

# On Uighur elements in Buddhist Mongolian Texts

SHÖGAITO Masahiro

0

It is well-known that the Uighur exerted a strong cultural influence towards the Mongolian during the Yuan Dynasty, and in recent years it has been argued that not only the Tibetan but also the Uighur played an important rôle in the Buddhist mission into the Mongolian. One of the grounds for these arguments is that many loan words borrowed from Uighur are found scattered in Buddhist Mongolian texts. Though no extensive research into these Uighur elements has yet been presented, it is not difficult to gain an insight into this problem at the present stage, when our knowledge of Uighur Buddhist terms has been increased substantially.

On the Ju yong guan 居庸関 inscription built in the suburbs of Beijing in 1343 dhāraṇis and the construction history of the inscription are inscribed in six types of scripts. Two of them are Hp'ags-pa and Uighur scripts, in which Mongolian and Uighur are written, respectively. The two inscriptions show a number of Buddhist terms similar to their counterparts found in the other version. As for an example, a part of the Mongolian text together with the corresponding Uighur version is cited below:

aqš [obi] purγanu sarvaviti vač'irabaniyin  
abida śagemuni purγannu'dun mandalnu'udi  
harban jūgun be batiragalbun miṅqan purγadun  
adišdid-t'an alt'an k'örgüdi eyin eyin e'udbeyi

nomun be öṅget'u qoyar beyeyin śarirnu ['ud] i  
nom saqiqč'in maqaračnu'ud k'i'ed alinu se'uderiyed  
no'oqr'asu miṅqan kalbudun ni'ul adilqaquyin  
nom śac'indur ber t'usa yeke üeleyi büt'u'ebeyi

(Nishida 1957: 257-258)

abi[tali] śakimūnili sar]va-vitñeli  
akšobili v(a)č'irapaniniṅ beš uguš mantali

ančulayu ok ontin siǰarkilī badīrakalptakī  
 [alku adī kötr]ülmiš burhanlarniǰ ymä körklāri  
 ürgüt tīnl(i)g oǰlanlar[īn oz] gurda[čī]lar  
 öǰlüg [no]ml[ug āt'öz...šar]jirlar  
 öǰdün siǰarkī dartiraštre bašlap m(a)haračlar  
 ülgülänčsiz uz uǰurīn ornatiltīlar

(Röhrborn 1980: 315)

The words with waved underlines, which are similar to the both versions, are as follows:<sup>1)</sup>

Mong.	Uig.
(1) aqšobi	akšobi <Skt. akṣobhya
(2) sarvaviti	sarvavitīne <Skt. *sarva-vijñā(?)
(3) šagemuni	šakimuni <Skt. śākyamuni
(4) mandal	mantal <Skt. maṇḍala
(5) batiragalb	badīrakalp <Skt. bhadrakalpa
(6) šarir	šarir <Skt. śarīra
(7) maqarač	maharač <Skt. mahārāja
(8) vač'irabani	vačirapani <Skt. vajrapāni
(9) puryan	burhan <Chin. 佛 (+qan)
(10) abida	abita <Chin. 阿弥陀

*vitne* of (2) Uig. *sarvavitīne* (2) is spelt VYTY-Y, which is almost identical with the Mongolian form in transliteration. Of course Sanskrit *sarva-vijñā* as reconstructed by Röhrborn from this spelling cannot be excluded since TY is employed in Uighur to represent Sanskrit *jñ*. However, it is much more natural to consider Sanskrit *sarva-vidya* (or *sarva-vidyā*) as the source of the word and to transcribe it as *sarvavītyi*, because, as T. Nishida correctly pointed out, Mong. *sarvaviti* corresponds to *pu ming fo* 普明佛 'god possessing all science',<sup>2)</sup> which agrees better with Skt. *sarva-vidya* (or *sarva-vidyā*) than *sarvavijñā*.<sup>3)</sup>

Apart from (2), the above-listed words are known to have already been settled in Uighur before the Yuan Dynasty, and the Mongolian forms may well have been borrowed from them. Though Uig. *sarvavītyi* has not yet been attested in Uighur, it shares the ending *-i* with the other animate nouns of Sanskrit origin<sup>4)</sup> and is most likely to be the etymon of Mong. *sarvaviti*.

The single-underlined terms, though not found in the Uighur version, are well attested in Uighur: *adišdid* (<Uig. *adištit* < Skt. *adhīsthitā*), *kalb* (<Uig. *kalp* <

Skt. *kalpa*), *śac'in* (< Uig. *šazin* < Skt. *śāsana*), *nom* (< Uig. *nom* < Sogd. *nwm*). Therefore, one may be entitled to assume that these Buddhist terms were not borrowed from Uighur on the occasion of building the inscription, but had already been settled in Mongolian by then.

## I

Though some of the Buddhist Mongolian terms go back to genuine Uighur (Turkic) words, most of the others came from other languages through the Uighur intermediary, and a great majority of them are from Sanskrit. It has recently been discovered that many of these Sanskrit words in Uighur were borrowed from Tocharian, and show the features peculiar to the Sanskrit loans settled in Tocharian. These features, which are schematized in the following rules, appear systematically in the endings:<sup>5)</sup>

	Skt.	Uig.	Toch. (A/B)	
1)	-a	-i	-e/ä -ā/a	} /animate
2)	-ā	{ -a (-i)		
3)	-a/ā	-#(zero)	-#	/inanimate
4)	-i/ī	-i	-i/e	
5)	-u/ū	-u	-u	
6)	-C	-C	-C	
7)	-in	-i	-i/ī	
8)	-jit	-či	-ji/cī	

As is shown by the following examples, the Sanskrit forms in Mongolian also observe these rules, which will hereafter be referred to as the 'Uighur-Tocharian rules':

	Skt.	Uig.	Mong.	Tochs
1)	śāriputra	šariputri	šaribudiri	śāriputre (B)
2)	sujātā	—	sučati	(sūjātā (A))
	mālikā	maliki	—	(mālikā (A)/mālika (B))
3)	abhiṣeka	abišik	abisig	abhišek (AB)
	pāramitā	paramit	baramid	pāramit (AB)
4)	vaiśālī	vaišali	waisali	vaiśāli (B)
5)	rāhu	raqu	raqu	rāhū (A)/rāhu (B)

6)	kanakamuni	kanakamuni	kanakamuni	kanakamuni (AB)
7)	šikhin	šiki	šiki	šikhi/šikhī
8)	abhijit	abiči	abiči	
	prasenajit	pirsanči	—	prasenaji (AB)

After the fall of the Yuan Dynasty, translation of Buddhist texts by the Mongolian had been suspended until it was started again with the introduction of Lamaism from Tibet. It is generally assumed that a number of Buddhist texts were translated into Mongolian during the Yuan Dynasty, and one might even suspect the existence of the Mongolian *Tripitaka* in that period. Nevertheless, only a few texts are known to have originated from the Yuan Dynasty; the bulk of the Buddhist Mongolian texts that we have today were produced after the sixteenth century, most of them being revised even later in the eighteenth century.

The Buddhist texts directly translated from Uighur, if such exist, certainly date back to the Yuan Dynasty. However, no text has so far been discovered of which the colophon clearly points to the Uighur origin. In this connection one finds intriguing colophons in the Mongolian versions of the *Pañcarakṣā*<sup>6)</sup> and the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* translated by Šes-rab seṅ-ge who played an active part in Mongolian Buddhism early in the fourteenth century. The colophon of the latter reads as follows:

“...Later the monk Šes-rab seṅ-ge of the Śākya (order) translated this powerful book (of) the holy and supreme Golden Light from the Tibetan and Uigur scriptures into Mongolian, on the report of Esen temür Tayuta who said: Let it be ambrosia for the pure (hearted) Mongolian people!

As the names of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas do not sound in Mongolian, he wrote them according to the Uigur usage (yosu), in Indian form. Together with Bunya-širi sidü (i.e. Puṇyaśrī situ), a connoisseur of Sanskrit and Tibetan, he compared the Indian, the Tibetan and the Uigur texts, and thus he translated the meanings and the words faultlessly.”<sup>7)</sup>

This colophon shows that Uighur as well as Tibetan was one of the original languages for translation. Since Puṇyaśrī is known to have translated Buddhist Tibetan texts into Uighur, it can safely be supposed that these Mongolian texts were produced in the same background as that of those Uighur text. Šes-rab seṅ-ge translated another Mongolian text *Lalitavistara*<sup>8)</sup> from Tibetan; although Uighur is not mentioned as its original, it contains many Uighur elements, such as Uig. *adaq* ‘foot’ instead of Mong. *köl* ‘id.’<sup>9)</sup> Therefore, it is clear that the Uighur version was also consulted for the translation of this text.

In fact, ‘the Indian (Sanskrit) forms’ of above-mentioned two texts and of the *Lalitavistara* agree with the Uighur-Tocharian rules fairly well. The second

chapter of the *Pañcaraksā* entitled *Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī* enumerates the names of more than one hundred yakṣas and their living places in Sanskrit.<sup>10)</sup> The following are the names of yakṣas observing the Uighur-Tocharian rules:

Skt.	Pañca.	Skt.	Pañca.
alaka	alaki	mahāsenā	maqasini
bala	bali	mahāgiri	maqagiri
caritaka	čaritaki	puṣpaketu	busbakitu
dhaneśvara	daniswari	śikhaṇḍin	sikandi
kumbhira	kumbiri		

Did these words, which have not hitherto been attested in Uighur, directly come from the forms once existent? It is true that a lot of Uighur forms do not observe the rules, but they are known to have been borrowed either from the forms which are exceptional even in Tocharian or via other languages such as Sogdian.<sup>11)</sup> In this connection, some Mongolian forms should be referred to which follow these rules but differ from the forms attested in Uighur. For example, a well-settled name of a monk Uig. *anant* (< Skt. *ānanda*) without the ending *-i* may go back to Toch. A *ānant/ānand* or to Sogd. *n'nt*, while one finds *anandi* in this list of yakṣa names. However, one must hasten to add that *ananda*, hardly from Uighur, was settled as a monk's name in Mongolian. Since *anand*, *ananda* or *anandi* does not appear in Uighur as a yakṣa name, one cannot be certain whether or not there was any formal difference between the name of a monk and that of a yakṣa in Uighur. Likewise, Mong. *kirakučandi* is radically different from Uig. *krakasundi* coming from Toch. A/B *krakasundi* (< Skt. *krakucchanda*),<sup>12)</sup> but agrees very much with the Sanskrit form except for the ending *-i*, which in turn follows the Uighur-Tocharian rules.<sup>13)</sup> It is almost certain that examples like *anandi* and *krakučandi* were hypercorrect forms, as it were, and in view of this type of hypercorrection one may conclude that the above-listed yakṣa names were not borrowed from Uighur but modified or corrected from the Sanskrit forms by the translator or the copyist in accordance with the Uighur-Tocharian rules.

As for the names of yakṣas' living places, one finds many words ending with *-i* at variance with the Uighur-Tocharian rules, where Sanskrit word final *-a/ā* of inanimate nouns are lost. The following are examples:

Skt.	Mong.	Skt.	Mong.
ahicchattrā	aqičatiri	raśina	rasini
ambastha	ambasti	siṃhala	siṃqali
bhīṣana	bisani	śākala	sakali

bharukaccha	barukači	vokkāna	vokani
darada	daradi	campā	čambi
goyoga	goyagi	dhvārakā	duwaraki
kotivarsa	kotiwarasi	bhadrikā	badiraki
malla	mali	uttarā	utari
nāgara	nagari	varunā	warni

In Uighur, distinction between the endings *-i* and *-#* is strictly observed depending on whether the word is animate or inanimate. For example, Skt. *sudaršana* appears as *sudaršani* when it is a king's name, while *sudaršan* is a name of a town; a personal name *arčuni* is clearly differentiated from a name of a plant *arčun*, both being reflects of Skt. *arjuna*.<sup>14)</sup> However, this distinction in Uighur was no more than a result of the extensive borrowing from Tocharian and was not at all productive. Therefore, when a new Sanskrit item was borrowed into Uighur, it did not take the special ending predicted by the rules, but simply reflected the form of the mediator language. In fact, in the texts translated from Tibetan during the Yuan Dynasty, there are some Sanskrit words revealing the Tibetan origin. To the present author's knowledge no inanimate noun with the animate ending *-i* has so far been encountered among them. Moreover, there is little possibility that the Tocharian *hīna-yāna* Buddhism acquainted with itself these tantric texts, nor is it easy to imagine that Tocharian texts once existent possessed so many names of *yakṣas* and their living places.

There is no way to know what these names looked like in the Uighur version, which was alleged to be one of the originals but is almost lost. However, as far as the Mongolian forms are concerned, there is good reason for supposing that they were based on Sanskrit. As for an example, a *yakṣa* name *maholūkkhalamekhalā* (*mahā-ulūkkhala-mekhalā*) is rendered word for word in the Tibetan version, i.e., *gtum* (corr. *gtun*) *chen gser gyi 'od dpag can* (corr. *'og pags can*) 'pilon ceinture ayant' (Lévi, p. 46 no. 58), while in the Chinese it is divided into names of two *yakṣas*, i.e., *maholūkkhala* and *mekhalā*. In Mongolian, on the other hand, this name appears as *kala mikali ulus- <tur> maquli* (Aalto 1961, p. 52, 19r), which means 'a *yakṣa* *Maquli* (<\*maholū-) in the country of *kala mikali* (<\*khalamekhalā)'. In view of the Tibetan and Chinese renderings, one cannot but think that this mistranslation was based on the Sanskrit original. Though it is not certain whether this segmentation had already existed in the Uighur version, or whether it was due to the ignorance of the Mongolian translator, the addition of *-i* to the non-existent element can be regarded as a kind of hypercorrection. Many of the Sanskrit words in this list have not been attested in the Buddhist Uighur texts published thus far, and it is likely that they had not been settled by the time of translating this Mongolian text.

It may be noticed in passing that, though many place names take *-#* form, they seem to be confined to familiar words or those forms which could easily be

analogized to other already existent loans:

Skt.	Mong.	Skt.	Mong.
gāndhāra	gandar	alakāpura	alkabur
kāsmīra	kasmir	dārukapura	darkabur
udumbara	udumbar	mahāpura	maqabur

The three words in the left column might have been settled, cf. *gandar* <Uig. < Toch. *gāndhār*, *kasmir* <Uig. *kaśmir*, *udumbar* < Uig. *udumbar* (a flower name). The rest containing an element Skt. *pura* 'town' were presumably formed on the analogy to such forms as Uig. *anantapur* (< Toch. < Skt. *āmandapura*).

What has been discussed above clearly indicates that the addition of *-i* to *kirakučandi*, *anandi* and the place names is due to a kind of hypercorrection, with the aim of aping the Uighur-Tocharian rules. Nevertheless, it is hard to think that this was done by Šes-rab seŋ-ge or Puṇyaśrī. Puṇyaśrī, as stated above, translated several Tibetan texts into Uighur, in which no hypercorrection of this kind is seen. In an Uighur tantric text translated by him (published in BTT 7), one finds a similar list comprising the names of parts constituting a maṇḍala on the one hand and the appellations of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and yoginīs dominating those parts on the other. There, the names of the parts do not end with *-i* but with *-a*, in accordance with other Sanskrit *-a/ā* forms not settled in Uighur. See the following examples:

#### Names of the Parts

Skt.	Uig.	Mong.
arbuda	arbuda	arbuda
jālandhara	čāndara	jālandhara
grihadeva	girix-a-tiu-a	gri-ha-diu-a-da
kulūta	kuluda	guludā

#### Names of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas

Skt.	Uig.	Mong.
aṅkura	aṅkuri	amguri
khaṇḍakapāla	kanta-kapali	khaṇḍa-kabala
virūpākṣa	(viru)pakṣi	virbagsi
kaṅkālā	kaṅkla	ka-m-ka-la
hayagrīva	xayaṅguru-a	hayaguru-a, qayaṅ-guru-a
subhadra	su-badir-a	subadr-a

## Names of yoginīs

Skt.	Uig.	Mong.
cakravegā	čakir-a-vigi	cagr-a-bigi
khaṇḍarohā	kanta-roxi	khaṇḍarohi
mahāvīryā	maxa-viry-a	mahā-biry-a
suvirā	suviri	subiri, sur-a-bir-a

The Uighur forms are cited from BTT 7 (pp. 104–112), and the corresponding Mongolian are those found in the Mongolian *Tandjur*. These names of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and yoginīs ending with *-i* may not perhaps been borrowed from Tocharian, but were so formed by Puṇyaśrī, who corrected them from the Sanskrit forms in accordance with the Uighur-Tocharian rules. The important point is, however, that no inanimate noun is found to take the ending *-i*. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that Puṇyaśrī advised Šes-rab seṅge, when translating the *Pañcarakṣā* into Mongolian, to add *-i* to the names of yakṣas' living places. Probably this was done later by another person, who knew the Uighur-Tocharian rules only partially, and added *-i* even to inanimate nouns.<sup>15)</sup>

## 2

The colophon of the *Pañcarakṣā* showed that the Uighur exerted a strong influence to Mongolian Buddhism; Mongolian people took these Uighur texts as their model for translation, and in particular, they tried to follow the Uighur-Tocharian rules when introducing terms from Sanskrit, the sacred language of Buddhism. It was with this background that the 'hypercorrection' in question was executed.

Even in the sixteenth century when Lamaism was introduced from Tibet, many Buddhist terms still remained to be those which had been borrowed from Uighur earlier in the fourteenth century. However, as an enormous amount of Buddhist Tibetan texts started to be translated, these settled forms began to be replaced by new ones borrowed or translated from Tibetan. The Leningrad version of the *Mahāvīryūtpatti* contains a large amount of Mongolian vocabulary presumably employed in the period of the Ching Dynasty.<sup>16)</sup> The following are the words denoting 'eight heavenly gods' and 'pretas,' found in the *Mahāvīryūtpatti* and in the *Pañcarakṣā*, together with the corresponding Sanskrit, Uighur and Chinese forms.

Skt.	Uig.	Pañca.	Mahāvīryūtp.	Chin.
deva	täṅri	teṅri	teṅri (3045)	天
nāga	luu	luus	luus (3046)	龍



asura	asuri	asuri	asuri (3049)	非天
garuḍa	garudi	garudi	garudi (3051)	金翅鳥
gandharva	gandarvi	gandarwi	gandaris (3048)	尋香
kiṃnara	kinari	kinari	kinari (3052)	人非人
mahoraga	maqoragi	maqoragi	mahoraga (3053)	大腹
yakṣa	yakṣa/yāk	yaksa	yakṣa (3047)	藥叉
preta	prit	birid	birid (4494)	餓鬼
piśāca	pišači	bisači	miq-a idesiten (4496)	食肉
kumbhāṇḍa	kumbanti	kumbandi	kumbandi (3054)	瓶腹
pūtana	putani	butani	nabtarqai (4498)	臭者
kaṭapūtana	kataputani	katabutani	nabtarqai bi-(e)-tü (4499)	体臭者
skandha	—	iskandi	qatayirtaγuluγči (4501)	作嘆
unmada	—	udmadi/ud- mandi	γaljaγuraγuluγči (4500)	作顛者
chāyā	—	čai	següder daruγči (4503)	鎮影者
apasmāra	apasmari	abasmari	umartaγuluγči (4502)	作忘者

In Uighur all forms except for *tägri*, *luu* and *yäk* are of Sanskrit origin. Apart from *luus* and *gandaris* which are accompanied by the Mongolian plural suffix *-s*, those attested in the *Pañcarakṣā* are basically the same as the Uighur forms.<sup>17)</sup> In the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, while *luus*, *asuri*, *garudi*, *kinari*, *birid* and *kumbandi* agree with the Uighur forms, *mahorga* and *yakṣa* are introduced directly from Sanskrit or via Tibetan, the rest being translated from Tibetan. Since the appellations of devas and pretas appear most frequently in the Buddhist literature, they are likely to have been deeply rooted in Mongolian. But later the stronger the Tibetan influence became, the more Uighur forms were replaced by the Tibetan, as is shown by the preceding list.

Incidentally, groups of words borrowed collectively from Uighur tended to be intact from the Tibetan influence even in the Ching Dynasty. Three Uighur texts published in TT VII comprise the following names of twenty-eight lunar mansions (*aṣṭāvīmśatinakṣatra*),<sup>18)</sup> which are well reflected in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (3017–3044):

	Skt.	TT VII.	Mahāvvyut.
1)	kṛttikā	kirtik	kirdik
2)	rohinī	urukini	rokini
3)	mrga-śirā	mrgašir	margasiri
4)	ārdrā	ardir	ardir

5)	punar-vasu	punarvasu	bunarvasu
6)	puṣya	puš	bus
7)	a-śleṣā	ašliš	aslis
8)	maghā	mag	mag
9)	pūrva-phalgunī	purvapalguni	burvabalguni
10)	uttara-phalgunī	utrapalguni	uuirabalguni
11)	hastā	qast	qasda
12)	citrā/caitra	čaitir	čaidir
13)	svātī	suvati	suvadi
14)	viśākhā	sušak <sup>19)</sup>	šusaq
15)	anurādhā	anurat	anurat
16)	jyesthā	čišt	čisda
17)	mūla	mul	mul
18)	pūrvāśadhā	purvašat	burvasat
19)	uttarāśadhā	utrasat	udirasat
20)	śravaṇā	širavan	siravan
21)	abhijit	abiči	abiči
22)	śata-bhiṣā	satabis	sadabis
23)	dhanīṣṭhā	daniš/taništa	tanis
24)	pūrva-bhadra-padā	purvabadirabat	purvabadirabat
25)	uttara-bhadra-padā	utrabadirabat	udirabadirabat
26)	revatī	rivati	rivadi
27)	aśvinī	ašvini	asuvani
28)	bharanī	barani	brani

With the exception of 2), 3), 11) and 16), the Mongolian forms are almost the same as the Uighur. Moreover, the forms radically different from Sanskrit, such as 6), 14), 21) and 23), are common to the both languages. Therefore, it is certain that these names were introduced into Mongolian collectively as a set. It is also to be noted that the endings of these words follow the Uighur-Tocharian rules discussed above, and they are most likely to be borrowed via Tocharian.

### 3

It has been emphasized so far that Sanskrit forms were introduced into Uighur through Tocharian and then taken over by Mongolian. However, an

unexpected number of Sogdian elements are also met with in Mongolian, again borrowed through the Uighur intermediary:

- Skt. ratna>Sogd. rṭny>Uig. ärdini>Mong. erdini/erdeni  
 Skt. koti>Sogd. kwrty>Uig. kolti>Mong. költi  
 Skt. punya>Sogd. pwny'n>Uig. buyan>Mong. buyan  
 Skt. cakravartin>Sogd. ckrβrt>Uig. čakiravrt>Mong. čakiravard  
 Skt. śiksāpada>Sogd. škš'pt>Uig. čixšapat>Mong. čiyšabad

Beside the preceding examples of Sanskrit origin, one also finds the following genuine Sogdian forms settled in Mongolian:

- Mong. esrua (Pañca. Lalita. Mp. Kandj.)<Uig. äzrua<Sogd. 'zrw'  
 Mong. kebid (Lalita.)/kebid (Hp. 2–19)<Uig. kibit<Sogd. kpyδ  
 Mong. nisvanis (Prajña. Lalita. Mp.)<Uig. nizvani<Sogd. nyzβny  
 Mong. nom<Uig. nom<Sogd. nwm  
 Mong. qormusda (Pañca. Subhā. Lalita. Mp.)<Uig. xormuzta<Sogd. xwrmtz'  
 Mong. tamu (Expiation. Mp.)<Uig. tamu<Sogd. tmw  
 Mong. titim<Uig. diδim, <Sogd. δyδm

In addition to these Sogdian elements, Chinese loan words, including those of Indian origin such as *šabi*, also find a place in Buddhist Mongolian texts.

- Mong. šabi (Mp.)<Uig. šabi<沙彌<<Skt. śrāmanera  
 Mong. čai (Lalita.)<Uig. čai<齋<sup>20)</sup>  
 Mong. qonsi-im (H. Zwei. Bhadra.)/qonsim (Kandj.)/γuan ši yim (Hp. p. 20)<Uig qonši-im/ qanši-im<觀世音  
 Mong. baγši (Lalita. Bodhi. Hp. 10–6 Subhā. Mp. Kandj.)<Uig. baxši<博士  
 Mong. biba (Mp.)<Uig. biba<琵琶  
 Mong. bisamun (H. Zwei.)/bisman (Kandj.)<Uig. bišaman/bišamin<毘沙門  
 <Skt. vaiśravaṇa<sup>21)</sup>  
 Mong. purγan (Hp. 12–6)/burqan (Mp. Kandj.)<Uig. burxan<佛 (-xan)  
 <Skt. buddha  
 Mong. labai (Lalita. Subhā. Mp.)<Uig. labai<螺貝  
 Mong. lénγua (Hp. 12–6)/linqu-a (Lalita. Subhā.)/lingqu-a (Kandj. Bhadra.)  
 <Uig. linxu-a<蓮華  
 Mong. lu (Hp. h3–42)/luu (Mp.)<Uig. lu/luu<龍

Mong. *titsi* (Lalita. Mp.) <Uig. *titsi* <弟子

Mong. *toyin* (Lalita. Bodhi. Mp. Kandj.) <Uig. *toyin* <道人

Of course there are loan words from the Turkic languages, but to put them in the proper historical context is difficult in two respects. First, it is not easy to distinguish Turkic (Uighur) loan words settled in Mongolian from foreign forms which happen to appear in texts translated from Uighur or in texts made by the translators whose mother tongue was Turkic. To the latter may belong *sariγ* (<Uig. *sariγ* 'yellow' Subhā.), *taγ* (<Uig. *taγ* 'mountain' H. Zwei.), etc., as well as above-mentioned *adaq* of the *Lalitavistara*. Secondly, it is sometimes impossible to tell whether they had been borrowed before the introduction of Buddhism, through the contact of the two languages, or whether they came from Buddhist Uighur as cultural words. For example, there is no telling when *bölüg* 'chapter, section' (Mp. Kandj.), no doubt from Uig. *bölük* (<*böl* 'divide' + *-ük* (suffix of deverbal noun)), was introduced. In the case of *erdem* 'virtue' (Lalita. Subhā. Mp. Kandj.), it is certain that this word had originated from the period well before the Buddhist influence, because of the two corresponding Uighur words, *ärdäm* and *ädräm*, which was derived from *ärdäm* through metathesis, the latter was prevalent in the Buddhist Uighur texts in the Yuan Dynasty. For Uig. *ärk* 'might, power,' there is a similar Mongolian word *erke*, which already appears in the *Secret History of Mongols* of the thirteenth century, while one finds *erklig* (Lalita. Subhā.) accompanied by the Turkic possessive suffix *-lig* in the early Buddhist texts. This *erklig* can safely be taken to have been borrowed from Uig. *ärklig*. Later *erklig* developed into *erlig* (Mp.), and was used side by side with *erke-tü*. Likewise, it is clear, because of its peculiar spelling, that Mong. *kkir* (Lalita. Subhā. Pañca. Mp. Kandj.) faithfully reflects Uig. *kkir* 'dirty, firth.' In addition to them, the following expressions settled as set phrases are also certain to have been borrowed from Uighur:<sup>22)</sup>

Mong. *ayaγ-qa tegimlig* <Uig. *ayaγ-qa tägimlig* 'worthy of respect'

Mong. *bilge bilig* <Uig. *bilgä bilig* 'wisdom'

Mong. *ed tavar* <Uig. *äd tavar* 'property'

Mong. *el ulus* (Lalita.) <Uig. *il ulus* 'state'

Mong. *ordu qarsi* <Uig. *ordu qarši* 'royal place'

Mong. *yirdinčü-deki* <Uig. *yirtinčü-täki* '(in this) world'

Mong. *bursaj quvraγ* <Uig. *bursaj quvraγ* 'monastic community'

## 4

In this section, some phonetic modifications are discussed which the forms borrowed from Uighur underwent in the course of settling in Mongolian.

## 4.1 Insertion and Addition of Vowels

The syllabic structure of Sanskrit and Sogdian are adapted to that of Mongolian.

- Skt. śāriputra>>Uig. śariputri Mong. śaribudiri (Bhaga.) śaribudari (Kandj.)  
 Skt. cakravartin>Sogd.>Uig. čkravrt/čakiravrt/čakiravart (BTT13 Sho-ava.) Mong. čakiravard (Subhā.) č'akiravard (Hp. 13–2)  
 Skt. citra>>Uig. čitri Mong. čitiri (Lalita.)  
 Skt. pratyekabuddha>>Uig. pratikabut/piratakabut (BTT13) Mong. bradikabud (Mp.) biratikabud (Bodhi.)/bardakbud (Mp. metathesis)  
 Skt. brāhmaṇa>>Uig. braman/biraman (Or. 109) Mong. biraman (Subhā. Lalita. Pañca. Fragment. Mp. Kandj.)  
 Skt. preta>>Uig. prit/pirit (Or. 108-Köŋül) Mong. birit (Kandj. Less.) biriti (Pañca.)  
 Skt. maitreya>>Uig. maytri/maydari (BTT3) Mong. maidari (Lalita. H.Zwei. Mp. Kandj. Bhadra. Less.)  
 Skt. kalpa>>Uig. kalp Mong. galb (Lalita. Subhā.) galab (H. Zwei. Mp. Kandj. Less.) ɣalab (Less.)

It is to be noted that the underlined Uighur forms which are cited from the texts of the Yuan Dynasty agree with corresponding Mongolian forms. They are obviously influenced by the contemporary Mongolian forms.

- Sogd. šmn'nc>Uig. šmnanč Mong. šimnanč (Bodhi.) šimnanča (Pañca. Mp.)  
 Sogd. 'wp's'nc>Uig. upasanč Mong. ubasanča (Pañca. Mp. Less.)  
 Skt. ksemam-kara>>Uig. kšimangkari Mong. aksemanggari (Kandj.)

Sogdian final cluster *-nc* is permissible in Uighur, and no example with *-a* added has been encountered. Therefore, the addition of *-a* found in the settled forms is ascribed to Mongolian development.<sup>23)</sup>

## 4.2 Assimilation of Vowels

- Skt. śloka>>Uig. šlok Mong. silüg (Lalita. Pañca. Mp. Kandj. Less.)

- Skt. *koti*>>Uig. *kolti* Mong. *költi* (Lalita. Subhā. H.Zwei. Mp.)  
 Skt. *sumeru*>>Uig. *sumir/sumur* Mong. *sümer* (Pañca. Subhā)/*sümür* (Subhā.)  
 Skt. *tuṣita*>>Uig. *tužit* Mong. *tüsid* (Lalita. Mp.)  
 Skt. *ratna*>>Uig. *ärdini* Mong. *erdini* (Lalita.) *ërdini* (Hp. a2–4) *erdeni* (Subhā. Kandj. Mp. Bhadra.)

Mong. *költi*, *sümer* and *tüsid* underwent regressive assimilation, while *silüg* and *erdeni*, progressive. The *e* of Mong. *sümer*, as well as that of *erdeni*, is lowered from *i*. There are other cases where Mong. *e* corresponds to Uig. *i*:

- Uig. *bilgä* (*bilig*) ‘wisdom’: Mong. *bilge* (*bilig*) (Ouig.-mong. Bhaga. Lalita.) *belge* (*bilig*) (Pañca. Bhadra. Kandj. Less.)  
 Uig. *sizik/säzik* (Or. 109) ‘doubt’: Mong. *sezig/sesig* (Bhadra. Mp.)  
 Uig. *yilvi*>Mong. *yelvi* (Lalita. Mp.) ‘illusion’  
 Uig. *birä* (measure of length): Mong. *bere*  
 Uig. *bičin* ‘monkey’: Mong. *bečin*

In view of its occurrence in texts written before the Buddhist influence, Mong. *belge* is hardly a loan word from Uig. *bilgä*, from which Mong. *bilge* apparently originates. As a matter of fact, Uig. *i* in the first syllable of the other four examples was pronounced as [e], i. e., a closed variant of *e*. However, since this *e* (i. e. [e]) otherwise corresponds to Mong. *i*, they may also be regarded as cases where the Uighur high vowels correspond to the Mongolian non-high. Uig. *säzik*, which contradicts this correspondence, is known to have been re-borrowed from Mong. *sezig*. Incidentally, *birä* and *bičin* are also loan words in Uighur but it is generally assumed that they were introduced into Mongolian via Uighur.

#### 4.3 Uvularization of Consonants

Some Sanskrit velar stops become uvularized when adjoined by back vowels (here Mong. *γ* standing for [G]):

- Skt. *kalpa*>>Uig. *kalp* Mong. *galb* (Lalita. Subhā.) *galab* (H. Zwei. Mp. Kandj. Less.)  
 γalb (Cause.)γalab (Less.)  
 Skt. *aṅgāraka*>>Uig. *angarak* Mong. *aṅgaraγ* (Mp. Kandj.)  
 Skt. *pādaka*>>Uig. *padak* Mong. *badag* (Bodhi.) *baday* (Less.)  
 Skt. *kalmāṣapāda*>>Uig. *kalmaṣapadi* Mong. *kalmaṣabadi* (Subhā.) *qalmasbadi* (Subhā.)

## 4.4 Insertion of Consonants

Skt. *sumeru*>>Uig. *sumir/sumur* Mong. *sümer* (Pañca. Subhā.)/*sümür* (Subhā.)  
*sümbür* (Mp.)

Skt. *adakavati*>>Mong. *adakavati* (Lalita. Pañca.) *adakavanti* (Lalita. Kandj.)

Skt. *vyākṛta*>>Uig. *vyakrit* Mong. *viyakirid* (Lalita.) *viyaḡgirid* (H. Zwei.) *vivaḡgird/*  
*vivaḡgirid* (Mp. Kandj.)

*b* of *sümbür* is an intrusive consonant introduced between *m* and the following *ü*; *sümbür* then ousted *sümer* and *sümür*. The remaining two examples show homoorganic nasals intruded before plosives. Similar phenomena are also met with in Uighur, e.g., Uig. *šilavandi* (<Skt. *šilavat* BTT 7), *vayročanda* (<Skt. *vairocana* BTT 8).

## 4.5 Other Consonant Changes

v>ö/o

Skt. *vajra*>>Uig. *včir* Mong. *včir* (Lalita. H.Zwei. Kandj.)  
*öčir/öčir* (Kandj. Less.)

v>b

Skt. *vasubandhu*>>Uig. *vasubandu* Mong. *basubandu* (Kandj.)

Skt. *virūpākṣa*>>Uig. *virupakši* Mong. *virubagsi* (Pañca.)  
*birubagsi* (Kandj.)/*birubagsa* (Mp.)

Skt. *virūdhaka*>>Uig. *virudaki* Mong. *virudaki* (Pañca. H.Zwei.)  
*birudaki* (Kandj.)/*birudaka* (Mp.)

Uig. *tavar*>Mong. *tavar* (Pañca. Mp.)  
*tabar* (Subhā. Expiation. Cause.)

v>u

Skt. *tattva*>>Mong. *dadu* (Kandj.)

Skt. *ratnasambhava*>>Uig. *ratna-sanbavi/ratnasambau-a* (BTT7. Or. 109)  
*mong. ratn-a sambau-a* (H.Zwei.)

Skt. *śrīdeva*>>Mong. *siri diu-a* (Lalita.)

Skt. *urubilvā*>>Mong. *urubilu-a* (Lalita.)

Skt. *mahādeva*>>Uig. *maxadivi* Mong. *maqadivi/maha-a diu-a* (Subhā.)

y>v

Skt. *maudgalyā-yana*>>Uig. *motgalayani/motokalyini* Mong. *modgalvani* (Pañca.)  
*motgalavani* (Mp.)

- Skt. vyākṛta>>Uig. vyakrit Mong. viyakirid (Lalita.) viyaṅgirid (H.Zwei.)  
vivagṅgird/vivaṅgirid (Mp. Kandj.)
- Skt. ṅg/mk/mkh>>Uig. ng/nk: Mong. ṅg
- Skt. aṅgulimāla>>Uig. aṅgulamali/angulmali Mong. aṅgulmali (Subhā.)
- Skt. asamkhyeya>>Uig. asanki Mong. asanki (Lalita.)  
asagṅgi (H.Zwei. Mp. Less.)
- Skt. dīpaṃkara>>Uig. dipankari/dipaṅkara-širi-inyana (BTT8)  
Mong. dibagṅgara (Lalita. Pañca. Kandj.)
- Skt. kalviṅka>>Uig. kalvink/kalavaṅki (BTT3) Mong. galabigṅga (Kandj.)
- Skt. -jñā(-)/-jñā(-)>Uig. -tya/-tyi Mong. -diya(-)/-jna(-)/-nča(-)/-nja(-)
- Skt. prajñā/prajñā>>Uig. pratya Mong. bradiya (Kandj.)  
brajina (Mp. Kandj.) branča/branja  
(Kandj.)
- Skt. abhijñā>>Uig. abitiyi Mong. abinča (Kandj.)

Of these, the change  $v > b$ ,  $v > u$  and  $ṅg/mk/mkh > ṅg$ , some of whose examples are given above, are often seen in Buddhist Uighur texts of the Yuan Dynasty, e.g., Skt. *vīnā* > *bini* (Or. 109), *piṇḍapāta* > Toch. A *pinwāt* > *pinbat* (BTT 7), *dharmasambhava* > *darmasambaua* (Or. 109), *antarābhava* > *antirabau* (Or. 109), *ankura* > *aṅkuri* (BTT 7), *mangala* > *mangal* (BTT 7 Or. 109), etc.

Some Mongolian forms borrowed from Uighur underwent parallel modifications to those found in their Uighur counterparts. This phenomenon is certainly due to the activities of the Uighur and Mongolian monks living in the same environment, and the above-mentioned consonant changes are peculiar to those Uighur texts which were written during the Yuan Dynasty.

## 5

Compared with the Buddhist terms found in the typical Uighur literary languages, many Mongolian forms represent the later stage of development. As stated above, some of these modifications are ascribed to Mongolian itself, but there are still others which are due to the Tibetan influence. Already in the earlier texts one finds Sanskrit forms which were introduced from Tibetan and were settled at the expense of the earlier Uighur forms. See the following examples:

- Mong. ananda (Pañca. Hp. 13 Less.) Uig. anant<<Skt. ānanda
- Mong. ganga (Pañca. Subhā. Kanj.) Uig. gang<<skt. gaṅgā
- Mong. magada (Pañca. Lalita.) Uig. magat<<Skt. magadha



Mong. darma (Pañca. Lalita. Kandj.) Uig. darm<<Skt. dharma

Mong. udpala (Pañca. Mp.) Uig. utpal<<Skt. utpala

Sometimes forms which came via Uighur and those via other routes were contaminated into new forms. For example, Uig. *čixšapat/čixšaput* was borrowed from Sogd. *cxš'pδ*, and this Uighur form entered directly into Mongolian, cf. Mong. *čiyšabd* (Bodhi.), *čayšabad* (Subhā. Expiation.). Later, through the contamination of this form and Skt. *śikṣāpada* introduced via Tibetan, new forms *šayšabad* (Lalita. Pañca. Fragment. Mp. Less.) and *šakšabad* (Bhadra.) appeared and were subsequently settled. One also finds *aksobhi* in some texts made during the Ching Dynasty (e.g. Kandj., etc.), where special letters were devised to reproduce Sanskrit spellings; this may likewise be due to the contamination between Skt. *aksobhya* on the one hand, and *aqsobil/aksobi* (Pañca. H. Zwei.) on the other, the latter of which was borrowed from Uig. *akšobi* via Tocharian.

There are also some cases, where two forms which participated in contamination were both borrowed from Uighur. Beside the synonym *tüsid* from Uig. *tužid* (<<Skt. *tusita*), Skt. *santusita* entered into Uighur via Tocharian as *santušuti/santušiti*, which was later introduced into Mongolian as *santusiti* (Pañca.). Mong. *santusid* (Kandj.) is therefore to be taken as the cross between *santusiti* and *tüsid*. It may be mentioned in passing that, apart from Mong. *gandarvi* (Pañca. Bodhi.) which is from Uig. *gandarvi* (<<Skt. *gandharva*), *gandari* is also found in later texts such as Mp.; this *gandari* seems to be due to the contamination between *gandarvi* and *kinari* (<Uig. *kinari* <<Skt. *kinara*), because the both have a similar meaning, i.e., 'musician in heaven,' and often appear in the same context.

A considerable length of time must have lain until the above-discussed modifications and contaminations were completed, and accordingly the appearance of these later forms in some texts can be taken as the indication that the texts in question are relatively young. Although due reservation should be made because older texts were often revised and renewed, those texts in which Uighur forms concentrate may safely be classified as older against younger ones, where fewer Uighur forms appear. Moreover, some forms show quite accurately that the texts in which they appear were written in the early stage. For example, Mong. *čiyšabd* (Bodhi.) from Skt. *śikṣāpada* is found only in the texts produced before the settlement of the contaminated forms *šayšabad* and *šakšabad* attested already in early texts. Likewise, an Uighur form *bilgä*, which was borrowed into Mongolian in a combination *bilgä bilig*, does not appear in later texts, because, soon after the borrowing, *bilgä* of this combination was replaced by a genuine Mongolian form *belge*, formally and semantically similar to *bilgä*.

Apart from the appearance of those forms which underwent the modifications in Mongolian, the alternation between the Sanskrit loan words borrowed via Tibetan and those forms via Uighur is also characteristic of younger texts:

Skt. abhidharma>>Uig. abidarim>Mong. abidarim (Bodhi.)  
abidarma (Mp.)

Skt. abhijit>>Uig. abiči>Mong. abiči (Pañca. Mp.)  
abijit (Kandj.)

Skt. bodhisattva>>Uig. bodistv> Mong. bodistv (Bodhi. Lalita. Mp.)  
bodisatuva (Kandj.)/bodisaduba (Mp.)

## 6

In spite of the later replacement by those introduced via other languages, one still finds a considerable number of Sanskrit loans borrowed from Uighur in classical (i.e. later) Buddhist Mongolian texts. The greater part of the Uighur texts, on the other hand, has been lost and those which we can see today are not very large in number and amount. Therefore, Sanskrit forms once existent in Uighur can be reconstructed by means of those loans inherited in Mongolian. For example, of the names of pretas given in section two, the forms which Uighur lacks could be restored as follows:

Skt.	Toch.	Uig.	Pañca.
skandha	> skandhe(A)	> *skandi/*iskandi	> iskandi
unmada	> —	> *udmadi	> udmadi/udmandi
chāyā	> —	> *čai	> čai

In general, the Uighur intermediary of Sanskrit loan words in Mongolian is betrayed in their endings. The following are some Uighur forms thus reconstructed, the numbers referring to the Uighur-Tocharian rules discussed in the first section:

- (1) Skt. cārumanta>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. čarumanti (Lalita.) Uig. \*čarumanti
- (3) Skt. ālokakara>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. alokakar (Lalita.) Uig. \*alokakar
- (3) Skt. āmaṅgala>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. amaṅgal (Lalita.) Uig. \*amangal
- (1) Skt. ānandita>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. anandati (Lalita.) Uig. \*ananditi/\*anandati
- (1) Skt. ārāḍa-kālāma>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. aratakalmi (Lalita.) Uig. \*aratakalmi
- (3) Skt. ayuta>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. ayut (Mp.) Uig. \*ayut
- (7) Skt. vakkalin>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. bakali (Kandj.) Uig. \*vakali
- (3) Skt. pāṇḍava>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. bandab (Lalita.) Uig. \*pandap
- (3) Skt. karnikāra>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. karnikar (Mp.) Uig. \*karnikar

- (1) Skt. ratna-garuda>Toch.>Uig.>Mong. ratnagarudi (Kandj.) Uig. \*ratna-garuti

A much larger number of forms will be collected, if other Mongolian texts, really huge in amount, are surveyed. By systematizing those reconstructed forms, it will not be impossible to estimate the nature and quantity of Buddhist Uighur texts lost now.<sup>24)</sup>

### NOTES

- 1) *maqaraq* in the second paragraph of Nishida's text is corrected by the present author to *maqarač*, because the reading of *č* is clear on the facsimile. See also Ligeti (1972: 86). It may be noticed that in Röhrborn's text *h* and *h/g* in combination with back vowels are phonemic transcriptions of the letter Q, e.g., *oglan* for 'WQL'N, which is transcribed as *oylan* in the rest of this paper.
- 2) See Nishida (1957: 258, Note 2), where he identifies it with Skt. *sarvavid*. In view of the Uighur form, however, his identification may well be discarded.
- 3) Cf. *sarva-vidya* 'possessing all science,' and *sarvavidyā* 'all science' (Monier p. 1187). On *ming* 明 'recognition, knowledge, learning' translating Skt. *vidyā*, see Nakamura (1975: 1306–b). Röhrborn's \**sarvavijña*, if it really exists, also means 'all-kundig, all-gelehrt' (Röhrborn 1980: 328).
- 4) In Uighur, either *-yi* or *i* corresponds to the Sanskrit ending *-ya* of an animate noun. In this case the Mongolian form *sarvaviti* reflects the latter, cf. Skt. *aksobhya* >Uig. *akšobi*>Mong. *aqšobi*.
- 5) See Mironov (1928/29), Shogaito (1978) and Moerloose (1980).
- 6) For the edition of this text, see Aalto (1961).
- 7) See Damdinsüren (1979: 40, 44 colophon A). On the basically same colophon of the *Pañcaraksā*, see Aalto (1979: 117), with the facsimile reproduced on p. 206, 8v.
- 8) Edited by Poppe (1967).
- 9) For the details of this point, see Poppe (1967: 13).
- 10) Two fragments of the *Mahāmāyūrī* are known in Uighur (cf. Radloff 1928 No. 60), and one fragment from the commentary of the *Pañcaraksā* is published (*ibid.* No. 103). However, the fragmentary nature of these MSS does not allow the direct comparison with the Mongolian version.
- 11) Words belonging to this category are also found in this Mongolian list, e.g., Mong. *sirawast* (Pañca.) < Uig. *šravst* << Skt. *śrāvastī*, Mong. *baranas* (Pañca.) < Uig. *baranas* < Skt. *vārānasī*, etc.
- 12) There are a considerable number of words which are modified in other parts than endings, e.g., Mong. *istirayastiris* (Pañca.) <Uig. *āstrayastriš* <<Skt. *trāyastriṣa*, Mong. *matar* (Lalita. Mp.) <Uig. *matar* <Toch. A *mātār* < Skt. *makara* and Mong. *usnir* (Lalita. H. Zwei. Kandj.) <Uig. *ušnir* < Toch. A *usnir* < Skt. *usnīsa*.
- 13) The form directly deriving from Uig. *krakasundi* was settled in Mongolian, and even in the rest of the *Pañcaraksā*, this form is met with. Cf. also *karakasundi* (Lalita.), *gargasundi* (Kandj.) and *garguwasundi* (Bhadra.).
- 14) See Shogaito (1978: 84) and (1982: 16).
- 15) Of the *Pañcaraksā* two xylographs are known, one preserved in Stockholm and the other in Leningrad. The above-quoted list of the yaksas and their living places is cited from the text edited by Aalto who based his edition on the Stockholm xylograph dated 1686. But, as far as this list is concerned, there is no basic difference between the Stockholm and Leningrad xylographs, on the latter of which is the colophon mentioned in note 7).
- 16) In this article, the photo copy of the manuscript made by S. Julian which is now deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) is consulted.
- 17) Other examples are: Sogd. *šmnw* > Uig. *šimnu* > Mong. *simnu* > *simnus* (Bodhi. H. Zwei. Kandj.

Mp.) and Sogd. *nyzβ'ny* > Uig. *nizvani* > Mong. *nisvani* > *nisvanis* (Prajña. Lalita. Kandj.).

18) See TT VII pp. 9–14 Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

19) Rachmeti gives *sušak* as the Uighur form corresponding to *visākhā* (14). This word appears in the two texts (Nos. 1 and 2) edited in TT VII. In the case of text No. 2 his reading can be examined against the facsimile, which clearly shows SWS'K. Since the Uighur letter S can stand both for *s* and *š*, Rachmeti transcribed the second S as *š* in the face of the Sanskrit counterpart. Here the Mongolian form is transcribed as *šusak*, because the manuscript of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* has in the initial a letter *š* diacritically differentiated from S and an ambiguous letter S in the second syllable. Therefore, it seems to me to be fit to transcribe the Uighur as either *šusak* or *sušak*.

I take this opportunity to cite the following names of the nine luminaries (*nava-graha*) from the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, Nos. 3008–3014. While the names for *āditya* 'the sun' and *śoma* 'the moon' are translated into Mongolian and *śukra* 'Venus' is borrowed from Sanskrit, the rest seem to reflect the Uighur forms.

Skt.	TT VII.	Mahāvvyut.	Chin.
āditya	aditya	naran	日
soma	soma	saran	月
aṅgāraka	aggarak	aggraq	火星
budha	bud	bud	水星
brhaspati	barxasuvadi	briqasbadi	木星
śukra	šükür	šukra	金星
śanaścara	šanišcar	sanisčar	土星
rāhu	raxu	raqu	羅睺
ketu	kitu	kidu	計都

20) In the *Lalitavistara*, *čai* appears in the following context:

basa mön qatayū-jiqui čay-tur sildegen-ü kümün nandi nandibali ner-e-ten ökid edür-tür naiman jayun biraman-nuyud-ta čai bariju...

'Also, at the time when he was bearing hardship, the maids Nandā and Nandabalā, village inhabitants, served tea daily to eight hundred brahmans,' (Poppe 1967: 51, 143)

However, *čai* 'tea,' though quite common in the modern languages of Central Asia, has not been attested in the Uighur texts of the Yuan Dynasty, whereas *čayši* (< Chin. 齋食) is found in the similar contexts:

irši-lār iligi burxan bašin bursaj quvray-iy čayši-qa ötünsär män

'when I offered foods to the monastic community, beginning with Buddha, the King of Rsis,' (Shogaito 1982: 62, 63)

Therefore, it is advisable to consider *čai* of the *Lalitavistara* not as denoting 'tea' but as representing Chin. 齋.

21) For this word, see also Mong. *vaisiravani* (Lalita. Kandj.) borrowed from Tocharian via Uighur, cf., Uig. *vaiširavani* < Skt. *vaiśravana*.

22) One finds the following sentence in the *Lalitavistara* (52v.):

kasari arslan metü kürkirejü ireküi

'Coming while roaring like buffaloes and lions' (Poppe 1967: 57, 150)

Though Poppe derives *kasari* from Skt. *kāsara* 'buffalo,' the facsimile clearly shows the spelling KYS'RY (*hisari*), which apparently contradicts his interpretation. In Uighur *kišari* from Skt. *keśarin* 'lion' constitutes a hendyadis with *arslan* 'id.', e.g., *kiši körklüg kišari arslan xani* 'a (Kešarin) Lion King with a human body' (Shogaito 1982: 52, 53). One may be entitled to identify *hisari arslan* of the *Lalitavistara* with this expression.

- 23) Some expressions borrowed from Uighur in set phrases appear without final *-a*, e.g., *toin šamnanč ubasi ubasanč* (Fragment.) <Uig. *toyin šmnanč upasi upasanč*.>
- 24) It is well-known that the Manchu inherited Mongolian Buddhism, and among Buddhist Manchu texts one finds Uighur forms borrowed via Mongolian. Some examples are given below:

Skt. *brāhmaṇa*>>Uig. *braman*>Mong. *biraman*>Man. *biraman*

Skt. *adhishṭhita*>>Uig. *adištit*>Mong. *adistid*>Man. *adistit*

Skt. *śāsana*>>Uig. *šažin*>Mong. *šasin*>Man. *šajin*

Skt. *pratyekabuddha*>>Uig. *pratikabut*>Mong. *bradikabud*>Man. *bradikabut*

Skt. *anāgāmin*>>Uig. *anagam*>Mong. *anagam*>Man. *anagam*

Sogd. *xwrmzt*'>Uig. *xormuzta*>Mong. *qormusda*>Man. *hormosda*

Sogd. 'zrw'>Uig. *äzrua*>Mong. *esrua*>Man. *esrua*

Since the Manchu script is able to represent phonetic value more exactly than the Mongolian and the Uighur, the exact pronunciations of some forms found in the two languages can be inferred from their Manchu counterparts. For example, it can be understood from Man. *šajin* that *s* of Mong. *šasin* was pronounced with [ʒ]. The transcription of [ʒ] with a letter *s* is peculiar to Uighur of the Yuan Dynasty and the Mongolian spelling *šasin* may have been based on this Uighur habit.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY (abbreviations given in <pointed brackets>)

- Aalto, P. (1954), "Prolegomena to an Edition of the Pañcarakṣā", *Studia Orientalia Edidit Societas Orientalis Fennica* XIX: 12, (Helsinki), pp. 1–48.
- (1961), *Qutuy-tu Pañcarakṣā Kemekü Tabun Sakıyan Neretü Yeke Kölgen Sudur*, Asiatische Forschungen, Band 10. (Wiesbaden). <Pañca.>
- Bosson, J. (1969), *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian* (Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 92, Indiana University Publication). <Subhā.>
- Damdinsüren, Ts. (1979), "Two Mongolian Colophons to the Suvarṇaprabhāṣot-tama-sūtra", *AOH*. XXXIII (1), pp. 39–58.
- Heissig, W. (1976), "Zwei mutamasslich mongolische Yüan-Übersetzungen und ihr Nachdruck", von 1431, *Zentralasiatische Studien*, 10, pp. 7–115. <H.Zwei.>
- Kara, G. und Zieme, P. (1976), *Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung*, Berliner Turfantexte VII (Berlin). <BTT7>.
- (1977), *Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas 'Tiefer Weg' von Sa-skya Paṇḍita und der Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*, Berliner Turfantexte VIII (Berlin) <BTT8>.
- Lessing, F. (1960), *Mongolian-English Dictionary* (University of California Press). <Less.>

- Lévi, M.S. (1915), "Catalogue géographique des yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī", *JA*, 1915, pp. 19–138.
- Ligeti, L. (1942), *Catologue du kanṣur mongol imprimé*, vol. I. Catalogue (Budapest).
- (1972), *Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa, pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise*, Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta III (Budapest).
- (1972), *Monuments préclassiques I. XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta II (Budapest). 'Le Bodistv-a čary-a avatar et son Commentaire. 1312' <Bodhi.>. 'Hymne de Mahākālī, <Mahākālī>. 'Sur les causes et effets des péchés' <Cause.>. 'Expiation du religieux pécheur' <Expiation>. 'Exercices d'écriture ouigouro-mongole' <Ouig. -mong.>. 'Fragments bouddhiques' <Fragment>. 'Bhagavatī-prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya' <Bhaga.>.
- Mahāvīyutpatti, Dictionnaire bouddhique tétraglotte copié sur le Manuscrit N: 25147 de l'Université de St. Pétersbourg* (Paris), MDCCCLVI-MDCCCLVII <Mp.>.
- Mironov, N.D., (1928/29), "Kuchean Studies 1," *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 6, pp. 89–169, 274–276.
- Moerloose, E. (1980), "Sanskrit Loan Words in Uighur", *TUBA* 4, pp. 61–78.
- Monier-Williams, M. (1899), *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford University Press).
- Nakamura, H. (1975), *Bukkyō Daijiten* [Great Dictionary of Buddhist Terms], Tokyo.
- Nishida, T. (1957), "Hp'ags-pa large script", "Hp'ags-pa small script" (in Japanese), in: J. Murata (ed.), *Chü-Yung-Kuan*, vol. I, Faculty of Engineering, Kyoto University, Kyoto, pp. 148–60, 243–69.
- Poppe, N. (1957), *The Mongolian Monuments in Hp'ags-pa Script*, Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen, Band 8 (Wiesbaden), <Hp.>.
- (1967), *The Twelve Deeds of Buddha, A Mongolian Version of the Lalitavistara*, Asiatische Forschungen, Band 23 (Wiesbaden). <Lalita.>.
- Poucha, P., *Institutiones Linguae Tocharicae* (Pars I, Praha).
- Radroff, W. (1928), *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler, Materialien nach dem Tode des Verfassers mit Ergänzungen von S. Malov herausgegeben* (Leningrad).
- Raghu Vira (1985), *Mongol-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Mongol-pitaka Vol. 1 (New Delhi). <Kandj.>.
- Röhrborn, K. und Sertkaya, O. (1980), "Die alttürkische Inschrift am Tor-Stüpa von Chü-yung-kuan" *ZDMG* Band 130–Heft 2, pp. 304–339.
- Shogaito, M. (1978), "On the Routes of the Loan Words of Indic Origin in the Old Uigur Language" (in Japanese), *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 15, 1978, pp. 79–110.
- (1982), *On the Two Buddhist Uigur Texts* (Studies in the Old Uigur Texts and Language I), Kobe City University, Kobe.
- Tekin, S. (1980), *Buddhistische Uigurica aus der Yüan-Zeit*, Asiatische Forschungen, Band 69 (Wiesbaden). <Or. 108.>.
- Tezcan, S. (1974), *Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra*, Berliner Turfantexte III (Berlin). <BTT3.>.

- Thomas, W. (1964), *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*, Band II (Heidelberg).
- Weller, F. (1928), *Tausend Buddhanamen des Bhadrakalpa* (Leipzig). <Bhadra.>.
- Zieme, P. und Kara, G. (1978), *Ein uigurisches Totenbuch* (Budapest). <Or. 109.>.
- Zieme, P. (1985), *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*, Berliner Turfan-  
texte XIII (Berlin). <BTT13.>.

