VARIABLE FORMS IN THE QUTADGU BILIG

Marcel ERDAL

In recent years the Qarakhanid source material has been made incomparably more accessible to linguistic and philological study: The *Qutadgu Bilig* mainly through the publication of the *İndeks* and Dankoff's translation, the *Dīvān Luġāti 't-Turk* through Dankoff and Kelly's careful translation of the Arabic and critical edition of the Turkic elements of the work. I recently published some land contracts dating from the same period. There is no doubt at all that the QB is the most important source for describing the grammar of the Qarakhanid language. It is not a compilation like the DLT, but a coherent work; as a voluminous and varied text with a rich vocabulary, it contains all the necessary contexts for serving as a base for a full-fledged grammar.

In principle, the QB represents an idiolect. In practice we have three mss. from which an archetype should be reconstructed, with no guarantee that the text of this archetype is identical to what Yūsuf might have written in his autograph. Serious linguistic study of the QB can clearly be based only on the content of such a reconstruction, which is not what the edition of Arat, 1947 gives us: This has been demonstrated effectively by Dankoff's short paper on 'Textual problems in the Qutadgu Bilig' (*TUBA* 3 (1979): 89-99). The text cannot be constituted on the base of preconceived ideas about what Qarakhanid should be like, but rather on the base of the following rule, formulated by Dankoff: «Regard as spurious the peculiar readings in C or in A, and restore to the archetype whatever B and C, or B and A, agree on.» Arat, however, often did not even adopt the version of A, B and C together. I mainly used the indispensible *İndeks* for my research, but have, in all cases, checked the mss. as they appear in Arat's critical apparatus, and chosen the reading according tho Dankoff's principles. When I quote the QB in this paper, I mean what can be ascribed to the archetype in this manner, interpreted according to what I think should be the phonological form of Qarakhanid Turkic.

Today, I shall not address myself to textual criticism, however, but to various forms in which morphemes and lexemes appear in different passages of the text. One such alternation occurs with the word for 'millet', which appears as *uyur* or *üyür* in couplet 3612 but as *yur* or *yür* in 3614, 4768 and 4769. Why do two forms appear; how can they be justified? The QB is written in metre and rhyme. These two constitute constraints likely tho impel the poet to adapt his wording or the forms of his words to suit their pattern. To return to our example, we culd say that Yūsuf chose *üyür* when he needed two syllables and *yür* when his line had place only for one. But such practice has its limits: If the poet means *agı* 'precious textile, treasure' he clearly can't shorten this to *ag* to suit the metre, as that would be understood o signify 'net'. Nor can he change *käldim* to *ḳäldi* for the sake of rhyme, but has to reformulate what he wants to say. Can a poet write 'wrong' Turkic for the sake of the metre? Can poetic diction allow itself to be unidiomatic in some way? To answer such questions one has to determine the relevant traits of the grammar, a task which has not yet been undertaken as far as the QB is concerned. From the grammatical point of view, a text can make sense in two ways: Firstly internally, when grammatical rules independant of metre and rhyme are set up for it; secondly externally, by comparing it with other, contemporaneous, earlier or later texts. Can any such thing be said about the word for 'millet' mentioned above? Yes: Numerous Uigur variants which can be read as *yür, yur, ür, uyur* and *üyür* are quoted in Clauson's dictionary and in Zieme's 'Uigurische Pachtdokumente' (*AoF* VII (1980): 201). Yūsuf therefore did not just drop the first syllable of the word when he needed *yür* or add one when he needed *üyür:* He knew both variants, his readers presumably as well, and he chose between them for his purposes.

Let us look at some other cases: *tusu* 'benefit, advantage' appears eight times in the QB, five among these being with the possessive suffix as *tususı*. In couplet 3681, however, we meet the form *tusgı yog* in ms. B, rhyming with *asgı yok;* mss. A and C write *asgı yok* at the end of both lines. A and C come from the same source and are therefore together not more valuable in their evidence than B by itself. I find *tusgı yok* more appealing esthetically and feel it should be retained, but only because one can make sense of it from the linguistic point of view: *tusu,* well known from Old Turkic, is opaque as to morphological shape. Yūsuf uses a verb *tusul-* 'to be beneficial' a lot; analogy with the *-Xg* fromation would have created *tusug* even in prose. A simiar case is that of *yiti* 'sharp', which is attested very often in Old Turkic with no velar at the end. Although

yiti is clearly the original form (Old Turkic never dropping final /g/), Kāšġarī only uses *yitig,* in obvious analogy with adjectives constructed with the same formative. Yūsuf uses both *yiti* and *yitig,* and they must have existed side by side in his language. *This* distinction happens not to be employed by him for metric or rhyming purposes, and we find two otherwise similar lines containing the two forms: *yiti kıl bo köz* (927 and 1252) vs. *yitig kıl közüg* (4393). Both *yiti* and *yitig* can here safely be ascribed to the archetype and the variation, not being due to metre, was real. Similarly, then, the variation *tusu* ~ *tusug,* which *was* used for poetic purposes.

As against thrice *tarıglag* 'cultivated field' in the QB, we find one instance of *tarlag* in one of Yūsuf's odes. While being metrically siginificant, this variation also corresponds to Yūsuf's place in the history of the Turkic languages: Old Turkic and Kāšġarī only use *tarıglag,* while all the post-Qarakhanid sources quoted in Clauson's dictionary have *tarlag.* The syncopated form must have been current in speech before it appeared in writing. Yūsuf knew both variants, and was free to use either without diverging from natural usage. A similar case it that of *kulgak* 'ear' vs. *kulak.* In all three instances of the former, the first syllable scans long, while it scans short in all 17 examples of *kulak* which appear in Yūsuf's work. It was thus clearly the metre xhich determined the choice between the two. The Old Turkic form of this lexeme is *kulkak,* documented in sources employing Runic, Brāhmī, Manichean and Tibetan writing. Kāšġarī knows *kulak, kulkak* and *kulḫak,* but says that first of these is 'more correct' than the other two. *kulgak,* while attested only in Yūsuf's work, is the link between the older *kulkak* and the younger *kulak.* The subsequent development of *kulgak* is similar to that of *kärgäk,* which has a variant *käräk* attested in very early sources like the Catechism in Tibetan writing recently published both by Maue and Röhrborn and by Moriyasu. The medial velar of nouns ending on the sequence consonant + *gAk* appears to have been dropped first in lexemes which had a velar also at their beginning, as *kärgäk* and the QB's *kulgak.* Only in Middle Turkic was the medial velar dropped also where there was no initial one. Both *kulak* and the fuller forms were in evident use in Qarakhanid Turkic. Note that *ämgäk* 'pain', of there are 90 examples in the QB, retains its /g/ in all of them: Although *ämäk* does, of course, appear in later texts, it would not have been correct for Yūsuf to use such a form, as there is no dissimilating velar in the first syllable. That would have been beyond the limit set to poetic licence.

elt- and *elät-* to lead' alternate for no reason I can see throughout Uigur, in Buddhist as well as in Manichean texts. The DLT mentions only the bisyllabic *elät-* (thus!) in its lemma in fol. 115, but in verse in fol. 398 we find *eltip*. The QB has 12 instances of *elät-* and 19 of *elt-*, both forms followed both by consonants and vowels. There is no visible justification for the alternation other than verse, a good enough reason in this case. With *kılk* ~ *kılık* 'behaviour', which also has an /l/ in the middle, the situation is different: There are 235 instances of *kılk* of which 216 are followed by a vowel (either of a suffix or of the following lexeme), and 48 instances of *kılık*, 40 among them at the end of the line or followed by a consonant. This means that, in general, *kılk* appeared before vowels, *kılık* where there was no following vowel, and where the cluster /lk/ would have had to close the syllable. The 27 instances which do not follow this distribution, which represent 9½ %, can, again, be justified only by the metre. Kāšγarī choses the pausal form *kılık* for his lemma in fol. 193, but adds that «the *lām* may also be unvowelled». It is this permissiveness of the language which Yūsuf has put to use.

kıyın, *kıyn* and *kın* 'punishment, torture, pain' are all common in Old Turkic texts. In the QB *kıyın* appears 5 times, *kın* 6, *kıyın* with suffixes starting with a consonant, *kın* with suffixes starting with a vowel. Among the four unsuffixed examples, two have the form *kıyın*, two *kın*. The choice lies by the metre again, but the alternatives were offered by the language and not invented. The alternation *kayuda* ~ *kayda* 'where' does not parallels in other texts to explain and justify it, as the syncopation of the final vowel of *kayu* before +*dA* seems to be natural. If we do turn to other texts, however, we find that the alternation of the QB constitutes a simplification of a more complex alternation : The DLT has *kayuda* in fol. 62, *kanda* in fol. 38, changed to *kayda* by a later hand. *kanda* can be explained only if starting off from *kañuda*, attested as *kanyuda* in TT II A 11 and U II 6, 13 and 16. Syncopating the second vowel, this gives **kañda*, which, containing the impossible cluster /ñd/, straightway becomes *kanda*. *kanda* must therefore have come into existence before /ñ/ changed to /y/ in the major Uigur dialect; it is not a borrowing from the dialect which changed /ñ/ to /n/ instead, but the result of neutralising assimilation, We find *kanda* e.g. in KP 58, 4, Suv 114, 17 and TT VIII F 7, *kayuda* e.g. in U II 29, 11, USp 17, 10 and TT VIII A 36. The step to *kayda* was therefore logical not only metrically but also by analogy. *kayda* and *kayuda* alternate also in the tafsīrs, in which metrical considerations can have played no part.

bärk and its derivates, and *birlä,* appear in the QB and also in many other sources both with and without /r/. Among these, we have only checked the distribution of the derived verb forms *bäkü-/bäki-, bärkit-/bärküt-* and *bäküt-/bäkit-*. Let us first deal with the alternation *i/ü* in the formative. The group AC has *bäk+ü-* and seven times *bäküt-,* ms. B *bäk+i-,* twice *bäkit-* and four times *bäküt-;* in 6497, B is missing. We would have dismissed the variant with *i* as an occasional idiosyncracy of the scribe of B, had we not found the forms in the DLT fol. 420 to be written *bäkütti/bäkitür/bäkitmäk,* had we not known that B is, after all, the most isportant ms. and had we not the forms with /r/ : Among those, *bärkütüp* appears only in 794BC, while four other couplets have *bärkitip* in all mss. This is corroborated by DLT fol. 433, which writes *bärkitti/bärkitür/bärkitmäk.* On the other hand, we might mention *bärkü-* of the *Rylands Interlinear Coran Translation,* and *bärküt-* of the tafsīr quoted by Clauson. All this may come from the fact that both *+I-* and *+U-* serve as denominal formatives or, more likely, be due to analogy with *-It-* verbs. The latter possibility implies that the *+U-* variants represent the historically original form, but is no proof that Yūsuf actually used this original form and not the one influenced by analogy. However the case may be, we find that the first syllable of *bärkit-* and *bärküt-* always scans long, while the first syllable of *bäkit-/bäküt-* is always short in the metre pattern. The choice, again, belonged to the metre. The alternation may, however, have been quite free in actual use, to judge from the loan contract for half a ton of wheat published Zieme (*AoF* VII (1980)) : The name of the borrower there appears as *Bäkümiş* in lines 2 and 4 but as *Bärkümiş* in line 9. Both instances clearly refer to the same person and, for all the persons concerned could have cared, he could have been called either way.

The alternation between *tutçı* (33 instances), *tutaşı* (5 instances) and *tuçı* is clearly determined by metre : When a sequence of short-long is needed, the text has *tuçı, tutaşı* when short-long-long is needed, and *tutçı* for long-short or long-long (short-short never occurs in this metric pattern). The entry *tutşı* of the *İndeks* should be deleted : This is a variant of *tutçı* appearing eight times in B and five times in A but hardly to be ascribed to the archetype. We should quote the entry *tutşı* of DLT fol. 213, in a section on bisyllables : Saying that «the *šīn* is here related to *jīm*», Kāşğarī adds that one may say *tutçı.* «A variant of the same word is *tutaşı*», he says, writing this with an *alif,* and offers the sentence *män saŋa tutaşı barır män* 'I go to you habitually' as an example. *tutaşı,*

not attested outside Qarakhanid Turkic, is clearly not an invention of Yūsuf, and is probably derived from an alternant to the base *tut-* found also in *tutam* 'a handfull'. In Uigur, *tutçı* dominates, nine examples being known to me, whereas the original *tutşı* appears to be attested only in Barmh 20. After voiceless consonants, /š/ becomes /č/ also in the DLT's *kikçür-, yapçur-* and *tapçur-* and in the QB's aorist from *yapçur* from *yapış-*. *tuçı* is not attested elsewhere, however; is it a mere metrical device? I think not, and can give *okıçı* as a parallel. This is a variant of *okıtçı* 'a summoner' attested in 36 ABC, 3470 B and 5022 A. *okı-t+çı*, formed like *basutçı, ölütçi, kütçi, yititçi, köçütçi, ögitçi, boşgutçı* and *küzätçi*, no doubt stood in the archetype in the three instances mentioned in the *İndeks* but in couplet 36, the archetype must have had *okıçı*. *okıçı* is scanned short-long-long like the instances of *okıtçı* and cannot have been written down *metri gratia*. Rather, *okıçı*, like *tuçı*, represents the simplification of the consonant cluster [ttš] to [tš]. Note that *tuçı* and *tutşı* differ in syllabification but not in phonetic structure, since /č/ = [tš]; so *tuçı* may just be this inherited earlier from.

So much for phonetics and phonology. One other lexical matter is the alternation of *biri* (80 instances) and *birisi* (about 40), well documented also in all forms of Middle Turkic from the tafsirs on. There are important syntactic differences between these two in Modern Turkish and it should be asked whether this is not the case in the QB as well.

Most alternations wihich Yūsuf could evaluate metrically came from morphology. A well-known one which was clearly not brought up for the sake of the metre is that of the aorist suffixes for verb stems ending in vowels. While *-yUr* is incomparably more commen in Old Turkic, *-r* comes to dominate from Qarakhanid Turkic on. Throughout Middle Turkic *-yUr* remains in use, however, as documented e.g. by Brockelmann, 1954: 231, in prose no less than in verse. In the QB, too, *-r* appears much more often than *-yUr*, but we find *-yUr* where needed: *bädüyür* vs. *bädür, mäŋzäyür* vs. *mäŋzär*, twice *teyür* vs. 257 times *ter, yarayur* vs. *yarar, yaruyur* vs. *yarur*, 5 times *yeyür* but 61 times times *yer. çoglayur, sözläyür* and *tuyur* have no counterpart in *-r*, and once *küçäyür* is matched by once *küçär*. Couplet 604 even has *yarur* and *yarayur* in the same line. Rhyme may also have been at work in selecting these forms, as some of them ryhme with *bolur, ayur, yatur, sanur* and *turur*, which have no *a* aorists. Elsewhere I showed how rhyme influences the choice of the aorist vowel in some consonant verbs in which this vowel fluctuates, like *alır ~ alur*.

Variations in the modal forms are quite frequently used both for regulating metre and rhyme. In the first person we have the old form *-AyIn* alternating with *-AyI* and *-Ay*. The second ode in fact has *-AyI* uniting the second lines of all the couplets in a single rhyme pattern, with frequent use of the form also within verses, which proves the bisyllabic scanning of the suffix In the second person singular, the endingless imperative alternates with the suffix or enclitic *gIl,* in the second person plural *-Xŋ* with *-XŋlAr*. The third person puts two additional form beside the suffix *-sUn,* which comes from earlier *-zUn* : A short variant *-sU* and a lengthened one, *-sUnI*. As distinct from all other variants recorded in this paper, these two are not easy to fond elsewhere. They are not isolated altogether, however : Doerfer in *Fundamenta,* I quotes *kätsini* referring to the third person in some Crimean dialect; *-sUlAr* is attested in the *Atabatu'l-Haqā'iq* as well, and *-sU* reminds us of the archaic phrase *täŋri yarlıqazu* 'God willing' in Toñ 53 and KT E 29. *-sU* may, of course, also just be the result of a weakening of the nasal by getting absorbed in the vowel, as happens in French, Chinese etc. Yūsuf, at any rate, played with the variants for his literary purposes. Witness the lime *aşasu yaşasun Luqman ynlı* (123 b), in which *aşasu* and *yaşasun* are in evident semantic parallelism, or *yorımasu bäglär sözi* in 1314, where *-sUn* would have been long by position. In couplet 5395, *ye-sü* rhymes with *tusu* 'benefit' which *yesün,* of course, would not have done. In fact, *-sUn* never appears to have been actually necessary, seeing that *-sU* can be scanned as long even before vowels, e.g. in couplets 5589 and 3178. Nor does *-sUn* ever appear in rhyme, at any rate, in rhyme with anything other than itself. It is difficult to find cases, as in 2455, where all mss. have *-sUn*. Whereas the functional load on *-sUn* is low, then, *-sU* and *-sUnI* are fully employed for purposes of metre and rhyme.

Nominal morphology, too, had some fluctuations to offer to the poet. In the accusative there were the competing suffixes *+Xg* and *+nI,* the latter transferred from the pronominal domain into the nominal one in many Turkic languages. This choice can regulate the number of syllables with bases ending in vowels, as with *kişini* vs. *kisig* and *yagın* vs. *yagıg* 'the enemy'. When followed by a vowel, *+nI* can be short while *+Xg* is long by position. Thus *ajunug tutayın tesä* (1748) vs.

sunup iki ajunn tutgu älig (351). In words such as *yigitlikni, ädgülükni, tiriglikni* and *könilikni, +nI* makes the syllable before it long by position: Metrical length may not have been compatible with the inherent nature of the vowel of this syllable. In many other cases, however, the alterna-

tion *+Xg - +nI* appears to have been perfectly arbitrary, e.g. in *≠ölümüg sakınsa* (1139) vs. *≠ölümni biligli* (1141) and *ogulug yava≠* (4509) vs.

≠asıgsız ogulnı yagı bil (3003). The *İndeks* also lists *+I* as accusative ending, but with that one has to be sure that the suffix is not the possessive added to object nouns. For, it is clear that possessed forms can be used as direct object even when no accusative suffix is added. E.g. *açtı uştmaḫ yolı≠* (63); rhymes with *yäli), bo tul tom suçlup* (84) and *yagı boynı ägdi kötürdi özün* (101; «The enemy, with bent neck, removed himself from view.»). In the first of these, rhyme is a good reason for not writing 'yolın'; why the third instance (attested in mss. A and B) should have *boynı* and not *'boynın'* is not clear to me, unless this is just a spontaneous lightening. In this use, *+I* alternates not only with the inherited *+In;* such objects appear also with a young ending *+InI,* due, again, to analogy from the pronominal declension. *+InI* forms appear often, but by no means exclusively, at the end of lines. As against 82 examples of *sözin,* for instance, there are 8 examples of *sözini.*

Qarakhanid word length is regulated not only in suffixes but also by syncopating the stem itself, as a rule in its second syllable. In order to discover the syncopations which are connected with metre, we had first to find out what grammatical rules apply to them in Yūsuf's language. Only syncopations not demanded by linguistic rules, or syncopations not carried out even though such rules demand them, can be ascribed to metrical considerations. What, then, are the rules in this matter? Syncopation applies only if the stem is followed by a suffix starting with a vowel. Concerning nouns and adjectives, such suffixes are either the accusative and instrumental endigs *+Xg* and *+Xn* or the possessive suffixes. I have not found a single instance of the presence of the accusative suffix leading to syncopation: Cf. twice *ogulug* vs. *oglum, oglıp, ogli, oglınıŋ, oglıŋa* etc., some of these with many examples. With respect to syncopatin, we can distinguish three groups of nominals: The first group comprises only opaque nouns: The names of parts of the body *boguz, yarın, köŋül, boyun, köküz, karın, mäŋiz* and *älig;* further, the nouns *ogul* 'one's son', *orun* 'one's place or seat' and *bodun* and *-ögür,* 'tribe' and 'herd' respectively. These syncopate their second vowel both with possessive and instrumental suffixes. If the second vowel of the name of a limb is wide, as with *adak* 'foot', there is no syncopation even with possessive suffixes. The second groups shows syncopation with possessive suffixes but not when instrumental *+Xn* is added to the stem.

This group comprises transparent nouns and adjectives which all end in /g/, most of them clearly formed with *-Xg: ötüg, tapug, tatıg, tirig, käzig, urug, ülüg, bilig, yulug, osug, kurug, asıf* and *kapug*. As with the first group, the second vowel of all the lexemes belonging to this group as well is /i ı ü u/ alternating according to fourfold harmony; secondary rounding in *kapug* and *tapug* is due to /p/. Other nominals, the third group, never, or hardly ever, syncopate, even when followed by possessive suffixes. They include transparent terms ending in /g/ like *körüg, etig, açı-g, biti-g* and *bodu-g*, and opaque ones like *kiçig, sarıg* and *ulug*. Further, transparent nominals formed with suffixes of fourfold harmony like *bil-iş, uk-uş, sak-ış, çık-ış, kär-iş, kir-iş, ük-üş, sök-üş; öl-üm, tul-um; tüg-ün, tüz-ün, yal-ın* etc., and practically opaque ones like *kılıç, tamur* and *yavuz* (secondary rounding), *ıdış, kümüş, yemiş, uvut, tokuz, uçuz* and *esiz*. In *açıg, bitig* and *bodug*, the second vowel belongs to the stem and not to the *-Xg* suffix, and this must originally have been the case also with *etig* and *körüg*, as I have shown elsewhere. It appears, therefore, that syncopation with possessive affixes but not with the instrumental applies only to *-Xg* forms when the vowel to be syncopated belongs to the suffix and not to the stem. I have counted 785 instances which corroborate these rules versus 17 which contradict them, i.e. approximately 2 %. These 2 % are evidently there *metri gratia;* e.g.

urugı silig ≠ (3015) vs. *isiz urgı bulur* ≠ (806). Further : *bo bäglär kapugı äräj kapgı ol* (2992);

muŋar mäŋzätü aydı bilgi açok / bo söz tutmaz ärniŋ biligi bıçok (2992). In couplets 3573-3588 alone, twice *tatıgı* alternates with thrice *tatgı*. Even names of body parts vary for the sake of the metre: In 1109 we meet *köŋülüŋ*, which differs from 200 isntances where this stem does syncopate its second vowel. Such alternation within one couplet (4589):

boguzuŋ küdäz bolma ärniŋ ılı
bo bozguŋ üçün bolma yalŋok kulı.

In short, the rules generally hold, unless Yūsuf can manage both verse form and rhyme and meaning only by infringing upon them.

We now turn to the syncopation of verb stems, which occurs before the suffixes *-Xp, -AyIn, -XgII, -U/A, -Ur/Ar, -UmAz* and *-UmAdI*. The vowels of *-Xl-, -Xn-, -Xş-, -Xz-* and, notably, *-Ur-* are syncopated, and so is the vowel of *-tUr-* before *-U*. Syncopation applies also to the second vowels of opaque stems of the form *(C)VCVC-* if this vowel is narrow; e.g. *adır-, äsür-, kadır-, dür-, yügür-, ayıt-, äşit-, igid-, ayın-* and *tupul-*.

Not syncopated in any position are the second vowels of *unıt-* and of bases ending in vowels, and the vowels of the formatives *-It-, -Ar-, +Ad-, +Ar-, -dUr-* (except before *-U), -gUr-* and, notably, *-Xk-* (attested only once, in ms. A) and *+Xk-* (rather more common). In one case, in *tındrur* (1876), *-dUr-* is syncopated even before the aorist ending. There are fluctuations with *oldrup* vs. *oldurur, öldrür* vs. *öldürür* and *çıkrur* (once; thus!) vs. *çıkarur*: All these are 'new' verbs replacing earlier *olur-, ölür-* and *taşgar-* respectively, and usage concerning them may not have settled down as yet. Leaving these aside, we found 419 instances for and only 8 instances against the above formulation. The vowel of *-Ur-*, for instance, is syncopated 40 times; the only exception, *äştürüp* in 5656, may have been left as it is because syncopation would have led to a difficult consonant cluster and because the form may have looked like a *-tUr-* verb and not a derivate from *äşit-*. Exceptions include *basmur* (2368), *irilür* (741) and *äşitip* (6429) vs. 9 times *äştip*. Such aberrations can, again, be accounted for only by the metre.

If all this is not enough for the syllable and rhyme pattern, one can have recourse to the particle *A, yA* after vowels, which could be added to nouns and verbs and, in general, to any part of speech, in any form. It appears at the end of lines, as Dankoff remarks in his review of the *İndeks,* thus particularly serving the rhyme; occasionally, we find it in the middle, however, e.g. in *oglum a!* in direct speech in couplet 1251. The alternation between the interjections *ay!* and *aya!,* which both appear anywhere in the line, might be mentioned as a further use of this enclitic *A*. Emphatic and vocative *A!* is not an invention of Yūsuf either, and wehave it in the following quatrain in DLT fol. 441 :

beriŋ maŋa sözkiyä
mäŋlig kara tuzkıya
yelvin tutar közkiyä
muŋum mänig biliŋ - ä

I hope to have shown that the assessment of the function of poetic licence in the Qutadgu Bilig is closely linked to the discovery of the rules regulating the grammar of the language of its author. Yūsuf can be said to have diverged from 'correct' Qarakhanid Turkic only to an exceedingly limited extent, and, on the other hand, to have made maximal use of variations existing in the natural speech of the society to which he belonged. No language community is monolithic, and even 'standard Qarakhanid' left many choices open. It is the art of the poet to choose without diverging from usage and norm.