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### 9.1.5 Official registers and lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OReg01</td>
<td>USp Nr. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.2 Private documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UlReg01</td>
<td>Ch/U 6107 v (Glas: T II T 1602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg02</td>
<td>Ch/U 6510 v (Glas: T II T 1602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg03</td>
<td>Ch/U 7012 r (T II S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg04</td>
<td>Ch/U 7145 v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg05</td>
<td>Ch/U 7368 v (T II D 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg06</td>
<td>Ch/U 8136 v (MIK 030465; T II S 53) + Ch/U 6039 v (T II M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg07</td>
<td>Ch/U 8175 v (MIK 031759) + Ch/U 6612 v (T III 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg08</td>
<td>Mainz 765 v (T II 1035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg09</td>
<td>U 5299 ([T I] D 176/TM 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg10</td>
<td>U 5307 (T II D 205a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg11</td>
<td>U 5311 (T II D 360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg12</td>
<td>Ch/U 7345 v (Glas: T III 2079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg13</td>
<td>Ch/U 7344 v (T III 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg14</td>
<td>Ch/U 8012 (MIK 028434; T I 1052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg15</td>
<td>Ch/U 8217 v (T II Y 59; MIK 030514) + Ch/U 6106 v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg16</td>
<td>Ch/U 8217 r (T II Y 59; MIK 030514) + Ch/U 6106 r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg17</td>
<td>U 6006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UlReg18</td>
<td>*U 9004 (TI / TM 241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.2.2 Other private lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PList01</td>
<td>Ch/U 8097 v (MIK 028440; Glas: T II 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PList02</td>
<td>U 6189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHAPTER X: MIDDLE MONGOLIAN DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mong01</td>
<td>Mainz 867 (TM 94 D 135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mong02</td>
<td>TM 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mong03</td>
<td>T II D 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mong04</td>
<td>Mainz 869 (T II D 306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mong05</td>
<td>F209:W68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHAPTER XI: THE POSTAL SYSTEM OF THE MONGOL EMPIRE IN MOTION: IN TIME AND SPACE

#### 11.1. ... in time

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mong01</td>
<td>Mong02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mong03</td>
<td>Mong04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 11.2. ... in space

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mong01</td>
<td>Mong02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mong03</td>
<td>Mong04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 11.3. Results and further prospects for research in the field

### VOCABULARY OF THE UYGHUR DOCUMENTS
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Introduction

Every historical study is determined by two factors: the subject of the study and the sources which are investigated in it. The subject of the present study is the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire in northeastern Turkestan and the main sources are the Old Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents unearthed in this region. So it seems appropriate to start this introduction, in order to gain a better understanding of the subject and aims of the present study, with an outline of the fundamental tendencies of two scholarly fields of research during the last decades: on the one hand the main changes of the study of the Mongol Empire have to be drawn up, while on the other hand the decisive trends of the philological study of the so-called Old Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents have to be delineated.

David O. Morgan’s indispensable monograph *The Mongols* (Morgan 1986) was published for the first time exactly thirty years ago and was a milestone in the study of the Mongol Empire. In this excellent and readable study the author summarized the up-to-date knowledge about the medieval Mongols and their empire. However, as Morgan pointed out himself in the second edition of his still essential monograph, the study of the Mongol Empire went through a huge development and fundamental changes during the last three decades (Morgan 2007: 181). These changes and developments were not accomplished because of

---

1 The name northeastern Turkestan is used in this study to describe that territory in East or Chinese Turkestan which was populated mostly by Uyghurs around the Turfan region during the Mongol period. This territory located in the contemporary Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China (PRC).

2 In this case, the term Old Uyghur is used to underline the difference between the Uyghur language of the sources of the present study – which is a variant of (Old) Turkic – and the Modern Uyghur language which is spoken in present day Xinjiang, Kazakhstan and other parts of Central Asia. Nevertheless, henceforth the term Uyghur will refer to Old Uyghur.

3 About the Middle Mongol language, see: RYBATZKI 2003.

4 The detailed research history of the concerning parts of both topics will be discussed in Chapter VIII. The here presented description is just a short review of the general tendencies of these two fields of research.

5 The first edition of *The Mongols* sums up the most important studies up to 1985 concerning the historiography of the Mongol Empire. Peter Jackson’s article *The State of Research: The Mongol Empire, 1986–1999* summarizes the main trends and most important works of the next one and a half decades (Jackson 2000). In the second edition of *The Mongols* Morgan added a chapter (*The Mongol Empire since 1985*) in which he summarizes the developments (Morgan 2007: 181–206) and a supplementary bibliography (Morgan 2007: 218–227). In 2013 Michal Biran surveyed the results of the research of the last decades in a world-historical perspective (Biran 2013) and lastly David Morgan devoted an article for the historiography of the Mongol Empire, in which he stressed the importance of cultural history (Morgan 2015).
the inclusion of new primary sources in the research⁶, but through the alteration of the approaches which were applied by scholars. The two main characteristics of these changes are the rise of cultural history, and the application of the so-called holistic perspective, i.e. the study of the Mongol Empire not only in local or regional perspectives, but in its entire Eurasian context. As David Morgan and Michal Biran pointed out, both the changes in the approaches and a good deal of the development in the research of the Mongol Empire can be credited to the works of Thomas T. Allsen (MORGAN 2007: 194–195; BIRAN 2013: 1022–1023). With these new approaches in the study of the Mongol Empire plenty of new topics emerged, which were earlier less studied, such as the economic, cultural and religious exchanges in Eurasia during the Mongol period (13th–14th century). Due to these new studies our image of the Mongols has changed fundamentally. Most of the contemporary scholars of the Mongol Empire do not deny the initial brutality and devastation of the Mongol conquest, but they stress more and more the importance of the Mongols as the founders of those macro structures (political, economic, religious and cultural) in Eurasia which led to unprecedented cultural and economic exchange. Moreover research over the last thirty years pointed out that many of the administrative and political structures of the Mongol Empire lived on in the early-modern states of Eurasia, and that the effects of the cultural changes that they caused are still felt. In these senses, the Mongols actively participated in the transition of the “Old World” into the modern ages.

In this last period one of the numerous topics which gained more attention is the postal relay system of the empire. On the one hand thanks to the general interest in the communication and information history, the postal relay systems of many pre- and early modern states and empires were subject to increasing scholarly attention, while on the other hand due to its implicit role in the connection and inner cohesion of the vast Mongol Empire more and more scholars devoted some paragraphs or a separate chapter to the subject in their works. It is important to call the attention, that in the case of the pre-modern states the postal relay system had a slightly different meaning than in the modern period. Contrary to their modern successors these pre-modern institutions did not serve to transmit the personal correspondence of civilians, but their main aim was the help the communication of the state (transport of couriers, foreign and domestic envoys and other officers of the state, etc.). In the case of the Mongols this duties completed with the support of the commercial activities within

---

⁶ However, many important sources appeared in new edition and many were translated into western languages. About the progress in the publishing of primary sources see: JACKSON 2000: 190–191; MORGAN 2007: 182–185; BIRAN 2013: 1023–1024.
the empire. In the present study the expressions post system and postal system, as well as the Turkic and Mongolian technical terms for the post stations (and probably for the postal system in general), yam-system and jam-system will be used as synonyms for postal relay system.7

Parallel to this process in the research of the Mongol Empire, the philological study of the Uyghur civil documents and Middle Mongolian documents went through a significant development too. In the present study, the designation Uyghur civil documents refers to a group of those documentary sources which derive from East or Chinese Turkestan (eastern part of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region in the Peoples Republic of China) and from the Gansu corridor, mainly from the vicinity of Dunhuang (today in Gansu Province in the Peoples Republic of China). These documents were written in semi-cursive and cursive style of the Uyghur script8 in the (Old) Turkic language under the West Uyghur (9th–12th centuries) and Mongol periods (13th–14th centuries).

The reason why the first part of (Old) Turkic is written in brackets is the problematic temporal classification of the Turkic languages, which has to be discussed here briefly. Apart from two texts which stem from the West Uyghur period (PO08, PO18), the vast majority of the Uyghur documents in the present study can be dated to the 13th and 14th centuries, i.e. to the Mongol era. This time period falls in most classifications in the “border zone” between the Old and Middle Turkic, therefore the specialists of Old Turkic philology and Turkic language history handled it differently. Annamarie von Gabain noted only that the blossom of the Old Turkic literature was between 750 and 1300 (GABAIN 1974: 2). Even the title of Sir Gerald Clauson’s fundamental dictionary of Old Turkic shows the problematic nature of the 13th and 14th centuries from the viewpoint of Turkic language history: An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish (ED). Klaus Röhrborn emphasized that the language of some Uyghur juridical (i.e. civil) documents of the 13th–14th cc. clearly differs from the classical period of Uyghur literature (UW I: 1). In 1979, in an article Marcel Erdal strictly considered the legal and economical documents to be outside of Old Turkic (ERDAL 1979: 174–175). In The Turkic Languages Erdal considered the 9th–13th cc. Old Uyghur manuscripts from

---

7 Though, according to Lessing the Mongolian örtege(n) means ‘relay system with stages about 20 miles apart, postal relay station’ (LESSING 1973: 643), and jam is ‘road, route, way, pass’ (LESSING 1973: 1033), the latter was used in the Middle Mongolian documents in the sense ‘post station’ and sometimes referred to the whole postal system too (cf.: BT XVI: 181–182, Nr. 74–75), meanwhile we have no evidence for such a usage by örtege(n) from this period. For the history of the word örtege(n) see: LIGETI 1970: 293–294. For the closely related Mongolian jam and Turkic yam, see the first section of chapter VI.

8 The Uyghur script is an Aramaic script which derived from Sogdian script. About the Aramaic scripts for Altaic languages in general see: KARA 1996; about the Uyghur script in particular: KARA 1996: 539–542. For the different styles of the Uyghur script: MORIYASU 2004a: 228–229.
northwest China as a part of the Old Turkic material (ERDAL 1998: 138). In the same volume Lars Johanson placed the Old Turkic period from the 8th century up to the Mongol rule, and according to him the middle period of the Turkic languages (i.e. the Middle Turkic) can be counted from the 13th century onwards (JOHANSON 1998: 85–86). In his other works Marcel Erdal is more permissive: in the introduction of the Old Turkic World Formation he defined the temporal borders of the Old Turkic as the 8th and the middle of the 14th century (OTWF I: 3) and in a later work he wrote: “Sources from the rule of the Yuan (i.e. Mongolian) dynasty were by their authors meant to be in the same language as earlier sources, however, and can be difficult to tell from earlier ones” (GoT: 7). Lately, András Róna-Tas and Árpád Berta drew the upper limit of the Old Turkic by the Mongol invasion in the early 13th century (WOT I: VII). As it can be seen from the above summary, the temporal classification of the Uyghur civil documents of the Mongol period are absolutely not obvious. In my opinion the 13th–14th centuries in historical aspect was a time which established the frames of transformation in Eurasia for the transition from the pre-modern into the early-modern period, it was a transitional period as well for the Turkic language(s) from the Old Turkic into the Middle Turkic period. Due to the conservative nature and the rigid formulas of the legal and administrative texts, the language of the Uyghur documents from the Mongol period in many ways are similar to those from the West Uyghur period (Cf. CLARKINTRO: 119). Though, specialists of the Uyghur civil documents established several linguistic and other criteria to distinguish the documents of the West Uyghur period from that of the Mongol period (CLARKINTRO: 121–171; MORIYASU 2004a: 228–231; MATSUI 2014a: 615–616), according to the author’s judgment the language of the latter group still stands closer to the Old Turkic texts than to the most of those which belong to the Middle Turkic period.

The second part of the designation (“civil documents”) shows that these – contrary to the most of the Old Uyghur sources9 – are not religious texts, but official or private documents.10 The Middle Mongolian documents are similar texts written in the Middle Mongolian language in the so-called Uyghur-Mongol script11 during the 13th–14th centuries.

With the dissolution of the bipolar world at the end of the 20th century, many of the collections – where these manuscripts were preserved – became more easily accessible in general, and the German collections – which contains the majority of the most important

9 The great majority of the Old Uyghur sources are religious texts, belonging to the three world religions: Manicheaism, Buddhism and Christianity. About the Uyghurs and their religions, see: LAUT 1996; ZIEME 2011.
10 A detailed description of Old Uyghur civil documents’ classification can be found in the introduction for the critical edition of the documents in the second part of the present study.
11 About the Uyghur-Mongol or Mongol script, see: KARA 1996: 545–547.
manuscripts for the purpose of the present study and which were separated earlier – were reunited. Due to these changes and to the revolution of internet technology since the 1990’s several positive processes have begun. First of all, important catalogues of the different collections and up to date text editions of the sources have been published; however the most of the documents presented here have not been translated into any western languages so far. Secondly, with the development of the internet, several projects started with the aim of digitalising the original manuscripts and to create online databases. These tendencies led to an ever increasing number of studies dealing with these materials and as a result a huge development of the field can be observed.

These changes and developments in the study of the Mongol Empire and in the study of the Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents have made it possible for the present study to come into existence. This dissertation is intended to fulfil a double aim: on the one hand, it aims to present a critical edition of the Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documentary sources concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire, including the philological study of this material. On the other hand, the results of the philological research shall be compared with our existing knowledge about the postal system and placed in a broader historical frame of interpretation.

The great importance of the primary sources of this dissertation (the Uyghur and Mongolian documents) arises from two facts: firstly, most of their places of origin were within the territory of the Chaghadaid ulus, which is the lesser studied realm of the Mongol Empire, due to a lack of relevant sources (cf.: BIRAN 1997: 3–6; BIRAN 2008: 369–373). Secondly, most of our present knowledge about the postal system of the Mongol Empire is based on various narrative sources, while the documentary sources were used only as marginal sources in the historical study of the empire in general and in the study of the postal system in particular. The main reason for this negligence might be the fact that many of the documents were not yet edited and translated into any western language.

The last survey of the main tendencies of the Old Uyghur studies can be found in: MATSUI 2009c.

For the purpose of the present study two projects are particularly important. The Digitales Turfan-Archiv (http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/index.html) of the Turfanforschung (http://turfan.bbaw.de/front-page-en?set_language=en) in Berlin provides almost seventy thousand images about the manuscripts of the Berlin Collection of oriental manuscripts, among them the photo copies of the most manuscripts of the present study are available too. The other project which has to be mentioned here is the International Dunhuang Project (IDP, http://idp.bl.uk/) of the British Library which is an international collaboration to make information about and all kind of sources of the Eastern Silk Road available and researachable on the internet. For a brief description of both projects see: MATSUI 2009c: 38–39.

During his lifetime Chinggis Khan is believed to share the territories of his empire among his four sons by his chief wife Börte: Jöchi (d. 1226/7), Chaghadai (d. 1242), Ögödei (d. 1241) and Tolui (d. 1232). These “appanages” are called ulus in the sources. For the uluses in the 13th–14th centuries, see: Map V–VII.
The double aim outlined above has determined the structure of the dissertation. The present study consists of two parts: the second part contains the research history of the expeditions which unearthed the documents under discussion, the research history of the documents and the critical edition of the sources with the English translation of the documents with appendices. The detailed description of its structure and other relevant information about the second part will be found in the introduction to the critical edition, and so in the following only the structure of the first part will be outlined. The first chapter gives a brief survey of the historical background of the subject from the fall of the Uyghur Khaganate (840) till the dissolution of the Chaghadaid ulus in the middle of the 14th century. The second chapter presents an overview of the most important traditional sources of the yam-system. The third chapter presents the research history of the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire. The fourth chapter contains a detailed description of the material (i.e. the Uyghur and Mongolian documents) and some of the results of the philological study of the documents. The following three chapters are case studies concerning particular questions concerning the material and the yam-system. The subjects of these three studies were chosen in order to show the different aspects of utility of the Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents. The fifth chapter deals with the animal terminology of the Uyghur documents to show how the results of the philological investigation of the material can contribute to our knowledge about the postal system of the Mongol Empire. The sixth chapter re-evaluates one of the most controversial issues concerning the yam-system, i.e. the origin of Mongol Empire’s postal system through the comparative analysis of the linguistic data, historical sources and the Uyghur documents. The seventh chapter is about the different means and levels of connection between the religious communities and the postal system of the Mongol Empire. The study focuses on the social aspects of the postal system. The conclusion of the dissertation is to be found after the critical edition of the documents. It is divided into three parts: the first two give a historical survey of the postal system in time and space, as it can be reconstructed from the comparative analysis of the documents of Turkestan and other sources of the yam-system.

The Turkic terms, including names and titles have been transliterated according to the system of the Uigureisches Wörterbuch (UW I: 6–17). For the Mongolian names the transliteration and transcription system of BT XVI is applied, which is based on Poppe’s Grammar of Written Mongolian (POPPE 1954) and the Monuments Linguae Mongolicae collecta 2/1 (LIGETI 1972a). In the case of the Arabic and Persian names the transliteration system of the International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies is followed. Deviations from these systems occur in those cases when a word has a common English form, e.g. Uyghur
instead of Uygur; Khaganate instead of Kaganate; Chinggis Khan instead of Činggis Qan is used. For Chinese, the *pinyin* transliteration system is adopted.
PART ONE: ANALYSIS
Chapter I: Historical background

In order to facilitate understanding of data concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire in the Uyghur territories this chapter presents the history of the region. It will thus provide a historical overview of the area under Mongol rule, i.e. from the beginning of the 13th century till the middle of the 14th century, with a special focus on those events which might have affected the administrative structure of the region or the postal system in particular. It does not aim to break new ground on this subject, however, and is thus primarily based mainly on secondary literature rather than original sources. Although the main subject of the chapter is the history of the Uyghur territories in this period, empire-wide issues will be discussed where necessary for a thorough understanding of the broader context.

1.1. Antecedents

The Kirgiz army destroyed the Uyghur Khaganate in 840. Contrary to similar cases in the steppe region the majority of the defeated Uyghurs did not stay in their former territory to serve the new rulers but migrated to China, Gansu and East Turkestan. Those parts of the

15 The majority of our knowledge about the period under discussion originates from Chinese and Persian sources, but beside these other documentary sources from the region can supplement our knowledge too. Thomas Allsen has collected and studied the most important sources for the 13th century (ALLSEN 1983). On the rebellion of Qaidu and the history of the second half of the 13th century in Central Asia the standard literature is written by Michal Biran, who summarised the most important sources in her introduction and listed them separately in the bibliography (BIRAN 1997: 3–6, 179–182). Concerning the history of the early 14th century in Central Asia Kazuhide Katō has surveyed the Persian sources (Katō 1991) and later Yingsheng Liu complemented this with a discussion of the Chinese sources (Liu 2005). The last decades under discussion are delineated only sketchily here due to the main purpose of the study, as mentioned above. Detailed descriptions of this period can be found in: BARTHOLOM 1956: 51–54, 134–138; MANZ 1989: 21–57. All kinds of sources on chancellery practices and diplomacy in the Chaghadaid ulus are collected and studied in: BIRAN 2008. For a compact and up-to-date discussion of the whole period, see: BIRAN 2009.

16 The most detailed bibliography about the early history of the Uyghurs: LAUT 2000. For Central Asia in the 8th–9th centuries, see: Map III.

17 There are a lot of publications on the early history of the Uyghurs and the history and fall of their steppe state (i.e. the Uyghur Khaganate), so here we only list some of the standard literature which provides detailed bibliographies for further reading: MACKERRAS 1972; GOLDEN 1992: 155–176; MACKERRAS 1994; SINOR 1998; SINOR 2000.

18 This group contained 13 Uyghur tribes who settled on the Chinese border because the Chinese authorities did not let them into the country. This unfriendly attitude of the Chinese soon shifted to open hostility. The last mention of this group can be dated to the 840s and most probably they were assimilated by the Chinese. For a detailed description of these events, see: DROMPP 2005.

19 This group settled in Northwest Gansu, an area populated mostly by Chinese and Tibetan people. The Uyghurs were able to consolidate their rule in the region up till the early 10th century and due to their key positions on the Silk Road their two cities Dunhuang and Ganzhou developed into flourishing trade centres. Their sovereignty was terminated by the expansive politics of the Khitan Liao dynasty (947–1125) whose territories extended across Manchuria and northern China. On the Gansu Uyghurs, see: PINKS 1968. According to Takao Moriyasu,
Uyghur people who migrated to the Turfan region in East Turkestan soon established their own state there; the so-called West Uyghur Kingdom (9–12th cc.). Although Turkic-speaking people had lived in this area for centuries, the migration of the Uyghurs led to the rapid Turkification of the territory; something that can be seen from its later Persian name Turkestan, literally: “the land of the Turks”. Parallel to this process the Uyghurs gradually gave up their nomadic lifestyle and settled in the oasis cities of the region. They merged with the mostly Indo-Iranian speaking local population and achieved a unique cultural development which was coupled with outstanding economic progress. Their state covered the eastern part of the Tien Shan Mountains, on the northern slopes of which lay the ruling centre Bešbalık, and the northern part of the Tarim basin which contained Kočo, the state’s second most important city. Around 1130 the West Uyghurs were subdued by Yelü Dashi (r. 1124–1143), the founder of the Qara Khitai or Western Liao Empire. According to our sources, the Qara Khitai maintained a loose control over the West Uyghur Kingdom and the Uyghur ruler the ıduk kut was able to preserve much of his autonomy. This situation changed fundamentally with the rise of the Mongol Empire in the first decade of the 13th century (ALLSEN 1983: 245–246).

1.2. Submission to the Mongols and the period of the united empire (1209 – mid 13th century)

In the first years of the 13th century the Qara Khitai sent a Buddhist monk to the Uyghurs as a new resident. Due to his tyrannical behaviour the Uyghurs repined and finally murdered him in Kočo in 1209 with the approval of the ıduk kut Barčuk Art Tegin. Shortly after the murder Mongol envoys arrived at the court of the ıduk kut and were warmly received. In response the Uyghur ruler sent an embassy to Chinggis to inform him of his willingness to submit, meanwhile he sent another envoy to the Qara Khitai ruler to clear his new status. Chinggis

---

20 The standard works on the establishment and history of the West Uyghur Kingdom are: GABAIN 1973; CZEGLÉDY 1984; ZIEME 2000.
21 In the Uyghur sources the city is called Kočo and Kara Kočo (Chin.: Gaochang) as well and in some literature the latter name is used, e.g. ALLSEN 1983. Cf.: MATSUI 2015b: 275, 294.
22 On Yelü Dashi and the Qara Khitai Empire: BIRAN 2005.
23 The meaning of the expression is ‘the sacred favour of heaven’ (ED: 46). On the title ıduk kut see: ARAT 1964; ARAT 1986.
24 For the Mongol conquest in Central Asia, see: Map IV.
25 There is an extremely rich literature on the life and career of Chinggis Khan. The standard biography is RATCHNEVSKY 1993a. Lately Michal Biran wrote a book about the life of Chinggis with a special focus on his impact upon the Islamic World (BIRAN 2007).
demanded the Uyghur ruler come to his court in person with tribute, but this personal meeting only came to pass after the Mongol campaign against the Tanguts in 1211 somewhere along the Kerülen River. After the voluntary submission of Barčuk Art Tegin the Uyghur state’s subordinate status was formalized within the Mongol Empire. Chinggis established a garrison on Uyghur territory and required the ıduk kut and Uyghur aristocrats to accompany the Mongol army on campaign. Barčuk himself participated in ıbe’s expedition against Küčlüg the Naiman ruler in 1216, and later attended the campaign against Khwārazm in 1218 with 10,000 Uyghur soldiers, mostly infantry, and he was an eyewitness to Chinggis’ last expedition against the Tanguts in 1225 (ALLSEN 1983: 248, 265–266).

Nonetheless their early and voluntary submission granted a privileged status to Barčuk Art Tegin and to Uyghurs in general within the Mongol Empire. After his subordination Chinggis bestowed with one of his daughters on the Uyghur ruler in marriage. Moreover the contemporary sources refer to the ıduk kut as the 5th son of Chinggis. The privileged status of the Uyghurs is summarized very clear in a passage from the Yuanshi:

“You [the Korean monarch] submitted later, therefore [you] are ranked low among the princes (wang). During the reign of our T’ai-tsu [Chinggis Khan], the Iduq qut was the first to submit, accordingly it was ordered that [he] be ranked first among the princes. Arslan [a-ssu-lan] next submitted, therefore [he] was ranked below him [the Iduq qut]. You ought to know this.” (YS 7: 128; translated and cited: ALLSEN 1983: 247)

This passage shows how subject rulers were ranked within the Mongol Empire, but beside their early and voluntary submission another factor played a major role in the Uyghurs’ special status, namely that they were the first sedentary people with a high cultural and administrative level to join the empire. Moreover they had had a nomadic past before their settlement and they submitted without resistance. These circumstances made them perfect agents for the transmission of the necessary know-how to rule sedentary subjects, vital for the

---

26 However Chinggis had more offspring only his four sons (Joči, Chaghadai, Ögödei and Tolui) from his senior wife Börte were endowed with high military and political ranks. Furthermore only these four sons of Chinggis received huge “apanages” (ulus) from their father. Moreover according to Allsen, who based his statement on Rashid al-Din Chinggis offered the same “position” to the Khwārazm Shah and to the Tangut ruler too, but due to their resistance against the Mongol rule finally they were annihilated. Moreover the Tatar Šigi Qutuqu and the Tangut Učaγan Noyan bore the same title (ALLSEN 1983: 271 note 31). On Šigi Qutuqu’s carrier in details: RATCHNEVSKY 1993b; SH I: 497–499, §135.

27 Arslan Khan was the ruler of the Karluks who travelled with Barčuk Art Tegin to the Kerülen River in 1211 to submit to Chinggis (ALLSEN 1983: 271 note 28).
Mongols in the formative period of the empire. During the reign of Chinggis the estimated Mongol population was 700,000, and only a few of them were literate. Furthermore they were suddenly faced with the challenge of ruling vast territories with a sedentary population who outnumbered them several times over. In this situation the recruitment of literate administrators who had experience in governing sedentary populations was a primary interest of the nomadic conquerors. These factors resulted in the high number of literate Uyghurs in the service of the Mongol rulers (Allsen 1983: 247; Rachewiltz 1983: 292–295).

It is a well-known fact that before his death Chinggis (1227) shared his empire among his four sons by Börte qatun. Concerning the fate of the Uyghur lands we find contradiction in our sources. Vaṣṣāf and Mustavit both placed it among the heritage of Chaghadai but in Juvaini’s account, who was arguably the best-informed Persian history of the period, beside the North-western part of the Uyghur territories, which was received by the new ruler Ögödei (r. 1229–1241), there is no information in Juvaini’s work about the affiliation of the Uyghur lands. Takeo Abe proposed that the Uyghur realm was not given to any of the royal sons but became a fifth khanate as it was ruled by the fifth son of Chinggis, the iduk kut (Abe 1954: 435). Thomas Allsen confuted this theory by pointing out that there is no direct reference in our sources of such a fifth ulus of the empire. He proposed that after the decease of Chinggis, the land of the Uyghurs was under the direct control of the grand Khan. He underpinned his theory with the fact that the iduk kut of the Uyghur lands was appointed by the great khan throughout the 13th century, as was the situation with every subordinate ruler up till the reign of Qubilai (r. 1259–1294) (Allsen 1983: 249–250).

The special status of the Uyghur realm is conspicuous if we have a look at the administrative arrangements of it. Chinggis assigned two Uyghur daruyačis to two small villages in the Uyghur realm but it appears there were no such agents in the larger towns of

---

28 There is an example of such a cultural broker even before the submission of the Uyghur iduk kut, namely Tatar Tö aş, the seal-bearer and chief bureaucrat of the Naimans, a Turkified Mongol tribe. When the Naimans were defeated by the Mongols he came over into their service and brought the seal of the Naimans with him. The introduction of the Uyghur script among the Mongols is often ascribed to him but this probably cannot be taken at face value. It seems certain, however, that Chinggis appointed him as his personal assistant and ordered him to be the tutor of the royal sons. Later the Uyghur Kara Igač Buyruk changed him in this position. By all means the table 10.1 (on page 285) in the 1983 article of Igor de Rachewiltz shows the high numbers of Uyghurs in Mongol service from the very beginning of their conquests (Rachewiltz 1983: 283–285). But not the Uyghurs were the only Central Asians of Turkic speaking group of people who were recruited by the Mongols to serve them even on the highest levels. On the Turks and other Central Asians in Mongol service in general, see: Rachewiltz 1983; Brose 2002. On the Uyghurs in Mongol service in particular, see: Brose 2005; Brose 2007.

29 The daruyačis (Turk.: baskak; Pers.: šāhnā) were the chief local administrators or controllers of the Mongol Empire. Among their numerous duties one was the maintenance of the postal stations. The literature about this title and about the exact duties of its holders is extremely rich. Fine summaries of the literature: TMEN I: 319–323, Nr. 193; SH II: 961–962, §263. The latest contribution to the subject: Vásáry 2015: 255–256. Cf.: the notes for PO01.
the territory. Seemingly the ıduk kut remained the governor of the country and there was no close control by the central government. After the campaign against the Naiman Küçlük in 1218 Barčuk Art Tegin was able to set up his own entourage from his relatives and servants who helped him in government. Right after his enthronement in 1229, Ögödei divided his empire into three large administrative units in order to gain a better control over the settled population. Of these three units the middle covered East and West Turkestan and was under the supervision of Maḥmūd Yalawač, the Khwārazmian administrator of the Mongols. While the daruyacıs were responsible for the local issues in the city to which they were appointed, Maḥmūd Yalawač was responsible for the administration of the vast areas mentioned above.

In 1241 he was sent to North China to serve there in the same position and his son Masʿūd Beg was appointed as chief administrator of Central Asia. The border between areas under their control was on the former Tangut-Uyghur frontier. Masʿūd Beg was able to hold his position, with short intermissions, in the service of several khans and rulers until his death in 1289. Both father and son were trained administrators and did a lot for the prosperity of the regions under their jurisdictions, but the constant civil wars from the middle of the 13th century among the different branches of the Mongol aristocracy left a lot of their achievements undone. According to the Chinese sources, Masʿūd Beg’s centre was in Bešbalıık but he was almost constantly on the way between the big cities under his control. As Möngke re-appointed Masʿūd Beg in 1251 an army was sent to the region of Bešbalıık led by a certain *Buriłigtei in order to facilitate alliances between the armies of the Toluids and Golden Horde in case military intervention against the remaining Ögödeids and Chaghadaids became necessary (see below) (ALLSEN 1983: 251–253; ALLSEN 1993: 128–129).

Throughout the whole 13th century the rulers of the Uyghur lands were chosen from the family of Barčuk Art Tegin. Barčuk died sometime during Ögödei’s later years. He was followed by his son *Kesmes but shortly after his father’s death he died too. Ögödei’s widow Töregene appointed another son of Barčuk, namely Salındı, who is depicted by the Persian sources as a powerful ruler but who lost his authority in the intrigues around Möngke’s (r. 1251–1259) succession. After the death of Güyük Khan (r. 1246–1248) an internecine war broke out among the different branches of the royal family. On the one side, was Şiremün, a grandson of Ögödei, who allied with the Chaghadaids. On the other, was Möngke the eldest son of Tolui, who allied with Batu, the ruler of the Jočid ulus (i.e. the Golden Horde). In the end, Möngke was victorious and as a result of the conflict the Ögödeid and Chaghadaid

lineage almost died out. Salındı chose the wrong side in this conflict, resulting in his public execution at Beşbalık. His executioner and successor was his brother Ögrünč. He died sometime under the reign of Möngke and was succeeded by his son, whose name cannot be reconstructed unequivocally, as it can be read as *Maumula, *Mamulag or *Mamura. He took his father’s place around 1257 and we know that he accompanied Möngke on campaign against the Song with an army of 10,000 soldiers and after Möngke’s death returned to Kočo (ALLSEN 1983: 250–251).

1.3. Civil wars in Central Asia (mid-13th–early 14th cc.)

After the death of Möngke (1259) a five year long civil war broke out between his two younger brothers Ariγ Böke and Qubilai. Unfortunately, the Uyghur role in this civil war is not well known. It is certain that Ariγ Böke conquered the Gansu corridor at the very beginning of the war and with this manoeuvre cut the direct connection between Qubilai – whose centre was in North China – and the Uyghur territories. Meanwhile there was a fight within Uyghur territories between the supporters of the two sides too. None of the fighting parties could gain the victory, but according to the Chinese sources it was the supporters of Qubilai who were on the defensive. Having finally decided to join Qubilai, due to the lack of a direct connection they had to go in a roundabout way through Kočo and Kašgar and reached him only in 1263 when the Gansu corridor had been opened by Qubilai’s forces under Qadan. The war ended soon after with the defeat and submission of Ariγ Böke. We do not know the exact standpoint or role of the ıduk kut (that time *Maumula) in this civil war. The only certain fact about his reign is that he died in Kočo and was followed by his son Kočkar Tegin, appointed ıduk kut in 1266 (ALLSEN 1983: 253–254; BIRAN 2009: 49).

Peaceful relations between the Central Asian Mongols and Qubilai did not last for long. In 1269, Qaidu a descendant of Ögödei, was proclaimed Khagan by a group of Central Asian Mongol princes somewhere along the Talas River. Qaidu’s own apanage was in West Dzungaria but he ruled over the territories of the Chaghadaid princes too, who were his subordinates. These territories witnessed an economic development under his rule. We have

---

31 In the Chinese sources Ögrünč is named as the direct successor of Barčuk Art Tegin and none of his brothers are mentioned, while the Persian sources give an account about them too. In this case Allsen’s standpoint seems acceptable; he prefers to believe Juvainī, who visited Beşbalık in person shortly after the enthronement of Möngke. Chinese sources understandably keep quiet concerning the unpleasant circumstances of Möngke’s succession (ALLSEN 1983: 273 note 56).

32 A detailed study on the life of Qaidu and the establishment of the independent Mongol state in Central Asia: BIRAN 1997.
no detailed information about the outbreak of the war between Qaidu and Qubilai, but it seems the first step was made by Qaidu. According to the Chinese sources, he attacked Beiting in 1268. In Chinese sources this name usually refers to Beşbalık but sometimes to Qara Qorum too, and in this case it probably means the latter since it was the capital of the Mongols (ABE 1954: 437; ALLSEN 1983: 254). According to Biran, Qaidu threatened the Uyghur capital and enjoyed some local help too because at this time he was the leader of the Berkin tribe who lived in the mountain region near to the Uyghur territories (BIRAN 1997: 23). Even if Beşbalık was not the main target of Qaidu’s attack, soon after the ǔduk kut and his court left the city on the northern side of the Tian Shan Mountains and moved to Kočo, in the northern part of the Tarim Basin, which was easier to defend. The exact date of this move is unknown but it took place sometime between 1270 and 1275. Although the ruling house had abandoned Beşbalık apparently Qaidu did not take it over, a conclusion supported by reports that some Chaghadaid princes surrendered there to Yuan authorities during the 1270s (ALLSEN 1983: 254).

The Yuan counter-attack was launched from two directions: one army attacked from Qara Qorum through the steppe region in the direction of the Chaghadaid capital Almalık, while the other army marched through the Gansu Corridor and the oases cities of Central Asia. The former army was constituted mainly of Mongol cavalry and was led by Nomuqan, the fourth son of Qubilai. Nomuqan began his advance in 1271 and this caused the withdrawal of Qaidu’s army to the Talas region. The main duty of the other Yuan army was to establish a supply line for Nomuqan’s troops. Until 1274 even Yarkand and Almalık were involved in this supply link, but by this time the warrior component of the two advancing lines had been weakened. Nomuqan’s army was in fact a coalition of various princes under Yuan rule, and apparently the ties between the princes and Nomuqan – or probably Qubilai – were not strong enough to hold this army together. Dissension grew within the army until 1277 when Nomuqan’s princely coalition totally disintegrated.³³ After the breakdown of Nomuqan’s army Qubialı gave up this line of advance and left the steppe territories to Qaidu (DARDESS 1972-73: 135–136; ALLSEN 1983: 255).

Meanwhile the struggles in the Uyghur lands went on. In 1275, Du’a (r. 1282–1307) – a Chaghadaid prince who later played a key role in the rise of the Chaghadaid realm – and Busma, another Chaghadaid prince, besieged Kočo. The city was defended by Kočkar ǔduk

---

³³ One of the rebellious princes was Melig Temür, who appears in the first line of PO09 as Melik Temür. He was the youngest son of Ariγ Böke, after his father died in 1264 he inherited his apanage in the Altai region. After the conflict discussed above he turned to Qaidu, but in 1296 surrendered to the Yuan, and in 1306 went to China, where he was executed in 1307 (DARDESS 1972-73: 136, fn. 65; MATSUI 2014a: 620–621).
kut for six months. Finally, Du’a gave up the siege after receiving a daughter of Kočkar in marriage. Qubilai rewarded the ıduk kut with a Mongol princess in marriage and 100,000 liang of paper money\textsuperscript{34}, but some years later Kočkar moved his court further to the East to Kumul, where he died soon after in another battle with Qaidu’s armies. Qubilai ordered his son Ne’üril Tegin to move his centre to Yongchang in Gansu because he was too young to rule. From this time on, the ruling family of the Uyghurs was in exile and unable in practice to affect the fate of their homelands. Qubilai started to extend Yuan governance in the Uyghur lands from the second half of the 1270s. As a result, in 1278 all Uyghur territories north of the Tian Shan, including the old capital Beşbalık, were under direct Yuan control. In 1280 the Chinese general Qi Gongzi was put in charge of the garrison at Beşbalık and another Chinese garrison set up in Kuča two years later, with a new line of 30 postal relay stations established through the steppe region north of the Gansu Corridor between the operational area and central government.\textsuperscript{35} Moreover in the first half of the 1280s the Uyghur territory was connected to the Yuan monetary\textsuperscript{36} system and the military-agricultural colonization of the Beşbalık area was also completed. In general it can be stated that the Yuan introduced direct control over the land of the Uyghurs, but struggles between the two realms did not finish (DARDESS 1972-73: 139–140, 141–142, fn. 94; ALLSEN 1983: 255–257; BIRAN 1997: 42).

In 1286, Qaidu attacked Beşbalık and defeated the Yuan defenders. From 1288 on, according to the Chinese sources, the Yuan started to retreat from the Tarim Basin. In 1290, one of Qaidu’s generals plundered Kumul but notwithstanding this success he did not conquer it. It seems Yuan forces made no further efforts after 1296–1297 to keep the majority of the Uyghur territories. There were, however, further battles in the frontier zone from 1298 to 1301 between the new Yuan ruler Temür Khan (r. 1297–1307) and the Qaidu–Du’a coalition. Qaidu himself died soon after one of these battles in September 1301 and Du’a was seriously injured, but the process did not stop. After the death of Qaidu real power fell into the hands of the Chaghadaid Du’a, although in official terms an Ögödeid, Čapar the oldest son of Qaidu, was enthroned in 1303. Under Du’a the Chaghadaid lineage regained its independence. This is illustrated by Temür Khan’s acceptance of Du’a’s peace proposal made soon after the

\textsuperscript{34} For a thorough discussion of the Yuan paper money, see: VOGEL 2013: 89–226.

\textsuperscript{35} According to Biran only 22 stages were established between Beşbalık and the Taihe range in northern Shanxi in 1281. In addition a series of stations were erected in order to connect Khotan, Lop, Cherchen and the whole southern route of the Silk Road with China proper in 1286. Due to a famine in the next year in the Khotan region military-agricultural colonies were set up beside the postal stations (BIRAN 1997: 42).

\textsuperscript{36} A sign for the introducing of the Yuan monetary system is the appearance of the Yuan paper money in the Uyghur civil documents as čao (< Chin. chao钞). Cf. the references at SUK II: 255 and MATSUI 2004a: 201 note 36.
enthronement of Čapar; because Du’a as a Chaghadaid represented no threat to his legitimacy. In 1304, Du’a and Čapar surrendered to Temür and a peace treaty was signed, which beside relations between the Central Asian Mongols and Yuan, settled many further issues among the Mongol realms of Eurasia such as the nexus between the Golden Horde and Ilkhanid Iran (Allsen 1983: 255, 258; Biran 1997: 44, 53–53; Biran 2009: 51–52).

After peace with the Yuan the Central Asian Mongols started to fight one another. In this war, the Chaghadaids, led by Du’a and supported by the Yuan, fought against the Ögödeids, headed by Čapar. In 1306, a joint Yuan and Chaghadaid force defeated Orus, the brother of Čapar, and as a result the Yuan took over the Irtysch and Altai region. In the same year, Čapar surrendered to Du’a, but the latter could not celebrate for long because he died in early 1307 (Liu 2005: 340; Biran 2009: 55).

As we have seen the Uyghur territories witnessed constant inter-Mongol civil war in the second half of the 13th century and the land of the Uyghurs became a border zone in warfare between the Yuan and the Central Asian Mongols. From the last years of the 1270s on, the Yuan gradually set up its own administrative systems in the region and during the 1280s they took direct control over the land of the Uyghurs. Even though small scale battles in the frontier zone remained constant the main territories of the Uyghurs were apparently neutral during the most of the 1290s and became a part of the Chaghadaid ulus in the early years of the first decade of the 14th century. This constant warfare caused economic and social disaster in the region and many of the Uyghurs migrated to China proper.

1.4. Under Chaghadaid rule (from the early 14th to mid-14th century)

Du’a was succeeded on the throne by his son Könček (r. 1307–1308), but he died shortly after his accession. The next ruler Naliqo’a (r. 1308–1309) could not keep power for a long time either because Kebek, another son of Du’a, managed to arrange his assassination. Kebek enthroned his older brother Esen Buka (r. 1309/10–1319/1320) and defeated the joint armies of the sons of Qaidu. As a result Čapar submitted to the Yuan, and with this act Ögödeid rule in Central Asia was over (Liu 2005: 340; Biran 2009: 55).

However, the final defeat of the Ögödeids did not signal the beginning of a peaceful period in the region. Soon after the accession of Esen Buka relations between the Chaghadaids and the Yuan deteriorated. One of the reasons for this was the distribution of Ögödeid territories between the two sides: some of the Chaghadaids’ summer and winter pastures were under Yuan control. Secondly, the status of the different khanates was still not
clarified, leading to diplomatic conflict. The third reason was the volume of trade and the general traffic between Central Asia and China. According to Chinese sources, the frequent embassies and the high number of merchants using official infrastructure was a burden for Yuan governance in general and for their garrisons in particular, because they were responsible for the upkeep of the postal stations. In 1312 the troops were unable to finance the maintenance of the postal stations between the Central Asian garrisons of the Yuan and the central government in China proper. To solve the problem two inspectors of the stages were appointed to two military garrisons: one on the northern and one on the southern route of the Silk Road. Their duty was to set up checkpoints and regulate the traffic of envoys and merchants. Although there is no evidence for the introduction of such regulations, probably even an attempt by the Yuan government to limit traffic between the two states was enough for the Chaghadaids to identify as an offensive act. The final main reason for deterioration in their contacts was the Chaghadaid fear of a joint attack by Yuan and Ilkhanid forces. It was probably this fear that led Esen Buka to block diplomatic contacts between China and Iran, stopping embassies in 1313–1314 (LIU 2005: 339–346).

Esen Buka finally attacked the Yuan garrisons in 1314 but failed twice. The Yuan counter attack reached the Talas River and on their way they took Kočo and re-established their garrison near to the Uyghur territories. Prince Köncük was the commander of this garrison and in the same year he requested better horse supply for the jam-system to maintain the flow of messengers to the Ilkhanids. The war continued and again and again it was the Yuan forces who took the upper hand in battle. In 1316 or 1318 Ne'üril iduk kut was restored in Uyghur lands at Kočo by the Yuan emperor Ayurbarwada (r. 1311–1320). Although the large-scale military conflict ended in Yuan victory, smaller scale battles continued until the end of the decade and the restoration of peace only took place after the deaths of both rulers. Esen Buka was succeeded by Kebek (r. 1320–1327) and Ayurbarwada’s successor was on the Yuan throne Gegeen Khan (r. 1320–1323). From the beginning of his reign, Kebek sought a peaceful settlement of the dispute and finally formally submitted to the Yuan ruler in 1323. After this episode peaceful tribute relations were maintained for several decades between the two realms. While the narrative sources do not mention it directly, Kebek may have regained the land of the Uyghurs as a result of the peace. The evidence for this is a Mongolian decree

---

37 The name of this title in the Chinese sources is tuotuo hesun 脫脱禾孫 from which form a Mongolian *todqosun* can be reconstructed. In the contemporary Western Mongol sources the form *todqayul* can be found. The main duty of these officials was to make regular checks on the conditions of the postal stations and the traffic of the yam-system. Cf.: OLBRICT 1954: 81–89; TMEN I: 251–253; Nr. 124.

38 For the routes of the Silk Road in Central Asia, see: Map VIII.
preserved in the Berlin collection, bearing Kebek’s name in its initial protocol (BT XVI: 183, Nr. 76).

After the restoration of peace Kebek moved his capital to Transoxania and tried to restore the once flourishing trade and agriculture in his realm. As a part of the reforms he re-arranged the administrative structure of his lands and divided them into tümenes. Kebek was succeeded by his brother Elǰigidei (r. 1327–1330) who maintained generally good relations with the Yuan, apart from his involvement in a failed attempt to overthrow the Yuan emperor. After his death, his brother Döre Temür (r. 1330–1331) followed him on the throne, but he too soon passed away and another of their brothers took control. Tarmaširin (r. 1331–1334) was a devoted Muslim who propagated his faith at the court and among his soldiers. Probably partly because of this, partly because of deteriorating contact with the military leaders of the eastern border and partly because he was a last descendant of Du’a on a lateral lineage, meaning that all the progeny of earlier Khans could demand the throne, after three years of rule he was replaced by his nephew Buzan (r. 1334–1335?), a son of Döre Temür. In the following years, the Chaghadaid ulus sank into a chaotic situation where the khans replaced one another very fast, and sometimes it is not at all clear who the official ruler was. In addition, outer threats emerged again: the Golden Horde revived its active foreign policy in Central Asia and an Ögödeid claimant to the throne appeared (ALLSEN 1983: 258–260; BIRAN 2009: 56–58).

Buzan’s throne was taken by Čangši (r. 1335–1337) a grandson of Du’a, soon killed and replaced by his brother Yisün Temür (r. 1337–1339/40). While, according the Muslim sources, he was insane, among the Mongolian documents from the Turfan region there are decrees in his name (e.g. Mong03), which indicate that a functioning administration was maintained and also provide the first direct reference to Chaghadaid control in the area. After his reign the power of the khans in the Chaghadaid realm was permanently weakened, and the exchange of rulers accelerated. Finally, in 1347 Qazγan, a leader of the Qara’unas, dethroned Qazan and took over the western territories of the Chaghadaid ulus while the eastern part of the state saw the enthronement, with the help of tribal leaders, of Tuγluq Temür (r. 1347–1363) 39 a grandson of Du’a who was famous for spreading Islam in East Turkestan. Although, in the beginning his rule was limited by the intervention of the tribal leaders, he was nonetheless able consolidate his rule and centralize power in the state. With these acts the Chaghadaid realm finally broke into two parts and was never again united. Within some

39 From his reign two Mongolian decrees preserved: one is the Mong01 of the present study the other is a tax exemption (BT XVI: 173–175, Nr. 70).
decades the western parts were conquered by Tamerlane (r. 1370–1405), while the eastern part became the so-called Moyul Khanate (Kim 1999: 299–304; Biran 2009: 58–60).

As it can be seen from the historical survey presented above the period from the early 13th to the mid-14th century was not a calm epoch for Uyghur lands. Although their voluntary submission, as well as their skills in literacy and administration, ensured them a privileged status within the empire from its formative and early period until the middle of the 13th century, from that time on their territories became a more or less permanent battlefield for the various branches of the Mongol aristocracy. First involved in internal conflicts concerning Möngke’s accession, they then suffered from the war between Ariγ Böke and Qubilai and later became a border zone in the fight between Qaidu and Yuan forces. The region lost its independence during the latter conflict and the ruling house of the iduk kut was moved to Gansu, meanwhile first the Yuan took direct control over the Uyghur territories then from the first decades of the 14th century they became a part of the Chaghadaid ulus. Conflict between the Central Asian Mongols and Yuan dynasty blazed once more in the 1310s, a period in which Yuan forces again entered Uyghur lands. When the conflict was resolved by Kebek in 1323, the territory became a part of his realm again and remained there until the division of the state in 1347, but these last decades were full of internal and external conflicts too. Nevertheless on the basis of the dated documents from the region we can state that administrative systems in the region functioned more or less permanently.

40 According to Matsui the name of the Moyul state goes back to the designation of the Chaghadaid rulers for their state: Dumdadu Mongol Ulus ‘the Middle Mongolian Empire’ (Matsui 2009b: 117).
Chapter II: The sources of the postal system of the Mongol Empire in general

However the topic of the present study is the postal system of the Mongol Empire in northeastern Turkestan, and due to this fact the main sources are the Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents of the Turfan region from the 13th and 14th centuries, other kind of sources are used as a comparative material too. For the reason that the most important sources concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire have never been collected and described in one work, it seems appropriate to add such a chapter to the present study. Of course the description of every single source which can be connected somehow to the yam-system would go beyond the scope of a chapter in this dissertation, thus only the most important written sources will be discussed here and references will be given concerning further literature. The main aim of this chapter is to present those – mainly narrative – sources which compose the traditional basis for the research of the yam-system.

2.1. The Secret History of the Mongols

The epic chronicle called The Secret History of the Mongols (Monγqol-un niuča tobča’an) is the earliest and most important literary source of the Mongolian languages as well as the life of Chinggis Khan. The question of the author(s) and the exact date of the composition of the text are long debated but there is no final result of the discussion. Taking everything into account the most what can be said is that the text was composed sometime in the middle of the 13th century along the Kerülen river in Khentii Province (North-eastern part of modern Mongolia), most probably by a member Chinggis’ family (cf.: SH I: xxv–xl).

The work is composed of 282 paragraphs and basically it can be divided into two parts: the first part from §1 to §268 is a detailed story of the life and career of Chinggis himself, while the second part from §267 to §282 describe his son and successor Ögödei’s reign (1229–1241). The first part of the work after the presentation of the ancestry and the legendary origins of the Mongols, describe a very detailed picture about Chinggis’ life from its earliest stages (from his born in ca. 1162) through his entire career till his death in 1227. Contrary to this the second part is rather sketchy and deals mainly with the political history of Ögödei’s reign.
For the purpose of the present study the second part of the work is more important, because the paragraphs concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire (§279–281) can be found in this section. The narrator of the Secret History claims that this description is about the establishment of the yam-system, but as Adam J. Silverstein pointed out this story is rather about the reform of an existing system than the installation of a new one (Silverstein 2007: 146–148). Either Ögödei reformed or created the yam-system the importance of the institution is shown in §281 where the establishment of the post is enumerated as second among the five good deeds of the ruler:

“As my second deed, I had post stations set up so that our messengers could ride in haste all along the way; and for that purpose I had all necessities conveyed to the post stations.” (SH I: 217)

Due to the high value of this source many translation and edition was published during the last more than a century. These publications as well as the complicated history of the manuscripts of the text, and the research history of the source is presented in the introduction of Igor de Rachewiltz’s edition of the Secret History (SH I: xxv–cxiii). Beside the informative introduction this two volumes edition of the work present the most detailed commentaries, with rich further literature on almost every emerging question concerning the text. In 2013 Rachewiltz published a third supplementary volume with additions, corrections and revisions in the text and in the commentaries involving the up to date literature.

2.2. Chinese sources

Because of the thousands of years long literary tradition of the Chinese civilisation, beside the works of the Persian historiographers (see below) the Chinese sources are the most numerous and one of the most remarkable concerning the history of the Mongol Empire in general. This statement remains more or less true in the case of the postal relay system of the empire too. Moreover beside the narrative sources they offer the greatest collection of documentary sources concerning the yam-system. The description of all the relevant texts was presented in Olbricht’s monograph (Olbricht 1954: 12–32), so here we confine ourselves to mention the three most important of the Chinese sources: the official history of the Yuan dynasty (Yuanshi
元史)\textsuperscript{41} and the two big document collections: the *Compendium for governing the world* (Jingshi dadian 經世大典)\textsuperscript{42} and the *Institutions of the Yuan* (Yuan dianzhang 元典章)\textsuperscript{43}.

The official histories of the Chinese dynasties were written or rather compiled always under the succeeding or a later dynasty. From the Tang dynasty (618–907) these were official undertakings by the order of the new dynasty, and these works followed always the same principles and methods.\textsuperscript{44} Among these dynastical histories the official history of the Yuan dynasty was completed during the shortest time. The first ruler of the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), the Hongwu Emperor (r. 1368–1398) ordered in early 1369 the compilation of the *Yuanshi*. Two consecutive historical commissions fulfilled the undertakings in Nanjing, the new capital of the Ming dynasty: the first commission with sixteen scholars worked 188 days in 1369, the second commission of fourteen scholars worked 143 days in 1370. So altogether the 210 juan of the *Yuanshi* were completed within 331 days (\textcite{YANG1965:44–46; MOTE1994:689–690}). On the one hand the *Yuanshi* was often considered as it suffers from many errors and careless editing due to the extreme haste of the compilation and the limited amount of sources.\textsuperscript{45} On the other hand due to the short time of compilation the historians of the two commissions often inserted their sources without editing and because of this the *Yuanshi* is less affected by the Ming point of view than the Chinese dynasties’ official histories in general by their successors’ perspective.

The *Yuanshi* consists of 47 juan of basic annals (benji 本紀), 8 juan of tables (biao 表), 58 juan of treatises (zhi 志) and 97 juan of biographies (liezhuan 列傳). In the *Yuanshi* within the “*Treatise on the Military*” (bingzhi 兵志) there are two sections in juan 101 about the postal relay system: one about the *jamči* (Chin.: zhan chi 站赤) and one about the military express couriers (Chin.: *jidipu* 急遞鋪). As it was proved the main direct source of those parts of the *Yuanshi* to where the chapters concerning the postal system belong was the below discussed *Jingshi dadian* (RATCHINEVSKY1937: XXII–XXIV; FRANKE 1949: 31–34; HSIAO1978: 69–70; MOTE1994: 697–699). But in the *Yuanshi* only about 10 percent of the *Jingshi*
dadian’s documents (65 from the ca. 600) were inserted, and the whole section is an abridged edition. Haneda Tōru pointed out that the section about the post was copied almost randomly from the Jingshi dadian. Furthermore the concerning part of the Yuanshi goes up to only 1324, while the Jingshi dadian discusses the events till 1329 (cited by HSIAO 1978: 71).46 Due to these facts Olbricht regards the Yuanshi as a source of secondary value concerning the postal system (OLBRICHT 1954: 20–23), however it has to be mentioned that other parts (e.g. the annals, biographies etc.) of the official history of the Yuan contain important information concerning the jam-system, but it has to be added that the Yuanshi contains no information concerning the period of the last Yuan emperor Toγon Temür (r. 1333–1368).

The Jingshi dadian is an official compilation from 1330–133147, which was written by the order of the Yuan emperor Tuy Temür (r. 1328–1329, 1329–1332). The aim of the work was to collect all kind of official documents for the empire’s administration. In order to do so the editors gathered documents from different offices and they did not only copy the original documents but transformed their language from vernacular style into a more literate style. Moreover two officials were assigned to translate Mongolian documents into Chinese for the same purpose. The most of these documents were dealing with events after Qubilai’s reign because the editors got no permission to see the secret chronicles of the earlier periods. Only a part of the work is preserved48 but from the preface we know that the work consisted of 880 juans divided into ten categories. The preface49 of the section which deals with the jam-system describes the postal relay system in general, the passports, stations, provisions, the workers of the post and the couriers. According to Olbricht, the main body of the jamči section contains more than 600 documents concerning the post from the period between 1229 and 1330 in strict chronological order. Moreover there is a very detailed register of postal stations, with approximately 1350 stations ordered according to the administrative districts with the number of horses, oxen and sheep, as well as the number of carts, litters and boats. Furthermore the list partly presents the number of boatmen, litter and load carriers who stationed on each jam. But this list is surely not complete because other sources mention the name of 600 other post stations (OLBRICHT 1954: 24).

---

46 According to Olbricht the Jingshi dadian contains documents up to 1330 (OLBRICHT 1954: 24).
47 According to Olbricht the work was compiled between 1329 and 1331 (OLBRICHT 1954: 23).
48 The most of the Jingshi dadian’s text were preserved in the great encyclopaedia of the Ming period, the Yongle dadian 永樂大典, edited between 1403 and 1408.
49 The preface contrary to the other parts of the work was preserved in the Guochao wenlei 國朝文類, the great literary anthology of the Yuan period (OLBRICHT 1954: 24).
The *Yuan dianzhang* is a 60 *juan* long compilation of laws and regulations which were issued between 1270\(^5\) and 1320, but these documents are not edited in a chronological order but according to subjects. In general it can be said that the language of the documents shows a bureaucratic style and often close to the colloquial Chinese of that time. Moreover, many of the documents were translated from the original Mongolian language. Three *juan* (16, 36 and 37) of the work are concerned with the *yam*-system. *Juan* 16 contains 30 documents about the regulations of the provision for the couriers and other travelling officials and about the amount of food that they were allowed to require. *Juan* 37 contains eight decrees concerning the military express couriers (*jidipu* 急遞鋪). *Juan* 36 is the most important for the purpose of the present study, because it contains 100 documents under the following main entries:

1. Post stations (with 7 subtitles)
2. Couriers (with 11 subtitles)
3. Controllers (with 2 subtitles)
4. Postal officers (with 4 subtitles)
5. Families with duties concerning the postal system (7 subtitles)
6. Permission for the usage of the postal system (14 subtitles)
7. Post horses (15 subtitles)
8. Long range post horses (3 subtitles)
9. Boats and litters (7 subtitles)
10. Transport and transport companionship (4 subtitles)
11. Violation of the postal regulation (11 subtitles)
12. Other regulations (1 subtitle)

(Olbricht 1954: 25)

As it can be seen, even from this very short discussion of the three most important works concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire, the Chinese sources offer narrative (the annals and biographies of the *Yuanshi*) and documentary sources too. Moreover the Chinese documents are much more numerous than the similar preserved material of any other language. Unfortunately, since the often criticized work of Peter Olbricht no western scholar undertook the examination of the original sources.

\(^5\) According to Olbricht, the documents can be dated between 1261 and 1320 (Olbricht 1954: 25).
2.3. Persian sources

As it is mentioned above the works of the Persian historiographers compose one of the most important groups of sources concerning the study of the Mongol Empire. From the broad selection of Persian sources, the works of three historiographers (ʿAṭā-Malik Juvainī, Rashīd al-Dīn and Wasṣāf) will be set off in the following, which contain the most important information concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire.

ʿAṭā-Malik Juvainī (1226–1283) is the author of the Taʾrīkh-i Jahān-Gushā (“The History of the World-Conqueror”),51 what is one of the most important Persian works about the early history of the Mongol Empire. Juvainī himself was a Persian aristocrat. His father was admitted into the conqueror Mongols’ service in the 1230’s. Later Juvainī and his brother followed their father in the service of the Mongols. Juvainī visited the capital of the empire two times: in 1249–1251 and in 1251–1253 as a member of Arγun Aqa’s (died in 1278)52 cortege. When later in 1256 Hülegü entered to Khurasan, Juvainī was attached to his service and accompanied his campaign against the Ismailis. After the conquest of Baghdad in 1258 he was appointed as governor of all the territories which were governed earlier by the Abbasid Caliphhs, i.e. the city of Baghdad, Arab Iraq (Lower Mesopotamia) and Khuzistan. He held this position for more than 20 years until his death in 1283 (BOYLE 1958: xv–xxv; BARTHOLD–BOYLE 1965: 606).

Juvainī started to write his work during his second visit to Qara Qorum in 1252 or 1253 and he did not finish it till 1260. Due to the fact that he had to work during his long travels there are some inaccuracies in the work. The History of the World-Conqueror can be divided into three main parts: 1) History of the Mongols down to the events after the death of Güyük Khan (1248) including the history of the Chaghadaids and Jočids; 2) History of the Khwārazm Shahs; 3) Continuation of the history of the Mongols till the overthrow of the Ismailis (BOYLE 1958: xxv–xxix; BARTHOLD–BOYLE 1965: 606–607). As an eyewitness of the events Juvainī gives an accurate and detailed picture about the formative period of the empire and its western expansion. In his description of the events the postal system appears several times, but apart from some paragraphs he did not devoted a particular section for the post, however his accounts are very informative and trustable in this sense too.


52 On the life and carrier of Arγun Aqa, see: LANE 1999.
Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍlallāh – who was considered by David Morgan as the greatest Persian historian of the Ilkhanid period (MORGAN 1995: 443) – was born in Hamadan as a son of a Jewish apothecary. He converted to Islam at the age of thirty and probably at the same time he started to serve Abaqa Ilkhan (r. 1265–1281) as a physician. The next information about his life is that in 1298 he became the deputy of Ghazan Ilkhan’s (r. 1295–1304) vizier. From that time his star was rising. He carried out Ghazan’s famous fiscal reforms in Iran, of what Rashīd al-Dīn may has been one of the real authors. Later, under the reign of Öljeitū (r. 1304–1316) he became one of the most influential statesmen in Iran. Under Öljeitū’s successor Abū Saʿīd (r. 1316–1335) due to hostile intrigues he was disgraced and executed (1328) and all of his properties were confiscated (BOYLE 1971: 3–6; MORGAN 1995: 443–444).

Rashīd al-Dīn started to work on the Jāmiʿ al-Tavārīkh (“Complete Collection of Histories”) in the reign of Ghazan but he finished it only under the rule of his successor Öljeitū. However, the work is attached to Rashīd al-Dīn most probably there was a group of scholars, translators, informants and other associates who took part in the making, so similarly to the Chinese official histories it was a project fulfilled by a scholarly committee, which was headed by Rashīd al-Dīn (ALLSEN 2001: 95–101). The Jāmiʿ al-Tavārīkh was divided into three volumes, from which the first two is preserved. Volume one is divided into five parts: 1) the history of the Mongol and Turkic tribes; 2) the history of the Mongols before the rise of Chinggis Khan; 3) the life of Chinggis; 4) the successors of Chinggis Khan from Ögödei (r. 1229–1241) to Temür Khan (r. 1294–1307); 5) the history of the Ilkhans from Hülegū (r. 1256–1265) till the death of Ghazan. The second volume of the work has not yet a full edition. Originally, it was divided into two parts from which the first part about the history of Öljeitū is missing. The second part is a universal history: it begins with Adam, the Patriarchs, the biblical prophets and the pre-Islamic rulers of Persia. It is followed by the history of Muhammad and the Caliphate down to the Mongol invasion in 1258; it has also separate sections on the Muslim dynasties of Persia, about the Oghuz tribes, the Turks, the Chinese, the Jews, the Franks (i.e. the Europeans) and the Indians. Andrew Boyle in his introduction to his translation considered this second volume as the first universal history (BOYLE 1971: 7).

Unfortunately, no manuscript of the third volume of the Jāmiʿ al-Tavārīkh, the Šuvar al-

53 About the particular contribution of Bolad the Yuan delegate at the Ilkhanid court to this work: ALLSEN 1996: 13–14; ALLSEN 2001: 72–80.
54 A composite edition of the Persian text was published by Bahman Karīmī (KARĪMĪ 1959) and a complete edition by Rawshan and Müsavī (RAWSHAN – MUŞAVĪ 1994). The English translation of the complete work was done by Wheeler M. Thackston in three volumes (THACKSTON 1999).
55 The standard English translation of this section is BOYLE 1971.
aqālīm ("Forms of the Climes") is known up to now. This volume was devoted to geography, but besides the geographical and topographical account of the then known world it contained a description of the highways and postal stations of Ilkhanid Iran (JAHN 1964: 119–120; BOYLE 1971: 8; ALLSEN 2001: 105). However, the absence of the Ṣuvar al-aqālīm is really regrettable, the preserved parts of the Jāmiʿ al-Tavārīkh still contains very important information about the postal system of the Mongol Empire. On the one hand similarly to Juvainī’s work, this source gives plenty accounts on the embassies of the Mongol period and on the establishment, maintenance and reforms of the yam-system. On the other hand beside the description of the reforms of Ghazan – which dealt with the relay system too –, Rashīd al-Dīn depicts a very vivid picture about the abuses concerning the postal system in the pre-Ghazan period. Meanwhile, as David Morgan pointed out the scholars have to preserve their critical attitude towards this description, since Rashīd al-Dīn was one of the chief ministers of Ghazan and according to Vaṣṣāf’s account – who himself was a protégé of Rashīd – the administration of the postal stations fell within his competence (MORGAN 2000: 382–383).

The last Persian author, who has to be discussed in this chapter is the above mentioned Vaṣṣāf al-Ḥadrat (“the court panegyrist”) and his work the Tārīkh-i Vaṣṣaf or more accurately the Tajziyat al-amṣār va-tajiyat al-aʿʃār “The allocation of cities and the propulsion of epochs”. Vaṣṣāf himself worked in the financial administration of Fārs province, and later under Ölǰeitü and his successor Abu Saʿīd (r. 1316–1335) he was in charge of revenue collection in three other provinces.

The Tārīkh-i Vaṣṣaf was composed as a continuation of al-Juvainī’s Taʾrīkh-i Jahān-Gushā in five volumes. Vaṣṣāf was able to present the preface of the work through the mediation of the two viziers Rashīd al-Dīn and Saʿīd al-Dīn to Ghazan Ilkhan in 1303. Ghazan was pleased with the work and allotted Vaṣṣāf with a pension. The first four volume of the work was presented to Ölǰeitü in 1312, but the last volume was finished only 15 or 16 years later. Vaṣṣāf’s work is written in an extremely high style, which was a model for the later Persian historiography. The work has a so highly artificial character that according to Vaṣṣāf Ölǰeitü Ilkhan was not able to understand a single word of it when he read certain parts of his work to him (BRWONE 1920: 67–68; JACKSON 2002: 174). However, the Tārīkh-i Vaṣṣaf is a very important source concerning the period between 1257 and 1328. Concerning the postal relay system, Vaṣṣāf’s information complements Rashīd al-Dīn’s accounts, and helps us to draw a more realistic picture of the yam-system in Iran.

---

56 Karl Jahn considered the Ṣuvar al-aqālīm as the fourth volume of the Jāmiʿ al-Tavārīkh (JAHN 1964: 119).
2.4. Latin sources

In general, besides the Secret History and the Chinese and Persian sources, the Latin sources are the most important concerning the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire. Firstly three of those European friars itineraries will be discussed who travelled within the Mongol Empire in the middle of the 13th century: John of Plano Carpini’s (ca. 1185–1252), C. de Bridia’s and William of Rubruck’s (ca. 1220–ca. 1293). Then the probably most famous description of the Mongol Empire, Maco Polo’s book will be presented and lastly a commercial handbook, Francesco Balducci Pegolotti’s Pratica della mercatura (‘The Practice of Merchandise’) will be introduced.

After the Mongol campaigns against Eastern- (1223, 1236–1240) and Central Europe (1241–1242)\(^{57}\) the European leaders felt the need to establish diplomatic relations and gain first-hand information about the Mongols.\(^{58}\) The first European embassy which reached the centre of the Mongol Empire was sent as a result of the Council of Lyons in 1245 by Pope, Innocent IV in the same year. This embassy (1245–1247) was led by John of Plano Carpini (Pian die Carpine) (ca. 1180–1252), a high ranking Franciscan friar and an experienced diplomat who was already about 60 years old when he undertook the journey. Carpini’s route went through Central- and Eastern Europe: in Poland a Polish Franciscan, Benedict joined them as interpreter, then they travelled through Galicia (Halych) and Kiev. From there they went on to the steppe region where they met with the Mongol outposts, who brought them first to the local leaders, then to the court of Batu (r. 1227–1255) at the lower Volga. Batu was the leader of Jöči’s ulus. He decided to send the envoys further in haste to the centre of the empire, in order to arrive in time to the inauguration ceremony of Güyük Khan (r. 1246–1248). Carpini and Benedict were forced to ride as fast as possible with 5 or 6 relays of horses per day by using the Mongol postal system, while their companions had to stay at Batu’s

\(^{57}\) On the western campaigns of the Mongols, see: GREKOV–JAKUBOVSKIJ 1950: 35–56; ZIMONYI 1984; ZIMONYI 2014.

\(^{58}\) In fact even before the Mongol campaigns of the 1230s and 1240s departed some missions from Hungary into the Eastern European steppe region. The Dominican friar, Julian led two missions: one to the Volga-Ural region (1235–1236) and one to the eastern Russian territories (1237). Julian and his companions’ original aim were to find and convert Eastern Hungarians. Julian found some of them in 1236 in the vicinity of Volga Bulgaria, and from them he heard about the Mongol trait first time. During the second expedition he could not reach the Eastern Hungarians due to the Mongol conquest, but he brought back a letter of Batu to the Hungarian king Béla IV (r. 1227–1255) at the lower Volga. Julian was the first who gave first-hand information to Béla IV and to the Papacy about the Mongols (RACHEWILTZ 1971: 41–43; VÁSÁRY 2009: 68–69). The standard edition of the so-called ‘Report of Riccardus’ and the ‘Letter of Julian’ is DÖRRIE 1956: 147–182. The German translation of both texts: GÖCKENJAN–SWEENEY 1985: 69–91; 95–125.
ordu. Thus Carpini was the first European who personally visited the court of the Khan in Mongolia, near to Qara Qorum and who came back and gave a first-hand account to the Pope.59

A letter of the Armenian king Hethum I (died in 1271) and the accounts of the Dominican envoys confirmed the role of Christianity among the Mongols, moreover according to other accounts Sartaq (died 1256) the son of Batu was a Christian himself. In Dawson’s view this information led the French king Louis IX (r. 1214–1270) to send the Franciscan friar, William of Rubruck in 1253 into the Mongol Empire in order to establish relations with the Christians of Central Asia (DAWSON 1955: xxi). According to Peter Jackson Rubruck’s mission was rather personal. He states that Rubruck had three aims: 1) to make contact with Sartaq; 2) to preach the Gospel among the Mongols in large scale; 3) and his main purpose was to help those German miners in their spiritual needs who had been captured in Hungary in 1241–1242 and were taken into Central Asia. As Jackson pointed it out all the three aims of Rubruck failed, but his account about his journey is still highly important (JACKSON 2011: 228–229). Rubruck departed from the court of Luis IX at Acre and first went to Constantinople from where he sailed through the Black Sea to Sudak at the Crimea. He reached Batu’s orda at the lower Volga through the steppe region, from where he went to the centre of the Empire. On his way back first he went to Syria in 1255, but the French king had gone home already, so later he followed him.

From the above mentioned details it is clear that both Carpini’s60 and Rubruck’s61 reports are important sources of the first rank. This is partly due to the fact that both envoys acted as a spy too (JACKSON 2011: 227, 228), but while Carpini’s mission was rather diplomatic, Rubruck’s undertaking was rather personal and pious. These differences can be detected in their accounts. Carpini’s Ystoria Mongalorum (‘The history of the Mongols’) is a well edited account about the Mongols’ history, customs and laws in general, furthermore it includes the first European description of the Mongol military organization and some hints

---

59 Parallel to Carpini’s mission Innocent IV dispatched two other embassies to the Mongols, headed by Dominican friars: Andrew of Longjumeau and Ascelinus. Both envoys met with the Mongol general Baiju (fl. 1230–1260), Andrew of Longjumeau in Tabriz, while Ascelinus in the valley of the Arax river. It is known that the opportunity to travel to the Mongol capital was offered to Ascelinus but he refused it (RACHEWILTZ 1971: 112–118; JACKSON 2011: 225).

60 The critical edition of the Latin text with the description of the manuscript tradition: WYNGAERT 1929: 3–130. The standard English translation of the text: DAWSON 1955: 3–72. A re-edition of the original text and a German translation with extensive annotation: GIEBAUF 1995. For the Central Asian travels of Carpini, Rubruck and Marco Polo, see: Map IX.

61 The critical edition of the text with the description of the manuscript tradition: WYNGAERT 1929: 147–332. An English translation can be found in Dawson’s edition (DAWSON 1955: 89–220), but the translation of Peter Jackson has better apparatus, which was written in co-working with David Morgan (JACKSON 1990).
concerning the methods of resistance. Carpini’s *Ystoria* came down to us in two versions, from which the second one contains – besides some other changes and interpolations – an additional chapter about his actual journey. Furthermore, a drafted version of Carpini’s *History of the Mongols* was written in Poland in 1247 under the title *Tartar Relation* by a certain C. de Bridia.62 Most probably, C. de Bridia was one of the members of Carpini’s entourage, who had to stay in Batu’s territory and joined to the envoys only on their way back to Europe. Unfortunately, this is our whole knowledge about the author, however even from this it is clear that *Tartar Relation* at least partly based on first-hand information, even though C. de Bridia borrowed extensive parts of his work from Carpini. Contrary to Carpini’s work the most of Rubruck’s account deals with his journey and his personal experiences. For the purpose of the present study both sources – and that of C. de Bridia’s account as well – are highly important, due to the fact that they include first-hand information about the functioning of the yam-system.

Probably the most well-known European source about the Mongols is Marco Polo’s (1254–1324) *Description of the World* or as commonly called in English *The Travels of Marco Polo*.63 Marco met with his father and uncle, Niccolo and Maffeo Polo – who were Venetian traders – for the first time in 1269 after they travelled through Central Asia and reached even the court of Qubilai Khan. Two years later – when Marco was only seventeen years old – they departed together to Asia again. This travel of Marco lasted more than twenty years, whilst he travelled through and through Asia by land and sea, most of it in the service of the Mongols. He was the first European who reached China, spent a longer time there and left an account about his experiences for the posterity. At the time of Marco Polo’s travels the inner political stability of the Mongol Empire was over and he was the eye-witness of the inter-Mongol struggles in the last decades of the 13th century.

Due to these circumstances (the longer period he spent in Asia, the different political circumstances, etc.) Marco Polo’s book is diverse from the above mentioned accounts of the Christian friars: it is much longer and contains many anecdotes, sometimes even legendary stories, but in most of the cases it gives an accurate description. However the contemporaries of Marco Polo regarded his account as unbelievable and not long ago its trustworthiness was queried again, the most significant researches of the field proved its authenticity again and

---

62 The Latin text is edited and translated into English by George Painter (PAINTER 1965).
63 There are numerous translations of the text into many languages. A full bibliographical collection with commentary about the Marco Polo editions can be found at: VOGL 2013: 547–554. From the English versions Aldo Ricci’s translation (RICCI 1931) – which were based on Benedetto’s critical edition (BENEDETTO 1928) of the original texts – contains a useful index, but the most commonly used is the Moule–Pelliot version (MOULE–PELLIOT 1938).
still count it as one of the most important sources concerning the Mongol Empire.\textsuperscript{64} Marco devoted a separate chapter to the postal system of the Mongol Empire, which is the longest description of the system in the contemporary Latin sources. However it is not absent from exaggerations, it is still one of our most precious sources. Marco Polo’s book is the first contemporary European source which reports about the runners within the postal system.\textsuperscript{65}

Francesco Balducci Pegolotti (fl. 1310–1347) was a representative of the Florentine Bardi banking house. He worked in Antwerp between 1315 and 1317, than went to London and later to Cyprus from 1324 to 1327 in the service of the Bardi Bank. Later he acted as politician at his homeland. Due to his high position he was well informed about the international commerce in this period. The larger part of his book the \textit{La pratica della mercatura} (“Treatise on the Practice of Trade”)\textsuperscript{66} was written between 1310 and 1340. Pegolotti’s book can be taken as a handbook for merchants: it describes the markets, the customs of business and the value of money, weight and measures throughout the then known world. Most probably he did not travel to China in person, but he used the accounts of the merchants who traded in Asia. The book does not deal with the postal system of the Mongol Empire in particular, but its account on the safe travel from Tana to China in the second chapter points out that infrastructure of the \textit{yam}-system functioned even after the dissolution of the Mongol Empire (\textsc{Yule–Cordier} 1914: 138–141; \textsc{Evans} 1936: xv, xxv).

\section*{2.5. Other sources}

Lastly some other important sources – which do not fit into the above presented sub-chapters – shall be discussed in chronological order at the end of this chapter.

One of the most important Armenian sources about the history of Armenia under Mongol rule is the work of Grigor of Akanc\textsuperscript{t}, the \textit{History of the Nation of the Archers}.\textsuperscript{67} Our

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{64} In her controversial book Frances Wood set up a theory that Marco Polo never went further to the East than the Black Sea region (\textsc{Wood} 1995). In response a series of articles were written by the leading scholars of the field in order to confute Wood’s statements (\textsc{Morgan} 1996, \textsc{Rachewiltz} 1997, \textsc{Jackson} 1998) but the series of refutations enriched in the last years too (\textsc{Vogel} 2013).

\textsuperscript{65} Later the Franciscan Friar, Odoric of Pordenone (1286–1331) travelled from Europe to the Far East (1318–1329/30) and spent three years in Qanbaliq (present day Beijing) at the court of Yisün Temür Khan (r. 1323–1328). Odoric reported the usage of runners in a very familiar way to Marco Polo; moreover, he mentioned the usage of dromedary camels within the \textit{yam}-system (\textsc{Wyngaert} 1929: 477–478; \textsc{Yule–Cordier} 1913: 232–234). On the life and travels of Odoric, see: \textsc{Yule–Cordier} 1913: 3–35.

\textsuperscript{66} The edition of the original text: \textsc{Evans} 1936. The English translation of the relevant parts of the book: \textsc{Yule–Cordier} 1914: 146–159.

\textsuperscript{67} The critical edition of the Armenian text with an English translation and commentary: \textsc{Blake–Frye} 1949. In the same issue of the \textit{Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies} Francis W. Cleaves published an article about the
only knowledge about the author is that he left from East Armenia to Cilicia in 1265 or 1266 and there joined as a monk to the Akner monastery. The work presents the history of Armenia between 1220 and 1273 (HACIKYAN 2002: 583–584). There is one paragraph in the work (BLAKE–FRYE 1949: 345, lines: 104–110) concerning the establishment of the yam-system in the Armenian territories by Hülegü, but it is quite important due to the fact that it is the only contemporary Armenian source which gives an account on this topic.

There is one passage of the letter (lines 24th–29th) of Ölǰeitü (r. 1304–1316) to Philip the Fair (r. 1285–1314) of France, where he writes about the reunification of the empire and in close connection to it about the reconnection of the jam stations. So this passage shows the primary importance of the postal system in the unity of the Mongol Empire.

Ibn Baṭṭūta (1304–1368/69 or 1377) is probably the most well-known Muslim traveller of the middle ages, who is renowned for his travels around the entire Muslim world of the 14th century and even beyond its borders in South and East Asia. His book – known as Rehla (Journey) – was written down after his dictation by Ibn Juzayy (1321–1357) in 1357. Not every part of the work is reliable, for example the description of the land of the Bulgars, certain stories about China, Syria and Arabia were borrowed from other Muslim writers and contains unrealistic elements (MIQUEL 1979: 735–736). In spite of these problematic parts, Ibn Baṭṭūta’s accounts of his travels in the Golden Horde and in Central Asia (ca. 1332–1333) are by all means important sources concerning the postal system. The book describes in details the way of travelling and means of transport in these territories. Moreover he gives an account on the functioning of postal houses in China.

Lastly besides the contemporary accounts, another – so far barely used – group of sources have to be mentioned here: the travel accounts of the early modern period and the modern ages. As Thomas Allsen pointed out in many cases in his review on Adam J. Silverstein’s book about the postal systems of the pre-modern Islamic world (ALLSEN 2010), these Central and East Asian travelogues can be used not only in the research of the successor institutions of the yam-system, but they provide further data concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire and help the interpretation of the contemporary sources. The reason of their applicability – beside the fact that the descendants of the yam-system functioned even Malay names and terms in the text (CLEAVES 1949b). The authorship of the text was clarified by Blake and Frye in their introduction to the text (BLAKE–FRYE 1949: 271–274).

several centuries later – is that the basic infrastructures of traveling (means of travel, the roads and other facilities, etc.) basically did not change till the 20th century. The enumeration of all the relevant early modern and modern travel accounts would certainly go beyond the scope of the present study, but a good deal of them can be found among the references of Allsen’s review from 2010.
Chapter III: Research history of the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire

Although many scholars since the first major works on the history of the Mongol Empire have pointed out the importance of the postal system, there is still a lot to do in this field. Apart from a monograph about the postal system of the Yuan dynasty (OLBRICHT 1954) some book chapters and articles on the yam-system, not much has been published in western languages so far. In the followings the main arguments of the most important works will be collected. Usually these works concentrate on some recurrent topics, so in this review they will be discussed in that order, as follows: 1) creation of the yam-system, 2) the purposes and services of the postal system, 3) administration and finances of the postal system, 4) inheritance.

3.1 The creation of the postal system

Bertold Spuler collected plenty of sources concerning the Mongol post in the first editions of his monographs on Ilkhanid Iran in 1939 (SPULER 1955: 422–426) and the Golden Horde (SPULER 1943: 409–415). He based his standpoint on the accounts of Rashīd al-Dīn and Rubruck and argued that Chinggis Khan (r. 1206–1227) had already established the yam-system. As mentioned above the first whole book on a western language concerning the Mongol postal system was written by Peter Olbricht in 1954. Olbricht drew Chinese sources and the Secret History of the Mongols into the investigation and dated the official establishment of the Mongol post to 1234 (OLBRICHT 1954: 41). David Morgan based his arguments on the chronicle of the Persian historiographer and the Mongolian epic chronicle, Handea Tōru’s Genchō ekiden zakkō (1930) seems to be the most important. Rachewiltz is quite critical towards Olbricht’s work and mentioned that he relied heavily on this work of Haneda Tōru (SH II: 1027).

70 Recently Hodong Kim reported (Kim 2009: 37 note 17) two Chinese works (MO 2004; DANG 2006) about the yam-system, but they were not available to me.

71 This topic is usually discussed in connection with the origins of the yam, but due to that fact that a whole chapter is devoted to this latter subject in the present dissertation the history of research concerning this will be discussed there, in chapter VI.

72 Olbricht reviewed the earlier works on the post in his book (OLBRICHT 1954: 32–35), but apart from the two chapters of Spuler mentioned above and some source publishing there were only Japanese and Chinese works. From these Handea Tōru’s Genchō ekiden zakkō (1930) seems to be the most important. Rachewiltz is quite critical towards Olbricht’s work and mentioned that he relied heavily on this work of Haneda Tōru (SH II: 1027).
surmising that Chinggis Khan had already arranged some kind of communications but probably not a regular postal relay system. He stressed that according to the Secret History there was already, prior to 1234, too great a burden on the population due to the frequent coming and going of messengers. He thought that Ögödei (r. 1229–1241) created the postal network first on his territories then connected it with his brothers’ (Čayatai and Tolui) and nephew’s (Batu) territory (Morgan 2007: 91). In a later article, Morgan added Juvainī to his sources, and concluded that 1234 was the time of the first reform of the system and not the time of its creation. According to Didier Gazagnadou, the establishment of the postal system took place at the quriltay of 1218 (Gazagnadou 1994: 45). Adam J. Silverstein in his book, Postal Systems in the Pre-Modern Islamic World devoted a whole chapter to the yam-system. According to him, the establishment of the yam was a response to the challenge caused by the rapid expansion of the Mongol Empire. He stated that the postal system undoubtedly already functioned under the reign of Chinggis Khan in some parts of the empire, and for justifying this statement beside the sources mentioned above he cited the travel account of Chang Chung, the Daoist monk who travelled from China to eastern Iran between 1220 and 1224. Moreover he argued that a careful reading of the relevant passages of the Secret History (§279–281) strengthens this theory, because a part of Ögödei’s reforms were issued in order to ease the burden of the population caused by the frequent demands of the travelling envoys (Silverstein 2007: 144–148). Thomas Allsen agreed with Silverstein about the creation of the yam in his review of the latter’s book. Moreover, he drew further Chinese and Persian sources into the investigation and called attention to the travels of Yelü Chucai, the Khitan advisor of Chinggis Khan, in 1227 when he travelled to the former Jin dynasty’s (1115–1234) capital by post horses and used post stations (Allsen 2010: 243).

To sum up, according to the earlier works it seems sure that some kind of postal relay system was already in use in the lifetime of Chinggis Khan. Later in 1234, Ögödei Khan the son of Chinggis reformed the system due to the earlier abuses and connected the sub-systems already working across the whole territory of the empire.

3.2 Purposes and services of the postal system

According to Morgan the creation of the yam had four main purposes: support for the travels of envoys to and from the Mongol court, the transportation of goods, particularly from North China to the core area of the Mongols, to help the transmission of the orders of the Khans and finally gathering intelligence. The maintenance was the duty of the army, but raising the
necessary horse reinforcements and other supplies were levied on the local population (Morgan 2007: 90–91). In his review, Allsen ascribes to Silverstein the finding that the most important duties of the pre-modern postal system were: intelligence, the transmission of the official orders and propaganda. Contrary to this, Allsen finds propaganda to be less important in the case of eastern Asian postal systems, while emphasising the importance of the conveyance of non-public information (Allsen 2010: 257). All of the authors agreed that it was very important for the empire to connect different parts, and this was the reason that they built up the system in every newly conquered territory.\(^{73}\)

Spuler mentioned the existence of a special kind of the jam; the so-called narin jam, but thought it only the route with stages between Qara Qorum and North China (Spuler 1955: 423). Olbricht was the first who distinguished the three different types of the Mongol jam: the morin jam ‘horse post’, tenger jam ‘wagon post’ and the narin jam ‘fine’ or ‘narrow post’\(^{74}\) (Olbricht 1954: 45 fn. 100). As Thomas Allsen developed, this more than half a century later, the morin jam can be regarded as the “normal post”, the tenger jam specialized in the transportation of goods, and was used mainly by merchants. This aspect of the postal system was especially important because it supplied the capital Qara Qorum. The narin jam was used only in urgent cases and probably mainly for military purposes (Allsen 2009: 144). Lately, Allsen has compared the data of the Yuanshi 元史 with Rashîd al-Dîn and concluded that all three types can be found in the Persian historiographer’s work. Furthermore, he noted that sometimes special postal routes were created with particular aims. Of these he highlighted three: the 30 stations raised between Shanxi and Beşbalîk from where further stations were established to the West in 1281 by Qubilai (r. 1260–1294) in order to gather intelligence about rebellious princes; the transportation of fresh fruit from Beijing to Shangdu mentioned by Marco Polo; and the gyrfalcon stations also established by Qubilai in 1260 between the mouth of the Amur and Beijing. In his conclusion, Allsen added that among the main duties of the eastern Asian postal systems the transportation of goods and support for interstate relations were much more important than in the Muslim barīd\(^{75}\) (Allsen 2010: 258).

Due to the congruent data of the sources all the authors agreed on the basic services of the Mongol postal system: supply of horses or other necessary mounts, provision of food and

\(^{73}\) As Henthorn and later Allsen pointed out, one of the basic demands of the Mongols toward the population of the newly occupied territories was to set up jam-stations. Allsen proposed that all of the basic demands were established by Chinggis Khan except two: the population register and the establishment of the postal stations, which were introduced for the first time by Ögödei (Henthorn 1963: 194; Allsen 1987: 114–115).

\(^{74}\) Allsen translated this latter as ‘careful-[handling]’ (Allsen 2009: 144).

\(^{75}\) On the barīd-system, see: Sourdel 1979; Silverstein 2007: 7–140.
drink (mainly alcoholic beverage), and lodging. Based his study on Uyghur, Mongolian and Chinese documents, Dai Matsui demonstrated that the amounts of the daily provision was more or less equal in the Chinese territories and in Central Asia. In Chinese measures it was 1 jin 斤 (596.82 gram) of meat, 1 sheng 升 of liquor (ca. 0.84 litre), 1 jin 斤 of grain and in addition in China they gave 1 sheng 升 of rice too (MATSUI 2004a: 197). On the distances between stations and the speed of the travel with the Mongol post accounts vary. In this regard, authors mostly refer to Marco Polo, the itineraries of the western travellers (Carpini, C. de Bridia, Rubruck, etc.) and the Persian sources, mainly Juvainī and Rashīd al-Dīn. George D. Painter compared the accounts of Carpini, C. de Bridia and Rubruck and concluded that the C. de Bridia’s 30 Bohemian miles (ca. 130 modern miles, equal to ca. 210 kilometres) per day data must be an exaggeration. He refers to Rubruck, who travelled with his companions a distance equivalent to Paris-Orleans (ca. 60 miles, equal to ca. 96.5 kilometres) per day in the Kangit country, and changed their horses 2–3 times per day, which would mean that they advanced 2–3 stages every day. This latter information is repeatedly affirmed by Carpini’s data whose daily average pace Painter counted as ca. 30 miles (ca. 48.25 kilometres) per day between the 8th of April and the 22nd of July from Batu’s camp to the Sira Ordu, the summer imperial camp of the Mongols’ about half a day’s journey from Qara Qorum to the south (PAINTER 1965: 37, 96 fn. 2). Concerning C. de Bridia’s 30 Bohemian miles Silverstein commented that this data might be an exaggeration for normal travellers but not impossible for express couriers (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 150 fn. 38). Morgan quoted Marco Polo’s 25–30 miles (ca. 40–48,25 kilometres) distance between stages in inhabited areas and 35–40 miles (ca. 56–64 kilometres) in uninhabited areas. In a later article, he added data from the Persian sources: according to Rashīd al-Dīn there was three farsakhs between each stage, while Vaṣṣāf mentioned four farsakhs. He cited the introductory chapters of Yāqūt’s Mu’jam al-Buldān where one farsakh is equal to three miles (MORGAN 20072: 91; MORGAN 2000: 382). Concerning the reforms of Ghazan Khan (r. 1295–1304) Silverstein cited the same sources and concluded that the distance between stations depended on the circumstances: distance to the next village, the topography of the region and the availability of water. According to him, the important thing was that these stations were established at smaller intervals than a full

76 Alberto E. Minetti wrote an article on the efficiency of the equine express postal systems in which he compared different pre-modern postal systems’ effectiveness with scientific methodology. He concluded that the maintainers of several pre-modern postal systems – among them the Mongols – without any scientific knowledge about the horses’ physiology independently found the optimal parameters, such as travel distances and the related speed. Moreover the average distance between the post stations by the most of the pre-modern postal systems were parallel to the distances between veterinary checkpoints in modern long distance horse races (MINETTI 2003: 786).
day’s travel. He added that contrary to other pre-modern postal systems no description of the particular routes of the yam-system is preserved and in this regard he did not share the opinion of Allsen who supposed that Rashid al-Dīn had written such a work (ALLSEN 2001: 103; SILVERSTEIN 2007: 154; 159). Morgan surmised that the traffic of the postal system normally moved around 25 miles (ca. 40 kilometres) per day but in urgent cases it could be much faster: from Marco Polo we find 200–300 miles (ca. 321.8–482.8 kilometres) a day, and from Rashid al-Dīn 60 farsakhs which is ca. 200 miles (MORGAN 20072: 92). Concerning the mounts and stuff of the stations the Secret History and Rashid al-Dīn are the most quoted sources. Silverstein quoted the former – which mentions twenty post-horses and twenty post-horse keepers– concerning the creation of the yam (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 147) and the latter – who talked about fifteen mounts per station – concerning the reforms of Ghazan Khan (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 159). Olbricht devoted a whole chapter to the officers within the postal system in China under the Mongol rule. He dealt with the post directors (Postvorsteher, Mong.: jamči(n)), the leaders of the post-people (Anführer der Postleute), the warehouse keepers (Speicherverwalter) and the courier companions (Kurierbegleiter; Mong.: ulaγači) (OLBRICHT 1954: 59–80).

It is a common belief that the usage of these services of the postal system was connected to the possession of a so called tablet of authority paiza (Chinese: paizi 牌子, Persian: pāiza, Mongolian: gerege). This could be made of wood, iron, silver or gold, it could be oblong or round in shape and it could carry an image of an animal such as a gerfalcon or tiger (MORGAN 20072: 91; SILVERSTEIN 2007: 142–143). As was shown already by Olbricht it was not always necessary to possess a paiza to use the yam-system (OLBRICHT 1954: 63–64); however these passes were tightly connected to the Mongol postal relay system. Baohai Dang studied all the available paizas and set up a classification for them in his two-part article (DANG 2001; DANG 2003). According to this three kinds of paizas were in circulation depending on their usage: the postal tablets were the first group which permitted the holder to use the postal system; the second group were possessed by the holders of official positions, specifically military leaders; the third group is curfew tablets, which were used for patrol and night travel (DANG 2001: 45). According to Dang, the postal tablets can be divided into three further groups. The earliest version was an oblong, bore a tiger figure and according to the Chinese sources was already issued under the reign of Chinggis Khan. These tablets bore Khitan characters too, which seems to strengthen Morgan’s opinion about the strong Khitan influence on the early Mongol post-service (see below). Later this tiger type was changed to
the so-called *haiqing pai* 海青牌—‘falcon tablet’, something that is known only from the written sources, because none of them are preserved. It was in usage until 1270 when the *chengyi paizi* 乘驿牌子 was introduced. This kind of tablet was round in shape with silver or gold inscriptions; from 1277 they were made of iron too. They bore ’Phags-pa script inscription that means they were used only within the Yuan territories, because other Mongol uluses did not accept this script (DANG 2001: 38–41). It worth mentioning that the results of Dang concerning the usage of *paizas* already by the time of Chinggis Khan, which seems quite convincing due to the fact that he could connect the Chinese written sources with the preserved objects, has so far escaped the notice of most authors contributing to the study of the Mongol post.

Recently Lane J. Harris published two articles about the postal and relay systems of the Ming Dynasty (HARRIS 2015a; HARRIS 2015b) which are interesting for the purpose of the present study from a methodical point of view. Harris consistently distinguishes the relay system (*yi* 驛) and the post station system (*jidipu* 急递铺) of the Ming Empire. He argues:

“The Ming relay system was not a postal or communications system – it did not employ its own messengers or deliver mail – but was an infrastructure of stations, horses, and boats maintained at stat expense to transport foreign envoys and messengers from a few high-ranking officials and military generals, with the proper certificates, to the capital. The little-known express post station network with its thousands of rustic buildings, corvée laborers serving as foot posts, complex mail handling procedures, and stipulated delivery times was the communication system of the Ming Empire.” Later he adds: “In the Jurchen Jin (1115–1234) and Mongol Yuan (1279–1368), the separation of the imperial communications system from the transportation network was nearly completed with the introduction of different administrators overseeing each network, stricter regulations on express post delivery, and the establishment of post stations across the empire” (HARRIS 2015a: 288–289).

The approach of Harris is unique in the western literature concerning the pre-modern communication systems of Asia and it will surely fecundate this field of research. Unfortunately the distinction of Harris concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire cannot be confirmed on the basis of the Uyghur and Mongolian documents.
3.3 Administration and finances

As Allsen pointed out, while in the Islamic tradition the *barīd* was a civilian-controlled system, in Chinese and Inner Asian tradition the administration of the postal system was always a part of the military organisation (ALLSEN 2010: 250). It can be said that the administration of the postal system in China under Mongol rule is the main topic of Olbricht’s monograph, which deals with central and local administration in separate chapters. In the former (OLBRICHT 1954: 40–47) he described those official organs responsible for the maintenance of the post and its high ranking officials, and in the latter (OLBRICHT 1954: 47–50) the local authorities. Moreover he devoted a whole chapter to the controllers of the *yam*-system (OLBRICHT 1954: 81–89).

As it is noted in the *Secret History* (SH I: 214–215, §279) from the earliest period of the empire the operation of the postal system was accompanied by abuses and misuse, but the maintenance of the post was a huge burden on the population even when it functioned properly. This situation is shown perfectly by the fact that everybody with some connection to the court tried to gain exemption from duties concerning the postal system. This was particularly true for religious communities, who received immunity from various taxes from the Mongols (ALLSEN 2010: 251). During Möngke’s reign (1251–1259) military units and specially designated peasant households in western Asia shared duties concerning the maintenance of the relay stations. Provision of the *ulags* mostly fell to the nomads, but the sedentary population had to supply fodder for the animals, repair the station houses and feed ambassadors and messengers. In Transcaucasia one household from each small village and two or three from each large village were responsible for station upkeep. These assigned households paid no other kinds of taxes, but the burdens were still high (ALLSEN 1987: 212–213). Silverstein discerned three types of abuses regarding the postal system leading to Möngke’s 1251 reforms, but these categories can be applied to the whole existence of the *yam*-system. The first of these is the increasing number of *paīzas* in use due to the practice under which *paīzas* issued by earlier rulers remained in operation. Because of this many unauthorized people used the postal service and caused it to malfunction. The second was the requisition of animals, food and drink from the population and ordinary travellers. The third

---

For a brief description of the administration and institutional history of the Yuan postal system, see: FARQUHAR 1990: 218–220.
reason, tightly connected to the first, was the excessive use of the postal infrastructure by merchants (Silverstein 2007: 152).

These oppressive burdens and constant abuses led to several reforms of the system from the earliest period of the empire. As Silverstein has demonstrated, the story in the Secret History on the creation of the yam-system (SH I: 214–217; §279–280) is in fact not about the establishment of the system but about the reform of an existing post service (Silverstein 2007: 146–148). As mentioned above, in 1251 Möngke Khan issued his own reforms, placing strict limits on the use of, and access to, the postal system. Firstly he took away the paizas from the merchant associations (ortaq) and restricted usage of the system to royal princes and high officers, and only for official duty. Moreover they could use only a regulated number of mounts and amount of provisions. They were banned from leaving the established postal routes to enter villages or cities where they had no official business (Allsen 1987: 80, 160; Morgan 2000: 380). By and large the later reforms by Qubilai (1263, 1270, 1281) in China, and by Şadr al-Dīn, minister of the ilkhan Gaykhatu (1291–1295) in Iran, followed these models of Ögödei and Möngke with their double aims: on the one hand they tried to decrease the burdens on the population and make the yam-system more effective, while on the other hand they tried to centralize its administration (Farquhar 1990: 219; Morgan 2000: 380). The extensive reforms of the Ilkhanid ruler Ghazan Khan differed in certain aspects from those mentioned above. He repeated the limitation of valid paizas and built new stations and limited the number of horses per station to fifteen. Moreover he appointed supervisors (amīr) to each yam-station to control the operation of the postal system, and introduced the usage of runners (Pers.: paykān) in Iran (see below). The most important of his reforms, however, was the centralization of the finances of the post service. With these arrangements he could reduce the burdens on the population (Morgan 2000: 380–381; Silverstein 2007: 157–161). We must, however, as David Morgan has stressed, keep it in mind that our main source on the reforms and the preceding conditions of the yam-system in Iran is Rashīd al-Dīn, one of Ghazan’s two chief ministers for many years. Moreover, if we can believe Vaṣṣāf, the administration of post stations was one of his specific duties (Morgan 2000: 382–383). So when we read Rashīd al-Dīn’s extremely vivid description about abuses in the

---

78 In this story from the Secret History two separate actions of Ögödei are probably merged into one another. According to Chinese sources, he issued orders concerning the post right after his enthronement in 1229, and in 1234, after his victory over the Jin dynasty, among ceremonial circumstances he announced the establishment of the postal system. Seemingly these two separate events merged into one another in the Secret History (Olbricht 1954: 40–41; SH II: 1028)
malfunctioning postal system before Ghazan on the one hand, and about the glorious and most effective reforms on the other, we have to preserve a critical attitude towards our source.

3.4 Runners

The application of runners in the postal system goes back to Chinese roots and according to Silverstein this tradition was transmitted directly from China to Persia under the reign of Ghazan (Silverstein 2007: 160). The basic description of the runners in the European tradition is given by Marco Polo, who reported that stations for runners were three miles apart, and that runners wore a belt with bells to let the people of the next station hear them approaching. According to him they did not only carry messages to the Khan but fresh fruit too. Rashīd al-Dīn stated that in Persia two runners (paykān) were supposed to be on every station, and they ran from one station to another to give the message to the next runner, and with this method they could cover 30 farsakh a day (in Vaṣṣāf this distance is 40 farsakh) (Moule–Pelliot 1938: 244–245; Morgan 20072: 93; Morgan 2000: 383; Silverstein 2007: 160). Allsen has recently developed a new theory, drawing another part of Polo’s account into the discussion, where he describes the cuiucci as assistants during the royal hunt. According to Pelliot, the cuiucci goes back to Chinese gui-chi or gui-yu-chi, transcriptions of Mongolian güyükči ‘runner’. The Chinese sources illuminate that these runners, beside their duties mentioned by Marco Polo, were infantrymen and, from 1287, part of the imperial guard. Most of these runners were recruited from the “Western Regions” i.e. East Turkestan and beyond. Allsen argued that a part of the runners mentioned by Marco Polo belonged to these güyükčis. According to Allsen, the Berkin (or Merkin) tribe played the main role in the transmission of runner post to Iran. These people, who are described by Rashīd al-Dīn as neither Mongols nor Uyghurs, were deported from the mountains of East Turkestan to Iran during Hülegü’s rule (1261–1265) to serve as messengers. They were renowned as outstanding mountaineers (Turk.: kayaçı ‘cragsman’ or ‘rock climber’) and served in northern Mesopotamia and Transcaucasia (Moule–Pelliot 1938: 228–229; Pelliot Notes I: 572–573; Allsen 1987: 211; Allsen 2010: 246–248).
3.5 Inheritance of the yam-system

The survival of the yam-system on the western part of the Mongol Empire, namely the Muscovite state and Russia, has received considerable attention. Bertold Spuler collected lexical data about Russian borrowings from Turkic and Mongolian languages concerning the postal system (Spuler 1943: 312). The Russian princes of the Muscovite state from the end of the 14th century had a tribute called iam. In the long run, up until the 16th century, the Muscovite state operated its own postal network which in many senses was an heir of the Mongol yam-system (Alef 1967; Dvornik 1974: 306–316; Allsen 2010: 263–265). The Mamluk barīd in the Near East and Egypt has been widely thought to be modelled on the yam (Sauvaget 1941: 13; Gazagnadou 1994: 73–80); this idea was recently refined by Silverstein and Allsen who argue that the Mamluk barīd goes back to Perso-Islamic tradition on the one hand and to the Mongol post system on the other (Silverstein 2007: 165–166; Allsen 2010: 262). The connections between the Ottoman ulaq and its Mongol patterns have not yet been thoroughly investigated, but even the name of the Ottoman system shows the connection. Silverstein also illuminated the connection of the postal systems of the Timurid state and Delhi Sultanate to the yam-system (Silverstein 2007: 162–164), while Allsen has called attention to the Manchu ula (Allsen 2010: 272), the connection of which to the Mongol service is also clear. In those areas which possessed their own postal relay system at the time of the Mongol conquest, i.e. China and Korea, Mongol influence can be detected too, even long after the end of their rule.
Chapter IV: Description of the material

The main sources of the present study will be introduced in this chapter. Two major groups of the Uyghur documents are the official and private documents. The former is divided to the following subgroups: decrees and administrative orders (provision orders, käzig documents, miscellaneous) and official accounts. The private documents are divided into: ulag-registers and other private lists. The Mongolian documents will be discussed separately. Each group of the documents will be described briefly by the following aspects: general characteristics, formal peculiarities, contents. At the end of the chapter a comparative analysis of the Uyghur and Mongolian official documents will be presented.

4.1. Uyghur documents

4.1.1. Official documents

Almost all of the Uyghur official documents of the present study were written within the administration of the Mongol Empire in northeastern Turkestan in Old Turkic language with Uyghur script. They have strict formal rules, which will be described at the beginning of every group of the official documents. They were sealed with a stamp, but in some cases because of their fragmentary state of preservation the stamp is missing on the manuscripts. All of the here presented official documents were issued in connection with the postal system of the Mongol Empire or its antecedents.

79 The classification of the Uyghur civil documents varies. For the different groupings of the documents: SUK II: XIII–XIV; VOHD13,21: 14–16 and the introduction for the critical edition of the documents in the second part of the present study.

80 There are two exceptions from this statement: PO08 and PO18. Both orders were issued in the West Uyghur period (9th–12th centuries) and can be regarded as the antecedents of a certain type of the official documents from the Mongol period, i.e. the provision orders. They are included in the material of the present study, because they provide important data on the origins of the Mongol Empire’s postal system.
4.1.1.1. Decrees and administrative orders

4.1.1.1. Provision orders

In total, there are 24 provision orders among our sources. From these nine are preserved in Berlin (PO01–09)\(^{81}\), six in St. Petersburg (PO19–24), five in Turfan (PO13–17)\(^{82}\) and one in London (PO18), while three documents belong to the so-called Arat-estate\(^{83}\) (PO10–12). These administrative documents are all orders which were issued by the administration of the postal system in order to provide provision (food and fodder) and relay animals for the travellers.\(^ {84}\)

Except from two orders (PO02–03) which are written on birch bark all of the provision orders are written on paper. While among the civil documents in general, it is quite often that the documents are written on the back side of an earlier Chinese text, there is only one (PO01) such document among the provision orders, which is written on the verso of a Chinese Buddhist text. This fact may give us a hint to that however the paper was precious and not always easily accessible in the Turfan region during the Mongol period in most of the cases the administration were supplied with it.

The provision orders are generally short decrees (3–15 lines) with a standard formula. Dai Matsui defined the general form of the administrative orders – within which the provision orders constitute a smaller sub-group in the present classification – as follows:

“\[a\] Date (only with the twelve animals cycle)

\[b\] Purpose or reasons of the goods [and the total amount]"

\(^{81}\) The second part of PO09, namely the fragment *U 9261 is preserved in the Arat-estate. Six (PO01, PO04–PO08) from the other eight documents are preserved at the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities), while two documents (PO02–03) are preserved at the Museum für Asiatische Kunst (Asian Art Museum) in Berlin.

\(^{82}\) The present inventory numbers of the manuscripts are unknown. Even the staff of the Turfan Museum could not find them for Dai Matsui when he tried to observe the originals. (MATSUI 2009a: 339–340). This is the reason of their signature: Bezeklik Text.

\(^{83}\) Reşit Rahmeti Arat studied and worked in Berlin before the Second World War and he collected a lot of photos of the documents preserved there. Before the outbreak of the war he moved back to Turkey and brought his photo collection too. Unfortunately during the war many documents were destroyed or lost, so the only available source of these documents is the Arat-estate today. Arat bequeathed the collection to his pupil Osman Fikri Sertkaya, who beside himself let three other scholars work on this material: Peter Zieme, Simone-Christiane Raschmann and Dai Matsui. Raschmann is preparing the catalogue of the estate.

\(^{84}\) Larry V. Clark in his dissertation distinguished the provision orders from the so-called post horse decrees. In the present study all kind of decrees which were issued in order to provide supplies for the travellers are called provision orders no matter if they provide animals, food or drink. Clark divided the administrative orders which were discussed in his dissertation to the following groups: depositions (Nr. 94–95), petitions (Nr. 96–97), miscellaneous decrees (Nr. 98–104), post-horse decrees (Nr. 105–109), provision decrees (Nr. 110–112), watch and work orders (Nr 113–119). From these the post-horse decrees are identical with PO21–24 (Nr. 105–108) and PO08 (Nr 109) of the present study and will be discussed below (CLARKINTRO: 387–390).
[c] Deliverer(s)
[d] Amounts delivered
[e] Closing from: birzün “(one) shall deliver” ~XX-qal-kâ tutzun “(one) shall count (the delivery) for XX [= taxes, labour services: qupčïr, sang, tütün, käzig, yam at, etc.]”
[f] Seal(s)”

(MATSUI 2014a: 613)

However this description of the administrative orders is correct in general, here I would like to make some completions concerning the provision orders of the present study. In three cases (PO04, PO05, PO07) a further element is added to the above mentioned, namely according to these orders the delivers have to give the goods to mediators or collectors, who are not identical with those who will get the provision (i.e. the beneficiaries). In this sense, the PO04 document is especially interesting. Due to the persons who are mentioned in both PO04 and PO01 documents these orders are closely connected. In both cases a certain Bürüngüdäy (elči) and a tümän noyin\(^{85}\) appear as beneficiaries and in both cases Yalın and Ögrünç Buka has to deliver the goods. But there is a person Kitay daruga\(^{86}\), who appears in both documents but in another role: while in PO01 he is the beneficiary of the order, in PO04 the deliverers have to give him the goods which are devoted to Bürüngüdäy and the tümän noyin, with other words, he is the mediator or collector. In PO05 the collector or mediator is a certain Kaya bahšı who might be a representative of the Buddhist community (cf.: Chapter VII), while in PO07 appear two mediators or collectors: Äsän and Atsız. The exact role of this mediators or collectors is not clear yet, but it is sure they participated somehow in the transmission of the goods from the delivers to the beneficiaries. Moreover according to PO01 and PO04 it seems possible that the same person could be once beneficiary and the next time mediator or collector.

Another comment is that the purpose or reason (point [b] by Matsui) is not always given in the orders under discussion: in PO03, PO04 only the names of the beneficiaries are given.

Finally, I would like to call the attention for three Uyghur documents among the provision orders (PO09, PO23–24) which formal peculiarities are partly can be connected to

\(^{85}\) The expression tümän noyin means most probably: ‘leader of a ten thousand unit, commander of a myriad’. For a detailed discussion of the expression, see the notes for translation of PO01.

\(^{86}\) In this context the compound kitay daruga most probably means a governor (daruga) whose name was Ktay. For a detailed discussion of the expression, see the notes for translation of PO01.
the formula of the Mongol decrees\textsuperscript{87}, but they are not exactly the same. Like the Mongol decrees, they are introduced with the name of the issuer, but this is followed by the dating which appears always at the closing formula of the Mongol orders, furthermore none of these documents quote the place of issue what is an indispensable part of the Mongolian administrative orders.

Lately Dai Matsui established the chronological order of 99 Uyghur administrative orders in an article (MATSUI 2014a). On the basis of the different stamping methods\textsuperscript{88} and the contents of the documents he distinguished eight different chronological groups of the texts:

A) West Uyghur period (9\textsuperscript{th}–12\textsuperscript{th} centuries)
B) Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period
C) Early Mongol – Yuan period
D) Yuan period
E) Kärsin-Yalın-texts (early 14\textsuperscript{th} century)
F) Čayatay Khanate period (after late 1320’s)
G) “Kutlug-seals” orders (mid-14\textsuperscript{th} century)
H) Undated/Fragments

(MATSUI 2014a: 616–617).

From the provision orders presented in this study: two belong to the West Uyghur period (PO08, PO18), six belong to the Pre-Yuan period (PO19–24), two belong to the Early Mongol – Yuan period (PO10–11), eight belong to the Yuan period (PO07, PO09, PO12–17), three belong to the Kärsin-Yalın-texts (PO01, PO03–04), none of them belongs to the Chaghadai Khanate period, two belong to the “Kutlug-seals” orders (PO05–06) and one is undated (PO02). As it can be seen, only two of the provision orders originate from the West Uyghur period, while 16 were issued in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, 5 in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century and one cannot be dated.

\textsuperscript{87} The formula of the Mongol decrees and the comparative analysis of the Uyghur and Mongol administrative orders will be discussed below in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{88} Dai Matsui separated three different types of stamping methods (Method I, II and III). In ‘Method I’ the documents are stamped with one large (over 8 centimetres square) red seal which bears Chinese legend. According to ‘Method II’, the orders are stamped with maximum two smaller (ca. 1x2 centimetres) black seals, which can be oval or rectangle. In this method the seals are impressed on the closing formula of the order, what is usually the imperative expression berzin ‘one shall give’. Due to this fact the position of the stamps are not constant in this method. In ‘Method III’ the size of the stamps are a little bigger than in ‘Method II’ (ca. 2.5–3 centimetres), but their form can be rectangle or oval also and they are black too. In this method the documents bear more stamps, from three to six on a document and they are stamped from the top to the bottom of the ending line(s). According to Matsui these three methods of stamping are referring to three chronological strata from which the first is the oldest and the third is the latest. This division of the stamping methods constitutes the basis for the further subdivision of the texts according to their contents (MATSUI 2014a: 614–616).
Beside the chronological order, the provision orders can be divided into further sub-groups according to their contents and form. For example from the 6 documents from the Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period the first two (PO19–20) and the last four (PO21–24) compose separate sub-groups. The first two documents\(^{89}\) are written on the same page but by different hands. However, according to a common personal name (Bičkün Kayak-a) among those persons who are responsible for the collection of the taxes and the appearance of the Buddhist and Christian communities of Pučaŋ and Čiktın cities as the tax or compensation payers it seems obvious that these two provision orders are closely related. If the last four (PO21–24) of the Early Mongol documents are written on the same sheet or on two sheets cannot be decided certainly on the basis of the so far published facsimiles. Meanwhile their contents leave no doubt that they are closely related. Larry Vernon Clark devoted a separate sub-group of the administrative orders for them complemented with the document PO08 of the present study as post-horse decrees.\(^{90}\)

Clark defined a standard format of the documents PO21–24 (in Clark’s work Nr. 105–108) as follows:

“A) Nrs. 107 and 108 [PO23–24; M.V.] have the name of the official who issues the decree.
B) Date.
C) Description of the business or task of the people to whom the post-horses are to be given.
D) Names of the people to whom the post-horses are to be given.
E) The stable or group of horses from which the post-horses are to be released.
F) A phrase that resists all analysis is transcribed by Radloff and Malov: bačq-a-tag yoz-ınta bolmîš trz; it is apparently an attribute of some kind to the following phrase.
G) The number of post-horses to be given and, optionally, the number of days they are to be used.
H) The amount of qubčir the users of the post-horses are to pay.”

(\textit{CLARKINTRO: 389})

\(^{89}\) The second of these two documents (PO20) are not a classical provision order due to the fact that it was not issued in order to provide provision of horses for a traveller of the \textit{yam} but it ordered the Buddhist and Christian communities of Pučaŋ and Čiktın to pay compensation for a certain Yalkar \textit{elći}. However due to its formal peculiarities and function it can be classified into the group of provision orders of the present study.

\(^{90}\) When Clark wrote his dissertation the criteria for the chronological order of the administrative orders was not yet established and due to this fact he was not aware of the fact that the PO08 document belongs to an earlier chronological stratum (the West Uyghur period) than the others (PO21–24) in this group of him which can be dated to the early Mongol or pre-Yuan period.
This description of Clark has to be complemented and corrected on some points. About point A) it has to be added that as it was mentioned above beside PO23–24 another document (PO09) bears the name of the maker of the document, but on the one hand due to the fact that in the 1970s the two parts of PO09 was not connected yet, we cannot hold this against Clark. On the other hand PO09 cannot be regarded as a post-horse decree because it orders the receiver(s) to provide food (meat and flour) for the envoys passing by. Point C) and D) are mixed up in PO24. After these parts (the introduction of the receivers and their tasks’) all the four documents tell the total amount of horses which are given with a locative structure (*X ata “from the X horses”). In the case of PO24 this amount is one horse-*ulag so the locative structure is missing. Clark’s E) and F) points have to be handled together. In my point of view the correct transcription and translation of the passage mentioned in the F) point is more or less: ...*bačak(-a) t(a)rk*an *yük-intä bolmış taz... “Bolmış-Taz (of) the Bačak-a Tarkan’s hundred-household-unit”.91 With this translation I follow the interpretation of Dai Matsui (cf.: MATSUI 2008a: 232), who regarded Bačak-a Tarkan92 as the leader of a hundred-household unit, and Bolmış-Taz as the tax payer who has to deliver the horse(s) and who belongs to this unit of Bačak-a Tarkan. Finally in point H) Clark’s interpretation is false. The expression *XY kümüş kupčir-ka tut-zun* has to be translated as “count/regard it as XY [amount] silver of the *kupčir*-tax”. So, contrary to Clark’s interpretation the mentioned amounts are not meant to be paid by the users of the post-horses, but these amounts are meant to be detracted from the yearly *kupčir*-tax93 of the provider.94

The two provision orders which belong to the Early Mongol – Yuan period (PO10–11) together with an official account (OAcc01) compose another rather problematic sub-group of the documents. These three documents of the Arat-estate (see above) are written on thin strips of paper which are glued together in the following order: PO10-OAcc01-P011. The first one (PO10) is hardly damaged, only a part of its (most probably) last line preserved: ...]

91 In this case the *yük* (‘hundred’) probably refers to the traditional Inner Asian method of social and military organization, the so called decimal organization. For a detailed discussion of the topic, see the notes for the translation of PO21.

92 The *tarkan* is an ancient title in Old Turkic, which was an early borrowing into Mongolian as *darqan* ‘a person exempt from ordinary taxation; artisan, craftsman’. For a detailed discussion of the topic, see the notes for the translation of PO21.

93 The *kupčir* in the Turfan region was an additional tax imposed by the Mongols apart from the sale- and basic-taxes, and labour services. For a detailed discussion of the topic and for further literature, see the notes for the translation of PO21.

94 For the detailed explanation of this interpretation cf.: MATSUI 2008a: 231–232; MATSUI 2014b: 619–620.
ber[zün] what means “...] one horse shall gi[ve...]”. The second (OAcc01) document’s structure is completely different from the provision orders, that is the reason why it is classified to the official accounts, but due to the physical condition of these three documents it has to be assumed that they belong together somehow. The third document of this group (PO11) is a classical provision order. However the connection between the three documents is not yet clear, although PO10 is hardly damaged, OAcc01 is a different type of document, and there are no similar personal names in the three documents, it seems quite sure that somehow they belong together. Probably they were glued together and preserved as a part of a postal stations archive. This question will be discussed below under the official accounts.

The so-called Bezeklik orders (PO13–17) form another group of the provision orders. They were found in the vicinity of Turfan in the Bezeklik caves (today: PRC, Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region) sometimes before 1980. Three other texts (PO01, PO03–04) among the provision orders belong to the so-called Kärsin-Yalın texts which are discussed by Dai Matsui in details (MATSUI 2003a).

4.1.1.1.2. Käzig orders

The käzig orders can be regarded as a special group of the administrative orders. The common features of the documents which belong to the group of the käzig orders is that the expression käzig appears in them and at the same time somehow they are connected to the postal system of the Mongol Empire. The original meaning of the Old Turkic käzig was ‘a turn (which comes from time to time)’ and ‘an intermittent illness’ (ED: 758), but as Dai Matsui demonstrated, in the Uyghur administrative orders it has to be translated as: ‘labour service levied in turn’ or ‘turn of labour service’, and as Matsui pointed out this labour service could be compensated by cash (coins or cloth) or in kind (MATSUI 2008a). In the 11 käzig orders which can be connected to the yam-system there is no example for compensation in cash, but

---

95 My interpretation of this fragment differs from the earlier readings which amended the last word with a past tense first person singular suffix: ber(tim) (USP: 57; LI 1996a: 320) or ber(dim) (ÖZYETGIN 2004a: 187) “I gave”. Most probably they chose this solution, because in the next document (OAcc02) the verbs in the last two lines stand in the same case (altım, bitidim) and in two similar documents of the Arat-estate (OAcc03, OAcc05) appears the same expression: ber(tim). Contrary to this I chose to amend the fragment with an imperative ending: ber(zün) “shall give” due to the following reasons: 1) In the official accounts the verb bertim is always directly preceded by a dative suffix (-KA), which shows for what they gave this or that (Cf.: 4th line of OAcc03 and 3rd line of OAcc05). This dative suffix is completely missing from the PO10 fragment. 2) In the official accounts they always pay some kind of money for animals but they never give animals. 3) The preserved line of the document is seemingly the last line of it and the verb seems to be the last word of it. In this position the most frequent expression in the provision orders is berzün, I based my emendation on the above mentioned facts and due to them I classified this fragment as a provision order, however only a part of the last line of it preserved.

96 There are further käzig documents which seemingly not connected with the postal system of the Mongol Empire and due to this fact their investigation would go beyond the limits of the present study.
beside the compensation in kind in four cases (Käz03, Käz06–08) the käzig was paid by animals (at, ulag, äśgäk ulag) and in one case (Käz08) the equipment of a relay service attendant or relay coachman (ulagčı) served as compensation of käzig. An interesting speciality of the käzig orders of the present study, that however Matsui convincingly proved that the käzig was a kind of labour service, apart from the fragmented Käz08 document where a horse and an ulagčı is given, in all the other orders the labour service is compensated by some other ways than labour work. This phenomenon might refer to the fact that these cases, presented in the käzig orders were exceptions which differed from the normal daily routine. If it is true, it seems not improbable to suppose, in the case of the käzig orders, only the deviations from the normal routine were fixed in writing.

Their formal peculiarities are common with the provision orders with some minor changes. Except one (Käz02), which bears only nišans (*mark, sign*)\(^{97}\), all of them are sealed with stamps. Matsui Dai summarised the structure of their texts as follows:

“1. Date; 2. Purpose or receiver of the delivery (as well as, in Text C, [PO21 of the present study, M.V.] the total amount of the necessary material); 3. Deliverer; 4. Amount of the delivered material; 5. Imperative phrase of order for delivery, (….)-qa/-kā tutzun (<v. tut- “keep; count, note”)” (MATSUI 2008a: 232).

The fifth point of Matsui’s summary refers to the final imperative expression of these orders: [ordinal number: baš, ikinti, tokuzunč] käzig-kā tut-zun what should be translated according to Matsui as: “count [the delivery] for […]th käzig!” (MATSUI 2008a: 229, 233). However this closing formula is not general for the käzig orders. In four cases (Käz01–03, Käz05) this closing formula is completely missing. In one case (Käz08) the ordinal number is replaced by the form: bu künki käzig “the käzig for today”. In another case (Käz06) the closing formula is supplemented:

Transcription

4. bir at baš käzig berip
5. lükčüŋ turpan at-ka tutzu[n]

---

\(^{97}\) For a detailed discussion of the word and for further literature, see the notes for the translation of OAcc03.
Translation

“...gave one horse as the first käzig (and) regard it as a horse (on the route between) Lükčüŋ (and) Turpan.”

The temporal distribution of the käzig orders is as follows: three documents (Käz06–08) originate from the Yuan-period, three of them (Käz05, Käz10–11) were issued under the Chaghadaid Khanate period (after late 1320’s), four of them (Käz01, Käz03–04, Käz09) belong to the ‘Kutlug-seals’ orders (mid-14th century) and one (Käz02) is undated. This temporal distribution suggests that the käzig labour services became compensable by delivery of provision or animal for the postal system from the late 13th century a period when the constant internal warfare between the different branches of the Činggisid lineage most probably raised a lot of difficulties in the operation of the postal system.

In three of the käzig orders (Käz01, Käz05, Käz10) appears the expression käzig aš-ka which can be translated literally as ‘regular food’, i.e. ‘regular provision’. In the fifth line of another unfortunately corrupted document (Käz07) appears the expression: on kün-lük azuk-t “provision for ten days”. According to these documents these regular provisions were composed of meat (probably sheep), wine and flour.98 The relation between the käzig aš and the käzig as labour service is not yet fully clear, meanwhile it is worth mentioning that two times (Käz01, Käz05) out of the three documents with käzig aš the closing käzig closing formula is missing, and both documents terminate as a general provision order.

Another interesting peculiarity of the käzig documents is that in them the burdens are mostly levied on communities and not on a singular person.99 Out of the eleven documents five times (Käz03–04, Käz06, Käz09–10) the burdens are levied on ons ‘decury’ or ‘ten-household units’100, in one case (Käz02) on the inčü borlukčı ‘the winegardener(s) of the fief’ and in one case (Käz 05) on a borluk ‘vineyard’. Three documents (Käz07–08, Käz11) are corrupted and the tax payers are missing from the preserved texts. This speciality of the käzig orders stand in contrast with many of the provision orders, in which many times the burdens are levied on individuals.

Finally, I would like to propose an assumption with regard to this last peculiarity of the käzig orders, i.e. the fact that the burdens in these documents are usually levied on

---

98 Dai Matsui dealt with the amount of provisions for the travellers in the Mongol postal system according to the Chinese, Mongolian and Uyghur sources (MATSUI 2004a: 197).
99 There is only one clear exception from this statement: Käz01, but as it was mentioned in the above paragraph the classification of this document is not yet sure.
100 The word ons in this case probably refers to the smallest decimal unit (i.e. a decury) of the Mongol army or to the smallest decimal unit of the taxation (i.e. ten-household unit). Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz03.
communities and not on individuals. The above mentioned decuries (\textit{onı}) are existent only in the \textit{käzig} orders among the documentary sources of the present study,\textsuperscript{101} but among them almost the half of them contains it. As was explained above, this \textit{onı} most probably refers to the smallest unit of the nomadic decimal military system which was introduced as a unit for taxation too under the Mongol rule. From Matsui’s summary (MATSUI 2008a: 230–231) about the earlier theories concerning the nature of the \textit{käzig}-tax it is clear that after Yamada’s article in 1968 many scholars agreed with him concerning a connection of the \textit{käzig} with the army, particularly with the Čayatai \textit{käšik} ‘watch guard’, however they did not explain it in details. Indeed, the fact that the turns of the \textit{käzig} are counted with ordinal numbers (first, second, etc.) could remind anyone for the turns of guards in the military service. Furthermore, according to Matsui’s chronology the first \textit{käzig} documents (Käz06–08) can be dated to the Yuan period, i.e. the last decades of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. In this period northeastern Turkestan was an eye witness of the war between the Yuan government and the Central Asian Mongols led by Qaidu. In the course of these struggles from the end of the 1270s on the Yuan government took the direct control over the Uyghur territories and introduced their own administration. As a part of the arrangements they established a military-agricultural colonization of the territory (cf.: DARDESS 1972-73: 139–140, 141–142, fn. 94; ALLSEN 1983: 255–257; BIRAN 1997: 42). Moreover Matsui convincingly proved that the Uyghur \textit{käzig}-tax goes back to the Chinese 番 \textit{fan} of the Tang-period (MATSUI 2008a: 233–235). Taking in to account all of this information, my assumption is that perhaps the \textit{käzig} was introduced (at least concerning the postal system) in accordance with the military-agricultural colonization by the Yuan in the Uyghur territories and the decuries (\textit{onı}) of the sources are units of this military-agricultural colonies, who had to take part in the maintenance of the postal system. Of course for a certain proof all of the \textit{käzig} orders have to be investigated and not just those which are connected to the postal system, but according to the sources in our disposal the above mentioned assumption seems probable.

4.1.1.1.3. Miscellaneous orders

All the three documents in this group (OMis01–03) are certainly orders and due to their contents all of them are connected to the postal system, but they do not fit into any other of the above discussed categories of the administrative orders. None of them can be dated

\textsuperscript{101} Apart from \textit{käzig} orders in the 7\textsuperscript{th} line of UlReg12 appears: \textit{tapa on bägi bolgay} “Tapa will be (the) decury leader”, but because of the fragmented state of this manuscript this section lacks its context.
precisely, but due to their vocabulary (kupčir, elći, ulag, ulagči) all of them were issued under the Mongol period. The first document (OMis01) starts with the authorization: tačudın sözüm “(This is) my, Tačudin’s word [i.e. order]” and then it mentions to whom it may concern: toyınčog-ka “to Toyınçog”. This formula is well known from the initial protocols of the Mongol documents, and even the Turkic form in this document is a borrowing of the Mongolian formula: üge manu ‘our word’. These peculiarities of the document suggest that it was issued on a higher level of the administration, while the appearance of the kupčir-tax makes it very probable that the order was somehow connected to the postal system.

The second document (OMis02) is preserved on a sheet of paper which bears Uyghur writing on both sides. The recto side of the document contains the OMis02 order, which is written in cursive Uyghur script. The document is preserved in fragmentary state, the initial and closing protocols and the stamps are missing. However, due to its contents most probably it was meant to be a provision order it is classified as a miscellaneous order because of the lack of the provision orders’ peculiarities (dating, imperative closing form, stamps, etc.). Seemingly, this order disposed about yagus ‘raincoats’ and in this sense it can be connected with two provision orders (PO01, PO04) which granted olpak ‘short padded jacket for winter travel on horseback’ and one (PO06) which granted tądłąys ‘jackets’. Only these four orders dealt with the delivery of garments among the administrative orders.

The third document of this group (OMis03) is strongly damaged and preserved in several fragments. The numerous occurrences of the words ulag and ulagčı make it sure that it was issued in connection with the yam-system, while the imperative closing forms (berzün) in the 16th and 18th line make it very likely that it was some kind of an official order as well.

4.1.1.2. Official accounts

The original manuscripts of all the four documents (OAcc01–04) belonging to this group were destroyed or lost during the Second World War and the documents are preserved as photographs only in the Arat-estate. Due to their formula and contents all of them can be

---

102 On the same sheet there is another order, but that seemingly is not in connection with the postal system. The two orders were written by the same hand. Both orders differ from the ordinary official documents (the dating is missing, and instead of the stamps a nişan closes the two texts. However according to the contents of the documents it can be regarded as an official order from the Mongol period.

103 On the other side of the sheet on which OMis02 is written there is another document which most probably can be dated to the West Uyghur period. Cf.: VOHD13.22: 36–37.
regarded as official documents; however, they essentially differ from the above introduced orders. The formula of the documents can be schematized as follow:

1. Date
2. (Name of the tax payer)
3. (Amount of the paid tax)
4. Name of the tax
5. (Recipient of the tax)
6. The purpose of the tax paid
7. Closing

The dating of the official accounts gives only the year to which the document is connected according to the twelve years animal cycles, the month and the day are always missing. The tax payer’s name is given in three documents (OAcc02–04) and in all cases this is the same person, a certain Ögrinä, what suggests that these three documents are closely connected. Only two of the accounts (OAcc03–04) mention the amount of the paid tax, what is in both cases one and a half sıtır\textsuperscript{105} that was approximately 60 grams, and according to the latter, it was paid in silver (kümüş). All the four documents are related to the kupčir-tax and the name of the tax appears in every document.\textsuperscript{106} Two of the official accounts (OAcc03–04) mention the name of the officer, i.e. the receiver of the tax. The recipient officer’s name (Čagan) in OAcc03 is identical with the one who wrote OAcc01. In all four cases the money was paid on renting or buying animals which can be connected to the postal system (at ulag, at, ulag). The closing formulas of the official accounts are not unified; in each of the four documents a slightly different protocol is followed:

\textbf{OAcc01:} m(מוק)נ čagan bitidim “I, Čagan, wrote it”
\textbf{OAcc02:} san-inta tutzun “take it into account!”
\textbf{OAcc03:} bu nišan mäniŋ ol kus kar tamga yakzun “This nišan is mine. Kus Kar shall put the tamga on it!”
\textbf{OAcc04:} bu tamga mäniŋ ol “This tamga is mine.”

\textsuperscript{104} Those elements which do not appear in every document are written in brackets.
\textsuperscript{105} One sıtır was equal to ca. 40 grams in the Mongol period (Matsui 2004a: 200). Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
\textsuperscript{106} In the two other official accounts (OAcc01–02) from the Early Mongol – Yuan period as well as in four of the provision orders (PO21–PO24) from the Early Mongol – pre-Yuan period appears the expression kupčir kümüş ‘kupčir(-tax) silver’, what suggests that the kupčir tax was paid in silver and was surely connected to the postal system at least in these periods.
The temporal distribution of the official accounts is quite unique: according to Dai Matsui’s
dating all of them originate from the early Mongol – Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

As it was mentioned at the section about the provision orders, OAcc01 is written on a
thin paper stripe and pasted in between PO10 and PO11. Due to this fact it is likely that these
three documents are closely connected. The other three official accounts (OAcc02–04)
according to the same kupčir-tax payer (:Eventä) in them, form another sub-group. Meanwhile
the officer who wrote OAcc01 and the officer who received the tax in OAcc03 bear the same
name Čagan, so it is quite probable that the two documents refer to the same person. If this
suspicion is true the two sub-groups and the six documents in them are interrelated.

Before the discussion of the function of the official accounts it seems to be appropriate
to cite a longer quotation from Dai Matsui on this topic:

“Obviously these two [OAcc04 and OAcc02 of the present study, M.V.] also
concern the conversion of the silver currency paid for the fee of official postal
relay horse into the certain amount (3 baqïr) of the poll tax (kupčir) levied
annually. However, the former is written according to the formula of the receipt,
while the latter has the closing phrase san-înta tutzun “(he) shall count (it) for the
account (of kupčir-tax)” in common with the administrative orders.

The large square seals on the administrative orders of Groups A and B107 may
well suggest that the officials responsible for the issue of them should be of the
higher rank among the bureaucratic hierarchy, who were authorized to demand
the compulsory requisitions of the local people.

At the terminal of the administrative organization, however, it might not be such
high-ranking officials but the minor local clerks that ruled and decided the
compulsory requisition in response to the practical necessity, to compose and
issue the receipt for certification to convert the extraordinary delivery into the
ordinary taxes. From time to time, these receipts could take the form of
administrative orders, ending with the imperative phrase -qal-kä san-înta tutzun
to definitely direct the conversion of delivery. Thus we may set the category of
such a hybrid formula between receipt and administrative orders, which include

107 In Matsui’s classification ‘Group A’ means the West Uyghur period and ‘Group B’ covers the Early Mongol
(Pre-Yuan) period. The following documents of the present study belong to these two groups of Matsui: PO08,
PO18–24.
Nos. 12-22 = C1-C11.\textsuperscript{108} This group can be a reflection of the historical situation in which the compulsory requisition became more frequent under the Mongol rule so that even the minor local officials were allowed to (or had to) respond them with official certificate in form of the receipt or administrative orders.

Even so, it is still possible that Groups B and C were contemporary: their difference may derive from the rank of administrative authorities, not from the chronological gap.”

(MATSUI 2014a: 619–620)

As we can see Matsui did not devote a separate group for the official accounts but he rather described the documents belong to his Group C as hybrids of receipts and administrative orders. He surmised that contrary to the administrative orders these hybrid documents were issued on a lower level of the bureaucracy, i.e. by local officials who could react to the daily challenges of the maintenance of the administrative system and convert the extraordinary deliveries into ordinary taxes. He even left open the question that the differences between his Group B and C are not because of the chronological differences but due to the difference between the ranks of the officials who issued them. However in the most of the main questions I agree with Professor Matsui, in the followings a slightly different interpretation of the documents will be introduced.

The starting point of the interpretation is the question: why did the officials write down in these four documents, that what did they spend the collected tax on?\textsuperscript{109} Namely the only common feature in the four official accounts is that they give this information to the reader. The other most important information of these documents is the name of the official who took over the tax (OAcc03–04) or who wrote the document (OAcc01). A receipt would have been given to the tax payer as a confirmation that he paid the levied tax, but on such a document these kind of information (on what did the official spent the money and the name of the official) would be absolutely unnecessary. Based on these facts, I think these documents cannot be regarded as receipts or a hybrid form of receipts and administrative orders, because the addressees of receipts and administrative orders were the tax payers but these documents

\textsuperscript{108} These documents are identical with PO10–11, OAcc01–04 of the present study and some (5) others which are not presented here, because they are not connected to the postal system. The other five documents are: SI 3Kr. 30b, SI 3Kr. 30c, SI 3Kr. 29b, SI 3Kr. 29a of the St. Petersburg collection and *U9258 of the Arat-estate. These documents altogether constitute Group C in Matsui’s classification, i.e. the Early Mongol – Yuan period group.

\textsuperscript{109} Dr. Simone-Christiane Raschmann called my attention for the below discussed peculiarities of the official accounts and the here presented theory is a result of our co-working on the documents. Of course every mistake in the text is the fault of the author of the present study.
seemingly were addressed to someone else. The emerging question is that: to whom these documents were addressed? A short quotation from Juvainī might help us to answer this question:

“Every year the yams are inspected, and whatever is missing or lost has to be replaced by the peasantry.” (JUVAINĪ/BOYLE I: 33)

So according to Juvainī, the yam stations were controlled yearly. Most probably the Persian historiographer refers here to the controller of the postal system (Mong.: *todqosun/todqaγul*), whose duty was to check the conditions of the postal stations and the traffic of the yam-system regularly. If we turn back to our official accounts, due to the main information they contain, it seems very likely that the addressees of these documents were rather these controllers than the tax payers. In Juvainī’s schematic description the controllers dealt only with the material equipment of the postal stations but in reality they surely inspected the finances of the stations too. We know that one of the pivots of Ghazan Khan’s (1295–1304) reforms in Iran was the centralization of the finances of the postal stations, what was unique in the history of the Mongol postal system (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 157–161). This fact shows that in the other uluses of the empire and before the rule of Ghazan in Iran itself too, the finances of the postal system were handled locally, and if the finances were handled locally the single stations or at least the main stations of the postal system had to maintain their own bookkeeping. Moreover, if they had their own bookkeeping they had to upkeep a kind of archive where they accounted their finances. In my opinion, the official accounts presented in this study were issued for the accountancy of a certain postal station. The above discussed interrelations between the documents make it very probable that the official accounts and the PO10–11 documents were issued at the same postal station. Furthermore, this theory could explain why were the thin paper-stripes of PO10–11 and of OAcc01 pasted together: probably they were connected to a certain issue – which is not clear, partly due to the damaged state of preservation of PO10 – and because of this, the officials wanted to preserve them together. And finally, this is the reason why the documents of this group are called official accounts in the present study: in my opinion they were accounts, written by the local officials about the finances of a certain postal station for their own archive in order to be able to account for their incomes and expenses for the controllers of the postal stations.
4.1.1.3. Official register

Only one document (OReg01) belongs to this group, which could not be classified into any other group of the official documents. The document was published by Radlov (USP: 93, 232; Nr. 54) and later Larry Clark dealt with it (CLARKINTRO: 151, 453–454; Nr. 132) but neither Radlov nor Clark cited the original signature of the document. Clark only mentioned the origin of the document: Roborovskij-Kozlov/Klementz, what shows that it belongs to the Russian collection.\(^\text{110}\)

Due to the lack of the original manuscript and to the fact that neither Radlov nor Clark thought it important to inform us if there is any stamp on the document, this aspect cannot be taken into consideration to decide if it is an official or a private document. Even though the content of the document and some special expressions (kupčir, čuv\(^\text{111}\)) make it quite clear that this document was written by an official and has to be regarded as an official register. The first eight lines of the document are constructed like this: [proper name] atı beš bakır\(^\text{112}\). Clark brought up that the word atı in this context can be interpreted as ‘name’ or as ‘horse’ too. He found some of the proper names suitable for horses (CLARKINTRO: 453). I preferred the translation of this structure as: “(for the) horse of [proper name]”, but anyhow that seems quite sure that the five bakırs were paid for horses as a part of the kupčir-tax, which was according to the other documents of the present study (at least partly) connected to the postal system in territory under discussion.

4.1.2. Private documents

This second group of the documents was not issued within the administration of the Mongol Empire or the postal system itself, but the majority of them were written most probably by civilians or professional scribes. However, in the present state of research no common formula for them can be detected, there is one formal peculiarity which is typical in private documents and we do not find it in the official documents. This peculiarity is the abbreviation of the verb ber- ‘to give’ with a single grapheme of <b>. This abbreviation is very common in

\(^{110}\) For my request Pavel Rykin, researcher of the Russian Academy of Sciences was so kind to try to look up the manuscript. According to the information of his colleagues, the manuscript was already lost in the 1960s. Due to these circumstances I based my reading on the USP.

\(^{111}\) The meaning of the Old Turkic word is ‘receipt’ or ‘voucher’. Cf.: KĀMBIRI/UMEMURA/MORIYASU 1990: 13–14.

\(^{112}\) One bakır in the Mongol period was equal to ca. 4 grams (MATSUI 2004a: 200). Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
the private documents and usually it makes more difficult to give a correct translation of the texts, because this abbreviation does not show the tense and the case of the verb.

Like the official documents, these texts are written on paper too, but many of the private documents are written on the other sides of sheets bearing earlier Chinese (mainly Buddhist) texts. This attribute suggests that the paper was a precious material in East Turkestan during the Mongol period, but while the official administration was quite well supplied with it (there is only one official document PO01 which bears Chinese text too); the civil population often had to re-use the paper. While most of the official documents (except OMis02–03) were published earlier (even though many of them only with a Japanese translation), 15 out of the 20 private lists were never published. This state of research can be explained by the fact, that if it is possible, these texts are even more difficult to read and interpret than the official documents. They are often only partly preserved, and the preserved parts torn out from their original context are sometimes unintelligible. However, these documents allow us to look at our subject (i.e. the postal system of the Mongol empire) from another point of view, and because of this they are precious sources of the present study. The private documents are divided into two sub-groups: lists and registers concerning the ulag-system and other private list.

4.1.2.1. Lists and registers concerning the ulag-system
The common feature of these documents is that in all of them appears the technical term ulag or an inflected form: ulagčı. The term ulag\textsuperscript{113} in the Turkic documents from the Mongol period generally describes every kind of animal which belonged to the postal system, while the inflected form ulagčı meant the person who had to take care for the animals, i.e. stableman, relay coachman or relay service attendant. The appearance of these words shows that these documents were connected to the so-called ulag-system. Under the concept ulag-system the present study means that sub-system of the Mongol postal system which was responsible for the animal supply of the yam-system\textsuperscript{114}.

As it was mentioned above, the private documents bear no general formula and due to this fact they cannot be always exactly dated, although some of them have a dating part. There are several different dating forms in these lists and registers. There is no example in this group

\textsuperscript{113} The detailed discussion of the word and other names for the animals in the Uyghur documents is presented in the fifth chapter of the present study.

\textsuperscript{114} However, neither the narrative sources nor the documentary sources mention such a system explicitly, if we take into account all the available information on the efforts to supply the necessary amount of animals for the postal system, it seems appropriate to talk about such an ulag-system.
of documents for the full dating which can be detected in the provision orders, namely: year, month and day; and there is only one example where the year and the month are given in the first two lines of UlReg09: "it yıl onunč ay a-նշ-tin berü “since the 10th month of the Dog year”. In UlReg07 and UlReg13 we find examples for the dating with month and day, such as in the 8th line of the former: säkiz-inch ay bir yanıkka “the first new day of the 8th month”. In UlReg06 and UlReg13 we find examples where the dating is given only by the days, such as in the 3rd line of the latter: säkiz yanıkka “on the 8th new day (of the month)”. Beside these abbreviated regular dating forms another dating practice can be detected, namely that the scribe connect the date to an important event. For example, we find in the 10th line of UlReg06 the followings: otači bahši kāmiš-tä “when the medicine man had been arrived”. In UlReg11 two times appears the expression: XY borun bagi bolmišta bermišim “my payments since XY became the borun bag”. These peculiarities of the dating of these documents suggest that they were made for temporary usage which usually lasted less than a year or in some cases even less than several months, since the abbreviated regular dating forms remained informative only within these short terms. The other form of dating in these documents, when the dating is connected to an important event could be valid for a certain group of local people who were aware about the mentioned events and could be used also just temporarily, maximum several years.

Another important question concerning these documents is that: who wrote them? Seemingly in some cases it is obvious that the lists about the paid taxes were written by the tax payers, where appear the inflected forms of the verb ber- ‘to give, to pay’, such as bermišim ‘my payment(s)’ (UlReg11) or berdim ‘I gave’ (UlReg09) and the like. However, if we compare these phrases with the contracts of the SUK it will be clear that these kinds of expressions were used by the scribes as well, so they cannot be taken as evidences. In other cases due to the fragmented state of the manuscripts it cannot be decided if the listed payments and delivery are connected to a single tax payer or to a community (e.g.: UlReg01–05). In this regard (i.e. the circumstances of the making) one document is especially interesting. UlReg07 is a long document (52 lines in total) which lists horses given to different people with the designation of those people who provided the horses. The beginning of the document is missing but the dating (month and day) is continuous in the text. According to the dating of the text, it can be divided into two parts: the first part (1st–18th

115 According to Dai Matsui the borun bagi was the leader of a borunluk, what was a social group, and he was responsible for the collection of the taxes and folding of the labour services from this group (MATSUI 2014b). Cf. with the notes for the translation of UlReg11.
lines) was written on the first two days of the 8th months and before, while the second part (10th–52nd lines) was written between the 21st day of the 6th month and the 4th day of the 7th month (14 days). According to the different hand writings, this list was written by different scribes. The different handwriting can be identified as follows: 1st–4th lines, 4th–9th lines, 10th–12th lines, 12th–18th lines, 19th–33rd lines, and 34th–52nd lines. Dai Matsui supposed that the 8th–18th lines were written later, only after lines 1st–7th and 19th–52nd were finished (MATSUI 2012: 122 fn. 1) With this explanation the problem of the unchronological dating can be solved. The 19th line of document helps the interpretation of the document: altınč ay bir otuzka kisga at ötği “Register of the short-distance horses up to the 21st (day of) the 6th month”. Taking into account this information and the general structure of the text it seems very probable that this document was written in a yam-station to register the number of the given horses, the recipients and the providers. It is very likely that the document was written by the personnel of a yam-station for their internal use, namely to follow up the traffic of the station and the levied burdens on the population. So the supposed circumstances of the making of the text would suggest that it is a kind of an official document, but due to its format and aim it has to be regarded as a private document.

Another important aspect of the registers and lists concerning the ulag-system is the question of the delivered materials. The delivered goods can be divided into several groups: animals, money, food, drink, fodder, other kinds of provision and servants. The animals are usually horses (at) or different kind of ulags (uzun ulag, at ulag, etc.). In UlReg15–16 appears the expression iš-lik ulag which would be ‘working-ulag’, but due to the fragmented state of the manuscript the reading is not certain. None of the documents refer to any payment in precious metals, but only in different kinds of böz (böz, yoruk böz, yumşak böz, yogluk böz). The word böz originally meant ‘cotton cloth’ (ED 389a) but in the civil documents it means simultaneously cotton as a fabric, a cotton based currency, and in some cases probably a tax which had to be paid in this money.116 The most common food are meat (ät) and flour (min) which are well known from the provision and käzig orders also, but beside these there are some other kinds of food. In the 4th line of UlReg03 dried cruds (kurut) is mentioned, while in the 24th line of UlReg11 rice (tögi) is delivered. Mostly wine (bor) is delivered as beverage, but in one case (in the 5th line of UlReg04) wheat beer (sorma)117 is mentioned. In UlReg08 a unique measurement appears for the wine: kalča. According to Matsui, this expression is a

116 For a detailed discussion of the different types of böz and for the explanation of the different meanings of the word see: RASCHMBAUMWOLLE.

117 For the various translations of the word in the earlier literature, see the notes for the translation of UlReg04.
loanword from the Mongolian *qalǰa* ‘écritoire faite avec de la corne de boeuf: falcon, fiole’; ‘inkstand made of horn’ (KOWALEWSKI II: 802; LESSING 1973: 922). He translates it as ‘bottle’ (MATSUI 1999: 107; Cf.: VOHD13,21: 206, fn. 4). However, I accept Matsui’s theory about the origin of the word, I find it not improbable that, *kalča* was rather a unit of measurement for liquids, than a concrete bottle. This is the reason why this word is not translated in the text edition of the present study. Two kinds of fodder mentioned in the texts: *saman* ‘straw’ (UlReg06) and *ot* ‘hay’ (UlReg06, UlReg09). Besides these kind of regular provisions to other kind of goods appear in the lists: *otuŋ* ‘dry firewood’ (UlReg03, UlReg06, UlReg11) and *yag* ‘oil, fat’ (UlReg06, UlReg11). Since the measurement for the latter is *tıŋčan* what is a borrowing of Chineses *deng-chan* 燈盞 ‘lamp’, most probably *yag* means ‘oil’ or more precisely ‘lamp oil’ in these cases. Apart from the delivery of animals and goods according to the lists, the equipment of servants was a duty of the taxpayers as well. There are two expressions in the sources: *tapıgčı* means ‘servant’ in general (UlReg06, UlReg11) while *ulagčı* means ‘stableman, relay service attendant’ or ‘relay coachman’ (UlReg02–04, UlReg06, UlReg12–13, UlReg17).

However due to the nature of these sources it cannot be determined with certainty that apart from the different kinds of *ulags* and the *ulagčis* the other delivered goods and people were paid for the upkeep of the postal system or not, but if we take in to account the circumstances it seems quite probable. Moreover the document UlReg18 helps us to see clearer in this question. It is a list of payments for different taxes and all kind of taxes are paid in *böz* ‘cotton based currency’. In the first lines it states: *yılan yıl-ka kalan-ka elči-kä bermišim* “What I paid as *kalan*-(tax) in the Snake year”. In a broader sense *kalan* together with *birim alım* covered all taxes and labour services. In a narrow sense *kalan* meant labour service and corresponded to the Mongol *alban*, however it could be paid in money or products. According to Matsui, *kalan* included several types of labour services like *tüütn*, *kavıt*, *kapı*, *basıg salıg*, *sikiš* and *käzig*. On the basis of Käz02 Matsui stated that in the Turfan region *kalan* could cover some labour services which were connected to the postal system (MATSUI 2005b: 72–74, 78). So it seems like that a labour service (*kalan*) which was connected to the postal system could have been paid in money (*böz*) or in products. On the one hand, this phenomenon is very similar to that what could be detected in the *käzig* orders, on the other

---

118 Apart from the documents of the present study (Käz02, UlReg12, UlReg18) as far as I am concerned the *kalan*-tax appears in the following documents: Ch/U 7460, U 5245, U 5279, U 5282a-b, U5305, U5330, *U 9016; *U 9168 II.
hand, it makes more probable that the different kind of goods in the lists and registers concerning the *ulag*-system were paid for the upkeep of the postal system.

4.1.2.2. Other private lists

The common feature of these two private lists is that although they cannot be linked to the *ulag*-system, due to their contents most probably they were written in connection to the *yam*-system. Their formal peculiarities are common with the previous group. The first document (PList01) is a list of various wine deliveries with regard to a certain Idrili *noyin*. The second document (PList02) is very fragmented, but because of the mentioning of the collection of the *kupčir*-tax it might be connected to the postal system as well.

4.2. Middle Mongolian Documents

Due to the fact that there are only five Middle Mongolian documents from East Turkestan which are connected to the postal system of the Mongol Empire, they are not divided into further sub-groups in the present study. From the five documents, four (Mong01–04) originate from the Turfan region and belong to the German collection. The last document (Mong05) was unearthed lately in the vicinity of Dunhuang by Chinese scholars. The first four documents are official decrees while the last one is a kind of official register. All of the documents are written on paper in the Uyghur-Mongol script. In the following firstly the four decrees will be introduced and then the official register will be discussed separately.

The formula of the Middle Mongolian decrees is well studied\footnote{Cf.: WEIERS 1967: 13–14; BT XVI: 165–167; BIRAN 2008: 386–389. The present description follows the terminology of the BT XVI and Biran.} and it can be described as follows: every decree is divided into three main parts: an initial protocol (A), the body of the decree (B) and a final protocol (C). The initial protocol contains the following parts:

**A/1 Authorization**

The authorization is the mentioning of the authority under which the document was written. Among our decrees Mong01 (Tuγluγ Temür [r. 1343–1363]) and Mong03 (Yisün Temür [r. 1337–1339/1340]) present the name of the ruler, Mong02 mentions only the *qan* in general, while the first lines with the authorization are missing from Mong04. After the name of the
khan appears the title of the document, i.e. jarliγ ‘decree’ (Mong02–03) or the expression üge manu what means “Our word” (Mong01). As Dai Matsui pointed out, the Chaghadaid rulers themselves did not call their own edicts jarliγ because they accepted the sovereignty of the Yuan rulers as Great Khans, whose privilege was to issue a jarliγ. Instead they used the form üge for their own decrees (Mong01), but their officials used the term jarliγ in their name (Mong02–03) because they considered the Chaghadaid khans to be equal to the Yuan rulers (MATSUI 2008c: 161).

A/2 Intitulatio
This is the name of the person who actually issued the document followed by the above mentioned formula: berketemür üge manu “(This is) our Berke Temür’s word [i.e. order]” (Mong02).

A/3 Publicatio and inscriptio
In this part of the decrees are the names of the people enumerated to whom the document is addressed. These are usually local officials: bolad q̄ ˹a˺y-a türmiš segünč ekiten “For those led by Bolad Qay-a and Türmis Segünče” (Mong01); i’duq qut čings(a)ng-a quba [y]iučing bai q(a)y-a sočing [a] k’iten noyadţa “for those noyans led by the iduq qut čingsang, Quba yiučing (and) Bay Qay-a sočing” (Mong02).\(^\text{120}\)

The body of the text (B) is composed of two parts narratio (B/1) and dispositio (B/2). The narratio contains the description of the case which triggered the issue of the document. In the dispositio the orders and instructions concerning the case are described.

The final protocol (C) is composed of three parts. The first (C/1) is a confirmation that the document is sealed with a stamp, e.g.: kemen niša-ðu bičig öd-bei “By saying that, we gave a document provided with a stamp” (Mong03). It is followed by the dating (C/2) (year/month/day in our documents). The year is given according to the twelve years animal cycle, the month is given with the designation of the season (e.g.: the last month of the spring) and the day according to the state of the moon: moγai j[i]l qaburun gčiš sar-a-in arban sin-e-de “in the Snake year, on the 10\(^{th}\) new day of the last month of spring” (Mong01). The last part of the final protocol (C/3) is the mentioning of the place of issue. So, a full final protocol looks like this: kemen ni[ša]n-tu bič[i]l g ödbei qonin jil ü’b’iilün dumdadu sarayn γunan

\(^{120}\) For the discussion of the titles čingsang, yiučing and sočing see the notes for the translation of Mong02.
sinète qungluду bü’küi-țür bičibeи “By saying that, we gave a document provided with a stamp. Sheep year, the 3rd day of the new month’s in the middle month of winter, while we were in Qunglu” (Mong04).

Another common formal aspect of the Mongolian decrees is the so-called “honorific lift”, what means that after the authorization (A/1) the following several lines were lifted down by the scribes. This method was used to express the honour to the ruler or another high ranking person (CLARKINTRO: 17, 435; BT XVI: 167; BIRAN 2008: 387).121

Three of the Mongolian decrees of the present study certainly originate from the 14th century: Mong01 was dated to 1353 (FRANKE 1962: 408), Mong02 was dated to 1331, by Rybatzki, however his dating is not certain (RYBATZKI 1997: 283) and Mong03 was dated by Franke to 1338 (FRANKE 1962: 405). Mong04 cannot be dated exactly, but due to its formal peculiarities it can be assumed that it is contemporary with the other documents.

These decrees were called by Weiers and Franke Reisbegleitschreiben (WEIERS 1967; FRANKE 1968) what can be translated as “travel accompanying letters” or “travel covering letters” and this name is correct because all the four decrees were issued in order to help the travel of some people on their official duties. The first three decrees (Mong01–03) are connected somehow to wine: in Mong01 the beneficiaries are transporting 200 leather bags of wine-grape probably to the khan; in Mong02 a certain Sevinč Buqa borči122 is going the secure the wine beverage (bor araki)123; Mong03 was issued for several borčis who were led by a certain Kŏk Buq-a. In Mon04 there is no specification of the travellers, the text reports about elčis what can be envoy, ambassador or state officer as well (cf.: ERDAL 1993: 94–99). The decrees order the local officers to supply the travellers with horses and provision: in Mong01 horses, wine, meat and provision (künesün, in this case most probably grain or flour) are ordered to be given; in Mong 02 only ulags, in Mong03 only provision (meat, beverage and grain) while in Mong04 ulagčis and ulags are provided.

As a summary, it can be said that the Middle Mongolian decrees are following a unified chancellery practice, which due to the authorizations and the significance of the issues seems to be used on a higher level of the administration.

121 Biran writes mistakenly that the name of the khan is on the top right margin. Due to the fact that the direction of the Uyghur-Mongol writing is from up to down and from left to the right, and that the name of the khan appears in the authorization which is the first part of the initial protocol, the khan’s name is on the top left margin.
122 The expression borči is a Turkic loanword in the text. It could mean wine grower or merchant. In this expression the +či nomen actoris is attached to the noun bor ‘wine’. For the detailed discussion of the possible translations, see the notes for the translation of Mong02.
123 For a detailed discussion of the expression, see the notes for the translation of Mong02.
As it was mentioned above the fifth document (Mong05) is a kind of official register which was unearthed only recently in the vicinity of Dunhuang. The whole register is dealing with camels which were delivered for the postal system. The register lists the number of the registered and died camels and the names of the people who registered them. The unique features of this document are the camels. No other document of the present study contains any reference for the usage of camels in the postal system. In this document not a single camel but dozens of them are mentioned. Due to the provenance of the document it can be assumed that in the region of Dunhuang camels were used within the postal system, while in the Turfan region from where the other documents are originate, the camel was not used.

4.3. The Middle Mongolian decrees in comparison with the Uyghur administrative documents

From the above mentioned description it is clear that the Middle Mongolian and Uyghur official orders are different and not just in their language but in their format, too. These differences can be summarized as follows: 1) The authorization is completely missing from the Uyghur documents and there is only one (OMis01) which contains an intitulatio, i.e. the name of the producer of the document. 2) In the Uyghur documents the dating is the first element while in the Mongolian documents it is a part of the ending protocol. Furthermore in the Uyghur documents the definition of the month is always given with ordinal numbers, but in the Mongolian documents sometimes it is expressed in terms of the season, i.e. which month (1st, 2nd or 3rd) of the actual season is meant. 3) The stamps are always mentioned in the Mongolian texts but never in the Uyghur texts. 4) The Mongolian texts always mention their provenance, what cannot be found in the Uyghur documents. These differences suggest that there were two different chancellary praxies in use in the Turfan region under the Mongol rule. This suspicion is confirmed by the fact that the Mongolian documents seemingly deal with more significant issues: they are authorized by the khan and volume of the mentioned goods are higher in them too, e.g. the 200 leather bags of wine-grape in Mong01. Based on these data, it can be said that there was at least two levels of bureaucracy in the Turfan region: the higher level of administration was processed in Mongolian while the lower level in Uyghur (i.e. Turkic).

124 Dai Matsui mentioned an unpublished Mongolian document of the British Library [Or. 12452(E)1 Toy. IV. iii. 02a)] in which a dültü temegen “middle (-distance) camel” appears, i.e. a cart camel which was used for middle distance transportation (MATSUI 2009a: 341). Unfortunately I could not manage to check the original manuscript.
This simplified picture becomes more complicated if we take into account the temporal distribution of the documents: while we have Uyghur documents from the whole Mongol period, the earliest Mongolian decrees in the present study can be dated to the 1330’s (Mong02–03). On this point we have to look beyond the sources concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire. The earliest published Mongolian decree from the Turfan region was issued under the rule of Kebek khan (r. 1310–1326) in 1326 (FRANKE 1962: 406). Moreover Dai Matsui published an Uyghur decree of tax exemption which was issued in the name of Du’a khan (1282–1307) (MATSUI 2007), what can be dated to 1290 or 1302. This document was written in Turkic language but bears every attributes of the later Mongolian decrees: it begins with an authorization, followed by an initulatio and the publicatio; the body of the text formed of narratio, dispositio and it is complemented with an inscriptio which names the beneficiary or the document (Altmaša-Kaya). The document differs only in its ending protocol from the Mongolian decrees: it gives the date according to the Uyghur practice and instead of the mentioning of the provenance it explains the reason of issuing (MATSUI 2007: 64). This information let us to draw two inferences: on the one hand, the basic structure of the Mongolian decrees was evolved till the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century in the Turfan region and they were in usage. On the other hand, the higher level of the administration in this period issued at least one document in Uyghur (Turkic) language and not in Mongolian.

As a conclusion, it can be stated that at latest at the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries there were at least two levels of administration in northeastern Turkestan in general, and this administrative distribution was true for the postal system latest from the 1330’s in particular. Moreover, Dai Matusi (MATSUI 2014a: 620) and the author of the present study came to similar conclusion, i.e. the Uyghur official documents were issued at least two different administrative levels: one local and a higher level. Taking everything into account, it seems appropriate to state that the administrative activities of single postal stations (OAcc01–04, UIReg07), above that a local level (the majority of the Uyghur administrative orders) and a highest level (Mongolian decrees) can be distinguished on the basis of the documentary sources.
Chapter V: Animal terminology in the Uyghur documents

In this chapter, some unclear animal denominations in Uyghur documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire will be examined. There are two expressions at the centre of the chapter: ulag and boguz at, however during the investigation a number of other terms will be analysed as well. Beside philological analysis of the documents data from earlier sources and modern languages will be incorporated too.

While in editions of Middle Mongolian documents the word ulaγa or ula’a is consistently translated as ‘post horse, relay horse’ or the like,125 in contemporaneous Uyghur documents the term ulag has additional translations in the fundamental dictionaries and scholarly works. In this chapter, will be clarified the exact meaning of this Turco-Mongol technical term in Uyghur civil documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire from the 13th and 14th centuries. Firstly, the question of possible etymologies will be treated, and then the few appearances of the word in earlier sources will be taken into account. A philological analysis of the Uyghur documents from the Mongol period will be presented and a new interpretation of the term ulag will be provided. Finally, the later history of the word will be illuminated.

5.1. Ulag

Almost all fundamental works and dictionaries agree on the origins of the term. According to them the word originates from the Old Turkic verb ula- ‘to join together, to join’ and the like (KOTWICZ 1953: 346–348; RAMSTEDT 1957: 143; RÄSÄNEN 1969: 512; TMEN II: 102, 105; SEVORTJAN 1974: 588–590; ED: 136; OTWF I: 212–213).126 However, differences in the


126 Here we have to refer to Denis Sino’s theory which differs from the above mentioned points of views. He mentions that the Ugric languages (Vogul, Ostiak and Hungarian) use the same word for horse. In Vogul it is luv, lô, lî, in Ostiak lay, tay, and in Hungarian as ló (lő). These words go back to an Ugric *luaγ, which he believes to be the origin of the Turco-Mongol ulag. Based on this he reconstructs a west-east movement of the expression (SINOR 1965: 314–315). However Sinor’s proposal was not accepted by other scholars, at least there are no references to his theory in later literature. Louis Ligeti took quite the opposite view. He proposed the idea that the Hungarian lő originates from the Turkic ulag (LIGETI 1986: 139–141). The recent work by András Róna-Tas and Árpád Berta deals with the question in detail in their list of improbable etymologies, providing rich
etymological interpretation can be found. Doerfer states: „Etymologie: das Wort ist eine Ableitung von ula- ‘festbinden’ (schon K u.a.), also ulay = ‘das festgebundene (Tier)’” (TMEN II: 103). Clauson’s explanation is as follows:

“The specific meaning seems to be that it is one of a string of horses available for hire or use, and it may originally have meant a string of horses rather than a single animal, but if so this meaning became obsolete very early. It is therefore prob. a Dev. N. fr. ula:–, etymologically identical with I ula:ği, but with a specialized meaning” (ED: 136). 127

Erdal confutes Doerfer’s etymology and gives various possible interpretations:

“I think it follows from the semantic development which this word took that such a horse was not called ulag because it was a »festgebundenes Tier« (TMEN 521), but because it represented an element in a chain (as pars pro toto). Thus, the grammatical task of ulag with respect to ula- could be as action noun (the ‘connection’), subject noun (‘what connects’), object noun (‘what is connected’) or as instrument noun (‘what one uses for connecting’)” (OTWF I: 213).

In sum we can state that most of the scholars are in accordance concerning the Turkic origins of the term (ula-), but that etymological interpretations vary. 128

According to Paul Pelliot the first appearance of the word ulag dates back to the 7th century. He states that it can be found in the Chinese biography of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Xuanzang (664). In the account about his travels across the territories of the Western Turks, the term appears twice in Chinese transcription as wu-luo 鄔落, with the meaning ‘corvée horse’. According to Pelliot this is the standard Chinese equivalent of the Turkic ulag,
pronounced at that time in Chinese as *uo-lâk* (PELLIOT 1929: 220). If Pelliot is right this would be the earliest appearance of the term.\(^{129}\)

The next occurrence of the word, which is well-known in the Turkological literature, can be found in Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī’s *Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk* (Compendium of the Turkic Dialects, hereafter: DLT) (1072–1074). In Robert Dankoff’s translation of the work the definition of *ulag* is:

“A horse which an express courier takes by order of the emir and rides until he finds another” (DLT I: 147).

The word appears in another part of the work as well:

“Let me be generous and get a name for generosity, send me to battle and help me by giving me a horse [ulag] that will convey me to it” (DLT II: 238).\(^{130}\)

Apart from these two sources (the Chinese Xuanzang biography and the DLT) the earlier Turcological literature on *ulag* cited no other occurrence of the word in texts from before the 13th century, which led to a four-century chronological gap in the history of the expression.

In a recent article, Dai Matsui called the attention to those works of Arakawa which dealt with questions of transportation and communication during the Tang dynasty (618–907) on the western borders of China and in Central Asia (MATSUI 2008a: 236, fn. 25). In an article Arakawa dealt with a series of Chinese Turfan documents dated after 657. In these fragments appeared the expression *wu-luo-zi* 烏駱子 ‘a guide accompanying *ulag*’ (ARAKAWA 1994a), which must be a takeover of the Old Turkic *ulagčı*, a derivative form of *ulag*. In another work Arakawa dealt with a Chinese document from Mazar-Tagh (located in

\(^{129}\) The Japanese sinologist Masaharu Arakawa studied the above mentioned passage of the Xuanzang biography in detail. According to his analysis of the text someone issued a decree (in Chinese: *chì* 刺) to the leaders of the oasis states placed westward from Kočo (Chinese: Gaochang Kingdom; present-day Gaochang in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region in the People’s Republic of China) to give *ulag* horses for the traveller. He argued only the khagan of the Western Turks had the authority to give such an order. In Arakawa’s interpretation the king of Kočo asked the khagan of the Western Turks to order the leaders of the other oasis countries to give *ulags* to Xuanzang. The rulers provided not only *ulags* but also guides. Arakawa interpreted this as evidence for the existence of a well-established traffic system in the region. He thinks that *wu-luo* 鄂落 must be the Chinese phonetical transcription of *ulag*, which must be of Turkic origins because this was the language of the Western Turk khagan and the leaders of the oasis countries (ARAKAWA 2010: 25–29). Unfortunately most of Arakawa’s works are available only in Japanese. Hereby I would like to express my gratitude to Yukiyo Kasai and Dai Matsui for summarizing their contents for me.

\(^{130}\) In Brockelmann’s dictionary we find these definitions: *ulag* ‘Kurierpferd, Streitross’ (BROCKELMANN 1928: 229). On the basis of the DLT’s data we can state that the word had partly differing meanings in the 11th century, at least at the Karahanid court.
the present-day Xinjiang Autonomous Region in the People’s Republic of China). This document is dated to around the 8th century, and includes the term the expression *wu-luo-ma* 烏駱馬 ‘ulag-horse’ (ARAKAWA 1994b). After comparative research on Chinese documents from Central Asia, Arakawa concluded that the Western Turk Khaganate imposed the *ulag-* system on the subordinate oasis states in the Tarim Basin, to request horses (*ulag*), guides and provisions from local inhabitants. He went further and suggested that this system could have been inherited by the Uyghur Khaganate. He quoted Tamīm ibn Bahr’s record of a journey to the Uyghur khagan from the 9th century in order to strengthen this theory (ARAKAWA 1994b: 21).

It is clear that the chronological gap between the Chinese biography of Xuanzang and the DLT can be almost fully filled with the results of Arakawa’s investigations. The word *ulag* is traceable in Central Asian Chinese sources from the 7th century on. Although Tamīm ibn Bahr used Arabic terminology to describe the Uyghur’s relay system (MINORSKY 1948: 278; 283), and did not mention *ulag*, if we take into account the numerous similarities between the Uyghur Khaganate and their predecessors the Turks, it seems probable that they inherited some kind of relay system from the Turks as well. So the word *ulag*, which was regarded as a Turco-Mongol technical term in the introduction of this chapter, seems to appear only in Chinese sources in the first four centuries of its history, though the etymologies mentioned above agree on its Turkic origin.

As seen above, contrary to the Middle Mongolian texts’ usage of *ulaγa* or *ula’a*, there are different ways of translating the term *ulag* in Old Turkic dictionaries and text editions. We can state that there were two main directions of definitions given in the dictionaries: one describing *ulag* as a pack animal or a beast of burden, the other connecting it tightly with the

---

131 The travel account of Tamīm ibn Bahr was published in: MINORSKY 1948. The report on the relay horses which were sent to Tamīm ibn Bahr by the Uyghur khagan can be found in the very beginning of the account (MINORSKY 1948: 283).

132 For the summary of these similarities cf.: SINOR 1998: 192; SINOR 2000: 189. For the criticism of Sinor’s standpoint: DROMPP 2005: 23.

133 For a long time it was generally agreed that the postal system of the Mongol Empire was adopted from the Chinese *Yi* 驛 system, with the mediation of Chinggis Khan’s Khitan and Uyghur advisers (GAZAGNADOU 1994: 45–47; MORGAN 2000: 379; MORGAN 2007: 94). Lately Adam J. Silverstein has brought up some arguments against this (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 141–144); however he acknowledged that the Chinese tradition was, at least initially, a model for the Mongols (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 144). In my point of view the above mentioned continuity of a postal relay system in Central Asia from the time of the First Turk Khaganate is a strong argument for the existence of a parallel tradition of maintaining a communication system in Central Asian states, even if it originated long ago from a Chinese model. It is therefore misleading to associate the Mongol *yam* only with the Chinese *Yi*. For a detailed discussion of this topic, see: Chapter VI.
postal system and translating it as post horse or the like.\footnote{Radloff describes it as follows; ”jedes Hausthier, welches zum Transporte von Sachen gebraucht wird, ein Lastthier, Saamthier, Thier, welches den Wagen oder Schlitten zieht” (VERSUCH I: 1679a). Ahmet Caferoğlu’s definition is: ’ulak, yük hayvanı’ (CAFEROĞLU 1934a: 205; CAFEROĞLU 1968: 264). Doerfer, in his Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, translates the word as ’Postpferd, Relaispferd, später Esel’ (TMEN II: 102). The Drevnetjurkskiy Słowar defines it as: ’1.вязное животное, верховой конь; 2. почтовый транспорт на перегонах между станциями’ (DTS: 608). Clauson, in his etymological dictionary, wrote, in addition to the part mentioned above: “a technical term for a horse used for carrying goods or riding, more particularly a horse for hire and a post horse.” (ED 136).} In standard editions of the documents scholars follow these two principal directions as well, always choosing the interpretation which best fits the context (cf.: USP 4, 47, 56; SUK II: 296; VOHD13,21: 37; TUGUSHEVA 2013: 204). In order to gain a better understanding of the phenomenon a philological investigation of the Uyghur documents has to be fulfilled.\footnote{Another contemporary Turkic source has to be mentioned here: the Codex Cumanicus, from the southern part of the Eastern European steppe zone. There are two riddles which may contain the word (DRIMBA 2000: 116 folio 60r line 31–32). Géza Kuun, the first editor of the source, transcribed it as ut(a)hī in the first riddle and did not take it in to the glossary (CC: 144); in the second riddle he read ulah in both lines and translated it simply ’equis’ (CC: 145; 260). Later Willy Bang transcribed the word in the first riddle as ulāhim and in the second as ulah and translated it as ‘Lasttier’ (BANG 1912: 344). Németh confuted Bang’s readings and transcribed the word in the first riddle as ulayim and translated as ‘mein? Zicklein’, while in the second he read ulak but gave no different translation (NÉMETH 1913:592–593). The Old Turkic word for ‘young goat’ is ogluk (ED: 84), so he might considered it as mistyping, but did not mention it (cf.: WOT: 638–642). Grønbech accepted Németh’s translation and gave the following entry in his dictionary referring to the first riddle: ulag [ulahH] ‘Zicklein’(GRØNBECH 1942: 264). Later Andreas Tietze investigated the riddles of the Codex Cumanicus in details and brought modern parallels into consideration. He mentioned that Radloff and Malov agreed with Németh as well (TIETZE 1966: 71).} In documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire we find many attestations of ulag and other animals as well, and we can find many compositions too. Among the approximately 70 texts which can be linked with the postal system we find the word ulag 34 times in 19 documents. The term ulagcē ‘stableman’, which is derived from ulag, appears 24 times in 13 documents. The compositions in which the term appears are the following: at ulag (‘horse ulag’) 11 times in 9 documents; ulag at (‘ulag horse’) 2 times in 2 documents; münğü [number] at ulag (‘[number of] riding horse ulag’) 3 times in 3 documents; aşgäk ulag (‘donkey ulag’) 4 times in 3 documents, münğü bir aşgäk ulag (‘one riding donkey ulag’) once, uzun-ka bargu aşgäk ulag (‘long distance donkey ulag’) once, uzun ulag (‘long ulag’) 9 times in 6 documents, kisga ulag (‘short ulag’) 3 times in 1 document, and ad ulag (‘ox ulag’) once.\footnote{For the whole list see Table 1.} It seems certain that the scribes intended these compositions to express some specialized meanings.

Besides the so-called ulag-compositions we have many constructions with other animals, such as: münğü at, kisga at, ṭuli at, uzun at, yol at, yap at, yùdgü aşgäk. Some of these are easy to explain: Old Turkic yol means ‘road, way’ (ED: 907), so yol at can surely be translated as ‘horse for the route’. The participle münğü goes back to the verb bin- ‘to mount
or ride (a horse)’, which has a late form as mün- (ED: 767, 348), and with the –GU deverbal suffix\(^{137}\) it results a münɡü at ‘a horse to ride on’ composition, which means ‘riding horse’. We find the same case in the term yüdgü äšgäk: yüd- ‘to carry’ (ED: 885) plus the –GU suffix, and the result is yüdgü äšgäk ‘a donkey to carry’ which is actually a pack-donkey.

About uzun and kısga at we can accept the opinion of Dai Matsui, who proposed that the adjectives uzun ‘long’ and kısga ‘short’ refer to the range the horses could reach, so uzun at is a horse for long-range travel, while the kısga at can be used for short distance journeys (MATSUI 1998a: 43–45; MATSUI 2002: 107-108).\(^{138}\) This definition helps us in the interpretation of the term uzun ulag: this expression surely refers to an ulag which is capable of performing long distance journeys. Dai Matsui puts in this group of compositions the expression tüli at. It appears in a text which belongs to a group of five administrative orders from the Mongol period (13\(^{th}\)–14\(^{th}\) cc.) which was unearthed at the Bezeklik Caves near Turfan (MATSUI 2009: 340–341).\(^{139}\) Matsui transcribes the second line of the first text as: “\(\text{2}^\text{ndu elči-ning tüli at-ırınga}\)” and translates it as: “\(\text{2}^\text{for the middle (-distance) horses of ambassador Indu}\)”.

He follows Umemura\(^{140}\) and equates tüli with the Mongolian düli\(^{141}\) ‘half, middle, middle of the day or night, noon, midnight; middling, mediocre, average; halfway, partly’ (LESSING 1973: 280),\(^{142}\) but contrary to Umemura’s ‘usual horse; normal horse’ interpretation, he suggests a “middle (-distance) horse” translation. If we accept his argument, we can state there was a three grade classification of the horses within the yam-system, according to the distance they were capable to achieve. In the current state of research it is very hard to define the exact short- middle- and long-distances on the basis of the Uyghur documents because they do not contain detailed information concerning these data. There is only one document (PO05) which mentions the destination of the recipients: “...\(\text{4}^\text{bäg-lär-ni} \text{yümış-ka bagu-ći} \text{5}^\text{lükčüŋ-ka} \text{6}^\text{müngüp bargu-ći} \text{7}^\text{kısg-ka ulag...}$$”, what can be translated as: “\(\text{4}^\text{for the travellers of the bägs, to go to Lükčüŋ as messengers}\) by riding two short (-distance) ulags...”. There is no attestation of the place of departure, however, so

---


\(^{138}\) Matsui surmised that the Turkic expressions go back to Chinese forms (MATSUI 2008a: 236).

\(^{139}\) These documents were first published by Geng Shimin with a Chinese translation (1980). Later Umemura Hiroshi (1981) and Kurban Weli (1984) presented their own readings. Lastly Dai Matsui gave a new interpretation of the texts and he republished the facsimiles (2009), what is important because the inventory numbers of the originals are unknown (MATSUI 2009: 339-340).

\(^{140}\) For the citation and refutation of the other readings: MATSUI 2009: 340 fn. 5.

\(^{141}\) According to Róna-Tas and Berta the Mongolian originates from a West Old Turkic *tülčĭ > *tülî and the original meaning was: ‘midday-time, lit. the sun came to its place’ (WOT I: 292–294).

\(^{142}\) In Kowalewski’s dictionary: ‘milieu, moitié, midi, minuit’ (KOWALEWSKI III: 1917).

\(^{143}\) As Dai Matsui called my attention on it, is very likely that the first word of the 5\(^{th}\) line (yümış) is a variant of yumuščı which has a secondary meaning in DTS as: посланник (‘messenger, envoy’) (DTS: 280).
we still do not have any distance data, but if we accept the assumption that the place of excavation could be near to the place of provenance, we can gain some more information. The old signature of the PO05 document is T.M. 71. The T.M. or TM signatures (‘Manuscritpe aus Turkistan’) were given by Albert von Le Coq in Berlin, and most probably all the fragments with this signature belong to the findings of the first German Turfan Expedition, which means they were unearthed in the Kočo area (VOHD 13,9: XIII). Due to the fact that Kočo was a local administrative centre in the Mongol period it seems probable that this was the place of provenance. According to Aurel Stein’s detailed map on the region Lükčün (on the map it is called Lukchun) is located south-east from Kočo (on the map it is called Kara-khōja) approximately 27.46 kilometres away (STEIN 1928: No. 28). All things considered it is very likely that the short distance ulags which went to Lükčün had to cover around 27.5 kilometres. Here I have to call attention to the strongly speculative nature of this calculation, but according to the given data I would assume that the short(-distance) ulags could cover an approximate minimum of 30 kilometres.

The following document (PO12) gives us further help in explaining the exact meaning of ulag as well:

**Transcription**

1. ud yıl säkizinč ay tokuz
2. yıngi-ka yeťär elći-kä yürüŋčin
3. –kä bargu tört at ulag-tä.
4. nampi-tä [tä]mir-či buyan tükäl
5. /[...\]WNG č(a)gan k[u]lî bilä bir at
6. berip yam at san-intá tutzun

**Translation**

_Ox year, 8th month, on the 9th new day. From the four horse-ulags for envoy Yetär to go to Yürüŋčin, 4,6 Tämir-či, Buyan (and) Tükäl, [...] WNG with Čagan Kuli from Nampi shall give one horse and take it into account as postal horse[-tax]._

---

144 Le Coq had a register about these manuscripts with detailed information, which he even quoted in his publications. Unfortunately this register has been lost (MÜLLER–LENTZ 1934: 43 [544]; BOYCE 1960: XXIII; VOHD13,21: 18).

145 Here I would like to express my gratitude to Réka Pogácsás who helped me with the calculations.
This text shows us that the original *ats* given by the persons mentioned were used as *at ulag* and the newly added decree states that they have to be taken into account as *yam at*, which probably means postal horse-tax.\(^{146}\)

To determine the specific meaning of these *ulag*-compositions we can have a look at another document (UIReg13):

**Transcription**

1. [ ]Q’
2. bir [a]t P//-kä bir at buka ūämir...
3. [ ]SWN [u]lag-či bilä berdi säkiz yanika P[...]
4. tokuz-unč ay altu y(e)girmikä QW//[...]
5. toksin-[k]a buka tämir ber-zünn T[...]
6. bermiš at-lar uzu[n u]lag-ka tu[zun...]
7. boldi tümen ak-a ’Y[ ]WN //LWN
8. -kä toksin inč[ü,...] /// ay/ni
9. [b]ir ulag müsir P[ ] [...]
10. ulag-či-ka tuṭuldu toksin[...]
11. [ ]L’R bargu //Y/[...

**Translation**

1[ ]Q’ **one [ho]rse for P[ ] , one horse. Buka T[ämir ...]** SWN together with a stableman was given. At the 8\(^{th}\) new day P[...] 9\(^{th}\) month (on the) 16\(^{th}\) (day) QW//[...] sin Toksin Buka Tämir shall give. T[...]

\(^{146}\) The literary meaning of *yam at* is ‘postal horse’; however Professor Dai Matsui called my attention to a possible abstract interpretation of the expression as: ‘postal horse-tax’. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO12.
same line of thought for those cases in which the other part is not a horse, namely äšgäk ulag and ud ulag. I think in these cases the original donkey and ox received special status and became donkey-ulag and ox-ulag.

To understand the special status of these animals we have to look at the later life of this term. As mentioned above, scholarly literature agrees that the Turkic word ulag was borrowed by Mongolian around the 13th century at the latest, in the form of ulaya or ula’a as ‘relay horse’ and the like. In Turkic sources originating from the later Golden Horde, the word ulag or ulaq was used for the postal system and for the claims that envoys made from the local population for food and animals (Spuler 1943: 335; Özyetgin 1996: 238; Özyetgin 2004: 139).

During the Mongol Period the term spread widely among the languages of Eurasia. In many cases (especially when the mediator language was Mongolian) the sense of the loanword was connected to the postal system. In the postal system of China under the rule of the Yuan dynasty the word wulachi 兀剌赤 was used for courier companions (Olbricht 1954: 60), or in David Farquhar’s formulation ‘Relay Horse Managers’ (Farquhar 1990: 220), which is a Chinese equivalent of the Mongolian ula’ačin ‘relay coachman, relay service attendant’ (Lessing 1973: 869). In Tibetan u-lag ‘socage service, compulsory post service’ (Lauffer 1916: 492); in Manchu: ula ‘Relaispost’ (Hauer 1952: 953); in Persian: ulāgh (الاغ), ulāq (الاق) ‘A forcing of one to work gratis; a relay of post horses; a courier; a small horse; ass’ (Steingass 1947: 91); in Zenker’s dictionary: ulak (اوراق, اولاق, اوولاق, اوولاق) ‘Eilbote, Eilschiff, Couriersschiff’; ‘Postpferd, Courierpferd’, ‘اولاق بارگیر’; ‘Eilbote zu Fuss’ (Zenker 1866: 129); Ottoman Turkic ulaq (اوراق) ‘messenger, a courier, one who is the channel for forwarding messages’ (Redhouse 1890: 265).

To summarise the early history of the word ulag it is very likely that the Turkic etymology which goes back to the word ula- ‘to join together, to join’ is correct. According to Pelliot and Arakawa’s investigations it appeared first in 7th century Chinese sources, and was

---

147 Though Farquhar refers only to Mongolian words as possible origins, if we take into account the above-mentioned works of Arakawa we see that the word was borrowed in to Chinese long before the Mongol period.

148 Such pejorative connotations can be noticed in the Turkic and Mongolian languages too. In Mongolian there is a verb ulaγla- ‘to use a relay system, travel by relay; to take by force, confiscate; to rob’ (Lessing 1973: 869). In the Central Asian literary language (so called Chagatay Turkic): كىىلاغ ‘travail sans salaire; cheval; courrier; petit bateau’ (PDC: 74). These disparaging overtones are results of the regular abuses and misuses in connection with the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire and its heirs. The contemporary Persian historiographers Juvaini (Boyle 1958: 501, 524, 598–599) and Rashid ad-Din (Thackston 1999: 714–718) mention this frequently. Rashid ad-Din draws an especially vivid picture on the abuses; however he might exaggerate its scale. For an analysis of the Persian sources on the subject see: Morgan 1977: 311–312; Morgan 2000: 380–383; Silverstein 2007: 141–164 (especially: 151, 156–157).

149 For further data on the spread of the word see: TMEN II: 105–107; LIGETI 1986: 139–141; WOT: 1192–1195.
tightly connected with some kind of relay system in Central Asia. From this time the word is
documented in the Chinese sources of Central Asia and Tang China. The first appearance of
the word in Turkic sources can be dated to the second half of the 11th century in the DLT,
where it has a dual meaning: ‘courier horse’ and ‘warhorse’. Most probably the word was
borrowed to Mongolian by the beginning of the 13th century at the latest. If we take into
account the fact that Turkic and Mongolian speaking people lived together in the eastern part
of the Eurasian steppe zone long before the rise of the Mongol Empire it does not seem
impossible. Additionally we know how important a role the Turkic (mostly Uyghur) advisers
played in the establishment and early history of the empire. The administration of this
newly established empire had to respond to many challenges concerning the maintenance of
this huge state. In this process they needed language tools to describe elements of the new
circumstances. So, most probably the word was borrowed into the Mongolian language in the
early years of the empire at the latest as ‘post horse, relay horse’. From this time on it was
tightly connected to the postal system of the empire, which was far larger in size and far more
complex in its variety of services than its Central Asian predecessors. These factors led to a
change in the meaning of the word in Old Turkic. The spread of the word did not stop in
Central Asia, but within the frame of the empire it infiltrated into numerous Eurasian
languages. Based on this, in my opinion the special status of those animals which became
ulags meant that they became the property of the state, more precisely the property of the
postal system of the Mongol Empire. A passage of Juvainī seems to strengthen this theory:

“Elchis now departed to all the lands to procure and dispatch taghars of flour for
the provisioning of the army and also a great number of animals both for
slaughter and for use as mounts. The provision had to be transported [over an
area stretching] from Armenia to Yezd and from the land of the Kurds to Jurjan
and the beasts belonging to the Divan being insufficient for the purpose the order
was given that the animals of any person whatsoever, whether noble or base, Turk
and Tazik, should be seized as ulaghs and the taghars thus dispatched.” (BOYLE
1958: 621)

150 There is accordance among scholars about the basic idea that the non-Mongol population of the Empire
played a key role in the establishment of administrative systems of the Mongol Empire, but there are long-lasting
debates about the involvement of certain groups (RACHEWILTZ 1966; MORGAN 1982). About the Turkic
influence on the Mongol Empire in its early phase, see fn. 27 in chapter I.
So probably in the Uyghur documents of Central Asia from the 13th and 14th centuries the word *ulag* could mean any kind of livestock which was used by the postal relay system, and if the scribes of the documents wanted to specify which kind of animals they meant, they used the compositions, such as *at ulag*, *äšgäk ulag*, etc., mentioned above.

5.2. Boguz at

There is another problematic composition in the documents: *boguz at*. Radloff, in his text edition, completed the expression as *boguz[-*lig]* at and translated it as ‘ein Pferd zum Schlachten’ (USP: 154–155, Nr. 91–7),151 probably deriving it from the verb *boguzla-* ‘to cut the throat of, slaughter’ (ED: 322). Dai Matsui thinks the word *boguz* has a ‘food’ meaning and explains the expression *boguz at* as ‘the horse for eating’ or ‘a horse as food’ (MATSUI 2002: 107–108). Matsui quotes the account of Wang Yande, the 10th century Chinese envoy to the West Uyghurs, in which several attestations of the Uyghurs’ habit of eating horse meat can be found (İZGI 1989: 89, 91–92). In the followings a closer analysis of this composition will be given in order to find a more plausible interpretation.

First we have to look at sources earlier than the Mongol period. In a decree about the economy of a Manichean monastery from the West Uyghur period (9th–12th centuries)152 the expression *aš boguz* appears two times (line 45 and 47) and the inflected form *ašı boguzı* once (line 43). The first part *aš* means ‘food’ (ED: 253). The primary meaning of *boguz* in the Old Turkic sources is ‘throat’ (ED: 322), but in the interpretation of the abovementioned passage, Moriyasu proposes to take it rather as ‘Magen, Bauch’, as the secondary meaning of the word according to the DTS is ‘желудок’ (‘stomach’) (DTS: 110).153 Finally he recommends translating the composition as ‘Essen’ (MORIYASU 2004b: 84). There is also a solo appearance of the word *boguz* in an adoption document from the same period, which was translated in the *Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte* as ‘Nahrung’ (SUK II: 118–119). Thirdly

---

151 The document Nr. 91 in the USp is identical with UlReg11 of the present study (document U 5311 of the Berlin signatures). Recently Dai Matsui noted that there is not enough space on the manuscript for Radloff’s –*lig* completion (MATSUI 2014b: 99). After the analysis of the original document I reject Radloff’s –*lig* completion too. Namely the 17th line starts with a –*lig* suffix, and if we compare the size of it with the missing part of the paper at the end of the 6th line it is clear there is simply not enough space to write there the suffix. In the DTS we find *boγuz[luγ] at* with the explanation: лошадь для убоя ‘horse for slaughter’ and the quotation of the above mentioned USp paragraph (DTS: 110).

152 The manuscript was unearthed in the Tarim Basin, and kept in Beijing at the Museum of Chinese History. The archive number of the manuscript is Zong 总 8782 T, 82 = Y 974 K 7709. It has been published by Takao Moriyasu with rich historical and philological commentary (MORIYASU 2004b: 39–147).

153 In both dictionaries of Caferoğlu the secondary meaning of the world is ‘hayvan yemi için tane halinde ekin’ (CAFEROĞLU 1934a: 34 CAFEROĞLU 1968: 46).
we can quote Nobuo Yamada, who interpreted the word in an article as ‘a kind of corn for feed stuff’ (YAMADA 1967: 90, fn. 6).

In order to make a better understanding of the expression we shall take a look at the various senses of the word in the later periods. In the dictionaries of the later Turkic languages we found that the word beside its primary sense (‘throat’), has two other secondary meanings, or homophone words. In the dictionary of Pavet de Courteille we find: بوغوز, بوغز (‘throat’), grain (‘grain’), jument pleine (‘pregnant mare’) (PdC: 172). In Budagov’s dictionary it appears as a variant of بوغوز, بوغز in the form بوغوز ‘пища, корм’ (‘food’), and in an expression as: اتنه بوغوز بيريب (‘giving food for the horses’), and thirdly it means беременная женщина (‘pregnant women’), стельная корова (‘cow with calf’) (BUDAGOV: 283). In Radloff’s dictionary the secondary meaning is ‘das Futter, die Nahrung’ (VERSUCH: 1651), while Räsänen’s etymological dictionary gives ‘Kehle’ and ‘schwanger’ (RÄSÄNEN 1969: 78). Sevortjan discusses the term under böğaz and he has two entries for it. In the first entry, as a fourth meaning we find: корм (‘food’) кормовое зерно (‘coarse grains’), провиант, фураж (‘provisions, forage’), твердый корм (‘solid food’), пища (‘food’), хлебные злаки (‘cereals’) (SEVORTJAN 1978: 167–168). There are two meanings in the second entry: беременная (‘pregnant’) and беременная женщина (‘pregnant woman’) (SEVORTJAN 1978: 169). In the modern Turkic languages there are some similar cases too. In the Khalaj language böğaz is ‘schwanger’ (DOERFER–TEZCAN 1980: 94). In the Eastern-Turki böğaz–buyaz means: 1) ‘strong fodder, grain or corn (used as fodder)’ 2) ‘pregnant’ (JARRING 1964: 57). In Modern Uyghur the secondary meaning of boğuz is ‘feed, fodder, and forage’ (SCHWARZ 1992: 79). In the Derleme sözlüğü which collects the vernacular usage of the Turkish words the third meaning of böğaz redirects to buzalaci ‘gebe inek, manda, gebe hayvan’ (‘pregnant cow, water buffalo, pregnant animal’), and the fifth meaning of böğaz is ‘yiyecik’ (‘food’) (DERLEME: 726, 810). Even in the Redhouse dictionary under boğaz the following meanings can be found: ‘5) supplying food, feeding 6) a mouth to feed 7) eating and drinking’ (REDHOUSE 2007: 134).

Taking these data into account we can state that the word boguz in Old Turkic had some secondary meanings like ‘food, fodder’ and ‘pregnant’ or ‘pregnant animal’ beside the primary sense ‘throat’. All of these meanings became widespread in the modern languages too, in which the Old Turkic boguz form frequently changed to boğaz and the like. So during

154 Similarly to boguz the Old Turkic tamgak had also two meanings: ‘throat’ and ‘food’ (ED: 505). The Mongolian *koalat(i) also had these two meanings (NUGTEREN 2011: 416).
the interpretation of the expression *boguz at* we have at least two additional senses of *boguz*, namely ‘food, fodder’ and ‘pregnant, pregnant animal’ which may be a homonym.\textsuperscript{155}

From the Mongol period the expression appears in three documents: PO05, UlReg11 and U 5306. UlReg11 and U 5306 of these are lists from which we get no further information to help the interpretation of the composition. But the document PO05 – which was already quoted with regard to the term *kısga ulag* – is a decree concerning the supply of horses. In this text we find the following passage:

**Transcription**
1. ud γ[ι] [ž]ün čahšp(a)τ ay bir
2. yaŋ-ka töŋül elči-kä üč
3. kün-lük bir boguz at…

**Translation**
“\textit{Ox year the leap 12\textsuperscript{th} month on the first 2\textsuperscript{nd} new day. For envoy Töŋül a fodder(-
carrying) horse for three days...}”

I translated it like this because I suppose in this context the ‘fodder’ sense is much more plausible than Radloff’s ‘horse for slaughter’ or the ‘pregnant’ meaning. On the one hand, it makes no sense to give pregnant horses for the travellers. On the other hand, we have no contemporary information about horses which were taken with the travellers just to slaughter them for their meat, but we know that they had led horses to transport provision for the people and animals as well. Meanwhile in the Old Uyghur documents several technical terms for provision are already attested, such as: *azuk* (PO19, Käz07), *yol azukluk* (PO09), *käzig aš* (Käz01, Käz05, Käz10), *tuzgu* (PO07). Due to this fact the *boguz* of the compound *boguz at* most probably means ‘fodder’. Moreover, if we take into consideration that an envoy never travelled alone but with some companions and frequently also with some official attendants of the postal system (*ulagči*), the necessity of a horse to carry the fodder – in our case a three day

\textsuperscript{155}The semantical connection between the first meaning ‘throat’ and the secondary ‘food, fodder’ is quite obvious, but on the other hand it is not clear yet how the third meaning ‘pregnant, pregnant animal’ is related to the other two. Maybe it is just a coincidence or as mentioned above a homonym. Apart from the data of the dictionaries we have some appearance of the word in the meaning ‘pregnant’ and the like. For example in the *Dāftar-i Čingiz-nāmā* its Kipchak form is *buwaz* (IVANICS–USMANOV 2002: 136). Moreover it appears in the Uyghur script version of the *Oğuz-nāmā* two times in a compound *töl bogus*. (Personal communication with Balázs Danka, whose detailed analysis of the source is forthcoming.)
fodder – becomes clear.\textsuperscript{156} So, in this case the \textit{üç kün-lük bir boguz at} means ‘a horse which is capable to carry fodder for three days’.\textsuperscript{157}

Although, we have just a few instances of \textit{boguz at} in Uyghur documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire, if these are compared with data of earlier texts and the modern languages a much more probable interpretation of the composition can be achieved. According to this \textit{boguz at} means ‘fodder horse, led horse’ or ‘horse to carry fodder’. Of course we need further instances of the word in old texts to answer for certain the question which emerged concerning the expression \textit{boguz at}, but in the present state of research we lack them.

In this chapter the animal terminology in the Uyghur documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire were investigated through the detailed analysis of two expressions: \textit{ulag} and \textit{boguz at}. Due to the results of this examination, new interpretations are proposed for them: in the Uyghur documents of the 13\textsuperscript{th}–14\textsuperscript{th} centuries \textit{ulag} referred to any kind of livestock which were the property of or were used by the postal system of the Mongol Empire; in the same sources \textit{boguz at} meant ‘led horse’ or ‘fodder(-carrying) horse’. In general we can state that a very sophisticated denomination system was in usage in the postal system of the Mongol Empire, which differed from the ordinary animal denominations and was based on practical considerations.\textsuperscript{158} Moreover if we take into account all the information of the documents it is clear that one of the main duties of the \textit{yam}-system was to supply animals for the travellers. Seemingly a whole sub-system of the postal system was responsible for the uninterrupted supply of the animals, what according to the newly found meaning of the word \textit{ulag}, could be called \textit{ulag}-system.

\textsuperscript{156} On the size of the political missions in the period reliable data can be found in the accounts of Plano Carpini (DAWSON 1955: 3–76) and Wilhelmus Rubruck (DAWSON 1955: 87–220). Cf.: BIRAN 2008: 382.
\textsuperscript{157} Cf. OTWF: 121–131.
\textsuperscript{158} The ordinary denominations for horses in Turkic and Mongolian languages are very varied as well. On this topic see the 3–4 issues of the 10\textsuperscript{th} volume of the Central Asiatic Journal (1965) and especially: CLAUSON 1965.
Chapter VI: The origin of the postal system of the Mongol Empire

Over the last decades almost every scholar dealing with the Mongol Empire has emphasized the significance of the so called jam-system among its works. The question: ‘What is the origin of the postal system of the Mongol Empire?’ emerged almost simultaneously with the investigation of the yam-system. In this chapter firstly a brief summary of the state of research concerning the origin of the Mongol post will be provided. After that, the Central Asian tradition of maintaining a communication system and its connection with the origins of the Mongol imperial post will be examined.

If we survey the research history of the Mongol post we see that there are basically two groups contributing to the investigation of its origins: linguists and historians. In the following the results of both parts will be taken into consideration and the author’s own comments to the topic will be added too.

6.1. Linguistic approaches

Chronologically the first attempts to identify the origin of the Mongol postal system were made by linguists. The focus of these researches was on the designation of the postal system, namely the etymology of the Middle Mongolian jam and (Old) Turkic yam. In the Mongol period both words were used for the designation of a single postal station, but the whole system in general too. From the beginning of the 20th century many linguists tried to etymologize these words and among the many theories Iranian, Altaic, Proto-Turkic, Mongolian, Topa, Manchu and also Chinese etymologies emerged. In 1975 Gerhard Doerfer made an end of the debate for more than thirty years. He dealt with the word on 8 pages in his enormous work the Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen (TMEN IV: 110–118; Nr. 1812). Beside the detailed summary of the research history he confuted most of the earlier etymologies and set up his own theory which was widely accepted for a long time among the specialists. Due to the importance of Doerfer’s work, in the followings his confutations concerning earlier theories will be presented in footnotes, than his own point will be introduced.
The first attempt to identify the origin of the *yam* was made by Edgar Blochet. In his edition of Rashīd al-Dīn’s *Jāmī‘ al-Tavārīkh* ("Complete Collection of Histories") he regarded it as borrowing from the Chinese *ye-ma* 驿馬 ‘post horse’ or *ye-mu* 驿務 ‘post’ to Mongolian and then it was transmitted to Persian (BLOCHET 1911: 311 fn. a). According to Willi Bang the Turkic *yam*, the Mongolian *jam* and the Manchu *giyamun* ‘Station, Post’ originates from a proto-Turkic < *giyam = *d’am, *d’ām + un* which goes back to Persian roots (BANG 1924: 19). Boris Vladimircov surmised that the word was originally Mongolian (*jam*) and later it was borrowed to Turkic (*yam*) and other languages (VLADIMIRCOV 1929: 290–294). Paul Pelliot disputed mainly with Vladimircov. Firstly he mentions that the Turkic form *yam* appeared already in the accounts of those Europeans who travelled in the Mongol Empire. Secondly he states that there were only a few specifically Mongolian words which were borrowed after the 13th century and survived in Ottoman Turkish, but the *yam* can be found in the Ottoman sources. Lastly he remarks that the word was attested already in a Chinese source, the *Nan Qi-shou* 南齊書 from the first half of the 6th century concerning the Touba or Tabgach language as *xian zhen* 咸真, pronounced at that time in Chinese somehow like *ji̇am*. Finally he concludes that the word is of Altaic origin (PELLIOT 1930: 193–195). Ernst Herzfeld derived it from the Old Persian *yuman* which would have been an inflected

---

159 Doerfer found this theory phonetically impossible (TMEN IV: 115).
160 Doerfer stated that this phonetical dissimulation is impossible by the Manchu *giyamun*. Furthermore he added that none of the Turkic words was borrowed directly into Manchu, but always through Mongolian mediation (TMEN IV: 116).
161 In the earlier literature this gentilic name appears as Toub (in the Wade-Giles transcription system: T’o-pa), while lately they are mentioned as Tabgach.
162 Already Shiratori referred to this passage, but he transcribed it wrongly as *han-chê̄n*, with the description: ‘Der Mann, welcher in allen Provinzen, wohin er reist, Postpferde benutzt’ (SHIRATORI 1900: 30).
163 Pelliot himself just defined it, here I followed Doerfer’s reconstruction (TMEN IV: 117).
164 Later Louis Ligeti (LIGETI 1970: 294–296) and Larry Vernon Clark (CLARK 1973: 186; CLARKINTRO: 458) agreed with Pelliot so their standpoints are not presented separately.
165 Doerfer polemicsed with Pelliot in details. Firstly he stated that the earliest appearance of the word can be detected in a Mongolian source, namely in the *Secret History of the Mongols*, and all the evidences with *y-* are later. He added that the establishment of a large postal system is connected to the Mongols and because of this it is culture historically not probable that it would have been a Turkic loanword in Mongolian. Furthermore he called the attention to the fact that *jam* is attested in the earliest Mongolian texts while *yam* is not attested in any Turkic text prior to the Mongol period.
166 He found Pelliot’s objection concerning the existence of *yam* in the Ottoman Turkish language only partly justified. Doerfer admitted that there are very few direct Mongolian loanwords can be found in the Ottoman Turkish, but he reminded that East Anatolia was under Mongol rule and they surely established there the *jam*-system, moreover he stated that the Ottomans surely knew the postal system of the Ilkhanid Iran. Based on these arguments he found it probable that the Ottoman Turkish *yam* was a borrowing from the Mongolian *jam* as a cultural loanword.
167 Thirdly due to culture historical reasons Doerfer found it more probable that the word goes back to Chinese origins rather than of a Turkic one. He proposed the question: why would the Chinese have borrowed a Turkic technical term for the postal system if they had invented their own system of communication centuries earlier? He added that the broader meaning of the word in Chinese strengthens his theory, too (TMEN IV: 117–118).
form of the radical yū- ‘to put (the horses to)’ and ‘to brace’ (HERZFELD 1947: 231). According to Bazin it is likely that the word is pre-Turkic (BAZIN 1950: 303). Władysław Kotwicz wrote an article about the Altaic terms concerning the postal system. In this he studied in details the origins of yam and jam. He connected the jam with the Mongolian ja Dalyra ‘space between; half way, situated between’ and derived it from a *ja- root with a meaning ‘interval’ (KOTWICZ 1953: 329–336). Eduard Erkes based his standpoint on Pelliot’s works and thought that the word zhan 站 ‘post station’ was one of the first Turkic loanwords in Chinese (ERKES 1957: 92–93). According to Henry Serruys the Chinese zhan 站 is a borrowing from Mongolian jam. He pointed out that in the early Mongol period the Chinese sources transcribed the Mongolian jam with different characters, even with the one, zhan 站, which means ‘to dip’. Only later under the Yuan dynasty (1271–1368) did the usage of zhan 站, of which the original meaning was ‘to stand, to stop,’ became widespread (SERRUYS 1957: 146–148). Gerald Clauson shared the opinion concerning its origins as Chinese, from zhan 站, he added that it was an early loanword in Mongolian too, probably directly from Chinese and presumably it reached the Turkic languages through Mongolian (ED: 933). Gerhard Doerfer himself agreed with Ilja P. Petruševskij (PETRUŠEVSKIJ 1960: 36, fn. 98) about the origins of the word. According to him it can be traced back to two different Chinese dialects: from one *ţám was borrowed to Touba and to Manchu, while from the other *ţ̆ám was borrowed to Mongolian and from there to Tibetan and Turkic and from the Turkic into many other languages of Eurasia (TMEN IV: 118). Recently Adam J. Silverstein has drawn a new source into the debate, calling attention to the appearance of the

165 Doerfer finds this etymology improbable because the origin of the word is explainable much more easily from Chinese (TMEN IV: 115).

166 More precisely Bazin thought the whole Touba language to be pre-Turkic and as a part of it this word too. Wolfram Eberhard shared Bazin’s opinion in his book about the Tuoba state in North China and referred to Bazin’s that time forthcoming work (EBERHARD 1949: 361–362). Doerfer rejected Bazin’s theory due to phonetical reasons and mentioned that the word is not attested in any Turkic sources before the Mongol period (TMEN IV: 116). Here we have to note that the linguistic affiliation of the Touba or Tabgach language was pending for a long time but in 1970 Louis Ligeti proved it convincingly on the basis of the glosses in hand that the Tabgach language must belong to the Mongol languages (LIGETI 1970). Lately some acclaimed scholars of the field regarded it as “Para-Mongolic” (JANHUNEN 2007; VOVIN 2007: 194–196).

167 More precisely Bazin thought the whole Touba language to be pre-Turkic and as a part of it this word too. Wolfram Eberhard shared Bazin’s opinion in his book about the Tuoba state in North China and referred to Bazin’s that time forthcoming work (EBERHARD 1949: 361–362). Doerfer rejected Bazin’s theory due to phonetical reasons and mentioned that the word is not attested in any Turkic sources before the Mongol period (TMEN IV: 116). Here we have to note that the linguistic affiliation of the Touba or Tabgach language was pending for a long time but in 1970 Louis Ligeti proved it convincingly on the basis of the glosses in hand that the Tabgach language must belong to the Mongol languages (LIGETI 1970). Lately some acclaimed scholars of the field regarded it as “Para-Mongolic” (JANHUNEN 2007; VOVIN 2007: 194–196).

168 Doerfer cites Kotwicz himself, who admitted that it is only a hypothesis (TMEN IV: 118).

169 Doerfer rejects this opinion on both linguistic and historical grounds (TMEN IV: 116).

170 Doerfer did not cite Clauson’s opinion probably because they were basically on the same standpoint.

171 Doerfer stated that according to Ramstedt the two words yam and jam are genetically related (‘urverwandt’), but on the referring page of Ramstedt’s work (RAMSTEDT 1935: 466) no such statement can be found.
word \textit{yām} in an 8\textsuperscript{th} century Judeo-Persian document from Central Asia with the meaning ‘postal courier’ (Silverstein 2007: 142–143).\footnote{For the facsimile, transcription, translation and comments on the text see: UTAS 1968; for a revised translation: Moreen 2000: 23–24.}

As it can be seen from the above given overview that this sustained linguistic discussion did not bring a satisfying result. However Doerfer’s standpoint was widely accepted for a long period, lately Allsen rehashed Serruys’ theory which has quite convincing philological arguments. Without the intention to settle this long debate, in the followings some new data concerning the history of the word \textit{yam} will be presented.

The word \textit{yam} is already attested in a late 10\textsuperscript{th} or early 11\textsuperscript{th} century Sogdian document from the Turfan Basin as a part of a proper name:\footnote{This text was edited by Werner Sundermann in 1985 (Sundermann 1985: 34), but here I cite the revised edition of Adam Benkato from his not yet published dissertation at the SOAS (Benkato 2015). Here I would like to express my gratitude to him for calling my attention to this source.}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Transliteration}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
ANc7 & kyL’pyr’tβr’twγšy-(’γð) [’k…

ANc8 & ’wk’prmyšy’mcwrwn’ntm’xt’γw[r]

ANc9 & s’r psy sw’t t’γwr
\end{tabular}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Translation}
\end{center}

\textit{“He who would not believe it should to ask brother(s) Wiγaši-āγaðē, Öğābirmiš, Yamčor, Wanantmāx, (and) Tataγur.”}

The second part of the name \textit{Yamčor}\footnote{Gerald Clauson and Rong Xinjiang considered the title as Turkic, what was transcribed to Chinese as \textit{chou} (ED: 427; Rong 2001: 291). Both Peter Zieme and Pavel B. Lurje regarded the word \textit{čor} as pre-Turkic but of uncertain origin. The word is particularly good attested among the Sogdo-Uyghur documents of the 9\textsuperscript{th}–10\textsuperscript{th} centuries (Sim˜ S-Williamson–Hamilton 1990: 75, 78; Lurje 2010: 127–168; Zieme 2006: 115–116). Concerning the exact meaning of the title the scholars agreed that it was a high dignity among the Turks. Clauson defined it as a higher rank than a \textit{bäg} but lower than a \textit{kagan} (ED: 427–428). Peter B. Golden supposed that perhaps it was the chieftain of a smaller tribal federation (Golden 1992: 135–136).} is probably the title \textit{čor/čur} which appears already in the Orkhon inscriptions (8\textsuperscript{th} century) in Old Turkic texts.\footnote{The same personal name appears in the 8\textsuperscript{th} line of a Uyghur loan contract of the St. Petersburg collection (SI Uig 16, ФБ 77, 16, Кне.-Poš. 1). The document was first published by Radlov (USP: 82–83, Nr. 47), later in the Sammlung Uigurischer Kontrakte again (SUK II: 92, Lo09) and lately by Tugusheva (Tugusheva 2013: 48, 3a 13). For the facsimile of the manuscript see: SUK III: Table 81; TUGUSHEVA 2013: 248. The transliteration of the whole name is as follows: Y’M-ČWR TW. The earlier readings transcibed it always with an <u> in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} syllable: Jamischkur’t (USP: 83); yam-čur tu (SUK II: 92; TUGUSHEVA 2013: 48); however due to the nature of the Uyghur script it can be read as \textit{yam-čor} tu as well.} The first part of the name can be
the first attestation of the Old Turkic *yam* however, it must be noted that Lurje brought up the possibility that it goes back to the Iranian *Yama* (LURJE 2010: 453).

As we can see, linguistic investigations concerning the origins of the Mongol postal system shared a common failing: they regularly identified the origins of the denomination of a system with the origins of the system itself. As Adam J. Silverstein (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 29–30, 141–144) and later Thomas Allsen have correctly remarked (ALLSEN 2010: 240–243), the origins of an institution are not necessarily the same as its denomination’s origins. And on this point I would like to switch the focus of the discussion to the historical approaches to the origin of the Mongol postal system.

### 6.2. Historical approaches

Specialists of the history of the Mongol Empire who have dealt with the *yam*-system speak about models and influences, rather than direct institutional transfer or origin. Peter Olbricht in his frequently cited work about the postal system in China under the Mongol rule emphasized the Persian and Chinese examples as models of the *yam*-system, so did the well-known Iranist Bertold Spuler (OLBRICHT 1954: 39; SPULER 1955²: 422). Francis Dvornik in his book about the origins of the intelligence services, what is rather an informative book for the public than a scholarly work underlined the role of the Muslim merchants in the establishment of the Mongol postal system and thought the Arab *barīd* to be the model for the *ǰam*, however he did not reject the possibility of Chinese influence (DVORNIK 1974: 280–281). David O. Morgan was the first who called the attention to a very important fact about the origins of the Mongol postal system in his rudimentary work *The Mongols* first published in 1986:

“It may perhaps first be worth saying that the search for ‘influences’ can sometimes get out of hand, and that anyone who is faced with the running of a large empire is likely to think, without being prompted, that a system of efficient couriers might be an idea worth considering.”

However in the next sentence he contradicted himself:

“But in this case, as it happens, the evidence for direct influence on the Mongols by others is very strong.” (MORGAN 2007²: 93)
He thought that the ultimate origins of the *yam*-system were Chinese, more precisely he found the similarities between the Mongol *jam* and the postal system run by the Khitan Liao dynasty (908–1127) too strong to be random. He found the *yam*-system as an example of the strong influence that the Khitan institutional tradition had on the formation of the administrative systems of the Mongol Empire. Meanwhile he rejected the idea that the Arab *barīd* would have been a model for the Mongol postal system due to the fact that the Abbasid Caliphate lost its real political power long before the emergence of the Mongols (MORGAN 2000: 379; MORGAN 20072: 93–94). Didier Gazagnadou in his book about the diffusion of the postal systems operation techniques in Eurasia, outlined a chain of transmission of the knowhow from China to the Mongols and from them to the Islamic world and from there finally to Europe (GAZAGNADOU 1994: 101–106).

During the last decade two highly important works were published concerning the Mongol post. Adam J. Silverstein published his PhD dissertation in 2007 with the title: *Postal Systems in the Pre-Modern Islamic World* in which he devoted a whole chapter to the *yam*-system and the other work is the almost 40-page review of Silverstein’s book by Thomas T. Allsen (ALLSEN 2010). Both authors are sceptical of attempts to explain the establishment of the Mongol post system as a direct institutional transfer. Silverstein confuted in detail the most popular theory, namely the direct borrowing of the earlier Chinese postal relay system. It is important to underline that Silverstein did not reject the transmission of the Chinese practices entirely. He rejected the direct institutional transfer from China to the Mongols; instead he surmised that the transmission was mediated by Khitans and Uyghurs (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 142, 144). His arguments against the direct transfer can be summarized in three points: Firstly he repeated Morgan’s thought that usage of mounted orderlies must have been obvious for the Mongols even in the pre-imperial period. Secondly, he dealt with the technical terms and tools connected to the postal system. His contribution to the origins of the word *yam* is mentioned above. From that he concluded that the word was a part of the Inner Asian vocabulary centuries before the Mongols could borrow it from Chinese. With regard to the Turkic *ulag* (Mongolian: *ulaγa*) he mentioned that this word is rather Central Asian than Chinese. Concerning the use of the tablets of authority (Chinese: *paizi* 貼子, Persian: *pāiza*, Mongolian: *gerege*) in both postal systems (the earlier Chinese and the Mongol), he noted that already in the 1st century CE Appolonius of Tyana chronicled the usage of such tablets on his travel from Ecbatana to India. Thirdly, Silverstein brought up the question of the geographical differences between China proper and Inner Asia or any other parts of the Mongol Empire. He pointed out that while the rivers and canals played a very important role in the traffic of South
China, they are almost absent from the most of the Inner and Central Asian territories. Moreover, the weather conditions are also very varied in the different parts of the empire. These facts led him to the consequence that even the direct copying of the Chinese system by the Mongols would have resulted in a non-functioning postal relay system on the most parts of the empire. Notwithstanding his convincing arguments Silverstein finally states: “Despite these objections, it is very likely that at least initially the Mongols used the Yi [the traditional Chinese postal system, M. V.] as the model for their Yām.” (Silverstein 2007: 141–144).

Allsen agreed with Silverstein, emphasising that the postal systems had deep roots in eastern Asia, and the key role played in the development of these systems by the changing collaboration and competition between sedentary Chinese people and nomadic Inner and Central Asians (Allsen 2010: 240–243). Basically both authors asserted Inner Asian roots for the concept and underlined especially the role of Uyghurs and Khitans as the transmitters of this knowledge, but discussing the role of the Central Asian tradition only in general terms.

It can be seen from the above presented research history that the linguists sometimes oversimplified the question by identifying the origins of the word *yam* with the origins of the postal system and there are still more probable etymologies of the word. The historians had a rather sophisticated view on the origins of the *yam*-system: they preferred to talk about models and influences. Within these models they mostly preferred to emphasise the influence of the Chinese and Islamic antecedents. David Morgan called the attention on the fact that the sending of mounted couriers was surely known even by the tribal leaders of the nomads long before the formation of the Mongol Empire and underlined the Khitans role in the later transmission of the knowhow. Lately Silverstein and Allsen inserted the Inner Asian roots in their concept; they underlined especially the role of Uyghurs and Khitans as the transmitters of the knowledge, although the role of the Central Asian tradition is usually mentioned only in general terms. In the following I shall argue that approximately since the middle of the first millennium CE the maintenance of specialized communication systems was a part of the imperial tradition in the Central Asian states.

### 6.3. Central Asia tradition

First of all we have to take into account the history of an important word concerning the Mongol post system, the above mentioned Middle Mongolian *ulaya* meant ‘post horse’ what is *ulag* in Turkic and basically meant ‘animals belonging to the *yam*-system’. As it was presented in the previous chapter the Turkic word can be attested in the Chinese sources since
the 7th century and was tightly connected with some kind of relay system in Central Asia. The word attested first time in a Turkic source in the second half of the 11th century in a dual meaning: ‘courier horse’ and ‘warhorse’.

In addition according to Chinese sources a Chinese ambassador of a Tang prince travelled to the Eastern Turk Shi-pi Khagan in 617. As reported in the account of his journey he used post stations on his way, and could thus manage to travel to the Turks and back in less than seven days (LIU 1958: 364). Despite the fact that it is not a direct reference for a Turk postal system, because of the short travel time we can assume that there was some kind of corvée system at the Turk’s territory too. Our first direct reference on the establishment of postal stations in the steppe region is connected with the Tiele, who according to Chinese sources established 66 or 68 station from the north of the Turks to the Huihe (Uyghurs) in 647 (LIU 1958: 418). In a recent article Arakawa Masaharu dealt in details with the post road system of the Tang dynasty. He states that in the 7th century the traffic situation remarkably changed, because as the Tang dynasty extended its rule into the Mongolian plateau and to Central Asia they established their own traffic system there (ARAKAWA 2011: 29–30).

To summarise the above mentioned the word ulag and in accordance with it some kind of communication system are traceable in the Central-Asian Chinese sources from the 7th century on. However the Arab traveller Tamīm ibn Baḥr who visited the Uyghur ruler in the 9th century used Arabic terminology in his travel account to describe the Uyghur’s relay system (MINORSKY 1948: 278; 283), and did not mention ulag, if we take into account the numerous similarities between the Uyghur Khaganate and their predecessors the Turks, it seems probable that they inherited some kind of relay system from the Turks as well.

In order to explore the later history of the Central Asian communication system in the following two Uyghur documents from the Turfan region dated to the West Uyghur Period (9th–12th centuries) will be presented.176 The first document is the PO08:

Transcription

1. toŋuz yı́l üčünĉ ay bir Y/[...]
2. msydr-lar-niş bir yol at[wn]

176 Takao Moriyasu has established the criteria for the dating of the Uyghur civil documents on the basis of the scripts. He distinguished four types of scripts: 1) square or book type, 2) semi-square, 3) semi-cursive and 4) cursive. According to him none of the civil documents are written with square script, all of the documents with semi-square script are belong to the West Uyghur period and all with semi-cursive or cursive script belong to the Mongol period (MORIYASU 2004a: 228–231). Dai Matsui in a recent article (MATSUI 2014a) summarized the results of his earlier studies and established the criteria for the dating of the Uyghur administrative orders. If a document is included to his study I follow his dating of the texts, if not I rely on the data given in the VOHD13,21 and VOHD13,22.
3. *taykay-takı yolčı-ka berz-ün*

**Translation**

“*Pig year, 3rd month, on the 1st/11th (day). Nestorian presbyters [msydr], shall give one of their road horses [yol atın] to the travel guide in Taykay.*”

If we look at the manuscript both the semi-square script and the big red stamp with Chinese legend show that this document clearly belongs to the West Uyghur period. However the words *ulag* or *yam* are not present in this text, due to the structure and the content of the document this provision order was surely issued within an official relay system. The next document PO18 belongs to the collection of the British Museum:

**Transcription**

1. küskü y(ı)l ċ(a)h(š)ap[at] ay /
2. –(k)a čanka süŋül-täki [
3. [b]altu bat[u]r müngü bir a[t
4. yüdgu bir at süngül] T[
5. Q’’T’KY (a)[t]-ta PY[

**Translation**

“*Rat year, 12th month /[…] on the […] being in Čanka Süŋül […] Baltu (and) Bat[u]r one riding horse […] one pack horse Süngü[lí] T[…] K’’T’KY from the horse(s) PY[…]”

However it is very corrupted and bears no stamp, the semi-square script lets us date it to the West Uyghur period and the structure of the text shows that it is some kind of order and due to the context disposes different kinds of horses, making it very probable that this document is connected to some kind of communication system, too. To sum up, on the basis of these two documents we can assume that there was some kind of communication or, so to say, postal relais system in the Turfan region during the West Uyghur period.

---

177 About the structure of the Uyghur administrative orders see: MATSUI 2014a: 613–614 and the chapter IV of the present study.
If we take into account the history of the word *ulag* and the *ulag*-system in Central Asia and the above presented documents, then it seems very probable that there was a continuous tradition of the maintenance of a post system in Central Asia at least from the 7th century till the eve of the Mongol conquest. Meanwhile an interesting question emerges concerning the early history of *ulag*: as I mentioned above this Turkic word appears only in the middle of the 11th century in a Turkic text, from the previous four centuries we have only the Chinese transcription in texts from or concerning Central Asia. We know that latest since the Han times Chinese dynasties had their own means of communication system the so-called yi 驛 system. The question is: why did the Chinese take over a technical term for the postal horses (or other animals connected to the post) in the 7th century if they had a several centuries long tradition of maintaining a postal relay system already? In my opinion the answer for this question lies in the criticism of Silverstein about the direct institutional transfer between the Chinese tradition and the *yam*-system. Namely the Tang (618–907) was the first Chinese dynasty which could extend its borders into Central Asia and to the steppe zone for a longer period. As Silverstein rightly mentioned it concerning the Mongols, they obviously faced with different topographical and geographical conditions in this area then in China proper. They had to adapt their system to these new challenges, and for this they could use that system which already existed in the area. Most probably the borrowing of the word *ulag* into the Chinese language is an evidence for this historical process. On the other hand as reported by Tamīm ibn Bahîr’s travelogue the tradition of the maintenance of a communication system remained intact in the Uyghur Khanate, too and even though the steppe empire of the Uyghurs collapsed in 840, according to the two above presented Uyghur civil documents from the West Uyghur period at least in one of the successor states this system survived, probably until the Mongol conquest in the 13th century.

If we take into consideration the well-known highly important role that the Uyghurs played in the formative period of the Mongol Empire it seems quite probable that, similarly to other parts of the Mongol administration, the Uyghurs heavily affected the formation of the *yam*-system too. It has to be stressed that it could not be a direct institutional transfer. The

---

178 About the postal systems in China before the Yuan dynasty see: OLBRICH 1954: 36–39; for a comparison of the road and postal systems’ of the Chinese Qin and Han dynasties with the Roman Empire’s see: NEEDHAM 1971: 1–38. Lately, Jidong Yang published an insightful analysis of Chinese documents, the so-called Xuanquan manuscripts concerning a postal station in the Gansu corridor from the Han period (YANG 2015). Almost the same question was articulated by Doerfer in his criticism on Pelliot’s theory on the origins of the word *yam*: “Die Posteinrichtung ist bei den Chinesen viel älter belegt als bei den Tu, und Mo.; und warum sollten die Chinesen für eine von ihnen selbst erfundene und seit längerem praktizierte Institution den alt. Ausdruck übernommen haben? ” (TMEN IV: 117–118).
concept of Silverstein and Allsen can be corroborated: the Mongols most probably already had their own way of communication in the pre-imperial or steppe period of their history. Later with the subjugation of sedentary cultures they encountered other methods of maintaining a communication system, and as far as it can be judged they not just copied these models but they unified the existing systems and adopted them to their special needs, such as they did with the weights and measures (Cf.: MATSUI 2004a)
Chapter VII: Religious communities and the postal system of the Mongol Empire

“The Catholic inquisitors of Europe who defended nonsense by cruelty, might have been confounded by the example of a barbarian, who anticipated the lessons of philosophy and established by his laws a system of pure theism and perfect toleration... a singular conformity may be found between the religious laws of Zingis khan and of Mr. Locke” (GIBBON 1914: 4, fn. 8.)

“Whatever they (the īlchīs) found in the villages they tyrannically took, and if in one day they came to ten villages and post-houses (khaylkhāna), they would take from all those places provisions (ʿalafa) double what the custom was. And since it would be more than they needed for their food, they would sell it.” (Rashīd al-Dīn: Jāmiʿ al-tawārīḵh III, 480–481; cited by: MORGAN 2000: 381)

Both of the above mentioned citations are extreme in their own ways. The former is from Edward Gibbon the famous historian of the 18th century about the religious tolerance of the Mongols, the latter is from Rashīd al-Dīn the contemporary Persian historiographer’s account on the abuses concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire in Iran before the reforms of Ghazan Khan.179 These kinds of exaggerations and oversimplifications are not rare even in the contemporary literature about the religious communities180 and the imperial postal system of the Mongol empire. However both topics were in the centre of scholarly interest during the last decades of research so far we are lack of a detailed analysis of the relations between these two important agents (the ğam and the religious communities) of the Mongol Empire.

Among the Uyghur and Mongolian documentary sources concerning the yam-system there are about a dozen of documents in which representatives of religions or religious

179 On the value of Rashīd al-Dīn’s account about the pre-Ghazan postal system in Iran cf.: MORGAN 2000: 383 and chapter 3.3 of the present study.
180 The expression, religious communities is applied for the representatives of those religions (Buddhism, Islam and various streams of Christianity) and religions like philosophical and ethical systems (Confucianism and Daoism) which were practiced in the Mongol Empire.
communities in general were mentioned, namely those two religions which were practiced in the region: Buddhism and “Nestorian” Christianity (also known as the Church of the East). In this chapter on the one hand a short summary is given about our knowledge on the relations between the postal system and the religious communities in the Mongol Empire in general. On the other hand the connections between the postal system and the religious communities in the eastern part of the Chaghadaid ulus of the Mongol Empire (i.e. northeastern Turkestan) will be analysed in particular, on the basis of the above mentioned documents.

The jam-system, this extended institution of the empire meant different things for the various social groups in the realm: for the commoners and particularly for the population of the postal-households which were ordered to maintain the upkeep of the system it was an oppressive burden. For the privileged traders who were members of the ortoqs, the merchant associations which enjoyed state protection and used state resources, the yam-system was a big advantage. For the leaders of the army it was necessary tool to transmit the confidential information as fast as it was possible, while for the messengers, envoys and diplomats it was a safe, fast and more or less comfortable mean of travelling. But what about the religious communities, whose high importance in the social and economic life of the empire is a well-known fact for a long while? After a survey of the relevant sources a very complex picture of the relation of the postal system and the religious communities can be seen. This complicated relation can be divided into three spheres: 1) taxation, 2) abuses concerning the post, 3) usage of the postal system by the representatives of the religions.

181 On problematic terms “Nestorian” and “Nestorianism” as well as the other names of this church cf.: TANG 2011: XVI–XVII. Due to these difficulties mostly the term Church of the East is applied and the expression “Nestorian” used only with quotation marks.

182 By the end of Qubilai Khan’s rule solely in Chinese territories were more than 1400 postal stations and to these stations belonged ca. 50000 horses, 1400 oxen, 6700 mules, 4000 carts, a little less than 6000 boats, more than 200 dogs and 1150 sheep (ROSSABI 1994: 450).

183 The Mongol rulers registered the entire population under their rule and classified the households into different categories according to their contribution to the maintenance of the state: military, peasant, artisan, mining, postal and several other kinds of registered households existed. The most of our knowledge about this practice originate from Chinese sources, due to this fact we have detailed information from this part of the empire (ENDICOTT-WEST 1994: 613; ALLSEN 2009: 147). In China under the Yuan rule the estimated number of postal households was 750000, what was ca. 6% of the entire population (KIM 2009: 37 note 19).

184 The word originates from Turkic ortuk~ortok ‘partner’ (ED 205; Cf.: TMEN II: 25–27; Nr. 446). From the earliest stages of their conquest the Mongols maintained a close cooperation with foreign merchants what was not unprecedented even by the earlier empires of the steppes like the Turk or Uyghur Khaganates. By the Mongols this cooperation evolved and these merchants united in associations, the so-called ortoqs. These privileged associations were the trade partners of the Mongol elite in every part of the empire. The ortoqs supplied the aristocracy with luxury goods, helped the maintenance the newly built capital (Qara Qorum) in the steppe region but they served as tax farmers or money landers too. Among their privileges one was their access to the imperial post system what was huge advantage for them comparing to those merchants who were not members of an ortoq. Their uncontrolled usage of the yam frequently overcharged the system. Due to this fact Möngke (1253) and Qublai (1263, 1272) restricted their access to the yam-system (ATWOOD 2004: 429–430). Cf.: ALLSEN 1989 and ENDICOTT-WEST 1989; YOKKAICHI 2006.
These spheres will provide the frames for the analysis of this relation: concerning every aspects firstly the results of the earlier literature will be presented and then the information of the Uyghur and Mongolian sources of East Turkestan will be added.

7.1. Taxation

Due to its importance for the empire and the numerous sources the taxation in general is one of the most studied fields of research concerning the Mongol Empire. Within this broader topic the taxation of the religious communities occupied the attention of the scholars too and due to the numerous decrees of tax exemption from different uluses of the empire and the detailed annals of the Yuan dynasty some important works were published already in the first half of the 20th century. Decrees of tax exemption are preserved from Yuan China, Ilkhanid Iran (CLEAVES 1953), the Golden Horde (GRIGOR’EV 1987; PRP III: 465–471) and its successor states (MUHAMEDYAROV–VÁSÁRY 1987) and from the Chaghadaid ulus in Chinese, Mongolian, Turkic and Russian languages and many of them were issued for monasteries or religious groups. Their temporal distribution ranges from the middle of the 13th century to the second part of the 15th century.

The fundamental analysis of the Mongol taxation: SCHURMANN 1956. A revision of Schurmann’s work with plenty of complements: SMITH 1970. Ann K. S. Lambton concluded in her two-part article that the Mongols did not set up an independent fiscal administration in Iran but carried on the earlier Persian system and introduced many irregular taxes what was an almost unbearable burden on the population (LAMBTON 1986; LAMBTON 1987). Later David Morgan shared Lambton’s opinion and argued that there was no coherent system in the taxation practise of the Mongols, but they imposed ad hoc taxes to maximize their income (MORGAN 2007: 87, 90). About the taxation in the Turfan region from the West Uyghur period till the Mongol rule Dai Matsui published an important article, in which he compares the Uyghur and Mongolian material with the Persian and Chinese sources (MATSUI 2005).

Edouard Chavannes raised the question of special privileges granted for the religious communities in his two-part article about the inscriptions and chancellery documents from Yuan China in the very beginning of the 20th century (CHAVANNES 1904; CHAVANNES 1908). Some decades later Paul Ratchnevsky was the first who dealt with the Yuan dian-zhang 元典章 and the Tong-zhi tiao-ge 通制條格, these two important compilations of edicts from the Yuan dynasty which contents’ concerns with the taxation of the religious groups too (RATCHNEVSKIY 1937). Three years later Erich Haenisch studied the questions in details (HAENISCH 1940). He based his study on three groups of sources: the official histories of the Yuan dynasty, the general edicts of the emperors and those edicts which granted individual privileges and tax exemptions. This work is the fullest discussion of the question concerning the Chinese territories of the Mongol Empire, however it is not absent of failures. As Herbert Franz Schurmann pointed out in his review on Haenisch’s work (SCHURMANN 1951) the author often rived out paragraphs from its contexts and his translation of the terminology concerning the taxation is not consistent. Nevertheless Schurmann agreed with the general conclusions of Haenisch.

Beside the above mentioned works: POPPE 1957: 47, 49–50, 52–53, 55, 56–57. An interesting peculiarity of the Chinese edicts that they were written often on stone steles and erected in front of the monasteries, while in the other regions of the empire these edicts were issued on paper. Moreover some of the Chinese edicts are bilinguals: Chinese and Mongolian the latter is written in ‘Phags-pa script.

The M 653 Mongolian document of the Berlin Collection which is a tax exemption document for a Buddhist monastery in the Turfan region was published several times. The last edition of the document with the list of the earlier publications: BT XVI: 170–172, Nr. 69.
These decrees gave exemptions from various taxes\textsuperscript{189} to the clergy but in one respect all of these documents share a common feature, what is the most important for the purpose of the present study: they release the clergy from the burden of giving relay horses (Mong.: \textit{ulaγa}) and giving provision (Mong.: \textit{šigüsi~šügüsi})\textsuperscript{190} to the envoys and messengers, moreover sometimes they were exonerated from housing the envoys too. This fact can be interpreted in two contrary ways: on the one hand one can conclude that according to these documents the clergy was freed from the taxes concerning the postal system throughout the empire. On the other hand one can say that too, that the recurrent necessity of issuing such documents from the middle of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century till the second half of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century in every corner of the Turco-Mongol world shows that the original aims were repeatedly failed and the clergy’s privileges had to be affirmed again and again. The Uyghur documents from the Turfan region can help us to find out which interpretation is more probable. The first document under examination (PO08) originates from the West Uyghur period (9–12\textsuperscript{th} centuries) and today preserved at the Berlin Turfan Collection:

\textbf{Transcription}

4. toŋuz yil ῦückü̱nč ay bir Y//[...]  
5. msydr-lar-nuŋ bir yol at[ın]  
6. taykay-taksi yolči-ka berz-ŭn

\textbf{Translation}

“Pig year, 3\textsuperscript{rd} month, on the 1\textsuperscript{st}/11\textsuperscript{th} (day). The Nestorian presbyters [msydr], shall give one of their road horses [yol atın] to the travel guide [yolči] in Taykay.”

\textsuperscript{189} It can be said about the tax exemption decrees for religious communities in general that they exempted the clergy from various taxes but not from all of their duties, mostly the land tax (Mong.: \textit{sang}; Chin.: \textit{di-shui} 地税) and sometimes the commercial tax (Mong.: \textit{tamγa}; Chin.: \textit{shang-shui} 商税) remained imposed on them.

\textsuperscript{190} The Mongolian \textit{šigüsi~šügüsi} originally meant ‘sap; food (usually meat) for offerings; food for travelling officials; whole sheep cooked and served to honoured guests’ (LESSING 1973: 704). It appears already in the \textit{Secret History of the Mongols} (280§), concerning Ögödei’s commands about the postal system (SH I: 216). Due to the fact that under the Mongol rule it was a regular burden on the population to supply with food, drink and sometimes with fodder the travellers of the \textit{ǰam}-system it became the name of this kind of tax concerning the provisioning of the travellers on official duty too. From Mongolian it was borrowed to Chinese (\textit{shousi} 首思), Turkic (\textit{süsün}), Persian (\textit{süsün}) and appeared in the Russian edicts for the priesthood as \textit{korm} ‘food’ (PRP III: 467–468) or later \textit{korm i pitie} ‘food and drink’ (PRP III: 465–466; 469). This latter form goes back to the \textit{süsün uliğa or uliğa süüsün} what is a hendiadys for ‘provisions, rations’ in the \textit{yarlıks} (VASÁRY 1977: 58). For a detailed discussion of the word see: TMEN I: 362–364, Nr. 238, Nr. 239 and VASÁRY 1977. For \textit{šigüsi} and for the official who was responsible for it (\textit{šigüsińči}) in Yuan China cf.: OLBRICH 1954: 73–77.
However the document does not use the standard word of the Mongol period for postal horses (*ulag*) from the context it seems obvious that before the eve of the Mongol conquest the clergy or at least the Church of the East was involved in the maintenance of the postal network in the West Uyghur state. Moreover in the Berlin collection preserved two tax exemption edicts for a Buddhist cloister in Murutluk, the modern Murtuk (U 5317; U 5319) issued by the West Uyghur rulers.¹⁹¹ None of these edicts contain any reference for any taxes concerning the upkeep of a postal system or some similar institution, while the above cited document makes it very probable that there was such a system even during the West Uyghur period in the Turfan region. Furthermore we do not know about any other documents so far which would contain such a tax name which could be connected to a postal system. In my opinion this contradiction can be resolved in two ways which do not exclude each other. The first is that the postal system or other means of communication was not enough institutionalized to make it necessary to impose a distinct regular tax with its own name, but the rulers (or their administration) issued occasional burdens on the population in order to help the travel of the officials. The other solution is that the religious communities were not exempted from the duties concerning the maintenance of a postal system under any circumstances. As it stated above, these two answers not necessarily exclude each other, both can be true in the same time. Anyhow it seems quite sure that during the West Uyghur period the religious groups (or at least the Church of the East) had to take part in the support of the travel of officials. The emerging question is that: did this situation changed under the Mongol rule?

The so-called Bezeklik-documents (PO14–18) were found in the vicinity of Turfan in the Bezeklik caves (today: PRC, Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region) sometimes before 1980. They consist five administrative more precisely provision orders and according to Dai Matsui they can be dated to 1313 or 1325 (MATSUI 2009a: 345). In the first three a certain Bökän *šäli* is ordered to give different amounts of hay and straw for the horses of the envoys (PO14–15) and a prince (PO16) passing by. The last two documents are too damaged to reconstruct the whole text but from the preserved fragments it is clear they had similar contents. Matsui explains the first part of the name from the Modern Uyghur *bökän ‘antelope’* (MATSUI 2009a: 341; SCHWARZ 1992: 83). The second part of the name is a Buddhist title *šäli* what is a borrowing form the Chinese *she-li* which goes back to the Sanskrit *ācārya* (cf.: HAMILTON 1984). Based on these and on the fact that these manuscripts were unearthed at

¹⁹¹ Peter Zieme dated U 5317 to 1259 CE (ZIEME 1981: 239–240) but lately Dai Matsui confuted his standpoint and regarded it as a duplicate of an original from the West Uyghur period (MATSUI 2005: 70 fn. 6).
Bezeklik, Dai Matsui assumes that Bökän-šäli was a Buddhist monk who lived at the Bezeklik cave temples (MATSUI 2009a: 341). So these documents underpin the assumption that the members of the clergy were subject to taxes concerning the postal system in the Mongol period.¹⁹²

Two other documents (PO19–20) belonging to the Russian collection at St. Petersburg are written on the same page and they have similar contents. They are dated to the early Mongol period before the establishment of the Yuan dynasty (MATSUI 2014a: 616–617). In the first document (PO19) different kinds of animals (ulag, müngü at, äšgäk, yüdgü äšgäk, äšgäk ulag, müngü äšgäk ulag, at) and provisions (böz) are demanded. Some of the requested animals (ulag, äšgäk ulag) clearly show that this administrative order was issued concerning the maintenance of the postal system and the last three lines clearly state that these animals had to be provided by the Buddhist and Christian body and the document names even those people who are responsible for the collection of the animals:

Transcription
13. bilä ata buka kanımdu inäki
14. bičkün [k]ayak-a b(i)lä kuvrak
15. ärkägű[n] el-tän bütürüp berz-ųn

Translation
“1³together, Ata, Buka, Kanımdu, Inäki, ¼Bičkün [K]ayak-a (they) together shall (collect it) from the people of the Buddhist community¹⁹³ (and the) ¼Christian community¹⁹⁴ (and) pay it in full.”

In the second case (PO20) compensation had to be paid for a certain Yalkar envoy. The amount of the compensation is 5 sitir and 3 bakır silver which had to be paid by the Christian

¹⁹² Moreover according to another administrative order from the Ōtani collection published by Matsui (MATSUI 1998b: 16–23, Plate II) the Buddhist fraternity had to deliver flour probably for similar purposes.
¹⁹³ The original meaning of the Old Turkic kuvrak was ‘crowd, gathering’ (ED: 585), ‘собрание, соин’ (DTS: 475), but in the Uyghur texts it is often the standard translation of the Sanskrit saṃgha ‘a monastic community’ and it was borrowed to Mongolian as quvaray ‘the clergy; priest, monk’ (ED: 585; LESSING 1973: 993).
¹⁹⁴ The etymology of the word ärkägün is not ascertained so far. It appeared first time in the Mongol period in the Uyghur and Mongol sources and refers to the Christian (mainly “Nestorian”) community. It was borrowed into Chinese as Yelikewen 也里可溫 in the same meaning. It has been conjectured that ärkägün was a transcription of the Greek ἄρχων, but Pelliott doubted this assumption (PELLIOT NOTES I: 49). Lately Li Tang collected the various theories concerning the origin of the word, however none of them really convincing (TANG 2011: 53–57).
and Buddhist community of the cities Pučaŋ and Čıktın⁹⁵ and this document also names those persons who are responsible for the collection of the money:

Transcription

3. …pučaŋ
4. čıktın bilä beš sı/tır .
5. üč bakır kümüš-ni
6. tümän buka at totok
7. bičkün kayak-a olar bütürü[p]
8. berz-ün . kuvrak är kägün-lär
9. ...b]ütürüp berz-ün .

Translation

“Pučaŋ (and) Čıktın (cities) 5 sıtr (and) 3 bakır silver altogether, Tümän Buka, At Totok, Bičkün, Kayak-a, they shall give it in full. The Christian and Buddhist communities have to give it in full.”

There is only one common name in both orders Bičkün Kayak-a, so probably he was a higher ranking officer in the region or in one of these communities. About the amount of the compensation we know that in the Mongol period the system of silver ingots were unified throughout the empire. In this unified system one sıtr (Chin.: liang 銖; Mong.: sıǰir; Pers.: sīr) was equal to ca. 40 grams (MATSUI 2004a: 200). According to Clauson originally bakır meant ‘copper, a copper coin’ or ‘the weight of a copper coin’ (ED: 317), but this document shows that in the Mongol period it was used rather as a unit in the system of silver ingots. According to Matsui it was the smallest unit of silver ingots (ca. 4 grams), and 1 bakır (Mong. bakır-baqır) corresponded to 1 Chinese qian 銖 which was equal to 1 mîsqâl of the Persian sources (MATSUI 2004a: 200). So altogether the compensation was around 212 grams of silver. In order to gain a better understanding how much was this 5 sıtr and 3 bakır or in other words 212 grams of silver we have to throw a glance at other documents.

There are two documents (OAcc03-04) from the so-called Arat-estate which deals with the kupčir-tax of a certain Ógrinä. In OAcc04 we find:

---

⁹⁵ About the two cities see: Matsui 2015: 276–278.
Transcription
1. küskü yılkı ögrinä-nin bır yarım
2. sıtır kupčir kümüş-in män ālik alıp

Translation
“1-2 I, Ālik received Ögrinä’s one and a half sıtır kupčir(-tax)-silver for the Rat year...”

In OAcc03 we find very similar form:

Transcription
1. ud yılkı ögrinä-n[ın]g bır yarım
2. sıtır kupčir män Čagan alıp

Translation
“The one and a half sıtır (for) kupčir(-tax) of Ögrinä for the Ox year I, Čagan, receive...”

However from OAcc03 the word kümüş ‘silver’ is missing, due to the same tax payer name (Ögrinä) and to the similar time period for what the kupčir was payed (one year) it seems quite probable that the kupčir-tax for one year was 1,5 sıtır (ca. 60grams) per person. Furthermore there are four provision orders from the St. Petersburg collection (PO21–24) which are dated to the early Mongol or pre-Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 629). According to their contents they are closely connected and provide us with some further knowledge about the prices in that age in the Turfan region. In all the four orders a certain Bolmiş Taz who belonged to Bačak or Bačak-a Tarkan’s hundred household-unit (yüz) had to provide a horse or a horse-ulag for different people who were travelling by concerning an official duty. In two cases (PO21 and PO23) he had to give it for two days and in return 3-3 bakır silver was detracted from his kupčir-tax. In one case (PO22) the duration is not given but the reduction of the kupčir-tax is still 3 bakır while in the fourth case (PO24) only 1,5 bakır is reduced and no duration is given. From these data it seems quite clear that the rental fee for one horse for one day was 1,5 bakır (ca. 6 grams) silver in this period in the Turfan region what was 10% of a yearly kupčir-tax. If we take into account all these data of the documents the 5 sıtır and 3
compensation which had to be paid by the Buddhist and Christian communities seems to be quite a big sum.

The common feature in the two texts (PO19–20) is that in both cases the burdens are levied on the Christian and Buddhist communities. Based on this fact we can state that in the Turfan region not only particular members of the religious groups but the religious communities in general were subject to taxes concerning the maintenance of the postal system and their burdens can be considered quite heavy.

Moreover as it was proved in Chapter 4.3 if we compare the Uyghur and Mongolian administrative orders which originate from the Turfan region some important differences can be detected and according to these differences two or three levels of the chancellery practice can be separated: a higher level of the chancellery dealt with the more important general issues in Mongolian while on the local and regional levels of the officialdom the Uyghurs’ language was in usage. Due to these facts it can be concluded that at the higher governmental level of the administration they exempted the religious communities, while in the local daily praxis both the religious communities in general and the members of the clergy in particular were involved in the maintenance of the postal system. In order to gain a better understanding of this contradiction on this point it is worth to take a look on the conclusion of Erich Haenisch in his work about the tax exemption of the religious groups in Yuan China:

“Aber die Klöster waren damit nicht zufriedengestellt. Sie gingen aufs Ganze: Befreiung ihres Guts und ihrer Betriebe von jedweder Abgabe überhaupt nach der Formel... ’sie sollen keine Abgaben irgendwelcher Art leisten’! Um diese absolute Steuerfreiheit, die zu den kaiserlichen Grund- und Sonderverfügungen in klarem Widerspruch steht, haben die Klöster ihren Kampf geführt.” (HAENISCH 1940: 47)

As it can be seen Haenisch detected the same contradiction concerning the Chinese sources of the Yuan dynasty what we saw in the case of the Uyghur and Mongol documents of the Turfan region. But Haenisch could work on a broader basis of sources so he went further in his conclusion: he stated that while the general Chinese edicts gave less or no privileges to the religious communities, the special decrees which granted tax exemption for a certain monastery gave more freedom from the official burdens. From this Haenisch concluded that

\footnote{Cf.: BT XVI: Nr. 69.}
while the local authorities tried to enforce the orders of the general edicts of the central government, the religious communities tried to use all of their influence to gain special privileges for themselves from the higher levels of administration (HAENISCH 1940: 47–49). From the Turfan region we have no such edicts with general validity but even on the basis of the available sources we can see this contradictory process of the different administrative levels.\(^{197}\)

### 7.2. Confiscation and requisition

As it was proved above most probably the tax exemption decrees from all parts of the empire shows that contrary to the central intention in the daily life the religious communities were repeatedly subject to the demands of envoys, messengers and other officials while they used the *yam*-system. In 2008 Dai Matsui published a Mongolian travel accompanying letter lately unearthed in the vicinity of Dunhuang (today north-western Gansu Province in PRC) (MATSUI 2008c). According to Matsui’s analysis this document was issued for a certain Buddhist *lama* with a Tibetan name in order to help his pilgrimage in the Kara-Kočo–Bars Köl–Bešbalık region. Due to the fact that the document was found near Dunhuang, it can be assumed that this *lama* continued his pious journey into Gansu (MATSUI 2008c: 167–171). For the purpose of the present study the most important part of the document is as follows:

“5...*Because this* 6guan-ding guo-shi Borǰi-Kirešis-Bal-Sangbo-lama, *together with his pupils, is to come and to Bars-Köl, Biš-Baliq and other (places) in the field of Qara-Qoče, to do his practice (i.e. Buddhist religious services), and [to] bless while traveling, *no one shall hold [them] back. No one shall take* their loads, carts, camels and 10horses, saying ‘[they are] the relay animals or provisions.’ 11*No one shall take* anything of *them.*” (B163:42; translated and commented: MATSUI 2008c: 160–165)

This source testifies that confiscations and requisitions in the name of the *yam*-system were committed not only against the monasteries or the clergy at their residences, but during their...

---

\(^{197}\) Beside the official documents some of the personal documents underpin the fact that the members of the clergy or the religious communities in general had to take part in the maintenance of the postal system. Cf.: UlReg06 line 6; UlReg12 lines 5–6; PList01 line 4.
pilgrimage or other official duties on the way too. The relation between the Tibetan lamas and the postal system leads us to the third and last aspect.

### 7.3. Usage of the postal system by the religious communities

In 2008 Yamamoto Meishi devoted a whole Japanese article to the usage of the *yam*-system by the Tibetan monks between Tibet and China proper based on the Chinese sources (MEISHI 2008). Another reference for the same topic can be found in an article of Baohai Dang from 2003 who examined the preserved *paízas*. A certain group of these tablets authorized its possessor to use the facilities of the postal system. According to Dang in 1995 a clear photo was published about such a *paíza* which were found in the Tashilhunpo Monastery in Lhasa. This *paíza* is unique of its kind because this is the only one preserved round tablet of authority from the Yuan era which bears a golden inscription and so it gave the highest level access for its bearer to the facilities of the postal system. Dang surmised that the *paíza* was taken to Tibet by the Buddhist lamas (DANG 2003: 8). In order to strengthen his theory he cited the following passage of the *Yuanshi*:

> “…*the Xifan* 西番 [i.e., Tibet] monks gird the round tablets with golden inscription, coming and going without end. Hundreds of them use the postal horses. [They are so many], the post station can not accommodate all of them.”
> (Yuanshi, chapter 202: 4522, cited by DANG 2003: 8)

In addition we can mention the travel account of the Daoist monk Chang Chun who was summoned by Chinggis Khan and because of this he was travelling from China by land to eastern Iran between 1220 and 1224. On his way to Chinggis he used several times the postal system (WALEY 1931: 50, 119, 125, 133, 158 fn. 4). As lately Johannes Preiser-Kapeller proved in a paper the Byzantine Orthodox church extended its activities in huge areas of Eurasia under the Mongol rule (PREISER-KAPELLER 2015). However he did not connect it with the usage of the postal system, based on our eastern examples it seems not impossible that they enjoyed the advantages of the *yam*-system.

---

198 Of course the first things what come to one’s mind concerning this topic are the travels of the European monks into the Mongol Empire or Rabban Bar Sauma’s journey to Europe from the 13th century, but these monks during their travels were delegates of rulers or the pope or at least they were designated as envoys or ambassadors. Due to their missions’ such nature they are not discussed in this section.
Among the Turfan Uyghur documents there is also a provision order (PO05) which is dated to the middle of the 14th century (MATSUI 2002: 107) and perhaps confirms the idea that the postal system was used by the representatives of the religious communities. The last lines of the document stand as follow:

**Transcription**

9. … alṭın kabı bir k[i]ş-a
10. ulag-ni k(a)y-a bahši-ka beržün

**Translation**

“… Altun Kabı shall give one short-distance service animal [ulag] to Kay-a bahši.”

In this case the Buddhist title bahši ‘master’ or ‘(Buddhist) religious teacher’ appears in the name of the person who shall get one short-distance ulag. This title originates from the Chinese bo-shi 博士. Later in Mongolian the word was used in a different meaning, it meant the scribes who were skilful in the Uyghur-Mongol alphabet. After the 13th century the word spread in this secondary meaning, and in some altered meanings like ‘strolling minstrel, magician, shaman, quack doctor’ in the Turkic languages (ECSEDY 1965: 90; ED: 321). Later with the spread of the Islam culture and as the Uyghur script lost its importance step by step, the word bahši was used in general for the scribes in the Turkic world (POPPE 1957: 60–62; 63–66; VÁSÁRY 1987a: 120–122). So according to the dating of the text we cannot be sure that this person was a member of the Buddhist clergy, but due to the above mentioned sources it would not be a surprise.

The results of this chapter can be summarized as follow: at least three different aspects of the relations between the religious communities of the Mongol Empire and the imperial postal system can be detected: the taxation, the requisitions and the usage of the postal system by the clergy. Of course these three aspects were interrelated closely. On the one hand about the taxation we could prove that in the Turfan region already before the Mongol conquest the clergy (or at least the Church of the East) was involved in the maintenance of the local post system. Later in the Mongol period in the local and regional administrative levels the members of the clergy and the religious communities in general were subjects to burdens concerning the maintenance of the postal system, however sometimes they managed to get exemption decrees from the higher levels of the government. This practice was surmised by
several earlier scholars concerning the tax exemption decrees, but was not proved in details concerning the Turfan region. Moreover it is pointed out that the abuses and requisitions in the name of the postal system did not spare the monks even during their travels. On the other hand we proved in detail that the religious communities benefited from the operation of the yam-system. They had access sometimes on the highest level to its facilities and could use it during their pious activities. On the whole it can be said that those one-sided contemporary accounts and the later scholarly descriptions are mostly false. The relations between the religious communities of the Mongol Empire and the postal system were not unequivocally good or bad but rather varied with advantages and disadvantages for both sides.
PART TWO: THE CRITICAL EDITION

OF THE DOCUMENTS
Introduction to the critical edition of the documents

In the following the critical edition of the Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire will be presented. From the here edited 63 Uyghur documents 33 have been never translated into any western language, precisely 18 were never published, and for 15 there exist only Chinese or Japanese translations so far. During my research I studied 19 further documents, but due to the fact that they are preserved only very fragmentarily, and do not enlarge our knowledge on the topic of the dissertation, finally I decided not to include them into the present edition. From the here edited five Middle Mongolian texts four were published earlier in German translations and one in Chinese and Japan translation, but they had no English translation so far. In order to gain a better understanding before the edition of the documents the research history of the material will be presented (Chapter VIII), what is divided into to sub-chapters: the research history of the expeditions and excavations which unearthed the documents (8.1) and the research history of the philological study of the material (8.2).

In the followings I will give some remarks concerning the edition of the documents, i.e. the order of the documents, the system of transliteration and transcription, the system of the citation of the earlier works and the vocabularies.

Order of the documents

The research on the Uyghur civil documents started shortly after the return of the first expedition from East-Turkestan. At the beginning scholars used the finding signatures (Fundortsignatur) given by the explorers to mark the single fragments, but later the editors of the texts started to introduce their own system of numbering in addition, or, in other cases, the sequence of the documents within a certain edition was used as a marker for the single documents by scholars later on. Three of them are especially worth mentioning here: the

---

199 In this case the Turkish language is included in to the western languages.
200 The signatures of the left out and so far unpublished manuscripts: U 5861 (T III M 122); U 5850a-c (T III Kurutka); U 5995; Ch/U 7017 r (T I α); Ch/U 7300 (Glas: T II T 1824); U 5856 (T III K 268); Ch 1082 v (T II S) + Ch/U 7451 v (T II S ); U 5549 (T II D 28); U 5566 (T II D 89); U 5691 (T II Toyoq); U 5999; U 6124; Ch/U 6518 v (Glas: T II T 1832) + Ch/U 6428 v (T II 1707) + Ch/U 8025 v (Glas: T III 3017; MIK 028488) + Ch/U 6862 v (Glas: T II 1966) + Ch/U 6773 v (Glas: T II T 1853). The signatures of the left out, but already published documents: * U9179 (TI/TM 244); *U 9180 (T I/TM 239); U 5265 (TM 235); U 5665 v (T II S 21); *U 9005 Side 2 (TI/TM 240); Ch/U 6756 ; U 5306 (T II D 205b)v.
numbering of Wilhelm Radloff in the *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler* (USp) which was the first important collection of these documents. Later the outstanding Turkologist and prominent investigator of the material Reşit Rahmeti Arat created his own system of numbering, the so-called Arat-numbers. Larry Vernon Clark gave a full picture about the research history in this field and achieved many new results in his Ph.D. dissertation in 1975, in which he studied all the documents which were accessible at that time. In his dissertation he applied his own numbering too (CLARKINTRO).

The publication of the three volumes of the *Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte* (SUK) was a milestone in the investigation of the Uyghur documents. In the introduction of the second volume the editors established a new classification of the documents (SUK II: xiii–xiv):

1. Official documents (administrative, diplomatic, military and documents concerning the religious communities)
   a. Decrees and administrative orders (including appointment orders)
   b. Diplomatic letters
   c. Certifications and permissions (including passes)
   d. Quittances
   e. Petitions
   f. Accounts (including memoranda)
   g. Registers and lists
   h. Prayers (including colophons)
   i. Miscellaneous

2. Personal documents (legal contracts, trading documents, etc.)
   a. Contracts (including wills)
   b. Quittances
   c. Letters and bills
   d. Registers and lists
   e. Prayers (including colophons)
   f. Miscellaneous

In this volume they edited the contracts so they made some subgroups of this category with the following signatures:

**Sa** (Sale)
Apart from some documents which belong to the Russian (9), Chinese (5), Japanese (1) and British (1) collections, the most of the here edited sources belong to the German Turfan collection which is located in Berlin. The most important catalogues concerning the documents of the Berlin collection are the two volumes of *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 13 and 14* (VOHD13,21; VOHD13,22) edited by Simone-Christiane Raschmann. In these indispensable catalogues Raschmann based the order of the documents on the above mentioned structure of the SUK with some changes. She left out the 8th class of the official documents (Prayers including colophons), and the 5th class of the personal documents (Prayers including colophons), because according to the plan of the *Alttürkische Handschriften* series these meant to be published in other catalogues (VOHD13,21: 14–16). After these changes the structure of the documents in the catalogues is as follows:

I. Official documents (administrative, diplomatic, military and documents concerning the religious communities)
   1. Decrees and administrative orders (including appointment orders)
   2. Diplomatic letters
   3. Certifications and permissions (including passes)
   4. Quittances
   5. Petitions
   6. Accounts (including memoranda)
   7. Registers and lists
   8. Miscellaneous

II. Personal documents (legal contracts, trading documents, etc.)

---

201 PO19–PO24; Käz10–Käz11; OReg01.
202 PO13–PO17.
203 Käz09.
204 PO18.
1. Contracts (including wills)
   i. Sale (Sa)
   ii. Exchange (Ex)
   iii. Rental of Hire (RH)
   iv. Loan (Lo)
   v. Adoption (Ad)
   vi. Emancipation (Em)
   vii. Will (WP)
   viii. Miscellaneous (Mi)

2. Quittances

3. Letters and bills

4. Registers and lists

5. Miscellaneous

In my edition I based the order of the documents on the structure of the VOHD catalogues, but since this edition deals with a special part of the documents I applied some changes, and inserted some new subgroups and left out some of the categories. In the present volume the order of the documents is therefore as follows:

1. Official documents (administrative, diplomatic, military and documents concerning the religious communities)
   a. Decrees and administrative orders (including appointment orders)
      1) Provision orders (PO)
         1. Ch/U 7370 v (Glas: T II 1054)
         2. MIK III 6972a (T I α)
         3. MIK III 6972b, c (T I α)
         4. U 5283 v (TM 70)
         5. U 5285 (TM 71)
         6. U 5291 ([T I] D 51/T.M. 91.)
         7. U 5315 ([T] II S 18)
         8. U 5329 (T II B 28)
         9. U 5790 (T III 66) + *U 9261
         10. *U 9180_Side 2 (a) (T I)
         11. *U 9180_Side 2 (c) (TI)
12. *U 9241 (TM 69)
13. Bezeklik Text 1
14. Bezeklik Text 2
15. Bezeklik Text 3
16. Bezeklik Text 4
17. Bezeklik Text 5
18. Or. 12207 (A) 06
19. SI O/39 (a)
20. SI O/39 (b)
21. SI Uig 14/a
22. SI Uig 14/b
23. SI Uig 14/c
24. SI Uig 14/d

2) Käzig documents (Käz)
   1. U 5284 (TM 68)
   2. U 5296 (T.M 217.)
   3. U 5297 (T.M. 110)
   4. U 5303 (Glas: T II D 68)
   5. U 5308 (T II D 238a)
   6. U 5314 (T II S 19b)
   7. U 5665 r/1 (T II S 21)
   8. U 5665 r/2 (T II S 21)
   9. Ot. Ry. 8127
  10. SI Kr. IV 604/a
  11. SI Kr. IV 604/b

3) Miscellaneous (OMis)
   1. U 5331 (T II Čiqtim 1)/a
   2. U 5947 r (T)
   3. U 6119 + U 6256 + U 5425 (T I D)

b. Accounts (including memoranda) (OAcc)
   1. *U 9180_Side 2 (b) (T I)
   2. *U 9255
   3. *U 9256 (T III No 279)
4. *U 9259

c. Registers and lists (**ROReg**)

1. USp 54

2. Private documents (legal contracts, trade documents, etc.)

   a. Registers and lists

      1) List and Registers concerning the *ulag*-system (**UlReg**)

         1. Ch/U 6107 v
         2. Ch/U 6510 v (Glas: T II T 1602)
         3. Ch/U 7012 r (T II S)
         4. Ch/U 7145 v
         5. Ch/U 7368 v (Glas: T II D 320)
         6. Ch/U 8136 v (MIK 030465; T II S 53) + Ch/U 6039 v (T II M)
         7. Ch/U 8175 v (Glas: T II 742; MIK 031759) + Ch/U 6512 v (T III 66)
         8. Mainz 765 v (T II 1035)
         9. U 5299
        10. U 5307 (T II D 205a)
        11. U 5311 (T II D 360)
        12. Ch/U 7345 v (Glas: T III 2079)
        13. Ch/U 7344 v
        14. Ch/U 8012 v (Glas: T I 1052; MIK 028434)
        15. Ch/U 8217 v (T II Y 59; MIK 030514) (+Ch/U 6106 v)
        16. Ch/U 8217 r (T II Y 59; MIK 030514) (+Ch/U 6106 r)
        17. U 6006
        18. *U 9004 (T I / TM 241)

      2) Other private lists (**PList**)

         1. Ch/U 8097 v (MIK 028440; Glas: T II 1938)
         2. U 6189

Within a certain group the following structure is applied: first the documents of the Berlin collection in the order as they are presented in the VOHD catalogues, these are followed by documents from other collections in the alphabetical order of their signatures.

Due to the fact that the Middle Mongolian documents (Mong01–Mong05) are far less numerous in this volume they are not divided into further subgroups. The first four documents
belong to the Berlin collection and the last one is preserved in China. The Berlin documents (Mong01–Mong04) appear in the order as they are published in the sixteenth volume of the Berliner Turfantexte (BT XVI).

The signatures of the documents are given in the headlines of every entry. In the case of the Berlin documents the signatures of the VOHD catalogues are added. In the case of documents from other collections the shelf numbers of the preserving institutions are used.205 After the headline the most important information concerning the manuscripts are given: the publications of the document (Publ.), the publications of facsimiles (Facs.), the quotations of the text (Cit.) and the assumed date of the text (Date). With regard to the documents of the Berlin collection this information is based on the VOHD catalogues, and updated with the thence published literature. This basic information is followed by the transcription and the translation of the original text. The deviating transcriptions and the earlier translations except the Japanese and Chinese are presented in the footnotes attached to the transcription and the translation in question.

The system of transliteration and transcription and the system of quotation

In this work the system of transliteration and transcription of the Uyghur texts follows the Uigurisches Wörterbuch (UW I: 6–17). The documents are written in cursive style of Uyghur script, and occasionally they are barely readable. Due to this fact the proper names and toponym sometimes could have different readings. To avoid the possible ambiguities the transliteration of every proper name and toponym is given in the footnotes, followed by the readings of the earlier editors of the texts.

The earlier works concerning the Uyghur civil documents used several different systems of transcription.206 To avoid a reinterpretation of their readings, they are always quoted in their original system of transcription.207 If the discrepancies are limited to the diverse systems of transcription, they are not quoted in the footnotes.

---

205 The only exceptions are the so called Bezeklik orders. These documents belong to the collection of the Turfan Museum (Xinjiang, Peoples Republic of China), but their inventory numbers are not known (cf.: (MATSUI 2009: 339-340). Due to this situation I applied my own signatures for them: the name of provenance (Bezeklik) and the numbers 1 to 5 which refer to their edition in Dai Matsui’s article (MATSUI 2009).

206 For the different transcription systems applied for the Old Uyghur texts see: AYAZLI–ÖLMEZ 2011.

207 Due to the fact that in the USp the documents Nr. 47–106 are published without transcription a special method had to be introduced to give back Radloff’s reading. For these documents I prepared a digital scan of the pages, cut out the passages in question and present them in Radloff’s original transliteration in Uyghur script.
By the Middle Mongolian documents I followed the transliteration and transcription system of the BT XVI what is based on the Popp’s *Grammar of Written Mongolian* (POPPE 1954) and the *Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae collecta 2/I* (LIGETI 1972a), with the following slight changes: if there are deviations in the writing of a word, in the transcription the correct form is written while the transliteration of the word can be read in the footnotes.

The philological comments of the author are presented in the footnotes of the transcriptions, while the historical comments appear in the footnotes of the translations. If a word which has to be explained appears in more documents, the explanation is added to its first presence and later cross-references will direct the reader to the explanation. The earlier translations of the texts into western languages can be found always in the last footnote of the translation.

**Vocabularies**

After the edition of the texts two separate vocabularies are added: one for the Uyghur and one for the Middle Mongolian texts. Both vocabularies arranged in alphabetical order. The stems of the words are the head of every entry, and the various inflected or suffixed forms appear under them in the order of their appearance in the texts. By the Uyghur documents the suffixes are abbreviated in the regular form in Old Turkic philology. By the Middle Mongolian documents as we are lack of such a common system, the suffixes are cited in the form as they appear in the text.

In every entry after the English explanation of the word, the places of appearances are listed in square brackets as follows: the signature of the document, hyphen, and the number of the line where it appears. If in one line the same word appears several times, than after the number of the line listed the number of the appearances in brackets. If a compounds first part belongs to another line than the second, than it counted according to the first part of the compound. The different manuscripts are separated in the list with forward slashes.
Chapter VIII: Research history of the material

8.1 Expeditions and excavations

In the second half of the 19th century when Central Asia became the field on which the so-called ‘Great Game’ was played out between the world’s major powers, the attention of the scholarly community turned to the area too. As a consequence expeditions from various countries departed for East Turkestan in the last decades of the 19th century and in the first decades of the 20th. These expeditions sent by Russia, Sweden, England, Germany, France, Japan and the USA unearthed and collected a huge amount of relics and written sources of ancient civilizations in the region. These expeditions established the basis of collections around the world which today preserve much of the history of East Turkestan. From the middle of the 20th century onward, scholars from most foreign countries were excluded from the region while the Chinese started their own excavations. Due to the fact that among the manuscripts under examination in this dissertation the majority belong to German and Russian collections, with some texts preserved in Chinese (6), Japanese (1) and British (1) collections, the following section briefly describes these expeditions.

8.1.1. Russian Expeditions

From the first half of the 19th century, in parallel with the eastern expansion of Russia, Russian scholars started to explore Central Asia systematically. From the second half of the 19th century these expeditions were organized by the Russian Geographical Society. Pjotr Petrovič Semjonov (1827–1914) was among the first explorers, and his hints were later very important for Nikolaj Mihajlovič Prževalskij (1839–1888) and Johann-Albert Regel (1845–1909) when they organized their own expeditions. These undertakings were mainly scientific, but besides the numerous geographical, botanical and zoological results, they started to collect archaeological findings too. Prževalskij himself led four expeditions in total between 1876...

---

208 For the places of the places of provenance of the written sources from East Turkestan, see: Map II.
209 For a general description of the expeditions, see: DABB 1963; HOPKIRK 1980; ELVERSKOG 1997: 2–5; GUANGDA–XINJIANG 1998. There is information on every major collection concerning Silk Road history and the various expeditions on the website of the International Dunhuang Project: the Silk Road Online which belongs to the British Library: http://idp.bl.uk.
210 Of course every expedition unearthed many different types of sources (archaeological, historical, etc.), but here I concentrate only on those parts of the findings which concern the dissertation topic, namely Uyghur and Middle Mongolian civil documents. For a summary of the Russian expeditions see the bilingual (Russian and English) edition: POPOVA 2008a and DREYER 2008; and lately: ČISTJAKOV 2014.
and 1888. On these trips Vsevolod Ivanovič Roborovskij (1856–1910) and Pjotr Kuzmič Kozlov (1863–1935) were among his companions who later became well known explorers of Central Asia in their own right (DREYER 2008: 63–64; IDP RU).

Between 1893 and 1895 Roborovskij led his own expedition to the Turfan Basin and to the region of Dunhuang. Roborovskij gave a detailed description of the Turfan Basin including its cities and villages. He showed particular interest to the ruins in Idıkutšarı in the vicinity of modern Gaochang (i.e. the historical Kočo) where was one of the residences of the rulers of the West Uyghur Kingdom (9th–13th centuries CE). Collected a huge amount of material, including a lot of manuscripts, from around Turfan, they transported it immediately to St. Petersburg. The findings stimulated the curiosity of Russian academic circles so much that in 1898 a new expedition departed for East Turkestan under the direction of Dimitrij Alexandrovič Klementz (1848–1914) aiming to collect similar materials. Besides a lot of other findings the expedition assembled an invaluable collection of Uyghur documents. This material was prepared for publishing shortly afterwards by Wilhelm Radloff (1837–1918)212, but publication was only completed after he passed away in 1928 (TUGUSHEVA 2008: 41–42; IDP RU).213

Klementz showed his findings to Albert Grünwedel (1856–1935), and this led indirectly to the organization of the first German expedition. Radloff and Sergej Fedorovič Oldenburg (1863–1934) presented the results of the Russian expeditions at the 12th International Congress of Orientalists in Rome in 1899. This and the discoveries of Aurel Stein, the Hungarian orientalist who worked in British service drew international attention toward East Turkestan.214

In 1903 the Russian Committee for Middle and East Asia Exploration was established. From that time onwards regular expeditions were sent to East Turkestan, and often reported the finding of new Uyghur and Mongolian documents. The expedition of Mihail Maihajlovič Berezovskij (1848–1912) between 1905 and 1908215 and the first Russian Turkestan

---

211 For a detailed description of Kozlov’s 1907–1909 expedition, see: KOZLOV 1955, the German translation of his 1923 Russian original.
212 Wilhelm Radloff was a German Turkologist who spent most of his career in Russia. He was a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the director of several museums. He wrote many of his works in Russian where he used his Russian name Vasilij V. Radlov. In this work I use his German name consistently.
213 On the cooperation between the Russian and German scholars in the organizing of expeditions and in the study of the manuscripts, and on the later cool down of the relations see: DREYER 2008: 66–67.
214 Scholars of the 12th International Congress of Orientalist in Rome even decided to organise joint expeditions and besides the national research committees establish a central institution in St. Petersburg (DREYER 2008: 66).
215 On this expedition see: VOROBYEVA-DESYATOVSKAYA 2008. Altogether the expedition collected 1876 fragments in Sanskrit, Tocharian B, Chinese, Khotan Saka and Uyghur. The Uyghur texts were written on the
expedition led by Oldenburg also found Uyghur official documents which were later published by Sergej Efimovič Malov (1880–1957). Oldenburg’s second expedition took place in 1914–1915. Malov too participated in Central Asian expeditions in 1909–1911 and 1913–1915. The most important finding of these expeditions was the Turkic manuscript of the Suvarṇaprabhāsa sutra the best preserved of all extant manuscripts. Beside that they found further Uyghur official documents which were published later by Malov (TUGUSHEVA 2008: 44–46).

Diplomats too played a very important role in the establishment of the Russian collection. Among them Nikolaj Fjodorovič Petrovskij (1837–1908), Russian consul in Kašgar from 1882 to 1896 and consul general from 1897 to 1904, was probably the most important. He acquired 582 precious pre-Islamic manuscripts mainly by purchase from local inhabitants and from professional treasure hunters (VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAIA 2006: 62; DREYER 2008: 64). But it should to be noted like his English colleague George Macartney (1867–1945), Petrovskij also bought manuscripts in an ‘unknown script’ which later turned out to be forgeries. Beside Petrovskij Nikolaj Nikolajevič Krotkov (1869–1919), Russian consul in Kulja and Ürümči between 1894 and 1912 managed to acquire many manuscripts, mainly Uyghur texts.

The Uyghur documents delivered to St. Petersburg are today kept in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The Uyghur manuscripts belong to the Central Asian (Serindica) collection. They preserve ca. 4.000 early medieval Turkic manuscripts. The majority of the non-religious texts, mostly economic documents, belong to the Oldenburg, Malov and Krotkov collections (TUGUSHEVA 2008: 46, 49; IDP RU).

On the first Oldenburg expedition to Turkestan see: POPOVA 2008b; about the second to Dunhuang: POPOVA 2008c. The first expedition collected around one hundred manuscripts in total from which amount about fifty were Uyghur documents, written on the reverse sides of Chinese scrolls. Many of the Uyghur texts were legal documents (bills, contracts, etc.) (POPOVA 2008b: 157).

Two unique Uyghur economic documents written on wood are preserved in the Petrovskij collection (VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAIA 2006: 62).


In this collection only the manuscripts brought back from Oldenburg’s first expedition to East Turkestan (1909–1910) are preserved. The findings of his second expedition to Dunhuang are kept in the Dunhuang collection. In the Oldenburg collection 115 manuscripts can be found in total, and most of them are fragments. From the 115 manuscripts three are Uyghur-Chinese texts, and a few other Uyghur fragments belong to the collection too (VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAIA 2006: 65).
8.1.2. British expeditions

Due to the fact that among the documents examined here only one (PO18) belongs to the British collection, only a short description of British expeditions is given here. British expeditions to Central Asia were originally sent to gather intelligence about the area as a part of the so-called “Great Game” between Russia and Britain from the middle of the 19th century. The first to purchase manuscripts in volume was George Macartney, the British representative in Kašgar, and Stuart Godfrey, assistant to the Resident in Kashmir. The majority of the British collection was collected by Sir Aurél Stein, the Hungarian scholar who explored Central Asia in British service. During his four expeditions (1900–1901, 1906–1908, 1913–1916, 1930–1931) he travelled along both the southern and northern route of the Silkroad in Central Asia, mapped previously unknown areas and excavated many sites, collecting a huge volume of archaeological findings and texts.²²³ Probably his most famous deed was the exploration of the so-called “secret library” in the Mogao caves near Dunhuang from where he acquired thousands of manuscripts, among them some Uyghur texts too.²²⁴ The bulk of the manuscripts belonging to the Stein collection are today preserved in the British Library (IDP EN).

8.1.3. German Expeditions²²⁵

After the 12th International Congress of Orientalists in Rome (1899) the Germans decided to send their own expedition into East Turkestan. The idea of organizing an expedition came from Albert Grünwedel (1856–1935) who was the director of the Department of Indology at the Ethnological Museum (Museum für Völkerkunde) in Berlin. Due to financial difficulties

²²⁰ The Kozlov collection contains the most of the Uyghur manuscripts and xylographs in the St. Petersburg collection. The material is available for researchers since 1994 (VOROBYEVA-DESYATOVSKAYA 2006: 67).
²²¹ The Krotkov collection contains 4073 items in total, most of these are written in cursive or semi-cursive Uyghur script, moreover fragments of Uyghur xylographs (⁹ᵗʰ–¹⁴ᵗʰ centuries) can be found there (VOROBYEVA-DESYATOVSKAYA 2006: 62–63).
²²² Apart from the above mentioned collections the A. I. Kokhanovskij collection contains two Uyghur texts, among the documents brought back by Klementz some Uyghur texts and xylographs can be found, and the A. A. Djakov collection contains some Uyghur texts as well (VOROBYEVA-DESYATOVSKAYA 2006: 66–67).
²²³ The accounts of Stein about his expeditions: STEIN 1903; STEIN 1912; STEIN 1933.
²²⁴ It is a little known fact that several decades before Stein, the Hungarian geographer and geologist Lajos Loczy had already visited the Mogao caves as a member of Béla Széchenyi’s expedition in 1879. Loczy called Stein’s attention to Dunhuang, and to its potential importance for the study of the history of Central Asia in 1902 (RÖNA-TAS 1968: 314–315; RÖNA-TAS 1988: 87).
²²⁵ A detailed description of the routes and the results of the four German expeditions can be found at: http://idp.bl.uk/pages/collections_de.a4d.
the undertaking could not start until 1902. Necessary support for the fieldwork was collected by public subscription and by the donation of the Ethnological Aid Committee Berlin (Ethnologisches Hilfskomitee Berlin) and some wealthy supporters. Finally on the 11th of August 1902, the first German Central Asian expedition set off, headed by Albert Grünwedel. He was accompanied by the famous orientalist Georg Huth (1867–1906) and by Theodor Bartus (1858–1941), the museum technician. Grünwedel’s most important aim was mapping the Turfan oasis and the excavation of local historical treasures, working with the approval of the Chinese authorities and the help of local Uyghur guides. The expedition reached the Turfan oasis in the December of 1902 and lasted till April 1903. Their findings were transported back to Germany in 46 boxes (YALDIZ-ZIEME 2002: 308–310; IDP DE).226

Thanks to these fantastic results it was easy to organize further expeditions, and it was undertaken with the support of the German state, the second expedition started under the name: First Royal Prussian Turfan expedition (Erste Königlich-Preußische Turfan-Expedition) in November 1904. Due to Grünwedel’s illness the excursion was led by Albert von Le Coq (1860–1930), a scientific collaborator of the museum. Their primary target was also the Turfan oasis, where they worked until December 1905. The third expedition, headed again by Grünwedel, started work in December 1905 where the two research groups were united. The third expedition lasted till June 1907 but Le Coq had to leave earlier because of illness. After the departure of Le Coq, Grünwedel and Bartus went on with excavations in the oases extending west from Turfan, and in the course of these digs excavated the huge complex of Buddhist cave temples in Kızıl. The result of the second expedition was 103 boxes, while the findings of the third expedition were sent to Germany in 118 boxes.227 The fourth and last expedition started in June 1913 and finished just before the outbreak of World War I in February 1914. The research team continued the work of the third expedition in the vicinity of Kuča. From this trip the explorers arrived home with 156 boxes of findings, each weighing 75–80 kilograms (YALDIZ-ZIEME 2002: 310–312, IDP DE). These four expeditions collected the material preserved today in Berlin.

The German Turfan collection is housed in three different institutions in Berlin: the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, the Oriental Department of the Berlin State Library - Prussian Heritage and the Department of East, Southeast and Central Asian Art of the Museum of Asian Art. Due to a settled agreement between the two institutions in 1996 the Oriental Department of the State Library holds the administrative

226 The results of the expedition were published in GRÜNWEDEL 1906.
227 The description of the second and third expeditions: GRÜNWEDEL 1912 and LE COQ 1926.
(conservation, restoration and utilization) responsibility for the manuscripts and block prints of the Turfan collection belonging to the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Nevertheless, there are around 12,000 manuscripts and block prints preserved in the Turfan archive of the Berlin Brandenburg Academy. From this amount approximately 6,000 belong to the Uyghur sub-division of the collection (with the signature ‘U’); about 1,600 to the sub-division Ch/U, i.e. mainly Chinese manuscripts with Uyghur texts on their back-side (secondary use of the paper); around 600 Middle Iranian and Old Turkic texts were housed in Mainz after World War II and were provisionally registered there, therefore they have the signature ‘Mainz’, they were returned to Berlin via Marburg; the approximately 3,500 Manichean texts are written in various languages, most of them are in Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian and Old Turkic (signature: ‘M’); besides these there are about 300 Sogdian manuscripts with Nestorian script (signature: ‘n’), 1,000 Sogdian and Chinese/Sogdian fragments (signature ‘So’ and ‘Ch/So’) as far as smaller collections of Tumšuqsakan (‘TS’), Khotansakan (‘KS’) and Bactrian (‘h’) fragments. The Uyghur documents presented in this dissertation belong to the group of Uyghur or Chinese-Uyghur texts. The most important manuscripts from our point of view in the Oriental Department of the Berlin State Library are the Mongolian texts, and all but one (Mong05), of the Middle Mongolian documents presented here are preserved there. The Turfan collection of the Museum of Asian Art in Berlin-Dahlem houses mostly art objects excavated during the Turfan expeditions, but also a small selection of Turfan often illustrated manuscripts and block prints for exhibition purposes mainly. From the documents of the present study two items (PO02 and PO03) are housed there (IDP DE).

8.1.4. Japanese expeditions

The Japanese expeditions into Central Asia were motivated mainly by religious considerations, however the other great powers in the area, especially the Russian and English authorities did not really believe this. The three Japanese undertakings were named after their main organizer and called the Ōtani expeditions (1902–1914). Count Ōtani Kōzui (1867–1948) was the 22nd Abbott of the Nishi Honganji branch of the Jōdo Shinshū Buddhist sect, one of the biggest Buddhist sects in Japan. He planned and financed all of the three

---

228 These are Chinese texts with completely independent Uyghur texts on the other side. These manuscripts are results of the secondary usage of the paper.

229 On the Russian and English authorities’ distrust towards the second Ōtani expedition, see: GALAMBOS 2010.
expeditions, and he also did a lot for the promotion of their results in western countries, especially England. Ōtani studied in London so had very good connections in England and with academic circles all around Europe. The main aim of all three expeditions was to study the Buddhist sites in Central Asia and collect as many ancient Buddhist materials, particularly manuscripts, as possible (GALAMBOS–KITSUDO 2012: 113–114; IDP JP).

The first expedition took place on a journey back to Japan from Europe between 1902 and 1904. Ōtani and his four companions approached from St. Petersburg via Baku and Samarkand on the inland route to Kašgar, where they split up into two groups: Ōtani and two others headed to India, Tesshin Watanabe and Kanyu Hori went to East Turkestan. The Central Asian team spent their first months on the southern route of the Silk Road in the vicinity of Khotan. In the beginning of 1903 they crossed the Taklamakan desert and moved to the northern route, visiting Aksu and Turfan and returning to Kašgar. Later they set out again and spent several months on the northern route investigating various sites including: Kizil, Kuča, Tumšuk and Aksu. Their main site was the previously unexplored Kuča (GALAMBOS–KITSUDO 2012: 114; IDP JP).

The second (1908–1909) and the third (1910–1914) expeditions were led by Zichō Tachibana. Apart from Tachibana there was only one participant in the second Ōtani expedition, Eizaburo Nomura. They reached Turfan via Beijjing, Inner Mongolia and Ürümči, and excavated in Murtuk, Yarkhoto, Karakhoja, Toyok, Kizil and Kumtura. For the third expedition Tachibana departed from London with an 18 year old English man A.O. Hobbs. They separated and while Tachibana did a southern turn through the Lop Nor desert to Čerčen and then headed back to Kuča, Hobbs went directly to Kuča. Unfortunately they never met again because Hobbs contracted smallpox and died before Tachibana’s arrival. Instead of Hobbs another Japanese explorer Koichiro Yoshikawa arrived to help Tachibana’s work. They stayed for a while in Dunhuang where they purchased 369 manuscripts, later moving along the northern route and excavateing Buddhist sights in Toyok and Gaochang (GALAMBOS–KITSUDO 2012: 115–118; IDP JP).

The Ōtani collection is housed in different institutions across Asia. Many items are today found in China in the Lüshun Museum, the Chinese Museum of History and the National Library of China, with some parts of the collection are preserved in the National Museum of Korea. In Japan the material is also spread between several institutions, the bulk of the findings housed in the following institutions: at the Tokyo National Museum and the

---

230 On Hobbs and his role in the third Ōtani expedition, see: GALAMBOS: 2008.
Kyoto National Museum. Most of the Uyghur material is preserved at the Ryukoku University in Kyoto (IDP JP).

8.1.5. Chinese expeditions

Huang Wenbi (1893–1966) was the first Chinese scholar to become famous for his archaeological researches in Eastern Turkestan, as a member of the Sino-Swedish expedition (1926–1935) into Xinjiang headed by Sven Hedin. Their relationship, as remembered by both men, was not without conflicts. Later Huang Wenbi became a member of the Institute of Archaeology at the Chinese Academy of Sciences and led further excavations in the region from the 1950’s unearthing not only new materials but new excavation sites. Huang was persecuted and died during the Cultural Revolution in 1966. Nonetheless his successors continued his work and later these works were coordinated by the Archaeological Research Institute of the Xinjiang Academy of Social Sciences. In 1983 they published a volume called *Xinjiang kaogyu sanshinian* (Thirty years of Xinjiang Archaeology) in which they collected the results of recent Chinese archaeology in this field. Archaeological investigations are ongoing in Xinjiang, coordinated since 2005 by the newly established Turfan Academy. Thanks to these excavations there are several extremely rich collections in China which are continually broadened by new findings (JACOBS 2014: 124–125; IDP CH).

8.2 Research history of the material

In this chapter philological research on the material will be reviewed in two sub-sections: Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents. Due to the difference between the two groups of sources in number and in the scholarly attention they have attracted, the first section is much longer than the second. The frame of the present study does not permit detailed presentation of every scholarly work on civil documents from more than one hundred years, so in the following works which are of less importance for our purpose will be mentioned briefly while

---

231 Due to the limits of the author’s knowledge the Chinese and Japanese secondary literature could not be reviewed fully. In most of the cases Japanese colleagues at least summarised their new results in western languages, so these work are cited here. From Chinese scholars articles by Geng Shimin (1980) and Kurban Weli (1984) have to be mentioned here. Both of them published newly excavated Uyghur administrative orders from Bezeklik. The review of both articles plus Umemura’s article (1981) on the same topic, are presented in MATSUI 2009. Furthermore the transcriptions in Geng Shimin’s monograph on the Uyghur civil documents (GENG 2006) were used by the author during the document editing process.
some more important works will be introduced in detail. The emphasis of the present review is on editions of the documents and studies of them so far.

8.2.1 Uyghur civil documents

Wilhelm Radloff was the first scholar to study Uyghur civil documents, working between 1897 and 1909. In 1899 he published two documents in Klementz’s research account (RADLOFF 1899). It is not clear so far whether these documents were bought by Roborovskij and Kozlov on their expedition or were purchased by Klementz. The result of Radloff’s research on Uyghur material is his book *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler* [hereafter: USp], published only in 1928, after Radloff’s death and thanks to the editorial work of S. E. Malov. For several decades this was the largest and most comprehensive collection of Uyghur civil documents.

In this work the documents are collected from various sources. Those brought back from East Turkestan by Russian explorers like Roborovskij, Kozlov and Klementz are included under Nos. 47–60 (USp: 82–112). Other documents were collected during the first German expedition (1902–1903) by Grünwedel. After Grünwedel arrived back to Berlin in 1903 he sent photos of several documents to Radloff, but unfortunately the exact number of them is unknown today. From these materials Radloff published his readings of 23 texts as an appendix to Grünwedel’s research account (RADLOFF 1906). These 23 documents along with some other texts from the first German expedition’s findings are also included in the USp under numbers 1 to 46 and are supplied with further philological comments by Radloff (USp: 68–81).

In 1908 Radloff visited his colleagues in Berlin where Friedrich Karl Müller (1863–1930) gave him 42 photos of documents from the second German expedition (1904–1905). From these ten manuscripts were too damaged for publication, but the remaining 32 were published in the USp under the numbers 61–76 and 78–93 (USp: 112; CLARKINTRO: 66). One document purchased during the Oldenburg expedition was also published in the book (No. 98). The last part of the USp contains 21 documents acquired between 1907 and 1909 by

---

232 Due to restrictions concerning the subject of this chapter some of those works, which are indispensable for the study of the Uyghur documents are not discussed here in detail. For example dictionaries of the Old Turkic language like the ED or the DTS, or the articles by Ligeti on Sino-Uyghur vocabularies (LIGETIVOC; LIGETIVOC2) are not presented here. Likewise enormous linguistic studies such as the TMEN and the WOT, or the essential grammars of Gabain (GABAIN 1974) and Erdal (GoT) although all important for the philological study of this materials do not bear directly on the research history of the civil documents.
Nikolaj Krotkov, the Russian consul in Ürümči (Nos. 107–127). In total, of the 128 documents in the USp edition, 78 items belong to the first and second German expeditions and 50 stem from Russian collections.

Radloff provided transliteration in Uyghur script, transcription in Cyrillic script and a German translation for the first 46 documents. For documents Nos. 47–106 he provided only a transliteration in Uyghur script and German translation while the documents Nos. 107–128 have only the German translation. The non-unified processing of the documents must be regarded as an imperfection of the USp. Another disadvantage of the book is that it only contains the facsimiles’ of three documents. On the other hand Radloff’s book with its investigation of 101 Uyghur civil documents was the most important work in this field until the 1970s. The failures in the text edition mirror both the level of Turkological knowledge of the time and the scholars’ perception of the period of Central Asian history from which the texts originate. Due to this Radloff’s pioneering work does not meet today’s requirements of philological precision.

As mentioned above, the USp was only published in 1928 after Radloff’s death. The necessary supplementary works on the manuscript were done by his pupil S. E. Malov, who not only prepared his master’s notices for publishing but wrote a foreword and re-studied those manuscripts available to him. The results of this work are attached to the book as well as an Addenda et corrigenda. Apart from this he prepared Uyghur script transliterations for those documents which had only German translations (USP: 217–259), and compiled a vocabulary of the texts too, containing Cyrillic transcription of the Turkic words with their Russian meaning (USP: 260–305).

Malov had already, in 1927, published two Uyghur documents purchased during his expedition (MALOV 1927). In 1932 he published five documents from the Oldenburg collection with a transliteration in Uyghur script, a transcription in Latin script and a Russian translation (MALOV 1932). Malov dealt with the Uyghur documents for the last time in his monumental work in 1951: Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis’menosti, publishing two documents acquired on his expedition with facsimiles and re-edit four documents from the USp (MALOV 1951: 201–218).

The German scholar Albert von Le Coq re-edited four documents which were published in Radloff’s work in 1906. The most outstanding part of this work is the

---

233 Not only civil documents were published in the USp. The exceptions are the following: Buddhist manuscripts and xylographs: Nos. 23, 43–44, 46, 58–60, 90, 94, 99–106, 128; ecclesiastical papers: Nos. 26, 45, 77, 80; Manichean texts: Nos. 95, 97; a divination text (No. 42), a private letter (No. 92) and a Christian text (No. 96) (CLARKINTRO: 94, fn. 26).
introduction discussing the historical importance of the documents. Later he published two further documents previously edited by Radloff (LE COQ 1918; LE COQ 1919).

Ahmet Caferoğlu (1899–1975) was the first to study the juridical and economical terminology of the documents. His work starts with a short research history, then in the first one third of the article describes the general appearance and content of the texts. The last part of the article attempts to define the different juridical and economical terms of the documents (CAFEROĞLU 1934b).

Shortly afterwards the Russo-American medievalist George Vernadsky (1887–1973) who dealt mainly with the history of medieval Russia, re-edited and published a document which had already appeared in the USp.\textsuperscript{234} This document, a petition of the workers of a vineyard for the Chaghadaid ruler Tuğluğ Temür (r. 1347–1363) was the basis for Vernadsky’s discussion of late medieval Uyghur history. One year later Reşit Rahmeti Arat (1900–1964) who later became one of the most important scholars in the research of Uyghur civil documents published this text again: his first publication on this field (VERNADSKY 1936; ARAT 1937).

Due to its methodological innovation it is very important to mention an article of Francis Woodman Cleaves (1911–1995) in which he analysed a Mongolian loan contract. In this article besides the philological investigation of the text Cleaves compared it with Chinese juridical documents (CLEAVES 1955). This approach became influential for research on civil documents. Two Japanese scholars, Masao Mori and Nobuo Yamada, played leading roles in this type of documentary research. Despite the fact that neither was originally a Turkologist or Mongolist both of them contributed greatly to the study of Uyghur civil documents, mostly because, thanks to their Sinological training, they could shed light on the Chinese background of many difficult expressions and terms. While Mori wrote mostly in Japanese, Yamada published his most important papers in English too and so he had greater effect on international research on this subject. Nonetheless Mori’s English article about the Uyghur loan contracts remains a basic work of the field (MORI 1961). Yamada dealt mainly with sale and loan contracts, moreover he was the first to study the stamps and hand signs of the documents and achieved new results concerning the weight- and other units of measure too. Furthermore he was the first to study the questions of slavery with regard to the information given in the documents (YAMADA 1963a; YAMADA 1963b; YAMADA 1964; YAMADA 1971;

\textsuperscript{234} The document was published in the USp under number 22. Today this document is preserved in the Turfan collection in Berlin with the signature U 5282b.
YAMADA 1981). Yamada’s most important Japanese and English works were reprinted in the first volume of the *Sammlung Uigurischer Kontrakte* (see below) in 1993 (SUK I).

In 1960 Mary Boyce published the catalogue of the Iranian manuscripts in Manichean script preserved in Berlin. Although this work does not concern our topic directly it is worth mentioning here because in her introduction the author deals in detail with the question of the finding marks added to the manuscripts. With the help of excavation accounts she reconstructed the system of signatures and explained which signature refers to which place of provenance (BOYCE 1960: X–XXI).

The above-mentioned Reşit Rahmeti Arat published his fundamental work, *Eski Türk hukuk vesikaları* [Old Trukic Law Documents] in 1964 (HUKVES). Arat provided a short description of the expeditions in the first part of his work, and in the second part an annotated bibliography of earlier works on the subject. In the third part he described the general characteristics of the documents, he dealing with the different document types, enumerating various *bitig*s, *yarlıg*s and *defters* and also examining terms relevant to our subject (*ulagčı*, *at, at ulag*, *kupčir*, etc.). In the fourth part Arat made a detailed analysis mostly from a formal point of view of some documents partly published earlier but partly published here for the first time. He dealt separately with the hand signs (*nišan*) and stamps (*tamga*). At the end of the work eight documents are published according to the international scholarly standards, i.e. with the transcription of the texts and with their facsimiles. Arat dealt with the civil documents in another article too, analysing a Uyghur document preserved in Istanbul (ARAT 1965).

Dimitrij Ivanovič Tikhonov was the first to interrogate the economic and social aspects of the documents. In 1966, after a series of articles he published his monograph on the subject (TICHONOV 1966). As Larry Clark has noted the disadvantage of this work is that the author considered all institutions appearing in the documents to be constant and permanent across the whole period (10th–14th centuries) and did not take into consideration the effects of the Kara Khitan (12th century) and the Mongol conquest (13th century). Moreover the author mostly used the earlier translations of Malov and Radloff rather than reading the relevant sources himself (CLARKINTRO: 77).

The PhD dissertation of Larry Vernon Clark from 1975: *Introduction to the Uyghur Civil Documents of East Turkestan* (13th–14th cc.) is, beside the substantial works of Radloff and Arat, one of the most cited works concerning Uyghur civil documents, but unfortunately was never published, so it is available as microfilm only. Clark’s work of almost 500 pages is divided into six parts. In the first chapter he introduced the historical context in which the
documents were issued. In the second chapter he described the expeditions, the collections of that time and the research history. The third chapter deals with the chronology of the documents. In this chapter he defined the grammatical markers for dating to the 13th century or later as follows: d’y sound change; only the –nI marks the definite object; the usage of –tIn for the ablative case; the abbreviated –sA form of the conditional; in those cases where the ‘staircase counting’ was not used, the ‘additive counting’ was used (CLARKINTRO: 124–136). In a terminological sense he dealt not only with the borrowings but enumerated a lot of personal names as markers for the 13th century or later dating (see below) (CLARKINTRO: 136–171). In the fourth chapter the formal types of the documents are investigated. In the fifth chapter the formal aspects of validation are presented. The last and sixth chapter classified the documents and described them briefly.

Altogether in his dissertation Clark studied 141 different documents, what was the largest amount of documents discussed in one work until that time. He studied these documents not just from a linguistic and philological point of view but interrogated their formal aspects too. It should be noted that although Clark reproached the authors of earlier works for lacking facsimiles, transcription or translation, he did not present transcriptions and translations in a unified manner either. Only transcribing and translating certain parts of the documents which he investigated concerning a specific question, he did not attach any facsimiles. In my opinion there are two reasons for these deficiencies. On the one hand Clark worked with a huge amount of documents and a scholarly correct procession of all documents would have resulted in a dissertation of enormous size. On the other hand publishing of facsimiles that time would have required the infrastructure of a professional printing-house, something probably not available to him.

Peter Zieme, the prominent researcher in the field of the Old Turkic philology, published a series of articles concerning civil documents starting from the 1970s onward. He wrote about almost every type of document: with Semih Tezcan about letters (TEZCAN-ZIEME 1971); documents concerning slavery (ZIEME 1977); sale contracts (ZIEME 1974; ZIEME 1992); loan- (ZIEME 1980a) and rental contracts (ZIEME 1980b); taxation (ZIEME 1981) and a private economic record (ZIEME 1982). In a three-part series of articles he tried to provide a basis for a Uyghur onomasticon. In these papers he used civil documents as sources, too (ZIEMEONOMASTICON I–III). In 1999 Zieme published an article together with Takao Moriyasu on Chinese-Uyghur bilingual documents, and reached the conclusion that most formal attributes of the documents go back to Chinese models (MORIYASU–ZIEME 1999).
Peter Zieme was the only European scholar who participated in the edition of the grand Japanese undertaking the *Sammlung Uigurischer Kontrakte* in 1993 (SUK I–III). In the first part of the three volumes work they re-edited the most important works of Nobuo Yamada on Uyghur civil documents in Japanese and English. The second volume contains the transcription and translation of 121 documents in Japanese and German. In the third volume they edited high quality images of the documents. The SUK is even today the most remarkable source publication even though the readings of some fragments have changed it is still a very useful material.

Simone-Christiane Raschmann studied various aspects of the civil documents in her articles: on slavery (*Raschmann* 1988), the social and economic aspects of the documents in general (*Raschmann* 1991), taxation (*Raschmann* 1992a) and several sets of documents from the so-called Arat-estate (*Raschmann* 2008; *Raschmann* 2013; *Raschmann* 2015). Her PhD dissertation published in 1995 is also very important in the field (*RaschmannBaumwolle*). In this work she studied the various attestations and meanings of the word böz ‘cotton’ in the Old Uyghur sources. Altogether she investigated 113 documents, various in natures but all connected to the böz somehow. The result of this scrutiny is that the different senses of the usages and meanings of the word became clear. Beside these Raschmann edited a catalogue with two volumes of the civil documents preserved in Berlin (VOHD13.21; VOHD13.22). The structure of the catalogue entries are as follows: physical description (paper size and colour, type of script, number of lines, etc.), the character of the document, the transcription of first and last lines. Apart from these earlier publications, *facsimile* publications and citations of the document are added. These two volumes are indispensable tools for research on Uyghur civil documents.

Osman Fikri Sertkaya a pupil of Arat, has dealt in some publications with the civil documents, too focussing on money and money usage by the early Turkic people. In the book he published together with Alimov in 2006 under the title *Eski Türklerde Para* (*Sertkaya–Alimov* 2006), they re-edited several of Sertkaya’s earlier articles on the money usage of the Uyghurs in Turkish (*Sertkaya* 1991; *Sertkaya* 2004; *Sertkaya* 2005) and published one of his earlier papers for the first time too (*Sertkaya* 2006).

Melek Özyetgin based her book *Eski Türk Vergi Terimleri* on two groups of sources: on the one hand Uyghur civil documents, and on the other hand the *yarlıks* of the Golden Horde (Özyetgin 2004). Thanks to her comparative analysis the book shows the later life and

---

235 If the document is unpublished the transcription of the whole document is attached.
changes in meanings of the terms used in the Uyghur civil documents. She provided a transliteration and a Turkish translation of the documents, but no facsimiles.

As the two Japanese scholars Mori and Yamada played an important role in this field of research from 1960’s, nowadays the works of Takao Moriyasu and Dai Matsui are of a comparable importance. Moriyasu greatly contributed to research in two topics: he established the criteria for the relative dating of documents (MORIYASU 1996; MORIYASU 2002; MORIYASU 2004a) and he studied a special group of the documents in details: the letters (MORIYASU 2011; MORIYASU 2012). Moreover he devoted a whole book for the Manicheanism among the Uyghurs, in which he studied the economy of Manichean monasteries in details (MORIYASU 2004b). Due to the high importance of the first topic for the purpose of the present study the results of Moriyasu’s work will be introduced in the following. According to Moriyasu three kinds of criteria can be distinguished: script, terminology and personal names. Moriyasu pointed out that all the documents from the Mongol period (13th–14th cc.) are written in semi-cursive or cursive script (MORIYASU 1996: 79–81, 91–92; MORIYASU 2004a: 228; 235 fn. 12). On terminology he shared Clark’s opinion and counted the following groups of words as criteria: some Mongolian loanwords concerning taxation (alban, kalan, kupčir, yasak), juridical terminology (kubi, tölö-, yasa, yosun), society (aka, bayan, nökör, ulug suu, taruga, tüšümel); some Chinese terms related to the Yuan dynasty (čao, čunđun baočao, ančaši) (CLARKINTRO: 139–160; MORIYASU 2004a: 229). Furthermore and contrary to Clark, Moriyasu accepted the opinion of Yamada about the nišan as a marker for the Mongol period and added two further expressions (taydü, učagur) (YAMADA 1963b: 322; CLARKINTRO: 326–328; MORIYASU 2004a: 229). Moriyasu agreed with Clark concerning personal names enumerated by the latter as markers (Bayan, Mongol, Monggölčın, Ógödäy, Karagunaz) and added some further names (Pintung, Kayımtu, Inanči, Ozmiš, Togrul, Turi) (CLARKINTRO: 139–144; MORIYASU 2004a: 229).

From the beginning of his career Dai Matsui’s main research topics were the administrative systems and taxation in Uyghur territories during the Mongol period and he based his studies mainly on Uyghur and Mongolian sources from that period. Unfortunately neither his MA thesis (MATSUI 1996) nor his PhD dissertation (MATSUI 1999) is published so far and both of them were written in Japanese, but quite a lot earlier unpublished materials are involved in them.\(^{236}\) In his first English article he studied weights and measure used in the Mongol Empire through the investigation of Uyghur and Mongolian documents and with the

\(^{236}\) Here I would like to express my gratitude to professor Dai Matsui letting me to use his MA thesis and PhD dissertation in my work.
presentations of the Chinese parallels (MATSUI 2004a). In another article he reconstructed Mongol taxation in East Turkestan with a similar methodology (MATSUI 2005). In this article he compared the taxation systems of the West Uyghur Kingdom, the taxation system in Uyghur documents under Mongol rule and the taxation system of the Mongol decrees. He concluded that the people of the Turfan region were subject to three kinds of taxes and labour services from the 9th to the 14th centuries: 1) basic taxes (including land tax and sales tax); 2) labour services for which the overall name was *iš küš* or *kalan*; 3) additional taxes (*kupčir, ulag*), which were concerned mainly with the postal system or military activities. Furthermore he stated that the Mongol taxation systems in China and Iran were quite similar to those in the Turfan region, and surmised that the Uyghur taxation system was the model for the Mongol Empire (MATSUI 2005: 78–79). In an article connected to the frequent expression of the Uyghur documents *käzig ‘turn’*, he studied the origin of the methods of taxation in the Turfan region and pointed out that many elements of it go back to Chinese origins (MATSUI 2008a). In 2009 he re-edited the so called Bezeklik administrative orders, reviewed their research history and offered plenty of new solutions for their translation (MATSUI 2009). Lately he answered many questions concerning Uyghur toponym (MATSUI 2013; MATSUI 2015) and solved many problems of the dating of the administrative orders from the West Uyghur and Mongol periods, too (MATSUI 2010a; MATSUI 2014a).

Although Lilija Tugusheva devoted many of her works to Uyghur civil documents, the reason for mentioning her name at the end of this summary of research history is that one of her latest works has the greatest value from our point of view. In this book she published 97 documents with transcription, Russian translation and in most cases with facsimiles. Even though she followed in most cases the out of date reading of the USp, this book carries great value because of the first-time publication of quite a number of facsimiles of documents from the St. Petersburg collection. Some of these newly published facsimiles are very important for the research of the Mongol postal system in East Turkestan (PO21–PO24).

From the above given summary of the research history it becomes clear that the study of Uyghur civil documents has developed greatly over slightly more than a century. The standard requirements for text editions (transcription, translation and the publication of facsimiles) were set and many philological questions were answered. However, as it will be shown in later chapters, there is still a lot to do in this field of research.

---

237 Concerning the document U 5296 (Käz02) he supposed that the *kalan* labour services included in the Turfan region some duties concerning the postal system (MATSUI 2005: 75).
8.2.2 The Middle Mongolian documents

The first article about some of the Middle Mongolian documents edited here (Mong03; Mong04) was written by Gustaf John Ramstedt (RAMSTEDT 1909), who provided a transcription and German translation of the texts but did not publish the photocopies of the documents. After this pioneering work, there was no scholarly activity concerning the Middle Mongolian documents of the Turfan Collection for half a century. In 1959 Erich Haenisch published the *facsimile* edition of the Mongolian documents from the Berlin collection, a part of them with colour images (HAENISCH 1959). In 1962 Herbert Franke published an article about the dating of the Mongolian documents from Turfan (FRANKE 1962). Three of the texts presented here (Mong01; Mong03; Mong04) were published by Michael Weiers with a detailed commentary (WEIERS 1967), while another (Mong02) was published by Franke in the same manner (FRANKE 1968). In 1972 Louis Ligeti published the pre-classical Mongolian documents (13th–14th cc.), in the second volume of his *Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta*, but he gave only a transcription of the texts without commentaries, translation or images of the original documents (LIGETI 1972a). 238 In 1993 Dalantai Ceren sodnom and Manfred Taube published their catalogue with a complete edition of all Mongolian texts preserved in Berlin with full apparatus (BT XVI). A few years later Volker Rybatzki wrote an article in which he dealt with different groups of the Middle Mongolian documents (RYBATZKI 1997). In this study he made some comments concerning the manuscripts from East Turkestan and dated one document (Mong02). 239

---

238 Ligeti published these texts for the first time in a Hungarian edition in the series *Mongol Nyelvelüktár* (1963–1965). These preliminary works were meant to be a basis for a planned Middle Mongolian dictionary which unfortunately has never been published. Nevertheless the unified transcription of the texts was a great step forward on this field of research, and later text editions based their system of transcription on Ligeti’s works.

239 Of course the so-called civil documents were written in many different languages in Central Asia, but due to the purpose of the present study we can just mention some important works concerning the subject: the Saka documents are being published since 1955 in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* series; the Turco-Sogdian documents of the 9th–10th centuries were published in 1990 (SIMS-WILLIAMS–HAMILTON 1990); Tsuguhito Takeuchi published the Old Tibetan contracts from Central Asia (TAKEUCHI 1995); lately Nicholas Sims-Williams edited a volume containing the Bactrian legal and economic documents (SIMS-WILLIAMS 2012).
Chapter IX: Uyghur documents

9.1 Official documents

9.1.1 Provision orders

PO01 Ch/U 7370 v (Glas: T II 1054)240

Cit.: ZIEMEWIRTSCHAFT: 333, note 9; RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 47, 86–87, 145 (Nr. 67);
MATSUI 1998b: 32; MATSUI 1999: 34–36; MORIYASU 2004a: 230a; VOHD13,21: 27 (Nr. 6);
MATSUI 2014a: 615–616, 621, 630 (Nr. 49 = E7).
Date: 1322 (according to MATSUI 2003: 60).

Transcription

1. it yıl yana bešinč ay y(e)g(i)rmikä241
2. kit(a)y242 đaruga bürüngüdäy243 elči-lär
3. -kä yam-ka bargu säkiz at
4. ulag bir ulag-çi kiši yana
5. tümän noym-ka bargü üč ş[1g]
6. min kitay244 đaruga-ka bergü /[...] 
7. şig min bürüngüdäy245 ḫ246[ ]
8. bargu üč olpak bilä munč[a247 [...] 
9. yalın248 ögrüne249 buka250 olar251[...] 
10. at ulag beš küri min olpak

240 Many interrelations can be detected between this document and PO04. Dai Matsui classified both documents as part of the so-called Kärsin–Yalın texts. Cf.: MATSUI 2003; MATSUI 2014a: 621–622.
242 QYD’Y. MATSUI 2003: qiday
243 PWY’RNKWD’Y. Zieme read this word as: hayrugü–bürügtüdi [bewyrtgwdy]. He states it is an unknown title (ZIEMEWIRTSCHAFT: 333)
244 QYD’Y.
245 PWY’RNKWD’Y.
248 Y’LYN. MATSUI 1999: yaliq.
249 'WYKRWNČ.
251 MATSUI 1999; MATSUI 2003: oγli [ ].
11. yantu tört y(e)tiz\textsuperscript{252} böz
12. bilä bütürüp berzün

\textsuperscript{252} MATSUI 1999; MATSUI 2003: yätiz.
Translation

1. Dog year and the intercalary 253 5th month on the 20th (day). 2. Eight horse-ulags 254 and one relay coachman [ulag-či kiši] for the Kitay daruga 255 and Büürüngüdäy elčis 256 in order to go to the yam 257 and three šig 258 flour to be given to the tümen noyin 259, [...] šig flour to be

253 According to Dai Matsui the word yana ‘again, and’ (ED: 943), if it was used in the dating formula between the year and the month, can be regarded as an equivalent for žūn~žyn < Chin. run [ mund ] ‘intercalary, leap’ (MATSUI 2003: 58). For žyn ~žūn < Chin. run [ mund ] cf.: LIGETIVOC: 199 (under šūn); BAZIN 1991: 158, 301; VOHD13.21: 31 fn. 4. For the Uyghur’s twelve years animal cycle see: BAZIN 1991: 209–357.

254 For a detailed discussion of the meaning of ulag and the various compounds formed with this word, see: Chapter 5.1.

255 The word kitay originally denoted the Khitans, who were nomadic people seceded from the Xianbei people and lived in the upper valley of the Liao river, which lies in the northern part of China today on the border of Liaoning and Jilin provinces and Inner Mongolia. The Khitans appeared first time in the Chinese sources in the middle of the 6th century. After they established the Liao (907–1125) dynasty in China the word frequently meant ‘China, Chinese’ (DTS: 637). Their dynasty was destroyed by the Jurchen people in 1125. Due to this event some of the Khitans moved westward under the leadership of the charismatic ruler Yelü Dashi and established the Kara Khitai empire (1124–1218). For the early history of the Khitans see: TWITCHETT–TIEZTE 1994; for the history of the Kara Khitai empire: BİRAN 2005. In this case kitay is probably a personal name, due to the title daruga which follows it. According to Rásonyi it was a practice among the Turkic people to name their children after people’s name (RÁSONYI 1953: 337–345), or more particularly after the defeated enemy (people, country and sovereign) at the time of birth (RÁSONYI 1976: 216). For Kitay as a personal name see: RASCHMANN 2012: 306; RYBATZKI 2006: 467. The Mongolian daruya(či) means ‘government, chief, superior, chairman, commander; director, manager, elder’ (TMEN I: 319–323, Nr. 193; LESSING 1973: 234). Donald Ostrowski assumed a dual administrative structure of the Mongol Empire what goes back to Chinese origins. In this dual administrative system daruya(či) was a civilian governor, and the baskak was a military governor. (OSTROWSKI 1998: 263–274). Lately István Vásáry challenged this theory. He pointed out that the etymological background of the two words are the same, namely both derive from the verb ‘to press’ (Mongolian: daruγa-, Turkic: bas-), and that the baskak served as the basis for the Mongolian loan translation daruga. Additionally he stated that the duties and competences of the officials were never so strictly divided in the nomadic societies of pre-modern Eurasia (VÁSÁRY 2015: 255–256). A full account on the extremely rich literature concerning this title: TMEN I: 319–323, Nr. 193; SH II: 961–962, §263. In this context the expression kitay daruga most probably means a governor (daruga) whose name was Kitay. The same person appears in the 4th line of U 5283 V.

256 The word elči has to meanings: according to Erdal: the original Old Turkic meaning was ‘Staatsmann’, which later during the Mongol period adopted a secondary meaning as ‘Botschafter, Kurier’ (ERDAL 1993: 94–99). Due to this ambiguity it is not always possible to decide which meaning should be translated in the documents. Therefore I let the expression in its original form in my translations. For elči as ‘envoy, ambassador, representative of government in foreign countries’ cf.: ED: 129; TMEN II: 203–207, Nr. 656.

257 The origin of the Turkic word yam and Mongolian jam are not yet clear (cf.: TMEN IV: 110–118, Nr. 1812; SERRUYS 1957: 146–148; and Chapter 6.1 of the present study). The basic meaning of the word is ‘a posting station’ (ED: 933), but in the Mongol period it meant the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire in general too. This word appears also in PO12 and UlReg01.

258 The Old Turkic šig originally was a unit of capacity and later became a measure of land like küṛi, what was smaller amount in a decimal measurement system (i.e. 10 küṛi = 1 šig). In these documents both appear in the first meaning, as a unit of capacity. As Nobuo Yamada pointed out the šig corresponded to the Chinese ＃ shi what was equal ca. 84 litres, while küṛi corresponded to Chinese dou ＃ what was equal to 8.4 litres (YAMADA 1971: 491–493; MATSUI 2004a: 200). Dai Matsui suggested that in the Mongol period the šig of the Uyghurs were officially equalized to the Mongolian tayar (which was itself originally a Turkic word) (MATSUI 2004a: 199).

259 According to Doerfer the word tümen is originally Turkic. It was borrowed in to Mongolian as, tümen, and later borrowed back to Turkic (TMEN II: 632–642, Nr. 983). Recently Andris Rõna-Tas and Árpád Berta confluted Doerfer’s thought and brought up the idea that the word most probably originates from a language which disappeared, e.g. the Ruanruan language (WOT II:932–935).The meaning of the word in Mongolian is ‘ten thousand, the masses, multitude, myriad’ (LESSING 1973: 853). In the Mongol period it meant a military unit containing theoretically 10000 soldiers, but in fact normally the number of soldiers in a tümen was less. Later it
given to Kitay daruga, together with three olpak\textsuperscript{260} [to] Bürüngüdäy... $g$ for going to […]. So many\[\ldots]\textsuperscript{9-12}(eight) horse-\textit{ulag}, five \textit{küri}\textsuperscript{261} flour, together with four wide-cotton clothes equivalent to the olpak they, Yalin (and) Ögrünč Buka shall give that in full.

\textsuperscript{260} A short padded jacket for winter journeys on horseback (TMEN II:111–112, Nr. 527).

\textsuperscript{261} It is a measure of capacity for dry goods like grain (ED: 737a). According to Yamada and Matsui 1 \textit{küri} is equal to 1 Mongolian \textit{šim} and to 1 Chinese \textit{dou} 头 what is ca. 8.4 litre (YAMADA 1971: 491–493; MATSUI 2004a: 200). Contrary to this in Farquhar’s handbook 1 \textit{šim} is equal to 1 \textit{sheng} 升 what 0.9488 litres is (FARQUHAR 1990: 444).
PO02 MIK III 6972a (T I α)


Cit.: VOHD13.21: 28 (Nr. 7); MATSUI 2014a: 615, 617, 623 (Nr. 98 = H12).

Date: Mongol period (MATSUI 2014a: 632).

Transcription

1. ...a]y tokuz y(e)girmikä\textsuperscript{262} tanjuday
2. ...]Y-kâ\textsuperscript{263} bargu tört at
3. ...] adak äṭ on altì [...]

Translation

[...,[mo]nth on the 19\textsuperscript{th} (day). Taŋuday\textsuperscript{264} [...] four horses to go to [...] adak\textsuperscript{265} meat, sixteen (…)  

\textsuperscript{262} MATSUI 1999: yägrmikä.

\textsuperscript{263} MATSUI 1999: (.)-kā. From the context it is clear before the dative suffix, there must have been a toponym.

\textsuperscript{264} The same personal name appears in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} line of UlReg02 and in the 39\textsuperscript{th} line of UlReg07.

\textsuperscript{265} The word adak originally means ‘leg, foot’. In this context it is most probably used as a measurement for meat.
PO03 MIK III 6972b, c (T I α)

Publ.: MATSUI 1999: 160 (Text 29); MATSUI 2003: 64–65 (Text F).
Cit.: VOHD13,21: 28–29 (Nr. 8); MATSUI 2014a: 615–616, 621, 630 (Nr. 43 = E1).
Date: Mongol period, early 14th century (MATSUI 2014a: 630).

Transcription
1. koyn yıl tokuz-unč ay sækiz otuz-ka […]
2. mačar266 elşi-kä bergü yetk Kalın bö-z-tä kär-sin267 YL268 […]
3. …bütürüp269 berz[ün]

Translation
1. Sheep year, 9th month, on the 28th (day). 2. From the seven thick böz270 which ought to be
given to the Mačar271 elçi, Kär-sin[…] has to pay it in full.

266 M’Č’R.
267 K’RSYN. Same personal name appears in PL1 line 3.
268 MATSUI 1999: yaǐq.
270 Böz is an old international word goes back to Egyptian origin. On the history of the word see: ECSEDY 1975; RÖNA-TAS 1975; RASCHBAUMWOLLE: 20–25. The Turkic word böz originally meant ‘cotton, cloth’ (ED: 389),
but it has a wide range of meanings in the Uyghur documents. It used as clothing material, currency, ware, it was
the name of a tax, and was used in many other different ways. A fully comprehensive analysis of böz in Turkic
Central Asia can be found in: RASCHBAUMWOLLE.
271 According to Matsui (MATSUI 2003: 64) mačar is probably a loanword form the Persian mağar ‘Hungarian,’
(STEINGASS 1947: 1174). However it seems more probable that the word comes from a Kipchak language, very
likely from Cuman. For the various forms of the ethnonym Mačar or Majar from the Volga region from the
Mongol period see: VÁSÁRY 1975 and RÖNA-TAS 1986. The same name appears in Ch/U 7411 v.
PO04

U 5283 v (TM70)\(^{272}\)

**Publ.:** Matsui 1996: 25–26 (Nr. 11); Matsui 1999: 154–156 (Text 24); Matsui 2003: 58–60 (Text A).


**Cit.:** ZiemeWirtschaft: 333 fn. 9; Matsui 1998b: 32; VOHD13,21: 29–30 (Nr. 9); Matsui 2014a: 615–616, 621, 630 (Nr. 48 = E6).

**Date:** 1322 (Matsui 2003: 58).

**Transcription**

1. it yıl yana bešinč ay y(e)g(i)rmika\(^{273}\) tümän noyın-ka bergü altı

2. olpak tümän noyın-nő bitigi bilä\(^{274}\) bürünüşüday\(^{275}\)-kä bergü üç

3. olpak bila\(^{276}\) munča-ta\(^{277}\) yalın\(^{278}\) òğrùnë\(^{279}\) buka\(^{280}\) olar\(^{281}\) bir olpak

4. bütürüp kita\(^{282}\) daruga-ka berzün

---

\(^{272}\) Many interrelations can be detected between this document and PO01. Dai Matsui classified both documents as part of the so-called Kärsin-Yalin texts. Cf.: Matsui 2003; Matsui 2014a: 621–622.


\(^{277}\) Matsui 1996: -tan.

\(^{278}\) Y’LYN. Matsui 1996; Matsui 1999: yaliq.

\(^{279}\) ‘WYKRWNČ.


\(^{282}\) QYD’Y.
Translation

1 Dog year, the 5th intercalary month on the 20th [day]. From as many as the six 2.3 olpakought be given to the tümän noyın, together with the tümän noyın’s document, (and) together with the three olpak ought to be given to Bürüngüdäy. Yalın and Ögrünç Buka, they shall give one opak in full to Kitay daruga.

283 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
284 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
285 It is an unclear part of the document. The word bitig originally was a general word for everything what is written: ‘inscription, book, letter, document, etc.’. In the civil documents it is quite common, in the sense of ‘document, contract’ (ED: 303; DTS: 103). Cf.: LIGETIVOC: 143; TMEN II: 262–264; BODROGLIGETI 1965: 108–109; LIGETIVOC2: 17; CLARKINTRO: 218–246.
287 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
This document and the Käz01 are written by the same hand. Cf.: Matsui 2014a: 623.


TWYNKL.

LWKČWNK.

It is very likely that this yumis is a variant of yumašči which has a secondary meaning in DTS as: посланник (‘messenger, envoy’) (DTS: 280).


LWKČWNK. MATSUI 1996: lükčüng.

LDYN.

Q’BY.


MATSUI 1996: bägi.

MATSUI 1996: birzün.
Translation

Ox year, the intercalary 12th month, on the 1st new day. From the one led horse with fodder for three days for Töŋül elči; (and from) the two short distance ulag for the travellers of the bāqs, to go to Lükčün as messengers by riding, further on from the one short-distance ulag for Kıdı elči to go to Lükčün by riding, Altın Kabı shall give one short-distance ulag to Kay-a bahšı.

302 For žün < Chin. run see: LIGETI/VOC: 199 (under šün); VOHD13,21: 31 fn. 4. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.

303 For a detailed discussion of the meaning of boguz at see: Chapter V.

304 The word bāq originally meant ‘the head of a clan or tribe, a subordinate chife’ in Old Turkic (ED: 322), later many different meanings added to it, but it remained basically a title of nobility. Cf.: TMEN I: 235–238, Nr. 11; TMEN II: 389–406, Nr. 828; ÖZYETGIN 2006.

305 The Chinese origin of the Uyghur city name Lükčün is Liu-zhong, and it is identical with the contemporary Lukčun in Xinjiang (MATSUI 2015b: 275 and 294 fn. 5).

306 The Buddhist title bahšī ‘master’ originates from the Chinese bo-shi (ECS005 1965: 90). Cf.: TMEN II: 271–277, Nr. 724. Later in Mongolian the word was used in a different meaning, it meant the scribes who were skillful in the Uyghur-Mongol alphabet. The first appearance of the word in Mongolian text can be dated to 1345 in an inscription written in phags-pa script at Ju-yong-guan. After the 13th century the word spread in this secondary meaning in the Turkic languages too. Later with the spread of the Islam culture and as the Uyghur script lost its importance step by step, the word bahšī was used in general for the scribes in the Turkic world. Cf.: POPPE 1957: 60–62; 63–66; LIGETI 1972b: 86, 88; VÁSÁRY 1987a: 120–122. Nevertheless the Uyghur literacy had a second heyday in the Timurid period in Central Asia, and scribes were employed to maintain correspondence in Uyghur script even at the chancellery of the Ottoman Empire in Constantinople in the 15th century (VASÁRY 1987a: 122–126).
PO06  U 5291 ([T I] D 51/T.M. 91.)

Publ.: MATSUI 1996: 61 (Nr. 34); MATSUI 1998b: 35–37; MATSUI 1999: 130–132 (Text 6); MATSUI 2014b: 93.


Cit.: HUKVES: 37 (Nr. 165/16); ZIEME 1974: 300; RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 39, 45, 99, 120 (Nr. 24); MATSUI 1998b: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10-11, 12, 13, 31, 41, 52; VOHD13,21: 33–34 (Nr. 14); MATSUI 2014a: 615–616, 617, 622, 624, 631 (Nr. 73 = G7); MATSUI 2014b: 96, 102.

Date: 1358 (?) (MATSUI 1999: 130).

Transcription

1. it yıl bir y(e)g(i)rminč ay tört y(a)ŋıka
2. tämür buk-a elči-kä yoln-ka
3. bergü bir kö(lü)k t[ägä]läy-ni tüütün-
4. tin öṭämiš k(a)y-a bir altın tämür
5. bir mušı oglı bäküz bir altın
6. yolç- bir bilä bir ton altın
7. darm-a iki kar-a k(a)y-a bir
8. yöläk bir bilä bir ton bu iki
9. käpäz-lig ton-ka bir köl(ü)k böz
10. tägäläy berzün.

---

309 T'MWR.
310 PWQ-'.
315 MATSUI 1996: ödımiš.
317 T'MWR.
319 P'KWZ.
320 YWLČY.
322 D'RM-'.
325 YWYL'.
326 MATSUI 1996: käpäz-lg, MATSUI 1998b: käpäzlig
Translation

1. Dog year, 11th month, on the 4th new day.

2. (The one load) (cotton?) jacket what is ought to be given [to] Tämür Buka elći for his journey, was paid from the tütün-(labour service).

4-6. (In terms of) one garment, consisting of Kaya’s one (tütün-unit), Altın (the lower?) Tämür’s one (tütün-unit), Báküz the son of Muši’s one (tütün-unit), Altın (the lower?) Yolčı one (tütün-unit).

6-8. (And) one garment consisting of Altın (the lower?) Darma’s two (tütün-units), Kara Kaya’s one (tütün-unit), Yölük’s one (tütün-unit).

8-10. For these two cotton-padded garments [käpäzîg ton] one load of cotton [böz] jacket shall be given.

328 In order to make a better understanding of the text the translation is segmented according to the text’s structure.

329 The interpretation of the 3rd word in the 3rd line and the 4th word in the 9th line is problematic. The translation of the word in the 3rd line is: KWK, while the translation of the word in the 9th line is KWYLK. Lately Dai Matsui read the first as kürk ‘fur’ (ED: 741), while the second as külk, however he translated both words as kürk into Turkish. Moreover he did not translate the word böz, which followed the külk in the 9th line (MATSUI 2014b: 93). Simone-Christiane Raschmann read the word in the 9th line as kölfüjk and translated it as ‘Ladung’ (RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 45, 120). I followed Raschmann’s reading in the 9th line and considered the word in the 3rd line as mistyping.

330 Matsui’s idea that tängäliy ~ dängäliy is a loan of the Mongolian degelei ‘camisole, one courte pelisse; jacket, camisole, short fur garment; Jacke mit kurzen Ärmeln’ is convincing (MATSUI 1998b: 35, cf.: KOWALEWSKI III: 1740; LESSING 1973 243; TMEN I: 327–328, Nr. 200). The same word appears in the 3rd line of UlReg10. However, only tängäliy (‘jacket’) is written in the 3rd line, due to the structure of the text this jacket is identical with the böz tängäliy of the closing form, so it is likely that the word böz (‘cotton’) is missing from the 3rd line.

331 The same personal name appears in the 2nd line of UlReg18.

332 Arat read it yulğ-ka and translated it as ‘iš iç’in’ (HUKVES: 37). Lately Dai Matsui listed yulğ among various taxes and labour services, but he did not add any further comment on it (MATSUI 2014a: 624). Here I would offer a new reading according to Dr. Simone-Christiane Raschmann’s suggestion. The final velar guttural and the final ⟨n⟩ can be written with the same shape in the cursive style Uyghur script, so it is possible to read this part as yolın-ka ‘for his journey’, yol ‘road, way’, plus +In possessive suffix, plus +KA dative suffix. The same phenomenon can be detected in the 2nd line of PO15, in the 4th line of OAcc03 and in the 6th line of *U 9168 II (MATSUI 2008b: 14).

333 The original meaning of the word tütün was ‘smoke’. According to Clauson it is likely that in the civil documents it meant a hut tax (ED: 457–458). Matsui regarded tütün as a labour service which was a part of the kalan, what was the general term for the various types of labour services (as: kalan, kavt–kavui, kapi–kapig, basig, salig, etc.). He added that the kalan in the Turfan region covered several labour services, which were connected to the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire. (MATSUI 2005: 73–75). In other words it is not improbable that the tütün-service somehow was connected with the postal relay system. The tütün-service appears in the following documents also: Kâz01, UlReg09, U 5292, U 5305, Mi20 in SUK. Lately Dai Matsui in his edition took ötämii as a part of a personal name: Ötämiš-Kaya (MATSUI 2014b: 93), however it can be regarded as the inflected past tense form of ötá ‘to carry out an obligation, to pay a dept’ (ED: 43). In my translation I applied this interpretation.

334 The original meaning of the word altın is ‘below, beneath, lower’ (ED: 131), however it is often used as a part of personal names. Cf.: OT I: 57–60. The same phenomenon can be observed in the 5th and 6th lines of this document.

335 The meaning of yolČi was ‘guide’ (ED: 921), but it was used often as a personal name too. In this case most probably it should be translated as a personal name. For Yolči as personal name see: OT: 348. Yolčи appears as ‘guide’ in the 3rd line of PO08, and in the 4th line of UlReg08, but in this case it is not clear in which sense.
Bu iki pamuklu giysi yerine bir kürk ceket versinler.

Tütün, Qara bir (çeyrek), Muši oğlu Bäküz bir (çeyrek), vergi) olarak verilen bir kürk ceketi (için),

Date: Yuan period (Matsui 2014a: 616).

Transcription

1. küskü,türgü; 2. kitir; 3. tuzgu-ka; 4. acari; 5. amti ok; 6. -ka tapşuruzun

However, the interpretation of the last part is very problematic, the structure of this document sheds light on the on the functioning of the tütün-tax. In my interpretation tha paid amounts were detracted from the tütün-tax, what would have been bir kölök tügälāy (one load of jacket), but it was paid in kāpāzīg ton böz (cotton padded garment).

Matsui 2014b: “Köpek yılının onbirinci ayının dördüncü gününde, Temür-Buqa elći’ye (kendisinin) yulfı (-vergi) olarak verilen bir kürk ceketi (çin), tütün (hizmeti)’den başka, Ötemiş-Qaya bir (çeyrek), alındı. Temür bir (çeyrek), Muši oğlu Bäküz bir (çeyrek), alındı. Yolčï kölük tägäläy (one load of jacket), but it was paid in kāpāzīg ton böz (cotton padded garment).

Matsui 1996, Matsui 1999: yngïqa; Tugusheva 2013: y(a)ngïqa.


Usp: အခြေခံ.


Matsui 1999: ta.

K’vs’dy. Usp: ; HukVes: keysedü; Geng 2006: käysädü; Tugusheva 2013: q(a)yso (?).

Usp: ; Tugusheva 2013: ačï.

Twy. Tugusheva 2013: ačï.


Matsui 1999: ’ädgü.

Usp: ; Tugusheva 2013: on.


**Tsyz. Usp: ; Matsui 1999: atsiz; Tugusheva 2013: ats//z (?).

Matsui 1999: oyli-.

Usp: ; HukVes: tapšuruz-un; Tugusheva 2013: bar(? b(as)ulz-un.

153
Translation

1 Rat year, 5th month, on the 3rd new day. 2 For the elčis coming from Kitir as provision [tuzgukal] from the produced wine Kävsädi 3acarı (and) Tipi shall give twenty batman good wine immediately, and hand it over to Āsän (and) Atsiz, to them.

357 The word *tuzgu* originally meant: ‘a gift of food given to a traveller’ (ED: 573b), cf.: TMEN II: 506–508, Nr. 900. In this context the *tuzgu* is rather a levied tax than a gift, this is the reason of my translation ‘as provision’. It seems like the Uyghurs used a word which were used traditionally to describe the free willing supplying of the travellers, for a new commitment, which were levied by the Mongol state.

358 ačarı < Skr. ācārya ‘master,’ the title of teaching Buddhist monks (UW I: 39–40).

359 The Uyg. batman ~ Mong. badman was originally a measure of capacity for grain. The DLT explains it as a measure: “bir batmān āt A manā of meat.” (DLT I: 334). In the Sino-Uyghur vocabulary from the Ming period it is ‘balance’, ‘un catty equivalent à 16 once’ and ‘mesure de poids’ (LIGETI VOC: 140). Nobuo Yamada mentioned that the word batman has two equivalents in Hua-yi-yi-yū, namely cheng ‘a steelyard, a weighing machine, a name of weight unit’ and jin ‘sixteen ounces Chinese scale’ (YAMADA 1971: 498). In the second appendix of Farquhar’s handbook about the government of China under the Mongol rule we find that 16 liang is equal to 1 jin which is equal to 1 Mongolian badman what is 596,82 grams (FARQUHAR 1990: 443). Dai Matsui showed that the Uyghur batman and Mongolian badman corresponds to Chinese jin (MATSUI 2004a: 200 fn. 10 refers to MATSUI 2002: 111–112). In the Uyghur documents batman was used frequently as a measure of wine or other liquids. Apart from this document we can observe the same phenomenon in: UlReg04 and Ch/U 7017. Meanwhile in UlReg08, UlReg11 and in U 5665 v batman is used as a measure of grain or meat. In UlReg06 batman is used both as a measurement for liquids and grain.

360 TUGUSHEVA 2013: “В год мыши, в пятом месяце, в третий [день] нового [месяца]. Посланникам (поверенным) правителя, которые прибудут из Кетира! От вина, положенного доставить для встречи(?) (~ доставить в Тушгу?), пусть Кайсо Ачи ныне (~ сейчас) отдаст десять [из] двадцати батманов хорошего вина, которые он должен отдать. Эсену и Атс[ъ]зу, им, пусть будет определено (~ на них возложено?) ///(?).”
PO08 U 5329 (T II B 28)

**Publ.**: USP: 156 (Nr. 93); LI 1996: 190; MATSUI 1996: 76 (Nr. 47); MATSUI 1999: 188–189 (Text 54); MATSUI 2010a: 26–28; MATSUI 2014a: 613 (Nr. 1 = A1).


**Cit.**: CLARKINTRO: 443 (Nr. 109); ZIEMEHANDEL: 239; UMEMURA 1981: 60, 62, fn. 18; YANG 1990: 18; VOHD13,21: 48–49 (Nr. 30); RASCHMANN 2009: 409; 411–413; MATSUI 2014a: 612–613, 615–617, 629 (Nr. 1 = A1).

**Date**: West Uyghur period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

**Transcription**

7. toñuz yıl üçünč ay bir Y/[...]

8. msydr³⁶²-lar-nuŋ bir yol at[ın]

9. taykay³⁶⁴-taki yolči-ka berz-ün

---


³⁶² MSYDR. USP: (\text{...}); LI 1996: m(a)smad(a)r; MATSUI 1996: msmdr.


Translation

1 Pig year, 3rd month, on the 1st/11th (day). The Nestorian presbyters [msydr] shall give one of their road horses [yol atin] to the travel guide in Taykay.

365 On the manuscript only the initial yod is readable. Due to this it can be amended either as yagı ‘first’ or yeg(i)rimi ‘eleventh’. About the dating of the Uyghur civil documents see: CLARKINTRO: 266–297.

366 The Old Turkic form goes back to a Sogdian masēδar (also can be found as: mśydr, mśyδ’r or m’śydr) ‘presbyter, priest’. This expression shows, that the people who had to give the horse were officers of the Nestorian religious community (also known as: The Church of the East). Cf.: RASCHMANN 2009: 413; MATSUI 2014a: 613.

367 The word yolčı can be taken as a personal name as well, but in my opinion the above interpretation fits better to the context. Yolčı appears as personal name in the 6th line of PO06. It appears also in the 4th line of UIReg08, but it is not clear in which sense.

368 USP: “Im Schweinjahre, den dritten Monat, am eiumundzwanzigsten Tage möge man ein Weg-Pferd von den M(a)smad(ar) für den in Tajaky befindlichen Wegführer geben.” MATSUI 2014a: “The Boar year, the 3rd month, on the 1st [day]. The Nestorian presbyters (msydr) shall deliver one of their horses for travel to the travel guides (bound) for Tayqay.”
Publ.: MATSUI 2015a: 66–68 (D20).
Fac.: MATSUI 2015a: 80.
Cit.: VOHD13,22: 19 (Nr. 270); MATSUI 2014a: 615–616, 620–621, 630 (Nr. 42 = D20).
Date: 1286 or 1298 (MATSUI 2014a: 620–621).

Transcription
1. melik\textsuperscript{369} temûr\textsuperscript{370} ogul-nuŋ
2. it yîl onûnç aîy aît ôñâika
3. uz-\textsuperscript{371} bay\textsuperscript{372} eltûr selib-a\textsuperscript{373} elêî
4. –niñ nôkôr y(a)nÊ a yisûdär\textsuperscript{374} el(ê)[ê]
5. yol aẓûk-luk bergû üç tayak êt
6. aît ôñû min-tä turpan-ta kânêmdu\textsuperscript{375}
7. bir tayak êt iki ôñû min
8. bûtûrûp b[erzû]n\textsuperscript{376}

\textsuperscript{369} MYLYK. MATSUI 2015a: milik.
\textsuperscript{370} T’MYR.
\textsuperscript{371} ’WZ.’.
\textsuperscript{372} P’Y. MATSUI 2015a: b(o)įr.
\textsuperscript{373} ŠYLYP.’. MATSUI 2015a: siliba.
\textsuperscript{374} YYSWD’R. MATSUI 2015a: yisûdär.
\textsuperscript{375} Q’NYMDW. MATSUI 2015a: qanîmdû.
\textsuperscript{376} MATSUI 2015a: b(i)[r][šû][n].
Translation

1Prince Melik Temür’s (order): 2Dog year, 10th month, on the 6th new day. 2aUza Bay carries (this order?). From the three tayak meat and six küri flour what shall be given for the nökör(s) of Seliba elči and for Yisüdar elči as provision for the journey, 6. 8Kanmdu from Turpan shall deliver one tayak meat (and) two küri flour.

377 Matsui identified this Milik Tämür with the Mongol prince Melig Temür, who was the youngest son of Ariγ Böke. After his father’s death in 1264 he took over his territories in the region of the Altai Mountains. He was an ally of the Ögödeid Qaidu against the Yuan Dynasty. In 1296 he surrendered to the Yuan, and in 1306 he went to China, where he was executed in 1307 (MATSUI 2014a: 620–621).

378 The first part of this name, the Old Turkic word uc means ’a skilled craftsman’ (ED: 277). These separated alifs are often a part of proper names. Cf.: GOT: 353. The Old Turkic word bay means ’rich, rich man’ (ED: 384), and frequently used as a part of proper names.

379 The word tayak originally meant ’prop, support’ or ’walking stick’ (ED: 568; cf.: TMEN II: 445–446, Nr. 865). In this document it seems to be a measurement unit of meat.

380 It is a measure of capacity for dry goods like grain, ca. 8.4 litre. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.

381 Uyg. nökör < Mong. nökör originally meant ’friend, comrade, companion, husband’ (LESSING 1973: 593) In the Mongol Empire nököd (plural form of nökör) meant the companions and personal dependents of the ruler or noblemen. They played a key role in the transformation of the Mongol society from the time of Činggis Khan. The word appears frequently already in the SH. For a detailed description of the word and its history with further literature cf.: TMEN I: 521–526, Nr. 388.; SH: 256–257; WOT: 623–624 (in the entry: nyögér).

382 Seliba < Syr. Šelībā (~Šelivā). This Syrian-Nestorian proper name appears in another Uyghur document too (*U 9000), which was published by Simone-Christiane Raschmann (RASCHMANN 2008: 123–129). This name occurs in the Syrian-Nestorian inscriptions of the Semirechye region as well. Cf.: CHWOLSON 1890: 134–135.


384 The word yol means ’road, way’ (ED: 917a). The azuklug (–azuklug) originally meant ’having food for a journey’ (ED: 284) or ’mit Verpflegung/Proviant ausgestattet’ (UW: 327). According to Röhborn it is a translation from the Chinese liang. Cf.: TMEN II: 56–57, Nr. 475. The same expression appears in the second line of Ch/U 7213.

385 The same personal name appears in the 13th line of PO19.
PO10

*U 9180_Side 2 (a)\(^{386}\)

**Publ.**:
USP: 56–57, 223 (Nr. 39/1); LI 1996: 320 (6.12/1); ÖZYTEGIN 2004: 187–188 (Nr. XIII/1); TUGUSHEVA 2013: 101–102 (Pa 14a).

**Cit.**:
HUKVES: 36 (121 b/R 39); CLARKINTRO: 454 (Nr. 134); MATSUI 2014a: 614–616, 618, 620, 629 (Nr. 20 = C9).

**Date**: Early Mongol – Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

**Transcription**

1. ...] bir at ber[zün]...

**Translation**

1. [...] one horse shall gi[ve...]

---

\(^{386}\) This document was quoted as *U 9188 in the earlier literature, but lately Dr. Simone-Christiane Raschmann identified it as the other side of *U 9180.

\(^{387}\) USP: неп (нім); LI 1996: бир(тім); ÖZYTEGIN 2004: бер(дим); TUGUSHEVA 2013: бёр<...>.

\(^{388}\) USP: “ein Pferd habe ich gegeben.”; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: “(1)... bir at verdim....”; TUGUSHEVA 2013: “<...> [я] дал(?) одну лошадь.”
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**PO11**  
*U 9180_Side 2 (c)*

**Publ.:** USP: 56–57, 223 (Nr. 39/3); LI 1996: 320 (6.12/3); ÖZYETGIN 2004: 187–188 (Nr. XIII/3); TUGUSHEVA 2013: 101–102 (Pa 14c); MATSUI 2014a: 614 (Nr. 22 = C11).  
**Cit.:** HUKVES: 36 (R 39); CLARKINTRO: 454 (Nr. 134); MATSUI 2014a: 614–616, 618, 620, 629 (Nr. 22 = C11).  
**Date:** Early Mongol – Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

**Transcription**

1. takıgu 389 yıl biry(e)g(i)rminč 390 ay 391 yetи yañka 392  
2. äŋürün 393 elči-kä yar 394 ka 395 bargu on at 396  
3. –ta 397 tämir 398 yastuk-ı 399 bir at berzü(n) 400

**Translation**

1. Fowl year, 11th month, on the 7th new day. 2. From the ten horses for Äŋürün elči to go to Yar, Tämir Yastuk-ı shall give one horse. 401
PO12  *U 9241 (TM 69)

**Publ.:** Matsui 2013: 428.

**Facs.:** Matsui 2013: 432.

**Cit.:** Matsui 2014a: 615–616, 620, 624, 630 (Nr. 39 = D17).

**Date:** Early Mongol – Yuan period (Matsui 2014a: 616).

**Transcription**

7. ud yil sakininç ay tokuz
8. yanjı-ka yeṭär\(^{402}\) elci-kä yürüncin\(^{403}\)
9. –ka\(^{404}\) bargu tört at ulag-ta .
10. nampi\(^{405}\) -ta [tä]mir-çï\(^{406}\) buyan\(^{407}\) tükäl\(^{408}\)
11. /[...]WNG č(a)gan\(^{409}\) k[u]h\(^{410}\) bilä bir at
12. berip yam at san-inta tutzun

\(^{402}\) YYD’R. Matsui 2013: yider.

\(^{403}\) YWYRWNKČYN. Matsui 2013: yürüncin.

\(^{404}\) Matsui 2013: -ka.

\(^{405}\) N’MPY.

\(^{406}\) MYR-ČY.

\(^{407}\) PWY’N.

\(^{408}\) TWK’L.

\(^{409}\) ČQ’N. Matsui 2013: çgan.

\(^{410}\) Q[W]LY. Matsui 2013: (k)[u]h.
Translation

Ox year, 8th month, on the 9th 2nd new day. From the four horse-ulags for Yetär elçi to go to Yürüşčin, Tämir-çi, Buyan (and) Tükäl, [...].WNG with Çagan Kulı from Nampı shall give one horse and take it into account as postal horse[-tax].

411 Cf.: OT II: 345.
412 As it was proofed by Matsui Yürüçın was the Uyghur name of the modern Ürümchi. Cf.: MATSUI 2013.
413 According to Matsui Nampı can be identified with the oasis of Nan-ping 南平 from the Gaochang Kingdom (4th–7th centuries) and Tang period (7th–9th centuries). The same toponym can be found in a document from the period of the West Uyghur Kingdom (Og. Ry. 1696), and in the 4th line of PO22. In the Uyghur texts appears a Lampı variant of this toponym too (U 5288; U 5510, Helsinki University Library No. 17). According to Matsui the Uyghur Nampı-Lampı* is identical with the Modern Uyghur Lampu (Chin. Le-mu-pi 勒木丕) (MATSUI 2013: 428 fn. 6; MATSUI 2015b: 288–292; 294).
414 The basic meaning of the word yam is ‘a posting station’ (ED: 933), but in the Mongol period it meant the whole postal relay system of the Mongol Empire in general too. So the literary meaning of yam at is ‘postal horse’; however Professor Dai Matsui called my attention to a possible abstract interpretation of the expression as: ‘postal horse-tax’. As he pointed out in several cases, in the Uyghur official decrees a single noun before the expression samunta tutzun or sanka tudup ‘take in to account’, can be taken as a name of a tax. He detected this phenomenon in the case of: bor ‘wine-tax’ (U 5323) (MATSUI 1998b: 47–48); tütün ‘smoke-tax’ (PO06, Käz01, U 5292, U 5305, Mi20 in SUK) (MATSUI 2002: 108–109); sag ‘land-tax’ (SI Kr I 149) (MATSUI 2004: 18–19). The word yam also appears also in PO01 and UIReg01. For further literature on yam see: the notes for the translation of PO01.
415 MATSUI 2013: “Şiğır yıl(ının), sekizinci ayn(ın) dokuz(uncu) gününde. Yiider elçi’ye (verilerek) Yürüşçım’a gidecek dört menzil atılarından, Nampı (şehir) ‘daki Temirçi, Buyan, Tükel, (.....)ung ve Çagan-Kuli ile bir at verip, posta atı hesabına kaydetsin.”
The next five documents compose a group of five administrative orders from the Mongol period (13th–14th centuries) which was unearthed at the Bezeklik Caves near Turfan (today: PRC, Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region).


GENG 1980: ilcining.


GENG 1980: atlaringa; at-l(i)r(i)nga.

WELI 1984: bïrgü.


WELI 1984: b(a)γ.

GENG 1980: sa-man (;); WELI 1984: (;) ikï t(än) g s(a)m(a)n (;); MATSUI 2009, MATSUI 2014a: saman-ta.


WELI 1984: b(a)γ.

Translation

The Ox year, 11th month, on the 9th new day. 2-3 (From) the twenty bundles of hay and two sacks of straw (as fodder) for the middle (-distance) horses of Índu, Бökän-šäli shall deliver ten bundles of hay.

---

431 The Old Turkic *tagar* meant ‘a large container, a sack’ (ED: 471b). It became a loan word in Mongolian (*tayar*) as a grain measure unit which corresponded to Chinese *shi* (*dan* 叢, ca. 84 litre, and later was re-borrowed to Uyghur in this meaning (Matsui 2004a: 197). However in this case due to the large amount which the *tagar* as grain measure unit meant, it is more probable that it have to be translated here with its original Old Turkic meaning (cf.: Matsui 2009: 341).

432 Here I accept the reading of Umemura and Matsui who connect the word ḏūḷi with the Mong. ḏūḷi ‘half, middle, middle of the day or night, noon, midnight; middling, mediocre, average; halfway, partly’ (Lessing 1973: 280). Contrary to Umemura’s ‘usual horse’ interpretation of ḏūḷi at Matsui explains it as ‘middle (-distance) horse’ what I find more probable. According to Matsui it would be a horse for ‘middle distance’ transportation between the long (uzun *ulag*-uzun *at*) and short (kisga *ulag*-kisga *at*) in the postal relay system (Matsui 2009: 340–341). For the citation and refutation of the other readings: Matsui 2009: 340 fn. 5.

433 However Geng and Umemura’s reading as Ḳgdu is not improbable, here I accept Matsui’s opinion and read this proper name as Índu. The personal name Índu ‘Indian’ seems to be common in this period. Matsui refers to two attestations: one is in the 8th line of SUK Lo03 (the original signature of the manuscript is Ot. Ry. 2733; SUK II: 87–88; the facsimile is published in SUK III: Table 73–74); the other is a Sino-Mongolian inscription from 1362, in memory of Prince Hindu, first edited by Cleaves (Matsui 2009: 340; Cleaves 1949a). Prince Hindu’s name is written as Índu in the Mongolian text (Cleaves 1949a: 68). Volker Rybatzki quotes some further appearance of the name (Rybatzki 2006: 127–130). The following presences of the name in the form *Intu*, in the Uyghur documents of the Berlin collection can be added: UlReg07 line 5, 14 and UlReg08 line 13.

434 This person appears in the PO13–PO15 documents as the provider of fodder for the horses of the envoys. It is very likely that the other two Bezeklik orders (PO16–PO17) are connected with him, but they are hardly damaged, so this personal name did not preserved. Matsui explains the first part of the name from the Modern Uyghur *bökkän* ‘antelope’ (Matsui 2009: 341). The second part of the name is a Buddhist title *śāli* (<Chin. *she-li* 闍梨) (cf.: Hamilton 1984). Based on these and on the fact that these manuscripts were unearthed at Bezeklik, Dai Matsui assumes that Bökän-śāli was a Buddhist monk who lived at the Bezeklik cave temples. Matsui 2009: “; The year of ox, the eleventh month, on the ninth (day). 2-3 Of twenty bundles of hay and two sacks of straw (as fodder) for the middle (-distance) horses of ambassador Índu, Бökän-śāli shall deliver then bundles of hay.’ Matsui 2014a: ‘;The OX year, the 11th month, on the 9th day. 2-3 Of 20 bundles of hay and 2 sacks of straw (as fodder) to give to the middle(-distance) horses of Ambassador Índu, Ðökän-sâli shall deliver 10 bundles of hay.’
PO14 Bezeklik Text 2


Date: 1313 or 1325 (MATSUI 2009: 345).

Transcription

1. ud yıl biry(e)g(i)rминç436 ay tokuz437 y(e)g(i)rmи438
2. –ka439 al[a]ču440 elči-niŋ441 ulag442 at-lar-
3. ka443 bökän444 šäli445 bir446 tagar447 saman448 ikinti449
4. [käzig]-{k}a450 berz-ün451

436 GENG 1980: bir ýgrminç; UMEMURA 1981: birigirminç; WELI 1984: (i)r ý(i)rminç MATSUI 2009: birigirminç
437 WELI 1984: törт.
438 GENG 1980: ýgrmi-; UMEMURA 1981: ýgirmi; WELI 1984: ý(i)g(i)rm MATSUI 2009:ýgrmi-
439 GENG 1980: gä (); WELI 1984: gä ().
441 GENG 1980: ilcining; WELI 1984: ilči n(i)ng.
442 WELI 1984: ul(a)r.
446 WELI 1984: b(i)r.
447 WELI 1984: t(än)g.
448 WELI 1984: s(a)m(a)n().
Translation
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Ox year, 11th month, on the 19th (day). For the ulag-horses of Alaču elči, Bökän-šäli shall give one sack of straw (as fodder), as the second turn (of the levied labor).

452 Because of the next word (elči) it is sure that this word must be a proper name. Unfortunately none of the so far published facsimiles’ quality is high enough to allow a certain reading, therefore lately Matsui decided to give only a transliteration of the name. Here I would like to express my gratitude to Professor András Róna-Tas for his suggestion of the reading as Alaču. This personal name appears in a Byzantine source (Notitiae Sugdaeae) from the Mongol period as Άλατζ(ού) as a name of a Christianized Tatar who died in 1291. In the same source appears the name Άλατζόδοκ too as a proper name of a Christianized Tatar who died in 1302. (BYZTURC II: 61; OT I: 43). The meaning of the word is ‘small (emergency) tent’. Cf.: TMEN II: 97–102; ED: 129.

453 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO13.

454 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO13.

455 Here I follow Matsui’s interpretation. Due to the last word of the 3rd line (ikinti ‘second’) it is very likely that the document ended with the usual closing form of the so-called käzig-docmunets (cf.: the käzig-documents in this work). The original meaning of the Old Turkic word käzig is ‘a turn (which comes from time to time); an intermittent illness’ (ED: 758b). In the Uyghur documents it has an additional meaning: ‘turn of labor service’. According to Matsui, it is a calque of the Chinese fan (MATSUI 2009: 342). For a detailed analysis of käzig and of the origins of taxations system in the West Uyghur Kingdom: MATSUI 2008a.

456 MATSUI 2009: “The year of ox, the eleventh month, on the nineteenth (day). One sack of straw (as fodder) for the horses of ambassador ’(.J(.ČW, Bökän-šäli shall deliver (it) instead of the second turn (of the levied labor).”
PO15

Bezeklik Text 3


Date: 1313 or 1325 (MATSUI 2009: 345).

Transcription

1 ud yıl čahšap\textsuperscript{457} ay iki\textsuperscript{458} otuz-ka\textsuperscript{459}

2 oglan-nŋ\textsuperscript{460} at-lar-in-ga\textsuperscript{461} on bag\textsuperscript{462} ot\textsuperscript{463}

3b bir tagar saman\textsuperscript{464}

3a {bir tagar saman} bökn\textsuperscript{465} šali\textsuperscript{466} berzün\textsuperscript{467}

\textsuperscript{457} GENG 1980: caγsaput; UMEMURA 1981: čaxšapat; WELI 1984: č(aq) s(a)pit; MATSUI 2009: čxâpt.

\textsuperscript{458} WELI 1984: ikü.

\textsuperscript{459} GENG 1980: otuzγa (.), WELI 1984: otuz-qa (.).

\textsuperscript{460} GENG 1980: ulayγing; UMEMURA 1981: ulaγ(?)-ning; WELI 1984: ulan n(i)ng.

\textsuperscript{461} GENG 1980: atlayγa (γa); UMEMURA 1981: at-lar-qa (qa); WELI 1984: at-l(i)r-in-γa.

\textsuperscript{462} WELI 1984: b(a)γ.

\textsuperscript{463} WELI 1984: ot (.),

\textsuperscript{464} GENG 1980: (bis taγar saman); UMEMURA 1981: biš [taγar saman]; WELI 1984: b(i)r t(än)g s(a)m(a)n.


\textsuperscript{466} Ś’LY. GENG 1980: salı; UMEMURA 1981: Sali; WELI 1984: s(a)lı.

\textsuperscript{467} GENG 1980: birz-ün (.), WELI 1984: b(ä)rz-ün (.)
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Translation

1. Ox year, 12th month, on the 28th (day). 2-3 For the horses of the Prince, Bökän-šäli shall give ten bundles of hay (and) one sack of straw (as fodder). 469

468 The most difficult part of the edition of this text was the interpretation of the last two lines. On the one had the first word of the 2nd line is hard to read; on the other hand the first part of the 3rd line is deleted, but seemingly the same words were written next to it, but lower than the original. Finally Dai Matsui could clarify the emerged questions, and pointed out that the two problems are connected. In the following I introduce his interpretation. Geng read the first word of the 2nd line as ulag ‘relay horse’, what is not improbable, because in the 2nd line of the PO14 appears the ulag at expression, like in another Uyghur document as well (cf.: UlReg07), and in the form at ulag is quite common (cf.: PO01, PO12, PO21, PO22, PO24, Oacc01, UlReg04, UlReg14, Ch/U 7300.). Nevertheless this construction does not fit to the context of this document. Additionally it is hard to imagine that they would be connected with genitive (+nXŋ) and possessive (+Xn) suffixes. Umemura and Weli interpreted the same word as personal names, but it did not solve the problem either. Matsui read the word as oglan ‘son, prince as a member of the Chinggisid house’ (for the latter meaning see: TMEN II: 78–79; Nr. 498). With this interpretation the deleting in the third line became easily explainable, namely on official documents the name of the members of the Chinggisid house have to be lifted above the other lines. This is the so called “honorific lift” (cf.: PO24). Cf.: CLARKINTRO: 17, 435. Matsui assumes that the scribe forgot to stick to this rule, and when he noticed the error, he deleted the part bir tagar saman of line 3a and wrote it again in line 3b in the correct form (MATSUI 2009: 343).

469 Geng and Umemura read the word as beš ‘five’, but the reading of Weli and Matsui as bir ‘one’ seems more convincing. Matsui argued that in the PO13 amount of provision was ‘twenty bundles of hay and two sacks of straw’, then here if the first part is the half of that (‘ten bundles of hay’) it is more probably that the second part will be the half (one sack of straw) too (MATSUI 2009: 343).

470 MATSUI 2009: “1. The year of ox, the twelfth month, on the twenty-second (day). 2-3 Bökän-šäli shall deliver ten bundles of hay and one sack of straw (as fodder) for the Prince’s horses.”
PO16–PO17

Bezeklik Text 4-5\(^{471}\)


**Facs.:** GENG 1980: 84; MATSUI 2009: 350.


**Date:** 1313 or 1325 (MATSUI 2009: 345).

**Transcription**

**PO 16**

1 ud yıl [\(^{472}\)]

2 elči-niŋ [\(^{473}\)]

3 bir tagar sam(an) [\(^{474}\)]

**PO 17**

1 ud yıl ča(h)šap(u)t ay üč [\(^{475}\)]

2 -kä kodur\(^{476}\) elči-niŋ a(t)[\(^{477}\)]

3 [ ] on (bag) [ot] \(^{478}\)

---

\(^{471}\) These two orders are written on one sheet, both are hardly damaged. The lower part of the PO16 is mostly missing. Geng Shimin handled them as one document (GENG 1980: 84).

\(^{472}\) GENG 1980: ud yïl c(aysaput ay) · · · · · · ; UMEMURA 1981: ud yïl [çaxš]apat ay]///; WELI 1984: ud yïl /// ///.

\(^{473}\) GENG 1980: ilcíning (atlarïnga); UMEMURA 1981: ilči –ni[ng]; WELI 1984: ilči n(i)ing /// ///; MATSUI 2009: ilči-niŋ \[at \].

\(^{474}\) GENG 1980: bir şayar sa (man) birz-ûn) (\); WELI 1984: b(i)r t(la)g s(a)m(a)n //.

\(^{475}\) GENG 1980: ud yïl čaγšapat ay üče; UMEMURA 1981: ud yïl čaxšapat ay üče [ygirmi] /// ///; WELI 1984: ud yïl č(a)š(p)i(t) ay üč /// ///; MATSUI 2009: ud yïl čxšpt ay üč ygrmi-.

\(^{476}\) QWDWR.

\(^{477}\) GENG 1980: (ygirmi-gä) (.) qodur ilcíning at (lariïnga); UMEMURA 1981: -kä [qodur ilči] ning // ///; WELI 1984: -gä (.) qudlug ilči n(i)ng at //.

\(^{478}\) GENG 1980: · · · · u (birz-) ün.; UMEMURA 1981: ... on /// ///; WELI 1984: /// /// on /// ///.
**Translation**

**PO17**

Ox year, [the XX month, on the XX (day)]. …..of XX elči…. one sack straw….\(^{479}\)

**PO18**

Ox year, 12\(^{\text{th}}\) month, 3\(^{\text{rd}}/13\(^{\text{th}}/23\(^{\text{rd}}\) (day)\(^{480}\). the horse of Kodur elči…. ten (bundles of hay)….\(^{481}\)

\(^{479}\)MATSUI 2009: ‘The year of ox, [the … month, on the … day]. 2…. [horse] of ambassador ….. 3one sack of straw ….’

\(^{480}\)Umemura completed this part to üč [ygrmi] ‘13\(^{\text{rd}}\),and Matsui considered the ygrmi readable here. On the basis of the available facsimiles I cannot identify this word, so I left the question open if that refers to the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\), 13\(^{\text{th}}\) or 23\(^{\text{rd}}\) of the month.

\(^{481}\)MATSUI 2009: “1,2 The year of ox, the twelfth month, the thirteenth day. [Of x sack of hay for?] the horse of ambassador Qodur …. 3ten(?)…..”
Transcription

6. küskü y(t)l č(a)h(š)ap[at] ay
7. –(k)a čanka sınnülük-täki
8. [b]altu bat[u]r mungü bir a[t
9. yüdgü bir at sınn[ğülük] T[
10. Q”T’KY (a)t-ta PY[

Translation

1Rat year, 12th month [...] on the [...] being in Čanka Sünülük [...] 3Baltu (and) Ba[t]ur [...] one riding horse [...] 4one pack horse Sünü{lü}g [...] 5K”T’KY from the horse(s) PY[...]

482 Matsuı 2010a: čx(š)ap[t] ay(b).
483 Č”NQ” SWYNKWLWK.
484 ’LTW. Matsuı 2010a: balu.
486 Matsuı 2010a: sün(g)[ğülük]
487 The interpretation is not clear for me so far, therefore I decided only to transliterate this part. Matsuı 2010a: qatägi.
488 Because of the suffix –tAKI it is very likely that it is a toponym. The first part Čanka means ‘a kind of game trap’ (ED: 425), while the second part sınnülük means ‘lancer’ (ED: 839).
489 The original meaning of the first proper name is ‘axe’ (ED: 333). The second part batur (≈ bagatur) is a very old loanword in Turkic from Mongolian, and it means ‘hero, knight, heroic, courageous, valiant brave’ (Les̆ing 1973: 68). Doerfer assumes this word was borrowed to Turkic languages in the Ruanruan period. For a detailed history of the word see: TMEN II: 366–377, Nr. 817; WOT: 106–107 (in the entry ‘bátor’). For the Mongolian name Bagatur see: RYBATZKI 2006: 209–210. The same proper name appears in the 16th line of UIReg06, and it appears as Bagatur in the 1st line of UIReg04.

**Facs.:** MALOV 1932: Tablet V.; TUGUSHEVA 2008: 48.

**Cit.:** HUKVES: 36 (Mal. IIa); CLARKINTRO: 457 (Nr. 141); RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 160 (Text 88); MATSUI 2010b: 57; MATSUI 2015b: 276–277; MATSUI 2014a: 615–617, 629 (Nr. 10 = B7).

**Date:** Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period (MATSUI 2014a: 616–617).

**Transcription**

16. 490-ulag 491-otuz böz ögüs buka 492
17. mümü ölç at tört äsgäk
18. azuk yügdü bir äsgäk . tuşü 493 [ ]/
19. –ka mümü ölç at iki äsgäk .
20. altmiş tökün 494-kä bir at iki
21. äsgäk . ulag 495-ulügdü 496 elci-kä törbi 497
22. elci-kä mümü sükiz at . bor
23. başlap barguçi iširâ 498-kä mümü
24. bir äsgäk ulag bilâ üç y(e)g(i)rmî 499
25. at altű y(e)g(i)rmî 500-äsgäk ulag-ta
26. pučâŋ 501-čiktn 502 birlâ bir at
27. bir äsgäk iki 503-ton-luk böz .
28. bilâ 504 ata 505-buka 506 kanımdu 507 inâki 508

490 Matsui in his both editions reconstructs a first line prior to this. He marked it as missing except three letters in the middle of the line which he transliterated as: 'WD (MATSUI 1996: 14; MATSUI 1999: 181).
492 'WYKWS PWQ'.
493 TYSYQ. MALOV 1932: Tysaq; MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: qişl-.
495 MALOV 1932: äškäk ułaŋ. .Probably the punctuation is written one word earlier than it should be.
496 WYLWWDW.
503 MATSUI 2014b: (i)ki.
29. bičkün [k]ayak-a b(i)lä kuvrk
30. ärkägü[n] el-tän bütürüp berz-ün

510 'YQ'. Q'NYMDW. MATSUI 2014b: qanimdu
511 'YN'KY. MALOV 1932: iki.
514 MALOV 1932: ikegü.
Translation

[...] ulag, thirty böz.515 (For) Ögüs Buka three mounts, four donkeys, and one provision carrying donkey. For Tişig one mount, two donkeys. 5.7. For Altmiş Tökün one horse, two donkey-ulags. For Ülügdü elći (and) for Törbi elći eight mounts. 7.9. For the arriving Işira who conducts the bor one donkey-ulag for riding. Altogether from the (above mentioned) 13 horse(s), (and) the 16 donkey-ulags: together one horse and enough böz for two garments, (and) together, Ata, Buka, Kanmdu, Inäki, Bičkün (they) together shall (collect it) from the people of the Buddhist community (and the) Christian community (and) pay it in full.522

515 The first part of the text is missing. In the summation in the 9th-10th lines 13 horses and 16 donkey-ulag (üç y(e)g(i)rmı al alt y(e)g(i)rmı iüşük ulag-ta) are mentioned. In the preserved text altogether 13 horses and 11 donkey-ulags appear, so most probably the missing part of the order disposed about five donkey-ulags.

516 Cf.: Torbi Taş (Rybatzki 2006: 415).

517 Işira as personal name appears in the 2nd line of Lo08 (SUK II: 91). There the two dots of the <š> are marked. Probably this expression (bor bašlap barguçı) refers to some similar activity like the kāpāz algali bargući in the 3rd line of PO22; and the bor sikturgalı kālgüči in the 3rd and 4th lines of PO23.

519 About the two cities, see: Matsui 2015b: 276–278.

520 The same personal name appears in the 6th line of PO09.

521 The same personal name appears in the 7th line of PO09.

522 MALOV 1932: “... вьючный скот, тридцать кусков холста, волов и быков, верховых трех лошадей, четырех ослов; для перевозки провианта одного осла; для Тысак: под верх одну лошадь, двух ослов; для Алтымыш (?) Тукун: одну лошадь, двух ослов - вьючный скот; послу Улюгду и послу Торпа: верховых восьми лошадей; начальнику (?) виноградников Баручи (?) Исчан верхового одного осла и как вьючный скот - тридцать лошадей; шестнадцать ослов - вьючного скота; Бучанг Чинатун: одну лошадь, одного осла, бязи на два платья и вола Канымду... вдвоем (?), в год выполнен, пусть даст.” MATSUI 2014b: “Of 13 horses and 16 postal-relay donkeys in total (above), together (from the cities of) Puçang and Ciqūn, 1 horse, 2 postal-relay donkeys and 2 cotton-cloth for clothes all together, (namely) Ata, Buqa, Qanimdū, İnäki, Baçaq, Qayaya, they shall deliver (them), collecting from people of the (Buddhist monastic) community and the Nestorian-Christian (monastery).”
PO20

SI O/39 (b)

Publ.: MALOV 1932: 140–143; MATSUI 1996: 14–16 (Nr. 5); MATSUI 1999: 181–185 (Nr. 49); MATSUI 2014b: 277 (only lines 2–8).


Cit.: HUKVES: 36 (Mal. II); CLARKINTRO: 457 (Nr. 141); RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 160 (Text 88); MATSUI 2010a: 30; MATSUI 2010b: 57; MATSUI 2015b: 277; MATSUI 2014a: 615–617, 629 (Nr. 11 = B8).

Date: Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period (MATSUI 2014a: 616–617).

Transcription

1. küskü yıl altunč ay b[ ]
2. y(e)g(i)rmikä yalkar elči-kä kor
3. kılmış kümüş-tä . pučaŋ
4. čiktın bilä beš s(ı)tı
5. üç bakır kümüš-ni
6. tümän buka' at to-tok
7. bičkün kayak-a olar bütürü[p]
8. berz-ün kuvrak ārkagün-lär
9. ...bjetürüp berz-ün.

524 MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: ygrunikä
526 MALOV 1932: suju.
527 PWČ’NK. MALOV 1932: Bučaŋ; MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: bučang
530 MALOV 1932: sḁtyr.
531 MATSUI 2014b: b[ba]qïr.
532 TWYM’NWQ’. 
533 MATSUI 2014b: ata.
534 ’T TWTWQ. MALOV 1932: at tutuq.
539 MALOV 1932: qujaq.
540 MALOV 1932: ikägün lär.
Translation

Rat year, 6th month, (the) 11th/15th (day). From the silver loss what have been caused to Yalkar elçi: 3 Pučaŋ (and) Čıktın (cities) and 3 bakır silver altogether,
6 Tümän Buka, At Totok, 7 Bičkün Kayak-a, they shall give it in full. The Christian and Buddhist communities have to give it in full.

The first element of the day is damaged, only the first letter is visible. It seems like an initial P. According to the counting method (the so-called staircase counting) which was used in the Uyghur documents, this damaged number must be one of the first ten numbers. Among these the bir ('one') and the beš ('five') starts with an initial P. The second word according the day of the date are clearly readable: ye(o)g(i)rmikä ('to twenty'). In sum there are two possibilities: the dating must refer to the 11th or to the 15th day of the month. About the staircase counting see: CLARKINTRO: 132–134.

About the two cities see: Matsui 2015b: 276–278.

The Old Turkic sıtır < Sogd. st'yr < Gr. stater ‘a silver coin’ was a currency unit or a unit of weight (ED: 802). In the Mongol period the system of silver ingots were unified throughout the empire. In this unified system one sıtır (Chin. liang; Mong. sijir; Pers. sîr) was equal to ca. 40 grams (MATSUI 2004a: 200).

According to Clauson originally bakır meant ‘copper, a copper coin’ or ‘the weight of a copper coin’ (ED: 317), but this document shows that in the Mongol period it was used rather as a unit in the system of silver ingots. According to Matsui it was the smallest unit of silver ingots (ca. 4 grams), and 1 bakır (Mong. bakir–baqir) corresponded to 1 Chinese qian which was equal to 1 mişqâl of the Persian sources (MATSUI 2004a: 200).

The same personal name appears in the 14th line of PO19.

MALOV 1932: “В год мыши, в шестой месяц, двенадцатого (числа); Улягур послу из серебра для военных надобностей (?) и Бучаң Чинатун пять сатьр и три бакыр серебра... Волов и лошадей (в поддержание...?) выполнив, пусть даст вдвоем... выполнив, пусть даст.” MATSU 2014b: “Of the silver that have been a loss (i.e., expenditure) for Ambassador Yilâgäy, 5 sıtır and 3 baqir of silver (from the cities of Pučang and Čiştìn altogether, Tümän-Buqa, Ata-totoq, Baçaq, Qayqa shall deliver (it) completely.”
The following four provision orders (PO21–PO24) are written on (probably) two separate sheets, but according to their orthography and content it is obvious that they belong together.


551 MATSUI 2015a: (ay).

552 USP: ; L1 1996: yagirmikä; MATSUI 2008a, MATSUI 2015a: yägirmikä.


554 TUGUSHEVA 2013: čerik.

555 MATSUI 2008a: klgüči; TUGUSHEVA 2013: kelgüči; MATSUI 2015a: klgüči.


557 TQRYL.


559 L1 1996: mün’gü.

560 This personal name appears in the other three SI Uig 14 documents (PO22, PO23 and PO24) as well. According to the other three documents here an alif is missing. These separated alifs can be a part of proper names. Cf. GOT: 353.


563 PWLMYŠ T’Z. USP: ; MATSUI 1996: tan; L1 1996: t(a)rz; ÖZYETGIN 2004: t(a)rš; TUGUSHEVA 2013: t(a)y.
14. kün⁵⁶⁶ berip üç bakır
15. kümüş kupčır-ka
16. tut-zun

⁵⁶⁴ MATSUI 2015a: (b)ir.
⁵⁶⁵ MATSUI 1996: birip.
⁵⁶⁶ MATSUI 1996: iki kün.
Sheep year, 7th month, 20th day. From the two horses for riding in the city, to Atay Togrıl (and) Košan, who are coming from the vanguard in order to take horses, 6-7Bolmïš-Taz (of) the Bačak-Tarkan’s hundred-household-unit shall deliver 1 horse-ulag, shall give it for 2 days and shall regard (it) as 3 bakır of the kupčïr(-tax).

The tarkan is an ancient title in Old Turkic, which (according to Pulleyblank) probably goes back to Xiongnu origins, but it can be attested in other Central Asian languages (Baktrian, Sogdian, etc.) in various forms. It was an early borrowing into Mongolian as darqan ‘a person exempt from ordinary taxation; artisan, craftsman’. In the Mongol period the title was used as a personal name too. Cf.: PULLEYBLANK 1962: 91; TMEN II: 460–474, Nr. 879; ED: 539–540; RYBATZKI 2006: 422–425 (under darqan).

The word yüz originally meant ‘hundred’ (ED: 983). In this case it probably refers to the traditional Inner Asian method of social and military organization, the so called decimal organization, in which the households were grouped in tens, hundreds and thousands. This method was in usage in the Mongol Empire too. On the decimal organization see: ATWOOD 2004: 139–140.

The kupčïr (< Mong. qubčiri) was originally a tax by the Mongols on cattle taken from the nomadic populace. Later it became a tax in cash, what was collected from all adult males of the settled population. In the Turfan region it was an additional tax imposed by the Mongols apart from the sale- and basic-taxes, and labour services. For the kupčïr in general see: PELLIOET 1944; SCHURMANN 1951: 303–306; SCHURMANN 1956; TMEN I: 387–391, Nr. 266; SMITH 1970; CLARKINTRO: 151–152; ÖZYETGİN 2004: 86–91. For the kupčïr in the Turfan region see: MATSUI 2005; MATSUI 2014a: 624–625.

The word kupčïr ‘silver of the cobchîr’ is attested in a number of Central Asian languages, notably Sogdian, in which it is written as *qubčiri* and is a tax and tribute paid by nomads. In the Turfan region it was an additional tax imposed by the Mongols apart from the sale- and basic-taxes, and labour services. For the kupčïr in general see: PELLIOET 1944; SCHURMANN 1951: 303–306; SCHURMANN 1956; TMEN I: 387–391, Nr. 266; SMITH 1970; CLARKINTRO: 151–152; ÖZYETGİN 2004: 86–91. For the kupčïr in the Turfan region see: MATSUI 2005; MATSUI 2014a: 624–625.

USP: “Im Schafjahre, den siebenten Monat, am zwanzigsten Tage hat er dem Adam Togril und Susang, die gekommen sind, um von den Vortruppen Pferde zu holen, unter den zwei Reitpferden den Batscha-Tak(?)-Regeln zuwider ein Pflicht-Pferd auf zwei Tage gegeben, dies möge er für drei Bakyr Silber auf den Koptschir anrechnen.” ÖZYETGİN 2004: “(1)Koyun yil, yedinci ay(ın) (2) yirmisinde ileri (dogudaki) ordu- (3) –dan at almak icin gelen (4) Adam Togrıl’a (ve) Susaŋ– (5) –a şehirde binilecek (6) iki attan Baçakatag (?) (7) nizamına aykırı olarak (8) bir atı ulak (ati olarak) verip iki (9) gün (icin) verip üç bakır (10) gümüş kupçîr’i (11) yerine geçsin”. MATSUI 2008a: “01-02 The sheep year, the 7th month, on the 20th day. 02-06 Of the two horses that Atay Togrıl and Qošang, who come from the vanguard in order to take horses, should ride in the city. 06-09 Bolmïš-Taz of Baçak-Taqan’s hundred-household-unit shall deliver one relay horse for two days and count (it) for 3 baqïr silver of kupčîr-tax.” TUGUSHEVA 2013: “Год овцы, седьмой месяц, двадцатый день. Адаю Тогрйлу и Сусангу, прибившим из Восточного Черика для получения пошадей, из [необходимых] для езды в городе двух лошадей, пусть [и] тамбун, находящегося на горе Бачаг, выдают (букв.: пусть стадо выдад) одну ездовую лошадь на два дня (букв.: в течение двух дней), и пусть [они] используют (букв.: держат) еë за три бакыра серебром в счет [налога] кобчйр.”

---

567 The tarkan is an ancient title in Old Turkic, which (according to Pulleyblank) probably goes back to Xiongnu origins, but it can be attested in other Central Asian languages (Baktrian, Sogdian, etc.) in various forms. It was an early borrowing into Mongolian as darqan ‘a person exempt from ordinary taxation; artisan, craftsman’. In the Mongol period the title was used as a personal name too. Cf.: PULLEYBLANK 1962: 91; TMEN II: 460–474, Nr. 879; ED: 539–540; RYBATZKI 2006: 422–425 (under darqan).

568 The word yüz originally meant ‘hundred’ (ED: 983). In this case it probably refers to the traditional Inner Asian method of social and military organization, the so called decimal organization, in which the households were grouped in tens, hundreds and thousands. This method was in usage in the Mongol Empire too. On the decimal organization see: ATWOOD 2004: 139–140.

569 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.

570 The kupçïr (< Mong. qubčiri) was originally a tax by the Mongols on cattle taken from the nomadic populace. Later it became a tax in cash, what was collected from all adult males of the settled population. In the Turfan region it was an additional tax imposed by the Mongols apart from the sale- and basic-taxes, and labour services. For the kupçïr in general see: PELLIOET 1944; SCHURMANN 1951: 303–306; SCHURMANN 1956; TMEN I: 387–391, Nr. 266; SMITH 1970; CLARKINTRO: 151–152; ÖZYETGİN 2004: 86–91. For the kupçïr in the Turfan region see: MATSUI 2005; MATSUI 2014a: 624–625.

571 USP: “Im Schafjahre, den siebenten Monat, am zwanzigsten Tage hat er dem Adam Togril und Susang, die gekommen sind, um von den Vortruppen Pferde zu holen, unter den zwei Reitpferden den Batscha-Tak(?)-Regeln zuwider ein Pflicht-Pferd auf zwei Tage gegeben, dies möge er für drei Bakyr Silber auf den Koptschir anrechnen.” ÖZYETGİN 2004: “(1)Koyun yil, yedinci ay(ın) (2) yirmisinde ileri (dogudaki) ordu- (3) –dan at almak icin gelen (4) Adam Togrıl’a (ve) Susaŋ– (5) –a şehirde binilecek (6) iki attan Baçakatag (?) (7) nizamına aykırı olarak (8) bir atı ulak (ati olarak) verip iki (9) gün (icin) verip üç bakır (10) gümüş kupçîr’i (11) yerine geçsin”. MATSUI 2008a: “01-02 The sheep year, the 7th month, on the 20th day. 02-06 Of the two horses that Atay Togrıl and Qošang, who come from the vanguard in order to take horses, should ride in the city. 06-09 Bolmïš-Taz of Baçaq-Taqan’s hundred-household-unit shall deliver one relay horse for two days and count (it) for 3 baqïr silver of kupçîr-tax.” TUGUSHEVA 2013: “Год овцы, седьмой месяц, двадцатый день. Адаю Тогрйлу и Сусангу, прибившим из Восточного Черика для получения пошадей, из [необходимых] для езды в городе двух лошадей, пусть [и] тамбун, находящегося на горе Бачаг, выдают (букв.: пусть стадо выдад) одну ездовую лошадь на два дня (букв.: в течение двух дней), и пусть [они] используют (букв.: держат) еë за три бакыра серебром в счет [налога] кобчйр.”
PO22

SI Uig 14/b

Publ.: USp: 90–91, 231 (Nr. 53/2); LI 1996: 198–202 (4.10 b); MATSUI 1996: 10 (Nr. 2); MATSUI 1999: 176–180 (Text 46); ÖZYETGIN 2004: 191 (Nr. XVI); TUGUSHEVA 2013: 136–137 (Pa 36b); MATSUI 2015a: 61–64 (B2); MATSUI 2015b: 289 (5b).

Facs.: TUGUSHEVA 2013: 317; MATSUI 2015a: 79 (reprint from TUGUSHEVA 2013).


Date: Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

Transcription

1. koyn572 yılkazinin æ yetï yan[[-ka]573
2. toksin574-takæ yetî yîlk b[a]575
3. käpäz algalı barguç yîgänçük576-
4. -kâ turmið-a577-ka578 nampî579-
5. –ka bargu iki at-ta
6. baçak-a (a)ɾkân580 yûz-intâ581
7. bolmiñ taz582 bir at ulag
8. berip üç bakr kümüš
9. kupçir-ka tuzun

573 USP: ئۇيغۇر ئۇزۇئىر دۇئۇر; LI 1996: y(a)ngi[qa]; MATSUI 1999: yangiça; ÖZYETGIN 2004: y(a)ŋ[-ka]; MATSUI 2015a; MATSUI 2015b: yngiça.
574 TWQSN.
577 TWRMYŞ-.
582 P’TLYS T’Z. USP: ئۇيغۇر ئۇزۇئىر دۇئۇر; LI 1996: t(a)ɾz; MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: tan; ÖZYETGIN 2004: t(a)ɾz; TUGUSHEVA 2013: t(a)].
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Translation

1Sheep year, 8th month, on the 7th new day. From the two horses for Yägänčük and Turmïš-a, who are going to Nampï in order to take the bundle of the seven year [yeti yılkı bag] cotton(-tax), (located) in Toksïn, Bolmïš Taz (of) the Baçak-a Tarkan’s hundred-household-unit shall deliver 1 horse-ulag and regard it as 3 bakır of silver of the kupčir(-tax).

---

583 The same personal name appears in the 5th line of OReg01.
584 The second line of this text has many different transcriptions and translations. In my interpretation the expression yeti yılkı ba[ğ] refers to some kind of tax. For the different kind of taxes in the Uyghur territories throughout the Mongol period see: MATSUI 2005.
585 Probably this expression (käpäz algalı bargučı) refers to some similar activity like the bor bašlap bargučı in the 7th and 8th lines of PO19, and the bor sikturgalı kälgüči in the 3rd and 4th lines of PO23.
586 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.
587 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
588 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.
589 USP: “Im Schafjahre, den achten Monat, am siebenten (Tage des) neuen (Mondes) hat er für Jekentschük, Turmisch un Ambi die bei den sieben Gemeinden, die am Toksïn sich befinden, den gesammten Kebes einzusammeln sich begeben, unter den zwei Fahrpferden den Batschaka-tak-Regeln zuwider ein Pflichtpferd gegeben, er möge es für drei Bakyr Silber auf das Kobtschir anrechen.” ÖZYETGIN 2004: “(1) Koyun yıh, sekizinç ay(ın) yedi(nci) gününde (2) Toksïn’daki yedi ili var (?) (3) pamuk almak için giden Yigençük- (4)e, Turmuş’a, Ambi- (5)’ya gidecek iki attan (6) Baçagatag nizamına (7) aykırı olarak bir ulak at(i) (8) verip üç bakır gümüş (9) kupčir zerine geçsin.” TUGUSHEVA 2013: “Год овцы, восьмой месяц, седьмой [день] нового [месяца]. Йегенчюку и Турмышу, направляющимся, чтобы получить находящийся в Токсуне хлопок [количеством] в семь лошадиных вьюков, из двух лошадей, [необходимых] для поездки в Амби, пусть [из] стада, находящегося на горе Бачаг,выдаст одну ездовую лошадь, и пусть [они] используют (букв.: держать) ее за три бакыра серебром в счет [налога] кубчир.” MATSUI 2015b: “‘The Sheep year, the 8th month, on the 7th day. Of the two really horses to go to (the city of) Nampi for Yagancuq and Turmiš, who are to go to take the cotton [from?] Yiti-ılayı-baγï in Toqsïn, Bolmïš-Taz who belongs to Baçaqa-Tarqan’s century (yüz) shall deliver (i.e. rent out) one relay horse [for two days], and count (it) for 3 baqïrs of silver of the kupčir-tax.’”
PO23

**Publ.:** USP: 91, 231 (Nr. 53/3); LI 1996: 199–202 (4.10 c); MATSUI 1996: 11 (Nr. 3); MATSUI 1999: 177–178, 180 (Text 47); ÖZYETGİN 2004: 192 (Nr. XVII); TUGUSHEVA 2013: 136–137 (Pa 36c); MATSUI 2015a: 61–65 (B3).

**Fac.:** TUGUSHEVA 2013: 317; MATSUI 2015a: 79 (reprint from TUGUSHEVA 2013).

**Cit.:** PELLIOIT 1944: 156–157; HUKVES: 36; TICHONOVCHOJI: 102; CLARKINTRO: 388–389, 442 (Nr. 107); MATSUI 2014a: 615–618, 624, 629 (Nr. 6 = B3).

**Date:** Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

**Transcription**

1. arg bökä-nin
2. koyın yil onunč ay bir
3. y(e)(g)(i)rmikä bor sikturgalï
4. kälgüčï korla elči k(a)ra
5. elči sogdi elči
6. olar-ka balik-ta mümgü
7. alti at ulag-ta bačak-a
8. t(a)ran yüz-intâ bolmiş
9. taz bir at iki kün
10. berip üc bakır kümüs
11. kupčir-ka tutzun

---

591 Li 1996: qoy(ın); ÖZYETGİN 2004: koy(ın).
593 USP: ÖZYETGİN 2004: bir.
595 TUGUSHEVA 2013: kelgüči.
600 USP: ； Li 1996: minγi.
605 Li 1996: üč.

182
Translation

Arıg Bökä’s (order): 2-3 Sheep year, 10th month, on the 11th (day). 3-7 From the 6 horse-ulag(s) for riding in the city for Korla606 elči, Kara elči (and) Sogdu elči, for them who came to (organize) the wine pressing607, 7-10 Bolımı-Taz (of) Bačak-a Tarkan’s hundred-household-unit608 shall deliver 1 horse (for) 2 day(s) 10-11 (and) regard it as 3 bakır609 of silver of the kupčir(-tax)610 611.

606 The city appears already on the map about the road system of the Han-dynasty as Karla (NEEDHAM 1971: Fig. 711, Nr. 48; cf.: the table one page 10). So Korla here might refer to an envoy from this city, but it can be a personal name too.

607 Probably this expression (bor sikturgah kälgüči) refers to some similar activity like the bor bašlap bargučı in the 7th and 8th lines of PO19, and the käpäz algah bargučı in the 3rd line of PO22.

608 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.

609 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.

610 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.

PO24  
SI Uig 14/d


**Fac.:** TUGUSHEVA 2013: 317; MATSUI 2015a: 79 (reprint from TUGUSHEVA 2013).

**Cit.:** PELLiOT 1944: 156–157; HUKVES: 36; TICHONoVOVCHOZİ: 102; CLARKINTRO: 388–389, 443 (Nr. 108); MATSUI 2014a: 615–618, 624, 629 (Nr. 7 = B4).

**Date:** Early Mongol (Pre-Yuan) period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

**Transcription**

1. kurumči ogul-nun⁶¹²
2. koyn⁶¹³ yıl biry(e)g(i)rminç⁶¹⁴ ay
3. bir otuz-ka bor-çı
4. salgar⁶¹⁵-ka bor targ(a)lı⁶¹⁶
5. balık-ta mängü⁶¹⁷ bir
6. at ulag bačak-a t(a)rk(a)na⁶¹⁸
7. yüz-inta⁶¹⁹ bolmuş taz⁶²⁰
8. berip bir yarım
9. bakır kümüş kupčir
10. –inja tutzun

---

⁶¹³ Li 1996: qoy(t)ın; ÖZİETGİN 2004: koy(t)ın.
⁶¹⁶ USP: ئوۇر; LI 1996: tary(l)ı; MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: tary(l); ÖZİETGİN 2004: tarsi(g)alı; TUGUSHEVA 2013: tərg(l)ı; MATSUI 2015a: tərg(l).
⁶¹⁷ Li 1996: miin gi.ü.
⁶²⁰ PWLMÝȘ T’Z. USP: ئورلر; LI 1996: t(a)rz; MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: tan; ÖZİETGİN 2004: t(a)rs; TUGUSHEVA 2013: t(a)y.
Translation

1 Prince^621^ Kurumči’s (order): 2,3 Sheep year, 11th month, on the 21st (day). 3,4 Bolmış-Taz (of) Bačak-a Tarkan’s hundred-household-unit^622^ shall give to Salgar^623^, the wine-merchant, to ride into the city for dispersing the wine 1 horse-ulag s-10(and) regard it as 1 and a half bakır^624^ of silver of the kupčir(-tax)^625^.

---

^621^ For the interpretation of the word ogul as ‘prince’ see: TMEN II: 81–82, Nr. 502.
^622^ Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
^623^ The same personal name appears as elči in the 16th line of UlReg08.
^624^ Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
^625^ Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.
^626^ USP: “Des Korumtschi Ogul. Im Schafjahre, den elften Monat, am einundzwanzigsten Tage hat er dem Weingärtner (?) Salgar, der die Wein(stöcke) besorgt, in der Stadt ein Pflichtprerd den Batschaka-tak-Regeln zuwider gegeben. Anderthalb Bakyr Silber soll er dafür auf seinen Koptschir anrechnen.” ÖZYETGİN 2004: “(1) Korumći Ogul’un (2) Koyun yıl, on birinci ay(in) (3) yirmi birinde şarapçı Salgar’a (4) şarap üretmek için (5) şehride binilecek bir (6) ulak atı Baçaga-tag (7) nizamına aykırı olarak (8) verip bir buçuk (9) bakır gümüş kupcir (10) yerine geçsin.” TUGUSHEVA 2013: “Корумцы Огула. В год овцы, в одиннадцатом месяце, в двадцать первый [день].Виноградарю Шалкару для езды в городе при возделывании винограда пусть выдадут одну ездовую лошадь [из] стада, находящегося на горе Бачаг, и пусть он использует (букв.: держит) ее за полтора бакыра серебром в счет [налога] кубчир.”
9.1.2 Käzig orders

Käz01 U 5284 (TM 68)


Cit.: HUKVES: 57; CLARKINTRO: 149, 444 (Nr. 111); UMEMURA 1981: 60–62; YANG 1990: 18; MATSUI 1998a: 050 fn. 11; VOHD13,21: 30–31 (Nr. 10); MATSUI 2010a: 40; MATSUI 2014a: 615, 617, 622–624, 632 (Nr. 84 = G18); MATSUI 2014b: 103.

Date: 1349 (?) (MATSUI 2002: 108).

Transcription

1. ud yıl čahš[apa]627 ay iki oţuz-[ka]628
2. buyan629 tāmūr630 elči-niň nökör
3. -lärin-gā kāzig631 aš-ka bergū632 bir
4. sak āt633 beš t[i ámb][in]634 bor-ni tü[tū][n]635
5. [sa]n-ka636 tu[tup tärbiš k(a)y-]637
6. beržün

---

628 HUKVES: oţuz-ka; GENG 2006: oţuzqa.
629 PWY’N.
630 TMWR. See also ZiemeSklav:76.
632 HUKVES: bir-gü.
Translation

1 Ox year, 12th month, on the 22nd (day). 2-4 The one sak\textsuperscript{638} meat (and) the five tämbin\textsuperscript{639} wine (which are) ought to be given as regular provision [käzig aš\textsuperscript{640}] to the nökör\textsuperscript{641} of Buyan Tämür elći, 4-6 shall be given by Tärbiş\textsuperscript{642} Kaya and shall be taken into account as tütün- (labour service)\textsuperscript{643}.

\textsuperscript{638} sak < Persian sāq ’The leg from the ankle to the knee, the shank’ (STEINGASS 1947: 642), in the Uyghur documents it is used as a measure unit of meat. Matsui mentions the Mongolian köl ‘foot, leg’ (LESSING 1973: 483), what was also a unit of meat, but it could be a unit of weight too (MATSUI 2004a: 200 fn. 9). The sak appears also in the 4th line of UIReg08 and in the 1st line of U 5999.

\textsuperscript{639} The Uyghur tämbin (Mong. tembin) was a measure unit for liquids. Already Nobuo Yamada pointed out that 30 tämbin were equal to 1 kap (YAMADA 1971: 493–495). Later Dai Matsui involved Chinese and Mongolian materials into the investigation and pointed out that tämbin was the smallest measurement for liquids, which was ca. 0.28 litre (MATSUI 2004a: 197, 200).

\textsuperscript{640} The Old Turkic käzig is ‘a turn (which comes from time to time); an intermittent illness’ (ED: 758). For a detailed description in the Uyghur documents, see the notes for the translation of PO14. The Old Turkic aš menas ‘food’ in a broad sense (ED: 253). So here the expression käzig aš most probably means ‘regular provision’.

\textsuperscript{641} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO09.

\textsuperscript{642} The same proper name appears frequently in the Uyghur civil documents. Cf. SUK II: 290.

\textsuperscript{643} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO06.

\textsuperscript{644} HUKVES: “1Sıgır yılı, on ikinci ayın yirmi ikisinde 3Buyan-Temür elçinin adamlarına 3sira yemek için verilen bir 3şiğ et, beş tembin şarabı, Turlan 3hesabına kaydedip, Takış-Kaya 3versin.”
Publ.: USP: 34–35, 220 (Nr. 25); LI 1996: 188–189 (4.4); ÖZYTEGIN 2004: 178; TUGUSHEVA 2013: 100 (Pa 12).
Cit.: HERRFAHRDT 1934: 100; HUKVES: 35; CLARKINTRO: 441 (Nr. 103); ZIEMEHANDEL: 239; VOHD13,21: 35–36 (Nr. 16); MATSUI 2005: 74; MATSUI 2014a: 615, 617, 623–624, 632 (Nr. 87 = H1).
Date: Mongol period (MATSUI 2014a: 623).

Transcription

1. Ityl säk(i)żinč645 ay
2. [ik]i646 y(e)g(i)rmikä647 bu tuš-ta
3. elči-l(ä)r648 tilär bolup kal[an...]649
4. [kọ]p650 iš bolmıš üčün
5. inčü sikuš-ka651 bilä inčü
6. borluk-či652 käzigṭä653 barča
7. basig salg654 bergü bolmü[$]
8. üčün nom külü655 čipin656
9. bay tämür657 bu üčägü658
10. [salg]-n659 buyan k(a)y-a660-ka
11. berz-ünü661

---

646 TUGUSHEVA 2013: iki.
647 USP: jäkirmikä; LI 1996: yägirmikä.
650 USP: (кён); TUGUSHEVA 2013: //.
651 USP: кылыкы; LI 1996: qïlïγ-ï; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: kılık-ı; TUGUSHEVA 2013: qïlïγ-ï(?)
652 USP: порлукчы.
654 USP: парсун сальк; LI 1996: barẓun salïγ; barzun salh.
655 NWM QWLY.
657 P’Y T’MWR.
658 TUGUSHEVA 2013: üč(ï)gü.
659 USP: (саллык)ыны; LI 1996: [saliγ]-ñï; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: [salhı]-ñï; TUGUSHEVA 2013: <...>'Y-ñï
661 USP: (пер)кэң. 
Translation

Dog year, 8th month, 2-4 on the 18th (day). Because this time the elčis (behaviour) became stubborn, and the duties (of) kalan multiplied, with the (amount marked out for) fief, all of the winegardener(s) of the fief in the [i.e.: as a part of] käzig shall give basig (and) salıg. Because of this Nom Kuhl, Čipin (and) Bay Tämür, this three, shall give (their salı)g to Buyan Kaya.

In a broader sense kalan together with birim alm covered all taxes and labour services. In a narrow sense kalan meant labour service and corresponded to Mong. alban, however it could be paid in money or produce. According to Matsui kalan included several types of labour services like túltun (cf.: the notes for PO06), kävit, kapı, basıg salıg, sikiš and käzig. In the Turfan region kalan could cover some labour services which were connected to the postal system (MATSUI 2005: 72–74, 78). Cf.: TMEN III: 488–490, Nr. 1503.

About the Old Turkic inčü Clauson writes: ‘which at any rate in the medieval period had much the same meaning as English ‘fief’, that is ‘a piece of land granted by a ruler on condition of the performance of certain services’, and, by extension, ‘the person(s) bound to perform such services.’’ (ED: 173). Cf.: TMEN II: 220–225, Nr. 670; MORIYASU 2004b: 238.

Most probably sikiš was a kind of labour service, which was a part of the kalan, and possibly concerned the postal system (MATSUI 2005: 72–74, 78). Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.

According to Matsui basıg and salıg were some kind of labour service, both were a part of the kalan (MATSUI 2005: 72–74, 78).  

The same personal name appears in the 3rd and 21st lines of UlReg09.  

In the 35th line of UlReg07 appears the personal name Buyan-a Kay-a.  

USP: “Im Hundejahre, den achten Monat, am zwölften Tage. Da zu dieser Zeit Wingärtner erwünscht sind, weil sehr viel Arbeit ist, so mögen nach Gebrauch der Domänen die Domänengärtner der Reihe nach Alle hingehen. Da der Salyk(?) zu geben ist, soll Nom -kuli, Tschidin und Bai -Tämür, alle drei ihren Salı(?) vergeben. Nom Kuły, Çatın, (?) Bay Temür, diese drei (?) Salı(?) gaben (liest: Buğan Kay-a).” TUGUSHEVA 2013: “В год собаки, в восьмом месяце, в двадцать второй [день], в виду того что в эту пору посланники (поверенные) правителя требуют [платы налога] kalan [на основании] положения о наследственных землях, то виноградарь - владельцы наследственных земель - согласно очередности (?) должны полностью уплатить [налоги] basıg и salıg. Ном Кулы, Чипин, Бай Темюр, эти трое <...> (?) пусть оплатят (букв.: отдадут) Буяну Кая.”
Käz03 U 5297 (T.M. 110)

Cit.: HKVES: 36, 57670; ZIEME 1974: 300; MATSUI 1998b: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 25, 32, 33, 39; VOHD13,21: 36–37 (Nr. 17); MATSUI 2014a: 615–617, 622, 624, 632 (Nr. 79 = G13).
Date: The middle of the 14th century (MATSUI 2014a: 617).

Transcription
1. [ bergü b[ir ]
2. // [ oni bir ula[g]
3. ödäm671 oni bir ulag [
4. oni bir ulag körpä sarig672
5. oni bir ulag košun taz673
6. oni bir ulag kün tapmuš674
7. oni bir ulag mayak bökän675
8. oni bir ulag b[ač]ak kül676
9. oni bir ulag noyın sarig677
10. oni bir ulag berz-ün
11. tüz yapa678 b
12. käzig -tin [b]ačak kül679 oni
13. mayak bökän680 oni bilä ulagčı
14. berz-ün yalan681[
15. bir ulag b[erip682 ]
16. käzig-kä [tutzun]683

---

670 Here under the wrong signal: 213/15.
671 'WYDM.
672 K'WYP' S'RYG. MATSUI 1996: küług qačan.
674 KWYN T'PMYS.
675 M'Y'Q BWYK'N.
676 P'[Č]'Q KWLY. MATSUI 1996: (...)Č'N qulï.
677 NWYYN S'RYG. MATSUI 1996: noyan qay(...)/.
678 MATSUI 1996: tôz yarba.
680 M'Y'Q BWYK'N.
682 MATSUI 1996: (...)////////.
683 MATSUI 1996: käsig-kä /////.
Translation

1[...] ought to be given one de crewsy
2the de crewsy one ula[...]
3Ödäm’s de crewsy one ulag,
4[...]
de crewsy of (...) one ulag, Körpä Sarig’s
decury one ulag, Košuŋ Taz’s
decury one ulag, Kün Ta pmis’s
decury one ulag, Mayak Bökän’s
decury one ulag, Bačak Kulı’s
decury one ulag, Noyın Sarig’s
decury one ulag shall give. 11Everything equal(ly) (shall be)
given.
5From the käzıg
6Bačak Kulı’s de crewsy (and) Mayak Bökän’s
decury altogether (one) stableman shall give. Yalan [...] one ulag g[ave...]
and take it into account] as käzıg.

684 The Old Turkic on means ‘ten’ (ED: 166). The inflected form oni in this case probably refers to the smallest decimal unit (i.e. a de crewsy) of the Mongol army or to the smallest decimal unit of the taxation (i.e. ten-household unit). About the decimal organization see: ATWOOD 2004: 139–140.
685 The personal name Körpä appears in the 2nd line of UlReg08.
686 According to the construction of the text the 11th line (tüz yapa b) is most probably a phrase which closes the earlier enumeration of burdens and separates it from the second part of the order, which starts from the 12th line. The tail of the <b> is extremely long, probably in order to fill out the whole line, and emphasize the separation. The word tüz means ‘level, flat, even’ and as an extended meaning ‘equal’ (ED: 571). The word yapa is quite rare in Old Turkic texts. According to Tezcan it is derived from the verb yap- and means ‘ganz, samt „alle, überall’ (BT III: 40, 106). The letter <b> is a common abbreviation in the Uyghur documents for the verb ber- ‘to give, to pay’. For the documents which contain this abbreviation see the vocabulary.
687 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.
688 Probably the same military unit’s name appears in the 5th line of Käz09.
Kāz04 U 5303 (Glas: T II D 68)


Cit.: CAFEROGLU 1934a: 40; HUKVES: 36, 57; UIGLAND: 300; CLARKINTRO: 445 (Nr. 115); UMEMURA 1981: fn. 33; YANG 1990: 19; MATSUI 1998a: 032; MATSUI 1998b: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10–11, 16, 40, 43; MATSUI 1999: 11–12; VOHD13,21: 39–40 (Nr. 20); MATSUI 2008a: 229–230; MATSUI 2014a: 615–616, 617, 622, 624, 631 (Nr. 76 = G10).

Date: 1360 (?) (MATSUI 1999: 134).

Transcription

1. küskü yıl č(a)hšap(a)lt
2. yaŋı-ka āl buq-a elči-kä
3. koluš bila bergü bir kap
4. bor-ni Altın sarıg oni
5. berip tokuz-unč käzig
6. –kä tuḍz-un

691 USP: بیرگی;
692 YAMADA 1968: birägü.
693 USP: ات ; ÖZYETGIN 2004: at.
694 USP: Altın ; ÖZYETGIN 2004: at-ni.
695 USP: ساکیز ; ÖZYETGIN 2004: sâkiz.
Translation

19th Rat year, 12th month, on the 6th new day. For Äl Buka elči together with the 3 kuluş-(tax)\(^{700}\) the one kap\(^{701}\) wine shall be given by the Altın Sarıg decury\(^{702}\), and (they) shall take it into account as the 9th turn of käzig\(^{703}\).\(^{704}\)

\(^{700}\) Malov in his note for this document regarded kuluş as some kind of tax. In the vocabulary he added that in the yarlıks of the Golden Horde it appears as: قولوش (USp: 237, 279). Vásáry and Muhamedyarov discussed kuluş together with koltka, and derived both from the verb kol- ‘to ask for, to pray’, and explain their meaning as request. They assume that these would be the Turkic equivalent for the Mongolian γuyul, which is an inflexion of γuyu- ’to request (MUHAMEDYAROV–VÁSÁRY 1987: 197). Özyetgin also regarded kuluş as a kind of tax (ÖZYETGIN 2004: 133–136).

\(^{701}\) The Old Turkic kap was a measure unit for liquids. Already Nobuo Yamada pointed out that 1 kap was equal to 30 tämbin (YAMADA 1971: 493–495). Lately Dai Matsui proved that 1 kap corresponded to 1 Chinese dou 穴, which was equal to ca. 8.4 litres (MATSUI 2004a: 197, 200).

\(^{702}\) The word säre originally meant ‘yellow’ (ED: 848). In this document surely it was used as a proper name for a decury (om, cf.: the notes for Käz03). The word altın ‘below, beneath, lower’ (ED: 131) here surely determine the following proper name (säre om). Two possible interpretation of this structure can be assumed. On the one hand altın säre om can be interpreted as ‘the decury of Little Säre’, as a (military-)unit led by a certain younger Säre. On the other hand altın säre om can be translated as ‘the lower Säre decury’. In this latter case the structure would refer to the military organization, where every military unit was categorized as either upper, middle and lower. (Cf.: HSIAO 1978: 72, 170–171, note 27; SMITH 2009: 65). The same proper name (Säre) appears in the 4th line of Käz09.

\(^{703}\) Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.

\(^{704}\) USP: “Im Maus-Jahre, im Tschaksapat-Monate, am sechsten (Tage des) neuen (Monats) hat El-Puka für den Eltschi und auf Frist ein Pferd zu liefern gehabt, er hat (dafür) ein Pferd angenommen und acht Bakyr gezahlt, er möge es auf die neunte Reihenfolge anrechnen.”; ÖZYETGIN 2004: “Fare yılı, ikinci ayın altı, (2) sında, Elçi El Buka’ya (3) kuluş (vergisi için) verilecek bir at (4) Altın sekiz bakır (5) verip dokuz üç (?) kişi için (6) alsın.”
Käz05 

U 5308 (T II D 238a)

**Publ.:** USP: 129, 236 (Nr. 75); LI 1996: 191 (4.6); MATSUI 1996: 41 (Nd. 24); MATSUI 1999: 174–175 (Text 43); MATSUI 2004a: 197; ÖZYETGİN 2004: 200–201.


**Cit.:** HUKVES: 37; TICHONOVCZOZI: 72; CLARKINTRO: 445 (Nd. 114); YANG 1990: 19; MATSUI 1998a: 050 fn. 11; MATSUI 2004a: 197; MATSUI 2004b: 164; VOHD13,21: 40–41 (Nd. 21); MATSUI 2010a: 40; MATSUI 2014a: 615, 617, 622, 624, 631 (Nd. 73 = G7).

**Date:** Chaghadaid Khanate period (after late 1320’s) (Matsui 2014a: 617, 631).

**Transcription**

1. it yıl b(i)r(ye)girmine nữ ay iki otuz-ka
2. yanja buka yocun eli-kä altu
3. otuz-ka-tägi kâz-igung aš-ka bir kap
4. bor-ni biküs buka be luk-1 berz-ün

---

710 LI 1996: qab.
Translation

1Dog year, 11\textsuperscript{th} month, on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} (day). 2,3 For Yaṇa Buqa and Yočı̈n elči\textsuperscript{713} as regular provision [kāzig aš-ka]\textsuperscript{714} till the 26\textsuperscript{th} (day), 3,4 Biküs Buqa’s vineyard shall give the one kap\textsuperscript{715} wine.\textsuperscript{716}

\textsuperscript{713} The same Yočı̈n elči appears in the 4\textsuperscript{th} line of document UlReg05 and in the 10\textsuperscript{th} line of UlReg08.

\textsuperscript{714} For kāzig aš see the notes for the translation of Kāz01.

\textsuperscript{715} Cf.: the notes for the translation of Kāz04.

\textsuperscript{716} USP: “Im Hundejahre, den elften Monats, am zweundzwanzigsten Tage. An Stelle des Kekä Buka möge dem Jütschin Eltschi am sechsundzwanzigsten für die der Reihe nach zukommende Speise sein Stellvertreter Piküsch Buka geben.”; ÖZYTEĞİN 2004: “(1) Köpek yılı, on birinci ay(ın) yirmi ikisinde (2) Yeke Buka Yüçin Elçi’ye (ayın) yirmi (3) altısı sırasıyla yemek için bir kap (4) şarabı Beküş Buka(nın) bağı versin.”; MATSUI 2004a: “,On the 22nd [day], the 11\textsuperscript{th} month, the year of the Dog. 2,3 For the provision (instead) of the levy labor in rotation (kāzig aš) until the 26\textsuperscript{th} [day] to [be delivered to] Yanga-Buqa and Ambassador Yočı̈n, 3,4 Biküs-Buqa’s vineyard shall deliver 1 gap of wine.”
Käz06 U 5314 (TII S 19b)


**Cit.:** HUKVES 36, VOHD13,21: 42–43 (Nr. 23); MATSUI 2014a: 615–616, 620, 624, 630 (Nr. 37 = D15).

**Date:** Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a:616, 630).

**Transcription**

6. [ta]vïš(a)n\(^{717}\) yïl onunç ay tört y(e)g(ı)rmikä\(^{718}\)
7. abišan-a\(^{719}\) bala toğa\(^{720}\) elçi-lär-kä kızıl\(^{721}\)-ka
8. [...]\(^{722}\) tört at-ta suvasdı\(^{723}\) onı\(^{724}\)
9. bir at baš käzig\(^{725}\) berip
10. lükčün\(^{726}\) turpan\(^{727}\) at-ka tuţzu[n]


\(^{720}\) ‘P’L’ TWNK’.

\(^{721}\) KYSYL.


\(^{723}\) SWV’SDY.


\(^{725}\) MATSUI 1996: käzig.

\(^{726}\) LWKČWNK.

\(^{727}\) TWRP’N.
Translation

1. Hare year, 10th month, on the 14th (day). From the four horses (which was given) to Abišan-a (and) Bala Toṣa elčis (to go) to Kızıl, the Suvasdı decury gave one horse as the first käzig, (and) regard it as a horse (on the route between) Lükčüŋ (and) Turpan.

728 The name Abiš appears in SUK II: 165 (Mi20, 5th line).
729 Concerning oni 'decury' see the notes for Kāz03. The same decury name (suvašdi oni) appears in MIK III 6283a.
730 The Old Turkic baš originally meant 'head, the beginning' (ED: 375). According to Matsui in a composition with käzig it means the first kāzig, i.e. the first turn of the kāzig labour service. Cf.: MATSUI 2008a.
Käz07

U 5665 r/1 (T II S 21)\textsuperscript{731}


\textbf{Date}: Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 616, 630).

\textbf{Transcription}

1. [ ]
2. [...\textit{y(e)g(i)rmik}\textsuperscript{732}]
3. [...\textit{yastuk tilagli}]x
4. [...\textit{grun}c t\textit{amur}\textsuperscript{733} a\textit{tay buka}\textsuperscript{734} yula altm[\textit{s}]\textsuperscript{735}]
5. [.../ki\textit{si on k\textit{un-l\textit{ik azuk-i}}]
6. [...\textit{sgik ulag bir k\textit{apaz-lik ton}}]
7. [...\textit{buetrup}\textsuperscript{736} berzun]
8. ...\textit{ka}\textsuperscript{737} bor m\textit{-\textit{a berip alt\textit{in\textit{c k\textit{azig-k\textit{a tu\textit{tzun}}}}}
9. .../\textit{NY m(\textit{t})sir}\textsuperscript{738} surup berzun

\textsuperscript{731} The following two documents are written on one sheet.
\textsuperscript{732} MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1998a, MATSUI 1999: y\textit{grmik\textit{a}}.
\textsuperscript{733} \textit{KRWN\text{\textsuperscript{\textit{C}}} T\text{\textsuperscript{\textit{MWR}}}.
\textsuperscript{734} 'D\textit{\textsuperscript{\textit{Y PWQ}}'}.
\textsuperscript{735} YWL’ ‘LTMY.
\textsuperscript{736} MATSUI 1996: \textit{undturup}.
\textsuperscript{737} MATSUI 1996: ///.
\textsuperscript{738} MSYR. MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1998a, MATSUI 1999: a\textit{srh}.
Translation

2[...]1Xth (day)\(^{739}\) [...] 3to seek the [...] \(yastuk\) Ögrünč Tämûr (and) Atay Buka\(^{740}\) (and) Yula Altmu\(š\)... 5man; the provision for ten days. [...]6do]-ulag 1 cotton garment[...] 7shall give in full. 8If \(\text{the } X \text{ ka}\)p wine are given, take it as the 6\(^{th}\) käzig\(^{741}\) [...] 9Misr\(^{742}\) shall follow and give.

\(^{739}\) Only the last word \(y(e)g(i)rnikâ\) remained from the dating, what means the date must be between the 11\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) day of the month. Cf.:

\(^{740}\) The name Atay appears also in PO21 as a part of Atay Togrıl.

\(^{741}\) Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.

\(^{742}\) The same personal name appears in the 18\(^{th}\) line of UlReg07, in the 9\(^{th}\) line of UlReg13 and in the 13\(^{th}\) line of UlReg18.
Käz08

Käz08

U 5665 r/2 (T II S 21)

Facs.: MATSUI 1996: Plate without Nr.; MATSUI 1999: Plate without Nr.
Date: Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 616, 630).

Transcription

1. –kā bargu iki at bir ulagči bilä
2. ...tiŋčañ yišiq-ı bilä bu künkä käzig
3. [b]erz-üň

Translation

1[...] together (with) 2 horses (and) one stableman to go to [...] 2 together with the rope(s) of the lamp shall give it as the käzig for today.

744 MATSUI 1996: (...)-Ç.
746 MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: (...)Z-WN
747 The word tiŋčan originates from the Chinese deng-chan 燈盞 ‘lamp, bowl’ (ED: 516; MATSUI 2014b: 100). In this case the expression tiŋčan yišiq-ı probably refers to the rope of the lamp, which was lighted.
748 Cf.: the notes for the translation of 14.
Käz09 Ot. Ry. 8127


Facs.: MATSUI 1998b: Plate VII.

Cit.: MATSUI 2008a: 229; MATSUI 2014a: 615–6, 617, 622, 624, 630 (Nr. 74 = G8).

Date: 1358 (?) (MATSUI 1999: 132).

Transcription

1. it yıl bir y(ç)g(ı)m[ınç ay.\textsuperscript{749}
2. oţuz-ka buk-\textsuperscript{750} ela[-kä
3. sukup\textsuperscript{751} bergü\textsuperscript{752} uć [čuval\textsuperscript{753}
4. altın sarıg\textsuperscript{754} oni\textsuperscript{755} bir čuval\textsuperscript{756}
5. oni\textsuperscript{757} bir čuval\textsuperscript{758} mayak bǔ[kän\textsuperscript{759} onı\textsuperscript{760}
6. bir [č]uval\textsuperscript{761} berip baş kā[z-
7. –ıg-kā tuṭzung

---

\textsuperscript{750} PWQ-'
\textsuperscript{751} MATSUI 1996: suruçp.
\textsuperscript{753} MATSUI 1996: čul.
\textsuperscript{754} S’RYQ.
\textsuperscript{756} MATSUI 1996: čul.
\textsuperscript{758} MATSUI 1996: čul.
\textsuperscript{759} M’Y’Q BW. MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1998a: mayaq PW(/)///.
\textsuperscript{761} MATSUI 1996: čul.
Translation

1st Dog year, 11th [month...] 2.42Xth (day)\textsuperscript{762}. [...] 3.4(From the) three [sack...] which ought to be filled\textsuperscript{763} (and) given to Buka elći, the Altın Sartıg decury\textsuperscript{764} gave one sa[ck\textsuperscript{765}...] decury gave one sack, Mayak Bū[kän’s decury]\textsuperscript{766} gave one sack. This shall be regarded as the 1st turn of kāzīg\textsuperscript{767}.

\textsuperscript{762} Only the last word o\textit{tuz-ka} remained from the end of the dating, what means the date must be between the 21\textsuperscript{th} and 29\textsuperscript{th} day of the month. Cf.: with the notes for the translation of PO08.

\textsuperscript{763} Matsui firstly derived this word as sugap ‘to draw out, or drain off’ (MATSUI 1996: 62), later he changed his opinion and read it as sukup (MATSUI 1998a: 29; MATSUI 1998b: 38; MATSUI 1999: 133). The original meaning of suk- is ‘to insert, thrust in’ (ED: 805), but in this context I think it refers to the sacks which ought to be filled or stuffed, probably with hay or straw.

\textsuperscript{764} The same structure appears in the 4\textsuperscript{th} line of Kāz04.

\textsuperscript{765} Here I follow Dai Matsui’s interpretation, who derived this word from the Persian ġ\textit{nuwil} ‘a sack, bag; half of (a horse-) load’ (STEINGASS 1947: 376). Later the word became a part of the Turkic lexicon, in Zenker’s dictionary: ‘Sack (von grober Leinwand), Getreidesack’ (ZENKER 1866: 369).

\textsuperscript{766} The same proper name appears in the 7\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} line of Kāz03.

\textsuperscript{767} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.
Käz10

SI Kr. IV. 604/a


Cit.: MATSUI 2008a: 229; MATSUI 2014a: 615, 617, 622, 624, 631 (Nr. 61 = F5; Nr. 62 = F6).

Date: Chaghadaid Kahanate period (MATSUI 2014a: 617, 631).

Transcription

1. koy(i)n yil b(i)ry(e)girminč ay iki otuz-ka
2. kut bâg elçi-kä käzig aš-[ka]
3. bergü bir koy(i)n-ni bir küri
4. min bilä ayag-a buk-a [o]ni berip
5. [tok]uzunč käz-ig-[k]ä tuṭz[-un]

768 The following two documents are written on the same sheet.
770 QWT P’K.
773 ‘Y’Q-. The second part of the name is unreadable on the facsimile, here I followed Matsui’s reading.
775 MATSUI 1998a: birip.
Translation

The year, 11th month, on the 22nd (day). Ayaga Buka’s decury gave the one sheep with one küri flour which ought to be given to Kut bäg as regular provision [käzig aš]. It shall be taken (into account) as the 9th turn of käzig.

777 One küri was equal to ca. 8.4 litres. For a detailed description, see the notes for the translation of PO01.

778 The word bäg was a title of nobility in this period. For a detailed discussion of the word see: Cf.: TMEN I: 235–238, Nr. 11; TMEN II: 389–406, Nr. 828; ÖZYETGIN 2006.

779 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz01.

780 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.
Kaz11


Cit.: Matsui 2008a: 229; Matsui 2014a: 615, 617, 622, 624, 631 (Nr. 61 = F5; Nr. 62 = F6).

Date: Chaghadaid Kahanate period (Matsui 2014a: 617, 631).

Transcription
1. koy(ı)n
781 yıl aram ay üč yaŋ-ka
782
2. [ elči-kä-nin
783
3. ]-/ta bergü
4. [ Y
784 bir küri
5. [ ayag]-a buk-a
785
6. [ Y käzig
786

Translation
1. Sheep year, 1st month, on the 3rd new day. […] 2for […] elči […] sin ought to be given […] Y 4one küri […] şAya]ga Buka […] 6Y käzig […]

781 Matsui 1999: qoyn.
782 Matsui 1999: yngïqa.
783 Matsui 1999: ilči-kä ning.
784 Matsui 1999: (..).
785 Q=-PWQ-'.
786 Matsui completed this line, and added a supposed 7th line too. Matsui 1999: (6) üy birip ikinti käzig (7)-kä tutzun.
787 One küri was equal to ca. 8.4 litres. For a detailed description, see the notes for the translation of PO01.
788 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.
9.1.3 Miscellaneous orders

OMis01 U 5331 (T II Čiqtim 1)/a

Fac.: SERTKAYA 1999: 246.
Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. tačudın790 sözüm . toyınčog791-kä . sänıŋ kupčir tarıg-ņ
2. -ta bu šämiz792 tavıšman793-kä üč küri tarıg bergil . kan yasak794
3. tutar-m(ä)n795

789 On the same sheet there is another order, but that seemingly is not in connection with the postal system. The two orders were written by the same hand. Both orders differ from the ordinary official documents (the dating is missing, and instead of the stamps a so-called nišan ‘hand signal’ closes the two texts. However according to the contents of the documents it can be regarded as an official order from the Mongol period. For nišan, see the notes for OAcc03.

792 Š’MYZ. The <š> is marked with two dots on the right of the main line. CLARKINTRO: Samiš; LI 1996: şamız.
795 LI 1996: tirär-m(ä)n.
Translation

(This is) my Tačudin’s word [i.e. order] to Toynčog. From your kupčir(-tax) paid in farm products [kupčir tariği] give this three küri [farm product] to this Šämiz Tavišman. I hold the kan(‘s) yasak.

---

796 The Old Turkic word söz originally meant ‘word, speech, statement’ (ED: 860), with the possessive suffix +Xm it means: ‘my word’. In the Uyghur documents from the Mongol period it is probably a borrowing from Mongolian. In the Mongolian decrees and letters the expression üge manu ‘our word’ was used from the 13th century on. Cf.: MOSTAERT-CLEAVES 1952: 434–436; POPPE 1957:76–78; TMEN III: 292–296, Nr. 1292.
797 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.
798 Moriyasu explained a broader meaning of tariği as ‘Hauptgetreide’ and a type of tax paid in farm products during the West Uyghur period: MORIYASU 2004b: 57–59.
799 Cf.: the notes for the translation of POO1
800 Dolkun, Umemura and Moriya and in her article A. G. Sertkaya read the last words of the 2nd line as san-inta ‘in to account’, but according to the face of letters this reading is problematic. The word yasak (<Mon. jasay) meant in Mongolian originally ‘(1) loi, gouvernement, administration, intendance; (2) administrateur, regent; (3) la peine, le supplice qu’impose la loi’ (KOWALEWSKI III: 2272) or ‘rule, governement, administration, ruling prince of a banner, power, political structure’ (LESSING 1973: 1039). Apart from its original meaning it were used in the expression alban jasay as a general term for the different taxes and labour services levied on the population of the Mongol Empire. The Turkic equivalent of this expression was yasak kalan. For kalan cf.: the notes of Käz02. For yasak cf.: SCHURMANN 1956; TMEN IV: 71–82, Nr. 1789; MATSUI 2005: 75–79. In this context the expression can be interpreted in two ways according to the reading of the last expression. Radloff, Clark, Li and Özyetgin read the last expression as tirärmän ‘I collect’, and translated it as the author of the order collects the yasak(-tax). In my reading the last word is tutarmän ‘I hold’, and I interpret it, as the author of the order is a representative of the kan.
Cit.: HUKVES: 35, 50; MATSUI 2007: 67 (only verso); VOHD13,22: 36–37 (Nr. 290).

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. ...]/ /[ ]
2. ...]/D’R elči [ ]
3. ...]-YNK’ . asmut\textsuperscript{803}-ka [...]
4. bargu ’W[ ]/ yagu-ta . tatınčuk\textsuperscript{804}
5. bir yagu . kurtam\textsuperscript{805}-ka\textsuperscript{806} bir yagu .
6. kuti\textsuperscript{807} bir yagu . berip
7. bir yagu tänjäš-i birär
8. ...]/// kümüş [ ]P//[ ]Y

Translation

…]/// /[…]2/D’R elči […]3-YNK’ to Asmut […]4 in order to go to […]from the ‘W[ ]/ raincoat(s) Tatınčuk (gave) 5 one raincoat, Kurtamı (gave) one raincoat, 6 Kutı gave one raincoat. 7 One raincoat equal\textsuperscript{808} one-one […]8/// silver […]P//[…]Y[…]

\textsuperscript{802} There are no stamps and dating on the document, but the content of the text let it be regarded as an official document. On the other side of the document there is a taxation registration probably from the time of the West Uyghur Kingdom, what may be an argument to date the document to the West Uyghur period. However we have only a provision order from the Mongol period (PO06), which dispose clothes to deliver, what may be an argument to date this document to the Mongol Period.

\textsuperscript{803} ’SMWT.

\textsuperscript{804} T’TYNČWQ.

\textsuperscript{805} QWRT’MY.

\textsuperscript{806} The initial velar guttural of the dative case is seemingly larger than the other initial gutturals. It is possible that the scribe waned to line through the suffix.

\textsuperscript{807} QWTY.

\textsuperscript{808} For tänjäš-i as ‘fitting, equal’ see OTWF I: 343; VOHD13,22: 37 fn. 5.
This is a very corrupted document preserved in three fragments. The stamps and the dating are missing, but the closing formula berzün ‘shall give’, shows that this document was originally some kind of order.

Translation


U 5245 verso

17one ulag half […]18/ together shall give.

---

816 The word ulagčı is derived with a +čI nomen actoris from the noun ulag. The word ulag referred to any kind of livestock which were the property or were used by the postal system of the Mongol Empire (Cf.: Chapter V). The derived form ulagčı are usually translated as ‘a guide accompanying ulag’ or ‘stableman’. Due to the fact that regularly appears the expression yarım ulagčı ‘half ulagčı’, it is very probable that in this case ulagčı does not refer to a certain person, rather to the supply of a person who fulfil the stableman’s duties. So this document might shed light on another usage of ulagčı, namely as duty or labour-service.

817 The same personal name appears in the 10th and 28th lines of UIReg07.

818 The same personal name appears in the 8th line of UIReg07.
9.1.4 Official Accounts

OAcc01 \*U 9180_Side 2 (b)


Cit.: HUKVES: 36 (216/R 39); CLARKINTRO: 454 (Nr. 134); MATSUI 2014a: 614–616, 618, 620, 629 (Nr. 21 = C10).

Date: Early Mongol – Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 629).

Transcription

1. yunt yilki kupcir kümüş-kä ‘‘LY[...]
2. koço\textsuperscript{820}-ka barr-ka kālir-kä yet[i\textsuperscript{821} ...
3. bakır-ka\textsuperscript{822} bir at ulag altım m(ä)n
4. čagan\textsuperscript{823} bitidim\textsuperscript{824}

\textsuperscript{819} USP: јонт јылы копчыр күмүш-кä алы(н); ÖZYETGIN 2004: yunt yili \textit{kupçır} kümüş-kä ali[p]...; TUGUSHEVA 2013: yont yilii quçir kümüš-kä ali(?)<...>.

\textsuperscript{820} KWČW.

\textsuperscript{821} USP: Jавт…….; ÖZYETGIN 2004: javit……; TUGUSHEVA 2013: vapts[so].

\textsuperscript{822} USP: Пакшы ка; ÖZYETGIN 2004: bahši-ka; TUGUSHEVA 2013: baxši-qa.

\textsuperscript{823} Č’Q’N.

\textsuperscript{824} USP: Асан (?) пит(и)жим.; LI 1996: bititim; ÖZYETGIN 2004: äsän bitidim; TUGUSHEVA 2013: esän bitidim.
Translation

1As kupčir\textsuperscript{825} silver for the Horse year ’’LY[...] 23to go and reach Kočo for seven [...] bakır\textsuperscript{826}

I bought one horse-eulag. I, Čagan, wrote it.

\textsuperscript{825} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.
\textsuperscript{826} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
According to their contents and the personal names in them, the following three documents belong together.

\[827\] According to their contents and the personal names in them, the following three documents belong together.

\[828\] The same proper name appears in the 1st lines of OAcc03 and OAcc04.

\[829\] Cf.: the notes for PO21 and OAcc03.

\[830\] Cf.: the notes for PO20.

\[831\] Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.

\[832\] Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
OAcc03  

*U 9256 (T III No 279)

**Cit.:** MATSUI 2014a: 614–616, 618, 620, 624, 629 (Nr. 19 = C8).  

**Date:** Early Mongol – Yuan period (MATSUI 2014a: 618–620).

**Transcription**

1. ud yılkı ögrinä
2. -n[in]g bir yarım
3. s(i)tur kupčir män čagan
4. alip
5. yam-ta kăčăr barr elči-niŋ ul[ag]-
6. –in-ga bertim bu nišan măniŋ ol
7. kus kar tamga yakzun

**Translation**

1-2 I, Čagan, receive the one and a half stir (for) kupčir(-tax) of Ögrinä for the Ox year; 3-4 I gave [i.e. payed] it for the ulag of the elči who passed on the postal relay station/system [yam] and went on. This nišan is mine. Kus Kar shall put the tamga on it.

---

834 ’WYKRYN’.  
835 Č’Q’N.  
836 QWS Q’R.  
837 The same personal name appears in the 5th line of PO12.  
838 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.  
839 The similar documents (the so-called vouchers) regularly contain kupčir kümüš on this part. Cf.: OAcc02 first line and OAcc04 2nd line. So here should appear the word kümüš too, or an accusative suffix should have been added to kupčir. The lack of both might alludes to the fact that the scribe copied at least the first part of the document. For kupčir, see the notes for the translation of PO21.  
840 The same proper name appears in the 1st lines of OAcc02 and OAcc04.  
841 It is not clear from the text whether if this yam refers to the postal relay system in general or to a particular postal station of the system where the document was issued.  
843 The expression tamga yakzun is unίc in the official documents up to now. According to Clauson tamga originally was a brand or mark of ownership, branded on horses and other livestock. Since a very early period it was used as a coat of arms as well, and tamgas appear on many Old Turkic runic inscriptions. Later it meant also ‘seal’ (ED: 504–505). It was borrowed to Mongolian as tamaga ‘seal, timbre’ (KOWALEWSKI III: 1643), ‘stamp, brand, banding iron’ (LESSING 1973: 774). Cf.: TMEN II: 554–565, Nr. 933. The verb yak- had three different meanings in Old Turkic: 1. ‘to rub on to, to anoint’ 2. ‘to approach, or be near to, to touch’ 3. ‘to ignite, burn’ (ED: 896–897, DTS: 237). In this context most probably it means ‘to put on, to stamp on’.  

---
Transcription

3. küskü yılkı ögrinä⁸⁴⁴-niŋ bir yarım
4. s(t)ıtr⁸⁴⁵ kupčir kümüş-in män âlik⁸⁴⁶ alip
5. ulag tār-in-gä bertim bu tamga māniŋ ol

Translation

1-2 I, Ālik⁸⁴⁷ received Ögrinä’s⁸⁴⁸ one and a half sitr⁸⁴⁹ kupčir(-tax)-silver⁸⁵⁰ for the Rat year and paid it for the ulag hiring.⁸⁵¹ This tamga⁸⁵² is mine.⁸⁵³

---

⁸⁴⁴ ‘WYKRYN’.
⁸⁴⁵ MATSUI 2014a: sitır.
⁸⁴⁶ ‘LYK.
⁸⁴⁷ This person was probably an officer of the yam. The same persona name appears in the 3⁰ line of PList02; in *U 9268; BT XXIII: 175 of the German collection, and in the 4⁰ line of 3Kr. 29a and in the 3⁰ line of 3Kr. 34 (SUK II: 47, Sa 22) of the Otani collection.
⁸⁴⁸ The same proper name appears in the 1⁰ lines of OAcc02 and OAcc03.
⁸⁴⁹ Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
⁸⁵⁰ Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21 and OAcc03.
⁸⁵¹ This document proves that the kupčir-tax in a period, at least partly was paid for the maintenance of the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire.
⁸⁵² Cf.: the notes for the translation of OAcc03.
⁸⁵³ MATSUI 2014a: ‘I, Ālik, received 1.5 sitır of kupčir-tax-silver of the Rat year, and paid (it) for the rent of a postal relay horse. This seal is mine.’
9.1.5 Official registers and lists

OReg01 USp Nr. 54

Publ.: USP 93, 232 (Nr. 54).
Cit.: CLARKINTRO 151, 453 (Nr. 132).
Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. čoban yıgmıš atı beš bakır
2. Q[ ]Y Togrıl atı beš bakır
3. kır čäčäk atı beš bakır
4. yıgmıš taš atı beš bakır
5. yägänčük atı beš bakır
6. tämir asak atı beš bakır
7. irčük atı beš bakır
8. ıg-ba atı beš bakır
9. berip čuv alzun
10. kupčir-ka

Translation

1 (For the) horse of Čoban Yıgmıš five bakır, 2 (for the) horse of Q[ ]Y Togrıl five bakır, 3 (for the) horse of Kır Čäčäk five bakır, 4 (for the) horse of Yıgmıš Taš five bakır, 5 (for the) horse of Yägänčük five bakır, 6 (for the) horse of Tämir Asak five bakır, 7 (for the) horse of Irčük five bakır, 8 (for the) horse of Ig-ba (?) five bakır is given, (they) shall take the voucher about 10 the kupčir(-tax).

854 Neither Radlov nor Clark cited the original signature of the document. Clark only mentioned the origins of the document: Roborovskij-Kozlov/Klementz, what shows that it belongs to the Russian collection. For my request Pavel Rykin, researcher of the Russian Academy of Sciences was so kind to look up the manuscript. According to his information, the manuscript was already lost in 1966. Due to these circumstances I based my reading on the USP. In this case I give no transliterations of the proper names, because I could not check the original document.
855 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO20.
856 The same personal name appears in the 3rd line of PO22.
857 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO21.
9.2 Private documents

9.2.1 Lists and Registers concerning the ulag-system

UIReg01 Ch/U 6107 v


Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. bir böz bilä iki bö[z... 858
2. orta ikirär böz yemiš-kä [...
3. intu 859 -nuŋ bir böz özï-nïŋ [...
4. kum 860 -ka barmïš at teringä [...
5. yana bašlap yam-ka bargu-ç[1...
6. bješ böz sadi 861 ulagi-nïŋ bir [b...
7. alti otuz-ka yana bašlap turpan 862 [...
8. baba sä(n)ç ñiŋ bir böz bâgiçü[k 864 [...
9. ]a tökrü 865 BWD[...]ortä ikirär[...
10. ] bir böz iki [...

858 This document can be divided into three sections as follows: from the 1st till the 4th line, from the 5th till the 7th line and from the 8th till end. The two latter sections are introduced with the expression yana bašlap ‘and’.
859 ‘YNTW.
860 QWM.
861 ‘DY.
862 TWRP’N.
863 P’PYČW.
864 TWYKRW.
865 P’KYČW.
**Translation**

Together with one böz⁶⁶⁶ two bö[z...](middle-two-) böz as food[...](middle-two) Intu’s⁶⁶⁷ one böz for the hire of the horse of Özi [...] in order to go to Kum. And to the yam arrivi[ng...](middle-two) böz (for) the ulag’s of Sadi⁶⁶⁸ one [gave...] on the twenty sixth (day). And the one böz of Baba Sävinč in Turpan Bägičü[k...](middle-two) Tökrü BWD[...] middle two-two [...] one böz two [...] ¹

---

⁶⁶⁶ In this document böz appears as currency. Cf.: VOHD13,21: 188 fn. 2.

⁶⁶⁷ The same personal name attested in 13th line of UlReg08; in the 5th, 14th and 50th lines of UlReg06. The name Indu appears in the 2nd line of PO13.

⁶⁶⁸ The same personal name appears in the 7th line of UlReg07.

⁶⁶⁹ The same personal name appears in the 6th line of U 6151.
Cit.: VOHD13,21: 189–190 (Nr. 182).
Date: Mongol period.

Transcription
1. ...]/[...
2. ...] taŋuday\textsuperscript{870}-ka P'[...
3. ...]-ka barguči at TW[...
4. ...] /// tölär\textsuperscript{871}-kā T[...
5. bir ulagči birlā b

Translation

[...] ʒfor Taŋuda\textsuperscript{872} [...] ʒto [...] arriving horse TW[...] ʒ// for Tölär T[...] ʒg(ave) with one stableman together.

\textsuperscript{870} T'NKWD'Y.
\textsuperscript{871} TWYL'R.
\textsuperscript{872} The same personal name appears in the first line of PO02and in the 39\textsuperscript{th} line of UlReg07.
UlReg03 Ch/U 7012 r (T II S)\textsuperscript{873}

**Facs.:** BT XIV: Table VI. Figure 8.

**Cit.:** BT XIV: 26; RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 45, 70, 71, 142 (Nr. 62); MATSUI 1998b: 46–47; MATSUI 1999: 149–150; VOHD13,21: 194 (Nr. 188).

**Date:** Mongol period.

**Transcription**

1. [...] /// /// /// WSMYW ///
2. [...]/
3. [...] karı böz b. bir lagsı b. bir yarım
4. karı böz b
5. kurut b.
6. beş bag otuŋ b. ordu-ka bir ulag-čı b.

**Translation**

[...] *karı*\textsuperscript{874} böz (ave), one *lagsı*\textsuperscript{875} g(ave), one and a half *karı böz* g(ave); dried curds g(ave), five bond firewood g(ave), to the palace one stableman g(ave).

\textsuperscript{873} The paper of this document was used for third time to write this register on it. The register is written in between the lines of a Chinese Buddhist text. On the other side of the document an Old Uyghur Buddhist text can be found.

\textsuperscript{874} Originally *karı* meant ‘forearm’, but it was used often as a unit of measurement as well. In this sense it meant ‘cubit, the distance from the elbow to the finger tips’ (ED: 644–645).

\textsuperscript{875} This *lagsı* is a borrowing from Chinese *luo zi* 络子 and means ‘net’ (VOHD13,21: 194). Cf.: MATSUI 1999: 149) According to UlReg06 it is very likely that it was used as a measurement for *saman* ‘straw’.

**Date:** Mongol period.

**Transcription**

1. ...]-a bagaṭur⁸⁷⁶-tın kälgüči {...}⁸⁷⁷
2. ...] bargu üč at ulag-ta kulči⁸⁷⁸
3. ...[/uyj bir at bir ulag-či b
4. ...] b on baṭman so(r)m-a bir išič
5. ..b]aṭman so(r)m-a bir küri min b

**Translation**

[...]i {...} those coming from [...]a Bagatur⁸⁷⁹ [...] to go to [...], from the three horse-ulags Kulči [...] g(ave) one horse, one stableman. [...] g(ave). Ten batman⁸⁸⁰ wheat beer⁸⁸¹, one jug [...]atman wheat beer, one küri⁸⁸² flour g(ave).

---

⁸⁷⁶ P’Q’DWR.
⁸⁷⁷ At the deleted part probably was a name or a part of a name.
⁸⁷⁸ QWLČY.
⁸⁷⁹ According to the WOT the word is an old Eurasian cultural term, but its origin is unclear. It means ‘hero’ and used as a title too, but we do not know which meaning was the original. (WOT I: 106–108). Cf.: TMEN II: 366–377, Nr. 817. This word was often part of personal names too.
⁸⁸⁰ Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO07.
⁸⁸² Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
Transcription
1. ...]bir uzun <ulag> b mamad
2. ...b]agčın alip b
3. ...]–K’
4. ...]očın elči-kä yavlak
5. ...]olar-ka bir uzun ulag
6. ...]–K’ b

Translation
1[... g(ave) one long-range <ulag>. Mamad ...B]agčın delivered. [...]to [...] to [Y]očın elči Yavlak [...] for them one long-range ulag [...].

Dai Matsui proposed that the adjective uzun ‘long’ refers to the range the horses could reach, so uzun at is a horse for long-range travel while the kisga at can be used for short distance journeys (MATSUI 1998a: 43–45; MATSUI 2002: 107-108). This definition helps us in the interpretation of the term uzun ulag: this expression surely refers to an ulag which is capable to perform long distance journeys. Matsui surmised that the Turkic expressions go back to Chinese forms: the uzun ulag goes back to chang-xing-ma 長行馬 ‘horse for distant transportation’ which appears in the Chinese documents from the Tang period; and the kisga ulag is derived from jin-xing-ma 近行馬 ‘horses for short range’ which is attested in documents from the Qu 麴 dynasty (501–640) of the Gaochang Kingdom (MATSUI 2008a: 236). The expression kisga ulag can be found in the 7th, 9th and 10th line of PO05, while kisga at is attested in the 19th line of UlReg07. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO13. In the SUK documents appears mamat as part of a personal name: Mamat Monjolčın (SUK II:139, 26th line of WP04). Cf.: VOHD13,21: 197, fn. 3.

The same Yočın elči appears in the 2nd line of document Käz05 and in the 10th line of UlReg08.

In SUK II, 142 (WP06, line 9) In the SUK documents appears yavlak as part of a personal name: Yavlak Öz Ačarı (SUK II: 142, 9th line of WP06). Cf.: VOHD13,21: 197, fn. 5.
UIReg06  Ch/U 8136 v (MIK 030465; T II S 53) + Ch/U 6039 v (T II M)

Cit.: Matsui 1999: 150 (only Ch/U 8136 v); VOHD 13,21: 202–203 (Nr. 200).
Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. [ ]
2. [ ]’P apam\(^{891}\) ulag-či
3. [ ] alip bermiš
4. [ ] y]ana bāg-lāri bor-ta bir bor
5. [ ]PL[ ]’N\(^{892}\) čiγay\(^{893}\) birlā alip berdi
6. [ ]/ barim yürüŋ tämür\(^{894}\)-kā šaz-in bāg-lāri bermiš bor-ta
7. bir kap bor kapam\(^{895}\) birlā ayitip berüsm(ā)n bakīr\(^{896}\) bārk\(^{897}\)-kā kuanbay\(^{898}\)-ka b
8. bir ulag b bārbāg\(^{899}\) kirmiš bermišinṭin bir kap bor üč b(a)ṭman min
9. tört tapığči beš lagiṣ saman on bag [o]\(t\) üč tuṛčan yagi
10. on bag oṭuŋ bir ud ulag bir ulagči oṭači bahši kālmiš-tā
11. iki {baṭman} āṭ üč baṭman min bir tapığči bir tuṛčan yag bir lagiṣ saman
12. beš bag oṭuŋ yana {…………} yeti y(a)ṇika bahši\(^{900}\) iki baṭman āṭ
13. üč baṭman min bir tapigail bir tuṛčan yag beš [baṭman] [ ]
14. saŋad ōŋ\(^{901}\) oğlan kutlug t(ā)mür\(^{902}\) bir kap bor šabir\(^{903}\) birlā alip b
15. sōrgān-kā\(^{904}\) bermiš beš kap-kā //W yargu\(^{905}\) bir baṭman bor iki lagiṣ
16. kuduki baṭur\(^{906}\)-ka iki kurug kap bir lagiṣ
17. ///// bir kap bor ///// yagi
18. bilān\(^{907}\) bermiš-tā bir kap alip b

\(^{891}\) ’P’M.
\(^{892}\) The last two letters can be read as N’ or Q as well.
\(^{893}\) ČYQ’Y.
\(^{894}\) YWYRNK T’MWR.
\(^{895}\) Q’P’M.
\(^{896}\) P’QYR.
\(^{897}\) P’RK. It appears as geographical name in the 3rd line of RH09 (SUK II:77).
\(^{898}\) QW’NB’Y.
\(^{899}\) P’QSY.
\(^{900}\) SWYRK’N.
\(^{901}\) SWYRK’N.
\(^{902}\) S’NK’D WYNK.
\(^{903}\) QWTLWQ TMWR.
\(^{904}\) S’PY.
\(^{905}\) SWYRK’N.
\(^{906}\) Y’RYQW.
\(^{907}\) QWDWQY B’DWR.
19. sekiz yağıka otaçı [...]
20. iki ba(t)man min iki [...]
21. bag otuŋ bir tap[ığıći\textsuperscript{908}

\textsuperscript{907} PYL’N.

\textsuperscript{908} The last five lines are very faded. It seems like this part of the manuscript was touched by water.
Translation

[...]2'P apam stableman [...] 3received (and) had been given. [...]further on (the) bägs as bor(-tax) one wine [...]5together with PL[ ]'N Čigay took and gave (it). [...] 6property (?); to Yürują Tämür from the wine(-tax) that had been given by the bägs of the Buddhist community, 7I [...] gave one kap909 wine together with Kapam. To Bakir in Bärk g(ave). To Kuan Bay g(ave).

8One ulag g(ave). Bärbäg from that, what came in and had been given: one kap wine, three batman flour, 9four servants, five lagsı910 straw, ten bundles hay, three tıŋčan911 oil, 10ten bundles fire wood, one ox-ulag, one stableman, when (the) medicine man had been arrived.

11Two {batman}meet, three batman flour, one servant, one tıŋčan oil, one lagsı straw, 12five bundles fire wood, and {………………} (on) the 7th new day. Bahşi912 two batman meat,

13three batman flour one servant, one tıŋčan oil, five [...] 14Saşad Öņ’s son Kutlug Tämür one kap wine together with Šabı took (and) g(ave). To the five kap wich were given to Sörgän [...] Yarıgu one batman wine two lagsı . 16To Kuduki Batur two dry kap, one lagsı [...] 17lllll one kap wine llllllll [ ] oil 18from (that what) Bilăn gave one kap [ ] took (and) g(ave) 19on the 8th new day (the) doctor [...] 20two batman flour, two [...] 21bundles fire wood, one ser[vant…

909 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz04.
910 Cf.: the notes for the translation of UlReg03.
911 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz08. Originally bir tıŋčan yag probably meant that much oil which is necessary to fill up a lamp. It is very likely that later it became a measurement.
912 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO05.
UlReg07 Ch/U 8175 v (Glas: T II 742; MIK 031759)+ Ch/U6512 v (T IIII 66)

Cit.: MATSUI 1999:187 (only Ch/U 6512v); VOHD 13,21: 205–206 (Nr. 202); MATSUI 2010b: 57; MATSUI 2012: 122; MATSUI 2015b: 292 (only Ch/U 8175 v).

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. [ ]///  
2. [...] TW-ka kočo\(^{914}\)-ka bargu inim[...  
3. ...]//\-ta čapat\(^{915}\) bir at tükäl\(^{916}\) bi[r]
4. at kida\(^{917}\) elči-kä kočo\(^{918}\)-ka bargu alti a[t-ta...
5. intu\(^{919}\) bir kulut\(^{920}\) bir kit\(^{921}\) bir kasay\(^{922}\) b[ir...
6. amrak k(a)y-a\(^{923}\) bir iš (t(ä)m)ir\(^{924}\) bir at  
7. tokuz otuz-ka sad\(^{925}\)-ka čapat\(^{926}\) bir at  
8. säkiz-inč ay bir yaŋka torč\(^{927}\)-ka kočo\(^{928}\)-ka  
9. bargu iki at-tükäl\(^{929}\) bir at b[ir...
10. a)t altmiš\(^{930}\)-ka ulag-ka tuṭup yogan\(^{931}\)  
11. yaŋmča b iki yaŋka /////  
12. ...]// bir at iki [yaŋka] tarıgci\(^{932}\)-ka
13. ...]amırak k(a)y-a\(^{933}\) [...] kita\(^{934}\) bir at

\(^{913}\) According to the different hand writings, this list was written by different scribes. The different handwriting can be identified as follows: 1\(^{st}\)–4\(^{th}\) lines, 4\(^{th}\)–9\(^{th}\) lines, 10\(^{th}\)–12\(^{th}\) lines, 12\(^{th}\)–18\(^{th}\) lines, 19\(^{th}\)–33\(^{th}\) lines, and 34\(^{th}\)–52\(^{nd}\) lines. According to Dai Matsui the 8\(^{th}\)–18\(^{th}\) lines were written later, only after lines 1\(^{st}\)–7\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\)–52\(^{nd}\) were finished (MATSUI 2012: 122 fn. 1).
14. [...] Y-ka čapa [935] bir at bir intu [936] 
15. [b]ir at bitig etgüči [ ]-kä toz [937] bir ulag 
16. at mun-lar bäg-lär koço [938] bargu tört /// 
18. msır [943] bir 
19. altınč ay bir otuz-ka kiswa at ötüği 
21. toyn [947] bir at korč [948] daruga-ka [...] 
22. bir at iki otuz-ka korč [949] [daruga...] 
23. -ka aday k(a)y-a [950] bir tört ot[uz-ka...] 
24. elči-kä yimsi [951] -kä bargu üč [...] 
26. at altı otuz-ka sombuz [955] elči[ ]-kä... 
27. yimsi [956] -kä bargu üč at-ta [...] 
28. bir altmıs [957] bir săvinč toyn [958] [bir at b...] 
29. bay buka [959] -ka tâŋ(i)sig [960] bir at... 
30. karay [961] -ka aday k(a)y-a [962] bir yetı ot[uz-ka...]
31. i duk kut\(^{963}\)-ka kudik-a\(^{964}\) bir sävig\(^{965}\) b[ir...]
32. b at\(^{966}\) iš tämir\(^{967}\) bir at saduk\(^{968}\)[...]
33. toiyg-a\(^{969}\) bir at bačak\(^{970}\) bir [...]
34. karay\(^{971}\)-ka sävinč toyn\(^{972}\) bir at S[...]
35. –ka buyan-a k(a)y-a\(^{973}\)-ka tänisig\(^{974}\) bir
36. aday k(a)y-a\(^{975}\) bir at tokz otuz[-ka...]
37. ...bar]gu-ka [...\(^{976}\) ]
38. at togogan\(^{977}\)-ka [... \(^{978}\) ]
39. bir at taŋuday\(^{978}\)-ka /[... ]
40. tänisig\(^{979}\) bir at ad[ay ky-a\(^{980}\) ... ]
41. otuz-ka togogan\(^{981}\)-ka KW[...] bir
42. [sä]vig\(^{982}\) bir at taŋuday\(^{983}\)-ka iš
43. tämir\(^{984}\) bir toiyg-a\(^{985}\) bir at tölak\(^{986}\)
44. –kä ay\(^{987}\)-ka bačak\(^{988}\) bir at yetinč ay
45. bir yaŋıka togogan\(^{989}\)-ka sävinč toyn\(^{990}\) bi[r]
46. tänisig\(^{991}\) bir at soņadı\(^{992}\)-ka aday k(a)y-a\(^{993}\) [bir]

\(^{962}\)'D'Y QY-.
\(^{963}\)There is a so-called honorific lift in text. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO15.
\(^{964}\)QWDYQ-.'
\(^{965}\)S'VYK.
\(^{966}\)Probably the scribe mixed up here the two words, that is why instead of at b he wrote b at.
\(^{967}\)YS T'MYR.
\(^{968}\)S'DWQ.
\(^{969}\)TWYYQ-.'
\(^{970}\)P'Č'Q.
\(^{971}\)Q'R'Y.
\(^{972}\)S'VYNČ TWYYN.
\(^{973}\)PWY'N-.' QY-'.
\(^{974}\)T'NKYSYK.
\(^{975}\)‘D’Y QY-.’
\(^{976}\)This is the first line of the manuscript Ch/U 6512 v (T III 66).
\(^{977}\)TWQWQ’N.
\(^{978}\)T’NKWD’Y.
\(^{979}\)T’NKYSYK.
\(^{980}\)‘D.
\(^{981}\)TWQWQ’N.
\(^{982}\)VYK.
\(^{983}\)T’NKWD’Y.
\(^{984}\)YS T’MYR.
\(^{985}\)TWYYQ-.’
\(^{986}\)TWYL’K.
\(^{987}\)‘Y.
\(^{988}\)P’Č’Q.
\(^{989}\)TWQWQ’N.
\(^{990}\)S’VYNČ TWYYN.
\(^{991}\)T’NKYSYK.
47. iki yanıka toqogan⁹⁹³-ka bagluz⁹⁹⁵ bir
48. səvig⁹⁹⁶ bir at soğad[i⁹⁹⁷-ka] čapət⁹⁹⁸
49. bir üç yanıka togo[gan⁹⁹⁹-ka...]WN tükələⁱ⁰⁰⁰
50. bir ntu¹⁰⁰¹ bir soğadı¹⁰⁰²-ka koluńči¹⁰⁰³ b[ir]
51. tört yanıka toqogan¹⁰⁰⁴-ka kūtay¹⁰⁰⁵ bir bagl[u]z¹⁰⁰⁶
52. bir soğadı¹⁰⁰⁷-ka səvig¹⁰⁰⁸ bir at
Translation

[...] 20 [...] TW, to go to Kočo; my younger brother [...] 3 from [...] Čapat one horse, Tükäl on[e] 4 horse (gave). [From the] six hor[ses] for Kidat elći to go to Kočo, Intu1009 (gave) one, Kulutı one, Kitay one, Kasay1010 o[ne...] 6 Amrak Kay-a one (and) Iš Tāmir one horse. 7 On the 29th (day). For Sadi1011 Čapat (gave) one horse. 8-9th month, on the 1st new day. From the two horses for Torči1012 to go to Kočo, Tükäl (gave) one horse. 9-11 Yogan gave according to the customs1013 one horse to Altmiş1014 which were taken into account as ulag. 2nd new day. // [ ...] 12// one horse. On the second [new day] for Tarığı [ ...] 13 Amrak Kay-a 1015 [...] Kitā one horse. [...] 14 For [ ] Y Čapat (give) [one hor]se; (and) Intu (gave) one 15 [o]ne horse. To the document creator [...] , Toz (gave) one 16 ulag-horse. [From the] four [horses to] the thousand chiefs and to the bāgš to go (to) Kočo /// 17 Yogan1016 one, Bınaluz one, Sāvig on, Tanučuk one, 18 Misir1017 one. 1018 Register of the short-distance horses up to the 21st (day of) the 6th month. 1019 For Uladay, Bačak1020 (gave) one horse; for Alay, Sāvinč 21 Toyn (gave) one horse; for Korči daruga [...] 22 one horse. On the 22nd (day). For Korči [daruga] 23 Aday Kay-a (gave) one (horse). On the [2]4th (day) [...] For [...] 24 elći to go to Yimši (from the) three [horses...] 25 Kodika (gave) one, Sāvig one (and) Iš Tāmir [...]. 26-27 (one) horse. On the 26th (day). From the three horses for Sombuz elći to go to Yimši [...] 28 one, Altmiş one (and) Sāvinč Toyn [one...] 29 For Bay Buka1021 Tānįśi o[ne horse...] 30 For Karay 1022 Aday Kay-a (gave) one (horse). On the [2]7th day. 31 For the udak kut1023 Kudik-a (gave) one, Sāvik o[ne...]

---

1009 The same personal name appears in the 3rd line of UlReg01, and as Indu in the 2nd line of PO13.
1010 The same personal name appears in the 20th line of UlReg08.
1011 The same personal name appears in the 6th line of UlReg01.
1012 The same personal name appears in the 14th line of OMis03.
1013 The expression el swallowed asgi birldı ‘according to the custom of the country together with interests’ is appear several times in the Uyghur loan contracts as a formula. Cf.: SUK II: Lo12 8th-9th lines, Lo13 7th-8th lines, Lo14 7th-8th lines, Lo29, 6th-7th lines. According to the SUK the word yaŋ ‘custom, manner, method’ origins from the Chinese yang 樣 (SUK II: 300).
1014 The same personal name appears in the 9th line of OMis03, and as a part of the name Altmiş Tāmir in the 7th line of the same document. The name Altmiş appears in the 28th line of this document too, but in that case as a person who gives the horse and not become it.
1015 This person might be identical with Amrak Kaya in line the 6th line of this document.
1016 This person might be identical with Yogan Yanginca in the 10th line of this document.
1017 The same personal name appears in the 9th line of Kāz07, in the 9th line of UlReg13 and in the 13th line of UlReg18.
1018 In this case there is plus one horse, than the aforementioned four.
1019 About kisga at see the notes for the translation of UlReg05. For ötig as register see: MORIYASU 2004b: 100, 103 fn. 132.
1020 The same personal name appears in the 8th line of UlReg15.
1021 The same personal name appears in the 6th line of UlReg18.
1022 This personal name is written with a kef, so possibly it is a foreign name.
1023 Iduk kut was the title of the rulers of the West Uyghur Kingdom, and later the title of the leader of Uyghur territory within the Mongol Empire. The meaning of the expression is ‘the sacred favour of heaven’ (ED: 46). On the title iduk kut see: ARAT 1964; ARAT 1986.
Iš Tāmir one horse, Saduk-a one horse, Bačak one [...]

For Karay Sāvinč Toyin (gave) one horse. For S[...] (and) for Buyan-a Kay-a Tāŋisig (gave) one, 36(and) Aday Kay-a one horse. [On the] 29th (day)[...] 37to go to [...] 38horse. For Togogan [...] 39one horse. For Taŋuday [...]

Tāŋisig (gave) one horse, Ad[ay Kay-a...] 41On the 30th (day). For Togogan KW[...] (gave) one, (and) 42[Sā]vig one horse. For Taŋuday Iš Tāmir (gave) one, (and) Toyığ-a one horse. For Tōläk, 44(and) for Ay Bačak (gave) one horse. The 7th month, 45(and) the 1st new day. For Togogan Sāvinč (gave) one, 46(and) Tāŋisig one horse. For Soṇadi, Aday Kay-a (gave) [one.] 47The 2nd new day. For Togogan Bagluz (gave) one, 48(and) Sāvig one horse. For Soṇadî, Čapat 49(gave) one (horse). The 3rd new day. [For] Togogan Kıtay (gave) one, (and) 50Intu one. For Soṇadî Kolunči (gave) one. 51The 4th new day. For Togogan Ktay (gave) one, (and) Baglu [z] 52one. For Soṇadi Sāvig (gave) one horse.

---

In the 10th line of Kāz02 appears the personal name Buyan Kay-a.

The same personal name appears in the 1st line of PO02 and in the 2nd line of UlReg02.

The same personal name appears in the 3rd line of UlReg12. In the 4th line of UlReg02 appears the personal name Tölär. Due to the peculiarity of the cursive Uyghur script it is not improbable, that the <r> and <k> are written similarly in final position. Another personal name (Taŋuday) is also common in the two documents.

The personal name Tükäl appears in the 3rd and 9th lines of this document, so perhaps the scribe miswrote the same personal name.
**Transcription**

1. [ ] LKN' /1028
2. üč kari b karpančın1029 elči-kä bir böz-tä körpä1030 [...1031
3. săl]kiz kari sarg1032 toyin1033 bir kari atay1034 bars-či1035-ka [...
4. [...] bir sak ät1036 b yolči1037-ka bermiš on iki böz-tä1038 [...
5. [...] yarım böz b yarım kari1039 toyin1040 üč kari körpä k(a)y[-a1041 [...
6. [...] kari b [...

7. sabartu1042 bäg1043-465 beš kalča yori1044 bor b1045 körpä k(a)y-a1046 b miy1047 [...
8. –ta1048 beš kalča bor b bag(a)tur1049-lar-ka on kalča iki batm[an1050 ...
9. monol1051 bahši-ka beš kalča bor bir1052 ba<t>man b1053 bir1054 batman m[ın1055 ...

---

1028 MATSUI 1996: T(………)  
1029 Q’RP’NKČYN.  
1030 KWYRP’.  
1031 MATSUI 1996: üč (………)  
1032 MATSUI 1996: yizün sardan.  
1033 S’RYQ TWYYN. MATSUI 1996: sardan toyin.  
1034 MATSUI 1996: (………).  
1036 MATSUI 1996: bir (………).  
1037 YWLČY. MATSUI 1996: (.)W(.)DLČY.  
1039 In this case the orthography of the measurement differs from its other instances in the document.  
1040 TWYYN.  
1041 KWYRP’ QY. MATSUI 1996: körpä qya.  
1042 S’P’RDW.  
1043 MATSUI 1996: bg.  
1044 MATSUI 1996: yorur.  
1045 According to the structure of the text this <b> is most probably a scribal error and should not be taken into consideration by the translation.  
1047 MATSUI 1996: munung.  
1048 MATSUI 1996-tan.  
1049 P’QTWR. MATSUI 1996: bayurči.  
1050 MATSUI 1996: b.  
1051 MWNKWL.  
1052 MATSUI 1996: b.  
1053 MATSUI 1996: P.  
1054 MATSUI 1996: bor.
10. yočin¹⁰⁵⁶ elči-kä sākiz kalča bor b baka¬lči¹⁰⁵⁴ elči-kä iki y[arim¹⁰⁵⁸ ... 
11. kekalča bor b t(ā)mir-či-lär-kä iki yarım kalča bor b 
12. tami(k)lī¹⁰⁵⁹ bag-niŋ nøkeri¹⁰⁶⁰-kä iki yarım kalča bor b 
13. intu¹⁰⁶¹ -niŋ ävín-tä¹⁰⁶² beş kalča bor b¹⁰⁶³ 
14. balčuk¹⁰⁶⁴ bor bermiši iki bor-ta¹⁰⁶⁵ beş kalča elči berip 
15. kalmiş¹⁰⁶⁶ ävtä ačmiş¹⁰⁶⁷ bagurći ürük¹⁰⁶⁸ elči-kä iki yarım 
16. kalča bor berdi kbartu¹⁰⁶⁹ bag sīm¹⁰⁷⁰ beş kalča bor salgar¹⁰⁷¹ 
17. elči-kä iki yarım kalča bor b oltay¹⁰⁷² elči-kä kāzij-t[a¹⁰⁷³ ... 
18. beş kalča bor bir ba(t)man min bir ät¹⁰⁷⁴ b amta¹⁰⁷⁵ elči-kä... 
19. beş kalča bor iki¹⁰⁷⁶ bamtan¹⁰⁷⁷ min bir batman ät b Y¹⁰⁷⁸[... 
20. kasay¹⁰⁷⁹ ogul-niŋ¹⁰⁸⁰ bey buka¹⁰⁸¹ elči-kä iki yarım kalča b[or¹⁰⁸² ... 
21. ba(t)man min b yana kürilig min-kä iki batman¹⁰⁸³ mi[n......... 
22. yambın¹⁰⁸⁴ -niŋ ävín-tä¹⁰⁸⁵ iki yarım kalča [or[... 
23. yana körpä kay-a¹⁰⁸⁶-niŋ ävín-tä¹⁰⁸⁷ beş kalča bor P[...
24. –kä beš\textsuperscript{1088} iki yarım kalča bor b yana kamun\textsuperscript{1089} elč[i-kä...  
25. yarım\textsuperscript{1090} kalča b \{........\}\textsuperscript{1091} bubu\textsuperscript{1092} kālip\textsuperscript{1093} iki yarım ka[lča bor\textsuperscript{1094} ...  
26. künkūy\textsuperscript{1095}–kā kudup\textsuperscript{1096} b yana on ulag-lai\textsuperscript{1097} beš ka[lča bor\textsuperscript{1098} ...  
27. bir batman\textsuperscript{1099} min balak\textsuperscript{1100} inčüy-ler tas\textsuperscript{1101}–ka bir batman\textsuperscript{1102} m[in...  
28. bor b\textsuperscript{1103} [...}
Translation

[...] 2g(ave)three karti\textsuperscript{1104}. From the one böz for Karpačin elći Körpä\textsuperscript{1105} [...] egkht karti, Sarg Toyın one karti. For Atay Barsći [...] 4 g(ave) one sak meat\textsuperscript{1106}. From the 12 böz which were given for Yolći\textsuperscript{1107} [...] sg(ave) half böz; half karti Toyın, three karti Körpä Kay[-a...] 6karti g(ave). 7-8Sabartu bâg g(ave) five kalčas\textsuperscript{1108} of yort (? wine. Körpä Kay-a g(ave). Thousand [...] from [...] g(ave) five kalčas of wine. For the bagaturs\textsuperscript{1109} ten kalčas (and) two bat[man...] 9for the Monöl bahši\textsuperscript{1110} five kalčas of wine (and) one batman (are) g(iven). One batman fl[our...] for Yočın elći\textsuperscript{1111} eight kalčas of wine (are) g(iven). For Bakalći elći two (and a) h[alf...] 11 kalčas of wine (are) g(iven). For the blacksmiths two and a half kalčas of wine (are) g(iven). 12For the nökers\textsuperscript{1112} of Tanuklı bâg two and a half kalčas of wine (are) g(iven). 13Instead the house (stem?) of Intu\textsuperscript{1113} five kalčas of wine (are) g(iven)\textsuperscript{1114}. The bor(-tax) payment of Balčuk. From the two wine (he) g(ave) five kalčas (for) the elći; 15,16 from that what remained open at home (?) he g(ave) for Bagurći Ürük elći two and a half kalčas of wine. Kibartu bâg siim (?) beş kalčas of wine, for Salgar\textsuperscript{1115} elći two and a half kalčas of wine (are) g(iven). For Oltay elći fr[om the] käzig(-tax)\textsuperscript{18} five kalčas of wine, one batman flour (and) one meat (are) g(iven). [For] Amta elći five kalčas of wine, two batman flour (and) one batman meat (are) g(iven). Y[...] 20 Kasay prince’s (order)\textsuperscript{1116}: for Bey Buka elći two and a half kalčas of w[ine...] 21 batman flour (are) g(iven); further on for küri flour\textsuperscript{1117} two batman flo[ur...] 23 Instead the house (stem?) of Yambn two and a half kalčas of wine[...]

\textsuperscript{1104} Cf.: the notes for the translation of UIReg03.
\textsuperscript{1105} The personal name Körpä Sarg appears in the 4\textsuperscript{th} line of Kâz03.
\textsuperscript{1106} The same expression bir sak ùt appears in the 4\textsuperscript{th} line of Kâz01. The word sak appears also in the 1\textsuperscript{st} line of U 5999. Cf.: MATSUI 2004a: 200, 9\textsuperscript{th} end note.
\textsuperscript{1107} The meaning of yolć was ‘guide’ (ED: 921), but it was used often as a personal name too. In this case both interpretations can be accepted. For Yolći as personal name see: OT: 348. Yolći appears as personal name in the 6\textsuperscript{th} line of PO06, and as ‘guide’ in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} line of PO08.
\textsuperscript{1108} According to Matsui this expression is a loanword from the Mongolian galja ‘écritoire faite avec de la corne de bœuf: falcon, fiole’; ‘inkstand made of horn’ (KOWALEWSKI II: 802; LESSING 1973: 922). He translates it as ‘bottle’ (MATSUI 1999: 107). Cf.: VOHD13,21: 206, fn. 4. However I accept Matsui’s theory about the origin of the word, it seems probable that, kalča was rather a unit of measurement for liquids, than an actual bottle. This is the reason why this word is not translated.
\textsuperscript{1109} Cf.: UIReg04 fn. XX. According to the context in this case most probably the word should be interpreted as a title.
\textsuperscript{1110} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO05.
\textsuperscript{1111} The same Yočin elći appears in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} line of document Kâz05 and in the 4\textsuperscript{th} line of UIReg05.
\textsuperscript{1112} This nöker is a variant of Uyg. nökör < Mong. nökör. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO09.
\textsuperscript{1113} The same personal name appears in the 5\textsuperscript{th}, 14\textsuperscript{th} and 50\textsuperscript{th} lines of UIReg07 and in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} line of UIReg01. The name Indu appears in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} line of PO13.
\textsuperscript{1114} For this interpretation cf.: MATSUI 2014b: 100 note A33.
\textsuperscript{1115} The same personal name appears as wine merchant (borći) in the 4\textsuperscript{th} line of PO24.
\textsuperscript{1116} For the interpretation of the word ogul as ‘prince’ see TMEN II: 81–82 (Nr. 502). The ‘honorific lift’ in the text strengthens this interpretation. The personal name Kasay appears in the 5\textsuperscript{th} line of UIReg07.
\textsuperscript{1117} Originally küri was a measure of capacity or weight, for dry goods like grain, equal to ca. 8,4 litre. Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01. In this case the word appears with a +IXg suffix. The meaning of the inflected form is not clear yet. Maybe kürlig min was a type of flour?
further on instead the house (stem?) of Körpä K(a)y-a five kalčas of wine P[...]

two kalčas of wine (are) g(iven); further on [for] Kamun elč[i...]

half kalča (is) g(iven)

Bubi came (and) two and a half kalčas of wine... for Küṇküy have been filled (and) g(iven); further on ten ulags (and) five kalčas of wine... for Tas one batman flour the workers of the Balak fief; for Tas one batman flo[ur...]
Transcription

1. it yıl onun č
2. ay a-niş-tun berü
3. män nom(k)ulı-niş
4. bermiš böz-niş
5. şani bir ton baš(a)p
6. tokuz berdim on
7. böz kan-ka berdim bir
8. ton tütsün-kä berdim
9. bir şig iür bir böz
10. meňšik kuča-ning
11. ulag-ka berdim on
12. beš böz käldür-täy

1119 NWMWLY. USP: Орсулаі; LI 1996: орсулаі.
1120 TUGUSHEVA 2013: böz-nig).
1121 USP: (a)шлап; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: (a)шлап.
1122 TUGUSHEVA 2013: torqu.
1124 LI 1996: qan.
1126 TUGUSHEVA 2013: tüdüm.
1127 USP: neprim; LI 1996: бирик.
1130 QWC.
1132 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ul(a)y-qa.
13. ulag t(e)rikä berdim
14. beš {böz}-kä darug-a koy(ı)n
15. alp bertim bir yıl
16. yarım yoruk böz {……}
17. darug-a berdim berdim
18. iki örmäk iki tor
19. torku yüz on böz
20. bolur bu böz-tä män
21. nom kuuli otuz böz
22. böz berdim [ik]i tavar
23. bir torku yüz on böz
24. beš böz bolur bu
25. böz-tä otuz böz
26. berdim

---

1136 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ul(a)γ.
1139 The word böz is inserted between two lines.
1141 TUGUSHEVA 2013: qoyın.
1143 TUGUSHEVA 2013: at.
1144 TUGUSHEVA 2013: yoriq.
1145 USP: tapiya (ka); LI 1996: taruγ-[a]-qä; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: tarug-a; TUGUSHEVA 2013: t(a)ruγ-a.
1146 The word berdim is written two times.
1147 USP: tım; LI 1996: ton; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: ton; TUGUSHEVA 2013: ton. Most probably the scribe started to write down the word torku which appears in the beginning of the next line, but when he realized that there is not enough space for it, he wrote it to the next line.
1149 USP: jyc; LI 1996: yüz; TUGUSHEVA 2013: yüz.
1150 TUGUSHEVA 2013: mi(e)n.
1152 USP: neur; LI 1996: bu; ÖZYTEGIN 2004: bir; TUGUSHEVA 2013: beš(?).
1153 The word böz is written down two times after successively.
1157 ÖZYTEGIN 2004: yuğı.
1158 ÖZYTEGIN 2004: otuz; TUGUSHEVA 2013: oduz.
Translation

1-5 The number (i.e. amount) of the delivered böüz by me, Nom Kulı since the 10th month of the Dog year: started with one garment 6-7 I gave nine. I gave ten böüz as Khan(-tax) 8 I gave one garment as tütün(-labour service) 9-13 I gave (i.e. payed) one şig 10 millet, one böüz for the ulag of Meğljig Kuča. I gave 15 böüz as rent for the ulag of Köldür-täy. 14-17 For five böüz I bought the sheep of the daruga. 18-20 That results in two knitted garment, two silk, 110 böüz. From this böüz 21-24 Nom Kulı gave (i.e. paid or delivered) 30 böüz. That result in two satin fabric, one silk fabric, 115 böüz. 25-26 From this böüz I gave (i.e. paid) 30.

---

1160 The same personal name appears in the 8th line of Käz02.
1161 This kind of tax is not characteized so far. The same expression appears in the 16th line of UlReg18.
1162 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO06.
1163 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
1164 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
**UlReg10**

**U 5307 (T II D 205a)**

**Publ.:** USP: 124–125, 235 (Nr. 72); TUGUSHEVA 2013: 68–69 (X 3 6).

**Facs.:** TUGUSHEVA 2013: 261 (X 3 6).

**Cit.:** CLARKINTRO: 448 (Nr. 121); ZIEMEHANDEL: 239; RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 54, 58, 80, 122–123 (Nr. 26); MATSUI 1998a: 043–044, 050 fn. 13; VOHD13,21: 212–213 (Nr 211); MATSUI 2008a: 236.

**Date:** Mongol period.

**Transcription**

1. kar-a tägün\(^{1167}\)-kä yumšak böz {...}\(^{1168}\)
2. tälip\(^{1169}\)-kä bir yarım\(^{1170}\) böz
3. bačak buk-a\(^{1171}\) tägäläy-kä\(^{1172}\) bir böz
4. bolmiš\(^{1173}\)-nng uzun ulag\(^{1174}\)
5. tört\(^{1175}\) yarım\(^{1176}\) böz kuṭlug k(a)y-a\(^{1177}\)
6. –ka bir yarım\(^{1178}\) böz kisig\(^{1179}\)
7. satıgč-ka\(^{1180}\) beš kari\(^{1181}\)
8. yo(g)luk\(^{1182}\) böz s(a)rg\(^{1183}\)-ka yanṭuṭ\(^{1184}\)
9. iki yarım kari\(^{1185}\) yoluk\(^{1186}\) böz

---

\(^{1167}\) Q’R-‘ T’KWN. TUGUSHEVA 2013: qara tégin(?).

\(^{1168}\) USP: qara tégin(?). TUGUSHEVA 2013: tegri.

\(^{1169}\) T’LYP. USP: \(\text{سُـمَّـَـَـِّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: télik.

\(^{1170}\) USP: \(\text{تْـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\).

\(^{1171}\) P’Č’Q PWQ’. USP: \(\text{بـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: bačaq birlä.

\(^{1172}\) USP: \(\text{تْـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: tevlär(?)-kä.

\(^{1173}\) PWLMYS.

\(^{1174}\) USP: \(\text{بـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\).

\(^{1175}\) TUGUSHEVA 2013: tuynïq-qa.

\(^{1176}\) USP: \(\text{شَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\).

\(^{1177}\) QWDLWQ QY’-‘.

\(^{1178}\) USP: \(\text{ٽَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\).

\(^{1179}\) QYSYQ. USP: \(\text{قـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: qïsraγ.

\(^{1180}\) TUGUSHEVA 2013: sâdingrax(?)-qa.

\(^{1181}\) USP: \(\text{قـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: qamqï.

\(^{1182}\) TUGUSHEVA 2013: yonluγ.

\(^{1183}\) SRYQ.

\(^{1184}\) USP: \(\text{يُـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: y(a)ndud.

\(^{1185}\) USP: \(\text{يُـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: qamqï.

\(^{1186}\) USP: \(\text{يُـَـَّـَـَّـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~}\); TUGUSHEVA 2013: yonluγ.
10. t(ä)girip\textsuperscript{1187} inük\textsuperscript{1188} -niŋ böz-kä\textsuperscript{1189}

11. beš böz

\textsuperscript{1187} USP: \textsuperscript{\textit{صرين سما}}; TUGUSHEVA 2013: t(e)girip.

\textsuperscript{1188} YNWyK. USP: \textsuperscript{\textit{بلاق بلاق}}.

\textsuperscript{1189} USP: \textsuperscript{\textit{بليك بليك}}; TUGUSHEVA 2013: béliz-kä.
Translation

1For Kara Tägün soft böz {...} 2for Tälip one and a half böz, 3Bačak Buka for a jacket one böz, 4the long-(distance)-ulag of Bolmiš, 5, 6four and a half böz for Kütług Kay-a, one and a half böz for Kısıg the merchant, five kart böz for clothes, for Sarıg instead of two and a half kart böz for clothes, shared five böz for Inük’s böz(-tax). 1191

1190 Cf.: the notes for the translation of UlReg03.


**Transcription**

1. *bošaču*\(^{1192}\)
2. *bo(t)un*\(^{1193}\) bägi bolmiš\(^{1194}\)
3. –ta\(^{1195}\) bermiš-im\(^{1196}\) öč(ü)kän\(^{1197}\)
4. –kä iki batman min b\(^{1198}\)
5. iki batman ät tögi\(^{1199}\)
6. iki batman bir boguz\(^{1200}\)
7. at bir kūri borsu […]\(^{1201}\)
8. tapıg-čı oṭuŋ […]\(^{1202}\)
9. ögdüš\(^{1203}\) āvintā bir\(^{1204}\)

---

\(^{1192}\) PWS’CW. USP: [ ] MATSUI 1996: bu sanı; MATSUI 1999: boqsatu; TUGUSHEVA 2013: <…> pusardu.

\(^{1193}\) USP: [ ] MATSUI 1996: b(…)łu; MATSUI 1999: burun; TUGUSHEVA 2013: buyruq.


\(^{1196}\) TUGUSHEVA 2013: bermišim.

\(^{1197}\) WYČK’N. USP: [ ] MATSUI 1996: (…..); MATSUI 1999: (…)K’N-; TUGUSHEVA 2013: or(?)/Il-.

\(^{1198}\) USP: [ ] TUGUSHEVA 2013: min. [yana]. After an autobiopsy of the original document Tugusheva’s emendation has to be denied, due to the lack of space on the paper. Moreover the <P> at the end of the line – which is transcribed by Tugusheva as <,> – clearly marks the end of a sentence.

\(^{1199}\) TUGUSHEVA 2013: tükü [min]. After an autobiopsy of the original document Tugusheva’s emendation has to be denied, due to the lack of space on the paper.

\(^{1200}\) USP: [ ] TUGUSHEVA 2013: boyuz-[łu] After an autobiopsy of the orginal document Radloff’s and Tugusheva’s emendations have to be denied, due to the lack of space on the paper.

\(^{1201}\) USP: [ ] TUGUSHEVA 2013: borsu [bir].

\(^{1202}\) MATSUI 2014b: [ ] (.)

\(^{1203}\) WYKDWS.
10. tapıg-çı beş bag
11. oṭ bir tıŋčan yag
12. üc bag otuŋ ürüü
13. tämir elçi-kä [...] elçi-kä
14. yarım böz b lük[çüng]
15. –lüg bahši-ka yarım bö[z]
16. b yana yarım böz turpa[n]
17. –lüg-ka b sičgan-çı 1215-nij
18. yumşak böz-kä bir böz
19. b sičgan-çı 'WNG [...]
20. ulag-ka iki [...] ulag-ka
21. karı sarig-ka [...] kari sarig-ka
22. böz b yazmïş
23. käz-ig-tä üc baṭman
24. ât üc baṭman tögi
25. min b bir tapıg-[-çi]
26. bir tıŋčan ya[g...]

1202 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ood. bir tıŋčan yag.
1204 WYRWNK T'MYR.
1205 TUGUSHEVA 2013: temir élçi-kä.
1206 USp: ئؤد، ئؤد; MATSUI 1996: ünt; MATSUI 1999: örüü; TUGUSHEVA 2013: ünt///(?).
1207 TUGUSHEVA 2013: temir élçii-kä.
1208 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ..
1209 LWYK.
1211 TUGUSHEVA 2013: yana.
1213 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ..
1214 SYÇQ'N-ČY.
1215 TUGUSHEVA 2013: böz.
1216 SYÇQ'N-ČY.
1217 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ulag-qa iki [böz].
1218 USp: (Word not found in dictionary)
1219 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ulag-qa iki [böz].
1220 S'RYQ.
1221 USp: (Word not found in dictionary)
1222 TUGUSHEVA 2013: ulag-qa iki [böz].
1223 S'RYQ.
1224 TUGUSHEVA 2013: badm(a)n.
1225 TUGUSHEVA 2013: tükü.
1226 USp: (Word not found in dictionary)
1227 TUGUSHEVA 2013: min. bir t(e)nbin [bor?].
27. udčı borun¹²²⁸ bägi
28. bolmış-ta bermişim
29. käz-ig-tâ¹²²⁹ iki batman
30. min b¹²³⁰ iki batman
31. ät b¹²³¹ îduk k(u)t¹²³²
32. –ka bir tapig-čî [...]¹²³³
33. yana şisir¹²³⁴ äv-[tâ...]¹²³⁵
34. bir (bat)man¹²³⁶ ät b¹²³⁷
35. yana yetı kari böz
36. lükcüj¹²³⁸-lüg-kâ b¹²³⁹
37. çäkir taysi¹²⁴⁰ äv[...]¹²⁴¹
38. bitgä-či-lär-k[ä...]¹²⁴²
39. koy(ı)n-ka bir [...]¹²⁴³
40. böz b /// [……]¹²⁴⁴
41. [...] ///¹²⁴⁵ [……]
42. [...] // [ ]

¹²²⁷ USP: ؛ MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: yar b; MATSUI 2014b: ya[y b]. After the 26th line there is a gap. Probably after the gap a new notice starts.
¹²²⁹ MATSUI 1996: käz-tän; TUGUSHEVA 2013: k(e)z-ik-tâ.
¹²³⁰ TUGUSHEVA 2013: ..
¹²³¹ TUGUSHEVA 2013: ..
¹²³² USP: ؛ MATSUI 1996, MATSUI 1999: îduq qut; TUGUSHEVA 2013: egd(ä)čin(?) t///.
¹²³⁴ SYSYR.
¹²³⁷ TUGUSHEVA 2013: ..
¹²³⁸ USP: ؛ TUGUSHEVA 2013: bidgäči-lär-[kä bir]; MATSUI 2014b: bitgäči-lär (...) [ ].
¹²³⁹ TUGUSHEVA 2013: qoyn-qa bir [yarîm?].
¹²⁴⁰ USP: ؛ TUGUSHEVA 2013: böz . qay<…>; MATSUI 2014b: böz (b) (...)].
¹²⁴¹ MATSUI 2014b: kä(..).
Translation

1-3 My payments since Bošaču borun bäg 1246. 3-4 For Öčükän (I) g(ave) two batman 1247 flour. 5-7 (I gave) two batman meat (and) rice 1248 two batman, one led horse 1249, one küri 1250 pea […] servant, dry firewood […] 9-14 Instead of the house (stem?) of Ögdüš one servant 1251, five bundles of hay, one tıŋčan 1252 oil, three bundles of dry firewood. For Ürüŋ Tämir elći (I) g(ave) […] half böz. 14-17 (I) g(ave) half bö[z] for the bahşi 1253 from Lükčůŋ and (I) g(ave) half böz for the one from Turpan. 17-19 (I) g(ave) one böz for the soft böz of Şiğanči. 19-22 Stıganči 'WNG[...] for/as ulag two […] kari; (I) g(ave) for Sang […] böz. 22-25 From the prescribed käzig 1254 (I) g(ave) three batman meat (and) three batman rice (and) flour. 25-26 One servant, one tıŋčan oil[…]

27-28 My payments since Udčı becmæ borun bäg. 29-32 From (the) (I) g(ave) käzig two batman flour. (I) g(ave) two batman meat. For the uduk kut one servant […] 33-36 and instead of the house (stem) of Şišir […] (I) g(ave) one batman meat; and (I) g(ave) seven kari böz for the one from Lükčůŋ. 37-42 [Instead of] the house (stem?) of Čākir Tayši […] for the scribes […] (I) g(ave) […] böz […]

---

1246 According to Dai Matsui this title originates from the Chinese bāo rén 保 人 ‘guranator’. He assumes that the borun bäg was the leader of a borunluk what was a social group, and he was responsible for the collection of the taxes and folding of the labour services from this group (MATSUI 2014b).

1247 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO07.

1248 Here Tugusheva emended the text as tükü [min] and translated as рисовой(?) муки ‘rice flour’ (TUGUSHEVA 2013: 72–72). Unfortunately, after an autopsy of the original document Tugusheva’s emendation has to be denied, due to the lack of space on the paper, what means her translation has to be disapproved too.

1249 For a detailed discussion of the meaning of boguz at, see: Chapter V

1250 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.

1251 For this interpretation cf.: MATSUI 2014b: 100 note A33.

1252 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz08.

1253 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO05.

1254 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO14.
Cit.: RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 54, 144 (Nr. 66); MATSUI 1998a: 044; MATSUI 1998b: 47; VOHD 13,21: 236–237 (Nr. 244); MATSUI 2008a: 236.

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. [ ] L [ ]
2. böz b üčlidü\textsuperscript{1255} elči-kä
3. ...]/ yarım böz-ni töläk\textsuperscript{1256}
4. ...]/-ka töläk\textsuperscript{1257}-niŋ äṭükin alip
5. ...] [k]očoka\textsuperscript{1258} [u]lagčt {...} töläk\textsuperscript{1259} b šy[:\textsuperscript{1260} šazın
6. ...]/ kočo\textsuperscript{1261} bir ulagči berti
7. ...]otuz-ka tapa\textsuperscript{1262} on bägi bolgay
8. ...]užun at T’RWD// T/YRLD töläk\textsuperscript{1263} üč[...
9. berg]\ü kalan-ka olpak-ka [...]/
10. ...]/ yumšak bözkä bir [...] 
11. ...yelal]ti käri töläk\textsuperscript{1264} [...] 
12. ...]almıš [b]öz[...
Translation

[...] bőz g[ave]. For Üçlidü elči [...] half bőz (acc.) Töläk for [...] took Töläk’s boot [...] to Kočo (one) stableman, {...} Töläk g[ave] Šıyan, the Buddhist community {...} Kočo gave one stableman. On the 30th (day) Tapa will be (the) decury leader [...] slong-range horse T’RWD// T/YRLD Töläk three [...] for the payment of the kalan, for the olpak [...] 9 for soft bőz one [...] 11[sev]en /[si]x kari (bőz) Töläk [...] 12 (the) taken [b]őz.

1265 The same personal name appears in the 43rd line of UlReg07.
1266 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Kāz02.
1267 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.
1268 Before the measurement kari there must be a number, but only the last two letters are readable. These are – TY, so this number could be alti (‘six’) or yetı (‘seven’).
1269 Cf.: the notes for the translation of UlReg03.
Cit.: VOHD13,22: 134 (Nr. 425).
Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

12. [ ]Q’
13. bir [a]t P//-kä bir at buka t[ämir]1270...
14. [ ]SWN [u]lag-ći bilä berdi sâkiz yanıkä P[...
15. tokuz-unç ay altu y(e)girmikä QW//[...]
16. toksin1271-[k]a buka tämir1272 ber-üzün T[...]
17. bermiš at-lar uç[u/n u]lag-ka tu[tun...]
18. boldi tûmän ak-a1273 ’Y[ ]WN //LWN
19. -kä toksin1274 inç[ü... ] //l ay/n[...]
20. [b]ir ulag mısır1275 P[... ] [...]
21. ulag-çi-ka tu[tuldu toksin1276 [...]
22. [ ]//L’R bargu //Y/[...]

Translation

1[ ]Q’ 2one [ho]rse for P[ ], one horse for Buka [T[ämir ...] 3–SWN together with a stableman was given. On the 8th new day P[...] 49th (day) SWN//[... ] 5sin Toksin Buka Tämir shall give. T[...] 6given horses for long-range ulag TWD(...) 7became, Tûmän Ak-a ’Y[ [...] 8for [...], the fief of Toksin [...] ///// 9one ulag Mısır1277 P[...] //// month [...] 10to be held for the stableman. Toksin[...] 11[...]/L’R ought to go to //Y/[....]

1270 PWQ’ T.
1271 TWQSYN.
1272 PWQ’ T’MYR.
1273 TWYM’N ’Q-’.
1274 TWQSYN.
1275 MYSYR.
1276 TWQSYN.
1277 The same personal name appears in the 9th line of Käz07 and in the 18th line of UlReg07 and in the 13th line of UlReg18.
Transcription
1. *tur*|pan\textsuperscript{1278} elči-lär yüklär
2. ...]/ [m]üngü altı at ulag
3. ...b]ir at ulag . yana
4. ...u]lag munča-ta turpan\textsuperscript{1279}
5. ...a]mtı tokuz at ulag...

Translation
The *elčis* of Turpan loads [...] 6 horse-*ulags* for riding [...]0]ne horse-*ulag*. Further on [...] *ulag*; from those (mentioned above) Turpan [...] now 9 horse-*ulags*...

\textsuperscript{1278} P’N.
\textsuperscript{1279} TWRP’N.
Cit.: VOHD13,22: 138–139 (Nr. 431).
Date: Mongol period (?)

Transcription

1. Q’N beş /[…
2. ’WY[…
3. iki . K[…
4. taŋ altu .[…
5. bılğdu_{1280} tuŋ […]
6. […] şäli kuli_{1281} tu[ŋ…
7. […]YL altu […]
8. […] . säkiz . bačak_{1282} üč. [ ]
9. kuli_{1283} . altu . kičig k(a)y-a_{1284} [ ]
10. tüküni bolup iki yüz iki [ ]
11. iki otuz mamalığ tän(r)im_{1285} [ ]
12. ulug iš-lik arslanıŋ_{1286} ül[e'] [ ]
13. şäli kuli_{1287} tuŋ-nuŋ iš-lik [ ]
14. ulag beš y(e)g(i)rmi PY///SW tuŋ
15. iš-lik ulag-nuŋ altu y(e)g(i)rmi .
16. …]// tört .

---

_{1280} PYLYQDW.
_{1281} S’LY QWLY.
_{1282} P’ČQ.
_{1283} QWLY.
_{1284} KYCYK KY'-.
_{1285} M’M’LYQ T’NKYM
_{1286} ’RSL’N.
_{1287} S’LY QWLY.
Translation

1Q’N five /[/…]/ WY/…] three. K[/…] taŋ1288 took [/…] Bılıgdu Tuŋ1289 [/…] Šäli1290 Kulı Tuŋ/…]; YL six. [/…] eight, Bačak1291 three, Šäli; six; Kičig Kay-a [/…] became his all 202 [/…] 1122 Mamalıg1292 Täŋrim […] great woring of Arslan th[ree…] 13-14 Šäli Kulı the working […] ulag of Tuŋ 15 PY///SW Tuŋ 15(th) working ulag’s1293 16, […] 16 four,

---

1288 According to Clauson taŋ was a fairly large measure of capacity for seed cotton in the Uyghur documents (ED: 511).
1289 The same personal name appears frequently in the documents of the SUK. Cf.: SUK II: 294.
1290 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO13.
1291 The same personal name appears in the 20th, 33rd and 44th line of UlReg07.
1292 The same personal name appears in the 1st line of UlReg16, what is written on the other side of the same sheet.
1293 The reading of the second part of the expression (ulag) is clear, but the first part is uncertain. The suffix of the second part is surely +lIK, but the stem is written with double yod (YYS), what makes the interpretation dubious. Most probably it should be taken as iš ‘work, labour’ (ED: 254), and than it would be an ulag for work. The same expression appears in the 1st line of UlReg16, what is written on the other side of the same sheet.
UlReg16  
Ch/U 8217 r (T II Y 59; MIK 030514) (+Ch/U 6106 r)

Cit.: VOHD13,22: 138–139 (Nr. 431).

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. mama-lıg\(^{1294}\)-nųŋ . iš-lik ulag
2. –nųŋ yetmiš čuintsi\(^{1295}\)
3. ////-kä beš . beš [ ] sak . beš . ag(1)r\(^{1296}\)
4. košt(a)r üč .

Translation

Mamalıg’s\(^{1297}\), working \(ulg’\)^\(^{2,3}\)\(^{1298}\) seventy, Čuintsi for //// five, five [ ] sak\(^{1299}\), five, Agır \(koštar\)^\(^{1300}\) three,

\(^{1294}\) M’M’-LYQ.

\(^{1295}\) ČWYNTSY.

\(^{1296}\) GR.

\(^{1297}\) The same personal name appears as a part of Mamalıg Täŋrim in the 11\(^{th}\) line of UlReg15 that is written on the other side of the same sheet.

\(^{1298}\) The same expression appears in the 15\(^{th}\) line of UlReg15, what is written on the other side of the same sheet.

\(^{1299}\) Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz01.

\(^{1300}\) If the interpretation is correct, \(koštar\) is a loanword from Sogdian \(xwštr\) ‘elder, chief, Presbyter’ (Gharib 2004: 439). According to Moriyasu this word detected only in the Manichean literature of the Uyghurs, and it was a title of in the Manichean hierarchy (Moriyasu 2004b: 108). On the other hand Rachewiltz and Rybatzki state that Manichean terms as \(dintar\) ‘monk’ and \(manistan\) ‘monastery’ can be found in the sources of other religions such as Buddhism or Church of the East (Rachewiltz–Rybatzki 2010: 46), so it seems probable that \(koštar\) could remain in usage after the disappearance of Manicheanism among the Uyghurs. Raschmann gave a hypotetical dating of the text to the Mongol period due to the appearance of \(ulg\) (VOHD13,22: 139 fn. 5). Due to the above mentioned her dating seems to be acceptable.
Transcription

1. [u]lag-nt[ŋ] / P[ ]L [...]
2. [ ]k(a)y-a1301 bor yükläp [...] /[ ...]
3. [ ]üč uzun ulag bir [...]
4. T’ iki ulag bir ulagč[1...
5. b
6. bir uzun ulag t(u)rpan1302 [...]
7. yan-a tümän bäg-niŋ /// [ ] ///1303
8. [ ]K YN [...]
9. [ ]Y K[...]

Translation

1[u]lag’s [...] 2Kay-a wine loaded [...] 3three long-range ulags, one [...] 4two ulags, one stableman [...] 5g(ave). 6One long-range ulag Turpan [...] 7and the tümän bäg’s1304 [...]

Cit.: CLARKINTRO 150, 177, 453 (Nr. 131); RASCHMBAUMWOLLE 73, 74, 76, 77, 153–155 (Nr. 81); VOHD13,22: 157–158 (Nr. 460).

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. yılan yıl-ki kalan-ka
2. elči-kâ bermišim tämür
3. buk-a ka bir böz yan-a [ ]
4. tumur buk-ka' bir böz
5. berdim yan-a tumur-ka bir
6. böz berdim yana bay buk-a
7. bor-ka yarım böz berdim
8. š(ä)rmis-ka to-ka köykü-ka
9. bir böz berdim yana k(a)y-a
10. bahşı-ka bir böz berdim
11. yana turpan barmiş-ta bir

This manuscript is probably connected with U 9005. Clark noticed that the two handwritings, and the contents (CLARKINTRO: 453) are quite similar. On the other side of both manuscripts we can find Loan contracts. The texts on the two sides have no connections.

1305 This manuscript is probably connected with U 9005. Clark noticed that the two handwritings, and the contents (CLARKINTRO: 453) are quite similar. On the other side of both manuscripts we can find Loan contracts. The texts on the two sides have no connections.

1306 LI 1996: birmiş-im :.
1307 T'MWR PWQ-.';
1308 USP: n(äk); LI 1996: bâ(k); ÖZETGIN 2004: bâ[g]; TUGUSHEVA 2013: be[k].
1310 PWQ-.
1311 USP: -nyka ka.
1312 USP: neprim; LI 1996: bir'tim.
1313 TWMWR. ÖZETGIN 2004: tämûr.
1314 USP: neprim; LI 1996: bir'tim.
1315 P'Y PWQ-'.
1316 USP: neprim; LI 1996: bir'tim.
1317 SRMYS.
1319 TWQ.
1321 KWYKW.
1323 USP: neprim; LI 1996: bir'tim.
1324 USP: neprim; LI 1996: bir'tim.
1326 USP: neprim; LI 1996: bir'tim.
12. բոզ ելչի-կա բոզ բերդ[իմ] 1328
13. յան-ա բոր-կա թեփ բոզ միս[ու] 1330
14. –ին ալֶբ բերդ[իմ] յան-ա բահŝ-տ 1331
15. –ին մղա-կա բոզ բերդ[իմ] 1332
16. յան-ա կան-կա թեփ յարմ բոզ
17. բերդ[իմ] յան-ա բուրալդայ կա-1336 բոզ
18. բոզ բարուն-կա 1338 բոզ
What I paid as kalan1340 in the Snake year: 2-5 for the elcí(s). I paid to Tämür Buk-a1341 one böz. Further on [...] I paid for Tumur Buk-a one böz. 5-1 Further on I paid to Tämür Buk-a 1341 one böz. I paid to Tämür Buk-a 1341 one böz. Further on I paid for Tumur Buk-a one böz. 5-7 Furhter on I paid to Tumur one böz. Further on I paid half böz as wine(-tax) to Bay Buka1342. 8-10 I paid one böz to Şärmiş, to Tok (and) to Köykü. Further on I paid one böz to Kay-a bahşi1343. 11-12 Further on when he arrived to Turpan, I paid one böz to the elcí. 13-15 Furhter on for the ulag of the bahşi I paid one böz. 16-17 Further on for the so called Khan(-tax)1345 I paid half böz. Further on to Burulday one 18böz (and) to Barun one böz.1346

1340 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Käz02.
1341 The same personal name appears in the 2nd line of PO06.
1342 The same personal name appears in the 29th line of UlReg07.
1343 Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO05.
1344 The same personal name appears in the 9th line of Käz07, in the 18th line of UlReg07 and in the 9th line of UlReg13.
1345 This kind of tax is not characteized so far. The same expression appears in the 7th line of UlReg09.
9.2.2 Other private lists

PL01 Ch/U 8097 v (MIK 028440; Glas: T II 1938)

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription
1. idrili\footnote{\textbf{YDRYLY}.} noyın kälimištä yalın turpan\footnote{\textbf{Y'LYN TWRP'N}.} ka bir kap \{bor\}\footnote{\textbf{YDRYLY}.} 1347
2. idrili\footnote{\textbf{K'SYN}.} noyn-ńń kaṭun kälimištä 1350
3. ...noyın tutgu bir kap bor b kā(ṛ)sin\footnote{\textbf{QWNKLY}.} daruga 1351
4. koŋli\footnote{\textbf{YDRYLY}.} -ka idrili\footnote{\textbf{YDRYLY}.} noyın-ka bir kap bor šazım[...]
5. kälp [...] alip berdi idrili\footnote{\textbf{YDRYLY}.} 1354 noyın lükčün 1355 -tin 1356
6. yani -ta iki kap bor b noyam-a 1357 lükčün 1358 -kä
7. bir kap bor alip berdi

Translation
1. When Idrili noyın\footnote{\textbf{Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01}.} came one kap\footnote{\textbf{Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO06}.} wine Yalın for Turpan. 2. When the wife of Idrili noyın came. [...noy]ın one kap stored wine g(ave). Kārsin daruga\footnote{\textbf{Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01}.} to Koŋli (and) to Idrili noyın one kap wine the Buddhist community [... ] came (and) delivered. Idrili noyın from Lükčün at 3. Yanı two kap wine g(ave). Noyam-a to Lükčün 4. one kap wine delivered.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1347} Y'LYN TWRP'N.  
\textsuperscript{1348} YDRYLY.  
\textsuperscript{1347} The word \textit{bor} was written nex to \textit{kap} on the right.  
\textsuperscript{1350} YDRYLY.  
\textsuperscript{1351} K'SYN.  
\textsuperscript{1352} QWNKLY.  
\textsuperscript{1353} YDRYLY.  
\textsuperscript{1354} YDRYLY.  
\textsuperscript{1355} LWYKČWNK.  
\textsuperscript{1356} Y'NY.  
\textsuperscript{1357} NWY'M-.’  
\textsuperscript{1358} LWYKČWNK.  
\textsuperscript{1359} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.  
\textsuperscript{1360} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO06.  
\textsuperscript{1361} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO01.}
Cit.: RASCHMBAUMWOLLE: 45, 74, 137 (Nr. 53); MATSUI 1998b: 46.

Date: Mongol period.

Transcription

1. ...]kupčir yıgmıš[...
2. ...]yarım kari böz
3. b ělik\textsuperscript{1362}-kä altú P[...
4. toŋul buka\textsuperscript{1363}-ka bir Y[...

Translation

1...]\textsuperscript{1364} kupčir collected [...] \textsuperscript{1365} half kari böz sg(ave). To Ėlik\textsuperscript{1366} six P[...] to Toŋul Buka one Y[...
Chapter X: Middle Mongolian documents

Mong01  Mainz 867 (TM 94 D 135)

Publ.: WeiERS 1967: 34–40 (Text B); BT XVI: 178–179 (Nr. 72).
Fac.: HAENISCH 1959: 33 (B 8); WEIERS 1967: 53.
Date: 1353 (FRANKE 1962: 408).

Transcription

1. tuyluytemür¹³⁶⁷ üge manu
2. bolad ǧ’a’ya-a¹³⁶⁸ türmiš segünê¹³⁶⁹
3. ekiten-e […] enel L[…]’Y¹³⁷⁰
4. qabûγ baliyê¹³⁷¹ ekiten alčin¹³⁷²
5. kürüged qoyar jayûn¹³⁷³ tulum¹³⁷⁴
6. bor-un üjûb¹³⁷⁵ anu¹³⁷⁶ osal¹³⁷⁷ ’ü’il’ü¹³⁷⁸ bolyan
7. [ire]gtûn¹³⁷⁹ ğde alčin-tûr¹³⁸⁰ γurban¹³⁸¹ ulay-a tabun
8. tembin¹³⁸² bor qoyar kül miq-a γurban¹³⁸³ badman¹³⁸⁴
9. kûnesûn ãğçê jorçiyultuγai¹³⁸⁵ kemen
10. ništû¹³⁸⁶ biçîg ãğbei¹³³ moγai j[i]¹³³

¹³⁶⁷ TWQLWQDMWR.
¹³⁷² WEIERS 1967: alčin.
¹³⁷³ LIGETI 1972a: jayûn [?].
¹³⁷⁴ LIGETI 1972a: tulum [?]; BT XVI: tulu’m’.
¹³⁷⁵ LIGETI 1972a: [s]łuçîg [?].
¹³⁷⁶ LIGETI 1972a: yérû.
¹³⁷⁷ WEIERS 1967: ãsä; LIGETI 1972a: […] ãsä?
¹³⁷⁸ LIGETI 1972a: ülu [?].
¹³⁷⁹ LIGETI 1972a: […]gtûn [?].
¹³⁸⁰ WEIERS 1967: alčin-tûr.
11. qaburun ąčūs sar-a-in arban sin-e-
12. -de minglay-a büküi-țür bičibe
Translation

(This is) our, Tuγluγ Temür’s\textsuperscript{1393} word [i.e. order]: \textsuperscript{2}For those led by Bolad Qay-a and Türmiš Segünč\textsuperscript{1394}. As soon as the \textit{elčis}\textsuperscript{1395} [...] led by \textit{Qabuγ Baliγči}\textsuperscript{1396} arrive, our 200 leather bags \textit{of wine-grape shall not be carelessly treated, (and they) shall come (to us?)}. To these \textit{elčis} 3 \textit{ulags}\textsuperscript{1397}, 5 \textit{stembin}\textsuperscript{1398} wine, two \textit{köl}\textsuperscript{1399} of meat (and) 3 \textit{badman}\textsuperscript{1400} provision shall be given (and they) shall be allowed to move on. By saying \textit{that}, we gave a document provided with a stamp.\textsuperscript{1401} We have written this in the Snake year, \textit{11-12} on the \textit{10}\textsuperscript{th} new day of the last month of spring, while we were in Minglaγ.\textsuperscript{1402}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1393} Tuγluγ Temür was a nephew of Kebek (1319/20–1327) and a ruler of the Chaghadai Khanate from 1347 to 1363. However the two parts of his name are written together in the document (as it is showed in the transcription), in the translation I wrote them apart, as his name can be found in the most of the sources and in the literature. On his life see: \textsc{Kim 1999: 299–304}.
\item \textsuperscript{1394} Both personal names seem to be of Turkic origin. The original form of the former was most probably Turmıš Sevinč (Cf.: \textsc{OT: 655–656; 800}).\textsuperscript{11} For both names see: \textsc{Weiers 1967: 35–36 and the notes of BT XVI: 178}.
\item \textsuperscript{1395} However in the transcription the word is transcribed as \textit{glicaγ} in accordance with the transcription system of this edition, in the translation the form \textit{elči}\textsuperscript{13} is applied in order to stress the fact, that this is the same title what can be found in the Uyghur documents.
\item \textsuperscript{1396} This proper name seems to be of Turkic too. Cf.: \textsc{Weiers 1967: 37 and the notes of BT XVI: 178}.
\item \textsuperscript{1397} However in the transcription the word is transcribed as \textit{ulag\textendash}a in accordance with the transcription system of this edition, in the translation the form \textit{ulag} is applied in order to stress the fact, that this is the same title what can be found in the Uyghur documents. For a detailed discussion of the meaning of \textit{ulag} and the various constructions formed with this word, see: Chapter 5.1.
\item \textsuperscript{1398} The Mongolian \textit{tembin} (Uyghur \textit{tämbin}) was a measure unit for liquids. Already Nobuo Yamada pointed out that 30 \textit{tämbin} were equal to 1 \textit{kap} (YAMADA 1971: 493–495). Later Dai Matsui involved Chinese and Mongolian materials into the investigation and pointed out that \textit{tembin} was the smallest measurement for liquids, which was ca. 0.28 litre (MATSUI 2004a: 197, 200).
\item \textsuperscript{1399} According to Dai Matsui Mongolian \textit{köl} ‘foot, leg’ (LESSING 1973: 483) was a unit of measurement for meat, but it could be a unit of weight too. Matsui mentions that in the Uyghur documents appears \textit{sak} (<Persian \textit{sāq}) as a measure unit for meat (MATSUI 2004a: 200 fn. 9). Cf.: the notes for the translation of Kāzž01.
\item \textsuperscript{1400} Cf.: the notes for the translation of PO07.
\item \textsuperscript{1401} The second part of the compound \textit{nīstu bičig} means ‘document’. The \textit{nīstu} is a derivative of \textit{nīṣan}. For \textit{nīṣan}, see the notes for the translation of OAcc03. The word \textit{nīṣan} appears in the documents of the Golden Horde and Ilkhanid Iran and also in the Mongolian documents of Central Asia, as a tool for the authentication of the documents. Apart from its original sense (‘sign, mark’) it meant ‘stamp’ as well. On the usage of \textit{nīṣan} in the Mongol Period: \textsc{Weiers 1967: 30–33} (with further literature); \textsc{Vásáry 1987: 46–50}.
\item \textsuperscript{1402} \textsc{Weiers 1967: “Unser Wort, Tuγluγ Temür an die (post)vorstehender Bulad-γaya und Türmiš-Segünč: Sobald die –Kurieren mit (.. enel-L.. laili?)) und (Q)abuγ-Ba(r)liqči an der Spitze angekommen sind, mögen sie, die 200 Ledersäcke ihrer Weintrauben nicht nachlässig behandeln, kommen! Man soll diesen Kurieren drei Wechselfelder, fünf \kquote{Kanven Wein, zwei Schafseine und drei batman \kquote{Getreide geben und sie (dann) weiterziehen lassen! Indem wir (dies) sagen, \textit{haben wir ein mit der Chiffre (des Khans) versehenes Schreiben gegeben. (Im) Schlangenjahr, \textit{11} am zehnten des zunehmenden Mondes des letzten Frühlingsmonsats \textit{12}haben Wir es beim Aufenthalt in Minglaγ geschrieben.” BT XVI: “Anordnung von Uns, von Tuγluγ Temür. \textit{An Bolad-γya, Türmiš-Segünč und die anderen. Sobald […] \kquote{Qabuγ-Baliγči und die anderen Kuriere \kquote{eingetroffen sind, sollen sie, die 200 Ledersäcke ihrer Weintrauben nicht nachlässig behandeln, (zu Uns?) kommen! Man soll diesen Kurieren drei Wechselfelder, fünf \kquote{Kanven Wein, zwei Schafseine und drei \textit{badman} \kquote{Getreide geben und sie weiterziehen lassen! Dieses \textit{mit einem Siegel versehene Schreiben haben Wir gegeben. Im Schlangen-Jahr, \textit{11} am zehnten (Tage) des neuen (Mondes) des letzten Frühlings-Monsats \textit{12}haben Wir (es), während Wir Uns in Minglaγ aufhielten, geschrieben.”
Mong02

**Publ.** FRANKE 1968: 7–14; BT XVI: 179–180 (Nr. 73).

**Facs.** HAENISCH 1959: 36 (B 14); FRANKE 1968: 14.


**Date:** 1331 (?) (RYBATZKI 1997: 283).

**Transcription**

1. qan-u jarliy-’i[ya]r
2. berketemür üge manu
3. ’i’duq qut čings(a)ng-a quba
4. [y]iučing bai q(a)y-a sočing
5. [g]’k’iten noyađa an-e sevinč
6. buq-a borči nasu bor [ara]ki-
7. –yi qadaγlaǰu yabuqu-yin tula
8. industan ākiten ilčin-e
9. abču oḏqu bor araki-yi
10. qad’a’ylaju kiyče asaraju
11. yabutuyai industan āk’i’te[n]
12. ilčin oḏqu-ṭur bor araki-
13. luγ- a qamtu γurban ulatu
14. oďtuγai kemen ništu belge

---

1403 FRANKE 1968; LIGETI 1972a: Jarliy-iyar.
1404 BYRK’D’MWR. FRANKE 1968; BT XVI: Bigetemür.
1405 LIGETI 1972a: Iduγ-qut; BT XVI: ’T’duq qud.
1407 FRANKE 1968: yuĉing; LIGETI 1972a: ĉuĉing [?].
1409 FRANKE 1968: (ak) iten; LIGETI 1972a: [ek]iten.
1412 FRANKE 1968: kiće; LIGETI 1972a; BT XVI: jigen (?).
1413 LIGETI 1972a: āsayçu.
1414 FRANKE 1968: yabutuyai.
1417 FRANKE 1968: qurban.
1418 FRANKE 1968: oďtuγai.
15. bičig ögbei qonin jil
16. arban sar-a-yin naiman qa’u’čí’n’a
17. bulad-a büküi-jür ’b’ičibei

1420 FRANKE 1968: qauchin; BT XVI: qa’u’čí’n’.
1421 BWLAD-. LIGETI 1972a: Bolad-a.
1422 FRANKE 1968; LIGETI 1972a: bičibei.
Translation

1By the order of the Khan1423 2(This is) our Berke Temür’s1424 word [i.e. order]: 3.5for those noyan1425 led by the idaq qut1426 čingsang1427, Quba yiučing1428 (and) Bay Qay-a sočing1429. Because this Sevinč 6-7Buqa-a borči1430 went to secure the wine beverage1431 of this year, shall the selčis led by Industan1432 9-10collect (the wine beverage), (they) shall

---

1423 There is no mention of the name of the qan in the text. Rybatzki identified him as Ḣayayatu qan (1329–1332). He based his identification on the fact that according to our sources there was only one period when a Uyghur ıduk kut held the Chinese title chengxiang (丞相). As recorded on an inscription from Gansu (GENG–HAMILTON 1981: 21–22) Temür Buka ıduk kut got this title from Ḣayayatu qan. Rybatzki states that the title qan which appears in the first place was applied only for the rulers of the whole Mongol Empire. Because of this he finds improbable the identification of the qan with Tarmaširin (1326–1334) then Čaγatayid ruler. He adds that as Tarmaširin was the first Islamic ruler of the Čaγatayid ulus, under his reign the dating would be presented according to the Muslim calculation of time (RYBATZKI 1997: 283–284).

1424 Here I followed the readings of Ligeti (LIGETI 1972a: 212) and Rybatzki (RYBATZKI 1997: 283), contrary to Franke and the BT XVI (both readings are in the footnote to the transcription). Cf.: RYBATZKI 2006: 226, 265.

1425 Mongolian noyan ‘lord, prince, chief, superior, commandant’ (LESSING 1973: 589). A detailed history of the word can be found in: TMEN I: 526–528; Nr. 389. The word appears in the form NWYYN in the following Uyghur documents concerning the yam-system: PO01, PO04; Käz03; PList01.

1426 Iduk kut (with our Turkic transcription system: ıduk kut) was the title of the rulers of the West Uyghur Kingdom, and later the title of the leader of Uyghur territory within the Mongol Empire. The meaning of the expression is ‘the sacred favour of heaven’ (ED: 46). Due to the fact that in the text it is followed by another title (čingsang, see the next footnote), Herbert Franke interpreted it as a proper name. Since from Rybatzki’s article we know that Temür Buka held simultaneously both titles (RYBATZKI 1997: 283–284, see the firs footnote for the translation of this document). On the title ıduk kut, see: ARAT 1964; ARAT 1986.

1427 The title čingsang is the Mongolian transcription of the Chinese chengxiang (丞相) ‘chancellor, prime minister’ (TMEN I: 310–312, Nr. 184; FARQUHAR 1990: 170, 368, 539).

1428 The title yiučing is the Mongolian transcription of the Chinese youcheng (右丞). In the literature various interpretations of this title can be found: ‘chin. Beamter der 4. Rangstufe’ (TMEN I: 554–555, Nr. 407); ‘Staatssekretär zur Rechten’ (FRANKE 1968: 10); ‘Senior Vice Councillor’ (FARQUHAR 1990: 171, 368, 588).

1429 The title sočing is the Mongolian transcription of the Chinese zuocheng (左丞). In the literature various interpretations of this title can be found: ‘Beamten 5. Grades der chin. Hierarchie’ (TMEN III: 215–216, Nr. 1201); ‘Staatssekretär zur Linken’ (FRANKE 1968: 10); ‘Junior Vice Councillor’ (FARQUHAR 1990: 171, 368, 582).

1430 The expression borči is a Turkic loanword in the text. In this expression the +či nomen actoris is attached to the noun bor ‘wine’. Originally it had two meanings in Old Turkic: ‘wine grower or merchant’ and ‘wine-bibber’ (ED: 357; DTS: 113). Franke translated the word in the former meaning as: ‘Winzer’ (FRANKE 1968: 9). In the BT XVI they interpreted it as: ‘der Einsammler der Weinabgaben’ (BT XVI: 180). In my opinion both solution is probable, because from the context it is not clear if Sevinč Buqa is an independent wine merchant who worked in this case for the state, or is he an officer of the state itself. For this reason I left the expression in its original form.

1431 The amendment of the lacuna in the 6th line (bor [ara]ki-) is based on the parallel places in the 9th and 12th lines. However the original meanings of araki(n) are ‘alcoholic liquor made of airaγ (q.v.) through distillation; any alcoholic beverage: brandy, wine, etc.’ (LESSING 1973: 48), Franke found it unlikely that the Mongols had some kind of brandy made of grape wine (‘Brauntwein aus Traubenwein’) that time, so he translated the expression as ‘Traubenwein’ (FRANKE 1968: 9, 11) and the editors of the BT XVI followed him (p. 180). For me bor araki seems like to be an apposition where araki means ‘alcoholic beverage’ in general and the bor specifies it as ‘wine’

1432 Industan is the borrowing of the Persian toponym Hindustan what means ‘India’, notwithstanding due to the context here it must refer to a person. While the personal name Indu (~Hindu) is well attested in the Mongolian and Uyghur sources from this period, there are no other evidence for Industan or Hindustan as a proper name (BT XVI: 180). For the name Indu (~Hindu) in the Mongolian sources and for further literature see: CLEAVES 1949a: 93–94 fn. 4. For Indu (~Hindu) in the contemporary Uyghur documents cf.: the notes for the translation of PO13.
preserve the wine beverage, take care of the dry food, and go. The elčis led by Industan for their trip with the wine beverage shall go with three ulags [i.e. shall be given three ulags]. By saying that, we gave a pass provided with a stamp. We have written this in the Sheep year, on the 8th day of the waning moon in the 10th month while we were in Bulad.

---

1433 This is the most problematic part of the text. Ligeti read it as jigen asayçu (LIGETI 1972a: 212). The editors of the BT XVI followed him concerning the first part of the expression and interpreted it as ‘befördern’(BT XVI: 180). For me Franke’s reading seems more probable, however not fully convincing. He read the two words as kiĉe asaraju and translated as ‘vor dem Wetter schützend, in Obhut nehmend’. He accounted for his interpretation with the fact that according to the dating of the document, it was issued in the second half of the 10th months’, so it must have been some times in November. He called the attention to the parallel part in the 6th line of Mong01 (FRANKE 1968: 12 note 10). According to George Kara’s Mongolian-Hungarian dictionary there is a word in contemporary Khalkha language xüliň which has a third meaning ‘dry food’ (‘száraz élelem’) (KARA 1998: 572). In the 4th volume of the Bolšoj akademičeskij mongolsko-russkij slovar the same word can be found with the following secondary meanings: ‘съестные припасы, продукты питания’ (BOLŠOJ IV: 83) However Kara drives it back to a kiĉe form, it seems not improbable to derive it from a Middle Mongolian kiyče. Here I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Róna-Tas who called my attention to this data.

Transcription

1. yisüntemür\textsuperscript{1435}–ün ğ(a)rḷ̊γ̄̊-iyar\textsuperscript{1436}
2. temür satilmış\textsuperscript{1437} akiten\textsuperscript{1438}
3. toγačin\textsuperscript{1439} sügüsüčin\textsuperscript{1440} üge
4. manu jaγur-a\textsuperscript{1441} bükün Jamudun\textsuperscript{1442}
5. ö(t)ögüs-e\textsuperscript{1443} ade\textsuperscript{1444} kök-buq-a\textsuperscript{1445}
6. ekiten borčin qočo\textsuperscript{1446} -tur öd̠̄ba-asu\textsuperscript{1447} od̠̄qui
7. irekü–tüń\textsuperscript{1448} ul(a)γ̄čidača\textsuperscript{1449} ţö̈ḡ-e\textsuperscript{1450} dörben
8. ul(a)γad\textsuperscript{1451} özgüsüčin;\textsuperscript{1452} Jamudun\textsuperscript{1442}
9. bayuju\textsuperscript{1453} morilatala yerüyin künesün bolan\textsuperscript{1454}
10. qoyar köl miʔ qan\textsuperscript{1455} qoyar saba umdan qoyar
11. baǰman\textsuperscript{1456} künesün özgüsüčin;\textsuperscript{1457} kemen

\textsuperscript{1435} WYSWND’MWR. WEIERS 1967: Yisün(t)emür.
\textsuperscript{1436} RAMSTEDT 1909: j(a)r(i)y y(a); WEIERS 1967: jrḷ̊γ̄̊-iyar; LIGETI 1972a: jrḷ̊γ̄̊-iyar; BT XVI: jrḷ̊γ̄̊-iyar.
\textsuperscript{1437} T’MWR S’DYLMYS.
\textsuperscript{1438} RAMSTEDT 1909: ekiten; WEIERS 1967: akiten.
\textsuperscript{1439} RAMSTEDT 1909: toγajin; WEIERS 1967: toqachin.
\textsuperscript{1440} RAMSTEDT 1909: sügüsüčin; WEIERS 1967: sügüsüčin.
\textsuperscript{1441} RAMSTEDT 1909: ja[γur?]-a; WEIERS 1967: Jaqur-a.
\textsuperscript{1442} RAMSTEDT 1909: Jamudun.
\textsuperscript{1443} RAMSTEDT 1909: öṭegüs-e; WEIERS 1967: ö(t)ögüs-e; LIGETI 1972a: öṭegüs-e.
\textsuperscript{1444} RAMSTEDT 1909: ende; WEIERS 1967: ade.
\textsuperscript{1445} KWYK BWQ-7. WEIERS 1967: Kök-Buq-a; LIGETI 1972a: Kök-Buq-a; BT XVI: Kök-Buq-a.
\textsuperscript{1446} QWCW. RAMSTEDT 1909: qojo. WEIERS 1967: Qojo.
\textsuperscript{1447} LIGETI 1972a; BT XVI: öd̠̄ba asu.
\textsuperscript{1448} RAMSTEDT 1909: -dür.
\textsuperscript{1449} RAMSTEDT 1909: ul(a)γ(a)čidača; WEIERS 1967: ulγ̄čidača; LIGETI 1972a, BT XVI: ulγ̄čidača.
\textsuperscript{1450} RAMSTEDT 1909, WEIERS 1967: özür-e.
\textsuperscript{1451} WEIERS 1967: ulqad; LIGETI 1972a, BT XVI: ulyad.
\textsuperscript{1452} WEIERS 1967: yorčiqlu̱tuqai.
\textsuperscript{1453} WEIERS 1967: barqju. WEIERS 1967: barqju.
\textsuperscript{1454} WEIERS 1967: bolcan.
\textsuperscript{1455} RAMSTEDT 1909, WEIERS 1967, LIGETI 1972a: miqan.
\textsuperscript{1456} WEIERS 1967: baǰman.
\textsuperscript{1457} WEIERS 1967: yorčiqlu̱tuqai.
12. niša-ḏu\textsuperscript{1458} bičīg ṭq-ḫt bars ḥil namurun
13. ečŭs sar-a-yin qoyar qaučin-ḫt türge-ḫt
14. bükü-ṭūr\textsuperscript{1459} bičibei

\textsuperscript{1458} RAMSTEDT 1909: niš-a-tu.
\textsuperscript{1459} RAMSTEDT 1909: -dūr.
Translation

By the order of Yisün Temür,1460 the leader of the accountants and the carterers (of the postal system, directed) to the seniors [i.e. leaders] of the postal stations’ which will be in between [i.e. on the way]. These borčis led by Kök Buq-a are going to Qočo. As they approach, four ulags shall be given to him by the ulagčis, (and) they shall be allowed to move on. As they stop on the way, until they mount their houses [i.e. continue their journey] they shall be given from the post station in the capacity of usual provision 2 kól meat, 2 saba beverage and 2 grain, (and) they shall be allowed to move on.

By saying that, we gave a document provided with a stamp. We have written this in the Tiger year, on the second (day) of the (moon) in the last month of autumn, while we were in Türgen.1468

---

1460 Yisün Temür (1337–1339/40) was a grandson of Dua’a (1282–1307). After the killing of his own brother Čangši (1335–1337), he became the rule of the Čagatayid ulus. The Muslim sources describe him as an insane man, among other things mention that he cut off his mother’s breasts (BIRAN 2009: 59). However the two parts of his name are written together in the document (as it is showed in the transcription), in the translation I wrote them apart, as his name can be found in the most of the sources and in the literature.

1461 This personal name is surely Turkic. The original form must have been Temür Satilmıs. Cf.: WEIERS 1967: 17.

1462 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong02.

1463 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong01. For a detailed discussion of the meaning of ulag and the various constructions formed with this word see: Chapter 5.1.

1464 However in the transcription the word is transcribed as ul(a)či in accordance with the transcription system of this edition, in the translation the form ulagči is applied in order to stress the fact, that this is the same title what can be found in the Uyghur documents. This word is composed from the noun ulag (see above) and the Old Turkic nomen actoris či. Generally it meant ‘relay coachman, relay service attendant’ (LESSING 1973: 869).

1465 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong01.

1466 Sabu was a unit of measurements for liquids in Mongolian. After the unification of weights and measures in the Mongol Empire 1 saba was equal to 1 Chinese sheng \(\frac{1}{2}\) ca. 0.84 litre (MATSU 2004a: 197. 200). Contrary to this in Farquhar’s handbook 1 Monglian šim was equal to 1 sheng \(\frac{1}{2}\) what 0.9488 litres was (FARQUHAR 1990: 444).

1467 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong01.


weiterreisen lassen! Pausieren sie, soll man (ihnen) bis zum Witerritt als allgemeine Verpflegung zwei Schafe, zwei Gefäße mit Getränken und zwei badman Getreide, geben (dann) soll man sie weiterziehen lassen. Dieses mit einem Siegel versehene Schreiben haben Wir gegeben. Im Tiger-Jahr, am zweiten (Tage) des alten (Mondes) des letzten Herbst-Monats haben Wir (es), während Wir Uns in Türgen aufhielten, geschrieben."
Transcription

[...]

1. jaqaγun-a\textsuperscript{1470} bükün jamudun\textsuperscript{1471}
2. ötegūs-e āt-e\textsuperscript{1472}
3. jumatin daiš-a\textsuperscript{1473}
4. akiten\textsuperscript{1474} elčiš\textsuperscript{1475}
5. M[...]\textsuperscript{1476} jarubai\textsuperscript{1477} ulači-šača\textsuperscript{1478} gör-e\textsuperscript{1479}
6. [n]aiman\textsuperscript{1480} ulayad\textsuperscript{1481} ögčü
7. yorčiy’ul-taršai\textsuperscript{1482} kemen
8. nišan-tu\textsuperscript{1483} bíčiš\textsuperscript{1484} ögbei qonin jil
9. üšquence\textsuperscript{1485} dumdatu\textsuperscript{1486} sarayin γunan\textsuperscript{1487} sineše\textsuperscript{1488}
10. qungludu\textsuperscript{1489} büšk’ü-tür\textsuperscript{1490} bičibe

\textsuperscript{1469} A part of the document on its left side is missing. This part contained the first line(s), but we do not know how many lines were there. Probably the lost part contained the name of the ruler (Cf.: Mong03). Due to the characteristics of the documents dating, without the name of the actual ruler it is impossible to assume the exact year when it was issued.

\textsuperscript{1470} RAMSTEDT 1909: ja[qamad?]-a; WEIERS 1967: Jaqaqun-a.
\textsuperscript{1471} RAMSTEDT 1909: jamudun; WEIERS 1967: Jamudu(n).
\textsuperscript{1472} RAMSTEDT 1909: ende; WEIERS 1967: ade; BT XVI: ad-e.
\textsuperscript{1473} RAMSTEDT 1909, WEIERS 1967: akiten.
\textsuperscript{1474} RAMSTEDT 1909, WEIERS 1967: ilčini; LIGETI 1972a, BT XVI: ilčini.
\textsuperscript{1475} RAMSTEDT 1909: t[..]; WEIERS 1967: M. ?. (T ?) ..; LIGETI 1972a: t[......?].
\textsuperscript{1476} RAMSTEDT 1909, LIGETI 1972a: ĉarubai.
\textsuperscript{1477} RAMSTEDT 1909: ul(a)γ(a)či-dača.
\textsuperscript{1478} RAMSTEDT 1909: qur-e; WEIERS 1967: qur-e.
\textsuperscript{1479} RAMSTEDT 1909: [na]qim; LIGETI 1972a: naiman.
\textsuperscript{1479} RAMSTEDT 1909: u[ld]aγad; WEIERS 1967: ulaqad.
\textsuperscript{1481} RAMSTEDT 1909: ni[s]an-tu; WEIERS 1967: n(i)šan-tu; LIGETI 1972a: nišan-tu.
\textsuperscript{1482} RAMSTEDT 1909, LIGETI 1972a: bičiš.
\textsuperscript{1483} RAMSTEDT 1909: üšquence; WEIERS 1967: üšquence; LIGETI 1972a: üšquence.
\textsuperscript{1484} RAMSTEDT 1909, WEIERS 1967: dumadatu.
\textsuperscript{1485} WEIERS 1967: qunan; LIGETI 1972a: qunan.
\textsuperscript{1486} RAMSTEDT 1909: sineš; WEIERS 1967: sineš(e); LIGETI 1972a: sineš-e.
\textsuperscript{1487} RAMSTEDT 1909: yurbašt(idu)?; WEIERS 1967: Qongludu.
Translation

...1-2 For the seniors [i.e. leaders] of the postal stations’ which will be in between [i.e. on the way]. 3-5 These elčis led by Žumatin Dails-a […] we employed. 5-8 ulags shall be given (to them) apart from the ulagečis, (and) they shall be allowed to move on. 7-10 By saying that, we gave a document provided with a stamp. Sheep year, the 3rd day of the new month’s in the middle month of winter, while we ere in Qunglu.

---

1491 The word jaqarun-a is not attested in any contemporary text. It might be a scribe error. According to the parallel text in the 4th line of Mong03 most probably it should be translated in the same meaning as jaqur-a. Cf.: BT XVI: 181 note for 74r4.
1492 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong01.
1493 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong01. For a detailed discussion of the meaning of ulag and the various constructions formed with this word see: Chapter V.
1494 Cf.: the notes for the translation of Mong03.
Transcription

1. [ni]gen temegen jam-ṭur yorčiba
2. lui sorumbu nigen temegen daraša
3. qoyar temegen jam-ṭur yorčiba
4. ibū ükü nigen temegen daraša
5. nigen temegen ükübe
6. ibū yoŋadiqud(a) γurban temegen daraša
7. nigen jam-ṭur oro nigen ükübe
8. / ibū sibirqui nigen daraša
9. qoyar temegen jam-ṭur oro
10. ou toldi γurban temegen daraša
11. γurban jam-ṭur or(o)ba
12. mongγol soγda tabun daraša
13. song siba(γ) nigen daraša
14. jo išt(e)mür qoyar temegen daraša
15. kebiḏ kil dolun temegen daraša
16. adirman arban daraša

---

1496 According to the damaged left side of the sheet, and the traces of some letters on the same side before the first readable line, it seems certain that the document contained at least one more line.
1498 LWY SWRWMBW.
1499 YBW 'WYKW.
1500 YBW YWN'DYQWDY. YOSHIDA–CHIMEDODORUI 2008: ibū yoŋadiqudai.
1504 WW TWLDY.
1505 YOSHIDA–CHIMEDODORUI 2008: or<u>u>ba.
1506 The beginnings of the last five lines (12th–16th) are marked at the beginning with a sign like: γ. It seems like the scribe wanted to mark, highlight or group the lines. It worth mentioning that in the earlier part of the text two or three lines belonged together semantically, but in these last five lines every line seems like an independent semantical unit.
1507 MWNKQWL SWQD'. YOSHIDA–CHIMEDODORUI 2008: mongγol soγda.
1508 SWNK SYB’W. YOSHIDA–CHIMEDODORUI 2008: soni sibau.
1509 JO YSTMWR. YOSHIDA–CHIMEDODORUI 2008: jo ištemür.
1510 K’BYDKY.
1511 ‘DYRM’N.
The exact meaning of this document is not clear yet. It bears no stamp or any criteria of an official document, though due to its content most probably it was issued within the postal system of the Mongol Empire. The document is a list of persons who somehow fulfilled their duties what was connected with camels, toward the postal system. The most problematic part is the interpretation of the verb *daru*- in this case. Originally it meant: ‘to press, press down, to squeeze; to affix a seal; to print; to pickle, marinate, preserve’ or ‘to oppress, suppress, subdue, defeat, restrain’ (LESSING 1973: 233). In my opinion in this context presumably it means some kind of registration through the stamping or affixing of a seal. However another likely interpretation can be applied here. This other translation would use the ‘restrain’ meaning of the verb *daru*- and the interpretation supposes that the mentioned persons gave a certain number of camels to the *jam*, but restrained some in return for earlier debits or overpayments. By this translation instead of “affixed a seal [i.e. registered] (on)” always “restrained” would stand. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor András Róna-Tas to call my attention to this other valid translation.

The second part of this personal name was probably Sibaγu, what means ‘bird, fowl’. The fact that in the 15th line the scribe wrote *dolun* instead of *dolugγan* ‘seven’ seems to strengthen this assumption. Cf.: RYBATZKI 2006: 659 (Sibaγuči).
Chapter XI: The postal system of the Mongol Empire in motion: in time and space (Conclusion)

The postal relay system of the Mongol Empire is usually handled by the scholars as a uniform and permanent institution throughout the Mongol period, with its temporal and spatial dimensions not being stressed sufficiently. Contrary to this attitude, an upshot of the present investigation of the postal system in general and the philological analysis of the Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents concerning the yam-system in particular is that it sees this complex and sophisticated communication system as an ever-changing institution both in time and space. Nonetheless – as can be seen in the previous chapters – the predecessors of the institution were in usage centuries before the Mongol period and some of its elements lived on in the successor institutions in Eurasia centuries after the fall of the Mongol Empire. The recognition of this situation and the intention to place the results of this study in a broader historical context lead to a division of the concluding remarks into three parts: the first two try to draw a picture of the postal system which presents its multifaceted reality in time and space, while the last contains the bare enumeration of the dissertation’s results and a short description of the prospects of further studies in the field.

11.1. …in time

At the moment there is better opportunity for the study of the temporal dimensions of the yam-system than ever before. On the one hand, the relative chronology of the Uyghur civil documents is established (MORIYASU 2004a) and recently the Uyghur administrative orders were dated too (MATSUI 2014a). On the other hand, the dating of most of the Middle Mongolian documents’ is complete as well (FRANKE 1962; RYBATZKI 1997). Now it is possible to separate temporal strata of the administration of the yam-system. These temporal strata can be connected to the data of the narrative sources (reforms, political events, etc.), and as a result of this connection of the administrative orders’ dating with the historical background the internal changes and evolution of the postal system of the Mongol Empire can be followed up. But before this analysis of the official documents it seems appropriate to broaden the temporal horizons of the examination and take into account the results of this study concerning the origin of the jam-system.
Like most of the historians who dealt with the history of the postal system of the Mongol Empire during the last decades, in my opinion the theory of a direct institutional transfer concerning the establishment of the \textit{yam}-system has to be rejected. Instead of a single origin it makes more sense to talk about models and influences. David Morgan was the first who stressed the similarities between the Khitan Liao dynasty’s postal system and the \textit{jam}-system (Morgan 2007\textsuperscript{2}: 93). The fact that the earliest \textit{paizas} of the Mongol postal system bore inscriptions in Khitan script confirms the theory of the Khitan influence in the early period (Dang 2001: 40). Lately Adam J. Silverstein and Thomas T. Allsen mentioned, besides the Khitan influence, the Inner or Central Asian (Uyghur) roots as well, but they discussed the role of this tradition only in general terms (Silverstein 2007: 141–144; Allsen 2010: 240–243). After all, with their open-minded attitude towards other influences than Chinese, both Morgan and Silverstein thought it very likely that the Chinese \textit{yi} 驛 was the initial model for the Mongol \textit{yam}-system.

The sixth chapter of the present study attempted to trace back the details of the above mentioned Inner or Central Asian tradition of the maintenance of a postal relay system. Its main arguments were the history of the technical term \textit{ulag}, the results of Masaharu Arakawa’s work, the travel account of Tamīm ibn Bahr and the provision orders from the period of the West Uyghur Kingdom. On the basis of these data it can be stated that there was a continuous tradition of the maintenance of a communication system in Central Asia at least from the middle of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century. Moreover it is very probable that this postal relay system was fundamentally different from the Chinese \textit{yi}. This assumption is based on the fact that the term \textit{ulag}, of Turkic origin, was borrowed into the Chinese language as \textit{wu-luo} 鄔落 in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century and was used in the Central Asian Chinese documents during the following centuries in the meaning ‘corvée horse’, as Masaharu Arakawa demonstrated. Obviously the question emerges: why did the Chinese borrow a technical term concerning the postal relay system from Turkic speaking people if they already had a long tradition of such a system? The only plausible answer to this question is: because this \textit{ulag}-system was somehow different than the Chinese \textit{yi}-system. If we add to this reasoning that the Tang dynasty (618–907) was the first Chinese ruling house, which expanded its authority into large territories of Central Asia for a longer period in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century, it seems quite reasonable that the data about the borrowing of the technical term \textit{ulag} from a Turkic language into Chinese, preserved the memory of the borrowing of new technologies of communication for a territory which was extraordinary for the Chinese conquerors. Tamīm ibn Bahr’s account of his journey to the Uyghur ruler in 821
shows that, this relay system still existed in the Uyghur Khaganate in the 9th century. Furthermore the provision orders from the West Uyghur period (PO08, PO18) point to the fact it did not terminate with the fall of the Uyghur Khaganate in 840.

In light of the above results it can be argued that, besides the Chinese and Khitan influence, there was a strong continuous tradition in Central Asia at least from the middle of the 7th century, preserved in the West Uyghur Kingdom, which could have affected the formation of the postal relay system of the Mongol Empire. The measure of the Uyghur influence can hardly be overestimated if we take into account the highly important role of the Uyghur aristocracy and intellectuals in the early formative period of the Mongol Empire.

From the 48 Uyghur and Mongolian official documents1514, 40 are dated so far.1515 From these 40 documents, 2 are dated to the West Uyghur period, 23 to the 13th century and 15 to the 14th century. The majority of the provision orders (16) and all of the official accounts (4) were issued in the 13th century. Only two provision orders were issued under the West Uyghur period and five in the 14th century. The earliest käzig orders (3) can be dated to the end of the 13th century but the most of them (7) were issued after the late 1320’s. All the three datable Mongolian orders were written between 1331 and 1353.1516

From Matsui’s subdivisions three (B, C, D) can be dated to the 13th century (MATSUI 2014a: 616–617) but as Matsui stated: “Even so it is still possible that Groups B and C were contemporary: their difference may derive from the rank of administrative authorities, not from the chronological gap.” (MATSUI 2014a: 620). Regarding the number of provision orders a significant setback can be observed in group C (2) comparing to the groups B (6) and D (8). If there is a real temporal difference between Matsui’s group B and C, this setback can be the result of the internal wars between the Central Asian Mongols and Qubilai and his successor in the last decades of the 13th century. Parallel to this setback appeared a new group of the official documents, the so-called official accounts. As was explained in the fourth chapter, these documents were most probably issued for the accountancy of a certain postal station. The function of these documents can be easily connected to the rationalization aims of the recurrent reforms of the postal system. It cannot be decided with certainty whether it was a result of Möngke’s reforms of 1251 or whether they appeared due to one of Qubilai’s reforms

1514 Because of their formal peculiarities the private documents are not yet dated and it seems like they will not be dated in the near future. Due to this fact only the official documents can help in the study of the temporal dimensions of the yam-system within the Mongol period.

1515 It has to be noticed that the following analysis has its own limits. On the one hand, unfortunately many of the Uyghur official documents cannot be dated exactly to a certain year, but only to a broadly defined period. On the other hand, the number of the preserved official documents is not sufficient to reach representative results with their analysis. Nonetheless, some essential tendencies can be trustworthily observed.

1516 The temporal distribution of the material is summed up in Table 2.
(1263, 1270, 1281), but most probably they were issued in connection with the rectifying intentions of the rulers in the second half of the 13th century.

According to Matsui’s dating, the last part of the 13th century was the most fruitful period in terms of administrative activity in the Uyghur territories. Beside the eight provision orders a new type of document appears in this period: the so-called käzig orders. The original meaning of the Old Turkic käzig was ‘a turn (which comes from time to time)’ and ‘an intermittent illness’ (ED: 758), but as Dai Matsui demonstrated, in the Uyghur administrative orders it must be translated as: ‘labour service levied in turn’ or ‘turn of labour service’, and as Matsui pointed out this labour service could be compensated by cash (coins or cloth) or in kind (MATSUI 2008a). As was argued in the fourth chapter, I assume that käzig-tax in connection with the postal system was introduced during the years of direct Yuan control over the Uyghur territories from the 1270s on, when they applied their own administration in the area. In order to strengthen this assumption the following three arguments are proposed: 1) The appearance of the documents overlap with direct Yuan control in land of the Uyghurs; 2) Dai Matsui convincingly proved that the Uyghur käzig-tax goes back to the Chinese 番 fan of the Tang-period (MATSUI 2008a: 233–235). The historical study of the period has already proved that several other Chinese administrative institutions were introduced in northeastern Turkestan during the time of Yuan rule in the territory, so it seems reasonable to count the introduction of the käzig-tax among them; 3) The burdens of the käzig orders are levied mostly on communities, standing in contrast with many of the provision orders which usually are levied on individuals. Moreover the decury (oni) as a unit of taxation appears only in the käzig orders within the official documents of the present study, but attested in almost half of them. As Matsui pointed out, in the earlier literature the käzig was often connected with the army, particularly with the Chagatai or Middle Turkic kāšik ‘watch guard’. The peculiarity of the käzig burdens, that they are counted in turns (first, second, etc.) could strengthen the idea that they were somehow connected with military organization. A possible explanation of these peculiarities could be that the decuries of the käzig orders are the military units of those military-agricultural colonies which were established by the Yuan in the area from the first part of the 1280’s (cf.: DARDESS 1972-73: 139–140, 141–142, fn. 94; ALLSEN 1983: 255–257; BIRAN 1997: 42).

The early 14th century brought again a setback in the number of the official documents concerning the postal system. Only three provision orders could be dated to this period. After the late 1320’s the käzig orders appear again and are present till the mid-14th century. The other novelty of the 14th century is the appearance of the Mongolian decrees from the 1330’s.
As was explained in the last part of the fourth chapter, the Mongolian decrees have a distinct formula which differs in almost every respect from the Uyghur official orders. A decree of D’ua Khan is preserved from the early years of the 14th century which bears almost every peculiarity of the Mongolian documents, but it was written in Turkic language (Matsui 2008b). This fact shows that the formula of the Mongolian documents – which were issued on the highest level of the administration – evolved till the beginning of the 14th century. If we take into account that the Uyghur documents of the present study were issued in two different administrative levels (local and regional), and that the Mongolian documents compose a group which was issued on an even higher administrative level, it can be stated that a triplet division of the administration (local level – regional level – highest level) was in usage from the beginning of the 14th century in northeastern Turkestan. Furthermore, this division of the administrative levels was applied latest in the 1330’s for the postal system too.

Perhaps even this short summary could show that historical interpretation of the philological results can help the delineation of the temporal aspects of the yam-system. The effects of the historical events (wars, reforms, etc.) can be identified in the Uyghur and Mongolian documents and with the connection of them the changes of the postal relay system in time can be tracked. As was mentioned, due to the paucity of documents, these observations have their own limits, but hopefully the number of the available documents will increase in the near future and therefore allow more precise investigations.

11.2. … in space

In this section the spatial aspects of the postal system will be discussed from two viewpoints: on the one hand the areal differences within the yam-system, one the other hand the day-to-day functioning of the postal relay system will be surveyed.

The jam-system covered enormous territories of Eurasia from the Korean peninsula in the East to the Volga region in the West and from the Siberian forest zone in the North to the territories of present-day Afghanistan in the South. Of course the different geographical regions and the different aims of the journeys demanded different means of travel. We know from Rubruck and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s accounts that in the steppe region to the North of the Black sea wagons with oxen were used in addition to pack horses within the postal system (Gībb II: 472–473; Jackson 1990: 68–69). Contrary to this, as is well-known in the Middle East carts were not used for transportation (Smith 2000: 44–45; Silverstein 2007: 143 fn. 12). Meanwhile from the Chinese sources we know that by the end of Qubilai Khan’s rule solely
in Chinese territories ca. 50,000 horses, 1400 oxen, 6700 mules, 4000 carts, a little less than 6000 boats, more than 200 dogs and 1150 sheep could be counted as belonging to the more than 1400 postal stations (ROSSABI 1994: 450).\footnote{This data of the Chinese sources seems to confirm the truth of an ancient Chinese proverb, cited by Silverstein: “South boat, North horse.” (SILVERSTEIN 2007: 143 fn. 13).} A very plausible example for these areal differences in the functioning of the postal system can be found in the documentary sources too. In the Uyghur documents from East Turkestan only donkeys (äšgäk, äšgäk ulag), different kinds of horses (at, ulag, ulag at, etc.) are attested as mounts and in one case an ox-ulag (ud ulag) in the 10th line of UIReg06. Contrary to this, Mong05 – the only document in the present study which was unearthed in the vicinity of Dunhuang – seems to be an official register which lists camels (temegen) which were delivered for the postal system.\footnote{Dai Matsui mentioned another so far unpublished Mongolian document of the British Library [OR. 12452(E)1 Toy. IV. iii. 02a]) in which dütül tü temegen ‘middle (-distance) camel’ is attested, i.e. a camel which was capable to go on middle distance journeys (MATSUI 2009a: 341).} These facts suggest that while in the Turfan region mainly horses were used for transportation, just several hundred kilometres to the East in the Dunhuang area camels were important means of travel too.

The Uyghur and Mongolian documents provide lots of information about the day-to-day functioning of the yam-system. For the better transparency, this information will be divided into three main sections in the following: travel and animals, provisions (food, drink, fodder and other supplies), and the social context of the postal system.

Despite the relatively numerous sources, our knowledge of the actual conditions of the traveling with the postal system of the Mongol Empire is relatively limited in some respects. Lately, Michal Biran gave a brief but highly informative description of the working of the embassies in the Chaghadaid ulus (BIRAN 2008: 382–385), but we have to keep in mind that the embassies were only one type of the numerous agents who used the yam-system. Most probably the conditions were different even for foreign (international) and domestic embassies, not to say the different type of messengers, merchants and other beneficiaries of the postal system’s services. According to common belief only a paiza was needed to use the benefits of the postal system. This conception could hardly explain the existence of the Mongolian Reisbegleitschreiben or the Uyghur provision orders. This contradiction can be resolved with the citations of the Čamči chapter in the Yongle dadian, translated by Francis Woodman Cleaves in his article about the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1240. According to these citations the user of the yam-system had to have both, i.e. a paiza and a written authorization (CLEAVES 1960–1961: 71–72). But the situation was even more complicated. As
was proved in the final section of chapter four, the official documents of the postal system were issued in different administrative levels. Seemingly the different levels of administration could issue documents with different competence: while the Uyghur provision orders could be valid only in a smaller territory and are often served in one particular issue, the Mongolian decrees, which were issued on the highest level of the administration could be valid for broader territories or the whole ulus. Moreover, as Baohai Dang pointed out the different types of paizas ensured different access to the services of the postal system (DANG 2001: 45). Taking all this information into account, a highly complex system of authorizations for the usage of the postal system can be observed. Meanwhile, the fact that one of the recurrent reforms’ main aims was to restrict access to the postal system shows that these complex rules were not always followed.

If somebody had the authorization to use the postal relay system, then he or she had access to its services. Among these services one of the most important was the supply of various animals for the travellers. The narrative sources deal with the animals of the yam-system only in general terms: besides the most important horses, oxen, camels and horses are mentioned. As was mentioned above in this chapter the great majority of the animals in the Uyghur and Mongol documents are various types of horses. As was presented in the fifth chapter of the present study, based on the documents a very complex system of animal terminology and in connection with it a complex system of the usage of the different animals can be reconstructed. The most characteristic attribute of the animal terminology is that the animals were distinguished by practical considerations, i.e. according to their usage within the postal system. Besides the general terms like müngü at ‘riding horse’ (lit.: ‘a horse to ride’) or yüdgü äšgäk ‘pack-donkey’ (lit.: ‘a donkey to carry’) they used more specific names too. For example, horses were distinguished according to the range they could reach: there were kısga at ‘short-distance horse’, dülü at ‘middle-distance horse’ and uzun at ‘long-distance horse’. According to Matsui this type of classification goes back to Chinese origins (cf.: MATSUI 2008a: 236). The distance that one horse could cover might have been important due to the fact that intervals between the postal stations differed in densely populated and remote areas. One of the most interesting terms in the documents is boguz at, for which a new interpretation was offered in the fifth chapter. Because of limited sources about the term, it is not possible to establish a certain translation of the expression, but based on the sources in hand ‘fodder carrying horse’ seems to be the most probable translation, which shows that horses may have been distinguished according to their usage as well. Finally a new interpretation of the word ulag was given in the fifth chapter. According to it, in the Uyghur documents of the 13th–14th
centuries ulag referred to any kind of livestock which were the property of or were used by the postal system of the Mongol Empire. Moreover it seems well-grounded to talk about a so-called ulag-system which was a subsystem of the yam-system and of which the main duty was the supply of animals within the postal system.

Besides the supply of animals the other most important duty of the postal system was the provisioning of travellers. In the narrative sources different accounts can be found concerning this topic: some are rather negative, like Rubruck’s account, and some are highly positive, like Marco Polo’s. As Dai Matsui pointed out, the basic provision consisted of meat, liquor, grain and in the Chinese sources appears rice as well. With the comparative analysis of the Mongolian, Uyghur and Chinese sources Matsui even defined the amounts of the daily provisions (MATSUI 2004a: 197). In the provision and käzig orders min (‘flour’) and ät (‘meat’) are attested mostly as food for provision, but if take into account the other documents concerning the postal system several other kind of rations can be found: kurut (‘dried cruds used as a kind of hard cheese’), borsu (‘pea’), ür (‘millet’), and tögi (‘rice’). In most of the cases bor (‘wine’) appears as beverage, but in one case (UIReg04) sorma (‘wheat beer’) is attested too. Nevertheless, not only were the travellers supplied, but the animals had provisions, i.e. fodder, too. As was discussed in the fifth chapter, separate technical terms can be identified in the Uyghur documents for the provision, i.e. food and beverage (azuk, yol azukluk, käzig aš, tuzgu) and for the fodder (boguz). As fodder, ot (‘hay’) and saman (‘straw’) were provided. The third group of supplied goods was clothing. In the documents, various kinds of clothes can be attested like: ätük (‘boot’), olpak (‘short padded jacket for winter travel on horseback’), tägäläy (‘jacket, camisole, short fur garment’), yagu (‘raincoat’). The last group of the supplies can be described as other necessary goods, such as: otuy (‘dry firewood’) and yag (‘oil’). However, many of the above mentioned supplies are attested only in the private and not in the official documents, due to the fact that these private documents are concerned with deliveries to the postal system it is highly feasible that these goods were provided for the travellers too.

Besides the research of the yam-system in the physical space, the examination of it in the social space seems equally important, but unfortunately this aspect of the postal system of the Mongol Empire is quite understudied. As was outlined in the seventh chapter, broad sections of society were in connection with the postal system. Apart from the postal-households who were responsible for the upkeep of the postal stations, the ortoq-merchants, the leaders of the army, envoys, diplomats and the religious communities as well had their specific relations to it. As was discussed in chapter seven the relations between the religious
communities and the postal system were complex with advantages and disadvantages for both sides. Nonetheless, theoretically the religious communities were freed from burdens concerning the yam-system, but for the representatives of the religious communities on a lower level and for the cloisters the taxes concerning the postal system – which were imposed regularly in practice – meant heavy burdens. Meanwhile for the members of the clergy with higher ranks jam-system was the best opportunity for fast and safe travels during their pious duties. In the present dissertation only one case study dealt with the subject, but the material offers some further opportunities to investigate the relations between the yam-system and the different social groups, as will be outlined below.

The spread of literacy among the Uyghurs in the Mongol period is worth to study in the Uyghur and Mongol documents. At first sight it seems that the private documents might help to answer this question. The majority of these documents were written in the civil sphere of the society, however it cannot be decided whether professional scribes or civilians wrote them in many cases. At the first blush the texts leave no doubt that they were written by taxpayers. For example in the first lines of UlReg09: it yıl onunč ay a-nuy-tın berü män nom(k)ulı-ny bermiš böz-niŋ “The number (i.e. amount) of the delivered böz by me, Nom Kuli since the 10th month of the Dog year” or in UlReg11: bošaču bo(r)un bägi bolmiš-ta bermišim “My payments since Bošaču borun bäg” and: udčı borun bägi bolmiš-ta bermišim “My payments since Udči becmae borun bäg” and also in the first lines of UlReg18: yılan yil-ki kal-an-ka elči-kä bermišim “What I paid as kalani(-tax) in the Snake year”. The first person singular in these documents suggests that the writer of the document is identical with the taxpayer, but if we take other Uyghur documents into consideration it is clear that these kinds of expressions appear frequently in such documents which were surely written by professional scribes (Cf. the contracts in SUK II).

11.3. Results and further prospects for research in the field

The most important result of the present study is the critical edition and translation of the Old Uyghur and Middle Mongolian documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire. On the one hand, with this edition the study of these documents is possible for those specialists of the history of the Mongol Empire who has no access to the Turkic and Mongolian original sources. On the other hand, this edition provides some further texts concerning the history of the Chaghadaid ulus, what is the less studied realm of the Mongol Empire due to the limited amount of sources.
The first chapter outlines the history of the Uyghur territories in northeastern Turkestan from the beginning of the 13th century until the middle of the 14th century. Due to the structure of the present study, the historiography of the Mongol postal system and the archaeological and philological study of the documents of Eastern Turkestan are presented separately. The research history concerning the historical studies of the postal system is discussed in the first part of the dissertation: in the second chapter, the so-called traditional sources of the postal system of the Mongol Empire are enumerated and in the third chapter, the research history of the yam-system is introduced. The international Central Asian expeditions of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which unearthed the documents of the present study and the research history of their philological study are described in the eighth chapter of the second part.

The results of the philological and historical researches of the documents are presented from the fourth to the seventh chapters. In the fourth chapter, the peculiarities of the different groups of the documents are introduced, and further subgroups are identified. In this section a new assumption is proposed concerning the military background of those käzig documents which are related to the postal system. Furthermore, a new group of the documents, the so-called official accounts, are identified, which were issued on the local level of the administration concerning the finances of the postal stations. In the last section of this chapter, as a result of the comparative analysis of the Uyghur and Mongolian documents, the different levels of the Mongol administration in the Uyghur territories were reconstructed. In the fifth chapter, the animal terminology of the Uyghur documents was studied, and new interpretations were offered for two technical terms: ulag and boguz at. In the sixth chapter, the continuous tradition of the maintenance of a post system in Central Asia from the middle of the 7th century was reconstructed, that most probably highly influenced the formation of the Mongol postal system in the 13th century. Based on the results of these three chapters (Chapter IV–VI) the theory of an ulag-system was proposed, what was a sub-system of the postal system and its duty was to supply the yam-system with animals. In the seventh chapter of the present study, the complex relations between the religious communities of the empire and the postal system were introduced.

The present study strengthens the theory, that the postal system was one of the most important institutions of the empire in East Turkestan – and probably on the other territories of the empire too – since almost every group of the society (postal households, army, clergy, merchants, etc.) had some kind of relations to it. In general, the fact that the Mongol Empire was the largest inland empire of the pre-modern history, so the importance of the postal
system is understandable. In particular the position of East Turkestan between the Chinese and Iranian territories increased the necessity of a well-functioning postal system in the region.

In his conclusion Adam J. Silverstein stressed the simplicity of the pre-modern imperial postal systems: their main aim was to connect the centre of the empire with the provinces and to do so they supplied provisions and animals for the couriers in order to grant the highest possible speed of the flow of information (Silverstein 2007: 187–188). In my opinion the results of the present study provide a ground to argue, however, the services of the yam-system were more or less simple (mounts, provision, fodder, etc.), the system itself and its social relations were highly complex. The functioning of the postal system of the Mongol Empire on its different territories was effected not only by the geographical, social and economic conditions but by the local cultural traditions as well. In the case of the postal system in northeastern Turkestan the interactions between the Chinese and the Central Asian traditions are well attested in the documents and some territorial differences (e.g. concerning the usage of camels) could be identified as well.

The further prospects of the study of the postal system of the Mongol Empire can be divided into two levels: micro and macro levels. Under the micro level the further philological and historical study of the yam-system is meant. Beside the results of the present study several philological and historical questions concerning the material and the postal system of the Mongol Empire in northeastern Turkestan remained open. One of the prospects for further studies of this topic is to answer these questions. The yet unpublished documents and the ever growing number of the new findings in general make it probable to answer some of the remaining questions in the near future. Beside the research of the Uyghur and Mongolian material the study of the Chinese texts and the comparative analysis of both groups of sources could be the next step in this field of research. On a macro level there are at least two directions of the further researches. On the one hand, as Allsen proposed (Allsen 2010: 275), the comparative analysis of the imperial postal systems could bring some new results. On the other hand, the comparative analysis of the Islamic, Central and East Asian administrative traditions in general, could contribute in large to our understanding of the pre-modern empires.
Vocabulary of the Uyghur documents

abišan-a – PN [Käz06-2]
ač- – ‘to open’
    -mIš – [UlReg08–15]
ačari (≪ Skr. ācārya ) – ‘master,’ the title of teaching Buddhist monks [PO07-4]
adak – ‘leg, foot’. In the Uyghur documents it used as a measure for meat too. [PO02-3]
aday kay-a – PN [UlReg07-23,30,36,40,46]
agır – PN [UlReg16-3]
al- – ‘to take’
    -gAlI – [PO21-3/PO22-1]
    -tI – [OAcc01-3]
    -Xp – [OAcc03-2/OAcc04-2/UlReg05-2/UlReg06-3,5,14,18/UlReg09-15/UlReg12-4/UlReg18-14/PList01-5,7]
    -zUn – [OReg01-9]
    -mIš – [UlReg12-12]
    -tI – [UlReg15-4]
alaču – PN [PO14-2]
alay – PN
    +KA – [UlReg07-20]
altı – ‘six’ [PO02-3/PO04-1/PO09-2,6/PO19-10/PO23-7/Käz04-1/Käz05-2/UlReg01-7/UlReg07-4,26/UlReg13-4/UlReg14-2/UlReg15-7,9,15/PList02-3]
altn – ‘lower’, PN [PO06-4,5,6/Käz04-4/Käz09-4]
altnč – ‘sixth’ [PO20-1/Käz07-8/UlReg07-19]
altn kabı – PN [PO05-9]
altmîş – PN [OMis03-9/UlReg07–28]
    +KA – [UlReg07-10]
altmîş tämir – PN [OMis03-7]
altmîş tökün – PN
    +KA [PO19-5]
amrak kaya – PN [UlReg07-6]
amrak kaya – PN [UlReg07-13]
amtta – PN [UlReg08-18]

amtu – ‘now’ [PO07-5/UlReg14-5]

apam – ‘honorary title’ [UlReg06-2]

aram – the 1st month of the Uyghur calendar [Käz11-1]

arg böke – PN
  +nlŋ – [PO23-1]

arslan – PN
  +(n)Xŋ – [UlReg15-12]

asmut – PN or TN
  +KA – [OMis02-3]

at – ‘horse’ [PO02-2/PO10-1/PO11-3/PO12-5/PO17-2/PO18-3,4/PO19-2,4,5,7,10,11/PO21-3/PO23-9/OAcc02-2/UlReg01-4/UlReg02-3/UlReg07-3,4,6,7,9,10,12,13,14,15,20,21,22,26,32(2),33,34,36,38,39,40,42,43,44,46,48,52/UlReg13-2(2)]
    +tA – [PO11-2/PO21-6/PO22-5/Käz06-3,4/Käz08-1/UlReg07-4,9,27]
    +lAr+In+KA – [PO15-2]
    +KA – [Käz06-5]
    +I – [OReg01-1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8]
    +lAr – [UlReg13-6]

kisga at – ‘short-distance horse’ [UlReg07-19]

uzun at – ‘long-distance horse’ [UlReg12-8]

at totok – PN [PO21-6]

ata – PN [PO19-13]

atay barsči – PN
  +KA – [UlReg08-3]

atay togrıl – PN [PO21-4]

atay buka – PN [Käz07-3]

atsız – [PO07-5]

ay – ’a (lunar) month’ [PO01-1/PO02-1/PO03-1/PO04-1/PO05-1/PO06-1/PO07-1/PO08-1/PO09-2/PO11-1/PO12-1/PO13-1/PO14-1/PO15-1/PO17-1/PO18-1/PO20-1/PO21-1/PO22-1/PO23-2/PO24-2/Käz01-1/Käz02-1/Käz04-1/Käz05-1/Käz06-1/Käz10-1/Käz11-1/UlReg07-8,19,44/UlReg13-4]
    +nXŋ+tIn – [UlReg09-2]

ay – PN (?)
+KA – [UlReg07-44]

**ayaga buka** – PN [Käz10-4/Käz11-5]

**ayit** – ‘to ask’ [UlReg06-7]

**azuk** – ‘food, food for a journey, provision’ [PO19-3]

+I – [Käz07-5]

**azukluk** – ‘food prepared for a journey’ [PO09-5]

**ädgü** – ‘good’ [PO07-4]

**äl buka** – PN [Käz04-2]

**älik** – PN [OAcc04-2]

+KA – [PList02-3]

**änürün** – PN [PO11-2]

**ärkägün** – the Christian community [PO19-15/PO20-8]

**äsän** – PN [PO07-1]

**äşgäk** – ‘donkey’ [PO19-2,3,4,12]

**ät** – ‘meat’ [PO02-3/PO09-5,7/Käz01-4/UlReg06-11,12/UlReg08-4,18,19/UlReg11-5,24,31,34]

**ätük** – ‘boot’

+In – [UlReg12-4]

**äv** – ‘house, tent’ [UlReg11-37]

+In+tA – [UlReg08–13,22,23/UlReg11-9,33]

+tA – [UlReg08–15]

**baba sävinč** – PN

+nXŋ – [UlReg01-8]

**bačak** – PN [UlReg07-20,33,44/UlReg15-8]

**bačak buka** – PN [UlReg10-3]

**bačak kül** – PN [Käz03-8, 12]

**bačak-a tarkan** – PN [PO21-6/PO22-6/PO23-7/PO24-6]

**bag** – ‘bond, tie, belt, bundle’ [PO13-3,4/PO15-2/PO22-2/UlReg03-6/UlReg06-9,10,12,21/UlReg11-10,12]

**bagatur** – ‘hero’, a title, PN

+tIn – [UlReg04-1]

+lAr+KA – [UlReg08-8]

**bagčin** – PN [UlReg05-2]

**bagluz** – PN [UlReg07-47,51]
bagurčı ürük – PN [UIReg08–15]

bahşı – ‘master’ (title), PN [UIReg06-10,12]
  +KA – [PO05-10/UIReg08-9/UIReg11-15/UIReg18-10]
  +nXŋ – [UIReg18-14]

bakalı – PN [UIReg08-10]

bakır – ‘the smallest silver ingot in East-Turkestan under the Mongol period, ca. 4 grams’
  [PO20-5/PO21-9/PO22-8/PO23-10/PO24-9/OAcc02-3/OReg01-1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8]
  +KA – [OAcc01-3]

bakır – PN [UIReg06-7]

bala toņa – PN [Käz06-2]

balak – TN or PN [UIReg08-27]

balčuk – PN [UIReg08–14]

balık – ‘city’
  +tA – [PO21-5/PO23-6/PO24-5]

baltu – PN [PO18-3]

bar- – ‘to go, to go away’
  -gU – [PO01-3,8/ PO02-2/PO05-6,8/PO11-2/PO12-3/PO22-5/Käz08-1/OMis02-4/UIReg04-2/UIReg07-2,4,9,16,24,27/UIReg13-11]
  -gU+KA – [UIReg07-37]
  -gUčI – [PO19-8/PO22-3/UIReg01-5/UIReg02-3]
  -gUčI+tAr+KA – [PO05-5]
  -Ir – [OAcc03-3]
  -Ir-KA – [OAcc01-2]
  -mIš – [UIReg01-4]
  -mIš+tA – [UIReg18-11]

barča – ‘all’ [Käz02-6]

barım – ‘property’ [UIReg06-6]

barun – PN
  +KA – [UIReg18-18]

basıg – a kind of labour service [Käz02-7]

baş kāzig – the 1st turn of the kāzig(-labour service) [Käz06-4]
  +KA – [Käz09-6]

başla- – ‘to begin, to lead’
  -(X)p – [PO19-8/UIReg01-5,7/UIReg09-5]
batman (~Mong. badman) – A measurement for grain and meat in the Mongolian documents. In the Uyghur documents it is used as measure of liquids too. It was ca. 596 grams. [PO07-4/UIReg04-4,5/UIReg06-8,11,12,13,15,20/UIReg08-8,9(2),18,19(2),21(2),27(2)/ UIReg11-4,5,6,23,24,29,30,34]

batur – PN [PO18-3]
bay buka – PN [UlReg18-6]
+KA – [UlReg07-29]
bay tämür – PN [Käz02-9]
bäg – ‘title of nobility’ [Käz10-2/UIReg08-7,16]

bägičük – PN – [UlReg01-8]
bärbäg – PN [UlReg06-8]
bärk – TN [UlReg06-7]
bäküz – PN [PO06-5]
ber- – ‘to give, to pay’. In the documents it is often abbreviated with a single <b> sign. [Käz03-11/UIReg02-5/UIReg03-3(2),4,5,6(2)/UIReg04-3,4,5/UIReg05-1,2,6/UIReg06-7,8,14,18/UIReg07-11,32/UIReg08-2,4,5,6,7(2),8,9,10,11(2),12,13,17,18,19,21,24,25,26,28/UIReg11-4,14,17,19,22,25,30,31,34,36,40/UIReg12-2,5/UIReg17-5/PLlist01-3,6/PLlist02-3]

-gU – [PO01-5,6/PO03-2/PO04-1,2/PO06-3/PO09-5/PO13-3/Käz01-3/Käz02-7/Käz03-1/Käz04-3/Käz09-3/Käz10-3/Käz11-3]
-zU – [PO01-12/PO03-3/PO04-4/PO05-10/PO06-10/PO07-5/PO08-3/PO09-8/PO10-1/PO11-3/PO13-4/PO14-4/PO15-3/PO19-15/PO20-8,9/Käz01-6/Käz02-11/Käz03-14/Käz05-4/Käz07-7,9/OMis03-16,18/UIReg13,5]
-Xp – [PO12-6/PO21-8,9/PO22-8/PO23-10/PO24-8/Käz03-15/Käz04-5/Käz06-4/Käz07-8/Käz09-6/Käz10-4/OMis02-6/OAcc02-3/OReg01-9/UIReg08-14]

-GIl – [OMis01-2]
-tlm – [OAcc03-4/OAcc04-3/UIReg09-15]

-mlı – [UIReg06-3,6,15/UIReg08-4/UIReg09-4/UIReg13-6]
-mlı+tln – [UIReg06-8]
-X̩-män – [UIReg06-7]
-dI – [UlReg06-5/UlReg08-16/ UlReg13-3/PList01-5,7]
-mš+tA – [UlReg06-18]
-mš+l₁ – [UlReg08-14]
-dlm – [UlReg09-6,7,8,11,13,17(2),22,26/UlReg18-5,6,7,9,10,12,14,15,17]
-mš+l₁m – [UlReg11-3,28/UlReg18-2]
-tI – [UlReg12-6]

berü – ‘since’ [UlReg09-2]
beš – ‘five’ [PO01-10/PO20-4/Käz01-4/OReg01-1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8/UlReg01-6/UlReg03-6/UlReg06-9,12,13,15/UlReg08-7,8,9,13,14,16,18,19,23,24,26/UlReg09-12,14,24/UlReg10-7,11,10/UlReg15-1,14/UlReg16-3(3)]
+Xnč – [PO01-1/PO04-1/PO07-1]

bey buka – PN [UlReg08-20]
bulgdü – PN [UlReg15-5]
binaluz – PN [UlReg07-17]
bičkün – PN [PO19-14/PO20-7]
biküs buka – PN [Käz05-4]

bilä, birlä – ‘with’ [PO01-8,12/PO04-2,3/PO06-6,8/PO12-5/P019-9,11,13,14/Käz02-5/Käz03-13/Käz04-3/Käz08-1,2/Käz10-4/OMis03-12,16,18/UlReg01-1/UlReg02-5/UlReg06-5,7,14/UlReg13-3]

bilän – PN [UlReg06-18]

bir – ‘one’ [PO01-4/PO04-3/PO05-1,3,8,9/PO06-3,4,5(2),6(2),7,8(2),9/PO08-1,2/PO09-7/PO10-1/PO11-3/PO12-5/PO14-3/PO15-3/PO16-3/PO18-3,4/PO19-3,4,5,9,11,12/PO20-4/PO21-8/PO22-7/PO23-2,9/PO24-3,5,8/Käz01-3/Käz03-1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,15/Käz04-3/Käz05-3/Käz06-4/Käz07-6/Käz08-1/Käz09-4,5,6/Käz10-3(2)/Käz11-4/OMis02-5(2),6,7/OMis03-3,4,5,6,7,8,15,17/OAcc01-3/OAcc03-1/OAcc04-1/UlReg01-1,3,6,8,10/UlReg02-5/UlReg03-3(2),6/UlReg04-3(2),4,5/UlReg05-1,5/UlReg06-4,7,8(2),10(2),11(3),13(2),14,15,16,17,18,21/UlReg07-3,5(4),6(2),7,8,9(2),12,13,14,15(2),17(4),18,19,20,21,22,23,25(2),28(2),29,30,31(2),32,33,34,35,36,39,40,41,42,43(2),44,45(2),46,47,48,49,50(3)51,52(2)/UlReg08-2,3,4,9(2),27/UlReg09-5,7,9(2),15,23/UlReg10-2,3/UlReg11-6,7,9,11,18,25,26,32,34,39/UlReg12-6,10/UlReg13-2(2),9/UlReg14-3/UlReg17-3,4,6/UlReg18-3,4,5,9,10,11,12,13,15,17,18/PList01-1,3,4,7/PList02-4]

+Ar – ‘one-one’ [OMis02-7]
biryegirminç (bir yeğirminç) – ‘eleventh’ [PO06-1/PO11-1/PO13-1/PO14-1/PO24-2/Käz05-1/Käz09-1/Käz10-1]

bit- – ‘to write’
  -DIm – [OAcc01-4]

bitgäči – ‘scribe’
  +lAr+KA – [UIReg11-38]

bitig – ‘document’ [UIReg07-15]
  +I – [PO04-2]

boguz at – ‘led horse, provision (carrying) horse’ [PO05-3/UIReg11-6]

bol- – ‘to become something’
  -Xp – [Käz02-3/UIReg15-10]
  -mIš – [Käz02-4,7]
  -Xr – [UIReg09-20,24]
  -mIš+tA – [UIReg11-2,28]
  -dI – [UIReg13-7]
  -gAy – [UIReg12-7]

bolmıš – PN
  +nXŋ – [UIReg10-4]

bolmıš taz – PN [PO21-7/PO22-7PO23-8/PO24-7]

bor – ‘wine’, a type of tax (?) [PO07-4/PO19-7PO23-3/PO24-4/Käz07-8/UIReg06-4,7,8,14,15,17/UIReg08-7,8,9,10,11(2),12,13,14,16(2),17,18,19,20,22,23,24,28/UIReg17-2/PList01-1,3,4,6,7]
  +tIn – [PO07-3]
  +čI – ‘wine-merchant, wine-maker’ [PO24-3]
  +nI – [Käz01-4/Käz04-4/Käz05-4]
  +tA – [UIReg06-4,6/UIReg08-14]
  +KA – [UIReg18-7,13]

borsu – ‘pea’ [UIReg11-7]

borluk – ‘vineyard’
  +I – [Käz05-4]

borlukči – ‘winegardener’ [Käz02-6]

borun bağlı – officer, the head of one borunluk (Cf.: MATSUI 2014b) [UIReg11-2,27]

bošaču – PN [UIReg11-1]

bökän – PN [PO13-4/PO14-3/PO15-3]
böz – ‘cotton cloth’ (ED 389a) In the documents it means simultaneously cotton as a fabric, a cotton based money, and in some cases probably a tax which had to be paid in this money.

bu – ‘this’ [PO06-8/Käz02-2,9/Käz08-2/OMis01-2/OAcc03-4/OAcc04-3/UIReg09-20,24]

bubı – PN [UIReg08-25]

buka – PN [PO19-13/Käz09-2/OMis03-5]

buka tämir – PN [UIReg13-2,5]

burulday – PN

+KA – [UIReg18-17]

buyan kay-a – PN

+KA – [Käz02-10]

buyan-a kay-a

+KA – [UIReg07-35]

buyan tāmür – PN [PO12-4/Käz01-2]

būrūngüdāy – PN [PO01-2,7]

+KA – [PO04-2]

būtūr- – ‘to perform, carry out, give, pay’

-(X)p – [PO01-12/PO03-3/PO04-4/PO09-8/PO19-15/PO20-7,9/Käz07-7/OMis03-14]

čagan – PN [OAcc01-4/OAcc03-2]

čagan kulı – PN [PO12-5]

čahšapat (čahsaput) – the 12th month of the Uyghur calendar [PO05-1/PO15-1/PO17-1/PO18-1/Käz01-1/Käz04-1]

čanka sünjülug – TN

+tAKI – [PO18-2]

čapat – PN [UIReg07-3,7,14,48]

čākir tāyšı – PN [UIReg11-37]

čigay – PN [UIReg06-5]

čıktun – TN [PO19-11/PO20-4]
čipin – PN [Käz02-8]
čoban yıgmış – PN [OReg01-1]
čuintsi – PN [UlReg16-2]
čuv – ‘voucher’ [OReg01-9]
čuval (<Pers. juval) – ‘sack, bag’ [Käz09-4,5,6]
darma – PN [PO006-7]
daruga (<Mong. daruγa(či)) – ‘chief, superior, chairman, commander; director, manager, elder’ [PO01-2/UlReg09-14,17/PList01-3]
  +KA – [PO01-6/PO04-4/UlReg07-21]
düli at (<Mong. dūli) – ‘middle (-distance) horse’
  +lAr+IŋA – [PO13-2]
el – ‘people’
  +tAn – [PO19-15]
elči – ‘envoy, ambassador, state officer’, occasionally part of a PN [PO09-4/PO23-4,5(2)/Käz09-2/OMis02-2/UlReg08-14]
  +lAr+KA – [PO01-2/PO07-2/Käz06-2]
  +lAr – [Käz02-3/UlReg14-1]
  +KA+nIŋ – [Käz11-2]
elt- – ‘to carry, bring, carry away’
  -Xr – [PO09-3]
et- – ‘to make, to create, to do’
  +GUčI+KA – [UlReg07-15]
ıduk kut – ‘title of the ruler of the West Uyghur Kingdom, later the ruler of the Uyghur territory in the Mongol Empire’
  +KA – [UlReg07-31/UlReg11-31]
ig-ba – PN [OReg01-8]
indu~ntu – PN [PO13-2/UlReg07-5,14,50]
  +nXŋ – [UlReg01-3/UlReg08-13]
ıt – ‘dog’ [PO01-1/PO04-1/PO06-1/PO09-2/Käz02-1/Käz05-1/Käz09-1/UlReg09-1]
ıdrili – PN [PList01-1,2,4,5]
iki – ‘two’ [PO05-6/PO06-7,8/PO09-7/PO13-3/PO15-1/PO19-4,5,12/PO21-6,8/PO22-5/PO23-9/Käz01-1/Käz02-2/Käz05-1/Käz08-1/Käz10-1/ULReg01-1,10/ULReg06-11,12,15,16,20(2)/ULReg07-9,11,12,22,47/ULReg08-4,8,10,11,12,14,15,17,19,20,21,22,24,25/ULReg09-18(2),22/ULReg10-9/ULReg11-4,5,6,29,30/ULReg15-3,10(2),11/ULReg17-4/PLst01-6] +rAr [ULReg01-2/9]

ikinti – ‘second’ [PO14-3]

inčü – ‘fief; the person(s) bound to perform certain services for a ruler in exchange for a piece of land’ [Käz02-5(2)/ULReg13-8]

inčüy+lAr – [ULReg08-27]

inäki – PN [PO19-13]

ini – ‘younger brother’

+im – [ULReg07-2]

inük – PN
+nXŋ – [ULReg10-10]

irčük – PN [OReg01-7]

iš – ‘work’ [Käz02-4]

+iIK – [ULReg15-12,13]

iš tämir – PN [ULReg07-6,25,32,42]

işič – ‘jug’ [ULReg04-4]

işirä – PN

+KA – [PO19-8]

kal- – ‘to remain’

-mIš+Im – [ULReg08-15]

kalan – ‘labour service’ [Käz02-3]

+KA – [ULReg12-9/ULReg18-1]

kalča (Mong. < qalja) – a measure unit of liquids [ULReg08-7,8(2),9,10,11(2),12,13,14,16(2),17,18,19,20,22,23,24,25(2),26]

kalın – ‘thick’ [PO03-2]

kamun – PN [ULReg08-24]

kan – ‘khan’ [OMis01-2]

+KA – [ULReg09-7/ULReg18-16]

kanımdu – PN [PO09-6/PO19-13]
kap – measure unit of liquids, ca. 8.4 litres [Käz04-3/Käz05-3/Käz07-8/UlReg06-7,8,14,16,17,18/PList01-1,3,4,6,7]
   +KA – [UlReg06-15]
kapam – PN [UlReg06-7]
kara – ‘black’, PN [PO23-4]
kara kaya – PN [PO06-7]
kara tägün – PN
   +KA – [UlReg10-1]
karay – PN
   +KA – [UlReg07–30,34]
kari – ‘forearm, a unit of measure’ [UlReg03-3,4/UlReg08-2,3(2),5(2),6/UlReg10-7,9/UlReg11-21,35/ULReg12-11/PList02-2]
karpaqčin – PN [UlReg08-2]
kasay – PN [UlReg07-5/ULReg08–20]
katun – ‘lady, wife’ [PList01-2]
kay-a – PN [PO05-10/OMis03-8/ULReg17-2/ULReg18-9]
kayak-a – PN [PO19-14/PO20-7]
käč– ‘to pass through, to cross’
   -Ar [OAcc03-3]
käl– ‘to come’
   -GUcil – [PO07-2/PO21-3/PO23-4/ULReg04-1]
   -Ir-KA – [OAcc01-2]
   -mIš-tA – [UlReg06-10/PList01-1,2]
   -Xp – [UlReg08-25/PList01-5]
käpäz – ‘cotton’ [PO22-3]
   +lIG – [PO06-9/Käz07-6]
kärsin – PN/TN [PO03-2/PList01-3]
kävsädi – PN [PO07-3]
käzig – ‘turn of labor service’ [Käz08-2]
   +KA – [PO14-4/Käz03-16/ Käz04-5/Käz07-8/Käz10-5/Käz11-6]
   +A – [Käz02-6/ULReg08–17/ULReg11-23,29]
   +In – [Käz03-12]
käzig aš – ‘regular provision’
   +KA – [Käz01-3/Käz05-3/Käz10-2]
kıbartu – PN [UlReg08-7,16]
kudatı – PN [UlReg07-4]
kudır – PN [PO05-7]
kil – ‘to do, to make’
   -mlš – [PO20-3]
kır čäčäk – PN [OReg01-3]
kışig – PN [UlReg10-6]
kitäy – ‘Kitay’; PN [PO01-2;6/PO04-4/UlReg07-5,51]
kızıl – TN
   +KA – [Käz06-2]
kiçig kay-a – PN [UlReg15-9]
kir- – ‘to enter’
   -mlš – [UlReg06-8]
kişi – ‘man, person, human being’ [Käz07-5]
kitā – PN [UlReg07-13]
kitir – TN
   +tIn – [PO07-2]
koço – TN [UlReg07-16/UlReg12-6]
   +KA [OAcc01-2/UlReg07-2,4,8/UlReg12-5]
kodik-a – PN [UlReg07–25]
kodur – PN [PO17-2]
koluńci – PN [UlReg07-50]
koluş – a type of tax [Käz04-3]
kojlı – PN or TN [PList01-4]
kor – ‘loss, damage’ [PO20-2]
körči – PN [UlReg07-21,22]
korla – PN or TN [PO23-4]
koşan – PN [PO21-4]
koštar (< Sogd. xwštr) – ‘elder, chief, Presbyter’ a title in the Manichean hierarchy
   [UlReg16-4]
kosoşuŋ taz – PN [Käz03-5]
koyin – ‘sheep; one of the animals of the twelve year animal cycle’ [PO03-1/PO21-1/PO22-1/PO23-2/PO24-2/Käz10-1/Käz11-1/UlReg09-14/]
   +nI – [Käz10-3]
kölür-täy – PN [UlReg09-12]
kölük – ‘load’ [PO06-9]
köp – ‘much, many’ [Käz02-4]
körpä – PN [UlReg08-2]
körpä kay-a – PN [UlReg08-5,7]

+nXŋ – [UlReg08-23]
körpä sarg – PN [Käz03-4]
köykü – PN

+kA – [UlReg18-8]
kuanbay – PN

+kA – [UlReg06-7]
kud- – ‘to pour out (a liquid), having filled’

+Xp – [UlReg08-26]
kuduk-a – PN [UlReg07–31]
kudukı batur – PN

+kA – [UlReg06-16]
kulči – PN [UlReg04-2]
kulı – PN [UlReg15-9]
kuluti – PN [UlReg07-5]
kum – TN

+kA – [UlReg01-4]
kupčir – In the Turfan region it was an additional tax imposed by the Mongols besides the sale- and basic-taxes, and labour services. [OMis01-1/OAcc01-1/OAcc02-1/OAcc03-2/OAcc04-2/PList02-1]

+kA – [PO21-10/PO22-9/PO23-11/OREg01-10]
+InGA – [PO24-9]
kurtamu – PN [OMis02-5]
kurug – ‘dry, empty’ [UlReg06-16]
kurumči – PN [PO24-1]
kurut – ‘dried cruds used as a kind of hard cheese’ [UlReg03-5]
kus kar – PN [OAcc03-5]
kut – PN [Käz10-2]
kuti – PN [OMis02-6]
kutlug kay-a – PN
  +KA – [UlReg10-5]

kutlug tämür – PN [UlReg06-14]

kuvrak – the Buddhist community [PO19-14/PO20-8]

kümüš – ‘silver’ [PO21-10/PO22-8/PO23-10/PO24-9/OMis02-8/OAcc02-3]
  +KA – [OAcc01-1]
  +tA – [PO20-3]
  +nI – [PO20-5]
  +In – [OAcc04-2]
  +In+tA – [OAcc02-1]

kün – ‘day’ [PO21-9/PO23-9]
  +lUK [PO05-3/Käz07-5]
  +KI [Käz08-2]

kün tapmış – PN [Käz03-6]

künküy – PN
  +KA – [UlReg08-26]

küri – a measure of capacity or weight, for dry goods like grain; ca. 8.4 litre [PO01-10/PO09-6,7/Käz10-3/Käz11-4/OMis01-2/UlReg04-5/UlReg11-7]
  +lXg – [UlReg08-21]

kürk – ‘fur’ [PO06-3]

küskü – ‘rat’ an element of the Uyghurs’ 12 year animal cycles calendar [PO07-1/PO18-1/PO20-1/Käz04-1/OAcc02-1/OAcc04-1]

lagsı – ‘net’ [UlReg03-3/UlReg06-9,11,15,16]

lükcüŋ – TN [Käz06-5]
  +KA – [PO05-4,7/PList01-6]
  +lXg – [UlReg11-14]
  +lXg+KA – [UlReg11-36]
  +tIn – [PList01-5]

mačar – ‘Hungarian or PN’ [PO03-2]

mamalıg – PN
  +(n)Xŋ – [UlReg16-1]

mamalıg täŋrim – PN [UlReg15-11]

mayak bökän – PN [Käz03-7, 13/Käz09-5]

mä – question particle [Käz07-8]
män – ‘I’ [OAcc01-3/OAcc03-2/OAcc04-2/UIReg09-3,20]
mäniŋ – ‘my’ [OAcc03-4/OAcc04-3]
melik temür – PN [PO09-1]
meñlig kuča – PN
   +nXŋ [UIReg09-10]
muŋ – ‘thousand, chief of a regiment of soldier’ [UIReg08-7]
   +tAr – [UIReg07-16]
mısır – PN [Käz07-9/UIReg07-18/UIReg13-9]
   +tln – [UIReg18-13]
mısira – PN
   +nlŋ – [OAcc02-2]
min – ‘flour’ [PO01-6,7,10/Käz10-4/UIReg04-5/UIReg06-8,11,13,20/UIReg08-9,18,19,21(2),27(2)/UIReg11-4,25,30]
   +tA – [PO09-6]
   +KA – [UIReg08-21]
moğol – ‘Mongol’ [UIReg08-9]
msydr (<Sogd. masēδar) – ‘Nestorian presbyter, priest’
   +tAr+nlŋ – [PO08-2]
munča [bunča] – ‘as many, or as much, as this, so many, or much’ (ED 349a); ’such, such a kind’ (SUK II: 266) [PO01-8]
   +tA – [PO04-3/UIReg14-4]
mušı – PN [PO06-5]
mün- – ‘to ride’
   -GU-Xp – [PO05-5,8]
nampı – TN
   +tA – [PO12-4]
   +KA – [PO22-4]
nišan – ‘mark, sign’ [OAcc03-4]
nom kulı – PN [Käz02-8/UIReg09-21]
   +nXŋ – [UIReg09-3]
noyam-a – PN [PList01-6]
noyu ( < Mong. noyan) – ‘chief, superior, commandant’ [PList01-1,3,5]
   +(n)Xŋ – [PList01-2]
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noyın sarıg – PN [Käz03-9]
nökör–nöker (<Mong. nökör) – the companions and personal dependents of the ruler or noblemen [PO09-4/]

oglán – ‘son, prince’ [UlReg06-14]

ogul – ‘son, prince’

ol – equivalent of the copula [OAcc03-4/OAcc04-3]

olar – ‘they’ [PO04-3/PO20-7]

olpak – ‘short padded jacket for winter travel on horseback’ [PO01-8,10/PO04-2,3(2)]

olta – PN [UlReg08–17]

on – ‘ten’ [PO02-3/PO09-2/PO11-2/PO13-4/PO15-2/PO17-3/Käz07-5/UlReg04-4/UlReg06-9,10/UlReg08-4,8,26/UlReg09-6,11,19,23]

on bägi – the leader of a decury [UlReg12-7]

onı – ‘decury’ [Käz03-2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,12,13/Käz04-4/Käz06-3/Käz09-4,5/Käz10-4]

orda – ‘palace’ [UlReg03-6]

orta – ‘middle’ [UlReg01-2,9]


otači – ‘doctor’ [UlReg06-10,19]

otuŋ – ‘dry firewood’ [UlReg03-6/UlReg06-10,12,21/UlReg11-8,12]

otuz – ‘thirty’ [PO19-1/UlReg09-21,25/UlReg15-11]

öčükän – PN
ödäm – PN [Käz03-3]
ögdüş – PN [UlReg11-9]
ögrinä – PN
  +nlŋ – [OAcc02-1/OAcc03-1/OAcc04-1]
ögrünč buka – PN [PO01-9/PO04-3]
ögrünč tämür – PN [Käz07-3]
ögüs buka – PN [PO19-1]
öŋtün čărig – vanguard [PO21-2]
örmäk – ‘knitted garment’ [UlReg09-18]
ötämiš kaya – PN [PO06-4]
ötig – ‘register’
  +I – [UlReg07-19]
öz – ‘self’
  +I+nXŋ [UlReg01-3]
pučan – TN [PO19-11/PO20-3]
sadi – PN [UlReg01-6]
  +KA [UlReg07-7]
saduk – PN [UlReg07-32]
salgar – PN [UlReg08-16]
  +KA – [PO24-4]
sak (<Pers. sāq) – ‘shank’, a measurement unit of meat [Käz01-4/UlReg08-4/UlReg16-3]
salg – a kind of labour service [Käz02-7]
  +nI – [Käz02-10]
saman – ‘straw’ [UlReg06-9,11]
  +tA – [PO13-3/PO14-3/PO15-3/PO16-3]
san – ‘number’
  +IntA – ‘in to account’ [PO12-6/OAcc02-3]
  +KA – [Käz01-5]
  +I – [UlReg09-5]
sanad ņŋ – PN [UlReg06-14]
sarig – ‘yellow’, PN [Käz04-4/Käz09-4]
  +KA – [UlReg10-8/UlReg11-21]
sarig toyın – PN [UlReg08-3]
satıgči – ‘merchant’
   +KA – [UIReg10-7]
sañiŋ – ‘yours’ [OMis01-1]
sävinč toyn – PN [UIReg07-20,28,34,45]
säkiz – ‘eight’ [PO01-3/PO03-1/PO19-7/UIReg06-19/UIReg08-3,10/UIReg13-3/UIReg15-8]
   +Inč – [PO12-1/PO22-1/Käz02-1/UIReg07-8]
sävīg – PN [UIReg07-17,25,31,42,48,52]
seliba – PN [PO09-3]
sičganč – PN [UIReg11-19]
   +nXŋ – [UIReg11-17]
sikiš – a kind of labour service
   +KA – [Käz02-5]
siktur – ‘to have something pressed, squeezed’
   -gAlI – [PO23-3]
sitr – a currency unit or a unit of weight [PO20-4/OAcc03-2/OAcc04-2]
siim – unidentified word [UIReg08–16]
sogdi – PN [PO23-5]
sombuz – PN [UIReg07–26]
soğadı – PN
   +KA – [UIReg07-46,48,50,52]
sorma – ‘wheat beer’ [UIReg04-4,5]
sörgän – PN
   +KA – [UIReg06-15]
sōz – ‘word, order’
   +Xm – [OMis01-1]
suk- – ‘to insert, thrust in’, ‘to fill(?)’
   -Xp – [Käz09-3]
suvasdi – PN [Käz06-3]
sünjülüg – TN [PO18-4]
sür- – ‘to follow, to spend time’ [Käz07-9]
šabı – PN [UIReg06-14]
šazin – ‘the Buddhist community’ [UIReg06-6/UIReg12-5/PList01-4]
šäli (<Chin. she-li 阿梨< Skt. ācārya) – a title of Buddhist monks [PO13-4/PO14-3/PO15-3]
šäli kuh – PN [UIReg15-6,13]
šämiz tavišman – PN
   +KA – [OMis01-2]
šärmiš – PN
   +KA – [UIReg18-8]
šig – (<Chin. shì) A measure of capacity, app. 84 litre [PO01-5,7/UIReg09-9]
šiyan – PN [UIReg12-5]
šişir – PN [UIReg11-33]
tačudın – PN [OMis01-1]
tagar – ‘a large container, a sack’ or a grain measure unit which corresponded to Chinese 石 shì (dan), ca. 84 litre [PO13-3/PO14-3/PO15-3/PO16-3/OMis03-13,16]
takıgu – ‘domestic fowl’ [PO11-1]
tamga – ‘seal, stamp’ [OAcc03-5/OAcc04-3]
tanuklí – PN [UIReg08-12]
taŋ – ‘a measure of capacity for seed cotton’ [UIReg15-4]
taŋučuk – PN [UIReg07-17]
taŋuday – PN [PO02-1]
   +KA – [UIReg02-2/UIReg07-39,42]
tapa – PN [UIReg12-7]
tapıgči – ‘servant’ [UIReg06-9,11,13,21/UIReg11-8,10,25,32]
tapšur- – ‘to hand over, entrust’
   -Uz-Un – [PO07-6]
tar- – ‘to disperse, to divide up (something)’
   -gAll – [PO24-4]
targ – ‘cultivated land, the produce of cultivated land’
   +Inj+TA – [OMis01-1,2]
targiči – PN (?)
   +KA [UIReg07-12]
tas – PN
   +KA [UIReg08-27]
tatnčuk – PN [OMis02-4]
tavar – ‘satin fabric’ [UIReg09-22]
tavišgan – ‘hare’ an element of the Uyghur’s 12 animal cycle calendar [Käz06-1]
tayak – a measurement unit of meat [PO09-5,7]
taykay – TN
+tAki – [PO08-3]

tägir – ‘in Uyg. ’share’ i.e. that which comes to someone later ’value, price’

-(X)p – [UIReg10-10]

tägäläy – (< Mong. degelei) ‘jacket, camisole, short fur garment’ [PO06-10]

+nI – [PO06-3]

+KA – [UIReg10-3]

tälip – PN

+KA – [UIReg10-2]

tämbin – the smallest measurement for liquids, which was ca. 0,28 litre [Käz01-4]

tämır asak – PN [OReg01-6]

tämırči – ‘blacksmith’, PN [PO12-4]

+lAr+KA – [UIReg08-11]

tämır yastuk-ı – PN [PO11-3]

tämür – PN [PO06-4/]

tämür buka – PN [PO06-2]

+KA – [UIReg18-2]

tänjäš-i – ‘fitting, equal’ [OMis02-7]

tänjisig – PN [UIReg07–29,35,40,46]

tär- – ‘to hire, to collect’

-İn+KA – [OAcc02-2/OAcc04-3/UIReg01-4]

-İ+KA – [UIReg09-13]

tärbiş kaya – PN [Käz01-5]

te- – ‘to say’

-(X)p – [UIReg18-13,16]

tuçan (<Chin. deng-chan 燈盏) – ‘lamp’ [Käz08-2/UIReg06-9,11,13/UIReg11-11,26]

tışig – PN

+KA – [PO19-3]

tile- (~tilä-) – ‘to seek, to desire, to ask’

-Xr – [Käz02-3]

GalII – [Käz07-2]

tipi – PN [PO07-4]

togogan – PN

+KA [UIReg07-38,41,45,47,49,51]

togrul – [OReg01-2]
tok – PN
   +KA – [UlReg18-8]

toksın – TN [UlReg13-8,10]
   +tAkI – [PO22-2]
   +KA – [UlReg13-5,]

tokuz – ‘nine’ [PO02-1/PO12-1/PO13-1/UlReg07-7,36/UlReg09-6/UlReg14-5]

ton – ‘garment, clothing’ [PO06-6,8/Käz07-6/UlReg09-5,8]
   +KA – [PO06-9]
   +IUK – [PO19-12]

toŋul buka – PN
   +KA – [PList02-4]

toŋuz – ‘boar, pig’, an element of the Uyghurs’ 12 year animal cycles calendar [PO08-1]

törči – PN [OMis03-14]
   +KA [UlReg07-8]

torku – ‘silk fabric’ [UlReg09-19,23]

toŋg-a – PN [UlReg07-33,43]

toyın – PN [UlReg08-5]

toyınčog – PN
   +KA – [OMis01-1]

tož – PN [UlReg07-15]

tögi – ‘rice’ [UlReg11-5,24]

tökrä – PN [UlReg01-9]

tölak – PN [UlReg12-3,5,8,11]
   +KA – [UlReg07-43]
   +nXŋ – [UlReg12-4]

tölär – PN
   +KA – [UlReg02-4]

törbi – PN [PO19-6]


tumor – PN
   +KA – [UlReg18-5]

tumor buka – PN
tuŋ – PN [UlReg15-5,6,14]
+(n)Xŋ – [UlReg15-13]

turmiš-a – PN
+KA – [PO22-4]

turpan – TN [Käz06-5/UlReg01-7/UlReg14-1,4/UlReg17-6/UlReg18-11]
+tA – [PO09-6]
+IXg+KA – [UlReg11-16]
+KA – [PList01-1]

tuš – ‘time’
+tA – [Käz02-2]

tut- – ‘to hold, to take’
-Xp – [Käz01-5/UlReg07-10]
-Ar-män – [OMis01-3]
-XldI – [UlReg13-10]
-GU – [PList01-3]

tuzgu – ‘provision, a gift of food given to a traveller’
+KA – [PO07-3]

tükäl – PN [PO12-4/UlReg07-3,9]

tükälä – PN [UlReg07-49]

tükün – ‘all’
+I – [UlReg15-10]

tümän aka – PN [UlReg13-7]

tümän bäg – the bäg of a tümän
+(n)Xŋ – [UlReg17-7]

tümän buka – PN [PO20-6]

tümän noyın – ‘the leader of a tümän’
+KA – [PO01-5/PO04-1]
+nlŋ – [PO04-2]

tünül – PN [PO05-2]

tütün – an unidentified type of tax or service [Käz01-4]
+tIn [PO06-3]
tüz – ‘equal’ [Kätz03-11]
ud – ‘bovine, ox’ [PO05-1/PO12-1/PO13-1/PO14-1/PO15-1/PO16-1/PO17-1/Kätz01-1/OAcc03-1]
udčı – PN [UlReg11-27]
uladay – PN
  +KA – [UlReg07-20]
ulag – ‘any kind of livestock which were the property of or were used by the postal system of the Mongol Empire’ [PO19-1/Kätz03-2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,15/OMis03-3,4,6,7,11,15,17/OAcc04-3/UlReg06-8/UlReg09-13/UlReg13-9/UlReg14-4/UlReg15-14/UlReg17-4]
  +čI – ‘stableman, relay coachman, relay service attendant’ [Kätz03-13/Kätz08-1/OMis03-2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,13/UlReg02-5/UlReg03-6/UlReg04-3/UlReg06-2,10/UlReg12-5,6/UlReg13-3/UlReg17-4]
  +čI+KA – [UlReg13-10]
  +čI kiši – ‘relay coachman, relay service attendant’ [PO01-4]
  +In+KA – [OAcc03-3]
  +I+(n)Xŋ – [UlReg01-6]
  +KA – [UlReg07-10/UlReg09-11/UlReg11-20]
  +lAr – [UlReg08-26]
  +(n)Xŋ – [UlReg17-1]
  +I+KA – [UlReg18-15]
at ulag – ‘horse-ulag’ [PO01-3,10/PO21-8/PO22-7/PO24-6/OAcc01-3/UlReg14-2,3/UlReg14-5]
  +tA – [PO12-3/PO23-7/UlReg04-2/]
äšgäk ulag – ‘donkey-ulag’ [PO19-6,9/Kätz07-6]
  +tA – [PO19-10]
kiswa ulag – ‘short distance ulag’ [PO05-6]
  +tA – [PO05-8]
  +nI – [PO05-9]
ulag at – ‘ulag-horse’ [UlReg07-15]
  +lAr+KA – [PO14-2]
ud ulag – ‘ox-ulag’ [UlReg06-10]
uzun ulag – ‘longe-range-ulag’ [UlReg05-1,5/UlReg10-4/UlReg17-3,6]
  +KA – [UlReg13-6]
išlik ulag – ‘working-ulag’
+(n)Xŋ – [UlReg15-15/ UlReg16-1]

ulug – ‘big, great’ [UlReg15-12]

uza bay – PN [PO09-3]

+(X)nč – ‘third’ [PO08-1]
+egü – [Käz02-9]

üčün – ‘because of, for’ [Käz02-4,8]

ülçidü – PN [UlReg12-2]

ülgidü – PN [PO19-6]

üntür- – ‘to produce’
-gU – [PO07-3]

ür – ‘millet’ [UlReg09-9]

üruŋ tämir – PN [UlReg11-12]

yag – ‘oil, fat’ [UlReg06-11,13/UlReg11-11]
+I – [UlReg06-9,17,26]

yagu – ‘raincoat’ [OMis02-5(2),6,7]
+tA – [OMis02-4]

yak- – ‘to put on, to stamp’ (?) [OAcc03-5]

yaland – PN [Käz03-14]

yalm – PN [PO01-9/PO04-3/PList01-1]

yalkar – PN [PO20-2]

yam – ‘a posting station, the whole postal relay system’
+KA – [PO01-3/UlReg01-5]
+tA – [OAcc03-3]

yam at – ‘postal horse(-tax?)’[PO12-6]

yambın – PN
+nXŋ – [UlReg08-22]

yana – ‘and, again, further on’ [PO01-1,4/PO05-6/PO09-4/UlReg01-5,7,UlReg06-4,12/UlReg08-21,23,24,26/UlReg11-16,33,35/UlReg14-3/UlReg17-7/UlReg18-3,5,6,9,11,13,14,16,17]
yanı – TN (?)
    +tA – [PList01-6]
yantut [yanut] – ‘something which comes back, instead of’ [PO01-11/UIReg10-8]
yaj (<Chin. yang 樣) – ‘custom, manner, method’
    +InčA – [UIReg07-11]
yanja buka – PN [Käz05-2]
yanı – ‘new; the first ten days of the new month’
    +KA – [PO05-2/PO06-1/PO07-1/PPO09-2/PO11-1/PO12-2/PO22-1/Käz04-
    1/Käz11-1/UIReg06-12,19/UIReg07-8,11,45,47,49,51/UIReg13-3]
yapa – ‘all, completely’ [Käz03-11]
yar – TN
    +KA – [PO11-2]
yarigu – PN [UIReg06-15]
yarım – ‘half’ [PO24-8/OMis03-4,5,6,7,10,11,17/OAcc03-1/OAcc04-1/UIReg03-3/UIReg08-
    5(2),10,11,12,15,17,20,22,24,25(2)/UIReg09-16/UIReg10-2,5,6,9/UIReg11-
    14,15,16/UIReg12-3/UIReg18-7,16/PList02-2]
yasak – a type of tax[OMis01-2]
yastuk – the largest currency unit in the documents [Käz07-2]
yavläk – PN [UIReg05-4]
yaz- – ‘to write’
    -mlš – [UIReg11-22]
yägänčük – PN [OReg01-5]
    +KA – [PO22-3]
    +KA [PO01-1/PO02-1/PO04-1/PO14-1/PO20-2/PO21-2/PO23-3/Käz02-2/Käz06-
    1/Käz07-1/UIReg13-4]
yemiš – ‘food, fodder’
    +KA – [UIReg01-2]
yetär – PN [PO12-2]
yeti – ‘seven’ [PO03-2/ PO11-1/PO22-1,2/ OAcc01-2/UIReg06-12/UIReg07–30,UIReg11-
    35]
yetinč – ‘seventh’ [PO21-1/UIReg07-44]
yetiz – ‘wide, broad, far-reaching’ [PO01-11]
yetmiš – ‘seventy’ [UIReg16-2]
yıg- – ‘to collect, assemble’
-mIš – [PLIST02-1]

yıgmiš taš – PN [ OREG01-4]

yıl – ‘year’ [PO01-1/PO03-1/PO04-1/PO05-1/PO06-1/PO07-1/PO08-1/PO09-2/PO11-1/PO12-1/PO13-1/PO14-1/PO15-1/PO16-1/PO17-1/PO18-1/PO20-1/PO21-1/PO22-1/PO23-2/PO24-2/Käz01-1/Käz02-1/Käz04-1/Käz05-1/Käz06-1/Käz09-1/Käz10-1/Käz11-1/ULREG09-1,15]

+yılgı – [PO22-2/OACC01-1/OACC02-1/OACC03-1/OACC04-1/ULREG18-1]

yılan – ‘snake’ an element of the Uyghurs’ 12 year animal cycles calendar [ULREG18-1]

yıšig – ‘cord, rope’

+I – [Käz08-2]

yimši – TN (identical with yemši)

+yımsı – [ULREG07–24,27]

yisüdär (<Mong. Yisüder) – PN [PO09-4]

yočın – PN [Käz05-2/ULREG05-4/ULREG08-10]

yogan – PN [ULREG07-10]

yogan – PN [ULREG07-17]

yogluğ böz – ‘böz for clothes’ [ULREG10-8,9]

yol – ‘road, way’ [PO09-5]

+yol-ka [PO06-2]

yol at – ‘road horse’ [PO08-2]

yorı – unidentified word, most probably it marks the quality of wine[ULREG08-7]

yolči – ‘guide’, PN [PO06-6]

+yolčı – [PO08-3/ULREG08-4]

yoruk – ‘current’ [ULREG09-16]

yöläk – PN [PO06-8]

yula altmıš – PN [Käz07-3]

yumıš – ‘messenger, envoy’

+yumıš – [PO05-5]

yumšak – ‘soft’ [ULREG10-1/ULREG11-18/ULREG12-10]

yunt – ‘horse’ [OACC01/-1]

yüd- – ‘to carry’

+yüd- – [PO18-4/PO19-3]

yük – ‘a load, burden’
+lAr – [UlReg14-1]
yüklä- – ‘to load’
   -(X)p – [UlReg17-2]
yürüŋ tämür – PN
   +KA – [UlReg06-6]
yürüŋčin – TN
   +KA – [PO12-2]
yüz – ‘hundred, hundred-household-unit in the army’ [UlReg09-19, 23/UlReg15-10]
   +IntA [PO21-7/PO22-6/PO23-8/PO24-7]
žün – ‘intercalary (month)’ [PO05-1]
Vocabulary of the Middle Mongolian documents

ab- – ‘to take, grasp, get hold of’
   -ču – [Mong02-9]

adirman – PN [Mong05-16]
araki(n) – ‘alcoholic liquor made of airay through distillation; any alcoholic beverage: brandy, wine etc.’
   +yi – [Mong02-6,9]
   +łuγ+a – [Mong02-12]
arba(n) – ‘ten’ [Mong01-11/Mong02-16/Mong05-16]
asara- – ‘to take care’
   -ju – [Mong02-10]

badman (~Uygh. batman) – A measurement for grain and meat in the Mongolian documents. In the Uyghur documents it is used as measure of liquids too. It was ca. 596 grams. [Mong01-8/Mong03-11]

bayu- – ‘to come or go down, fall; to descend, dismount, step down; to sette down, encamp; to stop by, stop on the way’
   -ju – [Mong03-9]

bars – ‘tiger; third year in the twelve-year cycle’ [Mong03-12]

bay qay-a – PN [Mong02-4]

belge bičig – ‘pass, certificate’ [Mong02-14]

biči- – ‘to write, inscribe’
   -bei – [Mong01-12/Mong02-17/Mong03-14/Mong04-10]

bičig – ‘anything written, writing, document’ [Mong01-10/Mong03-12/Mong04-8]

berketemür – PN [Mong02-2]

bolad qay-a – PN [Mong01-2]

bolγa- – ‘to cause to be[come]; to make, make into; to take as’
   -n – [Mong01-6/Mong03-9]]

bor – ‘wine, wine grape’ [Mong02-6,9,12]
   +un – [Mong01-6]

borči – ‘winemaker, wine merchant, collector of the wine toll’ [Mong02-6]
   +n – [Mong03-6]
bulad – TN
   +a – [Mong02-17]
bü– ‘to be’
   -küütür – [Mong01-12/Mong02-17/Mong03-14/Mong04-10]
   -kün – [Mong03-4/Mong04-1]
čingsang – the title čingsang is the Mongolian transcription of the Chinese chengxiang 丞相
   ‘chancellor, prime minister’
   +a – [Mong02-3]
daru– ‘to press, press down, to squeeze; to affix a seal; to print; to pickle, marinate,
   preserve’
   -ba – [Mong05-2,4,6,8,10,12,13,14,15,16]
dolu(n) (doluyan) – ‘seven’ [Mong05-15]
dörbe(n) – ‘four’ [Mong03-7]
dumdadu – ‘middle, central’ [Mong04-9]
ğčüş (~ečüş) – ‘end’ [Mong01-11/Mong03-13]
ad(n) – ‘these, they (referring to things or persons near to the speaker)’ [Mong01-7/Mong03-
   5/Mong04-2]
älči(n) (~elči) – ‘messenger, courier, envoy, ambassador’
   +n – [Mong01-4/Mong02-12]
   +n+tür – [Mong01-7]
   +n+e – [Mong02-8]
+n+I – [Mong04-4]
åne – demonstrative pronomen ‘he, she, it’ [Mong02-5]
ekiten (~əkiten) – ‘led by’ [Mong01-4/Mong02-5,8,11/Mong02-2/Mong03-6/Mong04-4]
   +A – [Mong01-3]
ğurban – ‘third day of a month’ [Mong04-9]
ğurban – ‘three’ [Mong01-7,8/Mong02-13/ Mong05-6,10,11]
gör-e (< ögör-e) – ‘other, except, disregarding’ [Mong04-5]
ibü sibirqui – PN [Mong05-8]
ibü ükü – PN [Mong05-4]
ibü yonadiqudai – PN [Mong05-6]
iduq qut – ‘title of the ruler of the Uyghur territory under Mongol rule’ [Mong02-3]
industan – PN [Mong02-8,11]
ire– ‘to come, arrive, approach’
-gtün – [Mong01-7]
-küi-tür – [Mong03-7]

jaγu(n) – ‘hundred’ [Mong01-5]
jaγur-a – ‘interval, space between halfway, situated between’ [Mong03-4]
jaqaγun – ‘between, in between; intermediate segment’
+a – [Mong04-1]

jam – ‘postal station; road, route, way, pass’
+ud+un – [Mong03-4/Mong04-1]
+ača – [Mong03-8]
+tur – [Mong05-1,3,7,9,11]

jarliγ – ‘decree, command, order, mandate; the Word (used only in reference to gods, sovereigns of feudal lords, and high government agencies)’
+iyar – [Mong02-1/Mong03-1]

jaru- – ‘to use or have a servant, worker, etc.; to control, to engage, to employ’
-bai – [Mong04-5]

jìl – ‘year’ [Mong01-10/Mong02-15/Mong03-12/Mong04-8]
jo ištemür – PN [Mong05-14]

jumatin dails-a – PN [Mong04-3]

kebidki – PN [Mong05-15]

keme- – ‘to say, speak, to intend’
-n – [Mong01-9/Mong02-14/Mong03-11/Mong04-7]

kiyče – ‘dry food’ [Mong02-10]

kög buqa – PN [Mong03-5]

köl – ‘shank’ [Mong01-8/Mong03-10]

künésün – ‘provision, grain, food’ [Mong01-9/Mong03-9,11]

kür- – ‘to reach, to arrive at’
-üged – [Mong01-5]

lui sorumbu – PN [Mong05-1]

manu (-anu) – ‘our’ [Mong01-1,6/Mong02-2/Mong03-4]

minglay – TN
+a – [Mong01-12]

miq-a(n) – ‘meat’ [Mong01-8/Mong03-10]

moγai – ‘snake, serpent’ the 6th year of the Mongols’ 12 year animal cycles calendar [Mong01-10]
**mongγol soγda** – PN [Mong05-12]  
**morila** – ‘to mount a horse, to ride a horse’  
-tala – [Mong03-9]  
**naima(n)** – ‘eight’ [Mong02-16/Mong04-6]  
**namur** – ‘autumn, fall’  
+un – [Mong03-12]  
**nige(n)** – one [Mong05-1,2,4,5,7(2),8,13]  
**niša(n)** – ‘stamp’  
+tu (~+du) – [Mong01-10/Mong02-14/Mong03-12/Mong04-8]  
**noyan** – ‘lord, prince, chief, superior, commandant; title sometimes given to the son of a prince or high-ranking nobleman’  
+d+ta – [Mong02-5]  
**od** – ‘to go to, to proceed to’  
-qu – [Mong02-9]  
-qu-tur – [Mong02-12]  
-tuγai – [Mong02-14]  
-ba-asu – [Mong03-6]  
-qui – [Mong03-6]  
**oro** – ‘to enter, go or come into a place, space, substance, state or condition; to be received (as proceeds, income)’  
-ba – [Mong05-7,9,11]  
**osal** – ‘mishap, negligence, carelessness’ [Mong01-6]  
**ou toldi** – PN [Mong05-10]  
**ög** – ‘to give, give away’  
-čū – [Mong01-9/Mong03-8,11/Mong04-6]  
-bei – [Mong01-10/Mong02-15/Mong03-12]  
**ögör-e** – ‘other, except, disregarding’ [Mong03-7]  
**ötögüs (~ötegüs)** – ‘seniors, elders, chieftains’  
+e – [Mong03-5/Mong04-2]  
**qabuyγ baliγči** – PN [Mong01-4]  
**qabur** – ‘spring’  
+un – [Mong01-11]  
**qadayla** – ‘to place in safekeeping, preserve, conserve, save, keep, to keep in confinement’  
-ju – [Mong02-7,10]
qamtu – adverb and postposition ‘together, along with, jointly, simultaneously’ [Mong02-13]
qan – ‘khan, king, chief’
  +u – [Mong02-1]
qaučin (~qayučin) – ‘old, ancient, former, past, last’ [Mong02-16]
  +a – [Mong03-13]
qočo – TN
  +tur – [Mong03-6]
qonin – ‘sheep, the 8th year in the 12-year cycle’ [Mong02-15/Mong04-8]
qoyar – ‘two’ [Mong01-5.8/Mong03-10(3),13/Mong05-3,2,9,14]
quba – PN [Mong02-3]
qunglu – TN
  +du – [Mong04-10]
saba – ‘any container or receptacle; vessel, vase’ ‘a unit of measurement, ca. 0.84 or 0.9488 litre’ [Mong03-10]
sar-a – ‘moon, lunar month’
  +in – [Mong01-11]
  +yin – [Mong02-16/Mong03-13/Mong04-9]
sevinč buq-a – PN [Mong02-5]
sin-e – ‘new, a day of the first decade of the lunar month’
  +de – [Mong01-11/Mong04-9]
song sibayu – PN [Mong05-13]
šügüsüčin (pl.) – ‘carterer, purser’ [Mong03-3]
sočing – The title sočing is the Mongolian transcription of the Chinese zuocheng 左丞 [Mong02-4]
tabun – ‘five’ [Mong01-7/Mong05-12]
tambin – the smallest measurement for liquids, which was ca. 0.28 litre [Mong01-8]
temege(n) – ‘camel’ [Mong05-1,2,3,4,5,6,9,10,14,15]
temür satilmis – PN [Mong03-2]
toyačin (pl) – ‘accountant, bookkeeper’ [Mong03-3]
tuγluγtemür (Tuγluγ Temür) – PN [Mong01-1]
tula – postposition ‘for, for the sake of, in consequence of, in view of, as, because, in order to’ [Mong02-7]
tulum – ‘leather bag’ [Mong01-5]
turmiš segünč – PN [Mong01-2]
türgen – TN
   +e – [Mong03-13]
ulαγ-α – ‘an animal which belongs to the postal system; postal horse’ [Mong01-7]
   +tu (ulatu) – [Mong02-13]
   +d (ulγad) – [Mong03-8/Mong04-6]
ulαγči (~ulači) – ‘relay coachman, relay service attendant’
   +dača – [Mong03-7]
   +tača – [Mong04-5]
umdan – ‘beverage, drink’ [Mong03-10]
übül – ‘winter’
   -ün – [Mong04-9]
üge – ‘word, utterance, phrase, language, speech’ [Mong01-1/Mong02-2/Mong03-3]
üjb – ‘grape’ [Mong01-6]
ükü- – ‘to die’
   -be – [Mong05-5,7]
ülü – negation preceding verb [Mong01-6]
yabu- – ‘to go, to walk, to depart, go away’
   -yin – [Mong02-7]
   -tuyai – [Mong02-11]
yerü – ‘general, usual, habitual, universal, public; in general, generally’
   +yin – [Mong03-9]
yisün temür – PN
   +ün – [Mong03-1]
yiučing – The title yiučing is the Mongolian transcription of the Chinese youcheng 右丞 [Mong02-4]
yorči- – ‘to walk, go, to travel, to set out, start for’
   -ba [Mong05-1,3]
yorčγul- – ‘to depart, to go away, to move away’
   -tuyai – [Mong01-9/Mong03-8,11/Mong04-7]
Personal names and toponyms

abišan-a – PN [Käz06-2]
adirman – PN [Mong05-16]
aday kay-a – PN [UlReg07-23,30,36,40,46]
agur – PN [UlReg16-3]
alaču – PN [PO14-2]
alay – PN
  +KA – [UlReg07-20]
altmış – PN [OMis03-9/UlReg07-28]
  +KA – [UlReg07-10]
altmış tāmīr – PN [OMis03-7]
altmış tōkūn – PN
  +KA [PO19-5]
amrak kaya – PN [UlReg07-6]
amrak kaya – PN [UlReg07-13]
amta – PN [UlReg08–18]
arg bōke – PN
  +nlŋ – [PO23-1]
arslan – PN
  +(n)Xŋ – [UlReg15-12]
asmut – PN or TN
  +KA – [OMis02-3]
at totok – PN [PO21-6]
ata – PN [PO19-13]
atay barsči – PN
  +KA – [UlReg08-3]
atay togruł – PN [PO21-4]
atay buka – PN [Käz07-3]
ay – PN (?)
  +KA – [UlReg07-44]
ayaga buka – PN [Käz10-4/Käz11-5]
äl buka – PN [Käz04-2]
älık – PN [OAcc04-2]
  +KA – [PList02-3]
ānjürūn – PN [PO11-2]
āsān – PN [PO07-1]
baba sāvinč – PN
  +nXŋ – [UlReg01-8]
bačak – PN [UlReg07-20,33,44/UiReg15-8]
bačak buka – PN [UlReg10-3]
bačak kula – PN [Käz03-8, 12]
bačak-a tarka – PN [PO21-6/PO22-6/PO23-7/PO24-6]
bagatur – ‘hero’, a title, PN
  +tn – [UlReg04-1]
  +lAr+KA – [UlReg08-8]
bagčın – PN [UlReg05-2]
bagluž – PN [UlReg07-47, 51]
bagurči ürük – PN [UlReg08-15]
bahši – ‘master’ (title), PN [UlReg06-10, 12]
  +KA – [PO05-10/UiReg08-9/UiReg11-15/UiReg18-10]
  +nXŋ – [UlReg18-14]
bakalči – PN [UlReg08-10]
bakur – PN [UlReg06-7]
bala toğa – PN [Käz06-2]
balak – TN or PN [UiReg08-27]
balčuk – PN [UlReg08-14]
baltu – PN [PO18-3]
barun – PN
batur – PN [PO18-3]
bay buka – PN [UlReg18-6]
+KA – [UlReg07-29]
bay qay-a – PN [Mong02-4]
bay tämür – PN [Käz02-9]
bägičük – PN – [UlReg01-8]
bärbäg – PN [UlReg06-8]
bäküz – PN [PO06-5]
berketemür – PN [Mong02-2]
bey buka – PN [UlReg08-20]
bülgüd – PN [UlReg15-5]
binaluz – PN [UlReg07-17]
bičkün – PN [PO19-14/PO20-7]
biküs buka – PN [Käz05-4]
bilän – PN [UlReg06-18]
bolad qay-a – PN [Mong01-2]
bolmiš – PN
+KA – [UlReg10-4]
bolmiš taz – PN [PO21-7/PO22-7/PO23-8/PO24-7]
bošaču – PN [UlReg11-1]
bökän – PN [PO13-4/PO14-3/PO15-3]
bubi – PN [UlReg08-25]
buka – PN [PO19-13/Käz09-2/OMis03-5]
buka tämür – PN [UlReg13-2,5]
bulad – TN
+a – [Mong02-17]
burulday – PN
+KA – [UlReg18-17]
buyan kay-a – PN
+KA – [Käz02-10]
buyan-a kay-a
+KA – [UlReg07-35]
buyan tämür – PN [PO12-4/Käz01-2]
bürüngüdäy – PN [PO01-2,7]
+KA – [PO04-2]
čagan – PN [OAcc01-4/OAcc03-2]
čagan kulı – PN [PO12-5]
čanka sünjülg – TN
+tAKI – [PO18-2]
čapat – PN [UlReg07-3,7,14,48]
čäkir tayša – PN [UlReg11-37]
čigay – PN [UlReg06-5]
čiktın – TN [PO19-11/PO20-4]
čipin – PN [Käz02-8]
čoban yigmiš – PN [OReg01-1]
čuintsi – PN [UlReg16-2]
darma – PN [PO006-7]
ig-ba – PN [OReg01-8]
indu-ıntu – PN [PO13-2/PO15-7,14,50]
+KA – [UlReg01-3/PO15-13]
ibü sibirqui – PN [Mong05-8]
ibü ükü – PN [Mong05-4]
ibü yonadiqduai – PN [Mong05-6]
idrili – PN [PList01-1,2,4,5]
industan – PN [Mong02-8,11]
inäki – PN [PO19-13]
inük – PN
+KA – [UlReg10-10]
irčük – PN [OReg01-7]
iş tämür – PN [UlReg07-6,25,32,42]
işirä – PN
+KA – [PO19-8]
jo ištemür – PN [Mong05-14]
jumatin dails-a – PN [Mong04-3]
kamun – PN [UIReg08-24]
kanimdu – PN [PO09-6/PO19-13]
kapam – PN [UIReg06-7]
kara kaya – PN [PO06-7]
kara tägün – PN
+KA – [UIReg10-1]
karay – PN
+KA – [UIReg07-30,34]
karpajčin – PN [UIReg08-2]
kasay – PN [UIReg07-5/UIReg08-20]
kay-a – PN [PO05-10/OMis03-8/UIReg17-2/UIReg18-9]
kayak-a – PN [PO19-14/PO20-7]
käršin – PN/TN [PO03-2/PLis01-3]
kävsädi – PN [PO07-3]
kebidki – PN [Mong05-15]
kibartu – PN [UIReg08-7,16]
kidat – PN [UIReg07-4]
kudır – PN [PO05-7]
kir čäčäk – PN [OReg01-3]
kusig – PN [UIReg10-6]
kitay – ‘Kitay’; PN [PO01-2;6/PO04-4/UIReg07-5,51]
kızıl – TN
+KA – [Käz06-2]
kičig kay-a – PN [UIReg15-9]
kitä – PN [UIReg07-13]
kitir – TN
+tIn – [PO07-2]
koço – TN [UIReg07-16/UIReg12-6]
+KA [OAcc01-2/UIReg07-2,4,8/UIReg12-5]
kodik-a – PN [UIReg07-25]
kodur – PN [PO17-2]
kolumči – PN [UIReg07-50]
koğlı – PN or TN [PLis01-4]
korči – PN [UIReg07-21,22]
korla – PN or TN [PO23-4]
koşaj – PN [PO21-4]
koşuň taz – PN [Käz03-5]
kög buqa – PN [Mong03-5]
köldür-täy – PN [UIReg09-12]
körpä – PN [UIReg08-2]
körpä kay-a – PN [UIReg08-5,7]
+nxη – [UIReg08-23]
körpä sarig – PN [Käz03-4]
köykü – PN
+KA – [UIReg18-8]
kuanbay – PN
+KA – [UIReg06-7]
kudik-a – PN [UIReg07-31]
kuduki batur – PN
+KA – [UIReg06-16]
kulči – PN [UIReg04-2]
kulh – PN [UIReg15-9]
kuluti – PN [UIReg07-5]
kum – TN
+KA – [UIReg01-4]
kurtami – PN [OMis02-5]
kurumči – PN [PO24-1]
kus kar – PN [OAcc03-5]
kut – PN [Käz10-2]
kuti – PN [OMis02-6]
kutlug kay-a – PN
+KA – [UIReg10-5]
kutlug tämür – PN [UIReg06-14]
kün tapmuš – PN [Käz03-6]
künküy – PN
lui sorumbu – PN [Mong05-1]
  +KA – [UlReg08-26]
lükčüŋ – TN [Käz06-5]
  +KA – [PO05-4,7/PList01-6]
  +IXg – [UlReg11-14]
  +IXg+KA – [UlReg11-36]
  +tIn – [PList01-5]
mačar – ‘Hungarian or PN’ [PO03-2]
mamalıg – PN
  +(n)Xŋ – [UlReg16-1]
mamalıg täŋrim – PN [UlReg15-11]
mayak bökan – PN [Käz03-7.13/Käz09-5]
melik temür – PN [PO09-1]
menlig kuca – PN
  +nXŋ [UlReg09-10]
misir – PN [Käz07-9/ULReg07-18/ULReg13-9]
  +tIn – [UlReg18-13]
msirə – PN
  +nlŋ – [OAcc02-2]
mintlayγ – TN
  +a – [Mong01-12]
mongγol soyda – PN [Mong05-12]
mušı – PN [PO06-5]
nampı – TN
  +tA – [PO12-4]
  +KA – [PO22-4]
nom kult – PN [Käz02-8/ULReg09-21]
  +nXŋ – [ULReg09-3]
noyam-a – PN [PList01-6]
noyın sarıg – PN [Käz03-9]
oltay – PN [ULReg08-17]
ou toldi – PN [Mong05-10]
očükän – PN
  +KA – [UlReg11-3]
ödäm – PN [Käz03-3]
ögdüš – PN [ULReg11-9]
ögrinä – PN
  +nlŋ – [OAcc02-1/OAcc03-1/OAcc04-1]
ögrünč buka– PN [PO01-9/PO04-3]
ögrünč tämür – PN [Käz07-3]
ögüš buka – PN [PO19-1]
ötamiš kaya – PN [PO06-4]
pučan – TN [PO19-11/PO20-3]
qabu̇γ baliqči – PN [Mong01-4]
qočo – TN
  +tur – [Mong03-6]
quba – PN [Mong02-3]
qunglu – TN
  +du – [Mong04-10]
sadi – PN [ULReg01-6]
  +KA [ULReg07-7]
saduk – PN [ULReg07-32]
salgar – PN [ULReg08-16]
  +KA – [PO24-4]
sanjad öŋ – PN [ULReg06-14]
sarig toyn – PN [ULReg08-3]
 săvinč toyn – PN [ULReg07-20,28,34,45]
sävíγ – PN [ULReg07-17,25,31,42,48,52]
seliba – PN [PO09-3]
sevinč buq-a – PN [Mong02-5]
sičganči – PN [ULReg11-19]
  +nXŋ – [ULReg11-17]
sogdi – PN [PO23-5]
sombuz – PN [ULReg07-26]
song sibayu – PN [Mong05-13]
soŋadı – PN
tämür buka – PN [PO06-2]
+KA – [UlReg18-2]
tänisig – PN [UlReg07–29,35,40,46]
tärbis kaya – PN [Käz01-5]
temür satilimis – PN [Mong03-2]
tşıg – PN
+KA – [PO19-3]
tipi – PN [PO07-4]
togogan – PN
+KA [UlReg07-38,41,45,47,49,51]
tok – PN
+KA – [UlReg18-8]
toksm – TN [UlReg13-8,10]
+tAkI – [PO22-2]
+KA – [UlReg13-5,]
toju buka – PN
+KA – [PList02-4]
torçi – PN [OMis03-14]
+KA [UlReg07-8]
toyıg-a – PN [UlReg07-33,43]
toyın – PN [UlReg08-5]
toyınçog – PN
+KA – [OMis01-1]
toz – PN [UlReg07-15]
tökrü – PN [UlReg01-9]
tölak – PN [UlReg12-3,5,8,11]
+KA – [UlReg07-43]
+nXŋ – [UlReg12-4]
tölär – PN
+KA – [UlReg02-4]
törbi – PN [PO19-6]
tuğlu temür (Tuğlu Temür) – PN [Mong01-1]
tumur – PN
+KA – [UlReg18-5]
tumur buka – PN
+KA – [UlReg18-4]
tuñ – PN [UlReg15-5,6,14]
+(n)Xŋ – [UlReg15-13]
turmiš seguint – PN [Mong01-2]
turmiš-a – PN
  +KA – [PO22-4]
turpan – TN [Käz06-5/UlReg01-7/UlReg14-1,4/UlReg17-6/UlReg18-11]
  +tA – [PO09-6]
  +IXg+KA – [UlReg11-16]
  +KA – [PList01-1]
tükäl – PN [PO12-4/UlReg07-3,9]
tükälä – PN [UlReg07-49]
tümän aka – PN [UlReg13-7]
tümän buka – PN [PO20-6]
tünül – PN [PO05-2]
türgen – TN
  +e – [Mong03-13]
udčı – PN [UlReg11-27]
uladay – PN
  +KA – [UlReg07-20]
uzabay – PN [PO09-3]
ülčidü – PN [UlReg12-2]
ülügdü – PN [PO19-6]
ürüŋ tämür – PN [UlReg11-12]
yalan PN [Käz03-14]
yalın – PN [PO01-9/PO04-3/PList01-1]
yalkar – PN [PO20-2]
yambil – PN
  +nXŋ – [UlReg08-22]
yanı – TN (?)
  +tA – [PList01-6]
yaq buka – PN [Käz05-2]
yar – TN
  +KA – [PO11-2]
yarigu – PN [UlReg06-15]
yavlak – PN [UlReg05-4]
yăgančük – PN [OReg01-5]
  +KA – [PO22-3]
yetär – PN [PO12-2]
ygmiš taš – PN [OReg01-4]
yimši – TN (identical with yemši)
  +KA – [UlReg07-24,27]
yisüdar (<Mong. Yisüder) – PN [PO09-4]
yisün temür – PN
  +ün – [Mong03-1]
yočin – PN [Käz05-2/UlReg05-4/UlReg08-10]
yogan – PN [UlReg07-10]
yogan – PN [UlReg07-17]
yolči – ‘guide’, PN [PO06-6]
  +KA – [PO08-3/UlReg08-4]
yöläk – PN [PO06-8]
yula almtimeš – PN [Käz07-3]
yürüŋ tämür – PN
  +KA – [UlReg06-6]
yürüŋčin – TN
  +KA – [PO12-2]
Table 1: Animal denominations in the Uyghur documents concerning the postal system of the Mongol Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Approximate number of appearances*</th>
<th>Number of documents</th>
<th>Signatures of the documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at**</td>
<td>62 (54)</td>
<td>20 (19)</td>
<td>PO02, PO10, PO11, PO12, PO15, PO16, PO17, PO19, PO21, PO22, PO23, Käz06, Käz08, OAcc02, OReg01, UlReg01, UlReg02, UlReg04, UlReg07, UlReg13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulag</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PO19, Käz03, OMis02, OAcc03, OAcc04, UlReg01, UlReg06, UlReg07, UlReg08, UlReg09, UlReg11, UlReg13, UlReg14, UlReg17, PList03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at ulag</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PO12, PO21, PO22, PO24, OAcc01, UlReg04, UlReg14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uzun ulag</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UlReg05, UlReg10, UlReg13, UlReg17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boguz at</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PO05, UlReg11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>äšgäk ulag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PO19, Käz07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>münğü X at ulag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PO23, PO24, UlReg14;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>münğü X at</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PO19, PO21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küşga ulag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PO05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>äšgäk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PO19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulag at</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PO14; UlReg07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UlReg13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išlik ulag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UlReg16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küşga at</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UlReg07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lükčüŋ turpan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Käz06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We can give only an approximate number of appearances here because the readings of the documents are often very dubious.

** The document Nr. 54 in the USp. is a list of payments. It contains eight occurrences of att. This can be considered as at ‘name’ plus an accusative ending or at ‘horse’ with the same suffix. Radloff translates it as horse. According to the context and the appearance of the kupčir-tax in the last line I would suggest that we should translate it in the sense of horse. However I am not sure because I could not check the original hand script, so numbers in parentheses indicate the count with these uncertain occurrences removed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>at</th>
<th>müngü bir äşgäk ulag</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>PO19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tülü at</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PO13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ud ulag</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UlReg06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uzun at</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UlReg12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yam at</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PO12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yol at</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PO08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yüdgü äşgäk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PO19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>PO (24)</td>
<td>Kâz (11)</td>
<td>OMis (3)</td>
<td>OAcc (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>PO08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West Uyghur Period)</td>
<td>PO18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B*</td>
<td>PO19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Early Mongol, Pre-Yuan)</td>
<td>PO20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C*</td>
<td>PO10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAcc01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Early Mongol, Yuan)</td>
<td>PO11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAcc04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>PO07</td>
<td>Kâz06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yuan)</td>
<td>PO09</td>
<td>Kâz07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO12</td>
<td>Kâz08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>PO01</td>
<td>Kâz05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(early 14th century)</td>
<td>PO03</td>
<td>Kâz10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mong03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO04</td>
<td>Kâz11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(after late 1320’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>PO05</td>
<td>Kâz01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mid-14th century)</td>
<td>PO06</td>
<td>Kâz03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kâz04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kâz09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>PO02</td>
<td>Kâz02</td>
<td>OMis01-03</td>
<td>OReg01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* According to Matsui it is possible that the formal differences of these two groups follow from the different levels of their issue and not from the temporal gap between them (MATSUI 2014a: 620).
Table 3: Genealogy of the Chaghadaid rulers (up to 1347)

Source: Biran 2009
Table 4: List of Rulers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uyghur ıduk kuts under Mongol rule (1209–1270’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Barçuk Art Tegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. *Kesmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salındı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ögrünč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *Maumula/*Mamulag/*Mamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kočkar Tegin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Khans of the Mongol Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinggis Khan (1206–1227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ögödei Khan (1229–1241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güyük Khan (1246–1248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Möngke Khan (1251–1259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubilai Khan (1260–1294)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The rulers of the Yuan-dynasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qubilai Khan (1260–1294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temür Khan (1294–1307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Külüg Khan (1307–1311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayurbarwada Buyantu Khan (1311–1320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gegeen Khan (1320–1323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yisün Temür (1323–1328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayibay Khan (1328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tüyor Temür (1328–1329, 1329–1332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutuğtu Khan (1329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinčinbal Khan (1332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyon Temür (1333–1368)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilkhanid rulers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hölegü Khan (1256–1265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abaqa Khan (1265–1282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Tegüder (1282–1284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsun (1284–1291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaykhatu (1291–1295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baydu (1295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud Ghazan (1295–1304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öljeitü (1304–1316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Sa’id Bahadur (1316–1335)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map I: The geography of East Turkestan

Source: STEIN 1928
Map II: Places of provenance of the written sources in East Turkestan

Source: [http://telota.bbaw.de/turfan/bilder/kartemax.gif](http://telota.bbaw.de/turfan/bilder/kartemax.gif)
(last download: 01.24.2016)
Map III: Central Asia in 8th–9th centuries

Source: BREGEL 2003: 19
Map IV: The Mongol conquest in Central Asia

Source: BREGEL 2003: 37
Map VI: The Mongol uluses in Central Asia in the 13th century

Source: BREGEL 2003: 39
Map VII: The Mongol ulus in Central Asia in the 14th century

Source: BREGEL 2003: 41
Map VIII: Routes of the Silk Road in Central Asia

Source: IDP (last download: 01.24.2016)
Map IX: The travels of Carpini, Rubruck and Marco Polo in Central Asia

Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Central_Asian_trade_routes_V2.jpg
(last download: 01.24.2016)
Map X: The travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa

Source: https://www.reddit.com/r/MapPorn/comments/1eou01/the_travels_of_ibn_battuta_2268_x_2195/
(last download: 01.24.2016)
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