ -(X)tXl- ~ -tUrXl-:) Lexical material 694
7.322 Morphology 698
7.323 Syntax 699

7.41 The transitive passive formative -sXk- 700
7.42 The causative passive formative -tXz- 706

7.5 Causative verbs 709
7.511 -Ur-: Lexical material 710
7.512 Petrified converbs 726
7.513 Morphology 733
7.521 -Ar-: Lexical material 734
7.522 Petrified converbs 740
7.523 Morphology 741
7.531 +gAr-: Lexical material 742
7.532 Petrified converbs 746
7.533 Morphology 746
7.541 -gUr-: Lexical material 748
7.542 Petrified converbs and morphology 755
7.551 -Xz-: Lexical material 757
7.552 Morphology 759
7.561 -(X)t-: Lexical material 760
7.562 Petrified converbs 797
7.563 Morphology 799
7.571 -tUr-: Lexical material 799
7.572 Petrified converbs 830

7.573 Morphology 830
7.581 Phonological and morphological distribution 830
7.582 Syntax and semantics of verbs with causative formatives 831

BIBLIOGRAPHY 834
INDEX OF VERB STEMS 849
INDEX OF LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA AND MORPHEMES 855
INDEX OF CORRECTED OR REINTERPRETED PASSAGES 869
. 872

PART V

The Formation of Denominal Verbs

Old Turkic distinguished clearly between formatives deriving verbs from nouns and formatives deriving verbs from verbs. The few instances which seem to point in the opposite direction, in which, that is, verbal endings seem to be added to nouns and vice versa, are mostly fictitious. Amanžolov, 1969: 64 is also of this opinion, and refutes the view of Sevortjan, who thought that the 'oldest' use was to add voice affixes to nouns as well.

Deverbal derivation exists and is justified by virtue of the significance which the derivational morpheme adds to the content and use of the base, since no passage from one part of speech to another occurs. Not so denominal derivation: The transference from one syntactic class to another is reason enough for the addition of a morpheme. But then why are there so many denominal verb formatives? The appearance of different formatives here cannot have been caused by the shape of the base, since *+lA-*, e.g., is added to bases of all shapes.

Nor is it generally possible to find clear cut semantic differences between the *base* groups of different formatives. A case where the bases of a formation *are* characterised semantically are the sonatives, e.g. *+kIr-*. There are many more cases in which it does seem feasible to classify the *derivates* of formations, both in various semantic ways and syntactically. The syntactical behaviour of such denominal derivates will occupy us no less than that of deverbal verbs. If a correlation can be found between the structure of a verbal stem and its relationships of government, this correlation is of importance to us no matter whether the verb in question is denominal or deverbal. The verbs formed with *+A-*, *+lA-*, *+tA-* (all listed under 5.1) and *+(X)rkA-* do not fit into any major syntactic behaviour group. The sonatives ending in *+kIr-* and the CV*ŋrA-* verbs, on the other and, are natural intransitives. All the formations discussed in sections 5.4-5.6 also form intransitives, whereas *+gAr-* verbs (section 7.531) are transitive. Denominal formations can thus be transitive, intransitive or neutral with respect to this distinction.

Entities denoted by particular nominals can take part in various typical activities. Therefore, language can use various denominal verbs from one and the same base. The DLT has *ot+la-* 'to graze', e.g., and, on the other hand, *ot+a-* 'to trim the crop so that it should not spoil' and 'to treat with medicine'. Three distinct activities, then, in which *ot* 'grass, herbs' is involved. It seems a coincidence that the latter two, and no others, are formed with the formative *+A-*. A particularly versatile base is *tāŋ* 'equivalence, value': *tāŋ+lā-* is 'to equate, compare', *tāŋ+ā-* 'to equal, to be like', *tāŋ+ik-* 'to become equal' and *tāŋkār-* 'to compare'. On the other hand, a language need not have a ready-made verb for each type of activity which, in addition, is to be transparent in denoting a particular entity taking part in that activity: It can, obviously, also use whole phrases, as I have done in English when twice translating *ota-*. Generally, denominal verbs like *ota-*

or otla- can't be *fully* transparent as to what activity is being expressed. For this to take place, one would *at least* have had to be able to express the contents of all the case suffixes and postpositions in deverbal formatives; that, of course, would have been wholly redundant. The transparence of a verb is designed to give indications as to its meaning *in context* and not in isolation. Therefore, at least some of the denominal verb formations are ambiguous or vague. The result is that language occasionally tolerates synonyms from different formations, like *yalın+a-* and *yalın+la-* both 'to flame'. On the other hand there are homonyms, as *ota-* having the two quite distinct meanings mentioned above.

We have already stated that some denominal verb formations correlate with particular clause structures while others don't, and deal with the two sets in different parts of this work. But there are other relevant differences between formations. Among the formatives *+A-*, *+lA-* and *+tA-*, *+lA-* differs from the other two in being freely appendable to foreign bases as well as to Turkic ones, and to bases of any shape and form. *+A-* and *+tA-* are added only to Turkic nominals which, in addition, have to end in consonants. The bases of *+tA-* are all monosyllables. *+A-* is added to bisyllabic bases as well, and then the second vowel of these bases is generally syncopated. *+lA-* derivates are more transparent than *+A-* verbs. Consonant clusters do not appear at the ends of bases for *+A-* verbs, but are not uncommon with *+lA-*. Such phonotactic limitations on the possible bases for *+A-* and *+tA-* in themselves speak against the possibility of a semantic division of labour between them and *+lA-*. Bisyllables ending in the velars /k g ŋ/ generally get *+lA-* and not *+A-* derivates, since their base does not get syncopated and has no consonant assimilations. They probably tend to be used when the semantic retrievability of the base is desired.

There is one domain in which denominal verb formatives are complementary to a certain extent. They differ in their application to classes of derived nominals. *+tA-* is practically never added to derived nominals,[1] *+Ad-* is added only to one *+gXl* adjective, to *kōrk* and to *yogun*. We find *+A-* with *-Xn* (quite often), *-Xş* and *-Xz* bases. *+lA-* is attested with most classes of derived nominals. We find it with the denominal formatives *+dXŋ*, *+gU*[2] and *+çI* and with the deverbal formatives *-(O)k*, *-(U)t*, *-(X)g*, *-(X)nçU*, *-(X)nç*, *-gOk*, *-gA*, *-mA*, *-gAk* and perhaps even *-dUk*, the morpheme for oblique participles. We do not, e.g., find *+lA-* after *-Xş*, however; that is verbalised with *+A-*. *+lAn-*, on the other hand, is found not only with *-Ok*, *-Ut*, *-Xg*, *-Xnç*, *-gAk*, *-XnçAŋ* and *-gAysOk* but also with *-Xş* and

1 This is probably because there aren't many *+tA-* verbs and bases have to be monosyllables; but cf. *ba-g+da-*.

2 In the converb *äsängülāyū*, common in letters. *+Ar-*, of course, only forms intr. verbs from *+gU* bases.

-Xz nominals as bases. *-Xg* is found expanded with *+lA-*, *+A-* and *+sIrA-*, but the third is, of course, quite distinct in meaning. Verbs are much more often derived from deverbal nominals than from denominal ones. Not only that the latter cases are much fewer than the former: Beside *äsän+gü+lä-yü-*, *yer+çi+lä-* and *tıl+aŋu+r-mak*, there are a few hapax legomena with problems; more are attested once each in the OB. Uigur *öz+i+rkä(-n)-* is remarkable in being, apparently, derived from a noun with possessive suffix.

Dealing with simple bases, the case of *ota-* and *otla-* mentioned above is not isolated. Cf. *bädizä-* and the hap. *bädizlä-*, the hap. *maŋa-* and *maŋla-*. In some cases the contrast is grammatical, as with *täŋ+ä-* (intr.) vs. *täŋ+lä-* (tr.).

In what follows, the lists of the verbs formed with the various denominal and deverbal suffixes take up quite a number of pages. The lists are alphabetical, *b* and *m* being treated as interchangeable phones at the beginning of verbs though not internally. I have tried to mention all verbs formed in each particular manner and attested in Old Turkic with a modicum of certainty, but by no means all the exs. for all the verbs. The lists are intended to be used together with the three dictionaries, *EDPT*, *UW* and *DTS*. If no reference to any dictionary appears, it should be understood that there is an adequate entry in the *EDPT*. '*EDPT* and *DTS*' or '*EDPT* and *UW*' signifies that the latter dictionary contains something in addition to what appears in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* is quoted only in this case. If not stated otherwise, it is the *EDPT*'s form, derivation etc. that is accepted. To a certain extent, these lists are also an appendix to the two dictionaries; I have often corrected the *EDPT* even on points not directly related to my subject. Material has been added to the dictionaries from recently published texts and from some minor sources published earlier but not used by them.

The entries of verbs mentioned even though their bases cannot be found are put in brackets. Verbs attested only in Qarakhanid Turkic and some late hapax legomena are not usually quoted, unless the formation in question is weakly attested. Thus we have an entry *soŋ+da-* although this verb is not found before Qarakhanid, because *+tA-* (*+dA-*) is a rare formative. About half the *+KIr-* verbs mentioned appear first in the DLT.

Actual instances of the verbs may or may not be quoted, depending on their interest. Additional exs. for the base lexemes are also sometimes given, in case their attestation in the dictionaries does not seem adequate. It will be found that the *EDPT* and the *DTS* have only a small portion of the verbs treated, let alone the exs. of these verbs. It seemed necessary to incorporate all this additional material, so as to give the reader the possibility to weigh our results and use them for further research.

No exhaustive listing of attested shades of meaning has been attempted; trans-

lations are mainly intended to be an instrument for identifying the lexemes in question.

5.11 *+A-*

aş+a- 'to eat'. In this sense practically a synonym with *ye-*; except that *ye-* is sometimes used to signify 'to devour', or in some other negative senses, whereas *aşa-* is positive. This fits well with Kāšgarī's statement that the Xākānī Türks use *aşa-* only of the nobility, and accords with the fact that *aşa-* is derived, i.e. secondary: It may have arisen as a euphemism. Nevertheless, cf. the biverb *aşa- ye-* in TT V B 53 and elsewhere. Also signifies 'to enjoy (something, not just food)', 'to enjoy, sc. life', rarely even 'to suffer something'. See the *UW* entry for exs. A further instance from Schwitz 32 should be added to par. 2 of that entry; cf. the runic ex. in the *EDPT*.

at+a- 'to call out by name; to nominate somebody; to invoke; to give something a name'. *UW*; DLT and QB exs. can be found in the *EDPT*. Runic exs. now appear in Tariat S 5 (*anta yabgu atadı* 'There he nominated (him) a *yabgu*') and 6 (thrice). Additional exs. in Bhaiş 2, 4, 6 and 8, BT XIII 2,70 and 20,57 and TuoLuoNi 119 and 152.

maŋ+a- 'to tread', hapax in Ernte 73. Not mentioned in *DTS* or *EDPT*; see both of these for *maŋ-* 'to stride, to walk'. *maŋ+la-* is discussed below.

mayak+a- 'to set up a road sign' is a hap. in TT VII 42,5, reedited in the n. to BT XIII 60,8. See the hap. *mayaka-n-* below. *mayak* 'a road sign' survives to this day in Tatar, Bashkir and Chuvash.

bādiz+ā- 'to adorn'. The word quoted in the *EDPT* from Asxete A 2 should be read as *bādizim* ('my ornament') according to Thomsen and Wulff's unpublished collations. Attested also in ETŞ 12,63, Maitr 51 r 2, 144 v 7 and 153 v 26, BuddhUig I 197 and ms. Mz 724 v 29-35, quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 23-4. This is the original form of *bāzā-*, found earliest in Maitr 21 r 6 and 54 r 3 and then in DLT and QB. MaitrH XVI 14 a 13 has the intermediate *bädzä-*. Cf. *bädizä-n-* and *bādizā-t-* below.

mäŋz+ā- 'to resemble' is found only from DLT and QB on, but *mäŋzä-t-* is well attested also in Uigur. *EDPT* 352 b, q.v., for some reason thinks there is little semantic connection between *bäŋiz* 'the complexion' and this verb.

bul(u)n+a- 'to take someone as prisoner'. In the *EDPT* only from DLT and QB on. According to Thomsen and Wulff, B^{1}W L^{1}N^{1}D^{1}I can be read quite clearly in KÇ 22, and this can only be *bul(u)nadı* in the existing context. The conjecture of Clauson and Tryjarski on l.5. therefore loses its base. Attested also as *bulunap* in BT V 6,98 (Manichaean).

mün+ä-: See the *EDPT* under *bün-*. 'to chastise or find fault with a person or

with oneself'. The base is now also attested as MYUN GÂDAG in BuddhKat 42, in a binomial found elsewhere as well. In Ht VII 17 a 16, Arlotto writes *münüyür* where Gabain in I. 1798 has *münäyür*; the latter is no doubt right in view of all the other exs. of the verb. The biverb *(y)er-münä-*, found in this Ht ex. (quoted in the *EDPT*), is additionally attested in BT III 542 and 605, BodhiAvaKomm 4, MaitrH III 3a 29 (*UW* 276b), Maitr 61 v 10 and 79 v 13 = T 118 β v 9; the BT IX index wrongly translates this as "schlecht machen". In his review of the QB Indeks, Tezcan has discovered *münä-* also in QB 5276. *münägüsüz* and *münägülüg*, ETŞ 15,2 and 15,30 respectively, may be forms of this verb or possibly come from a collective **mün+ägü*.

çiK(i)n+ä- 'to embroider', perhaps gold thread on brocade or silk. The *EDPT*, which quotes the verb from DLT and QB, suggests a Chin. etymology for the base; this would make *çiKnä-* the only *+A-* derivate from a foreign lexeme. *çiKin* itself is, however, attested also in Turkic. The verb appears, in addition, in Ht X 522 as *çiKnämiş* and HtPek 4 a 14 (quoted in the n. to the latter) as *çiKinämiş-*. *çine-* "mit Seide sticken" in the Codex Comanicus probably indicates that we should read the verb with /g/ and not /k/; the *EDPT* writes *k* because of the suggested Chin. etymon (but that could have had /g/ as well).

äsn+ä- 'to blow', of a breeze. Attested as *äsnämäkin äsnäyü* in Shō Agon 1,130, as *äsin äsnä-* 'a breeze blows' in Maitr 153 v 30, MaitrGeng 2 a 16 and DLT fol. 146; also in DLT fols. 378 and 508 quoting one and the same phrase. Similar figurae etymologicae are *yaşın yaşna-*, *yel yeltri-*, *yagmur yag-*. The same phrase appears also in Ernte 89-90, but is there spelled with initial I, as *esin esinä-* (no syncope). *es-in* turns up again in this passage, in Ernte 92. Zieme (personal communication) now says that this latter *may* have been *'ä°*; but he is sure about Ernte 89-90. The same aberration occurs in Ernte 28 with *ärmägür-* spelled as if it started with /e/ or /i/. Since all other exs. of *äs-in* 'a breeze' (discussed among the *-Xn* lexemes above) have an /ä/ (as has the verb *äs-*), the variant of Ernte must be secondary: This is a late text with a lot of aberrations. *esnä-* 'to yawn', on the other hand, appears to be a different verb: The DLT distinguishes between *äsnä-* 'to blow (breeze)' and *esnä-* 'to yawn', thrice written with *yā* in the first syllable. A latter hand thrice added a *fatḥa* to this letter, and Dankoff and Kelly (following the *EDPT*) alter *esnä-* to read *äsnä-*. The *EDPT* lists the two verbs under one lemma (although Clauson did not know the Ernte instances); they do, however, have rather distinct meanings, and there would be no explanation for the fronting of /ä/ under the given phonetic circumstances. Therefore, $S^2N^2G^2N^2$ *bars* 'a yawning tiger' in IrqB X can and must be read as *esnä-gän*.

ät(i)n+ä- 'to roar, shout, sing etc.'. Not in the *EDPT* but the instance of Suv 363,23 is mentioned in the *DTS*. Appearing in SuvBew, this ex. consists of the phrase *arslanlar ätinin ätinäyü*, attested also in MaitrGeng 13 a 6. Further exs. are found

in PañcFrag 53, 60, 62 and 98 (also of a lion), Ht IV 539 (wrongly written as *'ātändi'*), BuddhUig II 105 and Hochzeit 30. See *ät-in* above.

igid+ä- 'to lie'. Attested thrice, all three exs. in the Chuast; one of them reads *igiddäyü* in ms. J in ChuastBeitr. The base is attested several times in Manichaean texts but rare in Buddhist ones.[3] It appears as *yigid* thrice in BT V 27, which means that it probably started with **h*. Cf. the n. to BT V 294.

kan+ä- 'to bleed a person or an animal (tr.)'. *EDPT* and *DTS* quote this from DLT, TT VII 21 (several times) and Heilk II C; it appears also in Heilk II E 5, as *]O alun*[4] *kanazun; öŋädür*. Then there is the hapax *kana*K 'blood letting' from TT VII 42, mentioned among the *-(X)g* forms above, and *kanagu* 'lancet' in the DLT. Cf. intr. *kan+ı-*, discussed below.

(kävşä-, the base of *kävşäk* (discussed above) and *kävşän-* (discussed below) is attested in DLT fol. 570: *kurç näŋ kävşädi* "The hard thing became soft". **käviş* is not attested, but lives on to this day as *geviş* 'rumination' in Republican Turkish. It should come from *käv-* 'to weaken (tr.)'; cf. *käv-il-* below. The DLT has lexemes of the form *käv-* and *kävşä-* which signify 'to chew' and 'to ruminate (camel)' respectively. They are listed in the *EDPT* together with the lexemes mentioned above as if they only were special uses of those. *käv-* 'to chew' was borrowed into Qarakhanid and Western Turkic from some Indo-European language and is a cognate of Engl. 'to chew'; only the meaning 'to stutter' may have existed in Old Turkic. *kävş+ä-*, on the other hand, comes from '**to soften (tr.)' also when it came to mean 'to ruminate'.)

keŋ+ä- is rare, but cf. *keŋä-ş-* and *keŋä-t-* below. The *EDPT* quotes *keŋä-* "to arrange one's affairs with somebody" from DLT and QB; the latter instance is better translated with Dankoff as "to seek somebody's counsel". Cf. also ManBuchFrag I,1,2,7: *t(ä)ŋrikän Uygur Bokuk xan Koçogaru k(ä)lipän koyn yılka üç m(a)xistak olormak üçün mojakka keŋädi* ". . . wegen der im (cyclischen) Jahre 'Schaf' [zu bewirkenden] Niederlassung von drei Maxistak mit dem Možak Beratung hielt er", better 'sought the mojak's counsel'. The semantic connection with *keŋ* 'wide' is not too transparent but may have been calqued on some foreign model. The meaning of *keŋiş* 'advice' (an *-Xş* lexeme) shows that it comes from *keŋä-*.[5] *keŋäs* "shallow (water), easy (matter)" in DLT fol. 604 no doubt comes from an *-(X)z* derivate of this verb.

kın+a- 'to punish, torture'. The vowel of this verb is long in Tkm., and there is no doubt that it is derived from the noun *kıy(ı)n* transcribed as *kıyn* or *kın*, mentioned among the *-Xn* lexemes above. Some exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT*

3 The DLT lists it as Oguz.

4 To be completed e.g. as *kolınık altın kanazun* 'one should bleed his arm-pit'.

5 Republican Turkish *geniş* 'wide', on the other hand, comes from *keŋ+ü-*, q.v. below.

occur in Warnke 47, 165 and 352 and BT XIII 21,76 and perhaps also in BT II 1350: See the footn. thereto.

(*kırça-* is attested in DLT fol. 565 as *ol ok amaçka kırçadı* 'That arrow struck the side of the target and kept going'. The *EDPT* rightly postulated the existence of **kırş+a-* without knowing of *kırşa-l-*, q.v. below. Cf. *yapçur-* etc. for the post-consonatal development of /ş/ > /ç/ especially in the DLT. Concerning *kırça-t-* the DLT has an ex. about an eyebrow, which is more like the context of *kırşal-*. The hypothetical base **kırış* is not attested either, but should come from *kır-* 'to scrape'.)

ˈkız+a- 'to deflower (a virgin)' in DLT fol. 560 is noteworthy because of the meaning of 'undoing the base lexeme' which *+A-* here has. Compare this with *+sIrA-t-*, which signifies 'to create a lack of the base lexeme'.

kor+a- 'to suffer loss, to get destroyed'. Cf. the ns. to TT I 54 and 148. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Biverb with *es-il-* in Suv 56,4 and 245,16, BuyKäl 35 and MaitrGeng 13 a 10. Appears also in Wettkampf 80 and Suv 366,17.

kovuş+a- is attested in U IV B 50 with the meaning 'to straighten out, to smooth', and five times as *kurt kovşa-* 'of worms, to eat through, to hollow out' in the Maitr. DLT fol. 570 has *kovşa-* 'to straighten (an arrow)' and adds that there is a variant with *ġayn*. The base appears in DLT fol. 185 only as *koguş*, translated 'water course, drain, millrace' and 'arrow straightener'. What all these things have in common is their being hollowed out lengthwise, and we find, in the Codex Comanicus, *kouš* "hol", i.e. 'hollow'. Rabġūzī has *kovuş* 'gutter; hollow'. *EDPT* 613 b takes the °g° variants of base and *+A-* derivate to be the main ones, but they evidently constitute hypercorrections on the part of Kāšġarī: In his dialect, /g/ between rounded back vowels must already have been pronounced as a voiced bilabial glide. *kovuş* is a cognate of *kovok* 'hollow', attested since the DLT.[6]

kōŋl+ä- 'to think seriously about something'. The *EDPT* quotes this only from TT I and from modern Turkic.[7] For the semantic connection with *köŋül* cf. 'etw. zu Herzen nehmen" in German. Cf. *köŋlä-n-* below.

kur(u)g+a- appears in DLT fol. 571, translated "to dry up from lack of rain (of the ground)". The *-(X)g* derivate from this verb is much better attested: see that in section 3.101, where the base *kurug* can also be found. Cf. also *kurga-k*.

6 See the *EDPT*. For some reason, the Coman lexeme *kowuş* mentioned above is listed in the EDPT under *kovuk* and not under '2 *koğuş*'. *kuvı* 'unlucky, unfortunate' is not related to these lexemes. Oguz *kova* 'bucket, pail' probably is related, if we take it to come from **kov-ga* and to be a cognate of Mo. *koboga*. However, in spite of *EDPT* 583 b, **kovga* is not actually attested: The lexeme there quoted from M I should be read as *kuyka* and signifies 'skin of an animal'.

7 *sav* in the TT I instance signifies 'matter', and not "Wort" as written there or "statement" as in the *EDPT*.

(*kurşa-* 'to gird, surround, etc.'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; found also in BT II 966 and 976 and Maitr 83 v10. Cf. *kurşa-n-* and *kurşa-nl-* below. Listed here because the similarity with *kur* 'belt' is striking although there is no suffix '*+şA-*'. However, a collective suffix *+Xş* may be attested in *bagış* 'joints', attested in IrqB, DLT etc., if that is directly derived from *ba-g*; see above for the former and section 3.101 for the latter.[8] *kurşa-* might then be an *+A-* derivate from such a '**kur+ış*'.)

küç+ä- 'to use violence against somebody, force someone to do something, achieve something by force'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; also in Maitr 83 v24 and 110 r6, HamTouen 29,17-18[9] and BuddhUig I 107.

kür+ä- 'to desert, make oneself independent'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. *kür* appears in Hochzeit 29, DLT and QB; judging from what it signifies in the various modern languages, its basic meaning must have been something like 'self-willed, uncontrollable'. There is only one Uigur ex. of *kürä-*, in a Manichaean text. Cf. *kürä-g* above and *kürä-ş-* below; both are better attested than *kürä-*.

küz+ä- 'to spend the autumn (in a particular place, a particular way etc.)'. According to the *EDPT* a *hapax* in the DLT; found also in CYK 110: *mıŋ küz ädtä küz(ä)mäki bolzun* 'may he live through a thousand autumns'. The DLT's *küzük-*, *küzär-* and *küzKär-* have the season itself as subject.

orn+a- 'to settle down', from *orun* 'place'. *EDPT* from DLT and QB on; attested also in QB 4073 and 5738. Another ex. seems to appear in a fragmentary text, M III 43,5$_2$ (text 29). *orna-n-* is quite common, however, and so is *orna-g*, q.v. above. Cf. also *orna-ş-* and *orna-t-* below.

ot+a- 'to treat with medicinal herbs'. *EDPT* (second lemma s.v.) and *DTS*; a further ex. appears in Maitr 51 r7. This is the meaning the verb has also in the QB. For Käšgarī, however, 'to treat with medicine' is Oguz; he knows of *ota-* primarily with the meaning 'to trim the crop, cut the ears in tilling' (fol. 555).[10]

oyn+a- 'to play'. *EDPT*; further exs. in Yosıpas 126 (*oyun oynamış*), Maitr 32 v1, 140 r5, 134 r23 and 89 r16, SuvZieme 693,13, BuddhUig I 104 and 105 and UigTot 905 (*bödimäk oynamak*).

8 Other possible (though less convincing) candidates for such a formation would be *yemiş* 'fruit' from *ye-m* (discussed above); *bir ikinti+ş+kä* 'one another', if the '*ş*' here is not a 'contraction' of *+sI* (the possessive suffix). This *+Xş* would, furthermore, have to be distinct from the equally rare colour formative *+Xş* discussed in section 2.63.

9 *küçäp mä* (< *ymä*; not '*m(ä)n*', as Hamilton reads) *tarıyur m(ä)n . . . takı küçäp tarısar . . . . mä* is a focussing particle, demanded by the context; the repetition of the agent with the present form, on the other hand, would not be normal Old Turkic (although common in colloquial French or Hebrew).

10 *ota-* "to warm oneself by the fire and kindle the firewood", *ibid.*, need not have been a homophone, as *ot* 'fire' had a long vowel.

öç+ä- 'to desire revenge'. *EDPT* only from QB on, but add *öçäyü käklänü* (q.v. in the section on the *+lAn-* verbs) from ETŞ 13,138. *öçä-ş-*, q.v. below, has a wider semantic field.

ört+ä- 'to light or burn something'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in ETŞ 10,59, Maitr (nine times), Rāma 15, BT VII A333, UigTot 177 and 207 and QB 2656, 2769 and 5486. *ört* may come from *ör-* and is discussed in section 3.108. Cf. *örtä-n-* below.

san+a- 'to count'. The *EDPT*'s suggestion concerning S^{1}N^{1}G^{1}L^{1}I in Toñ 27, that it should be read as *aşangalı*, is likely but not necessary. Beside what is mentioned there, found also in Maitr 9 r6, 38 r28 and 103 r9 = MaitrH X 1 b10, BuddhUig I 398-401 (where it rather signifies 'to mention one by one, recount'), MoriContract 6 (twice) and elsewhere.

särm+ä- 'to strain a liquid', from *särim* 'a strainer', is by the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. Found also in BuddhUig II 90: *süçig çıvş(a)gun içgülärig süzüp särmäp kudturup . . .*, rendered by Ş. Tekin as "wird distilliert". The difference between *süz-* and *särmä-* appears to be the specificness of the latter about the instrument. Cf. *särmä-l-* below. The base *särim* is difficult to connect with *sär-* 'to endure'.

sıg(ı)t+a- 'to lament'. *EDPT*; further exs. in Ht X 1166 (with *ulı-*), Maitr 7 times with *ıgla-*, thrice with *ulı-* and once with *ulı-*, *mūŋrä-* and *yıgla-*, BuddhUig II 53 and 195 (both with *yıgla-*), TuoLuoNi 85, 316 and 330 (with *yıgla-*) and 280 (with *ulı-*) and perhaps BT XIII 3,76.

sın+a- 'to acquire experience of, to test'. *sın* 'the human body or stature' is well attested in Uigur. The semantic connection between it and *sına-* is not too obvious, but it should be noticed that both lexemes have a long °ı° in Tkm. In Heilk I found four times in *sınamış 'äm ol* 'This is a tested medicine'. Further Uigur exs. appear in Ht X 77, Ernte II 8 (against the eds.; cf. facs.) Maitr 60 v5, UigTot 213, Suv 600,2, Shō VI b9, BuddhUig II 197 and 263. The *EDPT* quotes DLT and several QB instances. Cf. *sınag* in section 3.101.

sig+ä- appears in BT VIII A146 in a biverb with *tut+a-* (q.v. below). Probably 'to urinate on', here used metaphorically; mo. *šige-* has this meaning. *sig* 'urine' is discussed in section 3.101; see *sid-* for other cognates. Cf. *kaşan-* (section 7.2) and, for the BT VIII A use, *kaşaŋ* as noted in the DLT (section 3.116 above).

suv+a- 'to irrigate land'. *EDPT* and both entries in *DTS* s.v. Further exs. in Ernte 25 and 40, Maitr 51 r1 ('nässen', not "glätten") and 120 r9 and in a ms. quoted in Sandel p. 379. Some of these and some additional instances are discussed in a long note to Murtuk 3, where the text has *suva-glıg*; I discuss *suva-glıg* in section 3.119 above.

tatg+a- 'to have a certain taste'. *Hap.* in BT XIII 8,13: *yapırgak täg tatgayu* 'tast-

ing like leaves'. The base of the common *tatga-n-*, which has the taster as subject; with *tatgā-*, on the other hand, the subject is the substance tasted.

tāŋ+ā- appears in Warnke 158: *bodıs(a)ıvlar birlā birikdāçi koŋūlūg, kertüdin kālmīşlār birlā tāŋādāçi koŋūlūg ōrītūp . . .* "eine mit den Tathāgatas gleich seiende Gesinnung hervorrufen". Intr., whereas *tāŋ+lā-* is tr. This context is very similar to Warnke 275: *koŋūlūmüz alko burxanlarnıŋ koŋüli birlā tāŋikip, kamag burxanlarnıŋ küsüşi birlā birikip . . .*; U II 48, 12-13: *bodısatvlarnıŋ koŋüli birlā tāŋ kōŋūlūg bulmak . . .* Another instance, *tāŋāgūlāk* [in Laut 42, probably signified something like '[difficult] to equal'. *tāŋā-şi* and *tāŋā-ş-*, qq.v. above and below respectively, come from this *tāŋā-*; the *tāŋ+ā-* which the *EDPT* quotes from the Atabatu 'l-Haqā'iq, on the other hand, signifies 'to value, to judge as equal (to)'.

tāpz+ā- 'to be envious'. DLT and QB. The *EDPT* does not mention QB 4252 and 4276; couplet 974, which it does mention, on the other hand, contains a form of the verb *tāp-*. *tāpiz* 'an envious person' and *tāpizlik* are both attested in the QB and the DLT.

(**terkā-* is not attested, but I know of *tirken-* in Anatolian Turkish (used of cranes flying in a row). DLT fol. 231 has the derivate *terkā-ş-* 'to walk in a line (used of camels and warriors)'. Unlike Dankoff and Kelly, we read the verb with /k/ and not /g/ in the second syllable, because of *terkiş* of the Orkhon inscriptions (q.v. among the *-Xş* formations) and because of the Anatolian verb. This does not preclude derivation from *ter-ig* (q.v. above among the *-(X)g* lexemes): The second vowel of *terig* getting syncopated, the sequence /rg/ would be regularly changed to /rk/: After /r/, the replacement of /g/ by /k/ is demanded by rules.)

tiş+ā- is attested in DLT fol. 561: *tägirmän tişädi* "he sharpened the cogs of the millstone". . . . *ol orgak tişädi* "He sharpened the teeth of the scythe". The DLT also has *tişā-t-* and *tişā-l-*, while *tişā-n-* has been wrongly written '*tişlän-*' and mixed up with the entry for *tışlan-* 'to grow teeth'. The base, probably attested in QB 2959 according to Tezcan's review of the QB İndeks, may be distinct from *tış* 'tooth'; the latter is consistently back-vocalic in Old Turkic and the DLT.

ton+a- appears in Maitr 9 r14 (*kādī]m ton ätük yevig tizig kädmiş tonamış körü kanınçs(ı)z . . . bir t(ā)ŋri [t(ā)ŋ]risi*) and Maitr 170 r27 (*bo tonug . . . kädär tonayur ārdi*). The phrase *kādgü tonagu* is found in Maitr 31 r1 and TT VI 392 (five mss. among six); the two lexemes in it are clearly morphologically parallel: *tonagu* is, then, unlikely to be a collective *+AgU* form signifying 'clothing'. *tona-* has been borrowed into the Mo. (XIIIth cent.) Secret History as (*ḥubcan*) *tono-* and served as base for *tona-t-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*; DLT ff.), *tona-n-* (q.v. below) and *tona-m* (q.v. above). *tona-* is not mentioned in the *DTS* nor, as lemma, in the *EDPT*; the latter mentions Middle and modern Turkic instances of it under *tonat-*.

tōgn+ā- 'to cauterise'. Earliest in TT VII 21 and the DLT.

tōl+ā- The *EDPT* has two lemmata of this form. The first quotes the DLT *hapax* signifying 'to lamb'. The second concerns *tōlā-* 'to pay (a debt), repay (a loan)', according to Clauson "almost certainly a Mong. l.-w. fr. *tōlō-*": It appears in late economic documents. But *tōl* 'progeny, descendants' could easily have made the semantic transfer to 'interest'. A good discussion of this verb is found in Clark, 1975: 155-157. Clark says that *tōlā-* is indeed from Turkic *tōl*, as Doerfer holds, but that the meaning 'to pay' evolved in Mo.; with this other meaning, the lexeme would then have been reborrowed into Turkic. See *TMEN* II 630-31. A simplex **tōlā-* is reconstructed under *tōlāk* (section 3.102).

tōlt+ā- 'to provide with cushions, lay out cushions'. The *EDPT* has one Uigur ex.; additional exs. are found in Abhi 2499 and BuddhUig II 122: *kaşınçıg körklā ol orun üzäsindā . . . orun tōşāk* SWQ *sunçuklarıg yaraşturu tōlţāp tōşāp . . . toorlarıg asarlar. tōltā-glig*, q.v. above, comes from this verb. The base signifies 'cushion'. It appears in the *EDPT* as '*tōlet*' i.e. '*tōlāt*', but is in fact always spelled as *tōlt*: *tōlt oron* in TT VIII D12 (Brāhmī!)[11] and similarly in Uigur script. The semantic, phonological and collocational affinity of *tōlt* and *tōşā-* can be explained lambdacistically.

tuş+a- 'to hobble' is quoted in the *EDPT* from QB 712. A further ex., the plural imperative *tuşa-ŋ*, is found in QB 2302.[12] *tuşa-g* 'a hobble' appears in the DLT, *tuşaglıg* in QB. '*tuşaglıg yinçü*' in FamArch 16 makes no sense and should be an error. *tuş* 'buckle' is attested in DLT and QB.

tut+a- 'to disparage'. See '*tota-*' in the *EDPT* and especially *utrun-* '*toda-*' in the *DTS*. We now know that the base is *tut* because of TU-DAḪ-YAG ZAB DIṄ-LA-YUR = *tut ayıg sav tıŋlayur* in BuddhKat 28, translated "Er hört herabsetzende, schlechte Worte . . .". The vowel is clearly *u*; while this text occasionally writes *o* for /u/ of the first syllable, it never has *u* for usual /o/. We know that the final dental is /t/ and not /d/ as the only word-final /d/ is written with *l* in this text.[13] Found also in BT VIII A 146, M II 11,6 (4th text), Suv 556,9-11, HamTouen 1,27, 40 and 42. Mo. *duta-*, Yak. *tutā-* and Teleut *tuda-*, mentioned in the n. to the last mentioned ex., show the expected form of this verb. The last two come from Mo., though, as they all three signify 'to be insufficient, wanting, lacking'.

11 The instance reads as tōl̲ə̲t[o]roṃ: On the same page, l.15, the well-known *alp* is written as al̲ə̲*p*, as we read also in *UW* s.v. *alp*. The same phrase appears in Maitr 12 r5, *tōlt* [in Maitr 30 v4, *tōlt tōşāk* in Maitr 65 r7, 73 r32, 76 r1 and 165 r16 and Suv 80,19 and 156,2, [*tō*]*ltın tōşākın* in Kuan 87, *tōlt oron tōşāk* in Maitr 58 r19 and *oron tōlt tōşāk* in Suv 513,13.

12 Arat had changed this to the unattested '*boşaŋ*'. Mss. B and C write *tuşaŋ*, A '*tasaŋ*'. Restored by Dankoff.

13 In the lexeme *egid*, written 'YE-GIL. This is probably intended to represent the sound [ð]. *yutuz* is spelled as YUL-TU-Z[and YULD-TUS in that text, perhaps standing for **yuðtuz*.

Whether the Mo. verb, with this meaning, really is related to the Old Turkic lexeme is a difficult question. *tut* appears, in addition to the exs. of the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, in BT I D(108) and F6; cf. *tut tulvı*, mentioned among the *-vl* forms.

(tuvr+a- 'to grow big' is a hap. in DLT fol. 566. Käšgarī says that this is derived from the lexeme found in *tuvur yinçü* "large pearls". Dankoff and Kelly spell the base as TUWUZ in the text but add the footn.: "Apparently corrected from TUWUR . . . ". In case *tuvuz* should nevertheless be the shape of the base, this would be a parallel to the derivation of *+s(I)rA-* verbs from *+sXz* nominals.)

tükä- 'to be completed, fulfilled'. Has been suggested by R. Dankoff at the P.I.A.C. meeting of 1983 to come from **türk+ä-*. This seems quite plausible: /rK/ clusters are often (though sporadically) simplified by deletion of /r/, e.g. in *irklä-* > *iklä-*, the two *bärk*, **kir-Kür-* etc.[14] The meaning of *tükä-* appears to have slipped towards 'coming to an end', but the earliest instances (e.g. in the IrqB), *tükä-l* 'perfect' and the adverb *tükäti* show that 'completion' was nearer to what the original meant.

tün+ä- 'to spend the night'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Beside the DLT and the QB attested once in Suv, and, additionally, in HtPar 162,25 (quoted in *UW* 252 b), V 16 a 5 and VII 5 b 20. Cf. *tünä-t-* below.

tüş+ä- 'to dream'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also s.v. *tül* 'dream', together with which it is practically always used before the DLT. *tüş* 'dream' appears first in the DLT and the QB, and must have become obsolete in the dialect(s) represented by Old Turkic proper. *tül tüşä-* appears also in Suv 16,15 (found in SuvLeg as well), UigTot 691, 789 and 791, Ht VII 14 b 21 and X 491, *tüşämiş tül* in BT XIII 2,45 and Ht X 320-21. In Suv 627,7 and Ht X 181, 527, 553 and 700, *tüşä-* has the dream's content as explicit or implied object. Bang, 1925 b: 400 connects all this with *tün* 'night'.

tüşn+ä- is attested only in DLT fol. 124, where it is used to describe mist as being stationary. Cf. *tüşnä-k* in IrqB LXI, Ht VII 7 a 12 and QB. The verb comes from *tüş-ün* 'lodgings, inn', of which there are a dozen exs. in the QB.

tütn+ä- from *tüt-ün* 'smoke' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *Hap.* in *içdin sınar tüṭün tüṭnäyür tägirü bälgülär bolur* (UigTot 262) "Im Inneren gibt es Zeichen$_2$ als ob Rauch raucht".

ug(u)r+a- 'to intend or plan (to do) something'. Instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in ETŞ 10,289 (with the beneficiary of the action in the accusative), TuoLuoNi 187 and UigBlock 35.

yag+a- 'to present a sacrifice' is attested in BT II 640, Maitr 117 v 12 and 95 r 6 and MaitrH I 16 b 28 (quoted in Laut, 1986: 21), in all four cases with *yagış* as

14 The simplification of *tärtrü* to *tätrü* is related. Further exs. under *körk+äd-* below.

object. In MaitrH XI 3 b16 (*yagap* on the facs.; misread) the object is *yagış saçıg*. *yagış* (q.v. among the *-Xş* derivates) comes from *yag+a-*. The connection with 'fat' is present also in Jewish and pagan Greek terminology on sacrifice to the deity.

yalın+a- 'to flame'. Cf. *yalın+la-* and *yal-ın-* below. Derived from *yal-ın* (section 3.107). Exs. of *yalına-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* can be found in BT V 435, BT VII A 110 and 324-25, UigTot 670, 674, 799, 800 etc., Maitr 24 r3 and so forth. The phrase *yalınayu tur-* appears also in CYK 88, Warnke 26, BT VII A 23 and 256 and BT VIII B 10, 136, 137 etc.; it signifies 'to stand ablaze'.[15]

yaş+a- 'to live'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in UigKol 33,[16] Ht X 347-8, CYK 65, ShōAgon 1,109, sixteen times in Maitr (often with *yaş* or *yıl* as internal object), Shō III a1 and BT XIII 49,47 and 52,1.

yaş(ı)n+a- 'to flash'. Usually in the phrase *yaşın yaşna-*, of lightning. Beside the DLT etc. attested in Suv, TT VIII A 8,[17] and BT XIII 27,6:] *kökin yaşınayur köl suvları* 'the lake's waters are flashing with the blue of . . .'. *yaşın* (an *-Xn* lexeme) can itself also signify 'gleam etc.'; cf. BT VIII B 90 and footnote.

yol+a- 'to pass through; to advance in a certain direction'. The *EDPT* misquotes Ht V 281-2: The text has *yolap*. KP LX 7-8 should not be read as '*yolayu*' but as *yol ay-u*. Further exs. of *yola-* appear in Warnke 585, ShōAgon 1,288 and Maitr 12 v7. The instance in BT XIII 28,25, *tagtın sınar yolıyu . . . taŋ adınçıg bägdinikä tapıg udug kılayın* "nach Norden mich wendend . . ." is dubious: The aberrant form *yolıyu* appears only in one among two mss. extant in this passage.

yumş+a- 'to send somebody' appears in *ärklig x[an bir yäk] ol [bayagut]ka yumşap . . .* (TuoLuoNi 245) ". . ., sandte Ärklig X[an einen Yakşa] zu dem [Reichen]" and *'ärin atın kızın kırkının işkä küçkä irtkä bertkä ıdtımız yumşadımız* (Maitr 62 v12). Middle Turkic exs. are quoted in the *EDPT* under the lemma *yumşa-* 'to be soft' and in the *DTS*. See *yumuş* and *yumuşçı* in the *EDPT*.

Three petrified converbs are related to this formation: *ugrayu* comes from *ug(u)r+a-*, while no related *+A-* verbs are attested for the other two.

äŋäyü '(in) particular, special' is always written as if it were to be read as '*aŋayu*', '*näŋäyü*' or '*naŋayu*'. However, the form *'äŋänyük* discussed under

15 What appears in M III 24,5$_4$ (text 9) and U I 37,8 (Töten) are instances of *yalvar-*, as now confirmed by Zieme (personal communication).

16 *mıŋ tümän yaşayu y(a)rlıkazun* "möge geruhen, 1000 × 10,000 [Jahre] zu leben". Should this be bracketed as (*mıŋ tümän yaş*)*ayu*??

17 Misunderstood by the editor: She translates the instance as "leben" and would like to emend it to '*yaşan-*'.

äŋäŋ- in section 7.21 shows that it had front vowels: It is written with front K in all instances. *äŋäyü* no doubt comes from *äŋ* 'most', which is also written in Uigur script as if it were *'aŋ'* or *'näŋ'* or *'naŋ'*. *äŋäyü* appears in the *DTS* under *'aŋaju'*; Clauson did not believe in the existence of such a lexeme, and the *EDPT* mentions a few Uigur exs. under *aŋaru*. Some of the passages in which *äŋäyü* can be found are U II 38,69, KudJunshō C r 5-6, Māngi 2, Abhi B 48 a 5, Ht IV 1336 and Ht VII 1859. In a n. to her edition of the last mentioned instance, A. v. Gabain quotes a number of additional exs. from mss. of the Ht, and discusses the lexeme. *äŋäyü üzä* in Genzan D v 9-10 may possibly be a mistake for *äŋäyü ök* on the part of the copyist. The words are damaged but the facs. shows that Röhrborn's reading is highly likely. *katnayu* is not mentioned in the *EDPT* but quoted in the *DTS* from Suv (with *ekilāyü*). Further exs. appear in ETŞ 20,123, ShōAgon 1,82 and 83 and HtPek 101 r 5-10. It is used adverbially to qualify the verb phrases *okıtu nomlayu yarlıka-*, *kolola-*, *okı-*, *sözlä-* and *yor-* and signifies 'over and again, repeatedly'. A verb *'katna-'* is not known,[18] but the source is to be found in the expression *katın katın* 'repeatedly', quoted in Gabain, 1974: 141 from two passages in HtPar and attested also in TuoLuoNi 285.

ugrayu 'especially, particularly, exactly, precisely, just, just then' is discussed in the *DTS* s. v. *'oyraju'* and in *EDPT* 91, in the n. to TT V B 86 and in Kudara's n. to his reedition of that text. It comes from *ug(u)r+a-*, q. v. above. Additional exs. appear in BT I D (148) and (181), Suv 593,1, ShōAgon 1,195, 283 etc., Ht IV 1100, Abhi B 52 a 6 and BuddhUig I 3 b 6-4 b 4. See *swk-(g)a* in section 3.323 for the binome *ugrayu swka*. HtPar 132,24 (quoted in *UW* 249 a) and perhaps other passages show *ugrayu* in adnominal use, meaning 'particular'.

+A- is the second most common denominal formative, and quite a number of additional instances could have been quoted from Qarakhanid sources. It is added only to mono- or bisyllabic stems which have to end in consonants. There is no limitation on the shape of monosyllabic bases. None of the more than thirty bisyllabic bases ends in a cluster; all of them, with the exception of the hapax *mayak+a-* (+ hapax *mayaka-n-*), have the narrow vowel of fourfold harmony in the second syllable. These two constraints must be connected with the fact that this second vowel is often syncopated away. The runic inscriptions are equivocal in this respect, but elsewhere there is good evidence from all types of texts both for syncopation and for its absence. This syncopation leads to contraction in Qarakhanid *bāzā-* (mentioned above).

18 DLT fol. 576 has a verb thrice written as *kayna-* and translated as 'to refuse to obey an order, to be insolent to the one ordering and contradict his words'. This is *not* the meaning one would expect from the finite counterpart of *katnayu*, *kayna-* should not be altered to read *'katna-'*, therefore, as both the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly do.

Most bases of *+A-* verbs appear to be simple nominals, but deverbal ones are quite common. Most of the latter are derived from *-Xn* or *-Xş* forms and are listed at the end of the sections dealing with these formatives. Cf. also the hap. *tat(ı)g+a-*.

+A- verbs are expanded with all major deverbal formatives, the causative affix being *-(X)t-*.

Discussion of late and modern forms can be found in Schakir, 1933: 18-22.

5.12 *+lA-*

Most Old Turkic *+lA-* verbs starting with *ad°* to *av°* are discussed in *UW* 1-4, but a few are not. These latter ones will here be listed first.

adok+la- 'to be astonished at something' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Attested also in Ht V 9 a25, clear in the facs.: *körtäçi kişi tanırkap toyın körkin adoklap Odon kanka ötünti* 'Persons who saw him were amazed, astonished at his monk's appearance, and related (the matter) to the king of Khotan'. The DLT also has *adok nāŋ* 'an unknown thing', and derives it from *agduk* 'imperfect etc.'. This suggestion, which the *EDPT* follows, cannot be correct as the /g/ would not have been elided as early as the Ht text. Nor is it likely that the Khotanese who came across Vairocana in the wilderness should have thought him to be deficient or imperfect. *adok* should probably be connected with *ad-*, *adın* etc.

adut+la- 'to scoop up with the palm (*adut*) of one's hand' is applied to coins and water in DLT fol. 151 (q.v. in the *EDPT*) and to sand in BT XIII 4,40: *adutlap kumug s[aç-* (?)].

agduk+la- from *agduk* (q.v. in the *UW*) appears as a hap. in HamTouen 1,52': *baxşılar okısar agduklamazunlar* 'que les mâitres [qui] les lisent ne les jugent pas (par trop) repréhensibles". For the semantics of *+lA-* in this passage cf. *ayıg+la-*.

aŋla- 'to understand' is not an Old Turkic verb at all. The *EDPT* shows that some runic instances are in fact figments. The only ex. adduced for Uigur (quoted in the *EDPT*) is most likely to be a misreading: See the facs. *aŋla-* is limited to Western Turkic (ʿAli, the Codex Comanicus, Ottoman etc.) and the DLT says that it is Oguz. Although *aŋlıg* and *aŋsız* can be found in Uigur as well (and are quoted in the *UW* s.vv. *aŋlag* and *aŋsız*), *aŋ* itself is mentioned only by Middle Turkic lexiographers. *aŋ+gar-* (q.v. in section 7.43) may have been an error. *aŋla-* was therefore *created* in the west, albeit prehistorically. Khal. *aŋla-* may be a borrowing from Azeri.

The next thirteen verbs are all listed in the *UW*; there is some evidence to be added, however, both Uigur and other.

adırt+la- 'to distinguish between things; to analyse'. Further Uigur evidence: Ā ṭ Sū 1 v 5 (Brāhmī script), Genzan C v 4, ShōAgon 1,20 and 2, p. 192,2, Abhi 2037,

UigFalt 115-6 and 121, ÅgFrag (1) B 9, BT VIII A 7, Buddhāv H 82, BuddhUig I 202 and 210 and II 44 and 476, SuvLeg T I D 129 v 13 (≈ Suv 15,4) and ms. T III 86-94 (U 1000) v 9 quoted in the introduction to Rāma, and so forth. Among these additional instances we find the biverbs *talula-adırtla-* and *kolola-adırtla-* which do not appear at all among the *UW*'s exs., and nine instances of *böl-adırtla-*, which is there quoted only once.

agır+la- 'to honour, respect'. Exs. of the common biverb *aya-agırla-* not listed in the *UW* entry for it can be found there under *aya-*; TuoLuoNi 255 = 259 is not listed there either. A further instance of *agırla-* appears in BuddhUig II 287.

agruk+la- is attested in fragmentary context in U III; a bit damaged, but well visible in the facs. Another ex. appears in MaitrH X 4 b22, is written *agrukłamatın* and signifies 'without feeling it as a burden'. The subject of this verb is the future mother of Buddha Maitreya; the body described in ls. 16-22 (the object of the verb) is not her body, however (not *'ät'özin'* but *ät'özüg*) but the body of her son. Both the translation and footn. 36 thereto are therefore misguided. Cf. *agru-k* above and *agrukla-n-* below.

ak+la- 'to abhor something'. See the *UW* also for the base. Exs. not mentioned there occur in ShōAgon 2, p. 190,2$_1$, BT XIII 19,25, Weih 6 and 7 (not certain as neither fits the context in meaning) and MaitrGeng 13 a 9.

amrak+la- is not a *UW* lemma. The expression *amraklagu kuvrag* appears in MaitrGeng 4 a 27, 7 a 15 and 7 b 23. In Maitr 101 r 1 there is a word appearing between lacunae, hesitatingly read as *amraklaşu* in the *UW* and as] *amraklagu* [by Ş. Tekin. Since all four instances appear in the same text and since a *+lA-* derivate from *amra-k* has appeared nowhere else, they are likely to represent *amrakla-gu*: Vowel converbs are not used in such constructions. *amrak+la-* must have been tr.

anço+la- 'to present something to a superior, an offering to a god etc.'. Uigur exs. not mentioned in the *UW* occur in BuddhUig II 535, 546 and 551. See the *EDPT* for Orkhon evidence and the *UW* for the base.

ara+la- 'to interrupt, to stop' is adequately discussed in the *UW*; it appears only in Uigur.

arıla- 'to intercede'; in Uigur 'in somebody's favour', in the DLT 'between parties, with a view to reconcile them'. The Uigur verb goes with the person, the soul or the life one intercedes for in the accusative, and with suffering in the ablative case. DLT fol. 156 gives *ara+la-* as canonical form but adds: "You may say *arıladı*; this is the colloquial pronunciation but the first is more correct". The DLT's view of the verb thus accords with the *UW*'s etymology. The n. to Samanta 6 suggests deriving *arıla-* from *arıg+la-* and accordingly translates the instances also quoted in the *UW* as "rein sein/werden", but this meaning does

not quite fit the contexts. Note that *arıg+la-* exists in Uigur in the unshortened form; that the same development occurred also in *övkilā-* < *övkā+lā-* and in *arıçı* 'intercessor' < *ara+çı*. For the semantics, cf. *ara kir-* and (*ara kir-*)*iş-*, exs. of which are listed in *UW* 171 a. (par. A,c).[19]

arıg+la- 'to pick out the best, sift out'. The *EDPT* has the DLT instance, the *UW* two Uigur ones. Cf. also *arıgla-t-* below.[20] A third Uigur instance is quoted in the n. to Samanta 6 from an unpublished text. This instance, which refers to the purification of a religious offering, would lend support to Zieme and Kara's interpretation of *arugl(a)p* in UigTot 1307 against the *UW* suggestion to emend this to *anukl(a)*- "vorbereiten". A verb '*anuk+la-*' is not otherwise attested, but '*anukl(a)*-' should probably be cancelled.

*ar*Kula- 'to mediate' is written with *ghain* in DLT fol. 159 (thrice), but DLT fol. 82 we find *arkuçı* 'mediator' written with *qāf*. The *UW* lemma for the verb is *arkula-* and not *argula-* although the single instance can be interpreted both ways, as Röhrborn considers connecting the verb with *arku* 'valley'. The matter remains open, as the context of the only Uigur ex. is quite obscure. The real problem are the conditions under which the opposition between /g/ and /k/ gets neutralised after /r/; these have not yet been studied. We only know that the DLT's *argula-* and *arkuçı* must have a common origin; the Uigur and the Qarakhanid verb may or may not be related.

arok+la- 'to take a rest'. See the *UW* for the Uigur, the *EDPT* for Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic instances. Intransitive.

arvı+la- 'to doubt'. Hap. In BuddhUig II. The base is attested once in Ht; see the *UW* for both.

*as*Kançu+*la-* 'to jeer at, deride, make fun of, wheedle' is fully documented in the *UW*. *as*Kançula- and *tagonla-* sometimes appear together, as do their bases *as*Kançu (q.v. in the *UW*) and *tagon*. 'A-SKAN-CU-LA-MA-SA of BuddhKat 13 fixes the voicelessness of the sibilant, though not necessarily of the velar: The suffix *-gAlI* is written as *-kAlI* after voiceless vowels in this text, which shows that there was a voicelessness assimilation at least with velars. This assimilation definitely did not take place in runic Turkic and was probably not general in Uigur either.

at+la- 'to ride a horse'. Hap. in a passage published in Profan p. 282, not in the

19 One argument I use against deriving *arıla-* from *arıgla-*, namely that *arıgla-* exists in Uigur, could have been used against *ara+la-* as well. All exs. we have of *arala-* have the form *aralap*, however, and this *may* be a lexicalised gerund. The split of *ayıg* 'bad' into *ayıg* and *ayı* 'very' is not a good counterargument either: *ayı* is an expressive particle, and such elements often escape the normal sound laws.

20 See also the discussion of the *UW* entry in section 1.1 of my introduction.

UW; *at arkasında atlamak*, *yaŋa boyunta* (thus?!) *yatlamak* "auf dem Pferderücken reiten, auf dem Elefantennacken Fremde attackieren". *atla-n-* and *atlantur-* are better attested.

av+la- 'to hunt wild game'. The instance 'quoted' in the *DTS* is a conjecture. The *EDPT*'s two lemmata of this form should be one, as the phrase *tägirmilägü avlap . . .* quoted from U IV A 20 and 192 in the second does not justify the assumption of a different verb: The surrounding action is expressed in the first verb and not in the second, and there is no doubt from the *context* that this surrounding is hostile. Therefore, there hardly is any semantic affinity with *av-* 'to crowd around'. For the reason just mentioned, the gloss "umzingeln" of the *UW* entry (where all the Uigur evidence is collected) is also misguided.

ayıg+la- 'to slight, scorn'. *EDPT* and *DTS*;[21] a further ex. appears in the *DTS* s.v. *ajıyla-*. Not "peculiar to Uyğur", as the *EDPT* writes: Found also in QB 685.

bag+la- 'to tie (down)'. Another instance in Maitr 66 r 9. The runic instance quoted in the *EDPT* has the rather specific meaning 'to attach one's daughter to a (different) clan'. Otherwise, the *EDPT* only has Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic exs. Attested also in Uigur, as *bag baglaguçı kişi* (Ernte 58), *bars baglamak* (UigTot 783 and 787) and *bamak baglamak* (UigTot 788). Cf. *bagla-l-* below.

baktokla- Hap. in Suv quoted in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*: *törttin sıŋar baktokılap barın idi tapmatı* 'He searched in all four directions but could in no way find his possessions'. Either derived from the *-dUk* form of *bak-*, or from the *-Ok* derivate of *bak-ıt-*, q.v. below: *+lA-* is frequently added to *-Ok* forms, but *-dUk* does not serve as base for derivations (except the fully petrified *agduk* in the hap. *agdukla-*).

maŋ+la- 'to stride'. To the ex. quoted in the *EDPT* add *akru akru maŋlayu* (Maitr 90 v 5), *yeti maŋ maŋlayu* (Maitr 145 r 30) *maŋlamış maŋıŋızlar* (Tiš 45 b 6) and *bir maŋın bardaçı maŋladaçı* (BT VIII B 221). Cf. *maŋ maŋmışça* (Suv 418 fin.): Why the language should have needed both *maŋ-* and *maŋla-* is a question I must leave unanswered.

basut+la- Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Hap. in Abhi 14: *kadyot kurtnuŋ yarokı kün t(ā)ŋrinin yarokıŋa basutlayurınça* should be translated as 'just as (little) as the light of the fire-fly aids the light of the sun'.

baş+la- 'to start something; to be the leader, to manage (intr.)'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; the latter also s.v. *başlamaq*. Additional exs. appear in Pfahl II 4, HamTouen 20,14 and 23,13, Ht V 6 a 25, etc.; there are many in the Maitr. See below for *başlayu*, a petrified converb.

bädiz+lä- is a hapax in IrqB XXVIII, used together with *mäŋi+lä-* 'to rejoice'.

21 The instance from TT VI quoted in the *DTS* appears in l. 46 and not 44.

bādiz 'drawing, ornamentation' is attested with *māŋi* in BT V 674 (Manichaean): *]ŋIn māŋin bādizin* [. For the meaning cf. the binomial *oyun bādiz* in BT VII A 174, 179, 184 and 189, not very satisfactorily translated as "Verzierungen". *bādiz* may have denoted anything with 'anmutigem Schwung', both moving and stationary.

bāk+lā- 'to fasten, secure, lock into'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Found also in Suv 208,22-23, BT XIII 5,67, Neujahr 44, Maitr 83 r31 and 84 r11-12, ShōKenkyū III 28, Ht X 1125, BT VII A 661 and so forth.

bālgū+lā- 'to follow up, search into'. The *EDPT* only quotes an instance from QB 792, which is misunderstood; 'to impart an explanation', as Dankoff translates the verb, is much more appropriate. It appears also in QB 5469, but there Dankoff leaves it untranslated. Uigur instances of *bālgūlā-* can be found in ShōAv 99, Ht V 15 a3 and VII 8 a27.

bāliŋ+lā- 'to start up, to feel very anxious and panic'. *DTS* s.v. '*ūrk- beliŋlā-*' and *EDPT*. Appears also in BT I D (61), BuddhUig II 306, Ht IV 712 and X 182, 313, 465 and 827, UigTot 77 and 1277, Maitr 196 v15 and 165 r23. See the *EDPT* for the base.

māŋ+lā- 'to look for grain'. Hapax in the IrqB, biverb with *āŋ+lā-*; similarly, *āŋ* and *māŋ* are used together in this text.

māŋi+lā- 'to rejoice, be happy, have a good time'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; the latter also s.v. *māŋi māŋilā-*, a phrase which can be found in BT XIII 1,34, thrice in Maitr 140 r15-24 and CYK 105 as well. The biverb *ilinçülā- māŋilā-* is used, among other places, in ĀgFrag (1) G5. Further exs. appear in ShōAv 12, twice in BuddhUig II, CYK 86, Hochzeit 26, BT XIII 49,80, Suv 209,18 (quoted s.v. *sogı-n-* below), Schwitz 32 and more than fifty times in the Maitr. *mōŋilā-* in verse in DLT fol. 620 may not be an error, as the *EDPT* assumes, although the main lemma is *māŋilā-*: The W is written by the first hand, and the vowel may have been rounded, in the dialect of the quatrain quoted, by the /m/.

boguz+la- 'to cut somebody's (or an animal's) throat' is quoted in the *EDPT* only from Middle Turkic on. It is, however, attested also in Ht IV 581: *yti kılıç üzā boguzladı, karnın tāşdi* 'with a sharp sword he cut his throat and pierced his belly'. There is an instance of *boguzla-n-* (q.v.) in Orkhon Turkic.

boşı+la- 'to beg for alms' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* but appears in Maitr 131 v11 and 183 r19 (tr.).

boto+la- A hapax in IrqB. *boto* is a 'camel colt', and *botola-* denotes the giving birth to one.

bozla- 'of a camel, to bellow' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, Middle Turkic and modern languages. It is found also in Brāhmī script, in two parallel mss. in ĀṭSū 3 r4 and 4 r c: *tävä tāg bozladaçılar* 'those who bellow like camels'.

bukagu+la- 'to fetter'. Found in Suv in a biverb with *bāklā-* (quoted by the *DTS*

s.v. *'bo°'*) and in two mss. in TT VI 110 (one quoted there, the other in OdaUigh A 11) together with *ba-*.

(butarla- 'to tear to pieces, to destroy' is probably formed with *+lA-*, but the *EDPT*'s etymology is unlikely.[22] Cf., on the other hand, BWTR "cotton of rushes" in DLT fol. 181. Exs. of the verb not mentioned in the *EDPT* are found in Maitr 173 r 24, 67 r 9, 78 r 22, 183 v 24 and 85 r 4 (all of them in the biverb *buza butarlayu* except one, in which *buza* is in a lacuna) and BT XIII 12,222. Attested both in Uigur and Manichaean script.)

buyan+la- 'to do a meritorious deed towards somebody'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Both their exs. are *buyanlayu yarlıka-* and refer to begging. In addition, we find *buyanlap kutgar-* with acc. in MaitrGeng 2 a 1.

buzagu+la- 'to calve'. The form in the IrqB is not "grammatically impossible', as Clauson thinks: *ingäk buzagulaçı bolmış* 'the cow was about to calve' has a semantic and formal parallel in DLT fol. 246 in *kulnaçı kısrak* 'a mare which is about to foal (*kulun+a-*)'. Add *buzagulaçı kotuz ingäk* (UigPañc 115). This must be the positive counterpart of the negative *-mAçI* participle.

bügü+lä- 'to make one's mystical wisdom bear on a matter'. The *EDPT* quotes this verb only from the XIVth century on and the *DTS* has two exs. from the QB. It appears also in Uigur: *bügülāyū y(a)rlıka-* (NesTex T III B 99 c 10) "möge geruhen weise zu sein" and *bügülämäk ädrämkä . . . täg-* (BuddhUig II 175). *bügülā-n-* is much more common in Uigur.

çagı+la- 'to babble, to gurgle', only of a flowing liquid. Thus *çagılar ögüz* "ein rauschender Fluß" in Hochzeit 31 and the verse instance referring to blood in DLT fol. 586. The *EDPT* has one entry for *çagıla-* (attested to this day in Republican Turkish with reference to water running or falling in nature) and *çogıla-*, although the latter is translated in the DLT as 'to shout', and has human subjects. While *çogı* is attested with the appropriate (human) meaning in Uigur, in the DLT and the QB, the base of *çagıla-* is known to me only from Ottoman *çagu*, *çag* etc. If Argu had *çagı* for *çogı* 'clamor', as DLT fol. 544 says, this does not mean that other dialects did not make the difference.

çam+la- 'to raise an objection'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in ActeOuig 14, twice in Ramstedt II 13 and MoriContract 15-16. This is a legal term. Base and cognates are mentioned in the beginning of section 2.94 above.

çöklä- 'to sacrifice by fire' is attested thrice in the phrase *otka çöklämişig yetäçilär* in one text published in U II, as mentioned in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. Explained by Ligeti in *AOH* 27 (1973): 149, it corresponds to Chin. "démons mangeant des offrandes brulées". *çök* is not attested in Uigur, but exists in

22 Aorist forms are not likely to have served as bases for derivation, and *buta-* turns up only in Middle Turkic.

Tat., Kaz. and Chuv. as "Opfer, Opferung, Opferfest". Cf. also *çöksig* in section 2.32 above.

çug+la- 'to tie up, wrap up' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, the QB, Middle Turkic etc. and is attested also in BT VII A256.[23] See the entry *I çu:g* in the *EDPT* for the base.

ād+lā- 'to make good use of a thing, to cultivate a garden, etc.'. There are a number of exs. in economical documents in USp and AmongUighDoc 9; it appears also in DLT and QB. The ex. in Mängi 3 should be translated as 'to esteem', a meaning attested in the DLT and the QB; cf. *san+la-* below.

ādgü+lā- is not mentioned in the dictionaries, and apparently attested only in Ht IV 1532. We there find the biverb *yegläyürlär . . . ādgülāyürlär* signifying 'they think well of it'; it clearly comes from the binome *yeg ādgü*. Cf. *ādgülāş-* below and, for the meaning, *ayıgla-* and *agdukla-*.

ām+lā- 'to treat and cure with medicine'. In fr. T III 84-75 r32 (in the n. to U IV D76-77) there is a *figura etymologica* with medicine as object: *anı tāg tapınıp udunup ām āmläp ymā ol tınl(ı)glarnıŋ iglärin ketärgäli umadı* "Obwohl er ihnen also Pflege angedeihen ließ und ihnen Medizin verabreichte, war er doch nicht imstande, jener Lebewesen Krankheiten zu vertreiben". Other exs. have this verb with the patient or the illness as object. Other instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* (qq.v.) appear in BT II 1001, Maitr 51 r7, BT XIII 12,127, Suv 587,10, 588,16-17, 589,5, 593,18, 598,16 and 603,3 and TuoLuoNi 75 and 124.

āmgāk+lā- 'to crawl', of human beings. Attested in this form in Ht X 354 in fragmentary context (although the word itself seems to be clear enough), and then in several sources from the XVth century on. In U IV C (quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. '*emgekle-*') we find *]işin böksägin*[24] *ömgäklädilär*. The last word appears to be a bit damaged, though, and may possibly be *emg°*; variants of this verb and of *āmgāk* with initial /e/ are found in Middle Turkic. Otherwise, *ömgäklā-* may have come about through sporadic rounding due to the contiguity with /m/. The DLT's *āmgāk+lān-* 'to consider some matter to be a hardship' is not derived from this.

ānük+lā- 'to give birth to young', in Suv of a tigress and in the DLT of a bitch and a lioness. The *EDPT* and the *DTS* have the same ex. from Suv; add the following (*ibid.* 610,2-3): *ānüklägäli yeti kün bolmış* 'It was seven days since she (the tigress) had given birth'.

āŋ+lā- 'to search for wild game'. Hapax in Irq B. This text is our evidence for both

23 The İndeks to the QB mixes up this verb with *çogla-*, a variant of *çogı+la-* which has a well-documented entry in the EDPT. *çogı+la-* is mentioned also under *çagı+la-* above.

24 Thus, as expected, in the facs., against the text of the edition.

äŋ (q.v. in the *EDPT*) and its derivates, showing that they were pronounced with front vowels. In Uigur, *äŋçi* and *äŋän-* (q.v. among the *-(X)n-* verbs) are spelt with two *alifs*,[25] presumably (as in other cases) to make sure that the second phoneme was read as *n*. This was no doubt also the spelling of *äŋ* in Uigur, for Mo. *aŋ* and *aŋči* are evident cases of spelling pronunciation. The Mo. lexemes were subsequently borrowed into North-East Turkic languages (quoted in the *EDPT*).[26]

är+lä- There are two distinct verbs of this form, neither of them mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. 1 *ärlä-* 'to enjoy male company' is attested in KPZieme 10 and 11, 2 *ärlä-* 'to be manly' in Neujahr 52 and 62. Neujahr 62, e.g., reads *ärk üzä ärlämäk* "an Kraft männlich sein". *ärlä-n-* in DLT fol. 133 is derived from the first and signifies 'to marry a man', *ärlä-ş-* 'to vie in manliness' in DLT fol. 126 from the second. Since 1 *ärlä-* and 2 *ärlä-* have no semantic traits in common except what is denoted by their mutual base, they must be treated as homophones.

ärig+lä- Attested only in a biverb with *ütlä-*, just as *ärig* (q.v. above under *är-ig*) usually appears together with *üt-* 'to give advice'. The instance in the *EDPT* is a conjecture; *DTS* s.v. *'ötlä- eriglä-'*. The same biverb is found also in BT II 435 and 1205, Maitr 47 r5, BuddhUig II 432, ShōKenkyū III 24, Ht V5 b6 and ShōAgon 1,10 and 18.

äv+lä- Hapax in Suci. 'to furnish (one's relatives) with dwellings' or perhaps 'to marry them off'.

äzüK+lä- 'to deceive'. Attested only in Suv, at least twice. See the *EDPT*, also for the base, and the *UW* s.v. *ar-* (II).

edi+lä- 'to own, to control'. Attested in BT III 1104 and, in fragmentary context, in BT XIII 5,192; cf. *edilä-t-* below. The base is attested already in Orkhon Turkic, and found in Khal. as *eydi*; Mo. *eǰen* is a cognate and synonym. According to Doerfer (personal communication), *eǰen* got its second syllable by analogy from many other titles ending in °*An* like *noyan*, *darqan* etc.; its original shape must have been **eǰī*, as **d* becomes *ǰ* only before /i/. Scholars now realise that *edi* and *igä* are distinct lexemes: The two often appear in the same text and sometimes as a binomial; /d/ and /g/ are not mutually reducible phonemes within Old Turkic. Nor is *igälä-*, q.v. below, synonymous with *edilä-*.

25 Cf. however, *ölürdäçi äŋ'çi* in BT VIII A 101.

26 The *EDPT* is wrong in taking the resemblance between the Turkic and Mo. lexemes to be fortuitous. Spelling pronunciations are valuable proof concerning the direction and manner of borrowing.

el+lä- 'to create an empire, rule a realm'. *EDPT*. According to Thomsen and Wulff's unpublished collations, the phrase found in KT and BQ can also be read in Ongin 1. Written as I L^{2}L^{2}D^{2a}K in KT E6. See n. 47 below for another ex. of *ellä-*.

erpäK+lä- is a hapax in Maitr 86 v 3, not mentioned in the dictionaries: *erpäKlärin erpäKläyü* 'sawing with saws . . .'. The base is discussed in the introductory pages of the section dealing with the formative *-(X)g*.

ıŋçık+la- 'to groan' is discussed in the *EDPT*. Its base appears in the QB and in the Uigur fr. U 316a r2 quoted in Zieme, 1969: 202. Another derivate, *ıŋçk+a-*, appears with the same meaning in the Codex Comanicus.

ırk+la- 'to consult the omens' appears six times in TT VII 28 (a late text) and in the DLT.

iç+lä- 'to line a garment'. Finite forms are found only in the DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*. Cf. *içlägülär* 'linings' (TT VIII I20).

ig+lä- 'to fall ill, to be ill'. *EDPT* and *DTS* (first entry). Also in UjgRuk I 17 and 20, Baguettes 1, Suv 17,20, UigTot 570, Maitr 41 r2, Ht V 7 b18 and ManMon 105.

igdü+lä- 'to feed'. The exs. in Ht IV 508, U II 86,47 (Kutlug) and DLT have a *t* instead of *d*, but in the TT IV B ex. (mentioned in the *EDPT*) and in *igdülä-n-*, q.v. below, we find *d*. Cf. *igtü* above, in section 3.114, from *igid-* 'to nourish'. The spelling with *°kt°* of the *EDPT* and the *DTS* is wrong.

igä+lä- 'to keep, to guard, to look after'. Not in the dictionaries. Attested in ShōAv 310 and 313 (correct in the first and the third ed.), UigSteu B5 and 13 (wrong translation: the monastery is not 'owned' by the monks) and, in a biverb with *asıra-*, in CYK 94 (misunderstood), GengContr II 10 and BT XIII 55,14. *asıra-* is a borrowing from Mo. (discussed in the *UW*). *igä+lä-* (spelled as '*egilä-*' in *UW* 233a) is *not* a synonym of *edi+lä-*, q.v. above; nor are the bases of the two verbs identical. *igä* and *iyä* appear to be variants and *iyä* appears to have been older; the lexeme is often spelled as *iä*. For the first vowel cf. Brāhmī *äv iyäsi* (TT VIII O8).

ilinçü+lä- 'to amuse oneself, to play'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. '*meŋilä- ilinčülä-*'. Further exs. of this biverb are quoted under *mäŋi+lä-* above; additional ones of *ilinçülä-* alone appear in BT I B (112), Maitr 35 r2-3 (damaged) and v9 and 224 r16 and Ht VII 6 b5. *arslan ilinçüsin ilinçüläđäçi* (BT II 353) is similar to *arslan ätinin ätinäyü* mentioned s.v. *ätin+ä-* above. See *il-inçü* in section 3.105.

im+lä- is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* from the DLT and QB, where it signifies 'to wink or gesture to somebody'. In addition, it is attested in BT XIII 5,115 in fragmentary context, and in Warnke 551: *antag bir yıkı bolup til irüp sözläyü umaz agın kävgäk, köküzdä sav tutup kǫŋülin imläp sözlägüçi . . . bol-*

sar biz, . . . '. . . If we should become dumb and stammer, and keep thought in our heart and struggle to express ourselves . . .'.[27]

iş+lā- 'to work, to do or carry out something'. In additon to the *EDPT*'s exs. found in ETŞ 13,24 and 16,36, 14 times in the Maitr, in BuddhUig I 286, 304, 305, 312, 320 and 349, four times in BuddhUig II. In BuddhKat 9, 18, 37, 38 and 40-41 it is written as *'IS-SLA-* or *'IS-SLYA-*. *işlägü* in Maitr 26 v 12 and 164 r 25, *işlämäsig* in Chuast 296-7 and *işlägüçi* in TT IV A 63 show that the verb had front vowels.

kagan+la- 'to make somebody a *kagan*'. Attested only in Orkhon Turkic in the phrase *kaganladuk kaganın . . .*, q.v. in the *EDPT*.

kalıŋula- 'to float on the water' is attested in DLT fol. 621-2 and BuddhUig II 88: *ol balıktakı tınl(ı)glar tün kün n tuţçı ol kemitā . . . OLORUP kalıŋulayu . . .* 'The living beings in that city very often, by day and by night, sit in that ship and . . ., float [in it] on the water and . . . and have a good time'. The base appears in DLT fol. 610, translated 'floating on the surface of the water'; this entry has another ex. of *kalıŋula-*.[28] A further ex., in Maitr 187 r 22, in quite fragmentary context, does not refer to 'floating on water': *idiz kök* [*kalıkta*] *kalŋulayu* TW [would appear to denote 'jumping up into' or at least 'floating in the air', like *kal(a)ŋu+r-*.

(kaŋsıla- or *kaŋşıla-* and *kakıla-* are onomatopoeics in BuddhUig II 105: *kakılayu ātināyū kaŋsılayu çıkrayu (?) oynayurlar. kakıla-* is attested also in QB 72, and both the BuddhUig II and the QB passage describe the cackling of all sorts of birds. The base of neither verb is attested, but DLT fol. 601 mentions *kaŋ* as the onomatopoeic for the honking of geese. See the *EDPT* entry for the possible base and for modern cognates of *kakıla-*.)

karı+la- 'to measure by cubits' is mentioned in the *EDPT* only from the DLT. According to *UW* 191 b s.v. *arıla-*, '*arılap*' twice in DvaUigDok is a mistake for *k(a)rıl(a)p* and *k(a)rılap* respectively. See the *EDPT* for the base.

karma+la- 'to plunder, pillage' appears in *yalŋoklarnıŋ 'ädin tavarın kunup karmalap . . .* (Maitr 203 r 18) and in DLT fols. 218 and 599. The base *karma* 'plun-

27 Warnke wrongly takes the first part of this to be a sentence in itself; she also assigns the verb discussed here to *āmlā-* and translates "den Sinn Heilendes sprechen".

28 In the entry for the base, the second vowel is written out and crossed out both in the base and in the derivate verb. This is understandable, as the section containing this entry deals with the word pattern *fa'lā*. Therefore, both the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly write the base as *kalŋu* and the verb as *kalŋula-*. They do this also for the entry in fol. 621-2, where the I is not crossed out in any of the three instances. *kalŋu* appears to have been the original variant, however, taking this lexeme to come from *kalı-n-gu*. Its listing by Kāšġarī in the *fa'lā* section shows that, for him, this must at least have been the main variant of the base. This need not, however, affect our reading of the derivate, which may have been more archaic in this respect; certainly not as far as Uigur is concerned.

der' (DLT fol. 218) is a variant of *kır-ma* (section 3.109 above). Similar to the biverb mentioned, *kırma* is used in a binome with *kun-uş*.

kavla- 'to join, to couple, to make to meet' is a hap. in fr. T III M56-11 (Mainz 786) r2-9 quoted in the n. to BT XIII 5,73: . . . *iki yası ban* [*i*]*kin ara är özkä b(ä)k kavlayu sıka tutup* . . ., translated "er ließ den Körper zwischen zwei flache Holzbretter fest einbinden und zwängen". This is the base of *kavla-n-* (UigTot) alternating with *kayvıla-n-*. We also find *kavlanışdur-*, equally in UigTot. *kayvılanışdur-*, which appears in BuddhUig I, turns out to have the same meaning as *kavlanışdur-*. Therefore, it seems possible that *kavla-* comes from **kayvı+la-*. **kay-vı* is not attested, but the meaning of *kayvısız*, q.v. above in section 3.115, makes this etymology likely.

kälin+lä- 'to provide (a young man) with a bride, i.e. to marry him off' is a hapax in USp, quoted in the *EDPT*. Cf. *äv+lä-* above.

kärgäk+lä- 'to need; to necessitate'. Exs. in the *EDPT*; also in BT I D (171) and (225), UigTot 1116, Maitr 161 r16, Suv 516,23 and 544,23-545,1, BuddhUig II 252, 292 and 325 etc. Replaced the obsolete *kärgä-*, discussed together with *kärgä-k*.

käsgöklä-: There is only one – double – instance of this verb. It appears, first, of all, in BT XIII 12,21: *käntün tuymak biligin käzgöklägyin barçanı* translated: "von selbst möchte ich durch das Erleuchtungs-Wissen alles durchdringen". Zieme takes the base to be a *-gOk* derivate (see section 3.22) of *käz-* 'to walk or travel about'. A different version of the same text appears in ShōKenkyū, and the verb in question can be found in II 3. It is in the first person *plural* and has an *s* and not a *z*. I take the variant with *s* to be the correct one: *-gOk* forms instrument nouns and no appropriate *-gOk* derivate from *käz-* seems thinkable for this context. *barçanı* must refer back to the 'bad deeds' of the previous sentence, which appear to have been conceived of as some monster. The *käs-gök* ("iron dog-collar" in the DLT) would then serve for their subdual.

kılıç+la- 'to strike and/or kill somebody with a sword'. *EDPT*. Attested in Orkhon Turkic and the DLT, not in Uigur.

kış+la- 'to spend the winter somewhere, to go into winter quarters'. Similar distribution as *kılıçla-*.

kiz+lä- 'to hide (tr.)'. The base is attested in DLT fol. 164, translated as 'scent-box, wardrobe, clothing-bag or any other sort of case or cupboard' and in Maitr 80+59 v6 (Laut, 1986: 205, translated "Behälter"). Exs. of *kizlä-* additional to those quoted in the *EDPT* can be found in the *DTS* s.v. *jašur-* (i.e. *yaşur-*); others in UigTot 964, 985, 986, 988 etc., Maitr 63 r10, BT VIII A 29, Ht X 120, 1125 and A 5, Suv 443,5 (quoted in the *UW* s.v. *artur-*), fr. T III TV 59 (U 4313) 1-8 quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 13, HazaiAval 9 and Ht VII 7 b20.

koldam+la-yu is attested in Suv 75,12 and Ernte II 52 and probably denotes the

action of repeated heaving. It is also discussed in connection with the formatives *+tA-* and *-(X)m* (which are taken to have been used in it). By meaning, *+lA-* should here be similar to *adut+la-* or *koltgu+la-*.

kolo+la- 'to meditate on, to investigate'. The second vowel is documented in GRO.LO.LA.MAG in TibStud. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in BT II 263, UigSūn 13, a number of times in ETŞ, ShōAgon 2, p. 192,2, UigKan 215, 217 and 296, Wettkampf 41, AmitIst 4, 5, 42, 46, 48 and 68 (some of them together with *sakın-*), twice in BuddhUig I, Buddhāv H 82, HamTouen 1,9 and 2,26 and elsewhere. HamTouen 1,9 is accompanied by a note of more than two pages explaining why *kolola-* comes from *kolo*, usually the name of a short period of time. *kolosuz* signifies 'incommensurable' in Suv 21,17, 117,17 and 546,5 and as a variant reading in TT VI 440 instead of *ülgüsüz*, with which it otherwise appears as a binomial. Cf. *ülgülüg kololug* in Suv 156,15.

koltgu+la- 'to beg' does not appear in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. We find this verb in ShōXII b4 and 15, in both cases in a biverb as *kolup koltgulap*. The former instance reads *boşıçı koltguçılarka tägi kolup koltgulap*, showing us a *+çI* derivate from the same base. All three forms write *d* instead of *t*. There is no doubt that U III $25,16_2$ should be read as *ko]lup koltgulamakın* instead of *'qolunqolamaqïn'*; WN and T look identical, as the facs. also shows, and the D of Shō corroborates this. *boşıçı koltguçı* is attested also in U III 10,5 (also misread as *'kolunyučï'*), *koltguçı* 'beggar' in KP 10,3-5, Maitr 12 v19 and 136 v4 and HamTouen 1,20. In Arabic writing we have *koltguçı* in QB 2093 (mss. BC) and 2613 (ms. C). *koltgu*, the base (mentioned neither by *EDPT* nor *DTS*), is found in QB 4275, *koltgusuz ibid.* 2721. The /t/ is probably not the causative morpheme (the causative of *kol-* being *koltur-*) but the parasitic stop met also in *kūlgū* ~ *kūltgū* 'apoplexy' (DLT fol. 216).[29] *kolguçı* is also attested, e.g. in KP 7,2-3.[30]

kōk+lā- 'to tighten or fasten with a thong' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and a modern language. It is attested also in Ernte 106.

kōrūm+lā- in ShōAgon 1,127 and *kōrümlā-n- ibid.* 125 and 126 appear in similar contexts, with *āt'ōz* as object. The exact meaning is not clear to me. *körümlā-* may also stand for *körüml(ā)n-*, A and N being identical.

kōrūnç+lā- 'to display things' is discussed in the *EDPT*. Further exs. appear in Ht VII 6 b23 and V 15 b26-27 and in Maitr 205 r2 and 144 (both in fragmentary context).

kōz+lā- Found in IrqB and then in the DLT and later texts. in IrqB it must mean

29 /rg/ > /rtg/ may also have taken place; see *körtKür-* in section 7.54.

30 *kolguçı* in QB 2093 A and 2613 AB should be a secondary correction.

'to sit on the lookout', which fits well with later uses; the DLT has it in a different sense. I know of no certain Uigur instances.[31]

kulun+la- Of a mare, 'to foal'. Attested in the IrqB and the Codex Comanicus. The DLT says that the synonymous *kuln+a-* comes from *kulunla-*, and may possibly be right. *kulnaçı kısrak* 'a mare in foal' is also attested, in the DLT and in two Kipchak sources. *kulnaçı* may perhaps also have stood in Windgott 13: *k(a)lın yunt sürügi* [. . . *k*]*ulnaçı bo*[*l*]*maz* [. . . *l*]*wgurmaz* 'as without him [mares in] the horse herd do not foal, [. . .] do not bring forth (without the wind god)'. When the second /u/ got syncopated, the sequence /lnl/ would certainly be prone to simplification.

kuş+la- 'to hunt birds'. Quoted in the *EDPT* from the IrqB, the DLT and a Kipchack source. Attested also in Maitr 5 r25.

kü+lä- 'to praise'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also under *ög- külä-*. *ög- külä-* is found also in BT III 848 and BT VIII B 216. Further exs. of *külä-* appear in ETŞ 20,70, Maitr 13 v9, BT VIII B23 and 48, HtPek 84 b11, ms. Ōtani 2695 a5 (*külämäklär* parallel to *ögdilär*) and so forth.

küni+lä- 'to be envious' is quoted in the *EDPT* twice from Suv and then only from Middle Turkic on. It is, however, also attested in the Manichaean BT V 618, and in UigTot 362, 363 and 1276, Maitr 227 r4, BT III 158, BT XIII 13,90 and in the ms. M 126 + M 520 m + M 201 r6, quoted in the n. to BT V 217. In at least two of these, *künilä-* forms a biverb with *azlan-*.

kür+lä- 'to be deceitful' is a hapax in Chuast, found in the *EDPT*. Used in a biverb with *tävlä-* as *täv* usually appears together with *kür* (not connected with the base of *kür+ä-*).

lala- 'to cut something up' has a foreign base not attested in Turkic. In addition to the exs. mentioned in the *EDPT*, *lala-* is found also in Heilk II A 42, 44 and 75 and twice in SuvDrog 476,16 (in two mss.). *ala-* is a variant of *lala-* attested in LautHōllen 79. In a n. to the passage, Röhrborn is quoted as having informed the editor that a further ex. of *ala-* is attested in the unpubl. Old Turkic version of the Padmacintāmaṇidhāraṇīsūtra. The phoneme /l/ being excluded from initial position in Old Turkic words, one way of getting rid of such an *l-* in a borrowed lexeme was simply to elide it.

nom+la- 'to preach'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also under *nom nomla-*. Found also in ETŞ 22,6, Suv 388,20, BT VIII B 30, ZweiFrag 5, Ht V 13 b10, UigTot 36, 736-7, 790, 922 and 937 and frequently in Maitr and in other texts.

ogurla- 'to steal' must be derived from *ogrı*.[32] 'OG-RLA-MA-SA in BuddhKat 11

31 In BuddhUig II 115, the Chinese ideogram for 'seeing' with the phonetic complement L'P may be an instance of this verb.

32 I cannot agree with Bang, 1917-21 IV: 21 paragr. 60, who believes the final vowel of *ogrı* to have

gives us two possibilities for the verb's pronunciation: Either there was a syllabic /r/ (found as a syllable-peak phone e.g. in Skt.), or the back-vowel allophone of /g/ was already pronounced as a fricative or glide, giving /ogr/ as one syllable. *arıla-* (discussed above) shows that a phoneme sequence similar to that of **ogrıla-* was not excluded. **yıgı+la- > yıgla-* 'to cry' and *orı+la- > orla-* 'to shout' prove, on the other hand, that /ı/ did tend to get absorbed under similar circumstances. Note that BuddhKat 11 also has 'OG-RÏ = *ogrı* 'thief', which makes the opposition even clearer.[33] Both exs. in Uigur script mentioned in the *EDPT* are transcribed as *ogurla-* (and not '*ogrıla-*') by their editors, and this is what we find also in Maitr 70 v31, 172 r6, 183 r16 and v2, 83 v23 and 72 r20, Suv 135,22 and BT XIII 13,81 (both mss.). In 'standard' Uigur, the verb appears, secondarily, to have acquired a more Turkic-like shape by sprouting an /X/ before the /r/.

orı+la- 'to shout' is attested in this form only in the DLT, which is also our source for the base. The *EDPT* s.v. *orla-* and the *DTS* s.v. '*urla-*' quote two Uigur instances, which both show the syncopated variant. We also find it in *ULUG ünin maŋrayu orlasar...* (BuddhUig II 203) and in *orlayu kıkıru* (TuoLuoNi 86). The first vowel is documented in two modern forms mentioned in the *EDPT*.

ot+la- 'to graze' is attested only in the DLT (quoted in the *EDPT*). *otla-t-* and *otla-msın-*, however, are found also in Uigur.

(otuŋ+la- is a hapax in M III $28,2_3$ (text 11) as *otuŋlayu*[. A derivate from *otuŋ* 'firewood' is likely because of the context as well, but the context does not give any hints at an activity. More probably, this is a *+lAyU* form as described in part IV.)

ögrünçü+lā- 'to have a good time' does not appear in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is

been the possessive suffix. Tel. *ūr* "Diebstahl", which he quotes from Radloff, 1893-1911, need not have been old. The incorporation of the 3rd person sg. possessive suffix applies to nouns denoting inalienables, not to nominals in general.

33 I cannot agree with Maue and Röhrborn's n. to BuddhKat 11, which maintains that the syncope is only graphic; consequently, the lexeme is transcribed as '*ogrıla-*' in their glossary. Moriyasu, like them, transliterates it into romanised Uigur orthography as 'WXRYL'-. Kāšğarī, an analogist like them, discusses the verb in fols. 159 and 152. Under *ogrıladı*: "The common people say it with no vowel on the *ra'*, but this is an error." The aorist and infinitive are then spelled as 'UΓRLA'R and 'UΓRLA'MA'Q, normalised by Dankoff and Kelly to *oyrılār oyrılāmāq*. Under *ogurladı*, there is another suggestion: "*ār tavar ogurladı* "The man stole the goods" – because he waited for the opportunity and the right time [= *ogur*]. There is another explanation for this verb, namely that it is based on the noun *ogrı*, the word for 'thief', and the *yā'* dropped through lightening. I prefer the latter explanation, but both are plausible." A connection with *ogur* does indeed seem too far-fetched semantically. There is no doubt that the DLT's *ogrıladı* is just as much a figment as the creation of the modern authorities.

attested four times in the Maitr, two of the exs. mentioned in the *UW* 116b s.v. *amarı* A,a. A third one is attested in MaitrH XI 4 a20 and a fourth appears in MaitrGeng 7 a16: *näçä ür käç amraklagu kuvrag birlä mäŋilägär ögrünçülägär, . . .* Cf. *ögrünçülä-n-* and *ögrünçülä-ş-*.

(ömä+lä- Hapax in the IrqB, quoted in the *EDPT*: *är ömäläyü barmış*, translated "a man went visiting". In this context, this could also be a *+lAyU* form, as if one said 'A man went as a visitor'. We slightly prefer the verbal interpretation of the form, because of its similarity to *kuşlayu bar- ibid.* XLIII and *äŋläyü mäŋläyü bar- ibid.* XLIX.)

öŋ+lä- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *öŋlämiş altun* (BT XIII 1,59) is translated as "gefärbtes Gold". Cf. *öŋlän-* 'to take on colour' in DLT fol. 147.

örlä- 'to rise, of the sun, the moon, stars or clouds'. Found in U IV A281, Hochzeit 32, Shō I b14 (very similar to the U IV ex.), U III $13,3_1$ (fragmentary context; mentioned in the *DTS*) and frequently in the QB (q.v. in the *EDPT*). Probably comes from *örü*; for the syncope, cf. *kerlä-* < *kerü+lä-* in the interlinear glosses to the Rylands Coran translation, and *ogurla-* and *orıla-* earlier in this section. No '*ör*' homophonous with *ör-* need be assumed to have existed to account for this verb, as the *EDPT* does.[34] *örülä-* in the DLT (q.v. in the *EDPT*) is a different verb, and the semantic connection with *örlä-t-* (q.v. below) is hard to find. *örlä-n-* in the DLT and in HamTouen 15,3 and 4-5, however, has the meaning which we find *örlä-* to have in BT III 159, i.e. the rising of clouds: See the verse in fol. 133.

öṭıK+lä- signifies 'to record, mention, remember one by one'. It appears in a biverb with *ö-* in ETŞ 10,5 (spelled '*ödiklä-*' by the ed.) and with *sakın-* in AbitAnk 14 (spelled '*üdiklä-*') and in BT XIII 28,7. In this last ex., the L-hook is completely lost in a lacuna, but cf. initial L elsewhere in the ms. The object of this is a certain *nom bitig* in the first case; in the second, the ms. is destroyed at that point, while it is one's sins in the third ex. It is unclear whether the verb read as *ötäg+lä-* in Suv 6,17 (*ötäg berim ötäglägülük yıl ay üd kolo sakış tolsar tükäsär . . .*) possibly also belongs here. The *EDPT* under *ötekle-* only has this instance, and translates it as "to repay debts". Then there is *m(ä)n Karaçwk agır iglämiştä oglum*[.]*a kalmış tavarnı*[35] *ötäglläp koḍtum* (Baguettes 2), translated "Alors que j'étais grièvement souffrant, . . . j'ai cédé à mon fils, en passant un contrat avec lui, . . .". In this case, 'to repay debts' does not fit at all; "passer un contrat" cannot be justified either: By meaning, at least, *öṭıKlä-* here fits best. The base of *öṭıKlä-* was first identified in the n. to Ht X 579,

34 See also the *EDPT* 193 a s.v. 1 *ö:r*. The Sanglax's evidence has no value, of course, as it may just as well be the result of back-formation.

35 Thus instead of the impossible '*tavar-ı*' of the editor; the two look identical.

referring to a personal letter from Zieme. The n. to HamTouen 34,1 also showed *ödig* (spelled thus) to differ from *ötüg* (q.v. among the *-(X)g* lexemes above) and to correspond to Chin. *ki. ötiK* 'register, memorandum, memoir' is attested in Ht IV 641 and 891, VII 2151 and X 579 and 589, in an economical document quoted in the letter mentioned above and in HamTouen 15,19, 34,1 and 19 and 35,8. *ötiK* has no attested base in Old Turkic.[36]

övkä+lä- 'to be angry (with someone)'; see the *DTS*, and the *EDPT* s.v. *öpkele:-*. *övkälä-* is found in IrqB LVIII, Ht IV 538, Maitr 216 v12 as quoted in *UW* 118b s.v. *amurtgur-* par. 3, Maitr Y 5 b22 (quoted in Laut, 1986: 199), Suv 226,9, 228,15 and 595,10 and in QB 6310. *öpkälä-* of UigTot 361 and 363 is not a surprise, as *övkä* and *öpkä* (discussed above in the chapter on *-gA*) also alternate. Unexplained are the variants *övkilä-* (Maitr 166 v13 and 15, KPZieme 10 and TT VI 18) and *öpkilä-* (Maitr 217 r9 and Suv 563,13[37]); cf. *övkilä-n-* below.[38] To these we can add *öpkilä-* with ablative in DLT fol. 159, translated 'to avoid someone because one is angry': For Kāšġarī (*ibid.*), *öpkälä-* is 'to strike someone in the lungs', a meaning not attested elsewhere. Otherwise, however, the forms with *°ilä-* (or *°elä-*) and *°älä-* have the same content. The only parallels I can think of are *tilik* < *tilä-* and *arıla* < *ara+la-* but *tamgala-* or *yinçgälä-* have no such variants. *ogıt ögintä kaŋınta övkäläpän* in the IrqB is similar to the DLT construction with ablative. In all our Uigur instances, however, the verb always governs the dative (when it has any government at all).

san+la- Hap. in Mängi 3, in] *kutlarıŋa ädlägü sanlayu boşgut* [. Zieme reads this as '*ädlayu sanlayu*' and translates "für die [Majestät]en der rühmend (Hend.) Lehren [erteilenden (?)]". For *äd+lä-* (by Zieme misinterpreted as '*at+la-*') cf. above. *san* 'fame' is adduced only from Ottoman, but cf. the related binome *ädlig* (front *g!*) *sanlıg* in TT I 84, to be translated as 'famous'. The base of *sanla-* is not *sa-n* 'number'. To judge by Republ. Turkish *şanlı* and by *şanlıg bälgülüg* in ETŞ 10,11, it got contaminated with Arabic *ša'n*. Ş is marked as such explicitly in the ETŞ text and has initial rhyme with seven other *ş°* words; the *ETŞ* passage is best interpreted in Kara, 1983: 49-50. Cf. the n. to TT I 84 in ETŞ pp. 428-9.

sap+la- 'to fit the point of an arrow unto the shaft, fasten a sword in its hilt etc.'. See the *EDPT*.

36 Hamilton's suggestion to derive *ödig* (thus) from *ö-* 'to remember' over **ö-d-* is tempting but unlikely, as *-(X)g* follows fourfold harmony.

37 Thus according to the Mainz fr. of this passage quoted by Ehlers; the contents of the Leningrad ms. at this point do not make sense.

38 *öpklä-* in HamTouen 19,2 and 30,10 and *övk[.]lämsin-* mentioned among the *-(X)msIn-* verbs can be interpreted either way.

sapan+la- 'to plough the land' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Attested twice in the Maitr, one ex. in 182 v14, the other quoted in *UW* 160 s.v. *anuk* A,b,2.

sav+la- 'to talk or tell'. *EDPT* and *DTS* only have the DLT entry. Add *çın savıg savlasar äzüK bolmaz* (BT I D(73)) and *bursaŋ kuvragıg ötünüp s(a)vlap kälürüp . . .* (ShōAv 322 'to bring over by gracious invitation', not with the meal as object of *kälür-*).

simāk+lā- is discussed in the *EDPT* with two exs. from Suv, but mistranslated. It appears also in BuddhUig I 264, Ht IV 1120 and ShōAv 51, 281 and 284-5 (these three with *anut-*). It signifies 'to exert oneself towards a certain end, to work purposefully on something', together with *anu-t-* 'to prepare carefully'. The base *simāk* is attested in ETŞ 12,12 in a binomial with *iş*, in BuddhUig I 264, in Ht X 154 in a binomial with *etig*, in Suv 602,7, Ht IV 1120 (as internal object of *simäklā-*) and is also misunderstood in the *EDPT*. Cf. particularly the ns. to ETŞ 9,15 and the Ht X instance. It should not be confused with *semāk*, which often appears in a binomial with *arıg*: Many exs. of that appear in *UW* 188-9, translated "Wald, Dickicht". Cf. also *simāksizin* 'effortlessly' in ETŞ 9,15; *simāk* itself denotes the action.

(*siŋilā-* 'to whirr or whine or make some similar sound'. *DTS* s.v. *sīŋīla-* and *EDPT*, from Suv and DLT. Related to the onomatopoeic *siŋ* and to *siŋāk* 'fly, mosquito', qq.v. in the *EDPT*, but immediate base not attested.)

so+la- 'to chain, fasten with chains'. *DTS* s.v. *solamamaq* and *EDPT*. Found only in Uigur. See the *EDPT* for *so* 'chain'.

söz+lä- 'to speak, say, talk with somebody'. In BuddhKat 12 written as ZUS-LA-MA-SA, with apparent /ū/ in the first syllable. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also s.v. *sōzlāmāk*. Frequent also in Maitr and BuddhUig I, and attested, in addition, in Ht V 3 a 11 and 12 and VII 6 a 3, Suv 598,22-3, ATSS and Shō I a 3 twice and elsewhere.

sü+lä- 'to campaign' is documented in the *EDPT* from Orkhon Turkic, Uigur and Qarakhanid.

tagon+la- Perhaps 'to deceive by flattering'. This and *tagonçı* are hapax legomena, the verb in TT IV. The n. to TT IV A 72 and the *UW* entry *askançu* (233-4) have all the evidence for *tagon*, the base. In footn. 131 to BuddhKat, a Chin. etymology is suggested for this nominal.

talkok+la- Not in the dictionaries. Hapax in BT II 552: *āt' özüg talkokladaçı tamu* is translated as "Hölle, wo man die Körper annagelt". Considering the meaning of *talkok* (discussed in section 3.22), however, the torture may have involved twisting the body or stretching it, not necessarily nailing.

talu+la- 'to choose, select'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, and also TT VI 228, 229 and 235, ShōAgon 1,20 (biverb with *adırtla-*), ETŞ 11,65, Ht IV 10 b 12 (quoted in *UW*

269 b s. v. *ailan-*), Ht VII 5 a 24, 8 a 14 and 15 and 10 b 14, Mängi 5, ETŞ 19,13, Warnke 102 and Ht X 75. See the n. to the latter for the etymology of *talu* 'choice, select, chosen'; attested from DLT and QB on. *talan-* (q. v. among the -*(X)n-* verbs) is a derivate.

tamga+la- 'to seal or stamp'. See the *EDPT* for the evidence and add *ü]ç türlüg tamgan tamgalam[ış* (HazaiAval 4). The *EDPT* wrongly adds the meaning "to brand"; it does not apply to any of the exs. *tam-ga* is discussed in section 3.323 above.

(tançgala- 'to bite to pieces' is attested in U I 45,18 = U IV A 72 and LautHöllen 55, both very clear in the facss." Although **tançga* is not attested, such an action nominal and *tançu* can easily both come from a tr. verb **tanç-*. We should not follow the *EDPT*, which wanted to read *tançula-* instead of these instances. It is not clear why A. v. Gabain reads *tançkıla-* in her edition of the LautHöllen passage in the n. to TT III 5: The second vowel is quite clear on the facs. In a footn. thereto she calls "das Verbum *tančqïla-* oder *tančqala-*" a "Frequentativum", but there is no reason to posit such a category in Old Turkic. *tamga+la-*, the only other verb of this shape known to me from the language, certainly bears no such content. In DLT fol. 156, *avala-* "to surround somebody (especially in regard to civil strife)" may have had some sort of 'intensive meaning'; it *may* come from **avga+la-*.)

tançu+la- 'to bite something to pieces'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, and *tançulagul[uk* in U III 53,10$_1$. *tançu* is attested also in Maitr 70 r 7, beside the places quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. It may have come from **tanç-ınçu* under haplological simplification, the formative *-(X)nçU* deriving objects from tr. bases. *tarmakın tarmayu tanç[gılay]ur* in Maitr 85 r 5 (BT IX 212,5$_1$) can in fact be read either as *tançgala-*, as *tançula-*, or as the synonymous *tançKa-* (attested in TuoLuoNi 288 = 307 and in the ms. quoted in footn. 39).

tanuk+la- 'to give evidence, to attest'. The exs. in BT I D (172), BT II 1182, Maitr 249 r 8, ETŞ 15,20, BuddhUig I 27, 150, 275, 302-3, 358 and 401, BT XIII 22,18, BuddhUig II 132 and 286, UigKol 9 and 18-19, Suv 133,4-5 and 701,18, Ht V 10 a 3 and VII 14 b 13, TuoLuoNi 49 (with *ta[n]kar-*) and many in UigTot can be added to the ones of the *EDPT*. Not attested outside Uigur. In some of these instances *tanukla-* signifies 'to serve as evidence for, i.e. exemplify, realise or embody a certain idea', the idea being in the accusative. Thus e.g. some of the exs. in BuddhUig I and II. CYK 52 and 57 even have *arxant kutın tanukladı* translated "erlangte die Arhat-Würde". All this is a calque on Chin., as shown in the n. thereto.

39 An unpubl. ms. parallel to this last (quoted by Zieme, personal communication) reads *tilin tançK[a]yur*. The same object should be postulated also for the lacuna in the Laut ms.

1 *taŋ+la-* Hap. in KP in the phrase *taŋ taŋlayur ärkän* 'while it was dawning', clear in the facs. See the *EDPT*.

2 *taŋ+la-* 'to wonder, be surprised (at something), find (something) wonderful etc.'. Exs. in the *EDPT* under 2 *taŋla:-* and the *DTS* under *taŋla-* I and *muŋad-* II. Also in Maitr 132 v18 (with *muŋad-*), BuddhUig II 395 and 589 (the first with *taŋırka-*, the second with *muŋad-*), Shō VIII a14 (with *muŋad-*) and XII b2.

tap+la- 'to consent to, or be pleased with, something'. *EDPT*[40] and *DTS*. Further exs. in HtPek 104 r10, four times in BuddhUig II, often in Maitr, BuddhUig I 314, BT XIII 9,17 (fragmentary), Ht X 144, Shō VIII a11, Zieme Sklav I 14. Reading *tapla-* in Genzan D r13, as Röhrborn does in his reedition, is untenable by the facs.

(*täginçülä-* is a hapax in a short fr. in the n. to BT V 266. *täginç* is discussed in section 3.104, but we have no '*täginçü*'. *täginç* 'moment' needn't be connected with this verb in meaning, as *-(X)nç* and *-(X)nçU* forms can differ sharply in this. The fr. reads: *mäŋigü ädgükä täginçülämäk*; 'to reach'?)

(*tägriglä-* 'to assemble a group of things or living beings around something'. *EDPT*; there are many additional exs. in the Maitr, among them in Maitr 80+59 r9-10, Maitr Geng 1 a7 and 11 a22-3 and fr. T III 118 β r5. The last is a ms. parallel to 79 r12, reedited in Laut, 1986: 202 as '*tägrikl(ä)nmiş*'. I think we should read this as well as *tägriglämiş*, taking the sinner and not the sins as agent. In Ht X 202 the editor reads '*tägrik*[*läyü*] *kavzayu*'. Not likely to come from *tägräk* 'rim', attested in the DLT, Middle Turkic and modern languages (q.v. in the *EDPT*), as the second vowel differs. The base must be an unattested *-(X)g* derivate from **tägir-*, which also gave *tägrä*, *tägirmän* and *tägirmi*.)

täŋ+lä- 'to equate, compare, estimate'. *EDPT*; the verb in Heilk II A 8 and 23, *bo otlarnı täŋläp katıp içç* 'mix these herbs in equal measures and drink them' appears, misquoted, in the *DTS*. Further exs. can be found in ETŞ 11,131, BT I B (117), BT II 263 (ending unclear) and BT VII O 9. See *ülgü+lä-* below for exs. of the biverb *ülgülä- täŋlä-*.

tärk+lä- 'to hurry in doing something'. *EDPT* and *DTS* quote the finite verb only from the DLT, but we also have *kataglansar t(ä)rkläsär* in M III $13,17_2$ (text 6). *tärkläyü*, which has an entry for itself in the *DTS*, is found in IrqB VII, M I 13,17 (TeilBuch), M III $23,6_2$ (text 8) and ManBuchFrag I 1,1,2. Note that none of these instances are Buddhist.

täv+lä- 'to act trickily'. Hapax in Chuast, biverb with *kür+lä-* (also a hapax), q.v. above.

40 In the *EDPT*'s quotation from KP, '*teg*' should be changed to '*tek*', i.e. *täk*, q.v. on p. 475 there.

ter+lā- 'to sweat'. In the *EDPT* only from the DLT on; attested also in Ernte 31: *tarıgçı bāglārnıŋ alnıları terlāyü . . . .* Cf. the derivationally irregular *terit-*.

tetiğ+lā- 'to be bright enough to succeed in a certain action'. This meaning would fit the context of the only ex., in BT XIII 18,2: *tutyakıg titsār t[u]ygalı tetiglār* "Wenn man das Festhalten aufgibt, zu erkennen ist man befähigt."[41]

tıŋ+la- 'to listen'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially under *eşit- tīŋla-*. Found also in BuddhKat 28 (DİN-LA-YUR), BT I B(37), BT II 1006, Warnke 227 (also with *āşıd-*), Maitr 23 v3, Shō I a4 and VI a4 (with *āşıd-*), HamTouen 1,1 and 1,49, Genzan C v3 and elsewhere. The base is attested in *nom tıŋka yıgıl-gaylar* 'They will assemble to listen to the doctrine', quoted in the *DTS* from Suv. *tıŋçı*, used together with *savçı* or *paxuayçı*, means 'spy, informer'; see the *+çı* formation above.

tış+la- 'to bite'. *EDPT*; attested from Heilk I, DLT and QB on. Back-vocalic like *tış* 'tooth' and *tışla-t-* (DLT). In the DLT entry for *tışla-*, the infinitive suffix has been altered from *-mak* to *-māk* in accordance with the late front-vowel form of *tış*.

tigi+lā- 'to make a certain sound, perhaps a droning one'. *DTS* and *EDPT*. TT I 74 is likely to be read as *çaşut yoŋag tigilāsār ād tavar saçılur*, and not '*tikilāşir*' as printed: This ms. does not distinguish /s/ from /ş/, a verb '*tikilāş-*' is not attested and *-Ir* is not an aorist ending that ever appears with *-Xş-* verbs.[42] Cf. *tigilā-n-* and see *tigrāt-* among the *-(X)t-* verbs for cognates.

tilik+lā-sār in BT V 18,409 and 413, translated "wünschen". In both cases in fragmentary context. Not in the *EDPT* or *DTS*.

(tWŋla- Used together with *tokı-* in five Maitr instances: One is quoted in the *EDPT*; another, 194 r19, is quoted in Schulz, 1978 par. 205. 'to beat'. See the *EDPT* for possible etymologies.)

tor+la- Hapax in Maitr 139 r11, quoted in *UW* 224a, where it is translated as "überspannen". Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.

toy+la- 'to form a large gathering of people' does not appear in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. There are two Maitr instances: *Matyadeş uluştakı tınlıglar kara bulıt tāg toylap . . .* (MaitrGeng 9 b24) and *Maytrı bodıs(a)vt . . . beş y(i)g(i)rmi urlar birlā takı ymā adan kırk ūmān tınlıglar birlā toylap . . .* (MaitrGeng 10 a11). Cf. *toyla-ş-*.

tūp+lā- appears in Ht V 6 a21, in *[ba]lık tūplāzūn* 'let him found a city'. *tūplā-* 'to investigate' of the DLT is an independent derivate from the same base; cf.,

41 The n. to the passage quotes an Uzbek verb; that, however, signifies 'to *make* somebody bright', and must be an independent derivation.

42 *'tigilāyü'* in Suv 9,10 is emended to *ükilāyü* in SuvÇag. Written correctly in the SuvLeg ms., justifying Çağatay's idea.

however, 'to lay a foundation', found in Kirgh. (Judaxin) and quoted by Radloff from the Baraba dialect.

uçuz+la- 'to treat someone or something with disrespect'. Beside the *EDPT*'s exs. found in BT VIII A 9, BuddhUig II 321, BT II 252 (together with *satga-* 'to trample on', which is here evidently used in a metaphorical sense). *uçuzladı* in HtKZ II 3 corresponds to *yenig kördi* in HtPar 129,26. A further ex. of *uçuzla-* is discussed under *yenig+lā-*. *tutap uçuzlap* appears in Suv 136,10, *uçuzla-* as *Kançula-* in Suv 136,14.

udık+la- 'to doze off, slumber'. The *EDPT* quotes this from TT VIII I and DLT on. The obscure *savıkla-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) also comes from TT VIII I. Another ex. is found in BT III 717. Both are late texts. See above for *udı-k*, the base.

ugut+la- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but appears several times in Maitr; it should have been read also in Maitr 152 v2. 'to yeast'.

ulug+la- 'to give glory; to respect' is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* only from the DLT; attested also in QB 4151 and 4176.

ūjik+lā- 'to spell'. *EDPT* s.v. *ūjükle:-*, the form of the DLT. Attested also in ETŞ 11,17, a late text.

ülgü+lā- 'to measure, estimate, weigh'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially under '*ülgülā- teŋlā-*'. The same biverb appears also in BT II 877, TuoLuoNi 170 and 256 = 260, ShōAgon 1,14, 20 and 28 and Halén A1. In ETŞ 15,4 we find *kolola- ülgülā-*, in BuddhUig I 225 *sakın- ülgülā-*. Cf. *ülgülänçsiz* above.

ülüg+lā- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but appears in Maitr 52 r5 and 84 v22. The first, *tana yip tuta ülüglāyürlär*, refers to construction workers, who *divide* a line or an area by using a plumb rule; the second refers to the division of some iron objects.

üt+lā- 'to give advice' is usually spelled with initial *ö* by the authorities, including the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; see these, the latter particularly under '*ötlāmāk*'. *üt* 'advice' is, however, written with *ü* in two Brāhmī instances mentioned above under *ār-ig*. Furthermore, we find a Brāhmī ex. of the verb *ütlā-*, spelled this way, in fr. Mz 648 ([T II] S19/I M8 II) text I, to be published by D. Maue: He read there *şamnançıg ütlätā[çi*. Further instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in BT II 435 and 1204-5, EhlersNotab 15, AbitAnk 15, BT VIII A 484, Maitr 47 r5 and 67 v6, BT XIII 12,141 and fr. M 865 r7, quoted in the n. to BT V 375. *ütlā-* is very common in a biverb with *ārig+lā-*, q.v. for the exs. This biverb is no doubt to be read also in U III 78,18 (Macht d. Liebe).[43]

43 Müller writes '*oyunlayu āriklāyü*', but in Uigur writing *ü*° and *oyun*° look practically identical; /g/ and /k/ are, of course, written with the same letter. See Zieme in *JA* 269 (1981): 390-1 for the ex. of *ütlā- ārigla-* appearing in TT VII 14,3 (Yetikān Sudur).

ūtū(g)+lā- 'to iron' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It appears in Maitr 84 v24 = BT IX 209,24₁ in *örtlüg yalınlıg ūtüg üzā tolp ät'özlärin ütülāyürlär*. Derived from *üt-üg* 'flat iron (for ironing clothes)'. Reading confirmed by Zieme (personal communication). /g/ may have first undergone spirantisation after /ū/: Cf. *tütsülüg* in TT V B 130 and 135.

(üzmālā- 'to tear out or away'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Base not attested but there is no doubt about its being the *-mA* noun of *üz-* 'to tear'. *UW* 95a has an additional ex. from Suv 689,21, a biverb with *alk-*. Further ones appear in Maitr 153 v18 and 13 r16 (biverbs with *tarkar-*), 162 r7, 164 v32, 48 v5 and 54 v12 and ms. Mz 777 v7, quoted in *UW* 194 a top. Cf. *üzmālātdūr-* in the same ms.)

yagı+la- 'to engage in hostilities with someone'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Add *yagılamazlar* (ShōAgon 2, p. 192,11₂).

yaka+la- Appears only in the sentence *yaka anta yakaladım* twice in the ŞU inscr. The *EDPT*'s translation s.v. 1 *yaka*: should be more or less correct.

yalın+la- The conjecture *ya]lınlayu turur . . . tuluKlar* in Höllen 35 (passage quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *tuluk*) is now supported by LautHöllen 113, with very clear facs.: *yalınlayu turur kızarı[mış tā]mirlig uzun yıp*. The two passages belong to different hell descriptions in the same source. 'to flame' is usually not *yalınla-* but *yalın+a-*. That verb is several times attested in the same collocation, *yalınayu tur-*; in TT III 135 (= ClarkPothi 175) even as *ya[l]ınayu turur tamu*.[44] *yalınla-* appears also in Maitr 29 v10: *Ketmati känt uluş altun öŋlüg kümüş öŋlüg yuŗüŋ öŋlüg* [. . .] *tägrigläp turkaru yalınlayur*. Tekin read this as '*yartlayur*', but neither such a verb nor its base would be attested. The hook of the letter L in Uigur script is often omitted, making it an R, and WN or even YN may look like a T. Zieme (personal communication) now confirms this suggestion.

1 *yat+la-* Attested in Profan p. 282: *yaŋa boyunta* (thus as in Qarakhanid, and without possessive suffix!) *yatlamak* "auf dem Elefantennacken Fremde attackieren". This is parallel to *at arkasınta atlamak*. 'to hunt strangers'. The *EDPT* has an instance from USp 77,16-17 translated 'to repudiate', one from the DLT translated 'to consider someone a stranger', and another one from the Sanglax.

2 *yat+la-* is attested only in the DLT, but cf. *yatla-n-*. 'to perform magic ceremonies with a rainstone'. *EDPT*.

yavız+la- 'to think badly of something'. Found in BT III 1092. The *EDPT* only has the DLT verb of this meaning, which has the shape *yavuzla-*.

yay+la- 'to spend the summer somewhere' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the ŞU

44 In the *EDPT* entry for *yalına-* for some reason changed to '*yalınayu turgan tamu*', unlikely in the language of that text.

inscr., the IrqB and from various Middle Turkic sources. It appears also twice in Tariat W 2 and in Tes 19, two other inscrs. of the Uigur kaghanate beside ŞU. Cf. *kış+la-* above and *yay+lag* and *kış+lag* in section 2.73. The distribution of *yay+la-* may not be a matter of dialect but of the connection of this verb with nomadic life.

yazok+la- appears to have had two meanings or, in fact, to have constituted two verbs: In the DLT and one Kipchak source it signifies 'to accuse someone of an offence'. In Suv 556,9-11, the Codex Comanicus and another Kipchak source it signifies 'to be guilty of an offence'. Suv: *yavız yavlak yalaŋukug ayamışka sävmişkä, tüzün yavaş kişilärig tutamışka yazoklap . . .*, by Schulz translated as "er sündigt".[45]

yeg+lä- 'to consider something or somebody to be good or superior'. Ht IV 1532 has *yeglâyürlär . . . ädgülâyürlär*, similar to the binomial *yeg ädgü*. *yeglä-* appears also in QB 1918 and 2753, mentioned in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*.[46]

yelvi+lä- 'to practise witchcraft'. Hap. in Chuast with *yelvi* as object. Cf. *yelvi+k-* 'to be affected by sorcery'.

yenig+lä- appears in Suv 88,2: *ötrü olar burxan ärdinig yeniglämädin, bursaŋ kuvrag ärdinig uçuzlamadın, tınl(ı)g oglanlarınıŋ . . . yılnızların tarıtdurgaylar* 'to consider something to be a light matter'. *DTS*; not in the *EDPT*. Cf. *yenig kör-*, which alternates with *uçuzla-* in HtKZ II 3.

yer+lä- 'to settle at a place' is, before the XVth century, attested only in YE 24 (reproduced in Malov, 1952 no. 24). The other instance mentioned in the *EDPT*, YE 8,1, receives a different reading when using unpublished material of Thomsen and Wulff.[47]

yerçi+lä- 'to guide' is discussed above, near the end of the section describing the *+çI* formation.

yıd+la- 'to smell (tr.)'. See the *EDPT*. Found also in Maitr 139 v22 and ms. T I Kš 15 a (U 939) r13 quoted in Sandel.

yıgla- 'to weep' is an 'onomatopoeic' verb like *tigi+lä-*, *çagı+la-*, *kakıla-*, syncopated like *orla-* from *orı+la-* and so forth. See above for these verbs. The base is attested in *antag bir yıgı bolup . . .* 'dann wird ein Jammern sein"(Warnke 549),

45 In the *EDPT*, BQ E 36 is said to have ⌋*yazuklaı*⌊. Thomsen, however, only writes ⌋*zuqı*⌊, and that may just as well be *yazokl*[*ug* or some other sequence.

46 *bütün çın kişilär özin yeglämäz* (QB 2753) is by Dankoff translated as "A sound and honest man will not prefer himself to others". If I understand the meaning of *yeglä-* correctly, this should better be understood as '. . . will not think of himself too highly'.

47 This is nr. 28 in Malov, 1952, not 29 as written in the *EDPT*. It should be read as *ärdäm üçün aglak yer ellädim*, the word preceding *yer* being uncertain. See *agla-k* above, in the section on *-(O)k*, for the expression *aglak yer*. Vasil'ev was unable to see this, and the stone may, since the Finnish moulds, have deteriorated further.

yıgın yıgla[in BT V 16,339 (instrumental case) and *busuş k(a)dgu y(ı)gıh [ıgı]t* in M III 43,4$_3$ (text 30).[48] Cf. the *EDPT* s.v. '*ıg', where modern cognates of *yıgı* are mentioned. See the *EDPT* s.v. *ıgla:-* and the *DTS* s.v. *jiriŋü-* for exs.; one of the many additional ones appears in Maitr 115 r3. Forms of the verb with and without initial /y/ are attested both in Uigur and in Qarakhanid Turkic. The alternation may be evidence for an original initial /h/. *yıl+la-* is quoted in *EDPT* 919a from QB 347, from Ottoman and from some modern languages. In QB 347 and also 6344, we find the phrase *nāçā yıllasa* signifying 'however many years he/it lives through, or continues'. In Tariat S2, we have: *takıgu yılka yorıdım, yılladım* 'I went (there) in the year of the hen, and spent a year (in that place).' This is similar to *kış+la-* and *yay+la-*.

yır+la- 'to sing'. *EDPT* s.v. *ırla:-*; the verb is attested both with and without initial /y/. In addition to the *EDPT*'s exs., we find *yırla-* in SuvZieme 693,13, *ırla-* in Maitr 32 r3 and 11 and the margin of KP LXVIII, as edited by Hamilton (+ facs.).

yinçgä+lä- 'to be meticulous about something' is also attested both with and without initial /y/, although *yinçgä* (q.v. above in section 3.323) and its cognates always start with *y°*. *EDPT* s.v. *yinçge:le:-*;[49] an ex. from Heilk II is quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *jinčkälāp*. Additional instances appear in HtPar 130,12, Shō VIII a6 and r64 of the colophon quoted on p. 76 of AbiShotan; all three lack initial *y°* and all three are used together with verbs signifying 'looking' or 'investigating', thus coming near in meaning to Republican Turkish *incele-*.

yog+la- 'to hold a funeral feast'. *EDPT*; not attested in Uigur. It governs the nominal referring to the deceased in the dative. Cf. *yogla-t-* below.

1 *yok+la-* 'to rise, get up, climb, move upwards'. *EDPT*; also attested in Höllen 70 and 71, QB 1805 and 3981 and in YE 10,10 (cf. *yol+uk-* below), 25,6 and 32,1. In these three, *yokladı* is used in connection with a deceased person, one of the many euphemisms in this matter. *yok* is found in the sense "upward slope of the land" only in the DLT, but *yokaru* 'upward' must be its directive

48 The final *h* in this last instance is no doubt merely graphic: Cf. *qmtuh* two lines earlier. The binomial which we conjecture to have stood here must have been the base of *yıgıt sıgıt* in the late UigTöt 131, where the analogy of the second member can be taken to have influenced the first.

49 Azeri *incel-* 'to become thin' (used also in Republican Turkish) is not, of course, a survival of this, as we read in this entry of the *EDPT*: *+lA-* is never reduced to '*+l-*', at least never in the south-west dialects. *+A-* and *-(X)l-* may have begun to fuse and give a combination already in late Old Turkic: Cf. *alpal-* and *moymal-* discussed among the *-(X)l-* verbs below. *+A-(X)l-* would become *+Al-*, which would, with time, get the allomorphs *+(A)l-*. *twş-ul-* apparently became reanalysed as *tuşu+(A)l-* in Qarakhanid, as described below. Cf. also Schakir, 1933: 32 Anm. II for some late exs. of *+(A)l-*. Modern *incel-* must be a product of this late combination.

(or possibly an *+Ar-U* converb). Add also *alnlı BİRli tal sögüt turkınça kök kalığka yoklap . . .* (BuddhUig II 533).[50]

2 *yok+la-* 'to miss' is attested in BuddhUig I 55 and 74. The *EDPT* only has a number of Middle Turkic and modern instances listed in 902b-903a, within the entry for 1 *yokla-* and before it.[51]

yulug+la- 'to risk something (accusative) for the sake of (dative)' is rather frequent in the QB but may appear nowhere else. Synonymous with *yulug kıl-* (nine times *ibid.*) and *yulug ber-* (Maitr).

yumgak+la- 'to make something into small balls'. *EDPT*: Once in TT VII 22 and in a Middle Turkic source.

1 *yuŋla-* 'to use (up)'. Base not attested in Turkic; see the index to Gabain, 1974 for the etymology of both this and of 2 *yuŋla-*. *EDPT* and *DTS*; additional exs. in Ht VII 13 b20, Shō XIII a9, FamArch 128, UigSün 39 and frequently in Maitr, many of all these in a biverb with *ye-* 'to eat'. This *yuŋla-* is the base of *yuŋlaKlık tavar/kūmūş/bōz/çao/kunpo* of the economical documents.

2 *yuŋla-* 'to make harmonious'. Hap. in Ht, derived from a Chin. lexeme. Biverb with *amırtgur-*, q.v. below. Mentioned in the *EDPT* under 3 *yuŋla:-*; 1 *yuŋla:-* of that dictionary is a hap. in the DLT derived from *yuŋ* 'wool', and '2 *yuŋla:-*' is our 1 *yuŋla-*.

yük+lä- is apparently a synonym of *yūd-* 'to load', quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, from various Middle Turkic sources etc. It appears also in Ernte 105.

Two lexemes which are more likely to be petrified converbs of *+lA-* verbs than *+lAyU* forms as described in part IV above are *başlayu* '(at) first' and *äsängüläyü*. *başlayu* appears nine times in KT and BQ, in YE 32,12 and, among later sources, e.g. in Suv 348,6. In TT V B3 and 7, *'äŋbaşlayukı* is written as one word. Cf. *başlayukı yıl* (Ht X 13), *başlayuça* (UigTot 1016) and *'äŋ başlayu bulmış yanı tüş* (ShōAgon 3, p. 204,10).

äsängüläyü always appears in letters and messages. The *EDPT* has an instance from Ht. It appears also in BT V 708 and 729; cf. UigBrief p. 453. In his review of BT V in *JA* 267 (1979), Hamilton states that it does not signify "demandant des nouvelles de la santé" but "faisant des voeux de bonne santé". Comparable, in effect, is *äsän+lä-* 'to greet', quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, Middle Turkic etc. *äsängüläyü* is attested also in HamTouen 20,4, 22,2 and 5, 23,3, 29,3 and 31,5, showing how common it was in actual correspond-

50 This does not signify that he climbed up actual palm trees, as Ş. Tekin's translation implies, but that he rose up towards heaven a height equivalent to that of so and so many palm trees. See *tur-k* above, in the introduction to section 3.102.

51 It is quite impossible to connect this verb with *yog+la-*, as suggested there: The two have different velars, and *yogla-* has a particularly narrow meaning.

ence. Cf. the use of *äsängü* as discussed in section 2.96 above, especially that in *äsängü bitig*.

+lA- is the most common denominal formative and the only one which is added freely to foreign bases. *+lA-n-* and *+lA-ş-* appear both as combinations and as formative sequences; there do not seem to be any phonological constraints which might have made it useful to present them together with *+lA-*. *+lA-t-* is not rare and *+lA-l-* is also found, but all verbs ending in these formative sequences are discussed under their last formative.

Many +lA- verbs (about a quarter of the ones we have listed) are derived from deverbal nominals. *-Xş+lA-* is conspicuously absent, whereas there are quite a number of *-Xş+A-* lexemes. *-Xn+A-* verbs are also surprisingly numerous, whereas *-Xn+lA-* is exceedingly rare: Otherwise, the base of *kälin+lä-* was hardly transparent. One *-Xn+lA-* verb is an obscure hapax whereas the other is only an alternant of an *-Xn+A-* verb, as far as one can see. The frequency of the deverbal forms attested as bases corresponds to the frequency of the deverbal nominals themselves; *-(X)g* and *-(O)k* bases, e.g., are represented with about ten *+lA-* derivates each. *+lA-* derivates from denominal nominals, on the other hand, are hardly known: *yerçilä-* and petrified *äsängülāyü* are the only ones we have in Old Turkic proper.

In fols. 584, 588 and 595-6, the DLT tries to define the *+lA-* formation semantically, and to determine what shape of base demands *+lA-* and what shape *+A-*; this attempt is not much of a success. I shall not aim at exhaustiveness but single out several semantic classes instead. *mäŋlä-*, *äŋlä-* and *kuşla-*, e.g., signify 'to search or hunt for the base'; but the 'hunting' verb *avla-* is derived from the name of the activity. *botola-*, *änüklä-*, *buzagula-* and *kulunla-* signify 'to give birth to the entity denoted by the base'. *çagula-*, *kaŋşıla-*, *kakıla-*, *orıla-*, *bozla-*, *tigilä-*, *yıgla-*, *ınçıkla-* and *tWŋla-* denote sound-producing activities. For *erpäKlä-* and *kılıçla-*, *bukagula-*, *sola-*, *torla-*, *kōklä-* and perhaps *bagla-*, for *ütüglä-* and for *sapanla-*, the base serves as instrument noun. In *adutla-*, *tışla-* and *közlä-*, the 'instrument' denoted by the base is the part of the agent's body; with *boguzla-*, on the other hand, the body-part denoted by the base belongs to the victim's body. While *yayla-*, *kışla-* and *yılla-*, signifying 'to spend the stretch of time denoted by the base in a certain place or way', are formed with *+lA-*, *küzä-*, of analogous meaning, is an *+A-* verb. The base lexeme can be the agent, direct or indirect object of the verb or be an abstract denoting the activity itself. Verbs like *adokla-*, *agdukla-*, *agırla-*, *agrukla-*, *akla-*, *amrakla-*, *ayıgla-*, *ädgülä-*, *yavızla-* or *yeglä-* can be collectively formulated as 'to consider the object to be describable by the base adjective'. Some bases, like *tanuk* and *tamga*, have semantically related though agentially differing meanings, and the relationship between base and derivate will depend on which use of the base lexeme we single out. *yagıla-* could be 'to *become*

an enemy, i.e. what is denoted by the base', or 'to *consider somebody* to be one's enemy'. But, in fact, these distinctions are irrelevant: A *+lA-* verb can mean practically anything with relationship to the meaning of the base. Sometimes, series like *botola-*, *ünüklä-* etc. can bring about the analogical creation of a further verb in their domain, when the need arises and such a verb does not yet exist. Analogy does not, however, appear to have been strong enough to change *küz+ä-* to '*küz+lä-*'.

5.13 *+tA-*

This formation has much fewer products than the previous two. We shall again first list these alphabetically, then discuss it as a whole.

al+ta- 'to deceive somebody'. *UW* and *EDPT*. There is only one Uigur ex., but *alta-g*, q.v. in section 3.101 below, and its expansions are quite widely attested. *alda-* in the DLT.

bag+da- is attested several times in the DLT, where it means 'to trip someone'. See below for the °*d*°. We also have *bagda-t-*, a hap. in the DLT, *bagdaş* 'the cross-legged way of sitting' in UigTot and QB (discussed in section 3.103) and the petrified converb *bagdaşınu* derived from it (discussed at the end of the section on *-(X)n-* below). The meaning of *bagta-m* (q.v. in section 3.106 above) makes the connection with *ba-g* (see this in section 3.101) quite plausible.[52]

(*mäŋ+dä-* appears in DLT fol. 618, where a verse is quoted to show its use. From *mäŋ* 'bird-seed, small grain' we also have *mäŋlä-* 'to look for, or pick up grain', but *mäŋdä-* signifies 'to pluck out hair': The derivation must be based on the physical similarity between the two actions. The DLT also has *mäŋdät-* and *mäŋdäş-*.)

istä- 'to seek something or ask for it'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *tilä-istä-*. The same biverb is also found in BT II 1012 and HtPar 130,3 (where the parallel text HtKZ II 6 has just *tilä-*) and in Shō VI a 10-11. We have the legal expression *ayıt- istä-* in UigLand 12-13 (twice), ZiemeSklav I 11-12 and 13-14 and ActeOuig 12 in addition to *ayıtmazun iztämäzün* (thus) of USp 107,12. The biverb *sora ışţäyü* appears in ETŞ 10,139. Instances like *ol udçı kälmäyükkä ävintäki kişilär istäyü* (HtPar 105 r 24-26 = Ht IV 82-84) "Als jener Rinderhirte nicht kam, suchten ihn seine Verwandten" und *istädi tüzünlär izin* (Ht VII 10 b 14; none of them quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*) make it likely that *istä-* comes from *iz* 'trace, track, footprints'; the *EDPT* quotes a number of exs. for *iz+dä-* from Middle Turkic. The evidence for original back-vocalic quality of *iz* is

52 The connection with *bag* 'bond, tie' is even more convincing if one looks at the following sentence: *Bu gez Beyrek kızın ince beline girdi, bağdadı* (Dede Korkut, quoted from the *Türkçe Sözlüğü*).

not strong;[53] a more serious objection to the connection of *istä-* with *iz* is the fact that it is usually written with /s/ both in Uigur and in Qarakhanid Turkic.[54] Another possible base for *istä-* lives on in Yak. *iäs* 'loan, debt', attested also in the binomial *iäs küs*. This, now, must be a direct descendent of the Orkhon Turkic binomial always written as *is küç*.[55] There is also a Yak. verb *iästä-* 'to ask for the return of a debt'. *istä-* is likely to have resulted from the collapse of **iz+tä-* with **es+tä-*.

(*käktäş-* 'to harbour rancour against each other' is attested only in DLT fol. 377, and a corresponding *°tA-* verb is not known. It ought, nevertheless, to be analysable as **käk+tä-ş-* from *käk* 'malice'.[56])

(*kurdaş-* 'to sit in the same rank as somebody' is attested only in DLT fol. 376, but should, similar to the previous verb, come from *kur* 'rank' over an unattested *+tA-* derivate.)

(*ok+ta-* 'to shoot an arrow at something'. It is not clear from the exs. in what case the animal or person shot at was placed. Attested only in the DLT in two passages. The DLT also has *oktaş-*, *oktat-* and *oktam*, and *okta-* is attested also in modern languages.)

soŋ+da- 'to chase'. Not attested outside the DLT and the QB; the exs. from QB 3423, 4351, 5004, 5859 and 6118 are not listed by the *EDPT*. DLT fol. 601 has an ex. for *soŋ* 'later; after' which would particularly suit the meaning of this verb, in the sentence *Sän mänig soŋda käl* 'You come behind me'.

tıl+ta- 'to make excuses, seek pretexts'. *EDPT*: Two instances with dative of the excuse appear in an economical text in USp, and another one, with *tıl+ın*, in the QB. All three are written with *+dA-*; we have, however, *tılta-n-* in the Chuast, and *tılta-g*, q.v. above, is very well attested.

53 *EDPT* 277 suggests that the original shape of this lexeme may have been *ı:z*, because of *ızıg* with *ghain* in QB 4411. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* is the accusative *iz+ig* in QB 2382. As Dankoff's translation of the QB also shows, the 2382 context is quite clearly for '(physical) tracks (of the enemy)', whereas the 4411 context is not clear at all. Note also that the QB has many instances of nominals used as objects with no case suffix. *ızıg* must, therefore, at the moment, remain a *crux*.

54 The verb is not attested in runic script, but cf. the Türk royal proper name *İstämi*, mentioned in footn. 443 above. This etymology may not seem too convincing on the face of it, but most other Kök Türk proper names are, after all, Turkic.

55 References to the exs. can be found in the index of Tekin, 1968 s.v. *is*. *esig küçüg ber-*, attested 14 times in the inscrs., seems to mean 'to pay duties, taxes'. The sentence "*Karluk esiŋä kälmädük*" *tedi*. in ŞU S1, followed by the fragments of an account of a campaign against the Qarluq, should signify: '"The Qarluq have evidently not come for (paying) their taxes" he said.' The same lexeme is probably also found in TT I 24, and elsewhere.

56 *käk* rhymes with *täg* in QB 2312. Nevertheless, I don't think it can be read as '*käg*', as it appears with **k* in the Codex Comanicus and elsewhere (see the *EDPT*). This accords with the fact that the suffix *+tA-* does not appear as *+dA-* in *käktäş-* in the DLT: In that source, the voicedness of the dental of this formative accords with that of the final phoneme of the base nominal.

ün+tä- 'to call'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially under '*maŋra- ündä-*' and '*oqï- ündä-*'. Although the lemmata of both dictionaries are written with °*d*°, we find °*ℓ*° in M III 9,13$_1$ (text 3) and 33,1$_2$ (Yosıpas), U II 26,13 (Bhadrā), KP 33,2/3 and 60,6, TT I 108 and TT X 282. Add *üntäyü* from U IV A 142 and *üntädi* from ChristManus r 13; further exs. with °*ℓ*° appear in LeCoqSchriftk IV 13 and Maitr 120 v 22 and 81 r 29.

(*üstä-* 'to increase something' is possibly derived from *üzä* 'above' with syncope of the unstressed and open second vowel and subsequent loss of voice in the sibilant. We find it in Suv 266,6-8, 407,15 and 593,19, Ht VII 12 b 20 and six times in the QB. *üstä-l-*, q.v. below, has many more exs., and cf. *üstä-ŋ* in section 3.116 above. *üstä-m* is found in Maitr, DLT and QB. *üstün* and *üstürti* are apparently derived from the same base with the same phonetic changes, and are even closer to it semantically. *üstün* is formed with the well-known suffix of deictic locality, *üstürti* with the equally well-known (though less productive) *+dXr+tI*.[57])

The bases for this formative are all monosyllabic stems ending in consonants, with the possible exception of **üzä+tä-* > *üstä-*. In all cases, at any rate, the *+tA-* verb itself is bisyllabic. Practically all the exs. of Old Turkic proper have the formative as *+tA-* and not *+dA-*; in Qarakhanid Turkic, however, all the verbs of this formation consistently have /t/ after voiceless, /d/ after voiced final phoneme in the base. A number of later exs. can be found in Schakir, 1933: 46-7. Onomatopoeic °*dA-* verbs as *tIrpIldA-* "schnattern" and *yälküldä-* "schlottern" in the Codex Comanicus do *not* belong to this formation, however: They may have come about through crasis with the verb *de-* 'to say' or follow Mo. models. *ba-g* is the only derived base for a *+tA-* verb. The n. to TT III 68 suggests that *arta-* 'to deteriorate etc.' also belong to this formation, and this hypothesis is quoted in the *UW* entry for the verb. There is no '**ar*', however, and the DLT's '*arsu*' may just as well be read as *ärsü*, as both the *EDPT* and DankKelly do.

Most *+tA-* verbs appear to be tr., but *tılta-* may not govern direct objects. It does not seem possible to find any semantic characterisation for *+tA-*, and its presence does not have any syntactic implication beside the possible one just mentioned. Nominals are formed either with *-(X)g* (*alta-g*, *istä-g*, *tılta-g*) or with *-(X)m* (*bagta-m*, *okta-m*, *üstä-m*). The verb *koldamla-*, attested in Suv 75,12 (quoted in the *DTS*) and Ernte II 52, probably comes from such an *-(X)m* derivate from an unattested *+tA-* verb: **koldam* is unlikely to have been formed using the formative of section 2.31, where *N+dAm* signifies 'having the properties of

57 The discussion of both belongs to Old Turkic case grammar. The base of the very common *üstün* is not *üst*, as assumed by *EDPT* 242 a; *üst* was back-formed from *üstün*, apparently in the language of Islamic texts only, and not before the 13th century.

N'. Nor is *nldam* (QB 3076 and 5651) likely to have been a *+dAm* lexeme, since it does not signify 'tonguelike' but 'one who speaks clearly and in a convincing way'. **kol+da-* would, like *til+ta-* or *al+ta-*, have had its INSTRUMENT as base.

The only verbal expansions from *+tA-* verbs are *tilta-n-* in Chuast and *istä-t-* in Suv, BT III and DLT. In the DLT we also find *bagda-t-* and *okta-t-*, *ündä-š-*, *mäŋdä-ş-*, *kurdaş-*, *käktäş-* and *okta-ş-*, and *istä-l-*. As with *+lA-* and *+A-*, there do not seem to be any limitations on the formation of verbs with *+tA-* bases. This speaks for indeterminate behaviour: We shall find that a whole group of denominal formatives is expandable only with causative affixes, onomatopoeic verbs have their limitation, and *-(X)rkA-*, to which we come presently, is practically limited to medial-reflexive expansion.

There are many *+dA-* verbs in Mo.; Mo. *arya+da-* is close in meaning to Tu. *al+ta-*, Mo. *dayu+da-* to Tu. *ün+tä*. The voiced dental of the Mo. formative accords with Qarakhanid *+dA-*: Devoicing after bases ending in voiceless consonants is secondary. Old Turkic *+tA-* is attested only after bases with /l/ (*al*, *til*), /n/ (*ün*) and /z/ (*iz?*, *üzä?*). These three (and /r/) are the phonemes after which /d/ appears in its stop and not in its spirantic allophone. *+tA-* can therefore here stand for /+dA-/; this is what we also find in Mo. and in Qarakhanid.

5.2 Verba sentiendi: *+(X)(r)kA-* (and *-(X)rkA-*)

The verbs created with this formative all denote feelings or sensations, the base nominal being either the name of the feeling, the object of the attitude, what one sees an object as, the mental source of the attitude, etc. They are generally transitive even when expanded with *-(X)n-*, the only exception being, perhaps, *busurkan-*. Their being *verba sentiendi* explains why most of them are attested only together with this medial-reflexive formative. In two cases, both *+(X)rkA-* and *+(X)rkA-n-* forms exist, and only three *+(X)rkA-* verbs have no *-(X)n-* expansion attested. *-(X)n-* is the only verbal formative which we find to get freely added to *+(X)rkA-* verbs. This comes to show that sense, sentiment and attitude are private and personal matters, which can neither be shared with others, induced in others or let oneself get induced to by others. The only two (late) exceptions are where Buddha is induced to compassion (a feeling to which he is always prone in the first place); in these rare cases, the expander is *-(X)t-*. Otherwise, agents of *+(X)rkA-* verbs can be *-(O)k* nominals, whereas their objects are formed with *-(X)nçlg*. We will here depart from our procedure of grouping forms by their last formative in discussing *+(X)rkA-n-* verbs in this section and not in the section on *-(X)n-*; there, they will only be mentioned.

The full variant of the formative appears when the base is monosyllabic: *alp+ir-*

kan-, *käy+ırkänçig*, *taŋ+ırka-*, *tok+urkak* and *tsoyurka-*. A bisyllabic base ending with a vowel receives the formative without the /X/: *kıvı+rkan-*, *kişi+rkäk* and *özi+rkän-* are such derivates. When a bisyllabic base ends in a consonant, the formative alternant is *+kA-*, e.g. in *erinç+kä-* and *yarlıg+ka-*. *äsirkä-* < *äsiz* is also in this third class: We remember the affinity between /z/ and /r/ in Proto-Turkic and think of the relationship between *+sXz* and *+s(ı)rA-* (discussed below) and of many similar ones *within* Turkic languages.

Röhrborn, 1983 wanted to derive *adkan-* (which he writes as '*atkan-*') from **art+ka-n-*. This would be against the distribution as described above, and no other formative of the shape *+kA-* exists in Old Turkic. Other points against this suggestion are mentioned under *adkaş-* in section 7.1. Note also that no other verb in the present formation has a *-(X)ş-* derivate. *adkan-* would have been the only such verb to consist not of three but of two syllables. Since the *+XrkA-* ~ *+rkA-* ~ *+kA-* alternation is a conspiracy whose object it is to keep the number of syllables in the stem constant, *adkan-* could not be in this formation. This assignment is strained from the semantic aspect and Uigur spelling *consistently* uses D.

Here, then, are the *-(X)(r)kA-* verbs and their *-(X)n-* derivates (in case they themselves are not attested):

agrıkan- 'to feel pain, to complain of pain' from *agrı-g*, the abstract which denotes the sensation felt and communicated. It should be a simplification from **agrı-g+ka-n-*: The passage /gk/ > /k/ happens with *yarlıg+ka-* as well,[58] und *agrıg* would, according to the above description, get the *+kA-* variant of the formative. See the *UW* for Uigur exs. of *agrıkan-* and the *EDPT* for the DLT. The translation "Schmerzen bereiten, schmerzen" given in the *UW* as one of two meanings is unlikely, as *+(X)rkA-* verbs always have the person feeling the sensation as subject.[59]

alp+ırkan- 'to have difficulties in something, to find something difficult; to find something boring' and the dubious *alp+ırka-* are adequately discussed in the *UW*. The last mentioned (metonymically extended) meaning of *alpırkan-* need not be supplied with a question mark, as the *UW* does: It accords with "to occupy oneself with something out of boredom" quoted in the *EDPT* from Kaz. and with the original and the context. *alparkan-* in TuoLuoNi 396 (= ZiemeDrevSlov 230 o. as quoted in the *UW*) is just an inferior ms. variant of the instance in USp 102 a4.

äsirkä- comes from *äsiz*, an exclamation of bereavement found already in the Yenisei inscrs. See the *EDPT* for it, though that entry lacks some instances,

58 It is unlikely that *yarlıgka-* should be a back-formation from *yarlıka-* created analogically, as the documentation for *yarlıgka-* is clearly *earlier* than that for *yarlıka-*.

59 The lacuna in HtPek 7 b16 should not be filled as '*baş[ı]*' but as *baş[ın]* (accusative) or *baş[da]*.

e.g. the one in HamTouen 1,30. Cf. also the following phraseological similarity in Qarakhanid Turkic: *äsirkäp açır män saŋa ay yigitlik* (QB 6528) "How I regret your loss, O youth" and *ässiz anıŋ yigitliki* (DLT fols. 83 and 466) "Alas for his youth". The DLT defines *ässiz*[60] as "a word of sighing for a loss". Prof. Doerfer (personal communication) is, in this connection, reminded of Mo. *ese* 'not to be, not'. *äsirkä-* never signifies 'to pity', as scholars have been led to believe by the ambiguous context of KP 71,3-4; it can always be translated as 'to regret the (imminent or effected) loss of someone or something'. 'regretting the loss of someone' is conceived of as a positive sentiment by the authors, whereas 'regretting the loss of an object' can have the negative connotations of 'to grudge'. The fact that DLT fol. 155[61] only mentions "regret at the loss of a thing" is no reason to think that Qarakhanid Turkic lacks the former use: Cf. especially QB 3131. Further instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Suv 227,16 (object: *ät'özlärin isig özlärin*) and 609,1 (*ät'özümin*), ShōAgon 2, p. 195,4$_2$ ([*ulu*]*g ädgü ögli köŋülüg*), BT XIII 49,18 (object in lacuna; wrong translation), QB 950 (*öz näŋin*) and 3745 (*dunyā*), BuddhUig II 16 (*ät'özin jSIG ÖZin ädin tavarın*) and BuddhKat 21 (*atın adgırın koyın*[62] *yılkısın abıg yutuzın inçkä kırkının käntü ätüzin*[63]). Further exs. can be found in BT III 202, ManErz IV 27 and Suv 453,21. The spelling *esirkäyü* of the KP instance is quite clear on the facs. It could be considered an error, were it not for another ex. in YE 29,4, hitherto misinterpreted. It reads: (*ä*)*rd*(*ä*)*ml*(*i*)[*g*] *bols*(*a*)*r bodun es*(*i*)*rk*(*ä*)*yür m*(*ä*)*n er*(*i*)*nçim* '. . . I am sad about having lost (my) people . . .'.

Cf. *äsirkä-n-* below and *äsirkänçsiz* in section 3.12.

erinçkä- 'to feel compassion with or pity for somebody'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. The biverb *erinçkä-tsoyurka-*, which is quoted there, appears also in ShōAgon 2, p. 195,4$_2$ and 1,181 and 182, SuvGeng 603,13 and Warnke 296. Ms. M 126 + M 502m + M 201 v6 edited in the n. to BT V 217 should be completed to *üzütlärig [er]inçkädük üçün* 'because he has compassion for the souls'; there is space for the additional letters and nothing else makes sense. The *EDPT* is right in emending *irinçlä-* of M III to *irinçkä-*: In the preceding line, the ms. writes *täplänçsz* instead of *täpränçsiz*. Besides, the resulting biverb *erinçkä-y*(*a*)*rlıka-*

60 The double *ss* is expressive, as Kāšġarī himself says with respect to *esiz*, and need not be introduced into the canonical variant which must have served as base for *äsirkä-*.

61 Dankoff and Kelly, following the *EDPT*, write the verb with *g* and not *k*. Against this, however, is the evidence of BuddhKat 21; cf. p. 301 of the first part of that paper.

62 This is, of course, *koy+ı+n* 'his sheep (accus.)', not a simple noun stem, as one is led to believe by footn. 40 thereto.

63 In the Brāhmī documents, /ō/ and /ū/ alternate in the second syllable of this lexeme. Our spelling must therefore remain conventional as far as texts written in Uigur script are concerned.

is attested, in addition, in Shō IX a14, Ht V 9 b20,[64] and Shō VII b9. Further exs. of *erinçkä-* appear in Suv 363,20, ETŞ 13,38, Ht VII 3 a12, BuddhUig II 291, BT XIII 12,04 and so forth. On the analogy of the biverb *erinçkä- yarlıka-* we find that, in Maitr 106 r10, *yarlıkançuçı* 'compassionate' is accompanied by *erinçkänçüçi*: This analogy is the only explanation for the isolated appearance of the latter beside the very common first lexeme.

käy+irkänçig 'pitiful' has already been discussed in section 3.311 above, together with *erinçkä-nçig*. It comes from *käy* 'sorrow' and appears only in Suv. Two of the instances are mentioned in the *DTS* s.v. '*kevirgänčik*'; not in the *EDPT*.

kıvı+rkan-mak appears together with *küni* and qualifies *kõŋül* in Maitr 66 r5; this is not mentioned either in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. From the same unattested *+(X)rkA-* verb we also have the rather common *kıvırkak* 'grasping, miserly', discussed among the *-(O)k* lexemes above; it is also used in a binomial with *küni*. Cf. also *kıvırkak+lan-* (discussed below), which is used twice together with *az+lan-*. The only possible existing base for these is *kıvı*, attested in QB 668, 1045 and 1332 as an attribute to *kut* 'fortune'. Dankoff, who translates this as "hollow Fortune", was probably thinking of *kovı*; but the first vowels of these lexemes are irreducibly different. 'mean' or 'niggardly Fortune' would do just as well in the context, and explains the *+(X)rkA-* derivates.[65]

(*kişi+rkäk är* should probably be read in DLT fol. 411, with the *DTS* but against '*köşerge:k*' of the *EDPT* and '*kösürgäk*' of DankKelly. It signifies "a man who feels cramped for space when he sees a person in his house". The ms. shows KSIRK'K, with a *sukün* added over the *sīn* by a later hand. This accords best with *kişirkäk*, for which nothing has to be taken to be *wrong* in the ms., and only two diacritics to be *omitted*. Semantically, cf. *alp+ırkan-*; note its formal similaritiy to *kıvı+rkak* and *tok+urkak*.)

oyurkan- is discussed under *ywKurkan-* below.

özi+rkä- apparently comes from *öz* + possessive suffix, whence the meaning 'to regard as one's own'. There are three exs. of *özirkä-n-*, discussed in section 7.21. *özirkä-*, on the other hand, is attested only in Ht VII 11 b12: *sam*[*tso*] *açarıka yu̧küngäli bol*[*tumuz*]. *bizni özirkäp özıŋä tarta y(a)rlıkamak üzä berü y(a)rlıkadı bodis(a)tvlar ç*[*(ı)xşapat*]*ın*. Another indication for the hypostasis of *özi* is the postpositional phrase *özi+ni birlä* in Ht X 628 and 682, where one would (had *öz* had the mere possessive suffix with it) have expected **özin birlä*. *bir(i)si* also already occurs in Uigur (Suv).

64 In the clause preceding this one, '*ämgä*[*nç*]*l(ä)rin*' is better read as *ämgä*[*k*]*l(ä)rin*; a lexeme '*ämgänç*' is not known.

65 The *EDPT* confuses *kıvı* and *kıv*, a presumable synonym of *kut* often used in a binomial with it. This is impossible both morphologically and syntactically, and does not fit the QB contexts. The QB İndeks, on the other hand, lists two instances of *kıv+ı* (with possessive suffix) under *kıvı*.

taŋ+ırka- 'to find something astonishing' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the QB and from Middle Turkic. It is, however, attested also in Warnke 71, Shō XII b10, BuddhUig II 395 (biverb with *taŋ+la-*) and Ht IV 40, 1173 and 1233 and V 9 a25. Ht VII 18 a10-11 (= 1846-7) should no doubt be completed as *az rep taŋır[ka]yu y(a)rlıkamazun.*

tok+urkak 'one who feels satiated' is attested in KT S 8 and BQ N 6. Discussed among the *-(O)k* lexemes above together with *tok*, q.v. We have no related *+(X)rkA-* verb but cf. *kıvırkak* above.

tsoyurka- 'to feel pity and compassion for somebody' comes from a Chin. lexeme signifying 'compassion(ate)', apparently itself not borrowed into Turkic. *lala-* among the *+lA-* verbs is a similar instance; *+çI* is another formative also added to foreign bases. The initial consonant cluster, which contradicts Turkic phonotactics, was sometimes simplified to /s/. Cf. the *EDPT* for the first vowel. Beside exs. of the verb quoted there (which include instances from the QB), we find it e.g. in BT VIII A 175, ShōAgon 2, p. 195,4-5_2 and InscrOuig IV 26 and V 13. *soyurka-t-* is attested in InscrOuig I 7, II 45, III 3, 45 and 49 and V 4. At least as far as InscrOuig is concerned, it may have been borrowed back from Mo. Cf. also *erinçkä-* above.

yarlıg+ka- 'to be gracious; to command'. In Uigur, it is very often used as an auxiliary of majesty, which can be translated as 'to deign'. In the QB and in Middle Turkic it signifies 'to pardon (sins)'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; further exs. in BT II 264, ETŞ 15,25 and 29 and elsewhere. In Erdal, 1979, the difference between *yarlıgka-* and *yarlıka-* is shown to be a matter of (chronological or stylistic) age. The *EDPT* discusses 1 *yarlıg* 'poor, destitute, pitiable' and 2 *yarlıg* 'command'.[66] 1 *yarlıg* usually appears in Uigur in a binomial with *erinç*. I take the original meaning of *yarlıgka-* to have been more or less similar to that of *erinçkä-* (q.v. above in this section), i.e. 'to feel compassion for and act or speak graciously to(wards) a pitiable person'. The honorific use of this verb must be secondary, and agrees with what one would consider to be a proper transfer in this pragmatic domain. This view does not explain the existence of 2 *yarlıg*; the semantic relationship between *yarlıg* 'command' and *yarlıgka-* 'to command' is not of the type found in this formation. Possibly, therefore, 2 *yarlıg* is a back-formation from *yarlıgka-* after the meaning of this verb was extended to mark social class. Note that *yarlıka-n-* (discussed below) signifies

66 As the following instance shows, I *yarlıg* is probably a *+lXg* derivate from *yar* 'spittle': *bizni kodup kança b(a)rgalı sakınur siz? . . . bo muntag irinç y(a)rlag, agaz yarlıg köz yaşlıg, näçükin kodup barır siz?* (MaitrGeng 6 b 29). *irinç yarlıg* (instance to be added to the *EDPT*) is here collocated with 'spittle-mouthed' and 'teary-eyed'. *yarlıg bilmäz yagı* 'an enemy who knows no mercy' (BT XIII 16,20) is a metaphor for death. It presupposes a meaning of *yarlıg* which I have not met elsewhere.

'to pity', and that *yarlıkançsız* and *yarlıkançuçı* (both discussed above in section 3.12) reflect only this meaning and not that typical of *yarlı(g)ka-*.[67] *(yw)Kurkan-* is found in TuoLuoNi 361: *muŋkul bolup ärtürü ywKurkanıp* . . ., is, following the Chin. original, translated as "(der Bäg) wurde verwirrt, . . ., er erstaunte sehr und . . .". The n. adds: "Die Bedeutung 'wehklagen (?)' (ATG) . . . ist aufzugeben, ebenso auch 'skryvat'sja' (DTS 270b), dazu Näheres in der Edition der uig. Avalokiteśvara-Sūtras." Attested also twice in the Suv, in one of these instances as a biverb with *oyurkan-*: *nä anı körüp takı artokrak oyurkanıı ywKurkanıı* (621,16-17) 'When she saw that, she was even more surprised$_2$'. Neither verb is mentioned in the *EDPT*; they do appear in the *DTS*, s.vv. '*yoyurqan-* I' and *ujurqan-* respectively. I have no etymology for these verbs, if they do not signify 'to bemoan'.)

We have already listed all the *-(X)n-*, *-(O)k* and *-(X)nçIg* derivates from verbs of this formation. *erinçkät-* is a hap. in Warnke, *yarlıkat-* a hap. in UigTot and *soyurkat-* is found only in InscrOuig; a rare and late expansion indeed. See Schakir, 1933: 35-37 for modern exs. of *+(X)rkA-*.

In a few cases, *+(X)rkA-* appears to have been transferred to the verbal domain. This is the case with *tuy-urka-* from *tuy-* 'to perceive, notice', in Warnke 24: [*taş*]*tırın bir tavış tuyuş ün äşidilti. ol tep tuyurkap körüp koḍḍukta, agulug yılan orduka agtınıp kälip* . . . The page on which this appears had been considered lost; as P. Zieme informs me, it has now been rediscovered as ms. Mz 272. No other Old Turkic formatives get added to both noun and verb bases, and one would want to explain this phenomenon away. One could evoke Mongolian, which has a formative *+rKA-*, dominant with bisyllabic bases. We find e.g. Mo. *omorka-* < *omoγ* 'conceit', *bayarka-* < *bayan* 'rich', *üye+rke-* 'to associate with people of one's own age', *čilegerke-*, *ünerke-*, *eǰerke-* and many more. Poppe, 1954 par. 247 translates the meaning of this formative as "to possess of something in abundance", however, which differs from what Old Turkic *+(X)rkA-* has been translated as. According to Prof. Doerfer (personal communication), the similarity is a coincidence. The relationship between the two should, I think, be looked into more closely, as some of the Old Turkic *+(X)rkA-* verbs *can* be understood to denote over-abundance. Similarly, one might want to derive *tuyurka-* from some nominal derivate from *tuy-*. No such derivate springs to mind, however; it would be a useless and *ad hoc* hypothesis to invent such a nominal. In the case of *tuyurka-*, at any rate, analogy with Mo. is of no help.

Another candidate for deverbal etymology is *kıs-ırkan-* in *DLT* in fol. 398: *är tavarın kısırkandı* "The man held on tightly to his money and was afraid to spend

67 The original Proto-Turkic verb for 'to order, command' should be *buyur-*, discussed in section 3.102 under *buyruk*; it became obsolete in all types of Old and Qarakhanid Turkic.

it". There is also a verse quotation, so that we can be sure that Kāšgarī did not make up the verb. The last line of this reads *amn anı kısırkan* referring to grain, translated "now hold on and do not spend it". The use of *kıs-ın-* in DLT fol. 344 is quite similar: The ex. for it is *är tavarın kısındı*, translated "The man was stingy with his wealth". One might want to derive *kısırkan-* from *kıs-ıg*, if one could assume *+(X)rkA-* to have been dominant. This nominal, although well-attested in Uigur and found also in the DLT (discussed above), always signifies 'confinement', however; it appears also in Middle Turkic, where it means 'distress'. A derivate from *kıs-ıg*, in short, would not have had the meaning which *kısırkan-* would demand. *ısırkān-* from *ısı-* 'to be hot' is translated by the *EDPT* "to come out in heat spots". This is the meaning assigned to the verb by the DLT, where the subject is *baş* 'head'. Following the DLT, the translation of *ısırkānmāk* in (Brāhmī) TT VIII 16 is "Hitzepickel". There is no reason to transfer this meaning to Uigur, however, when, moreover, the subject is not the head but the person as a whole. I prefer the rendering of *ät'öz ısırkānıp* (UigTot 1141; not in the dictionaries), which is "wenn den Körper Hitze befällt". The *EDPT* quotes North-East Turkic languages as using the verb to mean "to feel hot"; this is what it should signify also in Uigur. An early ex. occurs in MaitrH XVI 10 b 12: *burxanlag pariçatır sögüt kut bulmak* (read thus) *ıdışlığ xua çäçäk yertinçüdä yagıtur, ada tuda tınlaglar anıŋ kôligäsintä olorup ögirürlär sävinürlär. m(ä)n yana nızvanılag kün ı(ä)ŋrı çogıŋa . . . ısırkänsär m(ä)n yaramagay* '(extended metaphor in which Buddha is a shade-giving tree;) it will not do for me to get heated up by the blaze of the sun of vice'. In this case, *ısı-g* is attested and has the appropriate meaning. Since *+(X)rkA-* is not dominant with the ubiquitous *yarlıgka-*, however, it couldn't have been dominant here. *āmirkāş-* in BT III 990 must have gotten dissimilated from **āmri-rkā-ş-*, from *āmri-* "to itch" (DLT fol. 140). Considering *ātim barça āmrişti* (DLT fol. 125) and the fact that *-(X)rkA-* forms verbs of sensation, *āmirkāş-* should mean 'to feel itchy all over'. *yıdışka-* 'to smell, to scent (tr.)' is not in the *EDPT* but the *DTS* quotes it from Suv. It is attested also in BT III 245 (as *ıdış°*). It probably does not come from an *-Xş* derivate of *yıdı-* (which is not attested), but from *yıdı-ş-* (which is). *busurkan-* or *buşurkan-* is a hap. in SuvÇağ in a biverb with *busan-* (q.v. in section 7.21); it is quoted in the *DTS* under '*bušan-bušurkan-*' but not in the *EDPT*. The two verbs together might mean 'to be sorrowful', as *busan-* by itself does. *busan-* is related to *busuş* (section 3.103), and the two can be taken to have had the common base **busa-*. Whether hypothetical **busa-* should be taken to be a *+A-* derivate from *bus* 'fog' is questionable but not to be excluded. If this assumption is made, we could take a verb *bus+urka-n-* to come from the same base. Otherwise, we could read *buşurkan-* and derive that from *buş-* 'to be annoyed'. In the Codex Comanicus we find *köŋül açırgamax* translated as 'contritio cordis' i.e. 'remorse'; it should come from *açı-* 'to pity

etc.'. *yerig yırtızkayw kayutın sınar* . . . in BT III 285, on the other hand, is probably to be emended to *yerig yırtıp kayutın sınar* . . .; the letters Q'YW were probably repeated inadvertently.[68] *tuy-urka-*, *isi-rkän-* and *yıdış-ka-* do, in any case, appear to be solid enough.

In view of the antiquity of *isi-rkän-*, we have to face the fact that the formative described in this section was both denominal and deverbal. Old Turkic has no other such formative, but note the formal and semantic similarity between +(*X*)*k*- and -(*X*)*k*- and between +(*A*)*d*- and -*d*-. -(*X*)*rkA*- expresses a *type of action*, as dealt with in part VI of this book.

5.3 *Onomatopoeics and synaesthetics*

The following sections will deal mostly with verbs and also with some nominals, which all denote sound-producing activities. The sound may be the main object of the activity denoted and its essential part, or it may be a byproduct unintended by the agent. The bases, where such are attested, are imitative of the sound produced.

Beside being a functional group, the formations discussed here have some phonic similarities as well; they must have been related in Proto-Turkic or in Proto-Altaic (if such a language ever existed). Where anything about such relationships can be said merely on the base of Old Turkic or Qarakhanid material, this has been done here. Most of that is outside the scope of this work, however. T. Tekin, 1983 is the most recent paper on the subject from the Altaistic point of view, and also sums up studies by earlier scholars. Further work will, I believe, benefit from additional documentation from the various languages and dialects, and from minute morphophonological analysis of the facts. I here intend to do this for Old Turkic, clearly a key language in this matter. I have used the Qarakhanid sources more than elsewhere, as the documentation of Old Turkic (most texts of which are rather distant from the sounds of this world) is rather scanty for these particular formatives.

5.31 *+kIr-* and *+kI-*

What the vowel of this suffix was can only be determined with rounded bases. This is the case only for two verbs here, and the evidence for them is little and uncertain. To bring comparative evidence into the matter would not really be

68 A verb as here created would be unlike the other verbs in this formation in not having to do with senses and feelings, and a causative -(*X*)*z*- is not called for by the context.

scientific, as comparison must be based on what we know about the particular languages and not vice versa. Here are the data:

alakır- is found in Uigur only in a biverb with *kıkır-* 'to shout'. See the *UW*, and the *EDPT* for an Ottoman cognate. The base is not attested in Old Turkic. Cf. *alakır-ış-* among the *-(X)ş-* verbs. Both this derivate and *alakır-* have spellings with dotted Q in mss. which consistently distinguish it from its voiced counterpart.

ay+kır- 'to shout out loud' also has a distinctive dotted Q in the only Uigur (Manichaean) ms. in which it appears. See the *EDPT* both for this and for its base.

(*bakır-* 'to bellow'. Not attested before the DLT, where it is said to be Oguz. The Mo. cognate *barkira-* makes it possible that the base lives on in Republican Turkish *bar bar bağır-*; this would mean that a final /r/ was dropped from the end of the verb's first syllable by dissimilation.)

(*bırkır-* 'to snort', in the DLT. Cf. *bırkıg* 'snorting (of a horse or donkey)' in DLT fol. 232. The relationship between the two lexemes is discussed below.)

(*bükür-* 'to spurt out, spray' is attested thrice in Suv, quoted in the *DTS*. The variant *bürkür-* appears five times in DLT fol. 352. If *bürkür-* could be shown to be original, it would support the etymology for *bakır-* mentioned above. QB 98 and 4892 (quoted in the *EDPT*) have /i/ in the second syllable: In the former, the archetype must have had *büvkir-* while, in the latter, the mss. converge on *bürkir-*. As far as the first syllable is concerned, the QB may constitute an intermediary between the presence and the absence of the /r/.)

(*çakrış-* is said in DLT fol. 371 to signify 'to shout to one another' and to be in use in the Oguz dialect. *çakır-*, its base, appears neither in Old Turkic nor in Qarakhanid, but is found in south-west and western Turkic from the 13th cent. on: See the *EDPT*. It may be a borrowing from Sogdian, where *žyyr-* is common in this meaning.)

(*kakır-* 'to clear one's throat, to expectorate' appears in QB 4113 in mss. A and C, quoted in the *DTS*. B has *kıkır-* (q.v. below) instead, and is followed in the *EDPT* s.v. *kıkır-* and in Dankoff's translation. B not only changes the particular vowel, however, but has a wholly different couplet regular in verse and rhyme. Since B's couplet contains words from 4114, I prefer the AC version. The *EDPT* s.v. *kıkır-* also mentions some Middle Turkic evidence for *kakır-*.)

(*käkir-* 'to belch' is attested in the DLT, in Middle Turkic etc.; see the *EDPT*.)

kı+kır 'to shout'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. '*urla- qïqïr-*'. See the *EDPT* for *kı*; the DLT also has the binomial *orı kıkı* 'shouting', but *+kIr-/+kXr-* is semantically more appropriate than *+(A)r-*. An additional ex. is found in Suv 7,17, documented also by the ms. edited in SuvLeg. Add also

kıkırıp kaç- in Ernte 133, *kıkıru yor-* in BuddhUig II 225 and *orlayu kıkıru* in both mss. in TuoLuoNi 86.

(*sıkır-* 'to whistle'. Attested in the DLT, Middle and Modern Turkic; see the *EDPT*.)

(*üşkir-* 'to hiss, shriek or whistle' is attested in DLT fol. 121 and then in Modern languages, for which see the *EDPT*. *ol ıtıg käyikkä üşKürdi*, which seems to appear in the same entry of the DLT, has been confused with *üşkir-* first by the copyist in an apparent rereading of the work, and after him by Clauson and DankKelly; it is a *-gUr-* causative discussed in section 7.54. Intr. *üşkir-* itself is used four times, with vultures, snakes and persons as subject. The copyist had first marked the second syllable of *üşkir-* as I in two of these four exs. and left the two others unmarked. When rereading he added a U to three of the four instances because of the confusion.)

While this last bit of evidence thus speaks for /I/ in the second syllable, /X/ would seem to be slightly preferable as far as *bükür-* etc. is concerned. With the exception of this last mentioned, all verbs of this formation are onomatopoeics in the strict sense: They denote the emission of sounds by living beings. *bürkür-* appears originally to have been an *-Ur-* causative (base actually attested in various Turkic languages as quoted in the *EDPT* entry for *bürkür-*). In Qarakhanid Turkic it was then assimilated to the *+kIr-* verbs, by its aorist vowel /A/ in the DLT, by twice /I/ in the second syllable of the stem in the QB. This transfer had not yet taken place in Uigur. The shape of the present formative was consistently *+kIr-*, then.

We have already quoted *kıkıru* from BuddhUig II and TuoLuoNi. Otherwise, the converb and aorist vowel of this formation is /A/: *kıkıra* in U IV C89 and 138 and Suv 641,3, *burkıra* (apparently belonging to *bırkır-*) in BT III 159, *bürkirär*/*büvkirär* in the QB, and *bakırar*, *bırkırar*, *bürkürär*, *käkirär*, *kıkırar* and *sıkırar* in the DLT. In Erdal, 1979a, the appearance of this vowel in these forms has been connected with Mo. *+KirA-* to show that the original, Proto-Turkic form of the formative was **kIrA-*. A few onomatopoeic verbs ending in *°krA-* will be mentioned below. It will be difficult to connect the two sets convincingly, if it cannot be shown why the stem-final /A/ was dropped here but retained there. Note that *kıkır-* is one of the few *+kIr-* verbs which has a base actually attested in Old Turkic; on the other hand, it follows from T. Tekin, 1983 that this verb has no Mo. cognate. The fluctuation in its converb and aorist vowel may be explained by its being younger than the other relevant verbs. It may have been created after the final vowel of **kIrA-* was dropped, and never have had the longer stem form.

The DLT's *bırkır-* 'to snort' and *bırkıg* 'snorting' are evidently related. The latter seems to presuppose a base **bırk-* or **bırkı-* presumably synonymous with *bırkır-*. I would prefer it to be **bırkı-*, as there seems to have been a rare

onomatopoeic formative *+kI-* alongside the ones discussed in this chapter. It may appear in the following verbs:

okı- 'to call; to call out loud; to summon; to recite'. Only in Qarakhanid Turkic does this verb acquire the meaning 'to read'. Pe. *xāndan* shows the same semantic configuration. Exs. in the *EDPT* and elsewhere. May come from the exclamation *ö* which, according to DLT fol. 32, is "a particle of response to a caller".[69]

okı- 'to vomit' in the DLT etc. (see the *EDPT*) may also belong to this formation, but I know of no base for it.

sukı- is, in Uigur, attested only with *ärngāk*, practically always as object. Together, they signify 'to snap one's fingers': *ängrāk sukımı içintā* (ETŞ 12,49 as reread and interpreted by Zieme, personal communication) is 'in (as long as it takes to) snap one's fingers'. *ärngāk sukıgınça üdtā* (Maitr 4 v20, 16 r18, 148 r25 and 197 v11 and MaitrH X 5 b7) also means 'in a moment'. *ärngākin/ ärngāk sukıp udgurgalı sąkın-* (Maitr 128 r24 and 29) is 'intending to arouse (someone) by snapping one's fingers'. Since this *looks* so similar to *suk ärngāk* 'the index finger', the verb may perhaps come from **suk+kı-*. *ol anı sukıdı* "He poked him with his finger" in DLT fol. 562 must have some other explanation. *sukı-* is tr., and therefore unlikely to have been formed with *+I-*.

tokı- 'to hit, knock, beat; weave' (common; see the *EDPT*) is probably a *+kI-* derivate from *tok*, an onomatopoeic: Cf. *tok tok etti* "Something solid made a noise like one stone striking another" in DLT fol. 167. It has a double /k/ in some Turkic languages.

Several nominal formatives are added to *tokı-*, and verbal formatives of various sorts appear both with *okı-* and *tokı-*. From *+kIr-* verbs, on the other hand, we have no nominal derivates. The only verbal formative added to them is *-(X)ş-*, with *alakırış-*, *çakrış-* and *kökırış-* attested. This is an important difference.

+kIr- could be derived form *+kI-* with the deverbal intr. formative *-(I)r-* discussed in section 6.3. This analysis is not in contradiction with a connection with Mo. *+KirA-*, as that could also be a composite suffix.

Verbs whose second syllable has the shape /°KUr-/ or /°GUr-/ cannot have belonged to the *+kIr-* formative even if they denote certain sounds. This includes *katgur-* 'to laugh out loudly' (discussed under *katguruş-* in section 7.1) and *yaŋkur-* 'to echo, resound'. Nor can *ıkurmak* (Heilk II 3,30, translated "Atemnot") belong here, in spite of *ık* 'hiccough' in the DLT and related lexemes in modern languages. Not, that is, if read correctly with *u* in the second syllable.

69 The *EDPT* read this as a long *ö*, Dankoff and Kelly as a long *ū*.

5.32 Onomatopoeics and synaesthetics ending in °*rA*-

All verbs in this section are bisyllabic. In the Old Turkic instances, the /r/ is preceded by a velar, /k/, /g/ or /ŋ/. We shall also mention a few lexemes where the phoneme preceding the /r/ is /ç/ and /l/. If we include them, we relinquish the limitation to the shapes °*krA*-, °*grA*- and °*ŋrA*- as an essential one. We shall first present the evidence for the verbs themselves, and return to the formational relationships subsequently. These will lead us to the names for the sounds represented and to the lexemes used for imitating them. We start with the °*ŋrA*- verbs, which constitute the subset with the best documentation.

maŋra- 'to shout' is quite common. Beside the exs. quoted in the *EDPT*, we find it in Yosıpas 17, BT III 300, BuddhUig II 188 and 203, Maitr 35 v 14, MaitrH XVI Frag 87 and 90, has *mūŋrā-* instead. In MaitrH X 7 a 18 read *bo muntag . . . maŋırt maŋramış üni* ['his voice shouting thus' instead of *maŋramış üs*[*tün* (see facs.). Cf. *maŋra-n-* below.

mūŋrā- 'to bellow'. Among other places found in the IrqB, BT III 270 (*mūŋūrā-*) and PañcFrag 87 and 90. Add also *ulıyu mụŋrāyū* from Maitr 173 a r 4, 199 r 4 (Maitr 78 r 8). In Suv 641,1, *ulug ūnin mūŋrādi, orlayu kıkıra . . . sav sözlādi* is said of a *xatun*. Evidence for the first vowel comes from the Codex Comanicus, which has *sır muŋreydir* "pecora clamant".[70]

çıŋra- 'to jingle' is attested only from the DLT on, but cf. *çıŋra-t-* below.

(*ıŋra-* 'to moan' is used in DLT fol. 73 of a she-camel. We also find *ıŋrat-* (DLT fol. 441) and *ıŋran-* (DLT fol. 147, also of a she-camel). *ıŋra-* and *ıŋran-* are attested also in Middle Turkic. The DLT also has a -(*X*)ş- verb which may or may not come from *ıŋra-*. The lemma has the first syllable vowelled as *a* by the second hand but unvowelled by the first, and refers to babies in pain. Then there are three verse instances, all referring to clouds and to torrents pouring from them; these are either unvowelled (fol. 133), vowelled with *a* (fol. 461) or with *ı* (fol. 617).)

(*käŋrä-* may have stood in QB 4301, in what has been read as *uşak söz ädärmä, yemä kiknämä*. '*kiknä-*' (q.v. in the *EDPT*) would be isolated. Now *yä* may easily be an error for *nūn* and *nūn* for *rā*, giving *k*(*ä*)*ŋrä-*. The translation would then be 'Do not seek petty arguments and do not nag'. This fits the wider context perfectly. *käŋrä-n-* 'to grumble' (well attested in Uigur) and *käŋräş-* 'to rant or nag at each other' are discussed below, *käŋırtsız* and *käŋrä-g* above. *kẅŋrän-* in DLT fol. 618 is unlikely to be from a different base: It is translated

70 This should not be transcribed as '*muŋra-*', as Grønbech does.

the way we would translate the exs. of *käŋrän-*, and Dankoff and Kelly think the U of all three instances may have been changed from A by a later hand.)

(*koŋra-* appears only in the DLT, where it describes the voice of boys deepening at the age of puberty. *koŋra-gu* (quoted the *EDPT* from the DLT, Middle Turkic etc., and found also in Maitr 31 v 13 and 139 r 10) is some kind of bell, on the other hand, while the Codex Comanicus translates *koŋranır men* as 'ich murmere'. *koŋruk-* is discussed among the *+(X)k-* verbs.)

yaŋra- 'to babble'. *EDPT* (which also quotes *yaŋrat-* from the DLT). In IrqB XXII the agent of this verb, as well as of *käŋrän-*, is, of course, the *uzuntonlug* who dropped her mirror into the lake. Add *yala yaŋragu* from BT III 261 and 352 (but cf. the n. to SuvStockh 49-50).

çıkra- 'to squeak, to grate' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT; see that also for the DLT's *çıkra-ş-*. In Warnke 629, *]nlAr çıkrayu ünüp* [is wrongly translated as "[aus seinem Mund] kamen knirschend [unzählige Insekten und Würmer] hervor". Cf. *çıkra-t-* below. A further ex. should perhaps be read in BuddhUig II 105, quoted under *kaŋsıla-* among the *+lA-* verbs above: Tekin has an unattested *'çırına-'*.[71]

(*çïKrä-* is attested in DLT fol. 567, transcribed with *k* by Dankoff and Kelly but with *g* in the *EDPT*. The DLT being our only source for this verb, both seem possible to me. The DLT translates *ätmäktä taş çïKrädi* as "The teeth grated on the gravel that is in bread", but the subject of the verb in Turkic is clearly *taş* and not 'the teeth'.)

çokra- 'to bubble and boil', usually of a thick liquid. As the *EDPT* writes, this verb is attested in M III $9,15_2$ (text 4) and in the DLT. We find it also in Maitr 171 v 5 (of black fumes) and 218 r 23 (lost ms.) and BT II 554. Cf. *çokra-ş-* in the DLT, and *çokra-t-* below.

kükrä- 'to roar, bellow, thunder' is wrongly written with *ö* in the first syllable both in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; the former connects it with *kök* 'sky'. *kükrä-* had a short *ü*, however, whereas *kök* had a long *ö*, as Ottoman, Chuv. etc. show. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* are Ht IV 539 and V 2 b 4, BT VIII B 153, Hochzeit 29, Mängi 22 etc. The DLT also has *kükräş-*, and cf. *kükrä-t-* below.

(*okra-* 'to whinny' is attested in the DLT, Middle Turkic etc., *okraş-* in the DLT. See them in the *EDPT*.)

tigrä- is attested in DLT fol. 567, in *at adakı tigrädi*. Dankoff and Kelly spell it as

71 A connection with the DLT's *çIrIŋ* "onomatopoeic for the sound of a brass basin or the like" is unlikely, as the nasals differ and as the BuddhUig II passage is a description of birds' activities. Zieme (personal communication) says the word is difficult to read in the ms.

'ükrä-' (Arabic script using the same character for front /k/ and /g/), but we have *tigrä-t-* with G in Runic script. Both the *EDPT* and DankKelly translate the quoted sentence as "The horse's hoof (hooves) clattered"; but *dawiya*, the Arabic verb used by the DLT, has the wider meaning of 'to resound'. This is corroborated by an Uigur ex. of *tigrä-t-* which does not apply to horses (quoted below in the appropriate section). The IrqB instance of *tigrät-*, mistranslated in the *EDPT*, also agrees with *tigrä-* 'to resound'. The DLT has *tigrä-ş-* as well (of horses again).

Other consonants before °*rA-* are quite rare. *saçra-* 'to jump up or out, to fly (of sparks), spirt etc.', e.g., may be a synaesthetic verb, but note its semantic contiguity to (tr.) *saç-* 'to scatter, sprinkle'. Beside what appears in the *EDPT*, we have *saçırayu ün-* in Suv 315,5 and BT XIII 19,76, *közümüz karakımız saçrayur* in Maitr 172 v 15 and further exs. in Maitr 171 v 28 and Maitr XI 9 b 14. Cf. *saçra-t-* below. *sayra-* 'to twitter', *titrä-* 'to shake or tremble' and *täprä-* 'to move, stir, shake' could also be synaesthetics. In three verbs in the DLT, the first syllable ends in /l/. In all three cases, a parasitic voiced dental appears between the /l/ and the subsequent /r/ (as in Spanish *hombre* < **homne*, Greek *andra* < **anra* etc.):

çalra- in DLT fol. 567: *ok keştä çalradı* 'The arrows rattled in the quiver'. In fol. 636, *çaldra-* is said to be onomatopoeic for sound made by gravel, or by a chain falling on the ground.
kaldra- 'to rustle (of a garment)' is listed in DLT fol. 636.
kwlrä- appears in fol. 568 of a stone making a sound in a well. In DLT fol. 636-7, *taş kudug içrä kwldrädi* (thus) is translated as "The stone resounded in the well and indicated its depth".
twldra- in DLT fol. 636: *toy*[72] *twldradı* "The people dispersed on all sides" (Oguz dialect).

The variants of these verbs which have *d*'s are in fact spelled as *çaldıra-* (thrice), *kaldıra-* (thrice), *kwldürä-* (thrice) and *twldura-*, the additional vowel being by the first hand in the three verbs mentioned first. Both the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly list the lemmata as I have done, and the *EDPT* explains that they appear "in a section for disyllabic verbs". Anaptyctic /X/ before /r/ is characteristic for very late Old Turkic in general,[73] and appears also in other verbs mentioned in this section: We have noticed *maŋıra-n-*, *müŋürä-* and *saçıra-*. These are late variants, with no bearing on the question of what the original shape of the present formative may have been. The shape *(C)VCrA-* is common to all its products, the con-

72 By Dankoff and Kelly erroneously changed to *boy* 'clan'. *toy* 'a company of people, a multitude' is well attested.
73 See Erdal, 1979: 158.

sonant preceding the /r/ being one of the three velars in practically all Old Turkic instances.

Among the derivates, *koŋra-gu* 'bell' has already been mentioned. *käŋräK* 'kettle-drum' in BT VII A 149a, 376, 386 and 616 is unlikely to be derived from *käŋrä-* or *käŋrän-* 'to nag or grumble'; according to the distribution in modern languages, it must be a loan from Mo. *kenggerge*. This is suggested also by the shamanistic nature of BT VII A on the one hand, and the specific semantic domain of *käŋrän-* on the other. The possible connection of the two over Proto-Altaic cannot be discussed here. What is common to these three lexemes, though, is the fact that they denote implements made for emitting sounds. Another INSTRUMENT noun related to this formation is *çıŋratgu* in KP, mentioned under *çıŋra-ſ-* below. There is, finally, *çıŋırçak* 'cymbals', attested in BT III 972, BT VII A 164 and 628 and Hochzeit 25. This lexeme might come from **çıŋır*, the possible base of *çıŋra-*: Cf. *çıŋıl çıŋıl* in the DLT. It might also come from **çıŋırt-+çak*, as *oçuk* comes from *ot+çuk* (discussed in section 2.72); *+çAk* is usually a diminutive suffix (q.v. at the end of section 2.12), but cf. *bi+çäk*, *kapırçak* and *sörçük/sörçäk*, which are not. We are reminded, finally, of the deverbal instrument formative *-gUç*, which metathesises to *-çUK* after bases ending in /n/ or /r/ (section 3.21). Cf. also *çıŋra-k ün* 'a loud, clear sound' in DLT fol. 611.[74]

Action nouns from onomatopoeics in *°rA-* are consistently formed with *-(U)t*, discussed in section 3.108 above. We find *maŋırt* from *maŋra-*, *käŋirtsiz* related to *käŋrä-*, *tigirt* (and *tigirtsiz*) from *tigrä-*, *kükürt* from *kükrä-*. These forms cannot be interpreted to indicate that *°ŋrA-* verbs once ended in *°ŋXr-*, *°grA-* verbs in *°gXr-* or *°krA-* verbs in *°kXr-*: No action nouns in *°t* are attested from onomatopoeic verbs in *+klr-/+kXr-* (discussed in section 5.31) as base; *täprä-* 'to stir (intr.)', hardly an onomatopoeic, is the base of *täpirtsiz*, and there are explanations for the shape of these lexemes. Interestingly enough, the /r/ is preceded by an extra vowel also in *çıŋırçak* (just mentioned). Nor should *kaldurga ton* 'a rustling garment' (DLT fol. 635) < *kaldra-* be changed to '*qaldraγa*', as Dankoff and Kelly do.

We have to distinguish between the name of the sound-producing activity, the name of the sound and the imitation for the sound. For *tigrä-*, all three of these happen to be attested: *tigirt*, the name of the activity, is an *-(U)t* nominal. The imitation is attested in DLT fol. 182 in (*at adakı*) *tigir tigir etti* "(The horses' hooves) made such a sound". The name of the sound is *tigi* (Suv 166,6, TT I 90 and

74 The lemma following this one in the DLT is written an QNKRQ. This is interpreted as *koŋra-k* both by Brockelmann and the *EDPT*, who variously 'emend' the Arabic translation to signify, respectively, 'bell' and 'cymbal'. Dankoff and Kelly read *qaŋrıq* and make it likely that the Arabic, which in fact signifies 'palate', is correct. The word is found in Idrāk 75 with the meaning "cartilage of the nose" and may, in some garbled form, appear in Khot 49. This entry has nothing to do with the present formation, then.

135, Maitr 50 v 5). Cf. *tigisiz* (ETŞ 8,13 and ShôAgon 1,310). DLT fol. 547 translates *tigi* with *dawī* (from the same root as the lexeme which Kāšğarī uses to translate *tigrā-*), "heard", he writes, "during the night". Dankoff and Kelly render *dawī* as "a rustling noise".[75]

To judge by the evidence collected in the DLT, the verbs discussed in this section appear to have been created by using the formative *+A-* (q.v. above): *koŋur ün* "a hoarse voice" (DLT fol. 603) must be the base of *koŋra-* as translated above, and cf. *koŋr+uk-* below. *çiKir çiKir* "sound of teeth [chewing] bread that has grit in it so the teeth are set on edge" (DLT fol. 183) is clearly the base of *çiKrā-* (q.v. above) by both content and phonic form. The same can be said about *ok keştā çaldır çaldır etti* (DLT fol. 230) and *çalra-* ~ *çaldra-* (also DLT), q.v. above. Thus also *tigir tigir et-* and *tigrā-*, both discussed above. However, as long as these bisyllabic *°Xr* lexemes are documented only by the DLT evidence and practically all the *°rA-* verbs which can be explained by this are also found only in the DLT, it remains possible that the former are in fact back-formations.

Where the sound-imitating segment is monosyllabic, no derived verbs are generally created: *kulakım çıŋ etti*, *daŋ doŋ et-*, *kulakım sIŋ etti*, *çak çWk et-* are all listed in DLT fol. 600. *tWŋ tWŋ et-* (*ibid.*), however, is perhaps doubled by *tWŋla-* (q.v. among the *+lA-* verbs).

If the base is bisyllabic and vowel-ending. *+lA-* is generally used: *tigilā-*, *tıŋıla-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*), *çagıla-*, *kakıla-* are some of the examples. Some synaesthetics of the shape *yVltrI-* are discussed in section 5.42.

The bases of *maŋra-*, *mūŋrā-*, *ıŋra-*, *käŋrā-*, *yaŋra-*, *çıkra-*, *çokra-*, *kükrā-*, *okra-*, *kaldra-*, *kwl(d)rā-* and *twldra-* are not attested either in Old Turkic or in Qarakhanid. In some cases, on the other hand, we have the imitative bisyllabic *°r* form but not the corresponding *°rA-* verb. Thus e.g. *taş kudugka tüşti buldur buldur etti* in DLT fol. 229. The base of *çıŋra-* is not attested either, but cf. *yügün çIŋIl çIŋIl etti* (vowels by the second hand) in DLT fol. 604. Sometimes, we have the *-(U)t* derivate of an onomatopoeic but not the verbal base. In DLT fol. 586, we read that *çagı+la-* (q.v. in section 5.12) has the variants *jagıla-* and *şagıla-*. Similarly, *çogı+la-* (a different verb discussed together with *çagı+la-* above) may have had a variant **şogıla-*. The same relation may hold between *çogurt sögüt* 'whispering trees' (ETŞ 8,13) and *ulug tigirt şogırt turgurdılar* (BT III 233-4). It seems unlikely to me that one should read the former as *çokurt* and connect it with *çokra-* 'to emit the sound of bubbling and/or boiling', or read the latter as '*sogırt*'

75 Kāšğarī writes: "The word has *kasra* (I) on the *tā'*, but in my opinion *naṣb* (A) would be better." He holds this opinion because he (unacceptably) suggests connecting *tigi* with *tāg-* 'to arrive, etc.'. Since he does not say that anybody actually pronounced the lexeme as '*tegi*' of '*tägi*', Dankoff and Kelly are wrong in mentioning *tegi* as a possible alternative to '*tiki*'. See above under *tigrā-* for the voicedness of the velar.

(as the editor does). *çogı* is attested; in Suv 166,6, e.g., together with *tigi* as BT III has *şogırı* together with *tigirt*. While *tigrā-* is common, however, there is no **çogır-* *çogur*, nor a verb **çogra-*: Its function is filled by *çogıla-*. Sometimes, derivates are formed by analogy: *sıgıt* and *yıgı* are near synonyms from which, respectively, *sıgt+a-* and *yıgla-* (with *+lA-*) are derived. In *yıgıt sıgıtların tarkarıp* . . . (UigTot 131), however, the analogy of *sıgıt* caused the addition of a *°t* also to *yıgı*.

It is interesting that no nominal derivates at all are attested from *+kIr-/+kXr-* verbs, while the onomatopoeic verbs ending in *°rA-* (mostly preceded by a velar) have so many expansions. There are differences also in the verbal domain: The former are expanded only with *-Xş-*, the latter often with *-(X)t-* and *-(X)n-*. *-(X)ş-* expansions of *°rA-* onomatopoeics are found only in the DLT and may have been impossible in Old Turkic proper.

5.4 *Intransitive denominals*

5.41 *+U-*

The formatives *+U-* and *+I-* can, like *+A-*, be added only to bases ending in consonants. In this they differ from *+(A)d-*, *+(X)k-* and *+(A)r-*. Unlike *+A-* but like these latter three, *+U-* and *+I-* only form intr. verbs. *+I-* is not a conditioned variant of *+U-*: Both are added e.g. to bases ending in /d, r, n/; *+U-* forms verbs with a well-defined semantic profile, whereas *+I-* verbs are semantically varied. *+I-* alters some final phonemes in its bases. The two formations will therefore be dealt with separately; *+U-* verbs here, *+I-* verbs in the next section.

agr+u- 'to be or become heavy; of an illness, to become serious or severe' is attested only once in Uigur, discussed in the *UW* under *agrumak*. Cf. also *agru-k*, *agrukla-*, *agruklan-*. The *EDPT*, which confuses *agru-* with *agrı-* 'to ache, to be painful', quotes the evidence from the DLT and the QB. Both the DLT and the QB have both the metaphorical use of *agru-* (found in the Uigur instance) and the basic one.

(alŋu- 'to wane *(küçi)*' is discussed in the *UW* s.v. *al(ı)ŋu-*; see *alŋad-* in section 5.43 for the base. The ex. of *alŋu-* is 'emended' away in the *EDPT* s.v. *alaŋad-*;[76] the facs. is clear, however, and the two verbs have distinct meanings. '*alqu-*' "sich erschöpfen" in ATSS IX a r5, B5 is probably to be read as *algu-* and must be this same verb:[77] The dialect of the frs. excerpted in that publication replaces /ŋ/ with /g/ also in other lexemes.)

76 This was suggested already by Gabain in the n. to TT V A 88. By the way, there is no denominal '*+Ur-*' formative, as she writes.

77 The *UW* entry is to be changed accordingly, and the entry '*alku-*' in *UW* 104 a deleted. To judge by the translation of the ATSS verb, its base cannot have been *alıg* (q.v. in the *UW* and the *EDPT*).

az+u- 'to become less'. Not in the *EDPT*. Appears in Suv 379,23 (biverb with *āgsū-*) and 480,19, in both cases in the expression *kutı buyanı azumış*. In his n. to Neujahr 16, Zieme mentions a Berlin fr. of this latter instance, which writes *azum[ış]*. Attested also in Shō III a3 (with *yaŋıl-*), BuddhStab II 1 = BT XIII 49,15 (misunderstood in both editions; with *buzul-*) and Neujahr 16 (parallel to *yokad-*).

bay+u- 'to be or become rich'. *EDPT* only from the DLT and the QB on. In Uigur, only the infinitive is attested: In TT I 95-96, *bayumak* has been read correctly in the reedition in ETŞ; cf. the facs. Further exs. are *ād t(a)var ūzā bayumak* (Neujahr 65) and *bayumaklıg çog yalın* (ShōKenkyū III 30).

bā(r)k+ū- 'to be or get firm'. *EDPT* s.v. *bekū-*; Clauson is right about reading this verb also in QB 1772, against Arat's established text and against the İndeks. A Middle Turkic ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* is *bārkū-* in the glosses of the Rylands Coran translation. An instance in BT I B (74) is dubious. *Bā(r)kūmiş* is a N. Pr. in UigLeih, written without R in ls. 2 and 4 and with in l.9. A *Bākūmiş Totok* appears in DvaKol I 20. Cf. *bākū-t-* below.

çıgr+u- is a hap. in DLT fol. 567, translated as "The ground was trampled and hardened from so much stamping and walking on it". *çıgır* in the DLT and in Ottoman being 'a path (created by repeated walking)', the basic meaning of *çıgru-* must be '(of the ground) to become a path'. The DLT also has *çıgru-t-* and *çıgru-k yer* 'ground that is trampled down hard'.

çın+u-mak . . . köŋül in Ht X 235 may, by the context, signify either 'truthfulness' or 'the habit of constantly looking for the truth'. The only other form of this verb attested is *çınuyu* 'truthfully' in Ht IV 1709 and BT I B (175) = D (93). In the last-mentioned instance it is opposed to *yelāyū* and thus comparable to *çın+layu*; see these two in part IV.

kad+u- 'to turn into a blizzard' is a hap. in SuvStockh 83: *kadır yavlak yagmur yagıp ūdsüz kolosuz kaduyur* 'Grim and harmful rains fall and, out of season, turn into blizzards'. The mss. have QTWYWR and Q'DYYWR respectively. Cf. *kad* 'blizzard (which kills people)' in DLT fol. 508, and the *EDPT* for Middle Turkic. P. Zieme mentions Kirgh. *kayı-* 'to feel cold'; this verb could come either from *kadu-* or from '*kadı-*'. The eds. write "*katuyur* bleibt vorerst unklar" and leave it practically untranslated.

kaln+u- '(of a thin thing) to become thick' is a hap. in DLT fol. 576. From *kalın* 'thick, dense'.

keŋ+ü- 'to become wide, broad' is quoted in the *EDPT* from QB 5915, the DLT, Ottoman, etc. It is attested also in Ht IV 78 (with *bädü-* 'to grow'), QB 5657 and 6419 and found, in addition, in the glosses of the Rylands Coran translation. *keŋü-r-* and its derivates are very common (section 7.51 etc.).

kız+u- 'to rise in price (of merchandise)' is a hap. in DLT fol. 560, from *kız* 'expensive'.

tar+u- 'to be or become narrow, strait or constricted' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, the QB and one Middle Turkic source. Other Middle Turkic evidence comes from the glosses of the Rylands Coran translation, which has it six times and *taru-t-* four times. Attested also in the ms. Mz 627 (T II S 19b) 14 *d*, in Brāhmī, to be published by D. Maue: *gaumuşti* (a swelling) *tarumış ārsār*. . . .

(yeriŋü- 'to be or become sorry or sorry for somebody; to be moved', in Suv 619,8 and 644,9 (both mentioned in the *DTS* entry s.v. '*jiriŋü-*' and in *UW* 40 b s.vv. *açıg* I A, a and *açı-* II), HtPar 44 r 16, Warnke 67 and 343. '*köŋüli yeriŋäyü*' in Maitr 12 v 10 is in fact an instance of this verb. I write it with *e* in the first syllable and list it in this formation under the assumption that the base is an (unattested) *-(X)ŋ* derivate (see section 3.116) from *yer-* 'to disapprove etc.', and not *yirin* 'pus'.)

Two verbs ending in *°U-* look as if they were derived from verbs:

(sāşü- is a hap. in DLT fol. 562: *tūgün sāşüdi* "The knot weakened and nearly came loose" must, in some way, be related to *säş-* 'to loosen, untie, unfasten', by the DLT mentioned in a sentence with *tūgün* as object. In section 3.103 we found, however, that *-Xş* is lost haplologically when added to bases ending in /ş/. Thus, *tūş* comes from *tūş-*, *tuş* from *tuş-*, *sış* from *sış-*, *koş* from *koş-* and so forth; this is the only explanation for the fact that no full-length *-Xş* derivates from *°ş-* verbs are attested. *sāşü-* therefore no doubt comes from **säş*, an *-Xş* derivate from *säş-*. Räsänen, 1957: 163 refers to "uig. *säş-ü-* 'sich losmachen' from *säş-* 'lösen'"; no such instance is known to me.)

(adru- 'to be superior to (with dat. or abl.), excel (in something, ablative or *üzä* phrase)' has been derived from *adır-* 'to separate (tr.)'. Thus the *UW* entry, which mentions two Ht instances. We find *adru-* also in *[xo]rmuzta v(a)çırınta adrumış kögüzlüg* "der eine . . . den Vajra des Indra übertreffende Brust hat" (BT XIII 1,43) and *aytın künt[in] ad[r]umış* (BT XIII 19,59) "Mond und Sonne übertreffend". This last phrase is used parallel to *altunlug tagtın yegädmiş*, which corroborates the interpretation. In Warnke 783, *kutrulmaklıg ädgüg bulmaz m(ä)n adruyu barıp* has, I think wrongly, been translated as "mich loslösend"; I think the sentence means 'I have not, moving towards excellence, been able to attain the benefit of liberation'. *adruyu bar-* may appear also in BuddhUig I 11: Shōgaito, who edited the passage previously,[78] read it as *ädgü nomlar üzä adruyu*

78 Publication nr. 10 in Nachtrag 1 to the *UW* bibliography. "ETS 406 u." in the *UW* lemma for '*adrun-*' refers to this same passage, as quoted in a n. of Arat's. Röhrborn does not translate the verb and writes "Kont. unklar". He derives '*adrun-*' directly from *adır-*, although such a derivate would have an unrounded vowel in the second syllable. This *UW* lemma should be deleted.

barıp . . . nirvanka kirürlär. The construction here is similar to *ügrak bitimäk üzä adradı* (thus, by error?) in one of the Ht exs. Arat (n. to ETŞ 15,31) and Ş. Tekin thought they saw '*adrunu*', but Zieme (personal communication) says that *adruyu* is likelier. *bilgä biliglig üni üzä adırmış* "der sich durch seine Weisheits-Stimme auszeichnet" in BT II 643 is also likely to be a mistake for *adru-*.[79] TT V B 67 and 75, finally, definitely also contain *adru-*, not any of the suggested 'emendations': *bilgä biligdin adrudaçı*[80] 'excelling by wisdom' happens to be parallel to *kutrulmakdın b(ä)küdäçi*, the same construction with a *+U-* verb; it signifies 'strengthened through liberation'. In section 6.3 I reconstruct **ad-* or **adı-* to account for *adın*, *adıl* and *adır-*. If the aorist could serve as a base for derivation (which is not certain), *adru-* might come from the aorist **adı-r* of this verb, using *+U-*. It does not seem too likely to me that it should be a back-formation from *adr-ok* (which would take the base off my distinction between *adr-ok* and *adru-k* as two lexemes) since this hypothesis does not explain the semantic differentiation, since *adrw-* is rather well attested and such back-formations not too common in Old Turkic. *adru-* is certainly not a 'variant' of *adır-*, as it differs from it in shape, meaning and government. No deverbal formative '*-U-*' can yet be postulated, as some might be tempted to do for the sake of Altaistic comparison (following Ramstedt): A single verb does not make a formation.)

boş+u- 'to become empty, free or loose' is attested only in DLT fol. 561: *anıŋ özi boşudı* signifies "He moved his bowels", the basic meaning presumably being 'His self (or: core) became empty'. This may have been the only meaning of *boşu-* known to the author of the QB: *boşu-* itself is not found there,[81] but in QB 1059 and 6010 we find (*özin*) *boşutgu* 'to administer a purgative'. The DLT further has *tügün boşudı* "The knot weakened" and *at boşudı* "The horse was released from its tether". Note that the last sentence is ambiguous: In the Tu. sentence as it stands, *boşu-* can be understood as intr. and as having the horse as subject: Its

79 The original ms. is lost now, and *adır-* was, of course, the *lectio facilior*. The par. 9 of *adır-* in *UW* 54a can, I think, be deleted: Beside this instance, it contains a phrase in Suv which constitutes a misunderstanding of the Chin. original. Being just a slavish translation of the Chin. characters, it can be assigned no meaning at all, or else also be taken to signify 'those who attained a separating from the world'. In other words, *adır-* never really signifies "sich auszeichnen(?)".

80 Thus in l.75. *bilgä biligIKtin adrutaçı* is an error with little bearing. In his n. to ETŞ 15,31, Arat expresses surprise at the fact that the conjecture *adrut-* should have been included in the Analytical Index; it is even more surprising that this ghost lives on in the *UW*. '*adır-t-*', a variant ghost, is mentioned in the *UW* under **adırt-*. The *DTS* entry '*adırt-*' quotes instances of *adır-* in QB 2080 and 2787. *adırtıklıg* in TT VIII G 67 is probably an error in fragmentary context; what should have stood there will be found out when the source is discovered.

81 '*boşaŋ*' in couplet 2302 of the published text is Arat's conjecture. The text should read *tuşaŋ*, both by the mss. and by the meaning.

meaning would then be 'The horse became free'. Another reading, however, gives '(He) released the horse'; Kāšğarī's interpretation is, in a way, between the two. Taking *boşu-* to be tr. and *at* to be its object does not accord with the previous two sentences, nor what we have hitherto learned about *+U-*: that it derives intr. verbs from nominals. *boşu-* comes, of course, from *boş* 'empty, free'. But the sentences mentioned next in the DLT even have objects with accusative suffixes: *xan yalavaçıg boşudı* "The king permitted the messenger to return to the one who sent him"; *är uraguun boşudı* "The man divorced his wife". Kāšğarī adds that *boşu-* is both tr. and intr. In Uigur, however, only the tr. use of *boşw-* is attested. Beside the seven Manichaean and Buddhist exs. quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *boşu-* and *boşumaq* and in the *EDPT*, we find it in Yosıpas 105, HtPek 96 v 3-4, BuddhBio 25, UigSukh 9, Maitr 112 r 8, 177 v 4, and 52 v 20, Abhi 1401, ShōAv 141 and Ht X 1042. All have meanings like 'to release, give leave, liberate and set free'. In one case the object is the bonds and fetters holding one in bondage; in another one the sins, which have an analogous effect on one's spiritual life. In other instances, however, *boşw-* receives personal objects. Middle Turkic and the modern languages agree in assigning this tr. meaning to a verb *boşa-*. The connection with *boş* being beyond doubt, Uigur *boşw-* cannot be primary: It is either the result of a rounding of *boş+a-*[82] or some extension of the intr. use of *boş+u-* found in Qarakhanid, or a back formation from *boşu-n-* 'to free oneself, to get free'. This verb (discussed in section 7.21) may also have pushed intr. *boşu-* out of use. Within the present formation, *boşu-* is clearly an exception, at any rate; it will not be included in the syntactic discussion.

taşu- 'to convey' is not derived from *taş* 'outside'. This verb is attested in *ol āvkā yarmak taşudı* 'He conveyed the money (thus against Dankoff and Kelly) to his house' (DLT fol. 561). Also in Ht VII 16 b 5 (against Arlotto's t'š'dy with Zieme, personal communication): *Samıso Açarı k(ä)ntü özi sapdıçta lıŋtsıta luKçün yudüp taşudı* 'The Tripiṭaka Master himself loaded and conveyed bricks in baskets.' Neither of these refers to transportation to the outside; nor do Middle Turkic exs.: *taşu-* should be a simplex.

Later *+U-* verbs can be found in Schakir, 1933: 24-5.

+U- verbs are expandable with causative *-(X)t-*: *bayu-t-* and *bäkü-t-* are discussed below; the DLT has *çıgru-t-*, and *taru-t-* has been quoted above from a Middle Turkic source. *'adrut-'*, on the other hand, is unlikely to have existed, as explained under *adru-* above. Causative expansion with *-(U)r-* may also have been possible: *keŋür-* is rare but the petrified converb *keŋürü* is exceedingly com-

82 *+A-* verbs with /o/ in their bases, like *ot+a-* and *kor+a-*, did not undergo such a rounding, but the *b* may have helped: There is no *+A-* derivate from any nominal starting with *bO°* in our text. Cf., on the other hand, *bul(u)n+a-*.

mon, and cf. *keŋürt-* and *keŋürül-*. A *-(U)r-* derivate from *bäkü-* is not attested, but cf. the petrified converb *bäk(ü)rü*, and *bäkürt-* in the QB. See below for the distribution of these two causative formatives. Other expansions are exceedingly rare: There is a hapax *adru-l-*, and the DLT has *taru-n-*. The base of *boşlun-* (q.v. in section 7.22) is *boş+w-*, not a typical *+U-* verb. *-(X)ş-* expansions of *+U-* verbs are not known to me at all. *alaŋur-* is derived from *al(a)ŋu-* with the type-of-action formative *-(I)r-*, discussed in section 6.3.

Eleven *+U-* verbs are attested in Old Turkic proper. They are usually accompanied only by their agents. Thus e.g. the exs. of *kad+u-*, *tar+u-* (ms. Mz. 627) and *adru-* (Warnke 783) as quoted above. Such sentences can be found also in the *UW*, in 94b for *alŋ+u-* and in 40b (s.vv. *ačı-* (II) and *ačıg* (I) A,a) twice for *yeriŋü-*. One further ex. is *buzulup azuyu barıp alkıngu baŋgu täg bolmış* (BT XIII 49,15; agent lost in lacuna). The government of the locative case by *adru-* (in BT XIII 1,43 quoted above, and in Ht VII 1902[83]) is a lexical matter not connected with the function of *+U-*. Discussing *adru-*, we also mentioned a passage in which *adru-* and *bäkü-* appear with ablative case forms; these refer to the domain within which the verb applies.

More interesting are the three instances where *+U-* verbs are accompanied by *üzä* phrases: With passive verb forms, nominals governed by the postposition *üzä* refer to the agentive, the source of the action; if this were the case with *+U-* verbs, they would have to be classified as passives. An instance of *bayu-* and three of *adru-* with *üzä* phrases have already been mentioned. We also have *adkaK vişay üzä azumadın yaŋılmadın* (Shō III a3), where an *azu-* form appears parallely to one with the shape of a passive. In none of these sentences does the *üzä* phrase represent an active agent, however: In all of them, it refers to the REASON for which the process takes place, the concrete or abstract INSTRUMENT which lets it do so. *äd tavar*, *ädgü nomlar*, *tıgrak bitimäk* and *adkaK vişay* are not entities capable of instigating an event.

5.42 *+I-* and synaesthetics in *°trI-*

This is a formation for intr. verbs. Most of them, like the ones in the previous section, signify 'to become what the base nominal denotes'. We shall first deal with these, and then come to the other *+I-* derivates:

kād+i- 'to flourish, to grow vigorous' comes from *kād* 'good, vigorous, tough', discussed in the *EDPT*. It appears in *ı ıgaçda törümiş tüş yemişlär kädiyür* (Suv 517,9-10), published in U I 27,4 together with the Chin. original.[84] The aorist of

83 Quoted in the *UW* entry as Ht II 1902; my 'VII' refers to the subdivisions within the work proper.
84 Not mentioned in the *DTS*. The *EDPT* wanted to 'emend' *kādi-* to *bādü-* 'to grow bigger'.

kädi- appears in l.5 of ms. T II D 315 (Mz 738) published in ETŞ p. 218, in the N. Pr. *Kädir Inal*; read this instead of '*Kedin*' of the text. *Kädir* is also part of the name *Kädir Yalu* in USp 84,2 (so to be read instead of '*kädür*'). *Kädirä* in USp 48,2 is an expansion of this name; ms. T II D 315 l.5 could, according to P. Zieme, also have had *Kädirä* with the end lost in a lacuna: See *+A* in section 2.14 above.

öl+i- 'to be or get moist' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT on. It appears also in *suvka kirsär ölimägäy* (Kuan 17).

When bases end in /z/ or /ş/, these consonants are replaced by /r/ and /l/ respectively under *+I-* expansion. This descriptive statement could be replaced by an explanatory one only within a theory accounting for Altaic rhotacism and lambdacism as a whole. I have already remarked elsewhere about the connection between palatalisation and these phenomena.

sämri- 'to be or become fat or corpulent' comes from *sämiz* 'fat, corpulent' under syncopation of its second vowel. Quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB on; attested also in *yayıtda sämrimiş yagıg* "Opfertier fett geworden auf der Weide" (BT XIII 39,24). *sämri-t-* (q.v. below) appears already in the IrqB, and *sämiz* is common in Old Turkic.

sekri- 'to jump, start off (intr.)' is documented in the *EDPT*, and cf. *sekri-t-* below and *sekri-k* above. In addition, *sekri-* appears in Maitr 33 v 18 and 105 r 15 and (metathesised to *särki-r*) Hochzeit 32. *EDPT* and *DTS* do not have the base *sekiz* but it is found in Maitr: In *tetik sekiz biliglig ü[zä]* 'Because (he) is sharp-witted and bright' (4 r 23), *y(i)ti sekiz bilgä biligin ulag sapıg nomug tetrü körüp* (153 v 12 about a 'sharp and quick-witted mind') and the binome *y(i)ti sekiz* in 26 v 4 and MaitrH XI 14 a 7. This use must be a metaphorical extension of what *sekiz* can be taken to have signified originally.

yavrı- 'to be or become weak' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and from a Middle Turkic source, in the *DTS* also from QB (3094) and Suv 609,20. The second verb in the series *küçsirä- yavru- turu-* quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *küčsirä-* from Suv 116,22 should be a misreading of this verb. Further exs. are *yavrımış uluşın yana büntäg turgurdı* (InscrOuig III 6) and *yavrımaz ąrtamaz y(a)rp kaţıg toŋ şır* (ETŞ 10,19), translated in the n. to BT VIII B 102 as "Er [d.h. Vajragarbha] ist nicht schwach und vergeht nicht, er ist sicher$_2$ und fest$_2$." *yavrı-t-* (q.v. below) is found already in the BQ inscription. *yavız* 'bad', the base, may originally also have had the meaning 'weak', as Orkhon Turkic *yavız bat biz* or *yadag yavız boltı* and similar passages show. Very peculiar is *yavrı* as adjective in ETŞ 9,75 (*turuk yavrı braman*) and HamTouen 7,19 (*alp är*

yavrı bolsar. . .): One is reminded of the relationship between *karı* 'old' and *karı-* 'to grow old'.[85]

ükli- 'to increase (intr.)' is unlikely to have come from *ükil*, a hap. in DLT fol. 49, as stated in the *EDPT*. According to Kāšğarī, *ükil* is used in the Kıpçak dialect: It may either be a back-formation from *ükli-* created in that dialect, or a dialect variant of *üküş* 'many' from the Bolgar branch; the DLT often confuses these two dialects. Old Turkic not having participated in Bolgar (rhotacism and) lambdacism, *ükil* cannot have been the base of a derivation within it. As the specific rhotacism taking place before *+I-* is well-documented (above and below), lambdacism is likely to have occurred in these same circumstances; the very common *üküş* is the only reasonable base for *ükli-*. See the *EDPT* and the *DTS* for exs. for *ükli-*; further ones occur in BT II 1217, BodhiAvaKomm 22 Hochzeit 32, UigTot 489 and 500, BuyKäl 35, Maitr 44 v4 and 12 v14, Shō III a1 and ShōKenkyū III 11 and 23, with the antonym *esil-* in UigTot 508 and 510. *ükli-* has been used with *üstäl-* in Maitr 12 v14, with *bädü- ibid.* 151 v6, with its synonym *asıl-* in Warnke 206, 513 and 524, BuddhUig II 178 etc., Maitr 89 v17, 151 v8 and 169 r10, ShōUigFrag 2 and 3, BodhiAvaKomm 14 and ms. T II M12-17 v1-5.

A few verbs of the form *yVltrI-* deserve a separate mention. *°trI-* seems to have been the original form, with *°tr-* as (orthographical?) variant and *°tIr-*, *°trA-*, *°drI-* and *°dIrA-* as subsequent developments. The variants with *°A-* appear to have been influenced by the bisyllabic onomatopoeics and synaesthetics ending in *°lrA- > °ldrA-*; they are discussed in section 5.32.

yaltrı- 'to glimmer, etc.'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *yaltr(ı)yu* (TT VI 422), *yaltrıp* (ETŞ 20,61), *yaltrıryu* (thus, BT III 997), *yaltırsar* (ETŞ 20,64), *yaltrıyur* (*ibid.* 116), *yaltrıyu* (ManTürkTex 434), *yaltrıyu yaşoyu* (Ht X 718 and V 11 a13; BuddhUig II 599), *yaltrıyu yaşozuṇ* (CYK 90) and so forth. Further exs. in BuddhUig I 299 and 300 and II 97, seven times in Maitr and UigKan 89. May be derived from a noun found as *yaldız* in Ottoman, or from the ancestor of *yaldır yaldır* 'parıl parıl' which the *Tarama Sözlüğü* quotes from Dede Korkut. *yaltrık* is common as well.

yuldrı- 'to gleam or shimmer (of a sword, of jewels)' appears in DLT fol. 633; the ms. (first hand) actually has *yuldıra-* (twice) and *yuldırı-* (once). The original shape of this verb must have been **yultrı-*: *yaltrı-* also has a D in the DLT.[86] The

85 At that stage of the language, *yavrı* is quite unlikely to have come from '*yavrı-*g'. It lives on in Republican Turkish *yavru* 'fledgeling, (helpless) child'. Perhaps it was back-formed from *yavrı-* on analogy of the diametrically opposed *karı*; its exceeding rarity would go well with this hypothesis.

86 The two verbs are spelled with *dāl* and not *dhāl*, a stop and not a spirant. The DLT's [d] may have

base is likely to have been *yultuz* 'star'; hence my spelling of the verb with *u* against Dankoff and Kelly and others' *o*. Original meaning therefore something like 'to be or become (like!) a star'.

The existence of a verb **yltrı-* may be deduced from one Uigur and one Qarakhanid ex.: *yltrar ay* 'the shining moon' (Windgott 17), *yagı ot kötürmiş tağ ot yıldradı* 'the grass gleamed as if an enemy had put fire to it' (QB 6219). The velar of *yıldrık*, the name of a star in QB 5676 and 6220, shows back vocalism, and cf. Ottoman *yıldırım* 'lightning'. The meaning of **yltrı-* must have been close to those of the two preceding verbs.[87] The actual shapes of the stem in the two instances are analogous to the variants *yaltır-* and (Qarakhanid) *yaldra-* of the verb *yaltrı-* discussed above. As initial /y/ occasionally narrows /A/ of the first syllable, *yllılr-* and *ylldrA-* may in fact be two further variants of *yaltrı-*. Cf. also the near-synonym Old Turkic *yaşo-*, whose variant *ışo-* is attested in HamTouen 5,15.

yeltri- 'to blow' practically always has *yel* 'the wind' as subject; in Ernte 93 the subject is *esin* 'breeze'. The direct base of *yeltri-* is not attested, but it must, in some way, come from *yel*. The variant *yeltri-* appears only in M III 10,5$_1$ (text 4) as *yel y(e)ltrisär*. Otherwise, we have only *yeltir-*: See the *EDPT* s.v.,[88] and BT III 336, LautHöllen 91 and Ernte 93. The aorist appears as *yeltirär* in Suv 566,2 and SuvStockh 81, as *yeldirär* in the DLT.

Two further *+I-* stems presumably according with what we have found out about this formation from the semantic point of view are attested only with *-(X)ş-* expansion:

sorış- 'to wrinkle up (of the face), to frown' in DLT fol. 316. *sor* 'wrinkle' is attested in UigTot 574 (with Tib. original) and ZiemeTārā 15c. *+I-* brings the meaning 'to be or turn into what the base nominal signifies', *-(X)ş-* adding the collective aspect; wrinkles in a frown do not turn up singly. The *EDPT* confuses this verb with *sor-uş-* (from *sor-* 'to suck up, absorb'), although the two are well distinguished in the DLT.

suvış- 'to be or become thin from too much water' is attested in DLT fol. 319-320. It is discussed together with *suvıg* and/or *suvık* in section 3.101 above. **suv+ı-*, the obvious common base of these lexemes, has not turned up.

belonged to the phoneme /t/ under these circumstances, and may possibly have been pronounced as a voiced stop before /r/ even in Uigur.

87 I take the QB sentence to be a play on *öt* 'fire' and *ot* 'grass'. Dankoff's translation, "blazing like an enemy's fire signal" has *kara kuş* of the previous line, referring to Jupiter, as subject. This may fit the context but is hardly a correct translation of the sentence itself; it makes *ylldrA-* a tr. verb.

88 *yel turur* in KP XVIII 3 is clear on the facs. and should not be changed: A similar phrase is found also e.g. in M III 10,8$_1$, 11$_1$ and 15$_1$ (text 4); this is the passage in which we find the form *y(e)ltri-* quoted above.

sarıg 'yellow' has been explained in the n. to Ht X 799 as a -(*X*)g derivate from an unattested *+I-* stem coming from *saz* 'pale'. The rhotacism before *+I-* has already been found in *sämri-* and *yavrı-*, *yaltrı-* and *yultrı-*. Both *saz* and *sarıg* have a long /ā/; see the mentioned n. (which covers four folio pages) for further details. *balıg* 'wounded' (q.v. among the -(*X*)g lexemes) may have come about in a similar way but lambdacistically: From *baş* 'wound' over **balı-*. Cf. also *balık-* in the -(*X*)*k-* formation. *ūkli-* from *ūkūş* is an attested analogue.

The *+I-* verbs to be discussed next are intr. like the above, but do not signify 'to be or become the base nominal, to turn into it'; *yagrı-* and *yıdı-* are solidly attested. Note that the *+U-* formation, which shares this meaning with *+I-*, does not show such exceptions.

(*kan+ı-* 'to bleed (intr.)' is well distinguished in DLT fol. 564-5 from *kan+a-* 'to bleed (tr.)'. The ex. has *burun* 'nose' as subject, but it is said to be applicable to "any part of the body that bleeds". *kanımaz* in Höllen 10 has fragmentary and unclear context; it needn't belong to this verb, as the eds. think, but could also be 'our blood'. So *kanı-* is a hap. of the DLT.)

(*kẅti-* appears in Suv 347,22 (quoted in the *DTS*), BuddhUig II 592 (misread as KWNDYYW and given an impossible etymology) and Ht IV 1243 (miswritten as '*küdéyü*'), V 146, X 400 and X 748. It always has *yıd* or *yıpar* or both as subject, and is usually associated with *bur-*, with *yıdı-* or with both. This documentation fixes its meaning as 'to smell pleasantly, to emit a fragrance'. It should not, of course, be 'emended' away, as the *EDPT* suggests we should do. The base of *kẅti-* might have been *köt* 'backside, buttocks', hadn't it been for the semantic incompatibility.[89] Several scholars have taken *kẅti-* to be derived from some other **köt*, signifying "(a) high (place)". This, in turn, is taken to be derived from a verb **kö-* "to rise" (distinct from *kö-* 'to guard'), said to be the base also of *kötür-* 'to lift, to raise'. All this seems to me to be far-fetched. *kötür-* and *kötgi* (q.v. in section 3.110) probably have *köt-* (attested in Yak. and Azeri) as common base. By meaning, *kötit-* (discussed among the -(*X*)*t-* verbs) clearly also comes from this *köt-* and not from *kẅti-*. *kẅti-*, which only denotes the emission of fragrance, is unlikely to be connected with these but may be a simplex. It is true that smells often spread upwards; not exclusively upwards, however. I know of no derivational means which could make such a connection likely.)

soç+ı- is found earliest in DLT fols. 558 and 566, as *at soçıdı* "The horse reared". Its base, *soç*, is defined in DLT fol. 161 as "an onomatopoeic for something bouncing off" and quoted in examples. Derivates include *soçı-t-* in QB 3399 and 6537 and DLT, the DLT's *soçgur-*, *soçı-l-* and *soçı-n-*, the last two attested

89 Could it be that *köt* 'buttocks', first attested in the DLT, should be some sort of euphemism originally denoting something fragrant?

in Uigur (also discussed below). Dankoff and Kelly and the *EDPT* write all these with *u* in the first syllable, but Doerfer, 1983: 97 has shown that the vowel is /o/: *soči-* in Mo. and *su:oçuk* in Khalaj. Ottoman and Kıpchak *suç* 'fault, offence, crime' should not be confused with *soç*, as in the *EDPT*.

yagr+ı- 'to be galled (of a horse)' is attested in the IrqB and the DLT, *yagrı-t-* only in the DLT. *yagır* 'saddle-gall' and *yagırlıg* 'galled' are found in the DLT, in Middle and in Modern Turkic but not in Old Turkic; cf., on the other hand, the Mo. cognate of *yagır* mentioned in the *EDPT*. Semantically interesting is the DLT's *ol anğ yagırladı* "He treated the gall on his horse".

yıd+ı- 'to smell', with a bad or a good smell (intr.). Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* can be found in BuddhUig II 592, Maitr 74,9, Ht X 748. 'to smell (tr.)' is *yıd+la-*, reminding us of the couple *yagr+ı-* : *yagır+la-*.

Transitive *biti-* 'to write' will not be dealt with, as a (originally possibly Chin.) lexeme '*bit*' is not attested in Turkic. For all we know, the verb as such could have been borrowed from some other language (e.g. Proto-Mo., which also had it). *yaz-* 'to write' was replaced by *biti-* in the dialects which constitute Old Turkic. *yıdı-* and *yagrı-*, two *+I-* verbs differing in content from most of the verbs of this formation, do not show any aberrant syntactic behaviour.

As with *+U-*, the most common expander of *+I-* verbs is *-(X)t-*: We find *öli-t-*, *sämri-t-*, *yavrı-t-*, *ükli-t-*, *sekri-t-*, *yaltrı-t-*, *soçı-t-*, *yagrı-t-* (DLT) and *yıdı-t-*. Other verbal expanders are rare: *soçı-n-* is a hapax *with metaphorical* *-(X)n-*. The DLT's language is peculiar for its *-(X)ş-* derivates from *+I-* stems (not found at all with *+U-*): *öli-ş-* and the near-synonym *suvış-*; *sämri-ş-*, *sorış-* and *yıdış-*. All these *-(X)ş-* verbs are intr. collectives, bearing the notion that the process denoted applies to every part of the subject. A few nominal derivates are formed with *-(X)g*, *-(O)k* etc.

There are about as many *+I-* verbs as there are *+U-* verbs; there are similarities in the syntactic behaviour of the two formations. Like *+U-* stems, few of the *+I-* lexemes have any accompanying nominal expression, not taking the stem form of nominals into consideration. With no oblique nominal we can quote: *irıŋ kan tökülür, twza yıdıyur* (M I 6,5, Legende) 'Pus and blood are running, their smell is spreading and they stink'. Such an ex. with *käd+i-* was quoted above. A nominalised *+I-* verb with accompanying subject is *tigli üklimäk üzä* 'through the augmentation of drops' (UigTot 500). Concrete case forms dependent upon *+I-* verbs are *örlär ayça ükliyü* (Hochzeit 32) with an equative, and *ol ḫo yerteñçötä yaltrıyur* (TT VIII B 13) with a locative. With a postpositional phrase: *ot öŋlüg yarok yaşok alkodın sıŋar yaltr(ı)mışın yaşomışın sakınmış k(ä)rgäk* (TT V A 9) 'One has to imagine that fire-coloured lights and gleams shine and sparkle from all sides'. *yagrı-* in IrqB XVI is accompanied by a nominal governed by the postposition *tägi*.

yaltır- and *ükli-* are attested with non-actantial *üzä*-phrases: *arıgsızlıg akın üzä üklimiş* in TT VIII D 35 constitutes a slavish translation of a Skt. perfect participle accompanied by an instrumental case form:[90] *y(a)rok yaşok mani monçuk ärdini İnçIp öz y(a)rokı üzä yaltrıyu yaşoyu turmuş*[91] *täg* . . . (U II 37,56, Uşnişa Viçay) 'As if the shining and bright pearl-jewel Maṇi had stood shining and gleaming like that by its own light . . .'.

A difference between *+U-* and *+I-* verbs appears to be the greater semantic variation seen among the *+I-* verbs.

5.43 *+(A)d-*

The bases for this formation can be mono- or bisyllabic. All the bisyllabic bases ending in consonants have /X/ in their second syllable. *yagı+d-* and *yuvga+d-* are the only exs. for derivation from stems ending in vowels. It often has the same meaning as *+U-*, with the difference that many *+(A)d-* verbs have human subjects. Here are the *+(A)d-* verbs, listed alphabetically:

(*alŋad-* is mentioned only as a *hap.* in the *UW* s.v. *al(ı)ŋad-*; it is attested also in Wettkampf 65 and 66, as *alŋadtı*. *alŋad-* has human subjects, which *alŋu-* (discussed above among the *+U-* verbs) does not. Another practically synonym cognate, *alaŋur-* (q.v. among the *-(I)r-* verbs below) can have either. The base of all these has been taken to occur in ManErz IV 32, but that is probably an error.[92] As shown by five instances of *alaŋur-*, it probably had /a/ and not /ı/ in the second

90 Translating *puşţaṃ* as "ernährt" and *üklimiş* as "vermehrt" gives the impression that the Uigur translator allowed himself some freedom in his task. In fact, the Skt. form can also signify "reichlich", e.g.; it comes from *puş-*, among the meanings of which we find also "gedeihen" and "wachsen".

91 Thus very clearly visible in the facs.

92 This has been shown to be the case in a long n. to Pothi 381. Variants of *alaŋ* signifying "distracted, dumbfounded, amazed, stupid, foolish, thoughtless" are attested in Altai dialects, in Kazakh and Kirghiz. This does not accord with the Old Turkic instance either in meaning or in phonetic shape: While /ı/ is often spelled as A in Old Turkic and especially Manichaean texts, Common Turkic /a/ always appears as such also in Old Turkic. The meaning "schwach" postulated by Bang for the passage is an *ad hoc* twisting of the meaning unwarranted by modern evidence. The *UW*, which also adopts this translation, changes Bang's *oglanları*[*ŋız birlä*] to *oglanları* [*birlä*], but this cannot be accomodated with the context. In Clark's opinion, *alınları* is "either . . . an unerased error for *oγlanları*[*ŋgız*], or it is an error for *alınglar* < *al-* 'to take' plus 2nd Plur. Imper. *:ınglar* (i.e. [*ba*]*rıp alınglar*). The first possibility is the most likely one." I prefer the second possibility: "*yeti rınıkätägi* . . . [*ba*]*rıp alınlar, oglanları*[*ŋız birlä*] *äviŋizlärkä tägiŋlar*" *teyü ät' özin koḍḍı* is followed, two lines further on, by the carrying out of this last wish: *tükäsigçä rtni yinçü äd tavar alıp* [*öz öz el*]*iŋä uluşıŋa tägdilä*[*r*]. We need *alınlar* to govern the "seven jewels". [*kı*]*rıp* must be just as good as [*ba*]*rıp*, and there must be other possibilities. I have, incidentally, filled the lacuna of l.384 in a different way, to

syllable; the *UW* lemma should be corrected accordingly. In any case, neither *alŋad-* nor *alŋad-tur-* (q.v. below) are ever attested with a vowel after the /l/.)

alp+ad- 'to be or become a hero' is a hapax in *ar(a)mı to[ŋ]anıŋ alpadmakı* in Rāma 15. Not mentioned in any of the dictionaries (including the *UW*). Cf. *alpal-* 'to be warlike' in section 7.31; *'alplan-'* exists only as the nominal *alplanmak* 'military, heroic; heroism'.

baş+ad- 'to be or become a leader' is taken to have been used in two passages, in one of which the word in question is damaged: K^{1}W S^{2}ŋ Ẅ N^2:B^{1}Ş D^{1}Ẅ :T^{2}Ẅ R^{2}T^2[T^2]Ẅ M N^2:S^{2}Ẅ K^{2}L^{2}T^{2}I : (BQ S8) and T^{1}Y^{1}S^{2}ŋ Ẅ N^2:B^{1}Ş D^1[-]:B^{2}I S^{2}Y^{2}Ẅ Z R^{2}N^2:K^{2}L^{2}T^{2}I : (BQ S11). Syntactically, there is no reason why the word in question should not be a title. For *Kw säŋün* B^{1}Ş D^{1}W *törт* [ŋ]*ämän sü kälti* the closest parallel would be *w]ŋ totok beş tümän sü kälti* (BQ E25), and there are others. The second should be read as *Tay säŋün* B^{1}Ş D^{1}W *beş yüz ärin kälti* with the instrumental of *är*.[93] Converb forms are possible, though.

bäg+äd-mäk is the form of all seven exs. of this verb, which signifies 'to be a *bäg*'. One, a binome with *ärklänmäk*, is quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *erklen-*. The same couple reappears in DreiPrinz 66-7. Other exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in Maitr 50 r 19 with *yegädmäk* = MaitrH XVI 10 a 30 (with *eläd-mäk*). A verb *el+äd-* is not otherwise attested, and the meaning to be expected here does not accord with the behaviour of *+Ad-*. *elän-* (section 7.21 below) would fit, however: *elād-* may have been created in the inferior Hami version by analogy with *bägād-*. WÇIŋA B^{2}G^{2}D^{2}M A K^{2}A *tägir* in BlattRun 25 is read as *uçıŋa bägädmäkkä tägir* in *EDPT* 18 a top, s.v. *u:ç*. For a defense of Thomsen's interpretation as *bägdämä* "Paradise(?)" see Erdal, 1988: 257.

bilgād- and *körk+äd-* are discussed in DLT fols. 433-4, with the exs. *kız körKädti* "The girl had a beautiful complexion" and *oglan bilgädti* "The boy was intelligent". Kāšğarī explains: "*-ädti* is a suffix that is attached to nouns forming verbs that indicate natural qualities. Ex.: the word for 'beauty' is *körk*; to say that something was beautiful you attach the suffix *-ädti* thus: *körKädti* meaning 'It was beautiful'. The word for 'intelligence' is *bilig*; then: *oglan bilgädti* 'The boy was intelligent'." The *EDPT* disagrees with this etymology, deriving *bilgäd-* from *bilgä*. Clauson does not justify his view in any way. *+Ad-* verbs often do signify 'to become what the base nominal denotes' (which would favour *bilgä* as base), but sometimes also 'to acquire the denotee of the base as a trait': Cf. the

be translated as 'went each to his own country'; thus to account for the singular possessive suffix of *uluşıŋa*. The entry *alŋ* in the *UW* should, I think, be deleted: "Kinder, Frauen und Greise" are not "foolish etc.". Röhrborn calls the *DTS*'s *'alaŋad-'* "normalisiert"; so is his *'al(ı)ŋad-'*.

93 Concerning the presence of *är+än* in the inscrs. see the beginning of section 2.51.

very common *buŋ+ad-*. Nor is Clauson able to suggest any alternative explanation to *körKäd-*. Note that *bilgäd-* is a hapax, while *körKäd-* was known also in Middle Turkic. *bilgä+d-* is a possible etymology, but I see no reason to contradict the DLT.

buŋ+ad- EDPT and *DTS*, in the latter also s.vv. *muŋad-* I and II, *muŋadmaq* and *'muŋadquluy'*. Together with *adın-* or *taŋla-* it means 'to be surprised', by itself 'to be in trouble; to be worried'. These biverbs are distinguished in the *DTS*. Further exs. appear in Maitr 47 r13, 13 r6, 146 v10, 89 r16, 196 r31 and v5, 147 1707 and X 751 and 844. BuddhUig II has six exs. of *muŋad-* 'to be surprised', two of them with *taŋla-*, four with *aḍın-*. Add *taŋlap muŋadıp* (Maitr 132 v18). *taŋlançıgın körüp adı[nıı] muŋaḍḍı* "Er sah das Wunderbare und erstaunte₂" (HtPar 130,8),] *köŋülinä muŋadıp taŋlap . . .* (SuvGeng 604,1) and *körüp taŋlayu muŋadu* (Shō VIII a 14). *muŋadınçıg* (discussed in section 3.311) is also used together with *taŋlançıg* or *adınçıg*. *muŋaguluk taŋlaguluk . . . sav* in BT III 566 is probably an error for the present biverb: Cf. *muŋadguluk taŋlaguluk iş* (TT X 22). It was to be expected that the meaning which *buŋad-* has when used by itself should be the original one, and the biverb meaning a metaphorical extension: It represents a deflated hyperbole. This is shown also by the etymology: *buŋ* (*muŋ* in Uigur) signifies 'sorrow, grief, distress'. In this case, the formation does not signify 'to become what the base denotes' but 'to get into the state denoted by the base'. The original meaning of *buŋad-/muŋad-* is found in Orkhon Turkic on the one hand and Qarakhanid on the other, but hardly ever in Uigur.

äd+äd-, *EDPT* and *DTS*. One of the instances is in Manichaean script and therefore unambiguous. *äd* is 'any possession of value'; the verb, however, must, by the context, signify 'to thrive, become nice'. One of the exs. has tree shoots as subject, the other a place (*yer orun*). Cf. the hap. *ädäd-tür-*.

är+äd- is attested in two different entries in DLT fol. 112, signifying "to be reckoned a man". Appears nowhere else.

ken+äd- 'to be late, to fall behind'. Not in the dictionaries. Attested in BT III 855, in ETŞ 13,184 in the phrase *kenäḍmätin ogadmatın*[94] and BT XIII 12,218 (*Maytrıka kenädip tuşmaguka tüş kirmäzün* 'May the result not be that we have fallen behind and will not meet Maitreya!'). Qarakhanid Turkic has *kenik-* (q.v. among the *+(X)k-* verbs) instead of *kenäd-*.

kırgıl+ad- is a hap. in an *avadāna* text (Şaddanta). Of hair, 'to turn grey'. *DTS*; misinterpreted in the *EDPT*.

kıv+ad-mak is quoted once in the *EDPT*, together with *kutadmak*. Another ex.

94 See *og+ad-* below.

of *kutadmak kıvadmak* appears in ms. U 5362 I.2, quoted in the n. to BT V 665. *xıvadmak*, thus in Brāhmī, appears in ms. Mz 615 A 5, quoted in footn. 10 to Maue, 1984: 92. The binome *kut kıv* is common; no semantic difference can be detected between the two nouns, which is probably the case also with *kutadmak* and *kıvadmak*. The fact that the first mentioned instance is *kutadmak kıvadmak bolzun . . . dındarlarka* and not e.g. '*kıvadzunlar*' may indicate that '*kıvad-*' no longer existed as a finite verb.

köp+ād- 'to be or become numerous or copious'. Quoted in the *EDPT* from QB; found also in BuddhStab II 13 and CYK 42.

körk+ād- 'to be or become beautiful' has been quoted above, s.v. *bilgād-*, from the DLT. *kögādtür-*, discussed in the section on *-tUr-* below, probably comes from it: /r/ loss in velar clusters is found also e.g. in *börk* 'grove' > *bök* and *bärk* < *bärk* 'firm'. As for the voicing of the velar (in evidence for *kögädtür-*, q.v.), cf. *+(X)k-Ar-* > *+gAr-* and so forth. In CYK 102 we read: *tüş yemişlig altun urugları yadılıp* KWYK'TLYP *ür üdün* [. The editors hesitatingly translate this as "zum Himmel reichen", presumably connecting it with *kök* 'sky'. Such a verb being nowhere attested, I take this to be either an error for *köKād-*, the verb discussed here, or an *-(X)l-* derivate from it. The problem with the latter idea is that passive derivates from *+Ad-* verbs are not attested, and the present context does not demand a strictly passive form. Rather, L is likely to have slipped onto the stone under the analogy of *yadılıp*. T for /d/ is common in late texts. (Cf. Röhrborn, 1981 a, footn. 42.)

kul+ad- is a hap. in KT, used in parallel with *kūŋād-*; see the *EDPT*. 'to become a (male) slave'.

kut+ad- 'to become a blessing for someone; to enjoy divine favour and good fortune' or, what is sometimes called 'to be blessed'. Never governs direct objects, but governs the dative in the first-mentioned meaning. *EDPT* and *DTS*; appears also in Maitr 24,8, and see *kıvadmak* above. A proper name *Kutadmış* is found in UigLand 4, 10 etc., BT VIII p. 41, footn. A 180 and WoodFr 1; see additional exs. in the special entry of the *DTS* for this name.

küç+ād- is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. The *EDPT*'s translation is wrong: The verb is always intr. and means 'to be strengthened, or aggravated'. Exs. not mentioned there can be found in BT I B (102) (written with T), Maitr 16 v 18, SuvStockh 70, BT V (B) 341, BT XIII 16,13 and QB 6590. In Kinkashō śloka B, c, *küçādmāklig üd* translates Skt *bala-kāla-*.

kūŋ+ād- 'to become a maid-servant'. Hap in KT, parallel to *kul+ad-*. See the *EDPT*.

og+ad- 'to tarry, to fall behind' can be taken to come from *og* 'pause, free time' discussed in *EDPT* 75-6; see also the exs. quoted in the footn. to BT III 797 (three from ETŞ for the binome *arasız ogsuz* 'without pause' and two for the

binome *og yık*). *og yık* is attested in TuoLuoNi 185, 269 and 285, [*o*]*gsuz üzüksüz* 'continuously' in Maitr 156 b13 and *ogsuz tägingsiz* 'without chance (of meeting a Buddha)' is a common expression. The exs. for *ogad-*: *ogadıp kälmiş bizni täg tınl(ı)g* (TT III 62-3) 'Somebody who has, like us, been falling behind'. Very similar *ogadıp kalmış tınl(ı)glar* in ETŞ 10,289. *burxanlarıg ogadmadın [saş]matın utgurak tuşgay sizlär* (Suv 24,20) 'You will meet the Buddhas without remaining behind, unmistakably and straightaway'. A similar sentence is quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *tuš-* from Suv 421,6. ETŞ 13,133: *uka bilü umamaktın ogadıp kaltımız* 'We remained behind because of our unability to understand and know.' ETŞ 13,184: *kenädmätin ogadmatın, ken yakın barzunlar* 'Let them draw close, then, without being late or remaining behind'. *ogadmatın* is attested also in BT III 797 and 799. *utmışlartın ogadmayu* (ETŞ 13,85) can be understood in the light of] *burxanlartın ogadıp* [*tınl(ı)glar* "die Lebewesen, die die Buddhas verpaßt haben" (BT XIII 27,14). The *EDPT* translates this verb differently, but then most of the exs. quoted were unknown to its author. W G^{1}D^{1}M D^{1}M A in YE 51,2 and W G^{1}D^{1}M D^{1}M : in YE 70,3 can now be read as *ogadmadım* – *a* and *ogadmadım* respectively, to be translated as 'I did not fall behind'.

öŋ+äd- 'to recover one's health'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *uzun öŋädmäz*[96] *nızvanılıg igig ämlätäçi bolalım* (ManErz IV 19 = Pothi 348); *igi kämi antak(ı)ya ok öŋädür* (Tug 88); *agrıgı sönüp igi öŋädür* (Ht V 14 a27) and *bodunın karasın ämläp, öŋaḍḍilär bınıktılar*[97] (Suv 598,17). The *EDPT*'s 1 *öŋ* and 2 *öŋ* are two uses of the same lexeme whose central meaning would have been 'front, surface'. *öŋäd-* therefore 'to surface' or 'to advance' used metaphorically.

ul(u)g+ad- 'to grow up'. See the *EDPT* for runic, Buddhist and Middle Turkic exs. and the DLT. Additional exs. in YE 7,2 (runic), BT V 13(350) (Manichaean), Maitr 178 r15 (biverb with *bädü-*), 7 v22 and 69 v13, Ht V 7 a17 and QB 4708.

yagı+d- 'to be or become hostile'. To the *EDPT*'s exs.[98] add]WQ*adıp yagıdıp* (PañcFrag 184) and *yuvgadıp yagıdıp* (ms. U 182 v5). The last letter of

95 Zieme's translation of this, "von den Buddhas verspätet", seems somewhat unsuccessful.

96 Spelled °NK° which, in Manichaean script, is different from °NG° = /ŋ/. Since the two *are* identical in Uigur script, the spelling probably means that the text was transferred from that into Manichaean.

97 Or *bayaktılar*, q.v. among the *+(X)k-* verbs.

98 ManUigFrag r10 is quoted there as [*y*]*uvgaladı yagıdtı*, but this suggestion for the first word is uncertain: The third letter appears to be Y and not V, and the second has an unexplained irregularity.

'yagıdu' in ŞU E10^{m} is a conjecture of Ramstedt and the word could be the locative of *yagı*.

yeg+ād- 'to be better than or surpass someone; to succeed, improve'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Further exs. in Maitr 50 r19, 55 v3 and 97 r11 and Ht IV 146, all beside lacunae. *ut-yegād-* 'to overcome' is attested, in addition, in Maitr 186 v11, 137 v4 and 10, 159 v20, MaitrH X5 b23, BT XIII 39,8, UigTot 875, 883 and 889, BT VIII A490, BT VII A703. *yegādmiş* can be found, additionally, in ETŞ 10,254, BT II 511, ATSS, HamTouen 2,31 and 5,6', BT V(9) 131 (Manichaean) and ÁgFrag (1) B10, CYK 33 and as proper name. *[u]tdı yeŋādtı* (Ht V6 a7) seems fairly well visible on the facs.; if not a simple error, it must be a cross with *yeŋ-*, same meaning, mentioned in the DLT as being Oguz and Kipchak. The verb *yegād-* is attested neither in runic sources nor in Qarakhanid, but only in Uigur. $Y^2G^2D^2I$ in KT and BQ is *yeg+di*, an adverb like *katıg+dı* and *yarıklıg+dı*: This fits the context better, and the converb and aorist vowel of *yegād-* is consistently documented as /U/. The passage in TT I 7-8 must be read as two sentences: *asra atıŋ; yegādtiŋ* 'Your name is low (now), but you will soon have prevailed'.[100]

yogun+ad- 'to become thicker' is a hap. in TT IV, written with T for /d/; but this is not a very early text. Since the word is not mentioned in the notes, it presumably appears in this shape in both mss. quoted for the passage. A third one, ShōUigFrag 2, writes *yogunayu*. This is either an otherwise unattested (and a bit unlikely) verb *'yogun+a-'* or an instance of the late passage of /d/ to [y].

yok+ad- 'to perish, be destroyed'. *EDPT*; *DTS* also s.vv. *alkın- yoqad-*, *artayoqad-*, *yetlin- yoqad-* and *'yoqadmayuluy'*. TT III should be read as *yokaḍu turur* which, according to the n. to Pothi 28, is clear in the facs. Further exs. appear in BT II 946, Warnke 677, BuddhUig II 489, Buddhāv H52, HamTouen 1,42', BT XIII 13,128, 16,2 and 60,2 and on l.68 of the *Baxşı ögdisi* quoted in the n. to 13,98-9 and Neujahr 15. Neujahr 40 contains the couple *alkınmak yokadmak*.

yuvga+d- 'to be shameless and ill-mannered' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. It appears also in ms. U 182 v5 (Uigur) in a biverb with *yagı+d-*. Cf. the DLT's *yuvga+lan-* 'to be ill-natured' quoted in the *EDPT*, and n. 98.

The DLT's view of this suffix has been quoted s.v. *bilgād-* above. Modern exs. can be found in Schakir, 1933: 26-27. Cf. also Bang, 1925 b, 2. Anhang, p. 410.

All *+(A)d-* verbs have /U/ in the converb and aorist. A part of the exs. are

99 Not ŞU S4, as the *EDPT* writes.

100 Aspectually, this is similar to *ād tavar tilāsār bultuŋ taptıŋ* (TT I 11) and other such expressions in that text. Unless, of course, 'TYNG (*atıŋ*) is an error for 'RTYNG (*ārtiŋ*) 'you were': In this case, *yegādtiŋ* is something like a present perfect.

ulgadur ädädür (Windgott 9), *küçädü* (Maitr 16 v18), *küçädür* (SuvStockh 70), *öŋädür* (Ht V 14 a27 and Tug 88), *öŋädürlär* (BT V 458), *yegädür* (BT XIII 39,8, II 946). *äşid-* 'to hear', *igid-* 'to feed and rear', *küzäd-* 'to watch, guard, protect' and *uyad-* 'to be ashamed' are also °*d*- verbs with /U/ as converb and aorist vowel. They cannot belong to this formation, however: The first three because they govern direct objects, the fourth because it is formed with *-d-*. *küzäd-* had °*d*- in Orkhon Turkic and in KP; the metathesis *küdäz-* (not '*kütäz-*') also evidence for original /d/. Both in TT VIII A 1 and 34 and C 4 (Brāhmī; the last two with the formative *-(X)gIXg*) and in the DLT, however, this verb is attested as *küzät-*. The °*t- may* therefore have gotten generalised in Uigur; the *UW*, at any rate, writes *küzät-*. Such a development does not occur in Uigur with *+(A)d-*; it may, in this verb, be due to analogy from *-(X)t-*. See *küzäd* in n. 351 in the first vol.: It also later appears to have changed its °*d* to °*t*.

The medial (often tr.) formation *-d-* is discussed below. It should not, of course, be confused with *+(A)d-*; problems in this matter are dealt with in that section. Many *+(A)d-* verbs, among them *alŋad-*, *muŋad-*, *ädäd-*, *körkäd-*, *kutad-*, *öŋäd-*, *ul(u)gad-* and *yokad-*, are expanded with *-tUr-*. The hap. *kutadur-* may not be an exception, but a phonetically or graphically simplified variant of *kutadtur-*. Interesting is the expansion *yegäd-mäklāşü* 'competitively': In this form (discussed in section 7.102), a morphotactic constraint on *+Ad-* is overcome by adding a mutual-reciprocal formative to the infinitive base. *küzäd-* is excluded from this formation also by the fact that it can undergo passive expansion and admits the formative *-(X)n-*. There appear to be very few nominal derivates from *+(A)d-* verbs. The only ones I am aware of (not including *-mAk*) are *muŋadınçıg*, the hapax *yegädinçlig* and *yegädinçsiz*.

In the great majority of cases, *+(A)d-* verbs are not accompanied by any oblique nominal expressions at all. Exs.: *ädgü kutlug tınl(ı)glarnıŋ ogulanı ulgadsar*, ... (U III 80,1, Macht d. Liebe) 'When the children of good and blessed people grow up, ...'; *mäŋgü m(ä)n tedäçilär barça ärtärlär*[101] *yokadurlar* (BT II 946) 'Those who say "I am eternal" all pass away and perish'; *tämir kazgokug [yer]kä tokısar näçäkäṭägi yertä yatsar yogunaḍu uzayu umaz* (TT IV B 43) 'If one beats an iron stake into the ground, it cannot become thicker or longer, for however long it may lie in the earth'.

Sometimes, a concrete nominal appears: *taloy içintä yokadtı* (KP LIV 1) 'He

101 Thus the ms. The editor says that *ärt-* means "sterben" but writes '*artar*' because there is a biverb *arta- yokad-* in two other texts. This latter fact does not, however, reduce the chances of existence of a biverb *ärt- yokad-* as well. *ärt-* isn't really "sterben" but rather 'to pass, pass by, pass off' and thus also 'pass away'. In *UW* 206 a top (published in 1981), Röhrborn changed his mind and subscribed to the present view (found in my thesis which appeared in 1977).

perished in the sea'.] *igindin öŋädtü* (TT VIII A 22) has the *ablativus separationis*: 'He recovered from his illness'. A number of sentences showing *ogad-* with ablative are quoted above, in the entry. An instance of *yokad-* with the *+çA* case of similarity is attested in Neujahr 15, and the instrumental appears in *on küçin küçädü* in SuvStockh 70.

yaŋı äv bark iyäsiŋä kutadur (TT VI 100) is translated in the *EDPT* as "A new house brings good fortune to its owner". This is the *dativus ethicus*. *yegäd-* governs the ablative of comparison: *yertinçülärig . . . bermiş buyantın . . . çaylı örtmäktin ünmiş b(ä)lgürmiş buyan yegädür* (CYK 33) ". . . ist besser als . . .". Finally, the ablative of cause: *ol ärdinilär ayıg kılınç ärksinmäkintin yokadıp . . .* (BuddhUig II 489). Nowhere, however, do we have an *+(A)d-* verb governing a direct object, with or without accusative suffix.

Here are exs. of *+(A)d-* verbs being accompanied by *üzä* phrases: *sünüş aţış adası üzä yokadmaguluk . . . suvka kirgülük törösi* (SuvDrog 475,6) 'the method of going into water . . . so as not to be destroyed through the hazards of fighting and artillery'. This *üzä* phrase is not agentive, though, as fighting, shooting and the hazards connected with these are not agentives in themselves. The following ex. is decidedly instrumental: *d(a)rnilär küçi üzä kutadtaçı otlar kuvragı* (*ibid.* 13) 'the bouquet of healing weeds which is a blessing by the force of incantation'. We do have an ex. (from an evidently early text) of an agentive dative with such a verb: *mani burxan t(ä)ŋri yalavaçı alŋadtı, uçuz boltı; bir kişikä alŋadtı, uçuz yenig boltı* (Wettkampf 66), translated "Mani Buddha, der Gesandte Gottes, ist überwunden und beschämt, von einem Menschen wurde er überwunden und beschämt$_2$". Even if we prefer a formulation like 'einem Menschen unterliegen', *bir kişikä* remains agentive. In a sense, *alŋad-* is the passive of *alŋadtur-* 'to overcome'. As *yeg+äd-*, said of the victor, is coupled with tr. *ut-*, so its converse *alŋad-*, said of the loser, acquires a passive status merely by its lexical content. At least in this ex., the absence of a passive morpheme does not appear to have been any impediment.

5.44 *+(X)k-*

There are more than thirty verbs in this intr. formation. Here they are:

ada+k- 'to be in or come into distress' is dealt with in the *UW*. Both exs. quoted there are accompanied by *üzä* phrases referring to the source of the trouble, *yala yaŋku* in one case, *elçi ogrı* in the other. Add *oŋjın üzä adakıp* [. . . (Ht V 14 b 27), which shows the same construction, and the following, where the source appears in the ablative: *ig käm adasıntın adakgalı örlätgäli bulgaţılgalı ugrasar . . .* (TuoLuoNi 187) "wenn (sie) durch die Gefahren (ähnlicher) Krankheiten und Gebrechen bedrängt, gequält und in Wirrnis gebracht werden sollten . . .".

On the other hand, *kunçuylarnıŋ yüräkin bagırın adakur ärti* (*ibid.* 273) "Er bedrängte Herz und Leber (jener) Frau" is no doubt an error for *adakur-*, which appears further on in that text: Such a use of *adak-* would not accord with what we know about *+(X)k-* or Old Turkic voice in general. *adak-* is not mentioned in the *EDPT*.

ago+k- 'to be or get poisoned' is mentioned in the *UW* and the *EDPT* as '*aguk-*'; see the former for Uigur, the latter for DLT and modern evidence. The base appears in BuddhKat 27 (Tibetan script) as *ago* (to be added to the *UW* entry *agu*, I), in TT VIII I 15 (Brāhmī) as *agusuz*. To the *UW* entry for the verb add *suvsuz otsuz isig üzä agokup . . .* (Ht V 14 b 26), which has it accompanied by an agentive *üzä* phrase, and *agokmışlarnıŋ yürüntägi* (TuoLuoNi 399). In two other instances, in ETŞ 17,17[102] and TT III 28, the dative forms *nızvanılarka* and *nızvanıka* refer to the source of the poisoning.

ant+ık- 'to swear an oath' is dealt with in the *EDPT*, q.v. for the DLT and modern evidence, and the *UW*. The dental, written as D in the DLT and usually as T in Uigur, probably was [d] and not [ð] of [t]. *antık-* governs *ant* 'oath' as internal object, in two instances quoted in the *UW* and in a further one in BT XIII 21,41: All these have explicit agents as well; *andıkmış and* in BT XIII 21,43 (also to be added to the *UW*) therefore has an object serving as kernel.

at+ık-mış 'notorious, famous' is attested in QB 246, 928 (mentioned in the *EDPT*, which also has modern and Middle Turkic evidence) and 2338 and once in Ht; see the *UW* s.v. Cf. also *atık-ımsın-* below.

bärKä+k- is a hap. in Suv, mentioned in the *EDPT*. It is accompanied by the instrumental phrase *bärKä kagal üzä*.

'*bınık-*' has been read in *elintäki bodunın karasın ämläp, öŋädilär bınıktılar* (Suv 598,17) and translated as if it were a synonym of *öŋ+äd-* (q.v. above). This has been connected with what has been read as *bunkı täg* in Ht X 795[103] and Buddh- verb to be a misreading of '*tın+ık-*', but such a verb is not known either. I believe it to be an error for (rather than a misreading of) *baya+k-* signifying 'to be or become as before'. The postpositional phrase is probably to be read as *bayakı* or *b(a)yakı täg*, attested e.g. also in TT V A 100 and 115.[104]

bir+ik- 'to get together, join (intr. or tr.), be united'. *DTS* and *EDPT*. Further exs. appear in ETŞ 20,63, BT VIII A 118 and 140 (biverb with *kavış-*) and 194,

102 This instance is mentioned in the *UW* entry as "TT VII 60 u. 17": The passage first appeared within a n. to TT VII.

103 '*bunqı täg*[*räsi*]' must be rejected, in view of the two other instances and the present context.

104 Ş. Tekin's suggestion that the lexemes be derived from Middle Iranian *bwn* "Fundament" seems far-fetched both semantically and in view of the patterns of lexical borrowing documented for Uigur.

BuddhUig I 199 etc. What the subject is joined to appears in the dative, in Ht V 129[105] (quoted in the *EDPT*, misinterpreted by the editor), UigTot 1168, BuddhUig I 155. In Warnke 157 and 276, however, the nominal referring to what one is to be united with is governed by the postposition *birlä* instead of being in the dative. The word $B^2I\,R^2K^2I$ in the inscr., which appears four times adnominally in an almost identical phrase, surely does not belong here; it might be read as *bir+ki*: Even petrified converbs are rarely used adnominally, and under no circumstances does *+(X)k-* have */I/* as converb vowel.

(buln+uk- 'to become a captive' is from *bulun*, discussed among the *-Xn* lexemes in section 3.107. It is a hap. in QB 2389, not mentioned in the *EDPT* and misunderstood by the ed. and the *DTS*. The ed. appears to have confused the verb with *bulgan-*, to judge by his translation.)

muŋ+uk- 'to be distressed, tormented, pressed' is attested in QB 2397 (not mentioned in the *EDPT*) and 2391 and in the DLT. We have no early exs. for it, but it evidently is the base of Uigur *muŋkul*, discussed in section 3.113. *muŋuk-* also appears twice in the Rylands Coran translation glosses.

bur+uk- in *avda burukmış käyik osuglug* (Maitr nr. 51/116/174 v 16-17) may have signified 'to die': *bur* was the form in which the name of Buddha was borrowed from Chin., appearing also in *burxan* and *bursaŋ*. The phrase would signify 'similar to wild animals who died in a hunt'. P. Zieme reminds me of the semantic similarity with *t(ä)ŋri bol-* 'to die' in Ht X 752 ff.

mün+ük- 'to commit a fault' is a hap. in the late TT I; see the *EDPT*. The meaning is made certain by the Chin. original; cf. the n. to the text.

çav+ık- 'to be or become famous'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Add *çavıkmış* (BT II 431 and 572, ETŞ 10,63 and 159 and 11,109, BT VIII B 89 and Shō XII a 10, the last two in biverbs with *kükül-*). The three QB exs. quoted in the *EDPT* and the U II and Suv exs. quoted in the dictionaries also have the form *çavıkmış*; cf. the near-synonym *atıkmış*. Other exs. appear in BT III 390 and 771.

çı+k- 'to get moist' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. *çı* 'moist' is not attested before the DLT either; no doubt related to it, however, is *şı*: It has the same meaning, and is found, among other places, in BuddhKat 4.

äd+ik- 'to succeed in something etc.' is discussed in the *EDPT*. A. v. Gabain, the ed. of texts in which this verb occurs, takes it to be an *-(X)k-* derivate of *et-* 'to do, arrange, organise'. This suggestion is attractive semantically, but *et-* is written with I in Uigur, in particular in texts in which this verb is found. *ädik-*, on the other hand, is only once (in Suv 556,22) written as *edik-*; see Schulz, 1978: 39. From *äd* 'useful goods etc.', then, keeping *äd+gü* in mind.

105 This and the instance in the preceding line are read as '*bärik-*'; note, however, that the editor writes in the introduction that I and A are difficult to distinguish after K and B.

āt+ık- is attested only in DLT fol. 105, with the aorist *ātıkār*. *oglan ātıktı* "The boy put on flesh".

ıl+ık- and *alık-* have tended to get confused. *ıl+ık-* is attested in QB 337 ms. B; the weaker A writes *alık-*, while ms. C *deest*. It comes from *ıl*, translated as 'vile' in DLT fol. 36;[106] see *ılık-dur-* (Suv) below. In DLT fol. 105, on the other hand, the second hand changed *alık-* (dicussed among the *-(X)k-* verbs) to *ılık-*. The reason for the confusion must be the fact that the two verbs are similar also in content. *ılıkar āt ōz* in QB 337 has been translated as "his body will rot".

iç+ık- 'to submit, enter, capitulate', specifically 'to submit to a foreign ruler (to become an internal tribe)'. Beside the *EDPT*'s exs. (from runic texts and from the DLT) it is attested in ETŞ 10,107, where it seems to mean 'to surrender (to an abstract entity)' and in Shō VII b 5, where it is used together with *sıg-* 'to fit into'.

(keç+ık- 'to be late' is attested as *käçik-* in BT VIII A 158: *yegü aşta m-a ber[gü]çä azkı(y)a käçiksär* "wenn man von einer Speise etwas zu spät gibt". This is a synonym of Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic *keç-* e.g. in the DLT's *är keçti* "The man was slow about the business". I don't think it is formed with *-(X)k-* (section 7.24) from *käç-* or from *keç-*, however: *käç-* does not have the appropriate meaning, and *keç-* is not known to me from Old Turkic proper. The voiced /c/ in Ottoman *gecik-* shows that the first vowel was long. The word could possibly be a misreading of KNYYK°, an error for the verb of the next entry (see facs.).

ken+ik- 'to fall behind' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and from QB 4389. The latter is not actually in the text, but a good conjecture 'quoted' tacitly: One ms. has the impossible *kenil-*, the other *kǫnik-* and the third a lacuna. *kenik-* is, however, attested in QB 4652 (in all three mss.), not mentioned by the *EDPT*. In DLT fol. 349, DankKelly correctly emend *kınık-*, with the appropriate meaning "to be overcome by weakness so that one tarries behind one's companions", to *kenik-*.

kir+ik- 'to get soiled'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; further exs. appear in BT II 872,[107] BT III 681, Abhi A 139 b (quoted in *UW* 192 a midpage), Buddhāv H 109 and AbiShotan r 15-16 and v 15.

koŋr+uk- is a hap. in Ernte 34, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *tarıgçı bäglärniŋ ... karınları açıp koŋrukup ...* "ihre Magen werden hungrig und knurren". Cf. *koŋur ün* 'a hoarse voice' in DLT fol. 603, and *koŋra-* in section 5.32.

106 The İndeks of the QB confuses 1 *il* "memleket" with 2 *il* 'tent door, courtyard etc.' and *ıl* 'vile, ignoble, vility'. Sorted out, with a discussion of 2 *il* (> *ilki*, *ilgārū* etc.) by Tezcan in his review of this work. However, Tezcan mistakenly writes *ıl* also as '*il*'. *ıl* appears in the QB couplets 2295, 2622, 4672, *ıl+ı ibid.* 1669, 2203, 2724, 4073 and 4589. *EDPT* 123 also writes this lexeme as '*il*'.

107 See the footn. to the passage for the problematic first letter.

(say+ık- is a hap. in DLT fol. 528, used in the sentence *yer sayıktı* "The ground became a stony tract". *say*, q.v. in the *EDPT*, is attested also in Uigur.)

tag+ık- 'to take to the mountains' is quoted in the *EDPT* from Orkhon Turkic and the DLT. Then we have *sangçılar tăzip tagıktı* (Ht V 2 a 13) 'The merchants fled and took to the mountains'.

taş+ık- 'to go out, step out' is well-attested in Orkhon Turkic and Uigur and found in the DLT, as documented in the *EDPT*. Further exs. appear in BT XIII 6,13, Wettkampf 7 and 29 and in the ms. M657 v 1 quoted in the n. to BT V 521.

tăŋ+ık- is a hap. in Warnke 275, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *b(ä)k kang kertgünç kǫŋülümüz alko burxanlarnıŋ kǫŋüli birlä tăŋikip, kamag burxanlarnıŋ küsüşi birlä birikip* . . . ". . . möge gleich werden mit der Gesinnung aller Buddhas und sich vereinigen mit dem Gelübde aller Buddhas". Cf. *tăŋ+Kăr-*, the tr. counterpart of this verb.

tărs+ık- is mentioned in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. Hap. in Suv, in the biverb/binome *tărsikmăk tătrülmăk* 'perversion, confusion'. Cf. the biverb *tărsikdür-tătrüldür-* below.

(tonçu+k-: DLT fol. 380 *är tonçuktı* "The man was clogged up so that he couldn't breathe". *sugur tonçuktı* "The weasel hibernated". The first meaning survives in a number of dialects to this day: See the *EDPT* entry. From *to-nçu*, which belongs to the *-(X)nçU* formation, and discussed in that section.)

(tusu+k- from *tusu* 'benefit, usefulness' is a hap. in DLT fol. 326, used in the sentence *bo ot maŋa tusuktı* "This medicine benefited me". Clauson takes it to be an *-(X)k-* derivate from the hypothetical verbal base he thinks could be common to *tusul-* (q.v. among the *-(X)l-* verbs) and *tusu*.)

tŭp+ŭk- 'to get completed' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but is rather common in late Uigur: It is found in ETŞ 9,32, ShōAgon 1,24, BudhUig I 270 and elsewhere in this text and in UigTot 912 (with *tükä-*), 964, 985 and 992.

tŭz+ŭk- is attested in *]täki [. . .][Ar] bägätlär kǫŋüli tŭzŭküp* . . . (CYK 111) 'May there be harmony between the [. . .] and the gentry in the [. . .]'; the editors' "loyal werden" does not seem just as appropriate to me. This is probably the verb meant in TT VIII D 25 by the dittographical *tüsükmäkmäkkä bar-*, translating Skt. *sāmyam pra+i-*. *tŭz+ŭk-* therefore signifies 'to become equal, even, harmonious'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.

uç+uk- signifies 'to end (intr.)'. It is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, from QB 6216 and from Ottoman and further attested in QB 4698, 5167, 5638 and 5692, in all these exs. with 'life' as subject. We find it also in BT VII A 249 and in the ms. Ot. Ry 2695, published by Zieme in *JA* 269 (1981): 385-399 (in the colophon). It is attested sixteen times in UigTot, in three of these written (or at least read) as *uçık-*. This is an intr. verb which never governs direct objects; a

number of the UigTot instances have, however, been mistranslated: *öörütgülük uçukguluk yaratıglar* (1144) should not be "die zu schaffenden und zu vollendenden Verrichtungen" but 'die zu schaffenden und sich vollendenden Verrichtungen". *içtin sınar uçukguluk yaratıg* (397) should not be "die das Innere vervollkommnende Ausführung" but 'die Ausführung, die sich im Inneren zu vervollkommnen hat'. *içdin sınar uçukguluk yaŋ* (404) is not "die das Innere vervollkommnende Methode" but 'die Methode, wie die innere Vervollkommnung zustande kommen soll'. The translations of the five instances following this one should be changed accordingly.

uya+k- comes from *uya* 'an animal's or a bird's resting place or nest'. It is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but is attested in Maitr 12 v2 and 103 v12 = MaitrH X1 a18. In the first of these it denotes the sun's setting, in the second the setting of the stars. 'to set (intr.)' must therefore have been the meaning of this verb in Uigur.

(*yay+ık-* appears in DLT fol. 529, in the sentence *üd yayıktı* "The season became spring". The *EDPT* quotes it also from a modern language).

yelvi+k- 'to be affected by sorcery'. Quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* (also s.v. *jelvikmäk*). Found also in SuvDrog 475,8. The *EDPT* wrongly translates this verb as "to practise sorcery"; that, however, is *yelvi+lā-*. The error may have arisen from the Kuan context where, however, *yelvik-* and *agok-* have the victim as subject.

(*yer+ik-* 'to settle' is a hap. in QB 5177, mentioned in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*.)

yol+uk- 'to meet on the way'. Not in the *EDPT*. In the *DTS* quoted from ŞU, which is a conjecture, and from YE 10,10 where, according to the unpublished material of Thomsen and Wulff, $Y^1L^1K^1A\ Y^1N^1$ is a misreading for $Y^1W\ K^1L^1Y^1N^1$ (*yok+la-yın*). We do find *yoluk-* in ETŞ 13,85 and, in a biverb with *tuş-* 'to come accross', in BT XIII 58,25. In ShōAgon A59 we have *bizni tāg nomçıka yolukmakındın* 'because of meeting a preacher like us', instead of '*yolunmakındın*' of the previous edition. Cf. also *yoluk-uş-* below. Lives on in the Codex Comanicus and elsewhere.

+(X)k- appears both after vowels and after consonants. *+(X)k-* verbs and their bases all have either one or two syllables. The DLT's forms are discussed in Kowalski, 1949: 436; modern ones can be found in Schakir, 1933: 27-29. There is some degree of similarity in form, meaning, morphotactic distribution and aorist vowel between *+(X)k-* and *-(X)k-*. The converb and aorist vowel of *+(X)k-* is usually /A/. The exs. in the DLT are numerous; some of the others are *antıka* (Kuan 179) and *taşıkar* (ŞU E5 and M II 11,14 and 20, text 4). *ädikü umaz* (TT V B118) does

not come into the picture here,[108] but there are several other exceptions: *uyakur* has been read in Maitr 103 v 12, and we have *çavıkur* in ETŞ 11,109 and possibly *t]üzükür* in TT VIII C 7. In *kavışur birikür* (BT VIII A 118 and 140), the first aorist may possibly have had an influence on the second one.

Most Old Turkic expansions of *+(X)k-* verbs are causatives. We find *birikür-* (BT I, BT VII A, AbiShotan, ETŞ 13 and QB), *kirikdür-* (Suv), *uçukdur-* (CYK), *ılıkdur-* (Suv), *tärsikdür-* and *adaktur-* (both TuoLuoNi).[109] The standard causative or transitive counterpart of *+(X)k-* verbs, however, is the formation in *+gAr-*, discussed in section 7.53. *yoluk-uş-* appears as hap. in an exceedingly late text, InscrOuig. Cf. also *kükül-* in section 7.31.

All the verbs under this heading are intr., except *antık-* with its internal object *ant* discussed above. As with the other intr. formations, the exs. with no accompanying oblique nominals are nearly as numerous as all the other instances taken together. Such are the sentences quoted under *koŋr+uk-* and *tag+ık-* above. Here are another two: *ymä näçä igidäyü antıkımız ärsär, . . .* (Chuast 104) 'And inasmuch as we have lied and sworn (on it) . . .'; *balıkdakı tagıkmış, tagdakı enmiş* (KT E 12) 'Those who were in towns took to the mountains; those who were in the mountains came down'. With concrete cases we also have a number of instances. Locative: *ünlär kök kalıgta nätäg birikgäli umasar, . . .* (BuddhUig I 199) "So wie z. B. alle Laute sich nicht im Himmel vereinigen können, ebenso . . .". Ablatival locative: *t(a)mgakınta k(a)ra tütün taşıkar* (M II 11,20, text 4) 'Black smoke emerges from her gullet'. Instrumental: *kaŋım kagan yeti yigirmi ärin taşıkmış* (KT E 11) 'My father the *kagan* is said to have set out with 17 men.' *birik-* governs the dative of what something unites with, e.g. in *munı üzä KÖNGÜL töziŋä birikgäli umaz* (BuddhUig I 155). Under *täŋik-* above we quote a passage in which both *birik-* and *täŋik-* are accompanied by *birlä* phrases. In the following, both the locative and the dative are concrete: *täriŋ yinçgä savlarda bilgä biligläri birikmiş ol; täŋridäm köŋülkä birikmäkdä kök täŋri yaŋın kılmış ol* (Ht V 126-30), in the *EDPT* translated as "Their wisdom has been concentrated in deep subtle sayings; by uniting themselves with the divine mind they have acted like heaven itself".

An ex. with two postpositional phrases: *münsüz kadagsız arıgı süzüki üzä alkoçın sınar çavıkdılar* (BT III 390) 'Through their immaculate$_2$ purity$_2$ they were renowned at all quarters'. Most other exs. with *üzä* phrases also refer to such INSTRUMENTS: *näŋ köŋüli adkanguluk kirlär üzä kirikmäsär . . .* (HtPek H1 b5-9) is quoted in footn. 62 in TermBuddh. This is the case also in *yelvi kömän üzä yelvik-* (SuvDrog 475,8) 'to be ensorcelled by wizardry and magic'. Such are also the exs. quoted under *bärKäk-* and *agok-* above. With *ada+k-* 'to get into

108 See Erdal, 1979 a: 105.

distress', however, the source of the action marked by *üzä* can be of the sort which has its own wishes. Distress can be caused by *oŋjın* 'demons' in one case, by *elçi ogrı* in another case. Under *adak-* we also quoted an instance in which the source of distress, *ig käm adası*, appears with ablative suffix.

The present formation differs from the ones in *+U-*, *+(A)d-*, *+(A)r-* and generally also *+I-* in not signifying 'to be or become what the base nominal denotes'; with a few exceptions like the QB's *buln+uk-*, the subjects of *+(X)k-* verbs are not coreferential with the bases of these verbs.

5.45 +(A)r-

Verbs formed with this formative are about as numerous as the *+(A)d-* and the *+(X)k-* verbs. Here they are, listed alphabetically:

(*adart-*, discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs, may come from '*ada+r-*'. Such a verb is not actually attested, however, and cf. *ada+k-* and *ada+k-tur-*).

ak+ar- 'to become white' is, in Old Turkic, attested only in Ernte II 13; it lives on to this day, e.g. in Turkish *ağar-*. Not in the *UW* or the *EDPT*. It should be found out whether there is a semantic difference between this and *(y)ür(ü)ŋar-* and between *ak* and *(y)ürüŋ* or whether the distribution is a matter of dialects.

alar- 'to be dazzled' is attested in Maitr (quoted and translated in the *UW*), in the DLT (q.v. in the *EDPT*) and in UigTot 46, not mentioned in either: *közi alarıp uzun tın alıp* . . . "Das Auge wird geblendet, man nimmt einen langen Atemzug und . . .". I take this verb to come from *al* 'scarlet'; at least, this is the impression one gets from reading the DLT's translation of *alar-t-* (in fol. 629).[110] In any case, this verb should not be confused with *ala+r-*, as the *EDPT* does. *ala+r-* is attested only in DLT fol. 99, where it is mentioned in the sentences *talka alardı* "The sour grapes were varicoloured" and *kişi yeni alardı* "The person's body was leprous". *ala* has the two meanings appropriate for this verb in the DLT.

bagragu+r- appears in QB 6369, in the clause *özüŋ bagragursa, bādūtsā boyun, . . .*, which takes up 6367 a: *ät öz todsa kansa bolur bagragu*. Both base and derivate are written with A in the first syllable in the only ms. extant for the passage. Arat, the editor, and all the other scholars with him, change this to °*u*°, however, due to a spurious attempt at an etymology connecting it with *bugra* 'camel stallion'. There is a discussion of *bag(ı)r+agu* 'aggressive' in section

110 The *EDPT* renders Kāšğarī's translation of *ol aŋar közin alartu* with "He glanced at him with the look of one whose eyes are red with anger", where Dankoff and Kelly are content with "He looked at him askance". Arabic *šazr*, used here, really has both meanings of "askance (look)" and "blodshot with anger (eye)". Since blodshot eyes are likely to be biologically connected with anger, there is no reason to doubt that the Turks made the connection independently.

2.96; it is well-attested in the DLT and in Uigur. The "camel stallion" can be omitted from Dankoff's translation of the QB passage, which should be: 'And if your carnal self becomes aggressive and gets a thick neck, . . .'. As *boyn+agu* 'arrogant, haughty' (q.v. in that same discussion above) shows, 'having a thick neck' was a metaphor for arrogance.[111] Another ex. of this verb should be read in ShōKenkyū III 31: The first word in *bagragurmaklıg ı(ä)rs bilig barça kalınç-larıg kulturdı* wrongly received an L hook under its second Q. Here as in the QB, there is an instance of *bagragu* two lines before the verb.

bälgü+r- 'to become apparent, to appear'. In addition to the *EDPT*'s exs., this verb is found in ETŞ 16,58, 22,28 and 23,12, Suv 273,16, BuddhUig I 28-30, Neujahr 55, Weih 2 and 7, Ht X573 and A20, Ernte 22-23, BT VII A436 and 748, BT VIII B22, UigTot 921, 951 and 1116, UjgStichi 5, CYK 33, DruTür 10, AbitAnk 6, BT XIII 55,4 and 42,21 and elsewhere.

bu+r- 'to turn into steam', hence 'to steam, give odour'. Beside the *EDPT*'s exs. it is found in Neujahr 56, Ht X400 and QB 6625. *bu* is attested in the DLT. (*bus+ar-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 308: *kök busardı* "The sky became covered with mist". *bus* 'mist, fog', the base, is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, Ottoman etc.)

ärmägü+r- 'to be lazy'. *EDPT*; additional exs. appear in BT III 432, Ernte 28 (written *er°*), Warnke 497,[112] ShōAgon B(1) 350 and 352 and ms. Mz 627 (T II S19) b v4 (edited in SktUigBil). *ärmägürmäk* is the opposite of *katıglanmak*. See also the n. to TT II A94. Cf. *ärmägür-mäksiz* in section 3.328 above.

ärmägü is well attested.

äski+r- 'to become shabby, worn out', in the *EDPT* quoted from DLT, Atabatu 'l-Ḥaqā'iq etc. It is attested also in Maitr 52 v16 as *äskirmiş vrxar säŋräm*, and probably found also in Ht V2 a6 as completed in *UW* 206 b top: [*äs*]*kirmişi artamışı* is there said to correspond in this passage to Chin. *xiu*, translated as "verrotten".

(*imär-* 'to teem, to crowd' is derived from *imä* "birlikte yapılan iş, imece" in the n. to Ht X639, which quotes and follows Sevortyan's dictionary. The *EDPT* wants to 'emend' this verb to '*ämgä-*', and under that lemma mentions four exs.; all have the form *imärigmä*. *imärigmä* is attested also in Ht X639 and Suv 437,4. Clauson's proposal is unjustified, although *imä* has not yet turned up in Old Turkic. The derivate *imräm* in the DLT, discussed in the section on *-(X)m*, does not have any content related to suffering either. Its shape is one indication that the formative *+(A)r-* must originally have had the further vowel *A*.)

kadgu+r- 'to grieve, be sorrowful'. Exs. quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*.

111 This is a calque on Persian.

112 Translated also in *UW* 154 b bottom.

kal(a)ŋu+r- 'to rise in the air' is no doubt derived from *kalŋu*, a hap. in the DLT.[113] *kalŋu* is said to signify "floating on the surface of water"; but, as it probably comes from an *-(X)n-* derivate of *kalı-* 'to rise in the air', its meaning must originally have been wider. The verb is discussed by the *EDPT* and found in the *DTS*, in the latter also under *qalaŋγur-*. Add *kalaŋurmak* (BT I D (335) with facs.), *kalaŋurup öçär kılınçım* (ShōKenkyū III 15) and *ögrünç üzä kalŋurmış täg bol-* (thus, BuddhUig II 136.)

kap+ar- 'to form into a blister or a vesicle'. See the *EDPT*, and add *ayaları kaparıp tälinü* from Ernte 32. Cf. *kapar-ma* in section 3.109.

kara+r- 'to be or become black or dark'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in ETŞ 16,64 and 20, HT V 10 a 19, VII 3 b 3 and X 1018, Suv 595,11-18 (quoted in the n. to UigTot 233), Ernte 36 and five times in the QB.

(*karagu+r-* 'to be unable to see' is a hap. in QB 6092, explained in the *EDPT*. *kara+gu* 'blind' (q.v. in section 2.96) is attested also in Uigur.)

kebä+r- 'to swell, to be inflated (of one's belly)' is documented in the *EDPT*. A further ex. can be seen on the facs. of ms. T II T 563 (U 184) r 6 (BT V pl. 39), in fragmentary context. There is enough of the context to make the above meaning unlikely for it. The base does not appear before the XIVth century, and then only in the west.[114]

(*kızar-* 'to be or become red' is not attested before the DLT and the QB, but *kızar-t-*, q.v. below, is well attested earlier. We have no **kız* 'red', buz *kızgan*, *kızıl* and *kızgıl* no doubt also come from it.)

kök+är- 'to be or become blue/grey/green'. *EDPT* from the DLT on; add *kökärip turur körklüg tag* (ETŞ 8,25).

kötgi+r- 'to form a small swelling or protrusion' is a hap. in UigTot 752: *ol üdtä kintik altınınta kötgirip tursar. . . .* Cf. *ibid.* 756: *kintik altınındakı kötgi üzäsintä . . .*; this base is discussed in section 3.110 above.

kurgu+r- 'to be wilful, light-witted or conceited'. *EDPT* s.v. '*korğur-*' from the DLT and *DTS* s.v. *quryurmaq* from TT VIII A (Brāhmī, which fixes the first vowel). In its entry for *čökmäk* the *DTS* quotes a form '*qorqurmaq*' from the Suv; the context makes it probable that this is also the same verb. *bütmädük baxşılarnıŋ yörügi ärsär kurgurmaklıglarnıŋ nomı ärür* (BuddhUig I 380) has been read as if it were *kork-un-*. The facs. shows that both readings are possible, and I prefer the former: *korkun-* does not fit the context, as Tekin admits. Note that all three Uigur exs. are in *-mAk*. The base is found in the DLT (see the *EDPT*) and the QB (q.v. in the *DTS*.)

113 See *kalıŋula-* under the *+lA-* verbs and footn. 28 thereto for more details. The sequence /lŋ/ obtains also in *alŋ+ad-*, q.v. above.

114 Intervocalic [b] belongs to the phoneme /p/; the phoneme /b/ has the intervocalic allophone [v].

(*kūz+ār-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 308: *ūd kūzārdi* "The autumn season began".) *sar(ı)g+ar-* 'to be or become yellow'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *sarıgaru turur* 'keeps getting yellow' (ETŞ 11,38) and *sargaru bış-* (U IV D 124), a phrase similar to *yürüŋärü bış-* (q.v. below under *yürüŋ+är-*). A further ex. appears in M III 46,1$_1$ (text 35).

tank+ar- is found in TuoLuoNi 50: *kuan] şi im bodis(a)tv InçIp . . . közünür;* tanuklayu *ta[n]karu InçA tep ayur* 'The bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara then appears . . . and, giving attestations and pledges, says the following:'. P. Zieme (personal communication) has suggested reading this verb also in BT III 884. We then get: *Darmaruçi atl(ı)g elig xan ärdükünüz üzä tankarunız Mayıri ieıgäli* 'By being the king D. you have testified that you are named Maitreya'. The ed. read *'tanan-'* with impossible etymology. *tankar-* no doubt comes from *tanu-k* 'witness'. It should therefore basically signify 'to propose oneself as witness', whereas *tanuk+la-* is 'to bring forth evidence'. Cf. *tankar-ıg* above and the hap. *tankar-ış-* below.

taŋla+r- is a hap. in IrqB XXVI in the phrase *taŋ taŋlardı* 'It dawned'. Need not be taken to be an error:[115] Cf. *tün+ār-* and *tün kara+r-dı* on the one hand, and *tün+lā*, *tün+çülā* and Chuv. *kăntărla* (from *küntüz*) on the other. There is also a verb *taŋ+la-*, but it too is a hapax.

(*taz+ar-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 307: *tazardı näŋ* "The thing became bald or scabby". Note that Kāšġarī (fol. 509) makes *taz* qualify not only persons, but also horses, sheep and places, with various meanings.)

tılaŋu+r-mak 'eloquence' is quite common, but the *+(A)r-* verb itself is not attested. Beside what is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, *tılaŋurmak* appears in BT II 569, 650 and 1072, Suv 69,20, BT VIII A 186 and BT VIII Anh. 2-3,18 and Buddhāv H 59 and 84. *tınlaŋurmak* in CYK 39 is an error. Cf. *tılaŋurmaklıg* in ĀgFrag (1) E 4. *tıl+aŋu* is discussed in section 2.96 above.

(*toz+ar-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 527, in *toz tozardı* "The dust rose up".)

tün+är- signifies 'to be or become dark (of a place, of day or of one's eyes)' in the DLT and QB exs. quoted in the *EDPT*. All three Uigur exs., however, refer to 'a person's being in the (metaphorical) dark'. One of these latter is quoted in the *EDPT*; the other two are *tünärmäz saçılmaz dyan* 'thought which does not get obscured or scattered' (ETŞ 20,54) and, from Ht VII 11 a 20: *ırak tıdılıp bilgsiz bilig üzä, yakın tünärip kertü nom tözintä, burxan tözi ätözdä ärdükin bilü umaz biz*. Six of the QB instances of *tünär-* are not mentioned in the *EDPT*. *tünär-ig* (an *-(X)g* nominal) is very common.

tüpi+r- 'of the weather, to be stormy'. In KP written with W and not WY in the first syllable; cf. however e.g. *ibid.* II 4, where *böz* is written as BWZ.

115 As the *EDPT* tacitly does s.v. '1 *taŋla:*'.

(*tüz+är-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 307-8: *yer tüzärdi* "The ground became flat".)
(*yala+r-mak* is a hap. in Suv as mentioned by the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. 'to make false accusations', from *yala* 'false accusation or blame'.)
yaŋku+r- 'to resound'. The *EDPT* quotes two Uigur exs. with this meaning, and cf. *yaŋkur-t-*. Add [*on*] *yıŋak yaŋkurar* (MaitrH X 5 b20), *ünä yaŋkurar* (Maitr 153 v30, MaitrH XI 13 a6-7 and Maitr 145 r9 = MaitrH XI 10 b8-9. The DLT, however, translates *yaŋkur-* differently. 'to echo, to resound', *yaŋkur-* in Uigur, is *yaŋku+la-* in Qarakhanid Turkic; see the *EDPT* for this.
yaş+ar- 'to become green and/or moist'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in BuddhUig II 503, Weih 7, ms. TM 155 r3 (quoted in the n. to BT V 458 mistranslated), and in QB 1807 and 1810.
(*yaşaŋur-* appears in DLT fol. 620: Of the eyes, to be "dazzled from the sun's rays and tear". No doubt derived from *yaş* 'tears' and a formational parallel to *tılaŋu+r-*. The aorist form given for this verb by Atalay, the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly is a conjecture; it is also incorrect, as we shall see below. The ms. contracts the aorist to YAŠA'NKUR. Interestingly, the aorist of this verb appears in the same contracted form also in the Rylands interlinear Coran translation. Tezcan identified these as the instances of the same verb in his review of the edition of the latter work in *TDAYB* 1978/9: 291, but was wrong in taking the form to be an error.)
(*y*)*ürüŋ+är-* 'to be or become white'. In the *EDPT* quoted from Suv and the DLT. The converb in the following also represents this verb: *ötrü M*(*a*)*hendrasenı elig öz tirä*[*nip*][116] *ätözintäki kaparmış ätin yara bıçıp ak*[*a*] *kälmiş sül suvın iglig ärkä içürüp yänä ọk ätözintäki yurüŋärü bışa kälmiş ätin tançu tançu üzüp . . .* (U III 45,14). Cf. *sargaru bış-*, mentioned above.[117] Add also *kuzgun täg öŋlüg k*(*a*)*ra* [. . . *y*]*ürüŋärmäki mäŋigü InçA bolz*[*un*] (M III 46,3$_1$, text 35) 'May the whitening of the black, raven-faced [. . .] take place forever.'

For later *+(A)r-* verbs see Schakir, 1933: 30-32. Cf. footn. 1 to the n. to TT I which mentions that *+(A)r-* is added to names of colours in Uigur (while there more variation in later stages of Turkic). Beside this group, the bases of *+(A* verbs do not appear to have anything semantic in common. A number of ve dealt with above are hapax legomena in the DLT or the QB; others, however very common in Uigur.

The converb and aorist vowels of *+(A)r-* verbs vary. I therefore list al evidence available, first for stems ending with the phoneme sequence *°Ar-*

116 My conjecture; see *tirä-n-* below.
117 The *EDPT* takes this instance to be the directive of *yurun* 'patch, piece of cloth'. The common directive, however, is hardly ever abstract. Front vowels (with the obvious exc /ä/) are practically never written as such after initial y. Flesh, of course, looses its r cooking, becoming white.

(al+ar-ur DLT)
(ala+r-ur DLT)
(bus+ar-ur DLT)
kap+ar-u käl- U III 41,0, Mahendrasena; *kap+ar-ur* DLT
kara+r-u kurı- Ernte 36; *kara+r-u* [BT XIII 2,59; *kara+r-ur* DLT; QB 5347 and 5634
(kızar-ur DLT)
(kök+är-ür DLT)
(küz+är-ür DLT)
sarg+ar-u tur- ETŞ 11,38; *sarg+ar-u bış-* U IV D 124; *sarg+ar-ur* U I 37,13, Töten
ta[n]k+ar-u . . . ay- TuoLuoNi 50
(taz+ar-ur DLT)
(tün+är-ür DLT)
(tüz+är-ür DLT)
yaş+ar-ur Weih 7; ms. TM 155 r3 quoted in the footn. to BT V 458; DLT; *yaş+ar-u[r]* M III 20,10$_1$ (text 8)
yµrüŋ+är-ü bış- U III 45,14, Mahendrasena; *ürŋ+är-ür* DLT

As can be seen, all the forms listed above have /U/ as converb and aorist vowel.

Not so when the stem does *not* end in °*Ar-*:

b(ä)lgü+r-ä Warnke 110; *b(ä)lgürā y(ą)rlıka-* M III 35,15 (text 15);[118] USp 101,4; Suv 3,6; Weih 2 and Shō VI a 9 and XIV b 11. *bälgü+r-är* Windgott 11; TT VI 322,[119] 328 and eleven times in ls. 405-420; U II 5,3 and 6,5 (Lalitavistara); Maitr 70 r8 and, quoted out of the *nidāna* series in the Maitr, U II 8,15 and 9,1; BT I B (216); ETŞ 12,37; Suv 52,20; 74,20; 364,18-19; 367,15 and 374,13; Ht X573; UigTot 357[120] and 951; DLT and QB. The only exceptions are the following, all from rather late texts: *bälgürü y(a)rlıka-* U II 79,55 (Üdrät),[121] BT III 1102 and ShōAv 231; *bälgürür* UigTot 1116.[121]
bu+r-a Ht IV 175, V 146 and X 400 and TT I 193; *bu+r-ar* DLT and QB 6625
(ärmägü+r-är DLT)
(äski+r-ür DLT, an exception; spelled without *wāw*. The *EDPT* mentions an instance from the Atabatu 'l-Ḥaqā'iq where the mss. waver between *äskirär* and *äskirür*.)
kadgu+r-ar M II 8,6 (text 3), DLT and QB 1233; *kadgu+r-a* QB 5445
(kurgu+r-ar DLT)
tüpi+r-är KP XVIII 2 and DLT

118 Passage quoted also in U I p. 57.
119 The eds. mention *bälgürür* in one ms. among ten; it is not clear to me whether this is the ms. published as USp 99, which also has *bälgürür* (on l.2).
120 Clearly visible on the facs.; the printed text should be corrected.
121 Clearly visible on the facs.

yaŋku+r-ar TT I 135, Maitr 153 v30, MaitrH XI 10 b8-9 (= Maitr variant 145 v9 wrongly *yaŋkurur*) and 13 a6-7 and DLT.

Here, with insignificant exceptions, the converb and aorist vowel is /A/. This alternation between the two vowels in the converb and aorist suffixes does not appear with derived tr. stems ending in °*r*-: (Deverbal) *-Ur-*, *-Ar-*, *-gUr-*, *-ŋUr-* *-tUr-* and the (denominal) *+gAr-* verbs, mostly causatives, consistently show *-(U)r*. Other °*r*- formatives, however, have *-(A)r*: Thus the onomatopoeics in *+kIr-* or *+kXr-* discussed in section 5.31, the DLT's intr. *+gIr-* (discussed as an appendix to section 6.3) and verb classes expressing special modes of event, process or behaviour, formed with *-çIr-* and *-gIr-*. *-gIr-*, which forms tr. as well as intr. verbs (as consistent with its function) is not an Old Turkic formative: It is documented only in the DLT. Otherwise, transparently derived °*r*- verbs which have /A/ as converb and aorist vowel are all intr. What about opaque bisyllabic °*r*- stems? The tr. ones (mentioned below in connection with *-Ur-* and *-Ar-*) fluctuate, as do the intr. ones. Exs. for bisyllabic opaque °*r*- verbs are *yalvar-* 'to beg and pray' and *yakar-*, the rare synonym and biverb-mate of *yalvar-*. *yakar-* today lives on in Republican Turkish, but in Old Turkic appears only in *yalvaru yakaru* in TuoLuoNi 372. *yalvar-u* can otherwise be found in Suv 10,11, TT IV A 7,[122] ETŞ 13,146, BT VII B 101 and Warnke 726, *yalvarur* in BT VIII A 210,[123] IrqB LIV, Suv 10,15 and the DLT. *yalvar-a*, on the other hand, appears in Ht VII 2099 (= 22 b 20), U II 79,52 (Üdrät), TT IV A 13, Kuan 40[124] and QB (thrice, with no variants in the mss.), *yalvar-ar* in M II 10,2$_1$ (text 4) and r9 of the ms. published in footn. 3 of ChuastBeitr. *älvir-* 'to rave',[125] with aorist *älvirär* in DLT fol. 120, *ögir-* 'to rejoice' and *tälmir-* 'to throw expectant, longing or intense glances' are intr. opaque °*Ir*- verbs.[126] Exs. for *ögirä* and *ögirär* are quoted in Erdal, 1979: 154, there taken to characterise early texts. Another feature of the texts showing the converb and aorist vowel /A/ with *ögir-* is that they are runic (nine times in the IrqB) or Manichaean (thrice). All texts with /U/ are Buddhist: *ögirü* in Maitr 407 b v3, ETŞ 13,191, UigBlock 7, Ht V 226 and X 312 and 364, *ögirür* in Suv 151,19, 152,5, 153,5 and 517,9 (= U I 27,2) and ETŞ 14,16. *ögirä(r)* does appear to have been the original variant, however, as the texts in which it is found are, in general, more

122 And then *yalvara* five lines further down!? Both instances are followed by /ö/. We are given no facss. with this text.

123 The four last-mentioned exs. do not appear in the dictionaries.

124 Thus in the ms. read by Ş. Tekin. The other ms. is quoted by Radloff as *yalvaru*.

125 See the *UW s.v. alvır-* and BT XIII 2,48 (which has *älvirgü* with front-vowel [g]) with footn. DL fol. 120 writes the infinitive of this verb both with *kāf* and with *qāf*. *ol anıŋ yüziŋä AlwIrdI* is the translated as "He snapped back at him as though he wanted a quarrel".

126 Footn. 443 in vol. 1 proposes a possibly far-fetched etymology for *tälmir-*; a direct base for it is any case, not attested.

archaic. *tälmirü* is attested only in BT XIII 19,111 (see facs.).[127] *tälmirä*, on the other hand, appears in Suv 637,9, QB 6634 and, in Maitr fr. 105,[128] in the phrase *tälmirä közin*; this belongs to a pattern discussed in n. 506 below. We also have *tälmirärlär* in Suv 640,12 and *tälmirär* in the DLT.

+U-, *+I-*, *+(A)d-* and *+(X)k-* stems are expanded mostly with causative formatives. *+(A)r-* has only causative verbal expansion. Not counting *adart-*, which has no attested base, we find *alart-* (DLT only), *bälgürt-*, *karart-*, *kızart-*, *tünärt-* (hap. in the QB), *yaŋkurt-* and *yaşart-*. Nominal derivates from *+(A)r-* verbs are quite few: I can think of *kapar-ma*, *karar-ıg*, *tünär-ig* and *tankar-ıg* and of several nominalised *-mAk* forms.

+(A)r- verbs appear frequently with no accompanying oblique nominal expression. Here are a few exs.: *yıdı yıparı bura turur* (TT I 193) 'Its scent and perfume keep on rising'. *çıku taşın inçkä sokup lalap bakır eşiçtä sargargınça kagurup kün-çit yagınka* (thus!) *bulgap* . . . (Heilk I 173) 'Crush the *çıku* stone to dust, roast it in a copper pot until it gets yellow, blend it with sesame oil, . . .'. *ürän yaşaru*[r] *yadılur* (M III 20,10-11$_1$, text 8) 'The seed gets moist and green, and spreads'. It is not rare for concrete cases to accompany an *+(A)r-* verb. E.g.: *tümän ban yerdä yaŋkurar süzök suv tigisi* (TT I 135) 'The din of limpid water resounds in ten thousands of places'. An instance with an ablative: *yuŋräkdäki xuŋ ujikdin ujiklär bälgürüp* . . . (BT VII A 436). One ex. with a local dative is quoted above s.v. *imär-*. Instances of *kötgi+r-* and *tün+är-* with locative are quoted above when dealing with these verbs, and a further one can be found in BuddhUig I 28-30.

We have no exs. with direct objects. An ex. with an *üzä* phrase appears in the *DTS*: *ol täŋri kızı bo nomlug yarlıgıg eşidü täginip ögrünç sävinç üzä ärtiŋü uz kalaŋgurup* . . . (Suv 372,3) 'When that divine girl had the experience of hearing this commandment she jumped up for joy in a very skillful manner and . . .'. This *üzä* phrase represents the reason and context of the girl's action, and not its instigator.

Verbs formed with *+(A)r-* are intr. in the strictest sense, then: They never fade into the passive, nor into the transitive.

+(A)r- stems have one, two or three syllables. Surprisingly many of them are formed from bases ending in *°gU*. Even disregarding *karagur-*, which is a *hapax* in the QB, we still have *bälgür-*, *ärmägür-*, *kadgur-*, *bagragur-* and *kurgur-*. To these we might add *yaŋkur-*, which has a *°kU* base, and *kal(a)ŋur-* and *tılaŋur-*, perhaps also *yaşaŋur-*, as verbs formed from *°ŋU* nominals. Another conspicuous group

127 Zieme has no explanation for the third part in *El Çakır Şal*, the name of the scribe or the commissioner of the ms. It may, I think, be a Mo. variant of *şila* from Skt. *śīlavant*, with the 'breaking' of */i/* and syncopation of final vowels characteristic of late Mo.

128 Quoted in the n. to TT I 46.

are the derivates from colour names, *(y)ürüŋ+är-*, *ak+ar-*, *kara+r-*, *kızar-*, *al+ar-*, *kök+är-*, *sarg+ar-* and perhaps *yaş+ar-* (cf. Turkish *yeşer-*!). *+(A)r-* verbs generally do signify 'to be or become, to form or turn into what the base nominal denotes'. One well-attested exception is *kadgur-*; *kadgu* is an abstract, not employed for reference to sorrowful persons.

5.5 The verbal expression of lack and loss: *+s(ɪ)rA-*

For reasons given below, the entries for this formative will mention all evidence for a vowel after the *+s°*, and give information on the existence of a *+sXz* derivate from the base.

(*baş+sıra-* is a hap. in QB 4329: *karnı todsa tili başsırar* "Once a . . . man fills his belly, his tongue loses its head". For this metaphorical use, the Indeks gives the wrongly tr. translation "başsız bırakmak". *baş+sız* is, among other places, used in the QB itself, also metaphorically.)

el+sirä- 'to lose its social and political structure (of a people)' and *elsirä-t-*, q.v. below, are always written with °S²R²°. '*elsiz*' does not seem to be attested. *elsirä-* is a hap. in KT, quoted in the *EDPT*. *elsirä-t-* is attested thrice, also in the inscriptions.

enç+sirä- 'to be uneasy, full of anxiety' is attested several times in a late text in USp, quoted in the *EDPT*. Also in *tünläsintä yänä ençsirämäkin ençsirap uudımaz ärdi* (Warnke 21) and *nägülük munı täg ençsirayur s(ä)n tep ol bayagut oglı tıltagındakı ençsirägülük sablarıg keŋürü sözlädi* (TuoLuoNi 225-7). Cf. *ençsirä-t-* below. There are nine exs. of the two verbs together, and eight of them are written with explicit °i°. See *ençsiz* in the *EDPT*.

kagan+sıra- 'to lose one's *kagan*', a hap. in KT, quoted in the *EDPT*. It and *kagansıra-t-* are both spelled with °S¹R¹°. I do not remember having come across *kagan+sız*, but *kaganlıg bodun* appears in the same KT passage.

kut+sıra- 'to lack blessing' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. A Suv instance is quoted in the *DTS*, and we have *kutsıramış artamış elig uluşug kutadtur-* in ShōAv 320. Cf. *kutsıratılmış* (ETŞ 10) below. All exs. are given with explicit I. See *kutsuz* in the *EDPT*.

küç+sirä- 'to lack or lose strength'. See *küçsüz* in the *EDPT*. Exs. for *küçsir* *ibid.*, and *DTS* s.v. '*kevil- küčsirä-*' in particular. *kävil- küçsirä-* appears also Suv 588,4, quoted in the *UW*, 206 a middle. Found in Heilk I and a number times in the Suv, always written with I.

ög+sirä- 'to become or be unconscious, to faint; to lose one's head'. *ögsüz* ex Exs. for the verb can be found in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, the latter also u *ögsirämäk*. Further exs. in LautHöllen 40, UigTot 567, ShōAgon 1,350

TuoLuoNi 85. All these instances are spelled with I in the second syllable; so are all the Suv exs. as quoted by the editors and in the dictionaries. Both dictionaries misquote *KP* LXI 6, however, where the text has *°srā°* (cf. facs.). *ögsirā-t-* (q.v. below) is also spelled with explicit /i/.

söz+sirā- 'to shut up'. Not in the dictionaries. Hap. in BT I D (188), written with explicit *°i°*. I have not come across *'söz+sūz'*.

tatıg+sıra- EDPT and *DTS*. Attested in M III text 8, written T'TQSR'-, and in Suv. The former instance should be translated as 'His intellect loses its taste (for things)'. The Suv context is also served better with a metaphorical rendering. *tatıgsız* is found first in the QB.

tın+sıra- 'to lose one's breath'. Found twice in Suv, both exs. in biverbs with *ögsirā-* (q.v. above). A third ex. of the biverb is *ögsirāp tınsırap* in TuoLuoNi 85. Cf. *ögsirā-t- tınsıra-t-* below. All sources write *°sır°*. Cf. *tınsız* in the *EDPT*.

(tūp+sirā-t-ū is a hap. in BT I D (321), clearly written with explict *°i°*. 'to deprive of a base'. No *+sIrA-* stem is attested for this. Not mentioned in the dictionaries. See *tūpsūz* in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, the latter also s.v. *ulsuz*.)

tūş+sirā- 'to become fruitless'. *DTS* s.v. *tätiysïra-*, with which it appears as a biverb. Hap. in the Suv, not mentioned in the *EDPT*. Cf. *tūşsūz* in the *EDPT*.

(umug+sıra-t-maz is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 342. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. 'to make one lose hope'. No *+sIrA-* stem attested. The I is explicit. *umugsuz*, q.v. in the *EDPT*, is common.)

(urug+s·ra-t- 'to deprive someone of progeny'. Hap. in KT E10; does not appear in BQ, as implied in the *EDPT* s.v. Spelled W $R^1G^1S^1R^1T^1Y^1I\ N^2$; between S^1 and R^1 there should, according to this spelling, be either /u/ or /a/ or nothing.[129] *urugsuz* is quoted by the *EDPT* only from the QB but is perhaps found also in QaraBalg c6.[130])

The bases for this formation are mono- or bisyllabic nouns, in three cases belonging to the *-(X)g* formation. *+s(I)rA-* verbs are not numerous at all, but the formation has remained productive from the runic monuments all the way through Qarakhanid and the latest Uigur. A still later ex. is *uyuxısıra-* 'ʏachynde' i.e. 'waking' in the Codex Comanicus. For modern exs. see Schakir, 1933: 44-45. Another aspect worth mentioning about this formation is the fact that none of the verbs is really common. Among eleven *+s(I)rA-* verbs actually attested (i.e. disregarding the *+sIrAt-* verbs also quoted here), five are hap. legomena, two appear twice and the rest not more than eight times. The three *+s(I)rAt-* verbs quoted here because the corresponding *+s(I)rA-* stem is unknown are also all attested a single time.

129 See Meyer, 1965-6.

130 As $W\ L^1W\ R^1G^1S^1Z\ :B^2I\ L^2G^2[$ i.e. perhaps *ol urugsuz bilg[* or *bilig[*.

Ever since V. Thomsen,[131] the formative in question has been related to *+sXz*. It must be remarked that the vowel of the nominal formative is /X/, while has no explicit I in the earlier sources: KT, M III text 8, KP, both in runic and Uigur writing. Omission of vowels is not rare in Uigur texts and not especially noteworthy; in the present case, however, the linguistic reality of this absence is backed up by inscriptional evidence: especially the way *urugs°ratayın* is written. A possible explanation could be that *+sIrA-* was originally **+sXz+A-*. As so often happens in *+A-* derivation, the final vowel of the base was syncopated, resulting in **+szA-*. The two sibilants were apparently dissimilated and, in later texts, an anaptyctic vowel appeared. A zetacistic explanation is also possible. Cf. the discussion of *kösürKän* 'mole' in section 2.44. See also the DLT hap. *tuvra-* in section 5.11.

+s(I)rA- stems allowed of expansion only with *-(X)t-*, there being nine *+s(I)rA-t-* verbs (including *kutsıratıl-*).

Hardly any *+s(I)rA-* verbs are accompanied by any nominals except such as refer to the agent. Here is a biverb from Suv 619,18: *anı körüp ök āt' özlārin ol sünük üzā kämişip ögsirāp tınsırap kamıltılar* 'The moment they saw that, they threw themselves on that bone and fell over, fainting and losing their breath'. Here is an ex. from a Manichaean text: *bilgā biligi tat(ı)gsrayur; biligsizin yorıyur* (M III 18,12$_1$, text 8), translated above. The only oblique nominals which ever accompany these verbs are two instrumentals and one *tāg* phrase. *[bu]suşlug [ā]mgākin [ö]gsirāyürlār* (LautHöllen 40) is one instrumental; another one (in fact a *figura etymologica*) is quoted above under *ençsirā-*. So is *nägülük munı tāg ençsirāyür s(ā)n* 'Why are you so nervous?'.

The fact that *+s(I)rAt-* verbs are of about the same number as *+s(I)rA-* verbs may mean that the two formations formed an in a sense symmetrical couple: Lack or loss vs. deprivation. The occasional correlation of *+s(I)rA-* with *+lAn-*, dealt with next, parallels the *+sXz* : *+lXg* opposition.

5.6 +lAn-

There is no doubt that this formative is compounded of *+lA-* with *-(X)n-*, but it has a behaviour of its own: a composite denominal intr. formative. Even where

131 In the introduction to his edition of KT and BQ, p. 32.

132 Forms like Y^{1}W L^{1}S^{2}Z N^2 and B^{1}W N̊GS^{2}Z in Toñ 35 and 48 respectively are not in conflict with the /X/: Instances in Toñ (and elsewhere as well) of S^2 used where we would expect back-vocalic /s/, also adjacent to /a/ and /u/, are given e.g. in Tekin, 1968: 40 top. The only explicit /I/ I know of in this suffix is *buŋsız* written with °S^{2}I Z in YE 26,7.

+lA- derivates from the same nominals exist, the *+lAn-* lexemes can be shown to have been derived from these independently.

agız+lan-, a hap. in the early text Gebet, must have signified 'to be recited'; thus now translated correctly in *UW* 251a. Dealt with in the *UW* s.v. *agazlan-*, which is what the ms. actually has. Not related to the DLT's *agız+la-*, which is said to signify either "to make a mouth for a canal" or "to strike someone on the mouth" (fol. 152).

alp+lan-mak is described in the *UW*, translated as "Kriegshandwerk; Heroismus". Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. No *+lA-* derivate from *alp* is attested. The *UW* has three Ht exs. for this lexeme, and thinks the synonymous *alpal-*, which it quotes as a hap. in Suv, may perhaps be an error for this. There is, however, also an Ht ex. of *alpal-* (q.v. in the chapter on *-(X)l-* below). At least one of the *UW* instances of *alplan-*, *alp[lan]makka* in par. B, may therefore also be read as *alpal-*.

ayançaŋ+lan- is a hap. in BT VIII B 219 in a biverb with *aya-*. It presumably means 'to revere', since its base signifies 'reverent'. It is quoted in the *UW*. See the base in section 2.95 above.

az+lan- In addition to the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. 2 *a:zlan-*, found in Genzan D r 12, Maitr 13 r 2, BT VIII B 82, ShōAgon 2,2, p. 191, 4_2 and 8_2, UigTot 112, 116-7, 117, 119 and 1275, BT XIII 13,93 and Suv 266,20 and 319,21 (the last two quoted in the *DTS*). In Suv 16,9 (not mentioned in the dictionaries) read *ädkä tavarka azlanmagıl* with SuvLeg p. 156, and not *'ädgü tavarka . . .'*. As explained in the n. to BT XIII 13,93, the ex. there, a paraphrase of Suv 136,15, appears to come from *az* 'few, scanty, a little' and to signify 'to be mean and/or stingy': It deals with the giving of alms. A number of other instances, however, cannot but signify 'to be greedy', pointing towards *āz* 'greed, lust' as base. This is F. W. K. Müller's translation of the verb, favoured also by the *EDPT*. This latter must be the correct translation e.g. in *altı ädkangularka azlanmak bodulmak* in the Genzan ex., or in *bulmayukug* (or: *ḫolmayukug*, better) *bulgalı azlantaçı biligsiz bilig* (Suv 319,21). The UigTot 112-119 passage definitely speaks for this interpretation as well, and is so translated. Note also the biverb *azlan- küni+lä-* in UigTot 1275 and Suv 220,4 and the binome *azlanmaksız yapşınmaksız* in BT II 1362-3. The Suv 136,15 passage (followed by BT XIII 13,93) would seem to represent a reinterpretation of the verb by 'popular etymology' and not a different verb; all other instances can be accomodated with the derivation from *āz*. Qarakhanid Turkic, on the other hand, does have a different verb *azlan-* connected with *az* 'little, few': *azla-n-* 'to despise' in QB 305 and DLT fol. 151 from *az+la-* 'to belittle, to consider few' (QB 3231 and 3234, ignored by the *EDPT*). The latter is an *-(X)n-* derivate whereas the Uigur lexeme is a *+lAn-* verb with no attested verbal base.

batıg+lan- is a hap. in *v(ı)rxarka yakın batıglanmazunlar* in Maitr 174 v12. It probably signifies 'to empty one's bowels' and not 'sich beschmutzen' as translated in BT IX 175,12$_2$: Although formally derived from *bat-ıg* 'swamp, bog' (q.v. above), it is semantically akin to *batıg+lık* 'toilet'. There is no related *+lA-* verb.

baz+lan- is a hap. in Tes 11 as interpreted by T. Tekin in *AOH* XLII (1988): 115: *Tabgaça bazlanmış* 'became a subordinate ally of China'. *baz* is attested already in Orkhon, but there is no *+lA-* derivate from it.

bokok+lan- is attested in one Manichaean source and in the DLT, dealt with in the *EDPT*. The Manichaean passage is quoted in *UW* 68b s.v. *agırlıg* A,b with the spelling of the verb adopted here. A *+lA-* derivate is not attested at all, *bokok* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) from the DLT on. 'to come into bud'.

çeçäk+län- 'to flower'. Earliest occurences in an obscure passage in TT VIII P and in the DLT. No *+lA-* verb attested.

çog+lan- 'to become scorching hot, to blaze or glow'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Further exs. in BT III 1018, 1026, 1034 and 1042 and SuvStockh 74 ("glänzen die Könige herrlich", metaphorically). *çog* itself has both the concrete and the metaphorical meaning. There is no related *+lA-* verb.

ärk+län-[mä]kim was reconstructed in TT II 1 (quoted in the *EDPT*) in a biverb with *b(ä)gädmäk(ı)m*. The same couple, *bägädmäk ärklänmäk*, has turned up in another Manichaean text, DreiPrinz 67. 'to be powerful'. No related *+lA-* verb exists; cf. *ärk+sin-* (tr.).

ärkäç+län- 'to surge in waves' is attested in Suv 630,17 (quoted in the *DTS*) in a biverb with *yaykal-*; in Ht IV 210, BT VII A 240, HtPek 99 a 6 quoted in *UW* 152 a s.v. *antag* A,d, Ht V 12 b 12-13, HtPek H 1 b 5-9 quoted in n. 62 of BuddhTerm, HtPek 83 v 6 and 84 v 3 mentioned in a n. to Ht IV 210, HtPar 171,13 quoted in *UW* 199a, mid-page, UigKan 87 and HtPar 131,6-7 quoted together with HtFragm II 25. Cf. also *ärkäçlän-tür-* below. In view of all these, Warnke 296 should be completed as *[ärkä]çlänürlär*, and not as '*[örkü]çlänürlär*' as done there, and BT I B 88 as *ögüznüŋ [ärkäç]länmaki* and not as the ed. writes; '*örgüçlänmäki*' in *UW* 124a is misleading. The exs. of M III 9,3$_2$ and 10,16$_1$ can also be read as *[ä]rküçlän-*, as the first vowel is torn away in the ms. in both cases. The DLT has this verb in fols. 157 and 60, the former quoting the verb as lemma and the latter its nominal base. There is, there, good evidence of *ärküç* 'wave' and *ärküçlän-* and slightly weaker evidence for *ärkäçlän-*, the form given throughout by Dankoff and Kelly.[133] There is no evidence for '*örküçlän-*', the form favoured by the *EDPT*. The preference of the second

133 In all, the DLT has four instances of the verb, one of its base. In these five, the first vowel is explicitly written as *ä* in two cases by the first hand and as *ö* in three cases by the second hand. The

hand of the DLT ms. for this last variant may be explained by the adjacent appearance of the lemmata *örKūçlän-* 'to acquire a braid' and *örKūç* 'braid, tuft'. We have spelled both base and verb with *k* throughout, as Old Turkic morphophonemics seems to demand; there is no actual evidence for not writing *g* instead. While the Manichaean and Qarakhanid verb comes from *ärkūç* 'wave', the base of the Buddhist verb is *ärkäç*: This latter is the lexeme for 'he-goat' (q.v. in the *EDPT*). A noun *örgüç* denoting 'a camel's hump' and similar objects comes up in Middle Turkic, but is by no means identical with the DLT's word for 'wave', which was the base to our verb. Possibly, etymologically opaque *ärküç*, supported by the form of the verb in the archaic Manichaean source, was the original base of the present verb. *ärkäçlän-* may then have come up through popular etymology: Cf. *irkäk+län-* below and consider how young goats hop around.

enç+län- 'to be or live in peace' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the QB. It is, among other places, found in ShōAgon 1,211,] *korkup k(ä)ntü öz'iençlänmätin* . . . Cf. *enç+sirä-*.

ilgäysök+län- 'to become shrewd at something'. Hap. in ETŞ 10,81: *al altaglarta ilgäysöklänü / atyantik bolup* . . . 'He became a master at guiles and . . .'. The base is discussed in section 2.93 above.

irkäk+län- is found only in the DLT and in TT VIII P. In the latter, the context gives no clue as to the meaning. DLT fol. 159 has the translations 'to be wavy (of water); to shudder (of the skin); to pretend to be manly (of a man)'. The first vowel is clear in Brāhmī (TT VIII); the DLT ms. has both *fatḥa* and *kasra*, the former (i.e. an *ä*) probably being by a later hand. The third meaning in the DLT is etymologically unproblematic, but the first two need not be due to "a muddle" either, as the *EDPT* writes: A parallel for some metaphorical use would be *ärkäç+län-*, q.v. above. *irk+äk* is discussed in section 2.11 above; it has no *+lA-* derivate.

kan+lan- 'to get themselves a khan (of a nation)'. Hap. in Toñ; no related *+lA-* verb attested. See this in the *EDPT*.

katıg+lan- 'to exert oneself' is documented in the *EDPT* from runic, Manichaean, Buddhist, Qarakhanid and later texts. Additional exs. need not be mentioned, as they are exceedingly numerous. *katıgla-* has been read only in Uigur script and rarely: in Ht V 152, UigTot 980 and BT VIII A 11. These should be defective spellings of *katıglan-*, as often happens in such graphic circumstances in Uigur mss.; a semantic difference is not detectable either.

käk+län- 'to feel hate'. *öçäyü käklänü* appears in ETŞ 13,138: Hap., not men-

second vowel is explicitly written as *ū* by the first hand in two instances, not written at all in one instance, as *ā* by the first hand in one instance and as *ū* by the second hand in one instance.

tioned in the dictionaries. Cf. the expression *öçä- käk sür-* in the QB, and see *öç+ä-* above. A *+lA-* derivate from *käk* is not attested.

käm+län- 'to be or become ill' is by the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. It appears also in ms. T II D 523, l.2, edited in the n. to TT VII 30 (quoted in the *DTS*). The DLT is the only source for a verb *käm+lä-* which, the author says, has the same meaning as *käm+län-* and is an alternative for it.

kıvırkak+lan- 'to be grasping'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. In Suv, biverb with *az+lan-*. Then we have, in BT XIII 13,92, *nom boşıta kıvırkaklanmak* in parallel to *äd tavar boşıta azlanmak*. No *+lA-* form has turned up. Cf. *kıvırkan-* in section 5.2 and *kıvırkak* in section 3.102.

kişi+län- 'to take for a wife' is a hap. in Maitr 5 r 2. There is no '*kişi+lä-*'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. BuddhKat (Tibetan script) 4 and a Brāhmī ex. in the n. to it show that *kişi* was in Uigur not only 'person' but also 'wife'.[134]

körk+län- 'to become beautiful' is attested in Mängi 23 (*kümüşlüg tag täg körklänü* "wie ein silberner Berg schön wird") and ETŞ 10,275 but is not mentioned in the dictionaries. Cf. *körklän-tür-* below. The hap. *körk+lä-* in TT I 4 has the same meaning as *körklän-*, does not seem too dependable and may be an error for *körkl(ä)n-*; this possibility is considered also by the editor. In Heilk II p. 402, *körklän-* is 'to become well (of health)'. Cf. *körk+äd-* below.

xua+lan-: *bo yertinçülärdäki näçä sögütlär ıgaçlar otlar yaşlar ärsär üdsüz kolosuz yäşärip xu⟨a⟩lanıp* . . . 'to flower' (BuddhUig II 503). The scribe apparently forgot the A, which would have been written separately between the W and the L. Attested also in the late Buyan Āvirmāk (685,5). ETŞ 11,17 should probably be read as *q ujikläyü xualanu açıl* instead of '. . . *kua alu arıl*' as Arat does; see *aç-ıl-* for the last verb. Since '*xuala-*' is not attested and may never have existed, Ht X 336 should be completed as *bo alımla sögüt xual[an]makı ärsär*, . . ., and not '*xu-a-l[a]maqı*', as Tezcan does.

(*küç+län-* 'to be or become strong'. First occurrence in the DLT, but *küçlän-dür-* is attested in Uigur. *küç+lä-* does not appear before the XIVth century.)

küväz+län- 'to be or get proud' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only twice from the QB. It is, in addition, attested in QB 1377, 4111 and 4553, in Maitr 26 r 6 (*küväzlängülük bäg işi*) and BT VII A 158 (*küväzlänü turur*). There is no '*küväzlä-*'; *küväz* is discussed in section 3.111.

134 DLT fol. 166 has the following: "*kis* 'wife'. Thus: *anıŋ kisi* 'his wife'. Some use the word with the possessive suffix. *ol kisi aldı* 'He took a wife'." Thus if we disregard the second hand. Clauson (*EDPT*) has concluded that there was a lexeme '*kisi*' 'wife' from Orkhon Turkic on (where /s/ and /ş/ are hard to distinguish). I think the DLT's *kisi* is a secondary contraction from *kişi+si*, with vowel elision and geminate simplification. Incorporating possessive suffixes with names of family members is as common as with body parts.

(**odgurak+lan-* is not attested, but cf. *odguraklandur-* among the *-dUr-* verbs. *odgurak* is very common, but there is no '*odgurak+la-*'.)

ogul+lan- is a hap. in UjgRuk III 7 in the phrase *ogullanu altım* 'I have adopted him as my son'. *DTS*; not in the *EDPT*. A *+lA-* verb from *ogul* 'son' is not attested.

ög+lān- 'to collect one's senses, recover consciousness'. DLT fols. 134 and 151 and the QB give some additional meanings for the verb. *DTS* (also s.v. *oŋul-*) and *EDPT*. Additional exs. are *öglänmäk bilinmäk* in BT VIII B 267 and *öglänü bilinü* in Shō XII b 1. In view of these two, TT VIII G 12 should probably be completed as *öglänü bili[nü*, and not as '*öglänü bili[p]*' with the *EDPT* (which makes no sense). No *+lA-* cognate attested. *ög+läş-* 'to take counsel with each other' is likely also to be a direct derivate from *ö-g*.

parvış+lan-mış ay 'the haloed moon' is a hap. in BT XIII 20,8. The base (a loan from Skt.) is attested in BT XIII 1,49. Neither is mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. There is no *+lA-* cognate.

sak+lan- 'to be alert, protect oneself, hide'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, and also in Ht X 235 and Maitr 2 r 14 and 21. Several further exs. are mentioned in section 7.21 s.v. *ıçan-*. Both *saklan-* and *sak* are common in Uigur; the Uigur instances of *sak* are mentioned under *odug* above, in section 3.101. *sak+la-*, on the other hand, is first attested eight times in the QB (only one of them mentioned in the *EDPT*), and not at all in Old Turkic proper. Without *odug*, early *sak* 'awake, alert' is found only in Qarakhanid Turkic: QB (about 20 instances), Yarkand I 2 and DLT. It cannot be derived from *sā-* 'to count' both because of its meaning and because it has a short vowel in Türkmen.

saran+lan- 'to be or become a miser' is not mentioned in the dictionaries. Found in ETŞ 11,37 as *saranlanmak*, in BuddhUig II 16 in *saḍabira urudita . . . saranlanmaz āsirkāmāz ārti āt'özin İSİG ÖZin ädin tavarın*. TT III 76 (= Pothi 76) should probably be completed as . . . *ma]kıg [sar]anlanmakıg . . . sārgürtünüz*, as this is the only verb which fits both the space and the meaning well, and translated as 'You kept . . . and niggardliness . . . at bay'.[135] In Maitr 226 v 7 there is a biverb *saranlanmak yapışmak*, in which the second verb is used metaphorically. Since *saranlan-* is the only Uigur verb derived from *saran*, S'RN[']M'QSYZ in BT IX 145,18$_2$ (Maitr) should probably be completed as *sara[nlan]maksız*, the space in the lacuna permitting. *saran+la-* is a hap. in the DLT translated as 'to call somebody a miser'; it is unlikely that this grammatical ex. should be the base of *saran+lan-*.

sävinç+lān- is a hap. in Ht discussed in the *EDPT*. It is a biverb with *üdlā-n-* (q.v. among the *-(X)n-* verbs), the two together signifying 'to be full of joy'. The cognate *+lA-* verb is a hap. in the Codex Comanicus.

135 The rest of this fragmentary sentence is discussed under *er-iş-*.

suk+lan- 'to covet and desire something (also in the positive sense)' is quoted in the *EDPT* from Uigur and from the QB. It appears also in Maitr 34 r11 and 89 v11, MaitrH X8 a16, and BT XIII 19,6 and 53,2. In both BT XIII instances the context has, I believe, been misunderstood by the editor. In 19,6 the text should be read as follows: *nāŋ sizinŋ – umug ınag a! – azk(ı)ya ymā savınız bolmadı, sözlämišdä ök alko bilgälärkä suklanguluk küsägülük bolmadı ärsär.* This means: 'There has not been said even a bit about you – o haven of hope$_2$ – if, after their having spoken, you did not get coveted and hoped for by all wise persons'. In 53,2, *keŋ yörügiŋä suklanıp* cannot be a relative clause qualifying *Sävinä* but must have *Kki Kki Sutza* as agent. A *+lA-* derivate of *suk* 'greed' is not attested.

(*tägzinç+län-*, perhaps 'to be or become curly' or 'to form a lock (of hair)', is a hap. in MaitrGeng 5 a28: *birär ävin tüülärı öŋärü ävrilip tägzinçlänip tururlar. tägzinç* (q.v. in section 3.104) is not, I think, attested with reference to hair, but *tägzinçük* (section 2.12) is. No related *+lA-* verb has come up.)

tärKiş+län- is a hap. in Maitr 11 r14, in *bulganıp tärKişlänip niridanı braman InçA tep tedi.* This verb signifies 'to behave as a bully, become menacing', to judge by the meaning of the base (discussed in section 3.103). There is no *+lA-* cognate.

(*töläk+län-mäk* comes from *töläk*, discussed among the *-(O)k* lexemes. It is a hap. in Ht IV 1584, apparently signifying 'tranquillity'. There is no *+lA-* derivate from the base. Like the previous two verbs, not mentioned in the *EDPT*.)

turkıg+lan- 'to be inhibited'. *EDPT* s.v. '*turkuğlan-*' only from the DLT; that source, however, always writes the verb with I in the second syllable. The base is discussed in the section on *-(X)g*, q.v. above. '*turıtmamaγ turγıγlanmamaγ*' has been read in Suv 235,4.[136] What must have been the same biverb appears also in BT II 882. There, the ms. itself is lost; Le Coq had read it as *toqıt- tuγqınlan-*, A. v. Gabain as *twrıtmaqsız twrqınlanmaqsız*. The ed. of BT II chooses the first verb from Le Coq but the second from Gabain, for which his footn. brings some related modern forms. Similarity with the Suv couple and the meaning common to the Chin. original and the DLT in Arabic make it very likely that BT II 882 is a misreading of *turkıglan-*. *tur-kun* (rounded second vowel), discussed in section 3.112 above, at any rate, can have had nothing to do with this: Meaning and form are different. There is no *+lA-* derivate from the base.

tutyak+lan- 'to get befallen by *upādāna*' is mentioned in the *DTS* with two Uigur exs., but not in the *EDPT*. It appears also in ETŞ 9,36 (biverb with *yapşın-*, a terminological synonym), Abhi A 141 b4 quoted in *UW* 268 b and 141 b6 in *UW* 265 a (both biverbs with *adkan-*) and Maitr 44 r2 and 14. *tutyak* is well attested, but not a *+lA-* derivate from it.

136 Radloff changes this to '*tuγıγlanmamaq*'. *q*-dots being largely optional in this ms., Q can, of course, be read either as a voiced or as a voiceless back-vowel velar.

türgäk+län- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT; there, it applies to clothes and signifies 'to be wrapped up in a package'. In Warnke 26, it has been used somewhat metaphorically: *agulug yılan orduka agtınıp kälip ät'özin . . . türgäk-länip . . .* The translation ". . . mit einem Körper, der wie ein Bündel geschnürt war . . ." is awkward at best: 'made its body into a bundle' seems a better translation. There is no *+lA-* derivate from *tür-gäk* (discussed in section 3.327).

tüşüt+län- 'to think', not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, appears in UigTot 1200 and 1296 and BT VIII A 139. Cf. *tüşütlän-il-* below. *tüş-üt* 'thought' is discussed in section 3.108 above. A *+lA-* derivate from it has not turned up.

urı+lan- 'to give birth to a male child'. Hap. in IrqB; no *+lA-* form attested.

uz+lan- 'to practise craftmanship'. *+lA-* cognate not attested. Found only once before the DLT, in Gleichn (in M I).

yarık+lan- 'to put on, or wear, armour'. TT VIII, DLT and QB exs. quoted in the *EDPT*. Attested also in *yarıklanıp segirtmäk* "sich rüsten und angreifen" (Profan p. 282) and *yarıklanıp . . . yavız tüllärig tarkardaçı* "he who puts on armour and . . . drives away . . . bad dreams' (ZiemeTārā 20 c). No *+lA-* verb found here either.

yat+lan- 'to perform magical ceremonies' occurs several times in the phrase *yat yatlanguçı* in TT X. As explained in the *EDPT*, this means 'magician'. The additional ex. *balık yaŋlıg luu yaŋlıg* [. . .] *yatlangu sıruklar* (Ht VII 4 a 11) probably has the same collocation and should have *yat* in the lacuna: 'poles shaped like fish and like dragons for magical ceremonies'. In the specific context of Ht VII, the poles are not put to this particular use. *yat* 'rain magic' is attested from the DLT on, but it is not clear whether any such specific magic is denoted by the Uigur verb. The DLT has a hap. *yat+la-* in fols. 578-9, unlikely to be the base of *yat+lan-*: *yatçı yatladı* "The diviner performed a divination (thus!) with stones for clouds and rain".

(y(a)vlak+lan- is a hap. in BT II 256, used together with *basın-*. Exact meaning does not follow from the context. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. No *+lA-* cognate attested.)

(yevig+län-mäk 'to equip oneself (?) is a hap. in Maitr 216 v 14, in damaged form appearing also in a parallel ms. in 59 v 3. *yevä-g ~ yevig* is discussed in section 3.101; cf. *yevin-*. Not mentioned in the *EDPT*.

(yokay+lan-maksız is a hap. in BT II mentioned in section 3.329. See *yokay* in section 2.97: No other derivates from it are known to me. 'to be or get haughty' would be the meaning of the finite *+lAn-* verb. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.)

yüz+län- 'to face in a certain direction'. *+lA-* cognate not attested. Beside the DLT found four times in TT V A 71-99, and in UigTot 360-1: *anasıŋa utru . . . yüzlänip . . .* 'facing towards his mother'. Cf. *(y)üzlän-tür-*.

As this documentation is sufficiently varied from all points of view, *+lAn-* lexemes attested only in Qarakhanid Turkic have not been mentioned. The bases of the *+lAn-* verbs listed have one, two or three syllables. About half of them are simple (including borrowings from foreign languages), the rest representing a wide selection of denominal and deverbal formations. Surprisingly many *+lAn-* verbs are hap. legomena: More than half are attested only once in our sources, or in the DLT and once in Old Turkic. Such single occurrences are met with from the earliest (Toñ, Tes) to the latest texts; this shows *+lAn-* to have been fully productive at the individual level throughout Old Turkic.

Verbs in which *-(X)n-* is added to a *+lA-* stem are also common, and have been listed together with the *-(X)n-* verbs. Included there are all *°lAn-* verbs for which even a single ex. of a *+lA-* base is known; also lexemes like *atlan-*, whose *°lA-* cognate is either dubious or rarer than the *°lAn-* verb. In such cases, assignment to the present or to that section may have been arbitrary. Otherwise, however, *+lAn-* can clearly be seen not to bear reflexive or medial content any more than other (simple) denominal formatives like *+(A)r-*.

+lAn- is often expanded with *-dUr-*: We have *çoglandur-*, *ärkäçländür-*, *körkländür-*, *küçländür-*, *odguraklandur-*, *ögländür-*, *saklantur-* and *(y)üzländür-*. No *-(X)ş-* derivates from *+lAn-* verbs are attested. The expansion *tüşütlänil-* is interesting, for it shows that a *+lAn-* verb *could* undergo passive transformation.

The DLT lists many *+lAn-* verbs in fols. 398-406 and 531-535 and discusses their meaning in fols. 401 and 531-2. Kāšġarī's semantic grouping is the following (my formulation):

1. The *+lAn-* verb states that the agent has become owner of the base noun;
2. the agent naturally brings forth the base noun, becomes *with* it, covered by it etc.;
3. the agent considers himself to be one of the name of the nation appearing as base nominal, or dresses in their dress or otherwise becomes similar to the denotee of the base;
4. the agent reckons the object of the verb to belong to the category denoted by the base nominal.

The DLT's ex. for this last type is mentioned in fols. 531-2: *är atıg kızlandı* "The man reckoned the horse to be expensive". *ol anı kızlandı* "He counted the girl as one of his daughters", i.e. "He considered her a daughter". In Old Turkic, type 4 is not attested at all. Type 1 is rare even if the definition is understood in a broad manner: *yarıklan-* can be assigned to it, and *kanlan-*. *kişilän-* belongs to this type if the agent is the bridegroom; otherwise to type 3. *ogullan-* is here as it denotes adoption, whereas *urılan-*, which denotes birth, presumably belongs to type 2. Birth of animals is the domain of *+lA-*, with *botola-*, *buzagula-*, *änüklä-* and

kulunla-.[137] Type 2 includes what plants bring forth (*bokoklan-*, *çeçäklän-* and the latter's synonym, *xualan-*) and what appears around the moon (*parvışlan-*). Most members of types 2 and 3 have bases denoting qualities, a subject not covered by the DLT's definitions if taken literally. Since Old Turkic abstracts often denote both a quality and its bearer, it is, for some lexemes, impossible to choose between type 2 and type 3. Such an instance is *suklan-*, for *suk* is both 'greed' and 'greedy'. The antonym of possessive *+lAn-* (types 1 and 2) is *+s(I)rA-*: *ençlän-* vs. *ençsirä-*, *kanlan-* vs. *kagansıra-*, *küçlän-* vs. *küçsirä-*. In KP LXI-LXII, *+s(I)rA-* and *+lAn-* derivates from one base are used in contrast: *ögsrädi*, *talu*, *ölüg täg kamulu tüşti*. *ür keç temin öglänti*. The symmetrical relationship between *+s(I)rA-* and possessive *+lAn-* is the verbal counterpart of the relationship between possessive *+sXz* and *+lXg*. Type 3 *+lAn-* verbs usually have human subjects. This is true of *alplanmak*, *ayançaŋlan-*, *bazlan-*, *ilgäysöklän-*, *kıvırkaklan-*, *küväzlän-*, *saklan-*, *saranlan-*, *uzlan-*, *yokaylan-* etc. Note, on the other hand, that only two *+U-* verbs can have human subjects. *+lAn-* verbs sometimes have the same bases as other denominal verbal formatives: *alplanmak* and *alpadmak* seem to have more or less the same meaning, whereas *az+u-* is different from *azlan-* even when this is taken to come from the same *az* 'few'. *körkäd-* can be compared to *körklän-*, *küçäd-* to *küçlän-*. *yagı+d-* and *baz+lan-* can be considered opposites, as can *muŋ+uk-* and *sävinç+län-*.

+lAn- verbs appear in a rather wide variety of syntagms, the most common situation being, of course, the absence of all oblique expressions. For this, one ex. will do: *üçünç, kunçuyı urılanmış* (IrqB V) 'Thirdly, it turned out that his wife had given birth to a son'. An ex. for a concrete case accompanying a *+lAn-* verb is found in TT V A 71: *kün ünär ugurda . . . küngärü yüzlänip . . . tapınmış k(ä)rgäk* 'One must pray at sunrise, . . ., facing towards the sun, . . .'. Among the many *+lAn-* verbs with locative we quote only *karaŋguda ärkäçländäç[ilä]rig* "die in der Finsternis wirbelnden" in HtPar 131,6-7. Another instance with locative is quoted s.v. *ilgäysöklän-* above, two others s.v. *kıvırkaklan-*. Under *azlan-*, the *DTS* quotes a Suv passage in which *azlan-* and *kıvırkaklan-* are accompanied by a locative. The instrumental accompanies *agazlan-* (thus the ms.) in a passage quoted in the *UW* in the entry for that verb.

We find the dative in *ol ok täginmäk tıltagınta ajunlarka, äd tavarka, ärkkä türkkä azlanmak turur* (Maitr passage edited in U II 10,15-16) 'By the cause of just that *vedana* arises the greed for . . . authority and power'. *az+lan-* govern the dative also in UigTot 112, 116, 117 and 119 and in two other exs. quoted above when discussing the verb. *baz+lan-*, as quoted, also governs the dative, and so the two exs. of *suk+lan-* quoted under the lemma above. In none of these co

137 The difference might speak for empathy with human mothers.

structions does the nominal in the dative case refer to an active source of action, as encountered when it comes with passive verbs.

Just one ex. will be quoted from among the ones with a concrete postpositional phrase: *tagdın sınar yüzlänip ymä ançulayu sakınç kılıp ḍarni sözlämiş k(ä)rgäk* (TT V A.77) 'One must face towards the north, think such thoughts and recite a *dhāraṇī*'. Another instance with a postpositional phrase can be found above, under *körk+län-*. Our only ex. of an *üzä* phrase shows us that postposition in its instrumental function: *särinmäklig yarık üzä yarıklanmış ärür* (TT VIII A.35-6) 'He is armoured with the armour of endurance'. Here, again, we find that no *+lAn-* verbs are passives.

It is significant that there are no really transitive *+lAn-* verbs either: The only nominal objects found to accompany them are internal, in the phrase *yat yatlanguçı*. A certain affinity of this formation with the deverbal reflexive is shown by the fact that three among the four exs. of the accusative object I have come across refer back to the agent: *özlärin saklanu arıtı*[ı] *t(ä)zgürü tutzunlar* (M III 38,5$_1$, text 20, reedited in ZiemeTexterg II 10) 'Let them be on their guard and keep themselves really in flight'; *ät' özin artok saklanu tutar* (Maitr 2 r14). Under *türgäklän-* above we quoted an instance in which that verb governs *ät' özin*, referring, as in the previous two exs., to the agent himself. Here is our only ex. with an independent object: *nirvan bulmak küsüşin yalŋuklar yerin suklanıp* ... (USp 94,2, in a colophon of the Maitr) 'They covet the land of humans in the hope of finding nirvāṇa, and ...'. Normally, *suklan-* governs the dative and not the accusative of whatever is coveted.

The rare reflexive objects apart, *+lAn-* functions like any other one of the denominal verb formatives described above. Why did this secondary formation have to be created? The only reason is the fact that there are no constraints on the shape of *+lAn-* stems. Many have three and four syllables and they do not create consonant clusters by having the vowels of their bases get syncopated. This probably makes *+lAn-* verbs more transparent. This process echoes the popularity of *+lA-* over *+A-* and *+tA-*.

Part VI

Types of Action and Inaction

In Old Turkic, verbs are derived from verbs for two distinct purposes. By far the more important purpose, described in part VII below, consists in altering the structure of the group of participants of the event: When a causative or a passive are formed, this is the difference in syntax and meaning between the base and its derivate. With the formations to be described in part VI, the status of agent, patient, beneficiary etc. are not affected. The morphological space between the base of the verb and the slot for *-mA-*, the suffix of negation, is occupied by the signifiers for two distinct categories: The category of type of action (*Aktionsart* in German) and the category of voice. The two categories have often been united under the term *genera verbi*.[138] Intensives, verbal diminutives, iteratives, semelfactives, conatives, inchoatives, resultatives etc. express whether the event occurs just once or repeatedly, whether it is carried out intensively or feebly, whether it consists of a mere attempt at the action described by the base verb; they enable the speaker to refer just to the beginning (inchoative) or to a final stage (resultative) of an action, and so forth. Although some languages (e.g. Russian) have the same morphological means for expressing *Aktionsart* and aspect, the two terms mean something quite different: Aspect is the category distinguishing between *He sat at the table* and *He was sitting at the table (when somebody called him)*. These two sentences can be used to refer to the same event of sitting; the difference between them is that the first refers to it as a point event, while the second one makes it into a time frame for some other event. With members of the category of type of action, on the other hand, the event described through one member is stated to differ substantially from the one described by another member: 'to jump several times', 'to attempt to jump', to wish to jump', 'to land on the ground after a jump' etc. all denote classes of *different actions*, which cannot be covered by the simple verb 'to jump' if one is not to mislead the addressee about what is actually going on during the stretch referred to. German exs. for this category are *hüsteln* from *husten*, *aufessen* ('to eat up') from *essen* ('to eat'), *erkranken* ('to fall ill'). Whereas voice strongly interrelates with sentence syntax, the categories of aspect and type of action do not, in the languages I have come across, affect syntactic structure at all: Derived diminutives, conatives, intensives etc. are all intr. or tr. if their bases are so, and govern the same nominal cases as their bases. With derived reciprocal, causative, passive or reflexive verbs, however, the shape of the group or participators is always affected.

Most *Aktionsart* formatives actually detectable in Old Turkic do not denote

138 Just one example among very many in different languages is Böhtlingk, 1851: 268, where reflexives, passives, causatives and also intensives are called by the name *genera verbi*. The reason for this confusion lies in the morphology of the classical Indo-European languages, from where grammarians have uncritically transferred them to other language types. Morphological paradigms needn't coincide with functional ones.

'action' at all: They denote what could be called 'types of inaction'. Most important, here, is the desiderative, which expresses the mere *wish* to carry out something. Then we have *-(X)msIn-*, which forms verbs saying that one behaves *as if* one were doing something. The DLT's *-gXr-* verbs all signify that some event is on the point of happening. Verbs formed with the rare *-çIr-* state that action is taking place *a little bit*. The verbs of sensation in *-(X)(r)kA-* (section 5.2) do express action of a particular *sort*, but that formative is primarily denominal.

Intensives, of course, are a member of an *Aktionsart* category which denotes real and full action. The age of intensive formations, in which later Turkic languages are rich, had not yet come, however. *-(X)k-* and *-(X)d-* are not intensive suffixes, as assumed in Gabain, 1974 pars. 153 and 160; these formatives are discussed below. *-(X)k-* verbs *may* be inchoatives, but that formation is not very productive in Old Turkic. Old Turkic has no intensive formations at all; nor can they be assumed to have existed in Proto-Turkic, as Doerfer, 1981-2: 115-116 thinks. He mentions Brockelmann, 1954: 199ff. as source for his contention. As that passage thus serves as base for an important contention, it deserves some scrutiny. Brockelmann distinguishes between *-A-*, *-I-* and *-U-* as intensive formatives. He has three exs. of *'-U-'*: *qoqu-*, *saru-* and *ñõu-*. The first is quoted only from a Middle Turkic source; the second is probably a denominal from Persian *sar* 'head'; see n. 410 in vol. 1. *ñõu-*, quoted from QBK 162,11 = QB 2870, is contracted from *ñõ-u u-* < *ñõa u-*, as the meaning shows. *'-A-'* has the greatest number of exs. Among them, *buyura-*, *sapa-*, *sora-* (< Mo.?), *sürä-*, *talka-*, *tutaand rüzät-* are quoted from Middle Turkic sources only; they have not come up in Old Turkic proper or in Qarakhanid Turkic. *käsä-* in QBK 177,3 = QB 3076 is an error for *kişä-* 'to hobble'. *tara-* "to disperse" in DLT fol. 559 thus remains alone; for that, cf. *taral-* (section 7.31 below). After discussing *tara-* 'to comb', Kāšġarī notes that this verb and *tar-* 'to disperse' have the aorist form *tarar* in common. The form *taradı* which is added and translated as "He dispersed" is in contradiction with the statement that "the aorist is identical in [some] biliteral and triliteral [verbs] but the preterite differs".[139] Among the verbs mentioned as *'-I-* intensives', *sämri-* is the original stem with *sämir-* a late variant, while *taşı-* is a late variant of the simplex *taşu-* (q.v. in section 5.41) at the end). *sanı* in QBP 28,1 = QB 211 is a noun with a possessive suffix, *yinçü sanı+ı*. *tarı-* is a simplex not connected with *tar-* (see *tarı-g* above). *tokı-* (from onomatopoeic *tok*) can be found at the end of section 5.31, *'suçı-'* (or rather *soç+ı-*) in section 5.42. We are still left with a few real candidates for comparatively early *-I-*: DLT fol. 560 has a verb

139 Clauson is also suspicious of the DLT ms., while Dankoff and Kelly think *tara-* 'to disperse' may be a back-formation from *tar-* (over the aorist). Assigning an 'intensive' meaning to this stem-theoretical ex. is unwarranted in any case.

kazı- translated as 'excavating the ground; scraping off a scab and the like'. This verb is attested also in later and modern Muslim sources. It is surely related in some way to *kaz-* 'to dig up the ground' (DLT and QB 1734-5 and TT VII 29,2). *kazın-* (q.v. below), *kazıp* in QB 5364 and *kazıgh ibid.* 5357 might come from either base, but connecting them with *kaz-* would be a better guess. There is *no kazı-* in Uigur or in the QB. There is nothing detectably 'intense' about the meaning of *kazı-* as attested. *tat-* 'to taste (tr.)' and *tatı-* 'to be tasty, delightful, enjoyable, pleasant' are both discussed in the *EDPT*. The DLT only has *tatı-*; the QB *tat-* in 3568, 5440 and 5829, *tatı-* in 4169, 5627 and 4466.[140] The aorist of the former is *tat-ar*, attested in TT VI 174, of the latter *tatı-r*, attested in QB 4466 and possibly TT VIII 16 (fragmentary context). *tat-* is also found in *tatınış tang* (TT VI 176), *tatı-* also in ETŞ 11,8: *ançata tangay yilikiä* "Then it will be delightful in the marrow", i.e. 'in the essentials (??)'. The causative of the former is *tat-ur-*, mentioned below, the causative of the latter *tatı-t-*, found in the DLT. The most striking differences between *tat-* and *tatı-* are that the former is tr. and always refers to food; the latter is intr. and hardly ever does so. *tatı-* has no particular intensiveness about it. In spite of the fact that Kāšġari makes it refer to food, this verb may not be related to *tat-* at all: This may be his grammarian's rationalisation. *ütü-* 'to iron a garment' looks like an *-I-* derivate from *üt-* 'to singe', but is a hap. in DLT fol. 555. *üt-üg* 'flat iron' (section 3.101) appears to come from the latter. The similarity between *kak-* 'to strike lightly' and *kakı-* 'to be angry and annoyed at' is likely to be a coincidence.

Ibn Muhenna (quoted in *TMEN* and elsewhere by Doerfer) says that verbs like *kāl-i-dі* and *bar-ı-dı* denote *fast* (not intensive) action. Fastness *could*, implying shortness, even denote diminution (the opposite of intensity). There is not much ground for the assumptions that there were any suffixes of the form *'-A-'* (needed for the argument of Doerfer, 1981-2: 115-6)[141] or that there were any 'intensive' verbs in early Turkic: With the material we have at present, such a hypothesis cannot be supported.

6.1 *The desiderative*

The desiderative formative *-(X)gsA-* clearly consists of *-(X)g* (discussed in section 3.101 above) and the very rare denominal formative *+sA-*, also of desiderative

140 The last, with *türiglik* 'life' serving as subject as in 4169 and 5627, is wrongly incorporated in the entry *tat-* by the İndeks to the QB.

141 As an analogy from the Romance languages, Doerfer mentions *cantare*, which replaced Latin *canere* 'to sing'. Note that this is a denominal verb from the verbal noun *cantum*. The later Turkic intensives are mostly also derived from verbal nominals.

content, discussed further on in this section. No desiderative is attested in runic sources. Uigur (both Buddhist and Manichaean) has the *-(X)gsA-* verbs listed below; some of them appear also in the DLT.

bar-ıgsa- 'to want to go' is documented in the *EDPT*. *barıg* (q.v. above) has a set of rather specific meanings and uses.

eşid-igsā- 'to wish to hear' is not in the *EDPT*. *DTS* s.v. '*eštitigsāmāk*' quotes one Suv instance. We also have *utgurak KÜSÄYÜR sävär taplayur äşidigsäyür biz* (BuddhUig II 12) and *nomçı bilgälärig nomlayu olorur körüp nomın eşidigsä[* (Maitr 70 r31). '*eşidig*' is not attested.[142]

kavış-ıgsa- 'to wish to be united with someone'. Hap. in M II 3 (mentioned in the *EDPT*), an early text. *kavış-ıg* (q.v. above) is attested six times, always in the phrase *kaş kavışıg(ı)* 'the meeting point of the eyebrows'.

kir-igsā- 'to wish to enter', in the *EDPT*. '*kirig*' is not attested.

kör-ügsā- 'to wish to see'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.vv. *körüg-sägülük* and *körügsämägülük*. Another ex. perhaps appears in Maitr 170 v31 = BT IX 159,31, if that should be read as *kim kayu tınl(ı)g kop ädgü bütmäkin küsäsär kọrügsäsär, ol tınl(ı)g sımtags(ı)z ädgükä kataglarımış kärgäk* 'Whoever wishes for, and would like to witness, the good outcome of everything, . . .'.[143] *kör-üg* 'interpretation', a hap. in QB, is surely not the base of this verb.[144]

oz-ugsa- is a hap. in UigSukh 37 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *tişi tınl(ı)glar k(ä)ntünüŋ ämgäklig arkasız ätō[zin] yerip ozugsap* . . . "when female creatures despise their suffering, helpless body and want to be saved, . . .'. There is no '*oz-ug*'.

öp-ügsā- 'to wish to kiss' is a hap. in M II 3, as *kavış-ıgsa-*. See the *EDPT*. '*öp-ūg*' is not attested.

(*tapıgsak*, a derivate from an unattested *-(X)gsA-* verb, is discussed above among the *-(O)k* lexemes.)

ye-gsā- 'to wish to eat' appears in Ht V 7 b 20: *sirkälig tōgi öt[mäk] yegsäp koltı. baxşıs[ı] arxant "bo ötmäk kanta bar ärki?" tep täŋridäm kōz [üz]ä kördi* . . . . In DLT fol. 577, 'to wish to eat' becomes *yesā-*. There is no action noun in *-(X)g* derived from *ye-*.

142 On p. 177 we discuss *istā-g/istā-k*; one of the instances of that lexeme was mistakenly read as '*eşidig*', as mentioned there.

143 Ş. Tekin translates the verb as "hat nötig", transliterating it as *k'r'ks's'r*; he must be connecting it with *kärgäk*. This is unlikely, as the simplification of *kärgäk* doesn't occur in this text, and *+sA-* derivates are exceedingly rare in Uigur. '*kärgäklā-*' would be good semantically, and cf. *küsäyü kärgäklāyü* in Maitr 161 r16; but that is not what the ms. has.

144 What has otherwise been read as *kōrüg* is in fact *kürä-g*, q.v. among the *-(X)g* lexemes.

As is evident from what is stated above concerning -(*X*)g derivates from bases expanded by -(*X*)*gsA*-, the deverbal desiderative sequence is added as one whole. -(*X*)*gsA*- is, in Old Turkic, used only with simple bases. These bases can also be bisyllabic, as *eşid*-.

barıgsa-, *kirigsā*- and *körügsā*- are attested also in the DLT. In addition, we find in that source *öl-ügsā*- "to wish to be dead" (fol. 153), *bil-igsā*- "to desire wisdom", *ber-igsā*- "to be about to give" (thus), *kāl-igsā*- "to wish to come", *sat-ıgsa*- "to be about to sell" (thus), *tur-ugsa*- "to want to dwell in a certain place". In the DLT, the formative has the shape -(*X*)*gsA*- only with monosyllabic bases ending in /ɪ/ or /I/; *sat-ıgsa*- is an exception. Kāšġarī may have known it only from the following verse, which he quotes (fol. 590): *āvin barkın satıgsadı / yulug berip yazıgsadı*[145] */ tirig ārsā turugsadı / aŋar sakınç künі twgdı* "The enemy wished to sell his houses and his landed property, to ransom himself thereby; he wished to stay alive; the sun [i.e. the day] of sadness arose for him". With nearly 30 other monosyllabic bases mentioned in fols. 140-142, 568 and 577 and with the bisyllabic bases *kötür*- and *uçur*- (fol. 143), *okıt*- and *ögit*- (fol. 153) and *kādür*- (fol. 590), the deverbal desiderative formative is -*sA*-. Kāšġarī also constructs *ur*-, *al*-, *il*- and *sür*- exclusively with -*sA*- and not -(*X*)*gsA*-. In fol. 569, under the lemma *kör-sā*-, he adds that the "root-form" of this verb is *kör-ügsā*- (mentioned above), and the "root-form" of *kāl-sā*- *kāl-igsā*-. Even with monosyllabic /ɪ/ and /I/ bases, then, the first syllable of -(*X*)*gsA*- was optional in the DLT's language. "want", "intent" and "desire" are Kāšġarī's translations of this formative in his explanations.

It is worth noting that eleven among the desiderative stems listed in fols. 568-9 and 577 in fact have the shape -*IsA*-, the I being by the first hand. As we see in the ms.'s *yod-ısa*-, *sür-isā*- and *kör-isā*-, this vowel is /I/ and not /X/, whereas, when marked by the second hand, the vowel admits rounding and becomes /X/. This /I/ (emended away by Clauson and by Dankoff and Kelly) differs from both the converb and aorist vowel of the verbs in question, and from the phoneme in the first syllable of -(*X*)*gsA*-. Moreover, the stems are one syllable too long for the word patterns of these particular sections of the DLT. It should be noted that -(*X*)*gsA*- > -*sA*- (or -(*X*)*gsA*- > -(*I*)*sA*-, for that matter) is not a regular phonetic development in Old or Qarakhanid Turkic, as /g/ does not, at this stage of the language, disappear after vowels. Possibly +*sA*- (to be discussed straightway) was transferred to the deverbal realm; the DLT also has other exs. of such a transfer. Curiously enough, the formation becomes similar to the Skt. desiderative,[146] although a direct influence seems quite improbable.[147]

145 This verb is not listed above, as the word is a conjecture replacing YARIΓSA'DIY of the ms.

146 As e.g. *īpsa*- 'to seek to obtain' from *āp*- 'to obtain'.

147 T. Tekin, 1968: 116 wrongly and improbably assumes the existence of -*sa*-/-*sā*- in runic Ongin R 2;

Eastern Mediterranean Univer
LIBRARY

+sA-, which serves as second part of the deverbal desiderative formative, is a rare bird; there is only one *+sA-* verb of any solid attestation in Old Turkic: *suv+sa-* 'to be thirsty', found already in texts of group I. See *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *ačmaq suvsamaq. aç- suvsa-* is, besides, found several times in Maitr and in ms. T II Y 15.501 (U 3088) r4 quoted in the n. to UigTbt 895. Further, together with the synonym *oŋuk-* in ShōAgon A 33: *suvsamış oŋukmış KİŞİ sogık suvlug yulka tuşarça* 'as when a thirsty$_2$ and wilting person comes upon a spring of cold water'. Cf. *usmak suvsamak* in Ht VII 2040-1. *kǫygāy susagay* (thus), finally, is used in Ernte 49 of a field. The original verb for 'being thirsty' must have been *us-*, while *suvsa-* originally was 'to want water'.

The DLT mentions about 15 other *+sA-* verbs. Most of them, *aş+sa-*, *açıg+sa-*, *tatıg+sa-*, *âgır+sâ-*, *ârük+sâ-*, *ât+sâ-*, *kagun+sa-*, *çâniştürük+sâ-*, *kurut+sa-*, *bagır+sa-*, *balık+sa-* and *yag+sa-*, have bases denoting, in some way, alimentation. *suvsa-* actually also belongs to this group. *+sA-* can therefore be said to signify, in general, 'to wish some sort of food'. The only aberrant lexemes are *âv+sâ-* 'to long for one's home', *biligsâ-*, which could be an *-(X)gsA-* verb by form but is translated as "to desire wisdom", and *ulug+sa-*. This last is used in the grammatically interesting sentence *är atta ulugsadı* "The man wanted the large one of the horses" (fol. 153).

In QB 4830 we also find a *+sA-* derivate: *kök+sâ-* 'to want (to rise to) the sky'. Other exs. of *+sA-* are uncertain. There is *bergâ+sâ-* in M II 13,9 (text 5), a hap. at best. The text has been read, both by Le Coq and Arat,[148] as *mın*[*g . .*]*k*[*. .*] *bärgân urupan bergâsâyûr*; this would be translated 'He beats with a thousa[nd . . .] whips and wishes to whip', not very convincingly. It might be an error for *bergä+lä-*.[149]

$B^2R^2S^2G^2M$ should, however, probably be read as *ber-sig+im*. Cf. the variation *-sXk* ~ *-sXg* within the Chuast text.

148 ETŞ 6 is a reedition of this.

149 In U IV A 165 we read *anta ok elig bâg kapkara tünlâ tavış tıŋ* [new line] *sayu bir üdün-ki*(*y*)*â turdı*. The eds. read this as *tıŋsa-* and translate "wollte lauschen"; it may, however, be the postposition *sayu* 'to every', which joins the stem form of simple nouns and seems to involve a dative or directive sense. We do not find any '*tıŋsa-*' in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*; see *tıŋ+la-* in section 5.12 above, also for *tıŋ*. As the facs. shows, there is no mistake in the reading; there may, however, have occurred an error for *tıŋla-*, which fits the context very well. As a more remote possibility, *sayu* could also be an isolated ex., with unusual meaning, of *sa-* (q.v. in the next par.). In *UAJb* N.F. 2 (1982): 289, Tezcan suggests that *kü:sâ-* 'to wish' also belongs to this formation, and that its base lives on in Trkm. *küy* 'Phantasievorstellung, Wunschbild, Gedanke'; cf. Kirg. *küülö-* 'brünstig werden'. In M I 10,10 (quoted below), BuddhUig II 12, Maitr 170 v31 and perhaps elsewhere, *kûsâ-* and an *-(X)gsA-* verb are used in parallel manner; such instances lend support to the idea, but the base is not, in any case, attested as such in Old Turkic.

Middle Turkic and modern forms of *+sA-*, however, can be found in Schakir, 1933: 38-40. Verbal nominals, *-(X)g* and others, seem to have furnished the majority of the bases of those verbs, along with simple nominals.[150]

It has been maintained since the DLT (fol. 143) that *+sA-* developed from *sā-*. This verb is attested from the DLT and the QB on with the meaning 'to count', however, and probably never signified 'to wish' or even 'to think'. Doerfer and Tezcan, 1980: 182 explain it as coming from a Khal. and Tkm. verb signifying 'to beat (cotton and wool)'. (i.e. originally 'holding beat'). *sa-* and *sayu* are discussed also under *sa-n* in section 3.107 above. Moreover, a form like *kirigsāyūr* in KP is written as one word and there is no '*kirig*'; the final Ks in *eşidigsāmāk* and *körügsāgūlūk* (Suv) show that the second syllable of *-(X)gsA-* also follows vowel harmony. *-(X)gsA-* is, synchronically speaking, one suffix and not two: Most *-(X)g* forms related to the verbs in question are not attested or, if they are, have special and lexicalised meaning.

The *-(X)gsA-* verbs we have are not expanded by any verbal formatives. A nominal expander is *-(O)K*, at least in *tap-ıgsa-k* (mentioned above). It is questionable whether *twgsak* 'widow' in DLT fol. 236 can be analysed as *twg-(X)gsA-(O)k* with haplology, and derived from *twg-* 'to be born'; a derivation from *to-* 'to block' is not less questionable, on grammatical grounds. This formation is not attested in any relative constructions in the strict sense. Cf., however, the construction of *kör-ügsā-gülük* and of its negation mentioned above as being quoted in the *DTS*. The perfect, the aorist and the *-(X)p* gerund are the most common forms.

-(X)gsA- lives on in the Codex Comanicus, which has *kōrūvse-*, *tabuvsa-* and *kutkaruvsa-*.

Here are some exs. for the use of the desiderative: *nāglük barıgsadıŋız*? (KP LXVIII 8) 'Why did you want to go?' *anı üçün taloyka kirigsāyūr m(ā)n* (KP XXI

150 *ārsāk* 'nymphomaniac, lecherous woman, whore' is *ār+sā-(O)k*. This lexeme, attested from the DLT on and in most modern Turkic languages, should not be read as '*ārsāg*' as the *EDPT* does: The velar is /k/ in the Codex Comanicus and is retained in all subsequent sources. The fact that Mo., which also borrowed it, spells it with G is not an indication of Turkic /ˀg/ either, but rather of Turkic /ˀk/. Gabain, 1974 par. 79 mentions a formative *+sAk* and gives two exs.: One is *ārsāk*; the other, '*kāksāk*', I haven't been able to find in dictionaries. The glossary of Gabain, 1974 has *kākşāk* instead: A form *kākşāK* has in fact turned up in BT II 252; cf. the n. thereto. A n. of Gabain, 1974 refers to a passage in Bang, 1916. There, all the exs. are modern except '*tabuqsaq*' (i.e. *tap-ıgsa-k*, mentioned above and discussed in the section on *-(O)k*) and '*qoruqsaq*' (quoted as a hap. from QB). The latter is in fact *kurugsak* 'stomach etc.', q.v. in the *EDPT*. The DLT is not very likely to be right about connecting *kurugsak* with *kurug* 'empty, dry', although one does sometimes have an empty stomach. *+sA-k* would not have the right meaning here, and the semantic connection between the two lexemes is not convincing. *+sAk* may turn up in Mo., but is hardly a grammatical reality in the variants of early Turkic known to us.

7) 'That is why I want to enter the sea'. *säviglig yalıraglı isig yuzünüzün körüg-säyür biz, küsäyür biz* (M I 10,10, TeilBuch) 'We wish to see and long for your lovely, radiant and warm face'. Several additional exs. are quoted above where I mentioned the various *-(X)gsA-* verbs. They all give a consistent picture of the meaning and use of the formation.

The desiderative is comparable to the causative in that both can be represented as sentence embeddings. This in itself is not sufficient reason for considering the desiderative to be a voice morpheme: The members of the Old Turkic modal paradigm[151] can also be represented as sentence embeddings; what is more, both in them and in the desiderative the verb of the enveloping sentence must signify some sort of wishing. But in the modal paradigm the agent of the wishing is always the speaker, the agent of the embedded sentence, on the other hand, any of the six members[152] of the person paradigm. With the desiderative, however, the two agents have to be identical. With the Old Turkic (and Republican Turkish) interrogative modal sentence, the agent of the wishing is the hearer. In any case, a member of the modal paradigm contains two deictic indications, while none at all are introduced by the desiderative morpheme; for the latter, these can of course be supplied by a person pronoun. Had this been the only difference between the desiderative and a member of the modal paradigm, a present desiderative form accompanied by a first person singular pronoun would have been identical in content to the first person singular member of the modal paradigm, which is not the case. The desiderative indicative merely states the existence of a wish to perform an action or do something on the part of a particular agent; the members of the modal paradigm, on the other hand, incite or invite to action; they have rightly been called 'the vocative verb forms'. Although indicating the presence of a wish, the desiderative has no *prima facie* affinity with mood, then, since it says nothing about the attitude of the speaker as such towards the activity in question, about his degree of emotional involvement, which is what is expressed by the mood category. As a pragmatic goal, uttering a first person desiderative can, of course, be more than a mere transmission of information: If a lover says 'I wish to kiss my beloved' (as in M II $8,10_2$) and then makes sure that the text reaches him or her, the force of the utterance does not differ much from saying (or writing) *öp-üg-älim*. This collapse of pragmatic functions is beyond grammar, however.[153]

Formally, it is impossible to say whether *-(X)gsA-* can be considered to belong

151 Characterised by *-(A)yIn*, *Ø-(gIl)*, *-zUn*, *-(A)lIm* etc.

152 In the inscrs., at least, the 3rd person pl. does not appear to be morphologically distinct from the 3rd person sg., giving only five persons. There do, however, exist nominal and pronominal means to distinguish between the two.

153 Other first person desideratives are attested in M II 8,7 and KP 21,6-7 (sg.), M I 10,10 and BuddhUig II 12 (pl.).

to the voice paradigm: It is added only to simple bases and is not enlarged by any voice morphemes. One therefore cannot know, at present, whether it occupies any of the two morphological slots which will, below, be found occupied by the voice suffixes, or both of them, or none (constituting a slot together with the other type of action formatives). Had the situation been kept up through many exs., one would have had to take it to occupy both slots at a time, the base being capable of receiving either the desiderative morpheme or one or two of the voice morphemes.[154] But the *-(X)gsA-* instances are too few for such a statement.

We are left with functional considerations, and they speak against including the desiderative among the voice morphemes: Its addition to a base does not entail any change in the structure of the agent-patient group.

6.2 *The simulative*

To describe an action as mere pretense, one added *-(X)msIn-* to the stem denoting the real version of the action. This is, like *-(X)gsA-*, a composite formative. *-(X)m* is, like *-(X)g*, well attested (and discussed in section 3.106 above). *+sI-* and *+sIn-*, however, are (like *+sA-*) of problematic status as Old Turkic formatives. Synchronically, *-(X)msIn-* is indivisible: None of the Uigur *-(X)msIn-* verbs have an attested *-(X)m* nominal from the same base in Uigur. Beside the Uigur hapax *orla-msın-* there is, in the QB, a hapax *orla-m*; the two are of very different semantic domains, however, and unlikely to be directly related. DLT fols. 395-398 deals rather extensively with *-(X)msın-* and has many exs. for this formation from a varied collection of simple and derived bases. In fol. 398 Kāšġarī actually says that what he describes holds good for all verbs of the Turkic dialects/languages. His exs. will not be mentioned here, however. *-(X)msIn-* is not attested in runic sources and is rather rare in Uigur. The eight instances we have appear in five texts; beside *yara-msın-* (which is discussed also in the DLT), all are hap. legomena. Only *atık-ımsın-* (misread) and *kıl-ımsın-* are mentioned in the *DTS* or the *EDPT*. Here is the material:

kıl-ımsın- 'to pretend to be doing something' in Ht VII, quoted in the *EDPT*.

Three *-(X)msIn-* verbs are attested in BT III 230-232: *kızıg yölämsinip ün köŧürüp kaŧıg orlamsınu, 'Arıgımız Sundarini yagı mu eltdi?' yıglamsınu* . . . . In the order of their appearance, these verbs signify 'to go through the motions of being useful to . . .', 'to pretend to be shouting out of grief' and 'to pretend to be crying'. The denominal *or(ı)la-* and *yıgla-* are discussed under *+lA-* above.

154 Such is the case of *+lI*, the suffix of nominal coordination, which occupies both the slots of number and possession; it can, however, receive case suffixes.

otla-msın- is attested in HtIV 42: *ötrü ol ud[. . .]törüsinçä otlamsınu . . .*, translated as "wie auf der Weide". *ot+la-* 'to graze' appears in the DLT; see *otla-t-* below for a related verb in Uigur.

övkälä-msin- or *övkilämsin-* is attested in BT XIII 12,152, in *saŋa övk[.]lämsinü äznäyü . . .* 'to pretend to be angry at . . .'. *övkä+lä-* ~ *övki+lä-* is the fourth *+lA-* verb we find serving as base for *-(X)msIn-*.

yara-msın- 'to flatter' is attested in DLT fol. 398 and BT XIII 10,11, in *] yaramsınıp kimkä kälürüp [*. This is not to be translated as "als ob er jemandem schmeichelte (?)" as Zieme does: *yaramsın-* is just 'schmeicheln', the sememe 'als ob' being contained in the meaning of this lexeme. Käšgarī says so explicitly: After having rendered a series of *-(X)msIn-* verbs with "he pretended to . . .", he notes that the only verb on this pattern which does not have this content is *yaramsın-*.

atık-ımsın- appears in TT VII 42,5: *atıkımsınmayuk atıg bulsar art sayu mayakayur* 'If a person who had not had any pretenses at fame becomes famous, he defecates at every mountain pass'. Arat read the verb as *atak°*, which is now corrected in the n. to BT XIII 60,6. I cannot agree with Zieme's interpretation as '*adıgımsınmayuk adıg bolsar, . . .*', from *adıg* 'sober': This does not seem to me to be as appropriate in the given context. Besides, *adıg* 'sober' has not yet turned up outside Muslim sources. *at+ık-* is discussed in section. 5.44. *UW* 257 b follows Zieme's interpretation.

What Zieme was thinking of in proposing '*adıgımsın-*' is a denominal suffix *+(X)msIn-*. We have two instances in which *-(X)msIn-* does, indeed, appear in the denominal domain. One of these appears in TT VII 42,5, the same passage as *atıkımsın-* (as corrected in the n. to BT XIII 60,6): *bägimsinmayük bäg bolsar, bältir sayu bälgü salar* 'If somebody who had not hitherto thought of himself as *bäg* becomes a *bäg*, he sets up a mark at every cross-roads'. The other, *eş+imsin-*, signifies 'to behave as if one were somebody's equal', attested in QB 4095 and 4448. The list of proverbs published as TT VII is quite late, as other indices show. While *-(X)msIn-* is used in good Uigur texts like Ht, *+(X)msIn-* is marginal. Relevant for our understanding of how this transfer came about is *biysin-* "verachten" (*spernere*) in the Codex Comanicus. This comes from **bäg+sin-*; cf. *bey, biy ibid.*, < *bäg*. *eşimsin-* is used in the QB to signify 'to treat somebody inferior as if he were one's equal'; we find *biysin-* to be the exact opposite of this in meaning. Considering that the original denominal formative here was *+sIn-*, I take **bägsin-* to have been the earlier verb. *+sIn-* being obsolescent in Uigur, /(X)msIn/ was put to use instead of it. This analogical transference may never have gone beyond the semantic domain of 'considering someone to be in a certain class'. This is another reason why '*adıg+ımsın-*' should be rejected. Mo. has a denominal suffix *+msi-* e.g. in *ere+msi-* 'to act like a man', and *noyamsig* 'like a leader, suitable for a leader' from *noyan* 'noble-

man, leader' (both derivates in the Secret History). *ärämsi-* "prahlen" in the Codex Comanicus appears to be a borrowing from the Mo. lexeme mentioned; the QB verb *eşimsin-*, however, must be a Turkic creation. Therefore, *+XmsIn-* cannot have been taken over from Mongolian.

DLT fols. 131-132 has three *+sIn-* verbs: *ol kılmış işinä oxsındı* "He regretted what he had done" from an exclamation unrecorded in our sources; *ogul ärsindi* "The boy showed manliness" and *ol bo ävni ävsindi* "He reckoned this house as one of his own houses and stayed in it". Then we have the hap. *suk+sın+mak* 'greed' in ETŞ 10,224, clear on the facs. and appropriate to the context. The only common *+sIn-* verb, however, is *ärk+sin-*, attested from the earliest texts on. Documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, it signifies 'to have or acquire power or authority (over), to be potent'.[155] Exs. not mentioned there appear in BT II 4, 695 and 708, ETŞ 9,86 and 10,28, AmitIst 93, BuddhUig II 488-9, Maitr 73 v 10, Weih 18 and 19, BuddhUig I 16, 17, 21 twice and 253, ShōAv 8 and 71, GuanJing 47, BT VII L 12, BT VIII B 120 and 129, UigTot 822 and 823, TuoLuoNi 115 and 399, UigSteu A 31 and so forth. In the last mentioned exs. and elsewhere as well, *ärksin-* appears together with *ellän-*. This being in fact the only *+sIn-* verb attested in Old Turkic, there is no way to determine anything concerning the meaning of this formative, or of making any statements concerning syntactic behaviour. It clearly does not imply make-believe (as *-(X)msIn-* verbs do); nor does *suksınmak*. *ärksin-* is expanded to *ärksin-tür-*.

Whether *+sIn-*, consisting of *+sI-* and *-(X)n-*, was ever any more productive, is unclear. *+sI-*, however, must prehistorically have been an important formative. *+sIl* and *+sIg* (discussed in sections 2.61 and 2.32 respectively) are formed with it, and must have gotten fused long before our texts. Especially under the productive and well-attested *+sIg*, the semantic and functional connections of that formative with *+sIn-* and *-(X)msIn-* are clarified. *yara-mısı-k* "Heuchler, Schmeichler; Heuchelei" discussed in *TMEN* 1853 is related to *yara-msın-* discussed above;[156] Rabġūzī's *külümsi-* 'to smile' would seem to be the base of *külümsin-* (same meaning), attested since the DLT. All this would seem to show that the immediate constituents of *-(X)msIn-* were *-(X)msI-* and *-(X)n-* and not *-(X)m* and *+sIn-*. If that is so, *ärksin-* (and *suksınmak*) should be considered pure and simple members of the *-(X)n-* formation even though their *+sI-* bases are not attested. *suvsuş* 'a watery drink', finally, also comes from a *+sI-* verb under derivation with the dominant formative *-Xş* (discussed in section 3.103). *suvsuş* is well attested both in Buddhist and Manichaean texts.

155 The verb read as '*ärksiräyin*' in M II 6,8 (text 2) can be seen to look rather like *ärksin-* on the facs. A lexeme '*ärksirä-*' is not found anywhere.

156 Cf. *yaramsak* 'fidelis' in the Codex Comanicus.

As a verbal formative, however, *+sI-* survives mainly in the DLT. In fol. 144 there, it is stated that *+sI-* indicates that "the object named is altered from its original state and takes on the nature of what" serves as base for it. *süçig suvsıdı* "The wine became watery" and *üzüm açıgsıdı* "The grapes became sour" are given as exs. This *suv+sı-* is the base of *suvsuş*. *Under yag+sı-* (fol. 578) we find the sentence *yakrı yagı yagsımas* 'Fat does not behave like oil'. *ät kaksıdı* (fol. 569) is translated as 'The meat was cut into strips and dried, or almost did so'.[157] Cf. also *kurug+sı-* 'to start to dry' (fol. 590). *yarsı-* 'to be disgusted and revolted by something and loathe it' has been taken (cf. the *EDPT*) to be derived from *yar* 'spittle' and belong to this formation. This is quite unlikely, since *yarsı-* is tr. and does not signify 'to be or become like spittle'; *+sI-* would not yield any other meaning. *süçi-* 'to be sweet and pleasant' (DLT fol. 558 and QB 813), however, probably comes from *süt* 'milk' over **süt+sı-*. *süçi-g* 'sweet (of words); wine', attested already in Orkhon Turkic,[158] would be indirect evidence for the early presence of *+sI-*. Prof Doerfer (personal communication) reminds me that Tkm. *süyı* (= *sût*) and *süyjı* (= *süyjü*, < **sûçig*) both have long vowels, which adds likelihood to their connection. For the semantics cf. Middle Pe. *šīrēn* 'sweet' from *šīr* 'milk'. Most of the DLT's exs. for this formative are connected with food, but its original semantic scope may have been wider. Bang's etymology *açı-* < **at+sı-* (mentioned in the *UW* entry for *açig* (I)) is, however, too far-fetched to be taken seriously. Another base not belonging to this domain appears in *kaŋsık ata* 'stepfather' of DLT fol. 611. This should be an *-(O)k* derivate from **kaŋ+sı-* 'to be like (a) father'.[159] There is not a single *+sI-* verb in Old Turkic. For later periods see Schakir, 1933: 40-43. *+sI-* verbs express the similarity of their subjects to the base nominals. What they lack is the make-believe element of *-(X)msIn-*.

Unlike *ärksin-*, *-(X)msIn-* verbs are expanded neither with verbal, nor with nominal formatives. Most of the exs. of the latter are gerund forms. All except *kılınsın-* are quoted in context above; see the *EDPT* for that verb. As far as can be seen, *-(X)msIn-* verbs show the same syntactic behaviour as their bases. For the paradigmatic relationship to *-mAmIşsIg bol-* see the discussion of *+sIg* above. As *-(X)msIn-* is added to denominal but not to deverbal stems and is not expanded by voice formatives either, we have here the same problem as with *-(X)gsA-*: It cannot be proven formally that it does not go into the same morphological slot as the reflexive, the causative, the passive and so forth. Semantically, in any case, *-(X)msIn-* does not belong into that group.

A deverbal formative '*-sI-*', postulated in *EDPT* p.xlvi, does not exist in Old

157 *kak* (DLT) denotes food articles cut into strips, dried for future consumption.

158 This lexeme is discussed in the section dealing with *-(X)g*.

159 *kaŋsık ogul* 'stepson', *ibid.*, must have been created after the etymology of *kaŋsık* got obscured.

Turkic: The verb *'emsi-'* mentioned there is a dubious hapax in an obscure passage. *'sarsı-'*, which *EDPT* 854-5 creates because of "a clear semantic connection with 1 *sa:r-*", has in fact the shape *sars-*: Cf. the converb *sarsa* quoted there. For *sar-*, cf. *sar-ıl-* and *sar-ış-* below. I know of no candidates other than these two for such a formation at an early stage. Rabġūzī's *tal-sın-* 'to be about to faint' reminds one of the late transference of *+sA-* to verbal bases.

6.3 -(*I*)*r*-, -*çIr*- and -*gIr*-

A deverbal intr. °*r*- formative has to be taken to exist at least for a few inchoatives in the DLT. They are:

sūçi-r- in fol. 307: *açıg näŋ sūçirdi* "The bitter thing became sweet". Cf. *sūçi-* in DLT fol. 558 (*sūçidi näŋ* "The thing was sweet") and QB 813: *şākār tāg sūçiyū barır ol kişi* "That man goes away, sweet like sugar'. Further cognates are mentioned under *sūçi-g*, a derivate attested already in Orkhon Turkic. Aorist: *sūçi-r-ār*.

yılı-r- is used in an identical verse in DLT fols. 99 and 407: *ajun tını yılırdı* "The breath of the world became warm". *yılı-* is attested only from DLT fol. 482 on, but cf. *yılı-t-* below and *yılı-g* and *yılış-ıg* above; the last-mentioned appears already in Orkhon Turkic.

yunçı-r- in fol. 485: *ār işi yunçırdı* "The man's affair began to worsen". Aorist: *yunçı-r-ar*. Cf. *yunçı-* in *ār yunçıdı* and *bilgā būgū yunçıdı* (both DLT fol. 577), *kılıç tatıksa iş yunçır* (fol. 407) and Suv 553,20 (quoted and translated in *UW* 98 a par. 3) and *yunçı-g* (DLT and QB).

Elsewhere, we find the connections listed below; particularly questionable in them is the semantic relationship between base and -(*I*)*r*- derivate. We discuss them for what they are worth.

adır- 'to separate (tr.) etc.' is amply documented and discussed in the *UW*; cf. *adr-ıl-*, *adr-ok* and so forth. It shares its base with *adın* 'different' (section 3.107), *adıg* 'sober' (section 3.101), *adıl* 'excellent' (section 3.113) and *adın-* 'to sober up; to be impressed, surprised, shocked' (discussed below). *adız* 'branch of a canal; piece of arable land delimited by such (section 3.111) could come from it or from *adır-*. Cf. also *adru-* in section 5.41. It is unclear whether this untested[160] base was **ad-* or **adı-*; **adX-* would probably also have given **ad-*. The converb and aorist vowel of *adır-* is rarely /U/: We find *adırur* only in one

160 Ht X 803 is perhaps *ārtmādi tāgşilmā*[*di*] and not '*admatı*', as has been read. A single ex. is no certainty in any case.

As a verbal formative, however, *+sI-* survives mainly in the DLT. In fol. 144 there, it is stated that *+sI-* indicates that "the object named is altered from its original state and takes on the nature of what" serves as base for it. *süçig suvsıdı* "The wine became watery" and *üzüm açıgsıdı* "The grapes became sour" are given as exs. This *suv+sı-* is the base of *suvsuş*. Under *yag+sı-* (fol. 578) we find the sentence *yakrı yagı yagsımas* 'Fat does not behave like oil'. *ät kaksıdı* (fol. 569) is translated as 'The meat was cut into strips and dried, or almost did so'.[157] Cf. also *kurug+sı-* 'to start to dry' (fol. 590). *yarsı-* 'to be disgusted and revolted by something and loathe it' has been taken (cf. the *EDPT*) to be derived from *yar* 'spittle' and belong to this formation. This is quite unlikely, since *yarsı-* is tr. and does not signify 'to be or become like spittle'; *+sI-* would not yield any other meaning. *süçi-* 'to be sweet and pleasant' (DLT fol. 558 and QB 813), however, probably comes from *süt* 'milk' over **süt+sı-*. *süçi-g* 'sweet (of words); wine', attested already in Orkhon Turkic,[158] would be indirect evidence for the early presence of *+sI-*. Prof Doerfer (personal communication) reminds me that Tkm. *süyt* (= *sût*) and *süyji* (= *süyjü*, < **süçig*) both have long vowels, which adds likelihood to their connection. For the semantics cf. Middle Pe. *šīrēn* 'sweet' from *šīr* 'milk'. Most of the DLT's exs. for this formative are connected with food, but its original semantic scope may have been wider. Bang's etymology *açı-* < **at+sı-* (mentioned in the *UW* entry for *açıg* (I)) is, however, too far-fetched to be taken seriously. Another base not belonging to this domain appears in *kaŋsık ata* 'stepfather' of DLT fol. 611. This should be an *-(O)k* derivate from **kaŋ+sı-* 'to be like (a) father'.[159] There is not a single *+sI-* verb in Old Turkic. For later periods see Schakir, 1933: 40-43. *+sI-* verbs express the similarity of their subjects to the base nominals. What they lack is the make-believe element of *-(X)msIn-*.

Unlike *ärksin-*, *-(X)msIn-* verbs are expanded neither with verbal, nor with nominal formatives. Most of the exs. of the latter are gerund forms. All except *kılımsın-* are quoted in context above; see the *EDPT* for that verb. As far as can be seen, *-(X)msIn-* verbs show the same syntactic behaviour as their bases. For the paradigmatic relationship to *-mAmIşsIg bol-* see the discussion of *+sIg* above. As *-(X)msIn-* is added to denominal but not to deverbal stems and is not expanded by voice formatives either, we have here the same problem as with *-(X)gsA-*: It cannot be proven formally that it does not go into the same morphological slot as the reflexive, the causative, the passive and so forth. Semantically, in any case, *-(X)msIn-* does not belong into that group.

A deverbal formative '*-sI-*', postulated in *EDPT* p.xlvi, does not exist in Old

157 *kak* (DLT) denotes food articles cut into strips, dried for future consumption.
158 This lexeme is discussed in the section dealing with *-(X)g*.
159 *kaŋsık ogul* 'stepson', *ibid.*, must have been created after the etymology of *kaŋsık* got obscured.

Turkic: The verb *'emsi-'* mentioned there is a dubious hapax in an obscure passage. *'sarsı-'*, which *EDPT* 854-5 creates because of "a clear semantic connection with 1 *sa:r-*", has in fact the shape *sars-*; Cf. the converb *sarsa* quoted there. For *sar-*, cf. *sar-ıl-* and *sar-ış-* below. I know of no candidates other than these two for such a formation at an early stage. Rabġūzī's *tal-sın-* 'to be about to faint' reminds one of the late transference of *+sA-* to verbal bases.

6.3 -(*I*)*r*-, -*çIr*- and -*gIr*-

A deverbal intr. *°r-* formative has to be taken to exist at least for a few inchoatives in the DLT. They are:

süçi-r- in fol. 307: *açıg näŋ süçirdi* "The bitter thing became sweet". Cf. *süçi-* in DLT fol. 558 (*süçidi näŋ* "The thing was sweet") and QB 813: *şäkär täg süçiyü barır ol kişi* 'That man goes away, sweet like sugar'. Further cognates are mentioned under *süçi-g*, a derivate attested already in Orkhon Turkic. Aorist: *süçi-r-är*.

yılı-r- is used in an identical verse in DLT fols. 99 and 407: *ajun tını yılırdı* "The breath of the world became warm". *yılı-* is attested only from DLT fol. 482 on, but cf. *yılı-t-* below and *yılı-g* and *yılış-ıg* above; the last-mentioned appears already in Orkhon Turkic.

yunçı-r- in fol. 485: *är işi yunçırdı* "The man's affair began to worsen". Aorist: *yunçı-r-ar*. Cf. *yunçı-* in *är yunçıdı* and *bilgä bügü yunçıdı* (both DLT fol. 577), *kılıç tatıksa iş yunçır* (fol. 407) and Suv 553,20 (quoted and translated in UW 98 a par. 3) and *yunçı-g* (DLT and QB).

Elsewhere, we find the connections listed below; particularly questionable in them is the semantic relationship between base and -(*I*)*r*- derivate. We discuss them for what they are worth.

adır- 'to separate (tr.) etc.' is amply documented and discussed in the *UW*; cf. *adır-ıl-*, *adr-ok* and so forth. It shares its base with *adın* 'different' (section 3.107), *adıg* 'sober' (section 3.101), *adıl* 'excellent' (section 3.113) and *adın-* 'to sober up; to be impressed, surprised, shocked' (discussed below). *adız* 'branch of a canal; piece of arable land delimited by such (section 3.111) could come from it or from *adır-*. Cf. also *adru-* in section 5.41. It is unclear whether this unattested[160] base was **ad-* or **adı-*; **adX-* would probably also have given **ad-*. The converb and aorist vowel of *adır-* is rarely /U/: We find *adırur* only in one

160 Ht X 803 is perhaps *ärtmädi tägşilmä*[*di*] and not '*admatı*', as has been read. A single ex. is no certainty in any case.

ms. of TT VI 184 where another two have *adırar*, *adıru* only in ETŞ 13,141 and M I 18,4[1]. [161] *adıra* and *adırar*, on the other hand, are very common (recently published exs. in LautHöllen 33 and HamTouen 1,62). This fact proves that *adır-* was not a causative in *°r-*, for those verb classes consistently have /U/ in these forms. That, in turn, means that the base must have been tr.

alaŋu-r- 'to be or become weak' is attested several times in the Suv, discussed in the *UW*. *alŋu-* and *alŋad-* (discussed among the *+U-* and *+(A)d-* verbs respectively) are practically its synonyms; note that they are not attested in Suv. See *alŋad-* for etymology.

āgir- ~ äŋir- 'to surround, encircle or besiege; spin or twirl thread' has been connected by many to *āg- ~ äŋ-* 'to bend (tr.)'. If there is such a connection, it can only be through the formative *-(I)r-*. Early exs. of *äŋir-* to be added to the *EDPT* entry occur in Toñ 20, 21 and 29, correctly read (I think) only by Giraud: *kaçan äŋirsär* (in l.20 with the object *bizni*) 'when/if it (sc. the Türk army) surrounds us'. Other scholars were misled by the fact that *kaçan* is wrongly spelt with N^2 in two among the instances. '*kaç näŋ ärsär*' could not have had any of the suggested meanings. *yip āgir-* and *yip äŋir-* alternate in the Maitr. The converb and aorist vowel of *āgir- ~ äŋir-* is consistently /A/ (in KTN 6, KP 2,2-4 (thrice) and 41,2 and DLT). Had the formative been the causative *(-Ur-)*, *āgir-* would have had a rounded vowel both in its second syllable and as its converb and aorist vowel. The semantic relationship is not compatible with anything we can say about the present formative, however, and the explanation can only lie in prehistory.

ilgü-r- has been read in Maitr 12 v24 (*ätözümin ilgür*[) and ShōAgon 2, p. 196,2 (*isig özin ilgürmäsär. . .*, rechecked for me in the facs. by P. Zieme). This is phraseologically similar to the BT II instance of *ilgü-n-*. *ilgün-dür-* and *ilgü-t-* are also discussed in the appropriate sections, q.v. The QB adds an initial /y/ in the Maitr instance, in which the initial letter (taken to be *alif*) is missing in a lacuna. *yilgü-t-*, *yilgü-r-* and *yilgü*. This initial /y/ *may* actually have appeared also in the *yilgü-r-* is found twice in the QB: *kökiş turna köktä ünün yaŋkular / tizilmiş titir tāg uçar yilgürär* (74) ". . ./ soaring and fluttering in formation like a train of camels" and *kadaş köŋli barça saŋa kadgurar / körü ıdsa bulmaz köŋül yilgürär* (3329) "All your brothers' hearts are fluttering out of anxiety for your sake and longing to see you". QB 5972 should be read as *köŋül yilgü-di*: The passage is discussed in the *EDPT* s.v. '*yalŋu-*', a nonexistent verb.[162] *yilgü-* and *yilgür-*

161 *adıru bilmäsär ukmasar* of this text probably has its /U/ from the roughly synonymous *adıru umasar*, the impossibilitative sequence (see Erdal, 1979 a).

162 *älgürçi bor* (Hochzeit 19) could possibly be from *ilgür-t-çi*, which would make it signify 'invigorating' or 'exciting wine'. There is a rare agentive suffix *-çI* found in *buzagulaçı* etc., and in negative *-mAçI*. Haplology from **ilgürgüçi* is another one of the possible explanations, but meaning and

could possibly signify 'to be' and 'to get excited' or 'full of energy' in view of the meanings of the cognates (*yilgü-* and *yilgür-* differing perhaps in durativity).

kadır- 'to twist or turn back (tr.)' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB and from Middle Turkic sources; in all of these, it has /A/ as converb and aorist vowel. *kadırıp* appears in violent context in Maitr 108 v4. Cf. also *kadıra* 'repeatedly' in BT XIII 12,207, *kadra* 'back (adverb)' in the Rylands Interlinear Coran Translation. *kadıt-* 'to turn back (intr.) from the direction in which one was going' (q.v. below) must be its cognate. Their common base (**kad-* or **kadı-*) should also have been tr.: -(*I*)t- is often seen to turn tr. (and only tr.) verbs into passives, e.g. *säv-it-*, *agırla-t-*, *bas-ıt-*, *ägir-t-*. Note that the QB contexts refer to fighting, like some exs. of *ägirt-* and *basıt-*. Cf. *kadr-ıl-* below.

köpir- 'to foam or froth' and *köpik* ~ *köpük* 'foam, froth' are discussed in the section on -(*O*)*k*. Here, again, the common base is not attested in Old Turkic. It is, however, preserved in Mo. and elsewhere and its existence follows from the comparison between the two lexemes mentioned. It can have been **köp-* or **köpi-*. In no case could *köpir-* be considered to have been a causative (cf. *köpirt-*); it might have been an inchoative: Cf. *süt köpürdi* "The milk became foamy" in the DLT.

talpı-r- 'to flutter' is attested in BT III 250 as *Garudı kuşça talpıru*[163] *yarlıkadaçı*, and in the DLT. In the DLT, the aorist is *talpırar*, what we expect in this formation. The DLT also has *talpın-* and *talpış-*, all three referring to the fluttering of birds. The base is quoted by the *EDPT* from the 14th century on in various dialects, and is found also in the bird passage in BuddhUig II 104: *örü uçgalı talpıyu, karışu oynayu ... kakılayu ätinäyü...* The semantic difference between base and -(*I*)*r*- derivate is not clear.

**tägir-* 'to surround' is known mainly through its converb *tägrä* 'around'; cf. *tägriglä-* and *tägirmän* (discussed in the appropriate sections). It may possibly be derived from *täg-* 'to reach'; if so, only -(*I*)*r*- can be the formative. The main problem, again, is meaning.

ü(r)pär- 'to bristle, stand on end etc.' is quoted by the *EDPT* from the DLT and elsewhere. The *EDPT* also quotes the DLT and later exs. of *ürpäk*, *ürpät-* and *ürpäş-*. Add *üpärü turur sarıg saçlıg* 'with bristling blond hair' in l.4 of fr. T I α (U 5396) quoted in the n. to BT XIII 25,4. *üpär-* is either an error for DLT and later *ürpär-*, or the original variant. In any case, all the lexemes point to a common base **ürpä-* postulated also by the *EDPT*. The problem here is that the converb and aorist vowel is /U/ both in the DLT and in the Uigur passage

etymological connections seem clear enough. The initial vowel remains, of course, to be explained.

163 Thus instead of '*tälbirü*' of the ed.

quoted, against the rule of the *-(I)r-* formation. This may be a case of (dissimilatory?) complementary distribution as we find with *+(A)r-*, where *-Ar-* derives have /U/ as converb and aorist vowel.

yagu-r-mış (BT III 152) has the form of an *-(I)r-* derivate from *yagu-* 'to draw close', but is probably rather the result of back-formation from *yaguru* (discussed at the end of the section on *-Ur-*): *ölgülük üdi kolosı yagurmış ärdi* reminds one of *ɪwgurguluk üdi yaguru kälti* (U III 63,18) on the one hand, of *ölüm üdi yagudukda* . . . (U III 43,28) on the other.

+kIr- may perhaps have been derived from *+kI-* using this same formative; onomatopoeic *+kIr-* and *+kI-* verbs are discussed in section 5.31 above.

Summing up we can say that Proto-Old Turkic may have had a formative of the shape *-(I)r-* with /A/ in the converb and aorist, and that this formative seems not to have served the category of voice. What it did express is not clear.

A bit more can be said about *-çIr-* which possibly, in some way, contains *-(I)r-*. Here, at least, we have one unproblematical Uigur lexeme:

kül-çir- 'to smile', quoted in the *EDPT* six times from Uigur,[164] twice from the QB and from Middle Turkic. All those Uigur exs. contain the nominal phrase *kül-çirā yüzin*[165] 'with smiling face', which appears also in Maitr 13 r28, 38 r9, 15 v5 and 120 r13. Then we have *külçirmāk* in Suv (quoted in the *DTS*), BT VIII B43 and BT VIII Nachtrag 1 l.12, and the following: *burxanlar yaŋınça külçirü*[166] *ulug kuvrag arasında* InçA *tep yarlıkadı* (ShōAv 216); *kirt kirt külçirā* InçA *tep tedi tep* . . . (Maitr 12 r18); *bo ötügüg aşidip ötrü Samtso Açarı külçirā* InçA *tep tedi* (HtPek 54 r5-7) ". . . T.M. lächelnd folgendermaßen:"; *külçirā turur külçirgā atlag t(ā)ŋri kızın ündürüp* . . . (BT VII A 619). Another two exs. of *kül-çir-gā* are mentioned in section 3.323. The DLT is alone with its variant *kül-sir-*, attested four times in fols. 364 and 394. In spite of its solid documentation, *külsir-* may perhaps stand for **kül-şir-*, possibly the original form preserved by Kāšġarī.[167] *külçir-* is what can be called a verbal diminutive from *kül-* 'to laugh'.

tam-çır- in DLT fol. 354 similarly comes from *tam-* 'to drip'. *tam-* is not attested before Qarakhanid Turkic, but see *tam-ız-* in section 7.55. *tam-ga* (discussed in section 3.323) is early. In DLT fol. 354, *yagmur tamçurdı* is translated as "The rain drizzled" while, in fol. 367, *suv tamçırdı* is said to be "The water came down in a light shower from the cloud". Among the four instances, two have I by the first hand in the suffix, one U by the first hand, and one U by the second

164 One of these is only a conjecture.
165 See n. 506 in the section on *-(X)ɪ-* for a discussion of this construction.
166 Thus in all three editions of the text. This form is an exception.
167 *tap-şur-* < *tap-şur-*, a causative, may show the same process.

hand. In view of the rounding effect of the /m/, I appears to be the preferred reading. The aorist is *tamçırar*.
(*yakçırt-* 'to rouse' (discussed among the -(*X*)*t*- verbs) may also have had a *-çIr-* verb as base.)

To judge by *külçir-* and *tamçur-*, *-çIr-* is a type of action formative. In this formation, we may (in *yakçırt-*) have a causative formative added. This, in itself, does not prove that the two groups of formatives belong to different paradigms: The different voice formatives in Old Turkic also combine with each other.

In the DLT alone there is another °*r*- formation:

man-gır- (*mangırar*) in fol. 365: *ol ätmäkig yagka mangırdı* "He was about to dip the bread in the butter".
käl-gir- (*kälgirär*) *ibid.*: *ol maŋa kälgirdi* "He was about to come to me".
kol-gır- (*kolgırar*) in fol. 363: *ol mendin kolgırdı* "He was about to ask me for something".
saç-gır- (*saçgırar*) in fol. 360: *är suv saçgırdı* "The man was about to sprinkle the water". In all three forms, the second syllable is marked both by a *kasra* and a *ḍamma*.
soçgur- (*soçgurar*). Thus, with *ḍamma* in the suffix in all three forms, in fol. 360: *at soçgurdı* "The horse was about to leap". From *soç+ı-* (discussed above) under syncopation of the medial vowel.
sūs-gir- (*sūsgirār*) in fol. 361: *sıgır ārig sūsgirdi* "The ox was about to gore the man".
tam-gır- (*tamgırar*) in fol. 356: *suv tamgırdı* "Water was almost dripping" from *tam-*; related to *tam-çır-* just discussed. The couple *tamçır-* vs. *tamgır-* shows a neat opposition in the formatives: In the language of the DLT, at any rate, *-çIr-* may have marked light repeated action, whereas *-gIr-* was a sign of incipient action.

kurgır- (*kurgırar*) in fol. 363 is presumably derived with the same suffix from *kurı-* 'to dry (intr.)'. For some reason, however, *yer kurgırdı* is translated as "The ground *was* dry from lack of moisture)". Cf. *soçgur-* above for the syncopation of the /I/.

In DLT fol. 363 we find a verb *kamgır-* (*kamgırar*). Kāšġarī writes: *anıŋ yüzi kamgırdı* "His face was almost palsied. Also of anything that is slightly crooked". Now *kam-* is a tr. verb signifying 'to strike down'. DLT fol. 277 translates *ol anı kamdı* as "He beat him to death". *kamgır-* can by no means be a *-gIr-* derivate from *kam-*, for *-gIr-* clearly does not have any influence of the transitivity of verbs. Rather, it is an *+(A)r-* derivate from *kam-gı*, q.v. in section 3.110. The DLT translates *kamgı* as "twisted, crooked"; referring to persons' limbs and

faces, it signifies 'palsied'. The fact the Kāšgarī's first translation contains the word "almost" shows that he was trying to connect it with this formation. He must be wrong about that, but *kamgır-* can nevertheless show us the way to an explanation of *-gIr-*: This formative may come from *-gI+(A)r-*. The origin of *-gIr-* may, then, have been parallel to that of *-(X)gsA-* and *-(X)msIn-*: Verbal noun + denominal verbal formative. *kötgi+r-* 'to form a small swelling or protrusion' has been discussed among the *+(A)r-* verbs above. **köt-* is not attested, but can be reconstructed from *kötür-* 'to lift up', *kötgi* 'hillock, mound' and the DLT's *kötü* < **kötdü* 'roof'. *kötgir-* is therefore another instance, the only one attested in (late) Uigur, of the formative sequence *-gI+(A)r-*. Like *-(X)gsA-* and *-(X)msIn-*, *-gIr-* also denotes a type of inaction: Being about to do something. Note that the DLT's translations of *berigsä-* and *sangsa-* are also, for some reason, 'to be about to give' and 'to be about to sell' respectively.

kädKir- 'to run blindly, stumble while doing so' may possibly also have belonged to this formation. The *EDPT* and the *DTS* (s.v. *kedgir-*) have several exs. of this verb from Uigur and the DLT; further ones appear in Profan p. 282 (quoted below under *sekri-t-*) and in BT III 258.[168] This verb does not appear to have survived in any modern language. It also has the converb and aorist vowel /A/: *kädKirär* in U IV C13 and the DLT, *kädKirä* in Suv 10,8.

The DLT applies /gIr/ also to nominal bases:

say+gır- (*saygırar*) in fol. 529-30: *yer saygırdı* "The ground nearly became a stony tract" from *say* 'a stony tract'.

taz+gır- (*tazgırar*) in fol. 356: *är başı tazgırdı*[169] "The man's head was nearly bald" from *taz* 'bald'.

toz+gır- (*tozgırar*) in fol. 356: *yer tozgırdı* "The ground was at the point that dust would rise from it" from *toz* 'dust'.

süt+gir- (*sütgirär*) in fol. 361: *yogrut sütgirdi* "The yoghurt (was shaken up until it) became as watery as milk" is actually spelt with *fatḥa* on the *käf*, but aorist and infinitive have *kasras* in the formative.

There may have been some more such verbs, but their vowels are chaotic. They often show /A/ and not /I/ in the formative, and the whole phenomenon (as well as *kurgır-* mentioned above) appears to be a cross between *-gIr-* and *+(A)r-*.

Nothing much has been gained in this section for the grammar of Old Turkic

168 For *adınlar kädKirmäk üzä kılınç algay* (BT III 258) we read in *UW* 89 a bottom: "'man wird [böses] Karma erwerben, dafür daß man andere erschreckt hat' (übers. so?)". *kädKir-* is always intr., however, and *adınlar* should here be taken to be its subject and not its object. '. . ., wenn [es dazu kommt, daß] andere wild fliehen [müssen]' would probably be a more correct translation.

169 The ms. actually has *tazgardı* here, but the two other instances of the verb are spelled as *tazgır-*.

proper. It does become clear that the Old Turkic type of action category had more members to it than the -(*X*)*gsA*- and -(*X*)*msIn*- formations. What -(*I*)*r*- was originally used for demands further clarification. *In case yakçırt-* has a base belonging to a -*çIr*- formation, it shows that 'type of action' and 'voice' are intercombinable.

Part VII

Diathesis and Voice

Most morphemes used for deriving verbs from verbs in Old Turkic constitute the signs of the verbal category known as voice or diathesis. Each of these morphemes tends to choose a particular set of case functions from among a more general set. The set of nominal terms thus chosen by verbs of different classes is called the set of 'participants'. Some nominal categories, like the expressions for space and time, do not appear in any of the sets characteristic of particular voice morphemes, although compatible with any of them. These are not representative of participants, i.e. they do not refer to participants in the action. Voice, valency[170] and case have to be treated together, for voice determines the valency a verb is to have; valency is expressed by case forms. In Turkic, both case and voice are represented by inflectional paradigms, which makes functional description relatively easy. Distinctions lexical e.g. in English, like 'to remember' vs. 'to remind', 'to understand' vs. 'to explain' or even 'to say' vs. 'to ask' are part of the explicit grammar of Old Turkic: Their semantic content is subject to the rigidity of the system. Here we deal with the relation between the characterisation of the various nominal expressions in the sentence (or clause) by case endings and postpositions on the one hand, and the characterisation of the verb which governs them by voice formatives, on the other.

Since this part of the work tries ot correlate verbal with nominal behaviour, morphological and formational problems can concern either the nominal or the verbal sphere. As far as nominal case forms are concerned, matters are more or less clear by now; they are in broad outlines discussed by the grammars, e.g. Gabain, 1974. Some residual problems are mentioned below. On the verbal side, however, the situation is quite different. There are quite a few elements in use for deriving verbal stems from (shorter) verbal stems. This derivation creates new dictionary entries, is not quite systematic, and irregularities are common. The functions of various formatives sometimes seem to overlap: thus the passive and the medial-reflexive, thus also the passive and the causative. On the other hand, one and the same formative (e.g. the causative or the medial-reflexive) can have several functions.

Grammars[171] generally discuss all this under the heading of word formation, in the shortest possible terms. The syntactic aspects of such derivation have not been

170 I use this term to refer not only to the number of nominals which a verb can govern, but to the configuration of tasks which a verb deals out. A verb is accompanied by particular slots, which are occupied by obligatory or optional participants. Such occupation is a syntactical necessity, not related to thematic-rhematic structure nor to any pragmatic constraints.

171 Gabain, 1974: 80-83; Tekin, 1968: 115-117, Ščerbak, 1961: 165 par. 2, Nasilov, 1963: 29-30 and so forth. Thus for Old Turkic; grammars of other languages do, of course, often develop the subject.

treated adequately. There are several articles on a particularly interesting point[172] and some remarks here and there.[173] There has been one attempt to treat our subject comprehensively, i.e. Amanžolov, 1969. That is a book about verbal rection in the language of 'Old Turkic texts' where, however, 'Old Turkic' has been taken in what I think is an impossibly broad sense.[174] Chapter I discusses the phenomenon of verbal rection in general and in its relation to other aspects of Old Turkic. Chapter II is about the rection of the underived verb; all case forms are here taken in turn and discussed. Chapter IV deals with the rection of what Amanžolov calls the analytical verb: a verbal phrase in which the verb and a noun stand in close juncture. This has some bearing on our particular interests and is dealt with further on in this section. The object of Amanžolov's chapter III has most in common with our work: Part 1 is about the rection of denominal verbs, part 2 about the rection of deverbal verbs. On pp. 68 and 98, the author maintains that rection is determined in a purely lexical manner and not influenced by morphemes of diathesis. However, the business of the grammarian is to include as much as possible of the information on the language in the rule-governed part, i.e. in the grammar. By denying offhand this possibility for his subject matter, Amanžolov has missed the chance of getting at the regularities which his research could have brought forth.

Old Turkic has the following case suffixes: the accusative, the ablative, the locative-ablative, the dative, the genitive, the comitative, the so-called equative and the instrumental. Then there is the bare stem, which serves as nominative; as far as nominals[175] with no possessive ending (but not nominals with possessive ending, nor pronouns) are concerned, also as the case of the indefinite object. In pronouns and possessive nouns, the accusative form is used for all direct objects. In other words, the case of the indefinite object (which, as we shall see, also has another function) is sometimes syncretised with the nominative, while in the remaining situations the neutralisation is between it and the accusative. I think that this two-way collapse is sufficient reason to consider the indefinite object a case; further on, I will show that it also has a particular behaviour.[176] This indefi-

172 By Kowalski, Röhrborn and Johanson; see my remark at the end of section 7.582.

173 Some, by Bang, I have had the occasion to comment on. I have, in general, very little referred to authorities in this work, as it is long enough as it is.

174 The delimitation of Old Turkic is discussed in section 1.1 above. I am uneasy and apologetic about all I have included under the name of 'one language', but Amanžolov is even worse in this respect.

175 Arguments for and against the noun / adjective distinction have not been seriously discussed concerning Old Turkic; the terms have not even been defined explicitly.

176 Thus the Latin dative is considered a case, e.g., in spite of the fact that it is sometimes identical with the genitive, in other noun classes with the ablative.

nite object case is the one demanded by postpositions: *çik bodun kırkız birlä yagı boltı* (BQ E 26) but *kaganın birlä swŋa yışda sünüşdümüz* (KT E 35), *mini birlä* (U III 48,4), *yetinç oguşunuzlarnı birlä* (U III 55, 11-12), *sizlärni birlä* (U IV A 81). With a different postposition: *yıd yıpar täg* (TT I 146), *kaŋım kagan süsi böri täg ärmiş, yagısı koñ täg ärmiş* (KT E 12) and, on the other hand, *bizni täg* (TT III 16), *kün täŋri yarokın täg* (M II 8,13$_1$ and 15$_1$, text 3), *inisi äçisin täg kılınmaduk ärinç*; *ogli kaŋın täg kılınmaduk ärinç* (KT E 5).[177] Except for the indefinite object case, there is no structural difference between nominal and pronominal declension, although some cases may have different allomorphs for nominal and pronominal use. The comitative is not attested with pronominal bases, but is rare even with nouns. It is found several times in the great inscriptions,[178] in YE 28,8, M I 12,10 (TeilBuch) and several times in Chuast. This case will not be taken into consideration. As has been described in the grammars, the locative frequently has 'ablative' function: It can also mark the noun representing the starting point of the action. The delimitation of the ablative and the locative is a subject which should be looked at more closely, from the dialect, the historical and the functional points of view. In some texts the ablative form proper has a very limited use.

Functionally, there is no difference between case endings and postpositions. If we add the postpositions to the list of cases, which is not short in itself, we get an unstructured and quite open set, which *could* be termed 'lexical'.[179]

In this collection, one division has traditionally been made: that between 'abstract' and 'concrete' cases, 'concrete' including reference to time and to space. The 'grammatical' cases characterise certain patterns of interaction, whereas the others are, in a sense, circumstantial. In the classical Indo-European languages, the same case forms and prepositions had both abstract and concrete uses; in Old Turkic, however, the dative is the only case, I think, which appears in both domains.

Akin to this is the distinction between 'actants' and 'circonstants', first made in Tesnière, 1959: 102ff.: "Les *actants* sont les êtres ou les choses qui, à un titre quelconque et de quelque façon que ce soit, même au titre de simple figurants et de la façon la plus passive, participent au procès." "Les *circonstants* expriment les circonstances de temps, lieu, manière etc.'. There are two main differences between this distinction and the previous one: Firstly, Tesnière makes his distinc-

177 As has been shown in Erdal, 1979: 154, this is true only in texts classified as early for nouns with 3rd person possessive suffix. With the other possessive suffixes and with pronouns, this behaviour does not change even in later Old Turkic texts. In Qarakhanid Turkic, there are already some changes.

178 For these instances see Tekin, 1968, par. 3.2149.

179 See e.g. Gabain, 1974, pars. 272-326. I could not, however, accept as postposition everything she included under this name.

tion only in relation to the *verbal* syntagm and not for adnominal expressions. Secondly, Tesnière's concepts are based on semantic and/or syntactic peculiarities; for a linguist working on case, however, morphological characteristics, differences and identities are of prime importance. In this second point I do not follow Tesnière, as my interest lies in the correlation between morphological entities and syntactic structures.

A third distinction is that between obligatory, optional and free adjuncts to the verb. In the sentence

I fetched Judy from school an hour ago,

I and *Judy* are obligatory, *from school* is optional and *an hour ago* is free. Both the obligatory and the optional adjuncts are participants in the action, but the free ones are not. The obligatory and the optional adjuncts together represent the government pattern associated with the verb; it need not be completely realised, as some of its elements are optional. In what follows, I will limit my attention to those nominal expressions which represent actants or, as I call them, participants. I am not even interested in all participants, but only in the ones which can be brought into correlation with the members of the category of diathesis. Such a correlation is not a one-way determination from the verb towards the nominals. In the sentences

My son is running to / Ø *the office now.*,

it is the nominal structure that makes the verb's meaning explicit. It is quite thinkable that nominal patterns should be determining grammatical meaning for the verb as well.

In Old Turkic, place nominals in the locative case can clearly accompany a derived verb just in the sense in which they accompany its base: *vuusın ātözintā tutmış k(ā)rgāk* (TT VII 14,11, Yetikān) vs. *alkışım(ı)z ötügümüz . . . nā yerdā tıdınta tutunta ārsār, . . .* (Chuast 161) vs. *kün tāŋri kirdi; yer içintä yaromakı tıdılı* (TT I 23).[180] Another ex.: *yertinçütäki tı[nl](ı)glar yintä[m] nirbanta twgzunlar* (TT III 167) vs. *alkatmış beş kat t(ā)ŋri yerintä twgurtuŋuz* (TT III 60). With the instrumental: *[ka]tıg ünin kıkıra InçA tep tedi* (U IV C138) vs. *yäklär katıg ünin kıkrıştılar alakırıştılar* (U IV A295-6). The equative is not usually governed specifically by the verb either: "*Kōŋlüŋçä uduz*" *tedi*. *kök öŋüg yoguru ötükän yışgaru uduztum* (Toñ 15). Nor are most postpositional

180 The ed. joins *yer içintä* to *kirdi* and not to what follows, and translates "Der Sonnengott trat in die Erde ein". This, however, would demand the dative and not the locative, beside the unusual word order coming from such a division.

phrases, and here is one ex.: *elin üçün rddnilig tözün ätözin amgätip* . . . (M III 40,9$_1$, text 23). All such nominals are not participants.

A certain case is often demanded by a simple verb or by the base of a derived one through a semantic and/or lexical bond. Thus e.g. the ablative with verbs of escape and rescue: *alko yertinçütäki tınlıglar alp adalarıntın oẓẓunlar* (TT III 168) 'May all beings on earth escape from their grave dangers'. Such government stays invariant if the verb acquires a diathesis morphome: *tamutın tüzüni ozkurtunuz* (TT III 68) 'You saved all of them from hell'. In the *n*-dialect the locative form also covers the domain of an ablative, and thus we have *ölümtä ozmış* (IrqB XLIX) '(She) is said to have escaped death'. Also with causative transformation: *ämgäktä ozgurgay sän* (KP VI 2) 'You will save [them] from toil and trouble'.

As documented in the text, a considerable portion of the nominals accompanying the bases of verbs turns out to consist of bare noun stems, both as agent and as object. Close juncture between a verbal stem and a noun is shown, e.g., in the following ex.: *keniŋä tözün maytri burxanıg tuş bolalım* (Pfahl I 10) 'Afterwards we hope to meet the noble Buddha Maitreya'. The close juncture of *tuş* and *bol-* is here both semantic and syntactic. Although *bol-* is, of course, intr. *tuş bol-* is tr. *tuş* clearly occupies neither the subject nor the object slot; we have a sort of noun incorporation. This phenomenon was first discussed by Grønbech, 1936, who gives the following ex.: *özüm kagan olortukum üçün* . . . (BQ E36) 'because I myself sat as *kagan* . . .' and *özümün ol täŋri kagan olortdı* (KT E26 and BQ E21 complementarily) 'that (god of) the heavens seated me as *kagan*'. It ought to be mentioned that *olgurt-* usually serves as causative of *olor-*; *olort-* is found only as (*kagan olor-*)*-t-*, the causative of *kagan olor-*. Here is another ex. with a causative: *ç(a)mbudvip yer suv tolu ulug yel turgurmışın sakınmış k(ā)rgāk* (TT V A82) 'One must imagine that the earth and waters of Jambudvīpa fill up, and that (the gods) raise a great wind'. The sequence *yel tur-* to describe the rising of the wind is found e.g. in M III 10,8$_1$, 11$_1$ and 15$_1$ (text 4) and KP XVIII 3. The matter can be observed also with cooperative-reciprocal formations: *bo yok tözlüg öpkä nızbanı ey*[*in*] *utzukup u*[*zun*] *turkaru öç k*[*āk*] *alışu* . . . (TT II B85) 'They are defeated into conforming with this passion of fury rooted in nothingness and continually$_2$ take revenge$_2$ of each other . . .'. *öç käk al-*, the base of *öç käk*[181] *alış-*, can be found in DLT fol. 34. Nor is there any reason to think of a 'mutual or common becoming' when considering the third word in *tüŋür böşük boluşup kız berişip bagır böşük ädgü ögli bolurlar* (TT VI 308-9) 'They become each other's brothers- and sisters-in-law, give each other their daughters and become friends and well-wishers'. *ara kirişgäli umazlar* (BT II 950) 'They cannot intercede on each other's behalf' contains the reciprocal expansion of the expression *ara kir-*,

181 A common binomial.

which can be found in BT II 993-4 and Kuan 187, 206-7 and 211-12. Similar things can be said about *kut kol-* and *kut kolun-*, documented under *kol-un-* below and discussed in n. 310 in vol. 1. Here is an ex. with the causative of a tr. verb: *bökünki küntä bo nomlug oruntakı bir tāg kṣanti kılturdaçılarnıŋ, bökünтä* [(BT II 1066) 'From those who, as one, on this day bring about the atonement of sins in this bodhimaṇḍa, . . .', *kṣanti kıl-* is a fixed expression; *kṣanti* is therefore the object of the base of the verb. The immediate constituents of the phrase are (*kṣanti kıl-*)-*tur-*. *kṣanti kıltur-* is the causative of a verbal phrase signifying 'to atone one's sins', which is intr. when taken as a whole. Similarly the collocation *köŋül örit-*, which governs the dative, and its causative counterpart *köŋül örittür-*, which governs the same dative and, in addition, a direct object. Not only verbal stems serve as bases for voice affixes, then, but also verbal phrases containing, beside the verb, an adverbal predicative noun.

The accusative form is never used in close juncture with the verb base; the bare stem, on the other hand, is common in this status. There *are*, however, some instances in which bare stems serving as objects do not take part in a semantic union with the base of the verb, and represent participants. All those instances, and any others which may be such, will be duly considered.

The *accusative* case will receive attention in connection with all members of the paradigm of diathesis, as will the forms representing the indefinite object (i.e. bare stem for nouns, accusative form for pronouns etc.), under the conditions just mentioned. The *nominative*, on the other hand, although representing a participant, is not particularly interesting for us: All derived and underived finite verb forms have an agent in Old Turkic, which may always be expressed with the nominative, but may in any context also be left unexpressed. This is evidently so for the first and second persons of the modal and past indicative paradigms, but no less so also for all the third persons. In other words, the nominative is compatible with *all* verb forms and not characteristically present in conjunction with any particular ones.

The *dative*, however, turns out to be an especially interesting case for us. Beside a particularly wide spectrum of concrete significances,[182] it also has some abstract uses: *nākā ıglayu busuşlug kältiŋ?* (KP V2) 'Why did you come weeping and gloomy?'; *antag antag yertā bir köl suvı sugulup on mıŋ balıklar künkā köyüp unakıya ölgäli turu tāginürlär* (Suv 603,11) 'In a certain place the waters of a lake are retreating and ten thousand fish are burning in the sun and just about to reach the point of dying'. 'by, because of, through' the sun would be just as good for the context. *anıŋ yarlıkıŋa, ärksizin, mān bo muntag yavlak ada kılur m(ā)n* (U IV A 160-1) 'I produce these so evil dangers *by* his command, without my will'. *beş*

182 These are noted very clearly e.g. in par. 3.2144 of Tekin, 1968: 131-2.

yüz sıgunlar isig öz korkınçıŋa ögsüz bolup yerkä yapşınu sıgınıtlar (U IV C69) 'The five-hundred maral deer lost their mind in fear for their live self and stuck to the ground, seeking shelter'. Finally *kalmadı ärki ayıg kılınç maŋa kılmaduk* (BT XIII 13,109) 'There are probably no (types of) evil deeds which have not been carried out by me'. The nominal in the dative form represents the source or at least one of the sources from which the action issues, in an abstract sense. Thus the abstract significance of the dative form is diametrically opposed to its concrete significance, which is typically to refer to the point *towards* which the action is directed. It is the abstract significance which will occupy us in what follows. As we shall see, the 'originator' or 'instigator' sometimes referred to when passive behaviour is being described is, under certain circumstances, in the dative case. In the sentences quoted above, the verb is not passive but the dative form nevertheless seems to refer to 'originators'. This is equally so whether the verb is intr. as *köy-*, or tr., as *kıl-* in the sentence from U IV A 160-1. In BT XIII 13,109 the dative definitely has ergative sense, since it refers to the agent. The sentence represents a rhetorical figure in a versified text, and its structure may have been dictated by literary form. The grammatical fact remains documented for Old Turkic, however, and there are other instances. Whether this last type of dative is possible also when such an expression, containing an underived verb, has a *nominal* agent, remains to be determined. The Suv 603,11 instance with *köy-* could be considered a 'semantic passive', with the causative *köyür-* 'to burn (tr.)' as its 'active' counterpart. In any case, the dative appears in this sense also with tr. verbs. We will discuss the dative in connection with all members of the diathesis category, but in particular when treating the passives.

Among the postpositional phrases only those formed with *birlä* and *üzä* will be dealt with. Everything I have to say about *birlä* appears in the section on the reciprocal-cooperative activities. *üzä* has at least three meanings for which it is difficult to find a common denominator.[183] Primarily it means 'above', but sometimes also 'at', 'with' etc. We will be interested in the abstract uses of this postposition only; the main problem will be to decide when an *üzä* phrase represents a participant and when not. Uses as 'with the help of, through, by' tend towards this, and here are some exs.: *ün ägzig üzä yegädmiş atl(ı)g ı(ä)ŋri burxan kutıŋa yükünür biz* (BT II 511) 'We worship his honour the god Buddha named 'excellent in (or through, by) (his) voice and song'. "*käl toyın!*" *temäk üzä toyın kigürüp kuşılaram säŋrämkä eltü bardı* (U III 75,2$_1$) '(Buddha) enlisted (the *ṛşis*) as monks

183 Gabain, 1974: 396 n. 43 hints at the possibility that two lexemes, *üzä* and *özä*, may lie behind 'WYZ': *özä* is written so in the Codex Comanicus. However, *üzä* is attested dozens of times in the Brāhmī texts and thrice in BuddhKat 41-42 (Tibetan script); there is not a single exception. The Coman form is therefore irrelevant as far as Old Turkic is concerned.

by saying "Come, monk!" and took them to the Kuśalārāma monastery'. In these exs. the *ūzā* phrase clearly does not represent a participant in the action, and I have found no exs. for its doing so when the verb is not either passive or reflexive in form. We will come back to *ūzā* when discussing those members of the diathesis category.

There are quite a number of formatives used for expressing the content of a participant constellation different from the one associated with the base verb. Verbal duality and plurality is always associated with *-(X)ş-*, however, and reflexive content always with *-(X)n-*. Other diathesis formatives are passive or causative or, interestingly, both passive and causative. Our procedure will again be to list all verbs created with a particular formative, and then discuss its functioning and function. That is where the cases and postpositions come in, for they represent the realisation of diatheses in connection with the participants in the event being referred to.

7.1 *Verbs of vying and cooperation*

Actions characterised by their being carried out by more than one participant in cooperation or competition on, towards, for, by against etc. each other, are formed with *-(X)ş-*. *-(X)ş-* verbs denote events whose *nature* is affected by this multiple participation; otherwise, the speaker can just use the plural. We first list and document *-(X)ş-* stems. Then we mention a few verbs derived from nominals by *+lA-(X)ş-*; last comes our functional evaluation of the formative.

-(X)ş-: Lexical Material

(adkaş- 'to be joined' is found in ETŞ 8,1 as *adkaşu tur-*. See the *UW* entry s.v. *aṭkaş-* for this. The *UW* spells this verb, *adka*K (q.v. above in section 3.101) and *adkan-* (q.v. below in section 7.2) with *t* and not *d* against the overwhelming weight of the documentation, because of an etymology presented in Röhrborn, 1983: The verb is there 'explained' as coming from **art+ka-*. Beside Uigur spelling, this is unacceptable because of Kaz. and Kirg. verbs pointed out to me by T. Tekin: *aykas-* in the former and *aykaş-* are translated as "zusammengelegt sein, über's Kreuz gelegt sein, gefaltet sein (v. Händen), in Fugen gearbeitet sein (Holzarbeiten); sich vereinigen, untereinander verbinden, umarmen, packen beim Ringen" and there also is *aykalış-* with similar meaning. The *y* is here regular for older *d*. Thirdly, there is the sentence *ärüj birlä ämgäk adakşu yatur* in QB 2936 (both extant mss.), in Dankoff's translation "Hard work and contentment are bedfellows". The thus attested form is

grammatically obscure and there would be no violation of the metre in emending it to *adkaşu yat-* 'to be intertwined'. The QB does not confuse the dentals. Fourthly, there is no formative *+kA-* but only an allomorph of the morpheme *+(X)rkA-* discussed in section 5.2. As shown there, the addition of *+kA-* to *art* would have been counter-grammatical. **adka-* is not attested. A further ex. for *adkaş-* is quoted by Zieme in *OLZ* 84 (1989): 62 from an unpublished text; it there appears in a biverb with *yapış-* (q.v. below).)

ag-ış- is attested twice in Uigur with the meaning 'to deviate mutually (from the terms of a contract)'. See the *UW* for this verb, which comes from 2 *ag-* 'to change; deteriorate'. The DLT verb *ag-ış-* listed with its various meanings in the *EDPT*, on the other hand, comes from 1 *ag-* 'to rise'; it is not related to the present one.

akıl-ış- 'to flow together' is a hap. in Uigur discussed in the *UW*. It appears in a biverb with *kudul-uş-*; and the biverb *ak-ıl- kud-ul-* is also attested. See these and the biverb verbs below.

al-ış- 'to take from one another'. The Uigur ex. (quoted in the *UW*) contains the phrase *öç k[äk] alış-* 'to take revenge on one another'. This is the reciprocal of the phrase *öç käk al-* found in the DLT. The *EDPT* quotes *alış-* from the DLT and once from the QB; additional QB exs. appear in couplets 4111, 4305, 4421, 5032 and 5684. Several of these have the expression *älig alış-* 'to take each other's hand'.

alakır-ış- 'to shout out together or at each other'. Only in a biverb with *kıkır-ış-*. *UW*; only one of the exs. mentioned there, the one of U IV A296, actually exists: Of the other one, the ms. only has three letters.

amra-ş- 'to like each other'. See the *UW*; exs. not mentioned there appear in InscrOuig I 48 (*abamuluk amraşıp* [), BT XIII 49,47 (*xanlarımız amraşıp sävişip tümän tümän yaşazun* 'May our kings live in mutual love$_2$ for thousands and thousands of years') and ShōAgon 1,319 (*isinmāk ąmraşm[ak]*). Three further ones can be found under *isi-ş-* below.

(*arkaş-* is derived by the DLT, and by the *EDPT* s.v., from *arka* 'back' and translated accordingly. Outside the DLT and before the modern period it appears in two Brāhmī instances quoted in the *UW*, translated "ineinander legen, zusammenlegen". 'to clasp mutually' is, I think, a better translation: There are pairs of cooperating agents in all three instances; *-Xş-* denotes a mutuality of agents and not of objects. *arkaş-* is taken to have the same base as *arkag* "Querfaden des Gewebes, Schuß". The DLT's *arka-*, said to be Oguz, may have been their common base: Its translation is 'to search, investigate', but the original semantic kernel may have been more like 'to go through'. Cf. Chag. *arġa-* "den Faden einschießen (beim Weben)".)

aşla-ş- has been read in InscrOuig IV 50: *arṭamış buẓulmış sıŋ işlärin aşuru yasaşıp*

akalap olorurta aŋnukı tayançıKları aşlaşıp ayıklıg xan bolgu tayzı birlä anta yolukuşup . . . This probably signifies 'to join (mutually)'; there is no reason to take it to be a mistake, as the *UW* does. A further ex. not mentioned in the *UW* but quoted by Zieme in his review to the *UW* (*OLZ* 84 (1989): 62) must have the same meaning, as it appears in a series with *sola-ş-*, *adka-ş-* and *yap-ış-* (all of them discussed in this section). The meaning of *aşlaş-tur-* (q.v. below) fits well with this. The *EDPT*'s 2 *aşla-* (the base of *aşlaş-*) and *aşla-l-* are attested only in Qarakhanid sources: The meaning 'to mend' in which *aşla-* appears to have been used there may well be secondary.

at-ış- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT: *ok atış-* 'to compete in shooting arrows'. In Ht V 5 b 14 we find the sentence *ötrü anta ok sünüşüp* [. . .] *adrışgalı kılınmlar* well visible on the facs. From this and from the wider context it seems likely that this is an error for *atış-*, in the sense 'to shoot at each other'. For *sünüş- atış-* cf. the binomial *sünüş atış* in section 3.103. *adr-ış-* 'to part (intr.)' does appear in the DLT (see the *EDPT*) but not in Uigur. The *UW* has no *atış-*.

aya-ş- 'to respect each other': See the *UW* entry for it.

ayıgla-ş- 'to scorn each other' appears once in Suv in the series *tötüşmäk karışmak yoŋarışmak ayıglaşmak* as quoted by the *DTS*. See *ayıg+la-* above.

ayt-ış- does not appear in the *EDPT* and is quoted once from UjgRuk in the *DTS*. There, in InscrOuig IV 48 and in YamadaSlaves 11, it signifies 'to consult with'. In Ht V 5 b 12, on the other hand, *uruş aytışu tötüş boltı* is rather 'to invite each other (to fight)'. *olar için aytışdılar* "They became reconciled among themselves" (DLT fol. 50) is better read thus; not as '*etiş-*', as the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly do; This fits the meaning better.

basın-ış- is a hap. in SuvStockh 72: *bir ikintişkä basınaşıp kunuş kırma kılurlar*. The eds. translate correctly as "unterdrücken sich die Leute gegenseitig und . . ." but misread the verb as '*basıraşıp*'. *bas-ın-* (q.v. below) is tr.

ber-iş- 'to give something to each other' is found in TT VI 309 (passage quoted on p. 549 above) in addition to the exs. mentioned in the *EDPT* s.v. It appears also in UigLand 25 and in QB 4305 and 4421.

bıç-ış- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT; there it signifies 'to compete in cutting something'. Appears also in Maitr 173 r 10 as *etigläri yaratıgların üzüşür bıçışurlar* 'They cut$_2$ each other with their accessories$_2$ (instr.)', in 208 r 8 as *sançışu bıçışu*, 174 v 30 as *bir ikintişkä közrä kulgakra sançışur biz, tılımızını bıçışur biz*, in 171 v 3 as *bi bıçgu kılıçın bıçışurlar*, in 81 v 28 as *bir ikintişkä bıçuşurlar* (thus) *käsişürlär tokışurlar sançışurlar* 'They hew$_2$ at each other . . .' and in 218 r 10 (biverb with *os-uş-*, q.v. below).

bil-iş- 'to be acquainted with someone, to know each other, to meet people' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB. Found also in *anı birlä siz bilişgäy siz* "Vous ferez connaissance avec lui" (HamTuouen 28,20), *ozakı*

bilişmiş ädgü ögli kişi (UigTot 71) 'a well-meaning person who is an old acquaintance' and *için ara bilişmäz ... öŋin öŋin tururlar; olar ymä öz için ançulayu ok bilişmäz* (Suv 364,4-7). This last ex. does not refer to persons but to the different senses. For the first part of the passage, a Berlin ms. (quoted by Ş. Tekin) has the variant *için yänä bilişmäz. ikägü täŋ bilişip täŋ berür biz* (UigPacht J 10) has a different use of *biliş-*, with the two sides not direct objects of each others' knowing: "Wir werden beide zu gleichen Teilen verantwortlich sein und zu gleichen Teilen geben".

birik-iş- is a hap. in ETŞ 13,84 not mentioned in the dictionaries: *ädgü öglilär birlä birikişip bir orunta birgärü ärälim.* 'to gather (intr.) with'.

bog-uş- 'to strangle or try to strangle one another' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. It appears also in Maitr 81 v 30, *bir ikintişkä ... boguşurlar ölrüşürlär.*

bol-uş- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT on. Found also in TT VI 308, in a passage quoted on p. 549 above. No translation can be given for the verb itself, as there should be a bracketing (*tüŋür böşük bol-*)-*uş-*. One of the mss. has *kılış-* instead; this verb is discussed below. *boluşmaklıg uguş* appears in Abhi B 31 a 12, quoted and discussed in the n. to KudJunshō B r 1-2, also 31 b 10 and 32 a 1.

bul-uş- 'to find one another' or 'to find something in cooperation with someone' is quoted in the *EDPT* from 'Toy', i.e. T.M. 342 in KöktüTurf, and then only from the DLT.[184]

bulga-ş- is mentioned in the *DTS*, not in the *EDPT*. Only once in Suv, and in QB 2336. Cf. the hap. *bulgaşmaksız* in section 3.329. 'to be mixed up collectively; to be mixed up by one another'.

bür-üş- and *bur-uş-* (both DLT) are mixed up by the *EDPT*, although Kāšġarī makes clear that they are distinct. The former refers to twisting up the mouths of sacks and the like, the second to the wrinkling up of the skin and of textiles. *bur-kı*, *burış* and possibly *buşrı* (< **burşı*?) are related to the latter.

bürt-üş- 'to be in, or come into, contact with something'. Hap. in TT V, quoted in the *EPDT*.

çaxşa-ş- is a hap. in *kaxşaşu çaxşaşu yorır[lar* 'They walk about, collectively tottering and making clattering noises' (Ht IV 1541). The base is attested in DLT fol. 569: *taş çaxşadı* "The pebbles rattled. Also for the clinking of ornaments and other sounds". This, in turn, may come from an unattested *-Xş* derivate from *çak-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*), an onomatopoeic verb. yIŋşAşU *turur ol*

184 *yeg* (thus the *EDPT* with the facs.) *alıg buluşgalı unamaduklar* in the runic ex. signifies 'They did not agree about finding (it either) good (or) bad' or '... finding (its) virtues (and) inadequacies' or '... finding (it) superior (or) inferior' but not as translated in the *EDPT* s.v. 1 *a:l*: See *alıg* in the *UW* and the *EDPT*.

ärdinilig eŋlär (BuddhUig II 75) may contain a similar verb if read correctly (if, e.g., it is not a mistake for '*yaŋra-ş-*').

çiltä-ş- is a hap. in *aşka okışıp ayaşıp çiltäşip* . . . (Maitr 199 v 5) 'They invited each other to dinner, showed respect to each other$_2$ and . . .'. *çiltä-* is only used together with *aya-* and, according to *UW* 298 b, also with *ayaş-*, *çiltä-g* (q.v. in section 3.101) only with *aya-g*. Two exs. of *aya- çiltä-* are mentioned under *çiltäg*. Another one is found in HamTouen 15,16, wrongly spelled as "Y'DY CYLTY. The "radical *čilt-*", which the ed. would there like to reconstruct, is otherwise unattested; it could not be connected by any known formative to *çiltä-* or to its derivates. Connecting this verb with the Skt. radical *cint-* 'to consider' would probably also be too far-fetched.

ädgülä-ş- 'to be good to each other' is in the *EDPT* quoted from U IV D 56 and QB 4354. It is attested also in U IV D 60, and Ht V 8 b 3: *öz kılıkıŋa [ärt]inü uyadıp kaşmir xanı [bir]lä ädgülăşip ketdi* "He was very much ashamed of his own action, he and the king of Cashmere did good deeds to one another and he left". See *ädgü+lä-* above: It has a slightly different meaning, and may not really be the base of *ädgülăş-*; in that case, *ädgülăş-* would be a *+lAş-* derivate from *ädgü* itself.

äriglä-ş- appears in BT III 584 and Warnke 553 together with *ütlä-ş-* (q.v. below). Not mentioned in the dictionaries. See *ärig+lä-* above. It too is attested only in a biverb with *üt+lä-*, and cf. the binome *üt ärig*.

edär-iş- 'to chase each other, to follow one upon the other'. Attested in SuvZieme 693,20 (quoted in *UW* 135 a s.v. *ançata*) and UigĀg (1) E 5 (*toyın toyın edriş-mişlärin* . . . "in Gruppen$_2$ folgten sie aufeinander"). Also BuddhUig II 293: *saḍabira urudita BODISATV eyin bolup anıŋ savıŋa, edärişü birgärü bayagut-nıŋ āviŋā tägip* . . .[185] The same verb may appear also in ManMon 91: *iki iş ayguçılar etrā[ş]mäzün. etrăşip iş küç agduk kılsar kıy(ı)nka kızgutka tägzün*. This could signify 'to alternate on the job, i.e. not to carry it out simultaneously'. The variant *edräş-* may appear also in Maitr fr. 499 r 2: The /i/ of the formative may have gotten widened due to the /r/. A problem is posed only by the dental, for ManMon does not confuse the dentals, generally. See *edär-t-* also for the base.

elt-iş- appears in TT VII 17, and in TT VII 30, the continuation of the text of TT I. The two contexts are rather obscure and not really compatible. Arat's etymology and his and the *EDPT*'s translations are not too convincing, but I have no better suggestion. *elt-* is 'to bring'; cf. *elt-in-*.

185 Ş. Tekin has *edäriş-* govern *savıŋa*, but it is unlikely that this verb should signify 'to follow' in the abstract sense of 'acting in accordance with the words of . . .'. *savıŋa* is either used as an adverbial phrase by itself ('on her word') or governed by *eyin bol-*.

er-iş- 'to try to reach, one with respect to the other', i.e. 'to compete', is attested in TT III 77: *k[arışm]akıg erişmäkig särgürtüŋüz* "You have put off strife and competition". This translation (and my conjecture with *kar-ış-*) derive from similarity with the binomes *erşi karşı* and *erşisiz karşısız* (section 3.118 above) and, of course, from the context. The *EDPT*'s translation of *erişmäk* as "arrival" (adopted by Pothi) seems inappropriate. *bir ikintişkä erişmäki* (ĀgFrag (1) G b4), on the other hand, is no doubt correctly translated as "ihr Einander-Erreichen": This accords both with the Chin. original and with the context.

erpä-ş- in *bir ikintişkä erpäKin erpäşü kälirl[ä]r* (Maitr 68 v17) is a hap. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Cf. *erpäK* in section 3.101 and *erpä-l-* below.

eştr-üş- is a hap. quoted in the *EDPT*: *savlaşıp eştrüşüp* 'informing$_2$ one another'. See *eşt-ür-* (< *eşid-*) below.

et-iş- is attested only in a Suv instance and then in the Sanglax (as quoted in the *EDPT*). The DLT verb mentioned in the *EDPT* entry is better left as *aytış-* (q.v. above). *käşinlärniŋ sapında tägşilmäktin üd kolo tört uluglar etişip tägşilürlär üd eyin* (Suv 590,13-15) can be translated as follows: "Through the regular change of the two-month seasons, the periods and the four great (elements) form each other and get changed according to time".

evin-iş- 'to hurry up together, spur each other on' is a hap. in Shō VI b 12: *iki turgak äränlär evinişü tavranışu ünüp balıktın . . . . ev-in-* is found in the QB but not in Old Turkic. For the biverb cf. *evä* (read thus) *taya tavranu* (U II 29,18-19).

ıd-ış- 'to send something to each other' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT on. Uigur exs.: *Samtso açarınıŋ T(a)vgaç xan birlä kāliş barış bitig ıdışmakın ukutmak* (colophon of Ht IX, quoted in Ht X p. 11); *ol maŋa ärtüt ıdıştı, äd tavarlar b(ä)lgülüg bolsar, bälāg ıdışalım* (Maitr 157 v1); *ärdni b(ä)lgülüg bolsar, bir ikintişkä bälāg ıdışalım* (*ibid.* 19).

iç-iş- 'to drink collectively' appears in] *toylaşıp içişip* [(InscrOuig I 47). In the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT on.

ikä-ş- 'to quarrel' is found in DLT fol. 103 (quoted by the *EDPT*, which also has modern forms) and in Rabġūzī. The base is attested also in the DLT; cf. *ikinçsiz* in section 3.12 and *ikiş* in section 3.103.

il-iş- 'to get caught in one another' or, in the ETŞ ex., 'to get engaged as a group'. In the *EDPT* quoted only from DLT and QB on; Uigur exs. appear in ETŞ 13,72 and BT VII A 259.

isi-ş- is quoted in the *EDPT* only from the DLT; there the verb is attested in its primary sense connected with physical warmth. In Uigur, we find the verb in three Āgama instances: ShōAgon 1,177 and 192 and ĀgFrag (1) B 18 all have the binome *isişmäk amraşmak*. Cf. *amra-ş-* above, and the biverb *isi-n- amra-n-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs. All these refer to affection. Metaphorical *isiş-* was preceded by *isigläş-*.

isiglā-ş- in MaitrH XVI 5 b18 appears to have had the same metaphorical meaning as *isi-ş-* of the previous entry, whereas the DLT's *isig+lā-* has to do with the literal meaning of *isi-g*. Hap., not mentioned in the *EDPT*.

iskā-ş- 'to pluck out mutually' is mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS*. It is a hap. in Maitr 173 r29 (BT IX 172,29₁): *amarıları uvut yinlärin üzüşür iskāşürlär* 'Some of them are engaged in cutting up and plucking out each others' sexual organs'. The DLT has *iskä-* and *iskän-*; *iskä-* 'to pluck' is attested also in Ht IV 58 and six times in Maitr.

işlā-ş- 'to work for something together, to work for a common aim' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. It is attested also in BT II 939, MaitrGeng 11 b4 and Warnke 601.

it-iş- 'to push each other' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Attested also in BuddhUig II 88 together with *kakıtış-*.

kaçur-ış- 'to chase each other' is quoted by the *EDPT* only from the DLT. Found also in BuddhUig II 104, in a passage about birds: *karışu oynayu, kaçuruşu tokışu, kakılayu ätinäyü* . . .

(*kakıtış-* is a hap. in BuddhUig II 88, in *kalıŋulayu üşüşü, katguruşu külüşü, kakıtışu iţişü, kavışışu yıgılışu* . . . Base not attested, but related to *kak-* (DLT f.) 'to strike, tap, knock'. Left untranslated by the editor.)

(*kaxşaş-* appears in Ht IV 1541, quoted under *çaxşa-ş-* above. Its base is not attested in Old Turkic, but the n. to BT III 218 quotes it from several modern languages with meanings related to shaking (intr.). Toalster's 'explanation' is unacceptable.[186] We also have *sundari kız . . . kaxşaşu turur eţigligin tümägligin . . . oposalk(ı)ya kälir ärkän . . .* 'When the girl Sundarī came walking with (her) shaking adornments$_2$ . . .' (BT III 218).

kalı-ş- is used in the DLT (quoted in the *EDPT*) of horses and stallions, and translated as "to leap together". The base there signifies 'to rear and bolt' (fol. 564). In Tariat S2 it appears to have been used in connection with tribes: *beşinç ay üç yegirmikä kalışdı. sūŋūşdüm, anta sançdım*. 'On the thirteenth day of the fifth month there was a collective uprising (or the like). I fought, and routed them there'. This is a likelier interpretation than *kal-ış-* 'to stay behind (i.e. run off) collectively'. I take it to be a metaphorical transfer from the equine domain (so familiar to the early Turks).

kar-ış- probably originally signified 'to mix, mingle (with each other)'. This meaning is dead in Uigur, however, together with the base *kar-*. *kar-* is in the DLT

186 *EDPT* 613 a quotes *kak+sı-* (mentioned in section 6.2 above) from the DLT and from a Middle Turkic text in Arabic letters. It is there spelled with *ṣād* and translated as "(of oil) to be rancid". Toalster takes *ṣ* to be /ş/ (the way Skt. is transcribed) and, extending the translation outside the domain of the kitchen, translates "gehen *stinkend* und rasselnd umher". The final /ı/ of *kakıs-* is disregarded.

said to be Oguz, and has a rather Western distribution. In Uigur, *karış-* normally means 'to disagree, to quarrel', as documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Note, however, the not so serious use of *karış-* in BuddhUig II 104 (quoted under *kaçuruş-* above). The semantic shift of *karış-* appears to have come from battle terminology: Cf. melée in French, 'engagement in battle, joining battle' in English. QB 2290-2384, which describes fighting, has the verb not less than five times. Cf., on the other hand, *karışmaz yagılar* 'enemies that were implacable' in QB 145. An additional ex. in ETŞ 11,48 occurs in a rather obscure passage. The translation of *karışu turur törт azıglıg* (ms. T I α (U 5396) l.3 quoted in the n. to BT XIII 25,4) as "er hat vier unregelmäßig stehende (?) Hauer" is probably wrong: Cf. *böri tişi karıştı* "The wolf's teeth gnashed (?) – this occurs during the days of his fast, since the wolf does not eat for one week out of each month . . ." (DLT fol. 317).[187] Gnashing is thus another special meaning of this verb. *karşı* (section 3.118) and *karşut* (section 3.108) clearly come from the Uigur use of *kar-ış-*, and *karınçlıg* (q.v. in section 3.104) has an associated meaning. Cf. also *karış-ma yagı* 'hostile enemy' (QB 5866) and *karış-gan* "valiant" (QB 2379). *kar-* may have died out because of homophony with 2 *kar-* 'to choke on something' and 3 *kar-* 'to flow over'.

katgur-uş- 'of a group, to laugh loudly' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It appears in BuddhUig II 88 as quoted under *kakıış-* above and, as *katgur(u)ş-mak* in Maitr 18 v 11-12. *katgur-* is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB and found also in *xaxa tep katgurmak* (BT VIII B 144) and perhaps *külär yüzin kotgurur kaşın* (Maitr 13 r 5 with irregular vowel): *katgur-* and *kül-* are often used together; *çeçäk yazdı yüz kör külär katgurar* (QB 80) is similar to the Maitr instance.

kat-ış- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT; there it signifies 'to help someone mix one substance with another one', or 'to vie with someone at doing so'.[188] The sememe of the substances themselves mixing is already contained in the meaning of *kat-* 'to mix (two or more things, tr.)'. *katış-* is attested also in UigTot 14-16, but with a different content and use: *üç katışturmak 'ärsär, twgmak ölmäklig anţırabav az birlä katışmak, tüldäki anţırabav biligsiz bilig birlä katışmak, [ara] bolmaklıg anţırab(a)v öpkä birlä katışmak 'ärür*. This

187 Zieme's translation is unlikely also because *turur* is an auxiliary which denotes continuous aspect and/or durative Aktionsart: Cf., among many exs., the one with *kaxşaşu turur* quoted under *kaxşaş-* above.

188 The text of DLT fol. 313 reads: *ol mäniŋ birlä talkanka yag katışn* "He helped me mix the barley gruel with butter. Also for vying". The *birlä* is actually governed by the suffix *-Xş-*, to express either cooperation or competition. I don't understand why Dankoff and Kelly remark, in a footn.: "Thus the text; helping and vying should be reversed, or else *mänig birlä* should be read *maŋa*".

clearly means 'to mix (intr.)', i.e. 'to mix with each other'. Presumably due to the bilateral meaning of *kat-* itself, *-Xş-* here serves as de-transitiviser. *kat-ış-* is here practically a synonym of *kat-ıl-* (q.v. below) or, at any rate, of *katılış-*. This is not a case of sporadic confusion on the part of the translator of UigTot, as not the DLT's) *kat-ış-*.

katış-tur- (discussed below: attested elsewhere as well) comes from this (and

katıl-ış- 'to get mixed with one another' is attested in UigTot 73 (*suvlı süṭli katılış-mış täg*), 460 etc. and ShōAgon 1,331 (] *äränlär birlä öŋrä ajunta birgärü katlışu kavışu . . .*). Cf. *kaṭılışmaksız bulgaşmaksız* (BT II 1263). There is no reason to assume an error in the DLT, as the *EDPT* (which did not know this verb) does s.v. *katlış: katlış-* (syncopated as in ShōAgon) is attested in the DLT as well.

See *kat-ıl-* below, and cf. *katış-*.

kavı-ş- 'to come together, to reunite'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also s.v. *qatīl-qavīş-*. Among the many additional exs. we can mention the ones in Hazai 62 and 78, BT VIII A 117 and 193 and UigTot 347 and 630; a further one is quoted under *katıl-ış-*. Cf. *kavış-ıg* and *kavşut* above, *kavş-ur-* below, and *yol tämür . . . urug kadaş ogul kız birlä kavışgu üçün* (BT XIII 20,62) "damit Yol Tämür mit den Nachkommen, Verwandten, Söhnen und Töchtern (wieder) vereinigt werde". Although its content implies the participation of two parties, *kavış-* may not always have been felt to be an *-(X)ş-* verb: Cf. *kavış-ış-*. A base for it may appear in Toñ 12: *Tavgaç, Oguz, Kıtañ bo* (ü)*çägü* K¹B¹S¹R¹, . . . 'If these three, the Chinese, the Oghuz and the Kıtañ, unite, . . .'.[189] *rasıyanıg oŋ sol ayalarka bir ikintiṣkā kavıp sürtüp . . .* (BT VII A 379) is translated as "indem man das . . . Rasāyana auf die rechte und die linke Handfläche reibt, während [die Handflächen] aneinanderliegen, . . ." in *UW* 289 b; but the word is damaged and this late text is an unlikely place to find an obsolete base. It should be *kavı-*, to judge by the shape of its other derivate, *kavı-r-*. *kavır-* is an *-(U)r-* causative; the base must have been intr. because *kavış-* is intr.

kavış-ış- is a hap. in BuddhUig II 89, quoted under *kakıt-ış-* above. *EDPT* and *DTS* do not mention this verb. Such an instance, appearing in a flamboyant series of transparent *-(X)ş-* verbs, is not significant enough to put into question the appurtenance of *kavış-* to this formation.

(**kayvılan-ış-* and **kavlan-ış-* are not attested, but *kayvıla-n-* and *kavla-n-*, *kayvılanışdur-* and *kavlanışdur-* are: See those verbs below.)

käŋrā-ş- is a hap. in TeilBuch (M I) in a biverb with *yüntüş-* (q.v. below). It is spelled as *k(ä)ŋräş-*: cf. *k(ä)rgäksiz*, *t(ä)gl'ük* etc. in the same passage. It has therefore hitherto been read as *'käkräş-'*, which is how it appears also in the

189 It is possible that K¹B¹S¹R¹ should simply be *kavışsar*, but not very likely: Cf. *aşsız* 'without food', spelled Ş S¹Z in KT E 26 and BQ E 21.

EDPT. Such a stem would, however, be quite isolated: Osm. *kākrā-* "to be or become sour or acid" (mentioned in the *EDPT*) is probably a back-formation from *kākrā* "acrid, bitter", interpreted as < **kākrā-g*. *kākrā*, in turn, cannot be derived from *kāk* 'malice, rancour' (as suggested in the *EDPT*). A very common cognate of *käŋrāŋ-* is *käŋrā-n-* 'to grumble'. See *käŋrā-* in section 5.32. By the meaning of those lexemes and by the context, *käŋrāŋ-* must be 'to nag or rant at each other'.

kär-iŋ- 'to contend with someone or with each other' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and from one Uigur instance. *tötüŋ- käriŋ-*, which appears in the latter, can be compared to *tötüŋ käriŋ* and *tötüŋlüg kärilig* discussed in section 3.103. The idea behind *kär-iŋ-* must have been something like a tug-of-war: *kär-*, first attested in the DLT, only has the concrete meaning 'to stretch'.[190]

käs-iŋ- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT (with concrete meaning) and from several economical texts in the USp. In the latter, it signifies 'to conclude an agreement, settle an account'. Then there is an ex. in Maitr. quoted under *bıç-ıŋ-* above, which signifies 'to cut each other (physically)'. Cf. also *üz-üŋ-*.

keŋä-ŋ- 'to take counsel with someone' comes from *keŋ+ä-*, discussed among the *+A-* verbs. Instances of *keŋäŋ-* not quoted in the *EDPT* appear in Ramstedt II 4, BT XIII 49,31 (*aka in*[*i*] *kız kälinlär birlä käŋäŋip* (thus) . . .), InscrOuig IV 48 and FenTen III 12.

(*keŋşäŋ-* is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It appears in U III 66,17 (fragmentary context), BT III 180 (. . . *savlarıg keŋşäŋü InçA tep sözläştilär*), Warnke 80 (". . ." *tep käŋşäŋip* . . .), Maitr 11 v16 and 7 v28 (both *kä°*) and ShōAv 22, 96, 158, 258, 273 (all of them *kä°* and not *ke°*). The base of this verb is not attested, but should be **keŋiş+ä-*. Qarakhanid *keŋäş* 'counsel' is discussed among the *-Xş* lexemes. What has been read as '*kinggäšti-lär*' in U I 8,4 looks, in the facs., like *keŋşäşti-lär*. If this is correct, the distribution of *keŋşäş-* vs. *keŋäŋ-* seems to be the following: *keŋşäş-* only in religious Uigur texts, *keŋäŋ-* in non-religious Uigur documents, Qarakhanid and Muslim Middle Turkic and modern languages. The two verbs appear to have the same meaning.

ket-iŋ- 'to part from one another' is documented in the *EDPT*. Only one Uigur ex. has turned up; *tuţuşḍaçı* and *keţişgüçi* of this passage cannot be translated modally (which both the ed. and the *EDPT* do) but must be predicates of descriptive nominal clauses.

190 Kljaštornyj thought he had an instance of *käriş-* in Tes 10. T. Tekin shows in *AOH* XLII (1988): 114-5 that this reading is dubious, and makes it probable that the stretch is part of a place name. Not quite to be excluded is the possibility that it is an instance of the verb of the previous entry, spelled as *k(ä)ŋkr(ä)ŋ-*.

kıkır-ış- 'to shout to one another'. The *EDPT* s.v. has tacitly emended the ex. from U IV A 9: The text has *kıkıruşu*, well visible on the facs. In U IV A 295 and C 21 we find *kıkrış-*, as in the DLT. *kıkır-* is discussed in section 5.31.

kıl-ış- 'to do something to each other' is in the *EDPT* documented from the DLT but not from Uigur. One ms. of TT VI 308 has *kılış-* where the rest have *bol-uş-*. *kşanti kılışgalı y(a)rlıka-* (BT III 584 and 615) is the reciprocal of *kşanti kıl-*, a very common sequence. There is, finally, *t(ā)ŋrilär yalŋoklar birlä sävişip ... ögrünç sävinç kıl(ı)şmışlar* (Rāma 21).

(kırmalaş- is a hap. in *elig uluşug kırmalaş*[(TT VIII E 17) 'collectively pillaging realm and nation'. The *ś* before the lacuna is marked as uncertain. **kırmala-* is not attested but its variant *karma+la-* is discussed above; see section 3.109 for the variants *kırma* ~ *karma*, both 'plunder, pillage'. The *EDPT*'s tacit 'emendation' to '*karmalaş-*' is unjustified.)

kir-iş- 'to engage in something in a mutual manner' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Then there is *ara kiriş-* (BT II 950) 'to intercede for each other' and the following (Ht V 5 b 10): *üküş yıl ay ärtd[i], bo iki xanlar törüsi sav*[*ka*] *kiriş-mädi* 'Many years and months went by, and these two did not engage in (mutual) talks in the manner of kings'. Cf. *kiriş-tür-* below.

kōm-üş- 'to bury each other'. The *EDPT* quotes the DLT as the earliest source for this verb; appears also in a fragmentary passage in M III 32,2_2 (text 13).

kör-üş- 'to see one another, to look at each other, to meet'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in Hazai 78, UigBrief C 8 and 11, ShōAgon 2, p. 194,6_1, UigTot 72, BT VII O 1, BT VIII A 136, 137 and 138, Ht IV 445 and 1426, V 5 b 10 and 11 and 13 b 23 and VII 6 a 2 and 15 a 10-11, ManTürkTex 610, Hochzeit 26, Tenri A II and VIII and Maitr 135 r 1 and 217 v 7. In Maitr 187 r 29, this verb is used of the sun and the moon, as in TT I 93.

(kōzkiş- appears to signify 'to compare a copy with the original, collate mss.' in two colophons quoted in AbiShotan pp. 76 and 77 respectively: *bo ıdok Koşavarti şastırnıŋ patartında on kuonın m(ä)n Nom-kulı şabık(ı)ya közkişü tägindim. yaŋlok ägsük bolmış ärsär, ...* and *biz üç kiçig kişilär baştın bärü adakka tägi közkişü tükätmiş ärür. kärgäksiz yana ägsük bolsar, ...* The ex. of *közkiş-* in Ht V 256 has no object, and might signify 'to confront': [*sawşiŋ*][191] *baxşılar birlä közkiş*[*gäli*] *anuk* 'ready to take part in a confrontation with the *hīnayāna* teachers'. Another possibility (more in accordance with the other two exs. of the verb) would be to take the object 'text' to be 'understood': 'ready to compare canonical texts with ...' (in a learned dispute). No base is attested for this verb, but it might come from an *+(X)k-* derivate of *köz* 'eye'. The consistently unrounded second vowel would speak against such an etymology,

191 This word should have been marked as a conjecture in the *EDPT* entry for *közkiş-*.

though, and *közkiş-* might be compounded from *köz* and some unattested **kiş-*. **kiş-*, in turn, *might* have been a cooperative verb.)

kuç-uş- 'to embrace (one another)' is quoted in the *EDPT* from one Uigur ex., from the DLT and from Middle Turkic. It is attested also in QB 3292 and UigTot 1429 (*kuçuşur yaŋ üzā* "auf die Art der Umarmung").

kudul-uş- 'to be poured together' is a hap. in ETŞ 9, quoted in *UW* 81 a s.v. *akılış-*. Cf. that verb above.

kun-uş- 'to rob one another'. Quoted in the *EDPT* from the QaraBalg inscr., from the DLT and from Middle Turkic. *kun-* governs the noun referring to the stolen entity as object. From the DLT's *olar ikki tavar kunuşdı* "Each of them stole the other's property" we see that *kunuş-* retains this object but has the subjects as indirect sufferers. Cf. the use of *kun-suk-* in section 7.41.

kül-üş- 'to laugh collectively' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT on. It is attested also in BuddhUig II (biverb with *katgur-uş-*, quoted above s.v. *kakıtış-*) and Maitr 18 v 11, 134 v 30 and 145 r 11. Cf. *külüş-üg* among the *-(X)g* lexemes.

kürä-ş- 'to contend, come to grips with or fight with each other' is attested in BT XIII 12,170 (uncertain and in fragmentary context), QB 681, 2249 and 2360 and Wettkampf 71: *biziŋä bo öçäşmäk küräşmäk k(ā)rgak ärmäz* "Dieses miteinander Kämpfen$_2$ ist für uns nicht nötig".[192] DLT fol. 238 has the same verb: *kız birlä küräşmä* "Do not wrestle a virgin (for she will bring you down)", part of a proverb. In fol. 318, the DLT has a lemma for the verb *kürі-ş-*, translated as 'to help someone shovel something; vie with someone in shovelling'. There is a confusion in the vowels of this passage: *kürі-ş-* is spelled as KURAŞ°, *kör-üş-*, the previous lemma, as KURIŞ°. As happens with other lexemes, *küräş-* itself does not appear as lemma although it is used in an example. Due perhaps to this confusion, both *TMEN* 1626 and the *EDPT* derive *küräş-* from the verb signifying 'to shovel'. This is unacceptable both because of the second vowel in *küräş-* and because the semantic relation between contests and shovelling is tenuous. *küräş-* 'to contend or come to grips with each other' (secondarily, > 'to wrestle') is likelier to come from *kür+ä-* 'to desert, make oneself independent', discussed among the *+A-* verbs. Cf. also footn. 453 in vol. 1.

ogşa-ş- 'to resemble one another' is a hap. in ETŞ 16,27 not mentioned in the dictionaries.[193] Cf. *ogşaş-tur-* below, and see *ogşa-t-* for the quality of the velar.

okı-ş- signifies 'to call to one another, call or invite each other, shout at one

192 This translation is a bit sloppy: The context is about a contest and not about a real fight, and *öçäş-* and *küräş-* do not denote fighting in any strict sense.

193 Wrongly written with *u°* by Arat. Corrected by Zieme in a n. to Samanta 3, where ETŞ 16,25-28 are reedited.

Eastern Mediterranean Univ
LIBRARY

another' in both Uigur exs. cited in the *EDPT*, and also in Maitr 199 v 5 (quoted under *çiltä-ş-* above) and in QB 2365. The translation 'to read, or recite, together" given in the *EDPT* is not really found in the DLT either; it is not, in fact, attested before Middle Turkic.

orna-ş- 'to dwell collectively; to be permanently located, in a group' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Further exs. appear in ETŞ 10,10, ATSS VII and XV, Hochzeit 33, HtPek 153 a 11 (quoted in *UW* 99 b s.v. *alkış*, A,a), BT VIII B 110 and 116 and Shō XV 9. Cf. *ornaş-ıglıg* in ETŞ 10,286.

orn+a- is discussed among the *+A-* verbs.

os-uş- is mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS*. Found as *bıçışu osuşu* 'cutting one another into small pieces' in Maitr 218 r 10 and in Maitr 105 v 12 (= BT IX 230,12): *bıçışu] osuşu 'ärüyü sıza olıyu* [. Derived from *os-*, a simplex not to be confused with the base of *uvşal-*, *uvşan-*, *uvşat-* and *uvşak*. The converb of *os-* is *osa*, whereas the converb and aorist vowel of derived °*ş-* verbs is /U/: Thus e.g. *yeşür* in QB 6481. Nor is *os-* to be confused with *üz-*, as the Maitr carefully distinguishes /z/ and /s/, and as *os-guç* (discussed in section 3.21) has a back velar. This base is attested in *bıçıp osup* in Maitr 73 r 12 and *bıça osa* in Maitr 173 a 329 r 3. Cf. also *bıçıl-* *osul-* below. *os-*, q.v. in the *EDPT*, signifies 'to cut into small pieces'.

öçä-ş- 'to wager or argue or contend with one another'. The *EDPT*'s two *öçeş-* are clearly two uses of the same verb; especially since it is expressly stated in the pre-Qarakhanid item in '2 *öçeş-*' that the fight is *savın*, 'in words'. Add *baxşının savına öçäşmäk* (ETŞ 11,93). In Wettkampf 54 and 70, *öçäş-* denotes a real, physical contest between two persons. *bir ikintişkä ... yançışurlar öçäşürlär boguşurlar ölrüşürlär* (Maitr 81 v 30) is certainly even more violent. In view of these, *öçäşgü yok ölümkä* (BT XIII 16,8) is well translated as "Streiten mit dem Tod gibt es nicht". See *öç+ä-* above.

ögrünçülä-ş- 'to have a good time together' is a hap. in DreiPrinz 109. Cf. *ögrünçü+lä-* above.

ögü-ş- appears only in the IrqB. The *EDPT* (q.v.) is probably right in taking it to be the reciprocal of 'to grind'; this is written as *ögüş-* also in the DLT. The DLT gives the base as *ögi-*, but cf. *ögüp* in Heilk I 55 and *ögümiş unı* in Ernte 113.

ögür-üş- is a hap. in *bulmadukug bulmış täg ögürüşü sävinişü* (Shō VIII b 10) 'rejoicing$_2$ collectively like people who found something they hadn't (been able to) find (before)'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. The normal form of the base is *ögir-*, often used in a biverb with *säv-in-*.

ölr-üş- 'to kill each other' from *öl-ür-* (q.v. below) is not mentioned either in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *ölrüşür* is wrongly altered in Ht IV 1170. Then we have *bir ikintişkä ölrüşürlär* (Maitr 173 r 26) and *bir ikintişkä tokışur[lar] uruşur ölrüşürlär ärdi* (Maitr 166 v 5). Maitr 122 r 21 should no doubt also be read as *bir*

ikintişkä ölr(ü)şürlär instead of '*öläşürlär*' of BT IX 63,21. *örlüşürlär* in Maitr 81 v31 (quoted as *ölrüşürlär* under *öçä-ş-* above) is either a misreading of this verb or a case of a misplaced L-hook or the result of metathesis. Changing it to '*örlä-ş-*' is, at any rate, excluded because of the context: 'to get angry' is not violent enough.

öp-iş- 'to kiss one another'. The only ex. before the DLT is in the KP (see the *EDPT*) and has I in the second syllable; see facs. This might point to an original **äp-*. Cf. *öp-ün-* below.

örlät-iş-mäk is a hap. in Ht, quoted in the *EDPT*. 'mutual annoying'. Cf. *örlä-t-* below.

san-ış- is a hap. in ShōAgon 1,220, quoted also in the n. to ĀgFrag (1) F21: *ogul bolur birlä yänä sanışdaçı* "Kinder sind die Miteinander und Zusammen-Gehörenden". *sanış-* corresponds to Chin. *shu* 'to belong to, be subject to, connected with; depending upon'. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Cf. *sa-n-* below.

sanç-ış- 'to stab one another'. *EDPT* only from the DLT on. Attested also in Maitr 30 v29 (quoted in n. 53 in Gabain, 1974: 397), 86 r3 (quoted s.v. *tik-iş-* below), 81 v28, 208 r8 and 174 v30 (all quoted under *bıçış-* above) etc., and in InscrOuig II 10 and 51.

sar-ış- is a hap. in BT III 351, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. The passage is quoted in the syntactic discussion below. *sar-* "to rebuke harshly" is attested in the DLT. See *sars-ıg* above and *sars-ıt-* below for *sars-*, whose relation with *sar-* is abscure.

satıgla-ş- is found in Ht IV 965-6: *üküş ärdini yinçü vromluglar birlä satıglaşur* 'They trade great amounts of jewels and pearls with the Greeks'. *satıg+la-* is mentioned in the DLT, which adds: "The more correct form is *satıglaşdı*." The DLT ex. for *satıgla-* also governs the person one trades with by a *birlä* phrase.

savla-ş- should signify 'to tell each other anecdotes and stories'. Attested in the DLT and once in a Manichaean text, quoted in the *EDPT*. *sav+la-* is discussed above.

säv-iş- 'to like or love one another' is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Exs. not mentioned there appear in Rāma 20 and, quoted under *amra-ş-* above, in BT XIII 49,47.

sävin-iş- 'to rejoice collectively' is found in Shō VIII b10 (quoted s.v. *ögürüş-* above) and InscrOuig II 6. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.

sıg-ış- is quoted in the *DTS* from the Atabatu 'l-Ḥaqā'iq. Used also in *ulug ulug bramanlar . . . uluş balık sayukı bay bayagut kişilär tıkmış täg yolta sıgışmadın . . . basa yorıyurlar* (MaitrGeng 10 a13; 'to have enough space, of a group') and *oglanlarım birlä sıgışu yaraşu* (FenTen III 12; "to get along with").

sıgıa-ş- 'to lament together'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, in the latter also s.v. *ulığ- sïγlaş-*. Further exs. appear in BT II 967, BT III 1030 and Ht X 1065 and 1067-8. See *sıg(ı)t+a-* above.

sına-ş- 'to measure each other's strength' is quoted in the *EDPT* once from U IV. Found also in *bir ikinti birlä anta sınaşal(ı)m* (Wettkampf 83); cf. *küçümüz bir ikinti birlä sınalım* (*ibid.* 42). *sın+a-* is discussed above.

sogı-ş- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Found also in *ot yelkä sïŋmïştā älig adak sogışur* (UigTot 46). 'to cool down', "with a connotation of totality" (as the *EDPT* puts it).

sok-uş- 'to hit upon something or someone', occasionally 'in a fighting spirit; to find oneself in a certain situation; to meet'. Exs. additional to the ones of the *EDPT* appear in ETŞ 10,219, HtPar 165,22 (quoted in *UW* 43 b s.v. *ada*) and MaitrGeng 2 a 27. In Warnke 512, *sok-uş-* and *tuş-* are used as synonyms: *ädgü öglilärkä tuşsarlar, . . .* correlates with *ayıg öglilärkä sokuşsarlar, . . .* The Maitr has nine exs. of *. . . birlä sokuş-*.

sola-ş- appears in BuddhUig II 85: *äsriŋü ärdinilär üzä kavşuru solaşıp kavışu bütmiş ärdinilig kämilär*. 'to get fastened with chains collectively', or perhaps 'to each other'. A further ex. is quoted from an unpublished text by Zieme in *OLZ* 84 (1989): 62: In *]lArIn aşlaşu solaşu adkaşu yapışu* the first biverb is probably tr., the second not; this might mean that the direct object was inalienable (like 'hands').

sök-üş- 'to abuse one another' is discussed in the *EDPT* s.v. *'sögüş-'*. The base had a long vowel in Common Turkic, which gave voicing to the /k/ in Oguz and related sources; scholars therefore often write it with *g*. The /k/ is justified under *sök-üş* 'abuse', in section 3.103 above.

sözlä-ş- 'to converse, discuss a matter'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter under *sözläş-gülüg*. Found also in BT III 180 and 355 and, in a biverb with *ütlä-ş-*, 591, 599 and 615; Maitr 7 r 10-11 and 157 v 17, ShōAv 22 and 159, Ht VII 9 b 13 and ĀgFrag (1) E 4. Common in economical texts: ActeOuig 3-4, UigLand 5, ZiemeSklav I 2-3, UigPacht M 3 and YamSaleLoan. See *söz+lä-* above.

sün-üş- 'to fight'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; attested also in Maitr 81 v 11. This is beyond doubt related to inscriptional *sün-üg* (discussed in section 3.101)[194] and the action noun *sün-üş* (section 3.103). The fact that fighting is a reciprocal activity explains the near-absence of the base. It might, however, be *sün-*, attested in DLT fol. 614, its causative *sündür-* in fol. 617: *ördäk kamışka sündi* "The duck concealed itself in the reeds; the same for anyone who goes into a thing, such as a man who intrudes into a person's house, or the like", with aorist *sünär*, infinitive *sünmäk*. DankKelly were the first to recognise this verb: Already the sec-

194 Corresponding to *sün* < **sün-gü* in other dialects of Old Turkic.

ond hand crossed out the three Us of the first syllables and wrote Is instead (thus also in the causative), and was followed by the *EDPT* among others. If this really is the base of *sünüş-* etc., one can think of 'mutual intrusion into each other's ranks'. Less likely is a connection over *sünüg* ~ *sünü* 'lance, spear' (which enters the victim's body). Cf. *AoF* 17 (1990): 138.

sür-üş- is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 326: *münça sini birlä öç käk sürüşmäz* [*m*(*ā*)*n*] "Von nun an werde [ich] an dir keine Rache$_2$ (mehr) ausüben". A verb *sürüş-* may not itself have existed, however, as the sequence is the reciprocal counterpart of the phrase *öç käk sür-*, attested twice in the QB. In both these instances, there are *metri gratia* alterations: *öç sürsä käk*[195] (2312) and *öçäp käk sürär* (4651). *öç käk* is common.[196]

sürt-üş- is found from the DLT on, but see *sürtüş-tür-* (a hap. in Heilk I). See the *EDPT* for *sürt-* 'to rub, smear etc.'.

süyäş- is a hap. in BT I B 128: *tınl*(*ı*)*glı nomlı ikigü bir ikintikä sıyäşürlär* 'Living beings and *dharma* support each other'. Base not attested in Old Turkic but alive in Kırgız; see the n. to the passage for this and for other later and modern cognates. We also have *süyäk* 'support' (discussed among the -(*O*)*k* lexemes above) and *süyän-* 'to lean on something' in the Codex Comanicus.

tala-ş- 'to quarrel, engage in mutual encroachment'. Both this and its base are documented in the *EDPT*.

tan-ış- 'to deny one's faith collectively, go back on one's words as a group' was not identified by the ed. in BT III 1020: *mar mişaxa, m*(*a*)*da m*(*a*)*ryam, / m*(*a*)*xmat yal*(*a*)*vaç tanış*(*ı*)*pan / maŋr*(*a*)*nu, yerlärin tar bulup / mayaṭrım siziŋä ök ınangay* 'They . . . will all call out, denying their faith . . .'. Attested also in the DLT as quoted in the *EDPT*. Cf. *tan-* in the *EDPT* (especially the TT VI 215 instance) and in NesTex T III B 99 c (U 321) 2.

tankar-ış- 'to engage in mutual pledgeing'. Hap. in Maitr 157 r 29: *ötrü olar iki ulug eliglär bir ikintişkä InçA tep tankarışu b*(*ā*)*k katag sav sözlädilär*. Misunderstood in BT IX 133,28: Cf. *tankarıg* among the -*Xg* nominals and see *tank+ar-* in section 5.45.

tunukla-ş- is a hap. in MaitrGeng 12 a 13: *anta ötrü ol urılar badarı braman birlä*

195 This appears at the end of a verse and rhymes with *tāg*. We might therefore want to write all the Uigur and Qarakhanid exs. of this noun (qq.v. in the *EDPT*) as *käg*. The Codex Comanicus writes *kek*, however, which is also what the modern languages quoted by the *EDPT* show. Could the latter be cases of final devoicing?

196 What Thomsen read as *inili äçili kiŋşürtükin üçün* (KT E 6) could also be *käk sürtükin üçün*: Runic I changes to A and η to K^2 by the additon of little slant incisions, which may have been overlooked by scholars or gotten eroded. The sibilant is a plain S^2. Note that *inili äçili* is in the nominative, while *bägli bodunlıg*, the expression after it, is in the accusative. Cf. *kikşür-* among the *-Ur-* verbs.

tanuklaşmış savlarag öp sakınıp . . . 'to attest to each other about something'. See *tanuk+la-* above.

tap-ış- is very common: Beside the exs. of the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, we find it in ETŞ 10,283, 11,66, 69 and 101, Ht V 16 a 2, ms. PelliotOuïgour 203 r 6 (Uig-Bunken p. 77), BT XIII 55,5 and Shō XI a 13 (these two in a biverb with *tuş-*), QB 3314 and 6204, Suv 634,9 and BuddhUig II 71. Usually, it signifies 'to find one another'; in the last two exs., however, 'to find, of several agents'. *tapış-* does not appear in runic or Manichaean texts and is not mentioned in the DLT.

tapla-ş- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. Attested also in Ht V 5 a 24: *yegin üstünkisin talulap, kamagun taplaşıp xan kılınlar.* 'they collectively agreed' or 'unanimously ratified (the choice)' or were 'collectively pleased over it'. See *tap+la-* above.

tarma-ş- 'to scratch each other' appears in Maitr 173 r 19: *tämirlig tırnakın bir ikintişkä tarmaşurlar.* Cf. *tarma-k* (in section 3.102), where a Maitr sentence with *tarmak* and *tarma-* is quoted. *tarma-* 'to lacerate, scratch aggressively' is attested also in Maitr 74 v 22 (Zieme, personal communication, against Ş. Tekin; the latter's translation is wrongly influenced by the unrelated *tala-* 'to pillage'): *ätözlärig soka tarmayu yeyürlär.* Maitr 198 v 31: *yüzlärin* [. . .]*ArIn tarmayurlar.* The Maitr also has the derivate *tarmaklag* (spelled thus for *+lıg*). In the DLT we find *tarmaş-*, *tarmal-* and *tarmat-* (qq.v. in the *EDPT*). *tarmaş-* in DLT fol. 370 is actually spelled with both A and I in the first syllable; this may possibly be due to the influence of *tırnak* 'nail, claw'. *tarma-t-* has five times first-hand A in the first syllable, *tarma-* once A by the first hand and once A by the second, *tarmal-* once A by the first and twice I by the second hand.

tart-ış- appears only once before the DLT: in QaraBalg c 9, as *kunuşmak tartış-mak*. Probably 'to drag things away from each other'.

tavran-ış- is a hap. in Shō VI b 12, mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS*. Quoted unter *evin-iş-*, with which it appears as a biverb. 'to hurry together'. See *tavran-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

tavrat-ış- 'to vie with somebody in hurrying; to hustle each other' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Attested also in Ht IV 663.

tayan-ış-mak 'to rely on one another' is a hap. in BT II 923. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.

tāg-iş- 'to reach one another'. *EDPT* only from the DLT on, but found also in Maitr 104 v 11, InscrOuig I 45 and QB 2375, 2376, 2377,[197] and 3419. '*tavar altın*' *tedi. m(ā)n 'almadım' tedim.* '. . . *kälsär tägişgäy biz*' *tedim* . . . (HamTouen 34,15) is translated as ". . .'Lorsque Vaçı viendra, nous nous confronterons' ai-

197 Among the instances of *tägiş-*, the İndeks to the QB mentions one from couplet 2495. This, however, is the noun *tägiş*, for which the İndeks has no entry. Not noticed by Tezcan either.

je dit". The QB exs. refer to meeting the enemy in battle. The meanings of *tägşil-* and *tägşür-* (qq.v. below) are quite different; cf., however, *täg-iş* in section 3.103.

(*tägşür-üş-* is found only in USp 30, quoted in the *EDPT*. The end of the word is missing.[198] Possibly 'to exchange'. This ex. can perhaps be compared to *tüşüp üzülüşüp*, in a sentence I quote s.v. *üzül-üş-*. *täşgürüş-* might be metathesised from *tägşürüş-*.[199] See *tägşür-* among the *-Ur-* verbs.)

täŋä-ş- 'to be or become equal to one another' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, from two QB instances and from later sources. Attested also in HtPar 143,20 (quoted in *UW* 92 b under *alıg*; instead of [ihm] write [einander]) and QB 3484 and 4654. See *täŋ+ä-* above.

täprä-ş- 'to stir or shake (intr.) together'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in BT VII A 221 (*yumgınıŋ täpräşmişin sakınmak*) and BT XIII 4,41 (*alko marımları täpräşdi* 'All his members shook').

te-ş- 'to say to one another' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; found also in BT III 367 and Maitr 146 v 11 (with *bir ikintişkä*) and 129 v 13.

teril-iş- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* but found in Shō XIII b 14: *şıravast balık içindäki bodun bokun atlıg yüzlüg bäg işi birlä birgärü yıgılışıp terilişip.... ter-il-* 'to assemble (intr.)', q.v. below, is also attested in a biverb with *yıg-ıl-*. *teril-* and *teriliş-* should differ mainly in expressivity, since *ter-il-* already denotes a group activity.

tıdıl-ış- 'to be prevented collectively; to be restrained by each other'. Not in the dictionaries, but found in ETŞ 9,48, Suv 44,19, Warnke 339 and Abhi B 89 a 7-8. See *tıd-ıl-* below.

tik-iş- has been read in Maitr 86 r 3 (*tikişü sançışu* [) and Maitr fr. 499 r 2. Completed by MaitrH in Laut, 1986, 199, this latter reads as follows: *iki agulug yılan b(ä)lgürtdi, bir ikintişkä tikişü edrä[ş]ü* "ließ . . . zwei giftige Schlangen erscheinen, die sich gegenseitig stachen und verfolgten". *tik-* 'to sting (of snakes), to bite (of scorpions)' is attested in the DLT.

tirä-ş- 'to quarrel' is attested in Shō VI b 10 (*tiräşgäli kälmişi çın ärsär . . .*) and 11 (*tiräşip uturu turalım*). The *EDPT* quotes it only from the DLT.

to-ş- should not be confused with the simplex *tuş-* 'to encounter'. It is not mentioned in the *EDPT*, but the *DTS* s.v. *tol-* has a Suv ex. of the biverb *tol- toş-*. The same biverb is found also in *asankı p(a)ramıtalarımız tolup toşup . . .* (BT XIII 52,2) and *argamta ulatı kök kalık birlä t(ä)ŋ tüz, süzök toşu tolu tapıg*

198 Complete as *tägşürüşt[ümüz]* and not with unrounded vowels, as Radloff and the *EDPT* do.

199 '*täz-gür-üş-*' would be semantically difficult. Zieme appears to analyse it as *te-ş-gür-üş-*. One problem with this is that the first vowel is said to be A, not I; another one, that such a sequence would have a double appearance of the same formative *-Xş-* for no semantic purpose. (*tägşür-* contains no *living* instance of *-Xş-*.) Thirdly, *-gUr-* is usually primary.

uduglar boldı (UigTöt 1378) 'Argham etc. became offerings$_2$ equal$_2$ with heavens$_2$, filling$_2$ (intr.) with purity'. The exs. of *toş-* by itself are all late: *bilgä bilig[lig] suv üzä büfün ät'öz toşup* . . . (BT VII A 126); further ones appear in UigTöt 1135, 1137, 1139, 1164 etc. *tok* (discussed in section 3.102), *tol-* and *tod-* are cognates; see the latter for further cognates. The base *to-* may be attested in KT S 8 and BQ E 6: *açsar tos(u)k öm(ä)z s(ä)n, bir tods(a)r açs(ı)k öm(ä)z s(ä)n.*[200] *to-sXk* cannot be from '*todsuk*', as the lack of assimilation in *todsar* shows; nor can it be from '*toşsuk*' for semantical reasons, and because °*şs*° remains unassimilated in *aşsız* in the same inscriptions. A certain ex. of *to-* appears in BuddhUig II 193: *YALNGUKlar kulgakların toyu tuţup* . . . 'people stopped their ears and . . .'. In TT II B 20, *to-p* cannot be a variant of *tolp* 'all', as such a loss of /l/ would be completely isolated at this early period: *asra mänsiz sakınçlarıg turum ara top yokaḍurur yetlintürür* '(Anger) immediadely *stifles* lowly and selfless thoughts and destroys$_2$ them.' *toş-* should be something like 'to fill (intr.) with many things'.

twgr-uş-mak 'to generate each other' is a hap. in BT II 918. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.

tokı-ş- 'to collide (of two objects or living beings or of two warring forces)' is quoted in the *EDPT* only from the DLT. Attested in a description of bird activity in BuddhUig II 104, signifying 'to collide': . . . *kaçuruşu tokışu, kakılayu ätinäyü* . . . *oynayurlar*; in Maitr 176 v 16 (quoted in *UW* 204 a top, translated "sich schlagen"): *turkaru arşı karşı bolup* . . . *tokışurlar*; in Profan p. 282, translated "kämpfen": *tumlıp kirip tokışmak*; in Maitr 81 v 29 (q.v. under *bıç-ış-* above) and in 166 v 5 (quoted under *ölrüş-*), also in belligerent context and in Maitr 68 v 12 and 14 and 108 r 2 and QB 2364.

toyla-ş- 'to gather (intr.) together, to assemble (intr.)' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is attested in InscrOuig I 47 together with *iç-iş-* (q.v. above)[201] and in BuddhUig II 335 of birds: *yemişliklärdä yuullarda ödräk* . . . °*tä ulaţı kuşkı(y)alarnıŋ* . . . *üküşläşip toylaşıp uçmışların*. See *toy+la-* above, and *toylaş-tur-* below. The central meaning of *toy* is 'multitude, assembly'.

tötüş- 'to quarrel'. There is no attested base for this, but cf. *tötüş* (section 3.103 above) and the DLT's *tötür-* (discussed among the *-Ur-* verbs). Appears in the *DTS* s.vv. *tütüş-* and *tütüşmäk*, to which the *EDPT* adds the exs. from TT I 72 and DLT; see also the entry *tut-uş-* below. Further exs. appear in BT XIII 45,1 (fragmentary context), HtPar 171,22 (quoted in *UW* 249 b), NesTex T III B 99

200 The first word is A Ç S^{1}K and not A Ç S^{1}A R^{1} in KT; but the BQ version is preferable, and represents a correction on the part of the scribe.

201 Hamilton and Geng translate this as "manger et boire ensemble", which does not suit the meaning of the other instances or of the base. Ş. Tekin's translation of the following ex. as "sich vermehren" is also incorrect.

c3[202] and Maitr 176 r2 quoted in *UW* 204 a (q.v.). The DLT's *tötüg* 'quarrelsome' comes from this verb.

tur-uş- 'to confront, make a stand against each other' is quoted by the *EDPT* and the *DTS* from the DLT on. Found in Suv 7,10 in a biverb with *utrun-* (q.v. *gay?* and in Suv 18,13 (quoted in *UW* 93 a). Another ex. may possibly appear in ShōAgon 1,152, instead of what the ed. reads as '*turukdaçı ġränlär*'; Q and S can be quite similar in late Uigur cursive.

tuş-uş- 'to come across or meet one another'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Further exs. in BT XIII 6,7 and 46,2, Shō XIV b7, MaitrGeng 8 a22, Maitr 217 v6 (biverb with *körüş-*) and UigTot 701.

tut-uş- 'to hold or get hold of each other; to consider each other as . . .'. The *EDPT* confuses this with *tötüş-* and *tüt-üz-* (discussed among the *-Xz-* verbs). In addition to the passages quoted in the *EDPT*, *tutuş-* appears in TT VII 17,23 and 25,4, InscrOuig I 46, Maitr 199 v3, UigTot 459, 1041 and 1147 ('to hold together'), QB 41 and DLT. See footn. 377 in vol. 1 for *tutuş-* in the sense of 'to catch fire'.

tutul-uş- is a hap. in Abhi B 89 a7-8 as quoted in UigKan p. 149: *anıŋ tözi sūzōk ödrilig* (thus or *öṭvilig*?) *ārür ymā ǫk kalṭı sıparir tāg, bir ikintikā tıdılışmaz tuṭuluşmaz = nacānyo 'nyam āvṛṇvanti*. 'to adhere to each other'. See *tut-ul-* below.

(*ud-uş-* 'to follow in a group' is a hap. in BT III 800, perhaps better read as *ud-uz-* (q.v. below). The *EDPT* s.v. has the verb only from Middle Turkic on. Base and cognates are discussed under *uduz-*, and cf. *ud-un-* below. The form mentioned in *EDPT* 73 b s.v. '*uduşur-*' is quite dubious.)

ugra-ş- 'to fight one another' appears in the DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*. With the help of the facs. published by Bang in Georgspass, this verb can be seen to have appeared also in M III 49,1: *antag kişi mäniŋ* T'DYRY *xan birlā ugraşmaş(ı)m körüp*[203] *ösär, mar Gewargiz tep tesär, bolmazun ol kişi āvintā tāglök . . . aksak . . .* 'If such a person sees that I struggled with[204] T. xan and remembers it and says "St. George!", let there, in that person's house, be nobody blind or . . . lame or . . .'. For the semantic connection with the base cf. e.g. *öpkäm kälip ugradım* "I went toward the enemy in a raging fury" (DLT fol. 75) and *takı bolmaz ärsä yagı ugrasa / tokışmak tiläsä* (QB 2364).

ula-ş- 'to join one another, to follow upon one another, to form a continuum' is in

202 '*yirdi*' "beschimpfte" is perhaps better interpreted as *yerdi* 'he tore asunder'.

203 Looks rather like K in the ms., which is what the text has; but that makes no sense.

204 *ugraş-*, which can actually be seen on the facs., corresponds much better to Bang's ἀγών and ἄθλησις than his *uruş-*.

the *EDPT* quoted twice from the QB, from the DLT and from later sources. Attested also in]*kādlār ulaşu turdı* (Ht X A 21), *urug uçakları ulaşu bo örükä yetmişlärinä ıʔ* (InscrOuig V 43) and QB 2996, 3000, 6173 and 6281.

ulal-ış- is a hap. in ETŞ 9,59, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. 'to be joined together with something'. See *ula-l-* below.

ulı-ş- appears once together with *sıgta-ş-* in Suv (quoted in the *DTS*) and then only in the DLT. 'to howl together'. *ulı-* and *sıg(ı)t+a-* are also used in a biverb together.

ur-uş- 'to quarrel or fight with each other' is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Attested also in Maitr 176 v 16 and 166 v 6 (both biverbs with *tokış-*), Ht V 5 b 20, QB 2289, 2293, 2378, 2383 and 3400, and in Ernte 42: *ögänlikläri birlä suv üçün ülgüsin bilmädin uruşu* "wegen der Kanalanlagen und des Wassers kämpfen sie miteinander ohne Maß zu kennen".

üküşlä-ş- is a hap. in BuddhUig II 335: *yänä ymä kördilär . . . kuşk(ı)yalarnıŋ öŋisig ädgü ünläri üzä äjtä saryayu*[205] *üküşläşip toylaşıp uçmışların*. 'to become a multitude'. Base attested first in the DLT in a slightly different sense, but in Muhenna in this one.

ülä-ş- 'to divide something among each other'. Attested in ms. T II 1071 (U 5525) l. 4 quoted in ManTüTex p. 69, and in the DLT. Three other sources are economical: USp 28,6 (q.v. in the *EDPT*), UigPacht J 9 (*näçä urug bata ikigü täŋ üläşip alır biz*) and UigPacht K 10.

üntür-üş- 'to make something rise to appearance, of a group of agents'. BT III 355 and 364. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Cf. *ün-tür-* below.

üş-üş- is a hap. in Old Turkic, but found in Ottoman. It appears in *ol balıktakı tınl(ı)glar . . . kalıŋulayu üşüşü katguruşu külüşü . . . mäŋiläyürlär* (BuddhUig II 88) 'to crowd together from all sides around something'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *üş-* is first attested in the DLT, but several other Uigur derivates from it are discussed in the following sections.[206]

ütlä-ş- 'to give advice to each other'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Found in BT III 64, 591, 598 and 614 in a biverb with *sözlä-ş-* and 583 and Warnke 553 with *äriglä-ş-*. *üt+lä-* (q.v. among the *+lA-* verbs) is also, by the way, found frequently with *äriglä-*.

üz-üş- appears mainly in contracts, in which it signifies 'to reach a final agreement (between parties)': Two USp exs. are quoted in the *EDPT*; see, further, ActeOuig 5, YamSaleLoan 1,6 and 3/1,3, UigLand 7 and ZiemeSklav II 6. The

205 This is a metathesis of *sayra-*, q.v. in the *EDPT* (from the DLT).

206 Ş. Tekin translated the instance as "sie schwimmen", which means that he interpreted it as *(y)üz-üş-*. This does not fit the context: The agents live on ships but not in water, and could not have carried out some of their other activities if they had.

sum agreed upon is given in the dative case. The DLT has the verb only in the literal sense of 'helping each other, or competing in, cutting'. Kāšġarī does, however, document the same semantic development with *bıçıg* and *bıçgas* from *bıç-* 'to cut': He translates these lexemes as 'agreement, contract'. Cf. also *kās-iş-*. The Maitr has two exs. which have the literal meaning 'to cut (at) each other'; they appear in biverbs with *bıçış-* and *iskāş-* and are quoted with them.

üzül-üş- is a hap. in ms. TM 101 (U 5237) quoted with the n. to UigPacht C3: *yänä yWlṫWQantakı y(a)rım äkim yerimni Kayımtuka täşgürüşüp üzülüşüp* [*satdım*] (ls. 3-5) "Ferner habe ich mein halbes Saatland in Yol Togan an Qayımtu nach gegenseitiger Vereinbarung (Hend.) verkauft". The verb is synonymous with *üz-üş-*, then, but has only the seller as formal agent and does not govern the *dativus pretii*. *üz-ül-* is not attested with the special meaning which *üzüş-* and *üzülüş-* have in common; *üzülüş-* would appear to be an *ad hoc* creation starting out from *üz-üş-* and not from *üz-ül-*.

yagıla-ş- is a hap. in Suv, quoted in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. 'to engage in hostilities with one another'. See *yagı+la-*.

yak-ış- 'to be or come close to each other' is quoted in the *EDPT* under '2 *yakış-*' from the DLT, once from a Manichaean text and once from the QB. It appears also in QB 3036. See *yaxşı* in section 3.118.

yanç-ış- is a hap. in Maitr 81 v30, not mentioned in the dictionaries: *bir ikintişkā . . . tokışurlar sançışurlar yançışurlar öçäşürlär* . . . 'to crush each other underfoot'.

yap-ış- 'to literally stick or adhere to something'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add Maitr 218 v4 and 10, 168 v5 and 16, 199 r10, 164 v29 etc.

yara-ş- 'to be suitable; to agree, accord or fit in with each other'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in Maitr 104 v5, PañcFrag 211, ETŞ 11,53, FenTen III 12, Ht V6 a14 and 19 and 7 a19, UigTot 344, 654-5, 664, 665, 677 (twice) etc., Hochzeit 24, CYK 103 and elsewhere. An instance in Maitr 18 v26 is translated in *UW* 134 a s.v. *ançama* A,b as "geschmückt"; *ançama körklä kraja ton birlä yaraşmış ärür* is better rendered as 'How beautifully the monk's robes suit him!'. Cf. *yaraş-tur-* below and *yaraş-ı* in section 3.118.

ye-ş- 'to eat each other' appears in Maitr 150 r12: *yılkı ajunınta twgmış tınl(ı)g[larnın bir] ikintişkä yeşmäk* [*äm*]*gäk*[*läri* "[die Leiden] der in der Tierexistenz wiedergeborenen Lebewesen, daß sie einander gegenseitig auffressen". The *DTS* quotes *yeşür* from QB 6481 but the *EDPT* has neither instance.

(y)ıgla-ş- 'to weep together'. *EDPT* s.v. *ığlaş-* and *DTS* s.v. *jïγlaš-*. Further exs., in BT II 966, Suv 640,17-18 and Ht X 1068 and 1104, are all written with y°. The instances of KP 53,1 and Ht X 1068 have the verb together with *sıgta-ş-*, as *yıgla-* (discussed among the *+lA-* verbs above) accompanies *sıg(ı)t+a-*.

yıgıl-ış- 'of many persons, to meet all together' is quoted by the *EDPT* from the

DLT on. Attested also in *bäg bägät barça yıgılışıp . . .* (InscrOuig II 8), . . . *ol bałıktakı ınl(ı)glar . . . kakışşu ıtışü kavışışu yıgılışu . . . mäŋilüyürlär* (BuddhUig II 89) and *bodun bokun . . . bäg işi birlä birgärü yıgılışıp terilişip . . .* (Shō XIII b 14). *See 1 yıg-ıl-* below.

(yılı-ş- is, as a verb, attested only in the DLT, in the concrete sense of 'to become warm collectively'; cf. the *EDPT yılış-ıg* (q.v. among the *-(X)g* lexemes), however, is a very early figurative derivate from it.)

yoluk-uş- is a hap. in InscrOuig IV 52, an exceedingly late inscr.: *anta yolukuşup . . .* 'meeting each other there'. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Cf. *yol+uk-* above.

yölä-ş- has been read in *kün t(ä)ŋrikä ogşayur yǫläşür* in M III 18,7$_2$ (text 8). The facs. shows that the ms. is torn now and that the first and third letters of the word have disappeared. *yǫläş-* is possible, however; it reconstitutes the biverb which must have been the base of *ogşat- yǫläştür-* (see the causatives below). *yǫläşi* (discussed in section 3.118, q.v.) clearly comes from this verb, as does *yǫläş-ür-*. *yölä-* 'to support something or somebody' is also the base of *yölä-mısın~* (mentioned in section 6.2). The semantic relation between *yölä-* 'to support' (quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, the QB and modern languages) and *yǫläş-* 'to resemble' appears to have been a Sanskritism.

yügür-üş- 'to come running in a group' is attested in Ht V 15 b 26: . . . *tep äşidtäçilär k(ä)ntün ök yügürüşü bardılar.* The *EDPT* quotes this verb from the DLT on. *yünt-üş- EDPT* s.v. *'yöntüş-'*. All three exs. appear in one page, M I 9 (Legende). In one the verb forms a couple with *okış-*, in the other with *sökü̈ş-* and in the third with *käŋräş-* (all discussed above); these suggest some meaning like 'to insult each other'. The base is attested in Khal.[207] as *yint-/yünt-* "ausschimpfen", with *yindiş* "Schimpfwort". It cannot be connected with Ottoman *yont-*,[208] which is back vocalic, whereas Uigur *yuntüştükin* has front *k*. The Chuast word read as *yontumuz* (*EDPT* s.v., n. 89 in Asmussen, 1965: 172 and ChuastBeitr n. 9) in all mss. *could* also be *yunt(ı)ümüz: yü°* is often spelled as YW° in Uigur, and this text has the habit of spelling geminates as simple consonants. The fact that the previous verb is *ur-* does not mean that the two are synonyms.

Morphology

-(X)ş- appears both after vowels and consonants. Derived bases are not rare. Most common are *+A-ş-* and *+lA-ş-* with about a dozen verbs each; the latter count does

207 Doerfer and Tezcan s.v.

208 'to chisel, hew, carve', a not too suitable meaning either. See e.g. the dictionaries of Radloff and Zenker.

not include the formative *+lAş-*, to which we come soon. The formative *+kIr-*, discussed in section 5.31, is expanded only with *-Xş-*; this is a limitation which does not follow from the phonic shape of the formatives. Among deverbal bases, *-(X)l-* is the most common: We find *akılış-*, *katılış-*, *kuduluş-*, *teriliş-*, *tıdılış-*, *tutuluş-*, *ulalış-*, *üzülüş-* and *yıgılış-*. *-(X)l-Xş-* verbs are attested mainly in late texts; most (except, i.e., *katılış-*, *tıdılış-* and *yıgılış-*) are hapax legomena in Uigur. Two are also given by the DLT. There are several derivates from causative bases: *üntürüş-* appears twice in BT III. Derivates from *-Ur-* verbs are *eştrüş-*, *kaçuruş-*, *ölrüş-*, *tägşürüş-* and *twgruş-*. Then there is *aytış-*, *kakıtış-*, *örlätiş-* and *tavratış-* with *-Xt-* bases. From *-(X)n-* stems, finally, we find *basınış-*, *evinış-*, *sanış-*, *sävinış-*, *tavranış-* and *tayanış-*; the base of *sävinış-*, in particular, is not a medial-reflexive verb, as *säv-* has a very different meaning. None of the formative sequences found in these verbs are combinations.

The statement of Gabain, 1974 in par. 164 concerning this formative, "stets letztes der in diesem Kapitel genannten Bildungselemente", is not correct. Even if we disregard *tägşil-*, *bagdaşınu olor-* and *yapşın-*, whose *-(X)ş-* bases are not really cooperative-reciprocal, we are still left with many causative expansions: There are at least four *-şUr-* verbs and approximately twenty *-(X)ş-tUr-* verbs. All these are discussed among the causatives.

/U/ is the converb and aorist vowel of *-(X)ş-* verbs, at any rate of the polysyllabic ones.[209] There are no petrified converbs in this formation.

A few forms in *-mAklAşU* do seem to be used rather adverbially, though. I mean *bir ikintikä yegädmäkläşü . . . ilinçülädilär* (U II 22,27) "trying to get the better of one another" (*EDPT*) and *aşunmaklaşu* 'in competition', attested thrice in Suv (see *UW* entry for it).[210] They are expansions of *yeg+äd-* (section 5.43) and *aşun-* (section 7.21) respectively. Then there is *ünüp Sudarşan balıktın, ürgürmäkläşü TÄŋRİ TÄŋRİsi burxanka bardılar* (ShōAv 163) 'They set out from the city of Sudarśana and hurried to Buddha, the god of gods'. *ürgür-* is a variant of *ergür-*. Not a single finite *-mAklAş-* form is attested. We do, however, have, from a stem mentioned above: *]lıg yegädmäklāşmäklig kōŋüllāri* (ShōAgon 1,245). In view of this last ex., there is no petrified converb formative *-mAklAşU*. Being poorly attested, *-mAklAş-* cannot be considered a composite formative in its own right. What the exs. have in common is the content of competition.

209 The only monosyllabic verbs with this formative in Old Turkic are *te-ş-* and *toş-*. Of the first no aorist or converb has appeared till now, of the second the biverb *toşu tolu* in UigTot 1378. QB 6481 (all three mss.) has *ye-ş-ür*. See also Erdal, 1986 for the converb and aorist vowel of monosyllabic bases in Qarakhanid sources.

210 Schulz, 1978: 189 n. 12 tries to explain the existence of *aşunmaklaşu* (the only *-mAklAşU* form he appears to have noted) by the impossibility of creating a reciprocal derivate from *aşun-*. Since *-(X)ş- was* added to *-(X)n-* verbs, this explanation seems rather *ad hoc*.

In a way similar to *-mAklAşU* but clearly of different origin is *yar(ı)şmalaşu*, in BT II 274 and Ht VII 15 a3: *anı üçün öŋdün T(a)vgaç elintäkilär yar(ı)şmalaşu edärip üküş tıdılnlar*. Also in ShōAgon B 1,243; *öŋin öŋin y(a)rışmalaşu üläp bay barımlıg bolmakıg*,[210] . . . The first sibilant is written with S in] *ajuntakı ünlıglarıg yar(ı)smalaş[* (TT III 23, Manichaean script) but dotted as Ş in *yar(ı)şmalaşmaklıg* in BT II 196-7. The Pothi-book has a lot of consonant errors and is not more dependable in this respect than BT II. *yarsı-* 'to abhor' is therefore less likely as ultimate base than *yarış-* 'to race, compete', particularly since the second vowel is attested in ShōAgon B 1; 'in competition' fits the meaning best. One ex. of *yarış-* is quoted below, when dealing with the DLT's *+lAşU* forms. *yarış* 'race' and *yarşım* are DLT cognates. *yarşmalaşmaklıg* (BT II) is comparable to *yegädmäklıgläşmäklig* (just quoted). *yarış-* 'to compete' is attested only from the DLT on, in Middle Turkic etc., but *yaraş-* (considered by some to be the base) fits neither by sound nor meaning. The *-mAlAş-* form is practically a synonym of the three formed with *-mAklAş-*. The *+lAşU* forms in the DLT (q.v. below) also refer to 'competing' but get the stake of the related bet as base.

If *-mAklAş-* and *-mAlAş-* are occasional and not composite formatives, is there a formative *+lAş-*? Quite a number of *+lA-ş-* verbs appear earlier in this section, but corresponding *+lA-* verbs are rare. We find the following:

arka+laş- is a hap. in Ht VII 15 a5: *. . . arkalaşıp bir täg öŋi öŋi küni üzä* is, in the *UW* entry for this verb, translated as: "Indem sie sich allesamt durch Eifersucht in verschiedene Gruppen spalteten, . . ." This *arka* signifies 'faction'; the *EDPT* mentions no derivate from it.

çav+laş- is a hap. in Shō XII a 10: *bayagutlar amançlar çavlaşıp yıgılıp InçA tep . . .* If this would signify 'to make (the meeting) known to each other' or at least 'to call each other', it could be connected with *çav* 'fame'. *UW* 115 b translates the instance as "strömten zusammen (?)", Röhrborn and Laut, 1988, 93 as "gerieten (?) . . . in Aufregung (?)", with no explicit justification. No 'çav+la-' is known to me, and Qarakhanid *çavlan-* has a different meaning.

çıkan+laş- is a hap. in HamTouen 28,21: *anı birlä siz bilişgäy siz iki çıkanlaşgu* 'You will know each other so well as to be like two cousins to each other' (?). This difficult sentence (clear in the facs.) can only be understood by bracketing *(iki çıkan)+laş-gu*. No such verb is mentioned in the dictionaries.

(çImşIlAş- and *çImIlAş-* appear once each in the editions of Suv, in the same passage; in both cases used about *ät'öz* 'the body'. Quoted by the *DTS* but not be the *EDPT*. If these are mistakes for *'çImşIIIş-'*, they could possibly be a

211 Not *'bulmakıg'*, as Shōgaito writes.

-(X)l-(X)ş- derivate from '*çImşI-*': That may in fact have to be read as the second lexeme in *bıçmış çımkımış* (Heilk II 3,63, also of the human body).) (*ädgülläş-* is mentioned among the *-(X)ş-* verbs but may nevertheless belong here.)

(*keŋäş+läş-* should perhaps be read in Adams 31: *yänä bir kul algalı mini bilän keŋäşläşip turur* 'He is continuing his consultations with me with the intention of buying a slave'. This is merely a conjecture; *UW* 90 b (mid-page) writes the same as '*käŋkiläşip*'.)

kili+läş- appears in ETŞ 13,20 and BT XIII 28,24. We find *kili* in ETŞ 11,160 and (which reads *kililäşmäk kıl*[*ayın*]), ETŞ 11,160 is reinterpreted and *kili* given a Chin. explanation. the two lexemes are discussed in the n. to the latter. In the n. to the BT XIII ex.

kol+laş- is a hap. in Ernte 109: *kollaşıp köṭürgüçi kullar* 'the servants who carry (it) by clasping each others' arms'. The ed. found this verb with the same meaning in Old Ottoman.

ög+läş- 'to take counsel with each other'. Attested as early as Toñ (twice). *ö-g* is common and so is *öglän-*, but there is no *+lA-* cognate. Cf. *keŋäşläş-* for the meaning.

yarp+laş- is a hap. in Shō X a 2: *amtıkı savlarıg Sudarşanı elig on tümän bayagutlar birlä yarplaşıp ayagka tägimlig iki toyınlarka InçA tep sözlädilär.* 'to collectively confirm the present matters'.

To these verbs we can add the DLT hap. *salımlaş-* "to contend with someone and oppose him stubbornly", discussed in the *EPDT*. It has no attested *°m* base. The DLT mentions *konoklaş-* together with this, but for that the verb *konok+la-* is found several times in the DLT. Practically all of the above are hap. legomena, for which no *+lA-* cognate may have appeared by coincidence. Whenever their meanings and use is sufficiently clear, they can safely be dealt with as *-(X)ş-* verbs.

More interesting are the DLT's *+lAşU* forms where the base states the stake in a bet. He e.g. has *oynadım atlaşu* "I gambled and made the stake on it a horse"; *ol mäniŋ birlä oynadı kögürçünläşü* "He gambled with me with a pigeon as the stake"; *ol at yarışdı mäniŋ birlä tavışganlaşu* "He had a horse race with me for the prize of a hare, and the competitor who outlasted the other got it"; *ol anıŋ birlä çögän urdı ömläşü* "He wielded the polo-stick in competition with him for a stake of a pair of trousers". This does appear to have a become a real formative for denominal adverbs with very specific meaning; the DLT is not, however, a source for Old Turkic.

Dealing with the behaviour of *-(X)ş-* verbs, we consider dubious ones to be an improper base for syntactic consideration. Nor should we, in principle, deal with the behaviour of *ş-* verbs whose (not cooperative-reciprocal) bases are unknown in Old Turkic or uncertain: Such verbs are *arkaş-*, *kakıtış-*, *kaxşaş-*, *keŋşäş-*, *közkiş-*, *sünüş-* and *tötüş-*. However: Among these, *keŋşäş-* is in complementary distribution by text-type with *keŋä-ş-*; the two verbs have the same meaning and can be expected to have the same syntactic behaviour. *sünüş-* 'to fight' and *tötüş-* 'to quarrel' are reciprocal by basic meaning. *kakıtış-* is a hap. in a series of *-Xş-* verbs and shares their behaviour. The base of *arkaş-* is attested in Chagatay, quoted e.g. in the *UW*. *kaxşaş-* has its base attested in several modern languages.

The meaning of *-Xş-* is such that its use presupposes the presence of parties acting against, from, at, in competition with, to, on, in cooperation with, together with or for each other. Practically all *-Xş-* verbs do have two or more *subjects/agents* vying or cooperating, or one subject/agent vying or cooperating with some other participant in the action. *yapış-* does not have such a meaning, and should be excluded from the following discussion. Nor is there anything mutual about *ayıg öglilärkä sokuşsarlar* . . . (Warnke 512) e.g.; neither in what is quoted, not in the context. Most instances of *yara-ş-* are not typical of *-(X)ş-* either. Some are, however, e.g. *oglanlarım birlä sıgışu yaraşu* . . . (FenTen III 12) 'staying on good terms with my sons'. *közkiş-*, finally, has been translated as having a plurality of objects and not necessarily of subjects: The ex. quoted first in the entry even has a real singular subject. We take it, though, that collation or textual comparison was carried out by two or more persons reciting their respective mss. or blockprints. This would give cooperation of subjects beside plurality of objects and make *közkiş-* have normal *-Xş-* meaning.[212] So much for aberrations.

The different meanings of *-Xş-*, like 'helping' or 'vying', are not connected with distinctive syntactic structures and are not signalled in any other way. Thus, DLT fol. 313, *ol mäniŋ birlä talkanka yag katıştı*, is translated as both "He vied with me in mixing gruel with butter" and "He helped me mix". In fol. 325-6, Kāšġarī holds a different view. He writes: 'This form . . . occurs with the meaning of giving help in the action. Thus *ol maŋa ton tikişdi* "He helped me sew the garment". *ol maŋa bitig bitişdi* "He helped me write the book". [Secondly,] it occurs with the meaning of vying in the action – to see which of the two is the more skillful, the more courageous, the stronger or the more resourceful in that action. Thus *ol mäniŋ birlä çälişdi*[213] "He wrestled with me (to see which of us was the better or the stronger wrestler)". *ol mäniŋ birlä ya kuruştı* "He contended with me in stringing

212 *If it is an -(X)ş-* verb at all: See the entry itself.

213 This instance is not mentioned in the *EDPT* either in this or in any other form.

the bow (to see which of us was the stronger in stringing)". The distinction between helping and vying is as follows: When you mention the particle *maŋa* meaning "to me", then it has the meaning of helping. When you join to the verb the particle *mäniŋ birlä* meaning "with me", then it has the meaning of helping.' This statement can easily be shown to be wrong at least as far as Old Turkic is concerned: A few counter-examples are listed below.

A distinction which Old Turkic does make is that between the asymmetrical use of *-Xş-* verbs and the symmetrical one. By 'asymmetrical' I mean the use in which only one of the participant parties is presented as subject: the other one is 'demoted', in a sense which will appear more clearly below. In the symmetrical use of verbs of cooperation or vying there is a homogeneous subject group of individuals all behaving in the manner denoted.

We deal first with *-Xş-* action presented as asymmetrical. The nominal representing the 'major' participant here appears in the nominative, whereas the nominal referring to the demoted participant is governed by the postposition *birlä* 'with'. *birlä* is an original *+lA* adverb signifying 'together', mentioned in part IV of the present work. Occasional remnants of such a use are *ikki är birlä sünüşdi* "The two men jousted in battle" in DLT fol. 616; or, *birlä kavışmış ka kadaş y(e)gän tagay adaş böşük ädgü öglilär kim bar ärsär* (U III 33,16) "Whatever there are of brothers and relatives, nephews and uncles, comrades$_2$ and well-wishers united together . . .'. Nominal phrases governed by *birlä* appear to have been as common with verbs not formed with *-Xş-*, if not more common. Here are a few exs.: *o[guz] bodun tokuz tatar birlä terilip kälti* (BQ E34) 'The Oguz people assembled with the Tokuz Tatar and came'. *eçim kagan birlä ilgärü yaşıl ögüz şanDuŋ yazıka tägi sülädimiz* (KT E17) 'Together with my elder brother the *kagan* we campaigned eastward all the way to the Green River and the plain of Shantung'. *tört tugum beş ajun altı yoltakı tınlıglar birlä katılu karılu* 'mixing$_2$ with the creatures of . . .' (Suv 133,15). *ötrü ol br(a)xmadatı elig tişi bars birlä yazınmışda* . . . (U III 63,13) 'Then, when that king Brahmadatta sinned with the female tiger, . . .'. Although the tigress may well have been involved actively, this was no sin on *her* part. Exs. in which the *birlä* phrase is not counterpart of the agent appear to be less easy to find. Two instances are: *alko nızvanılarıg yıdı yokı birlä kalısız birtäm tarkarmış* (Suv 49,1) 'those who did away with all vices totally$_2$ and uniformly'. *tävä*[214] *iki yig torku iki ketmän birlä alıp ävdä berin* (HamTouen 23,17) 'Take the camel together with two (bales of) untreated silk and two mattocks and bring them home'. Instrumental *birlä* may have been rare in early texts. One possible ex. appears in Ht X154. A *birlä* phrase can also depend on a nomi-

214 The word *ol* preceding this belongs to the previous sentence, where it serves as copula. Thus against Hamilton's translation.

nal, e.g. *kök kalık birlä ı(ā)ŋ tüz* (UigTot 1378) quoted s.v. *toş-* above. Sometimes (though rarely and apparently only in colloquial language) *birlä* becomes a mere 'and'; e.g. in the sentence quoted under *uruş-* above. Late variants of *birlä* are *bilä* and *bilän*; *birlän* is rare.

-Xş- verbs governing *birlä* phrases representative of the 'secondary' participant have already been quoted above, under *aşlaş-* (with *yoluk-uş-*), *birikiş-*, *ädgülāş-*, *udış-* (from Ht), *katılış-* (from ShōAgon), *keŋäş-* (from BT XIII), *säviş-*, *sıgış-*, *sürüş-*, *tanuklaş-*, *terilig-*, *ugraş-*, *yıgılış-*, *keŋäşläş-* and *yarplaş-*. In all these, the entity referred to by the nominal phrase governed by *birlä* is a human being or a group of humans. Something non-human can only be found under *katış-* above. This distribution is not a coincidence; rather, it reflects what we generally found to be the case. Runic exs. are *inim kōl tegin birlä sözläşdimiz* (KT E 26) implying cooperation and *kaganın birlä soŋa yışda sünüşdümüz* (*ibid.* 35) implying antagonism. Note, in connection with the KT E 26 instance, that only two persons are involved: the speaker and Kōl Tegin. As with Republican Turkish *ile*, singular subject plus singular nominal governed by *birlä* demand a plural verb form.[215]

Further *-Xş-* verbs typically governing human *birlä* phrases refer to meeting and consultations (*körüş-*, *tuşuş-*, *ay(ı)tış-*, *keŋäş-*, *sözläş-* e.g. in UjgRuk 3,2, InscrOuig IV 48, BT VIII A 136-8, BT XIII 49,31, FenTen III 11, UigTot 72, Ht IV 445 and V 78-9 and 13 b 23, TT VII 30,7-8, U II 35,26-8, Suv 612,10 and 420,6, TT V A 27), to fights (BQ E 27, Suv 18,12) or to other bilateral activities (e.g. ShōAv 20 quoted in the *UW* s.v. *ayaş-*, M II 8,16-17$_2$, KP 52,6 and so forth). When the factor found in the *birlä* phrase is non-human, it usually consists of the vices one is supposed to fight against (e.g. in M III 12,13-14$_2$: *nızvanılar birlä sünüşmäk öçäşmäk*); these are, in a sense, personalised. I have only met two instances in which inanimate (albeit spiritual) contact is represented by *-Xş-* verb plus asymmetrical agent representation: In these two passages (TT V B 71 and U II 10,19), the grammatical agent is also of the same type as the one found in the *birlä* phrase. From this consistent equivalence in the real-world status between grammatical agent and the entity 'demoted' into grammatical subordination it follows that the activity itself is truly mutual. The *initiative*, however, may be considered to have been that of the agent, or the speaker-writer may be *empathe-* c with him and see the activity through his eyes, or *concord* may demand this nstruction: The *-Xş-* verb may be subordinated to a non-mutual verb and share agent. The sentence with *satıgla-ş-* also quoted above, e.g., is *about* what the nts do, not about the Greeks' activities. By this, though, the bilateral nature of e is not denied; nor is there an implication of initiative on the part of the t. Cf. also *ädgülāşip* parallel to *uyadıp* under *ädgülāş-* above. The sentence

f. also Russian *my s toboj* signifying 'you and I' and not necessarily 'you and we'.

quoted under *birikiş-* above is *addressed to* the grammatical agent of *birikiş-* and not to the participant governed by *birlä*; the former is invited to initiate a bilateral activity. The Ht sentence with *ıd-ış-* (also quoted above) is a chapter title in the biography of Xuandzang; it is therefore natural that his name should be the agent of the sentence. The mutual nature of the correspondence with the emperor of China is stressed, however, by the adverbial *käliş barış*.

Whenever demanded by rhetoric, the verb of such an *-Xş-* sentence *can* appear in the singular. Cf. the *veni – vidi – vici* tone of the following: *kırkız bodunuğ uda basdım. kaganın birlä soŋa yışda sünüşdüm. kaganın ölürtüm, elin anta altım* and so forth (BQ E27).

Grammatically symmetrical *-Xş-* clauses have all participants showing mutual behaviour appear as grammatical subject. When parties take each other as direct or as indirect object, the adverb *bir ikintikä* ~ *bir ikintişkä* can be used. This appears as *bir ikintişkä* in Maitr (twelve exs.), BT III (four exs.), Suv (twice) and ÄgFrag (1) G but as *bir ikintikä* in ManTürkTex 610, Tenri (twice), Abhi, BT I. The *avadāna* frs. fluctuate, with *bir ikintikä* in U II 22,27 (no facs.; original lost) and U IV A 84-5, but *bir ikintişkä* in U IV A 42[216] (both checked in the facs.). The damaged ex. in TT II A 55-6 can therefore be completed either way. This probably comes from the possessive suffix *+sI*. It is true that the sibilant would not have swallowed up the /I/ within 'normal' Old Turkic phonology, and that the dative form of this possessive suffix is *+sIŋA* and not '*+sIkA*'. Cf., however, [*bir ikinti*]*s*^{2}*ik*^{2}*ä* : *s*^{1}(*a*)*b*^{1}*ın*^{1} : *öç*(*ä*)*ş*^{2}*miş*^{2}*l*^{2}(*ä*)*r*^{2} in KöktüTurf TM 342 2 r1 (assuming the conjecture to be correct). Sentences with *bir ikinti(ş)kä* are quoted above s.vv. *bıçış-*, *boguş-*, *ıdış-*, *öçäş-*, *ölrüş-*, *süyäş-*, *tankarış-*, *tarmaş-*, *tikiş-*, *tutuluş-* and *yançış-* and with *yegädmäkläşü* and in the *UW* under *amraş-*. Under *kavış-* we quote a sentence in which *bir ikintişkä* is used with two simple verbs: Although the palms of the two hands serve both as subject and indirect object of the action of rubbing on the *rasāyana*, the primary subject is the person;[217] using an *-Xş-* verb might have given the impression that more than one person is involved. Note that, although *bir ikinti(ş)kä* looks like a dative, the various agents need not be each others' dative objects: With *bıçış-*, *tokış-*, *käsiş-*, *sançış-*, *ölrüş-*, *ayaş-*, *amraş-*, *körüş-*, *tikiş-*, *tarmaş-* or *boguş-*, e.g., they are each others' direct objects. *bir ikintişkä bäläg ıdışalım* (Maitr 157 v19) shows an *-(X)ş-* verb with direct object and agents as each others' indirect objects. Unlike Uigur, the DLT's *bir äkindi* does have a declination: adnominal ∅ in fol. 126, *+ni* in fols. 126, 320 and 476,

216 *bir ikinti-s[ı]kä* in the first edition of this in U I 43,5-6 is misleading: The facs. shows that there is no lacuna here.

217 Primary and secondary subjects as in Chin. and Japanese syntax. An inalienable entity as the palm of one's hand is a most likely secondary subject.

+dIn in fols 313 and 487 and *+nIŋ* in fols. 122 and 368 beside *+kā* in fols. 375 and 476. Note that *Kāšġarī* uses analogical *ākinç* as ordinal, the dental form being retained only for the expression of mutuality. The neutralising dative *bir ikinti(ş)kā* would seem to be a specifically Uigur development. In *bolar üçägü . . . uça kälip ikintiškā [sō]z savın sözläšü* (Maitr 7 r10) the *bir* is lacking. *bir ikintiškā* in *tämir käšänkä oxşatı birsi birsiŋä ilişü tur-* (BT VII A 258) would be more specifically dative.

Under *sınaš-* above we quote an ex. with *bir ikinti birlā*, apparently the mark of mutual comitativity. Note that *bir ikinti birlā* is attested also with *sına-*, in a sentence in which the agents have not each other but *küčümüz* as mutual object. Here, the presence of *birlā* does not, of course, signal any asymmetry in the agent group, as no nominal representing a 'demoted' agent is governed by it. *bir ākindi birlā* appears also in sentences in DLT fols. 102, 103 and 373, but Uigur otherwise has nothing similar to it. The Manichaean text Wettkampf is either particularly archaic in this or else reflects a different dialect.

In the rare cases in which *birlā* is not a postposition but a coordinating conjunction, it marks a symmetrical relationship between agents. Such are the sentence quoted under *biliş-* from HamTouen 28,20 (in spite of the ed.'s translation) and the one quoted from the QB under *adkaş-*. Two nominals joined by *birlā* need not, of course, serve as subjects of any *-Xş-* verb, in fact not necessarily as subjects at all. Cf., in this connection, the ex. quoted from Ernte under *uruş-*.

Rather rare marks of complementary behaviour are *için* and *için ara*; both appear in a passage quoted from Suv under *biliş-* above. Another ex. is *ülägü ugrınta kamagun için ara sarışıp . . .* (BT III 350-51) "als sie den . . . Erwerb verteilten, schalten sie sich alle untereinander aus . . .". These instances are important, for the *EDPT* under *için* (an instrumental form) only has Manichaean and Muslim exs.

Other adverbials, e.g. *birgārū* or *kavşuru*, can also appear with *-Xş-* verbs. The most general characteristic of mutual, cooperative, vying clauses is the fact that their subject is represented by a plural form or by a collective. By 'collective' I mean such lexemes as *bodun* (with *keŋāş-* and *tep teş-*), *alko el bodun* (with *sāviniş-*), *bodun bokun* (with *sözläş-*), *tūŋür böşük* (with *kavış-* or *körüş-*) and so forth. In the greatest majority of *-Xş-* clauses, the verb has a plural nominal or pronominal subject or just appears in a plural verb form.

When *-Xş-* verbs denote activities carried out merely together with each other or in view of each other,[218] the specific meaning of the formative becomes difficult to detect. Merely collective meaning is found in the following verbs: *alakırış-*,

218 Damourette and Pichon, 1932-51 have the three auxiliaries *faire*, *laisser* and *voir* as the three members of their verbal category of 'immixtion'. Old Turkic expresses both *faire* and *laisser* by

kıkırış-, çaxşaş-, kaxşaş-, ulış-, sıgtaş-, yıglaş-, katguruş-, külüş-, özgürüş-, sävinış-, ıoylaş-, içiş-, üküşläş-, yıgılış-, terilış-, akılış-, kuduluş-, evinış-, tavranış-, kalış-, ornaş-, işläş-, sogış- and *täpräş-*. These verbs have here been listed by what I take to be the degree to which Westerners are likely to find it easy to conceive of the action expressed to be group behaviour and not merely plurality: Collective shouting (*kıkırış-*) or crying (*yıglaş-*) may be more of a specific experience for us than collective dwelling (*ornaş-*) or collective cooling down (*sogış-*). Yet *älig adak sogışur* may have had rather different connotations than if *sogı-* had been used instead. In BT II 939, the ed. takes *işläş-* in *bo kızkı(y)a yaşta işläşip nätägin k(ä)ntü özüm*[219] *keŋätgäli boşungalı ugay biz* to be an 'intensive': Referring to par. 164 of Prof. Gabain's grammar, he translates: "so werden wir in diesem so kurzen Leben *tüchtig arbeiten* und irgendwie werden wir das eigene Leben verlängern und (von Not (?)) befreien können". Note, however, the translation of *işläş-* in *b(ä)k katıg tutum kertgünç[kä] barmak yolänmäkkä işläşip...* (Warnke 601, the same text as BT II): "gemeinsam ausführen, sich gemeinsam um etwas bemühen". It may well be possible in some cases (e.g. with *ornaş-*) that the meaning of mutuality is practically nonexistent. These cases are rarer, however, than could be guessed from reading the translation.

Not many deverbal nominals come from *-Xş-* verbs. Section 3.118 above lists the ones in *-şI*. Then we have *kavışıg, yılışıg* and perhaps *külüşük* with *-(X)g* and *kavşut* with *-(U)t*. Quite a number of *-Xş* lexemes clearly also come from *-(X)ş-* verbs. *ornaş-ıglıg* and the binome-biverb *katılış-maksız bulgaş-maksız* are mentioned in the appropriate sections above. Relativisation of *-(X)ş-* verbs is rather rare.

7.2 *Medial, reflexive and anti-transitive verbs*

This chapter deals with verbs formed by using the common *-(X)n-*, the rather rare *-(X)k-* or the obsolete *-(X)d-* formatives. The combination *-lXn-* is also given a section of its own in this chapter. As elsewhere in this part, we first list the verbs alphabetically, then discuss their morphological and syntactic properties. Whereas *-(X)ş-* verbs pose no problems as far as their agential configuration is concerned, the verbs of section 7.2 are rather fuzzy in this respect. The general purport of the formatives discussed here is to stress the relevance of the agent

the causative morphemes (as described below; the content expressed by French *voir* (in this use) is left to non-systematical means. When this content is mutual, *-Xş-* is used for it.

219 This is probably an error, as there is more than one 'speaker'. *Kşänti* texts have standard formulations; the present instance appears to have been adapted from an original with a single repentant sinner and *özüm* have been overlooked.

himself, of what pertains to him, to the action. With reflexive verbs, the subject represents both the agent and the object of the action. When a verb is medial, the action is carried out with respect to or for the benefit of the subject, a member of his family, a part of his body or any other thing inalienably related to him. By 'anti-transitive' I mean presentation of an action as emanating from the subject itself, although the transitive base would have made an agent-patient representation possible. A synonym term for 'anti-transitive' is 'recessive', used e.g. by Tesnière; to call such verbs 'reversive' would be less appropriate, as the reversal of transitive is passive.

7.211 *-(X)n-*: Lexical Material

aç-ın- 'to open one's clothes, baring the bosom; to disclose one's sins'. See the *UW* for the Uigur instances. The *EDPT* confuses this verb with *açı-n-* and has a single entry for both. See that for the DLT's *aç-ın-* (which is given with the physical meaning).

açı-n- 'to care for, look after, tend (a person or an animal)'. The object should pertain to the agent either by family relationship or by possession or be treated as such. See the *UW* for the Uigur exs.; add the ones of HamTouen 5,70, 20,17, 25,6 and 30,5-6 (all with family relatives as objects) and ZiemeSklav III 30 (*açınu y(a)rl(i)g bolzun*). DLT and QB exs. of *açı-n-* are listed in the *EDPT*'s entry for this and for the previous verb. Derived from the *UW*'s *açı-* II and related to our 2 *açı-g* 'gift, favours' (see section 3.101 above). Seeing that the biverb *açı-n- agrı-n-* (attested in M III 11,2$_2$ (text 6) and Maitr 136 r5 and 198 v3) can also signify 'to look after', '*açı-* II' (with '*açı-g* II') appears to be only a secondary meaning of *açı-* 'to be sad (about something), regret (something)'; there are, after all, six Old Turkic exs. of '*açı-* I' but only two of '*açı-* II'. The existence of the binome *açıg agrıg* 'favours' also speaks for this. The semantic connection can also be seen in English *care* and in German *Sorge* vs. *Vorsorge, sich um jmdn. sorgen; sich um jmdn. kümmern* vs. *bekümmert* and so forth. Whether 'to be bitter (or sour)' was the original meaning of *açı-* (as suggested in the *EDPT*) is hard to tell; it does not follow from Old Turkic documentation.

(*adın-* has two distinct but connectible uses separated into two lemmata in the *EDPT* and the *UW*: 'to recover from drunkenness or a similar state' and 'to be moved (positively or negatively), to be very surprised'. The latter meaning can only be assigned to the couple *adın- muŋad-* and not to *adın-* alone. It is likely, therefore, that the two *adın-* are in fact one lexeme, and that the meanings of the two verbs in this collocation shifted towards each other. *adınçıg, adın, adıl, adıg* and probably also *adır-* (all dealt with above) are cognates. Whether the base is attested depends on the correctness of the reading *admatı tägşilmä[ti*

with reference to the complexion of a dead person in Ht X 803. As determined by N. Yüce, *adındı yüzi* in the Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab corresponds to *sahama wajhuhu* 'his face complexion changed'. Four instances of *adın- muŋad-* from BuddhUig II should be added to the *UW* entry. DLT and QB replaced *adın-* by *adıl-*.[220])

adır-ın- 'to separate (intr.) from one's family' appears in the first person sg. past form, thrice in the Yenisei inscr. Two of the instances are mentioned by the *DTS* but not the *EDPT* or the *UW*; the third appears in YE 13,2. In this last there is, according to Thomsen and Wulff's collations, no doubt about *kuyda kunçuyum ad(ı)rındım* (with N^2). *adır-* is discussed in section 6.3.

adırtla-n- is a hap. discussed in the *UW* (not mentioned in the *EDPT*). Accompanied by what appears to be an agentive *üzä* phrase, and may have had some such passive meaning as 'to be diagnosed', 'to be set apart', 'to be singled out' or 'to be under special observation'. See *adırt+la-* above.

(*adkan-* 'to perceive etc.' is documented in *UW* 263-9 together with its derivates. Although the *UW* spells it as *aṭkan-*, practically all sources write the dental as D; the main exception is the late Leningrad ms. of the Suv. See *adkaş-* in section 7.1 for etymology. Appears in biverbs with *ilin-*, *yapşın-* and *bodul-*, which shows its original meaning. *UW* 263 b writes: "Die *-n*-Erweiterung wohl in Analogie zu *tayan-*". *The* verb denoting abstract perception clearly does not need the assumption of such an analogy to account for the presence of *-(X)n-* in it. The many exs. with direct object accord with the fact that the meaning of this verb is not reflexive. Just as unacceptable as the etymology of Röhrborn, 1983 is that of Bang, 1925 b: 396; but Bang had only a fraction of the documentation at his disposal.)

(*ag(ı)zan-* 'to utter, to recite' is adequately discussed in the *UW*; see the *EDPT* for modern survivors. **ag(ı)z+a-* is not attested. Cf. *agız+lan-* 'to be recited' in section 5.6.)

agrı-n-; *agırın-* in the Suv (which also has the variant *agızan-*). In the DLT "to be in pain", in the Suv 'to complain of pain'. The biverb *açın- agrın-* shifted to 'caring for or about' somebody; cf. *açı-n-* above. Uigur *agrı-* has the body part (*tış*, *yüräk*, *baş*, *adak*, *boguz tamak*, *yan*, *sin sünük*, *ämig*, *burun*) as subject; the subject of *agrın-*, on the other hand, is the suffering person.

(*agrıkan-* 'to feel pain, to complain of pain' is discussed among the *+(X)rkA-* verbs, section 5.2. A corresponding stem without the *-(X)n-* is not attested.)

agrukla-n- 'to find a matter burdensome or onerous' is, by the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT. The *UW* has it from BT I. Attested also in HamTouen 14,2 and 3, in both cases with *l*-hook wrongly placed under the R. *tokuz on kat*

220 *adıl-* cannot be read in QB 2374, as written in the *EDPT*.

azıkı[221] *agruklanmazun* "qu'on ne tienne pas pour un fardeau les 90 couches de provisions". *tuglug*[221] *elim yavız kulınnn agruklanmazun* is wrongly translated as "Qu'on ne tienne pas pour un fardeau mon état à drapeau à cause de ses mauvais serviteurs (esclaves)". Rather, *tuglug elim* is the subject and *yavız kulı* a sg. referring to the writer himself. See *agruk+la-* above.

agt-ın- 'to rise, climb, get to' is used only in Uigur (both Buddhist and Manichaean) and is discussed in the *UW*. As written there, the evidence of the exs. in Brāhmī and Manichaean scripts speaks for a realisation as *axtın-*. The dotting of the velar in the Ht mss. could also be interpreted this way: Velar /k/ was no doubt, in certain circumstances, also realised as [x]. Not mentioned in the *UW*: *oglankıyası üzä agtınmış arkalıg* and *atasının arkasının otrasında agtını*[p] (ms. T II S19 *b* = Mz 652 v 7-8 in SktUigBil; Brāhmī),] *agtınur* (LautHöllen 71), *eyin käzigçä agtına agtına* (thus?! UigTöt 1100), *kayçu çiu atl(ı)g balıknın arkasınaru agtınıp barır ärkän* (TuoLuoNi 356) and *kök ı(ā)ŋrikä agtınıŋ, ı(ā)ŋrim* (BT XIII 27,25). The TuoLuoNi ex. has 'to go up to' in the sense of 'going to the capital': In a personal communication, P. Zieme notes that such expressions are found also in Chin. and Iranian; in the Old Testament one also went *up* to the capital. All the other exs. signifying 'to reach', however, have (some) hell as target: U II 78,43 and 79,46, UigSün 46 and LautHöllen 71. See 2 *ag-ıt-* 'to rise' among the *-(X)t-* verbs; *agt-ın-* should be its reflexive or anti-transitive derivate. The synonymous but rather rare 1 *ag-* (*ag-* II in the *UW*) is not, I think, attested in Buddhist texts; nor does it have the extended meaning 'to reach, to get to'.

al-ın- 'to accept, chose, receive into onself, take up'. In Buddhist texts only in the abstract sense (with 'advice', 'the true doctrine', 'the King of Men', 'the realm of Buddha', a '*sūtra*' etc. as objects), only *in bonam partem*. *al-*, on the other hand, is mostly concrete and often has negative connotations. A number of exs. are not mentioned either in the *UW* or the *EDPT*: KudGojūni A 6 and 7 and AbhiKār 14 *c* have the phrase *özkä alın-*, BuddhUig I 99, 103 and 106 the synonymous *KÖNGÜLkä alın-*. These join the three exs. of par. 3 of the *UW* entry. SP 26 has the sequence *alın- tut-*; this is probably not a biverb but has *alın-* used as inchoative of *tut-*. *al(ı)nur tep bitiyü tägintim* (BT XIII 39,25) signifies 'I have humbly written it down in the hope that (he) accepts (or: favours) (it)'. This instance was not identified by the editor, who wrongly writes '*alnır*'.[223] Whether *yetinç küntä . . . beşägü butık alınıp ünär* (the foetus as

221 If correctly translated, to be emended to *azukı*: This text wrongly writes *yıları* for *yuları*, *ögiriŋä* for *ögüriŋä* and *ülätü* for *ülätü*. *azıgı* 'its canine tooth' would give even less sense.

222 Wrongly written as TWXLWM.

223 A footn. adds: "Unklare Lesung, geschrieben *"l'ur* [i.e. *alnur*, M. E.]. Statt *-w-* ist vielleicht aber

subject, UigTot 359) is medial is an open question: Buddhist anatomy and physiology is, after all, a rather imaginated matter. In a Yenisei ex. (for which see the *EDPT*; discussed in the syntactic explanations below) and in Manichaean M III 14,4, (text 7; not quoted in context in the *UW*, not mentioned in the *EDPT*) it signifies 'to take for oneself as wife'. *al-* can also have this meaning (par. 12 in the *UW* entry), but only in the generalised phrase *är / kız / ul kişi / kälin al-*. *alın-*, however, has specific women as objects and appears to be more personal. *alın-* is medial, then,[224] in the sense in which this term is used in Greek grammar. The Qarakhanid exs. (q.v. in the *EDPT*) have different connotations.

alk-ın- 'to consume or exhaust oneself, perish, be or get used up'. See the *UW* for the Uigur exs., the *EDPT* for the runic and Qarakhanid ones and the *DTS* for biverbs. Instances from M I 8,8 (TeilBuch) and M III 10,9$_2$ (text 5) are listed under *alkın-* in the *EDPT* but under *alkan-* (q.v. below) in the *UW*. The first should, as the *UW* notes, be read as *alk-*; there are several other exs. in that text for extra prevocalic *alif*.[225] The M III instance, however, does belong to *alkın-* although it is spelled as *alkan-*: With the accusative *kamgag* for 'normal' /kamagıg/, this is one of the texts which occasionally uses *alif* for the phoneme /ı/. The context is not unclear, as the *UW* maintains, and von Le Coq's translation makes perfect sense. Other exs. to be added to the *UW* entry are *aẓuḳumuz tükäl alkınmışında* (InscrOuig II 11) and a further one *ibid.* 16, *alkınzun* (AbitAnk 42), *alkınmak yokadmak* (Neujahr 40), *agır ayıg kılınçları öçüp alkınıp ...* (AbitIst 62), *alkınur[lar ärti* (TuoLuoNi 204) and *alkıngu batgu* "Verschwinden und Untergang" (BT XIII 49,16). See *alkınmaksız* above, *alkındur-* below. *alkınçu* and *alkınçsız* could just as well come directly from *alk-* 'to destroy, use up, finish'.[226]

alka-n- 'to call out invocations or to call out in invocations, both when praying or praising and when cursing'. See the *UW*; the ex. of Wettkampf 5 (of praising) should be added to the entry. *alka-* is also used both *in bonam* and *in malam partem*.[227] *alka-* and *alkan-* appear to have had more or less the same meaning,

auch *-y-* zu lesen." The present interpretation makes the eds.' first choice of reading W appear preferable.

224 Against the *UW* entry, which denies this.

225 One of the objects of this verb is the accusative form which has been read as '*koyanug*' both in the *EDPT* and the *UW* and translated as 'sheep'. What the scribe meant to write must have been *koynnug*, which explains the rounded accusative allomorph. Similar ways of writing phonetically complex phonemes are attested also in other *early* texts; cf. *turuñya* in the Irq Bitig.

226 Both the *EDPT* and the *UW* maintain that *alko* (which they write as *alku*) is a petrified converb of *alk-*. I can't see much of a connection, though: *alko* signifies 'all', and the converb vowel of *alk-* is not rounded but /A/ as expected.

227 The *alka-* ex. of TT I 170 quoted as having positive content in *UW* 95 b is corrected in *UW* 244 a-b

but *alkan-* is used only in Manichaean texts. The biverb *kargan- alkan-* 'to call out curses to each other' comes from a biverb **karga- alka-*, whose assimilated variant is listed in DLT fol. 145. There we read: *'ol anı kargadı arkadı* "He cursed him and mentioned his evil deeds". This is used as a paired expression, never alone. It is derived from their word for "praise", *alkış*. From the frequent use in the paired expression, *alkadı* became used also for evil, even though its root-meaning was for good. Then the *rā'* is an alternant of the *lām.' Although Kāšġarī was right about the phonetics, he was wrong about the semantic aspect.* *alpırka-n-* 'to find something too difficult or tedious' is discussed with the *+(X)rkA-* verbs in section 5.2. The existence of *alpırka-* is not certain; see the *UW* s.v.

amra-n- 'to love' is discussed in the *UW*, also s.v. *amranmak* (which is much more common than *amran-*). Further exs. in UigTot 116 with an anaptyctic vowel as *amıranmak*, 183, 361 and 364, Tenri A I and IV and HamTouen 1,46, 5,32 and 6,5. An epistolary biverb *isinü amranu* appears in HamTouen 17,2 and 14, 20,4, 22,2 and 5, 23,3 and 29,2. In UigTot 183, *ög kaŋ amranmış üdtā* is translated as "Wenn Vater und Mutter sich lieben". I think this should be "Wenn man Vater und Mutter liebt" with *ög* and *kaŋ* as objects and not subjects (the formulation of the Tib. original permitting): Cf. *amra-ş-* above. For *amran-guluk sävgülük bol-* in TuoLuoNi 26 = 37, the meaning of *amran-* is wrongly given as "geliebt werden". The passive sense of the construction comes from the deontic passive participle, not from the verb stem itself. *amrançıg* (q.v. in section 3.311) can come from the base *amra-* (with which *amran-* appears to be synonymous); cf., however, *amranmaklıg* vs. *amramaklıg*.[228]

anu-n- 'to prepare oneself, to make ready'. See the *EDPT* for Qarakhanid exs. (there are more in the QB than mentioned there) and the *UW* for Uigur ones. Add *anunu küdā tururlar* 'they wait, preparing themselves' (BT XIII 19,81). The base is a hap. in the DLT.[229] Cf., however, *anu-t-* (below) and *anu-k* (above).

ar-ın- 'to tire (intr.)' is attested in BT II 970: *ät'özläri arınıp tınları tumılıp tını üzülgäli bartukta* ... 'When their bodies tire and their breath becomes cold and ...'. Does not belong to *er-in-* ~ *yer-in-*; that shouldn't and doesn't have such a variant and does not fit in meaning. The first verb in *arınıp ärmägürüp* in Chuast 255 and 266, associated with *ärkligin ärksizin* in both instances, also

and shown to have the opposite purport. Compare, as a semantic parallel, the ambivalence of Arabic *dā'a*.

228 *amramaklıg* is not a hap., as what it appears in the *UW* entry for it: It is attested also in Warnke 60. We discuss the morpheme sequence *-mAk+lXg* at the end of the section on *+lXg*.

229 The *'anı-'* instance mentioned in the *EDPT* is a mistake for *ay-*. This was noted by Tezcan in his n. to Ht X 1038.

belongs here. It is spelled with two *alif* in ms. TM 183,5 of the Chuast, in Manichaean script and published by Le Coq. He adds in a n.: "Schlaffheit und Mattigkeit des Handelns war ausdrücklich verboten". See *EDPT* and *UW* for *ar-* 'to be or get tired or weary'. The *UW* has no entry for *arın-* but considers this a spelling variant of '*ärin-*'. Such a form would have no appropriate etymology, however.

arı-n- 'to purify oneself, to be pure'. See the *UW* s.v., also for the valency difference between this verb and *arı-*: *arı-n-* always has personal subjects and spiritual content. The content of *arı-*, on the other hand, is not necessarily spiritual; even when it is, its subject is practically always non-personal. See *al-* and *al-ın-* (earlier in this section) for a similar distribution. Exs. in ShōAgon 1, p. 157,4 (. . . *bulur arınmakıg*) and AbiShotan v17 (*munuŋ arınmakıŋa yevig* [*ti*]*zig bolmakı*) should be added to the *UW* entry. See the *EDPT* for the uses to which the DLT puts *arın-*: They are purely carnal, although impeccably reflexive. Interesting for Uigur are the meanings *arın-* has in the Codex Comanicus.

arıt-ın- presumably 'to get oneself clean': In all six exs. mentioned and quoted in the *UW* and the *EDPT* it appears in a biverb with *yu-n-*. It may be noticed that three pre-Qarakhanid instances of *yu-* are *arıg yup*, *arıtı yup* and *arıtı yumış* least in one instance within an extended metaphor for something more abstract): hence a real reflexive. Cf. *arı-t-* below. *arıtmış k(ä)rgäk*. In all exs. the biverb is used of physical washing (although at

as-ın- should, I think, be read in TT VII 23,2 (which the *UW* apparently assigns to a verb '*äsin-*') and in TT VIII (Brāhmī) I 17 (which *UW* 234 b considers dubious). See a further ex. under *yorıt-* in section 7.561. It should *not* be read in Toñ (which see under *aşa-n-*) nor in the QB (which see under *aşun-*). I find all three Uigur contexts to be reasonably clear. In the Brāhmī ex., apparently, the diacritic for *i* was inadvertently omitted, leaving the middle *akşara* of the word *as(ı)nıp* with the shape for *sna*. The verb could signify 'to hang (an amulet, a necklace) on oneself'.

aşa-n- 'to have a meal; to eat (also with direct object); to enjoy'. A runic ex. is mentioned in the *EDPT* s.v. *asın-*, Uigur ones in the *UW*. *aş+a-* (q.v. above) and *aşan-* appear to be synonyms. Cf. *aşan-tur-* below.

(*aşgın-* 'to be worn away'. The *EDPT* only from the DLT and from later texts. The *UW* has two Uigur exs.; in his review of *UW* fascs. 3 and 4 in *OLZ* 84 (1989): 62, Zieme quotes two further ones. His suggestion that the verb be read as '*aşkın-*' appears to be motivated by his idea that it should be a variant of *alk-ın-*; this is unacceptable because of Ottoman *aşın-* (same meaning). I know of no base in Old Turkic for this verb. Ercilasun, 1984: 42-43 believes in a formative *-gXn-*, to which he assigns *ıçgın-* "kaybet-", *ötkün-* "taklit et-" and *tāzgin-* "dön-, dolaş-" from the QB, *aşgın-* and *boşgun-* from the DLT. *tāzgin-* is the

result of metathesis and none of the others have any evident bases. He adds: "Ekin . . . vazifesi belirsizdir".)

aşun- 'to surpass, excel'. Uigur exs. are listed in the *UW*, Qarakhanid ones in the *EDPT*. *aşın-* has been read in BT XIII 19,58 with a meaning appropriate for *aşun-*, and may be the original shape of the verb. A connection with *aş-* 'to cross over; to surpass' is made likely by the fact that, with other *-(X)n-* verbs as well, the *-(X)n-* derivate has the transferred meaning where the base verb has both the concrete and the transferred one.[230] Note also that there are several exs. in the transferred meaning, where both *aş-* and *aşun-* are used in biverbs with *ärt-*. Such phraseological similarities are a common characteristic of derivates. The major alternant *aşun-* may therefore be a back-formation from *aşnu*. *aşnu* is much more common and found much earlier and also served as base for several derivates; *aşnu*, in turn, would come from *aş-ın-*.[231] The QB 4848 ex. listed in the *EDPT* in fact belongs to *äşü-n-*. A real ex. in QB 595, on the other hand, is in the *EDPT* listed under *asın-*. There the mss. A and B have *asun-* (thus), while C is missing.[232] See Tezcan's review of the QB İndeks for both instances.

The *-mAklAşU* derivate of this verb is discussed in section 7.1. In BT XIII 49,15 there is an ex. of *az+u-* which the ed. would like to read as '*aşu-*' and take to be the base of *aşun-*. He translates it as "fortschreitet (?)" and calls it "eine erweiterte Form zu *aş-* 'überschreiten'". But that would give a hapax, whereas the context is perfectly served with *azu-*.

ata-n- 'to be named, to be called . . ., to be considered to be . . .; to be nominated to a high office'. The *EDPT* set up 'to be famous' as one of the meanings of this verb only for the sake of the IrqB LV instance; that, however, should better be translated as 'he was nominated to a high office'. See the *UW* for the Uigur exs., the *EDPT* for the Qarakhanid ones. There are additional exs. in the Tariat inscr.:[233] *k(a)ra bod(u)n . . . k(a)g(a)n (a)t(a)dı; t(ā)ŋridā bolm(ı)ş (e)l (e)tm(i)ş b(i)lgā k(a)g(a)n (a)t(a)dı, (e)l b(i)lgä k(a)tun (a)t(a)dı. k(a)g(a)n (a)t(a)n(ı)p x(a)tun (a)t(a)n(ı)p ötük(ā)n ortusınDa . . . örgin bunDa (e)ti(t)-d(i)m* (S6) and *t(ā)ŋridā bolm(ı)ş (e)l (e)tm(i)ş b(i)lgä k(a)g(a)n (e)l b(i)lgā k(a)tun k(a)g(a)n (a)t(ı)g k(a)tun (a)t(ı)g (a)t(a)n(ı)p . . .* (W1). T. Tekin's translations are as follows: "The common people . . . appointed (me) kagan, appointed (me) *Tängridä-bolmış, El-etmiş Bilgä Kagan* . . . and (my wife) *El-Bilgä Katun* . . . After having been appointed *kagan* and *katun*, I had my head-

230 For the latter meaning, see especially the *UW* entry.

231 Even if the Y in the BT XIII instance of this verb is uncertain and even if it should remain a hap., this account of the origin of the shape of *aşun-* remains viable.

232 Read QB as *kapugda aşungul maŋa bol yakın* 'excel at court . . .'; cf. Maue, 1981 for *kapıg* in this meaning.

233 The scholars are in disagreement over the overall ordering of the lines of this inscription.

quarters established here ... amidst Ötüken." and "I, the Heaven-born and the State-Founder Bilgä Kagan and (my wife) El-Bilgä Katun, having assumed the title of kagan and the title of katun, ...'. The reflexive meaning which Tekin assumes for the last two exs. of *atan-* is expressed in Ht IV 5 b8 as *ol tegin ymä özin xan atanu*. See the base *at+a-* in section 5.11.

atla-n- 'to ride or mount a horse, to set out' is documented in the *UW* (Uigur) and the *EDPT* (DLT etc.). Medial verb. See *at+la-* above and *atlan-tur-* below.

(*avın-* 'to enjoy oneself, take pleasure (in something)' is document in the *UW* (Uigur) and the *EDPT* (Qarakhanid exs.). *avınçu* (discussed among the *-(X)nçU* forms in section 3.105) is attested already in the IrqB, Qarakhanid Turkic also has the abstract *avınç* and cf. *avıt-* and *avıtıl-* below. A base for all these is not attested, however. This verb is also medial. '*avınıl-*' in TT VIII D U I corrected in the reedition of the text in U IV.)

aya-n-makka tükällig 'worthy of respect' is a hap. in an Uigur text, quoted in the *UW*. Anti-transitive, whereas *aya-l-* (q.v. below) is passive.

(*ayın-* must have been the original shape of a verb which then apparently turned into *äyin-*. The runic IrqB XIX and M III $10{,}6_3$ (text 5) in Manichaean script (both in the *EDPT*) have back vowels; *korkınu ayınu* (Suv 314,17, quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *qorqïn- ajïn-*) and *ayınıp äymänip* (Ht IV 1506, not in either dictionary) are ambivalent. *äyinç*, discussed above in section 3.104, has front vowels, however: It is attested with the accusative and dative suffix allomorphs *+ig* and *+kä*. No base is attested for *ayın-* 'to fear' in Turkic, but Mo. *ayu-* 'to fear' is very likely to represent **ayX-*: As follows from Thomsen Hansen, 1963, the argument used in the *EDPT* against such a connection is invalid. *ayın-* may have gotten fronted because of the /y/ or by analogy with *äymän-* (q.v. below). *äyin-* may also be dialect variant, as the Buddhist sources have it, and only the Buddhist ones. *korku aynu* in QB 4049 (not in the dictionaries, mistranslated in the İndeks of the QB) is probably also ambiguous as to fronting.)

ba-n- 'to bind something on oneself, to put on a weapon' is attested in a Yenisei inscr. and in the DLT. See the *EDPT*.

(*bagdaşınmak* is a hap. in the nominal phrase *yarım bagdaşınmakın* [*o*]*lor-* in MaitrH XI 6 b9; a description of this way of sitting is given in the n. to the translation. Cf. the petrified converb *bagdaşınu* below.)

bak-ın- 'to look at something for one's own benefit; to look around'. *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB on. Add *çınkaru bakın* (ETŞ 12,20) and *öŋdün kedin bakınu* (BuddhUig II 103). *bak-* 'to look at' is also quoted in the *EDPT* only from the DLT and the QB on, but is attested also e.g. in Ernte, Bud-

dhUig I (thrice), Suv, BT III (thrice) and ShōKenkyū. Cf. also *bak-ıg* 'glance' (DLT), *bak-ıt-* (BT VIII A) and *baktokla-* (Suv). The Uigur texts mentioned here are late.

maŋra-n- 'to call out' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* (which do have the DLT's *maŋraş-* and *maŋrat-*). Attested in *kuş mäŋin maŋranu* (Hochzeit 31) "(wie . . .) ein Vogel nach seinem Futter schreit", *kay kay sayu maŋırı(ı)n maŋırandılar*[234] (ShŌ XII b12, with anaptyctic /ı/) 'they called (it) out in all the markets' and in BT III 1020 (quoted under *tan-ış-* above). See *maŋra-* in section 5.32 above.

bar-ın- is, in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, quoted only from the DLT on. 'to flow off from a person's body': *āt'özümüzdin kan yirip söl . . . akar barınur* (Maitr 174 r4) and *irip tav akar barınur* (Maitr 61 r10), *kan irip akar barınur* (Maitr 174 r4) and *irip tav akar barınur* (ibid. 24). Cf. *uragutın kan barındı* (DLT fol. 338), of menstrual blood. *bar-* is, of course, 'to go' in the widest possible sense.

bas-ın- semantically differs from *bas-* 'to press, impress, crush, make a surprise attack, suppress' in several ways. Anti-transitive *basın-* in IrqB XLVI: *tābā tūtigkā tüşmiş; basınu . . .* 'A camel fell into a bog. Under (physical) pressure, it . . .'. Similar in *yat yagıka basınmaguluk* (Suv 422,3). Anti-transitive or reflexive in Tōñ 39: *nākā tāzār biz? ūkūş teyin näkä korkur biz? az teyin nā basınalım? tāgälim!* '"What are we running away for? Why do we consider (them) numerous and are afraid? Why should we consider (ourselves) few and feel under pressure (or: impose restraint on ourselves, or: suppress our spirit)? Let us attack!"'. The other exs. of *basın-* are tr., signify 'oppress, repress' in Uigur and 'oppress, treat with disrespect and despise' in Qarakhanid (q.v. in the *EDPT*). Here, *basın-* differs from *bas-* in having an abstract and metaphorical meaning, whereas *bas-* has mainly physical content.[235] Such exs. can be found in TT II 1,12 (quoted in the *EDPT*), TT VI 10 (biverb *iyin- basın-*), BT XIII 13,91 (*ōz[üm]tā kudı kişilārig iymāk basınmak*) and TuoLuoNi 190 (*basıngalı örlätgäli umazlar* "können nicht (mehr) bedrücken und quälen"). *basınç* 'oppression' (q.v. in section 3.104 above) and *basıntur-* 'to get oppressed etc.' (discussed below) come from this last use of *basın-*. Cf. also *basınguluksuz bol-* (section 3.312) and *basınış-*.

başla-n- 'to begin (intr.)' is documented in the *EDPT*. Exs. not mentioned there appear in Maitr 6 r1, 3, 5 and 8 (where it signifies 'to rule' as an intr. activity of

234 The ed. read *maŋırt(ı)n* as '*maŋınta*' which does not make much sense. Cf. *maŋırt maŋra-*.

235 *bas-* does appear in abstract use in two cases. Firstly, when denoting the repression of one's own passions: *öpkā nızvanuların iyā basa umadın ok, . . .* (TT II 2,74). Similar to this, TT III 120-1 (= Pothi 160-1) should probably be completed as *[nızvanı]ların bastılar, arxant kutın bul[tılar]*; not as '*[ayıg]ların . . .*'. Secondly, the biverb *iy- bas-* has non-physical content: *ayıg kılınçlıg tosun yavlak moyga tınlıgarıg iyār basar* (TT VI 255).

Buddhas before entering *nirvāṇa*), Ht X 11, ms. T I T 301 (U 2378) l.2-3 (in the n. to Hochzeit 12) and in l.2 of a Manichaean fr. from Istanbul quoted in the n. to SP 30.

mayakan- is a hap. in BT XIII 60,8: *maxeşvarı tāŋri başlap munça terini kuvragı birlä / mayakanẓun yämü* [. . .]*I sänin agızınka*. We have to face the fact that this verse is obscene and irreverent; obscene graffiti have always been a commonplace, and Cf. Republican Turkish *Ağzına sıçayım*. I translate: 'May the god Maheśvara together with all that assembly$_2$ of his defecate into your mouth [. . .], O.K.?'. Not translated by the ed. See the *EDPT* for *mayak*. Verbs denoting bodily functions tend to be medial in form.

bädizä-n- 'to adorn oneself' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Attested in Maitr 75 v32 as *bädizänürlär ärdi*. Cf. *bädiz+ä-* above, *bädizä-l-* below.

bädüklä-n-ü is found only in ShōAgon 2, p. 190,7 in fragmentary context. *bädük+lä-* appears in DLT fol. 593, translated 'to reckon somebody to be big'. In the entry *bädükläntür-* in the *EDPT* it should have been noted that, in the one possibly real ex., the first two letters are conjectured and the third is marked as uncertain.

bäklä-n- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT on and from Heilk I 12 (*n*[*n b*]*äk-länmä*[*k* 'the impediment of breath'). The DLT gives several meanings, corresponding to what we find in additional Uigur exs. *kızıl bakırlag naralar içintä bäklänmiş amarıları* (Maitr 68 v2) corresponds to the DLT's *bäkländi näŋ* "The thing was kept or guarded".[236] A further Maitr ex. of *bäklän-* appears in 176 v13. Cf. *alko üç yavlak yolnuŋ kapıgı tunzun bäklänzün* (BT XIII 46,24) 'May the gate to all three evil ways be blocked and secured'. Another DLT ex. is *är ävindä bäkländi* "The man entrenched himself in his house". By metaphorical extension of this meaning, *yarok yaşok sakınmak üzä bäklänip* . . . (UigTot 194) "man muss sich durch das Vorstellen von Licht verschließen". Another ex. of *bäklän-* appears *ibid.* 233. *ernim bäklänip* . . . 'my lips got locked up' appears in Suv 9,8; the ms. of this passage edited in SuvLeg (T I 164 v10) has *agızım bäklänip* instead. This reminds us both of the BT XIII instance and of the DLT's *bäkländi näŋ* 'The thing became firm'. Ht X793 has been read as *adakı sön tumlıyu b(ä)rkränmiş ärdi*, 'to get rigid (of a corpse)'. The *l*-hook must again have been forgotten and we have the same verb here. *bärk* is the original shape of *bäk* (unless this is also an error). Another ex. of *bäklän-*

236 The words "'the thing was stored up' or 'the thing was in store'(?)" of the *EDPT* entry should be deleted: Dankoff and Kelly correctly translate the original as "transitive or not transitive". What Kāšġarī probably means is that the Oguz used *bäklän-* both as anti-transitive and as passive (only transitives being capable or passive transformation). Where the Uigur have *bäklä-l-* (q.v. below), Ottoman Turkish to this day neutralises the opposition between passive and reflexive if the base has an /l/ in the last syllable.

appears in Ht X1114. Here the context is too fragmentary, but "gömülmüş" does not seem to be a likely meaning for this verb. See *bāk+lā-* above, *bāklā-l-* below.

bārt-in- 'to get injured' is in the *EDPT* quoted from one Uigur ex. and from the DLT. Attested also as follows: *buẓulup bārtinip* . . . (TuoLuoNi 98); *tançu aşlıg [. . .]z dyannn tursar ok* [. . .]*rU bārtinūr;*[237] *anı [ū]çün aşnuça [ya]g sūt kodup . . .* (Ht V3 a 5) i.e.: If you wake him up by giving him *bits* of food, he will get hurt; therefore give him lots of cream and milk. *busuşlug okın ursukup bertinip* (thus) *yürāki āmgāntī* (Suv 632,23) 'She got hit by the arrow of sorrow and got hurt, and her heart ached'. *bārt-* is "to wound or break without inflicting visible injury" (DLT). See exs. in the *EDPT*, and in the *DTS* s.vv. *bert-* (the ex. from TT I 198 quoted there should belong to *ber-* 'to give') and '*bart-*'. The spelling '*b(ı)rt(d)ımız / b(ı)rtd(ı)m(ı)z / b(ı)rtt(ı)m(ı)z*' of the eds. of the Chuast mss. in 80 and 215 is groundless. Cf. *bārKā* (with late variant *berKā*) and *bārt-ök* above.

bış(u)r-un- is a religious term signifying 'to assimilate a doctrine, get well versed in it and exercise it'. Not used in the concrete sense which *bış-ur-* (q.v. below in the section on *-Ur-*) and the hap. *bışrun-dur-* can have. Both Manichaean and Buddhist. Most common is the biverb *bışrun- ögrätin-*, attested in TT V B 8, Buddhāv H 18, AmitIst 68, Suv 39,14, 136,19, 140,11, 141,19, 213,18, 371,14 etc., BT III 769, UigKol 26-7, ShōAgon 1,15 (twice) and 92, UigFalt 8-9, 13 and 33, Wārnke 554. Further exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in BT II 99, 391 and 1070, Suv 211,6 and 372,9, ETŞ 13,82 and 100, 19,20 etc., 67 times in UigTot, twice in BuddhUig I 402, ShōAgon 1,187, BuddhUig II 14, UigKol 13-14, Buddhāv H 1 and 24, BT VII J 4 and 17 and A 768, 422 and 449, UigFalt 67, 69 and 70, BT VIII A 451 and 453, AbitAnk 21 and 23 and elsewhere. It can govern the dative (as in the TT III ex. quoted in the *EDPT*) or direct objects: *kāẓig, alko ādgūlār, kōni dyan, arıg yorıg, nom, yol* and others.

bil-in- 'to know for oneself; to attain self knowledge, to come to one's senses, to become self-conscious, to admit one's sins'. Documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* from runic, Manichaean, Buddhist and Qarakhanid sources, in the latter also s.v. *ökün- bilin-*. This biverb appears also in UigSünd 4. A biverb *tuyun- bilin-* can be found in Suv 218,18, UigTot 438 and in the Maitr, *öglän- bilin-* in ShōXII b 1, *ukun- bilin-* in BT II 969-70, Maitr 73 r 18 and 178 r 5, UigSünd 43. Further exs. in ShōKenkyū II 26, ms. T II K 8 r 6 in ChuastBeitr footn. 3, Suv 625,17 and BT XIII 4,34[238] and 12,13. The *EDPT* mentions instances where *bilin-* is used in biverbs with *açın-* and *kakın-*.

237 Not '*bardınur*', as the ed. writes.

238 *yazokın bilinip ol yaŋa* should here be translated as 'that elephant realised that he was sinful', not

boguzla-n- is a hap. in Toñ quoted in the *EDPT*; found also in the Sanglax, etc. See *boguz+la-* above. The instance is normally translated as if it were a passive form. Perhaps the limitation on *-(X)l-* in Ottoman Turkish, i.e. the fact that it could not be added to bases which had an */l/* in their last syllable, held also for Orkhon Turkic; at least I know of no instance to contradict it.

(*boşgun-* 'to get instruction, to learn'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in ETŞ 13,124 and 27,2, frequently in the Maitr, Ht V 12 b1 and IV 1688 (*kuldın nom boşgunıı*, source of instruction in the ablative), Töpfer 15 (*baxşıda boşgunmış bilig*, similar construction relativised), 19 and 26, UigFalt 2 and Suv 395,10. Base unknown, but no doubt connected with *boşgur-* (q.v. among the *-Ur-* verbs) and *boşgut* (section 3.108). Under *boşgut*, the reader can find several additional exs. of *boşgun-*, and there are many more. *boşgut-* (discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs) may not have existed.)

boşw-n- 'to free oneself, to get free, from impediments of the soul (mainly sin)'. Exs. in the *EDPT*, a further one in Maitr 73 r 19. Cf. also *yazokumuznı boşwnu kolmak* in Le Coq's ms. of Chuast 185 where Radloff's ms. has *boşwyu ötün-mäk*. The instance in ŞU quoted in the *EDPT* is not certain: Only B^1W seems to be free of doubt on the quite good photograph which I was generously allowed to examine in Copenhagen; *bo elkā* might also be possible. *boşw-* is tr. in Uigur (which makes it an exception in its formation). See its discussion in section 5.41, and that of *boşlun-* in section 7.22.

bög-ün- 'to comprehend, perceive, recognize' is better discussed in the *DTS* (also under *čïnyar- bögün-*); the *EDPT* has only one Uigur ex. and understands it wrongly. Additional exs. appear in BT III, ShōAgon 3, p. 203,2, BT XIII 35,9 and 38,14 (similar to the TT III ex. misunderstood in the *EDPT*). Used in biverbs with *sakın-* in Suv 706,16, BuddhUig II 609-10 (twice) and ShōAgon 1,61 and 105 (this last mistakenly read as '*saqïnmaq bögümäk*'). BuddhBio 12 should be read as *bo beş türlüg agır tüllärig bögünü kördi bodısıtv bilgä biligin* 'He perceived$_2$ these five types of important dreams through his wisdom of being a bodhisattva'. The ed. wrongly reads this as '*bügürü*'.[239] *bögün-* no doubt comes from *bög-* 'to gather and assemble'; the derivate differs from the base by being its spiritual counterpart. *bög-* is discussed in the *EDPT*; the Suv 137,4 instance was taken over into the versified version and now appears as BT XIII 13,110. Maitr 11 v8 has another ex.

böl-ün- 'to be divided into parts or groups' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the

as done by the editor. Thus both by the case and possessive suffixes and because of the context. Word order is a bit irregular but, as elsewhere in this text and in others, normal poetic licence.

239 He constructs an unattested verb '*bügü+r*'; the facs. shows the reading *bögün-* to be possible at least as well as this. Moreover, *+(A)r-* verbs typically signify 'to be or become the content of the base'; this could not be said of how the ed. translates his instance.

DTS. *bölänüp* appears quite clearly on the facs. in BT I D(174) and not at all clearly *ibid.* (158). *böl-* is quoted in the *EDPT* from a controversial passage in Toñ and in the *DTS* form a Suv instance; it appears also in BT II 227, ETŞ 12,6, Maitr 450 v3,[240] and UigFalt 115 and 120. Nine exs. of the biverb *böl- adırıla-* are mentioned under *adırı+la-* above. Cf. *böl-ük-* and *böl-ül-* below, *böl-ök* and *bölmäksiz* above.

bulga-n- 'to be stirred up, agitated; to be contaminated with something'. Exs. in *EDPT* and *DTS*, also in ETŞ 9,78 and 11,4, Suv 636,16 and ten times in Maitr (BT IX). Add also *övkälämäz bulganmazlar* (Maitr 80+59 v26). The biverb *busan- bulgan-* appears in Ht V6 b18 and ShōAgon 1,334. A number of QB exs. of *bulgan-ok* are mentioned under *bulga-k* above. Cf. also the next entry.

(burçın-mak appears in Mängi 12 in parallelism with *bulganmak*. *bur[ç]ınmaks[ız bul]ganmaksız köŋülin* (BT XIII 3,52) is translated as "mit unverstörtem und unverwirrtem Sinn". Cf. *burçıntur-* in BT XIII 13,88 and Suv 136,11. The *EDPT* did not believe in the existence of such a stem, but these four exs. remove all doubts about its existence. In Suv we find the series *köŋüllärin karınların irintür- burçıntur- örlät- ämgät-*, in BT XIII 13 (a paraphrase of the Suv passage) *burçıntur- . . . köŋüllärin busantur-*. These determine the meaning of *burçın-* as 'to be vexed, provoked, have a temper'. The *DTS* writes this verb with *o* in the first syllable, but the cognates quoted in Bang and Gabain's ns. to their ed. of the Suv passage indicate the opposite. The base is not attested in Old Turkic but lives on as stated in that note.)

busan- 'to be sorrowful'. **busa-* is not attested, but *busuş* must also come from it. *DTS* s.v. '*bušan-*' and *EDPT*. Add *busanguluk taplaguluk iki türlüg savlar* (BT II 918) "Tatsachen, über die man sich freuen (oder) bekümmert sein muß", *b[u]sanıp* (BT XIII 49,6), *ärtiŋü bäliŋlädilär busantılar* (Ht X465), *busanämgän-* (TuoLuoNi 229), *ayı busantımız* (HamTouen 20,13), *busanmaŋlar* (MaitrGeng 7 b11 according to Zieme, personal communication; misspelled as '*busa-*' by the editor), *yerinti busantı* (Ht X1020) and *köŋüli biligi ärtiŋü busantı yer[in]ti* (HamTouen 1,63). In UigTot 1184, the transcription '*bušan-*' is wrong, the translation "über . . . zornig werden" (with accusative) unlikely.[241] If anything, *busan-* governs an *üçün* phrase (as in the KP ex. quoted in the *EDPT*, the TT X ex. quoted in the *DTS* and *tagay çor üçün busanmaŋlar* (HamTouen 21,5); or the dative, as in Suv 631,3 (q.v. in the *DTS* entry) and Ht V6 a11: *yultuzçı körüm[çi] yokıŋa busanıp . . . sezinti*.)

240 It is, however, a mistake in Maitr 450 v3: *tarmaklag bölär käl[* should rather be translated as 'clawed (*tarmak+lXg*) spiders come . . .'. Ş. Tekin (107,15) wrongly transcribes the word as '*boylar*'.

241 The ed. apparently confused *busan-* with *buş-* 'to be irritated, annoyed, angry' or, at least, thought the two could be related. The *DTS* also writes '*bušan-*'.

(*busurkan-* is a hap. in a biverb with *busan-* and, as a *verbum sentiendi*, presumably its synonym. Discussed in section 5.2. An *+(X)rkA-* verb related to it is not found.)

bügülä-n- 'to have mystical wisdom'. Appears 13 times in the infinitive (including 6 in BT II and one in Abhi 1451, quoted in *UW* 289 a par. 3). Other exs. occur in Kuan (quoted in the *EDPT*), MaitrGeng 12 b9 (*bügülüg kŋülin bügülänü yarlıkap . . .*) and MaitrH XVI 5 b30 (*ı(ā)ŋri ı(ā)ŋrisi burxan . . . elig xannıŋ kŋülintäki sakınçın bügülänip . . .*). See *bügü+lä-* above.

bür-ün- 'to wrap something (direct object) round oneself' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from Qarakhanid Turkic on. The DLT's *uragut yogurkan büründi* is similar to an ex. in Maitr 128 v14 = BT IX 77,14: *böz bürünüp içintä olormış kim toyın ärki?* "Welcher Mönch ist es, der mit einem Baumwollgewand umhüllt drinnen sitzt?". There is a further ex., in fragmentary context, in Maitr 128 r3. The DLT also has the cognates *bürmä*, *bürül-*, *bürüş-* and *bürünçük*.

çız-ın- 'to draw or write for oneself' is a hap. in Shō XI b5: *tükäl tämür tu k(ı)ya*[242] *çızındım*. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *çız-dur-* is also a hap. in Uigur and *çız-* itself is rare as well. Only *çız-ıg* (q.v. above) is quite well attested. None of these appears in Qarakhanid Turkic. Mo. *jiru-* 'to draw, paint' is probably related to *çız-* (and not to *yaz-* 'to write', as stated in *EDPT* 984 a).

çu-n- 'to practice penitence'. Not mentioned in the dictionaries. Attested in *ämgäktä çunup* . . . (ETŞ 9,76) and *ulug çunmaklıg ärip çunmaknıŋ ıntın kıdıgıŋa tägmiş ärür* (BT VIII B 154-5) "Er ist der große Büßer, er ist zum jenseitigen Ufer der Buße gelangt". The instance in MaitrH Y6 r12 should be translated accordingly. See *çu-k-* and *çu-l-* below; the base is discussed under *çu-k-*.

ädlä-n- 'to serve as something, to be utilised' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT and from Ottoman. Under *atla-n-* in 269 b, the *UW* says that "DL'N- in Maitr 145 r30 should be read as *ädlän-* (in spite of BT IX I p. 110 n. where a nonexistant DLT verb is 'cited'); the instance governs a direct object, however, and remains a problem. Cf. *äd+lä-* above.

ämgä-n- 'to suffer'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Further exs. in Höllen 135, Maitr 127 r8, BT II 177 and 208, ManTüTex (16) 343, Ernte 84, BT VIII A 143, Shō IX a15, BuddhUig II 53, Ht V8 a18 etc. Worth quoting is *ätözin näŋ ämgäk ämgänmädim* (Ht V12 b25); another ex. with *ämgäk* as internal object is quoted under *ämgä-k* (written in Tib. script). The biverb *ämgän- tolgan-*, quoted in the *EDPT* from a Manichaean text, is attested also in BT XIII 12,105. Another

242 Expresses humility. *tu*, transcribing the Chin. term for 'slave' (as found out by P. Zieme), has the same purport.

biverb is *husan- āmgān-* (TuoLuoNi 229). The *üzā* phrase in *agrıg üzā āmgān-* (TuoLuoNi 85) is instrumental, *ās* the dative in *isig kuyaşka āmgānmiş k(i)şi* in TT VIII I 10.[243] See *āmgā-k* above for the mutual distribution of *āmgā-* (well attested in the QB) and *āmgān-*; the intr. *āmgā-* was displaced by the latter. Cf. also *āmgā-t-* below. See the *EDPT* for a special polite use of *āmgān-* reported on in the DLT; it reminds one of German 'sich hinbemühen'.

(āŋān- is attested in *kuvraghk*[244] *āvlārig yalıŋuz 'āŋāntimiz ārksintimiz, adnaguka ber(mā)dimiz* (Maitr 69 r4) and *šāŋik sāŋrām sanlıg idişin tavarın 'āŋānū alıp işlādimiz, adnaguka bermādimiz* (*ibid.* 11) with the meaning 'to set apart for oneself'. For the double initial *alīf* cf. *āŋ+lā-*. We do not have **āŋ+ā-* but see the petrified converb *'āŋāyū* '(in) particular, special' at the end of section 5.11. *'āŋān-yūk* is used with roughly the same meaning but is always adnominal. It appears, variously misread, in BT XIII 56,15 (see the n. thereto for the interpretation) and 5,57 (cf. facs. for the correct reading), Maitr fr. 249 v3, MaitrH X17 b9, ETŞ 9,51 and 10,25 and M III 22,14 (text 8; facs.?). DTL fol. 91 has this lexeme with *°n-y°* simplified to *y*, as in *ögrāyük, sarkıyuk, osayuk* and *bulgayuk*.)

(ārksin- 'to have or acquire power (over)' is dealt with in section 6.2, q.v. above.

This is a medial verb.)

āsirkā-n- 'to regret the loss of what is one's own, i.e. to grudge'. The *EDPT* is probably right in that M III 21,3 (text 8) should be emended to *āsirkānū kız-kanu* (and not, e.g., to *'āsirkāyū'*). A variant with initial /e/ appears in Maitr 198 r19: *boşı bergāylār ārdi, esirkānmāk kōŋül turgurmagaylar ārdi*. The base also has a variant with /e/. *āsirkā-* is discussed in section 5.2.

āşü-n- 'to cover oneself as with a blanket' appears in QB 3785, 4848 and 5003 (only the first of these mentioned in the *EDPT*). Also in BuddhBio 8: *üstünki kök t(ā)ŋrig āşükçā āşünür bolur* "Er hüllt den hoch oben befindlichen Himmel wie eine Bettdecke um sich".

(āymān- 'to be shy' is often spelled as *'āymān-*, for which an explanation is given in the *EDPT*. Front vocalism is guaranteed by *korkmak 'āymānmāk* (Maitr 55 r11-12), *āymānçlig* (Ht VII 3 b10), *āymānmāk* (HtPek 92 b13, Maitr 90 r7 and DLT fol. 138-9) and *āymānōk* 'reserved, self-effacing, reticent' (QB 2237 and 4349), which are all spelled with a front *kāf*. Also by *āymānçsiz* in (Brāhmī) TT VIII A 48 and *emān-, uman-* and *ymān-* in the Codex Comanicus. *āymānmāklıg* in (Brāhmī) TT VIII A 10 is a compromise; the counter-exs. are *korkınçıg*

243 Not TT VIII L 10, as written in the *EDPT*. Why the *EDPT* translates this as "suffering from sunstroke" is not clear.

244 Thus and signifying 'meant *for* the community, *for* public use'; not '*kuvraglıg*', as it has been read.

aymançıg (Suv 614,5) and *burxanka aymanmakın* (MaitrH XI 3 b14), both with Q. The back-vowel variant may be due to analogy with *ayın-* or be caused by spelling pronunciation of the first part. Other exs. are ambivalent in this respect: Some are mentioned in the *EDPT*, and in the *DTS* under '*ajman-*', '*qorq-ajman-*' and '*ujat-ejmän-*' (thus); others appear in Maitr 73 v 3, Ernte 51, Ht IV 1506 and 1686, Shō VI b 6, Suv 141,5, EhlersNotab 4 and BuddhUig II 501. See *äymänçsiz* in section 3.12. No base is attested for this *verbum sentiendi*. There is no reason to think that *äymän-* and *ayın-* 'to fear' (q.v. above) were originally related, although there is some superficial similarity especially in the written shapes, and although both can be used together with *kork-*.)

(*elän-* 'to rule, be a ruler'. *DTS* s.v. '*ülän-* I' and '*ülänmäk*' and *EDPT* s.v. *éllen-*; *UW* 163 b writes *el(l)änür*. It is always spelled with one L, however; even if it could be proven conclusively that it comes from *el+lä-* (q.v. above) and not from '**el+ä-*', geminate *l* could have been simplified prehistorically.[245] *ellä-* is attested only in runic sources, *elän-* never in them. In M III 19,16 (text 8), BT V (13) 375, UigSteu A 31 and UigSukh 25 we find exs. not mentioned in the two dictionaries. Another etymology not to be excluded would be to connect this verb with the base of *ilgärü* and *ilki* 'first', in view of the fact that *başlayukı* are synonyms of the latter.)

elt-in- 'to carry with one, acquire, get etc.'. Exs. in the *EDPT*; also in Maitr 84 v 1, 110 v 10, 203 r 11 and 127 r 11-12, ETŞ 9,99, 10,229, 13,13 and 199, 14,20 and in UigFalt 30 and 41 and ĀgFrag (1) B 12, 16 and 27 signifies 'to lead a certain way of life'; it may, as Maue has written in connection with the ex. mentioned last below, be a calque on the Skt. phrase *ātmānam ud+dhar-*. *äŋ kenki āt' ōzūg eltindāçi* in TT VIII A 48, BT III 488 and ms. T III Toyoq 302 (Ch/U 6939) v 14-17 (quoted on p. 335 of the publication containing Neujahr) corresponds to the Skt. compound *antima+deha+dhāri* 'the bearer of the very last body'. Ms. T II S 19 +IM 8 II (Mz 648) 3rd text b r 4 is in SktUigBil completed as [*utaçı*] *ol ātōzūg ye*[*ltingā*]*li* and translated as "Er ist in der Lage, sich am Leben zu erhalten". This is possible only if *elt-* or any of its derivates can be shown in any independent way to have had initial **h* (> *y* ~ ∅).

er-in- is a *verbum sentiendi* signifying 'to be annoyed at or impatient with (and therefore in some exs. to be negligent about) someone or something'. The *EDPT*'s lemmata for '*erin-* (?*érin-*)', '*irin-* (?*érin-*)' and '2 *yérin-*' (with variant *érin-* in the body of the entry) should be united. None of these comes from the DLT's *är irdi* "The man was lonely" (the base of the QB's *irinçig* 'boring'). The base of *er-in-* is *yer-* 'to loathe, oppose, despise, criticise', attested in Maitr 108

245 *elig xan* 'king' from *el+lig xan* has the same base, and there are numerous other cases.

r9, U III 73,21-2 and 83,27 and 13 times in the QB; further, in the biverbs *yer-mänä-* in Maitr T III 118 β v9 and Ht VII 1798, *yer- yarsı-* in U III 43,21, *asKançula- er-* (thus) in Heilk II p. 402 I.2[246] and *er- yalk-* (thus) in Suv 235,10-12 and 250,7. The variant with initial *y* must clearly be considered the main one with the base (and with the QB's *yerinçig* discussed above), but not with the other derivates: *er-ik-*, *er-il-*, *er-it-*, *erinç* ~ *yerinç* and *er-in-* (with *ärinöksüz* ~ *erinöksüz* discussed at the end of section 3.102, *ärinmäksiz* from section 3.329 and *erin-tür-* discussed below). In Uigur texts, *erin-* and *yerin-* fluctuate: ... *bägkä işikä yerinür övkiläyür* (TT VI 18) is the same biverb as *erinmädin [övkä]lämädin* (Ht VII 9 a13) and *näŋ kimkä ymä eringülük övkälägülük ärmäz* (Suv 228,14-15). From the biverb in *yerinti busantı* (Ht X 1020) we find the causative expansion *erintür- busantur-*. In TT VI 452, one ms. has *yerin-* while the other three write *erin-*. Further exs. with *yerin-* appear in KP 68,5, U III 73,22 and Warnke 20,[247] with *erin-* in Suv 488,5 and M II 12,3| (text 5, Manichaean). The two Chuast exs. quoted in the *EDPT* under '*erin-*' in fact belong to *ar-ın-*, q.v. above. In QB 2462, *erinmäz* is the variant of the two better mss., while the later one has *ärin-*; in the entry in DLT fol. 109, the forms fluctuate between *ärin-* and *erin-*.[248] Cf. *erin-tür-* ~ *yerin-tür-*.

et-in- 'to prepare oneself'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. In Old Turkic proper it usually appears in biverbs either with *yarat-ın-* or with *tımä-n-*. *etin- yaratın-* is attested also in BT VIII B 143 among other places, *etin-* alone e.g. in Maitr 112,36, ShōAv 133 and BuddhUig II 9, 103 and 342.

ev-in- 'to hurry (intr.)' is attested only in QB 1999, 2359 and 2363 (only the first of which is mentioned in the *EDPT*), but cf. *evin-iş-* above. The QB also has an imperative *ev-it!* 'Make it fast!'. The *EDPT* has *ev-* 'to hurry' only from DLT and QB ff. It was probably intended also in U II 29,18 and 24 in a binomial *evä taya* (describing a hysterical running about). Cf. also *eväk* in DLT and QB.

(içan- 'to be apprehensive about something, stand on one's guard, dodge' appears in different shapes. The *EDPT* s.v. *içan-* does not believe in the existence of such a verb. In two of the exs. quoted there it stands parallel to *saklan-*. *DTS* also has *saqlan- yïčan-* (thus) from Suv (not mentioned there under *yıçan-*).

246 As corrected in *UW* 234 b top. The ed. wrongly read *aya-* instead of *er-*.

247 According to P. Zieme, the "Lesung" of this ex. is "unklar"; '*yirivip*' of the edition must be an error.

248 The *EDPT* entry for '*erin-*' tacitly chooses the weaker variant of QB 2462, *ärinmäz*, which differs also from the original shape of the verb. In DLT fol. 109, we have *är ışka erindi* "The man was indolent in the matter out of boredom" and not as read or translated in the *EDPT*. In the aorist and infinitive forms in this entry, the first hand did write *fatḥas* (to which a second hand added *kasras*). *ar-ın-* 'to tire (of something)' is clearly a different verb, although the two can look similar in some scripts.

Add *içanıp saklanıp* (BT II 233 on a leaf now lost). In ThreeLett 47 and 48, the facs. shows *ayı kuṭuru uçınu saklanu turgu kılıŋ* 'make them go on being exceedingly$_2$ alert and on their guard' in one version, *içanu saklanu* in the other one.[249] In *UW* 67 a s.v. *agır* B,f fin., *yıçanmaklıg agır kŏŋülin* (Suv 492,18) is translated as "mit ehrfürchtigem und respektvollem Herzen". Not in the dictionaries is also *ıwgdı bälıŋ ṭäg seziki oglanıŋa yıçanu* (Suv 632,22). *sezin-* and (*y*)*ıçan-* are associated also in Warnke 242: [*ayıg*] *kılınçlıg* [*ı*]*dıg* [*ıu*]*ıug üzä* [*ıdı*]*lıp üzülüp kutrulmaklıg orunka alp öt*[*gülük*] *ärür tep çın kertü sezingülük içanguluk bolgaylar.*[250] A further biverb is *korka y*[*ı*]*çanu* in BT XIII 13,36. As stated by Zieme in *TDAYB* 1982-83 (1986): 235, *korka ıçanu* appears also in InscrOuig V 51 (misread by the eds.). Both exs. of this biverb describe the humility of scribes. Two identical passages in ManMon 45 and 47 are visible on the facs. but of obscure content. The Codex Comanicus has at least four times *yçan-*, changed in all instances by a German hand to *yaçan-* by adding an A. This alteration is significant: DLT fol. 479 also has thrice *yaçan-*. *ol mändin yaçandı* is there translated as "He was ashamed [before me] because he failed to do the matter". No base is attested for this *verbum sentiendi*.)

(*ıçgın-* 'to lose something, let it go, let it slip away' is very common in Old Turkic. *EDPT*; *DTS* especially s.v. '*jittür- ïčγïn-*'. Some of the exs. not mentioned there appear in UigTot 784, several times in ETŞ and in QB 2350. Add also *ög ıçgın-* 'to lose one's mind' in LautHöllen and *ıçxınur* in Brāhmī script in ms. Mz 210 A 3 quoted in n. 16 to Maue, 1984: 93. Base and derivation unknown, and the similarity with *ıçan-* may be coincidental. Possibly a medial verb.)

(*ınan-* 'to believe (in)'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear, among other places, in Hazai 5, ETŞ 9,96, 14,4 and 16,1, Maitr 18,4 and 5, UjgStichi 4, TuoLuoNi 241 (*ınan- kertgün-*), UigTot 1313, Ht VII 9 b21 (*yınan-*!) and Shō- and *ınal* (section 3.113) and also *ınamlı* < **ınam* in the Codex Comanicus.)

ırga-n- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from DLT fol. 132 and translated as 'to shake and sway (intr.)', and from later sources. In UigSukh 14 we have] *yer alko*

249 The readings and interpretations of both Tuguševa and Clauson are aberrant. *ıçınu* in one of the two versions of the passage is not surprising for the second vowel: As Clauson writes, "medial *a/e*, *ı/i* . . . are usually indistinguishable . . . A letter which looks like a clearly written *ı/i* sometimes appears where *a/e* might be expected."

250 The translation "Dann wird man durch das Taten-Hindernis verhindert und vernichtet und schwerlich zur Stätte der Befreiung gelangen, und man wird wahrhaftig zweifeln und argwöhnisch sein" has, I think, two errors: Firstly, *çın kertü* is probably the object of *sezin- içan-* and not adverbial. Secondly, the sentence *kutrulmaklıg orunka alp ötgülük ärür* probably represents the contents of the thought of those who have doubts and apprehensions; the ed.'s remark "*tip* hier im Sinne von *üçün*" does not, I think, apply.

251 '*amtı-ta ınanu*' in ms. T II M 12-24 as quoted in the n. to BT I D 177 should be *amtı-ta ınaru*.

yırganur (thus), translating a Chin. biverb with the same meaning. *yırga-t-*, q.v., is rather common, and cf. *ırga-g* above. The n. to the UighSukh instance mentions Anatolian forms of this verb with initial *y*.

igdülä-n- 'to feed oneself' with *kāntü özümin* as object: an Uigur hap. quoted in the *EDPT*. Tacitly emended there: The text has *igdilān-* (see facs.). *igdü+lä-* is discussed above.

ilgü-n- is perhaps 'to develop energy'. The *EDPT* wrongly writes that the only (Manichaean) instance which it quotes may be an error. Attested also in BT II 218, in *agızlarınta oi yalın ünüp isig özlārin tükāl ilgünü*[252] *umazlar* '. . . and they are quite unable to pull themselves together' or '. . . to muster up some energy'. In the Manichaean ex., *yel tāŋri küçin ilgünmākin* is 'by invigoration stemming from the wind god's force'. See *ilgü-r-* in section 6.3 above also for the base, and cf. *ilgü-t-* and especially *ilgün-dür-* below.

il-in- 'to be or get caught in or with something'. M I 15,5 (TeilBuch; quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *közkä ilān-* and joined to a verb signifying 'to reprove') should be read as *közinä nāŋ il-'(i)nmägāy*.[253] Several of the exs. mentioned in the *EDPT* are of the biverb *ilin-* (or *yilin-*) *yapşın-*. This biverb is additionally attested in U III 30,25, PañcFrag 19 (*y°*), Scharl 34, BuddhUig I 318. A biverb *adkan- ilin-* is found in ETŞ 15,16 and Suv 293,1, *tayan- ilin-* in BuddhUig I 261. *ilin-* appears also in BuddhUig II 38 etc., BT VII L 6, UigTot 108, 202 and 203 etc., *yilin-* in Maitr 164 v 29 and 168 v 4 (both biverb with *yapış-*), UigTot 97 and twice in ms. T III 84-60 (Mz 751) v 27-32 quoted in the n. to BT XIII 5,130. Cf. *ilinmäksiz* and *ilinçsiz* above.

isi-n- 'to have warm feelings towards someone'. In ManMon 108 (as translated in GeistDrog) 'to try hard'. Before the DLT, the dictionaries only have the biverb *isinmāk [a]m[r]anmak* in Ht. Further exs. of this biverb appear under *amra-n-* above. *isi-ş- amra-ş-* (q.v. among the *-(X)ş-* verbs) has the same transferred meaning. *isin- yılın-*, 'to be enthusiastic' or 'to try hard' is discussed under *yılı-n-* below. See *isi-g* above, where the base and other cognates are also discussed. (*isirkān-* 'to feel hot' is discussed among the *±(X)rkA-* verbs in section 5.2. Its *-(X)rkA-* base is not attested.)

iy-ín- 'to oppress and crush (in an abstract sense)'; *EDPT*. One of the exs. appears in a biverb with *bas-ın-*, as *iy-* (q.v. in the *EDPT* under *ıy-*) usually appears with *bas-*. Cf. also *iyin-tür- basın-tur-* below. Add *yança iyindāçi* (ETŞ 10,21). Ht

252 *ilgün-* is rather clear in the facs. in spite of '*ilgin-*' in the text: cf. e.g. the first word in the last l. of this ms. page for an instance of KY.

253 As elsewhere in Manichaean texts and as a continuation of Sogdian orthography, medial vowels are also often preceded by *alif*. Here the alif became necessary when the pen was lifted and the word divided into two; the vowel itself was omitted, however, as in 10,5, 11,15 and 4, 16,12 and elsewhere in that text.

VII 2 a 22, read as *kŏŋülüm biligim yetülmädin artokrak iyinip* . . . ('WYYNYP in Arlotto's reading) may be *ayın-* 'to fear' or *uy(a)d-* 'to be ashamed': Intr. exs. of *iyin-* haven't come up in Uigur. *ol är ıyındı* "The man strained at stool" (DLT fol. 138) is a different dialect: The DLT's infinitive is *ıyınmak* with *qāf*, which is why the *EDPT* wants to read all exs. with back vowels. Cf., however, *iymäk* with front K in BT VII B 12 and BT XIII 13,91. That the DLT's vowel is the original one is proven by the biverb *ıy- bas-*, which probably appears in (runic) Tes 17: Cf. T. Tekin in *AOH* XLII (1988): 117.

kakı-n- 'to repent' appears thrice in Suv in a biverb with *ökün-*: See the *EDPT* for two of the exs., *UW* 149 b s.v. *antada* A,a for the third. Two further exs. in BT XIII 13, a paraphrase of a section of Suv, are quoted s.v. *ökün-*, with which, again, they appear as biverbs. BT V 5,81 is by the ed. completed as *ka]kınalım aç[a]lım*; but the second verb is better taken to be *aç-ın-* 'to disclose one's sins'. *kakın-* is not a derivate of *kak-*, as written in the *EDPT*, but of *kakı-* 'to be angry' (beside the DLT attested in Suv and HamTouen 25,4 and in Ht IV 538: *övkälāp kakıp tagka ünüp kükrädi*). It is therefore a reflexive.

karga-n- is in Uigur attested twice in a Manichaean text in a biverb with *alka-n-*; both instances are quoted in the *UW* under this latter verb. The Yenisei passage referred to in the *EDPT* entry for this verb is quite correct, as can be seen in the Copenhagen material. *kargan-* there has the same meaning as in DLT fol. 391: *är özin kargandı* "The man cursed himself out of remorse". 'to curse each other' is, in the DLT, *karga-ş-*; Manichaean Old Turkic has, for this content, *kargan- alkan-*.

(*kaşan-* 'to urinate'. The *EDPT* quotes two Heilk I exs., the DLT and later texts. Also in a fr. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 1,113: . . . *bo munçanı* [. . .] *kaşanmış yertä saçzun* 'Let him scatter this much onto the place where X urinated'. This is not clear about the agent, but the two Heilk instances refer to humans. The DLT, on the other hand, says the verb applies to animals, especially to horses (as also the later exs. show). In Uigur, it thus enters the domain of *sid-*, a *-d-* verb. No base for *kaşan-* is known, but verbs denoting bodily functions do tend to be medial. Cf. also *kaşaŋ* in section 3.116.)

kat-ın- 'to become hard or tough' appears in TT VII 30 and the DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*. QTWNS'R in TT I 194 (q.v. in the *EDPT* entry) must be a mistake and could be many other things. *kat-* 'to be or become hard' is attested only from the DLT on; *kat-ıg*, on the other hand, is common.

katr-un- is attested in U IV A 15 and 23 (only the first of these mentioned in the *EDPT*) in the phrase *elig bäg yürägin katrunup* "stärkte sich in seinem Mut". Without *yüräk* as object, the verb appears in Ernte 38: *tarıgçı bäglär . . . olormadın kaṭurunup* . . . 'they did not sit down but hardened themselves'. Another possibility is to render it as in DLT fol. 390: *külär är katrundı* "The laughing

man restrained himself. Its root-meaning is to stop short in a matter." *ol manga yarmak berür ärkän katrundı* "He was giving me a dirham but then he stopped short and held back". In any case, to judge by the voiceless dental in the DLT and the round vowel of the formative, the only base I can think of is *kat-ur-* 'to harden (tr.)' in the DLT.[254]

kayvılan- appears in ShōAgon 1,184: *InçA kaltı ädgü at kamçıka kayvılanmış täg* 'just like a good horse getting docile through the whip',[255] misread as 'qayılänmiş'. Zieme (personal communication) suggests that *kayvılanmaksız köŋülin* should probably be read in BT VIII A 131 instead of '*kavırlanmaksız*' of the edition. Neither a verb '*kavırlan-*' is attested, by the way, nor an appropriate base for it. See section 3.329 for the form of this word. *kayvılanıştur-* is discussed in the section on *-tUr-* below. **kay-vı* is not attested, but *kayvısız* is discussed in section 3.115. *kayvılanıştur-* has, in UigTöt, a syncopated variant *kavlanışdur-*. What has been read as '*qrılnmış*' in UigTöt 447 should probably be *kavl(a)nmış*; the second letter does look like an A on the facs. The Tib. original having a verb signifying "to bring together, put together, make to meet", the eds. thought of '*kar-ıl-ın-*'; that, however, is too irregular and unattested. *kavl(a)n-* fits the context well, too. **kayvı+la-* is not attested as such, but see *kavla-* in section 5.12.

(*kazgan-* 'to win, earn, gain' is very common from the inscrs. on, through Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic. It has no known base, but its meaning is clearly medial. Cf. *kazganç*.)

kaz-ın- is quoted by the *EDPT* from the DLT. Attested also in Hochzeit 30 as *kotuz bukaça yer kazınu* 'digging about at the ground restively'. This comes from the specific use of *kaz-* with domestic animals as subjects: *at kazdı* "The horse was restive and dug at the ground with his forefeet". *kaz-* with domestic animals as *objects* is a quite different verb, q.v. s.v. *kazgok* (section 3.22).

kāḍlā-n- is a hap. in Suv, quoted in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. 'to get tough'.

kād+lā- is attested only in the DLT, with a rather similar meaning.

kāŋrā-n- 'to grumble, complain'. A probable instance of the base is discussed in section 5.32 and see *kāŋrā-ş-* above. The KP ex. is isolated with its I in the first syllable. The best interpretation of the verb in IrqB XXII is given by Bang, 1925 a:234. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *kāŋrängāy sän* (ETŞ 12,55),] *tep kāŋränü* (BT XIII 12,119), . . . *tep kāŋränti* (Ht VII 7 b9)[256] and *kāŋränmälim ken üdtä*

254 Lexically comparable from U III 26,13-14: *v(a)jırda ymā katıgrak sāniŋ köŋülüŋ* 'and your heart is harder than adamant'. The DLT's sentences could also be translated in this sense, or the translation given there may be secondary.

255 Translating the instance as "beachtet" with "die Peitsche" as object (*UW* 253 a bottom) is, I think, not very good.

256 Read wrongly by Arlotto, correctly by Geng.

tep 'so that we should not complain afterwards' (ShōKenkyū II 5). The parallel version of this last, appearing in BT XIII 12,25, has *käŋränmäyin* instead. All these show that the lemma *kéŋren-* of the *EDPT* has the wrong first vowel. Another ex. of this verb probably appears in BuddhUig II 420, misread as (the inexistent) '*kärgän-*': *öŧünmämiŧkä ayıtmamıŧka bo savlarıg, ökünü käŋränü turur ärkän* . . . 'not having asked$_2$ for these matters, I kept on being sorry and complaining, and . . .'.

kävşä-n-sär appears in ETŞ 11,61 with the meaning 'to become limp and soft'. The *EDPT* quotes this verb only from the DLT, in a different (though related) meaning. See the *EDPT* for the base (DLT ff.). *kävşä-k* (discussed above) is well attested in Uigur in the rounded variant *kövşäk*.

(kertgün- 'to believe (in) something'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; the exs. from BT II 235 and 739, Ht 2119, Maitr 9 v 10,[257] UigTot 722 and 724 and BT VIII A 226 are not mentioned there. Spelled twice with G in the second syllable in Brāhmī mss. (TT VIII), but four times with K there in the (Manichaean script) Chuast. Clearly connected with *kertü* 'true, truth', but the derivational relationships are not clear: The two may have had a common verbal base (*kertü* being formed with *-dU*, discussed above). It is less likely that *kertgün-* (or *kertkün-*) should come from **kertü+k-ün-*: The final vowel would be syncopated as stated in section 1.8, but *+(X)k-* verbs don't receive *-(X)n-* expansion.[258]

kıl-ın- 'to behave in a certain way, to behave as if . . ., to make oneself into, to act; to come into existence, be formed'. The last-mentioned, anti-transitive meaning is attested, among other places, in Toñ 1.[259] Par. 5 in the *DTS* entry has several exs. of *kılın-* governing *-gAlI*, with the meaning 'to prepare, set out to do'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in BT III 281, ShōKenkyū III 34, Suv 620,11, Adams 28, BT VII A 605, BT VIII A 159, UigTot 1311 and Maitr 226 v 21 and 227 r 7.

(*kızgan-* 'to be miserly, to grudge'. *EDPT*[260] and *DTS* both write this with °*s*°; all three (all Manichaean) pre-Qarakhanid instances have °*z*°, however. KIZ-

257 Misread or miswritten with R instead of N at the end of the stem.

258 This is a significant limitation which *+(X)k-* has in common with all the other formatives discussed in 5.4-5.6.

259 *bilgä toñukuk bän özüm tavgaç eliŋä kılıntım* is correctly translated in Nauta, 1969: 309 as "während des chinesischen Reiches / der chin. Herrschaft". The temporal dative of Orkhon Turkic is described in T. Tekin, 1968: 132, section 3,2144, par. 5. Orkhon Turkic has no local dative, however, and par. 4 of that section should be deleted. See the same Nauta paper for the difference between the physical dative and the locative.

260 In the passage from M III 11,8$_2$ (text 6), quoted there in part, *arıg nomka* is not the indirect object of *kızgan-*. The passage reads: *k(ä)ntü kizlänçünün arıg nomka kızganmatın akı köŋülün ınanu sezinmätin kizläŋ* 'Guard your own treasure without misgivings, believing in the pure doctrine without grudging and with a generous heart'. It happens quite often in Old Turkic that a subordi-

GAN° and CHEXGAN° in the Codex Comanicus is also evidence for [z]. The second velar is thrice written as /G/ in DLT fol. 391, which makes an original /k/ unlikely. The cognate *kızgak* 'stingy' (q.v. in section 3.102) is also spelled with Γ in the London ms. of TT VI (which distinguishes between the back-vowel velars). The etymology *kız+ka-n-*' (from *kız* 'miser(ly)' in DLT, two mss. in 5 and Maitr 80+59 v 23) of Zieme, 1969: 133 is therefore unacceptable.[261])

kiçi-n- 'to itch (intr.)', *EDPT*. Not attested before Heilk I and the DLT.

kizlä-n- is a hap. in Maitr 176 r 9, in *münlärin yazokların ürtünü kizlänü* 'hiding and concealing one's faults and sins'. Medial counterpart of *kiz+lä-*.

kol-un- *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *qut qolun-*. The instance quoted by the *EDPT* from Ht is a conjecture. Before the DLT, this verb appears only in the phrase *kut kolun-*; TT VIII K 5 should probably also be completed as *kut kuol[on]or* (Brāhmī). Additional exs. of this sequence appear in BT II 68, BT VII A 312 and B 94, Ht V 4 a 27 and AbitAnk 46. This is the medial counterpart of the common expression *kut kol-*, documented in the *EDPT* entry for *kol-*. See also (*kut kol-*)*unç* under *kolunç* in section 3.104 and especially n. 310 thereto.

kora-n- is a hap. in Heilk I, quoted in the *EDPT* and translated as "to lose flesh".

See *kor+a-* above.

kork-un- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT on. Further exs. appear in Maitr 216 v 12 and 59 v 2 and ShōAgon 1,7 and 21. Only an ex. quoted in the *DTS* from Suv has the shape *korkın-*; that is used in a biverb with *ayın-*. *ayın-* appears also together with *kork-*, and it does not really seem possible to distinguish in meaning between *korkun-* and its base.

köl-ün- 'to be hobbled, fettered, harnessed; to harness for oneself'. The last mentioned meaning is found in ShōAgon 2, p. 194, 9_2 in *münmāk azu kölünmāk*. Exs. in the *EDPT*; additional ones, with abstract meaning, in UigTot 306 and ShōAgon 1,235 (*kölünüp öçmāk*). *Cf. kölün-dür-*; some further possible evidence for *kölün-* in the medial meaning is mentioned under *köl-ür-* below.

köŋlä-n- 'to think seriously for or about oneself' is found four times in Maitr: *takı ymā kuturu köŋlänür m(ā)n* (MaitrGeng 2 a 2), *amtı köŋlänmätin ayıg kılınçtın tıdılmasarsizlār . . .* (*ibid.* 8 a 29) and . . . *tergäli, . . . yıggalı, . . . öçürgäli köŋlänip ötrü köŋülintā InçA sakınçı bolu* (Maitr 128 r 15) and in Maitr H XVI 5 b 30. These are not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*; the EDPT s.v. *köŋle:-*, however, quotes *kö:nle:n-* (thus) from Houtsma's text, translated 'to wonder at (something)'. *köŋl+ā-* is discussed above.

nated verb is placed between the verb 'above' it and that verb's direct or indirect object; but this matter deserves separate discussion.

261 In spite of the retention of the velar in South-West Turkic. *UW* 79 b bottom also writes *kızkan-* with *°k°*.

kör-ün- 'to become visible or be seen; to see for oneself'. By the *DTS* and the *EDPT* quoted only from QB (very frequent) and DLT. Found also in U II 87,58 (Qutlug, clearly visible on the facs.), Maitr 12 v24 and M II 9,6 (text 4, = ManErz I 2).

(*közün-* 'to be visible, to appear'. Derivation uncertain: Perhaps *köz+ü-n-* or possibly **kö-z-ün-*, from a base which might relate it to *kör-*. DLT fol. 345 says that *közün-* instead of *körün-* is Argu, and that it comes from analogy with *köz*. Seeing how well *közün-* is attested from the earliest Uigur texts on, the analogy may in fact have been the other way around: Seeing that *közün-* is derivationally opaque, *kör-ün-* may be the secondary creation, analogical after *kör-*. Exs. for *közün-* in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; some of the additional ones in ETŞ 9,16 and 44, 10,193, ThreeLett 10 (passage corrected in TUO), BuddhUig II 171 (as corrected in the n. to BT XIII 28,39) and in many additional exs. in BuddhUig I and II, UigTot 875, BT VIII A 87, 416, 423 etc., AmitIst 21 (twice) and 62, Ht IV 1243, V6 b4, X372 and 573 and Ernte 99. *yugärüki közünügmä* (Suv 135,23) is 'present' in the spatial, *közünür üd* (KudGojüni A 4) in the temporal sense. Cf. *közn-ök* and *közün-mä* above, *közün-dür-* below.)

kurşa-n- 'to put on (as) one's belt' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT on. Attested also in ManTüTex 520 as *kurşanŋu bolzun* (thus) and in Maitr 173 r7 (*kurlar kurşanıp*).

kuvra-n- 'to assemble, come together' is attested once in Toñ and once in a Manichaean text; see the *EDPT*.

küçä-n- 'to become arrogant; to seize by force'. *EDPT*; additional exs. in BT II 248 (*öz tapı eyin küçänip alko yavız işlärig işlämäk*) and QB 1053. *küç+ä-* is common.

küsä-n- 'to wish something for oneself' appears in BuddhUig I 362: *ol tözünlär täg ädgükä tägmädin kurug küsänip yorıyurlar*. Ş. Tekin's translation "sie sehnen sich immerdar umsonst danach, ohne zur Vortrefflichkeit zu gelangen wie jene Edlen" is unacceptable: *kurug* is not adverbial on *täg-* but the direct object of *küsän-*. The *EDPT* (s.v. *küsenç*) considered this verb to be "not noted before XIV" (i.e. the XIVth century). The proper name *Küsän Çor* in the margin of KP fols. XLIV and XLVI need not contain the Turkic name for the town of Kucha but could belong to the very common class of imperative names, in this case from the present verb.

(*küvän-* 'to be or get proud or arrogant' has no attested base, but cf. *küvāz* discussed in section 3.111 above and *küvänç* in section 3.104.[262] *EDPT*;[263] add *özün*

262 Hardly related is the one-before-last verb in *ätözümüzni ororlar yararlar iskäyürlär yançarlar wväyürlär kwväyürlär örtäyürlär* (Maitr 201 v27 = BT IX 251,27$_2$).

263 The *EDPT* entry for this quotes Middle and Modern Turkic verb instances of the form *kuvan-*,

(instr.) *ögär kūvänür ärti* (Wettkampf 75) and *ärkimiz kuçümüzkä kūvänip . . .* (Maitr 62 v9).)

kūzād-in- 'to guard oneself' is a hap. in ShōAgon 1,361: *yorımak üzä ädgüü yıgınurlar kūzādinür[lär. . .], InçA kala . . .* '(Monks) restrain and guard themselves well by . . ., just as (a tortoise . . .)'. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *kūzād-*, discussed at the end of section 5.43 above, is tr. and not an *+(A)d-* verb; had it been one, it could not have been expanded with *-(X)n-*. Cf. *2 yıg-ın-* below.

(*odun-* 'to wake up (intr.)'. No base attested, but cf. *odug* 'awake' in section 3.101 above and *odgur-* below. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in Ht V 3 a9 and X207, BuddhBio 24, Maitr 128 r31 and 163 r12, BT VIII B186 (*odunmuyun-*) and BuddhUig I 246. *odunmış* 'awake' can be found in Suv 16,15 (also in the parallel ms. edited as SuvLeg), Ht X 509, BT XIII 28,37 and several times in the QB.)

(*okı-n-* 'to be read; to pretend to read' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT on. Attested also in QB 1356, where it signifies 'to read for oneself'. Note that *okı-* is 'to read' in Qarakhanid Turkic whereas, in Old Turkic, it signifies only 'to call, to call out loud' and 'to recite'.)

oxşa-n- 'to caress, fondle'. Hap. in BT XIII 12,101: *kulunçakım [te]p oxşanu* '[She] caressed [me] saying "My little filly!"'. See the *EDPT* for the base, which is attested in the DLT and later Muslim texts, in the Codex Comanicus and in modern languages. Cf. *oxşançıg* in section 3.311 above and *oxşagu* (DLT and Maitr 33 v15). The °*n*° of *oxşanu* is well visible on the facs. The mediality of the verb must be due to the inalienability of one's children.

(*olın-* is discussed in the *EDPT*. It lives on in Khal. *holun-*, same meaning, which fixes the first vowel as /o/. The Uigur ex. quoted there has it in a biverb with *tolga-n-* which is attested also in DLT fol. 386-7. There is, further, [*nız*]*vanı basınçıŋa olınıp . . .* (Maitr 2 r4) 'writhing under the pressure of vice . . .'; a further Maitr ex. is discussed together with *olı*-K. The base has not turned up, but the DLT has *olıt-* 'to twist', e.g. somebody's neck. Cf., further, *olınç yol* in the DLT (section 3.104 above), *olınçıg* (section 3.312), *olı*K (section 3.101) and *olıglıg* (section 3.119).)

opla-n- should be read twice in IXu 23 in the following passage: *yagıka yalnus, oplanu tägip, oplanu kirip, özi kısga kärgäk boltı.*[264] Thus according to Thomsen and Wulff's unpublished materials, where Clauson read '*uplyu*' (thus) and

which signify 'to rejoice'; in the Codex Comanicus we find KOAN- with this meaning, and KOANÇ 'joy'. These are not secondary forms of *kūvān-*, as Clauson thinks, but come from **kıv+an-*; cf. *kıv+ad-* above.

264 *kärgäk bul-* is another reading for the idiom at the end of the sentence, a euphemism for 'dying'.

'uplu:' respectively. His dictionary therefore lists the first under *opla-* and the second under *uvul-*, a verb attested only from the DLT on.[265] *op+layu täg-* is discussed in part IV above, and there interpreted in accordance with a paper of Sertkaya. On the one hand, *oplayu* belongs to the group of adverbial animal similies. It was, apparently, *also* felt to be verbal, as we here find it expanded with *-(X)n-*. The explanation for this expansion is that the head-on attack was carried out on one's own (and consequently with tragic outcome) and apparently without consultation. It is from such a context that one can best understand the opposition *-(X)n-* : *-(X)ş-*.

orna-n- 'to stay (physically or spiritually), settle, establish oneself'. Cf. *orn+a-* above, where cognates are mentioned. To the *EDPT*'s exs.[266] add further ones in BT II 1267, ETŞ 9,50, Ht VII 5 a16, ManTüTex 10, BT VIII B 114, Maitr 16 v19, UigTot 225, 349, 385, 392, 395 etc. In BT XIII 15,64 we find the biverb *tōşän- ornan-*, in BuddhUig II 23-24 twice *ornan- tur-*, in Ht V 11 a14 and Shō III a 13 and VII a6 *olor- ornan-*.

(*otun-* is a hap. in Maitr 201 r8 (BT IX 250): *biz öŋrā v(ı)rxar sāŋrām sanlıg sögütin bıçtım(ı)z ärdi, otungu otuŋın altımız ärdi*; the ed. does not translate this verb. It might come from *ot* 'fire' by way of an unattested **ot+u-*; this latter could have served as base also for *otuŋ* 'firewood' (discussed in section 2.92), or the lone *otun-* could have come from the common *otuŋ* by back-formation.)

(*oyurkan-* is discussed in section 5.2 above, together with *ywkurkan-*. No *+(X)rkA-* base for it is attested, and its meaning is uncertain.)

ög-ün- 'to praise oneself, boast'. *EDPT* only from the DLT on. Attested also in ShōAgon 2, p. 195, 7$_1$-9: *käntü özi ögünür "alkonı bilir-män" tep . . . käntü özi ögünür "bar tuymakım" tep.*

(*ögrän-* and its cognate *ögrät-* have no attested base; they probably come from **ögür+ä-*. About *ögür*, the *EDPT* writes: "'a herd', esp. of horses, but also of other animals; this meaning survives in some modern languages, but it now usually means (of an animal) 'tame, domesticated'; (of a person) 'friend, comrade' (i.e. a member of the same group)." According to the DLT, *ögür* can denote also a group of slave girls. *ögränmiş* has been used in Ht to refer to 'trained horses'. The *EDPT* quotes *ögrän-* from the DLT and from an Uigur text where it qualifies a young woman as 'being used to something, having got training in . . .'. Among the Maitr exs. for *ögrän-* note *köŋüli . . . katılu karılu turgalı ögränmiş ärsär . . .* (Maitr Taf. 80+59 r72-3 and v5) 'whatever person's mind is used to be mixed with . . .'. The DLT's

265 The *EDPT*'s first instance for *'ufulu'* (thus) is also incorrect: See *topl-un-* below.

266 The reference there to 'M II 8,40-1' should be corrected to read T II 8,40-1.

ögrüyük "custom" does not come from the base but is a simplification of **ögrün-yük*.[267]

ögrät-in- 'to educate oneself, to practice something, to acquire a habit'. *ögrät-* is discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs, and *ögrät-ig* (section 3.101) is rather common. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter s.vv. *ögrätünmäk*, *bïšrun-* *ögrätin-* and *bïšurun-* *ögrätin-*. Further exs. of *bışrun-* *ögrätin-* are mentioned s.v. *bış(u)r-un-*. Add thrice *ögrätinsär* (Maitr T III β v13, 14 and 19), *maytri sakınçka / ädgü törükä ögrätin-* (Maitr 79 v17 and 21[268]), *panşukul ton kädmäkdä ögrätin-* (Warnke 491), *ögrätinmäkdä ögrätin-* (BT VIII A 397), *ögrätinmäk* (UigTöt 612 bis, 613 and 824), *ögrätindäçilär* (BuddhUig II 369-370 (twice) and AbitAnk 17 and 79.

ögrünçülä-n- 'to enjoy oneself' is discussed in the *EDPT*, but the lemma is there written wrongly. See *ögrünçü+lä-* above.

(ökün- 'to repent' has no attested base; a few exs. possibly belong to *(y)ük-* 'to heap up'. To the *EDPT*'s instances of *ökün-* add *ökünür män* (ETŞ 14,12). A further ex. is quoted s.v. *käŋrän-* above. Attested also in BT XIII 13,32 (with *kşanti kılın-*), 13,122, 13,131 (with *kşantı kılın-* and *kakın-*), 13,161 (with *kakın-*), 14,7 and 20 (both with *bilin-*) and 16,41 and Maitr 176 r24, 63 r6 and 71 r28 (all three with *kşantı kıl-*).)

öp-ün- 'to gulp down' is in the *EDPT* quoted from one early Manichaean instance. Also from the DLT, where it is translated as 'to pretend to sip'. *op-* is quoted in the *EDPT* with two exs., both with 'water' as object, from a runic text and from the DLT; it is attested also in Suv 641,6. We have *öp-* only from the DLT on, with the meanings 'to kiss; to sip soup'. These bases may be onomatopoeic, which may explain their similarity; cf. *öp-iş-*.

örlä-n- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT and from Middle and Modern Turkic. Attested also in HamTouen 15,3 and 4-5; in both exs. and in the DLT of the 'rising' of a cloud. *örlä-* is discussed among the *+lA-* verbs.

örtä-n- 'to blaze, be burning, be burnt (out, down)'. *EDPT*[269] and *DTS*. Further exs. appear in Höllen 37 and 73, UigSün 20, dozens of times in Maitr and Neujahr 88. *ört yalın üzä örṭünü turur* (Suv 99,16) is probably an error for this verb. Cf. *ört+ä-* above.

(ötkün- 'to imitate someone, taking him as a good example' or, *in malam partem*,

267 Similarly, Kāšġarī's *sarkıyuk* must be from *sarkın-yuk* as the simplex is *sark-* and not '*sarkı-*', and *osayuk* (QB and DLT) must be from *osan-yuk* as there is no '*osa-*'. The common Buddhist term *bulganyuk* (q.v. in *EDPT* 338) appears as *bulgayuk* in the DLT.

268 As completed by further mss. and edited in Laut, 1986: 203.

269 The sequence *kanatmın köyürgäy* (not *kü°* as written there) *örtängäy s(ä)n* quoted from M III is not, of course, a "Hend.".

'be a fake'; in Warnke 78 and the DLT also 'to tell (a story)'. The QB[270] and DLT exs. are mentioned in the *EDPT*. Found also in ETŞ 13,36 and 40. I write the velar as /k/ and not /g/ because of the Common Oguz form, *öykün-*; **ödkün-* regularly gave *ötkün-* in Qarakhanid. The Uigur exs. have twice *t* and once *d* in texts which cannot be depended upon for the representation of voicedness. For the meaning cf. Ar. *ḥāka*, which also signifies both 'to imitate' and 'to recount'. I would take 'to imitate' to be the primary, 'to recount' the secondary meaning (as Semitic shows it to be the case for Ar.). If this is so, the *EDPT*'s etymology[271] is not acceptable; a direct base for *ötkün-* is not attested, in any case. Cf. *ödkünç* in section 3.104.

öt-ün- is 'to present something to a superior (a king, a master, a spiritual leader etc.)', usually 'a request' but sometimes (e.g. U I 6,12 and CYK 52) 'offerings'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* are frequent in the Maitr, in BuddhUig I and elsewhere, and appear also in TibStud (*ötönü*); BT VIII B218 and Shō I b12 have the biverb *aya- ötün-*. The common *öt-üg* 'request, prayer' (q.v. above) is certainly a cognate. Mo. *öči-*, mentioned in the *EDPT*, cannot be connected, as its cognate would have had to be '*öti-*'.[272] It seems quite possible for *ötün-* to be derived from *öt-* 'to pass through, to penetrate, pass off', though. 'to push oneself through' would be a likely self-disparaging expression for the purpose; *-(X)n-* in other verbs as well transfers the meaning to the abstract metaphorical domain: Cf. *InçA tep ötti* (ManMsFr r8).[273]

övkilä-n-mäk is twice attested in the unpubl. fr. T II S32 a6 c, quoted in the n. to KPZieme 10. *övkilä-* is a variant of *övkä+lä-*, discussed above. The two verbs probably had roughly the same meaning, but *övkilän-* may have denoted a more introverted sort of anger.

özirkä-n- appears in TT III 101:] *özikänt*[*iŋiz*] *yomgunı*, with lacuna filled in accordance with parallel passages. The translation which we adopt, 'you have regarded them all as your own', is based on Arat's interpretation. Other exs. are attested in InscrOuig V5 (interpreted correctly as "s'approprier quelqu'un" in the most recent edition) and HtPek 48 r2 (quoted in *UW* 297 a-b; loan translation from Chin.). The meaning does not appear to have differed much from that of *özirkä-*, discussed in section 5.2.

sa-n- 'to be reckoned to be . . .'. *EDPT*; common in many sources. *sa-* 'to count' is attested from the DLT and the QB on, but the petrified converb *sayu* '(to, in,

270 The two QB exs. are mistakenly written as *ötgür-* in the QB Indeks.

271 The *EDPT* confuses *öt-üg* 'request, petition' and *ötük* 'register, memorandum' (discussed under *ötükK+lä-* above). The amalgam is supposed to have been the base of **ötg+ü-*; from this, in turn, the present verb is supposed to have come.

272 This probably did exist in Proto-Turkic, and was the base of *ötük* of the previous note.

273 Cf. Zieme, 1970 s.v., with references given there.

at) every' is common already in the runic inscrs. Doerfer and Tezcan take the original meaning of *sa-* to have been 'to beat; to keep beat'. See *sa-ŋ* (section 3.107).

sak-ın- 'to think, imagine, plan etc.'. Very common from the inscrs. on, but *sak-* is rare (TT VIII K, DLT and QB; see the *EDPT*). *sakış* (section 3.103) is a cognate, while *sakınç* (section 3.104) and *sakınok* ('thoughtful, cautious', found 47 times in the QB but nowhere else) come from *sakın-*. Due to the scarcity of *sak-*, any semantic difference between it and *sakın-* is difficult to make out; the *-(X)n-* may have been added to stress the fact that thinking is an internal process. Instances of *sakın-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or in the *DTS* occur frequently in the Maitr, fourteen times in AbitAnk and thirteen in AmitIst, in ETŞ 20,95, ATSS, BT VII A 428, BT VIII A 59, 61 etc., UigTot 329-30 (twice) and 595 (all three the biverb *ö- sakın-*) and so forth.

sal-ın- 'to hang down loosely'. Instances not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Ht V2 b10, in Maitr 173 r21 and 174 r9, in an unpubl. fr. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 5,130 and in ms. Mz 191 (T II 19a) (to be published by D. Maue). The Uigur exs. are all intr., and apply to people's flesh, hair and beard, lip and to an object hanging from a person's neck. In the QB and in Middle Turkic (as quoted in the *EDPT*) there also are tr. exs. which mean 'to cast away from oneself'. These two meanings are connected with different meanings of *sal-*, a rather polysemic tr. verb. *salıntur-* (q.v. below) accords in meaning with the Uigur evidence for *salın-*.

satga-n- probably appears in ĀgFrag (1) G b5 instead of '*satgayu inçip kälmiş*' of the editors: The facs. (although very clear) certainly shows no evident Y before the last letter, but perhaps N/'. The Chin. original demands and intr. verb signifying 'to fall utterly, to be in difficulties'. *satga-* 'to trample on something, to injure (a person's feelings)' is discussed in the *EDPT*. It is attested also in BT II 253 and LautHöllen 129-130. In both these exs., it has humans as object; it is, both in the BT II instance and in QB 4112 and a DLT ex., used in such extended senses as demanded by *satga-n-* in our context. Cf. also the meaning of *satga-g* (section 3.101).

sär-in- signifies 'to impose patience upon oneself' in the DLT, in BuddhKat 28 (ZYÊ.RÍN.NUR) and once in Suv. Otherwise only in the common Buddhistic term *särinmäk* '*kṣānti*'. Exs. of *särinmäk* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occur in BuddhKat 16, 27, 28, 39 and 42, BuddhUig I 327, UigFalt 1 and 7 and HamTouen 5,10 and 35 and 6,8. Cf. *sär-il-*.

säv-in- 'to rejoice' *EDPT*; attested also e.g. in BuddhUig I 357. Very common in a biverb with *ögir-* (similar meaning), e.g. several times in IrqB, in BT III 574-5, Ht IV 1721, V2 b10-11, VII 8 b9-10 and X 312-3 and 431, UigTot 1269, BT VII A 778 and B 85-6 and elsewhere. This biverb would also fit much better in BQ

E2, where the text has *öltäçiçä sakınıgma Türk bäglär bodun (ä)g(i)r(i)p sävinip toŋıtmış közi yüggärü körti.*[274] This same biverb also gave *ögürüş-säviniş-* and *ögirtdür-sävindür-*. *sävinç* comes from *sävin-*, but *säv-iglig*, *säv-ig*, *säv-iş-* and *säv-il-* belong to *säv-* 'to like, to love'. The semantic relationship between *säv-* and *sävin-* is such that 'joy' demands to be applied to an object with *säv-*, but remains within the sphere of the subject with *sävin-*. The meanings of *üdlä-* and *üdlän-* (q.v. below) supply a parallel to this.

sezin- 'to have an apprehension, a suspicion or a doubt'. See *sezik* (section 3.102) for **sezi-* and cognates. Middle Turkic evidence for *sez-* (thus) 'to feel, anticipate, become aware of' can be found in the *EDPT* entry for it. It lives on in most languages. *EDPT* and *DTS* have exs. of *sezin-*; additional ones appear in ETŞ 12,22, UigPañc 24, Maitr fr. 115 v2-3, BT III 66, Genzan A r5, 6 and 7, b9 and X492 and 791, ShōKenkyū III 17 and so forth.)

sı-n- 'to break (intr.), be broken' is adequately discussed in the *EDPT*. It is attested in runic Turkic, Uigur and Qarakhanid.

sıg-ın- 'to seek or take refuge somewhere'. *EDPT*; further exs. appear in Ht IV 443, Maitr 5 r28 and 31 and UigTot 1282 and 1287. See *sıg-* 'to fit into something or some place' in the *EDPT*. *sıgın-* is its spiritual and psychological counterpart. One of the meanings of *sıg-ur-* (q.v. below) is particularly close to this.

*sıka-n-*is found in Bhadrā, U II 25,16 in *Arçunı toŋa uzun saçın kedin arkasınta etip bilägin sıkanıp . . .* (as a preparation for action). Misunderstood by the ed. and also by the *EDPT* s.v. *sıgın-*: The phrase means 'to tuck up one's sleeves', even though the central meaning of *sıka-* is 'to stroke'. *sıka-* is attested in TT VIII K and the DLT and also in MaitrGeng 8 a25 (wrongly written *suqa-*). *kolun sıgan-* is common in Osm. from the XIVth century on in the present meaning, and *biläklärin sıgamışlar* can be found in the *Tarama Sözlüğü*.[275] The primary meaning of *sıkan-*, 'to rub oneself', is attested in BuddhUig II 103, but was misread as '*sıqaqu*'.[276] Describing bird behaviour: *öŋdün kedin bakınu, öŋlärin yüŋlärin sıkanu, ögän kıdıglarınta kımrayu, örü uçgalı* (mistakenly written '*ẅç°*') *talpıyu . . .* The DLT has *sıtga-n-* in this sense. *UW* 174 a s.v. *ara* A,h wants to change the U II text to read *sıtgan-* as well; the ms. itself is now lost. *sıtga-* (with derivates) is peculiar to the DLT, however; Osm. *sıga-* cannot

274 The regularly absent vowels have been marked as such only in the word under discussion. For the suggested emendation, one has to assume that the scribe forgot an Ẅ before the G[2] and an I after it.

275 Republican Turkish *sıva-* still has both meanings of 'to rub, stroke' and 'to tuck up (one's sleeve, skirt etc.)'. Azeri also has a cognate.

276 Q seems impossible; two dots can't be seen on the facs., although the single dot may be a bit bigger than usual.

be a survival of it (as the *EDPT* writes); the two verbs are not mutually reducible by historical phonology.

(sıgrun- is a hap. in BT XIII 12,8, in a fragmentary passage. The ed. takes the initial sibilant to alliterate with *Şiki burxan* of l.10, which refers to the Buddha Śikhin. This would mean that the word should be read as *şıgrunu* (although neither of the two are written with superscribed dots). Otherwise clearly visible on the facs. **sıg-ur-* is not attested, but *sıg-* and *sış* (< **sıg-ış*) are common. The variant *şıg-* can be documented from Middle Turkic on, whereas Windg and TT VIII M (which are written in scripts using distinct letters for /s/ and /ş/) clearly write *sış-*. So do Qarakhanid sources. Poetic licence may have compelled the author to introduce spoken or even vulgar variants into his text.)

silk-in- 'to shake oneself'. The earliest evidence for this in the *EDPT* is from the DLT. Attested also in BT II 355 and 1052-3, ShōKenkyū III 17 and Hochzeit 33. See *silkin-ig* above, *silk-tür-* below. *silk-* (*EDPT* and *DTS*) 'to shake (tr.)' applies to trees and bells in the exs. attested.

soçı-n- is mentioned in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. Hap. in Töten, U I 37,4. Of the heart, 'to beat irregularly'. *soç+ı-* (q.v. in section 5.42) appears in DLT and QB, and cf. *soçı-l-* below. Those denote the 'rearing (intr.)' or 'leaping' of an animal. The use of *soçın-* should therefore be metaphoric.

sogı-n- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. We also have the following: *anı üçün yılan [ü]küş sogınur* (Ht IV 481) 'That is why snakes cool themselves (there) a lot'; *sogık äsinlär üzä nätäg sogınu mäŋiläyür ilinçüläyür ärsär* ... (Suv 209,18) 'just as they get cooled down by cool breezes, have a good time and enjoy themselves' and *nızvanılıg y(i)ti ootın örtändäçi tınl(ı)glar, umugsuz ınagsız ämgäkin iyäsiz bolmış irinçlär sogındılar öz tapça mäŋü nırvan ençi üzä* (Suv 368,23) 'the ... burning creatures, the ... miserable ones got agreeably cooled down through the peace of eternal *nirvāṇa*'.[277] In all three instances, the cool is a pleasant experience for the creatures who are the subjects of the verb. The DLT's verb also has a human subject, whereas *sogı-* there applies to 'water'. Both the *EDPT* and Dankoff and Kelly spell the DLT instance as *sogun-*; but the second vowel is by the second hand, and therefore possibly wrong.[278] *sogungu* is attested in TT VI New 8,7 and 9 v 1, in ms. passages which correspond to TT VI 84, against at least seven other mss. which are not noted as having it. Oda considers it a problem, connects it with '*suq-* or *soq-*' 'to thrust into' and, with great hesitation, translates it as "winter dwelling". It is quite

277 Ş. Tekin here translates the verb as "wurden befriedigt", possibly so as to render an invented '*suk+ı-n-*'.

278 The entry appears to have gotten mixed up with that of *sug-un-*, a cognate of *sug-ul-* discussed below. The authorities mentioned spell the amalgam as '*sogun-*'.

unlikely for a winter dwelling to be *tagtın sınar* 'in the northern part'. Rather, this is a 'refreshing room' for the summer. A derivate of *sok-* or *suk-* would *not* have an unrounded vowel in the second syllable. *sogıngu* accords with the connotation of pleasantness associated with *sogın-* above.

sola-n- is not mentioned in the dictionaries. 'to lock oneself in' in BT III 1029, 'to be besieged' in Familienreg 19 and InscrOuig II 10. See *so+la-* 'to fasten with chains' among the *+lA-* verbs.

sögl-ün- 'to be roasted' is discussed in the *EDPT*; a further ex. appears in Maitr 183 v13. All three Uigur exs. have 'flesh' as subject. *sögül-* is a tr. simplex, quoted in the *EDPT* from Heilk I and the DLT on. 'roast meat' is *sögl-ünçü*. The Oguz, as first reported in DLT fol. 185, have a form *sögüş* surviving to this day in Republican Turkish. The DLT defines it as 'kid or lamb fit for roasting'; from his mentioning that this has a 'thin *kāf*' we know that the velar is g and not *k*. The relationship between *sögül-* and *sögüş-* must be lambdacistic, unless *sögüş* is based on a metanalysis of *sögül-*.

(*sun-* 'to stretch oneself, or one's hand, out towards someone' is documented in the *EDPT*. It may also be an *-(X)n-* verb, to judge by *boyun su-mak* 'obedience' and *boyun su-gan* 'obedient' in the Rylands Interlinear Coran Translation and in the Muqaddimatu 'l-Adab (as quoted by N. Yüce). It is noteworthy that the last mentioned text also has a variant *sū-*.)

suçul-un- 'to be plucked or pulled out'. *°çul°* is written out explicitly in the IrqB; the *EDPT* lemma is therefore misleading. That is the only ex. of the verb before the DLT. *suçul-* is a tr. simplex. It is found in DLT and QB and also in Maitr 33,19 and BuddhUig II 570.

sug-un- of DLT fol. 343 is correctly translated by Dankoff and Kelly as 'to make ablutions (after urinating etc.)'; wrong in the *EDPT*.[279] This is probably also how the verb in TT VII 32,20, 33,1, 3 and 4 should be read; it there refers to 'rinsing one's hair'. *sukun-*, the variant quoted in the DLT as being in use in the Uç dialect, surely need not be that of Uigur. *sug-ul-* and *sug-ur-* (qq.v. below) are cognates; cf. also *sugun-dur-*.

(*suk+sın-mak* 'greed' is mentioned in section 6.2. It is similar to *ārk+sin-*; no related *+sI-* is attested for it. It is a hapax and can be considered a *verbum sentiendi*.)

sürt-ün- 'to rub oneself'. *EDPT* only from the DLT on. Also attested in BuddhUig II 102: Referring to birds, *kudrukların tikā, kökŭzlārin bögsäglärin sürtünü* ... Ş. Tekin reads '*sürtür-*' with a translation as given here, which is impossible. The facs. shows both R and N to be possible readings.

(*talan-* is a hap. in Heilk II p. 4 (colophon), not mentioned in the dictionaries: *yuz*

279 See the previous note.

bir türlüg bitiglärdä talanmış ulug türlüg çiniK bo ärür 'This is a . . . selected from 101 sorts of books'. Meaningwise, this verb must be a derivate from an unattested, syncopated variant of *talu+la-* (q.v. above). That *tala-* 'to pillage' should have anything to do with this seems unlikely: The meanings seem too far apart, the OB has both verbs, and *tala-* is attested also in Ht, an early text (quoted in the *EDPT*).

tap-ın- Both 'to worship' and 'to serve' and even 'to nurse (a sick person)'.[280] These meanings can be taken to have belonged to a continuous semantic field: Cf. ZiemeTexterg II 16 *ąrıg dindarka ąrıg a[şın arıg] içgün tap(ı)nzu[n]* 'Let him serve (~ worship?) the pure elect with pure [food and pure] drink'. In ZiemeSklav III 16, the meaning 'to serve' is the only possible one. In addition to what the dictionaries have, the very common biverb *tapın- udun-* appears also in BT II 725-6, fifteen times in Maitr, ShōAv 47, 52, 209 and 235, Buddh. Uig I 383, ShōAgon 3, p. 203,21, Ht V 10 b 3 and X 274, Weih 17-18, BruchGeb 9 and elsewhere. See *tap-ıg* for its nominal counterpart, *tapıg udug*; another ex. of *tapın- udun-* is also quoted there. Further exs. of *tapın-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear frequently in the Maitr, in ATSS, BT VIII A 64 and 141 and Töpfer 36.[281] Another biverb is *yükünmäk tapınmak* (AbitAnk 61). *tap-* with dative[282] means 'to serve' and not 'to worship' in runic Turkic, Uigur and Qarakhanid (not taking one of the DLT's exs. into account); *tapın-* would be its spiritual counterpart, beside the possible interpretation as 'to serve for one's own good'. How *tap-* 'to find' fits into this is not clear.

tarı-n- appears once in USp 77,6 and in the DLT. 'to cultivate for oneself'. The quotation in the *EDPT* is misleading, as an *-Xp* form cannot be used adnominally in Old Turkic. The passage reads as follows: *tarıg tarır yerin bodun tarınıp yer başına kalan tutup* . . . 'The people cultivate the millet fields for themselves, and they pay *kalan* taxes per field'.[283]

tart-ın- 'to be attached (to one's relatives), to love them dearly' is attested in TT VII 37 and the DLT. It is abstract and spiritual, whereas *tart-* 'to pull, draw, drag' is concrete.

tatga-n- is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, and appears also in Suv 364,11, ETŞ 10,137 and UigTot 1424. It usually signifies 'to find a dish tasty', in the last mentioned ex., however, apparently 'to taste (something)'. The hap. *tatg+a-* (discussed in section 5.11), however, has the food and not the taster as subject.

tavran- 'to hurry, strive, be zealous'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* are found

280 Similarly with the Semitic root *'b d* and in many other civilisations.

281 The translation "ernährte" is not quite exact.

282 See the *EDPT* entry for it. There are six instances in the Yenisei materials in Copenhagen.

283 What has been read as *'tarınsar'* in TT I 208 is obscure and may be an error.

in ETŞ 13,153, ManTuTex 236-7, ATSS, Maitr 153 r22, 23, 24 and 25, UigTot 204, Shō I b2 and XI b1, Suv 141,19, BT XIII 12,135 and HamTouen 5,7. '*tavra-*' is not attested in spite of the *EDPT* and the DLT.[284] See *tavrak* among the *-(O)k* nominals and *tavrat-* among the *-(X)t-* verbs. *tärk tavranu*, which can be seen clearly on the facs. of ETŞ 13,145, replaces the usual adverbial phrase *tärk tavratı*.)

taya-n- 'to lean on or support oneself by something, rely on it'. Beside the *EDPT*'s exs. we find this verb in BT I B (68), BT II 969,[285] Ht VII 2 b1, BT VII H3, BT VIII A5, UigTot 30, 127, 592, 594 etc., BuddhBio 23[286] and elsewhere. *taya-* 'to prop something up, to lean it against something' appears to have kept alive only in the west: It is first attested in the DLT and now in use only in the Oguz languages. *taya-k*, on the other hand, is common in Uigur.

tägin- mainly signifies 'to undergo, to experience', of both pleasant and unpleasant, both moral and immoral experiences; 'to be entitled to' is another attested meaning. It thus essentially signifies 'to get to' like *täg-*, but with abstract goals. *täginmäz* signifies 'No.', like Republican Turkish *olmaz*. Another common use of *tägin-* is as an auxiliary of humbleness. This use (often e.g. in BT II) must have developed out of the content 'to approach for one's own benefit'. Its aorist is written as TE.KU.NUR in TibStud. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear, among other places, in BT II 853, ATSS, BuddhUig I 45, 243 and 365, frequently in BuddhUig II and in Maitr, in AmitIst 61, Ernte 11 and 41, KudGojūni A 1 (twice) and so on.

tägriglä-n- is a hap. in Maitr 216 r5 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *ayıg [kı]lınçların tägriglänmiş* is 'somebody who has surrounded himself or placed himself into a whirl of evil deeds'. See *tägriglä-* above; it is common in the Maitr.

(*tägzin-* signifies 'to revolve, rotate; travel about'. *tägzinü yorıdı Ānıkāk uluşug* in HtPar 129,27 corresponds to *kāzā yorıḍı Ānıkāk elin* in the parallel translation

284 *tavratı* of TT VIII D 1 is the petrified converb discussed in section 7.562 below and not the perfect form, as Clauson ('spelt *-tı*') thinks. The verb quoted by him from the DLT is thrice spelled as *yavra-*, by Kāšġarī said to be a synonym of *ıgra-* (which **tavra-* could not have been) and translated as *yaštaddu* 'was hard, sturdy'. Dankoff and Kelly here follow the *EDPT*'s unsound suggestion.

285 Spelled *ta'yan-*. There is no particular reason for reading '*tanyan-*' with the editor: As can be seen on the facs., there is no dot on the third letter; nor can there be any doubt about the identity of the verb.

286 *sünülärin yerkā tayanıp süçig udıyur* has, I think, the warriors and officers as subject and not the king, and should be understood in the plural. The sentence before that can be taken to read *şudoḍan xa[n]ımız alpagut ornut äränlärin balık kapıg[ınta tu]rgurup oglın küzädür* 'Our king Śuddhodana guards his son by placing his warrior and officer men at the city gate'.

from Chin. in HtKZ II 4. The eds. translate this as "Er durchwanderte . . .". Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* in ETŞ 10,43, BuddhUig II 287, 412 and 576, UigTot 545, 549, 550, 556 etc. and in many other texts. Derivation unclear, but connected with *tägirmi* (footn. 443 in vol. 1), *tägirmän* (section 3.325), *tägrä* (under **tägir-* in section 6.3) and *tägriglä-* (section 5.12). *tägzinç* (section 3.104) no doubt comes from *tägzin-* itself. It cannot be excluded, however, that *tägzin-* had not only rhotacistic, but also zetacistic cognates: *tägzig* has been read in ShōAv 37, *tägzim* 'piece of cotton rolled and stuck into the nose against bleeding' in Heilk II 2,2. Neither of these is certain, however.[287] The QB has the metathesis *täzgin-* instead of *tägzin-* and, from it, the hap. *täzgin-ök* 'turning'.)

täl-in- 'to get perforated, pierced, worn through'. *EDPT* from the Orkhon inscrs. on; attested also in Ernte 32 and 104. Said of the ground or, due to wounds etc., of the skin. *täl-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) is tr.[288]

tälgä-n- 'to get or be infuriated' is quoted in the *DTS* and the *EDPT* only from the DLT. There is also an ex. in U III 24,14$_1$, and in both we have the biverb *bulgan- tälgän-*. Similarly *tälgä-* appears in the DLT only with *bulga-*, and *tälgäk* (q.v. in section 3.102) only in the binome *bulgak tälgäk* (Manichaean text). In ms. Mz 648 ([T II] S 19) + IM 8 II, 2nd story, a v 5 (in SktUigBil in Brāhmī),]*lgäp ölürsär* corresponds to "wenn man eine Schlange reizt und tötet". This should presumably be completed to *bulgap tä*]*lgäp ölür-*. Similarly an ex. in Maitr 148 r13. In Maitr 2 r30, *takı ymä bar bo kanmaksız tälgänmäksiz tö*[*z-lüg . . .* is an error for *bulganmaksız tälgänmaksiz*; this is what the parallel ms. MaitrH Y11 a30 – b1 actually has. Many such couples of *-mAksXz* forms are listed in section 3.329.

(*täŋlä-n-* 'to estimate with respect to oneself' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the Suv. See *täŋ+lä-* above. The DLT's *täŋlän-* "to take measures (in one's affairs)" (fol. 618) is a different verb; it is probably directly derived from *täŋ* with the formative *+lAn-* (section 5.6.).)

täprä-n- 'to stir' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT and from three QB passages. It is, in addition, found in QB 3004, 3902, 4402 and 5030 and HT X754. Cf. also *kertü tözi täpränmäksiz üçün* 'because it is their true nature to be immobile' (BuddhUig II 445). *täprä-* 'to move, stir, shake' is documented in the *EDPT*. The two verbs are both intr. and have similar meanings, and both take

287 P. Zieme writes to me about *tägzim*: "Lesung schwierig! Besonders *-s-*? *-m* ist deutlich."

288 In the DLT entry for *täl-*, the infinitive and aorist forms were forgotten. The words about the kid and the milch-ewe clearly belong to a different verb, *täli-*, which must have gotten among the monosyllabic verbs by mistake: The past form of this verb was written as *tälidi*; the infinitive was written with both *fatḥa* and *kasra* and the *fatḥa* then crossed out; the aorist was first written with *alif* and *faiḥa*, subsequently changed to *yā* and *kasra*.

both animate and inanimate subjects. In the QB, the choice must have been determined by rhyme and metre; what determined it elsewhere is not clear to me.

täp-in- (DLT fol. 338) signifies 'to move one's foot, to kick', *äligin uvun- tävin-*, on the other hand, "to wring one's hands (with shame or regret)". In UigTot 47, *uzun tun alıp älig adak täpinür* is read as *täbinür* and translated as "reibt sich Hände und Füsse". It seems that *tävin-* is specific about hands as *täpin-* is about feet. The grapheme P represents the phoneme /p/ and the allophone [b] of the phoneme /b/, between vowels normally realised as [v]. UigTot 47 should be read as *täpin-*. A Suv ex. of *täp-in-* is quoted under *koldamla-* in the *DTS*.

(*tävşin-* "to be very active in a matter" is attested in Maitr 165 r 6: *amarıları yerdä suvda tarıg işin işläyü, amarıları isiç bukaç tägirmän tägrä tävşinü, . . .* (= BT IX 149,6). It appears also in the DLT, transcribed correctly by DankKelly. The *EDPT* erroneously changes it to '*tevşen-*' for the sake of an unacceptable etymological connection. We have no etymology for this verb.)

tet-in- is, in Uigur, attested in Ht X 209, ETŞ 15,77 and Warnke 254 (none in the *EDPT*); with *-gAlI* phrase it signifies 'to dare to do . . .'. *teŋingülüksüz* in BT III 315 is given a different translation but may nevertheless belong here. The *EDPT* has this verb only from the DLT. There, with dative, it signifies "to oppose someone boldly"; *yüziŋä tetnü bak-* is "to look at somebody's face directly". *tet-* is attested in the DLT and the QB but not in Old Turkic proper. There, with dative, it also signifies "to oppose" (as *tetin-* in the DLT). Uigur *tetin-* is more abstract.

tıd-ın- 'to restrain and/or control oneself, to refrain from doing something' is documented in the *EDPT*. Further exs. appear in QB 1380, 5436 and 6289 and BT XIII 13,152. This is the intr. and reflexive counterpart of *tıd-*, a common verb q.v. in the *EDPT*.

tılta-n- is a hap. in Chuast, quoted in the *EDPT*; 'to use something as a pretext'. *tıl+ta-* is discussed in section 5.13. Both verbs govern the dative of the excuse.

tıt-ın- 'to get torn to shreds'. Hap. in the IrqB, spelt $T^1I\,T^1N^2M\,S^2$; the sentence is quoted in the *EDPT* entry. I have not found *tıt-* 'to tear to shreds' before the DLT.

(*tigilä-n-* appears to be roughly synonymous with its base, *tigi+lä-* (q.v. above): Both are intr. and signify 'to emit a certain (droning?) sound'. *tigilän-* (not mentioned in either dictionary) is attested in UigTot 1152 and 1163.)

tilä-n- 'to seek or wish for something' is attested, in this shape, in an economical text in USp and in DLT and QB. These are quoted in the *EDPT*. The classical Uigur form, however, was *tilin-*, attested in Ht X 51 and IV 1038 and Warnke 576. The first is translated best in *UW* 279 a top, as *tilingü* "erstrebenswert". The third appears after a lacuna, as *üç y(a)vlak* [*yolta . . .*] *tilinip tägzinip . . .*

The ed. took it to be synonymous with *tägzin-* but it may have had an object signifying 'refuge' or 'repose' in the lacuna. P. Zieme tells me that the Chin. original here only has *lun zhuan* "sich drehen". 'seeking [repose/refuge]' would then be a (quite appropriate) addition of the translator. The distribution of *tilin-* and *tilän-* corresponds to what we have for *tilik ~ tilāk*, with *tiliklig*, *tiliksiz* and *tiliklā-*. See *tilik* in section 3.102, where the original shape of the base is also dealt with. *tilā-* 'to seek' is documented in the *EDPT*.

tümä-n- is quoted in the *EDPT* from Ht, while the *DTS* quotes *tümän-* (thus) from Suv. Both are instances of the biverb *etin- tümän-*. Elsewhere, *etin-* appears in a biverb with *tümä- ~ tümä-*; *et- tümä-* is also attested. Our biverb is to be translated as 'to prepare oneself'. See *tümäg* (section 3.101) for the biverb *etig tümäg*. An instance of *etig+lig tümäg+lig* is also quoted there; what we have in BT VII B 1, however, is *et-iglig tümä-glig*, referring to the object of *et- tümä-*,[289] *tirä-n-* 'to brace oneself, resist' is, in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, quoted only from Qarakhanid. Further exs. appear in Warnke 433, 497 and 644, all three with the biverb *katglan- tirän-*. The same biverb is attested also in QB 3638, translated "be firm and brace yourself". *tirä-* 'to prop against' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT and then from Middle Turkic. It is attested also in UigTot 1021, of propping the tongue against the palate. As distinct from *tirän-*, *tirä-* appears to have been capable only of reference to physical matters.

to-n- 'to be blocked, to be closed up'. See *to-d-* in section 7.23 for the base and for cognates. In addition to what there is in the *DTS* s.v. *tun-* and in the *EDPT*, we find *ton-* in *kökü̈z tonsar* (Heilk II 2,29), *tamu yolı tondı bäkländi* (MaitrH XVI 4 a8), *alko üç yavlak yolnuŋ kapıgı tonzun bäklänzün* (BT XIII 46,24) and *tdıglıg tuman tonmakı tarıkar* (*ibid.* 18,3). Like the third, TT VI 234 also has a door as object of *ton-*. The fourth, beside being a metaphor, reminds one of *kök tondı* 'The sky was overcast' in the DLT. *to-* is tr.

tokı-n- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT, and from the phrase *kö̈ziŋä tokın-* 'to catch sight of' (with the entity being caught sight of as grammatical subject)'. A further ex. (q.v. under *tültrün-* below) signifies 'to be struck by a certain feeling'. In *öŋräki Xormuzta sünüşintä tokıntım* "Je fus défait dans le combat d'Ohrmizd qui (eut lieu) auparavant" (HamTouen 8,7), *tokın-* signifies 'to be beaten (in war)'. Note that *är tokındı* "The man was beaten" is said in the DLT to be in the Oguz dialect.

tolga-n- 'to writhe'. In one ex. quoted in the *EDPT* of a girl dancing; in another, however, with *ämgän-*, in which case it can be compared to *ämgät- tolgat-*: See *tolga-t-* below. *ämgän- tolgan-* 'to undergo pain' is found also in BT XIII 12,105. BT XIII 12,81 refers to two mss., one of them edited as ShōKenkyū II

289 The last mentioned is an instance of the formation discussed in section 3.119.

30; Concerning *tolganmış k[içi]g ögümüz / tugum ajun tutmışımızta / tumlugta isigdä ämgänip* . . . Zieme says that his reading is "unklar"; Shōgaito read *tolgatmış*. Zieme's translation "die wir selbst mit der Geburt-Tat(?) gequält haben!" would fit Shōgaito's reading better; with *tolga-n-* it should be: '(Our birth-belaboured dear own one!) Our dear little mother who writhed in pain when . . .'. Shōgaito's not too clear facs. deserves rechecking.

tona-n- 'to dress (intr.)' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. See *ton+a-* 'to put on (a piece of clothing)'; other cognates are also discussed there. *tonangu*, which has its own entries in *EDPT* and *DTS*, is from *tonan-*; we find it also in Maitr 126 v 14. Cf. also *tonan-dur-* below.

(*topl-un-* 'to get pierced' is a hap. in the DLT. *topol-* 'to pierce' is a simplex in spite of its passive appearance (cf. also tr. *sögül-*). Its first vowel is discussed under *topolgak* in section 3.327. See '*tupul-*' in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, the latter especially under '*öt- tupul-*' and '*ötkür- tupul-*'. Additional exs. of *topol-* appear in BT I D (170), ETŞ 10,23 and 57, BT III 221, Maitr 2,24, Ht IV 424 and ShōKenkyū II 21. Two further exs. from Toñ 13 are mistranscribed by Aalto and in the *EDPT* as *topla-*, a verb which is first attested in modern sources. IrqB L should read *topolgınça* 'till one pierces a hole in it', again in idiomatic use. Another ex. of *topol-* in KÇ 19 is transcribed as '*at ufulu*', but '*uful-*' does not exist.[290] Other cognates are *topl-ok* and *topol-gan*; see *topl-ok* above for possible etymological connections.)

töşä-n- 'to prepare some place as a bed for oneself' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and thrice from the QB. Further QB exs. occur in couplets 4591, 6404, 6507 etc. Uigur exs. appear in BuddhBio 5-6 and BT XIII 15,64. With *töşäk* 'mattress, bedding' as object, it signifies 'to spread out (a mattress) for oneself'; thus in Maitr 65 r8 and 165 r17 and 19 with *tölt töşäk* as object. *töşä-* (documented in the *EDPT*; attested also in Maitr 138 v6, 55 v 13 and 52 r2 and LautHöllen 71) lacks the medial content which *töşän-* has; cf. also *töşä-k* above.

tut-un- signifies 'to hold oneself; to hold oneself on to something, to occupy it; to be held or caught; to get hold of something of one's own'. In Suv 434,20 and SuvStockh 86, of the sun or the moon, it signifies 'to get eclipsed'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; further exs. appear in USp 105 a12, BuddhBio 15 and Suv 141,9. Very common in the QB; occurs already in Orkhon Turkic. *tut-* is just 'to hold, grasp, seize'.

tuy-un- 'to be or get aware, comprehend, achieve enlightenment', *tuyunmış* 'enlightened, *buddha*' and *tuyunmak* 'enlightenment, *bodhi*' is very common in Uigur but attested only there. With the exception of TT III 120, all exs. occur in

290 The *EDPT* entry for *uvul-* contains another '*ufulu*' from the same inscr.; that should be *opla-n-u*, q.v. above.

Buddhist literature; the presence of *tuyun-* in that text could be another indication of its syncretistic nature. *tuy-* 'to perceive, notice, feel', on the other hand, is not part of any religious terminology, and occurs in runic and Qarakhanid sources in addition to Buddhist and Manichaean texts. Exs. of *tuyun-* not mentioned in the *DTS* and the *EDPT* are very numerous: They occur *passim* in ETŞ, BT II and BuddhUig I, and also in Buddhāv H 8 etc., UigKan 69, BT VIII B 186 and 226, UigTot 437, Shō IX b 3, Ht VII 10 b 12, ms. Mz 640 (T II S 19) + IM 9 III + I M 4 I r 3 in SktUigBil, BT XIII 21,60. Cf. *yetinçsiz tuyununçsuz [küü] kälig* (Ht V 11 a 18).

tültr-ün- is a hap. in MaitrGeng 9 b 16: *toyın bolmak küsüşin tültrünü tokınu*[291] *tülükin yol yorıyur* 'struck$_2$ by the wish of becoming a monk'. *tültür-* 'to strike, beat' is discussed among the *-tUr-* verbs.

türt-ün- 'to rub (an ointment) onto oneself' is documented in the *EDPT*, also under *türtüngü*. *türt-* is not reflexive by itself (i.e. unless accompanied by *öz(ıŋā)*); the ex. in the fr. quoted in the n. to BT V 458 was mistranslated.

u-n- 'to be successful; to thrive' is usually attested in the aorist forms *unar* and *unmaz*: In M I 36-37 of hens and cocks (quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. '*on-*')[292] and in HamTouen: *m(ā)n unmaz yaŋı agduk bitkäçi* "moi, le copiste maladroit, novice et abject" (1,47') and *unmaz kulı* "serviteurs (esclaves) incorrigibles" (1,4), parallel to *yavız kulı* "mauvais serviteurs (esclaves)". In the QB, the aorist of *un-* is consistently *unur*, not *unar*. The QB's *unur* (exceedingly common) and *unmaz* (only in couplet 3667) were identified in Tezcan's review of the İndeks to the QB. He follows Arat's interpretation of *unarça ayayın* 'Let me say it as best I can' in Atabatu 'l-Ḥaqā'iq l.4 (with long n.) and Eckmann's *ägär unsa miz* ... and *korkuŋlar Täŋridä unmışıŋızça* of the Rylands Interlinear Coran Translation. In the QB we have, e.g., *särinsä kişi tägmä iştä unur* (2612) 'if a person is patient, he will succeed in anything', *yagıda kayusı sak ärsä unur* (2353) 'Among enemies, whoever is awake prevails' or *bilig birlä yalŋuk bädüp çavlanur / kişilärdä üstär kamug iş unur* (2415, wrongly spelt as '*önür*' in

291 Geng writes '*tōltrinū toqunu*'.

292 In his n. to DhāSū 16, Röhrborn thinks one might translate these five instances as 'to hide'. DhāSū 16 reads *eşidsärlär olar bo darni sözlämişig, k(ā)ntün ök ongay yaşgaylar*. The ed. notes that the Chin. original has a binome signifying 'to hide' and expects the translation to have a similar binome. In Uigur, however, 'to hide' is only *yaş-* and *ongay* could be taken together with *käntün ök*: The copyist may possibly have written it instead of *oŋay* (q.v. in section 2.97), Q for K. If such a rare error did actually take place, the translation would be 'When these (creatures) hear that this *dhāraṇī* has been pronounced, they hide by themselves, without problems'. The fragmentary M I context would indeed permit any translation, but the other instances of *un-* are clear.

the text). *unup sınap* (Ernte II 8) signifies 'succeed and gain experience!'. *u-* governs verbs, *u-n-* never; *u-* usually refers to ability in a specific domain, *u-n-* to general success. *un-* is not (of course) related to the West (Middle) Turkic verb *oŋ-*, which gave Tat. *uŋ-*. Chuv. *ın-*, on the other hand, probably comes from *u-n-*.

(*uçın-* is found in Tiš 49 a7 as quoted in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*: *yelvikip uçınıp ölmägäy*. In SuvDrog 475,7, *uçıK yelpig üzä uçın-* is parallel to *yelvi kömän üzä yelvik-*. *uçın-* is clearly related to *uçıK*, which appears twice in a binome with *yelpig* and is discussed together with it in section 3.101. *uçın-* apparently denotes some sort of magical practice. A base for this verb is not attested. *uçıK* possibly lived on in Ottoman *uçuk* 'epilepsy' quoted in *EDPT* 23 a s.v. *uçuk*. Because of their second vowel, these lexemes cannot be connected with *uç-*.)

(*uçuzla-n-* is, I think, attested in *tuglug elim unmaz kulıntın uçuzl(a)nmazun* (HamTouen 14,4). *uçuz+la-*, which the ms. has, is a tr. verb (discussed in section 5.12 above). Besides, the sentence is parallel to *tuglug elim yavız kulıntın agruklanmazun*; the sequence 'N is often simplified to one 'tooth'. I therefore translate: 'May my standard-owning country not consider itself worthless due to its good-for-nothing slave' (i.e. 'because of me'?).

ud-un- appears always in the biverb *tapın- udun-* (or *udun- tapın-*); it is therefore difficult to assign to it a meaning by itself. Spelt as 'U.DU.NUR in TibStud. See the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; many additional exs. are quoted under *tap-ın-* above. Further ones can be found in BT II 734, 894 and 898, frequently in Maitr etc. Cf. also *tapın-tur- udun-tur-* below. Base and cognates are mentioned under *ud-uz-* below. *ud-* is absent from Old Turkic proper; this is another reason why the function of *-(X)n-* can't be determined here.

uk-un- 'to realise something about oneself' is attested four times in a biverb with *bil-in-* (q.v. above for the exs.) and also in Maitr 226 v20 and 227 v14.

ula-n- 'to be joined or attached to something, to be rooted in it etc.' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT, the QB and from Middle Turkic. It is attested also in *korkın[ç]ıg sansarka ulanmış ärsär sizlär* . . . (MaitrH X5 a14) "die ihr dem furchtbaren *Saṃsāra* verhaftet seid, . . .". *ula-* is tr.; *ula-l-*, q.v. below, has a different and specific meaning.

um-un- 'to desire something; to expect, to imagine'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Add *umunguluk taplaguluk* (BT II 234), *umunu küdä tur-* (BuddhUig II 598). In an ex. in U III it governs the accusative, but the sequence *umun- ınan-* (which appears seventeen times in BT II) governs the dative of the thing prayed for. *umun-ınan-* appears also in Warnke 130, the same text as BT II. *umun-* also governs *-gAlI* forms, e.g. in BuddhUig II 476 and ETŞ 13,63. In ETŞ 12,114 we have *umun- küsä-*. A meaning 'to imagine, to think of' with no volitive content

appears in ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) v 3,[293] BT III 303 (*kimni birök öz kişi tep umunsarlar, olar ok . . .* "Die Menschen, von denen man meint, sie seien einem Vertraute, eben diese . . .") and in a ms. fr. quoted in the n. to this last. *um-* is attested only from the DLT and the QB on; cf., however, the common *un-ug* (section 3.101), with which a number of other cognates are also mentioned. *umun-* may have replaced *um-* in Uigur.

ur-un- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and QB, Middle Turkic etc. In the DLT and QB it mainly signifies 'to beat one's body' (for various reasons) or 'to put on something', a piece of clothing, a turban, a veil, a new face. Not found in the *EDPT* is an ex. from QB 4886 and one from U IV A 299. This latter has, pretty well visible on the facs., *sıçganakların urun-*; it probably means 'to beat one's muscles', as a sort of massage.

utr-un- 'to oppose something or somebody, confront an enemy'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; also in Maitr 5 r 7. An ex. of *utrun-* from BT XIII 3,27 is quoted s.v. *uya-d-* below. The base is discussed with the petrified converb *utru*, in the section on the formative *-Ar-*. *utar-* and *utruş-* (DLT) also have confrontational meanings, *utru* not necessarily.

(*uvşan-* 'to crumble (intr.)' is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Hap. in Kuan 28, with the *v.l. uşan-*. A direct base would be formed from *uvuş* (DLT) with the *+A-* formative, but is not attested. See the pretty common *uvşak* in section 3.102, also for other cognates.)

(*uzanmak* 'ability, mastery' is documented in the *DTS* under '*usanmaq*' and *uzanmaqlïγ* and in the *EDPT*; other exs. occur in ShōAgon 2, p. 194,8_2 (wrongly written as *osanmak*), HtPek 39 v 8 and 87 r 5-9, Saṃy. ms. Stockh H 13 a 20 quoted in *UW* 254 a top and TuoLuoNï 364. Agentive *uzanmaklıg* is discussed on p. 154. Clearly from *uz* '(a) skilled (craftsman)', but no other related form has appeared: Neither an *+A-* nor an *+A-(X)n-* verb, nor any other cognate. Cf., however, *uz+lan-* (section 5.6). Not to be confused with *osan-* 'to be negligent', documented in the *EDPT* from the QB on.)

(*ün-* 'to rise, spring up, set out' may also have been formed with *-(X)n-* although its base is not attested in Old Turkic: This base still lives on in Khal. and must have had the shape **hü-*. This etymology is corroborated by the variant *yün-* attested in BlattRun 16 and in a Brāhmī ms. edited in SktUigBil.)

293 This was edited and normalised from Brāhmī script in SktUigBil, where the sentence reads: *kim sıgmatı ārsār ätüzününüŋ* (thus, not *ätöz*, also elsewhere in Brāhmī) *içindä ülgüsüz [. . .]rïŋ umunur män arslan bolmakıg bulup ol bolor taştın turmış tāg*. If we 'normalise' word order as well, we get '*umunur män kim ülgüsüz [ārdāmlā]rïŋ ätüzününüŋ içindä sıgmadı ārsār, arslan bolmakıg bulup taştın turmış bolor ol tep*' and, translating, 'I reckon that, if your innumerable virtues found no place in your body, they must have remained outside when it (i.e. your body) changed into being a lion'.

üdlä-n- is documented in the *EDPT*. It is attested in the DLT, where it applies to mares and signifies 'to be on heat'. The only Uigur ex. is in Ht, in a biverb with *sävinçlän-*, a hap. discussed in section 5.6 above. The two are translated by the ed., who took the Chin. original into consideration, as "ich habe mich entzückt und erfreut". In this case the agent is the speaker, Xuandzang himself. The base *üdlä-* 'to desire' is attested in QB 1504, probably 1588 (actually attested only in one of the three mss.) and perhaps 5635 (where the ed., the *EDPT* and others read *udlayu*). The semantic content of the addition of *-(X)n-* must have been similar here to that found in *sävin-* from *säv-*. The unattested base of *üdlä-* could have given *üdig* 'passion' (DLT, QB ff.) over an unattested **üd+i-*.

ük-ün- '(of troops) to collect (intr.), (of an army commander) to collect (his troops) around him'. In the *EDPT* quoted twice from the Orkhon inscrs.; attested also in Profan p. 282: *ükünüp tägip är tutmak* "sich sammeln, angreifen und Männer ergreifen". See the *EDPT* for *ük-*,[294] and *ükü§* (section 3.103) for some cognates.

ürt-ün- 'to cover oneself, to cover up something about oneself'. *EDPT* and *DTS* from TT VII 1, DLT and QB. Found also in Maitr 176 r 9 and 202 r 20, both with *yazokların* 'their sins' as object. Cf. *ürt-ül-* below.

ü§-ün- is a hap. in ÄgFrag (1) B 1: *köŋüllärin yıgınmış üşünmişlär*, translated "Sie haben ihre Sinne gesammelt$_2$". Not in the dictionaries. The Chin. original writes 'to guard, protect'. See the intr. *ü§-* 'to crowd together, collect in a crowd' in the *EDPT*, and note that *yıg-* is tr. The *-(X)n-* here marks reflexivity and also the metaphorical and abstract use to which the verb has been put. *köŋül yıgın-* is a common phrase; the translator must here have added *üşün-* to make clear he meant 1 *yıgın-* and not 2 *yıgın-* (as the Chin. original would demand).

yad-ın- 'to open oneself up (to view and to criticism)'. Hap. in Suv 138,1 mentioned in the *DTS*, in a biverb with *aç-ın-*: *açınur m(ä)n yadınur m(ä)n, yaşurmaz m(ä)n baturmaz m(ä)n, ürtmäz m(ä)n kizlämäz m(ä)n. aç- yad-* appears three pages further on in the same text; *açın- yadın-* is its reflexive *and* metaphorical counterpart.

(*yaxsın-* is found in DLT fol. 489: *är kaftan yaxsındı* "The man threw the cloak over his shoulders but did not fasten the middle or put his arms in it. Also for a tunic or other". Not mentioned in the *EDPT* are three Uigur exs. of this verb. The DLT ms. writes thrice S and not Ş, but the (in themselves ambivalent)

294 *biligni yükär män* is quoted in the *EDPT* for *ük-*. DankKelly emend this to *biligni bögär män*, no doubt because *bä* and *yä* are practically identical in Arabic script and are often confused in this text, and as the meaning of *bög-* is quite appropriate. While the *EDPT* does not seem to me to be *necessarily* wrong in this, the DankKelly version must clearly raise doubts concerning *yük-* as a variant for *ük-*. Cf. also *yükün-* below.

Uigur instances should probably by transcribed with *ş: t(ā)ŋri burxan . . . tumluğ holmışka [üç] agır kraja ton [ät'özin] üzä yaxşınu y(a)rlık[adı]* (Ht IV 1001) "Als der Göttergott Buddha sich früher an dieser Stelle aufzuhalten geruhte, geruhte er die drei heiligen Kaśāya-Gewänder über den Körper zu ziehen, weil die Nacht kühl wurde" and *saçımızını sakalımızını yülütip tüşürüp, saŋaŋ kraja yaxşınıp, toyın törösindä turup . . .* (Shō VII 7) both suit the DLT's meaning perfectly. In MaitrGeng 10 b 26, *altun öŋlüg yaltrık yalma yaxşınmış* is parallel to *yörgänmiş* and *kädmiş*; the word *yalma* (hitherto found only in the DLT) denoted a "padded raincoat". I take the DLT spelling to be 'economical' or the result of dissimilation: [x] is the back-vowel allophone of /k/ when adjacent to /ş/ and not /s/. The *X* itself therefore indicates that the sibilant was /ş/. It is also demanded by etymology: The verb obviously contains the formatives *-(X)ş-* and *-(X)n-* (and not *+sIn-*, e.g.); cf. the rare *yak-ış-* 'to be or come close to each other' (section 7.1) and Qarakhanid (and later) *yaxş* 'fine, appropriate'. *yaxşın-* has reflexive meaning.)

(1 *yal-ın-* is a hap. in *örtlı yalın yalınu sakınmış k(ā)rgāk* (TT V A 121). *yal-* is probably a simplex. It is, in Old Turkic, found only in the biverb *örtän- yal-*, in U II 9,30 (Maitr) and Maitr 218 r 22, the second not mentioned in the dictionaries. *örtän- yal-* is 'to blaze, to flame'.[295] The usual verb for this content is *yal-ın+a-* (q.v. in section 5.11) and cf. *yalın+la-* (section 5.12). Cf. also *örtä-n-* above. *yal-ın* 'flame' is a cognate.)

(2 *yalın-* 'to strip oneself' *may* be derived, particularly if it is related to *yalın* 'naked, bare'. *yalın kaya* 'bare rock' *may* be a cognate. Beside the DLT ex. quoted in the *EDPT* it is also found in BruchGeb 37, ShōAgon 1,57 and QB 5243.)

yap-ın- is documented in the *EDPT*. The three Uigur exs. have *aya* as object and signify 'to place (the palms of) one's (hands) together'. The DLT has other uses, e.g. 'to cover oneself with something'. *yap-* 'to stick (things) together, to fix (things), to build' is rather rare in Old Turkic; cf. *yap-ış-*, *yap-ıl-*, *yap-ıt-* etc. *yapş-ın-* or *yafşın-*,[296] 'to adhere, be attached to'. Beside the *EDPT*'s exs. attested in UigPañc 19, UigKan 207, BT II 1195 and 1206, UigTot 202 and 282, BuddhUig I 318 and 320, Ht VII 10 b 4, BuddhUig II 42, Warnke 538, Abhi A 93 b 1 (quoted in *UW* 267-8), Suv 102,19, 109,14, 306,20-24, 376,16 and else-

295 *yan-* 'to burn' is first mentioned in the DLT as the Qıpčaq variant of *yal-* and does not reappear till the XIVth century; it may be an analogical creation. *yak-* is given as 'to burn (tr.)' in a dictionary of that period, the earlier meaning being 'to come into or be in contact'. Cf. also *yak-tur-* below.

296 Thus, with F, apparently in TT III 127; in Manichaean writing, which has a special character for [f]. The continuant /ş/ appears to have extended its fricative nature to voiceless consonants preceding it, thus bringing about fricative allophones: [x] for /k/ and here [f] for /p/. Process attested in the environment of posterior vowels only.

where. Often in biverbs with *bodul-*, *(y)ilin-*, *adkan-*, in texts of Buddhistic doctrine: of 'attachment' to women, one's body, riches, sense objects and, in general, things of 'this' world. This use is never attested with the base *yap-ıŋ-* 'to stick, adhere', discussed in the previous section. *yapın-* can, however, also be put to concrete use; e.g. in U IV C69, of maral deer fearfully clinging to the ground and, in UigKan 207, of musical instruments stuck up in the sky.

yara-n- 'to curry favour, ingratiate oneself with someone' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from one Uigur ex. and from the DLT. Found also in QB 614, 4063 and 4753. *yara-* being 'to be advantageous, beneficial, useful', *yaran-* must basically have signified 'to make someone useful and advantageous for oneself'.

yarat-ın- 'to organise oneself; to adorn and furnish oneself with something; to work hard on something for oneself'. BT VIII A 452 and 454, BT III 436, 450, 464 and 625, ETŞ 9,80, 10,170, 13,180 (twice) and 20,219, BuddhUig I 250 and often as *yaraţınmak* in that text, BT XIII 38,20 and 55,7. *yaratın-* in KT E 10 must be an error, rectified in the parallel passage in BQ E 9.[297] *yara-t-*, q.v. below among the *-(X)t-* verbs, is semantically quite distinct from *yara-*; the adjacence of two formatives is therefore irrelevant here.

yarlıka-n- is attested in M III 11,13$_1$ (text 5), quoted in the *DTS*[298] but not the *EDPT*. *yarlı(g)ka-*, its base, is discussed in section 5.2. It either signifies 'to command' or is a pragmatic auxiliary which can be translated as 'to graciously. . .'. Since it comes from *yarlıg* 'poor, pitiable; pity', its original meaning should have been 'to pity'; the passage from this meaning to the ones actually attested can easily be followed when the agent is a focus of power over others. *yarlıka-n-* links with that original meaning of *yarlıka-*, for it signifies 'to have pity on . . .'. A second ex. of it is attested in ZiemeSklav III 5, in fragmentary and unclear context; translating this *y(a)rl(ı)kanzun* as "möge man geruhen" is unacceptable.

yarma-n- 'to cling unto a precipice, a wall, a ladder and to scale or climb it'. The context of the TT I 46 ex. is translated better in the *EDPT* than by Bang and Gabain; an ex. from the Maitr quoted in the n. to the latter (found also in the *EDPT*) is transcribed and translated better there than in BT IX 248,24$_2$. *yarman-* governs the dative of the wall in the DLT and the ladder appears in an *üzä* phrase in SuvZiemé 692,19 (not in the *EDPT*): *ol şatu üzä yarmanıp ŧ(ā)ŋri yeriŋä agţın-*. A further ex. in BT XIII 16,21: *y(a)rlıg bilmäz yagıka yarmantaçı kim bolgay?* 'Who might grapple with the enemy who knows no mercy?', only a

297 This is also the opinion of Hovdhaugen, 1974, who adds: "There is no evidence for an original rounded vowel in the reflexive morpheme."

298 '*ölülür*' in that quotation has to be corrected to *ölürür*.

tentative translation. *yarma-*, a hap. in Höllen 62 (q.v. in the *EDPT*) also signifies 'to scale, climb up', but governs a direct object.[299]

yasta-n- 'to use (something, direct object) as pillow or support, prop oneself on (something)' appears, damaged, in BuddhBio 7: *Sumer tagıg yastwkça yas-ı(a)nur* "Er legt den Sumeruberg wie ein Kopfkissen für sich zurecht". Attested also in QB 622, 2727 (not in the *EDPT*) and 5974 in rather similar meaning, and in Middle Turkic. Also, with metathesis, in Ht VII 7 b3: *kolın yatsangusıntın üntürüp, ulug tına . . .* 'he raised his arm from where it rested, sighed deeply and . . .',[300] *yasta-*, documented in the *EDPT*, signifies 'to prop (somebody, in the dative) up on (something, direct object)'. Cf. *yastwk* in section 3.102.

yayka-n- 'to sway and be disturbed, (as) of water' is attested twice in a Manichaean text and once in a Buddhistic one as mentioned by the *EDPT* and the *DTS* (the latter also under *bulyanmaq jajqanmaq*). The *v.l.* of TT VI 422 (quoted and 'translated' in the *EDPT*) appears only in one among three mss. and is a meaningless error. *taloy ögüz suvları yaykanur* can be added from Maitr 145 r5 and 153 v25. *yayka-* is only found from the XIVth century on, but see *yaykal-* among the *-(X)l-* verbs.

yaz-ın- is documented in the *EDPT* under 2 *yazın-* from Orkhon Turkic, Manichaean and Buddhist texts; attested also in Maitr 174 r13 and v21, 80r 4 and 84 r21 and 23. Not found in Qarakhanid or later. 'to do something morally wrong, to sin'. This seems to be the meaning of practically all the early exs. of

299 A 'precipice' is *yar* in Old Turkic, but an etymological connection between this and *yarma-* can hardly be established.

300 Geng reads '*yarsıngu*' instead of Arlotto's *yatsangu*, but that makes no sense at all in the context. Arlotto has a n.: "*yatsa-* MK 'to lie down' + refl. *-n-* and *-qw* nomen instrumenti. Here of course 'where one puts one's arm down' or 'pillow'. Professor Pritsak has pointed out the connection between this word and the modern Turkish word *yastık* 'pillow'." Arlotto, that is, thought this to be an instance of what appears in DankKelly as follows: "*ār yatsadı* 'The man wanted (footn.: "wanted" added in margin by later hand.) to settle down for the night, to sleep and to lie down'. *yatsar yatsamaq*." The DLT ms. actually has thrice *yatısa-* and not '*yatsa-*', altered by DankKelly. This is a desiderative form, as discussed in section 6.1 above. The desiderative formative had the shape *-(X)gsA-* throughout Uigur; only in the DLT, and under certain conditions, did it lose its velar and even, sometimes, its first vowel. Such a development cannot be imagined to have taken place already in Ht; there is no '*-sA-*' in Old Turkic proper. As long as it stands alone against so many exs. of *yasta-* and *yastwk*, *yatsa-n-gu* can only have been the result of metathesis. Even if it were the source of *yasta-*, such a verb could not be used to postulate the existence of a deverbal '*-sA-*': It would still stand alone as a lexeme and, what is more, has no desiderative content. The fact that the first hand omitted the verb 'wanted' from the translation of the DLT's *yatısa-* has no particular significance. Ercilasun, 1984: 19 thinks *yasta-* may come from '*yas*' in *yas sōŋük* (Suv 625,10); that, however, is to be read as *yaş sūŋük* 'fresh bones' (less likely is *yas sūŋük* 'bones of bereavement').

yaz- too; *yaz-*, however, is sometimes used in the concrete sense of 'going astray, off the right path etc.', while *yazın-* is only used figuratively.

(y)ettür-ün- is a hap. in ETŞ 10,148, not mentioned in the dictionaries: *başın eṭṭürünmiş* (not '*ıdturunmış*') *Yaṭyadatı* 'Yajñadatta who lost his head'. See *yet-dür-* among the *-tUr-* verbs. *yetlin-* and 1 *yetil-* also have variants without initial */y/*.

yevin- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is found in] *yevinmāk tuṣka* [(Scharl 94) and *iki türlüg yevāglär üzā yevinip* . . . (Scharl 97), translated as "Zeit des Sich-Ausstattens (sambhārāvasthā)" and "sich mit zwei Arten von Ausstattung . . . ausgestattet habend, . . ." respectively. See under the cognate *yevā-g* (section 3.101) why the second vowel may have become */ü/*, and cf. *yevil-*, *yevä-t-* and *yevig+län-*. *yevin-* is the reflexive-medial counterpart of tr. *yevā-*.

1 *yıg-ın-* is attested as 'to collect something for oneself' only in the DLT; the base of *yıgın-tur-* (q.v. among the *-tUr-* verbs) must also have been concrete. Uigur 1 *yıgın-* is spiritual only: With *kõŋül* (and *õg*) as real or understood object, it signifies 'to concentrate one's mind, to meditate'. This is attested e.g. in TT III 162 (Manichaean) and Warnke 287, TT VIII A 27, DvaKol I 25, BT VIII A 290, ShõAgon 1,53 and BT XIII 5,226 (Buddhist). This corresponds to *kõŋül yıg-* e.g. in TT III 31 ("to collect somebody's thoughts", Manichaean), USp 43,6 and TT I 222, and is a loan translation from Skt. *sam+ā+dhī-*, parallel to Parthian *amwrd(ī)šn* (q.v. in the *UW*).

2 *yıg-ın-*, related to 2 *yıg-ıl-* (q.v. below), signifies 'to keep away (intr.), hold back, restrain oneself'. *kõz başlap kaçıgların yıgın-* (ETŞ 8,29) is 'to restain their senses, first and foremost the eyes'. This second *yıg-ın-* is found also in the QB: *buşı bolma iştā sān övkā yıgın* 'Don't be irritable in business, restrain your anger' (1414 and 5216), *tilāk arzu sürmā havaŋnı* ('your passions') *yıgın* (6118). Thus also in *azlanguluk tıltaglartın ätõzüg kõŋülüg yıgınmak ärür* (Suv 242,3-4) 'That is, to hold one's body and mind in check before vicious causes'. This is how *yıgın- küzädin-* (ShõAgon 1,361, quoted under *küzād-in-* above) and *yıgın- üşün-* in *õz kọŋüllärin yıgınmış üşünmişlär* (ĀgFrag (1) B 1) come to have practically the same Chin. counterparts: 'concentration' and 'meditation'. what protects and guards the believer against the impressions of this world. T *amv(a)rd(ı)şnlıg ot* (TT III 28-9) serves as antidote to *az nızvanı* (Manichae text). The corresponding use of *yıg-* is known to me mainly from Mus sources. QB 1265 has *ay ädgü du'ā sān balānı yıg a* "O benediction, hold b evil". The DLT's *ol mäni aşka yıgdı* "He detained me for a meal" also bel here. The use of *this yıg-* in Middle Turkic is well described by Bodrogli 1984: 463; cf. also what the *EDPT* gives. The two verbs *yıg-ıl-* (q.v. below) have various meanings corresponding to the ones of *yıg-ın-*.

yılı-n- is not mentioned in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* has an ex. from (the inferio

A *in* QB 101. Uigur only has it in the biverb *isi-n- yılı-n-*, which perhaps signified 'to be enthusiastic' or 'to try hard'. *toyınlar isinū yılınu* (ed.: '*yalınu*') *bışrunsar ögrätinsär, . . . uyur oz[galı* (ShōAgon 1,357) and *bir iştäg kamag ulug kuvrag birlä [ön]gin [ön]gin yaraglarınça isinū yılınu, agır ayaŋçaŋ [sak]ınçı[n] . . . kōŋülüg öritip . . .* (Warnke 150); a further ex. appears *ibid.* 553. These can't be instances of *ilin- ~ yilin-* (q.v. above under *il-in-*) because of the positive content and the semantic affinity with *isi-n-*. *yılı-* 'to be or become warm' (*EDPT* quoted from DLT) is only concrete and literal, *yılın-* only attested in metaphorical use; cf., however, *yılı-g* (section 3.101). The metaphor may have its origin in the spiritual meaning of Skt. *tapas* 'warmth'.

yod-un- is the reflexive of *yod-* 'to wipe off', discussed in section 7.23. In both instances, Suv and DLT (qq.v. in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*), it appears with *yaş* as object and signifies 'to wipe away one's tears'.

(*ywKurkan-* is an obscure verb discussed in section 5.2.).

yola-n- 'to go in a certain direction, to make oneself a way' must be distinguished from *yölä-n-*, although this may be difficult in specific cases. *yola-n-* comes from *yol+a-*, q.v. in section 5.11. I read *yolan-* in *körtilär . . . yomg bertin yıŋak yolanıp . . . barmışların* (Suv 599,19). *UW* 246 translates this as "sie sahen, daß [die Tiere] . . . alle nach einer Richtung sich orientierten und . . . liefen", but still transcribes '*yölänip*'. This ex. is quoted in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. Another instance *may* be *Çixuen atl(ı)g bilgā yakın yaguk yolantı* (Ht V 11 b 26) and cf. s.v. *yölän-*.

yölä-n- is generally written as YWL'N°; spelling *yw°* as YW and not YWY° is common orthographical practice. Thence the difficulty in distinguishing between this verb and the one in the previous entry. *yölän-* is certain in *b(ä)k katıg tutum kertgünç[kā] barmak yoḷänmäkkā işlāşip . . .* (Warnke 601) "sich bemühen, in dem fest zu haltenden Glauben zu wandeln und sich auf ihn zu stützen". *ölänsär* (thus) *ükūş turgurmakka* (ShōAgon 1,21) is also spelled by the ed. with front vowel; cf. *ädgükä ölänturmāk* (*ibid.* 34).[301] *ät' ḫzintäki kop tüüsi yokaru yoḷänip tururlar* (MaitrGeng 5 a 26) and *yokaru yoḷänmiş tüülāri* (*ibid.* 11 b 23) probably belong here as well, while Abhi 2363 is certainly an instance of *yölän-*: *ąmtı . . . sizlär maŋa tayaklıg ärür sizlär. m(ä)n nırvan bulmışta ken . . . tayanmış yoḷänmişiŋizlär kärgāk sudurka.* An ex. in BT I B (61), finally, has probably wrongly been taken to have *yölän-*: *ortun yolta kalmaguluk ol: . . . kōŋül tapa yolanmış k(ā)rgāk. yölā-* 'to support' is mentioned in the DLT only with its physical sense of 'propping up'; QB 2105, 5125 and 5792 have metaphorical uses, however, which directly correspond to what we have for *yölän-*.

301 I have no explanation for the absence of the initial *y*; **h*??

yörgä-n- 'to be wrapped around, covered up with something'. By the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted only from the DLT. Fourteen times attested in the Maitr: also e.g. in MaitrGeng 10 b25, where *yörgänmiş* is parallel to *yaxşınmış* (q.v. above). This verb without the initial y is attested in Legende, M I 5,14, *öl tözün är k(a)mag özi toni baştan adak(k)a tägi kanka irinnä* (thus) *örgänip* . . . Same verb, similar context, *ibid.* 6,8. See *yörgä-l-* below for exs. of the (tr.) base.

yu-n- 'to wash (intr.), wash oneself'. *EDPT*; further exs. in Ht VII 10 b16, Suv 478,2-7 (quoted in the n. to BT VII A 21), Shō XIII a11 and BT VIII B 156. *uŋun arıtıp agızın yunzun* (Suv 524,15) is 'One must clean one's teeth and wash one's mouth'; not "man soll seine Zähne putzen, den Mund [spülen] und sich baden", as translated in *UW* 70 a s.v. *agız* A,a,1: A reflexive form can, of course, govern a body part as object. *yu-* 'to wash (tr.)' is well attested.

yul-un- 'to be pulled off, plucked away, redeemed' is dealt with in the *EDPT*; add an ex. from QB 1438.[302] There is only one (late) Uigur instance.

yupa-n- 'to hide from a difficult situation, a difficult task etc.'. The only Uigur ex. is *yarsınçıg yavız ölümkä yaşıp yupanıp ozgu yok* (BT XIII 16,19) "Vor dem . . . Tod gibt es kein Verstecken$_2$, keine Erlösung". Attested also in the DLT, for which see the *EDPT*; cf. also *yupa-t-* below. The base is attested in the DLT (spelled as '*yuba-*' in the *EDPT*); DankKelly translate "The man neglected the matter and did not settle it". *yupa-*, *yupan-* and *yupat-* all have this slightly different meaning in the DLT, which the Uigur ex. of *yupa-t-* does not share either.

(*yükün-* with dative, 'to worship, do obeisance to somebody'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *jinčür-*. *yinçürü yükün-* appears also in ETŞ 20,36, whereas AbitAnk 61, e.g., has *yükünmäk tapınmak*. *yükün-* is very frequent in UigTot and Maitr, and appears also in BT II 148, BT VIII B219, CYK 51, ShōKenkyū III 32, Ht V2 b14 and 18, AmitIst 86, 91 and 99 and so forth. Worth noting is YUG-KUN-NUR-BIS in BuddhKat 1 and 2. Bang and Gabain[303] tried to connect *yükün-* with *yükmäk* ~ *ükmäk* 'heap'. The semantical problems in such a connection could perhaps be solved; weightier is the objection that the *y* of *yükün-* is always there, whereas the alternation *ük-* ~ *yük-* goes back to **hük-*: Cf. *ük-ün-* and especially *hük-ün* above. I propose to derive this verb as **yü-k-ün-*, connecting it with *yügärü* and *yülüg* 'facing etc.'. This last is analysed as **yü-l-üg* and discussed (together with *yügärü*) in section 3.101 above. Tezcan's review of BT V (*TDAYB* 1978-9 (1981): 299) has a different etymology.)

302 The entries '*yolun-*' "sıyrıl-" and *yulun-* "kurtar-" of the İndeks to the QB should be united. The quality of the base vowel varies in the Turkic languages.

303 In footn 1 to p. 98 of TT VI. The *EDPT* notes *yükün-* as a simplex.

yükün-ün- 'to worship for one's own sake'. Hap. in BT XIII 60,5: *Maheşvarı täŋrikä yükününgäli kälmişiŋkä*. The ed. thinks it is an error for *yükün-*; but as *yükün-* was opaque for its users, it is quite normal that there should be a medial expansion from it.

PETRIFIED CONVERBS

One such lexeme is *aşnu* 'before, previous etc.', q.v. in the *UW* together with its derivates. I think it can only have temporal meaning and never signify "voran"; Par. A,a of the entry should probably be deleted: The KP instance can very well be understood temporally, and what appears in Töpfer 42 is probably *asnu* 'hanging on/for oneself' from *as-ın-*. See *aşun-* 'to surpass, excel' above.

The sequence *bagdaşınu olor-* 'to sit with crossed legs' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* has one ex. from Suv. *bagdaşınu* and *olor-* are always adjacent except in ETŞ 9,13-14; there, the separation is probably justified by the metre. Further exs. appear in UigTot 1017, Maitr 7 r19 and 148 r10, BT XIII 33,5 and UigKan 303 and 319. BT XIII 20,9 has the collocation in three mss., A (= Hazai 9), B (= UjgStichi 8) and C. *v(a)jır bagdaşınu olor-* of BT VII C18 can be compared to *v(a)jır bagdaş täg* in UigTot 750. A hap. *bagdaşınmak* is discussed among the *-(X)n-* verbs; no **bagda-ş-* is attested. See *bag+da-* in section 5.13. *bagdaş* appears in the QB and in Middle Türkic.

MORPHOLOGY

-(X)n- is not often added to *-(X)ş-* verbs. *yaxşın-/yaxsın-* has its problems. We just mentioned the petrified converb *bagdaşınu* and its obsolete base. One other ex. is *yapşın-*, whose base is not a cooperative-reciprocal as far as its meaning is concerned. *umşun-* in BuddhUig I 318 must be an *-(X)n-* verb, but no **um-uş-* is, in any case, attested. What has been read as *yargaşın*[z]*un* in BT XIII 6,1 is rather dubious, as the lacuna may have been greater. *-lXn-* verbs, in which *-(X)n-* appears after *-(X)l-*, are discussed in the next section: *-lXn-* is, in some cases, a combination of formatives rather than a formative sequence. *-(X)n-* is in a number of cases added to causative forms, among them *agtın-*, *arıtın-*, *ögrätin-* and *yaratın-*, *bışrun-*, *katrun-* and *şişrun-*. Note *yükünün-*, finally, whose base is opaque. Among all these, *agtın-* is a real anti-transitive of a causative, *arıtın-* a real reflexive of a causative. In none of the other cases can two distinct diathesis meanings be isolated.

-(X)n- verbs receive mainly causative expansion. *bışrunul-*, *ötündürül-*, *tapınturul-* and *yüküntürül-* are passive derivates from *-(X)n-* verbs: The three verbs mentioned last are formed with the suffix of section 7.32. *bışrun-* and *ötün-* govern

direct objects, the other two indirect ones. All four *-(X)n-* verbs have lost the medial or reflexive component of their meaning. Five *-(X)n-(X)ş-* verbs (listed in the previous section) are not significant from the functional point of view: Concerning *sanış-*, *tavranış-* and *tayanış-*, note that there is no *sa-* or **tavra-* or *taya-* in Old Turkic, so that *san-*, *tavran-* and *tayan-* were not analysable as far as the speakers of that language are concerned; the base of *sävin-iş-* is a semantic simplex. *eviniş-* is a hap. in an Uigur text while *evin-* appears only in the QB. Thus it is again only the combination of *-(X)n-* with causative formatives that represents a true joining of two diatheses.

-(X)n- is very often added to denominal bases, the most prominent among them being those formed with *+lA-*. This is only natural, as *+lA-* is the most common of denominal formatives forming verb stems. If a related *+lA-* verb is not attested, a verb formed with the combination of the two formatives is discussed in section 5.6: *+lAn-* acquired a life of its own; it was used as a single element without many of the characteristics of *-(X)n-*. For about 20 *-(X)n-* verbs, however, a *+lA-* stem can be shown to have served as base; these, of course, appear in this section. Other denominal verbs also served as bases for the present formative, e.g. *+A-*. *ag(ı)zan-*, *äŋän-*, *uvşan-* and *uzanmak* presumably also come from *+A-* verbs, but those have not yet turned up. The relationship of *-(X)n-* with *+(X)(r)kA-* ~ *-(X)(r)kA-* has been pointed out in section 5.2; the collocational affinity between the two formatives has its source in their semantic affinity: *verba sentiendi* by definition have an egocentric content.

Converbs and aorists of *-(X)n-* verbs have /U/ in their suffixes; as shown and documented in Erdal, 1979 a: 107, this usually holds also for monosyllabic *-(X)n-* verbs. *ün-* may also originally have been an *-(X)n-* verb, but is opaque within Old Turkic: As shown ibid. 111, its converb and aorist vowel is generally /A/, with possibly one or two Manichaean exceptions. Some of the *°n-* verbs discussed above cannot be shown to actually have been formed with *-(X)n-*, among them *aşgın-*, *äymän-*, *içan-*, *içgın-*, *kaşan-*, *kazgan-*, *kızgan-*, *ötkün-* and *tävşin-*. Some of these may in fact be simple verbs. All of them, however, have /U/ as the vowel of the converb and the aorist. The only polysyllabic verb ending in /n/ whose converb and aorist vowel is /A/ is *kayın-* 'to boil (intr.)'. How this came about is explained in Erdal, 1979 a: 115.[304] Since, with the exception of *kayın-*, there are no

304 The first word in B¹W S¹N¹A :B¹W S¹N¹L¹D¹M in ŞU E7 has been read as '*boşuna*', among others in *EDPT* 383 a. The second word cannot be identified with anything known; as a quite clear photograph shows, the first word is damaged particularly in the third letter and therefore uncertain. *boşunu* and *boşunur* appear, in any case, in Kuan 40, at least 18 times in Chuast, in TT IV A 7 and 14 and elsewhere. *busan-*, a possibility at least as far as the reading alone is concerned, is also often attested with *-U(r)*. *ötü täginär m(ä)n* in U II 80,64 Üdrät seems to be rather clear on the facs. and must be an error. TT IX 54, Suv 401,10, U III 4,1₂ Haricandra, KP LXXIII 2, U

polysyllabic *-n- verbs which do not have /U/ in the converb and aorist suffixes, this vowel cannot be used with them as a criterion to distinguish the simple from the derived verbs.

Syntax and Semantics

Most *-(X)n-* verbs are not accompanied by any nominal except that representing the subject: *özin ol tuşbaşıŋa kämišti, yuntı, arıntı* (M I 7,21) 'He threw himself into that spring and washed and cleaned himself'; *ıda taşda kalmışı kuvranıp yeti yüz bolu* (Toñ 4) 'Those who had remained in forest and desert gathered and there turned out to be 700 men'. The fact that it comes natural to use a simple intr. in the English translation should not be seen as the taking of a stand on the question of whether the *-(X)n-* form was actually felt as a genuine reflexive. It was the group, strictly speaking, that gathered itself; a mutually cooperative and concerted behaviour on the part of all the men taken as separate entities should have demanded the *-(X)ş-* form. One further ex.: *anı üçün m(ä)n taz artukaç birlä ökünür biz bilinür biz* (TT IV B 28) 'That is why I, Dhāsa, together with *Artukaç*, we repent and admit (our sins)'. Not very different are the instances with *figura etymologica*: Their direct object which is a verbal noun, is not a participant but has adverbial function: *arslan silkinigin silkindäçi atl(ı)g bodis(a)tv kutıŋa yükünür biz* (BT II 1052) 'We prostrate ourselves before his holiness the bodhisattva named "He who shakes himself with the shake of a lion"'; *yüräk yarılınçıg ämgäk ämgänürlär* (Höllen 135) 'They suffer heartbreaking sufferings'.

Here is an ex. with an ablatival locative: *yazokda boşunu ötünür biz* (Chuast 85, 92, 101 etc.) 'We pray to free ourselves from sin'; *yin[d]äm ayıgta y(a)ratıntaçılarıg tıdtıŋız* (TT III 74-5) 'You curbed those who consistently adorned themselves with evil'. Locative expressions as the one in the last-mentioned ex. never serve as participants. The following sections will discuss only those expressions which may do so.

-(X)n- verbs with direct object

Direct objects may be with or without accusative mark; with pronouns, only the first possibility exists. In most of the medial-reflexive sentences with accusative, the object contains a possessive suffix referring to the agent:

87,63 Kutlug, BT II 68 and 71 and many other places all have *tāginür*. Perhaps the vowels have been interchanged and one should emend to **ötä tāginür*; **ötünü tāginür* is another possibility. *eyin käzigçä agtına agtına* in UigTot 1100, "der Reihe nach sich erhebend" only shows how late that text is.

1. The direct object may be the word *özin* or *äṫ' özin*, e.g.: *ol kişi suvka kirip äṫ' özin arıg yunup yarı arıg ton kädip* . . . (Suv 519,12) 'That man went into the water, washed himself clean, put on clean new clothes, . . .'.
2. Sometimes the object is a part of the agent's body: *kanatımın silkinip ymä t(ä)rklägü kal(ı)kdan kudı entim* (M III 23,6$_2$, text 8) 'I shook my wing(s) and came down from heavens in a hurry'; *tişin arıp agızın yunzun* (Suv 524,15) 'One must clean one's teeth and rinse one's mouth'.
3. The object can also be an abstract noun referred to the agent: *yazokumuzni bilinür biz* (TT IV A 65) 'We admit our sin'; *kayuka ärsär tayangusın tüşgüsin arıtı bilinmäz ukunmaz* (BT II 969-70) 'He no longer has the awareness nor the self-understanding concerning what it is he should lean upon or alight on'. In the following rather complicated ex., *kılınçımızni* is governed by *ökün-* (which could not yet be shown to be an *-(X)n-* verb but behaves like one): *amtı ol kılmış agar tsuy ayıg kılınç(ı)m(ı)zni kaltı kurug kovuk sögüt özänintä örtü tamıtmış täg ökünmäklig örtin örtänür biz* (UigSün 19) 'We now burn with the (metaphorical) fire of repenting those committed heavy sins$_2$ of ours, as if one had kindled a fire in the heart of a dry and hollow tree'. Cf. also *münlärin yazokların ürtünü kizlänü* (Maitr 176 r9).
4. *öz* and *äṫ' öz* with *-(X)n-* verbs refer to the subject's self and body even when not accompanied by a possessive suffix: *täginmäk nomug özkä alınıp köŋüldä kılur* (TT V B 73; see *al-ın-* above and the *UW* entry for this verb, par. 3); *äŋ kenki ätözög eltindäçi* (TT VIII A 48) 'the bearer of the very last body'.
5. Direct objects which are the subject's children or other relatives of his or are considered or treated as such are governed by *-(X)n-* verbs whose content denotes such treatment. This is the case with *açı-n-* and the biverb *açın- agrın-*. In Buddhistic texts the persons 'cared for and looked after' are, however, mostly the needy and destitute.
6. Action which the subject takes for his own benefit is also expressed with *-(X)n-*. Such verbs are *äŋän-* 'to disappropriate' and *ärksin-*.
7. Those sentences can be disregarded here in which the verb either has no attested base, as *adkan-* or *tägzin-*, or has dissociated itself from its base semantically, as the common *tägin-* 'to experience' from *täg-* 'to reach, attain', or *bışrun-* 'to assimilate a doctrine' from *bışur-* 'to cook'. *basın-* 'to oppress' is typical of a whole class of *-(X)n-* verbs: Semantic proximity to *bas-* is clear, but the use of *basın-* can hardly be argued to be reflexive. It is therefore not surprising that, e.g. in TT II 1,12, BT II 256 and BT XIII 13,91, we find *basın-* with the independent direct object. With quite a number of *-(X)n-* verbs, the difference between them and their base consists of their being abstract, metaphorical, spiritual. See the above entries of *aç-ın-* 'to disclose one's sins', *adkan-* 'to perceive', *al-ın-* 'to accept advice, the true doctrine etc.', *arı-n-* 'to

be pure, purify oneself (with personal subjects and spiritual content)', *bas-ın-*, *bışr-un-*, *boşw-n-* 'to get free from impediments of the soul', *bög-ün-* 'to comprehend, perceive', *elt-in-* 'to lead a certain way of life', *isi-n-* 'to have warm feelings towards someone; to try hard, to be enthusiastic' (this last also together with *yılı-n-*), *iy-in-* 'to oppress and crush (in an abstract sense)', *käŋrä-n-* 'to grumble, complain', *öt-ün-* 'to present something to a superior', *sıg-ın-* 'to seek or take refuge', *tap-ın-* 'to worship', *tart-ın-* 'to be attached to somebody, love him dearly', *täg-in-*, *tokı-n-* 'to be struck by a certain feeling', *tuy-un-* 'to comprehend, achieve enlightenment', *yad-ın-* 'to open oneself up to view and to criticism', *yarat-ın-* 'to work hard on something', *yarlıka-n-* as auxiliary of majesty, *yaz-ın-* 'to sin' and 1 *yıg-ın-* 'to concentrate one's mind, meditate'. Since the reason for using *-(X)n-* in these verbs is semantic rather than syntactic, it is not surprising that the resulting derivates should not have the syntactic behaviour of reflexive or of medial verbs.

8. When *-(X)n-* verbs are medial and not reflexive or anti-transitive, they can, of course, govern any object; tr. verbs no less than intr. ones can be marked for including the subject or his domain as beneficiary of the action: *ıt tışın käŋç oglan asınsar yüräklig bolur* (TT VII 23,2) 'If a little boy hangs the tooth of a dog onto himself, . . .'; *bo yetikän sudur ärdinig agzanıp miŋ kuön tükäl yakdurup . . .* ' (I) recited this *Yetikän* sūtra jewel and had printed fully a thousand copies . . .' (TT VII 40,121, the *Yetikän sudur*); *yaŋı arıg ton tonanıp . . .* '(he) put on new and clean clothes and . . .' (Suv 487,7); *bilgä biliglig y(i)ti kılıçıg tayanmak k(ä)rgäk* (BT I B (78)) 'One should support oneself by the sharp sword of wisdom'; *ymä t(ä)ŋrim siz yunduŋuz bilgä biliglig suv üzä biligsiz biliglig kkirlärig* (ms. T II S90 [U 5335] 32,13 and 33,2-3). This phenomenon seems to be rare but does exist.

However, in the great majority of sentences and other verbal constructions dominated by *-(X)n-* verbs, no reference appears to any direct object except as being, in some sense, a 'part' of the subject. All this does not, of course, apply to verbs like *umun-*, whose base was in disuse as far as the speakers of Uigur were concerned: In this sense, *tün kün sini umunıp* (the last vowel may be wrong; the ms. looks as if it were damaged here) *saŋa amranmakın muna ölür m(ä)n* (U III 82,27) 'I wish for you by day and by night and – lo – am dying in love for you' is no real exception.

In most cases in which an object not marked with an accusative sign accompanies a medial-reflexive verb, the object is clearly in close juncture with the verb and unspecific. Some such instances have already been quoted and will not here be repeated. Only the following two need be discussed: *turkaru aş içgü InçA kolosınça aşanmak k(ä)rgäk* (M III $12,3_2$, text 6) "(darum) ist es nötig, immer

Speise und Trank so zu ihrer (bestimmten) Zeit zu geniessen". The objects are unspecific, and were separated from the verb apparently in order to lend maximum prominence to *InçA* and *kolosınça*. An early ex. with unspecific object, clearly not lexically connected with the verb's base: *sü yorıdım . . . karıg sökdüm, yok(g)aru at yetü, yadagın, ıgaç tutunu agturtum* (Toñ 25) 'I had the army set out . . . I made them climb on foot, towing their horses upwards, holding themselves on to trees'.

Here may be the place to mention the third category of reflexive constructions of DLT fol. 393, which is of the type
Subject – *özinä* – Indefinite Object – -(*X*)*n*- verb derived from tr. base
The dative (*dativus commodi*) of *özinä* was apparently not necessary in Old Turkic proper as the morpheme -(*X*)*n*- was sufficient to convey its content.

-(*X*)*n*- verbs accompanied by *üzä* phrases

It has to be determined whether *üzä* is here used to form ergative expressions, a function it has in the passive. If it turns out that this does happen, that would mean that -(*X*)*n*- is also capable of being a genuine passive. In some cases this is clearly not so, as in the following, where *üzä* is used in parallelism with the instrumental suffix: *ädgü ögli y(a)rlıkançuçı köŋül üzä burxanlar birlä täŋ köŋülin, burxanlar birlä tüz küsüşin yertinçünüŋ ulug ädgü ögli y(a)rlıkançuçı köŋüllüg kaŋlarıŋa tüzükä umunup ınanıp yükünür biz* (BT II 28) 'We prostrate ourselves, hoping for, and believing in, all the great, well-thinking, compassionate fathers of the world, through well-thinking and compassion, with a mind in tune with the Buddhas and with intentions in accord with those of the Buddhas'. Cf. also the instrumental *üzä* phrase in the sentence *siz yunduŋuz bilgä biliglig suv üzä biligsiz biliglig kkirlärig* quoted above as ex. for an -(*X*)*n*- verb governing an accusative. The matter is not so clear in the following instance, but an instrumental interpretation of the *üzä* phrase is still more convincing: *kılınçıŋa ökünmäklig örtü üzä örtänip kop köŋülin ayıg kılınçdın ävrilsär* . . . (U III 5,2) 'If he burns with the fire of repentance for his deed, and if he turns away from evil action wholeheartedly, . . .'. In *amarı pretlär k(ä)ntü saçları üzä ürtülüp yorgänip . . . uzun kürtüklärdä yugürürlär kaçarlar* (Maitr 198 r 7) the -(*X*)*n*- verb is even used in parallelism with a passive form together with an *üzä* phrase. The decision as to whether a phrase with *üzä* is to be taken as agentive or as instrumental depends on our understanding of the text. If we now try to get to the *basis* of this understanding, the following appears: Living (or supernatural) creatures tend to be seen as agents, while everything else is felt to be instrumental. Strictly speaking, living creatures can, of course, have their function limited to being just instruments; tales, on the other hand, can personify anything. But the first is a rather rare possibility which the

speaker-author can be expected to thematise, while context should give us sufficient notice in the second case. Other exceptions can be assigned to the various types of metonymy and metaphor. In general, then, the ergative expression will contain a living creature, or anything which the speaker-author conceives of or chooses to present as being endowed with its motivated behaviour. We have only one such case with *-(X)n-*, and that in a relatively late text: *kimlär birök ulug ig käm üzä tutulup otaçılar üzä adırtlanıp titmiş koḍmuş ärsär ymä* . . . (U II 43,20, Uşnişa Viçay). Possible translations for the hap. *adırtla-n-* are mentioned in the entry for it above; the rest is 'Even such people as have already been caught by a major illness and . . . given up$_2$ by the doctors . . .'. Whether doctors were independent or instrumental can only be decided by information on the society being reflected in this text; in the Manichaean institution for which ManMon served as charter, the latter appears to have been the case. '*adırtlal-*' would, in any case, have been just as possible as *bäkläl-*, *baglal-*, *külál-*, *nomlal-* etc., qq.v. below. The use of *üzä* must here be due to the influence of the passive within parallelism of the two *-(X)p* clauses.

-(X)n- verbs with dative forms

As we shall see below, the dative can also mark an ergative expression, e.g. in the passive use of *-(X)t-* verbs. The cooccurrence of this case form with *-(X)n-* therefore also needs investigation. The concrete uses of the dative can be disregarded from the start; such, e.g., are the datives accompanying the reflexive forms in the following sentence: *ol beş yüz sıgunlar isig öz korkınçıŋa ögsüz bolup yerkä yapşınu sıgıntılar* (U IV C69) 'Those 500 maral deer became senseless from fear for their life and stuck to the ground, seeking shelter in it'. In the following sentence and in others similar to it, the dative does represent an abstract relation, but not ergative content: *äzrua t(ä)ŋrikä, kün ay t(ä)ŋrikä, küçlüg t(ä)ŋrikä, burxanlarka ınantım(ı)z tayantım(ı)z* (Chuast 139-40) 'We have put our trust in and rely on the god Zerwan, the God of the Sun and the Moon, in the Powerful God and the prophets'. There is a special construction for *sa-n-* with the dative, which signifies 'to be esteemed as, or pass for . . .': *kayu kişiög kaŋ köŋlin bärtsär ol tınlıg tamuluk bolur, ogul kızka sanmaz* (KP XI 8) 'Whatever person breaks his parents' heart, that creature becomes fit for hell and is not counted for a son or a daughter'. We might also mention the dative which accompanies *(y)il-in-* (*yapşın-*): *mäniŋ özümkä ymä yilinmäkim yapşınmakım yok* (UigPañc 19) 'I have no adherence$_2$ to my ego'. *turuñya kuş tüşnäkiŋä konmış, tuymatın tuz(a)k(k)a ilinmiş* (IrqB LXI) 'A crane settled on its resting place; without noticing it got caught in a snare'. Here and in the following ex., the dative form may be conceived of as the source of the action, but there is definitely nothing ergative about it: [*nız*]*vanı*

basınçıŋa olınıp . . . (Maitr) is translated above in the entry for the verb. In none of the sentences with *-(X)n-* does a dative represent a participant in the action, then. Ergo, *-(X)n-* verbs are never passives.

7.22 *-lXn-*: Lexical Material

The combination of the formatives *-(X)l-* and *-(X)n-* normally syncopates the vowel of the first formative (which falls off in any case if the base happens to end in a vowel). *-lXn-* is dealt with as a combined formative rather than as a sequence because none of the exs. appears to have been derived from an *-(X)l-* verb as base. Meaningwise, the verbs to be discussed below are more limited than what we find in section 7.21. This may be a coincidence, since *-(X)n-* verbs are much more numerous than *-lXn-* verbs; there may, however, have been a real difference, determining the choice of the speaker/writer between *-(X)n-* and *-lXn-*. Here, then, are the verbs:

boşlun- is an intr. verb in Heilk I, referring to women's bearing of children. This is a hap., mentioned in the *EDPT*. No doubt to be analysed as *boşw-lun-*, with the usual syncope of the second vowel. This is the only case of the addition of *-lXn-* to a base ending in a vowel. It is unlikely that it should be a rounding of '*boş+lan-*': Such a rounding does not happen with *çoglan-*, *ögläṅ-* etc.. *boş+w-* is discussed in section 5.41. Whereas the DLT's *boş+u-* is intr. like a regular *+U-* verb, Uigur *boşw-* is tr. Meaningwise, *boşlun-* corresponds to the DLT's *anıŋ özi boşudı* "His bowels were opened". *boşu-n-* is intr., but limited to the spiritual domain.

suk-lun- 'to get stuck (in something)' is correctly interpreted in the n. to Pothi 55 = TT III 55. It appears in this meaning also in the DLT, and in Maitr 58 r 18: *taş kapıgınta oy kazıp tolu örtyalın koz kodup bälgüsüz agzın ürtdi.* [*o*]*yta tägdüktä suklunup tüşzün* [*tep*] *sakıntı*. The translation "soll er geblendet sein" of BT IX 161,18$_2$ follows earlier attempts to translate the verb, and is wrong. *suk-ul-*, attested only in the DLT, is a real passive and gets the object of the action as subject. All three exs. of *suklun-* have to do with holes in the ground, and the two Uigur exs. may have had the narrower meaning of 'falling in'. In TT III 55, *suv kŵznäki* 'water hole' is a metaphor for 'pride'.[305]

305 Both Bang and Gabain and Clark took the 'water' by itself to be the metaphor for 'pride', but the 'water *hole*' is what one gets stuck in. *kŵẓnäk* is attested also in BuddhUig I 389, 390 and 392 with reference to the holes in a net. K^{2}W̃ Z N^{2}W̃ K, i.e. *kŵznŵk* in IrqB XVIII refers to the smoke hole in a tent, and must be the same lexeme. The BuddhUig exs. are correctly translated as "Loch", but the ed. mistakenly took the original meaning of the lexeme to be "eingeschrumpft". Nevertheless, his connection with Ottoman *küsnü-* ~ *küsnä-* and *küsnük* may have something to

tik-lin- 'to be, or be placed, or place oneself vertically, i.e. upright' is, in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT; there it concerns a piece of wood. In BT VII B 83, in] *özlärinin tillärintün y(a)rok ünüp balıka tiklinip . . .*, a ray of light goes vertically towards the *bali* offering. In BuddhUig I 557, finally, the subject is a person: *amtı maŋa yaramagay olorgalı yatgalı. . . . azuça ärsär ymä tikilinip turup küdäyin . . . tep artı olormadı yatmadı uḍımadı*. The context makes the significance of *tikilinip* (thus here!) clear. *tik-il-* has been used more or less like *tiklin-* in UigTöt 1039, but is a real passive in DLT and QB 4009. *tik-* is tr.

tök-lün- appears once in Heilk II A (quoted also in *UW* 76 b s.v. *agu* A,a) and in the DLT. 'to pour out (intr.), to ooze out'. *tök-ül-* is very well attested and *töklün-* is synonymous with some of its intr. uses. '*tök-ün-*' is not, but cf. the Manichaean hap. *tökünür-*.

üz-lün- signifies 'to break (of a rope)' in the DLT. The Uigur exs., however, have 'doubts' or 'hopes' as subject and signify 'to come to an end'; this is a metaphorical or abstract use as we often find it with *-(X)n-*. One such ex. appears in three mss. in TT VI 381 where the other four have *üzül-*; the others (not found in the *EDPT*) are *sezikiŋiz üzlünzün* (MaitrGeng 2 a24) and *umugı üzlünmiş osuglug* (Maitr 161 r27). *üz-ül-* (q.v. below) also often has this meaning 'to cease, be cancelled, come to an end' in Uigur; but *üzlün-* makes this abstract meaning explicit. *üzlün-* should perhaps better be considered a derivate from *üzül-* than directly from *üz-*. Cf. also the solidly attested *üzlünçü* 'end' (discussed in section 3.105).

yet-lin- 'to disappear' is common, and so is its base *yet-* 'to lose'; an *-(X)n-* derivate from this base is not attested, however, and *yet-il-* is very rare. The *EDPT* writes that this verb is often used together with *bar-*; it may be, then, that the hap. occurring in *yitrinip bardılar* in Suv (quoted in the *DTS*) should be emended to *yetlin-*: The omission of L hooks by scribes is notorious. *yetlin- bar-* is additionally attested in Ht IV 1172 and X 745 and Maitr 85 v 6, 116 v 30 and 14 r 3. The last-mentioned ex. is spelled without the *y*, as the ones in ShōAgon 3, p. 203, ls. 12, 13 and 16 and Maitr 198 v 14. Further exs. of *yetlin-* can be found in Ht X 1011, BuddhUig II 434 (with *közünmäz bol-*), Suv 198,8 (with *yok+ad-*), seven times in Maitr and SuvStockh 86.

yuk-lun- 'to be polluted; of filth, to adhere' is, curiously enough, attested only in negated form. *DTS*; not in the *EDPT*: *ädgü altunug sızguru särgürsär toz tumanlıg kkirlär yuklunmadın öz tözi arınmış süzülmiş altun tözi b(ä)lgürär* (Suv 74,18). Add BT I B (67), misunderstood by the eds.: *nızvanıka yuklun-*

it. A derivation from *közün-* 'to appear' is out of question, in any case: both because of the meanings, and as there is no deverbal suffix '*-Ak*'. That *kwznäk* is not 'reflection' (thus e.g. Clark in Pothi) should be clear by now.

masar, . . . tayansar kkirsiz arıg orunka, . . . 'If one does not get polluted by passion, . . . if one has an undirtied clean place as base, then . . .'. A further ex. is *ol BODUGlar munçukka yuklunmadın munçuk arıg tözinçä turup . . .* in BuddhUig I 99. *yuklunmaksız* 'unpolluted' in U II 37,59 (Uşnïşa Vïçay) was misunderstood by the ed. (and also by the *EDPT* s.v. 'yoklun-'). In ETŞ 10,262 we should read *kkir yuklunmaksız* instead of '*yolatmaksız*'.[306] In ETŞ 10,262 appears also ibid. 10,274 and 15,6.[307] *yuk-ul-*, q.v. below, is very similar in meaning. *yuk-* 'to pollute' is attested in the metaphorical sense of most of the instances of *yuklun-* and *yukul-* in ETŞ 18,8 and BuddhUig I 399.

yub-lun-maklıg kọŋülümin urgu yer bulmaz m(ā)n (Ht VII 1968 = 20 a'24) is by Arlotto translated as "nervous heart". Prof. Gabain derives this form from a Mo. verb, while the *EDPT* connects it with the DLT's *yupa-* 'to neglect' (which is there read as '*yuba-*'), *yupal-* 'to be neglected'. These, however, would have given an unrounded vowel in the formative. These authorities were misled by the labial, spelled with the character for P. The same verb appears also in QB 662, spelled with *fā'* with three dots; this represents the sound [β], a voiced bilabial spirant: *nätäg kim orunsuz topık yuvlunur / anı täg mā dāvlāt özüm yulunur* "Just as a ball with no fixed position rolls about, in the same way, I, too, fortune, retain my freedom". 'rolling about' is in both exs. used as a metaphor for restlessness and instability. The DLT's ex. for *yuvlun-* is purely concrete, as befits a dictionary. *yuv-ul-* is attested in Toñ, DLT and QB.

Grammar

All our *-lXn-* verbs are bisyllabic. The converb and aorist vowel of all of them is /U/. The bases of all *-lXn-* verbs are tr., which is not true of *-(X)n-*, for example. All of them are simple verbs. The only expansion of a *-lXn-* verb is *yetlintür-*; *yetlin-* is also the most common verb in this section. There are many more *-lXn-* verbs in the DLT, e.g. *aç-lın-* 'to open (intr.)', *bog-lun-* to choke (intr.)', *bög-lün-* 'of water, to be stagnant', *būk-lūn-* 'to be bent or folded double over'. Kāšġarī fol. 491 on this formation is worth quoting. In the DankKelly translation: "One says: *är topık yuvdı* 'The man rolled the ball'; then: *topık yuvuldı* 'The ball was rolled'. Then *nūn* may be added to it, thus: *yuvlundı* meaning 'It rolled by itself'. Before the *nūn* was added to the *lām* the verb was intransitive in two respects. One is that the action was performed by an unknown or absent agent; in this case the verb acts intransitively, and when *nūn* is combined with it, the verb becomes intr.

306 The facs. is quite clear: There even is a dot on the N. Only the hook of the L has slipped a bit backwards.

307 *yana ywkıla käl-*, which is quoted there from Kuan 36-7, is obscure.

without anything else performing the action upon it [i.e. middle – DankKelly]. As in the above ex.: *yuvdı* means 'He rolled' – a biliteral tr. verb; when *lâm* is added, thus: *yuvuldı* it means 'It was rolled by the agency of something else [i.e. passive – DankKelly]; or else 'It rolled by itself [i.e. middle – DankKelly]. The verb becomes triliteral and intr. in two respects. And when *nûn* and *lâm* are combined, thus: *yuvlundı* it means 'It rolled by itself'. The verb becomes quadriliteral and intr., progressing from biliteral to triliteral, and from triliteral to quadriliteral.[a] What Kâšγarî means is that *-(X)l-* verbs can be used both as passives and as anti-transitives, *-lXn-* verbs, on the other hand, only as anti-transitives.

With most *-lXn-* verbs there is no oblique nominal at all, e.g.: *agazımtakı tatagılar barça yetlinip artokrak açıg bolup kün t(ā)ŋri yarokı közümtä arıtı közünmäz* (U III 37,31) 'The tastes in my mouth all disappear and there comes an extreme bitterness, and the light of the sun no longer is visible to me'.

There are two instances with dative, one of them local: *küfänçlig suv kwznäkiŋa suklunmışlarka kw[...lüg] köprügüg körkittiŋiz* (TT III 55, an extended metaphor) 'To those stuck in the water-hole of pride you have shown the bridge of [...]'. The other one is not ergative either: *nızvanıta turup nızvanıka yuklunmasar, yertinçü üzä tayansar kirsiz arıg oronka...* (BT I B (67)) 'If he stands in the face of lust and does not pollute himself with lust, if he leans on a dirtless and pure place, ...'. No candidates for ergative expressions have turned up here, and *-lXn-* presents itself as a purely anti-transitive formative.

I have not come across any relative uses of *-lXn-* verbs.

The only verbs which justify considering *-lXn-* a formation in its own right are *suklun-* and the late hap. *boŋlun-*. *üzlün-* and *yuvlun-* are probably best analysed as *üzl-ün-* and *yuvl-un-*, with the *-(X)n-* adding metaphorical content. With the four remaining verbs, the *-(X)l-* stem is practically synonymous with the one ending in *-lXn-*, neither being passive in the strict sense. No *-lXn-* verbs are medial or reflexive.

7.23 Medial verbs in *-(X)d-*

Some verbs denoting states and activities of the body and the mind appear to have been formed with this rare formative. Here is the evidence:

(*bud-* 'to be very cold; to freeze to death' appears in *toŋmış budmış tınlaglarag ... kigürüp...* (MaitrH XI 6 b21) and *är tumlugka budu* (DLT fol. 633). The *EDPT* adds evidence from modern sources. It must be related to *buz* 'ice', which would be an *-(X)z* nominal denoting the object of tr. **bu-*.)

(*sid-* 'to urinate', *EDPT*. The reason for the scarcity of this verb (Heilk I once, two entries in the DLT) may be its meaning. No base attested, but *sik* 'penis' is

a cognate. *sik-* 'to copulate' involves another person, which *sid-* does not. (Admittedly, there are other differences to the experience as well.) Cf. also *sig* 'urine' (section 3.101) and *sig+ä-*. Cf. *kapan-* (section 7.21).)

sök-üd- 'to kneel in somebody's presence' is a hap. in TT II 1,35: *kuvraggaru k(ä)ld(i)*, *d(ı)ndarlar(ka . . .] sökädüp . . .* "vor den Elekten auf die Knie fallend . . .". This is unlikely to be an *-Xt-* causative, as TT II 1 is an archaic text which nowhere confuses the velars. It also has /ü/ as aorist vowel, the phoneme /ö/ in its original shape and several exs. of the directive suffix *+gArU*, which gets rare later on. The meaning of *sökäd-* is not appropriate for *-Xt-* verbs either, for the synonym *sök-* is intr., and its *-Xt-* derivate (q.v. in section 7.56) a simple causative. *ol bägkä sökti sökü* (DLT) and *bo Aytoldı kirdi köründi sökäp* (QB 581) have practically the same meaning as Manichaean *sökäd-*. *sökäd-* was borrowed into Mo., where it has /g/ instead of /k/, but runic *sök-ür-* (q.v. above) shows the Old Turkic velar. The Yak. verb *üöt-* "(Schamane) die Geister herbeirufen, beschwören, unter fließenden Bewegungen des Körpers und vornehmlich der Hand in Richtung Süden den Geistern Geschenke darbieten" must have gotten to it through Mo., as its velar would not otherwise have dropped. (I owe the information on the Mo. and Yak. verbs to Prof. Doerfer.) Cf. also Ordos *sö'-* *ᵏxör-* "saluer en pliant un genou . . .". The hap. *sökäd-* is our only evidence for the vowel of *-(X)d-*.

(*sud-* 'to spit' is another verb of solitary bodily activity. Attested, in addition to what is quoted in the *EDPT*, also in Suv 612,5 (miswritten as 'su-' by A. v. Gabain) and ETŞ 11,106. No base or cognates; lives on in Chuv. *sur-*.)

to-d- 'to be or become satiated'. This, *to-k* (section 3.102), *to-l-*, *to-n-* and *to-ş-* are all cognates. See *to-ş-* (section 7.1) for the base. Cf. also *to-z-umçı* (section 2.75). Exs. for *tod-* are listed in the *EDPT*; there are many derivates from this verb.

uya-d- 'to be ashamed' may belong here. The base *uya-* 'to put to shame' may appear in BT XIII 3,28: *uluqunḍın tözi ünmädin / utrunmuşça boduruŋnu / uyap kalsar s(ä)n bolmaz mu? / antag kalmadın bürökçi /arıgka balıktın ünsär s(ä)n*, . . . 'Isn't it better if you do not set out altogether from your state but, as if opposing them, put your people to shame and stay? In case you do not act this way but set out from the town to the forest . . .'.[308] The ed. takes *boduruŋnu* to be governed by *utrun-*, but that demands the dative of whatever one is opposed to. He translates *uyap* as "beschämt", but that would leave the suffix *-d-* without function. If *aṭ kalıp onıp turur* in LetterTunHuang 12 (no facs.) should in fact be *kalıp wyap*, *uya-* might instead signify something like 'to stay at home'; in that case this entry should be deleted. The *-d-* of *uyad-* (exs. in the *EDPT* but

308 The unusual place of *arıg* before *balık* is demanded by the alliterative pattern.

there are many more) is guaranteed by the DLT and the QB. Four instances written *uyat-* in TT VIII E do not disprove it, for that text also has several *adın, ögid-* and *odog* written with T. *uyat* 'shame' is discussed in section 3.108. (*yūd-* is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; further exs. appear in ETŞ 9,99 (*yūdā elünü*) and 13,126 (*yūk yūḍā*), Profan p. 278 (*çipin taloyug sugurgalı, çömäli tagıg yudgāli kılınurça*[309]), Ht V 13 a 20 (*yaŋa yūḍmiş nom bitiglār ükü üçün*) and 15 a 20 (*yük yūḍmiş atın*) and VII 16 b 5 (*k(ā)ntü özi . . . yudūp*) and Maitr 74 r 2 (*āŋınlārıntā yūdā*), 75,33 (*āŋınlārıntā yūdūp*), *ibid.* 45 (*kapların yūdā*), 51 and 57. *yūd-* is often used with *yük* as object, signifying 'to load something on oneself, to carry' or 'to load on one's pack animal'. It must also be connected etymologically with *yük*, which must be an *-(O)k* derivate from their common base. Such a base is not attested, however. Cf. also *yütür-* (under *-tUr-*).)

An additional verb which *may* have belonged to this formation is *āŋ-it-* 'to bend down (of humans)', if it originally had /d/. *āŋıt-* is discussed in the section on the causative formative *-Xt-*, as it is spelled with T in TT VIII.

The converb and aorist vowel of this formation is /A/, at least as far as the monosyllabic verbs are concerned: *yūdā* is found in Maitr 74 r 2, ETŞ 9,99 and 13,126 and U II 76,3 (Üdrāt), *yūdār* in TT V B 49. When it appears later, *sid-* is also attested only with *-A(r)*. Concerning *tod-*, the DLT says that *todur* is permissible beside *todar*. We have *toḍa* in ETŞ 9,76,[310] however, and QB 923 has *todar. uya-d-*, however, is attested in the aorist form *uyadur* (e.g. in TT VIII E and the DLT), whereas *āŋıtā* is the very common converb form of *āŋıt-*. Since monosyllables do tend to have /A/ as converb and aorist vowel in general,[311] the identity of the original vowel of this formation remains an open question.

All bases of *-(X)d-* verbs are simple. They are expanded only with causative formatives, e.g. *todur-* and *todgur-*.

-(X)d- is an obsolete formative; verbs here mentioned were already preformed by the time of Old Turkic and may, in fact, have been opaque. *-d-* is therefore irrelevant for Old Turkic grammar.

309 This is a simile, which says: 'as when a midge attempts to sip up the sea and an ant to carry a mountain'. The ed. translates the latter as "durchdringen", presumably taking it to be a variant of *öt-* 'to pass through'. I have not met such a variant elsewhere, however; initial /y/ is a reflex of **h*, and cannot be taken to pop up without reason.

310 Interpreted correctly in *UW* 239 a par. d,1 against the ed.

311 See Erdal, 1979 a passim.

Our documentation for this formative is clearly better than what we have for *-d-*, although it is far from being a common or active one. Here are the verbs:

(*alık-* and *alığ* 'bad' (discussed in the *UW*) probably have the base **alı-* in common (distinct from **alX-* > *al-* 'to take'). *alık-* is attested in five instances in DLT fol. 105, translated with terms denoting both physical and moral rottenness, pollution, vility and corruption. Four of the instances are changed to *alık-* by the second hand, which probably took this to be *al+ık-* (q.v. among the *+(X)k-* verbs). Then there is *açmış bars tāg alıku* (Mängi 22), conjecturally translated as "wie die hungrige Tigerin erschöpft ist". The correct content of the sentence is likely to have referred to the vile nature of hungry tigers in general.)[312]

(*amrık-* is a hap. in Tiš, quoted in the *UW* s.v.; it is there translated as "zur Ruhe gelangen, ruhig werden(?)". Need not be an "alter Fehler" for *amrıl-* (q.v. below), although this latter is exceedingly common: *-(X)k-* verbs in general tend to be rare. The base the two verbs have in common is not attested in any case, but its petrified converb *amru*, q.v. in the *UW*, is.)

(*aşuk-* signifies 'to hurry, to be in a hurry' in Uigur (q.v. in the *UW*), in quite a number of Middle Turkic sources (q.v. in the *EDPT*) and in modern languages. The meaning "to crave or long for something" in DLT fol. 105 also has some Middle Turkic evidence for it. In view of its context, the reading *aşuk|maz* in UigBrief C13 may be correct in spite of scepticism in the *UW*; it would belong to the second use. *aşuk-* can be considered to be derived only if it can be proven to be related to *aşun-* 'to surpass, excel' (q.v. in section 7.21. For the meaning, cf. *aşunmaklaşu* 'in competition' (documented in the *UW*).)

(*balık-* 'to get wounded'. The *EDPT* quotes this verb only from the DLT and the QB; found also in Chuast 74, written without the second vowel. This *balk-* can be compared to *elt-* ~ *elit-* and *tark-* ~ *tar-ık-*. The base must have been a verb: Cf. *balığ* 'wounded' (section 3.101 above) and *baş* 'wound'. Its shape could have been either '*bal-*' or '*balı-*': Zieme, 1969: 258 (n. 764) speaks of a verb '*bal-*' said to be attested in an unpubl. 'Lehrtext'; but that could possibly be a form to be understood either way, like '*balıp*'. For the first possibility cf. *yavaş* and *yaval-* (mentioned under *yaval-tur-* below); for the second, the *+I-* verb *ūkli-* and *ūkūş* 'a lot'. Another case similar to that of the *base* of *balık-* could be *sōgūl-* (q.v. under *sōgl-ūn-*) and *sōgūş*.)

bodu-k- is a hap. in ShōAv 312, not understood by any of the eds.: *işlārig işlāgū*

312 I don't believe that *alk-* 'to terminate, exterminate' comes from *al-* 'to take'; there are "semantische Probleme", as the *UW* says s.v. *alk-*. DankKelly consistently spell *alık-* as '*eliq-*'; what they mean by this spelling is not clear to me.

tuşında / bodukmış bilgin boş taş eliglig signifies 'at the time of carrying out meritorious deeds, with a dedicated mind and a generous$_2$ hand'. *bodu-l-* (q.v. below) has a similar abstract meaning in Uigur.

(*böl-ük-* "to get into separate flocks and assemble in them" is a hap. in the DLT noted by the *EDPT*. See *böl-ün-* for cognates and the base.)

(**bur-k-*, perhaps 'to be wrinkled up and become stern, of one's face' is not attested, but cf. Republican Turkish *yüzünü burkmak* and *yüzü burkulmak*. From this come the DLT's *burkug* (q.v. in section 3.101) and *burk-ıt-* 'to make one's face stern'. The DLT's *burış* "a wrinkle in skin or clothing" (fol. 184) is from the same base, and so are *bur-kı* and *buşrı* (a *-şI* form with metathesis).)

çom-uk- is a hap. in InçA *k(a)ln tärin tüügtä çomukmış ud täg* 'like a bovine drowned in deep mud' (ShōAgon 1,270). *çom-* is intr.; cf. *çom-ur-* and *çomr-ul-* below.

çu-k- appears only in TT VIII C5, in a biverb with *ämgä-n-* 'to suffer'.[313] The simplex is attested in the corresponding biverb: *çudılar ämgätdilär* in ms. T III 84-74 r9-10 (quoted in Zieme, 1970 s.v. *čoγ*). Also in] *küçin kün çogı çumakta ötkürü sarıg terilür* (TT VIII I 23) 'By the force of . . . and the striking of the sun (cf. 'sunstroke') the bile gets concentrated' (or: *tirilür* 'regenerated'?) and *amarı[ları]n tarta esä tokıyu toŋ[layu] çuyu bälgürtür* (Maitr 165 r2). *çu-k-* is therefore the anti-transitive where *çu-n-* (q.v. above) is reflexive and *çu-l-* (q.v. below) passive. *çog* 'blaze, glare' is not a cognate; Choi, 1988: 162 suggests a Chin. etymology for it.

(*er-ik-* 'to be bored or vexed' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT, the QB, Middle Turkic etc. The exs. of QB 765, 1005 and 3773 are not quoted there. See also Tezcan's review of the İndeks. The *EDPT*'s lemma is wrongly '*irik-*': cf. *ärik-* in the Codex Comanicus and other cognates under *er-in-* above.)

(*kork-* 'to be afraid' (with dat., later also abl. of what one is afraid of) is taken to be derived from *korı-*; **korı-k-* would have been syncopated like *balk-* and *tar-k-*. *kork-* would originally have meant 'to protect oneself', then, which might be the real meaning of a part of the instances. **korı-k-* explains the shape of *kork-ınç*; see this above in section 3.104 also for the other lexemes containing /ı/ instead of the expected /u/. *korı-* 'to protect' and other derivates from it are attested in the DLT, but *korı-g* appears already in various runic inscrs. (section 3.101). IrqB

313 The two verbs correspond to what is written in Skt. as *ādipita*. This has to be emended to *ādīpita* to give the perfect passive participle of *ā+dīp-*, 'to flame, blaze'. This is what the ed. does to translate *çukup* as "flammend". It has been noted that the shortening of *ādīpita* to *ādipita* would be necessary to save the Skt. metre. Whatever the author of the Skt. text meant, however, the translator apparently took it to be the perfect passive participle of the desiderative of *ā+dabh-* 'to hurt', which is *ādipsita*.

XXXVI reads K¹W R¹K¹ŃÇIŃG vs., in the same *ırk*, W G²R²ŃÇWŃG. The explicit I in the last syllable of the former can only be explained if the verb had an unrounded vowel after /r/. Note that the second vowel of *korıg* is not explicit in any of the instances. Whatever the reason for this, it enables us to read also K¹W R¹*KW R¹ in Toñ 39 as *korıkur*. The IrqB might also have had *korıkınç*. All these deficient spellings could have been better accounted for if the base had been *kor+a-* 'to suffer loss', for /A/ is implied by runic consonant characters; but the meanings of *kora-* and *kork-* do not fit.)

oŋ-uk- 'to wilt' is attested in ShōAgon A 33: *suvsamış oŋukmış usukmış YALN-GUK sogık suvlug yulka tuşarça* . . . The DLT has two entries for this verb, in both with one ex. referring to a man's face and one to a fabric. The human ex. is, in one case, translated as "to become pale", in the other as "to become lean because of illness etc.". For *oŋ-*, the DLT has only an ex. with a fabric, but there is a reference to a person in QB 3845. In addition to the *EDPT* exs., *oŋ-* appears also in QB 4959.[314] The IrqB ex. of *oŋ-* has a horse exhausted in the desert, like the man in the ShōAgon instance of *oŋuk-*.

(*ōç-ūk-* appears in the DLT and once in the QB; quoted in the *EDPT*. Of voice, 'to fail', of breathing, 'to be interrupted', of embers, 'to die'. Although *ōç-* is intr., there is a verb *ōçül-*.)

(*öyük-* or *üyük-* 'to sink into quicksand' is attested only in DLT fol. 138. It must belong to this formation because of its synonym *wyül-* in QB 3090 and *wyük* "quicksand" in DLT and QB 974, 3089, 3090, 3091 and 3795 (the last four not mentioned in the *EDPT*).[315] The base could have had one syllable or two.)

(*sanç-ık-* 'to be routed, to be stabbed' in DLT fol. 380 has passive meaning and could perhaps come from **sanç-sık-* (formation described in section 7.41 below).)

(*savr-uk-* is attested in DLT fol. 380, bot as a lemma and in verse. Of tears, 'to trickle' from the eye; also "of water in flowing rivers when it surges". *EDPT*. Cf. *savr-ıl-* below.)

(*sezik-* is attested only in the DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*. 'to have an apprehension towards somebody in some matter'. See *sezik* in section 3.102 for base and cognates.)

sor-uk- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, where it signifies 'to be inquired about'. There are two Uigur exs. of *sorukmış* 'famous': *suvlug yalınlıg sorukmış bilgä Sukuşmaçudı atl(ı)g bayagut* (ShōAv 10) 'the glorious$_2$, famous and wise *śreṣṭhi* named *Sūkṣmacūḍa*' and *umug ınag bolgalı umaktın . . . aṭ küü*

314 The İndeks to the QB says that *oŋ-* appears also in couplet 1908, but that turns out to belong to *oŋay* 'easy' instead.

315 This must have ended in /k/ and not /g/ as it rhymes with *tāzgin-ōk* in QB 3089.

elinür . . . sorukmış bilgin (ETŞ 10,231). Cf. *küsi sorulmuş* in Gebet, M I and *kü sorug* (Suci).

(*soy-uk-* is a hap. in the DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*: *är soyukı* "The man's property was plundered". Cf. *soyul-* below.)

tar-ık- 'to disperse (intr.), to be driven away, go away'. Quite distinct from *tar+ık-* 'to be or become narrow' (DLT), but confused with it by the *EDPT*. A further ex. is given by the *DTS*, and others can be found in U III 41,5_2 (Mahendrasena), BT I B (100) and (114), BT II 686 (*ket- tarık-*), BT III 572, 1108 and 1109, ms. T II M 12-17 v 2 (*ket- tarık-*, quoted in the footn. to BT I B (74)), ETŞ 20,83 (*tarıkar*) and 20,216 (*ket- tarık-*), BT XIII 13,31 (*tarıku[r]*), 18,3 (*tarıkar*), 37,2 and 46,21 (*ketzün tarıkzun*), Ht IV 1261 (*tarıkdı ketdi*), Buddhāv H 93,[316] Warnke 448 (*[tar]ıkar ketär öçür amrılur*), UigKol 17, Junshō C v 7, Abhi B 48 a 6 (*tarıku tükät-*) and 12 (*tarıkur*), Mängi 15 and elsewhere. In TT VIII *tarık-* corresponds to Skt. *apa+it-*, in ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) in SktUigBil *tarıkmış* to Skt. *gata* 'gone': There is no passivity about the meaning, just intransitivity. Further exs. of *tarıka(r)* can be found in U III 41,5_2, BT I D (315) and Suv 469,21 and 516,22, of *tarıkur* in TT III 94. *tar-* 'to disperse, scatter, do away with, remove' is attested in ETŞ 11,22 with *nızvanı* as object, in QB 2268 with *yagı* and in DLT fol. 201 (verse) of dispersing the enemy army. Cf. *tarkar-* in section 7.52 below and the problems posed by *taral-* (section 7.31). *tarkınç* (section 3.104) comes from *tar-ık-*. *tarık- ket-* is a very common biverb; it appears, beside the exs. mentioned above, in UigBlock 151, UigTot 771 and 943 and Ernte 7. *ketz]ün tarkzun* in ManTüTex (22) 494 and *sezikimiz tarkzun* in Maitr 165 v 28 should not be thought to be a defective spelling but must be an archaic variant or a dialect form: *balk-* < *balık-* also appears in a Manichaean text, and cf. *kork-* above and Ottoman *bur-k-*.

(*tur-uk-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 326, in *kan turuktı* "The blood swelled in the vein"; 'the same when pus and matter gather in a wound'. *EDPT*: '*turuk-*' in ShōAgon 1,152 is a mistake; it should, according to P. Zieme, perhaps be emended to *tur-*.)

us-uk- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT,[317] and translated as 'to be thirsty, to be overcome with thirst'. DLT fol. 104 has a proverb with nominalised *usukmış* "the thirsty one". An Uigur ex. of *usukmış* is quoted under *oŋ-uk-* above. In Ernte 33 we read *usukup, karınları açıp koŋrukup* "sie werden durstig, ihre Magen werden hungrig und knurren". The base is in the DLT trans-

316 *yavlak* (not '*yavrak*', as in the text) *[yo]llar alkugun barça tarıktı [ket]di*, hardly '*[öç]di*' as they write.

317 '*asukı*' there quoted from Kaş. II 165,9 (i.e. fol. 349) must be a printer's mistake: The text has a plain *ḍamma*.

lated just like *usuk-*. The *EDPT* and the *DTS* have Uigur exs., one of them the biverb *us- suvsa-*. A further ex. of *us-* appears in Heilk II 1,13. In TuoLuoNi 143 and ShōAgon 1,63, *us-* is associated with *aç-* 'to be hungry', *suv+sa-* (q.v. in section 6.1 above) is a synonym.

yalk-ık- is a hap. in ETŞ 13,126, quite clear on the facs. 'to have had enough of something, to be nauseated'. Not in the dictionaries. *yalk-* is attested in Suv, DLT and QB. In the preceding line and in rhyme with *yalkık-* is a verb *tal-ık-* 'to go under' (in the whirlpool of *saṃsāra*). This is a hap. in Old Turkic but lives on in a number of modern languages. See *tal-* in the *EDPT*.

Grammar

tarık- is both well attested and transparent. *kork-* is excellently, *aşuk-* well attested, but both are opaque. Among the others, *bölük-*, *wyük-*, *sançık-*, *savruk-*, *sezik-*, *soyuk-* and *turuk-* are attested only in the DLT, *erik-* and *öçük-* only in the DLT and the QB. We have the hapax legomena *amrık-*, *çomuk-*, *çuk-*, *talık-*, *boduk-* and *yalkık-*. *alık-* and *balık-* are also opaque. Beside *tarık-*, the reasonably solid *-(X)k-* verbs are *oŋuk-* (once ShōAgon and DLT), *soruk-* (once ShōAv, once ETŞ 10 and DLT) and *usuk-* (same passage as *oŋuk-*; once Ernte and DLT). Living bases of transparent *-(X)k-* verbs are tr. in *boduk-*, *bölük-*, *çuk-*, *erik-*, *sançık-* *savruk-*, *sezik-*, *soruk-*, *soyuk-* and *tarık-*, intr. in *çomuk-*, *oŋuk-*, *öçük-*, *talık-*, *turuk-*, *usuk-* and *yalkık-*. All *-(X)k-* verbs are intr., and may be inchoative. All bases are simple, except perhaps the DLT hap. *savruk-*; the verbs *bastık-* and *bultuk-* are discussed further on in this section. *-(X)k-* has the causative expansion *-Ar-* in *büt-K-är-ç kıs-K-ar-* and *tar-k-ar-* (section 7.52). The DLT verb *könKär-* (section 7.53) *might* have a similar structure. These are simple transitivations with the causee as object. In a different dialect, the DLT's *bur-k-ıt-* 'to make (one's face) stern' has *-(I)t-* instead.

The converb and aorist vowel of this formation shows great fluctuations. The *-A(r)* and *-U(r)* forms of *tar-ık-* are listed among the various forms quoted for that verb; the *UW* quotes an instance of *aşuka* and one of *aşuku*. Toñ writes *korkur*, but the Suv has *korkar*; the QB fluctuates between /A/ and /U/. The DLT has /A/ in all verbs discussed in this section. Note also that *-sXk-* forms generally have /A/ in their converbs and aorists: *-(X)k-* appears as second element in the formative *-sXk-*, discussed in section 7.41.

bastık- and *bultuk-* have *-(X)k-* as last element of the stem, after *-(X)t-*. While *bastık-* may, however, be derived from the well-attested *bas-ıt-* (discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs below), *bultuk-* appears to have been formed by using a combination *-tXk-*, not attested elsewhere. Cf. Kowalski, 1949: 430.

bas-t-ık- 'to be overwhelmed or overcome by, fall victim to (something)' is in the *EDPT* quoted from *tört türlüg ş(i)mnularka çalsıkmaz bastıkmaz* (TT V B 29) and *ig agrıg üzä basnkmak* (TT VII 40,134, in the *EDPT* misquoted as '. . . *agrıgka* . . .'). We also have [*övkä*] *köŋülkä basţıkıp* "von [Zornes-]Sinn bedrückt" (BT XIII 5,119), *bastıkmış köŋülkä özi* (ETŞ 11,100) and *kalın uuka basţıkmış täg bolup* . . . 'he felt as if overcome by a deep sleep' (UigTot 109). These exs., i.e. the construction with the *üzä* phrase and the one with agentive dative, show *bastık-* to be some sort of passive; *bas-ıt-*, on the other hand, leaves some responsibility with the victim. *bastık-* thus becomes the Uigur counterpart of Qarakhanid *bas-sık-* (discussed in section 7.41). *bas-tık-* is attested only in Buddhist Uigur texts and does not reappear anywhere else. The spelling *basţık-* of UigTot also points in the direction of a connection with *basıt-* (although this is, of course, a very late text).

bul-tuk- is, in DLT fol. 380, constructed in the sentence *buldukı näŋ* "The thing was found". In Uigur, however, it has some very different uses: Like Arabic *wujida*, Republican Turkish *bulun-*, Danish (*der*) *findes* etc., it denotes 'existence'. There appears, in Uigur, to have arisen the need for a verbal way to express the content of *bar* and *yok*. The biverb *bar bultukar* is attested in Scharl 34. We have *bultukar* also in Maitr 4 r16 and Suv 390,2. The verb is mostly attested as *bultukmaz*, of which we have counted 40 instances. In comparison, we have one *bultukgay*, one *bultuksar* (Suv 694,9), one *bulţukup* (Suv 693,13), one *bulţukmasar* (ETŞ 15,47). This count does not include the equally well-attested phrase *-gAlI bultuk-*, which signifies 'to be possible'. The syntax and semantics of *bultuk-* are clearly better to describe within a general account of what serves as copula in Old Turkic. Not to be dismissed is the possibility, suggested in the n. to TT X 526, that *bultukmaz* was contracted from **bul-tuk ärmäz*. The other forms of *bultuk-* could easily have been secondary. The copular domain shows unparallelled phenomena in many languages.

Like *-(X)k-* verbs, then, *bastık-* and *bultuk-* are intr., and their bases are simple. Whether they are syntactically aberrant remains to be seen.

-(X)k- has been said to produce 'intensive' verbs, but I can see no base for this contention; in fact there is no reason to think that there is such a 'signifié' in Old Turkic. *tarık-*, the most common *-(X)k-* verb, is mostly attested in a biverb with the simple *ket-*, in intr. constructions. Most of the other instances of transparent Old Turkic *-(X)k-* verbs have already been quoted; none is accompanied by a direct object or qualifies a direct object, and none has an agentive dative or *üzä* phrase with it. Other than the exs. of *tarık-* and the ex. of *usukup* quoted from Ernte, they all appear in relative constructions: *amrıkmış arıg çaxşap(a)tlıglar* (Tiš), *täriŋ titigdä çomukmış ud* and *suvsamış oŋukmış usukmış YALNGUK*

(both ShōAgon), *bodukmış bilig* and *sorukmış bilgā . . . bayagut* (both ShōAv) and *sorukmış bilgin* (ETŞ 10). *yūzā bata bo sansarta . . . talıkıp / . . . beş yollarta . . .* *yalkıkıp / . . . āmgāk tāginūr tınl(ı)g* (ETŞ 13) is also relative. The kernel of all of these is the agent.

-(X)k- verbs are neither tr. nor passive, then, nor medial or reflexive. They are all anti-transitive. *çomuk-*, *oŋuk-* and *usuk-*, *talık-* and *yalkık-* are, in this sense, over-characterised.

The transparent *-(X)k-* verbs are all late, it turns out, with the exception of *tarık-*. *-(X)k-* appears to be a rejuvenated formative.

7.3 *Passive verbs*

In this chapter we deal with verbs whose subject is the object of the action. A verb is passive if the subject is represented as taking no initiative in the occurrence of the event. The formatives forming such verbs are *-(X)l-* and *-tXl-*. With *-sXk-* (section 7.41), it is the suffering concernee who lacks initiative. *-(X)l-*, the only simple passive formative, is the most common one. Verbs formed with passive formatives often have anti-transitive meaning. *aç-ıl-*, e.g., signifies 'to open (intr.)', where *açın-* is reserved for reflexive and metaphorical uses. 'to separate (intr.)' is *adr-ın-* only in the Yenisei inscrs.; the other sources, from Orkhon Turkic to Uigur, Qarakhanid Turkic and later, have *adrıl-* for this meaning as well. All these matters will be sorted out after the listing and documentation of the specific verbs. *-sXk-* verbs are never anti-transitive, but can, on the contrary, even be transitive: Their subject is the creature *concerned* by the action but not necessarily the ultimate object. The derived verb passivises for the concernee but still governs the direct object of the base verb: Cf. Engl. *The man was given the book*. *-tXl-* appears only in late texts and has a grammatically somewhat biased distribution; *-(X)l-* was, therefore, the only early formative which formed single-participant passives. *-sXk-* is dealt with in 7.4, together with *-tXz-* (with which it has the participant configuration in common).

7.31 -(X)l-: Lexical material

aç-ıl- is documented in the *UW*; beside the concrete meaning 'to open (intr.)', it can also signify 'to open up (intr.), to become evident, to become public' etc. Additional Uigur exs. appear in BuddhUig I 392-5 and UigTot 877 and 1067 (to the *UW* par. 1,a), Māngi 24, BuddhUig II 97, Shō I b 13 and VII a 5 and UigTot 811 and 818 (*UW* par. 2), *açıl- yadıl-* in Kinkashō D,d (pertains to *UW* par. 4) and *ibid.* C,d (for *UW* par. 5), ShōAgon 1,284 and UigTot 64. ETŞ 11,17

should be read as '*Q' ujiklāyū xualanu açıl / kamag ıtsılarnıŋ ara* instead of '*arıl*' of the edition:[318] 'Open up among the disciples like the letter Q'. This is a play on two meanings of *açıl-*, respectively translated as "aufblühen" and "zugänglich werden" in the *UW*; moreover, the letter Q having the shape of a tulip in the Uigur alphabet, the addressee is invited to 'flower' and 'open up' like it. Par. 7 of the *UW* entry should be deleted, as the ex. quoted in it belongs to par. 2: The sun is there[319] likened to a flower, said to have opened. All exs. of *açıl-* are anti-tr., including the Qarakhanid ones quoted in the *EDPT*; none are passive in the strict sense. Cf. *aç-ın-*.

adr-ıl- 'to be or get separated'. See the *EDPT* for runic and Qarakhanid exs., the *UW* for Uigur ones. Found also in LautHöllen 28 (to *UW* par. 2) and AsXete B 1. Often used with the adverb *öŋi*.

adru-l- is found in BT XIII 39,2-3: *alkışlıgın adrulmış alkatmış Uygur elimiz* "unser an Segen *ausgezeichnetes*, gepriesenes uigurisches Reich!". Probably not the passive of *adru-* (discussed in section 5.41) but a cross between it and *adrıl-*. *adrulmış kükülmiş Gandaharti atl(ı)g yaŋa* of Buyan (not an Old Uigur text) clearly belongs to this lexeme, to be translated as 'to excel'.[320]

agt-ıl- "to be knocked down" is attested in DLT fol. 129, ETŞ 11,79 and BT III 369. The DLT ex. is quoted in the *EDPT*, the two Uigur ones in the *UW* under *agtal-*. *agtal-* is a form attested in Tug 48, and Röhrborn says the ETŞ and BT III verbs are "vielleicht Lesefehler" for it. This is stated not to be the case in Zieme, 1982: 175. The Tug 48 biverb *agtalu toŋtalu* is discussed with the petrified converb *agtaru* in section 7.52: I don't think that is an instance of *agt-ıl-*. Kāšğarī says that *agtıl-* comes from *agtarıl-* and the *EDPT* and the *UW* follow him in this belief. *agtarıl-* is also attested in Uigur, however; a sporadic elision of a phoneme pair like /ar/ is something unheard of within Old Turkic. See 1 *ag-ıt-*, the likely base, in the section on *-(X)t-*.

agtar-ıl- 'to get knocked about, turned about or translated'. Exs. in the *UW*. See the base *agt-ar-* in the section on *-Ar-*.

318 This being a second person imperative form, the statement "nur in der 3. Pers." of the *UW* entry (top of 41 b) should be deleted. This emendation is hesitatingly suggested in *UW* 191 b top.

319 *kün ı(ā)ŋrı xaytsısı açılu yarodı* is translated as "der Sonne Glanz ist aufgegangen und erstrahlte", although "Glanz" does not 'open up' in Old Turkic. *xaytsı* is probably the same lexeme as *xoytsı* of TT VIII A 39. It is discussed in Maue, 1987: 37-38, who also mentions a Ht ex. The fact that the present instance definitely refers to a flower may help untie the Gordian knot with which Maue feels confronted.

320 Although a nearly modern addition to the Leningrad ms. of Suv, Buyan is included in the corpus of the *UW*. This Buyan instance is listed as a spelling variant in the *UW* entry for *adrıl-* and, because of its different meaning, given a paragraph for itself. Par. 7 of this entry should now be deleted.

ak-ıl- 'to come flowing, flow about; get dissipated (of the doctrine), to be swept over by etc.'. *UW*; an ex. assigned to *ag-ıl-* by the ed. in Neujahr 56 is better translated as in *UW* 275 b top s.v. *av-*. The biverb *akıl- ün-*, in the *UW* quoted only from ETŞ 20,139 (= UigKan 168), appears also in GuanJing 38-39 and Abhi 1948 (twice). Further additional exs. are attested in UigTot 1156 (of a drop) and Ht V 14 b25 (of a path in the desert being *swept over* by sand). The transferred meaning of *akıl-* as 'to be propagated' is also found in BT XIII 49,1, this verb. Cf. also *akıl-tur- ulal-tur-*, the causative of this biverb. This secondary meaning of *akıl-* (not attested with *ak-*) is calqued on Chinese. In BuddhUig II 475-8, *akıl- sāril-* is used twice in reference to water seen as a mirage. *akıl-* is used together with *kudul-* in BT III 670 and 673 and UigKan 166-8, and cf. *akıl- ış- kudul-uş-* above. *ak- kudul-* is also attested. Note that the bases of *kudul-*, *yadıl-*, *sūzūl-*, *sāril-* and *ulal-*, all used together with *akıl-*, are tr., while *ak-* is intr.

al-ıl-mış 'taken' is in the *UW* quoted from a single Uigur instance; attested also, in a biverb with *bul-ul-*, in BT XIII 58,37. *al-ın-* is never, in Old Turkic, used in a passive sense.

(*alpal-* is, in the *UW*, quoted only from one Suv ex.; it there appears together with *kādlā-n-*. Röhrborn considers the possibility that this be an error for *alp+lan-*; this is made less likely by the existence of a further ex., in Ht V 4 b7: *Odon xan ärtiŋü kadır bil[ig] sür(ü)p alpalmaklıg, antag ädgülärig ädrämliglärig sävdäçi amradaçı*[321] *ol*. An *+A-* derivate of *alp* is not attested. See also *alp+lan-mak* in section 5.6. *alpal-* is 'to be warlike'. For the possibility that a formative *+Al-* was coming up cf. *moymal-* in this section, n. 49 in vol. 2, *oŋal-* (the XIIIth cent. variant of *oŋul-*), Rabġūzī's *sag+al-* and Qarakhanid *tusu+l-*(?).)

(*amrıl-* 'to quiet down, be at peace' etc.; see the *UW* entry for the various Uigur meanings and for most of Uigur documentation. Qarakhanid material is collected in the *EDPT*. Related to *amurtgur-* (q.v. among the *-gUr-* verbs), *amrık-* (a hap. in section 7.24) and the petrified converb *amru* (see *UW* entry), but the base is not actually attested. Some of the exs. not mentioned in the *UW* occur in UigTot 163, 907 and 1239, BuddhUig I 19, 23, 38, 41, 64, 104, 266 and 297, ZiemeTārā 16 a and b, BT XIII 21,12 and 19 and 47,16 and UigKan 84. The *UW* lists a number of exs. where *amrıl-* is used in biverbs with *turul-* or *öç-*. Instances of BuddhUig I, ZiemeTārā and UigTot which I quote also have this last biverb, which served as base for the binome *öçmā amrılma* (discussed in

321 The ed. wrongly writes '*āmrādāçī*', misled by the single *alif* at the beginning of the word. *alpal-maklıg* (and not '*alplamaklıg*') is well visible on the facs., although a bit damaged.

section 3.109).[322] **amu-r-* must have belonged to the *-Ur-* formation (and not to *-(I)r-* discussed in section 6.3) as it has a /U/ converb and a passive derivate. Its cognates, in turn, were *amıl* (section 3.113 above) and *amuş-* in DLT fol. 104. Note also A-MRİ-LU[R] in TibStud.

anut-ul- 'to be prepared' is a hap. in TT VIII G, quoted in the *UW*. *anu-t-* (dealt with among the *-(X)t-* verbs below) is rather common, whereas *anu-* is a dubious hap. in DLT.

apıt-ıl-maksız is a hap. discussed in section 3.329 above, quoted in the *UW* as *abıtılmaksız*. *apı-t-* is discussed in the section on *-(X)t-*. 'to get eclipsed'.

ar-ıl- 'to be tricked' is quoted in the *EDPT* from KT and BQ, in the *UW* from a Manichaean text. Clauson preferred to derive the verb from *ar-* 'to be tired', but the ManTüTex context makes it clear that the other *ar-* was the base.

(art-ıl- 'to get loaded on a pack animal' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and from Middle Turkic. An instance in Ernte 111 is dubious, as the *UW* writes.)

as-ıl- 1 'to get suspended' is quoted in the *UW* s.v. *asıl-* II from two Uigur exs., in the *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB etc. An instance in BT XIII 5,200, by the ed. assigned to this verb but transferred to *asıl-* 2 in the *UW*, should better remain here. It occurs in a fragmentary context, but corresponds to the sentence "Halte dich am Ast eines Baumes fest!" of the Skt. text. As the 'festhalten' takes place only in 1.204, I prefer to read *asılıp kalm*[*ak*] *sögütk*[*ā* instead of Zieme's '*kalm*[*ış*]'.

as-ıl- 2 'to be increased, show gains, flourish, prosper' is attested only in Uigur and documented in the *UW*; a further ex. appears in BuyKäl 30. Wrongly written as '*aşıl-*' in the *EDPT*; see the base in the *UW* and *as-ıg* among the *-(X)g* lexemes above. *asıl-* is very often used in biverbs, with *ükli-*, *küçād-*, *üstäl-*. *küçläri asılzun üstälzün*. *[a]sılmış üklimiş küçlügin küsünlügin* . . . in ms. PelliotOuigour 212, 11 (UigBunken p. 67) shows that such biverbs are interchangeable synonyms.

ata-l- 'to be called by (a) certain name(s)' is only attested twice in Uigur, quoted in the *UW* but not mentioned in the *EDPT*. See *at+a-* above. The 'normal' verb for this content is *ata-n-*, q.v. in section 7.21.

avıt-ıl- 'to get distracted' is read in TT VIII D13 in the *UW*; where previous authorities had given '*avınıl-*'. Exactly the same phrase as in TT VIII D13 is found also *ibid.* 39, translating the same Skt. expression as there. A. v. Gabain had there also read '*avınıl-*', presumably wrongly. This second ex., however, is mentioned in the *UW* neither under '*avınıl-*' nor under *avıtıl-*. See *avıt-* 'to distract and comfort (a child)' among the *-(X)t-* verbs.

322 *öç-* always appears first, *amrıl-* always second, due to the universal tendency to have the shorter element first under coordination.

aya-l- 'to be respected' is attested thrice in Ht, discussed in the *UW*. See *aya-n-* above, *aya-t-* and *aya-tıl-* below.

ba-l- 'to be attached, tied down'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter s.v. '*balmaq beklāl-māk*' (Suv). Further exs.: *bāk katıg bag çugın balmış ārūr s(ā)n* Maitr 116 v8); *tümän türlüg ämgäklär üzä [yor]gälürlär balurlar* (Warnke 577); a further ex. of the biverb *yörgäl- bal-* is quoted under *yörgä-l-* below from ShōAgon. Further: *kälginig tarkarmakta näŋ yana balmamak* (ShōAgon 1,88); *tuysar muntag sarıtakı bag üzä balmaz* (ETŞ 12,35 as rectified by Ş. Tekin); *kamag kut bul-maḍuk yalaŋuklar üç türlüg tözlär üzä tıdılmışka balmışka* (Suv 57,3) "Weil alle Menschen, die das Heil noch nicht erlangt haben, durch die drei (folgenden) Prinzipien beschränkt und gebunden sind, . . .". In all our exs., the 'ties' appear to be spiritual. Cf. *bal-dur-* below.

bagla-l- 'to be bound and fastened'. Not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Appears in ETŞ 13,50 and 15,58 and 59. See *bag+la-* above.

bar-ıl-mış appears in TT VIII A 16 to translate the Skt. passive perfect participle *yāta*: *eyen barıl-* 'to be followed' is the passive of the verbal phrase *eyen bar-* 'to follow' (e.g. twice in TT VIII A 16-17 and in D 15). *bar-ıl-* in DLT fols. 333 and 337 is used as an impersonal and not as a passive verb.

bas-ıl- 'to be pressed down' does not appear in the *EDPT* but is quoted in the *DTS* from the QB. Attested also in BT III 135.

bat-ıl- 'to stick in (something) and be submerged in (it)' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from TT III 27.[323] It is found also in BT I B (160) in fragmentary context, in Wortlisten A v ii 1 and, misspelled, 2 (with Soghdian counterpart), and Maitr 77 r6: *uzun örtlüg yalınlıg tüülärim(ī)z käntü saçım(ı)zta banlıp . . .* 'our long flaming$_2$ hairs get stuck in among our own hair'. The TT III ex. also governs the dative of what the subject gets immersed or stuck in.

bädizā-l- 'to be adorned' is attested in *tuglar pralar yälü kögän tāg ıraktın bädizäl-gäy* (Ht VII 6 b 17). The *EDPT* only has *bāzāl-* from the DLT. See *bädiz+ā-* in section 5.11.

bäklä-l- 'to be fastened; to be held as prisoner'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. '*balmaq beklälmäk*'. Found also in BT II 1163 and ETŞ 13,149. See *bäk+lä-* above.

bıç-ıl- 'to be cut, to be cut off'. *EDPT* only from the DLT on, *DTS* also Tiš (*bıçıl-üzül-*) and Suv. In Buddhist contexts often of the cutting (off) of parts of the body; beside the two mentioned exs. also in Höllen 63, Maitr 201 v5 and

323 Not 'irregular', as written there; cf. *ak-ıl-* above. Cf. also 'to be sunk' from 'to sink' in English. Note that no passive derivate from *batur-* 'to submerge' has till now appeared in Old or Qarakhanid Turkic: The formative *-(X)l-* was apparently sufficient to mark the presence of an instigator for the sinking as distinct from the subject.

LautHöllen 73 (all three *bıçıl- osul-*) and BT XIII 3,62. Attested also in BT I D (51) and BT V 159 (both with *käsil-*), 156 and 161. *bıçış-* is also used in biverbs with *osuş-* and *käsiş-*.

bışrun-ul- 'to get practised, get assimilated (of a religious doctrine)'. Appears only in TT VIII B and C, once in each, quoted in the *EDPT*. *bışr-un-* (q.v. among the *-(X)n-* verbs) is a tr. semantic simplex.

bil-il- 'to be known'. *EDPT*; *ögin ök bililgäy özin* (ETŞ 11,14) is very similar to the phrase quoted there from Ht. Further exs. appear in BT I B (101) and CYK 2, the biverb *bilil-ukul-* in BT III 745 and BT VIII A 275. Cf. the biverb *biltür-uktur-*.

bitï-l- 'to be written'. *EDPT*; mainly in Manichaean texts.

bodu-l- signifies 'to be dyed' only in the QB; in Uigur, however, 'to cling', usually metaphorically.[324] The hap. *bodu-k-* (section 7.24) appears to have a similar abstract meaning. *bodul-* has a positive connotation only in ETŞ 13,24 (*ögirmäkig bodulu işlälim*) and Suv 373,15 (*nırvanka ymä bodulmaz*). See the *EDPT* and *DTS* for exs., the latter especially s.v. *bodulmaq*.[325] Appears also in Maitr 176 v 22 and 218 v 4 (*yapışmış bodulup*), ETŞ 12,7, Suv 102,19 (*tişi tınl(ı)gka bodulmak yapşınmak*), ShōAgon 3, p. 203,18 (*bodulmış yapşınmış kōŋüll[ü]g biliglig*), Genzan D r 12 (*altı adkangularka azlanmak bodulmak*). Spelled as *bodol-* in Brāhmī script (ms. Mz 627 b r 7 in SktUigBil). See also Röhrborn, 1981: 342, where the verb is translated as "sich hinreißen lassen von, entzückt sein von . . .".

boymal-mışlar is a hap. in Ht quoted in the *EDPT*; 'the confused'. Cf. the DLT's *boymaş-*. An *+A-* form is not found, but see the *EDPT* under '*muyum*'; an ex. not quoted there appears in Zieme, 1970 s.v. Cf. *alpal-* above for the formation.)

bōl-ül- is mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor the *DTS*. Found in *ken bōlülmiş bilgä bilig* (BT I B (232)), *üç uguşlar üzä bōlülmiş* "auf drei Generationen verteilt" (BT III 104) and *ançulayu ymä KÖNGÜL tegli kertü töznüŋ bölülmäki yok ärip* . . . (BuddhUig I 134). 'to be or get divided'. Cf. *bōl-ün-*.

bulga-l- is, as a verb, a hap. in Warnke 433: *bilgäli ukgalı umamakları ugrınta ikirçgü sezik üzä kōŋüllări bulgalıp* . . . 'to get confused'. Cf. *bulgalmaksız* (section 3.329) in BT II, the same text as Warnke.

bul-ul- 'to be or get found or attained' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from TT VIII G. Attested also in ETŞ 16,82 and 84, Abhi A 117 a 15 (in UigKan p. 151) and

324 As D. Maue has noted, the Skt. verb *ra(ñ)j-* has both meanings; the most common Uigur use would, I think, be a loan translation.

325 The ex. mentioned in the *EDPT* as appearing in Ht VII 2121 is a conjecture. The suggestion of *EDPT* 297 a s.v. '2 **bo:d*' that *bodu-* be derived from a word written '*boi*' in M II D 11,18 cannot be correct: *d* > *y* is a late development. Rather, that word must be read as *bō* 'spider'.

118 a 13 (in TermBuddh), BT VIII A 8 and BT XIII 49,40 (*mundırtın bululmış agır buyan*) and 58,37 (*alılmış bulul[mış buyan*).

buşr-ul- 'to be annoyed'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also under *buś- buśrul-*. All three of their exs. are from Suv. Add *buşrulu* from Ht IV 1466. See *buş-ur-* among the *-Ur-* verbs.

buz-ul- 'to be spoiled or destroyed'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also s.vv. *arta-buzul-*, *buzulmaq* etc. Further exs. are found in ETŞ 15,60 and 61, BuddhUig I 37, ShōAgon 1,112, Weih 12, ms. T II Y 15,501 (U 3088) v7 quoted in the n. to UigTot 895 and TuoLuoNi 98. The biverb *arta- buzul-* is, beside what the *DTS* mentions, found in BuddhUig II 580, BT XIII 49,15, Maitr 1 r3, InscrOuig IV 10,180. Similarly, there are Uigur exs. (from the Maitr on) of the biverb *buz-arta-t-*. Cf. DLT and QB *buz-uk* 'ruined' (exs. in the *EDPT*).

bük-ül- 'to be bent or doubled over'. In the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, Middle Turkic etc. Attested also in Maitr 12 r 17 and v 9, in *ulug karı bükülmiş är' öz* and *ägrilmiş bükü[l]miş är' öz* respectively. *bük-* is intr. both in the DLT and in BT III 214; this fact is not disproved by the existence of *bükül-*, as Clauson thinks. (*büksül-* 'to burst and split open' is said in the DLT of a wineskin or of "any vessel", in the Suv of the heart. The first is quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. '*bükşül-*', the second in the *DTS* s.v. '*böksül-*' (biverb with *yarıl-*). I take the *EDPT* to be right about the connection with *bük-*, but the immediate source could have been **bük-üz-*; there is no sign of a Ş in any of the four instances. If the second vowel of the Suv ex. can get any additional support, this etymology should be abandoned altogether. Cf. Kaz. *böksör-* "sehr verringern; töten, zerreissen, zerfleischen", quoted by Radloff. The second verb in *kürülügüçi kişiniŋ küsüri sökülẓün, ala tagarnıŋ yivi büsälẓün, targıl öküznüŋ tapanı tälinẓün* (Ernte 103) probably also belongs into this entry, taking the velar to have been omitted inadvertently: The other two verbs imply bursting etc. due to excessive produce, and other passages of the text have similar purport. Seams of sacks burst under such conditions; they do not get pulled together, as Zieme's connection with Osm. *büzül-* implies. Ottoman *büz-* appears to be a variant of *bür-*.).

bürt-ül- 'to be touched'. *EDPT* from one Uigur ex.; attested also in ShōAgon 1,119, AbitAnk 71 (*büritilmäk*) and Maitr 171 r 11 and 76 v 7 (both spelled with BWR°), 63 r 14, 177 v 8 and 89 v 9. In the last mentioned ex., the scribe forgot the L hook, which makes the verb appear as '*bürtür-*'.

bütür-ül- 'to be carried out' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Attested only in BuddhStab I 16.

çomr-ul- 'to be made to submerge' is a hap. in Abhi 1104: *ol s(a)nsar ärür üçün alko tınl(ı)glarka çomrulguluk batguluk orun*, . . . 'because that *saṃsāra* is the place where all creatures are made to go under'. The passage is quoted in n. 348

in UigKan, read as *'çomnul-'*: But the sequence *-(X)n-(X)l-* was not in use,[326] and there is no *'çom-un-'*. What appears in an interpolation after TT VI 195 in ms. P 1 should be read as *çom'ar batar*, not *'çomnar'*, which would have had /U/ as aorist vowel.[327] *çom-ur-*, q.v. below, is well-attested.

çöz-ül- 'to fall apart, be dispersed'. In Suv, of a flying star. *DTS*; the *EDPT* quotes only the DLT (*çöjül-*), the Sanglax and modern Oguz languages (all spelled with the latter S in that ms. Whether a verb in Mängi 18 spelled *çözül-*). The Suv ex. is spelled as *çoẓül-*; there is nothing surprising about /z/ like the Suv instance also belongs here is a different question. The ed. makes the connection with the Suv verb but not with *çözül-* and translates] *turur kut buyan çusulu turur. çog yalın*[as "Glück und Verdienst, sich herabsenkender (?) Glanz und Pracht". This interpretation disregards the punctuation mark and does not, I think, accord with the context. Does Republican Turkish *coş-* 'to exult' have any cognates?

çu-l- 'to be smitten, afflicted'. Not in the *EDPT*. All the exs. in the *DTS* s.vv. *'čol-soqul-'*, *'čolmaq'*, *'čolmaqsïz'* and *'buzulmaqsïz čolmaqsız'* are from the Suv. For base and cognates see *çu-n-* and *çu-k-* above. The literal meaning of *çul-maksız* must be 'without affliction'; not "hitzelos", as proposed in ÄgFrag (1) p. 279.

äg-il- 'to be or get bent' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT, the QB etc. Exs. from QB 3491, 6532 and others are not mentioned there. *äggil-* in ATSS could be either a graphic doubling like *s(ä)vägg = sävig*, *tünärigg* and *mäŋ(i)zligg* in M III text 4, or represent *äŋil-* as the ed. writes: The same text also spells *alŋ+u-* (discussed in the section on *+U-*) as *algu-*. Cf. *ägir- ~ äŋir-*, *äŋ-it-* and *äŋ-iz-*.

ägr-il- has been read in Maitr 12 v 9 in a biverb with *bük-ül-* and presumably as a synonym with it; see *bük-ül-* above. The *EDPT* quotes *ägril-* from the DLT, where it has the two meanings 'to be besieged' and 'to be spun'.

(äş-il- 'to be poured (of dry substances like sand or flour)' is attested in the DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*. The *DTS* assigns a verb in Suv to this lexeme but, as written in the n. to BT XIII 17,12, it is a mistake for *es-il-*. The DLT also has *äş-* 'to pour out a dry substance': To judge by *eşmiş min* 'poured-out flour' in ManMon 65 and 67 and *i*ˇ*s-* in Khal.,[328] it appears originally to have had the vowel /e/.)

ätiz-il- 'to be played (of a musical instrument)' is a hap. in Buddhāv H 89: *ätizilmiş*

326 *-lXn-*, on the other hand, is common. *bışrunul-* is not real counter-evidence, as the very common *bışrun-* has a function, life and meaning quite different from that of *bış-ur-*.

327 Radloff, who edited the ms. as 'Beilage II' to his edition of Kuan, did not put a dot on the 'N of the word (in l.25); this should probably signify that he did not intend it to be read as /n/. Bang, Gabain and Rachmati, on the other hand, write *'çomnar'* in the footn. of their edition.

328 This Khal. verb does not belong to *es-* 'to diminish (tr.)', as Tezcan, 1981: 31 writes.

t(ā)ŋridām oyun bādiz ūn(ı̄. This is the passive of *āt-iz-*, q.v. below among the *-(X)z-* verbs.

āvr-il- 'to turn, revolve, turn back; to develop (intr.); to practise'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. ETŞ 10,51 and 277, 13,135, 155 and 163 and 16,78, Maitr 4,47, 15,12 and 44 r10, Ht V 13 r17 and v20 (both *yanturu āvril-*), thrice in BuddhUig I 179-180, Buddhāv H 51, Suv 652,13-15 (*oŋaru āvrilmiş*; quoted in the n. to BT VII A 43), UigTot 742 and 745 (*yokaru āvril-*), ShōAv 45 (*törü eyin āvril-*) and 139 (*inçgälāyü körüp alkonı, āvrilip yana bizinkā kāliŋlār*), ShōAgon 1, p. 157,2 (*yol āvrilmäz yanmaz*) and BT XIII 55,7 (*ādgülük işlärdä āvrilip y(a)ratınıp . . .*) bring additional exs. The BT XIII 55 phrase appears also in BT III 864; but *āvril-* was there deleted by the first hand and replaced (for no good reason) by *āvrildür-*. *+tIn āvril-* in LautHöllen 1 and 37 is 'to turn away from (an action etc.)', i.e. not to do it.

(*er-il-* appears in DLT fol. 107 in a biverb with *sarıl-*, translated "to be shaken with grief and remorse". Exs. in QB 5629 and 5773 were identified by Tezcan in his review of the QB İndeks, and translated as "üzülmek"; 5773 also has the binomial *eril- sarıl-* just mentioned. The İndeks itself confuses these with *ir-il-* "küçül-, gedil-" (10 exs.). Cf. *er-in-*, also for other cognates. The Uigur hap. *eritil-* has a different meaning.)

erpā-l- 'to be sawn'. TT VIII G and DLT, quoted in the *EDPT*. The *EDPT* and the *DTS* quote *erpā-* only from the DLT, but it is attested also in LautHöllen 119. Cf. *erpā-K* (section 3.101) and *ārpā-ş-*.

es-il- 'to diminish (intr.)' is quoted in the *DTS* from DLT fol. 139 and Suv (*esil-mäksiz koramaksız*). *EDPT* 117 b and 248 a wants to 'emend' this verb to '*egsil-/eksil-*' (meaning *āgsū-l-*, not in use before Middle Turkic) and has one Uigur ex. Attested also in Suv 71,1 (with *ūklimāk*; still written as '*eşilmāk*' in Suv-Schul p. 131) and 516,21-2, BuddhUig I 18 and 23, UigTot 508 and 510 (with its antonym *ūklimāk*), Maitr 109 r10 and 168 v10, ShōKenkyū III 23 (with the same antonym) and Ht VII 7 b13. '*ezilmāk*' and '*ezilmāksiz*' in the *DTS* seem also to belong here. In ShōAv 310 we have *ertāki tāg etgūkā ugraglıg esilū turur bodunug bokunug* . . . A further ex. appears in QB 221, as stated in Tezcan's review to the QB İndeks;[329] another one presumably in Warnke 335, where '*işilmāklig tuş*' should be read as *esilmāklig tuş* 'age of decadence'. The n. to BT XIII 17,12 assigns an instance in Suv 433,11 to this verb as well (apparently with *kora-* like the Suv ex. quoted above, and like a further ex. in BuyKāl 35). *es-* 'to reduce' is attested in *ār at kul kūŋlārniŋ aş ton yegū içgülārin estilār* (Maitr 75 v24) and, in a biverb with *tart-* and signifying 'to disappropriate', in Maitr 62 v13 and 82 r6. *bodunnuŋ āmgāklārin esdāçi* (ShōAv 316) signifies 'who reduce

329 Dankoff translates this as 'to be hanged', presumably reading *asıl-*; unlikely.

the suffering of the people' and not "wünschen ... daß die Leiden des ... Volkes vergehen": The ed. appears to have been thinking of *ıstā-* instead of *es-*. *beş yükmāklārig kördüktä / birdäm kertü nom bar / biligsiz karaŋgu / birl[ä] turur, esär* / (BT XIII 17,12) should not be translated as "abnehmen": 'When one sees the five aggregates, at once there is one true doctrine. The darkness of ignorance halts on the spot, and one reduces it'. The sequence *öçür- es-* quoted in the n. thereto from Suv 588,12 also shows *es-* to be tr., as do the Maitr exs.. *es-* is attested also in QB 5280, also to be translated as 'to make less, reduce'. According to Tezcan, 1981: 311 this base is attested also in Anatolian Turkish.[330] A cognate is *es-iz* (q.v. among the *-(X)z* nominals).

eşt-il- is the most common variant of the passive of *äşid-* 'to hear' and signifies 'to be heard'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter s.v. *ešitil-*. The original shape of the base, used without exception in Orkhon Turkic and common also later, had an /ä/ in the first syllable. The alteration to /e/ is a case of *Umlaut*; appearing most when the second vowel is syncopated, it is due to compensation. *eştür-*, an *-Ur-* derivate discussed below, practically always shows syncopation and practically always /e/. The behaviour of the passive is more varied: Two thirds of the exs. are syncopated, nearly two thirds have /e/, nearly two thirds write the dental as /t/. Among the exs. not mentioned in the dictionaries, we find *eştil-* in ManTü-Tex 396, thirty three times in Maitr and in MaitrH IV 13 b6-7 and X7 a21, *eşidil-* in UigTöt 565 and 706, *äşdil-* in BT VII A 338, *äştil-* apparently in Laut-Höllen 92 (thus(?) facs. against *e°* of the ed.) and *äşidil-* (the etymology-sensitive variant) in ETŞ 11,51 (according to P. Zieme perhaps for the sake of the metre) and 20,147, InscrOuig III 13, Ht VII 10 a5 and X 531-2, BuddhUig II 19, 29, 47, 416 and 565, Warnke 791, TUO 19 = XVIII, BT XIII 4,11, and 24,3.

Often has *ün* 'voice, sound' as object. Cf. also *äşid-tür-* in section 7.57.

et-il- 'to be made, arranged'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.vv. '*edād-etil-*' and *biš- etil-*. Additional exs. in Sho III a 11 and XII a 7, eight times *etilmiş* in Maitr, BuddhUig II 493 (with antonym *buzul-*); the biverb *etil- yaratıl-* also in BuddhUig II 330, GuanJing 2-3 and 24, Shō VII a 3 and VIII b 6, AbitAnk 58 and probably TuoLuoNi 115. This biverb always has the shape X *üzä etilmiş yaratılmış* Y 'a Y adorned$_2$ with X'.

ırga-l- 'to sway, to be shaken'. In the *EDPT*'s exs. said of trees. Attested also in UigTöt 262 (*ırgalur täpräyür* of the human body), Maitr 145 r8 and 156 r22 (of divine palaces) and 153 v24 (with *titrä-*, of mount Sumeru) and Ht VII 3 a9 (*yelkä ırgalur sögüt* [*tāg*]). *ırga-*, in the *EDPT* quoted form the DLT, is found also in Rāma 9. Cf. *ırga-g* (section 3.101).

igid-il- 'to be fed, reared'. The *EDPT* has this stem only from TT VIII D as 'hap.'

330 But not in Khal., as he thinks; cf. footn. 328.

and, as a separate entry, *igdil-* (same meaning) from the DLT. *igdil-* is attested also in M III 45,6_2 (text 32).

irk-il- 'to be accumulated'. *EDPT* from the DLT on; attested also in QB 310 and 5502, and in ETŞ 10,65: *ilkisiz uzun sansarın bārū irkilū kālmiş tuuy erinçü* '. . . which have been accumulating since . . .'.

kadrıl- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT: in *anıŋ boynı kadrıldı* "His neck twisted". *kadır-* signifies also 'to turn (tr.) back'; its etymology is discussed in section 6.3. The following is also an ex. for this verb: *yaŋalar bāgi . . . oŋaru tāgzinū kadrılu kayıp . . . InçA tep tedi* (MaitrGeng 7 a 5) 'The lord of the elephants twisted back around over his right side and . . . said as follows:". Cf. *kerū kaydı* 'He turned back' in the DLT. Then we have *kamaguru tükäl bāl-gülāp, kadarılıp bārū* (not '*baru*') *kälinlär* (Shō VI b 9) 'Find out about it all$_2$ and come back here'. This is more likely to belong here in spite of the second *a*, and not to *katar-* (discussed in the section on *-Ar-*): The passive of a causative is inappropriate here.

kagr-ul- ~ *kagur-ul-* is, in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, quoted only from Suv (several times) and the DLT. In Suv it is used in connection with *busan-* and *busuş* and signifies 'to be mentally tortured', although *kagur-* (apparently a simplex) is 'to parch or roast'. In the following passage the first verb may also be this one, but P. Zieme tells me that the ms. has disappeared: *sagur(u)lgay örtängäy [o]tlug tamu içintā* (M III 7,11_2, first text) is written in Uigur writing, in which S and Q would look rather similar. A parallel passage is written in Manichaean script, but the critical stretch is a lacuna: *[ka]grulgay ör⟨t⟩ängäy otlug [tamu] içintā* (M III 6,6_1, text 1).[331] The original and concrete use of this verb is attested also in BT XIII 3,64: *ayaztakı künnüŋ çogı üzā / arturu birdām kavrıldı* '(They) got quite$_2$ parched by the blaze of the sun in the clear sky'. In the DLT, *kagrul-* and *kavrul-* are said to be alternatives. Several further instances of *kavrıl-* also appear to belong here rather than be passives of *kavır-* 'to collect; constrict': *āmgākin kavrılıp ādgü yolçı yārçi baxşıg kōrü umadım* (MaitrGeng 4 b 14); *xua çāçäklāri kavrılur* (Maitr 198 v 18); *oŋmaz kavrılmaz kut küçintā* (Maitr 28 v 1). For *kudı bolsu duşman başı kavrılu* (QB 119) one can really hesitate between *kagr-ul-* and *kavr-ıl-* as etymology.[332]

kam-ıl- 'to be struck down, fall to the ground'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *tüš- qamıl-*. Also in *oprıda tüşär biz kamılur biz* (Maitr 174 v 5), *tōpön kamılıp . . .* (BT XIII 12,152) '(I) fall to the ground on my head and . . .' and ig

331 The *EDPT* would like to change this to '*sugurul-*'; such a verb, however, does not exist either.

332 The *EDPT* assigns the QB instance to *kavr-ıl-*; Tezcan agrees with him in the review of the Q İndeks, against the translation of the İndeks. Especially after the form appearing in BT XIII, o cannot be so sure any more.

agrıgka naş bolup är'öz ölüp kamılsar . . . (Suv 366,13 quoted in *UW* 72 b middle) "wenn der Körper auf Krankheit$_2$ trifft und sterbend zusammenbricht . . . ". Should also be read in IrqB XII, misunderstood by Clauson:[333] *är avka barmış, tagda kamılmış. "täŋridä ärklig!" ter. yavız ol* 'A man went hunting. On the mountain he fell to the ground. He says "O almighty in heaven!" . This is bad'. Cf. *kam-ıt-* below.

kar-ıl- appears, in DLT, QB and Suv, together with *katıl-*, except in the DLT's Oguz ex.; all these (mentioned in the *EDPT*) mean 'to mingle (intr.)'. The same biverb appears also in *kimniŋ kõŋüli bo üç türlüg ädgülär birlä katılu karılu turgalı ögränmiş ärsär* . . . (*ibid.* r27).[334] Cf. the biverb *katdımız kardımız* in Maitr 62 r20-21. *karıl-* is attested without *katıl-* in BuddhUig II 451: *yana ymä alko* (not "LWQ, as the ed. writes) *nomlarnıŋ çınju tözi kavışdaçı ymä ärmäz, karıldaçı ymä ärmäz, yalŋuz bälgülüg ärür*. Cf. also *al*[*ko*] *äd tavar barça tolp karılsar* . . . (Maitr 1 r14).

kat-ıl- to be mixed with something' and associated meanings, also 'to interfere with somebody's actions, come into conflict with him'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; the biverb *katıl- karıl-* is discussed in the previous entry. Further exs. of *katıl-* in M I 17,8 (TeilBuch), BT III 293, HukVes I 9-10, BT VII A 784 (*tüzül- katıl-*) and 787, Maitr 60 v 6 and 140 r14 and UigTot 457. *birlä katılmak* in AbhiKārKomm 5 and 8 signifies 'to correspond with someone'. *ikägü kaŧ(ı)lıp ätöz bolur* (UigTot 466) shows that the relationship between the two mixing entities can also be a symmetrical one. *katıl-* also governs *birlä*, e.g. in UigTot 348, *sūŧli suvlı tägbilig birlä kaŧılıp tutur*. For this, cf. also *katış-* and *katılış-* in section 7.1 above. 'to have to deal with something': *bo yer suv bag borluk savıŋa ŧ(ä)ŋri mojak aŧtadan xruxanlar katılmazun, iş ayguçılar bilzün* (ManMon 94); *saŋa katılmaguka ŧ*[. . .] *münça sini birlä öç käk sürüşmäz* [*m*(*ä*)*n*] (TuoLuoNi 325) "dir nicht in die Quere zu kommen [habe ich versprochen]. Von nun an werde ich an dir keine Rache$_2$ ausüben".

käd-il- has, in TT I 149 and DLT, clothing as subject and signifies 'to be put on, to be worn'. *börk täg kädilü* (Mängi 24) "wie eine Mütze aufgesetzt wird" also has this meaning. A second use of *kädil-* seems to be to refer to the (in some way visible) adherence of sin or meritorious deeds to somebody: *ayıg sakınıp kılmış işläri özläriŋä vn yanıp kädilzün, ayıg sakındaçıl*[*arka*] *kädilzün, aşnusında ok ayıg iştä ilindäçilärkä vn* [*ya*]*n*[*ıp*] *kädilzün, öŋ' d*[*ün*] *ked*[*in* . . .] *ya*[*nı*]*p kädil-*

333 *kamla-*, the verb which Clauson takes to have stood there, does not appear before the XIVth century according to *EDPT* evidence. Even there, it signifies 'to practice medicine' and not the meaning demanded by the present context.

334 Reedited in Laut, 1966: 204; translation on p. 207.

zün (BT VII L 3-9) versus *täŋri kızının tişi äṭ' özi tägşilip äzrua täŋri äṭ' özlüg boltı, bodis(a)tvlarnıŋ kutı buyanı kädilti. anı körüp ulug äzrua täŋri aŋsız muŋadıp taŋlap . . .*[335] (Suv 381,12). Cf. *käd-ür-* below, and the base attested in the Codex Comanicus: *ätüz käy-* (< *ätüz* < *äṭ' öz käd-*) is said of the incarnation of Jesus Christ. For this use of *kädil-*, 'to be transformed into . . .', there are five exs., three of them mentioned in the *EDPT*; all of them are Manichaean: In M I 18,3_2 and 5_2 and ManUigFr 400,1, the entity into which the subject is transformed appears in the dative; in M III 15,7_2 (text 7) and M I 21,4 the goal appears in an *üzä* phrase. It may be a coincidence that, in these last mentioned two exs., there is a many-to-one transformation. Cf. *kädil-tür-* below. In M I 21,4_1, *kädil-* is paraphrased as *birlä kanl-* 'to mix and become one'. The Old Turks appear to have understood the notion of transformation through masquerade.

kämiş-il- 'to be thrown away'. Found in BT III 134 and TT VIII D (reference in the *EDPT*). *kämiş-* is a tr. simplex.

kär-il- 'to stretch (intr.), get stretched'. Attested in the biverb *karın ürülmäk kärilmäk* "des Bauches Anschwellung" in Heilk II 1,39 and 60; the *EDPT* also has the evidence from the DLT. Found further in Ernte 116 and Tug 36, and in *kärilip töpön yükünür m(ä)n* 'I stretch (down my) head and worship (Buddha)' (BT XIII 12,26).

käs-il- is a biverb with *üz-ül-* in all three pre-Qarakhanid exs. quoted by the *EDPT*. This same biverb is found also in BT VII A 682 and Shō XV 6. The biverb *bıç-ıl- käs-il-* is attested in ManTüTex 9,159 and BT I D (51). *sizin ulınız näçük käsilip yerdä tüşmäz*? (HamTouen 1,41) "Comment votre langue n'est-elle pas coupée et ne tombe-t-elle pas à terre?" has a physical use for this verb; some of the exs. mentioned above, however, signify 'to be discontinued'. *isig tını käsilip . . .* (BT XIII 16,15) is "His warm breath is cut off, and . . .'; the same expression appears in the DLT.

käv-il- 'to get weak'; with *küç küsün* of strength, 'to get undermined'. *küç küsün kävil-* is, in addition to what appears in the *EDPT*, attested in Ht VII 2 b 19 (biverb with *arta-*) and X 439 (biverb with *alk-ın-*). Further exs.: *bo äṭ' öz kävilip küçsiräp artayur* (Suv 588,4 quoted in *UW* 206 a middle) "dieser Körper wird schwach und verfällt"; *kävilmäkkä barı* [*tü*]*käṭtim*[336] (Ht IV 299) and *tarıgçı bäglär . . . kävilü* (Ernte 41). *käv-* 'to weaken somebody's strength' is attested in the DLT; cf. *kävş+ä-*.

335 Ş. Tekin has a misled translation. In a n. to it there is a reference to Gabain, 1950, a previous edition of the grammar. That, however, has the correct translation.

336 *tükät-* (and not *tükä-*) is a perfective auxiliary. *küçüm küsünüm kävilü tükäṭti* of Ht VII 2071-2 should not be changed to '*tükädi*', as written in *UW* 214 b mid-page.

664

keŋür-ül- 'to get widened, to get spread'. *DTS*; not in *EDPT*: Quoted from Suv. Attested also in *atı küsi ke[ŋü]rülmiş ärdi* (Ht VII 15 b14-15) 'His name and fame had roamed wide' and *nirvannıŋ köni yolı açılzun keŋürülzün* (BT XIII 46,25) 'May the righteous way of *nirvāṇa* be opened wide'. In his edition in UigFalt 156, Hazai read this as '*ölzün kigürülzün*'. Zieme corrected the first verb but left the second one unchanged, although the N is clear on the facs.[337] *açıl- keŋürül-* is phraseologically connected with *keŋürü açıl-* of HtPek 80 a2 (quoted in *UW* 41 b s.v. *açıl-*, 4); cf. also the instances of *keŋürü aç-* quoted in *UW* 38. The two verbs are in antithesis to *tonzun bäklänzün* of the previous verse. Further, there is a *bälgü nom keŋrülmäklig sävinç* (HtPar 58 r17-23) and a *keŋürülmäklig bilgä bilig* (UigTot 53). See *keŋü-r-* in section 7.51 below.

kıl-ıl- 'to be done, to be made'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in ETŞ 11,159 and 13,15.

kır-ıl- 'to be scraped away', *EDPT* and *DTS*. Except in the DLT attested in Suv in the biverb *ärt- kırıl-*, a euphemism for dying. The same biverb was perhaps intended in BuddhStab II 20, in *ärtmiş kırılmış ög kaŋ aka ini kız kälinlärimiz*, although the facs. looks more like the ed.'s *kınıl-*. As especially the meanings of *kınıg* and *kınımlıg* (qq.v. above) show, *kın-* rather means 'to strive towards, be intent upon'; this would not fit here. Some of the Middle Turkic exs. of *kırıl-* quoted in the *EDPT* have meanings like 'to be destroyed' and 'to be massacred'. *kır-* 'to pluck out hair, to scrape (e.g. the ground)' is attested only from the DLT on. Cf. also the common biverb *ärt- kıyıl-* below.

kırşa-l- is, in the *EDPT* quoted from DLT fol. 383, where it appears in: *anıŋ başıŋa taş kırçaldı* "The stone struck his head and fractured the skull". The DLT has the base also as *kırça-*, discussed in section 5.11 above. The shape as given above appears twice in Ht X: *samtso açarı . . . adakı tayıp sürçüp yoţası ançak(ı)ya kırşaldı* (Ht X 504) 'His foot slipped and he stumbled and his thigh was wounded somewhat';[338] *tayı[o] samtso açarı adakı kırşalmak* [*ug*]*rınta agır tapsız bolti* (Ht X 983) 'The Dai-Tang master Tripiṭaka quite lost his energy as a result of wounding his leg'.

kıs-ıl- 'to be or get squeezed'. *EDPT*; attested also in Heilk II 1,10 and as *kısag taŋagta* (i.e. *kısıg taŋıgta*) *kısılur taŋılur* (Maitr 114 v7). The inscriptional

337 *kigr-ül-* is attested in the DLT (q.v. in the *EDPT*) as the passive of *kigür-* (discussed among the *-gUr-* verbs): *tavar āvkā kigrüldi*. As expected, it takes the entity which is introduced as subject.

338 *UW* 133 b s.v. *ančakya* A,a translates this as "sein [Schien]bein wurde etwas aufgekratzt"; if that were all that happened, however, the outcome would not have been as grave as it turns out to be subsequently. Tezcan wrongly reads both instances as '*korsal-*', a verb which does not exist, '*korsa-*', as Tezcan read in Ht X 508, should be *kogşa-* 'to become weak' (q.v. in the *EDPT*). The instance quoted in the n. to Ht X 504 from U III 69,6, by the ed. read as '*kurşa-*', may also have been *kogşa-*; the ms., at any rate, is now lost.

instances in the *EDPT* entry for *kıs-* probably constitute a different verb; otherwise, *kıs-* is there quoted only from the QB and the DLT on. We also find *kıs-kıyı-l-* 'to be hewn, felled'. The *EDPT* has exs. from Ht VII 1887-8,[339] DLT and QB; another one from QB 5076 should be added. The Ht ex. mentioned and the ones in Ht IV 1106 (*elig bäg kıyılmışda ken . . .*) and 1195 (*Şila aditi elig kıyılu*), Suv 395,17, BT XIII 38,38 (*ärtmiştä kıyılmışta*), BT XIII 49,71 (*ärtmiş kıyılmış ög kaŋ . . .*), Ht X 498 (*man[ga är]ıgülük kıyılguluk b(ä)lgü ol*) and UigOn III B r5 (*boävniŋ barkn[ŋ e]dilări iälări ärtmiş kıyılm[ış ıdok]arka . . .*) are all used metaphorically about the death of a honoured person. *ärt- kıyıl-* quoted under *kırıl-*, the mss. permitting. *kıyı-* is *not* an alternant of *kıdı-*; the matter is discussed under *kıdı-g* in section 3.101 above. *kıyı-* happens not to be attested before DLT and QB, where it has two distinct meanings; basically, it signifies 'to cut slantwise'. *kıyı-ma*, *kıyı-n* and *kıyı-k* are cognates attested in Uigur, *kıyïur-*, *kıyış-* and *kıyma* from the DLT on.

koŋr-ul- 'to be uprooted', *EDPT*. Before Middle Turkic attested only once in Suv. The first certain ex. for the base is in the DLT. Another one may appear in TT IX 67 = Pothi 450, in *]larıg başkoklarıg konku[r-*; see *başgok* in section 2.94.

koş-ul- 'to be joined to something, by something or through something'. In the *EDPT* from TT VIII A, DLT and Middle Turkic. Add *üçägü koşulup . . .* (UigTot 381) and *alko koşug ~ koşuglar üzä koşulguluk bolmakı* in Junshō C r3 and Abhi B 48 a1 ff. In QB B 59, *koşul-* refers to the composition of verse. *koş-* 'to conjoin' is a simple verb not related to *kon-*, *kod-* or *kop* 'all'; *koş* 'a pair' (q.v. in section 3.103) probably comes from **koş-uş*. The aorist form of *koş-* is *koşar* (DLT and QB) and not '*koşur*'. *kon-* does not have the converb and aorist vowel appropriate for *-(X)n-* verbs either; the problems encountered if one wants to assign *kod-* to any of the *°d-* formatives are more of the semantic sort. *koş-* has a plurality of objects, not of subjects (as the use of the *-(X)ş-* formative would have implied). *kop* is semantically far away.

kömm-ül- 'to be buried'. By *DTS* and *EDPT* quoted only from QB on; found also in BT III 135 and Maitr 74 r8.

könnt-ül- 'to be straightened; to be put right; to be healed'. A Suv ex. (biverb with *oŋarıl-*) is quoted in the *DTS*, a Ht ex. in the *EDPT*. Also *yatıp atl(ı)g külüg otlar üzä ämläp könnülmäsär* (TuoLuoNi 123) and *igi kämi [. . .] könnül[* (*ibid.*

339 The accusative in *baxşım(ı)znı kıyılu tep äşidip . . .* (Ht VII 1887-8) is not "a scribal error", as Clauson writes, but an integral part of the *accusativus cum indicativo* construction quite common in Old Turkic.

243). *kön-üt-* 'to make straight, to make something straight about oneself' is attested only in the DLT and the QB. *kön-* 'to get straight' appears also in ThS I a 6[340] and, not mentioned in the *EDPT*, Rabġūzī. QB exs. of *könüt-* which the *EDPT* does not have appear in couplets 2884, 4997, 5204, 5527, 6082 and 6561. Cf. *kön-i* (section 3.118).

kör-ül- 'to be seen' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from TT VIII D and the DLT. Attested also in QB 4249; also in *yügärü*] *körülü turur* 'It is evidently visible' (Junshō A r 3) and *anılayu ok körülür barı* (Abhi 2349, translated in *UW* 141 b).

köşit-il- 'to get obstructed' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *köşi-* has the obstructing entity, *köşi-t-* (q.v.) the obstructer as subject. Exs.: *köşitilmiş kertü tözlüg tınlag oglanlarnıŋ aşaylarıŋa çarıtlarıŋa yaraşı körk mäŋizlär körkitü . . . köşiklärin tıdıgların ketärip tarkarıp . . .* (Shō XI b 11); *alko tınl(ı)glarnıŋ biligsiz bilig üzä bilgä bi[lig]lärі ürtülüp nızvanıları üzä koŋüllärі köşitilip . . .* (Warnke 213) "wird die Gesinnung verhüllt" and *alko tınl(ı)glar ikirçgü seziktin öŋi ödrülmäyük, [. . .], nomta üküş tıdılurlar köşitilürlär* (*ibid.* 415).

kötr-ül- 'to be raised, exalted'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. The common title *atı kötrülmiş* is dealt with in *UW* 259-60. Related are also *Ku[mara]çivi baxşınıŋ atı küs[i] kamagta kötrülmiş ärdi* (Ht V 1 b 19) and *kopta kötrülmiş nom eligi* (SuvGeng 598,7). A further ex. is quoted under *külä-l-* below. *kötür-* (discussed among the *-Ur-* verbs) has no attested base in Old Turkic.

kuç-ul- 'to be embraced, carried in the arms' is a hap. in TT VIII D, quoted in the *EDPT*.

kud-ul- 'to be poured'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *aka kudulu başladı* (BT III 123 and 128), *akıl- kudul-* (*ibid.* 670 and 673), *suvlar kudulup . . .* (ETŞ 20,137), *kudulur sular* (thus Ernte 22), *kudulur akınlar* (Ernte 23) and a further one in ShōAgon 1,119.

kurı-l- ~ kurul- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Its etymology is discussed under *kurug* in section 3.101 above; note that its base is intr. The base signifies 'to dry (up)', its *-(X)l-* derivate, metaphorically, 'to suffer loss, get destroyed'. The biverb *kurıl- arta-* is attested in BuddhUig II 183: *kololayu körsär m(ä)n bo ätözümin, kurıldaçı*[341] *arṭadaçı ärür, näŋ ür turmaz*. Two lines further: *baxşıka tapıg kılsar m(ä)n, kurılmaksız bäk mäŋü ätözüg bulgay m(ä)n*. The form *kurılmaksız* has the same meaning in ETŞ 13,72. Warnke has the other variant: *ġmtı bo üdtä mäniŋ tört m(a)xabutlarım takı kurulmadın . . .*

340 *otka könmiş kılıç*, as we read there, cannot be 'a sword burnt through fire' but only 'a sword straightened through fire': Since the text also has the word *koñçı* 'shepherd' with *ñ*, *kōñ-* could not yet have become *kön-* (or *köy-*) in it.

341 Thus, as the facs. shows clearly; not qwryl'-, as Tekin writes.

(539) "in dieser Zeit, wo meine vier Elemente nicht verfallen sind" and *ol kişi nä [är]sär ymä esilmädin özi ǫk kurulup* . . . (614) "ohne (die Tugend) jenes Menschen, wie es auch sei,[342] zu vermindern, selbst überaus Schaden nehmen". Cf. *kurul-dur-*.

kutadţur-ul-mış 'given good fortune' is a hap. in USp 103 a, a dhāraṇī; the *EDPT* tacitly emends the dentals of the form. See *kutad-tur-* below.

(*kutsıra-t-ıl-mış* is the inverse of the previous lemma, 'a person from whom divine favour is withheld'. Hap. in ETŞ 10,67, not mentioned in the dictionaries. *kut+sıra-* is an intr. hap., '*kutsıra-t-*' not attested at all.)

kutr-ul- 'to be saved, to attain salvation' apparently comes from *kutur-* 'to pass one's limits, be excessive; rave'. It is the intr. counterpart of *kutgar-* 'to save' (discussed in section 7.52); they probably come from the same intr. base. *EDPT* s.v. *kurtul-* and *DTS* s.vv. *qurtul-*, *boğun- qurtul-*, *oz- qurtul-* (*qutrul-*), *qutrulmaq* and others. A proper name spelled Κουτλουμούς and Κουτουλμούς is common in Greek sources[343] from the XIth century on. The variant without /r/ is found in most modern languages. *kutul-* appears to have been normal in the QB, while the DLT has both *kutul-* and *kurtul-*. Kāšğarī says in fol. 383 that *kurtul-* comes from *kutul-*, in fol. 329 that *kutul-* could come from *kurtul-*.[344] *kutrul-* is the most common variant in Uigur: Beside the exs. quoted in the dictionaries, it appears in Maitr 465 r6, BT I D (86) and F (36), fifteen times in BT II,[345] BT III 403, ETŞ 9,49, 13,179, 15,56 and 66 and 20,162, Hazai Aval 21-22, BT VII A 698, BT VIII A 25-6 and BT XIII 49,74 (these four with the biverb *oz- kutrul-*), UigTot 485 (*kuţrulmaklıg yol*), ShōUigFrag 30 and 32, Shō XIV b2 (with subject, in *ātōz kutrulmak kūsūş ōrit-*) and so forth. *kurtul-* strikes us as the variant of sources standing outside the orthographical norm: BuddhKat 15 has 'O-ZAR. GOR-TU-LUR., 43-44 GUR-RTOL-GO. DÍN-LGIG. YAS-MAS.[346] *kurtul-* is further attested in ATSS, HamTouen 1,43' and 2,13 and 36, beside exs. mentioned in the dictionaries. U III 11,7 even has *kurtruldaçı* (cf. facs.). Maitr 145 v22 has *kurtuļ-*, the parallel ms. MaitrH XI 11 a18 *kutul-*. Earlier Manichaean sources like M I 29,32 and Wettkampf 25 writ

342 Better: 'in welchem Maße auch nur'.

343 See Moravcsik s.vv.

344 He suggests *kut buldı* as alternative explanation for *kutul-*; that is, of course, wholly unacce able.

345 See the index there. Three of these exs. have the form *kutrur-*; these are probably cases of omission of the L hook rather than real variants.

346 The ms. has a redundat *akşara* LOG after the stem of the verb, which we have left out. *kur tınlıg yazmaz* is 'Beings destined to be saved do not stray'. *yaz-* 'to err' being intr., DÍN-L should be *tınlıg* and not its accusative form. The text has a rather free use of G (in thi possibly indicative of the velar pronunciation of the /l/); cf. also *adrır-* for *adır-* in this text. untie, loosen', is unlikely in this context.

kurtul- while the later pothi book (TT III 25 and IX 28) shows *kutrul-* in accordance with the etymologising norm.

(*kükül-* 'to be known (by some name), to be famous, praised'. Probably from *kü* 'fame', apparently as **kü+k-ül-*. Not in the *EDPT*; *DTS* s.v. *kügül-*. The biverb *kükül- çavık-* is found in BT VIII B 89 and Shō XII a 10. *tüzüdin kükül-müş* 'praised everywhere' (BT XIII 20,39)[347] is an epithet of Avalokiteśvara; another ex. from Buyan āvirmāk is quoted in the n. thereto. Further exs. appear in BT VIII B 105, BT III 771 and 864, BT XIII 21,26, Suv 493,20 and 549,5, Ht IV 821 and 1575, HtPek 39 v 8 and 79 r 2 (quoted in *UW* 248 b middle) and HtPar 4 r 11 (quoted in the n. to Ht VII 1870) and ETŞ 15,33 (*alkoḍa yeg adruk üzä kükülür siz* 'You are known as the most excellent of all').)

külä-l- is found in HtPar 139,26 quoted in *UW* 143 b bottom: *külälmiş kötrülmiş kŏni nom* "die gepriesene$_2$ wahre Lehre". Not mentioned in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* has an instance from Buyan āvirmāk, which we do not consider Old Turkic. Cf. *külä-til-* below (section on *-tXl-*), which is also used in a biverb with *kötrülmiş*. That verb also reappears in Buyan āvirmāk. *kü+lä-* is discussed in section 5.12 above.

küzäd-il- 'to be guarded'. *EDPT* s.v. '*ködezil-*' and *DLT*. Found twice in QB in the metathetical Qarakhanid variant, and in Tiš: *alko Kumb(a)nıı kuvr[agı] üzä küzädilip* . . . We know that the base had an /ü/ and not an /ö/ because of three Brāhmī exs., and that it ended with /d/ at least originally, because of runic and Qarakhanid evidence. As at the end of other bisyllabic opaque bases ending in /d/, there may have been a passage to /t/ at least in some variants of Uigur and Qarakhanid. *küzädig*, *küzäḍḍür-*, *küzäd* and *küzädin-* are cognates; see also the end of section 5.43 for the base.

nomla-l-muş 'preached' is a hap. in TT VIII B. *DTS*; not in the *EDPT*. Cf. *nomla-tıl-* below. *nomla-n-muş*, a hap. in Maitr 88 v 15 (BT IX 216,15$_2$) occurs in fragmentary context any may be a mistake for this. See *nom+la-* in section 5.12.

oŋar-ıl- 'to be put right' is quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *köntül-*, with which it appears together in a Suv biverb. Hapax, not in the *EDPT*. The n. to TuoLuoNi 126 gives the Chin. source of the biverb. *oŋar-* is a causative like *kön-it-*.

(*oŋul-* 'to recover (intr.)' is attested in the major one among three mss. in TT VI 215, thrice in TT VII, once in Suv, in QB 2443, 3874 and 4357 (these three not mentioned in the *EDPT*) and several times in the DLT. The *EDPT* has an unlikely etymology for this verb,[348] but our suggestion may not be much better:

347 This follows the translation of the editor. *UW* 270 a-b instead writes "der 'Von-allen-Gelobte'", taking the *+dIn* suffix as agentive ablative.

348 The forms *oŋul-* and *oŋal-* are not at all "used indiscriminately", as the *EDPT* writes; *oŋal-* is not found before the XIIIth century at the best. Clauson only gives the lemma as '*oŋal-/oŋul-*' to suit his etymology: that it is "presumably Pass. f. of **oŋa:-*, cf. *oŋar-*".

oŋul- and *oŋar-* perhaps come from a verb *oŋ-* 'to be in good order, thrive, prosper', attested only from the XIVth century on: The *EDPT* has some evidence for it under '*on-*' (which I discuss above as *u-n-*).)
(*ornat-ıl-* is a hap. in CYK 21, a very late text. *orna-t-* is common and also found *ibid.* 28. *orn+a-* is rare.)

os-ul- is found only in a biverb with *bıç-ıl-*, in Höllen 63, LautHöllen 73 and probably 87 and Maitr 201 v5, with the meaning 'to be cut into small pieces'. Cf. the *EDPT*. *os-* itself is attested only with *bıç-* in Old Turkic; cf. *os-uş-* above in section 7.1.

oy-ul- 'to be hollowed out', *EDPT*.[349]

öç-ül- 'to be quenched' is attested in *toloyka* (thus) *tüşmiş yıçınça tamduksuz öçülü* (Neujahr 23) and *yalınap yana ok öçülür* and similar sentences in UigTot 767, 800, 813, 814 and so forth. Another two exs. quoted by the *EDPT* are biverbs with *alkın-*, and in both the agent is 'our' sins. There also is a biverb *öç-alkın-* with the same meaning, exs. for which can be found in the three dictionaries.[350] *öç-* is intr.: *öçül-* is taken up again below.

örlät-il- 'to be torn by anger or be subject to other negatively intensive feelings'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Found in *övkä üzä örlätil-* (ETŞ 13,138), *busuş-lug bolup ämgänürlär örlätilürlär* (ShöAgon 3, p. 203, l.14) and *busuş kadgu ämgäk örtlätilmäk* (*ibid.* 17). *örlä-t-* (an *-(X)t-* verb) is a semantic simplex.

ötä-l- 'to get transmitted, given, paid' appears twice in QB 2670. In DLT fol. 105 it signifies 'to exert oneself, to go to great pains'; this is further from the etymology but was the base of *ötl-üm* (section 3.106).

saç-ıl- 'to be scattered or dissipated'. Beside the exs. in the *EDPT* it is attested in ETŞ 20,44, 62 and 65, in ms. T III M 84-58 l.1 quoted in the first n. to TT V A 117 and frequent in the QB. Further: *bitig saçılgay tep korkup* (Ht VII 13 a24), then [*bitï*]*glär ymä saçılmış* (*ibid.* 16 a14) and *änätkäkçä nomlar saçılgay* (*ibid.* 16), [*kav*]*ıklayu saçılu* "wie Kleie zerstreut werden" (Neujahr 29) and *kovı sünüki saçılur* (BT XIII 17,6) 'his hollow bones get scattered about'.

sanç-ıl- 'to get thrust into something'. *EDPT* only from the DLT; attested also i Maitr 110 r12 with needles as subject. Exs. in UigTot 375, 377 and 473 all ref to a Y-shaped grafting of one vein upon another.

sap-ıl- 'to be or get together, to join (intr.) or get joined or grafted'. *EDPT* o

349 Clauson calls the word *yerkā*, which appears in the U III sentence in which *oyul-* is atte "doubtful". The facs. shows it to be very clear and not doubtful at all.

350 The *EDPT* writes, among other things: "*öçül-* Pass. f. of *öç-*; 'to be extinguished'. Tech ungrammatical, since *öç-*, which has the same meaning and is also used in Hend. with a Intrans. and should not have a Pass., but survives in NE Tel. *üçül- . . .*". Grammatical however, shows that *öçül-* is not ungrammatical; all *-(X)l-* verbs from intr. bases are colle discussed below.

from the DLT. Add *sapılgu ol sanka* (ETŞ 11,146) 'One should be added to that number'.[351] Cf. *sapılu tägingülük bursaŋ kuvragnıŋ sanıŋa* (Shō VII b7). A biverb *ula-ł- sap-ıl-* is attested in Suv 44,1 and in Ht VII 2 b12: *yurtta ıdok nom ulaldı[ı] sapılın*. Cf. the binome *ulag sapıg* 'endless succession' (section 3.101) and *ula[ma]kta sapmak[ta* (Ht X1176). Additional exs. appear in the colophon of the Aryarājavādakasūtra[352] and in Ht X833. Further: *anam xatundın adrılıp bir ajunlug busuş kadgu kөŋülümkä sapılıp* . . . (HtPar 20 r11) 'I was separated from my honoured mother, sorrow of a lifetime was grafted into my heart and . . .'. *biçäk täg sapılu* (Mängi 24) is translated as "wie ein Messer an sich genommen wird"; if it is to connote swiftness, as the context demands, the author should rather be thinking of the throwing of knives. Cf. *itilgän sapılgan* "a bustler, one who goes in and out among affairs" in DLT fol. 90 (spelled SAYILI'N, but *bā* and *yā* are practically identical). Some exs. of *sap-* are mentioned in the *EDPT*.[353] Cf. also *sap-şı* and *sapşı+sıg* (with back velar) above. *sapıl-* should not be confused with *säp-il-*, q.v. below; *sap-tur-* and *säp-tūr-* are distinguished clearly in the DLT.

sar-ıl- 'to be angry with somebody'. Infinitive spelled with *qāf* in DLT fol. 330, which fixes the harmony class. The base *sar-* 'to ill-use someone, to address him harshly' does not (according to DankKelly) have "*-ma:k* altered from *-me:k*", as the *EDPT* writes, but rather a ligature of K and Q by the same first hand. Tezcan (review of the QB İndeks) may therefore be wrong in reading *sär-* and *säril-* to accord with Republican Turkish, Azeri and Kirghiz *sert*. Cf. *sar-ış-ıp* in BT III 351. The *EDPT* quotes the form *sarılsa* twice from the QB; add *sarıldım saŋa män* (QB 795), *sarılma maŋa* (3809) and *erilmä sarılma* (5773). *sarılma yüräkim* in ETŞ 11,91, does not help in determining the vowels either.

351 *UW* 291 b bottom wants to emend *sanka* to '*saŋka*' and to translate: "man muß sich dem Saṅgha anschließen". Such an 'emendation' is unnecessary, however, as the Shō VII ex. quoted next shows.

352 As quoted in the *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* II, p. 227, by A. v. Gabain.

353 The *EDPT* is no doubt right about reading *säpü* "equipped" (tr.) in KP. I agree with the n. to Ht X1176 that *säpär* in the IrqB (quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *sap-*) is an error for *sapar*; this means that the source of the text must have been in Uigur script (where the two words are indistinguishable): In *sınokıŋın säpär* (recte: *sapar*) *mān, ūzūkiŋin ulayur mān* we find the same parallelism with *ula-* which we find in *ulag sapıg* and in *ulal- sapıl-*. *sınokug sapar ol, buzukug etār* (QB 1858) must have been an idiom akin to the IrqB expression. *et-* can, on the other hand, appear also together with *säp-* 'to furnish, equip, procure': *etmāksiz* (misunderstood by the eds.) *säpmāksiz* (thus, with front *k*) in BT VIII A115 is a translation of a Tib. lexeme signifying "genuine"; *anı nāŋ tınl(ı)glar etip säpip kılmış ārmāz* (BuddhUig II 486) refers to *çın ārdinilār*, and should have the same purport. UigSteu A 28 should be read as *aryadanıg etip säpip* . . ., not '*sapıp*'.

sat-il- 'to be sold'. By the *DTS* and the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. There are two Uigur exs., both of a person being sold as slave. One is *satılur m(ā)n* 'I am for sale' in BuddhUig II 225, while the other appears in GengContr 2,13.

sav-il- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the QB and the DLT, Middle Turkic etc. Attested also in *oy koṭgi yerlärig tüzä, sapan tuṭup savılu* . . . (Ernte 36). The ed.'s translation as "die Vertiefungen und Erhebungen (aufweisenden) Flächen ebnen sie, den Pflug halten sie und beugen sich . . ." is probably motivated by the DLT's statement that *savıl-*[354] is used about "anything when it declines from a fixed position or inclines". The earliest occurrence of *sav-* is not in the Tafṣīr, as stated in *EDPT* 788 b bottom, but in Heilk II 1,4 and in QB 6168. Cf. *savış* in section 3.103.

savr-ıl- 'to spray or spatter (intr.)'. *EDPT* and *DTS* from Suv, DLT and so forth. Found also in BT I B (89) and *yaşları savrılu* (not: '*savliru*') *ıglayu* (MaitrGeng 6 b6) and *Mayıridin adralmak* (normalised: *adrılmak*) *ämgäkkä yaşları* (thus presumably instead of '*yasruli*') *savrılu äliglärin kavşurup* . . . (*ibid.* 4 a4). Cf. *savr-uk-* above.

säç-il- 'to be chosen, to excel (by some particular quality)'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *säçilmiş* (BT II 793 and 1214), *üdrülmiş säçilmiş subum orun* (ShōAv 252) and *ya[ḷ]ıuz säçilmiş* (Schwitz 12). Further exs. not mentioned there occur in ETŞ 15,36 (quoted and best translated in *UW* 249 b par. c,1) and QB 5595.

säp-il- 'to be equipped with, to get, have' is attested thrice in Ht: Two exs. are quoted in *UW* 124 a, spelled '*sapıl-*'; a third, spelled correctly, in *UW* 235 b par. B,c. See n. 353 above for the base.

sär-il- 'to endure, to remain as one is, to stay, to tarry'; apparently also 'to calm down'. See *seril-* I and II in the *DTS*, and *EDPT*. *kalı säril-* in BuddhUig I 53 appears to be not "aptallığı devam et-" but 'His madness calmed down with time'; one often needs the context to disambiguate between the different meanings of this verb. Other additional exs.: *sansız üküş kalp üd üzä ür käç särilür* (ETŞ 9,30); *näŋ särilü tıdılu umadı* (Ht X 1007); *ançakı(y)a särilip tavrak bargalı bolmadı* 'we tarried therefore for some time, and it was impossible to advance quickly" (Ht V 13 a23); *näçäkäṭägi KÖNGÜL tözintä särilip turdaçılar ärsär* . . . (BuddhUig I 33) "(die) die solange (thus!) in der Bewußtseinsnatur ständig ausgeharrt haben"; *bulıtlar yılṭızsız ärdükintin särilip umatın utru törümiştä utru keṭip kök kalık nätäg arıg süzük bolur ärsär, ançulayu ymä igid sakınçlar yılṭızsız ärtükintin särilip umatın uṭru turmışı utru öçüp* . . . (*ibid.* 169-171); exs. in BT III 1117, Neujahr 86 and BT XIII 38,23; two further ones

354 DLT fol. 330-31 has, in the second syllable, once a *kasra* by the first hand and thrice a *damma* by the second. I agree with DankKelly's introduction, which states that the first hand knew better; their choice of *sawul-* as lemma is therefore unjustified.

quoted under *akıl-* above; *[bir . . .]k(ı)ya ärsär ymä ınnalım särilälim* 'Let us pause, at least for a while' (Warnke 555) and *ymä inçip ädgü tetig nomlug yertinçütä yazınım öçülmägin alkınmagın surağı üdkä tägınçä-käd(ä)gi*[355] *särilip . . .* "Nun aber bleibt meine gut zu nennende (following an interpretation of the eds.' meaningless TYWYWK as if it were the grammatically impossible *'te-t-yük'*) Dharma-Disziplin ohne zu verlöschen und zu verschwinden bis zu ewigen (langen) Zeiten auf der Welt" (Suv 164,17). Cf. also *sär-in-*, *särinçsiz* and *särgüsüz*, *särimlig* and *särimsiz* in the appropriate sections.

särmä-l- 'to be moved through water' or, of water, 'to be strained'. The *EDPT* has only the DLT. Add *särmälip akar* (ETŞ 8,19), which *UW* 78 a rather loosely translates as "reinigendes fließendes Gewässer". Cf. *särm+ä-* among the *+A-* verbs.

säş-il- 'to be unfastened, untied'. The *EDPT* quotes this from Suv about "wrappings and bonds" (*bag çug*) and from the DLT about knots (*tügün*) and rams and he-goats. Exs. with *tügün* are attested also in UigTöt 772, 803, 809 and 817. Bt I D(200) is quoted in *UW* 232b s.v. *asıl-* par. 1,b; *yol säşilip . . .* is there translated as "der [Asaṃkhyeya-]Weg entfaltet sich (?) und . . .". In KP LXXVIII 6, the good king excuses himself for leaving the beggars by saying: *bo yertinçü törüsi antag ol: amrak ymä adrılur, sävig ymä säşilür*.[356] A verse similar to this proverb is found in DLT fol. 486, where Käsġarī translates *koçŋar täkä säşildi* as "the rams and billy-goats separated from the ewes and she-goats". Suv 12,6-7 should (against the *DTS*) be read as *ısig öz alımçılarımnıŋ yavlak köŋüllüri şäşilzün* 'May the malice of my life-takers be relaxed!'. *'saşıl-'* is not attested anywhere and would not fit the context.

sık-ıl- 'to get squeezed; feel constricted, under pressure or in anguish'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; additional exs. appear in Suv 638,14-15, BT XIII 26,1 and TuoLuoNi 280; an instance in Maitr 198 r24 is translated best in *UW* 171b middle. The biverb *sıkıl- taŋıl-* is attested in Suv 586,14, Warnke 461[357] and TuoLuoNi 86. Other sequences are *uyad- sıkıl-* (BuddhUig II 274) and *ämgän- sıkıl-* (Warnke 320). For this last, cf. *açmaklıg ämgäkin sıkıl-* (Warnke 51).

sımta-l- 'to be negligent and careless'. *EDPT* from TT VIII A and Kuan. In Kinkashō B,d, *sımtalguluk* translates the same Skt. term as in TT VIII A. The *EDPT* has two exs. of *sımta-* 'to neglect, be careless about (something)', and a third one appears in ETŞ 12,54. Note that *sımtal-* is by no means its passive

355 K'DGY should be a late addition: The parallel ms. U 702 does not have it. The content of *+kA tägi* is in fact already included in that of *-gInçA*.

356 Thus Hamilton, against Pelliot's *'särilür'*. The facs. shows the word to be damaged in the ms., but it does look like *säşlür* (thus). *särilür* does not fit the context too well.

357 *tın buşup sıkılıp taŋılıp . . .* Similar to this, Heilk I 3-5 should be read as *yüräk sıkılmak tın buşmak*; not *'buzmak'*, as the *EDPT* writes following the editor.

counterpart (which would have the neglected entity as subject) but its intr. one. Cf. *sımla-g*. Neither *sımta-* nor any of its derivates seem to be found in any Turkic source outside Uigur, but Mo. does have them.

sız-ıl- 'to melt and ooze away', in both exs. (quoted in the *EDPT*) about fat. Cf. *sız-gur-* below. *sız-ıg* (QB 2579; not in *EDPT* or *DTS*) signifies 'melting'; its meaning should not be confused with that of *sızla-g-*. *sız-* is intr.; it is in the *EDPT* quoted only from Qarakhanid sources, but appears also in Maitr 105 v12 (with *ārū-*) and in ManTürkFrag 3.[358]

(*soçı-l-* may be a hap. in a difficult passage in MaitrH X 7 b10, which the eds. translate as if it were *suçul-* 'to pluck or pull out'. The descent of Maitreya onto earth is likened to something leaping (= *soçıl-*) from something onto a wall. P. Zieme suggests tentatively that *krp* may come from Skt. *garbha* 'womb'. Cf. intr. *soç+ı-* in section 5.42 above, where cognates are mentioned.)

sok-ul- 'to be crushed'. *EDPT* only from DLT on. Ms. T II D523 l.2, which belongs to the text of TT I (quoted in the n. to TT VII 30) has the biverb *yemril-sokul-*.

sola-l- 'to be chained, to be locked in' is a hap. in BT II 1162-3, in the biverb *solalmış bäklälmiş*. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *sola-* and *bäklä-* are also used in a biverb (quoted in the *DTS* s.v. *solamamaq*). See *so+la-* in section 5.12.

sor-ul- 'to be enquired about'. *kūsi sorulmuş* in M I 26,28 (Gebet) should be compared to *kü+m sorug+um* in Suci 4, and *sor-uk-* in section 7.24. Except this ex., *sorul-* is attested only from the XIIIth century on.

soy-ul- 'to get flayed' is found in Töpfer 3, in *ätiŋiz soyulu*. *EDPT* from the DLT, Middle Turkic etc. DLT also has meanings like 'to get stripped' and 'to get peeled'. *soy-* is also attested only in concrete sense, while the DLT's *soy-uk-* and *soy-suk-* are metaphorical.

sök-ül- is attested in *kürülügüçi kişiniŋ kūsüri sökülsün* (Ernte 102) "Des aufhäufenden Menschen Rippen mögen gebrochen werden". *EDPT* quoted from the DLT on, as 'to be torn apart, split'.

sözlä-l- 'to be mentioned' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*, but a passage mentioned in the *DTS* has three exs. from Suv. It is attested also in BT VIII A 194 and CYK 81, and *alko etiglig nomlar birgärü bir kşan üdtä bolurlar . . . sudurta sözlälmäkintin* (Tenri B 64) 'All elaborated dharmas come into existence in a moment by their being mentioned in a sūtra'. *sōz+lä-* is discussed in section 5.12.

sug-ul- 'to become scanty by being drained off', of a liquid. *EDPT*; a further ex. from Suv 600,6 is quoted in the *UW* 97b top. With a dative of source: *ulug ulug*

358 Chuv. *šăr-* 'to urinate', which the *EDPT* assigns to this etymon, no doubt comes from a back-vowel (and presumably older) counterpart of *sid-*, same meaning.

ögüz suvıŋa tägsärlär, olarnıŋ täpizlärinä kurıp sugulup barır (Maitr 198 r14). An ex. from QB 2866 is not quoted in the *EDPT* either. Cf. *sugulmaksız kudulur sular* (thus, Ernte 22).

süz-ül- 'to be strained or rinsed' or, metaphorically, 'to be pure and pious; to have faith (in . . .)'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *arınmaq süzülmäk*. The concrete sense of *süzül-* is additionally attested in BuddhUig I 80 and 189 and UigKan 84 (with *tur-* and *amrıl-*) and 168. Common in Uigur is the spiritual meaning, lent to Mo. as *süsül-*: It appears, in addition to what the *EDPT* quotes (and mistranslates), in MaitrH I 6 a 3 (Laut, 1985: 50), BT XIII 46,5, BuddhUig I 10, BT VIII A 111 and 113, CYK 51, Shō XIII b 3, Maitr 4 v 5 and 226 r 15 and elsewhere. Shō VII a 7-8, HazaiAval 8,[359] Ht VII 7 b 2, BT XIII 13,12 etc. have a biverb *süzül- kertgün- ~ kertgün- süzül-*. *süzülmişlär* in BT VIII A 379 signifies 'the faithful' and not as translated. Cf. *süz-ök* above.

tak-ıl- 'to be fastened to something'. The *EDPT* quotes this from the DLT on. What appears in ETŞ 11,70 as *bo biliglär takılıp* . . . does not, probably, come from this base but should be *täkıl-* 'to fall apart and scatter': This is also found in two Middle Turkic exs. quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *takıl-*, and *dağıl-* in the Oguz languages and *täkul-* in Khal. Cognates are Turkish *dağıt-*, *dağınık* and the second part of *darmadağın*.

tamıt-ıl- appears as *tamdulmış* 'on fire' in Suv (quoted in the *EDPT* s.v.) and ETŞ 13,25. The rounding is no-doubt due to the /m/. As Zieme notes, the Suv 141,8 instance of *tamdulmış* has a (probably more original, as I believe) variant *tamıtmış* in an earlier ms. Also in *alnın*[360] *ılılur tamdulur adroklug Uygur biznin elimiz a!* (BT XIII 39,6). *tamıt-* is not reducible and unrelated to *tam-ga* (q.v. in section 3.323). See *tamt-ur-* below.

taŋ-ıl- 'to be constricted'. The entry in the *EDPT* comprises some exs. for *täg-il-*, q.v. below. Exs. of a biverb with *sık-ıl-* are mentioned under that verb. The *EDPT* has a Maitr biverb with *kıs-ıl-* and the DLT evidence. An ex. in QB 4595 is a mistake for *yaŋıl-*, according to Tezcan's review of the İndeks. *taŋ-* 'to tie up tightly' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from DLT and Middle Turkic, but appears also in Maitr 82 r19 and 182 v1.

taral- 'to be or get dispersed'. Written clearly with *a* in the second syllable in two Uigur exs.: *taraldaçı targu bilig* (ETŞ 11,71) and *dan*[*ı*]*n tokıṭurça taralu* (Neujahr 19). Taking the first word in the second ex.[361] to be an instrumental and not

359 Probably not '*süzülmiş kert*[*günç*] *kōŋüllüg*' but *süzülmiş kert*[*günmiş*] *kōŋüllüg*.

360 This may possibly stand for *yalnın* by poetic licence, being constrained by the *≠a°* of the rote-rhyme. *alın* makes no sense in the context, whereas *yalın* is reminiscent of *çog yalın* 'glory$_2$'. Zieme takes *llll-* to be *yılı-l-*; that is not attested elsewhere, but I have no better explanation.

361 The ed. leaves this untranslated. I would like to explain it through Skt. *daṇḍa* 'a stick', over a Middle Indian **daṇṇa*.

an accusative, we get 'getting dispersed (i.e. breaking apart) as if beaten with a stick'. The DLT fol. 331 passive derivate from *tar-* is *tarıl-*, whereas *taral-* is there the passive of *tara-* 'to comb'. Exs. of *tar-* are mentioned under *tar-ık-* in section 7.24 below. *tara-* 'to comb' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and the QB on, but appears also UigTot 434: *taramış* there corresponds to a Tib. expression signifying 'bristly, rugged, shaggy'. DLT fol. 559 discusses both *tar-* and *tara-*; that passage is discussed above in the introduction to part VI. *tar-ıl-* 'to get dispersed' is attested also several times in the Rylands Interlinear Coran Translation. The Uigur variant *taral-* may have arisen out of contamination between *tar-* and *tara-* or, alternatively, the second vowel may be due to the influence of the /r/. As we read in *EDPT* 547 a, some modern languages have *tara-* as a secondary form of *tar-*. The present ex. *may* also be the first instance of such an *-A-* expansion, as comes up in a number of verbs in Middle Turkic. This remains only a possibility as long as there is no certain such ex. of *tara-* itself.

tart-ıl- 'to be drawn from, drawn out, attracted'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. A further ex., *bo aŋar tayaklıgın, andırtın tarţılıp twgmışka ārūr ūçūn* . . . (Abhi 1943) is accompanied by an ablative like the instance from TT V quoted in the *EDPT*. This is the ablative called 'of separation'.

taş-ıl- is probably to be read in M I 5,11 (Legende) in *ol yarsınçıg ātözintāki kan irin arıgsız yablak taşıltı tōkūlti*, with the *DTS*. The *EDPT* prefers to read '*tesilti*'; cf. *tāş-il-* below. The subject being a liquid, *tāşil-* is inappropriate in this context. BT XIII 27,1 should also, I think, be read as *tōkū]lū taşılu turur* (editor's conjecture; context fragmentary). Other *-(X)l-* verbs are also derived from intr. bases; parallelism with *tōk-ūl-* (or whatever other verb can be conjectured in BT XIII) should have helped.

tāg-il- 'to come to coincide with something', i.e. 'to become something else'. Often used together with its antonym *ag-* 'to come to differ'; *UW* 61 b bottom (quoting and correctly translating M III $12,14_1$, text 6) renders both together as "die Form wechseln[2]". Can be found in the *DTS*, but the *EDPT* does not recognize its existence.[362] Semantically related to *tāgşil-* and *tāgşūr-* (And their base, attested in Ottoman as *değiş-*). The antonym couple (used about souls in the numerous existences) appears as *aga tāgilā* (three mss. among four in TT IV A 20; Maitr 149 r 12 and 131 r 1 and BuddhKat 7), *aga tāgilū* (Maitr 114 v 4; MaitrGeng 4 a 22) and *agmak t(ā)g(ī)lmāk* (the M III ex. mentioned). The converb vowel of *tāgil-ā* is against the rules as set out in Erdal, 1979 a, but this is not the only case where this vowel is altered by parallelism with an adjacent converb. The instance *yelü kögän . . . küntün [yı]ŋak kälip purnavasu yultuzka*

362 The exs. are discussed by him under *tāgil-* 'to be blinded' and *taŋıl-*.

tägilip . . . (Ht X 824) is wrongly translated as "değip". Whether *täg-il-* "berührt werden" in ATSS is meant to belong here or to the verb signifying 'to get blinded' is not clear.

(*tägşil-* 'to alter, change (intr.), to be changed' has no base attested in Old Turkic, but this base probably lives on in Republican Turkish *değiş-*, same meaning. Not directly related to Old Turkic *täg-iş-* (q.v. above), but *tägşür-* is close; cf. also *täg-il-* for the meaning. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also s.v. '*şaş- tegşil-*'. Appears also in BT I D(75), (109) and (311), BT II 921 (spelled (*tägjilmäz*), ManTüTex 574, ShōAgon 1,218 and 220, Suv 419,5, 595,11-18 (in the n. to UigTot 233), 590,13-15 (quoted s.v. *et-iş-* above) and SuvZieme 691 r2, BT XIII 12,155, AmitIst 14, BT VII H12, Ht V 4 b12 and X 1129, UigTot 282, 542, 546, 554 etc., 978, 1237, 1374 and 1376; Abhi B 59 b6 *apud UW* 249b par. A,b,2. The biverb *ag- tägşil-* appears in Warnke 256, 270 and 422, *arta- tägşil-* in Ht X 471, *ärŋ- tägşil-* or *ad- tägşil-* as read by the ed. in Ht X 803. Cf. also *tägşilmäksiz* (section 3.329).)

täş-il- 'to be pierced', *EDPT*.[363]

(*tätrül-*, apparently 'to be perverted' or 'to be pathologically obstinate'. The *EDPT* mistakenly writes this with *é* (i.e. /e/) although, as Clauson himself states, all exs. have *ä*; his motives are, as often, etymological. The instance from Suv (*DTS*) has *tälvä bolup tärsikmäk tätrülmäk*; cf. *tärsik-dür- tätrül-dür-* below. Add *altı kaçıg tätrülmäki* "die Falschheit der sechs Sinnesorgane" (UigTot 1261) and *t(ä)rs tätrü körüm üzä köŋülüm köküzüm tätrülüp* . . . (Suv 136,18) and cf. *tätrülmäklig* in Maitr 137 v13. Base not attested but *tärtrü* ~ *tätrü* must be its petrified converb.[364])

tävr-il- 'to roll over, revolve'. In both of the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* associated with *ävril-*, and said of the movement of *saṃsāra*. *ävrilmäk* . . . *tävrilmäk* is attested also in Maitr 153 r11; add also *tävrilü yorıyur* (Maitr 156 v3). The only Uigur ex. of *tävir-* in the *EDPT* is *nom tilgänin tävirär* in TT VII 455. It is attested also nine times in the Maitr, six of these in the phrase *nomlug tilgän tävir-* 'to turn the wheel of *dharma*'.

tävşä-l- is attested in DLT fol. 384 in the biverb *uşal- tävşäl-* 'to crumble (intr.)'. The base is attested in DLT fol. 569: *anıŋ täri tŵvşädi* "His sweat covered him in beads (from work)". Since this and the aorist and infinitive are all spelled with *ḍamma*, the *EDPT* changes *tävşäl-* to '*tüvşäl-*'; the rounding is, I think, second-

363 The phrase written '*iċägüsi taşūlīp*' in U III 43,24 (Mahendrasena) is changed in the *EDPT* s.v. to *teşilip*. Clauson's view is now confirmed by *içägüsin täşip*, as should be read in UigPañc 116 in spite of the ed. The translation cannot be "ihre Eingeweide heraustraten . . ." if *içägü* has the accusative suffix. *taş-* and *täş-* look identical in Uigur script but can, in identical forms, be distinguished through the transitivity of the second and the intransitivity of the first.

364 Discussed among the petrified converbs in section 7.512.

ary and caused by the /v/. Attested also in Suv 366,16: *ig agrıgka tuş bolup är öz kamılsar, ulug kiçig arıgsız*[365] *artok bolup tävşilür* (thus in the second syllable?) 'when one is confronted by illness, and the body collapses, the small and the big excrements become excessive and form into pellets'. The base, then, is also intr.

ter-il- 'to assemble (intr.)'. In addition to the exs. quoted by the *EDPT* we find this in Maitr 129 r 9, U III 74,17 and BT III 61 in a biverb with 1 *yıgıl-*. Cf. *yıg-ter-* in Suv 360,13, *terä yıga* in BT III 775. *teril-* is common since Orkhon Turkic.

tıd-ıl- 'to be held in check, be limited to a certain domain, to hold oneself away from something, to hold back or be held back'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *öz yaş tıdılmış üd* (BT II 949), *biligsiz biliglig tıdıg üzä tıdılmış* (BT II 874), *ögnün kaŋnıŋ oglın kızın sakınmaklıg ädgü ögli koŋüli bo bir ajunta ok tıdılur ärip* . . . (Warnke 198), *yana k(ä)ntü özi ymä bo bitiglär kälginçä Odon zanta tıdılıp bargal[ı] bolmay-ukka* . . . (Ht V 11 b 12), *ırak tıdılıp biligsiz bilig üzä, yakın tünärip kertü nom tözintä* . . . (Ht VII 11 a 19), *amtı bilinür biz käntü yazokumuznı, bokünkä ınaru sözläŋlär* (Shō VIII b2). Further exs. appear in Suv 57,3, BT III 679, Warnke 791, Maitr 122 r 29, 31, v 4, 10, 14, 23 and 28, 123 r 4 and 198 v 25, ms. Mz 751 v 3 quoted in *UW* 234 a bottom (*sözlämäktin tıdıl-*), Abhi 118 b 4 in TermBuddh., Ernte 89 (*tıdılmadın tuţçı*), Ht X 1008 (*säril- tıdıl-*) and Neujahr 11.

tıg-ıl- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT,[366] of an arrowhead, 'to get blunted and broken' when striking a rock. *tıg-* also has this meaning of a rock 'blunting' the head of an arrow, but also a psychological use: *bulun bolup başı tıgdı*, which Kāśgarī (fol. 155) translates as "he bowed his head from the hardships he suffered"; *ärän körüp başı tıgdı*, translated (fol. 310-11) "when he saw the men of my army he hid his head and fled". Suv 622,12 should perhaps be read as *açıgı üzä tıgılıp* . . . instead of *tıkılıp* of *UW* 40 b s.v. *ačıg* par. A,a: Röhrborn translates "er wurde durch den Kummer bedrückt", which fits the uses of *tıg-*. A similar feeling is that of Xuandzang, when he feels his imminent death and says to the *tapıgçılar* (Ht X 613): *mä[niŋ] una ärtimlig törü tıgıp kälm[iş] ol*.[367]

tık-ıl- 'to be crammed into something'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Add *tıkılıp turur* from Höllen 105 and Ht X 527. In Ht X 825, a monk sees a vision of a four-way rainbow changing into a constellation, which gets crammed into Xuandzang's cell: . . . *p[avan]ka enip tıkılıp turmışın adırtlıg kördi*. It seems to me less likely that this should be *tıgıl-*, although the Q has no dots to it.[368]

365 Ms. 'QRYQSYZ, corrected by Ş. Tekin and in *UW* 190b par. A,b.

366 The ms. has thrice '*tagıl-*', in the *EDPT* correctly (I think) changed to *tıgıl-*.

367 Tezcan loosely translates as "yaklaşıp gelmiştir". Clauson (*EDPT*) wants to have another *tıg-* DLT fol. 547 where the ms. has *ag-* preceded by what could be T, N or Y; DankKelly prefer *y-* which seems much better in the context.

368 Tezcan's index has a practically identical translation for *tıgıl-* and for *tıkıl-*! Similarly, *ädgü*

(*tıntur-ul-* is a hap. in U II (Uşnişa Viçay), quoted in the *EDPT*: *alko ançulayu kālmişlār üzā tınturulmakı bolur*, 'to be put to rest'. Müller's translation, which related to *tın* 'breath etc.', would have been likelier if *tın* and *turulmak* had been written separately (which the facs. shows them not to be). See *tın-tur-* below).

tik-il- 'to be set up or to join vertically' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted only from the DLT. It is attested also in QB 4009 (metaphorical) and UigTot 1039: *bo iki tamırlarnıŋ üstün uçı burunnuŋ ikidin sınarında tikilip turur*. Cf. *tik-lin-*.

tir-il- 'to be revived, resuscitated, to come back to life'. The *EDPT* has runic and Qarakhanid exs. but knows of "no clear occurrence" in Uygur. *ölgüm bar ärsär tirilgāy tep saknur mān* (ZiemeSklav III 20), to be translated as 'Should I have to die, it will, I think, come back to life' is an Uigur ex. So are many in the descriptions of hell: Maitr 81 v32, 82 r17 and v21, 83 v17, 84 v26 and 108 v3 and LautHöllen 92-3.[369] The inmates are told *tiriliŋlär* so that their suffering can continue, which they do: (*ölüp*) *ikilā tirilürlär*, *yana tirilürlär*; *ölürlär yana ymā tirilürlär*. A hap. *tir-* 'to live' is quoted in the *DTS* (but not the *EDPT*) from U II (Qutlug). *nāçā tirsā dunyā* . . . (QB 114) may contain this verb, but see *EDPT* s.v. *ter-*. Note that the base is intr. *tir-ig* and *tir-gür-* are cognates.

tit-il- is definitely attested only in ShōAgon 1,110, in the phrase *birlā titilmāk üzā* 'to be given up together (with those things at the moment of death)'. Some of the verb forms read as *tıdıl-* may possibly belong here instead.] *özläri titilmāz*, as has been read *ibid.* 114, is perhaps an instance of *tıdıl-*.

tiz-il- 'to be arranged in a row' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from QB 74 and the DLT. It is attested also in QB 5676 and in *kurınça kāzig[inçā] tiziltilär* (Ht VII 4 b17), *munçukka oxşatı tizilü* (BT VII A 253-4) and *divatarıŋ öŋiŋä oxşatı öŋlügin tizilü* (*ibid.* 262).

to-l- 'to be filled, crammed, to fill (intr.); to fill (tr. of the filling substance as subject), to be made to block a passage; to be fulfilled'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. *tolu* is a petrified converb from this; exs. for it which are not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in ShōKenkyū III 19, Höllen 105, BT I B (208), D (152) and D (236) and BT II 1074. Additional verbal exs. for *tol-* appear in Maitr 159 r28, 144 v9 (*kapıgınta tolup tur-*), 174 r25 (*ötägiŋiz tolmaz*) and 83 v16. See *to-ş-* above, also for the base and for other cognates. Exs. for a biverb *tol- toş-* are also mentioned there.

togra-l- 'to be cut in slices' is, in this form, found in DLT fol. 381: *ät tograldı* and

l(ı)glar üzā tıkmış tāg tolu (MaitrH X 4 a6 translated as "vollgestopft") should hardly have been written as '*tıgmış*'.

369 Verbs in Maitr 86 r1 and 2 are wrongly listed under *tiril-* in the Maitr index, although their translation in the text correctly denotes *teril-*. There would have been less likelihood for this error if the text had been transcribed and not just transliterated.

ton kirdān tograldı; Kāšġarī adds that this verb is used "also if there appear splits in a leg or in any woven material". Uigur has the variant *togrwl-*, applying only to human flesh: *tarıgçı bāglārnıŋ . . . adak soŋları togrwlu* (Ernte 33);]*ātı yini togrwlup yarılsar*[370] [(U III 78,23);]*togrwlup yıdıp sasıp* [(U III 25,6). The base is attested as *togra-* in DLT, Heilk I and in later sources. I have no explanation for the shape of the Uigur derivate; *-Xl-* is not dominant e.g. in *ata-l-*, *aya-l-*, *bagla-l-*, *bādizā-l-*, *bāklā-l-* and so forth.

tolgur-ul- is attested in *sol eligi üzā beş rasıyanlar üzā tolgurulmış kapala tutup . . . kapāla*" (BT VII A 414) "in der linken Hand hält sie eine mit den 5 Rasāyana gefüllte Kapāla". Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *tol-gur-* (q.v. below) is common.

toŋtar-ıl-u is attested twice in Suv, in both exs. as biverb with *agtarılu*: 'to be overturned$_2$'. *EDPT* s.v. *tōŋderil-*, *UW* s.v. *agtarıl-*. See under *toŋtar-* below for the problem of the vowels of this verb. *agtarılu toŋtarılu* may be a late replacement of the biverb *agtaru toŋtaru*, the *-(X)l-* getting added to make the intr. meaning of the petrified converb explicit.

tōk-ūl- 'to pour out (intr.), spill (intr.)' is common in Old Turkic. The *EDPT* lacks the ex. from QB 5982, and *yaşı tōkūlū ıglayu InçA tep ötüg ötünti* (BruchGeb 67).

tur-ul- 'to calm down, be calm, stable'. To the exs. of *DTS* (*turul-* II) and the *EDPT* add *turulmış* 'calm' (Ht VII 5 a10 and the thrice in BT II), *amrılmış turulsar // sakınç amrılsar* (BT I B (90)) and *amuru saçılmadın turulsar* (ETŞ 20,65). Concerning *çın kertü turulmak yavalmakta yavaldurtaçı* (ShōAgon 1, p. 157,5) note that *yaval-* is, like *turul-*, attested in a biverb with *amrıl-*. *tur-* is intr.; when not reduced to a marker of durativity it stands in concrete use, whereas *turul-* is spiritual. Cf. *turul-tur-*.

(*turgur-ul-* is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is a hap. in InscrOuig V 50, an extremely late text. *tur-gur-* is very well attested.)

(*tusul-* is attested more than 70 times in the QB and appears in DLT fol. 332 in the phrase *bo ot aŋar tusuldı*[371] "This medicine was beneficial to him". Kāšġarī says that this verb comes from *tusu bol-* or *bul-*, while Ercilasun, 1984: 20 takes it to be '*tusu+l-*' and Clauson '*tus-ul-*'.[372] The word quoted in the *EDPT* under '*tus-*'

370 Thus the ms. against the editor; the word is *a bit* damaged.

371 The *EDPT* thinks the ms. has '*tasaldı*', but DankKelly write TUSUL^{a}DIY without comment. They all agree that the aorist and infinitive have U in both syllables.

372 Ercilasun further mentions the following as exs. for '*+l-*': *çavıl-* in A 40,11 (*çavlan-* in the parallel passages in BC); *ögdil-* (which does not come from *ögdi*, however, but from *ög-it-il-* with syncopation) and *kwyul-* 'derinleş-', which he would like to derive from "'sağlam' mânâsındaki *koḍı*". *kwyul-* is attested not only in QB 3070 (mss. BC) but also in the DLT, where it signifies 'to coagulate, become viscid, thick (of a liquid)'. The DLT also has the related *kwyug* 'viscid, thick

is only a weak variant, however, the better one being *tusul-* itself. *tusu* 'benefit, advantage' (spelled thus in TT VIII K 9, Brāhmī) does not look as if it were the member of any known formation; Sinor, 1970 makes it likely that it was borrowed from Proto-Mongolian. Somebody in UigSklav III 5 is called *Tuşul T(ā)ŋrim kutı*; the ms. appears to distinguish between S and Ş by giving the lower part of the former letter a leftward slant. If this is an imperative name (as is common), it might show that Uigur has a verb *tuş-ul-*; *tusul-* might then be a secondary contamination with (foreign?) *tusu*. In Uigur we have *bo ār'özkā kŋülüg eyin bolguluk savlarıg bo ok közünür ajunta tilämiş k(ā)rgāk, ār'öz kodup adın ajunka barsar bo mäŋilär barça nā ärsär tuşulmaz* (U III 43,14) 'When one goes to another world, none of these delights, whatever they are, can be attained'; *sökı xanlar küçi ymā tuşulmagay* (TT I 106) 'The might of the kings of old will no longer be attained'; *ätözlärinä ança munça*[373] *tuşulur* (TT VI 262) 'Their own benefits will be rather moderate'; *nā*] *ärsär tuşulmaz* (Laut-Höllen 41) 'Nothing whatsoever will be of any avail';[374] *tuymaklıg tugsar tüzükā tuşulur* (BT XIII 18,16) "Wenn ein mit Verstand versehener geboren wird, nutzt es allen"; *tuprakda t[ō]rümiş tüzükā tuşulur* (*ibid.* 25) and *üntürür künüā bo bütgig üç kata okızun . . . ärtiŋü tuşulgay kutadgay* (TT VI 287). Concerning the biverb in the last ex. note that *Kutad+a* contains another imperative name, like *Tuşul*. All the Uigur exs. are spelled with *s* by their eds.; our suggestion can only be proven to be correct if some exs. of *tuşul-* with dotted Ş turn up. Meanwhile, *tusul-* remains a problem. *tuş-* does not govern direct objects.)

tut-ul- 'to be grasped, seized, held'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Further exs. appear in ETŞ 10,105 and 185, Suv 123,3 and 156,17, QB 2711 and 2720, Ht VII 12 a 16, BT XIII 12,175, ms. Ōtani 2695 a 18 and Scharl 83 and in another two exs. in the n. thereto. According to this n., *tutuldaçı* corresponds to Skt. *grāhya* (a cognate of English 'to grab'), elsewhere translated as *adkandaçı*. Cf. *adkan-*, *adka*K above. *tutulu tıdılu umazlar* in Maitr 198 v 25 signifies 'They are impossible to be held back' and not as translated in BT IX.

tüş(ü)r-ül- 'to be dropped'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Found in ETŞ 10,109; also in Abhi 118 b 13 (in TermBuddh): *kurugın tüşürülür üçün ärtmiş üdkā an bolur ärtmāk tep*. A third ex. is quoted in the n. to this. See *tüş-ür-* below.

tüşütlän-il-miş is a hap. in TT VIII B quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *eyin*, there given a wrong translation. The ed.'s translation, "durchgedacht", should be correct by

(of a liquid)'. QB 3829 uses this *kwyug* 'thick' metaphorically: *bilgi kwyug* 'with profound knowledge'. The same metaphor appears in QB 3070, *kwyuldı bilig*. The base of these must have been **kwy-* or **kwyw-* but surely nothing with /d/. Cf. also n. 49 in vol. 2.

373 This phrase also in ETŞ 14,31 and a number of times in the Maitr.

374 Last takes *ärsär* to be conditional also by meaning, but cf. the U III ex. of *tuşul-* (among other similar instances).

meaning of the Skt. original and also by etymology. Cf. *tüşüt+län-* in section 5.6.

tüz-ül- 'to be put in order, to be at one and in harmony with, etc.'. In addition to the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* it appears in Suv 373,12, 383,22-384,1 (together with *öŋi bol-ma-*) and SuvZieme 693,18, UigTot 566, 860, 870 and 976, BT VII XIII 1,110 as corrected in *UW* 290 a top. For the last ex., which refers to the ground 'becoming level', cf. *yer tüzülti* in the DLT.[375]

(*uduz-ul-* is not attested as a finite verb, but *uduzulmaksız* has been read in BT VIII B 127[376] and translated as "nicht irregeführt". I take it that the eds. base this translation on the Tib. original, which is supplied in a footn. Cf. *ud-uz-* 'to lead' in section 7.55.)

ugra-l- appears in *nägü işkä ugralsar m(ä)n, . . .* (Adams 29) 'for whatever work I was intended'. The *EDPT* has this verb only from the DLT: 'to be intended for something'.

uk-ul- 'to be understood'. In the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted only from the DLT and the QB. Found also in BT I and III and in Scharl 64. See *bil-il-* above for the biverb *bilil- ukul-*.

ula-l- 'to join, be related, transmitted, handed on'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Buddhāv H 76, Tenri B 54, ms. T II S 91 in the n. to BT I B (12) etc. Further exs. either contain the phrase *ulalu kälmiş baxşılar* 'gurus who have been continuously succeeding each other' (UigTot 1328 and 1415, BT VII A 344 and 757, B 17 and 25 and N 3, BT VIII A 58 and 334) or refer to the transmittence of the teaching (*nom, y(a)rlıg, ün, sav*) to others (e.g. BT XIII 58,34) or to those in the future (e.g. BT XIII 53,4). Biverbs are *ulal- yadıl-* (Ht V 10 a 14), *ulal- akıl-* (BT XIII 49,1) and *ulal- sapıl-* (Ht VII 2 b 11). It appears with antonyms in *tuţçı ulalıp üzülmädin käsilmädin . . .* (Shō XV 6). *nom ulalmışı* in *bo nom ulalmışı . . . baxşıkaţägi ulalmış ärür* (UigTot 230-2) signifies 'tradition'. *ol ıdoklarnıŋ y(a)rlıgları äşid(i)lgü ünläri ulalguta bizin̆ kǫŋüllüg yolumuz birtäm tıdılıp . . .* (Warnke 791) signifies 'in the handing on of the precepts and the worth-observing utterances of the saints the passage of our heart was utterly impeded . . .'.

unıt-ıl- 'to be forgotten' does not appear in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* but has been used in *unıtılmış kalmış ogulka kızka* (UigOn I v 9).

(*uşal-* 'to get crumbled' is attested in Suv (quoted in the *DTS*) and DLT (quoted in

375 Zieme writes '*tüşül-*' but is unable to interpret three words further on in the line; Kara (*OLZ* 84 (1989): 355) suggests *yagız* for the first. *tüzül-* is here spelled with Ş, but so is *oznlar* six lines further on. A verb '*tüşül-*' does not exist: BT XIII 3,68 should better be read as *üz-ül-* (q.v. below).

376 Not 217, as written in the index to the text.

the *EDPT*), and then in the Codex Comanicus and elsewhere. *uvşan-*, *uvşar-* and *uvşak* (q.v. in section 3.102) are cognates; but the direct base is not attested before Middle Turkic, and is dubious even there.)

üd(ü)r-ül- 'to be set apart etc.' in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, the latter especially under '*ödrülmäklig*', '*ödrülmiş*' and '*ödürül-*'. Very common is the phrase *öŋi üd(ü)rül-* (as *öŋi üdür-* appears in TT III 32): It can be found in U II 42,8, TT V B 40-1, Suv 99,5, BuddhUig II 522, UigFalt 9/10, Warnke 414, BT VII A 705-6, ShōAgon 1,49, in the *Baxşı Ögdisi* quoted in the n. to BT XIII 13,98-9, Buddhāv H 63, Maitr 146 r 21, 51 r 28, 91 v 11 and 35 v 4, Junshō C v 2 and Abhi B 48 a 5 quoted in the n. thereto, Tug 119 and BT III 20,58. Note the word order in direct speech, in *biz ymä siznidä üdrülüp öŋi munta kalmaz biz* (Maitr 51 v 11) "Auch wir, getrennt von Euch, bleiben nicht hier". This phrase usually governs the ablative in *+dIn*, sometimes instead the case in *+dA*. Common is also *üdrül-miş* in the sense of 'chosen; elect; excellent', e.g. in M I 28,26, Pfahl as quoted in the *EDPT*, ManTüTex 8,122, UigTot 408, Shō XII a 4 (with *säçilmiş*), Hamtouen 5,43. Further exs. of this verb appear in UigTot 880 and 939-40, Ht IV 404, BT VII B 122.

ür-ül- 'to get or be inflated or distended'. Exs. in the *EDPT*. The base is attested as *yür-* in UigTot 1047 and in Heilk I,[377] and Heilk II 1,60 writes *yurül-*.

ürt-ül- 'to be or get covered; to cover, to be made to cover (said of the covering object)'. This latter meaning is found in *bususlug bulutları ürtüldi* (BT III 334 and 394). Both the *EDPT* and the *DTS* write this verb as *örtül-*. Exs. not mentioned in them are found in BT I D (106), BuddhUig I 7, Suv 340,19 (quoted as also *biligsiz bilig üzā ü[r]tülmişlāri üzā* "weil sie von Unwissenheit bedeckt sind". Röhrborn, who gives this translation in a reedition, still writes *ö°*. Zieme also writes *örtül-* in BT XIII 15,34 and 58,8. However, TT VIII G 69 has *ürt-*, TT VIII A 15 *ürtül-*. A third Brāhmī ex., in ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) v 4, reads *yürtülmiş ay tāŋriniŋ yadılmaz çogı yalını* 'the unspreading brilliance$_2$ of the covered moon' (according to SktUigBil). Khal. *irt-* "bedecken" also speaks for original */ü/*.[378] I take original *ürt-* to have subsequently widened its vowel because of the */r/*.

üstā-l- 'to be increased, become more'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter expecially under '*aful- üstāl-*'. The passages where this biverb appears are listed in the *UW* s.v. *asıl-*, mid-page in 232 a. In addition, *üstāl-* appears in Suv 10,7, Ht VII 2 a 23

377 The reading of these latter exs. was checked by Zieme, as he writes in the n. to the UigTot instance. They therefore stand in spite of the *EDPT*'s idea that they were "mistranscribed".

378 Though not for the initial **h. yurtgün*, a variant of *ürtgün* discussed in section 3.112, is another piece of evidence *for* this, on the other hand.

and 7 a 4, BuddhUig I 18 and 22 (both with the antonym *esil-*), BT XIII 12,213 and Maitr 12 v 14 (with synonym *ükli-*) and 63 v 3. Similar to the biverb *asıl-üstäl-*, *as-* appears with *üstä-* in Suv 266,6-8 and in a number of other instances mentioned in *UW* 223 b. *üstä-* is discussed in section 5.13.

üz-ül- 'to be torn or broken, to end (intr.), to be discontinued'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also under *üzülmäk*, *öçmäksiz üzülmäksiz* etc. '*üẓül-*' of TT VII 40,15 is in *UW* 232 a corrected to *üs(ä)l-*. A biverb *üzül- käsül-* is documented under *käs-il-* above. 'to stop breathing is *tın(ı) üzül-* (BT II 964 and 971 and UigTot 270), 'to die' *isig özi üzül-* (LautHöllen 123), 'to end one's existence in some hell' *özi üzül-* (Maitr 174 r 24). In three passages quoted in *UW* 171 a, *ikin ara üz-* and its passive *ikin ara üzül-* translate the same Chin. expression. *üẓül-mädin tutçı* (Ernte 93) is a synonym couple. In BT XIII 3,68 we can read]*olor-*]*kalı turkalı umatın* /[*u . . . küçi*]*üẓülüp kamıltı*, instead of '*r*]*üẓülüp*' as Zieme writes.[379] Further exs. of *üzül-* occur in BuddhUig I 263, 311, 312 and 328, UigTot 49 (twice), Ernte 117, BT XIII 1,6 and 24,1, Ht VII 8 b 9 and HtPar 225,12 *apud UW* 285 a top, ms. T II 7 15.501 (U 3088) r 5 and 6 quoted in the n. to UigTot 895 and several times in Suv as quoted variously by Röhrborn.

yad-ıl- 'to spread (intr.), to be spread or widespread'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. The couple *açıl- yadıl-* is quoted thrice from Ht in *UW* 41 b s.v. *ačıl-* par. 4; a further ex. see *UW* 81 a for the biverb *akıl- yadıl-*, *ula-l-* above for the biverb *ulal- yadıl-*. *an yadıl-* appears in HamTouen 5,55 and 3', 7,11 and 21,2 and HtPek 87 a 4 (*UW* 250 b bottom) etc., *aṭı* [ç]*avı ırakta yadıl-* ShōAgon p. 207,6, *kü(sï) aṭ(ı) yadıl-* in HamTouen 7,11, KP 7,2 etc., *aṭ(ı) kü(sï) yadıl-* in BT XIII 49,45, Suv 567,12, TT I 146 etc. *keŋürü yadıl-* can be found in HtPar 21 v 21 and BuyKäl 29. Further exs. of *yadıl-* occur in Maitr 13 r 18, 19 v 15, 88 r 10 and 150 v 15, UigTot 444, 446, 1056 and 1069, CYK 102, BT VII H 7 and 26, UigKan 88, Ht VII 14 b 25, Ht X 1116 and 1127, HtPek 119 b 6-10 quoted in the n. to Ht X 60, LautHöllen 54, BT I D (59) and (101), BT II 902, BT III 125, a number of the times in ETŞ and frequently in the QB.

yakdur-ul- in l. 3 of a colophon quoted in AbiShotan p. 81 is a passive of *yak-tur-* 'to have printed': *ud yıl üçünç ay bir yaŋıka Kamçoḍa yakdurultı* '. . . got printed . . .'.

yanç-ıl- 'to be crushed or oppressed'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Add *yançılıp öŋi saçılur* (BT XIII 16,4).

yap-ıl- 'to be covered, closed'. *EDPT* from the DLT and the QB; the instances of QB 1321 and 4638 are not mentioned. Found also in BuddhStab II 16.

379 A verb '*tüşül-*' does not exist; see *tüz-ül-* above and footn. 375 for another non-instance in BT XIII.

yapr-ıl- is attested in Heilk II 3,156 in the phrase *yaprılıp tursar . . .* 'if it adheres . . .' in fragmentary context. *yaprul-* 'to stick closely' in the DLT has the rounding of the second syllable either from the /p/, or as a reflex of the second formative, *-Ur-*, in its unsyncopated shape. The subject is a wound in Heilk, clothes in the DLT. The Heilk instance does not appear in the *EDPT*, and is wrongly quoted in the *DTS* as '*yavrıl-*'. Rachmati's '*yabrıl-*' is confusing. *yap-ur-*, q.v. below, means 'to smoothe, to level'; this is a bit different from what one would expect the base of *yaprıl-* to signify. The semantic connection between *yap-* and *yaprıl-* is clear, however.

yar-ıl- 'to split (intr.), to be split'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. It applies to the 'splitting open' of the ground in U I 37,17 and Maitr 105 r 10, to the 'bursting' of flowers in Maitr 55 v 17 and BuddhUig I 97; the DLT also has the phrase *çeçäk yarılu* of flowers bursting into bloom. The bursting apart of human flesh is described in IrqB, M1, Heilk I and, not mentioned in the dictionaries, Maitr 61 r 7 (with *yırıl-*) and Ernte 109. The metaphorical breaking of the heart is *yüräk yarıl-* (TT X and Suv) whence (described in section 3.311) the phrase *yüräk yarılınçıg* 'heartbreaking'. Very similar are the passages *yäk içkäkniŋ başı yeti öŋi yarılgay InçA kaltı alı ıgaç täg* (TT VI 375) and *yarılgay olarnıŋ başları yeti bin öŋi adrılıp, InçA kaltı şutı atl(ı)g ıgaç butıkı yarılmış täg* (the Suv fr. ms. T II Y 59 (U 1868 a) r 2-5 quoted in n. to ÄgFrag (1) F 3). The QB 4715 and 6139 exs. are not mentioned in the *EDPT*; neither are the ones of Maitr 227 v 17 and Ht X 1016.[380]

(y(a)ra-l- has been read in TT VIII A 34 (quoted in the *EDPT*) and HamTouen 5,22, in both cases with unclear use and meaning.)

yarat-ıl- is quoted in the *EDPT* with a TT VIII ex., *bilgä b(i)lig üzä y(a)ratılmış -bol-*. Under *et-il-* I quote a number of exs. of the biverb *etilmiş yaratılmış*. Further exs. appear in BT VIII B 60, ETŞ 13,171 (*Antsaŋ üzä yaratılmış takşut*) and 15,88 (*Aryabaşça yaratılmış . . . takşut*), BuddhUig I 272 (*KÖNGÜL birlä yaratılmamışın ukıt-*). Note that *etilmiş yaratılmış* signifies 'to be adorned with . . .', while *yaratılmış* is 'to be created'. *birlä yaratıl-* in Tenri A IV and VIII and Abhi A 93 b 9-10 and 94 b 7-8 appears to have some special meaning ("tätig werden" in *UW* 267 b bottom) and may be a loan translation. Mentioned here and not under *-tXl-* because it belongs semantically to *yarat-* (q.v. below among the *-(X)t-* verbs) and not to *yara-*.

yarot-ıl- is a hap. in Kinkashō D,c: *m(ä)nsiz tözlüküg, kim burxanlıg kün t(ä)ŋriniŋ savlıg yarokı üzä yarotılmışıg . . . kör-* 'to see the *nirätmatä*, which is made to shine (or shined upon or enlightened) by the word-light of the Buddha-sun'. *yaro-t-* (q.v. among the *-(X)t-* verbs) is common.

380 In this last ex., in *ämgäklig taloy [ögüz] ikiḍin yarılu, ikidin* is probably not the *+dln* ablative but the orientational locative case in *+tXn*.

yayı-l- 'to be shaken, upset, be put into disarray'. *DTS* and *EDPT*, the former especially under *jajïl- jajqal-* and '*tebränçsiz jajïlmaqsïz*'. Add *öŋtün baragla*[*r*] *bodun Sogçio taştınınta yayılıp* . . . 'the host going in front went into disarray on the outskirts of (the city of) S. and . . .' (ManBuchFrag II 2,2,5); *Sintu ögüz käçmiştä kemi yayılıp* [*suv*]*da tüşmiş* (Ht V 11 b 5) 'the ship was upset and fell into the [water]'. The biverb *yayıl- yaykal-* is attested also in BuddhUig II 498 and UigKan 86. *yayıl-* has been read also in Weih 6; if this is correct, it should not be translated as "zerstreut werden" but as 'to get excited'. The base is spelled as *yay-* in M III 6,3$_5$ (text 1, quoted in the *EDPT*) but as *yayı-*[381] in ManTüTex 15,282: *ol yäklärig bo yerdä suvda öŋi yayıgay sürgäy tamuka kämişgay*. The DLT's *yayık* can also only be explained as *yayı-k*, although that source otherwise syncopates the final vowel of *yayı-*. Kāšġarī thought that *yayık* was a "variant" of *yay-ıg* 'fickle, unstable' (which is attested 30 times in the QB) and the *EDPT* follows him. The QB 1428, 2336, 5600 and 5601 exs. of *yayıl-* are not mentioned in the *EDPT* either.

yayka-l- 'to be shaken, to sway, quake'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially under '*erkäçlän- jajqal-*'. Exs. of the biverb *yayıl- yaykal-* are mentioned in the previous entry; they have 'the earth' and 'waters' as subjects. An instance in fragmentary context occurs in Ht X 862. See *yayka-n-* for the base: It is an *+A-* derivate from *yayı-k* "unstable" (DLT fol. 454) living to this day in many Turkic languages. Old Turkic has no formative '*-kA-*' which could connect *yayka-* directly with *yayı-*; the allomorph *-kA-* of *+(X)rkA- ~ -(X)rkA-* (section 5.2) is inapplicable in this case.

yaz-ıl- 'to be or get relaxed or unattached', from *yaz-* 'to untie, dissolve' is attested in ShōAgon 3, p. 207,16: *ögrünçlüg sävinçlig bolmak üzä ötrü bolur yazılmakı ögirmäki*: The meaning 'to relax' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT ("the wrinkles of one's face"), from a *tafsīr* and from Ottoman. *yazılur intiri kaçıgla*[*r*]*ı* (BT XIII 19,64) signifies 'Their senses$_2$ become unattached'. *yazıl-* is common in the QB in the sense 'to get untied'.

yemr-il- 'to be shattered'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *yemrilti sokultı* (ms. T II D 523, 1.2); *kum* [*tāg*] *yıgılu / korum kaya tāg yemrilü* (Māngi 25) "[wie] Sand angehäuft wird, wie Steinfelsen niederstürzen"; *täŋri kükräp yer täprämäk tıl-*

381 As S. Tezcan stated in the 1988 session of the P. I. A. C. at Weimar, this word should not be read as '*barašlı*' with the edited text. The facs. is clearly visible but admittedly ambiguous; this is the *-(X)gIl* form of *bar-*, with */ı/* spelled as A.

382 *yay-*/*yayı-* never signifies 'verbreiten, austreiben' in Old Turkic, as Zieme writes in his n. to BT XIII 39,23. What he is thinking of is *yad-*, the phonic change of which, however, took place after Old Turkic. Therefore, there can be no "dev. Nomen" from this latter base of the form '*yayı*'. The extra "Haken" which Zieme saw after the '*ı*' is not superfluous at all: The word can be read as *yaylag* (q.v. above, section 2.73), the scribe having forgotten to add the hook of the L.

tagınta tag yemrilip üŋür açılmış (Ht V 2 b 5); *kök kalıktın ulug türlüg tag kayı tüşmiş yemrülmiş* (thus) *täg* (UigTöt 325) translated "herunterstürzen"; *yemrü miş v(ı)rxar säŋrämkä yakın* "nahe den verfallenen Tempeln und Klöstern" (Maitr 109 r 4); a further ex. in Maitr 101 r 12-13 is translated as "zerstört"; *tag yemrilürçä* (BuddhUig II 245; similarly 583); *ulug ta*[*g ye*]*mrilmiqkä* (thus).[383] An ex. in Suv 602,14 has *yemr-* and *yemril-* together, applying to the mouth of a canal. The translation "niederherunter-stürzen" does not seem appropriate but is derived only from the context. See the *EDPT* for the (presumably simple) base; an ex. for it not mentioned there occurs in Maitr 60 r 4.

yer-il-, of objects 'to be split apart'. *EDPT* from the DLT, and also in *tsun tsuŋ*[384] *yerilip yırılıp* (BT II 982; read thus) 'torn to pieces the size of an inch'. Ht VII 2039 has the biverb *adrılgalı yerilgäli* applying to persons who get separated and are parted; Hochzeit 35 can also be completed to *ay ayıŋa* [*adrı*]*l*[*m*]*azun, yıl yılıŋa yerilmä*[*zün* 'may they not part, month after month and year after year'.

1 *yet-il-* from *yet-* 'to get lost' is badly attested. Maitr 6 v 3 has a biverb *yetilür alkınur* between lacunae. Neujahr 35 is likelier to be *ätözlärintin ırayu*, [*koŋ*]*gıl-lär*[*in*]*tin* (*y*)*eṭilü* 'removing themselves from their bodies, disappearing from their hearts', which is considered a possibility in the n. thereto; *it-il-* 'to be pushed', favoured by the ed., seems less likely to me. The common *yet-lin-* has some exs. without initial /y/, and the hapax legomena (*y*)*ettür-ün-* and (*y*)*etiŋi-* lack it as well. See *yet-tür-* below on why I write the base with /e/ and not /ï/; in view of the unstable /y/, its original shape must have been **het-*. *it-il-* 'to be pushed' is found in the DLT but not in Old Turkic proper.

2 *yet-il-* is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT on; it is found also in Uigur, where it can mean 'to suffice' or 'to arrive'. This accords with the ambiguity of 2 *yet-*, which is 'to catch up with, overtake' and also 'to be sufficient; to overcome'. *küçi / küçüŋ yet-* to be strong enough' (U II 26,12-13; U III 71,6, TT VII 25,18 etc.) is similar to *küçüm näçük yetilgay?* (InscrOuig V 47). *yılımız yaşımız yetdi* "our years and age have caught up with us (i.e. we have come to the end of our lives)" in U II 88,79 has its counterpart in *yaş yetil-* (QB 261 and 1222) and *üd yetil-* (QB 1099 and 1211) and cf. *karılık yetil-* (QB 5716). *avıçga arokı yetti* (KP 37,1) exactly corresponds to *arokuŋ yetilip kälmiştä / ançak*(*ı*)*ya udıyu* . . . (BT XIII 12,145) 'when you get tired, sleep a bit and . . .'. *bakırı ädi tavarı yetilmädin* (TuoLuoNi 347) and *köŋülüm biligim yetilmädin* (Ht VII 2 a 21) both sig-

383 There is no reason to devise the translation "dahinschmelzen" for this instance (Ernte 6): During the thawing season, ice masses often move to the edges of precipices and get shattered when falling off them.

384 Found also in U II 86,42 (Kutlug): The reference in the *DTS* should be corrected accordingly.

nify 'not to be enough'. *küç* (or *köç*?) *yetilmäyükkä* (Ht V 13 a23) could either be '. . . were not equal to the task' or '. . . did not arrive'.

yevil- 'to be equipped, fitted out' is attested in Suv 566,8 (quoted in the *DTS*) and in DLT ff. (for which see the *EDPT*). The DLT ms. fluctuates between *yevil-* and *yevül-*, the variation of the second vowel being due to the rounding effect of the /v/. Cf. *yevä-g* and *yevin-* above, *yevä-t-* below.

1 *yıg-ıl-* 'to be accumulated'. Discussed in the *EDPT*; add *yıgılmış yazoklar* (ETŞ 13,17). Another ex. in BT III 61 is a biverb with *teril-*. '*bürtmäkdin yakıldaçı*', which appears twice in TT V B, has, in Kudara's reedition, been corrected to *yıgıl-*. Further: *al[ko] yumgı yıgıldı* 'all assembled together' (BT XIII 6,15); *beş türlüg ärkliglär birlä yıgılıp turzun* 'May the five types of senses remain collected' (*ibid.* 12,15) and *barçası yumgı yıgılsar* (BT XIII 35,7). A Brāhmī ex. with *yıgılur* can be found in ms. Mz 648 ([T II] S 19 + I M 8 II), 2nd story ("Der blinde Brahmane") a v5 in SktUigBil. More exs. in Ht VII 4 a1, 9 b10 and 16 a12, X 1086 and elsewhere in Ht, UigTot 281, 299, 302, 876, 1113 etc., at least 20 times in Maitr, ShōAv 258, AmitIst 23, Hochzeit 21, Ernte 96, BT VII A 223-4, Suv 33,8 and 188,10, BT VIII A 231 and 254 and Anh. 2-3,10, BT III 462 and so forth. *yıg-ıl-* served as anti-tr. for *yıg-*; 1 *yıg-ın-* is in Old Turkic used in exclusively spiritual meanings, while the DLT has it as medial.

2 *yıg-ıl-* is, in DLT fol. 477, distinguished from the other verb of this shape. For the present one he writes: "*är iştin yıgıldı* 'The man refrained from work'. Also when someone else prevents him – tr. or not tr. [i.e. passive or middle]". This *yıgıl-* is derived from 2 *yıg-*, documented under 2*yıg-ın-* above. Cf., further, the following Middle Turkic sentences, quoted by Bodrogligeti in *JAOS* 104/3 (1984): 463: *bilig Ḥaqqnı bilmāk, taqı āmrini tutup yıġmışındın yıġılmaq kamāl* 'Knowledge is to know God, to carry out his commandments and to abstain completely from what he has forbidden'; *yıġ(ġ)aqtın yıġılmas tākābbürlüg är* 'An insolent person does not abstain from what is prohibited (through religion)'. 2 *yıgıl-* may appear also in UigTot 876: *törт türlüg yıgılguluk ig kämlär* is hardly "die viererlei anhäufenden Krankheiten[2]" as translated by the eds., as *yıgıl-* is passive and *-gUlXk* a necessitative form. It could signify "The four illnesses which should be prevented', if the Tib. original permits it.

yıgr-ıl- is attested in BT XIII 3,66: *b[ut]ł[arı] . . . künnüŋ çogı üzā . . . kavruldı . . . udlukları artok yıgrılıp . . .* 'to get drawn together, to get wrinkled'. *EDPT* from DLT and modern languages; the language of the Quu (Lebed) uses it in connection with the skin. The *EDPT* quotes the base only from Shor, but it also gave *yıgır-gok* (q.v. in section 3.22).

yırt-ıl- is attested in Maitr 61 r8, in *'ätim(i)z yinim(i)z yarılur yırtılur örtänür yalar* 'Our flesh and bodies get cleaved and torn, . . .'. The *EDPT* quotes it from the DLT, Middle Turkic etc.

yod-ul- 'to be or get smeared'. In the *EDPT* attested from the DLT on ("to be wiped"). Appears also in Maitr 176 v 22 (BT IX 184,22): *bir ikint[işkä] amran-makın bodulup yodulu[p . . .] . . . ulug yazoklar ärt(t)imiz* of sexual contact. *yogr-ul-* 'of wet substances to combine with dry ones to form mud, dough etc.'. *EDPT* and *DTS* from the DLT and Suv. Cf. *yogurt* (a cognate) and *yogun* (a cognate of the base).

(*yorı-l-* is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*; it appears to have been an *ad-hoc* creation in Kinkashō A,d: *ädgülärig kuruldurdaçılar üzä nizvanılar üzä tıragsızlar*[385] *üzä özin wkdämin*[386] *amtı yorılur*, in Röhrborn and Laut, 1988: 29 translated as ". . . wird durch die Die-Guṇas-Schädigenden, durch die Klefas, durch die ohne (Elefanten)-Haken, nach Gutdünken jetzt gegangen". The Skt. text has *caryate*, the medio-passive form of the root *car-* = *yorı-*. In Skt., however, this root has the additional meaning 'to set about doing something, to approach a task', when it is tr. The translation of *nir-aṅkuśa* is also over-literal, as this is also used metaphorically to signify 'unchecked, unruly, uncontrolled'.[387])

yörgä-l- 'to get wrapped around with something, to be wrapped around' does not appear in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* has one ex. from Suv. We further find *kuguş kapta yorg(ä)lip . . .* 'wrapped around in a leather sack' (BT XIII 17,3),] *yorgälip* in fragmentary context in BT XIII 19,109, *InçA k(a)ltı bıntadu kurtı öz yapıpa yorgälmiş täg* (Ht VII 11 a5) 'as the silkworm is wrapped in his own thread';[388] *seziklig toor üzä bäk kang yörgälip* (Scharl 26) "mit dem Netz des Zweifels fest umhüllt". Two exs. of the biverb *ba-l- yörgä-l-* are metaphorical: *]barça birgärü yorgälmiş balmuşlar ol* (ShōAgon 1,180) and *tümän türlüg ämgäklär üzä [yor]gälürlär balurlar* (Warnke 577). Another instance appears in Warnke 719. *yörgä-* is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from three Uigur exs.; we find it also in Ht IV 1254 and eight times in the Maitr (two of these with *tolga-*, one with *ägür-* and another with *ürt-*). Cf. also *yörgä-n-* above; it appears as *örgän-* in an early text, which points towards initial **h*.

385 There is no reason to take the present variant as a "Schreibfehler", as Röhrborn and Laut, 1988 suggest: See *urgu-g* in section 3.101.

386 This word is discussed in n. 88 in vol. 1. Kudara at least transcribes the word as '*ökdämin*'. Röhrborn and Laut, 1988 obscure the ms.'s data by writing '*ök temin*' where the ms. in fact clearly separates between 'WYKD'M and YN but makes no division after the K. The vowel after the dental is ' and not Y, as Röhrborn and Laut's transcription would let us believe; nor are Uigur words spelled with initial D known to me. In the interlinear mapping of the Skt. and Uigur passage, Röhrborn and Laut moved '*ök*' out of the domain of *öka* into that of *svaira* (as against Kudara's attempt).

387 As Kudara stresses, the text actually has no meaning as such in Turkic; it cannot, therefore, be used to describe Turkic grammar.

388 Adiotto wrongly *yyuk'l-*.

yör-ül- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from Suv (once) and the DLT and signifies 'to be unwrapped'. In QB 6028 it is used of a dream, and signifies 'to be interpreted'. *yuk-ul-* 'to be polluted with something; of the polluting substance, 'to infect, soil, adhere to'. The *EDPT* quotes this verb from the DLT, where the voicelessness of the velar is (thrice) beyond doubt; I don't see why Röhrborn spells it with g. What the *EDPT* quotes from Kuan probably does not belong to this verb at all. Attested in *ät' özläriŋä öl ödüş yukulur* (Maitr 198 v16) and *olarnıŋ nızvanlıg u birlä yukulmış* (read thus) *bilgä biliglärin açıp* . . . (HtPar 164,6 quoted in UW 38 a s.v. *ač-* par. 6). A further instance, quoted from Şiŋko Şäli Totoŋ's writings by K. Röhrborn at the 1988 (Weimar) session of the P.I.A.C., is *ägsük bol-guluk ayıg kılınçka yukulmagalı* . . . "nicht befleckt zu werden".

yuv-ul- appears in Toñ 26,[389] in *s Barlık aşdımız, yuvulu entimiz*. One is reminded of *äşyäk yuvdı* "The donkey ran at top speed" in the DLT. DLT fol. 478 gives *topık yuvuldı* "The ball rolled" as example sentence for the verb. A verse he quotes there, however, has the sentence *Kwlbak udu yuvulma* translated "do not roll behind *Qulbäq*"; i.e., presumably, "do not run after him". The QB has *yuvul-* in couplets 4902, 6213 (the only one mentioned by the *EDPT*), 6238 and 6327, all of them of tears 'running or rolling' down one's face. The central meaning of *yuvul-* must then have been one of a 'free movement down an inclined or vertical surface'. The *EDPT* gives yuv- 'to roll (tr.)' only from the DLT on; but the U III 64,21 text should probably be read *boyunun buçup başın yerdä yuvdı* instead of '*yoidī*'.[390] See *yuv-lun-* in section 7.22.

Morphology

It is by no means the case that all polysyllabic verbs ending in /l/ are -(*X*)*l-* verbs. Simple verbs in °*l-* are, e.g., *kötül-* 'to stretch out one's legs' (*EDPT* from the DLT on; also in Ht X 741, Shö IX a12 and BT XIII 60,11), *sögül-* 'to roast' (attested with object e.g. in BT XIII 5,95), *suçul-* 'to pluck out' (q.v. under *suçl-un-*), *topol-* 'to pierce' (discussed under *topl-un-* above), *yaŋıl-* 'to err' and *yavul-* 'to be tamed, subdued' (related to *yavaş*). These will, of course, be excluded from discussion in this section.

The aorist and converb vowel of -(*X*)*l-* verbs is /U/, also when the derivate is monosyllabic: *balůr* (Ht VII 1873 and Warnke 577), *tolur* (BT I D(223) // B(19

389 '*jobalu*', the transcription given by Aalto (among others), is impossible for the reasons gi the *EDPT*.

390 Rolling people's heads about must have had a special significance, as the DLT has the verse *başın ol yuvar*. Cf. also n. 346 in vol. 1.

and four times in the QB[90]) and *tolu* (M I 25,11 (Gebet), Ht VII 1923, Hollen 105 and 132, TT V A 81-2, TT X 185, Heilk I 176-7, Suv 199,20, TT VIII B 10, in a number of exs. in the QB and in others quoted above s.v. *to-l-*). *ye-l-ür*, which appears only in the DLT entry, can be added to the list. One of the reasons for considering *yal-* to "blaze up" to be a simplex is the fact that its converb and aorist vowel is /A/.[91]

-(X)l- is added to bases ending in all the consonants and vowels.[92]

The only formative combination which has *-(X)l-* as second element is *-tXl-*, discussed in the next section. Together with it we mention a few instances of the formative sequence *-tUr-Xl-*. *-(X)l-* is, in fact, very often added to causative bases. Mentioning only the unproblematic instances we have *ag-t-ıl-*, *agt-ar-ıl-*, *apv-t-ıl-*, *buş-r-ul-*, *çomr-ul-*, *bût-ûr-ûl-*, *ât-ız-ıl-*, *keŋü-r-ül-*, *kön-t-ül-*, *köşi-t-il-*, *kutad-tur-ul-*, *kutsıra-t-ıl-*, *orna-t-ıl-*, *tın-tur-ul-*, *tol-gur-ul-*, *tüg-ür-ül-*, *yak-tur-ul-* and *yaro-t-ıl-*. *-(X)l-* derivates from other deverbal stems, on the other hand, are not formed: Not from desideratives, cooperative-reciprocals, reflexive or medials. *adru-l-*, *buyun-ul-* and *tägş-il-* are not real exceptions, as a study of these verbs will show. The bases of all three are simple from the semantic point of view; the assignment of *adru-* is problematical, to say the least.

A number of *-(X)l-* verbs are expanded with *-tUr-*; they are discussed together with the other verbs formed with that formative. Taken together with what was just stated concerning the addition of *-(X)l-* to deverbally derived stems, it emerges straightway that passive and causative form a category distinct from that including the other diathesis morphemes. There are a number of *-l-Xş-* verbs, however, and they are discussed in section 7.1. The anti-transitive formative *-lXn-* (section 7.22) has *-(X)l-* as its first element.

One would have expected *-(X)l-*, the 'classical' passive formative, to get added only to transitive bases. This is not at all the case: *ak-ıl-* (common), *bar-ıl-* (hap. in TT VIII A in the phrase *eyen barıl-*), *bat-ıl-*, *kurı-l-* (~ *kurul-*, common, metaphorical), *öç-ül-* (common), *sınta-l-*, *sız-ıl-*, *taş-ıl-*, *täg-il-* (metaphorical), *täyşä-l-*, *tir-il-* (common; *tir-* hap.), *tur-ul-* (common, metaphorical), 1 *yet-il-* and

91 Couplets 536, 759, 5731 and 5913. *tolır* in QB 137, rhyming with *yorır*, must be the result of poetic licence.

92 It has no Old Turkic cognates: Cf. n. 295 above.

93 Amanžolov, 1969: 72 is wrong in thinking that it is not added to stems ending in /V. We have a number of such exs., the more common ones being *bilil-* and *kılıl-*. Amanžolov is thinking of a complementary distribution with *-(X)n-*. This does not exist in Old Uigur, although it is found in some modern languages. The content of the passive and medial-reflexive formatives coincides only when they represent the anti-transitive. Such verbs formed with both *-(X)n-* and *-(X)l-* are discussed below.

yorı-l- (hap. Kinkashō) all come from intr. bases. To this we can add *sür-il-* 'to endure, remain as one is, stay, tarry, calm down', which comes from *sür-* 'to endure something'. This base is tr. while the *-(X)l-* derivate is intr., but the latter refers to the former's subject, not to its object. The metaphorical *-(X)l-* derivates from intr. bases remind us of the metaphorical use of *-(X)n-* described above, but are much fewer. In metaphorical *ügül-*, e.g., *ügün-* in this sense was blocked because that verb already existed with a different meaning. In other cases, parallelism may have helped: *akıl-* was used together with *kadıl-*, *yadıl-*, *tüzül-*, *sävül-* or *ulal-*, *tapıl-* with *sökül-*. With the hap. legomena *barıl-* and *yorıl-*, the derivate appears to have been a calque on a Skt. medio-passive within a Slavish translation. With *tür-il-*, the base had actually fallen into misuse. With derivates from intr. bases, at any rate, the addition of *-(X)l-* is not accompanied by any change in the group of participants.

Syntax

-(X)l- verbs are not usually accompanied by oblique nominals; this fact holds for passives, anti-transitives, medial-reflexives in general. Most of the nominals which do accompany *-(X)l-* verbs are place and time expressions. E.g. *ol ädgü kü at törт bulunda yadılu* (KP VII 2) 'That good name and reputation spread in all four directions'. With the ablatival locative: *türk bodun kamın bolmayın Tavgaçda ad(ı)rılu* (Toñ 2) 'The Türk nation separated from China without having a khan (of its own)'. The ablative form itself is also attested: *anın anınta elig bägnin oŋ kolu bilägindin käsilip kulıçı birlä yerdä tüşti* (U IV C135) 'While that happened, the king's right arm was cut off at its wrist and fell to earth together with his sword'. Another strictly concrete case form is the instrumental: *ı(ä)ŋrilı̈i yl̈äkli y(a)roklı karalı ol üdün k[a]lılu* (Chuast 7) 'God and demon, light and darkness (were) mixed at that time'.

-(X)l- verbs accompanied by the dative

It turns out that most of the dative forms accompanying these verbs are also in concrete use. A temporal dative: *ol ädgü kü at törт bulunda yadılu, künüŋä kol-guçılar üzülmädi* '. . . Day by day the (stream of) beggars did not stop' (KP VII 3). In some other cases the dative is dependent on the specific content of the base: *el bulgakıŋa katıltımız ärsär* . . . (TT IV B 18) 'If we took part in public unrest . . .'; *igid könül küçädip öçürgäli umasar mänli kiŋli körümkä ikilägü ävrilür* (BT I B (103)) 'If falseness grows strong and one cannot quench it, one turns again to the view (distinguishing between) "I" and "others".'

The following instance is instrumental rather than local: *kuguş [yı]pka yor-*

g(ā)lip . . . (ms. THI 3008 [Ch/U 7503] 3 quoted in the n. to BT VII A 407), translated as "mit Leder-Schnüren umwunden". The dative in *kerigünçsüz [özüg sawya arılıpan* [. . .]*O sapıksar, ānā ol yāklār yegāy* (ManTüTks (15)277) shows the verb signifying 'to be tricked' accompanied by what could be either an instrumental or an ergative expression.

Unmistakeably ergative datives accompany *-(X)l-* verbs only in very late texts, and very rarely: *anıg arasında bo savlar pır(a)s(ı)naçı eligkā äşidilü* (BT III 366) 'In the meantime these matters were heard by king Prasenajit'. With the same verb, *kimkā äşidilip ängäkligniŋ açığ üni* . . . (BT XIII 24,3) "von wem gehört wird des Leidenden bittere Stimme". Also with *kimkā*, in TT VIII B10-12: *anapānasmṛti dhyān kimkā tolo ülkāl uz pıgrunulmış ärsär, eyen käzigçā tüşürlänürmiş, nätäg täŋri burxan üzā nomlalmış ärsär, ol po yertençöü yalrıyur*. The instigator of the action described by the form *nomla-ł-mış* is Buddha; just as clearly, the person who could carry out the action described by the verbs *bıgrun-* and *nägülän-* is referred to as *kim*. *kimni üzā* does exist (e.g. in M III 11,11$_1$ and 22,11$_2$ and BT III 149) and *bıgrunul-* can govern an *üzā* phrase (the only other ex. of this verb). The Skt. original has the genitive *yasya* 'whose', so that the Uigur wording cannot be a calque either. I take this dative to have been taken over from the ergative dative which we find with *-(X)l-* verbs in passive function.

-(X)l- verbs accompanied by phrases with *üzā*

The sentence just discussed already supplied us with an ergative *üzā* phrase accompanying a passive form with *-(X)l-*. Another ex. is *oyta kämişilip tut uçuz bolmaklıg toz tup'rak üzā kömülülär basılular* (BT III 135-6). Notice that this last *üzā* phrase allows both of an ergative and an instrumental interpretation. One can translate 'They were thrown into a hole and buried and pressed down by the dust and the earth of despicableness', or 'with the dust and the earth of . . .'. In case the instrumental interpretation of the *üzā* phrase is adopted, there are again two interpretations: Either the *-(X)l-* forms are passive, in which case one must understand that an unspecified (and hence indefinite) person used the dust and the earth to bury 'them', or the verbs are anti-transitive, in which case 'their' intr. buried and repressed state is referred to. Cf. also *nägülük muntag yaŋılmak üzā nälinıŋız ärki?* (Ht VII 2126-7) 'Why is it that you were so inhibited through (or 'by') error?'. Further exs.: *ajuntakı kılınç tüşi üzā ürtülmişlär* (BT I D(106)) 'those who are covered by the fruit of (good) action (performed) in the world'; *bilkā b(i)lig üzā y(a)ratılmış bolmasar*. . . (TT VIII A11) 'If it is not created through (or 'by') wisdom . . .'. The status of the *üzā* phrases in these clauses seems undecided. There are also many exs. in which an instrumental interpretation seems the only possible one: *yükünür biz idiz ädrämi üzā säçilmiş atl(ı)g ı(ā)ŋrı*

burxan kutmꝫ (BT II 793) 'We bow to his honour the divine Buddha named 'he who has been singled out through his lofty virtue'.

Among the numerous sentences in which an *-(X)l-* verb is accompanied by a phrase with the postposition *üzä* I have found only few in which freedom of action can reasonably be attributed to the entity represented by the nominal governed by *üzä*. Here is one of them: *ol tınlıgıg ınçlp alka ançulayu kälmişlär üzä viyakrıt ärür tep bilgälük ol* (U II 39,100-101, Uşnişa Viçay). What we have here is the passive of the phrase *viyakrıt kıl-* 'to profesy', not of *kıl-* by itself; the sentence as a whole is an ex. of the *accusativus cum indicativo* construction so common in Uigur. Thus: 'Let it be known that a profesy by all the *tathāgatas* has gone out concerning that creature, and that it is recoilless and unflinching from the highest straightforward, Buddhahood of enlightenment'. Another instance is *nätäg täŋri burxan üzä nomlalmış ärsär, ol po yertençütä yalıtıyur* (TT VIII B 12) already quoted above. This part of the sentence is a real calque on the Skt. *yatha buddhena* [*deśita*] *so 'smin* [*pra*]*bhāsate loke* 'as has been profesied by Buddha, who shines in this world': *nätäg* and *ol* have been made to introduce relative clauses, which they cannot do in any real form of Old Turkic; the relative clause describing Buddha has been postposed and not embedded. In accord with this practice, the Skt. instrumental is translated by the *üzä* phrase. In this and in the previous ex., using the basically instrumental *üzä* to create ergative phrases appears to be a Sanskritism; the whole phenomenon may be due to foreign influence. One other point has to be kept in mind concerning these sentences as well as the one with *kömültülär basılılar* appearing above: In both, the verbs in question are used in parallelism with other verbs, with which they have the agent in common. As real passives with explicit ergative expression they could indeed have been transformed ('back') into active constructions; this, however, could not have happened to the parallel expressions, be it only because there are no ergative phrases to them: The topic and comment pattern would be disrupted. If, moreover, *viyakrıt kılıl-* would have been transformed into the active, *ol tınlıgıg* could have been mistaken for the agent of *viyakrıt kıl-* and *ançulayu kälmişlär* for a direct object. Except under such very special conditions, *-(X)l-* verbs do not seem to have participated in passive constructions of the type 'John was hit by Jack'. They are, that is, either anti-transitive, or at least passive only in the sense of the Arabic *majhūl*: They are used when an entity undergoes an action whose instigator is not mentioned.

7.32 *-tXl-* (*— -(X)tXl- — -tUrXl-*): LEXICAL MATERIAL

agırla-tıl- 'to be revered' is a hap. in ETŞ, quoted and discussed in the *UW*. It serves as passive for *agır+la-* 'to honour, revere' and not to *agırla-t-* 'to get oneself (or somebody else) honoured or revered'. *agırla-n-* is in the *UW* mentioned as a hap. with no context (i.e. in fragmentary surroundings); it can therefore be assigned no meaning or function.

alka-tıl-mış appears as a biverb with *ögitilmiş* once in BT III, quoted and discussed in the *UW*. The two together signify 'praised', which is also the meaning of *alka-t-mış* (discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs). *alka-tıl-* here appears to have been created after *ögitil-* on the analogy of the biverb *ög- alka-* (numerous exs. in the *UW* entry for *alka-*); it is not a derivate from *alka-t-mış*.

amra-tıl-mış is a hap. in Laut 37 not mentioned in any of the dictionaries: *amratılmış sävitilmiş [ay t(ä)ŋ]ri tilgäni* 'the beloved moon-disc' (with Skt. original). Appears to have been created in a way very similar to that of the verb of the previous entry: *sävitil-* is well attested like *ögitil-*, and *amra-* was often used together with *säv-*. *amra-tıl-mış* is not the passive of *amra-t-mış* 'beloved'. The common *amra-n-* is *not* anti-transitive.

ay-turul-mış ūṭ ärig (ETŞ 13,167) is 'a prescribed advice$_2$, something one is told to do'. Hap., not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *ay-tur-* 'to make somebody tell something' appears in DLT fol. 138, but cannot have been the source of the present verb: 'an advice one was made to utter' is not a meaning appropriate to the context.

aya-tıl-mış 'honoured, revered' appears in U II 60,3$_2$; *ayatılıp* in TT VIII D 12 and 21 as gloss to Skt. participles with the same meaning. Synonym of *agırla-tıl-* as *alkatıl-* and *ögitil-*, *amratıl-* and *sävitil-* are synonym couples. *aya-* and *agırla-* are very often used together as a biverb (see *UW* s.v. *aya-*). *aya-n-* is a hap. in the phrase *ayanmakka tükällig* in ZiemeTārā, while *aya-l-* appears thrice in Ht (twice *ayalmış*, once *ayalıp*). When somebody is described as *deserving* the honour he gets, *aya-t-* is used (q.v. among the *-(X)t-* verbs). *aya-tıl-* is not a passive of that but, like the equally rare *aya-l-* and *aya-n-*, derived directly from *aya-*.

bas-ıtıl- 'to be overwhelmed' is found in ETŞ 10,68 (*-mış*) and 154 (*-maklıg*), not mentioned in the dictionaries. *bas-ıl-* appears only in BT III 135, while *bas-ın-* has a tr. meaning, semantically removed from that of the concrete meaning of *bas-*. *bas-ıtıl-* is thus the strictly passive counterpart of *basıt-*, which means 'to let oneself be overwhelmed'.

bulga-tıl- is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 187: *ig käm adasıntın adakgalı örlätgäli*[394] *bulgaṭılgalı ugrasar . . .* "wenn . . . sie durch die . . . Krankheiten und Gebrechen . . . in

Wirrnis gebracht werden sollten". *bulga-t-* and *bulga-l-*, which both also have passive meaning, are also hap. legomena. *bulgat-* appears in a Manichaean text and is unlikely to have served as base for *bulgatıl-*. *bulga-n-* is the only common verb in this family of lexemes.

er-itil-miş is a hap. in *ançulayu kälmiş üzä eritilmiş* "durch den Tathāgata getadelt" (BT III 645). This comes from (*y*)*er-* 'to criticise, loathe'; it is the late alternative to *er-it-miş* (q.v. in section 7.56 below). The -(*X*)*l-* derivate from this base is attested in Qarakhanid, with a different meaning.

ısır-tıl- is a hap. in ETŞ 10,67: *içgäklär üzä ısırtılmak* 'to be bitten by devils'. The *EDPT* has Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic exs. of the base; it is, however, attested in Suv 19,12-13 and Warnke 53f. (quoted in *UW* 275b). The DLT also has the passive *ısrıl-* and the causative *ısırt-* 'to make somebody bite something'; there is no reason to think that *ısır-tıl-* comes from this latter.

kavza-tıl- 'to be surrounded'. *EDPT*, and *DTS* under *qavsatıl-*. Further exs. of *kavzatılmış* occur in ETŞ 13,75 and BT VII A 114, 121, 427 and B 4 (*taloy* [*ögüz*] *üzä kavzatılmış*). *kavzaṭıl-* appears also in BT VIII A 470, 476 and 481, ShōAv 89 (*mıŋ yol yarokları üzä tägirmiläyü kavzaṭılıp*) and BuddhUig II 597 (*ULUG kuvragka kavzaṭılu*) and 113 (*68000 apsarılar üzä kavzatılu*). *kavza-* 'to surround' and *kavza-t-* 'to surround oneself with' are discussed in the section on -(*X*)*t-*.

kizlä-til- is a hap. in *adrok adrɔk ärdini äd tavarlar yula yokıntın karaŋgu üzä kiẓläṭilip* . . . (UigFalt 111) 'in the absence of a lamp, various$_2$ jewel articles$_2$ are hidden by the dark'. *kizlä-t-* 'to urge someone to conceal something' is attested in the DLT; by meaning, *kizlätil-* is not its passive but that of *kiz+lä-*, discussed among the *+lA-* verbs.

kurşa-tıl- appears twice in Uşnişa Viçay (quoted in the *EDPT* under *kavzatıl-*) in a biverb with *kavza-tıl-*; no difference in meaning can be detected between the two verbs. See also the *DTS*. *kurşatıl-* appears also in ETŞ 9,19 and BT VII A 461, and all four exs. end in *-u*. *kurşa-t-* appears in the DLT with the meaning "to order somebody to gird himself"; this cannot be the base of *kurşatıl-* as attested. *kurşa-* (discussed above among the *+A-* verbs) and *kurşa-n-* are found also in Uigur. The nominals referring to the surrounders appear in the U II 30,30 and BT VII A instances in *üzä* phrases.

külä-til- is a hap. in BT XIII 13,18: *külätilmiş kötrülm*[*iş baştınkı*]*ta baştınkı* "Gepriesener, Erhabener, der [Ersten] Erster, . . .". *külä-l-*, a Ht hap. quoted in the previous section, also appears as *külälmiş kötrülmiş*. No -(*X*)*t-* derivate of *kü+lä-* 'to praise' is attested. *ög-* and *külä-* are often used together; *küla-til-* therefore semantically and formally accords with *alka-tıl-* and *ög-itil-*. *külälmiş* qualifies 'the true doctrine'; *külätilmiş*, on the other hand, a supreme Buddha (lost in a lacuna) who is himself the source of his own praiseworthiness.

nomla-tıl-mış 'preached (participle)' appears in TT VIII A 16, ETŞ 10,291, BT VII B 112, BT VIII A 11, 14, 35 etc., BT XIII 13,27, 20,51 (stanza identical to the passage of the BT VII B 112 instance) and 50,13. Not mentioned by the *EDPT*; the only ex. quoted in the *DTS* belongs to Buyan, a post-Old Turkic addition to Suv. Several of the instances quoted above have the form *X üzä nomlatılmış* 'preached by X'. The only instance of *nomla-l-* (mentioned among the *-(X)l-* verbs) also has the shape *X üzä nomlalmış*. *nomla-t-* is a causative also by meaning. Again by meaning, *nomlatıl-* is not the passive of this causative but of *nom+la-*, 'to preach', an often used verb.

ög-ţıl- 'to be praised' is used in PetInscr 1,3, InscrOuig V 3 and QB 177 and 909, *ögiţil-* in ETŞ 15,3 and BT III 71. The proper name *Ögdülmiş* (thus) appears frequently in the QB. Most of these texts are late, whereas *ög-üt-miş* ~ *ög-it-miş* 'who has deserved praise' appears also in early texts. It is the only attested form of the stem *ög-üt-* / *ög-it-*, which is unlikely to have served as derivational base to *ög-til-*. *ög-* 'to praise' is also common.

ötün-dürül-miş 'humbly uttered (in ⟨my version of⟩ the Upālisūtra)' appears in ETŞ 10,290. The context does not permit us to connect it with *ötün-dür-* as it cannot have signified 'to be made to pray for (something)'. Another ex. of *ötündürül-* may have stood in InscrOuig V 1, but the context is unclear.

säv-itil- is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. We have *utmışnıŋ oglanları üzä* [*är*]*tingü sävitilmişkä* 'to him who is exceedingly loved by the Victor's sons' (ZiemeTārā 5d), *t(ā)ŋrilärli kinarılar üzä sävitilmişkä* 'to him who is loved both by the gods ⟨and⟩ the Kiṃnaras' (*ibid.* 20b) and *alko kamag burxanlar üzä artok sävitilmiş ıdok* (BT XIII 26,7) "die von allen$_2$ Buddhas äußerst geliebte Heiligkeit". Then we have, in BT III 72 and 578, the biverb *säviţilmiş taplaţılmış* and in Laut 37 *amratılmış säviţilmiş*, with the near-synonyms *amra-tıl-* and *tapla-tıl-*. There also are biverbs *säv-it- amra-t-* and *säv-it- tapla-t-*, but these signify 'to arouse love' or 'liking'. The just mentioned forms with *-tXl-mIş*, on the other hand, have, respectively, *yaŋı kün* and [*ay t(ā)ŋ*]*ri tilgäni* as kernel; these are not entities which could be given credit for arousing love or admiration.

sözlä-til-miş appears in TT VIII A 44[395] corresponding to Skt. *ukta*, in Kinkashō C,c corresponding to *vāhita*: 'uttered, proclaimed'. The same form is attested also in BT VII A 766 and BT VIII A 279, 286, 292 and 389. The finite verb with this meaning was *sözlä-l-*, of which the text just mentioned, BT VIII A, had an example. *sözlä-t-*, discussed below, has a 'real' causative meaning; *sözlätilmiş* is not its passive, however, as it refers to the utterance.

la-tıl-mış appears in BT III 72 and 578 in a biverb with *sävitilmiş* and qualifying *aŋı kün*. Further *üküşkä taplatılmış Maxa Sanpadi xan täg* (DruTur 11) "wie

ist VII A 44, as the *EDPT* writes.

der von vielen verehrte König Mahāsaṃmata (thus P. Zieme)"; *taplaglıglarka taplatılmış üçün, YMĀ bizin taplagım(ı)zta taplatılmış ärmäz üçün ymä ter* (Junshō A v10); *ol tınlıg . . . baxşı üzä taplatılmış ym[ā bolgay* (BT VIII B274) 'That creature . . . will be accepted as guru'; *. . . tep taplatılmışça* (BT XIII 13,28) 'as it is accepted/believed that . . .'. Related to this last use is *inçip munda yänä tamırlarıg beş türlüg üzä taplatılur* "Hier aber wiederum, was die Adern betrifft, so werden sie auf 5 Arten angenommen"[396] (UigTot 430). *tapla-t-* also has a passive-like meaning but implies self-triggering.

tapın-turul-mış is a hap. in SuvCaitya 31,23: *āzrua xormuztanıŋ . . . adakınta tapınturulmış . . . çaytı* 'the *caitya* of his (i.e. Buddha's) being done obeisance to at his (i.e. Buddha's) feet'. *tap-ın-* (q.v. above) governs objects in the dative.

tokı-tıl- 'to be struck (perhaps also to be driven along)' by the wind or a torrent. The *EDPT* quotes two exs.; add *suv kälginiŋä tokıtılmışlar* (ETŞ 10,225). Both *tokı-* and *tokı-t-* are common. *tokı-tıl-* is, by meaning, not derived from the latter. *tokıt-* has a causative meaning in most instances but a passive one in others.

yör-itil- has been identified by Röhrborn and Laut, 1988: 32 where Kudara had read '*yorıtıl-*': *mıŋ mıŋ tözünlär üzä yoritilmiş m(ā)nsiz tözlük*[397] (Kinkashō D,b) 'the *nirātmatā*, interpreted by thousands of nobles'. *yör-* 'to interpret' is reasonably common, an *-(X)t-* (or *-(I)t-*) derivate from it not attested. *yör-* is tr., and see *yör-ül-*: The QB uses *yör-ül-* for the interpretation of dreams, while the only Uigur ex. has it describe (physical) unwrapping.

yükün-türülmiş signifies 'one worshipped' and not 'one who is made to worship (someone else)'; it therefore belongs into this section and not into that of *-(X)l-*. *yükün-*, having, at any rate, the shape of an *-(X)n-* verb, could apparently not be expanded with *-(X)t-* even when incorporated into *-tXl-*. *yükün-türülmiş* is attested twice in the Utsukmaksız Darni (U II 53,3_3 and 54,2_1), in one case accompanied by instrumental-comitative *mudurlar üzä* and in the other by agentive *analar kuvragı üzä*. The first-mentioned instance is, both in meaning and shape, similar to the construction found with *tapınturulmış*: That also refers to the indirect object, and is accompanied by instrumental *tokırları üzä*. The second ex. is quoted by the *DTS*, none by the *EDPT*. There is another one with an agentive *üzä* phrase in BT VIII A260: *alko burxanlar üzä yükün-*

396 To judge by this translation, the eds. appear to have taken the accusative morpheme as a mark of thematisation. They *may* be right about this; this is just a speculation if there are no further exs. for such a construction, however. Alternatively, the accusative form may indicate that the verb was not meant as passive but as impersonal; That happens in Republican Turkish with the passive, however, without recourse to such a mixed construction. *taplaglıg* very often appears in UigTot with the meaning 'having a particular opinion or view or preference'.

397 Spelled as '*tözlüg*' by the editors; see under *+lXk* type B_5, section 2.77 above.

dürülmiş "von allen Buddhas verehrt". *yükün-* does not govern the accusative but the dative; formally seen, therefore, it should not have been able to undergo passive transformation; nor is an *-(X)l-* derivate from it attested. *yükün-tür-* is attested in Orkhon Turkic with real causative content. *yükün-* may originally have been an *-(X)n-* verb (and is discussed in section 7.2), but is semantically a simplex.

MORPHOLOGY

ötündürül-, *tapınturul-* and perhaps *yüküntürül-* are derived from deverbal bases; other bases are denominals in *+lA-*. The three verbs just mentioned and *ayturul-* *muş* have the rarer *-tUrXl-*; *aytıl-* would have been 'to be asked'. The exs. of all four passive *-tUrXl-* verbs end in *-mIş* and all are late. The variants *-tXl-*, *-XtXl-* and *-tUrXl-* taken together make the shape of the present formative identical to the sequence of a causative formative with *-Xl-*; what especially characterises the present combination is its meaning.

There are nearly as many verbs in the preceding section in which *-(X)l-* is added to causative bases as there are derivates in the present section. While the present (composite) formative is added only to tr. bases (with the dative-governing *yükün-* again an exception in a sense), the sequence causative formative + *-(X)l-* never appears after tr. bases. We could therefore speak of a complementary distribution and deal with the two phenomena together. We would, however, then be disregarding the fact that the causative element *here* contributes nothing to the meaning of the derivate. Where the causative of the base is attested, the *-tXl-*, *-XtXl-* or *-tUrXl-* form does not come from it by meaning, if that base is transitive.

Another characteristic of the present formation is the fact that more than half of its derivates are attested only in the *-mIş* form, as perfect passive participles. Even when other forms are attested, as with *tokıtıl-*, the *-mIş* form is unexpectedly well represented. Other verbs, as *agırla-tıl-*, *bulga-tıl-*, *ısır-tıl-*, are hap. legomena.

Thirdly, practically all verbs listed here occur only in relatively late Buddhist texts. The main exception is *ögtil-* in the QB. Neither Runic nor Manichaean sources have them; nor do I know of any instances from the Maitr, the *avadāna* collection of U III etc., not TT VI or KP. Very well represented, on the other hand, are sources as BT III, VII and VIII, UigTot etc. and late verse of ETŞ, BT XIII, BuddhUig II, ShōAv, Laut and Kinkashō. From this and from what was said above it can be concluded that it was ungrammatical in early Old Turkic to add causative formative + *-(X)l-* to transitive bases, be it separately or as a combination.

Most verbs in this section belong to several limited semantic domains. Group-

ing them by bases, we have *amra-*, *sāv-* and *tapla-* for loving or liking, *alka-*, *ög-* and *külā-* for praising, *agırla-* and *aya-* for revering and honouring and *(y)er-* for their opposite, *yükün-* for worshipping, *kavza-* and *kurşa-* for surrounding, *bas-*, *bulga-*, *ısır-* and *tokı-* have violent content, and only *kizlā-* 'to hide' stands by itself. The last group is *nomla-*, *sözlā-*, *ay-*, *ötün-* and *yör-*, which all refer to the emitting and receiving of religious verbal material. The formation appears to have spread within such semantic fields, often with the help of biverbs. After *aya-tıl-* existed, e.g., the common biverb *aya- agırla-* may have led the writer of the ETŞ verse to *agırla-tıl-*. Using the verb *ögitil-* he had learned with his language, the author of BT III may have created the biverb *alkatılmış ögitilmiş* on the analogy of the biverb *ög- alka-*, thus bringing about the appearance of the hap. *alka-tıl-*. Similarly the hap. *amratıl-mış* after the quite common *sāv-inil-*.

Most interesting is the relationship of the present formation with those among the *-(X)t-* verbs which have been said to have 'passive' meaning. This aspect of *-tXl-* is dealt with further on in this section. Here we just mention a fact concerning those bases from which we have both 'passive' *-(X)t-* and *-tXl-* derivates: comparing the agents of such verbs, we find that the former group of derivates get animate agents where the *-tXl-* verbs tend to have inanimate ones: Only animate agents can *incur* praise, reverence or violence.

One further evidence of the fact that *-tXl-* is only *in statu nascendi* is the shape it has after bases ending in consonants. For fully fused combinations such as *-sXk-* *-tUr-* or *-lXn-*, the initial vowel of the first element is never reconstituted even after consonants. Concerning the present combination, however, we find such forms as *basıtıl-*, *ögitil-*, *sāvitil-* and *yöritil-* beside once *ısır-tıl-* (which has a bisyllabic base) and *ög-til-* (twice Yuan Uigur, twice QB).

Syntax

There is no great difference between the behaviour of the verbs of this formation and that of the *-(X)l-* verbs. Here are two exs. with *üzā* expressions which may be ergative; both appear in the Uşnişa Viçay, in which we had found a rare ex. of an *-(X)l-* verb with ergative *üzā* phrase: m(ā)*n İnçIp t(ā)ŋri kızlarılıg terin kuvrag üzä kurşaţılu kavzaţılu t(ā)ŋridäm vişaylıg mäŋilärig k(a)lın tapımça täginürümtä İnçA tep ün eşidilti* (U II 30,30) 'While I was thus surrounded and encircled by the multitude of divine maidens and experiencing divine sense pleasures, there was heard a voice saying thus:'; *anıŋ tozı tuprakı yel üzä tokıţılıp tägsär ymä – t(ā)ŋrilär eligiya – ol tınl(ı)gka näŋ ayıg kılınç bolguluk, ayıg yavız yollarta barguluk korkınç ayınç bolmaz* (U II 39,90) 'If just its dust should be knocked about by the wind and get (to him), o king of gods, that living being will not be in any danger of meeting evil deeds or of going on bad and evil ways'. A fourth sentence

with an ergative *üzä* phrase, *alko ançulayu kälmişlär üzä tınturul-*, also appears in that same Uşnişa Viçay, U II 46,64. Such exs. are met with also when the *-tXl-* verb is relative. There also are relative clauses in which a *-tXl-* verb is accompanied by a dative with ergative function.

In the Petersburg ms. of the Suv there is an ex. in which a non-relative *-tXl-* verb is accompanied by such a dative: *InçA kaltı ulug ı ıgaç küçlüg katıg yelkä tokıtılıp kamılmış täg tüşdilär kamıldılar* (Suv 625,14) 'They were thrown down and fell, just as if a great tree$_2$ were hit by a strong and hard wind and were felled'. The other Suv ms. for the passage quoted by Röhrborn, 1972: 74 has *tokıtıp* and can, for other reasons as well, be taken to reflect an earlier stage of the language. With passive *-(X)t-* verbs, the regular ergative expression is the dative. In a later version, the passive *-(X)t-* was replaced by the more explicitly morphologically passive *-tXl-*, without changing the construction. Language change here took place between one scribe and another.

It can also otherwise be shown that this is in fact a passage from one formation to another. Thus *ögitmiş alkatmış* has an early attestation, but *ögitilmiş alkatılmış* (q.v. under *alka-tıl-* above) turns up in a very late text with just the same sense and use. In UigPañc 207 we have *alkoka sävitir taplatır*, in BT III 578 *burxanlar üzä säviţilmiş taplaţılmış. yeţi änüklärinä ägirţip kavẓaţıp . . . yatur* (Suv 609,19) represents the older construction, *terin kuvrag üzä kurşaţılu kavẓaţılu . . .* (U II 30,30) a later one. *-(X)l-*, though, lived through the whole history of Old Turkic.

7.41 The transitive passive formative *-sXk-*

The verbs *al-sık-* and *kun-suk-*, both 'to be robbed of something', have a special status within this formation: They both govern the accusative of the entity the subject gets robbed of. This is not the behaviour of a passive verb: *al-sık-* and *kun-suk-* are closer to the permissive causative of the type 'to get one's car stolen'. We deal with *-sXk-* here and not among the causatives because most of the members of the formation do behave like passives. First, then, these two:

al-sık- appears in Adams 25: *amtı ol bitiglärni bägim yaman kayuta kodup unıtdı. kişikä mu alsıkdı? mini "alyuk s(ä)n" tep enç kılmadın turur.* 'Now my master has misplaced those documents somewhere and forgotten (where. Or) did he let somebody take (them)? He keeps pestering me by saying "You took them".'[398] DLT fol. 127 has *ol tavarın alsıktı* "He was plundered, dep-

398 I think the translation "ist [der Freibrief] von jemandem gestohlen worden?" in the *UW* entry for the verb is incorrect. The subject of the preceding as well as of the following verb is the master; it is unlikely that a sentence with a different subject should appear between the two,

rived of his property" with the property in the accusative. Instances in QB 2726, 2803 (not mentioned in the *EDPT*) and 4119 all have direct objects, one's head in the first and third, *nāŋ* 'something' in the second.

tiŋā adasıŋa, azu ymā y(a)vlak kişikā basıtıp ādin tavarın ārdinisin kunsuk-sar, . . . (DhāSū 18) "oder wenn man durch Bösewichter überfallen wird und seiner Habe und Kleinodien beraubt wird, . . .',[399] *kun-* governs the stolen possessions as direct objects; *kunsuk-* gets the sufferer of the theft as subject but retains this object. *kun-uş-* (section 7.1) also retains the object of *kun-* while adding the mutual sufferers of the theft.

ut-suk- behaves just like these two verbs in the DLT, although Uigur evidence is characteristic of a passive verb: *ol yarmakın*[400] *utsukı* 'He lost his money at wagering'. It seems worthwhile to compare this with the structure of the Arabic sentence which serves as gloss: *annahu qūmira darāhima fī 'l-la'ibi*. Lane's dictionary gives an ex. of doubly tr. *qamara*: *qamartuhu 'l-māla* translated "I contended with him in a game of hazard for the property" with the optional additional content "and overcame him". *qāmirahu* "he contended with him for stakes or wagers, laid by both to be taken by the winner" evidently also retained its *accusativus rei* when the *accusativus personae* was transformed into a nominative: The result is Kāšgarī's sentence. This is also how the Turkic sentence is structured. If, now, the entity the loser has lost remains unmentioned, what remains is a passive sentence pure and simple:

ut-suk- to be defeated, to be the loser' is attested in Ht VII 1802 as *bo ymā aŋsız uyaḍıp utsukup özin bilindi* "Und dieser hat sich sehr geschämt und sich als besiegt erklärt" and in TT II B 83, as *bo yok tözlüg öpkā nızbanı ey[in] utzuxup . . .* "Wenn infolge dieser auf Nichts-gebauten (beruhenden) Zorn-Leidenschaft [die Lebewesen] besiegt werden und . . ." (both mentioned in the *EDPT*). Further: *anı ol utsukguçı bramanka körkitip* (Ht IV 1671) translated as "besiegter Brahmane" and *ya t[öz]ünüm yadta utsukup kul bol[duŋ]* (*ibid.*

when the subject is explicit neither in it nor in the third sentence. Subjects of finite *-sXk-* verbs are, moreover, always living creatures with a will of their own.

399 A footn. asks: "Liegt bei *ādin . . .* der Instr. vor?" To take *ādin tavarın ārdinisin* to be instrumentals would be quite unjustified, as the instrumental is not found in Old Turkic in any function compatible with this context. Cf. the DLT's *kun-uş-*, which also governs *tavar* as direct object.

400 DankKelly write *yarmāq* without comment and the *EDPT yarma:kın* and the *EDPT* is right: Very clearly visible under the *qāf* are two *kasras* for *tanwīn*. They must have been overlooked by DankKelly, who note such things even when they take them to be added by the second hand. *darāhim* has both a *ḍamma* and a *fatḥa* at the end, but the sentence is correct only if it has a *fatḥa* (for 'accusative').

1717) "... von einem Ausländer wurdest du besiegt ...". Three instances of *utsukmaksız* are mentioned in section 3.329.

None of the other *-sXk-* verbs are attested in tr. constructions. We list them in alphabetical order:

ar-sık- 'to be deceived, tricked' is documented in the *UW* entry with three ETŞ exs., in the *EDPT* with DLT, QB and Middle Turkic material. Also *azaglarını nomınta / arsıkmaŋlar tözünlär ä!* "Durch die Lehre von Irrlehrern laßt euch nicht betrügen, o Edle!" (BT XIII 15,24); *az nızvanıka arsıkıp / ayıg kılınç ükü̈ş kılumız* 'getting deceived by the vice of greed we committed lots of evil deeds' (*ibid.* 16,39); *YÄNÄ arsıkdukta ymä ter* (unpubl. ms. Stockh H3 b5 quoted in *UW* 242 a s.v. *aşan-* par. 2). *UW* 278 b s.v. *avıçga* par A,2 suggests completing M III 11,15, (text 5) as *avıçga kurtgaka arsı⟨k⟩maz* "[der Tod] läßt sich von Greisen und Greisinnen nicht betrügen".

(bas-sık- is attested only in Qarakhanid Turkic; its Uigur counterpart is *bas-tık-* (section 7.24). DLT fol. 3.26 has *kişi yagıka basıktı* "The people were attacked at night by the enemy", adding that *basık-* comes from *bassık-*. In the QB, the choice between *basık-* and *bassık-* follows the demands of the metre, *bassık-* in couplet 679, *basık-* 5145 (*ölümkä basıkma kälir algalı*) and 5196 (*ḫavaka basıkma kö̈ŋül tut tirig*). In view of this distribution, Kāšġarī's statement and the meaning of this verb, it is excluded that one of the forms should be an *-(X)k-* verb.)

bil-sik- 'to be known' corresponds to Skt. *jñāta* in TT VIII E7. An ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appears in *bilsikmiş ädgülük*[401] *bursaŋ kuvrag* (BT XIII 38,5). *ol är bilsikti* "The man was recognised and his hidden affair became known" (DLT fol. 15) accords with the general Old Turkic practice of allowing only living subjects for *-sXk-* verbs; another ex., in DLT fol. 380-81 is aberrant in this respect. *bil-il-*, q.v. among the *-(X)l-* verbs, does not get human subjects. (*busuk-* in *är busuktı* "The man was caught in an ambush" of DLT fol. 326 may also belong to this formation and not be formed with *-(X)k-* of section 7.24: This is made likely by the meaning; the double °*s-s*° is simplified also in *bas-sık-*. *bus-* and *bus-ug* are found in Qarakhanid as quoted in the *EDPT*, *busug* additionally in QB 5414 and 6271.)

çal-sık- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from TT V B29: *tört türlüg §(ı)mnularka çalsıkmaz bastıkmaz* 'He is not prone to surprise attacks$_2$ by the four classes of devils'. Attested also in *sezikkä çalsıkmışlarka* ... (ETŞ 10,155) 'to those struck by doubts'.

401 The ed. writes '*ädgülüg*', translating 'gut'. That would have been just *ädgü*, however. *ädgülük* should here be 'serving the good'.

kuy-suk- is a hap. in Ht V 2 a 14, clear on the facs.: [. . .] *yaŋa kuysukup suvda [ı]tıkti* "The elephant(s) bolted and drowned in the water'.[402] Cf. *at kuydı* "The horse bolted" in DLT fol. 553 and, for the vowel, the modern cognates quoted in the *EDPT*. The above translation fits the Chin. original. *kuy-* would be the only intr. base of a *-sXk-* verb but is not, in fact, attested in Old Turkic proper. It is unlikely that *yaŋa* should be the direct object (as with *kunsuk-*) and that the subject should have been lost in the lacuna, as the elephants are the subject of the drowning.

(*soy-suk-* is a hap. in *är soysukdı* "The man was stripped of his wealth", DLT fol. 15. The DLT's *soy-uk-* is a synonym.)

tut-suk- is in the *EDPT* quoted from *ogrı ogurlasar tutsuksar* (TT VI 110) 'if a thief steals and is caught' and *är yagıka tutsukdı* "The man was captured by the enemy", in the *DTS* also in a Suv ex. of a dove getting caught by a falcon. *tut-ul-* is much more common and, e.g. in USp 45,12, Suv 123,3, ETŞ 10,185 or BT XIII 12,175 has living subjects like *tutsuk-*. The difference appears to be that *tutsuk-* is inchoative and denotes point aspect whereas *tutul-* is durative.

(*tuy-suk-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 529: *är tuysukdı*, translated "The man realised that he was being deceived". This fits in well among the *-sXk-* verbs semantically (cf. especially *arsık-*) but not as far as participant structure is concerned; the semantic content of 'being deceived' is not even in the base.)

ur-suk- 'to get hit' is found in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, in the latter especially under *oqın ursuq-*: The phrase *okın ursuk-* is, in all, attested in Suv 621,9, 623,17 and 632,13, Warnke 318 and BuddhUig II 139. Qarakhanid Turkic has *ursuk-* outside this phrase, in QB 679 (*urayın tegüçi özi ursukar / basayın tegüçi özi bassıkar*) and the DLT.

(*yar-sık-* is a hap. in DLT fol. 488: *är ogl(ı)ndın yarsıkdı* "The man got separated from his son". Cf. the different meaning of *yar-ıl-*.)

(*yet-sik-* from 2 *yet-* is attested in DLT fols. 15 and 488 from *kaçgın är yetsikti* "The fleeing man was caught up with" and *är yetsikti* translated "The man reached senility". This last instance connects with some uses of *yet-* and *yet-il-* quoted under 2 *yet-il-* above: *yılımız yaşımız yetti* and *yaş / karılık / üd yetil-*. Concerning the first instance, note that *yet-* gets its object in the dative, not the accusative.

yint-sik- 'to be found out, to be discovered': *yintsikmätin şımnularka* 'without being found out by the devils' (ETŞ 9,62). *yintsikmäksiz yeg mäŋi* (ETŞ 9,62) 'the undiscovered supreme happiness' belongs to section 3.329. In TT III 41 (= Pothi 21) there is another ex. in fragmentary context:] *üzä yintäm tutçı yintsiḳü*

402 *titik-* 'to drown' appears also in *kälir ärkän yolta yaŋa titikip ölti* (*ibid.* 13 a 19); both exs. are corroborated by the Chin. original. I know of no etymology for this verb.

yerinç[-ə] *yinč-* or *yinr-* is found in ETŞ 13,26 and the DLT: *EW* 64 a bottom translates *yinip inip* (HtPar 134,3) as "suchen[ə]". What is spelled like this verb in BT VIII B 154 appears to have been *ümüş yr(g)ädmiş* (the common hiverb) with the *K* omitted inadvertently.

Even if we were sure that the TT III ex. of *yintsïk-* is an instance of a vowel converb, this would not be too dependable evidence as to what the converb vowel is: The text is by no means free from errors. Otherwise, aorist forms of this formation are attested from Qarakhanid Turkic: The DLT has *alsïkar*, *arsïkar*, *bassïkar*, *bilsïkär*, *tutsukar*, *ursukar*, *utsukar*, *yarsïkar* and *yetsïkär* and perhaps some others. We also find *alsïkar* in QB 2726 and 4119, *arsïkar* in QB 2726 and 3618, *bassïkar* in QB 679 and *ursukar ibid.*

-(X)z- is not a common formative; nevertheless, several *-sXk-* verbs have *-Xz-* cognates: *tut-uz* and *ut-uz-* and, related to the DLT hap., *tuy-uz-*. All the bases of *-sXk-* verbs are simple, consist of one syllable and end in a consonant; this is the case also with practically all of the *-(X)z-* verbs. *-sXk-* is therefore likely to be a combination of *-(X)z-* with *-(X)k-*. This origin can also explain the functioning of the formation as enabling double government. The form *uzuxup* of Manichaean TT II B *may* therefore have retained the sibilant as it originally was, i.e. voiced. The fact that the sibilant is generally unvoiced is, of course, a problem for this etymology of the formative. The only other suffix which starts with /z/ is the third person imperative suffix, and in that the *z* is generally retained in Brāhmī sources. This is now *-s*[ə] in the Turkic languages,[404] and had become so already in Qarakhanid Turkic. /s/ and /z/ may, further, have been in complementary distribution in this position, /s/ replacing /z/ after /r l n/.[405] Excluding the verbs attested only in Qarakhanid Turkic from this argumentation, we find that *alsïk-*, *kunsuk-*, *arsïk-*, *bilsïk-*, *çalsïk-* and *ursuk-* may have demanded /s/ after the base by this phonological rule. We are left with *utsuk-* and *tutsuk-*, which we expect to have originally shown [z].

-sXk- may have been created during the history of Old Turkic. The runic sources do not have it at all;[406] there are two or three instances in Manichaean texts:

403 Clark's conjecture *yïrïnſçä* is not justified by the context; *yïrïn* is at the end of the line and could also be the ablative of *yer*, e.g. The word which interests us could be a converb or possibly a *-gU* form with omitted velar or simplified geminate; as listed by Clark (p. 162), the text has a number of errors. The context is too fragmentary for a choice to be made between these forms. The text is in Manichaean script, which means that *yintsïk-* cannot be a misreading (as the BT VIII B 154 ex. mentioned here).

404 Except where it has been changed back to *-z*[ə] again, e.g. intervocally.

405 The behaviour of the dentals and the velars in these surroundings has not been wholly clarified as yet.

406 Cf. *ar-ıl-* in Runic Turkic as against *ar-sık-* in Uigur.

One is the *ut-suz-* mentioned above and the other appears in a late (and syncretistic) Manichaean text, the Pothi Book. A third ex. in M III text 5 was hypothetically reconstituted. Some Buddhistic texts, e.g. the Maitr or the story collection of U III and IV, do not seem to have the formation either.

-sXk- is not syntagmatically compatible with any verbal formative: It is not added to any and is not expanded by any. In this, *-sXk-* also differs from e.g. *-(X)l-* or *-(X)tXl-*.

This incompatibility should in some way be connected with the fact that *-sXk-* verbs typically describe a very particular class of actions: With nearly all instances of *-sXk-* verbs, the subject becomes the victim of some point action (occasionally with respect to some possession of his). This action sometimes has an intentional origin, though the agent-source for it need not be mentioned. The configuration of participants being thus fully specified by the presence of *-sXk-*, no slots are open for determination by other diathesis morphemes. All subject-victims of finite *-sXk-* verbs are living beings; ultimate objects which get stolen, taken etc. are typically not. Such creatures as the death angel of M III text 5 (s.v. *arsık-* above) need not, of course, be excluded from the set of 'living beings', be it only because the sentence is meant metaphorically. All the above does not hold for *-mAksXz* derivates from *-sXk-* verbs as *yıntsıkmaksız yeg mäŋi* (ETŞ 9). The subject is a living being neither in this last instance, nor in *utsukmaksız ulug yanturdaçı* (U II 58,3) "unbesiegliche, große, abwehrende [Formel]". *bilsikmiş ädgülük bursaŋ kuvrag* (BT XIII 38,5) does not imply that the entity referred to by the kernel undergoes any evil; nor can it be called 'a living being' in the strict sense. *bil-sik-* may, however, be a bit untypical in any case; *bit-il-* being in use only for non-human entities, the domain left over for *bilsik-* may possibly be a little wider than for the other *-sXk-* verbs. These, at any rate, are the only exceptions to the above semantic description.[407]

-sXk- verbs do not, of course, have to be accompanied by any nominals referring to participants, or these participants can be retrieved from the context. The subject often appears with the verb, as in the TT VI sentence quoted under *ut-suk-*, or the Ht VII 1802 sentence quoted under *ut-suk-*. The ultimate object appears with accusative suffix, as in the Dhāsū sentence quoted under *kun-suk-*, or in the stem form, as *yaŋa* in the Ht V sentence quoted there. It can also be retrievable from the context, as *bitiglär* and the sentence *kişikä mu alsıkın?* (q.v.

407 *näŋ bilsikmiş k(ı)şi yalŋuk bolgulak ärmäz* "Nicht soll er ein bekanntgewordener Mensch sein" (TT VIII E 7) at first looks like another exception, in that the content of *bilsik-* in it does not seem to be negative. When one reads the context, however, one sees that it is not: The monk "möge keine Verehrung begehren", "möge Abgeschiedenheit erstreben", "möge sich durchaus nicht überall anstrengen", "nicht auf andere sich stützend möge er leben", "mit der Lehre möge man nicht Handel treiben" etc. In this context, 'to be known' has negative connotations.

under *al-sık-* above). Sentences with *-sXk-* verbs can, in addition, be accompanied by representatives of other functions; e.g. the instrumental *ok+ın* 'with an arrow' found a number of times with *ur-suk-* 'to get hit'.

Particularly common with *-sXk-* verbs is the dative referring to the instigator of the action. The sentence with *alsık-* and dative was just quoted. *az nızvanıka arsıkıp . . .* (BT XIII 16,39), *körümkä arsıkıp . . .* (ETŞ 10,74), *sezikkä çalsıkmışlar* (ibid. 155) are other examples. Not all datives accompanying a *-sXk-* form have this function, of course: In *okın yürākimkā*[408] *ursukmış tāg sıkılur mān ämgākin* (Suv 621,9) there is a local dative. In two cases there is a possibly ablatival locative marking the source of the action: *azaglarnıŋ nomınta arsıkmaŋlar* (BT XIII 15,24) and *yadta utsukup kul bol[duŋ]* (Ht IV 1717), both quoted above with their editors' translations. Or should we translate *yadta* as 'in foreign / enemy country'?

All attested bases of *-sXk-* verbs are transitive. *-sXk-* does not, however, always form their passive in the sense that, whatever was the object of the base becomes the subject of the derivate. With the derivates of *al-*, *kun-* and *ut-*, the object of the 'taking', the 'stealing' and the 'winning' remains an object with the derivates as well: The new subject is the LOSER, who can only have had an oblique status in the sentence with the simple verb. Because of one sentence with *alsık-*, one with *kunsuk-* and one DLT ex. with *utsuk-*, 'the agent to whose detriment something happens' has to be introduced into the participant structure.

Verbs formed with *-sXk-* and with *-tXz-* are similar as to the structure of the group of participants. Both sets are basically passives which can govern the accusative of the action's ultimate object. There appears to be the semantic difference that the subjects of *-sXk-* verbs are not blamed by the speaker for the misfortune which befalls them, while the subjects of *-tXz-* verbs are. This leaves these latter a sort of agential status; *-tXz-* verbs are dealt with in the next section.

7.42 The causative-passive formative *-tXz-*

al-tız- is in the *EDPT* s.v. *altuz-* quoted from an Orkhon Turkic ex. and from the DLT fol. 312. *alduz-* is the form the verb has in the DLT, there quoted as Oguz: *ol tavar alduzdı* 'He was robbed$_2$ of some property'. This is how Kāšġarī's *annahu qad ḥuriba mālahu wa-suliba* should be translated. By writing "lit[erally] 'he let his property be taken'", Clauson allows his preconception about what *altız-* 'should have' signified to influence his interpretation. Equally misleading is DankKelly's "He [let his property be taken; it was] plundered or stolen": The Arabic construction is discussed and documented e.g. in Recken-

408 This is Gabain's version; Malov writes *yūrākiŋā* with third person possessive suffix.

dorf, 1921: 90, par. 51.5. The runic ex. of KT E38 occurs in a fragmentary passage and could be understood either way. It cannot be read as '*altuz-*' as done in the *EDPT*, in spite of the shape the verb has in the DLT: ÜTZ D¹1 can, as stated in footn. 482 below, only be read as *altız-* (or possibly *aldız-*). Attested also in MaitrH X2 b3: *Maytiri bodis(a)vt nızvanılıg barslarka poo altızmış kamag beş ajun tınl(ı)glarıg sävä amrayu* . . . "die Wesen . . ., die sich von den Tigern der Leidenschaft die Seele rauben ließen . . .". The creatures of the five types of existence are clearly the sufferers of the soul-robbery but may not be free from blame. The tigers are metaphors for the *kleśas*. The Sängim ms. of the Maitr has *yäklärig barslarıg* instead of *barslarka* of the Hami version, no doubt wrongly.[409] As distinct from the DLT's Oguz *al-duz-*, therefore, Old Turkic *al-tız-* may really have signified 'to get oneself robbed of something'; the sufferer must have been aware to what his attachment to *nizvanı*, i.e. vice, would lead, but can still be considered a victim. *al-sık-* means nearly the same, but shifts responsibility away from the sufferer.

ar-tız- 'to get oneself deceived' has all of its exs. in the *UW* entry. All of them are Manichaean: Runic Turkic used *ar-tur-* (discussed below) instead, while Buddhist and Qarakhanid Turkic in its stead had *ar-sık-*; *arsık-* may also have appeared in one Manichaean text. *arsık-* (discussed in section 7.41 above) is not just a passive; cf. the following similarities: *nızvanıka arsıkıp* (BT XIII 16,39), *süçig savıŋa yımşak agısıŋa arturup* (KT S6 and BQ N5) and *arṭ(ı)zmaŋlar az yäkkä* (M III 30,8-9₁, text 12) or *täŋriçi m(ä)n nomçı m(ä)n tegmäkä artızıp* . . . (Chuast 135-6).

bil-tiz- appears in TT VI 355 (not 335 as written in the *EDPT* entry *bildüz-*), as *biltizmädin tuyuzmadın tınlıglarka asıg tusu kılu yorıyur ärtilär* ". . . pflegten sie, ohne sich zu erkennen zu geben (Hend.), den Lebewesen Vorteile zu bringen". This wording actually appears only in four among eight mss. extant for the passage, including one published by Oda in 1983: Three others have *biltür-*, one *biltüz-* (with rounding not authentic in Uigur). Four among the mss. add *ad(ı)naguka* before this, changing the meaning to either 'making the

409 In BT IX p. 103 this is translated literally as "so und noch viel mehr liebt . . . Maitreya die Leidenschafts-Dämonen und -Tiger und sämtliche, der Lebenskraft beraubte Lebewesen . . .", which makes no sense. The *UW* entry for *altız-* contains solely this passage. It translates *ad sensum* ". . . die . . . Lebewesen (Akk.), die sich von den Kleśa-Dämonen und -Tigern die Seele rauben ließen". We deal with metaphorical *+lXg* in section 2.91 H above. Looking through exs. quoted there, one finds nothing unusual about rapacious tigers being used as a metaphor for the *kleśas*. The demons do not fit into this metaphor, and show that the copyist of that ms. wrongly understood the text as Ş. Tekin translates it. Nor is there ever anywhere in Old Turkic an ablative-accusative. Röhrborn's translation would therefore have been correct for the Hami version, too free as far as the text quoted in the *UW* is concerned.

matter / themselves known to others' or 'letting others know of the matter / of themselves'. *tuyuz-* is replaced by *uktur-* in at least three among the mss.; both *tuyuz-* 'to make someone aware of something' and *uktur-* (discussed among the *-tUr-* verbs) are real causatives with no passive component in their meaning. Taking *bilniz-* and either of these verbs to be parallel in function, one comes to the translation 'making (it) known$_2$ to nobody' (against the eds.' passive interpretation). This view gets support from DLT fol. 368 *bildüz-* "to inform someone of a matter" (said to be Oguz and not in use "by the Turks"). Still, 'to inform' is *bil-tür-* in Uigur (as also in Qarakhanid), and 'keeping something unknown' demands some care which 'not to inform' does not.

bul-duz- in DLT fol. 368 is a hap. in *bulduzdı nāŋni* "He caused him to find the thing".

ut-uz- 'to give up, lose' is found in IrqB (runic) and TT VIII (Brāhmī), once each as quoted in the *EDPT*, and then in Middle Turkic. From this comes the hap. in *] turkaru utuzmaks(ı)z ol [* in TT X 286 in fragmentary context. Both the IrqB and the TT VIII C exs. govern the nominals referring to what one loses (or does not lose) in the accusative. *ut-uz-* this has both the meaning and the function of *ut-suk-* in the DLT as described in section 7.41 above. The sentence *ol yarmakın utsukta* refers to a loss at gambling or wagering just as the IrqB ex. of *ut-uz-* does. Note that *-sXk-* was taken to have *-(X)z-* as first element. *utuzmaksız* must have had about the same significance as *utsukmaksız* (U II 50, 51 and 58), corresponding to Skt. *aparājita*. The behaviour of *utuz-* would be quite aberrant among *-Xz-* verbs and can be explained by assuming that it comes from a simplification of **ut-tuz-*.

-tXz- is no doubt a combination of *-(X)t-* and *-(X)z-*. Its aorist vowel is /U/. All five bases are simple single syllable verbs. Some exs. for this formative in Middle and Modern Turkic are given by Tekin, 1969: 72. Both T. Tekin and Amanžolov and perhaps others consider *-tXz-* to be a variant of *-tUr-*. However, the two formatives have only one of their three phonemes in common, since /U/ and /X/ are distinct archphonemes; there is also a clear phonemic opposition between /r/ and /z/ in Old Turkic. Most important, the two formatives have quite different meanings. The shape *-dUz-* which Kāšġarī presents the formative in is apparently really connected with the fact that he knew it only from Oguz: The dialect he was referring to had apparently changed original /X/ to /U/ or, rather, had retained Proto-Turkic /U/ and not changed it to /X/ as we find it in Old Turkic. The DLT mentions three among the four verbs and says about two of them that they are Oguz. This may in fact have been meant for all three, as the lemma with *bildüz-*, in which the statement about Oguz does occur, directly follows upon that for *bulduz-*. Note that the DLT spells the dental as *dāl* and not as *dhāl* in all instances.

-tXz- verbs are quite rare, but we still have Orkhon and ms. runic, Manichaean, Buddhist and DLT evidence for them. Leaving the last-mentioned evidence aside (all DLT exs. are after all grammarian's inventions and not verse quotations and the like) we are left with 9 exs. for the whole formation, only six of them in intelligible context. Two among these six show ms. variation and one gets the impression that the functioning of the formation may not really have been known to the scribes. It seems noteworthy that the Hamī ms. of the Maitr, sometimes considered to show a later language than the Sāngim ms., is better as far as the sentence with *alıız-* is concerned.

The bases of all *-tXz-* verbs (as the bases of the *-sXk-* verbs) are tr., *al-* and *ut-* are, however, trivalent where *ar-*, *bil-* and *bul-* are bivalent. From this it follows that *alıız-* and *utuz-* (like *alsık-* and *kunsuk-*) remain tr. even when they are passive. Old Turkic *-tXz-* verbs can govern the causee-agent in the dative case: *barslarka buu altızmış . . . tınl(ı)glar* (Maitr) like *arɣ(ı)zmaŋlar az yākkā* (M III text 12) like *adınaguka biltizmādin* (TT VI). The DLT has the same dative in *ol maŋa ış bildūzdi*. Kāšgarī simplifies the function of this formative (which he says he did not use) by making *bildūz-* and *bulduz-* into plain causatives on the one hand, and by freeing the agent of *alduz-* from all responsibility on the other. Exs. of *alıız-* with accusative have already been quoted; *ut(t)uz-* is attested with accusative in IrqB XXIX and TT VIII C5.

Four of the *-tXz-* verbs have counterparts in *-sXk-*; considering *yint-* not to be semantically too far from *bul-*, we might say that there are *-sXk-* counterparts for all of them.

Most *-tXz-* verbs also have counterparts in *-tUr-* where, however, *ar-tur-* is a dialect alternant of *ar-tız-*. *-tXz-* verbs are, by grammatical meaning, between the *-sXk-* formation and the causatives.

-tXz- verbs are not expanded by any formatives.

7.5 *Causative verbs*

There are in Old Turkic a number of formatives able to denote the causation of events or actions whose subjects differ from the instigators. Four of them (*-(X)t-*, *-(U)r-*, *-gUr-* and *-(X)z-*) are simple; others were compounded prehistorically *-tUr-*, e.g., no doubt from *-(X)t-* and *-Ur-*. Several formatives ending in /t/ aros from the addition of *-(U)r-* to bases ending in vowels, which were then elided fro the bases but retained in the causative stems. The behaviour of the various caus tive formatives has to be observed separately before a functional grouping can suggested for them.

Causative formatives can, in principle, be added both to intr. and to tr. ba

Causative verbs derived from tr. bases can allot three participant tasks: the INSTIGATOR, the SUBJECT and the (ultimate) OBJECT. In some formations and with some derivates, the instigator and the (ultimate) object can be identical. We then get a sort of triggered passive, whose functions have to get delimited as against the passive in the strict sense. This last domain will be dealt with last, and we start with the °*r*- formations.

Together with a number of causative formatives, particularly *-Ur-* and *-(X)t-*, we have listings of petrified converbs. With this term I mean adverbs derived from (in this case causative) verbs with semantic developments of their own and usually no causative meaning.

7.51 *-(U)r-*: Lexical material

aç-ur- 'to starve (tr.) is in the *UW* quoted from one Uygur ex., in the *EDPT* form the DLT. An instance in QB 6365 is merely a conjecture in a passage which appears only in the (late) ms. A. See the *EDPT* for Orkhon Turkic, Qarakhanid and later evidence for *aç-* 'to be hungry' (which has a long vowel), the *UW* entry *ač-* (I) for Uigur instances. Exs. for this *aç-* to be added to the *UW* entry occur in TuoLuoNi 143 and ShōAgon 1,63.

(*adır-* 'to separate' could possibly have belonged into this section and not into section 6.3, where it is discussed at present. It has many cognates but no attested base.)

art-ur- 'to add on, make more' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT, the QB, Middle Turkic etc., in the *UW* entry from one dubious Suv instance. A clear ex. occurs in *ädrām işin arṭurup azk(ı)ya* "Vermehrt die Tugend-Dinge, (wenn auch nur) ein bißchen" (BT XIII 60,24). Cf. the petrified converb *arturu* below. An instance of *arturur* not mentioned in the *EDPT* appears in QB 1506.

aş-ur- is, in the *EDPT* quoted only from the XIVth century on; but the *EDPT* also has the DLT's *aşr-ul-* 'to be carried over something' (in the DLT's ex. 'a pass'). Possibly attested in *bāg yutuzug aşurup adırsar* (Maitr 51+116+174 r4, also quoted in *UW* 53 b s.v. *adır-*[410]) 'if a husband has his wife by obduction and by separating her (from her family) . . .'. For the meaning, cf. *aşır-* 'to snatch away' in Ottoman. See the petrified converb *aşru* below.

bas-ur- 'to press something onto something else, to weigh down', documented in the *EDPT*. Cf. *basur-ok* in section 3.102.

410 The translation there, "wenn der Mann die Gattin erhebt(?) und verstößt . . .", is unacceptable: Under no circumstances can *aşur-* signify "erhebt", and I don't think this makes sense even within Röhrborn's own translation. This being the only instance in *adır-* par. 5, this par. should probably be deleted. The *UW* does not have any entry *aşur-*, which can be taken to mean that the author has already rejected his interpretation.

bat-ur- 'to cause to sink or go down into something'. Exs. in the *EDPT*; additional ones in Höllen 36, BT XIII 29,12 and Ernte 38: *urugın yerkā baṭurup* "das Saatgut versenken sie in die Erde". *ārdām batur-* is 'to conceal one's virtues', i.e. 'to behave humbly': We find *ārdāmin baturup* in TT VI 352,[411] and (ā)rd(ā)m(i)g b(a)turm(ı)ş in YE 29,3. The biverb *yaşur- batur-* is attested in Maitr 70 v31, 176 r16 and 202 r20 and BT XIII 13,125; see *yaş-ur-* below for further exs. The Maitr 220 r20 ex. is about 'concealing one's sins': *bat-* is always concrete, *batur-* often not.

bış-ur- 'to cook (tr.), to cook up; to bring to maturity, physically or spiritually'. Exs. in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Also: *aş bışuru'ŋlar* (ShōAgon 1,275); *ola bışurmış munı tāg ugramış aşımın aş[aŋlar* (BT XIII 3,43-4) 'Eat my meal which (I) cooked to tenderness and especially prepared in this manner'; *bışur-* verdaut)" (Suv 588,11, quoted and translated in *UW* 239 b). The same fire is in *daçı aş otı* "das verdauende Speise-Feuer (i.e. das Körperfeuer, das die Speisen TT VIII M 22 called *aş būş(ū)rdäçi ot* (cf. translation in *UW* 238 a). Spelled as *būşär-* which, in an Indian script, means that the diacritic for U was forgotten. Ms. Mz 648 ([T II] S 19) + IM 8 II, 2nd story, a v2 is in SktUigBil given as *kalva birlä bışurmış* "mit Gemüse gekocht (od. viell. "vergoren"?)". *altun bışurdaçı sımık ot* (BuddhUig I 382) is apparently 'mercuric acid which oxidizes gold'.[412] Metaphorically then *ol sänin ädgülük yıltızının bışurup burxan kutın buldurgay* (BuddhUig II 165) and *ädgülük yıltızın būţürkälir bışurkalır üçün* (ibid. 551). With the meaning 'to exercise' which it has in Töpfer 19 and 26, *bış-ur-* reaches the base of the meaning of *bışr-un-*: *baxşı(sın)da boşgunmış bilig ädgüti bışur-*; this *also* connects with the following instance: *äşitmiş sözini bışurdı uzun* "he reflected for a long time on the words that he had heard" (QB 4883). *tözün yolug bışurup* . . . of MaitrH XVI 13 a20 corresponds to *bışrunup* in Maitr 162 r9 (the parallel ms.).

bok-ur- 'to restrict, reduce' is attested with *qāf* in DLT fol. 310. The ex. is *ol at tägirindä bokurdı* "He lowered the price of the horse (or other, as a favor, or for another reason). The same for anything that you lower from its place". In the *DTS* s.v. '*boyur-*' we find two Uigur exs. which must be assigned to the same verb: *korkmak ürkmäk köŋüllärin bokururlar* (Suv 291,5) 'They reduce their feelings of fear$_2$' and *anataraş ayıg kılınçıg burxanlarnıŋ yarlıgı yavalturur*

411 Instead of this phrase of the London scroll, the fr. of the text published as USp 90 writes *ārdāmlärig baṭurup*. This is mistakenly mentioned as '*bedürüp*' in *DTS*; the entry '*bedür-*(?)' there should be cancelled. Instead of *ārdāmin*, other mss. of this text quoted by Oda in various publications have *ārdāmlärin*, *ādrāmlärin*, *är*]*ḍämlärin* or *ä*]*drämlärin*.

412 Not "Gold erzeugendes Quecksilber" of the ed., which leaves *ot* untranslated and attributes unexplained powers to mercury. The expression is a simile for the showing up of mendacious thoughts.

bokurur (Suv 507,9) 'It is the Buddhas' precepts which subdue and reduce the *ānantarya* sins'. *] bokurup s[* (UigPañc 5) should also be this verb. Further exs.: *az / övkä nızvanı bokurup turgurmazlar* (BuddhUig I 335 and 337); *igiḍ sakınç-nın yılızı yokın bilmiş üçün BİLİGSİZ BİLİGig bokururlar* (*ibid.* 339) and *üç agu kõŋülüg bokurgalı ıdgalı arıtgalı katıglanınlar* (UigFalt 96). *UW* 194 a s.v. *arıt-* par. 6 translates this verb as "erdrücken" and transcribes it as *bogur-*. This transcription is against DLT evidence, and misleading if the verb is thus considered to be a derivate of *bog-* 'to choke, to strangle': *bog-* is always tr., as documented in the *EDPT* and as found in modern languages; cf. also *bog-ok* and *bog-um* above. There is, on the other hand, an intransitive verb *bok-*, whose semantics correspond to those of *bok-ur-*. It is quoted in two biverbs with *amrıl-* in the *DTS* s.v. '*boγ-* II', one from Suv and the other from the post-Uigur Buyan Ävirmäk. In his review of the *UW*, Zieme showed that another instance of the biverb *bok- amrıl-* (which he spelled '*bog-' amrıl-*) should be read in ETŞ 25,4. We also have *üç türlüg adalar bokup amrılıp* . . . in ShōAv 270 (still spelled as '*bogup amrılıp*' by Laut and Röhrborn in 1988), *yagı yavlak bokup amrılıp* in BT XIII 46,27 and *] bokup kılınç arızun ibid.* 13,28. The transcription is '*bog-*', and Zieme's translation and explanations make clear that he takes this to be the verb "erwürgen". I find confusion between the two verbs impossible both syntactically and semantically.

(*boşgur-* 'to instruct'. Base not attested but see *boşgun-* (section 7.21), where other cognates are listed. *EDPT* and *DTS*; attested also in ETŞ 13,123, Ht V 10 a 9 (quoted and reinterpreted in *UW* 230 a s.v. *asıglıg* A,2) and X 681, UigSukh 19, BT XIII 46,39, Maitr 136 v 12 and *bo nom ärdinig tutar boşgurur okıyur sözlāyür* (Warnke 767).)

bök-ür- 'to satiate'. Hap. in Suv 558,16-18, quoted in the n. to BT XIII 15,38: *yesär ymä yänä artokrak aş içgü, tatıgın çivgin*[413] *bökürü bolmazlar* 'Even if they eat a lot and drink a lot, they are unable to get satiated with wholesome food$_2$.' Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Instead of it, DLT fol. 420 has *bök-üt-*, which also takes the instrumental of what one is satiated with: One ex. sentence is *ol māni tavarın bökütti*, translated "He satiated me with money". Cf. also *[b]ógóvrvr* "zum Erbrechen ekeln" in the Codex Comanicus. *bök-* appears frequently in the Yenisei inscrs., of which some are quoted in the *DTS* entry.[414]

413 Written as *çivāgin* in one of the two mss. in which the sentence is attested. I take this to be the instrumental of an otherwise unknown noun *çivig*; it would be related to (but not identical with) the adjective *çivgin aş* "food that is wholesome and fattening" in DLT fol. 222 (also in the entry for *kāvgin aş*). The second vowel of *tatıg* belongs to the base and is not syncopated; the second vowel of *çivig* is.

414 The QB instance mentioned there appears in the late A ms. of couplet 1772; it should be *bāk+ü-p*, q.v. among the *+U-* verbs above. As Tezcan has shown on p. 37 of his review of the İndeks,

DLT fol. 273 defines (and documents) *bök-* as "to be filled to nausea, to be fed up and have had one's fill, to skulk'. In both sources, *bök-* is intr.; it governs the ablative of food but the dative of everything else including *tavar, ädgü, ogul, tänridäki kün* and *yerdäki elim*. There is an Uigur ex. in Scharl 24: *biligsiz [bilig]lig karaŋu tünlä böküp yaşıp* . . . 'in the dark night of ignorance (I) skulk and hide' (a metaphor).[415]

buş-ur- 'to vex, make nervous'. *EDPT* and *DTS* have this from Suv, DLT and QB 794. Add *ig ämgäk artok buşurur ämgätür* (BT XIII 8,24). In Suv 367,38, the text should read *üzüksüz ägirä sıkıp buşurur* '(they) uninterruptedly encircle and constrict and vex (them)', not '*busuyur*'. *sık- buşur-* is the causative of *sıkıl-buş-* as documented in exs. from Warnke 491 and Heilk I 1-5. While the 22 QB exs. and the DLT use *buş-* in the sense of 'to be annoyed, irritated', the Uigur exs. of *buş-* mainly denote shortness of breath; this concrete meaning should be the original one. Not mentioned in the dictionaries is *tın alu umatın buşsar* (Heilk II 5,16). In TT VIII I 6, *uzatı kurımak isirkänmäk buşmaklıg bolur* does not signify "Erregtheit" but 'shortness of breath, asthma'. Cf. *tın buşgak* 'asthma(tic)' in section 3.327. The *DTS* has an ex. of the biverb *buş- buşrul-* with the meaning 'to be annoyed'. Otherwise, 'to be annoyed' is not *buş-* but *buşr-ul-* (discussed among the *-(X)l-* verbs). With *sıkıl-*, the concrete sense is, after all, also the original one.

büt-ür- 'to complete, carry out, accomplish'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially s.v. *bütürmäk*. Further exs. appear in ETŞ 9,22, 13,64, 104, 130 (with *büṭKär-*), 160 and 16,64 and 80, AbitAnk 77, TuoLuoNi 20, 50, 51, 169 and 172, Suv 218,3 and 10, 602,12, 17 and 20 and 694,1, BuddhUig II 46, 286 and 550 (*ät'özintäki başların büṭür-* 'to heal the wounds on his body'), UigFalt 75-6, BT VII B 47 and O 9, BT VIII A 57, 289, 466 and Anh. 2-3,27, UigTot 167, 208, 251, 896 and 1340, Weih 10, InscrOuig II 16, HtPar 131,1 and V 6 b 15, Maitr 52 v 3, 83 r 19, 119 v 4 and 223 v 2 and elsewhere. Brāhmī exs. occur in ms. Mz 648 ([T II] S 19) ~ IM 8 II, 2nd text, v 1 (SktUigBil) and ĀṭSū 1 v 3 and 5. See the petrified converb *bütürü*. The imperative *Bütür* is used as proper name in BT

bök- does appear in QB 1286, and lives on to this day in Tuvan. Tezcan also rightly rejects t *EDPT* suggestion to read the Yenisei verbs as '*äv+ük-*': The vowel of *+(X)k-* would at this peri here have been /i/ even after a labial consonant, the meaning doesn't fit and such a verb has turned up anywhere else.

415 The tr. verb of BT XIII 15,38, which Zieme would like to read as *bök-*, is probably *bög-*. Ur standing *är* in a collective sense: *çigsin ügrä buşılık / çıgay ärig bögünlär* 'Alms of noodle b Assemble poor people (sc. for it)'. *bög-* is used with human objects e.g. in the DLT, *bäg bögdi*. In view of the use and meaning of *bökür-* and in view of the Scharl instance, *bök-* definitely be intr. in Uigur. Note also that Käšgarī defines *bök-* with a rather negative c the Yenisei instances, being negated, do not disprove this last point.

XIII 12,75, as *Bütür T(ā)ŋrïm* in an unpubl. text quoted in BT XIII p. 70 and, misinterpreted by the ed., in Acte 17. The latter should be understood as *körüp*[416] *olorguçı inim Bütür*. Cf. *büt-Kär-* below.

(*çaşur-* 'to delate' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, sometimes together with *bulga-* or *yoŋa-*. An additional ex. in BuddhKat 12, in Tibetan script, shows that the second vowel was a /u/. *çaşut* 'calumny' (section 3.108 above) probably comes from *çaşur-*, but *çaşı* (section 3.118) from the unattested base.)

çom-ur- and/or *çöm-ür-* is/are documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. A further ex. occurs in Höllen 103. The harmony is not explicit in any of the Old Turkic forms; the DLT distinguishes between *çom-* 'to dive, sink in the water' and *çöm-* 'to dive or sink deeply' both in base and derivates.

ärt-ür- 'to let something pass or cause to pass, to pass off, etc.'. *EDPT* and *DTS*.[417] Add *ämgäklig tüntün ärtürdäçi* (ETŞ 10,27), *y(a)rok b(ä)lgüsin ärtürmädin* (ms. T III MQ 62 = U 5088 l.4 quoted in the n. to ManTüTex 438), *tükäl sözläp ärtürgäli bolmaz* "kann man . . . vollkommen überhaupt nicht sagen" (TuoLuoNi 165). *yıl ärtür-* (Ht VII 7 b 26 and TuoLuoNi 122 + 125) is 'to let a year pass'. The Maitr has this verb in 41 r 10, 202 v 7 (days and nights), 7 r 21 (days of *dhyāna*) and 103 v 7 (*yoksuz üd*). In Maitr 65 r 11 and 227 r 11, the object 'time' appears to be understood. Further exs. in ETŞ 12,49 and 13,29, BT III 593 and 600 (wrongly analysed as '*är-tür-*') and in the ms. T III TV 68.505 v in the n. to BT III 57.

eşt-ür- 'to let somebody hear something, to tell or inform'. Comes from **äşid-ür-*, but the variant with initial /e/ is thrice as common as the one with /ä/: The vowel appears to have been fronted by 'Umlaut' from the (syncopated) /i/. By the *EDPT* (s.v. '*éşidtür-*'!) and the *DTS* quoted only from DLT and QB. *äşid-tür-* (q.v. in section 7.57) is a different verb. *eştür-* occurs in M III 10,7$_3$ (text 5), Maitr 19 r 19, 81 r 26, 82 v 31, 83 r 8 and 137 r 17, Brāhmī ms. Mz 648 ([T II] S 19) ~ IM 8 II, 3rd story b v 5 in SktUigBil, Ht V 11 b 9-10 and 13 b 2 and HamTouen 5,68 and 6,2; cf. *eştr-üş-* in TT I A 56. *äştür-* occurs in DreiPrinz 74, HamTouen 5,28, BuddhUig II 193,[418] and QB 5022. The three (Manichaean) HamTouen exs. all have *ögrünçü* as object; BT V 11,204, which contains practically the same text, should also be understood as *ögrünçü äştrügli*. The DLT has both /e/ and /ä/ in one instance, while another instance has only a second hand /e/. The M

416 Not '*küyüp*', which would have been *kö-p* or *küd-üp* if the ed. intended them to be from *kö-* or from *küd-*.

417 The verb quoted in the *DTS* from KT E 40 is, however, written with I in the first syllable and belongs to *er-tür-*. There are two exs. of *ärt-ür-* (spelled thus) in the runic inscriptions.

418 *kulgakların toyu tuţup äşidürmä-* (thus), about preventing people from hearing by stopping their ears. This is by no means the same thing as '(not) telling', and the instance may contain a different verb. Whether it is a simplification of *äşid-tür-* is an open question.

III ex. is a biverb with *tuy-uz-*. *äşid-* is common in Orkhon Turkic, *eşid-* in Uigur.

iç-ür- 'to give someone something to drink'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Additional exs. in BT II 468, BT XIII 13,72, TuoLuoNi 104 and 128, Ernte 69, Ht IV 793, ZiemeSklav III 30 and frequently in the QB.

kaç-ur- 'to put to flight, drive away'. By *EDPT* and *DTS* quoted only from DLT and QB 3912. Found also in ETŞ 10,235.[419]

(*kavır-* 'to collect, bring together' is frequently attested in Uigur in its petrified converb form *kavıra*.[420] Finite forms are *kavırsar* in UigTot 531 and what the DLT has. *kavış-* 'to come together, be united' being an intr. cognate, the common base should have been intr. **kavı-*. The meaning of *kavış-* is also the reason why *kavır-* does not belong to the group of problematical verbs discussed in section 6.3. *kavıt* (section 3.108) comes from *kavır-*. See *kavış-* in section 7.1.)

kavş-ur- 'to bring together', often used when describing a religious gesture of the hands. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Tug 44, six times in BuddhUig II (e.g. in 85), TuoLuoNi 11, CYK 51, BT VII A 596, 663, 671 and 717, BT VIII B 38, Ht IV 688-9 and 1568, V 2 b10-11 and X224, 608 and 737, SuvZieme 692,17, BuddhUig I 106-7 etc. There are 24 exs. in Maitr, 6 among them in the unsyncopated variant *kavışur-*. Maitr 187 r17 should, no doubt, also be completed as *kavışu[rup*. Particularly late texts have the variant *kabşur-*, e.g. UigTot 1057 and Abhi 1919 (*adıra kabşuru* as antonyms). Cf. the late and rare *kavış-tur-*.

käç-ür- 'to cause to pass, to help or make cross over'. *DTS* and *EDPT*. Ad *käçürür* from BT I D (229) and ETŞ 11,62. BT XIII 13,99 and AbitAnk 18 ex have time as object, whereas one in Maitr 159 v29 refers to transfer over the s of *saṃsāra*.

käd-ür- signifies 'to dress someone (dative) in a garment (accus.)' in Maitr 21 and 120 v2 (not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*) and in the DLT. second verb in *oglumka ton etip kätüräyin* (Maitr 120 r27) has to be a deri of *käd-*. It is either one of the rare cases of the confusion of dentals which o in this text or a simplification of otherwise unattested **käd-tür-*. Used also III 16,3, 6, 9 and 11 (text 8), where each time a different *bilig* (accus.) is 'c red upon' a different god (*üzä* phrases). The context of these is st reminiscent of the four Manichaean passages containing the verb *käd-il-*

419 The verb read as *kaçurtuŋuz* in M III 48,1$_2$ is better taken to be *käçürtüŋüz* with the ed 51 (a reedition of the same text). In the Manichaean writing system, back and fron differ only in a pair of dots; *käçür-* fits the context better.

420 Cf. also *kavırasınça* in UigTot 2, 23, 25 etc., BT VIII A 110 and elsewhere.

käl-ür- 'to bring'. In ŞU E 3 we read $K^2L^2R^2T^2M$ and *ibid.* S 3 $K^2L^2IR^2T^2M$. There is no doubt concerning the meaning of these words, and rounded vowels following unrounded ones are always written out in this rather long inscr. The same holds of $K^2L^2R^2T^2I$ in YE 28,1, *on ay eltdi ögüm . . . kälirü* "Ten (lunar) months my mother carried me and (then) brough me forth'. This causative should be connected with the fact that *käl-* has an *i* in its converb and aorist: As shown in Erdal, 1979 a: 112-114, the original base may have been **käli-*. The normal *kälür-* may be secondary. For it, see the *EDPT* and the *DTS*; further exs. e.g. in ETŞ 11,3, Ht VII 2 a 4 and 13 a 20, InscrOuig II 5 and IV 42, BT VIII Anh. 2-3,18, ManTüTex 9,143, Hochzeit 19, Ernte 69, ZiemeSklav I 13, ShōAv 322,[42] ManMon 63, BT XIII 10,11, HamTouen 5,21, 21,8, 27,9, 29,20, 35,5 and 7 and Maitr 192 v 4 and 157 v 13. Cf. *käl-tür-*.

keç-ür- 'to delay something' is in the *EDPT* quoted from several USp instances and from the DLT. Also found in U III 29,11 (*keçürmädin ıdguluk ol*) and BuddhUig II 214 (*keçürmädin tärk tavrak bergäy mü sän?*), with a form signifying 'without delay'. Cf. for this also *keçmädin* (most recent ex. in AmitIst 34).

keç- is homophonous with *keç* 'late'.

keŋü-r- 'to enlarge; to spread open, i.e. explain'. *EDPT*, also from DLT and QB. The Uigur exs. quoted there are all from the converb *keŋürü*, q.v. among the petrified converbs below. Attested also in UigTot 1293 as *keŋürsär* and in ÂgFrag (1) B 26 as *ädgüti keŋürüp yadıp nom padaknıŋ yorügin* "wer trefflich ausbreitet$_2$ die Deutung der Lehr-Verse". *keŋürü yorı-* in Ht V 1 b 5 (*kamag on bölök şastr yaratdı; amtı barça keŋürü yorıyur*) does not contain the petrified converb *keŋürü*; *yorı-* is here the durative auxiliary. In *ı(ä)ŋrí ı(ä)ŋrisi burxan . . . utlısın tüşin keŋirü* (thus?!) *y(a)rlıkadı* (Maitr 25 r 4) *yarlıka-* is the honorific auxiliary. In Ht VII 1 a 10, [*nom*] *keŋürmiş bavan* is the name of a monastery to be built. Cf. *keŋ+ü-* (section 5.41) and *keŋür-ül-* above, *keŋür-t-* below.

kıs-ur- 'to shorten, abbreviate'. In the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and the QB. Attested also in Warnke 302: *Şakimuni burxan yänä uzun yaşın körkitü y(a)rlıkamadın yaşaguluk yaşın kısurup kısga kılıp . . .* "das zu lebende Leben verkürzt (Hend.)". The base of this can hardly be *kıs-* 'to pinch, squeeze, compress, reduce', which gave *kısıg* 'confinement', *kısıl* 'gorge', *kısgaç* 'pincers' and *kısıl-* 'to be or get squeezed'; there might have been another **kıs-* 'to be short', which also could have served as base to *kısga* 'short'.

(*kikşür-* 'to incite to mutual enmity' must have had *-(X)ş-* before the causative formative. The KP ex. quoted in the *EDPT* is quite dubious, as the facs. shows. The verb in KT E 6 is written in Thomsen's edition with *ŋ* as second consonant,

[1] The object is not "Speisen", as appears in the translation of the Laut and Röhrborn reedition, but the invited guests.

but it appears from the Finnish Atlas and from other sources that this letter was uncertain; runic K² and ŋ are rather similar. Cf. n. 196 in vol. 2 for a further possibility. The Chuast instance is the best evidence for this verb. The development to *kikçür-* in the DLT is regular: Cf. the passage of *yapşur-* to *yapçur-* there. *kikşür-* is probably related to *kïKinç* 'answer' (q.v. in section 3.104); both may be metaphorical derivates from the DLT's *kik-* 'to whet' (with -(X)ş- expansion in the present verb).

kop-ur- 'to raise' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and the QB. Attested also in SP 40 (with the name of the *sūtra* as object lost in a lacuna) and, as *kopurzun*, in ms. U 305 v 10 quoted in Zieme, 1969: 204. The instances of QB 1390, 3369, 4271 and 6245 are not mentioned in the *EDPT* either.

köç-ür- 'to cause to migrate' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the IrqB and then from the DLT on. It is attested also in *elig uluşug köçürüp . . .* (Ht V 6 a 8).

köl-ür-, literally 'to cause to harness', signifies 'to ride a vehicle' in the Uigur exs. in which we have it. The facs. is best visible in BT VII A 693: *yavız körümlärig arıtıp keŧärip üzäliksiz kölüŋükä kölürüp . . . barmakımız bolzun* ". . . auf die höchste *Yāna* steigen . . .". Then BT XIII 27,24: *kölökünüzni kükrāŧü çıkraŧu kölürüp kök t(ä)ŋrikä agtınıŋ, t(ä)ŋrim!* 'Ride your . . . vehicle and rise into the sky, my god!'. Similar to these is ms. T III TV 59 (U 4313) 1-8 quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 13: *ulug kölökkä kölündäçilärniŋ arasınta twg-* 'to be born among those who ride the Great Vehicle'. Cf., on the other hand, the ShöAgon ex. quoted under *köl-ün-* above, which gives this verb as synonym of *mün-* 'to mount'. Whether any instance read as *kölün-* is in fact *kölür-* or *vice versa* is still, I think, open. 'having an animal harnessed to a cart' and 'riding a cart' being contiguous events, the meaning of *kölür-* can be explained by metonymy.

köñ-ür- 'to burn (tr.)' appears in the *EDPT* under '*küñür-*', in the *DTS* under *köjür-* and *könür-*. An ex. from M III 23,4₂ (text 8), not mentioned by either dictionary, is read as *küy'ürgäi* by Le Coq but as *kön'ür-* in ManErz II 4; shouldn't this be *köynür-* or *könyür-*? /ñ/ became /y/ in some Turkic dialects and /n/ in others, and lived on as /yn/ e.g. in Oguz. The biverb *ört+ä- köy-ür-*, quoted in the *DTS* from Suv and U III, is attested also in Maitr 172 r 18, 172 v 2 = 225 r 12 and 201 v 12, respectively accompanied by *burnaç osuglug, kovuk sögü osuglug* and *kurug kamışça*, and in ShöAgon 1,39. Further exs. of *köyü-* appear in Suv 544,17-18 (quoted in Schulz, 1978: 72) and 591,17 (quoted in U 237 a as '*küyür-*'), HtPek 30 b 10,[422] BuddhUig II 126, 357, 364 and 392[423] a

422 *aniŋ ara Bimbasarı elig xan ordusında ok ot köyürdilär* 'In the meantime, they set up a fire in Bimbasāra's palace'. Schulz, 1978: 72, who quotes this, mistakenly reads '*köyün-*'; such a does not appear to be found in Old Turkic, however, and would, to accord with Schulz's tr tion, have to have a plural subject.

423 Should probably be *olarnıŋ saçmış xwaların köyürmiş tütsüglärin . . . bälgürtdi* instead of

Genzan D v 7: *oglanların oẓgurgalı kutgargalı kim ol örtänü turur ootka köyür-mägäli* is interesting because it has the agentive dative. In his 1988 reedition, Röhrborn (who transcribes '*küyür-*' again) translates: "seine Söhne . . . zu retten$_2$, um sie nicht in diesem lodernden Feuer verbrennen zu lassen". The exs. in Maitr 62 v 3 and 83 v 15 appear in fragmentary context.

(*kötür-* 'to raise, lift up, bear (also metaphorically), carry away' is excellently attested in all forms of Old Turkic from the Orkhon inscrs. on. Only some of the exs. are listed in the *DTS* (q.v. especially under *kötürmäk*) and the *EDPT*, but we will not, in this case, mention much additional ones: The base of *kötür-*, not being found in Old Turkic, the derivate does not have much value for our purposes. *kötgi*, *kötü* and *kötit-* (all dealt with in the present work) come from the same base, however, and this base lives on in Yakut and in the Azeri speech area.[424] The second vowel of *kötür-* is rounded already in Orkhon Turkic; *kötür-gülük ayıg kılınç* in U III 89,17 (visible on the facs.) is probably just an error. GO-DUR-RUR, an instance in Tib. script, is found in BuddhKat 42.[425] In *arak-şazlarnı kötürüp avış tamuka baturgıl* (BT XIII 29,12), the verb probably means 'to take away, remove, carry off' and not "erheben" as translated; Cf. the Middle Turkic and Ottoman uses quoted in the *EDPT* entry and Uigur phrases like *kötürü elt-* and *kötürü al-*. Cf. also *kötür-mä* and *kötr-üm* and *kötr-ül-*.)

öç-ür- 'to extinguish a fire; suppress passions etc.'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in M III 29,11-12$_3$ (text 12; *suk otın öçürür* 'He suppresses his fire of greed'), ETŞ 10,173 and 13,129, BuddhStab III 3, Ht V 4 a 12, Warnke 579, BT VII A 276 (with *amurtgur-*), ShōKenkyū II 12, BT XIII 12,41, 28,5 and 51,3, in two Suv exs. quoted in the introduction to BT XIII 13, in Maitr 128 r 15, 148 r 28 and 219 r 7 and elsewhere.

öl-ür- 'to kill'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Attested also in M I 7,1 (TeilBuch), about 70 times in Maitr, BT VIII A 101 and 415, UigTot 105, ms. T III 86-64 (U 1000) v 10 quoted in the introduction to Rāma, UigPañc 8, 57, 64 and 92, 'YO-LUD 'YU-LYUR-MA-SA in Tib. script for *ölüt ölürmäsä(r)* in BuddhKat 11 and *özlüg ölür-* in LautHöllen 9-10, 12, 33 and 36.

(*öŋ-ür-* is a problematical hap. of TT I quoted in the *EDPT*. It has been connected with *üŋ-* 'to dig a hole in something, hollow it out' (DLT, Codex Comanicus

kwywnmys qw ' l'ryn twytswk l'ryn: N and R can look similar; the word in question is written above the line and should (by meaning) be inserted there.

424 Yak. *kōt-* 'to fly (up), to skip or jump'; *göt-* 'to lift up' as quoted in the Radloff dictionary from the Azeri area and in the *Derleme Sözlüğü* from Samsun and Kars (north east Anatolia). Cf. Yak. *götöx-* 'to lift' and *götük-* 'to bring' (Ankara area, *Derleme Sözlüğü* again).

425 The passage is discussed along with *iyinç* in section 3.104 above. Similar to *basın(ç) i(yi)n(ç) kötür-*, as should be read there, we find in M III 37,14$_2$ *üküş t[ür]lüg [iy]inç basınç k[öt]ür-*.

etc.); the context perhaps goes better with *öŋ-* 'to approach stealthily and with evil motives', which appears in QB 4265: See Tezcan's review of the QB İndeks. Cf. also n. 450 in vol. 1.)

öt-ür- 'to pierce something' is, by the *EDPT* ('2 *ötür-*') and the *DTS* quoted only from the DLT. We have it also in ms. fr. T II S 32 a ~ 58 v 12 (the story about the piercer of pearls known also from Sogdian, quoted in the n. to UigPañc 18) as *ärdini ötürgüçi är.* *öt-* 'to go through' is, in addition to the exs. given by *EDPT* and *DTS*, found also e.g. in BT I D (284). The meanings of 'to make something go through' and 'to pierce' are contiguous. *öt(ü)rü*, a petrified converb, is discussed in section 7.512. *öt-gür-*, a cognate from a different causative formation, practically always has a rather metaphorical significance.

saş-ur- 'to mix up a succession, turn or order' appears in two Uigur exs. quoted by the *EDPT* s.v. *'seşür-'*: *saş-* was unknown to Clauson. As the variations *saş-maksız* ~ *şaşmaksız* (section 3.329) and *saşımsız* ~ *şaşımsız* (section 3.106; all four supported by alliteration) show, the first sibilant was sporadically assimilated to the second: Initial /s/ and /ş/ do not alliterate when no other sibilant is around to influence them. Cf. also *şaşut* (quoted in the *DTS* from the QB) and *şaşutsuz* (section 3.108). *käziglärin şaşurmadın* (UigTot 152) is very similar to the ex. quoted in the EDPT from Suv 590,7, and got translated as "ohne die Reihen zu verwirren". The DLT ex. written as *saşurmak* with *qāf* better fits *säş-(ür-)* in content, and an ex. in QB 6616 can be read with both back and front vowels. The QB İndeks assigns to this the meaning 'to mix up'; Tezcan's review of the İndeks gives (like Kāšġarī) to this verb the meaning of *säş-ür-* while retaining back vocalism. The DLT instance is an error or at least a problem. The one in QB 6616, however, can either be read as *şaşurdum* and translated as 'I placed in a row the words (of verse), mixing them up' or read as *şäş-ür-* and given the meaning appropriate for *that*: Both meanings fit.

sıg-ur- has, first of all, the concrete meaning 'to fit something into something else' to introduce'. Beside the DLT ex. (quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *sığur-*) this is attested in *ütki(y)ätä kök kalıkıg sıgurur* (ETŞ 12,45), *alkolarnı birkä sıgurı birni alkoka kigürmäk antag ok ärür* (ETŞ 9,45) and *ymä ọk yok antag yarma [öz ä]tözümin sıgurguça* (Warnke 50) "es gibt keine Spalte, die mein Körper paßt" or better, 'into which to press my body'. When the agent is the receptacle, we get the meanings 'to admit into one's heart, give refuge, embrace'; this is a metaphorical meaning closely related to *sıg-ın-* (q.v. above). Here belong the two Manichaean exs. in the *EDPT* quoted under *'sı-* better translated in Pothi 100 and 159 respectively. Here also Maitr 33 *ät'özlüg kovukum içintä kamag beş ajun tınl(ı)g[ları]n sıgurayın ärti* 'I could give refuge ...'. In this semantic domain is also an ex. in ShōA which I quote with Röhrborn's translation; it contains a chain metapho

nomlug m(a)xasumudar ulug taloy ögüzüg kõŋüllüg kölindä sıguru içgärü "Der . . . den Mahāsamudra, den großen Ozean, des wahren Dharma, in den See des Herzens eingießt".[426] This sentence aims at illustrating the introduction of *dharma* into the mind. *üdsüz kolosuz sıgurmak* (Maitr 32 r1) refers to 'inopportune introduction', i.e. of harmful thought into people's mind through flattery, etc. *kõŋül* is the target also in *äşittim, kõŋülkä sıgurdum anı* of QB 3860. Being in Arabic script, this ex. shows clearly that Clauson was wrong in his etymology. Cf. *bo yörügüg äşidsärlär sıgurgalı alpırkagaylar* 'When they hear this definition, they will find it difficult to admit' (BT I B (140)). The affective meaning is, in DLT fol. 271, attested also for the base: *bo söz kõŋülkä sıgdı signifies* "These words touched the heart" (against the *EDPT*). Similarly in *elig kõŋliŋä sıgdı ärsä tapug / älig berdi dävlät açıldı kapug* (QB 1607). Without *kõŋül, sıgur-* then also refers to the gracious acceding, on the part of the subject, to prayers, requests or imprecations: *küsüşümüz ol; sıgurup alı yarlıkazun* (Ht VII 2026-7), *ötünür biz . . . bo bitigtä körüp ötügümüzni, sıgurup . . .* (BT I $A_3$38), *öŧügümüzni sıguru y(a)rlıkazun* (InscrOuig II 15), *Viçitaseni açarı bo öŧügki(y)ämin* (BuddhUig II 282). *Viçitaseni açarı bo öŧügin sıgurmadı* (Ht IV 1105), *anın öŧünür m(ä)n sıguru yarlıkazun bo mäniŋ*

siŋ-ür- is a variant attested in KP 17,3, Heilk I 153, Suv 475,9, BT VII A 430 and 444 and UigTòt 783 and 785, while U IV A 19 and 175, Maitr 8 r21, Ernte 24 and 25, Ht IV 75 and V 8 a 9, BT VII A 105 a, 118 and 463 have *siŋir-*. Three Suv instances of *siŋir-t-* should be added to the second form. The second vowel in the much more common *siŋir-* is, in Erdal, 1979 b: 102-3, explained as belonging to the original stem **siŋi-*. A Mo. cognate with such a final vowel is also mentioned there. *simür-* 'to swallow in a single gulp' is unlikely to be related to this. The original form of *simür-* (DLT ff.) appears in one Maitr passage together with *siŋir-*: *kaltı Çax⟨n⟩u ärji Gäŋ ögüz suvın siŋirürçä alko şastar bilgä bilig simridi boşguntı* (Maitr 8 r23) 'He gulped down and learned all the treatises of knowledge as the *ŗşi* Jahnu swallowed the water of the river Ganges'. *simri-* can't be a variant of *siŋir-* (a derivate!) but must be related to *šimi-* in Mo., Secret History and elsewhere. *simir-ür+çä* in Maitr 119 r7 leads to the later *simür-*. In Ht V 8 a 9, *siŋir-* and *içgär-* (q.v. among the *+gAr-* verbs) are used together. *ago siŋür-* of SuvDrog 475,9 reminds one of *ago siŋürmäk* in UigTòt 783; Maue's translation tacitly leaves the verb of the former instance untranslated.

sök-ür- 'to make someone kneel in one's presence' is documented in the *EDPT*. It

426 This translation is a bit too free, as *sıgur- içgär-* does not actually signify 'to pour in' but just 'to introduce': Röhrborn went beyond the text in extending the metaphor to the verb. Note also that the (admittedly difficult) possessive suffix of *kölindä* has remained untranslated.

is attested several times in the Orkhon inscrs. and only there. The DLT counterpart of *sökür-* is *sök-it-*. The meaning 'to cause to kneel' does not appear to be found in Buddhist or Manichaean texts. *sök-* and *çök-* are discussed under *sök-it-*, and cf. *sök-üd-* (section 7.23).

sug-ur- 'to drain off (tr.)'. By the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT on. Attested also in *nāçā bar suvı ymā, sugurgay ārdi* (UigSukh 29) 'However much water there should be, he would drain it off'. Maitr 12 v 17 has it in metaphorical use: *alım[ış] yaşka tägi küç küsün āt kan üstälü ükliyü turdı, yetmiştä ınaru yüz y(e)girmi yaşka tägi kün küniŋä sän karımaklag* (for /+ış/) *suk yäk sora sora sugurduŋ. sug-* is a hap. in the DLT, but cf. *sug-ul-* and *sug-un-* above, *sug-tur-* below.

tamt-ur- 'to set afire, kindle' is a derivate of the simplex *tamıt-* 'to be set afire, to blaze up' and must be unrelated to *tamga* 'seal, stamp' (discussed in section 3.323). A verb "*tam-* sich entzünden", which appears in the TT VIII index and has from there been quoted by other scholars, is a ghost: *tamtu* and *tamtuk* are discussed in section 3.114. *DTS* s.v. *tamdur-* and *tamtur-* I and *EDPT*. The *EDPT* lemma is '*tamdur-*'; Clauson calls the DLT's *tamturdı* an error, changing it to '*tamdurdı*'. Among the exs. of the *EDPT*, however, only the one from Yetikän Sudur (TT VII 40) has D as opposed to six mostly earlier instances with T. Add also *tamturdumuz* in Maitr 450 r 5 vs. the exceedingly late CYK 50 with *tamdurmış*. Cf. also *tamt-ıl-* above. The base appears in the *EDPT* under '*tamıd-*', quoting an ex. with *ot* 'fire' as subject. Further exs. of *tamıt-*: *kaltı kurug kovuk sögüt özänintä ört tamıtmış täg* (UigSün 19) 'as if a flame had been kindled in the heart of a dry hollow tree (we blaze with the flame of repentance)'; *t(ä)ŋrim . . . öçgüm bar ärsär tamıtgay*[427] (ZiemeSklav III 21) 'My lord . . . if I am destined to be extinguished, he will be set afire (metaphorically)'; *kaltı başta tamıtmış ot ok täg* (ShōAgon 1,231) 'just like the fire[428] set ablaze on (one's) head'.

(*takşur-* 'to compose verses' was probably pronounced as *taxşur-* in Old Turkic: /ş/ spirantised adjacent stops appearing before it and created special allophones. *EDPT* s.v. *takşur-* and *DTS* s.v. *tayšur-*; all the exs. are spelled as written in the *DTS*, but Clauson is right from the etymological point of view: A connection with *tak-* 'to fasten, attach' seems plausible semantically; *koş-*, another verb used for denoting the writing of verses, has a similar basic meaning. The rather common *takşut* 'verse' is discussed in section 3.108; it probably comes from *takşur-*. Exs. of *takşur-* not found in the *EDPT* occur in BT I $A_1$10 and $A_2$45 Maitr 32 r 4 (*takşut sav takşur-*), BT VIII B 30 and BT XIII 3,76.)

427 The ed. translates this verb and the form *tirilgäy* appearing earlier in this sentence as tr., which misleading.

428 The eds. reading '*oot-uy*' gives no sense in the context.

tapş-ur-, *EDPT*. Beside the DLT attested twice in a contract published in USp: in the phrase *tapşurup ber-*, apparently 'to hand over personally'. The DLT gives this verb as *tapçur-* but is aware that /ç/ here comes from /ş/: This is a case of progressive assimilation, with the stopping of air getting continued into the palatal domain. In Uigur, this verb may have been pronounced as *tafşur-* with regressive assimilation. The DLT ex. has a son getting entrusted to his mother; with this content, *tapşur-* can very well be the causative of *tap-ış-* 'to find one another'.

tat-ur- 'to make someone taste or eat something' quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT and from later texts. Appears also in the text published in the n. to TT VII 6 and again as ETŞ 17. This is correctly written as *tatur-* in the former, but wrongly appears as '*tatut-*' in ETŞ 17,20. Retranslated in *UW* 62 s.v. *agat*. Man-Mon 77 is in *UW* 252 b read as *atlarka yezgü taturzun* and translated as "er soll die Pferde mit Futter(?) füttern!"; the ed. wrote '*katur-*', which makes no sense in this context. DLT ff. had a verb *tatı-t-* 'to make tasty', dealt with in the *EDPT*. That is clearly something else: *tat-* 'to taste' is tr., while *tatı-* 'to be tasty' is intr.

tägg-ür- 'to bring, convey'. In addition to the exs. of the *EDPT*, this verb appears in BT II 15, ThreeLett 64, ManMon 53, ETŞ 10,53 and 77, USp 12,8 (twice), Ht V 14 a 10 and 15 a 19-20 and X 662, 1072, 1085 and 1115, Shō II b 10, ShōKen-kyū III 32, ManTüTex 120 and 595, BuyKāl 9, BodhiAvaKomm 20 and 32, Ernte 29, BT VII A 328-9, 434 and 735, BT VIII A 69, Suv 276,4, UigTot 485, 1424 and 1430, Maitr 150 r 4, 135 r 17, 106 v 4, 65 r 8, 6 r 12, 5 v 10, 91 r 14, 5 v 28, 126 r 13 and 2 v 29 and BT XIII 18,26. BT XIII 12,015, 12,017, 46,1 and ms. T III M 115 (U 3204) v 1-6 have the phrase *utlı sävinç tägür-* 'to show gratitude'. (*tägşür-* 'to alter, change (tr.)'. Semantically closer to *tägşil-* (q.v. among the *-(X)l-* verbs, also for the base) than to *täg-iş-* (also discussed above). Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in TT V A 89, TT VIII L 14 and 20, BT II 1175, ms. TM 151 (U 128 a) v(?) 5 quoted in the n. to ManTüTex 574, BT VII A 169, UigTot 612, 851 and 912, Ht V 6 b 11 and VII 8 a 4, BuddhUig II 255 (*körkin tägşür-* as in the Manichaean fr. TM 151 mentioned, and elsewhere), Suv 592,2 (quoted in *UW* 237 b), Zerst 10 and Maitr 61 v 13 (*mäŋzin tägşür-*). A meaning 'change (tr.), exchange, give and take something in exchange' occurs in Maitr 170 r 21, e.g., best translated in *UW* 90 a bottom, and HamTouen 22,14 and 15. Cf. *tägşür-üş-* in section 7.1.)

d-ur- 'to satiate, fill the stomach' is, in the *EDPT*, listed in the lemma of *tod-gur-*, its synonym. Qarakhanid Turkic has both derivates, and Kāšğarī maintains that *todur-* comes from *todgur-*. QB exs. of *todur-* not mentioned by he *EDPT* occur in couplets 2976, 2982, 3350, 3923, 5513 and 6371. *todgur-* is therwise attested thrice in Suv; *todur-*, on the other hand, in a Manichaean

text and thrice in Maitr: *suk otın öçürür, toduru umaz* (M III 29,12$_5$, text 12, Manichaean script) 'He suppresses the fire of greed but is unable to satiate it'; *tü türlüg aşın içgün tançun todurdı kanturdı* (Maitr 21 r8 + MaitrH III 8 a3); *anı . . . bilgā biligin ögrünçün todurtum* [*kantur*]*dum* (Maitr 21 r10) and *boşılayu yorıp karan* (for /karın/) *toduru . . .* (Maitr 131 v12). The Suv 606,3 instance of *todgur-* has that in a biverb with *kantur-*, in practically the same context as the Maitr 21 r8 ex. of *todur-*.

tog-ur- 'to cross over, traverse'. As a verb, this appears in *kāçinçsiz tārin taloy öğüz suvın togurup . . .* (ms. fr. TM 269 quoted in the footn. to the n. to TT VI 115) and *otra akdaçı nızvanılıg öğüz suvın togurup . . .* (UigFalt 24), to be translated as 'crossing the waters of the *kleśa* river flowing in between'. Cf. also the petrified converb *toguru* discussed in section 7.512. By meaning, the verb *togur-* in DLT fol. 309 appears to be a back-formation from this converb. *tog-* is found only in the runic inscrs. and only in the form *toga*.[429]

twg-ur- 'to give birth; to engender, cause to exist'. *EDPT*; found also in BT III 459,[430] UigTot 574, 846-7 and 1124, ms. T II M 6 (U 4680) 21-25 in the n. to UigTot 109, BuddhUig II 369, ShōKenkyū II 32, Abhi 47, 86, 121 etc., BT XIII 12,85 and on l.69 of a fr. quoted in the n. to BT XIII 13,98-99 and Maitr 58 r30 and 152 v4.

tomur- 'to bleed (intr.)', *EDPT*: Quoted thrice from Heilk I and from DLT with reference to nose bleeding. This is probably a rounding of **tam-ur-* 'to drip'; it would be caused by the /m/, supported by the rounded second vowel. Note that some of the DLT exs. are actually spelled with *fatḥa*. Cf. *tam-ız-* below.

toŋ-ur- 'to freeze (tr.)' is a hap. in Ernte II 2, used together with *üşüt-* (from üşi-). The base is found in the IrqB but not in Uigur proper.

(*tötür-* appears in DLT fol. 306: *ol aŋar ıt tötürdi* 'He set the dog on him to catch him'. Kāšğarī adds: "One may say *tötgürdi*". As the infinitive also shows, this lexeme has front vowels; it should therefore not be connected with *tut-*, as suggested in the *EDPT*. It is probably connected with *tötüş-*, q.v. among the -(*X*)*ş-* verbs.)

(*tur-ur-u koḍu y*(*a*)*rlıkamışlar* is very clear on the facs. of Rāma 31, and has *tö* as object: "(Sie haben das) Gesetz aufstellen lassen und festzulegen geruht Since no other ex. of such a causative has come up and since *tur-gur-* (discuss below) is so common, the Q may just have been inadvertently omitted: T short text has many other omissions and errors.)

tüş-ür- 'to drop, let somebody come down or dismount, force down, bring to fell'. The YE 28,3 sentence quoted in the *EDPT* should read *iniŋizkä eçin*

429 See *EDPT* 465 a. *twga* in M III 23,9$_2$ (text 8) can either be from this or from *twg-* 'to be

430 In the n. to BT I D (216), the verb of this passage is wrongly quoted as '*twgut-*'.

in(i)gän yükі I L²Z *tüşürtüŋüz* 'You brought your elder and younger brothers a female camel's load of I L²Z'. Exs. not mentioned by the *EDPT* occur in ETŞ 11,83, Ht V9 a14, Maitr 82 r28, Shō VII b6, Wettkampf 61 (with *alŋadur-*) and QB 2370. *uçuz oŋay tugurur tüşürür* in TuoLuoNi 106 does not signify just "gebären", as the ed. writes, but refers to the removal of the child or foetus by birth or by *abortion*.[431]

uç-ur- 'to make something fly'. In *EDPT* and *DTS* quoted only from TT VIII A, QB and DLT; in the first, the Skt. original means something slightly different. Attested also in ManTürkGed r5, BT III 224 and Ht VII 4 b25. The phrase *köŋül uçur-* used in HtPar 30 r10-11 and in the Brāhmī ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) of SktUigBil may possibly have signified something like 'to exhilerate'. Similar is *közüg sakınçıg köŋülüg uçruldur-* in BuddhUig II 82.

yap-ur- 'to level the ground' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT. Attested also in Ernte 39, same meaning. *yap-* is rare in Old Turkic but appears, basically, to have denoted the sticking together of surfaces by mud.

yafş-ur- is written with F in TT III 128, which should be followed: /ş/ spirantizes stops preceding it: Cf. *yavşuru* / yapşuru / in ShōAgon 1,365, with [f], allophone of /p/, spelled as V. *yafş-ur-* 'to stick or fasten something onto something else' is the causative of *yap-ış-* 'to stick or adhere to something'. The DLT has *yapçur-*, in which the beginning of the second syllable is strengthened and the [p] can be retained. See the *EDPT* for this and for Uigur evidence. Exs. not mentioned there occur in Maitr 51 r5, 54 r4 and 83 r15 and Ht V14 a25.

yaş-ur- 'to conceal' appears (except in the DLT) mainly in biverbs. Suv exs. quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* have *yaşur- batur- ürt- kizlā-* and twice *kizlā-yaşur-*. Not mentioned there we have *b(ä)krü kizlä yaşurgıl, adın kişi körmāzün* (M III 29,1$_2$, text 12), *ürt- kiẓlā- yaşur- batur-* (ETŞ 18,42), *yaşuru baturu kiẓlā-* (Suv 107,14), *yaşuru baturu* as quoted s.v. *bat-ur-*, and *yaşuru igiḍṭürdi* in ShōAgon 2, p. 194,3.

yet-ür- ~ et-ür- 'to lose' is, by the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, quoted only from the DLT and the QB.[432] Attested also in M III 17,13$_2$ (text 8): *birök ol kişi ögin köŋülin ıçgınsar ötrü anıŋ b(ä)lgüsi antag bolur: s(ä)rinmāk biligin yetürür. eṭürmädāçi* in BT II 718 has the same meaning, as also *yetürgäy* in BuddhBio 24, *etürsär m(ä)n* in Warnke 243 and *agıtmayın etürmäyin ibid.* 266 and KP 77,4.[433] There also is a *-dUr-* derivate from the same base, and it has the same meaning.

Cf. (*çocuk*) *düşürmek* 'to lose or get rid of the foetus, either naturally or by abortion' in Republican Turkish. One of the dangers for the mother is, of course, that she is unable to get rid of a dead foetus. Note that the following sentence of the text says that one is quickly to throw a stillborn child into water.

The *EDPT* also mentions "I E7, II E7"; those are exs. of *yetrü*, which belongs elsewhere.

Thus according to Tezcan in his review of BT VII in *TDAYB* 1978-79 (1981): 304. Hamilton, the

(*yinçür-* is mostly attested in the petrified converb *yinçürü* discussed below. I take it to be related to *yinçgä* 'fine, delicate, polite' (discussed in section 3.323), whose base is not attested: The meaning 'politely' seems quite appropriate for *yinçürü* in the context in which we find it. A non-petrified converb occurs in *yinçürü adıra biltäçi* (Suv 594,15), which corresponds to "wer genau überlegt" in the German translation of the Chinese original. *yinçür-* here reminds one of *yinçgä+lä-* 'to be meticulous about something', Republican Turkish *incele-* 'to study, analyse'. Thus also] *yinçürmäk isdämäk yorü*[*g* of Nyūabi (7) v7, where the biverb could signify 'to investigate'. *yinçr-ün-*, a derivate from the present verb apparently signifying 'to do obeisance' like *yinçürü*, is a hap. in QB 5805.)

(1 *yogur-* 'to knead'; originally perhaps 'to condense, thicken (tr.)' if it is related to *yogrut* and *yogun*. See *yogrut* 'yogurt' (and its rare variants *yorgut* and *yorgurt*) in section 3.108, the cognate *yogun* 'thick, massive, dense' in section 3.107. See the *EDPT* under '*yuğur-*' and *DTS* under *joγur-*. *yog-* 'to thicken, curdle, clot (intr.)' is mentioned by the Republican Turkish dictionaries of Radloff and Samy-Bey. *yogur-* was apparently felt to be a simple verb, as its *-Ut* derivate would otherwise have been '*yogut*'.[434] To the dictionaries' exs. add *tıtıg yogurup . . .* "kneten" (TuoLuoNi 129).)

(*yoŋşur-* 'to incite people to mutual false accusations' appears only in KT E6 // BQ E7, in parallelism with *kikşür-* (q.v. above). Interpreted correctly in the *DTS* under '*joŋašur-*'; the *EDPT* has a weaker etymology. V. Thomsen already got the meaning more or less correctly, although a narrow vowel after /ŋ/ is unacceptable: It is derived from Vámbéry's version of the base verb; *his* only source, in turn, was an obsolete version of QB. *yoŋa-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) is well-known from DLT and QB and appears in TT IV A 71 in a biverb with *çaşur-*. The same biverb also gave *çaşut yoŋa-g* (section 3.101). Our direct base **yoŋa-ş-* is not attested; *yoŋarışmak* a hap. cognate if not a mistake, is quoted under *ayıgla-ş-* above. The unsyncopated form serving as lemma to the *DTS* would be just as correct a reading; I assume the verb was syncopated, as all other *-Ur-* verb stems have exactly two syllables. There is no reason to *assume* an exception, and /A/ also does get syncopated.)

yöläş-ür- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* but appears in Maitr 38 r15, 19 and 23 *sumer* [*tag*]*k*[*a / taloy ögüz suvıŋa / tözün maytriniŋ bilgä biliginä yoläşürgäl bolmaz* 'X cannot be compared to Y'. In later texts, this verb is replaced b *yöläş-tür-*, q.v. below. The petrified converb *yöläşürü* is discussed in section 7.5 and the derivate *yöläşür-üg* in section 3.101. See *yölä-ş-* 'to resemble' abov

ed. of the most recent (and best) edition of KP, follows him in his glossary of HamTouen (w includes the material of KP as well).

434 See the section on *-Ut* for details.

yüd-ür- 'to load' is attested in *biriglärig alıp* [. . .] *kaŋırka yudurtı* (Ht V 2 a 19; cf. facs.) and *agır yüklär yudurüp tarıturlar* (Maitr 182 v 8), and in DLT and QB as quoted in the *EDPT*. See *yüd-tür-* for details.

PETRIFIED CONVERBS

Quite a number of adverbial terms are etymologically related to verbal bases and have, moreover, the shape *-Ur-U*. Since vowel converbs from simple bases or from ones derived by other formatives have similar tasks, we connect the lexemes of the following list to the *-(U)r-* formation: Many but not all of them have related *-(U)r-* verbs. They do not generally have causative meaning; this holds true also for petrified converbs related to other causative formatives. In some cases, petrified converbs here appear to be older than finite *-(U)r-* verbs; one reason for this may be that, having gotten separated from the verbal system, analogy no longer applied to them. Here they are, then:

akru 'gently, slowly' probably comes from an unattested *-Ur-* derivate from *ak-* 'to flow', as the *UW* reaffirms; *akruş* (discussed among the *-(X)ş* nominals above) clearly also comes from this hypothetical *-Ur-* verb. Quite as common (if apparently not as old as *akru*) is the variant *akuru*. See Uigur exs. in the *UW* entry, Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic evidence in the *EDPT*. Exs. not mentioned in either occur in BT XIII 2,34 (fragmentary context) and Ht V 15 b 13 (*akru käl-*). The Maitr 15 r 8 instance mentioned as "Ohne Kont." by Röhrborn has its full context in the Hami ms., MaitrGeng 1 a 7: *akru akru maŋlayu ayagka tägimlig Maytri*, . . . The attested causative of *ak-* is *akıt-*, discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs below. As shown there, petrified converbs connected with the *-(X)t-* formation all come from stems ending in /A/ or /I/ but not consonants; their distribution thus differs from that of the verbal formation itself.

amru 'constantly, continuously, without interruption' is adequately discussed in the *UW*. The variants *amuru* and *amıru* are rare and probably due to secondary anaptyxis. Cf. *amrıl-* among the *-(X)l-* verbs, where other cognates are also mentioned. Neither the base nor a related *-(U)r-* verb are attested.[435])

arkuru 'crosswise, across', may be related to *arkuk* 'obstinate, refractory' in the DLT and the QB. Only if it is can it be from an unattested *-Ur-* verb and belong into this section. The semantic connection with the DLT hap. *arkuçı* 'go-between' seems even more tenuous to me. See the *UW* for exs.; the lexeme lived on into Middle Turkic, for which see the *EDPT*.)

art-ur-u 'exceedingly' appears in BT I C (9) and in the following: *arturu uz etilmiş*

435 The *EDPT* is wrong in stating that it is peculiar to Buddhist texts.

yaraılmış (ShōAv 107) 'exceedingly well adorned';[436] *alko el bodun açıp körüp arturu sävinişip . . .* (InscrOuig II 6); *arturu birdäm kavruldı* (BT XIII 3,64) and *arturu* ("sehr", spelled as *ärtürü* by the eds.) *yokurkanıp . . .* (TuoLuoNi 361). The phoneme sequence /är/ is sometimes spelled as *ar* in word-initial position, but this does not appear to have been the case here: Beside being supported by alliteration, the meaning of *arturu* also accords perfectly with *art-ur-* 'to add on, make more' and not at all with *ärt-ür-* 'to allow or cause something to pass'. I am not sure *UW* 262 b is wrong about reading *ärtürü kiẓlämiş . . . nom tözi* in ETŞ 13,142 and translating ". . . die man wieder (?) verborgen hat"; reading *arturu* and translating 'which one has quite hidden' is, however, I think, just as good.

(*aşru* 'exceedingly' is attested in QB 1766 (the only ex. mentioned in the *EDPT*), 4040, 5038 and 6191. By content, it only appears to be connected more with *as-* 'to increase (tr.)' than with *aş-*. Nor does the only (questionable) ex. of the verb in Uigur quite fit with that meaning. This *aşru* was, however, borrowed into Preclassical Mo. (cf. Poppe in *AOH* 36 (1982): 405-411), where it appears as *asuru*. The instance in InscrOuig IV 49 must be a re-borrowing, also written as *asuru*: That text has quite a number of Mo. loans.[437] Çagatay, Coman and Harezm Turkic *asru* probably also come from Mo. Not, however, Ottoman *aşırı* and Tkm. *āşırı*, with long first vowel as in *āş-*: These come from Turkic *aş(u)ru*.)

bākrū ~ *bākūrū* 'firmly' is documented in *DTS* s.vv. '*begrū*', '*bekrū*' and '*bekūr-*' and in the *EDPT*; add *bākrū ba-* from ManTüTex 462 and *b(ā)kūrū tu⌈t-*(?) in Halén G r1. *bāk+ū-* is discussed in section 5.41. Its finite causative is *bākū-t-* (q.v. below). **bākūr-* is not attested, but *bākūrt-* (discussed among the *-(X)t-* verbs) may come from it if it really existed. A petrified converb from *bākūt-* appears to have been excluded for the reason given under *akru* (another petrified *-(U)r-* converb).

būt-ūr-ū 'completely, thoroughly' can be found in the *DTS* s.vv. *būtrū* and *būtūrū* and in the *EDPT*. Appears, in addition, in *būtūrū yarot-* in Ht IV 1239 and X398 and *būṭūrū eṭ-* in ETŞ 13,104. *büt-ür-* is well attested.

(*kövrü turuk ätözlüg* in BT XIII 1,7 is translated as "mit einem schwachen, mage-

436 The *a* (not *ā*) is supported by the systematic alliteration. The ed. wrote *a*, which the *UW* entry (216 a) calls a "Fehlinterpretation". In his reedition of this same text, Röhrborn comes back to Shōgaito's reading. Some of the other exs. of *arturu* were unknown when the 3rd fascicle of the *UW* appeared.

437 I see no reason to follow *UW* 236 b, where this *asuru* is considered to be a "Lesefehler fü *ašunu*?". The *UW* does not, however, appear to mention it either under *aşnu* (for which no thre syllable variant is mentioned at all), or under *aşun-*. Meaningwise, both *asuru* and *aşnu* a possible, and an examination of the stone may lead to a decision.

ren Körper" and convincingly explained as a rounded petrified converb from **käv-ür-*. As usual with petrified converbs, there is no causative meaning in this. *käv-* is tr.)

keŋü-r-ü 'widely, openly, in detail etc.' comes from *keŋü-r-* (q.v. in section 7.511). *keŋürü sözlä-* appears in UigPañc 21, TT V B 22, U III 59,2$_2$, USp 102 b 13, Maitr 81 r 9, TuoLuoNi 227, *keŋürü ukıt-* BT III 529, *keŋürü aç-* HtPek 81 b 8 *apud UW* 240 b, *keŋürü ay-* HtPar 4,24 *apud UW* 244 a, *keŋürü yad-* Ht VII 2008 and 12 a 23 and X 412-3, BT II 1033, SuvGeng 599,9, *keŋürü yadıl-* BT I D (59), BT III 125, HtPar 21 v 21, BuyKäl 29, *keŋürü bil-* UigTot 1293 and *keŋürü nomla-* in DvaKol 105 and Suv 583,20 (in the n. to ManTüTex 393): All main verbs are of saying and thinking. *keŋürü ıd-* in BT II 980 is 'to let one roam freely'. The context is fragmentary in Maitr 20 r 4, Ht X 857 and TuoLuoNi 208. *keŋürü asıg kılur* (BT XIII 24,4) shows the petrified converb as a real adverb, and a predicative-adjectival ex. in the QB is quoted in the *EDPT* entry *ké:ŋür-*. The latest texts have real nominalisations: *keŋürüsinçä* in U II 41,22 (Uşnişa Viçay) and BT VIII A 292, *keŋürüni tapla-* in BT VII A 447.

(*kwdur-u* 'vigorously, attentively, excessively', also 'very, extremely, a lot'. DLT fol. 307 has a verb *kwdur-* "to exert oneself, do one's utmost in a matter" spelled with *dāl*, not *dhāl* (as *kadır-* or *todur-*) or *tā* (as *kutur-* "to go beyond one's measure" etc.). This may really be the base of *kwduru* as suggested in the *EDPT*,[438] but it can also be a back-formation. Exs. for *kwduru* are given by the *EDPT*. Additional ones: *kwduru uk-* (Maitr 19 v 16 and 96 r 5), *kwduru kolola-* (Maitr 48 r 6 together with *ädgüti eşid*, and 151 + 41 r 6), *kwduru ıçanu saklanu* (Three Lett 45), *kwduru aḍkanmak yapşınmak* (Suv 109,14),[439] *ayı kwdru yalvartıŋ* (thus syncopated, BT XIII 12,126), *kwduru b[u]san-* (BT XIII 49,6), *kwduru kololap tıŋlagıl* (U III 79,9-10$_2$), *kwduru [ärti]ŋü sakınu kololaŋ* (HamTouen 1,8). *kwduru* does not belong here if *kwdur-* is a simplex.)

ötrü ~ *ötürü* comes from an *-Ur-* causative of *öt-* 'to go through, pass through, pass off' but not directly from *öt-ür-* 'to pierce' as attested: It must have been formed prehistorically, when *ötür-* had a wider meaning, or perhaps derived directly from the base with a composite element *-(U)rU*. That its creation is prehistorical follows also from the fact that it is further removed from verbal status than many petrified converbs in serving as postposition or conjunction:

The ms. has thrice *dāl* not *dhāl*, but Clauson may be right in emending the text on the basis of the fact that the lemma appears between *kadır-* and *kādür-*. Any conclusions concerning the existence of a third non-nasal dental phoneme would in any case be unwarranted.

UW 265 a quotes this, spelling it as '*kuturu*' and translating "in übertriebener Weise". It also writes '*atkanmak*'; *adkan-* is discussed among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

We find *anta ötrü* already in runic inscriptions. As a postposition governing the locative-ablative it signifies 'because of, upon'; as a conjunction or sentence adverb it could be translated as 'thereupon'. Exs. in the *DTS* s.vv. *ötrü* and *ötürü* and in the *EDPT*; ManTüTex 618 and the n. thereto have some additional ones. It appears also thrice in Tib. script, in BuddhKat 9, 28 and 30. Adding these to three Brāhmī instances we find that, in five among six exs., the final syllable is spelled with *ö* and not *ü*. This no doubt corresponds to a phonetic reality, but I would not jump to any conclusions concerning the phonemic appurtenance of the converb vowel of the *-Ur-* formation.

sıguru+k(ı)ya is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 89 (2 parallel mss.): *yinçgāki(y)ā üjik üzā sıguruk(ı)ya bitip . . .* According to the n., this does not correspond to the Chin. original; the ed.'s translation is therefore hypothetical: "mit feinsten Buchstaben wie gedruckt schreiben". Considering the meanings given above for *sıgur-*, the most likely translation seems to me to be 'writing (the *dhāraṇī*) with the finest characters and fitting it into an exceedingly small space'.

tāg-ür-ü is attested as a postposition signifying 'till, up to' in BT VIII A 69 (*sünükkā yilikkā tāgürü*) and 108 and Suv 276,4 (*muŋa tāgürü*) quoted in the n. thereto. The *EDPT* or the *DTS* have no such entry. *tāg-ür-* is a well attested causative; *tāgürü*, however, has no causative meaning (as usual with petrified converbs).

(*tärtrü* ~ *tätrü* 'opposing(ly), the wrong way around, inverted, crosswise' should not be confused with *tetrü*, which has a very different meaning. A finite *-ür-* verb related to *tä(r)trü* is not attested, but *tätrül-* 'to be perverted, to be irrationally obstinate' should come from it. *tärtrü* is the rarer variant but appears to be earlier: We find it in IrqB XXXIX, Chuast 135 and M II 11,16 (text 4).[440] *tätrü* appears in Maitr 182 r24, TT IV A 74, TT VI 331, TT VII 40,37 (Yetikān Sudur) and TT VIII O 2 (Brāhmī) in a binome with *tärs*; the /r/ in *tärs* may have helped in the elimination of one of the /r/s in *tärtrü*. A further ex. of *tärs tätrü* is mentioned under *tätrül-* which, itself, often appears in a biverb with *tärs+ik-*. There even is an expansion *tärsikdür- tätrüldür-*. *tätrü* appears by itself in Suv 630,18 (quoted in the *DTS*), M II 12,1$_2$ (text 5; Manichaean!) and, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, BT XIII 27,15 and Abhi B 53 b11 (= 5466, quoted in the n. to TT VKud 14). The DLT distinguishes clearly between *tätrü* 'inverted' and *tetrü* (next entry), as does the QB: *tätrü* (not '*tetrü*' as written in the *EDPT*) is written in QB 536, 1670 (only ms. C *tetrü* against AB), 1902, 1984

440 It may also be a characteristic of a Manichaean dialect, if such a thing can be proven to have existed. There is no particular reason to believe that the IrqB is Manichaean, at any rate. Note, on the other hand, that the first /r/ in the causative of *kurtgar-* discussed further on is also peculiar to Manichaean texts. There I (also) take it to be a case of retention rather than addition.

(C alone wrong again) and 5507. *tätrü* was also borrowed into Preclassical Mo., where it appears with an additional vowel after the /t/ and the meaning 'but, however, on the other hand, on the contrary, inversely, incorrectly'.) (*tetrü* 'clearly, correctly, attentively' and the lexeme of the previous entry were confused both in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*, but got unraveled by Kudara in his reedition of TT V B. In TT V B 13 we find the binome *tetrü çıngaru* of which Kudara gives the Chin. equivalent in a n. It was also he who suggested connecting *tä(r)trü* with *tätrül-* but *tetrü* with *tetig* (q.v. among the *-(X)g* lexemes above). *tetil-* "to become clever" in DLT fol. 329 is another cognate. *tet-* 'to oppose' and *tetin-* 'to dare to do something', however, are semantically too far away. Here belong all the instances in the *EDPT* entry of the sequences *tetrü uk-* / *kör-* / *sakın-* / *bak-*. We can add *tetrü köni uk-* (BT I $A_2$17 f.) 'to understand clearly and correctly', *tetrü tıŋla* (Genzan C v 3), *tetrü kör-* (Ht X 738 and Suv 612,16 as quoted in the n. to Ht V 70) and *tetrü üç kata kaya körüp* (TuoLuoNi 357) 'he looked attentively back three times'.[441] The *EDPT* also quotes two DLT exs. with *tetrü bak-* and one from QB with *tetrü kör-*.)

tog-(u)r-u 'straight, straightforward'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, not quoted before the (late) economical documents. There it is common in the phrase *tog(u)ru tumlıtu sat-*. Additional exs. are *toguru satdım* (FenTen II 3) and *toguru* [*tumlı*]*ıtu sat-* (UigLand 4). An explanation for it is offered in the n. to ActeOuig 3, where the text has a mutilated version of the formula. *tog-ur-* 'to cross over, traverse' is discussed above. In the following instance, *toguru* is well on the way to petrification: *toguru käç[üräy]in . . . tınl(ı)glarıg t(ä)ŋrim* (UigSukh 16) "Hinübergelangen (Hend.) lassen will ich . . . die . . . Lebewesen, mein Gott!" *togur-* not being a causative, however, what we here have is not a biverb as translated.[442] We should rather translate it as an adverbial 'across'. Postpositional *toguru* is attested very early, in ŞU E 1 and S 5: *eki yaŋıka kün toguru süŋüşdüm* 'On the second day of the month I fought throughout the day'.[443] The shift of postpositional *togru* to the meaning 'straight towards' is well documented in Middle

441 Not "Er blickte genau dreimal zurück" as translated by the eds. As the meaning and use of all its other exs. show, *tetrü* has to qualify the glance itself.

442 Some morphemes can, in Turkic languages, apply to two or more words in common. This is not the case with the causative or any other voice formatives, not, at any rate, in Old Turkic. The difference between morphemes which do and those which do not behave in this way is one between different degrees of morpho-syntactic juncture. These have not yet been investigated for Old Turkic.

443 The phrase *kün twg-* for the rising of the sun is common, whence the accepted translation of *kün toguru* as 'at dawn'. Cf. *EDPT* 472 b under *tugur-* "to give birth", who translates the sentence as "I started the battle at sunrise on the second day of the month". The confusion is, of course, due to the fact that *togur-* and *twgur-* look identical in runic writing. A petrified converb of *twgur-* 'to give birth' is nowhere in sight. We understand from the context of the inscription that its author

Turkic, but cf. the mss. of QB 2550. Equally Middle Turkic *togru* 'true' reminds us of the legal use we started out with.

(*ükşürü* has *ük-* ~ *yük-* < *hük-* 'to heap up' as ultimate base. Cognates are *ükü-*, Qarakhanid *ükül-*, *ükün-* etc., but a *-(X)ş-* derivate from this base is not attested. The verbs *kikşür-*, *takşur-* and *yoŋşur-* discussed earlier in this section are similar cases. In Ht X 742 = HtKZ I r 3, *adakın adak üzä ükşürü urup* . . . is by Kudara and Zieme translated over-literally as "das (linke) Bein auf das (rechte) aufstapelnd legte". Adverbial is also *ükşürü ötüntün* (Genzan C v 2) 'you begged repeatedly'. 'repetition' can be iconically expressed by repetition, whence we get *ikşürü ikşürü aş üläyü* (ShōAv 208), in Laut's translation "wiederholt$_2$ Speise verteilten". The reason for the unrounding is unclear; it may be a reflex of a lost initial /y/. Further unrounded is *üştürti kudı xua çäçäk-lärig ikşirü ikşirü yagıtdılar* (BT III 550). In a binome with *yana* 'again', *ükşürü* attested in *bo ükşürü ötügümin bütürü y(a)rlıka*[*zun*] (Ht V 12 b 23). A probably adnominal use is to fulfill this repeated prayer of mine'.[444] Definitely adnominal is *mäniŋ ükşürü* [*a*]*yıg kılınçım* 'my repeated(ly) evil deeds' (Ht V 10 a 22). *agturup bilgä biliglig kün t(ä)ŋri yarotdı ükşürü karaŋgularıg* (HtPar 208,3) is in *UW* 76 b translated as "Er ließ die Weisheitssonne aufsteigen und überdeckte die Finsternisse mit Glanz". I don't think *ükşürü* should be connected with *yarot-*, however, but rather with *karaŋgular*.)

yagru ~ *yaguru* 'near; recently' comes from an unattested *-(U)r-* causative of *yagu-* 'to be near, to be imminent, to approach'.[445] The runic exs. are spelled as Y^{1}G^{1}R^{1}W, which should be read as *yagru*.[446] *yagru* is also the variant of the DLT. Uigur generally has *yaguru*. Most exs. are adverbial: *yagru kon-* (KT S 5), *yagru bar-* (BQ N 6), *yagru yorı-* (DLT), *yaguru käl-* (U III 63,18) and *yaguru yakın käl-* (U III 84,16). Similar to the last pair, *yagu-k yak-ın* is a

had no reason to single out the *start* of the battle. Whether *sünüş-* could be inchoative is another question in need of investigation.

444 This reminds one of the Genzan instance. I follow *UW* 167 a bottom in assuming (against the ed.) that nothing stood after *ükşürü* in the worn-out edge of the leaf. If there is enough space, one could reconstruct *ükşürü* [*aymış*] *ötügüm*. The *EDPT* wrongly makes this ex. into '*ükşürü*[g]'; the entry (p. 119) for this lemma should be cancelled.

445 This verb is a simplex, by no means to be connected with *yak-* in spite of their similar meanings. Clauson thought *yagru* was "apparently a Directive f. in *-ru*:"; but the suffixes with such a meaning have the forms *+gArU* and *+rA* only. He was even ready to accept the view that *yagru* come from '*yakru*', although Käšğarī had made this suggestion for his obviously impossible Arab etymology: Runic evidence, to say the least, speaks against this. Nor is an appropriate nomin **yag* (thought up as an alternative in the *EDPT*) found anywhere.

446 Thomsen's text is wrong in KT S 5. I take it that rounded vowels appearing after unrounded o are always explicit in the KT and BQ inscriptions (following Meyer, 1965-6).

common binome. Adnominal is *yaguru yerdā üddā* (MaitrG 7 r16), which naturally led to *yagrudakı ot* (HamTouen 29,19-20). The sentence adverb *yaguru* 'recently' (HtPar 118,4 quoted in *UW* 74 b and Ht V314) served as base to *yaguru+k(ı)ya* (q.v. in section 2.13). In section 6.3 we quote a hap. *yagu-r-* from BT III; being intr., we take it to be a back-form from *yaguru* and not its base. Since the petrified converbs listed here have no causative meaning, couldn't they be from *-(I)r-/-(X)r-* as dealt with in section 6.3 instead of the origin we have taken them to have? We think not. Beside the fact that many such converbs have living *-(U)r-* cognates, we note that petrified converbs from *-(X)t-* and *-tUr-* verbs equally lose causative content.

yaş-ur-u ~ *yaşru* 'secretly, furtively' has the well-attested base *yaş-ur-*. See the *EDPT* s.v. *yaşru*: Appears also in *yaşru batutlug uvut yini* (MaitrGeng 5 a21), which reminds one of the biverb *yaşur- batur-*. As *yaşurukı iş* (TT I 217) shows, it needs the suffix *+kI* to become adnominal. In *yaşrukı(y)a kõŋlin sezik ayıdı* (MaitrGeng 12 a17), on the other hand, the whole expression *yaşrukı(y)a kõŋlin* is adverbal.

yetrü ıd- 'to dismiss and/or lose' in KT and BQ E7 is from *yet-ür-* 'to lose'. Both exs. are written $Y^2I\ T^2R^2\ddot{W}$. The word in the expression *aŋa otoz yettürü* in TT VIII L25 may belong here and should be translated 'subtracting 30 from that'.[447]

(yinçür-ü 'in veneration' is a petrified converb from *yinçür-* (discussed above). The exs. *yinçürü kololayu sakıngu ol* (UigKan 233) and *ikinti kololamakıg* [*öritip*] */ ınanu yinçürü yükün-* (UigKan 79) form a link to the meaning of *yinçür-* itself. Appears equally in Manichaean texts, e.g. *söküdüp yinçürü*[448] *öt[ün]ti* (TT II 1,35), and Buddhist ones, e.g. *yinçürü kõŋültä bögünsär* (BT XIII 35,9). Most common is the combination with *yükün-* or with *tõpön yükün-*, attested in Pothi 230, 240[449] and 282, U III 13,5$_2$, TT X 272, at least six times in Suv, ManTüTex 8,121, HamTouen 1,51, UigTot 237, BuddhBio 19 and BuyKäl 2.)

yõlāş-ür-ü is a petrified converb from *yõlāşür-* (q.v. above). It occurs thrice in Manichaean texts: The *EDPT* has two exs. in postpositional use, signifying 'like'; a third one appears in ManTüTex 13,355.

In Qarakhanid Turkic (and first there) was an adverbial ending *+rU* abstracted

447 Consonants to be taken as simple are often written double in Brāhmī: cf. *tuttup* on ls.11 and 15 of the same text. The translation of the passage in *UW* 140 b s.v. *anı*, "addiere 30 dazu und ziehe sie heraus!"(?) is less satisfactory: One does not add and take away by the same action. The *EDPT* s.v. *yétür-* also writes "adding . . .".

448 Wrongly spelled as *yinçirlü*.

449 The *EDPT* refers to this ex. twice: TT III 175 and TT IX 5 is the same place in the same ms.

from these forms. Thus the original petrified converb *tapa* 'towards' is changed to *taparu* in QB and DLT. In the phrase *kıŋru bakar*, Kāšġarī changes *kıŋır* 'squinting' to *kıŋru*.[450]

As the spelling of *yagru* and *yetrū* shows, the vowel of the formative was already syncopated in the inscriptions. In this the petrified converbs differ from the verbal ones. In Uigur, however, the vowel is often retained even in the petrified converb, or reconstituted by analogy.[451]

Morphology

All *-(U)r-* verbs are bisyllabic. This appears to have been the central constraint on the type of bases to which it could be added. When it is added to bases of the shape *(C)VCVC-*, the second vowel of the base is usually syncopated: This happens in *eşt-ūr-*, *kikşūr-*, *tamt-ur-*, *takşur-*, *tapş-ur-*, *tāgşūr-*, *yafş-ur-* and *yoŋşur-* (the last under syncopation of a wide vowel), but not in *yölāşūr-*. We find no expansions from bases ending in /n/ or /z/, and there is only one dubious hap. case of expansion from a base ending in /r/. Most bases end in consonants. *-(U)r-* is mostly used primarily, although found as second element in the common combination *-tUr-*. The only denominal base is *keŋ+ū-*. A few deverbal bases formed with *-(X)ş-* are fused semantically and functionally; the normal and common causative expander of *-(X)ş-* verbs is *-tUr-* (which does not cause any obscuring syncopations). *-tUr-* is added also to *-(X)n-* verbs etc.

Expansions of *-(U)r-* verbs are not too common: *eştūr-*, *kaçur-*, *ölūr-*, *tāgşūr-* and *twgur-* are found expanded with *-(X)ş-*, *bışur-* with *-(X)n-*,[452] *buşur-*, *bütür-*, *keŋür-*, *kötür-*, *tüşür-*, *yapur-* and *yogur-* with *-(X)l-*; several double causatives end in *-(U)r-t-*. There are no formal limitations on expansion, then.

Most *-(U)r-* verbs have intr. bases. The bases of *basur-*, *eştür-*, *içür-*, *kädür-*, *kölür-*, *tatur-* and *yapur-* are tr. The (ultimate) objects of all these verbs are, however, food and drink, clothes, carts and drawing animals, mud, medicine or words; no *-(U)r-* verb therefore denotes an event or a process in which three participants are involved: The causee is not an agent in the fullest sense.

When dealing with all the causative morphemes together, we will find that the

450 Cf. also *kıŋırtı* with the adverbial formative *+tI* in one of the two mss. in Kuan 33. See the *EDPT* s.v. *kıŋır* and, on the other hand, the n. to U IV C128. *körmäk kıŋırtmak* "Sehen und Scheelblicken" in UigTot 787 is the result of a similar verbalising development as in *kıŋru*: As its meaning is not causative, it is quite unlikely to be a causative derivate from an unattested base. This is an exceedingly late text.

451 The only petrified converb from a *-tUr-* verb is *yanturu*; as runic Y^{I}N$^{\dot{N}}$TR^{I}W shows, the early inscrs. syncopated the formative vowel also there.

452 *katrun-* and *sıŋrun-* have no bases attested in Old Turkic.

various formatives are to a certain extent in complementary distribution regarding the shape of their bases. If one wishes to get at differences of behaviour between verbs formed with the different formatives, one has to look for them when added to monosyllabic bases ending in consonants (but not /r/ or /l/). It is this complementary distribution which makes a separate syntactic treatment of the various causative formations unnecessary.

7.52 *-Ar-*: Lexical material

agt-ar- 'to throw, turn or roll something over; to translate' appears in the *UW* entry *agtar-* (*I*). The base 1 *ag-ıt-* is discussed in the section on *-(X)t-*; see the cognate *agt-ıl-* above. The *UW* entry *agtar-* (II), which gives the translation "herumgewirbelt werden" for a single U II ex., should be cancelled as such: It refers to the petrified converb couple *agtaru toŋtaru*, and petrified converbs are known to lose their causative meaning. The DLT a number of times writes this verb as *axtar-* (documented in the *EDPT*). To explain this, I take /g/ to have been a fricative at least in back-vowel surroundings; in the cluster /gt/ this then became [xt]. Before /t/ and in back-vowel words, the opposition /g : k/ appears to have been neutralised. The common dotting of the velar in the Ht text is probably intended to reflect this same fact. The common meaning 'to translate' is, beside the exs. of the *UW*,[453] found in UigTot 1005, TuoLuoNi 159, BuddhLett 18, and HtPar 130,21-22 as published with HtKZ II 18. The meaning given first above has only one ex.; near to it is *kertü nomın bilmädin / kirlig ät'özkä agtarıp /. . .* (BT XIII 17,14), translated "man wird mit einem schmutzigen Körper herumgewirbelt". Never having met a comitative or instrumental dative, I suggest translating 'transfer it into a dirty body'; this also serves as semantic link to 'translating'. *agtaru* is discussed below as petrified converb. Cf. *agtar-ıl-*.

ämt-är- 'to divert something in a certain direction' is, before the XIVth century, attested only once, in TT III; see the *EDPT* for it. *ämit-* 'to lean in a certain direction so as to be about to fall over' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT on; it appears also in BT I B (75)[454] and HtPek 158 b 8 as quoted and translated in *UW* 75 b s.v. *agtarıl-* par. 2. Ht V 2 a 6 and Maitr 101 v 13 have the biverb *ämitmiş kamıtmış* 'fallen over'.

(*katar-*, quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, is attested also in QB 2290 and 6539. It must be a contraction of **kadt-ar-*: This follows from *kaytar-*, the Oguz form

3 The instance quoted there with the unexplained *siglum* Śricakra later appeared as UigTot 1006. Ms. B is lost. Taking the Chin. version into consideration, one could read *inärkä inmäzkä ämitmägülük ol* 'one should tend neither towards what goes down nor towards what does not go down'. But the passage has its problems.

given in the DLT and attested also later. *katar-* means 'to turn something back', *kadıt-* 'to turn back (intr.)'.[455] The Uigur converb *kataru* is discussed further on below.)

ket-är- 'to send or drive away, remove'. See the *EDPT* s.v. Quite a number of additional exs. are found in BT I and II and ETŞ; further, in Ht IV 1307, V 6 a7, X209 and 549, BT VII A 692, ms. Mz 724 v29-35 quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 23-4, ATSS, ShōKenkyū II 14, Nest U 323,4, BT XIII 15,17, Bhaiṣ 7, TuoLuoNi 8, 76 and 195, Suv 248,16 quoted in *UW* 268 b, BuddhUig I 216-218 and so forth. The adverb *öŋi* stresses the content of *ketär-* e.g. in Maitr 129 v15 and 26 r7 and BuddhUig II 269. Used in a biverb with *tarkar-* (discussed further on in this section) in TT VII 40,93 (Yetikān Sudur), USp 105 a8-9, BT I B (3), D (207) and (269), BT II 875, U III 73,28, Ht X169-70 and ShōAv 136, 248 and 279 (only the first mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*). The equally common biverb *ket- tar-ık-* (the base of *ketär- tarkar-*) is documented under *tar-ık-* in section 7.24. *ket-* has a voiceless dental in all early texts.[456]

(*kutgar-* 'to save'. *EDPT* s.v. *qurtğar-* and *DTS* s.vv. *qurtqar-*, *qutqar-*, *bošumaq qutqarmaq* and *ozyur- qutqar-*. The variant with an /r/ before the /t/ appears only in Manichaean texts: M II 9,7 (text 4), M III 31,3_3 (text 13) and 35,1_2 (text 16), HamTouen 8,13 and ms. TM 163 (U 139) r7 quoted in the n. to ManTüTex 175. The ATSS list (no texts published!) gives an instance of *kutgar-* in one fr., an uncertain instance of *kurtgar-* in another. The first variant in the alternation *tärtrü* ~ *tätrü* (petrified converb of section 7.51) is also used only in Manichaean text (and in the IrqB!), so that this must be a real (dialect?) characteristic.[457] The second velar must be /g/ and not /k/ because it disappears in the Oguz group of languages. Those languages in which it does not disappear let it lose its

455 The *EDPT* calls this the causative of '**ka:d-*' which, it is presumed, was the original form of *kay-* 'to turn or tend towards, pay heed to' (exs. in the *EDPT*). This is impossible, however, because a passage from /d/ to /y/ is not attested at such an early date. The text USp 97 quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *kadıt-* is identical with ManMsFr, which should be preferred as source. The facs. shows that *kadıt-* was *not* intended. *kadıt-* is therefore attested in Qarakhanid Turkic, in Heilk II and InscrOuig I 49: *kayıtıp barayın* in this last source does come from *kadıt-*, in a text which also has *kaygu* < *kadgu*.

456 *kedhmāsār* in Brāhmī script in TT VIII K12 is of no importance, as the same text also has *ketmāsār* (same meaning) in l.10; on the other hand, the dentals of *burxan kutı*, *ot* ('weed'), *kut* and *sögöt* are also transcribed with *dh*. *kedär kedmäk* (not the fricative as noted by the *EDPT*) in the DLT may be the result of a hypercorrecting back-formation from *ketti*. The *EDPT* notes the aorist of the DLT as if it only had a *fatḥa*; according to DankKelly it has both *fatḥa* and *kasra* by the first hand.

457 According to what the *EDPT* gives, the /r/ is retained in Osm. and Az. but absent in all other languages including. Tkm. This might also speak for an east-west isogloss. The Manichaean texts which have the /r/ are not among those showing characteristics of great age.

voice by assimilation. A cognate to this verb is *kutrul-* ~ *kurtul-* 'to attain salvation, to be saved'. I take the two to come from *kutur-* with syncopation of its second vowel. **kutr-ar-* would then have given *kutg-ar-* by dissimilation of /r/, a universal process in the world's languages. A similar case of dissimilation must have been **ol(o)r-ur-t-* > *olgurt-* 'to seat', from *olor-* 'to sit'. The paradigmatic relationship with *kurtul-* is visible also in biverbs: *boşwn- kurtul-* has its tr. counterpart in *boşw- kutgar-*, *oz- kutrul-* in *ozKur- kutgar-*. Exs. of *kutgar-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear e.g. in Maitr 228 r2, ETŞ 9,21, and *20,195*, UigFalt 72, Weih 6, Ht X661; exs. for the biverb *ozKur- kutgar-* appear under *oz-Kur-*.)

(*oŋar-* signifies 'to make or do something right, correctly, rightfully or well, to succeed, to be right in something'; also 'to fathom, to comprehend'. The connection with *oŋ* 'right' assumed in the *EDPT* entry[458] is difficult to uphold: A *+KAr-* derivate from *oŋ* would have retained the velar, as *täŋ+Kär-* shows; an *+(A)r-* derivate would have been intr. and signified 'to be or become what the base nominal denotes'.[459] I take *oŋar-* to come from the base of *oŋul-* 'to recover (intr.)'; see that in section 7.31 also for the base. The Suv ex. quoted in the *EDPT* belongs to the semantic domain of the first translations suggested above. So do the QB instances; the ones in couplets 205, 1643, 1813, 1842, *1967*, *2222* and *5507* are not mentioned in the QB. *ayturulmış üţ ärigig aḍırtlıg oŋarıp / . . . iş kılınlar* (ETŞ 13,167) could perhaps also be accomodated with this meaning. The other Uigur exs. clearly have the latter meanings listed above: *tuya oŋaru yarlıka-* (BT II 271), *tuyup bilip oŋargu ol* (BT I D (252)), *tözüg uksar oŋarsar . . .* (*ibid.* B (95)), *tuyguluk oŋarguluk* (ETŞ 15,64), *yorüg-l[ärin kalı]sızın ukdum oŋardım* (BT VIII A 185), *igäsiz kurugın oŋarsar* "if one perceives the derelict voidness of the . . ." (UigKan 26). Ms. Ch/U 7555 v4 in ÄgFrag (1) p. 272 has: *barçanı koşup kılmış m(ä)n, munı bir yolı sakınıp ma umaz m(ä)n, oŋarıp ma umaz m(ä)n*. If *sakın-* and *oŋar-* are to have similar meanings and (negated) form a climax, *oŋar-* should here also signify 'to comprehend' and not "verbessern".[460] *oŋargalı bolmaz* (HtPar 16 r5) may also sig-

458 It tacitly changes the last word in the quotation from QB 1989; it should read *işin*. I don't think the verb is attested in the DLT at all, in spite of a statement in this entry: The passage quoted there has an unintelligible 'NK'KAY^{e} in nominal or adnominal function.

459 *oŋ* usually signifies 'right' as the opposite of 'left', more rarely as the opposite of 'wrong'. Even in the latter meaning, it is not easily accomodated with *oŋar-*: In that meaning it denotes the entity which is right and not the person who is right. There is no reason to think that a parallelism with English 'to be right' holds.

460 I think this difficult text can be understood better if both this sentence and the one following it (both followed by the words *tep turur* 'he keeps on saying') are taken to have been uttered by the *ıdok kut* and only reported by the writer of the letter. The *ıdok kut* may have complained that he

nify 'to comprehend', if we take it to be similar to *tüpKärgäli bolmaz tözin tüpin* (HtPar 14 v15) and *köŋülkä inçıp ötKürgäli bolmaz* (HtPar 16 r2); the three passages are quoted in the n. to Ht VII 1870. A further ex. appears in fragmentary context in BT XIII 35,13. *oŋKargalı bolmagu* "nicht heilen könnend" in BT XIII 1,86 is damaged; if read correctly, it might be a different verb to be analysed e.g. as *oŋ+Kar-*.[461]

tägl-är- 'to blind' is discussed in the *EDPT*. An ex. not mentioned there occurs in Maitr 173 r17: *amarı kaz[gukın] közlärin täglärürlär, amarıları tämirlig tırnakın bir ikintişkä tarmaşurlar.* A Warnke 319 verb must have received one L hook by mistake, and be an instance of *täglär-*: *birök tınl(ı)glarnıŋ ämgäk tolgak täginmiş[lärin] körmiş üdtä . . . bi bıçgu üzä közin täglälmiş [. . .] täg bolup . . . mäŋikä tägürgäli küsäyü y(a)rlıkarlar* 'When they once have seen that creatures undergo suffering$_2$, they get as if somebody had blinded them with knives$_2$ and . . . they graciously wish to lead them to happiness'. I am now told by P. Zieme that a parallel ms. of this text here actually has *täglärmiş*. The simple base *tägil-* 'to be blinded' is always used with *köz* in the absolute case, served as base for *tägl-ök* 'blind' (q.v. in section 3.102) and probably had no connection with *täg-*. The *EDPT* confused this *tägil-* with *täg-il-*, an *-(X)l-* verb discussed above; see that for details.[462]

tärt-är- 'to make somebody sweat' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from TT VIII M35: *uzatı tärtärmiş kärgäk* 'One must make him sweat extensively'. *tärit-* 'to sweat' is documented in the *EDPT*: Additional exs. of it are found in Heilk II 3,31 and 187; also in *işlärig ätözi täritginçä işlägülük ol* (BT VIII A77), where the Tib. original says "und den Schweiß ausbrechen lassende Arbeiten verrichtet". A further ex. is *titrämäkim teritmäkim* (thus!?) *ärtiŋü asıldı* (HtPek 48 r2-5) "Mein Zittern und Schwitzen hat sich sehr vermehrt". *tärit-* is no doubt connected with *tär* 'sweat', but the derivation is obscure; being intr. (and not passive either), it is improbable that it should be an *-(X)t-* causative. Moreover, its aorist form (found in Heilk II 3,31 and the DLT) has an /A/, unlike those of *-(X)t-* verbs but like those of the bases of the other verbs discussed in this section.

toŋt-ar- 'to turn (upside) down (tr.)'. *EDPT* s.v. '*töŋder-*', but it is clearly back-

was unable even to comprehend or to learn the texts unless they were put into verse. For *bir yolı* 'even' cf. some uses of Republican Turkish adverbial *bir*.

461 The ed.'s translation does not accord with the meaning of *oŋar-*. *oŋar-* is never spelled as *oŋgar-*, and the glossary to the work should have listed them separately.

462 '*täklirär*', as has been read in M I 11,6 (TeilBuch), is almost certainly to be emended to *t(ä)ŋrilär*. L hooks frequently get misplaced; transferring the one of this word to the first R, we get: *ol üdkä k(a)mag t(ä)ŋrilär m(ä)ŋigü ögrünçülüg s(ä)vinçlig bolgaylar* "Then all the gods will be eternally happy and joyous'.

vocalic in Runic, Uigur and Brāhmī scripts. An ex. not mentioned there is *töpön toŋaru bir yolça eltü bardılar* (Suv 8,3 as completed in SuvLeg T I 164 r 9) 'They held me down by the head and led me away (straight towards the north)'. The verb in Tariat E 8 read as '*toqytyrtym*' by Kljaštornyj and '*toqt(a)rt(ı)m*' by T. Tekin is probably another instance.[463] The petrified converb *toŋtaru* is mentioned together with *agtaru* in section 7.522. The DLT writes the derivate as *tōŋdār-*, its base as *tōŋūt-*; the front vowels may be due to contamination with *tōn-* 'to return'. The same variant of the base is found already in KP (passage quoted in the *DTS* entry) with *baş* 'head' as object, as in the DLT. MaitrGeng 5 a 18, on the other hand, still has the original back vowels: *äŋitmädük toŋıtmaduk ätözin* 'with unbent and unstooping body'. The earliest shape of the base appears in *ögirip sävinip toŋutmış közi yügärü körti* '(They) rejoiced$_2$ and their downcast eyes began to face things' in BQ E 2. The word is written as $T^1WNGT^1MS^2$, which means that the second vowel can't have been an /ı/ (as written e.g. in the *EDPT*). Nor can the word have been '*toŋtamış*' (as T. Tekin, e.g. writes) in view of the above evidence. The passage from °*Xt-* to °*It-* reminds one of the change which occurred in the shape of the *-(X)t-* formative. It would appear to be that same change in case the verb can be connected to DLT and QB *tŵŋūl-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*), "give up a matter, despair of it".

(*utar-* is, in Old Turkic, a hap. in HamTouen 11,5, spelled 'WVT'R- or 'WYT'R-: *yavlak yagıg utargay siz*, translated "Vous vaincrez le méchant ennemi". Perhaps it is rather a synonym of Yak. *utār-* 'to drive off'. The ed. takes it to be "sans doute l'intensif en *-°r-* de *ut-* 'vaincre'", but we know of no such formative. *ut-* 'to defeat' is found also (but not only) in similar contexts, e.g. *tört türlüg ş(ı)mnu sūsin utup yegādip* . . . (TT IV B 55) or *yagıg utguçı* (QB 2141). For details see the petrified converb *utru* further on in this section.)

yumd-ar- 'to bring together' is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT and the QB. Uigur only has the form *yumdaru*, which appears as *yumdaru tutdaçı* (BT II 1077) and *yumdaru tuţulur alko nomlar bir yükmāk oron uguş ugurınta* (AbhiKār 18 a); here, *yumdaru tut-* corresponds to Skt. *sarva+saṃ+grah-*. Two exs. of *yumdaru* are mentioned below as petrified converbs. *asıg yumdarur* of QB 2996 is not mentioned in the *EDPT* either. *yumıt-* "to come together, assemble" (q.v. in the *EDPT*) is common, but only in DLT, QB, Middle Turkic etc. The Codex Comanicus writes this verb as *yomdar-* and another derivate from the ultimate base as *yomuk-* (an error for *yomut-* if one agrees with *EDPT*

463 ŃG differs from K^1 only by a small vertical line which may, in this case, be a stray scratch or furrow in the stone. We get: *(a)nta toŋt(a)rt(ı)m, k(a)n[ın . . .] (a)nta yok bolu, Türk bod(u)n(u)g (a)nta (ï)çg(ā)rt(ï)m* 'There I overturned (the Türk state) and [took (?) its] khan, there it was annihilated, there I subdued the Türk nation'.

935 b); we may therefore be wrong with the /u/. The base **yum-* is not attested,[464] but we list many derivates from it under *yumgı* (section 3.110). One of them, we believe, is *yumurtga* 'egg', which is written with U in BuddhKat (Tib. script). Taking all modern cognates into consideration, /u/ seems a bit likelier.[465]

The following three verbs can also be called *-Ar-* verbs, although no immediate base is attested for two of them. All three appear to come from *-Xk-* derivates (as discussed in section 7.24). A fourth such verb *could* be *könKär-*, with which I have dealt in section 7.53; its base *could* also be a verb formed with *-(X)k-*.

bütKär- 'to complete, accomplish' is practically a synonym of *büt-ür-*, with which it even appears as biverb in ETŞ 13,130. It presumably comes from **büt-ük-*. *EDPT* s.v. *'bütgür-'*. To his exs. add *bütKärür* (BT I D (172)), *bütKärip* (ETŞ 16,22), *bütKärälim* (ETŞ 13,122), *paramıtlarıg bütKärip* (ShõAv 237 and 337-8), *pudgul işlärig bütKärip* (BT XIII 21,8), all visible on facss. The form with *°ü°* in the second syllable, which the *EDPT* takes to be basic, is attested only in USp 70,4.[466]

kısKar- is not mentioned in the *EDPT*; *DTS* once from Suv. Add *şımnu küçin kısKaru . . .* (ETŞ 13,111). The Suv ex. *adınlarnıŋ küçin küsünin kısKarıp kävip . . .* probably signifies 'to reduce or control the strength$_2$ of others'. Röhrborn states in a review in *CAJ* 24 (1980): 156 that the verb is attested also in BT VII A 704, in a biverb with *käv-* again; cf. also the facs. As *bütKär-* and *bütür-* are causative cognates, so are *kısKar-* and *kıs-ur-*. On the analogy of the former, the base of *kısKar-* and *kısur-* could also have had an intr. use; cf. especially *kısur-* in section 7.51 and *kısga* in section 3.323. *kıskınç* in BT II 567 (where Le Coq's transcription is unnecessarily questioned) probably comes from the unattested direct base of *kısKar-*, and should be analysed as *kıs-(ı)k-(X)nç*. Here we have a parallelism with the verb of the next entry, for *kıskınç* is similar to *tarkınç* from *tar-ık-*. Cf. also the formal parallelism between *kıs-ga* 'short etc.' and *tar-ka* 'alone, lonely'.

tark-ar- 'to drive away, remove'. The *EDPT* was led into a wrong translation by its erroneous etymology. See also the *DTS*. The form spelt as *trkärür* in M III 5,4$_2$ (text 1) should probably be read as *t(a)rkarur*, which differs from the former only by two dots on the K. *tarkarur* is found also in I.5,3$_1$ there. *tarkar-* appears in an additional eleven exs. in BT II, with objects like *alko ayıg* (Uig-

464 Not to be confused with *yüm-* 'to close one's eyes'.

465 Cf. on the other hand e.g. *özä* in the Codex Comanicus for Old Turkic *üzä*.

466 Not 70,6, as written in the *EDPT*. This is a late contract about which Radloff writes: "Dieses Schriftstück ist so verwischt, daß viele Wörter kaum entzifferbar sind".

Falt 66), *bag çıg* (TuoLuoNi 7), *nızvanı* (BT VII H20), *ilig ad[k]aklar* (BT VIII A 307 etc.), *ürtüglär* (ShöKenkyū II 12). The biverb *keṭär-tarkar-* is found e.g. in TT VII 40,93 and ShöAv 136; see *tar-ık-* for the common biverb *ket-tarık-*. Further exs. of *tarkar-* occur in BT VIII B 35, 70, 135, 212, 214 etc., UigTöt 88, 132 and 873, ManTüTex (13) 248 and 252 (*tarkarur*), Abhi 625, 635, 640 and elsewhere. Why the *EDPT* says that *tarkar-* "was in fact *tarğar-*" is not clear: Among the five Brāhmī exs., four write *tarkar-*; the only one which writes *targar-* (text A) also has *tayag, tutugsuz* and several times *bilkā*. In Manichaean script, two exs. of *tarkar-* quoted above (and spelled with Q) are not mentioned by the *EDPT*, and the *tarkar-* of Windgott is misquoted. Cf. *tark-ınç* in Toñ 22. *tar-ık-*, the base of *tarkar-*, is quoted in section 7.24.

PETRIFIED CONVERBS

agtaru toŋtaru 'in somersaults' qualifies the verb *tägzin-* in a hap. in U II 4,10. Although the forms are those of two *-Ar-* verbs, there is no causative meaning here (as there is none in any of the petrified converbs of causatives). *agtalu toŋtalu tāg(z)in-* in Tüg 48 has the same meaning. It appears to be a cross between *agtaru toŋtaru* and the passive meaning of *agt-ıl-* (q.v. among *-(X)l-* verbs). Instead of these, the Suv has twice *agtarılu toŋtarılu* with the same meaning: This last couple reminds one of the replacement of quasi-passives in *-(X)t-* by *-tXl-* verbs. No finite verbs '*toŋtal-*' or '*toŋtarıl-*' are attested: This proves, I think, that the source of the last-mentioned two couples is in *agtaru toŋtaru*. All three couples are mentioned in the *UW* under the respective stems of their first members; the exs. of *agtıl-* are not "Lesefehler" for *agtal-*, however.

kataru appears as follows: *birōk Yaṭyadatı* (read thus!) *azkı(y)a kaṭaru yanıp közüngüni bakmış ārsār*, ... (BuddhUig I 73) "Wenn Yajñadatta sich ein wenig zurückgezogen hätte und (dann) in den Spiegel geschaut hätte, ..."; *[ka]vıklayu saçılu, kaṭaru yanıp kālmäyü* ... (Neujahr 30) "wie Kleie verstreut werdend, nicht umkehrend und zurückkommend ..."; *biri bādük bārgä üzā tüz töpürā uru elgimin* (*eligimin* in the Leningrad ms.) *kataru bap* ... (Suv 7,22 according to the Leningrad ms., which has a lacuna after *kataru*, and the Suv-Leg ms.) 'One of them struck me with a great whip, twisted my hands backwards and bound them ...".[467] While the third ex. could have causative meaning as translated, the two instances of *kataru yan-* 'to turn back (intr.)' have it in petrified intr. use.

467 The conjectures '*meni*' before *tüz* and '*iki*' before *elgimin* are unnecessary both for grammar and the understanding.

utru 'opposite, facing, against' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. It is often joined to verbs like *yor-* (ŞU S3), *tur-* (M III 22,9$_2$, text 8), *kāl-* (TT I 96, 112, 113, 175, BT II 960 as *uturu*, AbitAnk 101), *bar-* (IrqB XLIII, U II 26,17, U III 70,5, ShōAv 147), *tut-* (Ht X724), *ötün-* (ShōAv 121). It is sometimes accompanied by *yüz* 'face', e.g. in *yuz utru kāl-* (Maitr 164 r 18), *yüzümüz utru* (TT II 1,6), *yuzün utru tur-* (M III) etc. It was also nominalised, e.g. in *utruŋda asıg tusu yeḏārū kālti* (TT I 113) 'Advantages$_2$ have come towards you chasing (each other)'. Absolute uses of *utru* can be found notably in the IrqB. The following instance looks as if it were not an ex. of the petrified converb but of a verb *utur-*: *uẓatı anıŋ tıdıgların uturu keṭārip* . . . (ETŞ 13,162) 'If one opposes at great length one's hamperings and drives them off . . .'. This need not be so, however, and we might have the same *utru* secondarily stretched. Yak. *utār-* 'to drive off' was above connected with the Old Turkic hap. *utar-*. Yak. *also* has a verb *utār-* 'to oppose', however, and that would regularly correspond to **ut-ur-*. Either of the two may be a back-formation from *utru* (which must have been very common indeed), unless one wishes to envisage a formative *-Ar-* originally differing in meaning from *-Ur-*. *utr-un-* (dealt with in section 7.21 above) and the DLT's *utruş-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) could come from either. How all this connects with Mo. *učira-* 'to meet' is not clear.

yumdaru is a petrified converb in *b[a]rça yumdaru İÇTİN TAŞTIN ikirār bōlōk bolsar ymā* . . . (Junshō B v 6) where, together with *barça*, it signifies something like 'all in all'. It goes with numbers also e.g. in Abhi 622, 623 and 624. Further: *bo yumdaru iki samazlarka tayaklıg ārūr: 'āŋ'ilki nıŋ samaz ikinti lıg samaz ārūr* (Abhi 1959) "This (Abhidharmakośa) is based upon two compounds in all: first the *tatpuruṣa* compound and secondly the *bahuvrīhi* compound".

Morphology

The converb and aorist vowel of this formation is /U/. Thus we have, beside the petrified converbs just quoted, *täglärü sanç-* in KP LVIII 7, *täglärürlär* in Maitr 173 r 17, *ketärürlär* in BT I D (284), *toŋtaru tık-* in M II 13,5 (text 5), *tōpōn toŋṭaru* in Suv 8,3 (+ ms. T I 164 r 9), *kısKaru* (ETŞ 13,111), *tarkarur* (M III 5,4$_2$ and 5,3$_1$) etc.

All *-Ar-* verbs are bisyllabic. All are derived from one or two syllable bases, many of which are simple. Whether *-Ar-* could be added to bases ending in vowels cannot be determined: *-Ar-* and *-Ur-* become, of course, identical when they lose their vowel. Their converb and aorist vowel is also the same. In the previous section we listed a few *-Ur-* verbs added to vowel stems; they could also have been *-Ar-* derivates. *-Ar-* and *-Ur-* verbs do not differ from the functional point of view either: Like *-Ur-*, *-Ar-* forms verbs with two and never with three participants: In

no instance is there a causee made to act upon a third entity. The vowel syncopation in (C)VCVC- shaped bases, which we saw with *-Ur-*, is the rule here as well. Why *tamıt-* should have been expanded with *-Ur-*, *ämit-*, on the other hand, with *-Ar-*, is not clear to me; unless *ämit-* originally had the shape **ämtä-* with the final vowel retained in the causative. Concerning *tar-ık-* and *tarkar-* we find the vowel /a/ again in the aorist *tarık-ar*; cf., for this, Erdal, 1979 a: 117-118. The syntax of the formatives *-Ur-* and *-Ar-* will, at any rate, be dealt with together.

7.53 *+gAr-*: Lexical material

and+gar- 'to make somebody swear an oath' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. *andg[ar-* with dotted N and Q in LetterTunHuang 9 is in fragmentary context.

(aŋ+Kar- is a hap. in ETŞ 13,143, in a passage best translated in *UW* 262 b s.v. *'aŧkak'* par A,c. The entry in *UW* 163 states that it could be an error for *oŋar-*; this is especially unlikely since no certain ex. of *oŋar-* spelled as *oŋgar-* has appeared.[468] See *aŋla-* 'to understand' in section 5.12 for the (possible) base *aŋ*. If it is not an error, *aŋKar-* could be 'to understand': This is the meaning in which the verb is quoted from modern languages).

(asKar- 'to give profit; to help on the road to salvation' is adequately discussed in the *UW* entry, except for its etymology: It can't be an *+Ar-* derivate from *as-ıg* (q.v. in the *UW*) as *+(A)r-* (discussed in section 5.45 above) forms intr. verbs usually signifying 'to be or become (the base)'. A derivation of the shape *as-(ı)k-ar-* is also unlikely: *asKar-* is semantically linked to the specific developments which *asıg* underwent in Uigur, in which *as-* 'to augment' did not participate. I therefore take it to be simplified from **asıg+Kar-*.)

(at+gar- 'to make one or help one mount a horse', DLT fol. 119. Also in later and modern sources (*EDPT*).)

baş+gar- is best attested in r63 of a colophon published in AbiShotan p. 76: *yaŋlok āgsūk bolmış ārsār özümnūŋ başgarıp umayukum ārür* 'If it turns out to be wrong or deficient, that is because I myself was unable to carry it out successfully'. A further instance, appearing in TT I 11 and quoted in the *EDPT*, is obscure. See the *EDPT* also for the etymological connection. Otherwise attested only from the XIVth century on, with the meanings 'to show the way; to complete a task, settle a matter'. That the velar was /g/ can be inferred from he fact that it disappears in Ottoman *başar-*, whose meaning is identical with hat of the Uigur ex. of the colophon.

ee *oŋar-*, which can also signify 'to understand', in section 7.52. The reading of the ETŞ 13 ssage in *UW* 36 b is now obsolete.

(*muŋ+kar-* 'to cause distress' is found only in the DLT and the QB as quoted in the *EDPT*. Spelled thus with Q. Related to *muŋ+uk-*.)

çın+gar- 'to investigate something; according to the DLT, "to search out the root of a matter and determine the truth about it". Spelled with *ghain* and not *qāf* in the DLT, which is why I take the velar to have been voiced in Old Turkic as well. The converb *çıngaru* is discussed below. Other forms are *çıngarıp adırtlap* (TT V B 76) and, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, *yaŋlokın kōntū{rūp} ornatıp çıngarıp* ... (Ht X 233), *tōziŋā tāgi çıngarıp* ... (ShōKenkyū III 34), *KÖNGÜLni çıngarzunlar* (BuddhUig I 125) and *tūz nom* ... *tuta çıngarguçı* (Warnke 620). The instances of U III 36,17 and 53,4$_2$ are wrongly spelled with °ng° = /ŋ/ by the editor; the facs. shows NQ in both cases. I am unable to check the facs. in TT X 459, where the edition has *çıŋaru*. *çın+ık-* 'of news or a statement, to be confirmed, found genuine' appears in the DLT etc. (*EDPT*).

ädgü+Kär- 'to change to the better, to reform (tr.)' has to be taken to exist because of U IV A 277: *uzun turkaru adın tınl(ı)glarıg adgüKärü katıglanıp tavrandı* 'He continuously strove to reform the other people'. As a noun in the directive case *ädgüKärü* could not have had a direct object; as a converb it is parallel to *kötürü* before it. Cf. further *ädgüKärü uzk(ı)ya ūţlādiŋ* "hast du zum Guten trefflich Ratschläge erteilt" in BT XIII 12,141. The glossary takes this to be the directive of *ädgü*, but I don't think that is quite as satisfactory by meaning. One of the DLT's three uses for *ädgär-*, *ol yavuz nāŋni ädgärdi* 'He repaired the damaged article', has a meaning closer to that of *ädgüKär-*: It may have come from *ädgüKär-* by syncopation of the second vowel, making the two verbs coincide.

äd+gär- 'to attach importance to something and pay attention to it'. *DTS* and *EDPT*. Found also in Manichaean script. The meaning of the M III exs. goes together with the second one given by the DLT.[469] A further ex. is *ädgärmätin adın öŋi iş kūdüg sav sakınçlarıg* (BuddhUig II 57), not very satisfactorily translated as "beschäftigt": By the context, the meaning is in fact the same as above. *äd+ik-* 'to succeed in something' no doubt has the same base but, to judge by meaning, *ädgär-* is not an *-Ar-* derivate from it.

iç+gär- 'to introduce something into something else, to subdue, conquer (metaphorically as well)'. The /g/ is testified to by one Brāhmī and three runic exs. mentioned in the *EDPT*. Appears also in the (runic) Tariat 23 and 27. The biverb *tut- içgär-* occurs in BT II 363, 614, 745, 822 and 1337, *siŋir- içgär-* in Ht

469 The *EDPT*'s source for Karaim apparently was Radloff I 844, q.v. The verb mentioned there must, however, be a derivate from *et-* 'to make'. Another verb *etkerme* is mentioned by A. Mardkowicz, *Karay Sez-Bitigi* (Karaimisches Wörterbuch), Łuck, 1935., translated "durchbohren, zerhacken"; this, in turn, should perhaps be connected with *ötgür-* 'to pierce' etc. in Old Turkic.

V 8 a 9, *sıgur-içgär-* in ShöAv 245, none of them in the *EDPT*. Still further exs. appear in ETŞ 10,80, Hazai 20, BT VII B 5 and 46, Maitr 65 v 3, BT XIII 20,20 and HamTouen 1,55. Related semantically and apparently also derivationally with *iç+ik-* 'to enter, capitulate, submit (a.o. to a foreign ruler)'. Cf. the frequently occurring *içgärü* 'inwards, the inside, interior'.

köŋül+Kär- 'to reflect on something (in the accusative)'. It is attested only in Uigur script, whence the indeterminacy of the formative's velar. *DTS* s.v. '*köŋül ker-*' (i.e. two lexemes!) and *EDPT*. Additional exs. appear in Adams 36 (with *uk-*), BT II 648, Maitr 151 r 22, 152 r 27 and 43 r 2, UigTöt 1054, 1072, 1079, 1179 etc., AbhiKär B 8, BT VIII Nachtr. 2-3,3 and 7.

kudı+Kar- is attested only in BodhiAvaKomm 5 (Uigur script) in the phrase *kudıKarmaklıg köŋül*, translated as "ein Sinn des Erniedrigens". The eds. want to reconstitute this form also in l.12. Cf. *kudıKar-tur-* below. Wrongly spelled with *o* by the eds.: As *kuḍı+kı* in Brāhmī script (TT VIII A 2) and Uzb. *kuyı* as quoted in the *EDPT* show, the base had a /u/. Clauson wrote *o* because of his erroneous etymology. *kudı* 'down(wards)' should not be confused with a lexeme meaning 'strongly, very', *koḍı* in TT VIII A 4. See *kud-ı* in section 3.118.

san+gar- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from DLT fol. 361, where *ol anı kişidin sangardı* (with *ghain*) is translated as "He considered him to be a person". Appreciation is connoted especially in BuddhUig II 17: *sangarmaz ärti aṭ kuṷ bulunç alınç agır ayagıg*, in *UW* 293 a translated as "er legte keinen Wert auf . . .". In a fragmentary passage in UigÐn III C 2, the ed. thinks a form which looks rather like *saŋsarmatın* may in fact be *saŋgarmatın* and constitute a spelling variant for this verb.

+gar- 'to bring out, give out, get out'. *DTS* and *EDPT*; the latter quotes a runic instance with voiced velar. Cf. also the *EDPT* s.v. *taşgaru*, and *taş+ık-* above.

Add *taşgarıp* from ETŞ 9,61, 10,227 and 13,62. *ridi taşgar-* (BuddhUig II 399, GuanJing 46-7) is 'to reveal supernatural powers'. Further *tarıp taşgarıp tınl(ı)glarıg ünṭür-* (Abhi 72).

tāŋ+Kär- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from DLT fol. 617, where it signifies "to balance one thing with another". Add *yölāştürgäli tāŋKärgäli* (BT I B (240)) and *tarıg tāŋärip* (thus!) *alsun* (Ernte 112). *KÜÇlärinā tāŋKärip* in ShōAv 284 is translated as "gemäß ihren je eigenen Kräften". Neither Uigur nor Arabic script help us determine whether the velar is voiced. Cf. the hap. *tāŋ+ik-* above.

tüp+Kär- 'to fathom a matter, get to its roots, understand it fully'. *tüp+ük-* 'to get completed', used only in late texts, was probably not the base for this, as the meanings are incompatible. For exs. see the *DTS* s.v. '*tözkär- tüpkär-*' and the *EDPT*. Also ShōAv 339, BT I A_2 12, B (238) and D (184), Ht IV 424 and 1090, V 13 a4 and VII 2 b3. Further: *ötKürmiş tüpKärmiş* (Maitr 127 r24), *tüpKärü tuymış* (ETŞ 10,171), *inçgälāp tüpKärdi ulug* [*iş*] *küdüglärig* (HtPar 130,12), *tüpKärü käz-* (HtPar 130,2) "gründlich durchwandern", *tüpKärü bilgäli maxayan nomug* (HtPar 16 v 19-21) "to fathom and know the teachings of Mahāyāna", *ąmrılmış KÖNGÜL üzä tüpKärsär* . . . (BuddhUig I 266).

tüz+Kär- and its derivates are attested only in Uigur script and in the DLT, which makes the velar ambiguous. Cf. *tüzKärinçsiz* and *tüzKärgülüksüz* in section 3.12. It is proven in OdaRemarks 66 that these lexemes come from *tüz* 'level, even, equal' and not from *töz* 'origin'. The *EDPT* quotes the verb from M III and from the DLT. The M III instance belongs to *täz-gür-*, however, and not to this verb; see *-gUr-* below. The verb which the *EDPT* there quotes as *tüzgär-* and translates as "to guide" is by DankKelly translated as "to give (somebody) a gift". Its shape is shown to be *täzKür-* altered to *tüzKär-* in the perfect and to *tüzKür-* in the aorist and the infinitive. This surely does not belong here. I prefer the *EDPT* rendering of Arabic *ahdaytuhu*, not far from 'to help to escape'; cf. *täz-gür-* in section 7.54. What *tüzKärsär m(ä)n* in BuddhUig I 2 means is not clear to me. In the HtPar 199,16 passage quoted in *UW* 189-90, *arıglayu tüzKärgü* (spelled with *g* by Röhrborn) corresponds to a Chin. lexeme translated as "verfeinern". Seeing that *arıg+la-* is 'to sift out, pick out the best' and *tüz+ük-* (among other things) 'to become harmonious', *tüzKär-* might, in the context, signify 'to make even, harmonize'. The nominal forms mentioned above signify 'unbettered, unsurpassable'.[470]

470 *an-uttara* (Skt.), which *tüzKärinçsiz* is intended to translate, is a possessive derivate signifying 'something which has nothing beyond, something concerning which there is nothing surpassing'. *tüzKärinçsiz* claims even greater excellence for the entity being so described, as it denotes 'something unequalled'. The n. to TT X96 confuses the meanings of *tüzKärinçsiz* and *tüpKärinçsiz*: *tüp+Kär-* ist not "den Gipfel erreichen", as written there: There is no reason why Old Turkic

Petrified converbs

There is no reason to take *içgärü* 'inside, inner, inwards' and *taşgaru* 'outside, outer, outwards' to be petrified converbs of this formation. The directive is a real and lively case already in the inscrs., and the two forms concerned are more common than *içgär-* and *taşgar-*. In the following, however, we have a dilemma:

birgärü has *G* in TT VIII *C*, a ms. in which velars are very carefully distinguished. To the EDPT's exs.[471] add BT II 984 and 1325, BT III 61, 428, 913, 969, BT VIII *A*3 and ETŞ 9,45, 13,160 and 175, 16,5 and 20,44. The living causative of *bir+ik-* appears to be *biriktür-* (q.v. among the *-tUr-* verbs). *birgärü* could well be the directive of *bir*, were it not for the existence of *birgärt-* (clearly a *-(X)t-* verb) and for its paradigmatic connection with *bir+ik-* (to which we return below). It means 'to one place' or, if one prefers it, 'collecting at one place'. It could then also be a petrified converb.

çıngaru has no directive meaning and can only be a converb; whether it is a 'petrified' one is not clear. It often appears in phrases like *çıngaru kör-* 'to look closely' or *çıngaru sakın-* 'to think deeply (also in LautHöllen 126). See *çın+gar-* above.

Morphology

It is clear that the velar of this formative was voiced from the earliest texts on: *içgär-* and *taşgar-* are spelled with G^2 and G^1 in the runic inscriptions.[472] *aŋgar-*, *başgar-*, *çıngar-*, *ädgär-* and *sangar-* also had /g/. The only counter-evidence is Qarakhanid *muŋkar-*, which is several times written with /k/ in the sources. Further DLT support for /g/ appears in *and+gar-* ~ (with elision of the dental) *angar-* (q.v. above), *ot+gar-* 'to graze (an animal)' and *suv+gar-* 'to water (a horse etc.)'. It is highly likely, therefore, that the formative had the shape *+gAr-* in all verbs. This is not wholly beyond doubt, however: *tüzKär-* or *köŋülKär-* might be *tüzkär-* or *köŋülkär-*, e.g., as the opposition between /g/ and /k/ may get neutralised after what, in Old Turkic, behaves as a sonant. *çıngar-* and *sangar-* speak against this, since /n/ is one of the sonants. Seeing that *muŋkar-* has a /k/, *täŋKär-* and *aŋKar-* could also have one. A special behaviour around /ŋ/ is not noted from

should have confused bottom and peak or pinnacle. *tüzKärinçsiz* is not "unergründlich" (and should not be derived from *töz*), as its use shows.

471 *U II 53,5₂*, Utsuqmaqsız Darni, is quoted in a misleading way in the *DTS*: In the ms., the letters *kä* following the word are written separately and themselves followed by a lacuna; they could as well be the beginning of a new word.

472 Amanžolov, 1969: 60 is of the opinion that this affix is not found in runic texts. The first of these two verbs appears in *BQ* and the second in *ŞU*, however.

any other domain of Old Turkic grammar, however, and *muŋkar-* better remains a lone Qarakhanid (but not Old Turkic) exception. Even if there is thus sufficient evidence that the formative did start with a voiced velar, it does not seem too likely that the directive should have emerged from petrified converbs of this formation.

A number of *+gAr-* verbs have a paradigmatic relationship with *+(X)k-* verbs, *andgar-* with *antık-* (*andık-*), *birgärü* / *birgärt-* with *birik-*, *muŋkar-* with *muŋuk-*, *çıngar-* with *çınık-*, *içgär-* with *içik-*, *taşgar-* with *taşık-*, *täŋKär-* with *täŋik-* and *tüzKär-* with *tüzük-*:[473] In view of the formal and semantic parallelisms, it seems likely that *+gAr-* comes from *+(X)k+Ar-*. The voicing of the velar cannot have been too early: *çıkar-*, a variant of *taşgar-* appearing from QB and DLT on and the only form in some Turkic languages today, clearly goes back to **taşıkar-* with a different syncope pattern. In Old Turkic, however, the vowel of *+(X)k-* was syncopated away as the vowels of *-VC-* / *+VC-* suffixes when they become the first element in a combination. The first element vowels of the combinations *-lXn-*, *-tUr-* or *-sXk-*, e.g. got elided even when they appear after consonants. *-tXl-* (section 7.32), on the other hand, *occasionally* has the shape *-XtXl-* after consonants. The fact that *+gAr-* has no such variant may indicate a stronger juncture between the elements of the combination. As for the problem of the difference between the velars: The opposition /k/ : /g/ appears to be very weak after consonants in Old Turkic, if present at all.[474] The phonology of Old Turkic has not yet been written, and this matter must also remain open for the time being. Note only that the change from **-zXk-* to *-sXk-* involves the opposite process, devoicing.

Because of these phonological differences, the morphological relationship between *+(X)k-* and *+gAr-* is not as agglutinative as one is used to in many Turkic languages. This relationship is, however, real and clear enough for us to deal with *+gAr-* here and not among the denominal verbs: *+gAr-* verbs are *-Ar-* expansions of *+(X)k-* verbs. Note also that denominal formatives are either only intr. (as *+Ar-*, *+Ad-*, *+U-* etc.) or indifferent to the tr. : intr. distinction (as *+A-*, *+lA-* etc.); but none of them are consistently tr. By behaviour, therefore, *+gAr-* verbs accord with *-Ar-* and with *-Ur-* verbs, and their syntax is dealt with together with the syntax of those. In *birik-tür-* and the hap. legomena *ılıkdur-* (Suv), *tärsikdür-* (TuoLuoNi), *adaktur-* (twice TuoLuoNi, one passage), *kirikdür-* (Suv) and *uçukdur-* (CYK), *+(X)k-* verbs do resort to the 'normal' causative expansion of derived verbs: This happens only in late texts. Note that *biriktür-* replaces the

473 With *äd+ik-* vs. *äd+gär-* and *tüp+ük-* vs. *tüp+Kär-*, the semantic relationship between the lexemes as we have it in our texts does not admit the hypothesis that the *+gAr-* verb comes from the one ending in *+(X)k-*.

474 This opposition is well upheld after vowels, e.g. in *agı* 'treasure' : *akı* 'generous', *äg-* 'to bend' : *äk-* 'to sow'; I have not been able to find minimal pairs for postconsonantal position, however.

unattested source of *birgārū* and *birgārt-*. *birgārt-* is also the only attested expansion of a *+gAr-* verb.
Modern forms of this formation are listed in Schakir, 1933: 29.

7.54 *-gUr-*: LEXICAL MATERIAL

amırt-Kur- 'to allay, to pacify, to stop' is documented in the *UW*. We have it only from Uigur and only in Uigur script, which leaves the velar indeterminate; evidence does tend to indicate that it was voiced, though. See its intr. counterpart *amrıl-* in section 7.31 above for other cognates and unattested ultimate base. A verb *amurt-* (with rounding due to the /m/) 'to quiet (an angry person, a refractory foal)' appears in DLT fol. 630. Kāšgarī quotes it from verse, which shows that it was real enough. *amurt-* and *amırtKur-* had practically the same meaning and must have been dialect variants. An alternative phonetic explanation for the /t/ is offered under *körtKür-* below. Exs. of *amırtKur-* not mentioned in the *UW* entry occur in MaitrH Y 5 b 25 in Laut 1986: 199 (with variant "M'RTQWR- to be added to the introduction of the entry), Ht V 10 a 12, InscrOuig V 11 and ShōAgon 1,32, 242, 246, 250, 262 and 310.

(ar-gur- 'to tire out, exhaust' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT (also in verse). Found also in QB 5705.)

(arın-Kur- is attested only in AbiShotan r 21 and v 7, the latter quite visible in the facs. Not mentioned in any dictionary. 'to cause to be or get pure'. In the first instance *arınKurmak* is used together with *kertgünç*, in the second in opposition to *kirikdür-* 'to cause to get dirty'. See *arı-n-* 'to purify oneself, be pure' above; it is attested also in AbiShotan itself. This is the only *-gUr-* expansion of an *-(X)n-* verb, in a text from the early XIVth century. *-(X)n-* verbs are normally expanded with *-tUr-*.)

az-gur- 'to lead astray'. Attested in Manichaean texts, the writing of which fixes the quality of the velar. An ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* is found in ManTüTex 6,98. Non-Manichaean is only *ayıg kılınç kõŋülümin azgurdı* (spelled with *Q̈*!) in Töpfer 66. Synonym of *az-ıt-*.

ārgür- 1 'to melt, dissolve (tr.)'. The instance quoted by the *EDPT* from Windgott 46-7 belongs to the next entry. The one from Windgott 39-40 is damaged in the middle but the *G* is clear; it may possibly belong here. This verb is derived from *ārü-* 'to melt (intr.)' with the regular syncopation of its final vowel; cf. section 1.8 above. *yakrısın ārgüsüp sürṭsār . . .* (Heilk I 58) is probably a mistake for *ārgürüp.*[475] Add *ārgürmiş kızıl bakır* 'melted red(-hot) copper' thrice in BT II,

475 See the facs. for the similarity between S and R in that ms. On the other hand, this may be the first ex. of the late formative *-KXz-*: Heilk I is, after all, a very late text.

ärgürmiş şopag [altun 'melted gold$_2$' (BT XIII 1,55), *ärgürmiş altun* (*ibid.* 5,59), *kurtik bir ärgürüp suv birlä içzün* (ms. T II Y 15.501 (U 3088) r1, in the n. to Uigʃot 895), *sızgurgu ärgürgü* (BT III 966). *arıyü sıza* is a biverb in Maitr 105 v12, misunderstood in BT IX and not mentioned in the *EDPT* (which has *ärü-* only from the DLT on).

är-gür- 2 'to make something be'. Found in Windgott 46-7: *isigig ärgürür*[476] *tarkarur* should be translated as 'He brings the heat (and also) dissipates it'. *ärgürmäklig küç* in Laut 40 may also belong here, if it can signify 'creative power'.

er-gür- 'to do something in time, before it is too late'. The *EDPT* quotes it as finite verb from the DLT, but the Uigur exs. quoted there all belong to the petrified converb *ergürü / ürgürü* discussed below. Causative of *er-* 'to reach' in the sense of 'making one's actions catch up with reality'. Finite exs. are *kim k[a]yu bo b[ur]xan nomınta sansardın ozgalı kutrulgalı ergürmäsär, . . .* "Wer in der Lehre dieses Buddha (d.h. Śākyamuni) nicht erreicht, aus dem Saṃsāra erlöst und befreit zu werden" (Maitr 8 v15 = BT IX 45,15$_1$), *iş küdügüg ergürü tägin-mägäy ärki m(ā)n* 'I may not get around to finishing work$_2$ in time' (Ht VII 2 b22) and *akru kälip ergürmägäy* (Ht V 15 b14), 'will proceed slowly and be too late'. The n. to Abhi 118 b11 in TermBuddh has shown that *ürgür-* is merely a variant of *ergür-*: *adkanu ürgürmätin* in Abhi 118 b12 signifies absolutely the same as *adkanu ergürmätin* in 119 a2. *ürgürü* is therefore not "prob. a misreading of *ergürü*", as the EDPT writes. As Röhrborn adds, "das Suffix -gür- scheint auch beim Verb *kirgür-* "hineinbringen" häufig eine Rundung des Wurzelvokals zu bewirken". We further have *ot äm kılgalı ymä ürgürmädilär* (Ht X 992) "İlaç vermek için de vaktinde yetişemediler", *öglüg kaŋlıg ıdoklarımızka ürgürmädimiz ädgüti tapıngalı* (ShōAv 23) 'We did not have time enough to serve our deceased parents$_2$ well'. The n. to the Ht X ex. quotes *ürgür-* from many Turkic languages with this meaning. Cf. *ürgürmäklāşü* "im Wettlauf" in ShōAv 163, discussed with other *-mAklAşU* forms in section 7.102 above. All three exs. of this verb in DLT fol. 121 are spelled with *ḍamma* by the first hand, changed to *fatḥa* by a later hand. This means that the DLT also had *ürgür-*.

kız-gur- is, in the *EDPT*, quoted from the DLT, where it signifies 'to inflict exemplary punishment'. A Brāhmī instance occurs in ms. Mz 648 ([T II] S 19) + IM 8 II part I, where *kızguralım* is used about punishing a woman who ate her son (text with Tib. parallel to be published by D. Maue). There is nothing exemplary about that punishment, and 'exemplariness' may not have been a semantic component of the lexeme in Old Turkic: It is not present in the derivate *kızgut* (very common, dealt with in section 3.108 above). 1 *kız-* 'to be in trou-

476 Written thus and not '*érgürer*' as in the *EDPT*; see facs.

ble, to suffer from need' has turned up only in BT II 758: *āt'özläri koŋüll[äri] toḍup kanıp açmakları kızmakları ymā [ye]tip yokadıp . . .* "Ihre Körper und Herzen sollen satt werden$_2$ und ihr Hunger und ihre Not (?) sollen zum Ende kommen$_2$" (not mentioned in the *UW* s.vv. *ač-* (I) or *ačmak*). The *UW* entry *ač* has several exs. of the nominal couple *ač kız* translated "Hunger und Knappheit". The latter word (which leans on the DLT) may not quite hit the mark. While *1 kız-* in any case denotes negative experiences, *2 kız-* can describe 'the glowing of cheeks' as a sign of pleasure. The two bases must be distinct. The first two characters in *kızmak* are quite peculiar, however, and one would wish for another ex.

(*kigür-* 'to introduce, bring in' served as causative of *kir-* 'to enter'. It is unlikely, however, that is should actually have been derived from *kir-*: No elision of /r/ occurs with a number of *-gUr-* derivates from bases ending in this phoneme, the most relevant instance being *tir-gür-*. A verb *kirgür-*, which has been read in Suv 46,7 could e.g. be a mistake for *kügür-* (discussed further on in this entry); cf. *kigür- ibid.* 47,1, at any rate. *kir-* (which had a long vowel) and *kigür-* could, however, come from the same unattested base; *kir-* (which has /U/ as converb and aorist vowel) would, in such a case, have to belong to the tentative *°r-* formation discussed in section 6.3. Exs. for *kigür-* appear in the *DTS* (also s.vv. *kigürmāk* and *'kigürsük'*[477]) and the *EDPT*. The perfect forms *kigürtüg* (KT E 23 and BQ E 19) and *kigürti* (KÇ 20) are the earliest exs., for some reason not mentioned in these dictionaries. Further exs. occur in BT I A$_1$ 4, BT II 243, ETŞ 9,46 and Ht V 9 a 12, VII 1 b 13, X 96 and 1113. At least part of the exs. quoted in the *EDPT* under *'kögür-'* (one of them a runic ms.) belong here as well, as their context makes probable. This variant with regressive rounding (as in *ergür- ~ ürgür-*) is further attested in FamArch 174, in the parallel ms. in U III 65,2$_2$ where the main ms. gives *kigür-* and in Töpfer 67. Cf. *kügürüştür-* among the *-tUr-* verbs.)

körtKür- 'to show, make manifest'. An ex. in Manichaean writing, in M III 39,3$_2$ (text 22), spells the second velar as K and not G; it is not wholly beyond doubt, though, as the same ms. also spells *süŋük* 'bone' as *süŋüg*. All the non-Uigur evidence quoted in the *EDPT* concerns different derivates from *kör-*; *körtKür-* is therefore specifically Uigur. An ex. spelled *körKür-* in a Kuan ms. quoted in the *EDPT* is just erratic; the same text does show this lexeme with T elsewhere. We further have the aorist *körtKürür* in ManTüTex 13,246 and 253 and a stem *körtKürmā-* in ATSS XV a v2. Why *körtKürgüçi* in a fragmentary passage in Maitr 80 v 9 should be an error for *kertgün-* (as the index to BT IX says) is not

The instance quoted there from Chuast ends in G and not K, as the facs. shows; this is Manichaean script!

clear. A variant *kört*K*ür-* is attested in UigSukh 4 and in ms. C of Kuan; this simplification of the triple cluster is not surprising. '*kör-t-*' or '*kör-it-*' is not attested, and one is reminded of *amırt*K*ur-*. The /t/ may be parasitic (but one wonders why *amırt*K*ur-* is the only other °*r-gUr-* verb which may have been affected by a similar development). Under *koltgu+la-* above I mention several exs. for the process /lg/ > /ltg/; results of the process /rg/ > /rtg/ are, e.g., *çäkürkä* 'locust', which evolved a /t/ between /r/ and /k/ in many dialects and, in HamTouen 3,1', *är'öz körtkin kört*K*ürüp* instead of the usual *körk+in*. Cf. *kör*K*it-* and *kör-tür-*.

(*odgur-* 'to wake someone up' is attested with voiced velar in Runic and Arabic script as documented in the *EDPT*. A base is not attested, but *odug* (section 3.101) and *odun-* (section 7.21 above) are common cognates. The QB uses *odul-*.[478] Exs. not mentioned by the *EDPT* occur in Maitr 128 r 24, 25 and 29, 129 v 10 and 130 v 7, ms. T I D 596 line 17 (*odgurur*) and the Suv ms. Mz 597 r 3-5 (*ötrü ol nomçı bilgälär ymä kim biziŋ odgurmakımız küçintä ol ol uluşlarka barıp . . .*, said to be preferable to the version of the Petersburg ms. in being closer to the original by meaning).)

oz-Kur- 'to save' is not attested in Runic or in Arabic script; the three exs. in Manichaean script (mentioned in the *EDPT*) spell it with K and not G. Uigur script exs. also generally dot their Qs in those mss. which distinguish back-vowel /k/ from /g/ by this means. The biverb *oz*K*ur- kutgar-* is found in Suv 166,4-5, Warnke 313, Maitr 154 v 14, Genzan D v 5, ShōAv 68 and 86, GuanJing 50-51 and ms. T I D 616 (U 4861) 4-6 quoted in the n. to BT XIII 1,2. Further exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* can be found in U II 59,3_3, seven times in BT II (see the index), ETŞ 10,145, 13,131 and 14,28, BuddhUig II 409, Warnke 65, Maitr 5 v 9 and 14 and 135 r 17, BT VII M 6, WarnkeFragm 65, ShōAv 53 and 56, SP 7, BT XIII 1,76, 20,29 and 21,42 and 59 and MaitrH Y 7 a 5-6 (in Laut, 1986: 107 footn. 2). It governs the ablative of what one is saved from.

öt-gür- is not attested in runic or in Manichaean script; we therefore do not know whether its velar was voiced or not. I take it to be voiced because the petrified converb *ötgürü* (discussed further on in this section) appears as *ötürü* in Republican Turkish. Only rarely does it signify 'to get something through (physically)'; *ötgürünçsüz* 'impenetrable' does come from this concrete meaning, however. Generally it means, metaphorically, 'to get to the bottom of a problem, understand it thoroughly' or 'to manage to explain'. It has these meanings even when used together with *topol-* 'to pierce' (q.v. under *topl-un-* above), as happens in Suv 279,9 and BT I D (170). *ötgür-* appears also in BT I B (139) and D (271), Maitr 127 r 24 and 108 v 1, BT II 103 and 1366 and ETŞ 9,40 and 91 and 16,40.

478 Attested not only in couplet 1215, as the *EDPT* writes, but also in 1142, 1177, 1273, 4551 and 6540.

Further şastır nomug ötgürmiş . . . tözünlär (ShōKenkyū II 9 = BT XIII 12,34), *alko nomlarıg ötgürdäçi* (BT VIII Anh. 2+3, 4), *üç agılık nom ötgürmiş (ZiemeSıngqu* r5). *sav ötgürdäçi ordu* (Ht X 426-7) is translated as "yazı işleri sarayı"; if this is the Bureau of Interpreters, *ötgür-* should here as well have its abstract sense. Cf. further *yarok yaşok ötgürürlär* (ShōAgon 2, p. 192,3) 'make light penetrate', i.e. 'enlighten'. *öt-* appears in various sentence patterns and governs different case forms; with which of them *ötgür-* should be connected is not clear.

sär-gür- 'to keep something still or as it is'. Spelled with G in TT VIII A 4. TT III, in Manichaean script, writes once K; that text, however, frequently confuses the velars, e.g. in *ämkäk*. To the EDPT's exs.[479] add *tıdgalı särgürgäli u-* (BT III 149, Ht IV 1123 and BT II 962), *üküş kalp üd üzä särgürü tutalım* (ETŞ 13,32), *ulug yeelig yagmurug särgürgäli bol-* (SuvZieme 694,3) and *k(ä)ntü özümin särgürü tutguluk küçki(y)äm* (Warnke 51).

sız-gur- 'to melt (tr.)'. The *EDPT* attests this from DLT and Heilk I on. The two instances there quoted from Suv are in fact conjectures. Both exs. in QB 3384, 6158 and 6276 (none mentioned in the *EDPT*) and in DLT write the verb with *ghain*. Add *sızgurmış kızıl bakır* (Maitr 72 r10 and 19 and 131 r25), *t(ä)mir sızgurgu ärgürgü täg* (BT III 965), *sızgurmış bışıg altun* (Suv 348,18 in *UW* 112 b) and *altunug sızguru särgürsär* (Suv 74,17). *alko ayıg kılınç-[ların] . . . sızgurup öçürüp . . .* (WarnkeFragm 58) is metaphorical.

täz-gür- is 'to put to flight' only in ETŞ 10 (quoted below) and DreiPrinz 49: *yılanlar . . . mini kapap t(ä)zgürdilär*. It has an entry in the *DTS* but not in the *EDPT*. The ex. quoted there appears in M III 38,6$_1$ (text 20, completed in ZiemeTexterg II): *özlärin saklanu arıt[ı] t(ä)zgürü tutzunl[ar]*, by Zieme translated as "ihre Körper bewahrend, sollen sie sie durchaus fliehen lassen (d.h. sie vor Unkeuschheit behüten)".[480] Zieme takes *özlärin* to serve as anaphoric pronoun. The existence of the following ex. makes Le Coq's translation as "sollen sie . . . flüchten" a bit more likely: *ätözin ketärü täzgürür bolur. näçä täzgürsär ymä ol kişil[är] amru yakın kälip . . .* (Ht X 549-50, a bit too freely translated as "*kaç-*"). *özlärin* ~ *ät'özin* appears to have served somewhat as reflexive pronoun, as 'to keep (oneself) away', with *tut-* something of a durative marker. In *yagılarıg ırak täzgürü kaçurmak* (ETŞ 10,235), the two verbs signify 'to keep away and put to flight'. The M III ex., in Manichaean script, spells the verb with *G* and not *K*.[481]

479 The reference there to 'U II 69,5 (ii)' should read 69,1 (ii).

480 Only the *EDPT* wants to read the verb as *t(ü)zgürü* against orthographical practice, and assigns the instance to *tüz+Kär-* (a verb discussed among the *+gAr-* verbs in section 7.53).

481 This is a particularly old ms., which does not confuse the stops even a single time. It has two or

tir-gür- 'to bring to life'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* are]*ölügüg tirgürti* (BT VII O 6) and *ölmiş üzütüg ölmäkdä tirgürmiş t(ā)ŋrim* (b r 5-6 in a ms. quoted on p. 60 of ManTüTex.) A further ex. appears in QB 4717. The /g/ can be determined by the Chuast ex. quoted in the *EDPT*. $T^2I\,R^2G^2R^2\ddot{W}$ in KT E 29 is hardly an ex. for this verb, as the *EDPT* writes;[482] rather of *tirig+gärü*. Cf. the common *tir-il-* above, also for the rare base. Another cognate is *tür-ig* (section 3.101).

tod-gur- 'to satiate' is a cognate and synonym of *tod-ur-*, q.v. in section 7.51. The DLT spells it with *ghain*, whence the /g/. Otherwise attested only in Suv 118,7 (q.v. in the *EDPT*), 605,2 and 606,3 (these two in Geng's ed.; also quoted in *UW* 237 a and 239 a respectively).[483] In view of the distribution of *todur-*, the distinction between the two appears to be one of dialect only.

tol-Kur- 'to fill, to fulfill', is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is attested only in Buddhist texts, while Manichaean and Qarakhanid ones have *tol-tur-* (q.v. below) instead. We don't know what the velar was, as all exs. are in Uigur writing. Exs. for physical filling are *kapalalarta ras(a)yan tolKurmış ärür* (Uig-Tot 427), *yertinçülärig tolKurup* (CYK 30) and *yertinçüg tolKurup* (BT VIII B 44). The *pāramitās* are object of this verb in BuddhUig II 646, 648 and 649 and BuyKäl 9, *yeviglär* in ShōAv 338 (biverb with *toşgur-*) and BuddhUig II 260, *işlär* in ETŞ 16,36. Further exs. appear in BT I D (166), ETŞ 13,119 and 16,55 and UigTot 616.

toş-gur- 'to fill; to fulfill, accomplish' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT; that spells the verb with *ghain*. Concrete exs. are *tarıg tsaŋlarıg toşgurmak* (ShōAv 17), *toşgurup kudar susgak* (BT VII A 332) 'a ladle which one fills and with which one pours out', *kök kalıkıg toşgurup* . . . 'filling the sky$_2$ (with one's words)' (16 times in BT VII A), *lenxua çäçäk kötü[rü] kirip kim anıŋ ädgü yıdı yıpa[r]ı üzä ol pr(a)yan için büt[ürü] toşgurup Samtso açarı ü[skin]tä çökiţü olorup* . . . (Ht X 722) and, also of fragrance filling a closed space, *kövräsi yer-din ünüp kälti, gausar çıntan yıdı üzä kamag Çetavan säŋrämig toşgurdı* (Maitr 196 r 30, in Sandel p. 379 translated as "mit dem Duft von Gosāra-Candana erfüllte er das ganze Jetavana-Kloster"). Further, *suv tamızımı näçä azk(ı)ya ärsär ymä* . . . *toşgurmış täg ulug bädük edişlärig* (BT III 660) "Wie gering auch ein Wassertropfen sei, . . . bringt er doch . . . große Töpfe zum Überlaufen".

three exs. of the archaic *kanyu*, which subsequently changed either to *kayu* (most of Uigur) or to *kanu*.

482 As Meyer, 1965-66 has shown, rounded vowels are not tacit in Orkhon spelling after unrounded ones. The parallel passage of the BQ inscr. (also in the *EDPT*) is damaged. The exs. in the short list in Tekin, 1968: 36 (headed "Rounded vowels occurring after unrounded ones are not marked only in the following examples:") can all be refuted, excepting two in the Ongin inscr.

483 The Suv 605,2 ex. is wrongly quoted in the *DTS* under '*tutyur-*', a lemma to be deleted.

Metaphorically of accomplishing a task, serving out a period of toil etc., we find *toŋgur-* with the objects *ädgü yiltızlär* (Scharl 98), *yorık* (ETŞ 13,119 biverb *tolKur-toŋgur-*) and *on oronlug yorıklar* (BT II 392, 612 and 690). Like *tolKur-*, *toŋgur-* governs *ŋat paramıt* (ETŞ 11,149), *paramıtlıg yevägläг* (Ht X 648), *üç asankı alu paramıt ädgü kılınç* (Maitr 118 v 25), *üç asankı ämgäk* (Maitr 8 r 2) or just *üç asankılar* (ShōAv 218). Under *to-ş-* we quote the clause *asankı pramıtlarımız tolup toŋup* . . . of which expressions as the above are causatives. The Pfahl instance quoted in the *EDPT* under *tuŋgur-* also belongs here.

tur-gur- 'to raise, rouse, set up, arrange, bring forth' has explicit /g/ in the runic sources, the DLT and Brāhmī TT VIII A, all quoted in the *EDPT* and, not mentioned there, QB 6644. Significant are also the BuddhKat exs. [DUR]-GUR-MA-SAR (14), DUR-GŪR-MAS (28) and DUR-GŪR-MA-TĪ (30), with *az almur kōŋül* and twice *ōbkā kōŋül* respectively as objects: As shown on p. 301 of the paper, word-internal but syllable-initial /g/ and /k/ are carefully distinguished in this text. In view of all this, explicit /k/ in Pothi 166 and 468 (Manichaean script) seems insignificant, for that text often confuses the velars. Nor should much importance be attached to the dotting of the velar in Uigur script in late mss.: To judge by the glossary of BT IX, this does not occur even once among the 43 exs. of the Maitr (an early text). Other exs. not quoted in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in BT I B (48) and (231) and D (186), BT II 281 and 807, ETŞ 10,261, 13,30 and 158, 20,126 and 22,13, Ht X 1094, Ernte 54, UigTot 906, CYK 76, ShōKenkyū II 20, InscrOuig IV 9, ms. T II Y 59, I.14, BuddhUig I 111,155 and 273 and II 43 and elsewhere. It often has the lexemes *sakınç*, *kōŋül*, *körüm* or *bilig* accompanied by some further specification as object, to refer to the induction of mental or emotional states.

tuş-gur- 'to help to meet' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, where it is spelled with *ghain*. The Pfahl instance quoted there should have been read as *toŋgur-*; the two verbs have been confused by other scholars as well. Nor are *tuş-* 'to meet' and *to-ş-* easy to keep apart in Uigur script in any context. *ädgü üdkä koloka tuşgurdaçı* (UigOn III B r 4) also belongs here. Some exs. of *tWşgur-* appearing in unclear or fragmentary contexts may also do so, of course. Mostly, however, the distinction can be kept up only by meaning.

(*üş-Kür-* is attested only in DLT fol. 121, and the evidence has been discussed under *üşkir-* in section 5.31 above. The sentence *ol ıtıg käyikkä üşKürdi* is translated as "He incited the dog against the game", but *ıt* could, in Old Turkic, also have been used as a collective. I take the verb to come from *üş-* 'to surround something in a crowd'. *üşün-* and *üşüş-*, both discussed above, are cognates.)

yat-gur- 'to lay somebody down or to make him lie down'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* are found in BT III 290 and BT XIII 12,100. What has been read as

'*yatururlar*' in Maitr 82 v 13-14 may also be an instance of this verb: The first *w*, marked as uncertain, appears at the end of the line and may be a misreading for *ghain*.

yet-Kür- 'to make something available to somebody, help him reach it' does not appear in the *EDPT*. The *DTS* s.v. '*jitkür-*' quotes Suv 26,20: *ägsükin yetKürgäli . . . d(a)rnini sözläp . . .* is better translated as 'to utter the *dhāraṇī* . . . so as to provide him with what he lacks' than as translated there. Further we have: *yintsikmäksiz yeg mäŋikä yetKürgü üçün* (ETŞ 9,62) 'in order to get creatures to reach undiscovered supreme happiness'; *uçıŋa kıdıgıŋa tägi tolu tükäl yetKürü* (InscrOuig V 46) 'making it fully$_2$ reach its utmost$_2$'; *alko kamag buyanlarımın . . . öglärim kaŋlarımka . . . tüzü' kä yetKürü üläyü* (BuyKäl 5)[484] 'providing all$_2$ my *puŋya* to all my . . ., distributing it (among them) and . . .'; *ogul kälin alıp kori yuŋlagı ävdin yätKürmädin asıgka tüşkä alıp . . .* and *üç ölüg kötürmiştäki yuŋlag ävdin yätkürmädin asıgka tüşkä alıp . . .* "getting wives for the sons / conducting three burial services could not be provided from the family resources and was borrowed at interest$_2$" (FamArch 177 and 182-3). Attested as *yetkir-* in the Codex Comanicus, but the *k* could there be the result of assimilation. As all early exs. are written in Uigur script, the voicedness of the velar cannot be determined. Comes from *yet-* 'to reach'.

(*yogur-* 2 'to cross the sea, a desert or a dangerous area, to pass a critical stretch of time'. Base not known but possibly related to *yol* 'way'. The fact that the latter has a long vowel e.g. in Tkm. would speak for such a connection, as the vowel of all *CV-* verbs was long. The velar is attested in runic script: *kök öŋüg yoguru* (Toñ 15),] *öŋüg yoguru . . . käçdim* (BQ SE), *yogurunçsuz ulug öŋ körtükü̈g yogurup* (fr. TM 269 quoted in the footn. to the n. to TT VI 115), *ol . . . yolug käçäyin* (ETŞ 16,20) and *yıl ärtürüp, ay yogurup* (TuoLuoNi 123 + 125) "Jahre verbringend, Monate durchstehend". For all this see Bang, 1917.[485])

Petrified converbs and morphology

ergürü / ürgürü 'in time, early' comes from *er-gür-* discussed above. The EDPT has exs. from TT I 171-3 and VII 28,2. The last mentioned instance reminds one of *ärtiŋü bäk katıg ugramış katıglanmaklıg* [. . .] *ürkünü buyanta yaratın-*

484 The word dealt with here is left untranslated.

485 The *EDPT* has it all wrong: The converb forms are dealt with under *yokaru* 'upwards', the others under '*yokur-*'. The etymology offered for that is impossible for the reasons which Clauson himself gives. Beside, of course, the fact that there can be no doubt about the /g/.

756

daçı, . . . (*BT XIII 38,20*). The facs. shows the reading to be correct. If one nevertheless takes *N* to be an error for R (the two often being similar in Uigur script) one gets: '(He) is one of particularly strong$_2$ and directed striving, [. . .] early in carrying out meritorious deeds.' For the TT I instance cf. the translation in *UW* 244 b.

ötgürü deserves the separate entry it is given in *EDPT* 54 a, q.v. for its meaning and use, and in the *DTS*. It is much more common than all the other forms of the verb, has developed a wide semantic field of its own, is used as adverb and postposition. Exs. not mentioned in those dictionaries occur 9 times in Maitr 151 and 152, BT II 143 and 1359, BT III 557, ETŞ 10,49 and perhaps in UigKan 341 and LautHöllen 117 (fragmentary contexts). Further exs. are *küçlüg tärin kertgünç könüllärindin ötgürü* "wegen dieses starken, tiefen Glaubens" (*ShōAv* 112) and *süzülmäklärindin ötgürü* "weil sie gläubig geworden waren" (*ibid.* 295).

Morphology

For 19 among the 26 verbs which we have in this formation, the velar of the formative is documented as /g/. With another six verbs there is nothing in the documentation which could tell us whether the velar was voiced or not. The only verb for which the only evidence we have is of K comes for *ozKur-* from TT III (Pothi). As shown in Pothi p. 162, however, that is a ms. which often confuses the velars in back-vowel words: Among others, *tamga*, *boşgut*, *tugum*, *bayagut*, *simtagsız* and suffixes like *-gInçA*, *-gAlI* and *-gU* are spelled with Q. Pothi even more frequently writes K for G in front vowel words. In two verbs in this section, *sürgür-* and *tur-gur-*, Pothi writes K/Q against the evidence of all the other sources. The evidence of Pothi for *ozKur-* is therefore of no value, and the formative can be taken to have been consistently *-gUr-*. *-gUr-* cannot be shown to be compounded from anything, in particular *not* from *-(X)k-* and *-Ur-*. As shown earlier, *-(X)k-* verbs have other causative expanders. No *-gUr-* verbs have semantic parallels in *-(X)k-*.

Most *-gUr-* verbs consist of two syllables, but *amırtgur-* and the isolated *arıngur-* have three. A great proportion of them come from stems ending in /r/ or /z/. Bases can be simple or derived. Expansions are *toşgur-t-*, *kigür-ül-* and, in the DLT, *argur-t-*. The converb and aorist vowel of this formation is always /U/.

-gUr- verbs have intr. bases and are thus, themselves, simple transitives. Their syntactic behaviour is practically identical to that of *-Ur-*, *-Ar-* and *+gAr-* verbs.

äm-iz- 'to suckle' is in the *EDPT* s.v. '*emüz-*' quoted from DLT, Middle Turkic etc. The DLT rounding of the second vowel is due to the influence of /m/. Found also in Maitr 21 v11: *Ga]utami xatun . . . [. . .] sütin ämzip igidti* '. . . suckled (you) with her milk and reared (you)'. A further possible ex. in Suv 366,16 is obscure to me.

(*äŋ-iz-* is a hap. in Ht IV 700, in *altun t(ä)ŋri burxan äf*['özin] *kudı 'äŋizip töpösin-täk*[*i*] *ärdini munçukug berd*[*i*] 'The golden divine Buddha bent his body down and gave (him) the jewel$_2$ which was on his head'. *äŋ-* (a variant of *äg-* 'to bend'?) is discussed together with *äŋ-it-* (section 7.56 below). This *may* be an error for *äŋit-*, and most of the direct object is in a lacuna. The ed. read '*äŋiş-*', which is inappropriate.)

ät-iz- 'to play an instrument, make music' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from two KP instances. Here (as in other cases) the verb is spelled with two initial *alif*, which is why Clauson has '*atız-*' as lemma.[486] Further exs. are *kay* (spelled kıy) *sayu bodun sayu borku ätizäŋ* (ManManus v as interpreted correctly in ManErz I 34), another ex. spelled *atız-* between KP LXVIII 1 and 2 (mentioned by Hamilton on p. 51 of his edition and visible on the facs.), *äṭizgü ürgü ıŋ labay ätiẓip . . .* (BuddhUig II 507), *oyun äṭizip* (ibid. 364), *kopuzlı kışaklı ätüzüp oyunçılar ikidin yorıp oyun ätizdilär* (Ht VII 4 b19). It is common in Maitr: *beş türlüg yinçgä oyun ätizü* (32 v3), *eşidü kanınçsız beş türlüg yinçgä oyun ätizülär ärdi* (17 v3 = MaitrGeng 9 a15), *kuŋxau ätizip* (4 r5), *o]yun 'ätizü* (101 r3), *ätizgülük oyunlar* (H X5 b4), *oyun ätiziŋlär* (ibid. 13), *ätizmiş [oyun]larıntın tagda sıgun ätsär . . .* (BQ W5).[487] Tuvin also uses *ät-* of the sounds of animals,[488] which is also the semantic domain of *ätin+ä-*.

kork-ız- appears in BT XIII 25,4: *korkıẓur mudur kıltaçı* 'he who makes the frightening *mudrā*'. The n. thereto quotes the unpubl. fr. T I α (U 5396) l.1, *korkıẓur mudur kılu turur*. The base is *kork-* 'to fear'. See *korkınç* (section 3.104), n. 312 and *kork-* itself (discussed among the *-(X)k-* verbs in section

486 *UW* 70 a also spells an ex. of KP as '*atız-*', translating it misleadingly as "[die Saiten] schlagen".

487 As interpreted correctly by Räsänen, 1947.

488 Cf. the source quoted in the *EDPT* under *öt-*. *öt-*, attested in the DLT but not in Old Turkic proper, is used only of the song of birds. *ät-* applies to roaring, bellowing etc. and, in the Suv ex. quoted, of drums. Note the unexplained variation *öt / ät* in the lexeme 'bread' (*EDPT* 60 a). Still, the two verbs can in no way be connected with what we know of Old Turkic variations and phonology and must be carefully distinguished.

7.24) on why this verb originally must have had the shape **korık-*. *korkız-* was derived from this at first unsyncopated stem, which explains the unrounded vowel of the formative. Cf. also *korkıt-*. *korkız-* is not in the *EDPT*.

tam-ız- 'to pour out drop by drop' is not attested before Heilk I and II, DLT and QB, all quoted in the *EDPT*. *tamız-ım* 'drop' is discussed in section 3.106. *tam-* 'to drip' is first noted in Qarakhanid. Cf. also *tam-ga* 'seal' in section 3.323. All these are unrelated to *tamıt-* 'to be set afire, blaze up' discussed under *tamıt-ur-* above; *tamıt-* must be a simplex. The DLT thrice spells *tamız-* as *tamuz-*.

tap-uz- 'to ask someone a riddle' appears only in the DLT (quoted in the *EDPT*); that source also has the derivates *tapz-ug* 'riddle', *tapuz-gu* and (discussed in section 3.22) *tapuz-guk*. The rounding of the suffix vowel is due to the presence of the /p/; cf. *ämüz-* and *tamuz-* in the DLT. *tap-* 'to find' is a tr. verb.

tut-uz- 'to entrust something to someone; to instruct, enjoin, admonish'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter especially under *tutuzmaq*. *tutuz-* when accompanied by *urunçak* 'pledge' signifies 'to entrust'. It then has either one's son as object (in KP 25,5, QB 1483), or dear ones (e.g. U III 27,18) or one's body (Maitr 19 r 7, 187 r 7, 3 v 10 and MaitrGeng 10 a 21, BT III 20,5, BuddhUig II 288, U III 83,9). In U II 34,9 the object is a *mudrā* while, in economical texts (USp 88,18-19, ZiemeSklav I 7), *tutuz-* may just have signified 'to hand over'. Exs. of *tutuz-* in the sense of 'instructing' not mentioned in the *EDPT* appear in Ht VII 1 a 11 and X 32 and 85, BT VII B 47, CYK 116, Suv 16,11, BruchGeb 12, BT II 959, BT XIII 27,16 and Yosıpas 34 and 118. *tutuzgu näŋ* is rightly reconstituted by DankKelly in DLT fol. 245, where the ms. omits the dot of the Z.[489] *tut-* is tr.; cf. *tutdur-*.

tuy-uz- 'to make someone aware of something' has a tr. base. The ex. quoted in the *EDPT* from M III *may* have had a passive sense. Exs. not mentioned in the EDPT[490] occur in Maitr 137 r 17 (together with *eştür-*, an *-Ur-* causative, as in the M III ex.), 20 v 6 and 35 v 12.

tüt-üz 'to let something smoke; to fumigate something'. The *EDPT* is wrong in taking 'to emit smoke' to be '*tütä-*'.[491] U II 47,77 should not be read as '*tutuş-*',

489 The *EDPT* entry '*tuturğu:*' should be omitted.

490 The TT VI ex. mentioned there and quoted under '*bildüz-*' appears on l.355 and not 335 as written, and not in all mss.

491 *tütär* in KP, the only ex. adduced for this, is better divided *tüt-är* than otherwise. *tütäk* 'spout' spelled TUTAK in DLT fol. 194, may be one of the numerous vowel errors of that source: All other documentation indicates a narrow vowel. *tütäk* could also come from **tüt-gäk*; cf. n. 463 in vol. 1. Note also that this lexeme has a long vowel in Tkm., whereas the verb has a short one there: There may have been an *+A-* derivate from *tüt* as onomatopoeic for the sound emitted from a reed pipe (unrelated to the verb denoting the emittance of smoke). As for the *-(X)t-* causative signifying 'to emit smoke (of fire)' in DLT fol. 415: Attested are *tütätti*, *tütitür*, *tütitmäk*, of which the first must be a simple error (for *tüt-it-*).

as done there, but as *küji tütẓüklärig tütüẓüp* . . . CYK 51 also has *tütẓük tütüz-miş*. Cf. *tützük* in section 3.102.

ud-uz- 'to lead'. The base does not appear before QB (see the QB Indeks for exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT*) and DLT, but there is a common petrified converb *udu* from it. Cf. also the cognates *udun-* and *uduş-* above. Exs. of *ud-uz-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in ETŞ 9,64 (with *yeṭ-* and *elṭ-*), AmitIst 65 (with *elt-*), HtPar 205,22 quoted in *UW* 293 a, CYK 59, Maḫrn 137, Maitr 137 v15, UigTot 26, 27, 994 and 1015, Ht V 9 a12, VII 4 a3 and 5 b11 and X95-6 and ShōAv 56 and 202.

Morphology

All attested *-Xz-* verbs are bisyllabic, as all their bases end in consonants; these bases either have one syllable or, as in the case of **korık-*, have had their second vowel syncopated away. This may originally have been different: *yol tozumçı* 'highwayman', a hap. in Maitr, may come from a verb **to-z-* (related to *tod-*, *tol-*, *toş-* etc.): It is documented in section 2.75 above. Secondly, *ye-z-gü* 'animal fodder' in BT II 222 and ManMon 77 comes from *ye-* 'to eat' (said by Kāšġarī to be less polite than *aşa-*). **ye-z-* might have been 'to feed an animal', derived from tr. *ye-*. *-Xz-* is thus non-dominant and had the original form *-(X)z-*. The bases of *-(X)z-* verbs are simple at least synchronically. The formative is, however, used as second element in the combination *-tXz-* treated in section 7.42. We found that *-(U)r-* was also mostly used primarily although found as second element in *-tUr-*. The combination *-KXz-*, which is common in several modern dialects, does not appear in Old Turkic. Cf. *körgüz-* 'to show', *olturguz-* 'to seat', *sārgiz-* 'to tame' and *örgüz-* 'to bring to the grazing ground' in the Codex Comanicus.

Nominal expansions from *-(X)z-* stems beside the ones just mentioned are *tützük* and *tapzug*, *tamızım*, *tapuzguk* and *uduzgak*. Verbal expansions are rare: We find *ät-iz-dür-*, *ät-iz-il-* and *uduẓulmaksız*. *-sXk-* (section 7.41), however, probably contains *-(X)z-* as first element.

Exs. for this formative from Middle and Modern Turkic can be found in Tekin, 1969: 70-72, whose opinion about it is unacceptable: *-Xz-* differs from *-Ur-* both in its vowel and its consonant; we know of no synchronic rule within Old Turkic to replace /r/ by /z/, /U/ by /X/ (or vice versa). This seems hardly thinkable in the present case, since the two formatives have practically the same distribution. Already Bang, 1919: 16 was of the opinion that these two formatives are "besser als zwei ganz verschiedene Formantien aufzufassen".

The aorist and converb vowel of *-Xz-* verbs is always /U/. Petrified converbs do not appear to have come about here.

The bases *ät-*, *kork-*, *tam-*, *tüt-* and *ud-* are intr., while *äm-*, *tap-*, *tut-*, *tuy-*, *to-*

and *ye-* are tr. *utuz-* is taken to be from **ut-tuz-*; see section 7.42. With its high proportion of tr. bases, *-(X)z-* differs sharply from all the causative formatives ending in /r/. *tutuz-* is especially noteworthy in admitting humans as ultimate objects; for this there is not a single ex. among the /r/ causatives.

7.56 *-(X)t-*: LEXICAL MATERIAL

açı-t- signifies 'to cause grief' and not "quälen" as translated in the *UW*. The only two Uigur exs. (in one text) use it together with *agrı-t-*, which Röhrborn translates as biverb. *açı-* (q.v. especially in the *UW* itself) signifies 'to grieve'. See *açıt-* in the *EDPT* for Qarakhanid and later exs., also in the original sense of 'making sour'. Add the QB 2579 and 6543 exs. to that entry. *açıg* also signifies either (physically) 'bitter' or 'grief, grieveous, (metaphorical) bitter(ness)' but, in Old Turkic, never 'pain'.

(*adart-* 'to harm, to endanger' is no doubt connected with *ada* 'danger', but a verb **ada+r-* is not attested. See the *EDPT* for the runic exs., the *UW* for some in Uigur script. Additional exs. appear in BuddhUig II 373 as quoted in *UW* 269 b s.v. '*atkaḫ-*' and in SuvStockh 9. An ex. in UigKol 16-17 is similar to that in Suv 74,8 (which the *UW* entry for some reason lists as "Unklarer Kont[ext]"). Another ex. of nominal *adartmak* appears in Suv 145,12. Add, further, *kılınç adartmakın öçürmäk*, the title of a section of the Suv in ms. T I D 125 (U 731) r 5 as quoted in BT XIII p. 88).

1 *ag-ıt-* 'to alter, to shift (tr.) away from, modify; leave off with'. *agıt-* I in the *UW* has a correctly understood Manichaean ex., and the *DTS* is more or less right about this and about a runic and a Qarakhanid instance. Otherwise, practically all scholars dealing with this verb have erred in their interpretations. A Buddhist ex. appears in HamTouen 1,15: *özin başın ıdalap alkosın bermäk(k)ä agıtmaz ärdi* 'He would give up his self and body and would not deflect anything he had from being given away'.[492] A further instance is probably found in Warnke 266, in *bokünki bo kertgünç kǫŋülümni agıtmayın (y)etürmäyin* 'may I not alter or lose the faith which I (feel) today'. The *EDPT* may be right about translating the runic exs. as "rousing", i.e. attaching them to 2 *ag-ıt-* but, in view of the use of *agıt* in QB 1233 and 6312, 1 *ag-ıt-* would be even more appropriate to the context: Note that the DLT's three exs. of 2 *ag-ıt-* are all about physical upward movement. 'to make a new start with . . .' would be perfect in the runic contexts.

(2 *ag-ıt-* 'to raise' is attested in the DLT. The *EDPT* assigns a Chuast verb here,

492 Thus in Erdal, 1988: 253, where I discuss Hamilton's interpretation and the QB instances.

but I prefer the *UW*'s interpretation.[493] *agt-ın-* is a derivate of *this* verb and *ag-tur-* is a cognate.)

agırla-t- is in the *UW* quoted thrice: Once, in a biverb with *aya-t-*, it signifies 'to cause to respect'; it governs the person to be respected in the accusative and the persons to respect him in the dative. One instance of *ayatmış agırlatmış* and another of *agırlatmış* alone signify 'respected'. Tr. *agır+la-* also often appears with *aya-*.

agla-t- 'to leave (land) unoccupied' is in the *UW* quoted from a Maitr ex., in the *EDPT* from the DLT. Cf. the common petrified converb *aglatı* below. *agla-agla-k* above.

agrı-t- 'to cause pain' in the *UW* (Uigur) and the *EDPT* (DLT and Middle Turkic). The form *agrıdı* in Suv 632,21, in the *UW* entry assigned to this verb, can better be understood as *agrı-dı*: The three verbs in the series are probably impersonal sensation verbs and do not have "[Die Haare]" as subject.

agtar-t- 'to have something translated' is a hap. in UigKol 11 not mentioned in the *UW*: *türkçä agtartıp t(a)vgaççasın türkçäsin tamgata oydurup* ... 'He had it translated into Turkic and had both the Chinese and the Turkic (version) carved on a printing-block'. *agt-ar-*, also 'to translate', is discussed in section 7.52.

ak-ıt- 'to let something flow (away)'; has some special military meaning in the runic inscrs. See the *EDPT* for Orkhon and Qarakhanid Turkic, the *UW* for Uigur: The HtPar 208,21 ex. only mentioned on p. 82 is actually quoted s.v. *adınçıg* par. A, *UW* 52 a. Exs. not mentioned in the *UW* occur five times in BuddhUig II (all with *kan* 'blood' as object), BT XIII 3,19 and TuoLuoNi 330 (both with *yaş* 'tears' as object, in the second case as conjecture). A Brāhmī ex. is quoted under *sark-ıt-* below.

alka-t-mış 'praised' is common but attested only in Uigur, documented in the *UW*. Exs. not mentioned there appear in HamTouen 5,1, 2 and 6', BT XIII 39,2-3, ShōUigFrag 28 and, as a female proper name, HazaiAval 20.[494]

amra-t-mış 'loved' appears in a biverb with *sävitmiş* once in Ht, quoted in the *UW*. A proper name *Amratmış Täŋrim* in Pfahl II 12 is not mentioned in any of the dictionaries. *amra-* and *säv-* are a common biverb.

493 In his edition of the Chuast, Asmussen takes this to be a variant of *ak-ıt-* and translates accordingly; see also his n. on p. 221. This is impossible, as Old Turkic /k/ does not have a voiced variant even between vowels (as far as we can tell from all our evidence).

494 *'alkıtu ögdi'* in QB 5610 cannot be an instance of this verb as it has the wrong form and the wrong meaning: 'to praise' is *alka-*, often used in a biverb with *ög-*; the form (attested in mss. BC with *yā'* in the second syllable) is probably an error for *alkayu*. Medial Y and T are very similar in Arabic script.

ançola-t- 'to cause to present tribute' is a hap. in Ht quoted in the *UW*. It may have the 'presenters' as object in the accusative (and not the presents as translated in the *UW*): This follows mainly from the parallelism with *t[ap]ıntur-* and from the meaning. The reason may be that the dative case form was probably occupied by the target of the 'presentation', the receiver of tribute. See *ançoˌ+la-* above.

anu-t- 'to prepare' is documented in the *UW* (Uigur) and the *EDPT* (Qarakhanid). Not mentioned in either are *alko kärgäkligçä tapıg udug yeväg-lärin m(ä)n tüẓü tükäl anuṭayın* (BuddhUig II 253), *yuz tapıgçı URllarıŋa ymä YETİ ärdinilig kaŋlılar anuṭup . . .* (*ibid.* 322) and *anı barça tükäl anuṭup . . .* (BT XIII 49,35).

apı-t- comes from *apı-* 'to shield something or somebody' attested in DLT fol. 555: *ol anı kişidän apıdı* "He hid it from the people. Also of anything that one conceals from another person". The base appears to have had the concealing entity as subject, while the subject of *apı-t-* is the concealer. The ex. which DLT fol. 116 uses for this is identical to that used for *apı-*, but I don't think one should 'emend' the dental away.[495] The concealed or shielded thing can be one's self: *ol özin mändin apıttı* in DLT fol. 111, similarly with *apıtgan* in fol. 88. This is the construction found in Warnke 29: *k(ä)ntü özin apıtu yupaṭu umadın* "ohne sich selbst verstecken und verbergen zu können". Two further exs. of *apıt-* have fragmentary contexts and may have either had the subject or others as the object of 'shielding' or 'concealment': *arıg [küçläri] asılıp üstälip / aç kız [. . . al]ko adalartın / apıṭu kölitü* [(BT XIII 58,44), with 'lords and ladies' as subject, may have had either the citizens as object or the lords and ladies themselves. In *] raxuya, apıtmış s(ä)n kök kalıkta* (ShōAgon 1,209), the object is the moon (as the sentence in the following line shows). *apıtılmaksız* (q.v. in section 3.329) comes from an unattested *-tXl-* derivate from the same base. *apı-g* is, in section 3.101, discussed as *abı-g*, which is how it is written in Brāhmī and Tib. script: /VpV/ appears to have been pronounced as [VbV]. The *EDPT* lists the verb as *abıt-* (which is phonetically correct). The *UW* has neither *abıt-* not *apıt-* but, under *avıt-*, suggests reading *karaçu elin abuṭıp* (InscrOuig II 27) as '*karaçu eltā abuṭıp*' and translating it as "er versteckte sich im Karaču-Land".

495 This is what DankKelly do. They also change the first letter of the stem, (according to them) explicitly written thrice with A of the first hand, to *o*. Equally, they change thrice explicit *apı-* in fol. 555 to '*opı-*', and *apıt-* in fol. 111 (twice explicit, once W by a later hand) to '*opıt-*'. *apıtgan* should also have been read in fol. 88 although not vowelled in the ms. Their reason for all this may have been *upan-* in fol. 108, with the second vowel thrice by the second hand, the first vowel twice by the first and once by the second. The translation being 'to hide (intr.)', it seems that a confusion occurred between *apı-n-* and *yupa-n-*, which has a similar meaning. We see *apıt-* and *yupat-* as biverb in Warnke. Cf. *yupan-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs. The change in fol. 116 is especially unacceptable as the entry appears after *enät-*, *ayıt-* and *uyat-* and before *oŋuk-* and *oŋul-*.

Röhrborn is no doubt right about assigning the instance to the present verb, but the accusative should remain: In view of the ex. from BT XIII, the phrase should signify 'shielding his *karaçu* people'. The base is attested also in BT XIII 42,13: *raçaputıra tayzılarnı ymä apıyu uzun üdün küzädzün* 'May he shield the *rājaputra* princes and protect them for a long time'.[496]

arı-t- 'to clean, purify'. Documented in the *UW*; the *EDPT* has Qarakhanid exs. Add e.g. *süzmiş arıtmış kirlig* (Schwitz 14) and 'A-RÏD-HÄ-LE (= *arıtgalı*, with the *kleśa*s as object) in BuddhKat 37. *arıtı* is a probable petrified converb from this verb.

arıgla-t- 'to get selected' or perhaps 'to get excerpted'. Hap. in Samanta 6 not mentioned in the *UW* (or the *EDPT*): *arıglatıp tamgaka intürüp yakdurup ülätmiş buyan* "... (dieses Werk) auswählen, auf Druckstöcke setzen ...", perhaps better translated as 'auslesen lassen'. See *arıg+la-* above.

arta-t- 'to damage, spoil, corrupt, destroy (physically or metaphorically)' is documented in the *EDPT* (runic and Qarakhanid) and the *UW* (Uigur). Another runic ex. is found in Tariat E5, a Buddhist one in TuoLuoNi 180: *buz-artat-* corresponds to one lexeme in the Chin. source.

aşa-t- 'to feed; to cause to enjoy' is documented in the *UW* (Uigur) and the *EDPT* (Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic).

(*avıt-* 'to comfort' appears once in Uigur (q.v. in the *UW*) and several times in the QB. The base is not attested but see *avın-* above, where other derivates from *avın-* are mentioned. Cf. also *avıt-ıl-* above.)

aya-t- is attested only in Uigur, documented in the *UW*. One ex., a biverb with *agırla-t-*, signifies 'to make (some person) be revered or respected' (with respecters in the dative). Otherwise 'to be / get respected' (with respecters again in the dative).

ayıt- is primarily 'to make somebody say something', from *ay-* 'say, speak, declare, prescribe, prophesy, utter', amply documented in the *UW* and with runic exs. in the *EDPT*. As distinct from other *-Vt-* derivates from consonant bases, the second vowel of *ayıt-* is always syncopated (19 times) in the QB before all suffixes starting with vowels. It follows that the base was **ayı-* < **ayX-*.[497] See *ayı-k* in section 3.102 above and Erdal, 1979 a: 113-4. *ayıt-* ~ *ayt-* generally signifies 'to ask, to inquire about', the person being asked being referred to in the dative. See the *EDPT* and the *DTS* for some of the exs. for it. It is exceedingly common in all texts from the runic inscrs. on. Y^1T^1A in the Yenisei inscrs. is not a form of this verb but an interjection signifying 'alas',

496 The ed. reads '*apayu*' but the facs. is clear enough. He assigns the verb to *av-* in the index, but the converb of that would have been *ava*. /v/ and /p/ are distinct and opposed phonemes in Uigur.

497 That is also why the aorist of the base is *ayur* < **ayıyur* and not '*ay-ar*'.

appearing also in KP LVII 3 and perhaps XIX 6 (see also n. thereto). The *EDPT* may, on the other hand, be right in reading *ayıtayın* and not *añıtayın* in BQ E41.[498] Uigur exs. of *ayıt-* will not be listed here; there are e.g. 25 of them in Maitr. *sezik* or *sezinç ay(ı)t-* 'to give vent to one's doubts, ask for explanations' is discussed under *sezik* and *sezinç* respectively. *köŋül ayıt-* 'to inquire about how somebody feels', a common phrase, is attested also in ShōAgon 1,10 (wrongly read as '*avıt-*'). The biverb *ayıt- istä-* is discussed under *istä-* in section 5.13. See the derivates *ayıt-ıg* and *ayıt-ış-* above.

az-ıt- 'to lead astray' is Manichaean (like its synonym *az-gur-* discussed in section 7.54 above) and Muslim. Exs. from QB 2115, 3344 and 4194 do not appear in the *EDPT* entry. Used metaphorically, both *azgur-* and *azıt-* can have *ög* or *köŋül* as object.

baça-t- 'to induce someone to fast' is a hap. mentioned by the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*: *arıg baçatıp* in Suv 444,13 is comparable to *arıg baçap* in Suv 524,13. Both are mentioned in *UW* 183 a s.v. *arıg* par. A,f, where *arıg* is translated as "ungebrochen, konsequent". Cf. also *arıg baçak baça-* in a Manichaean text.

bak-ıt- 'to make someone look at something' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. We also find it in BT VIII A 320 (a tantric text) in *alının . . . öz ätözkä bakıtıp . . .* 'make one's forehead look at one's own self'. See *bak-ın-* above, also for the base and other cognates. The DLT's *bak-ur-* governs the shown entity as object and the looker-on in the dative, inversely from *bakıt-*. The Suv hap. *baktokla- may* have an unattested *-Ok* derivate from *bakıt-* as base.

baltur-t- is attested four times in Maitr, in all four exs. in a biverb with *igid-* 'to nourish, rear': *] sütün ämizip igidti balturtdı* (21 v11), *ätlig tärlig kanlıg ät' özü-min igidti balturttı ärsär* (22 v7), *nomlug ät' özin igidtim bal[turtdum* (22 r16) and *ätlig kanlıg ät' özüŋüz igidtäçi balturtdaçı ataŋız* (161 v25). MaitrH XVI 13 a5, the Hami version of the last ex., has *baltdurtaçı* instead. All these instances could have been read with front vowels, but I take *balturt-* to come from *ba-l-tur-*, q.v. in section 7.57. A derivation from *belä-* 'to swaddle etc.' seems impossible.

bas-ıt- 'to (let oneself) be overwhelmed, oppressed, beaten, taken by surprise or overcome, to fall victim to' is used without explicit 'aggressor' in Toñ 34 (*yälmä kargu ädgüti urgıl, basıtma*) and QB 2369. The (usually explicit) aggressor appears in the dative. Only rarely is he a human agent like *yavlak kişikä* (DhāSū 18), *yat kişikä* (TT I 56-7) or *kiçigkä* (QB 707). Grief, anxiety, illness and pain is more common: *ig agrıgka* (Suv 587,1-3), *busuş köŋüliŋä* (Suv

498 As can be seen in the Finnish Atlas and in Thomsen's unpublished materials, the *ñ* is uncertain: It could be a misreading of an effaced Y^1, with which it has the sideward arc in common. Neither '*añıt-*' nor any lexeme which can be shown to be related ever appeared.

635,1), *busuşka* (Suv 641,9), *sakınçka busuşka* (HtPek 96 b8 quoted in *UW* 234 a-b). Note also *yavız kılınçka basılmış m(ā)n* in ShōKenkyū III 29. Particularly the instance with *ig agrıg* makes it unlikely that the subject should have had a part in his own suffering; we need not give up the notion, however, that the Toñ ex. implies responsibility for the subject if he should fall victim to a surprise attack. The expansions *bast-ık-* and *bas-ıtıl-* discussed above are not very different as far as meaning is concerned; see them in sections 7.24 and 7.32 respectively. With them, however, the enemy is never a real being one can defend oneself against, and the subject never appears to be responsible. Their aggressors are mostly in the dative too, but twice appear as *üzä* phrases. In particular, *ig agrıg üzä bastıkmak* (TT VII 40,134) can hardly be very different from *ig agrıgka basıtıp . . . yaturlar* (Suv; both texts late). *basıntur-* is also accompanied by aggressive agents in the dative, but may have had a slightly different meaning.

bayu-t-mış 'enrichened' is a proper name in Pfahl I 17; the *DTS* quotes this through the reedition in USp 26. The *EDPT*, however, has *bayut-* only from DLT and QB. Cf. *bay+u-* in section 5.41 above.

bädizä-t- 'to have something ornamented'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, from Orkhon Turkic on. Add *Çunti boḍıs(a)vıtnıŋ soo bäzäṭgü nomı* "die Lehre über das Malen der Gestalt des . . . Bodh. Cuṇḍī" (ms. Mz 724 v29-35 quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 23-4). The variant *bäzä-* of the base *bädiz+ä-* (discussed among the *+A-* verbs) is found only from Qarakhanid Turkic on.

bädü-t- 'to make something or someone grow, to increase (tr.), to rear'. The *EDPT* quotes this once from TT I, from DLT and QB, but the first mentioned is dubious: It may possibly be an instance of *bädü-*. *bädüt-* has been read also in Ht X 1173. Add also *yemig içimig bädütmäk* 'to increase food and drink' (ShōAv 19) and *ogulın kızın* (better thus!) *igidü umagu ämgäkin bädüṭü* 'bringing up one's children in grief about not being able to care for them' (Ernte 52).

bäklä-t- 'to have a thing or a person fastened or locked up'. By *EDPT* and *DTS* quoted only from the DLT. Found also in *kapıgın bäk bäkläṭip* . . . (BT III 264 and 320) and *kaŋı elig bägig kınlıkta bäklätip* . . . (Maitr 58 v19). See *bäk+lä-* above.

bäkü-t- 'to fix, take firm hold' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and the QB. Three QB exs. are not mentioned there: In couplets 1580 and 1855 ms. B alone has /i/ for second vowel, which both ed. and İndeks for some reason adopt. (B changes *ü* to *i* also in *bäk+ü-*). DLT fol. 420 has *bäkütti bäkitür bäkitmäk*. *bäkürt-* (discussed next) is a sort of alternative to this verb. In QB 794, the text wrongly has *bärkitip* with A: The better mss. BC write *bärkütüp*. Cf. *bä(r)k+ü-* in section 5.41.

(*bäkürt-* is found only in Maitr 226 v3-4, in *kop kamag ayıg y(a)vlak törülärig bäkürtdäçi bütürdäçi ṛtamış köŋül köküz ärür*, in BT IX 263 translated as "Das

verdorbene Herz und der Sinn sind es, die alle bösen und üblen Dinge *befesti-
gen und vervollständigen". In spite of this translation, the word appears in the
index as *p'ïkwrtd'cy* "zum Vorschein bringend".[499] It is in fact possible that an L
was inadvertently omitted and that this is another ex. of the very common
bälgürt-, but the *lectio difficilior* of the ms. cannot be excluded. *bäkürt-* appears
also in ms. B of QB 1892 (while the other mss. have other less acceptable
verbs). A verb **bäkür-* is not attested but its petrified converb *bäk(ü)rü* is very
common: See it at the end of section 7.51. Another explanation for *bäkürt-*
would be that it came from *bärk+ü-t-* by metathesis.)

bälgür-t- 'make manifest, display, bring forth' is quoted with a few of the exs. in
the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. Most common, among the additional exs., is the
phrase *ät'öz bälgürt-* (e.g. Maitr 169 r2, 148 v2, 4 r5, 60 r6, 106 v8, UigTot
1173) corresponding to the Buddhist term *bälgürtmä ät'öz* (section 3.109).
Another common object is *körk* (Maitr 4 r1, TuoLuoNi 49 and 206, BuddhUig
II 198). Some of the attested biverbs are *aç- bälgürt-* (q.v. in the *DTS*), *bälgürt-
ünṭür-* (UigTot 1392), *körkit- bälgürt-* (Suv 697,8). The converb of this verb is
bälgürti (quoted in the *EDPT*), the aorist *bälgürtir* (e.g. in Maitr 101 r21, v16
and 21, 165 r3, 12, 14, 15, 21, 148 r30 and v2); this must, by analogy, have
caused the form *bälgürtüp* (instead of *bälgürtüp*) in Maitr 4 r1 and 106 v8. In
late texts, of course, (e.g. Suv 697,8) the aorist is *bälgürtür*.

bäliŋlä-t- 'to put into panic' is mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS*. We
have *yalŋuk[ları]g ürkit[gäl]ir bäliŋlätgälir ü[çün* (Maitr 101 r18) and *adkanṭaçı
biliglär ärkäçlänip ürkitgäli bäliŋlätgäli ugay* (HtPek H1 b5-9 quoted in footn.
62 in TermBuddh).[500] See *bäliŋ+lä-* above, where we also mention the biverb
with *ürk-*.

mäŋilä-t- 'to make someone happy' is a hap. in Suv quoted in the *DTS*; not in the
EDPT. Cf. *mäŋi+lä-* above.

mäŋ(i)zä-t- 'to compare, liken'. *EDPT*[501] s.v. *beŋzet-* and *DTS* s.vv. '*meŋizät-*'
and '*meŋzät-*'. Appears also in Ht VII 2108 and 11 b26-27 (biverb with *ogşat-*)
and in Maitr 38 r13. See below for the petrified converb *mäŋzäti*. *mäŋz+ä-* 'to
resemble' is attested only from DLT and QB on.

bışur-t- 'to have something cooked' is found in BT II 228. Not in the *EDPT* or the
DTS. See *bış-ur-* in section 7.51.

499 The reading is changed tacitly and the entry refers to recto instead of verso.

500 "in Wallung kommen und erschreckt$_2$ werden" does not correspond to the Chin. text, which Röhrborn translates as "das Erschreckt-Werden-Können durch die Aufwallung des Bewußtseins". In Uigur, *biliglär* is the subject of all three verbs; in Chin., however, only of "Aufwallung" within the agentive phrase of a passive expression. The correct translation of the Uigur text which also corresponds to what the Chin. signifies is 'erschrecken$_2$ (tr.)'.

501 The reference to HTs 1889-90 should read 1989-90.

(*birgärt-* 'to unite' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. The *DTS* has a Suv ex. s.v. *birgärt-* I. Another Suv ex. quoted there under *birkärtmäk* (thus) appears also in *UW* 281 b (bottom). What the *DTS* quotes from Heilk I 70 (not 10, as written there) as *birgärtä tökgü* is probably a mistake, e.g. for *birgärün* (instrumental of the petrified converb). A further ex., a biverb with *yıg-* in HtPar 143,13, is quoted in *UW* 199 b. '*birkitsär*' in BT I B (52) should perhaps be read as *bir-g(ä)rtsär*.[502] Further exs. appear in ShōAgon 1,314 and BT III 926 (both as *birgärtip*) and Ht V 6 a2 (*birgärtdi*). The base must have had the shape **bir+gär-*. What we have instead is an adverb *birgärü*, which *may* be a directive from *bir* 'one'. We discuss it under the petrified converbs of section 7.53, however, under the assumption that it comes from the base of *birgärt-*.)

biti-t- 'to have something written' is documented in *EDPT* and *DTS* and appears also in U II 80,63 (*Üdrät*), Ht IV 773 (*bitig bitit-*) and V 7 a 6, Maitr 3 v 20, 27 r 4, 200 v 12, 1 r 12 (*nom bititgäli ötün-*), 1 v 3 (*nom bitigig bititü tägin-*) and 1 r 17 (*nom bitig bitit-*), ShōUigFrag 27, BT XIII 12,02, frequently in TuoLuoNi. '*bititü tägdi yadmaz*' in HazaiAval 13 should probably be read as *bititü tägin-d(i)miz*.[503]

boşu-t- 'to have somebody freed or something released' is, in Uigur, found only in Suv: The *DTS* has one ex. in 117,22: *olarnı barça . . . ämgäklärintin boşu-tup . . .*, with the person getting rid of something (abl.) in the accusative. An ex. in Suv 638,7 has the person getting rid as subject and what he gets rid of in the accusative case: *ançak(ı)ya boşutzun ulug elig bäg busuşın*. The QB exs. signify 'to help somebody open his bowels': *özi katmış, ämdi boşutgu käräk* (1059) "He is constipated and must be given a purgative" and *özini boşutgu* (6010) "He should be given a purgative". This use connects with the DLT's *anıŋ özi boşudı* (also with *öz*) "His bowels were opened", *bo ot karın boşatgan* "This drug purges the stomach". We spell this last with *a* in the second syllable although the ms. shows a second-hand *ḍamma*, because all other six instances of this verb in the DLT are written with *fatḥa* of the first hand there. See irregularly tr. *boşw-* in section 5.41. The form quoted in the *EDPT* entry from USp 125 reads *boşudu*, not '*boşut(ı)tu*', to which it is arbitrarily changed by Clauson; it could be an erratic or misread perfect form of *boşw-* (which fits the context better).

(*boşgutup* is a hap. in TT VIII K quoted in the *EDPT* and also in Maue, 1984: 93 footn. 16. It is likely to be a misreading or error for *boşgunup* (not *boşgurup*), which also has a more appropriate meaning. What has been read as this verb in

502 The ms. is lost and the original transcription has *birgät-*; the translation, presumably based on the Chin. original, fits this verb well.

503 After starting to write *tägdimiz*, the scribe started again from the middle of the word.

Maitr 162 r27 (= BT 141,27) is in fragmentary context and could also be *boş-guts[uz]*; but the *t* and *s* are uncertain as well.)

bödi-t- 'to make dance (a person or one's feet)' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. In Ht VII 5 b5 *bödigin böditip* is parallel to *oyun oynatıp* and BuddhUig II 90 has *urılarıg kızlarıg sürügin toyın böditip* .... *UW* 46 a quotes another Ht ex. of *bödi-t-*, in which the subject is 'the dancers' and the object *adakların* 'their feet'. For the vowel of the base see *bödi-g* above, and the *EDPT* on *bödi-*. Instances of the base not quoted there appear in BT VII B2 and 13.

bulga-t-mışlar 'the confused ones' is a hap. in v9 of a ms. quoted in footn. 3 of ChuastBeitr. Cf. *bulga-l-* above.

bütür-t- 'to get something completed and perfected' is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* (like *bulgat-* just mentioned). We have it in *yevğlärin büṭürtüp* ... (BuddhUig II 324) and *on kuen bir çır kılturup bütürtdi*, about having a book prepared (Warnke 107). *büt-ür-* is exceedingly common.

(*çaylat-* 'to have respected' has no attested *+lA-* base and is not mentioned in the dictionaries. Hap. in BT XIII 38,46, in a rather fragmentary context. Chin. *zhai* 'to respect' is attested in Ht X 388 in the phrase *çay kıl-*, presumably equivalent to **çay+la-*.)

çıkra-t- 'to cause to emit a grating sound' appears in LautHöllen 55 (passage previously edited in the n. to TT III 5) with *tişlärin* 'his teeth' as object, and in BT XIII 27,24 (quoted s.v. *köl-ür-* above) with *kölökünüzni* 'your vehicle' as object. The *EDPT* quotes the DLT, which has 'door', 'pen' and, in particular, 'teeth' (human and camel). See *çıkra-* in section 5.32.

çıŋra-t- 'to cause to jingle or to rattle' has an early finite attestation only in the DLT, but we find *çıŋratgu* 'bell' in KP (quoted in the *EDPT*) and in a Ht ms. (quoted in *UW* 40 a under *açarı* par. B). A further ex. in ShōAv 132 is translated as "Rasselstab"; the other two exs. may perhaps also have signified 'rattle'. *çıŋra-* belongs to the same class as *çıkra-* and *çokra-*.

çokra-t- 'to boil (tr.)', *EDPT* and *DTS*. *çokratmış* in TT X (quoted in the *DTS*) is marked as uncertain in the text. Otherwise found only a number of times in the late Heilk I and in the DLT. See *çokra-* in section 5.32.

çök-üt- ~ çök-it- EDPT and *DTS*; the latter also s.v. '*çökät-*', which has been read once in Suv and must be a mistake for *çökit-*. Some of the exs. not mentioned there are *ayasın kavşurup çökiṭü olorup* (BuddhUig II 247), *Odon xan ... bodunı bokunı birlä çökiṭü olo[r]up* (Ht V 11 a3), *tözünlärniŋ üskintä tört ulugumın çökiṭip* (ShōKenkyū III 35), *tizlärin çökiṭip ayal[arın] kavşurup* (Ht X 607) and *Samtso açarı ü[skin]tä çökiṭü olorup* (*ibid.* 723), which are also typical of the exs. which the dictionaries do quote. Attested further e.g. in BT II 1282 and Ht IV 688-9. The earlier variant with /ü/ in the second syllable appears

only in U III 28,12,[504] U IV C106, and USp 101,7. *üzin çökiţip* of TT VI O 11 appears in three mss. while another lacks the phrase altogether and a fifth one has *söküdüp*; see *sök-üd-* in section 7.23. See Erdal, 1979: 153 and 155 for the vowel alternation. Analogy from *söküd-* may be the reason why practically all exs. of the present verb are spelled with D, and one or two with T are among the latest ones. *sök-it-* is discussed further on in this section. Both *çökü̈t-* and *söküd-* denote 'kneeling', with or without explicit 'knee(s)'.

çugla-t- 'to have something tied up and made into a parcel' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. It appears also in Ernte 72, in *çïŋnä kaŋlı birlä yıgdurup çuglatıp* . . . These causative forms cannot be translated as "häuft man sie zusammen" as done there, nor are the two verbs a biverb: The present one refers to the tying down of the heaped-up bundles onto the cart. See *çug+la-* above.

ägir-t- 'to let or get (oneself) surrounded and encircled, to be enclosed'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; the latter also s.v. '*ikirt-*', a misreading of two Suv instances of the variant *äŋir-t-*. This variant appears also in Suv 619,3, not mentioned by the dictionaries: *körmiştä . . . aç barsıg ämgäkkä äŋirtip änükin yegäli kıl(ın)mışın* . . . 'having seen that the hungry tigress was (as if) besieged by hunger and about to eat her cub, . . .'. P. Zieme has suggested reading TT VII 40,57 as *agır ig agrıg üzä [ä]girtip ol ig[intin] agrıgıntın [öŋäd]gäli kü̈säsär . . .*; *äŋirtip* could also have stood there. The base *ägir- ~ äŋir-* is discussed in section 6.3; it is tr.

ägsü-t- 'to diminish (tr.), reduce'. Exs. in the *EDPT*. A common cognate is *ägsü-k*.

ämgä-t- 'to make someone suffer'. *EDPT*; common verb. Found also in ETŞ 13,145, LautHöllen 30 (*ämgäklärig ämgät-*), BT XIII 8,24 (quoted under *buş-ur-* above), Maitr 202 v 16 and 182 v 5 (both *ämgätirlär*). TT VIII O, from which the verb is quoted in the *EDPT*, is a ms. of TT VI. The verb in question, *ämgätür*, appears also in ms. BVN 6 r 5 but is absent from six other mss. of the passage including l.62 of the London scroll. There also are several exs. of *ämgätmäksiz* (section 3.329). ShōKenkyū II 31 was read as '*ämgätip*'; as the facs. shows and as accords well with the sense, the reedition in BT XIII 12,83 is right in reading *ämgänip* instead. Both *ämgä-n-* and *ämgä-k* are common.

ämlä-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, where it means "to have somebody treated with medicine". Attested also as *muntag ämgäkin ämlätdi[ŋ* (BT XIII 12,132) 'Going to all that trouble you have had (me) treated'. The ed.'s translation "hast du geheilt" is wrong, as the parent does not treat the child himself but (according to the context) gets doctors. "heilen" would have been *äm+lä-*, discussed above. A further ex. probably appears in ShōAgon 1,365 (there

504 With D tacitly changed to *t* in the *EDPT*.

transcribed *ąmlatmış*) but the context is not clear to me. Then in ManMon 106-7: *sagan ügälär igläsär . . . ämlätgüçi y[um]uş bolzun. otaçı okıp k(ä)lürüp otın ämin iş ayguçlarda b(ä)k tutup alıp uz ämlätzün* (transcription of GeistDrog) 'If the *sagan ügäs* should fall ill, he (the 'YWRX'NY ZM'STYK?) must serve as . . . errand to get them treated.[505] He must call and bring a doctor, make sure he procures and gets their medicinal plants and drugs from the overseers and get them treated well.'

äŋ- 'to bend' is apparently a variant of *äg-* (tr.). It has one's fingers as objects thrice in TT VA, but is intr. in the Codex Comanicus, in Altai dialects and in Qırghız. *äŋıt-* is frequently spelled with two initial *alif*s but has front vocalism in Brāhmī writing (TT VIII G). *adakınta äŋıtgäli yüküngäli tägim är-* (Maitr 38 v 8), *äŋıtmädük toŋıtmaduk ät'özin* (MaitrGeng 5 a 18), *yüküngülük 'äŋıtgülük yeg üstünki baxşı* (BT VIII B 219) etc. all show front K in the suffix. The aberrant spelling of *äŋıt-tür-* is therefore just an error. Exs. of *äŋıt-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur also in SuvStockh 46 (*töpömin 'äŋıtip* "beuge ich . . . meinen Scheitel . . ."), Warnke 496 (*särinip katıglanıp . . . yuķünüp 'äŋıtip*), Ht IV 395 (*'äŋıtip*), UigTot 245 (*'äŋıtür m(ä)n*), BT VIII Nachtr. 1,9 (*'äŋıtür*), Suv 419,15 (*kamagka . . . ayaguluk äŋıtgülük*, in *UW* 291 b translated "einer, den alle verehren und vor dem sich alle verneigen müssen") and BuddhUig II 505 (*'äŋıtü tur-*). A phrase *äŋıtä ät'özin* appears in U III 12,16 and 38,28, BT III 986, BT XIII 25,10, BT VIII B 37, BuddhUig II 413 (*äŋıtü ätözin*!) and Maitr 141 r 12, 90 r 9, 17 r 3, 13 r 28.[506] If this verb really belongs to the present formation, the converb vowel /A/ is irregular; nor is the meaning easy to accomodate with the usual functions of *-(X)t-*. By meaning it might belong to the formation *-(X)d-* discussed in section 7.23, but texts which do not confuse the dentals write it with T. Cf. *äŋ-iz-* above.)

505 Zieme in GeistDrog confuses the person *in charge* of the treatment with the doctor(s). "Dienst" is too general a term for *yumuş*: The person in charge of treatment fetches doctor and medicine but need not know much about the subject himself. Again, the translation "heilen" for *ämlä-t-* is inappropriate. Nor can I see any "Widerspruch" between this passage and l. 123: The fact that the doctors have to be on guard duty in the monastery does not signify that there is no need to summon them (presumably by the 'YWRX'NY ZM'STYK) to a person who becomes ill: Such a monastery would presumably be a large institution.

506 Similar phrases are *tikä kulgakın* (Höllen 93 and TT X 30), *yinçürü töpün* (16 exs. mentioned under the petrified converb *yinçürü* in section 7.512 above), *titrāyü ünin* (Maitr 11 r 8), *titrāyü (kamşayu) ät'özin* (MaitrGeng 2 b 19-20 and 4 b 11-12), *yaşru köŋlin* (*ibid.* 6 a 1), *külçirā yüzin* (all six Uigur exs. mentioned in the *EDPT* under *külçir-*) and *tälmirā közin* (Suv 637,9, Maitr fr. 105 and QB 6634). In seven among these, the kernel is a noun denoting a part of the body or the body itself. *ün* 'voice', the only exception, is just as natural a part of a person. The phrase is always put to adverbial use. Among the verbs there are both tr. and intr. ones.

äsür-t- 'to intoxicate or make drunk' has an intr. base, q.v. in the *EDPT*. The *EDPT* has *äsürt-* from the DLT and the QB on. Not mentioned there is an ex. in QB 6139, and the clause *yaŋalarka bor içürüp äsürtüp* in Ht IV 793.

ävdi-t- 'to have something gathered' has been read in *anta yänä kayu* [. . .]*mlş nomlarıg ävditip* . . . 'then, again, he let any texts which were [. . .] get collected and . . . (Warnke 104) and *bo . . . nomlarıg ävditip alıp* . . . 'he had these . . . texts gathered, took them and . . .' (*ibid.* 139) and nowhere else. *ävdit-* is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* either, but see Qarakhanid *ävdi-*, *ävdil-* and *ävdin-* quoted there. An Uigur ex. of *ävdi-mä* is discussed above. Finite exs. of *ävdi-* in Uigur are quoted in *EDPT* 42 b under 'E *idi:-*'. *ävditi yıgdı tärin . . . nomlarıg* of HtPar 130,11 is in HtFragm translated as a biverb "er sammelte$_2$"; in view of the perfect forms *tiladi*, *istädi*, *nomladı* etc. with D in the same passage, it could also be a converb *ävdi-t-i*.

ävir-t- is not in the *EDPT*. The form *ävirtiŋiz* quoted in the *DTS* from Suv seems rather to be the perfect of *ävir-* in a sentence very similar to the one quoted below from TT VI 455. What was thought to be '*ävirtsär*' in Ht VII 1994 has in Junshō p. 20 been shown to be a misreading of *ny(a)yanusarı* (the name of a *śästra*). In section 3.32 above we quote two real exs. of *ävir-t-* from Suv 163,18 and 181,17 respectively: *burxanlarka nom tilgänin ävirtgäli ötügçi bol-* and *burxanlarıg nom tilgänin ävirtgükä . . . ötügçi bol-*. This is the causative of *nom tilgänin* (or *nomlug tilgän*) *ävirgäy*, as written in four among eight mss. in TT VI 455 (including B7 in OdaUigh), translated "das Rad der Lehre drehen (und allen Wesen Vorteile bringen)". *ävirt-* is further used in the colophons of BT II (114) + Warnke (r5), as, respectively, *ögi kaŋı kutluglar üçün* and [*bo*] *iki kutluglar üçün ävirtgäli ötünmiş ötügiŋä*. Warnke translates "auf die Bitte des . . . für . . . (Puṇya) zuzuwenden", while BT II has something equivalent to 'to dedicate it to . . .'. It should be considered whether *nom tilgänin* is not to be understood as elliptic object here as well. A further possibility would be to take the verb to signify "to have (the present text) translated for the benefit of the souls of . . .': *ävir-* is well attested as 'to translate'.

edär-t- is a hap. in BT III 193 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *äyrig sarsıg bramanlarıg edärţü ıdtılar* 'They sent the repulsive and disgusting brahmans to pursue (her)'. The cognates *edär-t+çi* and *edär-iş-* are discussed above. The base *edär-* 'to follow' appears to have been a simplex. As Kaz. *iyär-* "folgen", Tob. Krm. *iär-* "erreichen" and Sagay *ezärä* "in einer Reihe" show, the dental was /d/ in spite of spellings with T in Warnke 678, AmitIst 102, TT I 113, TuoLuoNi 270 and 341 and TT VIII F3 (Brāhmī). Concerning this last ex., cf. *adırtla-* spelled with two T's in F4. Most exs. do spell the verb with D. In Ht V 5 a19, Warnke 678, AmitIst 102, TT I 113, TuoLuoNi 270 and 341 and TT VIII F3, the verb has a *y* before the vowel: We interpret this alternation as a reflex of

an original **h*. The aorist of this base is *edärür* in Suv 364,14 and 20, the converb *(y)edärü* in Ht V 5 a 19, Suv 600,3 and 4, BT III 164, TT I 113 (misunderstood) and TT VIII F 3 (read with I in the second syllable).

edilä-t- 'to let somebody own something' is attested in UigSteu A 24 and, with the *d* in a lacuna, *ibid.* 13. The *EDPT* under '**iktü:let-*' quotes the passage of l.24 from its previous ed. in USp 88 and quite misinterprets it; a lemma as postulated (and mistranscribed) in the *EDPT* does not exist. The passages have *bizin kut* "Unsere Majestät" as subject, the *Murutluk* monastery with adjoined land as object and the monks of the monastery as implicit (new) owners. *edi+lä-* 'to own' is discussed among the *+lA-* verbs above.

elsirä-t- 'to dispossess someone of his realm' is in the *EDPT* quoted from several Orkhon Turkic instances. See *el+sirä-* in section 5.5.

ençsirä-t- 'to make somebody insecure or uneasy' is in the *EDPT* quoted with two Uigur exs., and found also in ETŞ 13,145 and BT XIII 16,14. See *enç+sirä-* in section 5.5.

er-it-miş 'loathed, despised' from *yer-* ~ *er-* 'to loathe' appears in *bo muntag beş çöpik bulganyuk eritmiş kısga öztä yaşta* (Maitr 9 v 8 = MaitrGeng 1 b 11). The BT IX index translates the verb as "verfault sein", implying a connection with *(y)iri-* ~ *(y)irü-* 'to rot'. That, however, has a rounded vowel in the second syllable of the Uigur exs., and the causative of an intr. verb does not fit the context; all Uigur evidence for the verb 'to rot' appears *with* the *y*. For semantic and etymological connections cf. *er-in-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs and *yerinçig* in section 3.311. *är işkä yeritti* in DLT fol. 423 has the 'loather' as subject: A literal translation would be 'The man was repulsed by the work'. Cf. *er-itil-miş* in section 7.32.

erinçkä-t- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* and *DTS* but is a hap. in Warnke 235: *yinçürü töpön yükünüp [ön]rä kılmış kılınçlarıg erinçkätü kşanti kılgalı küsägülük* ... The verb in question is not translated by the ed., but should signify 'to evoke compassion (for oneself)'. *erinçkä-* is discussed in section 5.2 above.

et-it- 'to have something erected'. Attested twice in ŞU, and in Tariat S 6; the last is not mentioned in the dictionaries. In all three cases *örgin ... etitdim*; the two inscrs. are related and also otherwise show some overlapping subject matter and phraseology. Uigur and the DLT have *et-dür-* with the same meaning while a Manichaean text has *et-ür-* instead; see both in the next section.

ıra-t- 'to remove, put at a distance; permit to roam'. The three exs. quoted in the *EDPT* from DLT and QB are all written *yırat-*, and cf. *yıraş-* in QB 5659. We further have *ot äm yıratmış k(ä)rgäk* (Heilk II 3,159). Suv 401,1 (quoted in the n. to UigTot 233), however, writes *ırataltım. ıratu* should probably also be read in BT II 288 instead of the unaccountable '*ävrätü*' favoured by the ed.: The text

also writes *ırak* and not *yırak* for 'far'. In addition to the dictionaries' exs., *ıra-* is found also in BT III 174, Warnke 677 and AmitIst 19.

ilgü-t- does not appear in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It should be read in Manichaean ZiemeTexterg I 37, in]K/I *ilg[ū]tzün tep* [, in unintelligible context. This is a cognate of *ilgü-r-* (section 6.3), together with which an ex. for the base is mentioned, and *ilgü-n-*, qq.v. A variant with initial y appears in *uluş känd bäzändi köŋül yilgütür* (QB 3104), *etinmiş kälin täg köŋül yilgütür* (QB 3540) and *bäzänmiş kälin täg köŋül yilgütür* (QB 3567). In view of *köŋül yilgü-* and *köŋül yilgü-r-* quoted above, (*y*)*ilgüt-* appears to have signified 'to activate', with *köŋül* as object perhaps 'to make it beat harder'. Cf. also *ilgün-dür-*.

irklä-t- 'to help someone tread on something' has no doubt been correctly reconstituted in *beş ajunug irkl[ä]t[i]p* . . . in TT III 47. The *EDPT* otherwise quotes the verb only from the DLT, where it has the shape *iklät-*. The *EDPT* has suggested reading a verb appearing in KP 65,5 as *irklä-*; otherwise, the base is attested in BT II 617, 691, 841, 1079 and 1332 and in the DLT (again as *iklä-*). /t/ is often elided in triple clusters. *irklä-* cannot be shown to be derived, against Tekin, 1986: 158: The DLT's '*äkläş-*' is isolated and should be emended; the *original* meaning of *äz-* appears to have been 'to slit, gash, incise, furrow' and not as stated there (there is no early evidence for the meaning 'to crush'). The DLT's *äz-ig*, *äzil-*, *äzit-* and *äztür-* all refer to lengthwise scratching of the skin.

isi-t- 'to heat something' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. It appears also in Heilk II,1 102 and Maitr 152 v25. See *isi-g* in section 3.101 for (intr.) base and cognates.

istä-t- 'to have someone or something sought' is in the *DTS* and the *EDPT* quoted from Suv and the DLT. It is found also in BT III 565 and Warnke 97 (biverb with *tilät-*). The tr. *istä-* is discussed in section 5.13.

işlä-t- 'to let something function; make somebody do something; to put to work, put to use etc.'. *EDPT*[507] and *DTS*, the latter also s.vv. *yorït- išlät-*, '*išlätgülüg*' and others. Further exs. occur in BuddhKat 36, BuddhUig II 549, Ht V 8 a17, IV 1014 and VII 10 a26 and 12 b18, ManMon 5, 20, 38 and 102, HamTouen 23,19, Maitr 157 r24 and 27, 62 v15, 73 r26 and 177 r12, Abhi 1070-71 and 1080, ShōAgon 1,149, ShōAv 286 and elsewhere. *iş+lä-* is both tr. and intr.; *işlät-* governs both animate and inanimate objects.

kagansıra-t- 'to deprive a people of its *kagan*' is quoted in the *EDPT*. Both it and *kagan+sıra-* (q.v. in section 5.5 above) are found only in Orkhon Turkic.

kalı-t- 'to raise into the air' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and from KP: *kalıtı eltdi* (KP LII 3) should, however, be the vowel converb rather than the perfect. Cf. *kaldur-* below. *kalı-* 'to rise into the air' is, beside what the *EDPT*

507 The reference to USp 82,28 should be changed to 88,29.

has, attested also in Ht V 3 b 14. *sögüt turkınta idiz kök* [*kalık*]*da kalı-* (Maitr 197 r 8) is 'to rise up into the air as high as a tree' and not as translated by the ed. ManTürkGed 8 should have been read as *k(a)ra kuzguntäg . . . kal'ıy(ı)n*; cf. *yoŋıy(ı)n* in the previous l. for the shape of the suffix.

kam-ıt-mış 'knocked down' is attested in MaitrGeng 9 b 9, Maitr 101 v 13 (*yemri[l]miş, amarı 'ämitmiş kamıtmış y(a)ylak* (i.e. /yaylık/) *kışlık aşlık k(a)znakları*) and Ht V 2 a 5 ([*ä*]*mitmiş kamıtmışı* [*käd*]*girmişi artamışı yok*). The *EDPT* quotes the verb from two QB couplets, in which it is also associated with *ämit-* (an intr. verb, apparently a simplex). Clauson's translation of these is unlikely and awkward, as he takes the verb to be a double causative. Cf. *kam-* 'to strike down' in the *EDPT* and *kam-ıl-* 'to be struck down, fall to the ground' in section 7.31 above. Uigur may not have had any finite forms of *kam-ıt-*.

kamşa-t- 'to make something or someone waver or shake' is documented in the *EDPT* from runic and Manichaean texts. It appears also in Maitr 128 v 30 in a biverb with *täprä-t-*.

kan-ıt- appears to have been the purely grammatical causative of *kan-*, whereas *kan-tur-* (q.v. below), which is much better attested, has the more lexical meaning 'to satiate, to satisfy (physically, directly)'. *kanı(t)dıŋız* is correctly translated in HamTouen 23,9 as "vous (nous) aves fait bien plaisir". In the DLT (q.v. in the *EDPT*) it signifies 'to make cheerful'.

karar-t- 'to blacken, to darken (tr.)' is by the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted only from DLT and QB. Attested also in BT III 47 and 50. Add also *ot yarokın ı(ä)ŋri yarokın karartzun* (UigSukh 50) 'May (that light) outshine the brightness of fire and the brightness of the sky (i.e. make them appear as dark)'. The BT III exs. signify 'to dim'.

karga-t-mış kün 'accursed day' appears in TT VIII P 35 and 39. The *EDPT* only quotes the DLT, where it signifies 'to have something cursed'. *karga-* is tr.

kavza-t- 'to surround oneself with, to be surrounded'. *EDPT* s.v. *kavzat-* and *DTS* s.vv. *qavsat-* and '*egirt- qavšat-*' quote it several times from Suv and from TT VIII F 5, where it is spelled with Z. The very common spelling with S may not be due to the confusion of sibilants in all cases: Cf. the shape *kabsa-* which the base shows in DLT fols. 88, 233 and 569. One is reminded of the passage of the 3rd person imperative suffix from *-zUn* to *-sUn*. Exs. of *kavzat-* not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in Ht VII 7 a 16 (*t(ä)rkän* [*teg*]*in ı(ä)ŋrim Samtso açarı* [*ikä*]*gü birlä bardı. bäglär* [*üz*]*ä kavzatıp . . .*) and ShōKenkyū III 12. Cf. *kavzat-ıglıg* (section 3.119) and *kavza-tıl-* (section 7.32) above. *kavza-* 'to surround' may well be a simplex. The *EDPT* entries *kapsa:-* and *kavza:-* should be united, as the lemmata are synonymous variants; there is no reason to take the DLT labial stop to have been unvoiced. Three further exs. of *kavza-* appear in BT XIII. BuddhUig II 353 should (according to Zieme, personal

communication, against the ed.) be read as *kavzayu tägirmiläyü*, a biverb. The Suv 490,15 ex. of *kavzat-* is best translated in *UW* 202 b top where, for some reason, it is transcribed as '*kavšatu*'.

kay-ıt- is attested in *bo savag* (i.e. /savıg/) *äşidip tinï[n] kerü kayıı tartap* (i.e. /tartıp/) . . . *yanıp bardı* 'When he heard these words he pulled his reins in backward direction and . . . rode back' in ManManus v3. This is the reading of the USp edition of the text, well visible on the facs., against Le Coq's version (which does not make any sense either). The *EDPT* accepts the present reading, but its interpretation of the word is refuted in n. 455 above. See the *EDPT* for exs. of *kay-* 'to turn or tend towards something; to pay respect'; particularly similar to the present context is *kerü kaydı* 'He turned back' and *nälük . . . kerü körüp kaymadıŋ* "Why did you not pay heed and turn back?" in DLT fol. 553. Cf. also *yaŋalar bägi . . . tägzinü kadrılu kayıp . . .* 'the lord of the elephants . . . twisted back around and . . .' (MaitrGeng 7 a5). Further exs. of *kay-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* are *t(ä)ŋridäm közin bärü kayıp . . .* "(Sie mögen sich) mit göttlichem Auge hierher wenden" (Maitr 1 v25) and *Ärnem elig sukançıg körtlä közin kayıp . . .* "le roi Araṇemi, tournant (vers eux) ses beaux yeux doux, . . ." (HamTouen 1,43). These are a link to the phrase *kaya bak-/kör-* listed separately in *EDPT* 675 a.

kayına-t- 'to boil (tr.)'. The *EDPT* has it only from the DLT on; *kayınaţıp* also appears seven times in Heilk II,1 (see the index thereto). A stem *kayna-* appears, according to the *EDPT*, only from texts of the XIIIth century on, but is nevertheless the original shape of what appears in Uigur and Qarakhanid Turkic as *kayın-*: See Erdal, 1979 a: 115, and *kayın-tur-* below.

kälür-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted once from U III.[508] It is used also in *yag alıp kälürtüp* (Ernte 64), *Xuitex açarıg kälürtüp . . . bo savlarıg sözlädi* (Ht X559), *käntüsi tiktürmiş kraja kälürtüp körkitti* 'He had brought the clothes which he had had sewn and showed them' (HtPar 4 r14-17) and *t(ä)rkin şoo an[tın] algalı ıdıp yog şastr[ı]g kälürtdi* 'He had the Yogācāryabhūmiśāstra brought, sending somebody to get it speedily from Chang An' (HtPar 119,16 quoted in *UW* 86 a s.v. *al-* par. 3,a). 'to have something or somebody brought': *käl-ür-* is tr., *kälürt-* in all exs. a double causative without explicit intermediate agent.

kärgäklä-t-gäli is a hap. in ETŞ 11,58, not mentioned in the dictionaries. 'to make one need something'. See *kärgäk+lä-* 'to need' among the *+lA-* verbs.

keŋä-t- should signify 'to give counsel', seeing that *keŋ+ä-* (q.v. among the *+A-* verbs) signifies 'to seek somebody's counsel'; cf. also *keŋä-ş-*. *keŋät-* appears in BT II 940, *nätägin k(ä)ntü özüm keŋätgäli boşungalı ugay biz?* 'How will we be

508 Clauson writes '*kälürtip*', but both edition and facs. have *kälürtüp*.

able to counsel ourselves so as to get free?'[509] The proper name *El K(e)ŋäimiš Saŋun* (Pfahl I 17) probably also comes from this verb: The text has '*kike*', but cf. the facs.

keŋür-t- is specific to Ht, appearing in IV 1735 and VII 2 b 1, 3 a 14 and 23, 7 b 8, 15 a 24 and 20 b 5 (= 1976, the only ex. mentioned in the *EDPT*). It also appears to have been repeated in the colophons for all the books of the work, as *Gentsung vapşı atl(ı)g nomçı açarı keŋürtmiš* 'the law master named Yentsung elaborated upon it'; we have it for the VIIth (= 23 b 20 = 2153) and the IXth (in p. 10 of Tezcan's ed. of the Xth). The other exs. also have the doctrine, texts of the doctrine or metaphorical reference to the doctrine as object, and can also be translated as 'to propagate'.[510] This is in fact a synonym for the obsolescent *keŋü-r-*, which had a revival in late texts but was in 'classical' Uigur mainly represented by the petrified converb *keŋürü*; see both in section 7.51 above.

kır-t-mış 'shaved off' appears in ms. T I D 596 r 11, in the n. to TT VII 22: *saçı kırt kırtmış ärsä[r]*, . . . 'if his hair is shaved off short'. Arat writes the second and third words quoted as one word, but *kırt* must in fact be the *-(U)t* derivate from *kır-* discussed in section 3.108. *kır-ıl-* is the normal finite passive of *kır-*, but *-(X)t-* is appropriate for the perfect participle; the hair's 'bearer' can, moreover, be taken to have initiated the shaving. *kırtış* 'surface' may possibly, in some way, come from *kırt-*.

kızar-t-mış 'red-hot' appears at least fifteen times in Maitr and in Höllen 33 and qualifies *tämir* or *tämirlig*, *kızıl bakır* or *kızıl bakırlıg*, *örtlüg tämir* or *esiç*. The *EDPT* quotes none of these but has one Uigur ex. of *kızartmış*, and the morphologically varied DLT and QB evidence. Exs. from QB 3977, 4117, 4868, 5119, 5779 and 6002 should be added to the entry. All these QB exs. and the ones quoted in the *EDPT* signify 'to make somebody's face glow from pleasure'.

komı-t- 'to inspire, arouse, fill with yearning' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and QB. Attested also in *mäŋikä komıţu ilişälim* 'let us arouse and collectively engage in . . . happiness' (ETŞ 13,72). Intr. *komı-* is found in BT III 428, beside the Qarakhanid exs. mentioned in the *EDPT*.

kork-ut ~ *kork-ıt-* 'to frighten'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter under *ürkitmämäk qorqītmamaq*. Appears also in ETŞ 13,111 and 15,42 (*korkıţur*), Maitr 113 r 6 and 199 r 11, Profan p. 282, BT VII A 413 (*korkıţu tur-*) and BT XIII 33,9. The exs. of Chuast and Suv are biverbs with *ürkit-*. ChuastBeitr ms. U also writes

509 The context demands a rhetorical question and not 'irgendwie . . .'. The singular *özüm* was probably overlooked when copying the text from a source in which only a single confessor was provided for.

510 I am at a loss for an appropriate English term; what is meant is the whole activity of a 'teacher'.

korkıt(ıt)m(ı)z ürkit(it)m(i)z ärsär. For the second vowel, which is unrounded in Uigur, cf. especially *korkınç* in section 3.104 and *korkız-* in section 7.55.

kotur-t- 'to have (a text) copied' is in the *DTS* quoted from Suv 18,23: *. . . atl(ı)g nom ärdinig tavratı bititgil. . . . ol nom ärdini yana bo tägrä adın yerdä yok. yalaŋuz mäniŋ ävimtä ök bar ärür. anı alıp koturıgıl tep tedi* '" . . . It exists only in my house. Take it and have it copied" he said.' Further exs. appear in TuoLuoNi 213 = 216, 234 and 379. Cf. *kotur-* < *kod-tur-* among the *-tUr-* verbs below.

kov-ıt- 'to get chased' appears in Maitr 5 r25-6: *bir kuşlagu kuşka kovıtmış kökürçgün muŋka tarka t[ā]gip Şariputrı arxantnıŋ köligäsiŋä sıgıntı* "Eine von einem Jagdvogel verfolgte Taube hatte sich in der Not (Hend.) in den Schatten des Arhat Śāriputra gedrückt". The verb in *üç kökürçgän atayı laçınka kavıtur ärkän . . .* in Suv 620,20-21 is either an error or a mistake for *kovıt-*: The scenes in the two passages are identical; '*kavıt-*' can't be connected with the base of *kavış-* and *kavır-* because of its meaning. It can't come from *kap-* 'to grasp, snatch' as there is a phonemic opposition between /p/ and /v/, and is unlikely to be an error for '*kap-ıt-*' as such a verb is not attested. The first ex. is not mentioned in the *EDPT* and the second is given a quite aberrant interpretation on p. 582.[511] The *EDPT* quotes *kov-* 'to chase, pursue etc.' from the DLT and the QB on. Closest to the Uigur exs. is the phrase *laçın kuş kovar täg* in QB 2381, probably 'as when a falcon hunts a bird'.

köli-t- 'to shade, screen, guard' or, metaphorically, 'to put into the shade'. The *EDPT* quotes the KP ex., which has what is screened as direct object. Similarly in BT XIII 27,28 of a god to screen the plants, *ı tarıglarıg*. Grammatically similar but as a metaphor in BT XIII 58,44, *aç kız [. . . al]ko adalartın / apıtu kölitü[*. In UigSukh 49 and 70 and ETŞ 10,34, where the verb signifies 'to put into the shade', the direct object is the glaring entity, *kün çogı* in ETŞ, *kün yarokı* and *ay yarokı* in UigSukh 49 (parallel to the sentence quoted under *karar-t-* above).[512] The base is, in Old Turkic, used only in TT VIII D38, and there translates Skt. *paripālita* 'shielded, screened, guarded': This shows it to have been intr. The DLT's *köli-* 'to bury a corpse' and *kölit-* 'to have a corpse buried' have some semantic connection with the Uigur verbs; they belong to a different dialect, however, and cannot, in this case, be used for explaining anything about Uigur usage. Cf. also *köli-k* and *köli-gä* above.

köpir-t- 'to make a liquid froth'. *EDPT* under *köpürt-* from DLT and QB on. In

511 Unacceptable for the reasons mentioned is the translation of the clause in *UW* 259 a s.v. *atay* par. A,b.

512 The ETŞ instance is part of an extended metaphor in a passage quoted on p. 147 as an example for metaphorical *+lXg*.

QB 2382, two of the mss. have *köpirtür* and the third a corrupt form.[513] Add *köpirtü yaşartu udaçı* from ETŞ 10,37 (a metaphorical passage which also has a form of *kölit-*). Cf. *köpir-* in section 6.3 and *köpik* in section 3.102.

(*körKit-* 'to show, display, evidence, come up with, let experience' has a rounded second vowel only in Maitr 83 r 12, UigTot 36 and in some mss. in the QB. The only QB instance in which all three mss. have U there occurs in couplet 659. The *EDPT* gives consistently *körgüt-* for the DLT; as DankKelly show, however, that is the variant of the second hand: The first hand always writes I. The second velar is explicitly K (Manichaean letters) in TT III 56 and 58 and, damaged, 127, but G in 73; this preponderance of K does not mean much, as the text in fact confuses the velars. Nor is the spelling '*körgit-*' of *UW* (passim) and *EDPT* justified. The verb clearly comes from *kör-* 'to see', but can be explained either as *kör-(X)k-It-* or *körk+i-t-*: We don't have an *-(X)k-* derivate (section 7.24) from *kör-*, however, and the Old Turkic causative from *-(X)k-* verbs is formed with *-Ar-* (as *bütKär-*, *kısKar-* and *tarkar-*). Taking it to come from an unattested *+I-* derivate from *körk* 'appearance, shape etc.' seems preferable (like *öl+i-t-*, *sämri-t-*, *yavrı-t-*, *ükli-t-*, *yaltrı-t-*, *soç+ı-t-*, *yagr+ı-t-*, *yıd+ı-t-* and *üz+i-t-*). Exs. of *körKit-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in ETŞ 9,26, 10,12 and 76, 19,9, 20,107 etc., Pfahl II 25 (read with *ä* in the second syllable), Maitr 58 r 26, 175 v 13 and 202 r 9 (*körKitirlär ayurlar ärdi* in *UW* 227 b translated as "sie haben prophezeit$_2$"), BT VII B 117, BuddhUig I 75, ShōAv 330 (*kōrKiṭü y(a)rlıka-*), BT VIII A 410 and 420, B 43 and Anh. 2+3,11, 12 and 21, UigTot 335, 517, 587, 590 and 847 (*ukıṭur körKiṭür*), Ht V 10 a 8, Suv 267,22 (quoted in *UW* 248 b), 389,7 (*körKiṭürlär*) and 600,13 and elsewhere. Cf. *kört-Kür-* and *kör-tür-*.

köşi-t- 'to use something for the obstruction of sunlight; to hide something away from sight'. The second meaning occurs in Suv 693,2 and TuoLuoNi 131. Another ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* occurs in BT III 107. Cf. *köşit-il-* above, also for the meaning of *köşi-*; I know of this latter only as a hap. in the DLT, but *köşi-gä* and *köşi-k* are more common.

(*kötit-miş* 'high, eminent', is not mentioned in the dictionaries but appears in *kötitmiş çoglug* 'he of the eminent blaze' (ETŞ 10,279), *küvänçi kötitmiş täŋrilär* (BT III 996), *kötitmiş arslanlıg ordo* (*ibid.* 997) and *kötitmiş yeg* [*y*]*onglıg* 'he of the high and superior gait' (BT XIII 27,24). A clear finite ex. of this verb occurs in Ht V 7 a 12: *olar antag ötün*[*dü*]*kdä ötrü Vayşıravanı m(a)xaraç* [*öŋ*]*dünintäki yer kötitdi ınça k(a)ltı ämig täg* . . . 'After they thus presented their wish, the earth to the east of Vaiśravaṇa lifted up just like a breast'. Also in Suv 595,15, where *burunı wvişip kötitsär* corresponds to a Chin. phrase

513 The *EDPT* has "*köpirtir* (sic)", which is wrong.

translated as "wenn der Nasenrücken sich biegt": The Uigur translator must have been thinking of the convex aspect of such a curvature. *kötüt-* appears to be a near-synonym of the hap. *kötgi+r-* (section 5.45) which comes from *kötgi* 'swelling, protrusion, hillock, mound' (section 3.110). Their base is not found in Old Turkic, but Yak. has intr. *köt-* 'to fly up, skip, jump' while Azeri shows tr. *göt-* 'to lift up'; see n. 424 above for sources and derivates. Since *kötüt-* is not tr. and since it is mostly used as perfect participle, it should come from a tr. base; *kötür-* 'to raise, lift up, bear, carry away', on the other hand, is clearly a *-Ur-* derivate from an intr. base. Exceptionally, the base may have been both tr. and intr. in the protolanguage.[514])

kurı-t- 'to dry (tr.)' is in the *EDPT* quoted thrice from Heilk I, from DLT and QB. It is attested also thrice in UigTot 491-493.

kuvra-t- 'to collect, assemble (tr.)' is in the *EDPT* quoted from runic, Manichaean and Buddhist sources but not from Qarakhanid. Exs. from BT II 145, Ht V 5 b26 and Maitr 79 r1 and 5 and 96 v4 are not mentioned in the *EDPT*. The ex. mentioned last (*kuratır*) and the ones in Suv 134,18 and 137,4 have the shape *kurat-*. The Maitr 79 exs. are reedited in Laut, 1986: 202; the subject in them is the sinner and not the sins (as would follow from Laut's translation). *kuvra-g* and *kuvra-n-* are cognates, and see intr. *kuvra-* in the *EDPT*.

küçsirä-t- 'to weaken (tr.)' appears in Suv as quoted in the *DTS* under '*kev-* *küç-sirät-*' and under *küčsirätmāk*, and in ETŞ 10,125. Not in the *EDPT*. See *küç+sirä-* in section 5.5; it sometimes appears in a biverb with *kävil-*.

kükrä-t- 'to cause to thunder or roar' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It appears in BT XIII 27,24 in a biverb with *çıkra-t-* quoted above under *köl-ür-*. See *kükrä-* in section 5.32 above.

kürä-t- is in the DLT translated as 'to incite (someone else's slave) to run away'. In Maitr 80 r4, *ol ok kişi*[. . .] *eşilärin kürätip yazınsar*, it is 'to seduce somebody else's wife to adultery'. In QB 6526, 6541 and 6536 (all three in the ode) it signifies 'to let (a bird one was trying to catch etc.) get away'. A further ex. appears in fragmentary context in TT VIII A 8. The *EDPT* mentions only one of the QB exs. and the DLT. See *kür+ä-*, *kürä-g* etc. above.

nomla-t- 'to let somebody preach something' appears in ShōAv 57 and 325 with *bo sudur ärdini+g* as object, in TT VI 53 (4 among 7 mss.; cf. TT VI New 4,9 and n.) with *bo nom bitig+ig* as object. Only the latter is mentioned in the *DTS*, none in the *EDPT*. See *nom+la-* above; its passives are *nomla-l-* and *nomla-tıl-*.

514 Quite a different verb, *kwẅti-t-* 'to make something smell pleasantly', *may* have stood in Windgott 37: [*ta*]*t*(ı)*gl*(ı)*g ädgü yıd tützük urur kwẅt*[*i*]*tir*; a bit of the upper end of the second T seems visible: 'He puts up incense sticks of pleasant$_2$ smells and makes them emit (their) fragrance'. But the reading is quite dubious and there is no other ex. of this causative. See *kwẅti-* on p. 483.

ogşa-t- 'to compare'. *EDPT* s.vv. '*oxşat-*, *oxşatğuluksuz*, *oxşatığsız*' and '*oxşatı*' (petrified converb discussed below). Other derivates from *ogşat-* are *ogşatığsız* and *ogşatınçsız*, discussed above in section 3.12 together with further exs. of *ogşatguluksuz*. *ogşatsar yoläşfürsär* in Suv 156,10 and finite exs. in Maitr 38 r17 and 127 v23 are not mentioned in the *EDPT*. The base is written as *ogşa-* in Windgott 50 in Manichaean writing, which distinguishes between back and front-vowel /g/ on the one hand, between voiced and voiceless velar consonant phonemes on the other. Before /ş/, this /g/ appears to have been pronounced as a fricative and not as a stop: Four times *oHşatı* in Brāhmī writing are quoted below, and ms. Mz 647 e A 8 (Brāhmī) in n. 15 to Maue, 1984: 93 has *oHşamaz*. Maue, 1984 shows how H is often also used for phones belonging to /g/. The velar here appears to have been a voiced velar fricative, [ɣ]. *ogşa-* should constitute a minimal pair with *oxşa-* 'to caress'. In Qarakhanid Turkic, however, the opposition was suppressed, as voice assimilation set in: In the DLT and the QB both verbs appear as *oxşa-*.

okı-t- 'to have someone call out or recite something, have someone summoned' is sometimes impossible to distinguish from *uk-ıt-*, but there is no problem concerning the exs. quoted in the *EDPT*. The TT VI 52 instance appears only in 4 among 7 mss. In TT VI 74, only one among 7 mss. has this, while the rest have *okı-* instead; it should probably not be in the text. A number of ETŞ exs. are open to doubt. Add *okıtdaçı sözlädäçi* from BT II 1311. *okıtu* InçA *tep sözlādilār* in ShōAv 148 does not signify "rezitieren . . ." but 'had them called and said thus:'. *bitigüçi vapşıka okıtdı* (Ht X 605) is 'he had it recited by the learned scribe' but *bitkäçini okıtıp* (TuoLuoNi 377) 'to have a scribe called'. *konşi im bodis(a)tvıg . . . okıtsar* (ibid. 238) should have been translated as 'if he gets bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara evoked' and not as translated.

(*olgurt-* 'to seat' may have come from **ol(o)r-ur-t-* by /r/ dissimilation: Since *olor-* 'to sit' cannot be shown to be derived, I prefer this account to the hypothesis that there was a *-gUr-* verb underlying *olgurt-*.[515] Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Höllen 139, KPZieme 6, Maitr 170 r2 and 9, UigTot 130, Ht VII 1 b17 and 4 b9, HtPar 45,4 quoted in a n. to Ht VII 1859, HtPar 4 r2-4, ms. Mz 713 (T II Y 58) 23 quoted in the n. to UigSteu B 8 (strangely enough translated as "sie ließen sich . . . nieder"), Ht V 7 a20 and ShōAv 208. It can also mean 'to cause to sit' or, as in HtPar 45,4, 'to make reside'.

olor-t- is attested in the phrase *kagan olort-* 'to enthrone as *kagan*', causative of

515 *oldwr- ~ oltwr-* 'to sit' in Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic is *not* a *-tUr-* causative but a variant of *olor-* itself; I agree with the explanation in *EDPT* 150 b top. We already have *oltrup* in M II 11,13 (text 4), which also shows how the dental could have been introduced when the second vowel of *olor-* was syncopated. Cf. n. 324 in vol. 1.

kagan olor- 'to be enthroned'. The *EDPT* has the (runic) exs. The second vowel of *olor-* is /o/ in Brāhmī in TT VIII B16 and C12 and Ätsü 4 v c ('emended' by the eds.) and cf. Yak. *olor-* and Chuv. *lar-*.

oŋar-t- is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is a hap. in ETŞ 12,53 signifying 'to make somebody comprehend'. See *oŋar-* in section 7.52.

orna-t- 'to settle something, put it to where it belongs, put something right'. Cognates are mentioned under intr. *orn+a-*, q.v. above. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter also s.v. *turyurmaq ornatmaq. turyur- ornat-* is found also in BT III 417. Appears also in BT I $A_2$39 and D (186), BT II 863, ETŞ 14,24, BT XIII 58,6, Ht IV 1135 and X 153 and 233, BT VIII A 308, CYK 23 and 28, BuddhUig II 123, and v 8 has a N.Pr. *El Ornatmış*.

otla-t- is a not quite certain hap. in Maitr 201 r28 (BT IX 251,28_1): *otın aŋızın yılkıka otlat(ı)mız*; the ms. has only one T and the second one is added for the construction. See *ot+la-* (DLT) above also for another Uigur cognate.

oyna-t- 'to make (somebody, people) dance' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT on. It is attested also in *tokuz bag oyun ätizdürti. baçınlıg bödigin böditip ulatı kamag mıŋ beş yüz türlüg oyun oyn[a]tıp* . . . (Ht VII 5 b7) ". . . in all they had fifteen hundred different sorts of dances done".[516]

ög-üt-miş ~ *ög-it-miş* 'one who has deserved praise' is documented in the *EDPT* and in the *DTS* s.vv. *ögit-* and *ögüt-*. See Erdal, 1979: 152 ff. for the alternation in the formative. Further exs. of *ögüt-miş* occur in Maitr 81 r6 and 122 r5, Nest U 323, ATSS, HamTouen 5,17, 19 and 22. See *ög-(ī)til-* (section 7.32) above and *ög-* 'to praise' in the *EDPT*.

ögir-t- 'to give joy' is not in the *EDPT* and is quoted in the *DTS* with one Suv ex. Add *ögirtgülük* (ETŞ 10,141), *ögirtür* (ETŞ 15,45), *k(ä)ntü özlärin ögirtü turup sävintürüp* (SuvGeng 598,20). U II 63,5_1 (Utsukmaksız Darni) should be read as *ögirtdä[çi]*.[517] *ögir-* is intr.

(*ögrät-* 'to accustom, instruct or train a person, to tame or train an animal' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT and the QB on (where it rather signifies 'to teach'). Add *atlar yaŋalarıg turgurdaçı ögrätdäçi ärtimiz* (Maitr 110 r3), in *UW* 253 a translated as "wir waren Züchter und Dompteure von Pferden und Elefanten"; *baxşınıŋ ögrätmiş . . . yaŋlarıg* (thus UigTot 135) "vom Guru gelehrten . . . Weisen"; *at ögrätdilär, alp äränlärig kuvratdılar* (Ht V 5 b25) "trainierten sie die Pferde" und *ujik akşar tözlüg üzä adınka ögrätsär* (Buddh-

516 This is Arlotto's translation. The persons who are the agents of these verbs are mentioned in 5 a26-b1. The translation in *UW* 146 a, "insgesamt führten sie 1500 verschiedene Tänze auf" is wrong, as it takes the dancers to be the subjects; in that case the verb would have been *oyna-*.

517 And not as '*ögirün-*' with the ed., nor '*ögrün-*' with the *EDPT*: See the facs.

Uig I 377) "... den anderen beibringt". The base is not attested, but see ögrän- among the *-(X)n-* verbs for the likely etymology. *ögrät-in-* and *ögrät-ig* are common derivates.)

ögsirä-t- 'to make somebody unconscious' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 288, in a biverb with *tınsıra-t-*: *tançgayur ögsirätür tınsıraţur yıgla[ţur] sıgtaţur*. See *ög+sirä-* in section 5.5.

öli-t- 'to wet, to moisten' comes from *öl+i-* (section 5.42). *EDPT* and *DTS* quote it only from the DLT. Found also in BT III 558, HtPek 74 b 7-9 (with *yagmurla-*) and *luu bäglärі yıdl(ı)g yıparlag* (i.e. /yıparlıg/) *suv(ı)n yerig ölitü saçarlar ärdi* (MaitrGeng 9 a 8). *ölitip ootlug oprılarıg yalın üzä köyürmişig* "befeuchtete er die Feuer-Gruben, das in Flammen Brennende" of HtPar 131 r2 corresponds to *ölitdi* [. . . *mi]şig* of the fr. with which it is edited in HtFragm II 24.[518]

ölür-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted from two Suv exs., where it signifies 'to get somebody killed'.[519] Suv 8,11 has *täk s(ä)n munça munça tınl(ı)glarıg ölürtmişkä* 'just because you have put to death so many creatures . . .'. There is a non-immixtive in Ht IV 573: *bizni üçün ükü̈ş kişi ölürtgümüz ol* 'Because of ourselves we will inevitably get many people killed (sc. by not hindering the lion from killing them)'. M III 25,12$_3$ (text 9) should probably read *yäklärkä ɋlürţmäyin* 'Let me not get killed by the demons!'. The potential cause of this instance is the victim himself. *öl-ür-* 'to kill' and 'to cause to die' is discussed above.

ör-it- 'to raise, to arouse, to bring up'. There are dozens of exs. in which the verb has this form, versus five late ones in which it has been read as *ört-*: *küsüş örtgil bulgalı* . . . (ShōAgon 1,147), *t(ä)rs körüm örtdüm ärsär* (U II 85,26 with question mark under the *t*; original now apparently lost), *çaydi örţmäkdin* "durch das errichten eines *Caityas*" (CYK 32), *biz kuluţlarıg iç ordoŋuzta örţiŋ* (BT III 1105) and *körmäk bilmäklig bulıt örţüp* "er läßt die Wolke des Sehens und Wissens . . . aufziehen" (ETŞ 10,33 with facs. against the ed.; translation from *UW* 79 b s.v. *akaš*). The n. to CYK 32 may be right (in spite of the two prose exs. mentioned first) in attributing the syncopation to the metre,[520] but cf. *ör-k* from the *-(O)k* formation. In polysyllables the loss of the vowel of *-(X)t-* ~

518 In HtPar, Zieme and Kudara's *öli[tdi]* should be *ölitip* by Gabain's old transcription quoted in Mayer and Röhrborn, 1986: 119. Their translation "indem er die Feuer-Gruben befeuchtete, wo [die Wesen] durch Flammen verbrennen" may be the 'easier' one but just cannot arbitrarily be read into the text: There *are* two grammatical objects with a common referent; to write "(es) sei noch bemerkt, daß wir nicht von "zwei Objekten" ausgehen" will not do. Case congruence is, of course, to be expected in apposition, but such apposition is (to my knowledge) never a local complement. The Brāhmī ex. quoted by the authors shows *parallel* apposition and thus disproves their point.

519 '*bizni*', which Clauson brings as the object of the Suv 7,3 ex., is actually a conjecture in a lacuna.

520 The lack of harmony in BT III *örţiŋ* instead of the regular imperative **öritiŋ* speaks for *ad hoc* syncopation. Cf. also Erdal, 1986.

-(I)t- after /r/ always takes place. Maitr 63 r22 and 59 v4 and 6 have a variant *örüt-*. Most of the attested exs. of *örit-* denote the induced appearance of a mental state, as in the U II ex. quoted. Most common is *köŋül örit-*, with *köŋül* marked by a Chin. ideogram in BuddhUig I 250. Further exs. of this not noted in the dictionaries can be found in Suv 141,18, BT VII A 15 and 391, BT VIII A 109 and 372, CYK 47, ShōAv 215 and at least 11 times in Maitr. There also is *küsüş örit-* (Maitr 190 r2, ShōAv 297 and 324, AbitAnk 39), *bilig örit-* (Maitr 33 v28 and 217 r1 and ShōKenkyū II 14), *dyan örit-* (Maitr 148 r29, UigTot 1175 and BT VIII A 375), *küni örit-* (Maitr 59 v9 and 217 r4) and *sakınç örit-* (Maitr 216 v13), with the first element always getting further qualified. Further exs. in the ETŞ and elsewhere.

(*örlät-* 'to annoy etc.' is presumably an *-(X)t-* verb, but the semantic connection with *örlä-* (discussed among the *+lA-* verbs) and with its derivate *örlā-n-* is hard to find. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* appear in U III 81,26, ManTüTex 385, Maitr 82 r30 and TuoLuoNi 190. TuoLuoNi 187, however, should probably be emended to read *örlätil-* (a verb documented above among the *-(X)l-* verbs), in parallel with *adak-* and *bulgaţıl-*. A biverb *örlätdi bulgadı* is attested elsewhere.)

saç-ıt- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and the QB. There it has exs. like *ol anıŋ meŋisin saçıttı* (DLT fol. 415) "He beat him until he scattered his brain" and *saçıttı közin* (QB 4845) "scattered their eyes". A similar ex. occurs in LautHöllen 90:]*lArIn sokup t*[*öpölärі*]*n tālā meyi*[*lār*]*in saçıtı b*[. . ., with the same object as in the DLT. The difference between *saç-* (q.v. in the *EDPT*) and *saçıt-* appears to be in the specific domain of the latter's objects; the victim's person may have been conceived of as the intermediate subject of *saçıt-*.

saçra-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT, where it signifies 'to accidentally splash, spatter or scatter (tr.)'. Found also in *vıjır tumşuklug kuşlar kargalar kälip töpörä sokup karakımızını saçraturlar* '. . . thrust (their beaks) onto (our) heads and make our eyeballs spirt out' (Maitr 203 r5). The sentence is strikingly similar to the LautHöllen ex. of *saçıt-* in form and to the QB ex. of *saçıt-* in content. *saçra-* is quoted above in section 5.31 from Maitr with 'eyes' as subject, etc.

sanç-ıt- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from TT I 67, where it signifies "to be routed". The same meaning is found in Ht IV 783 and V 6 a3, while *süŋün yürākrā san*[*çı*]*tmış osuglug bolup* . . . (Maitr 33 r8) is about being 'as if pierced in one's heart with a lance'.[521]

sark-ıt- 'to pour down drop by drop, to drip-dry' etc. is in the *EDPT* quoted from

521 The translation in BT IX 102,8$_1$ wrongly writes "wie einer, der . . . sticht", but that would have been *sanç-*.

the DLT on. Also in ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) edited in SktUigBil: *yogtosı[n-da]kı suvın [sa]rkıtu akıtı arslan*, in the ed.'s translation of the Skt. original, "schüttelte der dann eilends das Mähnenwasser in Tropfen ab, der Mähnige". This ex. is in Brāhmī script.

(sars-ıt- 'to ill-use somebody and treat him harshly' is quoted by the *EDPT* from the DLT. See p. 535 for the base. *sarsıt-* becomes *sasıt-* in QB 4756 (identified correctly in Tezcan's review of the QB İndeks). See *sars-ıg* above. Both Uigur exs. of *sars-* have it in a biverb with *sök-*, and *sarsıg* is also often used of ill language.)

sası-t- 'to cause to stink' is a TT X hap. quoted in the *EDPT*. Otherwise attested in Middle Turkic: The QB instance of the *EDPT* belongs to *sarsıt-*. The TT X ex. is a biverb with *yıdı-t-*, as *sası-* and *yıdı-* appear together in Maitr 174 r 19 and v 9 and 74 r 9. Cf. *sası-g* above. If *sas* 'vapour' in the Codex Comanicus is correct and old, *sası-* would be an *+I-* derivate from it.

saş-ıt- to confuse, mix up', not mentioned in the *EDPT*, appears only in Ht VII 15 a 8 and 16 a 13. The first passage is quoted in the *UW* entry for *arkalaş-*, but the present verb is there misread as '*sasıt-*' and translated as "stinken lassen".[522] I would change the *UW* 197 b translation to read "gelangten sie dazu, daß sie die Wurzel der Lehre, die 'einen Geschmack hat' in Verwirrung brachten". The other ex.: (One cannot say that it equals the Sanskrit version:) *t(ä)k kutluglar bilgālār [ter]miş yıgılmış ānātkākçāsintā [yok] ançak(ı)ya saşıtmış* 'Only in the Skt. version, which accumulated after having been arranged by blessed and wise persons, are there no confusions at all'. Cf. *saşur-* above. *saş-* is tr.; I take the first ex. of *saşıt-* to be doubly causative, the second quasi-passive. *saş-ur-* has a more limited sense.

sämri-t- 'to fatten (tr.)' is discussed in the *EDPT*. The exs. in QB 1912, 5841 and 6389 are not mentioned there. One rendering of the IrqB XVI ex. (the only not Qarakhanid one) which has not been suggested is: '(Somebody) fattened a lean horse, then remembered his place and went (there) in a run'.

säv-it- 'to be loved, to make oneself loved'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. An additional ex. appears in Ht VII 1782 and a Ht ex. of *sävitmiş amratmış* is quoted in the *UW* entry for the latter. Further, PančFrag 207, *alkoka sävitir taplatır* 'He is (or: makes himself) loved and appreciated by everybody'. Common also in the QB. The QB name of Venus, *Sävit*, is an imperative name from this verb attested also in UigOn II.

sekri-t- "to make (one's horse) jump over (something), to skip a line in reading" is attested in DLT fol. 430 with A in the first syllable, with explicit I only after the R in two instances, before it in one instance and both before and after it in a

522 Arlotto's translation is also unacceptable, but he at least gets the meaning of this verb right.

fourth instance. For this last cf. the spelling of the base as *sekiri-* in Maitr 33 v 18 (< *sekiz*), but note that *sekrit-* is included in a section of bisyllabic verbs. *sekri-* is discussed in section 5.42 above. In a different entry in DLT fol. 631 there is a verb thrice spelled as *säkirt-* (note that *sekrit-* also has an *ä* in the first syllable in the DLT) and translated "to make the horse (or other) gallop". *This* is attested twice in Profan p. 282: as *yarıklanıp sekirtmäk* translated as "sich rüsten und angreifen" and as *käd Kirip tägip sekirtmäk* translated as "vorwärtsstürmen und angreifen". The two verbs *should* probably be related but may have split at an early date. This verb appears also in QB 2381 (*säkirtip çärig sürsä*) and 2383 (*säkirtür ya öldrür ya urşu ölür*), spelled as *sekirt-* twice in ms. B. A similar split occurred with *yorı-t-*, q.v. for details.

sıgta-t- 'to cause to weep' is quoted in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* only from the DLT on. Attested also in QB 6126 and in TuoLuoNi 289 = 308 (3 mss.). In this latter ex. (by the eds. wrongly written with *q*) *sıgta-t-* is used in a biverb with *yıglat-*, as *sıgta-* often appears with *yıgla-*. *sıg(ı)t+a-* is discussed in section 5.11.

sızla-t- 'to cause smarting'. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *nızvanı sınıg sünükü̈g sızlatur* (ShōKenkyū III 16). *sızla-* is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT on, but *sızla-g* (q.v. in section 3.101) appears also in Uigur.

sili-t- is a hap. in Maitr 139 v 11: *Şodanı yäk . . . balıkag* (i.e. /balıkıg/) *tetrü körür. näçä balık içintä taştın tanşız tapsız äd t(a)varlar bar ärsär alko arıtur silitür.* Tekin translates "räumt er weg und reinigt gänzlich", Röhrborn (*UW* 193 a) "reinigt und putzt alles". That, however, would have been *arı- sili-*. Śodhana, in fact, just carries out the inspection (*tetrü kör-*) and 'has everything cleaned up and wiped'. Cf. *sili-g* for the biverb with *arı-g*; the base *sili-* is also discussed there.

siŋir-t- is not in the *EDPT*. The *DTS* has an ex. from Suv and another two appear in Suv 617,6 (*kün täŋri Raxuka siŋirtmiş täg yaroksuz yaşoksuz . . . boldı*, misread or miswritten as SYKYRT°) and 641,6 (*ät'özi . . . rakşazka opa siŋirtü tükätmiş*). All three signify 'to get swallowed' and govern the swallower in the dative, the swallowed in the nominative. This appears to be the only 'passive' of *siŋ-ür-* ~ *siŋir-*, discussed in section 7.51.

sogı-t- 'to cool or chill'. *EDPT* and *DTS* from a few Manichaean, Buddhist and medical texts. *sogı-* is intr.

sola-t- 'to have one thing fastened to another'. Hap. in Pfahl I. *so+la-* 'to fasten with chains' is in section 5.12.

sök-it- 'to have something ripped to pieces' is a hap. in Suv quoted in the *EDPT*; *sök-* is tr.

sök-it- 'to make somebody kneel' probably stood in the source of DLT fol. 420;

the ms. in fact has A in the first syllable in all three instances.[523] In Orkhon Turkic, we find *sök-ür-* (q.v. above) in this meaning. Not to be confused with *sökit-* is *sök-üd-* 'to kneel to somebody', discussed in section 7.23. In TT VI 011, one ms. among five has *tizin sökküdüp* where another three have *çökidip*; see *çök-üt-* earlier in this section. What was meant by the scribe of this ms. may have been either *sök-it-* (with *tiz* as object) or *sök-üd-* (with *tiz* in the instrumental case form). *sök-* 'to kneel to somebody' is quoted under *sök-üd-* from the DLT and the QB; the *EDPT* entry for it quotes a USp instance. It should not be confused with *çök-*, which rather signified 'to sink, collapse, settle down'. In Qarakhanid and (in view of *çök-it-*, q.v. above) perhaps also in late Uigur, however, *çök-* and *sök-* may have converged; they were, after all, close both in meaning and in sound.

sözlä-t- 'to make someone speak or say something or talk' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT on. We also have *kişilärig boşgur[up] özini birlä bo* [ş]*lok sözlätdi* (Ht X 683) 'he had them recite this verse together with him' and a further ex. *ibid.* 697. Also *küntüz kan tıdıp sav* [sö]*zlätsär, tünlä* . . . (Ht VII 1 a 18) 'When the emperor kept him back during the day to make him speak of things, (he used to translate) at night'. The unpublished Yenisei inscr. 2508, 112-113 (of which there are collations in Copenhagen) has the words $S^2I\,Z\,N^2I$: $S^2\ddot{W}\,Z\,L^2T^2I$: $B^2T^2I\,Y^2\ddot{W}\,R^2$: B^2N^2. This should read *siz(i)ni* (or: *äsizni*) *sözläti bitiyür bän* 'I write letting you (i.e. 'the letters'? or: 'sorrow') speak'. See *söz+lä-* above.

suva-t- 'to have the ground irrigated' is a hap. in Suv edited in U I and quoted in the *EDPT*. See *suv+a-* above.

sülä-t- 'to have an army campaign'. There is no doubt that we have this verb in Toñ 43, but in Toñ 18 and 53 the sequence $S^2\ddot{W}\,L^2T^2$- can also be understood as *sü el(i)t-* as far as the context is concerned: Cf. *bo süg el(i)t!* in Toñ 32. An ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* appears in the runic inscr. of Ulankom; it is quoted under *ertür-* below. No other exs. are known. Cf. *sü+lä-* above.

süpir-t- is a hap. in *süpirt[ip arı]tıp v(ı)rxar stupug*[524] (CYK 50), signifying 'to have a place swept'. The base *sipir-* 'to sweep' is used in Windgott together with the same *arı-t-*. The secondary rounding to the first vowel is due to the /p/; *süpür-*, *süprül-* and *süpürgü* in the DLT even round both vowels. First vowel /i/ is,

523 The Arabic verb is actually emended by Clauson (whom DankKelly follow) to give this meaning, but I have no better suggestion as to what *säkit-* (as the verb is written) could otherwise have been.

524 There is an *alif* before the S, by the eds. transcribed as *ā*. It is clear that the foreign initial cluster was broken up by making the /s/ implosive, but it is unlikely that the auxiliary vowel with which this was carried out should have been contrary to vowel harmony. Turkic languages generally use a *narrow* harmonic vowel in these circumstances.

beside Windgott, found in ShōAgon 2 p. 191,6_2 and twice in Maitr; Mo. and Chuv. cognates also prove its originality.

talula-t- is a hap. in HtPar 152,24 quoted in *UW* 287 b: *anta ötrü iş başçı bäglärkä yeg adrok oronug talulatgalı ayn*, translated "danach ließ er die die Arbeit leitenden Begs den besten[2] Platz auswählen (mit Hilfe der Geomantik)". Seeing that those *bägs* are not geomancers, we should rather translate *ay-* literally: 'He told the *bägs* who were in charge of the work to get the most suitable place chosen (by geomancers)'. *talu+la-* is tr. and this is a double causative with the ultimate object in the accusative (as usual).

tanukla-t- DTS; not in the *EDPT*. 'to prove something to somebody'. Hap. in Suv in a biverb with *bil-tür-*. See *tanuk+la-* 'to give evidence' above, *tanuklat-dur-* below.

taŋla-t- 'to astonish', by the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted only from the DLT. Attested also in BT III 368. See 2 *taŋ+la-* above.

tapla-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from DLT fol. 434, where it signifies 'to make somebody content with (a matter)'. The only interpretable Uigur ex., in Pañc-Frag 207, has the passive sense of 'to be approved, appreciated': See *säv-it-* above, with which it appears in a biverb. We also have] *taplatıp* [in Ht IV 1436. The base is the tr. *tap+la-*. Cf. *taplatur-* in section 7.57.

tart-ıt- is a hap. in Maitr 182 v 8-9: (In the *avīci* hell) *k(ā)ntü āt' özlärintäki kadışın kaŋlılarka koşup agır yüklär yüdürüp tartıturlar*. Because of the tr. verbs *koşup* and *yüdürüp* and because of the wider context, I take *tartıt-* not to be a passive but a double causative: 'They (the demons?) harness them to wagons with straps which they have on their bodies, load heavy loads on them and let them pull them'. From such an ex., however, one can see how it came about that the *-(X)t-* causative became a passive.

(*tavrat-* 'to hustle or urge someone to do something' has no attested base, but cf. *tavran-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs. The petrified converb *tavratı* is dealt with further on in this section. Exs. of *tavrat-* not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Suv 10,10, in ManTüTex (13) 382 and in several exs. in the n. thereto, in BT VII A 278 (with *yorıt-*) and K 5, in Ht VII 5 a 3 and 4-5. *tavratdıŋız buyanka* (BT XIII 19,33) is not "Ihr habt gestrebt nach *Puŋya*" but 'You urged (others) towards *puŋya*'. As completed by SuvLeg ms. T I 164 r 11, Suv 8,3 is *ançulayu tavraţu eltür ärkän* . . .)

tay-ıt- 'to make slip down' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. Maitr 84 v 8 has a metaphorical ex.: *baça*K *olormış tınl(ı)glarıg ç(a)xşaputlarıntın tayıtsarlar* 'if they encourage . . . to slip away from their precepts'. *tay-* is intr., and cf. *tay-ıg* 'slippery' in DLT and QB 670 and 5231.

tägür-t- 'to have something delivered, handed out (by somebody)'. The USp ex. quoted in the *EDPT* entry with a special meaning reappears in UigSteu A 9.

Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in MaitrGeng 6 b 8 and Ht VII 12 b 11: *agır ayamakın azk(ı)ya ād ı(a)v(a)r* (Arlotto: *'tar'*) *tägirtü tdu tägi[ntı]m(ı)z*. If *tägirtü* has correctly been read with I, it reminds one of the three exs. of *tägir-* for *täg-ür-* which appear in ManTüTex; that, in turn, would be connected with the fact that the converb and aorist vowel of *täg-* is /i/.

täp-it- 'to have something trampled on' is a hap. in Ht quoted in the *EDPT*. *täp-* is tr.; cf. *täp-tür-* below.

täprā-t- 'to stir, move or shake something'. Exs. not mentioned by the *EDPT* are found in ATSS, Maitr 128 r 27 and v 1, 30 and 31, ms. T III 84-61 (Mz 671 = Ehlers 188) v 35 (with *kemi* as object) and Maitr 201 v 7 (with *yellär* as subject). The 'mover of threefold earth' is referred to in ZiemeTārā 18 d and BT VIII B 179. 'shaking a bell' is *çaŋ täprät-*, in BT VII A 593 and 725 and UigTot 1326. *t(ä)ŋridām oyun [bädizi]n / täprät-* (UigKan 203) is (for some reason) translated as "playing heavenly music". *köŋül täprät-* (Maitr 77 v 3, BuddhUig II 22, Uig-Falt 55) is 'to perturb the heart'; in the last mentioned ex. we learn that its opposite is *köŋülüg amırtgur-*. See *täprä-n-*, where the base is also mentioned.

tärklā-t- 'to quicken, speed on, expediate' comes from *tärk+lä-*, q.v. above. *tärk-lāt-* is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* but appears in ManTüTex (13) 300 and HamTouen 5,41 and, distorted, 6,14. The last two were misunderstood by the ed., but a n. to the first-mentioned refers to these exs.

te-t- 'to be said to be, to be called, to be considered' is an exceedingly common verb in all types of Uigur texts but appears nowhere else. It governs predicative nominals in the unmarked case-form and often comes close to being a copula. *te-* is the (tr.) quoting verb.

tınsıra-t- is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 88 in a passage quoted above s.v. *ögsirä-t-*. A parallel ms. has *'tınçsırat-'* instead, but *tınsırat-* is more likely in view of the fact that *tın+sıra-* (q.v. above, section 5.5) also appears several times with *ögsirä-*.

tigrā-t- 'to make something clatter' or, more generally perhaps, 'resound'. The *EDPT* entry quotes the verb from the IrqB and the DLT, in both of which its object is one's horse. DankKelly give the translation "to make one's horse run with a clatter", according to which the hitherto accepted translation of the IrqB instance should be corrected. An additional ex. is *ol üdün sıgtaşıp yerig tigrät-dilär* 'Then they made the earth resound with their collective weeping' (Ht X 1066). *tigrā-* and its cognates are discussed in section 5.32.

tilā-t- 'to have something sought, etc.' is in the *EDPT* quoted from USp 88 and the DLT. We further have *nomların tilätip istätip . . .* (Warnke 97). A further biverb with *istät-* appears in BT III 565, reinterpreted in *UW* 151 a par. A,a. *asıgıg tilätmäkin ulatı tusug ymä* (ShöAgon 2, p. 195,5_2) shows a word order that would have been normal for Sanskrit, and can be translated as 'by having profit$_2$ sought'. In NesTex T II B 28 (U 4910) 7, *s(ä)n ärür s(ä)n alko yok bol-*

mışlarıg til(ā)tdāçi 'You are the one who gets all the lost ones sought'.[525] See *tilā-n-*, where other cognates are also mentioned.

titrā-t- 'to make something or someone shake or tremble' is in the *EDPT* quoted from a Manichaean and a Buddhist source. It appears also in *tagag* (i.e. /tagıg/) *ışıg* (i.e. *yışıg*) *titrātū* in Rāma 8.

tokı-t- 'to have something beaten, beaten out, knocked in etc.' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the Orkhon inscrs. on, where it applies to "memorial stones". Clauson translates "driven (into the ground)", but 'hewn' or even 'incised' seems just as possible. The same object, at any rate, is found with *tokıtdım* also in Tariat W2. In the TT VIII ex. quoted in the *EDPT* it has the passive sense 'to get knocked down'. A further passive ex. of *tokıt-* is quoted under *taral-* among the *-(X)l-* verbs, but it signifies 'to get beaten with a stick'. An additional ex. quoted by Röhrborn, 1972, n. 25 also has this passive meaning. *tokı-* is discussed in section 5.3.

tolga-t- appears from BQ and IrqB on together with *āmgā-t-*; the biverb means 'to cause suffering'. This relates with the meaning of *āmgā-k tolga-g* (q.v. under *tolgag* in section 3.101 above) and *amgān- tolgan-* (discussed under *tolga-n-* above). *tolga-* 'to wrap around' is in the *EDPT* quoted from DLT, Middle Turkic and modern languages. We also find it in a biverb with *yörgā-* in Maitr 198 v2 and 203 r7 signifying 'to wrap around': in the first case of the swaddling of babies, in the second of fiery nets and bonds being used for wrapping up creatures in hell. The passage from this to 'suffering' goes over 'writhing' (the meaning of *tolgan-* when used by itself), and 'colic, pangs' (the meaning of *tolgag* by itself). One possible ex. of *tolgat-* by itself is quoted under *tolga-n-* above. Another one appears in continuation to that passage, in both mss. of BT XIII 12,85: *tokuz ay on kün kötürüp tolgatu twgurtuŋuzlar*. The translation "neun Monate und zehn Tage habt Ihr uns getragen und unter Qualen geboren" is not explicit about the fact that it is the baby which is said to be made to 'writhe in pain'.

toşgur-t- is mentioned neither in *EDPT* nor *DTS*, but appears in *burxanlarıg . . . altı p(a)ramıtlarıg toşgurtguka ötügçi bol-* 'to beg the Buddhas to get (our) six *pāramitās* accomplished' (Suv 181,17). This is triple causation: Under *to-ş-* we quote an ex. with 'our (group of) *pāramitās*' as subject; under *toş-gur-* (section 7.54) we have exs. with the *pāramitās* as object. *toşgurt-* refers to the Buddhas who are to make us accomplish our *pāramitās*, and we hope to get them to do that by begging them to.

525 The ed. writes "unklar" and translates it as "Erlöser o.ä.". He may have thought that it could be haplographic for *tirilt-*, but such a verb is quoted in the *EDPT* s.v. *tirgür-* only from the XVth century on.

tōrū-t- 'to create, bring into existence' has an intr. base. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in ManTüTex (10) 174, BuddhUig II 369, UigTot 396, 508 and 1316, BT VII A 299 and 457, BT VIII A 374 and elsewhere.

tumlı-t- 'to chill' is attested only in the DLT, QB etc., but see the petrified converb *tumlıtu* common in economical texts, discussed below in this section. Cf. *tumlı-g* above.

tur-ıt- may have signified 'to inhibit', if it existed at all: *turıtmamak turkıglan-mamak* may have stood in Suv 235,4, *turıtmaksız turkıglanmaksız* in BT II 882: See *turkıg+lan-* in section 5.6 for the possibility that these were indeed the readings. *turıtmaksız kōŋüllüg Sada bira urudita BODISATV* appears (by the facs.) to have stood in BuddhUig II 141 (the ed. has TWNYD-). No such verb is mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. The *-mAksXz* form would signify 'who does not get inhibited'.

turultur-t- 'to have something brought to rest' does not appear in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *samtso açarı turulturttı kōŋülin bilgā biligig işlatmäktā* (HtPar 32 v 8-10) is by P. Schulz translated as "Der Dreikorb-Meister ließ seinen Sinn zur Ruhe kommen, indem er die Weisheit (*prajñā*) wirken ließ"; better perhaps 'had *prajñā* bring his mind to rest'. In ShōAgon 1,38, the ed. takes *turulturţu yaval-`turţu tükāţsār* to be formed with the 'intensive' *-d-*. That was shown in section 7.23 not to form anything 'intensive', and to be added only to simple and mostly monosyllabic verbs. The D, which here appears also in *tükä-t-*, is (of course) insignificant.

tükä-t- 'to finish, complete'. *tükäti* is a petrified converb q.v. below. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Often used as a perfective auxiliary (cf. also n. 336 above), as in the second ex. of the previous entry. Further such exs. not mentioned in the dictionaries are *ārtürü tükäţ-* (ETŞ 13,29), *yarlıkayu tükäţ-* (Ht V 13 b 27), *körü tükäţip* (ibid. 1 b 13) *kılu tükäţ-* (*ibid.* 7 b 11), *yorıtu tükät-* (ShōAv 288) etc. It is also used as fully predicative verb, e.g. in *paramıtlarıg tükäţip* (ShōAv 67). *tükä-l* (section 3.113 above) is a cognate. There is no '*tükän-*' in early Turkic: What has been so read in BT III 140 is an error for *tükä-*; in QB 2739 and 4732, *tükä-* of ms. C should be preferred to *tükän-* of AB.

tünä-t- 'to put somebody up for the night' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. Attested also in *Samtso açarıg kodup ordota tü[nä]ţti* (Ht VII b 17-18). A further ex. occurs in Ht V 9 a 5. *tün+ä-* (section 5.11) is intr.

(*tüpsirät-ü[* is a hap. in BT I dealt with among the *+sIrA-* verbs although a *+sIrA-* base for it is not attested; see section 5.5. It signifies 'to rob something of its base'.)

udı-t- 'to put someone to sleep'. *EDPT* from Heilk II, QB and DLT. *udı-* is intr.

uk-ıt- 'to explain'. *EDPT* and probably also the exs. in the *DTS*. *bilgä biliglärig ukıtu yarlıkadı* (Tiš 18 b 2), *açа yada ukıţu* (Suv 7,8) and *yok kurug tözin ukıt-*

mak (Suv 362,20) probably also belong here and not to *okı-t-*. Further exs. appear in TekinSingku v2, Ht X 37, UigTot 588, 590 and 847, ETŞ 15,92, CYK 12, frequently in the Maitr and BuddhUig I, AbitAnk 21 and 23, ShōAv 116 and often elsewhere. *uk-* 'to understand' is tr.

ula-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT but is found also in QB 5604. See further on in this section for the petrified converb *ulatı. ula-* is tr.

(*umugsırat-* is a hap. in TuoLuoNi discussed among the *+sIrA-* verbs although no *+sIrA-* base for it is attested. 'to make one lose hope'.)

(*urugsırat-* is a hap. in KT discussed among the *+sIrA-* verbs although no *+sIrA-* base for it is attested. 'to deprive someone of progeny'.)

(*uvşat-* 'to crumble (tr.)' has no attested base. See *uvşak* (section 3.102), also for other cognates. The *EDPT* has *uvşat-* from one Suv ex. and from DLT, QB etc. Another Suv ex. is mentioned in the *DTS* under '*ušatuš-*': This should in fact have been read as *kog kıçmuk* (thus!) *tāg uşatu sıp* . . . (Suv 113,22) 'crumbling and breaking (them, the mountains$_2$) to dust'. Another ex. appears in Suv 370,4. Add also *yinçgā uvşatıp* (Maitr 123 v24), *ulug tagıg uşat[daçı* (BT VIII B 106) and *ulug ugakta uvşatu sokarlar* (LautHöllen 133) 'They crumble and crush them in a big mortar'.)

uza-t- signifies 'to see somebody off' in the two pre-Qarakhanid exs. quoted in the *EDPT*; this meaning is found also in the QB. In DLT and sometimes also in QB it means 'to lengthen'. An additional ex., *uzatmagu* [in fr. M 865 v 6, is quoted in the n. to ManTüTex 375. *uzatı* is a petrified converb discussed below.

ūdrā-t- 'to increase (tr.), multiply (tr.), increase the yield' is attested in the DLT, the base both in the QB and the DLT. The proper name of U II 77,21 and 78,40 should also be read as *Üḍrāt*; it is one of the common class of proper names of imperative form. *Üdrātmiş* is also a N. Pr. (Schlangenzauber).

ükli-t- 'to increase (tr.)', *EDPT* and *DTS*. Additional exs. in ETŞ 10,37 (*ükliṭü*) and 93 and 15,24, BT III 453, ShōAgon 1,59 (the biverb *ūklit- as-*), U IV A 270-1 (same biverb), InscrOuig IV 22, Warnke, colophon r3 (*Üklit T(ä)ŋrim*), Ht V 16 a22 (*upasanç El Üklitmiş*), DvaKol I r3 (*Y(a)rp* [. . .] *Üklitmiş tutuŋ*), BT VIII A 374 (biverb with *törüṭ-*), UigTot 573, BT VII A 741, Ht IV 1747 and elsewhere. See *ükli-* in section 5.42.

ülä-t- 'to have something divided and distributed' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. It is attested also in Samanta 6 as *arka kamag tınl(ı)glarka* . . . *ülätmiş buyan küçintä* . . . "Kraft des Verdienstes, daß ich . . . verteilen lassen habe, ..."[526]

526 The word which appears in *EDPT* 133 a under '*ölüt-*', is there said to be '*öt-*' but has by others been interpreted as '*ülät-*' is best read as *täŋri öl temiş* 'Heavens is said to have said "Die!"'. *öt-* does not, moreover, ever show the meaning it is said to have by Clauson in this case.

ürk-üt- ~ *ürk-ıt-* 'to startle or scare away'. W $R^2K^2T^2T^2\eta$ of IrqB XXI has to be read as *ürküttüŋ*; had it been '*ürkittiŋ*', the second vowel would have been explicit. *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter s.v. *ürkitmämäk*; also in Maitr 225 v15. Further exs. are mentioned under *korkut-* and *bäliŋlät-* above. See *kork-ut-* ~ *kork-ıt-* for the alternation.

üşi-t- 'to chill, to expose to cold' has the second syllable with a *kasra* of the first hand in DLT fol. 113; the second hand added a *kasra* in one other instance, a *ḍamma* in two further ones. Ernte 24 and Ernte II 2 both have *üşüt-* with this meaning; the first of these was first translated correctly in *UW* 81 b top. The Ernte II ex. appears together with *toŋ-ur-*, which corroborates this interpretation.

yag-ıt- 'to let it rain (of rain, tears, jewels, flowers etc.)'. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* are found in ETŞ 10,34, BT III 551, Suv 170,16, ShōAgon 1,129, BT VII A 174, BT VIII A 459, BT XIII 15,35, 19,53 and 27,20 and 26, Maitr 145 r15, 139 v3 and 15, 18 v8 and 192 r5, MaitrH XVI 10 b7 (*yagıtır* ms.; publ. text wrong), USp 102,23, SuvStockh 32 and HtPar 130,25 = HtFragm II 21. Many have *yagmur* as object.

yagu-t- 'to bring something near, attract'. *EDPT* (which quotes hardly any of the numerous QB exs.) and *DTS*. *aç kız ig kegän yagı yavlak adası yagutmalım* (Suv 397,18) is spelled correctly in the *DTS*, but *UW* 44 a writes '*yakut-*'. *yagu-* etc. have /g/ in Qarakhanid Turkic; there is no connection between this and *yak-*.

(*yakçırt-* 'to rouse' has no direct base attested but may come from a *-çIr-* derivate (section 6.3) of *yak-*. The *EDPT* quotes a Suv ex. of this verb; another one appears in Ht V 3 a8: *anı [ü]çün aşnuça [sa]g süt kudup ät'öz[in] yakçırtmış k(ä)rgäk. anta [ken] käntik tokısar odunur* (Ht V 3 a8) 'Therefore one should first pour some pure milk and rouse his body. If one then rings a bell (< Sogd. *knt'yk* < Skt. *ghaṇṭikā*; P. Zieme) he will wake up'.)

yalga-t- 'to make someone lick something'. Beside the DLT attested only in USp 102 a = TuoLuoNi 403. *yalga-* is tr.

yalına-t- 'to put something to flames' is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It appears in UigTot 89 and 599 and BT III 276. *yalın+a-* is an intr. verb discussed above.

yalk-ıt- is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* but appears in Ernte 65: *yaglıg takçaŋ kıldurup yalkıṭu yedüräyin sizlärkä* 'I'll have a fatty *takçaŋ* prepared and give you to eat of it until you have had your fill'. We find twice *yalk-* in Suv and *yalkık-* in ETŞ. The collocation with *yag* is not a coincidence: The DLT has the ex. sentence *ol yagka yalkdı* "He got sick to his stomach from the oil" and quotes a proverb starting *yalksa yemä yag ädgü* . . . "Butter, though it causes indigestion, is better (than plain salted food) . . .". The ed. translates

"schlecken lassend", taking it to be "eine Form für *yalyat-*" although *yalgatur-* appears several lines further on.

yaltrı-t- 'to illuminate; to make something shine'. *EDPT* and *DTS*; attested also in BT I D (153), ETŞ 9,53, 11,51 and 13,87, Maitr 165 v 8 and 130 r 7, Ht VII 4 b 26 and X 61, Weih 3, BT VIII B 41 and 57 and B 165. See intr. *yaltrı-* in section 5.42.

yaŋkur-t- 'to let something echo or resound' comes from *yaŋku+r-* 'to resound' (section 5.45). *EDPT* and *DTS*, the latter s.vv. '*janqurt-*' and '*jaŋɣurt-*'.[527] Exs. not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in Ht VII 16 a 2, SuvStockh 33 and Maitr 55 r 24, 140 r 6, 145 v 4. MaitrH X 5 a 5 is by Laut wrongly translated as if it were a relative form. *külüşmäk . . . ünüg kök kalık yaŋkurdı* (Maitr 18 v 12) may belong here in view of its having an object, in spite of the simple (or simplified) dental.

yap-ıt-ı bertim 'I graciously had . . . built', a hap. in ŞU quoted in the EDPT. *yap-* is tr.

yara-t- 'to create, arrange, bring into a particular state etc.' is semantically not too close to *yara-* 'to be useful or suitable'. A runic ex. not mentioned in the EDPT is *b(ä)lgüs(i)n bit(i)gin bo urtı bo y(a)r(a)tdı* (Tes 20) 'This is what he incised and created as his mark and his testament'. Particularly common is the biverb *et- yarat-*, attested also in Maitr 138 v 4, 31 r 13, 21 r 4, 184 r 2, 37 r 4 and 8, 126 r 4, 159 v 10 and 104 v 14, Weih 10, Suv 694,1, Ht V 1 b 2 etc. Still further exs. can be found e.g. in Rāma 12 and 23, ATSS, Ht X 275-6 and 1122, BT VIII A 493, CYK 127, Ht V 1 b 4, EhlersNotab 15 and 19, HamTouen 5,9 (*yaŋı täŋrilik yaratır*) and 15,7 and dozens of times in Maitr.

yarat-ıt- 'to have something erected, fitted up' is in the EDPT quoted only from three ŞU instances which have *örgin*, *bälgü* or *bitig* as object. The verb is attested also in Tariat W 1, 2 and 3 with the same objects (but by no means the same wording): The two inscrs. 'speak in the name of' the same ruler. *yaratıt-* is the only verb in which *-(X)t-* is added to a polysyllabic consonant stem (other than *°r-*), the only one of more than two syllables in which it appears in its full form; other sources use *yarat-dur-* for this content.

yarlıka-t- is a hap. in UigTot 1304, not in the *EDPT* or *DTS*: *burxanlarıg . . yarlıkaṭıp* "die . . . Buddhas erscheinen lassen". Cf. *buyur-* 'to come' in Ott man. *yarlıka-* is tr. but would here have an elliptic object.

yaro-t- 'to illuminate; to let shine' or, metaphorically, 'to enlighten'. See *yar* for the second vowel. *EDPT* and *DTS*; additional exs. occur in Ht VII 19

527 '*yaŋıkurtur*' of TT IX 84, quoted in the *EDPT* entry, should be *yaŋkurtur*. The DTS '*jaŋɣurtur*'. Clark (Pothi 470) is no doubt right about the ms. now having *yaŋkurtu*, but the must have gotten damaged only after the first edition.

UigSukh 41, BT I B(104), Kuan 199 (*yarotır*) and 200 (*yarotu berzün*), ETŞ 20,11, *Buddhāv H* 92 and 120, BuddhUig I 10 and 256 and II 76 and 349, Warnke 607, *Ht IV* 209, V1 b14, 8 b16 and 10 a5, VII 15 b25 and 16 b17, X39g and *HtPek* 74 b7-9, BT XIII 30,3 and 58,10 and Maitr 164 v4, 183 r24.

yaşa-t- 'to let somebody live'. *DTS*; not in the *EDPT*: Attested only once in Utsukmaksız Darni and in QB 6548. See intr. *yaş+a-* above.

yaşar-t- 'to make green and/or moist'. In the *EDPT* only from the DLT; appears also in ETŞ 10,37 as *yaşarţu*. See *yaş+ar-* in section 5.45 above.

yaşo-t- is practically always used in a biverb with *yaro-t-* and the meaning of the couple does not seem to differ significantly from that of the latter verb by itself. In *Ht IV* 1431 we find *yaşotgu* without *yarot-*. For exs. see the *DTS* s.v. '*jarut-*' and the *EDPT*. Add *kamag elig uluşug yarotu yaşotu yarlıkadı* (ShōAv 204); the same biverb in Maitr 153 v21. See *yaşo-k* among the *-(O)k* lexemes for the second vowel.

yavrı-t- 'to weaken somebody, cause his condition to deteriorate' is attested in the *BQ* inscr. and in DLT and QB but not in Uigur. An ex. of QB 6389 is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. See *yavrı-* (intr.) in section 5.42.

yayı-t- 'to be shaken, to be moved by something'. See *yayı-l-*, for the base as well. The *EDPT* wrongly changes the TT VIII instance to '*yayıl-*', q.v. there.[528] Further exs. are *yayıţu ayıglıKka* 'perturbed by the evil one' and *yalınka çogka yayıţu* (Neujahr 33) 'moved by glory$_2$'.

yet-it- 'to cause to arrive' is a hap. in Suv 481,16 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *anta ötrü ol kuvrag arasında ärigmä Kondini atlıg braman täŋri täŋrisi burxannıŋ küü kälig ädrämlig küçi üzä yetitmäkiŋa ol Sarasvati atlıg täŋri kızın ögä şlok takşutın ınça tep tedi* 'When Buddha, the god of gods, used his ability$_2$ of magical appearance to make the divine maiden Sarasvatī arrive, the brahman named Kauṇḍinya who was in that assembly thereupon praised her, speaking the following verse$_2$'.[529] The base is intr.

yevā-t- 'to provide somebody with something, to supply something'. *EDPT* s.v. *yivit-*; a number of additional exs. appear in the n. to TT V B 103. In a Maitr passage quoted under *yevā-g* (and not mentioned in the *EDPT*) two mss. have

528 Clauson thinks *yayıtmagay* is here "prob. a scribal error" for '*ya:yılma:zun*', but the *-(X)t-* form often has passive meaning. The German translation of the Skt. text is also misleading: 'erschüttern' is tr., whereas Skt. *vyath-* means something like (intr.) 'to waver'; the form is, moreover, the medio-passive optative.

529 Schulz, 1978, who quotes the sentence, wrongly translates it as "Weil der Göttergott Buddha . . . seinen (des Brahmanen) Verstand geschärft hatte, . . .". 'Verstand' is not in the text, however; *yitit-* 'to sharpen', not attested before the Atabatu 'l-Haqāyiq, is derived from a back-formation from *yitig*, a late secondary form of the unanalysable *yiti* 'sharp'. The At. instance does have 'mind' as object. Nor could the *küü kälig ädrämlig küç* be used to sharpen minds.

yevit- and *yevät-* respectively. See *yevāg* above for the phonemes of these lexemes and of *yevil-* and *yevin-* and for why the second syllable may have had an alternating vowel. *yevāti* in BT I A$_2$24 governs the dative and signifies 'in addition to'.

yıdı-t- 'to make (something) stink' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the IrqB and from one Uigur instance. See *yıd+ı-* in section 5.42.

yılı-t- 'to warm something' is in the *EDPT* quoted once from Heïlk I and from the DLT. Cf. the cognates *yılı-g* and *yılı-n-* above; the base and *yılı-r-* appear in the DLT.

yogla-t- 'to have a funeral feast celebrated for someone' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from runic Turkic. *yog+la-* 'to hold a funeral feast' is tr.

yola-t- 'to bring through'. Not in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* quotes *kulgaklarınta bo tütrüm tärin yorügläg nom eliginiŋ tärin yorügi birk(ī)yä yolatguça ärsär, . . .* (Suv) 'If one could just make the purport of . . . get through their ears, . . .'. Cf. the hapax *yolatmaksız* in section 3.329 above. See intr. *yol+a-* above.

yorı-t- 'to make people walk, water flow etc.'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. Appears also in ETŞ 9,84, HamTouen 14,9, BT VII A 278 (biverb with *tavraṭ-*), ShōAv 288 (of water) and Maitr 139 r 14 and 164 r 32. An ex. in Töpfer 42 was misunderstood by the ed.: *bir üdün Utarı urı kaŋlıta olorup beş yüz braman urılar birlä kapıgdın ünär ärdi. altun tayak altun olorçuk asnu yorıtur ärdilär* signifies 'having hung their golden staffs and golden seats onto themselves (or onto the cart) they used to make it go (or to lead it)'.[530] *yort-* 'to trot, amble' is likely to be a syncopated special use of this verb, because its aorist in Maitr 36 r 3, 140 v 2 and 224 r 16 is *yortır* and not '*yortar*'.[531] *taŋ ata yortalım / Budraç kanın irtälim* in DLT fol. 600, translated "We'll set out at the break of dawn, and . . .", reminds us of instances hitherto read as *yorıt-* in KT S 4 and 6. In *sü yorıt-* in Toñ 25 and 35 there is an explicit second vowel in the base. In what I think must be *yort-*, however, there is no such vowel: *bunça yerkä tägi yortdum* (KT S 4) and *Tavgaç bodun . . . ädgü alp kişig yortmaz ärmiş* (KT S 6) would otherwise, according to the rules of the Orkhon inscrs., have been spelled with explicit I. *yort-* 'to ride' therefore appears to have split off at an early date from *yorıt-*, with 'horse'

530 Ehlers translates "Einen goldenen Stab und einen goldenen Sitz führten sie vor sich her", but *yorı-t-* cannot be used of staffs and seats which cannot move forward on their own (*yorı-*). *aşnu*, as Ehlers understood the word before *yorı-t-*, does not signify "vor sich her". *aşnu yorıt-* would have been 'to make someone walk or something advance before'. *aşnu* (q.v. in section 7.212) probably had only temporal meaning.

531 These three are not mentioned in the *EDPT*. The translation of two of them as "etwas gewöhnlich tun" in the BT IX glossary is wrong. The *EDPT* does not mark *yort-* as derived, connecting it with a Mo. verb, but this latter would be a regular cognate of *yorıt-* as well. The fact that DLT fol. 632 explicitly gives *yortur* (with *wāw*) as alternative aorist form also speaks for my derivation.

implied. A similar split occurred with *sekri-t-* (discussed earlier in this section): 'horse' was an implied object with other early verbs as well. Cf. *yort-ug* 'a royal escort' in QB 2345, 2586 and 2588 and DLT.

yölä-t- is a hap. in BT XIII 24,7, not mentioned in the *EDPT*: *bo sansarta yolatgay lenxua çäç(ä)k eligligkä* 'In this *saṃsāra* he will be supported by the lotus-flower-handed one'. *yölä-* is tr.; cf. *yölä-k* 'support' in section 3.102.

1 yumşa-t- 'to soften (tr.)' is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. It appears also in Ernte II 41. The base (original shape **yımşa-*) should not be confused with *yumş+a-* (q.v. in section 5.11 above).

2 yumşa-t- in BT XIII 20,60 does not signify "entsenden", as written in the glossary thereto, but "gesandt werden" as translated with the text. *yumş+a-* 'to send' from *yumuş* 'errand' is not attested before the *Vocabulaire sino-ouigour des Ming*, but the present text is also, after all, fourteenth century. *yumşa-t-* is a passive derivate from this tr. base.

yupa-t- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and from modern languages. It also appears, in very similar contexts, in Warnke 29 (quoted under *apı-t-* above) and in QB 3866: *yupatma özüŋ*, "Do not neglect your duty!" in Dankoff's rather free translation. 'to shirk from a task or from an unpleasant situation' appears to give the central meaning, also compatible with the DLT's 'to have an affair neglected and to urge others to neglect it'. See *yupa-n-* and the base in section 7.21 and cf. n. 495 above.

yügür-t- 'to make someone or something run' is in the *EDPT* quoted from Toñ 54 and Qarakhanid Turkic. Vilhelm Thomsen (unpublished papers) wanted to read this verb also in Toñ 52; see also Aalto's n. thereto, p. 61. Found also in HtPar 130,15. *köŋülüg anta munta yügürtgü ol* of Ht VII 10 b 2 is best translated in *UW* 148 b as "man soll den Sinn hierhin und dorthin laufen lassen!".

yüli-t- 'to have oneself shaved'. In the *EDPT* quoted from USp 105 and the DLT. A further ex. of Ht VII 6 a 18 is in *UW* 242 a wrongly spelled as '*yölitip*'. Appears also in ShōAv 125 and 148. All exs. have *saç* and/or *sakal* as direct object. Most have the hair or beard's owner as subject, but in Ht VII the hair-owners appear in the dative (and might *possibly* be shaving their own hair) with the person who causes the shaving to take place in the nominative. Except in this ex., the hair or beard in question is the instigators'.

yüz-üt- is a hap. in BQ E30 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *Tögla ögüzüg* Y^{2}W̄ Z T^{2}I *käçip . . . sünüşdüm* is 'I crossed the T. river by having (the horses) swim and . . . fought'. Since the second vowel is implicit, it must be /ü/ and not /i/.

aglatı 'especially, particularly' is presumably connected with *agla-t-* 'to leave unoccupied' (q.v. above): Cf. English *let alone* as conjunction and the etymology of 'particularly'. Most exs. appear in the *UW* entry; not mentioned in the *EDPT*. Usually associated with *art-ok* or *tak-ı*. Exs. of *aglatı takı* of BT XIII 42,14[532] and ShōAv 205 should be added to what the *UW* has. Note that *agla-k* (an *-(O)k* adjective) can also signify "einmalig, einzigartig" (*UW*).

arıtı 'quite' comes from *arı-t-* 'to clean purify': Cf. the extended meanings of English *purely*. Attested only in Uigur. Exs. not mentioned in the *UW* occur in BT XIII 26,8 and UigKan 299.

mäŋzätı is not given a special entry by the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is used with the dative to signify 'similar to, like': *taglarka mäŋzätı* (Ht VII 1989), *muŋar mäŋzätı* (M I 23,27, Gebet). *muŋar mäŋzätü* (thus) is called a stock phrase by the *EDPT* s.v. *beŋzet-* and is very common in the QB. Cf. *mäŋ(ī)zä-t-* 'to compare, liken'.

ogşatı has the same meaning and use as *mäŋzätı*. See *ogşa-t-* 'to compare' above for the quality of the velar; *ogşatı* is spelled with Brāhmī H in TT VIII D 4 and 34 and G 71 and in ms. Mz 647 f. B 8 quoted in n. 15 to Maue, 1984: 93. Exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* under *oxşatı* or the *DTS* under *oqšatı* occur in U III 24,10$_1$ and 75,12 and BT III 117.

tavratı 'quickly, suddenly' has an entry in the *DTS* but not in the *EDPT*. Some further exs. occur in Ht V 12 b 5 and HtPar 39 v 14, in ms. Mz 652 (T II S 19 b) in SktUigBil and, together with *tārkin* (an instrumental form) in BT I A$_1$3 and Suv 406,10. In BT XIII 28,31, on the other hand, *tavrak* is used adverbially. *tavrat-* and *tavran-* are both used a lot, but their common base was no longer in use.

tumlıtu is used in the phrase *tog(u)ru tumlıtu sat-* in USp 55,6, 57,8, 61,5, 107,3, 109,3 and 110,4, UigLand 4 and perhaps elsewhere, always in economical documents and with the meaning 'to sell outright and irrevocably'. The dental is in practically all exs. spelled with D. Both this and the fact that the converb vowel is /u/ and not /ı/ show that this lexeme got petrified at a late date: See Erdal, 1979 for the change in this vowel. The semantic relationship with *tumlı-t-* 'to chill' is not opaque but goes over 'rigid'. Instead of this phrase,

532 *aglatı takı bo buyan küçintā kim ... atam ... anam ... birlā ... burxan bālgürzünlār* is a cleft sentence: 'It is especially$_2$ by force of this *puŋya* that I wish my father ... together with my mother and ... should be born ... as ... Buddhas'. The ed.'s translation does not reflect the sentence's structure. Nor can *arslan bilgā tāŋri elig* be part of the names and titles of the *ıdok kut*, for they appear before the word *atam* and are qualified by *ol*. The correct translation of the phrase is 'that lion, the wise and divine king, (i.e.) my father the *ıdok kut Kirāşiz*'.

Acte 3 has been read as *togu[ru] tum[ɪ]ug saŋ-*; the n. thereto is, in any case, the most extensive discussion of this phrase.

tükäti 'completely' is very common. See the *EDPT* and the *DTS* for some of the exs. Many additional ones appear in Maitr and elsewhere. Cf. *tükät-* above.

ulatı is common in all Uigur texts (and appears once in a runic ms.) but was not in use in runic inscrs. nor in Qarakhanid. Moerloose, 1986 describes its meaning and use as a conjunction in adnominal position. The inscrs. have *ulayu*, which does not reappear elsewhere. *EDPT* and *DTS* have only a fraction of the exs. of *ulatı*; noteworthy is the ex. in Tib. script which appears in TibStud. *ula-* is common from the earliest texts on but we have only two Qarakhanid instances of *ula-t-*. Since Qarakhanid Turkic does not have this petrified converb so often met with in Uigur, the possibility exists that *ulatı* was derived directly from *ula-* as deverbal adverb in *-tI*.

uzatı 'for a long time' is related to *uza-t-* 'to see somebody off' but not directly connected with it semantically: *uza-* does mostly apply to time being drawn out, and one of the prehistoric meanings of *uzat-* must have covered that domain as well. Exs. of *uzatı* in *EDPT* 282 b and *DTS*, the latter especially under *ürük uzatı*. The last mentioned couple appears also in GuanJing 15. Other exs. not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in Maitr 82 r 2, KP XXXI 1-2, AmitIst 104, BT XIII 49,80, BuddhKat 31 (Tibetan script!), a number of times in BT I and II and ETŞ, in Neujahr 80 and elsewhere. In M I 9,3 (TeilBuch) it is mistakenly written as *uzıtı*.

(*yaŋırtı* 'afresh, anew' is hardly akin to pronominal and other local-case forms which end similarly; however, the base is in the *EDPT* first quoted from the XVth century: It is an *-(X)t-* causative from an *+(A)r-* derivate of *yaŋı*. *yaŋırtı* is attested only in Uigur; exs. not mentioned in the *EDPT* occur in Ht VII 2155, BT I A_2 45 and B(113), Suv 637,17 (with *yana*), HtPar 12 r 21, Suv 141,18, BT XIII 48,4, 53,5 and 54,4, HamTouen 12,7 and BuddhUig I 294. The second word in *olar yaŋırṭukan yok ärmäz; öŋrädinbärü kǫŋül tözindä yok ärür* (BuddhUig I 227) 'It is not from recent times that they are nonexistent; they do not exist in the root of consciousness from earlier on' probably contains another instance, together with the element *kan* discussed in section 2.21. BuddhUig I is a late text, which explains the /u/ instead of /ı/ after the dental.)

Not obviously related to the petrified converbs in *-t-I* are the *+tI* expansions of *+lA* adverbs discussed in part IV. The adverb *tı* 'firm', attested e.g. in Ht VII 13 a 24 and in such collocations as *ädgü tı, üküş tı, ulug tı, katıg tı, tı yavlak*, perhaps *otguratı* (< *otgurak tı*?), also has a different origin. Thirdly, there exist traces of an old case suffix *+dI*, to be discussed elsewhere. The real petrified converbs ending in *-t-I* are all added, it turns out, to bases ending in vowels. But after all, most *-(X)t-* verbs have vowel bases.

As shown in Erdal, 1979, the converb and aorist vowel of this formative changed from /I/ to /U/ in the course of the use of Old Turkic. More or less parallelly, the shape of the formative itself changed from *-(X)t-* to *-(ʃ)t-* (as shown in the same paper). In 84 % of all *-(X)t-* verbs, however, the formative looses its initial vowel because it is added to bases ending in vowels or to polysyllabic bases ending in /r/. With one-syllable verbs ending in /r/, the formative vowel is usually retained but may also get syncopated: See *kırt-*, *örit-* and *turıt-* above (the second being more solid than the other two).

-(X)t- appears as first element in the combinations *-tXl-*, *-tUr-* and *-tXz-*; it is expanded with *-tUr-* (at least ten verbs), *-Xş-* (four verbs), *-Xn-* (four verbs), *-Xk-* (two verbs) and *-Xl-* (six verbs). As expander, however, it is not versatile at all: We find it expanding the causatives *bış-ur-*, *büt-ür-*, *käl-ür-*, *keŋür-*, **olgur-*, *öl-ür-*, *siŋir-* and *täg-ür-*; the synchronically simple *yarat-*; *toş-gur-*; *agt-ar-*; *kotur-* and *turul-tur-*. It does not expand the members of any other class of deverbal verbs but leaves that task to *-tUr-*. Nor does it appear as second element in any combination of formatives.

All the petrified converbs I have found here are derived from bases ending in *°A-* or *°I-*. Looking at the petrified converbs ending in *-(U)r-U* listed in section 7.512, we find that their bases end either in consonants or in *°U-*. None of the petrified converbs formed with *-Ar-U*, *+gAr-U* or *-gUr-U* has a base ending in a vowel. There is, then, a complementary distribution[533] along similar lines as with the living causative verbs: Those are discussed a bit further on. The difference between the two areas concerns only *°U-* bases, as *yagu-t-* and *bäkü-t-* on the one hand, *yagu-ru* and *bäkü-rü* on the other.[534] This complementary distribution makes the whole set of petrified converbs into a grammatical category of deverbal adverbs, an independent entity.

7.57 *-tUr-*: LEXICAL MATERIAL

We deal with the listing of this formation in a manner different from that of other formations: We give the *-tUr-* derivates from the various deverbal verbs in separate lists. First, then, come the *-tUr-* verbs derived from simple or denominal bases; then the causatives of cooperative-reciprocals, of medial-reflexives, of passives and of causatives. The grouping is not quite as in the respective sections above: *+lAn-* verbs are listed together with *-(X)n-* verbs while *kudıKar-tur-* is together with the derivates from simple and denominal bases.

533 None of the bases of petrified converbs appears to end in /O/.

534 Cf. also *ak-ıt-* and *ak(u)ru* 'gently, quietly'. '*ak-ur-*' would also have been theoretically possible; note that the *EDPT* takes *akru* to be a simplex and rejects all etymologies for it.

aç-tur- 'to order something to be opened' does not appear in the *UW*; the *EDPT* quotes it only from the DLT. Found in InscrOuig II 7 with *bitig* as direct object.

aç- is tr.

adak-tur- 'to bring someone into trouble' is attested in TuoLuoNi 321 and 342, mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *UW*. The first ex. has it together with *öl-ür-*, the second with *umugsıra-t-*; this latter has the 'troubles' (*ada tudalar*) as subject. See *ada+k-* above in section 5.44; it is intr.

ag-tur- 'to raise, to cause to rise' comes from an intr. base. See the *EDPT* for the Toñ ex., the *UW* for Uigur evidence. The velar may have gotten devoiced to [x]: Cf. the dotting evidence mentioned in the *UW* entry.[535] Exs. mentioned in neither dictionary occur in UigTot 797, TuoLuoNi 362, AbitAnk 87 and UigKan 12 (the last two exs. together with *endür-*). Spelled with T from Toñ on.

al-tur- 'to have something taken' is not in the *UW* and the *EDPT* quotes it from the DLT and from Middle Turkic. Found also as *bitkäçilärkä kşanti kılguluk [nom bitig] talulap alturup* . . . (Warnke 102) and as *satgın alturup* 'causing to buy' in fragmentary context in UigSteu A 4. The DLT ex. governs *yarmak* as ultimate object.

alŋad-tur- 'to overcome' appears in the *UW* as '*al(ı)ŋadtur-*' and in the *EDPT* as '*alaŋadtur-*', but none of the exs. has a vowel after *al°*. *alŋ+ad-* (discussed in section 5.43) does not have such a vowel either. Further exs.: *ınçıp ötrü bir är ät yemäz bor içmäz, yagı [w]rm(ı)zt teginig tüşürti alŋadturtı* (Wettkampf 62) 'Here, then, is a man who does not eat meat and does not drink wine, and he felled and overcame the fiendish prince Ormızt';[536] *sezik köŋülüg katıglanmak küçindä* 'AL-ÑAD-DUR-LĀR in Tib.-script BuddhKat 39 is correctly translated as "Den Zweifel (skt. *vicikitsā*) entmachtet man kraft Bemühung (skt. *vīrya*)".[537]

535 What is quoted as '*tirgüklüg*' from a HtPar sentence in *UW* 76 b, par. 2 of the entry should better be interpreted as *tirgüklük* 'system of pillars'.

536 The eds. of this text also introduce their '(*ī*)' into this verb. Their translation "Dann (wird) jeder (sagen:) '(Der Gott), der Fleisch nicht ißt und Wein nicht trinkt, hat den Feind Ormizt zu Fall gebracht und besiegt!'" is impossible: It interpolates two lexemes which are not there; even joining *bir är* to *birär* (as they do) one does not get "jeder" but the distributive 'je einer' (which does not fit); asyndetic relative clauses (as implied by the translation) do not occur in Old Turkic, asyndetic coordination does.

537 *alŋadtururlar* was by haplology syncopated to *alŋadturlar* as, in l.35 of that text, *olur* < *olorur*. *kötürür* and *berür*, the aorists of the front-vowel *kötür-* and *ber-*, are not syncopated: /r/ may have had a tongue-tip allophone when adjacent to front vowels. One might have thought of an (untested) verb '*alŋad-(ı)t-*'; as *ī̆şlätir* in l.36 shows, however, the aorist vowel of *-(X)t-* verbs is /I/ in this text. Moriyasu's reading as '*alkıturlar*' is unacceptable because it has the wrong aorist vowel, because such a verb is nowhere attested, because *alk-* is already tr. and because the nasal is not explained.

ar-tur- 'to let oneself be deceived' with the dative of what one lets oneself get deceived by appears only in parallel passages in KT and BQ inscrs. Quoted in the *EDPT* under 1 *artur-* (2 *artur-* being the *-Ur-* causative from *art-*).[538]

as-dur- 1 'to have something suspended, hung up' is in the *UW* quoted from a single Suv ex., in the *EDPT* from the DLT (and Middle Turkic). Neither ex. mentions the intermediate agent. *as-* 'to suspend' is tr.

as-dur- 2 'to cause to bring about an increase' is a hap. in Suv quoted in the *UW*: a biverb with *ükli-t-tür-* as *as-* is often used with *ükli-t-* in a biverb signifying 'to increase (tr.)'. Only the ultimate object is explicit.

at-dur- 'to have something (e.g. an arrow) shot (at something)' is in the *UW* under *atṭur-* quoted from a single InscrOuig ex., in the *EDPT* from the DLT etc. *at-* is tr.

ber-tür- 'to make somebody give something, to let something be given'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. In the TT VI instance, the main ms. has *bertrürlär* with syncopated second syllable, unlike the printed text. Further exs. occur in ThreeLett 66, UigSteu B 16, Ht IV 603 (*agıçılarka ayıp ükü̈ş altun bertürüp* . . . 'He told the treasurers to give (him) a lot of gilders (and had him banished)') and VII 5 a9 and InscrOuig I 32, III 5, 30 and 50 and IV 1.

bıç-tur- 'to have something cut'. *EDPT* and *DTS* from Suv and DLT. Attested also in BT I D (62): *öz ätin bıçturdı*. The Suv ex. has 'other people's heads' as object. An ex. in BuddhUig II 577 appears to have permissive content: *altı yollarta tägzinip adrok adrok ätözlär tägindüktä adınlar üzä bıçturup, azuça ärsär ymä kart baş bolup, asıgsız näçä täg kanım akdı*.

bil-tür- 'to make a thing known, to inform someone'. *EDPT* and *DTS*. *b[ï]ltürü y(a)rlıka-* fits the context best in Ht VII 12 a1, instead of '*kältür-*' of the eds.: The second letter is, according to P. Zieme (personal communication) in a lacuna; B and K can be easily confused in this position. *See uk-tur-* below for another ex. Found also in BT I B (21), HtPar 183,4 as quoted in *UW* 265 b top, Ht VII 13 b4 and X417 and HtPar 208,20 as quoted in *UW* 52 a top, BuddhUig I 382 and Suv 388,17. Governs the accusative of the information and the dative of the person to be informed.

mün-tür- is attested in BT XIII 1,74 (*uçaŋızka arkaŋızka müntürüp* . . .) and 4,5 (*tosın yaŋaka müntürüp* . . .) and DLT fol. 365 (*ol maŋa at müntürdi*): 'to make or help someone mount (a horse etc.)'. The base is attested as *bin-* in Orkhon Turkic, as *min-* in the IrqB and as *mün-* in Uigur and Qarakhanid. Several scholars (including the *EDPT*) read '*bintürä*' in Toñ 25 and assign the form to the verb discussed here. This is quite unlikely as the second vowel is not written

538 This meaning and attestation makes '*[artu]rup*' in ĀgFrag (1) E6 a dubious conjecture for Chin. 'to deceive', beside the fact that *ar-* is tr. by itself. *[azgu]rup* (a *-gUr-* verb) would be better.

out and cannot therefore be rounded, and the converb vowel of this formation is not /A/. Read perhaps *ävin terä* instead. *bin-* etc. governs the horse (or whatever) as direct object; *mündür-* retains this government in the DLT but governs the beast in the dative in our two Uigur exs.

birik-dür- 'to unite, bring to agreement etc.' comes from *bir+ik-* (q.v. in section 5.44). *DTS* only from QB 4280; not mentioned in the *EDPT*. Further exs. in BT I D(164) and (282), ETŞ 13,97 and AbiShotan r8. In BT VII A 688 the text should read *al altag* (the eds.' suggestion for ATLQ) *bilgä* (*bilig*)*ig bir(i)kdürmäkimiz bolzun* and not '*bärkdür-*'; cf. the facs. Practically all Uigur exs. are spelled with D and not T in the formative.

bul-tur- 'to let or help find (something)' is in Uigur spelled both with D and with T; it is not attested in runic or in Qarakhanid texts. Beside the *EDPT*'s exs. we find it in ETŞ 10,115, TuoLuoNi 54 = 62, BT VIII A 121, BT XIII 15,40, 20,37, 43,18 and 47,26, UigTot 607, Abhi 1081 (with the intended 'finder' in the dative), Junshō C v1, ShōAgon 3, p. 203,7, BuddhUig II 127, 165, 375 and 622 and HtPek 33 a9-11.

mun-tur- 'to make somebody mad' is a hap. in M III q.v. in the *EDPT*; written with T. The intr. base appears there under *bun-*.

muŋad-tur- is found in *Badari bramanta ulatı ulug bilgälärig nom bilgä bilig ugrınta muŋadturtı* (Maitr 8 r30) 'He amazed the great sages, with the brahmin *Bädhari* foremost among them, in the domain of erudition'. *buŋ+ad-* (q.v. above) signifies 'to be surprised' only together with *adın-* or with *taŋla-*; by itself it signifies 'to be in trouble, to be worried'. This second meaning is reflected by the use of *muŋadtur-* in QB 3995 and 1264. Only the last-mentioned ex. is found in the *EDPT*. All exs. have T in the formative.

çız-dur- is a hap. in TT VII 26 quoted in the *EDPT*. 'to have something drawn', with the drawing in the accusative. Cf. *çız-ıg* and *çız-ın-* above.

ädäd-tür- 'to get something to materialise' is a hap. in BT III 77 mentioned neither in the *EDPT* nor in the *DTS*. *äd+äd-* (q.v. above) is attested only twice.

äşid-tür- 'to let somebody hear (something)' should not be confused with *eşt-ür-* although the two verbs appear to have the same meaning, have the same etymology and DLT fol. 118 took the latter to come from the former: Both *-Ur-* and *-tUr-* derivates from *äşid-* are, in principle, possible, and the language may have hesitated between them. The *EDPT*, however, treats them as if they were one verb. *äşidtür-* is attested in M III $28,9_1$ (text 9), U II 43,16 and 49,24 and BT VII A 779, *eşidtür-* in U I 6,3 (Magier, the only ex. mentioned in the *EDPT*), BT VIII A 81 and InscrOuig IV 27: The base had the shape *äşid-*, and its regular *-tUr-* causative has a better and earlier attestation than the one with *e°*. With *eşt-il-* and *eşt-ür-* (discussed above), documentation favours

eşid-. This shows that fronting to a certain degree correlates with syncopation in conjunction with 'Umlaut'.

en-tür- 'to bring somebody or something down'. *EDPT*; the ex. from M III 30,4$_2$ (text 13) should, however, rather be read as *iyintür-* (q.v. below) and the KP ex. as (*y*)*etür-* 'to lose' (as proposed by Tezcan in *TDAYB* 1978-9 (1981): 304). Add *üstünki yeelig altın endürüp* . . . (UigTot 1060) and *y*(*e*)*g*(*i*)*rmi kata koŋül eyin agdurguluk endürgül*[*ük*] *ol* (AbitAnk 87). The meaning of the verb in the following two exs. is late, and may possibly have been influenced by Chin. *yin*; cf. the n. to BT VII B 124 which Zieme retracts in BT XIII: *arıg uz bitiṭip* . . . *tamgaka endürüp* . . . (BT XIII 20,65) 'I had it written clearly and masterly and engraved on a printing block'; *arıglatıp tamgaka entürüp yakdurup ülät-* (Samanta 6) 'having it excerpted, engraved on a printing block, printed and distributed'. The verb in *ạntsang* . . . *koşugka entürmiş şlok takşut nom* (ETŞ 16,11, reading corrected in UigKan p. 66), *takşutka entürü tägintim* (ETŞ 19,14) and]*alıp koşugka entürm*[*iş* . . .] *bölökü*ğ . . . (BuddhStab III 3) signifies 'to reduce to (verse)'.

er-tür- is found in KT E40. In the passage preceding this, the Turk forces are described as being in unexpected difficulties. The sentence *Kül teginig az ärin ertürü* I T^{1}M Z. *ulug sünüş sünüşmiş* follows, the perfect form representing (in some way) *ıd-dımız*. This must mean 'we sent him with a few men to get there'.[539] For similar instances of verbs of causation used redundantly with a causative morpheme of a connected verb cf. *ber-tür-* with *ay-* earlier in this section, *kılturgalı* . . . *ay-* in Suv 551,11 as quoted and translated in *UW* 287 b under *ay-* par. 1,d and *kolturgalı ıd-* below in this section. The other instances in the *EDPT* s.v. '1 *értür-*' belong to *ärt-ür-* (q.v.). A dubious further ex. may appear in Ulankom 4, read as *TItImta sülätip Çwnkä çärig ıd*(*ı*)*ım. Yarganta ertürü todum* (D in the last word even more uncertain).

et-dür- 'to have something done or constructed' is in the *EDPT* quoted from one of several mss. in TT IV A46, from the DLT and from Middle Turkic. Add *uz etdürmiş ärdi* (Ht VII 1 a 13), *änätkäkdäki yaŋça etdürti* 'He had it constructed in the Indian style' (*ibid.* 14 a 3), *ayı körklä st*[*up*] *etdürti* (Ht X A 8), *ıstup çaydı eṭtürmäk* (CYK 22) and a similar ex. *ibid.* 60, *elig bäg* . . . *ulug balık etdürüp* . . . (Ht V 6 b 12), *bara eṭtürmäk* (InscrOuig I 22), *aşnukı bizin etdürgüçi stup* "in unserem früher zu errichtenden (?) Stūpa" (BT XIII 38,45). Verbs in ManMon 11, 87 and 90 spelt *etür-* should probably be read as *et*(*d*)*ür-*, as the *UW* writes and translates the third mentioned ex. in 223 a-b. The other two are *bag* [*borluk*] *yer suv kak temäzün, uz et*(*d*)*ürzün* 'he must have the vineyards$_2$ and

539 A semantic parallel to this: Republican Turkish *yetiş-* can also signify 'to arrive to the help of somebody' and comes from *yet-* 'to reach'.

(other) land$_2$ cultivated well, irrespective of whether they are dry' and *bag borluk yer suv iki iş ayguçılar uz et(d)ürüp* . . . (rest of the sentence quoted and interpreted in UigPacht p. 216) 'the two overseers must get the vineyards$_2$ and other land$_2$ cultivated well'. A verb *et-ür-* is, of course, a possibility but has not yet turned up in any other source: This could either be a dialect characteristic of ManMon (we have no ex. of *etdür-* in any Manichaean text) or an orthographical matter. The inscriptional counterpart of *etdür-* is *et-it-* (q.v. in the previous section).

ıd-tur- is mentioned neither in the *DTS* nor in the *EDPT*. It signifies 'to have (something) sent' in *näçä aş bar ärsär anı barça bärü ıdturu y(a)rlıkazun* (SuvGeng 605,8) '. . . whatever food there is, may he be so kind as to have it all sent here'. In ShōAgon 1,217 it rather means 'to cause to release', in accordance with the meaning of *ıd-* e.g. in *alkonı ölürgäy bir tirig ıdmagaylar* (TT II,1 17): *sōz[läp arvış savış]şlokug udı kim raxu asurıka*[540] *ıdturgalı ay t(ä)ŋrig* 'Pronouncing the incantational and exorcistic verse he was able to make the *asura* Rāhu let go the moon'.

ılık-dur- 'to pollute' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. This is a hap. in the Petersburg ms. of Suv quoted in the *DTS*, and in *UW* 190 b under *arıgsız* par. A,b,1. The base *ıl+ık-* (discussed in section 5.44) has appeared only in Qarakhanid and is intr. *ılıt-*, the variant of ms. Mz 762 (TIII M56-25) as quoted by Ehlers, is hardly to be attributed to the archtype.

igid-tür- 'to have a child nourished and reared' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It is a hap. in ShōAgon 2, p. 194,3. The base is tr.

kaldur- is attested in three exceedingly late Uigur texts: *kaldurmış täg bolmak* . . . *köŋül turgurur* (UigTot 905) 'one evokes a sensation as if someone lifted one off'. This comes from *kalı-* under syncopation of the °*ı-*, with meaning and origin like the DLT and KP verb *kalı-t-* (previous section). 'to lift off' becomes 'to carry off' in InscrOuig II 13: *yagımız . . . aṭayınız Öŋ Tegin Bäkini kalduru kiṭmiş adası* "danger que notre ennemi . . . s'en aille en emportant votre enfant chérie Öŋ Tegin Bäki". This, in turn, becomes 'to take away' in an economical document quoted in the *EDPT* under *kaltur-*. There should have been two entries there, for the DLT's verb with this shape comes from *kal-* 'to stay'. Some Middle Turkic texts and the Oguz languages today have *kaldur-* > *kaldır-* 'to lift, raise, kidnap'.

kan-tur- 'to satisfy, satiate' is a pretty common verb; see the *EDPT* and the *DTS*,

540 This passage is quoted in the n. to ĀgFrag (1) F5-8, which contains the same text but has *titdür-* instead of *ıdtur-*. Another difference is that the Kudara-Zieme text has [*asurı*]*tın*, the Shōgaito text *asurıka*. Kudara and Zieme quote Shōgaito's text as an ablative, about which P. Zieme informs me that "*-tīn* ist die wahrscheinlichere Lesung". The *UW* transcribes *asurı* (back-vowel dative!) as *asure*, presumably because of the spelling of the word in Tokharian. Röhrborn admits that he does that "trotz des Brāhmī-Belegs . . . *a su rī*"; Brāhmī I *can also* transcribe /ı/.

the latter escpecially under *qanturmaq*. Appears also eight times in the ETŞ (only once with D). Further, Maitr 119 v 4 and 35 v 10, BT XIII 1,98, TuoLuoNi 51 and ShōAv 52 all have *kūsūš* 'wish, desire' as object. Two biverbs with *tod-ur-* are quoted in the entry for that verb above, and there also is a biverb *todgur-kantur-*. Add also *kanturdaçı* in BT VII M13, *kanturuŋ* in MaitrH XI 4 b25, *kanturgalı* in Ht VII 5b18, *KÖNGÜLümin kanturup* ... (BuddhUig II 433) etc. There is an imperative name *Kantur saŋun* in ZiemeSklav II 1, a proper name *Kanturmış* in UigLand 22.

kayın-tur- 'to boil something'. Common, especially in Heilk II. An ex. not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* is quoted in the n. to UigTot 895. *kayın-* is a simplex; see *kayına-t-*.

käl-tür- 'to have or let somebody come; bring'. *DTS* (also s.v. '*keldür-*') and the *EDPT*. There are 12 exs. in the QB and 8 in the DLT. According to V. Thomsen found also in Toñ 53 and 54, but this is dubious. *kältür-* is used also in *tay(a)ŋu yarlıgı* (L hook misplaced, giving *yalrıgı*) *kältürdi* (HamTouen 18,6). *käl-ür-* (q.v. above) is very common from the inscrs. on all the way to the latest Uigur, but is not found in the DLT or the QB. This means that the Khotan dialect, in which HamTouen 18 must have been written, had this particular isogloss in common with Qarakhanid.

käs-tür- 'to get something cut' is by the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. We also have *elig [bäg ko]lın buţın kästürmiş [ārtí]* (Ht IV 978).

kıl-tur- 'to cause or let somebody (dative) do or make something, to get something (direct object) done'. *EDPT* and *DTS* quote this from Suv, USp and DLT. Found also in BT II 1066, ManMon 45 and 69, CYK 78, ShōKenkyū III 31, Ernte 65 and 74, Ht X 85 and 98, Ht VII 7 b 22 and 14 a 4 and 11, Warnke 103 and Suv 551,11.

kın-tur- 'to arouse an urge in someone'. *EDPT* from TT V B and Ht and then Middle Turkic. The exs. in Ht and Maitr have T, the one in TT V B (tacitly changed in the *EDPT*) and an additional one in ETŞ 15,43 D. Maitr 20 v 10 reads *barıp k[uvra]gag* (i.e. /kuvragıg/) *kınturuŋ* 'Go and arouse the community!', with those who are to develop a longing towards buddhahood referred to in the accusative.[541]

kıs-dur- 'to have something squeezed' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. It has been reconstructed in BT XIII 5,75: *başların käsdürü, ... [tı]şın ... tart-duru, kısd[ur]u* ... Both this and the DLT ex. are about torture. *kıs-* 'to compress, squeeze, pinch' is in this physical sense attested in the DLT. The QB has

541 The translation "strengt euch an!" in BT IX 68,10, is wholly unfounded. The n. thereto refers to TT V B 19 (which has the correct translation) and otherwise makes some quite imaginary and unacceptable etymological suggestions.

metaphorical instances, and the inscrs. (quoted in the *EDPT* entry for *kıs-*) use it with a predicative noun in a sense which is still not wholly clear. There may have been a different, intr., verb **kıs-*, for which see *kıs-ur-* above. Cf. *kıs-ıl-*, *kıs-ıl*, *kıs-ga*, *kısKınç*, *kıs-guç* etc.[542]

kirik-dür- 'to soil something' comes from intr. *kir+ik-* (section 5.44). A Suv ex. is mentioned in the *DTS* but not in the *EDPT*. Still further exs. are *arıg yorıgıg kirikdürüp . . .* (Tenri A III) and *yolug kirikdürdäçi toyın* (ĀgFrag (1) B 13 and 17). In AbiShotan v6, *kirikdür-* is used in opposition to *arın-gur-*.

kod-tur- appears in two passages in Suv with different meaning; these are quoted by the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. The passage around 17,9 is about somebody unable to find a certain book. Finally, *Suvaştik sı atl(ı)g säŋrämtä tapışıp ötrü koḍḍurup altı*. This means 'to copy': It appears with dentals simplified to *kotur-* in Suv 18,23 and in SuvCaitya 33,19 (wrongly spelled as '*kodur-*' there): *aktarıp öz eligin koturu tägintim* '. . . copied with my own hand'. Cf. *kotur-t-* in the previous section and the modern exs. with this meaning mentioned in the n. to TuoLuoNi 213. That n. mentions a further ex. in HtPek 93 b3. In Suv 181,1-2, on the other hand, *kod-tur-* signifies 'to do away with': *yavlak kılınçlarıg koḍdrup alko aḍgū tōrōlärtä yaratınıp . . .* refers to the agent's evil deeds. In *el xan kōrüp b(ā)lgülüg öz el içindä boḍunın yavlak kılınç kılmakın arıtı koḍturmasar ıtdmasar* (SuvStockh 54), the king may 'not do away at all' with the evil deeds of his nation. We have a similar meaning, this time with simplified dental cluster, in QB 117: *sävinçin tolu tut sakınçın kotur* 'keep his joy full and do away with his care'. Also *esizlärni tutma eliŋdin kotur* (QB 1455) 'do not support disruptive people but drive them from your realm'. Both meanings of *kodtur-* are semantically specialised, then.

kol-tur- 'to have someone ask or beg for something' is in the *EDPT* quoted from DLT and Rabġūzi. Also found in TuoLuoNi 354: *saŋgıst(a)v(ı)rı şı açarı bir kiçigk(i)yä şabini kayçu çiu atl(ı)g balıkta bakır kolturgalı ıḍḍı* ". . . schickte . . . um das Kupfergeld (zurück) zu erbitten". The causative meaning is contained in *ıd-* as well, as with *er-türü ıd-* quoted in the entry earlier in this section.

542 The n. to the BT XIII passage confuses the adjective *yası* 'flat', applied to movable entities, with *yazı* 'open ground, a large plain', which applies to terrain. It must be realised that /s/ and /z/ are distinct phonemes throughout Old Turkic, although overlapping in certain surroundings and frequently spelled indiscriminately in relatively late Uigur texts (e.g. here, where *yası* was written as *yaşı*). The DLT (quoted in the *EDPT*) does distinguish between the two lexemes. (*yas-* and *yaz-* 'to untie, loosen' appear to be the same verb in the DLT, but that is the result of a recent split to be discussed elsewhere.) *yazı* appears in the KT, BQ and Toñ inscrs. with /z/, *yası* in the ŞU and Tariat inscrs. with /s/. *yası* lives on in Turkic languages with /s/ to this day. It appears in *yası ban* attested here and as quoted in the n. to this passage from Suv 477,13-17 and from an unpublished fr. *keŋ yazı . . . oron* (Suv 574,16-19), on the other hand, contains the lexeme *yazı*, as the content of the Chin. original shows. *yazı* is found also in TT V A 123 and TT VII 42,8.

kon-tur- 'to settle (people somewhere)' is in the *EDPT* quoted from Orkhon Turkic, the IrqB, the DLT and Middle Turkic. *kon-* governs the accusative in Orkhon Turkic but the dative (or even the locative, rarely) later.

koş-dur- appears in *udlar koşdurup* . . . 'having the oxen harnessed, . . .' in Ernte 75 and in similar phrases in Ernte II 34 and 38. *EDPT* and *DTS* do not have this verb. *koş-* is tr.

kögäḍ-dür- 'to praise something, embellish it in words': *EDPT* s.v. '*kökädtür-*' (implied derivation from *kök* 'sky; blue'), *DTS* s.v. '*kügädtür-*' (implied derivation from *kü* 'fame') quote two exs. from Suv. A further ex. from HtPek 79 b2 is quoted in *UW* 251 a and translated as "preisen". In the versified Suv paraphrase in BT XIII 13,66, the instance of Suv 135,12 is written with V, as *kövätdürüp*. As the ed. notes, this means that the verb had /g/ and not /k/ as its second consonant. The derivation from *kög* 'melody', which he suggests, is made possible by the use of this noun in M II 8,19 (text 3) to refer to a hymn of praise. Still, deriving it from *körk+äd-* 'to be or become beautiful' (q.v. in section 5.43) seems much more likely in view of the meaning, because *+Ad-* usually signifies 'to be or become the content of the base' and as an *+Ad-* derivate from *kög* is not known. The other etymologies seem even less likely. See *körk+äd-* for the phonetics.

kön-tür- 'to straighten'; metaphorically, 'to guide, direct'. *EDPT* and *DTS* from Suv and then from QB on, the former with T, the latter with (assimilated) D. Add *yaŋlokın köntü[rüp]* 'correcting his mistake' (Ht X 232), *uçanı köndürüp* 'straightening the back' (and not quite as translated, UigTot 1017) and *yerig köntürüp* 'flattening the ground' (ManMon 88).

köy-dür- 'to burn something' is attested in TT VII 23 and the DLT as quoted in the *EDPT* under **küñdür-*.[543] The normal and early verb for this content is *köñ-ür-*, q.v. above in section 7.51.

kör-tür- is quoted in the *EDPT* from the DLT, in the *DTS* also from M III $5,1_4$ (text 1) in a fragmentary and obscure passage. It apparently signified 'to urge to see', whereas the common *körtKür-* and *körKit-* were 'to show, display, make manifest etc.': The former thus implied influence on the seer, the latter on the object.

kud-tur- 'to have something poured out, to have metal cast'. The last mentioned meaning is attested in TuoLuoNi 169, *şopaK altun üzä burxanlarnıŋ körkin kuḍḍurup* . . . Further: *süçig çıvş(a)gun içgülärig süzüp särmäp kudturup* (BuddhUig II 90, wrongly translated as "setzen") and *toyın sözlämiş [sag] süt kudturup* . . . (Ht V 3 a 15) 'having the pure milk which the monk talked about poured out and . . .'. What the monk said about pure milk to be poured out is

543 Clauson for some reason mentions M I 18,1-2, although the verb appearing there is *kǫyür-*.

quoted under *yakçırt-* in the previous section. *kud-* is tr. What the *EDPT* under *1 kutur-* quotes from the DLT comes from this verb under simplification of the dentals; what is there quoted from the QB belongs to *kod-tur-* > *kotur-*. *kudıKar-tur-* 'to cause something to be disparaged' is found in Suv 135,12[544] and in the versified paraphrase of that passage in BT XIII 13,67. The *EDPT*'s etymology for this is impossible; cf. *kudı+Kar-* in section 7.53 above.

kutad-tur- 'to give good fortune etc.' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but appears in ETŞ 10,69, BT VII A 12, 300, 367, 377-8, 586 and 751 and I 4 and 20, BT VIII A 68, 331 and 332 and B 48, Maitr 155 v 7, UigTot 145 and 143 and ShōAv 320 (quoted s.v. *kutsıra-* above). *köz kaçıglarıg kutadurdaçı* in ETŞ 10,194 is probably an instance of this same verb, with one dental omitted; an *-Ur-* derivate from *kutad-* is not otherwise attested. See *kut+ad-* in section 5.43 above.

küḏ-dür- 'to detain, cause to wait' is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. It appears in Ht IV 1187 and ShōAgon 1,285.

küzäḏ-dür- is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. It is in the *DTS* quoted from Suv 180,17, and there is an identical phrase in Suv 180,21: *'äŋäyü burxan kutın küzäḏḏürmäk buyan ädgü kılınç* is 'the meritorious deed$_2$ of bringing about special consideration for buddhadom'. Then there is *k(ä)ntü on ädgü kılınç küzäḏḏürtüm, poşıl(ı)g yagış turgurdum* (Maitr 45 v 4) 'I myself had the ten (sorts of) good deeds (or 'commandments'?) kept, had the offering of charity presented'. *küzäd-* (discussed on p. 491) appears to be a simplex. Cf. *küzäd-il-* for cognates.

oy-tur- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT. It means 'to have hollowed out' in *oyturup karaklarınnı* (BT XIII 5,128) and *başların bıçturu karakların oyturu tārilārin soyturu . . .* (Suv 235,7); *oy-* was often used of gouging out the eyes. A meaning 'to have engraved, carved' appears in *t(a)vgaççasın türkçäsin tamgata oydurup mıŋ vuu yakdurup* (UigKol 13) "seine chin. und seine tü. [Version] auf einen Blockdruck schneiden lassen, 100 Amulette abziehen lassen, . . .", *tamga[ta] oydurup* (BT XIII 46,7), *tamgasın ärtä uz oyturup* (48,4), *tamgasın oyturgalı* (49,33) and *yaŋırtı tamgasın oyturup* (53,5). *oy-* is tr.

ō-dür- 'to remind somebody of something' is by the *EDPT* quoted with this meaning from the DLT. Found also in BT III 566, and 531: *ödürür män sizlārni, toyınlar a!* The ed.'s suggestion to read *'ütür-'* and consider this a derivate of *üt* 'advice' does not seem likely as there is no formative *'+Ur-'*.

ōŋād-dür- 'to cure someone' is spelled with °TD° in all its Buddhist, Manichaean and Christian exs.; it is not attested in runic or Muslim sources. The *EDPT* has

544 This and another three words here make the line longer than the others and are by the eds. put into square brackets; they were apparently added in the margin or between the lines.

four exs. from Suv, the *DTS* has an additional one and a sixth one appears in 603,4. Further, *igliglärig ö[ŋ]äddtürti* in ms. TM 155 r3 quoted in the n. to ManTüTex 458 and *igliglärig karıka bal(ı)glarıg igindä agrıgınta öŋäḍḍürtäçi* in NesTex ms. T II B 28 (U 4910) 11. M III 24,7-10$_4$ (text 9) should read *uz ootaçı siz. ädgü öglilärig öŋäḍḍrügli siz . . . ɣmtı öŋäḍḍürüŋ mänin̆ başımın* '. . . cure now my wound'.[545] In Heilk I 14 we find the sentence *ençsiz bolmakıg, alko yeel* < *alŋadturur* in BuddhKat 39 and *olur* < *olorur ibid.* 35. *öŋädtür-* either governs the illnesses in the accusative or the patients in the accusative with the illnesses in the ablative (and ablatival +*dA*). See *öŋ+äd-* 'to recover' in section 5.43.

ör-tür- is in the *EDPT* quoted from TeilBuch (M I), *ıg yaŋı yerdän temin örtürürçä* . . . 'Just as one makes plants rise from the fresh earth'. Clear on the facs.; otherwise the verb for growing plants is *ün-tür-*: *täŋri oṭ ündürdi* in the DLT. *örtür-* in *bulut*] *örtürüp yagmur yagıtıp* . . . (ShōAgon 1,129) 'made the clouds rise and the rain come down', on the other hand, is in accord with what we otherwise know about the use of these verbs. *ör-* 'to rise' is intr.

sal-tur- 'to have something thrown somewhere etc.' is in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted from TT VII 25 (°LD°) and USp (a letter; °LT°) and the DLT.

sı-tur- 'to have something broken', *EDPT* and *DTS*, from Suv (quoted under *soy-tur-* below) and the DLT. The words *sıturu çaxşapat* in TUO XXXIII may possibly in some way belong here too, seeing that *çaxşapat sı-* is 'to break a commandment'. Beyond doubt is [*bil*]*ikin yotasın sıturu* 'getting his wrists and thighs broken' in BT XIII 5,79. *sı-* is tr.

silk-tür- is a hap. in U III quoted in the *EDPT*. 'to have something (a bell in this case) shaken'. *silk-* is tr.

sok-tur- is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, which has an ex. about 'having pepper ground'. We further have the exs. *tämürçikä barıp orgak sokdurup* . . . (Ernte 57) 'goes to the blacksmith and has the sickle beaten' (similarly in Ernte II 18) and *baxşıka sokdurmak* (BT VIII A 155) 'to get beaten by one's guru'.

soy-tur- 'to have somebody stripped or flayed'. The Manichaean text quoted in the *EDPT* has D, but T appears in the following two, not mentioned there: *tärilärin soyturu süŋüklärin sıturu* (Suv 235,8) 'having their skins flayed and their bones broken . . .' and] *kırtışın soyturgalı* [(unpublished ms. in the n. to BT XIII 12,01). *soy-* is tr.

sön-tür- 'to let something (especially evil influences) die out'. *EDPT* s.v. *söndür-*

545 And not "Jetzt veranlasse Du meinen Kopf zum Lernen!": The ed. had read the verb as *örg°* instead of *öŋ°*. The second instance is spelled as *örgädtürüŋ* but in fact has °TD° and not °DT°: The D is added on top of the T.

(although all the exs. have T) and *DTS*. Appears in Heilk II C, Suv and, as a weaker variant in several mss. in a passage in TT VI.

sür-tür- 'to have somebody banished or animals driven somewhere'. In the *EDPT* under 1 *sürtür-* quoted from the DLT. Add *agıçılarka ayıp ükü̧ altun bertürüp elintä ta̧ştın sürtürdi* (Ht IV 603) '... and had him driven away outside his realm', *buyruk[lar]ın bägläri atl(ı)gın yüzlügin barça sürtürdi kuz[tın] yıŋak ıddı* (Ht V5 a14) 'He had all his generals, *bägs* and notables$_2$ (who were in Taxila) banished and sent them to the north' and *mıŋ irk Talaska sürtürdüm ärdi* (ZiemeSklav III 6). Read thus (cf. facs.), the last sentence signifies 'I had a thousand rams driven to Talas'; the DLT ex. for *sürtür-* concerns the driving of sheep. The passage is purely economical: *algum bar* of the following l. is 'I have a debt to collect'.

täp-tür-, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* from earlier than the 15th century, appears in Ernte 75: *udlar koşdurup turmadın tutçı täptürüp* ... 'one harnesses oxen ... and has them uninterruptedly$_2$ trample on (the cereal)'. *ol kapıg kaşın[ta a]şmış sezik bitigig [en]dürüp täptürdi* is read in Ht IV 1498 and translated "den Irrbrief, der an der Seite der Tür hing, ließ er herunternehmen und vernichten". *täptür-* can hardly have been "vernichten", since *täp-* is just 'to kick'; cf. also DLT *täp-ig* 'a kick' and *täp-ök* 'a football'. 'kick it (away)' therefore seems to be the translation most appropriate to the text. This instance differs from the first also in governing the ultimate object (like *täp-it-* and *irklät-*) and not the intermediate subject.

tärsik-dür- and *tätrüldür-* 'to lead astray' are attested as a biverb in TuoLuoNi 343, as *t(ä)rsikdürmäz tätrüldürmäz*. Both are hap. legomena. *tärs tätrü* is used as a binome and there is a hap. *tärsikmäk tätrülmäk*. *+Xk-* forms intr. verbs.

te-dür- 'to arrange for something to be said' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. We also have *amtıkı eligimiz kutı ... nomug ukıtdaçı sụ̈ü yaratı tedürtilär* 'His Highness our present king ... composed a preface to explain the ... doctrine and had it recited' (honorific plural; Ht VII 15 b25). *te-* is tr., *te-t-* passive.

(ter-tür- 'to have a group assembled', not in the dictionaries. Dubious hap. in BT I B(46).)

tın-tur- 'to let somebody or something (in Ernte 26 a field) rest', also with *arok* 'exhaustion' as direct object. To the *EDPT*'s exs. add *tındurur* (ETŞ 15,44), *arokın tınturgalı sakınmışın biltürdi* (BT I B(21)) and *tındurmış tın tarıglag yerlär* (Ernte 26) 'uncultivated agricultural land which had been allowed to rest'. The base is intr.

tik-tür- 'to have something sewn' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT. Attested also in *ävirmiş kamag nomlar on bölök, tiktürmiş çikin sọ̈ö iki yüz* (Ht VII 8 b19) 'The works which he had translated were all together ten classes, the silk images which he had had sewn two hundred'; *ol [kra]jalar agdukıŋa xan*

[. . .]lup käntüsi tiktürmiš kraja kälürtüp körkitti (HtPar 4 r (= 159) 15) 'Since those monks' clothes had deteriorated, the king [. . .]ed, had brought monks' clothing which he had had sewn himself, and showed (it to them)'. *tik-* is tr.

tit-dür- is a hap. in ĀgFrag (1) F 8, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *udı kim [raxu asurı]tın titdürgäli ay t(ä)ŋrig* "er konnte veranlassen, daß vom [Asura Rāhu] freigegeben wird der Mond". See *ıd-tur-* above: That is what the parallel text in ShōAgon has instead of *titdür-*. *tit-* 'to renounce, give up' is tr.

tol-tur- 'to fill' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, Middle Turkic, etc. We also find it in *ymä tolturuŋ ol m(ä)ŋülüg bar(ı)mlık agılıkıŋızka* (M III 11,2$_2$, text 6) 'And fill up that eternal storehouse and treasury of yours (with those alms)'. Unlike European languages, *toltur-* can govern the substance filled into a receptacle as direct object and the receptacle in the dative. *tol-gur-* (q.v. in section 7.54) may not have been used in this construction and is, moreover, attested only in Buddhist texts.

tut-dur- has 'a thief' as object in DLT fol. 353. In Uigur, however, it means 'to have something kept' or 'upheld', twice with *nom* as object: *tägintürgü tutdurgu üçün köni nom nomlalım* (ETŞ 13,96) 'Let us teach the true doctrine in order to make people attain it and keep it'; according to Zieme in *JA* 269 (1981): 390-1 n. 36, *arıg ıdok nomug şazın*[ıg] *boşgunsar tutdursar* is to be read in TT VII 40,18-19 (Yetikān Sudur) instead of what is printed there. A further ex. appears in Warnke 98, with *at bitiglär* 'indices' as object. See *tutur-* in the *EDPT* for Kāšġarī about this verb, and cf. *tutr-uk* above.[546]

tuy-tur- 'to make somebody sense something' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT and from USp. 59. It is found also in *çın KÖNGÜLni semäksiz üzä tuyturdaçı ärür* (BuddhUig I 275), *burxanlar baxşılar tuymaduk tınlaglarnı* (= /tınlıglarnı/) *bo KÖNGÜLin tuydurgalı üküş tälim nomlar nomlasar . . .* (*ibid.* 122) and in a further ex. from this text quoted under *tanuklatdur-* below. In the second-mentioned ex., *KÖNGÜLin* is in the instrumental case.

tül-tür- 'to beat' is in the *EDPT* quoted from M II 11,13 (text 4) but misunderstood: *yäklär . . . tüş üzä oltrup tültürür* 'The demons . . . sit on one's chest and beat it'. Attested also in *takı ymä Kantarı gantarvılar t(ä)ŋridäm kövrüglärig tültürdi* (Maitr 18 v10) and *tämirlig çomakın bärgän tokıyurlar tültürürlär* (Maitr 82 r24) 'They beat them with iron cudgels and whips'. Similarly, U III 11,7 should be completed as *nomlug kö*[*vrügüg*] *tültürüp kurtruldaçı tınl(ı)glarıg y*[*av*]*l*[*a*]*k agar ayıg kılınçl(ı)g uvlarıntın udgurup . . .* 'I wish to beat the drum of *dharma* and arouse the creatures to be saved from their bad and heavy

546 *yollarıg tututruŋ* (ThreeLett 20) and *yolug yana tututurgay siz* (*ibid.* 38) should probably be read as *tutu tur-* (for *tuta tur-*) 'stand and hold' and do not belong here at all. '*tuttuyup*' in ZweiFrag 2 should best be interpreted as *tut⟨a⟩ turup*, as shown in Hitch, 1987.

sleep of evil deeds' (a double metaphor string). Cf. *tültr-ün-* above. *tüldür-* should be read also in DLT fol. 354, although DankKelly write '*taldur-*'; the second-hand *ḍamma* can be trusted in this case: *atlıg anı tüldürdi* "The horse-man knocked into him". This meaning is similar enough to be related, and the different dialect can account for the divergent meaning; there is no infinitive to show frontness. The lemma for *tül-* in DLT fol. 275 does not have any infinitive either: *är topıknı adrı bilä tüldi*, with first hand *ḍamma* in the first syllable. DankKelly nevertheless change this (as well) to '*taldı*' because of the subsequent lemma (which also involves a game). The semantic similarity to the Uigur verb seems to justify the separation into two verbs (but not the alteration of the following *taldı talar talmak* to *tü°*). The semantic relationship between *tül-* and *tültür-* is not one of causation, unless one considers the sticks and cudgels to be implicit intermediate subjects. *tül-ü*K 'violence, vigour', appears to be a cognate.

uk-tur- 'to make somebody understand' and / or 'to get something understood'; *EDPT* and *DTS*. Two of the exs. are biverbs with *bil-tür-* (q.v. above). In Suv 386,17 we find a further ex. of this biverb not mentioned in the dictionaries. *bil-uk-* is, among other places, found in UigTot 243 and 246; cf. the biverb *bilil-ukul-* under *bil-il-* above.

unıt-dur- 'to make someone forget; to get something forgotten' is not mentioned in the *EDPT*. A Suv ex. is quoted in the *DTS*. Add *bilmäkig unıtdurup ögrätinmäk* (UigTot 618).

ur-tur- 'to have something put somewhere' is in the *EDPT* quoted from Orkhon Turkic and Uigur, in both cases governing the ultimate object.

ün-tür- 'to cause something to rise' and adjacent meanings like 'to lift up, get something out, bring forth, display, let out, help out, uproot, remove, bring up, raise a sum' is an exceedingly common verb only partly documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*: Further exs. occur in Maitr 102 r5, 66 v3, 182 v12, 51 r6, 83 v2, 182 r16, 52 v5 and 130 v6, HtPek 33 a9-11, Ht V 8 b11 and VII 7 b3, ShōKenkyū III 25, BuddhUig II 223, ĀṭSū 1 r2, UigPacht L18, HtPar 220,10 quoted in *UW* 52 a under *adınçıg* par. A, UigTot 765, 789, 818, 1048, 616, 1306, 1307 and 1392, Ht X 1099, BT XIII 13,69, 19,104, 51,26 and 58,5, Abhi 73 and 1105, TuoLuoNi 401, BT VII A 609 = 613, 619 and 670 and B 2 and 95, ShōAgon 2, p. 191 l.6, BT VIII B 40, Suv 29,21-22, BT III 100, FamArch 83, 176 and 199, ETŞ 11,16, 13,11 and 131 and 17,12, HamTouen 35,6 and 28,13. The last-mentioned ex. spells the verb as *yuntürüŋ*, with *y°* as the base is spelled in a runic ms. quoted in the *EDPT* under *ün-*. BuddhKat 32 (Tib. script) also has the verb as *yüntrüp*. These are indicative of original initial /h/, possibly pronounced but in any case left unexpressed by the writers of Orkhon Turkic. In *bwlçwka taŋ üntürü tägdimiz* in Toñ 35, *taŋ* must be a temporal absolute, a

use found often with *tün* 'night'. The sentence probably signifies 'We reached B., having made the soldiers[547] get up at dawn'.

üz-tür- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from the DLT, where it denotes the 'breaking' of a rope. Ht IV 357 has the phrase *vakpadi baxşınıŋ asurılar pryanınta turup maytri bodıs(a)tvnıŋ burxan kutın bulgusın küḍüp sezikin üztürgäli ugramış oron* 'the place where master V. remains in the *asuras*' cell to wait for *bodhisattva* Maitreya to find buddhahood so as to have (him) solve his (the *baxşi*'s) doubts'; here, 'Maitreya' is deleted from its appearance as intermediate subject because it already serves as subject of *bul-*. In Ht IV 845, read *ellig bodunlugka ymä ölüt ölürmä[kig] üztürmiş ärdi* instead of the ed.'s '*ölürmä[ktin]*': 'He had made those belonging to the state and the nation stop killing'. In this third ex., *üz-tür-* signifies 'to cause to stop'. *üz-* is tr.

yad-tur- 'to get something spread (by somebody else, in the dative)' is in the *EDPT* quoted from Chuast and the DLT. The latter has 'bedding' as ultimate object, the former 'the doctrine'. *yad-* is tr.

yag-tur- 'to make it rain (rain or something else)' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, Middle Turkic etc. Found also in Maitr 183 v18. The usual Uigur causative of *yag-* is *yag-ıt-*, q.v. in the previous section.

yak-tur- was misunderstood before Zieme in BuddhStab n. 51 determined that it signifies 'to have (something) printed'. One instance is quoted under *oy-tur-* earlier in this section; its object is *vuu* 'amulet'. Otherwise attested with *nom* as object in BT XIII 41,17, 42,22, 46,7, 47,11 and 49,77, and with *küen* ~ *küön* as object in TT VI colophon III, TT VII 40,121 (Yetikän Sudur), Hazai 66 and BT XIII 42,3, 47,10. Cf. also UigOn II p. 82 n. 10. Spelled both with T and D. The *EDPT* should have connected the TT VII ex. (the only Uigur instance which it knows) with the DLT verb mentioned in its entry 2 *yaktur-*, not the one mentioned in the entry 3 *yaktur-*: The base is *yak-* 'to come into or be in contact'.

yan-tur- 'to turn back (tr.), bring back, avert'. *EDPT* (first entry s.v.) and *DTS*. An ex. from M III 10,7$_1$ (text 4) is not quoted by the dictionaries. The two exs. from TT X are only partly preserved and uncertain. Further exs. occur in Maitr 71 r24 and 74 r18, DreiPrinz 61, Ht V 8 a19 and Warnke 610; common in the QB. The patient can return *from* something, as in *sansartın yandurup* (UigTot 588) and *oot ... yaromaktın yandurmak* (UigTot 785) "vom Aufleuchten abwenden" or *to* something, as in *tınl(ı)glarıg ayıg kıl[ınç]dın ävirip buyanka yanturdı* (HtPar 131 r2 quoted in Mayer and Röhrborn, 1986: 119). The meaning 'to avert' is attested e.g. in U II 51,5 and in *ş(ı)mnulug yagı[g ... dAç]ı yanturdaçılar* (BT VIII Anh. 2-3,29). Only an instance in USp and two in Uig-

547 Causatives with 'the army' as 'understood' object can be found, among other places, in Toñ 15, 25 and 27.

Tot are spelled with ND instead of NT. See the petrified converb *yanturu* below. *yan-* is intr.

yaŋıl-tur- 'to make somebody go wrong' is in the *DTS* (but not in the *EDPT*) quoted once from Suv, where it governs the erring creatures in the accusative. Found also in *tayanguluk yolnı yaŋılturur, igiḍ sakınç üzä biltürür* (BuddhUig I 381), where a further syntactic slot is occupied by the accusative. *yaŋıl-* should (as far as we know) be a simplex.

yaval-tur- to subdue, make docile, tame'. See the *EDPT* s.v. Another ex. is found in the *DTS* under *turultur- yavaltur-*, and others in BT I B (30) (*kõŋülüg yaval-turmış*) and (32), D (336) (*kõŋülüg yavalturgalı* . . .) and F (37), ETŞ 9,81, 10,17 and 253, Buddhāv H 107 and the Abhi ex. quoted in the n. thereto, Maitr 171 r8, UigFalt 54 (with *turuldur-*), BT VIII B 42, BuddhUig II 42 (*ayıg sakınçlarıg yavaltur-*), ShōAgon 1,337, 13 (*yavaltursar kõŋülin*), 22, 35, 38 etc. and 2, p. 194,10_2 and BT XIII 4,11, 5,222 and 25,17. The *EDPT* and the *DTS* have three Old Turkic exs. of the base, one in Brāhmī script. All three have the form *yavalmış* 'soft tempered, gentle minded', and *yavalmış* is also what we find in Sitātap 132 (with *amrılmış*, quoted in the *UW* under this latter), BT II 1260 and MaitrGeng 7 b 29. In ShōAgon 1, p. 157, 5-6, however, we find the phrase *çın kertü turulmak yavalmakta yavaldurtaçı*, with the base in a form other than with *-mış* and in the common biverb with *turul-*. A converb form is found in HtPar 29 r2-4: *nomlug yarlıgı takı näŋ tägmäzkän ınçıp bütä yavalu tükämişlär ärdi* 'Although his *dharma*-teaching had not yet reached them at all, they were so perfectly mature and gentle minded'. Further forms of *yaval-* appear in the DLT; the *EDPT* 'emends' their vowels. The MaitrGeng ex. predicates *yaval-* upon wild animals,[548] but the others refer to persons.

(*yāl-tür-* in Toñ 54, mentioned in the *EDPT*, is dubious and may also be *käl-tür-*.)

ye-tür- 'to give someone (dative) something (accusative) to eat'. *EDPT* and *DTS*, neither of which, however, noticed an ex. in U III $65,6_2$. Further exs. in *aşıg tatıgıg tägşürmätin bın tõrõçä yetürsär* . . . (Suv 592,2), in *UW* 237 b translated as "wenn man die Speisen und ihre Geschmacksarten . . . nicht verwechselt und . . . verabreicht" and *yedüräyin sizlärkä* (Ernte 66).

yer-tür- appears in Genzan D v 10, read and interpreted correctly in *UW* 287 b:

548 With the *figura etymologica yavalmış yavaş*. *yavaş* may not contain *-Xş*, which is a dominant formative and in Old Turkic not added to derived verbs; nor is *yaval-* necessarily derived. Tezcan, in his review of the QB İndeks, would like a verb in QB 2409 to be understood as '*yava-r*' "yumuşatır, uysallaştırır", but the form is found only in one ms. where the other two have *yıgar*. In fact, the line as constructed by Arat is not found in any of the mss. The relationship between *yaval-* and *yavaş* reminds one of *sõgül-* and *sõgüş* (Oguz), the base of *balık-* and *baş* 'wound' (see *balık-* in section 7.24) and so forth. The matter is further complicated by the lexeme *yaval*, discussed in section 3.113.

äŋäyü üzä [an]ıŋ yavızın yertürgäli aymak, kop adasın tudasın sözlämäk 'in particular, to demand (from them) to despise its evil aspects and to tell (them) all about its dangers$_2$'. Causation is, as elsewhere, co-denoted by *ay-* and *-tUr-*. The DLT's *yer-tür-* 'to cause to split (tr.)', which has an entry in the *EDPT*, is a different verb. *yer-* ~ *er-* 'to despise, criticise etc.' is tr.; the Genzan *yertür-* governs the ultimate object in the accusative.

1 *yet-dür-* ~ *et-dür-* 'to allow something to get lost', i.e. 'to lose it'; 'to cause to disappear'. *DTS* under '*yittür-*'; not an entry in the *EDPT*, which mentions it as a variant of '*yitür-*'. Found in Suv in a biverb with *ıçgın-* and in the DLT. Further exs.: *ötrü kamagun bir yaŋlıg ulug ünin sıgtaştılar kal boltılar busuşka, "yettürtümüz teginig" tep* (Suv 634,21), *ög eṭṭürmäk* 'to lose one's mind' (Kudlär (*ibid.* 312). The n. to *ç(a)xşap(a)tıg eṭṭürmäk* (Tenri A VI) discusses the verb along the same lines as done here and adds exs. from Abhi 2363 and 2520. These are both biverbs with *unıt-* 'to forget' and have *sütras* as objects. *yet-ür-* ~ *et-ür-* (same alternation as here!) has the same meaning.

yıg-tur- 'to cause to heap up, order to be collected' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the DLT, which has *ol aŋar tarıg yıgturdı*. Similarly in Ernte 72-77: *bugday adakın . . . kaŋlı birlä yıgdurup . . . täptürüp toẓgurup oṭra yıgdurup . . .* In Ht X 616 it applies to persons: *kamag kuvrag[ıg anta] yıgturdı*. In ManMon 66 to 'flour': *t(ä)ŋrilär nŵdmäkä / barsar eşmiş minin öŋi yıgturzun* 'When their majesties go to a reception (I follow P. Zieme's personal suggestion to interpret the word as a loan from Sogd. *nwyδm*' "Einladung"), he must get the poured-out flour collected elsewhere'. Further exs. appear in Warnke 74 (*lovudi xan . . . toyınlarıg dıntarlarıg yıgturup kälürüp . . .*) and 120 (quoted under *yarat-tur-* below). *yıg-* is tr.

yokad-tur- 'to annihilate'. Both the *EDPT* and the *DTS* emend tacitly, as the verb is written with TD in their three instances. Additional exs.: Maitr 175 r 4 spelled with DT, BT III 109 TD but 313 DT, BT I D (253) DT, parallel text in B (224) TD and D (263) also TD, ZiemeTārā 16 d DT, BT VIII M 2 TT, ShōAgon 1,178 TD and in HamTouen 3,17 the verb is spelled with °DT°. The annihilated entities are of all sorts. See *yok+ad-* in section 5.43.

yüd-tür- is attested in Suv 604,8 (*üküş tälim kaplarta kwlguklarta ol yaŋalarka küçi yetmişçä suv yüḍḍürüp . . .*) and 605,12 (*ol yaŋalarka kümän aş yüḍḍürüp*). The earlier verb signifying 'to load', however, was *yütür-*: It appears in U I 8,2 (Magier), tacitly changed in the *EDPT* quotation to '*yüdür-*', and in HtPar 134,7, explicitly changed in the *UW* quotation under *at* par. A,1 (252 b) to '*yüḍür-*'. The word in IrqB XXIV written '*yütürük*' in Thomsen's text in fact reads $Y^2\ddot{W}T^2\ddot{W}R^{2W}P$ (passage quoted in the *EDPT* under '*yütürük*'): See Erdal, 1978; this must also be an instance of the present verb. *yütür-* cannot, at

such an early date, have resulted from a simplification of *yüdtür-*, as no such thing happens to any other *-tUr-* derivate from a *°d-* base. Rather, it should come from the base which *yüd-* (section 7.23) and *yük* (section 3.102) have in common. Qarakhanid Turkic has *yüd-ür-*, attested also in the early Uigur Maitr and once in Ht. *yüd-* is 'to load something on oneself or on one's own pack animal' whereas *yütür-*, replaced by the regular and transparent *yüd-ür-* and *yüd-tür-*, is 'to have something loaded'.

-tUr- derivates from cooperative-reciprocal bases

(*aralaşturu* appears in BuddhUig II 72 but is not mentioned in the *UW*: . . . *ärdinilär üzä aralaşturu et-* may signify 'to fashion . . . by arranging . . . miscellaneous jewels in gaps' or perhaps 'alternatingly'. A base **aralaş-* is not found, but a *-tUr-* derivate from it would no doubt be transparent about *ara*.)

aşlaş-tur- is a hap. in ETŞ 11,3, q.v. in the *UW*. 'to join (tr.)'. Cf. *aşla-ş-* in section 7.1.[549]

edäriş-tür- 'to make a group of people follow (someone) collectively' is a hap. in ShōAv 202, not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *bayagutlar, irjilär eligi t(ā)ŋri burxanıg burxan kuvragı birlä edäriştürü . . . uduzup balıkka kigürdilär.* See *edär-iş-* above.

ırla-ştur- 'to make people sing collectively' is a hap. in Ernte 69 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *ırlaşduru içüräyin sizlärkä*. No *-(X)ş-* derivate from *yır+la-* ~ *ır+la-* is attested.

iliş-tür- 'to bring things into mutual connection or engagement' is a hap. in BT XIII 1,106 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*:]*güg / iliştürüp solaşturup urmışta* cannot be translated as "beim Verhaftet- und Verkettet-Sein". 'when one places [. . .] into mutual attachments and bonds' should be preferable. See *il-iş-* above.

katış-tur- 'to let or make two substances mix' is not in the *EDPT*; the *DTS* quotes an ex. from Heilk I. Found also in *azkı(y)a ärsär ymä yaŋlok adkanıp könülkä kaţışturmamış k(ā)rgäk* 'One must not attach oneself even to a little bit of wrong nor allow it to mix with (one's) mind' (BuddhUig I 229) and *üç kaţışdurmak* 'three mixings' (UigTot 4 and 13). See *kat-ış-*, also for this last-mentioned expression; further on in the same passage, *kat-ış-* itself is (curiously enough) used for the same content.

kavış-tur- 'to unite' is in the *EDPT* quoted from the QB on. It appears also in *baxşı tıltag basuţçıların kavışdrup . . .* (BT VIII A 223) and in the biverb *kavış-*

549 There is no reason to doubt Arat's interpretation, as the *UW* appears to do.

dur- köröşdür- in UigTot 398.[550] This is a late and rare replacement for *kav(ı)ş-ur-* (common, discussed above). *kavış-* is hardly analysable.

kayvılan-ıştur- 'to bring into mutual compliance' appears in BuddhUig I 14: *tözki tugmaksız KÖNGÜL töziŋä kayvılanıştursar*, translated as "wenn man zur Natur des ursprünglichen, ungeborenen Bewußtseins *hinneigt". UigTot 634-5 has a syncopated variant: *üştünki tın yeel birlä altınkı yeel tın ikigüni kavlanışdurup bışrunmak* "vereinigt man den oberen Atem-Wind und den unteren Atem-Wind, diese beiden, . . .". *kayvılan-* (q.v. in section 7.21) also has a variant *kavlan-* in UigTot. None of these is mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*.

kügür-üştür- is a hap. in BuddhUig II 80 not mentioned in the dictionaries: *kök vayduri kümüş altunta ulatı ÄRDİNİlär üzä kügürüştürüp etmiş* signifies 'fashioned with inlaid blue *vaiḍūrya*, silver, gold and all sorts of other jewels'. *kügür-* is a variant of *kigür-*, discussed in section 7.54. No related *-(X)ş-* verb is attested. The ed.'s translation of the BuddhUig II derivate is unjustified.

kiriş-tür- is a hap. in Ht IV 1325; not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *tözin kiriştürmäk* translates the Chin. name of a *śāstra*, by Toalster given as *huì zōng* "Vereinbarung der Schulen". The Uigur title was more allusive, for it signifies 'the attainment of mutual permeation through principle'. Cf. *kir-iş-* above.

körüş-dür- is a hap. in UigTot 398, not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: . . . *yaratıgıg bir ikindikä kavışdursar körüşdürsär*, translated ". . . miteinander zusammenstellt und vergleicht . . .". Cf. the biverb *körüşüp kavışıp* in Hazai 78. *kör-üş-* is quite common.

ogşaş-tur- is a hap. in ShöAgon 1,144: [*kertgünçlüg*] *bilgä biligligig bir ikintişkä ogşaştursar* . . . 'If one makes faith and wisdom resemble one another'. *ogşa-ş-* is also a hap., and signifies 'to resemble one another'. The ed. wrote '*bir ikintisin*' (which would be a hap.), but P. Zieme informs me that this "ist eindeutig *bir ikintiškä* zu lesen".

sokuş-tur- 'to cause or help one party meet with another'. Hap. in Maitr 132 r15, not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *köp kalın tınl(ı)glarka tözün maytri bodıs(a)vt birlä sokuşturgalı üçün*, in BT IX 81 translated as "um viele, massenhafte Lebewesen mit dem edlen B.M. zusammentreffen zu lassen". See *sok-uş-* above.

solaş-tur- 'to bind things to one another' is a hap. in BT XIII 1 quoted under *iliş-tür-* above. *sola-ş-* is also a hap.

550 In '*kavışt*[*urup*' in Maitr 187 r17 in BT IX 239, the '*t*' is marked as uncertain and is probably wrong: *kavışur*[*up* would be possible as well and much more likely. As stated under *kavş-ur-* above, the Maitr does not syncopate the second vowel, and *kavıştur-* would not turn up in such an early text.

sözläş-tür-älim 'Let's have (them) discuss the matter' is a hap. in Ht IV 1418, not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *sözlä-ş-* is quite common.

sürtüş-tür- 'to make two things rub together' is a hap. in Heilk I quoted in the *EDPT*. *sürt-üş-* is attested in the DLT and Middle Turkic.

toylaş-tur-u in Ernte 62 should perhaps best be translated as 'giving a party'. The word is written beside the last three words of the sentence to be read as *torma tağ sämiz erkäç alıp taŋusok*[551] *kılayın sizlärkä*, probably signifiying 'I'll take (or: 'buy') a he-goat as fat as a sacrificial one and prepare it wonderfully for you'. The ed. translates *toylaşturu* as "ein Festmahl veranstalten lassend" and puts it after *alıp*; it might also have been meant to stand before *kılayın*. My translation is justified by the meanings of *toy+la-* ('to form a large gathering of people') and *toyla-ş-* ('to gather (intr.) together, to assemble (intr.)', both discussed above. Such gatherings could, of course, on occasion, be feasts; cf. *toylaş- içiş-* in InscrOuig I 47. *töläştürü* is another possible reading; that would connect with *töl+ä-* 'to pay a debt'.

yaraş-tur- 'to make various things agree or fit' is in the *EDPT* quoted from USp 44 and the QB. Further exs. appear in BuddhUig II 122 (quoted under *töl+ä-* above), UigTot 3, 9, 11 and 12-13 and QB 3726. See *yara-ş-* above.

yöläş-tür- 'to compare'. *EDPT* under '*yöleştürüg*' and '*yöleştürgülüksüz*' and *DTS*, especially under '*oqšat- yölāštür-*'. This biverb is found several times. Further exs. are *bo tuɫtagın tiŋigkä yoɫäşdürmiş ärür* (Abhi 1105) 'This is why it gets compared to mud' and *alko türlüg yoɫäşdürgülüklär* (BT VIII B 232) "alle Arten von Vergleichen". *yöläştür-* is otherwise attested in TT VIII A and a number of times in Suv. The practically obsolete *yöläş-ür-* (q.v. above) was replaced by *yöläştür-* in late Uigur.

-tUr- derivates from medial-reflexive bases

1 açın-tur- is from *aç-ın-* (discussed above). It is a hap. in ms. T II Y 15.501 (U 3088) v 5 (quoted in the n. to UigTot 895) not mentioned in the *UW*, the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *bir oy kazıp beş kün kömgü k(ä)rgäk. birök içgäli sakınsar, açınturup . . .* ". . . muß man eine Grube graben und es fünf Tage eingraben. Wenn man daran denkt (better: 'beabsichtigt'), es zu trinken, dann muß man sie öffnen . . .". Better would have been 'sie sich öffnen lassen', i.e. 'to have it opened for oneself'.

551 Spelled TWNGWS'Q inadvertently, and therefore by the ed. tentatively translated as "Schwein(?)". *taŋ+sok* (section 2.93) in several instances has an anaptyctic /ı/ between its two central consonants; in BT XIII 46,35 we find *taŋgusok* with regressive assimilation. Ernte is a layman's ms. with quite a number of errors.

2 *açın-dur-* is from *açı-n-* (q.v. above). It is a hap. in BuddhUig II 527, mentioned neither in the *UW* nor in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *açınduru öṭünmäkim üzä siziŋä* apparently signifies 'by praying to you, asking you to care (for me)'.

alkın-dur- 'to do away with' appears twice in Suv, in both instances in a biverb with *arı-t-*; see the *UW* entry for it. The common *alk-ın-* is documented above.

aşan-tur- 'to invite to dinner' is attested in two Uigur exs. adequately dealt with in the *UW*. *aşanturgalı öṭün-* in ShöAv 205 reminds one of *açınduru öṭün-* quoted above. Cf. *aşa-t-* and *aşa-n-* above.

atlan-tur- 'to send someone on a ride' appears once in KP (q.v. in the *UW*) and not again before Middle Turkic (q.v. in the *EDPT*). Connected semantically with the meaning of *atlan-* listed in par. 3 of the *UW* entry for that verb. (The *EDPT* translation of *atlantur-* is more awkward.)

basın-tur- comes from the tr. use of *bas-ın-* (q.v. above), which signifies 'to oppress'. When accompanied by the dative, it is its passive counterpart and signifies 'to get oppressed': We have *yäkkä içgäkkä basındur-* in TT VII 40,37 and *yat yagıka basıntur-* 'to get oppressed by the foreign enemy' in Suv 87,13-14 phraseological similarity: It could either be an error for *basınturma°* or (seeing that it is closer to runic exs. of *basın-*) have preserved original usage. *bo yerdä muŋlugun i(yï)ntürü basınduru yorıyur sizlär* (M III 30,3-5$_2$, text 13) shows that the passive sense is retained when the dative does not appear: 'You live here in distress and under oppression$_2$' can only be understood in the light of tr. *iyin-basın-*. *dyan sakınç küçindä nızvanılarıg basınturmaz* (BuddhKat 43) has the accusative quite clear on the facs., and the meaning is not passive: 'By the force of *dhyāna* (meditation) one prevents the lusts from oppressing one'. The tasks normally associated with *-(X)t-* when added to tr. bases are here assumed by *-tUr-*: *bas-ın-* is an unusually common tr. *-(X)n-* verb which attained semantic independence, and *-tUr-* was the only possible causative formative for it.

bışrun-dur- is a hap. in Suv 88,6-7 in a sentence quoted and translated in *UW* 236a top under '*aşṭur-* (I)'. 'to bring something to maturity', a meaning which would be associated with *bışr-un-* (q.v. above) by its etymology but not actually used with it: *bışr-un-* (presumably secondarily) signifies 'to assimilate a doctrine'.

bulgan-tur- is a hap. in BT XIII 13,88, not mentioned in the *EDPT*: *kọn]güllärin bulganturdaçı* 'confusing (or: agitating) their minds'. See *bulga-n-* above.

burçın-tur-, possibly 'to trouble', is attested in Suv 136,11 and in the paraphrase of the passage, in BT XIII 13,88. The first reads *köŋüllärin karınların irintürdüm burçınturdum örlätdim...*, the second *tıdıg kıltaçı*, *burçınd[urup kọn]güllärin bulganturdaçı.... burçıntur-* is certainly not an error for *busantur-*, as suggested in the *EDPT*: Cf. *burçın-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs. Zieme has shown that BT XIII 13 is quite dependent on the Suv text.

Eastern Mediterranea
LIBRA
1979

busan-tur- 'to make someone sorrowful' has appeared twice: *erintürgülük* *busa[n]turg(u)luk* is in the *EDPT* entry for the verb quoted from TT II B, and we find *busandurtaçı nızvanılar* in ETŞ 10,176. The other instance which the *EDPT* assigns to this verb in fact reads *burçıntur-*. See *busan-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

buyan-la-ndur- should signify 'to help people accumulate meritorious deeds'. This is a hap. in ShōAv 321, as *bodunug bokunug yanduru yana buyanlandurgalı* used in parallelism with *kuṭsıramış arṭamış elig uluşug kuṭaḍturgalı*. Direct base not attested, but *buyan+la-* is.

çoglan-dur- 'to make something blaze or glow' is found only in BT III 442 and 459. Not in the dictionaries. *çog+lan-* is dealt with in section 5.6.

ärkäçlän-tür- 'to make something surge in waves' is found in HtPar 130,17 as quoted in the edition of HtFragm: *u[jık]larıg ediz ärkäçläntürdi agızlıg [taloy]ınta* "er ließ die ... Silben hoch emporwallen im Mund-Meer", an extended metaphor. The corresponding passage in HtFragm II 21 is completed as *ärkäç[läntürdi]*. See *ärkäç+län-* in section 5.6.

ärksin-tür- 'to give power over something' is in the *EDPT* quoted from two infinitive exs. in TT VIII A. Attested also in the phrase *kọŋüllüg täginmäk iyin ärksintürmiş üçün* in ShōAgon 1,360. *ärksin-* is discussed in section 7.2 although a direct *+sI-* base for it is not attested.

erin-tür- 'to cause annoyance or distress'. In the *EDPT* documented in the series *ämgät- tolgat- erintür- busantur-* in the TT II B ex., *erintür- burçıntur- örlät-ämgät-* in the Suv ex., *ämgät- erintür-* in the U II (Üdrät) and TT IV B (ms. F) exs. Found also in Maitr 81 v17, in *toyın şamnançlarka kọŋülin yerintürdäçilär* 'those who cause distress to monks and nuns'. This is the causative of the expression *kọŋli yerinti* (KP 68,5). See *er-in-* ~ *yer-in-*.

ilgün-dür- is a hap. in Abhi 1080, in a passage quoted in the n. to Hochzeit 19: *ymä avırda analarnıŋ süçig taṭıglıg aş içgülärig işläṭip ilgündürmäkläri ärsär äṭ'özin oglıŋa buldurgu üçün*, by Zieme translated as "was das Anwenden und Wirkenlassen von süßer, schmackhafter Nahrung ... von Ammen betrifft, (so geschieht es), um seinen Sohn einen (kräftigen) Körper erlangen zu lassen". The Uigur sentence is meant as a free translation of Chin. *ru mu gan shan yong zi shen*, which Zieme renders with "man benutzt die süße Nahrung von Ammen, um den Körper gedeihen zu lassen". I take the object of *işlät-* to be *aş içgülär*, the object of *ilgündür-* to be the baby: In view of the likely meaning of its base *ilgü-n-* and of cognates, *ilgündür-* should signify 'to get it invigorated'.

ilin-tür- 'to make somebody or something get entangled' is in the *EDPT* quoted from TT VIII A, in the *DTS* from Suv (this last ex. quoted and translated also in *UW* 263 b). There is another instance in Tenri A IX, in a biverb with *ba-*.

The Suv ex. is a biverb with *yapşıntur-*, as *il-in-* (q.v. above) and *yapş-ın-* are also often used together.

iyin-tür- should, I think, have stood in a biverb with *basın-tur-* in the M III text 13 instance quoted above under the last-mentioned verb. The text has *ıntür-*, which looks like the rather common *en-tür-* (also discussed above). The meaning does not accord with *entür-*, however, and this biverb is clearly connected with the biverb *iy-in- bas-ın-*. This well-attested biverb, in turn, comes from the biverb *iy- bas-*. The meaning of *iyin-tür- basın-tur-* can hardly be distinguished from that of *basıntur-* by itself.

kar-ıntur- 'to let something get mixed' is not mentioned by the dictionaries. It is a hap. in (Manichaean) ZiemeTexterg II 2, used together with *tökün̈tür-* (q.v. below). *-(X)n-* base not attested, *kar-* only from the DLT on, but cf. *kar-ış-* (also for the base).

katıglan-tur- is discussed in the *EDPT*. Both exs. are Manichaean and signify 'to spur on to good deeds'. See the common *katıg+lan-* in section 5.6.

kertgün-tür- is a hap. in TuoLuoNi 383: *m*[*ın*]*g kụ̄on koturtup . . . xua çäç(ā)k üzā kertgüntürdi* 'He had 1000 exs. copied . . . venerated$_2$ it with flowers . . . From then on, the lord governing (the city of Huaizhou) prescribed (it) to his household and had them have faith in (it).' *kertgün-tür-* 'to cause (somebody) to believe in (something)' was misunderstood by the eds., who failed to realise that its object is the *sūtra* forming the substance of the text. See *kertgün-* in section 7.21.

tapınıp udunup . . . muntata ın(a)ru . . . ayguçı bāg āvindākilārkā ayıp ạrtokrak

kölün-dür- is a hap. in BuddhUig II 326, in *alko kärgäklikçä tapıg udug yevägläri̇n büṭürtüp yarlıkançuçı KÖNGÜLlüg BODİSATVka ärdinilig kaŋlıka kölündürüp . . .* It means 'to have horses harnessed to a cart', in this case for the *bodhisattva*: Cf., four lines earlier: *BODİSATVka, käntü özläriŋä, kızıŋa . . . tapıgçı KIZlarıŋa . . . kaŋlılar anuṭup . . .* The ed. mistranslates here. See *köl-ün-*.

körklän-tür- is a hap. in BT III 459, not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. 'to make something beautiful'. See *körk+län-* in section 5.6.

közün-tür- 'to make something appear'. *DTS*; not in the *EDPT*. Found also in BT I D (155) (*körkin közüntürmäsär . . .*) and ETŞ 21,2 (*közündürüp*). The phrase *közüntürü körkittim* appears in Suv 368,5. Add also *öŋlüg bälgülüg köligäg körkiṭür közündürür* (Suv 53,19) 'He makes visible$_2$ the appearance possessing colour and characteristics'.

küçlän-tür- 'to strengthen (tr.)' is in the *DTS* (but not the *EDPT*) quoted once from Suv, with *küç* as object. The passage appears in Gabain, 1974: 298 l.4. Attested also as *nızvanılarıg küçlänẗürüp* in BuddhUig I 7 and, as °*ndür-*, *ibid.* 11. *küç+län-* appears first in the DLT.

(*odguraklandur-* has been read in BT VIII A 225. It was, I think, intended to have stood also *ibid.* 305, where one can read *odgurakl(a)ndur-*: The two translate the same Tib. term, and *-dUr-* would not have formed the causative of a *+lA-* verb. Neither a *+lA-* nor a *+lAn-* derivate from the very common *odgurak* is attested. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. 'to engender evident truth'.)

odun-tur- 'to wake up (tr.) or to keep awake (tr.)'. The Suv ex. *oḍunduru sakınduru tägінip unıtduru tägінmägäy biz* 'We will venture to keep you awake and on your guard and . . .' is mentioned by the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. Also found in *alko kamag tınlıglarıg alkonı barça tuyunturu odunturu y(a)rlıkazunlar* (Warnke 395) ". . . zur Einsicht kommen zu lassen und zu erwecken". The biverb *tuyun- odun-* is also attested: See the n. to the passage. *odun-* is discussed among the *-(X)n-* verbs, although its base dropped from use.

öglän-tür- 'to help someone or some creature recover his or its senses' is documented in the *EDPT* and the *DTS*. See *ög+län-* in section 5.6.

ötün-dür- is a hap. in BT VII A 387-8 not mentioned in the dictionaries: *anta basa yumışçı tıtsıka mantal öṭündürüp* "Danach muß man durch den assistierenden Schüler ein Maṇḍala herbeibitten lassen". 'to have somebody beg for something'. A verb *ötündürül-* discussed in section 7.32 appears to come directly from *öt-ün-* (q.v. above) and not from this verb: *-dUrXl-* is the alternant of the composite passive formative *-tXl-* after *-(X)n-* verbs.

sakın-tur- signifies rather 'to keep someone on his guard' in the ex. quoted above under *odun-tur-*, but 'to permit to think' or perhaps 'to instil (certain) thoughts' in ms. Mz 673 v1-2 quoted in UigSteu p. 247, n. 57: *küni sakınç sakıntursar, tarka yerdäki mäŋisin artok agırlamasar* cannot have signified "Wenn man Neid Gedanken denkt, wenn man die Freude des einsamen Ortes nicht genügend schätzt". "denken" would have been *sak-ın-* (q.v. above); here, however, the monks are involved as causees.

saklan-tur- 'to make someone take care of himself' is a hap. in TeilBuch quoted in the *EDPT*. *sak+lan-* is common.

salın-tur- 'to hang something out, up, down' is in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted twice, of one's tongue and a veil respectively. We also have *ol uzun ıgaçta pralar salınturup* (Ht VII 4 b3), *yinçülüg toorlarıg asarlar salındururlar* (BuddhUig II 122) and *adrok yinçgä tooglar pralar . . . asıp salındurup* [(Suv 81,9). The semantic specialisation of *sal-ın-* (q.v. above) as compared to *sal-* is thus continued here.

sävin-tür- 'to give joy'. *EDPT*; further exs. in a biverb with *ögirtür- ~ ögirttür-* occur in Maitr 52 v6, BT III 635 and 765 and BT VIII A 36; cf. *käntü ätözlärin ögirtü turup sävintürüp . . .* (SuvGeng 598,21). *sävintür-* is also found in Maitr 214 r6, 181 v11 and 129 r18 and is common in the QB. *säv-in-* (a semantic simplex) often appears with *ögir-*.

sugun-dur- 'to have somebody wash or rinse himself' appears in Suv 25,19 together with *yun-tur-*. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. See *sug-un-* above.

tapın-tur- 'to get someone to worship something or somebody' or 'to get oneself worshipped by somebody'. In the *EDPT* quoted twice from Uigur and from the QB. Not mentioned there are the exs. from ManMon 61 and QB 635. In TT VI together with *uduntur-*, which means that it comes from the common biverb *tap-ın- ud-un-*. The TT VII 28 ex. spells the formative with D.

tatgan-dur-, not mentioned in the *EDPT*, appears in BuddhUig II 338: *d(a)rma uḍgaṭı ıdok BODİSATVnıŋ . . . sudurug tatganduru sukanşınduru nomlamışın* ". . ., daß Dharmodgata, der heilige Bodhisattva, das . . . Sūtra predigt, indem er dessen angenehmen Geschmack schmecken läßt". *tatga-n-* (q.v. above) usually signifies 'to find a dish tasty', so that the ed.'s translation is roughly adequate as far as the first verb is concerned. If *sukanşıntur-* is read and interpreted correctly, it is probably related with *sukançıg* over **suk+a-*. Both verbs are hap. legomena.

tayan-tur- appears in Ht VII 14 b15, in *burxanlar tanuklam[ış no]mug nomlamakıg äşidmäkkä tayanturup kǫŋülüg* . . . 'leaning heart and body towards listening to the preaching of the doctrine which the Buddhas had testified to' and has been read also in Weih 4. *taya-n-* is 'to lean (intr.)', *tayan-tur-* 'to lean (tr.)'.

tägin-tür- 'to make someone experience something' is a hap. in *tapınça mäŋilär tägintürdäçi* (ETŞ 10,113). This verb does not appear in the *EDPT*. Cf. the meaning of *täg-in-* (discussed above).

tägzin-tür- 'to make something revolve, to cause something to move around something else'. *tägzin-* (q.v. in section 7.21) has no attested base. The ex. quoted in the *EDPT* entry, a petrified converb from an economical text in USp, is discussed below. The *DTS* quotes from Suv 304,23-4, where we read *sansar içindä tägzintürdäçi ämgäklig tägzinç*. There are additional exs. in U IV A 228-9, ETŞ 9,23 and 92, 10,161 and 11,130, BT III 38 and 96 and BT VII A 111, 326, 601, 673 and 780.

tonan-dur- 'to clothe somebody' is a hap. in Suv quoted in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*. *tona-n-* is discussed among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

tök-üntür- 'to let something get spilled' is a hap. in ZiemeTexterg II 1, as *artatmazun, töküntürmäzün, karıntturmazun*. Neither this nor *kar-ıntur-* have related *-(X)n-* verbs attested, and might possibly have been derived directly from *tök-* and *kar-*. *töküntür-* is not in the dictionaries.

tuyun-tur- 'to give awareness' is an Uigur hap. quoted under *odun-tur-* (together with which it is used) earlier in this section. Not in the dictionaries. *tuy-un-* (q.v. above) and *odun-* are also used together.

udun-tur- 'to make someone obey' is a hap. in TT VI in the biverb *tapıntururlar*

uduntururlar, with aorist vowel misquoted in the *EDPT*. *ud-un-* (q.v. above) is always used together with *tap-ın-*.

(yalgantur- is used in the three Uigur exs. from which it is quoted in the *DTS*[552] and the *EDPT* of females wickedly tempting men, in U IV D 84 of a hare deceiving his friends, in Ht IV 578 of a lion benevolently approaching his hostile son. Except in the last-mentioned ex., it should signify 'to behave in a deceptive manner towards somebody' (with the target person in the dative in U III 54,12). The Arabic counterpart of *this* content is *kadhaba*, which I take to have stood in the original text in DLT fol. 493 as the translation of *yalgandur-*; the ms. has *kadhdhaba* (with *šadda*), which gives a different meaning. A verb **yalgan-* is not attested but may, in some way, have been a cognate of *yalgan* 'a lie, a fraud, untruthful'. Whether they could come from *yalga-* 'to lick' is an open question; some exs. of *yalga-* do indicate that the connection is not impossible. The context of a further ex. in DreiPrinz 7-8 is unclear. In Ernte 70, "..." *tep yalgaduru* is probably to be read as *yalg(a)nduru* and given the less negative meaning 'to entice, lure on';[553] cf. the Ht IV instance.)

yapşın-tur- 'to let somebody get stuck'. Hap. in Suv in the phrase *ilintürmätin yapşınturmatın*, quoted by the *DTS* and in *UW* 262 b but not in the *EDPT*. See *yapşın- / yafşın-* among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

yaratın-dur- is a hap. in *ol tözinçä yaratındurtaçı kõŋül ärür* (BuddhUig I 271), not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *yarat-ın-* 'to organise oneself etc.' is a common *-(X)n-* verb. "sich ... organisiert", the ed.'s translation, suits this last verb and not its causative.

yetlin-tür- 'to make something vanish' appears in TT II B (quoted in the *EDPT*), where we find *yokadturur yetlintürür*. We also have *kaltı yelviçi äränlär ... adruk adruk ädlärig bälgürţüp anıŋ ara yänä yetlindürsär ...* (BuddhUig II 458) and *ş(ı)mnu kanı alko savlarıg barça yetlindürüp közünmäz kılu* (*ibid.* 573), which are not mentioned in the *EDPT*. *yet-lin-* belongs to a formation discussed in section 7.22: As counterparts of what we found above we have it together with *közünmäz bol-*, e.g., and with *yokad-*.

yıgın-tur- is not in the dictionaries. Hap. in HtPar 15 v 12 (quoted in the n. to Ht VII 1936): *yakaların yıgınturup ...* 'drawing together their sleeves (as a Chin. way of greeting somebody)'. See 1 *yıg-ın-*, the base.

yölän-tür- 'to prop up (with something)' is attested only in ShōAgon 1, which writes both this and its base *yölä-n-* (q.v. above) without initial *y°*: 1,34 has

552 The reference there should be to U III, not U II.

553 This is not all that different from what the temptful ladies of the *avadānas* do. Zieme's "schlecken lassen" would have stood inside the quoted stretch and not after *tep*, and the causative of *yalga-* would have been (and is!) *yalga-ı-*.

ädgükä öläntürmäk 'to lean (tr.) on the Good' and 37 *birök yertinçüdäkilärig öläntürsär*. Not mentioned in the *EDPT*.

yun-tur- 'to make somebody wash (himself)' appears in Suv 25,19 in the biverb *yunturup sugundurup*, in which both verbs are hap. legomena. *yu-n-* 'to wash (intr.)' is common. *yuntur-* is not in the dictionaries.

yükün-tür- 'to make (people) bow to one, subdue them'. Attested in Orkhon Turkic and after that only in the XVth century. Appears in KT thrice and in BQ four times (damaged in some of these), always written with the N͡T ligature. The common *yükün-* is dealt with among the *-(X)n-* verbs.

yüzlän-tür- is a hap. in Suv 12,13, not mentioned in the dictionaries: *ol balık kapıgınça kigürüp bir bök içinä elṭip tagdın yınak üzläntürdilär* (thus). *tagdın yınak körsär män* ... '... and made them face towards the north'. The eds.' version here is likely to be a mistake, as it appears at the beginning of the line (and may have been damaged) and as Y and ' can be very similar in this position; *yüz* 'face' and *yüz+län-* (section 5.6) never lack their y°.

tUr- derivates from passive and anti-transitive verbs

akıl-tur- 'to dissipate (virtue, the doctrine, a text)' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS* and in the *UW* quoted only from BuddhStab (used together with *ulal[tur-*). Found also in *ädrämig akılturdaçı yadtaçı atl(ı)g t(ā)ŋri burxan kutıŋa* (Warnke 803) and *akıldurmak üzä* (Tenri AI). Only *ak-ıl-* (q.v. above) is used in the relevant extended sense, not *ak-* 'to flow'.

amrıl-tur- 'to calm (through meditation)' appears once in TT V B and then not before the XIVth century. Dealt with both in the *EDPT* and the UW. See section 7.31 for the etymologically difficult *amrıl-*.

bal-dur- is a hap. in ShōKenkyū III 13: *kavzatmış mäniŋ özk(ī)yäm, kararıg ayıg kı(l)ınçım kaç yılt[ın] bärü baldurdı* 'O my beleaguered self, for how many years have my evil deeds tied it down!'. *ba-l-* is rather common; *baltur-t-*, attested several times in Maitr, has a positive sense.

esil-tür- 'to let (or make) something get less' is a hap. in BT VIII A374, in *törüṭü ükliṭü esilṭürmäyü* 'engendering, increasing and not letting get less'. Not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. *esiltür-* is the causative – permissive of *es-il-* 'to diminish (intr.)', and by no means synonymous with *es-* 'to reduce'.

katıl-tur- is a hap. in Tug 44 in a biverb with *kavşur-*. This is the causative of the biverb *katıl- kavış-* found in Suv. 'to have something mix or mingle'. Not in the *DTS* or the *EDPT*. *kat-ıl-* is common.

kädil-tür- is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*, but appears in BT VIII B137-8: *v(a)jır kädiltürdäçi ulug kädiltürdäçi*, translated as "er ist der Vajra-Niederwerfende, der Grosse Niederwerfende". The ed. has a not quite acceptable etymology to

accord for this translation; this instance is likely to be the causative of *käd-il-* in the third use as discussed in the entry in section 7.31 above: Mo. *bayulya-* can also signify 'to copy'. *kädiltür-* is therefore 'to incarnate'; Buddha is the 'Great Incarnator'. Chin. *jiang lin* points in the same direction but Skt. *veśa* (for *veṣa*) is most suggestive of our explanation.

kurul-dur- 'to destroy' is not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Hap. in *ädgülärig kuruldurtaçılar üzä*, which corresponds to Skt. *guṇaghātibhir* 'by the destroyers of virtues' (Kinkashō śl. A,c). It comes from the metaphorical use of *kurul-*, a variant of *kurı-l-*, discussed above.

kutrul-tur-daçı 'bestower of salvation' is a hap. in ETŞ 10,117 not mentioned in the dictionaries. *kutr-ul-* (section 7.31) is exceedingly common.

saçıl-tur- is a hap. in Suv, mentioned in the *DTS* but not the *EDPT*: *nomlarıg öŋi saçılturmagu* 'One should not let the prescriptions of the law get scattered about'. See *saç-ıl-* above.

säşil-tür-mädin 'not letting it get unfastened', hap. in ETŞ 11,123. Not in the dictionaries. See *säş-il-* above.

tartıl-tur- is a hap. in ShōKenkyū II 17, reedited as BT XIII 12,53: *tamırlıg yiltizlig kılınçımızını tartılturalım t(ä)rk üdün* 'Let us soon allow our (evil)-deed roots$_2$ to get pulled out'.[554] See *tart-ıl-* above.

tätrül-dür- is an Uigur hap. quoted above under *tärsik-dür-*, with which it appears in a biverb signifying 'to lead astray'. *tätrül-* is discussed among the *-(X)l-* verbs.

turul-tur- 'to tame, calm down (tr.), suppress, subdue' comes from *tur-ul-* 'to be calm, calm down', a semantic simplex. This is why *turultur-* is relatively common. We find it in UigTot 313-4 of taming a wild horse (*toosın at*), in BT XIII 4,17-19 twice of subduing the heart of a wild elephant (*tosın yaŋa*). Other objects are 'the body' (UigFalt 54) and 'the heart' (Abhi B 24 b 10 quoted in the n. to Buddhāv H107), 'wild men' (Suv 73,2, 84,4 and 187,8, with *toşın*) or others 'hard to subdue' (*alp turuldurguluk(lar)* in USp 59,20-1 and BT VIII B9). The TT V B instance quoted in the *EDPT* is about the action of faith on the heart. I don't think the instance in Ernte 88, where the object is something agricultural, fits into all this, but I have no constructive suggestion to make for it. The UigFalt, UigTot and Abhi exs. are biverbs with *yaval-tur-* (q.v. above), and *tur-ul-* is also used with *yaval-*.

554 Zieme translates *tamırlıg yiltizlig kılınçımız* as "unsere Ader- und Wurzel- (= all unsere?) Taten". The *EDPT* quotes *tamır* as applying to plants from TT I and VIII and the translation 'root' for this lexeme from two sources of Middle Turkic. Here, *tamır yıltız tart-* serves as extended metaphor for the uprooting of bad *karma* (from Skt. root *kṛ°*; *kıl-ınç* exact loan translation); hence the metaphorical *+lXg* applying to the binome. Shōgaito has an erroneous reading of the verb, while Zieme writes *tartultur-*; the facs. of ShōKenkyū shows (I think) that the second vowel I suggest cannot be excluded at least as far as that ms. is concerned.

tutul-tur- is in the *EDPT* quoted only from TT III, where the context is fragmentary. Attested also in *yeg yorüglär tep temişi ärsär kalu yeg adrok yeg sukançıg tep yorüg ol. bir yorügıä tutuldurkalur üçün ol üküş tälim yorüglärig anın atamış ol yeg yorüglüg tep* (Abhi 1936) "The phrase "the excellent meanings" means "fine and eminent". In order to contain those many meanings in one meaning, (Vasubandhu) has described it as "possessing excellent meanings".' and *çın kertü agamınızlar yukdiŋizlär barça nom oronta tutuldurmış ärmäz* (Junshō B v17). 'to cause something to be held, caught or included'. See *tut-ul-* above.

(*uçr-uldur-* is a hap. in BuddhUig II 82 not mentioned in the dictionaries: *közüg sakınçıg köŋülüg uçrulduru turur* "(Die Dekorationen) lassen den Blick, den Gedanken und das Gemüt fliegen". Base not attested, although *uç-ur-*, of course, is.)

(*ulal*[*-tur-* was reconstituted at a lacuna in BuddhStab, as quoted in the *UW* entry for *akıltur-*; this entry refers to what may be a further instance. *ula-l-* is common.)

-tUr- derivates from causative verbs

bäḍüṭ-tür- is a hap. in TT IX (Pothi 277), quoted in the *EDPT*. Perhaps best translated as 'to inspire increase', but the context is, in any case, fragmentary. *bädü-t-* appears to have been used about physical increasing etc., whereas the present context is spiritual.

bitit-dür- is a hap. in Ht VII 14 a 18: *bitkäçilär ulugı . . . çuu baglıg suy lāō* [*aɪ*]*l*(ɪ)*g bägkä bititdürti* "They had it inscribed by the lord named Chu Sui-liang, who was . . .", i.e. the inscription containing "the prefaces to the Tripitaka's holy teaching which were written by the two emperors". The fact that the form is *bitit-dür-* and not *biti-t-* (q.v. above; common) *may* indicate that a further personage was included in the chain of causation.

äŋit-tür- 'to make somebody bow' is spelled with two initial *alef*, the normal spelling for *#än°*. This made the eds. and Clauson think it had back-vowels. It appears to have misled also the scribe of TT III 78, who (among many other errors) spelled the /ŋ/ as NQ (in Manichaean script, which distinguishes four velar phones!). '*äŋitt*[*ü*]*rt*[*ü*]*ŋ*[*üz* appears in the *EDPT* under '*aŋıttır-*', in the *DTS* under '*eŋittir-*'. Further exs. are *bärü äŋiṭtürmäk* (UigTot 797) "Niederwerfen"(!) and *t*(*ä*)*ŋri t*(*ä*)*ŋrisi burxan üşkindä tägdüklärintä töpölärin 'äŋittürüp beş tilgänin yerkä tägürüp yinçürü töpön yükünüp* . . . 'When they reached the presence of Buddha, the god of gods, they bowed their heads, placed their five *cakra*s on the ground . . .'. This last is actually synonymous with *äŋ-it-* (q.v. above); see that also about the question of these verbs' vowels.

ätiz-dür- is a hap. in Ht VII 5 b 4, not mentioned in the *EDPT*. With *oyun*, which

here signifies 'dance (tune)', as object, it means 'to have (music) played'. *ät-iz-* (section 7.55) also occurs with *oyun* as object (but with the musician(s) as subject).

okıt-dur- 'to have somebody called' is not in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*. Hap. in BT I $A_1(4)$. *okı-t-* can also signify 'to have somebody summoned', but with *okıtdur-* the chain of causation may have included a further participant.

ögirt-tür- ~ *ögirtür-* 'to give joy' is not mentioned as such in the *EDPT*, but the entry '*ögründür-*' refers to a word which probably belongs here: '*ögirüntür-dāçi*', as the ed. writes, has the wrong second vowel and WN is in many mss. identical with T; the block-print is now lost. '*ögr[ün]dürtäçi*' in BT II 52 is therefore a bad conjecture. *ögirtür-* appears in BT I $A_1(5)$, WarnkeFragm 96 and Maitr 52 v 5, 186 v 15 (fragmentary passage) and MaitrGeng 8 b 8. *ögirttür-* is more common but the texts which have it are later than Maitr: It comes up in BT III 635 and 765, Suv 43,2 and 257,1, BT VII A 730 and 745 d, BT VIII A 19, 36, 49 (twice), 52, 153, 263, 277, 278 etc., 496 and B 72, 76 etc., UigTot 1339 and 1422 and BuddhUig II 434 and 441. The conjecture *ögir[t]dürti* of *UW* 230 a s.v. *asıglıg* par. A,1 for Ht V 10 a 9-10 is excellent. A biverb of this verb with *sävintür-* is attested in Maitr 52 v 5, BT III 635 and 765 and BT VIII A 36, as *ögir-* is often used with *sävin-*. A meaning difference between *ögir-t-*, *ögirtür-* and *ögirt-tür-* cannot be detected. *ögirtür-* is likely to have come from *ögirttür-* by simplifying the cluster: *-tUr-* is not otherwise added to two-syllable °*r*- stems.

örit-dür- is not mentioned in the *EDPT*, but the *DTS* quotes the following Suv ex.: *tınl(ı)glarıg . . . köŋül öritdürgäli ötlämäk* 'to admonish people to arouse their minds'. Further, *olarnı barça samtso açarı nomlap süzüp yerçiläp uduzup barçanı burxan kutŋa köŋül öritdürür ärdi* (Ht VII 9 a 23). What we here have is not the causative of *ör-it-*, but of the exceedingly common phrase *köŋül örit-* 'to arouse one's mind' (documented in the entry for that verb above): Its subject here becomes accusative object. In Maitr 191 r 5 = MaitrH IV 18 a 28 (quoted and translated in LautBuddh pp. 56-7) we find *kertü nom nomladım, alko tınlıgıg agınçsız burxan kutŋa köŋül öritdim*. This clearly represents the same construction; the only solution is to emend the verb to **öritdürtüm*.[555]

örlätür- is a hap. in *örlätmäk işlig täŋrilig şımnu / ölümlüg şımnu . . . ülgüsüz üküş yaţ yagıların / örlätürmädin utmış yavaldurmış* as an epithet of Buddha. Coming from *örlät-* 'to annoy' (q.v. among the *-(X)t-* verbs), it should signify 'not letting . . . annoy him'. The instance appears in ETŞ 10,253, a text which also writes the common *kutad-tur-* as *kutadur-* (*not* a different verb). It is therefore much less likely that this should be a *-tUr-* derivate from *örlä-* 'to rise (of sun, moon etc.)'; beside the semantic incompatibility, there is the fact that the causative

555 The reading of this sentence in *UW* 65 a under *agınçsız* should also be corrected.

formative for bases ending in vowels is *-(X)t-*, not *-tUr-*. *örlät-* is a semantic simplex. *örlätür-* is not mentioned in the dictionaries.

sözlät-dür- is a hap. in ShōAgon 1,136 not mentioned in the *EDPT* or the *DTS*: *näŋ sözlätdürdäçi ärmäz kŏni tuymakıg*. This has the content of speech as direct object; with *sözlä-t-* (q.v. in the previous section), on the other hand, the person to say something is governed as direct object. The causee would presumably here be in the dative.

tanuklat-dur- 'to have evidence brought forward concerning something' appears in *KÖNGÜL tözin açgalı ukıtgalı tuydurgalı tanuklaṭturgalır üçün* . . . (BuddhUigI 30) and *mäŋü mäŋig tanuklatdurtaçılarka* . . . "die ewige Freude bezeugen lassen" (Suvstockh 42). Cf. the Suv hap. *tanukla-t-*.

tapladur- is a hap. in UigTot 1422 not mentioned in the dictionaries: *ögirtdürmäk tapladurmak tapıg* "das Erfreuungs-Opfer". *tapla-t-* has the same meaning as this in the DLT, but in PañcFrag we find the biverb *sävit- taplat-* with the passive meaning 'to be appreciated'. The *-dUr-* form may have been created here either because *tapla-t-* was, for the author, already occupied by this passive use, or / and through parallelism with *ögirtdür-*. This late text either simplifies the dental cluster (in which case I would spell the word as *taplaṭurmak*) or, against the rules of classical Uigur, uses this formative with a vowel base.

tarıt-dur- 'to make people plant something' is a hap. in Suv mentioned by the *DTS* but not by the *EDPT*. *tarı-t-* is attested in QB 6529 (the ode) and in the DLT in the same meaning as this. *tarıtdur-* may possibly have the *-dUr-* formative because it is followed by *bışrundur-* in a parallel construction.

tägür-tür- is a hap. in Maitr 82 v 25, not mentioned by the dictionaries: *körünlär sizlär saŋat tamunuŋ korkınçıgın, kim bo muntag türlüg tsuylug yazoklug tın-l(ı)glarıg kın kızgut tägürtürür*. What we have here is the causative of the phrase *kın kızgut täg-ür-* (found in U II 20,2 and U III 56,7$_1$) with the meaning 'to cause someone (dative) suffering'. (*kın kızgut tägür-*)*tür-* is therefore 'to make people cause (here *sc.* themselves) suffering'. *tägür-t-* is also attested, but (in the Maitr-Geng ex.) governs the target of the action in the dative (like *täg-*). With *tägürtür-*, however, the causee = target becomes the direct object of the instigator.

üklit-tür- 'to cause someone to increase something' is a hap. in Suv not mentioned in the *EDPT* but quoted in the *DTS* and in *UW* 236 a top. Biverb with *as-tur-* 2, q.v. earlier in this section; cf. the biverb *as- üklit-*.

üzmälä-tdür- is a hap. in ms. Mz 777 v 13 (unpubl.) quoted in *UW* 194 b under *arıtı* par. A,a: *alko agularıg barça arıtı birtäm üzmälätdürtäçi ärür* "[Die Lehre] veranlaßt, daß man alle 'Gifte' (sc. die Kleśas) völlig^2 vernichtet". No *-t-* form attested, but the same ms. also has the well-attested *üzmälä-* (q.v. among the *+lA-* verbs). *üzmälätdür-* governs the ultimate object, while the *-t-* form *may* have governed the causee.

yarat-tur- 'to have something constructed, arranged, created' is in the *EDPT* and the *DTS* quoted only from KT S12, where it is written $Y^1R^1T^1W^1R^1T^1M$. We also find it in *bi taş yaratdurmak üzä 'äŋäyü biltürdi ädrämin taybo atl(ı)g balıkta* 'Through the construction of an inscribed monument he had his virtues especially made known in the town named Ta-hiang' (HtPek 84 r12 quoted in the n. to Ht VII 1859). The ŞU and Tariat inscrs. have *yarat-ıt-* for this content. Add *lovudi atl(ı)g t(ä)ŋri t(a)vgaç xan . . . tolp tay[tsokı] ulug agılık [nomlarıg . . .]p yıgturup yaratdurmış [o]l* (Warnke 120), where the object is a compilation of texts. *yara-t-* (q.v. above) is a semantic simplex.

PETRIFIED CONVERBS

tägzintürü tamlıg kavlalıkım 'my vegetable garden which has an encircling wall' appears in USp 15 as quoted in the *EDPT* under '*tegzindür-*'; reedited as Huk- Ves V. Cf. the tr. *tägzin-tür-* above.

yanturu 'back (adv.); again; moreover' comes from *yan-tur-* 'to bring back'. $Y^1AN\hat{T}R^1W$ in KT N11 can only be read as *yantru*;[556] this syncopated form lived on in Qarakhanid Turkic but not, in general, in Uigur. Some of the exs. are collected in the *EDPT* under *yanturu:* and in the *DTS* under *janduru*. We find the *figura etymologica yanturu yana* or *yana yanturu* in Ht V97-8, five times in BT I, AmitIst 22 and ShōAv 320. Further exs. not mentioned in the dictionaries occur in Maitr 202 r22, BT II 614 and 1179, BT I (five times), AmitIst 37, BT VII C5, Ht V11 b19, 13 a17 and b20, 15 a21 and HtPar 209,17 (quoted in *UW* 196 a), BuddhUig I 5 and 76 and II 522, Genzan D v9, ShōAgon 1,210 and HamTouen 28,15.

MORPHOLOGY

The converb and aorist vowel of *-tUr-* verbs is /U/. The formative always has the shape *-tUr-* in texts which do not confuse the dentals, with the exception of the problems caused when the stem ends in /d/ or /t/. This is in accord with the etymology of Ramstedt, 1912: 28 for *-tUr-*, as consisting of *-(X)t-* and *-Ur-*. At the end of stems ending in dentals, the /d : t/ opposition appears to get neutralised when a dental follows. In Uigur script, in which the majority of our texts are written, *°t-tUr-* and *°d-tUr-* generally both give the spelling *°tdUr-*.[557] Exs. from *°t-* stems are

556 As shown by Meyer, 1965-6, rounded vowels after unrounded ones are explicit in Orkhon Turkic. We there also find the petrified converbs *yetrü*, *yagru* etc. syncopated as well.

557 This holds for inflectional morphemes no less than for derivational ones. The n. to U IV A38 gives a few exs. such as *ütdä* for *üd+dä* and *kotdum* for *kod-dum* and has an explanation for the predominance of TD connected with the letters' shapes. It should be stressed that the phenome-

etdūr-, *ögirtdūr-*, *öritdūr-*, *tarıtdur-*, *tutdur-*, *unıtdur-*, *üklitdūr-*, *yaratdur-*. With °*d-* stems we find e.g. *eşitdūr-*, *küzätdūr-*, *öŋütdūr-*, *igüdūr-*, *kotdur-*, *kutdur-*, *kütdūr-* and *yokatdur-*, some of these in very early texts. Early exceptions to this practice are very rare. Our only runic exs. are $Y^1R^1T^1W\,R^1$- < *yarat-tur-* and $Y^2\ddot{W}$ $T^2\ddot{W}\,R^2$- *in case* it comes from *yūd-tūr-* and not from *yūtūr-*. The runic consonant signs, however, are rather ambivalent.[558] The only ex. in Tib. script is *alŋad-tur-* spelled with two Ds. In Manichaean writing there do not seem to be any particular rules for *-tUr-* derivates from bases ending in dentals, but then the exs. are few and occur in early and late texts, and may belong to various dialects.

Thus the neutralisation of the oral dentals before *-tUr-* is realised differently in the different writing systems, but seems to cover all the sources. It is carried out rather systematically in early Uigur texts; it is therefore wrong to 'emend' the orthography of the texts in as far as it reflects this particular matter, as has been done by some etymology-minded editors. Except after dentals, texts with no consonant confusions agree in writing *-tUr-*; the habit of some dictionaries to change this to *-dUr-* must also be condemned.

-tUr- is in principle added after all phonemes, but bases ending in /v/ happen not to be attested. Bases ending in vowels are rare, but we find *ö-tūr-*, *sı-tur-* and *yetūr-* and the exceedingly late *kaldur-* < **kalı-dur-* and possibly the equally late hap. *tapladur-*; the last two can safely be called exceptions (if taken into consideration at all).

-tUr- derivates from deverbal verbs are extremely common; in fact, the only causative expander of -(*X*)*l-* and -(*X*)*n-* verbs is *-tUr-*. On the other hand, more than three quarters of all -(*X*)*ş-tUr-* verbs are attested only once, and a great majority of them appear only in very late texts. -(*X*)*n-* verbs form the largest group.

7.581 Phonological and morphological distribution

There are, including the combinations, seven causative formatives, one among them the denominal *+gAr-*. It has to be found out whether and how the remaining six are in complementary distribution. Only where they are opposed can we look

non occurs also in texts which otherwise carefully distinguish between the dentals. A detailed description of classical Uigur orthography would be exceedingly helpful as one of the necessary bases for a phonology. *If* no rules are detectable for Manichaean script, some reason as the one referred to would be in order. Note that the spelling TD in some cases means that D is written *on top* of the T, within the line of writing as if simultaneously.

558 T can stand for /t/ or /tt/; it can also represent etymological /dd/, as when 'he sent' from *ıd-* is written $I\,T^1I$ (KT E 7) etc., or /td/, as G^1T^1M (BQ), which must mean *agıtdım* since the same expression appears with *agıtıp* in KT N 7. Cf. also *yavrıtdım* in the same line.

for functional and semantic differences between them. Taking only transparent derivations with base attested in Old Turkic into account,[559] we get the following picture:

The formative for polysyllabic bases ending in a vowel or /r/ is *-(X)t-*, but cf. *keŋü-r-*. Monosyllabic stems ending in vowels have *-tUr-*, possibly because one preferred derived stems not to be monosyllables: *ye-tür-*, *sı-tur-*, *te-tür-* and *ö-tür-*. *te-t-*, which is incomparably more common than *te-tür-*, has passive meaning. This is in accordance with the fact that *-(X)t-* is the main creator of passive verbs among the formatives otherwise used for causatives. Among the bases ending in consonants other than /r/, polysyllabic verbs which had had /A/ as their converb and aorist vowel are expanded with the help of *-Ar-*. Other polysyllabic verbs ending in consonants usually have *-tUr-* as causative expander, with the following exceptions: Verbs ending in /ş/ can have *-Ur-* as well, and we also find *eşt-ür-* and *tamt-ur-*. There are two polysyllabic consonant verbs expanded with *-gUr-*, *amırtgur-*[560] and the practically hap. *arıngur-*. *-Xz-* is used only with monosyllabic bases ending in consonants. Only in this last-mentioned domain is there no complementary distribution.

After monosyllabic consonant stems all causative formatives are used. We find that *°n-* verbs are expanded only with *-tUr-*, and for some reason only *-(X)t-* is used after *°v-*. *-Ur-* and *-(X)z-* are not used after the sonants /r/, /z/ and /n/,[561] and *-(X)t-* is not used after polysyllabic stems ending in the dentals /d/, /t/ and /n/: The ŞU and Tariat inscrs. go their own way on this point, however, with *yarat-tt-*. Stems ending in velars, i.e. /g/, /k/ and /ŋ/, are not expanded with *-gUr-*. One-syllable cluster stems like *sarç-*, *sark-*, *sars-*, *yalk-*, *tart-*, *kork-* and *ürk-* are generally expanded with *-(X)t-*, but note *art-ur-*, *ärt-ür-*, *kork-ız-* and *silk-tür-*.

There is still enough room left for oppositions: To give only a few exs., stems ending in /s/ can be followed by *-Ur-* or *-Xt-*, stems ending in /y/ by *-Xt-*, *-tUr-* or *-Xz-*, stems ending in /r/ are followed by *-Xt-*, *-tUr-*, and *-gUr-*.

The causative expander of *-Xn-*, *-Xl-*, *+Ad-* and *-Xz-* verbs appears always to have been *-tUr-*; formatives ending in vowels or /r/, like *+Ar-*, *-Ur-* and *-gUr-*, were expanded with *-(X)t-*. *-(X)t-* itself was followed by *-tUr-*; the status of the /t/ of *amırtgur-* is not very clear. The causative counterpart of *-Xk-* was *-kAr-*, formed with *-Ar-*. To judge by *todgur-*, *-gUr-* may have been the causative expander of *-(X)d-* verbs; the late *yüdtür-* shows that it was subsequently replaced by *-tUr-*. The passage to *-tUr-* is much more conspicuous where *-Xş-* and *+Xk-* are

559 This does not hold for petrified converbs, of course, for which see section 7.563.

560 This is not necessarily an exception, as the *°r* may have been introduced secondarily. See the entry for this verb, section 7.54.

561 And /l/, the fourth sonant, if one does not take *kälür-* and *ölür-* into consideration.

expanded: The original expander of *-Xş-* verbs was *-Ur-*, giving *°şUr-*, the original expander of *+Xk-* verbs *-Ar-*, giving the verbs listed in section 7.53 (*+gAr-*). There is a continuous development towards *-XştUr-* starting with Maitr *sokuştur-*, however, and *°şUr-* verbs clearly are pre-formed; *+gAr-* is replaced by *+XktUr-* where new expansions are to be formed, thus giving *biriktür-* and the five late and rare verbs listed at the end of section 5.44. Note that *-tUr-* thus encroaches on the domains of *-gUr-*, *-Ur-* and *-Ar-*, but not a bit on that of *-(X)t-*. This is in accord with our statistics:

Limiting ourselves to transparent derivates from attested stems, we find that causative verbs are formed from 429 (simple and derived) bases. 44% of these are formed with *-tUr-*, 41% with *-(X)t-*, 12% with *-Ur-*, 4% with *-gUr-*, 2% with *-(X)z-* and 1.6% with *-Ar-*; these numbers would, of course, be rather different if less regular forms were also included. Although *-(X)z-*, e.g., was rare, it need not be assumed that it was totally unproductive. Adding the numbers up, we get more than 100%: From 22 (= 5%) among the bases, causative derivates are formed with more than one formative. Not in all these cases is there competition: In half of them, the different derivates simply belong to different periods or dialects. *et-* and *yap-ıt-* 'to have built' appear only in ŞU and Tariat, as against *et-ür-* (Manichaean) and *et-dür-* (other Uigur; Qarakhanid) and *yap-ur-* (the late Ernte and DLT; 'to level the ground'). *yöläştür-*, *köydür-*, *tuytur-*, *yüdtür-*, *todgur-*, *bütkär-*, *turıt-* ('to inhibit'; only infinite forms), *agıt-* and *sökit-* are late counterparts of *yöläşür-*, *köñür-*, *tuyuz-* (specific meaning), *yütür-* and *yüdür-*, *todur-*, *bütür-*, *turgur-*, *agtur-* (Toñ ff.!) and *sökür-* respectively. The 'early' verbs are not attested only in early texts: Sometimes, as with *bütür-* and *bütkär-*, they even appear in biverbs, and are real synonyms; in other cases, the older verb (e.g. *tuyuz-*) has evolved a rather limited meaning, making it into an unmotivated lexeme and demanding the creation of a new causative. Sometimes, two causatives are in fact formed from the same base with apparently the same meaning: TT III (a Manichaean text) 34: *nızvanılar ögin köŋülin azıtıp örlätür ärti tınlıglarıg* vs. Chuast (another Manichaean text) 19: *anıg kılınçlıg ş(ı)mnu ögümüzni sakınçımızını azgurdukın, ... biligsiz ögsüz boltukumuz* [ü]*çün* ... A similar pair: Suv 524,1 *sidi tegmä işig küdüküg utgurak büţürtäçi*... vs. BT I D (172) *burxan kutın tanuklap yok kurugug bütKärür* ("vollendet das Leere"). In the following, both verbs have the passive significance to which we return below: KT S6 *süçig savıŋa yımşak agısıŋa arturup üküş türk bodun öltüg* vs. Chuast 122 "*Nomçı män*" *tegmäkä artızıp anıŋ savın alıp* ... or M III 30,8-9$_1$ (text 12) *arţızmaŋlar az yäkkä*. Here we saw an equation between a formative which is in other cases used with purely causative meaning, and one which never forms real causative verbs. Other competing but synonym causative couples are *kälür-* and *kältür-*, *korkut-* and the rare and special *korkız-*, *saşıt-* and *saşur-*, *yagıt-* and the

rare *yagtur-* and *äştür-* as against *äşidtür-*. In none of these could I detect a difference in meaning or use.

With some other such couples, the difference is an idiosyncratic matter of the lexicon: *kanıt-* is 'to give pleasure', *kantur-* 'to satiate, satisfy'; *ötür-* is concrete, *ötgür-* always metaphorical; *tutdur-* is the grammatical causative whereas *tutuz-* signifies 'to entrust'; *örit-* is spiritual, the very rare *örtür-* concrete. Only with tr. bases can one point at a grammatically significant difference: The hap. *täpit-* governs the ultimate object but *täptür-* the intermediate agent; *yetit-* the ultimate object whereas *yetgür-* goes with the 'person one makes something available to'. *tedür-* is a real causative whereas *tet-* in fact signifies 'to be called so and so' or even 'to be so and so'. *basur-*, finally, is a causative in the strict sense whereas *basıt-* tends towards passive use, but there also is a lexical difference: *basur-* has to do with the meaning 'to weigh down' of *bas-*, whereas, for *basıt-*, *bas-* is 'to make a surprise attack'. In all four cases, the *-(X)t-* derivate is related to government of the ultimate object (which can be identical with the instigator), whereas the /r/ derivate is connected to government of the causee. There is some interest in this, but four cases among 429 are insignificant for a grammar.

The fact that the living causative derivate of a particular verb thus turns out to be fixed in particular cases does not mean that there could not be any difference between the various causative formations. Especially with single syllable underived bases ending in consonants, several possibilities existed for the language; the choice needn't have been determined by coincidence, but could also be a function of meaning. Some causative formatives were, after all, added mostly to intr. bases; they were not the ones associated with the passive turn in the derivate. It can now be seen why there is no point in treating the behaviour of the different causative formatives separately, as we did with the passive.

Any observations about the formatives will have to set out from the constructions in which the verbs are, or are not, attested.

7.582 The syntactic behaviour of verbs with causative formatives

It is on purpose that the title does not mention 'causative verbs': It turns out that some of the formatives in question under certain circumstances make the verbs behave as passives. To find out what these circumstances are, one cannot start with sense but has to set out from formal characteristics.

As in the previous chapters, many causatives as well are not accompanied by any nominal at all. In all such cases the direct object is understood from the context. Thus in the second clause of the following, with a predicative nominal of adjectival content: *birki(y)ä amrak oglumun siziŋä tutuzur m(ä)n; ąsän tükäl kälürüŋ* (KP XXV 1) 'I entrust to you my only dear son; bring (him back) safe and

sound'. There are cases in which no direct object is understood; in those cases none *can* in fact be understood, as the verb has passive sense. Such sentences will be treated in a particular section.

There are also many exs. for nominals to express time, space and other accompanying circumstances. The second verb in the following sentence is accompanied by a locative and an instrumental: *anta tamu ärkliglärı örtlüg kızartmış tämirlig yer[d]ä töpön yatgururlar* (Höllen 34) 'There the potentates of hell make (them) lie head-down on a place with flaming red-hot iron'; *anta uduzup balık ortosınta bältirdä kalın kuvrag ara olgurt(d)ı* (KP LXX 7). Both verbs serve as exs. here: 'He led (him) from[562] there and seated (him) among the dense crowd at a cross-roads in the centre of town'. The second sentence also contained a postpositional phrase. Here, finally, is a morphological ablative: *bo adadın ozgurup [b]iziŋä isig öz boşı bergil* (U IV C91) 'Save (us) from this danger and bestow life upon us'.

Much more numerous, with causative forms, are the cases in which the direct object is not understood but expressed, be it in the accusative or as unmarked object. We found that direct objects were altogether incompatible with passive voice, rather limited semantically with the reflexive and not too common with cooperative-reciprocal verbs. One can therefore understand Kasem-Beg, 1848: 85 par. 218, where the causative is called "das transitive Verbum". An intr. verb with a causative suffix is sure to be tr.; a tr. verb with a causative suffix often serves as passive in Old Turkic, as we shall see. Here only the definition of a tr. verb as capable of governing a *direct object* and of an intr. one as incapable of doing so.[563] Upon receiving a causative formative, an intr. base becomes tr. and then generally behaves just as if it were a simple tr. verb: *içgärülük ädgü yemişig kuşlar artatır* (KP LXXII 8-LXXIII 1) 'Birds spoil the good fruit intended for the palace';[564] *koy lagzın ulatı tınlıglarıg ölürür, tärisin soyar, kan ögüz akıtır* (KP III 3) '(They) kill sheep and pigs and other such beings, flay their skin and pour forth a river of blood'. The three verbs are simple trs. in English; two of them are causatives in Old Turkic.

562 The wider context demands an ablative sense. This text is in a dialect in which the locative form has ablatival use as well.

563 This is not a commonplace: Some scholars (dealing perhaps with other languages) define a tr. verb as one which can govern any 'object', a 'dative object' as well. Such a definition is unsuited to Old Turkic structure.

564 Note word order, topicalising the object. English would have passivised for such a purpose, as 'The . . . fruit is spoiled by birds'.

Causative verbs with unmarked object, without dative

We can distinguish here between a pattern in which the subject is expressed, be it as a nominal or as the person suffix of the verb, and one in which the subject is not expressed. Here are exs.; the first type: *tavga]ç kaganta bädizçi kälürtüm* (KT S11) 'I brought decorators from the emperor of China'; *aroksuz könülin uzun turkaru t(ä)ŋridäm xua çäçäk saçtılar yagıtdılar* (TT X 155) 'With an untiring heart they incessantly scattered and sprinkled divine lotus flowers'. Here, now, is a subordinate clause in which no agent is expressed: *oŋulu umatın yaŋlok sakınç turgursar, . . . ötrü ol tınl(ı)g bo yertinçüdäki taloy ögüz tägzinçiŋä çomar batar tägzinür* (TT VI 216) 'If one cannot improve but thinks up wrong things, . . . then the creature in question goes under into the whirlpool of the sea which is this world,[565] and whirls around'. When no agent is expressed one can, in principle, mistake the unmarked direct object for a subject. Put as a question, how can one tell that a nominal with no case suffix or postposition, accompanying a verb in the 3rd person singular, is not the agent but a direct object? It turns out that, in the great majority of cases, such an object immediately precedes the verb. In the very few cases where this is not so, it is meaning and the context one falls back to. Here is such an exception: *tavgaç kaganta* I S²Y²I L²I K²NG *kälti. bir tümän agı altun kärgäksiz kälürti* (KT N 12) 'From the emperor of China came I.L.; he brought ten thousand (loads of) brocade, gold and silver complete'. The word *kärgäksiz* was promoted into the most predicative position in the sentence, to stress the large quantity. Here is a further ex., in which the suffix *+lI* appears to give the unmarked object the prosodic independence it otherwise lacks: *öläyin tesär ymä ölü umaz, ämgäkli mäŋili k(ä)ntün kötürür* (TT VI 451). The eds. translate: "Wenn man sterben möchte, so kann man . . . das nicht. Man wird Qual und Freude aus sich selbst ertragen".

Practically all causatives appearing with unmarked object but without the dative are derived from intr. bases, and thus behave as simple tr. verbs. The following will serve as an ex. for what is *not* an exception; the unmarked object is in close juncture with the base, and the bracketing is (*kşanti kıl-*)*tur-*: *bökünki küntä bo nomlug orontakı bir täg kşanti kılturdaçılarnıŋ, böküntä* [(BT II 1066). Such exs. were discussed in the introduction to part VII. Particularly interesting for us are those cases in which the base is tr. and there is an unmarked object. This construction is not too common but there is nothing aberrant about the instances. Here is one with and one without agent: *anta ötrü maxenḍraseni elig bäg ulug bädük kaŋlılarda tälim üküş aş içgü äd tavar ärdnilär urturup kay bältir sayu eltip*

565 *taloy ögüz tägzinçi* is a metaphor for *bo yertinçü*. The metaphoric relationship is usually expressed by the element *+lXg* (q.v. above) but, as one sees, not always.

alkoka boşı berip barçasın berür ärti (U III 40,29-30) "Thereupon, king Mahendrasena would have a lot of food and drink, goods$_2$ and gems put on big and large carts, would lead (them) to all the market-places and crossroads, would bestow them upon everybody and give it all out'. Notice that the king does not himself put (*ur-*) his presents and alms on the carts but has (an) anonymous attendant(s) do that. The nouns accompanying the verb *urtur-* represent the ultimate object. Here is another ex., translated in the entry for *yarat-tur-*: *bi taş yaratdurmak üzä 'äŋäyü biltürdi ädrämin taybo atl(ı)g balıkta*. Instead of saying that the king 'had a lot of food etc. put on carts' or that he 'had his virtues made known', one could also have translated that he 'had somebody put a lot of food etc. on carts' or 'had (the people) know his good qualities': The Uigur sentences are indifferent in this respect. The question which interpretation one is to choose is more appropriate with this language than appears at first sight, because it does not use anaphorical or even indefinite pronouns to complete clause patterns. 'Understood' entities such as 'attendants' or 'the public' would be left unexpressed in Old Turkic even if they belonged to the grammatical structure of the clause. One can obviously distinguish between two acts in all these exs.: The act of causation and the activity described by the base verb. *A priori*, the activity referred to by the base can be conceived of as passive or as active, but Old Turkic grammar does not give us the possibility to distinguish between these when the intermediate agent remains unmentioned. In all exs. as discussed in this section, the unmarked object represents the ultimate object; in none does it represent the intermediate agent, which would have left the ultimate object unexpressed.

Clauses with causative verb and accusative; no dative

The number of exs. for this pattern is double that of the exs. for the previous one, and the ratio between a great majority of verbs derived from intr. bases versus few derived from tr. ones does not change. As already stated, the intr. base becomes transitivised and in most cases behaves like a simple tr. verb. Some special products of such derivation are, however, worth noticing. The action of the instigator can consist in the whole spectrum of degrees and types of involvement. This involvement can have been quite coercive in *başlıgıg yükündürmiş, tizligig sökürmiş* (KT E2) 'Those who had heads he forced to bow, those who had knees he forced to kneel'. In the following sentence, however, it may not have been more than the advice of an ally: "*Siz taşıkıŋ, çikig taşgarıŋ*" *temiş* (ŞU E10) 'He is said to have said "Move out yourself and make the Çik move out (as well)"'. The formation *+gAr-*, within which *taşgar-* was created, is denominal but stands in a causative – intransitive relationship with the products of another denominal formative, *+(X)k-*. Negated, causative verbs can imply hindering (and not just not-

causing): *bo türk bodun ara yarıklıg yagıg kältürmädim* (Toñ 54)[566] should not be translated as 'I did not bring . . .' but as 'I did not give a chance for the mail-clad enemy to come in among this august (or 'Turkic') people'. The (Old) Turkic causative denotes not only causation, but also permission, authorisation, non-hindrance on purpose or by negligence etc.

Now to the derivates of tr. bases. As we had found it to be the case with unmarked direct objects, here as well the direct object generally represents the ultimate goal, not the intermediate agent. *bargay m(ä)n, anta şri nal(a)ndar(a)n sāŋrāmig täpitip ko[g] kıçmık kılgay m(ä)n* (Ht V 322) 'I will go and there have the convent of Śrīnālandārāma trampled down and make it into motes and filings'. We could also have translated 'I will there make (them) trample down the convent . . .'; in fact the sentence *yaŋalıg sıµü bulıtçulayu yıggay m(ä)n* 'I will ammass an army of elephants like a cloud', which immediately precedes this one, lets us know that 'them' are elephants. Here is another ex.: *kertü köŋülümüzni azk(ı)ya t(a)var birlä ymä körkitgäli kılınsar, antın kälmiş köŋülüg näŋ tükäti biltürgäli bolmaz* (Ht VII 2138) 'Even if we try to show (you) our true heart with a few objects, it is quite impossible to fully convey (to you) the state of mind which arose from that (matter)'. This is written in a letter accompanied by presents, which is why 'you' follows from the context. '. . . let our true attitude become evident . . .' would also have been possible. In *Vakpadı bagşınıŋ asurlar pryanınta turup Maytrı bodis(a)tvnıŋ burxan kutın bulgusın küdüp sezikin üztürgäli ugramış oron* (Ht IV 357), the intermediate agent is the bodhisattva Maitreya: His presence as accompanying *üz-tür-* is understood from his appearance in the preceding *küd-* clause. With the following sentence, one hesitates between a causational interpretation and one implying permission; the decision could have doctrinal relevance: *nomug törüg yadturmatın tıdtımız ärsär* . . . (Chuast 91) 'If we should have been in the way of the spreading of the doctrine and the code, and held it back . . .'. The alternative version is that of the *EDPT* under *yadtur-*: "if we have impeded the (true) doctrine and rules by not causing them to be published abroad".[567]

I have come across only one ex. of the present pattern in which the accusative form represents the intermediate agent: *dyan sakınç küçindä nızvanılarıg basıntur-maz* (BuddhKat 43) has been translated as 'By the force of *dhyāna* i.e. meditation one prevents the lusts from oppressing one' in the entry on *basın-tur-*; the meaning is there compared to *basıntur-* with ergative dative, which gives a passive

566 The argument is not changed if *yältür-* is the correct reading.

567 Asmussen, 1965: 194 (IV B) left the causative segment untranslated: He writes "if we, not spreading the Doctrine and the Law, should have obstructed them . . .".

meaning.[568] How do we know that the lusts are intermediate agent and not ultimate objects? Because, in this system of thought, one cannot oppress them. Knowing whether a base is tr. or intr. is also a lexical bit of information.

As appears both in this section and in the preceding one, then, the nominal identified as referring to the direct object of the verb represents a different sort of participant depending on whether the base of the causative derivation is tr. or intr. and, if it is tr., depending on whether it might represent the intermediate agent or the ultimate object. How the ultimate object and the intermediate agent are expressed in the same sentence will be seen in the following sections.

Causative verbs with accusative and dative

In some instances the dative has a concrete meaning, and is, in a part of these, governed by the base of the verb. Thus e.g. *ötrü ol aşçı är söglünçüsin elig bägkä kälürüp üskintä urdı* (ms. T III 84-60 v 28 quoted in the n. to TT V A 124) 'Thereupon that cook brought the king his roast meat and placed it in front of him'. Similarly, we find quite a few datives with *tägür-*, among them *beş tilgänim(i)zni yerkä tägürüp* . . . (BT II 303) 'bringing our five *cakras* to the ground . . .'. We also find datives of interest: *kün t(ä)ŋri bo yer suv üzä twgar, k(ä)ntü y(a)rokın k(a)magka y(a)rotır* (M III 14,10$_1$, text 7) 'The sun rises above this earth and makes its own light shine for all'.[569]

In other sentences the dative can be understood to be referring to the intermediate agent, who is taken to act directly upon the ultimate object. This construction has been discussed by Bang, 1925: 15-17, including references to modern Turkic languages and an attempt at an explanation. I add a few exs.: *ötrü maxeṇḍraseni elig öz tiri[g] ätözintäki kaparmış ätin yara bıçıp ak[a] kälmiş söl suvın iglig ärkä içürüp* . . . (U III 45,13) 'Thereupon, king Mahendrasena split and cut the swollen flesh of his own living body, had the sick man drink the lymph which had come flowing, and . . .' or 'had the lymph, which had come flowing, drunk by the sick man, and . . .'. The appearance of the intermediate agent does not, we find, help us decide whether the embedded sentence is to be understood actively or passively. One could say that the question is unnecessary, and that both the lymph and the sick man (although marked differently) are, in a sense, objects. Or, that the active-passive opposition is neutralised in embedded sen-

568 The eds.' translation "Kraft Versenkung läßt man sich nicht durch die Affekte unterdrücken" should better have been '. . . verhindert man die Affekte davor, einen zu unterdrücken', although this may be slightly less idiomatic.

569 Thus if we understand *yarokın* as accusative. The content is slightly altered if we take this word as instrumental. Then, the direct object would be taken over from the previous clause: '. . . and with its own light illuminates it (i.e. this earth) for the benefit of all'.

tences. We withhold judgement on this till after the discussion of the instances with dative but without direct object. *birki(y)ä amrak oglumın siziŋä tutuzur m(ä)n* (KP XXV 5) is a different case, as *tut-uz-* 'to entrust' has gotten semantically dissociated from *tut-* and has (as far as participant structure is concerned) moved towards *ber-* 'to give'. Here, therefore, the only translation is 'I entrust to you my only beloved son'. A further ex.: *bo muntag köni kertü tözüg ol tözün bilgälär adınaguka ymä biltürgälir üçün* . . . (Suv 388,17) 'But, so as to make this so true$_2$ principle known to others, those noble wise men . . .'. Or should we have said 'to inform others of this . . . principle'? Perhaps we should, here as e.g. in the U III ex. discussed above, be guided by the word order chosen by the translator; this would give 'got the lymph . . . drunk by the sick man' there, 'make this principle known to others' here. Having an accusative in common with several verbs does not help in the decision: *oglanların ozgurgalı kutgargalı kim ol örtänü turur [oo]tka köyürmägäli* (Genzan D v 7) 'to save$_2$ one's children so that one does not let that continuously flaming fire burn them up' or 'so that one does not let them get burned up by that . . . fire'. Further *bod kötürmäçä tınl(ı)g oglanıŋa bulturayın nirvanıg* (TT VII 40,142, Yetikän sudur) 'Let me enable the sons of men to find *nirvāṇa*' and *bod kötürmäçä tınl(ı)glar oglanlarıŋa bulturayın nirvanıg* (BT XIII 47,26), with only one possible translation: No initiative for the 'finding' can go out of *nirvāṇa*. In the following, the first ex. of *oy-tur-* has both dative and accusative while the second is accompanied only by the object: *Anandaşiri atl(ı)g toyınka amtıkı nomlarnıŋ tamgasın oyturgalı aŋa k(ä)rgäklig y(e)vigin anı barça tükäl anuṭup anıŋ tamgasın oydurup* . . . (BT XIII 49,33 ff.) 'in order to have the blocks of the present *sūtras* carved by the monk named Ānandaśrī, I had all necessary equipment for it prepared in full, had its blocks carved, and . . .'. *udlarıg kälürüp oglanlarka sürdürüp* . . . (Ernte II 39) can only be translated as 'bring the oxen and have them driven out by the boys . . .'.

The ex. *raxu asurıka ıdturgalı ay täŋrig* (ShōAgon 1,217) has already been quoted and translated in the entry for *ıd-tur-*, but cf. n. 540. What is interesting is the variant *raxu asurıtın titdürgäli ay t(ä)ŋrig* (ĀgFrag (1) F8) in a text otherwise identical with the former (cf. the translation quoted in the entry for *tit-dür-*). This is probably an *ablativus separationis* into which the intermediate agent got attracted. An ergative ablative is not quite unknown in Uigur: Cf. the translation of *tüzüdin kükülmiş* (Ged 39) as "Von-allen-Gelobter" in *UW* 270 a-b, *ig käm adasıntın . . . örlätgäli bulgaṭılgalı ugrasar*, in TuoLuoNi 187 translated as "wenn . . . sie durch die . . . Krankheiten und Gebrechen . . . in Wirrnis gebracht werden sollten" and the series of ablative *+dIn* with anti-transitive or intr. verbs in TT V B65-67. I know of no such exs. with a causative form, however.

In a few further passages a dative comes close to instrumental meaning: *köŋülin yüräkin buyan ädgü kılınça üklitdi astı* (U IV A270) 'He magnified his heart$_2$

through good deeds$_2$' and *anıg kılınça erinçükä k(ä)ntü özümüzni ämgätir biz* (Chuast 201) 'We cause ourselves distress through bad deeds and sins'.[570] Translating 'We allow bad deeds and sin to cause us distress' is impossible because *ämgät-* does not signify 'to make A cause distress to B'. Both quoted sentences have direct objects referring back to the subject, and neither causative is derived from a tr. base. This is also why the causative occurs in a biverb with a simple verb in the first sentence. There can here clearly be no intermediate agent; beside the (primary and only) agent they can only govern one object.

We already met sentences (see the ones quoted above from TT VII 40,42 and BT XIII 47,26) in which the dative unequivocally represented the embedded agent. This is clearly so also in the following ex., in which both embedded agent and ultimate object are persons: *biz kamagun ol elig xanıg köyü küzädü tutup kamag yalaŋukka barçaka bir yaŋlıg ayatgay agırlatgay biz* (Suv 408,3), quoted in *UW* 298 b and translated as "wir alle werden diesen König$_2$ ständig behüten$_2$ und werden veranlassen, daß alle Menschen insgesamt und gleicherweise [ihm] huldigen".[571] In the following, all three participants are, again, humans: *anta ötrü baḍra xatun elig bägkä ät' özin sävitgälir üçün kün küniŋä tözün yumşak savlar sözläy*[*ür ärt*]*i* (U III 54,17) 'Thereupon, queen Bhadrā day by day used to say gentle and soft words, in order to make the king$_2$ love her' or '. . . in order to make herself loved by the king$_2$'. We have already become accustomed to this ambiguity in translation. These renderings are a bit free, for *ät' özin* is not the reflexive pronoun (which would have been *käntüsin*); Bhadrā wants the king to love 'her body'. A *purely* reflexive content would have remained implicit, as we shall see when dealing with causative constructions with dative but without explicit direct object.

Sentences with causative and dative and suffixless object

First, here, is an ex. with a temporal dative: *lagzın yıl beşinç ay yeti otuzka yog ärtürtüm* (BQ S 10) 'On the 27th of the 5th month in the year of the pig I brought the funeral feast to a conclusion'. In practically all the other exs. the dative can be interpreted as local: *ąmtı xormuzta t(ä)ŋri t(ä)rkin maŋa suv kälürzün* (U III 38,25) 'Now let the god Indra quickly bring me water'; *ötrü buyruklar . . . arkışlarka sav tutuzup InçA tep tedilär*: (U III 29,15) 'Then the officers entrusted a

570 Cf. also Asmussen, 1965: 198 "Because of evil deeds and sin we incur agony upon ourselves (our own selves)".

571 There is a strange n.: "Akk. wohl nur auf *kü- küzät-* zu beziehen, gegen o.S. 68 a." This is impossible, however, as [ihm] in the given translation shows: German *huldigen* happens to govern the dative in that language, but *aya- agırla-* governs the accusative. The two clauses in Old Turkic have the object in common. Cf. Republican Turkish *Kıralı koruyup herkese saydıracağız.*

message to the envoys, saying thus:'; *yaŋalar bägiŋä kıyn kızgut tägüräyin* (U II 20,2) 'I'd like to inflict suffering$_2$ upon the lord of the elephants'. *ber-* is another verb which governs the dative by itself or with causative expansion: *aç yäklärkä içgäklärkä ... aş içgü agı barım bert(ü)rürlär* (TT VI 266) 'They have (people) give food and drink and riches$_2$ to hunger-demons and vampires'. This is the only translation possible in the context; I dare not suggest that the sentence could (given a different context) also have signified 'cause the demons and vampires to give (others) food, drink and riches$_2$'. As it is, the intermediate agent is left unexpressed in this sentence.[572]

In the following ex., the dative should be identified with the intermediate agent: *anta basa yumuşçı ıtsıka mandal öŧündürüp ...* (BT VII A 387-8). The given translation, "Danach muß man durch den assistierenden Schüler ein Mandala herbeibitten lassen",. suggests an instrumental interpretation, which would not have been the case if "durch den" were replaced by 'den'. The pupil probably does have ancillary status, and the *causation* of *his* act is probably itself not part of the rite but to be arranged beforehand. An instrumental interpretation is not to be excluded in the following instance either: *mänin savımın sımadı. tavgaç kaganıŋ içräki bädizçig ı(d)tı. aŋar adınçıg bark yarat(d)urtum, için taşın adınçıg bädiz urturtum* (KT S 12). A nearly identical passage appears in BQ N 14: *sa]vımın sımadı. içräki bädizçig ı(d)tı. aŋar adınçıg bark yaratdım, için taşın adınçıg bädiz [*. The main difference between these passages is the fact that the second has *yarat-* where the first has *yarat(d)ur-*. The first sentence could be translated 'I had him build an exquisite house' or 'I had an exquisite house built by him'. If we assume that the two passages are identical in content,[573] however, we have to assign an instrumental sense to the dative. The BQ passage can only be translated as 'I constructed an exquisite house with his participation'; the KT inscr. would then signify 'I had an exquisite house constructed with his participation'. This would only be natural, since decorators do not build houses but only decorate them.

Concerning the following sentence it must be noted that *ayıt-* in most texts no longer signifies 'to cause to say' but has limited itself to signifying 'to ask, inquire about' while keeping its original government pattern: *körümçi ulatı t(ä)rs tätrü törüçikä bilig aytıp üküş türlüg törösüz tsuylug erinçülüg ay(ı)g kılınçl(ı)g iş işläyürlär* (TT VI 331) 'They ask for knowledge from seers and various other propagators of perverse laws and perform many types of forbidden and sinful$_2$ actions

572 The implicit intermediate agent retains his empty slot also in the next sentence: *saçıg tökülg ayu berürlär, tapınıtururlar udunıtururlar* (two mss. have *kılıtururlar* instead of *ayu berürlär*). The demons and vampires are governed by *tapın- udun-*, equally before causative expansion.

573 It is known that one of the inscrs. copied part of its content from the other; see also Hovdhaugen, 1974. It is beyond doubt that the two passages relate the same event.

involving evil deeds'. In this section, then, there are no certain exs. of a dative representing an intermediate agent. For that to happen, it was not (apparently) sufficient that there was an ultimate object; this ultimate object also had to appear in the accusative case.

As in the section on unmarked objects appearing without dative, here too we will have to ask what it is that makes us identify the direct object as such and not, in cases where the agent remains unexpressed, take it to represent the agent. Here too we find that the unmarked object is adjacent to the verb: nearly always before, in a few cases after it. But the various set phrases like *kŏŋül ŏrit-* and *kŏŋül turgur-* are in any case easily identified.

Causatives in more elaborate constructions

We quoted the sentence *aç yäklärkä içgäklärkä . . . aş içgü agı barım bert(ü)rürlär* 'They have people give food and drink and riches$_2$ to hunger-demons and vampires'. What shape would the sentence have had if there had been explicit reference to those 'people'? The following two instances do this in the same way: *anı\a basa basa bäglär kälip yazokların ökünü kşanti [k]ılsarlar, olarnı barça samtso açarı nomlap süzüp yärçiläp uduzup barçanı burxan kutıŋa kŏŋül öritdürür ärdi* (Ht VII 9 a22-3). The intermediate agent (referring to the *bägs*) has the accusative form; it is as if one had said '*bäglärig burxan kutıŋa kınturur*'. In Maitr 132 r13: *sansız tümän tınl(ı)glarag* (i.e. *+lAr+Xg*) *burxan kutıŋa ulug küsüş turgurgalı üçün, . . .*, translated as "um zahllose zehntausende von Lebewesen dazu zu veranlassen, den großen Wunsch nach der Buddhaschaft zu erwecken". When the sentence contains a concrete dative, then, the embedded agent is in the accusative. The continuation of the last-quoted sentence is an interesting case of attraction: *. . . köp kalın tınl(ı)glarka tözün maytri bodis(a)tv birlä sokuşturgalı üçün* (*ibid.* 15). I would have expected either '*tınlıglarıg . . . maytri birlä*', '*tınlıglarıg . . . maytri bodisatvka*', '*tınlıglarka . . . bodisatvıg*', but not the dative as the mark for the only causee.

Causatives without direct object, with dative

Here, again, we have the many sentences with *tägür-* 'to convey', *kälür-* 'to bring', *kigür-* 'to introduce' etc., with which the dative denotes direction in space. Temporal datives are not lacking either: *ädgü künkä ädgü üdkä tem(i)n taşgaru taşrurlar* (TT VI 230) 'They bring (them i.e. the dead) out on a good day (and) good time'. In the following sentence, the dative accompanies the phrase *kı turup iç-* and not just the causative *kayıntur-*: *p(i)şig sıŋkar patpadi tupulg kayınturup içsär . . .* (TT VIII M29) 'If one boils and drinks half a ripe p

against colic, . . . '. From a tr. base: *näçükin bolsar sizlär yana yanıp k[ä]lip maŋa eşitdürüŋlär* (U I 6,3, Magier) '. . . let me hear (it)'.

In the previous section we quoted three sentences, with *ar-tur-* (KT S16) and *ar-nz-* (Chuast 122 and M III 30,8-9$_1$, text 12). The first can be translated as 'You were deceived by their sweet words and soft silk brocade, o multitude of Turks, and died'. More exact would be 'You let (yourself) be deceived . . .', which the Turk nation is being blamed for in the passage. Thus also Thomsen, p. 116: "En se laissant vaincre par leur doux appel . . .". Similarly Asmussen, 1965: 196 for Chuast 122: ". . . allowing ourselves to be deceived by one who . . .". Accordingly, the M III sentence should be rendered as 'Do not let (yourself) be deceived by the demon of lust'. The construction lived on in the Codex Comanicus: *murvatŋa sän yändirip yazıxımızını kötirdiŋ* "von deiner Güte besiegt hast du unsere Sünden getragen", corresponding to Latin *benignitate tua victus* .... It still exists in Kazakh, as Melioranski, 1922 par. 68,1 formulates it: "Si dans une telle proposition le sujet et le complément direct sont identiques, le complément direct est omis: *džauya aldırdım* 'J'ai permis à l'énnemi de (me) vaincre'; autrement dit: 'J'ai été vaincu par l'énnemi' ou 'Je me suis laissé vaincre par l'énnemi'. Nous voyons donc que dans quelques tournures la voix factitive se rapproche de la voix passive. S'il s'agit de personnes, on n'emploie guère le passif, mais on a toujours recours à un verbe factitif'." All this can also be said of Old Turkic, except that the distinction between 'personnes' and everything else does not always hold.

So much so that one is tempted to change the name of the 'causative' to 'reversive': What it mostly does is to change intransitive to transitive and transitive to (intr.) passive.

Here some exs. with *-(X)t-: kişi küçi korasar yad kişikä basıtur* (TT I 57) 'If the strength of a person is impaired, he is prone to attack by strangers'. Clauson, biased through his preoccupation with the primary senses of morphemes, translates ". . . he lets himself be oppressed by strangers"; A. v. Gabain, the ed., is less constrained by 'grammar' and writes: ". . . so wird er von fremden Menschen unterdrückt (überfallen)". A n. to the passage gives the following parallel: *tük tümän kişilär ig agrıgka basıtıp umugsuz ınagsız yaturlar* (Suv 587,3) "Tausende und aber Tausende von Menschen werden von Krankheiten bedrückt (sind ihnen verfallen) und liegen hoffnungslos danieder". It would be absurd to translate this as '. . . let themselves be attacked by . . .'; the active participation of the subject can just not be assumed, and these instances have to be given a passive interpretation. Thus also *sakınçka busuşka basıtu täginmiş biz* (HtPek 96 b 8) quoted in *UW* 234 a-b, "wir sind von Sorge[2] bedrückt, daß . . .". My judgement of *ögkä kaŋka sävitmiş ärdiŋ, kadaş a* (Suv 620,1) 'You were loved by mother and father, o brother!' and *anı täg nomçı bilgäkä ymä agırlatmış ärür siz* (Ht VII 1788-9) 'You are honoured even by an erudite wise man like him' would be a bit different:

Here, the subject should at least be given the *credit* for being loved or being honoured, for being its cause if not its instigator. Further such exs. are quoted in the verb entries; cf., e.g., the Suv ex. under *kov-ıt-*.

It is an important fact that the different causative formatives differ in their relation to this matter. It can be seen already from the quoted exs. that *-(X)t-* is particularly well attested in the passive sense; the real mass of exs. would have been much more impressive. *-Ar-*, *-Ur-*, *+gAr-*, *-gUr-* and *-(X)z-* never form such passive verbs, and *-tUr-* is very rare in such function. The main reason for this is no doubt that the mentioned formatives nearly always expand intr. bases; see the various formatives for details, and for semantic limitations on the tr. bases to which they do get added. When this does happen with *-Ur-*, *-Ar-*, *-gUr-* or *-(X)z-*, the ultimate object is never human, excepting a few exs. of the lexicalised *tutuz-*. Beside *-(X)t-*, then, *-tUr-* also forms passives. *ar-tur-* has already been quoted with passive meaning. Further exs. are *amtıkı bo üdtä baxşıka sokdurmak takı nägü tursun* (BT VIII A 155) "Wozu soll aber in der jetzigen Zeit das Geschlagenwerden von einem Guru sein?"; *kim kayu tözünlär oglı tözünlär kızı azu yäkkä içgäkkä basındurmış bolsar* ... (TT VII 40,37, Yetikän sudur) 'If any male or female *ärya* are oppressed by demons and vampires, ...'. This last is a rather special case, as we see in the entry on *basın-tur-*: As distinct from other *-(X)n-* verbs, *bas-ın-* evolved a truly tr. meaning; no *-(X)n-* verb gets expanded by *-(X)t-*, however, which is the normal creator of passive verbs from tr. bases.

To return to *-(X)t-*: Remember that this is the only causative formative possible with polysyllabic bases ending in vowels or in /r/. It also forms real causatives with bases with which other formatives are possible as well, e.g. in *az-ıt-* and *yag-ıt-*. The classification of its uses will therefore have to go on depending on the constructions in which it appears. What is obvious is that the *-(X)t-* derivate of a tr. base ending in a vowel need not have passive sense, since no other causative derivation is possible from such a base. In the following sentence, e.g., the dative is local: *türk bilgä kagan eliŋä bititdim, bän bilgä toñukuk* (Toñ 58) 'I had this written down in the realm of Bilgä Kagan, I, T. the wise'.

The understood reference back to the agent can also be as indirect object. Take the expression common in the inscrs., *başlıgıg yüküntürtümüz*. This is reasonably translated as 'We made those who had heads bow (to us)'. *kälin alşa tapındurmaz* (TT VII 28,51) means 'If he takes a bride, he does not (i.e. is unable to) make her respect (him)'. Both *yükün-* and *tapın-* govern datives; dative objects are not capable, in Old Turkic, of becoming subjects of passive sentences.

Causative verbs with üzä phrases

In chapter 7.3 it turned out that the ergative expression was constructed as a phrase governed by the postposition *üzä* for most exs. of the passive formations. We found that causative formations, foremost among them *-(X)t-*, could also serve as passive, and that (as with the formations of chapter 7.4) the dative was used to mark the instigator. We ought to check whether *üzä* phrases appearing in sentences containing a causative verb ever show themselves with such tasks as well.

There are quite a number of exs. and in only a part does the *üzä* phrase have a concrete sense. E.g. *lö xanı utru ünti; elgin tuta kigürüp ärdinilig oronluk üzä olgurt(d)ı* (KP XLVI 3) 'The prince of dragons rose to meet him; taking him by the hand[574] he led him in, and seated him on a jewelled throne'.

In quite a few passages the *üzä*-phrase refers to a sort of means: *közlüg kurınçımızını sini körmäklig yagmur üzä kanturalım* (U IV D24), in the *EDPT* under *kurınç* translated as "Let us satiate (i.e. alleviate) the dryness of our eyes with the rain of seeing you". In the next ex. we also have an expression with *tutup içgärip*; note that the first verb in this couple is a tr. simplex, the second formed with *+gAr-*, a denominal formative standing in causative relationship to the intr. *+Xk-*: *kụü käliglig küçläri üzä yanturu alkonı tutup içgärip bir täg nomlug oronta olorup* . . . (BT II 614) 'Through their magical power they again held and introduced them all, and . . .'; similarly, *ädgü ögli y(a)rlıkançuçı köŋüllüg küçläri üzä artokrak bir täg tuta içgärü y(a)rlıkazunlar* (BT II 745) 'With their power of well-meaning and charity let them keep (us) quite like one and introduce (us) (to *nirvāṇa*).' The absence of an explicit object does not, of course, affect the pattern. I have met only one ex., in an exceedingly late text, in which a *-(X)t-* verb is accompanied by an ergative *üzä* phrase: *tuug atl(ı)g baxşı üzä yaratmış ärür* (UigTot 1001) "Es ist geschaffen von dem . . . Mönch, dem Guru namens . . .". This exception does not affect the rule, as UigTot excludes itself from normal Uigur grammar also by other aspects of linguistic behaviour.

Causative and passive: an epilogue

The behaviour of most causative derivates from intr. bases is no different from that of simple tr. verbs. Yet whole formations of causatives are practically limited to intr. bases. Another limitation on the appearance of a full-fledged causative of tr. action is the fact that the instigator so often functions also as object of the embedded proposition, pushing the verb into passive content. This trait is com-

574 Or 'taking his hand', depending on whether one takes *älgin* to be instrumental or accusative.

mon to a number of Eurasian languages, as shown in par. 15 of v. der Gabelentz, 1861, called "Passivum durch das Causativum", and in Kormušin, 1976. Attempts at dealing with the double nature of the Old Turkic -(*X*)*t*- formation were made by Kowalski, 1949 and Röhrborn, 1972; some weaknesses of their views are pointed out in Johanson, 1974.

It has been variously noticed, and I have pointed out above, that the activity of the primary agent can actually be quite diverse. Amanžolov, 1969: 68 has defined it as "zastavlat', velet', pobudit', pozvoljat', dat', dopustit' čto-libo sdelat'". This whole spectrum finds a single overt representation in the Old Turkic causative, as e.g. in English and German. French, on the other hand, uses a three-member paradigm, called "immixtion" by Damourette and Pichon.

Early passives are hardly ever accompanied by an expression of the source of the action and in fact often simply serve as intr. counterparts to tr. bases.

Instead of voice and/or diathesis we should therefore, as far as Old Turkic is concerned, speak of three different systems: The tr.-intr. dichotomy, to be here defined in a way which suits the grammar of the language, where derivation simply serves as a source of enrichment of the lexical givens. The system of the grammatical means used in this language for the representation of participant interaction; the complexity of this system, whose means are complemented by the (as yet undescribed) system of cases, is exemplified by the presence of such members as the formations in -*sXk*- and -*tXz*-, and cuts through the first-mentioned dichotomy. Symptomatic for the third level are the 'passive' derivates from intr. bases, and the concrete – abstract opposition associated with the formation in -(*X*)*n*.-

A description of word-formation must leave it at these somewhat random remarks. Erdal, 1976: 358-396 contained some ideas on the grammatical status of the causative and the passive in Old Turkic and in a few other languages. In view of the general-linguistic interest of this subject, it deserves a theory-oriented and comprehensive treatment on the base of data supplied by us here. Such a description is already being planned.

Two other domains broached in Erdal, 1976 which deserve independent syntactic treatment are the case grammar of Old Turkic, and relativisation: The latter includes not only the 'traditional' participles, but also pronominal, collocational and conjunctional means.

Bibliography

This is a minimal bibliography not listing all work done on our subject matter nor even all the authorities consulted, but only publications cited explicitly. For sigla referring to texts see pp. 5-13 above.

Amanžolov, 1969 — A. S. Amanžolov, *Glagol'noe Upravlenie v JAzyke Drevnetjurkskix Pamjatnikov*, Moskva.

Bang, 1896 — W. Bang, 'Zu den Kök Türk-Inschriften aus der Mongolei', *TP* 7: 325ff.

Bang, 1915 — *id.*, 'Zur Kritik und Erklärung der Berliner uigurischen Turfanfragmente', *SBAW* 39: 623-635.

Bang, 1916 — *id.*, 'Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Türksprachen [2]', *SBAW* 22: 522-535.

Bang, 1916/17 — *id.*, 'Über die türkischen Namen einiger Großkatzen', *KSz* XVII: 112-146.

Bang, 1917 — *id.*, 'Turcica'. Pp. 270-294 in *Orientalistische Studien. Fritz Hommel . . . gewidmet . . .*, Bd. 2, Leipzig, 1918. *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* 22 (1917).

Bang, 1917-21 — *id.*, 'Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen'. 4 Mitteilungen, *ABAW* 1917/6, 1919/5 and 1921/2.

Bang, 1918 — *id.*, 'Zu den türkischen Zeitbestimmungen', *Türán*: 91-98.

Bang, 1918a — *id.*, 'Beiträge zur türkischen Wortforschung', *Türán*: 289-310.

Bang, 1925 — *id.*, 'Manichaeische Hymnen', *Muséon* 38: 1-55.

Bang, 1925a — *id.*, 'Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut', 2. Brief', *UJb* 5: 231-251.

Bang, 1925b — *id.*, 'Turkologische Briefe . . .', 3. Brief, *UJb* 5: 392-416.

Bang, 1930 — *id.*, 'Turkologische Briefe . . .', 5. Brief, *UJb* 10: 16-20.

Bang, 1933 — *id.*, 'Gewagte türkische Worterklärungen'. *MSFOu* 67: 35-41.

Bang, 1934 — *id.* 'Turkologische Briefe . . .', 7. Brief, *UJb* 14: 193-214.

Böhtlingk, 1851 — O. Böhtlingk, *Über die Sprache der Jakuten*, St. Petersburg.

Brockelmann, 1918 — C. Brockelmann, 'Maḥmūd al-Kāšgharīs Darstellung des türkischen Verbalbaus', *KSz* 18: 29ff.

Brockelmann, 1954 — *id.*, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasiens*, Leiden.

Bodrogligeti, 1984 — A. Bodrogligeti, 'Ghosts, copulating friends and pedestrian locusts in some reviews of Eckmann's "Middle Turkic Glosses"', *JAOS* 104: 455-464.

Choi, 1988 — H. W. Choi, 'On some Chinese loan words in Uighur', *CAJ* 32: 161-169.

Clark, 1975 — L. V. Clark, *Introduction to the Uyghur Civil Documents of East Turkestan*, Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Indiana.

Clauson, 1962 — Sir Gerard Clauson, *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*, London.

Clauson, 1967 — *id.*, 'Three notes on early Turkish', *TDAYB* 1966: 1-18.

Clauson, 1972 — *id.*, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford. (= *EDPT*)

Damourette and Pichon, 1911-40 — J. Damourette et E. Pichon, *Des mots à la pensée. Essai de grammaire de la langue française*, Paris.

Doerfer, 1963-75 — G. Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, I-IV, Wiesbaden. (= *TMEN*)

Doerfer, 1967 — *id.*, 'Türkisch *-n* > tschuwaschisch *-m*?', *UAJb* 39: 53-70.

Doerfer, 1973 — *id.*, *Lautgesetz und Zufall*, Innsbruck.

Doerfer, 1981-82 — *id.*, 'Zum Vokalismus nichterster Silben im Alttürkischen', *WZKM* 73: 47-87 and 74: 103-128.

Doerfer, 1982 — *id.*, 'Nomenverba im Türkischen', *Studia Turcologica Memoriae Alexii Bombaci Dicata*, Napoli: 101-114.

Doerfer, 1983 — *id.*, 'Türkolōjide eleştiri sorunları', *TDAYB* 1980-81: 87-99.

Doerfer, 1983a — *id.*, 'Die Lanze und der alttürkische Genitiv', *IV. Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi*, Istanbul.

Doerfer and Tezcan, 1980 — *id.* and S. Tezcan, *Wörterbuch des Chaladsch (Dialekt von Charrab)*, Budapest.

Eckmann, 1966 — J. Eckmann, *Chagatay Manual*, Bloomington.

Eckmann, 1976 — *id.*, *Middle Turkic Glosses of the Rylands Interlinear Koran Translation*, Budapest.

Eraslan, 1980 — K. Eraslan, *Eski Türkçede İsim-Fiiller*, Istanbul.

Ercilasun, 1984 — A.B. Ercilasun, *Kutadgu Bilig Grameri – Fiil*, Ankara.

Erdal, 1976 — M. Erdal, *Voice and Case in Old Turkish*. 2 vols. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Jerusalem.

Erdal, 1978 — *id.*, 'Irk Bitig üzerine yeni notlar', *TDAYB* 1977: 87-119.

Erdal, 1979 — *id.*, 'The chronological classification of Old Turkish texts', *CAJ* XXIII: 151-175.

Erdal, 1979a — *id.*, 'Die Konverb- und Aoristendungen des Alttürkischen', *UAJb* 51: 104-126.

Erdal, 1979b — *id.*, 'Die Morphemfuge im Alttürkischen', *WZKM* 71: 83-114.

Erdal, 1981 — *id.*, 'Les doigts coupables des Turcs'. Pp. 121-126 in: F. de Sivers (ed.), *La main et les doigts dans l'expression linguistique II*, Paris (= Lacito – Documents Eurasie, 6).

Erdal, 1982 — *id.*, 'Ein Bericht über zwei Projekte zur alttürkischen Grammatik', *UAJb N.F.*: 277-80 (Summary of a paper read at the symposium 'Neue Ergebnisse der Zentralasienforschung', Hamburg, 1981).

Erdal, 1982a — *id.*, '*Çelebi* and some early Turkish names for the Moslem God', *Asian and African Studies* 16: 407-416.

Erdal, 1985 — *id.*, 'Variable forms in the Qutadgu Bilig', *V. Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi, Tebliğler*, I, Türk Dili 1, Istanbul.

Erdal, 1986 — *id.*, 'Constraints on poetic licence in the Qutadgu Bilig', *TDED* XXIV-XXV: 205-214.

Erdal, 1988 — *id.*, 'Uigurica from Dunhuang', *BSOAS* LI: 251-7.

Finnish Atlas, 1892 — *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon, rec. par l'expédition finnoise 1890 et publ. par la Société finno-ougrienne*, Helsingfors.

Gabain, 1945 — A. v. Gabain, *Özbekische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
Gabain, 1950 — *id.*, *Alttürkische Grammatik*, 2. verbesserte Aufl., Leipzig.
Gabain, 1974 — *id.*, *Alttürkische Grammatik*, 3. Auflage, Wiesbaden.
v. d. Gabelentz, 1861 — H. C. v. der Gabelentz, *Über das Passivum*, Leipzig.
Grønbech, 1936 — K. Grønbech, *Der türkische Sprachbau*, Kopenhagen.
Grønbech, 1942 — *id.*, *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Comanicus*, Kopenhagen.

Henning, 1940 — W. B. Henning, *Sogdica*, London.
Hitch, 1984 — D. Hitch, 'Old Turkic '*b*' and '*p*''. Ms. of a lecture held at the P.I.A.C. of 1984, 23 pp.
Hitch, 1987 — *id.*, 'Tumshuqese and Turkic Brāhmī *rā*', *TUBA* 11: 249-252.
Houtsma, 1894 — M. T. Houtsma, *Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar*, Leiden.
Hovdhaugen, 1974 — E. Hovdhaugen, 'The relationship between the two Orkhon inscriptions', *AO* 36: 55 ff.

Johanson, 1974 — L. Johanson, 'Zur Syntax der alttürkischen Kausativa', *ZDMG Suppl.* 2, *XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag*, Wiesbaden, pp. 529-40.
Johanson, 1979 — *id.*, *Alttürkisch als "dissimilierende Sprache"*, Wiesbaden. (*Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit.*, Mainz 1979,2)
Judaxin, 1944 — K. K. Judaxin, *Russko-Kirgizskij Slovar'*, Moskva.
Justi, 1895 — F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, Marburg.

Kara, 1983 — G. Kara, 'Sino-uigurische Worterklärungen'. Pp. 44-51 in Röhrborn and Veenker, 1983.
Kasem-Beg, 1848 — M. A. Kasem-Beg, *Allgemeine Grammatik der türkisch-tatarischen Sprache*. Übersetzt von Dr. J. Th. Zenker, Leipzig.
Kononov, 1980 — A. N. Kononov, *Grammatika JAzyka Tjurkskix Runičeskix Pamjatnikov*, Leningrad.
Korkmaz, 1962 — Z. Korkmaz, *Türkçede Eklerin Kullanılış Şekilleri ve Ek Kalıplaşması Olayları*, Ankara.
Kormušin, 1976 — I. V. Kormušin, 'O passivnom značenii kauzativnyx glagolov', *Turcologica* (Kononov Festschrift), Leningrad, 89-93.
Kowalewski, 1844-49 — J. E. Kowalewski, '*Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français*, Kazan, 3 vols.
Kowalski, 1949 — T. Kowalski, 'De la nature du causatif et du passif dans les langues turques', *RO* 15: 430 ff.
Kuryłowicz, 1960 — J. Kuryłowicz, 'Dérivation lexicale et dérivation syntaxique'. Pp. 41-50 in: *Esquisses Linguistiques*, Wrocław–Krakow.

Laude-Cirtautas, 1961 — I. Laude-Cirtautas, *Der Gebrauch der Farbbezeichnungen in den Turkdialekten*, Wiesbaden.
Laut, 1986 — J.-P. Laut, *Der frühe türkische Buddhismus und seine literarischen Denkmäler*, Wiesbaden.
Laut and Röhrborn, 1988 — J.-P. Laut and K. Röhrborn, *Der türkische Buddhismus in der japanischen Forschung*, Wiesbaden.

Maue, 1981 — D. Maue, 'Zur Nebenüberlieferung von ai. *jalūka-* "Blutegel"', *Scholia. Beiträge zur Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde A. v. Gabain ... dargebracht ...*, Wiesbaden, pp. 114-7.

Maue, 1983 — *id.*, 'Zu den Dentalen im Brāhmī-Uigurischen', pp. 53-64 in: K. Röhrborn and W. Veenker (eds.), *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions von ... 1981*, Wiesbaden.

Maue, 1984 — *id.*, 'Vorläufige Bemerkungen zu den Gutturalgraphemen in der alttürkischen Brāhmī', *UAJb N.F.* 4: 90-96.

Mayer and Röhrborn, 1986 — A. Mayer and K. Röhrborn, 'Der Wert der modernen Übersetzungen der chinesischen Hsüan-tsang-Biographie und die alttürkische Version dieses Textes', *UAJb N.F.* 6: 100-121.

Melioranski, 1922 — P.M. Melioranski, 'La syntaxe kirghize ... traduite du Russe ...', *Muséon* 35: 217ff.

Menges, 1962 — K.H. Menges, 'Über den Bau der türkischen Wurzel', *UAJb* 36: 156ff.

Menges, 1968 — *id.*, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples*, Wiesbaden.

Menges, 1980 — *id.*, review of the first two fascicles of Röhrborn, 1977-88, *Anthropos* 75: 65-86.

Meyer, 1965-6 — I.R. Meyer, 'Vokal und Schriftsystem des Runentürkischen', *AO* 29: 183ff.

Meyer, 1968 — *id.*, 'Türkeitürk. *tanı-* 'kennen' und *tanık* 'Zeuge'', *UAJb* 40: 79-81.

Moerloose, 1986· — E. Moerloose, 'Uighur *ulatı*', *AoF* 13: 123-133.

Moravcsik, 1943 — G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II. Budapest.

Müller, 1920 — F.W.K. Müller, 'Uigurische Glossen'. *Festschrift für Friedrich Hirt ...*, Berlin.

Nadeljaev et al., 1969 — V.M. Nadeljaev et al., *Drevnetjurkskij Slovar'*, Leningrad.

Nasilov, 1963 — D.M. Nasilov, *Drevneujgurskij JAzyk*, Moskva.

Nauta, 1969 — A. Nauta, review of Tekin, 1968. *CAJ* 13: 308-11.

Nobel, 1958 — J. Nobel, *Suvarṇaprabhasottama-sūtra ... Ein Sanskrittext ... I-tsing's chinesische Version und ihre tibetische Übersetzung*, I: *I-tsing's chinesische Version, übersetzt ...*, Leiden.

Orkun, 1936-41 — H.N. Orkun, *Eski Türk Yazıtları*, Istanbul. 4 vols.

Pavet de Courteille, 1870 — *Dictionnaire türk-oriental*, Paris.

Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta — *1959 Vol. 1. Wiesbaden.*

Poppe, 1954 — N. Poppe, *A Grammar of Written Mongolian*, Wiesbaden.

Porcher, 1982 — M.C. Porcher, 'Métaphore et comparaison dans quelques composés sanskrits', *JA* 270: 153-171.

Rachewiltz, 1982 — I. Rachewiltz, 'The Secret History of the Mongols. Chapter Ten', *PFEH* 26: 39-84.

Rachmati, 1928 — G.R. Rachmatullin (= Rahmeti Arat) 'Die Hilfsverben und Verbaladverbien im Altaischen, II: Verbaladverbien', *UJb* 8: 309-336.

Radloff, 1866-1907 — W. Radloff, *Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens*, Nachdruck Leipzig, 1965.

Radloff, 1893-1911 — *id.*, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*, Bd. 1-4, Sankt-peterburg.

Ramstedt, 1912 — G.J. Ramstedt, *Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen*, Helsingfors.

Räsänen, 1947 — M. Räsänen, *Regenbogen – Himmelsbrücke*, *SOF* XVI,1.

Räsänen, 1957 — *id.*, *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen*, *SOF* XXI.

Räsänen, 1969 — *id.*, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, Helsinki.

Reckendorf, 1921 — H. Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax*, Heidelberg.

Röhrborn, 1972 — K. Röhrborn, 'Kausativ und Passiv im Uigurischen', *CAJ* 16: 70ff.

Röhrborn, 1977-88 — *id.*, *Uigurisches Wörterbuch* . . ., Lfg. 1-4, Wiesbaden. (= *UW*)

Röhrborn, 1981 — *id.*, 'Zum Wanderweg des altindischen Lehngutes im Alttürkischen', pp. 337-343 in: *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des vorderen Orients. Festschrift für Bertold Spuler* . . ., Leiden.

Röhrborn, 1981a — *id.*, 'Ein Glückwunsch für den Kaiser Toγon Temür', pp. 123-129 in: *Scholia. Beiträge zur Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde Annemarie von Gabain zum 80. Geburtstag* . . ., Wiesbaden.

Röhrborn, 1983 — *id.*, 'Zur Terminologie der buddhistischen Sekundärüberlieferung in Zentralasien', *ZDMG* 133: 173-296.

Röhrborn and Veenker, 1983 — *id.* and W. Veenker (eds.), *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions von . . . 1981, Wiesbaden.

Ross, 1909 — E.D. Ross, *A Polyglot list of Birds in Turki, Manchu and Chinese*. Ed. by . . ., Calcutta.

ŠČerbak, 1961 — A.M. ŠČerbak, *Grammatičeskij Očerk JAzyke Tjurkskix Tekstov X.-XIII. vv. iz Vostočnogo Turkestana*, Moskva.

Schakir, 1933 — S. Schakir, geb. Is'haki (= S.Ş. Çağatay), *Denominale Verbbildungen in den Türksprachen*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde . . ., Roma.

Schinkewitsch, 1926-7 — J. Schinkewitsch, 'Rabγuzis Syntax', *MSOSW* 29: 130ff. and 30: 1ff.

Schmitt, 1971 — G. Schmitt, 'Wo siedelten nachweislich türkische Stämme im ersten Jahrhundert vor bzw. nach der Zeitwende?', *AOH* 24: 337-358.

Schulz, 1978 — P. Schulz, *Verbalnomina und Konverbien als adverbiale Ergänzungen im Alttürkischen*. Unpubl. Ph.D.-Thesis, Gießen.

Sertkaya, 1983 — O.F. Sertkaya, 'Göktürk tarihinin meseleleri: Kül Tigin ve Kül-iç-çorkitabelerinde geçen *oplayu tegmek* deyimi üzerine', *TUBA* 7: 369-75.

Sertkaya, 1984 — *id.*, '*Kül Tigin*'in ölümünün 1250. yıl dönümü dolayısı ile *Mogolistan Halk Cumhuriyeti*'ndeki Köktürk harfli metinler üzerinde yapılan arkeolojik ve filolojik çalışmalara toplu bir bakış', *Belleten* XLVII: 67-85.

Shōgaito, 1978 — M. Shōgaito, 'On the routes of the loan words of Indic origin in the Old Uigur language', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 15: 79-110. (Japanese title and text).

Sinor, 1970 — D. Sinor, 'Two Altaic etymologies'. Pp. 540-544 in: *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics Presented to Shirō Hattori* . . ., Tokyo.

Sims-Williams, 1981 — N. Sims-Williams, 'The Sogdian sound-system and the origins of the Uyghur script', *JA* CCLXIX: 347-60 (= Monuments et Inscriptions de Haute Asie . . . Colloque international . . . 1979).

Sprachwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der deutschen Turfan-Forschung. Text-Editionen und Interpretationen von A. A. v. Le Coq et al., Bde. I, II and IV. Leipzig, 1972 ff.

XIII. Yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle Yazılmış Kitaplardan Toplanan Tanıklariyle Tarama Sözlüğü, I-VI. Ankara, 1963-72. (= *TTS*).

Tâtár, 1985 M. Tâtár, Paper read at the *V. Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi*, Tebliğler, I, Türk Dili 1, Istanbul.

Tekin, 1968 T. Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, Bloomington.

Tekin, 1983 *id.*, 'On the structure of Altaic echoic verbs {<KIrA}', *AOH* 36: 503-13.

Tekin, 1986 *id.*, 'Zetacism and sigmatism: Main pillars of the Altaic theory', *CAJ* 30: 141-160.

Tezcan, 1981 S. Tezcan, 'Kutadgu Bilig dizini üzerine', *Belleten* XLV: 23-78.

Tezcan, 1981a *id.*, review of BT VIII, *TDAYB* 1978-9: 307-313.

Thomsen, 1896 V. Thomsen, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, Helsingfors.

Thomsen Hansen, 1963 K. Thomsen, 'Bemerkungen über das türkische Vokalsystem der zweiten Silbe', *AOH* 13: 313 ff.

Verbitskij, 1884 V. Verbitskij, *Slovar' Altajskago i Aladanskago Narečij Tjurkskago JAzyka*, Kazan'.

Zenker, 1866 J. Th. Zenker, *Türkisch-arabisch-persisches Handwörterbuch*, Leipzig.

Zieme, 1969 P. Zieme, *Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache der manichäischtürkischen Turfantexte*. Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Berlin.

Zieme, 1970 *id.*, review of Nadeljaev et al., 1969, *CAJ* 14: 228 ff.

Zieme, 1978 *id.*, review of Röhrborn, 1977-88, Lfg. 1: 'Zur Lexikographie des Alttürkischen', *OLZ* 73: 325-330.

Zieme, 1982 *id.*, review of the same, Lfg. 2, *OLZ* 77: 174-7.

Zimmer, 1982-3 S. Zimmer, 'Die Funktion der tocharischen *ṣi/ṣṣe*-Adjektive', *KZ* 96: 277-89.

INDICES

(Numbers refer to pages. Multiple occurrence on a particular page is not especially noted.)

I. Verb stems discussed lexically or grammatically

(Initial m and p filed together with b)

aç- 'to open' 57, 226, 584, 651-2, 800, 818
āç- 'to be hungry' 710
açı- 179-81, 534, 584, 760, 819
ad-/adı-, adır- 154, 181, 226-7, 265, 301, 304, 309-10, 314, 323-5, 330, 340, 366-7, 429, 476-7, 479, 487, 535-6, 584-5, 652, 710
adak- 492-3, 800
adart- 499, 760
adırtla- 315, 429-30, 585, 638
adkan-, adkaş- 178, 459, 552-3, 585
adokla- 429
adru- 226-7, 476, 652
adutla- 429, 440
1 ag- 'to alter (intr.)' 351-2, 399, 553, 652, 734, 740, 760, 761
2 ag- 'to rise' 269, 297, 399, 586, 632, 760-1, 800
agdukla- 429
agırla- 430, 694, 761
ag(ı)zan- 585
agızlan- 510
agla- 227, 761, 797
agok- 493
agrı- 155, 179-81, 203, 584-5, 761
agrıkan- 459, 585
agru- 227, 474
agrukla- 227, 430, 585-6
ak- 179-81, 262, 269, 297, 301, 384, 553, 653, 726, 761, 799, 825
akla- 363-4, 430
akar- 499
axsa- 227
al-/*alı- 35, 220, 227, 269-70, 283, 289, 296, 389, 549, 553, 586-7, 653, 700-701, 706-7, 800
alakır- 466, 468, 553
alar- (< al) 499
alar- (< ala) 499
alık- , alıg 495, 645
alk- 286, 288, 352, 399, 587, 819
alka- 262, 587-8, 694, 761
*alkı-, alkıg 179-81
alŋad- 337, 485-6, 492, 800
alŋu- /algu- /alaŋu- 175, 337, 474, 479, 485, 536
alpad- 486
alpal- 452, 510, 653
alpırka- 458-9, 588
alplanmak 486, 510
alta- 179-81, 455
amırtgur-, amrıl-, amuş- 316-7, 330, 645, 653-4, 726, 748, 825
amra- 155, 227-8, 363-4, 399, 553, 557, 588, 694, 761
amrakla- 430
ançola- 430, 762
antık- 493, 742
anu- 228, 588, 654, 762
aŋKar- 429, 742
aŋla- 429
apı-/abı- 179, 181, 215, 654, 762-3
1 ar- 'to cheat' 114, 342, 358, 654, 702, 704, 707, 801, 833
2 ar- 'to be/get tired' 175, 228, 259, 261, 588-9, 748
arala- 430, 816
arı- 25, 155, 179, 180, 203, 267, 589, 632, 748, 763, 797
arıgla-/arugla- 5, 431, 763

arıla-/arala- 118, 430-31
arKaş-, arKag 179, 268, 553
arkalaş- 576
arKula- 431
arokla- 431
1 art- 'to increase (intr.)' 228, 710, 726-7
2 art- 'to load onto' 314-5, 654
arta- 228, 352, 375, 457, 657, 763
arva- 262, 271
arvıla- 431
1 as- 'to increase' (tr.) 36, 56, 179, 181, 654, 683, 801
2 as- 'to suspend' 176, 327, 329, 346, 359, 589, 654, 801
asKançula- 224, 431
asKar- 742
aş- 403, 590, 710, 727
aşa- 418, 589, 759, 763, 819
aşgın- 589-90
aşla- 553-4, 816
aşuk- 645
aşun-/aşın- 575, 590, 632, 645
at- 266, 270, 288, 291-2, 554, 801
ata- 418, 590-91, 654
atgar- 742
atık- 493, 532
atla- 431-2, 591, 819
av- 446
avıt-, avın- 287, 289, 591, 654, 763
avla- 432
ay-, *ayı- 182, 228-9, 264, 371, 395-6, 554, 694, 763-4, 787, 803, 815
aya- 160, 179-81, 186, 347, 554, 556, 591, 655, 694, 763
ayançaŋlan- 160, 510
ayıgla- 432, 554
ayın-/äyin- 160, 181, 283, 349, 591, 599
aykır- 466
az- 175, 229, 748, 764, 833
*aza-, azag 174-5
azlan- 510, 513
azu- 474-5, 479
ba- 173, 182, 325, 357, 422, 457, 591, 655, 764, 825
baça- 173, 764
bagda- 265, 293-4, 455, 591, 632
bagla- 432, 655
bagragur- 162, 165, 499-500
bak- 272, 432, 591-2, 764
bakır- 466-7
baktokla- 432, 764
balık-, balığ 182, 483, 645
man- 539
maŋ- 297
maŋa- 418
maŋla- 432
maŋra- 309, 469, 472, 592
bar- 22, 69, 182, 269, 292-3, 317, 329, 526-7, 592, 655
parvışlan- 514
bas- 182, 229, 282, 314, 385, 393, 403, 554, 592, 649-50, 655, 694, 702, 710, 764-5, 819, 834
basutla- 315, 432
başad- 486
başgar- 742
başla- 154, 176, 183, 403, 407, 432, 453, 592-3
başsıra- 507
bat- 183, 264, 298, 311, 312, 655, 711
batıglan- 183, 511
bayak- 493
mayaka- 418, 593
mayıl- 331
bayu- 475, 478, 765
bazlan- 511
bād(i)zā- 111, 418, 593, 655, 765
bādizlā- 432-3
bādü- 230, 765, 827
bādüklā- 593
bāgād- 486
bāgimsin- 532
bāklā- 433, 593-4, 655, 765
bālgülā- 433
bālgür- 170, 316, 318, 320, 324, 500, 766
bāliŋlā- 433, 766
māŋdā- 455
māŋilā-/mōŋilā- 433, 766
māŋlā- 433, 455
māŋ(i)zā- 418, 766, 797
bārKāk- 493
bā(r)kū- 312, 475, 478-9, 727, 765-6, 799
bārt- 230, 379, 594
bāz- 394
belā- 158, 230
ber- 123, 137, 154, 199, 270, 296, 310, 527, 555, 801
bergāsā- 528

bıç- 47, 268, 296, 317, 358, 380, 395, 555, 573, 655-6, 801
bırkır- 466-7
bış- 183, 298, 313, 594, 656, 658, 711, 766, 819
bil- 183-4, 268, 328, 376, 527, 555-6, 594, 656, 702, 705, 707-8, 801
bilgād- 486-7
bin-/min-/mün- 801-2
birik- 494, 556, 746-8, 767, 802
biti- 184, 347, 484, 656, 767, 827
bodu- 184, 645, 656
bog- 230, 296, 305, 326, 556, 712
boguzla- 433, 595
bok- 'to get restricted' 711-12
bokoklan- 511
bol- 272, 299, 386, 549, 555
boşgur-, boşgun- 595, 712, 767-8
boşıla- 433
boşw-, boşu- 35, 184, 347, 353-4, 477-9, 595, 639, 767
botola- 433
moy- /boy- /*boñ- 295, 376
boyma- 295, 452, 656
bozla- 433
bödi- 184, 371, 768
bög- 271, 325, 328, 595
bök- 'to have had enough' 304, 712-3
böl- 230-1, 259, 398, 595-6, 646, 656
bud- 306, 642
bukagula- 433-4
bul- 72, 184, 268, 283, 286, 305, 356, 555, 649-50, 656-7, 708, 802
bulga- 231, 247, 265, 317, 319, 555, 596, 618, 656, 694-5, 768, 819
bulnuk- 308, 494
bul(u)na- 308, 418
mun- 231, 323-4, 802
buŋad- 36, 366-7, 487, 802
muŋuk- 330-1, 494, 743
1 bur- 'to fume, steam' 500
2 bur- 'to twist, wrinkle' 185, 321, 344, 646
burçın- 596, 819
buruk- 494
bus- 'to ambush' 702
busan-, *busa- 262, 283, 464, 596, 820
busar- 500
busurkan- 458, 464, 597
buş- 36, 185, 241, 341, 344, 394, 657, 713
buta- 44
butarla- 434
buyanla- 434, 820
buyur- 231, 463
buz- 657
buzagula- 434
bügülä- 434, 597
bük- 325, 328, 341, 657
büksül- 657
münä- 418-9
münük- 494
müŋ(ü)rä- 469
bür- 'to draw together (tr.)' 317, 337, 357, 556, 597, 657
bü(r)kür-/bürkir-/büvkir- 466-7
bürt- 185, 556, 657
büt- 176, 301, 303, 314, 657, 713-4, 727, 739, 768, 833
çagıla-/jagıla-/şagıla- 434, 473
çakır- 466, 468
çak- 555
çaxşa- 272, 556-7
çal- 185, 271, 702
çalpa- 231-2, 262, 337
çalra-/çald(ı)ra- 471, 473
çamgoklan- 158
çamla- 158, 434
çaşur- , çaşı 311, 341, 714
çavık- 494
çavlaş-, çavlan- 576
çaylat- 768
çeçäklän- 511
çıgru- 475, 478
çık- 'to get moist' 494
çıkanlaş- 576
çıkra- 470, 768
çImşIlAş-/çImIlAş- 576-7
çınık-, çıngar- 743, 746
çınla- 408
çınu- 475
çıŋra- 469, 472-3, 768
çıvşa- 337
çız- 185, 307-8, 597, 802
çik(i)nä- 419
çiKrä- 470, 473
çiltä- 186, 556
çogıla- 43, 473-4
çoglan- 511, 820

çokra- 317, 470, 473, 768
çom-/*çam- 273, 391, 646, 657-8, 714
çök- 173, 186, 314, 381, 768-9, 786
çöklä- 71, 434-5
çöm- 714
çöz- 658
çu- 310, 597, 646, 658
çugla- 435, 769
ädäd- 487, 802
ädgär- 743, 747
ädgüKär- 743
ädgülä- 435, 556, 577
ädik-/edik- 494-5
ädlä- 435, 597
äg- /äŋ- 294, 305, 317, 332, 644, 658, 757, 770, 827
ägir- /äŋir- 186, 296, 310, 340-1, 536, 658, 769
ägsü- 231, 236, 769
äk- 213, 297, 304
älvir- 505
äm- 186, 346, 757
ämgä- 36, 209, 231, 597-8, 769
ämgäklä-/ömgäklä- 435
ämgäklän- 'to consider to be a hardship' 435
ämit- 734, 742, 774
ämlä- 435, 769-70
ämri- 464
änüklä- 435
äŋ- 'to be bewildered' 367
äŋän-, äŋäyü 427-8, 598
äŋlä- 435-6
är- 62, 182, 186-7, 271, 276, 292, 321, 383, 749
äräd- 487
äriglä- 187, 436, 557
ärkäçlän- 511-2, 820
ärklänmäk 511
ärksin- 316-7, 533, 598, 820
1 ärlä- 436
2 ärlä- 436
ärmägür- 419, 500
ärsin- 72, 533
ärt- 352, 375, 714, 727
ärü- 35, 187, 323-5, 338, 748-9
äs- 301, 419
äsängülä- 416-7, 453-4
äsirkä- 326, 352-3, 363, 365, 459-60, 598
äskir- 500
äsnä- 308, 419
äsür- 232, 771
1 äş- 'to amble' 114, 329, 393
2 äş-/eş- 'to pour out dry matter' 328, 658
äşid- /eşid- /eşit- 313, 354, 491, 526, 557, 660, 714-15, 802-3
äşü- 232-3, 598
ät- 304, 658-9, 757, 827-8
ätik- 495
ätinä- 304, 308, 419-20, 757
ävdi- 318, 771
ävir- 155, 170, 271, 351-2, 399, 659, 771
ävlä- 436
äymän- /ayman- 283, 349, 365, 598-9
äz- 773
äzüKlä- 408, 436
edilä- 436-7, 772
ekä- 262, 267-8
ellä- 436-7, 486, 599
elsirä- 507, 772
el(i)t- 556, 599
en- 269, 803
ençlän- 512, 518
ençsirä- 507, 518, 772
er- 'to reach' 187, 557, 575, 749, 803
erinçkä- 284, 365, 459-61, 772
erpä- 176, 557, 659
erpäKlä- 437
es- 326, 421, 659-60, 825
es(i)nä- 419
eşimsin- 532-3
et- 187, 211, 216, 347, 557, 600, 660, 772, 803-4
ev- 377, 395, 557, 600
(y)edär- 115, 310, 557, 771-2, 816
(y)er- 259, 278, 284, 287, 339, 342, 366, 476, 599-600, 646, 659, 695, 772, 814-5, 820
1 (y)et- 'to disappear' 115, 335, 629, 640, 686, 724, 732, 815, 825
ıçan-/yaçan- 600-601
(y)ıgla- 72, 451-2, 474, 531, 573
(y)ıra- 233, 772-3
(y)ırga-/*ırŋa- 188, 601-2, 660
(y)ırla- 97, 452, 816
*(y)ış-, (y)ışıg 188-9, 304
(y)ig(i)dä- 420
(y)il- 158, 189, 272, 288, 296, 352, 391, 399, 557, 602, 816, 820-21
(y)ilgü- 536-7, 602, 773, 820
ilinçülä- 204, 289, 437

(y)iri-/(y)irü- 218-9, 338
yörgä-, örgän- 278, 287, 319, 630, 688
ötül- 330
(h)wy- 'to squeeze' 241, 318
hük- / (y)ük- 253, 267, 297, 302, 318, 625, 731
(y)ün- 269, 354, 572, 624, 812-13
(y)ür- 682
ürk- 329, 792
(y)ürt- 173, 328, 347, 388, 625, 682
(y)ürüŋär- 499, 503
(y)üşä- 337
ıçgın- 601
ıd- 233, 289, 317, 330, 332, 557, 803, 804
ıkurmak 468
ıl- 'to descend' 378
ılık- 495, 804
ınan- /(yınan-), ınag 188, 213, 277, 286-7, 331, 601
ınçıkla- 437
ıŋra- 'to moan' 469
ırkla- 437
ısır- 291, 695
iç- 154, 294-5, 393, 557, 715
içik- 304, 495, 743-4, 746
içlä- 437
igdülä- 437, 602
igälä- 437
igid- 267, 333, 437, 491, 660-61, 804
iglä- 437
iKä- 262, 267, 353, 557
ilgäysöklän- 158, 512
imär- 294, 500
imlä- 437-8
1 ir- 'to be lonely' 366, 599
2 ïr- 'to make a notch' 233
irinçkä- 114
irk- 307, 661
irkäklän- 512
irklä- 426, 773
isi- 189, 339, 464, 557, 602, 773
isiglä- 558
iskä- 558
istä- 176, 455-6, 773
işlä- 438, 558, 773
it- 271, 288, 558, 686
iy-/ıy- 282, 325, 602-3, 821
kaç- 189-90, 311, 314, 329, 558, 715
kadgur- 501, 507
kadır(*a)- , kadıt- 233-4, 537, 661, 734-5, 740
kadu- 475
kaganla- 438
kagansıra- 507, 518, 773
kagur- 311, 319, 661
kak- 'to knock' 525, 558
kakı- 190, 525, 603
kakıla- 473
kakır- 466
kaxşaş- 558
kal- 288, 340-1, 804
kal(a)ŋur- 501
kald(ı)ra- 378, 471
kalı- 234, 303, 317, 501, 558, 773-4, 804
kal(ı)ŋula- 438
kalnu- 475
kam- 321, 539-40, 661-2, 774
kamşa- 190, 774
kan- 55, 190, 286, 353-5, 375, 774, 804-5, 834
kana- 176, 420
kanı- 483
kanlan- 512, 518
kaŋsıla-, kaŋşıla- 438
kap-/*kapa- 190, 270, 384-5
kapar- 316, 501
1 kar- 'to mix' 284, 314, 342, 558-9, 662, 821
2 kar- 'to choke' 190
3 kar- 'to overflow from a canal' 293
karagur- 165, 501
karakla- 395
karar- 190, 501, 774
karga- 262, 266, 395, 603, 774
karı- 480
karıla- 438
kaşan- 191, 337-8, 423, 603
kaşı- 365
1 kat- 'to be hard' 55, 191, 322, 603-4
2 kat-/*katı- 'to add, mix, fold' 234, 314, 318, 345, 403, 559-60, 662, 816
katgur- 468, 559
katıglan- 512, 821
*katna-, katnayu 308, 428
kavı-, kavır-, kavış- 191, 311-3, 3 715, 816-7
kavza- 348, 695, 774-5
kay- 336, 403, 775
kayın-/kayına- 633, 775, 805
kayvıla-/kavla- 336, 439, 560, 6

1 kaz- 'to dig' 293, 525, 604
2 kaz- 'to attach one's horse' 360
kazgan- 281, 604
käç- 191, 271, 354, 375, 403, 715
käd- 36, 234-5, 294, 662-3, 715, 825-6
kädi- 479-80
kädir- 296
kädKir- 540
kädlä- 604
käkir- 466-7
käklän- 512-13
käktäş- 456
käl-/*käli- 35, 191, 269, 302, 314, 328, 539, 716, 775, 805
kälinlä- 439
kämiş- 32, 663
kämlä- 513
kämür- 235
käŋirsi- 175
käŋrä- 192, 309, 469-70, 472, 560-61, 604-5
kär- 191, 270, 296, 561, 663
kärgä- 235-6, 395, 439
kärgäklä- 439, 775
kärt- 323-4, 388
käs- 40, 259, 288, 304, 319, 561, 573, 663, 805
käsgöklä- 439
1 käv- 'to weaken (tr.)' 236, 328, 420, 663, 727-8
2 käv- 'to stammer, to chew' 328, 393, 420
kävrä- 236
kävşä- 236-7, 272, 420, 605, 663
*käyirkä(n)- 459, 461
käz- 192
kebär- 501
keç- 495, 716
keçik-/käçik- 495
kenäd- 487
kenik- 487, 495
keŋä- 262, 266, 420, 561, 775-6
keŋşäş- 272
keŋü- 420, 475, 478, 664, 716, 728, 776
kertgün- 244, 282, 605, 821
ket- 69, 155, 561, 735
kıçı- 101
kıdı- 192
kıkır- 466-8, 562
kıl-/*kılı- 237, 261, 276-7, 531, 550, 605, 664, 805
kılıçla- 439
kın- 175, 193, 375, 399, 805
kır- 193, 237, 310, 318, 328, 421, 664, 776
kırgılad- 98, 488
kırmalaş-, karmala- 318, 320, 438-9, 562
kırşa- 103, 272, 421, 664
kıs- 85, 193, 278, 330, 332, 381, 390, 463-4, 664-5, 716, 739, 805-6
kışla- 109, 439
kıvad- 488
kıvırkaklan- 513
kıvırkan- 237, 459, 461
kıy-/*kıyı- 237-8, 304-5, 319, 665
kıyna-/kına- 308, 420-21
1 kız- 'to be in trouble/need' 313, 393, 749-50
2 kız- 'to become red hot' 99-100, 331, 750
kıza- 421
kızar- 90, 98, 99, 101, 501, 776
kızgan- 238, 605-6
kızu- 475
kiçi- 606
kik- 103, 282, 716-7
kililäş- 577
kir-, kigür-, 269, 329, 526-7, 549, 562, 664, 750, 817
kirik- 495, 806
kişä- 300, 305
kişilän- 513
kizlä- 174, 289, 347, 439, 606, 695
kod- 326-7, 665, 777, 806
kwdur- 728
kogşa- 238
kok- 324-6
kol- 154, 171, 280, 294, 440, 539, 550, 606, 806
koldamla- 298, 439-40, 457
kollaş- 577
kolola- 440
koltgula- 440
komı- 776
kon- 238, 261, 294, 314, 344, 665, 807
konokla- 577
koŋra- 470, 472, 496
koŋruk- 495-6
koŋur- 665
kop- 717
kora- 193, 194, 421, 606
korı-/*korX- 193-4, 221, 366, 646-7
kork-/*korık- 281, 363-6, 606, 646-7, 757-8, 776-7

koş- 194, 264, 268, 346, 476, 665, 807
kov- 777
kov(u)şa- 269, 421
kwyul- 679-80
kö- 115, 194, 278, 310, 326, 358, 373
köç- 314, 316-7, 329, 717
kökär- 501
köklä- 440
köksä- 528
köl- 238-9, 606, 717, 821
köli- 239, 261, 378, 777
kŵlrä- / kŵldürä- 471
kömü- 319, 562, 665
kön- 341, 665-6, 744, 807
könKär- 739, 744
köñ-/köy- 240, 328, 384, 390, 717-8, 807
köŋülkär- 744
köŋlä- 421, 606
köpäd- 488
köpir-, *köpi- 239-40, 537, 777-8
kör- 26, 224, 272, 282, 295, 300, 310, 326, 343, 354-5, 374, 384, 389, 405-6, 526-7, 562, 607, 666, 750-51, 807, 817
kö(r)käd- 486-8, 807
körKit- 778
körklän- 513, 821
körümlä- 440
körünçlä- 282, 284, 440
kösül- 689
köşi- 240, 261, 378, 666, 778
*köt-, kötür- 171, 296, 311, 316-7, 319-20, 322, 333, 354, 540, 666, 718, 778-9
kötgir- 322, 501, 540
kŵti- 483, 779
közkiş- 562-3
közlä- 440-41
közün- 316-7, 607, 821
xualan- 513
kuç- 272, 297, 395, 563, 666
kud- 194, 301, 318, 341, 384, 553, 563, 666, 744, 807-8
kudıKar- 744, 808
kulad- 488
kulna- 434, 441
kulunla- 441
kun- 270, 275, 563, 700-701
kur- 335
kurda- 456
kurga-/kurka- 195, 421
kurgur- 501
kuru- /kuru- 194-5, 279, 309, 539, 666-7, 779, 826
kurşa- 422, 607, 695
kus- 174, 366, 394
kuşla- 109, 441
kutad- 488, 667, 808
kutsıra- 507, 667
kutur- 317, 323-4, 667-8, 735-6, 826
kuvra- 196, 607, 779
kuy- 703
küçä- 196, 422, 607
küçäd- 488
küçlän- 513, 518, 821
küçsirä- 507, 518, 779
küd- 115, 196, 375-6, 808
kükrä- 309, 378, 470, 472, 779
kükül- 668
kül- 176, 314, 378, 538, 563
külä- 263, 441, 668, 695
künilä- 441
küŋäd- 488
kürä- 196, 391, 422, 563, 779
küri- 391
kürlä- 441
küsä- 262, 272, 305-6, 364, 373, 528, 607
küvän- 282, 324, 607-8
küväzlän- 513
küzä- 422
küzäd- 116, 197, 311, 347, 491, 608, 668, 808
küzär- 422, 502
küzük- 422
lala-/ala- 441
nomla- 441, 668, 696, 779
*od(u)-, odgur-, odun- 173, 197, 608, 751,
odguraklandur- 513, 822
ogad- 489
ogşa- 'to resemble' 170, 197, 265-7, 355 780, 797, 817
ogullan- 514
ogurla- 441-2
1 okı- 'to call out, recite' 115, 309, 357 563-4, 608, 780, 828
2 okı- 'to vomit' 468
oKra- 470
oxşa- 364, 608
okta- 297, 456

ol- 314
oli- 176, 278, 348, 366, 608
olor- 197, 210, 292, 294, 357-8, 549, 736, 780-81
1 oŋ- 'to pale' 647
oŋar-, oŋul- 668-9, 736-7, 742, 781
op- 176, 610
opla- 409, 608-9
opra- 240-1
or- 297, 310, 391
or(ı)la- 72, 297, 442, 531
or(u)na- 197-8, 348, 422, 564, 609, 669, 781
os- 36, 358, 564, 669
osan- , osal 55, 330, 610
ota- 415-6, 422
otgar- 746
otla- 415, 442, 531-2, 781
otun- 156, 609
otuŋla- 442
oy- 'to hollow out' 198, 669, 808
oyna- 241, 265-6, 422, 781
oyurkan- 463, 609
oz- 155, 241, 403, 526, 751
ö- 198, 313, 325, 376-7, 393, 808
öç- 174, 316-7, 647, 669, 718
öçä- 265, 309, 423, 512-13, 564
ög- 55, 154, 241, 339, 441, 609, 696, 781
ögir- 276, 286, 505, 564, 612-13, 781, 828
öglän-, ögläş- 514, 518, 577, 822
*ögrä-, ögrän-, ögrät- 33, 198, 609-10, 781-2
ögrünçülä- 289, 442-3, 564, 610
ögsirä- 507-8, 518, 782
ögü-/ögi- 115, 309, 564
ökün- 278, 281-2, 353, 610
öl- 22, 115, 116, 173, 198, 292, 299, 310, 384, 527, 564-5, 718, 782
öli- 480, 484, 782
ömälä- 443
öŋ- 718-9
öŋäd- 489, 808-9
öŋlä- 443
öp- 272, 297, 377, 526, 565, 610
öpkälä-/öpkilä-/övkälä-/övkilä- 444, 532, 611
1 ör- 'to rise' 224-6, 272, 310, 389, 423, 550, 782-3, 809, 828, 834
2 ör- 'to plait, knit' 42, 294, 317-8, 358-9
örlä- 226, 443, 565, 610, 669, 783, 828-9
örtä- 423, 610
öt- 55, 173, 199, 226, 281, 291, 335-6, 354, 372, 374, 380, 394, 611, 696, 719, 728-9, 751-2, 822, 834
ötä- 199, 291, 293, 296, 321, 372, 669
ötiKlä- 199, 443-4
ötkün-/*ödkün- 277, 610-11
üyük- 647
özirkän- 417, 459, 461, 611
sa- 300, 306-7, 403, 529, 565, 611-12, 638
saç- 199, 209, 241-2, 393, 471, 539, 669, 783, 826
saç(ı)ra- 471, 783
sag- 297
sak-, sakın- 114, 271, 280, 355, 612, 822
sakı- 199, 294
sakla- 514, 822
sal- 176, 200, 377, 380, 577, 612, 809, 822
sana- 308, 422
sanç- 200, 565, 647, 669
sandrı- 270-1
sangar- 308, 744
sanla- 444
sap- 'to graft, join on' 72, 200, 344, 669-70
sapanla- 445
sapla- 444
sar- 535, 565, 670
saranla- 514
sar(ı)gar- 502
sark- 610, 783-4
sarmal-, sarmaş- 265, 358
sars- 200, 535, 565, 784
saru-, *sara-, sarla- 358
sası- 201, 719, 784
saş-/şaş- 244, 299, 310, 399, 784
sat- 201, 372, 527, 671
satga- 201, 612
satıgla- 565
sav- 271, 671
savıkla- 449
savla- 445, 565
savur- 647, 671
saygır- 540
sayık- 496
sayra- 471, 572
säç- 318, 671
sädrä- 242
sämri- 323, 480, 484, 524, 784
säp- 'to furnish, equip, procure' 671
sär- 299, 354, 375-6, 612, 671-2, 752
särmä- 423, 672

säş- 476, 672, 719, 826
säşü- 476
säv- 58, 201, 223, 272, 276, 280, 347, 565, 612-13, 696, 784, 822
sävinçlän- 284, 514
sekri- 242, 480, 484, 784-5
*sezi- 242-3, 279-80, 350, 613
sı- 170, 243, 361, 613, 809
sıç- 88, 102, 394
sıdır- 296
sıg- 565, 613, 719-20, 729
sıgta- 111, 423, 474, 566, 572, 785
sık- 202, 271, 389, 672
sıka- 613-14
sıkır- 467
sımta- 134, 202-3, 672-3
sına- 203, 372, 423, 566
sış-/şış- 264, 476, 614
sıtga- 613
sız- 673, 752
sızla- 203, 785
sid- , sik- , *si- 203, 243, 272, 423, 603, 642-3, 673
sigä- 203, 423
sili- /sil- 203, 336, 785
silk- 204, 614, 809
simäklä- 445
simri-/simir-/simür- 159, 720
siŋ- 341, 376, 720, 785
siŋilä- 445
sipir-/süpir- 786-7
soçı- 483-4, 539, 614, 673
sogı- 243, 566, 614-15, 785
sok- 'to hit,beat' 381, 566, 673, 809, 817
sola- 174, 445, 566, 615, 673, 785, 817
soŋda- 456
1 sor- 'to ask' 204, 224, 386, 647-8, 673
2 sor- 'to suck up' 319
sorış- 482, 484
soy- 648, 673, 703, 809
sögül- 289, 615, 689
1 sök- 'to rip apart' 270, 388, 673, 785
2 sök- 'to curse, revile' 200, 270, 566
3 sök- 'to kneel' 643, 720-21, 769, 785-6
sön- 243, 259, 809
sözlä- 355, 445, 566, 673, 696, 786, 818, 829
sözsirä- 508
suçul- 615
sud- 643
sug- 615, 673-4, 721, 823
suk- 'to thrust/stick in' 381, 395, 639
sukançig, sukanşıntur- 175, 364, 823
sukı- 298, 468
suklan- 364, 514-15
suksınmak 364, 533, 615
sumlı- 294
sun- , su- 357, 615
süs- 391
suva- 346-7, 423, 786
suvgar- 746
suvıglan- 177
suvış-, *sıvı- 177, 482, 484
suvla- 109
suvsa- 262, 266, 528
suvsı- 262, 266-7, 300, 533-4
süçi- 72, 204, 534-5
sülä- 445, 786
süŋ- 205, 266, 270, 566-7
sür- 173, 205, 224, 323, 567, 810
sürt- 567, 615, 818
süs- 539
sütgir- 540
süyäş-, süyäk 243, 567
süz- 243-4, 318, 423, 674
tagık- 496
tagwnla- 445
tak- 311, 340, 674, 721
täkıl- 674, 677
tal- 384, 649
tala- 567, 616
talk- 360
talkokla- 445
talpı- 537
talula-, talan- 445-6, 615-16, 787
tam- 'to drip (intr.)' 170, 290, 297, 378-80, 392, 446, 538-9, 723, 758
tamgala- 446
tamıt-, 333, 379, 674, 721
tan- 567
*tanç- 446
tançgala- 446
tançKa- 446
tançula- 446
tankar- 205, 258, 502, 567
tanu- 244
tanukla- 446, 502, 567-8, 787, 829

taŋ- 193, 202, 205, 271, 674
tanırka- 205, 459, 462
1 tanla- 'to dawn' 447
2 tanla- 'to wonder' 36, 366-7, 447, 487, 787
taŋlar- 404, 502
1 tap- 'to serve, worship' 55, 205, 212, 244-5, 272, 373-4, 526, 616, 697, 823
2 tap- 'to find' 72, 360, 403, 568, 722, 758
tapla- 206, 447, 568, 696-7, 787, 829
tar- 69, 206, 271, 278, 381, 524, 648, 674-5, 739-40, 742
tara- 391, 524, 675
tarı- 206, 371, 616, 829
tarma- 83, 245, 568
tarmutlan- 82
tart- 206-7, 284, 307, 568, 616, 675, 787, 826
taru- 476, 478
taş- 96, 293, 328, 675
taşık-/çık- 265, 269, 496, 744-6
taşu- 478
tat- 207, 525, 722
tatga- 423-4, 616, 823
tatı- 207, 525, 722
tatıgsıra- 508
tavran-, tavrat- 245, 568, 616-17, 787, 797
tay- 88, 787
taya- 245-6, 277, 568, 617, 823
tazar- 502
tazgır- 540
tăg- 279, 284, 288, 293, 299, 312, 374, 386, 403, 537, 568-9, 617, 675-6, 722, 729, 787-8, 823, 829
tăgil- 'lose one's eyesight' 32, 246-7, 737
tăginçülă- 288, 447
tăgriglă- 447, 617
*tăgir- 388, 537
tăgzin- (~ tăzgin-) 279, 285, 617-18, 823, 830
tăgzinçlăn- 47, 279, 284, 515
tăl- 247, 388, 618
tălgă- 247, 618
tăli- 618
tălmir- 388, 505-6
tăŋ- 358
tăŋă- 343, 415, 417, 424, 569
tăŋik- 415, 496, 745
tăŋlă- 355, 415, 417, 424, 447, 618
tăp- 304, 619, 788, 810, 834
tăpră- 247, 309, 352, 399, 471-2, 569, 618-9, 788
tăpză- 424
tărit- (~ terit- ?) 737
tărKişlăn- 268, 515
tărklă- 447, 788
tărsik- 496, 810
tăş- 96, 676
tătrŭl-, tătrŭ 676, 729-30, 810, 826
tăvin- (Cf. tăvşin-) 619
tăvir- 676
tăvlă- 447
tăvşă- 676-7
tăvşin- (< *täv-iş- ?) 88, 619
tăz- 207, 321, 394, 752
te- 154, 316, 318, 457, 569, 788, 810, 834
ter- 47, 96, 207, 266, 304, 321, 327, 329, 569, 677, 810
*terkă-, terkăş- 262, 265, 268, 424
terlă- 448
tet- 'to dare' 294, 370, 375, 619
tetiglă- 448
tetil- 'to become clever', tetrŭ 207-8, 730
tıd- 208, 271, 569, 619, 677
tıg- 677
tıgra- 247
tık- 677
tılaŋurmak 163, 165, 417, 502
tılta- 208, 456-7, 619
tın- 275, 678, 810
tınsıra- 508, 788
tıŋıla- 473
tıŋla- 448, 528
tışla- 'to bite' 448
tıt- 'to tear to shreds' 619
tigilă- 448, 473, 619
tigră- 309, 470-74, 788
tik- 208, 294, 318, 325, 334, 358, 381, 385, 569, 640, 678, 810-11
til- 296, 381
tilă-/*tili-/telă- 247-8, 619-20, 788-9
tiliklă- 448
timă-/tümă- 26, 211, 347, 620
tir- 57, 208, 678, 753
tiră- 360, 569, 620
tişă- 424
tit- 'to give up, let go' 678, 811
titik- 'to drown' 703
titră- 471, 789
tiz- 209, 218, 678

to- 117, 248, 264, 289, 293, 297, 298-9, 303, 329, 334, 353, 359-60, 403, 496, 569-70, 620, 643, 678, 679, 722-3, 753-4, 759, 789, 811
1 tog- /tug- 'to be born' 274, 292, 357, 570, 723
2 tog- 'to cross over' 403, 723, 730-31
togra- 678
tokı- 262, 266, 270, 296, 468, 570, 620, 697, 789
tokurkak 459, 462
twld(w)ra- 471
tolga- 36, 209, 620-21, 789
tona- 36, 294, 424, 621, 823
tonçuk- 289, 496
toŋ- 723
twŋla- 448, 473
toŋut-/töŋüt- 679, 737-8
topol- 248, 354, 394, 621, 751
torla- 448
toyla- 448, 570, 818
tozar- 502
tozgır- 540
tög- 340
tögnä- 308, 425
tök- 209, 640, 679, 823
tölä- 'to repay a loan; to lamb' 425, 818
tölāk, tölān- 'to be quiet' 248-9
tölāklānmāk 515
töltā- 346-7, 425
tön- 738
törü- 317, 324, 790
töşä- 249, 345, 425, 621
tötür-, tötüş- 270, 570-71, 723
tsoyurka-/soyurka- 459, 462
tul- 293, 335
*tum- 387-8
tumlı- 209, 790, 797-8
tupra- 249, 387
tur- 'to stand' 109, 210, 224, 269-70, 292, 298, 328, 353, 386, 392-3, 527, 571, 648, 679, 723, 754, 790, 826
turkıglan- 210, 515
turkın-, turkıg 210
twru- 'to be lean' 249
tusuk- 496
? tusul- 452, 679-80
tuş- 55, 264, 476, 571, 680, 754
tuşa- 425
tut- 103, 210-11, 224, 249-50, 284, 289, 297-8, 298-9, 305, 318-9, 327, 329, 333, 343, 348, 355, 361, 381, 384, 392, 571, 621, 680, 703-4, 758, 760, 811, 827, 834
tuta- 335, 386, 425-6
tutyaklan- 515
tuvra- 426
tuy- 268, 291, 299, 463, 621-2, 703-4, 758, 811, 823
tüg- 170, 250-1, 303-4, 318
tükä- 170, 300, 303, 330, 352, 426, 663, 790, 798
tül- 175, 622, 811-12
tünä- 211, 426, 790
tünär- 211, 502
tüpir- 502
tüpKär- 745, 747
tüplä- 448-9
tüpsirät- 508, 790
tüpük- 283, 496
tür- 395
türgäklän- 395, 515-16
türt- 622
tüş- 251, 264, 302, 314, 426, 476, 680, 723-4
tüşä- 426
tüşnä- 251, 308, 426
tüşsirä- 508
tüşütlän- 314, 516-17, 680-81
tüt- 251, 302, 353, 758-9
tütnä- 308, 427
tüz- 251-2, 681
tüzär- 503
tüzük- 355-6, 370, 496, 745
u- 55, 275, 278, 325, 354, 383-4, 622-3
uç- 211-2, 252 (?), 291, 294, 324, 724, 827
uçın- 217, 623
uçuk-/uçık- 496-7
uçuzla- 155, 449, 623
ud- 212, 373, 386, 393, 571, 623, 681, 759, 823-4
udı-/(ud(ı)-) 252, 316, 318, 384, 790
udıkla- 252, 449
ugra- 212, 426-8, 571, 681
ugutla- 449
uk- 271, 623, 681, 790-91, 812
ula- 200, 212, 222, 262, 267, 295, 300, 305, 571-2, 623, 681, 791, 798, 827
ulı- 572
ul(u)gad- 489
ulugla- 449
ulugsa- 528
ulugsın- 72

um- 173, 188, 213, 279, 332-3, 623-4
umugsırat- 508, 791
una- 346
unıt- 154, 681, 812
ur- 213, 224, 270, 310, 339, 572, 624, 703, 812
urılan- 516
urugsırat- 508, 791
us- 528, 648-9
ut- 266, 490, 701-2, 704, 708, 741
utrun-, utar- 624, 738, 741
uv- 268, 319, 391
uvşan-, uvşat-, uvşal- 252, 624, 681-2, 791
uya- 313, 491, 643-4
uyak- 497
uza- 253, 300, 302, 791, 798
uzanmak 154, 624
uzlan- 516
üdlä- 'to be joyful' 613, 625
üdrä- 56, 791
üdür- 69, 271, 296, 309-10, 682
ügri- 101-2
üjiklä- 449
ükli- 36, 56, 324, 481, 484-5, 791, 829
ükküşlä- 572
ülä- 55, 213, 248, 262, 268, 333, 345, 572, 791
ülgülä- 355, 449
ülüglä- 449
üntä- 457
üŋ- 390
ü(r)pär-, ürpät-, ürpäş- 537-8
üstä- 295, 337, 457, 682-3
üş- 467, 572, 625, 754
üşi- 792
üşkir- 467
üt- 214, 525
ütlä- 187, 449, 556, 572
ütü<g>lä- 450
üz- 170, 253, 259, 288, 320, 380, 450, 572-3, 640, 683, 813
üzi- 778
üzmälä- 69, 450, 829
yad- 296, 329, 334, 337, 346, 625, 683, 813
yag- 389, 792, 813
yaga- 262, 265, 426-7
yagıd- 489-90
yagıla- 450, 454-5, 573
yagırla- 484
yagmurla- 390
yagrı- 484
yagu- 55, 253, 538, 731-2, 792, 799
yak- 55, 302, 344, 381, 539, 573, 626, 683, 792, 813
yakala- 450
yakar- 505
yakçırt- 792
yaxsın- , yaxşın- 625-6
yal- 302, 310, 427, 626, 690
yalar- 503
yalga- 792
yalgantur- 824
yalın- 338, 626
yalına- 308, 416, 427, 450, 626, 792
yalınla- 308, 416, 450
yalk- 649, 792-3
yaltrı- / yaldrı- 254, 481, 484-5, 793
yalvar- 365, 505
yama- 345
yan- 'to return' 214, 269, 311, 321-2, 351-2, 399, 403, 405, 813-14, 830
yanç- 214, 573, 683
yanıl- 254-5, 814
yanıla- 407
yaŋkula- 503
yaŋkur- 468, 503, 793
yaŋra- 470
yaŋşa- 255
yaŋza- 215
yap- 103, 215, 311, 313, 340, 341, 391, 394, 573, 626-7, 683-4, 724, 793, 824
yar- 55, 170, 255, 271, 291, 295, 297, 319, 334, 343, 365, 386, 684, 703
yara- 34, 60, 215-6, 342, 347, 532-3, 573, 627, 684, 793, 818, 824, 830
yarıklan- 516
yarış- 271, 576
yarlı(g)ka- 114, 286, 459, 462-4, 627, 793
yarma- 627-8
yaro- 55, 254, 255, 300-1, 684, 793-4
yarplaş- 577
yarsı- 320, 366, 393, 534
yasta- 255, 628
yaş- 312, 724, 732
yaşa- 427, 794
yaşaŋur- 165, 503
yaşar- 503, 794
yaşna- 308, 427

yaşo-/yaşı-/işo- 255-6, 301-2, 482, 794
yat- 204, 265-6, 334, 392-3, 754-5
yatgaş- 266
1 yatla- 'to attack strangers' 450
2 yatla- 'to practise rain magic' 450, 516
*yav- 324, 388
yaval- 331, 814
yavızla-/yavuzla- 450
yavlaklan- 516
yavrı- 323, 480-81, 484, 794
yayı- 685, 794
yayık- 497
yayka- 628, 685
yayla- 109, 450-51
1 yaz- 'to go astray, err' 256, 260, 296, 353, 628-9
2 yaz- 'to untie, dissolve, loosen' 256, 685
3 yaz- 'to write' 484
yazokla- 451
yäl- 266, 316, 329, 814
ye- 34, 175, 290, 294-5, 393, 418, 422, 526, 573, 759, 814
yed- 395
yegäd- 284-5, 356, 490-91, 575
yeglä- 451
yelpi- 216-7, 336
yeltri-, yeltir- 482
yelvik- 497
yelvilä- 451, 497
yemir- 685-6
yeni- 217
yeniglä- 451
yeŋ- 490
yer- 'to split (tr.)' 256, 295, 686, 815
yerçilä- 34, 117, 417, 451
yerik- 497
yeriŋü- 476
yerlä- 451
2 yet- 'to reach, suffice' 291, 299, 335, 354-5, 686-7, 703, 755, 794, 834
3 yet- 'to lead on' 345, 386, 395
yevä-, yevit-, yevil- 331-2, 629, 687, 794-5
yeviglänmäk 516
yezä- 317
yıdı- 201, 218, 464, 484, 795
yıdla- 451, 484
1 yıg- 'to heap up' 296, 306, 334, 345-6, 569, 573-4, 625, 629, 687, 815, 824
2 yıg- 'to prevent' 625, 629, 687
yıgır- 359, 687
yildra- / yiltır- 482
yılı- 55, 218, 380, 388, 535, 574, 629-30, 795
yılla- 452
*yımşa- / yumşa- 256-7, 796
yırt- 295, 687
yıv- 339
yilmir- 388
yinçgälä- 452
yinçür-, yinçgä 381-2, 725, 732
yint- 703-4
yod-, yok 219, 257, 306, 630, 688
yogla- 452, 795
yoguna- 308, 490
yogunad- 308, 490
1 yogur- 'to knead, mix wet and dry', yogun 72, 297, 303, 313, 358, 688, 725
2 yogur- 'to cross a dangerous area', yol, yogwç 354, 411, 755
yokad- 490, 815
yokaylanmaksız 516
1 yokla- 'to rise' 452-3
2 yokla- 'to miss' 453
ywKurkan- 463, 630
yola- 427, 630, 795
yolçıla- 117
yoluk- 497, 574
yon- 574
yoŋa- 219, 371-2, 725
yorı- 173, 257, 261, 377, 386, 688, 795-6
yölä- 72, 170, 173, 219, 257-8, 343, 531, 574, 630, 725, 732, 796, 818, 824-5
yör- 173, 219, 224, 689, 697
yŵş- 385
yu- 361, 393, 589, 630, 825
yuk- 170, 352, 399, 640-41, 689
yul- 'to redeem, extract' 173, 201, 219-20, 271, 631
yulı- 'to pillage' 389, 395
yulk- 395
yultrı- / yuldrı- 254, 323, 481
yulugla- 453
*yum- 94, 322, 325, 380-1, 390, 392, 738-9, 741
yumgakla- 453
yumşa- 427, 796
yumurla- 390
yunçı- 220, 535
1 yuŋla- 'to use' 178, 453

2 yuŋla- 'to make harmonious' 453
yupa- 631, 796
yuv-/yub- 641, 689
yuvgad- 490
yuvgalan- 490
*yū- 220, 326
yūd-, yük 258, 346, 644, 725, 815
yügür- 258, 297, 384, 574, 796
yüklä- 453
yüksä- 258
yükün- 279, 631-2, 697-8, 825
yüli- 796
yüm- 345
yünt- 220-1, 270, 574
yüz- 796
yüzlän- 516, 825

II. Linguistic phenomena, morphemes and dialect features
(excluding formation concepts and formatives)

abstract nominal 126-7, 132-4, 150, 160, 164, 183, 189, 191, 209, 211, 226, 260-1, 336, 518
accusativus cum indicativo 665, 693
a-dialect 156, 384
adjective vs. noun 132-4, 546
agentivity 580, 637-8, 692-3, 699, 701-2, 705-6, 733, 764-5, 840
°AgU° > °A° 82, 122
/a/ > /ı/ beside /r l/ 430-31, 444
alliteration (rote-rhyme) 197, 218, 237, 305, 399, 444, 643, 674, 719, 727
ambivalence, semantic 587-8
anaptyxis adjacent to /l/ 246-7, 254
anaptyxis adjacent to /ŋ/ 365, 818
anaptyxis adjacent to /r/ 16, 80, 185, 188, 192, 229-30, 242, 309, 343, 388, 442, 469, 471-2, 481, 509, 588, 592, 726
apposition 144-6, 149-51, 231, 339, 782
Argu 84, 434
aspect 261, 381, 490, 523, 559, 703
assimilation 188, 211, 218, 224, 247-8, 251, 272, 277, 295, 299, 328, 329, 332-3, 390, 395, 431, 456-7, 588, 611, 614, 660, 719, 780, 818
auxiliary 383, 462, 559, 617, 627, 663, 716, 790
back-formation 392, 477-8, 538, 561, 590, 723, 728, 732, 735, 741
bahuvrīhi 143
/b/ ~ /m/ 86, 801
/b/ → [b] adjacent to /l/ 336, 365, 372, 641
bol- vs. kıl- 182, 306
Bolgar 75, 90, 481
bracketing (juncture) 69, 71, 114, 116, 120, 128, 134-5, 144, 148-9, 151-2, 171, 185, 187, 193, 198, 201, 202, 209, 215, 219, 238, 240, 253, 254, 260, 280, 283, 298, 300, 307, 354-5, 365, 368, 410, 427, 549-50, 555, 562, 567, 576, 606, 655, 693, 730, 780-81, 828, 829, 836
calque 218, 259, 269, 303, 379, 446, 500, 574, 653, 656, 691, 693
case 410-11, 545-7
chiasma 143, 215
Chinese 377, 581
cleft sentence 69, 797
cluster simplification 323, 379, 380, 388, 426, 441, 475, 488, 751, 773, 807
collective 582-3
compensation 660
concatenation 139-41
contraction 301, 319, 333, 422, 439, 503
converb 340, 381, 403
converb/aorist vowel 467, 491, 497-8, 503-6, 535-540, 564, 575, 633-4, 644, 649, 675, 689-90, 704, 716, 735, 737, 741, 756, 759, 763, 770, 788, 795, 799, 830
copula 650, 788
creativity and productivity 170
/ç/ as ıç 108, 117, 343
/ç/ ~ /ş/, /j/ 309, 319, 466, 473, 494
/çs/ > /ç/ 363
/d/ ([d]) spelled L 425
/d/ → [δ] beside sonant 68, 106, 327, 334, 339, 493, 556, 708
/d/ > /y/ 384, 490, 656, 735
dative 605, 762, 764, 839-45
defocalisation 118
demotion 579-80
denexal (derivation) 118, 135
denotation 186
directive 503
disambiguation 109
discontinuous clause 605-6
dissimilation 104-5, 174-5, 320, 464, 466, 593, 595, 626, 729, 736, 780, 800, 809
dominance 43, 78, 104, 262-3, 265, 275, 300-1, 310, 533
doubling 731
-dUk 333
/e/ and /ā/ ~ /i/ 16, 93, 619-20
Early Western Turkic 256, 269, 300-1, 358, 384, 429, 617, 623, 735, 753, 764

elision 60 f., 77, 107, 217, 309, 441, 513, 581
embedding 530, 837, 841
empathy 518, 580-81
ergative 169
euphemism 174, 418, 452, 483, 608, 664
expressive gemination 460
factivity 121, 155
figura etymologica 36, 81, 95, 96, 156, 160, 185, 204, 257, 266-7, 281, 305, 308-311, 326, 329, 339,419, 427, 432-3, 435, 437, 440-41, 451, 469, 502, 507, 509, 516, 621, 634, 713, 764, 814, 830
front/back alternation 242, 610
fronting 591, 803
full predicativity 134-5
g > Ø 32, 75, 77, 85, 109, 166, 235, 348, 388, 395, 450, 527
/g/ narrowing /O/ 377, 380
/gt/→ [xt] 586, 734, 800
/g/ > v or w beside rounded vowels 269, 421, 661, 807
-gAy 157-8, 301, 382
geminate simplification 26, 47, 85, 86, 119, 139, 156, 319, 329, 332-4, 358, 360, 381, 385, 390, 395, 408, 459, 462, 513, 599, 616, 702, 708, 806, 828-9
generic 139, 171
genitive 139-41, 146, 151, 205
-gInçA 222, 328-9
/g/ → /k/ after sonant 75, 83, 86, 88, 195, 224, 225, 301, 320, 323, 359-60, 381, 383, 424
-gU 97, 121, 138, 152, 354, 357-9, 362
°gVr° < °rVr° 736, 780
/h/ 21-22, 189, 219, 302, 328, 330, 420, 452, 599, 630, 686, 688, 731, 812
haplology 208, 264-5, 275, 353, 363, 800, 809
harmony reflex 235, 262, 286, 646-7, 684
honorifics 462, 716, 793, 810
human & non-human 517-8, 580, 589, 845
humility 50, 597, 617
hypercorrection 185, 421, 735
hypostasis 120, 217, 461
/ı/ ~ /i/ variation 15-16, 18, 84, 204, 206, 380, 448, 456, 603, 673
impersonal 697
implicit verbs 112-3
impossibilitative 138
inalienability 142, 381, 513, 581, 584, 608, 770
inchoative 523, 537, 586
incorporation 171, 280, 549
initial cluster 786
instigator 111, 551, 692-3, 710, 837, 846-7
"intensives" 524
/iy/ > /ī/ 97, 325
izāfet construction 298
+kI 273, 301
Kıpçak 75, 110, 626
/k g/→ [x ɣ] beside /ş ç/ 272, 344, 555, 601, 626, 721, 780, 797
lexical split 431, 785, 795-6
l° < n° 174
long vowel 15, 158, 345, 420, 423, 483, 674
-mAk 170-1, 153-4
'Manichaean' dialect 277, 280, 286, 350, 405-6, 410, 420, 505, 568, 588, 603, 621-2, 729, 732, 735
meta-language 125
metaphor 145-7, 408 and passim.
metathesis 358-9, 569, 590, 618, 628, 668
metathesis with /r/ 75, 188, 231, 240, 309, 313, 323, 344, 358-9, 442, 472, 480-81, 572, 646, 667
/m/< /n ŋ/ between rounded vowels 99, 104
mode of action 112, 117, 374, 386, 387, 465, 523-5, 559, 752, 790
morpheme genesis 274
n-dialect 48, 549
negation 170, 354, 368, 396
neutralisation 747, 830-31
/*ng/ > /ŋ/ 75, 97, 166
(non)intervention 782, 838
/ny/ > /y/ (DLT) 231, 598, 610
/ñ/ 48, 181-2, 717
/ŋ/ and /g/ 17, 84, 91, 186, 188, 232, 294, 362, 474, 536, 658
object 357, 362, 546, 550, 836; dummy o. 310, 311 implied o. 785, 796, 813 internal o. 204, 427, 445, 493, 498, 519 resultative o. 241, 378, 381 (un)specific o. 587, 636-7
Oguz 30, 32, 42, 65, 84, 85, 86, 102, 231, 243, 248, 270, 282, 328, 338, 340, 344, 358-9, 361, 394, 420, 422, 429, 466, 559, 566, 593, 611, 615, 620, 706-8, 717
/p/→ [f] beside /ş/ 626, 722, 724
parasitic dental with sonants 105, 197, 291, 295, 324, 440, 471, 481, 744, 751, 780

participle 170-1, 273, 370-71, 383, 386-7, 396, 400, 698
particle 114, 151, 321, 381, 422, 431
perfect form 316, 348, 698
perfective 663, 790
plurality 90, 95, 150, 578, 583
poetic licence 197, 595, 614, 632, 674, 690
postpositions 135, 151, 306, 403-4, 410-11, 547, 579-80
pragmatic element 273, 321, 462, 598, 627
pronouns 410, 752
prop-words 142, 160, 203
quantification 291, 297-8
/r/ > Ø after vowels 77, 580
+rA 96, 554, 783
redundant causative suffix 803, 806, 815
referring noun 171, 319
relativisation 155, 800
rephonologisation 16
rhyme 232-3, 239, 243, 257, 287, 317, 456, 567, 619
rounding, secondary 41, 564, 679, 749-50, 757, 792, 817, 826
rounding through /m/ 83, 84, 85, 102, 209, 211, 256, 273, 382, 389, 391, 410, 433, 435, 620, 674, 686, 720, 723, 748, 757-8, 791, 796, 801
rounding through /b/, [v] 177, 184, 202, 236-7, 262, 289, 377, 395, 467, 661, 676-7, 687, 728, 757
rounding through /p/ 206, 239-40, 244-5, 262, 373, 394, 565, 684, 758, 762, 786
rsC° ~ z# 101
°rXl° > °rl° 442-3
secondary case suffix 67
semantic fields 699
spelling pronunciation 599
spirantic allophones 17, 442, 481
spiritual vs. physical 586, 589, 590, 592, 594, 595, 602, 611, 613, 616, 620, 621-2, 625, 627, 629, 630, 635-6, 640, 655, 679
Sprachbund 126
subject 578-81, 836
syllable number 172, 179, 226, 265, 275-7, 283, 290-1, 300, 313, 320-1, 327, 330, 334, 337, 428, 457, 459, 471, 485, 641, 725, 733, 741, 759, 782-3, 832
syncopation 191, 201, 214, 219, 224, 229, 235, 262, 275-7, 281, 286, 291, 321, 342, 360, 395, 407, 416, 428, 441-2, 457, 480, 509, 539, 560, 616, 639, 646, 648, 660, 672, 679, 699, 714, 725, 733, 736, 742-4, 747, 748, 758, 763, 782, 795, 799, 801, 803, 817, 830
/ʂ/ ~ /ɪy/ or /ʊ 88, 426, 480-81, 483, 615, 814
/ʂ/ > /ç/ after (con)sonant 103, 272, 275, 421, 538, 664, 717, 722, 724
/ʂ/ ~ /s/ 304, 310, 399, 614, 719
/tç/ > /ç/ 108, 112, 115, 310, 343, 472, 536
temporal absolute 812-13
transitivity 835
/ts/ > /ç/ 204
+tXn 106, 135, 457, 684
+tXr+ 457
Tokharian 141-2, 146, 410
translation 150, 155, 197, 688, 826
Umlaut 660, 714, 803
unrounding 107, 731
/uv/ ~ /ū/ 252, 319, 391, 624, 674, 681-2, 779, 791, 811
voicing 17, 179, 488, 747, 761, 762
vowel harmony 16, 60, 67, 164, 374
vowel alternations 40
widening through /r/ 675, 682
[x] ∈ /k/ 77
/X/ 18, 33, 85, 86, 105
/X I U/ → /A O/ after low vowel 106, 197, 232, 282, 290, 656, 729
/X/ ~ /A/ 86, 92, 156
/X/ ~ /U/ 192, 591, 706-8
*/X#/ > Ø 82, 92, 101, 237, 238, 242, 305, 665, 685, 721, 763
#(y)a° ~ #(y)ı° 81, 254, 482, 600-601
/z/ ~ /r/, /ry/ 26, 33, 88, 293, 323-4, 426, 459, 480, 483, 509, 618
/z/ > /s/ after (con)sonants 704, 774

III. Passages corrected or reinterpreted

(Title abbreviations are those used in the UW or the supplementary ones listed on pp. 5-13 above. Boldface refers to pages.)

A. Runic inscriptions

Asxete A 2: **418**
BQ E 2: **613, 738**; 26: **205**; 36: **451**; 41: **764**; S 8 and 11: **486**; SE: **372**
IXu 23: **608-9**
KÇ 5: **418**; 19: **621**; 22: **418**
Khutuk Ula: **287**
KT E 2 (= BQ E 3): **134**; 6: **567, 716-7**; 7 (= BQ E 7): **203**; 10 (& BQ E 9): **627**; 23 (= BQ E 19): **205**; 24: **203**; 26 (= BQ E 21): **218**; 29: **753**; N 7: **81**; 8 (=BQ E 31): **194**; 9: **91**; S 4: **795**; 5: **731**; 6: **795**; 8: **570**
Ongin 1: **436-7**; front 5: **91**; R 2: **527-8**
QaraBalg c 6: **508**
Suci 7: **210**
ŞU E 1: **730**; 7: **595, 633**; 10: **490**; S 5: **730**
Tariat E 8: **738**; N 2: **78, 392**; S 2: **558**
Tes 9: **360**; 13: **277**
Toñ 3: **791**; 8: **196, 252** (oçuk 'fireplace' is also possible); 9: **196**; 12: **560**; 13: **621**; 15: **239**; 20 and 21: **536**; 25: **801-2**; 27: **423**; 28: **205**; 29: **196, 536**; 33: **196**; 35: **132**; 39: **647**; 45: **57**; 52: **796**; 53: **805**; 54: **308, 805, 814**
YE 8,1: **451**; 10,10: **497**; 13,2: **585**; 26,1: **286-7**; 6: **379**; 28,3: **723-4**; 29,4: **460**; 32,12: **211**; 41,8: **301**; 51,2 and 70,3: **489**

B. Uigur

Abhi 1104: **657-8**
AbhiKārKomm 10: **267**
Acte 17: **714**
Adams 25: **700-701**; 31: **577**
ĀgFrag (1) B 340: **269**; E 6: **801**; G b 5: **612**
AmitIst 66: **114-5**
AmongUigDoc 20: **342**
ATSS IX a r 5, B 5: **474**
Baguettes 2: **443**
BlattRun 25: **486**
BT I B 52: **767**; 61: **630**; 67: **640-41**; 88: **511**; D 33: **125**; 133-4: **368**; 143-9: **141**
BT II 218: **602**; 288: **772**; 643: **477**; 665: **156**; 713: **352**; 882: **515**; 940: **775**; 946: **491**; 969: **617**; 982: **686**; 1351: **373**
BT III 47: **343**; 129: **150**; 140: **790**; 250: **537**; 258: **540**; 285: **465**; 302: **337**; 308: **72**; 315: **370, 619**; 514: **186**; 531: **808**; 658: **297**; 800: **571**; 884: **502**; 902: **375**; 938: **348**; 1020: **567**; 1116: **349**
BT V 5, 81: **603**; 21,462: **182**
BT VII A 326: **177**; 688: **802**; D 13: **202**; G 8: **328**
BT VIII A 115: **670**; 131: **604**; 158: **495**; 379: **674**; B 137-8: **825-6**; 154: **704**; 239: **241**
BT XIII 1,86: **737**; 106: **816**; 3,9: **105**; 28: **643**; 68: **683**; 5,27: **364**; 34: **594-5**; 57: **598**; 75: **806**; 200: **654**; 6,1: **632**; 10,11: **532**; 12,21: **439**; 32: **769**; 44: **185**; 53: **826**; 81: **620-21**; 85: **789**; 13,133: **407**; 159: **366**; 15,38: **713**; 17,12: **660**; 14: **734**; 19,6: **515**; 24: **333**; 21,34: **409-10**; 22,14: **283**; 26,1: **331**; 27,1: **675**; 8: **328**; 33,6: **398**; 38,20: **755-6**; 39,6: **674**; 25: **586-7**; 42,13: **763**; 14: **797**; 46,7: **129**; 25: **664**; 49,15: **475, 590**; 65: **215**; 77: **267**; 53,2: **515**; 55,9: **215-6**; 60,5: **632**; 8: **593**
Buddhāv H 14: **299**; 93: **648**
BuddhBio 12: **595**; 21: **80**; 23: **617**
BuddhKat 20: **179**; 25: **378-9**; 28: **220-1**; 35: **189, 800**; 39: **800**; 42: **282, 718**; 43-44: **667**
BuddhStab II 20: **664**
BuddhUig I 11: **476-7**; 53: **671**; 271: **824**; 362: **607**; 380: **501**; 382: **711**
BuddhUig II 80: **817**; 88: **572**; 90: **807**; 101: **166**; 102: **615**; 103: **613**; 105: **470**; 141: **790**; 183: **666**; 244: **330**; 286: **493**; 296 : **330**; 326: **821**; 335: **570**; 346: **330**; 353: **774-5**; 392: **717-8**; 420: **605**; 474: **384**; 533: **453**; 592: **483**
BuyKāl 5: **755**
Chuast 6: **95**; 88-9: **574**; 91: **838**

CYK 102: **488**
DhāSū 16: **166, 622**
Ernte 21: **225**; 30: **227-8**; 52: **765**; 56: **312**; 62: **818**; 65: **792-3**; 70: **824**; 72: **769**; 87: **302**; 89-90 and 92: **419**; 94-6: **409**; 103: **657**
Ernte II 8: **423**; 51: **192**
ETŞ 9,29: **355**; 10,33: **782**; 79: **328**; 141: **266**; 148: **629**; 202: **194, 396, 641**; 231: **328**; 262: **193**; 264: **303**; 273: **317**; 11,5: **179**; 17: **513, 651-2**; 110: **306**;12,38: **308**; 49: **468**; 13,36: **271**
Genzan D r 13: **447**
HamTouen 7,2-3: **68, 183**; 11,5: **738**; 8: **231**; 14,2-3: **585-6**; 4: **623**; 15,16: **556**; 16,15: **269**; 23,10: **288**; 29,17-18: **422**
HazaiAval 13: **767**
Heilk I 3-5: **672**; 70: **767**; 85: **178**; 135: **178**; 186: **178**; II 3,48 and 51: **319**; 3,63: **577**
Hochzeit 12: **250**; 13: **271**; 35: **686**
Höllen 10: **483**;19-20: **129**;35: **450**; 53: **327-8**
Ht IV 539: **420**; 845: **813**; 1170: **564**; 1541: **558**; V 172: **143**; 5 b 7: **653**; 14: **554**; 9 b 20: **461**; 13 b 21: **315-6**; VII 2 a 25: **216**; 3 a 16: **155**; 4 b 16: **212**; 5 a 21: **117**; 6 a 20: **339**; 7 b 3: **628**; 11 a 5: **688**; 12 a 1: **801**; b 6-7: **52**; 15 a 8: **784**; 16 b 5: **478**; 17 a 16: **419**; 19-23: **50**; 2026: **125**; 2071-2: **663**; X 44: **407**; 504 and 508: **664**; 793: **593**; 795: **493**; 803: **535, 584-5**; 824: **675-6**; 983: **664**; HtPar 9 r 13: **362**; 131 r 2: **782**; 158,1: **130**; HtPek H 1 b 5-9: **766**; 14 v 17: **312**; 74 b 7-8: **408-9**
InscrOuig I 47: **570**; II 27: **762-3**; IV 49: **727**
IrqB X: **382, 419**; XII: **662**; XVIII: **639-40**; XLVIII: **243**; L: **621**; LV: **345**
Khot 66: **157**
Kinkashō A,d: **70, 688**; B,a: **326**; D,b: **126**
KöktüTurf TM 326 r 3: **372**; 342: **555**; 342 r 1-2: **210**
KP LX 7-8: **427**
Kuan 27: **379-80**
LautBemerk 41: **115, 214**
LautHöllen 21: **116**; 41: **680**; 55: **446**; 92: **660**; 113: **391**
LeCoqSchriftk p. 107, l. 2: **251-2**
LetterTunHuang 12: **643**
M I 5,11: **675**; 8,8: **587**; 9,16-18: **560-61**; 11,6: **737**; 15,5: **602**; 26,29: **216**
M II 6,8: **533**; 11,18: **656**; 12,12: **177**; 13,9: **528**
M III 5,1_3: **320**; 4_2: **739**; 7,11_2: **661**; 9,3_2: **511**; 10,9_5: **587**; 16,$_5$: **511**; 11,8_5: **605**; 12,18_5: **239**; 23,9_5: **73-4**; 24,5_4: **427**; 7-10_4: **809**; 25,5_5: **138**; 30,$3-5_5$: **803, 821**; 31,8_5: **352**; 37,5_5: **378**; 14,$_5$: **282**; 38,6_5: **752**; 42, 18: **95**; 43,11_5: **51**; 49,1_5: **571**
Maitr 2 r 30: **397, 618**; 3 r 18-19: **349**; 30: **343**; 9 v 8: **772**; 10: **605**; 11 r 1-3: **285**; 29: **43**; 12 v 10: **476**; 16: **145**; 20 v 10: **805**; 29 v 10: **450**; 30 r 9: **66**; 33 r 8: **783**; 25: **707**; 51/116/174 r 4: **710**; 8: **380**; v 16-17: **494**; 58 r 18: **639**; 71 r 25: **380**; 74 v 22: **568**; 79 r 12: **447**; 81 v 10: **270**; 31: **565**; 82 v 13-14: **755**; 84 v 24: **450**; 89 v 9: **657**; 101 r 1: **430**; 105 v 12: **749**; 122 r 21: **564-5**; 128 v 14: **51**; 139 r 27: **228**; v 11: **785**; 140 v 3: **102**; 159 r 25: **410**; 162 r 27: **768**; 170 v 31: **526**; 174 v 29: **177**; 187 r 17: **817**; 197 r 8: **774**; 198 v 25: **680**; 201 r 8: **609**; 226 v 3-4: **765-6**; 450 v 3: **596**; BT IX 145,18_2: **514**; MaitrGeng 1 b 28: **353**; 2 b 18: **279**; 4 a 4: **671**; b 3: **303**; 5 a 13: **136, 322**; 6 b 6: **671**; 7 b 11: **596**; 8 a 25: **613**; 9 b 16: **622**; MaitrH X 2 b 14: **372-3**; 4 a 6: **678**; b 22: **430**; 7 a 18: **469**; 7 b 10: **673**; XI 3 b 16: **427**; XVI 10 b 7: **792**
ManBuchFrag II 2,2,2: **332**; 5: **685**
ManErz IV 19 (Pothi 348): **489**; 25 and 28: **149**; 32 (Pothi 381): **485-6**; 34: **149**
ManManus 1211, 13-14: **56**
ManMon 66: **815**; 77: **722**; 106-7: **770**
ManTürkGed 8: **774**
ManUigFrag r 10: **489**
Māngi 3: **444**; 18: **658**; 22: **645**
ms. Ch/U 7555 v 4: **736-7**
ms. T I α (U 5396) l.3: **559**
ms. Mz 673 v 1-2: **822**
ms. T I D 596 r 11: **776**
ms. T II D 315 (Mz 738) 5: **479-80**
ms. T II M 12-24: **601**
ms. T II Y 15.501 (U 3088) v 5: **818**
ms. T II Y 58 (Mz 713) 23: **780**
Neujahr 19: **674-5**
NesTex T II B 28 (U 4910) 7: **788-9**
Pacht A 10: **124**
Pfahl I 8: **239**; 17: **776**
PañcFrag 116: **96, 676**; 150: **64, 200**
Profan p. 278: **644**
Shō VI b 9: **661**;VII b 5: **197-8**; XII b 12: **592**; ShōAv 21: **332**; 176: **354**; 274: **309**; 312: **645-6**; 316: **659-660**; 322: **445, 716**

ShōAgon 1,10: **764**; 144: **817**; 152: **571, 648**; 184: **604**; 214: **271-2**; 217: **804**; 231: **721**; 357: **630**; 359: **210**; 2, p. 192,13$_3$: **299**; 194,8$_2$: **624**; 196,2: **536**
ShōKenkyū III 31: **500**; 35: **290-1**
Sitātap 4,2: **313**
Sklavendok III 12: **123-4**
Suv 7,20: **359-60**; 22: **740**; 9,10: **448**; 10,17: **182**; 15,8: **290**; 83,21: **369**; 99,16: **610**; 113,22: **791**; 164,17: **672**; 235,5: **515**; 366,3: **147**; 367,38: **713**; 368,23: **614**; 408,3: **841**; 488,13: **259**; 524,15: **631**; 558,20-559-3: **353**; 597,15 and 598,17: **493**; 599,19: **630**; 604,10: **408**; 612,5: **643**; 613,1: **200**; 620,20-21: **777**; 621,13: **375**; 625,14: **700**; 632,21: **761**; SuvStockh 72: **318, 554**; 83: **475**
ThreeLett 20: **811**; 29: **325**; 38: **811**
ThS I a 6: **666**; b r 1: **331**; c 6: **110**
Töpfer 42: **795**
TT I 7-8: **490**; 23: **548**; 74: **448**; 126: **303**; 113: **771-2**; 152: **56**; 184: **79**; 194: **603**; 208: **616**; 218: **390**; 221: **247**
TT II B 14-15: **338**; 20: **570**
TT III 2: **160**; 23: **576**; 41: **703-4**; 42: **274**; 55: **639**; 76: **514**; 81: **405**; 93: **407**; 114: **225**; 120-1: **592**
TT IV A 11: **279, 353**; 44: **140**; 57: **310**; 77: **557**
TT IV B 43: **308**; 60: **349**
TT V B 20: **116**; 67 and 75: **477**; 100: **178**; 123: **68**
TT VI 023: **241-2**; 14: **326**; 84 (TT VINew 8,7 and 9 v 1): **614-5**; 313: **290**; 355: **707-8**; 362: **353**; 422: **628**; 463: **290**
TT VII 25,1: **180**; 32,20, 33,1, 3 and 4: **615**; 42,5: **532**
TT VIII A 4: **211**; 8: **427**; 32: **144**; 35: **209**; 40: **189**; C 5: **646**; 7: **498**; D 12: **361, 425**; 25: **496**; 27: **393**; 38: **361**; E 42: **794**; 48: **136**; G 12: **514**; I 6: **713**; 17: **589**; 21: **179**; K 5: **606**; 7: **767**; 11: **375**; L 25: **732**; M 22: **711**; 29: **394**; O 4: **216**
TT IX 67: **158-9, 665**; 84: **793**
TT X 124-5: **357**; 491: **254**
Tug 48: **652, 740**; 53: **318**
TugDvaUjgDok I 14: **332**
TuoLuoNi 31 = 40: **41**; 89: **729**; 106: **724**; 335: **294**; 357: **730**; 361: **727**; 383: **821**
U I 6,12: **226**; 8,4: **561**; 37,8: **427**
U II 11,7: **209**; 24,1-2: **256-7**; 25,16: **613**; 29,18-19: **557, 600**; 24: **600**; 37,59: **641**; 47,77: **758-9**; 53,5$_2$: **746**; 58,4-5$_3$: **828**; 63,5$_1$: **781**; 77,21 and 78,40: **791**; 80,64: **633-4**
U III 4,8: **406**; 10,5 and 25,16$_2$: **440**; 36,17: **743**; 45,14: **503**; 53,4$_2$: **743**; 64,21: **689**; 65,10$_1$: **124**; 69,6: **664**; 73,17: **189, 193**; 78,18: **449**; 78,23: **679**
U IV A 9: **562**; 42: **581**; 165: **528**; C 70: **435**
UigBrief C 13: **645**
UigKan 90: **225**; 172: **346**
UigSteu A 28: **670**
UigTot 47: **619**; 103: **320**; 183: **588**; 357: **504**; 397 and 404: **497**; 447: **604**; 876: **687**; 1144: **497**; 1184: **596**
USp 73,5: **82**; 84,2: **480**; 98,15: **243**
Warnke 20: **600**;242: **601**; 296: **511**; 319: **737**; 335: **659**; 551: **437-8**; 576: **619-20**; 601: **297-8**; 629: **470**; 783: **476**
Wettkampf 32: **126**; 62: **800**
Windgott 13: **441**; 37: **779**
ZiemeSklav III 5: **627**; 6: **810**; 21: **721**
ZiemeTārā 15 c: **344**
ZiemeTexterg I 37: **773**; II 1-2: **36**

C. Qarakhanid

DLT fol. 47: **187**; 50: **554**; 59: **202**; 76: **342**; 82: **178**; 88: **762**; 90: **670**; 108, 111 and 116: **762**; 121: **467**; 127: **701**; 184: **344**; 186: **201**; 201: **303-4**; 232: **185, 207**; 234: **195**; 255: **344-5**; 257: **387**; 275: **618**; 275-6: **293**; 312: **706**; 318: **563**; 343: **614**; 354: **812**; 411: **461**; 415: **758**; 467: **258**; 493: **824**; 521: **96**; 555: **762**; 566: **617**; 582: **221**; 607: **161**; 611: **472**; 614: **566**; 621-2: **438**; 625: **98**; 627-8: **744**; 633: **481**; 635: **472**; 636: **471**
QB 221: **659**; 337: **495**; 595: **590**; 630: **264**; 794: **765**; 925: **235**; 1069: **252**; 1126: **162**; 1580 and 1855: **765**; 1989: **736**; 2302: **425, 477**; 2389: **494**; 2409: **814**; 2739: **790**; 2936: **552-3**; 3076: **524**; 3238: **227**; 4113: **466**; 4139: **206**; 4301: **469**; 4732: **790**; 5610: **761**; 5635: **625**; 5972: **536**; 6166: **162**; 6367: **162, 499-500**; 6369: **499-500**

D. Other

(Mo.) Secret History 244: **6**
(Sogd.) ms. M 146 b II r 5: **363**