Article

# Further note on the Irk Bitig

Erdal, Marc

in: Articles | Periodical issue - [1] | Turkic languages - 1 | Periodical
38 page(s) (63 - 100)

---

## Nutzungsbedingungen

DigiZeitschriften e.V. gewährt ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Das Copyright bleibt bei den Herausgebern oder sonstigen Rechteinhabern. Als Nutzer sind Sie sind nicht dazu berechtigt, eine Lizenz zu übertragen, zu transferieren oder an Dritte weiter zu geben.
Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen:
Sie müssen auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten; und Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgend einer Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen; es sei denn, es liegt Ihnen eine schriftliche Genehmigung von DigiZeitschriften e.V. und vom Herausgeber oder sonstigen Rechteinhaber vor.
Mit dem Gebrauch von DigiZeitschriften e.V. und der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

## Terms of use

DigiZeitschriften e.V. grants the non-exclusive, non-transferable, personal and restricted right of using this document. This document is intended for the personal, non-commercial use. The copyright belongs to the publisher or to other copyright holders. You do not have the right to transfer a licence or to give it to a third party.
Use does not represent a transfer of the copyright of this document, and the following restrictions apply:
You must abide by all notices of copyright or other legal protection for all copies taken from this document; and You may not change this document in any way, nor may you duplicate, exhibit, display, distribute or use this document for public or commercial reasons unless you have the written permission of DigiZeitschriften e.V. and the publisher or other copyright holders.
By using DigiZeitschriften e.V. and this document you agree to the conditions of use.

## Kontakt / Contact

DigiZeitschriften e.V.
Papendiek 14
37073 Goettingen
Email: info@digizeitschriften.de

# Further notes on the *Irk Bitig*

**Marcel Erdal**

Erdal, Marcel 1997. Further notes on the *Irk Bitig*. *Turkic Languages* 1, 63-100.

This paper deals with one of the more enigmatic, certainly one of the most beautiful texts created by the composite civilisation of Central Asia in Tang times. It proposes interpretations of its divinational contents, critically reviewing previous suggestions, and deals with details of its Old Uygur dialect.

*Marcel Erdal, Department of Turcology, J. W. Goethe University, P.O. Box 11 19 32, D-60054 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.*

The *Irk Bitig* is a fifty-eight leaf booklet discovered in 1907 by Marc Aurel Stein in the famous manuscript grotto of the "Halls of the Thousand Buddhas" in Shazhou, near Dunhuang in Western China. Its Old Turkic content figures 65 "chapters", consisting of a few sentences each and ending in statements such as "This is bad" or "This is very good", and a colophon. These wonderfully concise outlines of a narrative or a situation served the divinatory interpretation of casts of three knucklebones or three four-sided dice. Stein entrusted this and three other manuscripts in Old Turkic runes to Vilhelm Thomsen, the decipherer of the script, for publication; Orkun's (1938: 71-93) and Malov's (1951: 80-92) versions are practically translations of Thomsen's (1912: 190-214) edition into Turkish and Russian respectively, with minor enhancements and a few additional notes.

Tekin (1993) is a reedition of the text together with an introduction, "explanations", a glossary and—at last—facsimiles. Tekin has some good ideas concerning a few *ırk*s, but some of these are not new: The book has several drawbacks, disregard for progress already achieved being the weightiest of them. Quite a few scholars have published their thoughts on particular passages in this text, for which they all deserve credit. Examples are Kljaštornyj (1981: 126-130) and various remarks in

Roux (1966).[1] With such an important source, scholarly attempts at an interpretation should be quoted even if one does not agree with them (and argued against if necessary).

As it is, Tekin has missed some relevant ideas. The chapter headed "Previous Works on Irk Bitig" (Tekin 1993: 2) only contains reference to the editions mentioned, to Hamilton (1975),[2] to Clauson's "Notes on the Irk Bitig" (1961) and to "Irk Bitig üzerine yeni notlar" (Erdal 1978). Thomsen called his edition of the *Irk Bitig* a "preliminary note" (1912: 195).

The title of the present paper is meant as a follow-up to the various "notes"; its main (but not only) purpose is to bring together references to relevant research mentioned neither by Tekin (1993) nor by Clauson (1961) or Erdal (1978), towards a definitive edition one day in the future. The *Irk Bitig* is the most noteworthy direct testimony of Turkic lore and culture in the first millennium. Some readers interested in this source will, naturally, not be too well-versed in Old Turkic and its problems and mostly make use of the translation. Some of the translations of Tekin (1993) are definitely unacceptable. Linguists may, e.g., be misled by the way he renders some of the causatives.

The remarks following below will, like the treatment in Tekin (1993), be chiefly text oriented. Altaic astragalomancy practices and knucklebone games (*aşık oyunu*) feature animal names for sides of the dice, perhaps connected in some way with the many animals appearing in the *Irk Bitig*.[3] This and colour symbolism are among the topics which might

[1] The latter will not be discussed in this paper, insofar as it concerns neither textual interpretation nor linguistic features; as can be seen in the book's index under "Irq Bitig", it discusses the divination book on twenty different pages. Nor will work by I. V. Stebleva on poetic forms (quoted in Kljaštornyj 1981), for the same reason.

[2] Tekin (1993) actually writes "1973"; he also dates my *Notlar* as 1977. On p. 29, references to Tekin (1985) and to "Ramstedt 1915" are left unelucidated, the latter actually being Ramstedt (1913) (see bibliography).

[3] A recent paper on such practices and games is Axmet'janov (1988), which documents the rich Turkic terminology in this domain; earlier literature is also quoted there. Roux (1959-60: 57) (in a paper equally ignored by Tekin 1993) has statistics on the various animals appearing in the *Irk Bitig*, the horse figuring most often.

help in trying to solve its enigmas.[4] Research into the Altaic anthropological context should be deepened and detailed comparisons carried out with Tibetan divination books, of which there is quite an abundance.[5] Cf. Hamilton (1975: 9-10, notes omitted):

> "En tibétain ... on a trouvé de nombreux manuels ou fragments de manuels d'un type tout à fait analogue, c.-à.-d. composés de présages qui débutent toujours par une série de petits ronds groupés en trois éléments, comptant chacun de un à quatre,[6] et qui se terminent par l'énoncé du sort bon ou mauvais. D'une manière générale, cependant, on remarque que, par rapport à *l'ïrq bitig*, les textes des présages en tibétain sont nettement ... plus élaborés avec des alternances de vers et de prose. La plupart des manuscrits de ces manuels tibétains ... proviennent, comme *l'ïrq bitig* de la grotte aux manuscrits de Chatcheou ... ."

Other such Tibetan fragments were found near Turfan, another area of intensive Turkic settlement.

> "Quant à *l'ïrq bitig* " Hamilton sums up his view, "on doit vraisemblablement le tenir pour un reflet simplifié et tardif de grands modèles tibétains."

There is not a word of reference to Tibetan parallels in Tekin (1993: 3), where we read:

> "The artistic style used in the book indicates that it is not a work translated from a foreign language. There is no doubt that it was compiled by a Turk who seems to have had a literary talent in using his native tongue."

Thomsen (1912: 194) also thought that

[4] In some cases, the colour names obviously merely serve purposes of alliteration, a very strongly constitutive element in the *Irk Bitig*; thus e.g. *sarıg atlıg sawçı*, *yazıg atlıg yalawaç* (ırk 11).

[5] See Thomas (1957: 113-115, 140-143) for a general comparison. The two manuscripts described by Thomas on pp. 140-141 are outwardly particularly similar to the *Irk Bitig*.

[6] This is exactly the arrangement in the *Irk Bitig*.

> "several of the details are so closely connected with the mode of living of the Turks that ... it is impossible to conceive that (these paragraphs) are translations from another language" (1912: 194).

It does, indeed, seem clear that the *Irk Bitig* is not a translation but the work of a skilled and gifted author. Zieme (1991) gives ample evidence for the use of skill and talent in the abbreviation and adaptation of foreign texts to Turkic verse patterns, however, some of the beautiful Manichaean hymns no doubt have Middle Iranian models. Spontaneous, unforced parallelism, alliteration and assonance on the one hand, and topics such as the joys of the *bäg* in *ırk* 5, the description of the tent in *ırk* 18 or the hunt of the khan with his retinue in *ırk* 63 on the other, do indeed have as strong a Turkic flavour as the *Dede Korkut* epic.[7] Roux (1966: 291) points out the similarity between *ırk* 5, where human birth echoes animal birth, and a particular passage in *Dede Korkut*, where a similar parallelism is expressed.

Yet, early Turkic culture was also composite and must have assimilated elements from the surrounding societies, where everyday life may not have been too different from that of the early Turks. In a Tibetan divination manual (Francke 1924: 7 ff.) we encounter camels going to drink water when the day gets hot, exuberant antilopes, cold winds in open fields and deer too gentle to butt with their horns, all of which very much remind us of the *Irk Bitig*'s nature descriptions. Tibetan iconography may help us find out who the messenger on a yellow horse (*ırk* 11) is, or what the golden-headed snake with a golden stomach (*ırk* 8) and the white horse which chooses its adversary in a contest (*ırk* 19) stand for (to mention just a few of the protagonists). The all-powerful *talım kara kuş* of *ırk* 3, for instance, reminds us of the Tibetan cult of the eagle Garuḍa holding a snake in his mouth (Hoffmann 1950: 145-146), in its turn derived from the Indian *garuḍa* eating up *nāgas*.

Not only foreign evidence can help us discover the spiritual and ethnological significance of the text, of course; we should also look for it in the mythology of the South Siberian and other Altaic peoples. Thus (going back to the same mythical being), the (Mongolian) Buryats con-

[7] von Gabain (1964: 215) thinks that the term *uzun tonlug* used in this source to denote 'women' (*ırk*s 22 and 42) is a "Hinweis auf seßhafte Lebensweise mit ihren feierlicheren Gewändern"; the Turks of the 10th century must, however, no doubt have been acquainted with both modes of life.

sider the eagle to be the ancestor of the shamans; for the (Turkic) Altay tribes the eagle (*kara kuş*) is the son of the sky god *Ülgän* (cf. also Harva 1938: 157). L. P. Potapov (quoted by Kljaštornyj 1981: 135) notes that the figure of a road god riding on a dappled horse, called *yer yol payan* or *tengere,* survived among the shamans of the Teleut (an Altay tribe) till the beginning of this century. This is clearly the old road god on a dappled horse of *ırk*s 2 and 48 (and perhaps 47).

Thomsen thought it could not be definitely settled whether the book is of Buddhistic or Manichaean origin but, he writes, "most outer and inner criteria speak in favour of the latter" (1912: 196). Hamilton (1975: 13-17) again discussed the question with reference to some nouns and proper names in the colophon, but could reach no decision either. Thomas (1957) speaks of the Tibetan divination books in very similar terms, noting that there is nothing particularly Buddhistic about them; their background seems to be generally Bon-po, but not necessarily so. Concerning the *Irk Bitig,* the

> "possibilité de l'existence d'un certain état de syncrétisme entre le bouddhisme et le manichéisme, ou, à tout le moins, de la cohabitation de communautés religieuses bouddhiques et manichéennes"

was evoked by Hamilton (1975: 14). Since then, contact and mutual influence between these religions in the Uygur milieu has been much discussed. It must, perhaps, also be conceded that such a text as the *Irk Bitig* can have been composed in a manner which, if not areligious, is still indifferent as to a choice between "standard" religions; the importance of these for the Uygurs may have been exaggerated because so much of the extant material does come from the clergy. Roux also denies both Manichaean and Buddhistic influence on this text, saying it seems "purement turc" (1966: 45).

The fight between two animals, described again and again in so many configurations in the *Irk Bitig,* is one motive which catches one's attention: A perennial theme in High Asian art (and hence thought) since times immemorial (cf. Roux 1966: 273), several vivid descriptions of such fights can still be found in verse by Abai, the Kazakh national poet. These points touch upon content. According to Peter Zieme (personal communication), the occurrence of the word *manistan* 'Manichaean monastery' in the colophon settles the question of the author's religious adherence: Since the *Irk Bitig* was written for two of the author's hear-

ers residing in a *manistan*, the author, too, must be a Manichaean. Then, however, the term *guru,* which is the second part of his name, is certainly remarkable. Another question which ought to be answered is whether there are any clearly Buddhist manuscripts in runic script; if not, this is further evidence for Manichaeism.[8] The fact that the author happened to be a Manichaean would not, however, necessarily make the text a Manichaean one; it should not be included into a corpus of Manichaean writings any more than Mickey Mouse should be considered a Christian figure or the gospel of St. John a Jewish text.

One of the features common to the *Irk Bitig* and Tibetan *Mo*-divination (dealt with, among other places, in Thomas (1957, ch. VI) is the series of small circles, arranged in three groups of from one to four, in continually alternating combinations; a line of such circles heads each omen (*ırk* in Old Turkic) to represent the die-marks shown on three casts of dice. The cast triads of the *Irk Bitig* were first published in Thomas (1957: 142), and reappear in Tekin (1993).[9] The triads are left-aligned in the latter, whereas Thomas rightly assumes that the direction of the writing, which reads from right to left, governs also that of the "eye" groups. This is important if one is trying to find out rules of divination. Similar systems were in use in Antiquity in Greece and India and are still part of the lore of many Turkic and Mongolian peoples: Good casts and bad casts might have remained the same, or may have changed in some interesting way. Such rules may, if discovered, in turn help us understand more about the text. Roux (1966: 43-44) points out, at any rate, that it can be good both if an animal wins (e.g. the panther in *ırk* 31) and loses (the panther in *ırk* 49) showing that, if anything, the cast must have mattered.

A very different domain still needing some elucidation is the place of the *Irk Bitig* within runic paleography and orthography. According to Tekin, "the runic syllabic letters *ot* and *up* / *üp* do not occur elsewhere" (1993: 4). This is not at all the case. *up* / *üp* is known from the Turfan manuscripts, as stated in Thomsen (1912: 191; see von Le Coq 1909: 1051, 1059). It has also turned up twice in what appears to be a letter, in Tezcan & Zieme (1971: 456). *ot* seems to appear thrice in the Ongin inscription (Clauson 1957), as made likely by Tryjarski & Hamilton

[8] Peter Zieme has recently identified some runic manuscript fragments as Manichaean liturgical material.

[9] For *ırk* 53, the data of Tekin (993) are right, those of Thomas wrong.

(1975: 177). There seems to have been a whole series of labialised voiceless stops, $^{w}$k, $^{w}$t and $^{w}$p, possibly neutral as to frontness. The sign for $^{w}$p appears subsequently to have been used to express the sound sequences *ök* and *ük*; the labiovelar characters were apparently kept alive by the many suffixes ending in rounded vowel + voiceless velar.

The labialised stop runes are not syllabic signs in the sense of the Semitic alphabets: They merely indicate that a rounded vowel is the kernel of the syllable they close.[10] In this sense, s$^{1}$w$^{w}$kws$^{1}$mIs$^{2}$ = *sokuşmiş* (*ırk* 2), t$^{1}$wt$^{1}$w$^{w}$pn$^{1}$ = *tutupan* (*ırk* 16) or t$^{2}$ẅ$^{ẅ}$kl$^{2}$ = *tükäl* (*ırk* 27) are not redundant; they are, in fact, quite common in this text. These signs are used also when they occur as second element in clusters, when, that is, there is a phoneme between them and the vowel: k$^{2}$ẅr$^{2ẅ}$kl$^{2}$ẅg$^{2}$(*ırk*s 18 and 64) is *körklüg* 'beautiful'; it need not be read as "*körüklüg*" with the EDPT (followed by Tekin (1993)). Since there is good evidence for this orthographical feature also from the inscriptions, the word sometimes spelled as t$^{2}$ẅr$^{2ẅ}$k is not *türük* or *türkü* but just *türk*.

*Irk* 15 has twice *d* in *turdı* and thrice *t* in *aztı*. Johanson (1979: 114, with n.) discusses the matter summarily and explains it through the *Irk Bitig*'s lateness (cf. *ündi – boltı* in *ırk* 53). Erdal (1978: 94) had already, comparing *ölümdä oz-* in *ırk*s 13 and 17 with twice *ölümtä oz-* in *ırk* 49, pointed out that such fluctuation does not take place in "early" sources.

The spelling of /e/ in this text has never been commented upon. *be, bel, ber- el, et-, keçä, ken, keyik, te-, teril-, ye-, yel, yer,* etc. are all consistently spelled with I in the *Irk Bitig,* as done in the Uygur and Manichaean writing systems; this is unlike the Runic inscriptions, which, to represent /e/, show variation between implicitness and I. This fact need not be evidence for a source in Uygur script but could just mean that the scribe was influenced by Uygur spelling. Tekin (1993) transcribes these instances as *bir-*, *yi-* etc.; this practice is as unjustified in this case as with other Old Turkic texts, once we find that the documentation of sources in Brāhmī Tibetan and inscriptional runic scripts accords with comparative evidence.

This is after all where transcription differs from transliteration. The verbs s$^{2}$d$^{2}$- (thrice) and l$^{2}$t$^{2}$- (twice) and the numeral k$^{2}$I (thrice), which start off with an implicit vowel, should, on the other hand, be read as

[10] In the *Irk Bitig*, labialised consonants never seem to be used to open a syllable, as *ko* etc.

*äşid-*, *äl(i)t-* and *äki;* Tekin (1993) here writes *(e)lt-*, *(e)ki* and *(e)şid-*.[11] *äki* and *äşid-* are spelled with (implicit) /ä/ without variation in the Orkhon inscriptions as well. The inscriptions of the Uygur kaganate, Tariat and Šine-usu, also frequently have *(ä)ki*, without a single exception, while Uygur consistently writes *iki* (*also* in Brāhmī and Tibetan writing). The runic manuscripts in Le Coq (1909: 1057, 1058) (TM 342 2 r 10 and TM 326 r 2), on the other hand, have *ikinti*. The shape of 'two' appears to be a dialectological and not just an orthographical matter: *äki* and *iki* do not, I think, go back to **eki*, as already argued in Erdal (1993: 145) (against Doerfer 1971: 292, a.o.).[12] *äşid-* is further found in BT V[13] (Manichaean; here equally common as *eşid-*), BT III, frequently in the Xuan Zang text, sometimes in the Maitrisimit, often in other Buddhist sources and twice (beside frequent *eşet-*) in Brāhmī texts; so there is nothing special about its appearance in the *Irk Bitig*.

The case of *äl(i)t-* is a bit more complicated: Uygur consistently writes this verb with I and the runic inscriptions fluctuate between an implicit vowel and I, which would make us read *el(i)t-*; this is in fact what several Brāhmī instances have. There is one Brāhmī instance read *ält-ür* (TT VIII F 9) though, and the modern dialects vary in the shape of this verb. So I retain *äl(i)t-* as far as the *Irk Bitig* is concerned, and consider this to be a dialect characteristic: /e/, then, is always spelled with I in this source, as in Uygur writing.

On the representation of initial /a:/ in the *Irk Bitig*, Doerfer (1995, 328) goes a bit beyond the observations of Tekin (1993: 4).

Another phonic characteristic which distinguishes the *Irk Bitig* from inscriptional texts is the treatment of word-initial labial consonants when there is a nasal as next consonant. In nine different lexemes and in the pronoun 'I', the *Irk Bitig* has initial /m/ as in Uygur manuscripts; cf. also *munçuk* in the runic manuscript T II T 14 from Turfan. The runic inscriptions (including the ones from the Yenisei basin) write b. Retaining /b/ in this position would be typically Oguz. This again brings

[11] Write colophon instead of 67 in Tekin (1993: 54) under *(e)şid-:* There is no *ırk* to be numbered 67. *(e)rmiş* for *(ä)rmiş* in the last line of p. 8 and *ölümde* for *ölümdä* in the last line of p. 10 are also simple errors.

[12] *äki* may possibly be due to an early reanalysis related to *äk* 'a joined piece', a noun surviving only in the South West.

[13] This and other abbreviations referring to Uygur sources are to be found in the UW.

up the question of dialectal affinities. Erdal (1978: 106, 112) had pointed out that the form *sınuq* (*ırk* 48) is said to be Oguz in the DLT (fol. 604), *sıŋuq*[14] being considered by Kāšġarī the "normal" form; further, that *künäş* (*ırk* 57) is the Oguz word for 'sun'. *sın-ok* is, however, attested in the *Qutadgu Bilig* and in an Uygur economical document (Erdal 1991: 243), whereas *sıŋok* does not seem to appear outside the DLT (cf. Erdal 1991: 361-362); *kinäş* (regularly from *künäş*) has in the meantime also appeared in Khaladj (translated as 'sonnig, nach der Sonne').

Another relevant dialectological feature is the spelling of the word for 'reed' in *ırk* 10, which is *kamuş; ırk* 38 again has the normal *kamış* and other vowels adjacent to labial consonants are not rounded in this text. Vowel rounding in this position is otherwise, in Old Turkic, found in the few manuscripts in Sogdian script, which also show other "western" characteristics. There does not seem to be anything definitely Oguz about the *Irk Bitig,* then, although the possibility of such an early dialect assignment cannot be excluded; in any case, its language appears not be any "standard" variety of Old Uygur either. According to Clauson (1961: 218),

> "it is written in what Professor von Gabain has aptly called 'the Manichaean *n*-dialect'; but as", Clauson suggests, "this is for all practical purposes identical with the language of the Orkhon inscriptions, it would be simpler to call all the *n*-dialects "Türkü", distinguishing the language of the manuscripts, if necessary, by calling it 'Manichaean Türkü'".

Hegaard (1976: 97, footnote) argues against this, pointing out that the *Irk Bitig* has two occurences of *bul-* 'to find' but no occurence of *tap-*, the other verb with this meaning. One would find it difficult to agree with his contention that the Orkhon inscriptions have no instance of *bul-* as his interpretations of the relevant Orkhon passages are hardly acceptable. Hegaard's criticism of Clauson's position appears, in itself, to be justified.

Tekin (1993: 5-6) features a list of "scribal errors", which, however, is incomplete; add the following: In 15, the first instance of *ogli* is written as wg$^{1}$I; in 20, *odguru* is written without the final w; in 25, *kamşa-* is spelled with s$^{2}$ instead of s$^{1}$ and *ol* is spelled as l$^{1}$w; in 27, *bolmiş* is spelled with two m's instead of one; in 33, *ter* is spelled as t$^{2}$II. Some of

[14] I would now write these as *sınok* and *sıńok* respectively (cf. Erdal 1996).

the errors just mentioned and the ones on the list of Tekin (1993) have been emended tacitly in the transcription while others have not.

The emendations in some of the *ırk*s are marked as such, while the ones in 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25 (twice), 27, 33, 34, 42, 52, 57 and 61 are tacit. 48 and 50 are emended only in the error list but not in the text. The transcription creates some new errors of its own: In the last sentence of *ırk* 5, read *bäg är* instead of just *bäg*, in *ırk* 8 *(ä)bint(i)n* instead of *(ä)bintin*, in *ırk*s 11 and 18 *(a)ñıg* instead of *(a)ñ(ı)g*, in *ırk* 24, *tiläyür* instead of *til(ä)yür*, in *ırk* 25, *buk(u)rsı* (or *bok(o)rsı*, *bok(a)rsı* etc.) instead of *bukursı*. In *ırk* 18, the word *köznöki* is written as if it had an explicit rounded vowel after the z (which is not the case). In 32, *asıgı war* 'there is a profit in it' is left untranslated, the words 'Know thus' appearing instead.

Unfortunately, the text offered by Tekin notes neither the ends of pages of the manuscript, nor are these numbered in the facsimile: This makes it very cumbersome to check manuscript passages, unless one has recourse to Thomsen's edition. The *ırk*s 10, 13 and 14 have twice double-dots at the end instead of 'It is good', 'It is bad' etc., between which space was apparently left for introducing these later. Such double double-dots are not marked in Tekin's edition, which disregards all original punctuation. The glossary lists words starting with *ka, kı, ko* and *ku* before words starting with *kä, ki, kö* and *kü*, although front and back /k/ are nowhere distinguished graphically (not, that is, as *q* and *k*).

The following notes on the various *ırk*s are supplementary to what can be found in the literature quoted by Tekin (1993). Points on which I fully agree with the editor are gone over in silence, which may make this paper seem unduly critical.

**1.**[15] Various Brāhmī texts show that the verb which Tekin (1993) writes as *olur-* was pronounced as *olor-;* this second vowel is retained in Yakut and reflected in Chuvash *lar-*, all signifying 'to sit (down)'.

The translation of *altun örgin üzä olorupan mäŋiläyür män* as "I enjoy sitting on the golden throne" is infelicitous, as sitting on the throne is unlikely to be the object of the Chinese emperor's beatitude. Better, I think, is something like 'Sitting on the golden throne I am in a state of happiness'. The sequence *olorupan mäŋiläyür män* also appears in *ırk 4*, and *ırk*s 51 and 56 similarly have *turupan mäŋiläyür män*. In those

[15] This and the subsequent boldface numerals refer to the *ırk*s in consecutive numbering.

cases, Tekin's translation as "I enjoy sitting / staying" may possibly be correct, as the subjects are various animals in obviously static situations. Even there, however, there may be more spirituality in the situation than this translation reveals: *Irk*s 4 and 56 stress the contiguity to a tree, the importance of which within shamanism is well known (cf. also Roux 1966: 376).

An "explanation" by Tekin (1993) expresses the opinion that *keçä* is not the equative form of **ke*, the root of *ken, kedin, kerü* (< **ke+gerü* by haplology) and *keç* (// *ka+ç*, cf. *kaçan*) as proposed in Erdal (1978: 88), but "derived from keç [ke:ç] 'late' with the ancient dative-locative suffix {+A}". I fail to see any argument against the first-mentioned etymology; Doerfer (1995: 327) gives further arguments to support it.

**2.** According to DLT fol. 53, *ala* signifies 'spotted black and white' when said of a horse; this and *ala+ça*, which later replaced it, are well documented for horses in Sağol (1995). Kāšġarī says that, applied to humans, *ala* signifies 'leprous'. 'leprous' is also given in later lexicography; UW 90 b and the EDPT can therefore hardly be right about this term.

See the discussion of *ırk* 48 for *yol* (or *yul*) *täŋri*.

$j^{1}l^{1}g^{1}$ is translated by Tekin (1993) as "joyful", with the glossary adding "jolly". This translation is taken from the Yakut binome *külü: salı:*, for which Böhtlingk (1851) gives the same meaning in his dictionary (Pekarskij 1907-1930), whom Tekin quotes, mentions Böhtlingk as his source for it). Böhtlingk derives the word from *sala:-* 'to lick', < *yalga-*, and Yakut *salı:* by itself has the meaning 'licking'; the special semantic development of the binome is best explained through metaphor. The Yakut word is therefore rather unlikely to throw light on this problem. *(a)yl(ı)g*, proposed before for the *Irk Bitig* passage, fails to give an acceptable meaning. *ya+lıg* 'bow-bearing' would be another possible rendering of the characters. *yïlïg yumşak*, which Erdal (1978: 89) quotes from TT I 178 (in Tekin (1993) wrongly "TT I 14"), is found also in BT II 1260 and in the Yükünç section of the Maitrisimit, 4 a 17 (Geng & Klimkeit 1988: 14). *yılı-g* remains the best reading in spite of the implicitness of the first vowel, for which cf. the reading *t(ı)g* in *ırk* 39.

The content of *-miş* is rendered with 'apparently'; this is a misleading translation of the evidential in the given context.

**3.** To account for *talım*, Tekin (1993) posits *talı-* as "a variety of well-attested *tala-*", which he quotes from U II 76. There the text has

*talıp kuna käsip* after a lacuna; the proposal of EDPT 490 b to read this hapax as *tälip kuna käsip* 'to pierce' is much likelier. This suggestion is also followed by Zieme (1991: 208, n. 394).

Concerning *kara kuş* 'eagle' see Doerfer (1967-75, 3: 431) and Menges (1982: 113-115) and what I quote in the introduction to this paper. In the QB and the DLT, the term also refers to the planet Jupiter. *talım kara kuş* is found here and in *ırk*s 43 and 51, here apparently referring to the 'sea eagle', in *ırk* 51 to the 'golden eagle' (who lives on mountains). *kara kuş* is not just "a predatory eagle" (as Tekin (1993) writes), but the Old Indian mythical bird *garuḍa*; this latter also has golden wings, like the bird in this *ırk*, and is the vehicle of *Viṣṇu*. Cf. TT VI 432 *täŋrilär, yäklär, ulug küçlüg luular, gantarvılar, asurlar, talım kara kuş kanları, kinarılar, maxoragilär* ... 'Götter, Dämonen, große, mächtige Drachen, *Gandharvas, Asuras, Garuḍas, Kiṃnaras, Mahoragas* ...', where the editors add: "Der uig. Name 'König der schwarzen *Raubvögel*' spielt an auf ihren machtvollen Kampf gegen die Drachen".

The *talım kara kuş* was already identified as Garuḍa in U II 20, 23 (= KIP 142), due to a parallel Chinese text. These *may* be taboo terms, as the 'royal eagle' (which is black) is in many Turkic languages called *bürküt*. *bürküt* appears to be the original name, if one follows Doerfer (1967-1975, II: § 782), who thinks that *bürküt* is originally Turkic although just as wide-spread in Mongolian. He is, however, able to document it in Turkic only from the 14th century on; so it may nevertheless come from Mongolian, even though Mongolian has *bürgüt* with /g/. In the Tüŋkä dialect of Buryat Mongolian (quoted by Menges 1982: 113), the royal eagle is called both *bürgüt* and *xaŋgardi;* this latter comes from *qan Garuḍa,* thus closing the circle.[16]

**5.** Tekin (1993) is unaware that his suggestion to interpret b$^{1}$wd$^{1}$l$^{1}$l$^{1}$g$^{1}$ as 'having a nose peg' was made by Zieme (1979: 479), who already quotes all the evidence. Zieme's proposal occurs in a review and refers to Roux (1976: 559-560). Roux's paper (equally unknown to Tekin) tried to interpret this same word as what is in fact a loan from Persian.[17] Roux remarks that both the mare and the she-camel

[16] The term was already borrowed into Old Uygur with an *i* / *ï*, and went on into Mongolian in this shape.

[17] Otherwise, the paper has some very interesting material on the use of knucklebones among the Turks and Mongols. The *ırk* is already discussed in Roux

are white; this, he notes, is a sacred colour,[18] the colour of animals dedicated to Altaic deities (as *ıdok*). 'Gold', which the hooves and the nose peg are to be made of, is the mark of royalty.

Tekin (1993) translates the sentence *üçünç kunçuyı urılamış* as 'his third princess had just given birth to a son', opting for polygamy in the society described. Obviously, Thomsen's "Thirdly, his wife had brought forth a male child" is much better in the context: There is a triad of events, and the birth of a son is the climax of the series.

Roux strangely translates the sentence *mäŋilig bäg är ärmiş* as "c'était un beg mâle, heureux", which would assume that *är* qualifies *bäg;*[19] in fact, the syntagmatic relationship is the inverse. *bäg är* also appears in the first sentence of the *ırk* and has turned up a number of times in Uygur texts; it might possibly simply mean 'gentleman'. Tekin's translation of *kunçuy* as 'princess' should, in any case, be replaced by 'lady': 'princess' is what the term meant originally; however, like *katun,* its denotees became more and more plebeian with time and the term came to signify just 'woman' in the end.

**8.** The golden-headed snake whose head is to be 'plucked out of its house' might be the poison-spitting snake whose head is crushed by Garuḍa (see above; Harva 1938: 62, 85); however, this does not explain why and by whose sword its golden stomach is to be cleaved open.

Arat (1965: 397, note to 12, 42) suggests that *intin* 'out of the hole' should be read as *irtin* 'sol, şimal' and *(ä)bint(i)n* as *birtin* 'sağ, cenup'. This far-fetched suggestion makes sense only if the original was in Uygur script.

**10.** Erdal (1991: 419) argued that the first word of this *ırk* should be read as *(e)sn(ä)g(ä)n* and not as *(ä)sn(ä)g(ä)n* (see also Erdal 1991: 382-383). This turns out to be contrary to the orthographical practice of the *Irk Bitig* (with the possible exception of *äl(i)t- / el(i)t-*). The verb signifying 'to yawn' probably comes from *äs-in* just like the other Old Turkic verb mentioned there. Clauson's 'snuffling' (1961) is not bad either.

Tekin (1993) renders *bars* here as "leopard", in *ırk*s 31 and 49 and in the colophon as "tiger" and gives both translations in the glossary. Ac-

(1959-1960: 58). We understand from a note to that passage that the aberrant idea is actually due to Jean Deny.

[18] Cf. *ırk* 41.

[19] Tekin (1993) altogether drops the word *är* (which is clear in the facsimile).

cording to Doerfer (1967-1975, II: 235-236), the term must have denoted the 'panther' (while 'tiger' was *kaplan*, 'jaguar' *irpiş*). The attribution of manly virtues (*alp ärdäm*) to the panther does not, I presume, follow from his having his head among the reeds, as the use of *antag* would normally presuppose: Rather, this is a stereotype, as discussed in Roux (1966: 235).

**11.** Tekin (1993) translates *yazıg* here as 'dark brown' but in *ırk* 50 as 'bay', reflecting the hesitation in the EDPT entry for the word. There it is considered to be either a metathesis of *yagız* (not too likely, since it appears twice) or related to Ibn Muhennā's *yōzag*, translated as *kumayt* 'dark bay' (not very convincing either, as a hapax). The proposal of Thomsen contradicts the sound laws.

**12.** There has been a long discussion whether k$^{l}$m$^{l}$l$^{l}$- should be interpreted as *kamla-* 'to perform shaman tricks' or *kamıl-* 'to fall down'. Erdal (1978) and Tekin (1993) quote most of the earlier views. Add Kljaštornyj's (1981: 127) and Molnár's (1996) defense of *kamla-*. Molnár further proposes understanding the words *awka barmış* 'went hunting' as *abka barmış* 'went to practice sorcery', thinking of Kāšġarī's *abaçı* and *abakı* 'bogy, idol' and Mongolian *ab* 'witchcraft, sorcery'. This proposal would explain why the *a* of *āw* is not explicit, which it should normally be in the *Irk Bitig;* the *a* isn't written out in the instance of *ırk* 43 either, however, where *aw* is certain (see Meyer 1960: 52-53).

One problem with the idea is the stem-final vowel in Kāšġarī's terms; another, that runic *b* represents Old and Common Turkic /w/, whereas the DLT's *b* is /p/. *kamla-* is not attested in Old Turkic at all; it is conceivable, however, that magical terminology would have stayed out of the sources we happen to have. The practice of animal consecration, alluded to in *ırk* 41, is not, after all, found in any other Old Turkic source either; the next earliest evidence for this practice, widespread among Turkic tribes in the 19th century, comes from accounts related to the Mongols (see Roux 1966: 177-186).

Bang (1925: 237, footnote 3) proposed *kamıl-* but went on with an unacceptable interpretation of the sentence *täŋridä ärklig ter,* which has several other possible renderings: Taking *ärklig* to be the accusative of the participle *är-kli*, he offers the translation "(den infolge des Sturzes Gestorbenen) stellt (das Bildchen) im Himmel seiend dar". This follows his idea that the *ırk*s were originally accompanied by drawings (in accordance with Indian but not Tibetan practice). *te-*, however, can hardly

signify 'darstellen'. See Erdal (1991: 662) for another interpretation of this phrase.

**13.** In the note to Tezcan (1975, l. 72) *täŋrilig kurtga* 'a devout old woman' is compared to the phrase *täŋri bol-,* which is a euphemism for dying (with further literature, a.o. Harva 1938). In this terminological context, the phrase might signify 'an old woman about to die'. In that case, however, the text might better have had *täŋrilik kurtga,* which would, again, be possible only if the original text were written in Uygur writing. The interpretation might benefit from the comparison with other passages where *täŋrilig* appears. The one passage I could find (*täŋrilig burxan* in BT XIII 2, 126) does not help much, however. Some of the (six) instances which appear in the Kutadgu Bilig (which can also be read as *täŋrilik*) were translated as 'devout', but Dankoff (1983) understands them differently.

**14.** *katıgtı* 'firmly' is now known to consist of two words: *tı* 'firm' appears by itself as well.

**15.** *keyik* should not be translated as 'deer', as Tekin (1993) does; in Old Turkic it denotes any wild animal. There is, in this *ırk,* a trifold division of living beings capable of receiving *kut:*[20] Humans, birds and, perhaps, four-legged animals. Are we to understand that fish and insects are excluded, or do we have here the apparently universal predilection for triples? Kljaštornyj (1981: 123) points out the mythical aspects of this *ırk.*

**16.** The word *s(ä)mriti* of this *ırk* was understood by Thomsen, Orkun, Malov, Clauson and Erdal (1978) as a gerund. Tekin (1993) takes it to be the causative form *sämri-t-ti* (which is a perfectly legitimate reading with the orthographical practice of this text) and proposes the translation "fattened (itself)". This translation is impossible for two reasons: Firstly, causatives of *transitive* verbs can be used with passive meaning in Old Turkic (as discussed in Erdal 1991: 844-847, with literature), but causatives of intransitive verbs (as *sämri-* 'to fatten') are always just transitives and have no reflexive (or medial) meaning. Secondly, the perfect (*-di)* and the evidential (*-miş*) forms are never used in parallel fashion as postulated, unless the latter can be understood to refer to somebody's thoughts.

[20] Note the remarks of Roux (1966: 42) on the similarity of the animal and the human condition before God shown in this *ırk.*

The solution proposed by Hamilton (1978: 248-252) (unknown to Tekin 1993) should be unacceptable for this same reason. Like Tekin (1993), Hamilton also takes *sämriti* to be a finite verb, but from the simple base. This is acceptable semantically; however, beside the problem just referred to in connection with Tekin's interpretation, we probably have some difficulty with *t* (instead of *d*) after a vowel in the perfect form. Erdal (1991: 784) had, in the entry *sämri-t-*, proposed a further solution involving the gerund, equally disregarded by Tekin (1993). Still another way to understand the sentence would be *sämri-t-i ye-r+in öpän* 'remembering that he had eaten (*ye-* in the aorist participle form) his fill'.

*utru yirdä*[21] *ogrı sokuş-* '(On its way home) a thief came across' is equally unsatisfactory, the translation part put into brackets being unwarranted and quite unnecessary and in any case not a correct translation of *utru* (if that is what it was intended to be). Hamilton (1978: 249-250) plausibly thinks that WTRW could be an error for WRTW *ortu* 'middle' (which was probably pronounced as *orto*); "faute d'autant plus compréhensible," he adds, "que la métathèse *-rt-* → *-tr-* était fréquente en turc ancien". He further compares the passage to *orto yerdä amgaka sokuşmış* (my spelling) in *ırk* 49. This proposal fails to account, however, for *utru eki ... kişi oglın sokuşmış* in *ırk* 2.

*yel* 'mane' is not discussed by Tekin (1993), while Hamilton (1978: 250) compares it with the entry in DLT fol. 450 (referred to in EDPT 924 b). The EDPT 916 entry shows the base forms of Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic to have been *ya:l* and *yalıg*, but I have come across no instance for the word for 'mane' in Uygur. The *Irk Bitig* lexeme being quite clear in its context and Yakut *siäl* a problemless cognate, *yel* must be posited for eastern Old Turkic. The statement in Doerfer (1967-1975, IV: § 1806) that "tü. *yäl* scheint nicht belegt zu sein" does not hold, then, and Mongolian *del* can very well be related to it. The dialect variant *yal*, on the other hand, could have resulted from a contamination with a cognate of Mongolian *dalu* 'shoulder blade'.

The base of k¹wd¹wr¹s¹wg¹Iŋn¹IŋA is by Tekin (1993) emended to an unattested *kudursug*, whereas *kudursugın*, Hamilton's proposal (1978: 250-252), stays closer to the manuscript and takes the various other attested forms of the word denoting the tail area of the horse into consideration: The scribe apparently wrongly wrote the stem-final nasal as ŋ, then corrected this to n without deleting the error. The last two

[21] Tekin's transcription for what I would give as *yerdä*.

vowels could also have been meant to be ı and u or ı and o: The form appearing in the Turkic-Khotanese wordlist (Emmerick & Róna-Tas 1992) is *kudıs(ı)gon*; this should either be read with /z/,[22] or else represents a simplification of the cluster through the dropping of /ɪ/. Doerfer (1967-1975, III: § 1494) deals with the word in detail. See Hamilton's discussion for everything else; it is clear, in any case, that the stem ended in /n/, as opposed to Tekin's choice.

**17.** Tekin (1993) translates *täŋri küçiŋä* as 'thanks to the strength given by Heaven', following EDPT 693 a, possibly in view of *täŋri küç bertök üçün* in the Köl Tegin and Bilgä Kagan inscriptions (KT E 12, BQ E 11). The phrase can be compared to *täŋri qutınta* 'by the grace of Heaven' (thus, with capital H in both translations) in *ırk* 15: I would rather ascribe *küç* to *täŋri*, as previous editors have done; cf. the imperial Mongolian formula *möŋke tengri-yin küčün-dür* 'in the might of Everlasting Heaven', attested already in the seal of the great-khan Güyüg (1246) and in the Secret History. It appears also in Turkic (*mäŋgü täŋri küçindä*) and Persian (*bi quwwat-i xudāi*).[23]

Tekin (1993) writes *yol sub* 'way and water', Malov (1951) *yul sub* 'a spring and water'; in view of parallelism between *yul sub kör-* and *yaş ot kör-* and between these and *sub içipän yaş yepän*, I would prefer Malov's choice.

**18.** The word spelled as *köznök*, where Tekin (1993) retains the earlier translation 'window', must instead be the same as *köznäk* 'hole'; this is attested in *suw köznäki* (TT III 55) 'water hole' and in *toornuh köznäki ... köznäkläri ... alko köznäklär* (BuddhUig I 389, 390, 392), where it refers to holes in nets. The variant *köznök* appears nowhere else, but tents in any case have smoke holes (see also Erdal 1991: 639-640, n. 305).

The second elements in the sequences *köznök* and *körklüg*, *ägin* and *ädgü*, *bagış* and *bar* in this *ırk* have obviously been chosen for the sake of alliteration and are therefore a bit arbitrary as far as content is concerned. Tekin 1993 follows the EDPT (744 b) in reading $k^2$ẅ$r^{2ẅ}kl^2$ẅ$g^2$ as *'körüklüg'* and translating this as 'can be seen through'. The same spelling is found also in *ırk* 64, there translated as 'with a wide view'. Such a form is not known from anywhere else, however, nor is there

[22] The well-known *r* ~ *z* alternation has a further variant *rs*, as in *ti:z* 'knee' / *tirsgäk* 'elbow'; cf. *kumursga* in *ırk* 37.

[23] Discussed in Kotwicz (1934: 134 ff) and elsewhere.

any *körük* (beside the word signifying 'bellows'). There is a near-participial suffix *-(X)glXg* (discussed in Erdal 1991, § 3.119) but none of the shape *-(X)klXg*. I have no doubt that the word meant is *körklüg* 'beautiful' although it is spelled with $^{w}$k in the second syllable: This happens elsewhere as well when the syllable has a rounded peak, even though a sonorant intervenes between the vowel and the stop.

Malov takes *bar*, which Tekin (1993) translates as 'they are all there', to be the aorist of *ba-* 'to bind', which may be preferable.

**19.** Kljaštornyj (1981: 129-131) proposes reading *ak ata* instead of *ak at* 'white horse' in this *ırk*, pointing out that *odguru* is, in *ırk* 20, (as an error, I would say) spelled without the final w; *ak ata* is supposed to be a Manichaean deity. In a review, Zieme (1984) gives three convincing arguments against this suggestion. One might add to his arguments that one cannot both entertain such a thought and support the idea, as Kljaštornyj does in that same passage, that the word b$^{l}$wl$^{l}$wg$^{l}$ of this *ırk* is to be read as *bolug* and signifies 'existence', i.e. Buddhistic *ažun*. Reading this word as *bulug* and translating the passage as 'chose its adversary in three quests' (Erdal 1991: 184-185) gives, I think, a more satisfactory meaning.

According to Kāšġarī (fol. 53), *ak* is used among the 'Turks' for horses' colours, whereas the Oguz are said to use it for anything. The non-Oguz early general word for 'white' was *ürüŋ / yürüŋ*. According to Sağol (1995), *ürüŋ* is, indeed, never used for horses. In (later) Uygur the distinction apparently weakened; the *UW* has a few instances of *ak* qualifying entities other than horses. It seems to have been kept up in the *Irk Bitig*, however: *Irk* 5 supplies us with a minimal pair, *ak be* 'white mare' against *ürüŋ ingän* 'white she-camel'; elsewhere in the *Irk Bitig ürüŋ* is applied to a calf, a cow and a falcon. All this speaks against *ak ata*.

**20.** Note that the second vowel of *turguru* is implicit, although the suffix *-gUr-* has the archiphoneme /U/; this contradicts the theory propounded by Doerfer in various publications, to the effect that only /X/, which is said to encompass only reduced vowels, is implicit. The matter is discussed in Erdal (1996).

In translating *titir bugra* as 'a camel stallion (with a herd of) females', Tekin (1993) is following the EDPT and, before that, Clauson (1961: 221). Clauson quotes QB 2312, where there is

> "a description of the qualities required of a general. It says that he must have the qualities of various animals ... and, if he is taking revenge, be as vindictive as the *titir bugrası*."

This account is, for Clauson, sufficient justification for the grammatically and semantically far-fetched translation 'the camel stallion with a herd of females'. The 'female camel' is *ingän,* occurring in *ırk* 5, where it corresponds to *bugra* as 'male camel'. The camel which the Old Turks were primarily familiar with must, of course, have been the (two-humped) Bactrian camel. Although Thomsen did not translate *titir* in his text, he gives the full and (I think) correct explanation in his notes (and is joined by Malov): Quoting the Houtsma text where the difference between *ingän* and *titir* is explained, he shows that *titir* is the Arabian one-humped female camel, which was used in Central Asia for mating with the native two-humped male camel.

It appears to have been known in West Turkestan since the Arabian conquest in the 8th century. The DLT's translation of *titir* as Arabic *nāqa* 'female camel' must, I assume, be understood to refer to the 'female dromedary'. Roux (1959-1960: 37-38, 40-41) discusses the term and the present passage and, in view of shamanist thinking, reaches certitude in his view that *titir bugra* is a 'hermaphrodite camel'. I find Thomsen's hypothesis more convincing and take *titir bugra* to have signified 'a male hybrid between a male Bactrian and a female Arabian camel'; *titir* would then refer, here, to the breed rather than the gender.

Tekin (1993) (like Thomsen) translates *köpük* as 'froth'. Roux (1959-1960: 58-59), in his discussion of the passage, translates this word as 'bave' (saliva). Nobody else, in fact, seems to have asked what might actually have been meant by this camel's 'froth', which appears to attain such universal diffusion. Roux connects the *ırk* with the miraculous saliva of various folklore and belief systems, where it gives remedy to the sick and resurrects the dead. According to him, it must be this saliva which wakes the sleeping and raises those lying down (which he interprets as referring to the sick and the dead). Roux further, in this connection, raises the question (which he leaves open) as to what "religion" might lie behind this belief in the present case.

**21.** Tekin (1993) is, of course, right in reading *(ä)t-* 'to sing' in this *ırk:* Not only because *te-* 'to say' "does not make sense here", but also because it would have been written with I.

*yıl yarumazkan* is translated by Clauson (1961: 221) as 'before the year brightened (that is 'before the days got long')'; for Tekin (1993) it is 'before (the new) year dawned'. I find Clauson more appropriate.

As Tekin (1993) points out, the verb *ödi- / ödü-* 'to get excited' survives in Kirghiz; Palló (1959: 254) postulated it to have survived in Chuvash as *ur-* 'rasend sein',[24] taken into Hungarian as *üz-*.

**22.** Doerfer (1995: 328) points out that 'mirror' is *küzŋü* and not *közŋü*, quoting the entry in Doerfer (1967-1975, III).

The omen of this *ırk* is the worst in the *Irk Bitig*: This is the only *ırk* with the predicate 'very bad' (*añıg yawlak*); the *ırk* is said to be 'distressing' (*muŋlug*). The anthropological background for this characterisation no doubt lies in the significance which a person's reflection in a mirror or in water was believed to have for one's fate (cf. Harva 1938: 252-254, 349).

**23.** We find *täzkin*, the wrong interpretation, also in Bang (1934: 199); nobody now any longer doubts Clauson's *täzäk+in* (Clauson 1961).

*käkük* appears also in Maitrisimit 32 v14, where this bird is said to attack the Indian cuckoo and the peacock (see Erdal 1991: 192). In DLT fol. 409 the term is rendered as 'falcon', by which 'a species of falcon' is apparently meant. This is also what we find in Tekin's glossary, but the translation accompanying the text writes 'eagle'. The inconsistency appears to come from a hasty reading of the EDPT entry: That entry quotes the translation 'eagle' from Steingass' Persian dictionary, a rendering of *zummaj*, the word used by Kāšġarī to translate *käkük*. Kāšġarī adds that its "bones are used in conjurations and love potions and their spells": There might have been some such use also for this bird's (dried) dung, or it may merely have been an omen. Tekin (1993) follows Erdal (1978) in emending çwk$^2$ to *çäkik* (making 'lark' in his translation into a vocative, however, where I had taken it to be in adnominal function). In view of love potions and spells and the boy who finds the falcon's dung, another lexeme, equally mentioned in DLT fol. 409, is perhaps better suited to the context: *çäkik* 'the penis of a small boy', which would give 'May the flesh of your penis be blessed'. That the sentence *ätiŋ kutlug bolzun* should be addressed to a 'lark' (as in Tekin's transla-

[24] The shift *ö* > *u* has its parallel in Chuvash *kur-* < *kör-* 'to see' and *kun* < *kün* 'day'.

tion) seems implausible in any case, as there would be no connection whatsoever with the previous sentence.

**24.** The word written by Tekin (1993) as *ortu* was pronounced as *orto,* as shown in Brāhmī practice; all Turkic languages not featuring labial attraction after [o] have *orta.* Similarly, *täglök* instead of Tekin's *täglük* (cf. Erdal 1996).

In his interpretation of *yütür-*, Tekin (1993) disregards Erdal (1978: 96-97), where another instance of this verb in U I is mentioned. Erdal (1991: 815-816) takes *yütür-* (also found in a Ht manuscript) to be a direct derivate from the base of *yüd-, yük* etc. and not to stand for *yüdür-;* instead, *yütür-* is stated there to be the earlier verb signifying 'to load', before the regularised *yüd-tür-* was created. Tekin (1993) regards "*yütür-* as the causative of a verb **yüt-*", taken to be "a dialectal form of OT *yit-* which survives only in Yakut *süt-* 'to be lost, get lost'". There is not a single trace of a Yakut dialect form in Old Turkic, however, where, on the contrary, *yit-* is attested unchanged in all sorts of texts. Similar to *süt-*, Yakut also has unexplained *sü:rbä* < *yegirmi*; there is no reason to take the Yakut forms to be old.

**29.** This *ırk* remains problematical even with Tekin's convincing interpretation for *oş-iç* as 'internal organs, intestines', because of the difficulty in translating *oyma är* as "a man whose job is to hollow out slaughtered animals": As shown in Erdal (1991: 316-320), *-mA* derivates from transitive verbs denote objects of these verbs and not their agents;[25] furthermore, there is a lexeme *oyma* 'boot'.

**31.** Roux (1966: 99, n. 10) notes the parallelism between this *ırk* and *ırk* 34. See Erdal (1991: 435-436) for *äŋ* and its derivates. For the binome, further add *äŋçi mäŋçi käyikçi* in Maitrisimit 75 r 5 (and *ırk* 49 below).

**33.** Tekin's translation of *kidizig suwka sukmış* as '(A man) put the felt into water' is contestable on feminist grounds; 'somebody put felt into water' is surely better.

**34.** Tekin (1993) takes the khan's soldiers to be the object of *köçürü konturu.* I would follow Malov (1951) in taking the object to be 'the

[25] This against Erdal (1978: 99 with footnote 43). The statement there to the effect that there is no noun *oy* is also wrong: *oy* 'hole; pit' is found several times in the HT's text and also in Höllen 113 and Einf IV 6. On the other hand, a lexeme *oy-ug* 'mark; ornament' is attested in QB 3382 and survives in a number of Turkic languages to this day (cf. Tezcan 1981: 54).

enemy', who is referred to just before the phrase in question; the khan and his soldiers, on the other hand, are the topic of the following sentence.

**35.** In Tekin's translation of *yolta* as 'on (his) way (back home)', the contents of the second bracket is unwarranted; going out to war, one might be happy to be brought right back home by a swan even before and not just after the fight.

Cf. Roux (1966: 353) for the place of the swan in Turkic myth.

There is no punctuation between *urup* and *anın;* taking *anın* to be the instrumental of *ol* and translating it as 'with him' is therefore unjustified. Furthermore, the common *anın* always signifies 'therefore, thereby', as one can see in the entries of EDPT and UW. Schulz (1978: 154-155, § 186) proposes reading *urupanın* and translating the passage as 'nachdem der Schwan ihn auf seine Flügel gesetzt hatte'. The expanded gerundial ending *-(X)pAnIn* is discussed in Johanson (1988: 143-146); it appears at least twice in the Maitrisimit, and in Manichaean fragments edited in M II and III. In view of the probable instrumental origin of the last part of the ending,[26] I would prefer 'indem er ... setzte'; this covers the content of 'thus', which Tekin (1993) adds in brackets at the beginning of the next sentence. In this I follow Johanson (1988: 143), where the sentence is translated as "The swan put [him] on his wings and [so] rose in the air and [so] brought him to his parents." Clauson (1972: 194, 617, s.vv. *ur-* and *qalı-*) got this sentence wrong because he failed to see that the swan is the agent (as already noted by Schulz 1978: 213).

**36.** In his "explanations" to this *ırk*, Tekin (1993) argues (agreeing with Erdal 1978: 102) for interpreting *atlıg* as 'having horses' and not as 'having a name, title, reputation'; this is also how these instances are rendered in the glossary. The translation, however, (wrongly) offers 'bearing ... titles' and 'having a ... reputation'! Further, Tekin (1993) understands (more or less following Clauson 1961) *üküş atlıg, kobı atlıg* and *uçruglug* as attributes of *ögrünç*, *korkınç* and *kut* respectively; I still believe (cf. Erdal 1978: 102) that these phrases should be interpreted as concessive (or temporal) clauses: '(Even when / Even though) possessing many horses, you have no joy; when (your) horses are unlucky, you are not worried; (when) flying (your) banners (for war), you do not enjoy the favour of heaven.' *uçrug,* finally, is not a flag for celebrations, as Tekin's translation might make one think; see the sources quoted for

[26] This is the position also of Ş. Tekin (1980: 71), in a long footnote.

this lexeme in Erdal (1991: 211-212): All of its uses referred to in earlier literature are warlike; the others describe Buddhist ceremonies irrelevant here.

**37.** *kumursga* is the general word for 'ant' outside Oguz; in the northeast (Shor, Yakut) there is a related form, to be reconstructed as *kımırdagaş* or *kımırdagaç*. Yakut further has *kımırıt* 'a small insect'. Variants in these languages as well as Khakas, Kazakh etc. show that the rounding in the first two vowels is secondary, no doubt being due to the /m/. See Erdal (1991: 84) for an etymology.

Tekin's translation of *turur* as 'lays down' is doubly misleading ('lies down' is no-doubt meant).

**38.** I agree with Tekin's "explanations" of this *ırk*, where we read: "It was Clauson who first understood this sentence correctly (1961: 223)." Surprisingly, Tekin's own translation radically differs from Clauson's and is unacceptable: He takes *kalmiş* and *unamaduk* to be finite, but these must be attributive participles, as the topic of the first clause and the object of the second one are left unstated till the third clause. Communicative principles are violated in a manner postulated by Tekin (1993) only under formal subordination. Further, the addition of '(alone)' is unwarranted. Bang (1930: 17) writes *abïnču-qatun* with a hyphen and offers the translation "sie ist (am Ufer) im Röhricht geblieben und mag ein von Gott verstoßenes 'Freudenmädchen' werden" with unstated reference for "sie". Bang was also mistaken in taking *qatun* to signify 'woman' as Ottoman *kadın*.

**40.** This *ırk* is discussed by Hamilton (1978: 252-254) and Tezcan (1981: 76-77), both ignored by Tekin (1993). I accept Tezcan's translation, which is "Yırtıcı kuzukapan, kürekkemiği kadar geniş ok temreniyle (= gagasıyla) yalçın kayayı yararak vurup[27] yalnız başına yaşıyor". His interpretation starts off with the verse *kalıkta uçuglı kara kuş yorı* in QB 5378. He then correctly identifies the last word of this verse with Kirghiz *ǰoru* 'bearded vulture' and takes *orı* of *ırk* 40 to be an alternant of the same word.[28] The QB's association of the word with *kara kuş* is a

[27] Better *yararcasına vurup*: One does not strike by splitting but rather splits by striking.

[28] *orı* could rather just be an error of the manuscript, of which quite a number are mentioned above: Qarakhanid initial /y/ is not otherwise dropped in any variants of Old Turkic, if one disregards cases as *yıgla-* 'to weep', where the /y/ is a reflex of *h. The opposite relationship can be found in *oşuk* 'helmet' in the DLT, cor-

strong argument in favour of this interpretation, as this is the term normally qualified by *talım* 'rapacious' (like *talım orı* in this *ırk*). Otherwise, there is only *talım balık*, a sea monster;[29] neither humans (Tekin) nor ravines (Hamilton) can be qualified in this way. Tezcan's translation of *yorı-* as 'yaşa-' is also the correct one (as against Tekin's 'marching'): The meaning 'leading a certain way of life', which this verb also has (cf. examples in the EDPT entry), is further attested in *ırk*s 20, 45 and 49. *yarın*, finally, is not 'shoulder' but 'shoulder blade', which is a further reason to prefer Tezcan's interpretation over Tekin's.

**41.** The form *buzagula-çı* was already defended against Clauson's "grammatically impossible" in Erdal (1991: 434); another example for this word is also quoted there from UigPañc 115.

Speaking of a cow, *timiş* can hardly, with Tekin (1993), be translated as 'she said'. *te-* is here better rendered with 'to think'; the woman in *ırk* 42 is also, no doubt, 'thinking'.

Tekin (1993) translates *ıdukluk*[30] as 'to dedicate to heaven'; I propose 'for consecration'. The practice among Turks and Mongols of consecrating animals to otherworldly beings is discussed in Roux (1966: 177-186), who points out that the present passage is the earliest evidence of this practice. There is no reason to believe that the Sky God was ever the only possible recipient of *ıdok* animals.

**42.** *idiş* 'cup' is expanded to *ıdış+lıg* four times in the older two manuscripts of the QB, which probably means that the word originally had back vowels. We find the (presumably secondary) front variant also in *idiş+ig* (twice) in BT I.

**44.** The ablative suffix in the *Irk Bitig* is written by Thomsen as *+d(i?)n*, by Orkun as *+dⁱn*, by Malov as *+din*, by Tekin as *+d(ä)n*. In Old Uygur and Qarakhanid, the ablative suffix has a high vowel exclusively. In the few examples of this morpheme found in runic inscriptions, the vowel is, as here, unspecified. One would not mind the suffix being read as *+dAn* in Orkhon Turkic: It nowadays has this shape in all

responding to *yoşuk* (twice) in another runic manuscript published in Thomsen 1912.

[29] See Hamilton (1978: 253). Hamilton also quotes a derivate *talm+a-*, which may be a misreading of *tarma-* 'to scratch with claws, to lacerate' (documented in Erdal (1991: 568) and discovered in M III 29,31 by Peter Zieme). *tarma-*, in turn, may possibly come from **tal(ı)m+a-*.

[30] Probably pronounced as *ıdoklok* (cf. Erdal 1996).

Turkic languages except Modern Uygur, and may well have done so in Orkhon Turkic as well. The *Irk Bitig,* however, is less likely to have diverged from Uygur in this matter; the possibility of Oguz affinities is discussed above.

Schulz (1978: 154) proposes reading *togan kuş oŋ tırŋgakı ögüşüpän* "nachdem seine rechte Kralle abgeschürft war, erhob sich der Falke in die Luft ..." instead of genitive *kuşuŋ*. He may be right, although there is no punctuation before *oŋ:* The sentence referring to the hare is in the so-called double subject construction,[31] and we might want to assume parallelism.

**45.** *näçök yorıyın* should have been translated as 'How shall I live?', in accordance with the translation for *yorı-* accepted above for *ırk* 40. Here is the sense of *yorı-* that no doubt served as the source for the use of this verb as a durative auxiliary.

**46.** The image of animals becoming stuck in mud and dying appears to have been common; cf. *inçä kaltı tärin titigtä çomukmış ud täg* 'just as an ox submerged in a deep bog' (ShōAgon B(1)270), used metaphorically for a person weighed down and mired in lust. Tekin (1993) says that it was Clauson (1972: 119) who first interpreted this *ırk* correctly. In fact, Rachmati (1930: 468, n. to l. 74, where *titig* occurs) already corrects Thomsen's interpretation, translating *titig* as 'Schlamm' and referring to the DLT. He adds:

> "Die von THOMSEN, *Wahrsagebuch* ... angenommene Bedeutung des Wortes 'B r u n n e n' paßt hier nicht. Hr. Prof. W. Bang hatte mich schon längst auf diesen Umstand aufmerksam gemacht."

Orkun also has the correct translation "çamur", and we further find it in Roux (1959-60: 59), where the author ascribes his interpretation to Louis Bazin. Roux's words are worth repeating:

> "Il ne s'agit pas d'une anecdote empruntée de la vie quotidienne, encore moins d'un symbolisme religieux; c'est une fable. Un personnage puissant, par suite d'un accident, se trouve tomber à la merci d'un individu quelconque."

This view gains further weight when one remembers that the camel is, in the Turkic world, proverbial for its strength and tenacity.

[31] See Erdal (forthcoming), where further examples for this construction are given.

**48.** The manuscript here visibly has *karı yol täŋri* and not *kara yol täŋri*, as first noted in Erdal (1978: 106) (correct in Tekin 1993). There is, then, no reason why this should not be the same god as the one appearing in *ırk* 2 (and possibly also *ırk* 47). Kljaštornyj (1981: 134-135) not only adheres to *kara* (although he quotes my paper on p. 127), but wants to emend this to *kara atlıg yol täŋri*. He concludes that there were two such deities, one riding on a dappled and another on a black horse. He sees his theory supported by a passage in Movses Kagankatvatsi (i.e. Dasxurantsi)'s "History of the Caucasian Albanians",[32] where the Western Türk (7th century) are said to have worshipped several road gods.[33] Other sources quoted by Kljaštornyj accord with the *Irk Bitig* in referring to just one such god, however:[34] L.P. Potapov's Altay materials already mentioned above speak only of a road god riding on a dappled horse, and there is no trace anywhere of one riding on a black horse.

Also very interesting is the state mentioned in a Tibetan manuscript found in the same cave as the *Irk Bitig*, quoted by Lalou (1965: 192),

[32] Translated in Dowsett (1961), who shows (xviii-xix) why the attribution of the surname *Kagankatvatsi* comes from a misinterpretation.

[33] Here is part of the passage (Dowsett 1961: 156; the rest is also worthy of interest): "Using horses as burnt offerings they worship some gigantic savage monster whom they invoke as the god *T'angri Xan*, called *Aspandiat* by the Persians. Possessing completely anarchical minds they stumble into every sort of error, beating drums and whistling over corpses, inflicting bloody sabre and dagger cuts on the cheek and limbs, and engaging naked in sword fights — O hellish sight — at the graves, man against man and troop against troop, all stripped for battle. Numerous groups wrestled with each other and in the orgy performed swift gallops on horseback, wheeling this way and that. Some were occupied in weeping and wailing, others in a game of diabolical fury. They played their games and danced their dances with obscene acts, sunk in benighted filth and deprived of the sight of the light of the Creator. They made sacrifices to fire and water and to certain gods of the roads, and to the moon and to all creatures considered in their eyes to be in some way remarkable."

[34] Kljaštornyj still propounded the same theory at a lecture given at the University of Giessen on 24 May, 1995. The handout: "Das *Irk Bitig* stellt eine deutliche Verbindung zur Staatsideologie her dadurch, daß die eine [Gottheit, i.e. the one of ırk 2] das *qut* 'die göttliche Gnade' verleiht, die andere die Ordnung im Staat garantiert." The last clause alludes to the sentence *elig etmiş män in ırk* 48.

whose *lha* ('deity': "pas tout à fait 'dieu', ni *deva*") is said to be Yol-tańre'= *Yol taŋrı*: Its capital was called "ču-ba *balık*", its rulers were "*hirkin*" and "*tarkan*" and its minister "*Türgüš* A-ma-ča"; this must have been a Turkic state, as all the terms mentioned are clearly Turkic.[35]

Clauson (1961: 223) was in favour of reading *yul täŋri* "the god of the spring" instead of *yol täŋri,* these two being, orthographically speaking, equivalent. This idea has not been accorded any attention and, in view of the god's occupation, does not *prima facie* seem convincing. Harva (1938: 400-404) has some details which make *yul* possible as well:

> "(Die Wassergeister) sollen dann auf den Wegen wandern und ihre kleinen Kinder, die sie reichlich haben, auf einem Ochsen mitnehmen. Man glaubt weiter, daß die Wassergeister auf ihren Wanderungen von einem Ort zum anderen verschiedene Stimmen hervorbringen. Um diese zu hören, setzen sich die Menschen an Wegkreuzungen, an Eislöcher oder neben verlassene Jurten. Aus dem, was sie dann gerade hören, sagen sie die Geschehnisse des kommenden Jahres voraus."

Erdal (1978) had proposed that the second word in the sentence *sınokıŋın sapar män, üzükiŋin ulayur män* uttered by the road god be emended to read as here, against *säpär* of the manuscript; this proposal (actually originally made in the note to Ht X 1176 by Tezcan 1975) is accepted by Tekin (1993). The sentence appears to contain a fixed expression: QB 1858 reads *sınokug sapar ol buzukug etär* "It mends what is broken and repairs what is in ruins" (Dankoff 1983), there predicated upon "intellect". Since *sapar* and *säpär* look identical only in Uygur script, I had postulated this to have been the script of a preceding version; this hypothesis is strengthened by the alliterative patterns: If

[35] The Tibetan transcription of *Türgüš* can only be interpreted as having *ü* in the second syllable. This should also be the variant of the runic inscriptions, seeing that the second vowel is implicit in all the numerous instances found there. As distinct from some other early titles, Turkic etymologies are possible for *tarkan* and *hirkin*: the former from *tar-* 'to disperse (the enemy)', the latter from *irk-* 'to collect, heap up'; this is actually how the title *irkin* is explained in DLT fol. 67. The suffix was pronounced with [k] after /r/, /l/: Erdal (1991: 327) mentions Brāhmī instances of *käl-kin* and *tur-kun*. Note further *tańrı*, the Western variant of the word for 'god, sky'.

*üzükiŋin ulayur* is to show at least visual alliteration,[36] like *sınokıŋın sapar* preceding it and *elig etmiş* following, ü and u cannot originally have been in runes. *sap-* and *ula-* form a common biverb, and *ulal-* often goes with *sapıl-*, *ulag* with *sapıg* (see Erdal 1991: 200 and 669-670). *sap-* also forms a biverb with *et-*, however, as e.g. in the QB example quoted, and from this we have the binome *sapılgan etilgän* in the DLT. Now in BT VIII A 115 we find the binome *etmäksiz säpmäksiz* with front k, which makes us wonder whether Uygur biverbs such as *etip sapıp* should not be read as *etip säpip*. The BT VIII phrase could also make us wonder whether *säpär* in this *ırk* is necessarily purely graphic.[37]

**50.** Tekin (1993) states that *tigrä-t-* and *yadrat-* "have not been understood correctly by previous scholars". However, the special horse-related use to which *tigrä-t-* is put here was already known to EDPT 486; Erdal (1991: 788) quotes an Uygur example with a more general meaning. Concerning *yadrat-*, the Altay-Turkic *yayrat-* is quoted both by Thomsen and the EDPT. Both considered it to be derived from the aorist of *yad-*, whence Clauson's 'make it lie down'. Tekin's translation 'make it run until it (almost) spreads down (on the ground)' seems to stem from fantasy:[38] Nothing is said in the text about the bay horse being made to run. Both *yayra-* and *yayra-t-* are in common use in Turkmen as well, with meanings similar to Turkish *yayıl-* and *yay-* respectively; Clauson is therefore probably right both with his etymology and his translation. *tärit-* is discussed in Erdal (1991: 737) together with its derivate *tärt-är-*.

Tezcan (1991: 155) (disregarded by Tekin 1993) discusses *üçürgü* 'a horse's sweat cloth (placed under the saddle)'; its many cognates in the Turkic languages[39] all start with /ü/ or /i/ against Clauson's etymology (q.v. Tekin 1993). Tezcan proposes a derivation from *iç* 'inside' (with backward assimilation of vowels). Now (personal communication) he would also consider a derivation from *iç-ür-* (here) 'imbibe (tr.)', which seems much likelier to me: I don't know of any denominal suffix *+ürgü*.

[36] That this is often the case can be seen in Zieme (1991): *ö* and *ü* often go together, as do *i*, *ı* and *e*, and so forth.

[37] Unless the frontness of *säpmäksiz* is ascribed to rhyming with *etmäksiz*.

[38] Likewise the translation 'to make a horse run until it becomes exhausted' offered in the "explanations".

[39] Many of these can be found in Sevortjan (1974: 394).

The verb which Tekin (1993) writes as *topul-* was apparently pronounced as *topol-;* see Erdal (1991: 394) for both a Brāhmī example and cognates. The stem itself is discussed there on p. 621 together with a number of additional runic and Uygur examples. *topl-ok,* which Tekin (1993) for some reason writes with an asterisk, is discussed there on p. 248.

**53.** The similarity between this *ırk* and the following passage is striking: *kara bulıt örläntöktä karlıg togan tüpintä; boz bulıt örläntöktä buzlug togan tüpintä* 'when the black cloud rises, there is a white falcon behind it; when the grey cloud rises, there is an icy falcon behind it' (HamTouen 15, 2-5). Hamilton sees in this an allusion to the *Ediz* and *Yaglakar* (recte *Yaglakır* ?) tribes. The similarity between the two texts cannot be a coincidence, even though their spirit is diametrically opposed. Zieme (1991: 371, n. 65) quotes this *ırk* as having "Strophen mit deutlicher strophischer Alliteration".

*bış-* 'to ripen etc.' consistently has back vowels in its very numerous forms and derivates in Old Uygur and Karakhanid, but front vowels here. The only exception I know of is *büş(ü)r-* in TT VIII M 22, which may possibly represent more wide-spread popular pronunciation; it may, alternately, have been (at the time) a dialect variant. Cf. *idiş* (*ırk* 42) discussed above.

**54.** Roux (1966: 41-42) points out the remarkable parallelism of the raven addressing God as the servant (thus, I think, more appropriately, as against Roux's and Tekin's 'slave') addresses his master, and God listening to the raven. He further notes that God also listens to the maral deer of *ırk* 60, and bestows *kut* upon young birds and animals in *ırk* 15. This is how the Early Turks felt about the unity of nature, and Roux gives examples for a similar view of things in modern Siberia.

**55.** *törüt-* cannot have signified 'to get oneself made (something)', as causatives of intransitive bases do not convey passive, reflexive or medial meaning. Something similar to passive or medial meaning obtains only when the base is transitive: The secondary causee can then become identical with the instigator or primary agent. *töröt-* (read better thus!) is well attested with the meaning 'to create, bring into existence'. Might *ärklig* be an error for *ärkli*? The sentence would then signify 'Being in the army, he caused the dispatch of messengers'; this might be something indicative of the resonance of the man's deeds.

*atı yetiglig* has to signify 'his horse being led (for him)', implying that he has a groom to do it, or that he receives a hero's welcome. This is

contrary to most of the opinions about this phrase till now, including Erdal (1978: 109-110) and Tekin (1993). Exceptions are Bang (1923: 119-120), who translated *yitiglig* as 'bezaumt', referring to *kolın yetip* in KP 36, 3. Malov was also on the right path when he translated the form as 'dressed in parade harness' on the base of an entry in Budagov (1871: 348-349). Turkish *yädäk* is not a loan from Persian, as Clauson (1961: 224) claimed in his attempt to show that "Malov's explanation is misconceived"; this word happens to have gone in the opposite direction (see Doerfer 1967-1975, IV: § 1831 and Erdal 1991: 395, n. 462). *yetiglig* must, indeed, be a "passive participle" (as the DLT defines this formation); cf. Erdal (1991: 345). *yitig*, which Tekin (1993) mentions, probably never existed, the *-(X)glXg* form being derived directly from the verb. This does not, of course, preclude a special semantic development. Understanding the noun *at* as 'reputation' (as still defended by Kljaštornyj 1981: 128) is unacceptable because that word has a long *ā* whereas the vowel here is implicit.

*atan-* is never 'to be famous', as we read in the EDPT and in Tekin (1993). It can signify 'to be called by a certain name' or 'to be considered to be something' if accompanied by a predicate; otherwise always 'to be appointed to an office': See EDPT, *UW* and Erdal (1991: 590-591).

**57.** Tekin (1993) takes k$^{l}$n$^{l}$g$^{l}$I to be a derivate from *kan-* 'to be satisfied' and translates it as 'her favorite (lover)'. This translation is not very convincing, as *kan-ıg* is only attested with the meaning 'cheerfulness, satisfaction', in the DLT. Tongerloo (1987: 215) sees in this word the Middle Persian *kanig* 'maiden', borrowed via Sogdian. *kanig* has indeed come into Old Turkic through Sogdian: It appears as *knyg rwšn tngrii* in M III 6,2$_2$ (text 1), as *kny rwšn tngri* in BT V 207 (text 11), referring to the Manichaean deity also called *virgo lucis*. Tongerloo's proposal assumes that the word was borrowed into Uygur as a common noun and not only as part of the proper name of a deity. This assumption is not easy to follow, especially since the words constitute mere transferences of Sogdian spelling and do not, e.g., show the Q / Γ letter. In Old Turkic, this deity is sometimes referred to as *yarok kızı;* in M I 25,34 she is *äzrua täŋrining amrak kızı yaşın täŋri*. Still, the idea should not be rejected offhand. Nor should Tekin's proposal, in view of Mongolian *qani* 'friend, companion'. Doerfer (1995: 328) thinks the final velar may, in this latter word, possibly have been lost due to the "bolgaroide Schicht". This proposal may be more problematical than one might

think: As far as I can remember, Mongolian and Chuvash share many instances of the loss of final /k/ but not, for some reason, the loss of final /g/.

*kan agı ülämiş* 'The king distributed riches' is actually a perfectly good reading of the first sentence; further, *bäglig ol* 'They (i.e. the riches) belong to the prince(s)' is a good continuation of the third sentence if this is understood to say 'Why should the king distribute riches?' However, there seems to be no way in which this interpretation could connect with the pail in the sun.

Doerfer (1995: 328), raises the question (mentioning the relevant entry in Räsänen's etymological dictionary) whether the strange variation of *köŋäk ~ könäk* could reflect an attempt at expressing a palatalised velar or dental nasal.

Erdal (1978: 111-112) thought that the only other Old Turkic occurrence of *nalük* was in a Manichaean text and took this as an indication for the Manichaean nature of the *Irk Bitig*. There are, however, attestations in Buddhist texts as well. The etymology of the form is discussed in Erdal (1991: 122).

*künäş* 'a sunny place' is a hapax here in Old Turkic. The word is otherwise known from Oguz and has turned up, in the apparently original meaning, in Khaladj (Doerfer 1987: 114). Erdal (1978: 112) was therefore probably right in reaching dialectal conclusions from its appearance in this text.[40] Note already von Gabain: "Das alte *-ny-*, bzw. das dialektische *-n-* statt dem häufigeren *-y-* erscheint im man. Irq-bitig in *künäš* ..." (von Gabain 1976: 76). The word is, indeed, attested in Yakut with nasalised /ỹ/ (cf. Schönig 1990: 265), in Dolgan with /ñ/ (Stachowski 1993: 161); this regularly corresponds to the Old Turkic phoneme transcribed as ñ. *künäş* and *kuyaş* 'the blazing heat of the midday or midsummer sun' seem to go back to the same source with *ñ*, perhaps via **kuynaş* and fronting. Contamination with *kün* 'sun' must have made the difference: /ñ/ is otherwise always retained in this text, e.g. in *koñ, añıg, tur(u)ña* and *çıgañ*; in fact, runic texts do not write [ñ] other than with the appropriate character.[41] I have taken [n] from /ñ/ to be

[40] The absence of this noun in other Old Turkic texts could, of course, also be due to a coincidence: Not too many of them might perhaps be expected to mention "sunny places".

[41] A further (less likely because rather more tentative) etymology would be *kün *yaş*, the latter being the putative base of *yaşu-* 'to flash'.

just as secondary as [y], as I have written elsewhere; whether Uygur script uses n for [ñ] due to the lack of an appropriate character, as others have thought more recently, is irrelevant here.

**58.** The word which Tekin (1993) reads as *öt* 'advice' has an *ü:* Erdal (1991: 449) under *üt+lä-* mentions three Brāhmī instances for the vowel. Examples for the common binome *üt saw* are listed there on p. 187. The derivation from *ö-* 'to remember' proposed in EDPT 36 is therefore untenable.

**60.** Tekin (1993) may perhaps be right in following the EDPT's emendation of *bädiz* to *bädük;* translating this as 'big (and) powerful' will not do, however, as 'powerful' is not denoted by *bädük.*

**61.** The correct interpretation of *tüşn+ä-k* is the one given in Erdal (1991: 251). Erdal (1978: 112-113) is wrong, as there is no early suffix *-Ak.* Roux (1966: 44) points out that the qualification of this *ırk* as "bad" implies identification with the crane and not with the hunter; perhaps, he thinks, the author felt it was unfair to place snares right into animals' resting places.

**64.** The note to TT VI 254 suggested replacing Thomsen's *buymul* 'untrained' (from Süleyman Efendi) by 'untrainable' and relating this to *muyga,* attested there. This suggestion is made obsolete by Clauson (1961: 225). Erdal (1991: 99) already has the (correct) reading with *o* (re-proposed by Tekin 1993) and discusses the derivation from *boyun.*

Hauenschild (1994: 75-76) identifies *tograk* as the *'populus euphratica (populus diversifolia)';* its fruit does look like a little nut. What is meant is not, of course, a nut in the strict sense, as Tekin's translation would make us believe.

**The concluding paragraph:** *ançıp* is not in the *UW,* it is, however, attested thrice in the (runic) Šine Usu inscription from the Uygur kaganate. The sentence in which this word occurs is understood in an untenable way by Kljaštornyj (1981: 129); it is, admittedly, somewhat ambiguous.

**Colophon:** Cf. Bazin (1991: 235-237) for the date. Doerfer (1995: 327) defends Bazin's dating as against Tekin's.

A number of examples for *manistan* from published and unpublished manuscripts are collected in Zieme (1975: 47-48, n. to l. 414); all of these appear to be Manichaean, as far as one can judge.

*kiçig dintar* is not 'young pious (disciple)', as translated by Tekin (1993): Hamilton (1975: 15-16) showed that *kiçig* serves the purpose of self-effacement, and Old Turkic *dintar* denotes monks.

In his review of Tekin (1993), Doerfer (1995: 327-328) writes:

> "Das Irk Bitig ... ist zuerst von V. Thomsen publiziert worden, danach von vielen Forschern immer wieder behandelt oder herangezogen ... . Talat Tekins verdienstvolle Arbeit stellt nun einen gewissen Abschluß dar, so daß nur noch wenig zu erforschen oder zu sagen bleibt." (1995: 327-328)

The reader of the present paper will, I think, have to agree that this is not quite the case as yet. The *Irk Bitig* remains mysterious even after all the material considered here is added to what Tekin has brought together; "les sibylles sont volontiers obscures", says Roux (1959-60: 59). Still, many of the *textual* problems have, I believe, presently come pretty close to a solution. *Irk Bitig* studies can now go on to throw more light on the iconographical and anthropological background of this fascinating source.[42]

## References

Arat, R. R. (= Rachmati) 1965. *Eski Türk şiiri.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Axmet'janov, R. G. 1988. Slova kuzy ~ qorγu i terminy igry v al'čiki v tatarskom i russkom jazykax. *Materialy po tatarskoj dialektologii* 6, 108-116.

Bang, W. 1923. Das negative Verbum der Türksprachen. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 17, 114-131.

Bang, W. 1925. Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. Zweiter Brief: Uzuntonluγ – die Krone der Schöpfung. *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 5 , 231-251.

Bang, W. 1930. Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. Fünfter Brief: Lautliches – allzu Lautliches. *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10, 16-26.

[42] Addition: The following study of the *Irk Bitig* came to the author's attention too late to be taken into consideration: Ikeda, Tetsuro 1984. The Irq Bitig, an ancient Turkic book on divination. *The Bulletin of the International Institute for Linguistic Sciences.* Kyoto: Sangyo University, 6, 81-125. (In Japanese.)

Bang, W. 1934. Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. Siebter Brief: Neue Ansichten – neue Einsichten? *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 14, 193-214.

Bazin, L. 1991. *Les systèmes chronologiques dans le monde turc ancien.* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 34.) Budapest-Paris: Akadémiai Kiadó, Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Böhtlingk, O. 1851 [1964]. *Über die Sprache der Jakuten.* (Uralic and Altaic Series 35.) Bloomington: Indiana University, The Hague: Mouton.

Budagov, L. 1871. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' turecko-tatarskix narečij* II. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Clauson, Sir G. 1957. The Ongin inscription. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 177-192.

Clauson, Sir G. 1961. Notes on the "Irk Bitig". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 33, 218-225.

Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dankoff, R. 1983. Yūsuf khaṣṣ ḥājib. *Wisdom of royal glory (Kutadgu Bilig). A Turko-Islamic mirror for princes.* Translated with an introduction and notes by R. Dankoff. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.

DLT: Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī. *Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk).* Edited and translated with introduction and indices by Robert Dankoff in collaboration with James Kelly. Parts I-III. (Sources of Oriental languages and literatures 7. Turkish sources 7.) Harvard University Printing Office, 1982-1985.

Doerfer, G. 1967-75. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit* I-IV. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 16, 19-21.) Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Doerfer, G. 1971. *Khalaj materials.* (Uralic and Altaic Series 115.) Bloomington: Indiana University, The Hague: Mouton.

Doerfer, G. 1987. *Lexik und Sprachgeographie des Chaladsch,* Textband. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Doerfer, G. 1995. Review of: Tekin, T. 1993, Irk Bitig. The Book of Omens. *Central Asiatic Journal* 39, 327-328.

Dowsett, C. J. F. 1961 (translator). *The history of the Caucasian Albanians* by Movsēs Dasxurançi. (London Oriental Series 8.) London: Oxford University Press.

EDPT: See Clauson 1972.

Emmerick, R. E. & Róna-Tas, A. 1992. The Turkish-Khotanese word list revisited. *Central Asiatic Journal* 36, 199-241.

Erdal, M. 1978. Irk Bitig üzerine yeni notlar. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* 1977, 87-119.

Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon.* (Turcologica 9.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Erdal, M. 1993. *Die Sprache der wolgabolgarischen Inschriften.* (Turcologica 13.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Erdal, M. 1996. Zum alttürkischen Vokalsystem. In: Emmerick, R. E. & Sundermann, W. & Warnke, I. & Zieme, P. (eds.) *Turfan, Khotan and Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung "Annemarie von Gabain und die Turfanforschung", veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12.12.1994).* Berlin, 67-82.

Erdal, M. forthcoming. Topic, subject and possessive compounds. [Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (Mainz 1994), to appear in the proceedings.]

Francke, A. H. 1924. Tibetische Handschriftenfunde aus Turfan. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 3, 5-20.

Geng, Sh. & Klimkeit, H.-J. 1988. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit*, in Zusammenarbeit mit H. Eimer und J. P. Laut herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert. Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hamilton, J. 1975. Le colophon de l'Ïrq Bitig. *Turcica* 7, 7-19.

Hamilton, J. 1978. Sur deux présages de l'Ïrq Bitig. In: *Quand le Crible était dans la Paille ... Hommage à Pertev Naili Boratav,* présenté par R. Dor et M. Nicolas. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 247-254.

Harva, U. 1938. *Die religiösen Vorstellungen der altaischen Völker.* (FF Communications 125.) Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Hauenschild, I. 1994. Botanica im *Dīvān luġāt at-turk. Journal of Turkology* 2, 25-100.

Hegaard, S. E. 1976. Some expressions pertaining to death in the Kök-Turkic inscriptions. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 48, 89-115.

Heissig, W. & Krueger, J. R. & Oinas, F. J. & Schütz, E. (eds.) 1976. *Tractata Altaica Denis Sinor sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata*. Wiesbaden: Harrasssowitz.

Hoffmann, H. 1950. *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon Religion*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1950, 4.) Mainz: Verlag der Akademie.

Johanson, L. 1979. *Alttürkisch als "dissimilierende Sprache"*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1979/2.) Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Johanson, L. 1988. On the renewal and reinterpretation of "instrumental" gerunds in Turkic. *Oriens* 31, 136-153.

Kāšġarī: See DLT.

Kljaštornyj, S. G. 1981. Mifologičeskie sjužety v drevnetjurkskix pamjatnikax. *Tjurkologičeskij Sbornik* 1977, 117-138.

Kotwicz, W. 1934. Formules initiales des documents mongols aux XIII$^{e}$ et XIV$^{e}$ ss. *Rocznik Orientalisztyczny* 10, 131-157.

Lalou, M. 1965. Catalogue des principautés du Tibet ancien. *Journal Asiatique* 253, 189-215.

Malov, S. E. 1951. *Pamjatniki Drevnetjurkskoj Pis'mennosti. Teksty i issledovanija*. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Menges, K. H. 1982. Etymologika. *Central Asiatic Journal* 26, 105-118

Meyer, I. R. 1960. *Vokallængde i tyrkisk*. [M.A. thesis, University of Copenhagen.]

Molnár, Á. 1996. Traces of shamanism in the Ïrq Bitig "Book of divination". *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1992 (26 Eylül 1992 - 1 Ekim 1992.)* (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları: 632). Ankara, 367-371.

Orkun, H. N. 1938. *Eski Türk yazıtları* 2. Istanbul: Devlet Basımevi.

Palló, M. K. 1959. Hungaro-Tschuwaschica. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 31, 239-258.

Pekarskij, E. K. 1907-1930. *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka* I-III. Petrograd / Leningrad: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk / Akademija Nauk SSSR.

QB: [Yūsuf khaṣṣ ḥājib] *Kutadgu Bilig*. I, Metin. Arat, R. R. (ed.). İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1947.

Rachmati, G. R. (= Arat) 1930. Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 24, 451-473.

Ramstedt, G. J. 1913. Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 30/3. Helsinki

Roux, J.-P. 1959-60. Le chameau en Asie centrale. Son nom – son élevage – sa place dans la mythologie. *Central Asiatic Journal* 5, 35-76.

Roux, J.-P. 1966. *Faune et flore sacrées dans les sociétés altaïques.* Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Roux, J.-P. 1976. A propos des osselets de Gengis Khan. In: Heissig, W. et al. (eds.), 557-568.

Röhrborn, K. 1977-1994. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch.* Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Sağol, G. 1995. Tarihi şivelerde at donları. In: Gürsoy Naskali, E. (ed.) *Türk kültüründe at ve çağdaş atçılık.* Istanbul, 126-146.

Schönig, C. 1990. Das Lenatürkische und die sprachlichen Merkmale des nordöstlichen türkischen Areals. In: Brendemoen, B. (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (Oslo, June 12-16, 1989).* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 263-285.

Schulz, P. 1978. *Verbalnomina und Konverbien als adverbiale Ergänzungen im Alttürkischen.* [Ph.D. dissertation, Justus-Liebig University, Gießen.]

Sevortjan, E. V. 1974. *Etimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov (obščetjurkskije i mežotjurkskije osnovy na glasnyje).* Moskva: Nauka.

Stachowski, M. 1993. *Dolganischer Wortschatz.* (Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1086, Prace Jezykoznawcze 114.) Kraków: Nakładem Uniwesytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Tekin, Ş. 1980. *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule* I-II. (Berliner Turfantexte 9.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Tekin, T. 1985. *üze* zarfı hakkında. In: *Beşinci Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi, Istanbul, 23-28 Eylül 1985. Tebliğler.* I, 1*: Türk Dili.* Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 253-260.

Tekin, T. 1993. *Irk Bitig. The Book of Omens.* (Turcologica 18.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tezcan, S. 1975. *Eski Uygurca Hsüan tsang biyografisi. X. bölüm.* Ankara (no publisher).

Tezcan, S. 1981. Kutadgu Bilig dizini üzerine. *Belleten* 45, sayı 178, 23-78.

Tezcan, S. 1991. Türk Dil Kurumu Yağma Hasan'ın böreği mi oldu? *Çağdaş Türk Dili* 40, 149-156.

Tezcan, S. & Zieme, P. 1971. Uigurische Brieffragmente. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.) *Studia Turcica.* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 17.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 451-460.

Thomas, F. W. 1957. *Ancient folk-literature from north-eastern Tibet (Introductions, texts, translations and notes.)* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Klasse für Sprache, Literatur und Kunst 1952: 3.) Berlin.

Thomsen, V. 1912. Dr. M. A. Stein's manuscripts in Turkish "Runic" script from Miran and Tun-huang. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 181-227.

Tryjarski, E. & Hamilton, J. R. 1975. L'inscription turque runiforme de Khutuk-Ula. *Journal Asiatique* 263, 171-182.

*UW:* See Röhrborn 1977-1994.

van Tongerloo, A. 1988. Iranian elements in Old Uygur. In: Bryder, P. (ed.) *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Manichaeism (August 1987, Lund).* Lund, 213-219.

von Gabain, A. 1964. Die alttürkische Literatur. In: Bazin, L. & Bombaci, A. & Deny, J. & Gökbilgin, T. & İz, F. & Scheel, H. (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 2. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner, 211-243.

von Gabain, A. 1976. Alttürkische Texte in sogdischer Schrift. In: Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (ed.) *Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in honour of Julius Németh.* Budapest: Loránd Eötvös University, 69-77.

von Le Coq, A. 1909. Köktürkisches aus Turfan. Manuskriptfragmente in köktürkischen "Runen" aus Toyok und Idiqut-Schähri (Oase von Turfan). *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 41, 1047-1061.

Zieme, P. 1975. *Manichäisch-türkische Texte.* (Berliner Turfantexte 5.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Zieme, P. 1979. Review of: Heissig, W. & Krueger, J. R. & Oinas, F. J. & Schütz, E. (eds.) 1976, *Tractata Altaica Denis Sinor sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 74, 479-481.

Zieme, P. 1984. Review of: *Tjurkologičeskij sbornik* 1977 (1981). *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 79, 37-38.

Zieme, P. 1991. *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung.* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 33.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.