HARRASSOWITZ Verlag

AN OLD TIBETAN DOCUMENT ON THE UIGHURS: A NEW TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION
Author(s): FEDERICA VENTURI
Source: *Journal of Asian History*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (2008), pp. 1-35
Published by: Harrassowitz Verlag
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41933476
Accessed: 30/10/2014 11:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Harrassowitz Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Asian History*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

FEDERICA VENTURI
(Indiana University, Bloomington)

AN OLD TIBETAN DOCUMENT ON THE UIGHURS: A NEW TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

The Old Tibetan document generally known by the title "Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord" is an eighth century Tibetan text that is probably better known among Turkologists than among Tibetologists. In fact, even though the language of the text is Old Tibetan, its subject does not concern Tibet at all, but rather the many Turkic and other nomadic tribes living in Northern Central Asia and in East Asia around the eighth century. The text presents important historical data, as well as several legends and anecdotes, and is thus a captivating mixture of fact and fiction. The vague borders separating history and reality are one of the factors that contribute to a series of intriguing questions. Who commissioned this text? When was it originally redacted? Was it originally redacted in Tibetan or in a different language, and, if so, why and how was it translated into Tibetan? Before we attempt to examine these questions, it is necessary to describe the text itself.

The name "Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord" refers to a small incomplete text kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, in the Pelliot Tibétain collection. The text forms part of a larger manuscript classified with the number P.T. 1283. This manuscript, found by Paul Pelliot (1878–1945) during his expedition to Central Asia in 1908, is in scroll form, and as many other documents found in Tun huang, is written on both sides. One side contains a Buddhist text in Chinese, while the other side contains two texts in Tibetan, both written by the same scribe.[1]

* This paper has greatly benefitted from the help, suggestions and advice of a number of professors and researchers of the Department of Central Eurasian Studies at Indiana University, Bloomington. These include Chris Atwood, Chris Beckwith, Gardner Bovingdon, György Kara, Ruth Meserve, Gedun Rabsal, Denis Sinor and Elliot Sperling. All of them deserve my deepest sentiments of gratitude. Many thanks are also due to Chris Walker of

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The first, much longer, Tibetan text is a dialogue between a senior monk and a novice, probably to be used as a didactic tool; the latter is the text under examination in this paper.

This document has been photographically reproduced twice, first as an appendix to Jacques Bacot's translation,[2] and then by Imaeda Yoshiro and Ariane Spanien.[3] It is in this latter form that it has been consulted by the author of this paper. The rather short text comprises just 110 lines, of which the last eight, from line 103 to line 110, are fragmentary. The paleography of the text presents not a few difficulties. The handwriting is, especially at first glance, almost illegible to a reader used to the clear, square fashion of modern *dbu can*, and at various tracts causes reading uncertainties which cannot always be satisfactorily solved.

The contents of this manuscript describe an itinerary, or better, a small series of itineraries through Central Asia, Northern Asia and also East Asia. These itineraries touch many areas inhabited by Turkic peoples, and for this reason the document has been a main source for Turkologists. However, since most Turkologists are not familiar with Tibetan, their knowledge of this source is limited to the translation of Bacot, which is approximate in many points and does not acknowledge uncertainties in the reading of the Tibetan. The aim of this paper, then, is to present a new English translation, with footnotes indicating the problematic passages and the ambiguous readings, as well as the various interpretations of scholars who have studied this text. This is done with the hope of providing the possibility for scholars to conduct new research on the problematic points of the manuscript, or to offer new interpretations on these difficult passages. Before proceeding with the new translation of the text, it is necessary to give a brief synopsis of its contents, and to examine the scholarship on this text to date.

---

the University of Chicago, who provided much needed help with the setting up and formatting of the Tibetan portion of the text. Needless to say, all errors and omissions are uniquely my responsibility.

1 See Marcelle Lalou, Inventaire des Manuscrits Tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale, vol. III (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1961): p. 1.

2 Jacques Bacot, Reconnaisance en Haute Asie Septentrionale par cinq envoyés Ouigours au VIIIe siècle. (Paris: Société Asiatique, 1957).

3 Yoshiro Imaeda and Ariane Spanien, *Choix de documents tibétains conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale*. (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1979): vol. 2, plates 544–549.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The text has two title statements. The first and genuine title, *byang phyogs na rgyal po du bzhugs pa'i rabs kyi yi ge'o,* which appears in ll. 1 and 2, is written in red ink and in larger letters. It can be rendered literally in English as: "Text on the sequence of however many kings live in the north."

The second title statement, on ll. 4 to 6, written in black ink and then in red ink over the black, may be translated as follows: "In the past, the king of the Hor issued an order, and [this] is an exemplar obtained from what is in the archives, the text of the order which dispatched five Hor men to look into how many kings there are in the north." This might be considered a "title statement" because it does not show the morphologic characteristics of a title; i.e. it does not appear at the very beginning, it is not written in a larger script, and it is not concise. However, it does provide a substantial amount of information on the origins of the text and its history. To compare it with something more familiar to a modern audience, it resembles a subtitle similar to those so often used in 18th and 19th century fiction.

This second title provides two different levels of information: one concerning this particular redaction, i.e. the text found by Pelliot; and the other concerning the genesis of the redaction of the original text. Concerning the original document, the title only tells us that it contained the text of the orders of the Hor king. These orders apparently sent five Hor men to investigate how many kings (and presumably kingdoms) there were in the North. Concerning the document found by Pelliot, instead, it is said to be a copy made from an original located in an archive, which, unfortunately, is not identified for us. However, notwithstanding the claim of the title statement, the document at our disposal does not contain the text of the orders of the king, but contains the final report of the envoys, plausibly submitted to the king at the end of their mission. As for the discrepancy between the title and the contents of the document at our disposal, it may be surmised that the original report was probably read by its recipients, maybe utilized for purposes of war or alliance, and eventually stored in the royal archives. Attached to the final report, and also kept in the archives, may have been the text of the royal orders. However, either because the text of the orders became detached from the report, or for other reasons that remain unknown to us, the scribe of PT 1283 copied the title of the original text, but did not copy the whole document, skipping the text of the orders and passing directly to the reports of the

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

five envoys. In so doing, he also omitted the sentences in which it was said which of the envoys followed which itinerary, thus causing the complete disappearance of the envoys from the corpus of the text.

The analysis of the titles also poses another ponderous question, namely, that of the language. In fact, if the document contains the reports of the five Hor envoys to the Hor king, how did it come to be written in Tibetan instead of in the Hor language? Was it translated from the Hor language into Tibetan? Or was it written directly in Tibetan? In order to attempt to answer this question, it is first necessary to identify the Hor. This has been a *vexata quaestio* for all the scholars of this text, but for the purposes of the present paper the focus will only be on the internal evidence found in the text. In fact, at ll. 59 to 65, a reader can find the description of a very well known historical event.

Quoting: "On the north of that there are five Basmel tribes, which united in a confederation of three with the Hor and the Gar log. They overthrew the rule of the qaghan, the king of the 'Bug chor. The chief of the Basmel obtained the [title of] qaghan, but the Hor and the Gar log killed the Basmel qaghan. The tribe of the Basmel dispersed and became as slaves."

This is the narration of the events of 742–744 AD, when a coalition of Basmil, Qarluq and Uighurs defeated and overthrew the qaghan of the Eastern Turks. The Basmil chief was then raised as qaghan, only to be overthrown after two years by the joined forces of the Uighurs and the Qarluqs, which dispersed his tribe. The Qarluqs then lost to the Uighurs, who came to dominate the area that had formerly been under the control of the Eastern Turks.[4]

From this succinct and simplified summary it appears that the Hor of this text can be identified with the Uighurs of the coalition mentioned above. However, it cannot be stated for sure whether every mention of the Hor in this text refers always to this particular group. For the purposes of the present study, it needs only be emphasized that as the Hor

4 On these events, see Christopher Beckwith, *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987): p. 126; Edouard Chavannes, *Documents sur le Tou-Kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux.* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1942): p. 94; Peter Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples.* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992): pp. 138 and 158; Colin Mackerras, *The Uyghur Empire According to the T'ang Dynastic Histories.* (Columbia: University of Southern Carolina Press, 1973): pp. 8–9 and 54.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

are certainly an Uighur group, consequently the Hor language is a form of Old Turkic. Why, then, is our text written in Old Tibetan instead of in a form of Old Turkic? The answer to this question must be, by necessity, twofold. In fact, by examining both the origins of the Pelliot Tibétain 1283 and of the original text from which our copy was eventually drawn, two likely answers emerge.

In terms of P.T. 1283 itself, the subtitle tells us that it was copied from a master-copy kept in the imperial archives. The fact that this manuscript is a copy obtained from a written text seems to be confirmed by certain scribal errors. These are errors that are clearly made by a copyist who has in front of him two texts: the one that he is writing and the one that he is copying from. In this process of passing from one document to another, he makes a number of mistakes that are probably familiar to many. In fact, he often tends to skip one or more lines because a sentence starts with the same words of another above it. Always because of instances of repetition of a similar portion of the text, he tends to re-transcribe words that he has already written. In fact in one case he even repeats a whole clause without realizing it, and ends up inserting a dittoism exactly where the verb of our sentence should have been.

Concerning the language of the original document, that from which PT 1283 was copied, we know that documents produced by the Uighurs have been transmitted to us in three different scripts: the Sogdian script, of Aramaic-Syriac derivation, the runiform alphabet and the Tibetan script.[5] However, the Uighurs also produced documents in the Tibetan language. This was generally employed either as a sacred language for Buddhist texts, or, as demonstrated by Géza Uray, as a "chancellery language" for the production of administrative documents, both during the time of the Tibetan empire and some time after its fall, in the 10th century.[6]

It is possible, then, that the original of this text was redacted directly in Tibetan. However, most Uighur documents written in Tibetan language and transmitted to us are Buddhist texts, and, as a consequence, our account would represent an exception in the panorama just described. In

5 On this see Golden 1992: p. 173; and György Kara: "Aramaic Scripts for Altaic Languages," in Peter T. Daniels and William Bright, eds.: *The World's Writing Systems.* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996): p. 537.

6 See Géza Uray, "L'emploi du tibétain dans les chancelleries des états du Kan-sou et de Khotan postérieurs à la domination tibétaine," *Journal Asiatique*, 269 (1981): p. 90.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

addition, if we accept the theory that the original text was written in Tibetan, it is necessary to pose the question of who wrote it. In fact, if it was written by a Uighur, as one would expect by reading the title, one problem (among many) arises: the very name Uighur is spelled in several different ways in the text.[7] How are we to explain that an Uighur did not know how to spell the name of his own people? A probable conclusion is that the original text was not written by an Uighur, but by a Tibetan.

According to this line of reasoning, then, the original text from which P.T. 1283 was copied was written in Tibetan by a Tibetan, presumably after having been translated from the Uighur (Old Turkic) language. Only two methods for such a translation are possible: from a written source, or from an oral communication. In the former case, it may be hypothesized that the Tibetans translated an original Old Turkic document into Tibetan, presumably in the area of Tun-huang where the text was found, an area that was under Tibetan control between 787 and 848. If this hypothesis were correct, however, the ethnonyms that are mentioned more than once (such as those of the Uighurs, of the Khitan and of the Kirghiz) would have always been transcribed in the same way. In fact, the name "Uighur", which occurs four times, is spelled in three different ways, and the names of the Khitan and the Kirghiz are also spelled differently within the space of a few lines.[8]

It may be objected that the different renditions of these names are simply due to scribal errors. However, it is my contention that instead these reflect the difficulties of a scribe/author trying to render *foreign sounds* into Tibetan. It is proposed here, then, that the scribe of the original Tibetan text was attempting, each time he tried to write a foreign term, to reproduce as closely as he could the foreign sounds that came to his ears. This would seem to point to an oral source.

---

7 See l. 25: *U yi kor*; l.26: *Ho yo 'or*; ll. 29 and 88: *Ho yo hor*. This ethnonym seems to be abbreviated in *Hor* throughout the text (ll. 4, 5, 36, 37, 44, 45, 47, 60, 61, 90). According to Moriyasu, instead, the name *Hor* is not a shortened form of *Ho yo hor*/*Ho yo 'or*/*U yi kor*, and represents a separate ethnic group. See Moriyasu Takao, "Tibetto-go shiryō chū ni arawareru Hoppō minzoku – Drugu to Hor," *Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyū* (*Journal of Asian and African Studies*), 14 (1977): pp. 34–46.

8 The one of the Khitan (occurring in l. 27, spelled first as *Ge tan* and then as *Ge tang*) and the one of the Kirghiz (l. 46: *Hir tis*, l. 47: *Gir tis* and l.55: *Hir kis*).

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

If this were a translation made from an oral source, then, the next question would concern how such an account, the result of Uighur intelligence, arrived in the hands of the Tibetans. The hypothesis that the five Uighur men may have been captured by the Tibetans, who translated their accounts directly into Tibetan, while seductive, is unfortunately impractical for more than one reason. Indeed, it is hard to imagine that the Tibetans were able to capture all of the five men, since they apparently followed very different itineraries and consequently must have been apart for most of their travels. At best, one may surmise that the five were captured after a *rendezvous*, but we cannot be sure that the five ever had such an appointment.[9] Nevertheless, even though this particular hypothesis is probably too far fetched, because of the transcription mistakes just mentioned, it seems that a translation made from an oral source is the most likely genesis of the original text of this document. A possible scenario for the production of the original Tibetan text would be that when the Tibetans occupied the region of Tun-huang, they came into contact with an Uighur who had heard of the report of the five envoys, and they wrote down his account.

The final question raised by the meagre three lines of the subtitle we have been examining involves the reasons for the missions ordered by the Uighur king. These are obviously strongly related to the period in which the events took place. The only time frame found within the text is the one mentioned above, regarding the years 742–744. These dates obviously represent a useful *terminus post quem*, but may also represent the frame in which to insert the event narrated in the subtitle, that is, the orders of the king of the Hor. In fact, the document could have been commissioned by the king of the Uighurs not long after his rise to power in 744, to find out which tribes were his allies or his enemies after the *coup* against the Basmil and the Qarluq.[10] The use of the temporal adverb *gna'* "once, one time", at the beginning of the subtitle, may in fact simply

9 This hypothesis was first examined and rejected by Ligeti. See Louis Ligeti, "A propos du «Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord»," in *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1971): p. 167.

10 Ligeti, 1971: p. 176 disqualifies this hypothesis because, he contends, the ruler of the Uighurs would have been already familiar with the situation. However, it cannot be excluded that such a mission was sent at this time, when the play of alliances between tribes was likely disrupted by the coup.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

introduce the temporal distance between the events narrated, which took place not long after 744, and the time in which they were narrated, which I would tentatively set toward the end of the 8th century i.e. in the period of Tibetan sovereignty over the area of Tun-huang.[11]

Now that a few basic coordinates for the placing of this text have been given, it is possible to discuss in detail the question of the itineraries followed by the envoys, and to examine the information they provide concerning the populations inhabiting Inner Asia around the middle of the 8th century. The itineraries described in the document provide information about the people living along the routes, mentioning their names, their particular mores and customs, and also describing the climatic and economic characteristics of the regions inhabited by them. There is no narrator, and the descriptions are always rendered impersonally, using "there is" and "there are", instead of being provided by the "voice" of the Uighur envoys through the use of personal pronouns such as "I" or "he". This impersonal narrative style suggests the idea that the narrator of these events to the Tibetans was not one of the five envoys, but merely a person familiar with the contents of the original report, that could talk about it without personal involvement.

However, even for the five Uighur envoys who did undertake these trips, it is likely that they did not visit personally all of the lands and peoples described in the text, but that they collected information on them during the course of their travels. In general, the more fantastic the description of a certain people, the less likely that these people were actually visited by the envoys. Thus, between the recipients, i.e. the Uighur envoys, and their source, i.e. whoever originally spoke to them about a certain tribe, likely a merchant, there must have been several layers of transmission. The hear-say origin of some of the news related in the document can also be inferred by a standard sentence which appears in the text: "Word has not been heard that there are men [there]" (*Myi mchis pa skad ma thos*).[12] Narrations of peoples that the envoys very likely did

11 Note, however, that both Bacot and Ligeti suggest that the use of the term *gna'* "once, one time" indicates the introduction of a fable-like narrative. See Jacques Bacot, "Reconnaissance en Haute Asie Septentrionale par cinq envoyés Ouigours au VIIIe siècle," *Journal Asiatique*, 244 (1956): p. 140; and Ligeti, 1971: p. 169.

12 See ll. 59 and 84. On the transmission of the information "par ouï-dire" see Ligeti 1971: pp. 171–172.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

not visit certainly include the fantastic legends about the tribes living beyond "the great mountain chain of sandy desert" (Tib.: *Mye ngam bye ri rgyud chen po*), i.e. the tribe of the giants (ll. 50–59), the tribe of the dogs (ll. 70–84) and the tribe of the savage Turkic people (ll. 94–110?), as well as the descriptions of dark skinned and curly haired people and of the people who, like fish, live in the water (II. 19–20).

As already noticed by Clauson,[13] "the great mountain chain of sandy desert" functions as the frontier between myth and reality. In the first instance (ll. 50–59), beyond this mountain chain there is a country of the giants, the habits of whom are described in the text. In a second instance (ll. 68–84) the text narrates a complicated story about two Turkic men who got lost in this mountain chain of sandy desert and were rescued with the help of a young woman and a pack of dogs. This story introduces a legend which has a young woman and two dogs as protagonists, and which seems to represent a Turkic myth of origin, since it can be assimilated to three other Turkic accounts of descent found in the Chinese sources.[14] According to this legend, the first dog descended from heaven. He emanated into a black dog and a red dog, and the two started looking for a consort. First they found a she wolf that proved to be "unsuitable for making children" (Tib.: *Bur ma rung*); so they kidnapped a young Turkic girl from a Turkic village, and they produced their offspring by mating with her. Their male children were all dogs, while the female children were all human. These offspring formed two tribes, which came to be called the tribe of the red snouts and the tribe of the black snouts. Aside from its implications as a Turkic origin myth, this legend, as well as the two other ones present in this text, certainly carries deeper and wider significance that can be brought up only by further study and research.

The last mythological people that live beyond the "mountain chain of sandy deserts" are the "savage Turks" (Tib.: *Dru gu'i myi rgod dag*), who are linked to an unfortunately incomplete legendary tale concerning a man with a broken leg (ll. 95–103). It is to be hoped that the significance

13 See Gerard Clauson, "A propos du Manuscrit Pelliot Tibétain 1283," *Journal Asiatique*, 245 (1957): p. 13.

14 See Denis Sinor, "The Legendary Origin of the Turks," in Egle Victoria Žygas and Peter Voorheis, eds: *Folklorica: Festschrift for Felix J. Oinas*. (Bloomington: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1982).

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of these three fabulous narratives, as well as the reasons for their inclusion in this account, will be researched in greater detail in the future.

Another characteristic of this text is that the names of the geographic regions themselves are almost never mentioned.[15] The precise route of each itinerary is not always clear, because directions are often given using an approximate terminology (such as beyond, behind or on the other side) and the starting point of each new section of the trip is generally not mentioned. However, since some of the ethnonyms are recognizable, several reconstructions of the itineraries have been attempted by modern scholars.

In fact, both Clauson and Moriyasu have attempted to reconstruct the itineraries, while the latter also produced maps based on the information found in the text. Nevertheless, there is still the opportunity to contribute to an increased understanding of these itineraries, and the possible ethnographic history they contain, by undertaking a new translation, as I have done, and also utilizing some of the more recent scholarship on Central Asian ethnographic history,[16] to attempt to further decipher and put in greater context some of the ambiguous references found in this text.

According to Bacot the document presents only one itinerary, presumably traced by the five envoys together, which he loosely reconstructed as eastward up to Korea, then north and northwest toward lake Baikal, and finally due west toward the steppe north of the Caspian Sea.[17] Bacot did not address the question of the point of origin of the itinerary, and his research mainly focused on an attempt to date the expedition of the five Uighur envoys, as well as to provide a redaction of the original text. Concerning the expedition, according to Bacot, this originated from the desire of the king of the Uighurs, who had just occupied new territories and settled there with his population, to find out who his neighbours were to the north.[18] The most likely time period for this would be the middle of the eighth century, when the Uighur settled in the area of the

15 The only exceptions being *Ji 'ur*/*Ba ker pa lig* (l. 7), *Mug lig*/*Ka'u li*/*Ke'u li* (ll. 15–16) and *Shan tong* (l. 16).

16 I refer in particular to the maps in Yuri Bregel, *An Historical Atlas of Central Asia* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) and to Peter Golden, *Ethnicity and State Formation in Pre-Činggisid Turkic Eurasia* (Bloomington: Department of Central Eurasian Studies, 2001).

17 Bacot 1956: pp. 137–138.

18 Bacot 1956: pp. 139–140.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Orkhon after chasing the Eastern Turks from the region. The redaction, or the translation into Tibetan of the account, then, would have taken place between 787 and 848, when the Tibetans were occupying the area of Tun-huang.

Only one year after the publication of Bacot's translation of this document, the Turkologist Gerard Clauson wrote an article on the subject. His main development in the analysis of the text consisted in identifying the territory of the 'Bug chor, or Eastern Turks, as the point of origin of five distinct itineraries, each traced by a different envoy.

According to Clauson, the five itineraries dealt with:

1) The country of the 'Bug chor proceeding East toward Korea and then South up to the coast of the Pacific Ocean (ll. 7–23);

2) A brief report on the immediate neighbours of Bug 'chor on the west, north and east (ll. 23–31);

3) A list of tribes, vaguely indicating their geographical location (ll. 31–59);

4) The tribes living north of the 'Bug chor (ll. 59–84);

5) The tribes living west of the 'Bug chor (ll. 84–110).

However, the five itinerary reports proposed by Clauson are problematic due to the difficulty of determining with precision the exact points marking the passage from one report to another in the document. Thus, the five itineraries proposed by Clauson are not only of unequal length but also partially overlapping. Concerning the redaction of the text, according to Clauson the reports of the envoys were compiled at the time of the first Uighur qaghan, and this text would reflect the qaghan's attempt to find out information about his new neighbouring territories. Furthermore, Clauson concluded that if this document had been translated from the Uighur language into Tibetan, the Turkic names would have been much more comprehensible. Hence he hypothesized that the translation of this text into Tibetan was mediated by Chinese.[19]

Clauson's remarks were all reconsidered by Louis Ligeti in an article published in 1971. Ligeti had the advantage of having known this text for a long time, since he had been introduced to its study already in 1927 by Bacot himself.[20] In his article on the document, Ligeti remarked on the

19 See Clauson 1957: pp. 12–13.

20 See Ligeti, 1971: p. 166.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

inadequacy of certain passages in Bacot's translation,[21] and also pointed out a major weakness of Clauson's proposed itineraries: they all depart from 'Bug chor. Instead, in Ligeti's more careful and nuanced reading, only the second itinerary commences from there, while the first starts from an unfortunately unidentified Ba ker Pa lig,[22] which appears to have been an Uighur city. In addition, 'Bug chor does not play a central role in the other itineraries, which seem not to depart from a central point, but, on the contrary, seemingly evolve from one place to another being related only to what precedes them, and not to an original point of departure.

Ligeti also noticed that the complete absence of the personal element in the text provokes the strong impression that the five men never visited many of the countries and people described in the text. Also, in Ligeti's opinion, it is bizarre that the five men reported to the Uighur king news with which he should have already been familiar (such as who pays tribute to the Uighurs, who is at war with them, etc.). Ligeti concludes, then, that the five envoys were not Uighurs, and that both the title and the subtitle of the document had been added by the redactor of the Tibetan text. He then suggested that since the text narrates *Drugu* legends, as well as mentions which people speak the *Drugu* language, but does not report on the *Drugu*, the envoys and their king must have been *Drugu*.[23] However, Ligeti does not succeed in identifying the *Drugu*,[24] and simply concludes that the text does not designate *Drugu* as a specific people or place, even though it must obviously be assumed that they are of Turkic stock.

The latest scholar to conduct research on the questions raised by the reports was Moriyasu Takao,[25] who, realizing the shortcomings of Bacot's original rendering, re-translated the text in its entirety and put forth new perspectives from those originally offered by Bacot. However, since this translation is in Japanese, many scholars have not availed themselves

21 Ligeti 1971: pp. 167–169.

22 This name has been reconstructed by Pelliot as *Baqïr Balïq, "the city of copper", but its location, maybe due to the fact that the corresponding Chinese name *Ji 'ur* has not been identified, remains unknown to us. This is unfortunate, since the country by this name seems to be the starting point of the five Uighur envoys.

23 Ligeti 1971: p. 177.

24 Ligeti 1971: pp. 172–176.

25 See the already cited Moriyasu 1977 and his "La nouvelle interprétation des mots *Hor* et *Ho-yo-hor* dans le manuscrit Pelliot Tibétain 1283," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 34 (1980): pp. 171–184.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of this work, and continue to refer to Bacot's pioneering translation, which had been executed at a very early stage of the existence of the field and was thus preliminary in a number of ways.

Moriyasu on the one hand accepted Ligeti's position that the five itineraries do not all depart from 'Bug chor,[26] but on the other also accepted the division in five itineraries suggested by Clauson, only proposing a different point of separation between the second and third itineraries.[27] The focus of Moriyasu's articles is his rebuttal of the identification of the *Hor* with the Uighurs advanced originally by Bacot. According to Moriyasu, the name *Hor* cannot be considered an abbreviated form of *Ho yo hor/Ho yo 'or/U yi kur*[28], and in this text designates some time the Uighurs of Mongolia and some other times the Uighurs of the Ho-si region east of the Tien shan mountains. Moriyasu attributes this ambiguity of the text to the ignorance of the Tibetan redactor of our text.

In conclusion, no agreement has been found among scholars on the interpretation and the possible answers to the many questions posed by this text. A convincing and definitive topography of the tribes and regions described in the document has yet to be produced, and the questions of the redaction of the text, its language and its genesis remain open. This paper presents a schematic and selected overview of some of these questions: the routes of the itineraries, as well as who commissioned the text, when it was redacted and why and how it was translated into Tibetan are all candidates for further inquiry to be carried out starting from a new, more literal translation of the text. This should be supplemented by subsidiary research that finds correlations with other documents from the same period, which may aid in providing additional details to the circumstances described in this document. In sum, fifty years after its first publication in a western language, this document still presents many challenges and the hope expressed by Bacot in 1956 must be expressed again here: this translation represents an appeal to all scholars and specialists in the disciplines involved to contribute their knowledge toward solving the problems presented by this manuscript.

---

26 Moriyasu 1980: p. 172.

27 Moriyasu proposes that the caesura line between the second and third report is to be found at l. 35 instead of at l. 31. See Moriyasu 1980: p. 174.

28 See especially Moriyasu 1977, quoted above, n. 7.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Notes to the Tibetan Texts and signes critiques.

In this manuscript the *tsheg* sign: ་ is often not present at the end of a morpheme when the morpheme is found at the end of a line. In order to maintain as strict as possible an adherence to the original manuscript, I have avoided adding the *tsheg* sign when not present. In fact, since these omissions occur especially at the end of a line, they do not lead to misinterpretations.

<ཀ་ཁ་ག>	letters omitted in the original document, but added by the editor
[ཀ་ཁ་ག]	letters illegible or disappeared, but supplied by the editor.
[ཀ་ཁ་ག?]	doubtful readings.
[…]	illegible letters: number unknown.
[_ _ _]	illegible letters: number known.
[±3]	illegible letter: approximate number known, indicated by a numeral with ±.
}ཀ་ཁ་ག་	text starts in the middle of a line due to physical damage.
ཀ་ཁ་ག{	text ends in the middle of a line, due to physical damage.

Apparatus criticus

cancellavit	crossed out in the original text by the scribe.
ante	before, in front of.
post	after.
supra	above.

ཅོ། བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ན་རྒྱལ་པོ་དཔུགས་པའི་བ
རབས་ཀྱི་ཡིགེ།
ཅོ། ་ །གཉ
ཅོ། । བཞལ་ཅོར་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་པོས་ །བཀའ་སྩལ་ཏེ། །བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ན།
5 རྒྱལ་པོ་དྲུ་མཆིས་པར། །ཅོར་ཀྱི་ལྟ་རྟོག་ཏུ་བཏང་བའི་བཀའ་མཆིད
ཀྱི་ཡི་གེ་གོ། ཕྱག་སྒྲུལ་ན་མཆིས་པ་ལས་དབྱེ་བྱང་པའོ། ।
ཅོ།।ཡུལ་ཀྱི་མྱིང་རྒྱ་སྐད་དུ་ཌི་[ཌར?]། །དྲུག་སྐད་དུ། །བ་ཀེར་པ་ཡིག་ཆེས
བཀྱི་བ། །ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱི་ཕྱོགས་སུ། །དྲུག་འབྲག་ཆོར་སྟེ་བཆུ་གཉིས་མཆིས་ཏེ།།

1 ད་ post བཞུགས་པའི་ cancellavit.
6 གོ་ post ཡི་གེ cancellavit.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ཆུལ་པོ་ཞ་མ་མོ་དན་སྟེ་ཆིག།ཨ།ཅ་ལི་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།ཞལ་ཤ་སྟེའི་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།ཤར་དུ་ཡིའི་
10 སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།ལོ་ཡང་གྱི་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།པར་སེལ་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།ཇི་ཀེའི་སྟེ་ཆིག།སེ་ནི་སྟེ་ཆིག་
ཇོལ་ཏུ་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།ཡན་ཏུ་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།ཅེ་བདལ་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།གར་ཐུར་སྟེ་ཆིག་ཨ།འདི་རྣམ།
ལ་ཆུལ་པོ་ནི་མ་མཆིས། །འདི་རྣམས་ལ་དམག་དྲུག་སྟོང་མཆིས།ཨ།དེའི་ཤར་ཕྱོགས་
ལྟར།བོད་གྱིས་ནི་ཉེ་ཞེས་བགྱི། །ཆུའི་ནི་ཉེ་ཆོ་དྲུག་ནི་དད་པྱི་ཞེས་བགྱི་བ་སྟེ་དཔོན་
ཆོང་བོང་ཡ། །དད་པྱི་འདིའི་ཕ་སྐྱེས་རྒྱ་བའི་མཚོ་བོ། །གཡེར་དཀྱལ་གྱིས་བཆུན་ཆིང་
15 ཚང་འཕོར་དུ་བགྱིད།ཨ།དེ་ནས་ཤར་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར། །དྲུ་གུས་ནི།སུག་ལིག།ཆུ་ནི་ཀེའུ་ལི
ཞེས་བགྱི་བ། །ཤན་ཏོང་ཕྱོགས་ཀྱི་དབང་བྱོན།ཚང་ཚུང་ཆིའི་ཁམས།ཀེའུ་ལི་འདི་ཕྱོགས་ལྟ
སྱི་སྐྱོ་སྐྱོ་བྱང་ལ་འབྱར་ཆིང། །སྱི་ཤ་འཚལ་ཏེ། །ཕ་མ་ཆུན་ཆོན་དང་སྱི་ཆུན་ཆོན་རྣམས
སྐྱེན་པོར་གཏོང་ཞིང་གསོད།ཨ།དེ་ནས་ཤར་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར། །མོན་བ་བེག་ཅོ་ཞེས་གཅིར
བྱར་མཆི་བ་མཆིས། །དེ་ནས་ལྷོ་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར། །སྱི་ཆུའི་ནང་དུ་ཉ་བཞིན་དུ་འདུག་
20 པ་མཆིས།ཨ།དེ་ནས་ལྷོ་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར།མོན་བ་ནག་པོ་སྱིག་དཀར་པོ། །སྐྱ་ཆུ་ཏུ་བཞིན་
དུ་འཁྱིལ་བ་མཆིས་ལྟ།།ཉ་བཞིན་དུ་ཆུལ་སྐྱེ་ཀོ།ཨ།དེད་དུ་ཡིའི་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར། །དེ་སྱི་སྟེ
ཆིག་མཆིས་ལྟ།།གུར་ཤིང་ཡང་ཉ་བཞིའི་རྩེ་ཐིག་ཁུ་གུར་གཡོགས་ཀྱང་།ཡ་རབས
ནི།ལྟ་ཉ་ཐགས་ལ་བགྱིད་།མ་རབས་ནི་།ཁྲོ་བ་ལ་བགྱིད།ཨ།འབྲུག་ཆོར་ནས་ནུབ་ཕྱོགས
ལྟར། །བོད་གྱིས་ནི།དྲུག་རྩུས་དགུ་ཞེས་བགྱི།སྟེ་དགུ་མཆིས་ཐའི་སྟེ་དཔོན་ཆེན་པོ་
25 ཌུ་ཡི་ཀོར་དེ་ཉོག་ལས། །ཆུས་བབས་སྐྱལ་ལ་།ཁ་གན་ཐོབ་སྟེ། །རུས་ནི།ཡག་ལེ
ཀེར་ཞེས་བགྱི། །སྐོར་ནི་ཉོག་དགུ་འཕྲུག་སྟེ། །ཉོ་ཡ་འོར་སྟེ་ཆིག་དམག་དྲུག་སྟོང་
མཆིས།ཨ།འདིའི་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར།གེ་ཉོ་ཞེས་བགྱི་བ་མཆིས་སྟེ། །ཆུལ་པོ་གེ་ཉོ་ཁ་ནག་ཀྱི་ཁ་གན
ཟས་དང་ཆོས་ཀྱང་།འ་ཞ་དང་འབྲ་སྟེ།ཕྱུགས་ཡང་།ལིའུ་ལུག་དང་རྟ་ཕལ་ཆེ།སྐད་ཀྱང་འ་ཞ་
དང་ཕལ་ཆེར་འཐུན།ཨ།ཉོ་ཡོ་ཉོར་དང་ཆེད་ནི་འཐབ།ཆེད་ནི་གཉེན།ཨ།དེ་ནས་ཤར་ཕྱོགས་ལྟ
30 དད་པྱི་མཆིས།།དེ་ནས།བྱང་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ན། གཱ་ར་བྱི་གཱི་སྟེ་ཆིག་མཆིས་ཕྱུལ་རོང་ཕྱོགས
ཕྱུགས་ཕག་འབའ་ཞིག་མཆིས།ཨ།ངོ་ལེ་མན་སྟེ་ཆིག་མཆིས་ཕྱུལ་ནས་བྱི་ཅོ་
པད་བཅང་པོ་དེ་ནས་བྱུང། །གྱུར་གོོ་བས་གཡོག་པ་སྟེ་ལྟ་མཆིས།ཨ།དེ་ནས་བྱང་ཕྱོགས
ན།མཆོ་མཐའ་སྱིད་པའི་འབྲུམ་ན། །སྱི་ཁྱིམ་དང་གཟུགས་འ་ཞ་དང་འབྲ། །ཕྱུགས་སྟ
ཆོགས་པར་མཆིས།།གོས་སྟ་སྟ་ཐགས་ཀྱོན།དགུན་ཐང་ཆེན་པོ་ལ་།ས་གས་སྟེ།
35 སྱི་ཕན་ཚུར་སྱི་ཐར་དུ། །ལ།སྟེ་ཅེ་ལ་སྐྱིད་པ་ཞེག་མཆིས།ཨ།དེ་ནས་བྱ[ང་]སྟེད་

---

9 ཞ་མ་མོ་དན་ lege ཞ་མ་ཁ་གན་.
22 གྱ ante གྱུར་ cancellavit.
23 ཐྱ ante ཀྱ་ cancellavit.
30 ཐྱོང་ ante ཐྱོང་ cancellavit.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ལྷར།ཞེ་ཆེད་སྲོ་ཆིག་མཆིས། །ཁྱད་གྲོ་བས་གཡོག །ཁོར་ལ།བྱི་བ་སྲོན་ཡེའི་པགས
པ་འབྲལ།০।དེ་ནས་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ན།ཡེ་ཟེ་སྲོ་བདུན་མཆིས་ཕྱི་རྒྱལ་ཡ་ནེ་མ་མཆིས། །ཁོར་
དང་རྟག་དུ་འཐབ། །ཁྱད་གྲོ་བས་གཡོག།སྐྱག་པའི་ཤིང་། །ཤིང་མ་ཞོ་ལྷར་འཛོ་ཞིང་
ཆང་དུ་བགྱིད། །ཡུལ་རོང་ཕྱོགས་སྐྱི་བརྒན།০।དེའི་ནུབ་ལྷར་།ཁྱད་སྲེ་རྩུ་དྲ་ཞིག་མཆིས་སྐྱེ
ཁྱིམ་ཡང་རི་ལ།རྩྭའི་སྐྱབ་མོ།ཤ་བ་ལ།ཁལ་འགེལ་ཞིང་སྐྱོད། །གོས་དབྱར་
དགུན་འབྲ་བར།རི་དགས་ཀྱི་པགས་པ།སོལ་བ་ནག་པོས།བསྐུ་ཞིང་ཚོན
ཟས་།རི་དགས་ཀྱི།ཤ་དང་ཁྲོ་མ་དང་ཚོན་བུ།བྱི་བས་བྱི་བུན་བསྐྱག་བསྐྱག
པ་དང་བྱི་མངས་དང་བྲིའུ་ཤིང་སྐྱ་མོས།ཤིང་སྐྱོམ་པོ་རྩྭ་བའོ་ནང་དུ། །
བསྐྱག་བསྐྱག་པ་འཚོལད། །ཁོར་ལ་གཆན་ཟན་ཀྱི་ཡགས་པ་འབྲལ།০।དེ་ནས
བྱང་སྲོད་ལྷར།ཀུ་ཆུ་འུར་སྲོ་ཆིག་མཆིས། །ཡུལ་བརྒན་ཏེ། །ཁོར་ཀྱི་ངག་སྲི་
ཉན་ནས་རྟག་དུ་འཐབ།০।དེའི་ལྷག་ན།ཉིར་ཏིས་སྲོ་ཆུ་དུ་གཉིས་མཆིས་ཏེ་
ཁོར་དང་ཆེད་ནི།འཐབ་ཆེད་ནི་གཉེན། །དེ་ནས་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་སུ། །གཡོར་ཏིས་སྲོ་ཆིག་
མཆིས། །སྲིག་ཤེལ་སྲིག་སྐྱ་མར་པོ། །ཡུལ་ན།ཕྱུགས་སུ་ཚོགས།མཆིས།རྟ་བོ
ཆེ་སྐྱེ།০।དེ་ནས་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་སུ། །སྲེ་ངམ་བྱེ་རྒྱུད་ཆེན་པོ་ཞེའིས་ཆོད།ཞ་མ
ཁ་གན་ཀྱིས་། །དམག་དྲངས་སུ། །དམག་ནི་མ་ཐར། །དེའི་ཁ་རོལ་།བྱང་ཕྱོགས་སུ
སྲི་ལུས་རིང་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་ཞེག།མཆིས་སྲི། །ཁོའི་ལུས་།འདོམ་གསུམ་ཙམ།མདའ་ཞེ
ཆ[ངར་]དང་ཟས།རྒྱལ་པོ་གཞན་དང་འབྲ། །དབུ་བཀྲིད་ཆིང་སྲི་ཙོང་ལ་འདོགས
ཞེང།འགྱམས་པའི་ཆོས་མ་མཆིས། །སྲི་གྱམ་ན།ཤིང་སྲི་བཀྲིད།མཆད་པ་སྲི་
རྩིག། །བྱིས་བ་རྡ་ཕྲད་པ་ཡན་ཆད། །ལྷ་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ། །ཕྱུགས་ཞེའུ་ལུག
སྐྱ་ཆོགས་མཆིས། །ཤིར་ཀིས། །ཁོ་ཉ་གཉང་གཉང་ན། །འདི་ལྟ་བུ་བྱིས་བ་འབྲ་བ
ཁྱིམ་བརྐུས་པར་འོང་ཞེས། །མཆིས་ནས། །ཁོང་ཏུའི་རྣ་ཞུ་རང་དུ་སྐྱལ་ཏེ་
དཔྱང་ལ་འདོགས། །ཁོ་ཉ་འདྲི་བ། །དེད་ཀྱི་ཞེའུ་ལུག་རྩི་ཐ་རང་ལིག
ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ཡོད་པའི་རིགས་ཤིག་ལ་འགོད་འདྲི་ཞེས་མཆི། །རྩྭི་རིང་ཐན་
ཆད་ནི།རྩྭི་མཆིས་པ་སྐད་མ་ཐོས།০।དེའི་བྱང་ཕྱོགས་བ་སྐྱི་སྲི་ལྟ་མཆིས།
དེ། །ཁོར་དང་ཁར་ལོག་དང་གསུམ་བསྡོད་སྐེ།འབྲག་ཆོར་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་པོ།ཁ་གན་

---

43 ante ཀྱི་ cancellavit.
49 ante ཀྱང་ cancellavit; ante ཞ་མ་ cancellavit.
50 ante ཀྱང་ cancellavit.
52 supra ཟས་ cancellavit.
58 ante ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ cancellavit; post འགོད་ cancellavit.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

གྱི་སྲིད་བརླག་སྟེ། །བ་མེལ་གྱི་སྡེ་ཁ་པོན་།ཁ་གན་གྱས་ཐོབ་པ་ལས། །ཏོར་
དང་།གར་ལོག་གིས།བ་མེལ་ཁ་གན་བསད་ནས། །བ་སྨིལ་སྡེ་འཐོས་ཏེ།སྡེ་བྲན་
དུ་མཆིས་པ་ལས། བ་སྨིལ་གྱི་ཁམས་།གེས་དུམ་སྡེ་ཆིག།།བ་སྨིལ་གྱི་ཁམས
བ་ཡར་བགོ་སྡེ་ཆིག།། སྡེ་དཔོན་ཡེད་སྲིས་།ཏིར་ཀིན།།ཏི་དོག་གས་སྡེ་ཆིག་
65 སྡེ་དཔོན་ཏི་ཀིལ་ཏོར་ཏི་ཀིན།ཡུལ་བརྒན་ཏེ།།གར་ལོགས་གིས།མ་ཁྲུགས་
དེ་ནས་བྱང་ཕྱོགསླ།གེ་ཀོག་སྡེ་ཆིག་སུ་དང་ཡང་སྲི་འཐབ་སྲི་སྟོད།།ཏེའི་ནུབ་ཕྱོགས
ན། །སྡེ་བརྒྱ་ཚམ་ཡོད།།ལ་ལ་ནི་ཡུལ་བརྒན་ལ་ལ་ནི་རོང་ཆེ་ལ་ལ་ནི་ཡུལ་བཟང
ཞིང་འབྲོག་ཆེ།།ཨའི་རྣམས་གྱི་བྱང་ཕྱོགསླ།་སྐེ་དམ་བྱེ་རི་རྒྱུད་ཆེན་པོ།ཕ་རོལ་ན
གནམ་གྱི་རྒྱལ་.ཏོ་སྡེ་གཉིས་མཆིསྲི། །འབྲུག་ཚོར་.གྱི་རྒྱལ་པོ།ཞ་ཞ་མ་ཁ
70 གན་གྱི་སྲིད་བདེ་བའོ་ཚེ། །འདི་ཕྱོགས་ན།དམག་དང་ན།དམག་གིས།མ་ཐར་ཏེ་
སྲི་ཉིས་འབྲུམསླ།མཆི་མཆི་བ། །རྡ་མོའི་རྩིས་ཞིག་དང་མཐལ་ནས།།རྩིས་
རྒྱ་དག་དུ་མཆི་མཆི་ན། །རྡ་མོ་ཕལ་མོ་ཆེ་ཞིག་མཆིས་པའི་གན་ན།བྱང་མེད་།
མཆིས་པ་དག་ཆིག་དང་མཐལ་ནས། །བྱུགས་སྐད་དུ་རྡ་མཐལ་ནས། །བྱང་མེད
དེས་བཀྲི་བཀྲི་སླ། །སྨས་ན། །ཕྱི་འབྲིང་།ཁྲི་ཕལ་མོ་ཆེ་ཞིག། །རི་དགས
75 ཤོར་དུ་མཆི་མཆི་བ་སྨར་མཆིས་པས། ।ཁྲིས་སྐས་ཚོར་ཏེ།ཁྲི་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ
དུ་བཏུགོ། ।དེ་ནས་ཁྲིས་।རྡ་མོ་བཏུ་དང་།ཆེ་འདོད་དགུ། ।དང་། ।སྐྱེ་ངམ་བྱེ་རི་རྒལ་
བའོ་ཆུ་བཀལ་ཏེ།སྨར་བཏང་ནས།བྱུགས་ཡུལ་དུ་ཕྱོགོ།०।ཁྲི་དང་པོ་གནམ་ལས་བབ་ཁྲི་
དམར་པོ་གཅིག་དང་ནག་པོ་གཅི་དང་གཉིས། ।ལ་བབ་སླ། ।ཆུང་མར། ।སྨྲུང་མོ་ཞིག
གཅིག་དང་ཕྱདེ་འཚོས་ན།བྱར་མ་རྩང་། ।དེ་ནས།བྱུགྱེ་ཁྲིམ་འདབ་ནས
80 བྱ་མོ་གཅིག་བརྐུསླ།།བྱ་མོ་དེ་དང་འཚོས་ནས། ।བྱ་ཕོ་རྣམསླ།ཁྲིར་བྱུང་།མོ་རྣམས
ནི།སྲིར་བྱང་ནས་ཆུང་བུད་མེད་དག་ཆིག་དུ་རེའོ།०।ཁྲི་དམར་པོའི་སྡེ་ནི་।གེ་ཐིར
གུ་ཤུ་ཞེས་བགྱིའོ། ।ཁྲི་ནག་པོའི་སྡེ་ནི། ।གར་གུ་ཤུ་ཞེས་བགྱིསྲི། ।ཁྲི་དང་བུད
མེད་བྱུགྱ་སྐད་དུ་རྡ་མཐལ་ནས། ।ཤུགས་ལ་སྐྱོགས་པ་ནི། ।ཏོར་ཐས་ནི་བྱད་མེད
གྱིས་।སྐྱོར་ཞིང་སྐྱོའོ།०।ཏེའི་ཕན་ཚད་ན།ཕྱི་མཆིས་པ་སྐད་མ་ཐོས།०।འདིའི་ནུབ
85 ཕྱོགས་ལྷར།གར་ལོག་སྡེ་གསུམ་ཞིག་མཆིསྲི། ।དམག་བརྒྱད་སྐྱོང་མཆིས།དུ་རྒྱུས
དང་ཏ་ཞིག་དང་འཐབོ།०।ཏེའི་ཤར་ཕྱོགས་ལྷར། ।ཞོག་རབ་སྡེ་གསུམ་མཆིསྲི། ।ཏོ་ཡོ

---

61 post སྲིད་ cancellavit.
69 ཀ་ ante ཀ་ cancellavit.
74 ante སྡེ་ cancellavit.
81 ཆུང་ ante བྱང་མེད cancellavit.
83 ནི་ post སྐྱོགས་པ cancellavit.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ཏོ་ཅེ་ཕྱོགས་ལྟར། །ནེ་ཤགས་ཆོས་ཀྱི་མཁན་པོ་ཆོམ་ཞིང་འགྲུབ་པའི་རྟེན་
བྱིད་ཆེང་ཏོ་ཡོ་ཏོར་དང་འཐབོ།0།དེའི་བྱང་སྟང་ན། །དྲུག་གུ་ལོག་གོལ་ཆོར་ཀྱི
འཕྲོ་ཕེ་བྱིལ་ཀོར་།སྟེ་ཆིག་མཆིལྟེ། །དམག་སྟོང་མཆིས།0།དེའི་བྱང་སྟོན་ན་ཞེ
90 ཅནག་སྟེ་ཆིག་མཆིལྟེ། །དམག་ལུ་སྟོང་མཆིས། །ཏོར་དང་འཐབོ།0།དེའི་ནུབ་ཕྱོགས
ན། །དྲུག་ཏུ་ལ་ཡུན་ལོག་སྟེ་ཆིག་མཆིལྟེ། །སྟེ་ཆེ་ལ་།སྐྱིད་པ་ཞེག་མཆིས།དྲུག་རྒྱ
བཀྲ་དེ་ནས་མཆིའོ།0།དེའི་བྱང་ཕྱོགས། །སྐྱེ་ངམ་བྱེ་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་ཕ་རོལ་ན།སྐྱེ་ཕུད
ཏུ་དག་ལེག་ཞེས་བཀྱི་བ། །ཤངང་པ།།བ་ལང་གི་སྐྱེག་པ་ཆན་ལ། །ལུས་ལ་སྐུ
ཤོལ་ཤོལ་པོ་ཞེག་མཆིས།སྐྱེ་ཤ་ལ་འཚལ།0།འདི་ཕྱོགས་ནས་བར། །དྲུགའི་
95 སྐྱེ་ཆོད་དག་ཆིག་མཆི་མཆི་ན། །སྐྱེ་ཆོད་གཆིའི་ཤངང་པ་ཆག་སྟེ།འཚོ་མ་ཕོད་
ནས། །རོགས་པོ་དག་གིས། །ཤངང་པ་ཆག་པའི་དྲུང་དུ།ཏྲ་ཆིག་བས་ནས་ལེང
མང་དུ་བསྟུན།སྐྱེ་ཆ་ལག་ཏུ་བྱིན་ཏེ། །དེར་བོར་ནས། །རེ་ཤེག་ན། །སྟག་གཆིག
སྐྱངས་ཅིན་ཏེ། །ཤངང་ཆག་གནད་དུ་ཕྱིན་ན། །སྟག་གི་ཕྱི་བཞིན་དུ། །ལུས་བྱི་ལ་ཆེན
པོ་ཚམ། །སྐྱུ་ལྷག་ཐྱར་མ་བཞིན་དུ་སྟ། །ཚོག་མ་དང་།མཆན་བོག
100 གཡའ་གཡོན། །མཐེབ་བོས་ཚམ་རེ་རེ་དཀར་ནས། །ནས། ཕྱི་ཤངང་ཆགི་ས
མཆན་བོག་དཀར་བ་དེར་མདའ་ཆེགི་ས་འཕངས་ཀྱི་བསད་ན། །ལུས་ནི་ཕག
བཞིན་སྐྱུར། །སྐྱུ་ནི་ལྷག་ཐྱར་མ་བཞིན་དུ་སྟ་ལ་རྟོ། །སྟྭ་དེ་ཐོག་མ་ནས
མཐུག་ཐོག {…}བར་དུ། །རལ་གྲི་བཞིན་དུ་རྟོ། །དྲུག་སྐད་དུ།།ཀོག་ཏོ་ཡོག
ཆེས་བའེ། །ི {……}ས་བྱ། །སྟེ།།སྟག་དང་ལྷང་འཐབ་པ་དེར་མཐོང་།0།
105 ……}ས་སོས་ཀྱ་བར་དུ། །སྟག་གིས་རི་དག་ས་བསད་ཆིང
……} ཕྱི་བྱ་དུ་གཟུགས་གཞན་དང་འདུ། །གོས་ཆུང
……} གཱ།སྟྲོག་རུས་གཡས་གཡོས་ན་མཆིས་།དེའི
……} ས་ཞེགི་ནང་ན། རི་བོག་རི་།ཉ་ཐེ་བའི {…
……} ང་ཅྱི་སྟན་སྟུན་ཡང་མཆིས་ལྟ། །རི་ ི{……
110 ……} ི་མཆེའི {……

---

87 post ོོ cancellavit.
92 ante ྱང cancellavit.
93 post ལོག cancellavit.
95 ཤངང cancellavit, sed non cancellandum est.
99 post མཆན་བོག cancellavit.
100 ནས post དཀར cancellavit. Ante ཕྱི cancellavit.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

(l. 1) Text on the sequence[29] of however many kings live in the north.

(l. 4) Previously the king of the Hor[30] issued an order which dispatched five Hor men to investigate how many kings were in the north, and [this] is a copy[31] of the text of the order taken from what is in the imperial archives.[32]

---

29 The Tibetan *rabs* is normally translated as "lineage" or "genealogy", being that in classical Tibetan this word is often found in compounds such as *rgyal rabs* ("royal genealogy, royal lineage"). However, as Ligeti, 1971: p. 167, has already pointed out, even a quick reading of this manuscript shows that its topic is not the lineage of the kings living in the north. Thus, a deeper examination of the word *rabs* and its context is necessary. Looking at the definition of *rabs* in H. A. Jaeschke, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Richmond: Curzon, 1998): p. 524, we find that three main meanings of this word are listed: 1) lineage, succession of families, race, family; 2) generation; 3) succession, series, development. The principal trait in common between these three meanings seems to be that of a string, a series or succession of things, either in a temporal (such as in the sense as "generation" or "family") or in a spatial connotation. Thus interpreted, the term *rabs* may be translated in this case as "sequence", "progression" or "succession" of kings – and kingdoms – in a spatial sense. Another possibility would be to follow R.A. Stein's suggestion to translate *rabs* as "récit". See R.A. Stein, "Tibetica Antiqua V: La religion indigène et les *Bon-po* dans les Manuscrits de Touen-Houang," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, 77 (1988): p. 46. In this case, though, *rabs kyi yi ge* would be a somewhat redundant "text on the account", or "text on the narration".

30 In this text the word Hor certainly designates an Uighur group. This becomes clear especially in ll. 59–63, where it appears that, at least in that passage, Hor indicates the Uighurs who formed the Uighur empire in 745. It is uncertain whether all the occurrences of the word Hor (which are usefully listed by Ligeti, 1971: p. 176) refer always to the Uighurs of the empire or to Uighur groups which spun off after the fall of the empire. If all the references to Hor refer to the Uighur empire, then this agrees with the idea that the missions of the five envoys were sent immediately after the formation of the empire in order to see who the allies and who the enemies were after the tumultuous coup. Otherwise, one may surmise that the term Hor refers to the Uighur empire only in the passage of ll. 59–63 and that in all other occasions, when it lists the allies and the enemies of the Hor, it refers to a different Uighur group formed after the end of the empire. See also the discussion on the interpretations of the meaning of Hor in the introduction.

31 *Dpē* means "pattern", "model", "example", and is also used in composite words meaning "writing copy". Cf. *dpe cha*, "book", and *ma dpe* and *bu dpe*, respectively "original" and "copy" of a book (literally "mother copy" and "child copy").

32 The meaning of *phyag sbyal*, not to be found in the dictionaries, has been established by Giuseppe Tucci in his *Tombs of the Tibetan Kings* (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1950): pp. 46 and 82, n. 94 as "archive". See another occurrence of this term in Li Fang Kuei and W. South Coblin, *A Study of the Old Tibetan Inscriptions*, (Taipei: Chung yang yen chiu yüan li shih yü yen yen chiu so, 1987): pp. 93–94.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

(l. 7) In the direction above the country which is called Ji ‘ur[33] in Chinese and Ba ker Pa lig (Baqïr Balïq)[34] in Turkic, are the twelve tribes [of] the ‘Bug chor (Bük čur)[35] Turks: *(l. 9)* the king Zha ma

---

33 Bacot read "*Ji ‘ur*" and did not attempt to identify this place (1956): pp. 141 and 145. Ligeti, 1971: p. 177 simply states that the Chinese name "*Ji ‘ur*" remains undeciphered. According to Beckwith (personal communication), a closer paleographic examination reveals that the *‘a* of *‘ur* does not look at all like the other *‘a* within the text. In particular, this has an upward "tail" on the top right corner that is not present in any of the other *‘a* in the text. This tail would be, according to him, the final part of a *ya* subscribed to a *ga*, forming thus a word that should be read "*gyur*" instead of *‘ur*. It is certain that the *‘a* glyph of this particular word is unlike all others within the text. However, after a close paleographic examination of all the occurrences of the compound "*gyu*" in the text, I have not been able to find any instance in which the same "tail" is present. Thus, it seems possible that in this case the tailed *‘a/gyu* represents an attempt of the scribe to remedy a mistake. Indeed, from the manuscript it appears that one letter was written over another one, and even though it may be presumed that the later writing is the intended one, the final reading is altogether unclear. Also, a city whose Chinese name was *Ji gyur* has not been identified. For the time being, the correspondence between the forms *?Ji ‘ur/gyur* and a possible Chinese equivalent needs further research.

34 This name has been reconstructed by Pelliot as *Baqïr Balïq, "the city of copper" (cf. Bacot, 1956: p. 151), but its location has not been established, maybe due to the fact that the corresponding Chinese name has not been identified (see note 19 above). According to K. Czeglédy, "Bahrām Čōbīn and the Persian Apocalyptic Literature," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 8 (1958): pp. 28–32, the Arabic *Madīnatu s-sufrīya* ("Copper City") and the Persian *Rōyīn diž* ("Copper Fortress") are translations of the Turkic *Baqïr Balïq*, and represent the name of the capital of the hero of Persian epic Afrāsiyāb, which is supposed to be located, according to different traditions, either somewhere in Persia or in the vicinity of Bukhara. Both of these locations are much too far west for its position in this text. This is unfortunate, since it seems clear from the text that Ji ‘ur/ Ba ker Pa lig identifies the name of a city or region (according to Czeglédy the capital) of the Uighurs. On *Baqïr Balïq see also Denis Sinor, "Random Remarks on Metallurgical Themes in Pre-Modern Inner Asia," in *Scripta Ottomanica et Res Altaicae* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2002): pp. 308–309.

35 This name seems to designate the Eastern Turks, as it appears evident from the description of the historical episode on ll. 59–63. However, in a pattern similar to that of the name Hor, this name may also refer to some tribal group remnant of the Eastern Turk Empire. In particular, ‘Bug chor appears to be the Tibetan transcription of the Turkic Bük čur, (Modern Mandarin Chinese Mo-cho), the title of the qaghan of the Eastern Türk who reigned between 691 and 716 with the name of Qapağan qağan (on whom see Golden, 1992: p. 137 and Beckwith, 1987: p. 58, n. 23 and passim). The correspondence ‘Bug chor/Mocho was first signalled by Pelliot in the notes in appendix to Bacot's translation of this document (Bacot, 1956: p. 151). According to Clauson, 1957: p. 12 the core of the East-

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

qaghan,[36] one tribe; the Hali,[37] one tribe; the A sha sde,[38] one tribe; the Shar du li,[39] one tribe; the Lo lad,[40] one tribe; the Par sil,[41] one tribe; the Ji ke,[42] one tribe; the So ni,[43] one tribe; *(l. 11)* the Jol ti,[44] one tribe; the Yan ti,[45] one tribe; the Heb dal,[46] one tribe; the Gar rga pur,[47] one tribe.

---

ern Türk Empire was around Qarabalgasun, on the Orkhon river. According to Ligeti, 1971: p. 178, on the contrary, 'Bug chor cannot be identified with the Eastern Turks, but must be identified, on the basis of a fragmentary Tibetan document containing a legendary tale studied by F.W. Thomas, with the region of western Kan-su, around the lake Lop nor. This theory discounts the passage in ll. 59–63 as being too distant from the time of the text's composition. Sinor summarizes the many hypothesis on whether 'Bug chor is a geographical or political term in "Some Components of the Civilization of the Türks (6th to 8th century AD)," in *Altaistic Studies* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1985): pp. 152–153.

36 See the critical edition above, where the text's *Zha ma mo ngan* has been corrected into *Zha ma kha gan*. In fact, the latter personage appears twice in the text as the qaghan of the 'Bug chor Turks (ll. 49–50 and 69–70). This scribal mistake was also identified by Clauson, 1957: p. 13.

37 Clauson, 1957: p. 18, attempts a reconstruction of *Hali* as the name of the Eastern Turk qaghan found in Chinese sources as *Hsieh li* (620–634), on whom see Golden, 1992: pp. 133–134.

38 Clauson, 1957: p. 18 hypothesizes that this may be *A shih te*, the clan name of Toñuquq, chief minister of Elteriš qaghan of the Eastern Turk Empire between 682–691. On Toñuquq see Golden, 1992: pp. 137–138.

39 Clauson, 1957: p. 18 proposes a reconstruction from Chinese, but its certainty is far from clear.

40 *Lo lad* has been reconstructed by Pelliot as *Nu la*, one of the tribes of the Eastern Turks in the 8th century (Bacot, 1956: p. 151). On the *Nu la* see Chavannes, 1942: pp. 32 and 96 (in the *Notes Additionnelles sur les Tou kiue Occidentaux*), and Beckwith, 1987: p. 150.

41 Clauson, 1957: p. 18 proposes a reconstruction from Chinese, but its certainty is far from clear.

42 Unidentified. Note that Bacot mistakenly reads: *rngi ke*.

43 Pelliot proposes to identify this with the *Su ni* tribe of the Türk (Bacot, 1956: p. 151).

44 Unidentified.

45 Unidentified.

46 This tribe is immediately identifiable with the Hephtalites (cf. for example Byzantine Ἀβδέλαι), the powerful confederation which held control over much of Inner Asia at the beginning of the sixth century C.E., and that was crushed by allied Turco-Sasanid forces in 557. The *Heb dal* mentioned here are not necessarily some remnants of the old dynasty, but more likely only a tribe bearing the same name of the more famous confederation.

47 Unidentified.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

They have no king[48]. They have an army of six thousand.

Looking to the east of these, *(l. 13)* those who are called He by the Tibetans, He tse by the Chinese [and] Dad pyi (Tatabï)[49] by the Turks, [their] chief Cong bong ya, decorates the heads of suitable ancestors of the Dad pyi with gold and silver and *(l. 15)* makes [them] into drinking (lit.: "beer") vessels.[50]

From there, looking to the east, in the direction of Ke'u li,[51] region of Chang chung chi, military governor of the direction of Shan tong (Shan-tung),[52] which is called Mug lig[53] by the Turks and Ka'u li by

48 This sentence is very ambiguous, since the use of the term *'di rnams*, "they", does not specify whether the tribes without kings are all, some, or just the last ones among those mentioned. It seems, however, that at least one of these tribes must have had a king. In fact, the name of the first tribe is not a proper ethnonym, but is linked to the tribe's king, Zha ma qaghan. The text is equally vague about which of the tribes has an army of six thousand: does this number represent all of the 'Bug chor forces joined together?

49 The *Dad pyi* have been identified already by Clauson, 1957: p. 19 and Ligeti, 1971: p. 186, n. 70, with the Tatabï, a people of Mongolic stock who lived in this period in the area north of Korea (Manchuria). On the Tatabï see Golden, 1992: pp. 145 and 184.

50 It may be interesting to note here that a similar custom was related almost five hundred years later by Friar Odoric of Pordenone, this time concerning Tibet: "And another fashion they have in this country is this. Suppose such an one's father to die, then the son will say, «I desire to pay respect to my father's memory»; and he calls together all the priests and monks and players in the country round, and likewise all the neighbours and kinsfolk. And they carry the body into the country with great rejoicings. And they have a great table in readiness, upon which the priests cut off the head, and then this is presented to the son. (…) And so he takes his father's head, and straightway cooks it and eats it; and of the skull he maketh a goblet, from which he and all of the family always drink devoutly to the memory of the deceased father". See Henry Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1965): vol. 2, pp. 251–254.

51 Both the spellings *Ka'u li* (l. 15) and *Ke'u li* (l. 16) are transcriptions of the Chinese *Kao-li,* or the state of Koguryo, which at this time did not exist anymore, but that was located in the area corresponding approximately to modern North Korea and Southern Manchuria.

52 This clearly stands for Shan-tung, and it is used to indicate the general direction of the area under discussion.

53 The name *Mug lig*, corresponding to the Turkic *Bükli* of the Orkhon inscriptions, and also attested in a Byzantine account under the form *Μουκρί*, has been identified with the state of Po-hai, located between the northern part of Korea and the eastern area of Manchuria (see Clauson, 1957: pp. 19–20; Ligeti, 1971: p. 186 n. 72; Moriyasu, 1980: pp. 175–176). On the correspondence between *Bükli* and *Μουκρί* see Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantino-*

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the Chinese, *(l. 17)* the people have [their] chin attached to the breast, they eat human flesh and they send out naked[54] their elderly parents and [other] old people and then kill them.

From there, looking to the east, are the southerners called Beg tshe (Paekche),[55] *(l. 19)* who go about naked.

From there, looking south, the people live inside the water like fish.

From there, looking south, [are] the black southerners [who have] white eyes and hair curled like sea horses *(l. 21)*, and who are skilled at swimming like fish.[56]

Looking to the north of the Dad pyi (Tatabï), there are the Da sre,[57] one tribe, who make [their] tent poles with fish ribs, and [as for their] tent covers, the upper class *(l. 23)* makes [them] from fish skin, [while] the lower class makes [them] from birch bark.

---

turcica, (Leiden: Brill, 1983): vol. 2, p. 193 (I am indebted to Professor Christopher Atwood for this bibliographic suggestion).

54 The meaning of the word *skyin po* is uncertain, and, depending on its translation, the whole sense of the phrase changes. Bacot also translates it as "naked". I have found this meaning only in rNam rgyal Tshe ring, *Bod yig brda rnying tshig mdzod* (Beijing, Krung go'i Bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2001): p. 34. In Jaeschke, 1998: p. 26, other relevant entries are *skyin*, "ibex", which results in a translation conveying the (cruel) image of old people grouped and then chased like ibexes to be killed; and *skyin pa/po*, "loan", which gives a translation such as: "they send their elderly parents and [other] old people as a loan (i.e. ransom?) and kill them". Even though tempting, this translation shows a faulty logic. If their old ones are sent as a ransom (to an enemy?), how can they be killed by the Ka'u li people themselves? I have preferred, then, to translate *skyin por* as "naked". Notice, however, that on ll. 18–19 of the text *gcher bu* is used for "naked".

55 *Mon* is a general name given to the countries situated south of Tibet, and thus *Mon ba* means literally "southerner". *Beg tse* corresponds to the Chinese transcription of the name of Paekche, thus indicating that the area under discussion in the text here is the southeastern corner of the Korean peninsula.

56 If *Mon ba* is translated as "southerners" this may be a description of australoid people, dark of skin and curly haired (the Ainu are considered to be part of this group).

57 So far unidentified. Both Clauson, 1957: p. 20 and Moriyasu, 1980: p. 176 note the fact that these were fluvial people of the area close to the Northern Pacific Ocean, an area where birch trees, very common in the taiga, are found and where the hunting of whales, whose skin and bones could be utilized in the manner described above, is possible.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Looking west[58] from the 'Bug chor, the great chief of the nine tribes which are called in Tibetan the Turks of the nine bones,[59] *(l. 25)* the Uighur (*'U yi kor*) military commander[60], has obtained [the title of] qaghan, bestowed by China.[61] Regarding the clan (lit.: "bone"), it is called Yag le ker;[62] as for [its] entourage,[63] it puts on the nine top ornaments,[64] and the tribe of the Uighur (*Ho yo 'or*) uniquely has an army of six thousand.

(l. 27) Looking north of this, are those called Ge tang (Khitan), and the qaghan of the Ge tan,[65] the king, both his food and his religion are similar [to those of] the 'A zha.[66] As for domestic animals, calves, sheep and

---

58 Note the use of *nub* for "west". In the oldest Tibetan texts, such as the *Annals*, the word "west" is consistently *stod*. Consequently, the use of *nub* here may be an indication that this text is later in date.

59 Tib.: *drugu rus dgu*. It is certainly the Tibetan translation of the Turkic *Toquz Oghuz*. According to K. Czeglédy, "On the Numerical Composition of the Ancient Turkish Tribal Confederations," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 25 (1972): pp. 276–277, the tribal confederation of the nine tribes (*toquz oghuz*) included in reality eighteen tribes, i.e. eight *Oghuz* tribes and one *Uighur* tribe, divided into nine sub-tribes. See also Golden, 1992: p. 156: "The Toquz Oğuz union consisted of the ruling Uyğurs, whose own tribal union consisted of ten tribes/clans and eight other tribal units." On the Toquz Oghuz see Edwin G. Pulleyblank, "Some Remarks on the Toquzoghuz Problem," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 28 (1956): 35–42; and James Hamilton, "Toquz Oγuz et On-Uyγur." *Journal Asiatique*, 250 (1962): 23–63.

60 Tib: *do stog*, Turkic *totoq/tutuq*: "military commander".

61 Lit.: "By the great chief of those that are called in Tibetan the nine tribes, the Uighur military commander, the [title of] qaghan, bestowed [and] descended from China, is obtained."

62 This is Yaghlaqar, the name of the royal clan of the Uighur. See Clauson, 1957: p. 20; Golden, 1992: p. 156; Ligeti, 1971: p. 180.

63 Tib. *sgor* is probably a mistake for *skor*, "circle", "entourage". "Circle" is also among the meanings of the word *sgor*. Bacot, 1956: p. 145, translates: "Il établit neuf classes de globules", since he interprets both *sgor* and *tog* as "circle". On the meaning of *tog* see note below.

64 Jaeschke, 1998: p. 205, translates *tog* as "the **top** of anything, **a top ornament**" (his bold type). These may be some kind of buttons or decorations for dignitaries.

65 *Ge tang/Ge tan* has been identified with the Khitan (Clauson, 1957: p. 22; Moriyasu, 1980: p. 176). On the origins of the Khitan see Golden, 1992: pp. 183–187). The spelling mistakes in the transcription of this ethnonym indicate that this text originated from an oral source.

66 *'A zha* is the Tibetan name of the T'u-yü-hun, a Mongolic speaking population that lived around lake Kokonor. On the 'A zha/T'u-yü-hun see Gabriella Molè, *The T'u-yü-hun*

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

horses are common. The language too *(l. 29)* generally agrees with that of the 'A zha. With the Uighur (*Ho yo hor*), sometimes they fight, sometimes they are friends.

From there, looking to the east, are the Dad pyi (Tatabï).

From there, on the north, there is the tribe of the Ga ra byi gir,[67] and [as for their] country, [in] the valleys *(l. 31)* they only have pigs for domestic animals.

From the country where is the one tribe of the Do le man,[68] comes excellent medicinal nectar.[69] There are five tribes who cover [their] tents with birch bark.

From there, looking to the north, *(l. 33)* on the shores of the limitless lake, [as for] the people, their houses and their bodies are similar to [those of] the 'A zha. They have various kinds of domestic animals. As for [their] clothes, they wear fur coats (lit.: "fur skins"). In the winter, on the great plain, the earth is cracked and the people *(l. 35)* cannot pass hither and thither. The great tribe is happy.[70]

From there, looking north east, are the Khe rged,[71] one tribe, who cover their tents with birch bark. They offer to the Hor the skins of blue rodents.

---

from the Northern Wei to the Time of the Five Dynasties. (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1970).

67 Hitherto unidentified. The name seems Turkic (*ga ra = qara*; *byi gir = ?*).

68 Hitherto unidentified.

69 Tib.: *byi tse*. In the dictionaries only *byi tser*, "medicinal nectar" or "medicinal herb" can be found.

70 The meaning of *skyid pa* in modern and classical Tibetan is "happy". However, the sense of this sentence is puzzling, especially considering that this expression (*sde che la skyid pa zhig mchis*) occurs more than once in the text (see ll. 91). It is likely that in Old Tibetan *skyid pa* had a different meaning than the one it has now. This can be inferred by the fact that in this sentence *skyid pa* is followed by *zhig*, "one", which may mean that *skyid pa* does not have an abstract meaning. The literal translation of this sentence is: "To the tribe there is one happiness," or "The great tribe has one happiness."

71 Bacot, 1956: p. 138 identified the *Khe rged* with the Kirghiz, and so did Clauson, 1957: p. 22, who considered this form simply a different transcription than the forms *Hir tis* (l. 46), *Gir tis* (l. 48) and *Hir kis* (l. 55). This does not seem very likely, and Clauson's theory has already been rejected by Moriyasu, 1980: pp. 178–179, who proposes instead a suggestion of Louis Bazin, who hypothesized that the Khe rged may be the Kherait mongols (<Kärägit).

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

(l. 37) From there, on the north, are seven tribes of the Ye dre,[72] who have no king. They continuously fight with the Hor. [They] cover [their] tents with birch bark. As for the birch tree, [they] milk its wood like mother's milk *(l. 39)* to make beer. As for the valley, it is strong.[73]

Looking west of that [place], there are the Gud,[74] one small tribe, who for their houses in the mountains use shelters of straw which they load on stags. As for [their] clothes, they are similar in the winter and in the summer: *(l. 41)* they wear the skins of wild game rubbed with black charcoal. As for food, they eat the meat of wild game, wheat, the medicinal herb *mon bu*, and mouse dung, which is stored by the mice, *(l. 43)* and the mice having become many, is stored inside rotten thick wood by woodpecker birds.[75] To the Hor, they offer the skin of wild beasts.

From there, *(l. 45)* looking northwest, there is one tribe of the Ku chu 'ur.[76] The country is strong, and as [they] do not listen to the orders of the Hor: [they] constantly fight.

Behind them there are two small Hir tis tribes; *(l. 47)* with the Hor sometimes they fight, sometimes they are friendly. From there, in the north is one tribe of the Gir tis. [As for] their eyes, [they] are crystal eyes,

---

72 The *Ye dre* are not identified. Clauson, 1957: p. 22 proposed that they were certainly not Turks, and maybe Finno-Ugric or Tungusic. Moriyasu, 1980: pp. 177–179 instead works on the relations between the Ye dre, the Khe rged, the Gud, the Ku chu 'ur and the Hor, and, interpreting the Hor as the Uighurs of Mongolia, places the Ye dre (as well as the Khe rged) in the area north east of Mongolia, i.e. south east of lake Baikal.

73 Bacot translates: "Le pays est bien fermé" (1956: p. 146). This sentence occurs more than once (ll. 45, 65, 67), and since the meaning of *brtsan* is "strong", "mighty", "powerful"; but also "firm" or "safe"', it seems to convey a sense of topographical and military position of strength of the country in question. Less literally, it could be rendered as: "Their land enjoys a [strategic] position of strength."

74 Hitherto unidentified.

75 This interconnected story is probably a folk motif that found its way into this account. *Mon bu* seems to be the name of a medicinal herb (see rNam rgyal Tshe ring, 2001: p.400) while *shing sta mo* seems to be equivalent to *shing rta mo*, a kind of woodpecker.

76 This tribe was identified by Ligeti, 1971: pp. 184–185 as the *Küčügür*, a tribe of the Naiman mongols mentioned in the *Secret History of the Mongols*. According to Moriyasu, 1980: p. 177 the Naimans in the 8th century occupied the region of the Tannu-ula Mountains.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

[as for] their hair, [they] are red [and] in their country there are various kinds of domestic animals. The horses *(l. 49)* are born big.[77]

From there, in the north it is cut off by a large mountain chain of sandy deserts; when Zha ma qaghan[78] led the army, the army could not cross [it]. On the other side of that [mountain chain], in the north, *(l. 51)* there is a people with big, tall bodies. Their bodies are about three fathoms. [Their] arrows, *zhi*,[79] weapons and food are similar to those of the other kings. In making enemies, [they] pay attention not to regret,[80] *(l. 53)* and there is no ritual (*chos*) for those who die. If a person dies, [they] make no funeral and build no tomb. From children who communicate with signs on up, [they] pay obeisance to the *Lha*.[81] As domestic animals they

---

77 The ethnonyms *Hir tis* and *Gir tis* are both a transcription of Kirghiz. This ethnonym appears again in the text as *Hir kis* (l. 55). This description of the physical features of the Kirghiz is not dissimilar from those found both in the Chinese and Islamic sources. The Kirghiz, in fact, were probably of non-Turkic stock, and archeological excavations have revealed a mix of Mongoloid and European features. On the origins of the Kirghiz, see Golden, 1992: pp. 176–183.

78 According to Clauson, 1957: p. 13 *Zha ma kha gan* is to be reconstructed as Özmiš qaghan, the last king of the Eastern Turk Empire.

79 *Zhi* means "calm", "quiet", "peace", all meanings that do not quite adapt to this context. We may suppose that *zhi* is a scribal error for *bzhi*, "four", but the ensuing sense of "four arrows" is beyond my comprehension. The other possibility would be a scribal error for *gzhi*, which means "base", "foundation", but also "residence", "abode" and "seat", "place". If we accept this possibility, the ensuing translation would be: "Their arrows, residences, (…)". Bacot, 1956: p. 146 reads *zhi* as *nyi*, "sun", and translates *nyi cha* as "exposé au soleil", thus arriving at a translation completely different from mine: "Le versant de la vallée étant exposé au soleil, il a autant de force et de nourriture que les autres rois." This translation cannot be accepted, first because the reading is certainly *zhi* and not *nyi*, and secondly because "the side of the valley" is nowhere to be found in the text. An interesting reading of this passage has been proposed by Gedun Rabsal (oral communication). In his opinion *mda'* "arrow" should be read *mnga'*, an honorific form of the verb to be, and *zhi* should be corrected as *zhing*, the suffix indicating the gerund form of a verb. With this reading, *mnga' zhing* would be syntactically attached to the former part of the sentence ("Their bodies being about three fathoms"), and the list of similarities with the other kings would include only the weapons and the food, thus resulting in the following translation: "Their bodies are about three fathoms and their weapons and food are similar to those of the other kings." However, this rendering may be criticized because it involves too many changes of the original text.

80 That is, these "giants" feel no remorse and, in short, are vindictive.

81 This passage seems to mean that among the giants, as soon as the children became able to communicate with signs (i.e. to speak), they began to worship deities (*Lha*). In fact,

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

have various kinds of calves and sheep. *(l. 55)* [As for] the Hir kis, when [they] send a messenger, [the giants?] say: "[You] are like this: a dog who comes to steal like children." [The giants] put inside his (the messenger's) ears (object?) *(l. 57)* and tie [him] to hang [him]. [They] ask to the messenger: "Our herdsman of calves and sheep, the one in the clan which is called Ga ra gang lig, where does he dwell"?[82] As for the other side of the giants, *(l. 59)* word has not been heard that there are men.

On the north of that there are five Ba sme[83] tribes, which united in a confederation of three with the Hor and the Gar log. They overthrew the rule of the qaghan, the king of the 'Bug chor. *(l. 61)* The chief of the Ba mel obtained the [title of] qaghan, but the Hor and the Gar log killed the Ba mel qaghan. The tribe of the Ba smel dispersed and became *(l. 63)* as slaves. The territory of the Ba smel, one tribe of the Ges dum,[84] the terri-

---

Tib.: *yan chad* 'above' is to be interpreted as "from this point on". Tib. *Lha*, often translated as "gods" or "deities", is best left untranslated or, at maximum, rendered as "supramundane being".

82 This sentence is problematic because the subjects of the verbs are always missing. In one case also the direct object is missing: we do not know what is put inside the ears, and we may presume it is something by which the person is hung (a form of torture?). The key to understanding this sentence may be in reading the expression *dpyang la 'dogs* "tied and hung" as a mistake for *dpyad la 'dogs*, "tied and interrogated". Thus interpreted, the following translation would ensue; "As for the Hir kis, when they send a messenger, [the giants?] say: '[You] are like this; dogs who come to steal like children.' [The giants tie [him] to interrogate [him] and ask the messenger (…)." Unfortunately, however, the orthography of the *nga* of *dpyang* does not give room to misinterpretations and thus the reading *dpyad* is, from the point of view of paleography, a forced one. In his translation, Bacot is mute on the problematic passage and simply renders: "Il l'attacha pour le pendre". See Bacot, 1956: p. 146. See also his note 22 on p. 150 in which he admits to have left untranslated the passage *khong ta'i rna zhu nang du stsal te*.

83 These are the Basmïl. What follows is a brief account of the events of the years 742–744. On the Basmïls see Golden, 1992: pp. 142–143; René Grousset, *The Empire of the Steppe* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991): p. 113. Note that the name for Basmïl is always spelled differently. This points to a redaction of the original text made from an oral source. In fact, one may easily imagine that each time a foreign name would be uttered, the Tibetan scribe would try to transcribe it in a way as close as possible to the sounds he was hearing. Only the last two times the name Basmïl is mentioned does the scribe seem to have decided on the correct way to transcribe its sound.

84 After a suggestion from Clauson, 1957: p. 14, Hambis has identified the *Ges dum* of this text with the Käštim, one of the tribes defeated by Činggis Khan. See Louis Hambis, "Käštim et Ges dum," *Journal Asiatique* 246 (1958): 313–320.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tory of the Ba smel,[85] one tribe of the Ba yar bgo,[86] [had] the chief Yed myis hir kin;[87] one tribe of the Hi dog kas,[88] *(l. 65)* [had] the chief Hi kil kor hir kin; [their] country is strong and the Gar logs did not get [it].

From there, on the north, the tribe of the Go kog[89] does not fight or contend with anybody.

To the west of that, *(l. 67)* there are about ten tribes.[90] Some [have] a strong country, some [have] great valleys, others [have] a good country and great pasture land.

To the north of these, beyond the great mountain chain of sandy desert, *(l. 69)* there are two tribes of the king of heaven.[91] At the time when the rule of Zha ma qaghan, the king of the 'Bug chor, was peaceful, when [he] lead the army in this direction, the army could not pass and *(l. 71)* two men went wandering about. Having run into the tracks of a female camel, as the tracks went towards pure water, near a herd of female camels *(l. 73)* they ran into a pure woman, and, speaking in Turkic, the woman led [them] and they followed [her] into hiding. A pack of dogs *(l. 75)* that was chasing game came back, so the dogs perceived them with their nose and [they] prostrated to the dogs. Then, the dogs loaded on ten female camels whatever they needed and water to cross over the sandy desert, *(l. 77)* and, having sent [them] back, they arrived (i.e. returned) to the country of the Turks.

---

85 This seems to be a dittoism, probably due to a mistake by the copyist of this particular manuscript. It would seem that the verb of this sentence should be here (possibly "taken", or "occupied"). Another possibility is that what is missing here is not the verb, but the name of the chief of this tribe (see the pattern in the following two lines), such as: "their chief (name) *irkin*".

86 This has been reconstructed as the Bayïrqu of the Orkhon inscriptions (Bacot, 1956: p. 152; Clauson, 1957: p. 14; Ligeti, 1971: p. 186; Moriyasu, 1980: p. 179). Golden, 1992: p. 143 confirms that their ruler held the title of *irkin*. He also asserts that "their habitat was North of the Tola river and South of the Uighurs, with whom they appear to be connected".

87 *Irkin* is a well known Turkic title designating a tribal chief (Golden, 1992: p. 136). Bacot read the name of this chief as *Yer myis*.

88 Clauson, 1957: p. 14 proposed three different interpretations for the identification of *Hi dog kas*, however, none of them has been endorsed by other scholars.

89 Hitherto unidentified.

90 Clauson, 1957: p. 15 interpreted these as the *On oq*. However Moriyasu, 1980: 180 deemed his hypothesis unacceptable.

91 This seems to be the Tibetan translation of *tengri qaghan*.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The first dog descended from heaven. It emanated into two, a red dog and a black dog, and, as a consort, *(l. 79)* whilst [they] met with a she wolf and mated [with her], she was not suitable for children. Then, [they] abducted a maiden from the wing of a Turkic household and united with that girl. As for the male children, [they] came out as dogs. Concerning the daughters, *(l. 81)* [they] came out as human and appeared as pure women (i.e. genuine women). Concerning the tribe of the red dog, it is called the Ge zir gu shu.[92] Concerning the tribe of the black dog, it is called the Ga ra gu shu[93] and the dogs and *(l. 83)* the women speak in Turkic.[94] As for [their] wealth and food, such as cattle, the women put it together and use it. Beyond that, none have heard tell that there are men.

Looking to the west of this, *(l. 85)* there are the three tribes of the Gar log.[95] They have an army of eight thousand. They fight with the Du rgyas[96] and with the Ta zhig.[97]

Looking to the east of that, there are three tribes of the Og rag,[98] and, *(l. 87)* looking in the direction of the great Ho yo hor, [they] make offerings to look for and summon *Ne shag* doctors of the law and they fight with the Ho yo hor.[99]

---

92 Lit.: "Red Snouts" (Old Turkic: *qïzïl küšü*). See Ligeti, 1971: p. 186.

93 Lit. "Black Snouts" (Old Turkic: *qara küšü*). See Ligeti, 1971: p. 186.

94 It is interesting to note that a story similar to this was related about five hundred years later by friar C. De Bridia in his *Historia Tartarorum*: "The Tartar (…) marching for more than a month through the desert reached the Land of Dogs, which in Tartar is called Nochoy Kadzar; for *nochoy* means dog in Tartar and *kadzar* means land. They found only women there without men (…). They asked the women where and of what kind the men were, and they replied that they were dogs by nature". See R. A. Skelton, Thomas E. Marston and George Painter, *The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965) p. 70.

95 As in ll. 60 and 62, Tib. *Gar log* transcribes Qarluq.

96 The Türgïš, who are in fact known for having caused quite a bit of trouble to the Arabs in the 8th century, together with their allies, the Tibetans. They were destroyed in 730 by joined Arab-Chinese forces, the same forces that defeated their Tibetan allies in 742. The Qarluq moved into the land of the Türgïš. On the Türgïš see Beckwith, 1987: chapters 3 and 4 especially.

97 This is the Tibetan transcription of the Middle Persian word for Arab, *Tayy/Tadjik*. This was originally the name of one of the Arab tribes which, by extension, became applied to the whole group.

98 According to Clauson, 1957: p. 15, these are the Oghraq of Mahmud Kashgari.

99 Here it would seem that the adjective *ce*, "great" added to the ethnonym *Ho yo hor* may indicate the Uighur Empire. It is unfortunate that the meaning of the term *Ne shag* is not

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

To the northeast of them, there are *(l. 89)* the I bil kor, one tribe, [which] issued out of the Gu log gol chor Turks and has an army of one thousand.[100]

To the north west of them, there is one tribe of the Be ca nag,[101] which has five thousand troops. They fight with the Hor.

To the west of them, *(l. 91)* there is one tribe of the Ha la yun log[102] Turks and this great tribe is happy; therefore they are called the piebald horse Turks.

To the north of them, beyond the mountain chain of sandy deserts, *(l. 93)* [there are] those called the Ud ha dag leg.[103] [Their] feet have

---

known, since this sentence seem to hint at the existence of Manichaeism among the Uighurs (whether or not this was the Uighur empire, or the Uighurs of Mongolia, as Moriyasu proposes, or still a larger Uighur group – as opposed to a small detachment – as Ligeti suggests). So far the most convincing hypothesis for the word *Ne shag* (which, as noted by Clauson, cannot be a Turkic word, since it has an initial "n") is that it may come from the Sogdian Ni-γo-shag, meaning "manichean layman". See Moriyasu 1980: p. 181.

100 Both names have not been identified.

101 These are the Pečeneg, who moved from North of the Aral sea to an area North of the Caspian Sea sometime during the second half of the 8th century. The Pečeneg were encountered in the area north of the Caspian Sea by the Muslim traveler ibn Fadlan in the early 10th century. On the Pečeneg see Omeljan Pritsak, "The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation," in *Studies in Medieval Eurasian History*. (London: Variorum Reprints: 1981); and Golden, 1992: pp. 264–270.

102 This tribe has been identified by Ligeti, 1971: pp. 181–182 with the Alayondluq of Mahmud Kashgari, an Oghuz tribe. The Tibetan for "piebald horse" is an *ad literam* translation of the Old Turkic: **Hala/*Ala* = Tib. *skra*; *yund* = Tib. *rta*; *luq* = Tib. *can*. According to Toru Senga, "«Northern» Neighbors of the Khazars around 750 A.D.," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 64 (1992): p. 66, the Ha la yund log, which he translates as "(the people) with piebald horses", lived "on the southern parts of the West Siberian lowlands, lying to the south of its marshy regions and between the Ob and Ishim rivers".

103 Turkic: Ud hadaglig. Again, the Tibetan for "feet with oxen hooves" is a literal translation of the Turkic; see Ligeti, 1971: pp. 182. Senga proposes that the Ud hadaglig lived in the basins of the upper Ural and Tobol rivers (cf. Senga, 1992: 68). It is curious to note that a people which seem to correspond to the Ud hadaglig was mentioned in the *Historia Tartarorum*: " Lastly they came to the people called Ucorcolon, that is, ox-feet, because *ucor* is Tartar for ox and *colon* for foot or otherwise Nochoyterim, that is Dog-heads, *nochoy* being Tartar for dog and *terim* for head. They have feet like oxen from the ankles down, and a human head from the back of the head to the ears, but with a face in every respect like a dog's, and for that reason they take name from the part of them which is monstrous in form". See R.A. Skelton *et alia*, 1965: p. 75.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

oxen hooves and [their] bodies are covered[104] with hair. They eat human flesh.

Beyond this direction, *(l. 95)* there is a group of savage Turkic people. The leg of one of the savage men broke, and since he could not walk, [his] friends killed a horse in front of [his] broken leg. Then [they] gathered much wood and *(l. 97)* handed [him] a flint. [They] left [him] there. After a little while, a tiger was completely exhausted and went close to the broken leg. Behind the tiger, [there came something]: the body bigger than a rodent, *(l. 99)* the fur hard as an iron tool, the neck and the flanks on the right and on the left with a white spot about [the size of] a thumb, and since the man with the broken leg *(l. 101)* shot with one arrow toward the white flank and killed [it], as for [its] body, it was humped like a pig, as for its fur, it was hard and spiky as an iron tool, and it went from the beginning of the nose *(l. 103)* to the tip of the tail, as pointy as a sword. In Turkic it is called *kog nyo yog*[105] […] *(l. 104)* […] great […] and saw the tiger and the hedgehog (*lgang*)[106] fight there. *(l. 105)* […] until healed (?); the tiger killed the wild beast. *(l. 106)* […] the man's proportions (?) are similar to the other body; the small garment *(l. 107)* […] screamed when the bone moved right (?); his *(l. 108)* […] inside one (…).

GLOSSARY

A-shih-te	阿史德	Nu-la	奴剌
Hsieh-li	頡利	Paekche	百濟
Kao-li	高麗	Po-hai	渤海
Mo-cho	默啜	Su-ni	蘇尼

104 Tib. *shol ba*: "intercalation, insertion" (cf. Jaeschke, 1998: p. 564). In this context the body of the Ud ha dag leg is "interspersed" or covered with hair.

105 From the context of the text *kog nyo yog* appears to be the Turkic for "hedgehog" or "porcupine" however no scholar has been able to find trace of this word, either in old or modern Turkic languages.

106 Old Tibetan *lgang* = modern Tibetan *rgang*, "hedgehog or perhaps rather porcupine" (see Jaeschke, 1998: p. 103). On the role of the hedgehog in Altaic mythology, see Erika Taube, "Der Igel in der Mythologie Altaischer Völker," in Bernt Brendemoen, ed. *Altaica Osloensia* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1991): pp. 339–354.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

List of References

Bacot, Jacques 1956: "Reconnaissance en Haute Asie Septentrionale par cinq envoyés Ouigours au VIIIe siècle." *Journal Asiatique*, 244: 137–153.

Beckwith, Christopher 1987: *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bregel, Yuri, 2003: *An Historical Atlas of Central Asia*. Leiden: Brill.

Chavannes, Edouard 1942: *Documents sur le Tou-Kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.

Clauson, Gerard 1957: "À propos du Manuscrit Pelliot Tibétain 1283." *Journal Asiatique*, 245: 11–24.

Czeglédy, K. 1958: "Bahrām Čōbīn and the Persian Apocalyptic Literature." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 8: 21–50.

Czeglédy, K. 1972: "On the Numerical Composition of the Ancient Turkish Tribal Confederations." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 25: 275–281.

Golden, Peter 1992: *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Golden, Peter 2001: *Ethnicity and State Formation in Pre-Činggisid Turkic Eurasia*. Bloomington: Department of Central Eurasian Studies, Indiana University.

Grousset, René 1991: *The Empire of the Steppes*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press (repr. 1970).

Hamilton, James 1962: "Toquz Oγuz et On-Uyγur." *Journal Asiatique*, 250: 23–63.

Hambis, Louis 1958: "Käštim et Ges dum." *Journal Asiatique* 246: 313–320.

Imaeda, Yoshiro and Spanien, Ariane 1979: *Choix de documents tibétains conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale*. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, vol. 2.

Jaeschke, H.A. 1998: *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Richmond: Curzon (repr. 1881).

Kara, György 1996: "Aramaic Scripts for Altaic Languages," in Peter T. Daniels and William Bright, eds. *The World's Writing Systems*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 536–558.

Lalou, Marcelle 1961: *Inventaire des Manuscrits Tibétains de Touen-houang conservé à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, vol. III. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Li Fang Kuei and W. South Coblin 1987: *A Study of the Old Tibetan Inscriptions*. Taipei: Chung yang yen chiu yüan li shih yü yen yen chiu so.

Ligeti, Louis 1971: "A propos du «Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord» ," in *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 166–189.

Mackerras, Colin 1969: "Sino-Uighur Diplomatic and Trade Contracts (744 to 840)." *Central Asiatic Journal*, 13.1: 215–240.

Mackerras, Colin 1973: *The Uyghur Empire According to the T'ang Dynastic Histories*. Columbia: University of Southern Carolina Press.

Minorsky, Vladimir 1948: "Tamīm ibn Bahr's Journey to the Uyghurs." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 12.2: 275–305.

Molè, Gabriella 1970: *The T'u-yü-hun from the Northern Wei to theTime of the Five Dynasties*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Moravcsik, Gyula 1983: *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.

Moriyasu, Takao 1977: "Tibetto-go shiryō chū ni arawareru Hoppō minzoku – Drugu to Hor," *Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyū* (*Journal of Asian and African Studies*), 14 (1977): 1–48.

Moriyasu, Takao 1980: "La nouvelle interprétation des mots *Hor* et *Ho-yo-hor* dans le manuscrit Pelliot Tibétain 1283." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 34: 171–184.

rNam rgyal tshe ring, 2001: *Bod yig brda rnying tshig mdzod*. Beijing: Krung kho'i Bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.

Pelliot, Paul 1959–1973: *Notes on Marco Polo*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 3 volumes.

Pritsak, Omeljan 1981: "The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation." in *Studies in Medieval Eurasian History*. London: Variorum Reprints: chapter X.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1956: "Some Remarks on the Toquzoghuz Problem." *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 28: 35–42.

Sinor, Denis 1982: "The Legendary Origin of the Turks," in *Folklorica: Festschrift for Felix J. Oinas*. Edited by Egle Victoria Žygas and Peter Voorheis, Bloomington: Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 141: 223–257.

Sinor, Denis 1985: "Some Components of the Civilization of the Türks (6th to 8th century)," in G. Jarring and S. Rosén, eds. *Altaistic Studies*. Papers Presented at the 25th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference at Uppsala June 7–11, 1982. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International: 145–159.

Sinor, Denis, 2002 "Random Remarks on Metallurgical Themes in Pre-Modern Inner Asia," in I. Hauenschild, C. Schönig and P. Zieme, eds.:

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Scripta Ottomanica et Res Altaica. Festschrift für Barbara Kellner-Heinkele zu ihrem 60. Geburtstag. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag: 297–312.

Skelton, R.A., Marston, Thomas E. and Painter, George 1965: *The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Stein, R.A., 1988: "Tibetica Antiqua V: La religion indigène et les *Bon-po* dans les Manuscrits de Touen-Houang," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, 77: 27–56.

Taube, Erika 1991: "Der Igel in der Mythologie Altaischer Völker," in Bernt Brendemoer, ed. *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (Oslo, June 12–16, 1989)*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget: 339–354.

Tucci, Giuseppe 1950: *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Uray, Géza 1981: "L'emploi du tibétain dans les chancelleries des états du Kan-sou et de Khotan postérieurs à la domination tibétaine." *Journal Asiatique*, 269: 81–90.

Yule, Henry 1965: *Cathay and the Way Thither*, vol. 2. London: The Hakluyt Society (repr. 1889).

This content downloaded from 134.76.21.204 on Thu, 30 Oct 2014 11:36:06 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions