Searching for the Dharma, Finding Salvation – Buddhist Pilgrimage in Time and Space

Proceedings of the Workshop
"Buddhist Pilgrimage in History and Present Times"
at the Lumbini International Research Institute (LIRI),
Lumbini, 11 - 13 January 2010



Edited by

Christoph Cueppers & Max Deeg

LUMBINI INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
2014

Searching for the Dharma, Finding Salvation – Buddhist Pilgrimage in Time and Space

LIRI Seminar Proceedings Series

Edited by

LUMBINI INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Volume 5



Searching for the Dharma, Finding Salvation – Buddhist Pilgrimage in Time and Space

Proceedings of the Workshop
"Buddhist Pilgrimage in History and Present Times"
at the Lumbini International Research Institute (LIRI),
Lumbini, 11 - 13 January 2010

Edited by
CHRISTOPH CUEPPERS & MAX DEEG

Lumbini International Research Institute
Lumbini 2014

Lumbini International Research Institute
P.O. Box 39
Bhairahawa, Dist. Rupandehi
NEPAL
E-mail: liri@mos.com.np

© Lumbini International Research Institute

Cover photo: Buddhist monks from Amnye Machen on pilgrimage
© Katia Buffetrille

All rights reserved.
Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photocopy, microfilm, scanner or any other means without prior written permission. Enquiries should be made to the publisher.

ISBN 978-9937-2-8825-5

First published in 2014

Printed in Nepal by Dongol Printers, Kathmandu

CONTENTS

MAX DEEG
Introduction 1

JAMES M. HEGARTY
Going Nowhere: Power and Polemic in Brahminical Pilgrimage Literature 29

JOHN S. STRONG
The Beginnings of Buddhist Pilgrimage: The Four Famous Sites in India 49

MAX DEEG
When Peregrinus is not Pilgrim: The Chinese "Pilgrims'" Records – A Revision of Literary Genre and Its Context 65

BANGWEI WANG
A Portrait Left by Faxian on His Pilgrimage to India 97

BERNADETTE BROESKAMP
The Implementation and Popularization of a New Visual Idiom - the Upper Tianzhu Monastery (上天竺寺) in Hangzhou and its Famous White-Robed Guanyin (白衣觀音) Sandalwood Statue 109

PETER SKILLING & SANTI PAKDEEKHAM
Phra Thaen Sila-at: From *Pañcabuddhabyākaraṇa* to Pilgrimage 141

TIBOR PORCIÓ
Some Peculiarities of the Uygur Buddhist Pilgrim Inscriptions 157

CHARLES RAMBLE
The Complexity of Tibetan Pilgrimage 179

KATIA BUFFETRILLE
The Pilgrimage to Mount Kha ba dkar po: A Metaphor for bardo? 197

HIM LAL GHIMIRE
Pilgrimage Tourism Networks: Prospects and Challenges in Nepal 221

Plates and Figures 251

SOME PECULIARITIES OF THE UYGUR BUDDHIST PILGRIM INSCRIPTIONS

TIBOR PORCIÓ

Introduction

According to the Nikāya-tradition as reflected in the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, the relics of an enlightened person should be placed in a *stūpa*, and visiting and venerating it will bring welfare and happiness to the worshippers. It is a well-known fact that Buddhist pilgrimage is common in both Nikāya and Mahāyāna Buddhism, and the sites where relics are held were, and are, of particular importance. According to a Chinese source, the Beiqi shu 北齊書 ("History of the Northern Qi"), in 574 A.D. the Emperor of the Northern Qi 北齊 (550-577) presented a text of this very *sūtra* (called Niepan jing 涅盤經) translated from Chinese into "the Türk language (*tujue yu* 突厥語)" to the Türk ruler, Tatpar Khagan (r. 572-581).[1] If we can give credit to this report, this Parinirvāṇasūtra would have been the very first Buddhist work in an "imaginary" library of the Turkic speaking peoples of Central Asia.[2] Unfortunately, neither the text itself, nor a corroborative evidence for the act of donation can be recovered. We know, however, that a dogmatically developed version of an earlier Nikāya text was translated into Uygur, namely from Chinese, but it has nothing to do with the alleged translation of the year 574.[3] We also know that the territories where the Uygur Buddhist culture once flourished were rich in sacred sites such as *stūpa*s, shrines, temples and monasteries. Obviously, it is not too daring to state that pilgrimage among the Uygur Buddhists was considered a meritorious act, like elsewhere in the Buddhist world. On the other hand, for a historian, the topic of Uygur pilgrimage is a very challenging one. The reason is very simple: the scarcity

1 Gabain 1954: 164, Klimkeit 1990: 55, Liu Mau-Tsai 1958: 34, Zieme 1992: 10-11.

2 Some scholars have questioned the reliability of this Chinese account (Gabain 1954: 163; Klimkeit, 1990: 54; Elverskog 1997: 5). Firstly, we do not have any evidence from the first Türk empire (6th-7th centuries A.D.) to speak of Turkic as a written language. The only text which has come down to us from this period is a Sogdian inscription (the so-called Bugut inscription, dated between 580 and 590; see Kljaštornyj, Livšic 1972, and more recently Yoshida, Moriyasu 1999). Secondly, it is hard to imagine that the Turkic religious vocabulary at that time would have been applicable to express the subtle concepts and complicated terminology of Buddhism (Klimkeit 1990: 55). Therefore, it is more plausible that − if the *sūtra* was actually a translation into the "language of the Tujue" − the target language was Sogdian, i.e. the official language of the first Türk empire (Tremblay 2007: 108).

3 Elverskog 1997: nos. 1, 32., see also Zieme 1992: 11-12.

of data. Since there are no autochthonous written sources comparable to the accounts of the famous Chinese travellers and / or to the Tibetan pilgrimage manuals, our main written sources are the extant inscriptions made by Uygur Buddhist pilgrims. This corpus consists of − mainly fragmentary – graffiti on sacred monuments or on the walls of religious edifices found in the Autonomous Region Xinjiang 新疆 and Gansu 甘肅 province of today's China. In the present paper I would like to highlight some of the peculiarities of these inscriptions, based on the editions that have been published (and have been available for consultation)[4]. By doing so, I hope to show that despite their "little content", they provide much more information than it might appear at first sight or as had been considered in previous studies. In addition to the fact that they are valuable historical sources in many ways, they can also be used as contributions to our conceptulisation of Buddhist pilgrimage in general, and as sources of Uygur Buddhist practices, in particular.

A brief survey of editions

Albert Grünwedel's famous study of the Third Prussian Turfan Expedition (January 1906-April 1907) appeared in 1912. In describing a wall painting of the "Halle 9" of the Bezeklik Caves,[5] he noted that there were several "scribbles" ("Kritzeleien") in Uygur script next to the image of a brahmin, apparently made by visitors.[6] It was his fellow-explorer, Albert von Le Coq who first called these "scribbles" found on the wall paintings of the Bezeklik and Kocho caves "pilgrim inscriptions" in his study containing the results of the Second Prussian Expedition (1904-1905) led by himself. He was also the first to take up the endeavour of transcribing and translating some of these inscriptions.[7] Thus he recognized that their content had, in contrary to the expectations, no particular connection with the content of the images on which they were written and, therefore, he judged their importance as marginal. In his opinion, the most important that could be said about them was that they all date from a later

4 "Since two relevant works known to me have appeared only after the completion of this paper, they cannot be dealt with here: Matsui, Dai 2013. "Notes on the Old Uigur Wall Inscriptions in the Dunhuang Caves [in Japanese]." *Studies in the Humanities* (*Volume of Cultural Science*) 30: 29-50., and Maue, Dieter 2014. *Alttürkische Handschriften: Dokumente in Brāhmī und Tibetischer Schrift*. Teil 2. Digitale Internetversion"

5 According to the presently used numbering Grünwedel's no. 9 corresponds to Bezeklik 20 (Moriyasu, Zieme 2003: 470, n. 12) or to 21 (?): cf. Matsui 2011: 147.

6 "An der äußeren Türw[and] fand ich noch einen nach innen gewendeten, gehenden Brāhmaṇa, er trägt Tigerfell als Kleid und Fellwadenstrümpfe, hält in der R[echten] einen Rosenkranz, in der L[inken] eine Blume. Daneben sind zahlreiche uighurische Kritzeleien: Dhārāṇīs, Besucherinschriften usw." (Grünwedel 1912: 259); quoted also in Zieme 1985: 190 (text 60e).

7 (Le Coq 1913: 34, 36) In some wall paintings both in Kocho and Bezeklik there where cartouche inscriptions in Brāhmī written in corrupt Sanskrit that he transcribed and translated. It is not very clear, however, by whom they were written (plausibly by Uygurs) or on what occasion (see e.g. Le Coq 1913: 28). He found also pilgrim inscriptions in Brāhmī, but unfortunately illegible, and in Chinese as well, that he translated into German (1913: 9).

period.[8] Besides that they were often difficult to read, this might be a reason why he lost his enthusiasm about dealing with pilgrim inscriptions in his subsequent study series on the results of the Royal Prussian Turfan-Expeditions.[9] Later, he only gave the partial transcription of a cartouche-inscription on a wall painting with a hell scene in a Bezeklik cave-temple, without attempting to translate it.[10] In the Turfan Studies (including Uygur Studies), for obvious reasons, the focus was (and still is) on murals, artefacts and manuscripts of which the major part was discovered or acquired by European and Japanese expeditions in the ancient cities of the Tarim basin and in northwest China between the last decade of the 19th and the second decade of the 20th centuries. After Le Coq's initial studies, "the scribbles" attracted no scholarly attention for a long time.[11] As Georg Kara formulated in 1976, the deciphering of the (pilgrim) inscriptions requires much efforts, but brings little results.[12] He made this remark in a short article, where he reproduced, translated and commented three short Uygur pilgrim inscriptions on the basis of photographs taken by the Pelliot Expedition in the Dunhuang 敦煌 Cave no.70.[13] These three, or more precisely two and half, where found on a wall painting, on both sides of the head of a Buddhist deity, scratched into the plaster by the same person, a certain Buyan Kaya coming from the town of Suzhou 蘇州 (Uyg. *Sügčü*). All these "scribbles" where written in Old Uygur language, two in Uygur script whereas the additional "half" with 'Phags pa characters, thus cleraly placing the inscriptions in the Yuan 元 period (according to Kara, to the 14th century). The first one was composed in stanzaic alliteration, just like the one referred to by Grünwedel or those expounded by Le Coq. This feature of the "texts", which seems to have been completely overlooked by the previous editors, attracted the interest of Peter Zieme, who (re-)edited the pilgrim inscriptions of Bezeklik noted

8 "Auf dem elfenbeinfarbenen Hintergrund sind hier und da Lotusblumen mit oder ohne Rankenwerk als Raumfüller eingezeichnet; außerdem haben Pilger oder andere müßige Personen hier und da allerhand Kritzeleien angebracht. Zur Zeit des Fundes wurden diese Sgraffitti für wichtig gehalten, ihre oft schwierige Lesung hat bisher noch nichts von Wichtigkeit ergeben. Wichtig ist nur das indirekte, aus der Schrift und den Formen erfolgende Ergebnis, daß diese Kritzeleien einer späten Zeit entstammen." (Le Coq 1913: 34)

9 Le Coq 1922-26, 1928.

10 "Die Aufschrift auf der mittleren Tafel, von Hause aus ungemein roh und ungeschickt geschrieben, ist von muhammedanischen Plünderern so stark beschädigt worden, daß wir eine Lesung nicht vornehmen wollen; ebenso wenig halten wir es für der Mühe wert, die Kritzeleien auf den zwei Kartuschen zur Linken zu entziffern. Die große Aufschrift auf der Kartusche ganz r[echts] ist ebenfalls schlecht geschrieben, wir lesen wie folgt: [...] Eine Übersetzung dieser späten Aufschrift versuchen wir nicht." He dated the fresco to the 9th-10th centuries (Le Coq 1924: 28).

11 There were inscriptions found on or beside wall paintings not only in Uygur, but in other languages as well, such as Chinese, Mongolian, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Tangut, but their attraction for the academic field developed somewhat similarly as in the case of the Uygur inscriptions. For references see Matsui 2008: 17, n.1.

12 Kara 1976: 55.

13 Pelliot 1924: plates CCCLXVI and CCCLXVII. On the discovery of the Dunhuang Buddhist Caves and on later excavations in the sites see Shichang 1995.

by the German explorers and included them in his studies on the strophic alliteration as observed in Uygur Buddhist texts.[14] He disputed Le Coq's view about the values of these wall inscriptions[15] and drew the attention to that they contain "important information"[16] − even if their relation with the frescoes was, litarally, superficial. Some Uygur pilgrim inscriptions in Brāhmī, copied ("Abklatsch") and brought back by the German Turfan expeditions (mainly the fourth) from Kumtura, Kizil and Kocho, appeared in the voluminous work by Maue.[17] In this he gave transliteration, transcription, and (German) translation of the short texts, together with their photographic reproductions.

In the works mentioned, except Kara's article, this type of inscriptions make up only a small proportion of the actual corpus or are secondary to the subject matter. In the light of this, the study by James Hamilton in collaboration with Niu Ruji[18] was "epoch-making".[19] In their article in French they transliterated, transcribed, translated and commented on twenty of the Uygur graffiti from the Yulin 榆林 Buddhist caves, and in the end of their paper they appended a glossary together with the photographic reproductions of the inscriptions on which their reading was based.[20] These inscriptions date from the 13th to 15th/16th centuries and were written down by pilgrims coming mostly from neighbouring regions such Shazhou 沙洲, Suzhou and Kamil (Hami 哈密).[21] In September 2006, the Japanese scholar, Matsui Dai visited the Yulin caves and thus was able to investigate some of the Uygur inscriptions *in situ*. Based on his direct investigation, he revised three inscriptions from among the ones dealt with by Hamilton and Niu.[22] His article also highlighted two important

14 Zieme 1985: 189-192. The text no.60d is from Toyok. The text nos.59, 60a have been recently re-edited and partially revised, with facsimiles in Matsui 2011: 143-148. On Toyok and its Buddhist caves in geohistorical context see Matsui 2010: 703-704.

15 See note 8.

16 "[...] doch glaube ich, daß sie [die Aufschriften auf den Wandgemälden] z. T. recht wichtige Informationen enthalten. Nicht erwarten kann man von ihnen allerdings Aufschlüsse über den Inhalt des Dargestellten, dazu sollten die Bilder allein sprechen. Es sind wohl meist Pilger, die diese Verse aufgeschrieben haben. Ob diese sie auch verfaßt haben, ist nicht bekannt, wohl aber anzunehmen." (Zieme 1985: 190).

17 Maue 1996: 201-5, texts nos.72-77.

18 Hamilton and Niu 1998: 127-210.

19 So called by Matsui 2008: 17. Unfortunately, the Chinese inscriptions and those written in Brāhmī script were ignored in their study.

20 In the same year they published the Chinese version, joined by Yang Fuxue, but with a reduced number of texts (12), and later Niu Ruji (Niu 2002) re-edited fifteen out of the already published twenty. These articles, unfortunately, has not been accessible to me, for references see Matsui 2008: 17-18; "However, all of the Uigur inscriptions dealt with in these Chinese articles had been already edited in Hamilton and Niu 1998, and the readings are substantially unchanged, except a few philological remarks." (Matsui 2008: 18).

21 Hamilton and Niu 1998: 128.

22 Matsui 2008: 17-33. The three inscriptions belong to the Yulin Cave 12, and were indicated by the letters H, J and L in Hamilton and Niu 1998. In an earlier article he already revised the

factors: firstly, the photo-based readings should be treated with caution; secondly, documenting and studying the inscriptions on spot is an urgent matter, since they are fading away day by day.[23] In his subsequent publications Matsui continued to draw upon pilgrim inscriptions,[24] and not least due to his findings it became clearer than ever before that the surviving inscriptions by the Uygur pilgrims are unavoidable sources for reconstructing the traffic sphere of the pilgrimages as well as the religio- and socio-cultural interactions between Uygurs, Mongols, Chinese and Tibetans in the Mongol era. As we can see, the recognition of these was a long gradual process. And it is for sure, that the aforesaid editions contain only a part of the extant Uygur pilgrim inscriptions.[25] It can be a future task to collect the whole of them into one volume. In addition to it, they often appear in the vicinity of other inscriptions, such as Chinese, Sanskrit (Brāhmī), Tangut or Tibetan, sometimes from different periods.[26] A comparative study of these different pilgrim inscriptions − similarly to the way as has been carried out on the colophons by Kasai[27] − is also a desideratum. Needless to say, such an enterprise is beyond the scope of this paper − and of my expertise. Matsui has noticed that the Uygur inscriptions have some features deviating from the rest and in this way they form a unique group.[28] It is important to add that Uygur pilgrims left scribbles not only in the shape of wall-graffiti but on Buddhist manuscripts held in the library of the given pilgrimage place as well.[29]

Locations

The aforesaid editions contain all together 33 Uygur inscriptions. The simplest way to distribute them is according to the sites where they have been found, which are

Inscription S and T (Matsui 2008: 170, n.44).

23 2008: 29.

24 E.g. Matsui 2008, 2008, 2011.

25 Cf. Matsui 2008: 169, with n.37.

26 See note 10.

27 Kasai 2008: 22-44.

28 "[...] in the Buddhist sites of East Turkestan, we have not yet any similar wall inscriptions written by Chinese and Mongolian pilgrims. They would suggest it was not the Chinese nor the Mongols but the Uigurs − in a precise sense, the Uigur-speaking-writing people − that played the main role in the Buddhist pilgrimage between the Gansu province and the East Tienshan or East Turkestan." (Matsui 2008: 28-29).

29 It is attested by a group of texts written on the verso side or the margin of the scroll of some Chinese Buddhist sūtras, and all of them dates back to the mid 13th century. They became titled by Matsui as "Sivšidu-Yaqšidu-manuscripts", because "[S]ome texts of the Sivšidu-Yaqšidu-manuscripts are inscriptions written by Sivšidu, Yaqšidu and their colleagues in memory of their pilgrimage and meditation at Buddhist caves, or their reading Chinese sutras." (2010: 698). On this basis these particular texts can be sorted into two categories, namely, of pilgrim inscriptions (in manuscript forms) and of reader-colophons. In the present paper, however, I confine myself to discuss basically the graffiti, and refer to the manuscript forms only occasionally.

from the West to the East as follows: Kızıl (1)[30] − Kumtura (3) − Kocho (1) − Bezeklik/Murtuk (4) − Toyok (1) − Dunhuang (2+1) − Yulin (20).

Script and language

After their locality, the easiest distinction concerns the script and the language. Naturally, the graffiti were written predominantly in the Uygur script, which is a modified form of the Sogdian cursive script, and in which the majority of Uygur Buddhist manuscripts came down to us. The Brāhmī script was also very popular and extensively used in Uygur Buddhist circles as evidenced by the (few and fragmentary) surviving documents.[31] In miniature, the wall inscriptions reflect the same. Inscriptions in Uygur and in Brāhmī scripts are prevalent from Kizil to Dunhuang, while graffiti in 'Phags pa or in Tibetan scripts seems to have been relatively rare. The single graffito in 'Phags pa script is a very laconic and simple sentence, *män bu-yän qa-yä*, "I, Buyan Kaya [wrote this]",[32] appended to the Uygur lines by the same scribe, apparently, to show his literacy. The two graffiti in Tibetan script noted in Hamilton and Niu[33] are not in Uygur but in Tibetan, and are simply the translations, respectively, of the Uygur inscription next to them, or the other way around. The inscription of Yulin Cave No. 25 reads in Uygur: *män kamıl-lıg yaŋı tsunpa yükünürmän*; in Tibetan: *iy cu pa btsun pa [sar] pa phyag 'tshal lo*,[34] both meaning "I, the fresh monk from Kamil, pay homage", where Uyg. *kamıl* ~ Tib. *iy cu,*[35] *+lıg ~ +pa, yaŋı ~ sar pa, tsunpa = btsun pa, män ... yükünürmän ~ phyag 'tshal lo.* Whether he was a newly ordained or a newcomer monk in Yulin, albeit the former seems to be more plausible, we are not in the position to decide, since the *yaŋı tsunpa ~ btsun pa sar pa* allow for both interpretations.[36] Either way, he was not a "pilgrim" in the classical sense.[37]

30 The figure in brackets indicates the number of edited inscriptions.

31 Maue 1996, Róna-Tas 1991: 63-91.

32 Kara 1976: 56, 59.

33 1998: 166-7, inscriptions S, T.

34 Hamilton and Niu 1998: 166; for the French translation see also there. Almost the same, and very likely by the same person, is the inscription in the Cave No. 36 (T): Uyg. *yaŋı tsunpa yükünürmän* ~ Tib. *btsun pa sar pa phyag 'tshal lo* (Hamilton and Niu 1998: 167). In the Tibetan, the editors transcribed wrongly *gra pa* for *sar pa*; cf. also Matsui 2008: 170 note 44.

35 Hamilton and Niu read iy-rgu to render Yiwu 伊吾, a Chinese name of Kamil (Hamilton and Niu 1998: 167). It was rightly corrected for *iy cu* < Chin. Yizhou 伊州 in Matsui 2008: 170, n. 44; see also Matsui 2008: 19.

36 Curiously enough, the scribe uses the Tibetan word *btsun pa* (which is ultimately the rendition of the Sanskrit *bhadanta*) in his Uygur sentence, instead of the regular Uygur term *toyin*, "monk" (a loan-word from Chinese 道人 *daoren*). Tib. *bstun pa* / Skt. *gaumin*, *bhadanta*, "monk; ordained male practitioner" (Tsepak 1986: 326); the Mongol Mahāvyutpatti translates *bhadanta ~ btsun pa* with the Uygur loan *toyin* (Ishihama, Fukuda 1989: nos. 8641, 9155). The last one (no. 9155) is listed in the 'Dul ba las btus pa'i skad thor bu ("Short Phrases Collected from the Vinaya") section.

37 Without entering into the problem of definitions, i.e. how we distinguish between "pilgrim" and

We have an example from Bezeklik for the use of Chinese as well, where the final line is in Chinese added to a quatrain written in Uygur script and language:[38]

wo Damoshiluo dizi xie yi 我達摩實囉弟子寫矣

I, the disciple [of?] *Darmašila (< Skt. Dharmaśīla)[39] have written [this].[40]

Some of the pilgrim inscriptions in Brāhmī script in Maue 1996 are stone carvings,[41] some are graffiti.[42] As for their languages, we can distuinguish three types: monolingual Uygur,[43] monolingual Sanskrit[44] and Sanskrit-Uygur bilingual.[45] Naturally, the length (and, consequently, the content) of an inscription did not depend solely on the intention of the scribe, but also on the available space, especially in case of cartouches. It could also influence the choice of script, as was rightly noted by Maue with reference to the Uygur monolingual "inscription 72", where, because of the limited space, the predicate *yükünürm(ä)n*, "I pay homage", is appended vertically in Uygur script to the horizontal Brāhmī text.[46]

For denoting the act of "inscribing" proper we find three different verbs in the corpus. With two exceptions, wherever expressed,[47] *biti-* is used, a very common and general Uygur word, meaning "to write".[48] The two exceptions, *čɪz-* and *il-* are more specific or poetic. The former verb meant originally "to scratch", hence "to draw (lines, characters etc.)".[49] In connection to this, it is worth mentioning that the inscription (from Kizil) in which it appears is a stone carving and written in Brāhmī script. Thus, it can be interpreted either as "to engrave" or "to draw". On the one hand, the technique of writing and the script used together might have determined the usage of this − otherwise quite rare − word: [50]

"visitor", suffice it to note here that "pilgrim inscriptions" constitute only a subcategory of the more general "graffiti inscriptions". Nevertheless, most of the graffiti referred to in this paper belong unmistakably to that subcategory.

38 Without the Chinese in Zieme 1985: 191, text 60a. For the whole inscription with comments see Matsui 2011: 145-148.

39 Or Darmaširi (?), cf. Matsui 2011: 148.

40 Here I would like to express my thanks to Max Deeg for providing me with the reading and translation of the Chinese sentence. He also informed me that, based on the hand writing, the scribe did not write Chinese very comfortly; he was most likely of Uygur origin.

41 Texts 72, 73, 74 and 77.

42 Texts 75 and 76.

43 Texts 72, 73, 75, 76.

44 Text 77.

45 Text 74.

46 1996: 201.

47 Kara 1976: 56; Hamilton and Niu 1998: G.3, H.10, K.10, O.4, P.5, Q.5; Matsui 2008: H.10.

48 For opinions on the origin of the Turkic verb see Róna-Tas, Berta and Károly 2011: 124.

49 Clauson 1972: 432a, Erdal 1991: 185, 597.

50 Erdal 1991: 597. Its reflexive form *čɪzɪn-* "to draw or write for oneself" is a hapax legomenon, occurring in the colophon of an Uygur *avadāna* connected to the Avalokiteśvara-sūtra, cf. Kasai 2008: 218.

oya toṣ ci-z ti(-)m (*Ötöš/Ödüš čızdım*)

I, Ödüš, have [this] drawn/engraved.[51]

On the other hand, it is attested to have been used for "inscribing" in manuscript, too.[52] Because of the profane name *Ödüš*, this inscription instances that Brāhmī was known and practiced outside the monastic circles, too.[53]

The latter verb, *il-* "to catch, cling, attach",[54] occurs in the inscriptions (written in Uygur script and language) edited by Zieme. In one of them (see below) it appears in its primary meaning, with negative conditional suffix (*-mAsAr*), joint to 2nd person (*sän*). The part of the text in question (unfortunately fairly damaged) reads: *kö/ü*[//: ??] *ilmäsär-sän* "if you do not attach [your mind?]". On the cases where it refers actually to the act of "inscribing", Zieme remarks: "Dem Kontext zufolge hat das Verb *il-* 'anheften' [...] hier die specielle Bedeutung '(eine Inschrift) anheften', 'anschreiben'".[55] One of its attestations is on the cartouches of a wall painting in Bezeklik,[56] as the clause of a quatrain (plus one by a different hand) graffito:

biz darmaširi taypodu iki kulut-lar ilä tägindimiz

We, the two servants [i.e. disciples],[57] Dharmaśrī and Taypodu,[58] have humbly appended [this].[59]

The direct object of the verb is explicit in another inscription in Toyok, found also on a wall painting:

---

51 In Maue's translation: "Ich, Ötöš, habe [das] eingeritzt." (Maue 1996: 202). For further attestations of the personal name Ödüš, which seems to be feminine, see Kasai 2008: 251-2, 255, 270; Rybatzki 2006: 135, 413; Zieme 1977 (1978): 83.

52 *(T)ïyoq kïzïl tisär nägü bolur ärki tip qulutï sivšidu čïztï(m)* "'How is the Tïyoq valley?' Thus saying, I, [the Buddha's] servant Sivšidu, drew (= wrote) [this inscription]' [...]" (Matsui 2010: 703).

53 Maue 1996: 202.

54 *il-*, "to catch (sg. with the hand, a hook, a noose etc.)" (Clauson 1972: 125). There he noted its semantical connection to the Buddhist Sanskrit term *āsajya*, "clinging". On the Turkic verb and its derivates see Erdal 1991: 158, 189, 272 et passim.

55 Zieme 1985: 190, n. 59.10. Here he refers to another occurrence of the verb in the same context in another wall inscription of Bezeklik, too.

56 Le Coq 1924: plate 19.

57 The Uygur term *kulut* is a derivation from *kul* "slave" with the plural ending *-t*, but it lost the plural connotation. In Buddhistic context it may correspond to Skt. *dāsa*, but its usage in Uygur documents is often similar to the use of *boku* 僕 "slave" in Japanese, as a male first-person pronoun, cf. Moriyasu 2011: 63.

58 These two names have several attestations, they also appear together elsewhere, see Matsui 2011: 150. Attached to the name, *-du/tu* is abbreviation of the Buddhist title *tutung* (< Chin. *dutong* 都統) "headpriest" (Matsui 2010: 698).

59 In Zieme's translation: "[...] Dharmaśrī und Taypodu, die beiden Sklaven, (dies) ergebenst angeschrieben" (Zieme 1985: 190). In VATEC glossary for *il-* the meaning "festhaken" is given, and here we find that in this part "angeschrieben" has been emended to "hinzugefügt" (http://vatec2.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/vatecasp/Berliner_Texte_13.22-60.htm#132457).

biz šapindu iry-a iki šabi-ky-a-lar bir padak ildim

We, Šapindu [and] Īrya, the two humble novices.[60] I have appended [this] single stanza.[61]

To what these lines were "appended/attached" is implicit in all these instances: it should be the frescoes (but not their content). We, modern readers, might think that by this activity they mutilated the paintings. Obviously, if these devotees would have felt the same, now we could not read their insciptions. There is a hint, however, implying that they, or at least some of them, had ambivalent feeling about it, as the following example testifies, albeit indirectly, for it was written not on a fresco but a Chinese *sūtra* scroll (which is, in this respect, not a big difference):

tavgač kün-tä bitimäk tamuluk bolgu kılınč ol tep sakınıp män [...] bitidim

"Writing on the Chinese scroll is a behavior to be reborn in Hell, thus thinking, I [three proper names] wrote [this]".[62]

Inscription as memory (*ödig*)

We can agree that inscribing on a sacred monument, regardless of the contents, is rather a profane act. These pious scribes, in fact, did not want to hide either that they were driven by a quite worldly − and as such very human − intent (just like those travelers, whose signs we can generally observe in turistic places today): to leave a memory. In some inscriptions it is specifically admitted by such phrases like *ödig*[63] *bolzun* "may it be a memory!"[64], or *ür turzun* "may [this inscription] be long-standing!".[65] In these cases the purpose was not only that of producing graffiti; these

60 Uyg. *šabi* < Ch. 沙彌 *shami*~ Skt. *śrāmaṇera*.

61 Uyg. *padak* << Skt. *pādaka*. In Zieme 1985: 192: "Wir, Šapindu und İ ry-a, die beiden Šabilein, (diesen) einen Vers (*pāda*) habe ich angeschrieben", revised in VATEC as "Wir, Šapindu (und) İ rya, die zwei kleinen Novizen, habe eine Strophe hinzugefügt" (http://vatec2.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/vatecasp/Berliner_Texte_13.22-60.htm#132871).

62 Matsui 2010: 706, ll. 5-6. We may also cite another inscription, which reads *män tıyoklug sävinč irik*[*ip*], translated by Matsui as "I, Sävinč of Tïyok, [wrote this inscription] disgustedly" (Matsui 2010: 703, n. 2). Still, I do not consider this instance as very corroborative, for the verb *irik-* can signify "to be disgusted, bored" (Clauson 1972: 226), hence there is nothing in the given context against the interpretation of *irikip* as "being bored" instead of "disgustedly".

63 The word is rendered in VATEC as 1. Überlieferung 2. Bericht 3. Verzeichnis; by Hamilton and Niu as "mémoire, souvenir" (1998: 161, 195). In the Old Turkic Xuanzang-Biography *ödig* corresponds to the Chinese *ji* 記 "record; memorandum, memoir", a term which is also found in the title of Xuanzang's Datang xiyu ji ("Records of the Western Regions"). On the possible etymon of the Turkic noun see Röhrborn 1991: 192-193; cf. also Erdal 1991: 443-444.

64 See in Hamilton and Niu 1998: 160-161 (Q.5); Matsui 2008: 18-19 (H.10).

65 See in Hamilton and Niu 1998: 157 (O.4).

phrases (or their variants) appear to be clichés that can be met in texts of other genres, as i.e. the Sivšidu-Yaqšidu-manuscripts[66] or a reader-colophon bear wittness.[67]

Style

A group of inscriptions is characterized by the well-known Old Turkic stanzaic alliteration, i.e. words rhyme at the beginning of stanzas and not at the end, and the alliteration was not auditive but visual.[68] Therefore, it concerns only those which were composed in Uygur script (and language). Despite the strict formal rules of poetry, it seems that these verses display greater diversity in content and structure than those which do not follow any poetic license, ranging from pious aphorism to mocking (and even obscene) notices. An example for the former reads: [69]

***kö**ngül-ü [ ] l [ ] u[] / **kö/ü**[ ] ilmäsär-sän / **kö**z yumup kösül[ü]p y(a)tmıš-ta / **kö**p-kä kölgülük (külägülük?) bolur s(ä)n yamu / pi ıt [y]ıl-ı*

If [your] mind ... you do not attach, when you close your eyes, stretch yourself out and lie down (i.e. when you die), [70] you will certainly be hobbled / worthy of being praised (?) by many. In the Bing(丙)-Dog-Year ...[71]

---

66 Cf. *iki käzig ödig kıltım ödig ol* "[I] made two lines of memory. This is memory", *ödig bolup ür ky-ä turzun tep ödiglätim* "'[This writing] shall be memory and stay [here] quite long!', thus saying, I recorded [it]." (Matsui 2010: 706, l.17, 708 ll.3-4).

67 *män Toŋa Buk-a šabi okiyu tägindim, sadu sadu bolzun, kutluɣ bečin yıl ikinti beš yaŋık-a saču balık-ta ödig kılıp bitidim, kenki körgü bolzun tep*, translated by the editor as "Ich, der Novize Toŋa Buka, habe (es) ergebenst gelesen. Es möge *sādhu sādhu* sein! Am 5. Tag des 2. Monats im gesegneten Affen-Jahr habe ich in der Stadt Sha zhou eine Liste gemacht und (es) geschrieben, damit Spätere (es) sehen mögen." (Kasai 2008: 218-9, 118b). Instead of "eine Liste machen" the phrase *ödig kıl-* can well be translated as "to make a memory" in view of the first example of the previous note.

68 Therefore it can be labeled as "eye rhyme" (Erdal 2004: 53, n. 84, 533-4.) The most elaborate work on this topic is Zieme 1991, and see also Erdal's review on it 1993.

69 The initial alliterating syllables are highlighted in bold characters.

70 For this figurative meaning of *kösül-*, "to stretch out one's legs", see Clauson 1972: 750.

71 The year of *pi ıt*, "Bing 丙-Dog", is identified by the editor as 1226 AD (Zieme 1985: 192). Unfortunately, the inscription is too damaged to comprehend clearly. Zieme's first interpretation was as follows: "Wenn [dein] Sinn [ ] wenn du nicht heftest (?) [ ] wirst du, wenn du die Augen schließt und dich ausstreckend niederlegst (Hend.), gewiß an viele (?) gebunden (?) sein." (Zieme 1985: 191, text 60c) It was later improved into "Wenn du dein (?) Herz [ ] nicht festhakst, wirst du, wenn du die Augen schließt, dich ausstreck[s]t (und) n[i]ederlegst, gewiß an vieles anzuspannen sein!" (http://vatec2.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/vatecasp/Berliner_Texte_13.22-60.htm#132746). We see that the interpretation of köpkä *kölgülük bol-* as "to be hobbled by many" poses difficulties, not only by its fragmentary context. I think that the word *kölgülük* (*köl-* in the meaning "to harness, to hobble") is a scribal error for *külägülük* (*külä-*, "to praise"), thus the clause can be translated less ambiguously as "you will certainly be worthy of being praised by many". We find a similar phrase in a similar context in the Old Turkic Kšanti Kılguluk Nom Bitig: *yaŋı kılınčıg kılmasarlar : alku burhanlarka öggülük külägülük bolgaylar*, "wenn sie eine neue (schlechte) Tat nicht begehen, dann sind sie es wert, von allen Buddhas

And for the latter:

> ***ma***kešvare täŋri-kä yükününgäli kälmišiŋ-kä / ***ma***ŋgal kut ažun berzün temišiŋ-kä / ***ma***kešvare täŋri bašlap munča terini kuvrag-ı birlä / ***ma***yakanzun yamu [ ]i säniŋ agızıŋ-ka
>
> As you have come to salute the god Maheśvara, as you have uttered: "May he give [us] a felicitous$_2$ life!", may the god Maheśvara together with all that assembly poop into your mouth [...][72]

Alliterative verses can also be found among the manuscript inscriptions[73] and many more among the colophons.

The inscription as 'colophon'

The function (as *ödig*) and the style are not the only similarities that we can observe between pilgrim inscriptions and colophons. In a manner, the pilgrim inscriptions can also be regarded as "colophons" or postscripts to pilgrimage. Even if we take solely the meaning of the Greek *kolophōn* 'summit, finishing touch', taking the term as has been used in modern bibliographical studies and in codicology, we can rightly say so, since most of the inscriptions seems to have been made as a "finishing touch", i.e. just before the departure, as, e.g., in the following example:

> *män sügčü-lüg yıgmıš kay-a šabı baxšı xu-a baxšı birlä on kün dyan olorup bardımız ...*

---

gepriesen und gelobt zu werden." (Wilkens 2007:104-105, ll. 0816-7). We may also adduce to a similar compound: *kamagka ayaguluk bolgaylar* "sie werden von allen verehrte (Menschen) sein" (Gabain 1950: 78).

72 In Zieme's translation: "Für dich, der du gekommen bist, um dich vor Gott Maheśvara zu verneigen; für dich, der du gesagt hast, die Existenz möge Ruhm und Glück geben; für deinen Mund, [daß er sage:] 'Mit solchen Scharen (Hend.), beginnend mit Gott Maheśvara, möge man (?) sich gewiß *mayaqan*-(?)'". (Zieme 1985: 191-2, text 60b). This has been revised as into "Dafür, daß Du gekommen bist, um Dich vor Gott Maheśvara zu neigen, dafür, daß Du gesagt hast: 'Die Daseinsform möge Glück (und) Heil geben!', für Deinen Mund, (daß er gesagt hat:) 'Angefangen bei dem Gott Maheśvara – mit solcher seiner Gemeinde (und) Schar möge man sich gewiß äußern [*mayaka*-(?)]!'" (http://vatec2.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/vatecasp/Berliner_Texte_13.22-60.htm#132657). For *mayaka*-, "to defecate", see (Clauson 1972: 772; Zieme 1985: 191-2); Zieme found this unacceptable in the context. *mayakan*-: is a hapax here, and with regards to this attestation Erdal has noted: "We have to face the fact that this verse is obscene and irreverent; obscene graffiti have always been a commonplace [...]" He translated the last sentence as: "May the god Maheśvara together with all that assembly^2 of his defecate into your mouth [...]" (Erdal 1991: 593). To tell more about the humorous (be it ironic or sarcastic) undertone of some of these pious inscriptions, we would need a few examples more; cf. also note 62.

73 Matsui 2010: 706, ll. 14-15.

> I, Yıgmıš Kay-a from Suzhou, together Šabı *bahšı* and Xua *bahšı,* having meditated[74] ten days, we left ...[75]

Most of the colophons are unique on their own,[76] that is to say, unlike the main text to which they were added as a "postscript", they bear "individualistic" characters. In a certain sense, to leave a memory is also "individualistic". Yet, as many examples show, they were not formulated at random. Basically, there are four types of the Uygur manuscript colophons, according to the actors who, in various ways, participated in the creation or use of a Buddhist text: author, translator, sponsor, scribe and reader. Among these, the sponsor-colophons are the longest and contain the most comprehensive information.[77] It has been observed that the Uygur Buddhist colophons in general, and the sponsor-colophons in particular followed a certain pattern both in their components and in their arrangements. By period they can be divided into two groups: the ones dating from the pre-Mongol (10^{th}-11^{th} centuries), and the others belonging to the Mongol period (13^{th}-14^{th} centuries).[78] With regard to some sponsor-colophons from the Mongol period, Zieme has noticed that they contain the same elements in the same order.[79] On the basis of formal features we can distinguish prose and verse colophons. While prose colophons, which are mainly short, are attested in Buddhist works from all epochs of the Uygur Buddhism, the verse-colophons can only be found (with two exceptions)[80] in the texts from the Mongol period.[81] In general, the longest and most detailed part of colophons from both periods is the "Transferring merit" (*puṇyapariṇāmanā*).[82] Besides the extensive use of strophic alliteration, the colophons from the Mongol period differ also from the earlier ones in their preference of subjects to whom the merit is deflected. While,

---

74 *dyan*, "meditation" < Sogdian *dy'(')n* or Tokharian A/B *dhyāṃ* < Skt. *dhyāna; dyan olor-*, "to meditate", cf. the index to the Kšanti Kılguluk Nom Bitig (Wilkens 2007: 361). This is an example of set expression, consisting a foreign noun and Turkic verb, literally "to sit (in) meditation"; on Old Turkic set combinations see Erdal 2004: 532.

75 Hamilton and Niu 1998: 131-132. For further inscriptions, where it is expressed explicitly that it was written down in the moments of "leaving or returning (home)", by the usage of *bar-*, "to go, to leave", or *yan*, "to return", see Zieme 1991: 192 (text 60e); Hamilton and Niu 1998: 131-2 (text B), 141-2 (F), 158-9 (P), 160-2 (Q); Matsui 2008: 18-21 (H), 22-5 (J); or in another way of expression rendered as *az-kı-ya olorup ... bitidim*, "having stayed a while ... I wrote", with *olor-* meaning "to sit, stay, abide", cf. Kara 1976: 55-56.

76 Kasai 2008: 7.

77 Kasai 2008: 7-8.

78 There is one exception from 1687/1688 (Kasai 2008: 8, n. 7.).

79 He termed these elements in German as follows: A. Einleitungsformel, B. Datum, C. Auftraggeber, D. Anlaβ, E. Verdienstzuwendung (E.1. an die Schutzgottheiten, E.2. an die Herrscher, E.3. an die Familienmitglieder, E.4. für die Auftraggeber selbst), F. Wünsche und Ziele, G. Abschluβformel, c.f. Zieme 1991: 48-89.

80 Both are colophons to the Maitrisimit nom bitig (Kasai 2008: 12, n. 32, 181, 194; Elverskog 1997: no. 81).

81 Zieme 1992: 46; Kasai 2008: 12.

82 Kasai 2008: 13.

e.g., the family members and relatives remained important, the emphasis on protective deities was shifted onto the Mongol royal family.[83] However, the fundamental structure of colophons from both epochs is more or less the same. This means, that the model which served as the basis for the Uygur Buddhist colophons must have been in existence in the 10th century[84] – i.e. in the period when the Buddhism became the dominant religion among the Uygurs –,[85] or, more likely, antedated it.

By far the most comprehensive and exhaustive treatment of the Uygur Buddhist colophons is Kasai 2008. Having followed in the footsteps of Zieme,[86] she analysed and systematized the structure of the colophons. In quest of the original model for Uygur colophons and of the possible external influences on their formation and development, she examined the characteristics of different colophon traditions available to the Uygurs in Central Asia, such as Sogdian, Tokharian, Tangut, Tibetan, Mongol and Chinese, and compared them with the Uygur.[87] I would like to highlight here two of her important findings: 1. there is no trace of a common Central Asian transmission-line concerning the colophons; 2. among them the Sogdian and the Chinese colophons show considerable similarities with the Uygur.[88] It may imply that the colophon pattern adhered to by the Uygurs was rather an adoption than a genuine invention – which can, indeed, be generally said about Uygur Buddhism, too.[89] This would also fit well to our knowledge on the emergence of Turkic Buddhism: the Sogdians and the Chinese played an active role in the conversion of the Turkic speaking peoples in Central Asia to Buddhism.[90] Furthermore, the vast majority of the extant Uygur texts were translated from Chinese.[91] A closer analysis, however, reveals that there is no direct relationship between the Sogdian and the Uygur colophons. Their apparent similarities are due to the fact that both groups evolved under Chinese influence, but independently from each other. The structure of the Uygur colophons seems to reflect a strong influence of Buddhism flourished in Dunhuang.[92] The relationship between the sponsor-colophons of the Uygur and of the early Chinese Buddhist texts from Dunhuang is obvious by their shared formal features. However, their "Transferring merit" section is significantly different. Whereas, in the Uygur model the merit is deflected in almost all cases firstly onto the protective deities, and then to the rulers etc., in the Dunhuang Chinese texts it is confined exclusively to the sponsor(s). Yet, as has been pointed out by Kasai, this

83 Kasai 2008: 20-22.
84 Kasai 2008: 37.
85 Elverskog 1997: 7-8.
86 See above, note 80.
87 Kasai 2008: 22-44.
88 Kasai 2008: 36.
89 Kasai 2008: 37.
90 Tremblay 2007: 107-114.
91 Elverskog 1997: 10.
92 On the relationship of the Uygurs with Dunhuang see Rong 2001.

deviation cannot be taken as an internal Uygur development. It is an adaptation, too, of which the underlying pattern can be detected in a different genre of Chinese Dunhuang textual sources, namely 願文 *yuanwen*, "vows". On the one hand, their overall structure is quite different from that of the colophons. On the other hand, the structure and the wording of their "Transferring merit" passage are so close to what we find in the corresponding section of Uygur colophons that it can hardly be regarded as mere coincidence. The principles according to which the "Transferring merit" of the *yuanwen*-texts should be arranged were laid down in the 9th century as the latest.[93] For the sake of brevity I refrain here from reproducing the comparative chart by Kasai, which includes the structural elements of Uygur, Chinese and Sogdian colophons and those of *yuanwen*.[94] Suffice it to say that the pattern of the Uygur colophons, both in content and structure, can well be explained as being a combination of patterns to be found in the above mentioned two separate Dunhuang Chinese literary sources. In the Uygur colophons, however, there are two additional elements which have no counterparts elsewhere: the introductory formulae *ymä*, "and, well"[95], and the closing formulae *sadu sadu* (< Skt. *sādhu sādhu*), "good! good!".[96] In this we may see an Uygur endeavour to put the composition into frames (i.e. frame structure), and, by doing so, to evolve an own distinctive style. This type of shaping seems to have taken place in the late 10th century, or definitely not later than the beginning of the 11th century. This style, indeed, was applied not only (or maybe not even primarily) to colophons, but to texts related to other Buddhist practices, too. Some of the Uygur Stake and Banner Inscriptions, composed according to the same pattern as the colophons, can safely be dated to this period.[97] Similarly to the case with the colophons, we can assume that they took shape under Chinese influence.[98]

93 Kasai 2008: 42, n. 189.

94 Kasai 2008: 43, table 1.

95 Zieme 1992: 48; for further variations see also there (n.218-220). (Indicated by the letter A; see above, note 79.)

96 Zieme 1992: 88. (Indicated by the letter G; see above note 79)

97 There are five extant wooden stakes with inscriptions that can be attributed to the Uygurs, and all were unearthed from Turfan (Moriyasu 2001). Four are written in Uygur and one in Chinese (Stake II). The latter one was dedicated by an Uygur prince and dates from A.D. 983 (151-2, 154-5). The most plausible date for Stake I and Stake III is 1008 and 1019 respectively, and Stake IV is probably also from the 11th century. Stake V is from the 13th-14th centuries, therefore latter is an important proof for the continuity of the tradition of dedicating stake inscriptions up to the Mongol period (152-157). As to the purpose of stakes bearing inscriptions, Moriyasu concluded that they were prepared to be "driven into the ground of temple yards during the ground-breaking ceremony as a symbol or monument of the foundation of a *stūpa* or temple, while they served at the same time for purifying the building site or pacifying underground demons. So the Stake Inscriptions were made to commemorate the establishment of *stūpa*s or temples by the Uighur donators." (174). The earliest Banner inscriptions are also from the same period, i.e. from the late 10th or the early 11th century A.D., see Moriyasu and Zieme 2003.

98 The structure of the Uygur Stake I (A.D. 1008) seems to differ from the Chinese Stake II (A.D. 983) in adding the introductory formulae *ymä* and the closing formulae *kutadmıš kutadmıš*,

Not all colophons − for various reasons − contain all elements of the traditional pattern.[99] It is even more the case with the pilgrim inscriptions, and not only because of incomplete preservation. It goes without saying, the colophons and the inscriptions are, by fundament, the outputs of two distinct activities and of different occasions, therefore they have their own distinctive characteristics, respectively; i.e. they contain elements without a direct counterpart in the other. However, it is not impossible to match, at least tentatively, some of these elements. For instance, the element "naming of the sponsor(s)" of a colophon may be matched with the "naming of pilgrim(s)" to be found in inscriptions. Furthermore, the scribe of a graffito had to face relatively more limitations in terms of space and time; e.g. the length of a graffito depended not only on the inspiration of its author but was certainly determined by the available space to write on, especially when it had to be put within the frames of a cartouche of a wall painting.[100]

The inscription Q from Yulin Cave no. 25 is one of the graffiti available as complete and can be used as an example for demonstrating some of the features in question:[101]

1. *kut-lug yont yıl tokzunč ay-nıŋ yegirmi*
2. *säkiz-kä bo kut-lug tag süm-kä ölǰäy tömür*
3. *darm-a širi biz šaču-tın yüküngäli kälip*
4. *yükünüp yanar-ta kač kur qıy-a*
5. *bitiyü tägintim kenki körgü ödig bolzun*
6. *bo yükünmiš buyan-larımız-nıŋ tüš-indä*
7. *közünür közünmäz ažun-lar-takı ayıg kılınč-larımız*
8. *arıp alku tınl(ı)g-lar birlä tärk tavrak burxan*
9. *kut-ın bulmaklar-ımız bolzun sadu sadu bolzun*[102]

"blessed! blessed!", a phrase basically equating to *sadu sadu* mentioned above; cf. Moriyasu 2001: 151, 161-162; Moriyasu noticed that there are some parallelism between the Stake Inscriptions and colophons (2001: 190, n.102), later Kasai has pointed out that the structure of Stake I and III (in Moriyasu 2001: 161-164, 186-191), just as the Banner inscription no. III 533 (in Moriyasu and Zieme 2003: 463) show a close resemblance to that of colophons (2008: 37 with n. 139).

99 Kasai 2008: 38.

100 As mentioned earlier, the disposable space also could have, occasionally, had an effect on the choice of script.

101 Edited in Hamilton and Niu 1998: 160-162. This inscription was first published in facsimile in Warner 1938: plates XIV- XV. Without facsimile it was transcribed, translated, and annotated in Yang 1994: 101-103, on which Hamilton and Niu refrained from commenting (1998: 161), and herewith I follow them.

102 The editors' translation is: "1. Le vingt-huit de la neuvième lune de la bienheureuse année du 2. Cheval, à ce bienheureux temple de montagne, nous, Ölǰey Tömür et 3. Dharma Širi, sommes venus de Shazhou pour nous prosterner, 4. et nous étant prosternés, au moment du retour, (moi,) Qač Qur qıy-a, je me suis, 5. je me suis permis d'écrire (ce texte). Que ce soit un souvenir pour les 6. jours futurs. Comme fruit de nos puṇya (acquis par) cette adoration, 7. que nos mauvaises

‘$_{1-2}$On the 28th day of the 9th month of the fortunate Horse Year,[103] $_{2-3}$we, Öljäy Tömür and Darm-a Širi came from Shazhou to this sacred mountain temple[104] in order to worship (*yükünġäli*). $_{4-5}$After having worshipped (*yükünüp*), [in the moment] of returning [I,] Kačkur *kıya*,[105] have humbly written [this text]. May it be a memory to be seen in future![106] $_{6}$As the fruit of our merits (*puṇya*) [gained by] this worship (*yükünmıš*) $_{7}$may our bad *karma* of the visible [i.e the present] as well as of the invisible [i.e. past and future][107] existences, $_{8-9}$be cleaned, and, together with all sentient beings, may us attain the Buddhahood quickly$_{2}$! *Sādhu*, *sādhu* may it be!

The following schema illustrates the sections of this inscription which can paired with structural elements of colophons:

			Colophon
–	–	–	A. Einleitungsformel
Date	ll. 1-2	→	B. Datum
Pilgrims	ll. 2, 3, 4	*→	C. Auftraggeber
Motivation	l. 3	→	D. Anlaß
Transferring merits	l. 6 (?)	?	E. Verdienstzuwendung
Wishes and aims	ll. 7-9	→	F. Wünsche und Ziele
Closing formulae	l. 9	→	G. Abschluβformel

actions dans les existences déjà vécues et encore à 8. vivre soient purifiées, et que nous puissions trouver 9. rapidement, avec tous les etres vivants, la béatitude du Bouddha. Que ce soit sādhu, sādhu.”

103 According to the editors this date can correspond to either November 5, 1390 or October 24, 1402, or, with less probability, October 11, 1414. (161)

104 *süm(-ä)* < Mong. *süm-e* / *süme*, “Buddhist temple, monastery”, see Matsui 2008: 21. In inscription I.4. it appears in synonym compound *buxar süm*, where the first is the Mongolian form of Skt. *vihāra*, cf. (Hamilton and Niu 1998: 148); *tag*, “mountain”, precedes *buxar* in P.2 and *süm(-ä)* in E.6,8 and in this very inscription, signifying “temple or monastery in the (inside of) mountain”. In an inscription from Dunhuang, where the place of pilgrimage is also indicated, Kara read [...] *burxanlïg bu tur-a odura az-qï-ya olurup*, “...en séjournant un peu dans cette ville pieuse”, on which he comments: “Au lieu de *tur-a* ‘ville fortifée’ on pourrait également lire *tag* ‘montagne’” (Kara 1976: 55-56). The latter reading is possible and, in the light of the previous examples, more probable; *odura* ~ *otra* signifies “the middle, or centre, of anything” (Clauson 1972: 203-4, s.v. *ortu*).

105 On the personal names appearing in this inscription see Hamilton and Niu 1998: 127-210.

106 Hamilton and Niu read *kenki künkä*, “pour les jours futures”. After having checked on the photograph used by them, I propose the reading *kenki körgü*, “seeing later”. This latter phrase is well attested, see e.g. the colophon cited here in note 67, or Matsui 2010: 709, 34.2; cf. also its variant in inscription H.9 *ken körmiš-tä*, “in looking later” (Matsui 2008: 18).

107 In the edition the expression *közünür közünmäz* is commented upon as follows: “[...] participes aoristes du verbe *közün-* ‘etre visible, etre présent, etre apparent’ doivent signifier ici ‘(existence) présentes, déjà vécues, et pas encore présentes, encore à vivre’.” (Hamilton and Niu 1998: 162).

The pilgrim inscriptions in general omit any opening formulae, but occasionally include the closing formulae just as our example above. The date is sometimes put at the end. The names of pilgrims are often enumerated in the inscriptions, sometimes adding their native place. We may assume that the person(s) who sponsored the pilgrimage was (were) among the participants − although, to my best knowledge, it is never indicated explicitly−, especially when they were high dignitaries or well-off lay-disciples.[108] Thus, we may not be wrong to take this element as the counterpart of "*Auftraggeber*" (C). The "*Anlaß*" (D)[109] may vary in each cases according to the actual occasion. Here the purpose or motivation of pilgrimage is "to worship" ("*yüküngäli*"), which is very common and general in inscriptions. However, it is clear, that the fruit of worshipping is *puṇya*, and in this way it is not different from the "*Anlaß*" of colophons or the Stake and Banner inscriptions, since the ultimate motivation in all cases is to accumulate religious merits. Some inscriptions are more explicit on the purpose of, or on the activities performed during the pilgrimage. Thus we find, visualization and praising the Buddha,[110] taking (*dharma-*) instructions,[111] meditating[112] or with more details, as, e.g., in the following inscription:

bo aryadan oron-ta kälip : čodpa b(e)rip yükünüp küši köy(ü)rüp yantım

I came to this monasterial place, made a religious offering, worshipped, burnt incense, and returned [home].[113]

As for "*Verdienstzuwendung*" (E), in our inscription it is not stated in a clear-cut way, however, the context implies that the accumulated merits were wished to bring benefit to all sentient beings. In contrary to the colophons, merit is rarely transferred to gods. There is only a single example but without naming any deity:

äv-imzkä yanıp barır-ta mn [ ] ädgü täŋrim-lärkä buyan ävi[rürmn]

When I will return to our home, I shall transfer the *puṇya* to my kind goddesses'.[114]

---

108 See especially the inscriptions H, J, L of Yulin caves, in Matsui 2008.

109 See Zieme 1992: 61-63; Kasai 2008: 14.

110 *burxan-ım biz-lär-kä körgü bolz-un ögtilz-ün*, translated by the editor as "que mon dieu nous regarde! qu'il soit glorifié!" (Kara 1976: 55); or it can be interpreted otherwise: "may my Buddha be seen and praised by us!".

111 Zieme 1985: 192, 60d.14; also from Toyok, there is a similar manuscript inscription in Matsui 2010: 709, ll.11-12: *bošgut algalı kälip*, "coming to take the instruction".

112 Hamilton and Niu 1998: B.5-6.

113 Yulin Inscription J.5-6. In connection to *čodpa* Matsui has remarked that "it is more likely that Uig. *čodpa* should be derived from Tib. *mchod-pa*, and be translated 'sacrifice'." (Matsui 2008: 24). I would not that specific, because the phrase *čodpa ber-* is obviously is calqued on the Tibetan expression mchod *pa 'bul* "to make a religious offering" (where Tib. *'bul* =~ Uyg. *ber-* "to give, to present and the like"), hence in the given context nothing indicates that it was a "bloody sacrifice".

114 Cf. Zieme 1985: 192, 60e25-26.

In general, we can establish that this element in inscriptions − wherever it is written (and extant) − is much less elaborated compared to the colophons. In the following example the merit is transferred to family members, namely to the parents:

buyanı ögüm kaŋım-ka tägzün

May the merit (of worship) reach my mother and father.[115]

Zieme has classified "*Wünsche und Ziele*" (F) as observed in colophons into two categories: (F.1) those for the period of worldly existence and (F.2) those for the time after death.[116] The examples of the first category, adduced by him, express concerns of mundane disasters and dangers, such famine, bad weather, shortage and sickness, and wishes for good weather, prosperity and health and so on.[117] According to him, the "wish for attaining Buddhahood" falls into the second category, even it may well refer to the present period of life −as he also noted.[118] It is not my "*Ziel*" here to refine these categories; what concerns us here is the way it is phrased in the colophons: with the use of adverbs signifying "without delay", "very quickly", or "instantly".[119] In our example above it is expressed by *tärk tavrak* (hendiadys), "quickly". It is important to add that we do not find in the pilgrim inscriptions any mundane wish; be in this life or after, they all regard to religious or spiritual aims.

Concluding remarks

I have not dealt here with the toponyms of inscriptions and, in connection with this, the 'traffic sphere' of Uygur Buddhist pilgrimages,[120] nor have I discussed the personal names appearing in the inscriptions, for both would have been too challenging, and requires further research by the author" by "all these would have pushed the scope of this paper. I have also excluded the problem of dating these graffiti. Among those which could have been dated more or less precisely, the oldest is the inscription in Bezeklik Cave No. 2, which dates to 1226 A.D.[121] The newest seem to belong either to the late 14th or to the first decades of the 15th century.[122] That

115 Yulin Inscription F.: the editors erroneously read and transcribed TYKZWN / *tegzün* for T'KZWN / *tägzün*, i.e. the vowel sign in the first syllable should be *alif* ['] and not *yod* [Y] (cf. Hamilton and Niu 1998: 142). The formulation, however, is quite similar to what we can read in a colophon: *öglüg: kaŋ-lıg iki ı-dok-larım-ka buyan-ı tägzün*, "... möge das Verdienst meine zwei Heiligen, meine Mutter und meinen Vater, erreichen." (Kasai 2008: 245, 130.2-3).

116 Zieme 1992: 83.

117 Zieme 1992: 84.

118 Zieme 1992: 85.

119 For attestations see Zieme 1992: 85. Cf. also in a Banner Inscription "May I be released quickly from [the misery of] *saṃsāra* by the strength of my good deeds." (Moriyasu and Zieme 2003: 466).

120 On this important subject see Matsui 2008.

121 Zieme 1985: 60c.

122 Cf. Yulin inscriptions D, O, P and Q in Hamilton and Niu 1998.

is to say, none of the known Uygur Buddhist pilgrim inscriptions can be dated prior to the Mongol period. As we have mentioned, the Sivšidu-Yaqšidu manuscript inscriptions can also be dated to this period. On the one hand, this certainly does not mean that Uygur Buddhists started visiting sacred places and monasteries only under Mongol rule. On the other hand, it certainly tells us that it was under Mongol rule that the Uygurs - and this is corroborated by other historical sources - were positioned to play a dominant role in the socio-religious life in the regions under consideration.

My main objective has been to challenge the − still prevalent − view which regards these graffiti as simple old touristic "scribbles" with silly content. As we can see, the scribes (or the authors) of these inscriptions − not only of the ones composed in strophic alliteration − were clearly literate and well versed. Therefore, it is not very surprising that the majority of the inscriptions demonstrate clear signs of having been influenced by the literary or textual tradition. This is manifest in their similarities to colophons and other Buddhist inscriptions, which include parallels in content, structure and phraseology. Although they are often fragmentary, damaged and difficult to read, they still can provide us with many pieces of valuable information. As it has been expressed aptly by Jason Neelis:

> ... epigraphic materials offer useful perspectives on Buddhist practices, patterns of mobility, and everyday concerns of individual agents of transmission in specific places and times.[123]

Bibliography:

Clauson, Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Elverskog, Johan. 1997. *Uygur Buddhist Literature*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Erdal, Marcel. 1991. *Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.

—. 1993. "The Alliterative Texts of the Uygur Turks of Turfan and Dunhuang – Studies of Old-Turkic Verse (Review of Zieme 1991)." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies-University of London* 56: 145-148.

—. 2004. *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Boston: Brill.

Gabain, Annemarie von. 1950. *Alttürkische Grammatik: Mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis, auch Neutürkisch*. 2., verbesserte Aufl. ed. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

—. 1954. "Buddhistische Türkenmission." In Schubert, Johannes; Schneider, Ulrich (eds.). *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller: Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz: 161-173.

123 Neelis 2010: 54.

Grünwedel, Albert. 1912. *Altbuddhistische Kultstätten in Chinesisch-Turkistan. Bericht über Archäologische Arbeiten von 1906 bis 1907 bei Kuča, Qarašahr und in der Oase Turfan* [(Ancient Buddhist Temples in Chinese Turkistan) – National Institute of Informatics / Digital Archive of Toyo Bunko Rare Books]. http://dsr.nii.ac.jp/toyobunko/VIII-5-B4-a-7/#VIII-5-B4-a-7/V-1 ed. Vol. 2012. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

Hamilton, James and Ru-ji Niu. 1998. "Inscriptions Ouïgoures des grottes bouddhiques de Yulin." *Journal Asiatique* 286: 127-210.

Ishihama, Yumiko and Yōichi Fukuda. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvyutpatti. Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology (Shintei Hon'Yaku Myōgi Taishū)*. Tōkyō: Toyo Bunko.

Kljaštornyj, Sergej G. and Livšic, Vladimir .A. 1972, "The Sogdian Inscription of Bugut Revisited." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 26: 69-102.

Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim. 1990. "Buddhism in Turkish Central Asia." *Numen* 37 (1): 53-69.

Liu Mau-Tsai. 1958. *Die Chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-Küe)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Matsui, Dai. 2008a. "A Mongolian Decree from the Chaghataid Khanate Discovered at Dunhuang." In Zieme, Peter (ed.). *Aspects of Research into Central Asian Buddhism: In Memoriam Kōgi Kudara*. Turnhout: Brepols: 273-284.

—. 2008b. "Revising the Uigur Inscriptions of the Yulin Caves." *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 23: 17-33.

—. 2010. "Uigur Manuscripts Related to the Monks Sivšidu and Yaqšidu at "Abita-Cave Temple" of Toyoq." In Academia Turfanica (ed.). *Journal of the Turfan Studies: Essays on the Third International Conference on Turfan Studies: The Origins and Migrations of Eurasian Nomadic Peoples (Tulufan xue yanjiu: disanjie Tulufan xueji Ou-Ya youmu minzu de qiyuan yu qiantu guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 吐鲁番学研究第三届吐鲁番学暨欧亚游牧民族的起源与迁徒国际学术研讨会论文集*)*. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社: 697-714.

—. 2011. "Ning-Rong 寧戎 and Bezeklik in Old Uigur Texts." *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 26 (3/29/2013): 141-175.

Maue, Dieter. 1996. *Alttürkische Handschriften* Teil 1: *Dokumente in Brāhmī und Tibetischer Schrift*. (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII,9). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Moriyasu, Takao. 2011. "Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road (Part 1)." *Ōsaka daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka kiyō* 大阪大学大学院文学研究科紀要 *[Bulletin of the Graduate School of Letters, Osaka University]* 51: 32-86.

—. 2001. "Uighur Buddhist Stake Inscriptions from Turfan." In Bazin, Louis; Zieme, Peter (eds.). *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout: Brepols: 149-223.

Moriyasu, Takao and Peter Zieme. 2003. "Uighur Inscriptions on the Banners from Turfan Housed in the Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin." In Bhattacharya-Haesner, Chhaya (ed.). *Central Asian Temple Banners in the Turfan Collection of the Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin: Painted Textiles from the Northern Silk Route*. Berlin: Reimer: 461-474.

Neelis, Jason Emmanuel. 2010. *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and Beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*. Dynamics in the History of Religions 2., edited by Volkhard Krech. 1st ed. Leiden-Boston: Brill Academic Pub.

Pelliot, Paul. 1924. *Les grottes de Touen-Houang. Peintures et sculptures bouddhiques des époques des Wei, des T'ang et des Song: tôme 6: grottes 146 à 182 et divers*. http://dsr.nii.ac.jp/toyobunko/VIII-5-B6-3/#VIII-5-B6-3/V-2 ed. Vol. 2012. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner.

Róna-Tas, András. 1991. *An Introduction to Turkology*. Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar.

Róna-Tas, András, Árpád Berta, and László Károly. 2011. *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rong, Xinjiang. 2001. "The Relationship of Dunhuang with the Uighur Kingdom." In Bazin, Louis; Zieme, Peter (eds.). *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout: Brepols: 275-298.

Shichang, Ma. 1995. "Buddhist Cave-Temples and the Cao Family at Mogao Ku, Dunhuang." *World Archaeology* 27 (Buddhist Archaeology 2): 303-317.

Tremblay, Xavier. 2007. "The Spread of Buddhism in Serindia – Buddhism among Iranians, Tocharians and Turks before the 13th Century." In Heirman, Ann; Bumbacher, Stephan Peter (eds.). *The Spread of Buddhism*. Leiden, Boston: Brill: 75-129.

Tsepak, Rig-'dzin. 1986. *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology (Nan̓ Don Rig-Pa'i Miṅ Tshig Bod dByin Śan Sbyar)*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

Warner, Langdon. 1938. *Buddhist Wall Paintings. A Study of a Ninth-Century Grotto at Wan Fo Hsia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wilkens, Jens. 2007. *Das Buch von der Sündentilgung. Edition des alttürkisch-buddhistischen Kšanti Kılguluk Nom Bitig*. (Berliner Turfantexte XXV). Turnhout: Brepols.

Yang, Fu-hsüeh. 1994. „On the Sha-Shou Uyghur Kingdom." *Central Asiatic Journal* 38:1: 80-107.

Yoshida, Yutaka and Moriyasu, Takao. 1999, "Bugut Inscription." In Moriyasu, Takao and Ochir, Ayudai (eds.). *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Complexes and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Toyonaka: Osaka University: 122-125.

Zieme, Peter. 1985. *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*. (Berliner Turfantexte XIII). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

—. 1991. *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang: Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

—. 1992. *Religion und Gesellschaft im Uigurischen Königreich von Qočo: Kolophone und Stifter des alttürkischen buddhistischen Schrifttums aus Zentralasien*. (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 88). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Lumbini International Research Institute
P.O. Box 39, Bhairahawa, Dist. Rupandehi
NEPAL

