

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

Yutaka Yoshida (Kyoto University)

Abstract: In this article I assemble the three Manichaean Sogdian texts discovered in Turfan which bear out the exchange between Sogdiana and Turfan during the 10th to early 11th centuries. While the first one (Ch/U 6879) proves the importation of cotton cloth from Sogdiana, the other two [LM 20 1552 (23) of the Lushun National Museum and Bāzāklik Letter B] attest the regular correspondence between the Manichaeans of Samarqand and those of Turfan. The Manichaean New Persian texts discovered in Turfan are most likely to represent the literary works of the Manichaeans living in Samanid or Qarakhanid Samarqand. Bāzāklik Letter B was sent by a bishop (aftādān) of the Manichaean community of the town of Tūdh near Samarqand to celebrate the New Year. The addressee was a Teacher Aryāmān Puhr staying in Turfan. Therefore, in the early 11th century the Manichaeans of Samarqand were under the leadership of a moʻżak or Teacher seated in the church of Turfan, possibly what is now called Ruin K. Finally, I dwell on the problems surrounding the so-called Manichaean Letters i and ii and argue that they are connected to the evacuation of Manichaeans from Mesopotamia reported by al-Nadīm as happening during the reign of al-Muqtadir (908-932 CE).

Keywords: Sogdian; Manichaeism; Turfan; Samarqand; Silk Road

Introduction

The heyday of the Silk Roads is no doubt the first half of the Tang Dynasty (618-906 CE). Many foreigners, in particular Sogdians or *huren* 胡人, came to China and settled in Chinese cities like Changan and Luoyang, where things related to *hu* 胡 such as *bufu* 胡服 “Sogdian dress”, *hushi* 胡食 “Sogdian food”, etc. were very popular.^① Many books about the history of the Silk Roads spend the bulk of pages on the relationship between China and the West during and before this period.^② Consequently, not much is written and known about the Silk Road history after the Anlushan Rebellion (755-763 CE), since when Tang China evacuated Central Asia and lost the interest in what was happening in that area. During this period the Islamization of Sogdiana happened

① E. Schafer, *The golden peaches of Samarkand. A study of Tang exotics*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1963, reprint 1985 is still the best book on this subject.

② One may refer to É. de la Vaissière, tr. J. Ward, *Sogdian traders. A history*, Leiden: Brill, 2005, which has now become a standard work. The third revised edition of its French original, *Histoire des marchands sogdiens*, has just appeared in 2016. One of the latest works is V. Hansen, *The Silk Road. A new history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. For us Japanese, T. Moriyasu, *The Silk Road and the Tang Empire* (in Japanese), Tokyo, 2007 is the most popular and informative.

to be underway and it gives a popular impression that the Silk Road trade came to an end after the Islamization. Nevertheless, the trade did survive and its traces are abundantly found among the Dunhuang documents of the 10th century, where productions of the Islamic West are recorded.^① As for another oasis city Turfan, one may refer to a passage in Gardīzī's *Zayn al-Akbbār* (ca 1049-1052 CE); in connection with the residence of a qaghan of the West Uighur kingdom or the Toğuz Oğuz country it records as follows: His (i.e. qaghan's, Y.Y.) floor-coverings are made of felt. But over these are spread carpets made by Muslims ..."^② In fact fragments of the textiles produced in the Islamic world have been discovered among the Turfan remains.^③

In this article, I assemble the three Turfan Sogdian texts of Manichaean affiliation that point to the relationship or exchange between Sogdiana and Turfan during the 10th to the early 11th centuries.

I Cotton cloth of Sogdiana and Qarašahr

First let us see the text and translation of an unpublished fragment Ch/U 6879,^④ which attests an interesting expression *šwδ'ny ws'yny* "cotton cloth of Sogdiana". It is a fragment of 21,6 cm x 11,2 cm and is written on the backside of a Chinese Buddhist text corresponding to *Taišo Tripitaka*, vol. 7, 700c12-23, part of the Chinese version of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*. Judging from the width of the fragment (11,2 cm), more than half is missing from the left-hand margin of the original paper, which was more or less 26 cm wide. Consequently, one cannot provide consecutive translation of the text. Manichaean affiliation of the text is made certain by *δyn''βr''y* "elect, Manichaean monk". Since the bulk of Manichaean texts discovered in Turfan are believed to go back to the 10th to the early 11th centuries,^⑤ there is practically no doubt that this manuscript written in late cursive script is also dated to the same period.

Ch/U 6879^⑥: TEXT

1 [(.w ...)	rt['yw''xr''ny ?]
2	zm''š''yky	kwrδy o nw'[]
3	'δry	'rk-c''ny ws'yny (.)	[
4	'rk-c''ny o	'βt' kwm'n[]
5	ws'yny oo	ctβ'r 'yw''x(r)[]
6	δyn''βr''y	wx(w)šw	pr(t)[

① Rong Xinjiang's article may be referred to: "Khotanese felt and Sogdian silver: Foreign gifts to Buddhist monasteries in 9th and 10th-century Dunhuang (in Chinese)", in idem, *The Silk Road and cultural interaction between East and West* (in Chinese), Beijing, 2015, pp.263-277.

② Cf. A. P. Martinez, "Gardīzī's two chapters on the Turks", *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, Tomus II, 1982, pp.109-175., esp. p.135; Professor T. Moriyasu drew my attention to a passage in the *Songhuiyaojigao*, Vol.197, p.7720, where the nine ministers of the Uighur Kingdom are mentioned as wearing garments of brocade and damask produced in *Dashiguo* "Islamic countries".

③ K. Sakamoto, "Two fragments of luxury cloth discovered in Turfan: Evidence of textile circulation from West to East", in D. Durkin-Meisterernst, et al. (eds.), *Turfan revisited - The first century of research into the arts and cultures of the Silk Road*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2004, pp.297-302.

④ On this fragment see Ch. Reck, *Mitteliranische Handschriften. Teil 1. Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischer Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift* (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Band XVIII, 1), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2006, p.282, no. 394.

⑤ For the exact dating of the Turfan Manichaean texts one may refer to the so-called Manichaean calendars written in Sogdian and Uighur. So far the following dates have been proposed: Sogdian, (1) M796 = 929-930 CE, (2) Otani 6191 = 932-933 CE, (3) M148=984-985 CE, (4) M5268 = 1000-1001 CE; Uighur, (5) Ch/U 6932 = 988- 989 CE, (6) U495 = 989-990 CE, (7) No. 88 in the *Tulufankaoquji* of Xuang Wenbi = 1002-1003 CE. On the Sogdian texts see Yoshida, "Buddhist influence on the bema festival?" in C. G. Cereti, M. Maggi and E. Provasi (eds.), *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia. Studies in honour of Professor G. Gnoli on the occasion of his 65th birthday on 6th December 2002*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2003, pp.453-458. For the Uighur calendars see J. Hamilton, "Calendriers manichéens ouïgours de 988, 989, et 1003", in J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont and R. Dor (eds.), *Mélanges offerts à Louis Bazin par ses disciples, collègues et amis*, Paris, 1992, pp.7-23.

⑥ For the photograph see the following web-site: http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/ch_u/images/chu6879versototal.jpg (accessed on 12th August 2016).

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

7 pncw prt kwm'n[]
8 'yw xw'nš'y wcnv w(r)[nh?]
9 swγδ'ny wš'yny kwrδy[]
10 (w)[š'yn](y) 'yw knpy 20+20+20 oo[]
11 [ty]m δβrw 10+iii 'rk-c'ny[]
12 (wxw)šwmy m'xy wx[w]šw[syty']
13 δy[n']βr('y ^a p)ncw prt(w)[]
14 (ZY 'δry kw)[m'n?]

(a) What I read *βr* looks more like *kr*.

TRANSLATION

“... a tunic for a novice(?). Nine ... three (pieces of) cotton cloth of Ark ... [made out of cotton cloth] of Ark. Seven (pairs of) trousers(?) ... <5> cotton cloth. Four novices(?) ... For an elect six (pieces of) silk cloth ... five (pieces of) silk cloth for(?) trousers. ... One tablecloth(?), old wool(?) ... Cotton cloth of Sogdiana for a tunic. ... <10> cotton cloth 59 (pieces) ... [More]over, I gave(?) 13 (pieces of) [cotton cloth] of Ark ... The sixth month, on the six[th day] ... (for) an elect five pieces of silk cloth ... and three pairs of trousers(?)”

COMMENTARY

2.1 *z̄m's'yky* “novice(?)”.^① This strange looking word is most likely to be connected with yet another enigmatic word *z̄m's'yktw 'yw'x'ny* encountered in Bāzāklīk Letter A (line 120).^② Commenting on the word, I also referred to *'ywrx'ny z̄m's'yky* found in a Manichaean Uighur text studied by T. Moriyasu.^③ In the both texts the expressions in question appear to denote Manichaean monks of relatively low rank, whence my translation “novice”. It is to be noted that *'ym'x(r)[]* of line 5 seems to be the same word as *'yw'x'ny* or *'ywrx'ny*, although the spellings differ slightly from each other. Minor discrepancy in spellings is again shared by *z̄m's'yky*, *z̄m's'yktw*, and *z̄m's'yky*. The most plausible explanation for this unusual vacillation in the spellings may be looked for in their foreign origin, although the etymologies of the two words are not known. Different order of the two words may perhaps imply that the two words denote two different kinds of novices. Among the Turfan Manichaean wall paintings and miniatures one actually finds two groups of young monks wearing headgears different from those worn by ordinary monks. One is those wearing a flat white hat and the other with a black hat, cf. left side of MIK III 4979 a, b.^④

In view of *δyn'βr'y* in line 6 and possibly in line 13, an unusual spelling of word medial -'-' may belong to our scribe's orthographic peculiarity. Cf. also *z̄m's'yky* and *'ym'x(r)[]*.

2.2 *knrδy* “tunic, shirt”. On this word see also Chr. *qwrthy*.^⑤ It no doubt denotes a white robe worn by electi or Manichaean monks.

3.1 *'rk-c'ny* “of (the city) of Ark (i.e. what is now Qarašahr in Xinjiang)”. The feminine form of this adjective is

① Reck, *op. cit.*, p.282, no. 394 reads *z̄m's'n'ky*. The two letters before *k* look very similar and Reck's reading is equally possible. See also my comment on the spelling of *δyn'βr'y* below.

② On the three Manichaean Sogdian letters (A, B, C) unearthed from Bāzāklīk and my edition see section III below.

③ Cf. T. Moriyasu, *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, (originally published in Japanese in 1990-1991), pp.85-86.

④ It is reproduced in Zs. Gulácsi, *Manichaean art in Berlin collections*, Turnhout 2001, pp.71, 245. Young monks wearing a flat hat are also seen in two different art objects, cf. Gulácsi, *ibid.*, pp.90, 204. Gulácsi remarks as follows: “... its (flat hat, Y.Y.) connection with a specific rank, geographic or ethnic group within the Manichaean church is uncertain”, cf. *ibid.*, p.204. Yet another word meaning “novice” is suggested in Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst, *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2012, p.94a s.v. *ju'nwtr*.

⑤ On this word see W. Sundermann, “Nachlese zu F. W. K. Müllers 'Soghdischen Texten I', 2. Teil”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 3, 1975, pp.55-90, esp. p.85, n. 146.

attested in L44, line 7: *r'ke'nch* (*x'rw'nb*) “(Uighur) queen of Ark”.^①

3.2 *ns'yny* “cotton cloth”. This word was first recognized by Sims-Williams, cf. Sims-Williams and J. Hamilton, *Documents turco-sogdiens du IX^e-X^e siècle de Touen-houang*, London 1990, pp.56-57.^② In the light of the words surviving in the text one may suppose that it is a document recording expenditure of textiles for making the dresses of Manichaean monks and novices. A similar Chinese text of 747 CE is known among the Turfan Chinese documents.^③ It is a document issued by a certain Buddhist temple and records the expenditure of cotton cloth for making the spring/summer dress (*chunyi* 春衣) worn by the workers attached to the temple. Three kinds of dresses are mentioned there: (a) *shan* 衫 “shirt”, *kun* 褌 “drawers”, and *ku* 袴 “trousers”.

4 *kwm'n* “trousers(?)”. Since *kwrðy* could be the Sogdian equivalent of *shan* 衫 “shirt”, one may compare *kwm'n* with Khotanese *kaumadai* “trousers”^④, although the phonetic similarity is admittedly slight.^⑤

5 *yw'x(r)[]* “novice(?)”. On this word see above.

6 *prr* “silk cloth(?)”^⑥. I take the word for a Sogdianized form of Skt. *pata* “silk cloth, etc.”. On Niya Prakrit *pata* and related forms see H. Lüders, “Textilien im alten Turkistan”, *APAW*, no. 3, Berlin, 1936, pp.24-28. On the pleonastic *r* in transcribing the Indian retroflex sound, cf. also *kwrty* “ten million” for *koti* and *pwrry'nyb* “religious merit” for *punya*.

8.1 *xw'ns'y* “tablecloth(?)”. My translation is a simple guess based on the assumption that *xw'n* is an element corresponding Middle Persian *xw'n* “table” widely used in Manichaean Sogdian and Uighur texts in the meaning of “cloth set with food, communal meal”. Recently, the Chinese equivalent *shidan* 食单 was discovered by Wang Ding.^⑦ On the other hand, if *xw'n* corresponds to *guan* 冠 “cap, head dress” (Middle Chinese **kuân*^⑧), *xw'ns'y* may be taken to mean “headgear, crown”, but I am not able to find the suitable Chinese character for the second element *s'y*.

8.2 *w(r)[nb]* “wool”. This restoration is again nothing more than my conjecture. On Sogdian *wrrnb* “wool” found in a medical text Pelliot sogdien 19, see E. Benveniste *Textes sogdiens*, Paris 1940, p.232.^⑨

11.1 *ðβrw*. My translation “I gave” is based on the presumption that it is an error for *ð'βrw*. In the light of the impersonal neuter preterite *xwrtw* “it was eaten” attested in Mug documents,^⑩ it may also be possible to take it for an error for **ðβrtw* “it was given”. Whatever the case may be, 1 sg. injunctive of *ðβr-* “to give” is most unexpected in the context.

11.2 A short line is drawn between lines 11 and 12. Since a date is entered in line 12, this short line may mark the end of the preceding entry or section, which would have been headed by another date earlier than the 6th of the 6th month.^⑪

① Cf. Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst, *op. cit.*, p.18a.

② See now also its English version: *Turco-Sogdian documents from 9th-10th century Dunhuang*, London: SOAS, 2015, pp.67-68.

③ The text is published in O. Ikeda, *Ancient Chinese household registers and related documents* (in Japanese), Tokyo, 1979, p.472, no. 214. For the text and translation see Appendix below.

④ Cf. H. Bailey, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, p.58b.

⑤ It may also be compared with Skt. *kaupina*, of which the Chinese equivalent is *kun* 褌 “drawers”, cf. W. Ogihara (ed.), *Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary with reference to the Chinese equivalents*, reprint, Tokyo, 1979, p.382b. Cf. also *kwm'p'n* discussed below.

⑥ In Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst, *op. cit.*, p.144a, *prr* is translated “roll of cloth” with a query and Lüders’s work is referred to. It is interesting to see that when *prr* is attested three times in this text, it is always accompanied by *ðyn'βr'y*. Different textiles, cotton and silk, appear to have been issued respectively to novices and ordinary monks.

⑦ Wang Ding, “Tablecloth and the Chinese Manichaean hymn *Shou shidan ji* 收食单偈”, in *East Asian studies. Festschrift in honor of the retirement of Professor Takata Tokio*, Kyoto, 2014, pp.438-454.

⑧ Middle Chinese forms are cited from B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1957.

⑨ *wrr'n* attested in a medical text, So 14822 (unpublished), seems to be the same word.

⑩ Cf. Yoshida, “Sogdian”, in G. Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian languages*, London and New York: Routledge, 2009, pp.279-335., esp. p.301.

⑪ This may have been the 6th day of the first month, if the second section beginning in line 12 records the issue of cloth covering the latter half of the year. Is it just a coincidence that the sixth day of the first month is the very last day of the fast lasting 28 days beginning on the 8th day of the preceding month?

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

The two kinds of cotton cloth mentioned in the text are *rk-c'ny wš'yny* “cotton cloth of Ark”^① and *swγδ'ny wš'yny* “cotton cloth of Sogdiana”. Similarly in the contemporary Chinese documents from Dunhuang two kinds of cotton cloth are encountered: *moluxie* 末祿縹 “cotton cloth of Merv” and *anxixie* 安西縹 “cotton cloth of Anxi, i.e. Kucha”, cf. E. Trombert, “Une trajectoire d’ouest en est sur la Route de la Soie”, in: *La Persia e l’Asia centrale de Alessandro al X secolo*, Rome 1996 (Atti dei convegni Lincei 127), pp.205-227. I venture to suppose that the two expressions in the Sogdian text correspond to the two in Chinese respectively, especially because Ark is a next oasis city to the east of Kucha usually referred to as Anxi.^② The cotton cloth produced in Western Turkestan may have been referred to as either “cotton cloth of Sogdiana” or “cotton cloth of Merv” in China. In the eyes of the scribe of Ch/U 6879, one kind of cotton cloth was produced in Sogdiana and the other in Ark or Qarašahr. In any case the former must have been imported from or via Sogdiana.^③ Accordingly, this document suggests the trade conducted between Sogdiana and Turfan.

In concluding this section, I should like to cite yet another similar Manichaean Sogdian document belonging to the Otani collection now preserved in the Lushun National Museum, China. All these manuscripts were discovered in Turfan by the Otani expedition. The text in question bears a signature LM20 1514/528 in the museum and was reproduced in: Lushun Museum and Ryukoku University (eds.), *Selected fragments of Chinese Buddhist texts from Xinjiang region in Lushun Museum*, Kyoto 2006, p.160. It measures 5.9 cm x 38.3 cm. Approximately three quarters of the sheet are lost from the left hand margin and only one or two words have survived from each line. The Sogdian text is written on the backside of a Buddhist Chinese text, which is again a part of the Chinese version of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra* but is too small to be identified with a particular place in this gigantic and repetitive Chinese text.^④

LM20 1514/528 verso

1	δyn'βr'y?	elect ...
2	kwrδy XII[a tunic, 12+x ...
3	XI prt'y[eleven pieces of silk cloth(?) ...
4	'yw'x'[rny?	novice ...
5	'βt'[seven ...
6	'δw p'n(.)[two ? ^⑤ ...
7	tym '(y)[w	moreover, one ...
8	tym 'ny(w)[yet another ...
9	'yw prt(?)[y	one piece of silk cloth ...
10	kwmp'n[trousers(?) ...
11	wšyny kw[rδy	cotton cloth, a tunic ...
12	'δry wr[nh(?)	three pieces of woolen cloth(?) ...

prt'y could be the same word as *prt* or a form derived from it. *'yw'x'[]* is likely to be compared with *'yw'x'ny*, etc., while *kwmp'n* may be a spelling variant of *kwm'n* discussed above.

① Professor T. Moriyasu drew my attention to the Uighur equivalent *solmi böc* “cotton cloth of (the country) Solmi or Qarašahr” found in an Uighur letter, cf. S.-Ch. Raschmann, *Baumwolle im türkischen Zentralasien*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1995, p.55.

② Cf. Trombert, *ibid.*, p.225.

③ Nevertheless, every oasis city of Turkestan could have its own cotton cloth. An oasis of PHEMA near Khotan was famous for its fine cotton cloth named *ganchengxixie* 紺城細縹 “fine cotton cloth of Gancheng or city of PHEMA”, cf. Rong Xinjiang, art. cit., p.271. See also idem, “Reality or tale? Marco Polo’s description of Khotan”, *Journal of Asian history* 49, 2015, pp.161-174, esp. p.171.

④ After line 12 a blank space of two lines and several incomplete lines follow. However, only beginnings of words are left and their relationship to the main text is hard to see. Here in this article I omitted this part.

⑤ Since either a name of a textile or dress is expected, *p'n* “table” does not seem to suit the context.

II Mention of Samarqand in a Manichaean Sogdian text

Yet another text belonging to the Otani Turfan collection preserved in the Lushun National Museum, LM 20 1552 (23) P.22. 9, is an oblong fragment measuring 11.0 cm by 27.0 cm.^① It is written only on one side and the verso is left blank. One can see a place where two sheets of paper were glued together, which indicates that the fragment comes from a longer scroll. Its Manichaean affiliation is made certain by such expressions as *'δw wkry 'ncmn* “twofold community” and *δy-np'šyt pryšty-(t)* “angels protecting the (Manichaean) religion”.^② Being a Manichaean text discovered in Turfan, the manuscript is also likely to be dated to the 10th century; this dating seems to be corroborated again by its late cursive handwriting. Unfortunately, what has been preserved in this fragmentary text is too meagre to identify the contents. Nevertheless, the fact that the text was written on a scroll of which the verso was left blank leads one to presume that it comes from a long letter like the two letters discovered in Bāzāklik. As we shall see below, the surviving words are compatible with this assumption, because the parallel expressions occur in the two Bāzāklik letters.

LM 20 1552 (23) P.22. 9: TEXT

- 1 [](m. . ZY s)[](. . .)[](m)γwnw
- 2 [mδy-c]yk 'δw wkry 'ncmn^a o βγ'nyk 'nt'c ZY sytm'nw
- 3 [](y-)t šyrxwz-yty 'pryw (o) pr 'nz-'wy-n'kw^b xwβw []
- 4 [yšwy](t) o Z(Y)[mγw](n) δy-np'šyt pryšty-(t)[]
- 5 [prn ZY w'xšykt?]ptnw smr[kn](δ)[h]^c
- 6 [](.) 'x[]

(a) A short line is written across the final stroke of *-n*. It is not clear what this short line is meant to be. (b) Two dots below the letter *z*. (c) The typical upper part of a letter *δ* (lamed) has survived and there is no doubt about the restoration of *δ*.

TRANSLATION

“... the whole twofold community staying [here]; together with the holy assembly and the entire [... and] friends; by [...] of the redeeming lord [Jesus]; [... all] the angels protecting the religion, [guardian spirits ...] the town of Samar[qand ...]”

COMMENTARY

2.1 [*mδy-c*]yk “(residing) here”. My restoration is a sheer guess. In principle [*tδy-c*]yk is equally possible.

2.2 *'δw wkry 'ncmn* “twofold community”. The combination also appears in M 697A and in Bāzāklik Letters A and B edited by me.^③ Its Uighur counterpart *iki ančman* is rendered by P. Zieme as “zwei Konvente (consisting of male and female believers)”.^④ This assumption is supported by the Kephalaion 87: “Now the holy church exists in two forms: in the brothers and the sisters”.^⑤ Differently A. van Tongerloo,^⑥ who considers the two communities to be consisting of clerical and secular congregations.

① This text was once published by me: “Sogdian materials in the Lushun Museum (in Japanese)”, in Lushun Museum and Ryukoku University (eds.), *Buddhist manuscripts excavated in Central Asia*, Kyoto, 2012, pp.39-53, esp. pp.41-44, 53.

② The two expressions are encountered in the Bāzāklik letters to be discussed in the next section.

③ For the three Bāzāklik letters and my edition see the next section.

④ Cf. idem, “Ein uigurischer Text über die Wirtschaft manichäischer Klöster im uigurischen Reich”, in L. Ligeti (ed.), *Researches in Altaic languages*, Budapest, 1975, pp.331-338, esp. pp.332-333.

⑤ Cf. I. Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the teacher*, Leiden / New York / Köln: Brill, 1995, p.225.

⑥ van Tongerloo, “L'identité de l'église manichéenne orientale (env. 8e s. ap. J.-C.). La communauté des croyants: ir. hnzmn/'njmn, ouig. ančm(a)n”, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 12, 1981, pp.265-272, esp. p.272.

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

3 *βy'nyk 'nt'c ZY sytm'n [](t) šyrxwz-yty 'pryw* “together with the holy assembly and the entire [...] and] friends”. This expression may perhaps refer to the divine or holy group of people, i.e. clergymen, and secular supporters of the Manichaean church.^①

3-4 *'nz- ny-n'kw xwβw [yšwy]* “redeeming lord Jesus”. For the restoration of *yšwy* cf. *'nz- 'wm'y xwβw yšwy* encountered in Bāzāklik Letter A, lines 76 and 106. On the combination of the preposition *pr* and *yšw* see *pr xwβw*^② *yšwy frm'mw δstwβry* (Bāzāklik Letter A, 19; Bāzāklik Letter B, 77-78) “one who has authority by the command of Lord Jesus”.^③ Therefore, it is tempting to restore *[yšwy δstwβr](y)*, but the damaged letter does look like *r* rather than *y*.

4-5 *[mym](n) δy-np'šyt pryšty-(t) [prn ZY w'xšykt]*. On this restoration see *mymnw δyn-p'šytw pryšt'kt(y) [prn] ZY w'xšykyt* (Bāzāklik Letter A, 77-78) “all the guardian angels, [glories] and guardian spirits of the religion”.

5.1 *ptmw* “town”. This word was borrowed from Indian *pattana* “id.”. It has been attested not only in Manichaean but also Buddhist Sogdian texts^④ and was well naturalized in Sogdian.

5.2 *smr[kn](δ)[h]*. The original name of Samarqand has been attested once on the envelope of Ancient Letter II: *sm'rknδh*. An adjective derived from it is encountered in Ancient Letter II, Mug documents, and the Ladakh inscription;^⑤ in all the texts it is spelled *sm'rknδc* except for one Mug document A14, where *smrknδc* is attested twice.^⑥ Since very few words begin with *smr-* followed by *δ*, there is practically no doubt about this restoration.

Mention of Samarqand in this text is presumably understood as indicating that it was dispatched either to or from Samarqand, and hence that during the 10th century exchange was held between the Manichaeans of Turfan and those of Samarqand. In fact existence of the Manichaean community in the Samarqand area in the 10th century was witnessed by such contemporary Islamic scholars as Ibn al-Nadīm (932-990 CE) and Al-Bīrūnī (973- ca. 1050 CE); Manichaeism is also mentioned in the *Hudūd al-'Ālam* (982/983 CE) in connection with Samarqand.^⑦ See also the fact that one ruler of the West Uighur Kingdom showed special concern about the ill fate of those Manichaeans who escaped from Babylon and took refuge in Samarqand during the reign of al-Muqtadir (908-932 CE). I cite Reeves's translation of the relevant passage of Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*:^⑧

The last time when they were visible was during the reign of al-Muqtadir (908-932 CE), when they kept close to Khurāsān. Out of fear for their lives, those of them who were left concealed their affairs and roamed about

① If this interpretation is correct, it lends support to van Tongerloo's understanding of *'dw wkery 'ncmn* mentioned above. However, since the notion of two communities comprising clergymen and clergywomen is so common not only in Manichaeism but also in Buddhism (cf. *erbuseng* 二部僧 “two groups of monks consisting of male and female”), I stick to my understanding of the expression.

② In Letter B one reads *xwt'w* instead of *xwβw*.

③ Cf. also *pr xwβw yšwy-y δstwβry* (Bāzāklik Letter B, 13-14) “one who has authority by (the help of) Lord Jesus”.

④ Cf. W. B. Henning, “Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch”, *APAW* 1936, No. 10, p.83, s.v. 698 and Sims-Williams, “Indian Elements in Parthian and Sogdian.” In K. Röhrborn et al. (eds.), *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983, pp.132-141.

⑤ Samarqand is referred to in one of the old inscriptions discovered in Kultobe, Kazakhstan. In the inscription the adjective is spelled *symkentc*, cf. Sims-Williams with F. Grenet and A. Podushkin, “Les plus anciens monuments de la langue sogdienne: Les inscriptions de Kultobe au Kazakhstan”, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 2007, pp.1005-1034. On the employment of *t* instead of *δ* in this very early monument see Sims-Williams, “From Aramaic to Manchu: Prehistory, life and after-life of the Sogdian script”, in Rong Xinjiang and Luo Feng (eds.), *Sogdians in China: New evidence in archaeological finds and unearthed texts*, Beijing, 2016, pp.414-421.

⑥ For the editions of these texts see the following publications: (1) Ancient Letter II: Sims-Williams, “The Sogdian Ancient Letter II”, in M. G. Schmidt and W. Bisang (eds.), *Philologica et Linguistica, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für H. Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag*, Trier, 2001, pp.267-280; (2) Mug documents: V. A. Livshitz, *Sogdian epigraphy of Central Asia and Semirech'e*, London, 2015; (3) Ladakh inscription: Sims-Williams, “The Sogdian inscriptions of Ladakh”, in K. Jettmar (ed.), *Antiquities of northern Pakistan*, vol. 2, Mainz, 1993, pp.151-163 + plates.

⑦ Relevant passages of the three Islamic sources are collected and translated by J. Reeves, *Prolegomena to a history of Islamicate Manichaeism*, Sheffield / Oakville, 2011, pp.227-230.

⑧ Reeves, *ibid.*, p.228.

in this region. (Eventually) around five hundred of their members gathered together in Samarqand. When their business became public, the governor of Khurāsān sought to put them to death. Then the king of China — I think it was (actually) the lord of the Toghuzghuz — sent a message to him saying: ‘In my country there are many more Muslims than there are people of my religion in your country,’ and he swore to him that if he should kill a single one of them, he would kill the whole community (of Muslims) who were with him. (He also promised) he would demolish the mosques and leave among the remaining lands lookouts against the Muslims in order to (identify and) kill them. So the governor of Khurāsān refrained from harming them, and accepted the *jizya* from them.

Since al-Nadīm’s *Fihrist* was drafted in 987 CE, the ruler of the Toghuzghuz mentioned by him is to be identified with one of the West Uighur qaghans, who were supporters of the Manichaean religion.

III Bāzāklīk Letters

In 1981 three Manichaean Sogdian and five Uighur letters were unearthed from one of the caves in Bāzāklīk. The three Sogdian texts were edited by the present author in: Turfan Antiquarian Bureau (ed.), *Studies in the new Manichaean texts recovered from Turfan*, Beijing, 2000, pp.3-199. Three letters are called Letters A, B, and C. Letter A measures 26 cm by 268 cm and comprises 135 lines. Its left-hand margin is badly damaged and the damage is greater towards the end than the beginning. Letter B (79 lines) measures 26 cm by 133 cm and Letter C (29 lines) 30 cm by 45.5 cm; the both are preserved almost intact. While Letter C is written on one sheet of paper, Letters A and B are scrolls consisting of several sheets of paper glued together. Letter A differs from Letter B in that it shows a miniature between lines 25 and 26; it depicts a mitre of a Teacher or moʻżak and two musicians in full colour. The miniature is painted on a narrower sheet of paper than the others and was glued between two sheets of paper constituting the body of the letter.

III-1 Dating of the letters^①

Letter C is sent by a monk called Shāh Wispuhr (*šʿy wɣspwɣr*) to his elder Khwar Zādag (*xwʿr ʒ-δʿk*) and is more private than the others; it mentions as many as 19 acquaintances of the addressor bearing Uighur names such as Lord Inčü Bilgä Tirāk (*ɣncw pylkʿ tyrʿk xwβw*) and asks the addressee to send his greetings to them. Letters A and B were sent to one and the same addressee named Mār Aryāmān Puhr (*mɣ ʿyʿmʿn pwxr*), who was a moʻżak or Teacher of eastern diocese (*xwrsnyk mwxʿk*). The two were dispatched to celebrate the New Year and are very similar to each other in that they share almost identical hyperbole expressions praising the Teacher. They also share the feature of bearing crimson seal impressions in various places of the letters, which seems to indicate more official nature of the letters. Nevertheless, while the body of Letter A consists in the wish of auspiciousness for the New Year, Letter B lists the religious services conducted by the addressor and his colleague monks during the month of fast (*cxʿpt mʿx*), which is the 12th luni-solar month preceding the New Year.

When I first published the letters I dated them vaguely to the latter half of the 10th century, because it was once shown by Taqizadeh that toward the end of the 10th century in the West Uighur Kingdom, the month of fast was moved ahead by one month from its original position, and because there seemed to me to be no other indication specifying the exact date.^② However, it was Professor T. Moriyasu who drew my attention to the fact

① This is a somewhat enlarged version of my discussion published in the following article: Yoshida, “Manichaean Sogdian letters discovered in Bāzāklīk”, in *Annuaire résumé des conférences et travaux* (École Pratique des Hautes Études. Section des sciences religieuses) Tome 109, 2000-2001[2002], pp.233-236.

② Originally, the Manichaean month of fast fell on the first luni-solar month of the Chinese calendar, cf. Taqizadeh *apud* Henning, “The Manichaean fasts”, *JRAS* 1945, pp.146-164, esp. p.160. Letters A and B are in fact dated toward the end of each letter. While almost nothing is left from this part of Letter A, Letter B states that it was written on Monday the sixth day of the month of Pushnu (*pwxnm*) or the first luni-solar month. This dating is far from specific enough to find the exact year.

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

that a name with a title Isig Ädgü Totoq Ögä (*ʾysyk ʾδkw twtwy ʾnyk*) appears both in Letter C and the two Uighur stake inscriptions of 1008 and 1019 CE, (respectively, Stake Inscriptions I and III) and suggested that the two could represent one and the same person.^① Following his suggestion I compared the proper names found in the three letters with those of the two stake inscriptions.^② Apart from one suggested by Moriyasu, another three names were discovered in the two groups of texts: (1) Alp Totoq Ögä (*ʾp twtwx ʾnyk*: Letter A and the two Uighur inscriptions), (2) Sariy Baš Tarqan (*sryy pʾs trx'n*)^③ and (3) Asmiš Tängirim (*ʾsmyš tñkrym*)^④ (Letter C and the inscription of 1008 CE).

Especially noteworthy is Alp Totoq Ögä. Letter A (line 123) mentions him as a leader (after the qaghan) heading the lay community of Qočo, where the Teacher was seated: *tðy byk(k)[yr'nw nymš'kptw] ʾp twtwx ʾnyk* “there (where you are), outside (with respect to secular matters,) [the leader of the auditors] Alp Totoq Ögä”. The Uighur minister (Ögä) bearing the same name appears in the following titles: *qočo baliq bägi alp totoq ögä* “the head of the City of Qočo, Alp Totoq Ögä (Stake Inscription I, line 18) and *[el] ögäsi alp totoq ögä qutluq qočo uluṣny baṣlayur ärkän* “the prime minister Alp Totoq Ögä is the head of the fortunate country of Qočo” (Stake Inscription III, lines 3-4). Accordingly, Alp Totoq Ögä was promoted from the head of the City of Qočo to the prime minister who was in charge of the entire country of Qočo by 1019. Although one does not know what title Alp Totoq Ögä bore in Letter A, the three names shared by Letter C and Stake Inscription I of 1008 CE induce one to date Letters A, B and C nearer to Stake Inscription I of 1008 CE than to III of 1019 CE.^⑤ Letter B is dated on Monday the 6th of the first month, and if one looks up the Chinese calendar of the early 11th century, the sixth day of the first month falls on Monday in the years 1007 (27th January), 1010 (23rd January), and 1014 (8th February). In any case, all the three Bāzāklīk letters are most likely to go back to the early 11th century.^⑥

III-2 Twδ kδ, the place of dispatch mentioned in Letter B

The West Uighur Kingdom had two capitals; one for winter is Qočo and the other for summer, Bešbaliq or Beiting 北庭, today's Jimsar located some 120 km to the north of Qočo. In Letter A (lines 42-44 and 96-97) the Uighur qaghan is mentioned as staying with Aryāmān Puhr; it is most expected that the qaghan stayed in the winter capital during the New Year's season. Since princes and princesses, the members of the royal family, are mentioned with the addressor (lines 125-127), the most likely place of dispatch for Letter A is the winter capital Bešbaliq. In the light of the fact that Letter C mentions the several people bearing Uighur names as having departed from the place where the addressor is staying, it is fitting to suppose that the letter was sent from a locality well within the territory of the West Uighur Kingdom. In this respect Letter B differs from the other two in that no Uighur names are found in it. This situation suggests that Letter B was dispatched from the place outside of the kingdom. In fact the place of dispatch is referred to in Letter B as *twδ-kδ: mðy ms twδ-kδcykw prn-w'xjykw* (line 70) “here again, the guardian spirits of the town of Tūdh”. In my old study published in 2000, I

① His idea is mentioned in Yoshida and Moriyasu, “Manichaean Sogdian and Uighur letters unearthed in Bāzāklīk, Turfan (in Japanese)”, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*, Vol. 15, 2000, pp.135-178., esp. p.178.

② The two inscriptions were driven into the ground when stupas were built and the names of donors were written on them. For the text and translation of the two inscriptions see Moriyasu, “Uighur Buddhist stake inscriptions from Turfan”, in L. Bazin and P. Zieme (eds.), *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommages à J. R. Hamilton*, Turnhout, 2001, pp.149-233.

③ I now abandon my old reading Sariy Bars Tarqan (*sryy prs trx'n*) in favour of Moriyasu's Sariy Baš Tarqan.

④ Moriyasu reads Asmiš, but for the reading of Asmiš see Sims-Williams and Hamilton, *Documents turco-sogdiens ...*, p.59.

⑤ On the other hand, as Sundermann argued, not only Buddhism spread but also Manichaean literature flourished in particular under the qaghan mentioned in Stake Inscription III, Kün Ay Tängriä Qut Bulmiš Uluq Qut Ornanmiš Alpiñ Ärdämin Il Tutmiš Alp Arslan Qutluq Köl Bilgä Tängri Xan, and the Bāzāklīk letters may possibly be considered against this historical background, cf. Sundermann, “Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts concerning the Turfan region”, in: A. Cadonna (ed.), *Turfan and Tun-huang. The texts*, Florence, 1992, pp.63-84., esp. p.70.

⑥ This dating no doubt applies to the other five letters in Uighur, which were discovered with the Sogdian letters.

suggested identifying *twδ* with a place named Tūdh which is recorded in an Islamic source as located within three farsangs or some 18 km from Samarqand.^①

Later when I came to recognize through Dodge's translation of the *Fibrīst* that Tūnkath (*twnkθ*) is mentioned by al-Nadīm as a town in Sogdiana where numerous Manichaeans were resident in his time, I proposed to identify *twδ-kδ* with al-Nadīm's *twnkθ*, which could have been a corruption of **twδkθ* due to the similarity of Arabic letters *n* (nūn) and *δ* (dhāl).

This people [the Manichaeans], who are called Ajārā, are at Rustāq, Samarqand, Ṣughd (Sughd), and especially Tūnkath.^②

In his note, Dodge infers that *twnkθ* was located in the Shash or Tashkent region. In the meantime, Moriyasu and I discovered that one Manichaean Uighur text mentions a donator originating from the area around Talas, and that the text can be shown to date back to the early 11th century.^③ Thus, my suggestion of identifying *twδ-kδ* with al-Nadīm's *twnkθ* seems to be supported. However, later I came to understand that Dodge's translation is not the only possible rendering of the Arabic original, but several other versions have been proposed.

(1) Diese Manichäer heissen Adschārī und leben auf den Dörfern von Samarqand, Sogd und vorzugsweise in Nūnkath. (Flügel)^④

(2) An-Nadīm sagt aber auch, daß zu seiner Zeit Manichäer in Samarkand, Suḡd und insbesondere **Nawēkaθ* lebten. *Nawēkaθ* ist eher Nawqad Quariš von Samarkand, zwischen Nasaf und Kiš (...) als Nūkath in Shāsh und Īlāq. (Sundermann)^⑤

(3) the remaining Manichaeans in Khurasan are in the district of Samarqand and Sogdiana and especially in *Nawēkaθ*. (de Blois)^⑥

(4) Those people whom they term 'ajārā live in the rural districts of Samarqand, Sogdia, and especially *Nawīkath*. (Reeves, *ibid.*, p.229)

What Dodge read *twnkθ* has been read *Nawēkath*, etc., i.e. *mykθ*, by the other scholars. Unfortunately, where to locate *Nawēkath* has not yet been settled,^⑦ although it is often searched for in the area surrounding Samarqand. It is to be noted that the anonymous author of the *Hudūd al-'Alam* clearly indicates that in his time the area designated as Sughd was located between Buchara and Samarqand, much narrower than what we understand

① Cf. W. Balthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, 2nd ed., London 1957, p.132. On a personal name *twδ'ye* possibly derived from this place name see Sims-Williams, *Sogdian and other Iranian inscriptions of the Upper Indus*, vol. II, London 1992, p.74.

② Cf. B. Dodge, B. 1970: *The Fibrīst of an-Nadīm*, New York, 1970, p.803.

③ Cf. Moriyasu, "Four lectures at the College de France in May 2003. History of Manichaeism among the Uighurs from the 8th to the 11th centuries in Central Asia", in: T. Moriyasu (ed.), *World history reconsidered through the Silk Road*, Osaka 2003, pp.23-111; Yoshida, "Dating of linguistic changes encountered in the texts unearthed from the Silk Road (in Japanese)", *Ex Oriente*, vol. 11, 2004, pp.3-34.

④ Cf. G. Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Manichäismus aus dem Fibrīst*, Leipzig, 1862, p.106.

⑤ Cf. Sundermann, "Ein manichäischer Lehrtext in neupersischer Sprache", in L. Paul (ed.), *Persian origins — Early Judaeo-Persian and the emergence of New Persian*, Wiesbaden, 2003, pp.243-274, esp. p.244.

⑥ Cf. F. de Blois, F. *apud* de Blois and Sims-Williams (eds.), *Dictionary of Manichaean texts*. Vol. II. *Texts from Iraq and Iran*, Turnhout, 2006, pp.26-27, 82-83.

⑦ Since the presence of Manichaeans in the Talas area is suggested by the Uighur text just mentioned, Moriyasu and myself propose to identify *Nawēkath* with the city referred to as *mykθ* in a Mug document, cf. Yoshida, *Studies of the Chinese Manichaean paintings of South Chinese origin preserved in Japan* (in Japanese), Kyoto, 2015, p.35. The town called *mykθ* is generally believed to be the old name of today's Krasnaya Rechka on the left bank of the Chu, cf. Livshitz, *op. cit.*, p.22 with note 3. On this problem see also P. B. Lur'e, "O sledax manixeizma v Srednej Azii", in P. B. Lurje et al. (eds.), *Sogdijcy, ix predšestvenniki, sovremenniki i nasledniki*, St. Petersburg, 2013, pp.219-251, esp. p.251.

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

under the name of Sogdiana or Sogdian speaking area.^① In any case, the town of Tūdh near Samarqand is most likely to be equated rather with what al-Nadīm calls “district of Samarqand” than Nawēkath. Consequently, Letter B was sent from Samarqand to Turfan and betrays the correspondence or exchange between the Manichaean communities of the two cities during the early 11th century.

IV The so-called Manichaean Letters: Letters from Samarqand?

The conclusion reached in the last section induces one to ask whether one can find any other Iranian texts originating from Samarqand among the Turfan materials. One will soon think of those Manichaean New Persian texts discovered from Turfan as likely candidates. Actually, in connection with the dating and the place of origin of the New Persian text studied by him, Sundermann states as follows: “das mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit im 11. Jahrhundert entstand und dessen Heimat Samarkand oder die Sogdiana im weiteren Sinne war”.^② In view of the fact that it is written on parchment rather than paper, one may also assume that one Middle Persian text discovered by A. Stein from the Ruin K (Kao. 0111 = Or. 12452D/3) was also copied in Samarqand.^③ If this assumption is correct, the miniature of the manuscript was also produced there and requires fresh studies from the viewpoint of the history of Manichaean art.

Here I should like to propose that the two so-called Manichaean Letters once studied by Henning and Sundermann were also dispatched from Samarqand.^④ In the letters, in particular Manichaean Letter i, the addressor, who appears to be an indigenous elect, complains about the foreign elects’ misbehaviours, which, in his eyes, obviously transgress the precepts. The fact that the names of two schismatics Mihriyya and Miqlāsiyya are mentioned in the forms of *mybry’nd* “adherents of Mihr” and *mk’lyktyy* “adherents of Miklās” lead both Henning and Sundermann to date the letters to the period before the closing of the schism, which, according to Henning, happened before 880 CE.^⑤ Sundermann also paid attention to the fact that no Uighur element is found in the two letters, and assumed that they were written before the Uighurs’ evacuation from Mongolia in 840 CE.

However, *mybry’nd* and *mk’lyktyy* appearing in damaged and different places, one cannot see the exact relationship between the two adherents. Moreover, even if the schism was closed the adherents of the fractions and consequently their names could continue to exist. In my opinion *mys’nd rymnyt kmbyt swrykty* (Manichaean Letter ii, line 15) “these dirty mean Syrians” are to be identified with those approximately 500 Manichaeans mentioned by al-Nadīm who left Mesopotamia for Samarqand during the reign of al-Muqtadir (908-932 CE). It would certainly be odd if one cannot find any Turkish word or proper name in the Sogdian letters written in the 10th century Turfan.

① Cf. V. Minorsky, V. (tr.) *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam. The Religions of the World. A Persian Geography 372 A.H. – 982 A.D.*, 2nd ed., London 1970, p.113. This understanding of the area covered by Suγd is corroborated by Kāšyari’s statement about Soγd: “They (= Soγdāq) are from Soγd which is between Bukhara and Samarqand”, cf. R. Dankoff and J. Kelly (eds.) 1982-85: *Mahmūd al-Kāšyari, Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luḡat al-Turk)*. 3 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1982-1985, p.352.

② Cf. Sundermann, “Ein manichäischer Lehrtext ...”, p.251. Since the language of Samarqand and Bukhara of the 10th century reported by al-Muqaddasī is nothing but a local variety of New Persian (cf. Yoshida, “Sogdian”, 2009, p.330), Sogdian began to lose its ground by that time.

③ This manuscript was studied by Zs. Gulácsi, U. Sims-Williams, and W. Sundermann, “An illustrated parchment folio from a Middle Persian Manichaean codex in the collection of the British Library”, Or. 12452/D (Kao. 0111), *Journal of Inner Asian art and archaeology*, Vol. 1, 2006, pp.149-155.

④ Henning, “Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus”, *ZDMG* 90, 1936, pp.1-18; Sundermann, “Probleme der Interpretation manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe”, in J. Harmatta (ed.), *From Hecataeus to Al-Ḥunwāriẓmī*, Budapest 1984, pp.289-316; idem., “Eine Re-Edition zweier manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe”, in M. Macuch et al. (eds.), *Iranian languages and texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick memorial volume*, Wiesbaden, 2007, pp.403-421. The English translation of the two letters was published in D. Durkin-Meisterernst, “Was Manichaeism a Merchant Religion?”, in Academia Turfanica / Turfan Museum (eds.), *Journal of Turfan Studies. Essays on Ancient Coins and Silk: Selected Papers, the Fourth International Conference on Turfan Studies*, Shanghai, 2015, pp.245-256.

⑤ As far as I can see, neither Henning nor Sundermann gives the basis for this dating.

Nevertheless, it would come as no surprise if letters sent from Samarqand during the 10th century lack Uighur elements. As a matter of fact, no Uighur form is encountered in Letter B. It may be worth noting that Sundermann himself seriously considered the possibility of connecting the situation described in the Manichaean Letters with the evacuation of Manichaeans from Babylon during the reign of al-Muqtadir. He remarks as follows: Es liegt nahe, das Vordringen der manichäischen Syrer nach Zentralasien dann mit diesem Ereignis (i.e. flight of Manichaeans from Babylon to Samarqand, Y.Y.) zu verbinden und in das 10. Jh. zu datieren.^①

If my assumption concerning the date and the place of dispatch of Manichaean Letter i proves to be correct, the verbs *sn-* “to go up” and *wxʒ* “to go down” found in Manichaean Letter ii may directly refer to the elects’ going back and forth between Samarqand and Turfan:^② *ʾrty cw wʾmw wʾβʾnd skwn kt srδ(ng)t pr ʾympʾzʾkyʾ snʾ(nd) [ʾ]ty δβtyk ʾwxʒʾnd δymyδ wʾxs i pʾryk nʾs xcyʾy* (ii, lines 16-17) “And when they are saying that the leaders go up on the visit and come down again, in this word there is altogether destruction”. Obviously moʒak Māhdād went up to Turfan for replacing the late moʒak Mihrīzad, but there was no gain from that: *pr βyrwʾn myb(rʾy)[zδ] (mwjʾk)yy sryy mʾhdʾd mwjʾk styy cn(d)n (f)[rtryʾ ʾkrtw] (δ)ʾrt* (ii, lines 18-19) “Moʒak Māhdād went up (from Samarqand to Turfan) for replacing the late moʒak Mihrīzad. (But) how much improvement did he do?”.

When dating the Manichaean Letters, Henning, and for that matter Sundermann as well, did not pay attention to the Uighur text written on the verso of Manichaean Letter i, which, according to Menges, was written much later and had nothing to do with the Sogdian text on the recto.^③ When Moriyasu re-edited the Uighur text published by Geng Shimin and Klimkeit, he was able to establish the exact date of the text; he considered the description of the year in Indian terms, which was identified by M. Yano, a specialist of the Indian astrology, with 983 CE.^④ The text was written by an elder (qoʒtar) named Kād Oγul, who complains about the ill fate of one Manichaean temple in Qočo, from which several ornaments were taken away to decorate and to equip a Buddhist temple. Although no connection can be seen between the Sogdian letter and the Uighur text, my dating of the Sogdian letter places the two texts well within the 10th century, when the bulk of the Turfan Manichaean texts are dated.

Since the first half of the 10th century onward when the Mesopotamian Manichaeans came to join the congregation of Samarqand, the organized Manichaean community existed only in Central Asia.^⑤ The sender of Bāzāklik Letter B who led the church of Samarqand was Mānī Wahman (*mʾny wxmn ʾβtʾδʾmw*) and bore a title of bishop (aftādān). Thus, he was inferior to Aryāmān Puhr, who was seated in Turfan and headed the entire community including the Manichaeans of Samarqand. This situation seems to suggest that Aryāmān Puhr was not just a Teacher of the eastern diocese but could also be an archegos of the whole Manichaean church. This assumption may be vindicated by the fact that Aryāmān Puhr is called *pʾʾryrw* “successor, deputy” in Letters A and B. As Sundermann once proved, the word *pʾʾryrw* refers to the paraclete and the successor of Mani.^⑥ Towards the very end of Central Asian Manichaeism during the early 11th century the centre of the entire Manichaean world is likely to have been situated in Turfan.

① Cf. Sundermann, “Probleme ...”, 1984, p.302. Sundermann himself rejects this possibility on the ground that the language and the contents point to much older period.

② On these expressions see also Sundermann, “Probleme ...”, pp.207-208. One may remember that in Sogdian *ʾky kyrʾn* “lit. upwards” and *ʾδr kyrʾn* “lit. downward” also mean respectively “eastward” and “westward”, cf. F. Grenet, in *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 21, 2007[2012], pp.171-175, esp. p.175, n. 54.

③ Cf. Henning, art. cit., pp.17-18, n. 4.

④ Cf. Moriyasu, *Die Geschichte ...*, 2004, pp.174-181. The text was re-edited by L. Clark and Gulácsi cites Clark’s still unpublished translation in her recent work, *Mani’s pictures*, Leiden, 2015, pp.118-123.

⑤ The contemporary Manichaeans of Southern China may well be ignored in this context.

⑥ Cf. Sundermann, “Der Paraklet in der ostmanichäischen Überlieferung”, in P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund, 1988, pp.201-212.

Relationship between Sogdiana and Turfan During the 10th - 11th Centuries as Reflected in Manichaean Sogdian Texts

V Conclusion

In this article I assembled the three Manichaean Sogdian texts discovered in Turfan which bear out the exchange between Sogdiana and Turfan during the 10th to early 11th centuries. While the first one (Ch/U 6879) proves the importation of cotton cloth from Sogdiana, the other two (LM 20 1552 (23) of the Lushun National Museum and Bāzāklik Letter B) attest the regular correspondence between the Manichaeans of Samarqand and those of Turfan. The Manichaean New Persian texts discovered in Turfan are most likely to represent the literary works of the Manichaeans living in Samanid or Qarakhanid Samarqand. Bāzāklik Letter B was sent by a bishop (aftādān) of the Manichaean community of the town of Tūdh near Samarqand to celebrate the New Year. The addressee was a Teacher Aryāmān Puhr staying in Turfan. Therefore, in the early 11th century the Manichaeans of Samarqand were under the leadership of a možak or Teacher seated in the church of Turfan, possibly what is now called Ruin K. Finally, I dwelled on the problems surrounding the so-called Manichaean Letters i and ii and argued that they are connected to the evacuation of Manichaeans from Mesopotamia reported by al-Nadīm as happened during the reign of al-Muqtadir (908-932 CE).

Appendix

1 天宝六载四月十四日给家人春衣历

已上肆人々各给縹

2 常住 大及 子 奴 一段充衫八尺充袴

3 祀奴 末如 已上两人々各给一段充衫祀奴八尺充袴

4 可 付縹一段充衫 胡尾子付縹一丈二尺充袴

5 右件縹玖段每段用钱貳佰貳买到用给上件

6 家人春衣谨以为案请僧连署 僧无生

7 僧 僧玄藏 僧法藏 僧澄练

1 Ledger of spring clothes given to the house workers (attached to a certain Buddhist temple) on the 14th of the 4th month in the 6th year of Tianbao era (= 747 CE).

2 Changzhu, Daji, ???zi, ???nu: (Given) to each of the above mentioned four people one *duan* 段 (equivalent to 20 *chi* 尺^① “foot”) of cotton cloth for making a shirt; eight feet (of cotton cloth) for making (one pair of) drawers.

3 Sinu, Moru: Given to each of these two people one *duan* 段 of cotton cloth for making a shirt; (Given) to Sinu eight feet (of cotton cloth) for making (one pair of) drawers.

4 Given to Keseng one *duan* 段 of cotton cloth for making a shirt. Given to Huweizi one *zhang* 丈 (= 10 feet) and two feet of cotton cloth for making (one pair of) trousers.

5-7 The above mentioned nine *duans* 段 of cotton cloth: For each *duan* 段 of cotton cloth 202 copper coins were spent; the cotton cloth was purchased and given to the above mentioned house workers for making their spring clothes. This register document is prepared humbly by us. The monks are requested to sign jointly: (Signatures) Monk Wusheng,^② Monk (left blank), Monk Xuanzang, Monk Fazang, Monk Chenglian.

① I am grateful to Professor Takao Moriyasu for clarifying the value of *duan* for me.

② Underlined names are the signatures.