Offprint

CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

Edited by Giovanni Stary

44 (2000) 2

Harrassowitz Verlag

CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature, History and Archaeology of Central Asia

Founded by Karl Jahn
Edited by Giovanni Stary

CONTENTS of CAJ 44/2 (2000)

Articles

Reviews

Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers in the Old Turkic Inscriptions

by
VOLKER RYBATZKI
(University of Helsinki)

In this article I would like to speak about the names and titles of Türk and Uigur rulers in the Old Turkic inscriptions. My aim is to give a picture of what were the names and titles of these rulers, as well as to give some thoughts about the structure of their titles. This study may be of some use, when for exemple investigating OT manuscripts. Attempts have been made to date some of these manuscripts, on the basis of the titles, to the period of the Uigur Steppe Qanate. A comparison of the titles of some of the manuscripts with those of the inscriptions, given in the last part of the article, reveals, however, that only some of the titles, for example the one occurring in the *Mahrnāmag* can be considered identical with those appearing in the inscriptions. Others, like the titles of the famous *Pfahlinschriften*, differ considerably and have to be dated later; structurally similar titles, belonging to the 11th century, have been published by Yang [1994].

My attempt to date some of the Old Uigur manuscripts relies mostly on the examination of the structure of the titles. More linguistic attempts to date Old Uigur manuscripts have been undertaken by Zieme [1969], Erdal [1979] and Doerfer [1993(b)]. A comprehensive study on various aspects of Old and Middle Turkic as well as Old Uigur dating systems has been made by Bazin [1991].

This article has a long story. Originally it was presented as a paper at the Fifth European Seminar of Central Asian Studies in Copenhagen in 1995. Afterwards, I prepared the paper for publication in the proceedings of the seminar, but, due to the great number of Chinese characters, the editors of the proceedings were not able to print the article. In 1998 Giovanni Stary, after reading an earlier version of the article, showed an interest in publishing it in the *Central Asiatic Journal*. Last, but not least, in the early summer of 1999 I received the important publication *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*, edited by Takao Moriyasu and Ayudai Ochir, containing a lot of new readings and interpretations of different parts of the inscriptions. Due to the long time of processing this article, it may contain some unevenness for which I apologize.

In this place I would like to thank several people, who took their time and gave suggestions to improve this article, particulary James R. Hamilton and Sergej G. Kljaštornyj, as well as Stefan Kuzay, who helped me in processing the Chinese characters of the article. A special thank goes to my teachers Harry Halén and Juha Janhunen, who read and commented on earlier versions of this article, and gave all their support in a very difficult personal situation. Alessandra Pozzi not only explained me the grammatical structure of some of the Chinese parts of the titles, but also, by taking care of everything practical and unpractical, made it possible that this article could ever be finished. A special thanks goes to Peter Zieme, who made a numbers of very valuable corrections regarding different parts of the texts. Due to lack of time not all of these corrections could be taken into consideration in a way they deserve.

It is needless to say that all points of view are mine, and some views, for example my reading *kül* instead of *köl*, differ from those suggested by the above mentioned scholars.

Rulers of the first Türk empire

†552 Bumïn [? ~~†552~~], the founder of the first Türk Qanate, occurs in the *Zhoushu* (50), *Suishu* (84) and *Xin Tangshu* (215A; 215B) as *Tumen* [(1)[1]; MChinL *t^huə'mun*, MChinE *thɔ'mən* (all MChin. reconstructions are given, if not otherwise indicated, after Pul-

1 The numbers in brackets refer to the glossary of Chinese characters.

leyblank 1991) [Liu 1958. 7, 41, 181, 781]. Bumïn's regnal title was *yili kehan* [(2); MChinL *ʔjili*, MChinE *ʔjilih*], according to the *Zhoushu* identical with the title *shanyu* of the Xiongnu [Liu 1958.7]; the *Tangshu* states, however, that *qaγan* is identical with *shanyu* [Liu 1958.181].

On a Post-Sasanidian seal, written in Pahlavi script, the same name appears as *bwmyn* [*Būmēn*] [Brunner 1978. 147:47, Yamauchi 1993.14].

Yili kehan has usually been read *ellig qaγan*, but there are some problems with this reading. – OT *el* is transcribed in the Qarabalγasun-inscription by the character *xie* (3); MChinL *xɦjiat*, MChinE *γεt*]. It has to be noticed that the same Chin. characters are used to transcribe OT words in the Chin. parts of the inscriptions. When comparing the Chin. parts of the Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscriptions with the Qarabalγasun-inscription, only some exceptions are discernible. The phonetical value of these variants is nearly identical, but this is not the case with *yi* (4) and *xie* (5). The phonetical value of the second character *li* (6) does not fit either, most disturbing is the absence of the final *-g*, as MChin. still possessed final velar consonants. According to Hamilton [1955.166, Nr. 39] the second character *li* stands for OT *-l*, so the word behind *yili* could be *el*, and the whole title would have to be read *el qaγan* in this case. Erdal [1993.93] compared *yili kehan* with the form *elig xan* > *elxan* and suggested that *yili kehan* should possibly be considered as an early example of 'Geminatenvereinfachung'. This suggestion is supported by Pulleyblank's MChin. reconstructions. Erdal's proposal is, nevertheless, problematic, as it is by no means sure that the title *el/ellig qaγan* is semantically identical with the later title *elxan*.

The same element *yili* occurs also in the title of Nawār as given in the *Suishu*. In this connection *yili* has been read by Pelliot [1929b.210] as *el* and translated as 'realm, pax'. Pritsak [1985.206] on the contrary reads **ilik* and translates 'king, ruler'. Neither of these two explanations seems to fit the context and I have a strong feeling that *yili* transcribes a different word than *el* or *elig*, although I cannot give any suggestion yet. If *yili* is a transcription of *ellig*, this word has to be taken as an adjective and must be translated 'having a land'. In this last case, Bumïn's title is 'Qaγan who has a land', and Nawār's title is *yili julu she* *mophe shiboluo kehan* (16) 'Külüg Šad, Baγa Ïšbara Qaγan, who has a land'.

According to Kljaštornyj & Livšic [1972] Bumïn is mentioned twice in the Bugut stela [BII:8, BII:9], once [BII:10] in connection with an inquiry of the ruling Qaγan, interpreted by them as concerning the foundation of a Buddhist monastery. These readings are not confirmed by Yoshida & Moriyasu [1999], as they read [BII:8] as *mγ' wmn x'γ'n*, and [BII:9] as a blank spot. Furthermore, they do not accept the interpretation of Kljaštornyj & Livšic regarding line [BII:10]. Whereas the later read *nw(h) snk'* 'a new saṃgha', connecting the last word with SogdB *snk* for Chin. *seng = saṃgha: pwrsnk* 'community of monks', trl. Chin. *seng = (bhikṣu)saṃgha* [MacKenzie 1976.131], *snk, snkh, snk'* [*sang*] < Skt. *saṃgha* 'Buddhist church' [Gharib 8858, 8860], Yoshida & Moriyasu read *nwm snk'* 'a stone of law', < SogdM,C *sng* [*sang*] < Av.- *asənga* 'stone; St. Peter, Petrus' [Gharib 8855]; sogdB, S *snk*, sogdC *snq* [*sang*] 'stone, rock' [Gharib 8857, 8859], SogdM *sngcyk* [*sangčīk*] '(of) stone' [Gharib 8856], SogdB *snk'yn'k* [*sangēnē*] 'of stone' [Gharib 8863]. Taking into consideration the only little known Buddhist influence on the early Türks, the later interpretation seems preferable.

In the Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscriptions Bumïn Qaγan and Istemi Qaγan are called *ečü apa* 'forefathers', thus being considered the first rulers of mankind, and organisers of the traditional law, *törü*, and of the land, *el*.

> (KT O1 = BQ O2–3) ... *: ekin ara : kiši oγlï : qïlïnmïš : kiši : oγlïnda : üze : ečüm apam : bumïn qaγan : istemi qaγan : olurmïs : olurpan : türk : bodunuŋ : elin törüsin : tuta : bermiš : iti : bermiš :* 'Between the two [heaven and earth] he [*teŋri*] created the human children, [and] over the human children my ancestors Bumïn Qaγan [and] Istemi Qaγan reigned. After they were installed, they organized the land and the traditional law of the Türk clans'.

The Ongiin-inscription, usually dated as standing temporally between the Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscriptions, mentions a forefather whose name has been read as Yamï:

> (O 1) *ečümiz : apamïz : yamï : qaγan : tört : buluŋuγ : etmïš : yïγmïš : (y)aymïš : basmïš : ol qan yoq : boltuqda : kisre [: el :]*

> *yitmiš : ïčγïnmïš : q[ačmïš e]r[ti].* 'Our forefather Yamï Qaγan organised the four quarters, he collected, distributed [and] conquered. After that ruler died, the confederation perished, collapsed [and] disappeared.'

According to Clauson [1957.184] the name has to be read *istemi*, whereas Marquart, followed by Malov [1959.8] reads *bumïn*. All other sources have *yamï*. Attempts have also been made to connect the name with a Qaγan, mentioned in a Tib. manuscript from Dunhuang as *ža-ma-mo-ṅan* [Bacot 1956.151].

None of these identifications is convincing, although they might get some support from the textual context. As can be shown by comparing the written forms of the names Yamï [𐰖𐰢𐰃], Bumïn [𐰉𐰆𐰢𐰣] and Istemi [𐰃𐰽𐱅𐰢𐰃], after a possible emendation Bumïn would suit better than Istemi. Perhaps, however, the name mentioned here should be compared with the name Yoluγ [𐰖𐰆𐰞𐰍] mentioned as a forefather of the Uigurs in the Terx-inscription. Although also this interpretation includes a number of emendations: [𐰆𐰞] 'ol' = [𐰢] 'm', and [𐰍] 'γ' = [𐰃] 'i', these do not present unsurmountable difficulties. Furthermore, the emendations are not as forced as those included in the readings Bumïn or Istemi. The reading of 'i' as 'γ' is possible as only the upper left part is missing. The form of the 'm' employed in the Ongiin-inscription differs considerably from the 'standard-form' used in the Orxon-inscriptions, being identical with the variant used in the Tes-inscription [cf. Kljaštornyj 1985.156] and some Yenisei-inscriptions [Vasil'ev 1983a.124, Nr. 18:28, first form], coming very close to 'ol'.

In the light of the facts mentioned before, the 'up-till-now' dating of the Ongiin-inscription to the year 720 or 732 might not be right, as for paleographic as well as onomastic reasons the inscription might belong to the beginning of the period of the Uigur Steppe empire. Several other facts could support a dating to the first years of the Uigur empire, probably 744 or 756. The inscription uses as a mean of dating the animal-cycle, used regulary and extensively by those inscriptions belonging to the Uigur empire, but occurring only seldom in the Türk-inscriptions. A further piece of evidence could be the title *tengriken*, used only in this inscription, and in inscriptions and manuscripts *not* belonging to the second Türk empire:

(O 5–6) *qaŋïm : [...] teŋriken : eyin : anda : yorïmïš : išig küčin : (bermiš erti)* [10–14 words missing] *teŋrikenke : išig : bertiŋ : teyin : yarlïqamïš : šad : atïγ : anda : bermiš :* 'My father ... thereupon marched behind His Sacred Majesty and gave him his service. ... deigned to say ⟨You have given your service to my Sacred Majesty⟩ and there and then gave him the title of šad' [Clauson 1957.188]. (Q 1 = inscription shield) *"y tnkrδ' γwtpwr-myš 'ŗ-p[w] pyŗ-k' ßγy 'w[y]γwr γ'γ-'n* 'This Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Alp Bilge Baγi Uigur Qaγan' = Uig. inscription on the other side of the shield: *[b]u teŋriken teŋride qut bulmïš al[p] bilge teŋri uyγur qa[γanïŋ[...].* (Khutuk-Ula I) *q(a)ra k(e)r(e)kü t(e)ŋr(i)k(e)n (a)t yeg (i)n(e)nč (č)or* 'der himmlische Herrscher der ⟨schwarzen Zelte⟩; [sein] Name Yeg Inenč Čor' [Tryjarski & Hamilton 1975].

(MI 31u.4) *t(e)ngriken qunčuy* 'die erhabene Fürstin'. (MI 31u.6) ... *t(e)ngrikenim* 'mein Göttlicher'. (MIII 34o.r6–7; UI 57) *///ta]rqan quncuylar tngriken t(e)gitler ['il ü]gesii 'ilčii bilgeler q(a)m(a)γat(ï/a)γ* '(die im gesegnetem Land lebenden) Edelleute, Prinzessinnen, göttergleichen Prinzen, Il-Üge, Diplomaten und alle Namhaften'. (MIII 36m.r1) *tngriikenmz büg[ü///.* (MIII 36m.r4–6) ·· *tngriken qunčuy ///trqan tigitler ·· 'ilčii bilgeler ///lar tngrikenim* ··. (MIII 40o.r3–4) *// yaru]q bügü /// tngrikenimz* 'unser lichter, gebetsmächtiger /// Tengriken'. (MIII 40o.v5–9) ·· *anï ü[čün] qočo uluš ikii otuz balïq qutïï waχšikii ·· yme suγančïγ tngriknmz uluγ qutïn ertingüü* ·· 'Deshalb (hat) das Glück und der (Schutz)-Geist des Reiches Qočo und der zweiundzwanzig Städte ·· und unser lieblicher Tengriken seine hohe Majestät sehr'. (MIII 46u.1) *tngriken ///.* (MIII 46u.4) *[tngri]ken qaraquš t[egin ///.* (MIII 46u.5) *[tngr]iken yugetmiš ///.* (MXI I.1–2) *[...] tengriken uiγur buquq qan* '[...] der himmlische Uigur-Buquq-Qan'.

(Pfahl I.2–3) [...] *kün ay tngriteg küsenčig körte yaruq tngri büg[ü] tngriken-im[i]z kül bilge tngri ilig-niŋ orunqa olurmïš [...]* 'als Kün Ay Tengriteg [aus] Quča, [der] Körtle Yaruq Tengri, unser Bügü Tengriken, auf des Kül Bilge Tengri-Königs Thron saß'. (Pf I.4) [...] *upasanč tngriken tegin silig terken qunčui tngrim* '[...] die Laienschwester Tengriken Tegin Silig Terken Qunčui Tengrim'. (Pf I.13) · *tngriken körtle tngrim* ·. (Pf II.5–6) *tngriken körtle qatun tngrim · amraq qïzïmïz* *yigetmiš qatun tngrim* · 'Tengriken Körtle Qatun Tengrim; unsere liebe Tochter Yigetmiš Qatun Tengrim'. (Toyoq 21–22) *tnkry pwykw tnkryk'ʾnymz [...] pwykwlwk 'wlwq 'ydwq qwt qwtynk'* = *teŋri bügü teŋrikenimiz [...] bügülük uluγ ïduq qut qutïŋa* 'Teŋri Bügü unser Teŋriken [...] Bügülük Uluγ Ïduqqut, für seine Majestät', (Toyoq 22) *tnkryk'n twyzlwk qwcw p'ky tnkrym qwtynk'* = *teŋriken tözlüg qočo begi teŋrim qutïŋa* 'Teŋriken Tözlüg, [der] Beg von Qočo, mein Herr, für seine Majestät'. [Tekin 1976.229]. (Sino-uig. inscription) *tŋriken* 'souverain céleste, désignation du souverain des Ouïgours de Qočo': (II.9) *ayïγ-lïγ tngriken*, (II.18) *tngriken-imiz*, (II.22) *kalpaγu bodistaß ïduq tngriken-imiz* 'notre souverain céleste sacré, bodhisattva de tout un kalpa', (II.34) *adïnčïγ ïduq tngrikenimiz* 'notre souverain céleste extraordinairement saint', (II.44) *[...]un ïduq tngriken*, (III.3) *köngül-lüg tngriken*, (III.25) *tngrikenimiz qočγar ïduq-qut*, (IV.10–11) *tering biliglig tngriken-imiz qutïnda* 'par la grâce de notre céleste au savoir profond, furent créés', (V.3) *ögidilmiš tngrikenimiz-ni binlang-ta čing-sang q///* 'il fit notre souverain céleste louangé grand counseiller à Bian-ling', (V.8) *čindamani teg tngriken*, (V.15) *alqu-tu qanïmlïγ tngrikenimiz čngsang bolmïš-ïnda* 'alors que notre souverain céleste, en toute chose satisfait, se trouvait être grand conseiller' [Geng & Hamilton 1981.52].

Although the Ongiin-inscription mentions rulers of the second empire of the Türk, as well as a *türk bodun*, the inscription is very fragmentary with barely one complete sentence, and the latest relevant publication, by Ōsawa [1999], has only words and traces of sentences at the end of each line. Therefore, the reading of every sentence includes interpretations, until now strongly influenced by the hypothesis that the inscription must belong to the second Türk empire, as well as the emendations made by Radloff, cf. the publication of the "touched" and "untouched" photos of the inscription by Ercilasun & Vasiliev [1995.60, 63]. In consideration of the forementioned facts, a new edition of the inscription, if there is anything to edit, should at least take into consideration that the traditional dating of the inscription might not be correct.

While the Türk had two forefathers, the Uigur inscriptions [TR O1, TS 8] mention three forefathers, namely Yoluγ Qaγan, Bumïn Qaγan and a third unnamed Qaγan, who together ruled 200 or 300 years, a timespan that can be determined from about 220/320 AD to 520 AD [Kljaštornyj 1985.148–50].

> (TR O1) ... *yoluγ qaγan :* [about 10 signs missing] ... *bumïn qaγan : üč qaγan olurmïš eki yüz : yïl olurmïš* 'Yoluγ Qaγan, ... [and] Bumïn Qaγan, [these] three Qaγans reigned, reigned two hundred years'.

The name of the first Qaγan, *yol(l)uγ*, is a compound of the word *yol* 'luck', not mentioned in Clauson's dictionary, and the well-known suffix *-luγ* 'formative denoting characterisation by the base noun' [Erdal 1991.139–155]. The word *yol* 'luck' occurs in some OT texts, so for example in the KT- and BQ-inscriptions [KT S13, SO, SW; BQ SW], as a personal name: Yolluγ Tegin. Interesting is the occurance in the "Small" Qarabalγasun-inscription, where as a reason for the death of a person it is stated that (ll. 6–11) *kök : teŋride : qutïm : yuyqa : boltï : yaγïz : yerde : yolïm : qïsγa : boltï : tegmeke : boltï :* 'In the Blue Heaven my *Qut* has become small, on the Brown Earth my *Yol* [way *or* luck, according to Ōsawa "my way (i.e. life)"] has become short, my end has come' [Róna-Tas 1987.41; Šinexüü 1980.42–43, Ōsawa 1999, 144]. A further example is [TR N5] *: bunï yaratïγma : bilgä qutluγ : tarqan seŋün bunča bodunïγ atïn yolïn :* 'he who has made this Bilgä Qutluγ Tarqan Seŋün, (has defeated) so many people with glory' [Kljaštornyj 1982.345], Katayama [1999.170, 172] reads *: bunï yaratïγma ///# qutluγ tarqan [säŋ]ün //// [bo]-dunïγ : atïn : yolïn :* 'He who (inscribed and) built this (stone) is ... ***ed the reputation and the fame of the people'. In Old Uigur *yol* can be found as a part of the personal name, for example *öz bägim yol tämür yiučing* 'mein Herr (= Gemahl) der *you-cheng* Yol Tämür'; Yol Tämür is mentioned in the *Yuanshi* [34, 13b] as *you-cheng yue-li tie-mu-er*, and was identified by H. Franke (*CAJ* 17, 1973.292:50) [Zieme 1985.124]. A similar name can be found in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of Hindu: [XII.37] *Yolbuq-a gem siu ši wuu-yin samgün* 'Yolbuqa, *canjun* (title) of the *jian xiu guo shi fu* (office)'. Yol Buqa was the 4th son of Oron, in the Chin. part of the inscription [Chin., XII.23] his name is transcribed as *Youlu Buhua* 'Yolluγ? Buqa'.

From OT the word *yol* was borrowed into Mongolian. Although the word *ǰol* doesn't seem to be attested in Mmo. sources, the borrowing from OT into Mo. might have occurred at a fairly early stage, as the semantics 'luck etc.' do not seem to be attested in any Old Uigur text: MoL *ǰol*, Xal. *zol* 'good luck, fortune, good result, success' [Lessing 1069]; BurN, T *zol*, BurS *žol* 'Glück', BurN *zoltê*, BurT *zoltoi*, BurS *žoltê* 'glücklich' [Castrén 1857.161]; Kal. *zol* [Ö, veraltet] 'Glück, glückliche Reise, Erfolg' (vgl. atü. Yolluγ 'der Erfolgreiche') [Ramstedt 1935.475]. For *ǰol* 'luck', compare also TMEN #1930, MYYC 450 [here examples for some Mongolian languages who have retained the original Mo. word *qubi:* MMoS *qubi* 'fate, luck', TMEN 294; Dag. *xob'*, Yog. *xüβ* 'luck' (Kara 1990.318–319); Dag. *qobĭ*, *χobĭ*, Xal. *χuwĭ* 'Schicksal' (Poppe 1934–1935.30) ?> Uig. *qoβ* 'bonne fortune, chance, bonheur' (Hamilton 1986.91:15.16, 235]. For the change *y-* > *ǰ-*, cf. also *yiz* > *ǰiz* 'brass, copper'.

In modern Turkic languages *yol* is attested with the meaning 'luck, destiny, fate', as far as I know, only as loanwords from Mongolian, cf. the examples in Räsänen [VEWT 205–206], and Tekin [1982.52]; moreover, Dolg. *ǰol* 'Glück; glücklich; Erfolg' = jak. *ǰol* 'Glück, Erfolg' < mo.; moL *ǰol* 'idem' [Kałużyński 1961.17; Stachowski 1993.90, 1998.89]. As a loanword from Jak. the word is found as Ewn. *ǰol* 'Glück', *ǰololkon*, *ǰalalkan* 'glücklich', Ewk. *žol* 'Glück' [Halén 1978.95; Cincius & Rišes 1952.600, 1975.262], and Ma. *julgen* 'glücklicher Zufall, Glücksfall' [Hauer 554]. Not taking into consideration the Jak. forms, all the Tung. words were considered by Rozycki [1994.126] as loanwords from Mo. and thus viewed as "problematic phonologically".

Other Qaγans mentioned in the Bugut stela are unknown from other OT inscriptions, but occur in Chin. sources. The successor of Bumïn Qaγan, *keluo* [(7); MChinL *k^hua-la*, MChinE *k^hwa-la*], perhaps to be interpreted as **qara* [553], is known from the *Zhoushu* (50,1b) and *Suishu* (84,1a). His title was *yi kehan* (8) or *ayi kehan* (9), MChinL *ji* or *ʔa-ji*, MChinE *jiă/ji* or *ʔa-jiă/ji* 'Ayï Qaγan(?)'. According to the *Zhoushu* he was the son of Bumïn, the *Suishu* tells that he was a younger brother [Liu 1958.41; 493–494:34].

The interpretation of *ayï* presents some difficulties, perhaps the word may be compared with a title occuring in an Uigur manuscript as the title of a mother-in-law. The semantic change from male title to female title doesn't present any problem in this case, as it is attested also in connection with other titles, for example *tegin.* (UigOn II 82:6) *ärtmiš qadan atam singtsi qadan anam siukui ayï vapkui ayï* 'mein verstorbener Schwiegervater Singtsi, meine Schwiegermütter Siukui Ayï und Vapkui Ayï'. With regard to this title Röhrborn [314] writes: "Mit hinreichender Klarheit nur in einem Kolophon (UigOn II) belegt, und zwar als Titel oder Ehrentitel nach dem Eigennamen. Hamilton möchte 2 weitere Graphien ''*YY* aus einem schlecht erhaltenem Kolophon der Pariser Sammlung hierher stellen. Er läßt offen, ob ''*YY* dort Name oder Titel ist. Eher Name, denn ein voranstehender Titel (= Verwandtschaftsbezeichnung) sollte das Poss.-Suff. haben".

Keluo reigned only for one year and was followed by his younger brother, called in the Bugut stela *mwγ'n γ'γ'n* (10) 'Muhān Qaγan'. In the *Suishu* this title appears as (11). His personal names were *qijin* (*sijin*) (12), MChinL *kɦi-sɦin*, MChinE *gɨ/gi-zinʰ* in the *Zhoushu* (50,1b) and *Suishu* (84,1a) respectively, and *yandu* (13), MChinL *ʔjian-tuǝ̆*, MChinE *ʔɛn-tɔ* in the *Zhoushu* (50,1b) [Kljaštornyj & Livšic 1972.74, Liu 1958.8–13, 41; 495:36]. Muhān Qaγan is mentioned several times in the Bugut stela, the occurences are partly differently interpreted by Kljaštornyj & Livšic (KL) and Yoshida & Moriyasu (YM). Respectively:

KL: (BI:2–4) [...] *trwkc βγy nw''r γ'γ'n 'wskwp'r ckn'cw mγ'n (tykyn pr)[w] (γ'γ'n wy'k) w'(š)t* '... the Turkish Lord Nivar-Qaγan. After Mahān Tegin raised on the place of the Qaγan' = YM: *m(wx)-n x'γ'n y'rwk' 'ḪY nw'r x'γ'n 'wr-kwp-'r 'cr-''cw mγ'' t'[t](p)[l] x'γ'n wsn wy'(r)[nt]* 'Muqan Qaghan's Yaruka brother (named?) Niwar Qaghan ***ed (for the sake of) Urkupar Cracu Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; KL: (BI:3–4) *βγy mwγ'n γ'γ'n 'PZY βγy mγ'n tyky(n)* 'Lord Muhān Qaγan and Lord Mahān Tegin' = YM: *βγy mxw'n x'γ'n 'PZY βγy mγ' t't(p)['r] [x]'γ['n* 'God(like) Muqan Qaghan and God(like) Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; KL, XM: (BI:5) *βγy mwx'n x'γ'n* 'God(like) Muqan Qaghan ... (died)'; Kl, YM: (BII:3) *tw(') xwy-štr 'ḪY mxw'n x'γ'n* 'your (of Tatpar) elder brother Muqan Qaghan'.

The name-title *mγ'n tykyn* 'Mahān Tegin' has been read by Kljaštornyj & Livšic in several places of the Bugut-inscription [BI:2–3, BI:3–4, BII:4–5, BII:6]. This reading is not confirmed by Yoshida & Moriyasu, who read *mγ' t'tp-'r* 'Magha Tatpar' instead:

> KL: (BI:2–3) *'wskwp'r ckn'cw mγ'n (tykyn pr)[w] (γ'γ'n wy'k) w'(š)t* 'After Mahān Tegin raised on the place of the Qaγan' = YM: *wr-kwp-'r 'cr-"cw mγ" t'[t](p)[l] x'γ'n wsn wy'(r)[nt]* '(Niwar Qaghan) ***ed (for the sake of) Urkupar Cracu Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; KL: (BI:3–4) *βγy mγ'n tyky(n)* [5–6 letters missing] 'Lord Mahān Tegin' = YM: *βγy mγ' t't(p)['r] [x]'γ['n* 'God(like) Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; KL: (BII:4–5) *tγw βγy mγ'[n] (tyk)[yn] γ[šywny]* '(And now also) you Lord Mahān Tegin, [the] ruler ...' = YM: *tγw βγ' mγ' t('t)[p'](r) x[''γ'n]* ++ 'You, God(-like) Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; KL (BII:6): *(βγy mγ'n ty)[kyn ...* [about 25 letters missing] 'Lord Mahān Tegin' = YM: *βγy m(γ)' [t]'t(p)['r x'γ'n] m(s)++[...]* 'God(like) Magha Tatpar Qaghan'.

The readings of Yoshida & Moriyasu could be strengthened by the fact that OT *tegin* is written in the Bugut-inscription as *tk'y-nt* [Pl., BII:11], whereas Kljaštornyj & Livšic read the word as *tykyn*, a form also attested in the Qarabalγasun-inscription: [Q 2] *[...] tykyn 'wk' [...]* 'Tegin-Ügä'. In other non-Turkic sources this title occurs in the following written forms:

> Bactr. *tagino*, *tigino* 'dynastischer Name = «tegin»': *sri tagino šauo* (NumH 206–207 Av.); *tagino uōrsono šauo* (NumH 240,1–4 Av.) // *uōrsono* 'Xorāsān'; *tigino uōrsono šauo* (NumH 240,5 Av.). Vgl. atü. *tigin* 'Prinz', chin. *teqin: wusan teqin sa* (Chavannes, Documents 350, Sp. 2), skt. *tigina* (NumH 208 Av.), mpers. *tgyń* in: *tgyń hwl's'n MLKA* (NumH 208 Rv.), mpersM *tgin*, *tqin* (Müller 1913.9:19f.) und ar.-pers. *tegīn* 'Titel der türkischen Könige'. Vgl. weiterhin Humbach (1967.59, 61), Göbl (1967 I.140, 164) [Davary 1982.281–282]. Khot. *digyina* [P 5538 A 10], *dagyini* [Ch 00269.63], *dagyaina* [P 2024.30, 32]; Ind. (coins) *tkyń*; Brāhmī *tigīna*, Kašγarī *tigin*, Pl. *tigit* [Bailey 1939.91]. Cf. for the title *tegin* also Clauson [1972.483], TMEN #828, 922, Doerfer [1993(a).45], Bosworth & Clauson [1965.7].

The readings of Yoshida & Moriyasu make unnecessary the explanation of S. G. Kljaštornyj, who tried to indentify Mahān Tegin with Taspar/Tatpar Qaγan, taking the former title to be the title of Tas/tpar before his enthronisation as Qaγan.

Further information concerning Tas/tpar given in the Bugut stela are contradictory: the hare-year [572/573] is the initial year of Tas/tpar's rule [BII:6], as he was also the younger brother of Muhān Qaγan [BII:3]. The length of his rule is, however, unclear as the text [BII:7] has been read differently by Kljaštornyj & Livšic, "he ruled for six years", and Yoshida & Moriyasu, "he ruled for eleven years". According to Chinese sources, Liu [1958, Stammbaum], Muhān died in 572, and Tas/tpar in 580, being followed immediately by Nawār. In the list of rulers provided by Golzio [1984.60] Muhān ruled from 553–572 and Tas/tpar from 572–578, which would coincide with the reading of Kljaštornyj & Livšic, being followed by a ruler called An-lo, who ruled for only one year, 578, and Nawār, 578–587.

Tas/tpar Qaγan occurs in the *Zhoushu* and *Suishu* as *tuobo kehan* (14), MChinL *tʰa-puat*, MChinE *tʰa-pat* [Liu 1958.13, 42–43]. In the Bugut stela he is, according to the readings of Yoshida & Moriyasu, styled:

> (BI:2–3) *'wr-kwp-'r cr-"cw mγ" t'[t](p)['] x'γ'n* 'Urkupar Cracu Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; (BI:3–4) *βγy mwx'n x'γ'n 'PZY βγy mγ' t't(p)['r] [x]'γ['n* 'God(like) Muqan Qaghan and God (like) Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; (BII:4–5, BII:6) *βγy mγ' t't(p)['r] [x]'γ['n* 'God(like) Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; (BII:9) *'(B)Y mγ' t'tp'r x'γ'n* '(his, of Umna = Nawār?) father Magha Tatpar Qaghan'; (BII:11) *βγy t'(t)p'r x'γ'n* 'God(like) Tatpar Qaghan'.

The last Qaγan mentioned in the Bugut stela is Nawār Qaγan [B I.2 *nw"ry'γ'n*], who erected the Bugut stela. The Chinese sources state that Nawār was the son of Keluo [Liu 1958.42], the Bugut-inscription [BII:9] tells that he was a son of Tas/tpar Qaγan, and ruled from 578 to 587. His name has been read by Pritsak [1985.206] as Näbär, and by Kljaštornyj & Livšic as Nivār. His personal name was, according to the *Suishu*, *shetu* (15), MChinL *ṣiap-tɦuǝ̆*, MChinE *ɕiap-dɔ*. Under Tas/tpar he was a petty Qaγan, styled in the *Suishu* [Liu 1958.42] *erfu kehan*.

After the death of Tas/tpar he ruled, according to the *Suishu*, with the title *yili julu she mohe shiboluo kehan* (16) 'Yili Külüg Šad Baγa Ïšbara Qaγan'. Other variants of this title in the *Suishu* are: *cong tian sheng da tujue tianxia xian sheng tianzi yili julu she mohe shiboluo kehan* (17) 'The holy and wise emperor (lit. son of heaven) of the Great Türk empire, Yili Külüg Šad Baγa Ïšbara Qaγan, born from Heaven', found in a letter of Nawār to the Chin. emperor Gaozu; *da tujue yili julu she mohe shabolüe kehan* (18) 'Yili Külüg Šad Baγa Ïšbara Qaγan of the Great Türk', in Gaozu's answer to Nawār's letter; and *da tujue yili julu she mohe shibaluo kehan chen shetu* (19) 'Yili Külüg Šad Ïšbara Baγa Qaγan of the Great Türk, the subject Shetu', in a letter of submission of the year 585 [Liu 1958.44, 50, 51; Pritsak 1985.205–206]. The beginning of the second variant is interpreted by Pritsak [1985.209–211] as *cong tian sheng* 'born from heaven' = OT *tngride bolmïš; da tujue tianxia* 'empire of the great Turks' ~ Mo. *yeke mongγol ulus, da* = [Uig. Q] *tengri*, [Sogd. Q] *baγi*, Mo. *yeke*; *xian* 'wise = sovereign' = OT *bilge*; *sheng tianzi* = OT *tengriteg*. Often Nawār is called in the *Suishu* simply *shabolüe*, *shiboluo*, or *shaboluo* [Pritsak 1985.205–206:2].

Nawār Qaγan occurs in several places of the Bugut-inscription:

> (BI:2–3) *m(wx)'n x'γ'n y'rwk' 'ḪY nw''r x'γ'n* 'Muqan Qaghan's Yaruka brother (named?) Niwar Qaghan'; (BII:8–9) *mγ' wmn x'γ'n p'ðy-š'ð'(t)[w?] ð['](rnt)* 'They made Maha Umna Qaghan a king'; (BIII:4) *nwm (snk') w(+)n'' 'y-ry mγ[']* 'the stone of law. Umna(?) Iri Magha ...'.

The two variants in [BII:8–9] and [BIII:4] are in a certain way very far from each other and it is difficult to connect them. It can be, however, that two different rulers are indicated in these places, cf. the examples in [BII:15–16, 19], but the very fragmentary state of the Bugut-inscription doesn't allow any furthergoing conclusion: (BII:15–16) *ðw' xšywn'k* [about 45 letters missing] '(... ordered to establish the stone of law). When the two rulers ...', and (BII:19) *[...] dw' x'γ'n šy(t)nw mγ'*... 'the two Qaghans *** Magha ...'.

The personal names Bumïn, *Mahān, Muhān, Tas/tpar and Nawār can not be explained on a Turkic basis, as already Golden [1992.121] pointed out: "in addition to the «foreignness» of the name A-shih-na, we might also point to the non-Turkic appearance of the names of most of the early Türk rulers". The names

Bumïn, *Mahān and Muhān have an Iranian appearance and it is tempting to give these names Iranian etymologies.

On an Iranian basis, Bumïn could be divided into a stem *bum-* and a suffix *-in*. This suffix, well attested in Sogdian, is, according to Sims-Williams [1992.45; Schmitt in Mayrhofer 1973.287–297], 'a hypocoristic and/or (pro)patronymic suffix [Old Iranian **-ina*, **-aina* and **-āyana*]'. The stem *bum-* can be compared with Old Indian *bhūmi* 'earth; ground, soil; land', Old Persian *būmī-* 'earth'. Moreover, the word occurs in Middle and New Persian as *būm* 'land, earth', SogdB *βwmh*, *βwm-* 'earth, land; world' and Xvar. *βwm* 'earth' [EWbAi 1993.268, MacKenzie 1976.94, Gharib 2911].

In the Chin. sources the name of Bumïn appears as *tumen*. Until now no proposal for a connection between *tumen* and *bumïn* has been brought forward. In Chin. *tumen* is written with two characters, the first *tu* (20) has the meaning 'land, earth, soil, ground, territory', the second *men* (21) means 'door, gateway, opening; profession, sect, school or party; family'. If the aforementioned Iranian etymology for *bumïn* is acceptable, then the Chin. character combination could be an adaptation of *bumïn*. Taking into account the strong Sogd. influence in the first Türk Qanate, it does not seem impossible that the meaning of the name Bumïn was explained by the Sogdians to the Chinese, and that the Chinese, then, analysed the name *bum-ïn* quite correctly and made *tu-men* out of it.

The name *Mahān or *Māhān(?) [*mγ'n*] could, on a Sogd. basis, be divided into *mah-* and *-ān*. The first part may be connected with Sogd. *m'x*, *m'γ(h)*, *m'x* [*māx*] 'moon, month' [Gharib 5174, 5253], MPersM, ParthM *m'h* [*māh*] 'moon' [Boyce 1977.55]. The suffix of the word is, according to Sims-Williams [1992.41; Mayrhofer 1973.283] 'a (pro)patronymic suffix [Old Iranian **-āna*, West Middle Iranian *-ān*]'; translated as 'son of the moon?'. Names using *māh-* as a composition element are very numerous in Middle Persian, as well as in Sogdian [cf. Weber 1972.197, 198, 201; Gignoux & Gyselen 1987.301; Yamauchi 1993.22–24, 25; Gignoux 1986:510–556].

The name Muhān [*mwγ'n*] seems to contain the same patronymic suffix *-ān* as Mahān, but I cannot explain the stem *muh-*; possibly it can be connected with OPers. *magu-* 'Magus, Magier' [Brandenstein & Mayrhofer 1964.130–131]; MPersZ *magū* [*mgw*], *mōg* [*mwg*] 'a magus, magian' [Nyberg 1974.122, MacKenzie 1986.56, Back 1978.229–230]; SogdC *mγ-w*, *mwγ-* [*muγ*] 'Magus, Magian' [Sims-Williams 1985.215, Gharib 5512]. The history of the word from an Old Iranian language into Old Sinitic has been traced by Mair [1990.27–47].

Doerfer [1993(a).42] considered Tas/tpar and Nawār as deriving from the language of the Ruanruan. Their language is, however, unknown: possibly it was some kind of Mongolic. Doerfer's consideration are not convincing, and perhaps, in the light of the Iranian etymologies proposed before, Iranian etymologies should be sought also for these two names.

I can not explain the different shape of the name Tas/tpar as it is attested in the Sogd. and Chin. documents. The MChin. form *Tapar of the name can perhaps be compared with a name attested in the «Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk»: *tapar* 'the two sons of Ināl Ōz of the king of Qifčāq' [Dankoff & Kelly 1982.27]. Possibly, this is a Persian loanword in Karakhanid, cf. the remarks by Gershevitch "Armenian *tapar* 'axe'; New Persian *tabar*, Russian *topor* is a Scythian or Sarmatian loanword, it's origin should perhaps be sought in a metathesis of **parat* (Ossetian *færæt*, Khot. *pada*, Tokharian (loanword) *porat*, *peret*)" [1952.485:1], MPers. *tabar* 'axe, hatchet' [Tafazzoli 1993/94.192, Boyce 1977.86].

It might be, however, that the name Tas/tpar has to be divided into Tas/t- + -par. This last part, a suffix(?), of the name can be compared with the last part of another name of Tas/tpar, Urkupar, given by Yoshida & Moriyasu. I can neither explain the 'first' part, nor the 'second' part of these names, but reference should be made in this place to the name Mihr-Uruspar, a 'personnage mentionné à la synagogue de Doura-Europos'. In this case only the first part, < *mithra*, could be explained by Gignoux [1986:659]. The first part of the name Urkupar can be found in a still unpublished Sogdian scroll from Turfan in the form *twγmyš 'wrkw* 'Tuγmïš Urku' [Yutaka Yoshida, letter from 28. 10. 1999].

The other parts of Tas/tpar's name, Cracu and Maγa respectively, attested in the new reading of the Bugut-inscription, are as unclear as the other new variants of his name. The first name

Cracu has a Tokharian appearance; another example for a Tokharian name in OT sources could be the name *simä*, occuring in the form *toŋra simäg* (Acc.) in the Toñuquq-inscription (line 9). This OT name can be compared with *simā* 'PN' in a TokharianB civil document [SI B Toch./11] [Pinault 1999b.8–9:12].

The element Maγa should probably not be connected with Sogd. *m~~a~~γ'(')* < Skt. *mahā*, found only as the first part of compounds: SogdB *mγ''stβ* for Chin. *mohasa* < *ma-ha-sat* = Skt. *Mahāsattva*, as well as *mγ'r'c* trl. Chin. *tien wang* = Skt. *mahārāja* [MacKenzie 1976.110, Gharib 5304–5307]. No Turkic etymology for this word can be given, but perhaps it can be compared with a similar part of a personal name occuring in the 'Secret History of the Mongols': [#141] *Ikeres-ün Tüge Maqa* 'Tüge Maqa of the Ikeres' [Cleaves 1982.242], to be compared with MMoM *maγa*, *maqa* 'wer weiß, vielleicht, wohl, doch, gar', *maqat* 'wirklich, tatsächlich' [Haenisch 1939.106], MMoS *maχa* 'véritable, vrai, vraiment, en fait, sûrement' [Lewicki 1959.58], MoL *maγad*, Xal. *magad* (adj., adv., n.) 'sure[ly], certain[ly], true[ly]; probably, probable, real[ly], indeed, undoubtedly; most likely; certainty, determination, reality' [Lessing 519], Bur. *magat* 'freilich' [Castrén 1857.172], UigS *maγat* 'vrai, réellement' [Ligeti 1966.180].

Until now, I can not explain the name Nawār, perhaps there is a connection with Sogd. *nw'*, *nwh* [*nwa*, *nawa*] 'nine' (Gharib 6105, 6132] and an ending in *-r* 'Hypokoristikon mit dem iran. Suffix *-ira-* = altindoar. *-ila-*', for example in the name Kartīr [Schmitt 1980.66–67, 72; Gignoux 1986:497-500]. Further Iranian names including this suffix are Ardaxšīr [Gignoux 1986:126], Pakur [Gignoux 1986:741] and Tōsar [Gignoux 1986:911; for this name, compare also Nikitin 1993/94.72].

This etymology could find some support by the fact that in later Turkic and Mongolian onomastic names connected with 'nine', a number of luck, are very common, cf. for Turkic occurrences Rásonyi [1961.60–62]. Here only Middle Mongolian examples are given:

> MMoM *yesün* 'PN': [#225(3), 230, 234] *yesün te'e* 'Nine Spans; son of J̌elme; a captain of quiverbearers, etc.', (#278) *yesün tö'e* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.270]. MMoU *yisün* 'PN': (XXI,1.1) *yisün-temür-ün* 'Gen.; PN; Herrscher Moghulistans 1338–1339', <

MMoM *yesun* 'neun' [Haenisch 1939.170], MMoU (XVIII) *yisün* '9': *qubi sar-a tabun sar-a yisün sar-a : ede γurban saras-tur quluγan-a üdür ülü bolqu* :: 'Qubi-Monat (= 1. Monat), 5. Monat, 9. Monat: in diesen drei Monaten ist der Maus-Tag unpassend' [Kara 1979.191:19-21], MMoS *yäsun* 'neuf' [Lewicki 1959.88], *yisün* 'nine', Dag. *(y)is*, Yog. *šisən*, Bao. *yirsən*, San. *yəsun*, Mgr. *sjən*, Xal. *yös(ön)/yüs*, Bar. *yüs*, Qara, J̌arut *(y)is*, MoL *yisün* [Kara 1990.223], MMoA *yisün* 'neun' [Poppe 1928.78, Ligeti 1962.74].

MMoM *yesüder* 'PN': (#274) *yesüder qorči* 'Quiverbearer Yesüder; succourer of J̌alayirtai Qorči' [Cleaves 1982.270], < *yesü(n)* + *-der*; *yesügei* 'PN' [#56(2)] *yesügei* 'third son of Bartan Ba'atur; husband of Hö'elün; father of Temüǰin', (#69) *yesügei aqa* 'idem', (#50, 54, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67, 68, 70, 111, 140, 164) *yesügei ba'atur* 'idem', (#67) *yesügei kiyan* 'idem', (#150) *yesügei qa'an* 'idem', [#96, 105, 150(3), 151, 164, 177(4)] *yesügei qan* 'idem', [#62, 63(2), 65] *yesügei quda* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.270], < *yesü(n)* + *-gei*; *yesügen* 'PN': [#155(3), 156] *yesügen qadun* 'a daughter of Yeke Čeren of the Tatar; younger sister of Yesüi', [#155(2)] *yesügen qatun* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.270], < *yesü(n)* + *-gen*; *Yesüi* 'PN': (#156) *tatar-un yeke čeren-ü yesüi*, (#155, 156, 254) *yesüi* 'idem', [#156(2), 254, 265(2), 268] *yesüi qadun* 'idem', [#155(2)] *yesüi qatun* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.270], < *yesü(n)* + *-i* 'Diminutativ'; *yesün(g)ge* 'PN': (#183) *yesünge* 'second son of Qasar', (#269) *yesüngge* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.270], MMoU (I.4) *yisüngge* 'Meisterschütze, dem zu Ehren die Inschrift aus der Mitte der 1250iger Jahre errichtet wurde' [Ligeti 1972a.17, Rachewiltz 1977.493–494 (for the person), (494–495 (for the dating)], < *yesün* + *-ge*; MMoS *yisüder* 'PN'; *ariq-böke-yin uruγ-un kö'ün yisüder* 'Yisüder, ein Prinz aus der Nachkommenschaft des Ariq-Böke' [Ligeti 1972b.156, Haenisch 1952.15, Mostaert 1995.93–94], *qoyina basa emüneksi ne'üksen-ni ba yisüder ǰük dayyiǰiqsan manggia ǰe'en-buqa tan-u šilta'an-ni batu-tan-iyar öči'ülǰü ilēget darui-tur uruķši ne'üǰü* 'Nachdem ich dann später noch den erfolgten Aufbruch nach Süden und die Umstände von Manggia und Jeyen-buqa, die bei Yesüder rebelliert haben, durch Batu und Genossen habe melden lassen, sind wir sofort weiter gezogen' [Ligeti 1972b.158–159, Haenisch 1952.16].

Rulers of the second Türk empire

Elteriš Qaγan [682–691/92], the first ruler of the second Türk Qanate, is mentioned with his personal name Elteriš as *elteriš qaγan* in the Toñuquq-, Ongiin-, Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscription [T 7, 48, 50, 59; O 11; KT O11; BQ O11] and in an inscription from Eastern Mongolia [Kljaštornyj 1971.254]. The regnal title Qutluγ Qaγan appears in the Chin. part of the Kül Tegin-inscription as *gutulu kehan* (22) MChinL *kuttfuə´*luk kʰa´xfian*, MChinE *kwəttʰɔ'*luk kʰa'γan* [Pulleyblank; Schlegel 1892.22–28, 53; Radloff 1894.167–168]; in the *Tangshu* Elteriš occurs as *guduolu* (23).

The characters used to transcribe *qutluγ* are, with the exception of the last one, not identical in the Kül Tegin- and Qarabalγasun-inscriptions. In the Kül Tegin-inscription [V:8–9, VI:22–23] the first two characters *gutu-* are (24), whereas in the Qarabalγasun-inscription they are *guduo-* (25). The third character *lu* (26) is used in both inscriptions to transcribe OT *-luγ*. I could not find the last character in Pulleyblank [1991], according to Giles [7379], *lu* is pronounced in different Chin. dialects (languages) *luk*, *'lu'*, *lu*, or *louk*.

Toñuquq calls Elteriš often *qaγanïm* 'my Qaγan' [T 12, 15, 18, 30, 53], in contrast to Qapγan Qaγan, whom he calls simply *qaγan* 'The Qaγan', without personal suffix [T 33]. Bilge Qaγan calls Elteriš always *qaŋïm qaγan* 'my father, the Qaγan' [KT O12 = BQ O11, KT O15 = BQ O13; KT O16 = BQ O13, KT O25 = BQ O20, KT O30, KT O32, KT O35, KT O38, KT O16, KT O17, KT O31, BQ S10], and only in the part of the inscription [BQ O10, KT O11] relating to the enthronement of Elteriš the last is mentioned by his personal name: *: türk : bodun : yoq : bolmazun : tiyin : bodun : bolčun tiyin : qaŋïm : elteriš qaγanïγ : ögüm : elbilge qatunuγ : teŋri : töpüsinde : tutup : yügerü : kötürmiš erinč :* '(Damit) das Türk-Volk nicht untergeht, (sondern wieder) ein Volk wird, erhoben sie [*üze türk teŋrisi türk ïduq yiri* 'oben der Gott der Türken, (unten) die heilige Heimat'] meinen Vater, Elteriš Qaγan, (und) meine Mutter, El-Bilge Qatun (zu Herrschern)'.

Qapγan Qaγan [692–716], the second ruler of the second Türk Qanate, was the younger brother of Elteriš. Qapγan ist the personal name of this ruler. He is mentioned with his personal name Qapγan in the Toñuquq-, Küli Čor- and Ongiin-inscriptions, here together with Elteriš [T 51, 60, 61; KC 3; O 4]. The regnal title of Qapγan, *bügü qaγan*, or *türk bügü qaγan*, is known from the Toñuquq-inscription [T 34, 50]. In the *Jiu* and *Xin Tangshu* Qapγan is called *mochuo* (27), MChinL *muək-tṣʰyat*, MChinE *mək-tɕʰwiat*, Tib. *'bug čhor*. These forms seem to reflect the title **bügü čor*, although the MChin. forms could also point to a title **bügü šad*, cf. the variant *čad* of *šad* in the Terx-inscription, seemingly Qapγan's title before his enthronisation.

Pritsak [1985.207], following Pelliot [1929a.152] and Bombaci [1971.111, 117], interpretes *mochuo* as 'bäg čor'. As Beckwith [1987.58:23] has shown, the rendering of *mo* as *beg* is not correct, as in Chin. *fu* (28) is regulary used to transcribe *beg*. The title of the Uigur Bügü Qaγan is given in Chin. as *mouyu kehan* (48), Tib. *'bug čhor*. Here both of the first elements represent OT *bügü* 'weise, zauberträchtig' [Zieme 1975.79, Clauson 1972.324–325, Rybatzki 1997(b).162–163:179]. Therefore, I tend to see in Chin. *mo* (29), MChinL *muək*, MChinE *mək*, Chin. *mouyu* (30), MChinL *məw-yă*, MChinE *muw-wuă'*, and Tib. *'bug* transcriptions of OT *bügü*. The Chin. *mo* should be considered as an abbreviation or variant of *mouyu*.

There has been some discussion concerning the etymology of the word *qapγan*. Sinor [1939.543, 1954.181] considered the word to be a deverbal noun of the verb *qap-* 'to attack', and translated it as 'l'agresseur'. This etymology was rejected by Clauson [1956.73–77] who considered *qapγan* as etymological impossible to explain. Erdal [1991.382–386], however, brought forward new evidence for the name *qapγan* and showed that the name has to be analysed, as already done by Sinor, as consisting of a verb *qap-* 'to snatch; to grasp, or seize, with the hands, teeth etc.' [Clauson 1972.580] + *-gAn* 'a suffix that denotes subjects of both intr. and trans. verbs', and to be translated as 'snatcher'. With a different suffix we find "Tü. *qapqan* 'Fangeisen'; mo. *qabqan* (burj. *xabxān*); [Tung] W 1–3 *kapkan*, E 1–6 *kapkan* U; Z 1 *kakpa*, Onenko *kapkan* < E; L 1, 2, 4, 5 *kapkān*; mindestens die Belege mit *ā* der 2. Silbe können auch aus dem Russischen stammen" [Doerfer MT #178], cf. also Halén [1978.141], Räsänen [VEWT 233b] and Stachowski [1993.138]: "dolg. *kapkān* 'Schlinge' < russisch (< gemeintürkisch) *kapkan* 'idem' > jak. *kapkān* 'idem'." The verb *qab-* is not frequently attested in OT texts belonging to the eastern part of the Turkic language area, and most of the occurences, as well as derivations, are found in the «Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk», cf. Clauson [1972.578–588], Dankoff & Kelly [1985.127], Erdal [1991.270, 384–385]. In modern Turkic languages the verb is well attested [VEWT 233a; Joki 1952.146–147; Stachowski 1993.137, 1998.139]; as a loanword from Turkic it is also found in Mongolian: "Tü. *qab-* 'packen'; mo. *qabči-*; Tung. E 1, 2, 5 *kapči-* U; S 1 *xarči-* 3, 0 (chingan) *kapči-*. (Daneben auch im Tung. eine – wie in vielen Sprachen – weitverbreitete Sippe vom Typ *kap-* 'packen')" [Doerfer MT #470].

Some other personal names containing the root *qab-* are *Qab*, meaning 'attack!', a very common category of personal names formed with the help of the imperative [Rásonyi 1962.233–244], in the Yenisei-inscriptions: [E 135.1] *qab (a)pa : öz (e)rk(i)ne* 'Oh Qab-Apa [und?] Öz-Erkin!' [Vasil'ev 1983b.45, 126]. A morphologically similar name is found in the "Secret History of the Mongols": [#43] *Barin Ši'iratu Qabiči* 'son of Bodončar', [#43, 45] *Qabiči Ba'atur* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.232, 254; Bese 1978.360]. Further examples for names with this root are for example Old Bulgarian *Kampaganos* 'Personal name or title' [Beševliev 1975.93–97, Moravcsik 1983.156–157], Old Hungarian *Koppany* [Györffy 1971.197–198, Kakuk 1974.18–19], and Modern Mongolian *Qablan* [Vietze 1991.382].

Qapγan is styled *tian shang de guobao tiannan tujue sheng tian guduolu mochuo da kehan* (31) in an epitaph for Princess Yianli Pijia [Chavannes 1912, plate III, line 4:16–5:14]. This title variant contains two parts, *tian shang de guobao tiannan tujue sheng tian*, and *guduolu mochuo da kehan* = Qutluγ Bügü Čor Uluγ [or, following Pritsak (1985.211), *teŋri*] Qaγan. Different translations have been given to this title. Chavannes [1912.86, 86:2,3], who read the 4th and 5th character seperately as *guo bao*, translated "The great Qaγan of the *Tujue*, the holy and heavenly *Guduolu* (*Qutluγ*) *Mochuo*, having obtained this title from heavan (*tian shang de* = OT *teŋride*), truly witnessing his reward to the Son of Heaven (*guo bao tiannan* = title conferred by the Chin. Emperor to the Türk Qaγan)". This first translation includes a number of difficulties: "this title" is missing in the Chinese text; moreover, the translation "truly witnessing his reward" is not in accordance with the Chin. text, as "truly witnessing" could be the translation of *guo bao*, but then "his reward" is missing, or, contrary to Chavannes's own reading, the text has *guobao* 'reward', Mathews [3732:2] gives the meaning 'the consequence of actions in a previous state', and in this case "truly witnessing" is missing. Last, the interpretation of *tian shang de* as *teŋride* is not correct, as already *tian shang* means 'in heaven' [Mathews 5669:132].

A new interpretation and translation of this title was given by Pelliot [1929a.151–152]. He corrected Chavannes's reading *guo bao* into *guobao*, but forgot the *da* in front of *kehan*: *tian shang de guobao tiannan tujue sheng tian guduolu mochuo kehan*. Pelliot's new translation [1929a.152] was "the Qaγan *Mocho*, who obtained in Heaven the reward, the Son of Heaven, holy god of the Türk, *guduolu*", this was interpreted by him to stand for OT *teŋride qut bulmïš* ... *türk teŋriken qutluγ *bäg-čor qaγan*. He stated that *tiannan* 'Son of Heaven', *nan* meaning also 'boy', is hierarchically lower than *tianzi*; moreover he was not certain about the Turkic equivalent of *tiannan*, but he remarked that most probably *tiannan*, as well as *sheng tian*, stands for OT *teŋriken*. The beginning f of the title, *tian shang de* is, according to Pelliot, an equivalent of OT *teŋride bulmïš*; furthermore he did point out that, under the Tang, *bulmïš* and not *bolmïš* was intended, *qut* being expressed or not. Pelliot's interpretation and translation makes better sense than the one of Chavannes. The attempt of finding OT equivalents for the Chin. phrases is, however, problematic, as it seems by no means sure that *teŋriken* was a part of the nomenclature of the first and second Türk empire. The interpretation of *tian shang de guobao* as a translation of OT *teŋride qut*, or better *ülüg*, *bulmïš* could be acceptable; it has however to be remarked that titles with this kind of structure occur in OT sources only in connection with titles belonging to the Uigur Steppe empire, the comparable part of the title of the 1st and 2nd Türk empire was *teŋride bolmïš*.

Pelliot's interpretation was more or less accepted by Bombaci [1971.117]: "The Son of Heaven (*teŋriken*) Turk Divine (*teŋriken*) Grand Kaghan Qutluγ *Begčor, who received the Fortune in Heaven (*teŋride qut bulmïš*)". Pritsak [1985.206–211] interpreted *tian shang de guobao* as OT *teŋride qut bulmïš*, the next characters *tiannan* as *teŋriteg*, and takes *tiannan* as a "vulgar form" of *sheng tianzi*, attested in connection with Nawār's titulature. The last elements *tujue sheng tian* are, according to him, highly corrupted forms corresponding to *da tujue tianxia xian* 'sovereign of the empire of the Great Turks (*tujue*)' and *sheng tianzi* 'teŋriteg (*sheng tian*)' in Nawār's title.

The explanations given above to render the first part of Qapγan's title in the epitaph for Princess Xianli Pijia are not convincing, as they seem partly very forced. When trying to interpret the first part of Qapγan's title it has to be kept in mind that titles of the Qaγans of the Uigur Steppe empire noted down in Chin. sources have a Chin. as well as a Turkic part, the Chin. part being registered only in Chin. sources. This fact may also prevail here, and the first part should be taken as a purely Chin. part. So, perhaps, *tian shang de guobao tiannan tujue sheng tian guduolu mochuo da kehan* should be translated as follows (purely Chin. parts of the title are put into italics): 'The *divine* (and) blessed Bügü Čor, the *great* Qaγan *from the Türk, the son of Heaven, who obtained the reward in Heaven'*.

Bilge Qaγan never mentions Qapγan by his personal name or regnal title, but always speaks about his *ečim qaγan* 'my uncle, the Qaγan' [KT O17 = BQ O14, KT O17 = BQ O14, KT O31, KT W3; BQ O20, O35, N9, W6].

Bilge Qaγan [716–734], the successor of Qapγan, was a son of Elteriš. The personal name of Bilge Qaγan, *moju* (32), MChinL *muə̆k-kyə̆*, MChinE *mək-kuə*, Chin. *mojilian* (33), MChinL *muək-kiə̆k-lian*, MChinE *muək-kik-lian* [Liu 1958.614:954], is known from the *Jiu* and *Xin Tangshu*. It is unknown which OT name stands behind these transcriptions; there may be a connection with OT *bügü*. Perhaps, the last element of *mojilian* could present *-lan*, a suffix found in a number of animal names, cf. *qaplan* 'a large feline, prob. leopard rather than tiger, but the vagueness of oriental terminology makes certainty impossible' [C72.584], *arslan* 'lion; animal name with ending in *-lan*' [C72.238], *baqlan* 'one of the group of animal names ending in *-lan*; a particular kind of lamb, but whether of a particular age or fat or the like is obscure' [C72.314], *bulan* 'the elk' [C72.343], *burslan* 'tiger' [C72.368–369], *qulan* 'the wild ass' [C72.622], *yïlan* 'snake' [C72.930].

In the Toñuquq-inscription [T 31, 45] a person called Inel Qaγan is mentioned in connection with campaigns in Western Turkestan:

[T 31] *sü bašï : inel qaγan : tarduš šad : barzun* : 'At the head of the army (or: as the leader of the army) Inel Qaγan, the Tarduš Šad, shall go', [T 45] *inel qaγanqa* '(This many people came) to Inel Qaγan (and subjugated)'.

Orkun, Giraud, Tekin [1968], Ajdarov [1971], Clauson [1971] and Aalto [1958] considered *inel* a personal name; Thomsen [1924.167:4], Malov [1951.380], DTS [209] and Berta [1995.9:3] tried to identify Inel Qaγan with *yinie kehan* (106) of the Chinese sources, a son of Qapγan [Liu 1958.169]. Against an identification with *yinie kehan* speaks the fact that the son of Qapγan holds the title Qaγan only in Chin. sources. Among the Türks such an use of the title would be extraordinary, as Qaγan was used only as a title of the supreme ruler, dead or alive, and the son of Qapγan was never supreme ruler, as he was killed during the succession of Bilge Qaγan.

According to Doerfer [TMEN #1900] and Tekin [1995.220–221] *inel* means 'Stellvertreter', and *inel qaγan* has to be translated as 'Stellvertreter des Qaγan'. This interpretation doesn't seem to be grammatically correct, as the correct OT and OUig. form should be **qaγan ineli* or **qaγan inel*, as attested in an old Uigur manuscript belonging to the 10th or 11th century: (Ch/U 3917:8) *mar yiki bulaq inäli* 'der Inäl (Stellvertreter) des Mar Yiki Bulaq' [Zieme 1977.160–161].

In OT inscriptions, rulers occur with their names-titles before and after the enthronement, so Qutluγ Qaγan/Elteriš Qaγan, and Bügü Qaγan/Qapγan Qaγan respectively. The third ruler of the second Türk empire is known until now only with his title after the enthronement: (Türk) Bilge Qaγan. As I have tried to show [1997b.109–110:282], Inel Qaγan should be considered the name-title of Bilge Qaγan before his enthronisation. The campaigns described in the Toñuquq-inscription fall into the years 710/711. During this time Bilge Qaγan was, as he tells himself in the Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscriptions, šad of the Tarduš-tribe: (KT O17) *ečim qaγan : olurtuqda : özüm tarduš : bodun : üze : šad ertim* : 'When my uncle [Qapγan] reigned as Qaγan, I myself was šad over the Tarduš-people'; (BQ O15) *tört yegirmi : yašïmqa : tarduš : bodun : üze : šad : olurtum* : 'In my 14th year [697] I became šad over the Tarduš-people'. In a shorter way than in the Toñuquq-inscription, the Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscriptions [BQ O27–

28, KT O36–38] describe how he participated in the campaigns to Western Turkestan [cf. also Clauson 1971.129–130].

In the epitaph for Princess Xianli Pijia, Bilge Qaγan is called *sanshi xing tian shang de pijia sha kehan* (34) [Chavannes 1912, plate III, line 10:14–11:4], translated as "The Qaγan of the thirty tribes who obtained his title from Heaven, Pijia sha (Bilge šad)" [Chavannes 1912.84]; Bombaci misread *sanshi xing* as *san bu*, but nevertheless translates "Thirty Tribes": "Bilgä Šad Qaγan, from the Thirty Tribes, who received (the Fortune) in Heaven" [1971.117], Pritsak [1985.207] has the same reading as Chavannes, and interprets *sanshi xing* as "the [pax consisting of the] thirty tribes", Chin. *xing* = OT *oq* "organized polity able to supply 10,000 soldiers"; and *tian shang de* = OT *teŋride qut bulmïš* as an abbreviated version of *tian shang de guobao* [1985.208]. Bombaci's translation 'from the Thirty Tribes' is grammatically preferable to Chavannes's 'of the Thirty Tribes'. Pritsak's interpretation of *tian shang de* as an abbreviation of *tian shang de guobao* seems possible in the light of the remarks by Pelliot, mentioned before, on the use of *qut* in Chin. texts. As already stated before, however, also in this case the interpretation of certain parts of the title as translations from OT is problematic. I would prefer to interpret the first part of the title as a Chin. part, the second as an OT one, and translate Bilge Qaγan's title as 'Bilge Šad Qaγan *from the Thirty Tribes who has received [the Qut] in Heaven*'. Possibly, *tian shang de* stands here for OT *teŋriteg*, attested as part of Bilge Qaγan's title in KT [S1] and BQ [N1]. In this case, *tian shang* would stand for OT *teŋri* and *de*, MChinL *təək*, MChinE *tək* would be a transcription of the OT suffix *-teg*, expressing similarity with someone or something. In this case the translation would be 'Teŋriteg Bilge Šad Qaγan *from the Thirty Tribes*'.

The regnal title *bilge qaγan* occurs in all five inscriptions belonging to the period of the second Türk Qanate. Sometimes this regnal title is extended by the attributes *türk* or *teŋri*. Variants occurring in the OT inscriptions are *: türk bilge qaγan :* [T 50, T 58, BQ N1], *: türk : bilge qaγan :* [T 62], *: türk : bilge : qaγan :* [KT S1, KT W, BQ O1, BQ S13], *: bilge : qaγan :* [BQ W2], … *[bilge] qaγan* [KC 24, O12], *: teŋri bilge : qaγan :* [O 10, O11].

Bilge Qaγan's intitulation *teŋriteg teŋride bolmïš* is known from the Kül Tegin- and Bilge Qaγan-inscriptions [KT S1, BQ N1];

accordingly, his full title was *teŋriteg teŋride bolmïš türk bilge qaγan.*

A different intitulation, *teŋriteg teŋri yaratmïš*, occurs in the Bilge Qaγan-inscription [BQ O1, S13]. Doerfer [TMEN #828] was of the opinion that the intitulation of a ruler could change, and that also this one refers to Bilge Qaγan, whereas Bombaci [1965.287] considered this ruler as the son of Bilge Qaγan. Doerfer's opinion does not seem to be correct. The quotation [BQ S13–14] contains the complete title *teŋriteg teŋri yaratmïš türk bilge qaγan*, then follows the word *sabïm* '[this is] my word', and thereafter comes a list of tribal names and titles of dignitaries existing during the era of *qaŋïm türk bilge qaγan* 'my father, the Türk Bilge Qaγan'. If Bilge Qaγan speaks here with a different intitulation referring to his father Elteriš, he should have, as in all other instances, used the expression *qaŋïm qaγan.* For the eventual regnal title he should have used *qutluγ qaγan.* But he says *qaŋïm türk bilge qaγan.* This fact can only mean, that a different person than Elteriš is meant. Qapγan was not the father of Bilge Qaγan; furthermore, his regnal title was *bügü qaγan*, and he is always styled *ečim qaγan* by Bilge Qaγan. This means, in my opinion, that the person styled *qaŋïm türk bilge qaγan* has to be Bilge Qaγan, and that the ruler addressed *teŋriteg teŋri yaratmïš türk bilge qaγan*, who calls Bilge Qaγan 'my father', has to be the successor of Bilge Qaγan, possibly called *teŋri qaγan* in the Chin. part of the Bilge Qaγan-inscription [Radloff 1894.173; XX:24-27]; in the *Tangshu* he is mentioned as *dengli kehan* (36), MChinL *təəŋ-li'*, MChinE *təŋ-li*^{h}. According to Golzio [1984.60], there was a ruler called *yiran kehan* (35), MChinL *ʔji-rian*, MChinE *ʔji-ŋian* between Bilge Qaγan and Teŋri Qaγan, ruling for one year, but it remains uncertain whether such a ruler ever existed [Liu 1958.179, 621–629:1001].

A further ruler of the Türk, Ozmïš Qan, is mentioned in the Terx- and Šine Usu-inscriptions, belonging to the Uigur Qanate:

> (TR S1–2; SU N9–10) *ozmïš : tegin : qan bolmïš : ... [ozmïš teginig] tutdïm qatunïn altïm türk bodun ïnaγaru yoq boltï* 'Ozmïš-Tegin became Qan [of the Türk]. [Fights against the *üč*

> *tuγluγ türk bodun* 'the Türk clans with the three standards', date: *qoñ-yïlqa* 'in the sheep-year (743)']. ... I seized Ozmïš-Tegin, I took his Qatun, furthermore the Türk clans were destroyed'.

This ruler does not carry the title *qaγan*, but is called *qan*. This could mean simply 'ruler'. In my opinion, however, *qan* implies here a hierarchically lower position. The relevant passage gives the date 743, which means that the passage belongs to the time when the Türk had lost the supreme power in the steppe to their successors, the Uigurs. In the *Jiu Tangshu* (194A, 1a–12a) and *Xin Tangshu* (215A, 3a–12a; 215B, 1a–2b) the name of this ruler is *tian wusumishi kehan* (37); he reigned from 742 to 744 [Golzio 1984.60; Liu 1958.180, 230, 261, 630:1006]. The name Ozmïš, < *oz-* 'to outstrip (sometimes someone), hence to escape (from something); to surpass (someone)' [Clauson 1972.279, Berta 1996.222–223], is found also in later civil Uigur documents: (Ex01–25) *tanuq ozmïš* 'Zeuge ist Ozmïš', (Sa06–2, 23) *ozmïš* 'Personal name', (Lo10–7) *inim ozmïš toγrïl* 'mein jüngerer Bruder Ozmïš Toγrïl', (Sa05–1, 7, 14; Sa07–1 (= USp 107); Mi04–2, 6, 12, 14) *ozmïš toγrïl* 'Personal name'; in the document (Mi04) the younger brother of this person carries the name *basa toγrïl*, in (Sa05–18, Sa07–7, 23) *ozmïš* 'Personal name' occurs as a shortened form of *ozmïš toγrïl* [Yamada 1993.12, 14, 16, 64, 93, 150; DTS 375].

Rulers of the Uigur Steppe empire

As a last group I deal with the Qaγans of the Uigur Steppe Qanate. The founder of the Uigur Qanate, Kül Bilge Qaγan [?–747], destroyed in the year 742, assisted by the Basmïl and Qarluq, the Türk Qanate; in 744 he attacked the Basmïl and subdued them. Kül Bilge is neither mentioned in the Terx-, nor in the Tes-inscription, but occurs in the Šine Usu-inscription: [SU N5] ... *qaŋïm kül [bil]g[e qaγan ...]* '... my father Kül Bilge Qaγan ...'. In the Qarabalγasun-inscription Kül Bilge is mentioned in the Chin. as well as the Sogd. part in the form Kül Bilge Qaγan: [Sogd. 5, 7] *[kw]ṛ pyṛ-k' γ'γ-'n*, [Chin. V. 57–64] *que pijia kehan* (38) 'Kül Bilge Qaγan'; MChinL *kʰyat pɦjikɦia kʰaxɦan;* MChinE *kʰuat* *bjigia kʰa'γan*. According to Mathews [581] the character *jia* (39), read also *qie*, is used in Buddhist texts to transcribe Sanskrit *ga*, *ka*.

In the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/3a/1) and *Xin Tangshu* (217A/3a/3) Kül Bilge carries the title *guduolu pijia que (huairen) kehan* (40) 'Qutluγ Bilge Kül (cherishing benevolence to the Emperor) Qaγan'. His personal name was, according to the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/3a/3), *guli peiluo* (41), MChinL *qut-liǝ̆k pfuaj-la*, MChinE *kwǝt-lik bǝj-la*, or simply *peiluo* (42), read by Hamilton as *qullïγ*(?) *boyla*, and *boyla* respectively [Hamilton 1955.139:1; Mackerras 1968.1, 2, 125:1, 2, 156]. The first part of the personal name could be understood as *qullïγ* 'having slaves', or *qulluq* 'service, suit de serviteurs, garde, esclavage', *qulluqï* 'PN' [Clauson 1972.620–621, Hamilton 1986.237]. With the suffix *-suz* the word is found as *quluqsuz* perhaps in a Manichaean text called "Mani converts Ohrmezd" [Clark 1997.100, Nr. 97; ll. 79–82]: ·· *yirde töpüsingetegi oq qoramïš-ča* ·· *biz ikigü qul(l)uqsuz anta baralïm* ·· 'So wie ein [abgeschossener] Pfeil vom Boden bis zu seinem Höhepunkt [an Geschwindigkeit??] abnimmt, so wollen wir beide ohne Begleitung dorthin gehen', Geng, Klimkeit & Laut [1987.53:21] interpreted the word as *qoloqsuz* 'ohne Pfeil'. The element *qul* 'a (male) slave; the masculine equivalent of *küŋ*' [Clauson 1972.615], as well as it's derivations, are a very common element in OT onomastics. *boyla* was "a high title, the exact significance of which is uncertain; except among the Proto-Bulgar, n[oted] o[nly] a[s] b[elow]. Among the Proto-Bulgar, where the word goes back to the earliest period, at least to early IX, the *boyla* seems to have been next in rank to the *xaγan* (cf. Pritsak, O., *Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren*. Wiesbaden 1955.40 ff.). The word is very old, prob. pre-Turkish and possibly Hsiung-nu, but has not yet been traced in Chin. texts regarding that people" [Clauson 1972.385]:

Uig. *qul* 'serviteur, esclave; PN', TMEN #1519, 1572 [Hamilton 1971.119]. (Dun. LV.int.) *qul ït [...]* 'PN', (LXIII.int.) *el toγdï qul* 'PN' [Hamilton 1971.51]. (TTIV 432u.) *mn qul arslan asmïš [birle]* 'Ich Qul Arslan und Asmïš; Stifter eines Beichttext' [Röhrborn 223–224]. (Jur 2:22) *qul qara* 'PN' [DTS 464]. (Mahrnāmag 79–80) *'ûd xarâkûl lââ čûr* 'und Qara-Qul, [der] Lā Čor'.

(Civil documents) *qul qya, qul qya qopuz, qulduqaya* [Yamada 1993.323]. (Dunhuang) *qul yegen, begsig qul čor, qul bars qatun, qulum čor, tanuq qul čor* [Hamilton 1986.236]. MMoM (#152) *qulbari* 'a younger brother of Ong Qan of the Kereyid', (#177) *qulbari quri* 'idem' [Cleaves 1982.259].

Uig. *qulï* < *qul* + *-i* 'Poss.-Suffix, 3. Pers. Sgl. = genitive'; a grammatically similar structure is attested with *begi*, cf. *AoF* V.148: (Civil documents) *burxan qulï, ïnaγ qulï, toyïn qulï tutung* [Yamada 1993]. (BTT XIII.12:H) *tngri qulï [...], tngri qulï kim sat[...]* 'PN; der erste PN ist tü. (Sklave Gottes)' [Zieme 1985.71]. (BTT XIII.49:27) *buyan qulï* 'PN, Sklave des Buyan; Bruder des Buyan Tümenbegi' [Zieme 1985.175], (Ch/U 6245) *buyan qulï* 'Absender eines Briefes' [Zieme 1976(a).248]. *nom qulï* 'PN' [Zieme 1980.230, 231, Yamada 1993], cf. the semantically same name *budataz* 'PN' < ?skt. *buddhadāsa* 'Sklave des Buddha': (BTT XIII.49:27, 78) *budataz* 'PN; Bruder (Z. 27) bzw. Sohn (Z. 78) des Buyan Tümenbegi' [Zieme 1985.175, 177]. (U 594) *quvraq qulï* 'PN; = chin. *sengjianu*' [Zieme 1976(a).248, 1980.235, 1994.123–127]. (Dunhuang) *teŋri qulï* [Hamilton 1986.236]. (SklavDok.:r8) *aqunši-im(?) toyïn qulï ïnal-qa* [Zieme 1977.160–161]. (USp 84:5) *toyïn qulï šila* [DTS 572, Zieme 1981.241, Yamada 1993]. MMoU (XXI,15.4–5) *buyanquli*, cf. Franke 1965.124–125 [Ligeti 1972(a).235]; (XV.2) *sing-quli* [Ligeti 1972(a).108].

Uig. *qulut* 'Sklave, Diener, ich' [Zieme 1975.84, Kara & Zieme 1976.95], < *qul* 'Sklave' + *-ut-* 'class-marker' [Tezcan 1974.57–58:758], + *(X)t*, + *AgUt* 'class marker to designate groups and classes of persons and then also individuals' [Erdal 1991.78–85] (+ *-ï* 'Possessivsuffix'): (MIV 705, 706, 713, 719) *qulut* 'Sklave, Diener, ich', (MIV 699–700) *tömeninč kičig yavïz qulutï qutluγ bars* 'sein niedriger, geringer, schlechter Sklave Qutluγ Bars', (MIV 716) *qoštir qulutï el bars* 'der Sklave des Xweštar, El Bars', (MIV 727) *qulutï külüg tonga* 'sein (des Bischof) Sklave Külüg Tonga', (MIV 745) *qulutï kičig ...* 'sein Sklave Kičig ...' [Zieme 1975]. *qulut bodi tuvača šila* 'ich Bodhidhvaja Śīla' [Zieme 1985.164], *qulut čïnsuin* 'ich Čïnsuin' [Zieme 1985.177]. (BTT III:758) *ataq-tï quludï men čisim-tu* 'Ich, Čisim-Tu[tung], Diener von Ataq-tï' [Tezcan 1974.57], according to Röhrborn (Uigurisches Wörterbuch), the first word has to be read adaq-taqï 'low, humble'. (Kuan-ši-im-Pusar) *quludï sangga širi* 'PN' [Tezcan 1974.57:758; Gabain 1963.227o]. (ETŞ 16/106) *qulutï aryasang qalïm keyši* 'PN' [Tezcan 1974.57:758]. (Malov 202) *quludï bintung* 'Euer Diener Pintung' [Tezcan 1974.57:758].

boyla: (T 6–7) *bilge toñuqug : boyla baγa tarqan : birle : elteris qaγan : boluyïn :* 'Mit Bilge-Toñuquq, dem Boyla-Baγa-Tarqan, [an der Seite] will ich Elteris-Qaγan werden [sagte er]'. (BQ S13–14) *teŋriteg : teŋri : yaratmïš : türk : bilge : [qaγan] : sabïm : qaŋïm : türk : bilge : qaγan : olurtuqïnta : türk : amtï : begler : kisre : tarduš : begler : kül čor : bašlayu : ulayu : šadapït : begler : öŋre : tölis : begler : apa tarqan : bašlayu : ulayu : šadapït : begler : bu [...] taman tarqan : toñuquq : boyla baγa tarqan : ulayu : buyruq [...] ič buyruq : sebig kül irkin : bašlayu : ulayu : buyruq : bunča : amtï : begler : qaŋïm : qaγanqa : ertïŋü* 'Meine, des Teŋriteg Teŋri Yaratmïš Türk Bilge Qaγan's Rede [vernehmet]: als mein Vater der Türk Bilge Qaγan regierte, [da waren?] die starken heutigen(?) Herren [die folgenden]: im Westen die Tarduš Bege, angeführt von Kül-Čor sowie die Šadapït Bege, im Osten die Tölis Bege, angeführt von Apa-Tarqan, sowie die Šadapït Bege, diese [...] Taman-Tarqan, Toñuquq Boyla-Baγa-Tarqan, sowie die Buyruq [...], die inneren Buyruq, angeführt von Sebig-Kül-Irkin, sowie [die anderen?] Buyruq, so viele jetzige Bege meinem Vater, dem Qaγan ...'. (SU W4) *[...] alγačqa boyl [...]* '[...] den Alγač [ein] Boyla [...]??'. (Su 2) *boyla qutluγ yarγan.* (MX 5–7) *'íl úgásíí 'úítúr búílá ṭarxan* 'Der El-Ügesi Ötür Boyla, der Tarqan'. (MX 14–16) *vä ḥam búílá ṭápmiš búílá ṭarxá[n] // 'ašpádá* 'Dazu die Boylas: Tapmïš Boyla, [der] Tarqan [und] [...] Ašpada Boyla (oder Ašpa, der Ta-Boyla)'. (MX 24) *'úítúr búílá ṭarx[án] //// [...]* 'Ötür Boyla, [der] Tarqan, [...]'.

10

After the death of Kül Bilge his son El Etmiš [747–759] became ruler over the Uigur Qanate. As this ruler is the main participant of the Terx-, Tes- and Šine Usu-inscriptions, he occurs in several places: [TR W1, S6] *teŋride bolmïš el etmiš bilge qaγan,* [TR W6] *teŋride bolmïš el etmiš bilge qanïm,* [TR W10, N3] *teŋrim qanïm,* [TR N2] *teŋri qanïm,* [TR N2] *qanïma.*

In the Sogd. and Chin. parts of the Qarabalγasun-inscription El Etmiš appears with his full title Teŋgride Bolmïš El Etmiš Bilge Qaγan: [Sogd. 7] *//// [tn]kryδ' pwṛmyš 'yṛ 'ytmyš p[yṛ-k' γ'γ-'n;* [Chin. VI.1–13] *dengliluo momishi xie yidemishi pijia kehan* (43); MChinL *təŋlila mutmjitşi xɦjiat ʔjiajtəəkmjitşi pɦjikɦia kʰaxɦan*, MChinE *təŋli/lila mətmjitɕiə/ɕi γət ɛjʰtəkmjitɕiə/ɕi bjigia kʰa'γan.*

El Etmiš is the only Uigur Qaγan whose date of birth can be detected. In the Terx-inscription, written in the name of El Etmiš, it is stated that he was 28 (meaning 27?) years old in the dragon-year 741. This means that El Etmiš was born in 713/714, and that at the time of his death in 759, he was 46 years old (or 45, if the Uigurs counted in the same way as the Mongols):

> (TR O5) *sekiz otuz yasïma yïlan yïlqa türk elin anta bulγadïm anta artatdïm* 'At the age of 28, in the year of the dragon [741], I disordered the confederation of the Türk [and] destroyed [the confederation]'.

XX Variants of his name in the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/3a/3) are *mo-yan-chuo* (44) 'Buyan Čor *or* Čad', MChinL *mua-jian-tɕʰyat*, MChinE *ma-jian-tɕʰwiat*, or *gele kehan* (45), MChinL *kat-ləə̌k*, MChinE *kat-lək*, as well as *yingwu weiyuan pijia kehan* (46) 'Brave and warlike, aweing the distant lands, Bilge Qaγan' (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/4a/5, *Xin Tangshu* 217A/4a/1) [Mackerras 1968.2, 15, 16, 130:35, 156].

The word *moyan* has, according to Kljaštornyj, to be read *buyan* and is a loanword from Sanskrit *puṇya*; attested first in UigM in the form *buyan* 'merit', *buyančï* 'meritorious, deserving' [Clauson 1972.386]:

> Uig. *buyan* 'Verdienst, Segen; Teil des PN' [Hazai & Zieme 1971.57, Tezcan 1974.87, Kara & Zieme 1976.88, 1977.130, Tekin 1980.86, Clark 1982.212, Zieme 1985.209, Hamilton 1986.231, Yamada 1993.254, Zieme 1996.217] < TochA/B? / SogdB/S *pwny'n*, *pwrny'n* [*punyān*] '(religious) merit, piety, puṇya' [MacKenzie 1970.67, 1976.127; Gharib 8183(–8187), 8212] < ParthM *pwn* [*pun*] 'service, meritious act' [Boyce 1977.75, Sims-Williams 1983.140] < Skt. *puṇya* 'gut, schön, günstig; (moralisch) rein, tugendhaft, heilig; Gutes, Rechtes; Tugend, (moralisch) Verdienst' [Mylius 1980.285]. Uig. *buyančï* 'verdienstvoll, Wohltä-

ter' [Zieme 1975.78, Tekin 1980.86], *buyančuq* 'PN' [Yamada 1993.254], *buyanlïγ, pwy'nl'q, pwy'nlq* 'mit Verdienst versehen, verdienstvoll, Verdienst- (in Komposita)' [Hazai & Zieme 1971.57, Tezcan 1974.87, Kara & Zieme 1977.130, Zieme & Kara 1978.215, Tekin 1980.86, Zieme 1985.209], *buyanlïγ ükmäk* 'Verdienstanhäufung = skt. *puṇyaskandaha*' [Zieme 1996.217], *pwy'nsyz, pwy'nsz* 'ohne Verdienst [Tekin 1980.86]. TochA *puṇyavāṃ* = skt. *puṇyavant* 'deutender Name (Tugendreich) eines Prinzen' [Thomas 1964.118]. ParthM *pwnw'r* [*punwār*] 'charitable food-offering, food given as alms', *pwnwnd, pwnwynd* [*punwend*] 'meritious, dutiful' [Boyce 1977.75].

Bügü Qaγan [759–779], second son and successor of El Etmiš, gained significance through the support given by him to Manichaeism. The traditional view that Bügü Qaγan introduced Manichaeism among the Uigurs in 762 can not be uphold, as the fragment [T II D 180] of the Turfan collection seems to provide evidence for an earlier date of conversion. As Clark [1997.102] states: "According to this fragment, which is clearly not a colophon to the sermon or book, Manichaeism was promulgated «in the second year of the year named 'Great beginning'», a dating device unambiguously correlated with the year 761 in Chinese dynastic reckoning. Since the only major promulgation of Manichaeism in the East was among the Uygurs of the steppe, this text must refer to an official proclamation made by Bügü Khan after coming to power in 759. At the same time, the affirmation text implies that after an initial conversion this ruler came back to the faith, which may have been the year 761".

Bügü appears in the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/4b/2) [Mackerras 1968.26] and *Jiu Tangshu* (195/8b/8) [Mackerras 1968.59] as *yidijian* (47); MChinL *jitʰikkian*, MChinE *jiădiʰgianʰ*, *jidiʰgianʰ* [Pulleyblank], (VIII. c.) **id'ig'jän* [Hamilton 1955.139]. Kljaštornyj [1985.145] interpreted *yidijian* as OT **idi kenč*?, lit. 'Lord-Boy', basing his explanation on a wrong interpretation of the words *ödkünč qaγan* in the Tes-inscription [TS 13]. The word *ödkünč* was explained by Kljaštornyj as a personal name; Tekin [1988.115–116], Erdal [1991.277] and Ōsawa [1999.165] showed that *ödkünč qaγan* has to be translated as 'different Qaγan', 'false Qaγan' or 'fake Qaγan'. Furthermore the structure of the name

**idi kenč* is not suitable, as *kenč* 'the young; young' [Clauson 1972.727] occurs in all known name formations in the first place, never in the second:

> Tü. *känč* 'jung', mo. *kenǰe*; Tung. E 2 *kenǰe* 'Lamm' U; M *kenǰe* 'jung' N [Doerfer MT #519]. In modern Turkic languages the word is attested only in some languages [Radloff 1899(a).1554, 1082, 1083; VEWT 252 (with a wrong etymology)], in Uig., however, the word is frequently exemplified:
> Uig. *kenč* 'PN; jeune; the young, of human beings and animals' [Clauson 1972.727, Geng & Hamilton 1981.50, Tekin 1980.56]. Possibly the word is a Sogdian loanword, cf. SogdS/C/M *knc'k, qncq, qnck/cyy* [*kančē*] 'small girl, child; Kind (mit maskulinem Artikel), Mädchen' [Henning BBB 101:e22, 127; Gharib 4752]; ParthM, MPersM *qnycg* [*kanīzag* (MPers.), *kanīžag* (Part.)], *knyg* [*kanīg*] 'girl, maiden', *knygrwšn* [*kanīgrōšn*] 'the Maiden of light' [Boyce 1977.52; Sundermann 1979.100:2/15, 101:3/15, 102:4/14]; MPersZ *kanīg* [*knyk'*], *kanīzag* [*knyck'* / NPers. *kanīz(ak)*] 'girl, maid' [MacKenzie 1986.49]. (Maitrisimit 73) *kenčkiesin* 'ihr Kindlein', (Maitrisimit 2612) *kenč kičig* 'jung', (Maitrisimit 2619) *kenč kičigimte* 'in meiner Jugend' [Tekin 1980.56, Geng & Klimkeit 1988]. (Maitrisimit, BTT XIII.12:28, BT IX II.59a) *kenč-ky-e* 'Kleines' [Zieme 1985.214, Tekin 1980]. (BTT XIII) *kenčik* 'Kindchen' < *kenč* 'Kind, Junges' + *-ik* 'Deminutiv (AtüGr #57, Erdal 1991.40–44)' [Zieme 1985.83:168, 214]. (BTT III:949) *körünč-lük kenčüki čaya* 'Estraden-Jüngling und Maid (Tänzer und Tänzerinnen)' [Tezcan 1974.67, 90].
> As a personal name: (Pfahl I.13) *kenč tngrim*; (Pfahl I.15) · *kenč turmïš tarxan* 'Kenč Turmïš, [der] Tarqan' [Müller 1915, Clauson 1972.727]. (USp 74) *kenč estemi*, (USp 85) *kenč bersü*, (USp 26) *kenč toγmïš tarqan* [Clauson 1972.727, DTS 298]. (Civil documents, LoO1–5) *tanuq kenč bars* 'der Zeuge Kenč Bars' [Yamada 1993.86]. (Maitrisimit 29) *qïz-ïm kenč tüz-ün* 'meine Tochter Kenč Tözün (des Stifters des Maitrisimit)' [Geng & Klimkeit 1988].

Therefore, it is possible to accept Hamilton's reading **idiken*, and to explain the first part of the word as *idi* 'master' [Clauson 1972.41], and the second as the suffix *-kAn* 'formative of divine beings, honorifics and the like', found also in such words as *teŋriken* 'divine', *yetiken* 'Ursa Major' [Erdal 1991.76–77]. According to Bazin [1963.578–579] *yetiken* means "die sieben Chane", and *-ken* has to be interpreted as a "vordervokalisierte Form des bekannten Herrschertitels *xān* (auch *qān*) «Chan»". **idiken* could in this way be interpreted as 'imperious' (Germ. herrisch, der Herrische). Another interpretation of the word could be *(y)itikän* 'Ursa Major, the Great Bear'. However, this last interpretation might be wrong as yeti 'seven' is never found as eti/iti nor with -d-. Examples for personal names including astronomical aspects can be found among Old Hungarian names, which share many common semantic features with OT names, cf. Pais [1923.247]: "Auch die Himmelskörper kommen in das[!!] Bereich der Schmeichelnamen. So heißt 1152 eine Dienerin *Havadi* = 'Mondchen'; der Name ihrer Genossin aber war *Hugydi*, ein ausgestorbenes Wort, dem heute 'Stern' entspricht"; Turkic examples can be found in Kakuk [1974.11–14], in a category of names styled by her "noms se rattachant à la nature".

According to Kljaštornyj Bügü is called *bilge tarqan* [TR 12], *qutluγ tarqan seŋün* [TR 14] in the Terx-inscription, while his adult name (*er ati*) was *qutluγ bilge tarqan seŋün* [Kljaštornyj 1985.144–145]. These interpretations are hypothetical, as the reading of lines 12–15 of the Terx-inscription, as well as the reading of many other lines, are by no means sure. In the four different publications of the Terx-inscription known to me, the readings differ considerably from each other. The texts are either accompanied by handmade copies of the inscription [Šinexüü 1975, 1980], or photographs impossible to read [Kljaštornyj 1982]. Sure readings and interpretations of the Terx-inscription can be made only after reliable photographs of the inscription have been published.

After his enthronisation Bügü Qaγan received the title *mouyu kehan* (48) (*Xin Tangshu* 217A/4b/2) [Mackerras 1968.26], OT *bügü qaγan*. This title appears also in the Sogd. part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription [Sogd. 7–8] ... *γ'γ-'n*, [13] *pwkw γ'γ-'n* 'Bügü Qaγan', as well as in Tib. as *'bug čhor*. In the Chin. part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription his title is [Chin. VI.26–41] *dengliluo gu momishi xie duodengmishi he julu pijia kehan* 'Teŋride Qut Bulmiš El Tutmiš Alp Külüg Bilge Qaγan' (49); MChinL *təəŋ-*

*lila kut mutmjitşi xfijiat *tutəəŋmjitşi xfiap kyəlywk pfijikfiia k*^{h}*a´xfian*, MChinE *təŋli/lila kwət mətmjitçiə/çi γεt *tutəŋmjitçiə/çi γĕp/γap kuəluawk bjigia k*^{h}*aγan*. I could not find the character *duo* [(50), Mathews 6432, Giles 11340, 12087] in Pulleyblank. According to Giles the character is pronounced *tut, chut; chiok; ch'üe; tah; tu', to', ch'o'; ch'uk* in different parts of China; *tol, t'al* (Sino-Korean); *tetsz, setsz* (Sino-Japanese) and *tout* (Vietnamese).

According to Hamilton [1988.25], Bügü's title in the Chin. part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription has to be read *kün teŋride qut bulmïš el tutmïš alp külüg bay[a qaγan]*.

Furthermore, Bügü Qaγan occurs as *dengli kehan* (51) 'Teŋri Qaγan' in the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/5a/1, 5b/4, 6a/3) [Mackerras 1968.23, 29, 33, 156]. His regnal titles are given in the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/6b/5) as *dengli xie duodengmishi han julu yingyi jiangong pijia kehan* (52), and in the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/5b/4) *xieduo dengli guduo mishi he julu yingyi jiangong pijia kehan* (53), respectively [Mackerras 1968.39, 40, 156]. Kljaštornyj [1985.146] compares the first part of the honorary title *yingyi jiangong* (54), MChinL *ʔiajn-ŋi' kian'-kəwŋ*, MChinE *ʔianjn-ŋi*^{h}*/ŋiă*^{h} ~~*kian*^{h}*-*~~ *kəwŋ* with the personal name *iŋi [jγlaγr]* 'Iŋi Yaγlaγar' [Kljaštornyj & Livšic 1971.12–13:7] in the Uigur part of the Sogd.-Uigur stela from Sevrey; however, the reading is not confirmed by the newest reading of that part of the inscription [Katayama 1999.226].

H Kian^h-

The interpretation of these last two titles is not quite sure. In the first variant of the title *han* [(55); MChinL *xfiam*, MChinE *γəm/γam*] does not fit, but this may simply be a scribal error for *he* 'alp' [(56); MChinL *xfiap*, MChinE *γəp/γap*], as both characters are nearly identical, differing only slightly. So the first title variant could be read as 'Teŋri El Tutmïš Alp Külüg, brave and righteous, building up service to the Tang, Bilge Qaγan' [Mackerras 1968.134:62]. A different explanation is given for the second variant by the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/6b/5) [Mackerras 1968.39], where it is stated, that *xieduo* means 'the proper usage of the gods of the soil and harvests', *dengmishi* 'enfeoffed territory', *han julu* 'georgeous' and *pijia* 'having complete wisdom'. In my opinion this explanation is only partly correct, as the first seven character *deng li xie duo deng mi shi* should be, according to other occurrences, read *dengli* *xie duodengmishi*, and not *dengli xieduo dengmishi*, as *xieduo dengmishi* makes neither sense in Chinese, nor in OT. The second variant contains clear as well as unclear characters: *xie* = *el*, *duo* is unclear (OT *tu-*, *tut-*?), *dengli* = *teŋri*, *gu* (57) may stand for *qut*, being usually used to transcribe *qut*, *duo* is unclear, [MChinL *tryat*, MChinE *trwiat*], possibly it is a verbstem], *mishi* = *-miš*, if the previous character is a verbstem, or an abbreviation for *momishi* 'bolmiš', *he* = *alp*, *juli* = *külüg*, *pijia* = *bilge*, *kehan* = *qaγan*. Possibly, the scribe has confused some signs. / / hi

Further Qaγans of the Uigur Qanate occur only in the Qarabalγasun-inscription. After Bügü Qaγan had been assassinated by his cousin and first minister in 779, this minister himself became Qaγan with the title Alp Qutluγ Bilge Qaγan [779–789]. In the Sogd. part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription his title is given as [Sogd. 13] *'ṛ-pw γwt-ṛwγ pyṛ-k' γ'γ-'n* 'Alp Qutluγ Bilge Qaγan'. The corresponding part of the Chin. version is destroyed, only the word *kehan* is preserved.

In the Chin. sources Alp Qutluγ is mentioned as *dun mohe dagan* 'Tuŋ Baγa Tarqan, the chief minister' (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/7b/3, 8b/8; *Xin Tangshu* 217A/6b/7) [Mackerras 1968.47, 59, 60, 156], *dun* (58), MChinL *tun'*, MChinE *twən*ʰ 'Tuŋ' (*Xin Tangshu* 217A/6a/4) [Mackerras 1968.58, 156], *dun mohe* (59) 'Tuŋ Baγa' (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/8b/8, *Xin Tangshu* 217A/6b/7, 6b/11) [Mackerras 1968.59, 60, 62, 156], *he guduolu pijia kehan* (60) 'Alp Qutluγ Bilge Qaγan' (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/8b/8, *Xin Tangshu* 217A/6b/7) [Mackerras 1968.59, 60, 156], as well as *wuyi chenggung kehan* (61) 'warlike, righteous and achieving Qaγan' (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/9a/1, *Xin Tangshu* 217A/6b/11) [Mackerras 1968.61, 62, 140:83, 157] and *guduolu changshou tianqin pijia kehan* (62) 'Qutluγ, long-lived, beloved by heaven, Bilge Qaγan' (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/9a/8, *Xin Tangshu* 217A/8a/7) [Mackerras 1968.79, 80, 142:99, 157].

The successor of Alp Qutluγ was his son, who reigned as Külüg Bilge Qaγan from 789 to 790. In the Sogd. part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription his title occurs as [Sogd. 13] *tnkryδ' pwṛ-myš kwṛwk pyṛ-k' γ'γ-'n* 'Teŋride Bolmiš Külüg Bilge Qaγan', being identical with the version in the Chin. part [XI.16–27] *dengliluo momishi julu pijia kehan* (63); MChinL *təəŋlila mutmjitşi kyə-* f *lywk pɦjikɦia k*^{h}*axɦan*, MChinE *təŋli/lɨla mətmjitɕiə/ɕi kuəlu-awk bjigɨa k*^{h}*a'γan.*

In the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/8b/7) [Mackerras 1968.80, 157] this Qaγan is called *duoluosi* (64), MChinL *ta-la'-sẓ*, MChinE *ta-la*^{h}*-siə/si* and prince *panguan* (65), MChinL *p*^{h}*uan'-kuan*, MChinE *p*^{h}*an*^{h}*-kwan*. In the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/8b/7) [Mackerras 1968.80, 142:100, 157] his regnal title is *ai dengliluo gu momishi julu pijia zhong~~t~~-*
z *hen kehan* (66) 'Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Külüg Bilge, loyal and upright Qaγan', in the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/9a/8) [Mackerras 1968.79] he is styled simply *zhongzhen kehan* (67) 'loyal and upright Qaγan'.

Külüg Bilge was poisoned in the year 790. First his younger brother became Qaγan, but he was soon replaced by the youngest son of Külüg Bilge. This Qaγan reigned as Qutluγ Bilge Qaγan from 790 to 795. Qutluγ Bilge was the last Qaγan of the Uigur Qanate belonging to the Yaγlaqar clan. His regnal title is attested in the Sogd. as well as the Chin. part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription as [Sogd. 14] *γwt-ṛwγ pyṛ-k' γ'γ-'n;* [Chin. XI.40–46] *guduolu pijia kehan* (68) 'Qutluγ Bilge Qaγan'; MChinL *kut*tu*luk pɦjikɦia k*^{h}*a'xɦan*, MChinE *kwət*tu*luk bjigɨa k*^{h}*a'γan.*

In the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/9a/4) [Mackerras 1968.88, 157] his personal name is given as *achuo* (69), MChinL *ʔa-tɕ*^{h}*yat*, MChinE *ʔa-tɕ*^{w}*iat* 'A-Čor' or 'A-Čad (= Šad)', and he was appointed as *fengcheng kehan* (70) 'Qaγan, showing sincerity to the Emperor' (*Xin Tangshu* (217A/9a/8) [Mackerras 1968.90, 144:116, 157].

Qutluγ Bilge died in 795 without children, and was followed as ruler by his first minister, who belonged to the Xiedie clan and ruled as Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan [795–805/808]. Hamilton [1955.1:2, 140; 1962.28, 46–47] and Mori [1978.26] have interpreted *xiedie* rightly as *ediz*. In the Qarabalγasun-inscription this ruler is called Teŋride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan: [Sogd. 14] *tnkryδ' 'wṛ-wk pwṛ-myš 'ṛ-pw γwt-ṛwγ 'wṛ-wγ pyṛ-k' γ'γ-'n;* [Chin. XI.56–73] *dengliluo yulu momishi he guduolu hulu pijia kehan* (71); MChinL *təəŋlila *ywlywk mutmjitşi xɦap kut*tu*luγ xɦuə*luγ pɦjikɦia k*^{h}*a'xɦan*, MChinE *təŋli/lɨla *ualuak mətmjitɕiə/ɕi γəp/γap kwət*tu*luγ γɔ*luγ bjigɨa k*^{h}*a'γan.*

This ruler carried the name *guduolu* (72) 'Qutluγ' (*Xin Tangshu* 217A/9b/2) [Mackerras 1968.94, 157]. Two slightly different forms of his title appear in the Chin. sources. Respectively, in the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/10b/2) [Mackerras 1968.93, 145:122, 157] *tengliluo yulu momishi he luhu pi huaixin kehan* (73) 'Teŋride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Uluγ Bilge, cherishing sincerity to the Emperor, Qaγan', and in the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/9b/2) [Mackerras 1968.94, 157] *ai tengliluo yulu momishi he hulu pijia huaixin kehan* (74) 'Ay Teŋride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Uluγ Bilge, cherishing sincerity to the Emperor, Qaγan'.

The reading of the first title variant is somewhat uncertain. In my interpretation I assume that *luhu* (75) is a scribal error for *hulu* (76) 'uluγ', and *pi* (77) a scribal error or an abbreviation of *pijia* (78) 'bilge'. In the second variant of the title *hulu* and *pijia* are written correctly.

The successor of Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge was Alp Külüg Bilge Qaγan, probably Alp Qutluγ's son, who reigned from 805 to 808. In the *Xin Tangshu* (217A/9b/2) [Mackerras 1968.94, 157] his title is *tengli ye he julu pijia kehan* (79) 'Teŋri Ye(?) Alp Külüg Bilge Qaγan'. In the *Tanghuiyao* (/1 98) his title is given as *ai dengliluo yude mishi julu pijia kehan* 'Ay Teŋride Ülüg Bulmïš(?) Külüg Bilge Qaγan' [Mackerras 1968.147].

The characters standing for *yudi mishi* in the *Tanghuiyao* are unknown to me, as neither Mackerras [1968], nor Hamilton [1955] give the Chin. characters of the words. I would consider *yude* a scribal error for *yulu* 'ülüg' and *mishi* an abbreviation of *bulmïš*, although also the reading *qut* instead of *ülüg*, as proposed by Hamilton [1955.140], is possible. In the last instance, however, too many errors are involved: *yu* for *gu*, and *de* for *lu*. Therefore, I'm inclined to consider *ülüg* the correct reading, as in this case only one mistake (*-de* for *-lu*) has to be taken into account.

The existence of Alp Külüg was taken for sure by Schlegel [1896.6], Hamilton [1955.140–141] and Mackerras [1968.157], later Mackerras [1999.319:4] refused his former opinion, extending the ruling time of Alp Qutluγ until 808, and the same has been done by Hamilton [1988.19]. Because Alp Külüg does not seem to be mentioned in the Qarabalγasun-inscription, while the following Qaγan Alp Bilge Qaγan is mentioned, it is possible that the second Qaγan of the Ediz clan never existed, and that the rule of Alp Külüg lasted until 808 or, more probably, that the rule of Alp Bilge

Qaγan started already in 805. While critically examining this problem, one has to take into consideration that the variants of the title of Alp Külüg are neither identical with the title of Alp Qutluγ, nor with the one of Alp Bilge Qaγan. The elements standing in the title before *bilge qaγan* are the decisive elements when analysing the structure of Old Turkic titles. An element *alp külüg* is known, according to Chinese sources, from the title of the last ruler of the Uigur empire, a point that speaks for the fact that Alp Külüg did not exist, as two identical titles are not possible in Uigur titulature.

The different Chinese sources do not help much at this point, as there are known a great deal of variants of titles for the period 805–821, cf. Mackerras [1968.146–147]. The *Jiu Tangshu* (195/10b/2–3) just mentions the enthronisation of Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan in 795, jumping after this notice directly to the year 809, the time of Alp Bilge Qaγan [Mackerras 1968.93, 95]. The *Xin Tangshu* (217A/9b/2–9b/7) is a little bit more detailed. For the year 805 it records the death of Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan and the appointment of his successor as Tengli Ye He Julu Pijia Kehan. According to the *Xin Tangshu* Alp Külüg died in 808 and was followed by Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Alp Bilge Qaγan [Mackerras 1968.93, 95].

Starting at least in the year 808, Alp Bilge Qaγan was until 821 the ruler of the Uigurs. The Chin. sources know many variants of his title, for example *ai dehelilu momishi he mi pijia kehan* (80) 'Ay Teŋride [Qut] Bulmïš Alp Bilge Qaγan', or 'Ay Teŋride Bolmïš Alp Bilge Qaγan (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/10b/3) [Mackerras 1968.95, 157] and *ai dengliluo gu mishi he pijia baoyi kehan* (81) 'Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Alp Bilge, the righteousness protecting, Qaγan' (*Xin Tangshu* 217A/9b/7) [Mackerras 1968.96, 147:129, 157]. In this last variant the form *mishi*, is notable; if not a scribal error for *momishi*, this could speak for an abbreviation *mishi* = *bolmïš*. Further variants are *ai dengliluo gu momishi he pijia baoyi kehan* 'Ay Teŋride Quot Bulmïš Alpe Bilge, the righteousness protecting, Qaγan' (*Cefu Yuanguei* 965/11353), and *ai dengliluo gu momishi he pi baoyi kehan* (*Tang Huiyao* 98) [Mackerras 1968.147]. In the last variant *pi* seems to be an error or abbreviation for *pijia*.

These variants are identical with the forms of the title occurring in the Qarabalγasun-inscription: [Uig. Denkmalschild] *[b]u teŋri-ken teŋride qut bulmïš al[p] bilge teŋri uyγur qa[γan]*; [Sogd. 1] *"y tnkrδ- γwt pwṛ-myš 'ṛ-p[w] pyṛ-k' βγy -w[y]γwr γ'γ-'n*; [Chin. I.5–17] *jiu ying huigu* [one character missing] *dengliluo gu mom-ishi he pijia kehan* (82) 'Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Alp Bilge Qaγan of the five clans of the Uigur', MChinl *təəŋlila kut mutmjitşi xfiap pfijikfiia kʰa´xfian*, MChinE *təŋli/lila kwət mətmjitəçiə/çi γəp/ γap bjigia kʰa'γan*. An abbreviated version of the title occurs as *he pijia kehan* (83) 'Alp Bilge Qaγan' [Q Chin.XII.2–6].

Further Qaγans of the Uigur Qanate are not mentioned in the Old Turkic inscriptions. From Chin. sources their titles can be reconstructed as Küčlüg Bilge (821–824): (*Jiu Tangshu* 195/10b/ 9–10) *dengluo yulu momishi juzhulu pijia kehan* (107) 'Teŋ-[ri]de Ülüg Bulmïš Küčlüg Bilge Qaγan', and (*Xin Tangshu* 217B/ 1a/2) *dengluo yulu momishi juzhu pijia chongte kehan* (108) 'Teŋ[ri]de Ülüg Bulmïš Küč[lüg] Bilge, honouring virtue, Qaγan' [Mackerras 1968.105–107, 150:141, 158], in the *Cefu Yuanguei* (967/ 14a) he carries the title Kün Teŋride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Küčlüg Bilge, *chongte*, Qaγan. In this last variant the elements *kün* and *alp*, missing from all other sources, are remarkable [Hamilton 1955.141:10]. For the year 822 the *Jiu Tangshu* (195/11b/3) reports that "the Emperor ordered an embassy to invest and set up Deng-luo Gu Momishi He Pijia Li Kehan". The information is misdated and misplaced as the ruler mentioned in this place is Alp Bilge, Küčlüg Bilge's successor, and the character *li* is a mistake for *zhaoli* [Mackerras 1968.115, 152:152].

Alp Bilge (824–832) was the younger brother or nephew of Küčlüg Bilge. The *Xin Tangshu* (217B/1b/6) states that his per-sonal name was *hesa* (109), MChinL *xfiatsat*, MChinE *γatsat*, ac-cording to Hamilton pronounced in the 9th century as **xàrsàr*, and perhaps to be interpreted as Xazar [Hamilton 1955.141:11; Mackerras 1968.120, 153:155, 158]. His appointed title was (*Xin Tangshu* 217B/1b/6) *ai dengliluo gu momishi he pijia zhaoli kehan* (110) 'Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Alp Bilge, manifesting rites, Qaγan' [Mackerras 1968.120, 152:152, 158].

Alp Bilge was killed by his ministers, and his nephew Prince Hu (111) (*Xin Tangshu*), or his younger brother Prince Sa (*Jiu*

Tangshu) became the new ruler of the Uigurs, ruling from 832–839. The following year he was appointed by the Chinese as *ai dengliluo gu momishi he julu pijia zhangxin kehan* (112) 'Ay Teŋride Qut Bulmïš Alp Külüg Bilge, manifesting sincerity, Qaγan' (*Xin Tangshu* 217B/1b/8) [Hamilton 1955.141:12; Mackerras 1968.121–122, 153:157, 158].

In the year 839 Alp Külüg Bilge was killed by his minister Jueluowu (113), MChinL *kfiytlavjut, kfiytlavut*, MChinE *gutlamut*, reconstructed by Hamilton as **g'ür-lâ-m̀vür* = Küräbir, a name attested in a Runic document from Miran (ll. 7–10) *külüg : saŋunqa : I : yosuq yarlïγ : boltï : kürebir : uroŋo : saŋunqa : I :*
L q *qïlïč : I : barduq : yarlïγ : boltï :* 'Külüg, [dem] Saŋun wurde ein Helm zugeteilt. Küräbir Uroŋo, [dem] Saŋun wurde ein Schwert und ein Wasserkrug zugeteilt' [Thomsen 1912.187, Róna-Tas 1991.110], as well as in the famous Staël-Holstein scroll (l. 28) in a list of tribal names: *kurabīrä* '*Küräbir, *Küräbör; a tribe of the Töliš, belonging to the royal Yaγlaqar clan' [Henning 1938.555–556; Konow 1947.140, 154]. Is this name somehow connected with *Kütelbüri, reconstructed by Golzio [1984.33] as the name of the first ruler of the Ruanruan? After the death of Alp Külüg Bilge, Prince Hesa (114), MChinL *xfiapsap*, MChinE *γapsəp, γapsap*, became the new Qaγan of the Uigurs, but soon he was attacked by the Qïrqïz under *Külüg Baγa, who killed him, beheaded Jueluowu, and set fire to the court, thus putting an end to the Uigur Steppe empire [Hamilton 1955.141:13; Mackerras 1968.123–124, 158; Golden 1992.162–163].

Analysis of the structure of the Titles

An analysis of the structure of the titles of the Uigur Qaγans, cf. appendix 3, reveals the following facts: The first part of the title, the intitulation, occurs in the inscriptions as *teŋriteg teŋride bolmïš, teŋride bolmïš* or *teŋride qut/ülüg bulmïš*. The intitulation *teŋriteg teŋride bolmïs* is attested only for rulers of the second Türk Qanate, *teŋride bolmïš* is exemplified for the rulers of the Uigur Yaγlaqar clan. Rulers of the Ediz clan did not use this intitulation; their intitulation was *teŋride qut/ülüg bulmïš*, which is used for rulers of the Yaγlaqar clan only in the Chin. sources. Starting with the year 789 Uigur rulers can have as a part of their intitulation also the element *ay* 'moon' or *kün* 'sun': *ay/kün tengride qut/ülüg bulmïš*. According to Müller [1919/1920.315], the use of the elements sun and moon was a conscious resumption of royal titles of the Xiongnu, whereas Golden [1992.65] states that it is "difficult to determine if this usage, [...], with it's reference to a heavenly mandate, was a borrowing from China or part of the common cultural traditions of Inner Asia (the Tibetans held similar notions). It remained a consistent element in the formal statements of divine right ideology of nomadic rulers from the Hsiung-nu to the Činggisids". Röhrborn [314] considered *ay teŋri* "eine Lehnprägung nach sogd. *m'x βγyy* (BBB 85m; vgl. schon Bang 1931.15m) oder einer entsprechenden toch. Bildung (vgl. Mironov 1928.163)". On the matter, cf. also Aalto [1971.31–32] and Pinault [1998a.358]. Whatever is the origin of this formation, among the Uigurs the use of *ay* or/and *kün* as part of the intitulation has to be connected with Manichaeism. In Manichaeism sun and moon are the two palaces of light wherein the rescuing deities reside: in the sun, the 'Third Messenger', the 'Mother of Life' and the 'Living Spirit'; in the moon, 'Jesus the Splendour', the 'Virgin of Light' and the 'First Man' [Bombaci 1966.13–15, Klimkeit 1982(a).23–25, Sundermann 1979.99–103]. The intitulation does not need to be mentioned.

The rest of the title is composed of the significant name-title, that is the words *bügü/bilge qaγan/qan* and the describing attributes. These describing attributes are the most important parts of the title, as they are different for every Qaγan, and only this part can be used to identify rulers in other old sources, for example in Manichaean manuscripts. In chronological order these attributs are as follows: *kül, el etmiš [uyγur], el tutmïš, alp qutluγ, külüg, qutluγ, alp qutluγ uluγ, alp külüg, alp.*

An intitulation occurs only at the beginning of royal inscriptions. In further parts of these inscriptions former rulers are addressed according to their family relation either *qaŋïm qaγan* 'my father, the Qaγan' or *ečüm qaγan* 'my uncle, the Qaγan'. Only in those parts of the royal inscriptions speaking about the enthronisation, is the former ruler addressed with his regnal title. Inscriptions of persons not belonging to the royal family, for example the Čojr-, Ongiin- and Küli-Čor-inscriptions, address rulers always with their regnal title als *elteriš qaγan, qapγan (türk) bilge qaγan, (teŋri) bilge qaγan.* An exception from this rule is the Toñuquq-inscription, as Toñuquq addresses rulers either by their regnal titles, or as *qaγanïn* 'my Qaγan = Elteriš' and *qaγan* 'the Qaγan = Qapγan' respectively.

Summarizing the following facts may be stated: the names of the Qaγans of the first Türk Qanate do not seem do be of Turkic origin. Sure explanations can be given only for some names, and in these cases a strong Iranian influence is visible. In later times this situation changed, and the names of the second Türk Qanate and the Uigur Qanate are, as far as they are known, of Turkic origin.

The Chin. characters used to transcribe OT words are mostly the same in the Chin. versions of the Türk and Uigur inscriptions. Below is a list of OT words together with the Chin. characters used to transcribe them. It should be noted that the characters are, for most parts, not identical with those listed by Hamilton [1955.165–170]:

[te]ŋri (KT):	*-keli*	(84)
teŋride (Q):	*dengliluo*	(85)
tegin (KT):	*teqin*	(86)
qaγan (KT, BQ, Q):	*kehan*	(87)
kül (KT, Q):	*que*	(88)
bilge (KT, Q):	(KT) *bijia*	(89)
	(Q) *pijia*	(90)
el (Q):	*xie*	(91)
alp (Q):	*he*	(92)
qut (TQ):	*gu*	(93)
qutluγ (KT, Q):	(KT) *gutulu*	(94)
	(Q): *guduolu*	(95)
uluγ (Q):	*hulu*	(96)
külüg (Q):	*julu*	(97)
ülüg (Q):	*yulu*	(98)
bolmïš, bulmïš (Q):	*momishi*	(99)
etmiš (Q):	*yidemishi*	(100)
tutmïš (Q):	*duodengmishi*	(101)

Certain Chinese characters are used to transcribe certain Old Turkic stems and suffixes, e.g. the character *lu* (102) transcribes the suffix '-lüg', whereas *lu* (103) is used to transcribe the suffix '-luγ', both forming denominal nouns; *mishi* (104) transcribes '-miš/mïš', forming deverbal nouns, and also being the ending of the past tense; *gu* (105) stands for 'qut', as well as the first part qut- in the word *qutluγ*. Some kind of system seems to be in use here, but the examined corpus is too little to make any further going conclusion.

The official titles have to be divided into two parts, the intitulation, *(teŋriteg) teŋride bolmïš*, or *teŋride qut/ülüg bulmïš*, respectively, and the significant name-title, consisting of definite attributes and *bilge qaγan*. Qaγans may be mentioned by their personal names but, however, this never applies to the latest deceased Qaγan. The Qaγans of the two Türk Qanates, excluding Bilge Qaγan, are known through the inscriptions by their names and titles from before and after their enthronement, some also by their significant name-title. The Uigur Qaγans, except Bügü Qaγan, are known only through their official titulature. In official titles the intitulation can be dropped off, and *bilge qaγan* may appear as *qaγan or türk bilge, bilge uγγur qaγan*. The descriptive attributes, however, are unchangeable and they are always mentioned. This part of the titles is to be considered the most permanent and important. The great stability of the OT titles has to be stressed, the official title does not need to be mentioned in its entirety, but the descriptive attributes are permanent, unchangeable, and always mentioned. X normal

Appendix i: Qaγans and Qans of the first and second Türk Qanate

time	name	inscriptions	Chin. sources
?-552	Bumin Qaγan	bumïn qaγan ?βwmyn γ'γ'n	tumen kehan
			yili kehan
552–575	Istemi	istemi qaγan	shitiemi
552–553	Keluo		keluo yixiji ayi kehan yi kehan

553–572	Muhān Qaγan	mwγ'n γ'γ'n	muhan kehan qijin (sijin) yandu
572–578	Tas/tpar Qaγan	t'sp'r γ'γ'n t'tp'r x'γ'n ?mγ'n tykyn ?'wr-kwp-'r ɸcr-"cw mγ" t'[t](p)['r] x'γ'n	tuobo kehan
578	Anluo (GOLZIO)		
578–587	Nawār Qaγan	nw'r γ'γ'n ?y'rwk' ?mγ' wmn ?w(+)n" 'y-ry mγ[']	
			nietu shetu erfu kehan yili julu she mohe shibo-luo kehan cong tian sheng da tujue tianxia xian sheng tianzi yili julu she mohe shibo-luo kehan da tujue yili julu she mohe shibalüe kehan da tujue yili julu she mohe shibaluo kehan chen shetu shabolüe, shiboluo, sha-boluo
682–691	Elteriš Qaγan	elteriš qaγan gutulu kehan	guduolu kehan
691–716	Qapγan Qaγan	qap(a)γan qaγan [türk] bügü qaγan	
			mochuo guduolu mochuo da ke-han tian shang de guobao tiannan tujue sheng tian guduolu mochuo da kehan
716–734	Bilge Qaγan	inäl qaγan bilge qaγan pijia kehan türk/teŋri bilge qaγan teŋriteg teŋride bolmïš türk bilge qaγan	pijia kehan
			moju mojilian

			pijia sha kehan sanshi xing tian shang de pijia sha kehan
734	Yiran (GOLZIO)		yiran kehan
734–741	Tengri	dengli kehan teŋriteg teŋride yaratmïš türk bilge qaγan	dengli kehan
742–744	Ozmïš	ozmïš qan	tian wusumishi kehan

Appendix ii: Qaγans of the Uigur Steppe Qanate

name/time	inscriptions	Chin. sources	
Kül Bilge			
?–747	kül [bil]g[e qaγan] [kw]ṛ pyṛ-k' γ'γ-'n que pijia kehan	 que pijia kehan guduolu pijia que huairen kehan guli peiluo, peiluo	
El Etmiš Bilge			
747–759	teŋride bolmïš el etmiš bilge qaγan teŋride bolmïš el etmiš bilge qan teŋride bolmïs el etmiš uiγur qaγan [tŋ]kryð' pyṛmyš/'ytmyš p[yṛ-k'] γ'γ'-'n [dengli]luo momishi xie yidemishi pijia kehan teŋri qaγan el etmiš qan	 moyanchuo gele kehan ... pijia kehan	l'yš
Bügü			
759–779	pwkw γ'γ-'n dengliluo gu momishi xie duodengmishi he julu [pijia kehan] ?iŋi yaγlaqar	mouyu kehan dengli xie dudengmishi han julu ... pijia kehan xieduo dengli guduo mishi he julu ... pijia kehan yidijian dengli kehan	luo

Alp Qutluγ Bilge 779–789	’ṛ-pw γwt-ṛwγ pyṛ-k’ γ’γ-’n … kehan	he guduolu pijia [kehan] … kehan guduolu … pijia kehan dun, dun mohe, dun mohe dagan
Külüg Bilge 789–790	[tŋ]kryδ’ pwṛ-myš kwṛwk pyṛ-k’ γ’γ-’n dengliluo momishi julu pijia kehan	ai dengliluo gu momishi julu pijia … kehan duoluosi panguan … kehan
6 Qutluγ Bilge 790–795	γwt-ṛwγ pyṛ-k’ γ’γ-’n guduolu pijia kehan	achuo … kehan
> + younger brother 7/10 Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge 795–805	tnkryδ’ ’wṛ-wk pwṛ-myš ’ṛpw γwt-ṛwγ ’wṛwγ pyṛ-k’ γ’γ-’n dengliluo yulu momishi he guduolu hulu pijia kehan	guduolu tengliluo yulu momishi he luhu pi … kehan ai tengliluo yulu momishi he hulu pijia … kehan
8/9 (?)Alp Külüg Bilge 805–806		tengli ye he julu pijia kehan ai dengliluo yude mishi julu pijia kehan
9/10 Alp Bilge 808–821	teŋriken teŋride qut bulmïš alp bilge teŋri uyγur qaγan ”y tnkryδ’ γwt pwṛ-myš ’ṛp[w] pyṛ-k’ βgy ’w[y]γwr γ’γ-’n jiu xing huigu [ai] dengliluo gu momishi he pijia kehan he pijia kehan tian kehan	ai dengliluo gu momishi he pijia kehan ai dehelilu momishi he

+8

mi pijia ... kehan
ai dengliluo gu mishi he
pijia ... kehan
ai dengliluo gu momishi
he pi ... kehan

Appendix iii: Structure of the titles of the Qaγans of the Uigur Qanate

Nr	ai/kün	teŋride	qut/ülüg	bolmïš/bulmïš	definite attribute	bilge	qaγan
1					kül	bilge	qaγan
2		teŋride		bolmïš	el etmiš	bilge	qaγan
		teŋride		bolmïš	el etmiš uyγur		qaγan
					el etmiš		qan
3		teŋride	qut	bulmïš	el tutmiš alp külüg	bilge	qaγan
					bügü		qaγan
4					alp qutluγ	bilge	qaγan
5		teŋride		bolmïš	külüg	bilge	qaγan
6					qutluγ	bilge	qaγan
7		teŋride	ülüg	bulmïš	alp qutluγ uluγ	bilge	qaγan
8	ai	teŋride	ülüg(?)	bulmïš(?)	alp külüg	bilge	qaγan
9	ai	teŋride	qut	bulmïš	alp	bilge	qaγan
	ai	teŋride	qut	bulmïš	alp teŋri uyγur	bilge	qaγan
					alp	bilge	qaγan

Manuscripts from the Uigur Steppe empire?

I would like now to examine some manuscripts [cf. for example Gabain 1949, 1955; Le Coq 1912(a), 1912(b), 1919, 1922; Müller 1912, 1913, 1915; Zieme (1992(a); Klimkeit 1982(a), 1983, 1989; Sundermann 1992; Clark 1997] that have, for one reason or another, been dated to the period of the Uigur Steppe empire. As I hope to be able to show, taking the structure of the titles as a starting point, not all of the earlier attempts of dating can be accepted.

The titles appearing in these manuscripts have to be compared with those of the Steppe empire on one side, and those of the Uigur kingdom of Qočo on the other. About the last one, it has to be remarked that no list of Uigur rulers of Qočo does exist, although a tentative list can be established for the late 10th, early 11th century by comparing Hamilton [1955.141–143], Clark [1997.103], Moriyasu [1991.182–185] and Zieme [1992(a).323–324].

Aruspar

= Pahl 1

Mihr-Aruspar

(Gig. p29)

Yatas

→ Gignoux

72. p.35

Moriyasu 1991. 183–185	?864–874?	Boquq Qan 'Founder of the dynasty' ?Hamilton [1955.142, Nr. 17]: Pugu Jun
	around 954	Il Bilge Tngri Ilig
	around 981, 984	Arslan Bilge Tngri Ilig = Süŋülüg Qan ?Hamilton [1955.143, Nr. 20]: ?981–985? Arslan Qan
Moriyasu fehlt:	about 996–1007	Bügü Bilge Tngri Ilig
Mory. ?-1017-19-20-31-?	about 1007–1019/24	Kün Ay Tngride Qut Bulmïš Uluγ Qut Ornanmïš Alpïn Erdemin Il Tutmïš Alp Arslan Qutluγ Kül Bilge Tngri Qan
Moriyasu 1007-08-?	after 1019/24–?	Kün Ay Tngriteg Küsenčig Körtle Yaruq Tngri Bügü Tngriken (Kül Bilge Tngri)
?–1067–?	after 1068	Tngri Bügü Il Bilge Arslan Tngri Uyγur Tärkänimiz

From this list the following 'shortened' forms can be deduced: (1) Boquq Qan, (2) Il Bilge Tngri Ilig, (3) Arslan Bilge Tngri Ilig, (4) Bügü Bilge Tngri Ilig, (5) Kül Bilge Tngri Qan, and (6) Yaruq Tngri Bügü Tngriken.

Geng & Klimkeit [1985.7–8] dated the "Memoirs written by Ked /O ~~Q~~γul Qoštir" [Clark 1997.103, Nr. 106], containing the names of the second and third ruler, to the 13th century, basing their opinion on the paleography of the document. This date, also accepted by Doerfer [1993(b).75–76, 254], was rejected by Clark and Moriyasu [1991.149–183]. The third sovereign is mentioned for the year 982 as *shizi wang* = Arslan Qan or Arslan Ilig in the travel-account of Wang Yande [İzgi 1989.63–68, 63:178]. The fourth ruler, from a calendartext, is given after Zieme [1992(a).324, who refers to Hamilton 1991] as possibly mentioned also in an Uigur hymn addressed to a ruler named *///ü bilge tngri qan* '[Clark 1997.104, Nr. 125; Zieme 1975.58–60, Nr. 26; Boyce 1960.10]. According to Clark, "several other fragments mention this ruler or death, but their relationship [...] cannot be established" [1997.104–105, Nr. 139–141]. To me, it seems that the titles preserved in these manuscripts are too fragmentary to take any decision about their identification. The fifth and sixth ruler is mentioned first of all in the stake inscriptions [Müller 1915, Hamilton 1986.xcii–xviii, Bazin 1991.251–273, Moriyasu 1991.184–185].

The seventh ruler occurs in the colophon of the Hami-Maitrisimit [Geng & Klimkeit 1988.10–13, Moriyasu 1991.185].

A list of later Uigur rulers can be established by comparing Uigur and Middle Mongolian civil documents and inscriptions from the Yuan period. Due to the geographical location of Turfan and to the historical circumstances two lists have to be given. The first one, starting with Barčuq-Art, presents a line of rulers called by Allsen [1983.260] "Yuan" Ïduq Quts. These Ïduq Quts ruled until the 1280ies in Qočo; after that, they ruled a *de facto* Uigur government-in-exile in Gansu [Allsen 1983.254–260, Hambis 1954.130–134]. Another line of Ïduq Quts was installed by Čaγataid qans, after the incorporation of Turfan into their realm in the first half of the 14th century [Allsen 1983.258–260]. It is possible, however, to establish a firm line of successions only for the Yuan line, as the list of the Čaγatai Ïduq Quts remains very fragmentary.

In listing the "Yuan" and "Čaγatai" Ïduq Quts, the following exceptional abbreviations are used: (Sino-Uig. 1334): Sino-Uigur inscription of 1334 [Geng & Hamilton 1981], (Sino-Mo. 1362): Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362 [Cleaves 1949], (Civ.) secular MMo. documents [Ligeti 1972a.208–237].

"Yuan" Ïduq Quts:

Barčuq-Art Ïduq Qut

(Sino-Uig. 1334, III.51) *barčuq art*, (Sino-Mo. 1362) *uiγudun qan inu barčuq-ard iduγ-qud* 'Barčuq-Ard, der Ïduq Qut, Herrscher der Uiguren'. In 1209, he submitted to Činggis Qan; he died appearently during the later part of Ögödei's reign (r. 1229–1241).

*Kesmez

Son of Barčuq; he was removed by order of the regent Töregene (r. 1242–1246). Only mentioned in Persian sources [Allsen 1983.273:52, Boyle 1958.47–48].

*Salïndï (?–1253/1254)

Son of Barčuq; he replaced *Kesmez by order of Töregene and was executed at the beginning of Möngke's reign (r. 1251–1259), by his brother and successor in Bešbalïq. Mentioned only in Persian sources [Allsen 1983.273:53, Boyle 1958.48–52].

Ögrünč (1253/54–1257)

(Sino-Uig. 1334, Chin. 1.12) *yuguluncht* [Geng & Hamilton 1981.32]. Son of Barčuq; he died during Möngke's reign [Allsen 1983.273:55, Boyle 1958.52–53].

Mamuraq (1257–1265/66)
(Sino-Uig. 1334, I.4) *oγlï mamuraq tigin* 'sein Sohn Mamuraq Tegin'
Son of Ögrünč; he died in Qara Qočo [Allsen 1983.251, 253–254]. According to the Chin. part of the Sino-Uig. inscription, a little brother of Ögrünč [Geng & Hamilton 1981.32].

I, Qočγar Ïduq Qut (1266–about 1280)
1d
(Sino-Uig. 1334, I.5, III.24–25) *qočγar tigin, qočγar ïduq-qut,* (Sino-Mo. 1362) *qočqar iduγ-qut-i* '(Akk.) den Ïduq Qut Qočqar'.
Son of Mamuraq; he was installed as Ïduq Qut in 1266 and died in Qamïl between the end of the 1270ies and the beginning of the 1280ies [Allsen 1983.254].

I.1. Ne'üril Tegin (ruler 1280–1318, Ïduq Qut 1308/09–1318)
(Sino-Uig. 1334, IIII.44) *nigü[...]n tegin,* (Sino-Uig., Chin. 1.18) *niulin.*
Babuča
Son of Qočγar; he was installed as Ïduq Qut in the year of the Ape = 1308–1309 (Sino-Uig. 1334, III.44–46); before being installed as Ïduq Qut, he was at the head of the Uigur government-in-exile [Allsen 1983.254–255, 257, 259–260]; died at the 13th of December 1318 in Yongzang [Geng & Hamilton 1981.37].

I.1.1. Temür Buqa Tegin (1318/1323–1329)
Hambis 1954.143 130–37
(Sino-Uig. 1334, IV. 12, IV. 31) *temür buqa,* (IV. 24, IV. 28) *temür buqa tigin,* ?(Civ. 1331) *iduγ-qud čingsang-a* '(Dat.) to the Ïduq Qut Čingsang' [Ligeti 1972(a).212–213, Rybatzki 1997(a).283].
Son of Ne'üril Tegin; installed in 1323, resigned in 1329 in favour of his younger brother Senggi Tegin [Hambis 1952.130]; Geng & Hamilton [1981.39, 43] state that he resigned between 1330 and 1331. According to the Chin. part of the Sino-Uig. inscription of 1334 he was still alive when the inscription was erected.
It has to be noted that the Mongolian document from 1331 is the only one that can be attributed to a "Yuan" Ïduq Qut, first of all because of the intitulation *qan-u ǰarliγ-iyar,* refering to a Yuan ruler, as the other secular MMo. documents from Eastern Turkestan mention the name of the ruler who issued the document and also, because of the title *čing-sang,* < Chin. *chengxiang,* thereby mentioned. The investiture of the title *čingsang* to Temür Buqa is reported in line (V. 3) of the Sino-Uig. inscription: *tngrikenimiz-ni binlang-ta čing-sang q[ïlïp]* '[J̌iyaγatu Qaγan] made our Tengriken in Bianlang a *chengxiang* (prime minister)'.

I.1.2. Senggi Tegin (1330/1331–1332)
1 gi
(Sino-Uig. 1334, IV. 2) *senggi,* (Sino-Uig. 1334, V. 19, V. 32–33) *senggi tegin.*
Younger brother of Temür Buqa [Geng & Hamilton 1981.38, 39, 43].

X Taypïnu Tegin (1332–?)
2. (Sino-Uig. 1334, IV. 17) *taypïnu tigin;* (Sino-Uig., Chin.) *taipingnu.*
Half-brother of Senggi; installed in 1332, he was still reigning in 1334 [Geng & Hamilton 1981.39, 43–44, Hambis 1952.130].

"Čaγatai" Ïduq Quts:

?*Ürlüg
(*Yuanshi* 108) *yueluge.*
He died 1305 [Hambis 1952.134–137].

Kirešiz Ïduq Qut (?1305–1309/1318)

(BTT XII.41:9, 42:15) *arslan bilge tngri ilig atam kirešiz ïduq qut* 'Mein Vater Arslan Bilge Tngri Ilig, Kirešiz Ïduq Qut'; (USp 22:6, missing in Radloff) *.../z ïduq qut* '[Kireši]z Ïduq Qut' [Arat 1937, 1964.155; Clark 1975.196:9; Zieme 1985.158:41.9].

Identical with *chilashasi* (Hambis: *Kirašis), a grandchild of *Ürlüg, mentioned in the *Yuanshi*, cap. 108 [Hambis 1952.136, Zieme 1985.158:41.9].

Könčök Ïduq Qut (1309/1318–1326/1334)

(BTT XII.40:30) *arslan bilge tngri ilig könčök ïduq qut* 'der Ïduq Qut Arslan Bilge Tngri Ilig Könčök'; (BTT 41:16, 42:22) *mn könčök ïduq qut* 'Ich, Könčök Ïduq qut'; (USp 22:12; Radloff 1.4) *...[e]sen buqa qan čaγïnta könčök ïduq qut ...*; (USp 22:27; Radloff 1.19) *... qan čaγïnta könčök ïduq qut ...* [Arat 1937, 1964.153–155; Zieme 1985.156:40.30].

Son of Kirešiz. Ruled as Ïduq Qut during the time of Esen Buqa Qan (1309–1318) and Tarmaširin (1326–1334). + Buyantu ? (→ [illegible] qa)

?? Ïduq Qut

(Civ. 1339) *qoco-yin iduqud-ta* '(Dat.) to the Ïduq Qut of Qočo' (Ligeti 1972a.222–223, Clark 1975].

Successor of Könčök? Ruled during the time of Yisün Temür (1338–1339).

Čingtemür Ïduq Qut

(Civ. 1352; 1348 or 1360) *qočo-yin čingtemür iduqud-ta* 'to the Ïduq Qut Čingtemür of Qočo' [Ligeti 1972a.220–221, 227–228]. Iü

Ruled during the reign of Tuγluγtemür (r. 1348–1363, born in 1329/1330).

The first text worth to be examined for our purpose is the *Maḥrnāmag*, a Manichaean fragment in late and incorrect Middle Persian, consisting of two sheets. The first sheet contains part of an introduction to a hymn-book; the second contains part of an index of hymns. According to Sundermann [1992.72] the double-sheet had an opposite direction as suggested by Müller, with the end of the index followed by the "introduction" which was in fact a colophon. The text has some Parthian forms, and also some strikingly late linguistic features which are in accordance with the generally accepted 9th century dating of the manuscript [Müller 1913; Boyce 1975.52–53; Moriyasu 1991, plates xxi–xxii; Lieu 1997.275–276].

What concerns the dating of the work, it is stated that the book was begun "546 years after the birth of Mani, the messenger of light, and 162 years after the death of Marī Šād Ohrmezd", that is in the year 761/762, for the person of Šād Ohrmezd cf. Colditz [1992]. These years coincide with the years of the introduction of Manichaeism among the Uigurs. After that, it was "kept and preserved for many years in the monastery of Ark (= Qarašahr)", until it was finished during the reign of a ruler called (11. 9–12) *'ây ṭngriyδâ xût bûlmîs 'alp bîlgâẖ 'ûyγûr xâgâân* 'Ay Tengride

Qut Bulmïš Alp Bilge Uiγur Qaγan'. There is no doubt whatsoever that the manuscript has to be dated to the time of the Uigur Steppe empire [Sundermann 1992.71, Zieme 1992(a).326], but the problem is that there seem to have been two rulers having the same title, one reigning from 808 to 821, the other from 824 to 832 (the title of the last one is, however, recorded only in Chinese sources). Müller and Klimkeit [1989.182] identified the ruler of the *Maḥrnāmag* with the later one, Henning [1938.566], Hamilton [1955.141], Gabain [1955.195–196] and Mackerras [1990.322] with the former one. This later identification seems to be correct, as the book mentions in the third place after the Qaγan (ll. 20–21) a person called Qasār Tegin. As Hamilton [1955.141:11] has shown, this name was the personal name of the later Alp Bilge, called in Chinese sources Hesa, and therefore, the Alp Bilge mentioned in lines 9–12 has to be the former one. Another piece of evidence could be the form Bilge Uiγur Qaγan only recorded for the first ruler, used in the text instead of Bilge Qaγan, which was the title used for the second ruler.

The ruler Bilge Uiγur Qaγan seems to be also mentioned in a Middle Persian text in Sogdian script belonging to the Mannerheim Collection in Helsinki and published by Sims-Williams & Halén [1980.9:3-5]: *'['y] (t)nkryd' xwtpwlmyš ['](l)p [...] 'wy-γwr x'n* 'Ay Tengride Qut Bulmïš Alp [Bilge] Uyγur Qan', where, however, the use of *qan* instead of *qaγan* is disturbing. The identification with Bilge Uiγur Qaγan (808–821) was taken into consideration as a possibility by Sundermann [1992.70–71]; according to Zieme [in Sims-Williams & Halén 1980.10], also the emendation *qutluγ* is possible: in this case reference has to be made to the unpublished manuscript (M 2707) containing the fragmentary title *[...tng]ridāh qut [bulmïš ...? al]p qutluγ ... γan*. Zieme continues stating that "die Zeit [ist] unklar, doch scheint es mir sicher zu sein, daß es sich um einen König von Qočo handelt". Clark [1997.105:59] wants to identify the two rulers mentioned in the last two fragments with Tngride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan (795–805), but the elements *alp qutluγ uluγ bilge* speak against this identification.

The colophon to the *Šabuhragān* (?) [MI.10–12; Clark 1997.105, Nr. 145] contains a dating similar to that of the *Maḥrnāmag*. But,

Gulácsi (2001.222 §28/VIi/14-15)
[ay] tängridä qut [bulmïš qut] ornanmïš //
Su 92.68
R00.

doubt whatsoever
time of the Uigur
992(a).326], but the
rulers having the
other from 824 to
led only in Chinese
ntified the ruler of
938.566], Hamilton
ras [1990.322] with
s to be correct, as
Qaγan (11. 20–21)
a person called Qasar Tegin. As Hamilton [1955.141:11] has shown, this name was the personal name of the later Alp Bilge, called in Chinese sources Hesa, and therefore, the Alp Bilge mentioned in lines 9–12 has to be the former one. Another piece of evidence could be the form Bilge Uiγur Qaγan only recorded for the first ruler, used in the text instead of Bilge Qaγan, which was the title used for the second ruler.

The ruler Bilge Uiγur Qaγan seems to be also mentioned in a Middle Persian text in Sogdian script belonging to the Mannerheim Collection in Helsinki and published by Sims-Williams & Halén [1980.9:3–5]: *'['y] (t)nkryd' xwtpwlmyš [']('l)p [...] 'wy-γwr x'n* 'Ay Tengride Qut Bulmïš Alp [Bilge] Uyγur Qan', where, however, the use of *qan* instead of *qaγan* is disturbing. The identification with Bilge Uiγur Qaγan (808–821) was taken into consideration as a possibility by Sundermann [1992.70–71]; according to Zieme [in Sims-Williams & Halén 1980.10], also the emendation *qutluγ* is possible: in this case reference has to be made to the unpublished manuscript (M 2707) containing the fragmentary title *[...tng]ridāh qut [bulmïš ...? al]p qutluγ ... xan*. Zieme continues stating that "die Zeit [ist] unklar, doch scheint es mir sicher zu sein, daß es sich um einen König von Qočo handelt". Clark [1997.105:59] wants to identify the two rulers mentioned in the last two fragments with Tngride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan (795–805), but the elements *alp qutluγ uluγ bilge* speak against this identification.

The colophon to the *Šabuhragān* (?) [MI.10–12; Clark 1997.105, Nr. 145] contains a dating similar to that of the *Maḥrnāmag*. But, whereas the *Maḥrnāmag* is dated according to the birth of Mani, the colophon of the *Šabuhragān* dates after his death: (II.13–16) *teŋri mani burqan teŋri yiri-ŋerü barduqïnta kin bis yüz artuqï eki-i otuzunč layzïn yïl-qa* 'exactly 522 years after Mani, the messenger of light, entered the realm of the gods, in a Pig year'. This date corresponds to the year 795 of the Christian calendar, that is the last year of the rule of Qutluγ Bilge Qaγan (790–795) and the first year of the rule of Tngride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan (795–805). The epitaph for the ruler in the colophon (II.17–18), *ötükenteki nom ul-'uγ'ï tükel erdemlig yarl-aγ-qančučï bil-ge beg* 'der im Ötükän wohnende Gesetzesfürst, der sehr tugendhafte, gnädige Wissensfürst', doesn't fit with neither of these two titles. Generally, the mentioned ruler is identified with the later one [Gabain 1949.59–60, Bazin 1991.247–248, Clark 1997.105].

A Manichaean enthronement hymn [MIII.35, Nr. 15; Arat 1964.151–152; Clark 1997.104, Nr. 119] describes (II.21–24) how a ruler called *körtle küsenčig adïnčïγ y(a)ruq ạlp erdemlig bedük küčlüg 'iligimz qutïï üzeh ornanzun* ·· 'ein schöner, ersehnter, bunter Lichtstrahl möge sich niederlassen auf unserer Majestät, dem tapferen, tugendhaften, hohen, mächtigen Fürsten' was enthroned after the death of the former king: (MIII.35, Nr. 15:12–15) ·· *qaltïï y(a)na kün tngrii ornïnta y(a)ruq ạy tngrii yašïyu b(ä)lgür[e] y(a)rlïqarča 'iligimz 'ïduq qut avlavč orunta b(e)güre y(a)rlïqadïï* ·· 'Wie wieder an der Stelle des Sonnengottes der lichte Mondgott strahlend zu erscheinen geruht, so geruht unser Fürst, (der) Ïduq Qut an der Stelle des Awlawč(?) zu erscheinen'. The reading and interpretation of these lines contain several difficulties. Taking the element *küčlüg* as a part of the title of the new ruler, Gabain [1949.62] identified this ruler with one of the last Qaγan's of the Uigur Steppe empire, who ruled from 821–824. This identification is impossible, as the elements *alp erdemlig bedük küčlüg* are attributes, and not a part of the title of the ruler; furthermore, the title of this Uigur Steppe ruler is quite different: Tngride Ülüg Bulmïš Küčlüg Bilge Qaγan. On the other hand, there exists no other Uigur Steppe Qaγan with a title resembling the 'title' of the manuscript, for that reason also Clark's statement [1997.104] that "the identity of the ruler in question cannot be established with certainty, but internal evidence indicates that he was one of the Khans of the period 808–832" can not be accepted. According to Zieme (letter from 19. 5. 2000) the sentence *körtle küsenčig adïnčïγ yaruq alp erdemlig bedük küčlüg* equals the Manichaean view of the four Entities: God, Light, Wisdom and Power. Usually, however, ~~these~~ are expressed by the words *~~tn-gri~~ yaruq küčlüg bilgä* = *parthm βaγ rošan zāwar žirift* [vgl. Asmussen 1965.220–221]. Moreover, there are also other problems in the interpretation of the text. The interpretation of *avlavč* as the name of the former ruler in line 14 by Le Coq [1922.35] and Arat [1964.152] is not sure, because until now no ruler with such a name is known. According to Röhrborn [280], the word has to be read as *oloq* 'eben jener'. Zieme, in his review of the "Uigurisches Wörterbuch" in the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* explained it as *uluγ*. Also the reading of the title *iligimiz ïduq qut* in (recto) line 19, and (verso) lines 9, 14 and 19 [Arat 1964.151, 152] is problematic, as *ïduq qut* is attested as part of the titulature only in the OT inscriptions, and in documents belonging to the time of the Mongol empire, as it will be shown at the end of the article.

H tngri

~ normal

In the *Festschrift für Vilhelm Thomsen*, F. W. K. Müller published in 1912 a fragmentary Middle Persian text, which he considered a description of the court of a ruler called (11.13–17) *'úlúγ 'ílíg ṭngríðá qúṭ búlmís 'árðámín 'íl ṭúṭmís 'al[p] // qútlúγ qúúlúg bílgá 'úíγúr xaagán zaḥag 'í máni* 'Uluγ Ilig Tengride Qut Bulmïš Erdemin Il Tutmïš Al[p] // Qutluγ Külüg Bilge Uigur Qaγan, the emanation of Mani'; according to Sundermann [1992.72], the work is a colophon.

Müller (Uigurica II.95) tried to identify this ruler with Bügü Qaγan (759–779), an opinion supported also by Sundermann [1992.72], Lieu [1997.276] and Klimkeit [1989.195–196]: "probably Bilge Qaγan who ruled from 759 to 779". Zieme [1992(a).326] is more cautious in his identification: "Könnte Bügü Qaγan sein, zumal er das zusätzliche Beiwort *zahag ī Mani* 'Kind des Mani' trägt. Jedoch etwas unklar". There are two known titles containing the element *il tutmïš*, but the title occuring here is not exactly the same, as it is neither the same as Bügü's title, which closest variant occurs in the Chinese part of the Qarabalγasun-inscription (Tengride Qut Bulmïš Il Tutmïš Alp Külüg Bilge Qaγan), nor is it the same as the title of the 5th Uigur ruler of Qočo given above. This fact seems to point to the fact that the ruler of this text is neither of the two rulers mentioned before. Furthermore, the text does not belong to the time of the Uigur Steppe empire, but has to be dated to the time when the Uigur ruled in Gansu and Eastern Turkestan. This hypothesis is further strengthend by the use of *ilig*, a title not used in OT onomastics, but, as Bombaci [1966.42] stated, belonging instead to the Uigur kingdom of Qočo.

The manuscript TM 2756^{a} ~~a~~nd 2756^{b} (TT II.3–14) consists of two sheets that once belonged to a book bound in an European way. The text is an incomplete copy of a Turkic translation of a Sogdian letter written by an *electus*, and not the original letter as it was stated by Bang & Gabain [1929.3–4] as well as Gabain [1949.48]. This text records an affirmation of Bügü Qaγan's conversion to Manichaeism, rather than the initial conversion itself [Clark 1997.102]. Bügü Qaγan is called in this text *tŋrim* [11. 8, 20, 50], *tŋri ilig* [11. 27, 30, 66, 81, 90], *tŋriken* [1. 29], *tŋri ilig bügü qan* [11. 33, 52, 62], *bügü qan tŋriken* [1. 80], *qutluγ ül-üglüg ilig qan* [1. 88]. These titles point strongly to the fact that the manuscript does not belong to the time of the Steppe empire, but to the time when the Uigurs held an empire in Eastern Turkestan and Gansu.

A similar title can be found in the very fragmentary manuscript (MIII, Nr. 17:1–2): */// burqan tŋriikenmz bug/ /// tinga : tngrii možak*, according to Clark [1997.104], a "New Year's benediction for Bügü Qan".

Fragments of a Manichaean book were published by A. von Le Coq [1912(a)] in the *Festschrift für Vilhelm Thomsen*. Clark [1997.103], stating that "the possibilty that the whole text constituted a kind of history of the Uigurs up through the conversion of Bügü Qan cannot be excluded", called the book "Fragments of an Uigur history". The fragments speak of the visit of a ruler called Boquq Khan to Qočo: (11. 1–7) *tengriken uiγur boquq qan qočoγaru kelipen qoin yïlqa üč maxistak olurmaq üčün mažakka kingedi* ... 'der himmlische Uigur-Boquq-Qan kam nach Qočo im Schaf-Jahr (767) wegen der Einsetzung von drei Maxistak und verhandelte mit Mažak' [thus Le Coq 1912.149, who reads the name as *buγuγ*]. This translation is only partly correct, as *olurmaq* does not refer to the appointment of three presbyters, but is an expression indicating the celebration of the memorial for the leaders of the Manichaean church who died the martyr's death. These events, which were called yimki-feast [ParthM *ymg* (*yamag*) 'holy day in honour of a head of the church' > SogdM *ymk-*, *ymq-*, *ymq/gyy* [*yimak*] 'prayer, supplication (a Manichaean prayer)' > Uig. (X^{u}āstvānīft 11. 273, 275, 280, 284) *y(i)mki(i)* 'Yimki (festivals)'] in Uigur, were one of the most important religious celebrations of the eastern Manichaean church. The three presbyters mentioned here were "crucified" together with Sisinnios during the reign of Bahram II in 291 [Asmussen 1965.178, 224–227; Boyce 1977.102; Gharīb 10989, 10990; Henning 1936a.14–16:1-2, 1945; Sundermann 1986.74–75].

The identity of this ruler with Bügü Qaγan was taken for granted by Le Coq and Gabain [1949.58–59]. Bang & Gabain [1929.5] stated that *bügü* and *buγuγ* cannot be connected; they, however, concluded that the persons called, respectively, Buγuγ and Bügü, are two identical persons and considered Buγuγ to be the "Jugendname oder ein ihm später zugelegter Beiname". The name occurring in the Manichaean fragments, written *pwkwq*, has to be interpreted as *boquq* 'a swelling, esp. in the throat; in humans: goitre, double chin; in birds: crop; metaph.: a bud' [Clauson 1972.313–314; TMEN #801; Radloff 1911.1264–1 265, 1362]. Therefore, contrary to the previous opinions, Boquq and Bügü have to be considered two different persons, and the ruler called *boquq qan* has to be regarded the founder of the kingdom of the Uigurs of Qočo and Bešbalïq. Perhaps, he is mentioned in Chin. sources as Pugu Jun. MChinL *pɦəwk-kuə̆'*, MCHinE *bəwk-kɔʲʰ*, *bawk-kɔʲʰ*; Hamilton reconstucts this name as *b'uγ-kuŏ*, a 'leader of the Uigurs in the Tianshan' in the years ?864–874?, and his title (?) as *jun* 'superior, handsome, refined, eminent' [Hamilton 1955.142:17, Mathews 1727]. As a forefather of the Uigurs of Qočo and Gansu, he occurs in the Sino-Uigur inscription of 1334 as (II.29) *boquq tözlüg pundarik čeček ong tegin begi* 'Ong Tegin Begi, la fleur de lotus de la souche de Boquq' [Geng & Hamilton 1981.35]. The manuscript should refer to an event that happened at the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century, that is 887 or 947.

The word *boquq* is found also on a copper coin from the Cabinet des Médailles de la Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, whose origin is unknown to me: (recto) *kül bilge teŋri boquq uyγur qaγan*, (verso) *il tutmïš yarlïγïŋa* [Thierry 1998.269]. Thierry tried to establish that the Qaγan mentioned on the coin has to be identified with Teŋride Ülüg Bulmïš Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge Qaγan (795–805/808), the *il ügesi* of the three former Qaγans and founder of the Ediz dynasty of the Uigur Steppe empire, and also with Buquq of the Sino-Uig. inscription of 1334 [1998.269–273]. Considering the differences between the two titles, it is unacceptable to take them as referring to the same person. The Boquq on the coin and on the inscription of 1334 are to be considered as the same ruler, who has to be regarded another person than Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilge of the Qarabalγasun-inscription.

Some Manichaean "scratch sheets" from the Dunhuang Collection in Paris contain a very elaborated title that can be reconstructed as follows:

(*Pelliot Chinois* 3049; Hamilton 1986, Nr. 5:47–56)
(47) yeme üzeki tört
(48) yeme üzeki tört yaruq ellig ..
(49) tengri-lerde tükel qutbulmïš
burqanlarda (50) a ülüg bulmïš
nomqu nom qutï
(50) tengride bilge bilig bulmïš
kün .. (52) tengriteg körtle
ay tengriteg yarug
yakov frišti teg alp erdemlig
ekki (54) külüg čoγluγ
tört sïngar küsi (55) atï yadïlmïš
ekki törlügke tükellig
(56) ekki dïdïmqa tegimlig
yersuqdaqï

(Hamilton 1986, Nr. 5:'1–'11)
('1) ///////////////////////////lig
ekki ('2) //// čoγluγ
tört sïngar ('3) küsi atï yadïlmïš
ekki törlügke ('4) tükellig
ekki dïdïmqa tegimlig
('5) yer suvdaqï uluγ erklig küčlüg ('6) illig
yigedmiš qutadmïš alqatmïs
('7) edgü atï
ming ögmekke tümen ('8) alqamaqqa tegimlig
kün tengride ('9) qut bulmïš
erdemin il tutmïš
('10) alp qutluγ uluγ bilgä uyγur tengri
('11) uyγur qan qutïnga

Yang 1991. 87–88
=> Chin. Chen-Suo Wang-ton, who established the Sha-chou kingdom in 1036.
≈ tngri elig uygur qan (70)
Not accepted by Moriyasu 2000. 43ff. (Acta Asiatica)

Parts of the reconstructed title are found also in Hamilton [1986, Nr. 9A:1-4, Nr. 10:4-5]. Hamilton [1986.50], followed by Clark [1997.106], identified the ruler mentioned here with Bügü Qaγan (759–779), Zieme [1992(a).324] with Kül Bilge Tngri Qan (1007–1017/1018). Neither of the two identifications is convincing. The part of the titulature that can be used for comparison appears in (ll. '8–'11): *kün tengride qut bulmïš erdemin il tutmïš alp qutluγ uluγ bilge uγγur tengri uγγur qan.* Several reasons speak against an identification with one of the two rulers: Kül Bilge Tngri Qan received his *qut* from the *kün ay tngri*, Bügü Qaγan from the *tngri*, whereas the ruler stated here received it from the *kün tngri*. The element *uluγ qut ornanmïš*, taken by Zieme [1992(a)] as decisive in identifying Kül Bilge Tngri Qan, is missing in the titulature of the ruler occurring in Hamilton [1986]. Furthermore, the 'describing elements' are different for the three rulers, which strongly speaks for the assumption that the ruler mentioned here can neither be Bügü Qaγan, nor Kül Bilge Tngri Qan.

The third Uigur stake inscription contains the title (ll. 1–2) *kün ay tngride qut bulmïš uluγ qut ornanmïš alpïn erdemin il tutmïš alp arslan qutluγ kül bilgä* [over the line] *tngri qan[ïmïz].* As a date, the inscription gives *qutluγ ki ot qutluγ qoin yïl ikinti ay üč yangïqa* 'im Jahr des segenbringenden Elements Feuer, und des segenbringenden Schafs, im 2. Monat am 3. Tag' [Gabain 1955.198]. This is not the 44th year, as explained by Gabain [1949.56], but the 56th year of the sixty-year-cycle [Bazin 1991.258], corresponding to 779, 839, 899, 959, 1019, 1079, 1139, or 1199. Gabain [1949.56–57], basing her conclusions on the element *il tutmïš* of the title, first dated the inscription to the year 767, during the reign of Bügü Qaγan (759–779); later [1955.198], she changed her opinion, stating that the ruler mentioned here is someone ruling in the Qočo oasis and, after Hamilton [1955.143], she dated the inscription in the year 947. Doerfer [1991.183–184] dated the stake into the 'zeitliche und strukturelle Umwelt des 13./14. Jahrhunderts', taking it to be later than the first stake, a statement that contradicts the list of rulers given above. Hamilton [1986] dated the inscription in the 10th century; Zieme in the beginning of the 11th century; Bazin [1991.258] tried to give an exact date: 12th of March 1019.

On the basis of the structure of the two titles, an identification with Bügü Qaγan is impossible and this was already questioned by Müller [1915.26]. Taking the list of rulers of Qočo of the early 11th century as given by Zieme [1992(a).324] and the evidence provided by the date of the stake, this stake could be dated to the year 1019.

According to Gabain [1949.59], the event described in the "Fragments of an Uygur history" mentioned before, appears also in a miniature (IB 6368) published by Le Coq [1923.58:8a]. The miniature contains a fragmentary title which beginning can be restored as *qutluγ ilig : ay tngride qut bulmïš qut ornanmïš alp[ïn erdemin il] tutmïš [...]* [Zieme 1992(a).325]. Gabain [1949.59] identified this ruler with Bügü Qaγan (759–779) of the Steppe empire; Le Coq [1923.58], spoke more carefully about 'a Qaγan of the Steppe empire'; according to Klimkeit [1982(b).37], this was a ruler who reigned between 790 and 833. These identifications are not correct, as the elements *qut ornanmïš alpïn erdemin* do neither occur in Bügü Qaγan's titulature, nor in that of any other Qaγan of the Steppe empire. These elements can be, however, found in the title of the 5th Uigur ruler of Qočo from the beginning of the 11th century, mentioned also in the third stake inscription, and the ruler of the miniature has, therefore, to be identified with Kül Bilge Tngri Qan, as has been shown by Sundermann [1992.68–69], Zieme [1992(a).325] and Clark [1997.106].

Furthermore, the ruler Kül Bilge Tngri Qan is mentioned also in an Iranian fragment in Manichaean script (IB 8259), where the beginning of the title can be restored as *[ay] tngride qut [bulmïš qut o]rnan[mïš alpïn erdemin il tutmïš alp arslan]* [Boyce 1960.193–194:14-17, Sundermann 1992.68–69], and in a Middle Persian fragment (M 43): *tngry q'n qwyl bylg' q'n* 'Tngri Qan, Kül Bilge Qan' [Müller 1905. 78–79, Boyce 1975.193–194, Klimkeit 1989.197–198, Sundermann 1992.67]. Possibly also the title *(qwt) 'rn'nmyš 'lp qlwγ qwyl bylg'h tngryy x'nmz* 'Qut Ornanmïš Alp Qutluγ Kül Bilge Tngri Qan', occurring in a Middle Persian fragment (M 158) [Boyce 1960.12, Sundermann 1992.66–67, Zieme 1992(a).325] dates to the time of Kül Bilge Tngri Qan. However, it has to be remarked that this last title differs to a certain extent from the 'full' one as it occurs in the stake inscription and in the other documents mentioned before. The element *qut ornanmïš*, and the last part of the title *qutluγ bilge tngri qan* could speak for the identification with Kül Bilge Tngri Qan, although it is worth to remark once more that the titles of the rulers of Qočo are known only fragmentarily and, for that reason, also a hithero unknown Qan could be mentioned.

qwt

A "colophon to a book commissioned by a family mourning a son who died young," also mentions the Uygur ruler Kül Bilge Khan (1007–1024?) [(TM 301): MIII.43, Nr. 28; Clark 1997.106, Nr. 147]. His full title can be reconstructed as *qutluγ ülüglüg [ilig kün?] ay tngride qut bulmï[š qut ornanmïš] alpïn erdemin il tu[tmïš alp arslan] uluγ bilge t[ngri qan]* [Zieme 1992(a).326]. Because of the element *il tutmïš*, Gabain [1949.54, 1955.195] identified this ruler with Bügü Qaγan. As, however, there are two rulers with this element, and the other
(X e d~~i~~cisive element *qut ornanmïš* is not attested as a part of Bügü's title, but only as one for Kül Bilge Tngri Qan, the Qan mentioned here is the later one, as also proposed by Clark and Zieme.

This manuscript mentions a scribe styled aγduq: (MIII.43:12–13) *mn aγduq biti[geči///* 'I the miserable scribe'. A scribe with the same attribute is mentioned in another Manichaean manuscript (MI.28:19). This last one [Moriyasu 1991.xix–xx] consists of three parts: the main text, identified by Gabain [1949.50] and Klimkeit [1993.373] as a part of the *Iki yïltïz nom* or, more carefully, defined by Clark [1997.105, Nr. 16] as a "homiletic text"; a colophon, called by Clark [1997.105, Nr. 146] "The Arγu Colophon"; and three afterwords. The part were aγduq occurs reads as follows: [11. 54(17)–59(22)] *yme yigedmek utmaq bolzun manga aγduq xarï bitgeči-i : mar išoyazd maxistak üze : kim yme uluγ qmranmaqï-n aγïr küsüšün bitidim :.* Gabain [1949.50–51] translated here "ein betagter Maxistak namens Aγduq, mit dem Titel Mar Išoyazd". This interpretation is not correct, as the text should be translated 'und siegreich möge sein (= errettet möge werden) ich, der unvermögende, alte Schreiber. Auf Befehl des Mahistak Mar (Herr) Išoyazd (Jesus) habe ich [das Buch] in großer Liebe [und] tiefem Wunsch geschrieben'. A further occurence is found in the-colophon to the
talic X Dhāraṇī-Sūtra: umaz aγduq bithäči [Zieme 1976b. 769:2, Moriyasu 1997.51]. For the title Mahistak, compare the following examples:

Uig. *maxistak* < SogdM *mhystk [mahistak]* 'presbyter' [BBB 77:623, Gharib 5319] < MPersM *mhystg [mahistag]* 'elder, presbyter; 3rd in rank in the Man. hierachy, a synonym of *m' ns'r'r'* [Boyce 1977.57]. In the Chin. *Compendium* the Mahistaks are called 'die in den Gesetzhallen Residierenden' [Waldschmidt & Lentz 1933.521–522].

(MI.12:18–20) *tükel erdemlig y(a)rl-aγ-qančučï bil-ge beg t(e)ṅri m(a)r new mani m(a)χï-stakka ay-γïn* (?) *bu eki* 'der sehr tugendhafte, gnädige Wissensfürst, der göttliche Mar New Mani, dem Maχistak Ayγïn, diese beiden ...'. (MI.28:20) *m(a)r išoyazd maχistak* 'Mar Išoyazd, der Maχistak'. (MIII.9, Nr. 4:3) *mγi-stkan vrwrti ič[inte]* 'in the «Letters to the Presbyters»', Uig. *vrwrti* 'letter' < SogdS *βrwrtk* [*frawartē*] 'scroll, letter', SogdM *frwrty* 'epistle' < ParthM, MPersM *frwrdg, prwrdg* [*frawardag*] 'scroll, letter, epistle', MPersZ *frawardag* [*plwltk*] 'letter, epistle' [Gharib 2790, 3939, 7295; Boyce 1977.40; MacKenzie 1986.33; Zieme 1975.71:756, 88], cf. also the remarks by Klimkeit [1993.345, 348:2] on this passage. (MIII.35, Nr. 16:Titel; 36, Nr. 16:8–9, 9–10) *noγdar mγi-stak* 'Der Maγistak Noγdar'.

The text has been dated by Gabain [1949.54], followed by Klimkeit [1993.373], around the year 780. This dating is not correct as the text, especially the three afterwords, reveals some features typical of later texts. For example, in the afterwords there is a confusion between the letters *s* and *z*: [1. 84 (10)] *yrlγasunlar*, which stands for *yrlγazunlar*, in [1. 91 (17)] *bolmazunlar* is written 'correctly'. In particular, this feature has been taken by Doerfer [1993(b).27–29, 115–119] as one criteria for identifying texts belonging to a late period.

Furthermore, instead of *tabγač* as a designation for 'China', the first afterword uses *qtai*. This word, used as a word for China only after the conquest of Northern China by the Qitan, could as well point to a later date of the manuscript.

Uig. (Maitrisimit) *qyt'n* 'Qitan (Titel)' [Tekin 1980.103]. (Dunhuang) *xitay* 'nom de Khitay, peuple qui occupait au Xe siècle la Mongolie et le Nord de la Chine' [Hamilton 1986.232]. (Civil documents) *qïḍay* '(Nord-)China; chinesisch; Chinese'; *Qïdan, Qiḍay Buqa, Qïtay Bürt, Qïtay Yalavač, Qïty Qaya, Qïty Qya, Qora Qïḍay, Quduyčï Äsän Qïḍay* 'PN' [Yamada 1993.323]. MMoM *kitat* (Pl. v. Kitan) 'Stammesname' (Haenisch 1939.179]. MmoU (XXV:2a.37–38) *Uriangqadai-yin köbegün Qitadai* 'Qitadai, Sohn des Uriangqadai'. (IX.36) *qitad-un ayalγus-ača mongγol-un ayalγus-tur* 'aus der chinesischen Sprache in die mongolische Sprache'. MmoS *kitat* 'les Chinois' [Lewicki 1959.57].

The mentioned facts could indicate that the manuscript belongs to the 10th–11th century. Another Manichaean manuscript, now lost, dealing with "The four mentalities of Azrua" [(T II K 2a) MI.21–22; Clark 1997, Nr. 4] was taken by Gabain [1949.55–56] as being written by "Aγduq" too.

The first stake inscription mentions a ruler with the name (ll. 2–3) *kün ay teŋriteg küsenčig körtle yaruq tngri büg[ü] tngrikenim[i]z kül bilge tngri ilig-niŋ orunqa olurmïš ekinti yïlïŋa* 'Nachdem unser Kün Ay Teŋriteg Küsenčig Körtle Yaruq Tengri Bügü Tengriken, auf des Kül Bilge Tengri-Königs Thron saß [= regierte], im zweiten Jahr'. According to Zieme [after Sundermann 1992.69] and Hamilton [1986.xvii], in this place one ruler is mentioned, Müller supposed two rulers here. Müller's interpretation is seemingly wrong, as the ruler of the first stake can most probably not be the successor of the ruler of the third stake.

The date given on this stake is much more complete than the one given on the third stake: *qutadmïš qutluγ topraγ qutluγ bičin yïlqa ödrülmiš edgü ödke qutluγ qoluqa toquzunč ay tört otuzqa purva polguni yultuzqa* 'im Jahr des beglückenden, glückbringenden [Elements] Erde, und des segenbringenden Affen, zu auserwählt guter Zeit, zu glückbringendem Zeitpunkt, im 9. Monat, am 24. Tag, zur [Zeit der 22.] Mondstation Pūrva phalgunī'. This year is the 45th of the sixty-year-cycle and could be the year 768 or, starting from this point, the following years 828, 888, 948, 1008, 1068, 1128, 1188, or 1248.

The first attempts to date the inscription were made by Müller and Gabain [1949.57], who tried to identify the ruler mentioned here with Bügü Qaγan (759–779). This identification meets, however, difficulties, as 768 was not the second year of Bügü's reign, as already remarked by Müller [1915.4]. Furthermore, the title given here is quite different from that of Bügü Qaγan. Later, Gabain [1959.199] rejected her former identification, and taking as a starting point Hamilton's [1955.143] dating to the year 948, she dates the stake to the year 1008 or 60 years later. According to Zieme [1992(a).324] the ruler mentioned here is the sixth ruler of Qočo, whose reign started in 1017/1018; Doerfer [1991.184] states that the stake dates back to pre-Yuan times, most probably to the 11th century; Bazin fixed the date given in the stake to the 25th of October 1008 [1991.258].

However, the dates of the two stakes are somehow related and some clues are given by comparing them. The more precise date of the first stake points to a later date of composition than the third one, written in the 56th year of the sixty-year-cycle. As the first stake, written in the 2nd year of the reign of Yaruq Tngri Bügü Tngriken, was written in the 45th year of the sixty-year-cycle, Yaruq Tngri Bügü Tngriken is most probably not the direct successor of Kül Bilge Tngri Qan. If the date 1019 is acceptable for the third stake, the first one has to have been written in 1068. Other possible, but less probable, dates could be: third stake 959, first 1008, or 1079 and 1128, or 1139 and 1188, or 1199 and 1248, respectively. The last two possibilities are improbable: the year 1188 for the first stake falls completely out of the dating frame; the year 1248 coincides altready with the time of the Ïduq Qut Salïndï.

The text has some features which point to a rather late date and do not fit the picture given above. It contains confusion of dentals and sibilants, taken by Doerfer [1991.175–177] as one evidence for dating texts in the Yuan period. Furthermore, the title *tegin* does occur as a femal title, and this use is otherwise only found in documents originating from the Yuan period. Taking all the facts together, the dating of the stake inscriptions, and the succession of the rulers mentioned in them, can not be taken as certain.

Possibly, the ruler of the first stake inscription is mentioned in two other Uigur manuscripts, both now lost: (T I x13) *[...] rü tg küsänčig körtlä* [Zieme 1992(a).327]. A somewhat longer part of the title can be reconstructed from (TM 176) *a[y tngriteg küšenčig] qašïnčïγ [körtlä yru]q bügüü [...] tngriken* [MIII, Nr. 23; Zieme 1992(a).326–327]. However, the element *qašïnčïγ*, not mentioned in the stake inscription, is disturbing, and perhaps another ruler than Yaruq Tngri Bügü Tngriken is mentioned here. Clark [1997.104–105, Nr. 138] identified the last ruler with Bügü Bilge Tngri Qan (996–1007); this identification doesn't seem to be correct.

An element *tngri bügü tngriken* occurs as a part of a title also in a short Uigur inscription from Toyuq, speaking about the restoration of a Buddhist monastery: *teŋri bügü teŋrikenimiz* [?one word missing?] *bügülük uluγ ïduq qut qutïŋa* 'Teŋri Bügü, unser Teŋriken, Bügülük Uluγ Ïduq Qut, für seine Majestät'. This document, published by Tekin [1976.225–230], contains no date. According to Tekin [1976.226], the ruler mentioned here is the same as the one mentioned in the first stake inscription who, on his turn, is the same as Bügü Qaγan (759–779). This analysis was rejected by Doerfer [1993(b).250], who pointed out that the inscription belongs to the 11th or 12th century.

The identification of Tekin has some difficulties, as the ruler of the first stake inscription cannot be Bügü Qaγan. Furthermore, the titulature of the ruler mentioned in the Toyuq-inscription is quite different from the titulature of Yaruq Tngri Bügü Tngriken. Thus, also these two rulers can not be taken as the same person. A clue for the dating of the inscription and a subsequent identification of the ruler can perhaps be provided by the title Ïduq Qut. This title is attested in written sources for the second Türk Qanate (BQ E25) as a title of the Basmïl. An example from the Uigur Steppe empire (SU N4) is not confirmed by Moriyasu [1999.178, 182–183, 190–191]; he reads the quotation as *türük qaγan čïq älig yïl olurmïš türük eliŋä altï otuz yašïma enč////* 'I had heard that the Türük Qaγans had sat on the throne (or: had reigned) exactly for fifty years. At my age of twenty-six (A. D. 739), one ***ed peacefully ///'. The title occurs moreover in one Manichaean text (MIII.33–35, Nr. 15), the "enthronment hymn" mentioned before, which could not be dated by Doerfer [1993(b).246], and which Arat thought is "ein Muster für Schriftstücke, daß bei der Wahl eines Herrschers eine Rolle spielte". Arat's dating in the 9th century is, however, doubtful [Arat 1964.152–153, 156–157]. Khotanese documents dealing with the Uigurs of Gansu don't know the title either [Bailey 1939.90].

Besides the Manichaean document, difficult to date, Ïduq Qut doesn't seem to occur as part of the title in documents belonging to the time between the Türk and Uigur Steppe empire and the Mongolian period, cf. for example the occurrences in the documents published as USp. 40 and 41. In these documents the date is given, contrary to all other Uig. secular documents, at the end, a feature that is in accordance with MMo. documents of the same kind. In USp. 22 *caγïnta* 'during the time [of a ruler]' is exemplified several time. In Uig. *čaγ* 'time, a point of time, a period of time' is clearly a loanword from MMo., replacing the OT *öd* 'a point of time, a period of time' [Clauson 1972.35, 404–405; TMEN #1045; Doerfer(b).189]. Examining all relevant documents, Arat [1964.150] came to the conclusion that Ïduq Qut was used as a title or dynastic name only for rulers of the kingdom of Qočo.

OT (BQ E25) *: yegirmi : yašïma : basmïl : ïduq(q)ut : oγušum : bodun : erti : arqïz ïdmaz : teyin : süledim :* 'In meinem zwanzigsten Lebensjahr [704] zog ich gegen den Ïduq Qut der Basmïl, der mein Untertan war, in den Krieg, da er keine Tribute geschickt hatte'. (SU N4) *tür* [3 letters] *bčq* (Ramstedt 1913–1918, Orkun 1936), / *türük qïbčaq* (Malov 1959, Ajdarov 1971, Kljaštornyj 1988(b).74–75) *: elig yïl : olurmïš : türük iliŋä altï : otuz yašïma : ïduq[q?]u[t].*

Uig. *ïduqqut* 'Heilige Majestät (Titel der uigurischen Könige)' [Yamada 1993.256]. (MIII.34, Nr. 15:19-23; Uigurica I.57) ·· *tngrii 'iligim(i)z 'ïduq qut tngridem ïduq at at(a)maqïm(ï)z / altun örgin (e)rd(i)nilig taučang üze oluruu ornanu y(arlïqa-maqïï / qutluγ qïvl(ï)γ bolmaqïï bolzun* ·· 'Die durch uns vollzogene Titelverleihung mit dem göttlichen erlauchten Namen an unseren göttlichen König, den Ïduq Qut, (sowie) sein gnädiges Platznehmen auf dem Goldthron, auf dem juwelenreichen Thronsitz, sein Majestätisch-und-Glücklich-werden möge stattfinden'; (MIII.35, Nr. 15:9) *'iligimz 'ïduq qut kün tngriče* 'Da unser Fürst, der Iduq-qut wie der Sonnengott (verschwandt, d.h. starb)'. (MIII.35, Nr. 15:12-15) ·· *qaltïï y(a)na kün tngrii ornïnta y(a)ruq ay tngrii yašïyu b(e)lgür[e] y(a)rlïqarča 'iligimz 'ïduq qut avlavč orunta b(e)güre y(a)rlïqadïï* ·· 'Wie wieder an der Stelle des Sonnengottes der lichte Mondgott leuchtend zu erscheinen geruht, so geruht unser Fürst, (der) Ïduq Qut an der Stelle des Awlawč(?) zu erscheinen'. (MIII.35, Nr. 15:16-20) ·· *'il ötüken qutïï 'ilkii bügü 'iligler qanglarïh 'iligler qutïï bu 'ïduq örgin qutïh tngrii 'iligimz ïduq qut üze ornanmaqï bolzun* ·· 'Die Majestät des El-Ötükän, die Majestät(en) der früheren weisen Fürsten-Väter und Fürsten, (sowie) die Majestät dieses erlauchten Thrones mögen sich auf unsern göttlichen Fürsten, dem Ïduq Qut niederlassen'.

(BTT XIII.40:30) *arslan bilge tngri ilig könčök ïduq qut* 'der Ïduq

Qut Könčök, der Arslan Bilge Tngri Ilig' [Zieme 1985.156]; (BTT XIII.41:9, 42:15] *kireşiz ïduq qut* 'der Ïduq Qut Kirešiz; (Vater des Könčök)' [Zieme 1985.158, 160]; (BTT XIII.41:16, 42:22) *mn könčök ïduq qut* 'Ich, Könčök Ïduq Qut' [Zieme 1985.159, 160]. (Sino-Mong. inscription of 1334): (I:8) *[...]//ta ïduq qut adanïp* '(Qočγar Tigin) fut nommé Ïduq Qut à (Qočo?) [...]'; (I:28) *[...al]tun ïduq qut* 'Ïduq Qut d'or'; (III:24–25) *[se]čen qaγan-qa [...] tengrikenimiz qočγar ïduq qut u[...]* 'a (par?) Sečen Qaγan notre souverain cèleste Qočγar Ïduq Qut [...]'; (III:44–47) *öz oγlï nigü[...]n tigin külüg qaγan-qa soyurqadïp [...]un qutluγ bičin yïl-ïn ïduq qut adanïp on uyγur il-in osaqï yangča bašlayu yarlïqadï* 'son propre fils, Nigü[...]n Tigin ayant bénéficié de la faveur de Külüg Qaγan fut nommé Ïduq Qut en l'année bienheureuse [...] du Singe, et régna à la tête de l'État des On Uyγur selon le mode ancien'; (III:51) *[...] barčuq art ïduq qut [...]* 'Barčuq Art Ïduq Qut [...]'; (IV:28) *yana t[e]mür [b]uqa tigin ïduq qut adap* 'de plus Temür Buqa Tigin fut nommé Ïduq Qut et [...]'; (IV:44) *iduq qut ong ad altun tamγa özinde ök erip* 'le sceau d'or au titre de Ïduq Qut Wang était sur sa personne même'; (V:18–19) *altun tamγa-sïz ïduq qut kao-čang ong ad-nï amraq inisi senggi tigin-ke birip* '(pour que celui-ci) donne à son bien-aimé frère cadet Senggi Tigin le titre de Ïduq Qut Kaotch'ang Wang sans le sceau d'or, [...]' [Geng & Hamilton 1981]. (Civil documents): (Em01:15–16, Freilassungsurkunde) *uluγ suuqa bir altun yastuq aqa ini tigid-lär birer kümüš yastuq ïduqqut-qa bir yastuq šazïn ayγučï-qa bir at qïšγud ödünüp [...]* '(wenn wir von den Worten dieses Dokuments abweichen), sollen wir der Großen Majestät (d.h. dem mo. Kaiser) einen Gold-Yastuq, den älteren und jüngeren Prinzen je einen Silber-Yastuq, dem Ïduq Qut einen Yastuq, dem Religionsbeauftragen ein Pferd als Strafe darbringen [...]' [Yamada 1993.130–131]; (MI01:16–20 = USp. 115) *uluγ süü-kä biš altun yastuq aqa ini tigit-ler-ke birer altun yastuq qïšγut ïduq-qut-qa bir altun yastuq kögürüp qočo balïq ayγučï-qa bir kümüš yastuq birip [...]* '(wenn sie aber Streit erheben sollten), sollen sie der Großen Majestät fünf Gold-Yastuq, den älteren und jüngeren Prinzen je einen Gold-Yastuq als Strafe darbringen, dem Ïduq Qut einen Gold-Yastuq offerieren und dem Befehlshaber der Stadt Qočo einen Silber-Yastuq geben' [Yamada 1993.146–147]. (USp. 22:6) *[kireši]z*

ïduq-qut, (USp. 22:12, 27) *könčök iduq-qut* [Arat 1937, 1964.153]. (USp. 40:1; 41:1) *ïduqqut tngrikenimizke, ülči tümen ilči beglerke* '(eidesstattliche Erklärung) an dem Ïduq Qut, unseren majestätischen König und an die Elči und Bege des Ülči-Tümens' [Gabain 1973.69].
MMoM (#238) *ui'udun idu'ut* 'der Ïduq Qut der Uiguren' [Haenisch 1935.78, Heissig 1989.135], (#202, 243) *idoγudai, iduγudai* 'PN' 'a captain of a thousand' [Cleaves 1982.242, Poppe 1975.162, Bese 1978.367]. MMoU (XXV,2a.51) *iduqadai* 'PN' [Ligeti 1972a.272]; (XXi.17) *iduγ[?] tngriken t[...]* [Ligeti 1972a.237, Franke 1970.143]; (XII.4) *uiγudun qan inu barčuq-ard iduγ-qud* 'Barčuq-Ard, der Ïduq Qut, Herrscher der Uiguren', (XII.6) *iduγ-qud-un*, (XII.7) *iduγ-qud öber-ün tüsimel-iyer-iyen* 'der Iduqqut mit seinen eigenen Ministern', (XII.11) *iduγ-qud-ta qalqanliγ totuγ ner-e ögteǰü* 'vom Ïduq Qut wurde [Qara] der Titel Qalqanliγ Totuq verliehen', (XII.14) *mön qalqanliγ qara totuγ iduγ-qud-tur südkün duradqaǰu* 'derselbe Qalqanliγ Qara Totuq beriet den Iduqqut', (XII.20) *qočqar iduγ-qut-i* '(Akk.) den Ïduq Qut Qočqar', (XII.22) *iduγ-qud* [Ligeti 1972a.64–67]; (XXI,3.3) *iduγ-qud čingsang-a* 'dem Ïduq Qut Čingsang' [Ligeti 1972a.212; Franke 1968.10:3, TMEN I.310–312;" Haenisch 1952.60; Mostaert 1995.55], (XXI,7.2, 11.2) *qočo-yin čingtemür iduqud-ta* 'an Čingtemür, den Ïduq Qut von Qočo' [Ligeti 1972a.220, 227], (XXI.8.2) *qočo-yin iduqud-ta* 'an den Ïduq Qut von Qočo' [Ligeti 1972a.222].

The title of the ruler of the Toyuq-inscription resembles the titulature of the Uigur rulers of the Yuan period. During that time, the leaders of the Uigurs of Qočo and/or Gansu had as a last part of their title the element *ïduq qut*, as also here.

Several other facts speak against a dating of this inscription in the 8th century. All other inscriptions written in Uigur script known to me seem to originate from the Mongol period. These are the inscription of the Daruγači of Suzhou from the Yuan period, the Uigur part of the inscription on the gate of Juyongguang (1343–1345), and the Sino-Uig. inscription of 1334 from Wuwei [Geng & Hamilton 1981(.10–11), Röhrborn & Sertkaya 1980]. The dating of the Ulaangom-inscription is difficult, Ščerbak [1961, 1995.148] dates it in the beginning or middle of the 8th century, whereas Zieme [1986] thinks that there is no evidence for dating the inscription earlier than in the 9th century. However, it has to be remembered that the Ulaangom-inscription differs considerably from the 'later' Uigur inscriptions, stylistically similar examples can be found among the Yenisei-inscriptions.

As donors, the Toyuq-inscription mentions two persons called *On Baγlïγ Toyin* and *Tudum*(?) *Seli*. Help in dating can be obtained from the second name Tudum Säli. The first part could stand for *tutung*, including a confusion between *t* and *d*, pointing to a late date of the inscription, and a confusion or misreading of *-m* for *-ng* (the facsimile is very unclear at this point). Nevertheless, this word could also been interpreted as *todun*, an ancient title seemingly not found after the 11th century [Clauson 1972.457, TMEN #1194, Erdal 1984.299]. For the interpretation of the first element as *tutung* speaks the second part *seli* – *šeli*. The elements *tutung* and *šeli* are frequently attested together in Uigur onomastic. As, however, the sequence is always *šeli tutung*, never the other way around, the word *twdwm* of the Toyuq-inscription has perhaps to be taken as a personal name. As was shown by Hamilton [1984] Uig. *šeli* comes from Chin. *sheli*, Early Mandarin *[ṣɛ']-li'*, MChinL *ṣhia-li*, MChinE *dẓia-li*, and is an abbreviated transcription of Skt. *ācārya*, while Uig. *tutung* corresponds to Chin. *dutong*, Early Mandarin *tu-t*^{h}*ung*, MChinL *tuə-t*^{h}*əwŋ̆*, MChinE tɔ-t^{h}awŋ^h, a title used by the head of the Buddhist hierarchy during the 9th and 10th centuries. Both titles became current in Uig. only around the beginning of the 11th century.

Another feature pointing to a later date of the inscription than the one proposed by Tekin, is the confusion between *s* and *š* in the title *seli*, exemplified in Uigur texts only since the 10th centry [Doerfer 1993(b).94–115].

šeli 'Titel' [Hamilton 1984.425–437, Zieme 1981.251–252]: *küntsün seli tutung* 'Übersetzer und Gelehrter' [Zieme 1981.256]. (Ch/U 7479:v1) *qarun šeli tutung* 'PN' [Zieme 1981.251–252]. (U 2212) *sarïγ šeli* 'PN' [Zieme 1981.251–252]. (LO10:3) *šinsun šeli* 'der Mönch Šinsun' [Yamada 1993.92–93]. (Xuanzang IV:16a12–13, Xuanzang, Brief:2154; U 4627:102, nach einer handschriftlichen Notiz von P. Aalto handelt es sich, mit einem Verweis auf Nobel *SPAW* 1927.212, bei dem Blockdruck um das *Dharma-cakra-*

pravartana-sūtra, (U 2330:r5) *šingqo šeli tutung* 'Uig. Übersetzer des 10. Jh.' [Hazai 1975.95; Zieme 1976(b).769, 1991.308–309]. (Mz 619:6, Uig. in Tibetan script) *[...]tu šalika*, (Mz 58:1) *seho šali*, (Mz 58:3-4) *kolum(tu* oder *nu) šali, toγrïl šali* 'Personennamen' [Maue 1996.211–213]. (Murtuq-Maitrisimit) *seli* 'Mönchsgrad; n. pr.': *sintar seli* 'Schreiber des Maitrisimit' [Zieme 1981.251, Tekin 1980.105]. (Hami-Maitrisimit) *waptsun šeli* 'einer der Schreiber' [Geng & Klimkeit 1988.5]. (U 5317:20-23) *šilavanti-lar-nïng kičig-lär-i seli-ler-i* 'die Famuli und Seli der Mönche' [Zieme 1981.244]. (Ex 03:6) *seli sngisḍviri bolup* 'seien es ... Seli (oder) Gemeindeälteste (die Streit erheben sollten)', (Ex-03:10) *[mn] ögrünč qy-a seli-lerke ayïdïp bitidim* 'Ich, Ögrünč-Qy-a, habe es nach Diktat der Selis geschrieben' [Zieme 1981.252, Yamada 1993.67]. (U 5137:35) *šilavanti-lar-ta seli-te* 'Mönche und Selis' (Zieme 1981].

tutung 'Titel'; > *tu* [Zieme 1975.190, Hamilton 1984.425–437], in a number of examples, not listed here, -*tu* is a phonetic rendering of Chin. *nu* 'slave' [Zieme 1994]. (ETŞ 218:6) *küdägüm altmïš tutung* 'PN' [Röhrborn 112]. (Kolophon zur uig. *Buddhāvamtaṃsaka*-Übersetzung) *bešbalïq(lïγ) antsang baxšï tutung* 'der aus Bešbalïq stammende Antsang Baxšï Tutung' [Kara 1981.234, Zieme 1991.310–312]. (Warnke 248, 257, 274, 395, 730; UigOn II.93m) *šabi ata tutung* (or) *šabi ata tu* 'Text-Stifter' [Röhrborn 255]; (Ci bei dao chang chan) *ata tutung* 'Auftraggeber einer uig. Abschrift des Werkes' [Zieme 1991.316:78]; (Block 1) *a-ta to* 'Vater *(fu)*' [Gabain 1976] = *ata tu[tung]*. (FT 2:1, 7 = Feng 1450.1, 7, 12; 146u.6, 8 = Sa 24:1, 7, 12-13; Em01:6) *aḍay tutung* 'Verkäufer des Sklaven Pintung (Sa), Familienangehöriger des Šivsay Tayšï (Em)' [DTS 8; Röhrborn 259; Yamada 1993.51–52, 130–132]; (FenTen 1450.4 = Sa 24:4) *mn atay tu* 'Verkäufer des Sklaven Pintung' [Röhrborn 259, Yamada 1993.51–52]; (Em01:7-8) *qočotaqï aḍay tutung* 'Besitzer des Sklaven Pintung' [Geng 1984.11:6-7, Yamada 1993.130–132]. (Lo06:2, 10 = USp 63) *büdüs tutung* 'Leiher von Filz' [Yamada 1993.89–90]. (Insadi-Sūtra :1, 15, 23-26, 756) *čisim tu* 'Verfasser und Schreiber des Sūtra' [Tezcan 1974.25, 57; Zieme 1980.228:163, 1991.315–316]; according to Zieme [1994.129], to be explained as Chin. *zhengxinnu* 'Sklave des Aufrichtigen Herzen'. (MO III:19) *elgür tutung* [DTS 170]. (Mi11:8 = USp 83:7-8, Mi12:7 = USp 84:7) *asen tutung* 'Zeuge'

[Zieme 1981.241, 248; Yamada 1993.156–157, 157]; (Sa05:19 = USp 83) *esen tutung* 'Schreiber' [DTS 62 (*ašan*), Röhrborn 241, Yamada 1993.12–13]. *küntsün seli tutung* 'Übersetzer und Gelehrter' [Zieme 1981.256]. (Steuerbefreiungsurkunde U 5319:2, 4, 6, 14) *ligui tutung* 'Mönch im Murutluq-Kloster' [Zieme 1981.254–255, 256]. (Mi05:11) *öz qana tu* 'Schreiber' [Yamada 1993.151–152]. (Steuerbefreiungsurkunde U 5319:2, 4–5, 13; U 3037:r4; U 5082:1) *pintso tutung* 'Mönch im Murutluq-Kloster' [Zieme 1981.254–255, 256]. (Hausverkaufsurkunde) *bädizči qapootu* 'Der Maler Qapoo Tu[tung] (Hausbesitzer)' [Zieme 1992(b).365:4]. (Pf02:12 = USp 51; USp 27:4) *qarïmdu tutung* 'Schreiber (Pf)' [DTS 427, Yamada 1993.127–128]. (Ch/U 7479:v1) *qarun šäli tutung* 'PN' [Zieme 1981.251–252]. (WP02:21) *qaysin tu* 'Schreiber' [Yamada 1993.136–137]; (USp 113:2) *qaysïḍu tutung* 'PN' [DTS 408]; (MO 1:1, 21) *qaytso tutung* 'PN; Vater des Titso' [Zieme 1981.239, DTS 408]; (UjgRuk 130:8) *män qïytso tutung* 'PN' [Röhrborn 85b]; (Ad01:1, 10, 17; Pf01:1–2, 28) *qyytso tutung*, (Pf01:7, 16, 19, 22, 26) *qaytso tu* 'PN' + Titel; gibt seinen Sohn Titso in Adoption (Ad) oder für drei Jahr als Pfand (Pf), gleichzeitig Schreiber des Dokuments (Ad)' [Yamada 1993.115–117, 124–126], *qaitso tu* is interpreted by Zieme [1994.129–130] as Chin. *kaizangnu* 'Sklave des Kaizang?'. (Sa03:21) *qulunčung tutung* (or *totuq*) 'Name eines Zeugen' [Yamada 1993.8–9]. (*Altun Yaruq Sudur* S701–S707) *bo tört mxaraač tngri-lerke ḍorm-a birgü yang-ïn bödi-drm-a baxšï yaratmïšïy mn tańyasin ačari qumγan tuḍung-nung ötügi üze tavïšγan yïl bišinč ay-ïn töpöt til-intin uyγur til-ingä ävirtim* 'Dieses Ritual des *gtor-ma*-Darbringens an die vier Mahārāja-Götter, das von dem Guru Bodhidharma Geschaffene, habe ich, Tanyasin (= Dhanyasena) Ačari, auf Bitten des Qumγan Tuḍung im Hasen-Jahr, im elften Monat aus der tibetischen Sprache in die uigurische Sprache übersetzt' [Zieme 1996.118–119]. (Pf02:3, 5, 6(2), 10 = USp 51) *samboqdu tutung* 'Verpfänder seines Sohnes' [Yamada 1993.127–128]; in the USp (51), repeated in the DTS [415], wrongly read as *qambuqtu tutung; samboqdu* < Chin. *sanbaonu* 'Sklave des Triratna' [Zieme 1994.121]. (Insadi-Sūtra 51) *sangga tu* 'Schreiber (und?) Verfasser der Maitreya-Gedichte, die den zweiten Teil des BTT III bilden' [Tezcan 1974; Zieme 1991.316–318]; in this case *-tu* is Chin. *nu* 'Sklave', the whole words transcribes Chin. **sengnu* 'Sklave der Gemeinde' [Zieme 1994.125–126]. (YamSaleLoan 80u.1, 81m.21, 22) *saqa apa tutung* [Röhrborn 1966]. (Totenbuch 1007–1010) *či čing onunč-ï bars yïl altïnč ay tört yangï-qa üč lükčüng balïq-lïγ qulut mn yangï bošγutčï sarïγ tutung asuday oγul-nïng lingči üzä bitidim* 'Im zehnten (Jahr) von Zhi zhing, im Tigerjahr, im sechsten Monat, am Vierten habe ich, der Diener aus der Stadt Üč-Lükčüng, der Neu-Lehrer Sarïγ Tutung es auf Order des Prinzen Asuday geschrieben', (ETŞ 15:93) *sarïγ tutung* 'PN' [Zieme & Kara 1978.162–163]. (Sa13:2, 6, 15) *sayan apa tutung* 'Käufer eines Grundstückes' [Yamada 1993.30–31]. (Ex03:4) *sevinči tutung* 'Käufer von Ländereien' [Yamada 1993.67]. (Xuanzang IV:16a 12–13, Xuanzang, Brief:2154; U 4627:102: U 2330:r5) *šingqo šeli tutung* 'Uig. Übersetzer des 10. Jh.' [Zieme 1976(b).769, 1981.251–252, 1991.308–309; DTS 504; Hazai 1975.95]. (USp 74) *singuy tutung* 'PN' [Zieme 1981.249]; (WP02:3) *šinkuy tutung beg* 'Verwandter des Köni Quz' [Yamada 1993.136–137]. (Lo10:2, 13 = USp 113) *šivsaḍu tutung* 'Leiher von Silber' [Yamada 1993.92–93]. (U 2477, 2505:r5a) *suuza edgü tutung-qa* 'für den Suuza Edgü Tutung' [Zieme 1985.182:53.1]; (WP01:17–18 = USp 78 + 82) *šutza käd qy-a tutung* 'Angehöriger der buddhistischen Gemeinde' [Yamada 1993.134–135]. (YamSaleLoan 83m.2) *oγlum tïdu*(?) *kün arslan ikägü* 'mein Sohn Tïdu und Kün Arslan, beide' [Röhrborn 203]. (U 5268) *tïnsïdu* 'PN; Pächter', weitere Belege in U 5306:22 und Stein (Innermost Asia III, Tafel CXXVI:2); vielleicht besteht der Name aus (a) dem chin. Teil *sïtu*, vgl. Karunadaz Sidu (Zieme 1985.199:54, Kara 1981) und (b) *-tu* < *tutung* [Zieme 1980.226:161]. (Sa13:26) *tolu tutung arasï*(?) 'Zeuge' [Yamada 1993.30–31]. (Sa23:19 = USp 110) *toyïn qulï tutung* 'Schreiber' [Yamada 1993.49–50]. (U 4791) *nomčï bilge toyïnčoγ tu[t]ung beg* 'der Gesetzeslehrer, der Weise Toyïnčoγ Tutung Beg' [Zieme 1985.168:46.35]. (Sa07:18 = USp 107) *turmïš tutung* 'Besitzer von Ländereien' [Yamada 1993.16–17]; (USp 55:7) *turmïš tutung* [DTS 588]; (Em01:5–6) *turmïš tutung* 'Familienangehöriger des Šivsay Tayšï' [Yamada 1993.130–132]. (Sa07:22 = USp 107) *tarlïq tutung* 'Zeuge' [Yamada 1993.16–17]. (USp 74) *vaptso tutung* [Zieme 1981.249]; (Sa12:5, 7, 13, 15, Lo19:2, 6) *vaptso tu* 'Käufer eines Landstückes (Sa12), Schreiber (Lo19)' [Yamada 1993.27–29, 101–102; Zieme

1981.249]. (Lo09:8 = USp 47) *yam-čur tu* 'Schreiber' [Yamada 1993.92]. (Lo07:10 = USp 18, Lo08:6 = USp 52) *yïγïna tutung* 'Schreiber' [Yamada 1993.90–91, 91–92].

Taking into consideration all the facts just mentioned, it is impossible to date the Toyuq-inscription to the 8th century. No date earlier than the 12th century is possible for the inscription and, furthermore, a similar inscription in Qitan and Chinese dates from the year 1134. This date which is strongly connected with the rise of the nomadic people in the north of China, is further supported by historical facts, first of all the rehabilitation of Buddhism and the restoration of Buddhist monasteries after the strong Chinese anti-Buddhist movement in the middle of the 9th century: a monastery has first to be destroyed to be restored afterwards!

Concluding this paper, it has to be stated that only some Uigur texts can be dated to the time of the Uigur Steppe empire. Most of the documents analysed in the last part of this article belong to the time of the Uigur Qočo kingdom, but there is a lot of unsureness about their precise dating, as a list of the rulers of the Qočo kingdom can be established only for some periods, but not for the entire time of the kingdom. Another difficulty seems to be the great variety in the elements of the titulature, contrary to the stability of the elements of the titles of the Steppe empire. However, it can also be that this variety didn't exist, and some of the titles connected above with the same ruler should instead be attributed to different rulers. Much more research work is needed to clearify this matter.

Abbreviations

Anc.: Ancient Chinese (6th–7th century, Karlgren) = Early MChinese (Pulleyblank)
AoF: Altorientalische Forschungen
AOH: Acta Orientalia Hungarica
APAW: Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
AKPAW: Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
Arch.: Archaic Chinese (Early Zhou, Karlgren) = Old Chinese (Pulleyblank)
AtüGr.: Gabain 1974
Av.: Avestan
B: Bugut-Stela: Kljaštorny & Livšic 1972, 1992; Yoshida & Moriyasu 1999

B: Buddhist
Bactr.: Bactrian
Bao.: Baoan
Bar.: Barin
BBB: Henning 1936b
BQ: Bilge Qaγan inscription: Radloff 1894; Thomsen 1924; Orkun 1936; Malov 1959; Ajdarov 1966, 1971; Tekin 1968, 1988
BSO(A)S: Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies
BTT: Berliner Turfantexte
Bur.: Buriat
BurB: Bargu-Buriat
BurH: Hori dialect of Buriat
BurN: Nizhneudin dialect of Buriat
BurS: Selenghe dialect of Buriat
BurT: Tünhe dialect of Buriat
C: Christian
CAJ: Central Asiatic Journal
Chin.: Chinese
C72: Clauson 1972
Dag.: Dagur
Dolg.: Dolgan
DTS: *Drevnetjurkskij slovár'*. Leningrad 1969
Dun.: Dunhuang
E: Yenisei-inscriptions: Vasil'ev 1983b
ETŞ: Arat 1965
ETY: Orkun
EWbAi: Mayrhofer 1993
Ewk.: Ewenki
Ewn.: Ewen
HJAS: Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies
Ind.: Indian
JA: Journal Asiatique
Jak.: Yakut
JRAS: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JSFOu: Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne
K: Karlgren 1940
Kal.: Kalmuck
KC: Küli Čor inscription: Kotwicz & Samoïlovitch 1926; Orkun 1936; Malov 1949; Tekin 1968; Ajdarov 1971; Clauson & Tryjarski 1971; Hayashi & Ōsawa 1999
Khot.: Khotanese
KT: Kül Tegin inscription: Schlegel 1892; Radloff 1894; Thomsen 1924; Orkun 1936; Malov 1951; Tekin 1968, 1988; Ajdarov 1971; Gabain 1974
M: Manichaean
MA.: Manchu
MChin.: Middle Chinese
MChinE: Early Middle Chinese (Qieyun rhyme dictionary of 601, Pulleyblank)
MChinL: Late Middle Chinese (end of the 7th century, Pulleyblank)
Mgr.: Monguor
MMoA: Middle Mongolian in Arabic script
MMoM: Middle Mongolian of the Secret History
MMoP: Middle Mongolian in hPags-pa script

MMoS: Middle Mongolian in Chinese characters
MMoU: Middle Mongolian in Uigur script
MoL: Classical Mongolian
MPers.: Middle Persian
MSFOu: Memoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne
MT: Doerfer 1985
MYYV: *Menggu yuzu yuyan cidian.* Eds. Zhu Sun & alii. Xining 1990
MI-MIII: Le Coq 1912, 1919, 1922
MIV: Zieme 1975
MX: Müller 1912
MXI: LeCoq 1912(a)
O: Ongiin inscription: Radloff 1895; Orkun 1936; Clauson 1957; Malov 1959; Tekin 1968; Ajdarov 1971; Ōsawa 1999
OT: Old Turkic (of the inscriptions)
Parth.: Parthian
Pf(ahl): Müller 1914
PN: personal name
Q: Qarabalγasun inscription: Heikel 1892; Radloff 1894; Schlegel 1896; Müller 1909; Hansen 1930; Orkun 1936
Qara: Qarčin
S: secular texts
San.: Santa
Skt.: Sanskrit
Sogd.: Sogdian
SPAW: Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SS1–2: Cincius & Rišes 1975, 1977
StOr: Studia Orientalia
Su: Süüdži inscription: Ramstedt 1913; Orkun 1936; Malov 1951; Ajdarov 1971
SU: Šine Usu inscription: Ramstedt 1913; Orkun 1936; Malov 1959; Ajdarov 1971; Moriyasu 1999
T: Toñuquq inscription: Radloff 1899(b); Thomsen 1924; Orkun 1936; Malov 1951; Aalto 1958; Tekin 1968; Ajdarov 1971; Clauson 1971; Rybatzki 1997(b)
Tib.: Tibetan
TMEN: Doerfer 1963, 1965, 1967, 1975
TR: Terx inscription: Šinexüü 1975, 1980; Kljaštornyj 1982; Tekin 1982; Katayama 1999
TS: Tes inscription: Šinexüü 1980; Kljaštornyj 1985; Tekin 1988; Ōsawa 1999
TT: Türkische Turfantexte
UAJb: Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher
Uig.: Uigur
UJb: Ungarische Jahrbücher
USpr.: Radloff 1928
VEWT: Räsänen 1969
WZKM: Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes
Xal.: Xalxa
Xvar.: Xvarezmian
Yog.: Yogur
Z: Zoroastrian
ZAS: Zentralasiatische Studien
ZDMG: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
[ii (1–7)], MMoS: Ligeti 1972b.149–163; Haenisch 1952.13–17, 24–26; 28–30; Mostaert 1995.69–117

[I], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.17–18
[IX], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.51–58; Cleaves 1951
[XII], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.63–74; Cleaves 1949
[XV], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.108–109; Cleaves 1955
[XVIII], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.184–196; Bese 1972; Kara 1979
[XX], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a..35
[XXI], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.208–237
[XXIII], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a; Cleaves 1953
[XXV], MMoU: Ligeti 1972a.268–274

Bibliography

Aalto, P. 1958. Materialien zu den alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei, gesammelt von G. J. Ramstedt, J. G. Granö und Pentti Aalto. *JSFOu* 60:7, 1–91.
– 1971. Iranian contacts of the Turks in Pre-Islamic times. *Studia Turcica.* Ed. by. L. Ligeti. Budapest, 29–37.
Ajdarov, G. 1966. *Jazyk orxonskogo pamjatnika Bilge-Kagana.* Alma-Ata.
– 1971. *Jazyk orxonskix pamjatnikov drevnetjurkskoj piśmennosti VIII veka.* Alma-Ata.
Allsen, T. T. 1983. The Yüan Dynasty and the Uighurs of Turfan in the 13th century. *China among equals. The Middle Kingdom and its neighbours, 10th to 14th centuries.* Ed. M. Rossabi. Berkley-Los Angeles-London, 243–280.
Arat, R. A. 1937. Uygurca yazımalar arasınta. *Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi* III, 101–112.
– 1964. Der Herrschertitel Iduq-qut. *UAJb* 35, 150–157.
– 1965. Eski Türk şiiri. *Türk Tarih Kurumu yayınları* 7,45. Ankara.
Asmussen, J. P. 1965. X^{u}āstvānīft, studies in Manichaeism. *Acta Theologica Danica* VII. Copenhagen.
Back, M. 1978. Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften. *Acta Iranica* 18. Leiden.
Bacot, J. 1956. Reconnaissance en haute Asie septentrionale par cinq envoyés ouigours au VIII^{e} siècle. *JA* 244, 137–153. [Manuscrit Pelliot Tibétan 1283]
Bailey, H. W. 1939. Turks in Khotanese texts. *JRAS*, 85–91.
– 1979. *Dictionary of Khotan Saka.* Cambridge.
Bang, W. 1931. Manichäische Erzähler. *Muséon* XLIV, 1–36.
Bang W. & A. von Gabain 1929. Türkische Turfantexte II. *SPAW*, 411–430.
Bazin, L. 1963. Über die Sternkunde in alttürkischer Zeit. *Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse.* Mainz, 571–582.
– 1964. La littérature épigraphique turque ancienne. *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* II. Wiesbaden, 192–211.
– 1991. Les systèmes chronologiques dans le monde turc ancien. *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* XXXIV. Budapest.
Beckwith, C. I. 1987. *The Tibetan empire in Central Asia.* Princeton, New Jersey.
Berta Á. 1995. Neue Lesungs- und Deutungsvorschläge für die Inschrift Toñuquq. *AOH* 48, 313–320.

– 1996. Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschkakisch-Türkischen. *Turcologica* 24. Wiesbaden.
Bese L. 1972. An Old Mongolian calendar fragment. *AOH* 25, 149–174.
– 1978. Some Turkic personal names in the Secret History of the Mongols. *AOH* 32, 353–369.
– 1989. Some ethnic designations in the Secret History of the Mongols. *Gedanke und Wirkung, FS Poppe. Asiatische Forschungen.* Wiesbaden, 28–37.
Beševliev, V. 1975. Καυπαγνος = qapa(γ)an. *AOH* 29, 289–312.
Bombaci, A. 1965. Qutluγ bolzun! (Part one). *UAJb* 36, 284–291.
– 1966. Qutluγ bolzun! (Part two). *UAJb* 38, 13–43.
– 1971. The husbands of princess Hsien-li Bilgä. *Studia Turcica.* Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 103–123.
Bosworth, C. E. & G. Clauson 1965. Al-Xwārazmī on the people of Central Asia. *JRAS*, 2–12.
Boyce, M. 1960. A catalogue of the Iranian manuscripts in Manichaean script in the German Turfan collection. *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichungen* 45. Berlin.
– 1975. A reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. *Acta Iranica* 9, *Troisième série.* Leiden.
– 1977. A wordlist of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. *Acta Iranica, troisième série, volume* II, *supplément.* Leiden.
Boyle, J. A. 1958. *The history of the world-conqueror by 'Ala-ad-Din 'Ata-Malik Juvaini.* Manchester.
Brandenstein, W. & M. Mayrhofer 1964. *Handbuch des Altpersischen.* Wiesbaden.
Brunner, C. J. 1978. *Sasanian stamp seals in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.* New York.
Castrén, A. M. 1857. *Versuch einer burjatischen Sprachlehre nebst kurzem Wörterverzeichniss.* St. Pbg.
Chavannes, E. 1912. Épitaphes de deux princesses turques de l'époque des T'ang. *Festschrift für V. Thomsen.* Leipzig, 82–87.
Cincius, V. I. & L. D. Rišes 1952. *Russko-ėvenskij slovar'.* Moskva.
– 1975. 1977. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov* I–II. Leningrad.
Clark, L. 1975. On a mongol decree of Yisün Temür (1339). *CAJ* 19, 194–198.
– 1982. The Manichaean Turkic pothi-book. *AoF* 9, 145–218.
– 1997. The Turkic Manichaean literature. Ed. by P. Mirecki & J.BeDuhn. *Emerging from darkness. Studies in the recovery of Manichaean sources.* Leiden-New York-Köln, 89–141.
Clauson, Sir G. 1956. A note on Qapqan. *JRAS*, 73–77.
– 1957. The Ongin inscription. *JRAS*, 177–192.
– 1971. Some notes on the inscription of Toñuquq. *Studia Turcica.* Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 125–132.
– 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish.* Oxford.
Clauson, Sir G. & E. Tryjarski 1971. The inscription at Ikhe Khushotu. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 34, 1–33.
Cleaves, F. W. 1949. The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362 in memory of Prince Hindu. *HJAS* 12, 1–133.
– 1951. The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 in memory of Jigüntei. *HJAS* 14, 1–104.

– 1953. The Mongolian documents in the Musée de Téhéran. *HJAS* 16, 1–107.
– 1955. An early Mongolian loan contract from Qara Qoto. *HJAS* 18, 1–49.
– 1982. *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Cambridge, Mass.
Colditz, I. 1992. Hymnen an Šād-Ohrmezd. Ein Beitrag zur frühen Geschichte der Dīnāwarīya in Transoxanien. *AoF* 19, 322–341.
Dankoff, R. & J. Kelly 1982, 1984, 1985. Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī, Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān luγāt at-Turk). Part I–III. *Sources of Oriental languages and literatures* 7. Harvard.
Davary, G. D. 1982. *Baktrisch, ein Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
Doerfer, G. 1963, 1965, 1967, 1975. *Die türkischen und mongolischen Elemente im Neupersischen* I–IV. Wiesbaden.
– 1985. *Mongolo-Tungusica*. Wiesbaden.
– 1991. Bemerkungen zur chronologischen Klassifikation des älteren Türkischen. *AoF* 18, 170–186.
– 1993(a). Mongolica im Alttürkischen. *Festschrift für Bruno Lewin*. Bochum, 39–56.
– 1993(b). Versuch einer linguistischen Datierung älterer osttürkischer Texte. *Turcologica* 14. Wiesbaden.
Ercilasun, A. B. & D. D. Vasiliev 1995. *The atlas of historical works in Mongolia*. Ankara.
Erdal, M. 1979. The chronological classification of Old Turkish texts. *CAJ* 23, 151–175.
– 1984. The Turkish Yarkand documents. *BSOAS* 47, 260–301.
– 1991. Old Turkic word formation. *Turcologica* 7. Wiesbaden.
– 1993. Die türkisch-mongolischen Titel elχan and elči. *Altaica Berolinensia. Asiatische Forschungen* 126. Wiesbaden, 81–99.
Franke, H. 1965. A 14th century Mongolian letter fragment. *Asia Major* 11, 120–127.
– 1968. Ein weiteres mongolisches Reisebegleitschreiben aus Čaγatai (14. Jh.). *ZAS* 2, 7–14.
– 1970. Zwei mongolische Textfragmente aus Zentralasien. Ed. by L. Ligeti. *Mongolian Studies*. Budapest 1970, 137–145.
– 1978. A Sino-Uighur family portrait: notes on a woodcut from Turfan. *The Canada-Mongolia Review* 4:1, 33–40. [= Gabain 1976].
Gabain, A. von 1949. Steppe und Stadt im Leben der älteren Türken. *Der Islam*, 30–62.
– 1955. Alttürkische Datierungsformen. *UAJb* 27, 191–203.
– 1963. Vorislamische, alttürkische Literatur. *Handbuch der Orientalistik* I.V. 1, 207–228.
– 1973. *Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qočo (850–1250)*. Wiesbaden.
– 1974. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden.
– 1976. Ein chinesisch-uigurischer Blockdruck. *Tractata Altaica, Festschrift für D. Sinor*. Wiesbaden, 203–207. [= Franke 1978].
Geng Shimin 1984. A study of two Uighur contracts of the Yuan dynasty (1271–1368). *ZAS* 17, 7–18.
Geng Shimin & J. R. Hamilton 1981. L'inscription ouïgoure de la stèle commémorative des Iduq Qut de Qočo. *Turcica* 13, 10–54.
Geng Shimin & H.-J. Klimkeit 1985. Zerstörung manichäischer Klöster in Turfan. *ZAS* 18, 7–11.
– 1988. Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. *Asiatische Forschungen* 103. Wiesbaden.

Geng Shimin, H.-J. Klimkeit & J. P. Laut 1987. Manis Wettkampf mit dem Prinzen. Ein neues manichäisch-türkisches Fragment aus Turfan. *ZDMG* 137, 44–58.

Gershevitch, I. 1952. *A grammar of Manichaean Sogdian*. Oxford.

Gharib, B. 1995. *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian-Persian-English*. Teheran.

Gignoux, Ph. 1986. Iranisches Personennamenbuch, Faszikel 2: noms propres sassanides en moyen-perse épigraphique. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sonderpublikation der iranischen Kommission.*

Gignoux, P. & R. Gyselen 1987. *Bulles et sceaux sassanides de diverses collections*. Paris.

Giles, H. A. 1909. *A Chinese-English dictionary*. London.

Göbl, R. 1967. *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien* I–IV. Wiesbaden.

Golden, P. B. 1992. Introduction to the history of the Turkic people. *Turcica* 8. Wiesbaden.

Golzio, K.-H. 1984. *Kings, khans and other rulers of early Inner Asia*. Köln.

Györffy Gy. 1971. Der Aufstand von Koppány, *Studia Turcica*. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 175–211.

Haenisch, E. 1935. *Mongḥol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih). Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Leipzig.

– 1939. *Wörterbuch zum Mongḥol un niuca tobca'an*. Leipzig.

– 1952. Sino-mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts. *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1950* Nr. 4. Berlin.

– 1957. Sino-mongolische Glossare I. Das Hua-I ih-yü. *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1956* Nr. 5. Berlin.

Halén, H. 1978. Westlamutische Materialien. Aufgezeichnet von A. Sotavalta, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von H. Halén. *MSFOu* 168. Helsinki.

Hambis, L. 1952. Le chapitre CVIII du Yuan Che. *Monographies du T'oung Pao* III. Leiden.

Hamilton, J. R. 1955. *Les ouïghours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties, d'après les documents chinois*. Paris.

– 1962. Toquz-Oγuz et On-Uyγur. *JA* 250, 23–64.

– 1971. *Le conte boudhique du bon et du mauvais prince en version ouïgoure*. Paris.

– 1984. Les titres šäli et tutung en ouïgour. *JA* 272, 425–437.

– 1986. *Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe–Xe siècle de Touen-houang*. Paris.

– 1990. L'inscription trilingue de Qara Balgasun d'après les estampages de Bouillane de Lacoste. *Colloque Franco-Japonais de documents et archives provenant de l'Asie Centrale, 4.–8. octobre 1988. Kyoto International Conference Hall*. Kyoto, 18–28.

– 1991. Calendriers manichéens ouïgours de 988, 989 et 1003. *Mélanges offerts à Lois Bazin par ses disciples, collègues et amis*. Éd. par J. P. Bacque-Grammont et al. Paris, 7–23.

Hansen, O. 1930. Zur sogdischen Inschrift auf dem dreisprachigen Denkmal von Karabalgasun. *JSFOu* 44:3, 1–39.

Hauer, E. 1952–1955. *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache*. Wiesbaden.

Hayashi T. & Ōsawa T. 1999. Site of Ikh-Khoshoot and Küli Čor inscription. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 148–157.

Hazai Gy. 1975. Fragmente eines uigurischen Blockdruck-Faltbuches. *AOF* 3, 91–108.

Hazai Gy. & P. Zieme 1971. Fragmente der uigurischen Version des "Jin'gang-jing mit den Gāthās des Meister Fu". *Berliner Turfantexte* I. Berlin.

Heikel, A. O. 1892. *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon, recuillies par l'expédition finnoise 1890 et publiées par la Societe finno-ougrienne*. Helsingfors.

Heissig, W. 1989. Das Buch vom Ursprung der Mongolen. *Diedrichs Gelbe Reihe* 60. München.

Henning, W. B. 1936a. Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus. *ZDMG* 90, 1–18.

– 1936b. Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch. *APAW* 10. Berlin.

– 1938. Agri and the "Tokharians". *BSOAS* 9, 545–572.

– 1945. The Manichaean feasts. *JRAS*, 146–164.

Hovdhaugen, E. 1974. The relationship between the two Orkhon inscriptions. *Acta Orientalia* 36, 55–82.

Humbach, H. 1966, 1967. *Baktrische Denkmäler* I–II. Wiesbaden.

İzgi, Ö. 1989. Çin elçisi Wang Yen-te'nin uygur seyahatnamesi. *Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları*. II. Dizi, Sa. 26. Ankara.

Joki, A. J. 1952. Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen. *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 103. Helsinki.

Kakuk Sz. 1974. Quelques catégories de noms de personne turcs. *AOH* 28, 1–36.

Kałużyński, S. 1961. *Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache*. Warschau.

Kara Gy. 1979. Weitere mittelmongolische Bruchstücke aus der Berliner Turfansammlung. *AoF* 6, 181–204.

– 1981. Weiteres über die uigurische Nāmasaṃgīti. *AoF* 8, 227–236.

– 1984. Zu den mittelmongolischen Kalenderausdrücken. *AoF* 11, 347–352.

– 1990. Zhiyuan yiyu, Index alphabétique des mots mongols. *AOH* 44, 279–344.

Kara Gy. & P. Zieme 1976. Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung. *Berliner Turfantexte* VII. Berlin.

– 1977. Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas "Tiefer Weg" von Sa-skya Paṇḍita und der Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti. *Berliner Turfantexte* VIII. Berlin.

Karlgren, B. 1940. *Grammata Serica*. Stockholm.

Katayama A. 1999. Tariat inscription. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 168–176.

– 1999. Sevrey inscription. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 225–227.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1982(a). Manichaean kingship: gnosis at home in the world. *Numen* 29:1, 17–32.

– 1982(b). *Manichaean art and calligraphy*. Leiden.

– 1983. Das manichäische Königtum in Zentralasien. *Documenta barbarorum, FS W. Heissig. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica* 18. Wiesbaden, 225–243.

– 1989. Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts. *Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 79. Opladen.

– 1993. *Gnosis on the Silk road*. San Francisco.

Kljaštornyj, S. G. 1971. Runičeskaja nadpis' iz vostočnoj Gobi. *Studia Turcica*. Ed. by. L. Ligeti. Budapest, 249–258.
– 1982. The Terkhin inscription. *AOH* 36, 335–366.
– 1985. The Tes inscription of the Uighur Bögü Qaghan. *AOH* 39, 137–156.
– 1988(a). East Turkestan and the Kaghans of Ordubälïq. *AOH* 42, 277–280.
– 1988(b). Die Kiptschaken auf den runischen Denkmälern. *CAJ* 32, 73–90.
Kljaštornyj, S. G. & V. A. Livšic 1971. Une inscription inédite turque et sogdienne: La stèle de Sevrey (Gobi méridional). *JA* 259, 11–20.
– 1972. The Sogdian inscription of Bugut revised. *AOH* 26, 69–102.
– 1992. Bugut'taki sogtça kitabeye yeni bir bakış. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları yıllığı. Belleten 1987*. Ankara, 201–241.
Konow, S. 1947. The Khotanese text of the Staël-Holstein scroll. *Acta Orientalia* 20, 133–160.
Kotwicz, W. & A. Samoïlovitch 1926. Le monument turc d'Ikhe-khuchotu en Mongolie centrale. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 4, 60–107.
LeCoq, A. von 1912(a). Ein manichäisches Buch-Fragment aus Chotscho. *Festschrift für V. Thomsen*. Leipzig, 145–154.
– 1912(b), 1919, 1922. Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho I–III. *APAW 1911, 1919, 1922*. Berlin.
– 1923. *Buddhistische Spätantike II: Manichäische Miniaturen*. Berlin.
Lessing, F. D. 1995. *Mongolian-English dictionary*. Bloomington.
Lewicki, M. 1959. *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle: Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389*. II: *vocabulaire-index*. Wrocław.
Lieu, S. N. C. 1997. Manichaean art and texts from the Silk road. *Studies in silk road coins and culture. Papers in honour of Professor Ikuo Hirayama on his 65th birthday. The Institute of Silk Road Studies*. Kamakura, 261–312.
Ligeti L. 1962. Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul. *AOH* 14, 3–100.
– 1966. Un vocabulaire sino-ouigour des Ming. *AOH* 19, 117–199, 257–316.
– 1972(a). Monuments préclassiques I, XIIIe et XIVe siècles. *Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta* II. Budapest.
– 1972(b). Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa * pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise. *Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta* III. Budapest.
Liu Mau-Tsai 1958. Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe). *Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen* 10. Wiesbaden.
MacKenzie, D. N. 1970. The 'Sūtra of the Causes and effects of actions' in Sogdian. *London Oriental Series* 22. London-New York-Toronto.
– 1976. The Buddhist Sogdian texts of the British Library. *Acta Iranica* 10. Leiden.
– 1986. *A concise Pahlavi dictionary*. London.
Mackerras, C. 1968. The Uighur empire (744–840), according to the T'ang dynastic histories. *Australian National University, Centre of Oriental Studies* 8. Canberra.
– 1990. The Uighurs. *Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. Ed. by D. Sinor. Cambridge, 317–342.
Mair, V. H. 1990. Old Sinitic * *myag*, Old Persian *maguš* and English "magician". *Early China* 15, 27–47.
Malov, S. E. 1951. *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti*. Moskva-Leningrad.

– 1959. *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii.* Moskva-Leningrad.
Mathews, R. H. 1947. *Chinese-English dictionary.* Cambridge, Mass.
Maue, D. 1996. Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 1: Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift. *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland* XIII, 9. Stuttgart.
Mayrhofer, M. 1973. Onomastica Persepolitana. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsbericht* 286. Wien.
– 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, II:14, Heidelberg.
Mironov, N. D. 1928. Kuchean studies I: Indian loanwords in Kuchean. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 6, 89–169.
Moravcsik Gy. 1983. Byzantinoturcica. *Berliner byzantinische Arbeiten* 11. Berlin.
Mori M. 1978. An interpretation of the first three lines of the Sūdži inscription. *The Vth International Symposium. Comparative Studies of Altaic Languages, Sept. 4.–10. 1978.* Seoul, 25–28.
Moriyasu T. 1991. *A study on the history in Uighur Manichaeism.* Osaka. (Jap.).
– 1997. A Manichaean Runic manuscript with miniature (Kaσ. 01707) housed in the British Library. *Studies on the Inner Asian languages* XII, 41–71.
– 1999. Site and inscription of Šine-Usu. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998.* Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 177–195.
Mostaert, A. 1941–1942. *Dictionnaire Ordos.* Peking.
– 1995. Le matérial mongol du Hou I I Iu de Houng-ou (1389) II. commentaires. Par Antoine Mostaert et Igor de Rachewiltz. *Institut Belge des hautes études chinoises.* Bruxelles.
Mostaert, A. & F. W. Cleaves 1962. Les lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Arγun et Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel. *Harvard-Yenching Institute, Scripta Mongolica, Monograph Series* I, 1–104. Cambridge, Mass.
Müller, F. W. K. 1904. Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkistan. II. Teil, *AKPAW 1904*, Anhang.
– 1909. Ein iranisches Sprachdenkmal aus der nördlichen Mongolei. *SPAW.* Berlin.
– 1912. Der Hofstaat eines Uiguren-Königs. *Festschrift für V. Thomsen.* Leipzig, 207–213.
– 1913. Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch (Maḥrnâmag). *APAW 1912.* Berlin.
– 1915. Zwei Pfahlinschriften aus den Turfanfunden. *APAW.* Berlin, 1–37.
– 1919/1920. Uigurische Glossen. *Festschrift für Friedrich Hirth, Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 8, 310–324.
Mylius, K. 1980. *Wörterbuch Sanskrit-Deutsch.* Leipzig.
Nikitin, A. B. 1993/1994. Parthian bullae from Nisa. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 3. *Journal of the Institute of Silk Road Studies*, Kamakura, 71–79.
Nyberg, H. S. 1974. *A manual of Pahlavi* II. Wiesbaden.
Orkun, H. N. 1936. *Eski Türk yazıtları.* I. Istanbul.
Ōsawa T. 1999. Ongi inscription. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998.* Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 129–136.

– 1999. Qara-Balgasun Inscription II. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998.* Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 143–145.
– 1999. The Tes inscription. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998.* Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 158–167.
Pais, D. 1923. Die altungarischen Personennamen. *UJb* 3, 235–249.
Pelliot, P. 1912. La fille de Mo-tch'o qaghan et ses rapports avec Kül-tegin. *T'oung Pao* 13, 301–306.
– 1929a. L'édition collective des ouvres de Wang Kuo-wei. *T'oung pao* 26, 113–182.
– 1929b. Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie Centrale. *T'oung Pao* 26, 202–265.
Pinault, G.-J. 1998a. Tocharian language and Pre-Buddhist culture. *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age peoples of Eastern Central Asia* I. Ed. by V. H. Mair. Pennsylvania, 358–371.
– 1998b. Economic and administrative documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky Collections. *Manuscripta Orientalia* 4:4, 3–20.
Poppe, N. 1928. Das mongolische Sprachmaterial einer Leidener Handschrift. *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR 1927–1928.* Leningrad.
– 1934–1935. Über die Sprache der Daguren. *Asia Major* X, 1–32, 183–220.
– 1957. The Mongolian monuments in ḥP'ags-pa script. *Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen* 8. Wiesbaden.
– 1975. On some proper names in the Secret History. *UAJb* 47, 161–167.
Pritsak, O. 1985. Old Turkic regnal names in the Chinese sources. *Journal of Turkish Studies* 9, 205–211.
Pulleyblank, E. G. 1991. *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin.* Vancouver.
X 1976 Rachewiltz, I. de 1977. Some remarks on the stele of Yisüngge. *Tractata Altaica, Festschrift für Denis Sinor.* Wiesbaden, 487–508.
Radloff, W. 1893, 1899(a), 1905, 1911. *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türkdialekte* I–IV. Sankt Petersburg.
– 1894–1895. *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei* I–III. St. Petersburg.
– 1899(b). *Die alttürkischen Denkmäler der Mongolei. Zweite Folge.* St. Pétersbourg.
– 1928. *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler.* Leningrad.
Ramstedt, G. J. 1913–1918. Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei. *JSFOu* 30:3, 1–63.
– 1935. *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch.* Helsinki.
Räsänen, M. 1969. Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen. *Lexica Scietatis Fenno-Ugricae* XVII:1. Helsinki.
Rásonyi L. 1961. Les noms de nombre dans l'anthroponymie turque. *AOH* 12, 47–70.
– 1962. Les noms de personnes impératifs chez les peuples turques. *AOH* 15, 233–244.
Röhrborn, K. 1977–. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch,* Lieferung 1–. Wiesbaden.
Röhrborn, K. & O. Sertkaya 1980. Die alttürkische Inschrift am Tor-Stūpa von Chüyung-kuan. *ZDMG* 130, 304–339.

Róna-Tas A. 1987. Materialien zur alten Religion der Türken. *Synkretismus in den Religionen Zentralasiens*, Hrsg. W. Heissig und H.-J. Klimkeit. *Studies in Oriental Religions* 13. Wiesbaden, 33–45.
– 1991. An introduction to Turkology. *Studia uralo-altaica* 33. Szeged.
Rozycki, W. V. 1994. *Mongol elements in Manchu*. Bloomington.
Rybatzki, V. 1997(a). Einige Hilfsmittel zur Identifikation und Datierung mittelmongolischer ziviler Dokumente. Ed. by Á. Berta. *Historical and linguistic interaction between Inner-Asia and Europe. Studia uralo-altaica* 39. Szeged, 269–293.
– 1997(b). Die Toñuquq-Inschrift. *Studia uralo-altaica* 40. Szeged 1997.
Ščerbak, A. M. 1961. Nadpis na drevneujgurskom jazyke iz Mongolii. *Epigrafika Vostoka* 14, 23–25.
– 1995. Notes on the inscription at Ulaangom. *Laut- und Wortgeschichte der Türksprachen*. Hrsg. B. Kellner-Heinkele und M. Stachowski. *Turcologica* 26. Wiesbaden, 145–149.
Schlegel, G. 1892. La stèle funéraire du Teghin Giogh. *MSFOu* 3. Helsingfors.
– 1896. Die chinesische Inschrift auf dem Denkmal in Kara Balgassun. *MSFOu* 9. Helsingfors.
Schmitt, R. 1980. Zu Sprache und Wortschatz der Sasanideninschriften. *WZKM* 72, 61–82.
Sims-Williams, N. 1983. Indian elements in Parthian and Sogdian. *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*. Wiesbaden, 132–141.
– 1985. The Christian Sogdian manuscript C2. *Berliner Turfantexte* XII. Berlin.
– ~~1989~~. Sogdian and other Iranian inscriptions of the Upper Indus I. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* II.III:1. London. H १९८९
– 1992. Sogdian and other Iranian inscriptions of the Upper Indus II. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* II.III:2. London.
Sims-Williams, N. & H. Halén 1980. The Middle Iranian fragments in Sogdian script from the Mannheim Collection. *Studia Orientalia* 51:13.
Šinexüü, M. 1975. Tariatyn Orxon bičgijn šinè dursgal. *Arxeologijn dursgal* 6.1. Ulaan Baatar.
– 1980. Orxon-Sèlèngijn runi bičgijn šinè dursgal. *Arxeologijn sudlal* 8.1. Ulaan Baatar.
Sinor, D. 1939. À propos de la biographie ouigoure de Hiuan-tsang. *JA*.
– 1954. Qapqan. *JRAS*, 174–184.
Stachowski, M. 1993. *Dolganischer Wortschatz*. Kraków.
– 1998. *Dolganischer Wortschatz: Supplementband*. Kraków.
Sundermann, W. 1979. Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos. *AoF* 6, 95–134.
– 1986. Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I. *AoF* 13, 40–92.
– 1992. Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts concerning the Turfan region. Ed. by A. Cadonna. *Turfan and Tun-huang, the texts. Orientalia Venetiana* IV. Firenze, 63–84.
Tafazzoli, A. 1993/1994. A list of terms for weapons and armour in Western Middle Iranian. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 3. *Journal of the Institute of Silk Road Studies*, Kamakura, 187–198.
Taube, E. & M. Taube 1983. *Schamanen und Rhapsoden*. Wien.
Tekin, S. 1976. Die uigurische Weihinschrift eines buddhistischen Klosters aus den Jahren 767–780 in Toyuq. *UAJb* 48, 225–230.

– 1980. Maitrisimit nom bitig. 2. Teil: Analytischer und rückläufiger Index. *Berliner Turfantexte* IX. Berlin.
Tekin, T. 1968. *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic.* Bloomington.
– 1982. The Tariat (Terkhin) inscription. *AOH* 37, 43–68.
– 1988. Nine notes on the Tes inscription. *AOH* 42, 111–118.
– 1988. *Orhon yazıtları.* Ankara.
– 1995. Some remarks on the Tunyukuk inscription. *Beläk Bitig, Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag. Hrsg.* Marcel Erdal und Semih Tezcan. *Turcologia* 23. Wiesbaden, 209–222.
Tezcan, S. 1974. Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra. *Berliner Turfantexte* III. Berlin.
Thierry, F. 1998. Les monnaies de Boquq Qaghan des Ouighours (795–808). *Turcica* 30, 263–278.
Thomas, W. 1964. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch,* Band II: Texte und Glossar. Heidelberg.
Thomsen, V. 1912. Dr. M. A. Stein's manuscripts in Turkish 'Runic' script from Miran and Tunhuang. *JRAS,* 181–227.
– 1916. Turcica. *MSFOu* 37. Helsinki.
– 1924. Alttürkische Inschriften aus der Mongolei. *ZDMG* 78, 121–175.
Tryjarski, E. & J. Hamilton 1975. L'inscription turque runiforme de Khutukula. *JA* 263, 171–182.
Vasil'ev, D. D. 1983(a). *Grafičeskij fond pamjatnikov tjurkskoj runičeskoj pis'mennosti aziatskogo areala.* Moskva.
– 1983(b). *Korpus tjurkskih runičeskov pamjatnikov bassejna Enisseja.* Leningrad.
Vietze, H.-P. 1991. Hapaxlegomena auf γ- und q- in der "Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen". *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings of the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference. Oslo, June 12–16, 1989.* Hrsg. B. Brendemoen. Oslo, 379–390.
Waldschmidt, E. & E. Lentz 1926. Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus. *APAW* 1926:4.
– 1933. Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten. *SPAW,* 480–609.
Weber, D. 1972. Zur sogdischen Personennamengebung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 77, 191–208.
Yamada N. 1993. Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte. Hrsg. J. Oda, P. Zieme, H. Umemura, T. Moriyasu. Osaka.
Yamauchi, K. 1993. *The vocabulary of Sasanian seals.* Tokio.
Yang Fu-Hsüeh 1991. On the Sha-chou Uighur kingdom. *CAJ* 38, 80–107.
Yoshida, Y. & Moriyasu, T. 1999. Bugut inscription. *Provisional report of researches on historical sites and inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998.* Ed. by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Tokyo, 122–125.
Zieme, P. 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache der manichäisch-türkischen Turfantexte.* Berlin. (not published)
– 1974. Ein uigurischer Landkaufvertrag aus Murtuq. *AoF* 1, 295–308.
– 1975. Manichäisch-türkische Texte. *Berliner Turfantexte* V. Berlin.
– 1976(a). Zum Handel im uigurischen Reich von Qočo. *AoF* 4, 235–249.
– 1976(b). Sïngqu Säli Tutung. Übersetzer buddhistischer Schriften ins Uigurische. *Tractata Altaica, Festschrift für D. Sinor.* Wiesbaden, 767–775.
– 1977. Drei neue uigurische Sklavendokumente. *AoF* 5, 145–170.
– 1980. Uigurische Pachtdokumente. *AoF* 7, 197–245.
– 1981. Uigurische Steuerbefreiungsurkunden für buddhistische Klöster. *AoF* 8, 237–263.

– 1985. Buddhistische Stabreimdichtung der Uiguren. *Berliner Turfantexte* XIII. Berlin.
– 1986. Uygur yazısıyla yazılmış Uygur yazıtlarına dair bazı düşünceler. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı, Belleten 1982–1983*. Ankara, 230–231.
– 1991. Die Stabreim-Texte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* XXXIII. Budapest.
– 1992(a). Manichäische Kolophone und Könige. *Studies in Religions* 23, 319–327.
– 1992(b). Eine uigurische Hausverkaufsurkunde aus Qočo. *AoF* 19, 359–371.
– 1994. Samboqdu et alii. Einige alttürkische Personennamen im Wandel der Zeiten. *Journal of Turkology* 2, 119–133.
– 1996. Altun Yaruq. Vorwort und erstes Buch. *Berliner Turfantexte* XVIII. Turnhout.
Zieme, P. & Gy. Kara 1978. *Ein uigurisches Totenbuch*. Budapest.
Zimmer, S. 1991. Zur sprachlichen Deutung sasanidischer Personennamen. *AoF* 18, 109–150.

Chinese glossary according to numeration

1) 土門
2) 伊利可汗
3) 頡
4) 伊
5) 頡
6) 利
7) 科羅
8) 逸可汗
9) 阿逸可汗
10) 木汗可汗
11) 木扞可汗
12) 其燼
13) 燕都
14) 佗鉢可汗
15) 攝圖
16) 伊利俱盧設莫何始波羅可汗
17) 從天生大突厥天下賢聖天子伊利俱盧設莫何始波羅可汗
18) 大突厥伊利俱盧設莫何沙鉢搭可汗
19) 大突厥伊利俱虜設莫可始波羅可汗臣攝圖
20) 土
21) 門
22) 骨吐祿可汗
23) 骨咄祿
24) 骨吐
25) 汩咄
26) 祿
27) 默啜
28) 匐
29) 默
30) 牟羽
31) 天上得果報天男突厥聖天骨咄祿默啜大可汗
32) 默矩
33) 默棘連
34) 三十姓天上得毗伽煞可汗
35) 伊然可汗
36) 登利可汗
37) 天烏蘇米施可汗
38) 闕毗伽可汗
39) 伽

40) 骨咄祿毘伽闕懷仁可汗
41) 骨力裴羅
42) 裴羅
43) 登里囉沒蜜施頡翳得蜜施毗伽可汗
44) 磨延啜
45) 葛勒可汗
46) 英武威遠毘伽可汗
47) 移地健
48) 牟羽可汗
49) 登里囉汨沒蜜施頡咄登蜜施合俱錄毗伽可汗
50) 咄
51) 登里可汗
52) 登里頡咄登蜜施含俱錄英義建功毘伽可汗
53) 頡咄登里骨咄密施合俱錄英義建功毘伽可汗
54) 英義建功
55) 含
56) 合
57) 汨
58) 頓
59) 頓莫賀
60) 合骨咄祿毗伽可汗
61) 武義成功可汗
62) 汨咄祿長壽天親毘伽可汗
63) 登里囉沒蜜施俱錄毗伽可汗
64) 多邏斯
65) 泮官
66) 愛登里邏汨沒密施俱祿毗伽忠貞可汗
67) 忠貞可汗
68) 汨咄祿毗伽可汗
69) 阿啜
70) 奉誠可汗
71) 登里囉羽錄沒蜜施合汨咄祿胡祿毗伽可汗
72) 骨咄祿
73) 滕里邏羽錄沒密施合祿胡毘懷信可汗
74) 愛滕里邏羽錄沒密施合胡祿毘伽懷信可汗

75) 祿胡
76) 胡祿
77) 昆
78) 昆伽
79) 滕里野合俱錄毘伽可汗
80) 愛德曷里祿沒弭施合密毘迦可汗
81) 愛登里羅汨密施合毘迦保義可汗
82) 九姓迴鶻 登里囉汨沒蜜施合毗伽可汗
83) 合毗伽可汗
84) 克利
85) 登里囉
86) 特勤
87) 可汗
88) 闕
89) 苾伽
90) 毗伽
91) 頡
92) 合
93) 汨
94) 骨吐祿
95) 汨咄祿
96) 胡祿
97) 俱錄
98) 羽錄
99) 沒蜜施
100) 翳德蜜施
101) 咄登蜜施
102) 錄
103) 祿
104) 蜜施
105) 汨
106) 移湦可汗
107) 登羅羽錄沒密施句主毗伽可汗
108) 登囉羽錄沒密施句主毗伽崇德可汗
109) 曷薩
110) 愛登里囉汨沒蜜施合毗伽昭禮可汗
111) 胡
112) 愛登里囉汨沒密施合句錄毗伽彰信可汗
113) 掘羅勿
114) 屭馺

The Central Asiatic Journal is published twice a year.

On editorial matters, book reviews etc., please contact the Editor,
Professor Dr. Giovanni Stary, Via card. G. Urbani 25, I-30174 Mestre-Venezia, Italy.
Books for review should be sent to the editor only upon request. No publication received can be returned.

Manufactured by AZ Druck und Datentechnik GmbH, Kempten.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0008-9182