

On the Renewal and Reinterpretation of "Instrumental" Gerunds in Turkic

Lars Johanson

Oriens, Vol. 31. (1988), pp. 136-153.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0078-6527%281988%2931%3C136%3AOTRARO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D

Oriens is currently published by BRILL.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. 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/journals/bap.html.

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.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org
Fri Aug 24 04:23:25 2007

ON THE RENEWAL AND REINTERPRETATION OF "INSTRUMENTAL" GERUNDS IN TURKIC

by

Lars Johanson

Mainz

⟨B⟩ and ⟨BAn⟩

Most Turkic languages possess a "gerund"[1] based on a suffix ⟨B⟩, an element consisting minimally of a labial consonant[2]. ⟨B⟩ has been etymologized in various ways[3]; and we shall refrain from adding new proposals here[4]. In some Turkic texts and dialects, ⟨B⟩ may be followed by an element ⟨An⟩. Scholars have left no conceivable etymological explanation untried for this item either: it has been considered an allative[5], an instrumental[6], a locative[7] suffix, etc. It is not even certain whether the forms of the type ⟨B⟩ + ⟨An⟩ are "enlarged varieties" of ⟨B⟩[8] or represent an earlier stage of development than

[1] A verbal adverb, for which also the term "converb" is employed in the Turcological literature.

[2] Angular brackets of the ⟨ ⟩ are used here to mark *interlingual units*, comprising forms from different Turkic languages of various stages of development on the basis of etymological identity. The morphophonemic variation of ⟨B⟩, inter alia, the possible presence of a "buffer consonant" [y], the quality of the vowel preceding the consonant in some allomorphs, and the phonetic shape of the labial element itself—e.g., [p], [b], [b̯], [β] etc.—will not be discussed here, since this variation does not seem to have any bearing on our subject. There is, e.g., no evidence whatsoever for an Old Turkic fortis-lenis distinction *-p* (gerund): *-b* (participle) as supposed by O. Pritsak (1961).

[3] It has, inter alia, been compared to Tungusic *-fi, -pi*, Finno-Ugric *-pa, -pä* (K.H. Menges 1968, 136; M. Räsänen 1957, 191). B.A. Serebrennikov explains it as a relic of an old comitative-instrumental case in *-p, -b* (to which he even assigns the Chuvash instrumental {bA}; 1964, 133 sq.). According to A.N. Kononov, it originates from an Altaic verb **b°-* (cf. *bo-l-*) "to become" (1965, 110), according to P.I. Kuznecov, from the Turkic verb *ba-n-* "to bind to oneself" (1983, 60).

[4] *-yub*, appearing as an allomorph in Old Ottoman, might represent an early shape of the suffix, maybe a contraction product of **-yū + B...* (cf. Mongolian **-ǯu* (*-ǯu bai-*, etc.), just as the aorist *-yūr* may go back to **-yū + är...* (L. Johanson 1976). If **[ba:šla:yu:b̯] is older than [bašlab̯] (cf. **[ba:šla:yu:r]* > [bašlar]), there may have been a similar development with consonant stems, i.e., **ël°-yū är...* ≫ [alur] and **ël°-yū B...* ≫ [alub̯]. The development must then have gone faster with ⟨B⟩ than with the aorist, since Orkhon Turkic, as a matter of fact, shows no non-contracted forms, no clear traces of **-yū*, no signs of an original labial vowel. Early Old Ottoman, on the other hand, shows predominantly {(y)UB} (see G. Doerfer 1985, 33 sqq.).

[5] See, e.g., W. Bang 1917, 48.

[6] See, e.g., G.J. Ramstedt 1952, 132 (considering also an "instructive" origin), A. Caferoğlu 1970, 138, A.M. Ščerbak 1962, 173 sq., I.N. Ševašidze 1986, 90.

[7] See D. Sinor 1944.

[8] See A.v. Gabain 1950, 120 sq., T. Tekin 1968, 183.

the simpler form[9]. Most of these problems seem unsolvable without thorough investigations into the syntactic use of the items involved. Thus, the following considerations are not meant as a further contribution to the etymological segmentation of suffix elements but rather as a reexamination of some functional conditions for the use of the gerund types in question.

The distributional situation appears to be essential: whereas ⟨B⟩ is common and very frequent in older and newer languages, ⟨BAn⟩ plays a rather weak rôle in the history of Turkic. It is found in Runic Turkic[10], in the so-called "N-dialect" of Uighur[11], seldom in Qarakhanid and Khwarazmian Turkic[12], more frequently in older Ottoman, although only in poetry[13]. Thus, from the very beginning of the morphological history known to us, ⟨BAn⟩ seems to be a unit in retreat. About its use in spoken Turkic almost nothing is known; and, in the literary languages, it is obviously fading away rather early[14]. A remarkable exception is Azeri[15], where ⟨BAn⟩ still exists as an archaic feature

---

[9] A development from **-yūban* might be plausible, if, e.g., the nasal loss is seen as parallel to such cases as Proto-Turkic **bïŋan* = Mongolian *minggan*); cf. the archaic variant in *-a* in the earliest Uighur inscription (Šine-usu N 6, E 11) *b¹ñga* [bïŋa]; see G.J. Ramstedt 1918, 45.

As for the vowel preceding the labial consonant, however, the earliest form known is [X] and not [U]. Contrary to A.N. Kononovs statement (1965, 101), labial vowels are not predominant in the Runic Turkic forms. In the book of divination called "Irq Bitig" (H.N. Orkun, 1938, 73 sqq.), there is no sign of a labial vowel, if the vowel of the preceding syllable is nonlabial. Even in Old Ottoman, {IbAn} seems to be older than {UbAn} (G. Doerfer 1985, 33 sqq.). Cf., however, Qarakhanid notations like (K 60) *b'rw*b'n°* [baruban]. A.N. Kononov's alleged variant "*-aban*" (1965, 102) is simply the regular ⟨BAn⟩ form of *bulna-* "to capture". As for a "buffer consonant" [y], there is no trace of it in Old Turkic. A.N. Kononov (1965, 101 sq.) claims that {(y)XbAn} (e.g., the variant "*dä-j-°bän*" "сказав") occurs in Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī, but, in reality, we find forms such as (K 161) *y*k°s'b'n°* [yüksäbän] and (K 547) *tbn* [tebän].

[10] Infrequently; with predominance over ⟨B⟩ only in Irq Bitig.

[11] K.H. Menges (1968, 135): "the older layer of Ujγur with *n* < *ñ*, but otherwise rare in Ujγur". For this dialect of the Manichaean texts see A. v. Gabain 1950, 5. G. Clauson qualified it as "Türkü written in a non-Runic alphabet" (1972, xiv).

[12] M. Mansuroğlu 1959, 105; J. Eckmann 1966, 149: "occurs only in poetry for metrical convenience" ("zur Versfüllung"; 1959, 128).

[13] G. Doerfer 1985, 33.

[14] It is, however, also found in older documents in Tatar, Turkmen, etc. (A.N. Kononov 1965, 102). For the older Turkmen literary language, see J. Benzing 1939, 41. M. Ergin claims that ⟨BAn⟩ was preserved in Ottoman very long ("Osmanlıcanın son devirlerine kadar kullanılmıştır"; 1962, 326).

[15] As a matter of fact, it might be preserved also in Yakut, where the functional equivalent of ⟨B⟩ is the so-called gerund of "anteriority" in {(A)n}. The derivation of this gerund from "das alte Nomen perfecti auf -**yan*" (N. Poppe, 1959, 682) is unsatisfactory because it presupposes an untypical word class shift. If {(A)n} originates from the Mongolian gerund in *-n*, the suffix could only have been falsely detached from forms of verbs ending in *-A* (e.g. *ire-n*). It may also have some connection with the Old Turkic gerund {(y)Xn}, which, however, is provided with a "buffer consonant" [y]. {(A)n} might as well be the product of an intervocalic labial consonant loss, which is quite normal in Yakut: e.g. **[VbAn] > [A:n] (dialects) > [An]. C. Brockelmann considered *-an* < *-γan* etc. to be identical with ⟨An⟩ in ⟨B⟩ + ⟨An⟩ (1916, 199). We think, however, that Yakut {(A)n} may be etymologically identical with the entire form ⟨BAn⟩.

in dialects[16] and has, moreover, been widely used in the literary language —also in prose—until the beginning of our century[17].

The rather limited productivity of ⟨BAn⟩ may tell us something about the relative age of this morphological category: it is not likely to be a recent type. But is there a functional difference between ⟨B⟩ and ⟨BAn⟩? The answers to this question have generally been negative. Thus, A.N. Kononov considers ⟨B⟩ and ⟨BAn⟩ grammatical synonyms or almost doublets[18]. On the other hand, some Turcologists, including several native speakers of Turkic languages, tend to discern differences in meaning[19]. The most important statement on the subject has, in our view, been made by A. Caferoğlu (1958). This Turkish scholar of Azerbaijan extraction, whose competence in both Azeri (his mother tongue) and Turkish is beyond all doubt, asserts that the use of ⟨BAn⟩ in literary Azeri is very similar to the use of the Turkish {(y)ArAk} gerund[20]. For several independent reasons, we are inclined to consider this weighty testimony[21] the most promising point of departure for a functional analysis of a possible opposition ⟨BAn⟩ : ⟨B⟩.

Qualities of ⟨B⟩

Like all Turkic gerundial suffixes[22], ⟨B⟩ is a conjunctor, i.e., one of the possible predicators of nonfinite propositions, comparable to conjunctions in languages of other types. It conjoins hypotactically the segment based on it with a superordinate segment at some functional level of the sentence. In spite of various language-specific differences, the particular and typical task of ⟨B⟩ is to *duplicate* the function of the superordinate segment (signalling that it

---

[16] The form has a broad distribution, especially in Guba and the northern dialects (M. Š. Širaliev 1960, 98).

[17] A. Caferoğlu (1958).

[18] "/.../ грамматические синонимы, порою (например, в рунических текстах) приближающиеся к дублетам" (1965, 106; cf. also 1980, 130). The author supports this statement with references to W. Radloff, V. Thomsen, P.M. Melioranskij, K.H. Menges, S.E. Malov, A. von Gabain, and H. Mirzäzadä.

[19] E.g., S. Çagatay ascribes a final, purposive meaning to the Old Ottoman ⟨BAn⟩ form (1947, 31). O. Pritsak suggests that Old Turkic ⟨B⟩ is a "Converbium Perfecti" and ⟨BAn⟩ a "Converbium Plusquamperfecti" (1963, 44). V.M. Nasilov considers ⟨BAn⟩ to express a preceding action ("предшествующее действие") in the Orkhon-Yeniseian documents (1963, 50 sq.).

[20] This affinity is clearly exaggerated in M. Ergin's grammar, where the two suffixes are characterized as functionally identical ("farksız"; 1962, 327).

[21] I had the privilege of discussing this and similar functional problems with Prof. Caferoğlu during a visit to Istanbul in 1968, and want to take this opportunity, more than a decade after his untimely death, to express my reverence for this remarkable scholar.

[22] These may be simple, consisting of one suffix morpheme, or complex, containing more (even free) morphemes.

functions at the same level of surface structure hierarchy)[23]. This conjoining function resembles, in spite of the hypotactical form, that of some coordinative devices in other languages. Since ⟨B⟩ conveys no additional semantic idea (temporality, causality, instrumentality, conditionality, etc.) in a systematic way, it is often considered a conjunctor with rather "vague" functions.

Although other qualities of ⟨B⟩ may vary, it generally displays a meaning of "totality" or "terminality" derived from aspectual values established in its opposition to intraterminal gerunds, normally ⟨A⟩[24]. Since "terminal" items easily lend themselves to interpretations in terms of sequence, ⟨B⟩ is often used as a "plot-advancing" form, whereas the intraterminal ⟨A⟩ is not; i.e., the opposition may be interpreted in terms of temporal succession vs. overlapping.

Inherence

The Turkish {(y)ArAk} gerund, probably consisting of ⟨A⟩ with the addition of the comparative and modifying suffix ⟨rAk⟩, has taken over the intraterminal functions from the old ⟨A⟩ gerund, including various contextually and situationally conditioned shades of meaning. The latter are comparable to the interpretative possibilities offered by corresponding finite verb forms of an intraterminal aspect (Turkish {(I)yordu}, French *imparfait*, etc.)[25]. In a similar way, the segment based upon ⟨ArAk⟩ can often be interpreted in terms of inherence, temporal inclusion, logical implication, instrumentality, causality, specification, explicative comment, concomitance, accessory circumstances, etc. The particular relation may be rendered by such adverbial expressions as "thus", "and so", "therefore", "in this manner", "thereby", "therewith", "hence", "consequently", "that is", "moreover", "in other words", etc.

This is one of the typical features of ⟨ArAk⟩ as opposed to ⟨B⟩ in Turkish[26]: a function clearly connected with intraterminality, as the "comment" in question also interrupts the (iconic) linear successivity suggested by "terminal" forms. This intraterminal linkage will be referred to here as "*inherence*".

---

[23] Thus ⟨B⟩ forms can generally be interpreted "as though" they carried the same prefinal and final suffixes as the predicate nucleus of the super-ordinate segment; see É.Á. Csató & L. Johanson (forthcoming).

[24] I.e., the simple gerund with final vowel: {(y)A}; {(y)U}, etc.

[25] See L. Johanson 1971, 255 sqq., W. Pollak 1960, etc.

[26] See L. Johanson 1971, 68 sq. and 261; 1975, 113 sqq. Cf. H.J. Kissling 1961.

Adherence

⟨BAn⟩ forms show no traces of an intraterminal function, but generally suggest the linear successivity typical of terminal forms. Still there is an additional shade of meaning, a linkage similar to the one just discussed: a relation interpretable in terms of instrumentality, implication, corollary, explanatory comments, prospective causal relations (cause, reason, source, condition, etc., vs. consequence, result, effect, goal, etc.[27]). Consequently, the linkage in question can be translated as "thus", "so", "in this way (state, quality, manner, etc.)", "thereby", etc. These shades of meaning, which might well emanate from an originally instrumental function (v. infra), are close to the functions of ⟨ArAk⟩, which explains the fact that Turkish ⟨ArAk⟩ forms turn out to be the best translation equivalents of Azeri ⟨BAn⟩ gerunds. Since, however, there is no intraterminal meaning involved, we shall refer to this kind of linkage as "*adherence*" (to distinguish it from the intraterminally motivated "inherence").

Texts generally verify the assumption of an adherential linkage—translatable by interpolating "[and] in this way" (state, quality, etc.), "[and] so (thus, thereby, etc.)"—between the contents of ⟨BAn⟩ clauses and the super-ordinate items: e.g., Azeri *Bu xäŋgäri säniŋ sinäŋä basuban bu xarabälärin arasïnda ġaryalardan ötrü säni tä'am ġoyağayam.* "I will stab this dagger into your breast and [thus] leave you among these ruins as a prey to the crows"[28]. Since ⟨BAn⟩ and ⟨ArAk⟩ have a component of "herence" in common, the adherential form (*bas-uban*) is rendered into Turkish most adequately by an inherential ⟨ArAk⟩ form (→ *sok-arak*). Adherence might occasionally be possible as an accessory interpretation also for uses of the simple ⟨B⟩[29], but it is obvious that only ⟨BAn⟩ conveys this idea explicitly and systematically.

⟨BAn⟩ in Old Turkic

Functions change permanently. It appears, however, that an adherential meaning is discernible already in the use of ⟨BAn⟩ in older Turkic. Thus, almost all instances of ⟨BAn⟩ in Orkhon texts[30] clearly suggest adherential interpretations, e.g. (BQ E 3, KT E 1) *wl¹r¹pn¹ t²wr²q² b¹wd¹n¹n̂g il²in² t²r²ws²in² t¹wt¹a b²ir²ms² it²i b²ir²ms²* "they took their seat [on the throne] and [so, thereby, in this state] took control of the realm and the [unwritten]

[27] The antecedent proposition based upon ⟨BAn⟩ may be thought of as the source from which the consequent proposition proceeds.

[28] See A. Caferoğlu 1958 for this and other examples from older and more recent Azeri texts. The example cited has been chosen from a novel published in 1911 in Baku.

[29] This is often the case in languages without a special item expressing "herence" as opposed to ⟨B⟩.

[30] The same transliteration systems are used in this article as in L. Johanson 1979.

law of the Turkic people"; (BQ E 5) *b¹wn̂ğa b¹wd¹n¹ k²l²pn²* *s¹ig¹t¹ams²* *y¹wg¹l¹ams²* "so many people came, and [so] mourned and celebrated the funeral feast"; (BQ E 26 sq.): *s²wn̂gg²* *b¹t¹mi k¹r¹ig¹* *s²wk²pn²* /.../ *y¹w[r¹ip]* /.../ *b¹s¹d¹m* "I forced my way through the lancedeep snow and [so, thereby] marched /.../ and attacked /.../"; (KT E 7 sq.): /.../ *t¹b¹g¹č at¹in²* *t¹wt¹pn¹* *t¹b¹g¹č k¹g¹n¹k¹a k²wr²ms²*, *l²g²* *y²il¹* *is²g²* *k²wčg²* *b²ir²ms²* "[they] received Chinese titles and [thus, so, in this quality] obeyed the Chinese emperor and served him for 50 years".

It is not astonishing that Old Turkic ⟨BAn⟩ forms generally must be translated by ⟨ArAk⟩ into Turkish. The cases just cited are, e.g., translated by H.N. Orkun as "oturarak" (1936, 29), "bunca milletler gelerek" (p. 31), "karı sökerek" (p. 51), and "Çince adlarını alarak" (p. 32). The same situation holds in "Irq Bitig"[31]. Even a good translator's choice of equivalents in individual cases is, however, certainly no reliable test instrument, since he is, of course, also free to *refrain* from expressing the additional idea of adherence. In the following sentences, H.N. Orkun prefers the unmarked expressions "asker sevk edip" (1936, 29) and "yürüyüp" (1936, 66), though the original has adherential forms: (KT E 2) *s²w* *s²wl²pn²* *t²wr²t²* *b¹wl¹n̂gd¹k¹i* *b¹wd¹n¹g¹* *k¹wp l¹ms²* *k¹wp b¹z q¹l¹ms²* "they campaigned and [so, thereby, in this way] conquered and pacified all peoples in every direction"; (BQ E 37) *s²l²n̂ga* *q¹wd¹i* *y¹wr¹pn¹* /.../ *b¹wzd¹m* "I advanced down the Selenga and [thus, so, thereby] destroyed /.../".

The same holds true for a case in which ⟨B⟩ and ⟨BAn⟩ might seem to be used without any difference: (KT E 23) *y¹r¹q¹l¹g¹* *q¹n̂dn¹* *k²l²p* *y¹n̂ya l²t²d²i* *s²wn̂gg²l²g²* *q¹n̂dn k²l²pn²* *s²wr²a l²t²d²i* "Whence came the man in armour and put you to flight? Whence came the lancer and [thus, thereby] drove you away?" Also here it is of course possible to leave the functional difference unexpressed and to translate, indiscriminately, both cases as, e.g., "nereden gelip" (H.N. Orkun 1936, 40). This example does not, however, in any way prove that ⟨B⟩ and ⟨BAn⟩ are "doublets"[32].

In the following literary languages, such as Qarakhanid, we find many similar examples, e.g. in Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī (K 369) *s'n°* *k'l'b'n°* *t'b°r'šw''r°* "you come and [thereby, therewith] he moves". The adherence can often be interpreted almost as a relation of cause and effect: the superordinate segment appears to express the consequences which follow as a result of the event reported in the gerundial segment. V.M. Nasilov seems to be the only Turcologist to have noticed that, in (what he calls) Uighur and "Chaghatay"

---

[31] E.g., H.N. Orkun 1938, 84: "t*b'şg*n t*risi ön̈üş̈p*n yüğürü b*rmış" "tavşan derisi yırtılarak kaçmış". Of all the ⟨BAn⟩ forms, only a couple are rendered by Turkish {(y)Ip} in Orkun's translation.

[32] Cf. A.N. Kononov 1980, 130.

texts, ⟨BAn⟩ also signals a resultative-consecutive linkage between the events expressed by the gerund clause and the following clause. At the same time, however, Nasilov is fully conscious of the fact that this linkage is of a rather general nature and cannot be *defined* as a causal relation[33].

Instrumentality

It is, as we have seen, often possible to paraphrase the "adherence" by using instrumental conjunctors or adverbials of manner and means: "thus (in this way, manner)", "thereby", "so (in this state, condition, etc.)". From a functional point of view, ⟨BAn⟩ might well be of instrumental nature or origin, though it is impossible to establish the morphological connection with certainty. ⟨BAn⟩ segments may originally have been instrumental sentence adverbials provided with a morphologically complex conjunctor[34]. A. Caferoğlu even considers *kälipän* interpretable as "gelmekle", I.N. Šervašidze as "приходом, с приходом" (1986, 90). The Old Turkic instrumental case in {(X)n} is said to have, inter alia, instrumental, comitative, temporal functions[35]; it might rather, as the correspondent elements in some other Turkic languages, e.g., Chuvash, merit the more general designation *casus modalis*[36].

This situation is reminiscent of the circumstantial rôle of "instrument" in many other languages. A particularly interesting parallel is the instrumental component in "absolute" (participial and gerundial) constructions of Latin: the *ablativus absolutus,* (basically an instrumental use of the ablative: *natura docente* "[by] nature [as] teaching") and instrumentally used ablative gerunds (*docendo* "by teaching")[37]. As the development of these absolute constructions shows, the use of an instrumental item can, in course of time, be broadened to imply also other, e.g., temporal, relations.

If ⟨An⟩ is a vestige of the instrumental, it is not surprising that ⟨BAn⟩, as already stated, is in retreat very early. It is a well-known fact that the Old Turkic instrumental in {(X)n} already ceases to be productive in Uighur[38].

---

[33] "/.../ выражает также действие, с котором связано последующее действие как его результат и следствие. Одиако нельзя в данном случае говорить о причинной связи" (1963, 51).

[34] The segmentation is in any case problematic: {BA} + {n} or {B} + {An}?

[35] This holds true also for a number of other instrumental gerunds in Turkic languages. G.L. Lewis observes that the Ottoman form {mAgIn} can be translated in different ways, e.g., *olmaγïn* is "*by, because of, with, when being*", etc. (1967, 173). Cf. also Uzbek gerundial expressions with verbal nouns + [bˈlæn] "by, with", used also as temporal adjuncts: *u meni kòriši bilan...* "as he saw me..." (A.N. Kononov 1960, 300).

[36] See J. Benzing 1942.

[37] The ablative—functionally complex with several other uses—is the instrumental case of Latin (ablative of manner and means, or "instrumental ablative").

[38] At later stages, only non-paradigmatic, "fossilized" instrumental forms of a limited number of words occur ("adverbial relics": K.H. Menges 1968, 110).

⟨BAnIn⟩ and its instrumental uses

Fairly early—already in Irq Bitig—gerundial forms of the structure ⟨B⟩ + ⟨An⟩ + ⟨In⟩ are also found. ⟨In⟩ has been analysed as an instrumental[39], an adessive[40], and a genitive[41] suffix. The uses of ⟨BAnIn⟩ are obviously "instrumental" in the sense of ⟨BAn⟩. In Irq Bitig we read: (IrqB 35) *quyu quš qanatïŋa urupanïn qalïyu barïpan ögiŋä qaŋïŋa tägürmiš* "The swan put [him] on his wings and [so] rose in the air and [so] brought him to his parents"[42]. In A. von Le Coq's Manichaean texts: (M III[43]) *tngri yirin[täj]n inipänin tγai t[ngrig] klürdi. tγai tngr[i] kälipänin tamuluγ üzütümüzni tarqartï* "Bei seinem Herabkommen vom Götterhimmel den Gott Tγai führte er mit sich. Durch das Kommen des Gottes Tγai entfernte er unsere Höllenseelen".

Among the Uighur sentences commented on by P. Schulz (1978, 155f.[44]) in his interesting study on verbal nouns and gerunds used as adverbial adjuncts in Old Turkic, we find (Maitr.[45]) */.../ burxan /.../ saqïnčlarïn uqupanïn toyïnlaray oqïpanïn inčä tep yarlïqadï* "/.../ Buddha understood their thoughts /.../ and [thus] summoned the monks and [so] deigned to say". From A. von Le Coq's Manichaean texts we find: (M II[46]) *tetrü sačlïγ qurtγa yäk kälipänin tanmïš özütlärig tutupanïn tünärig tamuqa tartar* "an old female demon with dishevelled hair comes and [thus] seizes the souls who have denied and [so] pulls them into the dark hell"[47]; (M III[48]) */.../ körküŋüzni körüpänin biz qop ögrünčlüg boltumuz,* "we have seen your shape and [thus, therefore] become very joyful".

P. Schulz regards the first two ⟨BAnIn⟩ clauses as temporal adjuncts[49], and the third clause as a causal one. In these as well as other cases, adherential interpretations seem preferable—and the Turkish ⟨ArAk⟩ most appropriate as translation equivalent—, which, as we have already pointed out, does not exclude accessory shades of meaning (causal, temporal, etc.) according to context and situation.

---

[39] W. Bang 1923, 131; T. Banguoğlu 1938, 130.

[40] Because of its variants ending in *-ŋ*, {XbAnUŋ} etc. C. Brockelmann 1916, 199; cf. W. Bang 1917, 51.

[41] According to J. Deny, ⟨BAnIn⟩ consists of ⟨B⟩ + genitive of the pronoun *ol* (attached to the gerund "pour plus de précision"; 1953, 126).

[42] For the translation, cf. P. Schulz 1978, 154 and 213.

[43] A. von Le Coq 1922, 35; transcription and translation preserved.

[44] The examples are cited after P. Schulz; the translations are ours.

[45] See A. von Gabain 1957 (23 r. 11-14).

[46] See von Le Coq 1919, 12 sq.

[47] Cf., however, A. von Gabain's interpretation {pAn} + possessive sufix {i} + accusative suffix {n} (1950, Nachträge). The syntactic argumentation for this is not convincing.

[48] See von Le Coq 1922, 28.

[49] He renders them by the German conjunction (and anteriority marker) "nachdem".

It is indeed not easy to decide whether ⟨BAnIn⟩ is an old formation or a new one, if it is analysable as ⟨BAn⟩ + ⟨In⟩ or ⟨B⟩ + ⟨AnIn⟩, etc. There are at least four conceivable etymological possibilities.

1. ⟨BAnIn⟩ is an instrumental renewal of ⟨BAn⟩ by means of ⟨In⟩.
2. ⟨BAnIn⟩ is an old instrumental form which has been morphologically simplified, i.a., into ⟨BAn⟩.
3. ⟨An⟩ in ⟨BAn⟩ has been replaced (and its instrumentality corroborated) by the pronominal form *anïn*, formally attached to ⟨B⟩.

There is also an alternative "contaminational" solution: one of the first two possibilities (1-2) is valid, and the pronominal *anïn* (3) still plays a part, viz., as a means of reinterpretation.

Pronominal renewal or reinterpretation

A comment on the third possibility may be necessary. After the Old Turkic instrumental in {(X)n} had ceased to be productive, the pronominal form *anïn* "therefore, thereby, therewith, thus" still existed as a rather frequent adverb[50]. In the strict sense, the synchronic connection with the instrumental paradigm had broken down, the relationship was purely historical. Nevertheless, the functional association may have been strong enough for a renewal or replacement of ⟨An⟩ by means of the old form *anïn*, which still displayed functions proper to a *casus modalis ac formalis*[41].

How is this replacement likely to have taken place? As is well known, forms occurring together frequently may be reinterpreted as a single unit, which leads to certain grammatical adjustments. Through different kinds and degrees of fading in such combinations, new grammatical elements may arise: e.g., adverbs may shift and become postpositions or suffixes (case markers, conjunctors, etc.). Especially in agglutinative languages, inflectional suffixes often go back to originally independent, later grammaticalized words. Turkic languages, e.g., frequently develop aspecto-temporal forms, actional modifications, etc., out of analytic phrases.

Consider the Runic Turkic sequence (KT S 5) $y^1g^1r^1w\ q^1\widehat{n}dq^1d^1a\ k^2is^2r^2a\ nyg^1\ b^2il^2g^2\ \widehat{n}da\ wy^2wr^2\ r^2ms^2$, normally rendered as a complex sentence, e.g.: "after they had settled nearby, they seem to have thought evil thoughts there". The segment *-δa kesrä* "after ...ing", interpreted as a conjunctor (in the shape of a postpositional element seemingly governing a case) might well originate from the collocation of a deverbal noun (in an adverbially used case form),

[50] "Only here, the instrumental is attested in Ujγur" (K.H. Menges 1968, 123). Cf. Tuvan *o:n* < **on-ïn* "with it; therewith, thus".

[51] Cf., e.g., the uses of the Hungarian *casus formalis* and the pronominal demonstratives formed by this case: *akképp(en)* "in that way, so", *ekképp(en)* "in this way, thus".

qonduq°δa "when settling, as [they] settled", with an adverb *kesrä* "afterwards, then". In principle, a similar development is possible in the Qarakhanid sentence (K 145) *otlab # anïn ätlänür* "they graze, and thereby they become fat" > *otlab anïn # ätlänür*. Here, *anïn* may have shifted and faded into a conjunctor[52]. The reinterpretation may at first not have shown up overtly; it was an inductive change, which did not alter the outer shape, except perhaps the intonation curve. The next step, however, may have been suffixation (> *otlabanïn*).

If *anïn* was really used to renew the "instrumental" character of ⟨B⟩ + ⟨An⟩, this would fit into a certain tendency towards transition from 'nominal' to pronominal case suffixes. The disappearance of a productive instrumental was not the only change in the declension of the old Eastern Turkic literary languages. E.g., also the old accusative suffix {(X)G}[53] begins to disappear rather early. In Qarakhanid texts it still appears as a conservative form[54], but, in more progressive language variants, it has been replaced long before by {nI}[55]; an element from the pronominal declension. It is unknown whether {nI} had been erroneously detached from such form as *anï* (accusative of *ol*) and then attached to the nomen, or if a whole pronoun had been attached and the resultant complex contracted: e.g. *[at anï] > [at°nï] > [atnï] "the horse" (acc.), *[at°m anï] > [at°m°nï] > [at°mnï] "my horse" (acc.), etc.

Although this pronominalization would be a parallel phenomenon to the case discussed here, there are nevertheless obvious historical limitations to the comparison, since the latter development is untypical of the Oghuz languages, where, on the other hand, the type ⟨BAnIn⟩ is rather well-represented[56].

⟨B⟩ + ⟨AnIn⟩

As suggested above, there is another possible solution, which involves contamination. This alternative implies that an old ⟨BAnIn⟩ (not formed out of ⟨B⟩ + *anïn*⟩) has—at some point, parallel to the disappearance of the instrumental—been reinterpreted by identification (functional association) with the pronominal instrumental *anïn*. This contamination need not have changed the reinterpreted forms themselves. Identification with the pronoun

---

[52] Cf. the similar development of Latin ablative *quā rē* into a conjunction *quare* "because" (→ French *car*).

[53] Of course, even this suffix might, ultimately, be of pronominal origin (**igi*, etc.).

[54] "/.../ a form belonging to archaic or at least elevated language" (M. Erdal 1984, 264; cf. M. Mansuroğlu 1959, 99, C. Brockelmann 1954, 155). In the so-called "Yarkand documents", the nominal accusative suffix {nI} is already used (see M. Erdal *op. cit.*).

[55] For the spread of {nI} in Uighur, see M. Erdal 1979, 155 sqq.

[56] E.g., in Old Ottoman, where it is, however, far less frequent than ⟨BAn⟩. See, e.g., T. Banguoğlu 1938, 130.

would be quite natural in a period when the instrumental was no longer productive, but *anïn* still a frequent form. Even if the origin of ⟨BAnIn⟩ remains obscure, it is almost certain that *anïn* as a pronoun was associated with it.

Not too much guidance should be expected from notational conventions. The graphic representation may inform us about word boundaries, i.e., whether the verbal form is treated as an unbreakable single word, or if ⟨AnIn⟩ is—still, or already—a free word. Whether ⟨BAnIn⟩ is written as one word or not, cannot, however, be taken as evidence for its being of pronominal origin or not, viz., in the strict sense of morphological history. In the example from Irq Bitig already quoted, the notation *wr*^{1}*wpn*^{1}*in*^{1} does not suggest the reading *urup anïn*, since, in Irq Bitig, individual words are written separately (P. Schulz 1978, 154). Here, ⟨AnIn⟩ is treated in the same way as if it were a "case ending". If, on the other hand, ⟨B⟩ and ⟨AnIn⟩ are written separately, this is certainly not sufficient to prove a pronominal origin: contamination may be just as possible. The notation does, however, show that ⟨AnIn⟩ is at least identified—and associated functionally—with *anïn*.

Some occurrences of ⟨BAnIn⟩ in Qarakhanid Turkic seem to have been misinterpreted, probably because ⟨AnIn⟩ is written as a separate word. In the Turkic verses quoted by Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī[57] we meet with several instances of an interesting sentence type, e.g., (K 525) *t*^{w}*q*°*š*^{y}*b*° *'an*^{y}*n*° *ky*^{y}*ğ*°*t*^{y}*m*^{y}*z* "we fought together and [thus, therefore] were late"[58]. Although W. Bang was inclined to read *toqšupanïn* here (1923, 131), C. Brockelmann claims that such a form would be unparalleled (1954, 243)[59]. This is certainly not the case: see also, e.g., (K 145) *'wt*°*l'b*° *'an*^{y}*n*° *'at*°*l'nw*^{w}*r*°[60] "they graze and [so, thereby] get fat" or (K 551) *q*^{w}*z*°*γ*^{w}*n*° *ynkan s'y*°*r'b*° *'an*^{y}*n*° *'*^{w}*ny*^{y} *b*^{w}*tar*° "the raven and [?] twither and [thereby] their voice dies out"[61]. The gerunds occurring here, *toq*°*š- ọtla-, sayra-* + ⟨B⟩ + ⟨AnIn⟩, are perfectly comparable to the ⟨BAnIn⟩ forms found, for example, in Old Ottoman, i.e., forms renewed or reinterpreted by means of the pronominal instrumental.

A highly interesting and important example, which both corroborates our analysis and links this type to ⟨BAnI⟩ is (K 235): *y'n*°*k*°*š'q*° *t'ṗm*° *s'y*°*r'b*° *'any*^{y} *t'm*°*γ'q*° *q'tar*° "the loquacious person chatters much and [thereby, therefore]

---

[57] The examples are given here in transliterated Arabic script and cited as K, followed by the page of the manuscript.

[58] B. Atalay reads: "Tokşıp anın kèçtimiz" and translates "savaş yapıp onun için geçiktik" (1941, 183).

[59] "/.../ doch stände diese Form ganz allein".

[60] B. Atalay reads: "Otlap anın etlenür", and translates: "otlıyarak etlenir" (1939, 285).

[61] B. Atalay reads: "Kuzgun yanğan sayrap anın üni büter" and translates: "kuzgun, alacakarga öterek bu yüzden sesleri kısılır" (1941, 240 sq.). *ynk'n* is read as *taŋa:n* "white-headed crow" by G. Clauson (1972, 523a) and R. Dankoff & J. Kelly (1984, 275).

the palate stiffens"[62]. This sequence has obviously not been understood correctly by editors and grammarians, I. a., we search in vain for a plausible explanation of, or at least a reasonable comment on the function of the element *'any*^{y}. Clearly, it cannot be an accusative form *anï* in this context. It would indeed be a superfluous and unintelligible element, were it not in reality part of the gerund discussed here.

⟨BAnI⟩

Also the type ending in a vowel, ⟨BAnI⟩, occurring, e.g., (though rarely) in Old Ottoman, and—as an archaic feature—even in modern Azeri dialects[63], displays clearly adherential features. In the verses with which the book of Dädä Qorqud is intersperced we meet with several examples of the type (D 130) *q'lqwbany yrmdn mn ṭwr'ym*° "I will rise up from my place and [so] stand". Most of the examples from Dädä Qorqud, quoted by J. Deny (1921, 886), are translated by A.Ü. Elöve into Turkish as ⟨ArAk⟩ forms[64]. This is perfectly plausible; but it should be stressed again that also ⟨BAnI⟩ is adherential, not inherential. Thus, *qalqubanï, kälübäni,* etc., should not be understood as "when arising", "when coming", etc., but rather as "... arises (arose, etc.) and [so, thereby, etc.] ...".

⟨BAnI⟩ is often regarded as a secondary development, a simplification of ⟨BAnIn⟩ by loss of the final nasal[65]. Thus, its relationship to other forms depends on the choice made among the various possible etymological interpretations of ⟨BAnIn⟩ indicated above. It might, e.g., be regarded as an intermediate stage in a development ⟨BAnIn⟩ > ⟨BAn⟩, or (in the case of pronominal renewal or reinterpretation) as a product of a development ⟨B⟩ + *anïn* > ⟨B⟩ + *anï*.

Is it reasonable to take this to be a phonetically conditioned development? There are certainly cases of contamination of *anïn* and *anï*[66]. Interesting in this connection are also such cases as (KT E 1, etc.) $k^{2}in^{2}r^{1}a$ [ek:i:n ara:] "between the two", (K 54, etc.) *tw*^{w}*l*^{w}n° *''y*° [to:lun a:y] "full moon", etc., where the unexpected nasal *n* (cf. *ek:i:* "two", *to:lu:* "full", etc.) might well be part of the original stem, i.e., an element preserved in front of a vowel and lost elsewhere. In view of various other signs of an older Turkic **-n* that has

---

[62] B. Atalay reads: "Yanğşak telim sayrab anı tamgak katar" (1939, 467) R. Dankoff & J. Kelly: "yaŋšaq tälim sayrap ani tamγaq qatār" (1982, 349). C. Brockelmann translates: "wenn der Schwätzer viel redet, schnürt es ihm die Kehle zu" (1954, 310).

[63] Guba *-bAni* (plural *-bAnnAri*), Nucha *-vAnI* (M.Š. Širaliev 1960, 98).

[64] J. Deny & A.U. Elöve 1941, 847.

[65] T. Banguoğlu 1938, 130.

[66] The forms *anï* and *anïn* (Qutaδγu bilig 4786, 4787, 4790) are used, as it seems, in a syntactically parallel way. C. Brockelmann excludes an accusative interpretation (1954, 78).

disappeared later, we may really suspect *ek*:*in* and *to*:*lun* to represent older shapes of *ek*:*i*: and *to*:*lu*:. Similarly, it might be of some importance whether the gerund in ⟨BAnIn⟩ immediately precedes a vowel (as in *'anʸn° 'at°l'nwʷr°* and *'anʸn° 'ʷnyʸ*) or a consonant (as in *'anyʸ t'm°γ'q°*). It does not, however, seem possible to formulate this variation as a rule.

Could ⟨BAnI⟩ also have developed from ⟨BAnIŋ⟩[67]? The final *-ŋ* of the genitive suffix is sometimes lost so that genitive and accusative are not always clearly distinguished in all Turkic languages. We meet with this phenomenon sporadically already in Chaghatay, regularly in modern Qumyq and in Azeri, New Uighur and Uzbek dialects, where the contamination has levelled out the difference between accusative and genitive: {niŋ} > {ni}, e.g. *åt-ni båš-i* "the head of the horse".

Furthermore, in an interlingual perspective, there is a certain vacillation genitive ≈ accusative in positions where the case distinction is nonfunctional, neutralized, e.g., before postpositions governing a certain case (and where a case shift would, consequently, not imply any change of meaning), e.g., *anï üčün* ≈ *anïŋ üčün*, etc., "therefore".

Reinterpretation

The problem is still unsolved. Phonetic factors of the kind mentioned above may have had some influence on the development of ⟨BAnIn⟩. Basically, however, the problem is a question of *reinterpretation*: inductive reanalysis of ambiguous surface forms, and replacement of unfamiliar shapes by more familiar ones.

The point of departure is a gerund with a final nasal, an instrumental relic, not related to a paradigm any more and not interpretable in familiar morphological terms. It is probable, as we have seen, that this form was reinforced by pronominal reinterpretation. But this support was just a temporary remedy, since also *anïn* became less frequent.

The non-paradigmatic and unanalysable gerund in ⟨BAnIn⟩ was thus open to reinterpretation in terms of living, more familiar categories. A fossilized instrumental with a final nasal could, e.g., be readily interpreted as a genitive. This was the case in Old Ottoman {(X)bAnUŋ}[68].

Nor in this shape, however, was ⟨BAnIn⟩ a paradigmatic form in functional respect. As an instrumental remnant, not identified and understood as such, it could as well lose its final nasal, whether *-n* or *-ŋ*. The rest, ⟨BAnI⟩, could be interpreted as a third person possessive, as its outer shape was

[67] See C. Brockelmann 1919, 20 (by "dissimilation").

[68] See C. Brockelmann 1919, 19. T. Banguoğlu also considers the possibility of false analogy with the personal ending of the 2nd person singular (1938, 130), which is not so evident.

identical with it. At some point, this reinterpretation took place: thus, the Azeri dialect form {(X)bAni} even behaves like a possessive in that its final *-i* is always a front vowel (as in the possessive form)[69]. Accordingly, ⟨BAnI⟩ has, also by Turcologists, been understood as an enlarged form, i.e., a ⟨BAn⟩ with a secondarily attached possessive suffix. The identity is, however, probably limited to the outer shape, i.e., only the surface forms are ambiguous. In any case, K.H. Menges is right in his conclusion that these forms illustrate "the great age and petrified nature of the suffix" (1968, 136).

There are also other possible sources of reinterpretation. According to J. Benzing, the nunation (*fatḥa* written twice), used in the Arabic script for the element [An] in the ⟨BAn⟩ form of the older Turkmen literary language, shows that this form was incomprehensible to the later Turkmens (1939, 41). It is even possible that this notation is a sign of reanalysis of ⟨BAn⟩ as an adverbial element corresponding to the rather numerous Arabic absolute accusative forms (*casus pendens*), which were borrowed by the Turks as adverbs in {än}, etc.[70].

Even reinterpretation of ⟨BAnIn⟩ as an ablative is possible, e.g., in Azeri dialects of the Gädäbäy region, where *gälifdän, baxïfnan*[71], etc., i.e. *prima facie* ablative forms, occur. ⟨B⟩ gerunds occasionally appearing in this or other case forms are probably all results of such reinterpretation, and do not, as C. Brockelmann claims, demonstrate the originally "nominal nature" of ⟨B⟩, whatever might be meant by that[72].

Formation of "instrumental" gerunds

"Instrumentality", a rather productive idea in the formation of Turkic gerunds, is expressed and renewed in different ways. An example is the above-mentioned modern Turkish {(y)ArAk} gerund, analysable as ⟨A⟩ + ⟨rAk⟩. Whereas the "instrumental" linkage signalled by ⟨BAn⟩ is adherential, that of the intraterminal ⟨A⟩ is inherential. ⟨A⟩ + ⟨rAk⟩ has taken over the latter function. The comparative and modifying suffix ⟨rAk⟩, widely used in Old Ottoman, "sometimes expressing manner" (C.S. Mundy 1954, 315)[73], occurs

---

[69] See M.Š. Širaliev 1960, 98, K.H. Menges 1968, 136 does not exclude this, but admits that this type has not been explained so far. He remarks correctly that the presence of a possessive suffix might give raise to doubts in the origin of ⟨BAn⟩ as an allative or an instrumental.

[70] E.g. *ḥālan* > [ha:län]. As G.L. Lewis points out, it is not unknown for speakers of Turkish "of limited education" to coin analoguous adverbs from non-Arabic words, such as *kültür-en* for "culturally" (1967, 196).

[71] According to M.Š. Širaliev, *-nan* < *-dan* ablative (1960).

[72] He quotes from the Oγuznämä: "*köp soγuq bolupdïn* 'da es sehr kalt war'" and "*irtä bolupda* 'da es früh war'" (1954, 243).

[73] See C.S. Mundy: "/.../ this was a very natural development, somewhat analogous to the use of *-ce*" (1954, 315).

in this combination already in 14th-century texts, e.g., *arayuraq gäldi* "[by] searching, he arrived", i.e., (expressed coordinatively): "he searched and [thus, thereby, in doing this, in this manner] he arrived". This form has then developed into a very frequent gerund[74].

In Ottoman, ⟨BAn⟩ disappeared, and ⟨ArAk⟩ was used more and more. In Azeri (dialects as well as the old literature language), ⟨ArAk⟩ was not used, whereas ⟨BAn⟩ continued to exist. Very late, under the influence of Turkish, ⟨ArAk⟩ was introduced also in written Azeri, while ⟨BAn⟩ was abandoned[75]. Thus, also in Azeri, ⟨ArAk⟩ can be regarded as a renewal of an "instrumental" gerund[76].

There are also other instances of this type of renewal, e.g., by means of the comitative-instrumental, in the South Siberian type {(X)pInAŋ} (Qoibal)[77]. A similar, although inherential function is met with in modern Qaragas: When the two events connected by ⟨B⟩ are simultaneous and "parallel", the particle {1A} is usually added, e.g. *ïrlab la čoru* "he sings and [in this way] walks"[78]. For this and similar kinds of instrumental gerunds—e.g. Anatolian "*deyip bilä*"—see W. Bang 1917, 47.

It is beyond the scope of this article to treat all the other instrumental gerunds, formed by ⟨n⟩, ⟨1A⟩, ⟨bi(r)lä(n)⟩, etc., in Turkic languages[79]. Unlike ⟨B⟩, ⟨BAn⟩, ⟨ArAk⟩, etc., most of them function as modifying circumstantial adjuncts ("by ...ing ...") and do not, as a rule, present the content of the gerundial segment as thematically or narratively on a par with the content of the superordinate segment ("... and [thereby] ..."). In other words, they generally do not share the specific conjoining function, reminiscent, as we said before, of the use of coordinative devices. This difference

---

[74] On the other hand, the use of the ⟨B⟩ gerund seems to be gradually reduced in the modern language. If some of its functions are taken over by ⟨ArAk⟩, this may weaken the intraterminal-inherential component of the latter form and push it towards pure adherence. See, e.g., such sentences as *Ayrılarak, akşam köye geldik* "we left and [so] arrived in the village in the evening" (M. Makal: *Bizim köy,* İstanbul, 1961[7], p. 39). N. Yüce even interprets this gerundial form in terms of anteriority ("Als wir [sie] verlassen hatten..."; 1973, 19), which does not, however, seem quite adequate.

[75] See A. Caferoğlu 1958: M. Ergin 1962, 327.

[76] We shall not discuss the other uses of ⟨rAk⟩ here, viz., the gerundial forms ⟨B⟩ + ⟨rAk⟩ in different Turkic languages (as Turkmen, Noghay, Qaraqalpaq, Tatar, Uzbek, Kirgiz), e.g., {(i)bråq} of written Uzbek, or such forms as {(y)XnğArAk}, {(X)rkArak}, {(X)nsIrAk} in Anatolian dialects (see N. Yüce 1973, 34, 45, 78). These forms generally have a comparative-limitative meaning ("...ing somewhat [more]", etc.).

[77] See M.A. Castrén 1857, 32. G.J. Ramstedt derives it alternatively from ⟨B⟩ + *bïnaŋ*, "with, by" (< *bilän*) or from an ablative form **pïn-daŋ* (1952, 132).

[78] V.I. Rassadin 1978, 174. Also this *lA* may go back to *bilän* "by, with".

[79] See, e.g., N. Yüce for some examples from Turkish dialects, {(y)XšXn}, {(y)XšgXn}, {mAgIn}, {mAklA}, {mAylA(n)}, {mAynA(n)}, {mAsIylA}, {mAsIynA(n)}, {mAsIn:An}, {dXklAyIn}, {dXgIn:An}, {dXgInA}, etc. (1973, 50 sqq.).

poses some interesting problems which, however, must be discussed within another framework.

Bibliography

APAW = *Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse,* Berlin

Atalay, B., 1939: *Divanü lûgat-it-türk tercümesi* 1, Ankara

——, 1941: *Divanü lûgat-it-türk tercümesi* 3, Ankara

Bang, W., 1917: *Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen. Vorarbeiten zu einer vergleichenden Grammatik des Türkischen* 1 (= *APAW* 1917, pp. 1-62)

——, 1923: Das negative Verbum der Türksprachen (= *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse,* Berlin, 1923, pp. 114-131)

Banguoğlu, T., 1938: *Altosmanische Sprachstudien zu Süheyl-ü Nevbahar,* Breslau

Benzing, J., 1939. *Über die Verbformen im Türkmenischen* (= *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin* 42:2)

——, 1942. Tschuwaschische Forschungen (IV). Die Kasus (= *ZDMG* 96/1942, pp. 421-470)

——, 1959: Das Tschuwaschische (= *PhTf* 1, pp. 695-751)

Brockelmann, C., 1916: Zur Grammatik des Osmanisch-Türkischen (= *ZDMG* 70/1916, pp. 185-215)

——, 1919: Altosmanische Studien 1. Die Sprache Āšyq-pāšās und Aḥmedīs (= *ZDMG* 73/1919, pp. 1-29)

——, 1954. *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasiens,* Leiden

Caferoğlu, A., 1958: Azerî türkçesinde *-uban/-üben* eki (= Eckmann, J., et alii [eds.], 1958: *Jean Deny armağanı,* Ankara, pp. 61-66)

——, 1970: *Türk dili tarihi* 1², İstanbul (= *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi yayınları* 778)

Çagatay, S., 1947: Eski Osmanlıca'da fiil müştakları 3. Gerundifler (= *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 6/1947, pp. 27-47)

Castrén, M.A., 1857: = Schiefner, A. [ed.]: *M. Alexander Castréns Versuch einer koibalischen und karagassischen Sprachlehre nebst Wörterverzeichnissen aus den tatarischen Mundarten des Minusinschen Kreises,* St. Petersburg

Clauson, Sir G., 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish,* Oxford

Csató, É.Á. & L. Johanson: On gerundial syntax in Turkic [forthcoming]

Dankoff, R. & J. Kelly, 1982: *Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī, Compendium of Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk)* 1, Harvard

——, 1984: *Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī, Compendium of Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk)* 2, Harvard

Deny, J., 1921: *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli),* Paris

——, 1953: Le gérondif de liaison *-(y)üp* (= *60. doğum yılı münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü armağanı,* İstanbul, pp. 125-126)

Deny, J., & A.U. Elöve 1941 = Deny, J., 1941: *Türk dili grameri (Osmanlı lehçesi),* Tercüme eden: Ali Ulvi Elöve, İstanbul

Doerfer, G., 1985: *Zum Vokalismus nichterster Silben in altosmanischen Originaltexten.* Stuttgart (= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Veröffentlichungen der orientalischen Kommission 37)

Eckmann, J. 1959: Das Chwarezmtürkische (= *PhTF* 1, pp. 113-137)

——, 1966: *Chagatay Manual,* Bloomington & The Hague

Erdal, M., 1979: The chronological classification of Old Turkish text (= *Central Asiatic Journal* 23/1979, pp. 151-175)

——, 1984: The Turkish Yarkand documents (= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47, pp. 260-301)

Ergin, M., 1962: *Türk dil bilgisi,* İstanbul

Gabain, A. v., 1950: *Alttürkische Grammatik,* ²Leipzig
——, 1957: *Maitrisimit. Faksimile der alttürkischen Version eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule* 1, Wiesbaden
Johanson, L., 1971: *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems.* Uppsala (= *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Turcica Upsaliensia* 1)
——, 1975: Some remarks on Turkic "hypotaxis" (= *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 47/1975, pp. 104-118)
——, 1976: Das tschuwaschische Aoristthema (= *Orientalia Suecana* 23-24/1974-1975, pp. 106-158)
——, 1979: *Alttürkisch als "dissimilierende Sprache".* Wiesbaden (= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 1979:2)
Kissling H.J., 1961: [Review of] *PhTF* 1 (= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 111/1961, pp. 199-210)
Kononov, A.N., 1960: Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka, Moskva-Leningrad
——, 1965: Opyt rekonstrukcii tjurkskogo deepričastija na -(°)p, -(°)b, -(j)°b, -(°)pan, -(°)ban, -(°)banï, -(°)banïŋ(n) (Materialy k sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj grammatike tjurkskix jazykov) (= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1965:5, pp. 100-111)
——, 1980: *Grammatika jazyka tjurkskix runičeskix pamjatnikov VII-IX vv,* Leningrad
Kuznecov, P.I., 1983: Semantika i rekonstrukcija tjurkskogo deepričastija na -(°)b, -(°)p, -(j)°p ... (= *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 1983:1, pp. 53-60)
Le Coq, A. v., 1919: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho* 2 (= *APAW* 1919:3)
——, 1922: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho* 3 (= *APAW* 1922:2)
Lewis, G.L., 1967: *Turkish Grammar,* Oxford
Mansuroğlu, M., 1959: Das Karakhanidische (= *PhTF* 1, pp. 87-112)
Menges, K.H., 1963. Die sibirischen Türksprachen (= Spuler, B. [ed.], 1963. *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* 1. Abt., 5:1, Leiden-Köln, pp. 72-138)
——, 1968: *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies,* Wiesbaden (= *Ural-Altaische Bibliothek* 15)
Mundy, C.S., 1954: The *-e/-ü* gerund in Old Ottoman (= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 16, pp. 288-319)
Nasilov, V.M., 1963: *Drevneujgurskij jazyk,* Moskva
Orkun, H.N., 1936: *Eski Türk yazıtları* 1, İstanbul
——, 1938: *Eski Türk yazıtları* 2, İstanbul
PhTf 1 = Deny, J., et al. [eds.], 1959: *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 1, Aquis Mattiacis
Pollak, W., 1960: *Studien zum "Verbalaspekt" im Französischen,* Wien
Poppe, N., 1959: Das Jakutische (= *PhTF* 1, pp. 671-684)
Pritsak, O., 1961: Die Herkunft der Allophone und Allomorphe im Türkischen. Ein Beitrag zur türkischen Morphonologie (= *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 33/1961, pp. 142-145)
——, 1963: Das Alttürkische (= Spuler, B. [ed.], 1963, *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* 1. Abt., 5:1, Leiden-Köln, pp. 27-52)
Ramstedt, G.J., 1918: *Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei* (= *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 30/1913-18)
——, 1952: *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft* 2, *Formenlehre* (= *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 104:2)
Räsänen, M., 1957: *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen,* Helsinki (= *Studia Orientalia* 21)
Rassadin, V.I., 1978: *Morfologija tofalarskogo jazyka v sravnitel'nom osveščenii,* Moskva
Ščerbak, A.M., 1962. *Grammatika starouzbekskogo jazyka,* Moskva-Leningrad
Schulz, P., 1978: *Verbalnomina und Konverbien als adverbielle Ergänzungen im Altürkischen,* Diss. [University of Gießen]
Serebrennikov, B.A., 1964: Über tschuwaschische Themen (= *Acta Orientalia Hungaria* 17/1964, pp. 129-138)
Ševašidze, I.N., 1986: *Formy glagola v jazyke tjurkskix runičeskix nadpisej,* Tbilisi

Sinor, D., 1944: D'un morphème particulièrement répandu dans les langues ouralo-altaïques (= *T'oung Pao* 37/1944, pp. 135-152)

Širaliev, M.Š., 1960: Ob ėtimologii deepričastnoj formy na -ïban, -ibän, -uban, -übän (= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1960:3, pp. 98-99)

Tekin, T., 1968: *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic,* Bloomington-The Hague (= *Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series* 69)

Yüce, N., 1973: *Gerundien im Türkischen. Eine morphologische und syntaktische Untersuchung,* Diss. [University of Mainz]

ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft