Turkic Fragments in 'Phags-pa Script*

Peter Zieme

Introduction

N. Poppe wrote: "In addition to monuments in ḥP'ags-pa script in Mongolian, monuments in Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Turkic have come down to us. Consequently, VLADIMIRCOV was quite correct in calling this alphabet an international one."[1] Concerning the Turkic he presumably thought of the *tamγa* on a Mongolian document edited by G. J. Ramstedt.[2] But only in 1974 more Turkic texts on stamp seals were deciphered.[3] Recently D. Matsui gave a new investigation of these stamps in his study of Uigur documents of administration issued under Chaghatai-ulus (14th. cent.).[4]

Among the fragments edited in facsimile by E. Haenisch[5] there are two written in 'Phags-pa script which W. Heissig qualified as "Unidentifizierte 'P'ags pa-Fragmente (mong.)".[6] In their catalogue of the Mongolian texts of the Turfan Collection of Berlin D. Cerensodnom and M. Taube[7] did not add anything new on these documents, they only state that their language is not Mongolian. Thus the question in which language the texts are composed, has not been answered so far. I would like here to make some preliminary suggestions affecting the reading proposals of the texts of D 3 and D 4.[8]

---

* Here I would like to express my thanks to Ronald E. Emmerick for improving my English.

1 Poppe 1957, p. 2.

2 Ramstedt 1909; Kara 1972, p. 31.

3 Zieme 1974, p. 300.

4 See his article published in the present volume, especially pp. 3-11 above.

5 Haenisch 1959.

6 Heissig 1961 Nr. 640.

7 BT XVI, p. 47.

8 According to Haenisch 1959.

D 4

The fragment D 4 (TM 191)[9] is preserved in the Museum für Indische Kunst (MIK III 205).[10] The verso is written in vertical 'Phags-pa script and can be transliterated in the following way:

01 [ ]ŋi qa m.a ŋa sa vi nä

02 [ ]bô lu ra ya ši ŋa t'ub[ ][11]

03 [ ]ŋa ča hu [ ]

04 [ ]i hôn yi di [ ].

These lines can be read as follows:

01 [... ya]ŋɪ-ka maŋa Sävinä

02 [ ] bolur yašıŋa tub[ ]

03 [ ]ŋa ča hu [ ]

04 [ ]i hon yidi [ ].

Although it is impossible to give a full translation of the fragmentary text, one may understand what has been preserved of this document, in the following way: "On the ...[12] to me, Sävinä, ... it becomes. In age *tub[...] ... [...]ŋa ča hu [...] ... [....]i* seventeen ..."[13] As a whole, the content of the fragment is enigmatic. To judge by the date at the beginning, it is possibly a kind of contract. If so, the word *ča hu* may be some type of an object being transferred, but nothing comes to my mind. Perhaps one may think of Mongolian *čaγurγa(n)*, a variant of *čuγurγa(n)* "Lock, padlock"[14], or of *čaγasu(n)* "paper".[15]

---

9 According to T. Moriyasu (cf. fn. 10) this text comes from ruin α in Qočo.

10 The recto side bears a Chinese Buddhist text of the 8th cent. (T. Moriyasu) not yet identified. Cf. T. Moriyasu's remarks in the Catalogue 現代書道二十人展第35回記念トゥルファン古写本展，東京，朝日新聞社，1991: no. 14.

11 The last letter is only partly preserved, making it impossible to give a definite reading.

12 One day of the first decade of a month as one may conclude from the ending of the word.

13 The unclear words are written in italic.

14 Lessing, p. 206b.

15 Lessing, p. 159a.

The number "17" is of interest, because it reflects rather the Uigur spelling than the real pronunciation. In the latter case one should expect *on yedi*. On the other hand, the spelling of the first word is very intriguing because one does not expect an initial *h-* in the case of *on* "ten".[16] In his article on intial *h-* G. Doerfer nevertheless points out the fact that Tuvinian dialects have also *hon*, but he believes that the initial *h-* there is of secondary origin.[17]

The personal name Sävinä is derived from *sävin-* "to rejoice" plus the ending *-ä*.[18] As such it is known from a colophon[19], and as Sävinä Täŋrim from another post-script.[20]

The fragment D 4 contains beside this text two sections written in ordinary Uigur script.

(a) in the same vertical direction as the 'Phags-pa lines:

01 [ ]nč-kä yaŋ k(ä)rgäk bolup "On the ... (I) was in need of *yaŋ*".

The key word here seems to be *yaŋ* which I discussed in my article on a monastery document.[21] The word may be derived from Chinese 樣 *yàng* which has among its meanings "kind, style, sort" as well as "pattern, model".[22] I think, the latter meaning is likely here, and the object in question may well have been a kind of model for writing. Kāšγarī gives the following description: "'The model or pattern (*markaz*)' of a thing, from which one takes the measurements to make another thing in the same shape. Thus :: BURK • YANKIY **börk yaŋi** 'Cap pattern' – they cut out wings or a round hole from paper, or else mold something out of clay like a ball, and measure the brocade for the cap

16 Doerfer 1981, pp. 93-141, Doerfer 1982, pp. 138-168.

17 Doerfer 1982, p. 157.

18 UW 35 (only: *-a*). Further evidence in Erdal 56-57 who admits also vowel harmony: *a/ä*.

19 U 2819 + U 2820 (Zieme 1981).

20 Tugusheva 1978, II A 8.

21 Cf. Zieme 1995, p. 5.

22 Mathews 7256.

against it, then cut it accordingly. The same for the pattern of anything."[23] Unfortunately, so far no definite solution can be given, but as the old lexicographer says, it can be a model of anything. Thus it may well be understood e.g. as a woodblock for writing. On the other hand, the word is more frequently used in the general sense of "manner, sort" etc.

Now there is further evidence in two documents edited recently by L. Ju. Tugusheva.[24]

SI 4b Kr 236 (Tugusheva 1996 Nr. 5)

01 toŋuz yıl č(a)hšapt ay tört yaŋıka maŋa pusardu bit[igü?]

02 yaŋ krgäk bolup kaisidu tutuŋ-ka on satır kümüš-kä yaŋ

03 [altım] bo ok yaŋča uz bitiyü mn apam bitimäsär-mn on kamčı bergä

04 [ye]yür-mn tanuk hintso tanuk [...] bo tamga mn pusardu-nıŋ ol tep [...] ünsär

05 [...]yum[.....].

"In the Pig year, twelfth month, on the 4th. I, Pusardu[25], was in need of *yaŋ* for writi[ng?]. From Kaisidu Tutuŋ I obtained *yaŋ* against 10 *ster* silver. In this way writing skilfully, if I do not write, I shall obtain ten (lashes of the) whip (as punishment). Witness Hintso, witness [...]. This seal is mine, Pusardu's. If [...] appears, [...]."

SI 4b Kr 20 (Tugusheva 1996 Nr. 6)

01 toŋuz yıl törtünč (bešinč?) ay tokuz otuzka maŋa

02 kaisidu tutuŋ-ka yaŋ kärgäk bolup

03 sinho šäli üč käzig yaŋ altım munı

04 -ča ok [...]mäsä on kamčı bärgä

05 yeyü[r]-mn

"In the Pig year, fourth (fifth?) month, on the 29th. I, Kaisidu Tutuŋ, was in need of *yaŋ*. (From) Sinho Šäli I obtained three *käzig yaŋ*. Thus if I not [...], I shall obtain ten (lashes of the) whip (as punishment)."

23 Dankoff / Kelly II, 333.

24 Tugusheva 1996, pp. 221-222, No. 5 and No. 6.

25 < 菩薩奴 "Slave of Bodhisattva", cf. Zieme 1994, p. 120.

(b) The other section written in the opposite direction to the 'Phags-pa lines:

01 [ ] yıl ikinti ay tokuz otuz[ka]

02 [ ]tu bäg turmı[š]

03 [ ]ka yükängäli [ ]

04 [özü]m bitidim [ ]

"The year [...], second month, [on] the twenty-ninth. [...]tu Bäg Turmı[š ...], ... in order to venerate ..., I [mysel]f have written (it) ...".

How these texts or rather exercises are related to each other, is not clear to me.

D 3

The decipherment of the text D 3 is even more difficult. If one joins the two pieces of D 3, its reading can be presented in the following manner. I have to admit not only that the two pieces may originally have been separate but that there may be other possible ways of joining them. The only evidence for considering this fragment as Turkic is line 03 with its possible reading *[...m]iš bolsar*. In line 06 one can assume a reading like *sasıkıg*, accusative of *sasık* "earthenware" thus known from Kāšγarī's famous dictionary[26], but as *sası* from some other Old Turkic texts.[27] For all other letter remnants I cannot offer definite proposals.

Transliteration

01 [ ]ŋ[28] hib u[

02 [ ] eih. l[ ]ne gi

03 [m]iš bol[ ]sar [ ]

04 [ ]iki hin[29] [ ]ėm

05 [ ]sa si k'[ ]i.

26 ED 856a.

27 BT VII, p. 95b.

28 Or: [ ]e.

29 Or: din.

06 [ ]u se si

Although some evidence for Turkic texts in 'Phags-pa script has been presented here, the use of it among the Turks of Central Asia seems to have been rather limited, otherwise more fragments should have come to light.

References

BT VII: G. Kara, P. Zieme, Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung, Berlin 1976 (Berliner Turfantexte VII).

BT XVI: D. Cerensodnom, M. Taube, Die Mongolica der Berliner Turfansammlung, Berlin 1993 (Berliner Turfantexte XVI).

R. Dankoff, J. Kelly, Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk), I-III, Harvard 1982-1985.

G. Doerfer, Materialien zu türk. *h-* (I), in: Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher N. F. 1 (1981), pp. 93-141; (II), in: Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher N. F. 2 (1982), pp. 138-168.

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

M. Erdal, Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon, 1-2, Wiesbaden 1991.

E. Haenisch, Mongolica der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung II: Mongolische Texte der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung in Faksimile, Berlin 1959 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1959, Nr. 1).

W. Heissig, Mongolische Handschriften, Blockdrucke, Landkarten, Wiesbaden 1961 (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland I).

D. [= G.] Kara, Knigi mongol'skich kočevnikov (sem' vekov mongol'skoj pis'mennosti), Moskva 1972.

F. D. Lessing (General editor), Mongolian-English Dictionary, Bloomington 1973.

R. H. Mathews, Chinese-English Dictionary, Cambridge (Mass.) 1972.

D. Matsui, Uigur Administrative Orders Bearing "*Qutluγ*-seals", in: Studies on the Inner Asian Languages 13 (1998), pp. 1-62.

T. Moriyasu, *apud* 現代書道二十人展第 35 回記念トゥルファン古写本展，東京，朝日新聞社，1991: 14.

M. Nakano, A Phonological Study in the 'Phags-pa Script and the Meng-ku Tzu-yün, Canberra 1971.

N. Poppe, The Mongolian Monuments in ḥP'ags-pa Script, Second edition translated and edited by J. R. Krueger, Wiesbaden 1957.

G. J. Ramstedt, Mongolische Briefe aus Idiqut-Schähri, in: Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1909, pp. 838-848.

L. Ju. Tugusheva, Dva uigurskich kolofona iz sobranija drevneujgurskich rukopisej LO IVAN SSSR, in: Tjurkologičeskij Sbornik 1975, Moskva 1978, pp. 252-261.

L. Ju. Tugusheva, Neskol'ko ujgurskich dokumentov iz rukopisnogo sobranija Sankt-Peterburgskogo filiala IV RAN, in: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, vyp. 8 (1996), pp. 215-238.

UW: K. Röhrborn, Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien, Wiesbaden 1977-.

P. Zieme, Ein uigurischer Landverkaufsvertrag aus Murtuq, in: Altorientalische Forschungen 1 (1974), pp. 295-308.

P. Zieme, Materialien zum uigurischen Onomasticon II, in: Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten 1978-1979, Ankara 1981, pp. 81-94.

P. Zieme, Samboqdu et alii. Einige alttürkische Personennamen im Wandel der Zeiten, in: Journal of Turkology 2 (1994), pp. 119-133.

P. Zieme, An Uigur Monasterial Letter from Toyoq, in: Studies on the Inner Asian Languages 10 (1995), pp. 1-7.