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 amwardišn (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/n/4 - U 95/n/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.\(^7\)

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.\(^8\) 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.\(^9\) Because of its orthographical conventions G. Doerfer tried to date our manuscript to a later period, viz. the Yuan Dynasty.\(^10\) 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 Uygurs the practice of transferring \(punya\) 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 \textit{Maitrismit}. See e. g. lines 234-235 (= U

---

\(^7\) Clark (1982), 158 conjectured that the donor Aryaman Fristum Koštir had been a Buddhist prior to his adoption of Manicheism. “He selected the \textit{pothi}-leaf format and imbued the act of compilation with the principle of \textit{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)ñrım 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 kanınçsz körkłä körkünüzni “your beautiful appearance (Acc.) which one is never satisfied to observe”. As a Buddhist example see e. g. Maitri Y 6a 28-29 (ZusTreff 203-204): \(körü kanınçsz körkłä körkliğ “with an appearance which one is never satisfied to observe”. \(körü kanınçe\) is clearly modelled on Tocharian A \(asinät ìkäläm (ìkälyi, ìkälyam, ìkälyo) or ìkâtsy asinnät (see MSN p. 60, Tocharian A manuscript of the \textit{Maitreyasamitinätaka} YQ 1.9 /v/4-5/). In Tocharian B such an expression is likewise attested: \textit{ontsoye ìkälîe}.

\(^10\) Doerfer (1996), 123.
With this concept one can compare MaitriHY /r/10-15/ (= ed. in ZusTreff 10-15):

bo süü hätzämtsiš nom bititmiš buyan ädgü kalinëg 'än öyä ävirär [bix . üs]tünkä āxrua hormuzta tört [maharač] t(ä)ŋrilärkä () bo buyan ädgü [klin]ë küçintä t(ä)ŋridäm çog yalin [as]lzuń üstälzün “In the first place [we] transfer punya, 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 [Mahärajä] gods [ab]ove; by virtue of this punya, the good [deed], may (their) heavenly majesty and glory [increa]se 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. Moriyasu 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. Moriyasu 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 Moriyasu (2004).
13 See Moriyasu (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 . ami[...]. 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 säkiz 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/3/18 where säkiz törlüg äçtg l(a)rka19 ämgäklä is attested. This bilingual text in Middle Persian and Old Turkic bears the shelf mark U 122a today. In the Chinese Manichaean hymn-scroll Xiabu zan (verse 337) the term is met with as 八難 “acht Schwierigkeiten”. This is a Buddhist term going back to Sanskrit astţaksana which can be rendered in different ways in Uygur Buddhism. One typical expression is säkiz törlüg tāginēsz 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

examples passages in a totally damaged context where only some words are still legible are left out. They do not contribute anything substantial to our understanding of the text as a whole.

16 Röhrborn’s interpretation of line 172 (= 94 /v/2/) kőñül köñultaki ädgülāri as “seine Tugenden des Herzens und des Im-Herzen-Befindlichen (vgl. citta-caitasika° im Buddh.?)” is totally convincing (but the reference in UW p. 343b s. v. ädgü has to be corrected from M III (m) 132 to TT III (m) 132). In Abhidharma texts we have numerous attestations for the Sanskrit term citta-caitasika-dharmas as kőñül köñultaki nomlar. In our Manichaean text ädgü seems to render the Buddhist concept of dharma.

But note that nom is attested as well.

17 See Clark (1982), 191 and T III p. 27.
18 In fact it is the fourth line of the page.
19 Only the diacritical dots are missing.
20 See Wilkens (2000), No. 132.
21 Schmidt-GLINTZER (1987), 52.
22 See e. g. the glossary in BT XXV p. 403.
Chinese Manichaean texts that the occurrence in the hymn-scroll represents a Buddhist element.\(^{23}\) The same holds true for the Old Turkic examples. Note that in a Buddhist text the term sākiz törlüg ämığäk “the eightfold afflictions” is attested as well.\(^{24}\) 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.

§ 3

Another Buddhist term is to be expected in line 20 (= U 86 /t/5/): sädräksiz yigi kilinçlarin. The term most likely renders the concept of Skt. ánantaryakarma “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. ZIEME we find the same sādiräksiz yigi kilinçlarig with the simple accusative suffix.\(^{25}\)

§ 4

A phrase in lines 34-35 (= U 83 /v/4-5/) has previously been read kača[n i]dok kağım(iz). kaliğtn entiniz “When you, our Holy Father, descended from the sky ...”. What should be called into question is the reading [i]dok “holy” in spite of the fact that i dok kağımiz 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 WILKENS (2000), No. 360, the word in question has been read [a]rğ “clean” which is equally possible.\(^{26}\) But one would prefer the reading [bi]rők 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.

§ 5

Line 37 (= U 81 /r/2/) is destroyed in the upper part. The rest of the line has been read ulti sävinč ötl/kl/ ugrın yikın 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 ötfäjʃ “retribution, compensation, obligation”. The semantics are quite close to ulti sävinč which is best understood as a synonym compound meaning “thankfulness, reward”. The following ugrın yikın are instrumentals which can be translated as postpositions meaning “because of”. The whole phrase would mean: “because of thankfulness and obligation”.

\(^{23}\) MIKKELSEN (2006), 2b.
\(^{24}\) Mainz 292 /t/6-7/ (ed. ZIEME (2001), ll. 22-23).
\(^{25}\) ZIEME (2002), lines 20-21 and commentary p. 60.
\(^{26}\) WILKENS (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.

\[ \text{üştürti kudı enmäsär.} \]
\[ \text{iüç yavlak yollardakı}^{27} \]
\[ \text{iüküs rélim tûn(t)glar bulu ärtih} . \]
\[ \text{[öglüg kö]n[u]llüg}^{28} \text{ orukunuzn} . \]

"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 yariš- "to compete"^{29} meaning that the first sibilant is written with <s> instead of <š>. 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 conjugate is attested here. There are other instances where the vowel is –u (yarišmalašu).^{30}

Because the conjugate is cooperative and cannot govern a direct object the preceding accusative [beš] ažuntaki tûn(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)šmalašu is very likely tûn(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:

\[ \text{umugszuz erinž tûn(t)glar} \]
\[ \text{orukunuz učin bulmadın} \]
\[ \text{ulinčig sansarta kaltum(t)z} \]
\[ \text{[bilgà] biliglig šatu tikt[i]n[iz]} \]
\[ \text{beš ažunug irkl[ä]t[i]p ozgurt[unuz]} \]

Clark translates "We mortals, without an object of desire^{32} and miserable, remained in the tortuous samsâra 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 iüç 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 [kutrudal]çr.
32 A better translation would be "without refuge".
saved them.” A different explanation for the converse *irklätip* translated with a question mark “bezwingernd” in TT III can be offered. The key to our understanding is the preceding phrase *bîlgä* biliglig *şatu tikînîz* “You set up the ladder of wisdom”. Now, the simplex *irklâ*- 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(*)z* tümann sumer taglar tôpösi üzä irklâyû “climbing the summits of incalculable myriads of Sumeru mountains”.³³ Now, *beš 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 *samsâra*.

§ 9

Lines 50-52 (= U 87 /v/5/-/v/2/) have been read

ärtimlig mânikä ilimništä [ä]  
[dâ]siz köni nomug no[mlatûnîz]  
[jäm]ğäklig taloytn käçürtûnîz .  
ä[d]g[ü] ³⁵ nirvankah yâkin elliñîz

by BANG/VON GABAIN.³⁵ 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 nirvâna.”³⁶ The restoration [*dâ]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 *mäyi* and *nom*. This leads us to the assumption that we have to restore [*ärtinç]siz “immortal”, “unperishable”. If we fill in the lacuna like this then it would be preferable to assume *no[mlayu]* instead of *nomlatûnîz*. 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[o]o[d] nirvâna.”

§ 10

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

buynîlg sumer tag[îg tur]gurtûnîz .  
bo [//wnk ürl[üg] bulurtûnîz.

³³ The Hamiparallelisteranslated 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(fö)ẕlüg* is given instead of *ä[d]g[ü]*. The damaged MS seems to support this reading but because of the strophic alliteration *t(fö)ẕlüg* 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 *ülkünnügen* “of the heap” because in the context of accumulating *punya* which is mentioned in the preceding line this refers to the concept of Skt. *punyasambhāra* “the accumulation of merit”. Because of the genitive *ülkünügen* we can restore the following word as *ürlükügin*. The predicate *bulturtünüz* is likely to be *biltürtünüz* the second letter of which is a <y>. The suggested new reading is:

*buyanlıg sumer ta[tur]gurtünüz.*
*bo ülkünnügen ürlükügin* biltürtünüz.

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

§ 11

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

*al altağ uza[nma]klar[ig] tašgarip .
adnlarka asılgık37 işığ išlät(t)ınız.38*

**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 altağ uzanmaklarig* cannot be analysed as an attributive nominal “compound” with the meaning “their mastery of deceit” because the suffix +tig or a possessive suffix is missing. The translation by **BANG** and **VON GABAIN** “Trug und Lässigkeit entfernen”40 is equally misleading. *altağ* and *uzanmak* is attested in Buddhist texts as a positive concept because this refers to Sanskrit *upāyakauśalya* “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 Manichaeism 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 *asılgık*.
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-GLINTER** (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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a dziewli} & \quad \text{fişaylıg (mänılär.)} \\
\text{al altag uzanmak[ari]g üntürüp} & \\
\text{aŋa yr/...[.]} & \\
\text{aş¹ tu-su kıltıñız.}
\end{align*}
\]

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 <uç> is still visible so one is inclined to restore the lacuna to *fînîglîкрала* “[to the living beings”. In the next phrase the verb *ünîrûp* is supposed to have the same subject as the main verb *kıltıñiz* at the end of the sentence which certainly refers to Mani himself. The word in the next phrase *yœ/r/...* can be completed to *yœ(r)*[ašʃ][i]* “opportune, suitable” which perfectly fits the concept of *upâyakaušalya “skillful means” and which is again present in *al altag uzanmaklar*. After *yœ(raşı* a second attribute to *aş¹ tu-su* 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 skillful means to the fore and made the benefits appropriate to them [...].” Provided that the restoration *fînîglîкрала* is correct, we can detect a shift from the plural to the singular in the pronoun aŋa. 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 verb followed by another verb in \(-(X)p\) – is e.g. attested in the Daśakarma-patḥavādānamāla where the Buddha himself says: *amţ ucuna burhanlîg küčîmin taşgaru üntürup atâvaka yâkînî kûvânîçî tagûn yemîrîyîn “Now I want to display my power of a Buddha and smash the mountain of pride of the demon Ātavaka” (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 *yœ(r)*[ašʃ][i]* but *yœ(rašî* is attested in lines 167 (= U 94 /r/2/) and 198 (= U 97 /r/3/). Note that the next term after this sentence *kûsâncîçî mänîlär* refers to a Buddhist concept, viz. *pañcaçâmaguna*. See for example BT XXV 2887-2888 *beş törlüg kûsâncîçî mänîlär* and the adjective *beş törlüg kûsâncîçî mänîlîg* 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 āyaglarıg barça sızinā āmtārtınız and translated as “you drew all the honors to yourself”. In Wilkens (2000), No. 364, the line in question is quoted and the reading āyaglarıg is corrected to azaglarıg. With reference to Clauson’s establishment of the semantics of āmtär- 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 ādaḳın yorup sızni at(ayu) “They would walk on foot and call you by name” is more likely to be read as ed[a]/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)rlikançuçi könlüt[ünjüz üz] já
olarmi barça sk[û]rup (lines 99-100 = U 91/r/4-5/)

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

Instead of könlüt[ünjüz üz] já the reading könlüt[ünjûz] já 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 “pothi” 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. mahâkarûnâ) ...”. The sentence is repeated in lines 158-159 (= U 93/r/3-4/) and the text is again damaged after könlüt-. Here one would likewise prefer a restoration such as: ulug y(a)rlikançuçi könlüt[ünjûz] olarmi] 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: nizvanîlarka. eyin yeď[ârû] “following the passions”.

52 Clark refers to line 102 for his restoration. In TT III the damaged word is restored as könlüt[ünj üz] já.

53 Clark (1982), 184.

54 ED p. 815b.
§ 15

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

\[ \text{qyn} / k[\text{ö}]\text{nülünüz üz[â]} \]
\[ \text{kütü]z ödgü tüzükâ} \]

(lines 102-103 = U 91 /v/2-3/).

The damaged word can be restored as \text{kin} /imlî/jg\text{55} 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 y[i]/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:

\[ \text{t/} / \ldots /\text{nk}z \text{ tü} \text{şintâ} . \]
\[ \text{tü} \text{lık} \text{z burhan kütü]z} \]

(lines 106-107 = U 92 /v/1-2/).

The word preceding \text{tü} \text{şintâ} can be read as \text{buyan} /uç “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{buyan} /uç \text{ tü} \text{şintâ} . \text{odgurak burhan} \text{ kütü]z} \text{ bultu]z}. Both sentences differ in the attributes assigned to \text{buyan} and \text{burhan kütü].\text{56} Maybe we can reconstruct the first word of our sentence as t[ü]z[kärinçiz]. 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] 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 nyy} \text{. so} \text{d} \text{mi} \text{s} \text{57} \text{} \text{yar} \text{ça tittin} \text{i} \text{z} . \]

An inspection of the original allows for the reading \text{siz} /i]n mäninizni so]dmıș yarça tittin]ız 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{yanın} /çiz [a]žunka tâ]dil]âr is suggested.\text{58}

\text{55} On \text{kin} /imlî/jg see OTWF p. 375.
\text{56} \text{odgurak} can be used attributively or adverbially.
\text{57} The reading of the vowel of the first syllable follows ED p. 799a s. v. sod-.
\text{58} Line 156 (= U 93 /v/1/).
Instead of [a]žunka we should restore [o]ronka yielding another Buddhist concept because yaninčsz 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 [ayığ]ların 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 Uygar Buddhism the arhats are very often qualified by the attribute akıgsız ädgükä tägmiš “having attained the good state without influx (Skt. āsrava)”.

So we have to restore to [akıg]ların. As a further proof one can refer to a very similar Buddhist example from the “Sūtra of Golden Light”: yüz miŋ költi nayut tünän tün(1)glar alku akıglarin alkip nizvanihig kkilærin tarkarip arhant kutin bulup ... “One hundred thousands of köji-nayuta myriads of living beings eradicated all their āsravas, removed their kleşa-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 elig [kö]k kalık yužintá.

bahštig [burhan t]äŋri tugtuŋuz.60

First, the editors of T III p. 197 [17] translate: “Im Angesicht (vor) aller ililig Himmel (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 +lig serves as a marker showing that this nominal compound is an attribute of a following noun the possessive suffix precedes the suffix +lig. Second, the expressions kök kalık yužintá, kök kalık yužintâki etc. are quite common in Old Turkic. Yužintá 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. ělilig.
62 See burhan kutul(t)iğ oron (Mainz 760 /v/36/) or burhan tözig in U 2107 /A/5/.
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the face of”. Basically, we can assume a calque on a Tocharian expression which became a fixed term in Old Turkic.\(^\text{63}\) I was able to find the locution *iprerântse ânte* “the surface of the sky” in Tocharian B.\(^\text{64}\) In TEB II p. 166 s. v. *ânte* 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. *nabhasatala* “vault of the sky”. Third, instead of *bahšilg [burhan t]̣(ā)ŋri* one should restore the lacuna to *bahšilg [kūn t]̣(ā)ŋri*. As a proof one can refer to line 49 (= U 87 /r/4) where the similar *burhanlīg kūn t(ā)ŋrig körğāl[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 /r/5/) has been read as follows:

*sizni körüp tnl(ī)glar [++] .
sezik köňûllärin tarika[r ärti].

**CLARK** translates: „Seeing you, mortals ... And suppressed their doubtful minds.”\(^\text{65}\)

In his note (aa) he remarks that the readings of **BANG/vON GABAIN** (tartk[art]) and **CLAUSON** (targarti)\(^\text{66}\) have to be discarded. In my catalogue\(^\text{67}\) I emended the reading to *tartikt[ilar]* – the plural is, by the way, not strictly necessary – but failed to do so for *köňûllärin* which should be read as *köňûllär[i]*. Because the subject changes a restoration of the small lacuna\(^\text{68}\) after *tnl(ī)glar* to [yrmā] 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 /v/1-2/):

*[si]z y(a)rliki̇mi̇ş y(a)rlı̇gig .
sumtagsiy könjü̇lin] kőẕâti̇di .
kőẕâtm[i̇s]cã /// /vč-'/ṯ'/p\(^\text{69}\)

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

---

63 *kök kalik yüzi* and its derivations are attested in such a late text as BT III 249 (*kök kalıḵ yüzi̇ntâ*), 332-333 (*kök kalıḵ yüzi̇ntâ*), 458 (*kök kalik yüzi̇ṉtâ*).
64 See **SIEG/SIEGLING** (1953), 229 (No. 350 a4).
65 **CLARK** (1982), 185.
66 ED p. 540.
67 **WILKENS** (2000), No. 371.
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.
which [you] issued. Inasmuch as they obeyed (it) they took care ..."

§ 23

In line 245 (= U 99 /v/5/) only the Tocharian word *komñiktense* 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 *fy(a)ruk kün t(ä)ŋri-a*. We have to go back to A. VON GABAIN'S proposal in TT IX 10 to give the equivalent [kün t(ä)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 *körgäli*. 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 *tokil[t*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 *tokil[g*. CLARK who discusses the word in question at length thinks that Old Turkic *tokil[g* is a borrowing from Mongolian *tokil*¹. This sounds convincing because in Written Mongolian the base *tok* “staidness, decorum” and another derivation *tokitaï* “decorous, proper, fitting, suitable, etc.” is attested. But it is possible that the Mongolian words ultimately go back to the Old Turkic form *tok* “decorum” which is e.g. attested in BT XIII 14.3. ¹ 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 (*tokulug körklä ät[öz]lüğ*) because this phrase proves that *tokulug* is a synonym of *körklä*.¹¹ 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 SHOΓAITO (1988). In line 109 the editor gives the transcription: *açılımš lenhualig arig täg tugulg šubraligin*. Here tugulg (our *tokulg*) is followed by a word which is in a footnote linked to Skt. *śubhara* “glänzend, scheinend, schön”. As this is an adjective one may ask why the Old Turkic text has additionally *+lüğ*. If we derive the word in question from
recorded phrase körgäli körklä “beautiful to be seen” in early Old Turkic texts such as the Maitrisimt. körgäli tokalg would then be simply another way of expressing the same idea. In each case the Tocharian B counterpart is ikäşi 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 /r/2-4/)\(^{72}\) is probably to be interpreted in a different way:

Tocharian B: [eṅkāl war]ñai klešanma . Old Turkic: azta [ul]atu n[izvani]\(^{73}\)

Tocharian B: etaṅkätte [šemt]\(^{74}\) wikāṣṣemca . Old Turkic: tāgiatan birtā[m]-
kāli[r] siz tarkardači.

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.”\(^{75}\) 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 kāli[r]. A more appropriate restoration is kāli[siz] 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 birtām kalsiz “completely and without remainder”. BT XXI 0302-0304 is a very close Buddhist parallel with birtām following kalsiz: alku nizvanlarig yidi yuki birlä kalsiz birtām tarkarmiš “(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 etaṅkätte [ko]r wikāṣṣemca “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-pālkonš[an]\(^{76}\) etarimmen̄ pākri

\(^{72}\) 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.
täkowy\textsuperscript{77} oly' ästre: "von den Wegen des guten Denkens her offenbar werde der sehr reine (oder: der sehr Reine).\textsuperscript{78} The reading ästre 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{}. Then a damaged \textless{}\textgreater{} follows, then a letter is missing and then the traces of two or three letters are visible. Therefore \textsc{Pinault now} convincingly reads olyarste "superior". The Old Turkic translation of the phrase up to the supposed täkowy was hitherto read as: ...’ilüg yollarıntın b(ā)kiz b[älgilü]g b[olzun].\textsuperscript{79} Basing our reconstruction on the Tocharian krent-pälskoše\textsuperscript{80} we can fill in the lacuna with [ädğü köñül]lüg. The possessive suffix in yollarıntın was neither taken into consideration by \textsc{von Gabain} nor by \textsc{Clark}. It refers to Tocharian vaineyassëm wölméncsa\textsuperscript{81} or Old Turkic kurtultaçi [tinlig o]glanınıy\textsuperscript{82} in the preceding phrase. The genitive is to be constructed with the possessive suffix in yollarıntın. What remains to be discussed is the volitional 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular b[olzun] corresponding to Tocharian B täkowy in \textsc{Winter}’s reading. In his new study of the hymn \textsc{Pinault} has pointed out that \textsc{Winter}’s reading is questionable. Instead he prefers the reading täkow corresponding to tākau which is an analogical form of the preterite participle tätākau. For this reason it is impossible to restore b[olzun] in the Old Turkic part. Instead one would expect the constative preterite b[oltu] 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 äcän āçı 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]aların čće[ţ]klärin.\textsuperscript{84} The missing genitive could have been [č(a)hšap(a)lnarṇ] because \textsc{Pinault now} restores [şil]še “of the šīlas”. Because of the possessive suffixes in huların čćeäklärin 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 pākōr (Tocharian B pākri) but was perhaps metanalyzed in Old Turkic times as being related to b(ā)k “firm”.
\textsuperscript{80} I follow \textsc{Pinault’s new edition}.
\textsuperscript{81} This is \textsc{Pinault’s new reading}. \textsc{Winter} read wläwśemęca.
\textsuperscript{82} So read!
\textsuperscript{83} b[olmuš] is not excluded.
\textsuperscript{84} On the MS only ...jkl’ryn is visible of the second word.
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expected equivalent č(a)hšap(ā)līg is excluded here. The whole sentence would then run as follows: art[o]krah arig č(a)hšap(ā)lārný) h[u]lār čáč[ā]klārīn āčta[či] nom r(a)nīkāh ol titlag ül[žā ogā yūkīnūr m(ā)n]85 “F[or] this reason [I bow] to the dharma jewel 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[nčū]86 ügūztāg [ba]bra[mmlīg] ... “[rich] and we[althy] like the p[earl] River (i.e. the Syr Darya).” In view of the Tocharian B counterpart šāte “rich”, [ba]bra[mmlīg] is preferable compared to the former reading ba[yakut]. The restoration i[nčū] rests on the assumption that the name of the river is given here. (y)inčū ügūz “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 üdū[n] is visible in line 276 it is reasonable to assume – on the model of the Tocharian original – that another [üdūn] preceded this word. For üdūn üdūn see e.g. Suv 491.20.

§ 30

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

amnt m(ā)n [aryaman fristum] koštr. aya[guluk agir]la[guluk] süzök könl[in a]girlavu yinčû[rû tö]pûn yûkûnû [tûginûr] m(ā)n “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/).

ayaguluk agirlaguluk cannot be translated as “respectful (Hend.)” because both forms are projection participles, to use a term aptly coined by M. Erdal.88 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[guluk] preserves the trace of a further letter which is best interpreted as a <p>.89 This would yield a restoration [agir]lap, 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. 301sqq.
89 Already mentioned in Wilkens (2000), No. 380.
the instrumental case, maybe aya[mak]ı. Instead of süzök köňül[in] the reading süzök köňüлим üzä] is preferable because after the stem köňül-a <w> is visible in the manuscript. The lacuna is big enough for such a restoration. This leads to the new reading and translation: amtı t(ä)jrım m(ä)n [aryaman fristum] košt(a)r . aya[makın agr]lap süzök köňüüm üzä] a[ğr]layu yinçü[rü tö]pön yükünü [täginür] m(ä)n “Now, my lord, I, [Aryaman Fristum] Košt(a)r, after [venerating (you)] with respect, with] m[y] pure mind respectfully bowing my head, I [venture] to worship (you).”

§ 31

Line 302 (= U 84 /v/2/) has been read by CLARK as .../[z barig tıkal[i] üç “in order to restrain the existence ... three ...”. In the catalogue of the Manichaean manuscripts of the Berlin Turfan collection I tried to establish the reading [yav][z barig tıkal[r] üç[ün]]. The reading of the last two words should be retained but instead of [yav][z barig one should restore [njizvanıg]. One would simply translate this phrase as: “In order to restrain the klesa(s)...” On the same fragment in line 305 (/v/5/) it is possible to restore to küzät[d]ü[ communication(s)”.

§ 32

The severely damaged line 308 (= U 75 /r/3/) has been read –ıntäki 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]r, i.e. a plural of the loan word from Sogdian ry’nt which ultimately goes back to Sanskrit arhat. Only the diacritical dots of both letters <r> are visible. Another word with the two letters rw[... begins after rh[a]nt[la]r.

§ 33

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

90 A reading aya[man] is excluded because in this case a trace of the letter <γ> would have been visible.
91 In the Maitrisimit süzök köňül stands for “faith”.
92 CLARK (1982), 189.
93 WILKENs (2000), No. 425.
94 WILKENs (2000), No. 425 küzätđiʃ[rür] is suggested. The last letter is a <w> but in view of the new reading [č(a)hšap(a)ŋ 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:

bir ärşär ölümkâ kork[tl]ar .

ikinti ärşär ä[d]lig t(a)varlıg isig özüg äsirkâdilâr .

üçün[ç] ärşär özlerinin tîrîg öz b/... -sinâ tafrantâlar .

"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 ........ eilten sie")99. This is not an appropriate translation because bir ärşär, ikinti ärşär and üçünç ärşär is a simple enumeration as correctly observed by Clark.100 What is to be improved is the rendering of ädlig t(a)varlıg which cannot be translated as "with property (Hend.)" in this context. One would expect a postposition such as üzâ after âd 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: ösküngüzlârtâ t(a)/va[jr]çâ101 körüng "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 tafrantilar can be restored to bulğ[u]sîna 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-
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 /v/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 …] ahrentus 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 /v/1/) of our text it is possible to read k[izl]l bakir[lig] kö-zläglär “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]adroklar[in] t[rižullan]n[105] … b[ı]çğulan elig[lärintä] … “(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 (= /v/5/) it is still possible to read [yal]ŋokl[ar] kuv[rags] “the assemblage of hu]man bein[gs]”.

§ 39
In line 500 (= U 109 /v/5/) only some words are preserved in a damaged form. The line has been read by Clark in the following way: …/tynč burhan t(ä)ŋ[ri majni kutu 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 Sinkor with the accusative suffix: b(ä)ksıŋkoruŋ. There is a small piece of tape covering the diacritical dots of the š. The <g> of the digraph <ng> is visible in traces. sinkor “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 MORANO (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 WILKENS (2000), No. 14, I followed the reading kürug 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 Suŋkor Tegin (the MS is written in runiform script). See the edition in MORIYASU (1997), 46-47.
§ 40

In line 507 (= U 110 /r/2/) we can read a partly faded name as: *aryam[an] duht* toplū hatun “Aryam[an] Duht, Töpūt Hatun”.

Abbreviations and references:


---

109 The word is written with daleth.
Maitr Turfan manuscripts of the Maitrisimit (see the edition in BT IX)
MaitrHY Maitrisimit, Hami version chapter Yükünê (= “Introduction”), see the edition in ZusTreff
recto side


