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Peter Zieme

Notes on a Manichaean Turkic Prayer Cycle

Abstract: In this paper a recently identified new Manichaean-Turkic fragment (SI6621) from Toyok Mazar is analyzed and edited. This manuscript written on the verso side of a Chinese Buddhist scroll belongs to the Serindia Collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (IOM) of the Russian Academy. It is compared with other fragments of several manuscripts published earlier. On the basis of the new evidence, reading and translation can be improved.

Key words: Serindia Collection, Manichaean-Turkic, Manichaean hymn, comparison of different manuscripts.

Since the text discussed here is attested in at least five copies, it must have been very popular among the Turkic-speaking Manichaeans in Central Asia. It belongs to the rich literature of hymns and prayers known from the main Central Asian corpora of the Manichaeans. The Manichaean texts of the Central Asian Uighurs from the 9th to the 11th cc. were written in three scripts: Runic, Manichaean, and Uigur.¹ For this prayer book there are so far only fragments known in Uighur script.²

The manuscripts

Manuscript A

In 1922 A. von Le Coq edited a small codex book in Uighur script of which several fragments were found.³ As the book was in a bad condition

---

¹ A new complete edition of the corpus in three volumes started with volume II in 2013 (CLARK 2013). The third volume was published in 2017 (CLARK 2017). Volume I, to be published in the near future, will be the final volume.

² Kindly Nicholas Sims-Williams corrected my English text, otherwise I alone am responsible for all mistakes.

³ M III No. 9, I-XI.
and several small fragments are missing today, it did not find the interest it should have. Recently, Larry Clark reedited these fragments giving them a partially new order. In his study he regards this manuscript consisting of 16 different prayers as belonging to a Prayer book. Moreover, he gives each of them a header. Since one does not find headlines in the manuscript itself, this treatment is at least doubtful. One can approve the author’s intention to offer an interpretation which might be useful for studies of the Manichaean religion, but the poor state of the fragments is a great hindrance to a definite judgement, as we do not find any hint of such a division in the other manuscripts either. As a result of comparing the different manuscripts and especially taking the new fragment from St. Petersburg into consideration, one can determine a definite order for at least three of the fragments.

**Manuscript B**

Parts of a second manuscript belong to the Otani Collection of Ryukoku University Library (Kyoto) first edited by K. Kudara and recently reedited by myself.

**Manuscript C**

During the cataloguing work at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (IOM) of the Russian Academy some additional Old Uighur manuscripts have come to light. Here I would like to present an unedited Manichaean fragment written on the verso side of a Chinese *Prajñāpāramitā* scroll. It quickly became clear that the fragment SI 6621 is another copy of the above-mentioned Manichaean text. This new item is better preserved than the Berlin and Kyoto fragments, but it too contains only part of the whole book. According to an old note it was found at Toyok Mazar in 1909 by the expe-

---

4 CLARK 2013, 283–322. Under the title “Prayer Book” he has arranged the text of the fragments under 16 subtitles chosen according to some key-words. But since the sequence is not settled, most such titles remain questionable. There is no explanation as to why the author did not include Le Coq No. 9, VI (Mainz 394) [not preserved as a double leaf] and Le Coq No. 9, VIII-X (U 37+ U 52), leaf II. J. Wilkens has catalogued the fragments of this manuscript (cp. WILKENS 2000, 301–310), including those pieces that are omitted in Clark’s edition.

5 KUDARA 1996, (62). At this time, the fragment was still not identified.

6 ZIEME 2017, 54–55 (No. 20).

7 I express my gratitude to Irina Fedorovna Popova, the Director of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts as well as to Olga Lundysheva and Anna Turanskaya for giving me the opportunity to work on this fragment and to publish it here.

8 T.VI.220.418a23–b11.
dition of Oldenburg. The fragment measures 32.5×27 cm. The script is a fluidly written half cursive in a rather large format which is not typical for Manichaean manuscripts. The Schriftspiegel covers the whole height of the scroll without upper and lower margins as found on the Chinese side.

**Manuscript D**

Two fragments written on the verso side of a Chinese Buddhist scroll can be joined: Ch/U 6963 (T II T 1805 [only on glass]) + Ch/U 6042 (T III 2002 [only on glass]). The text corresponds to Clark LP251–260.

**Transcription of manuscript D with restorations from Ms. A (U 39)**

01 [bulun boltu]m siziŋärü ötünür  
02 [m(ä)n siziŋärü ... yalva]rar m(ä)n m(ä)n(i)n(i)ŋ  
03 [özümün eligim mänin] özütümün arılaglı  
04 [bägim tirig özünkä] ö-grünčü körtgürl  
05 [-ügli t(ä)ŋrim mänin] köŋül-ümün y(ar)ugl[1]

**Manuscript E**

Leaf I of the double leaf U 15 (T II K 8) is a parallel to M III Nr. 9,V (Clark LP172–180). U 15 II is a copy of the Manichaean Xaęstvänift. This shows that U 15 was a double leaf of a composite book (Sammelhandschrift). As the fragment M III Nr. 9,V (T II D 78e) is missing today, it is difficult to estimate whether A. v. Le Coq’s readings are all correct. In I v 3 he read tiriläyin which is followed by L. Clark with teriläyin.

---

9 Both fragments are missing in the catalogue of the Manichaean Turkic texts (WILKENS 2000).
10 T.X.279.72b4–10.
11 There is one fragment which also belongs to this manuscript but can not be located exactly because of the small amount of text preserved: Ot.Ry. 7142 verso (not mentioned in ZIEMLI 2017). It has only traces of two lines: (1) siziŋäru ...] (2) tänŋrim tänŋri yârak [...]. “To you [I pray…], my God, heavenly light […]”. The recto side belongs surely to T.VI.220, but the four preserved characters 若菩薩摩 appear too often.
12 Most recent edition by ÖZBAY 2014.
13 His translation “I myself collect” is not correct because terir- is a passive (ED 547b). In any case, it seems that the variant of U 15 bilinäyin should be taken into account. If Le Coq’s manuscript was slightly broken one also could think of emending tiriläyin to bilinäyin “I want to recognise” on the basis that there is no difference between medial r and n and that the l-hook may have been put in a wrong place.
Edition of manuscript C (IOM SI 6621)

01 [] -iniz [tīrig]
02 [öz] . bāk katg öz[n]g[üz] . kertū butkiniňz
03 ö格林ču yawışguruz amranmak yemiňiniz
04 mänigū tirig öz . yıdıňaz tataglag

14 Spelled: pwtyq “kʿz.
15 Spelled: t ʿq ʿq. The first line on U 53 II v has only the three letters lʿq (M III Nr. 9, XI Blatt II Rückseite 7 ///r; Clark LP111 lg), which correspond to the last syllable of tataglag. The text of the preceding lines in SI 6621 thus present a new passage, cp. translation.
16 sävīğlig is missing in U 53 II v, but one of the two dots of the punctuation mark is still visible. In SI 6621 they are present in the following line.
Fol. 2. SI 6621 verso
05 .. amtı t(ä)ŋrim
06 mäŋigü y(a)ruk tirig r
07 özünüz odugrak tuyuglı
08 köŋül ymä ulug nom ol . ymä yıdaŋ
09 ägsüksüz ukuglı bilgä bilig siz siz ..
10 siziŋ kutuŋuz-garń y(a)varar-m(ä)n y(a)rl(t)kayu
11 beriŋ t(ä)ŋrim . ürkä üzüksüz ög
12 -lāntürüŋ ukturuŋ siz y(a)rlıkaŋ
13 t(ä)ŋrim mäniŋ özümin siz tirgürün
14 ol ölürügli . tüşürmäkdä özü(ü)min
15 siziŋ kutuŋuz-garu y(a)lvarar-m(ä)n y(a)rl(ı)kayu
16 ozguruŋ ay(ı)g kılınčlag šmnu oglanın[a]

---

17 t(ä)ŋrim is missing in U 53 II v.
18 U 53 II v 03 (M III Nr. 9, XI Blatt II Rückseite 9 //ni; Clark LP113) has preserved only ny of the word.
19 As this manuscript makes no distinction between the letters n and r, one can easily read körtüm confirmed by the new manuscript with kördüm “I have seen”. While A. v. Le Coq read köntüm with a question mark, L. Clark translates köntüm by “I have acknowledged [you]” without comment, but a verb kön- “to acknowledge” is not attested.
20 ölmäyin is missing in U 53.
21 Here we observe a real variant which turns to be very important. While U 53 II v 05 (M III Nr. 9, XI Blatt II Rückseite 11; Clark LP115) has tirig öz “Living self”, SI 6621 reads tirig öz “Living tree”.
22 The last line of U 53 II v has öz. Therefore it is possible that the leaf Mainz 104 I follows it immediately. What is not obvious from SI 6621 is that the Berlin fragment Mainz 104 I recto almost joins it, but had a variant reading: against özünüz it has öz[üŋüz kut]uŋüz. The word odugrak of SI 6621 is not recorded in this manuscript.
23 Mainz 104 I r 02 starts with a letter read so far as y, but it is clearly the letter t as is now confirmed by SI 6621.
24 Mainz 104 I r 05 has only yydnk to be read as yid(ą)ŋ, now confirmed by SI 6621 yidaŋ.
25 The second w is very small, it looks like ʾ.
26 The word in Mainz 104 I r 09 has to be corrected to agree with SI 6621, as the spelling yarkagma makes no sense here.
27 Spelled: yrlq ʾyw.
28 The spelling uktro of Mainz 104 I r 12 is not correct.
29 t(ä)ŋrim is missing in Mainz 104 I v 01.
30 The first preserved word on Mainz 104 I v 01 must also be read mäniŋ.
31 Missing in Mainz 104 I v.
32 Missing in Mainz 104 I v.
33 Only partly preserved in Mainz 104 I v 03, but now easily emended to ölürügli.
34 Mainz 104 I v 04 tʃ jnąk-tāl.
35 It seems that in Mainz 104 I v 05 the w = ü is also missing, but it is not absolutely clear.
Clark transliterated in l. 05 wt/m/n.
36 kurtgarę against Mainz 104 I v 05–06 kurtgarę.
37 lag against Mainz 104 I v 09 l(ı)g.
38 Mainz 104 I v 09 ogulamında.
17 siz ıratıŋ\(^{39}\) mini siziŋ\(^{40}\) yıdlaŋ\(^{41}\) yıparlaŋ\(^{42}\)
18 [yemişlik]ınızikā\(^{43}\) kişürün... siziŋ\(^{44}\)
19 [köğüzdaki y(a)rak kuza-larąża] \(^{45}\)
20 [.. ymä siziŋ ödürünmiş]\(^{46}\)
21 [ögmäkiniz]-kä ymä t[(a)ŋrim] d(ä)m kertgümäkinijiz
22 [-kä özüm] tük[ällig bolaym] .. nā
23 [üçün tesår siziŋ m(ä)n] .. siz[intosh]\(^{47}\)
(U 39 I r 11–12)
24 bulun boltum siz
25 -iŋärü ötünürüm(ā)n
(U 39 I v 01–09)
26 a[ yalvarar-m(ä)n mäniŋ]
27 özüm elägäm
28 mäniŋ özütümin\(^{48}\)
29 arılaglı bägim tirig
26 özümkä ögrünčü\(^{49}\)
27 körtgürügli t(ä)ŋrim
28 mäniŋ köŋülümin\(^{50}\)
29 y(a)rutuglı kaŋım

Translation\(^{51}\)

Your [ ] is the L[iving Self], your firm and stable Self.
Truth is your branch, joy is your leaves, love is your fruit. The eternal liv-
ing self. Your fragrance is lovely and favoured.

---

\(^{39}\) ıratıŋ but SI 6621 has ıratıŋ which seems to be better.
\(^{40}\) sizing against Mainz 104 I v 10 s(ä)n(i)ŋ.
\(^{41}\) Mainz 104 I v 10 yıd¹l against yıd¹kag.
\(^{42}\) Mainz 104 I v 11 yıparlaŋ against yıpar-lag.
\(^{43}\) Emended according to the manuscript Mainz 104 I v 11-12.
\(^{44}\) In the Berlin manuscript U 39 I recto, whose first line is completely missing, apparently
follows the word siziŋ.
\(^{45}\) There is no further evidence for this line. The only allusion to lambs is found in the par-
allel of the Hymn-scroll, cp. ZIEME 2014, 208. Here the lambs (= human beings) are protected
by the shepherds a motif known also from the New Testament.
\(^{46}\) Read ödrülmiş. Berlin (U 39 I r 04) has adırmış, in the same meaning. In SI 6621 the l-
hook seems to be forgotten.
\(^{47}\) The sentence ends in bulun boltum. The Kyoto fragment Ot.Ry.11086 has it, too.
\(^{48}\) Ms D özütümin.
\(^{49}\) Ms D ö-grünčü.
\(^{50}\) Ms D köñül-ümün.
\(^{51}\) The translation follows that of L. Clark, deviating in some places to take account of new
readings.
Now, my God, I have seen you. I will not die! You are like the eternal light and living tree. Your whole self is strongly awake and perceiving, your fruit is the good heart and the great law.

And your fragrance is flawless, you are the one who understands, you are the wisdom. I pray to your majesty. Deign to give your grace, my God.

Forever and unceasingly deign to bring to me understanding and knowledge, my God.

Deign to bring to life my Self! From the state of falling (into hell) because of killing save my soul.

Save me from the dark enemies. Keep me far from the sons of the evildoer, the Devil!

Let me enter into your fragrant and aromatic orchard!

[Deign to keep] your light sheep that are in your breast!

And may I fully become able for your special praising and for the godly belief. Why? Because I am yours! I have become a captive in you. I pray to you. I beseech you on behalf of my self. My king! My Lord who intercedes on behalf of my soul! My god who reveals joy to my Living Self! My Father who enlightens my mind!

Commentary

From the new fragment (ms. C) it is evident that the order of the fragments of ms. A has to be changed, although A. v. Le Coq wrote that he edited the fragments in the order they were found. At least for the part covered by manuscript C the sequence can now be established as follows: U 53 I verso – Mainz 104 I recto – Mainz 104 I verso – U 39 I recto.

It is a task for the future to find out the correct order of the other leaves of manuscript A.

Outlook

One has to bear in mind that the fragments known so far represent only a very small proportion of the rich book corpora that once existed in the Manichaean monasteries and cities and among the believers. Although new finds of Manichaean-Turkic texts are rare today, every single leaf such as that edited here enriches our knowledge of the religious culture of the Cen-
tral Asian Manichaean to a greater or lesser degree. One may look forward to new finds in the future to enrich the corpus for further research both into the religious history of pre-Islamic Central Asia and into the language and literature of these who wrote and read these texts.
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