

Werk

Titel: On an ancient Uyghur Yarkand document in Arabic Script

Autor: Osmanov , Mirsultan; Jingwei , Li; Shangyi , Jim

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1999

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003 | LOG_0015

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

On an ancient Uyghur Yarkand document in Arabic script

Mirsultan Osmanov & Li Jingwei & Jin Shangyi

Osmanov, Mirsultan & Li Jingwei & Jin Shangyi 1999. On an ancient Uyghur Yarkand document in Arabic script. *Turkic Languages* 3, 43-55.

This is a re-examination of the Turkic Yarkand documents examined in Huart (1914), Erdal (1984), and Gronk (1986).

Mirsultan Osmanov, *Language and Script Committee*, *Xinhua nan lu* 41, 83000 Urumqi, P. R. China.

Li Jingwei & Jin Shangyi, *Language Department, Xinjiang Institute of Technology (Gonxue yvan)*, 830008 Urumqi, P. R. China.

1. Introduction

At the beginning of this century on the outskirts of Yarkand under a certain flowering tree, nineteen Qarakhanid-period documents were found. The whereabouts of six are unknown, namely four Uyghur documents in Arabic script, and two Arabic-language documents (Lin 1992: 97). Those that are published or available for research at present are the following: Three documents in Huart (1914); five Arabic-language documents in Gronk (1986); and five Ancient Uyghur documents in Erdal (1984), four in Sogdian script and one in Arabic script.

Recently, we decided to re-examine the Arabic-script Ancient Uyghur document in light of Erdal's article. What follows are the preliminary results of our investigation.

The document that Erdal analyzed was first studied by the English scholar E. Denison Ross (whose analysis we unfortunately haven't seen). In 1942 the English Iranicist Minorsky supplemented Ross' copy

and Persian translation with his own English translation and annotations (Minorsky 1942).

This copy appears in Plate VII of Erdal (1984), based on Minorsky's reprint (1942: 191). For reference we have appended the revised reproduction that appears in Erdal (1984) at the end of this article.

The text of the revised facsimile is written on horizontally-scored white paper; like other Islamic-period documents (i.e. post-10th c.), it opens with the exhortation: "Allahu bismilla irahim" The original document had a total of twelve lines, written from right to left in an Arabic-script-based Ancient Uyghur. An interlinear Persian translation, as appears here, was added later. In the main text, most of the words enclosed in parentheses do not have a Persian translation below them; it appears the translator was unsure of their meaning. The last two lines of the document contain a name list of witnesses. The copyist used short vertical strokes to separate their names.

The transcriptions below are based on accepted methods of transcribing Old Turkic documents; i.e. *t* = retroflex *t*; (...) = omitted from original, /.../ = text unclear. In addition, we have used the following symbols: *j* = [ɟ]; *z*-hacek = [ʒ]; *h* = [ɦ].

Transcription of the Ancient Uyghur text

- 1 *bu ol hät turur kim bi{l}ik*
this is document stay-AO CONJ knowledge

tanuqlari-ni hat ahirid(a) yad qilildi (.)
witness-ACC document end-LOC record do-PSS-PT.III
- 2 *men h(ä)s(ä)n h(oj)j aj-niŋ oyli*
I (pers.name)) Hajj-POSS son

m(u)h(äm)m(ä)d hajib iqrar qildük /s(u)lumas/-qa
(personal name) testify do-PT.Ipl. (pers.name)-DAT
- 3 *bir kesäk iki /yük/ orni yer*
one piece two yuk place-III land

sa(t)tim tört h(ä)(d)di birlä miŋ yarmaqa
sell-PT-Isg. four border together thousand yarmak

- 4 *bu yerniŋ äwwäl h(ä)(d)di b(a)t(i)q*
this land-POSS first border mud

ariq (.) ikkinč h(ä)(d)di m(ä)s'ud toyril sü-baši
ditch second border (pers.name) officer

- 5 *yeri (.) üçünč h(ä)(d)di č(i)mkat qaši (.)*
land-III third border (toponym) embankment

törtünč h(ä)(d)di h(o)jjaji hajib yeri üzh-
fourth border Hajj Hajib land-III mulberry

- 6 *mälik (.) t(a)n(u)q bu tört h(ä)(d)d içindäki yerni*
orchard (extra word) this four border inside-?LOC land-ACC

sattim b(ä)hasi t(ü)käl buldum (.) yerni
sell.PT-Isg. price-III completely become-PT-III land-ACC

- 7 *israfil hawli sü baši-ya opsarladim (.)*
(pers.name) officer-DAT hand.over-PT.Isg.

bu yer birlä kimgä ersä dä'wa
this land together who-DAT COP-COND dispute

- 8 *d(ä)stan yoq (.) kim dä'wa qilsa*
evil.plot not exist who dispute do-COND

dä'wasi batil turur tep d(u)r(u)st-luq
dispute.III invalid stay-AOR (say) realize?-

- 9 *üčün yil beš yüz on beš /tabsğa(n)?, nak/*
for year five hundred fifteen /hare?/

yili r(ä)be'äl'ahir ayinda bu
year fourth month-LOC this

- 10 *hät* *h(uj)j(ä)t* *berdim* (.) *(d(a)st-ih(ä)t* *m(u)h(ä)m(mä)d* *haj(i)b/*
document text give-PT-Isg. ?writer (pers.name)
- 11 *men* *ʔum(ä)r* (.) *men* *ʔuθman* (.) *men*
I (pers.name) I (pers.name) I
- sü baši* (.) *bu* *b(ä)yʔ* *üzä* *t(a)n(u)q* *men* (.) *män*
officer this transaction in witness I I
- 12 *ʔadir* *dash(u)d* *oğli* *t(a)nuq* *men* (.) *ähm(ä)d* *dashud* *t(a)n(u)q* *men*
(pers.name) son-III witness I (pers.name) witness I

2. Annotations

The line number is followed by the word number, in parentheses.

1 (3) *hät*.

From Arabic ‘character, word; letter; document’. Similar semantically to Ancient Uyghur *bitig*.

1 (5) *kim*.

Used here as a conjunction; the following clause is the attributive clause of the *hät* in the previous main clause.

1 (6) *bitik* [sic!] *bi{l}ik*.

Erdal believed this could have been a scribal error of the possessive suffix *-niŋ*, or *aniŋ* ‘its’. But considering the context of the entire document, and the fact that the Persian translation has *dana* ‘knowledge’, *bilik* must have been miswritten as *bitik*.

1 (7) *tanuqlar-ni*.

Erdal transcribed this as *tanuqlar (a)ti* ‘the names of witnesses’, interpreting the accusative suffix as *ati* ‘their names’. Perhaps this interpretation is the result of studying other documents with similar copying errors, but Erdal himself attached a question mark to his interpretation. The Persian translation uses an accusative postposition, suggesting *-ni* in the Turkic text. However, the collocation of an accusative *-ni* with the passive-reflexive verb *qilildi* is rather unusual.

1 (9) *ahirid(a)*.

The final *a* was not written by the copyist.

1 (10) *yad*.

From Persian ‘record’.

2 (2) *h(ä)s(ä)n*.

Erdal transcribed this as *h(u)s(e)n*, based on Huart’s fifth Arabic document: *M(u)h(a)m(ma)d bin al-hag(i)b bin al-H(u)s(e)yn al-h(a)gh(gh)agh bin Nöš-tegin ögä*.

2 (3) *h(oj)jaj*.

Transcribed by Erdal as *h(a)j(j)č* (N.B.: Erdal’s *gh* = our *j*). But the orthography of the time did not distinguish *j* and *č*; although this copy has *č*, it should be read *j* (i.e. [ǧ]). In the facsimile, this word appears as *h(oj)j as*. On top of the *s*, a *č* is written. This is an error. We believe that *h(oj)jaj* is a doubled form of *haj(i)* ‘pilgrim, person on a Hajj’.

2 (4) *-niḡ*.

This is a possessive suffix, yet is written separately from *h(oj)jaj*; written above the latter is *bäg*, but this does not appear in the Persian translation. From the traces of writing it appears that the Persian translator added *bäg* above the text. Perhaps in the original the possessive suffix *-niḡ* was unclear, and the translator suspected it was *bäg*.

2 (7) *iqrar*.

From Arabic ‘admission, recognition’.

2 (8) *qildük*.

Based on vowel harmony this should read *qilduq* (*qil-* ‘do’ + Ipl. past tense *-duq*). Given the context, it shouldn’t be plural, but rather a singular (*qildim*) although the Persian translator also used the first-person plural past tense. Perhaps this is also due to scribal error. Erdal has *qild(im) k(i)?*.

2 (9) *sulumas-qa* (~ *salumas-qa*).

Erdal transcribed this as *Sönmasta*, and suggested it was a toponym. The Persian translator added parentheses around *sulumas*; everywhere pa-

parentheses appear are places where the Persian translator was unsure of the meaning. *-mas* is very likely the imperfect negative adjectival suffix (cf. *yarimas*, *körmäs*, *pütmäs*, *tügimäs*). However, the Persian translator probably didn't understand the preceding part (*sul-* ~ *sal-*), hence the parentheses.

This word however is not a toponym, but rather it is the name of the person purchasing the land. The following suffix is *-qa*, not *-ta*: This is very clear if one compares it with the *-qa* at the end of the third line.

3 (4) *yük*.

This word is not translated into Persian; under the line of the [OU] original are only empty parentheses. The word means 'load' originally; it is used here to express the crop-carrying capacity of the land (i.e., how much seed can be sown on a given piece of land). It is a precise unit of weight. In the mercantile texts unearthed at Turfan, most used the unit *šiy* 'hectoliter', or *küri* 'decaliter' as land quantities; these are usually interpreted as "land that can be sown with xx *šiy* (or *küri*) of seed" (cf. Li 1996: 121). From this example, one could translate *iki / yük / orni yer* as "land that can be sown with two *yük* of grain". In addition, in Bukhara it equalled eight *pud*'; that is, one *yük* equals 16.38 kg (Budagov 1871: 379).

3 (12) *yarmaq*.

This was due to the influence of the Qarakhanid fondness of Islamic culture, in which they used three grades of currency: The *dinar* (gold), the *dirxan* (silver), and the *farsi* (copper). In Ancient Uyghur, the *dinar* is called *yarmaq* (Lin 1992: 103).

4 (5-6) *b(a)t(i)q ariq*.

The Persian translator also wrote *batiq ariq* according to the original form, yet at the beginning of the line outside of the pair of lines appears the Persian *nahr-u joy* 'stream; irrigation ditch'; this corresponds to Modern Uyghur *petiq eriq* 'big'.

4 (11) *sü-baši*.

From *sü* 'troops' + *baši* 'head of', i.e., 'leader of the troops, officer'. It appears that this was an official position or a rank of nobility; we trans-

late it here as ‘officer’. The Persian has ‘water administrator’. Since *u* and *ü* are not distinguished in this document, the Persian translator misinterpreted *sü* ‘troops’ as *su* ‘water’.

5 (4-5) *čimkat qaši*.

The Persian translator has *kenare čimkät* (‘čimkat’s border(s)’). Here the meaning of *čimkat* is not clear; it could be the name of a village or residential area. *qaš* is used to indicate the boundaries of this village or area, delineated by a rather high embankment. It is similar to the high embankments (also called *qaš*) that are built in the present day to stop river irrigation canal water from overflowing its banks.

5 (8) *h(oj)jaji*.

Erdal transcribed this as *h(oj)jači*, mistakenly, it seems. This is the land-seller’s honorific name.

7 (2) *hawli*.

Erdal transcribed this as *čawli*. Although this word was originally written as *čawli*, the original copyist and the Persian translator crossed out the three dots under the *č*. The Persian gives *hawli*, not *čawli*. In any case, the meaning of this word is unclear; here, we treat it as a personal name.

7 (5) *opsarladim*.

Erdal transcribed this as *uspa(r)ladim*. The Persian translation means ‘hand over, deliver’. We believe *opsar* is a root, *-la-* the Turkic verbalizing suffix, and *-dim* the first person singular past tense, if one compares Modern Uyghur *yoputmaq* ‘cover, conceal’. This appears in an early-twentieth century Chaghatay dictionary as *oputmaq* (Šeyx Süleymān 1298: 24). Certain Modern Uyghur dialects also have *oputmaq*. Given the semantic equivalence of these to the Persian gloss in the current text, we consider *opsar* (and its derivative verb *opsarla-*) to be cognate with Modern Uyghur *yapsar* (and its derivatives *yapsarlaš-*, *yapsar kältürüş*, etc.) ‘binded tightly, put / stuck tightly together’ (said of e.g. two pieces of wood stuck / glued tightly together). Hence a / the sense of ‘hand over’ for Ancient Uyghur *opsarla-* is plausible.

8 (7) *batil*.

Arabic ‘useless, invalid’. The original is written squeezed between the tops of the previous and following words, but the corresponding Arabic term below is clearly in line with the other words.

9 (2-6) *yıl beş yüz on beş*.

‘Year 515’, according to the Islamic calendar; corresponds to 1121-1122 A.D.

9 (7-8) */tabşğan nak/*.

Not transcribed by Erdal. This edition of the text has two words, but they are unclear. It seems the copyist couldn’t read the original very well, and therefore did not provide a Persian translation, instead just drawing empty parentheses. Under careful examination, the first word is *tabşyan*, the second, *nak*. However, the usual dot above the *n* is not written, and *tabşyan* is written *baburşya*, followed by a letter that might be *t* or *s*. [*tabşyan* may well refer to the ‘Year of the Hare’ according to the Chinese *ganzhi* Heavenly Stems and Earthly Branches dating system.] Particularly if we consider the preceding *yıl beş yüz on beş* (Year 515 = 1121-1122 A.D.), the Year of the Ox or Year of the Tiger), *tabşyan* should be 1123 A.D., and *nak* should be 1124 A.D., since the Year of the Hare follows the Years of the Ox and Tiger.

It seems that the copyist could not entirely make up his mind about the year nomenclature. Although the Islamic calendar-years in this type of document can be readily converted into Christian calendar-years, they do not mesh well with the Chinese *ganzhi* system of recording years. For dating this text, therefore, it is safest to use the date from the Islamic system (i.e., year 515) rather than the Chinese year system.

9 (10) *r(ä)beʔäl'ahir*.

Erdal transcribed this as *rabi'(a)'lah(i)r* ‘the fourth month (of the Islamic calendar)’.

10 (2) *h(uj)j(a)t*.

From Arabic, originally in the sense of ‘text, document’. Here together with *hät*, it forms a matched pair.

10 (4-6) /*d(ä)st-i-h(ä)t muhämmed hajib*/.

That which appears between slashes here was circled by the Persian copyist. It simply means ‘by the hand of Muhammet Hajib’. Perhaps the copyist wanted to indicate here that this was indeed Muhammet’s own signature. Erdal’s transliteration doesn’t have *d(ä)st-i-h(ä)t*.

11 (2) *ʔum(är)*.

Erdal transcribed ‘(U)m(a)r.

11 (4) *ʔuθman*.

Erdal transcribed ‘(U)θman.

11 (6-7) *sü baši*.

In this copy it is *nu baši*, a mistaken reading of the original by the copyist. In our opinion, this refers either to the man *israfil hawli sü baši* himself (the man who was commissioned to sell the aforementioned land), or it refers to *m(ä)s’ud toyril sü baši*, the owner of the second piece of property which was contiguous with the land in question. [5] The Persian has *mansab* ‘official post or title’.

12 (1) *ʔadir*.

Erdal transcribed *Qādir*.

12 (2) *dash(u)d*.

Not written clearly, and not transcribed by Erdal. The Persian has ‘patronym’.

12 (7) *dashud*.

Also not transcribed by Erdal; the Persian annotation has ‘nickname’, erroneously. We think that *das(u)d* in 12 (2) and *dashud* in 12 (7) constitute the same personal name. *Dashud* must be the father of the brothers *ʔahm(ä)d* and *ʔadir*, in 12 (6) and 12 (1), respectively.

3. Translation

- 1 This is a document in which the names of witnesses appear at the end.
- 2 I, Muhammed Haji, son of Häsän Haji, testify: I (take)
- 3 one piece of [land] plantable with two yük of seed, with four borders, and sell it to Sulumas [for a price of] 1,000 yarmaqs.
- 4 The first boundary of this land is a bog; the second boundary is Officer Mäs'ud Toyril's
- 5 land; the third is the boundary embankment of Chimkat village; the fourth is the land of Haji Hahib. A mulberry
- 6 orchard. I sell the land within these four boundaries. I have already received the total sum. I have already [taken] this land and
- 7 handed it over to Officer Israfil Hawli. As far as the land is concerned, no matter who it may be, they must have a dispute.
- 8 If anyone brings up a dispute, then this dispute is invalid. In order to confirm [it], I
- 9 [on] the fourth month of the year 515 [the Year of the Hare],
- 10 refer to this document. / [Here is] Muhammed Hajib's signature / mark./
- 11 I, Umar, I Othman, I Officer serve as witnesses to the transaction in this document. I,
- 12 Adir, son of Dashud, am a witness; Ähmäd Dashud is also a witness.

Compared to the Ancient Uyghur documents unearthed at Turfan, the language of the Yarkand documents also has a few characteristics, especially its use of numerous Arabic and Persian loanwords (and Arabic / Persian roots with Ancient Uyghur suffixes). Also, some consonants are not represented in Turfan Uyghur documents such as this one.

4. Appendix

Those lexical items which appear in the text are listed below, categorized according to language of origin, with a bare root as header, followed by its inflected form, if any. A text location number follows (e.g. 1 (9) = line 1, 9th word).

Arabic loanwords

<i>ahir</i>	‘after; last’
<i>ahirda</i>	1 (9)
<i>äwwäl</i>	‘before; first’ 4 (3)
<i>batil</i>	‘invalid, useless’ 8 (7)
<i>b(ä)ha</i>	‘price’
<i>b(ä)hasi</i>	6 (9)
<i>b(ä)y?</i>	‘transaction’ 11 (8)
<i>dä’wa</i>	‘dispute’ 7 (10), 8 (4)
<i>dä’wası</i>	8 (6)
<i>h(ä)(d)d</i>	‘boundary’ 6 (5)
<i>h(ä)(d)dı</i>	3 (9), 4 (4), 5 (3), 5 (7)
<i>hajib</i>	‘official’; also used as term of address 10 (7)
<i>h(u)j(ä)t</i>	‘document, official dispatch’ 10 (2)
<i>hät</i>	‘document’ 1 (3), 1 (8), 10 (1)
<i>iqrar</i>	‘admission, recognition’
<i>iqrar qildük</i>	2 (7-8)
<i>r(ä)be²äl’ahir</i>	‘fourth month of the Islamic calendar’ 9 (10)

[Iranic-] Persian loanwords

<i>d(ä)stan</i>	‘cunning plot, ruse’ 8 (1)
<i>d(u)r(u)st-luq</i>	‘accurate, precise’ 8 (10)
<i>kim</i>	(conj.) kim 1 (5)
<i>yad</i>	‘memory, record’ 1 (10)
<i>üčün</i>	‘for, because of’ 9 (1)

Ancient Uyghur lexical items

<i>ariq</i>	‘stream; irrigation canal / ditch’ 4 (6)
<i>ay</i>	‘moon; month’
<i>ayinda</i>	9 (11)
<i>är-</i>	‘to be’
<i>ärsä</i>	7 (9)

<i>b(a)t(i)q</i>	‘mud’
<i>b(a)t(i)q ariq</i>	4 (5-6)
<i>ber-</i>	‘to give, hand over’
<i>berdim</i>	10 (3)
<i>biš</i>	‘five’ 9 (3), 9 (5)
<i>bitik</i>	‘document’ 1 (6)
<i>bir</i>	‘one’ 3 (1)
<i>birlä</i>	‘together’ 3 (10), 7 (7)
<i>bu</i>	‘this’ 1 (1), 4 (1), 6 (3), 7 (5), 9 (12), 11 (7)
<i>bul-</i>	‘to receive’ ??b/c
<i>buldum</i>	6 (11)
<i>ič</i>	‘inside’
<i>ičindäki</i>	‘inside’ (adj.) 6 (6)
<i>i(k)ki</i>	‘two’ 3 (3)
<i>i(k)kinč</i>	‘second’ 4 (7)
<i>kesäk</i>	‘piece, clump (of earth)’ 3 (2)
<i>kim</i>	‘who?’ 8 (3)

References

- Budagov, L. 1871. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' turecko-tatarskix narječij* 2. Sanktpeterburg.
- Erdal, Marcel 1984. The Turkish Yarkand documents. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47, 260-301.
- Gronk, M. 1986. The Turkish Yarkand documents. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 49, 455-507.
- Huart, C. 1914. Trois actes notaires arabes de Yarkend. *Journal Asiatique* 4, 607-627.
- Li Jingwei 1996. *Tulufan Huiguwen shehui jingji wenshu yanjiu* [Research on Turfan Ancient Uyghur socioeconomic documents]. Ürümqi: Xinjiang Renmin Publishers.
- Lin Meicun 1992. You guan Shache faxian de Kalaxan wangchao wenxin de jige wenti [Some issues about the Qarakhanid documents discovered at Yarkand]. *Xiyu yanjiu* 2.
- Minorsky, V. 1942. Some early documents in Persian 1. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1942, 181-194.

Translated by Arienne M. Dwyer.

[illegible]