The confession of sins was one of the central elements of the Manichaean service and several Turfan fragments, now widely dispersed, preserve the Manichaean confessional texts in various languages. The most extensive texts are the Sogdian confessional part in the so-called Bet- und Beichtbuch, published by W. Henning in 1936, a Sogdian confessional for the elects and the so-called Xwāstwānīft, a confessional for the laymen. The Old Turkish version of the Xwāstwānīft has survived almost in its entirety; preserved in several manuscripts in London, St. Petersburg and Berlin.1 The most important texts are the scroll in Manichaean script in London (Or 8212(178)), the scroll in Uigur script in St. Petersburg (SI D1 = SI 3159)2 and the collection of various manuscripts in Berlin.3 Most fragments belong to a peculiar hand and format, called by Peter Zieme hand C. The fragments U 8 and U 10 fill the gap at the beginning of the scrolls,4 so that almost the complete text of the Old Turkish version of the Xwāstwānīft survives, save for the very beginning which is missing. The title is given in the colophon of the scroll in St. Petersburg: bütürmiš t(a)rhən tükädi n(i)gošaklar-nuy suyun yaz-okun öküngii hwastwan(i)ft5 “Tarqan Bötürmiş has ended the Xuāstvānīft of the Auditors’ errors and sins to be repented”6 and in Sogdian: xwʾstwʾnyβt ɣwʾny ʾnzʾnʾmʾnty “Xwāstwānīft, confession of
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sins". The formula “man āstār hirzā” shows the Parthian origin of the text and H.H. Schaeder proved that this text was composed in a Zurvanite environment in the 3rd or at the beginning of the 4th century. The usage of Sogdian words in the Old Turkish text led W. Henning to the assumption of a Sogdian intermediary. W.B. Henning published in 1940 in Sogdica, paragraph iv, two Sogdian fragments of the Xwāstwānīft, So 10900 and So 10700b. These are the most representative pieces of the Sogdian fragments of the Xwāstwānīft. So 10900 contains the final §xv c, which summarizes the confession of sins once again. One might assume that the preceding part should be the end of §xv b, but as Henning stated in his introduction to the edition, the preserved words do not agree with their Turkish equivalents and the poor stage of preservation of the Sogdian text “does not permit definite conclusions in this respect”.

So 10700b contains the § x a and b and the beginning of § xi.

In 1991 Nicholas Sims-Williams published the Sogdian fragments of the Xwāstwānīft housed in the St. Petersburg branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. These are L 34 (Kr IV-326), L 80 (2Kr-81) and L 106 (O 119). They contain parts of the §§ii c–iv b, §x a–b, §§iv b–x v b (L 80).

Henning 1940, pp. 64–65, ll. /5/ and /28/.

The recent investigations by Zekine Özertural have led to a revision of the division of § xv. She describes it as one confession without any division in her e-mail communication to me of 5th July 2010. Remarkable remains that the Sogdian texts mentions one part, obviously separated in agreement with Bang’s and Hennings’ division. The division of the paragraphs refers to a kind of interpretation. The paragraphs are often divided into an abstract (a) and a more detailed explanation (b) and the repentance of the sins being referred to (c). Zekine Özertural explained the results of her research at a workshop in Göttingen, 4–5 March 2010, published in Özertural 2011. She kindly checked the draft of my article and sent me some remarks, which I mention at the appropriate places. Larry Clark analyzed this paragraph xv as well. He decided for a division into two parts, see Clark 2013, pp. 8–10.

Ragoza 1980, pl. 16, 42 and 61.

Zekine Özertural kindly informed me that she interprets the part iv b (Bang, Sims-Williams) as iv c.

Zekine Özertural kindly informed me that she does not agree with the division of this paragraph. She interprets x a as x b and x b as x c.

Zekine Özertural kindly informed me that she does not agree with the division of this paragraph. She interprets xiv b (Bang, Sims-Williams) as xiv c.