

**Manichaeism - New Historical and Philological Studies**  
Research Article**Open Access**

Takao Moriyasu

# New Developments in the History of East Uighur Manichaeism

DOI 10.1515/opth-2015-0016

Received July 8, 2015; accepted August 7, 2015

**Abstract:** Most of the materials on the history of Manichaeism during the time of the East Uighur empire are Chinese sources (Chinese works and the Karabalgasun inscription) which are well known on account of its French translation with detailed notes by Chavannes and Pelliot (1911-1913). Thereafter several new materials in Middle Iranian or in Old Uighur have been published as follows: T II D 135, a colophon in Middle Persian; M 1, a colophon of the *Mahrnāmag* (*Hymn-Book*); U 1 (= T II K Bündel Nr. D 173), a fragment of an Uighur historical book about Old Turkic peoples; U 72 and U 73, an Uighur Account of Mouyu Qayan's Conversion to Manichaeism; U 168 II (= T II D 173 a2), the colophon of a prayer appended to a Uighur Manichaean scripture in 795. Also just recently Peter Zieme has discovered new material: 81TB10: 06-3a. I have tried to reconstruct the history of Manichaeism during the time of the East Uighur empire synthesizing all materials mentioned above.

**Keywords:** history of Manichaeism, East Uighur empire, Turfan documents, Old Turkic peoples, Inner Asia, Tang dynasty, Mouyu qaghan, Huaixin qaghan, Buqu xan legend

## Research Materials

The starting point of my research was my graduation thesis, submitted to the University of Tokyo in 1972 entitled “On Manichaeism in the East Uighur Empire.”<sup>1</sup> Next, the midway point in my subsequent forty-odd years of research was marked by my doctoral dissertation “A Study on the History of Uighur Manichaeism”<sup>2</sup> for which I was awarded a doctorate by Osaka University in 1992. But this latter study dealt essentially with the history of Manichaeism in the West Uighur kingdom (mid-ninth to early thirteenth-century), and apart from a few passing comments, I was unable to take up in detail the history of Manichaeism in the East Uighur empire (744-840 C.E.) which had been the subject of my graduation thesis.<sup>3</sup> I have until now been able to utilize the findings of my graduation thesis only partially in several articles dealing with other topics<sup>4</sup> and in an introductory book.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The thesis contains 334 pages, each consisting of 400 characters.

<sup>2</sup> Moriyasu, *Manikyō-shi* (1991).

<sup>3</sup> The East Uighur empire refers to the period during which the *qayans*' base lay on the Mongolian plateau between the Ötükän Mountains and the middle reaches of the Orkhon river, and it is also known as the Uighur khaganate or the Uighur steppe empire.

<sup>4</sup> In Moriyasu, “DRU-GU to HOR,” I used part of “An Account of Mouyu Qayan's Conversion to Manichaeism,” and in Moriyasu, “Zōho: Hokutei sōdatsusen,” I utilized part of U 1, the colophon of U 168 II, the colophon of the *Mahrnāmag* (M 1), and excerpts of Tamim ibn Bahri's account of his travels. Furthermore, a brief mention can be found on p. 162 of Moriyasu, “Anshi no ran.”

<sup>5</sup> Moriyasu, *Shirukurōdo to Tō teikoku*, chap. 7.

\*Corresponding author: Takao Moriyasu: Osaka University, e-mail: moriyasu@let.osaka-u.ac.jp

Most of the materials on the history of Manichaeism during the time of the East Uighur empire are Chinese sources (Chinese works and the Chinese text of the Karabalgasun inscription) and are well-known on account of their having been translated into French with detailed notes by Chavannes and Pelliot.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, in the following I wish to mention some representative non-Chinese sources, used also in my graduation thesis, in the hope that they will serve as a guide for future researchers.

First, there is U 1 (= T II K Bündel Nr. D 173 = Wilkens, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*, No. 49 = Clark, "Turkic Manichaean Literature," No. 105), a fragment of a Uighur history that was translated into German by Le Coq.<sup>7</sup> This represents two bifolios (i.e., eight pages) that formed part of a codex, and in one section it is recorded that the Türk counsellor Tonyuquq married his daughters to the Uighur and Basmil leaders, while elsewhere it is stated that the Uighur Boquy Xan visited Qočo (Gaochang 高昌) in the year of the sheep, met the *možak* (highest-ranking cleric in the Manichaean church), and discussed the installation of three *maxistaks* (third-ranking clerics in the Manichaean church). Next, there are the colophons of two Manichaean texts in Middle Persian (T II D 135; M 1) that were translated into German by Müller. T II D 135 (= MIK III 36 or 6371) is short, but lists the titles or names of ministers and noblemen in the court of the third qayan Mouyu 牟羽<sup>8</sup> (Müller, "Der Hofstaat").<sup>9</sup> The lengthy M 1 consists of the final section (index?) and colophon of a collection of Manichaean hymns called the *Mahrnāmag* (*Hymn-Book*), and it lists not only princes, ministers, noblemen, and noblewomen in the court of the eighth qayan Baoyi 保義,<sup>10</sup> but also the names of many rulers of cities on the trade routes to the north and south of the Tianshan 天山 Mountains who were under the sway of the Uighurs.<sup>11</sup> Next, there is the Uighur "Account of Mouyu Qayan's Conversion to Manichaeism" (U 72 & U 73 = TM 276 a & b = Wilkens, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*, Nos. 52 & 53 = Clark, "Turkic Manichaean Literature," No. 103), which has been well-known ever since a German translation was published by Bang and Gabain,<sup>12</sup> "Türkische Turfan-Texte, II", and this too is a fairly lengthy text. In addition, there is U 168 II (= T II D 173 a<sup>2</sup> = Wilkens, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*, No. 319 = Clark, "Turkic Manichaean Literature," No. 145), the colophon of a prayer appended to a Uighur Manichaean scripture translated into German by Le Coq.<sup>13</sup> Although a short text, it is an important one in that it informs us that there was a Manichaean "master of doctrine" in the Ötükän region of Mongolia in the year of the pig (795).<sup>14</sup>

The above are all documents that were discovered in the Turfan Basin, one of the centers of the West Uighur kingdom. As for Islamic sources to the west, there is the Arabic account of the travels of Tamīm ibn

<sup>6</sup> Chavannes and Pelliot, "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine."

<sup>7</sup> Le Coq, "Ein manichäisches Buch-Fragment."

<sup>8</sup> It was Müller himself who identified the subject of the colophon as Mouyu Qayan, albeit in another study. Cf. Müller, *Uigurica II*, 95. Most scholars since then have supported this identification (cf. Hamilton, *Les Ouïghours*, 139; Sundermann, "Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts," 72; Clark, "The Conversion of Bügü," 84 n. 2. Rybatzki ("Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers," 258-59) has advanced a different view which I am unable to accept.

<sup>9</sup> For a colour reproduction of this manuscript together with a recent English translation by Jason DeBuhn, see Gulácsi, *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*, No. 42. It is worth noting that one side of this manuscript is a miniature painting depicting a large number of people. This will be a subject for future research.

<sup>10</sup> Müller identified the subject of this colophon as Zhaoli 昭禮 Qayan, who had the same *qayan* title as Baoyi (cf. *Manikyō-shi*, 182 = GUMS, 222), and several scholars have followed this identification (cf. Boyce, *A Reader*, 52; Sundermann, "Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts," 71; Klimkeit, *Hymnen und Gebete*, 181-82; Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 274). But judging from circumstantial evidence, this is most unlikely, and it is more reasonable to identify him with Baoyi Qayan, who boasted overwhelming achievements. Furthermore, a point noted at an early stage by Hamilton is important, and there is no longer any scope for reviving the thesis identifying the said figure with Zhaoli Qayan (Hamilton, *Les Ouïghours*, 141; cf. Moriyasu, "Rūn moji Manikyō monjo Kao. 0107," 65 and n. 72; Rybatzki, "Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers," 256; Clark, "The Conversion of Bügü," 100; Tremblay, *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde*, 78; Wang, *Cong Bosi dao Zhongguo*, 70, 105).

<sup>11</sup> Müller, *Mahrnāmag*. For the most recent study of M 1 as a whole, see Wang, *Cong Bosi dao Zhongguo*, 43-106. But the earlier lexicographical Durkin-Meisterernst's *Dictionary* is useful for research on individual personal names. M 1 is a bifolio corresponding to four pages, and a color reproduction can be found in *Manikyō-shi*, pls. XXI-XXII. That M 1 is the colophon and not the preface was first pointed out by Sundermann ("Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts," 71-72). The colophon shows that the composition of the *Mahrnāmag* began during the reign of the third *qayan*, Mouyu Qayan, on which see section below.

<sup>12</sup> Bang and Gabain, "Türkische Turfan-Texte, II."

<sup>13</sup> *Türkische Manichaica I*, 12; Özertural, *Der uigurische Manichäismus*, 101-103.

<sup>14</sup> Moriyasu, "Zōho: Hokutei sōdatsusen," 216. The Uighur text and a translation are given below.

Baḥr in the first half of the ninth century, translated into English by Minorsky,<sup>15</sup> and the legend of Buqu Xan of the Mongol period, recorded in Persian.<sup>16</sup> Nor should one forget the Sogdian text and the fragments of the Uighur text on the Karabalgasun inscription erected on the Orkhon steppe in Mongolia.<sup>17</sup>

## Points at Issue in the History of East Uighur Manichaeism and New Developments in Research

Important issues in the history of East Uighur Manichaeism are the date of Mouyu Qayan's conversion to Manichaeism and his motives, the religion of ordinary Uighurs prior to this, the coup d'état by Mouyu Qayan's successor Dunmohe 頓莫賀 Tarqan and his persecution of Manichaeism, the revival of Manichaeism under the qayans Huaixin 懷信 and Baoyi and its true adoption as the state religion, and the identity of the subject of the Buqu Xan legend. I took up all of these issues in my graduation thesis, but the opportunity has never arisen for me to put together a new book on the history of East Uighur Manichaeism that quoted the full texts of these much-used sources with new annotated translations. Furthermore, the question of the date of the persecution of Manichaeism had been by and large resolved in a study by K. Tazaka entitled "Kaikotsu ni okeru Manikyō hakugai undō," while the Buqu Xan question had been dealt with in a detailed and persuasive study by T. Abe, *Nishi Uiguru koku shi*.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, in 1987 there appeared an outstanding study by Lin Wushu that overlapped in many respects with the views presented in my graduation thesis, and there seemed to be little need to readdress these issues.

However, since the publication of two studies by Y. Yoshida ("Karabarugasun hibun" and "Some New Readings") in which he reinterpreted the Sogdian text of the Karabalgasun inscription (an important source on the history of East Uighur Manichaeism), my own book on the history of Uighur Manichaeism,<sup>19</sup> and a selection of important Manichaean texts in Middle Iranian and Old Uighur from Turfan translated into English by Klimkeit,<sup>20</sup> there have been some quite considerable changes in the situation regarding source materials on East Uighur Manichaeism, and research on this subject has also begun to come to life. In chronological order, this current of research has taken the following course: Tuguševa, "Ein Fragment"; Moriyasu, "Rūn moji Manikyō monjo Kao. 0107"; Oda, "Buku-han densetsu"; Moriyasu, Yoshida and Katayama, "Qara-Balgasun Inscription"; Clark, "The Conversion of Bügü"; Wilkens, "Hymnus auf den Licht-Nous"; Tremblay, *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde*; Moriyasu, "Anshi no ran"; Moriyasu, "Four Lectures at the Collège de France"; Kasai, "Ein Kolophon um die Legende von Bokug Kagan"; Clark, "Manichaeism among the Uygurs"; Zieme, "Youguan Monijiao kaijiao"; Zhang and Zieme, "A Memorandum"; Yoshida, "Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyurukuzoku"; Yoshida, "Some New Readings," in *From Ötüken to İstanbul*; and Wang, *Cong Bosi dao Zhongguo*.<sup>21</sup> Among these studies, Tuguševa, Oda, Wilkens, Kasai, and Clark have all contributed to new developments regarding the Buqu Xan question, and in particular Tuguševa and Kasai surprised scholars by presenting new materials relating to the Buqu Xan legend. But what has been even more astounding has been the successive discoveries more recently of what would appear to be fragments of Uighur histories.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>15</sup> "Tamim ibn Baḥr's Journey."

<sup>16</sup> Cf. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, 429-35, Note V; D'Ohsson and Saguchi, *Mongoru teikokushi*, vol. 1:319-28; Boyle, *History of the World-Conqueror*, 53-61; Abe, *Nishi Uiguru koku shi*, 171-73, 203-205.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Yoshida, "Karabarugasun hibun"; Yoshida, "Some New Readings," in *Documents et archives*; Yoshida, "Some New Readings," in *From Ötüken to İstanbul*; Moriyasu, Yoshida and Katayama, "Qara-Balgasun Inscription."

<sup>18</sup> Abe, *Nishi Uiguru koku shi*, 169-99; Abe, "Where was the Capital of the West Uighurs?"

<sup>19</sup> Moriyasu, *Manikyō-shi*.

<sup>20</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis*.

<sup>21</sup> To these studies may be added the following "catalogs": Clark, "Turkic Manichaean Literature"; Gulácsi, "Identifying the Corpus of Manichaean Art"; Wilkens, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*; Gulácsi, *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*; Zieme, "The Manichaean Turkish Texts of the Stein Collection." While the steady stream of Chinese books and articles that have appeared in China since the Cultural Revolution includes some outstanding studies such as that by Lin Wushu, *Monijiao ji qi dongjian*, many of them are uninformed about the latest developments in academic circles and do not meet international standards even if they may pass muster in China, and therefore they have not been listed here. It should be noted, however, that there are some excellent and highly original contributions among studies on Manichaean doctrine published in Chinese.

<sup>22</sup> Zieme, "Youguan Monijiao kaijiao"; Zhang and Zieme, "A Memorandum."

I have previously discussed how the Uighurs, or the ancient Turks in general, possessed a “sense of history” and gave expression to this in inscriptions and written works.<sup>23</sup> As examples of fragments of what no one would object to identifying as historical works, mention may be made of the above-mentioned U 1 (Le Coq, “Ein manichäisches Buch-Fragmen”) and U 72 & U 73 (“An Account of Mouyu Qayan’s Conversion to Manichaeism”),<sup>24</sup> as well as Mainz 345 taken up in Moriyasu, “Anshi no ran.” All three of these texts are written in neat square Uighur script, and there is no need to doubt that these are fragments that became separated from historical works in book form.<sup>25</sup> Although these were discovered in the Turfan Basin, the main center of the Uighurs during the West Uighur period, and are thought to have circulated during the West Uighur period,<sup>26</sup> they record events of the East Uighur period and even the earlier Türkic period. However, the text recently brought to light by Zieme and Zhang is written in cursive Uighur script from the Mongol period, and yet it includes content going back as far as the East Uighur period. The fact that the history of the East Uighur period, a time when Manichaeism flourished, has been preserved in a Uighur text of the Mongol period, when the Uighurs had abandoned Manichaeism and converted completely to Buddhism, clearly demonstrates that from early times they persistently held on to a “sense of history” that engendered in them a desire to preserve works of history.<sup>27</sup>

It could be said that the time is now ripe to put forward a new thesis regarding the history of East Uighur Manichaeism. But owing to limited space, in the following I wish to present my views with reference to those studies among the aforementioned studies published since the 1990s that overlap in content with my graduation thesis, namely, two studies by Clark (“The Conversion of Bügü Khan” and “Manichaeism among the Uygurs”) dealing with the date of Mouyu Qayan’s conversion to Manichaeism and the Buqu Xan question, and the new material on Mouyu Qayan’s introduction of Manichaeism presented by Zieme.<sup>28</sup>

## The Date of Mouyu Qayan’s Conversion to Manichaeism

Ever since Chavannes and Pelliot, the established thesis regarding the introduction of Manichaeism among the Uighurs, based on the Chinese text of the Karabalgasun inscription, has been that Manichaeism became the state religion of the Uighurs after Mouyu Qayan, who had led an army of Uighur troops to the Tang in 762/763 to assist in the suppression of the An-Shi 安史 rebellion, encountered a group of Manichaeans in the vicinity of Luoyang 洛陽 and took four Manichaean clerics, one of them named Ruixi 睿息, back home with him in 763. In contrast, the gist of a lengthy study by Clark (“The Conversion of Bügü Khan”) is that Mouyu Qayan converted to Manichaeism not in 762/763 but at an earlier date.

The first reason given by Clark<sup>29</sup> is the following statement in U 111a (= T II D 180), thought to be a fragment of a codex written in Manichaean script:

uluy bašlay atlīy yilnīng ikinti yilnīnta nomī dini yadilmīšta : tavyač ilintin yana [rest missing]

“In the second year of the year named Great Beginning, when his (= Mani’s) religion spread, from China again (or returning) [rest missing]”

<sup>23</sup> Moriyasu, “Anshi no ran,” 147-50.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Moriyasu, “Anshi no ran,” 149-50. However, the fact that Clark (“Turkic Manichaean Literature,” 101-103, 132) classifies both of these as “Documents from the Eastern Church” is cause for some concern, although elsewhere (Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü,” 99) he definitely does recognize both as histories of the ancient Turks.

<sup>25</sup> An inspection of the originals of the three texts in Berlin revealed that they have been written in careful square script in the hand of a seemingly professional scribe on paper of medium to superior medium quality, with the text written in opposite directions on the recto and verso. In the case of codex-form books written horizontally, it is normal for the text to be written in opposite directions on the recto and verso. As was noted above, there have survived two bifolios of U 1, clearly indicating that it was a codex, and there is no reason to doubt that the other two texts also belonged to codices.

<sup>26</sup> On the basis of variations in the appellations of Mouyu Qayan used in U 72 & U 73, Rybatzki [“Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers,” 259] considers this text to date from the West Uighur period.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Moriyasu, “Anshi no ran,” 147-50; Yoshida, “Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyuruku-zoku,” 22.

<sup>28</sup> Zieme, “Youguan Monijiao kaijiao.”

<sup>29</sup> Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 90-99.

The view that would regard “the year named Great Beginning” as a Chinese era name and equate it with Shangyuan 上元 goes back to Bang and Gabain,<sup>30</sup> and since then opinion has been divided as to whether the second year of the Shangyuan era refers to 675, during the reign of Gaozong 高宗, or to 761, during the reign of Suzong 肅宗. Clark equates Shangyuan 2 with 761, and in addition he identifies the region to which Manichaeism is said to have spread in the above passage as neither China nor Turfan but as the kingdom of the Uighurs. Consequently, in place of the earlier view that dated the official promulgation of Manichaeism among the Uighurs to 762/763, he put forward the new date of 761. Although I do not completely reject this thesis, I cannot agree with it outright since until now there have not been reported any examples of the use of Chinese era names in Uighur translation. Clark himself is also aware of this fact and suggests that this text may have been written by a Sogdian Manichaeans.<sup>31</sup> But according to a private communication from Y. Yoshida, Chinese era names (e.g., Daxiang 大象, Yanshou 延壽, Longshuo 龍朔, and Kaiyuan 開元) were invariably transliterated in Sogdian and were never translated.

The second reason given by Clark<sup>32</sup> is a passage on the date and compilation of the *Mahrnāmag* (M 1) in the colophon of this work:<sup>33</sup>

M 1, ll. 160-197: cf. *Manikyō-shi*, upper half of pl. XXII (i.e., right half because it is written horizontally)

(In the Manichaean calendar) in the year 546 after the birth of the primordial Light Apostle (i.e., Mani, the Buddha of Light), furthermore in the year [number left out in the text] after he ascended in might, and in the year 162 after the ascension of the beneficent Mār Šād-Ormezd, this *Hymn-Book* (*Mahrnāmag*), full of living words and sweet hymns, was begun.

The scribe who began to write (this) at the command of the leaders of the religious community was not able to finish writing (this). Because he was not competent (?) and had no time, he wrote a little, (just) a few hymns, but did not complete (this *Hymn-Book*).

Unfinished, it remained there for many years. (That is,) it lay fallen in the monastery at Ark (i.e., Karashār). Thereupon, I, Yazad-Āmad the head preacher (*xrōhxwān*), when I saw this *Hymn-Book* unfinished and (lying) uselessly fallen, commanded anew my dearest child, my treasured son Naxurēg-Rōšn, to finish it.

In the past, the year referred to in this passage has been considered somewhat hazily to be one of the years from 761 to 763,<sup>34</sup> and, ignoring the difference of one or two years, it has been linked to the year 763, when Mouyu Qayan brought some Manichaean clerics back with him from China. But Clark, basing himself on the definitive dating of Mani’s birth to 216,<sup>35</sup> arrived at the date 761 by means of his own method of calculation, interpreting 546 years as a time span of 545-546 years ( $216 + 545/546 = 761/762$ ).<sup>36</sup> Then combining this with the widespread view that the motive behind the compilation of the *Mahrnāmag* lay in the conversion of Uighurs to Manichaeism, he used this to bolster his own above view, drawn from U 111a, that the official promulgation of Manichaeism among the Uighurs occurred in 761 rather than 762/763. Since I am in agreement with Clark regarding the motive behind the compilation of the *Mahrnāmag*,<sup>37</sup> even if the date in question should turn out to be 762 rather than 761, I would concur with the view that the official promulgation of Manichaeism among the Uighurs occurred before 763, when Mouyu Qayan brought back some Manichaean clerics from China.

<sup>30</sup> Bang and Gabain, “Türkische Turfan-Texte, II,” 425-26.

<sup>31</sup> Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 97.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 99-101.

<sup>33</sup> English translations of this passage can be found in Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 274; Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 100 and Durkin-Meisterernst, “Late Features in Middle Persian Texts,” 8-9, but here I present a translation prepared with the full assistance of Prof. Y. Yoshida. As always, I wish to thank him cordially for his help.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Müller, *Mahrnāmag*, 36; Abe, *Nishi Uiguru koku shi*, 217-18; Boyce, *A Reader*, 52; Sundermann, “Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts,” 71; Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 276 n. 34; Rybatzki, “Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers,” 255; Tremblay, *Pour une histoire de la Sérinte*, 78.

<sup>35</sup> Haloun/Henning, “Compendium,” 200-201; Boyce, *A Reader*, 1; Wu, “Tonkō kanbun shahon gaikan,” 122-23.

<sup>36</sup> Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 100. This method of calculation could be said to correspond to the difference between the Japanese system of calculating a person’s age in completed years and the traditional system, in which a newborn is deemed to be one year old and one year is added at every New Year.

<sup>37</sup> Boyce (*A Reader*, 52) and Rybatzki (“Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers,” 255) take the same view.

The third reason given by Clark<sup>38</sup> is the interpretation of U 72 & U 73, “An Account of Mouyu Qayan’s Conversion to Manichaeism.” It is clearly stated in this text that Mouyu (\*m̥iŋu-jiu, GSR 1110a + 98a) is Bögü.<sup>39</sup> It will be readily evident to anyone who reads through this account<sup>40</sup> that Mouyu’s conversion to Manichaeism did not go smoothly and take place all at once.<sup>41</sup> I too took note of this fact in my graduation thesis. Of course, even if one subscribes to the view that the original source material of U 72 & U 73, written in Uighur, was a Sogdian letter or report written by a Manichaean cleric who witnessed Mouyu Qayan’s conversion and that it was translated into Uighur,<sup>42</sup> the manuscript of U 72 & U 73 itself dates from the West Uighur period, and it cannot be said that there is no possibility of the original source materials having been deliberately “rewritten.”<sup>43</sup> However, when considered from the position of the Manichaean order, there would have been no advantage in deliberately misrepresenting the facts if Mouyu Qayan’s conversion had indeed gone smoothly. It should thus be considered that there really were some twists and turns in Mouyu Qayan’s conversion to Manichaeism. But unfortunately the account does not itself provide any grounds for positively asserting that the twists and turns that preceded his final decision to “re-convert” to Manichaeism took place prior to 763, when he brought back some Manichaean clerics from China, and it is also conceivable that they occurred after 763, as can be inferred from the fragmentary account given in the Karabalgasun inscription.

The above points are those that I can accept when viewing Clark’s thesis with a favorable eye. But his treatment of the memorial of Li Deyu 李德裕<sup>44</sup> misses the mark,<sup>45</sup> while his interpretation of the Chinese text of the Karabalgasun inscription<sup>46</sup> is so full of misunderstandings that it is quite impossible to accept. To give just one specific example, on p. 88 and p. 105 (and also p. 101) Clark translates the words 再三懇口 in line 9 of the inscription as “Twice and thrice [I have studied it] with sincerity” and interprets this as indicating that Mouyu Qayan had studied the teachings of Manichaeism over a long period, or “twice and thrice,” which, he maintains, hints at his conversion prior to 762/763. This interpretation is based in fact on Chavannes and Pelliot,<sup>47</sup> but it is wrong to posit a character meaning “to study” for the missing character

<sup>38</sup> Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 101-104.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 84; Moriyasu, “Anshi no ran,” 143.

<sup>40</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 364-68, is convenient for gaining a general idea of the content in English, even though this cannot be described as a completely satisfactory annotated translation. Since then a reliable, albeit partial, English translation has been published by Clark with the cooperation of Zieme (Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 102-104). It would be desirable to translate the entire text so as to enhance the reader’s understanding, but lack of space prevents me from doing so here. However, in the near future I hope to publish a collection of translated material related to Uighur Manichaeism that will include a full translation of this text.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Bang and Gabai, “Türkische Turfan-Texte, II,” 412; Lieu, *Manichaeism*, 194 = Lieu, *Manichaeism2*, 235; Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 364; Rybatzki, “Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers,” 235.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Bang and Gabain, “Türkische Turfan-Texte, II,” 411-12; Asmussen, *Xuāstvānift*, 147; Lieu, *Manichaeism*, 193 = Lieu, *Manichaeism2*, 235; Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 364; Clark, “Turkic Manichaean Literature,” 102; Klimkeit, “The Significance of the Manichaean Texts,” 234; Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 102. In particular, Asmussen and Clark, seizing on the fact that the word *yuan* ‘sin’ appearing in U 72 & U 73, l. 51 (=U 72, recto, l. 3) is Sogdian and has not been replaced by the Uighur equivalent *yazuq*, argue that U 72 & U 73 as a whole was translated from Sogdian. But since the word *suy* “sin,” borrowed from Chinese, is also used in l. 35 (=U 73, verso, l. 11), their argument is not founded on solid ground.

<sup>43</sup> I have no objection to regarding U 72 & U 73 as works of history, but it is common sense in historiography to assume that not everything written in a work of history is true. In any work of history information disadvantageous to the writer and those whom he represents will be suppressed or misrepresented. In addition, U 72 & U 73 say the same thing in different ways, they consist in their overall structure mainly of parallel constructions, and it is thus clear that rhetorical devices have been employed. Nonetheless, I believe that they reflect historical facts to a considerable extent. But I think it is going too far to conclude on the basis of U 72 & U 73, as many previous scholars have done, that Manichaeism had already become the state religion during the reign of Mouyu Qayan. In this respect Tremblay’s view (*Pour une histoire de la Sérinde*, 104) is the same as my own.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>45</sup> In this regard too Tremblay’s view (Tremblay, *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde*, 99 n. 167, 108) is the same as mine. To begin with, Clark makes the glaring mistake of describing Li Deyu, a grand councilor of the Tang court, as “a frontier official.” But it is most regrettable that not only his criticism of Clark’s thesis, but his study as a whole contains far too many misunderstandings, making it difficult to comment on. His book has been highly rated by some Western scholars, but this assessment is unwarranted.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 87-88, 104-106.

<sup>47</sup> Chavannes and Pelliot, “Un traité manichéen (deuxième partie),” 193.

in the phrase 再三懇口. A search of Chinese text databases for 再三懇 shows that in the overwhelming majority of cases this phrase is followed by a character meaning “to ask” (請, 求, 乞), and there are no instances of a character meaning “to study.” In view of the fact that the surviving strokes of the missing character are not inconsistent with the upper part of the character 請 in the phrase 允臣等所請 in line 12 of the same inscription, we have restored the word in question to 懇 [請].<sup>48</sup> It may also be noted that Schlegel, Chavannes and Pelliot, and Clark all concur in regarding Mouyu Qayan as the subject of the phrase 再三懇口, but in an annotated translation being prepared by Y. Yoshida and myself we have essayed a new reading. Taking the phrase 再三懇 [請] as part of the narrative text, we consider this to describe a scene in which high-ranking officials (military governors, district magistrates, and internal and external counsellors, etc.) in attendance on Mouyu Qayan “petitioned [him] earnestly again and again.”

Lastly, Clark stresses the possibility that the future Mouyu Qayan, who accompanied the campaign to the west during the reign of the second qayan Gele 葛勒 (Moyanchuo 磨延啜), may have met Manichaeans on that occasion in the Tianshan region and converted to Manichaeism in 755/756. It is true that Uighur campaigns in the west and the expansion of their territory during the 750s can be inferred from the Tes, Tariat, and Shine-Usu inscriptions recording the achievements of Gele Qayan. But Clark’s argument, in which he uses as evidence for Mouyu Qayan’s participation in the western campaigns prior to his accession to the throne the views of Klyashtorny<sup>49</sup>—who pieced together uncertain readings of the badly damaged Tariat inscription to identify the name of one of Gele Qayan’s sons as Bilgä Qutluy Tarqan and equated this person, who erected the Tariat inscription, with the future Mouyu Qayan—and then argues on this basis that Mouyu Qayan had been in contact with Manichaeans in the Tianshan region prior to his accession to the throne, leaves the impression of a castle built on sand and defies further comment. The texts of the three inscriptions should be compared with our report on field surveys of the inscriptions in Mongolia.<sup>50</sup>

Clark’s thesis that Mouyu Qayan first converted to Manichaeism before 763 is by no means absurd, and I too hold a similar view based on circumstantial considerations. But it has to be said that the supporting evidence is still lacking.

## Fragments of East Uighur Manichaean History That Survived Until the Mongol Period

In the previous section I criticized some inadequacies in Clark’s article “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” but we still share at least the basic view that Mouyu Qayan did not first convert to Manichaeism when he encountered some Manichaean clergymen in the vicinity of Luoyang during a campaign in China in 762/763. Accordingly, let us now turn our attention to a newly discovered source regarding the promulgation of Manichaeism by Mouyu Qayan. This is a fragment of a Uighur history written in cursive script that was unearthed at Bezeklik in 1981, and it was brought to the attention of academic circles through an article published in Chinese by Peter Zieme.<sup>51</sup> Judging from the fragment’s size and shape, it would seem that the upper half is missing, and this has been taken into account in the following reconstruction and translation of the text.

### 81TB10: 06-3a (Uighur text)

(01) /// **birlä** kingäš-ligin ođ täg ig /// (02)  
 /// aṭiṛdlayu altmış qarī säčti bulyat? qarī-liy īnanč orṭu-luy totoq-ni (03) /

<sup>48</sup> See Fig. 1 appended to Moriyasu, “Four Lectures at the Collège de France,” the most recent reconstruction of the Chinese text of the Karabalgasun inscription, one which I prepared in cooperation with Y. Yoshida on the basis of field investigations conducted in Mongolia in 1996-1997. This is, I believe, a major contribution to the history of the East Uighur period, but a still more detailed annotated translation, including that of the Sogdian text, has yet to be published.

<sup>49</sup> Klyashtorny, “The Terkhin Inscription,” 338; “East Turkestan,” 277.

<sup>50</sup> Moriyasu and Ochir, *Provisional Report*, 158-95.

<sup>51</sup> Zieme, “Youguan Monijiao kaijiao.”

////////// yarlıy-İN büdürdi anta il orqun-ta yangi nom-qa kigürmiš-in iki (04) /////////////// ulayu uč mošak-ni il orqun-qa ödünen iđti-lar (05) /////////////// kälgäli uyuradı ärdi kirü-kı dintar nom-uy törög kim (06) /////////////// ]TY dintar iki yüz nom ming san tavar bäkläp iki (07) /////////////// ]W-lar bular? tuyuristan qara qanglı yol-İN kälip ärdiš (08) /////////////// ]lar bögü xan özi bašlayu uduru barıp uluy ayamaqjin ordu (09) -qa /////////////// // kälürdi-lär ol tuš-ta il orqun-taqi tavyač-fin (10) /////////////// ]'WZ qavışip tängri mani burxan yirtinčü-tä (11) /////////////// /////////////// bulti (or bolti) ol söz-lärig qayu-sin sözlägäy biz (12) /////////////// /////////////// •••//•••//•••• bögü xan bir qara

### 81TB10: 06-3a (English translation)

(01-02) /////////////// by taking advice together with /////////////// as a medicinal herb /////////////// illness /////////////// chose exactly sixty seniors (i.e., Superiors).  
 (02'-03) /////////////// carried out the order to /////////////// Bulyat? Qariliy İnanč (and?) the Camp commander.  
 (03'-04) Then by having introduced for the new religion in the land of Orkhon (i.e., East Uighur empire) /////////////// two (people? times? fold?) /////////////// thereafter (?) they had imploringly invited the *možak* of Uč (or the border region *možak*) to the land of Orkhon.  
 (05-06) [The *možak*] had intended to come [to the land of Orkhon] ///////////////. Manichaeian priests from the West /////////////// the doctrine and teaching ///////////////  
 (06'-07) Having fastened (i.e., packed?) two hundred scriptures and one thousand bolts of silk, the Manichaeian priests /////////////// two ///////////////  
 (07'-08) These (?) came along (or via) the route from Tuyuristan and Qara Qanglı, [crossed] the Irtish [River] ///////////////  
 (08'-09) Starting with Bögü Xan himself, they went to welcome (them) and with great veneration [welcomed them into] the *ordu* (i.e., royal camp, palace). They carried with them [scriptures and so on?] ///////////////  
 (09'-11) At that time, [Manichaeian priests who had come?] from China (and were) in the land of Orkhon /////////////// joined (or assembled) /////////////// found (or became) /////////////// the divine Mani-Buddha /////////////// in this world ///////////////.

(11') "Any of those words we will speak."

(12) /////////////// Bögü Xan /////////////// one black (thing? person?)

It is extremely difficult to decipher a non-bilingual Uighur text in cursive script, and one cannot but marvel at Zieme's admirable ability to interpret such texts. I shall leave the details to Zieme's article, such as his interpretation of *qarī*, which usually means "elder, senior," as a "Superior" in the Manichaeian church.<sup>52</sup> There is just one place where my reading differs considerably from Zieme's, and that is *uč možak* in line 4, which I interpret as "the *možak* residing in the town of Uč" (or "the border region *možak*"), whereas Zieme reads this as *üč možak* "three *možaks*." In a large diocese there was generally only a single *možak*, the highest-ranking cleric in the Manichaeian hierarchy, and because I am of the view that in the middle of the eighth century (i.e., before the conversion of Uighurs to Manichaeism) the area to the east of the Pamirs, including China, constituted a single "eastern diocese," I do not take this phrase to refer to "three" *možaks*. As for the location of Uč where this single *možak* resided, it is presumably the same as the Uč mentioned in

<sup>52</sup> This also provides a lead for the interpretation of *qarī* and *qariliy* in a fragment of a Manichaeian prayer from Turfan held by the Faculty of Letters at Kyoto University. Cf. *Manikyō-shi*, 189 ll. 16, 17 = GUMS, 229.

the Third Stake Inscription of 1019, corresponding to modern Uč Turfan (formerly known as Wensu 温宿).<sup>53</sup> It was an ancient oasis town on the southern slopes of the Tianshan Mountains, lying slightly to the west of Aksu (Gumo 姑墨) midway between Kucha (Quici 龜茲) and Kashgar (Shule 疏勒).<sup>54</sup>

The important information to be gleaned from the above document is that the Manichaean order on which Mouyu Qayan relied at the time of the full-scale promulgation of Manichaeism was based not only in China to the south but also somewhere to the west in Central Asia. Even if Uč does not correspond to Uč Turfan, it is stated that when the *možak* and the clerics under him brought large numbers of Manichaean scriptures and bolts of silk in lieu of money to the Uighur base on the banks of the Orkhon river, they travelled along the route from Tuyuristan<sup>55</sup> to Qara Qangli (i.e., Heiche 黑車)<sup>56</sup> and passed through the valley of the Irtish River, which means that they would then have naturally crossed the Altai Mountains from west to east and so reached Ordubalıq. As for the identification of Tuyuristan, we should pay attention to a new reading by Y. Yoshida on line 19 of the Sogdian version of the Karabalgasun inscription. He has corrected the old reading *ctβ'r twyr'kc'ny* “Four-Twypy” to *ctβ'r twyr'ystny* “Four Tuyuristan.”<sup>57</sup> There exist several views on the location of Tuyuristan, identifying it with Kucha ~ Karashār (Yanqi 焉耆) ~ Qočo, Karashār ~ Qočo ~ Bišbalıq (Beiting 北庭), Kucha ~ Karashār, or simply the region around Karashār,<sup>58</sup> but in each case it is centered on Karashār. There is evidence that later during the West Uighur period there was a *možak* in “Four Tuyuristans.”<sup>59</sup> It would seem that the center of the “eastern diocese” (or “border region diocese”) of Manichaeism at the time in question lay along the northern branch of the Silk Road to the south of the Tianshan Mountains.

The next piece of material that I wish to quote is a Tibetan document (P. t. 1283) from Dunhuang that describes the situation in Inner Asia at the time of the rise of the East Uighur empire. Since I have already dealt with this document in its entirety on two previous occasions,<sup>60</sup> here I shall give only a translation of lines 84-90.

## P. t. 1283

[V-1] If one looks to the west (of the Uighurs), there are the three Qarlıq (Gar-log) tribes, and there is an army of eight thousand. (These Qarlıq) fought with the Türgiš (Du-rgyus) and Tajiks (Ta-zhig). [V-2] If one looks to their east, there are the three Og-rag tribes, and if one looks to Great Uighur (Ho-yo-hor), Manichaeans (Ne-shag) are seeking religious teachers<sup>61</sup> and helping to send for them, and (the Og-rag) fought with the Uighurs (Ho-yo-hor). [V-3] To the northeast of these (=Og-rag) is the I-byil-kor tribe, who stem from the Türkic Gu-log-gol-chor, and there is an army of one thousand. [V-4] To their northwest is the Pečeneg (Be-ča-nag) tribe, and there is an army of five thousand. (The Pečeneg) fought with the Uighurs (Hor).

<sup>53</sup> Moriyasu, “Uighur Buddhist Stake Inscriptions,” 188, 192. Uč was perceived as lying on the western border of the West Uighur kingdom.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Henning, “Argi and the Tokharians,” 568-69.

<sup>55</sup> On the identification of this locality I follow Yoshida (“Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyuruku-zoku,” 22 = Yoshida, “Some New Readings” in *From Ötüken to İstanbul*, 83-84) rather than Zieme.

<sup>56</sup> The idea of identifying Qara Qangli with the Heichezi 黑車子 tribe and linking them to the Tibetan document P. t. 1283 from Dunhuang has been put forward by Zieme/Wang, “Youguan Monijiao kaijiao,” 6 n. 1, but there is an earlier study on the same subject: Zhong Han 鐘煥, “Heichezi shiwei wenti chongkao” 黑車子室韋問題重考 [Rethinking the question of the Heichezi Shiwei], *Xibei Minzu Yanjiu* 西北民族研究 (2000-2002): 186-92.

<sup>57</sup> Yoshida, “Karabarugasun hibun,” 52, additional note; Yoshida, “The Karabalgasun Inscription and the Khotanese Documents,” 350; Yoshida, “Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyuruku-zoku,” 22 = Yoshida, “Some New Readings” in *From Ötüken to İstanbul*, 84.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Henning, “Argi and the Tokharians,” 550-51, 559-60; Sundermann, “Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts,” 68; Yoshida, “Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyuruku-zoku,” 22 = Yoshida, “Some New Readings” in *From Ötüken to İstanbul*, 83-84.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Henning, “Argi and the Tokharians,” 551; Sundermann, “Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts,” 68; Gulácsi, *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*, 222, No. 28; Moriyasu, “Four Lectures at the Collège de France,” 91-93.

<sup>60</sup> Moriyasu, “DRU-GU to HOR,” 2-13; Moriyasu, *Shirukurōdo to Tō teikoku*, 316-30.

<sup>61</sup> In Moriyasu, *Shirukurōdo to Tō teikoku*, 323, I took *ne-shag čhos* “religion of the Manichaeans” in line 87 to mean “Manichaeism” and translated *ne-shag čhos gyi mkhan-po tshol zhiñ* as “seeking teachers of Manichaeism,” but here I have gone back to my earlier interpretation (Moriyasu, “DRU-GU to HOR,” 7) and taken *ne-shag* as the subject.

A question that I had been unable to resolve until now was why in the middle of the eighth century, the period covered by P. t. 1283 as a whole, a reference to Manichaeism appears in the section on the Og-rag tribes, who lived to the west of the Irtish River, far to the west of the Uighurs, while there is no mention of Manichaeism in the section on the Uighurs themselves. But with the emergence of 81TB10: 06-3a, a fragment of a historical work, part of this question would now seem to have been answered. In other words, when considering the propagation of Manichaeism among the Uighurs, weight should perhaps be placed not just on the route from China, as expected from the Karabalgasun inscription, but also on the route from Central Asia.<sup>62</sup>

It should be noted, however, that even if my reconstruction “Manichaeian priests who had come” from China for the missing section in line 10 of 81TB10: 06-3a, following on from *ol tuš-ta il orqun-taqi tavyač-tün* “At that time, [...] from China in the land of Orkhon (i.e., East Uighur empire),” is correct, then the introduction of Manichaeism from Central Asia, of which we learn for the first time in this document, would not necessarily have occurred after the invitation of Manichaeian clerics from China in 763. What I placed importance on in my graduation thesis was refuting the simplistic scenario that had Mouyu Qayan chancing to encounter some Manichaeian clerics in the vicinity of Luoyang and promptly converting to Manichaeism. This was because I considered that, when compared with other nomadic states in Inner Asia, Mouyu Qayan too would no doubt have utilized, in addition to the military might of his mounted troops which bolstered his hold on power, the economic power of the Sogdians, who controlled trade along the Silk Road at the time, and he would also have longed for the authority of a more firmly established religion than a time-honored shamanism. It might be supposed, in other words, that from the time when he seized power he was looking for a religion suitable for serving as the state religion. Prior to his campaign to China in 762/763, Mouyu Qayan had already met many Sogdian Manichaeans in the Uighur homeland and was building up personal relationships with them. But it is perhaps reasonable to suppose that, even so, his return from China in 763 together with Ruixi and three other Manichaeian clerics whom he had met in China was remembered as the date of the official promulgation of Manichaeism and recorded in the Karabalgasun inscription more than half a century later. Mouyu Qayan’s invitation of a *možak* to his palace should perhaps be regarded as a singular event that was intended as some sort of spectacle.

## Rethinking the Buqu Xan Question

Buqu Xan is the protagonist of the Buqu Xan legend, the tale of the founder of the Uighurs preserved in Eastern and Western sources of the Mongol period. Various views have been put forward since the nineteenth century regarding the identity of Buqu Xan, the most persuasive of which have been those identifying him with either Mouyu Qayan or Huaixin Qayan. Since one of the major attributes of Buqu Xan is the introduction of a new religion, it is understandable that simple reasoning would suggest that Mouyu Qayan, who introduced Manichaeism, was a likely candidate. I shall omit details of the history of views on this subject because it would become too involved, but ever since Abe published his thesis equating Buqu Xan with Huaixin Qayan and rejecting the identification of Buqu Xan with Mouyu Qayan on logical grounds,<sup>63</sup> nothing further was heard of this latter thesis until it was revived by Clark in his “Manichaeism among the Uygurs.”<sup>64</sup>

The main motif of this legend is that Buqu Xan was born from a gnarl or knot in a tree or from a mound

<sup>62</sup> If it is inferred from the passage quoted above from P. t. 1283 that the Uighurs sent expeditionary forces as far as the lands of the Og-rag and Pečeneg tribes who lived between the Altai Mountains and Lake Balkhash, then this would work in favor of Clark’s views discussed in the previous section.

<sup>63</sup> Abe, *Nishi Uiguru koku shi*, 169-211.

<sup>64</sup> Two articles by Y. Kasai (in *SIAL* 19; *SIAL* 21) are useful for gaining a concise overview of the Buqu Xan legend and the history of scholarly views on the subject, and reference should be made especially to *SIAL* 21, 22-25, although she uses the new designation “Bokug Kagan legend.” Cf. *Manikyō-shi*, 168-69 = GUMS, 200-202; Hamilton, *Les Ouïghours* 2, viii. In China, where as was pointed out in n. 21 above, developments in academic circles lag behind the rest of the world, Buqu Xan is still generally identified with Mouyu Qayan.

between two trees. Because his name is rendered in Chinese as Bugu Kehan 卜古可罕 or Puqu Kehan 普鞠可汗,<sup>65</sup> it is surmised that the original form of his name was Boquy/Buquy Qayan, for in Old Turkic *boquy/buquy* means “protuberance, swelling, cyst; craw; bud; knot, gnarl.” Almost no one had queried this point, and it was confirmed with the emergence of two Uighur documents dating from the tenth to eleventh centuries. One was a Uighur Buddhist document in semi-square script held in St. Petersburg (SI D/17) and published by Tuguševa, “Ein Fragment” and Oda, “Buku-han densetsu,” and it may be described as a Buddhist version of the Buqu Xan legend. It is older than the hitherto known Chinese and Persian versions of the Mongol period, and because it includes details that supplement these other versions, I wish to quote it at least in translation.

**SI D/17** (Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg)

[missing] [seeing?] the suppression of the country, // abandoning two kinds of //, having been born from a tree in the midst of a grove called Qam-lan-čuin to the east of the eight Selenge (*säkiz Sänglä*) (rivers) and nine Toyla (*toquz Toyla*) (rivers) in the northern land of the world of Jambudvīpa (*Čambudivip*), having manifested in the Ötikän region, having grown up together as a group of five persons on a throne, born from the divine Boquy clan (*iđuq Boquy uyuš*) extolled by gods revered by earth and heaven and possessing great power, the person born of the clan of the Bodhisattva possessing the essence of enlightenment (Skt. *bodhi*), beautiful // having wisdom, valiant in state affairs in the four directions, // having ability like a heavenly god, // mind of the direction // like his son [rest missing]

The second of the two documents is U 971 (= T II S 20), the colophon of a Uighur Buddhist scripture in square script held in Berlin that was published by Kasai, “Bokug Kagan.” Since there already exist German and Japanese translations of this colophon by Kasai herself, I shall quote only the key passage in which a noblewoman of the Uighur royal family is described as resembling “the *uḍumbara* flower of the Udan clan, the *puṇḍarīka* (lotus) flower having the origin of Boquy” (Udan<sup>66</sup> *uyušnung udumbar lenxua-si* Boquy tözönüng pundarik čäčäki), where it is evident that this woman was linked to the lineage of Boquy Qayan.

Now the most contentious source in connection with the question of whether to identify Buqu Xan (Boquy Qayan) with Huaixin or Mouyu is the following passage in U 1, a fragment of a Uighur history:

**U 1=T II K Bündel Nr. D 173** (Le Coq, “Ein manichäisches Buch-Fragment,” 147).

*tängri-kän uyyur boquy xan qočo-yaru kälipän qoi-n yılqa üç maxi-stak olurmaq üçün možakkä kingädi:*  
“The Divine Ruler (*tängrikän*), the Uighur Boquy Xan, came to Qočo and discussed with the *možak* the installation of three *maxistaks* [to the Mongolian plateau] in the year of the sheep.”

For those of us who support Abe’s identification of Buqu Xan with Huaixin (r. 795-808), this “year of the sheep” can only be 803. While intimating that, in line with his foregoing arguments, he would prefer to regard the above incident as concerning Mouyu prior to his accession to the throne, Clark<sup>67</sup> appeared to acknowledge with some reluctance the 803 thesis going back to Abe. But in a subsequent article, published after Kasai, “Bokug Kagan,” Clark executed an about-face and once again propounded, in a way that made

<sup>65</sup> According to Karlgren and A. Tōdō, 卜古 was pronounced *puk-kuo* (GSR 1210a + 49a) in Middle Chinese and *pu-ku* in Early Mandarin, while 普鞠 was pronounced *p'u-kiuk* (GSR 72a + 1017h) in Middle Chinese and *p'u-ku* in Early Mandarin.

<sup>66</sup> Clark (“Manichaeism among the Uyghurs,” 64) is to be credited with restoring ‘WD//’ in Kasai’s text to Udan. In the inscription on a memorial to the Uighur royal family erected in 1334 during the Mongol period (“Yiduhu Gaochang wang shixun zhi bei” 亦都護高昌王世勲之碑), the name of the subject of the Buqu Xan legend is given as Wudan Bugu Kehan 兀單卜古可罕, with Wudan corresponding to Udan and Bugu to Boquy. In addition, Ch/U 8188, quoted in Zieme, “Toyn körklüg,” 26, includes the following passage: *kim ol ur uyuš-luy udan bay-liy uyyur il-ning ... čindamani ärdinisi tigli tägimlig bolmisi tängrikänimiz* “Our Majesty worthy to be called ‘Cintämaṇi jewel ... of the Uighur realm of the *Ur* generation and the *Udan* clan.” There can no longer be any doubt whatsoever about the existence of the name Udan.

<sup>67</sup> Clark, “The Conversion of Bügü Khan,” 114.

the views of Kasai the target of his attack, the thesis that Buqu Xan was Boquy Qayan, i.e., Mouyu Qayan.<sup>68</sup> He of course does not commit the phonologically naïve mistake of equating Bögü/Bügü (on which the Chinese transliteration Mouyu is based) with Boquy (ibid., 62), and instead he tries to argue that Bögü/Bügü was his real name while Boquy was an alternative name or sobriquet that arose in later times after he had become the stuff of legend.<sup>69</sup> And in view of the fact that there are no sources clearly stating that Boquy was the name of a specific individual, Clark regards Boquy as the name of the clan to which Mouyu belonged and equates this clan with the Pugu 僕固, one of the Nine Oguz tribes. Of course, the view that would regard Buqu Xan/Boquy Qayan as a scion of the Pugu has long been deeply entrenched,<sup>70</sup> but since Clark makes this assertion on the assumption that Buqu Xan/Boquy Qayan was Mouyu Qayan, his reasoning is quite incomprehensible since no one doubts that Mouyu Qayan belonged to the Yaylaqar clan, one of the ten clans of the Uighurs. Furthermore, Clark even refuses to recognize that Huaixin instigated the revolution that brought the Ädiz clan to power on the grounds that the Yaylaqar clan retained its power until later times (ibid., 68). However, in actual fact, Huaixin falsely claimed after the revolution to belong to the Yaylaqar clan, a fact that has not only been inferred from Chinese sources, but has also been confirmed in a recent study by Yoshida.<sup>71</sup> To put it the other way around, the royal Yaylaqar clan was of such great importance to the Uighurs, and the reckless assertion that Mouyu Qayan did not belong to the Yaylaqar clan cannot be allowed to go unchallenged.

At this juncture let us recall the fragment of the Uighur historical work from the Mongol period taken up in the previous section, where Mouyu Qayan was correctly referred to as Bögü Xan. This means that even five hundred years after the period when he lived his name was correctly remembered by the Uighurs, a fact that would be difficult to comprehend unless one assumes the existence of historical works that were passed down in the Uighur royal family. This means that the Uighurs clearly distinguished between Mouyu Qayan and Buqu Xan/Boquy Qayan, and Clark's thesis, equating these two figures, is no longer tenable.

In addition, if the account in U 1 means, as Clark insists, that Mouyu Qayan came to Qočo in 755/756 prior to his accession to the throne and discussed the installation of *maxistaks* with the *možak*, then the reference to the introduction of Manichaeism in the Karabalgasun inscription is left completely up in the air. This monument was erected by Baoyi Qayan in order to extol the achievements of himself and his predecessor Huaixin, the latter of whom had not only usurped the Yaylaqar dynasty and extended Uighur territory in the west, but had also restored Manichaeism and made it the true state religion. It was erected also in order to assert the legitimacy of the new Ädiz dynasty, but at the same time, it was also intended to commemorate the history of Manichaeian church among the Uighurs (Moriyasu, "Anshi no ran," 152-53). If Mouyu Qayan had really gone to Qočo in 755/756, met the *možak*, and discussed the installation of *maxistaks*, then such an important event in the history of Manichaeism is hardly likely not to have been recorded in the Karabalgasun inscription.

There is much else that is unfeasible in Clark's arguments. The reason that he clings to the Mouyu Qayan thesis to such a degree becomes apparent when he makes a series of rapid-fire comparisons between Mouyu and Huaixin:<sup>72</sup> (1) Who was it that brought the Silk Road in the Tianshan region under Uighur control for the first time? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin; (2) Who decisively defeated the anti-Tang rebels during the An-Shi rebellion and placed the Tang in a subordinate relationship with the Uighurs? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin; (3) Who built the foundations for siphoning off immeasurable riches from the Tang? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin; (4) Who established Manichaeism as the state religion of the Uighurs? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin; (5) Who brought Manichaeian clerics and missionaries to the Mongolian steppe for the first time? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin; (6) Who supported the first translation of Manichaeian texts into Uighur? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin; and (7) Who was the subject of one of the most famous texts of the period (U 72 & U 73)? It was Mouyu, not Huaixin.

<sup>68</sup> Clark, "Manichaeism among the Uygurs."

<sup>69</sup> In this respect Clark's view is the same as that of Bang and Gabain ("Türkische Turfan-Texte, II," 413), who also identified Buqu Xan with Mouyu.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Abe, *Nishi Uiguru koku shi*, 197-98; Haneda, "Uiguru moji kō," 12-13; Rybatzki, "Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers," 260.

<sup>71</sup> Yoshida, "Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyuruku-zoku," 17.

<sup>72</sup> Clark, "Manichaeism among the Uygurs," 69.

In this manner Clark stresses that the Boquy Qayan mentioned in U 1 cannot possibly be anyone other than Mouyu Qayan. But it would not be very productive to examine each of these assertions since it would involve repeating some of Abe's arguments. For my part, I shall confine myself to counter-posing my own view<sup>73</sup> that it was precisely because Mouyu Qayan had such great importance in the history of Uighur Manichaeism that, so long as Manichaeism remained the state religion, his achievements were publicly honored in statements of the Uighur government's official position, even in historical works (such as the Karabalgasun inscription and Mainz 345) that were composed after the reign of Huaixin Qayan when the royal bloodline changed from the Yaylaqar clan to the Ädiz clan.

Since there is no space here to analyze the Buqu Xan legend in detail, I shall without preamble present my own conclusion, going back to my graduation thesis, which is that Buqu Xan/Boquy Qayan is a "legendary figure" created by combining the persons of Mouyu Qayan and Huaixin Qayan, even though the main model would have been Huaixin Qayan. Many of the attributes of Buqu Xan are those of the founder of a new dynasty and befit Huaixin Qayan, who brought the northern slopes of the Tianshan Mountains from Bišbaliq as far as Balasagun in the far west under Uighur control, placed the region traversed by the northern branch of the Silk Road to the south of the Tianshan Mountains, including Qočo, Karashär, Kucha, and Kashgar, within his sphere of influence, and made Manichaeism the state religion in a true sense. Yet only his fame as a propagator of Manichaeism did not match that of Mouyu Qayan. Even in the Karabalgasun inscription, in which there is a pronounced tendency to ignore as much as possible the achievements of the previous Yaylaqar dynasty, Mouyu Qayan alone had to be treated as an exception.<sup>74</sup> It is universally recognized that the Buqu Xan legend is replete with Manichaeian elements, and it is most unlikely that the achievements of Mouyu Qayan would not have been reflected in the attributes of the protagonist of the Buqu Xan legend, which evolved from the second half of the East Uighur period to the first term of the West Uighur period, when Manichaeism was the state religion.

An enigma in past research on the titles of Uighur *qayans* has been why Mouyu's *qayan* title in T II D 135,<sup>75</sup> the colophon of a Manichaeian text in Middle Persian that describes Mouyu Qayan's court, begins with the words *Tängridä Qut Bulmīš* "he who found blessings from Heaven," whereas in the Chinese text of the Karabalgasun inscription this is rendered as *jun dengliluo gu momishi* 君登里囉汨沒蜜施, i.e., *Kün Tängridä Qut Bulmīš* "he who found blessings from the Sun God," with the word *jun* 君 having been added.<sup>76</sup> It has been recognized since Tazaka's study that the addition of the word 君 = *Kün*, meaning "sun," or 愛 = *Ay*, meaning "moon," at the start of the titles of Uighur *qayans* was due to the influence of Manichaeism, which worshipped the Sun and Moon gods.<sup>77</sup> In my view, the addition of 君 = *Kün* to Mouyu's title, which would originally have begun simply with *Tängridä* = 登里囉, represents a posthumous title and indicates that the mythologization of Mouyu Qayan had already begun in the early stages of the Ädiz dynasty.

As for U 1, which states that Boquy Qayan came to Qočo in 803 and discussed the installation of *maxistaks* with the *možak*, this is the fragment of a historical work dating from the West Uighur period, and it does not mean that Huaixin Qayan was himself being called Boquy Qayan in 803 during his reign.<sup>78</sup> Would it after all not have been during the West Uighur period that Mouyu Qayan and Huaixin Qayan were combined to form a legendary figure?

73 Moriyasu, "Anshi no ran," 151-57; Moriyasu, "Four Lectures at the Collège de France," 59-62.

74 Moriyasu, "Anshi no ran," 151-53.

75 Müller, "Der Hofstaat"; Gulácsi, *Manichaeian Art in Berlin Collections*, 232-34.

76 It was Hamilton ("L'inscription trilingue," 130) who, having reexamined the de Lacoste rubbing in Paris, suggested that the character 君 should be added to the start of Mouyu's *qayan* title in line 6 of the Karabalgasun inscription, and I endorse this from a different vantage point.

77 Tazaka, "Kaikotsu ni okeru Manikyō hakugai undō," 229-31; Mackerras, *The Uighur Empire*, 152; Klimkeit, *Gnosis*, 366; Rybatzki, "Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers," 245; Clark, "Manichaeism among the Uygurs," 71 n. 31.

78 In this respect alone my thinking differs from Kasai, "Bokug Kagan," 11-14. I am of the view that coins inscribed with the name of Boquy/Buquy Qayan date from the West Uighur period (Moriyasu, "Shirukurōdo töbu ni okeru tsūka," 21-22). It should be noted that the year 803 immediately follows the year when, according to Yoshida, the Uighurs gained control of the area beyond Kucha as far as Kashgar and Ferghana in the west (and therefore all of the western Tianshan region) (Yoshida, *Kōtan shutsudo*, 29-30, 45; Yoshida, "The Karabalgasun Inscription and the Khotanese Documents," 351-54; Yoshida, "Bakutoria-go monjo," 56), and fighting with the Tibetans and Qarluqs had finally come to a halt.

Like previous scholars, including Clark, I take the view that the motive behind the composition of the *Mahnāmag* was the propagation of Manichaeism by Mouyu Qayan. It would have been a truly propitious commemorative project for the Manichaeian order in Karashār, the center of Tuyuristan. By way of comparison, I would like to draw attention to U 168 & U 169 (= T II D 173 a & b) [Le Coq, *Türkische Manichaica I*, 7-15 + *Türkische Manichaica III*, 11-12], a Uighur Manichaeian scripture bearing a colophon with a prayer dated the year of the pig (795).<sup>79</sup> On inspecting the original manuscript, I found that whitish paper of a high, even quality and medium thickness without traces of ribs had been used, and if restored to its original form, it would have been a large codex 28 × 13 cm in size. It is of course written in square Uighur script, and the letters are well over twice the size of those in U 72 & U 73 and larger also than those of U 1 and Mainz 345. The frame lines are reddish purple, Manichaeian punctuation marks in red and black are used, and all in all it is a handsome manuscript with decorative elements added also to the headlines. In the colophon of the prayer in this manuscript we find the following passage.

**U 168 II = T II D 173 a2, verso** [Le Coq, *Türkische Manichaica I*, 11-12; Özertural, *Der uigurische Manichäismus*, 101-103]:

taqī üküš türlüg muntay ötüglär ötüngäy ol ödkä uluy ilig mängigü yarlıqançuči körtlä körkin ačyay bälgürtgäy : ol ödkä qamay tängrilär<sup>80</sup> mängigü ögrünçülüg sävinčlig bolyay-lar : : : ymä män zimtu män ol ädgü mängikä ortuqluyu bolayan mängigü mängigü : inčä bolzun : : : ymä tängri mani burxan tängri yiringärü barduqinta kin biš yüz artuqı äkii otuzunč layzin yılqa ötkäntäki nom uluvi tüklä ärdämlig yarlayqançuči bilgä bāg tängri mar niw mani maxistakk<sup>81</sup> ayyin bu äki

“Furthermore, (people) will offer many kinds of such prayers. Then the great king will manifest an eternal, immortal, compassionate, and beautiful form. Then all the Manichaeian clerics will be filled with eternal joy.

Again, I, Zimtu, will become a follower of that joy. May it be so in eternity!

Now, in the year of the pig, the 522nd (year) after the divine Mani-Buddha went to Heaven, by the command of the master of doctrine in Ötükän, the perfectly virtuous, compassionate, and wise Bāg, the divine Mar Niw Mani Maxistak, these two [*rest missing*]”

Because Özertural<sup>82</sup> could translate *tängrilär* in the above passage only as “gods,” she took *uluy ilig* “great king” to refer to the god Äzrua (= Father of Greatness = Father of Light = supreme deity of Manichaeism) in heaven.<sup>83</sup> In contrast, I take *tängrilär* in this context to refer to “Manichaeian clerics” on earth, and, noting

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Moriyasu, “Zōho: Hokutei sōdatsusen,” 216; Bazin, *Les systèmes chronologiques*, 247-48; Clark, “Turkic Manichaeian Literature,” 105; Özertural, *Der uigurische Manichäismus*, 97-98. In his English translation Klimkeit (*Gnosis*, 347) does not accept the year of the pig and considers the colophon to date from 798, but this can now be dismissed as being out of the question.

<sup>80</sup> Le Coq (*Türkische Manichaica I*, 11) read this as *täklirär*, which I emended to *tängrilär* when I inspected the original manuscript, but Özertural (*Der uigurische Manichäismus*, 101) had earlier proposed the same emendation. However, she interprets this *tängrilär* simply as “gods,” which is fundamentally different from my interpretation of “Manichaeian clerics.” On the fact that *tängri* can sometimes signify an ordinary Manichaeian cleric, see *Manikyō-shi*, 54-55=GUMS, 63 and Yoshida’s review of *Manikyō-shi* [*Shigaku Zasshi* 102-4, 1993, 112].

<sup>81</sup> In Moriyasu, “Zōho: Hokutei sōdatsusen”, 216, I read *maxistakk* as *maxistakka*, with a dative suffix, and translated this section as: “The perfectly virtuous and compassionate Bilgä Bāg to Tängri Mar Niw Mani Maxistak with words.” But following Clauson’s translation “by the command of Mar Név Mani Magistak” [ED, 270], Röhrborn’s translation “auf Befehl des Mar New Mani Mahistaka” [UW, 4, 294a], and Erdal’s translation “by the order of ...” [review of Bazin, *Les systèmes chronologiques* in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 89-3, p. 305], I have emended my translation as above. Clark (“Turkic Manichaeian Literature,” 105) and Özertural (*Der uigurische Manichäismus*, 103, 177) also follow this interpretation. The original word should be transliterated as MXYST’K’ rather than MXYST’KK, and I consider *maxistaka* to be merely a variant spelling for *maxistak*. Bazin (*Les systèmes chronologiques*, 247) takes *maxistaka* ayyin as a personal name, while Tongerloo (“Buddhist Indian Terminology,” 244, n. 8) gives his own original interpretation, but these interpretations are no longer tenable.

<sup>82</sup> *Der uigurische Manichäismus*, 103.

<sup>83</sup> Although Özertural gives no attestations, exactly the same expression *uluy ilig tängri xanı äzrua tängri* “the great king, the emperor of Heaven, God Zurvān” is attested in Manichaeian documents (cf. Pelliot chinois 3049, verso, l. 4 on MOTH, 38; T II D 171, recto ii, ll. 31-33 in *Türkische Manichaica I*, 25).

that “great king” is a title used for Mouyu Qayan in T II D 135, I consider this *uluy ilig* to refer to Huaixin Qayan. I surmise, in other words, that the copying of a Uighur Manichaean scripture of such fine quality (probably in multiple copies) in 795 was undoubtedly one of the commemorative projects undertaken to mark Huaixin Qayan’s accession to the throne in the same year. Of course, if one takes this view, then it may be possible to posit the accession of Baoyi Qayan as the event that prompted the completion of the *Mahrnāmag* after it had initially been left unfinished, but at present I do not wish to commit myself so far as to assert that this was indeed the case.

## Abbreviations

AOH	<i>Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i> , Budapest.
APAW	<i>Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse</i> , Berlin.
BSOAS	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i> .
BSOS	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies</i> .
CAJ	<i>Central Asiatic Journal</i> .
GUMS	Moriyasu 2004, <i>Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße</i> .
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i> .
Manikyō-shi	Moriyasu 1991, <i>Uiguru Manikyō-shi no kenkyū [A Study on the History of Uighur Manichaeism]</i> .
MOTH	J. Hamilton, <i>Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-houang</i> . Paris, 1986.
SIAL	『内陸アジア言語の研究』 <i>Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]</i> .
SPAW	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse</i> , Berlin.
Turfan-Forschung	<i>Sprachwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der deutschen Turfan-Forschung</i> , I-III. 3 vols., Leipzig, 1972-1985.
VOHD	<i>Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland</i> .

## References

Abe, Takeo. “Where was the Capital of the West Uighurs?” Pages 435-50 in *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-kagaku-kenkyūsho*. Kyoto University, 1954.

Abe, Takeo. 安部健夫『西ウイグル國史の研究』 *Nishi Uiguru koku shi no kenkyū [Historical Study of the West Uighur Kingdom]*. Kyoto: Ibundō shoten, 1955.

Asmussen, Jes P. *Xuāstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*. Acta Theologica Danica, 7. Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1965.

Bang, W. and A. von Gabain. “Türkische Turfan-Texte, II: Manichaica.” *SPAW* 1929: 411-30, + 4 pls. (Repr.: *Turfan-Forschung*, II: 31-50, pls. III-VI.)

Bazin, Louis. *Les systèmes chronologiques dans le monde turc ancien*. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, 34. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó/Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1991.

Boyce, Mary. *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes*. Acta Iranica, 9. Téhéran/Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Boyle, John Andrew. *The History of the World-Conqueror by 'Alā-ad-Dīn 'Ata-Malik Juvainī*. 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958.

Chavannes, Éd./P. Pelliot. “Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine.” *Journal Asiatique* 1911 nov.-déc., 499-617; (deuxième partie) *Journal Asiatique* 1913 jan.-fév., 99-199 & mar.-avr., 261-394, + 2 pls.

Clark, Larry Vernon. “The Turkic Manichaean Literature.” Pages 89-141 in *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43. Edited by Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997.

Clark, Larry Vernon. “The Conversion of Bügü Khan to Manichaeism.” Pages 83-123 in *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997*. Berichte und Abhandlungen der Berlin-Brandenburgische

Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sonderband 4. Edited by Ronald E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000.

Clark, Larry Vernon. "Manichaeism among the Uyghurs: The Uyghur Khan of the Bokug Clan." Pages 61-71 in *New Light on Manichaeism: Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 64. Edited by Jason David BeDuhn. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2009.

D'Ohsson, C. *Histoire des Mongols, depuis Tchinguiz-Khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan*. 4 vols. La Haye/Amsterdam: Les frères Van Cleef, 1834-35.

D'Ohsson, C., trans. with detailed annotations by T. Saguchi. 『モンゴル帝国史』 *Mongoru teikokushi [History of the Mongol Empire]*, Vol. 1. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1968.

Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond. "Late Features in Middle Persian Texts from Turfan." Pages 1-13 in *Persian Origins—: Early Judaeo-Persian and the Emergence of New Persian*. Iranica 6. Edited by Ludwig Paul. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2003.

Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond. *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia, Dictionary of Manichaean Texts, Vol. III: Texts from Central Asia and China, Part 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.

Gulácsi, Zsuzsanna. "Identifying the Corpus of Manichaean Art among the Turfan Remains." Pages 177-215 in *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43. Edited by Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997.

Gulácsi, Zsuzsanna. *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections: A Comprehensive Catalogue of Manichaean 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*. Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Archaeologica et Iconographica, 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.

Haloun, G. and W. B. Henning. "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light." *Asia Major* n.s. 3 (1953): 184-212.

Hamilton, James R. *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties d'après les documents chinois*. Bibliothèque de l'Institut des hautes études chinoises 10. Paris: Impr. nationale, 1955; 2d ed., Paris: Collège de France, Institut des hautes études chinoises, 1988.

Hamilton, James R. "L'inscription trilingue de Qara Balgasun d'après les estampages de Bouillane de Lacoste." Pages 125-33 in *Documents et archives provenant de l'Asie Centrale*. Edited by Akira Haneda. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1990.

Haneda, Tōru. 羽田亨「回鶻文字考」 "Uiguru moji kō [Réflexions sur l'alphabet ouigour]." *Haneda hakushi shigaku ronbunshū, gekan: gengo / shūkyōhen [Recueil des œuvres posthumes de Tōru Haneda, II: Études religieuses et linguistiques]*. Kyoto: Kyōto daigaku bungakubu Tōyō-shi kenkyūkai, 1958: 1-38.

Henning, W. B. "Argi and the 'Tokharians'." *BSOS* 9 (1938): 545-71.

Kasai, Yukio. "Ein Kolophon um die Legende von Bokug Kagan." *SIAL* 19 (2004): 1-27.

Kasai, Yukio. 笠井幸代「トカラ語より翻訳された未比定のウイグル語仏典註釈書」 "Tokara-go yori hon-yaku sareta mi-hitei no Uiguru-go butten chūshakusho [Ein Kommentar zu einem unbekannten uigurisch-buddhistischen Text, der aus dem Tocharischen übersetzt wurde]." *SIAL* 21 (2006): 21-47.

Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim. *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts: Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1989.

Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim. *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1993.

Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim. "The Significance of the Manichaean Texts in Turkish." Pages 225-45 in *Essays in Honour of Professor Geng Shimin on His Seventieth Birthday*. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe, 1999.

Klyashtorny, S. G. "The Terkhin Inscription." *AOH* 36 (1982): 335-66.

Klyashtorny, S. G. "East Turkestan and the Kaghans of Ordubalıq." *AOH* 42 (1988): 277-80.

Le Coq, Albert von. "Ein manichäisches Buch-Fragment aus Chotscho." Pages 145-54 in *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 25. Jan. 1912*. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1912. (Repr.: *Turfan-Forschung*, III: 539-48, pl. XXII.)

Le Coq, Albert von. *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho, I-III*. I=APAW 1911 (published in 1912), No. 6; II=APAW 1919, No. 3; III=APAW 1922, No. 2. (Repr.: *Turfan-Forschung*, I, 391-511, pls. VI-XIV.)

Lieu, Samuel N. C. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: A Historical Survey*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985; 2d. ed., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.

Lin, Wushu. 林悟殊『摩尼教及其東漸』 *Monijiao ji qi dongjian [Manichaeism and Its Eastward Spread]*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.

Mackerras, Colin. *The Uighur Empire according to the T'ang Dynastic Histories: A Study in Sino-Uighur Relations 744-840*. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1972.

Minorsky, Vladimir. "Tamīm ibn Bahr's Journey to the Uyghurs." *BSOAS* 12 (1948): 275-305.

Moriyasu, Takao. 森安孝夫「チベット語史料中に現われる北方民族—DRU-GUとHOR」 "Chibetto-go siryō chū ni arawareru hoppō minzoku—DRU-GU to HOR [À propos des tribus de l'Asie Centrale qui se trouvent dans les sources tibétaines: DRU-GU et HOR]." *Ajia Afurika gengo bunka kenkyū [Journal of Asian and African Studies]* 14 (1977): 1-48.

Moriyasu, Takao. 「増補：ウイグルと吐蕃の北庭争奪戦及びその後の西域情勢について」 "Zōho: Uiguru to Toban no Hokutei sōdatsusen oyobi sonogo no Seiki jōsei ni tsuite [The Uyghur-Tibetan Struggle for Beshbalygh and the

Subsequent Situation in Central Asia: An Enlarged Edition].” Pages 199-238 in *Ajia bunka-shi ronsō [Contributions to West, Central and North Asian Studies]*, Vol. 3. Edited by Ryūsha Kaisei shōgakukai. Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha, 1979.

Moriyasu, Takao. 『ウイグル=マニ教史の研究』 *Uiguru Manikyō-shi no kenkyū [A Study on the History of Uighur Manichaeism]*. Ōsaka daigaku bungakubu kiyō [Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters Ōsaka University] 31/32, 1991.

Moriyasu, Takao. 「大英図書館所蔵ルーン文字マニ教文書Kao. 0107の新研究」 “Daiiei-toshokan shozō Rūn moji Manikyō monjo Kao. 0107 no shin kenkyū [A Manichaeian Runic Manuscript with Miniature (Kao.0107) Housed in the British Library].” *SIAL* 12 (1997): 41-71.

Moriyasu, Takao. “Uighur Buddhist Stake Inscriptions from Turfan.” Pages 149-223 in *De Dunhuang à Istanbul: Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Silk Road Studies 5. Edited by L. Bazin and Peter Zieme. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.

Moriyasu, Takao. 「ウイグルから見た安史の乱」 “Uiguru kara mita Anshi no ran [The Rebellion of An Lu-shan and Shi Si-ming (755-763) from the Uighurs’ Viewpoint].” *SIAL* 17 (2002): 117-70.

Moriyasu, Takao. “Four Lectures at the Collège de France in May 2003: History of Manichaeism among the Uighurs from the 8th to the 11th Centuries in Central Asia.” Pages 23-111 in *Shirukurōdo to sekaishi [World History Reconsidered through the Silk Road]*, (Osaka University The 21st Century COE Program Interface Humanities Research Activities 2002\*2003, Vol. 3). Edited by T. Moriyasu. Toyonaka (Osaka): Osaka University, Graduate School of Letters, 2003.

Moriyasu, Takao. 「シルクロード東部における通貨——絹・西方銀錢・官布から銀錠へ」 “Shirukurōdo tōbu ni okeru tsūka —kinu, seihō ginsen, kanpu kara ginjō e— [Currencies on the Eastern Part of the Silk Road].” Pages 1-40 in *Chūō Ajia shitsudo bunbutsu ronsō [Papers on the Pre-Islamic Documents and Other Materials Unearthed from Central Asia]*. Edited by T. Moriyasu. Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, 2004: 1-40.

Moriyasu, Takao. *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße.: Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund*. Übersetzt von Christian Steineck. Studies in Oriental Religions 50. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004.

Moriyasu, Takao. 『シルクロードと唐帝国』 *Shirukurōdo to Tō teikoku [Silk Road and the Tang Empire]*. (What is Human History? Vol. 5). Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2007.

Moriyasu, Takao. 「シルクロード東部出土古ウイグル手紙文書の書式（前編）」 “Epistolary Formulae of the Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road (Part 1).” *Memoirs of the Graduate School of Letters Ōsaka University* 51 (2011): 1-86.

Moriyasu, T. and A. Ochir, eds. 『モンゴル国現存遺蹟・碑文調査研究報告』 *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Toyonaka (Osaka): Society of Central Eurasian Studies, 1999.

Moriyasu, T., Y. Yoshida, and A. Katayama. 「カラ=バルガスン碑文」 “Qara-Balgasun Inscription.” Pages 209-24 in *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*. Edited by T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir. Toyonaka (Osaka): Society of Central Eurasian Studies, 1999.

Müller, F. W. K. *Uigurica II*. APAW 1910, 1911. (Repr.: *Turfan-Forschung*, I: 61-168, pls. III-V.)

Müller, F. W. K. “Der Hofstaat eines Uiguren-Königs.” Pages 207-13 in *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen zur vollendung des siebzigsten lebensjahres am 25. jan. 1912*. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1912. (Repr.: *Turfan-Forschung*, III: 191-97.)

Müller, F. W. K. *Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch (Mahrnāmag)*. APAW 1912, Nr. 5; 1913. (Repr.: *Turfan-Forschung*, III: 151-90, pls. VII-VIII.)

Oda, Juten. 小田壽典「ブク・ハン伝説のウイグル仏教写本一断片——トゥグーシェヴァ発表によせて」 “Buku-han densetsu no Uiguru Bukkyō shahon ichi dampen —Tugūsheva happyō ni yosete— [A Fragment of the Buqu Xan Legend in a Uighur Buddhist Manuscript: With Reference to Tuguševa’s Paper].” *Aidai Shigaku—Nihonshi, Ajiashi, Chirigaku* 7, 1998: 57-67, incl. 1 pl.

Özertural, Zekine. *Der uigurische Manichäismus: Neubearbeitung von Texten aus Manichaica I und III von Albert v. Le Coq*. VSUA 74. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008.

Rybatzki, Volker. “Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers in the Old Turkic Inscriptions.” *CAJ* 44 (2000): 205-92.

Sundermann, Werner. “Iranian Manichaeian Turfan Texts concerning the Turfan Region.” Pages 63-84 in *Turfan and Tun-huang. The Texts: Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route*. Orientalia Venetiana 4. Edited by Alfredo Cadonna. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1992.

Tazaka, Kōdō. 田坂興道「回紇に於ける摩尼教迫害運動」 “Kaikotsu ni okeru Manikyō hakugai undō [The Movement to Persecute Manichaeism among the Uighurs].” *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Tokyo) 11-1 (1940): 223-232.

Tongerloo, Aloïs van. “Buddhist Indian Terminology in the Manichaeian Uygur and Middle Iranian Texts.” Pages 243-52 in *Middle Iranian Studies: Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*. Edited by Wojciech Skalmowski and Aloïs van Tongerloo. Leuven: Peeters, 1984.

Tremblay, Xavier. *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde: Le manichéisme parmi les peuples et religions d’Asie Centrale d’après les sources primaires*. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 690. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001.

Tuguševa, L. Ju. “Ein Fragment eines frühmittelalterlichen uigurischen Textes.” Pages 353-59 in *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang: Vorträge der Tagung “Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung.”* Edited by Ronald E. Emmerick, et al. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1996.

Wang, Yuanyuan. 王媛媛『從波斯到中國：摩尼教在中亞和中國的傳播』 *Cong Bosi dao Zhongguo: Monijiao zai Zhongya he Zhongguo de chuanbo [From Persia to China: The Dissemination of Manichaeism in Central Asia and China]*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2012.

Wilkens, Jens. *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 8: Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung*. VOHD Bd. XIII/16. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000.

Wilkens, Jens. "Ein manichäisch-türkischer Hymnus auf den Licht-Nous." *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* n.f. 16 (1999/2000): 217-31.

Wu, Qiyu. 吳其昱「敦煌漢文写本概観」 "Tonkō kanbun shahon gaikan [A Survey of Chinese Manuscripts from Dunhuang]." Pages 1-142 in *Kōza Tonkō 5: Tonkō kanbun bunken [Lecture Series on Dunhuang, 5: Chinese Documents from Dunhuang]*. Edited by O. Ikeda. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1992.

Yoshida, Yutaka. 吉田豊「カラバルガスン碑文のソグド語版について」 "Karabarugasun hibun no Sogudo-go ban ni tsuite [On the Sogdian Version of the Kara Balgasun Inscription]." *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 28 (1988): 24-52.

Yoshida, Yutaka. "Some New Readings of the Sogdian Version of the Karabalgasun Inscription." Pages 117-23 in *Documents et archives provenant de l'Asie Centrale*. Edited by A. Haneda. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1990.

Yoshida, Yutaka. "Manichaeian Sogdian Letters Discovered in Bäzäklik." *Annuaire de la Section des Sciences Religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études* 109 (2000-2001): 233-36.

Yoshida, Yutaka. 『コータン出土8-9世紀のコータン語世俗文書に関する覚え書き』 *Kōtan shutsudo 8-9 seiki no Kōtan-go sezoku monjo ni kansuru oboegaki [Notes on the Khotanese Documents of the 8th-8th Centuries Unearthed from Khotan]*, Kobe: Kōbe City University of Foreign Studies, 2006.

Yoshida, Yutaka. "The Karabalgasun Inscription and the Khotanese Documents." Pages 349-62 in *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit: Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann*. Edited by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Christiane Reck, and Dieter Weber. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2009.

Yoshida, Yutaka. 「ソグド人と古代のチュルク族との関係に関する三つの覚え書き」 "Sogudo-jin to kodai no Tyuruku-zoku to no kankei ni kansuru mitsu no oboegaki [Three Philological Notes on the Sogdo-Turkish Relationship]." *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters Kyoto University* 50, 2011: 1-41, incl 2 pls.

Yoshida, Yutaka. "Some New Readings in the Sogdian Version of Karabalgasun Inscription." Pages 77-86 in *Ötüken'den İstanbul'a (From Ötüken to İstanbul)*. Edited by M. Ölmez. İstanbul, 2011.

Yoshida, Yutaka. 「バクトリア語文書研究の近況と課題」 "Bakutoria-go monjo kenkyū no kinkyō to kadai [Current Issues of the Bactrian Studies]." *SIAL* 28 (2013): 39-65.

Zhang, Tieshan and P. Zieme. "A Memorandum about the King of the *On Uygur* and His Realm." *AOH* 64 (2011): 129-59.

Zieme, Peter. "The Manichaeian Turkish Texts of the Stein Collection at the British Library." *JRAS* 20 (2010): 255-66.

Zieme, Peter. "Toyn körklüg": An Old Uigur Buddha Poem." *SIAL* 28 (2013): 7-37.

Zieme, Peter (Cimo 茨默), (tr. Wang Ding). 「有闍摩尼教開教回鶻的一件新史料」 "Youguan Monijiao kaijiao Huihu de yijian xin shiliao [On a New Uighur Source on the Propagation of Manichaeism]." *Dunhuangxue jikan* 2009-3: 1-7, incl. 1 pl.