OUKA
Osaka University Knowledge Archive

Title	Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road (Part 1)
Author(s)	Moriyasu, Takao
Citation	大阪大学大学院文学研究科紀要. 51 P.32-P.86
Issue Date	2011-03-31
Text Version	publisher
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/11094/8205
DOI	
Rights	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA
http://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/dspace/

Osaka University

Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road (Part 1)

Takao MORIYASU

Preface

The Old Uighur letters are letters that were written in Old Uighur (a form of Old Turkic) using the Uighur script,[1] which derives from the Sogdian script. They were written by people of the West Uighur kingdom, which flourished from the second half of the ninth century to the start of the thirteenth century in and around the eastern Tianshan 天山 region including the Turfan Depression, and by Uighurs of the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries when this region had come under the rule of the Mongol empire (i.e., former West Uighurs). Although the use of paper had at the time not yet spread to Europe, these letters are all written on paper. The ink is similar to that which was used in China, but the letters were written with reed or wooden pens rather than with writing brushes. The majority of these letters were discovered in the twentieth century in China, either in the Turfan Depression in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region or in the famous Mogao 莫高 Caves of the Thousand Buddhas at Dunhuang 敦煌 in Gansu 甘肅, and a small number were unearthed at the remains of Kara-khoto in the Gansu Corridor. Dunhuang and Kara-khoto are usually not included in Central Asia, and therefore I have deliberately chosen to refer to them as letters from the Eastern Silk Road rather than from Central Asia, as has been the norm in the past.[2]

---

1) There is one letter written in Turk-Runic, and there may also have been a letter written in Manichaean script. See footnote 7.

2) What I refer to as the "Eastern Silk Road" is roughly synonymous with eastern premodern Central Eurasia. "Central Eurasia" as used here is a wide-area cultural concept encompassing the Great Steppe spanning the central part of the Eurasian continent from the vicinity of the Greater Khingan Range (Da Xing'an ling 大興安嶺) in the east to the Carpathian Steppe in the west, as well as the desert oasis region extending along the southern edge of this Great Steppe and the semi-agricultural and semi-pastoral zones that are prevalent still further to the south in North China and northern West Asia. The military might of horse-riding nomadic peoples from Central Eurasia and

The relationship between the Old Uighur letters and Old Uighur literature as a whole is discussed in chapter 1, but in short the former are included in the latter. The Old Uighur documents discovered at Dunhuang and Kara-khoto were written by the inhabitants of the West Uighur kingdom and their descendants, and as far as the Old Uighur documents are concerned, there is no need whatsoever to distinguish those discovered in Turfan from those discovered at Dunhuang and Kara-khoto. In other words, they may be treated as a single corpus. Today these documents are held by various institutions, including the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften and Museum für Asiatische Kunst (formerly known as Museum für Indische Kunst) in Berlin, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, the British Library in London, the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Ōmiya Library at Ryūkoku University in Kyoto, the Academia Turfanica (Turfan Museum) in Turfan, the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region Museum in Urumchi, the Dunhuang Academy China in Dunhuang, the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Institute of Cultural and Historical Relics and Archaeology in Huhehot, the National Library of China in Beijing, and Istanbul University in Turkey.

Now, when attempting to decipher ancient documents belonging to an early period that has no direct links either culturally or linguistically with the modern period, it is often useful to seek out documents of the same format and compare similar expressions appearing in these documents. This comparison is frequently conducted within the same language of the same period, but it is also not unusual for it to extend beyond the boundaries of a single language and a single period. In the case of the ancient documents written in a variety of languages that have been discovered along the Eastern Silk Road (or in eastern Central Eurasia), which was from early times a multiethnic society, it is contracts and letters that provide a model for this type of comparison. A large number of shared features, regarding both their overall structure and specific conventional expressions, can be found in these texts. Mention of formats generally calls to mind structural aspects, such as the order in which the various elements of a document are arranged, but it should be noted that they also

---

the economic power gained through the Silk Road contained within Central Eurasia were major driving forces of premodern Eurasian history. It is for this reason that I refer to eastern premodern Central Eurasia as the "Eastern Silk Road." It should be noted that the term "Central Asia" is used in truly diverse ways apart from its broad and narrow meanings and will no doubt continue to be used because of its convenience, but in cases where it may cause misunderstanding we intend to avoid using it whenever possible.

include the conventional expressions (or stock phrases) that are actually used with great frequency in particular sections of a document. Although formats in this broad sense change only slowly over time within the confines of a single language, they spread with comparative ease through cultural exchange between different languages and different peoples. Therefore, while research on the formats of contracts and letters is conducted primarily from the standpoint of philology, it is also of significance in historical research tracing the course of cultural exchange.[3)]

Such is the significance of the study of formats. In the case of Old Uighur documents, we have with regard to contracts already published *Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte* (hereafter referred to as SUK), and there is now a need for a similar collection of letters. The *Corpus of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road* (hereafter referred to as *Corpus of the Old Uighur Letters*), which I hope to bring to completion as part of my life's work, is intended to answer this need from the twin aspects of philological and historical studies, and I have been asked to have it included in the *Berliner Turfantexte* series. The present study, entitled "Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road," corresponds to the research volume of this forthcoming publication and has the following overall structure.

Contents:

Preface
1. The Position of Letters in Old Uighur Literature
2. The Periodization of Old Uighur Letters and Religious Distinctions
3. Research History
4. Special Terms and Formulae as Criteria for Identifying Letters
5. The Classification of Epistolary Formulae according to Naming Formulae
6. The Basic Structure of Old Uighur Letters and Honorific Expressions
---
7. Basic Conventional Greetings
8. Expressions about the Health of Both Parties

---

3) On the significance of the comparative study of the formats of contracts and letters in different languages, and the reason that this research began of necessity with contracts and then extended to letters, see Sims-Williams 1991, p. 176 = Sims-Williams 1996a, p. 79; Sims-Williams 2006, p. 701; Yoshida / Moriyasu 1989, pp. 34-37; Takeuchi 1986, pp. 568-569.

(1) Addressee's Health
(2) Sender's Sense of Relief
(3) Sender's Health
9. Greeting Phrases Used Especially by Manichaeans
10. Greeting Phrases Used Especially by Buddhists
11. Idiomatic Phrases and Popular Terms in the Body of the Letter (including Introductory Formulae and Closing Formulae)
(1) Introductory Formulae
(2) Terms and Idiomatic Phrases Frequently Used in the Body of the Letter
(3) Postscript Formulae (Change of Addressee, Change of Subject, Postscript)
(4) Closing Formulae
(5) Delivery Notes
12. The Caravan Trade and Communications
(1) The Importance of Caravans
(2) Caravan Traffic and Letters
(3) Gifts Accompanying Letters and Acknowledgement of Their Receipt
Concluding Remarks

It goes without saying that in my research I have tried to undertake comparisons with the epistolary formulae of other languages, although my endeavours in this regard are still inadequate. Nonetheless, I believe that, with about thirty years having elapsed since I first embarked on this research, I have now reached the end of one stage, and I began publishing my findings in 2008. The first instalment, entitled "Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from Central Asia" (*Acta Asiatica* 94, pp. 127-153 [Moriyasu 2008a]), was an English version of the first five chapters. The present study is based on a revised and enlarged Japanese version, with the addition of chapter 6. This corresponds to approximately one-third of the entire work.

Apart from some minor additions and corrections, chapters 1-4 are essentially no different from the earlier English version, but chapter 5, dealing with the classification of epistolary formulae, has been substantially rewritten. The classification of Uighur epistolary formulae lies at the very heart of this study, and I would therefore like to add a few words in explanation of the fact that I have had to substantially revise this classification.

The Old Uighur letters are all unearthed artefacts that have happened to survive purely by chance, and since most of them are fragments in a poor state of preservation, their meaning is hard to grasp. For this reason it is difficult to draw a sharp distinction between personal letters that were exchanged privately among individuals and official documents containing official orders or instructions which take the form of letters. Furthermore, in many respects the format of personal letters has its origins in official documents taking the form of letters with a sender and an addressee. The circumstances are similar for letters in any ancient language, and therefore the classification of epistolary formulae is affected by the state of surviving materials, making it difficult to establish a standard classification that can also be used for letters in other languages, and one is compelled to follow a process of trial and error.

The remaining chapters of my study, from chapter 7 onwards, have in fact also been more or less completed. But owing to limitations of space in this journal, and also because I felt it imperative to bring out a revised version of the first instalment as soon as possible, I have decided to publish here for the time being only the first six chapters.

1. The Position of Letters in Old Uighur Literature

The Uighurs, who were remarkably active along the Eastern Silk Road (or eastern Central Eurasia), including Mongolia and the Gansu Corridor, from the eighth to fourteenth centuries, left behind a large corpus of texts written in Old Uighur. These can be broadly divided into books or literary texts, civil and/or ecclesiastical documents, and inscriptions or epitaphs (cf. SUK 2, pp. ix-x), and they are written in a wide range of scripts, including Turk-Runic, Sogdian, Uighur, Manichaean, Tibetan, Brāhmī, Syriac, Chinese, and so on, while the places where they were written extended from Mongolia, East Turkistan, and the Gansu Corridor to Beijing, Hanzhou 杭州, and elsewhere in China proper.

I. Books or Literary Texts
  I-a. religious texts
  I-b. secular texts
II. Civil and/or Ecclesiastical Documents
  II-a. official documents
  II-b. personal documents

III. Inscriptions or Epitaphs
III-a. religious texts
III-b. secular texts

It should be noted that the word "documents" as used here differs in meaning from its use in, for example, expressions such as "Dunhuang 敦煌 documents" or "Turfan documents." Collective designations such as "Dunhuang documents" or "Turfan documents" encompass not only II. Civil and/or Ecclesiastical Documents, but also I. Books or Literary Texts and sometimes even III. Inscriptions and Epitaphs (especially rubbings and transcriptions). Therefore, when referring to ordinary documents, I use the term "civil and/or ecclesiastical documents," which include not only administrative and military documents, but also documents pertaining to the temple economy and monks' letters. In addition, contract documents pertaining to temples and monks' letters dealing with commodities, for example, cannot be classified as either religious or secular, and therefore the subdivisions of II. Civil and/or Ecclesiastical Documents differ from those of types I and III. I would like to point out that even so there are still instances in which it is difficult to draw a line between official documents and personal documents.

The majority of Uighur civil and/or ecclesiastical documents as defined in the above manner are manuscripts written in the Uighur script with pen and ink on paper, and they date from the time of the West Uighur kingdom, between the mid-ninth century and early thirteenth century, and from the Mongol period of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. With a few exceptions, they were all discovered in the Turfan Depression, Dunhuang, and Kara-khoto. These Uighur civil and/or ecclesiastical documents comprise the following kinds of documents:

II-a. official documents
1. decrees and administrative / military orders (incl. letters of appointment)
2. diplomatic letters
3. petitions
4. prayers (incl. colophons)
5. certificates and licences (incl. passports)
6. reports (incl. depositions)
7. registers and lists

8. receipts
9. miscellaneous

II-b. personal documents

1. letters and invoices
2. prayers (incl. colophons)
3. contracts (incl. wills)
4. registers and lists
5. receipts
6. miscellaneous

When it is clear who is issuing the order and who is receiving it, even official documents often take the form of letters. But the term "letter" usually refers to personal letters (II-b-1), and if one disregards the total amount of text (or number of lines), the overwhelming majority of letters that I have collected may be classified under II-b-1. But the format of official letters of types II-a-1, II-a-2, and II-a-3 would have evolved first, and it is highly likely that personal letters inherited this format or were strongly influenced by it. Therefore, personal letters alone are inadequate for gaining a comprehensive grasp of the formulae used in Old Uighur letters, and one must also take these official letters into consideration. In this respect I concur with T. Takeuchi (1986, p. 570), who has dealt with Old Tibetan letters of roughly the same period from the Eastern Silk Road.

Generally speaking, a "letter" is a document which is sent from the sender(s) to the addressee(s). The definition of a "letter" as used in my forthcoming *Corpus of the Old Uighur Letters* and in the present study is a document that was exchanged through intermediaries such as express messengers or members of a caravan (e.g., letter-carrier,[4] merchant, priest, ambassador, attendant, bodyguard, groom, etc.) between the sender(s) and addressee(s) separated by a certain distance (half a day's journey or more) and which as a general rule includes a formal greeting from the sender(s) to the addressee(s).[5] Documents

4) Although there is an Uighur term *yügürgän* "courier" deriving from *yügür-* "to run fast" and presumably corresponding to "letter-carrier," it is not known whether this term encompassed letter-carriers in a broad sense, including express messengers and caravan members, whether there were actually professional postmen, or whether a postal system had already been established. These are important issues that require further investigation.

5) Among Sogdian letters discovered to date, those addressed to inferiors are said to lack any greeting enquiring after the addressee's health (cf. TuMW, p. 255). It is true that there is a similar tendency in Uighur letters, but U 6198 + 6199, a letter of Type C in the *äsängü* form that is clearly

which, though taking the form of a letter, were not sent to someone in a far-off place and were instead delivered directly by hand to the addressee or the person concerned have not been included. In the case of Uighur letters, the names of the addressee(s) and sender(s) are almost without exception written at the start of the letter. Personal letters consist mainly of courtesy letters conveying the sender's respects to a superior, letters sent during the course of a journey and asking after the well-being of family members as well as informing them of the sender's own safety, congratulatory messages for festivals or other memorable events, requests about personal matters, or business-related letters, and some serve several purposes simultaneously. In the case of official letters, administrative or military orders from a superior to an inferior and, conversely, petitions from an inferior to a superior take especially well-defined epistolary forms, and so they have been included even if they lack a formal greeting but have been judged to be of significance for the study of epistolary formulae. Documents taking the form of letters among administrative orders relating to lawsuits or disputes within a community or between neighbouring communities, on the other hand, have been quoted in their entirety if they are short, but in the case of longer documents only the section relating to the opening formula has been quoted for reference.

In anticipation of the publication of my *Corpus of the Old Uighur Letters*, this study offers a summary at the present stage of my work, with a focus on the formulae and special terms that served as criteria for the selection of letters to be included in the above work. In order to pick out as many letters as possible from among the Old Uighur documents held by the institutes, libraries, and museums around the world mentioned in the Preface, it is first necessary, while taking into account past research, to analyze complete or almost complete letters, identify the special terms distinctive of letters, recover on this basis letters from among even small fragments, and by repeating this process ultimately educe the formulae and conventional phrases used only in letters. The present study represents the philological findings of such an undertaking, but at the same time it is also an attempt at historical research aiming to elucidate the nature of cultural exchange between speakers of different

---

addressed to an inferior, includes a salutation. In the case of documents addressed to inferiors, in which the main emphasis is on conveying some matter of business, I have not applied the condition about the inclusion of a formal greeting all that strictly, and whether or not to include such documents among letters has been determined on the basis of their content. Further, judging from examples in other languages, the existence of personal letters with content of an official nature can also not be discounted, and in such cases it can be fully expected that there will be no greetings.

languages in eastern Central Eurasia and the realities of Silk Road trade on the basis of primary sources left behind by people who lived in Central Eurasia, namely, the ancient Uighurs.

At the present point in time, I have identified approximately two hundred letters written in Old Uighur, made up of both actual letters and also drafts that deserve to be included on account of their content. The actual letters include tiny fragments, but when, for instance, only stock phrases used in letters have been written on the back of a Buddhist text, I have regarded these as examples of mere writing practice rather than drafts of letters written with the intention of actually sending them, and these have not been included in my corpus.

2. The Periodization of Old Uighur Letters and Religious Distinctions

Since 1985, I have proposed that the styles of Uighur script used in all Old Uighur texts, both religious and secular, written in the Uighur script (with theoretical *termini post quem* and *ante quem* of the eighth century and seventeenth century respectively, but actually dating for the most part from the ninth to fourteenth centuries) be divided into four categories — 1) square or book script (Jp. *kaisho* 楷書), 2) semi-square script (Jp. *han-kai-sho* 半楷書), 3) semi-cursive script (Jp. *han-sōsho* 半草書), and 4) cursive script (Jp. *sōsho* 草書) — and I have also argued that it is possible to date documents on the basis of the styles of Uighur script used.[6] While the square script may conceivably be used in books or literary texts and in inscriptions or epitaphs from any period, it can be said that, apart from a very few exceptions (which I suspect may be collections of writing models),[7] there are

6) The most detailed definition of these four scripts in Japanese is to be found in Moriyasu 1994, pp. 66-68, but because I have subsequently made some corrections, reference should also be made to Moriyasu 2003a, p. 461, and Moriyasu 2004b, p. 228, both in English. A list of actual examples of each script can be found in Moriyasu 2004b, pp. 232-233. As for the dating of documents on the basis of scripts, the most detailed treatment (in Japanese) is Moriyasu 1994, §10 (pp. 63-83, esp. pp. 66, 81-83), but in Western languages it is mentioned in: Moriyasu 1990, pp. 147-150; Moriyasu 1996, pp. 79-81, 91-93, 96 (n. 38); Moriyasu / Zieme 1999, p. 74; Moriyasu 2003a, pp. 461-462; Moriyasu 2004b, pp. 228-231.

7) Almost all of the Old Uighur letters are written in Uighur script, and apart from one exception in Runic script (U 181 v?), there is one example of what seems to be a specimen letter written in Manichaean script. The latter is U 141 (T II D 123), referred to in Tezcan and Zieme 1971 = UBr, p. 453, n. 6, which quotes the sentence *yiningiz ..... äsängüläyü ..... ötünür biz*. As will be discussed below, these are indeed terms that appear frequently in letters. But since this fragment U 141 in Manichaean script is on paper of a fine quality, not used for ordinary letters, and even has frame lines and characters written in red ink, it must be part of a book. I believe that, together with

virtually no examples of the use of the square script in civil and/or ecclesiastical documents. Setting aside the square script, which could have been used during any period, Old Uighur texts may be broadly divided on the basis of their script into two groups, namely, an early group written in the semi-square script (around the tenth and eleventh centuries) and a later group written in the cursive script (thirteenth to fourteenth centuries in the Mongol period). In other words, texts written in the semi-square script may be considered to date from the West Uighur period and those written in the cursive script from the Mongol period.[8] It should be noted that hereafter "early period" refers to the former and "new (or later) period" refers to the latter.

The situation regarding the dating of documents is quite favourable for letters in particular. This is because the relics unearthed from the famous Library Cave of the Mogao 莫高 Caves of the Thousand Buddhas at Dunhuang, whose *terminus ante quem* is the first decade of the eleventh century, included fifteen genuine letters (MOTH 19~32; Dong 冬 61) and two draft or practice letters (MOTH 5, 17). In addition, four letters or their drafts were discovered in the Northern Grottoes of the Mogao Caves, which date from the Mongol period. During what might be called the intervening period, from the second half of the eleventh century to the start of the thirteenth century, the kingdom of Xixia 西夏 ruled Hexi 河西 and to date no Uighur documents dating from this period have been found at Dunhuang. In other words, the Uighur documents discovered at Dunhuang are clearly divided by period into two groups, namely, documents brought or made around the tenth century by Uighurs

U 5085 r, the only letter-related fragment in square script to have been discovered, this is part of a handbook of model letters. In the case of Sogdian, there exist actual letters in Manichaean script, such as a well-known letter touching on the dispute between the Mihrīya and Miklāsīya sects, and thus there is a possibility that Uighur letters in Manichaean script may also be discovered in the future.

8) Needless to say, the identification of scripts is relative. There are also individual differences in writing, and it is difficult to define the criteria for identifying the semi-square script in a way that will not elicit any objections. For this reason, I have posited from the outset a grey zone in the form of the semi-cursive script for writing that I am unable to classify with confidence. The twelfth century has only been left as a transitional period, and it is not my intention to imply that the semi-cursive script is the script characteristic of the twelfth century. The positing of the semi-cursive script is no more than a temporary measure, and there is a possibility that sometime in the future it will separate into and be absorbed by the semi-square script and cursive script.
In addition, the dating of texts written in the Uighur script on the basis of their script alone cannot be categorical. While it is not possible for documents written in the newer cursive script to date from an earlier period, there is a possibility that manuscripts written in the semi-square script or a similar script may date from as late as the Mongol period. In other words, the semi-square script is a necessary condition for "antiquity" but not a sufficient condition.

coming from the West Uighur kingdom to Dunhuang, which was under the rule of the independent government of the imperial military commissioner (*jiedushi* 節度使) of the Return-to-Allegiance Army (*guiyijun* 歸義軍) of Hexi, and documents made or received by Uighurs residing in Dunhuang after both the West Uighur kingdom and Xixia had come under the rule of the Mongol empire in the thirteenth century and it had become easier to travel between the Tianshan region and Hexi, especially after the former royal family of the West Uighurs had moved to Hexi in the fourth quarter of the thirteenth century. Sixteen of the seventeen letters belonging to the early group were published by Hamilton in his major opus MOTH, while the single remaining letter (Dong 61) was added by myself,[9] and all of these are written in typical semi-square script. As for the four letters of the later group, I discovered three of them, while the fourth has recently been published by the Dunhuang Academy,[10] and these are all written in typical cursive script close to a scribble. By using these scripts as a yardstick and using as indices the epistolary formulae and special terms to be educed from these letters, it should become readily possible to classify the letters found among the Uighur texts from Turfan, which range from the ninth to fourteenth centuries and had hitherto been difficult to date, not simply on the basis of their script, but also with reference to their terminology and content.

If one surveys the entire corpus of Uighur letters while also taking into account trends in the religious history of the Uighurs as clarified so far,[11] it is found that while there are more letters by Manichaeans than by Buddhists in the early group written in the semi-square script, most of the letters in the later group in cursive script are by Buddhists, with a small number by Christians in both groups. But there are no letters at all by Muslims in either group. In the case of business letters, religious affiliations seldom appear in the wording of the letter, but nonetheless it may be assumed that this tendency is preserved in them too. Therefore, under no circumstances have letters in cursive script any links with Manichaeans, and it is safe to assume that they were written by Uighur Buddhists.

Paper, which is far lighter and also cheaper than parchment, spread from China to

---

9) Moriyasu 1991, pp. 200-204 and fig. 23 (eye copy). A German translation of the text with annotations can be found in GUMS, pp. 242-248. It is to be regretted that all the plates and figures included in the original Japanese version have been omitted in GUMS.

10) Moriyasu 1982, pp. 1-8 = Moriyasu 1983, pp. 209-218; Moriyasu 1985a, pp. 62-66 (incl. 5 figs.), pp. 76-87; MoBS I, pl. LXXXVIII, B59: 68; Yakup 2004, pp. 398-399.

11) Cf. Moriyasu 1989; Moriyasu 1990; Moriyasu 1991 = GUMS; Moriyasu 2001; Moriyasu 2003b; Moriyasu 2007b = Moriyasu 2008b.

Samarkand in Central Asia in the eighth century, penetrated the Arab world in the ninth to tenth centuries, appeared in Italy in Southern Europe only in the twelfth century, and reached Western Europe still later. This means that at the time when the Uighur letters in semi-square script were being written there was still no paper in Western Europe. But even though paper, which had come into wide use in China and surrounding regions, may have been a relatively cheap form of writing material at the time, this was true only in comparison with the writing materials used in other cultural spheres, and it was still a valuable article. It was for this reason that the following statement, for example, has survived in a letter in semi-square script from Dunhuang: *sän-lär näng bir bitig ïdmaz sän-lär nägül šačuda kägdä yoq+mu* (MOTH 30, ll. 3-4) "You do not send a single letter. Why? Is there not any paper in Shazhou (= Dunhuang)?" Similarly, another letter from Dunhuang, dating from the tenth century and written in Sogdian interspersed with Uighur (DTSTH, Text E), includes in Sogdian the admonition "Do not be sparing with paper (when there is a lot of news or business)!"

3. Research History

Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler (Radloff 1928 = USp), the first monumental work in the field of Old Uighur philology, contains a wide range of many different kinds of documents, including five documents taking the form of letters.[12] None of these are typical personal letters. One of them (USp 69 = U 5331) is an administrative order relating to taxes, two others (USp 17 = U 5293; USp 24 = U 5295) are documents relating to a dispute that arose concerning the ownership of land within a local community, and the final two (USp 45 = U 5294; USp 92 = U 5320) are semi-official letters. It proved extremely difficult even for Radloff, a great Turkic philologist, to decipher these secular documents that had been unearthed only a short time earlier along the Eastern Silk Road, and he erred in reading the word at the end of the first line of USp 92 as *č(a)sangtuz* and the word at the end of the second line as *söz* "word." It is now evident that the former should be read *äsängümüz*, signifying "(our salutatory) letter" in Uighur. The text of USp requires major revisions in other respects too, but this is only natural when one considers advances in scholarship.

Next, A. von Gabain translated the four letters included in the Uighur version of Vol. 7

---

12) Sertkaya (1999) has reexamined these documents.

of the *Da Ci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, a biography of the monk Xuanzang 玄奘 (Gabain 1938, "Briefe der uigurischen Hüen-tsang-Biographie" = BHtB).[13] This is no more than a translation of a Buddhist work originally written in Chinese, but Gabain (1964) went on to decipher one of the genuine letters of which only photographs had been reproduced in the *Tulufan kaogu ji* 吐魯番考古記 (TuKa) and, drawing on the fruits of BHtB, discussed the format of Uighur letters for the first time. Though this was only a brief study of two pages (Gabain 1964, pp. 238-239), it deserves a certain degree of recognition. However, the reason that in both BHtB and Gabain 1964 she states that there are four letters in Vol. 7 of Xuanzang's biography when there are only three in the original Chinese is that Šïngqo Šäli Tutung, who translated the biography into Uighur, misread the Chinese, and it should be noted that Gabain's first letter is a phantom letter. The other three letters all use the distinctive expression *äsängü bitig*, which, in view of the fact that there is no corresponding term in the original Chinese, Gabain deemed to be a purely Uighur term, and this was a memorable achievement in that she discovered for the first time an Uighur term signifying letters in general. Thereafter, many fragments of Uighur documents unearthed along the Eastern Silk Road have been identified as letters on account of the presence of this term. Unfortunately Gabain's interpretation of the meaning of *äsängü bitig* is incorrect and needs to be emended, and I shall touch on this in the next section.

When it comes to full-scale studies of letters written in Old Uighur, mention must first be made of Tezcan and Zieme 1971, "Uigurische Brieffragmente" (= UBr). Selecting two of four letters of which either the text or photographs had previously been published (TuKa, pls. 87-88 in pp. 93-94 = Text A; TuKa, pl. 81 in p. 87 = Text C) and a further two among fifteen documents that had been newly identified as letters among the Uighur texts held in Berlin (U 181 = Text B; U 5890 = Text D), the authors provided an explanation of epistolary formulae and full-scale annotated translations. They also indicated that the remaining thirteen letters held in Berlin (U 5503, U 5531, U 5545, U 5832, U 5847, U 5928, U 5929, U 5933, U 5941, U 5977, U 6069, U 6155, Ch/U 6854) would also be published in due course. Although at this stage attention was not yet being paid to differences between the letters of Manichaeans and Buddhists, the authors' foresight in presenting examples of not

---

13) Gabain had already realized at this stage that the precursor of the later Mongolian epistolary formula "personal name + *üge manu*" was the words *savïm* and *savïmïz*, found in the Uighur translation of the *Da Ci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan*. Subsequently, the relationship between the two was discussed in greater detail in TMEN, III, no. 1292 *sözümiz* (addition in IV, p. 466).

only semi-square and cursive Uighur, but also Runic, which is rather rare, was quite astounding. This study was followed by Zieme 1972, in which the author touched on six letters by Manichaeans (U 5281, U 5721, U 5928, U 5974, U 6069, Ch/U 6854), which contain the distinctively Manichaean terms *m(a)nastar xirza* and *qošt(i)ranč*.

Peter Zieme's reputation as a Turkologist was firmly established with the publication of *Manichäisch-türkische Texte* (= BTT V) in 1975. This is a representative work of his younger years, and it brings together various kinds of documents by Manichaeans among the Uighur documents discovered in Turfan. These documents are written either in Manichaean script or in square or semi-square Uighur script, and there are no examples of the cursive script. This work included the full texts of five letters or their drafts by Manichaeans (BTT V, no. 30 = U 5281; BTT V, no. 31 = U 5503; BTT V, no. 32 = Ch/U 6854 v; BTT V, no. 33 = U 5928; BTT V, no. 34 = U 6069)[14] with detailed annotated translations, and their publication not only supplemented the results of the earlier UBr, but also clarified for the first time the format of Manichaean letters. It is possible to ascertain on the basis of the photofacsimiles appended to this work that these five letters (two of them drafts) are all written in the semi-square script. However, among the seven letters cited for reference in the annotations (all with photographs) (U 5847, U 5874, U 5929, U 5933, U 5974, U 6198, U 6251), one (U 5847 in pl. XLII) is written in semi-cursive script, and it is difficult to determine whether another (U 5874 in pl. XLI) is in semi-square or semi-cursive script. Since it is possible to make out the words "*kši ačari äsängüm*" in the photograph of the latter letter, it was clearly sent by a high-ranking Buddhist monk,[15] while the former too is probably a letter by a Buddhist from a slightly later period. Therefore, it was just as well that these two letters were not included in the main body of this work, for otherwise they may have caused some confusion.

Next, in Zieme 1976a, "Zum Handel im uigurischen Reich von Qočo," pp. 247-249, Zieme provided brief comments on eight business-related letters, including some that had been mentioned in the past (U 181, U 5941, U 5977, U 6155, U 6190, Ch/U 3917, Ch/U

---

14) BTT V, no. 35 (Ch/U 6890 v) was also initially thought to be a letter, but when I later examined the original in Berlin, it was found to be not a letter, but a fragment of a narrative tale about King Shāpūr of the Sassanids.

15) Regarding the fact that *kši ačari* is a title closely connected with the Buddhist order in the early years of the West Uighur kingdom, see Moriyasu 2007b, pp. 22-25 = Moriyasu 2008b, pp. 210-213.

6245, Ch/U 6570).[16] In Zieme 1977, "Drei neue uigurische Sklavendokumente," pp. 156-167, he took up two slave contracts (SUK, Sa19 & Sa20) together with one of the letters touched on in his 1976 article (Ch/U 3917), dealing with the use and sale of slaves in Uighur Manichaean society, and discussed them in great detail. I rate this article highly as an illustration of how Uighur philology can contribute to the study of Central Eurasian history. Then, in Kudara and Zieme 1983, "Uigurische Āgama-Fragmente (1)," mention was made of a draft letter by a Buddhist in cursive script (Ch/U 7555).

In this fashion, Peter Zieme's contribution to the study of Uighur epistolary formulae has by no means been insignificant. On the contrary, it would be no exaggeration to say that it is he who, as Gabain's successor, has opened up this field of study.

The next person to make a major contribution to this field was James Hamilton. During the 1960s he noticed that the Dunhuang documents housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and the British Library in London included about fifty Uighur manuscripts, and over a period of more than twenty years he brought to completion his *Manuscrits ouïgours du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle de Touen-houang* (= MOTH), published in 1986. This consists of thirty-six Uighur documents in Uighur script accompanied by detailed annotations, a glossary, and plates. These documents are all written in square or semi-square script,[17] and, as was noted in the previous section, the fourteen genuine letters (MOTH 19~32) and two draft or practice letters (MOTH 5, 17) in particular are all without exception written in semi-square script. As a result of this publication, our knowledge about Old Uighur letters of around the tenth century increased dramatically. Hamilton's engagement in this work was widely known in academic circles, and the publication of his book filled a long-felt need. It goes without saying that the standard of this book, grounded as it was in Western traditions of Central Asian philology, met everyone's expectations. But what I rate even more highly about it is the perspicacity of Hamilton's insights into Central Asian history as reflected in his "Introduction" and "Conclusions." Since he is able to read Japanese fluently, he also incorporated the fruits of Japanese research on Central Asian history, which utilizes both documents from Dunhuang and Turfan and also Chinese-language sources, and he gave due recognition to the importance of Sogdians and the Silk Road.

---

16) However, when I later examined the originals in Berlin, it was found that one of these (U 6190) was not in fact a letter.

17) MOTH 12 alone is in semi-cursive script, and I suspect that it dates from the Mongol period. It would at any rate probably have been better not to include this document in MOTH so as to avoid any confusion.

Meanwhile, in Moriyasu 1982 = Moriyasu 1983, I published a letter (P. ou. 16 Bis [one manuscript peeled off from P. 4521]) that I had discovered inside the back cover of an Uighur Buddhist text in book form. Then, in Moriyasu 1985a, I sorted the Uighur fragments brought back by Pelliot from Cave 181 (Pelliot's numbering) of the Mogao Caves and succeeded in restoring two letters (P. 181 ou., no. 203 group, recto & verso) by joining together three fragments. These three letters were all written in cursive script, and in these two articles I highlighted in a clear form for the first time the existence of another corpus of Dunhuang documents from the caves of the Mongol period in addition to the Dunhuang documents from the famous Library Cave. The discovery of these three Uighur letters in cursive script was, as it were, a by-product of this major achievement, but it was made possible only because during my period of study in Paris in 1978-80 Professor Hamilton had been kind enough to go through in person with me the letters to be included in MOTH. Owing to differences in publishing conditions, the pupil's article ended up being published before the master's opus. But because the work embodied in Moriyasu 1982 = Moriyasu 1983 had been carried out under difficult conditions, trying to read a letter that had been reused as scrap paper by holding it up to the light of an electric lamp, it was imperfect from the outset. These defects were remedied in Hamilton 1992, which, comparing this letter with Text C in UBr, greatly advanced the study of the formats of letters written in cursive script among Uighur Buddhists of the Mongol period.

Lastly, mention must be made of the major presence of Sogdians or Sogdian-Uighurs in the West Uighur kingdom. Sims-Williams and Hamilton 1990 (= DTSTH) brings together eight Sogdian documents discovered in the Library Cave at Dunhuang, and these include three Sogdian letters interspersed with Uighur words (Texts E, F, G). It is worth noting that two of these would appear to have been written by Christians. In my view, these three letters were written by people of Sogdian descent living in the West Uighur kingdom, and they are of great interest in that they provide linguistic evidence of exchange between the Sogdian and Uighur languages around the tenth century. The elucidation of the historical significance of these letters left by Christians remains a task for the future. I have, however, discussed in Moriyasu 1997b how the Uighur letters by either Manichaean or Buddhist Uighurs or Sogdian-Uighurs that are included in the aforementioned MOTH can be used as sources for Central Asian history.

Also closely related to this is TuMW, including Yoshida / Moriyasu 2000a, the main part of which was written by Yoshida Yutaka and which was published in 2000 as a joint

Sino-Japanese study. The main focus of this work was eight letters by Manichaeans that were discovered all together in the Thousand Buddha Caves at Bezeklik in Turfan.[18] They were discovered in between walls of a special construction in what I have termed a double-walled cave,[19] and in view of these circumstances these letters may be assumed to date from roughly the same period. Three of them (81TB 65:1~3 = TuMW, Letters A, B, C) are lengthy Sogdian letters, while the remaining five (81TB 65:4~8 = TuMW, Letters D, E, F, G, H) are Uighur letters; Yoshida dealt with the former and I with the latter. Not only in his annotations to the Sogdian letters, but also in Yoshida 2000c, a study of Sogdian epistolary formulae published in the same volume, Yoshida undertook an extensive comparison with the letter (Dong 61) of an Uighur Manichaean appended to Moriyasu 1991 = GUMS (Moriyasu 2004c) and made an important contribution with respect to language contact between Sogdian and Uighur in the early West Uighur kingdom that is no less valuable than DTSTH. Since this book was published in Chinese, it will no doubt be frequently quoted in the future, but because of differences in publishing conditions in China and Japan, we were not given sufficient time to read the proofs properly, and there remain some inadequacies. It was therefore decided to publish an enlarged and revised version in Japanese of the eight letters with their annotations (Yoshida / Moriyasu 2000b). It should also be mentioned that, on the basis of my supplementary note on p. 178 and Yoshida 2002, these letters have been dated to the start of the eleventh century.[20] This is worth noting because we now have a firm foundation for comparing Sogdian and Uighur letters among the Turfan documents both diachronically and synchronically. When the abbreviation "TuMW" or the notation "Letters A–H" is used to indicate the sources of examples cited below, reference should also be made to Yoshida / Moriyasu 2000b.

In addition to the above, mention may also be made of the following studies or catalogues that include Uighur letters: Tuguševa 1971; Clauson 1973a; Raschmann 1991; Zieme 1995; Tuguševa 1996; Sertkaya 1999; Israpil 1999; Matsui 2005; Matsui 2006; Raschmann 2007; Raschmann 2009a; Raschmann 2009b. Worthy of special mention is the fact that an example of an Uighur letter from Kara-khoto was deciphered for the first time by Matsui Dai in Yoshida / Čimeddorǰi 2008, pp. 191-194, F9:W105.

---

18) Cf. Moriyasu 1991, pp. 28-29 = GUMS, pp. 30-31; Yoshida / Moriyasu 2000b, pp. 142-143.
19) Cf. Moriyasu 1991, pp. 7-11, 27-29 = GUMS, pp. 3-8, 28-31.
20) See also Moriyasu 2003b, pp. 84-86.

4. Special Terms and Formulae as Criteria for Identifying Letters

In the Uighur letters and documents taking the form of letters that I have gathered so far, I have been able to extract the following words as special terms used for referring to these documents: *yrlγ (yarlïγ), ötüg, söz, sav,* and *äsängü*. In actual practice, these terms appear in combination with the possessive suffix of the first person singular or plural or together with the word *bitig*, a general word for anything written (and, in the context of the present study, letters in general), and therefore I shall refer to them in the following manner:

Terms Signifying "Letter"

***yarlïγ* form:** *yarlïγïm, yarlïγïmïz, yarlïγ bitigim, yarlïγ bitigimiz,* (*äsängü* + *yarlïγ* form)

***ötüg* form:** *ötügüm, ötügümüz, ötüg bitigim, ötüg bitigimiz,* (*äsängü* + *ötüg* form)

***sav/söz* form:** *savïm, savïmïz, sözüm, sözümüz*

standard *äsängü* form: *äsängüm, äsängümüz, äsängü bitigim, äsängü bitigimiz*

simple *bitig* form: *bitigim, bitigimiz*

It should be noted that *bitig* can combine with *yarlïγ, ötüg*, or *äsängü*, but not with *söz* or *sav*. If one of these terms was found in any fragment, I went on to surmise the context of the rest of the text on the premise that it might be a letter and so determined whether or not it actually was a letter.

Documents taking the form of letters with a sender and an addressee can be divided into three kinds: 1) documents submitted by an inferior to a superior, 2) documents sent by a superior to an inferior, and 3) documents sent to someone of equal standing. Generally speaking, those sent by an inferior to a superior tend to be petitionary, while those sent by a superior to an inferior are often injunctive, and those sent to someone of equal standing were exchanged between peers and colleagues. But in the case of personal letters, it is only natural that when writing to someone with whom the writer has no superordinate-subordinate or superior-inferior relationship, letters of the first type will often be used to express politeness. This means that there exist letters of the first type that were sent both in name and in reality by an inferior to a superior and others that are only nominally of this type. Be that as it may, it is easy to identify a letter if it contains a term indicative of a letter sent by an inferior to a superior. One such term is *qutïnga*.

When searching for letters, one of the terms that I used as a pointer when none of the

above terms signifying a letter *per se* was present was *qutïnga* "to His/Her Majesty... > to His/Her Highness..., to His/Her Excellency..." indicating the addressee. The original meaning of *qut* is the "favour, fortune, or charisma" of the god of heaven, the universal supreme deity of the nomadic tribes of the Central Eurasian steppe (from whom the ruling class of the West Uighur kingdom was descended), and therefore originally it could be used only for someone of the highest status in both the religious and the secular worlds. Judging from examples of its usage found in MOTH and TuMW, in the tenth and early eleventh centuries it could be said to have still been strictly distinguished from the simple dative suffix *-qa/-kä*. Its usage would have gradually changed, being used first by laymen of high social standing for showing respect to members of the clergy, who were of lower social rank, and then when addressing any superior. Nonetheless, letters in which the term *qutïnga* is used may be regarded as being basically letters sent by an inferior to a superior.

For the Uighurs, who were originally pastoral nomads with no culture of writing, the original method of conveying information would have been the spoken word. The Uighur term for "word" in general is *söz* or *sav* (see footnote 29), but words addressed by a social superior to an inferior — that is, orders or instructions — are *yarlïγ*, while words addressed by an inferior to a superior are *ötüg*.

By the time of the Mongol period, the meaning of the term *yarlïγ*, in concord with the Mongolian *jarliγ*, had come to be restricted in meaning to an "imperial decree" issued by the *qaγan* or emperor, but during the West Uighur period it was being used in a slightly broader sense. SI 2 Kr 17 & SI Kr IV 256 (Tuguševa 1971, Clauson 1973a) were sent by the prime minister Il Ögäsi Bilgä Bäg, SI 4b Kr 222 (Tuguševa 1996, no. 7) was sent by an eminent Buddhist monk bearing the title *uluγ tutung*, probably the highest position in West Uighur Buddhist society,[21] and Ch/U 8140 was sent by the *t(ä)ngri možak*, the highest position in the Manichaean church among the West Uighurs, and all are written in semi-square script. As is noted by Clauson and Clark, the original meaning of *yarlïγ* was probably "a spoken command from a superior to an inferior" (ED, pp. 966-967; IUCD, pp. 247-249), and it then came to mean a letter from a social or religious superior. Therefore, letters of the *yarlïγ* form are invariably from a superior to an inferior.

In the past, the word *ötüg* has been translated in Western languages as "petition, request, prayer," "prière, demande" (Fr.), "Bitte, Petition, Eingabe" (Ger.), and "pros'ba, mol'ba" (Rus.), but none of these seem to me to get to the essence of this word's meaning.

21) Moriyasu 2007b, pp. 19-21 = Moriyasu 2008b, pp. 207-210.

"Request," "petition," and "prayer" are derivative meanings and deviate somewhat from the word's original sense. The original meaning of the verb *ötün-*, which has the same etymology, is "to submit a statement or something to a superior" (ED, p. 62; SUK 2, p. 271), and *ötüg* too originally signified words or things submitted by an inferior to a superior. As a consequence, it came to mean both "request," "petition" or "prayer" and a letter addressed to a superior, and in the phrase *biläk ötügüm* it means "my humble gift" (BHtB, p. 376, l. 1843; ED, p. 338). Therefore, when this term is used in a letter I translate it as "statement," "submission," "petition" or simply "letter." The *ötüg* is basically a document submitted by an inferior to a superior, and this is most definitely the case when this is emphasized by the use of the phrase *(y)inčgä ötügümüz* "a humble statement of ours."

It is not in the least surprising that the terms *sav* and *söz*, originally signifying the neutral "word," should have become terms for "letter." But it is somewhat surprising that in the examples that I have collected they appear to refer almost invariably not to letters sent between peers, but to letters sent by a superior to an inferior. I would interpret this in the following manner. Even mere "words" become "my orders or instructions" when uttered or sent by a superior, and they would have thus further changed into the meaning of "a letter from me to an inferior." The Mongolian phrase *üge manu* "my (lit. our) words," which is frequently used in the sense of a ruler's written orders in the later Mongol period, is almost undoubtedly a calque introduced from Uighur, and this conjecture is also supported, I believe, by its usage (cf. TMEN III, no. 1292 & IV, p. 466). If one takes into account the fact that during the Mongol period it was stipulated that only the supreme emperor (great khan) could use the phrase *jarlïγ manu* "my (lit. our) decree, imperial decree," while other rulers had to use *üge manu*, it should be assumed that in the foregoing West Uighur period too *yarlïγ* and *sav/söz* were differentiated. The word *yarlïγ* naturally has strong official overtones, while *sav/söz* tends to be more widely used in administrative orders than in personal letters, and almost all such letters appear to have no salutation.

The words *bitig* and *äsängü*, on the other hand, are used in all types of letters, be they between peers, from an inferior to a superior, or from a superior to an inferior. As is well known, *bitig* is a general word for anything written. But what is the original meaning of *äsängü*? Gabain translates *äsängü* as "unversehrt, vollständig, Gesamtheit; Wohlbefinden" and the derivative verb *äsängülä-* as "sich nach dem Befinden erkundigen," and she interprets *äsängü bitig* as "unversehrter Brief, vollständiger Brief" (BHtB, pp. 375, 377, 383, 384, 393 (note 1819), 410 (index); Gabain 1964, p. 238; ATG, p. 325). Zieme more or

less follows her interpretation (Zieme 1970, p. 231; UBr, pp. 453, 455; BTT V, pp. 67, 68, 69, 77). Clauson, on the other hand, translates *äsängü bitig* as "a letter of security, safe conduct (?)" (ED, p. 249), which has a slightly different nuance. But Hamilton rejected these earlier views and argued that the meaning of *äsängü* is not "état de santé" but "bonne santé," from which it also came to mean "ce qui est destiné à apporter la bonne santé, salut, salutaire, vœux de bonne santé, vœux de salut," while *äsängülä-* means not "demander des nouvelles de la santé" but "faire des vœux de bonne santé, exprimer des vœux de salut," and *äsängü bitig* signifies "lettre de vœux de bonne santé, lettre exprimant des vœux de salut, lettre de salut" (Hamilton 1979, p. 460; MOTH, pp. 53, 111, 216, etc.). His arguments are persuasive, being based on a wealth of examples found in letters discovered in the Library Cave at Dunhuang which he himself published for the first time, and it has become clear that even *äsängü* used alone can have the same meaning as *äsängü bitig* "salutatory letter, greeting letter." Erdal, while expressing full agreement with Hamilton's views, translates *äsängü* as "well-being" and regards it as synonymous with the abstract noun *äsänlik* appearing in the dictionary by Kāshgarī of the neighbouring Karakhanids (OTWF, pp. 164, 453-454). The word *äsänlik* does in fact also appear in Text C in UBr, but in Uighur letters it is only *äsängü* that means "letter" and never *äsänlik*.

In view of the above, I consider the original meaning of *äsängü* to have been "good health," from which there then developed the meaning of "prayer for good health > greeting." The meaning of "salutatory letter" no doubt arose as a result of the abbreviation of *äsängü bitig*. This term *äsängü bitig*, meaning "salutatory letter," is an expression universally applicable to letters to superiors, peers, inferiors, and family members. Evidence of this can be seen in the fact that there are attested both the expression *äsängü yarlïγ* (MOTH 17, line 12), directed at an inferior, and the expression *äsängü ötüg* (U 181 r? = UBr, Text B r?, line 3), directed at a superior. The all-inclusive expression *äsängü bitig* is of course the most widely used (cf. BHtB, p. 410; IUCD, pp. 262-265; MOTH, p. 216), and when a first-person possessive suffix is added to the abbreviated form *äsängü*, that is *äsängüm(üz)*, it takes the meaning of "my (our) salutatory letter," which naturally is also universally applicable to letters to superiors, peers, inferiors, and family members.

To sum up, it may be said that, among the terms signifying "letter," *yarlïγ* and *sav/söz* were used only for letters from a superior to an inferior and *ötüg* only for letters from an inferior to a superior, while *äsängü* and *bitig* were neutral general-purpose terms that could be used in either case.

5. The Classification of Epistolary Formulae according to Naming Formulae

Having collected approximately two hundred letters in the manner outlined above, I then set about analyzing them by bringing together as much information as possible about their format and wording, content, paper and form, and so on. As a result of my analysis, I reached the view that it would be useful for future research to broadly classify these letters in accordance with the opening formulae concerning the addressee and sender, that is, the naming formulae. I would like to refer to these opening formulae as addressee formulae, but because in actual practice the sender's name is often written together with the addressee's name and sometimes even precedes it, strictly speaking it would be inappropriate to refer to them as addressee formulae. In the previous version of this study (Moriyasu 2008a) I presented not only five major groupings (Types A~E), but also several subcategories. But this was criticized for being overly detailed and difficult to understand, and so, following further investigations, I here present a fresh classification. The classification into five types is the same as before, but it should be noted that in content only Types A and C are unchanged, and the other three types have been substantially altered. However, Types A and C remain the most important for classificatory purposes and provide the basic framework of my classification. This is because these two types possess a characteristic that is obvious to anyone. That is to say, the opening line (which may extend over two or more lines) begins from the same position as the start of the following salutation and main text of the letter, but the start of the next line (which may also extend over two or three lines) is indented with a rather large indention. In the following, I shall describe such patently obvious characteristics as "visual" characteristics.

Type A: Specific form of letter to superior with visual characteristic (used for a superior deserving special respect)

Type B: Specific simplified form of letter to superior

Type C: Specific form of letter to inferior with visual characteristic (used when the superior-inferior relationship is well-defined)

Type D: Non-specific form I (with a term indicative of a letter and used for superiors, peers, and inferiors)

Type E: Non-specific form II (without any term indicative of a letter and used for superiors, peers, and inferiors)

Of course, for any such classification of epistolary formulae to be truly useful, the homogeneity and universality of our corpus of Uighur letters needs to be guaranteed. It is with the aim of guaranteeing this to some extent that for each example cited below I have whenever possible indicated distinctions in script (semi-square, semi-cursive or cursive) and distinctions in religious affiliation (Manichaean, Buddhist, Christian or unknown).

Type A: Specific form of letter to superior with visual characteristic (used for a superior deserving special respect)

The addressee comes at the start. It is not unusual for the addressee's name and title to be preceded by epithets extolling the addressee. Together with the word *qutïnga*, indicating the addressee, this often accounts for only the first line, but if the epithets are lengthy, it may extend over two or more lines.[22] There is then a line break with an indention, followed by the sender's name. The sender's name is often preceded by self-deprecating epithets, and when these do not fit in a single line, or when the sender wishes to make a great display of humility, they may extend over two or three lines, all indented. In this fashion, a higher-ranking addressee and a lower-ranking sender are visually differentiated.

This style in which the sender's name in letters to a superior is indented can also be ascertained in (1) Sogdian documents of the first half of the eighth century from Mt. Mug, (2) a Sogdian letter of around the tenth century from Turfan (Sundermann 1996, pp. 101-102, U 6021), and (3) two letters of the late tenth to early eleventh century from Bezeklik (TuMW, Letters A & B). (2) and (3) were written by Manichaeans. The two letters comprising (3) are somewhat unusual, making it difficult to compare their form of indention with other letters, but (2) U 6021 is visually very similar to Type A of the Uighur letters, so similar in fact that, even though it is in Sogdian, the person who first classified it mistook it for an Uighur document and assigned it a number prefixed with "U." In this letter, the name of the high-ranking addressee occupies the first two lines, followed by the sender in lines 3-5, which have been indented, and the salutation starting from line 6 begins with "from

22) The longest known example in Uighur is five lines (Dong 61). In contrast, there is an extremely lengthy example of about twenty lines in a Sogdian letter addressed to a *možak* (*mushe* 慕闍) of the Eastern See in overall charge of the Manichaean church throughout the West Uighur kingdom (81TB 65:1 = TuMW, Letter A; 81 TB 65:2 = TuMW, Letter B). It might be noted that in Sogdian there exists a collection of writing models that brings together flowery epithets used with the addressee at the start of a letter (cf. Yoshida 2010, p. 16, n. 22). Similarly, flowery epithets applied to the addressee occupy a considerable portion of a handbook of model letters in Middle Persian (Zaehner 1939).

afar,” while in line 7, a continuation of the salutation, we find the word *krmšwxwn* (> Uig. *krmšuxun*), a stock greeting peculiar to Manichaeans.[23] Since Uighur Manichaeism had its origins in Sogdian Manichaeism, there is a quite high probability that the origins of our Type A may also go back to the Sogdian epistolary formulae of Manichaeans.

high-ranking addressee[24] **+ *qutïnga*** **<line break>**
<indention> **sender + *ötüg* form**[25] **or *(y)inčgä ötügümüz***[26]

Examples

Semi-square, Manichaean: U 5281 = BTT V, no. 30; 81TB 65:6 = TuMW, Letter F; 81TB 65:4 = TuMW, Letter D; Ch/U 6860 r; MOTH 5, 4th text; Ch/U 6854 v = BTT V, no. 32; extraordinarily U 5928 = BTT V, no. 33; U 5503 = BTT V, no. 31; Dong 61 = Moriyasu 1991, Add. 3 = GUMS, Anhang 3; Ot.Ry. 1697; Ot.Ry. 2822; 81TB 65:5 = TuMW, Letter E; U 6069 = BTT V, no. 34.

Semi-square, Buddhist: K 7713 = TuKa, pl. 84 on p. 90.

Semi-square: Christian: U 3890 r.

Semi-square: K 7718 = UBr, Text A; Ot.Ry. 6383; U 6251; U 5994; Ot.Ry. 2720 + 2795; U 5616; FB:1 in Israpil 1999; Ot.Ry. 1959.

Referential administrative documents

Cursive, Buddhist: Pintung’s petition in Oda 1992.

Type B: <u>Specific simplified form of letter to superior</u>

This is a simplified form of Type A, the typical type of letter to a superior, without any indention following the line break. It also came to be used for letters to peers. Any letter of the *ötüg* form is classified as either Type A or Type B.

---

23) On “from afar” see chap. 7, sect. (1a), and on *krmšuxun* chap. 9.

24) Members of the royal family, high-ranking officials, eminent clergymen, etc.

25) In the case of U 5928 = BTT V, no. 33, it would seem, judging from the size of the damaged part, that it ought to be restored not as *äsängü [ötügümüz]*, but simply as *äsängü[müz]*. This would mean that Type A is not invariably of the *ötüg* form and can also be of the standard *äsängü* form. But I would like to regard this as an exception in which what strictly speaking ought to have read *äsängü ötügümüz* has been abbreviated.

26) The phrase *(y)inčgä ötügümüz* is the expression of highest respect in the *ötüg* form, but I have deliberately differentiated it from the *ötüg* form. This is because the phrase *(y)inčgä ötügümüz* has so far been found only in Type A. This means that henceforth, as long as it contains the words

addressee + *qutïnga*　　<line break>
sender + *ötüg* form

Examples

Semi-square, Manichaean: Ch/U 6570 + 6959; U 5531 + 6066, Text a; U 5531 + 6066, Text b.

Semi-square: extraordinarily Ot.Ry. 1647.

Semi-cursive: extraordinarily Or. 8212-129.

Cursive, Buddhist: extraordinarily U 5941.

* As a rule, letters of this type need to have the word *qutïnga*, a line break, and the *ötüg* form, but so long as a letter is of the *ötüg* form it has been classified under this type even if it lacks the other two features. If, on the other hand, it possesses these two other features but is of the standard *äsängü* form rather than the *ötüg* form, it has also been classified under this type.

** In personal letters written in Chinese (used also in Japan) to a superior of the type known as *qi* 啓 (Jp. *kei*), the sender would seem to come at the start and the addressee at the end. But letters in this format, with the names of the sender and addressee separated by the main text of the letter, have not been found in Uighur, and it is unlikely that they existed in Sogdian or Bactrian either.

Type C: <u>Specific form of letter to inferior with visual characteristic (used when the superior-inferior relationship is well-defined)</u>

The sender comes at the start of the first line. There is then a line break with an indention, followed by the addressee's name. This pattern is the reverse of Type A, and it visually differentiates a high-ranking sender and a low-ranking addressee.[27)]

high-ranking sender + *yarlïγ* form, standard *äsängü* form, or *söz* form[28)] <line break>
<indention>　　addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä*

(y)inčgä ötügümüz, even the smallest fragment can probably be identified as belonging to Type A. This is why MOTH 5, 4th text, a draft with no line break, has been included in Type A.

27) This probably developed into the subsequent *Dai-ön ulus* "Yüan Dynasty" style (cf. Matsukawa 1995), in which the sender comes in a high position at the start, sometimes extending over several lines. This is followed by a line break and indention and then the name of the addressee, with the indention extending as far as the third line.

28) The only example of the *söz* form is Or. 12452 B-9, an administrative document in cursive script. According to the hitherto prevailing view, the Mongolian expression *üge manu/minu* is the original

Examples

Semi-square, Manichaean: U 6198 + 6199 (standard *äsängü* form); probably U 6194 (standard *äsängü* form).

Semi-square, Manichaean (draft with no indention): Ch/U 8140 (*yarlïγ* form).

Semi-square, Buddhist: SI 4b Kr 222 (*yarlïγ* form); U 5320 (standard *äsängü* form).

Semi-square: Or. 8212-115 fr. a+b (standard *äsängü* form); Ot.Ry. 1364 r (standard *äsängü* form); Ot.Ry. 1978 (standard *äsängü* form); probably SI Kr IV 597.

Semi-square (drafts with no indention): Or. 8212-116 = MOTH 17 (*yarlïγ* form); SI 2 Kr 17 & SI Kr IV 256 (*yarlïγ* form).

Cursive, Buddhist: Or. 12452 B-9 = M.B. V. 02 in *Innermost Asia* (*söz* form).

* The word *qutïnga* is never used to refer to the addressee in Type C.

** The forms *yarlïγ, yarlïγïmïz* or *äsängü yarlïγïmïz*, used by senders of the highest rank (ex. Uighur king, princes, or prime minister), should also be included under this type, and fortunately such examples can be inferred from Or. 8212-116 (MOTH 17), SI 2 Kr 17 & SI Kr IV 256 (Tuguševa 1971, Clauson 1973a), and Ch/U 8140. But regrettably SI 2 Kr 17 & SI Kr IV 256 are drafts in which more or less the same content has been rewritten, while the other two examples are not even drafts, but mere practice letters or random jottings. Therefore, none of these examples have line breaks or indentions, but every letter of the *yarlïγ* form ought to be included under Type C.

*** Properly speaking, *yarlïγ*, corresponding to an "order" from a superior to an inferior, is the appropriate term for "letter" in Type C, and the term *söz* or *sav*, simply meaning "word," can also be used in its place. As contrasted with them, the fact that the standard *äsängü* form, properly a "salutatory letter, greeting letter" devoid of any implication of a superior-inferior relationship, also came to be used in this context was no doubt because it had taken root as a popular term for letters. So long as the format of a line break followed by an indention was observed, there would have been no problem with the standard *äsängü* form. But even so, the superior-inferior relationship is not so clear-cut in the standard *äsängü* form as in the *yarlïγ* form or *söz* form, and there would seem to be

---

form that was established first, with Turkic *söz* being a calque imitating the Mongolian, and the singular form *sözüm* and plural form *sözümüz* are also said to have been differentiated. Cf. IUCD, pp. 161-162, 248-249; Sugiyama 1990, pp. 1-2, n. 1 = Sugiyama 2004, pp. 393-394. See also the next footnote.

many instances in which the relationship is somewhat vague.

**** The introductory formula *nä üküš sav ïdalïm* will be discussed in chapter 11, and letters in which this comes immediately after the indention without any salutation can be identified as belonging to Type C.

Type D: Non-specific form I (with a term indicative of a letter and used for superiors, peers, and inferiors)

* Letters of the *sav/söz* form are almost without exception letters to inferiors.

** Letters of the *söz* form are all written in cursive script, and thus this form may be said to have emerged in the later Mongol period. Unlike the *sav* form, the *söz* form never appears in the early period.[29)]

*** If *qutïnga* is used with the addressee's name in Types D and E, it is as a rule a letter to a superior. But even if the addressee is indicated merely by the dative suffix, respect for a superior or peer can still be expressed by prefixing epithets extolling the addressee (MOTH 20 [Type E1], MOTH 21 [Type E2]) or by adding a line break which, properly speaking, is not necessary (MOTH 29 & 31 [Type D1]).

Type D1

sender + standard *äsängü* form, simple *bitig* form, or *sav/söz* form <usually no line break, directly followed by> addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* [30)]

Examples

Semi-square, business: MOTH 24 (simple *bitig* form, no line break, to inferior); MOTH 25 (simple *bitig* form, no line break, to inferior); probably MOTH 26 (simple *bitig* form, no line break, to inferior).

---

29) To summarize the views of Clauson and Sinor, (1) the original Turkic word signifying "word" is *söz*, while *sav* is a loanword from the Finno-Ugric languages; (2) *söz* means "a single word, or short utterance," whereas *sav* means "a (full-length) speech, a narrative or story, a message" ; and (3) *sav* was frequently used in the early period until about the tenth century, but it virtually disappeared after the Mongol period (cf. ED, pp. 782, 860; Sinor 1980, pp. 769-770).

30) The three letters included in the Uighur translation of the *Da Ci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* (= Biography of Xuanzang) are all of Type D1, but whereas the addressee in two of them has the dative suffix *-qa/-kä* (BHtB, ll. 1824, 1866), one has *adaqïnga* "toward his feet" (BHtB, l. 2038). This latter phrase is a literal translation of the original Chinese *zuxia* 足下 "at (your) feet" and no doubt expresses respect for the addressee, but it is still unclear whether or not this is an expression that originally existed in Uighur.

Semi-square, Manichaean: 81TB 65:8 = TuMW, Letter H (standard *äsängü* form, no line break, to superior [mother]).

Semi-square, Christian?: SI D 11 r (simple *bitig* form, no line break, to inferior?).

Semi-square: MOTH 29 (standard *äsängü* form, line break, to peer); Or. 12207 A-8 & A-10 (standard *äsängü* form, no line break, to peer); MOTH 31 (standard *äsängü* form, to superior or peer); U 6155 (simple *bitig* form, line break); U 6180 r (standard *äsängü* form).

Semi-square or semi-cursive, Buddhist: U 5874 (standard *äsängü* form, no line break, to peer or superior).

Semi-square or semi-cursive: Or. 12452 B-11 (*sav* form, no line break, to peer or inferior?).

Semi-cursive, Buddhist: U 5977 (standard *äsängü* form, no line break, to peer).

Semi-cursive, Christian: U 7252 v (simple *bitig* form, no line break, to inferior); U 5831 (*söz* form, no line break).

Semi-cursive: U 5759 (standard *äsängü* form, no line break, to peer).

Cursive: U 5290 (*söz* form, no line break, to peer or inferior); U 5318 (*söz* form, no line break, to peer or inferior); U 5765; F9:W105 = Matsui 2008, pp. 191-192 (*söz* form, no line break); U 5293 = USp 17 (*söz* form); U 5295 = USp 24 (*söz* form).

Referential texts

Square: 3 letters in the Biography of Xuanzang.

Referential administrative documents

Semi-square: SI Kr IV 612 = Tuguševa 1996, no. 8 (*sav* form, no line break).

Cursive: U 5331 = USp 69 (*söz* form, no line break).

Type D2

addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* or *qutïnga* <usually no line break, directly followed by> sender + standard *äsängü* form, (simple *bitig* form) or *sav/söz* form

Examples

Semi-square, business: MOTH 23 (standard *äsängü* form, no line break, to peer).

Semi-square, Buddhist: MOTH 27 (standard *äsängü* form, to peer).

Semi-square: MOTH 28 (standard *äsängü* form, no line break but addressee's name accompanied by lengthy epithets, to superior or peer).

Cursive, Buddhist: U 5720 (*söz* form); Ch/U 7555 (*sav* form).

Type E: <u>Non-specific form II (without any term indicative of a letter and used for superiors, peers, and inferiors)</u>

This is a simple form without any term indicative of a letter, with the addressee being indicated by the dative (or *qutïnga*) and the sender by the ablative. There are also instances in which no ablative suffix is used with the sender, who, as the person offering the following salutation, is indicated without preamble by the nominative or a pronoun.

Type E1

addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* <no line break, directly followed by> sender + ablative suffix *-tïn/-tin/-dïn/-din*

Examples

Semi-square: MOTH 20 (to superior or peer).

Cursive, Buddhist: Ch/U 7426 (to peer or inferior); P. 181 ou., no. 203 group, verso in Moriyasu 1985a (to peer or inferior).

Cursive: SI Kr I 151 (to peer).

Type E2

addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* or *qutïnga* <usually no line break, directly followed by> sender without ablative suffix who, as the person offering the following salutations, is indicated by the nominative or a pronoun[31)]

Examples

Semi-square, Buddhist, business: MOTH 22 (no line break).

Semi-square: MOTH 21 (probably has line break, to superior); MOTH 30 (no line break); U 5754 r (probably has line break); U 5890 = UBr, Text D (no line break); Ot.Ry. 2718 (no line break); Ot.Ry. 1097b (no line break).

Semi-cursive: probably Ot.Ry. 6376 (line break).

Cursive, Buddhist: Ch/U 6245 (no line break); B59:68 in MoBS I (no line break); P. 181 ou., no. 203 group, recto in Moriyasu 1985a (no line break, to virtual peer); Dx 3654 v.

---

31) In the case of MOTH 21, the sender is given in a superscription on the verso, and therefore even the subject is not indicated in the main text. Nonetheless, this letter itself is termed *äsängü bitigim* in that superscription.

Type E3

sender + ablative suffix *-tïn/-tin/-dïn/-din* <no line break, directly followed by> addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä*

Examples

Cursive, Buddhist: K 7715 = UBr, Text C; probably *U 9003 in Raschmann 2008.

6. The Basic Structure of Old Uighur Letters and Honorific Expressions

In the previous chapter, I divided Uighur epistolary formulae broadly into five types (Types A~E) by focusing on the naming formulae at the start of the letter. But if one turns one's attention not just to the naming formulae, but also to the subsequent greetings, the body of the letter and the closing formulae, and analyzes the letters as a whole in greater detail, it is possible to educe the following basic structure.

The Basic Structure of Old Uighur Letters

[I] Naming Formulae

Type A: Specific form of letter to superior with visual characteristic

Type B: Specific simplified form of letter to superior

Type C: Specific form of letter to inferior with visual characteristic

Type D: Non-specific form I (with a term indicative of a letter)

Type E: Non-specific form II (without any term indicative of a letter)

[II] Greeting Formulae

[II-1] Basic Conventional Greetings

(1a), (1b), (1c), (1d), (1e), (1f), (1g)

[II-2] Religious Greetings

[II-3] Inquiries about the Addressee's Health

(3a), (3b), (3c), (3d), (3e), (3f), (3g), (3h), (3i), (3j)

[II-4] Sender's Sense of Relief

[II-5] Sender's Health

(5a), (5b), (5c), (5d)

[III] Body of the Letter

[III-1] Introductory Formulae

[III-2] Idiomatic Phrases
[III-3] Closing Formulae
[IV] Delivery Notes

The above overall structure is more or less the same as that for letters in other languages throughout all periods of history,[32] but there are two major differences. One is that there is no mention of the date and place of writing, which frequently come at the end of letters in other languages, and if on the rare occasion they are given, there is no fixed pattern (as for the date, cf. chap. 8, sect. 3 (5d) & chap. 11, sect. 2). It is odd that, unlike legal documents (mainly contract documents), nearly all of which bear dates, only a few of the Uighur letters are dated. The second difference is the existence of [II-2] religious greetings. These have been treated separately for convenience' sake, but they could, if necessary, be included in [II-1] basic conventional greeting phrases. In the letters of any language, it is [I] naming formulae and [II] greeting formulae that best illustrate the distinctive features of their epistolary formulae.

[I] Naming formulae have already been analyzed in detail in the previous chapter. However, because I neglected to mention the opening word in Uighur letters, I would like to add a brief comment here. This opening word is *ymä*, which comes at the start of a letter before the addressee, and it is attested five times only in the early period.[33] The word *ymä* usually means "and, also, too," but in this case it is interpreted as "Now, Well." It would appear to be an opening word with a rather formal nuance.

Next, [II] greeting formulae naturally need to be discussed in detail, but because they require considerable space, I shall deal with them in the following chapters, and in this chapter I first wish to describe honorific language (for expressing both respect and self-deprecation) in relation to the letter as a whole.

As is symbolized by the fact that the Uighur script derives from the Sogdian script, written Uighur came under the strong influence of Sogdian. Therefore, the fact that there are parallel expressions in Uighur for all the Sogdian expressions cited by Y. Yoshida in "Honorific and Polite Expressions in Sogdian" might lead one to infer that the honorific and polite expressions found in Uighur are also all due to the influence of Sogdian. This may by

---

32) See, e.g., TuMW, pp. 250-251; Ishihama 1998, p. 175. On a broader scale, see also the bibliography appended to my Concluding Remarks.
33) Dong 61; U 5503 (T II 897) = BTT V, no. 31 (draft b); MOTH 20; MOTH 21; MOTH 28.

and large be true, but the situation is not quite that simple. This is because many of the extant Sogdian texts were written not by Sogdians of the Sogdian homeland to the west of the Pamirs, but by Sogdians or Sogdo-Uighurs who were active from the time of the East Uighur empire (or khanate), i.e., the Uighur Steppe empire (a.d. 744-840), through to the West Uighur kingdom (mid-9th to early 13th cent.) in the area extending from the eastern Tianshan 天山 region to Hexi 河西, Mongolia and northern China, and there are also instances in which the Uighur language had an influence on written Sogdian.[34] This applies to letters too, and as is noted by Yoshida (TuMW, p. 258), the fact that the structure and formulae of the three Sogdian letters discovered at Bezeklik are basically identical to the structure and formulae of contemporaneous Uighur letters would indicate that it is going too far to assume that Uighur letters came under the complete and unilateral influence of Sogdian letters. In actual fact, one needs to carefully investigate each case individually while taking into account the truly complex historical background (cf. TuMW, pp. 277-278).

● Alternative Expressions for the First and Second Persons

Instead of the first-person singular pronoun *män* "I" being used to indicate the sender of a letter, the word *qulut*, deriving from *qul* "slave," and also *qulutï*, with the third-person ending *-ï*, are frequently used. This is similar to the use of *boku* 僕 (lit. "slave") in Japanese as a male first-person pronoun. It would appear that the *-t* of *qulut* was originally a plural ending, but the word *qulut* no longer has any plural connotation. There are also expressions that emphasize the writer's self-deprecation, such as *kičig yavïz qulï/qulutï* "his mean and wicked slave (= I)" and *tümäninč kičig yavïz qulutï* "his ten thousandth lesser and wicked slave (= I)."[35] In the latter case, in particular, there is an identical parallel expression in Sogdian.[36]

Although it has not been widely recognized until now, there are also substitute expressions for the second person. These are *tözün ïduq ät'özi* "noble and sacred flesh-spirit (= a live body)," *tngridäm tözün ät'özi* "godlike and noble flesh-spirit," and *tngridäm tözün ïduq ät'özi* "godlike, noble and sacred flesh-spirit," and I regard them as honorific

---

34) These points are discussed in Yoshida Yutaka's annotated translation of the Sogdian version of the Kara Balgasun inscription (Yoshida 1988) and in DTSTH by Sims-Williams and Hamilton, and the main points and references have been conveniently summarized in Yoshida's review of DTSTH (Yoshida 1993).

35) Cf. Moriyasu 1991, pp. 203-204 = GUMS, pp. 246-247.

36) Cf. TuMW, pp. 49, 264; Yoshida 2006, pp. 89-90; Yoshida 2010, p. 16.

expressions for the second person. I consider them to correspond to the word *zunti* 尊體 "(your) honorable body, esteemed person" frequently found in Chinese letters from Dunhuang, but it is not clear whether the Uighur expressions are calques of the Chinese. At any rate, I translate them as "YOU (YOUr)." There follow some examples.

tngri qoštar tngridäm tözün ät'özi köngli ädgü+mü yini yinik+mü [BTT V, no. 30 = U 5281, ll. 6-7, semi-square, Type A, Manichaean] "O divine Superior (*qoštar*), is YOUr mind (< lit. his mind of the godlike and noble flesh-spirit) good, and is your (lit. his) body light (unburdened)?"

tngri avtadan vašuyas kürlädä tözün ïduq ät'özi köngüli ädgü yini yinik+mü [BTT V, no. 32 = Ch/U 6854 v, ll. 5-6, semi-square, Type A, Manichaean] "O divine Bishop (*avtadan*) Vašuyas Kürlädä, is YOUr mind (< lit. his mind of the noble and sacred flesh-spirit) good, and is your (lit. his) body light (unburdened)?"

ačari bäg qutï tngridäm tözün ïduq ät'özi köngli ädgü+mü yini yinik+mü [TuKa, pl. 84 on p. 90 = K 7713 recto, ll. 4-5, semi-square, Type A, Buddhist] "O Your (lit. His) Excellency Ačari Bäg, is YOUr mind (< lit. his mind of the godlike, noble and sacred flesh-spirit) good, and is your (lit. his) body light (unburdened)?"

Naturally these honorific expressions ought to be used only in letters to a superior deserving special respect (Type A). The above three examples are all definitely of Type A, and there is no need to doubt that the other three examples (BTT V, no. 31; TuMW, Letter E; Ot.Ry. 2822) also belong to Type A if one takes into account their other characteristics.

● Questions of Person and Number

The use of the second-person plural instead of the second-person singular to show respect is a phenomenon seen in many languages, and it is found in Uighur too (cf. Erdal, GOT, pp. 520, 530, 236-237). The deliberate use of the plural form of "you" instead of the singular form even if the addressee of the letter is a single person is an expression of respect. The same phenomenon can be seen in Sogdian too, but it seems that it cannot be positively asserted that the Sogdian expressions had a direct influence on Uighur (cf. Yoshida 2006, p. 88).

Conversely, the use of plural "we, our" instead of "I, my" when the sender of a letter is a single person is a universal expression of humility or self-deprecation. Examples include:

ötügümüz“our statement to a superior”(BTT V, no. 32; TuMW, Letter E; U 5531 + 6066), *(y)inčgä ötügümüz*“our humble statement to a superior”(U 5281; MOTH 5 = P. 3049), and *äsängümüz*“our greeting letter”(U 5928; U 5531 + 6066; MOTH 28 = P. ou. 4; Or. 12207 A-8 & A-10; U 6198 + 6199). A point to note in the case of the last example in particular (U 6198 + 6199) is that, even though it is clearly a letter to an inferior of Type C in which the simple dative suffix is used instead of *qutïnga* to refer to the addressee, the term *äsängümüz*, with a first-person plural ending, is used. But it would not appear that this usage can always be viewed as an expression of self-deprecation when the sender is a superior. For example, in a letter written by someone in a position of power, there would, I think, be instances in which, based on his awareness of himself as the representative of the group centred around himself, he would expressly use the first-person plural instead of the first-person singular. A typical example of this is *yarlïγïmïz*, which served as the model for the later Mongolian expression *ǰarliγ manu*“our edict, imperial edict,”in which the first-person plural ending could perhaps be best described as an expression of domineeringness. On the other hand, in another letter to an inferior (SI 2 Kr 17 & SI Kr IV 256 in Tuguševa 1971, Clauson 1973a) we read *bitig ötügüngüz-täki soγdu-lar tilintäki qayu uγurluγ sav söz ärti ärsär barča uqa yarlïqadïmïz*“If the verbal report of the Sogdians cited in your statement letter had been ever so timely news, we would have been able to understand everything,”and if we take into account the use of the honorific auxiliary verb *yarlïqa-* at the end, the use of the plural in this case is probably due to the fact that a clerk wrote the letter on behalf of the sender (i.e. his master).

In addition, in Uighur there are instances in which the third person is used instead of the second person out of respect for the other party.[37] Especially noticeable in letters is the appeal *osal bolmazun*[38]“Don't be negligent!”which is used to urge someone to take prompt action. Grammatically speaking, this is a third-person voluntative-imperative meaning“May he not be negligent!”but it is clear from the actual context that the writer is addressing the letter's recipient (second person). It has accordingly been translated as“Don't be negligent!”The actual meaning of *qulutï*“his slave (= I),”mentioned earlier, is presumably“your slave (= I),”and therefore this too could be regarded as an example of the use of the third person for the second person to express respect. Further, the examples of“YOU”cited above (*tözün ïduq ät'özi*, etc. in the preceding section) are immediately

[37] Cf. UBr, Text A, p. 455; Erdal, GOT, pp. 521-522, 529-530, 493.
[38] Ch/U 6245; Ch/U 7426; U 5963; P. ou. 16 Bis.

followed by *köng(ü)li ädgü(+mü) yini yinik+mü* "is his mind good, and is his body light?" and this too could be regarded as an example of the same phenomenon.

● **Honorifics and Terms of Direct Address (*qut, qutï, tngri, tngrim*)**

In Chapter 4, I mentioned the word *qutïnga* "to His/Her Majesty ... > to His/Her Highness ..., to His Lordship / Her Ladyship ..." as a keyword for identifying letters. The original meaning of *qut* is "favour of heaven," "divine fortune" or "charisma." It is a well-known fact that the Sogdian word with a similar range of meanings as Uighur *qut* is *prn*, and Sogdian also has parallel honorific expressions using *prn*, but according to Yoshida, in this instance Uighur *qutïnga* has influenced Sogdian.[39)]

Meanwhile, Uighur *tngri* has the two meanings of "heaven" and "god," and when used to describe a person or modify a title, it creates an honorific by adding the sense of "heavenly, godlike, divine." Further, the form ***tngrim*** "my god," formed by adding the first-person singular possessive suffix *-m* to the noun *tngri*, has various meanings and has frequently been a cause of confusion, but on the basis of points made by others and past research[40)] I would classify its meanings in the following manner. (1) Goddess.[41)] (2) Title of royalty (used not only for women, but also for men). (3) Constituent element of personal names of women belonging to the ruling class, including the royal family.[42)] This usage as an element of personal names restricted to women probably derives from (1), and initially it would have been used by women of the royal family, later gradually spreading more widely among women of the ruling class. Previously it had been thought that (2) too was limited to women, but it has now become clear that it is unrelated to gender.[43)] But even so there can be confusion in connection with (3), and care is needed. Further, as forms of usage unrelated to women, there is (4) "God!" as a term of direct address to a god in the original sense of *tngri*, and in letters it is frequently used as a term of address meaning (5) "My Lord!" or "Your Highness!" Usages (2) and (5) call to mind Sogdian *βγ-* (cf. Yoshida 2006, pp. 85 ff.), but it is difficult to determine whether or not it is a calque of the Sogdian. Yoshida

39) Cf. TuMW, p. 259; Yoshida 2006, pp. 87-88.

40) Cf. CBBMP, p. 130; ED, p. 524; Gabain 1973, pp. 70-71; Zieme 1977, p. 159; MOTH, p. 253; Moriyasu 2001, pp. 166-167; Erdal, GOT, p. 528; Wilkens 2007, BTT XXV, p. 415, Kasai 2008, BTT XXVI, p. 324.

41) Cf. SUK 2, WP02, l. 18; Kasai 2008, BTT XXVI, p. 324.

42) Cf. Wilkens 2007, BTT XXV, p. 415.

43) As I have pointed out in my study of the Uighur Stake Inscriptions, the use of *tngrim* as a title is by no means confined to women (Moriyasu 2001, pp. 166-167).

(2006, p. 85, n. 6) rejects Livšic's view that Sogdian *βγ-* originally had, in addition to the meaning of "god," the meaning of "master" or "lord," and I would agree with him. It should be noted that while Uighur *tngri* has the meaning of "Manichaean monk" in the sense of "saint," it does not mean "master."

An important issue when interpreting letters is whether or not it is possible to differentiate clearly between (2) and (3). In the case of (3), *tngrim* needs to be immediately preceded by another constituent element of a personal name, but even if that part is missing, should the dative suffix *-kä* be directly attached to *tngrim* in the form *tngrim-kä*, then *tngrim* may in such cases be assumed to be an element of a personal name. But as was seen in Chapter 5, even in letters to peers, let alone letters to superiors, the indicator of the addressee is not just the simple dative suffix, and the name of the addressee is often followed by *qutïnga* "to His/Her Majesty ..., to His/Her Highness ..." It is to be anticipated, therefore, that the form *tngrim qutïnga* will appear not only when *tngrim* in the addressee's name serves as (2) a royal title, but even when it represents (3) part of a personal name. This makes it impossible to distinguish the two, and so one needs to adopt a different approach.

When one turns one's attention to actual letters, one finds that there are three instances in which, instead of the frequently occurring *tngrim qutïnga, tngrim qutï* without the dative suffix is used as a compound phrase completely independent of the surrounding context (Ch/U 3917 in Zieme 1977; U 181 r? in UBr; Ot.Ry. 2692 + 2693). This expression *tngrim qutï* also appears in other Uighur texts apart from letters, and Erdal compares the second element *qutï* not only with *qangïm qutï* "my honoured father, His Majesty my father," but also with *burxan qutï* and *arxant qutï*.[44] With regard to the latter two examples, there remains the question of whether they mean "His Lordship the Buddha" and "His Lordship the Arhat" or "the state of Buddhahood" and "the state of an Arhat" (= Skt. *arhattva*). But there are also clear-cut examples such as *xung tayxiu qutï* "Her Majesty the Empress Dowager" and *xung xiu qutï* "Her Majesty the Empress" (cf. Kasai 2008, BTT XXVI, p. 133), and rather than regarding the first element of *tngrim qutï* simply as (3) the element of a personal name, it would be more consistent overall to regard it as (2) an entity deserving respect. In other words, the compound phrase *tngrim qutï* signifies "His/Her Majesty, His/Her Highness." This fact can be ascertained from the context of each of the three letters mentioned above. Ch/U 3917, in which *tngrim qutï* appears repeatedly, is lengthy and has already been

---

44) OTWF, p. 150; Erdal, GOT, p. 528. Cf. Henning, *Sogdica*, p. 62 = HSP, II, p. 63; ED, p. 594.

published by Zieme 1977, and so I shall not quote it here. Instead I wish to cite just one other example.

> *ötügümüz savamaz yoγunsïγ boltï ärsär tngrim qutï käntü yarlïqayu birzün tngrim* [U 181 r? = UBr, Text B r?, ll. 4-5, semi-square, Type A or B] "If it be that our words were impolite/impudent (?), may Your (lit. His) Highness yourself be gracious, My Lord!"

My contention is that *tngrim* in this completely independent phrase *tngrim qutï* is a sort of marker indicating high status and does not belong to the same category as the many titles used for high-ranking officials. Rather than considering *tngrim* as used in sense (2) to have been applied to members of the ruling class as a whole, as many have maintained in the past, I am currently of the view that it was applied to a comparatively narrow range of people and served as a marker for members of the royal family other than the supreme ruler (*ilig, qaγan* or *ïduq-qut*). This alone does not enable one to distinguish between men and women, but by taking into account elements of the title or name preceding *tngrim* and the context, people at the time would have been readily able to determine whether it referred to the "empress," "crown prince," "princess consort," "prince," "princess" or some other member of royalty.

In actual Uighur texts, it is the form *tngrim qutïnga* that frequently appears, and in such cases it is extremely difficult to determine whether *tngrim* is the final element of a personal name followed by the universal honorific *qutïnga*, or whether the dative suffix has been added to the compound phrase *tngrim qutï* "His/Her Majesty, His/Her Highness." Of course, in the latter case it should, properly speaking, be *tngrim qutï qutïnga*, but this would be unnatural in Uighur and it is unlikely that people would have said this. In this regard, I would like to draw attention to a passage (ll. 22-23) in the Toyoq Inscription,[45] which can be dated to the second half of the tenth century or the first half of the eleventh century: *bögülüg uluγ ïduq-qut qutïnga, tngrikän tözlüg qu[nču]y tngrim qutïnga, trkän tigin tngrim qutïnga, alp qutluγ tigin tngrim qutïnga* (Ş. Tekin 1976, pp. 229-230; Geng Shimin 1981,

[45] On the grounds that part of *ïduq-qut*'s name in the Toyoq inscription is *Bügü*, Ş. Tekin 1976 identifies him with Mouyu 牟羽 *qaγan* and dates the inscription to 767-780. He has been influenced in this by the earlier view that attributed the First Stake Inscription to Mouyu *qaγan*, but this premise was itself mistaken (cf. Moriyasu 2001, pp. 152-154). Tremblay 2007, p. 108, still accepts this exceedingly immature thesis of Tekin's, but it is no longer worth consideration.

pp. 80-81). Here *tngrim*, which appears three times, should not be regarded as the element of a personal name, and one should definitely assume that the dative suffix has been added to *tngrim qutï* in the sense of a still more polite form of the title *tngrim* as used for royalty. In this respect, the interpretation of Geng Shimin is more correct than that of Şinasi Tekin, and this passage should be translated as follows: "To His Wise and Great Imperial Majesty, to Her Imperial Majesty Princess (*qunčuy tngrim*) Tängrikän Tözlüg, to His Highness Prince (*tigin tngrim*) Tärkän, to His Highness Prince (*tigin tngrim*) Alp Qutluγ ."

The two occurrences of *tngrim qutïnga* in the letter MOTH 5 = P. 3049 (ll. 57-58, 77) may also be assumed, not only in light of their usage in this document but also in comparison with the above examples, to represent *tngrim qutï* with the dative suffix. This interpretation is also supported by the fact that in l. 58 *qutïnga* is written as two words (XWTY-NK'). Therefore, I would translate *tngrikän il tonga tigin tngrim qutï-nga* (ll. 57-58) as "To His Majesty the heavenly ruler (*tngrikän*) Prince (*tigin tngrim*) Il Tonga." Likewise, the phrase *tärkän qunčuy tngrim qutï* appearing twice in U 5320 and ending conveniently in both cases with *qutï* should be translated not as "Her Highness Tärkän Qunčuy Tängrim" but as "Her Highness Princess (*qunčuy tngrim*) Tärkän," and the phrase *čaqrïl tigin tngrim qutïnga* in Ot.Ry. 2645 may be translated as "To His Highness Prince (*tigin tngrim*) Čaqrïl." In the case of *//////////M'XW tngrim qutï* in Ot.Ry. 2720 + 2795, l. 12, although it ends in *qutï*, the word before *tngrim* is unclear, and so I would provisionally translate it as "His Highness Prince / / / / / / / / /M'XW."

In the following two cases, however, it is unfortunately impossible to determine whether they are examples of (2) or (3), and one must therefore allow for the possibility of either. *[ ] buyančï tngrim qutïnga* (U 6251, l. 01) = "To His Highness / / / / / / / Buyančï." or "To His Lordship, / / / / / / / Buyančï Tngrim."; *[ ] N'KY tngrim qutïnga* (SI Kr IV 611, l. 2) = "To His Highness / / / / / N'KY" or "To His Lordship, / / / / /N'KY Tngrim."

Although I have concentrated specifically on honorific expressions in this chapter, this treatment alone is inadequate, and I shall touch on them as required in subsequent chapters too.

略号 Abbreviations

AoF	*Altorientalische Forschungen*, Berlin.
AOH	*Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Budapest.
APAW	Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin.
ATG	A. von Gabain, *Alttürkische Grammatik, 3. Auflage*. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium 15), Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974.
BBAW	Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.*
BSOS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies.*
BHtB	Gabain 1938, "Briefe der uigurischen Hüen-tsang-Biographie."
BTT	Berliner Turfantexte, Berlin.
BTT V	Zieme 1975, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte.*
CAJ	*Central Asiatic Journal.*
CBBMP	Hamilton 1971, *Le conte bouddhique du Bon et Mauvais Prince.*
Ch.	Chinese.
Ch/U	Documents found by German expeditions to Turfan at start of 20th century and now housed in BBAW, of which the recto is written in Chinese and the verso mostly in Uighur.
Chotscho	Le Coq 1913, *Chotscho.*
CTD	R. Dankoff / J. Kelly (eds.), *Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk)*, 3 vols., Cambridge: Harvard University Printing Office, 1982-1985.
DTS	V. M. Nadeljaev et al. (eds.), *Drevnetjurkskij Slovar'*, Leningrad: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Izdatel'stvo NAUKA, 1969.
DTSTH	Sims-Williams / Hamilton 1990, *Documents turco-sogdiens du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle de Touen-houang.*
ED	G. Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
ed., eds.	editor(s), edited, edition.
Erdal, GOT	M. Erdal, *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8, Vol. 3), Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004.
Ergebnisse	*Sprachwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der deutschen Turfan-Forschung,* I-III, 3 vols., Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1972-1985.
fr.	fragment(s).
Gharib	B. Gharib, *Sogdian Dictionary*. Tehran: Farhangan Publications, 1995.

GOT	T. Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. (Uralic and Altaic Series 69), Bloomington / The Hague, 1968. (See Erdal, GOT)
GSR	B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, Stockholm 1957. (Repr.: 1961.)
GUMS	Moriyasu 2004c, *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße.*
hend.	hendiadys.
HJAS	*Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.*
HSP	*W. B. Henning -- Selected Papers*. 2 vols, (Acta Iranica 14 & 15), Leiden: Brill & Téhéran / Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1977.
incl.	including.
IUCD	Clark 1975, *Introduction to the Uyghur Civil Documents of East Turkestan.*
JA	*Journal Asiatique.*
Jp.	Japanese.
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
JSFOu	*Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne.*
K	Call number of archaeological relics (Kaogu) held by China State Museum in Beijing. 北京の中国国家博物館所蔵の考古 (Kaogu) 遺物番号.
lit.	literally.
MoBS	彭 金章／王 建軍／敦煌研究院（編）『敦煌莫高窟北区石窟』全 3 巻, 北京, 文物出版社, 2000-2004. Peng Jinzhang / Wang Jianjun / Dunhuang Academy (eds.), *Dunhuang Mogaoku beiqu shiku [Northern grottoes of Mogaoku, Dunhuang]*, 3 vols., Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 2000-2004.
MOTH	Hamilton 1986, *Manuscrits ouïgours du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle de Touen-houang.*
MP.	Middle Persian.
MRDTB	*Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko.*
New En. Is.	*The Encyclopedia of Islam, New Edition.*
no., nos.	number(s).
NS.	New Series, Neue Serie.
OECD	Hamilton 1955, *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties.*
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.*
Or.	Oriental documents or manuscripts housed in British Library, London.
Ot.Ry.	Central Asian manuscript remains brought back by Ōtani Expedition and housed in Ōmiya Library of the Ryūkoku University, Kyoto, under the name "Seiiki bunka shiryō" 西域文化資料.
OTWF	M. Erdal, *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon.* (Turcologica 7), 2 vols., Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991.

P.	Pelliot chinois. Chinese documents found by Paul Pelliot in Library Cave, Dunhuang, and housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
P. 181 ou.	Uighur documents from Mongol period found by Paul Pelliot in Cave 181 (Pelliot's numbering), Dunhuang, and housed in Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
pl., pls.	plate(s).
P. ou.	Pelliot ouïgour. Uighur documents found by Paul Pelliot in Library Cave, Dunhuang, and housed in Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
pp., p.	page(s).
Pth.	Parthian.
r	recto.
Repr.	Reprint.
S.	Chinese documents found by Aurel Stein in Library Cave, Dunhuang, and housed in British Library, London.
SI	Documents found by Russian expeditions to SerIndia (Chinese Turkestan) in 20th century and now housed in St. Petersburg Section of Institute of Oriental Studies of Russia.
SIAL	『内陸アジア言語の研究』 *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]*. Volumes 1-7 published by Kobe City University of Foreign Studies; Volumes 8-25 published by Chūō Yūrasia-gaku kenkyūkai 中央ユーラシア学研究会 [Society of Central Eurasian Studies], Section of Oriental History, Graduate School of Letters, Osaka University.
Skt.	Sanskrit.
Sogd.	Sogdian.
Sogdica	Henning 1940, *Sogdica.*
Soothill	W. E. Soothill / L. Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms with Sanskrit and English Equivalents*, London 1937.
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin.
SUK	山田信夫（著）, 小田壽典／P. ツィーメ／梅村 坦／森安孝夫（編）『ウイグル文契約文書集成』全 3 巻, 吹田（大阪）, 大阪大学出版会, 1993. N. Yamada (author); J. Oda / P. Zieme / H. Umemura / T. Moriyasu (eds.), *Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte (Uiguru-bun keiyaku monjo shūsei)*, 3 vols., Suita (Osaka): Osaka University Press, 1993.
Taishō	*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō (= Taishō Tripiṭaka)* 大正新脩大藏經.
TMEN	G. Doerfer (ed.), *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, 4 vols., Wiesbaden 1963-1975.
Tokh.	Tokharian.

TP	*T'oung Pao.*
tr.	translated, translation.
TTT	Türkische Turfan-Texte, I-X. (Repr. of I-VII in *Ergebnisse* II.)
TuKa	黄文弼『吐魯番考古記』（中国科学院考古研究所，考古学特刊，第三號），北京，中国科学院，1954. Huang Wenbi, *Tulufan kaogu ji*, (Zhongguo kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo, Kaoguxue tekan, di 3 hao), Beijing: Zhongguo kexueyuan, 1954.
TuMW	新疆吐魯番地区文物局（編）『吐魯番新出摩尼教文献研究』北京，文物出版社，2000, (incl. 吉田／森安 2000a & 吉田 2000c). Xinjiang Tulufan diqu wenwuju (ed.), *Tulufan xinchu Monijiao wenxian yanjiu [Studies in the New Manichaean Texts Recovered from Turfan]*. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 2000, (incl. Yoshida / Moriyasu 2000a & Yoshida 2000c).
U	Uighur documents found by German expeditions to Turfan at start of 20th century and now housed in BBAW.
UAJ	*Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher.*
UBL	Elverskog 1997, *Uygur Buddhist Literature.*
UBr	Tezcan / Zieme 1971, "Uigurische Brieffragmente."
Uig.	Uighur.
USp	Radloff 1928, *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler.*
UW	K. Röhrborn, *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien.* Parts 1-6, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1977-1998 (to be continued).
v	verso.
vol., vols.	volume(s).
VOHD	Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland.
VSUA	Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica.

文献目録 Bibliography

Clark, Larry V.

1975 *Introduction to the Uyghur Civil Documents of East Turkestan (13th-14th CC.).* Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University. (Ann Arbor: Xerox University Microfilms.)

Clauson, Gerard

1973a "Two Uygur Administrative Orders." *UAJ* 45, pp. 213-222.

1973b "Turkish Philology in Hungary. = Review on: L. Ligeti (ed.), *Studia Turcica*." *AM*, NS. 18, pp. 209-219.

Dankoff, Robert

1983 *Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib, Wisdom of Royal Glory (Kutadgu Bilig). A Turko-Islamic Mirror for Princes*. Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press.

Erdal, Marcel

1988 "Uigurica from Dunhuang." *BSOAS* 51, pp. 251-257.

Gabain, Annemarie von

1938 "Briefe der uigurischen Hüen-tsang-Biographie." *SPAW* 1938, pp. 371-415, incl. 1 pl. (Repr.: *Ergebnisse* I, pp. 345-389.)

1964 "Die alttürkische Literatur." In: L. Bazin et al. (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, II, Wiesbaden, pp. 211-243.

1973 *Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qočo (850-1250)*. 2 vols., Wiesbaden.

Geng, Shimin 耿　世民

1981 「回鶻文『土都木薩理修寺碑』考釈」『世界宗教研究』1981-1, pp. 77-83. "Huihu-wen *Tudumusali xiusi bei* kaoshi [A Study of the Uighur Epitaph on the Reestablishment of a Temple by *Tudumusali*]." *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 1981-1, pp. 77-83.

Hamilton, James (R.)

1955 *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties d'après les documents chinois*. [Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises 10], Paris. (Repr.: Paris 1988.)

1979 "Review on: P. Zieme, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*, Berlin 1975." *JA* 267, pp. 459-460.

1986 *Manuscrits ouïgours du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle de Touen-houang*. 2 vols., Paris: Peeters.

1992 "Étude nouvelle de la lettre *Pelliot ouigour 16 Bis* d'un bouddhiste d'époque mongole." In: A. Cadonna (ed.), *Turfan and Tun-huang. The Texts. Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route,* (Orientalia Venetiana 4), Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, pp. 97-121, +5 pls.

2004 "Remarks concerning Turfan Stake Inscription III." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst et al. (eds.), *Turfan Revisited - the First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road,* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, pp. 121-124.

Henning, W. B.

1940 *Sogdica.* (James G. Forlong Fund 21), London, 67 p. (Repr. in HSP, II, pp. 1-68.)

Ishihama, Yumiko 石濱　裕美子

1998 「チベット文書簡の構造から見た17世紀のチベット，モンゴル，清関係の一断面」『アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究』55, pp. 165-189. "Chibetto-bun shokan no kōzō kara mita 17 seiki no Chibetto, Mongoru, Sin kankei no ichi danmen [One Aspect of Relations between Tibet, Mongolia, and the Qing in the Seventeenth Century as Seen from the Structure of Tibetan Letters]." *Ajia Afuri-*

ka gengo bunka kenkyū [Journal of Asian and African Studies] 55, pp. 165-189.

Israpil, Yüsüp [Yisilafei'er, Yusufu] 伊斯拉菲爾　玉蘇甫

1999　「吐魯番新発現的回鶻語文書」『敦煌吐魯番研究』4, pp. 287-298, +3 pls. in colour.“Tulufan xin faxian Huihu-yu wenshu [Uighur Documents Newly Discovered in Turfan].”*Dunhuang Tulufan yanjiu* 4, pp. 287-298, +3 pls. in colour.

Kasai, Yukiyo 笠井　幸代

2008　*Die uigurischen buddhistischen Kolophone.* (BTT XXVI), Turnhout: Brepols.

Kudara, K. 百濟　康義 / P. Zieme

1983　“Uigurische *Āgama*-Fragmente (1).”*AoF* 10-2, pp. 269-318, incl. 10 pls.

Matsui, Dai 松井　太

2005　「ウイグル文シヴシドゥ・ヤクシドゥ関係文書補遺」『人文社会論叢』（弘前大学人文学部）人文科学篇13, pp. 139-155.“Uiguru-bun Sivšidu・Yaqšidu kankei monjo hoi [Supplement to the Uigur Documents Related to Monks Sivšidu and Yaqšidu].”*Jinbun shakai ronsō (Jinbun kagaku-hen) [Studies in the Humanities (Volume of Cultural Sciences)]* 13, Faculty of Humanities Hirosaki University, pp. 139-155.

2006　“Six Uigur Contracts from the West Uigur Peiord (10th-12th Centuries).”『人文社会論叢』（弘前大学人文学部）人文科学篇 *Jinbun shakai ronsō (Jinbun kagaku-hen) [Studies in the Humanities (Volume of Cultural Sciences)]* 15, Faculty of Humanities Hirosaki University, pp. 37-62.

2008　cf. Umemura / Matsui 2008. 梅村／松井 2008.

Matsukawa, Takashi 松川　節

1995　「大元ウルス命令文の書式」『待兼山論叢（史学篇）』29, pp. 25-52.“Daigen Urusu meireibun no shoshiki [On the *Daiyuan-Ulus Style* in the Mongolian Edicts of the 13th and 14th Centuries].”*Machikaneyama ronsō (Section of History)* 29, pp. 25-52.

Moriyasu, Takao 森安　孝夫

1982　“An Uigur Buddhist's Letter of the Yüan Dynasty from Tun-huang --- Supplement to“Uigurica from Tun-huang”---.”*MRDTB* 40, pp. 1-18. (English version of Moriyasu 1983.)

1983　「元代ウィグル仏教徒の一書簡 ——敦煌出土ウィグル語文献補遺——」, 護雅夫（編）『内陸アジア・西アジアの社会と文化』東京, 山川出版社, pp. 209-231.“Gendai Uiguru Bukkyōto no ichi shokan ---Tonkō shutsudo Uiguru-go bunken hoi--- [An Uigur Buddhist's Letter of the Yüan Dynasty from Tun-huang. ---Supplement to my previous work“Uigurica from Tun-huang”---].”In: M. Mori (ed.), *Nairiku Ajia / Nishi Ajia no shakai to bunka [Society and Culture of Inner Asia and the Muslim World],* Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha, pp. 209-231.

1985a　「ウイグル語文献」, 山口瑞鳳（編）『講座敦煌 6 敦煌胡語文献』東京, 大東出版社, pp.

1-98, incl. 4 pls.“Uiguru-go bunken [Uigurica from Tun-huang].”In: Z. Yamaguchi (ed.), *Kōza Tonkō* 6 *Tonkō Ko-go bunken [Lecture Series on Tun-huang,* Vol. 6, *Literature in Central Asian Languages from Tun-huang],* Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, pp. 1-98, incl. 4 pls.

1985b 「チベット文字で書かれたウィグル文仏教教理問答（P. t. 1292）の研究」『大阪大学文学部紀要』25, pp. 1-85, +1 pl.“Chibetto moji de kakareta Uiguru-bun Bukkyō kyōri mondō (P. t. 1292) no kenkyū [Études sur un catéchisme bouddhique ouigour en écriture tibétaine (P. t. 1292)].”*Ōsaka daigaku bungakubu kiyō [Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Osaka University]* 25, pp. 1-85, +1 pl.

1987 「敦煌と西ウイグル王国 ――トゥルファンからの書簡と贈り物を中心に――」『東方学』74, pp. 58-74.“Tonkō to Nishi-Uiguru ōkoku ---Turufan kara no shokan to okurimono wo chūshin ni--- [Tun-huang and the West Uighur Kingdom: The Historical Background of the Letter, P 3672 Bis, Sent from Turfan].”*Tōhōgaku* 74, pp. 58-74, (English summary) pp. 5-6.

1989 「トルコ仏教の源流と古トルコ語仏典の出現」『史学雑誌』98-4, pp. 1-35.“Toruko Bukkyō no genryū to ko-Toruko-go butten no shutsugen [L’origine du Bouddhisme chez les Turcs et l’apparition des textes bouddhiques en turc ancien].”*Shigaku zasshi* 98-4, pp. 1-35, (French summary) pp. 152-150.

1990a “L’origine du Bouddhisme chez les Turcs et l’apparition des textes bouddhiques en turc ancien.”In: A. Haneda (ed.), *Documents et archives provenant de l’Asie centrale. Actes du colloque franco-japonais, Kyoto, 4-8 octobre 1988*, Kyoto: Dōhōsha, pp. 147-165.

1990b 「ウイグル文書箚記（その二）」『内陸アジア言語の研究』5 (1989), pp. 69-89.“Uiguru monjo sakki (sono 2) [Notes on Uigur Documents (2)].”*SIAL* 5 (1989), pp. 69-89.

1991 『ウイグル=マニ教史の研究』『大阪大学文学部紀要』第31･32巻合併号, 248 頁, 図版･スケッチ多数. *Uiguru Manikyō-shi no kenkyū [A Study on the History of Uighur Manichaeism. ---Research on Some Manichaean Materials and Their Historical Background---]. Ōsaka daigaku bungakubu kiyō [Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Osaka University]* 31/32, 248 pp. +34 pls., 23 figs., 2 maps.

1994 「ウイグル文書箚記(その四)」『内陸アジア言語の研究』9, pp. 63-93.“Uiguru monjo sakki (sono 4) [Notes on Uigur Documents (4)].”*SIAL* 9, pp. 63-93.

1996 “Notes on Uighur Documents.”*MRDTB* 53 (1995), pp. 67-108.

1997 「《シルクロード》のウイグル商人 ――ソグド商人とオルトク商人のあいだ――」, 杉山正明(編)『岩波講座世界歴史 11　中央ユーラシアの統合(九～一六世紀)』東京, 岩波書店, pp. 93-119.“Shirukurōdo no Uiguru shōnin --- Sogudo shōnin to Orutoku shōnin no aida [Uighur Merchants on the Silk Road: From Sogdian Merchants to *Ortoq* Merchants].”In: M. Sugiyama (ed.), *Chūō Yūrashia no tōgō (9-16 seiki) [The Integration of Central Eurasia (9th-16th cent.)],* Iwanami kōza sekai rekishi (shinpan) 11, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, pp. 93-119.

2000a　cf. Yoshida / Moriyasu 吉田／森安 2000a in TuMW.

2000b　cf. Yoshida / Moriyasu 吉田／森安 2000b in『内陸アジア言語の研究』*SIAL* 15.

2001　“Uighur Buddhist Stake Inscriptions from Turfan.” In: L. Bazin / P. Zieme (eds.), *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton,* (Silk Road Studies 5), Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols, pp. 149-223.

2003a　“Uighur Inscriptions on the Banners from Turfan Housed in the Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin.” In: Ch. Bhattacharya-Haesner (ed.), *Central Asian Temple Banners in the Turfan Collection of the Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin,* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, pp. 461-474.

2003b　「コレージュ＝ド＝フランス講演録　ウイグル=マニ教史特別講義」, 森安孝夫（編）『シルクロードと世界史』（大阪大学21世紀COEプログラム「インターフェイスの人文学」報告書, 第 3 巻）, 豊中（大阪）, 大阪大学大学院文学研究科, pp. 23-111, +15 pls. in colour, 8 maps, 3 figs. “Four Lectures at the Collège de France in May 2003. History of Manichaeism among the Uighurs from the 8th to the 11th Centuries in Central Asia.” In: T. Moriyasu (ed.), *Shirukurōdo to sekaishi [World History Reconsidered through the Silk Road],* (Osaka University The 21st Century COE Program Interface Humanities Research Activities 2002*2003, Vol. 3), Toyonaka (Osaka): Osaka University, Graduate School of Letters, pp. 23-111, +15 pls. in colour, 8 maps, 3 figs.

2004a　「シルクロード東部における通貨――絹・西方銀銭・官布から銀錠へ――」, 森安孝夫（編）『中央アジア出土文物論叢』京都, 朋友書店, pp. 1-40. “Shirukurōdo tōbu ni okeru tsūka ---kinu, seihō ginsen, kanpu kara ginjō e---- [Currencies on the Eastern Part of the Silk Road].” In: T. Moriyasu (ed.), *Chūō Ajia shutsudo bunbutsu ronsō [Papers on the Pre-Islamic Documents and Other Materials Unearthed from Central Asia],* Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, pp. 1-40.

2004b　“From Silk, Cotton and Copper Coin to Silver. Transition of the Currency Used by the Uighurs during the Period from the 8th to the 14th Centuries.” In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst et al. (eds.), *Turfan Revisited - the First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road,* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, pp. 228-239, incl. 2 pls.

2004c　*Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße. --- Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund* ---. Übersetzt von Christian Steineck, (Studies in Oriental Religions 50), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, xix + 292 p.

2007a　『シルクロードと唐帝国』（興亡の世界史 5）, 東京, 講談社. *Shirukurōdo to Tō teikoku [Silk Road and the Tang Empire]*. (What is Human History? Vol. 5), Tokyo: Kōdansha.

2007b　「西ウイグル仏教のクロノロジー ――ベゼクリクのグリュンヴェーデル編号第 8 窟（新編号第18窟）の壁画年代再考――」『仏教学研究』62 / 63, pp. 1-45. “Nishi-Uiguru Bukkyō no kuronorojī ---Bezekuriku no Grünwedel hengō dai-8-kutsu no hekiga nendai saikō--- [Chronology

of West Uighur Buddhism: Re-examination of the Dating of the Wall-paintings in Grünwedel's Cave No. 8 (New: No. 18), Bezeklik]. *Bukkyō-gaku kenkyū* 62 / 63, pp. 1-45.

2008a "Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from Central Asia." *Acta Asiatica* 94, pp. 127-153.

2008b "Chronology of West Uighur Buddhism: Re-examination of the Dating of the Wall-paintings in Grünwedel's Cave No. 8 (New: No. 18), Bezeklik." In: P. Zieme (ed.), *Aspects of Research into Central Asian Buddhism. In Memoriam Kōgi Kudara,* (Silk Road Studies 16), Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols, pp. 191-227.

Moriyasu, T. / P. Zieme

1999 "From Chinese to Uighur Documents." *SIAL* 14, pp. 73-102, +7 pls.

Oda, Juten 小田　壽典

1992 「ウイグル文ピントゥング嘆願書の訳注」『豊橋短期大学研究紀要』9, pp. 153-159. "Uiguru-bun Pintung tangansho no yakuchū [An Annotated Translation of Pintung's Petition in Uighur]." *Toyohashi tanki daigaku kenkū kiyō* 9, pp. 153-159.

Radloff, W.

1928 *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler. Materialien nach dem Tode des Verfassers mit Ergänzungen von S. Malov herausgegeben,* Leningrad. (Repr.: Osnabrück 1972.)

Raschmann, Simone-Christiane

1991 "Die alttürkischen Turfantexte als Quelle zur Erforschung der sozialökonomischen Geschichte Zentralasiens." In: H. Klengel / W. Sundermann (eds.), *Ägypten Vorderasien Turfan. Probleme der Edition und Bearbeitung altorientalischer Handschriften,* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 141-149, +2 pls.

2007 *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 13: Dokumente, Teil 1*. (VOHD, XIII-21), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

2008 "Baumwoll-Nachlese. Vier alttürkische *böz*-Dokumente aus dem Arat-Nachlaß (Istanbul)." *SIAL* 23, pp. 121-150, +4 pls.

2009a *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 14: Dokumente, Teil 2*. (VOHD, XIII-22), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

2009b "Traces of Christian Communities in the Old Turkish Documents." In: 張定京／阿不都熱西提・亜庫甫（編）『突厥語文研究——耿世民教授80華誕紀念文集——』Zhang Dingjing / Abdurishid Yakup (eds.), *Studies in Turkic Philology. Festshrift in Honour of the 80th Birthday of Professor Geng Shimin,* 北京, 中央民族大学出版社, Beijing: Minzu University Press, pp. 408-425, incl. 1 pl.

Röhrborn, Klaus

1991　*Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie, VII.* (VSUA 34-3), Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Semet, Ablet

2005　*Xuangzangs Leben und Werk, Teil 8: Lexikalische Untersuchungen zur uigurischen Xuangzang-Biographie.* (VSUA 34-8), Wiesbaden.

Sertkaya, A. G.

1999　"*Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler*'den beş mektup." *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* 1996, pp. 237-264, incl. 6 pls.

Sims-Williams, Nicholas

1991　"A Sogdian Greeting." In: R. E. Emmerick / D. Weber (eds.), *Corolla Iranica. Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. D. N. MacKenzie on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday on April 8th, 1991,* Frankfurt am Main / Bern / New York / Paris: Peter Lang, pp. 176-187.

1996a　"From Babylon to China. Astrological and Epistolary Formulae across Two Millenia." In: *La Persia e l'Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X Secolo*, (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 127), Roma: Accademia Nationale dei Lincei, pp. 77-84.

1996b　"The Sogdian Merchants in China and India." In: A. Cadonna / L. Lanciotti (eds.), *Cina e Iran da Alessandro Magno alla Dinastia Tang*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, pp. 45-67.

2006　"Bactrian Letters from the Sasanian and Hephthalite Periods." In: A. Panaino / A. Piras (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa held in Ravenna, 6-11 October 2003, Vol. 1: Ancient & Middle Iranian Studies,* Milano: Mimesis, pp. 701-713.

2007　*Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist Texts,* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II, Vol. III = Studies in the Khalili collection, Vol. III), London.

Sims-Williams, N. / J. Hamilton

1990　*Documents turco-sogdiens du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle de Touen-houang.* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, Vol. III: Sogdian), London: SOAS.

Sinor, Denis

1980　"Samoyed and Ugric Elements in Old Turkic." *Harvard Ukranian Studies* 3-4 (1979-1980), pp. 768-773.

Sugiyama, Masaaki 杉山　正明

1990　「元代蒙漢合璧命令文の研究（一）」『内陸アジア言語の研究』5 (1989), pp. 1-31, +2 pls.
"Gendai Moukan gappeki meireibun no kenkyū (1) [A Study on the Inscriptions of the Sino-Mongolian Edicts in 'Phags-pa Script]." *SIAL* 5 (1989), pp. 1-31, +2 pls.

2004 『モンゴル帝国と大元ウルス』(東洋史研究叢刊65), 京都, 京都大学学術出版会. *Mongoru teikoku to Daigen urusu [The Mongol Empire and Dai-ön Ulus],* (Oriental Research Series 65), Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.

Sundermann, Werner

1996 "Three Fragments of Sogdian Letters and Documents." In: *La Persia e l'Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X Secolo,* (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 127), Roma: Accademia Nationale dei Lincei, pp. 99-111.

Takeuchi, Tsuguhito 武内　紹人

1986 「敦煌・トルキスタン出土チベット語手紙文書の研究序説」, 山口瑞鳳（編）『チベットの仏教と社会』東京, 春秋社, pp. 563-602, incl. 2 pls. "Tonkō Torukisutan shutudo Chibetto-go tegami monjo no kenkyū josetsu [An Introduction to the Study of Tibetan Letters Discovered in Dunhuang and Chinese Turkestan]." In: Z. Yamaguchi (ed.), *Chibetto no bukkyō to shakai [Buddhism and Society in Tibet],* Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 563-602, incl. 2 pls.

1990 "A Group of Old Tibetan Letters Written under Kuei-i-chün: A Preliminary Study for the Classification of Old Tibetan Letters." *AOH* 44-1 / 2, pp. 175-190.

Tekin, Şinasi

1976 "Die uigurische Weihinschrift eines buddhistischen Klosters aus den Jahren 767-780 in Tuyoq." *UAJ* 48, pp. 225-230, +1 pl.

Tezcan, S. / P. Zieme

1971 "Uigurische Brieffragmente." In: L. Ligeti (ed.), *Studia Turcica*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 451-460, +6 pls.

Tremblay, Xavier

2007 "The Spread of Buddhism in Serindia: Buddhism among Iranians, Tocharians and Turks before the 13th Century." In: A. Heirman / S. P. Bumbacher (eds.), The Spread of Buddhism, (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section VIII, Central Asia, Vol. 16), Leiden / Boston: Brill, pp. 75-129.

Tuguševa, L. Ju.

1971 "Three Letters of Uighur Princes from the MS Collection of the Leningrad Section of the Institute of Oriental Studies." *AOH* 24-2, pp. 173-187, incl. 5 pls.

1996 "Neskol'ko ujgurskix dokumentov iz rukopisnogo sobranija Sankt-Peterburgskogo filiala IV RAN." *Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie* 8, pp. 215-238, incl. 11 pls.

Umemura, Hiroshi / Matsui Dai 梅村　坦／松井　太

2008 「ウイグル文字テュルク語文書」, 吉田順一／チメドドルジ編『ハラホト出土モンゴル文書の研究』東京, 雄山閣, pp. 183-199（松井担当分はpp. 190-197, Nos. 094-102）. "Uiguru

moji Tyuruku-go monjo [Turkic Documents in the Uigur Script].”(written with H. Umemura), In: J. Yoshida / Čimeddorǰi (eds.), *Harahoto shutsudo Mongoru monjo no kenkyū [Study on the Mongolian Documents Found at Qaraqota],* Tokyo: Yūzankaku, pp. 183-199 (Matsui responsible for pp. 190-197, Nos. 094-102).

Wilkens, Jens

2000 *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 8: Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung.* (VOHD, XIII-16), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

2007 *Das Buch von der Sündentilgung. Edition des alttürkisch-buddhistischen Kšanti Kılguluk Nom Bitig.* 2 vols., (BTT XXV), Turnhout: Brepols.

Yakup, Abdurishid

2004 “On a Newly Unearthed Uyghur Letter from Dunhuang.”In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst et al. (eds.), *Turfan Revisited - the First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road,* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, pp. 398-400.

Yoshida Jun'ichi / Čimeddorǰi (eds.) 吉田　順一／チメドドルジ（編）

2008 『ハラホト出土モンゴル文書の研究』東京, 雄山閣. *Harahoto shutsudo Mongoru monjo no kenkyū [Study on the Mongolian Documents Found at Qaraqota],* Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

Yoshida, Yutaka 吉田　豊

1988 「カラバルガスン碑文のソグド語版について」『西南アジア研究』28, pp. 24-52. “Karabarugasun hibun no Sogudo-go ban ni tsuite [On the Sogdian version of the Kara Balgasun Inscription].”*Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 28, pp. 24-52.

1993 Review on DTSTH, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 36, pp. 362-371.

2000a cf. Yoshida / Moriyasu 吉田／森安 2000a in TuMW.

2000b cf. Yoshida / Moriyasu 吉田／森安 2000b in『内陸アジア言語の研究』*SIAL* 15.

2000c 「柏孜克里克摩尼教粟特文書信的格式」“Baizikelike Monijiao sutewen shuxin de geshi.”In: TuMW, pp. 250-279.

2002 “Manichaean Sogdian Letters Discovered in Bäzäklik.”*Annuaire de la Section des Sciences Religieuses de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes,* Tome 109 (2000-2001), pp. 233-236.

2006 「ソグド語の敬語について」, 白井聡子／庄垣内正弘（共編）『中央アジア古文献の言語学的・文献学的研究』京都, 京都大学文学部言語学研究室“Sogudo-go no keigo ni tsuite [Honorific and Polite Expressions in Sogdian].”In: S. Shirai / M. Shōgaito (eds.), *Chūō Ajia ko-bunken no gengogaku-teki bunkengaku-teki kenkyū [Philological Studies on Old Central Asian Manuscripts],* Kyoto: Kyoto University, Department of Linguistics, pp. 81-94.

2010 「新出のソグド語資料について――新米書記の父への手紙から：西厳寺橘資料の紹介を兼

ねて――」『京都大学文学部研究紀要』49, pp. 1-24, incl. 3 pls.“Shinshutsu no Sogudo-go siryō ni tsuite ---Shinmai shoki no chichi e no tegami kara: Saigonji Tachibana shiryō no shōkai wo kanete--- [On Some Recently Discovered Sogdian Materials ---Edition of a Letter Draft Written by an Inexperienced Scribe: a Sample from the so far Unnoticed Saigonji Tachibana Texts---].”*Kyōto daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō [Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters Kyoto University]* 49, pp. 1-24.

Yoshida, Y. / T. Moriyasu 吉田　豊／森安　孝夫

1989 「麴氏高昌国時代ソグド文女奴隷売買文書」『内陸アジア言語の研究』4 (1988), pp. 1-50, +1 pl.“Kikushi Kōshōkoku jidai Sogudo-bun onna dorei baibai monjo [A Sogdian Sales Contract of a Female Slave from the Period of the Gaochang Kingdom under the Rule of Qu Clan].”*SIAL* 4 (1988), pp. 1-50, +1 pl.

2000a 吉田「粟特文考釈」Yoshida,“Sute-wen kaoshi”(pp. 3-199) & 森安「回鶻文考釈」Moriyasu,“Huihu-wen kaoshi”(pp. 200-212) in TuMW.

2000b 「ベゼクリク出土ソグド語・ウイグル語マニ教徒手紙文」『内陸アジア言語の研究』15, pp. 135-178.“Bezekuriku shutsudo Sogudo-go Uiguru-go Mani-kyōto tegamibun [Manichaean Sogdian and Uighur Letters Recently Unearthed in Bezeklik, Turfan].”*SIAL* 15, pp. 135-178.

Zaehner, R. C.

1939 “Nāmak-nipēsišnīh.”*BSOS* 9 (1937-1939), pp. 93-109.

Zieme, Peter

1970 “Review on: *Drevnetjurkskij Slovar'*, Leningrad 1969.”*CAJ* 14, pp. 228-236.

1972 “Zu einigen Problemen des Manichäismus bei den Türken.”In: *Traditions religieuses et para-religieuses des peuples altaïques. Communications présentées au XIII^e Congrès de la «Permanent International Altaistic Conference», Strasbourg, 25-30 juin 1970,* Paris: Presses universitaires de France, pp. 173-179.

1975 *Manichäisch-türkische Texte.* (BTT V), Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

1976a “Zum Handel im uigurischen Reich von Qočo.”*AoF* 4, pp. 235-249.

1976b “Sïngqu Säli Tutung -- Übersetzer buddhistischer Schriften ins Uigurische.”In: W. Heissig et al. (eds.), *Tractata Altaica,* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, pp. 767-775, incl. 2 pls.

1977 “Drei neue uigurische Sklavendokumente.”*AoF* 5, pp. 145-170, +4 pls.

1995 “An Uigur Monasterial Letter from Toyoq.”*SIAL* 10, pp. 1-7, +1 pl.

Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road (Part 1).

Takao MORIYASU

Summary

The Old Uighur letters are letters that were written in Old Uighur by people of the West Uighur kingdom, which flourished from the second half of the ninth century to the start of the thirteenth century in and around the eastern Tianshan region including the Turfan Depression, and by Uighurs of the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries when this region had come under the rule of the Mongol empire. Although the use of paper had at the time not yet spread to Europe, these letters are all written on paper. The ink is similar to that which was used in China, but the letters were written with reed or wooden pens rather than with writing brushes. The majority of these letters were discovered in China, either in the Turfan Depression in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region or in the famous Mogao Caves of the Thousand Buddhas at Dunhuang, and only one was unearthed at the remains of Kara-khoto in the Gansu Corridor. Dunhuang and Kara-khoto are usually not included in Central Asia, and therefore I have deliberately chosen to refer to them as letters from the Eastern Silk Road rather than from Central Asia, as has been the norm in the past. I have collected over two hundred letters, even though including small fragments.

The *Corpus of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road,* which I hope to bring to completion as part of my life's work, is expected to be included in the Berliner Turfantexte series. The present study, entitled "Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road," corresponds to the research volume of this forthcoming publication and has the following overall structure.

Contents:

Preface

1. The Position of Letters in Old Uighur Literature
2. The Periodization of Old Uighur Letters and Religious Distinctions
3. Research History
4. Special Terms and Formulae as Criteria for Identifying Letters
5. The Classification of Epistolary Formulae according to Naming Formulae
6. The Basic Structure of Old Uighur Letters and Honorific Expressions
7. Basic Conventional Greetings

8. Expressions about the Health of Both Parties
    (1) Addressee's Health
    (2) Sender's Sense of Relief
    (3) Sender's Health
9. Greeting Phrases Used Especially by Manichaeans
10. Greeting Phrases Used Especially by Buddhists
11. Idiomatic Phrases and Popular Terms in the Body of the Letter (including Introductory Formulae and Closing Formulae)
    (1) Introductory Formulae
    (2) Terms and Idiomatic Phrases Frequently Used in the Body of the Letter
    (3) Postscript Formulae (Change of Addressee, Change of Subject, Postscript)
    (4) Closing Formulae
    (5) Delivery Notes
12. The Caravan Trade and Communications
    (1) The Importance of Caravans
    (2) Caravan Traffic and Letters
    (3) Gifts Accompanying Letters and Acknowledgement of Their Receipt

Concluding Remarks

The first instalment, entitled "Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from Central Asia" (*Acta Asiatica* 94, pp. 127-153), was an English version of the first five chapters. The present study is a revised and enlarged Japanese version, with the addition of chapter 6. This corresponds to approximately one-third of the entire work. The remaining chapters of my study, from chapter 7 onwards, have in fact also been more or less completed. But owing to limitations of space, and also because I felt it imperative to bring out a revised version of the first instalment as soon as possible, I have decided to publish here for the time being only the first six chapters.

Apart from some minor additions and corrections, chapters 1-4 are essentially no different from the earlier English version, but chapter 5, dealing with the classification of epistolary formulae, has been substantially rewritten.

In my previous version of this study, I presented not only five major groupings (Types A~E), but also several subcategories. But this was criticized for being overly detailed and difficult to understand, and so, following further investigations, I here present a fresh classification. The classification into five types is the same as before, but it should be noted that in content only Types A and C are

unchanged, and the other three types have been substantially altered. However, Types A and C remain the most important for classificatory purposes and provide the basic framework of my classification. This is because these two types possess a characteristic that is obvious to anyone. That is to say, the opening line (which may extend over two or more lines) begins from the same position as the start of the following salutation and main text of the letter, but the start of the next line (which may also extend over two or three lines) is indented with a rather large indention. In the following, I shall describe such patently obvious characteristics as "visual" characteristics.

Type A: Specific form of letter to superior with visual characteristic (used for a superior deserving special respect)

high-ranking addressee + *qutïnga* <line break>
<indention> sender + *ötüg* form or *(y)inčgä ötügümüz*

Type B: Specific simplified form of letter to superior

addressee + *qutïnga* <line break>
sender + *ötüg* form

This is a simplified form of Type A without any indention following the line break.
Any letter of the *ötüg* form is classified as either Type A or Type B.

Type C: Specific form of letter to inferior with visual characteristic (used when the superior-inferior relationship is well-defined

high-ranking sender + *yarlïγ* form, standard *äsängü* form, or *söz* form <line break>
<indention> addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä*

Type D: Non-specific form I (with a term indicative of a letter and used for superiors, peers, and inferiors)

Type D1

sender + standard *äsängü* form, simple *bitig* form, or *sav/söz* form <usually no line break, directly followed by> addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä*

Type D2

addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* or *qutïnga* <usually no line break, directly followed by> sender + standard *äsängü* form, (simple *bitig* form) or *sav/söz* form

Type E: Non-specific form II (without any term indicative of a letter and used for superiors, peers, and inferiors)

Type E1

addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* <no line break, directly followed by> sender + ablative suffix *-tïn/-tin/-dïn/-din*

Type E2

addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä* or *qutïnga* <usually no line break, directly followed by> sender without ablative suffix who, as the person offering the following salutations, is indicated without preamble by the nominative or a pronoun

Type E3

sender + ablative suffix *-tïn/-tin/-dïn/-din* <no line break, directly followed by> addressee + dative suffix *-qa/-kä*