Notes on the «Irk Bitig»

By Sir Gerard Clauson (London)

One of the items in the Chrestomathy appended to my old friend Prof. Dr. Annemarie von Gabain's authoritative "Alttürkische Grammatik" is a short extract from the *Irk Bitig*. It therefore seems to me wholly appropriate that my modest contribution to the volume printed in her honour should be a few notes on that curious text.

The *Irk Bitig* was acquired by Sir Aurel Stein from the deposit of manuscripts in the "Halls of the Thousand Buddhas" near Tunhuang, and so cannot be precisely dated, but it is more likely to have been written in the 9th Century than in the 8th or 10th. It is written in what Professor von Gabain has aptly called "the Manichaean *n*-dialect", but as this is for all practical purposes identical with the language of the Orkhon inscriptions, I suggest that it would be simpler to call all the *n*-dialects "Türkü", distinguishing the language of the manuscripts, if necessary, by calling it "Manichaean Türkü". It seems to me very probable that the Manichaean missionaries, when they began to preach to the Turks in Central Asia, at first translated their scriptures into Türkü and did not start using Uyğur until after the accession to power of the first Uyğur dynasty in the middle of the 8th Century. This does not of course mean that Uyğur was not in common use in Central Asia long before that date; no doubt it was; nor does it mean that the actual surviving manuscripts written in Manichean Türkü are necessarily, or even probably, older than the manuscripts written in Uyğur.

The *Irk Bitig* was first published by V. Thomsen in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society", 1912 pp. 190 ff. Considering how little was known of Türkü and other early dialects at that date his edition is a real *tour de force*. Inevitably, however, it contains some mistakes, and it is a real misfortune that he did not print the *irk*, that is the three groups of small circles, at the head of each paragraph. This omission obscured the real purpose of the book, and led to the curious delusion, of which traces can still be found, that it was a handbook for interpreting dreams. Actually, as von Gabain has pointed out, it is simply a handbook for interpreting the significance of the various combinations of three throws of a "die", or rather a short rectangular rod with one to four circles inscribed on each side of it. It is interesting to note that such "dice" were recently discovered at Khayrabad Tepe, a few miles north of Termez in Uzbekistan, in a layer anterior to the 3rd Century A.D. containing Kushan coins. They are illustrated in L. A. Albaum's *Bqlalik Tepe*, Tashkent, 1960, figure 33. These "dice" are, of course, several centuries older than the *Irk Bitig*, but their discovery in a Kushan/Saka context suggests that the ideas underlying the *Irk Bitig* were Iranian; certainly they did not come

from China, which had quite a different system of fortune-telling. There is nothing to show that the book is a translation from an Iranian language, and indeed that is very improbable. Its whole flavour is Turkish, and it was almost certainly compiled for a Turkish audience, but perhaps by an author who was not himself a Turk. What we have, however, is obviously a copy, and not the original author's manuscript. This is shown by the fact that, apart from some obvious scribal errors, like *yvk* for *yavlak* "bad", which occurs several times, the concluding sentences of some paragraphs, which should all be in a standard form, are incomplete. Each paragraph, after *tér* ("close of inverted commas") should conclude *ança: biliŋler* "know thus" *edgü: ol* or *añïg edgü: ol* or *yavlak ol* or *añïg yavlak ol* "it is good", or "very good", or "bad" or "very bad". In fact 33 omens are described as "good", 5 as "very good", 17 as "bad" and 2 as "very bad", which suggests that the dice were heavily loaded on the side of the angels, but paragraphs 4, 10, 13, 14, 21, 48 and 51 all end at the words *ança: biliŋ(ler)*, which must have put the fortune-teller in a dreadful quandary. Paragraph 57 is unique; it ends "know thus! At the beginning of this *ïrk* there is a little pain, but later it becomes good again".

As each of the three groups of an *ïrk* contains between one and four circles, there should be 4×4×4, that is 64, paragraphs. Actually there are 65. This is because the *ïrk* 3 1 3 appears over both paragraph 24 and paragraph 25. There does not seem to be any logical basis behind the arrangement of the *ïrk's* except that the first four are 2 2 2, 4 4 4, 3 3 3, 1 1 1. These are followed by 2 4 2, 2 2 1, 2 1 2, 3 2 1. Quite apart from the fact that one was duplicated, therefore, it must have been very difficult for the fortune-teller to turn up the relevant *ïrk* in a hurry.

The whole *Irk Bitig* has been republished twice, by H. N. Orkun in "Eski Türk Yazïtlarï, Vol. II, İstanbul, 1939 and by S. Ye. Malov in "Pamyatniki Drevnetyurkskoy Pis'mennosti", Moscow-Leningrad, 1951, but although these are both accompanied by more accurate translations than Thomsen's they still contain some obvious errors. At the International Congress of Orientalists at Cambridge in 1954, the late K. Grønbech told me that he was contemplating a new edition and I gave him these notes, but unhappily he died before he could produce it.

Paragraph 3. "I am a golden-headed predatory eagle; *tanïm tüsi: takï: tüke: mezken*, lying by the sea I take what I please and eat what I like; I am so strong." The words quoted in original have defeated all previous editors but surely mean "although I am not yet fully fledged". *Tü*: certainly means "feathers", and *tanïm* must mean "my body". *Tan* is of course Iranian, and a common loan word in many modern Turkish languages, but I have not found any other certain occurrence of it before the mediaeval period. It perhaps suggests that the author was an Iranian or, at any rate, familiar with an Iranian language.

Paragraph 5. The manuscript certainly has *altu:n bodllg buğra:lïk yara:ğay*, but the second *l* in the second word must be an error for *u*:. Even so the meaning is not clear. *Bo:ġ* in Türkü (and *bo:y* in early Oğuz) meant "clan"; *bo:ġ* in Uyğur and Khakani meant something like "stature"; so the phrase means either "the camel stud of golden lineage will prosper" or "the golden-bodied camel stud will prosper".

Paragraph 8 is really difficult. The word *y o/u l*, hitherto taken for *yol* "road", is clearly the imperative *yul* "loosen, release". Rather tentatively I suggest that it should be translated, "I am a golden-headed snake. Cutting my golden belly

with a sword, release my body (*ō:zü:m*, or myself?) from the hole (*inti:n*); release my head from the berries (*evi:ntin*)". There are two oddities about this. These two words, and *teŋri:di:n* in paragraph 44 are the only examples in the book of an (Uyğur) ablative in *-dïn/-din*, instead of a (Türkü) Ablative in *-da:/de:*; and "berries" does not make much sense, but it makes better sense than "from its house" (*ev-in-tin*).

Paragraph 10. Neither Thomsen nor Orkun understood the first word; Malov translated it "stretching himself"; but *esne:-* is a denominal verb from *esen* "a gentle breeze" and means something like "to blow gently", so that *esnegen bars men* must mean "I am a snuffling (or yawning) leopard".

Paragraph 11. Yazïğ is discussed below under paragraph 50.

Paragraph 12. MALOV's translation is the best so far, but I think *er avka;barmi:ş tağda: kamlami:ş teŋri:de: erklig* really means "a went man hunting and made magic on a mountain, (declaring himself) independent of heaven", taking *teŋri:de:* as an Ablative not a Locative.

Paragraph 13 contains one of the very few mistranscriptions in Thomsen's text; the word which he read as *bulu:ŋïn* is in fact *bulu:pan* and the paragraph means "a devout old woman remained in the *yurt* (when the others went away); she found a greasy ladle and by licking it stayed alive and escaped death".

Paragraph 16. Kuḍu:rsu:ğïŋnï:ŋa: has every appearance of being a scribal error. *Kuḍu:rsu:ğïŋ* might be taken as a Genitive, but there is no other trace of such a word; nor is there any trace of a word like *an* or *anï:*. The meaning of the phrase as a whole is clear", "(the horse) being galled up to the mane and back to the tail". A rather drastic emendation would be *kuḍru:ğïŋ uçï:ŋa:* "to the edge of its tail", but it is not very like the original. *Yéli:ŋe:* "to its mane" is an interesting form. There is great inconsistency in the vocalization of the word for "mane" in Turkish. It has a back vowel in nearly all modern languages, but a front vowel in the North Eastern (South Siberian and Tuvan) languages and in Osmanli/Republican Turkish (*yele*). In Khakani both forms existed. *Kaşğari* has *ya:l-ʿurfu'l-faras wa hiya maʿrafatuhu fi camiʿi'l-luğāt* "a horse's mane, and also the part of the neck on which it grows, in all languages" *III 160*[1], and *yalïğ* translated "a cock's comb and also a horse's mane; other forms are *ya:l* and *yé:l*, the latter being more correct" *III 13. Yéli:ŋe:* shows that in Türkü the word had a front vowel. The original form must have been *ḍé:l*, which occurs in Mongolian as *del*, a "first period" loan word.

Paragraph 17. The first sentence has given all the previous editors some trouble; *özlük at öŋ yérde: arïp oŋu:p turu: kalmi:ş.* THOMSEN translated *öŋ* "first", Orkun "sunny" and Malov "eastern". But BANG in *Turcica* (M.V.A.G. 1917, p. 286) collected the scattered evidence which shows that as well as *öŋ* "front" and *öŋ* "colour" there was another word, *öŋ* or more probably *üŋ*, which meant "desert, barren ground". It occurs, *inter alia*, in *Türkische Turfan-texte VI, line 115*;

Tïşastɯstïk 50 b. 5 and *Uigurica III 29, 35*. So the sentence more plausibly means, "a favourite riding horse came to a standstill in a desert, exhausted and wilting".

Paragraph 18, with its list of technical terms for the parts of a *yurt* is one of the most interesting in the book, and a striking example of the stability of the Turkish vocabulary. In "*Notes on the Kazak Yurt of West Mongolia*", Acta Orientalia Hungarica XII, 1—3. A. Róna-Tas has published an interesting study of the modern Kazak *yurt* in the course of which he says that the lattice frame-work which makes the side of the tent is called *kerege* (corresponding to *kere:kü*: in this paragraph) and the felt cover of the smoke-hole *tümüldük* or *tüŋlük* (here *tügü:nük*). The modern equivalent of *közünük* is less clear. The interstices in the *kerege* are called *köz*, presumably "eye", and there is another word *kösk* or *köşk* meaning both "the curtains hung inside the tent" and "the canvas cover over the outside felt walls". Some of the ropes used in fastening the *yurt* together are called *bao*, but this corresponds to Türkü *ba:ğ* rather than *bağïş*. Kaşğari I 367 translate *bağïş* "the joint (of a finger or a cane)", but in Çağatay (*Sanglax* 125 r. 26), as in Türkü, *bagïş* meant "tent-rope". An interesting point arises on the words *bar ol*. Malov translated them "they bind it", clearly taking *bar* as the Aorist of *ba:-* "to bind", but this is grammatically difficult, and Orkun was probably right in translating them *vardïr* "they exist".

Paragraph 19 is wholly obscure. I think that Malov has done all that can be done with it.

Paragraph 20. Thomsen's transcription is impeccable, but *uḍï:ğmağ* is morphologically very odd, and I suspect that the text should read *uḍï:ğlï:ğ oḍğu:ru: yatï:ğlï:ğ turğuru*: "waking the sleepers and rousing the recumbent". *Titi:r buğra*: "female camel, camel stallion" has puzzled the editors. The explanation is to be found in the *Kutaḍğu: Bilig*, verses 2, 310ff. in Arat's edition, in a description of the qualities required by a general. It says that he must have the qualities of various animals, the lion, the leopard, the boar, the wolf, the bear, the fox etc., and, if he is taking revenge, be as vindicative as the *titir buğrasï*: "the camel stallion with a herd of females". It looks as if the *-sï*: had fallen out of our text.

Paragraph 21, too, is obscure; *kara: öpgü:k yïl yaru:mazkan tedi: öḍmeŋ körmeŋ ürkittiŋ*. There is no other known occurrence of *öḍ-* (or *üḍ-*). Orkun translated it "to advise", presumably connecting it with *ö:-* "to think", which is morphologically impossible. Malov, without explanation, translated it "to tame". But there is a deverbal noun *öḍig* (or *üḍig*), meaning "sexual desire, passion", which is so translated in *Kaşğari I 69* and occurs elsewhere in that work and in *Kutaḍğu: Bilig*, verse 6,300. I think therefore that the paragraph must mean, "the black hoopoe, before the year brightened (that is "before the days got long") said "Do not get excited, do not look, you startled me."

Paragraph 22. There have been divergent translations of this paragraph, but it certainly means, "a woman let her mirror fall into a lake; in the morning it tinkles, and in the evening it clatters".

Paragraph 23. Previous translations have been right off the point. The third word is *tezeki:n* "its dung" and the first sentence means "A boy found the dung of a golden eagle". The next word, *çu* followed by a front *k*, is clearly corrupt; it is

perhaps an error for *çariŋ* "your reputation". The next three words seem to be *atiŋ kutlu:ġ bolzu:n* "may your reputation be fortunate", and *çav* and *at* often occur together. There is of course any amount of folk-lore connected with bird's dung as a favourable omen.

Paragraph 24. MALOV's translation is the best so far, but *kanta:* must mean "where?", not "in blood". *Yütü:rük* is difficult. It can hardly be connected with Kipcak *yötür-* "to cough", and if it is correctly spelt, the likeliest connection is with Khakani *yüġ-* "to load one's self", of which the Türkü Causative form would be *yüt(t)ür-*. But semantically it would be better to emend the word to *yitü:rük*, which could mean "lost, strayed". The whole paragraph would then mean, "a blind colt looked for an udder on a stallion. If he is lost (like this) at mid-day, where (will he be) and how will he get on at mid-night?".

Paragraph 29. The general meaning is quite clear, but there is one error of transcription, *alïp* for *alï:* which is quite clear in the manuscript, and three difficult words. I take *oyuġ* to be the Accusative of *o:y* "a hole", assuming that we have here a game played on the ground (or a board), in which pieces are put into holes. (Incidentally in that event *oyun* "game" might be an irregular plural of *o:y*, parallel to *oğla:n* from *oğul* "son", *eren* from *er* "man" and *boġun* "tribe" from *bo:ġ* "clan".) *Usiç* is otherwise unknown; Orkun's "dangerous" and MALOV's "skilful" are both mere guesses; but the general connotation must be favourable. The first two words, *oyma: er*, must mean "gambler", but why? As a suffix, *-ma:* is practically non-existent in Türkü; the phrase may mean literally "the man who makes holes (to set out the game)", from *o:y-* "to perforate, hollow out". So the whole would mean, "a gambler staking his sons and womenfolk ended by getting the winning hole. So far from losing his sons and women folk he won ninety stray(?) sheep. His sons and maid-servants all rejoice".

Paragraph 31. Previous translators have missed the point that both this and paragraph 49 refer not to one animal but two, a leopard and a deer, who went to look for *eŋ* and *meŋ*. This is the only occurrence of *eŋ* "wild game" with a front vowel, but the same word, pronounced *aŋ*, occurs in Mongolian, presumably as a loan word from Turkish, and in some modern North Eastern languages. *Meŋ* occurs in Uyğur and Khakani with the specific meaning of "bird seed, poultry food", but must have a rather broader meaning here.

Paragraph 36 is much more difficult than it looks at first sight. *Ülkü:ş atlïġ öġrünçü:ŋ yok, kovï: atlïġ korkinçi:ŋ yok uçru:ğlu:ġ kutu:ŋ yok.* One's first inclination is to take the first two words to mean "possessing many horses", but according to *Kaşğari, III 226, kovï:* means *al-mudbir* "unlucky", more specifically applied to a man; so it looks as if the first two sentences mean "you get no pleasure out of having many titles, and you are not afraid of having a reputation for being unlucky". I cannot find other occurrence of *uçru:ğlu:ġ* and only two of *uçru:ġ* which is a deverbal noun from *uçur-* "to cause to fly". In *Uigurica II 40, 107 tuġ uçruġ* means "flying flags" and in *ditto 57, 1 (ii) yïġ uçruġ* means "spraying (or scattering) perfumes"; but this does not throw much light on the meaning of our third sentence.

Paragraph 38 has hitherto been completely misunderstood. *Kaşğari I 134* says that *avinçu:* means "a concubine". Even so the paragraph is obscure, but I think

that it means, "may the concubine who lived among the reeds without the favour of heaven become a queen".

Paragraph 39. THOMSEN mistranscribed, or silently emended, the first word, which is in fact spelt *tğığ*. This is probably a slinghtly incorrect scription for *tığı:ğ*, the Accusative of *tı:ğ* (see paragraph 50) which *Kaşğari III 127* translates in the phrase *tı:g at* "a horse with a coat between roan and dark bay". The paragraph must mean something like. "(a man) hobbled the dark roan horse crosswise (that is, say, near off leg to off hind leg), and it stood unable to move".

Paragraph 40 is very difficult. *Telim* "many" is common; but *talım* occurs only in the *Irk Bitig* and Uyğur and is always used to qualify some kind of animal. In Uyğur *talım kara kuş* is twice used, in Uigurica II 20, 23 and "Türkische Turfantexte VI" line 432, to translate Sanskrit *garuḍa*, a mythological bird. In PELLIOT's "La Version Ouigoure de l'Histoire des Princes Ḳalyāṇaṃkara et Pāpaṃkara" 17, 1 *talım baliğ* means something like "shark". *Urı*: normally means "a male child, boy", but in *Kaşğari* III 370, 1 *teriy u:rı*: is translated *facc 'amiq* "a deep ravine". It looks as if that were the meaning here. If so, *talım* is perhaps an error for *telim*, and the paragraph could mean "He walks alone, striking and cleaving the hard rock with his spears, until he cleaves many ravines in it."

Paragraph 41. Ülü:gde: ozmı:ş is rather obscure. Previous editors have translated it "it was saved from its fate", taking the word to be the same as that in the Postscript ("with the help of the *Irk Bitig* every man is master of his own fate"), but the stock phrase in paragraphs 12, 17 and 49 is *ölü:mde: ozmı:ş* "it escaped death", and I suspect that *-g-* here is a scribal error for *-m-*.

Paragraph 43. I think that previous translators have got confused between subject and object here, and that the paragraph really means "a hawk went hunting for river birds; a predatory eagle rose to meet it".

Paragraph 44. There have been minor errors in previous translations. I suggest, "a hawk, saying (to itself) 'there is a hare', swooped down from the sky. The hawk's claws were skinned and split. The hawk (*kuşu:ŋ* is I think a scribal error for *kuş*) flew up again with its claws damaged, and the hare ran away with its skin lacerated". The implication is that the hawk just missed the hare and hit the ground.

Paragraph 47. THOMSEN made a bad mistake in equating *ömе:le:-* with Taranchi *ömüle-* and Koibal *ömekte-* "to creep". These modern words are merely secondary forms of *emgekle:-* which occurs in this sense in a number of languages from Uyğur onwards. Actually *ömе:le:-* (or *üme:le:-*?) is a denominal verb from *ömе:* (or *üme:*?) translated in *Kaşğari I 92* "a guest who stays in one's house". The word seems to be peculiar to Khakani; it occurs several times in *Kaşğari*, and the Accusative *ömе:g* in *Kutaḍğu*: *Bilig* verses 495, 4,436 and 5,546. The paragraph means "A man went visiting and met a god", and so on.

Paragraph 48. It is an open question whether the reference is to *yol teŋri*: "the road god" or *yul teŋri*: "the god of the spring". The best translation would probably be "I am the god of the black spring".

Paragraph 49. Two animals are involved, see paragraph 31. *Mğa* cannot be transcribed *mağa*: and equated with Mongolian *moğay* "snake" as proposed by

MALOV. I have pointed out in a paper "The Initial Labial Sounds in the Turkish Languages", B.S.O.A.S., 1961, Part 2, that initial *m-* in true Turkish words is a secondary sound replacing *b-* in words containing nasals and does not occur in any other context. As L. BAZIN pointed out in "Noms de la 'Chèvre' en Turc et en Mongol", Studia Altaica, Wiesbaden, 1957, the word should be transcribed *amğa:* and translated" wild goat". But *amğa:* is an unusual spelling; in Khakani (*Kutadğu: Bilig*, verse 5, 373) and Çagatay (*Sanglax* 114 v. 29) the spelling is *imğa:*, and in Osmanli *ima* (or *ime*?). In the forme *ima'a(n)* (see E. HAENISCH, "Wörterbuch zu Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an", Leipzig, 1939 p. 82) it was an early loan word in Mongolian, but did not mean only "*wild* goat", since *ima'at* could be milked (*ibid.* p. 130, s. v. *sa'a-*).

Paragraph 50. For *tiğ* see paragraph 39. *Yaziğ* also occurs in paragraph 11, in antithesis to *sariğ* "yellow", but, so far as I can discover nowhere else. It must be a word for some kind of colour of a horse's coat, and the likeliest explanation is that it is a metathesis of *yağiz*, a well known word for "brown". *Tiğ* and *yaziğ*, were clearly chosen here for the sake of alliteration. Previous tranlators of *tigret-* have been too refined; *Kaşğari II 330* translates it "to make (a horse) break wind". The word *topu:u:luğ*, though correctly transcribed is clearly corrupt; the only plausible emendation is *topla:ğuluğ*. Thus the whole paragraph means, "tie up the bay horse's tail and make it break wind, throw the dun horse to the ground, pile nine of your horse-blankets over it, and make it sweat".

Paragraph 52. Bolï: is a mistranscription of *bulïtï:*; *bulïtï: a:ra:* "among the clouds", in reference to the sun, is the counterpart of *bosanç ara:* "in the midst of depression", in reference to the man.

Paragraph 54 has been slightly mistranslated; *kul* and *kuzğu:n* are the subjects and *savï*: the objects of the two sentences.

Paragraph 55 contains two difficult words. *Türt-* means "to rub"; Kaşğari's illustrative phrase is, "he rubbed oil on the leather"; it seems wholly inappropriate in this context. I think that the right transcription must be *töretmi:ş* "he created"; but even this does not make very good sense, unless we assume the alternative meaning of the Causative, "he got himself made". *Yitigli:g* is otherwise unknown. MALOV's explanation of *atï*: *yitigli:g* as "his horse is dressed in parade harness", on the basis of an entry in Budagov, is misconceived. The word in Budagov is derived from *yetek*, a corruption of the Persian word *yadak* "a led horse". Kaşğari III 18, after translating *yétig biçek* as "a sharp knife", translates *yétig er* as *al-raculu'l-nadb fi'l-umüri'l-ḥadd* "a man who is clever and sharp in dealing with affairs', and *yétigli:g* should probably be taken as a possessive adjective from the word in this sense. The whole paragraph might then mean, "a tough son of man went to the army, he got himself made an independent envoy in the fighting area. When he comes home, he will come with a good reputation, joyful and with a reputation for cleverness".

Paragraph 57. There is certainly one scribal error in this paragraph; *köye:ki:* and *köne:ki:* cannot both be right, and in fact the first must be wrong. *Kaşğari I 392* translates *könek* as *al-rakwa* "a leather water-skin". *Knğï*, which occurs twice, is more difficult. MALOV's suggestion that the sentence means, "his canal

has dried up and his drain is frozen", can hardly be right. Kaşğari I 376 translates *kaniğ* as *al-aryaḥiya* "cheerfulness", illustrated by a verse, "her (a queen's) cloud (that is, "of generosity") is constantly raining, it drops pure gold; when her stream flows, *kandï*: *meniŋ kaniğ*", translated *tamma naṣāti wa rawaytu mina'l-surūr* "I am full of joyfulness and draw out (the water of) joy". *Rawā* is a technical term for drawing water, and it looks as if the verse contained a whole series of puns, in which *kaniğ* like other words in the verse had a double meaning; but if this was so, it is surprising that Kaşğari did not explain them. Etymologically *kaniğ*, a deverbal noun from *kan-* "to be satisfied", should not have any other meaning than that which he gives. Besides, a cup or something of that sort could hardly be described as *beglig* "belonging to a headman" or "of the family of a headman" and be said to die. It is possible that *knğï* is a scribal error for *kaŋï*: "his father". If not, we can only suppose that *kaniğ* had some other meaning which is now lost.

Paragraph 60. Tokuz rlï is very difficult. Thomsen, without explanation, translated it "living in nine thickets". Malov, reading *aral(l)ï*: translated it "living in the 'nine' island", but this is impossible, since *aral* "island" is a Mongolian word not found in Turkish before the 15th Century (Çagatay). In any event the possessive adjectival suffix in Türkü was *-liğ/-lig*, not *-lï/-li*. The text is almost certainly corrupt and there is no obvious emendation.

Paragraph 61. Turñya must mean "crane". The spelling in *Kaşğari* is *turna:*, and this form is still current. The original form was probably *turña*: and the *-y-* in the *Irk Bitig* superfluous. Thomsen transcribed the third word in the paragraph *tüşne:ki:ŋe:* and translated it "among his companions". He got this translation from Radlov, who guessed that that was the meaning of this word in *Kutadğu: Bilig*, verse 3,570, but unfortunately he guessed wrong. The context there is, "if a man accumulates all the wealth in the world and lives in happiness for a thousand years, what is the good of it? In the end the black earth is deep and *aniŋ töşneki* (so to be spelt) *ol yağïz yér oyï*", which obviously means "his resting place is a hole in the brown earth". I take the word to be a contracted deverbal noun from *töşen-* "to make one's bed". *To/uzka* was transcribed *tozka*: and translated "in the dust" by Thomsen. Malov took the word to be *to:z* "birch-bark" and translated it "in a birch-bark(noose)". But a much more plausible transcription is *tuzak(k)a*: "in a snare". Thus the whole paragraph would mean, "A crane went to settle on its nest, but by not noticing it, was caught in a snare. It sits there unable to move".

Paragraph 62. Yarğu:n seems to be otherwise unknown. It may of course be a scribal error.

Paragraph 64. Buymu:l is said in Kaşğari III 176 to be a word used of horses and sheep and meaning "having a white neck". In Osmanli (Redhouse p. 413) it is translated "hen harrier, or marsh harrier", which is probably the approximate meaning which it had in this paragraph. The word *muymul*, "untamable", quoted by Thomsen, cannot be traced further back than Sheykh Süleyman's „Luğat Çagatay ve Turkī 'Uṭmānī", İstanbul, A.H. 1298, and is of very dubious authenicity.