II 48/24

ACTA ORIENTALIA

EDIDERUNT

SOCIETATES
ORIENTALES DANICA NORVEGICA
SVECICA

(LE MONDE ORIENTAL)

CURANTIBUS SØREN EGEROD, HAVNIÆ,
NILS SIMONSSON, OSLO, H. S. NYBERG †, UPSALIÆ

REDIGENDA CURAVIT
SØREN EGEROD

ADIUVIT
LISE SODE-MOGENSEN

XXXVI

APUD EJNAR MUNKSGAARD
HAVNIÆ
1974

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO ORKHON INSCRIPTIONS

BY

EVEN HOVDHAUGEN

University of Oslo

0. Introductory remarks

0.1. One of the most difficult problems connected with the interpretation of inscriptions is that errors and deviations from the standard norm of the language involved are very hard to discover and even more difficult to prove. This is especially the case when the inscriptions are the only existing corpus for a language or dialect. Interpreters of inscriptions are accordingly inclined to accept the whole text as "perfect" and to include all forms attested in a grammatical description of the corpus. This procedure is easily understandable since corrections in most cases will be arbitrary and simply mean that the interpreter does not understand the text. On the other hand, a too great confidence in the text may cause ghost forms to be included in the grammatical description of the material.

0.2. In the case of the two Old Turkic inscriptions known as the Orkhon inscriptions, we are in a unique position since a large part of these two inscriptions are identical except for a few, and in my opinion very important, divergencies. The identical parts of the two texts are either derived from the same primary source or one of them is a copy of the other.

0.3. The editions of these texts have paid little attention to these divergencies. Thomsen 1896 put most of the identical parts together in his edition, but gives very few comments concerning the relationship between the two versions. In one of the most

recent editions (Tekin 1968) a list, although not complete, of the divergencies is given, but without further comments. In connection with the analysis of a difficult passage in the two texts Thomsen 1916, p. 25 says: "Je ne m'engagerai pas dans le problème insoluble de savoir quel a été dans II le modèle des parties communes aux deux inscriptions: était-ce, par example, le brouillon ou le dessin conservé de I? ou bien une nouvelle copie revue, faite directement d'après le monument I? On n'en sait rien. Quoi qu'il en soit, je ferai seulement remarquer que, ailleurs aussi, lorsqu'il y a des écarts entre les deux textes parallèles, le texte de II est presque toujours préférable à celui de I". He then gives some examples which will be discussed below.

1. The material

1.1. A comparison of the two inscriptions (henceforth referred to as I = Kül Tegin and II = Bilgä Kagan) ought to be based on a critical and trustworthy philological edition. Unfortunately no such edition exists. From a philological point of view Thomsen 1896 still remains the best edition, but it contains several misprints, errors and doubtful readings. Accordingly I have based my analysis primarily on the photos and texts in Inscriptions 1892. There are also many errors in these texts, but they can in most cases be corrected on the basis of the photos. Where the photos are unreadable, I have used the texts in Inscriptions 1892, but with great care. The consequence of this procedure is that probably no ghost forms are included in my analysis. On the other hand some readings proposed by Thomsen, Radloff or others which may be quite correct, are excluded by me since I have not found sufficient support for them in the original photos.

1.2. In Thomsen 1896 as well as in other editions the identical parts of the two inscriptions are considered to be the following ones: I E 1–30 = II E 2–24 and I S 1–11 = II N 1–8. But it is clear that parts of I E 31–38 and I N 1–7 are identical with II E 24–32. In this case the two versions are not identical since events relating to Kül tegin are omitted in II and replaced by events relating to Bilgä kagan. But some sentences and passages referring

to events in which both persons took part are so similar that they must have the same source. These identical parts are as follows:[1]

I E 31 L¹T¹YČWB¹:S¹WG¹D¹K¹T¹PA:S²ẄL²D²MZ:
B¹WZD¹MZ:T¹B¹G¹Č:WηT¹WT¹ʷK:B²YS²T² . . . . . .
II E 24 L¹T¹YČ . . . . .(E 25) T¹PA:S²ẄL²D²M:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:
NDA B¹WZD¹M:T¹B¹ . . . . ηT¹WT¹ʷK: B²S²T²ẄMN:
S²ẄK²L²T²Y:

I E 32 WL¹S²ẄG²:NDAJ¹ʷKK¹YŠD¹MZ:
II E 25 WL¹S²ẄG²:NDAJ¹ʷKK¹YŠD¹M:

I E 35 ʸKYR¹K¹ZT¹PA: S²ẄL²D²MZ:S²YηẄ .:B¹T¹MY:
K¹R¹G¹:S²ẄK²PN²:K²ẄG²MN²:J²YŠG¹:T¹WG¹A:
J¹WR¹YP:ʸKYR¹K¹Z:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:WD¹A:B¹S¹D¹MZ:
K¹G¹N¹YN²:B²YR²L²A: S¹WηAJ²YŠD¹A: S²ẄηŠD²MZ:
I E 36 ʸKYR¹K¹Z:K¹G¹N¹YN²:ẄL²R²T²MZ: YL²YN²: L¹T¹MZ:
WL¹J²YL¹K¹A: T²Ẅ . . . . . .
II E 26 ʸKYR¹K¹Z:T¹PA: S²ẄL²D²M: S²ẄηG²B¹T¹M¹ . . . .
II E 27 K¹R¹G¹: S²ẄK²PN²:K²ẄG²MN²:J²YŠG¹:T¹WG¹A:
J¹W . . .: ʸKYR¹K¹Z:B¹WD¹N¹G¹: WD¹A:B¹S¹D¹M:
K¹G¹N¹YN²:B²YR²L²A: S¹WηA:J²YŠD¹A:S²ẄηŠD²M:

---

[1] My system of transliteration and transcription is not quite identical with the one usually used for these texts and needs a few comments.

The transliteration is given in capital letters. The vowel signs are transliterated as follows: A (*a*, *ä*), Y (*ı*, *i*), W (*u*, *o*), Ẅ (*ü*, *ö*). Consonants used only with back vowels are marked 1 and those used only with front vowels are marked 2. Consonatal signs indicating the quality of the vowel in other respects are written ʷK, ẅK, ʸK etc.

As for the transcription I do not distinguish between short and long vowels (cf. below). *e* is used both for primary *e* < **ä* and for secondary *e* < **a*, cf. Meyer 1965, pp. 185–7. *o*/*u* and *ö*/*ü* are distinguished when possible. When the modern dialects do not provide us with criteria for distinguishing between them, I have used *w* and *ẅ* in the transcription. B and D are transcribed as fricatives *β* and *δ* except in initial position. After *n*, *l* and *r* the phoneme /δ/ has an allophone *d*, written T or by a compound sign LD or ND. No distinction is made between *k* and *q* and *g* and *γ* although there undoubtedly was a clear allophonic difference. Some of the observations on which this transcription is based I owe to Meyer 1965 as well as to personal communication from her.

K¹G¹N¹YN²:ẄL²R²T²M:YL²N²:NDA L¹T¹M:
WL¹ . .L¹K¹A:T²ẄR²G²S²:

I E 37 R²T²S²ẄG²ZG²:K²ČA:J¹WR¹YD¹MZ:T²ẄR²G²S²:
B¹WD¹N¹G¹:WD¹A: B¹S¹D¹MZ:T²ẄR²G²S²:K¹G¹N¹:
S²ẄS²Y:B¹WL¹ČWD¹A: WT¹ČA: B¹WR¹ČA:K²L²T²Y:
S²ẄηŠD²MZ:
I E 38 K¹G¹N¹YN²NDA:ẄL²R²T²MZ:YL²YN²L¹T¹MZ:
II E 26 .T²S²Ẅ.ZG²:K²ČA:J¹WR¹Y . . . . . .B¹.D¹.M:
T²ẄR²G²S²: K¹G¹N¹:S²ẄS²Y:WT¹ČA:B¹WR¹ČA:
K²L² . . . . .
II E 27 B¹WL¹ČWD¹A:S²ẄηŠD²MZ:K¹G¹N¹YN²:
J¹B¹G¹WS²YN²:ŠD¹YN²:NDA ẄL²R²T²M:YL²N²:
NDAL¹T¹M:

I N 1 K¹R¹L¹ʷK:B¹WD¹N¹:R²ẄR²B¹R¹WR¹:R²K²L²Y:
J¹G¹YB¹WLDY:T¹MG¹YD¹ʷK:B¹ŠD¹A:S²ẄL²D²MZ
I N 2 K¹R¹L¹ʷKWG¹:ẄL².T²MZ:L¹T¹MZ:
II E 29 K¹R¹L¹ʷK: B¹WD¹N¹:B¹WηS¹Z . .ẄR²:B¹R¹WR¹:
R²K²L²Y:J¹G¹Y B¹WLDY:T¹MG¹YD¹ʷK:B¹ŠD¹A:
S²ẄηŠD²M:K¹R¹L¹ʷK:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:ẄL²R²T²M:
NDAL¹T¹M

I N 4 T¹ʷKWZWG¹Z:B¹WD¹N¹:K²N²T²Ẅ: B¹WD¹N¹M:
R²T²Y:T²ηR²Y: J²YR²: . . .G¹K¹Y N²: . .ẄN²:J¹G¹Y
B¹WLDY: .YR²J²YL¹K¹A:B²YŠJ¹WL¹Y:S²ẄηŠD²MZ:
ηYL²K²:T¹WG¹WB¹L¹ʸKD¹A:S²ẄηŠD²MZ
II E 29 T¹ . . . . . :MN²η:B¹WD¹N¹MR²T²Y:T²ηR²Y:
J²R²: B¹WL¹G¹K¹YN²:ẄČN²:ẄD²Y . . . .
II E 30 K²ẄN²Y:T²G²D²ʷK: ẄČN²:J¹G¹YB¹WLDY:B² .
.J²YL¹K¹A:T²ẄR²T² J¹WL¹Y:S²ẄηŠD²M:ηYL²K²Y:
T¹WG¹W:B¹L¹ʸKD¹A:S²ẄηŠD²M:

I N 6 S²ẄS²YN²:S¹NČD¹MZ: YL²YN²L¹T¹MZ:T²ẄR²T²NČ:
ČWŠYB¹ŠYNDA: S²ẄηŠD²MZ:T²ẄR²ʷK
I N 7 B¹WD¹N¹:D¹K¹K¹M ŠT¹D¹Y:J¹B¹L¹K¹B¹W. . .VY. . . .WZA
. .L²MS²:S²ẄS²YN²: K²ẄL²T²Y. .:G¹T¹P:T¹WηR¹A:
B²YR²WG¹Š: L¹PG¹W:WN¹R²G²:T¹WηAT²YG²N²:

J¹WG¹YNDA: G²R²PẄL²R²T²MZ: B²YS²NČ: ZG²N²T²Y:
K¹Z¹ZD¹A: WG¹Z: B²YR²L²A: S²ẄηS²D²MZ:
II E 30 S²ẄS²YN²: S¹NČ . . . . . .ηŠD²M: T²ẄR²ʷ̈K:
B¹WD¹N¹: D¹K¹K¹MŠT¹Y: J¹B¹L¹K¹
II E 31 B¹WL¹T¹ČY: R²T²YWZA: J¹NJA: K²L²G²MA: S²ẄS²Y:
G¹T¹M: ẄK²Š ẄL²T²ČY: NDA: T²YR²L²T²Y: NDA:
T¹WηR¹A: J²YL¹PG¹WT¹Y: B²YR²: WG¹ŠG¹: T¹WηA:
T²YG²N²: J¹WG¹. . .: G²R²AT¹WK¹YD¹M: T²ẄR²T²NČ:
ZG²NDY: K¹D¹ZD¹A: S²ẄηŠD²M:

It is also possible that there may have been some identical passages in I S 12–13 = II N 14–15 and I SE = II SW, but since these parts of II are very badly preserved, they will not be treated here.

2. Phonology

2.1. There are few errors in the texts. I have found 5 in I and 2 in II. The first five are probably due to the engraver, while the last two are more likely due to the scribe of the texts.

Examples:

I E 6 T¹B¹G¹ = II E 6 T¹B¹G¹Č *taβgač*

I E 3 B²YL²A = II E 4 B²YL²G²A *bilgä*

I E 3 Y²MA has M written with the top upwards like a B², while in II E 4 the normal sign for M is found.

I E 27 WL¹R¹MD¹ = II E 22 WL¹R¹MD¹M *olormaδïm*

I E 6 J¹WηŠWR¹T¹ʷ̈KYN² = II E 7 J¹WηŠWR¹T¹YN² *joηšordokin*

I E 7 K¹G¹N¹YN¹ = II E 7 K¹G¹N¹YN² *kaganin*

I E 2 J²ʷ̈KNDR²MS² = II E 3 . .K²NDR¹MS² *jükündörmüš*

2.2. Vowels

2.21. Most divergencies concern the spelling of *e*. In initial position it is written both plene and non-plene in I, but as far as I can see only plene in II. Apparent counterexamples like II E 19 L²ηA *eliηä* and II E 34 L²YN² *elin* are doubtful since the first one occurs after a lacuna and an initial Y may be missing and in the second one the L² is hardly visible and may be YL².

Examples:

I E 4 L² – II E 5 YL² *el*
I E 22 L²ηN² – II E 19 YL²ηN² *eliŋin*
I E 22 L²MZ – II E 20 YL²M. *elimiz*
I E 15 L²S²R²T²MS² – II E 13 YL²S²R²T²MŠ *elsirätmiš*
I E 21 T²D²MZ – II E 18 YT²D²MZ *etδimiz*
I E 23 L²T²D²Y – II E 19 YL²T²D²Y *eltδi*

In one case we find plene spelling in I and non-plene in II, but the word is a proper name and the original phonetic form of it is not certain. The example is the name of the kagan I E 1 YS²T²MY – II E 3 S²T²MY.

In non-initial position the spelling is more fluctuating, but there seems to be a preference for plene spelling in I and non-plene in II.

Examples:

a. I plene – II non-plene

I E 25 B²YR²G²MA – II E 21 B²R²G². . *berigmä*
I E 31 B²YS² – II E 25 B²S² *beš*
I N 4 J²YR² – II E 29 J²R² *jer*
I E 24 J²YR²D²A – II E 20 J²R²D²A *jerdä*
I S 4 J²YR²YηA – II N 3 J²R²ηA *jeriŋä*
I E 11 J²YT²Y – II E 10 J²T²Y *jeti*

In I E 15 most editions read J²T²Y as opposed to J²YT²Y in II E 13, but this reading is doubtful since there seems to be space enough for an Y between J² and T² in I.

The tendency to omit Y in the first syllable has also led the scribe of II to introduce a hypercorrect form like II E 7 S²L²K² – I E 7 S²YL²K² *silik*.

b. I non-plene – II plene

I E 14 B²R²MS² – II E 12 B²YR²MS² *bermiš*
I E 14 B²R²J²A – II E 12 B²YR²J²A *ber(i)jä*
I S 4 J²R² – II N 3 J²YR² *jer*

In the case of other vowels only two divergencies are found. One is I E 7 AT¹YN² – II E 7 T¹YN² *ātin* which indicates that

the spelling of *ā* as plene was not fixed in the orthography. The other is I S 5 J²YMŠK¹ = II N 4 J²MŠK¹ (and not J²MŠAK¹ as Thomsen 1896, p. 116 read, an error which is repeated by Clauson 1972, p. 958). The word is probably to be read as *jīmšak* or *jimšak*, but the spelling is elsewhere both in I and II J²MŠK¹.

The divergencies mentioned here do not give us much information about Old Turkic phonology, but they indicate the two different systems of orthography of the scribes of the two texts.

2.22. *Vowels in non-initial syllables.* The most important study concerning the spelling of vowels in non-initial syllables in Runic Turkic is Meyer 1965. She gives the following rules (pp. 196–7):

a. *A* wird im allgemeinen nur im Auslaut notiert und nimmt somit gegenüber *U* und *I* eine Sonderstellung ein.
b. Notation von *U* (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückt) ist nach einem ungerundeten (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückten) vokal der vorhergehenden Silbe obligatorisch . . . .
c. Notation von *I* (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückt) ist nach einem gerundeten (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückten) Vokal der vorhergehenden Silbe obligatorisch . . . .
d. Notation von *U* (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückt) ist nach einem (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückten) gerundeten Vokal der vorhergehenden Silbe nicht-obligatorisch, d.h. *U* mag notiert (oder implizit ausgedrückt) sein, im allgemeinen wird *U* aber nicht notiert . . . .
e. Notation von *I* (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückt) ist nach einem (explizit oder implizit ausgedrückten) ungerundeten Vokal der vorhergehenden Silbe nicht-obligatorisch . . . .

These rules which are mainly based on the orthography of the Toñukuk inscription, are to a large degree supported by the material provided by the Orkhon inscriptions. It seems that the scribe of II tried to observe them and has often, although not always, corrected the inconsistent spelling of I. Examples illustrating rule b. above are not found since I E 10 J¹R¹T¹WN¹W is probably a misspelling, cf. II E 9 J¹R¹T¹N¹W *jaratīno*. There is no evidence for an original rounded vowel in the reflexive morpheme.

Examples illustrating rule c. are the following ones where the spelling in II is the correct one:

I E 12 ᵛKWR¹G¹R¹W – II E 11 ᵛKWR¹YG¹R¹W *kwrīgaro*

The same alternation is found in I E 17 – II E 15. In II E 19 Thomsen 1896, p. 106 read ᵛKWR¹G¹R¹W while I E 24 has ᵛKWR¹YG¹R¹W. But the reading of the word in II is very difficult and remains doubtful.

I E 27 WD¹MD¹M – II E 22 WD¹YMD¹M *uðīmadīm*

Examples illustrating rule d. are very numerous. I include here also examples of plene versus nonplene spellings of the rounded variants of *X* (i.e. *i* – *ī* – *ü* – *u*):

I E 14 B¹WD¹WN¹ – II E 12 B¹WD¹N¹ *boðun*
I S 7 B¹WŠG¹WR¹WR¹ – II N 5 . .ŠG¹R¹WR¹ *bwšgwror*
I E 15 J²ẄK²NDẄ . . . – II E 13 J²ẄK²NDR²MS² *jükündörmüš*
I E 18 J²ᵛKẄNDR²T²MZ – II E 16 J²ẄK²NDR²T²MZ *jükündördümüz*
I E 20 ᵛKWNCJ¹WG¹ – II E 17 ᵛKW . .J¹G¹ *kunčujug*
I S 10 ᵛKẄŠ – II N 7 ẄK²Š *üküš*
I E 11 K²ẄT²ẄR²MS²V – II E 10 K²ẄT²R²T²Y *kötörmüš/kötördi*
I E 15 S²ẄK²ẄR²MS² – II E 13 S²ẄK²R²MŠ *sökörmüš*
I E 8 T²ẄR²ẄS²YN² – II E 8 T²ẄR²S²YN² *törösin*
I E 16 T²ẄR²ẄD²A – II E 14 T²ẄR²D²A *töröðä*
I E 22 T²ẄR²WηN² – II E 19 T²ẄR²G²N² *törön/gün*
I E 24 S²YηᵛKẄη – II E 20 S²Yηᵛ KG² *siŋökün/g*
I E 6 ẄČẄN² – II E 6 ẄČN² *üčün*. The same alternation occurs in I E 6 – II E 7, I E 15 – II E 13, I E 19 – II E 16 (twice), I E 23 – II E 19, I E 27 – II E 22, I E 29 – II E 23, I S 9 – II N 6 and I S 9 – II N 7. But not even in this word is the spelling consistent. ẄČN² is e.g. attested in I E 29 (beside ẄČẄN²) and ẄČẄN² e.g. in II E 23.
I E 10 ẄL²ẄR²J²YN² – II E 9 ẄL²R² . . . *ölöräjin*
I E 29 ẄL²ẄG²M – II E 23 ẄL²G²M *ülögüm*
I S 2 WR¹T¹WS²YηR¹W – II N 2 WR¹T¹S²YηR¹W *ortosï/iŋgaro*

There is only one clear example showing non-plene spelling in I and plene in II:

I E 6 T²ẄG²L²T²N² – II N 5 T²ẄG²L²T²ẄN², a place name for which the transcription is uncertain.

Examples illustrating rule e. show the same tendency. In some cases even the notation of the 3rd pers. poss. suffix is non-plene in II in some cases. Examples:

I E 36 YL²YN² – II E 27 YL²N² *elin*. The same alternation occurs in I E 38 – II E 27.
I E 16 ČYM – II E 14 ČM *ečim*
I E 12 J¹G¹YS²Y – II E 11 J¹G¹S²Y *jagīsi*
I S 1 Š²YD²G²L² – II N 1 S²D² . . *ä/ešiδgil*

This also explains I E 11 YL²B²YL²G²A – II E 10 YL²B²L²G²A *elbilgä*, a proper name which probably is considered to be one word although historically a compound form. Notice, however, the spelling B²L²G²A in Toñukuk 5.

There are two examples which seems to contradict the assumption that II has a more correct spelling than I. They are both connected with rule c. above. One is I E 13 T²ẄL²YS² – II E 12 T²ẄL²S², an ethnic name. The phonetic realization of this word is, however, not clear, cf. Hovdhaugen 1971, p. 201. The other is I S 5 S²ẄČYG² – II N 4 S²ẄČG². In this case the form in I is to be read *süčig*, while in II we have to assume *süčüg*. The last form is attested also in other Old Turkic texts, cf. Clauson 1972, p. 796f. Another piece of evidence for assuming that labial assimilation of vowels was more common in the dialect of the scribe of II than in the dialect of the scribe of I is I E 35 S²YŋẄ. – II E 26 S²ẄŋG² *siŋök/süŋök*.

2.3. Consonants

2.31. There are few divergencies in the spelling of consonants and few observations of importance can be made. Most of the alternations concern the use of the signs representing two phones. In the case of ᵂK the divergencies seem quite accidental. We find I E 2 K¹WP – II E 3 ᵂKWP *kop* and I E 7 K¹WL¹ – II E 7 ᵂKWL¹ *kul* but I E 20 ᵂKWL¹ – II E 17 K¹WL¹ *kul* and we have I E 11

J¹W^{w}K = II E 10 J¹^{w}K *jok*, but I S 8 T¹^{w}KR¹K¹K¹ = II N 6 T¹WK¹. . . , transcription uncertain. In the case of ^{w}K this sign is more common in I than in II:

I E 2 J²^{w}KNDR²MS² = II E 3 . .K²NDR¹MS² *jükündörmüš*
I E 18 J²^{w}KẄNDR²T²MZ = II E 16 J²ẄK²NDR²T²MZ *jükündördümüz*
I E 4 ^{w}KẄN² = II E 5 K²ẄN² *kün*, the same in I E 8 = II E 8
I E 3 ^{w}KẄK² = II E 4 K²ẄK² *kök*
I E 12 ^{w}KẄČ = II E 11 K²ẄČ *küč*
I S 10 ^{w}KẄŠ = II N 7 ẄK²Š *öküš*

There is only one example showing the opposite representation: I E 23 ẄK²ẄN² = II E 19 ^{w}KẄN², but this example is very doubtful since the reading is very difficult and Clauson 1972, p. 111 is probably right when he proposes the reading ẄČ(Ẅ)N² *üčün* here.

Concerning the other signs representing two phones there seems to be the rule that they are used more frequently in II than in I, but the examples are few.

I E 20 K¹YR¹K¹Z = II E 17 ^{y}KYR¹K¹Z *kïrkïz*
I S 2 YČR²K²Y = II N 2 ^{y}ČR²K²Y *ičräki*
I E 29 K¹YL¹T¹M = II E 24 K¹YLDM *kïldïm*
I E 27 K²ẄN²T²Z = II E 22 K²ẄNDZ *kündüz*
I N 7 ZG²N²T²Y = II E 31 ZG²NDY, a geographical name.

2.32. Another alternation which is common is I S² = II Š in the past participle -MS²/Š. It occurs more than 40 times, but the spelling -MŠ is also attested in I and -MS² in II. The transcription of this suffix has been a problem which has no generally accepted solution. After discussing previous theories Tekin 1968, p. 62 concludes "that the vowel of the suffix *-miš – -mis* is invariably *i* in Orkhon Turkic of the eight century". There are, however, a few arguments against this solution. First, there are a few examples showing an alternation S² = Š in other positions:

I E 15 S²ẄηS² = II E 13 S²ẄηŠ *süŋüš*
I N 7 S²ẄηS²D²MZ = II E 31 S²ẄηŠD²M *süŋüšdüm(üz)*

There are no clear examples of I Š – II S² since in II N 3 K²ẄMS² (– I S 5 K²ẄMŠ) *kẅmüš* the last letter is impossible to see clearly and the reading II N 6 K²YS²Y (– I S 7 K²YŠY) *kiši* is impossible to make out on the photos.

Further, we find a chronological development in the use of the sign Š. In Toñukuk it is only attested twice, in I it is rather frequent and in II very frequent. This seems to indicate that for reasons unknown the sign Š had gone out of use at least in one tradition or school of spelling and then was gradually introduced again. Since *š* probably was a palatal fricative it is not strange that it as a rule was represented by the palatal sign S² and not by the velar S¹. It is also possible that in final position this sound was more palatal or in other ways phonetically different from *š* in other positions.

Spelling of geminates:

I E 6 YL²L²D²ẅK – II E 7 YL²D²ẅK *illäðök*

Alternation *b* – *m*:

I E 21 T¹R¹MN¹K¹A – II E 18 T¹R¹B¹N¹K¹A, a place name. The original phonetic form of it is unknown.

Alternation S¹ – S² before *ï*:

I E 4 S¹YG¹T¹AMS² – II E 5 S²YG¹T¹AMŠ *sï/igtamïš*
I S 2 B¹T¹S²ʏKYηA – II N 2 B¹T¹S¹ʏKYηA *batsï/ikïŋa*

Alternation *g* – *η* in the second pers. poss. suffix:

I E 24 S²Yη̈KẄη – II E 20 . .η̈KG² *siŋökün/g*
I E 22 T²ẄR²ẄηN² – II E 19 T²ẄR²G²N² *törön/gün*, but in the same sentence I L²ηN² – II YL²ηN² *eliŋin*.

The reason for the alternation *η* – *g* in the second person possessive and past morphemes cannot be discussed here, but it is worth while to note that there is a tendency for the *g* forms to be used in the past endings and the *η* forms in possessive function. The examples given may indicate that in Orkhon Turkic the *g* forms by analogy were penetrating into the possessive system.

2.4. *Use of the punctuation mark* (:). In the use of the punctuation mark there are many divergencies between I and II. In

Thomsen 1896 there are more than 50. A systematic analysis of them is, however, difficult since in many cases the punctuation mark is difficult or impossible to read from the photos. The use of it in II seems more consistent than in I.

To take but one example:

The postposition *tägi* is always separated from the preceding word by a punctuation mark in II, but not always in I (e.g. I E 2, I E 17).

But also in II there are many inconsistencies (e.g. *taβgač:kaganka* in I E 8 and 9 = *taβgačkaganka* in II E 8 and 9, but *taβgač:kagan* in I E 14 = II E 12 and *taβgačboδun* in I E 6 = *taβgač:boδun* in II E 6 etc) and it seems clear that clear rules for the use of the punctuation mark did not exist in Orkhon Turkic.

3. Morphology

3.1. The use of case forms

3.11. The use of the accusative case is more correct in II than in I, cf. the following examples:

I E 10 T²ẄR²ʷ̃K:B¹WD¹N¹:ẄL²ẄR²J²YN² = II E 9 T²ẄR²ʷ̃K:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:ẄL²R² .... "let me kill the Turkish people".

The noun phrase "the Turkish people" is a definite one and object forms of *boδun* preceded by an ethnic name are always in accusative except once in I E 39 S¹WG¹D¹K¹B¹WD¹N¹:YT²J²YN² "let me organize the Sogdian people".

I E 20 K¹G¹N¹T¹:B¹WNDA:B²YZB²YR²T²MZ = II E 17 K¹G¹N¹T¹G¹:B¹WNDA:B²YZB²YR²T²MZ "we gave (him) here the name kagan". The object is also here clearly definite and the accusative form in II correct, cf. ʷKẂWNČJ¹WG¹:B²YR²T²MZ in the following sentence. In the use of the accusative form there are some plain errors in I which are corrected in II:

I E 6 T¹B¹G¹:B¹WD¹N¹:T²B²L²G²YN²:K²WR²L²G²ẄČẄN² = II E 6 T¹B¹G¹Č:B¹WD¹N¹:T²B²L² .... K²ẄR²L²G²YN²: .... "because the Chinese people being deceitful and tricky":

The use of the accusative possessive form in the first, but not the second part of the hendiaduoin in I is without parallels and certainly an error.

I E 7 T¹B¹G¹Č: B¹WD¹N¹K¹A: B²G²L²K²: WR¹YWG¹L¹YN²: K¹WL¹B¹WLDY: S²YL²K²: ʸKYZWG¹L¹YN²: K²ẄηB¹WLDY "their sons who were fit to be chiefs became slaves to the Chinese people, their chaste daughters became female slaves to the Chinese people" –

II E 7 T¹B¹G¹Č: B¹WD¹N¹K¹A: B²G²L²K²: WR¹YWGL¹ YN²: ʷKWL¹K¹YL¹T¹Y: S²L²K²: ʸKYZWG¹L¹YN²: K²ẄηK¹YLDY "they made their sons who were fit to become chiefs, slaves to the Chinese people, they made their chaste daughters female slaves to the Chinese people".

The wrong accusative forms in I are certainly due to a contamination of this sentence with the correct sentence in II, cf. the parallel and correct sentence in I E 24 B²G²L²K²: WR¹YWG¹L¹η: ʷKWL¹ B¹WLDY = II E 20 B²G²L²K²: WR¹YWG¹L¹ηN¹: ʷKWL¹K¹YLDG¹.

3.12. As for the other cases the following divergencies are found:

Locative – dative:

I E 8 YL²G²R²Ẅ: ʷKẄN²: T¹WG¹S¹K¹D¹A: B²ẄK²L²Y: K¹G¹N¹K¹A: T²G²Y: S²ẄL²J²Ẅ = II E 8 YL²G²R²Ẅ: K²ẄN: T¹WG¹S¹K¹A: B²ẄK²L²Y: K¹G¹N¹K¹A: T²G²Y: S²ẄL²J²Ẅ "campaigning eastwards (I) where the sun rises/(II) towards (into) the sunrise up to (the land of) BWKLY kagan".

Both sentences are probably grammatical, but the one in II is to be preferred, cf. I S 2 YL²G²R²Ẅ: K²ẄN: T¹WG¹S¹K¹A: (the parallel form T¹WG¹S¹K¹YηA in II N 2 which is found in all editions is doubtful. What can be read is T¹WG¹S¹K¹, then a sign which may be Y or A, and then a lacuna).

I E 17 ČYMK¹G¹N¹: WL¹R¹T¹ʷKD¹A = II E 14 ČYMK¹G¹N¹: WL¹R¹T¹ʷKA "when my paternal uncle ascended the throne".

Both cases are probably grammatical here, but owing to II E 2 WL¹R¹T¹ʷKMA "when I ascended the throne" the use of the dative seems most correct.

Directive:

I E 10 B²YR²T²ʷ̈KG²R²Ẅ – II E 9 B²YR²T²ʷ̈KR²Ẅ "towards (their) giving (service)". I am inclined to accept Nauta's theory (Nauta 1969, p. 309) that the form in II is a misspelling. There is no other evidence for an assimilation *kg* > *kk* (cf. Tekin 1968, p. 99) and the existence of a suffix *-rO* in Orkhon Turkic is doubtful (cf. Tekin 1968, p. 155).

Genitive:

I E 25 T²ẄR²ʷ̈K:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:T¹YK²ẄS²Y:J¹ʷKB¹WL¹MZWN¹ – II E 20 . . . . ʷ̈K:B¹WD¹N¹: T¹ . . . . . ʷKB¹WL¹MZ . .

The form *boδunug* is interpreted as a genitive by Tekin 1968, p. 127, but Nauta 1969, p. 309 interprets it as a possessive form and translates "dass die Ehre und der Ruhm *deines* türkischen Volkes nicht zugrunde gehe". I am inclined to consider the form in I as an error which is corrected in II, cf. I E 25 = II E 21 T²ẄR²ʷ̈K:B¹WD¹N¹T¹YK²ẄS²Y:J¹ʷKB¹WL¹MZWN¹. The reason for the error may be that the preceding sentence has an object in accusative (*kïrkïz kaganïg*) which then has influenced the initial noun phrase in the following sentence. In any case we have to do with a typical error of performance.

Instrumental:

I S 5 NYG¹B²YL²G²:NDAẄJ²ẄR²R²MS² – II N 4 .G¹B²YL² G²N²:NDAẄ . . . Š

The form *biligin* is interpreted as an accusative possessive form by Tekin 1968, p. 129. We should then expect the spelling *B²YL²G²YN², but as shown above (2.22) there are other examples showing the omission of the third person possessive suffix in the accusative in II when the word has unrounded vowels. The translation would then be "they seem to have thought their evil thoughts". But formally *biligin* may also be an instrumental and then the translation must be "they seem to have thought with evil

knowledge/thought", cf. Chuas. *anïγ yavlak biligin* "with very evil thoughts" (Clauson 1972, p. 339).

In the case of I E 23 K¹G¹N¹ηN¹ – II E 19 K¹G¹N¹ηA this alternation is treated by Thomsen 1896, p. 152 and I agree with him that the form in II is the correct one and that the form in I is either an accusative used as an anacoluthon or a genitive. It may also be a misspelling.

The following divergencies may be included here although they are more of a syntactic than morphological character:

I E 24 B²YL²MD²ẅKẄČ . . "because of no knowing" –
II E 20 WL¹B²YL²MD²ẅKG²N²:ẄČN² "because of this your not knowing". The expression in II is more precise and the use of *ol* and the possessive suffix makes the expression definite.

I E 26 B¹WD¹N¹K¹A:WL¹R¹MD¹M "I did not become ruler for a people".
II E 21 B¹WD¹NDA:ẄZA:WL¹R¹MD¹M "I did not become ruler over a people".

In the next sentence we find B¹WD¹NDA:ẄZA:WL¹R¹T¹M also in I and this must be the correct expression.

3.2. Morphology of the verb

3.21. In the use of the imperative we find the following divergency:

I E 22 T²ẄR²ẅK:WG¹Z:B²G²L²R²Y:B¹WD¹N¹:S²D²η –
II E 18 . . . . . D¹N¹:S²D² "you, Turkic and Oguz lords and peoples, listen".

Since there is a great lacuna in II it is impossible to know if the rest of the sentence is identical in the two versions, but the zero form of the plural imperative in II is supported by

I S 2 T¹ẅKWZWG¹Z:B²G²L²R²Y:B¹WD¹N¹Y:B¹WS¹B¹MN²:
D²G²Ẅ'T²Y:S²YD².

Another apparent divergency found in most editions is more doubtful. In I S we find S¹B¹MN¹:T²ẄK²T²Y:S²YD²G²L² "listen

well to my word". In II N 1 we have S¹..N¹:T²ẄK²T²Y:S²D² and then traces of at least one sign which looks like an M. Since the reading and interpretation of II in this case seems uncertain the examples is of little value.

3.22. Another divergency attested twice concerns the causative form. This is more a matter of phonology than morphology, but for practical reasons I have put it here. The examples which show the assimilation *tδ* > *t*(*t*) are I N 7 K¹MŠT¹D¹Y = II E 30 K¹MŠT¹Y *kamšat*(*δ*)*i* "he let waver/sway" and I S 10 ʷKWB¹R¹T¹D¹M = II N 7 ʷKWB¹R¹T¹M *kuβrat*(*δ*)*ïm* "I caused to assemble." This assimilation although more frequent in II than in I seems to have been optional in Orkhon Turkic, cf. I N 8 K¹YT¹MZ *akït*(*t*)*ïmïz* "we let flow/sent out" and II E 31 J¹B¹R¹YT¹D¹M *jaβrïlδïm* "I weakened".

3.23. Other divergencies are the following ones:

I E 11 J²ẄG²R²Ẅ:K²ẄT²ẄR²MS²R²NČ = II E 10 J²ẄG²R²Ẅ: K²ẄT²R²T²YR²NČ "must have raised up". This part of the inscriptions (E 1/II E 2 – I E 16/II E 14 is told in the *-miš* style, except two sentences I E 7/II E 7. The function of *-δi* forms in a story told in *-miš* style is not easy to state, but it may have the stylistic effect of stressing or guaranteeing something. But the use of it in II E 10 is not quite clear and a bit unexpected.

I E 25 K²ẄT²R²MŠ = II E 21 K²ẄT²R²G²MA *kötörmüš*/*kötörügmä* The *-miš* particle is clearly a past participle, while *-igmä* can both be present and past. In the function of a past participle there may be some aspectual difference between them, but this is difficult to state exactly on the basis of the texts available. In this case the meaning is clearly past, but there is one reason to prefer the form with *-igmä* since this expression is parallel also in I to another form with *-igmä* (K²ẄT²R²MŠ:T²ŋR²Y:YL²B² YR²G²MA:T²ŋR²Y "Heaven who raised and heaven who gave empire")

I E 19 J¹ŋL¹ʷKYN²:ẄČẄN² "because of their error" = II E 16 J¹ŋLDʷKYN²:J¹ZNDʷKYN²:ẄČN² "because they made a mistake and offended (us)". But although a word *jaŋlok*

"error, mistake" is attested elsewhere in Old Turkic (cf. Clauson 1972, p. 950), it is perhaps more likely to assume a misspelling in I, cf. Clauson 1972, p. 950.

Another divergency found in all editions of the texts is more doubtful. This is what has been read AČS²K¹ in I S 8 corresponding to AČS¹AR¹ in II N 6. Now, of the form in I only AČS can be read for certain. Then there occurs only the sign of a horizontal line (S²,R¹,K¹??). In II the first letter seems to be A although it is difficult to read, then we have Č and traces of a letter which looks like S¹ and then R¹. There is no sign of an A in the second syllable. The form in II is in any case to be preferred cf. the rest of the sentence.

3.3. Other examples of morphological divergencies

I N 4 ŋYL²K²:T¹WG¹WB¹L¹ɣKD¹A:S²ẄŋŠD²MZ = II E 30 ŋYL²K²Y:T¹WG¹W: B¹L¹ɣKD¹A:S²ẄŋŠD²M "first of all we/I fought at Twgw-balïk". The form *ilk* is nowhere else attested in Orkhon Turkic. We have only *ilki* and that is probably the correct form here. *ilk* is first attested in the 11th century A.D., Clauson 1972, p. 140.

Another example which perhaps is more syntactical than morphological is the following one:

I N 4 T¹ʷKWZWG¹Z:B¹WD¹N¹:K²N²T²Ẅ:B¹WD¹N¹M:R²T²Y = II E 29 T¹.....:MN²ŋ:B¹WD¹N¹MR²T²Y "The Tokuz-Oguz people was my own/*my* people". Both expressions are grammatical (cf. Toñukuk 21 *bäniŋ boδunum*, Uig. *kändö boδunum*, cf. Clauson 1972, p. 728) and probably meant almost the same, the difference being due to personal stylistic preference.

3.4. In the case of most of the morphological divergencies the forms in II are to be preferred. Either they are corrections of obvious errors in I or they have clear parallels elsewhere in the inscriptions or other Old Turkic texts, while the grammaticality of some of the expressions found in I can be questioned. II represents certainly a more normalized and literary language than I in this respect.

4. Vocabulary

The divergencies pertaining to vocabulary are few. In most cases the divergencies are merely stylistic, but as a rule the words in II are more vivid and precise than in I, cf. the following examples:

I E 24 K¹N¹η:S¹WB¹ČA:J²ẄG²R²T²Y "your blood ran like water" =
II E 20 . .η:ẄG²ZČA:J²ẄG²R²T²Y "your blood ran like a river".
I E 20 ẄZYJ¹ηLDY "he himself made a mistake" =
II E 17 ẄZYJ¹ZNDY "he himself sinned/misbehaved", cf. I E 19 and II E 16.
I E 19 ČẄMZ:PAMZ:T¹WT¹MS²:J²YR²S¹WB¹:YD²S²Z: B¹WL¹MZWN¹ "let the territory which our ancestors held become ownerless" =
II E 16 Č . . . . . Z:K¹L¹MZW . "let (the territory which our ancestors held) not remain (ownerless)".
I E 17 T¹R¹D¹WŠ:B¹WD¹N¹:ẄZA:ŠD¹R²T²M "I was šad over the Tarduš people" = II E 15 T¹R¹D¹WŠ:B¹WD¹N¹: ẄZA:ŠD¹WL¹R¹T¹M "I assumed the function of šad over the Tarduš people".
I N 1 T¹MG¹YD¹ʷK:B¹ŠD¹A:S²ẄL²D²MZ "we campaigned at TMGYDWK Baš" =
II E 29 T¹MG¹YD¹ʷK:B¹ŠD¹A:S²ẄηŠD²M "I fought at TMGYDWK Baš".

Further we have the divergency I *bol-* = II *kül-* in I E 7 = II E 7 and I E 24 = I E 20 treated above, cf. 3.11.

5. Syntactical and stylistic divergencies

5.1. It is often difficult or impossible to distinguish clearly between stylistic and syntactic divergencies and the classification of examples below is quite tentative. As mentioned earlier I E 31–38 and I N 1–7 are not quite identical with II E 24–32 since events relating to Kül tegin are omitted in II and replaced by events referring to Bilgä kagan. Also in II E 2–24 there are some additions of whole sentences which add important pieces of information referring to Bilgä kagan, e.g. II 14 and II 15. Similar additions may have existed in II E 17, 21, 22, 23, but in these cases the text

of II is rather corrupt and difficult, or impossible to read. These additions and omissions will not be treated here.

5.2. The following divergencies are classified as stylistic although there is a clear element of syntax in them since they mostly are related to deletion-rules of identical words or phrases in the surface structure.

a. Deletion in I, but not in II:

I E 22 NČAK¹ZG¹N¹MS²:YT²MS²:L²MZ:T²ẄR²ẄMZ:R²T²Y "our empire and traditional law was thus acquired and organized" –

II E 18 NČAK¹ZG¹N¹MŠ:NČAYT²MŠ:YL²M ..... "our empire (and traditional law was) thus acquired and thus organized".

I E 29 J¹L¹ηB¹WD¹N¹G¹:T¹WN¹L¹G¹:ČYG¹NYB¹WD¹N¹G¹: B¹J¹K¹YLDM "I made the naked people clothed, the poor people rich" –

II E 23 J¹L¹η:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:T¹WN¹L¹G¹:K¹YLDM:ČYG¹NY: B¹W . . . J¹K¹Y . . . "I made the naked people clothed and I made the poor people rich".

In the following case there is hardly a deletion in I, but an expanded and more precise way of expression in II:

I E 19 JηL¹ʷKYN²: ẄČẄN² "because of their error", cf. supra 3.23.

II E 16 J¹ηLDʷKYN²:J¹ZNDʷKYN²:ẄČN² "because they made a mistake and offended (us)".

b. Deletion in II, but not in I:

I E 3 B²YL²A:K¹G¹N¹R²MS²:L¹PK¹G¹N¹R²MS:B¹WJ¹R¹ʷKYJ² MA:B²YL²G²A:R²MS²R²NČ:L¹PR²MS²R²NČ:B²G²L²R²YJ² MA:B¹WD¹N¹YJ¹MAT²WZR²MS² "they were wise kagans, they were brave kagans, their bujruks too, were presumably wise, were presumably brave, both their begs and their people were orderly" –

II E 4 B²YL²G²A:K¹G¹N¹R²MS²:L¹PK¹G¹N¹R²MS:B¹WJ¹R¹ʷKY: B²YL²G²A:R²MS²R²NČ:L¹PR²MS²R²NČ:B²G²L²R²YJ²MA:

B¹WD¹N¹Y . . . . . "they were wise kagans, they were brave kagans, their bujruks were presumably wise, were presumably brave, both their begs and their people . . . . . .

In this case the J²MA in I seems quite superfluous.

c. In the following cases there are deletions both in I and II, but of different words:

I E 10–11 ẄZA:T²ẄR²ʷ̃K:T²ŋR²YS²Y:T²ẄR²ʷ̃KYD¹ʷKJ²YR²Y: S¹WB¹YNČAT²MS² "the Turkic Heaven above and the sacred Turkic territory thus organized (it)". –

II E 10 . . .T²ẄR²ʷ̃K:T²ŋR²YS²Y:Y D¹ʷK:J²YR²Y:S¹WB¹Y: NČAT²MŠR²NČ "the Turkic Heaven (above) and the sacred territory presumably organized (it) thus".

Owing to expressions like *türk bäglär boδun* (I E 10 etc.) "Turkic begs and people", the deletion of *türk* in II seems all right. As for *ärinč* it is often used when referring to the acts of the gods and in the following sentence it is attested both in I and II.

I E 16 WL¹T²ẄR²ẄD²A:ẄZA:ČYMK¹G¹N¹:WL¹R¹T¹Y:ČYM K¹G¹N¹:WL¹R¹PN¹:T²ẄR²ʷ̃K:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:J²YČA:YT² D²Y:YG²T²Y "according to that traditional law my paternal uncle ascended the throne as kagan. When my paternal uncle had ascended the throne as kagan, he organized the Turkic people as before and fed it".

II E 14 WL¹T²ẄR²D²A:ẄZA:ČMK¹G¹N¹:WL¹R¹T¹Y.WL¹R¹PN¹: T²ẄR²ʷ̃K:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:J²YČA:YT²D²Y:J²YČA:YG²T²Y – "According to that traditional law my paternal uncle ascended the throne as kagan. When he had ascended the throne, he organized the Turkic people as before and fed it as before".

Also in this case the version in II seems to be better from a stylistic point of view.

In the following example it is most probably owing to the size of the lacuna in I that we have a deletion of *bolmuš* in II and not as may seem, an extended version in II:

I E 21 WL¹ẄD²K²A:ʷKWL¹:ʷKWL¹L¹G¹:B¹WL¹M . . . . "at that time slaves had become slave-owners" –
II E 18 WL¹ẄD²K²A:ʷKWL¹:ʷKWL¹L¹G¹:K²Ẅη:K²ẄηL²G²: B¹WL¹MŠ:R²T²Y "at that time slaves (had become) slave-owners and maid servants had become owners of maid-servants".

5.3. In the following cases the omission of a word in I or II is not due to a deletion transformation, but to errors or abnormal syntactic constructions.

I E 3 K²YN²R¹A:YD²YWK¹S¹Z:ʷ̈KẄK²:T²ẄR²ʷ̈K:NČA: WL¹R¹WR¹R²MS² –
II E 4 K²YN²R¹A:YD²YWK¹S¹Z:K²ẄK²T²ẄR²ʷ̈K:YT²YNČA: WL¹R¹WR¹R²MS²

This sentence has been thoroughly investigated by Thomsen 1916, pp. 17–26 and he has convincingly showed that the omission of YT²Y in I is an error which makes the sentence nonsense.

I E 5 B¹WJ¹R¹ʷKY:J²MA:B²YL²G²S²ZR²NČ "their bujruks, too, (were) presumably without wisdom" –
II E 6 B¹WJ¹R¹ʷKY:J²MA:B²YL²G²S²ZR²MS²R²NČ "their bujruks, too, were presumably without wisdom".

Since *ärinč* elsewhere is always preceded by a verbal form, the omission of it here is probably ungrammatical.

I E 8 ʷKWR¹G¹R¹W:T²MR²K¹PG¹K¹A:T²G²Y:S²ẄL²J²Ẅ: B²YR²MS² "they went on campaign westwards up to the Iron Gate" –
II E 8 ʷKWR¹G¹R¹W:T²MR²:K¹PG¹K¹A:S²ẄL²J²Ẅ:B²YR MŠ "they went on campaign westwards into the Iron Gate".

In this case the word *tägi* "up to" is probably omitted by an error in II since everywhere else in the inscriptions it is stated that the Turks came to the Iron Gate, but never that they really passed it or tried to do so.

In the case of I E 23 B²YL²G²A:K¹G¹N¹η N¹ – II E 19 K¹G¹N¹ηA the omission of *bilgä* in II is probably only stylistic, but as the

sentence in II is an anacoluthon (cf. 3.12), the example is of little or no interest.

I E 31 S¹WG¹D¹K¹T¹PA:S²ẄL²D²MZ:B¹WZD¹MZ "we campaigned against the Sogdians and destroyed (them)" –
II E 25 T¹PA:S²ẄL²D²M:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:NDAB¹WZD¹M "I campaigned against (the Sogdians) and I destroyed the people there".

The omission of *boδunug* in I is probably only stylistic although I have not found other examples of *bwz-* without an object. More interesting is the omission of *anda* which is also attested in the following cases:

I E 36 ʸKYR¹K¹Z:K¹G¹N¹YN²:ẄL²R²T²MZ:YL²YN²:L¹T¹MZ "we killed the kagan of the Kirgiz and took their/his realm" –
II E 27 K¹G¹N¹YN²:ẄL²R²T²M:YL²N²:NDAL¹T¹M "I killed their kagan and thereupon took their realm". The reason for the omission of *Kīrkīz* in II is not clear.
I E 38 K¹G¹N¹YN²NDA:ẄL²R²T²MZ:YL²YN²L¹T¹MZ "we then/there killed their kagan and took their/his realm" –
II E 27 K¹G¹N¹YN²:J¹B¹G¹WS²YN²:ŠD¹YN²:NDAẄL²R²T²M:YL²N²:NDAL¹T¹M "I then/there killed their kagan, their jaβgo(s) and their šaδ(s) and I then/there took their realm".
I N 2 K¹R¹L¹ʷKWG¹:ẄL²:T²MZ:L¹T¹M¹Z "we killed the Karloks and subjugated (them)" –
II E 29 K¹R¹L¹ʷK:B¹WD¹N¹G¹:ẄL²R²T²M:NDAL¹T¹M "I killed the Karlok people and then I subjugated (it)". The omission of *boδunug* in I represents a syntactically deviant construction since ethnic nouns as a rule are not inflected for cases in the inscriptions, cf. Grönbech 1936, p. 160. The addition of *anda*, which in the last example and probably in the others too has the meaning "then, thereupon", clearly reflects in all these cases a stylistic difference which either is due to the fact that the two texts were written by different persons or that II is a more literary and thoroughly revized version of I, done by the same person, cf. below.

The following divergency is difficult to explain since the meaning and function of $R^2\ddot{W}R^2B^1R^1WR^1$ is unclear, cf. Clauson 1972, p. 194:

I N 1 $K^1R^1L^1{}^wK:B^1WD^1N^1:R^2\ddot{W}R^2B^1R^1WR^1:R^2K^2L^2Y:$
$J^1G^1YB^1WLDY$ –

II E 29 $K^1R^1L^1{}^wK:B^1WD^1N^1:B^1W\eta S^1Z\,..\,\ddot{W}R^2:B^1R^1WR^1:$
$R^2K^2L^2Y:J^1G^1Y:B^1WLDY$.

5.4. The most clear examples of syntactic divergencies are the following ones:

I E 28 $B^2YR^2G^2R^2\ddot{W}:T^1B^1G^1\check{C}T^1PA:WL^1G^1S^2\ddot{W}:K^2YJ^2G^2R^2..$ –
II E 23 $B^2YR^2G^2R^2\ddot{W}:T^1B^1G^1\check{C}:T^1PA:K^2YJ^2G^2R^2M$ .....

The end of the sentence is missing both in I and II, but the phrase *sü süla-* is well attested (e.g. I E 2/II E 3) and a reasonable reconstruction following II would be *birgärö taβgač tapa eki jegirmi ulog sü süläðim* "Twelve times I made great expeditions in the south against the Chinese . . . ." Syntactically the word order must be as in II since *sü* is intimately connected with *sülä-* as an inner object, cf. also I E 15 *jegirmi süŋüš süŋüšmüš* "fought twenty battles".

I E 29 $T^2\eta R^2Y:J^1R^1L^1K^1ZW:{}^wKWT^1M:B^1R^1\ddot{W}\check{C}N^2:\ddot{W}L^2\ddot{W}G^2M:$
$B^1R^1:\ddot{W}\check{C}\ddot{W}N^2:\ddot{W}L^2T^2\check{C}Y:B^1WD^1N^1G^1:T^2YR^2G^2R^2W:$
YG^2T^2M "because Heaven was gracious, because my good fortune existed, because my (good) fate existed, I revived and fed the dying people" –

II E 23 $T^2\eta R^2Y:J^1R^1L^1K^1D^1{}^wK:\ddot{W}\check{C}N^2:{}^wKWT^1M:\ddot{W}L^2G^2M:$
$B^1R^1\ddot{W}\check{C}N^2:\ddot{W}L^2T^2\check{C}Y:B^1WD^1$ ..... $\ddot{W}:YG^2T^2M$ "because Heaven was gracious, because my good fortune and my (good)fate existed, I (revived) and fed the dying people".

The translation of I may be wrong since the form *jarlïkazo* mainly is interpreted on account of the parallel *jarlïkðok üčün* in II. The ending *-zo* is only attested here and in Toñukuk 53 and there is no general agreement about its function. Giraud 1961, p. 13 takes it as an archaic converb, while Tekin 1968, p. 187 classifies it as

an imperative form. The scanty material hardly allows us to choose between these alternatives or to judge whether the use of the form in I is correct or not. In all probability this is a dying form already in Orkhon Turkic. The deletion of *bar üčün* in II seems stylistically better.

I E 37 T²ẄR²G²S²:K¹G¹N¹:S²ẄS²Y:B¹WL¹ČWD¹A:WT¹ČA:B¹WR¹ČA:K²L²T²Y:S²ẄŋŠD²MZ "Tẅrgäs kagan's army came from Bwlčw like a fire, like a *bwr* (cf. Clauson 1972, p. 357). We fought".

II E 26–7 T²ẄR²G²S²:K¹G¹N¹:S²ẄS²Y:WT¹ČA:B¹WR¹ČA:K²L² .. B¹WL¹ČWD¹A:S²ẄŋŠD²MZ "Tẅrgäs kagan's army came like a fire, like a *bwr*. We fought at Bwlčw".

The difference in meaning between the two sentences can be explained in two ways. II may simply be a correction of I and the correction referring to what actually happened. But it may also be that the two versions tell the same, but that I represents a colloquial and anacoluth syntax. The sentence in I should then be translated 'Tẅrgäs kagan's army—at Bwlčw—he/it came like a fire, like a *bwr*—we fought".

I N 7 T¹WŋR¹A:B²YR²WG¹Š:L¹PG¹W:WN¹R²G²:T¹WŋAT² YG²N²:J¹WG¹YNDA:G²R²PẄL²R²T²MZ "We surrounded and killed at Toŋa tegin's funeral one family of Twŋra, ten fighting men" –

II E 31 T¹WŋR¹A:J²YL¹PG¹WT¹Y:B²YR²:WG¹ŠG¹:T¹WŋA:T²YG²N²:J¹WG¹. . .:G²R²AT¹WK¹YD¹M "surrounding one family of Twŋra warriors at Toŋa tegin's funeral we beat (them)".

The alternation *ägirip – ägirä* is probably only stylistic (preceding versus simultaneous action) and the alternation *ölördümüz – tokïδïm* represents a historical correction. The word for "warrior" must be reconstructed as Proto-Turkic **alpagut*. It is generally considered to be a derivation from *alp* "brave", cf. Clauson 1972, p. 128, but the final *-t* is then difficult to explain and this together with the *u* instead of *o* in the last syllable (cf. Hovdhaugen 1971, p. 179) indicates that it is a loanword in Turkic. Both *alpagu* and

jilpagut are hapax legomena and both are considered to be misspellings by Clauson 1972, p. 128. They may also be older dialectal forms, but owing tc lack of material this is impossible to decide. The syntax of the first part of I seems very colloquial and the grammaticality of it can be questioned.

Finally I shall give an example which is not included in my list of identical parts of I and II, but where there may be a relationship:

I N 8 J¹Z YŋA:WG¹ZG¹R¹W:.ẄT¹ŠK¹D¹MZ "in the spring/summer we set out with the army towards the Oguz" =
II E 31–2 J¹ZŋA:WG¹Z:T¹PA:S²ẄL²D²M "in the spring/summer I campaigned towards the Oguz".

As Grönbech 1936, p. 160 has showed, the use of case endings with ethnic nouns is so seldom attested in Orkhon Turkic that it probably has to be considered as ungrammatical. Also in this case the text of I is to be preferred to that of II.

6. Our investigations so far seem to lead to the following conclusions:

a. The orthography of the two Orkhon inscriptions shows such clear and regular differences that it seems hardly possible to assume that they were written by one and the same scribe. A person does normally not change his orthography so much in only four years. The scribe of II has undoubtedly a more correct and normalized orthography than the scribe of I.

b. The morphological, syntactic and stylistic divergencies can be explained in two ways. There may have been two different authors each of whom has composed one inscription. In this case the authors may be identical with the scribes. But the author of the two texts may also be the same person who has completely revised his first text, correcting errors in it and making it stylistically better. An argument in favour of the last solution is the fact that II is in any case based on I and represents a revised version of it whereas events related to Kül tegin are left out and there is more stress on the activities of Bilgä kagan. On the other hand, some of the

grammatical and stylistic corrections in II are perhaps more easily understood if we assume the author of II to be someone other than the author of I. Instead of pursuing these rather futile speculations we must look at the texts once more and examine what they tell us about how and by whom the inscriptions were written.

In the following passage of I where Bilgä kagan himself is speaking, we find the following statement:

I S 11 $N^3\eta N^2\eta : S^1B^1M : R^2S^2R^2 : B^2\eta G^2\ddot{W} : T^1\check{S}K^1A : WR^1T^1M$ "all my words I have put on this memorial stone".

The same sentence although rather badly preserved occurs also in II N 8 and it seems rather difficult to avoid the conclusion that Bilgä kagan himself composed the text of I and perhaps also of II. Later on Bilgä kagan says:

I S 13 $B^2\eta G^2\ddot{W}T^1\check{S} : T^{1w}KYT^1D^1M : B^2YT^2YD^2M$

The normal translation of this sentence would be "I had a memorial stone driven into the ground and I inscribed it". But this translation depends on the interpretation of $B^2YT^2(Y)D^2M$. Normally it is taken as "I wrote/inscribed", but Tekin 1968, p. 99 argues that it is in this case a causative *bitīd(d)im < bitītdim* with an assimilation *td > d(d)*. This theory is rejected by Nauta 1969, p. 309 because we in the next line have the participle ***bitigmä*** and not ***bititigmä***. Besides, an assimilation *tδ > δ(δ)* is unknown elsewhere, while *tδ > t(t)* is well attested, cf. above 3.22. On the other hand there are several reasons to prefer Tekin's theory. First, it is hardly likely that Bilgä kagan himself inscribed the text. Secondly, in the next sentence we find the following statement: S 13 $B^1WB^2YT^2G^2 : B^2YT^2G^2MA : T^1 \ldots J^1WL^1G^1T^2 \ldots$ "the one who inscribed this inscription (was his nephew) Jollug t(ekin)". Now, if Jollug tegin inscribed the inscription, it cannot have been Bilgä kagan or vice versa. Unfortunately the last example is too fragmentary to be used as a decisive proof for anything. Beside a fragmentary sentence in I SW ($B^2YT^2D^2M : J^1WL^1L^1G^1 : T^2YG^2N^2$) we find however, another important sentence in I:

I SE $B^1WNČA : B^2YT^2G^2 : B^2YT^2G^2MA : K^2\ddot{W}L^2T^2YG^2N^2 : T^1YS^2Y$ $J^1WL^1G^1T^2YG^2N^2 : \ldots D^2M : J^2YG^2R^2MY : K^2\ddot{W}N^2 :$

WL¹R¹P:B¹WT¹ŠK¹A:B¹WT¹AMK¹A:ʷKWP:
J¹WL¹G¹T²YG²N²:B²YT²YD²M

"I Jollug tegin, the nephew of Kül tegin, who has written so many inscriptions, inscribed/had inscribed (this inscription). Sitting down for twenty days I Jollug tegin inscribed/had inscribed much on this stone/these stones and this wall/these walls".

In the last case the causative interpretation seems preferable and it is strongly supported by the following statement in II:

II SW B¹WNČA:B¹R¹K¹A:B²D²ZG²:WZG¹ .... G¹N¹:T¹YS²Y:
J¹WL¹G¹T²YG²N²MN²:J¹R¹T¹ʷKY:T²ẄR²T²K²Ẅ ....
R¹ ... B²YT²YD²M:B²D².T²M: "(Sitting down) one month and four days I Jollug tegin, the nephew (of the kagan) inscribed/had inscribed and ornamented all (these) grave goods, ornamentations and skilled work".

The form *bädi(z)tim* must be a causative since we know that the decorators were obtained from China (cf. I S II, II N 14), cf. also above 3.22 and Clauson 1972, p. 310. Both here and in I S 13 the form *bitiδim* is parallel to a causative form and it seems clear from the quotations above that the function of Jollug tegin was to organize the erection of the memorial stone, its decoration and inscription. This job was certainly also more important and a prince was worthy of functioning as more than just a scribe.

The only possible phonetic explanation of the form *bitiδim* as a causative seems to be as follows:

The expected form is *bititδim* (Toñukuk 58). This form could phonetically become **bitil(t)im* in Orkhon Turkic (cf. above 3.22). There are no evidences for an assimilation *tδ* > *δ(δ)* in Orkhon Turkic. But *bitiδim* may be due to a dissimilation of *bititδim* or perhaps *bitil(t)im*. The participle *bitigmä* and not **bititigmä* is not a conclusive argument against this theory since I S 13 is corrupt and in I SE it does not refer to the Orkhon inscriptions, cf. the translation.

As a conclusion we must state that the scribes of the two inscriptions remain unknown. The author of I is certainly Bilgä

kagan, a fact that is shown not only by the statement in I S 11, but also by the personal and affected expressions concerning his brother Kül tegin. In some examples discussed above we found traces of a colloquial syntax typical of oral composition in I and it seems likely that the text was first composed and perhaps recited by Bilgä kagan and then written down by a not very well trained scribe. The origin of II is more difficult to trace. The author is also here probably Bilgä kagan, but this text seems to be a more thoroughly literary text. The autor had before him a written version of I and then prepared carefully the text of II normalizing the language and correcting all errors and deviant constructions in I. This theory is of course partly hypothetical, but it seems the most likely one according to the scanty material we have.

References:

Giraud, R. 1961: *L'inscription de Baïn Tsokto.* Paris.
Clauson, G. 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish.* Oxford.
Grönbech, K. 1936: *Der türkische Sprachbau I.* Kopenhagen.
Hovdhaugen, E. 1971: *Turkish Words in Khotanese Texts. A Linguistic Analysis.* Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskab XXIV.
Inscriptions 1892: *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon, recueillis par l'expédition finnoise 1890 et publiées par la Société finno-ougriennes.* Helsinki.
Meyer, I. R. 1965: *Bemerkungen über Vokal- und Schriftsystem des Runentürkischen.* Acta Orientalia XXIX.
Nauta, A. 1969: *Review of Tekin 1968.* Central Asiatic Journal XIII, 4.
Tekin, T. 1968: *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic.* Bloomington.
Thomsen, V. 1896: *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées.* Helsinki.
Thomsen, V. 1916: *Turcica.* Helsinki.