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Musings on the Manichaean “pothi” book

Jens Wilkens

The so-called Manichaean “pothi” book is a unique example of a Manichaean work presented in a fashion originally designed for Buddhist texts. Its orthographic conventions, its language, its predominantly poetic style and its content display many interesting features. And besides its outward appearance similar to that of a Buddhist book it is particularly influenced by Buddhist terminology. Next to the Chinese Manichaean hymn-scroll Xiabu zan from Dunhuang it is probably the text in Eastern Manichaeism which contains the most Buddhist elements. It is an outstanding example of a Central Asian Manichaean work in Buddhist garb. But still it is a Manichaean text with typical Manichaean ideas and concepts written in the Manichaean script and accompanied by a frontispiece illustration in the Manichaean art style of Central Asia with a remarkable affinity to Chinese art. It is noteworthy that despite the adoption of a whole set of Buddhist concepts and ideas every time the author refers to the idea of meditation he made use of the Parthian loan word anwardišn (lit. “collection”). Most often issues such as the one under discussion have been discussed under the heading “syncretism”. Because only a few scholars would use this dazzling term in a similar way I will abstain from using it in spite of the fact that in the scientific literature some attempts have been made to “repatriate” the term in the field of Religious Studies as a purely descriptive concept. One may ask whether the Manichaean community in the West Uygur Empire as a whole was

1 I am especially grateful to Prof. Georges-Jean PINAULT (Paris) for sharing his views on the bilingual hymn with me. Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Desmond DURKIN-MEISTERERNST (Berlin) for checking the English of this article.

2 I use the term “pothi book” because the manuscript is well known under this title. One would prefer the designation pustaka instead. Of course “pothi book” is pleonastic. In this article a vertical reading of the Manichaean script is assumed.

3 See especially CLARK (1982), 161-165 on the spellings.

4 See for example the five commandments which are alluded to in lines 174-182 (= U 94 /v/4/- U 95 /v/2/) (cf. SIMS-WILLIAMS (1985), 576). In this article the line numbers refer to CLARK’s (1982) edition. It has the advantage of being comprehensive and has particular merits as regards the placement of the leaves. Additionally the shelf numbers of the fragments of the Berlin Turfan Collection are given throughout.

5 On the illustration see the discussion in GULÁCSI (2001), No. 69. GULÁCSI (2005), colour plate 6d calls it an “example of Chinese fully painted style”. For further examples of this style see her table 4/3 on p. 123.

6 Still an important overview is RUDOLPH (1979).
loosing its identity at the time when our text was committed to writing or whether other factors such as the individual predilection and biographical background of the author could have been responsible for the introduction of such a vast amount of Buddhist elements.  

It is important to note that the Buddhist terminology is expressed in a manner quite similar to the standard terminology in Buddhist texts. This means that our text cannot be dated to the earliest phase of Uygur Buddhism when Buddhist terms were still in the making. We have to assume that it was made after a standard Buddhist terminology had already been established. Seen from this angle the end of the tenth or rather the beginning of the eleventh century is very likely. It cannot be particularly late because one can still observe an affinity to certain expressions known from Buddhist works translated from Tocharian A which belong to the early period of Uygur Buddhism. Because of its orthographical conventions G. Doerfer tried to date our manuscript to a late period, viz. the Yuan Dynasty. But it is not likely that the spellings in the manuscript speak for a particularly late date. These spellings are to be interpreted in a way different from the confusion of dentals or sibilants in late manuscripts in Uygur script. In all probability the scribe was not familiar with the Manichaean script.

What has to be investigated is whether among the Uyghurs the practice of transferring puñya differs through the ages and whether the persons or gods to whom merit is transferred can be an indication of how old a text can be or whether it is indicative of an affiliation to a particular school. The Manichaean Turkic “pothi” book displays a concept which reminds us of the Maitriśimiti. See e. g. lines 234-235 (= U

7 CLARK (1982), 158 conjectured that the donor Aryaman Fristum Kostride had been a Buddhist prior to his adoption of Manichaicism. “He selected the pothi-leaf format and imbued the act of compilation with the principle of buyan. He turned to textual models and types that were more familiar to him from his previous religious experience.” One can only assent to the criticism in MORIYASU (1989), note 77, that this is not convincing. I would like to thank Dr. Yukiyo Kasai (Berlin) for her help in reading this article.

8 The dating of the “pothi” book is very much disputed. CLARK (1982), 160 followed A. von GABAIN (1955), 199-200 in dating the manuscript to the first quarter of the tenth century. The argument is based on the identity of Kuimsa Hatun T(ä)ñrim who is mentioned in line 509 (= U 110 /r/4/). But still there is doubt concerning this identification.

9 See e. g. line 81 (= U 89 /v/1/) körü kannıçisz körklá körkünüzni “your beautiful appearance (Acc.) which one is never satisfied to observe”. As a Buddhist example see e.g. MaitriHY 6a 28-29 (ZusTreff 203-204): körü kannıçisz körklä körklä “with an appearance which one is never satisfied to observe”. körü kannıçisz is clearly modelled on Tocharian A āsinät īkālām (īkāli, īkālem, īkālo) or īkātīs āsinät (see MSN p. 60, Tocharian A manuscript of the Maitreyasamitiṅṭaka YQ 1.9 /v/4-5/). In Tocharian B such an expression is likewise attested: ontsoyce īkālīe.

10 DoERFER (1996), 123.
öğä yükünmiş buyanım(ınız) tüşintä üstünkä altünkä t(ä)ŋrīlärm[i]ŋ. öňi öňi k[u]t wakṣiklärññ. üstälzün t(ä)ŋrid[ä]m küçl[äri] "By virtue of our puṇya, which arose (because we) have praised and prostrated ourselves, may the heavenly powers of the gods above and below, (the powers) of the different tutelary spirits increase!"

With this concept one can compare MaitrHY /r/10-15/ (= ed. in ZusTreff 10-15): bo süü bätzämiş nom hittimiš buyan ädgü kulinëğ 'än śnrä ävirär [bix . üst]ünkä äzrua hormuzta tört [maharač] t(ä)ŋrīlär kä (. . bo buyan ädgü [klin]é küçintä t(ä)ŋridäm çog yalin [asì]lün üstälzün "In the first place [we] transfer puṇya, the good deed, which arose (because we) have had this introduction illustrated and commissioned the writing of this book, to Brahmä, Indra and the four [Mahārāja] gods [ab]ove; by virtue of this puṇya, the good [deed], may (their) heavenly majesty and glory [increase] and wax."

The turn of the millennium, the probable date of compilation and copying of our MS, is marked by a serious shift of religious orientation among the Uygurs as Prof. Mōriyasu to whom these lines are humbly dedicated has shown in several important works. One of the key factors was certainly the royal patronage in the West Uygur Empire which decreased with reference to the Manichaean community at that time. The "pothi" book must belong to this transitional period. Basing his arguments on the language (the "y-language"), the Buddhist terms and the religio-political situation of the Manichaean community at that time, Prof. Mōriyasu arrived at a similar conclusion as regards the date of our MS which he himself dates to the 10th or 11th century.

So many passages of the manuscript are very difficult to decipher and the former editors (Arat, Bang, Clark, von Gabain, von Le Coq and Winter) have done brilliant work in editing and commenting which I admire greatly. Everybody working on this manuscript must cherish their pioneering efforts. For this reason a re-edition of the whole manuscript is not necessary, at least as far as the Old Turkic part is concerned. Instead, some selected new explanations and a choice of new readings are discussed. In some cases the Buddhist content of our text becomes even more pro-

---

11 The lines are quoted in Zieme (1991), 337.
12 Especially important is the third chapter of Mōriyasu (2004).
13 See Mōriyasu (1989), 19 (with note).
14 See especially TT III, TT IX, Clark (1982). For the other references see Clark (1982), 146-147 (with notes).
15 Some new readings were given already in Wilkens (2000). In some instances it is necessary to refer to them again (sometimes they have to be corrected). Other better readings which are not mentioned in Clark’s edition are discussed in Zieme (1969), passim. All passages corrected by Erdal are listed in OTWF p. 874. Except for some
nounced than before. In most cases Clark’s readings and translations are quoted because they still reflect the present level of research and are the most reliable.

In the transcription of the Old Turkic text the system of K. Röhrborn’s “Uigurisches Wörterbuch” is followed. A normalized text is given which does not heed double <yy> or double <dd> etc. in the transcription.

§ 1

Line 8 (= U 82 /r/3/) has been read biz siziňä . än/ [... . Of the last word in question the third letter can be read as <w> so we are able to restore the phrase to biz siziňä . anu/ntumuz/ ... as in line 3 (= MIK III 8260 /v/3/) where anuntumuz siziňä is attested. But in line 8 we have to begin a new phrase with anu/ntumuz/ because of the punctuation mark after siziňä. And the strophic alliteration of this passage requires a word beginning with a- as the first word of the phrase.

§ 2

In line 19 (= U 86 /r/4/) we find the expression sākiz törlüg ämgäk “the eightfold afflictions”. The earlier editors had difficulties explaining the meaning of this term. The editors of TT III rightly refer in their note to the unpublished fragment in Manichaean script TM 149 /r/3/ where sākiz törlüg aēg t(a)rka æmgäklär is attested. This bilingual text in Middle Persian and Old Turkic bears the shelf mark U 122a today. In the Chinese Manichaean hymn-scroll Xiābu zan (verse 337) the term is met with as 八難 “acht Schwierigkeiten”. This is a Buddhist term going back to Sanskrit aṣṭākṣaṇa which can be rendered in different ways in Uygur Buddhism. One typical expression is sākiz törlüg täginäsiz oronlar. In the preceding line we come across another Buddhist term tört tugum (Skt. caturyoni) so a Buddhist interpretation is very likely. G. Mikkelsen has already observed in his dictionary of...
Chinese Manichaean texts that the occurrence in the hymn-scroll represents a Buddhist element.\textsuperscript{23} The same holds true for the Old Turkic examples. Note that in a Buddhist text the term sākiz törług ämgäk “the eightfold afflictions” is attested as well.\textsuperscript{24} The editor rightly refers to SH 39b 八苦: “The eight distresses—birth, age, sickness, death, parting with what we love, meeting with what we hate, unattained aims, and all the ills of the five skandhas.” One would tend to derive the Manichaean terms from this Buddhist concept but it does not seem to be widespread.

\section*{§ 3}

Another Buddhist term is to be expected in line 20 (= U 86 /t/5/): sādirāksiz yigi kilinçlarin. The term most likely renders the concept of Skt. ānantaryakarma “action(s) with immediate retribution”. There are five such actions: killing one’s mother, killing one’s father, killing an arhat, causing dissension in the Buddhist samgha and causing a Tathāgata’s blood to flow. In a Christian text published by P. Ziemë we find the same sādirāksiz yigi kilinçlarig with the simple accusative suffix.\textsuperscript{25}

\section*{§ 4}

A phrase in lines 34-35 (= U 83 /w/4-5/) has previously been read kača[n ıdok kañım(t)z. kağıtın entiniz “When you, our Holy Father, descended from the sky ...”. What should be called into question is the reading [ıdok “holy” in spite of the fact that ıdok kañımz is attested several times in our text. The letters are only partly discernable but the first letter after the lacuna is an <r> with the diacritical dot clearly visible. The last letter can be either a <g> or a <γ>. In Wilkëns (2000), No. 360, the word in question has been read [a]rıg “clean” which is equally possible.\textsuperscript{26} But one would prefer the reading [bı]rıök instead, so that we have the combined conjunction kačan birök at the beginning. In line 64 birök is equally written with a <g> as the last letter.

\section*{§ 5}

Line 37 (= U 81 /r/2/) is destroyed in the upper part. The rest of the line has been read ulți sâvinč öt//k/ ugrın yikin by Clark who translated “reward and pleasure ... in propitious circumstances”. The third word the interpretation of which has been marked as uncertain up to now can be read as ötlük “retribution, compensation, obligation”. The semantics are quite close to ulți sâvinč which is best understood as a synonym compound meaning “thankfulness, reward”. The following ugrın yikin are instrumentals which can be translated as postpositions meaning “because of”. The whole phrase would mean: “because of thankfulness and obligation”.

\textsuperscript{23} Mikkelsen (2006), 2b.
\textsuperscript{24} Mainz 292 //t//6-7// (ed. Ziemë (2001), ll. 22-23).
\textsuperscript{25} Ziemë (2002), lines 20-21 and commentary p. 60.
\textsuperscript{26} Wilkëns (2000), No. 360.
§ 6
For lines 40-42 (= U 81 /r/5/ - /v/2/) a completion of the missing parts can be attempted on the basis of the strophic alliteration and on a parallel expression in the text. It is remarkable that the main verb is not negated.

üştürti kuði enmäsär.
üç [yavlak yol]lardaki²⁷
üküš râlim tînl(t)glar bulû ürtih .
[fâglüğ kö]hûlûg²⁸ orukûnuznu .

"If (our Holy Father) had not descended from on high, (it would not have been possible that) numerous living beings [on the] three [bad ways] would have found your paths of [thought and understanding]."

§ 7
The last word of line 43 (= U 81 /v/3/) has been read yarsmalaš- at the end of the line. Erdal has convincingly shown that this verb belongs to the base yarsiš- "to compete"²⁹ meaning that the first sibilant is written with <s> instead of <ç>. In checking the manuscript one discovers that there is another letter at the end of the line which should be interpreted as <w>. This leads us to the assumption that the vowel converb is attested here. There are other instances where the vowel is –u (yarsišmalašu).³⁰

Because the converb is cooperative and cannot govern a direct object the preceding accusative [beš] aţuntaki tînl(t)glar forms the end of the preceding sentence. One would expect the verb to stand at the beginning of the sentence. The subject of yar(t)şmalašu is very likely tînl(t)glar in line 44 (= U 81 /v/4/).³¹

§ 8
Lines 45-47 (= U 81 /v/5/ - U 87 /r/2/) have correctly been read as follows:

umugsuz erinê tînl(t)glar
orukûnuz uçin bulmadin
ulînçig sansarta kalûm(t)z
[bîlgâ] bilîgliq šatu tikt[i]hîz[]z
beš aţûnum irkl[i]t[i]p ozgurt[u]nuz]

CLARK translates "We mortals, without an object of desire³² and miserable, remained in the tortuous sansâra without obtaining the end of your path. You set up the ladder of wisdom. You caused them to trample on the five states of existence and

²⁷ For üç yavlak yol which is a Buddhist concept see line 183 (= U 95 /v/3/).
²⁸ The next word begins with a <k> but this seems to have been deliberately wiped out.
²⁹ OTWF p. 576.
³⁰ Loc. cit.
³¹ The preceding word can be completed as [kutruıl]daçtı.
³² A better translation would be "without refuge".

( 214 )
saved them.” A different explanation for the converse irklätip translated with a question mark “beezwingend” in TT III can be offered. The key to our understanding is the preceding phrase bilgä bililig šatu tikitijiz “You set up the ladder of wisdom”. Now, the simplex irklät- does not only mean “to trample” but also “to climb”. An example is for instance Maitr plate 4 /v/12-13/ (= BT IX p. 36): sans(s)iz tümän sumer taglar töpösi üzä irkläyū “climbing the summits of incalculable myriads of Sumeru mountains”. Now, beș ažunug irklätip should best be translated as “causing (them) to climb the five existences”. The idea is that the living beings are supposed to be born in a better existence in the next life in the manner of someone going up step by step on a ladder with the final aim of emancipation from sansāra.

§ 9

Lines 50-52 (= U 87 /r/5/ - /v/2/) have been read
ärtimlig mäniği ilimnišk[ä]
[dä]siz köni nomug no[mlatnýz]
[äm]gälig taloytn kächürtñýz.
ä[d]g[ü]35 nirvankah yakin eltitiñz.

by BANG/von GABAIN. Clark accepted their interpretation and translated: “To those attached to transitory pleasures you preached the unequalled true doctrine. You led them across the sea of suffering. You brought them near to good nirvāṇa.” The restoration [dä]siz “unequalled” is not certain. Because we have ärtimlig in the preceding phrase it is more likely that a contrast is intended in the qualification of mäni and nom. This leads us to the assumption that we have to restore [ärtinē]siz “immortal”, “unperishable”. If we fill in the lacuna like this then it would be preferable to assume no[mlayu] instead of [nomlatnýz]. In this case every quatrain would consist of ten syllables each. We can translate: “By preaching the un[perishable] and true doctrine to those clinging to transitory pleasures you ferried them across the ocean of [su]ffering. And you led them near to g[ö]o[d] nirvāṇa.”

§ 10

Two lines further, i. e. in 54-55 (= U 87 /v/4-5/) the previous editors proposed the following reading:

buyanlig sumer tag[ŋ tur]gurtuñuz.
bo //wnk ürl[üg] bulurtuñuz.

33 The Hami parallel is translated as „,(geruht) zu betreten“ in ZusTreff p. 21. Tekin’s translation „(geruht), ... zu klettern“ is better here.
34 In Wilkens (2000), No. 362 (and note 1017) the erroneous reading t[ö]z[lüg] is given instead of ä[d]g[ü]. The damaged MS seems to support this reading but because of the strophic alliteration t[ö]z[lüg] is excluded.
35 TT III 50-52.
36 Clark (1982), 169, translation 182.
The damaged word after bo begins with an initial <’> after which follows a <w> or a <y>. The letter preceding the digraph <nk> could be either <w> or <y> but the first solution is more likely. One would like to restore ül[künn]ün “of the heap” because in the context of accumulating punya which is mentioned in the preceding line this refers to the concept of Skt. punyasaṃbhāra “the accumulation of merit”. Because of the genitive ükünning we can restore the following word as ürl[iüklügin]. The predicate bulturtnüz is likely to be biltürtünüz the second letter of which is a <y>. The suggested new reading is:

buynalıg sumer tag[ig tur]gurtunüz.

“You [rai]sed the Sumeru mountain of merit.
You showed the ever[lastingness] of this ac[umulation].”

§ 11

Particularly interesting from a buddhological point of view are lines 68-69 (= U 88 /r/3-4/), which have been read

al altag uzan[na]k[lar]i g tašgarip .
adnlarka asılgılık37 işıq išlät(t)iňiç38.

CLARK translates: “You expelled from them their mastery of deceit (Hend.), and caused them to do works of benefit to others.”39 What is disputable is the interpretation of the first phrase because al altag uzanmaklağ cannot be analysed as an attributive nominal “compound” with the meaning “their mastery of deceit”, because the suffix +lig or a possessive suffix is missing. The translation by BANG and von GABAIN “Trug und Lässigkeit entferndern”40 is equally misleading. al altag and uzan-
mak is attested in Buddhist texts as a positive concept because this refers to Sanskrit upāyakauṣalya “skilful means”.41 In Chinese Buddhism we have the expression 方便 to render this concept. And what is more, this term is attested in all three major Chinese Manichaean texts, viz. the Traité Pelliot, the Hymn-scroll and the Compendium of the Teachings and Style.42 This concept has entered Uygur Manichaecism as well and the instance in our “pothi” book is a beautiful illustration. The next problem is the semantics of tašgar-. It does not only mean “to bring out, give out, get out” but is used metaphorically in the sense of “to reveal, to show, to display”.43 An example

37 This is one of the examples of the typical confusion of the velars in our MS. One would expect asılgıg.
38 The double dental is reduced to one. See CLARK (1982), 170, note h.
39 CLARK (1982), 183.
40 TT III p. 11 [191].
41 See the excellent monograph by PYE (1978).
42 See the glossary in SCHMIDT-GLINTZER (1987), 126 for the attestations.
43 See OTWF p. 745.
from a Buddhist text which can be directly linked to our sentence is ridi taşgar- “to reveal supernatural powers (Skt. rddhi)”.

A new translation of our Manichaean sentence would be: “By displaying skills and exp[er]tise you caused others to do work(s) of benefit.” Another instance in our text where we should likewise assign a positive meaning to al altag uzanmak is met with in lines 161-163 (= U 93 /v/1-3/). This sentence replaces the verb taşgar- by üntür- which has the same metaphorical meaning “to reveal”. The former reading according to the strophic alliteration is:

adığalgı fişaylıg [mânîlär .]
al altag uzanmak[ari]g üntürüp
anâ yr/...[.]
asis tuṣu kiltınız.

CLARK translates this as: “Pleasures of the vişaya (Hend.) promoted the mastery of deceit (Hend.), ... to it ... you made benefits (Hend.).”

After fişaylıg a trace of the letter <t> is still visible so one is inclined to restore the lacuna to t[înlîglarka] “to the living beings”. In the next phrase the converb üntürüp is supposed to have the same subject as the main verb kiltınız at the end of the sentence which certainly refers to Mani himself. The word in the next phrase yr/... can be completed to y(a)r[âstit] “opportunite, suitable” which perfectly fits the concept of upâyakausahaan “skillful means” and which is again present in al altag uzanmaklar. After y(a)rašî a second attribute to asîg tuṣu should be expected. The translation would run as follows: “[To] li[ving beings] with sense objects (vişaya) (i.e. still clinging to sense objects) you brought skilful means to the fore and made the benefits appropriate to them [...].” Provided that the restoration t[înlîglarka] is correct, we can detect a shift from the plural to the singular in the pronoun anâ. We can explain this either as a collective singular or the shift in number occurred because Mani benefited all living beings in each case appropriately. The meaning of the sentence is totally Buddhist in content and reminds us of a Buddhastotra.

44 Quoted from OTWF p. 745.
45 In a Buddhist context a combination of both verbs – in this case a vowel converb followed by another converb in –(X)p – is e.g. attested in the Dašakarma-pathâvadânamâlā where the Buddha himself says: amî muna burhanîg kücîmin taşgaru üntürüp aţâvake yâkînî küvânčiç tagûn yemîrâyîn “Now I want to display my power of a Buddha and smash the mountain of pride of the demon Āâvaka” (TT X 199-201). In this case taşgaru üntür- seems to be lexicalized already.
46 Contrary to CLARK’s edition, the word is written with a double alif at the beginning.
47 Equally possible is y(a)r[âstit] but y(a)rašî is attested in lines 167 (= U 94 /t/2/) and 198 (= U 97 /t/3/).
48 Note that the next term after this sentenceânsîç mânîlär refers to a Buddhist concept, viz. paîcakâmâguna. See for example BT XXV 2887-2888 beî törlîg ânsîç mânîlär and the adjective beî törlîg ânsîç mâniîlîg in BT XXV 3747-3748.
§ 12

A highly disputed phrase is met with in lines 75-76 (= U 88 /v/5/- U 89 /r/1/). This has been read as ayaglarig barça siziği âmtûrinjiz and translated as “you drew all the honors to yourself”.

In WILKENs (2000), No. 364, the line in question is quoted and the reading ayaglarig is corrected to azaglarig. With reference to CLAUSON’s establishment of the semantics of âmtûr- as “to turn over” we should translate the phrase as “you turned the heretics, all of them, to you” which means “you converted them to your teaching”. This certainly refers to Mani’s missionary activity.

§ 13

The last word of the phrase in line 97 (= U 91 /r/2/) hitherto read as adakan yorup sizi ni at/ayı) “They would walk on foot and call you by name” is more likely to be read as ed[â]r[ü] so that we arrive at the improved translation: “walking on foot and following you …”.

§ 14

Another strophic alliteration was restored as follows by CLARK:

ulug y(a)rlikančeçi könül[i]ünjüz üz]lâ
olarnı barça sik[u]rump (lines 99-100 = U 91 /r/4-5/)

“Embracing all of them with your great compassionate mind, …”

Instead of könül[i]ünjüz üz]lâ the reading könül[i]ünjük]lâ is preferable so that this becomes the indirect object of the verb sigur- (written sikur-). CLAUSON quotes s. v. sigur- the similar phrase könlükâ sigurdum ânu from the Kutadgu Bilig but he assigns a different lemma sikur- to the phrase from our “pothî” book. This is not convincing because the instance in our text clearly belongs to the verb sigur-. The translation would be: “You fit them all into your great compassion (Skt. mahâkaruna) …”. The sentence is repeated in lines 158-159 (= U 93 /r/3-4/) and the text is again damaged after könül-. Here one would likewise prefer a restoration such as: ulug y(a)rlikančeçi könül[i]ünjük olarnı) barça sigurup.

---

49 CLARK (1982), 183. CLAUSON similarly gives the translation: “you heaped(?) all honours upon yourselves.” (ED 157b, where the reference has to be corrected from TT II to TT III).

50 WILKENs (2000), No. 364.

51 The dot of the <r> is still visible. In line 203 (= U 97 /v/3/) the construction is with the dative case. I propose the reading: nizvanilarka . eyin ye[d]rü “following the passions”.

52 CLARK refers to line 102 for his restoration. In TT III the damaged word is restored as könül[i]ünj üz]lâ.


54 ED p. 815b.
§ 15

Another instance of a destroyed initial word in a strophic alliteration is the sentence:

\[ \text{qyn//}/r \text{k[ö]jüliünüz üz[ä]} \]
\[ \text{kütüez ädgü tüzükä } \text{ (lines 102-103 = U 91 /v/2-3/).} \]

The damaged word can be restored as \text{künimlikg} but following it, two characters are visible which can be interpreted as a double <yy>. Then we have a small lacuna before the next word begins. A likely restoration would be \text{yi[t]i} “sharp-(witted)” so that we arrive at the translation: “With your ste[adfas]t and sharp-(witted) mind you benefited them all.”

§ 16

Some lines further down the text is again partly damaged. It has been hitherto read as:

\[ \text{t/\ldots/} \text{ nkz tüşinätä .} \]
\[ \text{ tedious burhan kutin bul[tuğuz] } \text{ (lines 106-107 = U 92 /v/1-2/).} \]

The word preceding \text{tüşinätä} can be read as \text{buyanuz} “your merit”. The content of the sentence is very similar to the preceding lines 105-106 (= U 91 /v/5/ - U 92 /v/1/) which has been reconstructed as ol \text{buyanuz tüşinätä}. \text{odgurak burhan [kütin bultuğuz]}. Both sentences differ in the attributes assigned to \text{buyan} and \text{burhan kuti}.

Maybe we can reconstruct the first word of our sentence as \text{f[ü]z[karincisiz]}. A trace of the letter <z> seems to be visible at the end of the line. This would lead to the following translation: “As a result of your [un]f[at]h[omable] \text{punya} you ob[tained] unhindered buddhahood.”

§ 17

Line 112 (= U 92 /v/2/) is damaged at the beginning. It has been read as: \ldots/\text{wnkwz}
\[ \text{nyy . sdmś} \text{ yarça tittiñiz .} \]

An inspection of the original allows for the reading [siz][ön] màniñi zi soñmtś yarça tittiñiz which should be translated as: “You abandoned [yo]ur own happiness like spittle which has been ejected.” This might refer to Mani’s martyrdom which he suffered for the benefit of humankind.

§ 18

In Wilkens (2000), No. 370, a new restoration of the lacuna in the expression which the previous editors completed to \text{yanınçisiz [a]žanka tâgdilär} is suggested.

55 On künimlik see OTWF p. 375.
56 \text{odgurak} can be used attributively or adverbially.
57 The reading of the vowel of the first syllable follows ED p. 799a s. v. sod-.
58 Line 156 (= U 93 /v/1/).
Instead of [a]žunka we should restore [o]ronka yielding another Buddhist concept because yaninčez oron corresponds to Skt. avaivartikabhūmi. The translation would be “they reached the place of no return”.

§ 19

In lines 160-161 (= U 93 /r/5/ - /v/1/) Clark restored [ayıg]larin bastılar. arhant kutin bul[tilar] “(the blessed ones) … suppressed their evils. They obtained the blessed state of being an arhat.” He follows the proposal advanced in TT III 120. Erdal restores [nizvani]ların in OTWF p. 592, n. 235 which is far better for semantical reasons insofar as the eradication of the klešas is a prerequisite for becoming an arhat but the strophic alliteration demands a word beginning with an a-. The solution is that in Uygur Buddhism the arhats are very often qualified by the attribute akıgsız ädgükä tägmiš “having attained the good state without influx (Skt. āśrava)”. So we have to restore to [a]yıg]ların. As a further proof one can refer to a very similar Buddhist example from the “Sūtra of Golden Light”: yüç miŋ költi nayut tümän tutl(i)glar alku akıgların akıp nizvanılg kiırlärin tarkarıp arhant kutin bulup … “One hundred thousands of köçi-nayuta myriads of living beings eradicated all their āśravas, removed their kleša-stains, obtained arhatship …” (Suv 185,19,-22).

§ 20

For the very difficult lines 169-170 (= U 94 /r/4-5/) a different interpretation and restoration of the lacuna is possible. These lines have been hitherto read as:

bar elilig [kö]k kalık yüzintä.  
baḥšılıg [burhan t]([dü]ri tugtuŋuz.  

First, the editors of T III p. 197 [17] translate: “Im Angesicht (vor) aller ililig Him- mel (Firmamente, Äther). Als Lehrer-Burchan-Gott wurdest Du geboren.” Clark’s translation is far better: “In the face of the blue sky of the whole realm you were born as the Prophet-God of teachers.” He was right in following Clauson’s proposal in linking the obscure ililig in TT III to el “realm”. Clark and Clauson seem to think that bar is the same as barča but this is groundless. Bar “existence” and el “realm” are both part of a nominal compound with a possessive suffix to which the suffix +lig is added. Sometimes, when the nominal compound is regarded as being particularly fixed and when +lxg serves as a marker showing that this nominal compound is an attribute of a following noun the possessive suffix precedes the suffix +lxg. Second, the expressions kök kalık yüzintä, kök kalık yüzintäki etc. are quite common in Old Turkic. Yüzintä cannot be translated as “im Angesicht (vor)” or “in

59 In Wilkens (2000), No. 370, no restoration of the lacuna is given.  
60 See e.g. BT XXV 3300, 3662-3663.  
61 ED p. 145b s. v. elilig.  
62 See burhan kutul(i)g oron (Mainz 760 /v/36/) or burhan tözilig in U 2107 /A/5.
the face of”. Basically, we can assume a calque on a Tocharian expression which became a fixed term in Old Turkic. I was able to find the locution ipreräntse änte “the surface of the sky” in Tocharian B. In TEB II p. 166 s. v. änte the meanings “Fläche, Stirn, Front” are given which shows that the Old Turkic rendering is perfectly suited. The Tocharian expression should itself go back to Skt. nabhastala “vault of the sky”. Third, instead of bahšilig [burhan t](ā)iğri one should restore the lacuna to bahšilig [kün t](ā)iğri. As a proof one can refer to line 49 (= U 87/1/4) where the similar burhanlig kün t(ā)iğrig körgäl[i] “in order to see the Buddha sun” occurs. A fresh translation would run as follows: “In the vault of the [fir]mament of the realm of existence you rose (lit. were born) as the teacher [su]n”.

§ 21

A verse from line 170 (= U 94/1/5) has been read as follows:

sizni körüp tnl(1)glar [...] .
sezik könjullarin tarika[r ärti].

Clark translates: „Seeing you, mortals ... And suppressed their doubtful minds.”

In his note (aa) he remarks that the readings of Bang/von Gabain (tarık(arti)) and Clauson (targarti) have to be discarded. In my catalogue I emended the reading to tarikt[ilar] – the plural is, by the way, not strictly necessary – but failed to do so for könjullarin which should be read as könjullär[i]. Because the subject changes a restoration of the small lacuna after tnl(1)glar to [ymâ] is very likely. We have to translate: “The living beings saw you [and] their doubts ceased.”

§ 22

And immediately afterwards the text has been read as (lines 171-172 = U 94/1/1-2):

[sız] y(a)rlikamiş y(a)rlıgig .
sıntagsız könjülín] küzâtdi .
küzâtm[iš]çä /// /yç-/'ıʃ/.

It is likely that after küzâmišçä only a line filler has to be assumed at the end of line 171. The damaged word should be reconstructed as iça[mıp which leads us to the translation: “[With] a mi[nd] free from neglectfulness they obeyed the command

63 kök kalık yüzi and its derivations are attested in such a late text as BT III 249 (kök kalıkny yüüzintå), 332-333 (kök kalıkny yüüzintå), 458 (kök kalık yüüzintå).
64 See Sieg/Siegling (1953), 229 (No. 350 a4).
65 Clark (1982), 185.
66 ED p. 540.
68 Only three or four letters are missing.
69 I refrain from quoting the next half verse because I already mentioned it at the beginning of this article.

( 221 )
which [yo]u issued. Inasmuch as they obeyed (it) they took care ..."

§ 23
In line 245 (= U 99 /v/5/) only the Tocharian word komniktense is partly preserved. In his new study on the bilingual hymn to Mani PINAULT remarks that the word is in the genitive case. For this reason it is not appropriate to restore with CLARK a vocative /3(α)/ruk kün t(ā)ŋri-α/. We have to go back to A. VON GABAIN’S proposal in TT IX 10 to give the equivalent /kün t(ā)ŋrinig/.

§ 24
A word that puzzled the Turcologists is the thrice attested — in a more or less complete fashion — word tugil or togil in lines 249 (= U 100 /v/4/) and 255 (= U 100 /v/5/, twice). In each case this is constructed with the preceding gerund körgili. In the last instance at the end of line 255 only a part of the letter <t> is preserved. At the beginning of the same line the word is damaged just in the middle part of the letter <t>. The best preserved example is at the beginning of line 249. But then the string hole comes after tugil/togil. For this reason it is not certain whether the word is indeed complete or if the scribe had to interrupt it because of the string hole. After the string hole the trace of a punctuation mark or of the letter <y> follows and then comes a lacuna. If the trace really belongs to the letter <y> then nothing prevents us from restoring the word as tokili[g]. This would hold true for all three examples so that we can delete the obscure tugil/togil from the Old Turkic vocabulary. In TT IX p. 20 A. VON GABAIN already pointed out a possible connection between tugil/togil and tokilg. CLARK who discusses the word in question at length thinks that Old Turkic tokilg is a borrowing from Mongolian tokiliy. This sounds convincing because in Written Mongolian the base toki “stainness, decorum” and another derivation tokitai “decorous, proper, fitting, suitable, etc.” is attested. But it is possible that the Mongolian words ultimately go back to the Old Turkic form toki “decorum” which is e. g. attested in BT XIII 14.3. The instances in our Manichaean text show that the velar was prone to fluctuate or that we are once more forced to assume a confusion of velars in the MS. For semantic reasons it would seem reasonable to separate all these forms from Old Turkic toku “ceremony” and tokulug “faithful to traditional ceremonies”. Important is CLARK’s reference to BT VII 192-193 (tokilg körklä ät[öz]lűg) because this phrase proves that tokilg is a synonym of körklä. This reminds us of the often

70 In a note ZIEME already questioned CLARK’S etymological hypothesis.
71 Another interesting instance is found in an Avadāna text published by SHŌGAIKO (1988). In line 109 the editor gives the transcription: ačilmış lenhualig arig tāg tugilug șubralığın. Here tugilug (our tokilg) is followed by a word which is in a footnote linked to Skt. șubhara “glänzend, scheinend, schön”. As this is an adjective one may ask why the Old Turkic text has additionally +İY. If we derive the word in question from
recorded phrase körgäli körklä “beautiful to be seen” in early Old Turkic texts such as the Maitrisimit. körgäli tokalig would then be simply another way of expressing the same idea. In each case the Tocharian B counterpart is Ikäši šuke now rendered by PINAULT as “[you are] nectar to be seen”.

§ 25

In the Tocharian B and Old Turkic bilingual text a passage (lines 257-259 = U 101 /t/2-4/) is probably to be interpreted in a different way:


The Old Turkic text is translated by CLARK as: “You, who come completely unhindered, are the one who will restrain greed and the other passions.” VON GABAIN’s translation is cryptical “Gier und die übrigen klešas ... in Hindernislosigkeit ganz kommt Ihr Vernichtender.” What can be challenged for semantic and phraseological reasons is the reading käli[r]. A more appropriate restoration is kalı[sız] because the first letter is only partially preserved. It is not clear whether we have to read the letter as a front or a back <k> with two diacritical dots. This would yield the binominal birtäm kalısz “completely and without remainder”. BT XXI 0302-0304 is a very close Buddhist parallel with birtäm following kalısz: alku nizvanlarığ yidi yuki birlä kalısz birtäm tarkarmış “(the Buddhas) have routed all klešas without any remnants completely”. In altering the established editions in this way the Old Turkic text is closer to the Tocharian B counterpart for which PINAULT now offers a different restoration: [entse war]ñai klešanma etañkätte [ko]r wikäşşemca “Driving away the myriad, without being hindered, of the passions, starting with greed, ...”.

§ 26

In lines 263-264 (= U 101 /v/3-4/) both the Tocharian phrase and its Old Turkic translation are partly interrupted by lacunae. I quote WINTER’s restitution first which is based on the extant Old Turkic text: krent-pälskosșan [75] etarimmem päkri

a substantive then this fact is easier to explain. Therefore we should read şoban+lig which derives from Skt. śobhana. This can be either an adjective or a substantive (“decorum, luck, virtue” etc.). The word şoban with a possessive suffix which makes it clearly a substantive is attested in BT XIII 14.3. In his note ZIEME already thought of the possibility of reading şobanlig instead of şubralig in the Avadāna text.

72 See TT IX 22-24.
73 Here the plural suffix can be added in the lacuna.
74 [šemt] is doubtful because from the last letter the trace of a diacritical dot is visible. See now PINAULT’s new reading [ko]r.
75 CLARK (1982), 188.
76 See PINAULT’s new reading quoted below.
tākowy\textsuperscript{77} oly' āstre: "von den Wegen des guten Denkens her offenbar werde der sehr reine (oder: der sehr Reine).\textsuperscript{78} The reading āstre is in fact only a reconstruction as we can see from the transliteration. In spite of the Old Turkic text quoted below this reading is doubtful because after the letter \textless{}\textgreater{} a diacritical dot is visible which should belong to the letter \textless{}\textgreater{}. Then a damaged \textless{}\textgreater{} follows, then a letter is missing and then the traces of two or three letters are visible. Therefore PINAULT now convincingly reads olyarṣε "superior". The Old Turkic translation of the phrase up to the supposed tākowy was hitherto read as: ...ľüg yollarıntu b(ā)kiz b[ālgülı]g b[olţu].\textsuperscript{79} Basing our reconstruction on the Tocharian krent-pälkosse\textsuperscript{80} we can fill in the lacuna with [ādgū köjęll]ľüg. The possessive suffix in yollarıntu was neither taken into consideration by VON GABAIN nor by CLARK. It refers to Tocharian vainejyaśsem wǝlomencsa\textsuperscript{81} or Old Turkic kutrutačči [tnîg o]glannuŋ\textsuperscript{82} in the preceding phrase. The genitive is to be constructed with the possessive suffix in yollarıntu. What remains to be discussed is the volitional 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular b[olţu] corresponding to Tocharian B tākowy in WINTER's reading. In his new study of the hymn PINAULT has pointed out that WINTER's reading is questionable. Instead he prefers the reading tākow corresponding to tākau which is an analogical form of the preterite participle tätākau. For this reason it is impossible to restore b[olţu] in the Old Turkic part. Instead one would expect the constative preterite b[olţu] here.\textsuperscript{83} The translation of the restored Old Turkic phrase would be: [it has] b[ecome] m[anifies]t from the ways of [good thinking] of the [ch]ildren of the [human beings] who are saved."

§ 27

The hitherto unconnected lines 265-267 (= U 101 /v/5 - U 102 /t/2/) most probably all belong to a single sentence. Especially line 266 is heavily damaged. The objects of the participle ačtačči are still unclear. If we take our last refuge in a blotted mirror imprint of the second object preserved on U 101 next to line /v/5/ then it is likely that these objects should be reconstructed as h[u]alarıν čač[ät]klärin.\textsuperscript{84} The missing genitive could have been [č(a)hšap(a)larnuŋ] because PINAULT now restores [ši]lse "of the Šīlas". Because of the possessive suffixes in hularıν čačaklärin the

\textsuperscript{77} Hereafter the Old Turkic translation of this phrase is inserted.
\textsuperscript{78} TT IX p. 31.
\textsuperscript{79} It is conceivable that Old Turkic bākiz is by zetacism etymologically related to Tocharian A pākär (Tocharian B pākri) but was perhaps metanalyzed in Old Turkic times as being related to b(ā)k "firm".
\textsuperscript{80} I follow PINAULT's new edition.
\textsuperscript{81} This is PINAULT's new reading. WINTER read wławśemca.
\textsuperscript{82} So read!
\textsuperscript{83} b[olmaš] is not excluded.
\textsuperscript{84} On the MS only ...JKL'RN is visible of the second word.
expected equivalent č(a)hšap(a)tlig is excluded here. The whole sentence would then run as follows: art[o]karak arrig [č(a)hšap(a)tlarny] h[u]alarn čæç[ä]klärin ačta[či] nom r(a)nikah ol tilaq ü[zä ögä yükinüür m(ä)n]^{85} “F[or] this reason [I bow] to the dharma juwel which opens the blossoms of the extremely pure [precepts].”

§ 28

A tentative reconstruction of lines 270-271 (= U 102 /r/5/-/v/1/) would be: i[nčü]^{86} ügüztäg [bay] ba[rmlig] ... “[rich] and we[althy] like the p[earl] River (i.e. the Syr Darya).” In view of the Tocharian B counterpart šäte “rich”, [bay] ba[rmlig] is preferable compared to the former reading bafyakut]. The restoration i[nčü] rests on the assumption that the name of the river is given here. (y)inčü ügüz “pearl river” is a common name for the Syr Darya in the Orhon inscriptions.

§ 29

The new edition of the Tocharian B text by Pinault yields the reading preke preke “time after time” in line 275 (= U 102 /v/5/). Since in the Old Turkic translation üdün[n] is visible in line 276 it is reasonable to assume – on the model of the Tocharian original – that another [üdün] preceded this word. For üdün üdün see e.g. Suv 491^{20}.

§ 30

The patron of the manuscript displays his feelings of reverence in words which have been reconstructed as:

\[
\text{amtu } t(ä)ņrim } m(ä)n \text{ [aryaman fristum} koštr \text{. aya[galuk agir]la[galuk] süzök könl[in a]girlayu } inčü[rü töl]pön } yükinüü \text{ [täginüür} m(ä)n} \text{ “Now, Majesty, I,}
\]

Aryaman Fristum Qoštr, with a respectful (Hend.) pure mind, venture to honor, bow my head, and worship you."^{87} (lines 281-283 = U 103 /v/1-3/).

\text{ayaguluk agirlaguluk cannot be translated as “respectful (Hend.)” because both forms are projection participles, to use a term aptly coined by M. Erdal.}^{88} \text{ A humble worshipper is not supposed to describe his personal attitude with the attributes ayaguluk agirlaguluk. Only the object of his worship would be fit to receive these attributes. The second word so far read as [agir]la[galuk] preserves the trace of a further letter which is best interpreted as a <p>.}^{89} \text{ This would yield a restoration } [agir]lap, \text{ i.e. a verb. The preceding word should best be a verbal noun in}

---

85 There is not enough space for this restoration of the line but viewed from the context a similar but shorter phrase must be assumed.
86 The word is written with ‘Ain.
87 Clark 1982, 188.
88 See GOT pp. 301sq.
89 Already mentioned in Wilkens (2000), No. 380.
the instrumental case, maybe aya[ma]n]. Instead of süzök könlü[m üzä] it is preferable because after the stem könlü- a <w> is visible in the manuscript. The lacuna is big enough for such a restoration. This leads to the new reading and translation: amit t(ä)nrim m(ä)n [aryaman fristum] košt(a)r . aya[ma]n aqur]lap süzök könlü[m üzä] ajgurlayu yünçü[rü tö]pön yüükünü [täginür] m(ä)n “Now, my lord, I, [Aryaman Fristum] Košt(a)r, after [venerating (you)] with respect, with] m[y] pure mind91 respectfully bowing my head, I [venture] to worship (you).”

§ 31

Line 302 (= U 84 /v/2/) has been read by CLARK as ...]z barig tiꜜd[kal[í] uč “in order to restrain the existence ... three ...”92 In the catalogue of the Manichaean manuscripts of the Berlin Turfan collection I tried to establish the reading [jav]iz barig tiꜜd[kal[r] učün].93 The reading of the last two words should be retained but instead of [jav]iz barig one should restore /n]izvanig. One would simply translate this phrase as: “In order to restrain the kleša(s)...” On the same fragment in line 305 (/v/5/) it is possible to restore to küzät[d]üf94 č(a)hšap(a)t(í)g “observing the commandment(s)”.

§ 32

The severely damaged line 308 (= U 75 /r/3/) has been read –intäki x/r//nt- ... so far. While I am not able to offer a restoration of the first word the second is best explained as rh[a]nt-[la]jr,95 i.e. a plural of the loan word from Sogdian ry’nt which ultimately goes back to Sanskrit arhat.96 Only the diacritical dots of both letters <r> are visible. Another word with the two letters rw[... begins after rh[a]nt[la]jr.

§ 33

In line 309 (= U 75 /r/4) we can restore the verbal phrase in the conditional stum [bus]jtum äf[rsär]. Because st- and bus- is used quite often in connection with č(a)hšap(a)t we can translate “[if] I violated or [broke the precepts].”

---

90 A reading aya[gın] is excluded because in this case a trace of the letter <γ> would have been visible.
91 In the Maitrisimit süzök könlü stands for “faith”.
92 CLARK (1982), 189.
93 WILKENS (2000), No. 425.
94 In WILKENS (2000), No. 425 küzät-du[r] is suggested. The last letter is a <w> but in view of the new reading [č(a)hšap(a)t]g there is no space for such a reading. Therefore the text is best to be emended to küzät[d]ü.
95 But note that this word is attested as arhant in line 161 (= U 93 /v/1/) of the manuscript.
96 See GHARIB (1995), 341a (No. 8472). For the different orthographical variants of the Ancient Uygur term see UW p. 178a-b.
Difficult is the interpretation of lines 370-372 (= U 76 /r/5/ - /v/2/) which belong to the short story of the merchant Arazan. Some people are mentioned who accepted the advice of the merchant. Then we come across a passage which I quote from Clark's edition and translation:

\[\text{bir ösür ölümkâ kork[tıl]ar .} \]
\[\text{ikinti ösüräd[j]lig t(a)varlg isig özüg äsirkâdilâr .} \]
\[\text{üçünç ösür özlerinînî dirig öz b/... -siyâ tafrantlar.} \]

"and first, they feared death; second, they pitied the living souls with property (Hend.); third, they hurried to their own living ..." 98

This translation is clearly an improvement of Bang's older rendering which reckons with three groups of people each behaving differently after receiving proper advice ("da fürchteten die einen den Tod, die anderen bedauerten ihr (bisheriges) wohlhabendes (opulentes) Leben, die dritten zu ihres Lebens ....... eilt en sie") 99. This is not an appropriate translation because \[\text{bir ösür, ikinti ösür and üçünç øsür} \] is a simple enumeration as correctly observed by Clark. 100 What is to be improved is the rendering of ädlig t(a)varlg which cannot be translated as "with property (Hend.)" in this context. One would expect a postposition such as üzâ after äd t(a)var or the instrumental case. So the older rendering by Bang is better in this context. But it is to be expected, as is often the case, that the construction is metaphorical: "life which is something valuable". This should refer to a statement made by Arazan some lines above in a damaged context. He addresses the people by saying: öskünlizlärta t(a)/va]rca 101 körün "regard ... in front of you like pro[per]ty." (line 366 = U 76 /r/1/). In lines 370-371 one can expect that some people take pity on the life of others because these people do not treat life properly, i. e. as something precious and valuable. The damaged word before tafrantlar can be restored to bulğ[u]siyâ so that we arrive at the following translation of the whole passage: "First, they feared death; second, they begrudged life which is something valuable; third, they strove in order to obtain for themselves a living self." 102

§ 35

In his study on the Manichaean Middle Iranian incantation texts from Turfan E. Morano edited some texts which he subsumed under the German titles "Segens-

97 The beginning of the story, i.e. leaf 37, is missing.
98 Clark (1982), 189.
99 See Bang (1931), 29.
100 See UW p. 407a for the use of ösür with numerals.
101 For this reconstruction see Wilkens (2000), No. 4.
102 The first part of the next sentence is to be read as: arazan [alt]g sangçînîñ ûf[i] ãrîgî [el]yîn (instead of û[zâ]f) âfrîlp.
sprüche” and “Zauberspruch”. In these texts the names of several angels are enumerated. Lines 431-432 (= M 1144 /v/1-2/) of our text clearly represent a Turkic version of this literature. In line 430 (= M 1144 /t/5/) these angels are invoked in order to protect the country. Following the names in the Middle Persian texts we can complete some names in our Old Turkic manuscript: [bar] z(a)ka\(^{104}\) frešti ba[r simus …] ahraentus set […] “Angel [Bar] Zaka, Ba[r Simus …], Ahrendus, Seth …”. As the order of these names differs in the texts it is unfortunately impossible to fill in the other missing names.

§ 36

In line 446 (= U 106 /t/1/) of our text it is possible to read k[izi][l bakir[lig] közlüglär “Those having eyes of r[e]d copper”.

§ 37

A complete new reading can be offered for line 453 (= U 106 /v/3/) – the context is rebirth in hell: [b]aðroklar[in] t[rižuları]n\(^{105}\) … b[i]çguların elâg[lârîntä] …\(^{106}\) “(the guardians of hell wielded) [their s]tandards, t[ridents … and k]nives [in their] hands …”.

§ 38

The fragment U 79 is severely damaged but in line 480 (= /t/5/) it is still possible to read [yal]ŋokl[ar] kuv[râq] “the assembl[y of hu]man bein[g(s)]”.

§ 39

In line 500 (= U 109 /t/5/) only some words are preserved in a damaged form. The line has been read by Clark in the following way: …ʃ[tyńc burhan t(ä)ŋri majni kutt b/ksyn kurug.\(^{107}\) After an inspection of the manuscript it seems to be clear that the last two words in question are written as one word which is to be interpreted as a personal name B(ä)k Şıŋkor with the accusative suffix: b(ä)kṣuŋkorug. There is a small piece of tape covering the diacritical dots of the <ŋ>. The <g> of the digraph <ŋg> is visible in traces. şuŋkor “gerfalcon” is quite often attested as a personal name in Old Turkic.\(^{108}\) The next word coming after this name is likely to be a verb.

103 See Moran (2004), 222.
104 Only a small trace of the letter <z> is visible and the other two letters are damaged as well.
105 This restoration is less certain.
107 In Wilkins (2000), No. 14, I followed the reading kürüg in TT IX 92.
108 See the attestations in Mongolian and Old Turkic sources as documented by Rybatzki (2006), 704b-705b. As part of a Manichaean name suŋkor is attested in the manuscript Kao. 0107 (Or. 8212-1692) housed in the British Library, left column II. 2-3, 10-11 as Alp Şıŋkor Tegin (the MS is written in runiform script). See the edition in Moriyasu (1997), 46-47.
In line 507 (= U 110 /r/2/) we can read a partly faded name as: *aryam[an] duht*\textsuperscript{109} *töpüüt hatun* "Aryam[an] Duht, Töpüüt Hatun".

**Abbreviations and references:**


\textsuperscript{109} The word is written with daleth.
Maitr Turfan manuscripts of the Maitrisimit (see the edition in BT IX)
MaitrHY Maitrisimit, Hami version chapter Yükünč (= “Introduction”), see the edition in ZusTreff


