



Title	Musings on the Manichaeian "pothi" book
Author(s)	Wilkins, Jens
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 2008, 23, p. 209-231
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/11094/16663">https://hdl.handle.net/11094/16663</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

# Musings on the Manichaean “pothi” book<sup>1</sup>

Jens Wilkens

The so-called Manichaean “pothi” book<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 下部讚 *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<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> Because of its orthographical conventions G. DOERFER tried to date our manuscript to a late period, viz. the Yuan Dynasty.<sup>10</sup> 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 *Maitrisimit*. See e. g. lines 234-235 (= U

7 CLARK (1982), 158 conjectured that the donor Aryaman Fristum Koštr had been a Buddhist prior to his adoption of Manichaeism. “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)girim 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 kanınčsız körklä körkünüzni* “your beautiful appearance (Acc.) which one is never satisfied to observe”. As a Buddhist example see e. g. MaitrH Y 6a 28-29 (ZusTreff 203-204): *körü kanınčsız körklä körklüg* “with an appearance which one is never satisfied to observe”. *körü kanınčsız* is clearly modelled on Tocharian A *asinät lkälām* (*lkälyi*, *lkälyām*, *lkälyo*) or *lkätsy asinät* (see MSN p. 60, Tocharian A manuscript of the *Maitreyasamitinātaka* YQ 1.9 /v/4-5/). In Tocharian B such an expression is likewise attested: *ontsoyce lkälñe*.

10 DOERFER (1996), 123.

*ögä yükünmiş buyanım(ı)z tüşintä üstünki altunki t(ä)ñrilärn[i]ñ . öñi öñi k[u]t wakşiklarnıñ . üstälzün t(ä)ñrid[ä]m küçl[ä]ri* “By virtue of our *punya*, 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 MaitrH Y /r/10-15/ (= ed. in ZusTreff 10-15): *bo süü bázätmiş nom bititmiş buyan ädgü kılınçığ ’äñ öñrä ävirär [biz . üs]tünki äzrua hormuzta tört [maharač] t(ä)ñrilärkä (.) bo buyan ädgü [kılın]č küçintä t(ä)ñridäm čog yalın [ası]lzun 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 Brahmā, Indra and the four [Mahārāja] gods [ab]ove; by virtue of this *punya*, the good [dee]d, 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 Uyghurs as Prof. MORIYASU to whom these lines are humbly dedicated has shown in several important works.<sup>12</sup> One of the key factors was certainly the royal patronage in the West Uyghur 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.<sup>13</sup>

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.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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 siziñä . 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 siziñä . anu[ntumuz]* ... as in line 3 (= MIK III 8260 /v/3/) where *anuntumuz siziñä* is attested. But in line 8 we have to begin a new phrase with *anu[ntumuz]* because of the punctuation mark after *siziñä*. 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.<sup>17</sup> The editors of TT III rightly refer in their note to the unpublished fragment in Manichaean script TM 149 /r/3/<sup>18</sup> where *säkiz törlüg açığ t(a)rka*<sup>19</sup> *ämgäklär* is attested. This bilingual text in Middle Persian and Old Turkic bears the shelf mark U 122a today.<sup>20</sup> In the Chinese Manichaean hymn-scroll 下部讚 *Xiabu zan* (verse 337) the term is met with as 八難 "acht Schwierigkeiten".<sup>21</sup> This is a Buddhist term going back to Sanskrit *aṣṭākṣaṇa* which can be rendered in different ways in Uyghur Buddhism. One typical expression is *säkiz törlüg täginčsiz oronlar*.<sup>22</sup> In the preceding line we come across another Buddhist term *tört tugum* (Skt. *caturyonī*) 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/) *könül köñültäki ädgüläri* 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 *könül köñültäki 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.<sup>23</sup> The same holds true for the Old Turkic examples. Note that in a Buddhist text the term *säkiz törlüg ämgäk* “the eightfold afflictions” is attested as well.<sup>24</sup> 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 /r/5/): *sädräksiz yigi kılınčların*. 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 *saṃgha* and causing a Tathāgata’s blood to flow. In a Christian text published by P. ZIEME we find the same *sädüräksiz yigi kılınčlarıg* with the simple accusative suffix.<sup>25</sup>

### § 4

A phrase in lines 34-35 (= U 83 /v/4-5/) has previously been read *kača[n ı]dok kañım(ı)z. kalıgtın entinüz* “When you, our Holy Father, descended from the sky ...”. What should be called into question is the reading *[ı]dok* “holy” in spite of the fact that *ıdok kañımız* 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]rıg* “clean” which is equally possible.<sup>26</sup> But one would prefer the reading *[bi]rök* 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 *utlı sävinč öt/ık/ ugrın ykın* 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 *öt/ä]k* “retribution, compensation, obligation”. The semantics are quite close to *utlı sävinč* which is best understood as a synonym compound meaning “thankfulness, reward”. The following *ugrın ykın* 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 /r/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.

*üstürti kuđı enmäsär.*

*üč [yavlak yollardakı]²⁷*

*üküş tälīm tınl(ı)glar bulı ärtih .*

*[öglüg kö]η[ü]llüg²⁸ orukıuzı .*

“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 und]erstanding.”

## § 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 converb is attested here. There are other instances where the vowel is –u (*yarišmalašu*).³⁰ Because the converb is cooperative and cannot govern a direct object the preceding accusative [*beš*] *ažuntakı tınl(ı)glar*ıg forms the end of the preceding sentence. One would expect the verb to stand at the beginning of the sentence. The subject of *yar(ı)šmalašu* is very likely *tınl(ı)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 erinž tınl(ı)glar*

*orukıuz učen bulmadın*

*ulınčıg sansarta kaltum(ı)z*

*[bilgä] biliglig šatu tikt[i]η[i]z*

*beš ažuıug irkl[ä]t[i]p ozğurt[uıuz]*

CLARK translates “We mortals, without an object of desire³² and miserable, remained in the tortuous *samsāra* 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 *üč 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 [*kutrulda*]či.

32 A better translation would be “without refuge”.

saved them.” A different explanation for the converb *irklätip* translated with a question mark “bezwingend” in TT III can be offered. The key to our understanding is the preceding phrase *bilgä biliglig šatu tikiñiz* “You set up the ladder of wisdom”. Now, the simplex *irklä-* 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(ı)z tümän sumer taglar töpösi üzä irkläyü* “climbing the summits of incalculable myriads of Sumeru mountains”.<sup>33</sup> 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 *samsāra*.

## § 9

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

*ärtimlig māñikā ilinmišk[ä]*

*[äš]siz köni nomug no[m]latuñuz*

*[äm]gäklig taloytın kächürtüñüz .*

*ä[d]g[ü]<sup>34</sup> nirvankah yakın elttiñiz*

by BANG/VON GABAIN.<sup>35</sup> 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*.”<sup>36</sup> The restoration *[äš]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 *māñi* and *nom*. This leads us to the assumption that we have to restore *[ärtinč]siz* “immortal”, “unperishable”. If we fill in the lacuna like this then it would be preferable to assume *no[m]layu* instead of *[no]mlatuñuz*. In this case every quatrain would consist of ten syllables each. We can translate: “By pr[eaching] 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] *nirvāṇa*.”

## § 10

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

*buyanlıg sumer tag[ıg tur]ğurtuñuz .*

*bo ///wnk ürl[üg] bulturtuñuz.*

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 *ü[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. *puṇyasambhāra* “the accumulation of merit”. Because of the genitive *ükünnün* we can restore the following word as *ürl[üklügin]*. The predicate *bulturtuñuz* is likely to be *biltürtünüz* the second letter of which is a <y>. The suggested new reading is:

*buyanlıg sumer tag[ıg tur]ğurtuñuz .*

*bo ü[künn]ün ürl[üklügin] 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 altag uza[nma]k[ları]g taşgarıp .*

*adınlarka asıglık<sup>37</sup> işig işlät(t)iniz<sup>38</sup>.*

CLARK translates: “You expelled from them their mastery of deceit (Hend.), and caused them to do works of benefit to others.”<sup>39</sup> What is disputable is the interpretation of the first phrase because *al altag uzanmaklarıg* cannot be analysed as an attributive nominal “compound” with the meaning “their mastery of deceit”, because the suffix +*lıg* or a possessive suffix is missing. The translation by BANG and VON GABAIN “Trug und Lässigkeit entfernend”<sup>40</sup> is equally misleading. *al altag* and *uzanmak* is attested in Buddhist texts as a positive concept because this refers to Sanskrit *upāyakaṣālya* “skilful means”.<sup>41</sup> 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*.<sup>42</sup> This concept has entered Uyghur Manichaeism as well and the instance in our “pothi” book is a beautiful illustration. The next problem is the semantics of *taşgar-*. 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”.<sup>43</sup> An example

37 This is one of the examples of the typical confusion of the velars in our MS. One would expect *asıglik*.

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*)”.<sup>44</sup> 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”.<sup>45</sup> The former reading according to the strophic alliteration is:

*aḡkaḡlıḡ<sup>46</sup> fişaylıḡ [mäñilär .]  
al altag uzanmakl[arı]ḡ üntürüp  
aḡa yr/...[.]  
asıḡ tuşu kultıḡız.*

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

After *fişaylıḡ* a trace of the letter <t> is still visible so one is inclined to restore the lacuna to *t[ınlıḡlarka]* “to the living beings”. In the next phrase the converb *üntürüp* is supposed to have the same subject as the main verb *kultıḡız* 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[aşı]*<sup>47</sup> “opportune, suitable” which perfectly fits the concept of *upāyakaṣālya* “skilful means” and which is again present in *al altag uzanmaklar*. After *y(a)rāşı* a second attribute to *asıḡ tuşu* should be expected. The translation would run as follows: “[To] li[v]ing beings] with sense objects<sub>2</sub> (*vişaya*) (i. e. still clinging to sense objects) you brought skilful means<sub>2</sub> to the fore and made the benefits<sub>2</sub> appropriate to them [...].” Provided that the restoration *t[ınlıḡlarka]* is correct, we can detect a shift from the plural to the singular in the pronoun *aḡa*. 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.<sup>48</sup>

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 *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* where the Buddha himself says: *amtı muna burhanlıḡ küçümin taşgaru üntürüp aṭavake yäknıñ küvānčlıḡ taḡın yemiräyin* “Now I want to display my power of a Buddha and smash the mountain of pride of the demon Āṭavaka” (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[aglıḡ]* but *y(a)rāşı* is attested in lines 167 (= U 94 /t/2/) and 198 (= U 97 /t/3/).

48 Note that the next term after this sentence *küsānčıḡ mäñilär* refers to a Buddhist concept, viz. *pañcakāmaḡa*. See for example BT XXV 2887-2888 *beş törlüḡ küsānčıḡ mäñilär* and the adjective *beş törlüḡ küsānčıḡ mäñiliḡ* 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 *ayaglarıḡ barča siziḡä ämtärtingiz* and translated as “you drew all the honors to yourself”.<sup>49</sup> In WILKENS (2000), No. 364, the line in question is quoted and the reading *ayaglarıḡ* is corrected to *azaglarıḡ*.<sup>50</sup> With reference to CLAUSON’s establishment of the semantics of *ämtär-* 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 *adakin yorip sizni at[ayu]* “They would walk on foot and call you by name” is more likely to be read as *ed[ä]r[ü]*<sup>51</sup> so that we arrive at the improved translation: “walking on foot and fo[llowing] you ...”.

## § 14

Another strophic alliteration was restored as follows by CLARK:

*ulug y(a)rlıkančuı köñül[ün]üz üzjä*<sup>52</sup>

*oları barča sık[u]rup* (lines 99-100 = U 91 /r/4-5/)

“Embracing all of them with your great compassionate mind, ...”<sup>53</sup>

Instead of *köñül[ün]üz üzjä* the reading *köñül[ün]üz[k]jä* is preferable so that this becomes the indirect object of the verb *sigur-* (written *sıkur-*). CLAUSON quotes s. v. *sıgur-* the similar phrase *köñülkä sıgurdım anı* from the *Kutadgu Bilig*<sup>54</sup> but he assigns a different lemma *sıkur-* 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. *mahākaruṇā*) ...”. The sentence is repeated in lines 158-159 (= U 93 /r/3-4/) and the text is again damaged after *köñül-*. Here one would likewise prefer a restoration such as: *ulug y(a)rlıkančuı köñül[ün]üz[k]ä olarını barča sıgurup*.

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 <T> is still visible. In line 203 (= U 97 /v/3/) the construction is with the dative case. I propose the reading: *nizvanılarka . eyin yed[ärü]* “following the passions”.

52 CLARK refers to line 102 for his restoration. In TT III the damaged word is restored as *köñül[ün]üzjä*.

53 CLARK (1982), 184.

54 ED p. 815b.

## § 15

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

*QYN///r k[ö]ñülünüz üz[ä]*

*kultunuz ädgü tüzükä* (lines 102-103 = U 91 /v/2-3/).

The damaged word can be restored as *kn[umh]g*<sup>55</sup> 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 *yi[ti]* “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:

*τ// .../NKYZ tüşintä .*

*tuđıgsız burhan kutın bul[tuñuz]* (lines 106-107 = U 92 /r/1-2/).

The word preceding *tüşintä* can be read as *buyanınız* “your merit”. The content of the sentence is very similar to the preceding lines 105-106 (= U 91 /v/5/ - U 92 /r/1/) which has been reconstructed as *ol buyanınız tüşintä . odğurak burhan [kutın bultuñuz]*. Both sentences differ in the attributes assigned to *buyan* and *burhan kutı*.<sup>56</sup> Maybe we can reconstruct the first word of our sentence as *t[ü]z[kärinčsiz]*. 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: *.../WNKWZ NY . sođmıš<sup>57</sup> yarča titiñiz .*

An inspection of the original allows for the reading *[siz]iñ mäñiñizni sođmıš yarča titiñiz* 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 *yanunčsız [a]žunka täğdilär* is suggested.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>55</sup> On *knımlıg* see OTWF p. 375.

<sup>56</sup> *odğurak* can be used attributively or adverbially.

<sup>57</sup> The reading of the vowel of the first syllable follows ED p. 799a s. v. *sod-*.

<sup>58</sup> Line 156 (= U 93 /r/1/).

Instead of [a]žunka we should restore [o]ronka yielding another Buddhist concept because *yanınçsız 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 kutın bul[tılar] “(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 semantic reasons insofar as the eradication of the *kleśas* is a prerequisite for becoming an arhat but the strophic alliteration demands a word beginning with an *a*-.<sup>59</sup> The solution is that in Uygur Buddhism the arhats are very often qualified by the attribute *akıgsız ädgükä tägmış* “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 min kolti nayut tümän tınıl(ı)glar alku akıgların alkap nizvanılıg kkirlärin tarkarıp arhant kutın bulup ...* “One hundred thousands of *koṭi-nayuta* myriads of living beings eradicated all their *āśravas*, removed their *kleśa*-stains, obtained arhatship ...” (Suv 185<sub>19-22</sub>).

## § 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.*

*bahşılıg [burhan t](ä)ñri tugtuğuz.*<sup>60</sup>

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”.<sup>61</sup> 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 *+IXg* serves as a marker showing that this nominal compound is an attribute of a following noun the possessive suffix precedes the suffix *+IXg*.<sup>62</sup> 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

<sup>59</sup> In WILKENS (2000), No. 370, no restoration of the lacuna is given.

<sup>60</sup> See e.g. BT XXV 3300, 3662-3663.

<sup>61</sup> ED p. 145b s. v. *élig*.

<sup>62</sup> See *burhan kutıl(ı)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.<sup>63</sup> I was able to find the location *ipreräntse änte* "the surface of the sky" in Tocharian B.<sup>64</sup> 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 *bahšılıg [burhan t](ä)ñri* one should restore the lacuna to *bahšılıg [kün t](ä)ñri*. As a proof one can refer to line 49 (= U 87 /r/4) where the similar *burhanlıg kün t(ä)ñrig 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 /r/5/) has been read as follows:

*sizni körüp tnl(ı)glar [...]*

*sezik köñüllärin tarıka[r ärti].*

CLARK translates: „Seeing you, mortals ... And suppressed their doubtful minds.”<sup>65</sup> In his note (aa) he remarks that the readings of BANG/VON GABAIN (*tarık[artı]*) and CLAUSON (*targartı*)<sup>66</sup> have to be discarded. In my catalogue<sup>67</sup> I emended the reading to *tarıkt[ılar]* – the plural is, by the way, not strictly necessary – but failed to do so for *köñüllärin* which should be read as *köñüllär[i]*. Because the subject changes a restoration of the small lacuna<sup>68</sup> after *tnl(ı)glar* to *[ymä]* 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)rıkamış y(a)rılıgı .*

*sumtagsız köñfülin] küzättdi .*

*küzätm[iş]čä /// /vč-'/p<sup>69</sup>*

It is likely that after *küzätmiščä* only a line filler has to be assumed at the end of line 171. The damaged word should be reconstructed as *iča[nu]p* 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 kalıkñıñ yüzintä*), 332-333 (*kök kalıkñıñ yüzintä*), 458 (*kök kalık yüzintä*).

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 [yo]u 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 [*y(a)ruk kūn t(ä)ñri-a*]. We have to go back to A. VON GABAIN’s proposal in TT IX 10 to give the equivalent [*kūn t(ä)ñriniŋ*].

## § 24

A word that puzzled the Turcologists is the thrice attested – in a more or less complete fashion – word *tugıl* or *togıl* in lines 249 (= U 100 /t/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 <l>. The best preserved example is at the beginning of line 249. But then the string hole comes after *tugıl/togıl*. 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 *tokılı[g]*. This would hold true for all three examples so that we can delete the obscure *tugıl/togıl* from the Old Turkic vocabulary. In TT IX p. 20 A. VON GABAIN already pointed out a possible connection between *tugıl/togıl* and *tokılıg*. CLARK who discusses the word in question at length thinks that Old Turkic *tokılıg* is a borrowing from Mongolian *tokiliy*. This sounds convincing because in Written Mongolian the base *toki* “staidness, 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.<sup>70</sup> 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 (*tokılıg körklä ät[öz]lög*) because this phrase proves that *tokılıg* is a synonym of *körklä*.<sup>71</sup> This reminds us of the often

<sup>70</sup> In a note ZIEME already questioned CLARK’s etymological hypothesis.

<sup>71</sup> Another interesting instance is found in an Avadāna text published by SHŌGAITO (1988). In line 109 the editor gives the transcription: *ačilmuš lenhualig arig tąg tugilig šubralıgın*. Here *tugilig* (our *tokilig*) is followed by a word which is in a footnote linked to Skt. *śubhra* “glänzend, scheinend, schön”. As this is an adjective one may ask why the Old Turkic text has additionally +*lig*. 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 tokılıg* would then be simply another way of expressing the same idea. In each case the Tocharian B counterpart is *lkäsi 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/)<sup>72</sup> is probably to be interpreted in a different way:

Tocharian B: *[eñkäl war]ñai klešanma* . Old Turkic: *azta [ul]atı n[izvani]*<sup>73</sup>

Tocharian B: *etañkätte [šemt]*<sup>74</sup> *wikäššeñca* . Old Turkic: *tuđıgızın birtä[m]. käl[r] siz tarkardaçı*.

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.”<sup>75</sup> 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 *käl[r]*. A more appropriate restoration is *käl[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 kalısız* “completely and without remainder”. BT XXI 0302-0304 is a very close Buddhist parallel with *birtäm* following *kalısız*: *alku nizvanılarıg yadı yuku birlä kalısız 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 wikäššeñca* “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-pälskoşş[an]*<sup>76</sup> *etarımmeñ] päkri*

---

a substantive then this fact is easier to explain. Therefore we should read *šoban+lıg* which derives from Skt. *śobhana*. This can be either an adjective or a substantive (“decorum, luck, virtue” etc.). The word *šoban* 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 *šobanlıg* instead of *šubralıg* 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*<sup>77</sup> *oly' āstre*: “von den Wegen des guten Denkens her offenbar werde der sehr reine (oder: der sehr Reine).”<sup>78</sup> 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 <’> a diacritical dot is visible which should belong to the letter <r>. Then a damaged <t> follows, then a letter is missing and then the traces of two or three letters are visible. Therefore PINAULT now convincingly reads *olyartse* “superior”. The Old Turkic translation of the phrase up to the supposed *tākowy* was hitherto read as: ...*lūg yollarıntın b(ä)kiz b[älgülü]g b[olzun]*.<sup>79</sup> Basing our reconstruction on the Tocharian *krent-pälskošše*<sup>80</sup> we can fill in the lacuna with *[ädgü köñül]lūg*. The possessive suffix in *yollarıntın* was neither taken into consideration by VON GABAIN nor by CLARK. It refers to Tocharian *vaineyäššem wlołmencsa*<sup>81</sup> or Old Turkic *kuṭrultači [tınlıg o]ğlanınuṭ*<sup>82</sup> 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<sup>rd</sup> person singular *b[olzun]* 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 *tatākau*. 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.<sup>83</sup> The translation of the restored Old Turkic phrase would be: “[it has] b[ecome] m[anifes]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 /r/2/) most probably all belong to a single sentence. Especially line 266 is heavily damaged. The objects of the participle *ačtači* 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 čäč[ä]klärin*.<sup>84</sup> The missing genitive could have been *[č(a)hšap(a)tarnıṭ]* because PINAULT now restores *[ši]lše* “of the *šilas*”. Because of the possessive suffixes in *huaların čäčäklärin* the

77 Hereafter the Old Turkic translation of this phrase is inserted.

78 TT IX p. 31.

79 It is conceivable that Old Turkic *bäkiz* is by zetacism etymologically related to Tocharian A *pākār* (Tocharian B *pākri*) but was perhaps metanalyzed in Old Turkic times as being related to *b(ä)k* “firm”.

80 I follow PINAULT’s new edition.

81 This is PINAULT’s new reading. WINTER read *wlāwšemca*.

82 So read!

83 *b[olmıš]* is not excluded.

84 On the MS only ...*JKL’RYN* 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]krak arig [č(a)hšap(a)tlarnıñ] h[u]aların čäč[ä]klärin ačta[či] nom r(a)tnikäh ol tultag ü[zä] ögä yökünür m(ä)n*<sup>85</sup> “F[or] this reason [I bow] to the dharma jewel which opens the blossoms<sub>2</sub> of the extremely pure [precepts].”

## § 28

A tentative reconstruction of lines 270-271 (= U 102 /r/5/ - /v/1/) would be: *i[nčü]*<sup>86</sup> *ügüztäg [bay] ba[rımlıg]* ... “[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[rımlıg]* is preferable compared to the former reading *ba[yakut]*. 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 *üdü[n]* is visible in line 276 it is reasonable to assume – on the model of the Tocharian original – that another *[üdüñ]* preceded this word. For *üdüñ üdüñ* see e.g. Suv 491<sub>20</sub>.

## § 30

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

*amtu t(ä)ñrim m(ä)n [aryaman fristum] koštr . aya[guluk ağır]la[guluk] süzök köñül[in a]ğurlayu yinčü[rü tö]pön yökünü [täginür] m(ä)n* “Now, Majesty, I, Aryaman Fristum Qoštr, with a respectful (Hend.) pure mind, venture to honor, bow my head, and worship you.”<sup>87</sup> (lines 281-283 = U 103 /v/1-3/).

*ayaguluk ağırlaguluk* cannot be translated as “respectful (Hend.)” because both forms are projection participles, to use a term aptly coined by M. ERDAL.<sup>88</sup> A humble worshipper is not supposed to describe his personal attitude with the attributes *ayaguluk ağırlaguluk*. 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>.<sup>89</sup> This would yield a restoration *[agir]lap*, i.e. a converb. 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[makin]*.<sup>90</sup> Instead of *süzök köñül[in]* the reading *süzök köñülü[m üzä]* is preferable because after the stem *köñül-* 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)ñrim m(ä)n [aryaman fristum] košt(a)r . aya[makin ağır]lap süzök köñülü[m üzä a]gırlayu yinčü[rü tö]pön yükünü [täginür] m(ä)n* “Now, my lord, I, [Aryaman Fristum] Košt(a)r, after [venera]ting (you) with resp[ect, with] m[y] pure mind<sup>91</sup> respectfully bowing my head, I [venture] to worship (you).”

### § 31

Line 302 (= U 84 /v/2/) has been read by CLARK as .../z barıg tıdkal[ı] üč “in order to restrain the existence ... three ...”<sup>92</sup> In the catalogue of the Manichaean manuscripts of the Berlin Turfan collection I tried to establish the reading [*yav*]ız *barıg tıdkal[ır] üč[ün]*.<sup>93</sup> The reading of the last two words should be retained but instead of [*yav*]ız *barıg* one should restore [*n*]izvanıg. 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}ü*<sup>94</sup> *č(a)h]šap(a)t(ı)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]r*,<sup>95</sup> i.e. a plural of the loan word from Sogdian *ry’nt* which ultimately goes back to Sanskrit *arhat*.<sup>96</sup> 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 *sutum* [*buz*]tum *ä[rsär]*. Because *st-* and *buz-* is used quite often in connection with *č(a)h]šap(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 köñül* stands for “faith”.

92 CLARK (1982), 189.

93 WILKENS (2000), No. 425.

94 In WILKENS (2000), No. 425 *küzät{d}ürür]* is suggested. The last letter is a <w> but in view of the new reading [*č(a)h]šap(a)tıg* 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 Uyğur term see UW p. 178a-b.

## § 34

Difficult is the interpretation of lines 370-372 (= U 76 /r/5/ - /v/2/) which belong to the short story of the merchant Arazan.<sup>97</sup> 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 ärsär ölümkä kork[tu]lar .*

*ikinti ärsär ä[d]lig t(a)varlıg isig özüg äsirkädilär .*

*üçü[nç] ärsär özläriniñ tirig öz b/... -siñä tafrantılar.*

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

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")<sup>99</sup>. This is not an appropriate translation because *bir ärsär*, *ikinti ärsär* and *üçünç ärsär* is a simple enumeration as correctly observed by CLARK.<sup>100</sup> 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 *üzä* 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: *öskünjüzlärtä t(a)[va]rča*<sup>101</sup> *körüñ* "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 *tafrantılar* can be restored to *bulğ[u]sıñä* 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."<sup>102</sup>

## § 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 *ärsär* 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 [atlu]g satugcınuy üf[i] ärigi [e]yin* (instead of *üzä*) *äfrilip*.

sprüche” and “Zauberspruch”.<sup>103</sup> 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 /r/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*<sup>104</sup> *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 /r/1/) of our text it is possible to read *k[ızı]l bakır[lıg] kö-zlüglär* “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]ađrokla[r]ın t[ri]žulların*<sup>105</sup> ... *bı]čğuların elig[lärintä]* ...<sup>106</sup> “(the guardians of hell wielded) [their s]tandards, t[ri]dents ... and k[n]ives [in their] hands ...”.

### § 38

The fragment U 79 is severely damaged but in line 480 (= /r/5/) it is still possible to read *[yal]ñokl[ar] kuv[rağı]* “the asse[m]bly of hu[m]an bein[gs]”.

### § 39

In line 500 (= U 109 /r/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)ñ[ri ma]ñi kuti b/KSYN kurug.<sup>107</sup> 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 Sıñkor with the accusative suffix: *b(ä)ksıñkorug*. There is a small piece of tape covering the diacritical dots of the <ä>. The <g> of the digraph <ng> is visible in traces. *sıñkor* “gerfalcon” is quite often attested as a personal name in Old Turkic.<sup>108</sup> 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.

106 CLARK (1982): *[yal]truklar[u] t.../kuların il/...*

107 In WILKENS (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 *sıñkor* is attested in the manuscript Kao. 0107 (Or. 8212-1692) housed in the British Library, left column ll. 2-3, 10-11 as Alp Sıñkor 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*<sup>109</sup>  
*töpüt hatun* “Aryam[an] Duht, Töpüt Hatun”.

### Abbreviations and references:

- BANG, W[illi] (1931): Manichäische Erzähler. In: *Muséon* XLIV, 1-36.
- BT III TEZCAN, Semih (1974): *Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte III).
- BT VII KARA, Georg and Peter ZIEME (1976): *Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte VII).
- BT IX TEKIN, Şinasi (1980): *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*. 1. Teil: Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen. 2. Teil: Analytischer und rückläufiger Index. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte IX).
- BT XIII ZIEME, Peter (1985): *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte XIII).
- BT XXI WILKENS, Jens (2001): *Die drei Körper des Buddha (trikāya). Das dritte Kapitel der uigurischen Fassung des Goldglanzsūtras (Altun Yaruk Sudur) eingeleitet, nach den Handschriften aus Berlin und St. Petersburg herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XXI).
- BT XXV WILKENS, Jens (2007): *Das Buch von der Sündentilgung. Edition des alttürkisch-buddhistischen Kṣānti Kūlguluk Nom Bitig*. Vols. 1-2. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XXV).
- CLARK, Larry (1982): The Manichean Turkic Poethi-Book. In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* IX, 145-218.
- DOERFER, Gerhard (1996): *Formen der älteren türkischen Lyrik*. Szeged (Studia uralo-altaica 37).
- ED CLAUSON, Sir Gerard (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford.
- GABAIN, Annemarie VON (1955): Alttürkische Datierungsformen. In: *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 27, 191-203.
- GHARIB, B[adr-az-Zamān] (1995): *Sogdian Dictionary, Sogdian-Persian-English*. Tehran.
- GOT ERDAL, Marcel (2004): *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden/Boston (Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch der Orientalistik; Section Eight: Central Asia; Vol. 3).
- GULÁCSI, Zsuzsanna (2001): *Manichaeen Art in Berlin Collections. A Comprehensive Catalogue of Manichaeen Artifacts belonging to the Berlin State Museums of the Prussian Cultural Foundation, Museum of Indian Art, and the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, deposited in the Berlin State Library of the Prussian Cultural Foundation*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum; Series Archaeologica et Iconographica I).
- GULÁCSI, Zsuzsanna (2005): *Mediaeval Manichaeen Book Art. A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th-11th Century East Central Asia*. Leiden/Boston (Nag Hammadi and Manichaeen Studies 57).

109 The word is written with daleth.

- Maitr      Turfan manuscripts of the Maitrisimit (see the edition in BT IX)
- MaitrH Y   Maitrisimit, Hami version chapter Yūkūnč (= “Introduction”), see the edition in ZusTreff
- MIKKELSEN, Gunner B. (2006): *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Part 4: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts in Chinese*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Subsidia).
- MORANO, Enrico (2004): Manichaean Middle Iranian Incantation Texts from Turfan. In: Desmond DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, Simone-Christiane RASCHMANN, Jens WILKENS, Marianne YALDIZ, Peter ZIEME (eds.), *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Berlin (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17), 221-227.
- MORIYASU Takao (1989): Toruko Bukkyō no genryū to ko-Toruko-go butten no shutsugen. In: *Shigaku zasshi* 98-4, 1-35.
- MORIYASU Takao (1997): Daiei-Toshokan shozō Rūn moji Mani-kyō monjo Kao. 0107 no shin kenkyū [A Manichaean Runic Manuscript with Miniature (Kao. 0107) Housed in the British Library]. In: *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 12, 41-73.
- MORIYASU Takao (2004): *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße. Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund*. Übersetzt von Christian Steineck. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 50).
- MSN      Ji Xianlin, Werner WINTER und Georges-Jean PINAULT: *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang-Museum, China*. Berlin/ New York 1998 (Trends in Linguistics 113).
- OTWF      ERDAL, Marcel (1991): *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexikon*. 2 Vols. Wiesbaden. Turcologica 9.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean (2008): Bilingual hymn to Mani: analysis of the Tocharian B parts. In: *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 23, 93-120.
- PYE, Michael (1978): *Skilful Means: A Concept in Mahayana Buddhism*. London.
- /r/      recto side
- RUDOLPH, Kurt (1979): Synkretismus – vom theologischen Scheltwort zum religionswissenschaftlichen Begriff. In: *Humanitas Religiosa. Festschrift für Haralds Biezais zu seinem 70. Geburtstag. Dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen*. Stockholm, 194-212.
- RYBATZKI, Volker (2006): *Die Personennamen und Titel der mittelmongolischen Dokumente. Eine lexikalische Untersuchung*. Helsinki (Publications of the Institute for Asian and African Studies 8).
- SCHMIDT-GLINTZER, Helwig (1987): *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 14).
- SH      SOOTHILL, William Edward und Lewis HODGINS (1937): *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms with Sanskrit and English Equivalents and a Sanskrit-Pali Index*. London 1937 (reprint: Delhi 1997).
- SHOGAITO Masahiro (1988): Drei zum Avalokiteśvara-sūtra passende Avadānas. In: Klaus RÖHRBORN und Jens Peter LAUT (eds.): *Der türkische Buddhismus in der japanischen Forschung*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 23), 56-99 (plates pp. 107-119).

- †SIEG, Emil and †Wilhelm SIEGLING (1953): *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprache B. Heft 2: Fragmente Nr. 71-633*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Werner THOMAS. Göttingen.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas (1985): The Manichaeic Commandments: A Survey of the Sources. In: *Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce*. Leiden (Acta Iranica 25), 573-582 (Planche XXXV).
- Suv RADLOFF, Wilhelm and Sergej E. MALOV (1913-1917): *Suvarṇaprabhāsa (sutra zolotoḡo bleska). Tekst uḡurskoj redakcii*. I-II. Sanktpeterburg (Bibliotheca Buddhica 17).
- TEB II THOMAS, Werner unter Mitwirkung von Wolfgang KRAUSE (1964): *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band II: *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Erste Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher).
- TT III BANG, Willi and Annemarie von GABAIN (1930): *Türkische Turfan-Texte III. Der große Hymnus auf Mani*. Berlin. Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-hist. Klasse 1930. XIII, 183-211.
- TT IX GABAIN, Annemarie von and Werner WINTER (1958): *Türkische Turfantexte IX. Ein Hymnus an den Vater Mani auf „Tocharisch B“ mit alttürkischer Übersetzung*. Berlin. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst 1956, 2.
- TT X KOWALSKI, Tadeusz (1959): *Türkische Turfantexte X. Das Avadāna des Dämons Āḡavaka*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Annemarie von GABAIN. Berlin. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1958, Nr. 1.
- UW ROHRBORN, Klaus (1977-): *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Wiesbaden.
- /v/ verso side
- WILKENS, Jens (2000): *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 8. Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 16).
- ZIEME, Peter (1969): *Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache der manichäisch-türkischen Turfantexte*. Berlin [unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Humboldt-University, Berlin].
- ZIEME, Peter (1991): *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung*. Budapest (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XXXIII).
- ZIEME, Peter (2001): Araḡemi-Jātaka und ein Sündenbekenntnistext in einer alttürkischen Sammelhandschrift. In: *De Dunhuang à Istanbul*. Hommage à James Russell HAMILTON présenté par L. BAZIN et P. ZIEME. Turnhout (Silk Road Studies V), 401-433 (Planches XXXVI-LIII).
- ZIEME, Peter (2002): Paulus und Thekla in der türkischen Überlieferung. In: *Apocrypha* 13, 53-62.
- ZusTreff GENG Shimin and Hans-Joachim KLIMKEIT (1988): *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit, in Zusammenarbeit mit Helmut EIMER und Jens Peter LAUT herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. 2 vols. Wiesbaden (Asiatische Forschungen 103).