On some morphological and syntactic differences between Manichean and Buddhist Uyghur texts

Zekine Özertural

Özertural, Zekine 2004. On some morphological and syntactic differences between Manichean and Buddhist Uyghur texts. *Turkic Languages* 8, 225-231.

Manichean and Buddhist Old Uyghur texts differ from each other phonologically, morphologically and lexically. The present article discusses the different roles of the participial suffixes *-GlI* and *-GmA* in Manichean and Buddhist texts. While both suffixes are productive in Manichean texts, they occur in petrified forms in Buddhist texts. Here they were replaced by *-DAčI*, which is known from the Orkhon inscriptions and is also used, although less frequently, in Manichean texts.

Zekine Özertural, Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde, Georg-August-Universität, D-37075 Göttingen, Germany.

It is well-known that there are some phonological and morphological differences between Manichean and Buddhist Uyghur texts. A. von Gabain (1974), Peter Zieme (1969), Semih Tezcan (1984) and Masahiro Shōgaito (1982) have worked on this topic and published important research results. A complete representation of those differences, however, is still missing. So far there is no study which could demonstrate morphological and syntactic differences between Manichean and Buddhist Uyghur texts. In this paper I would like to discuss some of them.

1. The participle ending in *-glı/-gli*

The participle ending -glı/-gli[1] does not exist in the Orkhon inscriptions but it occurs in the Irk Bitig as well as in Manichean and Buddhist Uyghur texts. It occurs very frequently in Manichean Uyghur texts and is mostly used in the function of attribute, e.g. *ölügüg tirgürügli ay täŋri* 'the moon god who brings the dead man to life' (Le Coq 1922: 15), *bušı berigli özütin tilägli kišilär* 'the people who give alms and seek for their own soul' (Le Coq 1922: 11), *bo ätözdän ärtigli beš täŋri küči* 'the power of five gods that passes from this body' (Le Coq 1922: 17). A Manichean term *ädgü ög-*

[1] In some early Buddhist texts (Fedakâr 1994: 48-49, Laut 1983: 95) I have found the same usage of *-glı/-gli* as in the Manichean texts. I will discuss this further on.

li (see M III p. 24 right side below lines 6-7) is also attested. In the following examples this ending is used as nominal predicate although this is not frequent: /// *ädgü ögli bolur* '/// will be a good-thinker' (Le Coq 1922: 21), *mäŋigü täŋrilärig yaratıglı ol* 'he is the one who created eternal gods' (Asmussen 1965: lines 29-30).

This ending is used very rarely in Buddhist texts. Words with this ending almost always function as attributes, e.g. *ädgü ögli baglıg bodisatav* 'the Bodhisattva from the Maitrī-family' (Kaya 1994: 34d, lines 6-7), *burhannıŋ ädgü ögli köŋüli* 'the Maitrī "compassionate mind of the Buddha"' (Röhrborn 1991: line 51), *bušı tegli yörüg* 'the meaning called "alms"' (Röhrborn 1991: line 1549), *tarkardačı tegli sav* 'the word called "restrainer"' (Röhrborn 1991: line 889) *ol täriŋ tegli nom* 'the Dharma called "mystical"' (Röhrborn 1996: line 548). Most of these attributes are the expressions *ädgü ögli* 'good thinking' and *tegli* 'called'. Here the ending *-glı /-gli* has often solidified and become a derivative ending.

However, in Buddhist texts the ending *-glı/-gli* is used with the verb *bar-* 'go' and *käl-* 'come', e.g. *barıglı käliglilärig örlätti bulgadı* '(the mountain-ghost) annoyed (hend.) the visitors' (Toalster 1977: lines 345-346). One might consider *barıglı käligli* as a petrified phrase whose usage can be compare with that of Turkish *gelen giden*. Certainly, there is a further example in which *käligli* 'one who has come' is used independently: *oronta öŋdürtin käliglilär* 'those who come on the land-route from the east (travellers)' (Ölmez 1994, line 249).[2] Perhaps, in this case *käligli* signifies 'traveller' and represents a petrified usage.

It seems that sometimes *-glı/-gli* is only used to derive new words in Buddhist texts: *yašatačı* might be 'a living [being]', but *yašaglı*, just as in *Turfantexte I* (Hazai & Zieme 1971: 34, line 87), means 'living being'. Perhaps, this word is used only once. The translator has used an archaic suffix in order to demonstrate that he is constructing a new word.

I also believe that the ending *-glı/-gli* is no longer active in Buddhist texts, surviving only as a derivative suffix in single words. I will now examine whether the verbs with this ending can govern the accusative as can the finite forms of the same verbs. In Manichean Uyghur texts I have found that in some cases the verbs with the ending *-glı/-gli* govern the accusative, e.g. *ölügüg tirgürügli ay täŋri* 'the moon god who brings the dead man to life' (Le Coq 1922: 15), *köŋülüg ačıglı* 'one who makes happy (lit. one who opens the heart)' (Le Coq 1912: 26), *özütin tilägli kišilär* 'the people who give alms and seek for their own soul' (Le Coq 1922: 11), *mäniŋ özütümin arılaglı bägim* 'my master who purifies my soul' (Le Coq 1922: 24), *mäniŋ köŋülümin yarotuglı kaŋım* 'my father who enlightens my heart' (Le Coq 1922: 24), *nomug taplaglı kišilär* 'the people who worship the Doctrine' (le Coq 1922: 12), *beš täŋri yarokın kuvratıglı frištilär* 'the Angels collecting the light of the five gods' (Asmussen 1965: line 224). In one example the verb *käl-* 'come' is used with an un-

[2] I would like to express my thanks to Professor K. Röhrborn for pointing this out.

marked object: *ınanč kälürügli* 'one who brings belief' (Hamilton 1986: 39, line 21). I have not been able to find any example in Buddhist Uyghur texts in which a verb with this ending governs the accusative.

Moreover, I have found that the formations with *-glı/-gli* are used with the ablative and the equative in Manichean texts, e.g. *bo ätözdän ärtigli beš täŋri küči* 'the power of the five gods that passes from the body' (Le Coq 1922: 17) and *kušča ätigli* 'one who sings like a bird' (Le Coq 1922: 34). Examples with the ablative and the equative are not found in Buddhist texts.

2. The participle ending in *-gma/-gmä*

A further discrepancy between the two types of texts is apparent in the usage of the participle ending in *-gma/-gmä*. This ending is used in both in attribute and nominal functions in the Orkhon inscriptions, and I have found it used in both of these functions in Manichean texts as well.

Examples of attributive usage: *körünügmä ay täŋri* 'visible moon god' (Le Coq 1919: 9), *iki yarok ordo ičrä olurugma täŋrilär* 'the gods sitting in the two palaces of light' (Asmussen 1965: lines 15-16), *učugma tınlıg* 'flying creature' (Asmussen 1965: line 82), *bagrın yorıgma tınlıg* 'creature that crawls on its belly' (Asmussen 1965: line 84).

Examples of nominal usage: *täŋrilär törösinčä (?) tiläyü berigmälär* 'those which were asked and given after the divine law' (?) (Le Coq 1922: 5)*, tünärig yäklärkä tapunugmalar* 'those who worship the demons of darkness' (Le Coq 1919: 11), *yäkkä täŋri tepän yükünč yükünügmä* 'one who worships a demon, saying that he is a god' (Asmussen 1965: lines 129-130).

Examples occurring in Buddhist texts always represent attributive usage, e.g. *ken käligmä üd* 'the time coming later; future' (Röhrborn 1991: line 1528), *tört taloy ügüz ičintäki imrärigmä öz kötürdäči tınlıglar* 'die wimmelnden, ein Selbst tragenden Lebewesen innerhalb der Vier Meere (d. h. innerhalb Chinas)' (Ölmez 1994: line 1095), *altı kapıglıg darni tegmä sudur* 'the Sūtra which is called "the Dhāraṇī of six gates"' (Ölmez 1994: line 553), *kaš čäčäklig ordo tegmä yaylag* 'the summer palace which is called "the palace of jade-flower"' (Ölmez 1994 : line 931), *bagrın yorıgma tınlıg* 'creature that crawl' (Asmussen 1965: 84), the latter is probably a Turkic designation for crawlers, and *učugma kuš* 'flying bird' (Ölmez 1994: 248) may be a designation used to differentiate wild birds from peacocks and others. In the word *učugma* the suffix *-gma/-gmä* might also designate a habitual action, since there is another expression *učugma toz tuprak* 'flying dust (hend.)' (Ölmez 1994: 1688). Looking at examples from Buddhist texts, one finds only very limited number of verbs with the suffix *-gma/-gmä*: *är-* 'to be' *(ärigmä)*, *imrär-* 'to be numerous' *(imrärigmä)*, *käl-* 'to come' *(käligmä)*, *te-* 'to say' *(tegmä)*, *uč-* 'to fly' *(učugma)* and *yorı-* 'to go' *(yorıgma)*. Of these, some are used in specific expressions, e.g. *käligmä*, *učugma* and *yorıgma*, and the others have become independent lexemes, e.g. *imrärigmä* 'teeming' or *tegmä* 'called' The latter has a meaning different from *atlıg* in

the Buddhist texts of the classical period. This has been described in Röhrborn (1983: 110-111).

I also suppose that the ending *-gma/-gmä* was no longer active in Buddhist texts. Therefore, I would like to determine which kinds of case endings could be added to these verbforms in both types of texts. For the accusative there are examples in Manichean texts for both forms: marked and unmarked, e.g. *täŋri nomın tutagmalar* 'those who disparage god's doctrine' (Le Coq 1919: 11),[3] *igid nomug törög tutugma* 'one who holds to a false doctrine and rules' (Asmussen 1965: line 129), *ınanč kälürügli* 'one who brings belief' (Hamilton 1986: I, 39), *ög berigmä* 'one which gives comprehension' (Hamilton 1986: I, 39), *yükünč yükünügmä* 'one who worships' (Asmussen 1965: line 130). Verbs in *-gma/-gmä* are not used with the accusative in Buddhist texts. The same applies to the example *altı kapıglıg darni tegmä sudur,* which I cited above, and in which *tegmä* is a kind of binding element much like *tep* and has attributive function. It should be mentioned in this context that the word preceding *tegmä* always is the translation of an expression of foreign origin (Röhrborn 1983: 109-112).

Furthermore, in Manichean texts there are examples of the usage of verbs in *-gma/-gmä* with the directive and instrumental cases, e.g. *siziŋ kutuŋuzgaru yarlıkagma* 'permission for going to your salvation' (Le Coq 1922: 25) or *bagrın yorıgma tınlıg* 'the creature that crawls on its belly' (Asmussen 1965: line 84). In Buddhist texts there is no example of the usage with the directive. *Bagrın yorıgma tınlıg* often occurs in Buddhist texts, but I consider this formulation to represent a petrified usage. If a locative expression occurs in Buddhist texts in combination with *ärigmä* or *učugma*, this does not contradict the assumption that *-gma/-gmä* only occurs in petrified forms. Such a locative expression may relate to a superordinate predicate, e.g. *uč yerdäki bäglär küniŋä körgäli bolurlar bulıtta učugma kuš bädizlig ...* 'every time, if the Bägs of border provinces can see something in the clouds that looks like a 'flying bird ...' (Ölmez 1994: lines 246-248). As in the following example, a locative expression may also belong to the preceding sentence: *lenhua çäçäk ünär bälgürär süzük suvlarda učugma toz tupraklar näŋ ymä umaz kirikdürgäli anıŋ yapırgakın* 'The lotus-flower grows in pure water; flying dust (hend.) could not soil its leaves' (Ölmez 1994: lines 1686-1689). A lexeme in *-gma/-gmä* may also have the same rection as the corresponding finite verb. This is true in the case of *ärigmä* 'one to be located' that in Buddhist texts mostly takes a locative complement, e.g. *ol kuvragda ärigmä tümän tirig özlüglär* 'all ten thousand livings beings in this assembly' (Kaya 1994: 84, lines 14-16), *ontın sıŋar yertinčülärtä ärigmä alku ulug bodisatavlar* 'all great Bodhisattvas to be located themselves in the world of ten directions' (Kaya 1994: 139, lines 19-21), *ol kuvragda ärigmä eliglär hanlar* 'all kings (hend.) who are in that assembly' (Kaya 1994: 567, lines 23, 568, line 1). The locative is thus not a

[3] The verb *tuta-* is also described in Erdal (1991: 425).

standard for deciding whether a verbal noun is used as a petrified form or not. Decisive are always the examples with the accusative. There are very few examples of a petrified verbal noun or deverbal nominal taking the accusative.

The use of verbs in *-gma/-gmä* as 'postverbs' might be considered further evidence that the verbs in *-gma/-gmä* are used freely in Manichean texts, and not only in petrified expressions. For instance, in *bu muntag körksüz agnayu yatagma kiši* 'such an ugly person who is rolling himself on the soil', the verb *yat-* has a somewhat altered (restricted) meaning and is subordinate to the verb *agna-* 'to roll'. Such a usage is not known from Buddhist texts.

The results indicate that the endings *-glı/-gli* and *-gma/-gmä* that were productive in Manichean texts lost their productivity in Buddhist texts and that the forms with these endings are used as petrified lexemes. In Buddhist texts, these forms are rare and constitute only the remnants of the productive participle endings *-glı/-gli* and *-gma/-gmä* found in Manichean texts. Now the question is: By what were those endings replaced? In their place, the Buddhist Uyghurs used the ending *-dačı/-däči,* which has the same func-tions as the endings *-glı/-gli* and *-gma/-gmä* in Manichean texts.

The ending *-dačı/-däči* is known to us from the Orkhon inscriptions, in which as a 'secondary finite form' it used to designate future (Tekin 2000: 188) with personal endings (like the -°*r*-present), e.g. *kaltačı biz* 'we will fall behind (without help)' (Tekin 2000: 188) or *öltäči sän* 'you will die' (Tekin 2000: 188). The ending *-tačı/-täči* is also known as the ending of the 'verbal adjective' in the Orkhon inscriptions. According to Talat Tekin *öltäči bodun* 'the dying people' (Tekin 2000: 172) is an example of that.

In Manichean texts only the second function is preserved, and *-dačı/-däči* also appears as a further 'verbal adjective' next to *-glı/-gli* and *-gma/-gmä*. In his doctoral dissertation, Peter Zieme talks about a participle in *dačı/-däči* which often has future function (Zieme 1969: 79). However, what allows Zieme to suppose a future function is only one example in which *-dačı/-däči* forms a contrast with the ending *-glı/-gli*, e.g. *ymä beš täŋri yarokın kuvratıglı freştilär hroštag padvahtag täŋri täŋrigärü bardačı bošuntačı beš täŋri yarokın biziŋärü kälürdi ärsär* ... 'and if the angels gathering the light of the Fivefold God (and) Xroštag and Padvaxtag täŋri should let the light of the Fivefold God, which goes up to Heaven and is liberated, come to us …' (Asmussen 1965: lines 223-227). In this sentence an ever-present property of angels, etc. ('gathering') is set in contrast with a property of lights which happens in the future ('which goes up ... and is liberated'). I have not been able to find any other example. I suppose the function of *-dačı/-däči* in Manichean texts to be identical with the function of *-glı/-gli*. Numerous examples of *-dačı/-däči* which are cited by Zieme (1969: 80) from *Türkische Turfantexte III*, *Manichäische Erzähler* and *Türkische Turfantexte IX,* edited by Larry Clark as *The Manichean Turkic Pothi-Book*, may paint a false picture, because the Manichean Pothi-Book belongs not to Manichean, but rather to Buddhist texts. This explains why there is no example of the endings *-glı/-gli* and *-gma/-gmä* in the Pothi-Book. As I have pointed out, these endings

are missing in Buddhist texts, where they are replaced by the ending *dači/-däči,* which occurs more often in Buddhist than in Manichean texts.

References

Asmussen, Jes P. 1965. *Xvāstvānīt. Studies in Manichaeism*. (Acta theologica danica 7.) Kopenhagen: Munksgaard.

Bang, Willi & von Gabain, Annemarie 1930. *Türkische Turfan-Texte III.* Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1930, 13. 183-211. Berlin.

Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon*. (Turcologica 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Fedakâr, Durdu 1994. *Alttürkische Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-Fragmente in sogdischer Schrift.* Memoriae Munusculum. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 39. 43-53.

von Gabain, Annemarie 1974[3]. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hamilton James Russel 1986. *Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-houang*. Paris.

Hazai, Georg & Zieme, Peter 1971. Fragmente der uigurischen Version des 'Jin'gangjing mit den Gāthās des Meister Fu'. (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 3. Berliner Turfantexte 1.) Berlin.

Kaya, Ceval 1994. *Uygurca altun yaruk. Giriş, metin ve dizin*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 607.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Laut, Jens Peter 1983. Ein Bruchstück einer alttürkischen Buddhabiographie. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* N.F. 3, 88-101.

von Le Coq, Albert 1912. *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho I.* Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1911, Anhang. Berlin.

von Le Coq, Albert 1919. *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho II.* Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1919, 3. Berlin.

von Le Coq, Albert 1922. *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho III.* Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1922, 2. Berlin.

Ölmez, Mehmet 1994. *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VI.* [Ph.D. Dissertation Georg-August University of Göttingen.]

Röhrborn, Klaus 1983. Syntaktisches Verhalten der indischen Fremdwörter im Alttürkischen. In: Klaus Röhrborn & Wolfgang Veenker (eds.) *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 16.) 103-112.

Röhrborn, Klaus 1984. Review of Shōgaito, Masahiro 1982. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* N.F. 4, 314-315.

Röhrborn, Klaus 1991. *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VII.* Nach der Handschrift von Leningrad, Paris und Peking sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie v. Gabain. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Röhrborn, Klaus 1996. *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VIII. Nach der Handschrift von Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie v. Gabain.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Shōgaito, Masahiro 1982. Kodai torukogo n hōgen ni okeru *ï/i* no teiboinka ni tsuite. *Kōbe gaidai ronsō* 33, 39-57.

Tekin, Talât 2000. *Orhon Türkçesi grameri*. Ankara.

Tezcan, Semih 1984a. Uygur alfabesi. Ankara. *Türk Ansiklopedisi* 33, 121-126.

Tezcan, Semih 1984b. Uygur edebiyatı. Ankara. *Türk Ansiklopedisi* 33, 126-131.

Tezcan, Semih 1984c. Uygurca. Ankara. *Türk Ansiklopedisi* 33, 141-148.
Tezcan, Semih 1984d. Uygurlar. Ankara. *Türk Ansiklopedisi* 33, 148-155.
Toalster, John Peter Claver 1977. *Die uigurische Xuan-Zang-Biographie 4. Kapitel mit Übersetzung und Kommentar.* [PhD dissertation Universität Gießen].
Zieme, Peter 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache der manichäisch-türkischen Turfantexte.* [PhD dissertation Humboldt-Universität Berlin.]