DIALECTAL ELEMENTS IN THE VOCABULARY OF THE UYGHUR KHANATE INSCRIPTIONS

ERHAN AYDIN

İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey, Faculty of Science and Literature,
Department of Turkish Language and Literature,
e-mail: erhan.aydin@inonu.edu.tr

One of the significant problems with Old Turkic inscriptions is that it is not known by which peoples' or tribe's Turkic language the inscriptions were written in. Although among the clans and persons who wrote and erected the large inscriptions of the Turkic and Uyghur Khanates, those of Köl Tegin, Bilge Kaghan, Şine Usu, Tariat, Tes and Karabalghasun I were identified, the peoples or clans having erected the other inscriptions are mostly unknown. The most serious problem encountered by researchers in consideration of the tribal seals present in the inscriptions is the uncertainty whether the seal belonged to the tribe that wrote or erected the inscription, or the tribe that was in power at that time.

This paper investigates the inscriptions of the Uyghur Khanate. Our scrutiny is based on the examination of the peculiarities of the Uyghur Khanate inscriptions which cannot be observed in any other inscriptions of Mongolia, Yenisei, Altai and Kyrgyzstan. By substituting these peculiar words with other words to be found in other inscriptions, an attempt has been made to prove that these words are Uyghur dialectal words. After an inquiry whether the words were used subsequent to the runic period, etymological suggestions concerning the words have also been put forward.

Key words: Old Turkic, Old Turkic inscriptions, Uyghur Khanate, vocabulary, dialectal elements.

Introduction

One of the basic problems with Old Turkic inscriptions is the fact that almost all of them are undated, the best example being the inscriptions of the Yenisei Region. An additional problem is that in most cases it is difficult to identify the Turkic people or clan that wrote or erected them. Although some of the clans and persons who wrote and erected the large inscriptions of the Turkic and Uyghur Khanates, those of Köl Tegin, Bilge Kaghan, Şine Usu, Tariat, Tes and Karabalghasun I were identified, the peoples or clans erecting the other inscriptions are for the most part unknown. Studies that

treated the seals of these inscriptions have met a major dilemma since one can by no means ascertain whether the seals belonged to the clan of the individual who erected the inscription or to the clan in administration. For instance, although the inscriptions of the Yenisei region, a significant terrain for Old Turkic inscriptions, were classified in a numerical order, I. V. Kormušin (1997) in his book *Тюркские енисейские эпитафии, тексты и исследования* arranged the inscriptions according to their seals, not in the numerical order. The underlying idea of Kormušin's method was that the inscriptions bearing the same or similar seals were written by the same clan or people. However, it is rather difficult to identify the people or clan by the seal since there is no definitive information on the seals of the clans in the writing of Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī's *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*. Besides, the seals depicted by Kāshgharī were specific to Oghuz clans. Thus the problem is related to the inscriptions found in Mongolia, Altai and Kyrgyzstan. Inscriptions bearing the same stamp might have been written by the same people, however, they might as well bear the seal of the administering or ruling clan. Perhaps the only seals we could be certain about are the Uyghur clan seals, since the inscription on the northern side of the ŠU inscription bears the same seal as the Chinese–Uyghur epitaph found in Xi'an.

There is no doubt that the Tes, Ta, ŠU and Karabalghasun I (QB I) inscriptions were documents of the Uyghur Khanate. The seal on the Qarı Čor epitaph, discovered at Xi'an towards the end of 2012, replicated the seal found on the northern side of the ŠU inscription, showing that the Uyghurs had erected both inscriptions. The Karabalghasun II, Sevrey, Sudji, Hoyto–Tamir (HT), Gurvaljiyn–Uul and Arhanan inscriptions are also regarded by some as artifacts of the Uyghurs.

In this paper research will be made into single words and phrases found on Uyghur Khanate inscriptions. Attempt is made to prove that these words and phrases do not occur on the major Turkic inscriptions such as Köl Tegin, Bilge Kaghan, Tonyukuk, Ongi and Küli Čor, but other words were used in their stead. Based on this fact the paper arrives at the conclusion that the special words on Uyghur Khanate inscriptions unattested elsewhere must have been dialectal elements of the Uyghur language. *Twenty-four* words will be scrutinised below with a special view to their possible etymologies.

The Word Material

1. adın 'other' (Tes E 2).
Tes E 2: *anta adın ödkün̲č̲ qaγan ärmiš* <…> "Other than that (one of them) was the
    false khan <…>".

T. Tekin (1990, p. 394) corrected the spelling as *anta adın*, stating that S. Kljaštornyj's spelling which connected the two words as *antadan* cannot be attested in any area of the Turkic languages. However, M. Erdal (2004, p. 204) still reads it as *antadan ~ antadın*. Erdal's reference should be *antada ~ muntada*, a usage common in Uyghur texts.

This word, commonly observed in Uyghur texts, was first analysed by W. Bang (1980, p. 30) who deconstructed it as *ad-(ı)n* and regarded the suffix -*n* as a suffix forming a deverbal noun: < *adına-* < *adınaγu*. In addition, Bang claims that the suffix +*sIG* was equivalent to +*sI* in Ottoman in the form *adınčıγ* < *adınsıγ* and gives the examples of *ärkäksi* (masculine), *qadınsı* (feminine). DTS (p. 10) cites examples from the Uyghur literature with the meaning of 'другой, иной'. After citing Bang's view, K. Röhrborn (UW, pp. 48–51) presents examples formed with the case suffix in Uyghur texts. Y.-S. Li (2004, pp. 59–60) cautiously claims that the word has been conjugated from the verb *ad-* 'to be otherwise' using the gerundial suffix -ᵒ*n* and used with the ablative suffix. Li's examples also go back only as far as the Uyghur period. Li, after giving examples from ancient periods, refers to the modern Turkic forms such as Yak. *atın*, Dolg. *atın*.

According to Erdal (2004, p. 160) the word *adın-aγu* 'other(s)' is derived from the word *adın* using the collective suffix. He also states that the word *adın* should basically derive from the verb *adır-* 'to separate' (op. cit., p. 334). For *adınčıγ* see ED p. 63 and UW p. 51.

2. ančıp 'afterwards' (Tes N 2, Tes E 3, ŠU E 7, 8, ŠU W 1, 4, 5).

Tes N 2: *anıŋ eli üč yüz yıl el tutmıš a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ bodunı bardı* "His homeland, homeland for three hundred years, afterwards its people left".

Tes E 3: *el tutdı a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ yašı tägdi* "he held (organised) the homeland. Afterwards his age added up (died)".

ŠU E 7: *tarduš tölis bodunqa bertim a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ bars yılqa čik tapa yorıdım* "I appointed (them as administrators) to the Tarduš and Tölis tribes. Afterwards, in the year of the leopard (750) I marched towards the Čik".

ŠU E 8: *bälgümün bitigimin a̲n̲t̲a̲ yaratıtdım a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ ol yıl küzün ilgärü yorıdım* "I created my seal (and) inscription there. Afterwords I marched towards east in that year's autumn".

ŠU W 1: <...> *a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ säkizin̲č̲ ay üč yaŋıqa yor[ıdım?]* "<…> afterwards, I proceeded on the third day of the eighth month".

ŠU W 4: *γs¹n¹γ yo̲q̲ qılmıš a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ kälti eki qızın* "<…> destroyed. Afterwards (thus), came. With two daughters".

ŠU W 5: <…> *a̲n̲č̲ı̲p̲ s²čg²n² soγ[da]q tawγačqa säläŋädä bay ba̲l̲ıq yapıtı bertim* "<…> afterwards <…> I came to procure (the city of) Baybalık at the Selenge (river) for the Sogdian(s) (and) Chinese".

In addition to these seven examples from the Uyghur Khanate inscriptions, the word was also attested in Bichiktu-boom X (A 77) of the Altai inscriptions. Albeit the line was not very clear, Tybykova–Nevskaya–Erdal (2012, p. 64) read and explained the meaning of *ančıp* as 'так'.

Clauson (ED, pp. 173b–174a), stated that the word was *ančıp* from *anča ärip*, and the meaning could be interpreted as 'this being so', 'so much for that'. Since Clauson exemplifies his thesis with the ŠU inscription, the Irq Bitig and scripts from later periods, it has been claimed that it was not used in periods later than the Uyghur era. Erdal (2004, pp. 201, 327) noted that the word means 'doing that, thereupon' and

he claims that the word *ınčıp*, used extensively in Uyghur texts, was formed by adding the suffix *-p* to the form *ınča*. E. Ragagnin (2010), after citing earlier views, gives examples from northeastern Turkic languages and provides names derived from the Sayan Turkic verbs of *ınǰa-* 'to act like that', *mınǰa-* 'to act like this' and *ganǰa-* 'to act in which way, to behave how' and questions if these verbs used in Sayan Turkic were of ancient origins. (Also see DTS, p. 44.)

3. aqız- 'set against' (Tes N 3, Ta E 2).

Tes N 3: *boz oq bašın aqıza učuz kölkä atlıγın tökä barmıš* "(He) set (leader of) Grey Arrow(s) against (the enemy), dumped (them) into Lake Učuz (with) their horses".

Ta E 2: <...> *[bodu]nı aqıza barmıš uč[uz köl]kä atlıγın tökä barmıš* "<…> suppressed the people, dumped (them) into Lake Učuz with their horses".

In runic texts, the verb *aq-* does not occur. However, since the derivatives of the verb *aq-* were used, it should have existed in that period. For example, *aqıt-* 'to make someone to raid' (KT N 8, T 35). In the name *aqınču alp bilgä čigši* observed in the first line of the north face of the Ta inscription, the word *aqınču* should have been formed by adding *-(X)nčU* + suffix to the verb *aq-*. M. Erdal (OTWF, pp. 285–290) provides some examples for that suffix: *alqınču, ärinčü, ınanču, ilinčü, qalınču, üzlünčü*.

The verb *aqız-* made with the causative suffix *-z-* and *aqıt-* (KT and T) with the causative suffix *-t-* were attested in two Uyghur inscriptions. It also occurs in Uyghur texts in the form *aqız-*. The *aqıt-* 'can flow' form witnessed in TT III, 163 (Bang–Gabain 1931, p. 465) demonstrates that this is the original meaning of the verb *aqıt-*, but it should be added that this form, used in the runic period, was a literary expression in a figurative meaning. Tekin (1990, p. 392) admitted that he misread the same expression in the Ta inscription and concluded that the correct form should be *aqız-*, with the addition of the gerundial suffix *-a*, *aqıza* (see also Tekin 2003, p. 237).

In the following epochs of Turkic the causative form of the verb *aq-* was used only with its basic meaning. For example, in the *Lugat-i Nevaiyye* in entries *aqızdı, aqızdıŋ, aqızmaq* and *aqızur*, the causative form of the verb *aq-* is apparent and its meaning is 'flow of the water' (Kaçalin 2010, p. 132).

If there is no mistake in reading the letters of the verb *aqız-* and the adverb *aqıza*, it is a significant finding for the vocabulary of the Uyghur inscriptions.

4. arqar 'the mountain sheep' (ŠU S 1).

ŠU S 1: *ärtiš ügüzüg arqar bašı tuši anta är qamıš altın . [ya]nta s<...>p käčdim* "At the junction(?) (of) Irtysh River (called) head of Arqar, there made of cane, down under <…> I passed".

Among the runic texts the word occurs only in ŠU S 1. It was used in the placename *arqar bašı* and read by everbody in this way (Aydın 2011a, p. 78).

According to Doerfer (TMEN I, No. 12) the word was borrowed into Mongolian from its form *arqarı* 'sein Wildschaf', and thence into Manchu as *arγali* 'weibliches Wildschaf, Ovis ammon'. It is worth mentioning that this animal did not live in

the steppes, but in higher mountains like Altai and Khangai and could not be found in certain mountains of Mongolia, e.g. Khentii Mountains. Clauson (ED, p. 131a) mentioned that the missing phrases in the section *är qamıš altın .nta s..p* could be complemented as *yanta sallap* the meaning of which would be "putting the men on rafts below the reeds". In the entry *baš*, he interpreted *arqar bašı* as 'the mountain sheep's head' (ED, p. 375a–b) and assigned the meaning 'the mountain sheep, Ovis argali' to the word *arqar* Clauson (ED, p. 216b). He also cited the form found in ŠU inscription, adding that the Mo. word *arγali* was borrowed from Turkic. DTS (p. 54) refers also to the word *arqar* mentioned by Kāshgharī: 'архар, аргали, горный баран'.

For *arqar*, mentioned in ŠU inscription, Kāshgharī construed 'boynuzundan bıçak yapılan dişi dağ keçisi: female mountain goat, whose horns were used to produce knives' (Atalay 1992/I, p. 117, 214, 421). Also see: *arqarγalca* 'species of deer'. It is a species of red deer: 'kızıl keyik' (Pavet de Courteille 1972, p. 14), *arqa γalča* 'a species of red deer' (ŠS, p. 9). The difference between Pavet de Courteille and ŠS might be due to a misspelling. In *The King's Dictionary* (Golden 2000, p. 220), *arqar* was mentioned as a Tu. and Mo. word. In modern Turkic languages; Kirg. *arxar* 'female of mountain goat' (Yudahin 1988, p. 47), Alt. *arqar* 'wild sheep' (Baskakov–Toshchakova 1999, p. 28) and Uyg. *arhar* 'wild sheep' (Necip 1995, p. 16) forms survive. Although the form *arqar* is not observed in Turkish and its dialects spoken in Turkey today, *arγali* 'wild sheep' used in Turkish is related to *arqar*: *arγalı* 'yaban koyunu, dağ koyunu, dağ keçisi: wild sheep, mountain sheep, mountain goat' (Toven 2004, p. 32), *arγalı* 'yabani koyun: wild sheep' (Kestelli 2004, p. 16). H. Eren (1999, pp. 16–17) reports that the name of the animal he describes as 'Sibirya ve Orta Asya'da yaşayan, büyük boynuzları olan yaban koyunu (*Ovis argali*): wild sheep (*Ovis argali*) with large horns living in Siberia and Central Asia' was originally Mongolian, however, *arγali* came from Turkic *arqar*; and Fars. *āryālī* came from Mongolian. Vgl. *arγalı* 'das argali-schaf, wilde gems' < Otü. *arqar* (Ramstedt 1976, p. 13). The word is used in Mongolian writing as *arγali*: 'Argali, mountain sheep (female)' (Lessing 1960, p. 52). (See also VEWT, p. 26; Aydın 2008, pp. 202–204; 2012, pp. 45–47.)

5. ayur 'narrator, teller' (Ta N 5, 5).

Ta N 5: *[bunı] bitigmä bunı yaratıγma bilgä qutluγ tarqan säŋün bun̲ča bodunuγ atın yolın ayıγma qanım? e̲čisi? eki ayur tedi qutluγ bilgä säŋün urušu qutluγ tarqan säŋün ol eki ayur* "whoever writes ('tis), creates 'tis (is) Bilgä Qutluγ Tarqan Sängün. Two narrators? told (narrated), (who were) the uncle(s) of the my khan?, who said (narrated) the names, reputations of all these clans. These two narrators? (who were called) Qutluγ Bilgä Sängün and Qutluγ Tarqan Sängün".

This form found in Ta inscription was presented at the international symposium organised in Ulaanbaatar during August 15–16, 2011 entitled "The Progressive Epochs of Turkish Culture: The Age of the Beginnings and Inscriptions" in this author's presentation "New Reading and Interpretation Proposals for the 5th Line of the Northern Side of the Tariat Inscription". The word found in the middle and at the end of the

line was interpreted by Kljaštornyj (1982, pp. 342, 345) as *ol-eki yor* "these two (persons)", Tekin (1983, pp. 807–811) as *ol eki yur* "these two brothers in law", Kljaštornyj (1988, p. 277) as *ol-eki yor* "to two (persons)", Katayama (1999, p. 170, 172) as *ol eki yur* "these two men are brothers-in-law(?)". As could be understood by the readings, the word *yur* was interpreted as *yurč* 'brother-in-law.' The fact that the word meaning 'brother-in-law' is *yurč* forced the publishers to add a question mark next to the interpretation. It is very unlikely that the scribe made a mistake in a word used twice in the same line by omitting the final -*č* twice. The word does not have a meaning when read as *yor* or *yur*. If the word is prefixed with an *A*, it would turn into *ayur*, then it would have the meaning of 'narrator'. Since the line speaks about the maker, writer and narrators of the inscription from the beginning, it could be appropriate to interpret the word *ayur* as the 'narrator.' It could also be interpreted that the word *ayur* was created from the verb *ay-* by using the -*(U)r*+ suffix to create an adjective from a verb. Gabain (1950, § 128, § 150) gives numerous examples of words constituted by using the suffix -*r* to create deverbal nouns and adjectives: *tilär* 'Gottes-anbeterin (*tilä-* 'bitten')', *ot öčüri* 'des Feuers Verlöschen', *ögdir* 'Preis' and *säwär* 'lieb', *učar* 'fliegender', *közünür* 'erscheinender, augenblicklicher'. This word that we proposed to read and interpret as *ayur* 'narrator', has not yet been attested in any text.

6. bälgü 'stamp' (Tes S 3, Ta W 2, ŠU E 8, 9).

Tes S 3: *bälgüsin bitigin bo urtı bo yaratdı* "That (person) deserved his stamp and scripture and that (person) created".

Ta W 2: *bıŋ yıl<l>ıg tümän künlük bitigimin bälgümün bunta* "my writing and stamp (destined to last for) one thousand years (and) ten thousand days, here".

ŠU E 8: *bälgümün bitigimin anta yaratıtdım* "I created there my stamp (and) my writing".

ŠU E 9: *bıŋ yıllıq tümän künlük bitigimin bälgümün anta yası tašqa* "my writing and stamp (destined to last for) one thousand years (and) ten thousand days, there on the flat stone".

The word was not attested in any runic text other than the Uyghur Khanate inscriptions. Doerfer (TMEN I, No. 94) states that the word could be early Turkic **bälgö*. Fundamentally, the main point made by Doerfer is the fact that the word passed on to the European languages from Turkic. Clauson (ED, p. 340a) interpreted it as 'sign, mark' and stated cautiously that it could be *bälgö* and the Mongolian form was borrowed from Turkic. Clauson provides the example in Toyok text from Orkun (1938, p. 58) and the example in ŠU inscription. (For Toyok text, see also Yıldırım 2013, p. 454.) It has been used as *bälgü* in other historical periods of Turkish (ED, p. 340a). Räsänen (VEWT, p. 69) accepts the word as originating from the root **bäl* and gives examples from other Turkic languages. (For Mongolian forms see Ramstedt 1976, p. 46.)

The word *tamγa* 'stamp' could not be found in runic texts, however, the word *tamγačı* (KT N 13, 13) occurs. The fact that the word *bälgü* appears in Uyghur inscriptions instead of *tamγa* could be interpreted as a dialectal factor.

7. bältir '(river) junction' (ŠU E 9, ŠU S 10).

ŠU E 9: *yawaš toquš bältirintä a<u>nt</u>a yayladım* "I spent the summer at Yavaş and To-
      kuş (rivers) junction".

ŠU S 10: *orǧon balıqlıɣ bältirintä el örginin a<u>nt</u>a örgipän etitdim* "I built and ar-
      ranged the throne (administrative centre) of the country at the junction of Or-
      khon (River) (and) Balıqlıɣ (River)".

No specimens were found in the runic texts other than the two above. Clauson
(ED, p. 334a) interprets the word as 'the junction of two or more rivers' and states
that it was borrowed into Mongolian as *bälčir*. Clauson, referring to Radloff, states
that it was borrowed into northeastern Turkic languages as *pältir* and enumerates the
examples of Khak. *píltir*, Tuv. *bäldir* and the examples in ŠU inscription and also pro-
vides examples from Uyghur and Karakhanid. We can learn from Kāshgharī 's (Atalay
1992/I, p. 456) data (*taɣ bäldiri*) that the word was not only used to describe river
junctions, but the meeting point of the mountains were also called *bältir ~ bäldir*.
Räsänen (VEWT, p. 69) interprets the word with the wide meaning of 'Kreuzweg'
and refers to other Turkic languages as well. The initial meaning of the word must
have been 'the meeting point of two rivers' as can be seen from the Mo. *bälčir* (see
also Ramstedt 1976, p. 42).

8. bošun- 'escape, to break free' (ŠU E 7), **bošunul-** 'escape, to break free' (ŠU E 7).

ŠU E 7: *öt<u>ük</u>än irin qıšladım yaɣ<ı>da bošuna bošunuldum* "I spent the winter in
      northern Ötüken. I escaped from the enemy (and was) at ease".

The word was not attested in other runic texts. Clauson (ED, p. 383a−b) con-
siders the verb as the reflexive form of *bošu:-*. He interprets that example in ŠU in-
scription as *yaɣıda bošuna bošunladım*. He provides examples from later periods in
the form of *bošan-*. In the entry for *bošun-* in DTS (p. 115) the above example from
ŠU inscription was not included. It is obvious that the verb was formed from the
noun *boš* 'empty' (VEWT, p. 82). Tietze (2002, p. 303) treated the verb *bošan-* under
two different headings: *bošan-* (1) 'kendini bir yerden kurtarmak = to save one's self
from a place', (2) 'kocası tarafından bırakılmak; eşinden ayrılmak = left by her hus-
band: to be separated from the partner'. It is not quite understandable why Tietze con-
sidered the basically same meanings of the verb in two different entries.

9. čıt 'fence, border stones or pegs surrounding the military quarters' (Tes S 2, Ta W
      1, 2, ŠU E 8, 9, ŠU S 2).

Tes S 2: *<...>[tä]zig qasar qur<ı>ɣ ǧontı čıt tikdi* "<…> Settled on Tes (River's)
      (source?), West of Kasar. Built fence".

Ta W 1: *örgin [a<u>nt</u>a etitdim čıt] a<u>nt</u>a yaratıtdım* "(There I made them set the) throne,
      (and) made them stroke (the fence) there".

Ta W 2: *örgin bu<u>nt</u>a yaratı<t>dım čıt bu<u>nt</u>a toqıtdım* "Here I made them set the
      throne, (and) made them stroke the fence here".

ŠU E 8: *örgin a<u>nt</u>a etitdim čıt a<u>nt</u>a toqıtdım* "There I made them set the throne, (and)
      made them stroke the fence there".

ŠU E 9: *örgin anta yaratıtdım čıt anta toġıtdım* "There I made them set the throne, (and) made them stroke the fence there".

ŠU S 2: *täz bašı čıtımın² yayladım* "(I made them construct) my fence at the source of the (River) Tes and spent the summer (there)".

Doerfer (TMEN III, No. 1152) designates the word as *čēt* and does not mention any example from the runic period. He provides examples only from other periods and the modern Turkish language. In his entry on the word, Clauson (ED, p. 401b) sets the vowel as *ı*, but states it was written also as *i* and *ä*, and in addition to the ŠU inscription puts forward examples from different periods of Turkic. As Clauson mentions, originally the word had a velar vowel, but in the subsequent periods it was also written with a front vowel as *ä* or *i*. (See also Eren 1999, p. 95; Tietze 2002, p. 455.)

10. egil '(ordinary) people' (ŠU E 2).

ŠU E 2: *qara egil bodunuγ yoq qılmadım* "I did not annihilate the ordinary people (commons)".

The word occurs only once in runic texts. By pointing at the specimen in ŠU, Clauson (ED, p. 106a) gives the definition of 'common, ordinary, lower class' and states that the Mo. form is *ägäl*. Gabain (1950, p. 310) assigns the meaning of 'umumî, dünyevî = public, earthly' to the word. It is a word that has not been attested in any other runic texts, but used solely in the Uyghur inscriptions. (See also DTS, p. 204.)

11. ılaγ 'valley, pasture' (Ta W 4, 5).

Ta W 4: *ekin ara ılaγım tarıγlaγım säkiz säläŋä ...* "among (these) two of my valleys (and) my fields eight (armed) Selenge (River)…"

Ta W 5: *<…> ič ılaγım ötükän yiri ongı tar[qan] süy ...* "<…> my inner pasture Ötüken, in the north Ongı Tarkan Süy…"

The word in the 4th line of the inscription was read as *ılγım* by Šinekhüü and Kljaštornyj, and as *ılγam* by Tekin and Berta; the example in the 5th line of the Ta inscription was read as *čalγım* by Kljaštornyj, as *ılγam* by Tekin, as *///-laγım* by Katayama, and as *...lγm* by Berta.

Tekin (1983, p. 818) mentions in his notes that the word after *ılaγ* is *tarıγlaγ*, and the one before it should be a word that could form hendiadys and he states that it could be *yılγa, cılγa* 'river'. As far as I know, the first person who read the word in the right way was Katayama (1999, pp. 168–176). In his paper about this word, S. Şen (2010, pp. 105–106) states that by opening it up as *ı+laγ* and identifying it as 'woodland, copse' and forming reduplication with *tarıγlaγ,* it should therefore be understood as 'my lands'. He also states that there are several examples of *ı tarıγ* reduplication in Uyghur texts, however, *ılaγ tarıγlaγ* reduplication was not seen in these texts. For the suffix *+lAG* in the word, see OTWF pp. 108–109. The word has not been attested in the runic period texts or in any other periods of Turkic.

12. küt- 'to wait' (ŠU E 5).

ŠU E 5: *eki ay kütdüm kälmädi* "Two months I waited (for them but) they did not come".

Clauson (ED, p. 701a−b) identified it as *kü:δ-* meaning 'to wait' and 'to wait for (someone Acc.)'. Clauson stated that the origin of the verb was *küδ-* and evolved via the *-δ- > -d- > -t-* change into the verb *küt-* and provided examples from northeast and southeast Turkic languages. The fact that the word was seen in Uyghur texts with the consonant *δ* should have forced Clauson to write about this transformation. However, the specimen in ŠU was written with a *t*. Clauson also mentioned a discrepancy between the printed text and the facsimile for ŠU. He also provides samples that it was observed in *küδ-* and *küz-* forms in later periods of Turkic. It is obvious that in certain periods of Turkic, there were examples with *t*, *δ*, *z* and *y* sounds. Erdal (OTWF, pp. 196, 375−376 and 808) also accepts the verb as *küδ-*. (See also DTS, p. 324.)

13. ödkünč 'false, fake' (Tes E 2).

Tes E 2: <...> *eki ärmiš <u>anta</u> adın ödkünč qaγan ärmiš* <…> "<…> was two. Other than that (one of them) was the false khan <…>".

This is a rather debated text and read in different ways by different publishers of the inscription. Kljaštornyj read it as *öd känč*, and Berta as *öδkẅn,* while Tekin (1990, pp. 394−395) read and interpreted the word quite differently. Tekin considered the word as *ödkünč* 'fabrication, fake' and wanted to connect it to the verb *ödkün-* 'to imitate' known from other Turkic texts. According to Tekin, the word occcurs twice in the Kutadgu Bilig, but Arat read it as *ödgünč* and Clauson followed his suit. Tekin considers it one and the same with Osm. and Čag. *öykün-* 'to imitate'. According to Tekin, Šor and Sag. *öktän-* and *öktön-* are metathetical forms and Yak. *ütügün-* also goes back to the verb *ödkün-*. (For the examples in Kutadgu Bilig, see Arat 1979, p. 366; and for Clauson's *ötgünç* and *ötgün-* forms, see ED, p. 52a.) Erdal (OTWF, p. 277) also thought, in a cautious way, that the original form of the word could be **ödkün-*. Gülensoy (2007, p. 657), in his description of the item *ökün-*, compared it with *ökün-* 'to regret' and *ökünč* 'remorse'. But *ökün-* 'to regret' is another verb, and *ökün* and *öykün-* 'to imitate' go back to the verb **ödkün-*. This is corroborated also by Tel. *öktön-* 'to imitate'.

14. örgi- 'to establish a throne' (ŠU S 10).

örgin 'throne' (Tes S 2, Ta S 6, Ta W 1, 2, ŠU E 8, 9, ŠU W 6, ŠU S 10).

ŠU S 10: *el örginin <u>anta</u> örgipän etitdim* "I had the throne (administrative centre) of the country established there and had it put in order".

Tes S 2: *čıt tikdi örgin yaratdı yayladı* "He built fence, established the throne, (and) spent the summer (there)".

Ramstedt (1913, p. 53), compares the word *örgin* with Mo. *örgügä* and **örgü-*. See Mo. *örgägä / örgögä* 'residence or tent of a prince, palace of a khan or a person of rank, etc.' (VEWT, p. 374). Clauson (ED, p. 225b) relates the word to the verb *örgä-* and gives the meaning 'throne'. On the other hand, L. Clark (1977, p. 142) takes the root of the word that he considers Mongolian from the verb *ör-* 'to rise', assumes that the *-γın / -gin* suffix functioned as a deverbal suffix and compares it with the words *tér-* 'to gather together' > *térgin* 'gathered together, a concentration'; *yel-* 'to trot,

amble' > *yelgin* 'one who rides fast, traveller'; *kev-* 'to chew' > *kevgin* 'indigestible food (which must be chewed thoroughly)'. It is obvious that the word *örgin* used to designate the tent of the khan, built a little higher than the ground, can be derived from the verb *örgi-* 'to raise', since the verb *örgi-* appears once in ŠU S 10. Clark's idea that it was derived from the verb *ör-* by using the deverbal suffix *-Gın*, does not seem to be convincing. Furthermore, O. N. Tuna (1957, p. 67) assigns the meaning 'yığma tepe = stockpiled hill' to *örgin*, which is not possible. (See also Menges 1958; Esztergár 1963, p. 39; Erdal 1978, p. 88.)

The Mongolian form of the verb is *ärgü-* / *örü-*; while the Mongolian equivalent of Tu. *örgin* is *ärgügä(n)* / *örgügä(n)* (Tekin 1983, p. 816). Although Ramstedt, Räsänän and Clark argued that the word was originally Mongolian, I think it was the other way round: the Turkic word was borrowed into Mongolian.

15. suqaq 'female deer' (ŠU S 11).

ŠU S 11: *qara buluq öŋ[dü]n suqaq yulı anta čigil totoq <...>* "To the east of Qara Buluq, at Sukak Yulı (Gazelle Spring, Deer Spring), the military governor of the Čigil(s) < … >".

Various studies read the phrase as follows: Ramstedt (1913, p. 31) *sooqaq yolı* 'Sokak-weg'; Orkun (1936, p. 178) *sokak yolı* 'Sokak yolu = Sokak way'; Malov (1959, pp. 37, 42) *Soqaq (~ Šoqaq) yolı* 'дорога (~речка) Cокак'; Moriyasu (1999, pp. 181, 185) *suqaq yulı* 'Sukak-Yulı'; Berta (2004, pp. 296, 311) *sokwk yolı* 'Szokuk útja'; Aydın (2007, pp. 51, 62) *suukak yulı* 'Sukak Yulı (Ceylan Pınarı; Geyik Pınarı)', and Ölmez (2013, pp. 298, 304) *su^ukak yulı* 'Sukak Pınarı'.

Clauson (ED, pp. 808a, 918a) explains the meaning as 'female gazelle'. Kāshgharī (Atalay 1992/I, p. 214; 1992/II, p. 287) gives the word as *suqaq* 'sığın, geyik, beyaz geyik'. Erdal (2004, p. 112) considers the word as *suq-γaq < *suq-* 'to thrust (with the horns)'. The word has been used in other Turkish language periods: *suqaq* 'beyaz geyik' (Ş. Tekin 1976, p. 461), *suqaγ* 'a large deer species whose horns are used to make knife handles; narrow street' (Pavet de Courteille 1972, p. 357), *suqaγ* 'bir nevi büyük geyik' (ŠS, p. 191), *sokak* 'ala renkli geyik' (Toparlı – Vural – Karaatlı 2003, p. 238). See also *suqaγ, suqaq* 'Reh' (VEWT, p. 432; Hauenschild 2003, pp. 189 – 190; Aydın 2007, pp. 95 – 96; 2008, p. 204; 2012, pp. 152 – 153).

16. šıp (sıp?) 'colt?' (ŠU E 3, 4).

ŠU E 3: *säläŋä kedin yılun qol ber<i>din šıp bašıŋa tägi čärig etdim* "To the west of Selenge (River), from the southern tip of Yılun-Kol to the source of Şıp (River), I deployed soldiers".

ŠU E 4: *kärgün saqıšın šıp bašın körä? kälti* "The enemy came seeing? Kergü, Saqıš and Šıp (River) source".

This word was observed twice in runic texts. In Kāshgharī, it was mentioned as *sıp* 'iki yaşına girmiş olan tay = two-year-old colt' (Atalay 1992, Vol. I, pp. 207, 319; 1992, Vol. III, p. 158); *sıp aqur* 'hayvan torbası = animal bag' (Atalay 1992, Vol. I, p. 487); *sıp aqurı* 'hayvan torbası; iki yaşındaki tayın yem yediği yer = animal bag; the bag two years old colt eats from' (Atalay 1992, Vol. I, p. 487). Clauson (ED,

p. 375a) reads it in conjunction with the subsequent word as *sıp bašī* and assigns the meaning of 'the colt's head' to the word. In the item *sıp*, he gives the meaning of the word as 'a one-year-old colt' and compares it with *sıpa* 'a donkey colt from six months to a year' (ED, p. 783a). Eren (1999, p. 365) mentions that the final *-a* of *sıpa* is a suffix and could have been formed similarly to *buγra*. He also points to the fact that in modern Turkish languages different words were used to denote 'colt' and *sıpa* has a rather limited meaning. (See also Hauenschild 2003, pp. 185–186; Aydın 2007, pp. 78–79; 2008, pp. 204–205; 2012, p. 135.)

17. tapıg 'service' (ŠU W 5).
ŠU W 4–5: *eki qızın tapıγ bert[i]* "He performed service with two daughters".
      The word occurs only once in the runic texts. According to Clauson (ED, p. 437a–b) the verbal root of the word *tapıγ* 'service' is *tap-* and enumerates examples from Uyghur and later Turkic texts (see also TMEN Vol. II, No. 849; DTS, p. 534; Erdal 2004, p. 420).

18. tarıγlaγ 'field' (Ta W 4).
      The word *tarıγlaγ* that could be observed with *ılaγ* (see above) in the 4th line of the western side of the Ta inscription is a well-known and commonly attested word. However, early publishers have read it in a different way (see Tekin 1983, p. 818). For the suffix *+lAG*, see OTWF, pp. 108–109; see also ED pp. 541b–542a. Certain studies proposed that the word *tarlaγ* observed in the Yenisei inscriptions Aldıı–Bel I (E 12) 2nd line, Aldıı–Bel I (E 12) 3rd line and Aldıı–Bel II (E 72) 1st line also meant 'field', e.g. Orkun 1940, p. 53. However, the word *tarlaγ* in the Yenisei inscriptions did not mean 'field', but the name of the river Tarlaq (see Aydın 2011b, pp. 254–255; 2012, pp. 114–115).

19. tayγan 'hound, hound dog' (ŠU S 3).
ŠU S 3: *tayγan költä teriltim* "I gathered at Taygan Lake (again)".
      This word occurs once as a place-name in the runic texts. It is quoted in Kāshgharī (Atalay 1992, Vol. I, p. 421; 1992, Vol. II, pp. 15, 343; 1992, Vol. III, pp. 174, 175) as *tayγan* 'tazı, av köpeği = hound, hound dog'. Doerfer discussed the previous etymologies of the word, especially Ramstedt's comparison of Mo.-Tü. *tay* and Kor. *kańi, and noted that the word was formed from the verb *tay-* 'to slide' that was used in Southern Siberian Turkic languages, then borrowed into Mongolian as *tayiga*, and from Mongolian to Manchu as *taiha*. However, Doerfer (TMEN Vol. II, No. 866) did not relate the word to the place-name *tayγan köl* in ŠU. Räsänen (VEWT, p. 456) proposes an interesting etymology for *tayγan*: Mo. *tayi 'forest' + Tü. *qan 'dog'. Clauson (ED, p. 568b, 715a) defines it as an animal name formed with the *-GAn* suffix and meaning 'greyhound, borzoi', however, he does not relate the word to *tayγan köl* in ŠU. Clark (1977, p. 154) thought the word was Mongolian: *tayγan* 'greyhound'. Erdal (OTWF, p. 88) derives the word *tayγan* from the verb *tay-* 'to slip by, to slip down, to glide along' supplied with the suffix *-GAn*. We can subscribe to Erdal's opinion since the verb *tay-* was widely used in historical and modern Turkic

languages with several meanings, but especially with the meaning 'to slip'. (For examples and details, see Aydın 2008, p. 205; DTS, p. 528; Aydın 2012, pp. 165–167.)

20. toŋtar- 'bring down, topple' (Ta E 8).

Ta E 8: *<…> anta toŋtartım qan[ın altım]* "<…> there I brought it down (toppled) and I captured the Khan".

    This word, observed only in the 8th line of the east face of the Ta inscription, was read and interpreted by Kljaštornyj as *toqıtırtım*, by Tekin as *toqtartım*, and by Berta as *toŋDarDım*[?] (Aydın 2011a, p. 44). Erdal (OTWF, p. 738, note 463) read and interpreted the word as *toŋtartım* 'I overturned'. Clauson (ED, p. 518b) connected the verb *toŋtar-* to the verb *töŋdär-* and stated that in that case it was the causative form of the verb *töŋit-*.

21. utru 'opposite, opposite side' (ŠU S 3).

ŠU S 3: *qara yotulqan käčip kälirti bän utru yorıdım* "(He said that) he passed Kara Yotulkan and brought (?). I moved (towards) the opposite side".

    This word occurs only once in the runic texts. It was read the same way by all studies on the ŠU inscription (Aydın 2011a, p. 80). Clauson (ED, p. 64a–b), identified it as an adverb formed from the verb **utur-* and quoted the examples in the ŠU inscription, the Irk Bitig and other sources. Tekin (1978, pp. 37–38) connected it with Mo. *uɣtu-* 'karşılaşmak, gelen komşuyu karşılamak ya da kabul etmek, beklenen bir konuğu karşılamak = to welcome, to welcome or accept a visiting neighbour, to welcome an expected guest' and envisaged the following development: *utru < *utur- < ut-ur- < *uqt- < *uqtŭ-*. According to Erdal (2004, pp. 333, 408) it can be associated with Yak. *utar-* and **ut-ur* (see also OTWF, p. 741).

22. yamaš- 'to join' (Ta E 6).

Ta E 6: *<…> atlıɣın yamašdı* "<…> joined (us) with his horsemen".

    Tekin (1983, p. 813), in his paper where he published the Ta inscription, criticised Kljaštornyj's reading and interpretation as *yumšadı* 'sent' and stated that the verb was formed using the verbal root *yama-* and the reciprocal suffix *-š-* and gave the example of modern Turkic (Uyg., Uzb.) *yamaš-* 'katılmak, iltihak etmek, birleşmek = to join, to adhere, to unite'. The word was not mentioned in ED and DTS. In both dictionaries the verb *yamaš-* was related to Kāshgharī's example of *ol aŋar ton yamašdı*, which is the modern Turkish verb of *yama-* 'to repair with a patch' (DTS, p. 231; ED, p. 939a).

23. yaŋı 'initial day(s) of the month' (ŠU N 9, ŠU E 1, 3, 5, 6, 11, ŠU W 1, 2, 4, HT VI/4, HT XV/2, QČ 17).

ŠU E 3: *törtünč ay toquz yaŋıqa süŋüšdüm* "I waged war on the ninth day of the fourth month, was lanced".

HT VI, 4: *bir yegirmikä ay bir yaŋıqa ayaɣ (?) k²* "First day of the eleventh month, respect (?)".

HT XV, 1−3: 1. *bečin yılqa*, 2. *toquzunč ay eki yaŋıqa*, 3. *bardımız* "1. In the year of the monkey, 2. on the second day of the ninth month, 3. we went (arrived)".

QČ 15−16−17: *laγzın yıl altınč ayqa yeti yaŋıqa* "on the seventh day of the sixth month of the year of the pig".

The word can also be found in the 17th line of the recently discovered Uyghur epitaph in Xi'an. However, it does not occur in any other runic texts. If so, it could rightly be supposed that the Hoyto-Tamir VI and XV inscriptions were also written in the Uyghur dialect.

Clauson (ED, pp. 943b−944a) gave the meaning of the word *yaŋı* as 'new' and stated that it had substantial and abstract uses. Clauson, after defining the word, claimed that the word had the meaning of 'one of the first ten days of the month' in Uyghur texts and quoted examples from the ŠU inscription. However, the other specimens he mentioned were all related to the word's meaning of 'new'. DTS (p. 234) provides it as the second meaning in the entry. (See also Erdal 2004, p. 227.) The word continued to be used in Uyghur texts, but in the great inscriptions of the Second Turk Khanate the word *kün* was used instead. So this special usage of *yaŋı* can be tentatively connected to Uyghur.

24. yoluq- 'encounter, come across' (ŠU S 1).

ŠU S 1: *bir yegirminč ay säkiz yegirmikä <…> yoluqdum* "on the eighteenth of the eleventh month <…> I came across".

The word occurs once in the runic texts, see DTS p. 272. It is not mentioned by Clauson in ED.

Conclusion

Twenty-four words were discussed in this paper. There exist a few more examples that, owing to certain reading problems, were excluded from the sphere of investigation. The fact that those twenty-four words are attested only in Uyghur inscriptions, and they are replaced by other words in other runic inscriptions, prompted us to conclude that the discussed words may have been of Uyghur dialectal descent. We are convinced that a few more words will crop up in the future demonstrating that Uyghur-speaking people could have written those inscriptions. In the 8th century, similarly to the modern period, different Turkic words could have existed side by side with the same or similar meanings, and these dialectal features may help identify the people or clan that erected and wrote the related inscriptions.

Abbreviations

Inscriptions and Aspects

E   East (the face of the inscription)
KT   Köl Tegin inscription
N   North (the face of the inscription)

QÇ	Qarı Čor (Xi'an) inscription
S	South (the face of the inscription)
ŠU	Šine Usu inscription
T	Tonyukuk inscription
Ta	Tariat inscription
W	West (the face of the inscription)

Languages

Alt.	Altai
Čag.	Chagatai
Dolg.	Dolgan
Khak.	Khakas
Kırg.	Kirghiz
Kor.	Korean
Mo.	Mongolian
Osm.	Ottoman Turkish
Otü.	Old Turkic
Sag.	Sagai
Šor	Šor
Tel.	Teleüt
Tuv.	Tuvan
Tü.	Turkic
Uyg.	Uyghur
Uzb.	Uzbek
Yak.	Yakut

Bibliography

Arat, R. R. (1979): *Kutadgu Bilig. III Indeks*. Prepared by Eraslan, K. – Sertkaya, O. F. – Yüce, N. İstanbul, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü.

Atalay, B. (1992): *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk Tercümesi*. 3 vols. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Aydın, E. (2007): *Şine Usu Yazıtı*. Çorum, KaraM.

Aydın, E. (2008): Şine Usu Yazıtında Hayvan Adlarıyla Kurulmuş Yer Adları Üzerine İncelemeler. *Turkish Studies, International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 202–208.

Aydın, E. (2011a): *Uygur Kağanlığı Yazıtları*. Konya, Kömen.

Aydın, E. (2011b): Remarks on *Qatun* in the Yenisei Inscriptions. *AOH* Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 251–256.

Aydın, E. (2012): *Eski Türk Yer Adları, Eski Türk Yazıtlarına Göre*. Konya, Kömen.

Bang, W. (1980): *Berlindeki Macar Enstitüsünden Türkoloji Mektupları (1925–1934)*. Translated by Tekin, Ş. Erzurum, Atatürk University.

Bang, W. – Gabain, A. von (1931): *Analytischer Index zu den fünf ersten Stücken der Türkischen Turfan-Texte*. Berlin.

Baskakov, N. A. – Toshchakova, T. M. (1999): *Altayca – Türkçe Sözlük*. Eds Gürsoy Naskali, E. – Duranlı, M. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Berta, Á. (2004): *Szavaimat jól halljátok … A türk és ujgur rovásírásos emlékek kritikai kiadása* [Closely listen to my words … A critical editon of records in Turkic and Uyghur runic scripts]. Szeged, JATE.

Clark, L. V. (1977): Mongol Elements in Old Turkic? *JSFOu* Vol. 75, pp. 110–168.

Clauson, G. (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford, Oxford University.

Doerfer, G. (1963–1975): *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. 4 vols. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

DTS see Nadeljaev et al. (1969).

ED see Clauson (1972).

Erdal, M. (1978): Irk Bitig Üzerine Yeni Notlar. *TDAYB* Vol. 1977, pp. 87–119.

Erdal, M. (1991): *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. 2 vols. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Erdal, M. (2004): *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden–Boston, Brill.

Eren, H. (1999): *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Esztergár, M. (1963): Words Pertaining to Housing and Dwelling in the Altaic Languages. In: Sinor, D. (ed.): *Aspect of Altaic Civilization (Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Held at Indiana University, June 4–9, 1962)*. Bloomington, Indiana University, pp. 33–43.

Gabain, A. v. (1950): *Alttürkische Grammatik: mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen, auch neutürkisch*. Leipzig, Porta Linguarum Orientalium (2. verbesserte Auflage).

Golden, P. B. (2000): *The King's Dictionary. The Rasûlid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabulaires in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*. Leiden, Brill.

Gülensoy, T. (2007): *Türkiye Türkçesindeki Türkçe Sözcüklerin Köken Bilgisi Sözlüğü*. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Hauenschild, I. (2003): *Die Tierbezeichnungen bei Mahmud al-Kaschgari. Eine Untersuchung aus sprach- und kulturhistorischer Sicht*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz (Turcologica 53).

Kaçalin, M. S. (2010): *Niyāzī, el-lugātu'n-nevā'iyye ve'l-istişhādātu'l-cagatā'iyye, Nevâyî'nin Sözleri ve Çağatayca Tanıklar*. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Katayama, A. (1999): Tariat Inscription. In: Moriyasu, T.–Ochir, A. (eds): *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Osaka, The Society of Central Eurasian Studies, pp. 168–176.

Kestelli, R. N. (2004): *Resimli Türkçe Kamus*. Prepared by Toparlı, R.–Tezcan Aksu, B.–Kanoğlu, C. S.–Türkmen, S. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Kljaštornyj, S. G. (1982): The Terkhin Inscription. *AOH* Vol. 36, Nos 1–3, pp. 335–366.

Kljaštornyj, S. G. (1988): East Turkestan and the Kaghans of Ordubalyk Interpretation of the Fourteenth Line of the Terkh Inscriptions. *AOH* Vol. 42, Nos 2–3, pp. 277–280.

Kormušin, I. V. (1997): *Тюркские енисейские эпитафии, тексты и исследования*. Moskva, Nauka.

Lessing, F. D. (1960): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. Berkeley–Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Li, Y.-S. (2004): *Türk Dillerinde Son Takılar*. İstanbul (Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 40).

Malov, S. E. (1959): *Памятники древнетюркской письменности Монголии и Киргизии*. Moskva–Leningrad, Akademija Nauk SSSR.

Menges, K. H. (1958): A Note on the Compound Titles in the Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions. *Byzantion* Vol. 28, pp. 441–453.

Moriyasu, T. (1999): Site and Inscription of Şine-Usu. In: Moriyasu, T.–Ochir, A. (eds): *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Osaka, The Society of Central Eurasian Studies, pp. 177–195.

Nadeljaev, V. M.–Nasilov, D. M.–Tenišev, E. R.–Ščerbak, A. M. (1969): *Древнетюркский Словарь*. Leningrad, Nauka.

Necip, E. N. (1995): *Yeni Uygur Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Translated by Kurban, İ. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Orkun, H. N. (1936): *Eski Türk Yazıtları*. I. İstanbul, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Orkun, H. N. (1938): *Eski Türk Yazıtları*. II. İstanbul, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Orkun, H. N. (1940): *Eski Türk Yazıtları*. III. İstanbul, Türk Dil Kurumu.

OTWF see Erdal (1991).

Ölmez, M. (2013): *Orhon-Uygur Hanlığı Dönemi Moğolistan'daki Eski Türk Yazıtları*. Ankara, BilgeSu.

Pavet de Courteille, A. (1972): *Dictionnaire Turk-Oriental*. Amsterdam, Philo.

Ragagnin, E. (2010): Traces of Old Turkic *ančïp* and *ïnčïp* in Altaic Languages. In: Kappler, M. – Kirchner, M. – Zieme, P. (eds): *Trans-Turkic Studies. Festschrift in Honour of Marcel Erdal*. İstanbul (Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 49), pp. 299–314.

Ramstedt, G. J. (1913): Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei. *JSFOu* Vol. 30, pp. 1–63.

Ramstedt, G. J. (1976): *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki, Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae.

Räsänen, M. (1969): *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*. Helsinki, Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae.

Röhrborn, K. (1977–1998): *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen Türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

Şen, S. (2010): Taryat Yazıtının Batı Yüzünde *ILGM* ve *LGM* İşaretleriyle Yazılan Sözcük Nasıl Okunup Anlaşılmalı? *TDAYB* Vol. 2008/II, pp. 99–107.

Şeyh Süleyman Efendi-yi Buhârî (1298 AH): *Lugat-i Çağatay ve Türkî-yi Osmanî*. İstanbul, Mihran.

ŠS see Şeyh Süleyman Efendi-yi Buhârî (1298 AH).

Tekin, Ş. (1976): Uygurca Metinler II: *Maytrısimit*, Burkancıların Mehdisi Maitreya İle Buluşma, Uygurca İptidaî Bir Dram. Ankara, Atatürk University.

Tekin, T. (1978): Ön Türkçede Ünsüz Yitimi. *TDAYB* Vol. 1977, pp. 35–51.

Tekin, T. (1983): Kuzey Moğolistan'da Yeni Bir Uygur Anıtı: Taryat (Terhin) Kitabesi. *Belleten* Vol. 46, No. 184, pp. 795–838.

Tekin, T. (1990): Tes Yazıtı Hakkında Dokuz Not. Translated to Turkish by Çelik, Ü. *Erdem* Vol. 5, No. 14, pp. 389–398.

Tekin, T. (2003): *Orhon Türkçesi Grameri*. İstanbul (Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 9).

Tietze, A. (2002): *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı*. Vol. 1. İstanbul–Wien, Simurg.

TMEN see Doerfer (1963–1975).

Toparlı, R. – Vural, H. – Karaatlı, R. (2003): *Kıpçak Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Toven, M. B. (2004): *Yeni Türkçe Lügat*. Prepared by A. Hayber. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.

Tuna, O. N. (1957): Bazı İmlâ Gelenekleri Bunların Metin İncelemelerindeki Önemi ve Orhon Yazıtların'da Birkaç Açıklama. *TDAYB* Vol. 1957, pp. 41–81.

Tybykova L. N. – Nevskaja, I. A. – Erdal, M. (2012): *Каталог древнетюркских рунических памятников Горного Алтая*. Gorno-Altajsk, Gorno-Altajskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet.

UW see Röhrborn (1977–1998).

VEWT see Räsänen (1969).

Yıldırım, F. (2013): Kâğıda Yazılı Runik Harfli Eski Türkçe Metinler. In: *Yenisey–Kırgızistan Yazıtları ve Irk Bitig*. Prepared by Aydın, E. – Alimov, R. – Yıldırım, F. Ankara, BilgeSu, pp. 339–494.

Yudahin, K. K. (1988): *Kırgız Sözlüğü*. Translated by A. Taymas. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu.