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It is well-known that the Uighur exerted a strong cultural influence towards the Mongolian during the Yuan Dynasty, and in recent years it has been argued that not only the Tibetan but also the Uighur played an important role in the Buddhist mission into the Mongolian. One of the grounds for these arguments is that many loan words borrowed from Uighur are found scattered in Buddhist Mongolian texts. Though no extensive research into these Uighur elements has yet been presented, it is not difficult to gain an insight into this problem at the present stage, when our knowledge of Uighur Buddhist terms has been increased substantially.

On the Ju yong guan 居庸関 inscription built in the suburbs of Beijing in 1343 dhāranis and the construction history of the inscription are inscribed in six types of scripts. Two of them are Hp'ags-pa and Uighur scripts, in which Mongolian and Uighur are written, respectively. The two inscriptions show a number of Buddhist terms similar to their counterparts found in the other version. As for an example, a part of the Mongolian text together with the corresponding Uighur version is cited below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aği [obi] pur'ənu șərrayitı va'irəbanıvın} \\
\text{ahida șərəmnuni pur'ənnu duż mandalnu'udi} \\
\text{harban jügu n be hərəgalbun məşqan pu'yadun} \\
\text{اديیدی -رن alt'an kərgüdi eyin eyin c'udbeyi} \\
\text{nomun be öqet'u qoyar beyeyin şəri'nu [ud] i} \\
\text{nom saşiç'in maşara'nu'ud k'i'ed alinu se'uderiyed} \\
\text{no oqr'asu məşqan kalbudun ni'ul adılaqquíyın} \\
\text{nom şac'indur ber t'usa yêke üleley bü't'u ebeyi} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Nishida 1957: 257–258)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{abi[ali şəkinunli sar'ba-viteli} \\
\text{aksobiłi vi(ə)rapanıñ beş uguś mantalı} \\
\end{align*}
\]
The words with waved underlines, which are similar to the both versions, are as follows:

Mong. | Uig. | Skt. | Toch. (A/B)
---|---|---|---
(1) aqobi | akobi | <Skt. aksobhya | -a -i -e/a
(2) sarvaviti | sarvavite | <Skt. *sarva-vijñā(?) | -ā -i -ā
(3) śāgumuni | šākimuni | <Skt. šākyamuni | -ā -i -ā
(4) mandal | mantal | <Skt. mandala | -ā -i -ā
(5) batiragdlb | bidrakalp | <Skt. bhadrakalpa | -ā -i -ā
(6) šarir | šarīr | <Skt. šārīra | -ā -i -ā
(7) mañarač | maharač | <Skt. mahāraja | -æ -i -e
(8) vačirabani | vačirapani | <Skt. vaśrapāni | -æ -i -e
(9) pur'yan | burhan | <Chin. 佛 (+qan) | -æ -i -e
(10) abida | abita | <Chin. 阿弥陀 | -æ -i -e

vitīc of (2) Uig. sarvavitiše (2) is spelt VITY-Y, which is almost identical with the Mongolian form in transliteration. Of course Sanskrit sarva-vijñā as reconstructed by Röhrborn from this spelling cannot be excluded since TY is employed in Uighur to represent Sanskrit jñ. However, it is much more natural to consider Sanskrit sarva-vidya (or sarva-vidyā) as the source of the word and to transcribe it as sarvavatiše, because, as T. Nishida correctly pointed out, Mong. sarvavitiše corresponds to pu ming fo 布明佛 'god possessing all science', which agrees better with Skt. sarva-vidya (or sarva-vidyā) than sarva-vijñā. 3 A

Apart from (2), the above-listed words are known to have already been settled in Uighur before the Yuan Dynasty, and the Mongolian forms may well have been borrowed from them. Though Uig. sarvaviti has not yet been attested in Uighur, it shares the ending -i with the other animate nouns of Sanskrit origin and is most likely to be the etymon of Mong. sarvaviti.

The single-underlined terms, though not found in the Uighur version, are well attested in Uighur: adisud (<Uig. adisiti < Skt. adhisthita), kalb (<Uig. kalp < Skt. kalpa), Šac'ìn (<Uig. šazin < Skt. sāsana), nom (<Uig. nom < Sogd. num). Therefore, one may be entitled to assume that these Buddhist terms were not borrowed from Uighur on the occasion of building the inscription, but had already been settled in Mongolian by then.

1

Though some of the Buddhist Mongolian terms go back to genuine Uighur (Turkic) words, most of the others came from other languages through the Uighur intermediary, and a great majority of them are from Sanskrit. It has recently been discovered that many of these Sanskrit words in Uighur were borrowed from Tocharian, and show the features peculiar to the Sanskrit loans settled in Tocharian. These features, which are schematized in the following rules, appear systematically in the endings:

As is shown by the following examples, the Sanskrit forms in Mongolian also observe these rules, which will hereafter be referred to as the ‘Uighur-Tocharian rules’:

Skt. | Uig. | Mong. | Tochs
---|---|---|---
1) sāriputra | šaribudiri | šāriputre (B) |
2) suñjata | suñjati (sujātā (A)) |
3) mālikā | mālik (mālikā (A)/mālika (B)) |
4) abhiṣeka | abhisig | abhiṣek (AB) |
5) pāramitā | baramid | pāramit (AB) |
6) vaisāli | vaisali | vaisali (B) |
7) rāhu | rāhu | rāhu (A)/rāhu (B) |
After the fall of the Yuan Dynasty, translation of Buddhist texts by the Mongolian had been suspended until it was started again with the introduction of Lamaism from Tibet. It is generally assumed that a number of Buddhist texts were translated into Mongolian during the Yuan Dynasty, and one might even suspect the existence of the Mongolian Tripitaka in that period. Nevertheless, only a few texts are known to have originated from the Yuan Dynasty; the bulk of the Buddhist Mongolian texts that we have today were produced after the sixteenth century, most of them being revised even later in the eighteenth century.

The Buddhist texts directly translated from Uighur, if such exist, certainly date back to the Yuan Dynasty. However, no text has so far been discovered of which the colophon clearly points to the Uighur origin. In this connection one finds intriguing colophons in the Mongolian versions of the Pañcarāsa and the Svavaraprabhasa translated by Ses-rab sen-ge who played an active part in Mongolian Buddhism early in the fourteenth century. The colophon of the latter reads as follows:

"...Later the monk Ses-rab sen-ge of the Śākya (order) translated this powerful book (of) the holy and supreme Golden Light from the Tibetan and Uigur scriptures into Mongolian, on the report of Esen temür Tayuwa who said: Let it be ambrosia for the pure (hearted) Mongolian people!"

As the names of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas do not sound in Mongolian, he wrote them according to the Uigur usage (yusu), in Indian form. Together with Bunya-širi sidu (i.e. Punyaśri situ), a connoisseur of Sanskrit and Tibetan, he compared the Indian, the Tibetan and the Uigur texts, and thus he translated the meanings and the words faultlessly.

This colophon shows that Uighur as well as Tibetan was one of the original languages for translation. Since Punyaśri is known to have translated Buddhist Tibetan texts into Uighur, it can safely be supposed that these Mongolian texts were produced in the same background as that of those Uighur text. Ses-rab sen-ge translated another Mongolian text Lalitavistara from Tibetan; although Uighur is not mentioned as its original, it contains many Uighur elements, such as Uig. adaq ‘foot’ instead of Mong. köl ‘id.’ Therefore, it is clear that the Uighur version was also consulted for the translation of this text.

In fact, the Indian (Sanskrit) forms of above-mentioned two texts and of the Lalitavistara agree with the Uighur-Tocharian rules fairly well. The second chapter of the Pañcarāsa entitled Mahāmāyāvīddāryājñi enumerates the names of more than one hundred yaksas and their living places in Sanskrit. The following are the names of yaksas observing the Uighur-Tocharian rules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alaka</td>
<td>alaki</td>
<td>mahāsena</td>
<td>maqasini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bala</td>
<td>bati</td>
<td>mahāgiri</td>
<td>maqagiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caritaka</td>
<td>caritaki</td>
<td>puspaketa</td>
<td>busbakitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhanesvara</td>
<td>danisvari</td>
<td>śikhandin</td>
<td>sikandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumbhira</td>
<td>kumbiri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did these words, which have not hitherto been attested in Uighur, directly come from the forms once existing? It is true that a lot of Uighur forms do not observe the rules, but they are known to have been borrowed either from the forms which are exceptional even in Tocharian or via other languages such as Sogdian. In this connection, some Mongolian forms should be referred to which follow these rules but differ from the forms attested in Uighur. For example, a well-settled name of a monk Uig. anand (Skt. ānanda) without the ending -i may go back to Toch. ānantānānd or to Sogd. "n't, while one finds anandi in this list of yakṣa names. However, one must hasten to add that ananda, hardly from Uighur, was settled as a monk's name in Mongolian. Since anand, ananda or anandi does not appear in Uighur as a yakṣa name, one cannot be certain whether or not there was any formal difference between the name of a monk and that of a yakṣa in Uighur. Likewise, Mong. kirakučandi is radically different from Uig. krakasundi coming from Toch. A/B krakasundi (Skt. krakucchanda), but agrees very much with the Sanskrit form except for the ending -i, which in turn follows the Uighur-Tocharian rules. It is almost certain that examples like anandi and krakutandi were hypercorrect forms, as it were, and in view of this type of hypercorrection one may conclude that the above-listed yakṣa names were not borrowed from Uighur but modified or corrected from the Sanskrit forms by the translator or the copyist in accordance with the Uighur-Tocharian rules.

As for the names of yakṣa's living places, one finds many words ending with -i at variance with the Uighur-Tocharian rules, where Sanskrit word final -ālā of inanimate nouns are lost. The following are examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abhīchattrā</td>
<td>aqīcatiri</td>
<td>raśīna</td>
<td>raśini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambāṣṭha</td>
<td>ambasti</td>
<td>simbala</td>
<td>siqqali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhīsana</td>
<td>bisani</td>
<td>šākala</td>
<td>šakali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Uighur, distinction between the endings -i and -# is strictly observed depending on whether the word is animate or inanimate. For example, Skt. *sudarśana* appears as *sudarśan* when it is a king's name, while *sudarśan* is a name of a town; a personal name *artiṇa* is clearly differentiated from a name of a plant *artiṇa*, both being reflects of Skt. *arjuna*. However, this distinction in Uighur was more than a result of the extensive borrowing form Tocharian and was not at all productive. Therefore, when a new Sanskrit item was borrowed into Uighur, it did not take the special ending predicted by the rules, but simply reflected the form of the mediator language. In fact, in the texts translated from Tibetan during the Yuan Dynasty, there are some Sanskrit words revealing the Tocharian origin. To the present author's knowledge no inanimate noun with the animate ending -i has so far been encountered among them. Moreover, there is little possibility that the Tocharian hīna-yāna Buddhism acquainted with itself these tantric texts, nor is it easy to imagine that Tocharian texts once existent possessed so many names of yaksas and their living places.

There is no way to know what these names looked like in the Uighur version, which was alleged to be one of the originals but is almost lost. However, as far as the Mongolian forms are concerned, there is good reason for supposing that they were based on Sanskrit. As for an example, a yakṣa name *maholākhalamekkhala* (*mahā-ulākhalam-ekkhalā* or *mahā-ulākhalam-ekkhalā*) is rendered word for word in the Tibetan version, i.e., *gtum* (corr. *gtum* čhen gser gyi 'od dpag can* (corr. 'og pags can) *'plon ceinture ayant* (*Lévi, p. 46 no. 38), while in the Chinese it is divided into names of two yakṣas, i.e., *maholākhalā* and *mekkhalā*. In Mongolian, on the other hand, this name appears as *kala mikhlals -<tur> maquli* (Aalto 1961, p. 52, 19r), which means 'a yakṣa *Maquli* (*<maholā>-*) in the country of *kala mikhals* (*<khahalamekkhala>).* In view of the Tibetan and Chinese renderings, one cannot but think that this mistranslation was based on the Sanskrit original. Though it is not certain whether this segmentation had already existed in the Uighur version, or whether it was due to the ignorance of the Mongolian translator, the addition of -i to the non-existent element can be regarded as a kind of hypercorrection. Many of the Sanskrit words in this list have not been attested in the Buddhist Uighur texts published thus far, and it is likely that they had not been settled by the time of translating this Mongolian text.

It may be noticed in passing that, though many place names take -# form, they seem to be confined to familiar words or those forms which could easily be analogized to other already existent loans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gāndhāra</td>
<td>gandar</td>
<td>alakāpura</td>
<td>alkabur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāśmira</td>
<td>kasmir</td>
<td>dārakapura</td>
<td>darkabur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udumbara</td>
<td>udubar</td>
<td>mahāpura</td>
<td>maqabur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three words in the left column might have been settled, cf. *gandar* <Uig. <Toch. *gāndhar*, *kāśmir* <Uig. *kāsmir*, *udumbar* <Uig. *udubar* (a flower name). The rest containing an element Skt. *pura* 'town' were presumably formed on the analogy to such forms as Uig. *anantapur* (<Toch. <Skt. *ānandapura*).

What has been discussed above clearly indicates that the addition of -i to *kirakūtanī, anandi* and the place names is due to a kind of hypercorrection, with the aim of aping the Uighur-Tocharian rules. Nevertheless, it is hard to think that this was done by Śes-rab sen-ge or Punyaśrī. Punyaśrī, as stated above, translated several Tibetan texts into Uighur, in which no hypercorrection of this kind is seen. In an Uighur tantric text translated by him (published in BT 7), one finds a similar list comprising the names of parts constituting a mandala on the one hand and the appellations of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and yoginis dominating those parts on the other. There, the names of the parts do not end with -i but with -a, in accordance with other Sanskrit -alā forms not settled in Uighur. See the following examples:

Names of the Parts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skt.</th>
<th>Uig.</th>
<th>Mong.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arbuda</td>
<td>arbuda</td>
<td>arbuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jālandhara</td>
<td>ālandara</td>
<td>jālandhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grihadeva</td>
<td>grīxa-tiu-a</td>
<td>gri-ha-di-a-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kulūta</td>
<td>kuluda</td>
<td>guludā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skt.</th>
<th>Uig.</th>
<th>Mong.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aṅkura</td>
<td>aṅkuri</td>
<td>amguri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khandakapala</td>
<td>kanta-kapali</td>
<td>khaṇḍa-kabala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virūpākṣa</td>
<td>(vīru)pakṣi</td>
<td>virṛgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāṇkāḷa</td>
<td>kāṇkāḷa</td>
<td>ka-m-ka-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>havyagriṣya</td>
<td>havyagriṣya</td>
<td>havyagriṣya, qayag-griṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subhādra</td>
<td>su-badri-a</td>
<td>subādri-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Uighur forms are cited from BTT 7 (pp. 104–112), and the corresponding Mongolian are those found in the Mongolian Tandjur. These names of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and yoginis ending with -i may not perhaps be borrowed from Tocharian, but were so formed by Punyaśrī, who corrected them from the Sanskrit forms in accordance with the Uighur-Tocharian rules. The important point is, however, that no inanimate noun is found to take the ending -i. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that Punyaśrī advised Śes-rab senge, when translating the Pañcarāṣṭra into Mongolian, to add -i to the names of yaksas’ living places. Probably this was done later by another person, who knew the Uighur-Tocharian rules only partially, and added -i even to inanimate nouns.15)

The colophon of the Pañcarāṣṭra showed that the Uighur exerted a strong influence to Mongolian Buddhism; Mongolian people took these Uighur texts as their model for translation, and in particular, they tried to follow the Uighur-Tocharian rules when introducing terms form Sanskrit, the sacred language of Buddhism. It was with this background that the ‘hypercorrection’ in question was executed.

In the sixteenth century when Lamaism was introduced from Tibet, many Buddhist terms still remained to be those which had been borrowed from Uighur earlier in the fourteenth century. However, as an enormous amount of Buddhist Tibetan texts started to be translated, these settled forms began to be replaced by new ones borrowed or translated from Tibetan. The Leningrad version of the Mahāyānpati contains a large amount of Mongolian vocabulary presumably employed in the period of the Ching Dynasty.16) The following are the words denoting ‘eight heavenly gods’ and ‘pretas,’ found in the Mahāyānpati and in the Pañcarāṣṭra, together with the corresponding Sanskrit, Uighur and Chinese forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deva</td>
<td>tāγri</td>
<td>tegri</td>
<td>tegri (3045)</td>
<td>天</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāga</td>
<td>luu</td>
<td>luus</td>
<td>luus (3046)</td>
<td>龍</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Uighur all forms except for tāγri, luu and yāk are of Sanskrit origin. Apart from luu and gandarvi which are accompanied by the Mongolian plural suffix -s, those attested in the Pañcarāṣṭra are basically the same as the Uighur forms.17) In the Mahāyānpati, while luu, asuri, gandarvi, kinari, birid and kumbandi agree with the Uighur forms, mahorga and yaksa are introduced directly from Sanskrit or via Tibetan, the rest being translated from Tibetan. Since the appellations of devas and pretas appear most frequently in the Buddhist literature, they are likely to have been deeply rooted in Mongolian. But later the stronger the Tibetan influence became, the more Uighur forms were replaced by the Tibetan, as is shown by the preceding list.

Incidentally, groups of words borrowed collectively from Uighur tended to be intact from the Tibetan influence even in the Ching Dynasty. Three Uighur texts published in TT VII comprise the following names of twenty-eight lunar mansions (astāvimsatimaksatra),18) which are well reflected in the Mahāyānpati (3017–3044):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skt.</th>
<th>TT VII.</th>
<th>Mahāvyut.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>kṛtikā</td>
<td>kārtik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>rohiṇi</td>
<td>urukini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>mṛga-sīrā</td>
<td>mrgasir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>ārdra</td>
<td>ārdir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unexpected number of Sogdian elements are also met with in Mongolian, again borrowed through the Uighur intermediary:

Skt. ratna> Sogd. rtun> Uig. ardini> Mong. erdini/erdeni
Skt. koti> Sogd. kwrt> Uig. kolt> Mong. kolt
Skt. punya> Sogd. pwyn'> Uig. buyan> Mong. buyan
Skt. cakravartin> Sogd. ckr> Uig. čakiravrt> Mong. čakiravard
Skt. šikṣāpada> Sogd. škṣp> Uig. čixṣap> Mong. ĝixabad

Beside the preceding examples of Sanskrit origin, one also finds the following genuine Sogdian forms settled in Mongolian:

Mong. esrua (Pañca. Lalita. M₄. Kand.)< Uig. āsrwa< Sogd. 'srw
Mong. kebid (Lalita.) kebid (Hp. 2–19)< Uig. kibit< Sogd. kpyδ
Mong. nisvanis (Prajñā. Lalita. M₄.)< Uig. nizvans< Sogd. nyzəny
Mong. nom< Uig. nom< Sogd. nm
Mong. qormusda (Pañca. Subhā. Lalita. M₄.)< Uig. xormusta< Sogd. xwrmɔt
Mong. tamu (Expiation. M₄.)< Uig. tamu< Sogd. tmw
Mong. tittim< Uig. džim, < Sogd. dzım

In addition to these Sogdian elements, Chinese loan words, including those of Indian origin such as sabi, also find a place in Buddhist Mongolian texts.

Mong. sabi (M₄.)< Uig. šabi< 沙彌< <Skt. śrāmanera
Mong. čai (Lalita.)< Uig. čai< 蔡⁴⁰
Mong. qonsi-im (H. Zwei. Bhadra.) qonsim (Kand.) yuan ši yim (Hp. p. 20)< Uig. qonsi-im< quonsi-im< 觀世音
Mong. biba (M₄.)< Uig. biba< 觀音
Mong. bisamun (H. Zwei.) bisman (Kand.)< Uig. bisaman/bisamin< 觀沙門< <Skt. vaśravanā²¹
Mong. puryan (Hp. 12–6)/burqan (M₄. Kand.)< Uig. burxan< 摘< <Skt. buddha
Mong. labai (Lalita. Subhā. M₄.)< Uig. labai< 樂音
Mong. lenyu (Hp. 12–6)/lingu-a (Lalita. Subhā)/lingqu-a (Kand. Bhadra.)< Uig. linqu-a< 聽音
Mong. lu (Hp. 5–42)/lu (M₄.)< Uig. lu/lu< 龍
Of course there are loan words from the Turkic languages, but to put them in the proper historical context is difficult in two respects. First, it is not easy to distinguish Turkic (Uighur) loan words settled in Mongolian from foreign forms which happen to appear in texts translated from Uighur or in texts made by the translators whose mother tongue was Turkic. To the latter may belong sarîy (<Uig. sarî 'yellow' Subhã.), tay (<Uig. tay 'mountain' H. Zwei.), etc., as well as above-mentioned adâg of the Lalitaavistara. Secondly, it is sometimes impossible to tell whether they had been borrowed before the introduction of Buddhism, through the contact of the two languages, or whether they came from Buddhist Uighur as cultural words. For example, there is no telling when bûlig 'chapter, section' (M. Kandj.), no doubt from Uig. bûlûk (bûl 'divide' + -ûk (suffix of deverbal noun)), was introduced. In the case of erdem 'virtue' (Lalita. Subhã. M. Kandj.), it is certain that this word had originated from the period well before the Buddhist influence, because of the two corresponding Uighur words, ærðâm and æðrâm, which was derived from ærdâm through metathesis, the latter was prevalent in the Buddhist Uighur texts in the Yuan Dynasty. For Uig. ærk 'might, power,' there is a similar Mongolian word erhe, which already appears in the Secret History of Mongols of the thirteenth century, while one finds erâkîg (Lalita. Subhã.) accompanied by the Turkic possessive suffix -îg in the early Buddhist texts. This erâkîg can safely be taken to have been borrowed from Uig. ærkîg. Later erâkîg developed into erîg (M.), and was used side by side with erke-tù. Likewise, it is clear, because of its peculiar spelling, that Mong. kkir (Lalita. Subhã. Pañca. M. Kandj.) faithfully reflects Uig. kkir 'dirty, filthy.' In addition to them, the following expressions settled as set phrases are also certain to have been borrowed from Uighur.22)

Mong. ayaq-taqimlig <Uig. ayaq-taqimlig 'worthy of respect'
Mong. bilge bilig <Uig. bilgâ bilig 'wisdom'
Mong. ed tavar <Uig. âd tavar 'property'
Mong. el ulus (Lalita.) <Uig. il ulus 'state'
Mong. ordu qarsi <Uig. ordu qarš 'royal place'
Mong. yirinči-täki <Uig. yirinči-täki 'in this world'
Mong. bursaq quvra <Uig. bursaq quvra 'monastic community'

4

In this section, some phonetic modifications are discussed which the forms borrowed from Uighur underwent in the course of settling in Mongolian.

4.1 Insertion and Addition of Vowels
The syllabic structure of Sanskrit and Sogdian are adapted to that of Mongolian.

Skt. śāriputra>>Uig. šāripuṭra Mong. śaribudiri (Bhaga.) šaribudari (Kandj.)
Skt. cakravartin>Sogd. >Uig. čavartiči /čakravartiči /čakravarti (BTT13 Sho-ava.) Mong. čavart (Subhã.) čavarti (Hp. 13–2)
Skt. citra>>Uig. čiri Mong. čiri (Lalita.)
Skt. pratyekabuddha>>Uig. pratičabutt (BTT13) Mong. bradikabud (M.) biradikabud (Bodh.) bardikabud (M. metathesis)
Skt. brāhmaṇa>>Uig. braman/biraman (Or. 109) Mong. biramun (Subhã. Lalita. Pañca. Fragment. M. Kandj.)
Skt. preta>>Uig. prītī (Or. 108-Kōgûl) Mong. birit (Kandj. Less) biriti (Pañca.)
Skt. kalpa>>Uig. kalp Mong. galb (Lalita. Subhã.) galab (H. Zwei. M. Kandj. Less.)

It is to be noted that the underlined Uighur forms which are cited from the texts of the Yuan Dynasty agree with corresponding Mongolian forms. They are obviously influenced by the contemporary Mongolian forms.

Sogd. šinmean>Uig. šinmanč Mong. šinmanč (Bodh.) šinmança (Pañca. M.)
Sogd. wpšn>Uig. upšanč (Bodh.) upšança (Pañca. M. Less)
Skt. kseman-kara>>Uig. kšiingkari Mong. aksemanggari (Kandj.)

Sogdian final cluster -nc is permissible in Uighur, and no example with -a added has been encountered. Therefore, the addition of -a found in the settled forms is ascribed to Mongolian development.23)

4.2 Assimilation of Vowels

Skt. śloka>>Uig. šlo Mong. shiğ (Lalita. Pañca. M. Kandj. Less.)
4.4 Insertion of Consonants

Skt. sumeru>>Uig. sumir/sumur Mong. sūmer (Pańca. Subhā)/sūmūr (Subhā.)
sūmr (Mp.)

Skt. adakavatii>>Mong. adakavi (Lalita. Pańca.) addakavanti (Lalita. Kandd.)

Skt. vyāktra>>Uig. vyakriti Mong. vyakridi (Lalita.) vyagirdi (H. Zwei.) vyaggirdi/
vivargirdi (Mn. Kandd.)

b of sūmūr is an intrusive consonant introduced between m and the following
ū; sūmūr then ousted sūmer and sūmūr. The remaining two examples show
homoorganic nasals intruded before plosives. Similar phenomena are also met
with in Uighur, e.g., Uig. śilavandi (<Skt. śilavat BTT 7), vāyrocana (<Skt.
vairocana BTT 8).

4.5 Other Consonant Changes

v>õ/õ

Skt. vajra>>Uig. vīr Mong. vīr (Lalita. H. Zwei. Kandd.)

By/õ (Kandd. Less.)

b>

Skt. vasubandha>>Uig. vasubandu Mong. basubandu (Kandd.)

Skt. virūpākṣa>>Uig. virupaksi Mong. virubagsi (Pańca.)

birubagsi (Kandd.)/birubagsa (Mp.)

Skt. virūḍhaka>>Uig. virudaki Mong. virudaki (Pańca. H. Zwei.)

birudaki (Kandd.)/birudaka (Mp.)

Uig. tāvar>>Mong. tavar (Pańca. Mp.)

tabar (Subhā. Expiation. Cause.)

u>

Skt. tattva>>Mong. dadu (Kandd.)

Skt. ratnasambhava>>Uig. ratna-sanbavi/ratnasambau-a (BTT7. Or. 109)

mong. ratn-a sambau-a (H. Zwei.)

Skt. śrīdeva>>Mong. siri diu (Lalita.)

Skt. urubīru>>Mong. urubīlu-a (Lalita.)

Skt. mahādeva>>Uig. maxadivi Mong. maqadivi/maha-a diu-a (Subhā.)

y>v

Skt. mardgalyā-yana>>Uig. motgalayani/motokalyini Mong. modgalvani (Pańca.)

motgalavani (Mn.)
Mong. darma (Pāṇca. Lałita. Kandj.) Uig. darm<<Skt. dharma
Mong. udpala (Pāṇca. Mp.) Uig. utpal<<Skt. utpal

Sometimes forms which came via Uighur and those via other routes were contaminated into new forms. For example, Uig. ęçeçıpa/texçıpa was borrowed from Sogd. csʰpʰ, and this Uighur form entered directly into Mongol., csʰab (Subhā. Explication.). Later, through the contamination of this form and Skt. sākṣāpa introduced via Tibetan, new forms sāⱻab (Lałita. Pača. Fragment. Mp. Less.) and sākṣab (Bhadra.) appeared and were subsequently settled. One also finds akṣobhi in some texts made during the Ching Dynasty (e.g. Kandj., etc.), where special letters were devised to reproduce Sanskrit spellings; this may likewise be due to the contamination between Skt. akṣobhya on the one hand, and aqṣobhi (Pača. H. Zwei.) on the other, the latter of which was borrowed from Uig. akṣobhi via Tocharian.

There are also some cases, where two forms which participated in contamination were both borrowed from Uighur. Beside the synonym tūsōd from Uig. tūzid (<<Skt. tūṣita), Skt. saṃtusita entered into Uighur via Tocharian as saṃtusḷisvatsusśita, which was later introduced into Mongol. as saṃtusśita (Pača.). Mong. saṃtusśid (Kandj.) is therefore to be taken as the cross between saṃtusśita and tūsōd. It may be mentioned in passing that, apart from Mong. gandarvi (Pača. Bodhi.) which is from Uig. gandarvi (<<Skt. gandarāvī), gandarvi is also found in later texts such as Mp.; this gandarvi seems to be due to the contamination between gandarvi and kjarvi (Uig. kjarvi (<<Skt. kjarvā), because the both have a similar meaning, i.e., musician in heaven,’ and often appear in the same context.

A considerable length of time must have lain until the above-discussed modifications and contaminations were completed, and accordingly the appearance of these later forms in some texts can be taken as the indication that the texts in question are relatively young. Although due reservation should be made because older texts were often revised and renewed, those texts in which Uighur forms concentrate may safely be classified as older against younger ones, where fewer Uighur forms appear. Moreover, some forms show quite accurately that the texts in which they appear were written in the early stage. For example, Mong. čišab (Bodhi.) from Skt. sākṣāpa is found only in the texts produced before the settlement of the contaminated forms sāičab and sākṣab attested already in early texts. Likewise, an Uighur form bilgä, which was borrowed into Mongol. in a combination bilgä “bölge,” does not appear in later texts, because, soon after the borrowing, bilgä of this combination was replaced by a genuine Mongol. form belge, formally and semantically similar to bilgä.

From the appearance of those forms which underwent the modifications in Mongol. the alternation between the Sanskrit loan words borrowed via Tibetan and those forms via Uighur is also characteristic of younger texts.
The memoirs of the Toyko Bunko, 49, 1991

Skt. abhidharma > Uig. abidimar > Mong. abidarim (Bodhi.)
abidarma (Mong.)

Skt. abhijñ > Uig. abichi > Mong. abici (Pança. Mong.)
abijit (Kand.)

Skt. bodhisattva > Uig. bodistv > Mong. bodistv (Bodhi. Lalita. Mont.)
bodisatsuva (Kand.) bodisaduba (Mong.)

6

In spite of the later replacement by those introduced via other languages, one still finds a considerable number of Sanskrit loans borrowed from Uighur in classical (i.e. later) Buddhist Mongolian texts. The greater part of the Uighur texts, on the other hand, has been lost and those which we can see today are not very large in number and amount. Therefore, Sanskrit forms once existent in Uighur can be reconstructed by means of those loaned inherited in Mongolian. For example, of the names of pretas given in section two, the forms which Uighur lacks could be restored as follows:

Skt. Toch. Uig. Pança.
skandha > skandha(A) > *skandi/iskandi > iskandi
unmada > — > *udnadi > udnadi/udnandi
chāyā > — > *cāi > cāi

In general, the Uighur intermediary of Sanskrit loan words in Mongolian is betrayed in their endings. The following are some Uighur forms thus reconstructed, the numbers referring to the Uighur-Tocharian rules discussed in the first section:

(1) Skt. cārumanta > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. cāruman (Lalita.) Uig. cārumanti
(3) Skt. alokakara > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. alokakar (Lalita.) Uig. alokakar
(3) Skt. amangala > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. amaggal (Lalita.) Uig. amangal
(1) Skt. ānandita > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. ānandati (Lalita.) Uig. ānandita/ānandati

(1) Skt. ārada-kālāma > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. aratalkalm (Lalita.) Uig. aratalkalm
(3) Skt. ayuta > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. ayutu (Mong.) Uig. auyut
(7) Skt. vakkalin > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. bakali (Kand.) Uig. vakali
(3) Skt. pāndava > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. bandlab (Lalita.) Uig. pāndap
(3) Skt. karṇikāra > Toch. > Uig. > Mong. karnikar (Mong.) Uig. karṇikar

A much larger number of forms will be collected, if other Mongolian texts, really huge in amount, are surveyed. By systematizing those reconstructed forms, it will not be impossible to estimate the nature and quantity of Buddhist Uighur texts lost now.\(^{26}\)

NOTES

1) maqaraj in the second paragraph of Nishida’s text is corrected by the present author to maqarat, because the reading of ţi is clear on the facsimile. See also Ligei (1972: 86). It may be noticed that in Röhrborn’s text A and āg in combination with back vowels are phonemic transcriptions of the letter Q, e.g. oqlis for ‘WQL-N, which is transcribed as oqlis in the rest of this paper.

2) See Nishida (1957: 258, Note 2), where he identifies it with Skt. sarvavīra. In view of the Uighur form, however, his identification may well be discarded.

3) Cf. sarva-viśva ‘possessing all science,’ and sarvavīrāja ‘all science’ (Monier p. 1187). On ning برج ‘recognition, knowledge, learning’ translating Skt. viśva, see Nakamura (1975: 1306-b). Rörborn’s sarvavīraja, if it really exists, also means ‘all-kundig, all-gleicht’ (Rörborn 1980: 328).

4) In Uighur, either –ji or -i corresponds to the Sanskrit ending -ji of an animate noun. In this case the Mongolian form sarvavīra reflects the latter, cf. Skt. sākhāra > Uig. sākha > Mong. sākhā.

5) See Mitrovn (1928-29), Shogaito (1978) and Moebius (1980).

6) For the edition of this text, see Aalto (1961).

7) See Damissionsen (1979: 40, 44, colophon A). On the basically same colophon of the Pañcarakṣa, see Aalto (1979: 117), with the facsimile reproduced on p. 206, 8v.

8) Edited by Poppe (1967).

9) For the details of this point, see Poppe (1967: 13).

10) Two fragments of the Mahābhūtikāya are known in Uighur (cf. Radlof 1928 No. 60), and one fragment from the commentary of the Pañcarakṣa is published (ibid. No. 103). However, the fragmentary nature of these MSS does not allow the direct comparison with the Mongolian version.

11) Words belonging to this category are also found in this Mongolian list, e.g. Mong. sāruvat (Pança.) < Uig. tāvāvat (Pança.) < Skt. tāvāvat. Mong. bānana (Pança.) < Uig. bānana < Skt. vānara, etc.

12) There are a considerable number of words which are modified in other parts than endings, e.g. Mong. stāryaprastāra (Pança.) < Uig. stāryaprastāra, Mong. mātrat (Lalita. Mong.) < Uig. mātra < Toch. A mātra < Skt. mātra and Mong. mātr (Lalita. H. Zwei. Kand.) < Uig. mātr < Toch. A mātr < Skt. mātr.

13) The form directly deriving from Uig. kākrasūndi was settled in Mongolian, and even in the rest of the Pañcarakṣa, this form is met with. Cf. also kākrasūndi (Lalita.), gārjasūnda (Kand.) and gārjasawun (Bhadra.).


15) Of the Pañcarakṣa two xylographs are known, one preserved in Stockholm and the other in Leningrad. The above-quoted list of the yakas and their living places is cited from the text edited by Aalto who based his edition on the Stockholm xylograph dated 1686. But, as far as this list is concerned, there is no basic difference between the Stockholm and Leningrad xylographs, on the latter of which is the colophon mentioned in note 7.

16) In this article, the photo copy of the manuscript made by S. Julian which is now deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) is consulted.

17) Other examples are: Sogd. šinmu > Uig. šinmu > Mong. šinmu > šinmu (Bodhi. H. Zwei. Kand.)
kasari arslan meta künkregi irekki
'Coming while roaring like buffaloes and lions' (Poppe 1967: 57, 150)

Though Poppe derives kasari from Skt. kásara 'buffalo,' the facsimile clearly shows the spelling KYSR/y (kizari), which apparently contradicts his interpretation. In Uighur k시라 from Skt. kára 'horn' constitutes a hendyrad with arslan 'id.', e.g., kíi kárra kásari arslan xant 'a (Kelserin) Lion King with a human body' (Shogaito 1982: 52, 53). One may be enabled to identify kísar arslan of the Lasavatara with this expression.

23) Some expressions borrowed from Uighur in set phrases appear without final -a, e.g., tiim lamant ulasi ulasans (Fragment.) <Uig. tiim lamant ulasi ulasants.

24) It is well-known that the Manchu inherited Mongolian Buddhism, and among Buddhist Manchu texts one finds Uighur forms borrowed via Mongolian. Some examples are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skt.</th>
<th>TT VII</th>
<th>Mahâvyut.</th>
<th>Chin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aditya</td>
<td>aditya</td>
<td>naran</td>
<td>日</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soma</td>
<td>soma</td>
<td>saran</td>
<td>月</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aigâraka</td>
<td>angarak</td>
<td>aggraq</td>
<td>火星</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budha</td>
<td>bud</td>
<td>bud</td>
<td>水星</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brhaspati</td>
<td>barxasuvadi</td>
<td>briqabadi</td>
<td>木星</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skura</td>
<td>skûrû</td>
<td>skûra</td>
<td>金星</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šânaścara</td>
<td>šâniščar</td>
<td>sanisãar</td>
<td>土星</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rãhu</td>
<td>raxu</td>
<td>raqu</td>
<td>骑鹿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ketu</td>
<td>kîtu</td>
<td>kidu</td>
<td>骑驴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Lasavatara, ĉai appears in the following contexts:

basa mûn qaṭay-ujiqi ĉay-tur sîldegen-a kûmnand nandi nandibali ner-e-ten ökid edîr-tûr
naiman jeyan braman-neyuld-ĉai ĉai ĉai bujû...
‘Also, at the time when he was bearing hardship, the maidens Nandi and Nandabali, village inhabitants, served tea daily to eight hundred brahmanas,' (Poppe 1967: 51, 143)

However, ĉai 'tea,' though quite common in the modern languages of Central Asia, has not been attested in the Uighur texts of the Yuan Dynasty, whereas ĉayî (< Chin. 喝) is found in the similar contexts:

irsi-lâr ilgi burxan bûfûn bursaq quvray-û ĉayi-û qa őtûnsûn mûn
‘When I offered foods to the monastic community, beginning with Buddha, the King of Kings,’ (Shogaito 1982: 62, 63)

Therefore, it is advisable to consider ĉai of the Lasavatara not as denoting 'tea' but as representing Chin. 喝.

21) For this word, see also Mong. vasinorâni (Lalita. Kandj.) borrowed from Tocharian via Uighur, cf., Uig. vaisina < Skt. vaisnavasana.

22) One finds the following sentence in the Lasavatara (52v.):
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