

Other MS.
remains in
'Runic'
Turkish
script.

A literary character, both in contents and writing, appertains also to the three fragments, Ch. 0014, which all belonged to one treatise, evidently of a religious or moral character.¹⁵ Of a different and distinctly curious nature is the apparently complete document Ch. 00183, written very plainly, but by an evidently unpractised hand.¹⁶ In it the writer, probably an officer, 'bearing the rather high-sounding name of Baghatur Chigshi, pronounces in angry terms his discontent' with the commissariat arrangements made for a certain chief and his followers, 'thirty men of rank and consideration'. Both in wording and in writing the little record conveys a refreshing touch of actuality from the times when the Chinese of the Tun-huang oasis had troublesome visitors from the Turkish tribes dominating the north and north-east.

Turkish
Manichæan
manuscript.

A very valuable Turkish manuscript of a type not otherwise represented in my collection is the fine roll Ch. 0015, over 14 feet long, written in the Manichæan variety of Estrangelo and containing in 338 lines by far the greatest portion of the *Khuastuanift*, or confession prayer of the Manichæans.¹⁷ Professor von Lecoq, the distinguished Turcologist, first recognized the character of this beautifully clear manuscript, and at my request published it completely, with translation and commentary, supplementing from Turfān fragments now at Berlin most of the first two articles, which our text lacks out of the total of fifteen.¹⁸ For observations on the particular critical value of the manuscript and on the importance of the text itself, previously known to this extent only from a Turfān manuscript in the difficult Uigur writing, I may refer to Professor von Lecoq's pages.¹⁹

Manichæans
at Turfān
and Tun-
huang.

The discoveries at Turfān sites have furnished abundant reason for the belief that Manichæan and Buddhist worship had existed there peaceably side by side among a population which had come relatively early under Turkish domination as well as racial influence. Considering how close Uigur power was established to Tun-huang, both in the north and in the westernmost marches of Kan-su, it can cause no surprise that among all the thousands of Buddhist sacred texts deposited in the cave there should have survived also a manuscript relic of Mani's church. The latter is likely enough to have had followers among the local colonies from the Central-Asian north and west, just as Tun-huang town nowadays, in spite of its thorough Chinese character, has its small settlement of Muhammadan traders, carriers, etc., from Turfān, Charkhlik, and other western oases. But there can be no longer any doubt that Manichæan propaganda had in T'ang times secured a firm foothold also in China itself. This fact, long suspected from scattered indications, has now been established by Chinese Manichæan texts found at Ch'ien-fo-tung. During his search at the cave M. Pelliot had already discovered a fragment of a Chinese treatise manifestly setting forth points of Manichæan doctrine.²⁰ Subsequently there came to light, among the remains of the walled-up library which had found their way to Peking, a Manichæan work in Chinese, first published by Mr. Lo Chên-yü and since translated and annotated by MM. Chavannes and Pelliot.²¹ Nor has our collection failed to yield up a contribution of this kind; for in a well-preserved Chinese roll, resembling a Buddhist Sūtra text in outer appearance, M. Yabuki in 1916 discovered an extensive treatise which he declares to be Manichæan and of considerable importance.²²

Chinese
Manichæan
texts from
Ch'ien-
fo-tung.

¹⁵ Cf. Thomsen, *J.R.A.S.*, 1912, pp. 215 sqq.; see Pl. CLXI.

¹⁶ See Pl. CLXI; cf. Thomsen, *J.R.A.S.*, 1912, pp. 218 sqq.

¹⁷ For specimens from the roll, including the colophon, see Pl. CLXII.

¹⁸ See A. von Lecoq, *Dr. Stein's Turkish Khuastuanift from Tun-huang*, etc., *J.R.A.S.*, 1911, pp. 277-314, with plates reproducing the whole of our roll.

¹⁹ He points out in particular: 'Its excellent state of preservation, and the fact of its being written in the clear un-

equivocal letters of the Manichæan alphabet, render this manuscript a most valuable help to all interested in the study of the ancient Turkish speech;' see *J.R.A.S.*, 1911, p. 277.

²⁰ Cf. *B.É.F.E.O.*, viii. p. 518 (reprint *La Mission Pelliot*, p. 36).

²¹ Cf. Chavannes-Pelliot, *Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine*, *J. Asiat.*, novembre-décembre 1911, pp. 499-617.

²² Mr. Yabuki refers to this discovery in his preliminary report (Japanese) *Tonkō-chihō-shutsu kosha-buten kaisetsu moku roku*, Tokyo, 1917; also in his letter of July 27, 1917, to me.