A COLLECTION OF CLEAR SCRIPT MANUSCRIPTS OF S. NAADGAI AND THE CONTINUITY OF CLEAR SCRIPT USAGE IN OIRAT RELIGIOUS LIFE

ABSTRACT
The article presents a survey and a list of a manuscript collection created in the last decades of the 20th century by S. Naadgai in Mo’nhhairhan, Hovd aimag (Mongolia), who belonged to the last generation of Oirats in Mongolia actively using the Clear script (todo bičig) in their religious practice. The collection and the oral history connected with Naadgai’s lifetime give an evidence about the role of the Clear script usage among the ethnic group of Altain Uriankhains, a tradition now definitely interrupted on the Mongolian side of the Altai range. The aim of this paper is to clarify the palaeographic and orthographical differences of Naadgai’s autographs from the classical Written Oirat (17–18th centuries). The analysis shows an influence of the spoken dialect and a general decline of the Clear script literacy in the contemporary Western Mongolia.
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1. Usage of the national language in the Mongolian Buddhism
The translating of Buddhist texts into Mongolian started in the late 13th or the very beginning of the 14th centuries. The vigorous work of translators of the Yuan dynasty became almost forgotten and lost during the centuries of a political and trade isolation of the Mongolian regions from China until Altan Khan’s agreement with China (1571) and his attempts to legitimize his authority by contacts with Tibetan
Buddhist leaders, followed by other local khans. Although the whole Buddhist Canon was translated into Mongolian as early as in the first part of the 17th century, Tibetan remained the language of Buddhist rituals and scholarship. Besides the voluminous Mongolian manuscripts ordered and donated by political leaders mainly through the 17th and the first part of 18th centuries, the majority of religious books written in Mongolian in the 18th and 19th centuries were intended for the popular use, although it was still a good habit for the well-educated lamas to be versed also in the Mongolian religious literature. The monastic usage of Mongolian, partly promoted by a group of religious leaders in the 17th century (mainly around Neiji toyin), has been gradually pushed away by the Tibetan language. According to Erdeni-yin erike (written in 1835) (ISIBALDAN 1961) only five monasteries in Inner Mongolia used Mongolian as their main language of rituals, or by a less proper term “liturgy”: Mergen juu, Bay-a juu in Köke qota, one or two monasteries among the Qorčin and Maqakala-yin süm-e in Peking (ISIBALDAN 1961, 28r/57).

Mergen süm-e in Urad is the only one which has preserved the tradition and re-established it after the years of the Cultural revolution. Following the indigenous tradition and the general opinion of Inner Mongolian researchers, Mongolian liturgy originally came to Mergen süm-e with its first Mergen gegen Dinv-a, a disciple of Neyiji toyin (1557–1653). All the texts used in Mergen süm-e were composed and adapted by the Third Mergen Gegen Lubsangdambijalsan (1717–1766) and included in his collected works whose xylograph was cut in Beijing in 1783. All the liturgical texts have been versified and fitted to particular melodies. The Mongolian liturgical tradition of Mergen süm-e achieved a great popularity and was introduced to all the monasteries in the Right Urad Banner (Urad-un Barayun gung-ün qosiyu) and sporadically to the surrounding areas. In Northern Mongolia, Khalkha, we have only scarce evidence about the Mongolian liturgy at the monasteries and it seems true that it has never been widely used.

1 The basic literature concerning the Third Mergen Gegen and his literary work are the following titles: MÖNGKE 1995, 2004, LHAMO – MÖNGKE 2007. The most recent work has been written by Caroline Humphrey and Hürelbaatar Ujeed (Humphrey – Ujeed 2013).
2 A complete facsimile of the preserved parts of the collected works by the Third Mergen Gegen Lubsangdambijalsan (Wčir dhara mergen diyanči blam-a-yin gegen-ü gbum jarliy kemegdekü orusiba) has been published three times in Inner Mongolia (LUBSANGDAMBIJALSAN 1998; MÖNGKEBATU 2012, vol. 1 and 2).
3 MHT, 370–371 mentions that the monastery Honic’iin hu’ree (founded 1788) in the area of Tüsiyetü qan ayimay-un Gobi mergen wang-un qosiyu (now Mandah sum in Dornogovi aimag) together with Bulag bilu’unii hiid (now in O’lziit sum, Dundovi aimag) were using Mongolian liturgy. The tradition of the Mongolian liturgy has been probably limited to the large Gobi mergen wang-un qosiyu and the Da wang-un qosiyu (Gobi Tüsiyetü çin wang-un qosiyu; the mention about this qosiyu probably relates to the Bulag bilu’unii hiid, which was located within its boundaries).
2. Religious use of Mongolian in the Eastern Mongolia

Within one century following Altan Khan’s propagation of the Buddhism, Mongolian scholars created several new writing systems (Ayusi Güüsi’s Ali kali, Zanabazar’s horizontal quadratic script and Soyombo script). All of these attempts have responded to a need to note the recently translated Buddhist texts in a way enabling their accurate reading by everyone. Their authors have been aware of phonetic imperfections of the Classical Mongolian (CM) script. Mastering CM script needed a longer experience as far as many words might have been red in several ways. It is well known that reading of the religious texts by unskilled readers led even to the establishment of new words in Mongolian (e.g. bodisung as a misreading of the archaic Uigur-like form bodistwa, čakrawar-un qayan instead of čakrawar-t[i] qayan, uwaą instead of ḍom etc.).

The only writing system of the 17th century which spread and became common, was the Clear Script todo or todorxoi bičiq (abbreviated CS), invented by the Oirat monk Zaya pandita (1599–1662), according to his biography in 1648. CS received wide circulation only at the end of the 17th and in the 18th centuries, when it became the single official script of the Dzungar khanate and Volga Kalmyks. The earliest preserved monuments written in todo bičiq date to the end of the 17th century, but the oldest religious manuscripts come at best case from the first part of the 18th century. The Dzungar governor Galdantseren (1727–1745) supported first xylographic editions of CS sūtras in Zaya pandita’s CS translation.

We have no evidence whether in the time of the Dzungar khanate the Oirat sūtras were used for the monastic liturgy, although it is believed that they were among Zaya pandita’s disciples. In the 19th and 20th centuries all the monasteries in Western Mongolia were already using Tibetan, but the Clear script books were widely used by lay persons. Specialists for reading CS sūtras are called xara baysi “lay masters”. Originally, xara baysi were performing much more than the simple ritual reading of Oirat sūtras, resembling shamans in some respect (the essential difference was that the ancestral spirits ongyud did not enter xara baysi). Xara baysi

---

4 Kara 2005, 141 considered the letters of Galdan boşoytu to the Russian Tsar (among them the letter of 1691) the earliest known monuments of the Oirat script. Earlier correspondence of Oirat nobles in Russian archives, e.g. the letter from Prince Dayičing tayişi to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich of 1661 (facsimile in Ustjugov 1967, 131), has been still written in CM script and only starting with Ayuka Khan (correspondence from 1713–1724) documents are written in CS (Suseeva 2009). For the Dzungar Khanate, letters written in CS have been attested in Manchu archives in Beijing since 1678 (letters of Galdan tayiji to Kangxi Emperor). (Dayičing gürün-ü dotuyatu yamun-u mongyol bičiq-ün ger-ün dangse 2005, II 143).

5 Two xylographs have been found so far: Xutuqtu biligiyin činadu kürügsen tasuluqči učir kemekü yeke kölgiŋi sudur orošiboi (skt. Ārya-vajracchedikā-nāma-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, “Diamond sutra” a Nayiman mingya-tu orošiboi (skt. Ārya-aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, “Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines”. Both of the prints have been preserved as sacral objects worshiped by Mongolian families in Mongγolküriy-e, Ili Kazakh Autonomous Region, Xinjiang).
were acquainted with divination and astrology, otherwise were able to perform rituals detecting thieves and stolen thinks. The existence of xara baysi is attested by Ööld, Alt.U. and Dörvöd Oirat ethnic groups. The religious role of CS has been less important at Torguud and Khoshuud areas. Up to the present times, the tradition of xara baysi has been widely preserved only in one Ööld county, Mongγolküriy-e (Ili Kazakh Autonomous Region) in Xinjiang. A few xara baysi can be found also in the nearby counties Tekes and Nilq-a. The contemporary xara baysi in Mongγolküriy-e are usually only reading sūtras and copying them – both of these activities have strict rules. For the reading of more voluminous titles several xara baysi gather and read various parts of the book simultaneously in order to complete the reciting of the whole sūtra in a reasonable time.

3. The usage of the Written Oirat by Altai Uriankhains

Altai Uriankhains (Alt.U.) living at the Xinjiang side of the Mongolian Altai practised the ritual reciting of CS sūtras until recently. Old people still remember xara baysi who as late as in the 1990s were reading CS sūtras on demand of others and practising a method of detecting stolen things (usually some livestock) by a ritual arrow or a vajra. Even though a few of CS manuscripts survived the Cultural Revolution and the old and middle age generations learned CS in schools, in present days there is nobody regularly reciting and copying CS sūtras as it is practices in Mongγolküriy-e and the nearby counties.

A similar situation is at the north-eastern Mongolian side of Altai mountains, where Alt.U. survived as a minority among Kazakhs in Buyant, Altai, Altanco’gc and Bulgan sums in Bayan-O’lgii aimag (except the Tuva-speaking Alt.U. in Cengel sum, regarded today as the Tuva nationality) and as a majority in two sums (Mo’nhhairhan, Duut) in Hovd aimag. During my repeated oral history research in these areas (since 2010), I have collected some few mentions about local people previously famous in their native place for their knowledge of CS and reciting CS sūtras. The best evidence came from the former Barayun amban-u qosiγu of the Left wing of Alt.U. (today’s Mo’nhhairhan and Bulgan sums and a part of Duut sum).

6 Only a little has been written about this tradition so far. Mende – Bayankešig 2006, 264–288; Mingad Erdemtū 2006.

7 During the ritual of reciting the texts, xara baysi are seated in a line. The first one takes one leaf of the sūtra after another, reads a passage of the text and passes it down to his neighbour and takes a new leaf for himself. Every xara baysi uses his own melody and a slightly different speed of reciting taken over from his personal teacher. Xara baysi distinguish propitious and unfavourable days for reciting sūtras. Similarly to the monastic Buddhism, reciting of every sūtra has its particular effects and its choice reflects the situation of the household who ordered the reciting and the time conditions. In present days, women are actually excluded from the usage of Clear script sūtras, although some xara baysi’s mention that women used to be admitted to the reciting wearing a cap (toγurçay).
Unlike in Xinjiang, where CS was in use as the official writing system for Mongolian until early 1990s, in Western Mongolia (formerly the Khovd Frontier Qobdu-yin kijayar) CM script was used for the administrative needs starting with the Manchu times (at least 19th century) and, of course, replaced by the Cyrillic during the late 1940s. CS has been limited to the private use, mainly for religious needs, and has never been taught in official schools. Still the books in CS has been kept in a high esteem and despite big losses caused by several forced migrations in the first half of the 20th century and the harsh anti-religious campaigns from 1940s to 1990, a large amount of the books is still kept by local families and re-established local temples.

Unlike in Mongyolküriy-e, in Barayun amban-u qosiγu it has been no exception that women mastered CS and regularly recited the scriptures. Tu’ruunii Togtoh (deceased in 1963, 76 years old) belonging to the Myangat sum of the Baruun amban's banner, was known as usanz (skr. upāsikā), a lay devotee, who had undertaken certain vows, transmitted her knowledge of CS and inherited her books to her daughter, Damdinii Muuz’a (1909–1992). Muuz’a in her older age also started to observe precepts and rules of an usanz. She has been reciting the Diamond sūtra on 15th and 30th day of every month of the Mongolian calendar. She started to recite the Diamond sūtra as soon as the morning tasks like milking of cattle has been finished, lit a lamp and made an incense offering. Muuz’a learned CS spontaneously just following her mother’s reciting. She has probably never used CS for writing.

Reciting the Diamond sūtra, Muuz’a is said to use a literary pronunciation, strange for her children listening to it. Her son, C’uluunoc’ir remembered only two words from the reciting as an example tegiinčinen bolugsan, which excellently shows the abidance of the written form of the written language (the colloquial form would be tǖnčilĕn bolsŏn, Mongolian translation of the skr. Tathāgata). C’uluunoc’ir did not remember the exact melody, but recalled that the melody had been agreeable to listening and similar to the melody of the “mani chants” maani högz’ooh. Once the

---

8 The oldest archive materials provenant from the Alt.U. banners kept in the National Archives of Mongolia date to the first half of the 19th century.
9 The only short time when the Clear script appeared in the archives of the Alt.U. banners were the late 1910s, when Alt.U. pertained to Chinese authorities in Sir-a süm-e (today’s Altay in Xinjiang) – Fu dutong xian Aertaishan daoyin gongshu副都統銜阿爾泰山道尹公署.
10 Muuz’as father Damdin belonged to the Oriyas elkin of Ah sumun in the Baruun ambanii hos’uu. His father was Sam’ya and gradfather Baglaan (Bo’HHUYAG 2010, 51).
reciting has been finished, Muuz’a started to sing one of the “mani chants”, usually repeating the following stanza:

\[
\text{mānīn zurgān ēṣīg (nī) / maytān śīlūglen unśidźū / ōm manī pad me xom ... 3x / maśī xalūn tamāsā (nī) / tatān soyorxān odičo / ōm manī pad me xom ... 3x (“Six syllables of the mani / Read them with praises and reciting / Let us deliver / From the very hot hells”)
\]

Although the chant remembered by C’uluunoc’ir is too short as to provide a material for an analysis, it is curious to note, that forms of words like unśidźū (instead of the colloquial unśidž or unśidžĭ) and śīlūglen (instead of šüleglen) are both pronounced forms of the written Mongolian ungsiju and silüglen. The syllabic principle of the verse also needs the word maś (which is received as a single syllable in modern Khalha and Oirat in Mongolia) to be pronounced maši (CM and TB masi) in order to keep the number of syllables in the verse.\(^{12}\) Understanding the contents of the sūtra was not so important as the simple act of its reciting. After the reciting has been completed, Muuz’a was telling stories about benefits from reading the Diamond sūtra. Such stories were extremely popular in Mongolia in the second part of the 19th and the first part of the 20th centuries, as it is attested by a large amount of preserved manuscripts.\(^{13}\) C’uluunoc’ir mentioned one story about a hunter whom the simple physical contact with a manuscript of the Diamond sūtra procured salvation from hells and reincarnation in the human body. The story is not included in the written collection.

The motif of a wise old woman reciting the Diamont sūtra can also be found in Alt.U. oral narratives. In a tale called Altuuz’ mergen, the wandering hero comes several times to the house of a woman reciting the sūtra. In some cases, the woman gives him an advise, in other cases not, but thanks to the encounter with the miraculous power of the wise woman and her sūtra, the young man is every time inspired with a sense of the right direction:

“The young man got down from his shedding colt and entered the ger. Inside, an old woman was reciting the Diamond sūtra. The child approached, bowed thrice, received blessings and set before her. When the old woman completed the reciting, put the sūtra on the hoimor, [versified:] turned towards him and fired the juniper, / turned back and placed the offerings, / walked out and made a libation

\(^{12}\) In the mani chants we can usually find the last relics of the “oral-literary” pronunciation in the contemporary Mongolian. After 1990 the mani chants became again a part of the popular Buddhist culture in Mongolia and the Cultural revolution in China, but its traditional authentic forms can still be heard for example in Govi-Altai aimag Cogt sum, in Ordos and among Kölnbùyir Buriats.

\(^{13}\) Usually with the title: Qutuytu bilig-ün činadu kijāyār kürügesen wēr-iyar oytuluyči-yin ači tusa erdem-ün taviburi-yin sudur. The manuscript copies are present in almost every catalogue of old Mongolian manuscripts.
of tea, / [returned to the ger and] from a vase-shaped tea pot / poured the red tea and passed it to the boy.” (Puncagdorz’ 1990, 33).

4. Sanz’iin Naadgai and her manuscript heritage

Another legendary old wise woman reciting the Diamond sūtra was Sanz’iin Naadgai from Mo’nhhairhan sum (Hovd aimag). Although she is not mentioned in the existing monograph of the sum (Bo’ho 2004), she can be considered one of the most remarkable personalities in the recent past of the place. She was born in 1902/1903 as a daughter of Sanz’i zahiragc’, presumably an assistant of the banner’s governor.15

Being an old lady with a perfect memory, Naadgai was interviewed by several researchers. In 1978, she was called to talk with prof. Jaroslav Vacek from the Charles University in Prague and Jugderiin Lubsangdorji, who went to Mo’nhhairhan during their dialectological research in Hovd aimag.16 In 1988, she provided a lot of ethnological information to the field researcher I. Lhagvasu’ren from the Mongolian Academy of Sciences.17 Z’. Coloo in his article about the Alt.U. written culture mentions traditional names of the graphical components and letters of CS recorded from S. Naadgai with their comparison to the names included in written sources.18

According to my interviews with Naadgai’s son Magsar and her daughter-in-law Pooluugiin Noosgoi,19 Naadgai learned CS from her father, forgot it through his life and brushed up her knowledge again when she was seventy, it means in 1970s. At that time she was searching for old manuscripts preserved by others and probably collected some of them. Then she was copying them by hand. She has also presented many copies to the people.

Naadgai used to give tea offerings to her sūtras placed in the home altar hoimor every morning and fire the juniper frequently. P. Noosgoi describes the process of reading as follows:

nom bolxār dzāvăl č güi xömört bānă. tegēd oglō bukēn ter cānān dēdēž tāvīnē. ūrgēldē saŋ tāvildē arc ūyūlā. ūm odō nom sudūr erxbiš arcā ūyūlād, nōgō tegdēr burū dzōvīg sūčxēd, tegēd ūzdēg, ... nomīn barintāγ gedēγ čaŋγa orādž og, nom gentēdgiī, ter

---

14 Her father belonged to the Tünken elken (clan) in Ah arvan of Oorcog sumun of Baruun ambanii hos’uu. Naadgai was a resident of Bort bag in Mo’nhhairhan sum.
15 Otherwise, the name Sanz’ zahiragc’ has never been mentioned in the oral history I have collected in the region of the former banner.
16 Prof. Jaroslav Vacek has written a short account about his expedition in Nový Orient (VACEK 1980). About the meeting with S. Naadgai, J. Lubsangdorji has written an impressive story in his textbook of the Mongolian conversation (LUVSANDORDŽ – VACEK 1990, 137).
17 His recordings were published in MUZHSEH 2011, 32–33, 40, 64.
barintăγ mašĭ čangγăldž orādăγ. nomdŭ barintăγ ogsĕn kümŭn, ölgigę ögölgin dēd xamyin tom ölgigę nomin barintăγ, nom xadăyalaxăd xerętgă. mană ēdžī bičixdēn bol ter xar bex gedęg yum närūlăd bičidăži bādīm. nigę usūn butăγ bāsăn şiy sanāydăd, ter ulan bek gedă bāsăn, xāyā xāyā nigę uyin todotyl orūldăγ bāsănşiybānăldă. astă mod üzürleğıgsen, ter närūlsān yümānd xığed bičdēg bāsim, bal mal bāsāngui, tegęd bičd minibă. mană ēdžīn nom unšixū bičixū bolxăr bosăd yărăny uyāčıxăd, tegęd şan tăviăd, şan dērē engęd xoyor yarăn engęd ariłčıxăd, tegęd nomön avăd, delgęd, bidendĕ unšdăγ bāsim (Interview 6.7.2013 in Mo’nhhairhan sum).

“A sūtra has to be placed on the hoimor necessarily. Everyday morning, [Naadgai] gave an offering of tea and also fired the juniper frequently – offered the incense. Having removed the book in the proper way, she started to recite it. ... [She used to remind me] to wrap the book clothing on tight, [in this way] the book won’t damage. She wrapped the book clothing very firmly. The cloth wrapping of the book is the supreme pious gift, for it is needed to protect the book. Our mother used the black ink for writing, she was used to prepare it herself. Then there was something like a watercolour, called the red ink, which she used to write sometimes an epithet [of a deity or Buddha]. Then she had a pointed wooden stick. She dipped the stick into the mixed ink and wrote. There has not been any pen. When going to recite or copy a book, our mother stood up, washed her hands, fired the juniper and purified her hands in the smoke of the juniper. Only after this she took the book, unwrapped it and started to recite it to us.”

5. A list of CS manuscripts from the inheritance of S. Naadgai

During two of my visits to the family of Magsar and P. Noosgoi, I was kindly permitted to see and take photographs of all the manuscripts in the possession of this family. The collection can be divided into two parts – manuscripts written by S. Naadgai herself and older manuscripts. It is quite simple to distinguish them, for the first group is written either on the hand-made Russian paper (which was used in the Northern Mongolia approximately between 1780s – 1850s) and the Russian machine-made paper (used in the Northern Mongolia between 1850s – 1920s). S. Naadgai’s manuscripts are usually written on modern thick white paper.

5.1 Manuascripts attributed to S. Naadgai
1. itegel orošibai (CM itegel orusibai, Tib. skyabs’ gro bzhugs so), 5 fol.
3. sukew[a]diyin iröl orosibui (CM sukawadi-yin irügel orusibai), 6 fol.
4. zoürdüyin sonosod sudur orosibiu (CM jayuratu-yin sonusuyad tonilyaçi sudur orusibai, Tib. bar do thos grol), 14 fol.
5. tamu ebdekuxouri kemekü altan usun xutuyan oršiboï (CM tamü ebdeki qouri kemekü altan usun qutuy-a orusibai), translation by Rab byampa corji. Title on fol. 1v: xamuq kile[n]ce nam[an]cilxu sudur
   Incipit: arban züg yurban cagiyin xamuq burxan bodhi satwa nar-tu mörgümü::
   Explicit: kilince namančilxu altan usun xutuyan tamun ebtekü xouri kemekü dousubai::
6. Mila burxan Xormustu yeke tenggeriyin z[a]rliq orošibo’i (CM Mila burqan Qormusta yeke tngri-yin jarliy orusibai), 13 fol.²⁰
7. [A prophetic text Čilaγun-u bičig], 6 fol. A concise version of the preceding prophetic text.
   Incipit: N[a]mo guru abaraltan dedü yurban erdeni-dü mürgemü’i: na zha ja taya ku-du nige gerte’i čulun buujai ireqse-ece yar[a]qsan nomin z[a]rliq egüni debter z[a]r tarxabal buyun yeke bolmu’i:: ...
8. xutuqtu doqšin šiyike neretü sudur orošiba’i, 4 fol.

5.2 Older manuscripts written by various scribes:
1. xutuqtu biligiyin činadu kürügsen tasuluqči učir kemerü yeke kölgöni sudur orošiboï (skt. Ārya-vajracchedikā-nāma-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra), 35 fol. on the Russian hand-made paper, 1 fol. of the modern paper with S. Naadgai’s handwriting.
2. xutuqtu sa’in yabudali’in irööli’in xān orošiboï: (CM Qutuqtu sayin yabudal-un irügel-ün qayan, Tib. bzang po spyod pa’i smon lam gyi rgyal po), Russian machine-made paper, 17 fol.
1v-3r: [buuriyin sang: A prayer of the landscape worship]
3r-5v: xutuq-tu arban zügi-yin xarangγui büküni teyin arilyaçi kemēkü yeke kölgüni sudur [Tib. Phyogs bcu’i mun ba rnam par sel ba]
5v-7v: [möriyin sang orošibo] Incipit: namo buddhā-ya: namo dharma-ya namā sangghā-ya: yurban kürüdyi sedkiqsen-yer tögünčilen medeqći tedeni dörbön tantariqsanı dotoron oroluqsan amitan bügüde-dü endöürel ügei ünen möriyigi üzüülüqçi xamugi medeqći nomiyin boqdo-du zalbarimui: ...
5. Two manuscripts written by S. Naadgai and their analysis

Text A: Taking the Refugee (No. 1)

1r/1 itegel orošibai:
2r/1 bi kiged eke bol[o]=
1v/2 qsan xam[u]q amitin arban
1v/3 züg yurban c[a]qin xamuq tó=
1v/4 güyin čilen boloqs[a]diin bi=
1v/5 ye kelen setegel erd[e]m ü=
1v/6 i=le bğuudiin mőn čınar bo=
1v/7 loqs[a]n nayan dörben mi[n]gγan
1v/8 nom=’i coqca yarxui oron
1v/9 xamuq xutuqtu xu[w][a]r[a]qin
1v/10 ezen ačitu ündüsün kige=

1v/11 d ü[n]düşlen seletecoqtu
1v/12 dēdu blama noyodu i=
1v/13 tegemü: blama-du itegemü=
1v/14 ’i burxan-du itegemü’i:
2r/1 nom-du itegemü’i: burs[an]g
2r/2 xu[w][a]r[a]q-du itegemü: id[a]
2r/3 m mand[a]=
2r/4 sütü buxan but<te>ku bolo=tu=
2r/5 nom tetegqčii s[a]güüssan
2r/6 belbi. bilegii. ničetü.
2r/7 dēdu coqtu itegel no=
2r/8 yodu-tu itegemü: bu[r]xan
2r/9 nom kiged cuulyan-ni dedü
2r/10 noyodu bodi kūrdel bi i=

2r/11 tegemü: mini ögelege te=
2r/12 rgegeten üledeqsen e=
2r/13 ne buyen-yer amitini tu=
2r/14 si tul[a]da bu[r]xan bútükü bo=
2v/1 ituyai: dedü yurban erde=
2v/2 ni-dü bi itegemü: xamuq
2v/3 kili[n]ge börü börü nam[a]
2v/4 mü amitini buy[a]n-du day[a]n
2v/5 bay[a][s][a][c]a[mui]: burxani bodi
2v/6 sütü itegemü: xamuq xutuqtu
2v/7 kili[n]ge amitin jirγal[a]=
2v/8 ng kiged jirγal[a]ng-i
2v/9 nü düsünyan tögüsüküyi
2v/10 tula burxan but<te>ku bolo=tu=
2v/11 xamuq amitin ci vočil=
2v/12 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/13 xamuq amitin ci vočil=
2v/14 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/15 ‘i över busdiin tusa s[a]i-
2v/16 tar bügüdeγün tula bodi sa-
2v/17 tega läesgen ündüsün:
2v/18 dedü bodi sategel läesgen
2v/19 xamuq amitin ci vočil=
2v/20 xamuq amitin ci vočil=
2v/21 xamuq amitin ci vočil=
2v/22 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/23 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/24 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/25 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/26 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/27 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/28 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/29 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/30 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/31 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/32 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/33 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/34 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/35 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/36 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/37 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/38 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/39 xamq amitin ci vočil=
2v/40 xamq amitin ci vočil=

21 Omitted letters, which should be present according to the standard forms in the Written Oirat, are written in square brackets. Asterisk marks superfluous letters, syllables or parts of words. <> marks complementary syllables or words written by the scribe outside the main line.
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Text B: A prayer to reborn in the paradise Sukhavati (No. 3)

1r/1 Suk[a]w[a]diyin iröl oroš’ibu’i::
1r/2 xamugi med[e]qči bal=
1r/3 ma’iyin ölmödü süzülün
1r/4 mörgümüü kiz[a]:r üge::
1r/5 irol oyoto toguş=*
1r/6 qsen kütün=yer arban zuq-
1r/7 tü suuqsan xamuq burxa=
1r/8 d maqtaqsan:: :: erdemi-yin
1r/8 erke ögüüleki o=
1r/9 ron sukew[a]di-du xu=
1r/10 bilun törökü boltuyai
1r/11 xoyör költöni erkin
1r/12 itegel: amid[a]ba ni=
1r/13 dü-bēr: üzeqči ki=
1r/14 ged yeke küců oloqsan

fol. 2r

2v/1 terigü’uten c[a]ql[a]şī-

22 A mistaken writing of amuraq.

23 A mistaken writing of zöölön.
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Written torokü.

Written onggü.
5.1 Palaeographical notes

Unlike CM script, CS has been created as a phonetic system recording all the phonemes of the language. It has 7 graphemes for the short vowels and a special sign indicating the length (according to the general rules this sign is used with all the vowels but u and ü, whose long variants are recorded by a doubled letter). Although CS can excellently record the Oirat Mongolian and eliminate multiple readings quite common in CM – especially when applied to a dialect, in comparison with the classical Mongolian script it is rather difficult to write fast. This is the reason why CS was so popular within the religious texts, but gained only a limited use for administrative purposes. Such a high level of a graphical redundancy in CS (CM script does not make any comprehension problems even with less distinctive graphemes) led the scribes to its individual simplifications and so was the case of S. Naadgai.

Naadgai frequently does not distinguish u and ü, o and ö (e.g.: töröküi (3v/4) written töroküi, or kötölön (3v/14) written kötölon). In the transcription, I had to follow the vowel harmony according to the real standard pronunciation of the Written Oirat (or followed the vowel in the first syllable, which is usually written correctly). Sometimes, there is no distinction between a and e, and e is recorded by a (e.g.: dörben (1v/7) written dörban, or seleten (2r/4) written selaten), which is a clear influence of CM. Another simplification is the confusion of c and č, z and j – also an influence of CM or just a lack of strict rules in CS. In the next paragraphs I will observe, how far the peculiarities in Naadgai’s handwriting can be considered an influence of the
spoken Oirat, or only as mistakes of an unprofessional (but still highly assiduous) scribe.

**a) Elision of vowels** – in the following examples, the elision of vowels in the unstressed syllables of the word can be considered an influence of the colloquial Oirat, or Alt.U. respectively. These vowels are weakened, but still reflected as present in all the colloquial Oirat dialects and reflected as absent in modern Kalmyk.


The diphtong ei at the end of a word is pronounced as a in Alt.U., which influenced the loss of the letter : γaz[a]r deleke (A5r/11), TB: γazar delekei, CM: γajar delekei.

Compare with the next example, where the diphtong ei is replaced by the colloquial long vowel è: zemisa=tē modun (B2v/10), TB: zemis-tei modun, CM: jims-tei modun.

The presence or absence of unstressed vowels are not consistent in Naadgai’s manuscripts. In some cases she followed the original version with Zaya Pandita’s orthography, in other cases she preferred her own pronunciation and ignored the unstressed or unclear vowels.

E.g.: bol[o]qsan (A1v/1) x boloqs[a]n (A1v/6); xam[u]q (A1v/2) x xamuq (A1v/9).

**b) Elision of consonants** – to various phonetic simplifications pertain the elisions of consonants. These are usually debisker consonants, i.e. consonants followed by another consonant or closing the word (otherwise every consonant must be followed by a vowel in CM and CS).

The archaic debisker q in the suffix of nomen perfecti -qsan/qsen (Todo) or -ysan/gsen (CM) is not reflected in the spoken language in Western Mongolia anymore, al-
though it is still written in the modern CS in Xinjiang. Naadgai used the simplified form -san in several cases: amirlesan (A3v/12), TB: amurlısan, CM: amurlıysan; s[a] güüsän (A2r/5)\(^{26}\). TB: sayuuqsan, CM: sayuysan. Another example of the elision of a consonant is the next word: sözüülün (B1v/2), TB: sözügülen, CM: sözügülen.

A special case without any evidence in the spoken Western dialects is the release of debisker d in the final position, which could be in fact also considered a simple omission: nizege (B2r/13), TB: nizeđ / nizęged (TODAJEVA 2001, 246), CM: nizged. The majority of cases with omitted consonants are certainly mistaken writings:


c) Addition of vowels – in certain debisker combinations we can observe a tendency to insert a vowel. Although this phenomenon is not reflected in dialectical dictionaries, it is clear that the speakers can individually perceive the space between the debisker sound and the next consonant as a mute vowel similar to the weakened vowels in the unstressed syllables:


d) Elision of vowels not reflecting the pronunciation – apart from the vowels omitted in the writing because of their weakened pronunciation, Naadgai frequently omits vowels in the stressed and clearly pronounced syllables. The very high occurrence of these elisions could be explained only as a variant of the speed-writing. In the shorthand cursive style of the Mongolian script, all the “teeth” (sidü) are replaced by a single base-line. In such a recording the general image of the written word is what plays the greater role, more than its actual components. Although CS does not support the cursive writing, some samples can be found in the archives of Yosutu qosiyu of Alt.U. from the years 1917–1920.\(^{29}\) The cursive ductus of these archive documents still permits only the omission of the letter a, the letter e is always noted.


\(^{26}\) The nonstandard usage of a velar g (instead of the uvular γ) in the word containing mainly the back vowels demands to consider the next long vowel u as üü. This writing is apparently a mistake.

\(^{27}\) COLOO 1988, 511 quotes plenty of variants in the Clear script: yirtenčü, yirtemci, yirtinčü, yirtimci, yirtımji, yirtınčü, the spoken form in Alt.U. being yirtımšı.


\(^{29}\) National Central Archive of Mongolia, A-130, D-1, XH-63, 69.
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e) Assimilation of sounds – a special case of the vowel assimilation is the word: amitin (A1v/2), TB: amitan, CM: amitan. In modern Oirat dialects the second vowel a is weakened to ĕ and i sometimes disappears (Kalmyk ämtṇ Ramstedt 1935, 23, amtn Муниев 1977, 42). The stress on the first syllable in ämtén caused a shift of still implicitly present i to the second syllable, where it replaced the weak vowel ĕ. A similar example of assimilation is the word: s[a]yitir (A4r/5), TB: sayitur, CM: sayitur; negen (A3v/7), TB: nigen, CM: nigen. In two following cases, the weakened vowel of the final syllable preceding a suffix is assimilated by the vowel of the suffix: üiled-eqsen (A2r/12), TB: üiledügesen, CM: üiledügesen; buyen-yer (A2r/13), TB: buyan-yēr, CM: buyan-iyar.

f) Length of the vowels – in CS, the length of the vowels a, e, o, ö is expressed by a special sign called udān attached to the single letter (the corresponding long vowels are then transliterated like ā, ē, ĕ). The length of u, ū, i by a reduplication of the letter (then transliterated like uu or ou, ūū or öū, ii or iyi or i’i). Naadgai frequently neglects the standard usage of udān, as well as the appropriate usage of the distinctive forms of o, ö, u, ū. The length of vowels in Naadgai’s manuscripts cannot be attributed to the impact of the Alt.U. spoken dialect. A special attention should be given to the word kiz[a]:r with udān, but without any visible vowel. This case seems to correspond with the theory pronounced by G. Z’am’yan, that udān is not a sign without a phonetic value on its own, but the long vowel ā or ē according to the vowel harmony (Z’am’yan 2012, 33–43).

E.g.: iröl (B1r/1), TB: irö̆l, CM: irügel; kiz[a]:r (B1v/3), TB: kizār, CM: kijaγar.

Breach of rules of the vowel harmony, in CM script as well as in CS, has always been a sign of the unprofessional writing. It also frequently occurs in Naadgai’s handwriting:


g) Examples of mistaken writings – parts of words omitted, corrected and uncorrected by Naadgai:
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6. Conclusion

W. Kotwicz claimed, that Zaya pandita had recorded the colloquial pronunciation of his time, but the orthography of CS had conserved the language of the 17th century, which had turned again to be archaic from the point of view of the colloquial Kalmyk of the beginning of the 20th century (Kotvič 1929, V–VI). More recent scholars disagree in that point, that Zaya pandita’s script recorded the colloquial pronunciation. The translations attributed to Zaya pandita and his disciples show an orthography which is similar to the oral literary pronunciation of CM Script, whereas already the Oirat language recorded in Galdan bošuytu’s letters from the 1670s shows more colloquial features. The administrative documents were closer to the spoken language, but similarly to the part of Mongolia, where CM script was in use, there existed a generally known oral-literary language mastered by both literate and illiterate people.30 The language of CS texts was not perceived by Oirats as archaic – at least in its phonetic aspects – until the introduction of Cyrillic in Mongolia or the replacement of CS by CM script and other languages (Kazakh, Chinese) in Xinjiang.

The primary purpose of the manuscripts written by S. Naadgai was not their reading, but the worship. They might have been intended for those who would not be able to read them. Even when a manuscript was used for reading – or reciting – the mistakes would not make the comprehension difficult. Naadgai has certainly memorized the text since her childhood and the written text served her only as an aide mémoire and as a material object of the worship, a materialized object of ven-

30 For the question of the oral-literary language see Vladimircov 1929.
eration. And in case of larger texts, Naadgai used older calligraphic manuscripts, much more convenient for reading. Her collection contains also few texts, whose merits issue from their copying – not reciting. These are especially the prophetic texts (№ 6, 7).

The manuscripts of S. Naadgai together with a large amount of recent manuscripts from Western Mongolia show, how CS, once the official script of the Dzungar Khanate, lost its representative character and became a folk script (or the script of the folk Buddhism) opened to the influences of the spoken language. It also shows that the role of CS in the Alt.U. society has been strictly limited to the religious use. None of the known folk littérateurs of the former Baruun amban’s banner used CS for his personal notes, records or correspondence. In all the other spheres of life it has been the oral transmission or – more recently – the Cyrillic script, that served these purposes. The knowledge of CS has been transmitted orally, through the individual relations between the teacher and his disciple, frequently inside the families. The fact that the natural transmission of CS survived more than two hundred years since the destruction of the Dzungar Khanate despite the campaigns against the old culture under the Communist rule is not incidental. The tradition of CS use has finally broken in the last decades, following the shift of the cultural centres from the countryside to the cities and the decline of the traditional way of life, regardless of the increasing value of old books and manuscripts and growing facilities to learn CS and to get acquainted with the old literature.

Transcription: For transcribing the Mongolian words in Cyrillic alphabet I use the simple transcription introduced by A. Oberfalzerová and J. Lubsangdorji (e.g. see in Mongolica Pragensia ’02, p. 13). For Classical Mongolian I use the standard transcription introduced by N. Poppe and L. Ligeti. For the Clear script I use the transcription presented by Лувсанвандан 1975. In quotations from oral materials in spoken Oirat I have used a slightly modified and generally comprehensible transcription used by Mongolian dialectologists for Oirat dialects (COLOO 1988, CENDEE 2012).
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