ZIEME, PETER, *Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"* , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143

Altorientalische Forschungen	10	1983	1	143–149

PETER ZIEME

Colophons to the *Säkiz yükmäk yaruq*

In their edition of the *SYY* W. Bang, A. v. Gabain, and G. R. Rachmati stated: „Leider hat sich unter der Unzahl von Fragmenten kein einziges gefunden, das einen Kolophon enthalten hätte."[1] Recently I found three fragments of colophons belonging to different book types. Although none of these texts contains the name(s) of the Uigur translator or exact dates, they give us valuable informations on some names of sponsors, and, in the case of the block print, on the approximate time when the *sūtra* was printed. Let us now examine the fragments.

I

A fragment of a *pustaka* book of undeterminable size which I found among the Suvarṇaprabhāsa texts: T I (U 741). According to lines b 6–8, where it was possible to restore the text on the basis of the text edition, only little of the beginnings and endings of the lines is missing. The hole interrupts at least lines 1–3 on each side.

a 1 [/ / /]n[/ /]maq̈-larïn [. . .]
2 [/ / /]miš krgäk: [. . .]
3 [/ / /]ïng-q̈a yïγïlmïš [. . .]
4 [/ /t]irin q̈uvraγ bo paryoki a[tlγ sudur nom]
5 [biti]g bo muntaγ tüpsüz täring y[o̤rüg]-
6 [läri]g adïnčïγ mungadïnčïγ činžu ti[gmä]
7 [ärtü]ktäg kirtü töznüng [. . .]
8 [. . . . .]uγ oru[n . . .]
b 1 [. . . . .] bitkäči [alq]u
2 [. . . . .] baxšïm punyavatr(?)
3 [. . . . .]i bäg-ning b[uya]n [. . .]
4 [. . . k]örüp s[ïnq]ay a̤lp a̤rslan [. . .]
5 küsüš-läringä bitiyü täginmiš [. . .]
6 [tngril]i y[i]r-[li]-d[ä] säkiz tö[r]lügin yarumï[š]
7 [yaltrïmïš ï]d[uq] darni tana yi[p]
8 [atlγ sudur n]o[m b]i[tig . . .]

[1] Türkische Turfantexte VI p. 97.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH

ZIEME, PETER, ***Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"*** , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143



Fig. 1. T I (U 741) side a.

Translation

(a 1–2) "It is necessary to ... the .... (3–4) The assembly (hend.) which was assembled at ..., (4–8) (shall venerate?) the [*sūtra*] named *Paryoki* (and?) these groundless deep [explanations] (as the exposition?) of the wonderful (hend.), true root of *tathatā*, called *zhen ru* [眞如] ...

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH

ZIEME, PETER, ***Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"*** , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143



Fig. 2. T I (U 741) side b.

(b1) . . . scribe all(?) . . . , (2) . . . my master Puṇyavatr(?), (3–5) Seeing (?) the merits(?) of the . . . . . *bäg*; according to the wishes of S[ïnq]ay (and?) Alp Arslan [I] have written (6–8) [the *sūtra* called] 'Eightfold light in heaven and on earth, holy Dhāraṇī, *tana yip*'."

As the title in b 6–8 is identical with that of the *SYY* edition, it is clear that this text is a colophon of *SYY*. The short title of the Chinese version is 八陽經 *ba yang jing* which appears in the Tibetan and Mongolian titles, too.[2] Accordingly we can

[2] L. Ligeti, Autour du *Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq*, in: Studia Turcica, Budapest 1971, 316–318.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH

ZIEME, PETER, *Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"* , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143

explain the Uigur title *paryoki* (in line a 4) as derived from this Chinese one. For the phonetical details see the explanations by L. Ligeti.[3] Despite all efforts I could not find a good reading for the name of the *guru* mentioned in b 2. What can be taken as sure, is the first part of the name Punyavatr(?); it might stem from Sanskrit *puṇya.* The name(s) of the sponsor(s) in b 4 is (are) S[ïnq]ay (and?) Alp Arslan, probably known from a colophon fragment of a Suvarṇaprabhāsa manuscript.[4] The element S[ïnq]ay appears in a document edited by J. Hamilton, too.[5]

II

The second fragment is the end of a scroll which contained three *sūtras* according to the colophon. The text of T II Y 60b (U 5033) reads as follows:

1 [. . . . . .][. . .][. . .]i[. . .]
2 [/ /]ïnčï aγïr [ayïγ] q̈ïlïn[č-lar]ï arïzun tžit



Fig. 3. T II Y 60b (U 5033).

[3] Ligeti (cf. footnote 2) 316–317.
[4] P. Zieme, Materialien zum uigurischen Onomasticon II, in: Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı – Belleten 1978–1979 [Ankara 1981], pp. 89–90.
[5] J. Hamilton, Un acte ouïgour de vente de terrain provenant de Yar-khoto, in: Turcica 1 [1969], p. 35 l. 18.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH

ZIEME, PETER, ***Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"*** , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143

3 [kša]nti bolzun: q̈[op qa]maγ ayīγ q̈īlīnčīγ
4 [ö]künüp kšant[i] qīlmaq̈ nom bitig bir tägz-
5 [in]č tü[k]äd[i]:
6 [nam]o but: [namo] drm: namo sang:
7 mn tüm[an / / /]dük upasanč ašmīš mama
8 [bi]rlä bo ī-duq̈ bir kụ̈n ymlangwang ki
9 [bir] kụ̈n pryoki bir kụ̈n kšanti bit[ig]
10 üč kụ̈n nom ärdini bititdimz bu[yan]
11 [äd]gü q̈īlīnč' küčintä burxan qutīn [. . .]
12 [. . .] uzun [. . .]lar [. . .]
13 [. . .] nirvan mängisingä t[ägmäki]
14 [bolzu]n: su[. . . . . .]

Translation

(2–3) ". . . [all] their [evil] deeds may be purified! *Deśita kṣānti* may be! (3–5) The *sūtra* of repenting all (hend.) evil deeds (and) of forgiving (them), one scroll, is finished. (6) *Namo buddhāya, namo dharmāya, namaḥ saṃghāya*! (7–10) I, Tum[an / / /]dük, and the lay-sister Ašmïš Mama, we let write these three holy scrolls of *sūtras*: one scroll of the *Yamarājasūtra*, one scroll of the *Bayangjing*, (and) one scroll of the *Kšanti sūtra*. (10–14) In virtue of the *puṇya*, the good deed, [we may obtain?] the buddhahood, . . . long . . . (and) reach the bliss of *Nirvāṇa*!"

Since the third work mentioned in the colophon itself is the *Kšanti bitig* (l. 9), it is natural to find the title of it in its fuller form at the end of the text (ll. 3–5); for parallels see now M. Shōgaito, Ein uigurisches Fragment eines Beichttextes.[6] In the same line there is the above treated Uigur title of the Chinese *Bayangjing*, this time written without *-a-* in the first syllable. The first title, i.e., *ymlangwang ki* of line 8, can be explained as an adaptation of the Chinese short title of the *sūtra* 閻羅王 (五天使者) 經 *Yan luo wang* (*wu tian shi zhe*) *jing* (Taishō Tripiṭaka Nr. 43, vol. I, or similar text). While Uigur *ym* or *yim* (of hitherto unpublished fragments fits well to the Middle Chinese pronunciation of 閻, i.e., *yiɛm*,[7] the spelling *lang* for Middle Chinese 羅 *lâ*[8] is curious.

The names of the persons who ordered the copying of the *sūtras* (see l. 7) are otherwise not known.

III

The block print TM 16 (U 4761), published some years ago,[9] can now be joined with the fragment T I μ (U 4670). This makes it possible to restore some parts of

[6] M. Shōgaito, Ein uigurisches Fragment eines Beichttextes, in: Scholia, Beiträge zur Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde, Annemarie von Gabain zum 80. Geburtstag, Wiesbaden 1981, 89–90.
[7] Gakken Kanji daijiten, Tokio 1978, 1408c.
[8] F. Mártonfi, Yi-ching's Buddhist Sanskrit Chinese Glossary, in: Acta Orient. Hung. 29 [1975], p. 33 No. 7.
[9] P. Zieme, Zur buddhistischen Stabreimdichtung der alten Uiguren, in: Acta Orient. Hung. 29 [1975], 199–202.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH

ZIEME, PETER, *Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"* , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143

the text having been unclear up to now. Since I intend to give a new transcription of the whole colophon in my forthcoming „Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen", I must at the moment confine myself to a relevant part in connection with the SYY.

As far as we can conclude, this block print is a colophon to a collection of different Mahāyāna sūtras, the last of which is in the preserved text varyoki. This form might be a variant of the discussed *sūtra* title. The initial *v-* instead of *p-* (or *b-*) may be due to Uigur phonetics.

Let us cite the mention of the *sūtra* titles:.[. . . söz?]lämiš arïš arïγ bo ušniš-a vičay-a [. . .]n amita ayusi sitaḍapatri varyoki [. . .] arïγ mxayan sudur nomlarïγ "[. . . spo]ken this most pure *Uṣnīṣavijayā*[10], [. . .], *Amitāyus-*[*sūtra*][11], *Sitātapatrā*[12], *Bayangjing* [. . . all?] pure *Mahāyāna-sūtras* (acc.)".[13]

Another part of the joined block print may be given here, because it contains also the name of the person who was responsible for carving the block:

ạmraq inim tuγluγ tämür bolat tämür ar-a tämür töz tämür tümän tämür buyan qulï sayïn tämür budataz tayaq tämür orun tigin qïz tämür qïčï altun buyan qutluγ šakar čanča körklüg ögrünč tigin bašlap
aγ-a in[i] qïz kälin-lär birlä käṇgäšip
aṅaṅdašiṛi atlγ toyïn-qa
amtï-qï nom-lar-nïng tamγa-sïn oyturγalï
anga krgäk-lig yvig-in
anï barča tükäl anuḍup
anïng tamγ-a-sïn oydurup
anta basa oq yụz säkizär kün yaqdurup

Translation

"After conferring with my dear younger brother Tuγluγ Tämür, (and?) with the elder and younger brothers (as well as their) wifes beginning with Bolat Tämür, Ara Tämür, Töz Tämür, Tümän Tämür, Tümän Tämür, Buyan Qulï, Sayïn Tämür, Budataz, Tayaq Tämür, Orun Tigin, Qïz Tämür, Qïčï Altun, Buyan Qutluγ, Šakar Čanča Körklüg, and Ögrünč Tigin, in order to let carve the blocks of the temporary (i.e., named?) *sūtras* by the monk called Ānandaśrī, I let prepare the necessary equipments for it, this all completely, and I let carve the blocks, thereafter I let print 108 copies."[14]

A comment on the personal names will be given on another occasion, here it may be said that it is difficult to determine which of the names are male and which are female names, but I think that the last four are rather female ones.

[10] This title may refer to the Tantric work [*Sarva-durgati-pariśodhana*]-*uṣṇīṣa-vijayā*-[*dhāraṇī*], Uigur fragments of which were edited by F. W. K. Müller, in: Uigurica II, 27–50.

[11] It is not possible to determine which of the *Amitāyus-sūtras* is meant, see K. Röhrborn, Uigurisches Wörterbuch fasc. 2, Wiesbaden 1979, 118–119.

[12] This seems to be a short title of the [*Ārya-sarva-tathāgata-uṣṇīṣa*]-*sitātapatrā*-[*nāma-aparājitā-dhāraṇī*], the Uigur version of which was published in Uigurica II, 50–75.

[13] T I μ (U 4670) ll. 9–11.

[14] See Zieme (cf. footnote 9) p. 200 ll. 6–9 plus additional ll. of the block print cited in footnote 13.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH

ZIEME, PETER, ***Colophons to the "Säkiz yükmäk yaruq"*** , Altorientalische Forschungen, 10 (1983) p.143

In the colophon of Nr. 709 of the Mongolian *Kanjur* there is the following statement: *ariγun-a Anantasiri*(?) *kiged-iyer qabtasun-dur čoγulγaǰu.*[15] This sentence perfectly corresponds to the Uigur fragment where we read: ***anandaširi atly toyïn-qa amtï-qï nom-lar-nïng tamγa-sïn oyturγalï***, more concretely, the name (if the reading of the Kanjur is correct) is the same, Uig. *-qa* corresponds to Mong. *-iyer*, and Uig. *tamγa* and *oytur-* have the Mong. equivalents *qabtasun* and *čoγulγa-*. In 1967 the name was read by L. Ligeti as Ṛadasiri,[16] and F. A. Bischoff follows him, as can be seen from his German translation: „Sauber hat schließlich Qatasiri (?Śataśrī?, Anāthaśrī?) die Druckblöcke schneiden lassen."[17] If we are right to consider both Ānandaśrīs as one and the same person, we should have a further proof for L. Ligeti's assumption that the Mongolian translation was composed during Yuan times.[18]

[15] L. Ligeti, Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé, Budapest 1942, 160.

[16] L. Ligeti, Mongol Nyelvemléktár V, Preklasszikus emlékek, Budapest 1967, 137. As this is the only possible reading in the printed edition (see Śatapiṭaka Series Vol. 124, New Delhi, p. 602 = 301 v 4; I would like to thank Prof. G. Kara and Prof. J. Oda for this kind information), one must suppose that the spelling Ṛadaširi is an old mistake.

[17] F. A. Bischoff, Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone, Bloomington 1968, 296.

[18] Ligeti (cf. note 16) 115. As Prof. G. Kara kindly informed me, certainty on the exact reading of the name could only be obtained by a comparison of the printed Kanjur with the manuscript of it preserved in Leningrad. Upon my request A. G. Sazykin and Z. K. Kas'janenko tried to find the text in the copy of Leningrad, but their search resulted in the fact that this text is obviously missing in that manuscript. Herewith I express my deepest thanks to the named scholars for their help. Until another occurrence of that name will be found, my suggestion on the relationship of the two Ānandaśrī's remains highly conjectural.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Akademie Verlag GmbH