



The -E/-Ü Gerund in Old Ottoman: I. Formal Analysis
Author(s): C. S. Mundy
Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (1954), pp. 298-319
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/609170
Accessed: 16/03/2011 15:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and *School of Oriental and African Studies* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.*

http://www.jstor.org

THE -E/-Ü GERUND IN OLD OTTOMAN

I. FORMAL ANALYSIS

By C. S. MUNDY

THE gerund here studied is a grammatical form of great interest on account of its phonological variations and the wide range of its syntactical relationships. It occurs in the single form, *gide*, in a strengthened form, *giderek*, and in a pair form, *gide gide*. We find it as an independent gerund and in verbal combinations which vary from mere association to complete fusion, such as *gidememek* and *gideyor* (*gidiyor*). It also has a tendency to become specialized in use as a post-gerund, and numerous particles have originated in this way. It has had a long history, being one of the basic grammatical forms of Turkish, a common feature of the Turkish family of languages from the time of the early inscriptions of northern Asia. In Ottoman Turkish its importance (except in the *-erek* and pair forms) has gradually declined during the last 500 years, and it is now used only to a very limited extent; but in Old Ottoman it was fairly widely employed, and the texts which have survived provide ample material for study. It is, however, a complicated study. In the work which has been done it would seem that investigators have usually relied on insufficient data, or have applied methods unsuitable for this case. For example, the method of general comparison between Ottoman on the one hand and various speech forms such as Uighur, Chaghatai, and modern Anatolian dialects on the other, cannot give satisfactory results. There are too many unknown factors, too many imponderables. Such a procedure inevitably leads to the comparison of mere isolated examples which do not really prove anything. I have therefore confined myself to Old Ottoman, and my method has been to take whole texts and collect and classify all the examples of this gerund which they contain. This is laborious, but it produces results which cannot be obtained in any other way.

Before discussing the gerund itself I wish to say something about the nature and quality of the Old Ottoman material we possess. This is the basic factor, for it determines the limits within which linguistic investigation can be made and the degree of certainty that can be claimed for the results. In the present case such an assessment of the material is particularly necessary, as we have to deal with a grammatical form which was passing through a stage of phonological development, and was also liable to variation from other causes.

By Old Ottoman is meant the language of the 14th and 15th centuries, as represented by written texts. During those centuries development was continuous, and some lexical and formal changes occurred. Also, the Turkish-speaking population of western Anatolia and Rumeli was not homogeneous, and in the spoken language there must have been local and dialect differences. But our texts indicate these variations in only a very uncertain manner. The local differences hardly appear, while the course of the changes in the language

as a whole cannot be ascertained precisely, and they certainly cannot be dated. This state of affairs is to be attributed to three principal causes : the uniformity proper to a written language, the development of a systematic orthography, and the manner in which the texts have been transmitted to us.

Old Ottoman, as we know it, was a written language, and more than that it was a literary language. We must not be misled by its simplicity, or by the apparent *naïveté* of some of the books composed in it. It was a well developed instrument, supple and uniform, such as can only have been evolved by a long period of continuous literary effort. Those who doubt this are invited to consider the case of *Suheyl u Nevbahar* (completed in 780/1378). It is impossible to believe that this work, with its sureness of technique, its maturity, its facility of expression, is an isolated phenomenon without a tradition. It is clearly the product of a flourishing literature, and must have had many contemporaries and predecessors. Now such a written language is bound to have strong conservative and standardizing tendencies. It will retain obsolete words and forms, and refuse admission to new ones long after they have become current in spoken discourse ; and at the same time, by its uniformity, it will mask local variations. This is precisely what happened in Old Ottoman.

Orthography, too, has the same fundamental characteristics of conservatism and standardization. It has also another characteristic which has much bearing on our present subject : it tends to develop an identity of its own separate from the language of which it is the notation, producing purely orthographical patterns which do not correspond exactly to the sound patterns of speech. The importance of this will appear as we proceed. About Old Ottoman orthography in general, it may be said that the tendencies just mentioned are largely obscured by the irregularities which occur. There was a good deal of laxity ; alternative spellings and individual preferences were tolerated ; and there were inconsistencies due to conflicting influences. Moreover, there was not one completely uniform system ; rather there were separate schools or traditions, which future investigations may be able to distinguish.

The transmission of the old texts is a further source of perplexity. In the main we are dependent upon copies made long after the date of composition. In the case of a 14th-century text copied late in the 15th century, we can have no idea how many hands have contributed modifications, at what dates the modifications occurred, or in what localities. Such a copy may, indeed, be very good and accurate, but we are obliged to be cautious, and this hampers us in forming conclusions. Even contemporary or nearly contemporary copies are sometimes very different from their originals. The simpler kind of prose text, upon which most of the study of Old Ottoman must be based, is particularly liable to suffer in transmission, sometimes being deliberately embellished and sometimes modernized by a long process of folk-editing. There is also an insidious danger which must be mentioned. We are commonly tempted to attribute all the irregularities we find to the copyist ; but in some cases he is undoubtedly responsible for regularity, imposing his own habits of speech and

especially of orthography. Thus uniformity in a text is not necessarily a proof of authenticity. This point also is not without importance in the present investigation.

These considerations make it necessary to state clearly the limits of the present study. It is primarily a fact-finding investigation based upon a group of texts ; and it consists of a study of a grammatical form as it occurs in written speech, modified according to the changes in the spoken language, and controlled by orthography. At present, for the reasons outlined above, we are obliged to regard the whole Old Ottoman period as a single unit, and the whole area where written Ottoman was current as a single language area. But though some of the conclusions reached are certainly of general import, at the present stage no claims of universal validity are proposed.

The -E/-Ü Gerund and the Muzari

Undoubtedly the most striking feature of this gerund as we find it in Old Ottoman is the close correspondence of its dual *-e/-ü* structural pattern with that of the muzari (or aorist) stem. It is also the fundamental point in the present study, and will be the basis of the classification which we shall use for the gerund. It is therefore necessary first to give some attention to the muzari.[1]

The structural pattern of the muzari in Old Ottoman was almost identical with that familiar to us in modern Turkish : consonant stems assumed one or other of the affixes *-er/-ar* and *-ür/-ur*, of which the latter has now become a fourfold *i* affix ; vowel stems added *-r* (perhaps to be regarded as *-'r*). The categories are as follows :—

1. Simple consonant stems, normal form,[2] *-er* : *gid-er*, *bak-ar*.
2. Simple consonant stems, exceptional form, *-ür* : *bil-ür*, *yat-ur*.
3. Increased consonant stems, *-ür* : *gid-er-ür*, *yap-ıl-ur*.
4. Vowel stems, *-r* : *yi-r* (*yer*, eats), *ko-r*, *aŋla-r*.

The second category consists of only a small number of verbs, most of which are the same as those belonging to this category in the modern language : *al-ur*, *bil-ür*, *bul-ur*, *gel-ür*, *kal-ur*, *ol-ur*, *öl-ür* ; *dur-ur* (*tur-ur*), *gör-ür*, *vir-ür*,[3] *ur-ur* (*vur-ur*) [4] ; *san-ur*.[5] The following verbs now have *-er* affixes but formerly

[1] Before doing so it would be well to say something about the method of transcription used. At the present stage it seems desirable to use as loose a system as possible, and I therefore employ the modern Turkish script supplemented by *ḫ* and *ŋ* (and occasionally *ṭ* to represent ط). In spite of its known weaknesses this script is sufficient for the purpose, and it has two advantages : it avoids the impression that the writer is attempting any phonetic representation of sounds, and it enables him to evade such thorny questions as that of the close *e*, here irrelevant. In all cases where the MS. has ى or *kesre* I transcribe *i*, e.g. *irişmek*, *virmek*.—As types the front-vowel forms are given throughout this paper : thus *-ü* represents also *-u*.

[2] The words ' normal ' and ' exceptional ' are here used in a purely quantitative sense : no suggestion about which is the basic form is intended.

[3] This verb also occurs as *vermek*, with *fethe*, in some old MSS.

[4] *Vurmak* occurs occasionally as far back as the 15th century.

[5] *Sanmak*, however, should probably be regarded as an increased stem, *sa-n*. *Eyd-ür* (*ayd-ur*) is also an increased form, *ay-d*. *Bırakmak* has the muzari *bırağ-ur* : being a disyllabic stem it has the sound pattern of an increased form.

had *-ür* : *kıl-ur, gir-ür, yat-ur*, this last still surviving in common use in Anatolia, *yat-ır*. The verb *değmek* had two and perhaps three muzari forms, the commonest being the interesting eccentric form *değ-ir* : it occurs in all meanings of the verb (arrive, be worth, appertain, etc.) and is thoroughly attested in MSS.[1] (*SN*, *Ah. Dâ'î*, *Füt.*, and elsewhere).[2] I believe I have seen *değ-ür*, but it must be rare [3] ; *değ-er* has sufficient MS. authority (including Şîrâzî, before the middle of the 15th century). The forms of *geymek* are analogous to those of *değmek*, but a little more uncertain : we find *gey-ür*, but sometimes also *gey-er* (Şîrâzî, also the Tefsir Frag. used in this study, for which see below ; and a few other cases have been found in 15th-century MSS.). A form with *kesre* sometimes occurs, but whether it is *geyir* or *giyer* is not clear ; the later history of the verb suggests the latter alternative, but it may be that both are sound.[4] Some interest attaches to these *-er* forms, and I shall revert to them when discussing the standardization of the gerund. A very important variant for our study is that of the verb *görmek*, which in addition to its usual muzari *gör-ür* had a rarer parallel form *gör-er*. This never became established in standard Ottoman. Both *gör-ür* and *gör-er* occur in the traditional text of the Garibname, where they are proved by rhyme.[5] I have found *gör-er* in a popular romance (*Âşık Garib*), and it exists in Anatolian dialect. This, too, will be mentioned again later. Occasionally *-ür* forms of other verbs not listed here are found, but they are too uncertain to be accepted without good evidence.[6]

Another non-Ottoman form which must be noticed is the alternative muzari of vowel stems, with the cushion-consonant *-y-* and the affix *-ür* : *ayla-y-ur*, parallel to *ayla-r*. This *-y-ür* form occurs in the Uighur group,[7] and in Rabguzi. It is mentioned here solely for comparison with the *-e/-ü* gerund in Ottoman, for at this point there is a divergence between the gerund and the Ottoman muzari. The gerund affix, being a vowel only, without consonant, obviously cannot be attached to the vowel stem by the method of elision ; the cushion consonant *-y-* is used, producing a form *-y-ü*, which differs from the Ottoman muzari but is exactly analogous to the alternative eastern muzari. But apart from this the basic correspondence between the forms in Ottoman is complete :

[1] These abbreviations are used : *KD* = *Kalile ve Dimne* ; *SN* = *Süheyl u Nevbahar* ; *Füt.* = *Fütûhu'ş-Şâm*. For texts used in this study see p. 307.

[2] It corresponds to the form in Kashgari, *tegir*.—In *KD*, 77, 6, Zajączkowski reads *degär*, which in my mode of transcription would be *diğer*. I do not believe that the root form *dig-* can be sound ; it seems probable that Zajączkowski has been misled by the copyist's placing of the vowel points, and that the word should be *değir*. This seems the more probable in view of the fact that he several times gives the word *kankı* (= *kangı*, which), as *kanık*, a form I have never seen anywhere.

[3] It may be a variant of *değir*, by analogy.

[4] Zajączkowski gives *giyersiz*, *Cevahir*, p. 34, fourth line from the bottom. The form *giy-* is supported by *giyüb* in *SN*, 98. 4 ; but cf. *geyüb*, ib. 99. 3.

[5] Kashgari has both *kör-ür* and *kör-er*.

[6] Deny, *Gramm.*, p. 1109, gives distinct muzari forms for the two verbs *sormak* : *sor-ar* (asks) and *sor-ur* (sucks). But *sormak* = suck is no longer used in standard Turkish, and in Old Ott. its muzari was *sor-ar* (*SN* 205, 14, and 361, 12). He also (p. 393) gives *böl-ür* as the muzari of *bölmek*, but the standard form is *böl-er* : I have no record of the Old Ott. form.

[7] Noticed in Von Gabain, *Alttürk. Gr.*, pp. 211–12.

the broad principle is that where the muzari has *-er* the gerund has *-e*, and where the muzari has *-ür* the gerund has *-ü* (with variant *-i*). To this principle not unnaturally we find exceptions, which it will be our duty to examine and if possible explain.

BASIC CLASSIFICATION

	Muzari	Gerund
1. Simp. cons. normal :	*gid-er*	*gid-e*
2. Simp. cons. excep. :	*kıl-ur*	*kıl-u* (*kıl-ı*)
3. Increased cons. :	*gider-ür*	*gider-ü* (*gider-i*)
4. Vowel :	*bekle-r* (variant—*bekle-y-ür*)	*bekle-y-ü* (*bekle-y-i*)

The negative verb constructed with the affix *-me* is an increased vowel stem, so that the gerund has *-y-ü* (*-y-i*). Thus the negative gerund corresponding to *gid-e* is *gitme-y-ü* (*gitme-y-i*).

I must here state emphatically that in speaking of the correspondence between the formal patterns of the muzari and of the gerund I make no inference about their origin. Such matters are beyond the scope of this paper and of the present writer. We are here concerned exclusively with the facts as they occur in Old Ottoman, which had inherited both muzari and gerund from a distant past. It may be remarked, however, that the same correspondence is visible in the forms given by Kashgari, and this in spite of the slightly different structural pattern of the muzari which we find in his book. Some increased stems which in Ottoman would have the affix *-ür* he shows as having *-er*. In one case, the verb *kadhġurmak* (Old Ott. *kayurmak*, mod. *kayırmak*), he gives both muzari and gerund, *kadhġur-ar* and *kadhġur-a*. He gives also another analogous gerund form, *yolġır-a*, formed on the same pattern.

PHONOLOGY OF THE -E/-Ü GERUND

During the Old Ottoman period we find this gerund subject to phonological modifications. In discussing these changes a certain reservation has to be made. We do not know exactly what the heritage of Old Ottoman was, but we do know that it was not entirely homogeneous, and that it had some admixture of elements of eastern (or northern) origin. Now some *-i* forms of the gerund occur in the remains of the Uighur group of languages,[1] and there is always the possibility that some of them may have been incorporated in Ottoman. It is also possible that the tendency to form such variants was inherited. In this study we cannot take such factors into account. In view of the fact that in Kashgari there are more than 50 *-ü* gerunds and no *-i* variants (though he does give occasional *-ir* muzari forms),[2] we shall accept *-ü* as the basic form and examine the *-i* variants purely as a feature of Old Ottoman.

The phonological modifications we have to deal with can be classified under three heads : two kinds of *-i* variant, and standardization in the *-e* form.

[1] See Von Gabain, op. cit., p. 121.

[2] The fact that Kashgari gives no *-i* variants does not, of course, prove that they did not exist in the speech he was recording.

1. The structural *-i* variant. This affects only the *-ü* forms, the change being *-ü* > *-i*, e.g. *geçürü* > *geçüri*. I have called it ' structural ' because it is primarily a change in the actual gerund itself and not a result of combination with an auxiliary verb. This variant is very uncertain and perplexing, largely for orthographical reasons, about which more will be said below.

2. The *-i* variant of regressive attraction. The auxiliary verb *virmek* exercises a powerful attraction upon the gerund which precedes it, and in the great majority of cases the termination of the gerund changes from *-e* or *-ü* to *-i*. The *-e* form always changes ; with the *-ü* form exceptions occur, notably in the case of the vowel-stem verbs, which sometimes preserve the form *-y-ü*. A similar regressive attraction sometimes occurs also with the auxiliaries *bilmek* and *görmek*, but is less strong. In the case of *virmek* the attraction is so strong and uniform that for purposes of analysis it is best to regard the *-i* variant as the normal form, and I have accordingly made this a separate category in the classified lists.[1]

3. Standardization to the *-e* form. In modern Turkish the *-ü* form has been standardized to *-e*, except in combination with *vermek* and in *alıkomak*. Old Ottoman shows only very rare signs of this development, but there is evidence that it had already begun in the first half of the 15th century. There are two examples in Şîrâzî, in which the form is fixed by the rhyme. In one of these the *-e* form, *sevine*, could in a far-fetched manner be explained as a subjunctive, 3rd person ; but in the other this is not possible, and the example is conclusive :

Kolaylu kolayumuza yayılduk — Görüb gölgemüzi ürküb bayılduk
Kaça kaça dirile vü ṭağıla — Ecel kurdından üş girdük ağıla
(Metre : ⏑ – – – | ⏑ – – – | ⏑ – –.)

' We have scattered, each as best he could, and have taken fright and swooned at sight of our own shadows ; fleeing with all our might, now bunching together and now separating, we have entered the fold through fear of the Wolf of Death.' (Or *ecel kurdından* could be taken with *kaça kaça*.) Here there is no possibility that *dirile* and *ṭağıla* might be subjunctives : this is precluded by the person reference, which is 1st person. They must therefore be standardized forms of *dirilü* and *ṭağılu*. In addition I have one example of a pair form in which the same standardization has occurred : *yiye içe* ' eating and drinking ' (Hamzevi, *Iskendernâme*, in a prose passage ; MS. not dated but about the year 1500), from *yiyü içe*. One might expect that in pair forms this change would be particularly liable to happen, on account of their sound balance, but this is the only case I have recorded in 15th-century texts to date. I must here warn the reader, however, of the possibility that in some cases I may have mistaken such standardized forms for subjunctives and so left them unrecorded. This applies more to the single form than to the pair form. I invite caution upon this point.

In connexion with this standardization of the gerund the alternative *-e*

[1] In modern Turkish the *-i* variant is the standard form in combination with *vermek*, but it follows fourfold harmony. A tendency in this direction is discernible in Old Ott. also (see p. 313).

form of the muzari of some verbs is of great interest. It is clear that at least in the case of *değmek* and *geymek* the modern form had already begun to appear, and it is noteworthy that both occur in the MS. of Şîrâzî which provides the gerund examples cited above. It is to be inferred that the process of standardization affected both muzari and gerund in the Old Ottoman period. In the case of the gerund, a not very frequently used form, standardization was almost complete. But with the muzari, which was in constant use, the basic *-e/-ü* pattern remained, and the changes were confined to the standardizing of a small number of exceptional forms.

The case of *gör-e* I believe to be different. I think it is not a standardized form of *gör-ü*, but an original form corresponding to the non-Ottoman muzari *görer*. The form *gör-e* is universal in Old Ottoman as the normal gerund, and I believe it owes its retention to the influence of the particle *göre* (originally the same word, and a post-gerund), which was inherited in this form. In the comparative lists therefore *gör-e* is classed as a regular *-e* gerund.

The -İ Variant: Phonology and Orthography

In the study of the development of the structural *-i* variant there are perhaps two principal phonological factors to be taken into account. The first of these is the system of vowel harmony, which underwent an important change in the Old Ottoman period. What happened was that the twofold *i/ı* and *ü/u* groups[1] of affixes were gradually formed into a single fourfold group, *i/ı/ü/u*, the system which prevails to-day. This involved the following modifications of harmony sequences: *e-ü* > *e-i*, *i-ü* > *i-i*; *ü-i* > *ü-ü*, *ö-i* > *ö-ü*. We have no means of ascertaining when this change began or what course it followed. It is likely that it did not affect all the *i/ı* and *ü/u* affixes uniformly and contemporaneously. The weight of MS. evidence seems to show, for example, that the passive affix *-il* became subject to the fourfold harmony at a relatively early period, and that the causal affix *-dür*, the personal affixes *-üm*, *-üŋ*, and the genitive affix *-üŋ* retained their twofold structure much longer.[2] The other factor is not a certainty but rather a matter of conjecture.

[1] The distinction of front and back vowels is assumed. We have evidence that it was strong in Old Ott. (shown by ك—ق, ك—غ) though MSS. have discrepancies which are hard to explain.

[2] The *ü* forms appear to have been maintained deliberately as 'correct' speech for a long time. Meninski, in his *Grammatica Turcica* (1680), gives them as the standard both for writing and for speech. Speaking of the genitive (p. 26) he says that some use *i*, 'sed Doctiores sic scribunt et legunt, ut nos hic tradimus', in which statement the significant word is *doctiores*. The change in the genitive form seems to be the cause of a curious gap in later Turkish grammar. In modern Turkish the infinitive *-mek* is never used in the genitive case, for no reason valid at the present day. In Old Ott. this genitive, e.g. *gitmeğüŋ*, is not infrequent, and it certainly continued in use into the 16th century. But the new vowel harmony would require *i* in this form; and there is some evidence that *ŋ* was changing to *n* in the 16th century (ن for ك in some MSS.). As a result of these modifications *gitmeğüŋ* would become *gitmeğin*, thus coinciding with the instrumental form then in common use. This could have caused confusion, and is sufficient to explain the disappearance of the genitive form. It was no doubt a gradual disappearance. Meninski, op. cit., gives *-meğüŋ* as a current form, but one suspects that in his day it was used only by the *doctiores*. What is very interesting is the fact that the genitive form, once lost, was never restored, in spite of the later disappearance of the instrumental *gitmeğin*.

Some *-i* variants (e.g. *geçüri*) are contrary to fourfold harmony, and we must therefore consider the possibility that *ü* terminations tended to become unrounded to *i* independently of vowel harmony. This is quite feasible, and I would suggest that there is an analogy to it in the frontalization of vowels in some terminations in modern Stamboul pronunciation, e.g. *bakacağım* > *bakıciğim*, *ne yapayım* > *napiim* (these are only approximate renderings).

Upon this question we can only hope to obtain certain information if we can be sure that the orthography of the MSS. does represent phonological changes faithfully. Unfortunately it is only too patent that in some cases it does not. To demonstrate this it is sufficient to cite the two homophonous affixes *-i*, 3rd pers. possessive (in final position) and definite accusative, and *-di*, affix of the past tense. Through the ages, from the earliest times up to 1928, they were always and in all circumstances written as *-i* and *-di* (with ـِ or *kesre*), so that the standard orthography does not show that they ever became subject to the fourfold system at all. But what was the situation in the Old Ottoman period ? Had the change already taken place or not ? It is important that we should find an answer to this question.

Now it happens that this matter of the representation of vowel harmony can be checked, and in three ways, provided, of course, that the necessary materials exist for any given period. It can be checked by transcriptions in other alphabets, by departures from standard orthography, and by rhymes. The Ottoman of the 15th century can be tested by all three methods, and I shall give an example of each.

1. Transcription. In Old Ottoman the name of the conqueror Timur is so written, *Timür*, which is its eastern form ; while the same word as a noun meaning ' iron ' is always *demür*. These forms persisted in writing throughout Ottoman Turkish though in speech the common noun came to be pronounced *demir*. But in the Byzantine writers of the 15th century the proper name is written *Τεμίρης*, *Ντεμίρης*, i.e. *Demir-is*, with some variations but always in a form which gives *i* in the second syllable.[1] It is not likely that the variation in the initial, *τ* and *ντ*, represents any variation in the Turkish pronunciation.[2] The only reasonable conclusion is that in Ottoman at that time Timur's name was given the form of the ordinary noun *demür*, and that this was already pronounced *demir* (*e-ü* > *e-i*). This illustrates an orthographic *ü*.

2. Departures from standard orthography, which vary from occasional irregularities in good MSS. to habitual misspellings by uneducated persons. Their value is sometimes difficult to assess. The following example is from the Cambridge *Ḳıṣaṣu'l-Enbiya* (dated 847/1443)[3]: *dilüŋü* ' your heart ', accusative,

[1] See the long list in Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, ii. 257.

[2] The Greek *τ* is an unaspirated dental, and Greeks have difficulty in pronouncing and representing the Turkish *t* and *d*, which are aspirated. Sometimes *τ* is used indiscriminately for both, as in some 18th- and 19th-century ' Karamanlitika ' texts (Turkish in Greek characters) ; *ντ* is the usual device for *d*, but a dotted *τ̇* has also been used.

[3] Camb. Univ. Library, Ll. 5, 12, recorded as No. 865 in Browne, *Hand-list of Muhammadan MSS.*, p. 155, where it is inaccurately described.

written دلكُو instead of the standard form *dilüyi*. This indicates a change *ü-i* > *ü-ü*, and shows an orthographic *i* in the standard form.

3. Rhymes. The poet Necâtî, whose floruit lies in the second half of the 15th century, was the first Ottoman poet to bring classical verse close to actual speech. His rhymes occasionally provide important evidence. I shall quote three separate miṣra'ṣ from one of his gazels.

1. Gafil yürüme, aç gözüŋi, gün giceli-dür [1] (گجه‌ليدر).
2. La'l-i lebinüŋ bûsesi cânuŋ bedeli-dür (بدليدر).
3. İnanmayasız sözine zîrâ-ki deli-dür (دليدر).

(Metre : – – ∪ | ∪ – – ∪ | ∪ – – ∪ | ∪ – –.)

The key word here is *bedeli* : *bedel* + *i*, 3rd pers. possessive. This fixes the rhyme vowel as *i*, for no other sound will do. Rhyming with it we have *gice-li*, adjective, and *deli*, noun, both of which are very definitely *ü* forms in standard orthography : adjective affix *-lü* لو and *delü* دلو. Unless Necâtî's rhymes are imperfect (which is unlikely, especially as the syllable in question is scanned long and is therefore prominent), we must conclude that the standard spellings no longer corresponded to the pronunciation of cultured circles at that period. In the body of the lines the standard orthography is maintained,[2] while in the rhyme there is an enforced breach of this orthography : the need for uniformity in the spelling of the rhymes, which was *de rigueur*, overrides other considerations. I have had to leave the copula *-dür* in its standard form ; in these verses it may well have been pronounced *dir*, but of course there is no indication of this. It was one of the most strictly standardized forms in Old Ottoman, and I have no actual evidence of its pronunciation.[3]

These examples are given as specimens, not of course as sufficient proof in themselves. Objections could easily be raised against them individually. Moreover, they represent an over-simplification of the position, in that no allowance is made for intermediate sounds. We also know that there were alternative pronunciations ; for example, the word commonly written as *karşu* occurs in rhymes both as *karşu* and as *karşı*. However, the cumulative effect of the three kinds of evidence is irresistible ; it is certain that in the middle of the 15th century the fourfold harmony was operative to a considerable degree, and that the spelling was partly orthographical.

In the instances quoted above we have evidence of obsolete harmony patterns, *e-ü* and *ü-i*, preserved and perpetuated as standardized forms. But in the case of this gerund the MSS. display also another kind of standardization,

[1] Renderings : 1. Do not walk unwarily, open your eyes, for the day has its night. 2. Your life is the price of a kiss from the ruby of her (his) lips. 3. Believe not what he says, for he is mad.

[2] But the MS. is unpointed and some of the vowels have been supplied by me. Also some of the spellings are conventional, e.g. *bûsesi*, which was probably *bûsası* in Necâtî's time.

[3] For a good reason : *dir* was the muzari of *dimek* (mod. *der*, *demek*), so that there must have been strong inducement to maintain the standard *ü* form in the copula in order to avoid confusion. (But *der* and *deyü*, for *dir*, *diyü*, occur occasionally in old MSS.)

in which the *-i* form is accepted as the standard ; and in some MSS. it is so uniform that it appears to be an established orthographic habit, perhaps due to analogy with the established affixes *-i* and especially *-di*. In the comparative lists I include a text of this kind, the *Cevâhirü'l-Asdâf*. It will thus be seen that the situation is very confused indeed. There are alternative possibilities, both phonological and orthographical. For my part I am content simply to record the facts as they occur in the texts, and for the rest I adopt a Pyrrhonian attitude and suspend judgment.

Comparative Analysis

The following five texts have been used :—

Kalile ve Dimne, ed. A. Zajączkowski, *Études sur la langue vieille-osmanlie*, i, Krakow, 1934. This contains about half the whole work, consisting of 98 pages of closely printed text. This work is a most valuable specimen of Old Ottoman, and the editor deserves our gratitude for his meticulous presentation of it. Composed about 1330, copied 1490.

Süheyl u Nevbahar, the facsimile published by J. H. Mordtmann, Hanover, 1925. Composition completed in 1378, date of copy not known.

Cinân-ı Cenân, an anonymous work of religious exhortation. The MS. (in my possession) is dated 836/1432 ; date of composition not given, but appears to be little earlier than that of the copy. Details of this MS., with a facsimile specimen, will be found in the very important *Ahmed-i Dâ'î, hayatı ve eserleri* of Prof. Ismail Hikmet Ertaylan, Istanbul, 1952. I am dubious of the ascription to Ahmed-i Dâ'î, for linguistic reasons.

Tefsir fragment, anonymous and unidentified. The MS. (in my possession), comprises 60 leaves, and covers Surahs lxxxvi–xcvij. The language is old and may well belong to the 14th century ; the MS. seems to be *c.* 1500.

Cevâhirü'l-Asdâf, ed. A. Zajączkowski, *Études sur la langue vieille-osmanlie*, ii, Krakow, 1937. Contains 77 pages of selections, based on what seems to be a good 16th-century MS. and checked by two others, one dated 905/1499. Composed in the first half of the 15th century. Zajączkowski has a short note on phonological variation, but these texts clearly present many features of phonology and/or orthography which require study.

I must here mention a text which I have several times quoted in this paper :—

Şîrâzî, Gülşen-i Râz : Ottoman version of the *Gulshan-i Rāz* of Shabistari, composed 829, copy dated 845/1441. The MS. (in my possession) is in a very good hand, but is rather inaccurate. It lacks the first 15 ff.

I have also alluded to *Ahmed-i Dâ'î* and the *Fütûhu'ş-Şâm* (*Futūḥ al-Shām*). The former is the volume recently published in Stamboul, mentioned above. The *Fütûh* is a battered fragment in my possession, which agrees very exactly with the fine Ayasofya MS. (No. 3327). This is certainly not Dharir's original text, but may represent a 15th-century edition. This MS. appears to be of the 16th century.

Although the *-e/-ü* gerund was in general use in Old Ottoman it was not one of the commonest speech forms, and the investigator has to do a great deal of reading in order to amass sufficient material. Many texts supply too few examples for a comparative classification of the forms; and only one of those examined, *Süheyl u Nevbahar*, has a sufficient quantity for even a superficial inquiry into underlying tendencies. I have therefore prepared lists of two kinds. Firstly, comparative lists of forms only, based on four texts, all of which are interesting for diverse reasons: *KD* for the early date of its original; the *Cinân* as a specimen of an early copy; the Tefsir fragment and the *Cevâhir* as representatives of differing traditions in the same class of work. These lists are primarily intended to demonstrate the dual *-e/-ü* structure of the gerund. *SN* I have treated differently, as the material it provides is suitable for some degree of analysis. To have given a complete list would have taken up too much space, and it would have involved the inclusion of a number (not large, however) of doubtful forms. It also seemed unnecessary at this stage. I have therefore given this list in a synoptic form, but have added details necessary for the elucidation of the main phonological tendencies.—I must add a word of apology for any accidental omissions which may have occurred. In dealing with a text like *SN* such omissions are inevitable. In the main they cannot affect the general conclusions, for they are not dangerous unless a whole category, or large part of a category, is involved. This does not seem likely, except perhaps in the case of *-ü* forms standardized to *-e*, to which I have already drawn the reader's attention.

(In the lists which follow components of pairs are listed as single forms. One or two post-gerundial particles have been omitted. Hyphens are not used. Variants are indented slightly, and forms which do not agree with the basic classification are marked with an asterisk.)

-E/-Ü Gerund: Comparative Lists

	Kal. Dim.	Cinan.	Tefsir fr.	Cevahir.
1. Simple *-e*	*arta*	*asa*	*aka*	*düze*
	çeke	*çıka*	*çıka*	*geçe*
	dike	*dike*	*döne*	*göre*
	ese	*geçe*	*göre*	*kese*
	gide	*gide*	*güle*	*ide*
	göre	*ide*	*ive*	*ine*
	içe		*kaça*	*yora*
	ive		*korka*	
	sara		*kova*	
	saya			
	uya			
	üşe			

	Kal. Dim.	Cinan.	Tefsir fr.	Cevahir.
2. Simple *-ü*	*alu*	*duru*	*duru*	*durı*
	duru	*kılı*		
	kılu			
	olu			
3. Increased *-ü*	*beklenü*	*eğlenü*	*dolduru*	*atılı*
	çevürü	*irişi*	*döndürü*	*başarı*
	daşınu	*yalvaru*	*görünü*	*çekili*
	dirilü	**yitişe*	*iledü*	*otarı*
	eydi		*irişi*	
	işidü			
	koyulu		*inanu*	
	kurtılu		*koyulu*	
	perkidü		*söylenü*	
	sığınu		*şaşurı*	
	söyleşü			
	ulaşduru			
	ulaşdurı			
	urışu			
	uyanu			
4. Vowel *-y-ü*				
Simple :	*diyü*	—	*diyü*	—
	yiyü			
Increased :				
	aŋlayu	*ağlayu*	*ağlayu*	—
	avlayu	*alđayu*	*avlayu*	
	dileyü	*eriyi*	*bekleyü*	
	eyleyü		*dileyü*	
	gizleyü			
	iŋleyü			
	isteyü			
	ırlayu			
	kurtarlayu			
	saklayu			
	söyleyü			
	uğrayu			

	Kal. Dim.	Cinan.	Tefsir fr.	Cevahir.
5. *-i-virmek*				
(1)	*dutı*	*dutı*	*koyu* [1]	*idi*
	düzi	*dutu*	*sunu*	*salı*
	idi	*idi*		
	koşı	*salı*		
	salı			
(2)	*alı*	*duru*	—	—
	eydi	*kılı*		
(3)	—	*akdarı*	*iledü*	—
		dolanu	*öldüri*	
		dönderi		
		geçüri		
		kurtarı		
(4)	*söyleyü*	*saklayı*	*dileyü*	—
		saklayu		
		yalayı		

Süheyl ü Nevbahar

1. Simple cons. *-e* type :—
   (*a*) Some 40 gerunds with *-e*.
   (*b*) The following forms with *-i* :—
   **çıkı* (298. 11), **düzi* (354. 5), **göri* (309. 8 ; 360. 9), **idi* (20. 8 ; 232. 7), **iri* (218. 6 ; 260. 6), **sayı* (31. 9).
   (All in combination with the auxiliary *bilmek* in the subjunctive.)
   **güli* (178. 9). (Combined with *görmek*.)
   (*c*) Two with *-ü* : **idü* (260. 4), **yanu* (211. 9).

2. Simple cons. *-ü* type :—
   -ü : *duru*, *olu* (both combined with *gelmek*).
   -i : *alı*, *bulı*, *varı* (combined with *bilmek*).
   olı (combined with *görmek*).
   geli (combined with *durmak*).
   urı (independent).

3. Increased cons. stems :—
   Thirty gerunds, 22 with *-ü* and eight with *-i* (of which three are with *bilmek* and three with *görmek*, including *irişi* (162. 7.—See other lists).

[1] From *koymak* (or *kuymak* ?), normal gerund form *koya*.

4. Vowel stems :—

In affirmative verbs *-ü* is greatly preponderant ; 29 with *-ü*, one with *-i* (*diyi* + *bilmek*).

This text has the rare neg. form four times :—

-ü : *olmayu* (361. 10), *virmeyü* (132. 11).

-i : *dirilmeyi* (18. 1), *ivmeyi* (97. 12). (All four combined with *gör*, imperative.)

5. Combination with *virmek* :—

Simple, *-e* type : *düzi*, *sunı*, *tutı*.

-ü type : *alı*, *bili*, *bulı*.

Increased stem : *öğredü*.

Vowel stems : *diyi* (twice).

diyü (once), *yiyü*, *koyu*.[1]

The -E/-Ü Structural Pattern

It will be observed that the examples in these lists give strong confirmation to the dual *-e/-ü* structure pattern of this gerund as set out in the basic classification on p. 302. We shall now examine the few exceptions which occur.

1. *Yitişe* (*Cinân*). This is the only case of an increased or vowel stem with the affix *-e* in these texts. It occurs in this sentence :—

Pes imdi mu'minüŋ himmeti ol vech-ile olmak gerek ki cehd idüp [*sic*] meydan-ı 'ibadetde ilerü geçe-bile, tâ ki cennete giricek daḫı a'lâ makama yitişe-bile.

' The earnestness of the Believer must be such that he should strive and so be able to advance in the field of worship, in order that when he enters Paradise he may be able to attain to a higher station.' There is ground for speculation here, but taken at its face value this is an example of standardization to the *-e* form, of which a specimen has been given from a text approximately contemporary with this. It is striking that this standardized *-e* form should occur in combination with the auxiliary *bilmek*, which in *SN* provides several instances of regressive attraction of *-e* to *-i* (see the next paragraph). I have found a parallel, *irüre bildi*, in the *Fütûh*, but in a rather uncertain sentence.

2. *Çıkı*, *düzi*, *göri*, *idi*, *iri*, *sayı* in combination with *bilmek* (*SN*). These are all verbs which ordinarily have the affix *-e* for their gerund, corresponding to *-er* of the muzari. The reason for including *görmek* among these verbs has already been given (p. 304). The cause of these *-i* forms is undoubtedly the regressive influence of the auxiliary *bilmek* (see below). It was not a uniform or stable influence, as is shown by the fact that parallel to these six *-i* forms *SN* has the following six *-e* forms in combination with *bilmek* : *düze*, *gide*, *göre*, *ide*, *tuta*, *uça*, one case of each. Observe that three verbs supply both *-e* and *-i* examples.[2]

3. *Güli* in combination with *görmek* (*SN*). *Gülmek* also ordinarily has an *-e* gerund, and there is good reason for believing that here, too, we have regressive influence (see below).

[1] From *komak*.

[2] See also the remarks about *-ememek* on p. 318.

4. *İdü*, independent gerund (*SN*). The verse is as follows :—

Satu ḫarc idü kendüzüŋi ṭonat (260. 4)

'Sell (the jewels) and use the proceeds to array yourself', *idü* being a gerund of circumstance. The normal form is *ide*. I have no satisfactory explanation to offer.[1] Emendation would be easy, but of course our present object is to state and explain what we find in the texts, not to suggest corrections.

5. *Yanu*, occurring in the pair form, *yanu yanu* (*SN*). This example is of great interest. The standard reduplicated gerund of *yanmak* is *yana yana*, corresponding to the muzari *yanar* : it was very common in Old Ottoman, but I have not recorded an example from *SN*. It seems likely that in origin *yanu yanu* is not a reduplicated gerund at all, but a single gerund form from *yanu yanmak*, in which *yanu* is a noun and cognate object to *yanmak*. This expression occurs elsewhere in *SN*, e.g. 355. 12, *yanu yanmaḏum* : cf. also the analogous *sanu sanmak*. Now *yanu yanmak* would give a gerundial form *yanu yana*, which I suggest has been normalized as a pair form with uniform endings. One would perhaps rather expect a pair to be standardized in the *-e* form, as in the case of *yiye içe* quoted earlier. But observe that the cognate object and verb practically form one unit, *yanu yan-*, and would thus tend to remain as a fixed form.

Thus we see that reasonable philological explanations can be given for most of the exceptions. But in any case, even if the explanations are considered unacceptable, the exceptions are too few to affect the general position.

The -İ Forms

These texts vary in the extent to which they admit the *-i* forms. The extreme cases are *KD*, which has *-ü* in all examples but two in the first four categories (i.e. disregarding the *virmek* combination) and the *Cevâhir*, which always has *-i*. Unfortunately this latter text has only one example in which the *-i* form is contrary to fourfold harmony, *durı* ; but it is a striking example, for it occurs in the combination *durı-geldi*, which in Old Ottoman we constantly find as *duru-geldi*. This fact, combined with the uniformity with which the *-i* forms occur in the *Cevâhir* (it is the only one of these texts with *-i* in the pair form), suggests that we have here a standardized orthographic *-i*. In the case of *KD*, which in origin (but not in this copy) is the oldest of the texts we are examining, the uniform *-ü* may represent the speech habit of the early period ; but we cannot exclude the possibility of orthographic *-ü* standardization.[2] Of the others, *SN* and the Tefsir frag. are preponderantly *-ü* texts, while the *Cinân* is perhaps less certain. I have remarked that the only one of these texts to provide material for even superficial analysis is *SN* ;

[1] Note in this connexion the apparent persistence of *-ü* with *-ed-* stems, mentioned on p. 313 (footnote).

[2] The partial survival of *-ümez* in this text (see the *-ememek* list on p. 316) suggests that the *-ü* forms here are not orthographical ; but as we do not know the history of the transmission of the text we cannot say positively that there has not been standardization at some stage. I do not think this likely, but we must consider all possibilities.

but the conclusions which *SN* appears to warrant can to some extent be checked by reference to the other lists. The amount of certain information which we obtain is not great, and on some matters, for example the structural *-i* form, it is disappointingly small. There are, however, two important points which stand out: first, the regressive influence of *virmek*, *bilmek*, and *görmek*; and second, the strong tendency of the *-yü* form of vowel-stem verbs to persist, even against the regressive influence of the verbs just named.

How strong was the attraction of *virmek* can be seen by a glance at the special category devoted to it in the lists. No *-e* affix remains unchanged. Some have become *-ü*, but that is the result of vowel harmony, e.g. *koyu*, *sunu*, in the Tefsir frag., and *dutu* in the *Cinân*, the change being *suna* > *sunı* > *sunu*. In the case of *bilmek* we have also seen the same tendency in operation in a group of verbs in *SN*, and the same text provides one case of this change in combination with *görmek*. If these two verbs can sometimes cause a change *-e* > *-i*, we might expect *a fortiori* that they would also cause the *-ü* forms to change; and this, indeed, does frequently happen. In the second category in *SN* the *-i* form preponderates over *-ü*, most of the gerunds being in combination with *bilmek*, and one with *görmek*. In the other lists (excluding the *Cevâhir* from this discussion) there are two *-i* forms in this category, *eydi* in *KD*, in combination with *görmek*,[1] and *kılı* in the Cinân, combined with *bilmek*.

The persistence of *-yü* with vowel-stem verbs is remarkable. Among the affirmative verbs in this category in *SN* there is only one *-yi* form, *diyi*, and that combined with *bilmek*. But there are four cases of *-yü* with *bilmek*: *gizleyü* (80. 1), *beyzeyü* (178. 3), *bekleyü* (216. 14), *saḫlayu* (216. 11). (Compare this with the increased consonant stems in combination with *bilmek*: three with *-i*, *düleni* [295. 14], *başarı* [342. 8; 348. 7; 359. 5], *inanı* [286. 9]; one possible case of *-ü*, ? *yidürü* [305. 13], in a corrupt verse.) The *-yü* form also occurs three times with the auxiliary *görmek*. The four negative forms are all combined with *görmek*: two are changed and two remain as *-yü*. The occurrence of the *-yi* form with these negative verbs is suggestive: it may well be that the difference of stress (on the syllable before the negative affix) plays an important part. Even with *virmek* a few *-yü* forms survive, three in *SN* and one each in the other three texts. Of the three vowel-stem forms in the *Cinân*, *aldayu* is a pair, *aldayu aldayu*, while both *ağlayu* and *eriyi* are combined with *yorumak*[2] (the former occurring twice; about *eriyi* see below). It is unsafe to assume that these persistent *-yü* forms correspond to actual speech; they may be an orthographical habit, a stereotyped ending يو. We have no means of deciding the point.[3]

[1] But *eydi* is a special case, in which other phonological tendencies may be involved quite apart from the regressive influence of *görmek*.

[2] In this paper I assume that the form is *yorumak*.

[3] There may also be a tendency towards persistence of *-ü* in increased stems in *-ed*: the lists show examples from *SN* and the Tef. fr. in combination with *virmek*, and one of these, *öğredü*, also occurs in *SN* combined with *görmek*. But these examples are not sufficient to serve as a basis for any theory.

Unfortunately there is little evidence about what I have called the structural *-i* variant, meaning those cases of the *-i* form which are not attributable to regressive influence. Independent gerunds are rather uncommon, while in the case of the combined forms there is not enough evidence to show whether the auxiliary verbs (apart from the three already discussed) exercise any appreciable regressive influence or not. There is also the difficulty that in addition to combination with auxiliaries this gerund often occurs in association with certain main verbs, e.g. *isteyü gitmek* (or *varmak*) ' to go in search of ', a not uncommon phrase in Old Ottoman ; and that such associations may be close or loose,[1] a fact which has some phonological significance. In view of these uncertainties, in addition to those mentioned in the general discussion of the *-i* variant earlier in this paper, I am reluctant to commit myself to any conclusions. I shall confine myself to noting the following points :—

1. These texts, on the whole, represent a fairly early stage of the development of the *-i* variant in Ottoman, in which the *-ü* form still largely preponderates.

2. In some cases internal structure (both vowel and consonant) seems to have favoured the *-i* form. This is noticeable in some stems in *-eş*,[2] *-iş*, and in particular in the gerund *irişi*, which always has this form in these lists. In one case (*SN*) it is combined with *görmek*, which is sufficient to explain the *-i*, but in the other two cases (*Cinân* and Tef. fr.) it is in combination with *gelmek*, an auxiliary which does not seem to have a special influence on the preceding affix ; and one of these, that in the Tefsir frag., is contrary to the general orthographic habit of the writer. The case of *eriyi* in the *Cinân* is perhaps similar ; the fact that both *eriyi* and *ağlayu* occur in combination with the same verb, *yorumak*, provides an instructive comparison.

3. Some independent *-i* gerunds in which the form is contrary to fourfold harmony do occur, e.g. *urı* (*SN* 98. 7) :—

Kopuzın(ı) düzdi el urı kıla

' He tuned his lute, setting his hand to the strings '. This is the only completely independent *-i* form I have found in *SN*. In the other lists we find *ulaşdurı* (*KD*, also *ulaşduru*) and *şaşurı* (Tef. fr.), both exceptional forms for those texts, and both independent gerunds which have practically become adverbs.

Pair Forms

In these texts the pair forms are very regular and for this reason it has not been thought necessary to use space to classify them separately. The types are the reduplicated pair *giđe giđe*, *sevinü sevinü*, and the complementary pair *güle oynayu*. The only text to provide a considerable quantity is *SN*, which has some 30 pairs ; *KD* has two certain examples and one doubtful one, the *Cinân* has four, the Tefsir frag. seven, and the *Cevâhir* two. The only *-i* form occurs, as

[1] Association and combination will be discussed in the second part of this paper.

[2] Necâtî again supplies evidence : the gerund *dolaşı* rhyming with *mahveşi* (= *mahveş* + *i*, 3rd pers. affix).

one would expect, in the *Cevâhir* : *atılı atılı*. There is no case of the standardization of dissimilar terminations, except perhaps *yanu yanu* in *SN*, discussed above.

The structure of complementary pairs deserves some notice. These forms occur :—

SN : *güle oynayu* (syllabic rhythm 2–3)
gümürdenü söylenü (4–3)
öteleyü geçürü (4–3)
dağıdu yağışlayu (3–4)
KD : *çeke çevirü* (2–3).

But these examples are too few for any speculation about rhythmic pattern.

-E-REK/-Ü-REK

The familiar *-erek* gerund of modern Turkish, *giderek*, *isteyerek* (*istiyerek*), is only the *-e/-ü* form with the addition of the comparative and modifying affix *-rek*, which was widely used in Old Ottoman, sometimes expressing manner. This was a very natural development, somewhat analogous to the use of *-ce*. The new form thus produced had considerable advantages over the simple gerund, as we shall see in the second part of this study, where syntactical relations are discussed. In the written remains of the Old Ottoman period, however, it is not common. In fact it has been stated that it does not occur at all in 14th-century texts ; but this is not correct. *SN* has the gerund *göyerek* ' waiting ' three times (141. 4 ; 168. 10 ; 177. 14), and I have found *arayurak* ' searching ' in the verse *Maktel-i Hüseyn* (variously dated 760 and 770 in the two MSS. in the Bodleian).

Gönilsün Yemen yolına, göyerek
Bize, vü idinsün demürden yürek (*SN*. 141. 4)

' Let them set out on the way to Yemen, waiting for us, and let them have hearts of iron '.

From the *Maktel-i Hüseyn* :—

Arayurak geldi meğer bir yire (Bod., Hunt. 507)

' Now it happened that in his search he came to a certain place '.

In the texts studied here, in addition to *göyerek* in *SN*, I have found only this instance in the *Cevâhir* :—

Ḫalkdan ṣol vardurur ki Taŋrıya tapar kıyı kaparak (*Cev.* p. 45 ; Surah xxij. 11)

' There are those (there is he) of the people who worship God keeping to the margin ', where *kıyı kaparak* renders على حرف (for which see commentaries).

It is not unlikely that this form was in extensive use in current speech, and its apparent rarity may be due to the conservatism of written style. It occurs in the *Müzekki ün-Nüfûs* of Eşrefoğlu, a book which shows signs of rapid composition and is simple and natural in tone, and also in *Dede Korkud* (both

texts), a book not greatly influenced by literary tradition. I shall quote one specimen from the former work :—

Ola-kim bunuŋ fenasın aŋlayurak göŋlüŋi bundan götüresin

' Perhaps, realizing that it (the world) is transient, you will take your heart away from it '.

-EMEMEK/-ÜMEMEK

This verb form, developed by the fusion of the *-e/-ü* gerund and the old auxiliary verb *umak* ' be able ', was in Old Ottoman as in modern Turkish the standard form of impossibility, though in Old Ottoman we find sporadic cases of *-e-bilmemek*,[1] which survives in Azeri. In general its phonological pattern seems to have agreed with that of the muzari and of the gerund, and it underwent the same process of standardization to the *-e* form ; but at the same time there was some independent development. I shall allow the lists to speak for themselves. The classification is as before, but the order of the categories has been changed in the *SN* list for convenience. In the first four lists the verbs are printed as they occur in the texts ; with the *SN* list this was not possible, as some occur a number of times in various tenses, and they have therefore been simplified to *-mez*.

COMPARATIVE LISTS

	Kal. Dim.	Cinân.	Tefsir Fr.	Cevâhir.
1.	*göremez* *idemez*, etc. *iremez*	*dutamazın* *idemediler*	*doyamaduŋ*	*idemezem*, etc. *kıyamadılar* *sayamayasız*
2.	*bulumadı* *urımayavuz* **olamaz*	*bilimedüm* *bulımaz* *durımaz* *olımaz*	*bulımaz* (1) **bulamaz* (2) *kılımaz* **kılamaz* *virimedi*	—
3.	*assılanumaz* *başarumadı* *getürümedi* *gözedimedi* *kurtarımazsa*	*getürimedüm* *katlanımazsam*	—	*başarımazlar* **başaramayalar* **işitdüremezsin* *yaradımaz* (with vl. **yaradamaz*)
4.	*aŋlayumadı* *depeleyümez* *eyleyümez* *okıyımadı* *saklayumazvan*	*saklayımaz*	*söyleyümedi* **söyleyemez*	**aŋlayamaz-mısız* *işleyimezsiz*

[1] Şîrâzî has one example, *ide-bilmez*. I have also found it in the dictionary of Helîmî, and elsewhere.

SÜHEYL Ü NEVBAHAR

(*The order of the categories has been changed, for convenience.*)

1. Simple cons., *-e* type :—

(Normal.)	(Exceptional.)
ayamaz	
doyamaz	
gidemez (3)—	**gidimez* (1)
göremez (1)—	**görimez* (3)
idemez (3)—	**idimez* (4)
koyamaz	
tutamaz	
yazamaz	
yiyemez	—**yiyimez*
yitemez	
	**çekimez*
	**dirimez*
	**duyımaz*
	**kovımaz*
	**yudımaz*

4. Vowel stems : *-ü* (*-i*) :—

(Normal.)	(Exceptional.)
diyimez (2)—	**diyemez* (1)
aylayımaz	
yarayımaz	

The other two categories have no exceptional forms. They are as follows :—

2. Simple cons., *-ü* type : eight verbs with *-imez* :—

alımaz, bilimez, bulımaz, kılımaz, olımaz, ṭurımaz, urımaz, varımaz. (Of these *bilimez, bulımaz, olımaz* are numerous.)

3. Increased cons. : fourteen with *-imez*, two with *-ümez* :—

(*a*) *-imez* preceded by *e* or *i* : *başarımaz* (2), *eydimez* (2), *beyzedimez, ṭurışımaz* (2), *kımradımaz, katlanımaz, kurtılımaz, işidimez, dönderimez.*

(*b*) *-imez* preceded by *ü* : *içürimez, bitürımez, götürimez* (2), *dirşürimez, getürimez.*

(*c*) *-ümez* : *oturumaz, gönüldümez.*

These lists require little comment. The dual *-e/-ü* structure is clearly marked in the first four texts, but somewhat obscured in *SN* by the numerous *-imez* forms in the first or *-e-* category.

Standardization to the *-e-* type is more noticeable here than with the gerund. It is curious that the *Cinân*, which gave us the only standardized gerund, *yitişe*, is here the only text without standardized forms ; but its small list of nine verbs (in ten examples all told) is not serious evidence on this point.

The *-i-* form also is much more prominent than with the gerund, and in fact it is the standard form in all the texts except *KD*. In *SN* its prevalence is very marked ; there are only two *-ümez* forms, while in the first category *-imez*

occurs as frequently as *-emez*. This strongly suggests a phonological tendency towards *i* standardization, and it gives added significance to the *-i* variant gerunds of the first category with the auxiliaries *bilmek* and *görmek*. It will be recalled that these were a feature of *SN*, and did not occur in the other lists. However, it is better at the present stage to avoid speculation. We can content ourselves with the remark that in the texts before us *-ememek* appears to be more advanced phonologically than the gerund.

E-DUR IN THE GARIBNAME

I shall close this part of my study of the *-e/-ü* gerund with a brief note upon the interesting form *-e-dur* which occurs in the Garibname.

Old Ottoman had two gerund-auxiliary combinations which were used to express progressive action, *-e-durur* and *-e-yorur*. Of these the latter subsequently developed by haplology into the reduced form *-eyor* (*-iyor*), the continuous present tense of modern Turkish. I have not yet found any example of this reduced form in any 15th-century text, and have therefore excluded it from the present study. The combination *-e-durur* never developed in this way in standard Ottoman (although in Old Ottoman *durur*, *turur*, as a copula was already mainly used in the reduced form *dur*); and it has continued its existence as a combined form to the present day. But in the Garibname we find numerous instances of the reduced form *e-dur* (or perhaps *e-dür*) and I shall quote a few examples.[1]

Yir durub-dur göğe karşu intizar
Gök döne-dur dün ü gündüz bî-karar (Bâb viii, dâsıtân 6)

'The earth has taken its station facing the heavens expectantly, while the heavens continually turn, night and day, without cease'.

Odı gör-kim yüreğüŋde yana-dur
Issılığuŋ od değül-mi ye[2] ne-dür ? (Bâb iv, dâs. 1)[3]

'Look at the fire which is burning in your heart; if the heat within you is not fire, what then is it ?'

In the following example we have *-e-dur* + *iken* as *-edurken* (cf. Ott. *-eyorken*):—

Görü-durken cümle çirkin ḫuları
Eyle-yiken ḫoş dutarlar anları (Bâb iii, dâs. 9)

'Although they continually see the evil ways (of the people), in spite of this they approve of them'. This form *-edurken* is important, for it proves that the reduced *-dur* in these examples is the auxiliary *durmak* and not the copula.

[1] From a moderately good copy of the traditional text in my possession.

[2] I transcribe *ye* as the MS. has ﻳ not ﻴ.

[3] Also in Gibb, *Hist. of Ott. Poetry*, vi, p. 10, with small variations.—The reduced form *yana-dur* also occurs in a poem by Nesîmî, in the same vol. of Gibb, p. 37.

The full form *-e-durur* also occurs :—

'Işk içinde görnü-durur dost yüzi (Bâb viii, dâs. 5)

' In love the face of the Beloved is manifest ', or ' It is in love that . . .' (*görnü* = *görinü*).

* * *

This concludes the first part of this study. The reader is reminded that it only claims to be an exploratory investigation of facts, and that any interpretations offered in these pages are tentative.