

Uigurica from Dunhuang
Author(s): Marcel Erdal
Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 51, No. 2, (1988), pp. 251-257
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/618211
Accessed: 21/07/2008 16:45

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org

UIGURICA FROM DUNHUANG

By MARCEL ERDAL

Since the early years of this century, there has been a steady flow of publications containing editions of Uigur texts found in the Turfan region and brought to Germany. Not so the Uigur MSS of Dunhuang, which are kept in London and Paris. A good start was made by Le Coq, Thomsen and Pelliot in 1911–1914. Twenty years later, Bang, Gabain and Rachmati published the 'Sūtra of Eight Heaps'.[1] Another forty years were to elapse before the appearance of further material.[2] Moriyasu[3] mentions hundreds of MSS found in the cave which was given the number 181. There have, on the other hand, been multiple editions: The 'Story of the Two Princes' was edited three times;[4] recently, an Uigur text in Tibetan script was published—twice.[5]

From the linguistic point of view, this last is a most exciting find: like the Brāhmī writing system, Tibetan transcription gives phonetic details which cannot be gained from the study of Old Turkic in any of the other scripts which were in use for it. It has been maintained that the Brāhmī texts represent an aberrant dialect perhaps reflecting the speech of Tokharians, and could not, therefore, be used as evidence for Old Turkic as a whole. Brāhmī evidence is now corroborated, or at least complemented, by a document in a very different writing system, discovered in a different place, and not attached to an orthographical tradition: scholars can now proceed to describe the phonetics and phonology of Uigur. The readings of the two editions differ in about twenty points, not all of them trivial. Fortunately, Moriyasu's (otherwise not wholly reliable) edition offers a facsimile. Discussing the issues raised by that text here would, however, lead us too far astray.

In two beautifully printed volumes,[6] Hamilton has now given us access to another 36 Uigur MSS from Dunhuang. One third of these is kept in London, the rest in Paris. We gain, here, a glimpse of the daily life and spiritual experiences of a motley society. The editor has followed the Buddhist, Manichaean or Christian authors or translators with erudition, and is also at home with the often colloquial style of the private letters.

The work opens with a detailed and well-documented account of the fortunes of Dunhuang in the ninth and tenth centuries and of the political and military circumstances in the whole area. Then comes the edition proper, followed by 'Conclusions' (which I shall not quote), a rich bibliography and various indexes. The documents are presented both in transliteration and in

[1] W. Bang, A. von Gabain and G. R. Rachmati, 'Das buddhistische Sūtra Säkiz yükmäk (= Türkische Turfantexte, VI)'. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1934: 93–192.

[2] P. Zieme and G. Kara, *Ein uigurisches Totenbuch*, Budapest, 1978; Ş. Tekin, *Buddhistische Uigurica aus der Yüan-Zeit*, Budapest, 1980.

[3] Moriyasu, T. '*Uigurugo bunken* (Uigurica from Tun-huang)', *Kōza Tonkō*, 6, 1985, 3–98. A few of the MSS are published there, but the vast majority are just mentioned. An edition of the rather extensive *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya-ṭīkā-tattvārtha-nāma* is being prepared by Kōgi Kudara.

[4] First by Huart, then by Pelliot, and most recently by James Hamilton: *Le Conte bouddhique du Bon et du Mauvais Prince en version ouïgoure*, Manuscrits ouïgours de Touen-houang, Mission Paul Pelliot, Documents conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale, III, Paris, 1971.

[5] D. Maue and K. Röhrborn, 'Ein "buddhistischer Katechismus" in alttürkischer Sprache und tibetischer Schrift', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 134, 1984, 286–313 and 135, 1985, 68–91; T. Moriyasu, 'Etude sur un catéchisme bouddhique ouigour en écriture tibétaine (P.t.1292)', *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Osaka University*, XXV, 1985, 1–85.

[6] J. Hamilton (ed.), *Manuscrits ouïgours du IX^e–X^e siècle de Touen-houang*, 352 pp. + map, Paris, Peeters, 1986. BFr. 2800.

transcription.[7] There follow a glossary of all the texts edited here and of the Story of the Two Princes,[8] and excellent facsimiles, including those of the London MS of the 'Sūtra of Eight Heaps' (mentioned above). The latter enable us to check readings of TT VI which I had shown to be problematical.[9] Although mainly based on this practically undamaged MS, TT VI had numerous aberrations: it changed correct *küzädü* to wrong *'küzätü'*, *äşid-* to *'äşit-'*, *taşgar-* to *'taşkar-'* throughout the text. On l. 17, the MS can now be seen to have *ämgätir*, the earlier aorist of *ämgä-t-*; this had tacitly been changed to the later *'ämgätür'*. *boguzı* of the MS, the well-attested form of Uigur, was changed in l. 14 to *'bogazı'*, actually found only in Ottoman. *ärdäm* was altered by Bang, Gabain and Rachmati into the late variant *'ädräm'* and, in l. 247, the edition had the unlikely *'oglanum'* where the facsimile now shows regular *ogulan(ı)m*.

One of the caves in Dunhuang had been walled up, apparently shortly after the year A.D. 1000. The work under review contains only MSS from this cave. Hamilton therefore believes that the MSS he has edited all belong to the ninth or tenth centuries, or to the beginning of the eleventh at the latest. The cave evidently did not remain walled up all the time, however, as the Tattvārtha and the works mentioned in note 2 above are all later by several centuries. At least two texts in the present selection must also be quite late: **30** has *sänlär* for *siz* and *-sA* for *-sAr*, e.g., and **21** contains, in addition to *silär* for *siz(lär)* and *-sA* for *-sAr*, the Mongolian loan *tuŋak*. *-sAr* appears as *-sA* also in the catechism in Tibetan writing mentioned above. There, however, we also find 'A-RU for evident *är-ür*, the aorist. The present instances, on the other hand, are to be seen in the light of change affecting the orthographical tradition of the so-called Uigur script. *tuŋγaγ* 'proclamation' and its base *tuŋγa-* 'to proclaim' can be found in the Secret History, *tuŋγa-* in the Hua-yi yi-yü and *tuŋγaγ* itself in Ḥp'agspa documents. *tuŋγaγ* appears also in Classical Mongolian (e.g. in Altan Tobči) and in (modern) Ordos, Kalmuck and Khalkha. In view of all this, the appearance of *tuŋa-* in the Codex Comanicus and its occasional occurrence in Middle Kipchak must be due to borrowing from Mongol: These sources have a strong Mongol component in their lexicon. **21** is, therefore, from the thirteenth century at the earliest.

Texts **1–4** are Buddhistic in content. No. **1** is identified as the beginning (and the colophon) of the Araṇemi-jātaka, fragments of which in Tokharian A and B and in the Saka dialect of Tumshuk had also been discovered. No. **2** is the beginning of a translation of the Great *Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra*, one of the central texts of Amitābha Buddhism. During the last years, a number of Uigur texts belonging to this school have been published (but are not mentioned by Hamilton).[10] Only one detail seems worth mentioning here: all of those MSS write the name of Buddha Amitābha as *abita*, with one exception. A fragment

[7] With some unwarranted 'normalizations': *yarlıka-* appears here as *yarlıgka-*, presumably because it was a *+kA-* derivate from *yarlıg*. *yokaru* < **yok+garu* becomes *yokkaru* in this book; I would write *bodısavt* or *bodısıvt* but not *bodısavat*.

[8] Mentioned in n. 4. The lexicon of this text is not merely repeated here, but corrected as well: see e.g. the lemmata *är*, *ätiz-*, *itür-*, *uβat-* and *batatu*.

[9] M. Erdal, 'The chronological classification of Old Turkic texts', *Central Asiatic Journal*, XXIII, 1979, 164–5.

[10] K. Kudara, 'Guan Jing—critique of a Uigur fragment of the Guan wu-liang-shou jing', *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, 35, 1979, 33–56; P. Zieme, 'A new fragment of the Uigur *Guanwuliangshoujing*', *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyōbunka kenkyūsho*, kiyō 20, 1982, 20–9; A. Temir, K. Kudara and K. Röhrborn, 'Die alttürkischen Abitaki-Fragmente des Etnografya Müzesi, Ankara', *Turcica*, XVI, 1984, 13–28 + V pls.; O. Sertkaya and K. Röhrborn, 'Bruchstücke der alttürkischen Amitābha-Literatur aus Istanbul', *UAJb*, N.F., 4, 1984, 97–117; P. Zieme and K. Kudara, *Uigurugo no kanmuryojukyō* (*Guanwuliangshoujing in Uigur*), Kyōto, 1985.

published recently by Zieme [11] uses the variant *amita*, as found in Hamilton's fragment in l. 5. While being translations of the same Chinese source,[12] the two fragments evidently belong to different MSS. Zieme shows why the variant *amita* (as opposed to *abita*) might place the text in the Yuan period. This should hold for Hamilton's text **2** as well.

Texts **5–10** are Manichaean but, as often with Turkic Manichaeism, fascinatingly syncretistic. Text **7** has a Manichaean bishop jotting down the Buddhistic formula *namo but, namo dram* (thus!), *namo saŋ*, while **8** mentions the *skandhas* of *Ṣamnu*, i.e. Ahriman. Text **9** starts off with the four gods of light but passes on to Turkic folk-lore.

11–17 are a mixed lot. Particularly interesting are: **11**, which may be a fragment of a divination manual; **14**, the first part of which was written according to a distinctive verse scheme; **15**, by one of a group of ambassadors on their way back from the land of the *Yaglakır* (thus the last vowel) tribe. **16** and **17** contain proverbs. One of the proverbs turns up in a very similar form in TT VII, 42, 7, a MS from Turfan, and two are mentioned by Kāšġarī. One of the latter appears in **16**, 15–16 as *käyik näçä yol bilsä avçı ança al bilir* and in DLT fol. 43 inversely, as *avçı näçä al bilsä adıg ança yol bilir*. Kašġarī's comment, 'This is coined about two clever people who have a dispute' shows that the two versions have the same purport.[13] The proverb of DLT fol. 601 is perfectly identical to the one found in **16**, 11–12. The fact that one proverb thus appears in the north of the Tarim basin and on its south-east edge, and two both in the Buddhist east and in the Muslim west, proves again the unity of early Turkic lore.

After a short legal document, there comes a wealth of letters, showing the Silk Road in action, as it were. Texts **19–31** are addressed to family relatives in distant lands, who are also business partners.

Here are some additional points. *agıtmaz* in **1**, 15 is connected with *ag-* 'to rise' and translated as 'il n'avait pas son pareil'. That would make *agıt-* signify 'to cause to rise', however, and not 'celui qu'on ne peut pas surpasser, insurmontable, imbattable' as suggested in the note to the passage. There is another verb *ag-* 'to change (intr.)' listed in the dictionaries of Clauson and Röhrborn. Clauson quotes it from Kāšġarī and says that it is 'unrecorded elsewhere', but Röhrborn mentions eight Uigur examples for it. Hamilton bases his translation on an obsolete interpretation of *agıt* in couplets 1233 and 6312 of the *Qutadgu Bilig: sıgıtnı agıt* 'leave off weeping'[14] and *nägü bo sıgıt . . . munı sän agıt* which has about the same meaning. *özin başın ıdalap alkosın bermäk(k)ä agıtmaz ärti* of Hamilton's text is therefore to be translated as follows: 'He would give up his self and body and would not deflect anything he had[15] from being given away (*sc.* to the needy)'.

ımırt taŋda in **1**, 32' does not signify 'à l'aube de l'immortalité' but 'in the dusk of dawn'. Hamilton is thinking of Skt. *amṛta* but the first vowel is against all other evidence from such borrowing; *amırta* is in fact attested in Uigur (*v.* Röhrborn's *UW*). *ımırt* 'dusk, gloom, gloomy' is found in ETŞ 8, 13 (where it describes trees in a monastery) and BT, XIII, 24, 7, where it qualifies *saṃsāra*. It is related to *ımır*, according to Kāšġarī (fol. 59) the Oguz variant of *ıŋır* 'twilight, dusk'. *ıŋır* is attested in Uigur as well. *ımır/ıŋır* appears in nominal use, *ımırt* adjectivally.

[11] 'Uigurische *Sukhāvatīvyūha*-Fragmente', *AoF*, 12, 1985, 129–49.
[12] No. 360 in the *tripiṭaka* of Taishō, vol. XII, 265c ff.
[13] O. F. Sertkaya, 'Eski Türk atasözleri üzerine', *Elçin Armağanı*, Ankara, 1983, 284, quotes the same proverb from Republican Turkish.
[14] We quote the brilliant translation of Robert Dankoff, *Wisdom of royal glory*, Chicago, 1983.
[15] Or: 'whatever was his due', if we read *al-gu+sın* instead of *alkosın*, Hamilton's *'alqusîn'*.

Küçä Inal (**4**, 3) is unlikely to come from the name of the city of Kuča, as Hamilton thinks; *nomina locorum* do not appear as persons' names in Old Turkic. Rather, *Küçä* consists of *küç* 'strength' (cf. the proper names Küç Kül Totok, Küç Tegin, Küç Temür, etc., mentioned in the *Drevnetjurkskij Slovar'*) together with the (male and female) proper name formative *+A* found e.g. in *Togana*, *Arıga*, *Yol(l)uga*, *Äsänä*, *Tükälä*, *Kädirä* and *Kutada*.

vam[16] *t(ä)ŋri kim künkä yaŋı t(ä)ŋrilik y(a)ratır* (**5**, 8) is translated as 'le dieu βam, qui construit au soleil la nouvelle demeure des dieux'. A note adds: 'La localisation "au soleil" du Nouveau Paradis est, à ma connaissance, un détail inédit'. The form *künkä* might, however, better be interpreted as a *dativus ethicus*, as 'a new sanctuary *for* the sun'. *tüp tüz ögütmiş* 'parfaitement digne(s) d'éloges' in **5**, 19 is unconvincing, as the reduplication *tüp tüz* signifies 'quite level' or 'quite even', but not 'parfaitement'. Since the qualified entity is 'le grand arbre aux fruits éternels', I suggest reading *tüp töz* 'roots$_2$'. This binomial is attested also, e.g. in fol. 496 of the *Dīvān Luġāti 't-Turk*. *töz* is used metaphorically, e.g. in Chuastvānīft 5–6 and 47–8, another Manichaean text. The expression therefore signifies 'praiseworthy as to its roots (i.e. essence)'. In **5**, 41 we find *'täglätgüçi täŋri'* translated as 'le dieu qui fait tourner (les Trois Roues)'. This should be read as *t(ä)rklätgüçi t(ä)ŋri* (the second character R and not an *alif*), similar to BT V 13,300, also Manichaean. In his note to the BT V passage, Zieme actually suggests reading *t(ä)rklätgüçi* also in the two Paris MSS, here **5**, 41 and **6**, 14. *tärk+lä-t-* is 'to quicken (tr.), expediate, speed on', whereas a verb *'täglät-'* is not attested. 'le factitif en *-t-* du verbe *tägil-*, passif de *täg-*...' would have been **täg-il-t-; täg-* 'to attain' cannot be connected with *tägrä, tägirmi*, etc. (as suggested in the note to **5**, 41) by any known mechanisms of Old Turkic grammar or etymology.

kataglıg in **8**, 5 stands for *kadaglıg* 'sinful', exhibiting the common confusion of the dentals. *katıglıg* 'mixed, containing an admixture' (suggested by Hamilton) seems less likely in this particular context. *munça yaruk küçi kim t(ä)ŋrilär kurtgardı* in **8**, 13 cannot be translated as the editor does it, but should be understood as follows: 'Thus is the power of light which the gods have saved!'

Hamilton is not satisfied with **13**, 5 and his note suggests corrections. It should probably be emended to read *üz övkä* instead of *öz ävkä* and translated: 'By the power of Buddha, may no aggressivity$_2$ attain my old father, who has lived for 90 years'.

süçi bir t(ä)ŋri xanım in **14**, 8 is translated as 'mon Seigneur, dieu unique et guerrier, (*soit* mon unique Khan céleste guerrier)'. In the 'Conclusions', only the first possibility is mentioned. I think the expression refers to a ruler and not to God: As *täŋri Uygur xan* (**5**, 10' and **15**, 7) and *täŋri Tavgaç xan* (**15**, 7) or *täŋri elig Uygur xan* (**17**, 1) show (quoting only instances found in the present work), the translation Hamilton first puts into brackets and then drops altogether is perfectly natural. An unwarranted association with the Old Testament God of hosts (*ṣəbå'ōt*^{h}) appears to have crept in. The author of the text, although bearing the presumably Christian name *Yox(a)nan*, is in a nationalistic mood throughout the section and betrays no religious feelings anywhere in the text.

The mysterious beginning of text **15** mentions the rise of a black (*kara*) and a grey (*boz*) cloud, each followed by a falcon. The first falcon is called X'RL'X, the second PWYZLWX, which represent *karlıg* 'of snow' and *buzlug* 'of ice'

[16] Actually, the editor writes *βam*, this *β* corresponding to *v* in the work of others. I have tacitly transposed all quoted transcriptions to my (equivalent) mode.

respectively.[17] We find, e.g. *karlıg buzlug üd bolur* in Suv. 590, 4–5. These words should not be read as *'karalag'* (which demands the addition of a letter) and *'bozlug'*, even at the price of losing the parallelism with the black and the grey cloud. Nor could such lexemes (nowhere actually attested) be translated as 'noirâtre' and 'grisâtre', as *+lXg* never signifies *'-âtre'* (-ish). Among the two ways of further interpreting the passage suggested by Hamilton, I prefer the inner-Uigur one alluding to the clans *Yaglakar* and *Ädiz*.

The sentence *bo bir kün bitig kim okısar bizıŋ ymä sav vat* (**15**, 5'–7') is remarkable in having a Sogdian predicate: *β't* is the 3 s. subjunctive of the Sogdian verb 'to be'. Two forms of the Sogdian copula, *b't/v't* and *m't* (the preterite), have been put to a number of uses in Turkic. We just note that both are found both in Uigur and in Qarakhanid Turkic (DLT and QB a number of times each); that *b't/v't* is attested already in the Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions; and that *māt* has travelled on into Mongolian (spelled *mayad*)[18] and still lives, e.g. in Ordos. Crosses have occurred between the two words (originally distinct in Turkic as well), due to the fact that neither [v] nor /m/ are regular word-initial sounds in Old Turkic. They have, furthermore, joined the interjection *ä* to form the word for 'Yes' in some Turkic languages, *ävät* in Ottoman, *äwät, yämät*, etc., elsewhere. The present instance has a very particular place in the history of these terms, as it shows *vat* as modal predicate: it explains its development into an assertive or affirmative particle on the one hand, and, on the other, shows the way to the various uses of *ävät* in Early Ottoman, before it crystallized into a simple 'Yes'.[19]

The proverb in **16**, 14–15 should be understood as follows: *agal* (i.e. *agıl*) *ıtı alış(ı)g bulsa böriliki töz* 'If the sheep-fold dog finds a ways to grasp, wolfishness (will turn out to be) his real nature'. *'ališiq bolsa'*, as Hamilton reads, is unacceptable because both *alışık* and *alış-* in the sense 'to get used to something' are specific to Ottoman Turkish, which is a different language.

17, 11' can clearly be read as *sansız tüman yıl boltı mäŋigü t(ä)ŋri yerindä* 'numberless myriads of years have gone by in the eternal Land of Gods'. In the last word, the character Hamilton reads as *β* is in fact a small D.

'bir täk yıpar . . . elitti' (**18**, 9) 'a porté un seul musc' should be read as *bir t(a)ŋ y(ı)par . . . elitti*, since *äk* and *ŋ* are written the same way in Uigur script. Other examples of this lexeme *taŋ* are mentioned in Clauson's dictionary, all of them referring to quantities of cotton seed. Dispatching a single musc (whatever that means) to somebody is absurd. Clauson is rather confused about the meaning and origin of *taŋ*; the best discussion of this term and of its etymology occurs in P. Zieme, 'Uigurische Pachtdokumente',[20] p. 217, n. 113. It is there shown to come from Saka, where it is used 'to measure cotton, hemp, but also sugar and radishes'. In Uigurische Pachtdokumente E 5 and 6, *taŋ* is written as

[17] The graphemes WY often appear to represent back vowels in these texts. In any case, the editor's interpretation also demands the word to have posterior vowels.

[18] In Mongolian (as in Russian and German), words written with final voiced consonants are in fact realized with voiceless finals. This is true also of *tuŋyay*, discussed above.

[19] For these latter uses, cf. C. S. Mundy, *'Evet, evet ki* and *geyise'*, pp. 118 f. in *Studia Altaica* (Festschrift Poppe), Wiesbaden, 1957. 'Yes' appears to have been absent from Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Semitic as well. In a letter dated 13 March 1987, Dr. Sims-Williams has reminded me of 'the Sogdian word for "yes", attested in Christian texts as *d'p't* [δāpāt], which Henning, *BSOAS*, XXVIII, 2, 1965, p. 253, n. 72, tentatively analysed as δ- "with" + *"p't* "bravo!".' While *d'p't* has the same meaning as Ottoman *ävät* etc., the phonetics of borrowing into Turkic would be far from clear in this case: a change of *#δ > #y* may have taken place in Proto-Turkic (the river *Δάιξ*, in Turkic *yayık; yog* 'funeral feast' appearing as *δόγια* in Byzantine sources; Mongolian comparative evidence) but is excluded *within* Orkhon and Uigur Turkic, not to speak of further development to θ. What *"p't* itself would have become (and signified) in Uigur is a different question. All this demands further elucidation.

[20] *Altorientalische Forschungen*, VII, 1980, 197–245, 12 pl.

TNK, which is presumably what the present text has. Here, however, we might as well have remained with T'K: in this text, the phoneme /ŋ/ is spelled as K. This may be an orthographical and not a phonetic phenomenon (as assumed by the editor), just as Ottoman used *kāf* for /ŋ/ in Arabic script. Thus, in this text, 'WXLYK' (with anterior K) = *oglıŋa* (l. 10) and 'YST'K L'R = *istäŋlär* (l. 6). Accordingly, the lexeme spelled as T'Y'KW in lines 5 and 12 should be transcribed not as *'tayagu'*, as is done here, but as *tayaŋu*. Hamilton himself mentions the instance in DLT fol. 610, where Kāšġarī connects this title with the verb *tayan-*. In view of this etymology, the front-vowel variant of the dative suffix found in l. 12 cannot be of any significance for the reading of *tayaŋu*.

The note to **20**, 6 deals with the sentence *amtı nä üküş sav (ayu) ıdayın/ıdalım*, which appears with minor variations in most of the letters: it is inserted after the inquiry about well-being, appropriate wishes and other expressions of politeness, and before turning to the main matter of the letter. I do not think Hamilton's translation—'Maintenant, que j'envoie dans la lettre dire le plus possible de nouvelles!'—quite hits the mark. I take *nä* here (and *cw* in the corresponding expression in Sogdian) to signal a rhetorical question (as German *was* can do and as has happened to Arabic *mā* 'what' > 'not'). 'What use is it to write a lot of words? (Let's get down to business!)' is my idea of what the sentence means.

In **20**, 9, YẒYR YM' 'WYTK'N K' [.]YN K'LTY is translated as 'Quant à Yazîr, il est venu à [de? par la suite?] l'Ötükän'. There is the following note: ''WYTK'N doit désigner, comme 'WYTK'N du manuscrit *Pelliot Chinois 2988* = **15**, 1, le pays de l'Ötükän, correspondant à la région des Monts Khangaï en Mongolie. La phrase semble indiquer que Yazîr, un des auteurs de la lettre, "est venu à l'Ötükän", et dans ce cas le mot /YN devant *kälti* ne pourrait guère représenter autre chose que *ken*, "après", pour signifier que "Yazîr est venu à l'Ötükän par la suite". Or, comme Yazîr devait se trouver chez les Čuŋul, non loin du Lob-nor et très loin, au contraire, de l'Ötükän, au moment d'écrire la lettre, on peut se demander si le *-kä* du datif n'a pas été écrit par erreur, sans que l'auteur de la lettre s'en rende compte, et si la graphie /YN de la ligne suivante n'est pas à restaurer en *-tin* de l'ablatif, pour comprendre "Yazîr est venu *de* l'Ötükän".' This seems unjustified: There are only two vowels in 'WYTK'N, which can thus be read as *Ötgän, Ütgän* and so forth. There is no reason to assume that this place, where the letter was written, was identical to a region an enormous distance away from the Uigur country of the time and quite off the caravan roads. No need, therefore, to 'emend' away the dative suffix. A comparison with the mythical context of **15**, 1 seems out of question.

S'RYK TWRXW S'V in **21**, 9 need not be 'le message relatif à la soie *särik*'. A lexeme corresponding to Latin *serica*, etc. has not, hitherto, turned up in Turkic. *särig turgu savın sözlädüŋüz*[21] *Türük tili* can be translated as 'You have expressed it in calming words, in Turkic'. Thus if we connect *särig* to *sär-* 'to be patient, to endure' and in view of the fact that *-Xg* is an exceedingly common formative. Far-reaching conclusions concerning the *Seres* (uttered already in connexion with *Türk Sir bodun* of the Orkhon inscriptions) should await a more solid bit of evidence.

In **25**, 11, *muntakıtı äsän ol* is translated as 'il sont, à la manière de ceux d'ici (? présentement?), en bonne santé'. The syllable *tı* does not belong to *muntakı*, however, but qualifies the following word: *tı äsän* is 'in continuous good health'. The adverb *tı* is discussed by Clauson, whose entry has the instances *tı turkaru* (a synonym couple), *küntämäk tı* and *tı ornaglıg*. It is found also, e.g. in *üküş tı* (TT VI, 269).

[21] This text also writes /ŋ/ with the character K: Cf. *busanmaŋlar* written as PWS'NMKL'R in line 5.

kiçig ınallarka in **32**, 7 is significant: a discussion has been going on on whether there had existed a lexeme *inäl* beside *ınal*. Hitherto, all instances capable of showing whether the stem has back or front vowels (like the dative or accusative case forms) had occurred as proper names. This is the first time demonstrably back-vowel *ınal* occurs as a common noun signifying ' young boy of noble birth '. *' inäl '* is thus proven to be a non-existant ghost. *ınal* with the meaning just mentioned is identical in shape with the administrative title *ınal*.

Some of the lexical observations made by Hamilton have important implications for other texts as well. Thus the note on *küräg* on p. 112, which concerns also the runic Toñukuk inscription, and the distinction between *ödig* ' record ' and *ötüg* ' petition ' (p. 168). Further, the frozen converbs *toga* and *körü*, attested in **17**, 7' and **20**, 1 and in **16**, 13 and **16**, 14 respectively. *toga* is for the first time correctly translated as ' by birth '; *körü* is recognized for what it is, a postposition signifying ' rather than '. This enables Hamilton to interpret correctly two other examples of *körü*, one in a runic source and the other in the *Dīvān Luġāti 't-Turk*. Curiously enough, all four instances of this postposition occur in proverbs.

Linguistically most interesting is the element *+dämä/dama* found in *kölikd(ä)mä* in **7**, 2 and in *batagdama* in **7**, 3. The runic front-vowel form $B^2G^2D^2MAK^2A$ (dative) shows that it followed vowel harmony; Sogdian *dm'n/dmn* ' dwelling ' (*d³mān*) would be interpreted in Turkic as having posterior vowels. The runic instance could also have been interpreted as *'b(ä)g+(ä)d-mäk+(k)ä'*, with an infinitive as base, as done on p. 325 of Clauson's dictionary: *bägädmäk* is attested also in Maitr 50 r 19 and 210 v 8 (neither one mentioned in that dictionary) and in TT II, 1, 43. Hamilton is right in returning to Vilhelm Thomsen's interpretation, as the context shows. The three lexemes in *+dAmA*, referring to heaven, to purgatory and to hell, were no doubt calqued on Iranian models. They are similar in structure and meaning to the *+hāne* or *+istan* compounds of Ottoman. Nominal compounds have always been ' un-Turkic '; we here have the earliest example for a foreign type being reduced to affixation. Vowel harmony does appear to have applied at this stage, unlike the later *+hāne* and *+istan*.

So many matters to discuss on a first reading! Religious scientists, historians, philologists and other specialists will no doubt find this book a treasure-house for further reasons.