IRANICA 25

Zur lichten Heimat

Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann

Herausgegeben von
einem Team „Turfanforschung“

Harrassowitz Verlag

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

IRANICA

Herausgegeben von Alberto Cantera
und Maria Macuch

Band 25

2017

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Zur lichten Heimat

Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann

Herausgegeben von
einem Team „Turfanforschung“

2017

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung durch:
Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum
Institut für Iranistik der Freien Universität Berlin
Societas Iranologica Europaea.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.dnb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Informationen zum Verlagsprogramm finden Sie unter
http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2017
Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen jeder Art, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und für die Einspeicherung in elektronische Systeme.
Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Satz und Layout: Tatsiana Harting
Druck und Verarbeitung: Memminger MedienCentrum AG
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0944-1271
ISBN 978-3-447-10884-3
e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Werner Sundermann

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Inhalt

Vorwort XI

Christoph Markschies
Geleitwort 1

Manfred Lorenz †
Werner Sundermann und die persische Literatur 7

Nicholas Sims-Williams
Werner Sundermann and the Christian Texts of the Berlin Turfan Collection 11

Ionuț Daniel Băncilă
Die mandäische „dualistische Formel“ und der manichäische „Dualismus“.
Ein Beitrag zum aramäischen Hintergrund des Manichäismus 19

Jason David BeDuhn
The Nature of the Manichaean Soul 39

Adam Benkato
Exploring the Oral Background of the Manichaean Parables 51

Olga M. Chunakova
A Manichaean Fragment from the Oldenburg Archives 65

Luigi Cirillo
Mani's Reaction to the Doctrine of the Baptismal Sects
Concerning Man's Redemption from Evil 73

Iris Colditz
Manichäische Parabeln – didaktische Literatur für Hörer? 85

Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst
Observations on the Middle Persian Barm-e Delak Inscription 103

Harry Falk / Nicholas Sims-Williams
A Decorated Silver Pyxis from the Time of Vāsudeva 121

Ela Filippone
Middle Iranian *grīw/γrīw*: Possible Paths for Semantic Changes
and Functional Shifts 139

Majella Franzmann
Mariam, the Net-Caster and Shepherd: the Further Development
of the Johannine Mary Magdalene in the Manichaean Psalm Book 157

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Wolf-Peter Funk
Wer ist „der Achte“? Ein west-östliches Rätsel manichäischer Terminologie 165

Iain Gardner
Some Comments on the Remnants of the Codex of Mani's *Epistles* in Middle Persian as Edited by W. Sundermann 173

Matthew Goff
The Two Tablets of Enoch: The Contribution of the "Leningrad" Fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants* to the Study of the Qumran *Book of Giants* . 181

Zsuzsanna Gulácsi
A Parthian Exposition on Mani's *Book of Pictures*. A Contextualized Study of a Fragmentary *Ārdhang Wifrās* Bifolio *(M 8255)* in the Turfanforschung of the BBAW, Berlin 195

Jens-Uwe Hartmann / Ruixuan Chen
Eine khotanische Bilingue aus Triratnadāsas *Guṇāparyantastotra* 211

Manfred Hutter
Buddha in Iranian Manichaean Writings 221

Julia Iwersen
A Manichaean Ritual of Ascent? A Discussion of T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5 in the Light of Other Coptic Gnostic Materials 231

Judith Josephson
On the Choice between Good and Evil in an Essay in Book 3 of the *Dēnkard* 241

Yukiyo Kasai
Ein Erzähltext unter den altuigurischen Fragmenten mit Brāhmī-Elementen 253

Gábor Kósa
Who Is the King of Honour and What Does He Do? Gleanings from the New Chinese Manichaean Sources 259

Claudia Leurini
Ein Riesenengel flog vom Himmel herab 273

Samuel N. C. Lieu
West of Parthia – Han China's Knowledge of the Graeco-Roman East . . 285

Владимир А. Лившиц †
Источники хорезмийской письменности 305

Pavel Lurje / Ilya Yakubovich
The Myth of Sogdian Lambdacism 319

Ma Xiaohe
The Manichaean "Wheel of *Karma*" (Zodiac). A Study on the Cosmology Painting and *Scripture of Buddha-nature* 343

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Maria Macuch
A Case of Loan and Mortgage in a Late Pahlavi Text 355

Mauro Maggi
Two Fragments of the Khotanese *Saṅghāṭasūtra*
in the Turfan Collection in Berlin 371

Miklós Maróth
Die syrische Epistolographie 381

Rea Matsangou
Strategius' Assignment: an Inquiry into Manichaeism and
the Manichaean Churches of the Roman East, during the 4th Century . . 395

Dai Matsui
An Old Uigur Account Book for Manichaean
and Buddhist Monasteries from Temple α in Qočo 409

Dieter Maue / Hirotoshi Ogihara
Tumschukische Miszellen III. 3. Tumshukese Dental Affricates 421

Елена К. Молчанова
Динамика погребальной лексики у современных зороастрийцев Ирана 433

Enrico Morano
An Antiphonal Body and Soul Hymn in Manichaean Middle Persian,
Parthian and Sogdian 445

Hirotoshi Ogihara / Ching Chao-jung
Some Observations on the Tumshuqese Documents
Newly Published in China 453

Paola Orsatti
The Order of Climes in Nezāmi's *Haft peykar* 483

Antonio Panaino
Multilingualism and Empires: Byzantium and Sasanian Persia 491

Timothy Pettipiece
Mani's Journey to India: Mission or Exile? 503

Georges-Jean Pinault
Theatre Jargon and Literary Language in Tocharian 511

Andrea Piras
The Writing Hearer. A Suggested Restoration of M 101d 525

Adrian Pirtea
Is There an Eclipse Dragon in Manichaeism?
Some Problems Concerning the Origin and Function
of *āṯālyā* in Manichaean Sources 535

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Paul-Hubert Poirier
L'obstruction de l'abîme d'après Titus de Bostra (*Contre les manichéens* I, 42). Un aspect de l'eschatologie manichéenne 555

Elio Provasi
Literary Motifs in the Sogdian "Job Story" 567

Simone-Christiane Raschmann
Lobpreis des Mannes (II) 583

Christiane Reck
Zwei weitere kleine Bruchstücke soghdischer Versionen des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtras* in der Berliner Turfansammlung . . 597

Rong Xinjiang
A Re-Examination of the Problem of the So-Called "Tocharian" Languages and the Meaning of "Tugristān" between Kucha and Beshbaliq 605

Adriano V. Rossi
Parth. *šāhīgān*, MP *šāhīgān*, Sogd. *š(')yk/qn(h)* 621

Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi
The Great Hymn of Wisdom. The First Manichaean Manuscript Fragment Unearthed in Iran 637

Aloïs van Tongerloo / Herman Seldeslachts
La correspondance Edmond Drouin / Willi Bang [Kaup] 655

Wang Yuanyuan / Lin Wushu
On the Title Indication of the "*Chusheng Zanwen* 初聲讚文" in the Chinese *Hymnscroll* 667

Dieter Weber
A Pahlavi Query 675

Jens Wilkens / Michaël Peyrot
Weitere Parallelen in Tocharisch B zur altuigurischen *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*: Mahendrasena- und Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna . 683

Abdurishid Yakup
An Old Uyghur Fragment of an Astrological Treatise Kept in the Beijing National Library 711

Yutaka Yoshida
The Xiapu 霞浦 Manichaean text *Sijizan* 四寂讚 "Praise of the Four Entities of Calmness" and Its Parthian Original 719

Peter Zieme
Mānīstān „Kloster" und manichäische Kolophone 737

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Vorwort

Werner Sundermann hat sein Leben der Arbeit an den mitteliranischen Handschriftenfragmenten aus der Turfanoase gewidmet. Trotz seiner langen Krankheit nahm er bis zu seinem Tod am 12. Oktober 2012 an der Arbeit aktiv Anteil. Seine Kolleginnen und Kollegen und Freunde in der ganzen Welt, aber besonders das Akademienvorhaben „Turfanforschung" der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (BBAW) vermissen ihn, seine Expertise und seinen Rat, sehr. Zwei Festschriften und zahlreiche Nachrufe würdigten sein wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk.[1] Von 1993 bis 2005 war er Arbeitsstellenleiter des Vorhabens. Unter seiner Leitung gelang es, den großen internationalen Ruhm der Berliner Turfanforschung weiter auszubauen. Am 13. Februar 2013 fand in der BBAW als 65. Collegium Turfanicum eine Gedenkveranstaltung für Werner Sundermann statt. Schnell entstand danach der Gedanke, ihm eine Gedenkschrift zu widmen, die seine fachliche Breite, seine internationale Eingebundenheit und Anerkennung widerspiegelt. Als Herausgeber fungiert ein „Turfanforschung" genanntes Team bestehend aus den wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern des Akademienvorhabens „Turfanforschung" der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Adam Benkato, Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Yukiyo Kasai und Abdurishid Yakup, den Mitarbeiterinnen des Akademienvorhabens „Katalogisierung der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland" der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Simone-Christiane Raschmann und Christiane Reck, und Nicholas Sims-Williams, Mitglied des Beirates zum Akademienvorhaben Turfanforschung an der BBAW.

Werner Sundermanns wichtigstes Arbeitsgebiet waren die manichäischen mitteliranischen Handschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung. Eine von ihm selbst getroffene Auswahl seiner bedeutendsten Artikel dazu wurde in einem zweibändigen Sammelband veröffentlicht.[2] Doch auch die christlichen und buddhistischen mitteliranischen Textfragmente fanden durch ihn wegweisende Bearbeitung.[3] Seine Editionen stellten die Texte stets in einen philologischen,

1 Alle Nachweise sind zu finden unter http://turfan.bbaw.de/bilder/bibliographie_sundermann.

2 W. Sundermann: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften*, hrsg. von Ch. Reck, D. Weber, C. Leurini und A. Panaino, Roma 2001 (Serie Orientale Roma 89) mit einem chronologischen Schriftenverzeichnis bis zum Jahr 2000. Eine systematische Bibliographie (bis Juni 1992) hatte er in *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* VIII, Kobe 1993, S. 139–148 veröffentlicht.

3 Eine vollständige Bibliographie ist im Internet unter http://turfan.bbaw.de/bilder/bibliographie_sundermann zu finden.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

sprach- oder religionshistorischen Rahmen, wodurch seine Publikationen weit in die iranistische Fachwelt und darüber hinaus wirkten. Diese Vielfalt schlägt sich in den mehr als fünfzig wissenschaftlichen Beiträgen der vorliegenden Gedenkschrift nieder. Die meisten sind iranistischen bzw. manichäologischen Themen gewidmet. Doch auch Kolleginnen und Kollegen und Weggefährten, die auf turkologischen und anderen Gebieten der Zentralasienkunde arbeiten, haben mit ihren Beiträgen Werner Sundermann Ehre erwiesen. Die Beiträge von Christoph Markschies, Nicholas Sims-Williams und Manfred Lorenz rufen persönliche Erinnerungen wach und lassen neben dem Wissenschaftler den zuhörenden, hilfsbereiten und Ausgleich stiftenden Menschen in Erscheinung treten.

Der Titel dieser Gedenkschrift geht auf eine Passage aus seinem letzten Buch zurück, dessen Publikation er mit Hilfe von Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst noch 2012 abschloss. Leider konnte er es in gedruckter Fassung nicht mehr in Empfang nehmen. Die entsprechende Stelle stellt die letzten Worte der „Rede der Lebendigen Seele" dar: kw xypδ ʾpzʾt sʾr „… in ihre Heimat", bzw. „… zur eigenen Heimat" (So 14570/r/1).[4] Diese Worte beschreiben die Hoffnung und Zuversicht der Lebendigen Seele, d. h. der Lichtsubstanz in der manichäischen Lehre, in das Lichtreich, das Paradies des Lichtes, zurückzukehren. Wir erlaubten uns daher, das Zitat für den Titel in diesem Sinn zu erweitern: „Zur lichten Heimat".

Wir danken Maria Macuch und Alberto Cantera für die Aufnahme dieses Bandes in die Reihe „Iranica", in der 1995 schon eine Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Werner Sundermann erschienen war. Unser besonderer Dank gilt Susann Rabuske für die Koordinierung der einzelnen herausgeberischen Arbeitsschritte. Michaël Peyrot und Götz König danken wir für die fachliche Unterstützung zu einzelnen Beiträgen. Tatsiana Harting hat die Layoutgestaltung und Endredaktion übernommen. Für ihre Arbeit danken wir ebenfalls herzlich.

Wir ehren mit dieser Gedenkschrift einen Gelehrten, Kollegen und Freund, der die Iranistik und Manichäismusforschung der letzten 50 Jahre weltweit entscheidend befördert und geprägt hat.

Berlin, Oktober 2016 Die Herausgeber

4 *Die Rede der Lebendigen Seele: ein manichäischer Hymnenzyklus in mittelpersischer und soghdischer Sprache*, hrsg. von W. Sundermann unter Mitarbeit von D. Durkin-Meisterernst, Turnhout 2012 (Berliner Turfantexte 30), S. 27, 97, 158–159.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Geleitwort

Christoph Markschies, Berlin

Gern komme ich der Bitte nach, zu dieser Gedenkschrift für Werner Sundermann ein Geleitwort beizusteuern,[1] hat mich doch der am 12. Oktober 2012 verstorbene große Gelehrte als höchst bescheidener Wissenschaftler und bezwingend liebenswürdiger wie hilfsbereiter Mensch nachhaltig beeindruckt. So ist es mir nicht nur Pflicht des Amtes als Vizepräsident der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, sondern auch persönliches Bedürfnis, dabei zu helfen, an diesen so beeindruckenden Forscher zu erinnern. Die außerordentliche Bedeutung von Sundermann ist im Hause am Gendarmenmarkt durchaus wahrgenommen worden, wie ein scheinbar marginales Detail zeigt: In der alten preußischen Akademie war es – wie mir Jürgen Dummer, der 2011 verstorbene frühere Arbeitsstellenleiter der „Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller",[2] gern erzählte – vollkommen unüblich, dass die Akademiebeamten zu Mitgliedern gewählt wurden und fast scheint es, als hätte die Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften diesen (nebenbei gesagt: nicht unproblematischen) Brauch ihrer oft im Haus beschworenen Vorgängerinstitution einfach übernommen. So war es natürlich seinerzeit unvorstellbar, dass der genial begabte Koptologe Carl Schmidt, dem wir nicht nur die Erschließung einer schier unglaublichen Zahl von koptischen Manuskripten und Fragmenten verdanken, sondern auch die Rettung wie den Ankauf der koptisch-manichäischen Schriften von Medinet-Madi,[3] zum Akademiemitglied gewählt wurde – war er doch gleichzeitig am Haus als wissenschaftlicher Beamter beschäftigt.

1 Die bei der Gedenkveranstaltung am 13. Februar 2013 namens der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie gesprochene einleitende Laudatio war frei vorgetragen; ich habe mich bemüht, in der schriftlichen Fassung ihren Duktus nachzugestalten. Sehr herzlich danke ich für Hinweise und Gespräche Herrn Kollegen Peter Zieme sowie meiner studentischen Hilfskraft Johann Anton Zieme.

2 Vgl. Ch. Markschies: „Geleitwort", in: *Epiphanius I: Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1–33*, hrsg. von K. Holl†; zweite, erweiterte Auflage hrsg. von M. Bergermann und Ch.-F. Collatz, Teilband I/1: *Text*, Berlin/Boston 2013 (Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge 10/1), S. V–XIV, hier S. VI–VIII.

3 Ch. Markschies: „Carl Schmidt und kein Ende. Aus großer Zeit der Koptologie an der Berliner Akademie und der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität", in: *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 13 (2009) [= *Neue Beiträge aus dem Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften. Hans-Gebhard Bethge zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von U.-K. Plisch), S. 5–28.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Werner Sundermann wurde dagegen im Jahre 1998 zum außerordentlichen Mitglied der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie gewählt, nachdem ihn in den Jahren zuvor schon die Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie in Düsseldorf (1988), die Königlich Dänische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Kopenhagen (1989), die Academia Europaea (1990), die British Academy (1991) und die Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (1993) als Konsodalen berufen hatten. Schon allein mit dieser Reihe von Mitgliedschaften stand er einzigartig unter Seinesgleichen da. Und trotzdem ließ er es sich, wie ich als langjähriger Sekretar der geisteswissenschaftlichen Klasse der Berliner Akademie bezeugen kann, nicht nehmen, ganz treu am Sitzungsleben seiner Berliner Klasse Anteil zu nehmen. Aufmerksam hörte er auch den Vorträgen zu, die nach Methodik oder Inhalt sehr weit von seiner eigenen Arbeit entfernt waren. Hilfsbereit gab er Auskunft, wenn er um Rat gefragt worden war.

Die Grundlagen dieser insbesondere für einen Gelehrten aus einem Land ohne Reisefreiheit und ohne staatliches Interesse an solcher traditionellen, gern als „bürgerlich" denunzierten Gelehrsamkeit staunenswerten Anerkennung gerade im „nichtsozialistischen Ausland" schuf ohne Zweifel seine Berliner Ausbildung an Universität und Akademie, von der hier zunächst die Rede sein muss. Werner Sundermann wurde am 22. Dezember 1935 in Thale/Harz geboren, nach Schulzeit unter Kriegs- und Nachkriegsbedingungen sowie dem Abitur nahm er das Studium der Iranistik unter Heinrich F. Junker und Bozorg Alavi an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin im Jahre 1954 auf, dazu das Studium der Arabistik unter Heinrich Simon, einem der raren jüdischen Remigranten in Ostdeutschland, der nach Jahren des Exils in Jerusalem an die Berliner *alma mater* zurückkehrte.[4] Selbstverständlich las Sundermann auch griechische, lateinische und syrische Quellen ohne Anstrengung. 1963 schloss er dieses Studium mit einer unveröffentlichten Promotion über die Herrschaftslegitimation der Sasaniden ab.[5] Sie zeigte bereits, dass Sundermann die philologische und (religions-)historische Arbeit immer als eine Einheit begriffen hat: Keine Religionsgeschichte ohne ihr basales philologisches Fundament, aber auch keine Philologie um ihrer selbst willen.

Die damalige „Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften" – noch nicht abschließend umgebildet zu einer Akademie neuen Typs nach dem Vorbild der russischen Akademie der Wissenschaften – bot Sundermann, der sich weigerte,

4 Vgl. *Der Vordere Orient in Antike und Mittelalter. Festgabe für Heinrich Simon, Ordinarius für Hebraistik und arabische Philosophie, anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages*, Berlin 1987 (Universität Berlin, Berichte 7/10 = Wissenschaftliche Publikationen der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Sektion Asienwissenschaften, Bereich Westasien).

5 *Die sāsānidische Herrscherlegitimation und ihre Bedingungen*, Berlin 1963. – Eine vollständige Bibliographie der Schriften von Werner Sundermann von Ch. Reck auf aktuellem Stand findet sich unter http://turfan.bbaw.de/bilder/bibliographie_sundermann (letzter Zugriff am 14.08.2016).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in die Staatspartei einzutreten, wie manchem anderen Wissenschaftler seit 1965 eine Art geschützten Raum für seine strikt dem Ideal strenger Wissenschaftlichkeit verpflichtete Forschung. In diesem Jahr trat er als Mitarbeiter in die von Wolfgang Steinitz und Georg Hazai gegründete Turfanforschungsgruppe im Institut für Orientforschung der Akademie ein, die von 1969 bis 1991 im Bereich „Alter Orient" des „Zentralinstituts für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR" um Zeit und andere Kapazitäten für freie Forschung kämpfen musste. Bald begann Sundermann in rascher Folge eine große Zahl von Arbeiten vorzulegen, die der Edition, Interpretation und philologischen sowie religionswissenschaftlichen Auswertung manichäischer, buddhistischer und christlicher Texte oder Textfragmente aus den Funden der Turfan-Expeditionen dienten. Auch wenn ich (beispielsweise bei meiner eigenen Beschäftigung mit gnostischen Texten) zu den vielen dankbaren Nutzern dieser Veröffentlichungen gehöre, bin ich zu einer regelrechten Würdigung schon aufgrund meiner begrenzten sprachlichen Kompetenz nicht berufen. Wie beispielsweise auch der eingangs genannte Kollege Jürgen Dummer wurde Sundermann im Zuge bestimmter Liberalisierungen an der Humboldt-Universität in den achtziger Jahren 1984 mit „Studien zu Geschichte und Wert historiographischer Überlieferungen der Manichäer unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der iranischen Überlieferungen" zum Dr. sc. phil. promoviert, dem in Ostdeutschland üblichen Äquivalent der Habilitation. Der Text dieser Qualifikationsschrift erschien bald in Aufsatzform und wurde auch in seinen unter dem Titel *Manichaica Iranica* gesammelten Schriften nachgedruckt.[6] Erst nach der Wende konnte Sundermann die gewöhnlich mit einer Habilitation verbundene Möglichkeit, selbständig zu lehren (die in der ehemaligen DDR einen ganz eigenständigen Schritt darstellte, für den politisches Wohlverhalten Voraussetzung war), auch nutzen: 1990 ernannte ihn die Humboldt-Universität zum Honorardozenten, 1992 wurde er Honorarprofessor am Institut für Iranistik der Freien Universität Berlin (und damit zugleich als erster ostdeutscher Wissenschaftler mit einer solchen Würde ausgezeichnet). Die vielleicht schönste akademische Ehrung erhielt Werner Sundermann im Jahre 1994, als ihn mit der Universität Bologna eine Gründungsinstitution der europäischen Universitäten mit einem Ehrendoktor auszeichnete.

6 „Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I", in: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13 (1986), S. 40–92; „Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer II", ebd., S. 239–317; „Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer III", in: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 14 (1987), S. 41–107 [= *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften*, Bd. 1, hrsg. von Ch. Reck, D. Weber, C. Leurini und A. Panaino, Rom 2001 (Serie Orientale Roma 89/1), S. 217–423]. Sundermann hat wie zu allen Beiträgen in diesen Sammelbänden auch seiner Habilitationsschrift *Addenda et Corrigenda* beigegeben (aaO., S. 270–274, 354f., 424–426).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Vielleicht verwundert es nicht, wenn der Kirchenhistoriker, der hier als Vizepräsident der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften die Verdienste von Werner Sundermann würdigt, wenigstens knapp darauf hinweist, wie wichtig die Beiträge sind, die dieser so ungemein produktive Kollege zur Geschichte des antiken Christentums und zum Verhältnis jüdischer wie christlicher zu zoroastrischen Elementen im Manichäismus vorgelegt hat – bereits einer der ersten Titel seiner staunenswert langen und reichen Bibliographie beschäftigt sich mit christlichen Evangelientexten.[7] Sundermann war, wie alle bezeugen können, die ihn näher kannten, übrigens ein überzeugter Christ und die Verbindung zu seiner Kirche war ihm wichtig. Das mag einer der vielen Gründe dafür gewesen sein, warum ihn auch das antike Christentum immer wieder beschäftigte. Daneben steht eine Fülle von Editionen mitteliranischer, mittelpersischer, parthischer und soghdischer manichäischer Schriften bzw. Fragmente in den „Berliner Turfantexten", eine Fülle von Aufsätzen und Rezensionen, seine zwei Bände im „Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum" und die Artikel in der *Encyclopædia Iranica* – diese Beiträge versuche ich, wie bereits gesagt, hier nun nicht einzeln zu behandeln; sie sind in einer ganzen Anzahl von Nachrufen von weit kundigeren Personen gewürdigt worden.[8] Insbesondere die Editionen in den „Berliner Turfantexten", aber auch die verschiedenen Beiträge zur Geschichte des Manichäismus von der frühen Wirksamkeit Manis bis hin zu den mittelalterlichen Ausläufern dieser synkretistischen Kunstreligion an der Seidenstraße sind längst zu unverzichtbaren Standardtiteln für alle, die sich ernsthaft mit dieser Religionsstiftung und ihren Folgen beschäftigen wollen, geworden. Nun, da wir sein Lebenswerk überblicken, wird deutlich, wie viel er für die Erschließung der mitteliranischen manichäischen Texte getan hat, die zu Beginn seiner Karriere gerade erst begonnen hatte. Natürlich wäre auch über buddhistische Texte zu reden, die er erschlossen und interpretiert hat. Aber ich lenke lieber zu der Akademie zurück, in deren Namen ich hier schreibe.

In der neu konstituierten Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften hat Sundermann von 1993 bis zu seiner Pensionierung im Jahre 2000 mit schier unglaublichem Engagement als Arbeitsstellenleiter das Akademienvorhaben Turfanforschung zu großer Blüte geführt und zugleich in seiner stillen wie bescheidenen Art seine Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter beeindruckt

7 „Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur", in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 14 (1968), S. 386–405.

8 In Auswahl: D. Durkin-Meisterernst: „Werner Sundermann (22nd of Dec. 1935 – 12th of Oct. 2012)", elektronisch zugänglich unter http://www.societasiranologicaeu.org; Ch. Reck: „Obituary: Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Werner Sundermann (Dec. 22nd 1935 – Oct. 12th 2012)", in: *Manichaean Studies Newsletter* 27 (2012/2013), S. 12–18; N. Sims-Williams: „Werner Sundermann, 1935–2012", in: *INDIRAN. The Newsletter of the Ancient India & Iran Trust* 8 (2013), S. 6; sowie P. Zieme: „Obituary. In Memoriam Werner Sundermann (22.12.1935 – 12.10.2012)", in: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 66 (2013), S. 109–115.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

und gerade dadurch ebenfalls zu großem Engagement motiviert, wie der seinerzeitige Präsident unserer Akademie in seinem Nachruf feststellte.[9] Eine große Schar von Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus dem In- und Ausland waren seine Freunde und erhielten zuverlässig auf jede Frage bald briefliche und später elektronische Antwort, so wie auch die Berliner Studierenden, die er aufmerksam betreute. Früh hat er die Bedeutung des Computers und die Chancen der Digitalisierung erkannt und entsprechende Schritte an den Funden aus der Turfan-Oase energisch unterstützt, zu Zeiten, in denen noch niemand von Digital Humanities überhaupt nur redete.

Schließen möchte ich meine Bemerkungen aber so persönlich, wie ich sie begonnen habe: Leben und Wirken von Werner Sundermann dokumentieren, dass unter den schwierigen Verhältnissen der ehemaligen DDR nicht nur herausragende Wissenschaft auf allerhöchstem Niveau betrieben werden konnte, die entsprechende Anerkennung hüben wie drüben fand, sondern ein gradliniges und aufrichtiges Leben möglich war, ohne sich zu verbiegen. Wer den liebenswürdigen und bescheidenen, stets hilfsbereiten, aber nie aufdringlichen Kollegen gekannt hat, wird ihn nicht vergessen. Und ganz vorsichtig und verstohlen versuchen, sein hohes menschliches und fachliches Ethos wenigstens ein kleines Stück weit zu kopieren. Die Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie verneigt sich vor ihrem Mitglied Werner Sundermann.

9 G. Stock: „Nachruf auf Werner Sundermann“, in: *Jahrbuch 2012 der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin 2013, S. 79–81.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Werner Sundermann und die persische Literatur*

Manfred Lorenz †, Berlin

Am Freitag, dem 12. Oktober 2012 verstarb Werner Sundermann, ehemaliger Mitarbeiter und Arbeitsstellenleiter der Turfanabteilung der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und Honorarprofessor der Freien Universität zu Berlin. Mit ihm verlor die Iranistik einen der besten Kenner des Mitteliranischen und vor allem des Manichäismus. Seine Leistung wurde auf einer Festveranstaltung der Akademie am 13.2.2013 in einem Vortrag seines Freundes und Kollegen Nicholas Sims-Williams gewürdigt. Eine Bibliographie seiner Werke findet man in *Manichaica Iranica: Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann,* herausgegeben von Ch. Reck, D. Weber, C .Leurini und A. Panaino, Rom 2001, S. 945–966.

Ich kannte Werner Sundermann als Kollegen wohl am längsten. Nachdem Professor H. F. J. Junker gemeinsam mit dem bekannten iranischen Schriftsteller Bozorg Alavi mit Eckhardt Fichtner und mir als erste Studenten im Januar 1954 die Fachrichtung Iranistik an der Berliner Humboldt-Universität eröffnet hatte, stellten sie eine Gruppe von Studenten zusammen, die im September dieses Jahres das Studium aufnahm. Darunter war Werner Sundermann. Wir wurden enge Freunde, besuchten zusammen Vorlesungen und arbeiteten später an gemeinsamen Projekten. Dabei ergab sich, dass Werner Sundermann vorwiegend der älteren Iranistik zugetan war, während meine Neigungen mehr auf dem Gebiet der modernen iranischen Sprachen lagen. Aber: als Schüler von Bozorg Alavi arbeitete sich Werner natürlich auch ins moderne Persisch ein. Unsere Persischkenntnisse wurden noch vertieft, als 1955 der von uns hochgeachtete Persisch-Lektor Hossein Kheirkhah (Esfahani), ein aus Iran emigrierter ehemaliger Schauspieler des Teheraner Saʿdi-Theaters, seine Arbeit an der Humboldt-Universität aufnahm. Sundermann selbst konnte also sehr gut Persisch!

Wissen die deutschen Literaturwissenschaftler heute überhaupt, dass wir, seitdem uns die Übersetzungen von Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall und Friedrich Rückert weniger leicht zugänglich sind, wissen sie also, dass wir eine umfassende und doch knappe Darstellung der klassischen persischen Literatur (vom 9. bis 16. Jahrhundert, also von Rudaki, Saʿdi, Ḥāfeẓ bis zu Dshāmi)

* Erstmals gedruckt in *Spektrum IRAN*, Nr. 2 (2013), 26. Jahrgang, S. 5–9.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

unserem Kollegen Werner Sundermann verdanken? Er hat in dem Band „Lob der Geliebten", erschienen 1968 bei Rütten & Loening, Berlin (2. Auflage 1983) Beispiele der persischen Klassik herausgegeben, von ihm als Rohübersetzung, von dem Dichter Martin Remané in Verse gebracht. Von besonderem Wert erscheint mir sein „Nachwort", in dem er nicht nur Dichter und ihre Werke vorstellt, in dem er auch die Geschichte der Deutsch-Übersetzungen persischer Klassik kurz umreißt. So hebt er die Rolle von Rückert, August von Platen-Hallermünde, Graf Adolf Friedrich von Schack, Friedrich Bodenstedt und anderer hervor. Auch zur Frage der Formgestaltung nimmt er Stellung. Wichtig scheint mir seine Feststellung (S. 226):

> Es bleibt immerhin eine Tatsache, dass viele Dichter Persiens, die Fürstenlob sangen, ihre bedeutendsten zumal, ihre Kunst nicht in pflichtschuldiger Panegyrik erschöpften, sondern auch die Überzeugung von der gottgeschaffenen Gleichheit aller Menschen, die Schilderung gemeinmenschlicher Gefühle und Schicksale, den Glauben an sittliche Ideale, ja bisweilen harte Kritik an den gesellschaftlichen Zuständen ihrer Zeit auszusprechen wagten.

Man konnte sich als Kollege immer wieder mit Fragen an Werner wenden, seine Antworten waren sachkundig und – seinem Charakter entsprechend – immer freundlich, liebenswürdig, selbstlos. Über die Grenzen Deutschlands hinaus war seine Stimme zu hören. Für einen Vortrag „Begegnung zwischen Ost und West – Hafez und Goethe" (*Spektrum*, Nr. 3/2010) konnte ich mit seinem Einverständnis einen Artikel benutzen, den Werner Sundermann in deutscher Sprache in Moskau veröffentlicht hatte, unter dem Titel „Hammer-Purgstalls Ḥāfiẓ-Übersetzung und ihre Bedeutung für Goethes Westöstlichen Divan" (in: *Teoretičeskie problemy vostočnych literatur,* Moskva 1969, S. 75–84).

Als ich 1990 das Bändchen „Die Abenteuer des Prinzen Hatem (Ein iranischer Märchenroman)" in Leipzig herausgab, beriet ich mich mit Werner bei der Abfassung des Nachworts. Also findet man dort auf S. 291 meine Bemerkung: „Ich danke Werner Sundermann, Berlin, für mündliche Hinweise zu den Ausführungen auf den Seiten 283 und 288. ML." Er hatte mir wertvolle Bemerkungen zum Alt- und Mitteliranischen, dem Manichäismus und dem buddhistischen Bodhisattva-Ideal vermittelt.

So könnte man noch viele Beispiele anführen, wo Werner Sundermanns Rat im Bereich der persischen Klassik hilfreich und hochgeschätzt war.

Doch nicht nur im Bereich der persischen Klassik hat Sundermann mitgearbeitet. Im Jahre 1984 gab der Verlag Rütten & Loening, Berlin, der um die Publikation persischer Literatur hervorragend bemüht war, einen Band moderner persischer Prosa heraus. Es waren Übersetzungen ins Deutsche durch mehrere Iranistik-Kollegen von Schriftstellern wie Dshamālzādeh, Hedājat, Tschubak, Al-e-Ahmad, Golestan, Doulatābādi, Sāʿedi und mehreren anderen. Herausgeber war Bozorg Alavi, und es kostete mich wie üblich große Mühe, Agha Bozorg zu veranlassen, auch drei seiner eigenen Erzählungen mit aufzunehmen.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Zwei Übersetzungen von Hedājat stammen aus der Feder von Werner Sundermann, „Der Morgen“ und die Erzählung „*Mohallel*“, die zu übersetzen uns große Schwierigkeiten bereitete. *Mohallel* als „Auslöser“ (eine Funktion im islamischen Rechtssystem) wäre unverständlich gewesen. Also wurde als Titel der Geschichte eine Variante gewählt, die zugleich als Titel des ganzen Bandes diente. Werner Sundermanns Geschichte heißt also „Die beiden Ehemänner“.

Doch viel, viel wichtiger sind die neun Seiten, die Werner Sundermann an den Anfang des Buches stellt: „Bozorg Alavi und wir“. Auf diesen Seiten bringt er die Liebe und Verehrung zum Ausdruck, die wir Schüler und Freunde unserem Agha Bozorg gegenüber fühlten. Er geht auf Einzelheiten ein, so die Verleihung der „Goldmedaille des Internationalen Friedensrates“, auf die Ereignisse in Iran 1953, die dazu führten, dass Alavi es vorzog, seinen Wohnsitz in Berlin zu wählen – was ja, wie gesagt, der Beginn einer beachtlichen Iranistik an der Humboldt-Universität war. Von Alavis Werken über seine Heimat Iran hebt er besonders den Band „Das Land der Rosen und der Nachtigallen“ (Kongress-Verlag, Berlin 1957) hervor und stellt zu Recht fest, eigentlich „verdient dieses Buch mehr Beachtung, als die Kritik ihm bisher zugebilligt hat.“ Mit der Veröffentlichung der „Geschichte und Entwicklung der modernen persischen Literatur“ (Berlin 1964) hat nach Sundermanns Ansicht sein Lehrer einen großen Namen als Wissenschaftler errungen.

Werner Sundermanns Platz in dieser Wertung charakterisiert er selbst auf Seite 8:

> Wenn ich hier von Alavi als einem Vermittler iranischer Kultur berichte, so soll dies in Form persönlicher Erinnerung geschehen, denn ich gehöre zu seinen Schülern seit 1954. Sein Unterricht war anspruchsvoll an Hörer und Lehrer zugleich und so intensiv, dass Mitarbeit und Vorbereitung oft wenig Zeit für andere Studienfächer ließen. Sein Unterricht vermochte aber auch die Erkenntnis zu wecken, dass sein Fachgebiet die großartige Geistesleistung eines begabten, traditionsreichen Volkes mit einer alten Kultur zum Inhalt hatte. Ich selbst war aus Interesse für die Kultur des alten Iran zu Alavi gekommen, wurde aber immer mehr in den Bann seiner Lehrgegenstände gezogen und wünschte mir am Ende meiner Studien nichts anderes als eine Arbeitsaufgabe im Bereich der neuesten persischen Literatur.

Das sollte meine Aussage in diesem kleinen Artikel sein.

Alavi hat Werner Sundermann als seinen Schüler hoch geachtet, geliebt. Im Februar 1997 war Agha Bozorg ernsthaft erkrankt. Seine Frau rief mich an. Er liege im Krankenhaus, aber morgen, das heißt am 17. Februar möchte er seine Schüler und Freunde, Werner Sundermann und mich, an seinem Krankenbett sehen. Wir hatte uns beide für den Vormittag verabredet. An diesem Morgen erhielten wir beide die Nachricht, dass Bozorg um 23.25 Uhr in der Nacht verstorben ist.

Es war zu spät – wie es leider zu oft zu spät ist.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Werner Sundermann and the Christian Texts of the Berlin Turfan Collection*

Nicholas Sims-Williams, Cambridge

Werner Sundermann is best known to the scholarly world for his work on the Manichaean texts of the Turfan collection – in particular his six volumes in the series *Berliner Turfantexte* published between 1973 and 2012 and the two volumes of collected papers reprinted in 2001 under the title *Manichaica Iranica* – but he also did important work on non-Manichaean material, including both Buddhist and Christian texts. Since it is impossible to do justice to the whole of Werner's scientific output in a single paper, I shall limit my remarks here to his work on the Christian texts from Turfan and related topics, an area in which we worked together for many years. Although our collaboration never led to any jointly-authored publications in this field, we regularly consulted each other and exchanged ideas and drafts of our editions of Sogdian and other texts, so that Werner's publications often contain generous footnotes acknowledging my suggestions, and my publications likewise refer frequently to Werner's practical and scientific help.

Werner's first publication dealing with a Christian topic was in fact the edition of a group of Manichaean fragments. This was his article on quotations from the Christian Gospels in the Iranian Manichaean texts, which was published in 1968.[1] This was also his first published work on the Turfan texts altogether, written a couple of years before he joined the staff of the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR and thus took up the editing of the Iranian Turfan texts as his official task. This early article may be seen as prophetic for Werner's future work in several ways. Not only is it a significant contribution both to Manichaean and to Christian studies, but it contains texts in all three of the Middle Iranian languages on which Werner was to work in the following years: Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian. Many years later, Werner took up a related subject, the Manichaean interpretation of the passion and death of Jesus,

* This paper is largely based on a memorial lecture entitled "Working with Werner: The Christian texts of the Berlin Turfan collection" which I gave at a meeting of the *Collegium Turfanicum* in Berlin on 13th February 2013. In adapting it for print, I have not attempted to change the personal character of the original talk.

1 W. Sundermann: "Christliche Evangelientexte der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur", in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 14/3 (1968), pp. 386–405.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in his contribution to the memorial volume for HANS-JOACHIM KLIMKEIT.[2] He also wrote an important survey for the *Encyclopædia Iranica* on the figure of Christ in Manichaeism;[3] and one of his very last articles was an edition of a Manichaean treatise against the Christians, which he published in a Festschrift which was presented to me on my 60th birthday – an honour which I treasure deeply.[4]

In the early 70s, when I was a research student in Cambridge, I remember my teacher ILYA GERSHEVITCH showing me Werner's article of 1968. GERSHEVITCH took the opportunity to tell me about WERNER SUNDERMANN, a "promising young man" who had recently taken up the study of the Iranian Turfan texts – GERSHEVITCH was of course 20 years older than Werner and more than 40 years older than me, so his idea of a "young man" was perhaps not quite the same as mine! At that time I had just begun work on my doctoral thesis, which eventually became an edition of the Christian Sogdian manuscript "C2".[5] In the course of reading OLAF HANSEN's edition of this manuscript, I had discovered that several unidentified fragments contain a Sogdian translation of a work by the East Syrian writer Dādišoʿ Qaṭrāyā, a commentary on the writings of Abba Isaiah. This discovery necessitated a new edition of the text, so GERSHEVITCH put me in touch with Werner, to whom I wrote in the hope of obtaining photos of these fragments. In those days it was no easy matter to obtain photos of the manuscripts in the possession of the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR; but Werner took the trouble to collate the manuscripts on my behalf, sending me a letter of four typed pages, from which I quoted liberally when I published my edition of these fragments a few months later.[6]

That was in 1973. Later in that same year, Dr GERSHEVITCH wrote on my behalf to the authorities of the Academy asking for me to be allowed to visit Berlin to study the Christian Sogdian manuscripts. The answer he received gave the required permission, but pointed out that I would only be allowed to see manuscripts which had already been published; it was the fixed policy of the Academy that unpublished manuscripts could only be studied and published by its own staff. In the case of the Iranian Turfan texts, that meant that all the texts –

2 W. SUNDERMANN: "Das Leiden und Sterben Jesu in manichäischer Deutung", in: W. GANTKE/K. HOHEISEL/W. KLEIN (eds.): *Religionsbegegnung und Kulturaustausch in Asien. Studien zum Gedenken an Hans-Joachim Klimkeit*, Wiesbaden 2002, pp. 209–217.

3 W. SUNDERMANN: "Christ in Manichaeism", in: E. YARSHATER (ed.): *Encyclopædia Iranica* V/5 (1991), pp. 535–539 [repr. in: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann*, ed. by CH. RECK/D. WEBER/C. LEURINI/A. PANAINO, Rome 2001, vol. I, pp. 5–11, with addenda on p. 12].

4 W. SUNDERMANN: "Ein manichäischer Traktat über und wider die Christen", in: W. SUNDERMANN/A. HINTZE/F. DE BLOIS (eds.): *Exegisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*, Wiesbaden 2009 (Iranica 17), pp. 497–508.

5 N. SIMS-WILLIAMS: *The Christian Sogdian manuscript C2*. Berlin 1985 (Berliner Turfantexte 12).

6 N. SIMS-WILLIAMS: "A Sogdian fragment of a work of Dadišoʿ Qaṭraya", in: *Asia Major*, N.S. 18/1 (1973), pp. 88–105, especially pp. 101–102.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Buddhist, Manichaean and Christian – were reserved for Werner's exclusive use. Another selfless act for which I owe Werner a great debt of gratitude is the fact that he gave up some of his exclusive rights and persuaded the authorities of the Academy to make an exception on my behalf. As a result, I was allowed to study previously unpublished fragments of the manuscript "C2" in order to include them in my edition. This must have happened already in 1974, the year of my first visit to Berlin, when I stayed in Dahlem in West Berlin as the guest of the late Prof. Carsten Colpe and crossed the border each day at Friedrichstraße in order to work in the Academy.

1974 was thus the year of my first meeting with Werner. It was also the year of his first publications of Christian texts. The subject of one of these was a fragment from a bilingual copy of the Book of Psalms, in alternating Syriac and New Persian.[7] Such a text is a great rarity: although the Turfan collection includes many Syriac manuscripts, there are only two New Persian manuscripts in Syriac script, of which this is one. The existence of this Psalter had been known since 1915, when F. W. K. Müller had published the upper part of a double folio.[8] Werner's article was prompted by his discovery of the lower part of the second folio, which neatly joins the upper part and turns it into a nearly complete folio.[9]

Werner's other article of 1974 was also devoted to the completion of a pioneering work by Müller. In 1913, when the study of Sogdian was still in its infancy, Müller had published an edition of all the Sogdian fragments known to him which contained passages from the New Testament – most of them in fact from lectionaries of the Gospels and the Epistles of St Paul.[10] The importance of Müller's edition for the history of Sogdian studies can hardly be overestimated. Since these texts are translated from Syriac, mostly in a very literal or even mechanical way, they provided a solid basis for identifying the meaning of Sogdian words and the function of the grammatical forms. But Müller's pioneer edition was naturally imperfect in many ways, and Werner set out to remedy its defects in a series of three long articles – 150 pages in total – published from 1974 onwards in the newly-founded journal *Altorientalische Forschungen*.[11] As in the

7 W. Sundermann: "Einige Bemerkungen zum syrisch-neupersischen Psalmenbruchstü[c]k aus Chinesisch-Turkistan", in: Ph. Gignoux/A. Tafazzoli (eds.): *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*, Louvain 1974, pp. 441–452.

8 F. W. K. Müller: "Ein syrisch-neupersisches Psalmenbruchstück aus Chinesisch-Turkistan", in: G. Weil (ed.): *Festschrift Eduard Sachau zum siebzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, Berlin 1915, pp. 215–222.

9 Montages showing the two fragments re-joined are included as Pl. 1–3 in N. Sims-Williams: "Early New Persian in Syriac script: Two texts from Turfan", in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 74 (2011), pp. 353–374.

10 F. W. K. Müller: *Soghdische Texte I*. Berlin 1913 (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1912, No. 2).

11 W. Sundermann: "Nachlese zu F. W. K. Müllers 'Soghdischen Texten I', 1.–3. Teil", in: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1 (1974), pp. 217–255; 3 (1975), pp. 55–90; 8 (1981), pp. 169–225.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

case of the bilingual Psalter, Werner identified many additional fragments of these lectionaries, some of which could be joined to form more substantial text-units. Moreover, while Müller had tended to treat the Sogdian text as if it was a translation from the German of Martin Luther, Werner compared it systematically with the Syriac and other ancient versions, as well as with the Greek original, throwing light on passages where the Sogdian translator had misunderstood what he was translating and also on the rare cases where the translator may perhaps have followed some text other than the Syriac Peshitta version. Both features are well illustrated by the Sogdian version of Matthew 10.29:

> Are not two sparrows sold for one "bond", and (yet) not one of them falls to the ground without the will of God your Father?

As Werner pointed out, the Sogdian word *bnt* "bond" is a mechanical rendering of Syriac *assār*, the name of a small coin (Gk. ἀσσάριον), which the translator has apparently interpreted, without regard for the context, as the homonym meaning "bond".[12] On the other hand, the word "will" is not found in the Peshitta, which simply reads "without your Father" like the underlying Greek text, but has at least a partial parallel in a Flemish gospel-harmony, a late representative of the Diatessaron tradition.[13]

After my first meeting with Werner in 1974 I visited Berlin many times. To begin with I always stayed in West Berlin and crossed the border each day to work on the manuscripts. This was a rather tiresome business, as the border guards regarded my transcriptions of Sogdian texts with great suspicion and sometimes detained me for several hours; but Werner was very kind to me, inviting me to his flat and introducing me to his wife and family, and we soon became good friends. Later on, in the late 70s and early 80s, I came several times under the terms of an exchange agreement between the British and East German Academies, which meant that I could live in East Berlin, in one of the Academy's guest-houses.

In 1983 I suggested to Werner that we might collaborate on a catalogue of the Iranian (Sogdian and Persian) manuscripts in Syriac script in the Berlin collection. I have to admit that this was a purely selfish suggestion on my part. Up to this time I had only been allowed to work on fragments which had already been published or, as in the case of "C2", additional unpublished fragments belonging to published manuscripts. Obviously, if I were commissioned to write a catalogue I would have to be allowed to see all the manuscripts; and I guessed, correctly as it turned out, that once I had been allowed to see the manuscripts it would be easier to get permission to publish some of them. Luckily, Werner agreed to my suggestion and persuaded the Academy to agree to it too; and so

12 Sundermann 1974 (previous note), p. 253, n. 150.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 254, n. 159, citing p. 160 of C. Peters: "Der Text der soghdischen Evangelienbruchstücke und das Problem der Pešiṭta", in: *Oriens Christianus*, 3rd series, 11 (1936), pp. 153–162.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

N21/27
N107

Signatur: C 3/17 alte Signatur: [T II B 17] + T III 52 + sechs Fragmente [T III 52]

Höhe: 17,5 cm Breite: cm Zeilenzahl: 26 + 29

Schriftspiegel, Höhe: Breite: 10,0 cm

Beschreibung: Fast ganz erhaltenes Blatt. Oberrand abgerissen, Außenrand, obere Hälfte des Innenrandes verstört. /R/ Kolophon in verblaßter roter Schrift, Text der V-Seite durch Überklebung, Abriß und Verschmutzung von Papier sehr verstört.

Zitat: /R/ spty b pr npys zprt ptry ywnnn dylwny ... z(n)[t] pwsty ...

Eigennamen, wichtige Begriffe: rbn (B2, 6, 7), ywnnn dylwny (R10, 14, 15), Blymwn (R16, 21, 23).

Inhalt: Gedenken des Todes Yōhannān Dailomāyās, Ende der Erzählung, Kolophon. Anfang der Vita des Serapion Sidonita. Proōmium. Zu Yōhannān vgl. syr. Ms. H Nr.44(?), zu Serapion Bedjan V, 263,1 - 264,9.

Publikation: /R/14-15/ Sundermann, Bruchstück, S. 101.

Fig. 1

we began our first and only formal collaboration. Over the course of the next four years we jointly completed catalogue-slips, in a macaronic mixture of German and English, for more than 500 fragments. The example shown in Fig. 1 is one of Werner's catalogue-slips, with a few annotations added by me. In this case, Werner had identified the content of the folio, which contains the end of the biography of John of Dailam and the beginning of the life of St Serapion.[14] He was also responsible for putting it together from some eight fragments of different sizes. So our joint work on cataloguing the fragments was at the same time a work of restoration, one result of which was to greatly reduce the number of catalogue entries required, in this case from eight entries to just one.

In 1987 Werner was forced by the pressure of other work to withdraw from active participation in the catalogue project, leaving me to finish it on my own. Soon after this, I too became very busy with other work, especially on the newly-discovered Bactrian documents from Northern Afghanistan, so the catalogue took rather a long time to finish; it was finally completed in 2011 and published in 2012, some 29 years after it was begun.[15] It appears with my name

14 Werner's identification of this and other Sogdian fragments of the life of John of Dailam (†738) was made known in W. Sundermann: "Ein Bruchstück einer soghdischen Kirchengeschichte aus Zentralasien?", in: *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24/1 (1976 [1979]), pp. 95–101.

15 N. Sims-Williams: *Iranian manuscripts in Syriac script in the Berlin Turfan collection*, Stuttgart 2012 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XVIII/4:

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

as sole author, but with a heartfelt dedication to Werner and an acknowledgement that a substantial part of the contents is his work. I am particularly glad that it did not appear too late for me to present a copy to Werner and thank him in person for having made it possible.

During the years after 1987 Werner continued to work from time to time on the Christian Sogdian texts, joining fragments, identifying texts and analyzing their significance for the history of the Christian community in the Turfan oasis. One of the most unusual texts which he published was a collection of riddles on biblical subjects, presented in the form of a dialogue between a pupil and a teacher.[16] A typical example of its contents is the following exchange:

> Pupil: Who was the non-speaking messenger who took an unwritten message and went to an unbuilt city? — Teacher: The non-speaking messenger was the dove, the unwritten message was the leaf of an olive tree, the unbuilt city was Noah's ark.

This manuscript is carelessly written and contains many rare or unknown words. Luckily, the text gives the answer to most of the riddles, but when the pupil's question occurs at the end of a page and the following page is missing, it is not always easy to find the solution. One such case is the question: "Who spoke a true word and died?" In his edition, Werner adopted my suggestion that the reference must be to the prophet Simeon, to whom it had been revealed that he would not die until he had seen the Messiah. In that case, the "true word" would be the *Nunc dimittis*, which he spoke when the baby Jesus was shown to him in the temple.[17] But recently I found the same riddle in a Syriac collection, with a quite different solution: the answer is Samson, who died as a result of revealing the secret of his strength to his wife Delilah.[18]

Almost all of the Christian Sogdian texts come from a single site, the ruins of an East Syrian monastery near Bulayïq in the Turfan oasis. In an important article entitled "Byzanz und Bulayïq",[19] Werner discusses the contents of the monastic library and what one can deduce about the monks' self-image from their choice of texts to translate or to copy. Ultimately, it is clear, the monks of Bulayïq regarded themselves as the spiritual heirs of St Anthony, and their library contains excerpts from the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, the stories and sayings of

---

Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 4). The entry in the published catalogue which corresponds to the catalogue-slip in Fig. 1 appears on p. 88 under the siglum "E26/23".

16 W. SUNDERMANN: "Der Schüler fragt den Lehrer. Eine Sammlung biblischer Rätsel in soghdischer Sprache", in: *A green leaf. Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*. Leiden 1988 (Acta Iranica 28), pp. 173–186.

17 *Ibid*., p. 177, n. 43.

18 SIMS-WILLIAMS 2012 (n. 15 above), p. 182 on E36/1, with reference to J.B. CHABOT: "Eclaircissements sur quelques points de la littérature syriaque", in: *Journal Asiatique*, 10e sér., 8 (1906), pp. 259–293, especially p. 279, ll. 5–7.

19 W. SUNDERMANN: "Byzanz und Bulayïq", in: P. VAVROUŠEK (ed.): *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial volume of Otakar Klíma*, Prague 1994, pp. 255–264.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the Egyptian "Desert Fathers", as well as works attributed to named ascetics of the 4th century, such as Evagrius Ponticus and Abba Isaiah, and even commentaries on such texts. But it is equally significant that the works translated into Sogdian included the lives of historical or legendary figures who were thought to have played an important part in bringing the monastic tradition from Egypt to Mesopotamia and Iran. These include Mar Awgen (Eugenius), who was credited with the foundation of the first monastery in Mesopotamia, at Mt Izla near Nisibis, close to the border between the Roman and Sasanian empires. It was Werner himself who identified a folio from the Sogdian version of this text[20] and later edited it in a Festschrift for his colleague Peter Zieme.[21] The life of John of Dailam is another text which can be regarded as belonging to this category, since John was chiefly famous as the founder of several monasteries in Western Iran.

As I have already mentioned in passing, the manuscript which contains the Sogdian version of this life also contains that of the Egyptian ascetic Serapion Sidonita. The manuscript in question, E26, formerly "C3", is known from a very large number of fragments in a distinctive tiny handwriting. At one time Werner and I thought of editing this manuscript jointly, and we both did a lot of preliminary work towards the edition: identifying the many small fragments, joining them together where possible and putting them into order. "Gegenwärtig" – wrote Werner in 1994 – "kann ich nach längeren Arbeiten aus diesem Werk 17 meist zusammengesetzte Fragmente als Teile der Serapion-Legende identifizieren".[22] Apart from two substantial excerpts which paraphrase passages from the New Testament and were therefore included in Müller's edition of the Sogdian biblical texts,[23] only two folios of the life of Serapion have been published so far;[24] but Werner's work on its reconstruction has been incorporated in my catalogue[25] as well as in a complete edition of the manuscript which is now in the press.[26]

Although none of our collaborative work ever resulted in a joint publication, Werner and I did, I think, make a good team. This was in part because our interests were rather different and complementary. My chief interest was

20 Sundermann 1994 (previous note), pp. 263–264.

21 W. Sundermann: "Ein soghdisches Fragment der Mār Eugen-Legende", in: M. Ölmez/S.-C. Raschmann (eds.): *Splitter aus der Gegend von Turfan. Festschrift für Peter Zieme*, Istanbul/Berlin 2002, pp. 309–331.

22 Sundermann 1994 (n. 19 above), p. 260.

23 Müller 1913 (n. 10 above), pp. 34, 80–81.

24 N. Sims-Williams: "Christian Sogdian texts from the Nachlass of Olaf Hansen, I: Fragments of the Life of Serapion", in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 58 (1995), pp. 50–68.

25 Sims-Williams 2012 (n. 15 above), pp. 88–95.

26 Since this was written the volume has appeared: N. Sims-Williams: *The Life of Serapion and other Christian Sogdian texts from the manuscripts E25 and E26*, Turnhout 2015 (Berliner Turfantexte 35).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the language of the texts, in particular their morphology and syntax; Werner was much more concerned with the content of the texts and what they could tell us about the lives and beliefs of the men who wrote them and read them. So sometimes I might say to Werner: no, surely that form must be present subjunctive, not past indicative; at other times he would say to me: no, that cannot be right, no Nestorian could ever have written such a thing. It was a great privilege for me to work with someone with such wide knowledge, deep understanding and true empathy for the many varieties of religious experience. As I continue my own work on the Christian texts of the Turfan collection, I deeply regret the loss of the opportunity to discuss them with Werner and the alternative perspective which he used to provide.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Die mandäische „dualistische Formel“ und der manichäische „Dualismus“

Ein Beitrag zum aramäischen Hintergrund des Manichäismus

Ionuț Daniel Băncilă, Berlin

Werner Sundermann (1935–2012) zu würdigen, ist zugleich eine Pflicht und eine Ehre für jeden, der sich der Untersuchung manichäischer Texte widmet: Dass heute von einer „Manichäologie“ als einer historisch-philologischen Wissenschaft die Rede ist, verdankt sich seinen bahnbrechenden Texteditionen und Analysen. Er verfügte nicht nur über die nötigen philologischen Kenntnisse, sondern auch über den kultur- und religionsgeschichtlichen Scharfsinn in der Erforschung der längst erloschenen „Religion des Lichtes“. Für die „Manichäologie“ ist das Zusammentreffen W. Sundermanns mit seiner *Daēnā* ein Glücksfall: Mit ihr wurde dieser noch jungen Wissenschaft ein Schutzgeist an die Seite gestellt.[1]

Der vorliegende Beitrag knüpft an einige Hauptanliegen W. Sundermanns in der Erforschung des Manichäismus an, nämlich an die Frage nach der Stellung des manichäischen „Dualismus“[2] in der Religionsgeschichte. Während er einräumt, dass zoroastrische Ideen („zurvanistischer“ Prägung) einen Einfluss auf die Herausbildung des radikalen „Dualismus“ der Manichäer gehabt haben *könnten*, präzisiert er, indem er auf den Titel eines bekannten Aufsatzes von Hans Heinrich Schaeder (1896–1957) Bezug nimmt, zugleich, dass es sich dabei eher um eine „Fortbildung“ innerhalb der „Urform“ des manichäischen Systems handle.[3] Ohne eine endgültige Antwort darauf geben zu können, werden wir im Folgenden unsere Aufmerksamkeit auf einige bisher in der

1 Nicht ohne Grund hat F. C. Andreas nach der ersten Durchsicht eines sogdischen Textes ekstatisch („außer sich“, so A. Grünwedel) ausgerufen: „Die Toten stehen auf!“, vgl. Walravens 2001, S. 50.

2 Hier immer in Anführungszeichen, da es sich um eine umstrittene Kategorie der Religionswissenschaft, insbesondere bei der Behandlung der Religionen Irans handelt. Der italienische Religionswissenschaftler Ugo Bianchi (1922–1995) hat dem „Dualismus“ die ausführlichsten Untersuchungen gewidmet. Für eine Zusammenfassung und Darlegung des theoretischen Rahmens seiner Auffassung siehe Băncilă 2010, S. 72–76.

3 Sundermann 1997, S. 360 [= Sundermann 2001, S. 56].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

„Manichäologie“ wenig erforschten Quellen lenken, nämlich auf das aramäische und mandäische Textmaterial. Die Frage, der wir nachgehen wollen, betrifft die Stellung der „dualistischen Formel“ in den magischen, liturgischen und literarischen mandäischen Werken und ihre Beziehung zum manichäischen „Dualismus“.

Die ersten beiden Fassungen der „dualistischen Formel“ in der *Ginza*

Die ersten beiden „Traktate“ des heiligen mandäischen Buches *Ginza* geben zwei verschiedene „Rezensionen“ derselben Schrift wieder.[4] Diese zwei Fassungen sind wie folgt strukturiert: (1) ein Lobpreis des höchsten göttlichen Wesens, gefolgt von einer (2) narrativen Entfaltung der zentralen Themen der mandäischen Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie sowie von (3) einem mandäischen „Moralkodex“[5], der Ermahnungen und Warnungen ethischen und kultischen Inhalts umfasst, und abschließend (4) eine theologische Deutung des Geschichtsverlaufs mit apokalyptischen Zügen. Die „dualistische Formel“ kommt im letzten, apokalyptischen Teil der beiden Fassungen des Textes vor, und zwar im Kontext einer Beschreibung des irdischen Aufenthalts und der Offenbarung verschiedener Lichtwesen. Nach einer scharfen Polemik gegen Christus, den „Prophet(en) der Juden“ (*mšiha nbiha ḏ-iahuṭaiia*, Gy 27.14), bei der seine Behauptung, das Lichtwesen Hibil-Ziua zu sein[6], vehement verneint wird, ist über ein anderes Lichtwesen Anoš-Utra und dessen irdischen Aufenthalt „in den Jahren von Palṭus (= Pilatus)“ die Rede. Die literarische Gestaltung des Lichtwesens Anoš-Utra überlappt sich mit der Figur Jesu: Handlungen, die gemäß der evangelischen Überlieferung für Jesus spezifisch sind (z. B. die Krankenheilungen), werden den Lichtwesen zugeschrieben.[7] Die für uns interessante „dualistische Glaubensformel“ gibt den Inhalt der Lehre Anoš-Utras an die Juden wieder:

4 Gy I[.1] (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 5–30) und Gy II.1 (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 31–54).

5 Lidzbarski 1925, S. 3.

6 Fassung A: *ana hu šliha qadmaia ana hu hibil ziua ḏ-mn mruma etit* (Gy 29.1–2), „Ich bin der erste Gesandte, ich bin Hibil-Ziua, der aus der Höhe gekommen bin“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 29). Fassung B: *ana hu ḏ-mn alaha hua […] ana hu bra ḏ-alaha ḏ-ab l-haka šadran* […] *ana hu šliha qadmaia ana hu hibil ziua ana ḏ-mn mruma etit* (Gy 52.14–17), „Ich bin es, der aus Gott entstanden ist […] Ich bin der Sohn Gottes, den […] mein Vater hierher gesandt hat […] Ich bin der erste Gesandte, ich bin Hibil-Ziua, der ich aus der oberen Höhe gekommen bin“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 47).

7 Fassung A: *u-masgia u-atia b-šnia ḏ-palṭus malka ḏ-alma enuš eutra l-alma atia b-haila ḏ-malka rama ḏ-nhura masia qrsania u-mpata euiria u-muakia girbania u-maqim mtabria u-šapupia l-masguiia u-malil haršia u-dugia* (Gy 29.7–11), „Er geht und kommt in den Jahren des Palṭus, des Königs der Welt. Enuš-Utra kommt in die Welt mit der Kraft des hohen Lichtkönigs. Er heilt die Kranken, macht die Blinden sehend, reinigt die Aussätzigen, richtet die Verkrüppelten, auf dem Boden Kriechenden, auf, dass sie gehen können, macht die Taubstummen redend und belebt die Toten“ (Lidzbarski

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

„Fassung A“ (Gy 29.11–15)	„Fassung B“ (Gy 53.9–14)
u-mhaiia mitia u-mhaitin mn iahuṭaiia u-mhauilun	*mhaiia mitia u-mhaimun mn iahuṭaiia u-mhauilun*
ḏ-eit muta u-eit hiia	*ḏ-eit hiia u-eit muta*
u-eit hšuka u-eit nhura	*u-eit nhura u-eit hšuka u-nura ḏ-iaqra*
u-eit ṭeia u-eit šrara	*u-eit šrara u-eit ṭeia*
u-mapiq iahuṭaiia el šuma ḏ-malaka rama ḏ-nhura	*u-mapik minaihun kul ḏ-šiah u-mihaiman bihra maraihun ḏ-kulhun alma*
„Er gewinnt Gläubige unter den Juden und zeigt ihnen:	„Er gewinnt Gläubige unter den Juden und zeigt ihnen:
es gibt Tod und es gibt Leben,	es gibt Leben und es gibt Tod,
es gibt Finsternis und es gibt Licht,	es gibt Licht und es gibt Finsternis und loderndes Feuer,
es gibt Irrtum und es gibt Wahrheit.	es gibt Wahrheit und es gibt Irrtum.
Er bekehrt die Juden zum Namen des hohen Lichtkönigs.“	Er führt einen jeden von ihnen hinaus, der eifrig und fest im Glauben an den Einen, den Herrn aller Welten, ist.“
(Lidzbarski 1925, S. 30)	(Lidzbarski 1925, S. 48)

Die Versionen weisen Merkmale einer sekundären Bearbeitung eines Urtextes auf. Kurz vor der Rede über die irdische Offenbarung des Lichtwesens Anoš Utra wird das Auftreten Christi *(mšiha)* angedeutet. Die „Fassung A“ ist kürzer und präziser als die längere „Fassung B“, die den Kampf gegen einen Lügenpropheten (an der entsprechenden Stelle in „Fassung A“ explizit mit Christus identifiziert)[8] ausführlicher beschreibt.[9] Das Auftreten Anoš Utras in der Welt

1925, S. 30); Fassung B: *b-haila d-malka rama ḏ-nhura u-atia l-alma hazin b-šnia piliaṭus ḏ-hauia malka b-alma u-anuš eutra l-alma atia b-haila ḏ-malka rama ḏ-nhura u-asia qirsania u-mpata euiria u-mdakia girbania u-maqim mtabria l-masguiia* (Gy 53, 4–9), „Er kommt in diese Welt in den Jahren des Pilatus, der dann König der Welt ist. Anuš-Utra kommt in die Welt mit der Kraft des hohen Lichtkönigs. Er heilt die Kranken, macht die Blinden sehend, reinigt die Aussätzigen, richtet die Verkrüppelten auf, dass sie gehen können, und macht die Taubstummen redend. Mit der Kraft des hohen Lichtkönigs belebt er die Toten“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 48).

8 Beiden Versionen gemeinsam ist: „Amunel [i. e. Emanuel] ist sein Name, Jesus der Heiland nannte er sich selber“, vgl. Lidzbarski 1925, S. 29 und 47 (*amunel šuma eši masiha qaria l-napšḫ*, Gy 28.17–18 und 52.3–4).

9 Fassung A: *u-hauia mšiha nbiha ḏ-iahuṭaiia qala l-šibiahia qarilin b-ligṭma lagiṭlun eniš eniš el dilḫ* (Gy 27.14–15) „Dann erscheint Christus, der Prophet der Juden. Er ruft den Planeten zu, er macht sie zu seiner Partei, und ein jeder kämpft für ihn“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 28), vgl. mit Fassung B: „Dann werden Lügenpropheten auftreten, die Gestalt von … annehmen, in jeder Stadt auftreten. Die Völker werden sich verteilen, die Zungen sich verteilen über jede Stadt, über jeden Ort. Die Juden werden über jede Stadt zerstreut werden. Die Welt wird sich spalten und Tyrannen sich eines jeden Ortes bemächtigen. Ein Ort wird über den anderen herfallen, eine Stadt über die andere mit Krieg herfallen, und sie vergießen Blutströme in der Welt. Ein jeder sucht für sich selber einen Vorteil und kämpft um das, was nicht ihm gehört *(u-el ḏ-lai dilḫ mitkadaš)*“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 46 = Gy 50.16–24).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

folgt direkt auf die zurückgewiesene Behauptung Christi, Hibil Ziua zu sein.[10] Die Frage nach dem Alter der beiden Fassungen lässt sich nicht leicht beantworten, doch für ein jüngeres Datum der „Fassung B“ sprechen sowohl die erklärenden Einschübe, als auch die Wiedergabe der Personennamen auf Mandäisch.[11]

Fassung C

Die „dualistische Formel“ kommt nochmals, mit mehreren sekundären Einschüben, im sechsten Buch der *Ginza* vor, wo von zwei phantastischen Gestalten der mandäischen Geisterwelt die Rede ist: Dinanukt, „der weise Schriftgelehrte, das Tintenbuch der (heidnischen) Götter“ (*sapra u-hakita spar diuta ḏ-alahia*, Gy 204.23 und 205.19–20) und „der kleine Diṣai“, ein personifiziertes Buch. Dieser Abschnitt mandäischer Literatur ist auch deswegen von großem Interesse, weil es als solches von dem nestorianischen Bischof Theodor bar Kōni am Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts belegt ist:

ܐܦܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܘܟܬ ܣܦܪܐ ܘܟܬܝܬܐ ܕܣܦܪ ܕܐܠܗܐ	*ana hu dinanukt sapra u-hakita spar diuta ḏ-alahia* […]
ܘܐܬܝܐ ܕܕܝܨܝ ܙܝܬܐ ܠܩܕܡܝ ܢܦܠܝܗ	*u-atia diṣai ziṭa l-qudamai npaliḫ*
(Theodor bar Kōni, vgl. Pognon 1898, S. 155)	(Gy 204.22–23 und 205.5–6)
„und sie sagen auch über Dinanus, der Schreiber/das Buch der Religionen, und über den kleinen Diṣa“.[12]	„ich bin Dinanukt, der weise Schriftgelehrte, das Tintenbuch der [heidnischen] Götter […] Da kam der kleine Diṣai und fiel vor mich hin. Ich öffnete ihn und studierte ihn“. (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 206)

Die Tatsache, dass Theodor bar Kōni die Geschichte über Dinanukt kennt (obwohl er sie nicht zitiert)[13] und gemäß dem in der mandäischen *Ginza* erhaltenen

10 Fassung A: „Hibil Ziua ist nicht mit Feuer bekleidet, Hibil Ziua offenbart sich in jenem Zeitalter nicht“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 29), *hibil ziua la-i nura lbiš u-hibi ziua b-dara hanuta la-mitigliḫ*, Gy 29.3–4, vgl. Fassung B: Lidzbarski 1925, S. 47 = Gy 52.18–19, Erzählung in der 1. Person Singular. In *Qolasta* ist Christus als Gestaltenverdreher beschrieben: *ezdahrulia ahia […] ešu mšiha batla u-men apid dmauata*, „Nehmet euch in acht, meine Brüder […] vor dem nichtigen Jesus Christus, vor dem, der die Gestalten verdreht“, Lidzbarski 1920, S. 191 (Text: Zeilen 5–7).

11 Zum Beispiel *Palṭus* (Fassung A: Gy 29.8), gegenüber von *Piliaṭus* (Fassung B: Gy 53.6). Man beachte auch die Variationen der Namen des Lichtwesens Enoš-Utra (Fassung A: Gy 29.8 und in dem redaktionellen Einschub in Fassung B: Gy 52.24, sowie in Fassung B: Gy 52.19–20) gegenüber von Anoš-Utra (Fassung B: Gy 53.6, sowie im textlichen Zusatz: Gy 53.2 – Anuš). Darüber M. Lidzbarski (1925, S. 48, Anm. 1): „Wahrscheinlich stand in diesem Einschiebsel statt ענוש die andere Form אנוש, die in mandäischen Schriften mit ענוש abwechselt (an erster Stelle abgeändert) und daraufhin wurde weiterhin אנוש geschrieben“.

12 Text in Pognon 1898, S. 155.

13 „Il est probable qu'un scribe du moyen âge trouvant l'histoire du Dinanous trop longue l'a suprimée en la remplançant par cette phrase“, vgl. Pognon 1898, S. 227, Anm. 4.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Text darauf hinweist, spricht für eine feste historische Verankerung dieser Erzählung in der mandäischen Literatur. Freilich zitiert der Bischof Theodor sie unter der Überschrift: ܗܐܪܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܐ ܕܐܬܪܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܠܦ („die Häresie der Dos[i]-thäer, die von Ado, dem Wanderer, gelehrt ist“). Das kann als ein zusätzlicher Beleg dafür verstanden werden, dass verschiedene Schriften, die unterschiedlichen religiösen Strömungen im spätantiken Mesopotamien angehörten, in die große mandäische Schrift *Ginza* aufgenommen wurden.[14] Dies geschah höchstwahrscheinlich nach dem 8. Jahrhundert, als die Mandäer ihre Religion unter dem Druck des Islams als „Buchreligion“ legitimieren mussten.

Die mandäische „Fassung C“ der dualistischen Formel wird mehrfach in derselben Texteinheit („Traktat“) überliefert, jedoch mit geringer Textvariation. Sie gibt im Text (1) die dreifache Rede (Klage) des kleinen Diṣai und (2) die Aussage des bösen weiblichen Geistes Ruha wieder, der sich den Inhalt der Formel in der 1. Person Singular aneignet. Der „Traktat“ endet mit einer apokalyptischen Entrückung Dinanukts und seinem Aufstieg in die Himmelssphären.[15]

		aka hiia ḏ-hun mn la-qadmia
		u-aka kušṭa ḏ-hiia mn qudam
		b-riša
		aka ziua aka nhura
eit muta u-eit hiia	*eit hiia u-eit muta*	*(aka muta aka hiia*
u-eit hšuka u-eit nhura	*u-eit nhura u-eit hšuka*	*aka hšuka aka nhura)*[16]
	u-nura ḏ-iaqra	
u-eit ṭeia u-eit šrara	*u-eit šrara u-eit ṭeia*	*aka ṭeia aka šrara*
(Gy 29.12–14)	(Gy 53.11–13)	*aka hbila aka biniana*
		aka thima aka asuta
		aka gabra iatira ḏ-qašiš mn
		qudam bania šumia u-arqa hu(*a*)
		(Gy 205.8–11, 206.3–8, 207.1–5, vgl. 207.15–21)
		„es gibt ein Leben, das von jeher war, und es gibt eine Kušṭa, die schon früher am Anfang war. Es gibt Glanz, es gibt Licht.

14 Ausführliche Analyse bei Duchemin 2012.

15 Eine Zusammenfassung und Diskussion bietet Buckley 2010. Zu Ruha in diesem Kontext siehe Buckley 2002, S. 40–48. Es mag nicht zufällig sein, dass sowohl die mandäische Erzählung über Dianukht als auch die griechische manichäische „Manibiographie“ *(CMC)* eine ähnliche Argumentationsstrategie verfolgen: Sowohl das 6. Buch der mandäischen *Ginza* als auch der Baraies-Passus über die apokalyptischen Zeugnisse Manis und seiner gesandten Vorgänger (*CMC* 45.1–72.7) zielen darauf ab, den höheren Grad des Wissens aus Offenbarungen gegenüber dem Bücherwissen zu beweisen, vgl. Buckley 2010, S. 19.

16 Nur in Gy 206.5; 207.2–3, vgl. 207.17–18. In der ersten Rede Diṣais fehlt es.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

„es gibt Tod und es gibt Leben,	„es gibt Leben und es gibt Tod,	Es gibt Tod, es gibt Leben;
es gibt Finsternis und es gibt Licht,	es gibt Licht und es gibt Finsternis und loderndes Feuer,	es gibt Finsternis, es gibt Licht.
es gibt Irrtum und es gibt Wahrheit.“	es gibt Wahrheit und es gibt Irrtum.“	Es gibt Irrtum, es gibt Wahrheit.
(Lidzbarski 1925, S. 30)	(Lidzbarski 1925, S. 48)	Es gibt Zerstörung, es gibt Aufbau. Es gibt Schlag, es gibt Heilung. Es gibt einen erhabenen Mann, der älter ist und früher da war als der Erbauer des Himmels und der Erde“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 207)

Gegenüber den ersten beiden Varianten bietet die „dualistische Formel“ der „Fassung C“ einige Erweiterungen zu der Liste der Gegensatzpaare: z. B. passt der Einschub *aka ziua aka nhura*, „es gibt Glanz, es gibt Licht“, hier nicht, weil in der sonstigen mandäischen Literatur kein Gegensatz zwischen Glanz *(ziua)* und Licht *(nhura)* belegt ist.[17] Ansonsten ist *hbila* („Zerstörung“)[18] als negative Größe mehrmals in Verbindung mit *muta* („Tod“) in der gesamten mandäischen Literatur bezeugt[19] und bildet einen Gegenpol zu *biniana* („Aufbau“, „Akt der Schöpfung“, aber auch „Körper[struktur]“)[20]. Weil die semantische Sphäre des ersten Elementes des Gegensatzpaares *thima-asuta* („Schlag-Heilung“) sehr weit reichend sein kann,[21] bildet es keine festgesetzte Symmetrie, da *tihma* als

17 Dieser Zusatz kann auch durch den Einschub einer „genealogischen“ Theogonie erklärt werden. Die „genealogische“ Variante der mandäischen Theo- und Kosmogonie findet sich in der kurzen Übersicht über die Schöpfung in Gy XV.20, wo das Licht *(nhura)* von Glanz *(ziua)* emaniert wird: *hiia hun b-arqa ḏ-nhura u-mn hiia mia hun mn hiia hun mia u-mn mia ziua hua u-mn ziua hua nhura u-mn nhura eutria hun mn nhura hun eutria ḏ-qaimia l-hiia mšaba* (Gy 358.23–359.3), „auf der Lichterde war das Leben und von Leben ward Wasser. Von Leben ward das Wasser, und von Wasser ward der Glanz. Von Glanz war das Licht, und von Licht wurden die Utras, die dastehen und das Leben preisen“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 378–379 und Rudolph 1965, S. 63–64). Das Auftreten des Elementes „Wasser“ in dieser „genealogischen“ Theo-/Kosmologie ist unerwartet.

18 Drower/ Macuch 1963, S. 129.

19 Und zwar in demselben ersten Traktat der *Ginza*: *hbila ḏ-muta* (Gy 8.15) und im sechsten *Ginza*-Buch, wo auch die Erzählung über Dinanukt vorkommt: *hbila muta* (Gy 210.17).

20 Drower/ Macuch 1963, S. 61, s. v. *biniana*: „building, construction, frame-work, design, composition, edifice, something put together, (of body) structure, constitution”.

21 Das Wort *thima* ist eine sekundäre Bildung, ausgehend von der Wurzel √*TMH* („to be torpid, stupid, stupefied, astounded, dull, inert, listless, inactive, rigid, motionless, senseless, stunned, struck aghast, astonished, amazed, confounded; [of water (…)] to be brackish, turbid”, Drower/ Macuch 1963, S. 483) und bedeutet „Wunder, Erstaunen“ (so Nöldeke 1875, S. 102, vgl. Drower/ Macuch 1963, S. 485, s. v. *tihma*).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Antonym zu *asuta* („Heil[ung]”)[22] sonst nicht belegt ist.[23] Vermutlich ist in diesem Fall ein Schreib- oder Vermittlungsfehler aufgetreten und demzufolge *tihma* in *mhita* zu korrigieren.[24]

Die „dualistische Formel“ wird vielmehr von einer Reihe von Aussagen eingerahmt, die ihre „Radikalität“ relativiert und „theologisch“ zu korrigieren versucht: (1) Die Endlichkeit des Lebens *(hiia)* und des Kušṭa wird präzisiert und (2) die Vorrangstellung des erhabenen Mannes *(gabra iatira)*[25] gegenüber dem Schöpfer *(bania)* wird explizit zur Sprache gebracht. Ähnliche Strategien sind aus den ältesten Überlieferungen der mandäischen Literatur – der mandäischen Hymnensammlung *Qolasta* – bekannt.[26]

22 Drower/ Macuch 1963, S. 28, s. v. *asuta*.

23 Man findet die griechische Wiedergabe des aramäischen Wortes *thima/tihma* in einem rätselhaften Abschnitt der CMC, wo Mani die Lehre über die wahre Bedeutung der Reinheit, als Gnosis, den Täufer verkündigt: ἡ τοίνυν κατθαρότης περὶ ἧς ἐλέχθη, αὕτη τυγχάνει ἡ διὰ τῆς γνώσεως, χωρισμὸς φωτὸς ἀπὸ σκότους καὶ τοῦ θανάτου τῆς ζωῆς [κα]ὶ **τῶν ζώντων ὑδά[τω]ν ἐκ τῶν τεθαμβω[μέ]νων** CMC 84.9–16) „die Reinheit, von der geschrieben steht, ist also die Reinheit durch die Gnosis, d. i. die Trennung des Lichts von der Finsternis, des Todes vom Leben und **der lebendigen Wasser von den erstarrten**“ (Henrichs/Koenen 1988, S. 59). Hinter diesem seltsamen griechischen Gegensatzpaar steckt die aramäische, bei den Mandäern lehrinhaltlich wichtige, Gegenüberstellung von „lebendigem“ und „erstarrtem Wasser“ (*mia hiia* und *mia tahmia*). Die semantische Bestimmung des mandäischen Ausdruckes *mia tahmia* hängt davon ab, ob dieser wortspielerisch verwendet und gedeutet wird. Das mandäische *tahma* (aktives Partizip von √*THM*) als Beiwort für unbeseelte Gegenstände kann „trüb, brackig“ bedeuten. Anhand der Elision der zweiten *aspirata* und der Metathese kann im Mandäischen diese Grundbedeutung in erheblichem Maße durch die Sekundärwurzel √*TMH* erweitert werden, sodass das Wasser, das als *mia tahmia* charakterisiert wird, als „ausgeschaltetes, abgestelltes Wasser“, im Gegensatz zum „laufenden, fließenden Wasser“ verstanden werden kann, oder, als „verdorbenes Wasser“, wenn man den Ausdruck von der Wurzel √*TMA* ableiten mag. Außerdem kann auch die Wurzel √*THM*, „erstaunen“, miteinbezogen sein.

24 In der mandäischen Schrift sehen die beiden Wörter auch sehr ähnlich aus: ـــــــــــــــ *(thima)* und ـــــــــــــــ *(mhita)*.

25 Als *gabra qadmaia* kann sowohl der erste (kosmische) Mann (Adam/Adakas/*Anthropos*), als auch, unbestimmt, ein Lichtwesen oder -gesandter bezeichnet werden, vgl. Rudolph 1965, S. 62, Anm. 1 und S. 134, Anm. 1. Über *gabra* siehe Drower/ Macuch 1963, S. 73.

26 *b-šuma ḏ-hiia u-b-šuma ḏ-manda ḏ-hiia* [hier wird die dualistische Formel in *Ginza* eingeschoben – n. n.] *u-b-šuma ḏ-hahu gabra kadmaia ḏ-kašiš mn qudam mia u-ziua u-nhura u-eqara gabra ḏ-qra qalḫ u-malil b-malalḫ* „Im Namen des Lebens, im Namen des Manda ḏ-Hiia und im Namen jenes ersten Mannes, der älter ist als Wasser, Glanz, Licht und Herrlichkeit; des Mannes, der mit seiner Stimme rief und mit seiner Rede sprach” (Lidzbarski 1920, S. 3–4). Was den ersten Abschnitt dieser Stelle betrifft, kann sowohl Kušṭa, als auch *gabra qadmaia* anstelle des Manda ḏ-Hiia vorkommen, vgl. Rudolph 1965, S. 157, Anm. 1 und S. 338, Anm. 1 (für *gabra qadmaia* und Manda ḏ-Hiia), sowie Sundberg 1953, S. 112 (für Kušṭa und Manda ḏ-Hiia). Dass Kušṭa an der entsprechenden Stelle der „dualistischen Formel“ in der *Ginza*-Version vorkommt, kann auch als ein Hinweis auf das jüngere Datum dieses Textes ausgelegt werden, da Kušṭa nur in den späten theologischen Spekulation eine besondere Rolle bekommt. Unter den

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Die „dualistische Formel“ in der mandäischen Hymnensammlung und in der magischen Literatur

Die „dualistische Formel“ ist auch an anderen Stellen der mandäischen Literatur bezeugt, wie z. B. in der Gebetsammlung *(Qolasta)*, nämlich im zweiten Gebet für den Ritualtrank *(mambuha)*, das während einer „Totenmesse“ *(masiqta)* rezitiert wird,[27] sowie im ersten Gebet für die Taufe und Totenmesse:

hazin hu mambuha ḏ-hiia …

ḏ-abar almia u-ata bza rqiha u-etiglia
haimanuta aina ḏ-eniš la-hzat
u-ašmitinin eudna d-br anaša la-šimat
apiqtinan mn muta u-laptinan b-hiia
apiqtinan mn hšuka u-laptinan b-nhura
apiqtinan mn biša u-laptinan b-ṭaba
hauitinan euhra ḏ-hiia
u-adriktinan dirkia ḏ-kušṭa u-haimanuta
ḏ-nitin hiia u-nidhunḫ l-muta
u-nitia nhura u-nidihiiḫ l-hšuka
u-nitia ṭaba u-nidihiiḫ l-biša

u-mšabilh l-ziua ḏ-elauia ziuia u-l-nhura
d-elauia nhuria
u-l-gabra ṭaba ḏ-abar almia u-ata u-bza
rqiha u-etiglin
apriš nhura mn hšuka
u-apriš ṭaba mn biša
u-apriš hiia mn muta

u-aprišinun l-rahmia šumḫ d-kušṭa
mn hšuka l-nhura
u-mn biša l-ṭaba
u-mn muta l-hiia
u-aqimtinun b-dirkia ḏ-kušṭa u-haimanuta

„Dies ist der Quell des Lebens …

er drang durch die Welten, kam, spaltete das Firmament und offenbarte sich.

Du zeigtest uns, was niemandes Auge geschaut, du ließest uns hören, was keines Menschen Ohr gehört
Du holtest uns aus dem Tode und verknüpftest uns mit dem Leben,
Du holtest uns aus der Finsternis und verknüpftest uns mit dem Lichte,

„sie priesen den Glanz, der über den Glanzwesen, das Licht, das über den Lichtwesen,
und den Guten Mann, der durch die Welten drang, kam, das Firmament spaltete und sich offenbarte.

Er sonderte das Licht von der Finsternis,

sonderte das Gute vom Bösen,

mannigfaltigen Funktionen, die Kušṭa mit der Zeit bekommen hat, ist seine Rolle in der Kosmogonie nicht unerwartet. In dem *Qolasta*-Text wird indes Manda ḏ-Hiia an zweiter Stelle nach das Leben *(hiia)* genannt, was in Einklang mit anderen „theogonischen“ Abschnitten in den übrigen mandäischen Schriften steht, die das Leben, als Schöpfer Manda ḏ-Hiia vorstellen. Über das Leben *(hiia)* als Schöpfer des Manda ḏ-Hiia siehe die *Ginza*-Stellen: Gy 72.22, 73.18–19 und 75.21–22, sowie Rudolph 1965, S. 52.

27 Für das Schema des Rituals vgl. Rudolph 1961, S. 264–271.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

du holtest uns aus dem Bösen und
verknüpftest uns mit dem Guten.
Du zeigtest uns den Weg des Lebens
und ließest uns die Pfade der Wahrheit
und des Glaubens wandeln.
Das Leben komme und verdränge den Tod,
das Licht komme und verdränge die
Finsternis,
der Gute komme und verdränge den Bösen”
(Lidzbarski 1920, S. 77, Text: Z. 2–9)

sonderte das Leben vom Tode.

Er sonderte ab die Freunde seines
Kušṭa-Namens
von der Finsternis zum Lichte
vom Bösen zum Gute
vom Tode zum Leben
und stellte sie auf den Pfaden der Kušṭa
und des Glaubens auf.“
(Lidzbarski 1920, S. 128, Text: Z. 1–5)

Die Identität des Lichtwesens, das „die Welten durchdringt und das Firmament spaltet“, um sich zu offenbaren *(ḏ-abar almia u-ata bza rqiha u-etigliḫ)*, ist unter Heranziehung der Parallelstellen in den mandäischen Schriften nicht eindeutig erklärbar,[28] doch ist diese Gestalt unter der Bezeichnung „Mann“ *(gabra)* schon in den magischen Texten bekannt.[29] In den beiden vorgeführten Varianten wird seine Aufgabe unterschiedlich ausgedrückt: auf einer kosmologischen Ebene trennt er die gegensätzlichen Größen (das Verb hier ist √*PRŠ*),[30] auf einer soteriologischen Ebene führt er die Auserwählten vom Bösen weg (das Verb √*APK*) und vereinigt sie mit dem Guten (das Verb √*LUP*).[31] Das „dualistische Bekenntnis“ wird in beiden Fällen verdoppelt: Während es sich in der zweiten Fassung auf die soteriologische Handlung des Lichtwesens bezieht, wird es in der ersten Fassung durch eine „direkte Invokation“[32] wiedergegeben. Die hier verwendeten Verben √*APK* „etwas [um-/ver]drehen, verrücken, umkehren“ und √*DHA*, „austreiben“[33] sind ebenfalls zusammen in den magischen Texten in festen oder leicht variierbaren Eingangsformeln verschiedener Beschwörungen häufig belegt.[34]

28 In der Linken *Ginza* wird er einfach „Mann“ (*gabra*, Gs 130.21) und in der Rechten Ginza – „fremder Mann“ (*gabra nukraiia*, Gy 196. 16–17) genannt; außerdem wird er im *Qolasta* mit „Iukabar“, „der Bote der ersten Männer von erprobter Gerechtigkeit“ (Lidzbarski 1920, S. 11) identifiziert. Über Iokabar siehe Rudoplh 1965, S. 316, Anm. 1.

29 Siehe die Belege bei Müller-Kessler 2005b, S. 234.

30 Drower/Macuch 1963, S. 381–382. Dieses Verb kann – semantisch erweitert – auch „verstehen“ bedeuten, vgl. schon Zimmer 1920, S. 434, Anm. 4.

31 Dieses ist ein Schlüsselverb der mandäischen Soteriologie und des mandäischen Kultus’, vgl. Drower/Macuch 1963, S. 233–234. Die Substantivierung dieses Verbs, *laupa*, bezeichnet die mandäische „Gemeinschaft“ der erlösten Seelen, vgl. Rudolph 1961, S. 149–155.

32 Rudolph 1961, S. 123, Anm. 5.

33 Drower/Macuch 1963, S. 31 *(√APK)* und S. 102–103 *(√DHA)*.

34 *ʿpykʾ u-krybʾ u-dhyʾ l-wṭʾtʾ w-kryʾtʾ* „abgewehrt, abgewendet und verdrängt sind die Flüche und die Beschwörungen“, vgl. Yamauchi 1967, S. 154 (§1.1), 158 (§3.1–2), 164 (§5.1), 204 (§15.1–2) und 266 (§ 26.1–2), Über das Verb √*APK*, auch in magischen Texten, siehe Băncilă 2013, S. 14–16. An anderen Stellen wird das Verb √*DHA* in Verbindung mit *šiqupta*, „Schlag” (Yamauchi 1967, S. 234 [§22.19]) und *qria* gesetzt („Widerspenstigkeit, Widrigkeit”, vgl. Nöldeke 1875, S. 102; siehe auch Drower/Macuch 1963, S. 412, s. v. *qiria 1*), vgl. Yamauchi 1967, S. 234 (§22.25).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Die „dualistische Formel“ ist den mandäischen und jüdisch-aramäischen magischen Texten nicht unbekannt. Ein Beispiel dafür bietet eine Zauberschale, die in der Region Kutha (heute: Tell Ibrahim al-Khalil, in Iraq) 1881 gefunden wurde. Der Text der Schale umfasst zwei Beschwörungen, die voneinander durch einen „magischen Kreis“ (C. Müller-Kessler) getrennt sind. Der Abschnitt, der uns interessiert, kommt als Abschluss auf der Außenseite der Schale, vor dem Namen der Kunden, vor.[35] Der Text enthält auch Elemente, die als „spezifisch mandäisch“ zu werten sind. Wegen der Ähnlichkeit des Textes mit der *Ginza*-„Fassung C“ werden die beiden Texte hier zusammengestellt:

	kbyš kbyš
aka[36] *ziua aka nhura*	
(aka muta aka hiia	
aka hšuka aka nhura)[37]	*ḫyšwkʾ mn qwdʾm nḫwrʾ*
aka ṭeia aka šrara	*w-kbyš ḫbylʾ mn qwdʾm bynyʾnʾ*
aka hbila aka biniana	*w-kbyš ṭʿyʾ mn qwdʾm šrʾrʾ*
aka thima aka asuta	*w-kbyšʾ myḥtʾ mn qwdʾm ʾswtʾ*
(Gy 205.9–10, 206.4–6, 207.2–4, vgl. 207.17–19)	(BM 91715)[38]
	„Niedergedrückt ist die Finsternis vor dem Licht
„Es gibt Glanz, es gibt Licht. Es gibt Tod, es gibt Leben; es gibt Finsternis, es gibt Licht. Es gibt Irrtum, es gibt Wahrheit. Es gibt Zerstörung, es gibt Aufbau. Es gibt Schlag, es gibt Heilung“ (Lidzbarski 1925, S. 208)	und niedergedrückt ist die Vernichtung vor dem Bau und niedergedrückt ist der Irrtum vor der Wahrheit und niedergedrückt ist die Plage vor der Gesundheit“ (Müller-Kessler 2002, S. 205; Text, S. 204, Z. 5–6)

Die beiden Texte sind, von Auslassungen und einigen Verkehrungen abgesehen, erstaunlich ähnlich. Die Diskussion der „Formel“ knüpft an die Behandlung des *Ginza*-Textes oben an. Mittels einer wiederholten Prädikation verliert dieselbe Formel in der *Ginza*-Fassung die performativen Merkmale des magischen Textes, da sie nur den Unterschied zwischen den Gegensatzpaaren zum Ausdruck bringt. Hier sei noch angemerkt, dass die Lesart *wkbyš ʾmwhtʾ*, die J. B. Segal vorschlägt, nicht haltbar ist.[39] Müller-Kesslers Korrektur in *myhtʾ* („Schlag“) ist ohne Zweifel die richtige Lösung.[40]

35 Es gibt mehrere Lesarten des Schalentextes: Segal 2000, S. 111–112; Müller-Kessler 2002, S. 204–205; Ford 2002, S. 32–33; Müller-Kessler 2001–2002, S. 132–133.

36 In Gy 205.8–9: nur *eka*.

37 Nur in Gy 206.5; 207.2–3, vgl. 207.17–18.

38 Die Zeilen sind in verschiedenen Ausgaben jeweils anders nummeriert.

39 Segal 2000, S. 112 (§84M.17–18).

40 Auf der Photographie (Segal 2000, Abb. 88) ist das runde Zeichen für das mandäische *Aleph* (ه) kurz nach dem Verb *kbyš* zu sehen. Das folgende Wort ist nach unten gerutscht und wegen der Ähnlichkeit zwischen den Folgen *h-i* (ـهـ) und *i-h* (ـيـه) in der

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Von einer fragmentarischen Entsprechung des Textes zu einer anderen Zauberschale im Britischen Museum abgesehen,[41] kommt diese „dualistische Formel“ in anderen Texten magischen Inhalts vor, wie z. B auf einer aramäisch beschrifteten Schale aus Nippur, die für dieselbe Familie angefertigt wurde, wie drei andere, davon zwei in syrischer Schrift.[42] Textentsprechungen sind auch auf einer weiteren Schale im Britischen Museum ersichtlich.[43]

w-byšmyh rbʾ dqdy ʾlhʾ qdyšʾ d-ḥd šmyh
d-kbyš ḥšukh tḥwt nhwrʾ
mḥtʾ tḥwt ʾswtʾ
sytrʾ tḥwt bynynʾ
ḥbltʾ tḥwt šwytʾ
rwgzʾ tḥwt nyḥʾ
(Montgomery 1913, S. 188 [§16.5–7]; mit Korrekturen von Epstein 1921, S. 47 und unter Heranziehung von BM 139524, §3–5)
„und in seinem großen Namen, des Heiligen Gottes, dessen Name
Der Eine ist,
der die Finsternis unter das Licht niederdrückt
(der) den Tod unter das Leben (niederdrückt),
(der) die Verwüstung unter den Bau (niederdrückt),
(der) die Zerstörung unter Vollendung (niederdrückt),
(der) den Zorn unter Ruhe (niederdrückt).“

yhy šmyh rbh dyqrʾ ʾlhʾ qdyš dḥd šmyh
dkbyš ḥšwkh tḥwt nhwrʾ
mḥtʾ tḥwt ʾswtʾ
sytrʾ tḥwt bynynh
ḥbltʾ tḥwt šwytʾ
rwgzʾ tḥwt nyḥʾ
(BM 139524, §3–5 in Segal 2000, S. 63 [§23A])
„(gesegnet) sei sein großer Name, der <der Heilige Gott> genannt ist, der <der Eine> (genannt) ist,
(der) die Finsternis unter das Licht niederdrückt,
(der) den Tod unter das Leben (niederdrückt),
(der) die Verwüstung unter den Bau (niederdrückt),
(der) die Zerstörung unter Vollendung (niederdrückt).“
(der) den Zorn unter Ruhe (niederdrückt)“.

---

mandäischen Schrift schwer deutbar. Die Photographie legt eher die Lesart *mihta* nahe, weil der Buchstabe /i/ im Mandäischen nicht mit einem unmittelbar nachfolgenden Buchstaben verbunden wird (vgl. z. B. ܐܝܡܐ, *iama*, ܐܘܬܪܡܝܕܐ, *u-tarmida*). Wenn dem so ist, wäre die Lesart *(a)mihta* als Schreibfehler für *mhita*, „Schlag” *(√MHA)* zu verstehen, da *mihta* auch semantisch sehr gut als Antonym von *asuta*, „Heilung”, im Text passt. Ansonsten ist *mhita* „Schlag, Plage” auf den Zauberschalen häufig als *myhtʾ byštʾ*, „böse Plage” belegt, vgl. Müller-Kessler 2005a, S. 24 (§5.3), 28 (§6.1–2) usw.

41 […] *kwlʾ hylʾ ḏ-hšwkʾ myn qwdʾm kulʾ rbʾ hylʾ ḏ-nhwrʾ* […] (Segal 2000, S. 105 und 106, §97M.4) „[…] all the power of darkness before all the power of great light […]“.Diese Stelle wurde von Ford 2002, S. 42 folgendermaßen rekonstruiert: *kby[š hyšwkʾ myn qwdʾm nhwrʾ wkbyš] kwlʾ hylʾ ḏ-hšwkʾ mynqwdʾm kulʾ rbʾ hylʾ ḏ-nhwrʾ* „suppre[ssed is darkness before light and suppressed is] all the power of darkness before all the power of great light”.

42 Erstpublikation: Montgomery 1913, S. 188–189 (§16). Neue Lesarten und Korrekturen durch Epstein 1921, S. 47–48. Die entsprechenden Schalentexte sind in Montgomery 1913, S. 174–175, 223 und 230 (§§12, 31 und 33) veröffentlicht.

43 BM 139524, in Segal 2000, S. 63–64 (§023A), Erstpublikation: Geller 1980, S. 101–117 *(non vidi)*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Von Schreibfehlern am Anfang des von J. Montgomery veröffentlichten Schalentextes abgesehen, ist die strukturelle und inhaltliche Ähnlichkeit der beiden Texte festzustellen. Die Gegensatzpaare „Finsternis–Licht" und „Tod–Leben" wurden beibehalten, während *hbyl'–bynyn'* (mand. *hbila–biniana*) verdoppelt und *nyḥ'–rwgz'* („Ruhe–Zorn") hinzugefügt wurde. Hauptakteur der Beschwörung ist in beiden Texten „der Heilige Gott, dessen Name <Der Eine> ist". Dass er das Licht und die Finsternis meistert, ruft verschiedene biblische Texte in Erinnerung.[44] Es ist in solchen Texten nicht unüblich, die höchste anerkannte Gottheit oder Schutzfigur anzurufen, wobei hier und an anderen Stellen der jüdische Gott bevorzugt wird. Die Gegensatzpaare sind als Ausdruck der Allmacht des Einen Gottes inszeniert, ein jüdischer Brauch, der auch auf den griechischen magischen Papyri ersichtlich ist.[45]

Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen, dass das Gegensatzpaar „Licht–Finsternis" zu den am häufigsten verwendeten Bestandteilen der „Formel" gehört, und zwar sowohl in den magischen als auch in den literarischen Texten. Den (ältesten) Kern der „Formel" (nämlich die Paare: „Licht–Finsternis", „Leben–Tod") kann man in den Texten beider aramäischen Zauberschalen erahnen. Trotzdem wird eine Chronologie der verschiedenen Versionen der „Formel" dadurch erheblich erschwert, dass alle hier bezeugten Varianten archaische Züge aufweisen (wie z. B. Überreste magischer Formeln in der *Qolasta*-Version; eine Offenbarungstheologie in der *Ginza*-Version, die noch nicht „mandäisiert" ist, usw.). Die überlieferten Varianten der „dualistischen Formel" sind im Hinblick auf den mündlichen und performativen Charakter der Sprache der aramäischen und mandäischen Zauberschalentexte nicht überraschend: Erinnert sei daran, dass das, was wir hier als „magische Texte" bezeichnen, eher für die Rezitation als für das Lesen bestimmt war.[46]

Die manichäische Verbindung

Sowohl nach allgemeinem Verständnis als auch in der Wissenschaft neigt man dazu, den „Dualismus" mit dem Manichäismus in enge Verbindung zu bringen.[47] Solche „simplifizierenden Deutungsschemata" werden im wissenschaftlichen Diskurs allerdings nicht geduldet. Auch verliert die Kategorie „Dualismus" an heuristischem Potential in der Religionswissenschaft, weil sie oft das Erbe der häresiographischen Diskurse mit einbezieht. Ähnliche Theoretisierungsversuche

44 Siehe Aalen 1951.

45 Vgl. *PGM* V.99–110 (Preisendanz 1973, S. 185), sowie *PGM* V.460–465 (ebd., S. 197). Philonenko (1985, S. 437–438) macht auf den manichäischen Anklang des letzten Textes aufmerksam.

46 Vgl. Häberl 2009. Zur performativen Sprache der magischen Texte siehe Tambiah 1985.

47 Über den Sprachgewohnheiten des Alltags siehe Oerter 2003.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

gibt es in jüngster Zeit auch in Bezug auf die religionswissenschaftliche Kategorie der „Magie“.[48]

Auch wenn wir die Bezeichnung „Dualismus“ vermeiden möchten, bleibt es eine Tatsache, dass bereits in den manichäischen Schriften die Lehre von den zwei Prinzipien häufig mit Hilfe antagonistischer Paare ausgedrückt wird, wobei die Licht–Finsternis-Metaphorik eine herausragende Rolle spielt. Zentrale Aufgabe der Manichäer ist demgemäß die „Unterscheidung“ der beiden Elemente nach dem Beispiel des Erlösers.[49] Auch in der manichäischen täglichen Gebetspraxis, die durch Berichte muslimischer Autoren gut bekannt ist,[50] wird diese Lehre erwähnt, wie das jüngst erschlossene griechische „Gebet der Emanationen“ (εὐχὴ τῶν προβολῶν, P. Kell. Gr. 98)[51] aus Kellis in Ägypten bezeugt, das auch parthisch überliefert ist:

P. Kell. Gr. 98.33–52	M1971
Προς(κυνῶ καὶ δοξάζω) τὸν τῆς μεγαλειότητος ἔγγονον, τὸν φωτινὸν νοῦν, βασιλέα, Χρ(ιστὸ)ν, τὸν ἐκ τῶν ἐξωτέρων αἰώνων ἐληλυθότα εἰς τὴν ἄνω κειμένην διακόσμησιν καὶ ἐκ ταύτης εἰς τήνδε τὴν κάτω κειμένην δημιουργίαν καῖ ἀπαραπακύπτως ἐξηγησάμενον αὐτοῦ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ τὰ ἀπόρρητα μυστήρια τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς ἀν(θρώπ)οις καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ὁδὸν ὑποδείξαντα σύμπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ πάσαις ἑρμηνεύσαντα φωναῖς	[nm’c br’](m) w ’fryn’m […mnw](h)myd rwšn (k)[y] […] ’bryn […] ‘ymyn […] ’bgwst […] wcyh’d (’wd p)d [hm’g *šht *pd wys]p wxr (r)’h̲ [cy *r’štyft ’b](dy)[št]
καὶ τοῦ ψεύδους τὸ ἀληθές διορίσαντα καὶ το<ῦ> σκότους τὸ φῶς καὶ τοῦ φαύλου τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τῶν πονηρῶν τοῦς δικαίους. Ἐκ σοῦ πᾶσα χάρις ἔγνωσται τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ζωὴ ἅμα καὶ ἀληθείᾳ παντὶ φύλῳ πάσαις ἑρμήνευται φωναῖς (Gardner 2007, S. 120–121)	(r)’šryft ’c drwg (r)wšn ’c t’r qyrbkr ’c bzkr ’wt̲ (m)[…] ’c drwnd [wy]wd’d w hmg r’štyft […] [’w](t̲) […] (Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, S. 109)

48 Siehe Otto 2011.

49 *Keph* 232.3–4: ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲁϥϫⲓ ⲁⲣⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲧϩⲉⲗⲓⲡⲥ [ⲙⲛ ⲡⲛⲁ]ϩⲧⲉ ⲁϥⲡⲱⲧϫ ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ „Jeder Mensch, der die Hoffnung und den Glauben angenommen hat, er hat das Licht von der Finsternis getrennt“ (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, S. 232); *Keph* 117.15–17: ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲁⲩϥ ⲁⲡⲓⲟⲩⲣⲏϩ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲣⲱϥ ⲉⲧϩⲓⲃⲁⲗ ϫⲉ ⲉϥⲁⲥⲱⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲡ̄ϥⲡⲣⲱⲣϫ ⲧⲟⲩϣⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ ⲛϩⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲉⲩ „Darauf aber sandte man ihn [i. e. den Dritten Gesandten] in diesen freien Raum draußen, damit er das Licht ausläutere und die Nacht und den Tag voneinander trenne“ (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, S. 117).

50 Siehe de Blois 2000.

51 Erstedition: Jenkins 1995. Neue Edition: Gardner 2007, S. 115–124.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

„Ich preise und segne den Abkömmling
der Größe, den leuchtenden Nous,
den König, Christus; der von den äußeren
Äonen in die obere Weltordnung
ausgegangen ist und von dort in diese
untere geschaffene Welt;
der unverborgen seine Weisheit und die
unaussprechlichen Mysterien den
Menschen auf der Erde ausgelegt hat;
der den Weg der Wahrheit der ganzen
Welt gezeigt hat und in allen Sprachen
ausgelegt hat;
der die Wahrheit von der Lüge,
das Licht von der Finsternis und
die Gerechten von den Bösen getrennt hat.
Von dir wird jede Gnade der Welt bekannt
gemacht und das Leben zusammen mit
der Wahrheit werden jedem Stamm in
allen Sprachen ausgelegt."

„Ich preise und segne […] den
Licht-Nous, der […] oben […] sie […]
er hat offenbart […] er hat gelehrt […]
Und in der ganzen Welt zeigte er in
jeder Sprache den Weg der Wahrheit;

er hat die Wahrheit von dem Trug
abgesondert,
das Licht von der Finsternis,
den Frommen von dem Sünder
und den Gerechten von dem Bösen.
Und […] all die Wahrheit […] und […]."

In dem arabischen Bericht Ibn an-Nadīms ist dieser Teil des manichäischen Gebetes verkürzt und, weil an der entsprechenden Stelle der „Vater der Größe" das zweite Mal verherrlicht wird, möglicherweise verschoben, um die islamische religiöse Empfindlichkeit gegenüber der göttlichen Einheit nicht zu verletzen.[52] Die griechischen und die parthischen Textvarianten stimmen miteinander überein: Die Lobpreisung des himmlischen Gesandten (in der griechischen Variante des Gebets mit Christus identifiziert) beginnt mit einer Beschreibung seiner Offenbarung in der Welt. Diese Betonung der Offenbarung teilt das manichäische Gebet mit den oben aufgeführten mandäischen Texten, vor allem in *Qolasta* und *Ginza*. Außerdem bemerkt I. Gardner, dass die Form der im Griechischen überlieferten Variante des manichäischen Gebets den Eindruck eines „quasi-Bekenntnisses" erweckt.[53] Weil das Gebet auch parthisch überliefert wird, ist es wahrscheinlich, dass es auf ein verlorenes aramäisches Original zurückgeht.[54]

Ähnliche Ausdrücke kommen auch in den „dogmatischen" manichäischen Schriften vor, wie z. B. in der koptischen *Kephalaia* §45, wo beklagt wird, dass die anderen Religionen (ndogma) das „Mysterium des Lichtes und der Finsternis" (ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲟⲩⲁ̈ⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ ⲡⲁⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ, *Keph* 163.25–26) nicht unterscheiden bzw. verstehen. Die Trennung zwischen den gegensätzlichen Elementen nimmt auch hier eine besondere Stellung ein:

52 Vgl. Gardner 2011, S. 93.
53 Gardner 2007, S. 126: „this series of paired opposites has a semi-creedal ring to it".
54 So Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, S. xvii: die griechische Überlieferung „confirms the distinct nature of this text and allows the conclusion that the text goes back to an Aramaic original by Mani".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Keph 186.9–11	*Ps* 56.23–25
ⲁ̈ⲡⲱⲣϫ [ⲡⲟⲩⲁ̈ⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ ⲁ̈]ⲇ[ⲓⲁⲕⲣⲓⲛ]ⲉ ⲙⲡⲱⲛϩ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̅ⲡⲙⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲛ[ⲓⲧ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ]ⲡ[ⲉⲧϩⲁ]ⲩ ⲡⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲉϥⲣ̅ⲛ[ⲁⲃⲉ	ⲡⲟⲩⲁ̈ⲛⲉ ⲁ̈ⲡⲁⲣϫϥ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ [ⲡⲱⲛϩ] ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̅ⲡⲙⲟⲩ
	ⲡϫ̅ⲣⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲁ̈ⲡⲁⲣϫⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ
„ich habe getrennt [das Licht von der Finsternis und habe] das Leben vom Tode ge[schieden], das Gute [vom Bösen], den Gerechten vom Sünder.” (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, S. 186)[55]	„das Licht habe ich von Finsternis geschieden, das Leben von Tod,
	Christus und die Kirche habe ich von dem Trug (ἀπάτη) der Welt geschieden.”

Die Reihenfolge und die Elemente der Gegensatzpaare können von konkreten Enrsprechungen in verschiedenen Stellen der manichäischen Literatur abweichen (*Keph* 288.12).Dazu wird im Manichäismus die Trennung zwischen entgegengesetzten Elementen auch mittels symbolischer Sprache weiterentwickelt, wobei „Parabeln“, wie das neutestamentliche Gleichnis von den zwei Bäumen (*Keph* 23.1–9) oder der kosmologische Tag–Nacht-Zyklus, in diesem Sinn aufgewertet werden können (*Keph* 162.9–13; 163.30–164.8 sowie 25.8–10).[56] Außerdem spielen die Gegensatzpaare „Licht–Finsternis“ und „Leben–Tod“ auch in der Rede Manis an den Täufer im griechischen „Kölner Mani-Kodex“ als Zusammenfassung seiner Lehre (*CMC* 84.9–85.1) eine zentrale Rolle. Die „dualistische Formel“ dient zugleich als Ausdruck für das zentrale Merkmal der manichäischen Ethik: das Gebot, zwischen den gegensätzlichen Elementen zu unterscheiden (*Keph* 27.30).

Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, dass, auch wenn sich die ursprüngliche Lehre Manis im Verlauf der Ausbreitung der manichäischen Religion weiterentwickelt hat,[57] der Licht–Finsternis-Antagonismus eine Grundauffassung der gesamten manichäischen Theologie ist.[58]

55 Dieselbe Formel wird kurz danach fragmentarisch wiederholt: *Keph* 186.29–30: ⲙ[ⲡϩⲣⲁ]ⲩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲧⲁϣⲉⲁ̈ϣ ⲁ̈ⲡ[ⲱⲣϫ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲁ̈ⲛⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙⲡⲕⲉ]ⲕⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲛⲓⲧ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̅[ⲡⲉⲧϩⲁⲩ] „mit [der Stimme] der Predigt [trennte] ich [das Licht von der] Finsternis in ihr, das Gute vom [Bösen] …” (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, S. 186).

56 Siehe auch die parthische Parabel vom Bauern, der das gute Getreide von den unnützlichen Zusätzen trennt (Colditz 1987, S. 287).

57 So auch Gardner 2010.

58 Ideengeschichtlich steht auf dem Weg zum manichäischen „Dualismus“ auch die Nag Hammadi Schrift: *Die Paraphrase des Shem*, vgl. Roberge 2010, S. 84 und 88–89.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Die aramäischen „dualistischen Formeln" und die dualistische Frühauffassung Manis

Was hier als „dualistische Formel" bezeichnet wird, ist in verschiedenen Textgattungen mit unterschiedlichem sprachlichen Ausdruck überliefert worden. Ein zeitlicher Vorrang der aramäischen Zauberschalen gegenüber den mandäischen ist möglich, doch nicht gesichert, weil diese in verschiedenen Gemeinden gleichzeitig oder von denselben Personen angefertigt worden sein können. Trotzdem unterscheiden sich die aramäischen Varianten der „dualistischen Formel" von den anderen dadurch, dass sie eine biblisch geprägte Anschauung über die Gottheit, die in dem Zauberspruch angerufen wird, vermitteln. Daher kann diese Verwendung der „dualistischen Formel" als älter, wenn nicht sogar als die älteste, eingestuft werden, und zwar gerade deswegen, weil sie noch nicht „dualistisch", sondern eher schöpfungstheologisch verstanden wird. Das Prestige des jüdischen Gottes war den antiken „Magiern" weit bekannt, da sein/e Name/n in Zaubersprüchen verschiedener kultureller Prägung bewusst miteinbezogen wurden.[59] Spuren derselben Übernahme kann man auch in den mandäischen Zauberschalentexten finden. Hier sind zwei neue Akzente sichtbar: Auf der einen Seite wird die (magische) Handlung unpersönlich prädiziert, auf der anderen Seite wird die jüdische Schöpfungstheologie in eine Offenbarungstheologie umgewandelt. Dass die mandäischen *Qolasta*-Versionen der „dualistischen Formel" aus der magischen Literatur übertragen worden sind, zeigen die sprachlichen Relikte (meistens Verben), die den magischen Texten spezifisch sind. Diese „Kanonisierung" der „dualistischen Formel" veranlasst ihre spätere Verwendung in weiteren polemischen Kontexten, die offenbarungsgeschichtliche Fragen behandeln (*Ginza*-Versionen A und B) oder die gängigen metaphysischen Auffassungen apokalyptisch (d. h. hier visionsorientiert) überprüfen (wie in der *Ginza*-Version C). Diese mandäischen Überlieferungen gehören zur früheren mandäischen Literatur, da sie noch nicht in Bezug auf die unter islamischem Druck entwickelte (johanneszentrierten) Offenbarungstheologie korrigiert wurden. Das gilt auch für die *Ginza*-Fassung C, die dem nestorianischen Bischof Theodor bar Kōnay wahrscheinlich im 8. Jahrhundert bekannt war. Sie ist in einen Offenbarungsdiskurs eingebettet, der archaische Züge verrät.[60]

Mani dürfte die „dualistische Formel" wahrscheinlich bereits zur Zeit seines Aufenthalts in der Täufer-Gemeinschaft bekannt gewesen sein. Die Vertrautheit der Manichäer mit der (aramäischen) Magiepraxis gilt mittlerweile als gesichert.[61] Es ist deswegen kaum verwunderlich, dass auch rezeptionsgeschichtlich das Leben Manis für die frühen Christen unter dem Zeichen der Magie steht,

59 Zu jüdischem Material in den griechischen magischen Texten siehe Smith 1986 und LiDonnici 2007.

60 Siehe ausführlich Buckley 2010.

61 Siehe jüngst Mirecki 2012 mit Hinsicht auf den ägyptischen Kontext.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

auch wenn es hier um häresiographischen Gewohnheiten handelt.[62] Inwieweit die „dualistische Formel“ der aramäischen (und später) mandäischen magischen Texte die religiöse Weltanschauung Manis beeinflusst haben könnte, ist nicht endgültig geklärt. Doch zu beachten ist, dass die Kenntnisnahme einer solchen „Formel“ nicht nur mittels magischer Texte erfolgt sein könnte, sondern auch durch aramäische literarische Werke. Das zeigt sich an einer Stelle in den koptischen manichäischen „Thomaspsalmen“, die das deutlichste Beispiel für die Übernahme aramäischen (später „mandäisierten“) Gedankengutes im Manichäismus abgeben, was chronologisch auch als ein „Fixpunkt“ (so C. Colpe) in der Geschichte „syro-iranischer Gnosis“ gelten kann:[63]

Ps 207.8–10
ϯⲛⲁⲡⲣⲁⲕ ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁϫⲥ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲁϩ [ⲡⲟ]ⲩⲁⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲙⲁ
ϯⲛⲁⲡⲁⲣⲕ ⲡⲡⲉⲑⲁⲩ [ⲧ]ⲁⲛⲁϫⲥ [ⲁⲃⲁ]ⲗ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲁϩ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲙⲁ
„Ich werde die Finsternis ausreißen und hinausstoßen
Und das Licht an ihrer Stelle pflanzen.
Ich werde das Böse ausreißen und hinausstoßen
Und das Gute an seiner Stelle pflanzen.“ (Nagel 1980, S. 35)

Die „dualistische Formel“ ist hier in eine Pflanzenmetaphorik eingebettet, und zwar in einer Art und Weise, die wenig an die oben angeführten magischen Texte erinnert. Eher als ein Erbe der iranischen Geisteswelt ist demzufolge die frühe dualistische Auffassung Manis durch die Aufnahme eines im aramäischen Sprachumfeld Manis gebräuchlichen Ausdrucks besser verstehbar.

Abkürzungen

CMC	Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis (Henrichs/Koenen 1988)
Gy, Gs	*Ginza iamina* und *Ginza smala* (Petermann 1867)
Keph	koptische manichäische *Kephalaia* (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940)
Ps	koptisch manichäisches *Psalmenbuch* (Allberry 1938)

62 Das hat Spät 2004 ausführlich belegt, indem sie die griechische *Acta Archelai* als Bearbeitung der frühen Traditionen über den „Erzketzer“ Simon Magus identifiziert.

63 Vgl. Colpe 1964. Es war das Verdienst des schwedischen Ägyptologen Trogny Säve-Söderbergh (1914–1998) in der „religionsgeschichtlichen Schule“ Geo Widengrens (1907–1996), die Entsprechungen zwischen den koptischen manichäischen „Thomaspsalmen“ und der mandäischen hymnischen Literatur inhaltlich und metrisch zu erklären (Säve-Söderbergh 1949). Trotzdem sind die „Thomaspsalmen“ keine Fremdkörper in der manichäischen Literatur, sondern in das gesamte manichäische Lehrsystem integriert, so die These Oerters 1975.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Literatur

Aalen, S. 1951: *Die Begriffe ‚Licht' und ‚Finsternis' im Alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus*. Oslo.

Allberry, C.R.C. 1938: *A Manichaean Psalm-Book II. Including Psalms by Syrus, Heraclides and Thomas. A Transcription and Translation of the Coptic Text*. Stuttgart.

Băncilă, I.D. 2010: „Ugo Bianchis religionsgeschichtliche ‚Gnosis' und die Gnosisdefinition der Messinakonferenz (1966)." In: *Archaeus. Études d'Histoire des Religions* 14 [= E. Ciurtin (Hrsg.): *Histoire religieuse de l'Europe et de l'Asie. Actes du 6e Congrès de l'EASR, Conférence speciale de l'IAHR, Bucharest, 20–23 September 2006*. Bd. III: *Proceedings of the Panels The Legacy of Mircea Eliade, Religions and Modernity, Hermetic Currents & Esotericism and other Contributions*. Bucarest], S. 69–91.

— 2013: „Die Stellung der mandäischen Version des 114. Psalmes in *Qolasta*. Eine semantische Kontextualisierung." In: R. Voigt (Hrsg.): *„Durch Dein Wort ward jegliches Ding!" 2. mandäistische und samaritanistische Tagung zum Gedenken an Rudolf Macuch (1919–1993).* Wiesbaden, S. 3–44.

de Blois, F. 2000: „The Manichaean Daily Prayers." In: R. Emmerick/W. Sundermann/P. Zieme (Hrsg.): *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997.* Berlin, S. 49–54.

Buckley, J.J. 2002: *The Mandaeans: Ancient Texts and Modern People*. Oxford.

— 2010: „New Perspectives on the Sage Dinanukt on Right *Ginza* 6." In: *Aram* 22 [2013], S. 15–29.

Colditz, I. 1987: „Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 14, S. 274–313.

Colpe, C. 1964: „Die Thomaspsalmen als chronologischer Fixpunkt in der Geschichte der orientalischen Gnosis." In: *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 7, S. 77–93 [Nachdruck in: C. Colpe: *Kleine Schriften.* Bd. VI, Abt. I: *Gnostica und Manichaica*. Hrsg. von M. Torini und A. Löw. Berlin 1996, S. 60–78].

Drower, E.S./R. Macuch 1963: *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford.

Duchemin, J.-M. 2012: „Un réexamen des notices de Théodore bar Konaï sur les Mandéens." In: *Apocrypha* 23 [2013], S. 171–207.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D./E. Morano 2010: *Mani's Psalms. Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian Texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout.

Epstein, J. 1921: „Gloses babylo-araméennes [I]." In: *Revue des Études Juives* 73, S. 27–58.

Ford, J.N. 2002: „Another Look at the Mandaic Incantation Bowl BM 91715." In: *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 29, S. 31–47.

Gardner, I. 2007: *Kellis Literary Texts*. Bd 2. Oxford.

— 2010: „Towards an Understanding of Mani's Religious Developement and the Archaeology of Manichaean Identity." In: C. Cusack/C. Hartney (Hrsg.): *Religion and Retributive Logic. Essays in Honour of Professor Garry W. Trompf.* Leiden, S. 147–158.

Geller, M. 1980: „Four Aramaic Incantation Bowls." In: G. Rendsburg/R. Adler/M. Afra/N.H. Winter (Hrsg.): *The Bible World. Essays in Honour of Cyrus H. Gordon*. New York.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Häberl, C. 2009: „The Production and Reception of a Mandaic Incantation.“ In: C. Häberl (Hrsg.): *Afroasiatic Studies in Memory of Robert Hetzron. Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the North American Conference on Afroasiatic Linguistics (NACAL 35).* Newcastle, S. 130–148.

Henrichs, A./L. Koenen 1988: *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Über das Werden seines Leibes*. Opladen.

Jenkins, R. 1995: „The Prayer of the Emanations in Greek from Kellis.“ In: *Le Muséon* 108, S. 243–263.

Levene, D. 2003: *A Corpus of Magic Bowls. Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity*. London/New York.

LiDonnici, L. 2007: „‚According to the Jews‘: Identified (and identifying) ‚Jewish‘ Elements in the Greek Magical Payri.“ In: L. LiDonnici/A. Lieber (Hrsg.): *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Leiden, S. 87–108.

Lidzbarski, M. 1920: *Mandäische Liturgien*. Berlin [Nachdruck 1962 und 1978].

— 1925: *Ginzā. Der Schatz, oder Das Große Buch der Mandäer. Übersetzt und erklärt*. Göttingen/Leipzig.

Mirecki, P. 2012: „Manichaeism, scribal magic and Papyrus Kellis 35.“ In: M. Knüppel/L. Cirillo (Hrsg.): *Gnostica et Manichaica. Festschrift für Aloïs van Tongerloo anläßlich des 60. Geburtstages überreicht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Wiesbaden, S. 133–146.

Montgomery, J. 1913: *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*. Philadelphia.

Müller-Kessler, C. 2001–2002: „Die Zauberschalensammlung in British Museum.“ In: *Archiv für Orientforschung* 48–49, S. 115–145 [Besprechung von Segal 2000].

— 2002: „Die aramäische Beschwörung und ihre Rezeption in den mandäisch-magischen Texten am Beispiel ausgewählter aramäischer Beschwörungsformulare.“ In: R. Gyselen (Hrsg.): *Charmes et sortilèges, magie et magiciens*. Bures-sur-Yvette, S. 193–208.

— 2005a: *Die Zauberschalentexte in der Hilprecht-Sammlung, Jena, und weitere Nippur-Texte anderer Sammlungen*. Wiesbaden.

— 2005b: „Of Jesus, Darius, Marduk …: Aramaic Magic Bowls in the Moussaieff Collection.“ In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125, S. 219–240 [Besprechung von Levene 2003].

Nagel, P. 1980: *Die Thomaspsalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches, übersetzt und erläutert*. Berlin.

Oerter, W.-B. 1975: *Die Thomaspsalmen des manichäischen Psalters als genuiner Bestandteil der manichäischen Literatur*. Dissertation für Promotion A, Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Sektion Geschichte. [unveröffentlicht].

— 2003: „Zur Verwendung des Begriffs ‚Manichäer‘ im heutigen deutschen Sprachgebrauch.“ In: *Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft* 35 [= W. Beltz/U. Pietruschka/J. Tubach (Hrsg.): *Sprache und Geist. Peter Nagel zum 65. Geburtstag*. Halle], S. 167–184.

Otto, B.-C. 2011: *Magie. Rezeptions- und diskursgeschichtliche Analysen von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*. Berlin/New York.

Petermann, H. 1867: *Thesaurus sive Liber Magnus vulgo ‚Liber Adami‘ appellatus, opus Mandaeorum summi ponderis*, *Tomus I textum continens*. Lipsiae.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Philonenko, M. 1985: „Une prière magique au Dieu créateur (PGM 5. 459–489).“ In: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 129, S. 433–452.

Pognon, H. 1898: *Inscriptions Mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir: texte, traduction et commentaire philologique avec quatres appendices et un glossaire*. Paris [Nachdruck Amsterdam 1979].

Polotsky, H. J./A. Böhlig 1940: *Kephalaia, 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10).* Stuttgart.

Preisendanz, K. 1973: *Papyri graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Bd. I, 2. Verbesserte Auflage, hrsg. von A. Henrichs. Stuttgart.

Roberge, M. 2010: *The Paraphrase of Shem (NH VII,1). Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden.

Rudolph, K. 1960: *Die Mandäer.* Bd. I: *Prolegomena. Das Mandäerproblem*. Göttingen.

— 1961: *Die Mandäer.* Bd. II: *Der Kult.* Göttingen.

— 1965: *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften. Eine literarkritische und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Göttingen.

Säve-Söderbergh, T. 1949: *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book: Prosody and Mandaean Parallels*. Uppsala.

Segal, J. B. 2000: *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*. London.

Smith, M. 1986: „The Jewish Element in the Magical Papyri.“ In: *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 25, S. 455–462 [= M. Smith: *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh II: New Testament, Early Christianity & Magic*. Hrsg. von S. Cohen. Leiden 1996, S. 242–256].

Spät, E. 2004: „The ‚Teachers‘ of Mani in the *Acta Archelai* and Simon Magus.“ In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 58, S. 1–23.

Sundberg, W. 1953: *Kušṭa. A Monograph on a Principal Word in Mandaean Texts*. Bd. I: *The descending Knowledge*. Lund.

Sundermann, W. 1997: „How Zoroastrian is Mani's Dualism?“ In: *Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale di studi „Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico“, Arcavacata di Rende–Amatea, 31 agosto–5 settembre 1993*. Hrsg. von L. Cirillo/A. van Tongerloo. Louvain/Napoli, S. 343–360 [= Sundermann 2001, S. 39–58].

— 2001: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann.* Hrsg. von Ch. Reck/D. Weber/C. Leurini/A. Panaino. Roma.

Tambiah, S. J. 1985: „Form and Meaning of Magical Arts.“ In: ders.: *Culture, Thought and Social Action. An Anthropological Perspective*. Cambridge Mass./London, S. 60–86 [Deutsche Übersetzung von B. Luchesi: „Form und Bedeutung magischer Akte. Ein Standpunkt.“ In: H. G. Kippenberg/B. Luchesi (Hrsg.): *Magie. Die sozialwissenschaftliche Kontroverse über das Verstehen fremden Denkens*. 2. Aufl. Frankfurt a. M. 1995, S. 259–297].

Walravens, H. 2001: *Albert Grünwedel: Briefe und Dokumente*. Wiesbaden.

Yamauchi, E. 1967: *Mandaic Incantation Texts*. New Heaven [Nachdruck Piscataway 2005].

Zimmer, H. 1920: „Nazoräer (Nazarener).“ In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 74, S. 429–438.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Nature of the Manichaean Soul

Jason David BeDuhn, Flagstaff

Between 1994 and 2002 I made repeated visits to the Turfanforschung in Berlin to work on Middle Iranian Manichaean texts, and in that context got to know the remarkable Werner Sundermann. He immediately and graciously took me under his wing, and agreed to be a reader for my doctoral dissertation. He directed me to unpublished texts that would help my work on this project, both for the dissertation and later for its development into the book, *The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual*. He handed me advance proofs of his forthcoming edition of the *Gyān Wifrās*, since he knew that I planned a sequel to *The Manichaean Body*, on the subject of the Manichaean concept of the soul. Sometime later he told me that, after much consideration, he had decided that his next major edition would be the *Gōwišn ī grīw zīndag*. I remarked what a happy coincidence that choice was, since this was precisely the remaining major unpublished text that I would need to undertake my study. He looked steadily at me, a hint of a grin and a twinkle in his eye, and after a pregnant pause said simply, 'I know.'

Both Professor Sundermann's work on the *Gōwišn ī grīw zīndag* and my study on the Manichaean soul were delayed by other commitments. But we kept in touch, both before and after the opportunity I had to host him in Flagstaff in 2005 on the occasion of the 6th International Congress of Manichaean Studies, which proved to be the last time I would spend time with him in person. He finally completed his edition only a few weeks before his death. I have often wondered at how miraculous it is for those of us who labor in the field of Manichaean studies, that a man of Werner Sundermann's enormous gifts and wide erudition chose to devote the bulk of his very productive career to our subject. The project I am now finally commencing on the Manichaean soul, of which this article is a very preliminary statement, is only possible on the foundation of his many editions of, and brilliant insights into, Manichaean literature.

When we consider the Manichaean soul, we must abolish from our minds the idea of discrete, personal entities identified with individual human beings, whether they are imagined to pre-exist embodiment and fall into it through pride or error, or to be created specifically for embodiment as either master or pupil of worldly experience. The Manichaean soul is both more and less than the monadic soul of the western religious and philosophical tradition. The

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Manichaean soul is a collective soul, a mass of divine material with its proper abode in the realm of light. It went forth from the realm of light in defense of it, seeking to deflect the assault of darkness. Neither temptation nor error motivated this descent from transcendence to immanence, as in other familiar narratives of the soul. We should speak, then, not of a fall of the soul, but of a leap of the soul – good in its motives and ultimately good in its effect, but full of trial and tribulation.

When Manichaean sermons and hymns call upon the believer to "remember" the past of his or her soul, it is to remember this collective primordial descent and the history of dispersal throughout the cosmos, rather than a personal story of an individual soul.

> To you I say, my captive soul: Can you remember paradise? … Can you remember the devouring […] who imprisoned and devoured you with hunger? … Can you remember the hard primeval fight and the many battles which you had with the dark forces?[1]

In passages such as this from the Manichaean "Hymns to the Living Soul" *(Grīw Žīwandagīg Bāšāh)* we discover that the "soul" that constitutes their subject is not the individual human soul, but the entity that originally proceeded from the realm of light against the threat of darkness. The coming forth of this "soul" is not the creation of an individual soul, but the primordial mythology of the Primal Man and his elemental armament. The inhabitants of the realm of light rejoiced when this "light-soul" was born, and sang out: "Born is the pugnacious one who makes peace!" This original soul is given three missions: "That you destroy death, that you kill the enemies, and (that you) conceal the whole light paradise." The story continues:

> And you went out to the battle. And you concealed the whole light paradise. You bound the mighty prince forever. And you destroyed the abode of the dark ones. The friend of the light, first man was there until he accomplished the wish of the father.[2]

As a consequence of this primordial combat, the "soul" of the Primal Man remains mixed with darkness, and from this mixture the cosmos comes into being, with the soul continuing to suffer in its exile from the land of light, expressed at times in the soul's own voice.

> I belong to the light and the gods, and I have been exiled from them. The enemies gathered against me, and they lead me to the dead …. I am a god, who was born of the gods radiant, splendid, sparkling and bright, shining, fragrant and beautiful. But now I have fallen into want. Countless loathsome demons grabbed me, who made me a slave, made my soul weak, bit, tore, and ate me.[3]

1 M 33, Hymn 2 (Durkin-Meisterernst 2006, pp. 44–47, ll. 476–495).
2 M 10, Hymn 2 (Durkin-Meisterernst 2006, pp. 38–41, ll. 400–445).
3 M 7, Hymn 5 (Durkin-Meisterernst 2006, pp. 34–37, ll. 366–390).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Far from concerning an individual human soul, therefore, such recollections of the soul refer entirely to a mythological entity, understood to be now dispersed throughout the cosmos.

The "Recitation of the Living Soul" *(Gōwišn ī grīw zīndag)* similarly places this recollection of the collective soul's experiences in the mouth of this entity itself. Composed to be recited at the daily ritual meal of the Manichaean community,[4] it calls to mind the rescue of the soul being effected by Manichaean practice. "I was changed into many shapes, in numberless plant and fleshy creatures; in dark embryos I was held and I was born of impure wombs."[5] As the Manichaeans went about the work of their religion, careful in their handling of nature and bringing vegetarian food to the ritual meal so that the Elect could liberate this "soul" mixed within it, they found the motives for their actions in the mutual identification of the soul to be found in their offerings with their own individual soul.

> Because I am the Living Soul, and a noble, honorable son, from the same family as you, from the living paradise, and your own soul *(gy'n)* and life. And if you will collect me in good action, and if friends will bring [me] to you in love, obediently protect me in fear, my great and noble support.[6]

The Manichaean identification of the individual's own soul with the substance brought to the Elect in Manichaean ritual builds on antecedent sacrificial ideologies, whereby the offering bears a crucial connection to the life or soul of the sacrificer, and thus can substitute for that life or soul in atonement. Yet the Manichaeans developed these sacrificial ideas in a unique direction, understanding the route taken by sacrifices to the gods as effecting a liberation and transmission of soul itself from this world to heaven. They reinterpreted sacrificial imagery accordingly.[7]

According to Manichaeism, then, an original universal soul was captured and dispersed by the forces of evil at the dawn of time. All of the multiple differentiations of profane existence derive from evil, with the common vivifying divine soul spread throughout the great variety of "likenesses and images of every shape."[8]

4 §§12–13 (Sundermann 2012, pp. 100–103; English translations of this text used here and below are taken from that of Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst in Sundermann 2012, pp. 177–196).

5 §§23–24 (Sundermann 2012, p. 104f.).

6 §§71–74 (Sundermann 2012, p. 116f.).

7 E.g., in §§93–100 of the *Gōwišn ī grīw zīndag* (Sundermann 2012, p. 122f.). A prose discussion along similar lines, reinterpreting Zoroastrian fire-ritual in terms of the Manichaean vegetarian ritual meal and its purpose, occurs in kephalaion 326 of the Chester Beatty (Dublin) *Kephalaia* (Gardner/BeDuhn/Dilley, forthcoming; Giversen 1986, pp. 232–238).

8 *Kephalaion* 40, 105.7 (Gardner 1995, p. 109).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> For all these names […] are a single […] since the beginning … but they separated into all these parts in this first contest. They became set in all these altered forms, and these many names. Of course, if now all these varieties are laid bare, and stripped of all these appearances *(n.schēma)*, [and] parted from all these names, they will gather together [and] make a single form, and a single name, unaltered and unchangeable forever in the land of their first essence, from which they were sent forth against the enemy.[9]

These words from the Coptic *Kephalaia* demonstrate the consistency of this ideology across the geographical and temporal expanse of the Manichaean mission. In another passage from the same work, Mani is reported to have said: "You yourselves must be purifiers and redeemers of your soul, which is established in every place, so that you [may be counted] to the company of the fathers of light."[10] The key to understanding the Manichaean concept of soul is to grasp what it means to have one's soul "established in every place."

According to the Manichaean myth as preserved by Theodore bar Konai, when Jesus descends to awaken Adam, he shows Adam his soul *(napšeh)* spread out in the world, "mixed and imprisoned in all that exists, bound in the stench of darkness."[11] In other words, Adam is led to perceive that his soul is but a fragment of an original, larger soul invested in the whole cosmos. Similarly, in the Hymns to the Living Soul, Zarathustra, conversing with his own soul, says, "Heavy (is the) sleep into which you have fallen! Will you wake up and look at me!" to which the awakening soul replies with startled self-discovery, "I am the tender child of harmless Srōšāw; I am mixed, and I experience suffering. Lead me out of death's enclosure!" Zarathustra promises to do so for this "child of the mighty who has been made poor so that you always beg in every place."[12] This identification of one's own soul with the universal soul dispersed throughout material existence constitutes the core revelation brought repeatedly to humankind.

Due to its understandable focus on salvation and the motives for it, Manichaean literature can give the impression of a quite Gnostic or Platonic view of the material cosmos, as a place and state foreign to the soul, and as the latter's prison. It has been easy to interpret the strict rules Manichaeans followed on handling nature around them as part and parcel of an abhorrence of this world, and a commitment to have nothing to do with it. Hints here and there in Manichaean accounts of cosmogony suggested to some that such an understanding might be an oversimplification. But it was Werner Sundermann's edition of the "Sermon on the Soul" *(Gyān Wifrās)*, and his astute interpretive analysis of it, that revolutionized our thinking on Manichaean attitudes towards the

9 *Kephalaion* 72, 178.13ff. (Gardner 1995, p. 187f.).
10 *Kephalaion* 26, 77.18–20 (Gardner 1995, p. 78).
11 Reeves 1992, p. 193.
12 M 7 Hymn 2 (Durkin-Meisterernst 2006, pp. 26–29, ll. 245–281).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

surrounding world. Acknowledging the preponderance in other Manichaean texts of rhetoric regarding the soul's suffering, struggle, pollution, and imprisonment, Sundermann noted that the "Sermon on the Soul" brings out an important other dimension to Manichaen thinking.

> The distinctiveness of its message is that the Living Soul also is a powerful, effective pentad of divine light-elements, which bestows order on the world and continuity on its existence, sustains and supports the bodies of living beings, delivers continuous life to creatures, allows the plants to grow and multiply, even helps the birth and growth of humankind, fashions creatures in beauty and enables them to see and hear, to have the capacity to move and communicate with each other and live with one another in peace and well-being. Moreover, in many small things the Living Soul makes the life of humans on earth as pleasant and easy as possible.... In short: only through the presence of the Living Soul can the world exist at all.[13]

The "Sermon on the Soul" thus complements Manichaean cosmogonic accounts by explaining the role of "soul" mixed with darkness in forming and ordering the cosmos in all of its positive qualities, which the text enumerates with almost rapturous naturalism. So much for the "anti-cosmic" orientation of Manichaeism.[14]

As Sundermann points out, the "Sermon on the Soul" employs in its title and contents the term *(gyʾn)* ordinarily representing the personal soul combined with a body in an individual human life.[15] This appears deliberate, as the text proceeds to reveal the same mystery Jesus revealed to Adam and Zarathustra revealed to his own soul: the identity of one's personal soul with the "soul" dispersed throughout the cosmos. It informs its readers and hearers that, if they are to be saved, they must know the names of the soul. These names, which the text informs the reader are "your name," are: ether, wind, light, water and fire.[16] In other words, "this wonderful and great fact"[17] reveals that the very constitutive material elements of the world are one and the same as what the Manichaean tradition calls "soul." Of course, there are corresponding negative elements with which the positive ones are mixed. Manichaeism is indeed dualistic in that sense. Nevertheless, far from abhorring material existence, its dualism recognized an

13 Sundermann 1997, p. 15, translated from the German by myself. I have omitted the citations of individual passages of the text supporting each of these characterizations.

14 Cf. the Turkic lay confession text *Xwāstwānīft*, IIIA: "The tenfold sky above and the eightfold earth below exist because of the Fivefold God. The divine blessings and fortunes, the colors and complexions, the spirits and the souls, the forces and lights, and the origins and roots of all that is upon the earth is the Fivefold God" (Clark 2013, p. 89).

15 Sundermann 1997, p. 11.

16 Sundermann 1997, §21, characterizing them as "fünf lichte, lebendige, große und machtvolle Götter, die Kinder des Gottes *Ohrmezd*" [the five lights, living, great and powerful gods, the children of the god Ohrmezd].

17 Sundermann 1997, §12: "diese wundervolle und große Sache".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

almost pantheistic divine presence permeating the cosmos. In fact, the "Sermon on the Soul" states that, "There is in the world, beside these five gods, no other god," and that all individual souls represent offshoots and offspring of these elements *(mrδ'sp'nt)*.[18] In a similar vein, Ephrem Syrus reports that the Manichaeans insist that "honor and dignity should not be given to humanity alone, but rather to all the portions of light because they all derive from a single great and glorious essence."[19]

In speaking of the Manichaean "soul," therefore, we must recognize that it is spread far beyond the boundaries of the human self. In this way, it is more than the monadic soul typical of western discourse. At the same time, within each of us, the soul is made up of five distinct elements that have both psychic and physical attributes. In this way, it is less than the monadic soul, since even within the individual it represents a conglomerate of elemental properties, and not a homogenous essence. It is wrong, from the Manichaean point of view, even to talk of a human soul within the ordinary human being in its congenital condition. There is only a potential soul, the material of a soul, awaiting its formation and liberation from "us" just as it does from the surrounding world.

One of the sharpest divergences of Manichaean conceptions of the soul from the idea of an integral monadic soul can be seen in the Manichaean notion that the personal soul is fluid and permeable, enlarged by imports into the physical frame, and diminished by exports from it.[20] There is extensive coverage in surviving Manichaean literature of these processes, with "soul-stuff" coming into the body through food and the senses, and flowing out from the body through physical actions or vocalizations. Like everything else, food is a mixed entity, and brings to the individual unpredictable combinations of light and darkness, healthy substances and pathological ones, good impulses and bad drives.

> Again, trouble and confusion and anger [will] increase in him, and lust multiplies upon him together with depression and grief, because of the nourishment of the bread he has eaten and the water he has drunk, which are full of bothersome parts, a vengeful counsel. They shall enter his body, [mixed in] with these foods, and they become blended also with the wicked parts of the body and the sin that is in him, changing into anger and lust and depression and grief, these wicked thoughts of the body… There are times, however, [if] you shall find that the nourishment that comes into you is pure […] excelling in light and life while [the] waste is less in it, and the evil-doing is diminished [from it] … And they find you at ease and tranquil, as you are well-governed in your behavior because of [the] living part, which is greater on account of the light of these justified souls that are in it, the ones that have perfected their deeds. Their dues have ceased, while their soul is carefree (lit. "light-weight") […] they have been allied with these living

18 Sundermann 1997, §§112–113; §113: "Und ferner, auf der Welt gibt es außer diesen fünf Göttern keinen anderen Gott."

19 *Prose Refutations*, 115.9–18 (Reeves 1997, p. 231).

20 For a more detailed survey of this theme in Manichaean doctrine, see BeDuhn 2001.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> souls that [are] present in you. Due to this you shall find them in you, calm in tranquility, and they come out of you without trouble, and you are found flourishing of body. Even your deeds are determined, being well constructed after their manner, and your doctrines [are in] order, as your words [...] your soul is carefree within you, ascending like a bird.[21]

These imports are not just heteropathic elements that affect the soul, but include quantities of soul itself. These bits of soul are processed within the body in ways that depend on the degree of their "maturity," their "evolution" towards liberation, as well as on the condition of the body processing them, whether it remains in its defective congenital condition or has been corrected by Manichaean practice.

The permeability of the personal soul likewise involves elemental exports. All actions of the individual leave traces in the surrounding environment.[22] These include the more obvious exertions of force on fellow human beings and animals, but also involve acts as subtle as touching a leaf, or a bit of snow, walking on grass or bathing in a stream.[23] Every time one comes into contact with things around him or her, one leaves a bit of soul, like a fingerprint. Humans become linked with these objects in the responsibility and consequences of their actions. Most usually, these linkages hold one back from attaining liberation; they are a burden that must be rectified. To alter that burdensome relationship, the personal soul within the individual must undergo a transformation that allows it to gradually retrieve and liberate its set of dispersed parts. They are bound together, and may only be liberated together.

With "soul" passing in and out of the human individual every day, something must change to transform this circulation and dispersal of soul into a channeled path of liberation. Change comes with the intervention of divine aid through the light-messengers, culminating historically in Mani. According to the *Kephalaia*, he brings from his heavenly pre-existence the "forms" of those destined to accept his message; these forms join with the corresponding individual and provide unity and solidity to the soul substance within them. What is more, this unifying process triggers the release of all of the related soul substance deposited in the world through the individual's actions.

> The angels shall guide them to the places wherein they will be purified; because each catechumen, none of his deeds shall go to the gehennas, on account of the seal of the faith and the knowledge that is stamped on his soul... . Rather, they shall be drawn only to the transfusions *(metaggismos)* and suffering. Afterwards they come into the hands of the angels and are purified.... They shall loosen their bond and ascend from heaven and earth, from the trees and the fleshes. They are loosened from every place wherein they are and go to the heights with this first

21 *Kephalaion* 86, 215.15–216.13 (Gardner 1995, p. 223f.).
22 Augustine, *De moribus manichaeorum* 37.
23 As found in the confession texts for Elect; see Henning 1936, pp. 32–36.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> fasting and this first prayer; the principal (portion) of all his deeds.... They are cleansed in [the] firmaments of the heavens and go before him. There are some also among his limbs that shall be freed with him, at the time when he comes out from his body. There are others that shall be freed after him from the bonds of the earth and that of the creatures. [They] go and reach him in the land of the living.... He is healed, so that he [will be] gathered in, all of him, and go up to the land of the living.[24]

The location and extent of the "soul" represented in this passage defies western cultural expectations, shaped by religious and philosophical traditions that won out over Manichaeism historically. In the Manichaean view, all but forgotten before the modern rediscovery of the religion's literature, all of one's actions are an investment of soul stuff into the larger world, back into mixture from which it is trying to free itself. This is why the Elect practice "the rest of the hands" and cease to act upon the world as much as possible. All of the substances and energies of our physical presence, those we are born with and those which build us up through eating, are part of the "soul" for which we are responsible. One's "soul" is not complete without an account and a "collection" of all these deeds, the behaviors that are the manifestation of one's soul.

As a conglomeration of divine elements, which happens to be concentrated in sufficient quantity to cross the threshold to consciousness, that which the Manichaeans consider merely a potential soul strives to hold itself together and continue along a process of ever-increasing re-unification. If it fails to hold on to that consciousness, or if it fails to find "the open gate" through which it can continue its ascent, that soul will, at death, fly apart once again into its separate components, remaining mixed with darkness. It needs to find a form, a permanent cohesiveness that survives mortality, a "body" divested of the pollutants which undermine its unity and clarity. This is the need Mani proposed to resolve. He brought the true "commandments of the savior, [so that you] may redeem the soul from [annihilation] and destruction."[25] Salvation comes by means of establishing an integrity for the self, an identity beyond contingency. Hence, the Manichaean takes up the task of forming the soul or self through a rigorous process of sorting out the different experiential qualities of their physical existence. Manichaean practices identify, mark, define, promote, circumscribe, and valorize particular traits of the human body, specific sensations and thoughts within human experience; these are "collected" as a unified self that, by its emergence from mixture with other, non-approved traits and experiences, attains full self-consciousness, and recognition of its true eternal form. As Ephrem Syrus reports, "It has self-knowledge because it is collected together and fixed."[26]

24 *Kephalaion* 90,225.10–14, 29–30; 226.16–20; 227.20- 228.2 (Gardner 1995, pp. 233–235).
25 *Cologne Mani Codex* 84–85; the translation is my own.
26 *Prose Refutations*, 7 (Mitchell 1912, p. xxxii).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Secondary literature on Manichaeism commonly speaks of a belief in *metempsychosis*, implying the transmigration of intact souls to other bodies at death. But such terms do not accurately convey the Manichaean view. Rather, the separable divine elements within an individual are reprocessed at death into new forms through "transfusion" *(metaggismos)* – the word appears carefully chosen to avoid the implication of *metempsychosis* and other similar terms. The individual identity of the auditor is disassembled in the post-mortem *metaggismos* process and recycled through a multitude of pathways (15 in all, according to one text) to a variety of destinies. This is why Mani declined to depict the destiny of the Auditor in his *Picture Book*. The fate of the unified soul of the Elect and of the mass of irredeemable soul of the inveterate sinner can be shown quite clearly: salvation and damnation, respectively, that in effect removes them from the cosmos. But the post-mortem experiences of the soul of the Auditor who remains in the cosmos cannot be shown, "because he shall not be purified in a single place."[27] Hence, the non-perfected do not undergo rebirth or reincarnation or metempsychosis or transmigration, as those terms are normally used. The material which constitutes the human soul does not cohere in the ordinary passage from life to life. The Manichaeans taught that new human individuals, body and soul, come into existence in a *traducian* manner through reproduction; the "soul" does not enter into an independently formed body from elsewhere. The physical and psychical properties of a child derive from the material which constituted the parents' bodies – ultimately, that is, from food. That is why the "reprocessing" of what we can only loosely call the souls of ordinary people follows exactly the pattern by which the Elect reprocess the divine elements in their food,[28] and why it made every sense for a Manichaean Auditor to hope that his or her own soul substance would end up, on the other side of *metaggismos*, in the food brought to the Elect to liberate. From teachings such as these, the close interconnection of the material and spiritual evident in Manichaeism distinguishes it from more familiar spirit-matter dualisms that have historically prevailed in western discourse.

It was Werner Sundermann's opinion that, "The teaching of a world-animating cosmic soul belongs among the great religious ideas that the Manichaeans incorporated into their doctrinal system and fashioned with poetic expressiveness."[29] He understood well that among the tasks that await Manichaean Studies is a full investigation of the historical antecedents of this concept,[30] and determining what the outcome of that investigation can tell us about the particular cultural dynamic within which Manichaeism arose. But an understanding of the distinctive Manichaean conceptualization of the soul

27 *Kephalaion* 92, 235.18–236.4 (Gardner 1995, p. 242).
28 *Kephalaion* 91, 230.15–19 (Gardner 1995, p. 238).
29 Sundermann 1997, p. 14.
30 On which he offered some preliminary observations (Sundermann 1997, p. 21).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

also requires an analysis in the terms of the comparative study of religions and comparative cultural studies, in order to achieve a more complete picture of the kind of ethos implicit in such a set of teachings, once we recognize that it is foreign to the received assumptions of western views of the soul. What can similar ideas found in other non-western cultures tell us about how the typical Manichaean thought of his or her own identity and its relation to the surrounding world?

If we try to force Manichaean discourse on the soul into the familiar categories of what the western intellectual tradition usually means by that term, we are doomed to confusion and misunderstanding. We still have much to learn in this regard from the work of Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, who laid the groundwork for the sociology of knowledge by demonstrating the existence of culturally distinct systems of knowledge, understanding, and reasoning.[31] With regard to the culturally distinct views of the soul, the subject of his 1928 book (the French original appeared in 1927) he developed three key concepts that I think help us to understand what is going on with the Manichaeans.[32] First, he found that in many cultures the boundaries of the personal self or soul extend beyond the limits of the body, and that residues of one's personal identity are believed to be left on objects with which a person had contact. These "soul-residues" Lévy-Bruhl labeled "appurtenances" of the self or soul. Second, in the very same cultures, he found that abiding connections were thought to persist between the individual and his or her appurtenances, even at a great distance, and that the condition of one appurtenance had effects on them all, including on the core self or soul itself. It was Lévy-Bruhl, I believe, who coined the expression "participation" for this extensive interconnectedness, and the term has been much used since. Third, and finally, he also found in several cultures the idea that the soul within an individual is not a unity, but a collectivity of souls, each responsible for discrete psychic and physical functions, and not necessarily always in perfect functional harmony. The relevance to the Manichaean case of these ideas about the soul, found to exist in multiple cultures outside of the dominance of western cultural traditions, is perfectly obvious, and does not need to be belabored here.

In light of such comparisons, the category of "soul" in Manichaeism can be recognized to involve cosmological and biological components not usually

31 The neglect into which Lévy-Bruhl has fallen relates to his tendency in his early works to dichotomize modern rational thought and "primitive" thought, although it was the very point of his work that the latter is not irrational, but differently rational. Nevertheless, the increasing sophistication of his comparisons of alternative conceptual systems and modes of rationality coincided with the declining popularity of his writings, and he is chiefly remembered for his earlier discussions of "primitive mentality."

32 Lévy-Bruhl 1928, *passim*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

included in discussions of the topic in the western religious and intellectual tradition. On the one hand, the soul is quite a bit more than the vivifier of an individual body, and extends beyond the limits of the personal through the deposits of its activity in the world. On the other hand, the soul is quite a bit less than the total agency of the body, and motivates only a portion of individual behaviour, contending with impulses and ideas that the Manichaeans did not consider part of the soul. This distinctive discourse on the self offers a new angle from which to address timeless questions about what it means to be human, and what it is to strive to be more than mortal. In Manichaeism the soul is not cleansed or freed or restored or reanimated; it is made, built piece by piece from the vivifying elements of the world. Until these elements are collected and united, they are incapable of full consciousness, incapable of the selfhood presupposed in the more usual discussion of soul. Even after they have been so united and solidified to engender true agency, this does not remain their ultimate condition. Salvation does not preserve this newly fashioned personal soul for eternity; instead, it loses itself again in the original collectivity from which it sprang. Should we even use the word "soul," then, for this quite different substance of which the Manichaeans speak?

As we begin to think through the Manichaean conception of the soul, we may consider its implications and ramifications for the Manichaean way of life. How did thinking in terms of the mutual co-identity of soul in all living things shape the behavior and attitudes of Manichaeans in relation to the world around them? How well did it serve the motivation of Manichaeans to adhere to their strict behavioral codes and to participate in the ritual work of universal salvation? How might the world be different today if the Manichaean view of soul prevailed, if the cutting of a tree was as traumatic as the beheading of a person, if the sphere of one's concern did not stop at the finger tips, but extended to everything one touches with them? Beyond this, we may ponder how the modern psyche itself, the human self-image, might be different if Manichaeism had prevailed? What would it mean for one's sense of identity and responsibility to recognize evil impulses within as alien and other? Would that further or hinder the formation of a coherent identity and moral commitment? Werner Sundermann and I shared an almost aesthetic appreciation of Manichaeism as an intriguing alternative world view, and he relished the discovery that they were not the world-and-body hating caricature they have at times been made out to be. A full understanding of the Manichaean view of soul and its practical implications remains a complex field for further inquiry that will be undertaken, in large part, on the philological and interpretative foundations Werner Sundermann has provided for all of us.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliography

BeDuhn, J. D. 2001: "The Metabolism of Salvation: Manichaean Concepts of Human Physiology." In: P. Mirecki, J. BeDuhn (eds.): *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*. Leiden, pp. 5–37.

Clark, L. 2013: *Uygur Manichaean Texts.* Vol. II: *Liturgical Texts*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Series Turcica II).

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2006: *The Hymns to the Living Soul*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 24).

Gardner, I. 1995: *The Kephalaia of the Teacher.* Leiden.

Gardner, I./J. D. BeDuhn/P. Dilley [forthcoming]: *The Kephalaia of the Wisdom of my lord Mani.*

Giversen, S. 1986: *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library, I. Kephalaia. Facsimile Edition*. Geneva.

Henning, W. B. 1936: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Berlin (APAW, phil.-hist. Kl. 10).

Lévy-Bruhl, L. 1928: *The 'Soul' of the Primitive*. New York.

Mitchell, C. W. 1912: *St. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*. Oxford.

Reeves, J. C. 1992: *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the* Book of Giants *Traditions*. Cincinnati.

— 1997: "Manichaean Citations from the *Prose Refutations* of Ephrem." In: P. Mirecki, J. BeDuhn (eds.): *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Leiden, pp. 217–288.

Sundermann, W. 1997: *Der Sermon von der Seele*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 19).

— 2012: *Die Rede der Lebendigen Seele*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 30).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Exploring the Oral Background of the Manichaean Parables

Adam Benkato, Berlin

Any student of Manichaeism is indebted to the many important studies and text editions of Professor Sundermann, but a student of the Manichaean literature in Iranian languages in particular would find the going difficult indeed without his work. As I arrived in Berlin in 2012 for a research visit too late to meet Professor Sundermann in person, I can offer only to his memory the following study on the Manichaean parables.

The Manichaeans, especially those in Central Asia, seem to have been obsessed with writing and the production of written texts. Such an attitude stems, naturally, from the emphasis of Mani on the writing down of his Gospels and his belief in the incorruptibility of the written word.[1] Indeed, the production of a massive written corpus in Turfan attests to this. However, the Manichaeans' emphasis on writing, inherited to some extent by modern scholars, means that the question of the *use* to which the texts were put has received until now far less attention.[2] In what follows I hope to explore further the issue of orality and the Iranian Manichaean texts, focusing especially on the parables, and to suggest some new ways of gleaning further information on the medieval Manichaean communities from the fragmented remains of their texts.

The setting

Issues of language and literacy among the Manichaeans of Turfan have yet to be explored in depth, but it is fair to begin by emphasizing again the importance of the written text in that community, leaving aside for the moment the question of the use of written texts. This is suggested by both the voluminous amount of manuscripts produced in Turfan and the well-known idea that Elect could

1 See for example Gardner/Lieu 2004, pp. 265–268 for the well-known 'ten points' text in which Mani declares that his predecessors' religions failed especially because they did not write down their gospels.

2 Such concerns are already raised by Skjærvø 2005, p. 11f.; see also Graham 1993, esp. pp. 155–171.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

accrue merit through the act of writing.[3] It is worth re-stating what is already common knowledge among scholars, that the Elect were not only literate but multilingually so.[4] We can also be quite sure that the Manichaeans did not practice oral transmission in the same way as, for example, the Zoroastrians, at least not for their canonical texts, even if we do not have much information on the precise mechanisms of sacred text transmission.[5] At the same time, however, it can certainly not be said that Manichaean texts were strictly non-oral, as Mani himself is known to have also spread his Gospel by the spoken word.[6]

Moving to the Hearers also moves us along the spectrum of orality. What do we know about the relationship between Hearers and texts? At the most basic, we can assume that the Hearers literally *heard* their teachings:

> M 135/28–38/
> Thereupon all the Hearers became very joyful and happy on account of the divine words and priceless orders which they had *heard* from the Apostle, Lord Mār Mani …[7]

The relationship of Hearers as recipients of the Elects' teaching is further attested by a number of different texts, including parables which develop the idea of the 'Perfect Hearer', sermons addressed to Hearers, and texts which exhort, at length, the Hearers to virtuous behavior and alms-giving.[8] The teaching scenario in the Coptic *Kephalaia*, it might be added, features Mani responding orally to questions posed by Hearers.

In brief, the situation in the Manichaean community of Turfan may be characterized thus: a literate clergy, the Elect, who used the voice, in addition to or instead of, the written word, to communicate scripture and teachings to a lay public, either illiterate or of mixed literacy, the Hearers. This interaction of the

3 But evidence of Hearers also writing is found in M 101d: "The Hearer that copies a book is like unto a sick man that gave his …", edited in HENNING 1943, p. 64.

4 See for example TREMBLAY 2001, pp. 97–101.

5 Such oral transmission, of course, would be counter to the express wishes of Mani himself. The anecdote of a Manichaean in Egypt encouraging his son to practice writing so that he will be able to copy Manichaean books also suggests that knowledge of the texts was transmitted via the medium of writing, cf. GARDNER/LIEU 2004, pp. 272–275.

6 "… [the texts that] I have proclaimed from time to time! They are not written. You must remember them and write them; gather them in different places; because much is the wisdom that I have uttered to you" in *Kephalaia* 6.15–27, cf. GARDNER/LIEU 2004, p. 154. Indeed, Mani's picture book seems to have been intended to accompany oral explanation.

7 My emphasis. The text was edited by HENNING 1945, p. 470, from the same ms. as the 'Pearl-Borer' parable.

8 Several fragments can be cited in this regard, from the fragments of M 101 edited by HENNING (1943), to the Bactrian fragment M 1224 which contains a number of similes explaining the merit obtained by Hearers in return for their support of the Elect (edited by SIMS-WILLIAMS 2009). See also TREMBLAY 2001, p. 235 for an overview of texts for Hearers.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

groups would have led to a coexistence of the oral with the written, and hence books would have been written *both* for a reading audience *and* for a listening audience. What precisely this means in the Manichaean context I shall attempt to clarify.

It is often assumed that when one speaks of orality, one simply intends to distinguish only what is purely sound, such as oral recitation or transmission, from what is purely writing, such as a manuscript, discarding the question of reading or reciting altogether.[9] But there is also the possibility of a combination of the two: reading aloud from a written text, for example, or writing down an oral communication. These two latter modes compose what the textual critic Dennis Green calls the 'intermediate mode' of reception.[10] Such a mode, as Green describes it, supposes that there were few written works designed for either an exclusively *reading* public or for an exclusively *listening* public. The intermediate mode of reception in the context of the Manichaeans at Turfan is precisely what this study hopes to elucidate, and indeed the question becomes whether we can find evidence for oral delivery in the extant texts.

In fact, some texts quite clearly indicate that an oral communication is happening simultaneously with the reading of the manuscript. The fragment M 5779, for example, contains instructions in Sogdian for a Bema liturgy:

> … *You go, Mani, Maitreya-master, redeem me*. Twice, and then: *We call you, wonderful and noble master, Lord Mani, we praise you loudly, Light-bringer.* And when the name of the souls is called, and the hymn ends, make a short pause. And then read(?) from the Evangelion and make homage to the Apostle and the Elect. Then begin to do the confession, and when it is ended, these three hymns take place: "*Lord Mani, noble, beautiful in appearance, you father, I entreat. Remit my sin, beneficent Lord Mani. O God, answer us*. (twice) *O Mani life-giver, of noble name, save me, save, remit my sins*." And when the word 'Letter of the Seal' is concluded, sing this hymn in the presence of the Apostle: *My light father Lord Mani rose up to heaven* …[11]

This text clearly indicates the order in which specific hymns are to be sung, and how they fit into the ritual. What is striking is the specific timing, to the point that one must pay attention to the words one hears, in order to sing the hymn at the correct time. The text here provides the possessor of it with detailed instructions on the sequences of ritual actions, but the actual words on this fragment were probably not read or spoken in the ritual itself. A detailed

9 Of course in the medieval period, it was not even this simple, as private reading to a great extent involved vocalization, cf. Graham 1993, pp. 30–34.

10 See Green 1994, pp. 169–230, especially pp. 169–177.

11 Edited as BBBc by Henning 1936, p. 45f. and re-translated by BeDuhn 2001, p. 151f., my translation here. In lines /18–19/ the text has *cywyδyy cn ʾwnglywny* / [..]*šn ʾʾs* 'take a […] from the Evangelium'; Henning proposed to restore [*fr*]*šn* 'reading', but no such word exists so the gap remains unfilled. The sense of the pasage, however, is more or less clear.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

prior knowledge of the material is assumed. BeDuhn has already pointed out that Manichaean ritual texts and hymns had to be voiced to be effective, and thus one can only understand a fragment such as this with reference to its oral ritual context.[12]

Another example is M 114, an oft-cited fragment containing Sogdian instructions for a liturgy centered around the 'Body and Soul' rite. The fragment indicates that parables were among the texts used therein (note that the titles cited are in Parthian):

> … After this is the *Body and Soul* rite; first it is necessary that a preacher deliver the *Body and Soul* sermon. When the day draws to a close, let a parable be read, (namely) *The Prince with Candata's Son*. After this they should sing (the hymn) *Body and Soul*. Then say a short explanation …[13]

The text gives specific instructions for when, in the sequence of the rite, each text is to be read. But it also presupposes knowledge of the sermon, parable, and hymn that it cites; it is assumed that the person using the text has an ability, whether by memory or by using another manuscript, to deliver the required texts. The liturgy was, of course, an oral communication, and by extension the parable required in this instance must have been delivered orally.

Parables are a particularly interesting textual genre for study from the various perspectives of orality, as the genre itself implies teaching aloud to an audience. It is not by chance that nearly all examples of Biblical parables are not simply cited but are spoken aloud by Jesus to an attentive audience. Likewise, there are examples in the Coptic *Kephalaia* of Mani himself preaching to an audience by means of parables. However, the parable as an independent text is attested only in Iranian languages; parables seem to have played an important role both in ritual and in the Elects' teaching of Hearers in the Manichaean community of Turfan.[14]

Another text informs us that a specific parable should be read on Jaidan Monday, the central day of the Bema, the most important Manichaean feast:

> M 44/R/9–10/
> [Sogdian] To be preached on Jaidan Monday: [Parthian] Furthermore it is said: There was a low-born man, and he loved the king very much …[15]

12 See BeDuhn 2001, pp. 235–239 for an analysis of manuscripts like this from the perspective of speech act theory.

13 M 114, edited as BBBd in Henning 1936, pp. 46f., my translation. In fact, the text literally reads *ʿyw ʾʾznd frmʾyδ ʾkṭy* lit. 'deign to make a parable', which particular expression, a 2 pl. imperative followed by a past infinitive, is a way of expressing a polite request in Sogdian. Here the text makes that polite request to the reader of the manuscript.

14 The very clear overview of Sundermann (2009b, pp. 233–236) should be consulted in this regard.

15 Edited by Colditz 1987, pp. 300–302, my re-translation. Another fragment may likewise indicate the reading of a parable on Jaidan Monday, cf. Sims-Williams 1981, p. 236f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Not only is it clear that a particular parable is to be read at a certain time, but that it is to be read from the very manuscript in which the caption occurs. Further indication that the celebration of the Bema involved reading from texts is a well-known illuminated page depicting the Bema festival, in which an Elect holds a book aloft as if reading from it.[16]

Thus far we have encountered texts which state more or less explicitly that an oral reading should occur. Though these examples are strong evidence for the presence of oral delivery in Manichaean teaching and ritual, they are not the only pieces of evidence that one may muster to discuss orality in this context. But then the question arises as to how one should continue looking for such evidence, and what exactly qualifies as evidence. In order for such a study to be successful, I would argue, one should approach the extant Manichaean texts with a perspective broad enough to capture evidence much less explicit than a straightforward declaration of oral reading, indeed any evidence at all which is suggestive, even faintly, of some kind of orality. In this regard, a methodological concept introduced by the medievalist Paul Zumthor is quite useful:

> A *sign of orality* … is everything in a text that informs us about the intervention of the human voice in its publication; that is, in the change by which this has passed, once or several times, from a virtual state into actuality and existed from then on in the attention and memory of a certain number of individuals.[17]

The definition is quite broad. Statements such as the ones just presented that a given text is to be read aloud at a given time may be collected as a 'sign of orality', and so may other hallmarks of oral delivery discussed here, such as appeals to listen and introductory formulas.[18] The third type of evidence discussed here, parable abstracts, brings some codicological considerations into the discussion.

Request for attention / appeal to listen

One of the hallmarks of oral delivery is direct address, not to a reader, but to a listener. Such addresses can be found in a wide variety of medieval texts[19], and indeed Iranian Manichaean literature does not lack this feature. Appeals to a listening audience occur in a range of texts, including sermons and parables:

16 MIK III 4979a–b, cf. Gulácsi 2001, pp. 70–75.

17 Zumthor 1987, p. 37. Also: "Il nous arrive souvent de percevoir dans le texte la rumeur, éclatante ou confuse, d'un discours parlant de la voix même qui le porte. Chaque texte en cela demeure incomparable et exige une écoute singulière: il comporte ses propres *indices d'oralité*" (*ibid.*, my emphasis).

18 In particular these are referred to as "non-lexical" evidence in Green's study, whereas "lexical" evidence concerns the very words used for 'reading', 'reciting', and so forth. The latter type will have to remain for a further study.

19 See e.g. Crosby 1936, p. 100ff.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

M 455/B/ii/1–2/ MKG(2095–2096)
ʿšnwyyd ʾšmʾẖ / brʾdrʾn fryʾngʾn / wjydgʾn ʾwd ngwšʾgʾn
"Listen, beloved brethren, elect and auditors."[20]

M 1/279–280/
ʾwr ʾšnwyd ngwšʾgʾn / ʾwryd ngwšʾgʾn ʾšnwyd
"Come, hear, Hearers. Come, Hearers, hear."[21]

Both examples are Parthian. In the first example, it can be seen that the audience consists of both groups of Manichaeans, while in the second it is clearly Hearers, though in both it is probably an Elect who reads. The verb spelled *ʾšnwyyd* or *ʾšnwyd* is a 2nd-person plural imperative — only a reasonable choice if directed at an attending audience.

In a Sogdian church-historical text describing Mani's encounter with the Sasanian king, Mani must proceed through a series of Zoroastrian magi, convincing each in turn by means of a cleverly-told parable. The beginning of one is written thus:

KG 3/67–68/
rty xw βγ(y) / [mrmʾny w](ʾ)nw prmʾtδʾrt nγʾwš mwγʾ ʾyw prz-βr wʾβʾn kt ʾyw my(δ) …
"And Lord Mār Mani thus said 'Listen, magus, I will tell you a parable: One day…' "[22]

This scenario further emphasizes that the parable was a text to be used in teaching, and even convincing, both lay believers as well as outsiders to the religion. But I draw attention to the 2sg. imperative *nγʾwš* 'listen!', demanding the priest's attention to the coming orally delivered text. Interestingly, Mani uses the verb *nγʾwš*, which is the same verb on which the Sogdian word for 'Hearer', *nγʾwšʾk*, is based, rather than the common verb *ptγwš* 'listen!' from the same root; this places him in the same relation to the magus as an Elect is to a Hearer.

In another parable, an appeal to listen may also occur, if the fragmented Sogdian text is correctly understood. The manuscript is badly damaged at this point, but the example is worth citing, and may be valid as it is the first line of the parable:

20 Sundermann 1981, p. 125: "Höret ih[r], (geliebte Brüder)[?], Erwählte und Hör[er], …". Green 1994, pp. 96–99 and 204–205 has interesting comments about the reception of sermons by hearing, but also notes that especially collections of sermons could be meant both for public oral delivery and private reading.

21 Müller 1913, p. 21: "Herbei! Höret Hörer, kommet herbei, Hörer, höret." It should be noted that due to my use of the term 'Hearers', the translation results in a *figura etymologica* which does not exist in the original Parthian.

22 Edited by Sims-Williams 1990.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

AN/6/
rty nwkr kδry tγw pt[*γwš ’’z-’nt MN δynyh ZY MN sm’wtry*]
"And now, he[ar the parable of the Religion and the Ocean]."[23]

Regardless of whether the verb is correctly restored, one wonders to whom *tγw* 'you (sg.)' is addressed, or whether it is simply formulaic. Another scroll fragment possibly containing a parable may also attest a similar formula, though the Sogdian text is again damaged at the relevant point: So 13101/14 [*pt*]*γ’wš* ZY bg *’yw ’’z-’nt* "listen, lord, to a parable."[24]

Parable abstracts

The Sogdian parable of the 'Religion and the Ocean' is extant in two versions: one a redaction of more than 130 lines in the long scroll known as the 'Parable Book', and the other on the narrow fragment M 7420 of about 25 short lines which summarizes each of the parable's ten points by only three or four keywords per point (both were edited by Professor Sundermann)[25], for example:

§9 (abstract)
Ninth, concerning the twice-daily raising of the tide.

§9 (long redaction, epimythion)
Ninth, the strong giant of the ocean, which raises the tide and makes the whole ocean increase, is the Glory of the Religion …

The paper strip on which this text is written was cut from an older Chinese scroll, then lined and ruled specifically for it; today the beginning and end have been lost. Colditz has shown in a recent study that this text, and a number of similar ones, should be understood not simply as shorter versions of parables but as *abstracts* which capture, intentionally, the most important key words and phrases.[26] For some abstracts, a corresponding longer redaction is known (such as the parables of the lowly-born man and of the five brothers).[27] There are also examples of whole pages that contain a number of abstracts, most quite cryptic

23 The text was edited by Sundermann 1985, pp. 19–33: "Und] jetzt nun hö[re die Erzählung von der Religion und [vom Weltmeer.]".
24 The fragment is still unedited, but the line is published in Reck 2006, p. 74. One could in theory restore the verb [*n*]*γ’wš* instead, especially in light of the text of KG 3.
25 That fragment was first edited as ANe by Sundermann 1985, p. 36; for further comments on it see Colditz 2011, pp. 16–19. A second abstract of this text may exist on the fragment So 18070, but the fragment is too damaged to draw conclusions. The 'Parable Book' as well as related fragments are all being edited anew by the present author.
26 See Colditz 2011, pp. 19–22.
27 For an edition of the latter parable with corresponding abstract, see Reck 2009b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

since the longer version is not extant. The page M 127 (to which M1088 has recently been joined)[28] may contain up to ten abstracts in Sogdian. The abstracting technique seems, from that page, to have been simply to summarize the main narrative and epimythion in a few lines. In the following example, the gist of the narrative, as well as the moral point of it, are both quite clear despite the conciseness of the text. But what the Manichaean interpretation was can only be guessed at:

> M 127/10–14/
> One man was on the back of a [...] camel. / As people asked: where / are you going? He thus answered: I am going there, / where the mount may be taking me. He who / holds the pig's tail, is led to dirt and filth.[29]

The concise and abbreviated style of these abstracts is indicative of a mnemonic script aiding oral delivery, an *aide-mémoire*.[30] By providing a brief summary or the relevant keywords, such manuscripts would have assisted the lector, an Elect, with the oral delivery of a longer version.[31] The lector must have had prior familiarity with a 'base' text and would have been able to recite or improvise it with help from the abstract. Indeed, the delivery probably differed slightly each time it was given. Additionally, the loose page format of M 7420 further supports the idea that it was meant for use in an oral delivery scenario. If we recall the liturgical instructional text M 114 referred to previously, we note that it instructs one to read the 'Parable of the Prince with Candata's Son'. One would only be able to read it if one already knew the parable or had access to a written text, abstract or not, which would have been orally delivered. This text is a good exemplar of the issues at stake in our discussion. The Manichaean liturgical context appears to have been some kind of combination of literacy with orality. Despite the Manichaean emphasis on writing, their use of it was such that it coexisted with either (or both) a capacity to learn, remember, and orally deliver extensive texts and/or an ability to improvise the oral delivery thereof. One usually draws a contrast with the Zoroastrian tradition in this discussion, as that tradition emphasizes oral transmission over written transmission (it is worth remembering that the Zoroastrians wrote books, too). Though we have no detailed information on how the Manichaeans learned their hymns, liturgies, confessions, parables and so forth it is clear that they did not completely reject oral methods of transmission and recital.

28 For M 127 see Morano 2009, pp. 175–178. Morano has recently discovered that M 1088 completes the page of M 127 without a gap, for the complete text see Morano 2013.

29 Morano 2009, p. 177. The 'Three Fishes' text published as TaleC by Henning (1945, p. 471) is from this very manuscript page.

30 Suggested already by BeDuhn 2001, p. 190 with regards to the abstract of the parable of the 'Religion and the Ocean'.

31 Colditz 2011, p. 22.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Another example, the damaged and badly faded bifolio M 258 likewise seems to contain a number of parable abstracts in Parthian. The abstracts of this page are each only a phrase long, beginning with the word *až* 'about':

V/1–3/
ʾ[c] / (dy)w (ky)[ʾw] (cfʾr) br(ʾdr)ʾ(n) [ʾwjd] / (ʾwd qsdr brʾd ʾw dyw ʾwjd)
"About the demon who killed four brothers and the smallest brother killed the demon."

However, it is not clear whether they should be considered only as abstracts in the sense described here, or as perhaps an index to a book of parables.[32]

Parable abstracts require an oral delivery scenario or recital; it is hardly sensible to conceive of them as meant for individual reading. Abstracts then encourage us to think of the parable genre as an orally-delivered one, as Colditz already has suggested, and thus that the manuscripts of full-length parables could likewise be exploited for information on oral delivery.

'Once upon a time'

A well-known characteristic of oral delivery or oral performance is the use of repetitions or formulas.[33] In Iranian textual traditions, one may point to those repetitions of words, phrases, and whole stanzas that have been studied as evidence for oral transmission in Avestan texts.[34] Introductory phrases or formulas are one type of repetition; rather than functioning to unite the lector with the audience as with requests to listen, these phrases "appeal to the fondness of the audience for hearing things said in a familiar way."[35] The most familiar to us might be that known from the beginning of European fairy tales: 'once upon a time' (French 'au temps d'autrefois; il était une fois' and German 'es war einmal'). It is striking then, that the Sogdian equivalent of this expression is found in no less than five different parables (not all parables, of course, have an extant beginning):

AN/138–139/
rtm(s) (t)ym mʾyδ ptγwšty ʾYKZY prʾw ʾnyʾwr zmnw (ʾ)[δw kyrmy] wmʾtʾnt
"And further is heard: 'Once upon a time there were [two snakes]' "[36]

32 The page has never been edited in its entirety. Sundermann 2009a suggested that one abstract from the page implies an Iranian version of the tale of the 'Emperor's New Clothes'(!), while the text cited is perhaps an abstract of the parable of the five brothers, cf. Colditz 2011, p. 16 and Reck 2009b, pp. 252–254.
33 Crosby 1936, p. 102f.
34 See for example the important work of Skjærvø 1994, 2005.
35 Crosby, *loc. cit.*
36 Sundermann 1985, p. 28: "Ferner wurde vernommen, daß einst z[wei Schlangen] waren, …".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

L103/R/1–2/
pr nyʾwr zmnw ʾδw tʾyt mʾtʾnt
"Once upon a time there were two thieves"[37]

Ch/U 7115/V/1–2/
pr ʾnyʾwr z-mnw ʾyw wʾywkw mrty ʾskws(!)
"Once upon a time there was a hunter"[38]

TaleE/19–21/
qδwṭy pr nyʾwr jm(n)[w…]/ rʾmnd yʾβyy ʾṭy[ʾ]zt[yw…]/ βyyjyβrʾn šwʾzskwn[…](δ) I
"Once upon a time … always roving and exiled … he would go unhappy"[39]

O 9078/1
rty tym pr ʾnyʾwr (zmnw)
"Once upon a time"[40]

The phrase consists of *pr* 'at, in', *ʾnyʾwr* (a contraction of *ʾnyʾ* + *yʾwr* lit. 'another time') 'formerly, autrefois', and *jmnw* 'time': lit. 'in a former time'.[41] In another Sogdian parable, the beginning is similar but uses the word *ʾyw-pʾt* 'once' rather than the longer formula.[42]

So 11603+/4–5/
wʾnw cʾnw przβr wxsty ʾyw-pʾt ʾ(y)[w xrγwšy] / wmʾt
"As it is said in the parable: 'Once there was a rabbit' "[43]

In these examples, it is not only the phrase *pr ʾnyʾwr zmnw* 'once upon a time' which is formulaic, but also that it is accompanied by the introduction of the main character(s) of the narrative and a verb 'was'. That these texts open with such a formula is almost unquestionably a sign of either oral delivery or oral performance. The question is to which of the two – oral delivery or oral performance – the formula's existence in writing points.

In fact, we could argue for both. The formula introduces a parable, which for reasons detailed in previous sections ought to be regarded as an orally delivered text. In other words, the introductory formula under discussion here would have been read aloud from the manuscript, along with, of course, the rest of

37 Edited in Sims-Williams 1981, p. 236.
38 Edited in Reck 2009a, p. 10: "Es war einmal vor langer Zeit ein … Jägersmann". The strange form *ʾskws* is probably an error for the 3. sg. āz-impf. *ʾskwʾz*.
39 Sundermann (1985, p. 28, n. 93) correctly suggested that the formula also occurs in this text; the significance and meaning of the phrase was unknown to Henning (1945, p. 473f.) who first edited it. It is unclear from the ms. where the text begins and ends, and whether the story begun by this formula is embedded within another, different text.
40 The rest of the text on this fragment is not preserved, unfortunately.
41 Gershevitch 1954, §85, n. 1 and §479.
42 See Henning 1936, 106 for a discussion of *ʾyw-pʾt* 'once (only), nur einmal'.
43 Ed. Reck 2009a, p. 7f.: "… so wie <im> Gleichnis gesagt wird: Es war einmal ei[n Hase] …".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the parable. Evidence that the authors of the texts which begin with *pr ny'wr zmnw* themselves conceived of those texts as existing in oral setting is that, in two instances, the Sogdian conjunction *kaδuti* (Manichaean *qδwṭy*, Sogdian *'YKZY*), which most often is used to introduce direct speech, precedes the 'once upon a time' formula, marking it out in quotations, as it were.

But the formula also points to the heritage of the parable's narrative core as a folktale prior to its adaptation as a parable by the Manichaeans. Indeed it is because the Manichaeans frequently did adapt existing (folk)tales into parables that we find all attestations of this formula in parables.[44] This narrative material could only have been acquired orally.

Some conclusions about oral delivery

Professor Sundermann, in his important study of the Iranian Manichaean literary-categorical terms, implied in several places that oral delivery was the primary mode of reception of Iranian Manichaean prose literature in particular. It is worth citing at length the conclusion of his analysis of the Parthian term *wifrās* 'sermon':

> … *wifrās* originally and actually represented the oral sermon, … but then in the course of a progressive regularization of the forms of Manichaean worship, the wording of the sermons was also fixed in writing, either for the purpose of annual re-reading, or as the *guideline and basis for free address*.[45]

It is clear that Sundermann allowed for the possibility that the manuscripts of a sermon might not represent the only fixed version of a given text, nor even a fixed version at all, but simply the only version that is available to modern scholars. In other words, the setting down of a text in writing need not mean that that text ceased to exist in any other version besides the written one. One of the important conclusions of his study was that the literary-categorical terminology of Manichaean texts could shed light on the actual use of the manuscripts. That same possibility has been discussed here for the parables. On one hand, the parable abstracts require a scenario of oral delivery, but on the other, oral delivery can at least also be envisaged as one of several possibilities of the realization of the longer parable texts.

In particular, the benefit of a perspective such as 'signs of orality' is that it allows us to include all manner of information giving any clue about the

44 An example for which a non-Manichaean 'folkloric' version is known is the 'Monkey and the Fox' (see Sims-Williams 2010), which appears in Æsop. Evidence for the Manichaeans incorporating orally acquired material into various texts is also discussed in Skjærvø 2009.

45 Sundermann 1984, p. 232. My translation and emphasis.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

oral background of a written text. So, an introductory formula such as 'once upon a time' is evidence of orality prior to the text's being fixed in writing, and may also be evidence of the oral delivery of that very written text. These 'signs' are rife in Iranian Manichaean literature, from the more explicit, such as the instruction in a Parthian Monday-hymn to "Read ye the strict law and the writing"[46] to less obvious considerations such as the codicological (the shape and design of an abstract fragment) and paleographical (for example, YOSHIDA suggested to me in person that the purpose of the rather large script in the 'Parable Book' could be to facilitate oral delivery). Indeed, terms of literary genre such as *wifrās* 'sermon' and *āzand* 'parable' that suggest an oral background, according to SUNDERMANN, can also be considered 'signs of orality' from the perspective of this study.

Works cited

BEDUHN, J.D. 2001: *The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual*. Baltimore/London.

COLDITZ, I. 1987: "Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 14/2, pp. 274–313.

— 2011: "Parabeln und Parabelabstrakta – Beobachtungen zu gattungsübergreifenden Lehr- und Erzählmotiven in den iranischen Manichaica." In: Z. ÖZERTURAL/J. WILKENS (eds.): *Der östliche Manichäismus: Gattungs- und Werkgeschichte. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 4./5. März 2010.* Berlin/Boston (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge, 17), pp. 13–26.

CROSBY, R. 1936: "Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages." In: *Speculum* 11/1, pp. 88–110.

DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, D. 2008: "Aspects of the Organization of Manichaean Books in Central Asia." In: *Gazette du livre médiéval* 52–53, pp. 1–15.

— 2009 *et al.* (eds.): *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit. Vorträge eines Colloquiums zu Ehren W. Sundermanns.* Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 31).

GARDNER, I./S.N.C. LIEU 2004: *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.

GERSHEVITCH, I. 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford (Publications of the Philological Society 16).

GRAHAM, W.H. 1993: *Beyond the Written Word: Oral aspects of scripture in the history of religion*. Cambridge.

GREEN, D.H. 1994: *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800–1300.* Cambridge.

GULÁCSI, Zs. 2001: *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum; Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1).

46 M 5860 i/r/i/6–10/, ed. SUNDERMANN 1984, p. 232: "Das strenge Gesetz und die Schrift leset …".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Henning, W. B. 1936: "Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch." In: *Abhandlungen der (Königlich-) Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 10, pp. 1–143.
— 1943: "The Book of Giants." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 52–74.
— 1945: "Sogdian Tales." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 465–487.
Lieu, S. N. C. 1992: *Manichaeism in the later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Tübingen.
Morano, E. 2009: "Sogdian Tales in Manichaean Script." In: Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* 2009, pp. 173–200.
— 2013: "Una pagina da un libro sogdiano manicheo di storielle, parabole e aforismi." In: M. Capaldo/P. Lendinara/M. Negri (eds.): ΦΙΛΟΙΝ: *Scritti in onore di Mario Enrietti e Renato Gendre*. Alessandria (Alexandria VI), pp. 327–334.
Müller, F. W. K. 1913: "Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch (Maḥrnāmag)." In: *Abhandlungen der (Königlich-) Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 5, pp. 1–40.
Reck, Ch. 2006: *Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 18/4, Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 1).
— 2009a: "Soghdische manichäische Parabeln in soghdischer Schrift mit zwei Beispielen: Parabeln mit Hasen." In: Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* 2009, pp. 211–224.
— 2009b: "Snatches of the Middle Iranian 'Tale of the Five Brothers'." In: J. D. BeDuhn (ed.): *New Light on Manichaeism. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism*. Leiden, pp. 241–258.
Sims-Williams, N. 1981: "The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 44, pp. 231–240.
— 1990: "The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad II: Mani at the court of the Shahanshah." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4 [= *In honor of Richard Nelson Frye. Aspects of Iranian Culture*], pp. 281–288.
— 2009: "The Bactrian fragment in Manichaean script (M 1224)." In: Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* 2009, pp. 245–268.
— 2010: "A haunch of meat: A fable of Aesop in Sogdian and Old Turkish." In: R. Pintaudi (ed.): *Papyri graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen II). Essays and texts in honour of Martin Schøyen*. Firenze, pp. 197–201.
Skjærvø, P. O. 1994: "Hymnic Composition in the Avesta." In: *Die Sprache* 36, pp. 199–243.
— 2005: "The Importance of Orality for the Study of Old Iranian Literature and Myth." In: *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān. The International Journal of Ancient Iranian Studies* 5/1–2, pp. 1–23.
— 2009: "Reflexes of Iranian oral traditions in Manichean literature." In: Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* 2009, pp. 269–286.
Sundermann, W. 1984: "Die Prosaliteratur der iranischen Manichäer." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Middle Iranian studies: Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*. Leuven, pp. 227–241.
— 1985: *Ein manichäisch-soghdisches Parabelbuch*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 15).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2009a: "The Emperor's New Clothes." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 19, pp. 211–214.
— 2009b: "Manichaean Literature in Iranian Languages." In: R.E. EMMERICK/M. MACUCH (eds.): *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran. Companion Volume I to A History of Persian Literature*. London (A History of Persian Literature, vol. 17), pp. 197–265.
TREMBLAY, X. 2001: *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde: le manichéisme parmi les peuples et religions d'Asie Centrale d'après les source primaire*s. Vienna (Veröffentlichungen der Komission für Iranistik 28).
ZUMTHOR, P. 1987: *La lettre et la voix (de la 'littératur' médiévale)*. Paris.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Manichaean Fragment from the Oldenburg Archives*

Olga M. Chunakova, St. Petersburg

The collection of Manichaean fragments including those preserved by A. I. Kokhanowski, N. N. Krotkov, W. I. Roborowski, and S. F. Oldenburg is presently kept in the Central Asiatic Fund of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM RAS), formerly the Asiatic Museum. In the early 20th century, major Middle Persian fragments were published by C. Salemann[1] in his translations into German and Latin; in 2011, all the known fragments were translated into Russian and published[2]. It was quite recently that the Director of the St. Petersburg Department of the RAS Archives, Dr. I. V. Tunkina, was kind enough to draw my attention to a small (2.9 × 6 cm) Middle Persian Manichaean document designated as „fond 208, opis 1, delo 130, l.1" (henceforth referred to as Old.) bearing a note „Toyuq-Mazar, 1909" and kept in the Academician Oldenburg fund (1863–1934). It is well known that S. F. Oldenburg headed the first archaeological expedition to East Turkestan which in 1909–1910 performed the first study of the cultural monuments in the Turfan area including Toyuq-Mazar[3]. The excavations conducted at that site revealed about 100 handwritten fragments. Of those scraps of documents, about 50 were written in Uigur, but a few were in Chinese, Sogdian, and Sanskrit[4]. According to the inventories, this place was where two Middle Persian fragments were found that are now kept in the Central Asiatic Fund of the IOM RAS. They are: document S1 containing a list of prayers and homilies, published by Salemann 1904; and SI 3740, a narrow strip of fabric used for binding and displaying 40 washed and thus illegible lines on one of its sides. The Chinese texts discovered together with them indicate that they should be dated to the 8th–9th centuries. Almost seventy more Iranian Manichaean fragments found in Toyuq by the 1904–1905 Dr. A. von Le Coq expedition are kept in the Berlin Turfan collection[5].

* I would like to thank Prof. Dr. D. Durkin-Meisterernst for editing my article.

1 Salemann 1904; 1907; 1912.
2 Chunakova 2011.
3 Popova 2008.
4 Popova 2008, p. 157.
5 Boyce 1960, p. 130f., Reck 2006, pp. 320–322.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Middle Persian document from the Oldenburg fund is the middle part of a folio, written in a clear and nice hand in black, the lined paper has gone very dark. Altogether, its two sides contain 5 lines; at that, the top and bottom ones have only partial outlines of letters. Some letters written in three other lines have deteriorated and can barely be read, also because the paper was crumpled and has irreparable folds. However, the following words and letters can be read[6]:

Old.

A B

© Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS (Институт восточных рукописей РАН)

A

/1/ [ ]	/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ] prystg'n wyg(')[ ]	/2/ [ ] messengers… [ ]
/3/ [ ] ywjdhr(')n ky wyns(?)[ ]	/3/ [ ] the saints who… [ ]
/4/ [ ] 'c 'sm'n pr'c 'w(x) [ ]	/4/ [ ] from the sky to … [ ]
/5/ [ ](s)d (1)w(1)b [ ]	/5/ [ ]

B

/1/ [ ]	/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]h(y?) bwd 'wd hr(w) [ ]	/2/ [ ] … was, and all [ ]
/3/ [ ] (?)z bwyd 'wm pd n'm [ ]	/3/ [ ] … will be, and I? by name? [ ]
/4/ [ ] (?)ps(wd) hy qwš k'{.} n'm [ ]	/4/ [ ] … so that he?, when? name [ ]
/5/ [ ] (1)n(3?)(d) (3)[ ]	/5/ [ ]

6 Square brackets mark the edges of the folio, round ones indicate the suggested reading of a Manichaean letter, question marks mean that either a letter cannot be read or the translation is uncertain.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Notes

A /4/ *prʾc*: lit. "forward; in the direction of"; *ʾwx-* could be the beginning of the participle *ʾwxyst* „descended", cf. *ʾc ʾsmʾn frʾc [ʾ]wxyzyd* „he will descend from the sky" in S 14a V 5–6.

B /2/ or *hrw* "all, every".

B /3/ The pronominal enclitic with the coordinate conjunction *ʾwm* may express a dative or possessive ("and to me"; "and my …") rather than represent an agent within an ergative phrase. The preposition *pad* is equally polysemantic and difficult to translate outside the context; cf. *ʾwd pd ṯw nʾm ʾʾstwʾn hwm* "and in thy name we trust" in M 28 II R i 37 – V i 1[7].

B /4/ clearly legible is the verbal copula *hy,* probably denoting the present 2nd Sg., in which case the previous word should be a past participle, the verbal form being the past tense of either an intransitive verb, or a transitive one, the copula referring to the subject or the object accordingly. Besides, that copula could be perceived as a 3rd Sg. Optativ; then, the meaning would be "and may he be …". The exact meaning of the polysemantic conjunction *qw* ("that; in order to; therefore") accompanied by the 3rd Sg. enclitic cannot be specified outside the context. Between the conjunction *kʾ* and the noun *nʾm*, there are traces of a deleted letter.

In regard to the gradient, ductus, and shapes of the letters (ʾ, h, k, q, c, w, etc.), the hand of this document resembles that of two other Middle Persian fragments kept in the Central Asiatic fund of the IOM RAS, also written on lined paper preserving its color, S 14a (6.6 × 9.2 cm) with a margin, and S 14b (4.3 × 4.5 cm). According to their old designations, SI O/71 (Old.1) and SI O/72 (Old.2), they were also brought by S. F. Oldenburg's expedition, as it becomes now clear, accidently from Toyuq Mazar. It might be interesting to remark that the lexical content of the fragment Old. coincides with that of document S 14a (cf. line A 4). The shape and words preserved in the fragment Old. make it impossible to directly collate the two mentioned Middle Persian documents, but together, the three could well be fragments of one larger folio (possibly, a bifolio?).

Those fragments transliterated for the first time by C. Salemann[8] contain the following legible words.

7 Andreas/Henning 1933, p. 315.
8 Salemann 1912, p. 19f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

S 14a

© St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive, RAS (Санкт-Петербургский филиал Архива Российской Академии наук)

R

/1/ [ ] ’(1) [ ]
/2/ [ ]bzq[ ]
/3/ [zy]nd’n pry(s)[ ]
/4/ ’ndr h’n zynd’n ‘[5–6](t)(1) [ ]
/5/ hynd kyy ’’yb ’dwryn ‘y[ ]
/6/ ’[w]d dwd ’ndr ‘zwrdynd ’wš’[ ]
/7/ ’c ’yr hpt’d qwp’n tk(1–2)[ ]
/8/ ’wd nyr’pt hyn[d]
/9/ [ ] (g)rwyd (1)[ ]

/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ] a sinn[er?]
/3/ [pr]ison? send?[ ]
/4/ in that prison [ ]
/5/ <are>, when[9] the burning flame [ ]
/6/ and smoke, they? will turn back [ ]
/7/ from below seventy mountains [ ]
/8/ and cast down [ ]
/9/ [ ] will take? [ ]

V

/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]qs(1)[ ]
/3/ [ ]nd ’ny t[ ]
/4/ [ ] bwyd by(c) [4–5](h’n)
/5/ [ ] ‘y ’c ’sm’n fr’c
/6/ [’]wxyzyd ’wd ’dwr ‘y ’(h)[1–2]
/7/ [ ]ndg ’wl ’whryd ’wd pd
/8/ [ ](k)ynd ’wd ’ br
/9/ [ ][h’]n drwx(š)[ ]

/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [ ] some other [ ]
/4/ [ ] will be, besides [ ] (that?)
/5/ [ ] who from the sky to?
/6/ will descend, and the flame [ ]
/7/ [ ] will rise, and into?
/8/ [ ] and onto
/9/ [ ]those she- demon [s?]

9 As read by Salemann (1912, p. 19). In addition I have made a few corrections to my translation, e. g. in the grammatical tense of the verbs in S 14a V (6 and 7) (cf. Chunakova 2011, p. 67). It is possible that the designations R and V should be interchanged, as the wide outer margins seem to belong to the left side.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

S 14b

© St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive, RAS (Санкт-Петербургский филиал Архива Российской Академии наук)

R

1 [ ][p]d ʾ[ ]	1 [ ] into [ ]
2 [ ]wwšʾn ny h[ ]	2 [ ] they? not [ ]
3 [ ] hʾn rwc (ʿ)[ ]	3 [ ] that day [ ]
4 [ ] ° ʾwt ʾyʾd (h) [ ]	4 [ ] And your? memory [ ]
5 [ ]xyšm (ʿy) bzg (q) [ ]	5 [ ] the evil of sin? [ ]

V

1 [ ]ys [ ]	1 [ ]
2 [ ] hʾn dyw(ʾ)[ ]	2 [ ] those demons [ ]
3 [ʾ]wd pd sʾy(g) [ ]	3 [ ] and into the shadow [ ]
4 [ ]bt ky ʿyn ʾ(q) [ ]	4 [ ] which that one [ ]
5 [ ]pd zwd ʾc mrdwhm[ʾn][ ]	5 [ ] quickly from the people [ ]
6 [ ]	6 [ ]

With respect to their lexical contents, these fragments resemble a lot of cosmogonical and eschatological treatises and hymns, as well as the apocalyptical chapters of the *Šābuhragān* (here abbreviated to *Šb*)[10]. Noteworthy are the words *ʾʾyb* „flame“ (*Šb* 296, 309bis, 314 etc.) and *ʾʾyb ʿy ʾdwryn* „the burning flame“ (S 7 V I 17–18), *zyndʾn* „prison“ (S 9 R I 22) used in Manichaean texts to denote the human body and the material world in which the light elements

10 MacKenzie 1979; 1980.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

are imprisoned, *dyw* and *drwxš*, „demon and she-demon“ (S 9 R I 6, 7; *Šb* 243, 244, 248, 268, etc.). In S 14a R 5, 6 two of the five dark elements are mentioned: *dwd* „smoke“ and *ʾʾyb ʿy ʾdwryn* „the burning flame“. The word *ʾdwr*, of which a derivation is used in this context, seems to denote the light element in S 14a V 6. Such texts frequently mention *prystgʾn* „messengers“ (S 7 R II 9, 10, V II 7) actively participating in the process of the final liberation of the light from matter.

With so few legible words, it is hard to define the whole contents of the fragmented treatise. The text might well be about separating the interwoven dark and light elements when particles of light released from the material world rise while the dark ones descend and perish in the eschatological flame. The liberation of the light is facilitated, amongst everything else, by the messengers, and obstructed by the demons of both genders. One should note that a mythologema has so far remained obscure, the *hptʾd qwpʾn* „seventy mountains“ (S 14a R 7). No Iranian Manichaean texts provide evidence for this number of cosmological mountains, while Coptic texts mention no more than four[11]. The numeral, „seventy“, itself seems to be rare: the Parthian cosmogonical text M 183[12] mentions „seventy doors“ in the five walls around the world (14 x 5). A definite semantic load could also be carried by *hʾn rwc* „that day“ (S 14b R 3) (cf. *ʿym rwc* „this day“ in the hymns, denoting „the feast“ (Parth. M 137 I R 5, V 14[13], etc.), i. e. the one when the two essences finally get separated.

The conjunction with the pronominal 2nd Sg. enclitic *ʾwt* (S 14b R 4) and with the 1st Sg. enclitic *ʾwm* (Old. B 3) indicates that the treatise was written in the first person and had a specific addressee. It might be that it was a lengthy hymn addressing the deities and celebrating certain stages of cosmogonical history, apocalyptic events resulting in the liberation of light, individual and general eschatology. The noun *ʾyʾd* used next to *ʾwt* (S 14b R 4) frequently occurs in hymns; cf. *ʾwm ʾyʾd bwd hrwysp ṯymʾr* „and I recalled all my woes“ (M 273 R 14–16)[14]. The hymn was probably addressed to some divine entity perceived as the savior (e. g. Jesus); in that case, Old. B 3, 4 mentioned his name as *nʾm*.

It has already been mentioned that it was not possible to collate the fragments directly, but their contents lead to the assumption that S 14a V with its wide margin on the left-hand side, S 14b V mentioning „demons“ corresponding to the „she-demons“ of the former, and Old. A (under the condition that Old. is a part of the same page) should be identified as parts of the Recto side. Correspondingly, S 14a R, S 14b R, and Old. B could belong to the Verso side, as the words on Old. B seem to be logical at the end of the hymn.

11 Smagina 2011, p. 333f.
12 Sundermann 1973, p. 64.
13 Reck 2004, p. 93f.
14 Reck 2004, p. 173.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

It would seem that the three fragments are in no way similar to other Manichaean texts so far transliterated[15] and published as facsimile[16]; that makes their discovery in the Oldenburg fund all the more valuable.

Bibliography

Andreas, F. C./W. B. Henning 1933: "Mitteliranische Manichaica II." In: *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1933, pp. 294–363 [= Henning 1977, pp. 191–206].

Boyce, M. 1960: *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichean Script in the German Turfan Collection.* Berlin (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin; Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 45).

— 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes.* Téhéran/Liège (Acta Iranica 9).

Chunakova, O. M. 2011: *Manikhejskie rukopisi iz Vostochnogo Turkestana. Srednepersidskie i parfyanskie fragmenty. Vvedenie, transliteratsiya, perevod, kommentarij, prilozheniya. Faksimile rukopisej.* Moskva.

Henning, W. B. 1977: *Selected Papers I.* Ed. by J. Duchesne-Guillemin. Leiden/Téhéran/Liège (Hommages et Opera Minora 5; Acta Iranica 14).

MacKenzie, D. N. 1979: "Mani's Šābuhragān, pt. 1 (text and translation)." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42, pp. 500–534.

— 1980: "Mani's Šābuhragān, pt. 2 (glossary and plates)." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43, pp. 288–310.

Popova, I. F. 2008: "Pervaya russkaya turkestanskaya ekspeditsiya S. F. Oldenburga (1909–1910)." In: *Rossijskie ekspeditsii v Zentral'nuyu Aziyu v kontse XIX–nachale XX veka.* Sankt-Peterburg, pp. 148–157.

Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen.* Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 22).

— 2006: *Mitteliranische Handschriften.* Pt. 1: *Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift.* Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XVIII,1).

Salemann, C. 1904: "Ein Bruchstück Manichäischen Schrifttums im Asiatischen Museum." In: *Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg* 1904, pp. 1–26.

— 1907: "Manichaica I." In: *Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg* 1907, pp. 175–184.

— 1912: "Manichaica III." In: *Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg* 1912, pp. 1–32.

Smagina, E. B. 2011: *Manikhejstvo po rannim istochnikam*. Moskva.

15 Boyce 1975.

16 Sundermann 1996; Weber 2000.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sundermann, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer.* Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 4).
— 1996: *Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts in early publications (1904–1934). Photo Edition.* London (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Supplementary Series, vol. III).
Weber, D. 2000: *Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts in publications since 1934. Photo Edition.* London (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Supplementary Series, vol. IV).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mani's Reaction to the Doctrine of the Baptismal Sects Concerning Man's Redemption from Evil

Luigi Cirillo, Naples

Since the beginning, both the orthodox Church and the baptismal sects, born on its fringes, have performed the rite of baptism. Assigning to water a peculiar nature, sects have always considered it to be an essential part of this rite. One can cite as an example the Mandaic tradition,[1] according to which – influenced by mythical speculations – baptismal water is water of the Jordan River, which Mandaeans identified with the "living water". It comes from the "Realm of the Light" and can give life. On the basis of similar mythical speculations, also those Baptists belonging to the gnostic tradition and mentioned in the *Elenchos* (the *Refutation of All Heresies*, composed in the first half of the third century), saw the water utilized in their baptism as if it were an element originating from the superior world, therefore able to carry human rebirth into effect. In some sects, moreover, as baptismal water was connected to Thales' philosophy, it was reputed to be the primeval element of all things. Therefore, life itself (that is, the spiritual rebirth of human beings) comes from water. That was not the case at the beginning of the history of the Church. The Jewish-Christian community of Jerusalem continued to administer baptism by means of water following John's custom. Nevertheless, on the basis of Apostle Peter's words in *Ac* 1,38, the Church of Jerusalem gave baptism "in the name of Jesus", clearly stating that its validity and effectiveness were connected uniquely to the "name". As a matter of fact, the Christian baptismal formula interrupted the continuity of John's baptism. John himself, moreover, had spoken of a deep difference between his baptism and the baptism that Jesus would give "in the Holy Spirit" (cf. *Mt* 3,11f. and the parallel text *Lk* 3,16; cf. *Jn* 1,33). At the beginning of the history of Christianity, the Jewish baptismal custom of John was assiduously retained only by his disciples (termed *John's disciples* in the available sources). Such a custom was similar – in some respects – to that performed among both Essenes and members of Qumran community. John's disciples, indeed, were not even aware of the existence of the Holy Ghost.[2] As is well known, a vast bibliography has been developed about these questions.[3]

1 See Rudolph 1961.
2 *Ac* 19,1–7.
3 Some titles: Brandt 1910a, 1910b; Thomas 1935; Braun 1957; Rudolph 1981.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In the history of the heresiological sects baptism is a vast and complex sphere. In my short contribution to Professor Werner Sundermann's memorial volume, I will take into account the baptism administered by the sects of Elchasaite provenance. My choice of the topic is motivated by the importance of an essay – belonging to Sundermann's vast bibliography – titled "Iranische Lebensbeschreibungen Manis" (in: *Acta Orientalia* 36, 1974, pp. 125–149). In that article, through a brilliant philological and critical investigation (see pp. 128–130) Sundermann confirms that Mani undoubtedly knew Elchasai's relationship with the Baptists among whom Mani himself lived for 20 years, from circa 220 to 240 CE, before he founded his Church. Mani's life among the Baptist community is now a universally accepted event and a unique source for investigating the origins of history of Mani's life history and of his religious thought. He made his decision to move (so to speak) toward "another form of Christianity" precisely in order to react against "the baptism" of the Baptists of Elchasaite descendance. Sundermann's aforementioned essay begins with the philological examination of a Parthian fragment. Its surviving lines, on the *recto,* contain a date that, as expected, referred to an event in the life of Mani. Sundermann stated that the only possible reconstruction of what has survived on the *recto* of the fragment was a reference to the year 539 of Alexander's reign. Now, from the *Shâbuhragân* we know that Mani dated the remarkable events of his life. Furthermore, we know that Mani connected 539 – the year of the Babylonian Astronomers – to his first revelation, which he received when he was 13 years old (that is, in 228 CE). This was thus the event that originally constituted the topic of the fragment. On the other hand, on the *verso*, only the name "Elchasai" (written: *'lxs'*) has been preserved. Elchasai was the founder of the Baptists among whom Mani lived until he decided to leave them (in circa 240 CE). Sundermann's reconstruction of the Parthian fragment corresponds to the story of Mani's life, as the sources present it.[4] From more than one perspective, Werner Sundermann's article is a milestone in the study of Manichaeism. In my opinion, the name "Elchasai" was most probably related to Mani's first revelation, thus in some way connected to Mani's religious experience. Indeed, it was precisely in this Baptist community that Mani opened a way that led him to found his Church, after having experienced the uselessness of the baptismal custom. Consequently, my short presentation of the history of baptismal sects will start from the ancestors of Mani's Baptists – the Elchasaites. Then I will present the baptismal tradition inherent in the Pseudo-Clementines and the gnostic baptismal tradition mentioned in the *Elenchos*. Finally, I will conclude with the radical criticism that Mani expresses of all that past tradition, completely wiping out everything that had previously been said about baptism intended as a remedy for man's evils.

4 Al-Nadîm *Fihrist*, see Dodge 1970, I, p. 773ff.; II, p. 811 *(The Mughtasilah)*. See also Flügel 1862, pp. 133–136. *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* (further CMC) or *Mani Codex*, see Koenen/Römer 1988; Römer 1994, pp. 121–192.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1. The Elchasaites

The fundamental literary sources about the Elchasaites are the following three:

1. Book IX of *Refutation of all Heresies (Elenchos)*;
2. Origen's *Homily on Psalm* 82;
3. a few passages from the text on three heresies in Epiphanius' *Panarion*: *haer.* 19, 30 and 53.

The Elenchos is a work written in Rome in the first half of the third century, a little after the death of the bishop Callistus (217–222 CE). All the information relevant to our topic supplied by the author of the *Elenchos* comes from Alcibiades, a missionary who arrived in Rome from the city of Apamea in Coele Syria, bringing with him a copy of Elchasai's *Book of Revelation*. The author of the *Elenchos* characterized this copy in the following way: "the written words of Alcibiades" (*tà autoû engrapha,* cf. IX, 14,3b). It was, therefore, the source of Alcibiades' doctrines (= *dogmata, Elenchos* IX, 13,6). These "written words" were a Greek version of the *Book of Revelation*. The most important information we possess thanks to Alcibiades' *engrapha* concerns:

– the origins of Elchasai's *Book of Revelation* and, indirectly, also Elchasai's provenance from Parthia;
– the fact that Elchasai trusted a Baptist community (the *Sobiai*) with this book. It had been revealed by two Angels – a man and a woman – of gigantic height: the man was the Son of God and the woman was the Holy Spirit (IX, 13,2–3);
– a baptism that gave "a new remission of sins" and, therefore, was "a second baptism" (IX, 13,4 and 15,1–3);
– a baptism intended as a remedy for the bite of a rabid dog (IX, 15,4–6). Now we turn our attention to the last two baptismal rites.

Presumably, the second baptism must be related to a first baptism (cf. the expression *baptisasthô ek deutérou*). It concerned particular sorts of sins: bestiality, incest, adultery, and fornication. In order to obtain forgiveness for these sins, the believer had to be baptised a second time in the name of the great and the most High God and in the name of his Son, the mighty King. Moreover, the believer had to invoke in his favour "the seven witnesses that have been described in this book (namely, the *Book of Revelation*): heaven, water, the holy spirits, the angels of prayer, oil, salt, and the earth". The syncretic nature of such a rite is evident. A peculiar baptismal rite was prescribed in order to be healed from the evil caused by the bite "of a rabid dog *(kuôn lyssôn)*, possessed by a spirit of destruction" (IX, 15,4–6). It should be noted that, according to Peterson[5],

5 See Peterson 1959, pp. 221–235.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

such a dog could damage everybody, both men and women, both boys and girls. In order to be healed from this bite, it was necessary to immediately immerse oneself in the water of a river or of a spring, wearing all one's clothes, praying to the great and highest God, and calling upon the seven witnesses described in this book. After that, the person had to swear that he would not commit a sin anymore. Peterson, on the basis of the affinities between the *kuôn lyssôn* in the *Elenchos* and the texts of the Pseudo-Clementines on the *lyssa* (fury)[6] – as a synonym of the *epithymia*, passion or sexual desire – concluded that baptism against a dog bite actually was intended as a remedy against evil desire, that is, concupiscence.

Origen's knowledge of the Elchasaites originated from the preaching of a missionary who had gone to Caesarea in Palaestina. This is also the place where Origen living in the same period, namely around the middle of the third century. Origen mentions two ideas which emerged from the preaching of the Elchasaite missionary:

1. the revelation of the sect's holy book (the book of the Elchasaite revelation "has fallen from heaven");
2. the faith in the revealed message gave the "remission of sins, a remission (of sins) different from that given by Jesus Christ".

In Epiphanius' monumental (but confused) work about heresies, composed between 374 and 376 CE), which he titled *Panarion* (the chest of remedies against all heresies), he arranged all the available information concerning the Elchasaites under three heresies: the *Ossaeans*, the *Ebionites*, and the *Sampsaeans*. Epiphanius was in possession of several kinds of data. He made use of two sources, written and oral. First of all, we will turn our attention to the oral source. It consisted of a Transjordanian tradition, where the carriers of this tradition – who corresponded to the three aforementioned heresies – were living. On the other hand, Epiphanius' written source was a book titled "Elxai" – the Aramaic form of the name Elchasai – referred as *en tôi Elxai* (in the book "Elxai"), cf. *haer.* 19, 6,4 and 30, 17,4. The author of the *Elenchos*, too, was aware of the existence of an old book named after a certain Elchasai (cf. *Elenchos* X, 29,1).

It is difficult to say who the Ossaeans were, partly because only Epiphanius speaks of them. He sums up their doctrines in *haer.* 19: in 19, 1–2 Epiphanius clearly states that the Ossaeans were Jews; in 19, 1,4 he writes that Elxai joined the Ossaeans. Now, it is unlikely that Elxai himself (who, according to *haer.* 19, 1,4, lived in the days of the emperor Trajan and, according to the *Elenchos*, acted within Parthia) could have joined the Ossaeans, who were settled in Transjordan on the other shore of the Dead Sea (cf. *haer.* 19, 1,2). By saying that Elxai had joined the Ossaeans, Epiphanius meant, perhaps, that the book "Elxai" spread among the Ossaeans, as part of a fusion of the Ossaeans and

6 Cf. *Hom.* II, 2,3; III, 68,2; IV, 21,4 and XI, 26,4.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the Elchasaites. We cannot exclude historical relations between the Ossaeans and the Essenes.[7] In the context of the Ossaean heresy (cf. *haer.* 19, 3,6 and 7), Epiphanius says that Elxai condemns sacrifices as being alien to God and as never having been offered to God at all "as appears from the Fathers and the Law". Immediately after that, Epiphanius states that water is accepted by God, while fire is alien to Him. He quotes, to this purpose, the following *logion* of Elxai's (from the book titled "Elxai"):

> Children, do not go toward the sight of fire, for you shall err. This is an error, because, he says, you see it quite near and it is far away. Do not go toward the sight of it but rather go to the voice of water.

Epiphanius' Ebionites were not the Judeo-Christians of the heresiological tradition.[8] We find them mentioned for the first time by Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I, 26,2. Probably they were the Judeo-Christians who abandoned Jerusalem in the face of the city's collapse caused by the First Jewish-Roman War. Subsequently they took refuge in Transjordan, where they mixed with the Baptists who had adopted the book "Elxai", in use in that area (cf. *haer.* 30, 3,7). In this way they lost their original identity. Such an event could explain why Epiphanius ascribed the Elchasaites' doctrines and customs to the Ebionites. In *haer.* 30, 17,4, for example, Epiphanius speaks of the baptismal rites aimed at healing both diseases and "snake bite". Peterson[9] makes use of convincing argumentations in order to show that the baptism against "snake bite" was analogous to that prescribed against the bite of a rabid dog, according to the author of the *Elenchos* IX, 16,4–6. Also in the case of the interpretation of the snake bite, as we see from some Pseudo-Clementine texts (cf. *Hom.* X, 5,1; XI, 11,4; XI, 18,1), it is clear that we are not dealing with a real snake, but with an allegorical snake (a snake hidden in a man's heart). At the bottom of such an idea we find the Jewish doctrine of the "bad instinct" *(yeser hâ-râʿ)*, which is connected to concupiscence.[10] Also, the baptism against a snake bite involved both immersion in flowing water and the invocation of the holy names of the baptism mentioned in the book "Elxai": the sky, the earth, the water, the winds, the angels of justice, the bread, and the oil.

Sampsaeans settled both in Peraea – on the eastern coast of the Dead Sea – and in the area of Moabitis, around the Arnon river and beyond it, in Ithuraea and Nabatitis (*haer.* 53, 1). They were the remnants of the ancient Ossaeans (*haer.* 19, 2,2) and inhabited the territories of their ancestors (cf. *haer.* 19, 1,2). According

7 It is evident from local geography that the Ossaeans most probably were the heirs of the ancient Essenes. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* V, 17, places the Essenes near to the Dead Sea. As for the interpretation of the name *Ossaeans*, in Epiphanius' text we read *stibaron genos* (19, 1,3). In Pliny's text the Essenes are defined as *gens aeterna*.

8 See Hilgenfeld 1966, p. 421ff.

9 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 224ff.

10 Cf. Strack/Billerbeck 1961, p. 466ff.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

to *haer.* 19, 2,4, Sampsaeans were a heresy of the fourth century. Therefore, they were contemporary with Epiphanius, who most probably learned from them the most part of the information provided in his work. Their doctrines are listed in *haer.* 53, 1,4,7, where Epiphanius indicates their baptismal rites in the following very synthetic way: they honour God by performing certain baptisms (53, 1,4). Moreover, Epiphanius adds that Sampsaeans worship water like a deity and affirm, more or less, that *life comes from water.*

On the basis of Epiphanius' presentation of the three sects, it is clear that the Elchasaite groups were concentrated in the areas of Transjordan where – as we may think – an unknown missionary probably had brought the book titled "Elxai". As we have seen above, the Elchasaite doctrine spread in Rome too, because Alcibiades had brought Elchasai's *Book of Revelation* there.

2. The baptismal tradition in the Pseudo-Clementines

The texts relevant to us here are the section of *Hom.* XI, 24–27 and the parallel section of *Rec.* VI, 7, 1–3; 8, 1–7; 9, 1–6; cf. *Rec.* IX, 7, 5–6. The herald of the baptismal doctrine is the apostle Peter who talks to the pagans of Tripolis of Phoenicia. At the conclusion of his discourse, Peter deals with two points: knowledge of God and baptism, and man's right path. The first step in the discourse is learning to know "the cause of all" from inferior things. Therefore Peter takes into account Thales' philosophical principle: water is both the primeval element of the world and the principle of everything.[11] However, immediately after that, Peter corrects Thales' statement by affirming that water is moved by the "spirit", which, in turn, originates from the God of all (see *Gn.* 1,1–2).[12] Peter's statement makes sense only if we interpret the Greek word *pneuma* (of the *Septuaginta*) according to the original meaning of the Hebrew word *ruaḥ* (that is, a force, a moving principle able to carry life). Therefore, Peter says: if it is true that water creates everything, in Thales' philosophy, it should be taken into consideration that it is moved by "the breath/wind" and that, in turn, breath/wind depends on the God of all. The implicit conclusion is that the principle of everything is not water but God. This is the way, as Peter states, to attain God by reason. The second step: from knowledge of God to baptism. When a man has been rationally instructed about his origins, this knowledge leads him to understand that he must be regenerated, because his present condition is very different from his original condition. The regeneration is brought into effect by the baptismal water, which, ideally, does not belong to the earth, it is the primeval water (cf. *protogonô udati*), the water coming from the superior world. In this way, it is possible to retrieve Thales'

11 See the fragments in Dumont/Delattre/Poirier 1988, pp. 10 and 22.
12 The quotation of Moses' words is found in *Rec.* VI, 7,2.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

principle. As we have seen, the Sampsaeans affirmed that *life originates from water* (Epiphanius, *haer.* 53, 1,7). Now, baptismal water, so perceived, has the power to let a man become the heir of his ancestors (God's Spirit and the Water), who have generated him for incorruptibility (*pros aphtarsian, Hom.* XI, 24,2). Here a strong opposition between the original *aphtarsia* and the shallowness where man is found because of his carnal birth, is evident. Hence the human need for the original incorruptibility through baptism. In Peter's discourse (*Hom.* XI, 26,1), changing or abandoning the "first birth" – provoked by *epithymia* – is the typical effect of baptism. It is impossible – as Peter concludes – to obtain salvation otherwise, according to the words of the Prophet (that is, Christ, "the Prophet of truth" in the christological doctrine of the *Pseudo-Clementines*). These words basically correspond to the quotation of *Jn* 3,5. "Therefore flee to the waters – Peter says in his exhortation – for this alone can quench the violence of the fires" (*Hom.* XI, 26,2). Such violence in other Pseudo-Clementine texts corresponds to the impetus of bad desire. The parallel Pseudo-Clementine text – *Rec.* IX, 8,4–5 – confirms Peter's words in this way: baptismal regeneration extinguishes the fire of the old birth, that is the birth occurred by means of the fire of lust.

3. Baptismal rites in the gnostic milieu

A peculiar chapter in the history of the baptismal movement is represented by a few gnostic sects according to which "the living water" was an instrument for gaining spiritual re-birth, namely redemption from material chains. With regard to these sects, our source is the *Elenchos* again, specifically the passage where the author speaks about Naassenes (V, 9,18–22), Sethians (V, 19), and Justinus the gnostic – in the book entitled "*Baruch*" (V, 27). We should take special interest in Naassenes. According to this sect, human regeneration comes from water. This water is the water of the Euphrates, one of the four branches of the river originating in Eden (cf. *Gen* II, 10–14) and considered to be the image – the *antitypos* – of the water which is found in the superior world "above the firmament" (cf. *Elenchos* V, 9,18)[13]. Following Thales, Naassenes considered the water of the superior world to be the world's primeval element and the constituent element of every being, both mortal and immortal, animated or inanimate (*Elenchos* V, 9,13). The water of the superior world is the "living water" the Saviour was talking about in *Jn* 4,10. Every being draws from this water which belongs to its inner substance *(tò oikeîon)* (*Elenchos* V, 9,18,21–22), but, in particular, the Naassenes, "the spirituals", the real Christians (V, 9,18,21–22; GCS 26, pp. 101, ll. 25–27; 102, ll. 11–17). However, it is difficult to say whether the purification the Naassenes spoke of was carried into effect through proper baptismal rites.

13 In GCS 26, pp. 102, l. 22.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

4. Mani's criticism

Mani's Baptists were the most eastwardly Elchasaite community we know of. They purified (lit. "baptised") the vegetables they ate – grown in their garden. Furthermore, every day they purified their bodies (lit. "baptised themselves"). Hence the term *Hemerobaptistai*.[14] Mani drastically criticized the Elchasaite baptismal system in conversations with them where he showed them that both their "doctrines" and their "mysteries" (*tà mysteria* = their baptismal rites) did not correspond to the Saviour's precepts. In this context the Saviour is the Jesus of the New Testament tradition (according to the Manichaean interpretation)[15].

In the text of the *Mani Codex*, Mani starts his criticism with the purification of vegetables, that is, baptism of foodstuffs. He shows that the washing they applied to their food does not possess any value, for this body is defiled and molded in a mold of defilement (CMC 80,22–82,22). Therefore, whether you cleanse your food or not – as Mani says – you can see that "from it still come blood and bile and flatulence and excrements of shame and (the) defilement of the body". However, if one abstains from eating this food for some days, one realizes at once that all these "offals of shame (and) loathsomeness" are no longer found in the body. But, if one takes food again, in the same way the offals again abound in the body, so that they come from the food itself. On the other hand, it is impossible to distinguish between purified food and the food which has not been purified ("the loathsomeness and dregs of both are seen as not differing from each other"). It is thus impossible to distinguish between the food that has been washed, rejected and thrown away and the food that has not been purified.

Similarly, daily immersion for purification in water does not possess any value (CMC 82,23–83,19):

> For having been washed and purified once and for all, why do you wash again each day? So that also by this it is manifest that you are disgusted with yourselves each day and that you must wash yourselves on account of loathsomeness before you can become purified. And by this too it is clear most evidently that all the foulness is from the body.

The impossibility of obtaining purification shows that the Baptists' "act" – *tò pragma* (CMC 84,8) – namely their baptismal rite, comes about without a precept from the Saviour. From this we deduce that, according to Mani, the baptismal rites do not belong to the "Christian tradition". Purification can only concern the human soul.[16] Mani then concludes in a very precise manner:

14 Cf. Henrichs 1974, 1979; Koenen 1981; Rudolph 1974; Merkelbach 1988.
15 Cf. Sundermann 2001.
16 This principle is shared with the Neo-Platonist tradition; Iamblicus (250–330 CE) speaks of it in his treatise titled *On the Soul* [according to Joseph Bidez].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

"The purification, then, which was spoken about, is that which comes through knowledge, a separation of Light from Darkness, of Death from Life, of Living Waters from Turbid (Waters)" so that everyone realizes that each element of these pairs is not equal to the other and "you shall observe the precepts of the Saviour", so that he might save (redeem, cf. *apolytrôsetai*) your soul from death and destruction (CMC 84,8–12).[17]

We should note two aspects of this conclusion:

1. baptism with water does not depend on a precept of the Saviour;
2. purification, which was spoken about, comes through knowledge (through *gnôsis*).

Regarding the first aspect, Henrichs and Koenen, in their commentary on the Mani Codex,[18] have provided vast documentation showing that the baptism of the Baptists Mani describes did not depend on a precept of the Saviour. Therefore, their baptismal custom did not belong, in principle, to the Christian tradition. The first series of texts concerns the difference between baptism administered by John, the Baptist, and the baptism given by Jesus (*Mk* 1,8 and parallel texts: *Mt* 3,11ff.; *Lk* 3,16; cf. *Jn* 1,33). While John – who can be considered the model for baptismal practices in the Jewish tradition – baptised in water, Jesus baptised in the Holy Spirit. Consequently, it can be deduced that the baptism given by Jesus did not depend on the rite of water. According to other texts, Jesus condemned the purification performed by Pharisees, who were more interested in exterior purification than in the interior act (*Mt* 23,25 and *Lk* 11,38f.). *Jn* 1,33 returns to the tradition of Mark: John was sent to baptise in water; Jesus, on the other hand, baptises in the Holy Spirit. In *Jn* 4,2 we read that Jesus himself did not administer baptism: his disciples did.

Regarding the second aspect, we are not able to ascertain if the words quoted in the CMC 84,9–85,1, were the actual words that Mani said to the Bapists in that occasion.[19] Their form and content rather reflect Mani's mature way of thinking, expressed when he had already become the *archegos* of his Church. But the historical situation of these words corresponds to the period when Mani, the "disciple", "stood up and talked *syn chrêstotêti* to his teachers, the Baptists" (cf. CMC 80,21). If we take into account the way the Codex was composed,[20] the content of such a criticism corresponds substantially to what Mani remembered saying on that occasion and what Baraies, one of his first disciples, wrote down.[21]

17 The English texts of this section are extracted from Cameron/Dewey 1979.
18 Henrichs/Koenen 1978, pp. 143–145, n. 204ff.
19 Unfortunately, at the present time a study of the historicity of Mani's *logia* does not exist. The same is true of the Jesus *logia* about which an extensive philological-critical study confirming their historicity has not yet been performed. We face the same problem when dealing with the founders of the major religions.
20 To understand how CMC was composed cf. Merkelbach 1992.
21 Cf. Tardieu 1991.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Baraies' notebook was subsequently used by the final editor of the Codex concerning Mani's criticism of the baptism. In any case, Mani said what authentic purification is and also what it involves: according to him, purification is essentially outlined in the Scriptures and comes from "knowledge" of oneself. It implies the consciousness of the human condition, which is due to the mixture of two opposed primordial "Natures" and its consequences. This knowledge must lead everybody to separate in his own life that which corresponds to the opposing "Roots of the being", that is to separate Light from Darkness, Death from Life, Living Waters from Turbid Waters, so that everyone realizes that the elements of these pairs are not equal to each other. In this way one returns to the time before time, when the mixture of the two Natures began. Furthermore, Mani said: "you shall observe the precepts of the Saviour, so that he might save (redeem, cf. *apolytrôsetai*) your soul from death and destruction".[22] In this context, the precepts of the Saviour should be, strictly speaking, the precepts of the Encratites. Therefore, the "knowledge" and the observance of the precepts redeem the man. This was the true purification that the Baptists should have observed, but they deviated from it by continuing to cleanse their bodies in water – an entirely unwarranted action because the body is by nature unclean. In this conclusion we should include all the evils for which baptism was considered a remedy, as we have seen in the previous baptismal traditions. Mani's final solution to the problem of redemption is neat: to practice "knowledge" or to face definitive destruction and ruin.

Bibliography

Brandt, W. 1910a: *Die jüdischen Baptismen oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum mit Einschluss des Judenchristentums*. Gießen (Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beiheft 18).

— 1910b: *Jüdische Reinheitslehre und ihre Beschreibung in den Evangelien*. Gießen (Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beiheft 19).

Braun, H. 1957: *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus (Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte).* Vol. 1: *Das Spätjudentum*. Tübingen (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 24).

Cameron, R./A. J. Dewey 1979: *The Cologne Mani Codex "Concerning the Origin of His Body"*. Missoula (Text and Translations 15, Early Christian Literature Series 3).

Dodge, B. 1970: *The Fihrist of al-Nadîm. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. 2 vols. New York/London (Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies 83).

Dumont, J.-P./D. Delattre/J.-L. Poirier (eds.) 1988: *Les Présocratiques*. Paris (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade 345).

22 With regard to the integration of the damaged parts of the Code and the understanding of the text, cf. *apolytrôsetai*, and Koenen 1981, pp. 736–738.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Flügel, G. 1862: *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Manichäismus. Aus dem Fihrist des Abû'lfaradsch Muḥammad ben Isḥaḳ al-Warrâk, bekannt unter dem Namen Ibn Abî Ja'kûb an-Nadîm, im Text nebst Uebersetzung, Commentar und Index zum ersten Mal herausgegeben*. Leipzig.

GCS 26 = P. Wendland (ed.): *Hippolytus Werke*. Vol. 3: *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Leipzig 1916.

Henrichs, A. 1974: "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists. A Historical Confrontation." In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77, pp. 23–59.

— 1979: "The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered." In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83, pp. 339–367.

Henrichs, A./L. Koenen 1978: "Der Kölner Mani-Kodex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780). ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΕΝΝΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΣΩΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ. Edition der Seiten 72,8–99,9." In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 32, pp. 87–199.

Hilgenfeld, A. 1966: *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt*. Hildesheim.

Koenen, L. 1981: "From Baptism to the Gnosis of Manichaeism." In: B. Layton (ed.): *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism. Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28–31, 1978*. Vol. II: *Sethian Gnosticism*. Leiden, pp. 734–756.

Koenen, L./C. Römer 1988: *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes. Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition*. Opladen (Papyrologica Coloniensia 14).

Merkelbach, R. 1988: "Die Täufer, bei denen Mani aufwuchs." In: P. Bryder (ed.): *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5–9, 1987, Department of History of Religions, Lund University, Sweden*. Lund (Lund Studies in African and Asian Religions 1), pp. 104–133.

— 1992: "Wann wurde die Mani-Biographie abgefaßt, und welches waren ihre Quellen?" In: G. Wiessner/H.-J. Klimkeit (eds.): *Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 6.–10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 23), pp. 159–166.

Peterson, E. 1959: *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Studien und Untersuchungen*. Herder/Rom/Freiburg/Wien.

Römer, C. E. 1994*: Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibiographie. Textkritischer Kommentar und Erläuterungen zu p. 121–p. 192 des Kölner Mani-Kodex*. Opladen.

Rudolph, K. 1961: *Die Mandäer*. Vol. 2: *Der Kult*. Göttingen (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, N. F. 57).

— 1974: "Die Bedeutung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismusforschung." In: *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*. Paris, pp. 471–486.

— 1981: *Antike Baptisten. Zu den Überlieferungen über frühjüdische und -christliche Taufsekten*. Berlin (Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse 121/4).

Strack, H. L./P. Billerbeck 1961: *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Vol. 4/2: *Exkurse zu einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments. Abhandlungen zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Archäologie*. München.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sundermann, W. 2001: "Christ in Manichaeism." In: Ch. Reck/D. Weber/C. Leurini/A. Panaino (eds.): *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann*. Vol. 1: *Studien zur Lehre und Geschichte des Manichäismus*. Rome (Serie Orientale Roma 89), pp. 5–12.

Tardieu, M. 1991: "Les disciples araméens de Mani." In: *Annuaire du Collège de France* 42, pp. 506–509.

Thomas, J. 1935*: Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et en Syrie (150 avant J. C.–300 après J. C.*). Gembloux.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Manichäische Parabeln – didaktische Literatur für Hörer?*

Iris Colditz, Berlin

Neben vielen anderen Forschungsgebieten der Manichäismuskunde und der Iranistik, denen sich Werner Sundermann widmete, hat auch die iranische Parabelliteratur der Manichäer immer wieder seine Aufmerksamkeit gefunden. Von großer Bedeutung sind auf diesem Gebiet seine großen Texteditionen, wie die von Parabelsammlungen (Sundermann 1973) und des soghdischen *Parabelbuches* (1985), aber auch Untersuchungen zur literaturhistorischen Einordnung der Parabelliteratur (1984b) und zur Vermittlung narrativer Motive durch die Manichäer (1991; 2009a). Unter seiner wissenschaftlichen Anleitung begann meine eigene Beschäftigung mit den Turfantexten ebenfalls mit der Edition von Parabelbruchstücken (Colditz 1987). Somit schließt sich gewissermaßen ein Kreis, wenn mein Beitrag der Frage nach der Bestimmung und Funktion der Parabeln im Kontext der manichäischen Kirchenhierarchie nachgeht. Ich verbinde damit meinen tiefen Dank und meine Wertschätzung für das wissenschaftliche Lebenswerk meines Lehrers, Doktorvaters und Kollegen Werner Sundermann, dessen Gedenken der vorliegende Band gewidmet ist.

Parabeln hatten eine klare didaktische Funktion[1] innerhalb der manichäischen Gemeinde, aber es ist weniger offensichtlich, ob sich ihre Moral ausschließlich an die Laien, die manichäischen Hörer, richtete. Um darauf eine Antwort zu finden, soll im folgenden zunächst ein kurzer Überblick über die Entwicklung der literarischen Kategorie der Parabel im Kontext der Entstehung und Verbreitung des Manichäismus gegeben werden. Anschließend sollen Kriterien ausgearbeitet werden, welche eine Charakterisierung von Parabeln als „Texte der Erwählten“ oder „Texte der Hörer“ ermöglichen.

* Der Beitrag ist hervorgegangen aus einem in englischer Sprache gehaltenen Vortrag während des Workshops „Texts of the priests – texts of the laity“ des Käte Hamburger Kollegs „Dynamiken der Religionsgeschichte zwischen Asien und Europa“ an der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 20.–21. Februar 2014.

1 Nahezu die gesamte manichäische Prosaliteratur, die didaktische Sermone, Parabeln, Beichttexte und Briefe umfaßt, hat eine didaktische Funktion (Sundermann 2009b, S. 207).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1 Die Entwicklung der manichäischen Parabelliteratur

Die Entwicklung der manichäischen Literatur ist eng mit der Entwicklung der manichäischen Kirche verbunden.[2] Bücher spielten in Mission und Katechese eine entscheidende Rolle. So führten die Missionare Manis kanonische Schriften auf ihren Reisen in die verschiedenen Regionen mit sich. Die Bücher wurden übersetzt und terminologisch an die sprachlichen, kulturellen und religiösen Gegebenheiten der Missionsgebiete angepaßt. All das ging über ihren rein physischen Transfer von einem Ort zum anderen hinaus und kann Veränderungen in Form und Funktion der Texte bewirkt haben.

Der Manichäismus begann seinen Weg in Mesopotamien mit der Offenbarung der göttlichen Wahrheit an Mani zwischen dessen 12. und 24. Lebensjahr, d. h. 228–240 n. Chr., durch seinen spirituellen Zwilling. Schon bald darauf begann Mani, seine Lehre öffentlich zu predigen und Anhänger zu gewinnen. Es ist schwierig zu beurteilen, in welchem Ausmaß bereits Mani in seinen kanonischen Schriften Gebrauch von Parabeln machte. Von diesen ursprünglich in Aramäisch verfaßten Texten sind heute nur noch Fragmente ihrer Übersetzungen in andere Sprachen (Mittelpersisch, Parthisch, Soghdisch, Alttürkisch, Griechisch, Koptisch) sowie Zitate daraus in christlichen antihäretischen Schriften und in Büchern islamischer Historiker erhalten. Insbesondere Manis „Gigantenbuch“[3] hat narrativen Charakter. Es erzählt die im „Henochbuch“[4] überlieferte Geschichte der gefallenen Engel, der „Wächter“ (griech. ἐγρήγοροι, kopt. ⲛⲉⲅⲣⲏⲅⲟⲣⲟⲥ, aram. *ʿyr* > mp. *ēr*, sonst mp. *dēwān*, soghd. *δēwt* „Dämonen“), die vor der Sintflut mit den Menschentöchtern Kinder zeugten, die Riesen (griech. γίγαντες, kopt. ⲛ̄ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲅⲁⲥ, aram. **gabbārē*, hebr. *nəfīlīm*, mp. *kawān*, soghd. *kawišt*). Dabei adaptiert Mani jedoch diese Erzählung für seine eigene Lehre, indem er sie erscheinen läßt als „a grandiose parable illustrating the defeat of the spirituality of the body by the Light Nous and the awakening of the spirituality of the ‚New Man‘“.[5] Ein anderes kanonisches Buch, der „Schatz des Lebens (oder: der Lebendigen)“[6] enthielt vermutlich den kosmogonischen Mythos von der Verführung der Archonten. Bei dem verschollenen Buch „Pragmateia“[7] könnte sich um ein historisches Traktat gehandelt haben, das Mythen und Legenden einschloß. Alternativ identifiziert es Sundermann (2005) mit Manis Buch „Ārdhang“ und dieses als sein „Bild“ mit bildlichen Illustrationen seiner Lehre. Die erhaltenen

2 Zu einem Überblick über die iranisch-manichäische Literatur vgl. Boyce 1968; Sundermann 2009b.
3 Ed. Henning 1943; Morano 2009a; 2011; Sundermann 1984c; 1989a; 1994b; Wilkens 2000.
4 Zum „Henochbuch“ vgl. Reeves 1992; Stuckenbruck 1997.
5 Sundermann 2009b, S. 216.
6 Vgl. Sundermann 2009b, S. 215f.
7 Vgl. Sundermann 2005.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Teile des nichtkanonischen „Šābuhragān“[8], eine Šābuhr I. gewidmete Synopsis der manichäischen Religion in Mittelpersisch, enthalten kosmogonische, eschatologische und autobiographische Passagen und Ermahnungen für Hörer. Parabeln scheinen nicht dazugehört zu haben. Da Mani mit dem Werk wohl den Wunsch verband, den König zu seiner Religion zu bekehren, ist dieses Buch an einen potentiellen Hörer gerichtet. Allerdings hatte Mani wohl auch die zoroastrischen Priester als Zielgruppe im Sinn, seine Rivalen um die religiöse Gesinnung des Königs.

Andere Formen nichtkanonischer Literatur schließen die Überlieferungen der Worte und Taten Manis ein und wurden ursprünglich von seinen Jüngern in Aramäisch niedergeschrieben. Diese Tradition ist in koptischer Übersetzung in zwei Kodizes erhalten, den „Kephalaia des Lehrers“ und den „Kephalaia meines Herrn Mani“.[9] Daneben gibt es auch iranische Versionen, die deutliche inhaltliche Übereinstimmungen zur koptischen aufweisen.[10] Die Darlegung des kosmogonischen und eschatologischen Mythos nimmt in den Kephalaia einen großen Raum ein. Mani flicht in seine didaktischen Lehrreden (Sermone)[11] Metaphern ein, um seine dogmatischen Lehren zu illustrieren. Einerseits ist diese Bildsprache von den neutestamentlichen Gleichnissen inspiriert. Aber die manichäischen Texte geben diese nicht wörtlich wieder, sondern adaptieren ihre Erzählmotive und interpretieren sie aus manichäischer Sicht (z. B. Lk 8.4–15: Gleichnis vom Sämann). Dafür wurde das *Diatessaron* herangezogen, die Evangelienharmonie des Tatian (2. Jh.), die in der syrischen Kirche bis zum 5. Jh. in Gebrauch war.[12] Eine andere Quelle für solche Motive ist die Gnosis, im besonderen das im apokryphen *Thomasevangelium* überlieferte syrische „Lied von der Perle“[13]. Jedoch werden diese Gleichnisse, die Mani zur Illustration seiner Religion verwendet, nicht mit einer Erklärung versehen und können deshalb nicht als Parabel im engeren Sinn bezeichnet werden. Stattdessen werden Vergleiche zwischen einer fiktiven Erzählfigur und einem dogmatischen Element aufgestellt, die mit typischen Formeln wie „… gibt es …, … gleicht …, indem … gleich … (tut)“ / „wie nun …, so auch …“ / „so (ist es) auch (mit) …“ eingeleitet werden. Dennoch können diese Analogien als der Ursprung der späteren ausführlichen Parabeln betrachtet werden.

Hagiographische Sermone bilden eine weitere Gruppe dieser Literatur. Sie können ebenfalls auf die manichäische Jüngertradition zurückgeführt werden

8 Ed. MacKenzie 1979, 1980; Sundermann 1981, S. 93f.; Hutter 1992.
9 Ed. Polotsky/Böhlig 1940; Böhlig 1966; Funk 1999, 2000; Giversen 1986; Gardner/BeDuhn/Dilley 2015.
10 Vgl. u. a. Sundermann 1992b; 2009b, S. 224–228.
11 Die Sermone haben ihren Ursprung in der syr. *mēmrā*-Literatur (Sundermann 1984b, S. 230–232; 2009b, S. 208).
12 Vgl. Sundermann 1986, S. 90.
13 Ed. Feirrera 2002.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

und sind heute in Kopien aus Zentralasien in Mittelpersisch, Parthisch und Soghdisch erhalten. Auch sie weisen enge inhaltliche Bezüge zu den koptischen Kephalaia auf.[14] Diese Texte berichten von Manis Leben und Passion und von der manichäischen Mission im sasanidischen Iran und seinen Nachbarregionen, wie Palmyra, Armenien, Georgien und Tūrān (Balučestān). Sie nennen Personen, denen Mani und andere Missionare am sasanidischen Hof oder während ihrer Reisen begegneten, die aber oft anonym bleiben und nur „ein Schüler", „ein Gerechter", „ein(e) Hörer(in)" genannt werden. Aber es gibt auch Nichtmanichäer darunter, wie „die Täufer" oder „ein Weiser".[15] Darüber hinaus reflektieren die hagiographischen Sermone bereits Themen des Gemeindelebens, wie religiöse Gebote, Almosenspende oder Bedenken von Gläubigen bezüglich Sünden und Erlösung. Sicher muß dabei auch mit einer hagiographischen Stilisierung dieser Texte sowie mit einer Legendenbildung um den Religionsstifter gerechnet werden. In diesem Kontext finden sich Beispiele für Parabeln, die diese Themen diskutieren und dabei helfen sollen, das religiöse Wissen der Gemeindemitglieder darüber zu verbessern. Und es ist gerade dieser Kontext, in dem die Parabel als solche ihre spezifische literarische Form und Funktion entwickelt.

Die Ausbreitung des Manichäismus nach Westen, in das Römische Reich und Ägypten, aber auch in die östlichen Regionen, wie Iran, Mittel-, Zentralasien und China, machte seine Anpassung an die Sprachen und Kulturen der Missionsgebiete notwendig. So spiegelt die Terminologie der mittelpersischen Manichaica den iranischen Hintergrund (potentieller) zoroastrischer Konvertiten zum Manichäismus wider. Die parthischen Texte zeigen eher einen terminologischen Einfluß des Buddhismus, bewahren aber ebenso Elemente des Aramäischen als der Sprache des Kanons.[16] Die in die Texte integrierten Parabeln zeigen die Bemühungen um die Verstärkung der manichäischen Mission und die Festigung der bereits bestehenden Gemeinden. So kritisiert Mani beispielsweise die Totenklage, die auch aus zoroastrischer Sicht abgelehnt wird, indem er der Hörerin *Xēbrā* eine Parabel erzählt.[17] Die Texte thematisieren die unterschiedlichen Aufgaben und Funktionen der beiden Gruppen der manichäischen Gemeinde[18]: das Werk der Lichtbefreiung (kultisches Mahl, Gebete, Hymnen) und der Gemeindebelehrung der „Erwählten" (mp. *wizīdag*, parth. *wižīdag*, soghd. *wičītē*, lat. *electus*, kopt. ⲉⲕⲗⲉⲕⲧⲟⲥ) bzw. „Frommen" (mp. *dēnwar*, soghd. *δēnāvar*, *δēnδār*) oder „Gerechten" (mp., parth. *ardāw*, soghd. *artāw*)

14 Vgl. Sundermann 2009b, S. 230. Das koptische sogenannte „Historische Buch" ist bis auf wenige Blätter verloren (Pedersen 1997).

15 Zum Spektrum sozialer Kontakte der Manichäer vgl. Sundermann 1984a, S. 273; Colditz 2000, S. 29–39.

16 Zu einer Untersuchung am Beispiel von Götter- und Dämonennamen vgl. Sundermann 1979.

17 Mp. M45 (Sundermann 1973, S. 89f., Text 26.1; 1981, S. 89). Vgl. auch Colditz 2017.

18 Zur manichäischen Kirchenorganisation vgl. jetzt auch Leurini 2013.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

und die Almosengaben (mp., parth. *ruwānagān*, soghd. *rwānayān*, *ərwānayān*, *rwānakān* neben *rwānspāse* „Seelendienst") der „(Laien-)Hörer" (mp. *niyōšāg*, parth. *niyōšāg*, soghd. *niyōšāk*, lat. *auditor*, kopt. ⲕⲁⲧⲏⲭⲟⲩⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ) für die Erwählten, was zugleich als fromme Tat für die künftige Erlösung der Hörer beim Letzten Gericht galt.

Besonders in Zentralasien fand der Manichäismus zu einer neuen Blüte. Die meisten manichäischen Funde in iranischen Sprachen und in Alttürkisch stammen aus dem uighurischen Königreich von Qočo (Mitte 9. Jh.–1368 n. Chr.). So entwickelten sich stabile Gemeinden und florierende Klöster. Mit Beginn des 11. Jh. wurde der Manichäismus unter den Uighuren durch den Buddhismus verdrängt. Im 14. Jh. finden sich dann stark sinisierte Gemeinden in Fujian in Südostchina, wo der Manichäismus als lokaler buddhistischer Volkskult des 摩尼佛 *Moni fo* „Buddha Mani" endete.

Die Parabel hat sich erst in der ostmanichäischen Literatur zu einem eigenständigen literarischen Genre entwickelt[19], das durch folgende Attribute charakterisiert ist:

1. Didaktische Funktion

Reck[20] zufolge wird eine „Erzählung […] zur Parabel, wenn sie zur Veranschaulichung einer Belehrung benutzt wird." Diese engere Definition der Parabel unterscheidet sich von einem breiteren Konzept, das auch Analogien, Gleichnisse und andere Arten von Narrativen einschließt.

2. Formale Struktur

Eine Parabel kann gekennzeichnet sein durch eine Überschrift, die einen literarischen Terminus für „Parabel, Erzählung"[21] enthält: mp., parth., soghd. *āzend* < av. *ā-zanti-* „Verständnis, Auslegung, Erklärung (der heiligen Texte)" (Bartholomae 1904, Kol. 342). Allerdings bezeichnet der Terminus in manichäischen Texten die Erzählung selbst und nicht deren Auslegung. Ein weiterer und durchaus mehrdeutiger Begriff für „Parabel" ist parth. *saxwan* „Wort, Rede", der auch für Abhandlungen, Sermone, Versreden sowie Abschnitte daraus verwendet wird. Der eigentlichen Parabel geht eine kurze Einführung voraus, in der der Rahmen der Erzählung dargestellt wird (z. B. trifft Mani jemanden oder belehrt die Gemeindeversammlung) und die typische Einleitungsformeln verwendet. Obwohl Parabeln auch Unterhaltungswert besitzen, erschöpft sich ihre Funktion nicht darin. Sie sind begleitet von einer religiösen „Moral", einer

19 Vgl. Sundermann 2009b, S. 234.

20 Vgl. zum folgenden Reck 2009b, S. 214f.

21 Zu den literarischen Termini vgl. Sundermann 1984b, S. 229–232, 237–238; 2009b, S. 210, 212; Durkin-Meisterernst 2011, S. 40f. In christlich-soghdischen Texten übersetzt *āzend* wahrscheinlich syr. *taš'īṯā* „narratio, Geschichte", aber auch *šarḇā* „Erzählung, Geschichte, Rede, Abhandlung" (Sundermann 1984b, S. 238).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Erklärung bzw. Interpretation der Parabelgeschichte in Form eines Epimythion bzw. Promythion (mp. *wizārišn*, parth. *wižēhišn*, soghd. *xwēčakāwe*). Darin werden die Figuren und Gegenstände der Parabel mit solchen der manichäischen Lehre identifiziert.

3. Inhalt

Die handelnden Personen der Parabel bleiben meist anonym und fiktiv. Sie stehen eher für soziale Topoi (ein Mann, eine Frau, ein Reicher, ein Händler, ein Mönch, ein Jäger usw.). Auch Tiere treten auf (Schlangen, Affen, Hasen usw.). Die Erzählmotive weisen Einflüsse verschiedener Ursprünge auf. Parallelen in anderen Literaturen zeigen, daß die Manichäer nicht nur Geschichten aus dem Neuen Testament adaptierten, sondern auch aus der jüdischen (Henochbuch), der indischen *(Pañcatantra)* und der buddhistischen Literatur *(Jātakas, Avadānas)*, aus den Pahlavi-Texten (*Kalīlag ud Dimnag* > arab. *Kalīla wa Dimna*) sowie auch aus den Fabeln des Äsop.[22] Selbst der manichäische Mythos kann zum Gegenstand von Erzählungen werden (z. B. Parabel von der *Daēna*).[23] Der Stil der Parabeln ist narrativ, d. h. einfach und durch Wiederholungen gekennzeichnet.

4. „Sitz im Leben"

Parabeln können zwar auch in didaktische oder hagiographische Sermone integriert sein, die vielleicht auf Mani selbst zurückgehen. Die typische literarische Form in der ostmanichäischen Tradition ist jedoch die Parabelsammlung, eine Kompilation mehrerer Parabeln, wie z. B. das soghdische „Parabelbuch" *(Āzend-nāmē)*.[24] Sie sind vielleicht das Ergebnis eines stärkeren buddhistischen Einflusses, indem sie dem Muster von *Jātaka-* und *Avadāna-*Sammlungen folgen.[25] Die Auslegung der Parabeln ist jedoch rein manichäisch. Sie behandeln dabei nicht nur dogmatische Fragen, sondern beziehen auch weiterhin Probleme des Gemeindelebens ein. Texte mit liturgischen Anweisungen zeigen, daß Parabeln auch ihren Platz in der Liturgie der zentralasiatischen Kirche hatten. So heißt es in einer soghdischen Zwischenüberschrift zu einer parthischen Parabel, sie sei „an einem *J̌āydān*-Montag zu verkünden"[26], dem Montag vor oder nach dem Bēma-Fest, dem höchsten Feiertag der Manichäer, der dem Gedenken an Mani gewidmet war. An diesem Tag baten sie

22 Vgl. Asmussen 1966; Sundermann 2009b, S. 234f.
23 Vgl. Reck 2003.
24 Ed. Sundermann 1985. Zu weiteren Parabelsammlungen vgl. Henning 1945b; Sundermann 1973, S. 83–109; Colditz 1987; Morano 2009b; Reck 2009a, 2009b; Sims-Williams 1981, S. 236–238. Besonders unter den soghdischen Texten finden sich viele Parabeln, vgl. Reck 2006, S. 353f., Nr. 3.4.
25 Vgl. Sundermann 1973, S. 5.
26 M44/R/9/ (Colditz 1987, S. 300f., Text 2, Z. 160). Vgl. Henning 1945a, S. 155, Anm. 1; Sims-Williams 1981, S. 236f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

um Vergebung ihrer Sünden. Man stellte sich vor, daß Mani selbst an diesem Tag aus dem Paradies herabsteige und als Richter auf dem Thron (Bēma) Platz nehme.[27] Diese liturgische Funktion der Parabel wird auch durch das „Bet- und Beichtbuch" bestätigt, das Beichtformulare für Erwählte, Hymnen und Gebete enthält und eine Beschreibung des liturgischen Ablaufs gibt. In einer soghdischen Liturgie des „Körper-Seele-Ritus", die mit diesem Buch in Beziehung steht, heißt es: „Wenn der Tag sich neigt, so lasset eine Parabel vortragen, (z. B.) (parth.) ‚Der Prinz mit dem *Čandā[la(?)]*-Sohn'."[28] Dieser Rezitation folgt eine „Körper-und-Seele-Hymne", danach die Erklärung (wohl der Parabel, nicht der Hymne). Die Liturgie wird fortgesetzt mit dem kultischen Mahl der Erwählten am Abend, begleitet von Gebeten und Hymnen. Diese Beispiele zeigen die Bedeutung von Parabeln im liturgischen Kontext und ihre didaktische Funktion, die weit über eine bloße Unterhaltung der Zuhörer hinausgeht.

2 Kriterien für eine Charakterisierung von Parabeln als „Texte der Erwählten" oder „Texte der Hörer"

Lassen sich Parabeln in Bezug auf die Kirchenhierarchie als „Texte der Erwählten" oder „Texte der Hörer"[29] charakterisieren und wenn ja, nach welchen Kriterien? Die Beantwortung dieser Frage wird erschwert durch die Fragmentarität der meisten manichäischen Texte, schlecht erhaltene oder unvollständige Überschriften, das Fehlen von Kolophonen und das dadurch bedingte eingeschränkte Textverständnis. Dies gilt umso mehr, wenn das Epimythion einer Parabel nicht erhalten ist. Um die Parabeln möglicherweise einer der beiden hierarchischen Gruppen zuzuordnen, sollen sie unter folgenden Fragestellungen analysiert werden:

- Wer verfaßte die Parabeln?
- Wer sind die handelnden Personen der Parabeln?
- Wer sind die Adressaten der Parabeln?
- Was ist die Funktion der Parabeln im Gemeindekontext?

27 Zum Bēma-Fest und der Montagsliturgie vgl. Sundermann 1990; Reck 2004, S. 5–35.
28 M114/R/7/–/V/1/ (Henning 1937, S. 47, Text Ad, Z. 7–9).
29 Leurini (2013, S. 74–85) vertritt die These, daß die Kenntnis vor allem der kanonischen Texte auf die Elekten beschränkt war und Hörer demnach nur der Lesung aus den Büchern zuhörten bzw. die Bilder dazu anschauten. Doch auch die Kenntnisse der Elekten seien nach der kirchlichen Hierarchie gestaffelt gewesen. Leurini verbindet die einzelnen kanonischen Werke mit den Rängen der manichäischen Kirche, wonach Hörer einzig mit Manis „Lebendigem Evangelium" vertraut gewesen seien. Vgl. aber Colditz 2015b, S. 1–2.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

2.1 Autor, Schreiber, Stifter

Auch wenn die Überschrift einer Parabel erhalten ist, wird der Verfasser normalerweise nicht genannt. Stattdessen bezeichnet sie den Gegenstand der Parabel, z. B. mp. *āzendān īg panǰ brādarān nimāyēd* „Die Parabeln von den fünf Brüdern wird gezeigt“[30] und parth. *ud až ādur wuzurg āzend* „Aus der Parabel vom Großen Feuer“[31]. Es ist deshalb schwer zu entscheiden, ob eine Schlußformel einer Parabel wie mp. *hanǰaft āzend ī Bašndād* „Vollendet ist die Parabel von Bašndād“ bedeuten soll „Vollendet ist die Parabel *über* Bašndād“ oder „Vollendet ist die Parabel *des* Bašndād“, d. h. ob der genannte Bašndād (wenn es sich um einen Personennamen handelt) eine Erzählfigur oder der Autor der Parabel ist.[32]

Parabeln innerhalb von didaktischen und hagiographischen Sermonen werden vor einer Person oder einer Versammlung rezitiert. Meist ist Mani der Vortragende und der Deuter der Erzählung. Die Metaphern, die er dabei benutzt, sind aus den Evangelien adaptiert oder beruhen auch auf einer genauen Beobachtung des täglichen Lebens (Mutter und Kind, Jagd, Handel und Handwerk, Reichtum und Armut). Auch professionelle Geschichtenerzähler können eine Quelle für Erzählmotive in den manichäischen Parabeln darstellen.[33] In einem hagiographischen Text wird eine Erzählung von dem Missionar Mār Ammō oder von seinem Dialogpartner, dem „Geist der Chorāsāngrenze“ *(wāxš ī hwarāsān wimand)* namens Baγard, vorgetragen.[34] Allerdings bezieht sich dieser Abschnitt auf ein Kapitel aus dem kanonischen Buch „Schatz des Lebens“ und somit auf Mani selbst.

Parabelsammlungen sind nach buddhistischen Vorlagen gestaltet, jedoch lassen sich die Kernmotive zumindest einiger Parabeln möglicherweise auf Manis Schriften zurückführen. So hat die soghdische Parabel von einem Jungen, der sich taubstumm stellt, eine Parallele im buddhistischen *Mūgapakkha-Jātaka*, aber dem Epimythion zufolge erzählt Mani die Geschichte einem Magier.[35] Die Parabel von den zwei Schlangenbrüdern im soghdischen „Parabelbuch“ weist Übereinstimmungen mit wesentlichen Elementen und Schlüsseltermini mit Manis „Šābuhragān“ und verwandten Texten auf.[36] Sogar die soghdische „Parabel von der Religion und dem Weltmeer“ im selben Buch, bei der es sich um eine Adaption

30 Mp. Überschrift einer parth. Parabel: M6470/V–R/Ü/ (Sundermann 1973, S. 94, Text 28, Z. 1826–1827 mit der Korrektur Reck 2009a, S. 252f.).

31 Parth. M35/V/3/ (Henning 1943, S. 71f., Text N, Z. 21).

32 Mp. Titel in einer parth. Parabel: MIK III 8259/I/R/ii/2/ (Sundermann 1973, S. 99, Text 33, Z. 1924).

33 Zu diesen Barden (mp. *huniyāgar*, *huniwāz*, parth. *gōsān*) vgl. Boyce 1957; Sundermann 1997a, S. 67; 80f., §80; 128, Anm. 80,1; Macuch 2009, S. 117.

34 Mp. M2/II/V/i/31/–/V/ii/37/ (Andreas/Henning 1933, S. 305f.).

35 Soghd. Ch/So12400, Ch/U6926, L60+L68+L69+L83a–c+L87 (Sims-Williams 1981, S. 238; Reck 2006, S. 75–77, Nr. 74). Henning (1937, S. 99, Anm. zu d9; vgl. aber 1945b, S. 487) und Klimkeit (1993, S. 154, Anm. 42) verbinden diese Erzählung ebenfalls mit der o. g. Parabel „Der Prinz mit dem *Candā[la(?)]*-Sohn“.

36 Vgl. Colditz 2015a.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dieser Allegorie aus dem *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* handelt, zeigt Parallelen zu Texten der frühen manichäischen Tradition, wie dem mittelpersischen Text über die „Zehn Vorzüge von Manis Religion" und dem koptischen 151. Kephalaion.[37] Viele Narrative scheinen also Mani zugeschrieben zu werden, aber es ist unklar, ob er diese wirklich selbst verfaßt hat. Ein von Mani geschriebenes Parabelbuch ist nicht bekannt. Deshalb muß man wohl eher annehmen, daß seine ursprünglichen Allegorien und Lehrstoffe von seinen Jüngern und später den Erwählten weiterentwickelt wurden, die über das erforderliche Wissen über die religiöse Lehre verfügten. Die Erwählten waren es auch, die die Parabeln im Rahmen von Katechese und Gottesdienst rezitierten. Unter den manichäischen Texten finden sich Parabelabstrakta, die vermutlich zum Einprägen der Erzählstoffe dienten.[38]

Auch die manichäischen Schreiber gehörten dem Erwähltenstand an, sie genossen eine hohe Wertschätzung und werden in Hymnen an die Hierarchie gepriesen und auf Miniaturen dargestellt.[39] Personennamen von Schreibern finden sich an Hymnenenden, in Schreibübungen und Beichttexten. Das soghdische „Parabelbuch" erwähnt einige Personen, die an der Abfassung der Kopie im 9. Jh. mitgewirkt haben, darunter ein Schreiber namens *Nawĕmāx*.[40] Ihre soghdischen bzw. alttürkischen Namen deuten eher auf Hörer als auf Erwählte hin, da letztere in der Regel westmitteliranische kirchliche Namen tragen. Eine weitere Personengruppe, die in Beziehung zu Büchern steht, sind Stifter, die für das Kopieren oder Übersetzen von manichäischen Büchern spendeten. Dies wurde als fromme Tat für ihr Seelenheil angesehen. Diese Praxis zeigt sich ebenfalls an der Nennung ihrer Namen am Ende von Hymnen und Textpassagen.[41] Allerdings sind solche Namen nur selten in Parabeln belegt. Unter den Namensträgern sind Erwählte, aber auch Hörer.[42]

2.2 Handelnde Personen

Parabeln reflektieren die politischen, sozialen und ökonomischen Bedingungen ihrer Entstehungszeit und -region, wenn auch nur andeutungsweise. Mit ihrer Weiterverbreitung lösten sich die Erzählmotive von diesem Hintergrund und

37 Mp. M5794+M5761+M6062 (Andreas/Henning 1933, S. 295–297; Sundermann 1981, S. 131–133, Text 24.1; Lieu 2006, S. 151). Keph. (Funk 2000, 370.17–375.6). Vgl. Sundermann 1985, S. 7; 24, Anm. 57; Böhlig 1988, S. 30–32; Oerter 1988, 1990.

38 Vgl. Colditz 2011.

39 Vgl. Andreas/Henning 1933, S. 325; Gulácsi 2001, S. 92–94.

40 Sundermann 1985, S. 33–35, Text c; vgl. auch Colditz 2013, S. 18.

41 Vgl. Gabain 1964, S. 188f.; Sundermann 1992a, S. 73f. Zu einer alternativen Erklärung vgl. auch Colditz (i. E.).

42 Der mp. Name *Dōšist-Mānī* (M338/B/7/, ed. Sundermann 1973, S. 109, Text 39, Z. 2109; 1994a, S. 255, 259) ist vermutlich der eines Erwählten, aber soghd. *[ ]g-farn* (M47/I/R/3/, ed. Sundermann 1981, S. 102, Text 10, Z. 1578) oder alttürk. *Änük Čor Ïnal* (So10100m/R/7/, unpubl., vgl. Reck 2006, S. 37f., Nr. 25) deuten auf Hörer.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

wurden oft zu „Wandermotiven", die nicht mehr mit der historischen Realität in Verbindung gebracht werden können. Wie bereits erwähnt, repräsentieren die handelnden Personen in Parabeln meistens literarische Figuren, wie „ein Mann", „eine Frau", „ein Dieb" usw. Doch in einigen Fällen gibt es einen direkten Bezug zu Erwählten beziehungsweise Hörern. So enthält Manis „Gigantenbuch" Parabeln an Hörer[43], die durch einen direkten Vergleich des Hörers mit einer Figur der nachfolgenden Parabel eingeleitet werden: „Der Hörer, der (dies und jenes tut) ist wie ein … der (dies und jenes tut)" (mp. *niyōšāg kē … čaʾōn … kē …*). Andere Parabeln stellen einen solchen Bezug schon in der Überschrift her: „Über die Parabel von der Hörerin Xēbrā" (parth. *abar āzend až Xēbrā niyōšāgčān*).[44] Auch in anderen Parabeln werden Hörerinnen behandelt, z. B. über Verführungsversuche durch Ahreman, denen sie widerstehen müssen.[45] Einige Parabeln konzentrieren sich aber auch auf die Erwählten. Im „Sermon über (oder: für?) die Erwählten" (parth. *wižīdagān saxwan*) veranschaulicht Mani deren Werk und die damit verbundene Gefahr möglicher Sünden am Beispiel eines Handwerkers, der mit Feuer hantiert.[46] Andere Parabeln behandeln die Auseinandersetzung mit anderen Religionen. So lehrt Mani im „Sermon von den Ungläubigen" (parth. *Awāwarīgān saxwan*) über die vormanichäischen Apostel und die spätere Verfälschung ihrer Lehren sowie über die Verführung von Manichäern durch Ungläubige anhand einer adaptierten Version des Gleichnisses vom Sämann.[47]

2.3 Adressaten

Aus der Auslegung der Parabel (Epimythion) ist ersichtlich, an wen sie sich richtet. Viele Parabeln behandeln allgemeinere religiöse Gegenstände, wie Kosmogonie oder das Schicksal der von ihrer göttlichen Heimat getrennten Lebendigen Seele. Aber in einer Reihe von Erzählungen werden die literarischen Figuren mit den Gruppen der manichäischen Kirchenhierarchie identifiziert. So kann ein König, Prinz, Höfling oder Weiser den Erwählten symbolisieren, während ein Mann niedriger Herkunft für den Hörer stehen kann.[48] Ein Geschenk, ein Schatz oder die Lieblingstochter, die einem König präsentiert wird, repräsentieren die Almosen, welche die Hörer den Erwählten darbieten. Das rituelle Mahl der Erwählten kann als Hochzeit bezeichnet werden. Somit wird die Kirchenhierarchie durch die Parabelauslegung auf die Parabel übertragen.

43 Mp. M101a, M101d, M101f, M101h, M101m, M101n, M911 (Henning 1943, S. 58–60; 63–65, Text A, Z. 160–286).
44 Parth. M45/V–R/Ü/ (Sundermann 1973, S. 90, Text 26.1, Z. 1740–1741).
45 Parth. M4576 (Sundermann 1981, S. 57–60, Text 4a.2).
46 Parth. M4577 (Sundermann 1981, S. 60–62, Text 4a.3).
47 Parth. M332+M724, M499+M706+M334b (Colditz 1987, S. 276–289, Texte 1.1, 1.2).
48 Zur Verwendung sozialer Termini für Erwählte, Hörer und Ungläubige bzw. weltliche Menschen vgl. Sundermann 1976; Colditz 2000.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Ein Beispiel dafür ist eine Parabel von Freien, Schuldnern und Sklaven mit unterschiedlichen Rechten, eine Landesgrenze zu passieren. Sie stehen für die Erwählten, Hörer und weltlichen Menschen als die drei Kategorien von Personen entsprechend ihrem Anteil am Zyklus der Wiedergeburten.[49] Andere Parabeln beschwören die Einheit der manichäischen Kirche, z. B. indem die Erwählten, die Hörer und der Lichtnous verglichen werden mit drei Brüdern, die zu Teilhabern werden und gemeinsam ein ererbtes Stück Land bewirtschaften.[50] Eine Durchsicht der mitteliranischen manichäischen Parabeln vermittelt den Eindruck, daß – wenn eine bestimmte Gruppe im Epimythion angeführt wird – sich diese häufiger an die Hörer wendet als an die Erwählten. Allerdings bleibt die Frage offen, ob dieses Ergebnis für eine generelle Tendenz steht oder nur der Fragmentarität der Texte geschuldet ist.

2.4 Funktion

Ursprünglich wurden Parabeln im Rahmen von Lehrvorträgen von einem Lehrer (Mani und seine Jünger, Erwählte) vor einer Zuhörerschaft vorgetragen, die aus einem einzelnen Schüler[51], einer Gruppe von Hörern oder der ganzen Gemeinde bestehen konnte. Sie wurden auch während des Gottesdienstes und zu religiösen Feiertagen vor der Gemeinde rezitiert, besonders beim Bēma-Fest. Darin zeigt sich deutlich die didaktische Funktion dieses literarischen Genres. Aufgabe des Lehrers war es, die geeignete Parabel für den Gegenstand, über den gelehrt wurde, auszuwählen und die entsprechende Interpretation zu geben. Das schließt aber nicht die Möglichkeit aus, daß Parabeln auch im religiösen Selbststudium oder sogar zur Unterhaltung gelesen wurden. Die Hauptthemen der Parabeln und ihrer Erklärung für *Hörer* sind:

- Ermahnung zum Gehorsam gegenüber der Kirche und zur Einhaltung der religiösen Gebote[52]
- Warnung vor dem Abfall von der Religion
- Aufforderung zum Sündenbekenntnis
- Aufruf zu größeren Anstrengungen bei der Hilfe für die Erwählten, besonders durch Almosen.

49 Parth. M333, M334a (Colditz 1987, S. 289–297, Texte 1.3, 1.4).

50 Mp. M101a (Henning 1943, S. 59; 64, Text Aa).

51 Viele Kapitel der kopt. Kephalaia beginnen damit, daß ein Schüler bzw. Jünger (ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ) oder Hörer (ⲕⲁⲧⲏⲭⲟⲩⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ) Mani eine Frage stellt. Zum Lehrer-Schüler-Verhältnis vgl. auch parth. M5815/II/V/i/ (Andreas/Henning 1933, S. 14f.). Eine Liste von Schülernamen (mp. *hašāgerd*) ist in M6011 erhalten (Sundermann 1994a, S. 269).

52 Zu den Geboten für Hörer und Erwählte vgl. Sims-Williams 1985; *Fihrist* (Flügel 1862, S. 64, 95–97). Vgl. auch die in Beichtformularen genannten Sünden: Henning 1937, S. 32–41; Asmussen 1965, S. 235–252; Sundermann 1989b, 1997b; Reck 2006, S. 352f., Nr. 3.4.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In diesem Kontext wird auch die Figur des „Vollkommenen Hörers“ thematisiert – ein Hörer, der durch die strikte Einhaltung der manichäischen Ethik und durch außerordentliche Almosengaben den Elekten gleicht.[53] Parabeln, die an die *Erwählten*[54] gerichtet sind, behandeln folgende Punkte:

– Appell zur Erfüllung ihrer Pflichten als Anführer und Lehrer der Gemeinde;
– Warnung vor Nachlässigkeit in den religiösen Geboten[55].

Im Ergebnis dieser Analyse wird offensichtlich, daß die Parabeln deutlich die Hierarchie der manichäischen Kirche widerspiegeln, die das Gemeindeleben und die strenge Aufgabenteilung ihrer Mitglieder bestimmte. Daraus kann ein (allerdings nur vorläufiges) Schema der Zuschreibung der Parabeln zu den beiden Gruppen der Hierarchie aufgrund der o. g. Kriterien aufgestellt werden.

	Erwählte	Hörer	Andere
Autor	X (einschließlich Mani)	?	Evangelien und Apokryphen gnostische Literatur buddhistische Literatur zoroastrische Literatur indische Erzählungen professionelle Barden
Schreiber	?	X	
Stifter	X	X	
Rezitator	X (einschließlich Mani)	?	
Zuhörer	X	X	ganze Gemeinde König und Höflinge Vertreter anderer Religionen

53 Zum „Vollkommenen Hörer“ vgl. mp. M221 (Henning 1943, S. 64, Anm. 1; Sundermann 1973, S. 102–104, Text 36); mp. M101f (Henning 1943, S. 59; 63f., Text Af); parth. M44 (Colditz 1987, S. 299–304, Text 2); parth. M580 (Sundermann 1973, S. 87; 104–106, Text 37); Sundermann 1976, S. 182; 91. Keph. (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, 228.5–234.23). Zum Problem eines Gleichgewichts zwischen weltlichen und religiösen Pflichten der Hörer vgl. Colditz 2009.

54 Vgl. weiter den parth. „Sermon von der Seele“ (ed. Sundermann 1997a), mit Versionen in Soghdisch und Alttürkisch sowie Parallelen im 109. Keph., der sich an die Erwählten richtet und ebenfalls zahlreiche Metaphern und Parabeln enthält (ebd., S. 232).

55 So wird in Parabeln beispielsweise zwischen den Zeilen die Nichtbeachtung des „religionsgemäßen Verhaltens“ (Keuschheit) und der „gesegneten Armut“ (eigennützige Verwendung von Almosen) kritisiert. Vgl. auch die Kritik am Benehmen der „schmutzigen“ Syrer, Glaubensgenossen aus Mesopotamien, durch zentralasiatischen Erwählte in soghd. Briefen (Sundermann 2007).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

	Erwählte	Hörer	Andere
Handelnde Personen	X (seltener)	X	literarische Figuren Tiere mythische Figuren
Adressaten der „Moral“	X (seltener)	X	potentielle Konvertiten

3 Fazit

Wenn diese Beobachtung zutrifft, daß die Erwählten eher als Träger und Vermittler der Parabeln auftreten, die Hörer aber stärker im Fokus der „Moral“ stehen, stellt sich die Frage: Läßt sich für dieses literarische Genre eine „Bewegung“ hinsichtlich der Zuordnung zu einer der beiden hierarchischen Gruppen feststellen? Eine eindeutige Antwort darauf fällt auf der Basis der erhaltenen Texte schwer. Es zeigt sich, daß bereits Mani Allegorien, Metaphern und Parabeln (oder besser: Gleichnisse) verwendete, um seine Lehre zu predigen. Bei der weiteren Ausbreitung des Manichäismus erwiesen sich Parabeln als effektives didaktisches Mittel, da sich ihre universale narrative und bildhafte Sprache für unterschiedliche Kulturen eignete und auch Erzählmotive aus diesen Kulturen adaptierte. So zeigen einige Motive sogar eine Verwandtschaft zu solchen in den Grimmschen Märchen und anderen bekannten Sammlungen.[56] Mit Hilfe von Parabeln konnten in der Mission potentielle Konvertiten angesprochen, aber auch der Glaube in der Gemeinde vermittelt und lebendig gehalten werden. Die Weiterentwicklung der Parabel zu einem eigenständigen Genre lag vermutlich in den Händen der Erwählten, da sie die manichäische Deutung der Erzählung hinzufügten. Das Interesse an solchen Erzählungen muß aber besonders unter den Hörern recht groß gewesen sein, die sich versammelten, um sie zu hören und für das Anfertigen neuer Kopien spendeten. Hörer, die als Kaufleute[57] ihren Lebensunterhalt verdienten, brachten von ihren Reisen auch neue Erzählmotive mit, die sie in anderen Städten oder Ländern gehört hatten und die von den Erwählten zu neuen manichäischen Parabeln entwickelt werden konnten. Durch die Identifizierung der literarischen Figuren mit den Hörern im Epimythion wurden die Hörer selbst Helden der Erzählung. Eine „Bewegung“ der Texte kann somit beschrieben werden als Bewegung vom kanonischen Buch zur Gemeindeliteratur, vom autorisierten Wort zu einer Mobilität von Narrativen und von den religiösen Eliten zu einem volkstümlicheren Herangehen.

56 Vgl. parth. M258: „Über den betrügerischen Schneider und […] dessen Erscheinung das Kind nicht sieht“ ~ „Des Kaisers neue Kleider“ (Sundermann 2009a); soghd. M5270: Parabel vom Kaufmann und dem Geist ~ „Die Schöne und das Biest“ (Henning 1945b, S. 471f., Text D).

57 Vgl. Sundermann 1984a, S. 9–11, 281–283, 285.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Abkürzungen

Allgemeine Abkürzungen

alttürk.	alttürkisch	kopt.	koptisch
arab.	arabisch	lat.	lateinisch
aram.	aramäisch	Lk	Lukasevangelium
av.	avestisch	mp.	mittelpersisch
griech.	griechisch	parth.	parthisch
hebr.	hebräisch	soghd.	soghdisch
Keph.	Kephalaion	syr.	syrisch

Bibliographische Abkürzungen

AoF	*Altorientalische Forschungen*
ArOr	*Archiv Orientální*
BAI	*Bulletin of the Asia Institute*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
EIr	*Encyclopaedia Iranica*
HdO	*Handbuch der Orientalistik*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
VDI	*Vestnik Drevnej Istorii*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

Bibliographie

Andreas, F. C./W. B. Henning 1933: „Mitteliranische Manichaica II, aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von W. B. Henning.“ In: SPAW 1933, S. 292–363 [= Henning 1977, I, S. 191–260].

Asmussen, J. P. 1965: *Xᵘāstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism.* Copenhagen.

— 1966: „Der Manichäismus als Vermittler literarischen Gutes.“ In: *Temenos* 2, S. 5–21.

Bartholomae, Ch. 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch.* Strassburg [Nachdruck Berlin 1961].

BeDuhn, J. D. (Hrsg.) 2009: *New Light on Manichaeism. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism. Organized by The International Association of Manichaean Studies.* Leiden/Boston.

Böhlig, A. 1966: *Kephalaia I, 2. Hälfte, Lfg. 11/12, mit einem Beitrag von Hugo Ibscher.* Stuttgart.

— 1988: „Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Einordnung des Manichäismus.“ In: P. Bryder (Hrsg.): *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism.* Lund, S. 29–44.

Boyce, M. 1957: „The Parthian *gōsān* and Iranian Minstrel Tradition.“ In: *JRAS* 1957, S. 10–45.

— 1968: „The Manichaean Literature in Middle Iranian.“ In: *HdO* 1.4.2.1, S. 67–76.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Colditz, I. 1987: „Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen." In: *AoF* 14/2, S. 274–313.
— 2000: *Zur Sozialterminologie der iranischen Manichäer. Eine semantische Analyse im Vergleich zu den nichtmanichäischen iranischen Quellen.* Wiesbaden.
— 2009: „Manichaean Time-Management: Laymen between Religious and Secular Duties." In: BeDuhn 2009, S. 73–99.
— 2011: „Parabeln und Parabelabstrakta – Beobachtungen zu gattungsübergreifenden Lehr- und Erzählmotiven in den iranischen Manichaica." In: Özertural/Wilkens 2011, S. 13–25.
— 2013: „Das Problem des ‚Schweigens' der manichäischen Quellen zum Thema Übersetzung." In: J.P. Laut/K. Röhrborn (Hrsg.): *Vom Aramäischen zum Alttürkischen. Fragen zur Übersetzung von manichäischen Texten. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 29./30. September 2011.* Berlin/Boston, S. 7–29.
— 2015a: „Two snake-brothers on their way – Mani's scriptures as a source of Manichaean Central Asian parables?" In: A. Krasnowolska/R. Rusek Kowalska (Hrsg.): *Studies on the Iranian World: Before Islam. Proceedings of the 7th European Conference of Iranian Studies (Cracow 2011).* Krakau, S. 87–99.
— 2015b: Rezension zu Leurini 2013. In: *JRAS*, September 2015, S. 1–4 [Online verfügbar unter: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1356186315000371, erschienen 20 August 2015].
— 2017: „Another fragment of the ‚Parable on the female Hearer Xybrʾ'?" In: E. Morano/E. Provasi/A.V. Rossi (Hrsg.): *Studia Philologica Iranica. Gherardo Gnoli Memorial Volume*. Roma.
— (i.E.): „On the Names of ‚Donors' in Middle Iranian Manichaean Texts." In: *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference of Manichaean Studies", London, 9.–13. September 2013.*
Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2011: „Literarische Termini in mitteliranischen manichäischen Texten. In: Özertural/Wilkens 2011, S. 27–43.
Durkin-Meisterernst, D./Ch. Reck/D. Weber (Hrsg.) 2009: *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit. Kolloquium anläßlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann.* Wiesbaden.
Emmerick, R.E./M. Macuch (Hrsg.) 2009: The *Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran.* Companion Volume I to *A History of Persian Literature.* London.
Ferreira, J. 2002: *The hymn of the pearl. The Syriac and Greek texts with introduction, translation and notes.* Sydney u.a.
Flügel, G. 1862: *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften.* Leipzig.
Funk, W.P. 1999: *Kephalaia. I, 2. Hälfte, Lieferung 13/14.* Stuttgart.
— 2000: *Kephalaia. I, 2. Hälfte, Lieferung 15/16.* Stuttgart.
Gabain, A. von 1964: „Alttürkische Schreibkultur und Druckerei." In: L. Bazin *et al.* (Hrsg.): *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta II.* Wiesbaden, S. 171–190.
Gardner, I./J.D. BeDuhn/P. Dilley 2015: *Mani at the Court of the Persian Kings. Studies on the Chester Beatty Kephalaia Codex.* Leiden/Boston.
Giversen, S. 1986: *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library.* Bd. I: *Kephalaia. Facsimile Edition.* Genf.
Gulácsi, Zs. 2001: *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections: A comprehensive catalogue of Manichaean artifacts belonging to the Berlin State Museums of the Prussian*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Cultural Foundation, Museum of Indian Art, and the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, deposited in the Berlin State Library of the Prussian Cultural Foundation. Turnhout.

Henning, W.B. 1937: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch.* Berlin (APAW 1936 [1937], Nr. 10) [= Henning 1977, I, S. 417–557].

— 1943: „The Book of the Giants." In: *BSOAS* 11, S. 52–74 [= Henning 1977, II, S. 115–137].

— 1945a: „The Manichaean Fasts." In: *JRAS* 1945, S. 146–164 [= Henning 1977, II, S. 205–224].

— 1945b: „Sogdian Tales." In: *BSOAS* 11, S. 465–487 [= Henning 1977, II, S. 169–192].

— 1977: *W. B. Henning Selected Papers.* Bde. I–II. Téhéran/Liège/Leiden.

Hutter, M. 1992: *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte. Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980–7984.* Wiesbaden.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia.* San Francisco.

Leurini, C. 2013: *The Manichaean Church: An Essay Mainly Based on the Texts from Central Asia.* Roma.

Lieu, S.N.C. 2006: „‚My Church is Superior …' Mani's Missionary Statement in Coptic and Middle Persian." In: L. Painchaud (Hrsg.): *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica. Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk.* Quebec/Paris, S. 519–527.

MacKenzie, D.N. 1979: „Mani's Šābuhragān I." In: *BSOAS* 42/3, S. 504–534.

— 1980: „Mani's Šābuhragān II." In: *BSOAS* 43/2, S. 288–310.

Macuch, M. 2009: „Pahlavi Literature." In: Emmerick/Macuch 2009, S. 116–190.

Morano, E. 2009a: „‚If they had lived …' A Sogdian-Parthian Fragment of Mani's *Book of Giants*." In: W. Sundermann/A. Hintze/F. de Blois (Hrsg.): *Exegisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams.* Wiesbaden, S. 325–330.

— 2009b: „Sogdian Tales in Manichaean Script." In: Durkin-Meisterernst/Reck/Weber 2009, S. 173–200.

— 2011: „New Research on Mani's *Book of Giants*." In: Özertural/Wilkens 2011, S. 101–111.

Oerter, W.B. 1988: „Drei manichäisch-soghdische Parabeln im Lichte koptischer Manichaica." In: *ArOr* 56, S. 172–176.

— 1990: „Die Vorzüge der manichäischen Religion. Betrachtungen zu Kephalaia Cap. 154." In: P. Nagel (Hrsg.): *Carl-Schmidt-Kolloquium an der Martin-Luther-Universität 1988.* Halle, S. 259–271.

Özertural, Z./J. Wilkens (Hrsg.) 2011: *Der östliche Manichäismus. Gattungs- und Werkgeschichte. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 4./5. März 2010.* Berlin/Boston, S. 13–25.

Pedersen, N.A. 1997: „A Manichaean Historical Text." In: *ZPE* 119, S. 193–201.

Polotsky, H.J./A. Böhlig 1940: *Kephalaia I. Erste Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10).* Stuttgart.

Reck, Ch. 2003: „Die Beschreibung der Daēnā in einem soghdischen manichäischen Text." In: C. Cereti/M. Maggi/E. Provasi (Hrsg.): *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: studies in honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the occasion of his 65th birthday on 6 December 2002.* Wiesbaden, S. 323–338.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen.* Turnhout.
— 2006: *Fragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift.* Stuttgart.
— 2009a: „Snatches of the Middle Iranian ‚Tale of the Five Brothers'." In: BeDuhn 2009, S. 241–257.
— 2009b: „Soghdische manichäische Parabeln in soghdischer Schrift mit zwei Beispielen: Parabeln mit Hasen." In: Durkin-Meisterernst/Reck/Weber 2009, S. 211–224.
Reeves, J.C. 1992: *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions.* Cincinnati.
Sims-Williams, N. 1981: „The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad." In: *BSOAS* 44/2, S. 281–240.
— 1985: „The Manichean Commandments: A Survey of the Sources." In: J. Duchesne-Guillemin (Hrsg.): *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce.* Bd. II. Leiden, S. 573–582.
Stuckenbruck, L.T. 1997: *The Book of Giants from Qumran.* Tübingen.
Sundermann, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer, mit einigen Bemerkungen zu Motiven der Parabeltexte von Friedmar Geissler.* Berlin.
— 1976: „Commendatio pauperum. Eine Angabe der sassanidischen politisch-didaktischen Literatur zur gesellschaftlichen Struktur Irans." In: *AoF* 4, S. 167–194.
— 1979: „Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos." In: *AoF* 6, S. 95–133 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, I, S. 121–163].
— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts, mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams.* Berlin.
— 1984a: *Studien zu Geschichte und Wert historiographischer Traditionen der Manichäer unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der iranischen Überlieferung.* Dissertation B. Berlin (Manuskript).
— 1984b: „Die Prosaliteratur der iranischen Manichäer." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (Hrsg.): *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982.* Leuven, S. 227–241 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, I, S. 183–198].
— 1984c: „Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch." In: J. Duchesne-Guillemin/J. Loicq (Hrsg.): *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata.* Leiden, S. 491–505 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, II, S. 615–631].
— 1985: *Ein manichäisch-soghdisches Parabelbuch, mit einem Anhang von Friedmar Geissler über Erzählmotive in der Geschichte von den zwei Schlangen.* Berlin.
— 1986: „Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer. I." In: *AoF* 13, S. 40–92 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, I, S. 217–274].
— 1989a: „Kniga gigantov: Ešče odin fragment iz ‚knigi gigantov' Mani [The Book of Giants: Another Fragment from Mani's ‚Book of Giants']." In: *VDI* 1989, S. 67–79.
— 1989b: „Ein manichäischer Bekenntnistext in neupersischer Sprache." In: C.-H. de Fouchécour/Ph. Gignoux (Hrsg.): *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard.* Paris, S. 355–365 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, II, S. 645–656].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1990: „Bēma." In: *EIr* IV, S. 136–137.
— 1991: „Eine buddhistische Allegorie in manichäischer Überlieferung." In: R.E. Emmerick/D. Weber (Hrsg.): *Corolla Iranica. Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie on the occasion of his 65th birthday on April 8th, 1991.* Frankfurt a.M. u.a., S. 198–206 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, II, S. 657–666].
— 1992a: „Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts concerning the Turfan Region." In: A. Cadonna (Hrsg.): *Turfan and Tun-Huang. The Texts. Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route. Proceedings of the International Conference promoted and organized by the Istituto ‚Venezia e l'Oriente' … Venice, 15–16 January 1990.* Firenze, S. 63–84.
— 1992b: „Iranische Kephalaiatexte?" In: G. Wiessner/H.-J. Klimkeit (Hrsg.): *Studia Manichaica II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 6.–10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn.* Wiesbaden, S. 305–318 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, II, S. 667–681].
— 1994a: „Iranische Personennamen der Manichäer." In: *Die Sprache* 35/2, S. 244–270 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, I, S. 485–513].
— 1994b: „Mani's ‚Book of the Giants' and the Jewish Books of Enoch. A Case of Terminological Difference and What it Implies." In: Sh. Shaked/A. Netzer (Hrsg.): *Irano-Judaica III. Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture throughout the Ages.* Jerusalem, S. 40–48 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, II, S. 697–706].
— 1997a: *Der Sermon von der Seele: Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version mit einem Anhang von Peter Zieme: Die türkischen Fragmente des „Sermons von der Seele".* Turnhout.
— 1997b: „Ein weiterer manichäischer Beichttext aus Turfan." In: *AoF* 24/2, S. 259–267 [= Sundermann *et al.* 2001, II, S. 739–748].
— 2005: „Was the Ārdhang Mani's Picture-Book?" In: A. van Tongerloo/L. Cirillo (Hrsg.): *Il Manicheismo. Nuove prospettive delle richerca* (sic.!). Turnhout, S. 373–384.
— 2007: „Eine Re-Edition zweier manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe." In: M. Macuch/W. Sundermann (Hrsg.): *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume.* Wiesbaden, S. 403–421.
— 2009a: „The Emperor's New Clothes." In: *BAI* 19 (2005 [2009]), S. 211–213.
— 2009b: „Manichaean literature in Iranian languages." In: Emmerick/Macuch 2009, S. 197–265.
Sundermann, W./Ch. Reck/D. Weber/C. Leurini/A. Panaino (Hrsg.) 2001: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann.* Roma.
Wilkens, J. 2000: „Neue Fragmente aus Manis Gigantenbuch." In: *ZDMG* 151, S. 133–176.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Observations on the Middle Persian Barm-e Delak Inscription*

Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Berlin

The Barm-e Delak inscription in Middle Persian on a small fire altar has been quite well studied since its discovery in ca. 1986 and first publication in Tavoosi/Frye 1989. While any inscription was bound to be found interesting this one is particularly significant for a number of reasons: Firstly, it is very old, "cette inscription, antérieure à celle de Šābuhr I (ŠKZ) de plusieurs années, est la plus ancienne inscription rédigée en moyen perse" (Skjærvø 1992, p. 153; echoing Gignoux 1991, p. 11). Secondly, it is one of the very rare private inscriptions from Sasanian Iran ("non-imperial, non-religious" as Frye in Tavoosi/Frye 1989, p. 31 writes) showing that the sharp contrast often drawn by historians between the great numbers of private inscriptions in the Mediterranean world (particularly in Greek and Latin but also in Aramaic in Palmyra, Petra, Hatra etc.) and the very limited epigraphical culture in Sasanian Iran does have exceptions. Thirdly, Gignoux (1991, p. 15) identified a 1st singular optative with the ending *-yn* in this inscription. Skjærvø developed this idea further to suggest that an otherwise unknown 1st singular imperfect in *-yn* is to be found here, and only here. I would like to revisit this monument and offer some observations on its presentation and script. What has allowed me to do this is the new set of photographs Nima Jamali kindly made of the small monument and sent to me. He attended a class I gave at the summer school in Leiden 2009 during which I discussed this inscription and pointed to the need for a more careful analysis of its script. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Nima Jamali. Dedicating this article to the memory of Werner Sundermann, whose great range of interest in all things Iranian also included this inscription (see Sundermann 1993), is a reminder that this too is a topic I would have liked to have been able to discuss with him in order to hear his fresh and articulate views that often shook me awake to the realisation that he was thinking about aspects of a problem I hadn't even begun to consider.

The monument and the inscription have been described before and good photographs have been published by Tavoosi/Frye (1989) and reproduced in

* This article has benefitted from a careful reading by Nicholas Sims-Williams for which I am very grateful.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gignoux (1991, pp. 13–14) with a slight loss in quality. The drawings used here are based on Nima Jamali's photographs of all four sides of the circular fire altar and, as a supplement to the published photographs, are intended to make some features of the inscription and its distribution on the stone surface easier to see. The stone is soft sandstone with embedded pebbles and with various kinds of damage, some, such as a fissure after the first word of the main inscription, old and prior to the engraving and some much later than the inscription itself. It seems to me that the engraver also caused some damage to the stone particularly at the beginning of the inscription, where some letters seem to have caused intervening pieces of rock to dislodge during the work of chiselling. Perhaps this was because the stone was softer here than elsewhere, or perhaps the engraver needed to get a feeling for the amount of force he could apply to the stone. Given that the event referred to in the inscription was very close in time and was part of a promise made by Abnōn in the case of a victory over the Romans, it is likely that the altar and the inscription were made quite quickly.

The inscription is circular in two lines running around the small altar. Below the main inscription are four niches with figures and in the border above these, their names and titles.

The inscriptions above the four niches were labelled ABCD by Tavoosi/Frye (1989, pp. 27–28) in the sequence Ardašīr, the first Sasanian king (A), two sponsors Aspēz and Wahnām (B), Šābuhr the Sasanian king (C) and the main sponsor Abnōn (D). Because the inscription is dated to the third year of Šābuhr's reign (243–244, see Frye in Tavoosi/Frye 1989, p. 38; according to Grenet, in Gignoux 1991, p. 11, there is a possible reference to the battle of Misikhē[1] dated to the 11th of February 244 in the *Historia Augusta*) and the main inscription begins to the top right of C it is likely that this side is the "front". The main sponsor, Abnōn, follows on side D, before Šābuhr's father Ardašīr and the other two sponsors. The following four images show the inscription in the sequence CDAB. The lines to the left and right of each drawing indicate some of the overlap with the next drawing. The original script between these same two lines in each drawing is intended to be a complete record of the strokes visible on the photographs. As can be seen, there are some areas of damage on the surface of the stone. The inscription is written essentially in two lines and therefore the segments are identified by 1.1 and 2.1 etc. by MacKenzie on the basis of the photographs in Tavoosi/Frye, but the image of side B shows on the top left that in fact the inscription is a spiral which results at the beginning and end in a tier of three lines exactly at the place where the inscription stops. The space prior to the first word is left blank to allow the line to continue under the first word. When the line came round again the engraver was forced to squeeze the last words very close to the bottom edge of the space available.

1 The fact that the reading ⟨PWN myšyky⟩ 'in Misikhe' offered by Gignoux 1991, p. 12 in his line 15 is untenable does not negate this very likely historical context.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Table CDAB

Side C

Side D

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Side A

Side B

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Though the text of the inscription has been established by a series of scholars who achieved remarkable results within a short period of time and I have only a number of small points to add to this, it will be useful for the reader to have a transliteration to enable him/her to follow the discussion below.

Transliteration and Translation

CDAB

C	šhpwhry MLK'n MLK'	*šābuhr šāhān šāh*
D	'bnwn{?} ZY PWN špstn 'dnyk	*abnōn ī pad šabestān āyēnīg*
A	'rthštr MLK'n MLK'	*ardaxšīr šāhān šāh*
B	'spyc ZY dlpty whwn'm ZY prmt'r	*aspēz ī darbed wahnām ī framadār*

Main text

1.1	ZNH̲ 'twlg'hy 'bnwn ZY PWN špstn	*ēn ādurgāh abnōn ī pad šabestān*
1.2	'dnyk plm't MN(W) kl(t)y 'P KZY	*āyēnīg framād kē*[2] *kird. ud ahy*
1.3	p^lm'dyn[3] 'YKm HT YDH̲n HWH̲	*fra/parmāyēn: kū-m agar dastan hē,*
1.4	'DYN NWR'-I TNH̲ YTYBWN'n	*ēg ādur-ēw ēdar nišāyān.*
1.6	'HR 'MT QDM (Š)NT III	*pas ka abar sāl se*
1.7	šhpwhry[4] MLK'n MLK'	*šābuhr šāhān šāh,*
1.8a	'MT hlwm'dy	*ka hrōmāy*
1.8b	QDM p'lsy 'P plswby	*abar pārs und pahlaw*
1.9	Y'TWNd 'HR 'NH̲ TNH̲	*āyēnd, pas an ēdar*
1.10	PWN w(s)pš'ty	*pad wispšād*
1.11	(pr)d(w)š(yw) HW(…)[5] 'HR 'YK	*… … pas kū*
1.12	'ŠMH̲N[6] 'YK hlwm'dy	*āšnūd kū hrōmāy*
1.13–14	Y'TWNd 'HR 'NH̲	*āyēnd, pas an*
2.1	yzd'n p't[w]yhyn[7] 'YK	*yazdān pāywehēn(?): kū*

2 This is possibly an example of *kū*, *kē* and it having fallen together in the speakers dialect (Sims-Williams).

3 So Skjærvø; MacKenzie: plm'd(t). '^' is used here to designate the 'cap' above the ⟨p⟩.

4 The spelling ⟨šh-pwhry⟩ given in Skjærvø (1992, p. 159) and MacKenzie (1993, p. 106) has been avoided here because it only reflects an arbitrary division of the photographs but not of the text in the inscription written as it is in one continuous line.

5 MacKenzie: (pr)d(w)š(y YHWWNm); Skjærvø: PWN yš(ny) H(WY)[TNn]. Both readings are problematic. They agree on the first two letters, they just read the second one differently. The third letter is damaged but not straight enough for ⟨n⟩, a ⟨d⟩ seems possible. ⟨w⟩ or ⟨y⟩ follows, then ⟨š⟩ and possibly ⟨y⟩ (or ⟨r⟩) and ⟨w⟩ with a gap large enough to signify the end of the word, before the following ⟨h⟩ and unclear traces. MacKenzie's initial ⟨YH⟩ is therefore unlikely but Skjærvø's alternative is by no means certain.

6 MacKenzie: 'ŠMH̲N; Skjærvø: 'ŠMH̲n.

7 So Skjærvø; MacKenzie: p't(w)yh(t).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

2.2	(HT šh)pwhry[8] ZY MLK'n[9]	*agar šābuhr ī šāhān*
2.3	MLK' c[yly *YHWWN 'P[10]] hlwm'dyn	*šāh *cēr *bawē *ud hrōmāyān*
2.4	MHYTN 'Pšn SLYtr 'BYDWN ['D](š){?}[11]	*zan u-šān wattar kun *tā-/kū-š(?)*
2.6	PWN 'BDkyhy[12] YK'YMWNd 'DYNn hyl'n[13]	*pad bandagīh ēstēnd, ēg-n hilān*
2.7	'D NWR'-I TNH̲ YTYBWN'n 'HR	*tā adūr-ēw ēdar nišāyān. pas*
2.8a	'YK 'ŠMH̲N[14] 'YK hlwm'dy	*kū āšnūd kū hrōmāy*
2.8b	Y'TWNt[15] [H](WH̲)nd 'P šhpwhry	*āmad *hēnd ud šābuhr*
2.9	ZY MLK'n MLK' MHYTN HWH̲n⟨d⟩[16] 'Pš{?}[17]	*ī šāhān šāh zad hēnd u-š*
2.10	SLYtr klty [HWH̲nd *'Dš(?) *PWN *'BDkyhy]	*wattar kird *hēnd *tā-š(?) *pad *bandagīh/*
2.11	[YK'YMWNd *'DYNm *nywst NWR'-I][18]	**ēstēnd, *ēg-im *niwist *adūr-ēw*
2.12	YTYBWNn 'Pš plnbgy[19]	*nišāyān. u-š farnbay-*
2.13–14	šhpwhry 'bnwn ŠM 'BYDW[N]	*šābuhr-abnōn nām kird*

Šābuhr, the king of kings
Abnōn, the official in charge of the sleeping-quarters
Ardašīr, the king of kings
Aspēz, the head of the court; Wahnām the commander

This fireplace: Abnōn, the official in charge of the sleeping-quarters, commanded someone to make (it). "And initially I thought/considered: 'If I can, then I want to found a fire here!' Afterwards, when in year three (of) Šābuhr, the king of kings, when the Romans came against Pārs and Pahlaw, then *I *was here in all-happy … After (I/we/one) heard that the Romans are coming, then I implored the gods: 'If Šābuhr, the king of kings, will have been victorious and defeated the Romans and worsted them, so that they stand in his custody, then I will not let up until I found a

8 So MacKenzie; Skjærvø: [H](T) [šh]pwhry.
9 So MacKenzie; Skjærvø: M[LK']n.
10 MacKenzie: c[yly *YHWWN 'P]; Skjærvø: c[yl- ?.... 'P]. Sims-Williams suggested the optativ here.
11 MacKenzie: ['D](n); Skjærvø: ['YK](š?).
12 Not ⟨'B[D]kyhy⟩, the ⟨D⟩ is perfectly visible. The final ⟨y⟩ is separated from the rest of the word by a fissure in the rock.
13 MacKenzie: 'DYNn hyl'n; Skjærvø: 'DYN nhwl'n. Sims-Williams has convinced me of MacKenzie's reading.
14 MacKenzie: 'ŠMH̲N; Skjærvø: 'ŠMH̲n.
15 MacKenzie: Y'TWNt; Skjærvø: YHMTWN.
16 Gignoux: HW(H̲d); MacKenzie and Skjærvø: HWH̲nd.
17 Following ⟨š⟩ is a trace that might be the upper part of an ⟨n⟩ but without a clear trace of the distinctive lower part.
18 MacKenzie: [HWH̲nd *'Dn *PWN *'BDkyhy *YK'YMWNd *'DYNm *nywst NWR'-I]; Skjærvø: [HWH̲nd *'HR *ZNH̲ *NWR' TN](H̲), i.e. a much shorter conjecture (Livshits/Nikitin 1991, p. 41 indicated '15–20 letters'), and judging from the size of the script to the right and left, too short.
19 Livshits/Nikitin (1991, p. 41): plk'n; Gignoux (1991, p. 12): pn'<h>y; MacKenzie: pt'y; Skjærvø: pn'y. As Livhsits/Nikitin correctly recognized, between ⟨p⟩ and ⟨n⟩ is an ⟨l⟩ the upper part of which is the right side of a depression in the stone caused either during the engraving or after it. What appears to be ⟨'⟩ will be a tilted ⟨bg⟩.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

fire here!' After (I/we/one) heard that the Romans had come and Šābuhr, the king of kings, had defeated them and worsted them, until they were in his custody, I began to found a fire." And he named it "Farnbay-Šābuhr-Abnōn".

The script

The most notable thing about the script on this monument with four names together with titles (17 words in all) and a fairly short inscription (97 words and a further 11 words lost in gaps) is the variety of letter forms present. In particular, the script of the names above the niches is bigger and more formal than in most of the rest of the text, though formal features occur throughout the text. An explanation for this might be that the engraver of the names was a different person to the engraver of the main inscription, who however, also produces variants ranging between formal and less formal, even cursive, script.

The names above the figures

C: On side C Šābuhr's name and title are written very carefully and majestically. The first letter ⟨š⟩ slants to the left, the last letter ⟨'⟩ slants to the right in mirrored symmetry. Slanted forms of ⟨š⟩ are otherwise rare but they do occur: initially in ⟨špstn⟩ on side D, internally in ⟨wspš'ty⟩ 1.10. The forms of ⟨m⟩ and ⟨k⟩ are very fine, the ⟨r⟩ is comparatively large.

D: On side D the ⟨ZY⟩ after Abnōn's name has a unique form. The ⟨p⟩ in ⟨špstn⟩ is unusual in that the leading stroke starts below the letter.

A: On side A the first ⟨t⟩ in ⟨'rthštr⟩ is unusual in that the usually vertical stroke seems to be bent at the top. Compared with Šābuhr's name and title on C, Ardašīr's name and title do not seem to have been made quite so stridently, but here too the first and last letters, ⟨'⟩, slant, one to the left, the other to the right. Note also that ⟨š⟩ in ⟨'rthštr⟩ is slightly above the baseline.

B: On side B the first two letters of ⟨whwn'm⟩ almost join to form one shape. How deliberate this was is not clear but the main inscription starts in the same manner.

The main inscription

The first two letters of ⟨ZNẖ⟩ 1.1 are written so closely together as to practically join, though this is not, in fact, a ligature but an example of letters touching without losing any part of their individual shapes. The final ⟨ẖ⟩ is unusual, but

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

that may be due to the fissure in the rock. This fissure is also probably responsible for the first occurrence of a recurrent feature in this inscription: the next word ⟨'twlg'hy⟩ begins slightly higher than the end of the previous word. This feature is particularly obvious in 2.13 at the end of the inscription, i.e. just to the right of 1.1 where the engraver squeezes words in and, although he does not leave much space between them, sets them apart by beginning each word slightly higher than the end of the previous word and slanting each word downwards in turn. The curved surface may have contributed to this, but it is also likely that it is due to the writer's appreciation of word-units. The following word in 1.1 shows a remarkable feature of the letter ⟨b⟩ which is the only letter that runs through the letters following it and continues even beyond the word itself. Here, the heterogramm ⟨ZY⟩, itself in a form that may be called a ligature, "sits" on the extended horizontal stroke of the ⟨b⟩ and may even continue it, although it is difficult to see where ⟨b⟩ ends and ⟨Y⟩ sets in. Only ⟨b⟩ does this, as can be clearly seen in ⟨YTYBWN'n⟩ 1.4 – where ⟨'⟩ actually floats above the base-line formed by the continued stroke of ⟨b⟩ –, ⟨plswby⟩ 1.8b – here ⟨b⟩ extends into the space below the beginning of the following word ⟨Y'TWNd⟩ –, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.13 – where the slanted writing results in the final stroke of ⟨b⟩ pointing downwards. The only other letter that could run under other letters is ⟨n⟩ with its underlying stroke that points to the right. But this feature is not usually used to much effect: only rarely does ⟨n⟩ extend back farther than its own breadth, e.g. in ⟨YTYBWN'n⟩ 1.4, where both ⟨n⟩s extend to beneath the previous letter. This contrasts strongly with the Pahlavi Psalter, where such possibilities are made use of to mark word-units and no letters extend from one word to the next.

Some examples in a drawing of page 5 verso of the Pahlavi Psalter:

Line

5 ⟨kwn'klmn⟩ with two left-pointing ⟨k⟩s and two left-pointing ⟨n⟩s

6 ⟨bckl'n⟩ with a word encompassing ⟨b⟩

7 ⟨MDM⟩ … ⟨'DYNšn⟩ with right-pointing ⟨d⟩ twice and left-pointing ⟨n⟩

8 ⟨'MTšn⟩

9 ⟨MDM LNH 'Pšn⟩ here ⟨d⟩ and ⟨n⟩, from different words, almost meet

10 ⟨'Pm'n⟩ with an extender after ⟨'⟩ and a returning ⟨n⟩ to fill the line elegantly

Remarkably, the extension of letters from one word to the next is to be found in some varieties of Sogdian script, where the final letter or a word can indeed extend to the next one, this extension in itself being an indicator of the passing from one word to the next, e.g.:

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Reprography Department of the State Library Berlin

So 14410 I/v/5/ ⟨wyspw kwtyšt pr tw' šr'k kwn'nt tγw⟩ with linking between the second and third words (⟨t⟩ to ⟨p⟩), and all the words from the fourth to the end of the line (⟨'⟩ to ⟨š⟩, ⟨k⟩ to ⟨k⟩ and ⟨t⟩ to ⟨t⟩). However, other varieties of Sogdian script use a vertical stroke instead of the horizontal one seen here.

Manichaean script corresponds more to the tradition exemplified by the Pahlavi Psalter. Here, the underlying stroke of ⟨k⟩ (and ⟨c⟩) is used to good effect to mark word-units, e. g.:[20]

⟨'d'xtwm cšm⟩

⟨bwxtg⟩

⟨xwd'y⟩

Interestingly we have the same desire to graphically indicate the word-unit in scripts following very different principles, the Psalter script being a mixed heterographic consonantal script, whereas Manichaean script is a straightforward consonantal script, as is Sogdian script in the main (despite limited heterography).

Returning to 1.1, the word ⟨špstn⟩ provides an example of an alternative form of ⟨t⟩ (see below, no. 2 in the table), whereas in 1.2 ⟨plm't⟩ not only shows a very broad way of writing ⟨m⟩ (which re-occurs in the following ⟨MNW⟩), but also shows a standard ⟨t⟩ (no. 1 in the table below). The writing of ⟨t⟩ in this inscription is an important issue because the first word in 1.3 has been read ⟨plm'd(t)⟩ by MacKenzie and ⟨plm'dyn⟩ by Tavoosi, Gignoux and Skjærvø. MacKenzie interpreted the form read by him as a spelling of the past stem of the verb *framāy-*, *framād* "to command" (as in Manichaean Middle Persian prm'y-, prm'd rather than Zoroastrian Middle Persian plm'd-, plmwtn'/ *framāy-*, *framūdan*), i. e. the spelling of the present stem ⟨plm'd⟩ extended by a ⟨t⟩ for the past. The spelling is non-standard, because although ⟨plm'dty⟩ is attested in line 43 of the Middle Persian version of Narseh's Paikuli inscription, there it designates the imperative plural *framāyēd*. The attested spelling for the past stem is ⟨prm't(y)⟩ in ŠKZ 27, ⟨prm't⟩ in ŠH 11 and, very tellingly, in line 1.2 of this inscription. The infinitive is spelled ⟨prm'tny⟩ in Paikuli MP, line 34. Gignoux's and Skjærvø's reading ⟨plm'dyn⟩ was already proposed by Tavoosi (1989, p. 30) but, in the same article (p. 31) Frye suggested ⟨plm'dt⟩ instead. Gignoux (1991, p. 15) suggested a 1st singular optative used to designate the

20 Drawing of four words in M 273 (not in the same line of the fragment).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

past. Skjærvø (1992, p. 157) modified this to the 1st singular imperfect in Middle Persian and found the same spelling in ⟨p't[w]yhyn⟩ 2.1, which MacKenzie read as ⟨p't(w)yh(t)⟩. Sims-Williams considers the -n- of subjuctive to refer rather to the optative than to the imperfect. Skjærvø conjectured farther forms in ⟨H(WY)[TNn]⟩ 1.11 (where the reading is uncertain) and in ⟨'BYD[WNn]⟩ 2.14 and interpreted ⟨YTYBWNn⟩ 2.12 and ⟨'ŠMḪn⟩ (in his interpretation against MacKenzie's ⟨'ŠMḪN⟩) 1.12 and 2.8a as imperfects. He also interpreted ⟨Y'TWNd⟩ in 1.9 and 1.13 as 3rd plural imperfect *āyēnd* "they came" or "they were coming" (Skjærvø 1997, p. 163); I agree with the identification in 1.9 but I think 1.13 could be a present. Clearly the decision rests on the two visible spellings ⟨plm'dyn⟩ and ⟨p't[w]yhyn⟩, in which Skjærvø saw ⟨yn⟩ whereas MacKenzie saw a defective ⟨t⟩. While the final part of ⟨plm'dyn⟩ consists of strokes close to each other, without touching, ⟨p't[w]yhyn⟩ shows ⟨yn⟩ with the strokes at a distance from each other and clearly distinct. In neither spelling is an interpretation as ⟨t⟩ convincing because the two strokes do not touch (and the surface of the stone is not uneven or damaged in a way that would have hindered them from touching) and the characteristic oblique stroke at the top left of a correctly formed ⟨t⟩ is not present.

There is quite a range of forms of ⟨t⟩ present in the inscription:

1. a normal ⟨t⟩, e.g. in ⟨'twrg'hy⟩ 1.1 and elsewhere consisting of a vertical stroke with an oblique stroke going from it at top left and, at the base of the vertical stroke, a short horizontal stroke going to the right; at the top right the vertical stroke continues into a semicircle. In ⟨'MT⟩ 1.6 the semicircle has grown to almost a full circle, coming close to rejoining the vertical stroke further down the shaft. There the small stroke at the end of the shaft is no longer horizontal but this may be due to the stone flaking away when the stone-cutter chiselled the letter. This is a more formal shape of the letter, which occurs in Abnōn's title on side D whereas the normal form is attested on sides A and B;

2. a rather unusual form in ⟨špstn⟩ 1.1 where the semicircle on the right has been extended downwards to join the base of the vertical stroke. The right-pointing horizontal stroke at the base of the vertical stroke is not visible here but perhaps it has moved up to join the semicircle. The same form seems to occur in ⟨HT⟩ 1.3;

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

3. in ⟨YTYBWN'n⟩ 1.4 the letter ⟨t⟩ consists of a stroke going upwards at a slant to the left. To the right the "semicircle" extends down to join it at the base but is not joined with it at the top. At the top there is a similarity with ⟨yn⟩, but not at the bottom, because ⟨n⟩ extends further down and in neither case of ⟨yn⟩ do the two strokes meet;
4. the most unusual form of ⟨t⟩ is that in ⟨TNH̲⟩ 1.4 where a semicircle and a short vertical stroke stand next to each other without joining, though the lower part of a connecting stroke attached to the right-facing horizontal addition to the vertical stroke seems to be present and, at the same time, to point to some problem with the surface of the stone. The reading is plausible for the context, so despite the unusual form the letter does seem to be ⟨t⟩. It is nevertheless quite different in shape from the ending ⟨yn⟩. The vertical stroke does not extend beyond the base-line and is therefore shorter than the following letter ⟨n⟩.

Confirmation for the reading ⟨yn⟩ comes from a further word ⟨hlwm'dyn⟩, which occurs once in 2.3, whereas it otherwise occurs in the form ⟨hlwm'dy⟩ in 1.8a, 1.12 and 2.8a. The spelling ⟨'DYN⟩ 2.6 also lends support to ⟨yn⟩.

Joining, touching and ligatures; formal and cursive script

There are no real ligatures in this inscription. The closest to a ligature is the heterogram ⟨ZY⟩, e.g. in 1.1, where the two letters join, as opposed to the more formal writing in the name on side D with two distinct strokes. But even in 1.1 the joining does not alter the shapes of the letters and yield a new combined shape. There is quite a lot of joining or touching, features that can be attributed to cursive behaviour which is present in the main inscription but notably absent from the names on all four sides. On side D we also find the most unusual form of ⟨p⟩ with a vertical stroke below the circle. The most elaborate form of ⟨k⟩ also occurs in the names above the niches on C and A. Whilst some spellings in the names and titles allow certain letters to come very close, they are not allowed to touch. This is particularly obvious in the second line of the names and titles on side B where the first two letters ⟨wh⟩ are closely aligned. Examples for touching in the main inscription are ⟨sw⟩ in ⟨plswby⟩ 1.8b, ⟨hr⟩ in ⟨'HR⟩ 1.9 and 1.13 and ⟨lk⟩ in ⟨MLK'⟩ 1.7. There are also some examples for non-touching, e.g. ⟨šhpwhry⟩ 2.13 – perhaps the royal name caused the engraver to avoid joining ⟨wh⟩. Examples for overlap were mentioned above in connection with ⟨b⟩. In ⟨šhpwhry⟩ 2.8b ⟨š⟩ extends below the following ⟨h⟩ which starts above the base-line. In ⟨hyl'n⟩ 2.6 ⟨h⟩ extends below the following ⟨y⟩. Joining probably explains the following mistake in the spelling ⟨MHYTN 'Pšn⟩ in 2.4 where the first of the two vertical strokes of the initial ⟨'⟩ is identical with the vertical stroke of the final ⟨N⟩.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Strange spelling features are the following:

– The dot in ⟨p⟩ in ⟨'P⟩ 2.8b but apparently only there despite the occurrences of ⟨'P⟩ in 1.2 – where Nima Jamali's photo does not confirm that the dark mark on plate 2 in Tavoosi/Frye (1989, p. 32) indicates a dot –, and 1.8b. The spelling is conjectured once in 2.3 and occurs with enclitic pronouns in 2.4, 2.9 and 2.12.
– The "cap" above ⟨p⟩ in ⟨plm'dyn⟩ 1.3. This cap may signify a modification of the value of the letter ⟨p⟩ to designate the sound /f/ and be therefore comparable with the Avestan letter ⟨f⟩ which is a modified ⟨p⟩ with an integrated cap, raised slightly and joined to the lower part.

Hoffmann/Narten (1989, p. 26) saw in this modification an important feature of Avestan script:

> Daß die Zeichen für die stimmhaften Reibelaute *x*, *θ*, *f* die gleiche diakritische Markierung aufweisen, beweist, daß der Schrifterfinder das gemeinsame phonetische Merkmal dieser Laute erkannt hat.

However, the "cap" is not consistently used in this inscription for all the cases where ⟨p⟩ represents /f/, prmt'r/*framadār* in the title on side B, plm't/*framād* 1.2. Even if ⟨prmt'r⟩ on B may be a different case because the script above the niches is more formal and ⟨r⟩ is used instead of ⟨l⟩, this cannot apply to ⟨plm't⟩ 1.2. An alternative explanation would be to see in the "cap" a correction to indicate a missing ⟨'⟩. Skjærvø (1992, p. 157) pointed out that the only other non-heterographic form of the imperfect in this inscription, ⟨p't[w]yhyn⟩ 2.1 shows what seems to be a reflex of the augment in the ⟨'⟩ after the initial ⟨p⟩ and refers to Sogdian and Khwarezmian for "formes d'imparfait avec allongement de la voyelle préverbale". However, as Sogdian shows, the augment is usually in its correct place, Sogdian verbs with the prefix inherited from Old Iranian **pati-* spell the present stem with an initial ⟨pt⟩ but the imperfect with ⟨pty⟩, possibly *p(a)tī-* or *p(a)tē-* from Old Iranian **pati-a-*. Only a few Sogdian or Khwarezmian verbs with an initial double consonant depart from this rule. On the other hand, one of the four rare forms of the imperfect (3rd singular passive) attested in inscriptional Middle Persian (see Durkin-Meisterernst 2014, p. 244, § 491) show the regular initial augment: 'kylydy/*akirīy*, whereas another, 'pz'dyhy/*abzāyīh* probably has no augment, unless a transcription *abazāyīh* is meant, and the other two forms ⟨gwk'nyhy⟩ and ⟨wyšwpyhy⟩ are ambiguous and could be read *gugānīh* and *wišōbīh* without a trace of the augment or *gōgānīh* and *wīšōbīh* with a possible trace of the augment after the prefix. None of this lends support to the ⟨'⟩ in ⟨p't[w]yhyn⟩ unless we have recourse to an analogical

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

formation created without any understanding of the structure of the prefixed verbal stem. But if the form is correct, even if unexpected, we could also expect ⟨*pl'm'dyn⟩ (the "correct" formation from **fra-a-māy-*) or even ⟨**p'lm'dyn⟩ (with an analogical *fār*!?) instead of ⟨plm'dyn⟩ 1.3. There is even a third possibility. MacKenzie (1993, p. 107) objected that a "commoner" could not use the verb *framāy-* "to command" to describe his own speech. It is hard to know how valid this objection is, because Abnōn is certainly capable of giving orders to the workmen who prepared and engraved the stone. Nevertheless, it might be worth considering whether the spelling ⟨plm'dyn⟩ stands for *parmāyēn* "I thought, I was thinking". This verb is attested in Manichaean Middle Persian (and Parthian) texts in the spelling ⟨prm'y-⟩, which could stand for *framāy-* or *parmāy-*. Henning *apud* Boyce (1952, p. 435, n. 6) favoured *parmāy-*.[21] In that case, the "cap" would signify that the ⟨p⟩ was actually to be read /p/ and would exclude the reading /f/. The unique occurrence of this sign makes it impossible to resolve the difficulty. Nevertheless, this interpretation makes good sense because it describes Abnōn's initial plan to build a fire-altar before news of the Roman invasion. When he actually built it he dedicated it to Šābuhr's victory. But in this case, the "cap" would have a different interpretation to the very similar feature in Avestan script.

The procedure of integrating isolated marks into a letter can already be seen in the letter ⟨d⟩ in epigraphical Middle Persian, with an integrated lower part corresponding to Syriac ⟨d⟩ where the dot is separated from the main letter. Like Syriac, epigraphical Parthian uses a form of ⟨d⟩ with a diacritical mark below the main body of the letter and without joining the two (see the table above). We can see that despite their common background in Aramaic script epigraphical Middle Persian and epigraphical Parthian underwent quite different graphic developments and Avestan script clearly follows Middle Persian graphical rules in avoiding discrete graphical additions to main letters and using combined joining elements instead.

As well as the range of variants of ⟨t⟩ given above, the letter ⟨k⟩ shows variance between a form 1, with a distinct nick in the vertical stroke; 2, a straight vertical stroke and; 3, in ⟨'YK⟩ 1.12 where, at the bottom of the vertical shaft, a right-tending line is attached that curves in the way of the Pahlavi Psalter and, indeed, not unlike the Avestan letter ⟨γ⟩, as mentioned by Hoffmann/Narten (1989, p. 25). In some cases, therefore, ⟨k⟩ is distinguishable from ⟨n⟩ only by the small left-pointing stroke added at the top left of the vertical shaft. The form of ⟨š⟩ in ⟨'ŠMH̲N⟩ 1.12 is unusual, though I would not call it a ligature with Skjærvø (1992, p. 154). The very variance in this inscription gives us a glimpse of variety we know very little about and warns us that the homogeneous script of most of the Middle Persian royal inscriptions and Kerdir's is a particular style.

21 See also Sims-Williams 1985, p. 73.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Some of the debate about the text has centred on occurrences of final ⟨n⟩. These include the interpretation of undisputed spellings, a case of the proper division of words and the interpretation of traces.

Interpretations of undisputed spellings:

– ⟨ʿŠMḪN⟩ 1.12, which MacKenzie reads so, but Skjærvø ⟨ʿŠMḪn⟩ and again ⟨ʿŠMḪN⟩ 2.8a MacKenzie, Skjærvø ⟨ʿŠMḪn⟩. For MacKenzie both occurrences are bare heterograms for the past participle *āšnūd* "heard", for Skjærvø (1992, p. 157) both times an imperfect **āšnawēn* "I heard". For our understanding of the inscription the difference is not great. A past participle *ašnūd* in a sentence without an explicit subject indicates "one heard" in the sense of "we all heard" (the news of Šābuhr's victory) whereas a 1st singular imperfect would refer to Abnōn's personal experience of hearing the news.
– ⟨YTYBWNn⟩ 2.12, which MacKenzie interpreted as an infinitive, which Skjærvø (1992, p. 157 and 1997, p. 184) rejected in favour of his imperfect *nišāyēn* "I set up". A present participle in *-ān* (after a conjectured verb **nywst* "began" in the previous segment) is just as likely (see Durkin-Meisterernst 2003, p. 11).

To this we can add ⟨'DYNn⟩ 2.6 followed by ⟨hyl'n⟩ according to MacKenzie; Skjærvø suggests ⟨'DYN nhwl'n⟩. This is an important case, because it is the only clear occurrences of ⟨n⟩ after a word that is not a verb. The Middle Persian version of Šābuhr's inscription in Hajjiābād (and the damaged duplicate ŠTBq) both provide an unequivocal attestation for the spelling ⟨'DYNn⟩ which occurs in a sequence ⟨'Pn … 'DYNn … 'Pn⟩ in sentences where an enclitic pronoun of the 1st plural gives good sense, because the speaker is Šābuhr himself. Rather than claim that Abnōn is using a royal plural, or even that he is speaking not only for himself but also for his two co-sponsors, Aspēz and Wahnām, MacKenzie (1993, p. 108) resorted to interpreting the ⟨n⟩ in ⟨'DYNn⟩ as the non-enclitic pronoun of the 1st singular *an*, in what could only be a very aberrant spelling ("completely barbarous 'phonetic spelling'"). Skjærvø (1997, p. 184) rightly rejected this, but also went farther, to claim that the ⟨n⟩ does not belong to ⟨'DYN⟩ but to the following word which MacKenzie read as ⟨hyl'n⟩ but, Skjærvø, with the ⟨n⟩ attached, as ⟨nhwl'n⟩. The ⟨n⟩ is clearly in the some orientation as the world before it and the world following it. The letters ⟨y⟩ and ⟨w⟩ are often very similar in their upper parts, the difference between them is that the stroke if ⟨w⟩ extends farther down and should turn to the left and curl slightly upwards. However, in this word, the previous letter is ⟨h⟩ which extends below the following letter, meaning either that there is no space for a letter extending farther down than ⟨y⟩, unless the lower part of ⟨w⟩ actually touches or joins the lower part of ⟨h⟩. In fact, the two letters are clearly visible and not joined, so that only ⟨hyl'n⟩. The ⟨n⟩ can be a particule.As far as traces are concerned, MacKenzie suggested an ⟨n⟩ in [ʿD](n) 2.4. This partial reconstruction is problematic. Skjærvø (1992, p. 159,

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

l. 15) offered [’YK](š?) instead. The stone is damaged, only one vertical stroke, leaning slightly to the right, is visible. It is impossible to identify a ⟨š⟩ with certainty. MacKenzie conjectured ⟨*‘Dn⟩ again in 2.10. Skjærvø reconstructed a much shorter gap, in fact too short, but, of course, neither scholar can claim certainty for his conjectures here.

In the spelling ⟨‘BDkyh y⟩ 2.6 the final ⟨y⟩ is separated from the word by a fissure. Despite Skjærvø (1992, p. 159, l. 14) and MacKenzie (1993, p. 106) the ⟨D⟩ is clearly visible.

This brings us to the interpretation of the use of the ergative in this inscription. Without the imperfect, Middle Persian has only one way to express a past tense: It uses a past participle (or “past stem”) with an auxiliary verb. If the verb of which the past stem is being used is transitive the construction is ergative, that is, the logical subject is expressed by an oblique form of a pronoun, if such is present in the sentence. Parthian, which has no regular imperfect (just the unique from ’h’z/*ahāz* “he/she/it was”), consistently has the ergative.

Abnōn states, first hypothetically:

> ’YK (2.2) (HT šh)pwhry ZY MLK’n (2.3) MLK’ c[yly *YHWWN ’P] hlwm’dyn (2.4) MHYTN ’Pšn SLYtr ‘BYDWN [‘D](š) {?} (2.6) PWN ‘BDkyhy YK‘YMWNd ’DYN …
>
> *kū agar šābuhr ī šāhān šāh *cēr *bawē *ud hlōmāyān zan u-šān wattar kun *tā-š(?) pad bandagīh ēstēnd, ēg …*
>
> “If Šābuhr the king of kings will have been victorious and defeated the Romans and worsted them, so that they stand in his custody, then …!”

This is what we expect the inscription to say in the context. However, **ud hlōmāyān zad u-šān wattar kird* should mean “The Romans killed (someone) and they worsted (him).”

In the factual repetition of this content we find: ’Pš{?} (2.10) SLYtr klty [HWḪnd]/*u-š wattar kird *hēnd* which is partly conjectured to show the expected plural form of the auxiliary verb referring to the plural of the logical object “defeated them”. The spelling ⟨’Pš{?}⟩ is slightly problematic because there seems to be a trace after ⟨š⟩, but the singular would be the correct form, referring with an ergative oblique to the singular logical subject “he”, meaning Šābuhr.

The occurrences of ⟨’P⟩ in a different distribution to that of (the much later) Zoroastrian literature has led to the suggestion that it is a vulgarism or a mistake (Frye in Tavoosi/Frye 1989, p. 31, but also: “The ’P and ’Pš are noteworthy and probably show that some writers did not follow what we would call standard practice or spelling.”). Skjærvø (1992, p. 158) pointed out that the Pahlavi Psalter also has such spellings. As MacKenzie (1993, p. 105) stated, there can be no doubt that Abnōn and his colleagues were people of importance and power. The question is whether the inscription reflects on them and their competence in written Middle Persian. MacKenzie (1993, p. 106) writes:

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> The general tenor of the inscription suggests that its anonymous author was not Abnon but rather some humbler client of his, probably the local priest of what may well have been his home. The mason was not much better skilled …

Whether he was thinking of the very real possibility that a Sasanian nobleman, like the king, may not have been able to write (see Durkin-Meisterernst 2011) is not clear, but in any case, Abnōn will not have overseen the actual production of the inscription, certainly not the work of engraving the stone and perhaps not even the composition of the text of the inscription. However, the survey of the range of letter forms present in the inscription and the obvious care with which it was produced do not confirm the judgement on the mason as unskilled, given the possibility that he may have had to work fast on a far from ideal surface. I follow the judgement given by Skjærvø (1997, p. 183): "The inscription of Abnōn is in my interpretation grammatically and orthographically irreproachable" and I think this is essentially true even if I do not follow all of Skjærvø's suggestions. He adds: "… Abnōn used scribes accustomed to slightly different scribal conventions, as we can see from the use of AP for W."

The verb ⟨p't[w]yh-⟩ must mean "implore" in the sense of including a promise in the address to the gods. Nevertheless, the diction is not something like "if you gods let him win", but simply, "if he wins". The spelling differs in two ways from attested Middle Persian (Kerdir: ptwh-; Manichaean: pywh-) *paywah-* "to entreat"; the ⟨'⟩, but also the ⟨y⟩ between the conjectured ⟨*w⟩ and ⟨h⟩, allowing various possibilities (-*ē*- for a causitive verb, or *e* from *a* before *h*, or cf. Old Persian *patiavahya-* etymologically justified [Sims-Williams]), though in fact the simple verb *paywah-* is what seems to fit the context well.

What is the purpose of this inscription? What did the sponsors mean by it, what did they hope to gain by it? The sponsors are not royals but part of the royal household, very likely to be aristocrats. They do not identify themselves by origin or family, but by their titles. Though only one of them (Wahnām, see Gignoux 1991, p. 10) occurs in ŠKZ, MacKenzie (1993, p. 105) points out that the title and rank of 'dnyk/*āyēnīg* occurs three times there "always among the first high-ranking commoners to be mentioned". Skjærvø (1992, p. 154) points out that the title with ⟨PWN⟩ also occurs in Paikuli and ŠKZ with reference to the area a scribe is responsible for.

MacKenzie (1993, pp. 105–106) rightly criticised Gignoux's interpretation of Abnōn as a Semitic name which implies a (one-time) Christian dedicating a fire-temple to his master's victory and suggests an Iranian nick-name "shaker" Aβnōn < Old Iranian **abi-nawana-* instead.

Why is the first person imperfect attested only here? The first person is used to record a vow Abnōn made to the gods and is clearly the most appropriate way to record it. The inscription is based on a personal decision – interestingly, the co-sponsors Aspēz and Wahnām play no role in the inscription itself and

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

it is Abnōn's name that comes next to Šābuhr's in the designation of the fire as "Farnbay-Šābuhr-Abnōn". This presumably means "the Farnbay-fire of Šābuhr (and) Abnōn" and is an imposing name for a modest fire-altar. Was Abnōn purposefully using here an archaic verbal form, the imperfect, that is not otherwise attested for that very reason? Or did he speak a non-standard variant of Middle Persian?

Is the inscription a demonstration of servility? Or rather of general relief at the defeat of the Roman invaders? Is the inscription Abnōn's personal representation of a "public" sentiment? As Livshits/Nikitin (1991, p. 43) pointed out, despite the mention in the inscription of Pārs and Pahlaw, the core provinces of the Iranian part of the Sasanian Empire, the Romans did not penetrate to the Iranian plateau, though they probably had come to within striking distance of Ctesiphon and therefore were a clear threat to one of the most important centres of the state. Both above the niche and in the main inscription Šābuhr is given his title *šāhān šāh* "king of kings"; in the main inscription the title is attached to his name with an izafet, in what MacKenzie (1993, p. 107) interpreted as a colloquial form. Šābuhr's father, above niche A, is given the same title. Interestingly, as Sundermann (1993, p. 204) pointed out, in both cases the titles are without mention of Iran *(ērān)* or non-Iran *(anērān)*, in contrast to, for example, the titles in the Middle Persian version of Šābuhr's inscription at Hajjiābād, lines 1–3:

> šhpwhry MLK'n MLK' 'yr'n W 'nyr'n … BRH mzdysn bgy 'rthštr MLK'n MLK' 'yr'n
> "Šābuhr the king of kings of Iran and non-Iran … son of His Mazdaean Majesty Ardašīr king of kings of Iran."

While the absence of *anērān* here is no surprise, since Šābuhr started off as the partner of his father in might and titles, the absence of *ērān* creates the impression that the term only became relevant as part of the pair with *anērān* and, furthermore, that the development of the idea of Iran made no explicit reference to the Mesopotamian lowland that was predominantly Aramaic/Syriac. Rather, with Pārs and Pahlaw – of which Sundermann (1993, p. 204) says that it "may go back to an old tradition of Iranian political terminology and ultimately to the language of the Achaemenid court" – the stress is laid on the central partnership of the main parties on the Iranian side of the complex construction that was the Sasanian Empire, only a few decades from its very inception, which Pourshariati has described as collapsing so spectacularly in the 7th century when, among other things, this partnership broke down.

Is the bareness in this inscription due simply to lack of space on the stone? The central event is Abnōn's promise to the gods, but these are not named. Does the early date precede the developments in political thinking in Šābuhr's own inscriptions, all later than this one? Or is the inscription made by Abnōn (and his two co-sponsors) private in the sense that it was intended simply as a dedication and as proof of loyalty to the king and was simply not made with reference

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

to a broader public sphere, being of small scale and reserved for visitors to the fire temple and therefore within a common framework clear to all at the court and not needing explicit confirmation? This inscription offers a fascinating glimpse of an incident in the early Sasanian empire but leaves many questions unanswered.

Bibliography

Boyce, M. 1952: "Some Parthian abecedarian hymns." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14, pp. 435–450.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2003: "Late features in Middle Persian texts from Turfan." In: L. Paul (ed.): *Persian Origins – Early Judaeo-Persian and the Emergence of New Persian*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 6), pp. 1–13.

— 2011: "Was the Sasanian king able to read?" In: *Eurasian Studies* 10, pp. 190–211.

— 2014: *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch)*. Wien (Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse 850; Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik 73; Grammatica Iranica 1).

Gignoux, Ph. 1991: "D'Abnūn à Māhān. Étude de deux inscriptions sassanides." In: *Studia Iranica* 20, pp. 9–22.

Hoffmann, K./J. Narten 1998: *Der Sasanidische Archetypus. Untersuchungen zu Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen*. Wiesbaden.

Livshits, V. A./A. B. Nikitin 1991: "Some Notes on the Inscription from Naṣrābād." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* [N. S.] 5, pp. 41–43.

MacKenzie, D. N. 1993: "The Fire Altar of Happy *Frayosh." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* [N. S.] 7, pp. 105–109.

Pourshariati, P. 2008: *Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire. The Sasanian-Parthian Confederacy and the Arab Conquest of Iran*. London.

Sims-Williams, N. 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte XII).

Skjærvø, P. O. 1992: "L'inscription d'Abnūn et l'imparfait en moyen-perse." In: *Studia Iranica* 21, pp. 153–160.

Sundermann, W. 1993: "The date of the Barm-e Delak inscription." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* [N. S.] 7, pp. 203–205.

Tavoosi, M. [with Notes by R. N. Frye] 1989: "An inscribed Capital Dating from the time of Shapur I." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* [N. S.] 3, pp. 25–38.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Decorated Silver Pyxis from the Time of Vāsudeva*

Harry Falk, Berlin / Nicholas Sims-Williams, Cambridge

1.1. The object

The object presented here came to our knowledge in late 2012, when its Pakistani owner asked for advice regarding its significance. It is a pyxis made from sheet silver, 6.4 cm high and 10.6 cm wide in its finished form. The round side-wall had caved in on one side when a heavy object fell on it. The owner had this caved-in side-wall restored. Already in its damaged state it showed most of two pairs of figures, each framing the central figure of a seated Buddha.

Our pyxis is not complete. It has lost its lid, of which there are traces left. There are two devices riveted on diametrically opposite places between figures 3 and 4 and again between figures 6 and 1. These devices are double loop hinges, one serving as the rotation point, the other as a lock. The lid must have had two corresponding single loops, one fixed by a pin to a double loop. This pin is still there. The other single loop could be fastened to the second double loop and be closed by putting a movable pin or thread through the combined three loops to lock and seal the contents. The form of the hinges and the crude way of riveting shows that their application did not follow the same aesthetics which governed the production of the body of the pyxis. They may have been applied following an afterthought with the single aim of keeping its closure under control.

The object is singular in being made in silver. It is also unique in having its decoration incised, instead of being cast or hammered in repoussé. We regard it as a container for incense comparable to the so-called "Kaniṣka casket" from Shāh-jī kī Ḍheri, Peshawar, on which the Kushan king Huviṣka is depicted.[1] One of the figures which can be seen on our object is another Kushan king, in this case Vāsudeva.

* Part 1 by Harry Falk, Part 2 by Nicholas Sims-Williams. We thank the owner for bringing this object to our attention as well as Riaz Babar, Naeem Bhave, Joe Cribb and Jangar Ya. Ilyasov for numismatic data.

1 Nasim Khan 1999.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1.2. The time frame or: how many Vāsudevas?

Above each of the four framing figures runs a short legend in Bactrian script, one of which reads ϸαονανοϸαο βοζδηο κοϸανο "the king of kings, Vāsudeva the Kushan". This text neatly correlates with the figure of the king incised just below it and so the chronological frame is roughly clear: the object should pertain to the reign of Vāsudeva. Which Vāsudeva? Numismatic literature abounds in Vāsudevas, from I to III. Epigraphists are content with just one, as there is not the slightest literary or epigraphic evidence for a second one. The one we know quite well left traces on donated Buddhist statues with year numbers from allegedly 64 to 98 in the first century of the Kushan era, initiated by Kaniṣka, with year 0 in 127 CE. That would give us a range of ca. 191–225 CE for Vāsudeva. However, Sircar,[2] who edited the oldest piece, was unsure whether the ciphers should be read as 60–4 or 60–7. Some authors adopted the earliest date, year 64, without further investigation. Decades later, von Mitterwallner with good reason excluded a reading 64.[3] However, the very rubbing used by Sircar as well as photographs I owe to Michael Rabe and Don Stadtner admit only 60–8, with the 8 being of the "tilted *ha*" form, resembling roughly our capital *S*, seen here between *60* and *va*: . This new reading 68 leaves an eight year gap from year 60 when Huviṣka appears for the last time and 68, when Vāsudeva is attested for the first time. We can then safely allot to Vāsudeva the years 195 to 225 CE, possibly some more years before and after that range.

Although at least one experienced numismatist saw no reason to reconstruct more than one Vāsudeva,[4] Göbl, who had an immense influence, separated Vāsudeva into nos. I and II and a more recent no. III in his weighty book from 1984.[5] Later on he merged I and II into just I, and thus old no. III became no. II.[6] The designation "III" should therefore have disappeared from research papers.

However, not all who came after Göbl were aware of this reduction. Von Mitterwallner in her books on Kushan coinage and art speaks of I and of III; what she thought of II remains open. Much later, in 2003, Blet-Lemarquand, analyzing the purity of the gold coinage from Vima Kadphises to "Vasudeva III", refers only to Göbl 1984 and is surprised to see that after a slight but perceptible debasement under Kaniṣka II and Vāsiṣka the old purity of "Vasudeva I" is again reached under the allegedly following "Vasudeva II" and "Xodeshah", before the gold content drops drastically under the last king in the list called "Vasudeva III", and therefore suggests that the position of the allegedly late kings "Vasudeva II" and Xodeshah should be reconsidered.[7] At least the first

2 Sircar 1953–1954.
3 Von Mitterwallner 1986, p. 87.
4 Zejmal' 1983, p. 216.
5 Göbl 1984, pp. 37–38 *et passim*.
6 Göbl 1993, p. 35.
7 Blet-Lemarquand 2003, p. 175b, referring to the data summarized on p. 176, Table 1.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of them was given his fitting place within the production of Vāsudeva I already by Göbl in 1993.

Göbl's "Vāsudeva II" (old "III"), who finds his place with good reasons – also according to the metallurgical analysis of Blet-Lemarquand – after the last actually attested Kushan king Kaniṣka III, need not be a real person by that name. A necessity for a second king Vāsudeva in the middle of the second Kushan century only arises if one starts the Kushan era in 78 CE and compares this with a Chinese account according to which an embassy of Vāsudeva (Bodiao 波調) had arrived in China, to whom the Wei 魏 emperor in 230 CE granted a high-sounding title. This date is clearly beyond 177 CE and thus would require a second Vāsudeva. However, the Kushan era cannot have started in 78 CE in any case, and once one accepts my reasoning that it started in 127 CE, then the grant of the title in 230 CE is close to the last years of the one Vāsudeva we know for sure.

A second argument put forward by Mukherjee made use of an inscription on a dated *nāgarāja* from Mathura mentioning Vāsudeva, allegedly in a year 170 of the Kushan era.[8] This date was misread: the number is a simple 80,[9] thus conforming with what we know about the single Vāsudeva.

There are many degenerated gold coins with atrocious legends that mention Vāsudeva, stylistically worlds apart from the original series. There are concave series on broader flans in two styles, both of them with remarkably reduced gold content.[10] Most of them show the king holding on to a veritable *triśūla* in his left hand, which in the series of the "true" Vāsudeva is just a three-pronged sceptre, well known from Indo-Greek coinage and from Huviṣka riding the elephant. Instead of tracing the late issues back to a second Vāsudeva, I rather see posthumous editions as in the well-accepted case of Hermaios three centuries before, or in the case of the posthumous Azes issues, the so-called "Azes II" issues, two centuries earlier. Rosenfield seems to propose the same idea, while Bivar is very hesitant about the assumed Vāsudeva II, and Cribb's detailed summary of Kushan history prefers to call all coinage after Vāsiṣka "late Kushans", avoiding any further numbered Vāsudeva.[11] The idea of posthumous issues presupposes either a certain ignorance about who is really ruling or rival parties trying to demonstrate their close relationship to the last impressive king by using his name on their coinage in a time of decline. So far I cannot see a reason to assume a king called Vāsudeva after Kaniṣka III.

In addition to expecting three kings called Huviṣka, Lal Gupta divided the one Vāsudeva between Huviṣka and Kaniṣka II into three again, because he thought that from the Kushan year 84 onwards, Vāsudeva called himself *ṣāhi,* a

8 Mukherjee 1987.
9 Falk 2002–2003, p. 43f.
10 Blet-Lemarquand 2003, p. 176, Table 1.
11 Rosenfield 1967, p. 122; Bivar 2009; Cribb 2007.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

title kept up by his successors but unknown to his predecessors.[12] This is not in accordance with the facts. The title *ṣāhi* is used already for Vima Takhtu *alias* Vema Takṣu on the Mathura pedestal, and also for Huviṣka, both on the Mathura Museum pillar (Acc. no. 1119) dated year 28 and on a pedestal dated year 50;[13] the title also occurs on the previously-mentioned *nāgarāja* statue which refers to Vāsudeva's year 80. So, the use of *ṣāhi* is not such a radical change as to allow us to separate a Vāsudeva who bears this title from another one who does not. Lal Gupta then uses the changed arrangement of the legend and the Brāhmī control letters to postulate a third Vāsudeva living and ruling within the same time span as before.[14] This third Vāsudeva was Göbl's second, later merged with no. I, while Lal Gupta, without consulting Göbl's work, started the division anew. He did not however reckon with yet another Vāsudeva some time after Kaniṣka III, as Göbl consistently did.

If then we reduce all proposed Vāsudevas to just the one who is attested in epigraphs, this means that our pyxis should have been made in or around the narrow range of 195–225 CE.

1.3. The figures

The figures are six in total, two pairs of standing humans each flanking one sitting Buddha. Each figure stands or sits in the centre of a pointed arch which is supported by pillars with capitals standing on three-layered pedestals.

1.3.1. The *karalrang* (Fig. 1)

Starting with the first pair, which includes the king, we see one man to the left, facing the central Buddha no. 1. He wears sort of a royal crown decorated with a logogram or tamga with a definite Kushan touch. The first Kushan king, Kujula Kadphises, started the habit with a circular, three-armed tamga, which he adopted from the Kharahostes family. Vima Takhtu *alias* Soter Megas changed this to a basic circle, topped by a crossbar and a fork with three prongs. Vima Kadphises changed the lower part to a wavy fork, dropped the crossbar and enlarged the three prongs to four. Kaniṣka continued using just this, turning the personal tamgas to a dynastic one. Huviṣka preserved this tamga initially as well, but soon added a crossbar. Vāsudeva changed the lower end to a lozenge. What we see on the *karalrang*'s cap is rather close to the "family tamga" but has only three prongs. In any case it is not related to the tamga of Vāsudeva. If the craftsman knew what he was doing then this tamga expresses a family relationship of the *karalrang* to the royal house; if not he may have

12 Lal Gupta 1998, p. 243, n. 16.
13 Satya Shrava 1993, p. 93, no. 114.
14 Lal Gupta 1998, p. 239.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 1: Hinge 1 and arch 1 with Narkas the *karalrang*

invented a tamga on the basis of those he knew from coins. In this case the tamga of Vāsudeva cannot have been known for a long time.

A comparable pair of king and bystander with tamga is known from a Gandharan relief in a private collection showing a Kushan king picking flowers from a bowl held by a man to his right about to throw flowers on the path of a central Bodhisattva.[15] The man holding the bowl wears a Mithraic headgear which again shows a Kushan tamga. The beardless king could be Huviṣka or Vāsudeva; both are clean-shaven, both wear the same crown which can end in a tassel topping it. Again, the tamga does not look like a perfect copy of what we know from the coinage, but again it does not end in a lozenge, so that the "family tamga" could be meant.

On the pyxis the *karalrang* is dressed in a Kushan robe with belt, to which a sword is fixed. He grasps the hilt of the sword with his left hand while his right hand is raised, holding a roundish object near his shoulder which most likely is a large flower bud. Most surprising is a lunar crescent behind him. Another *karalrang* is found on the reverse of some copper coins issued in the time of Huviṣka, where the legend gives the *karalrang*'s name and title (see below on Inscription no. 4 and Figs. 10–11); here too he is decorated by an identical crescent

15 Kurita 2003, I, p. 277, no. 592.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 2: Arch 2 with first meditating Buddha

behind him (clearly visible in Fig. 11). For reasons unknown to us so far a *karalrang* was shown with the sign of the state deity Nana, the crescent, although in a late form alluding to the moon.[16]

On our pyxis, a legend in Bactrian above his head calls him "Narkas the *karalrang*" (ναρκασο καραλραγγο).

1.3.2. Seated Buddha no. 1 (Fig. 2)

The next pointed arch to the right frames the seated Buddha no. 1, clad in a simple garment. He is surrounded by a double halo in double outline, one halo around his head, the lower one around his body. His hands are completely wrapped up by the cloth. These hidden hands are found in many cases of Buddhas sitting cross-legged. Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw interprets this concealment of the hands as an "attitude of meditation", with examples from Sikri and other Gandharan places dating back to the earliest phase of Gandharan art.[17] The same view is expressed by Filigenzi with further and more recent literature.[18]

16 Falk 2015, p. 291.
17 Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw 1949, p. 108.
18 Filigenzi 2005, p. 109.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 3: Arch 3 with Vāsudeva

1.3.3. The king Vāsudeva (Fig. 3)

The next arch surrounds the king. Vāsudeva is dressed in a long gown, the sides held together on his chest by a device which includes two large buttons or knobs high on his chest. This gown is best known from Surkh Kotal, where the headless statue of one of the kings shows it.[19] The two buttons seem to go back to Achaemenid dresses, since Xerxes and Darius are shown with such gowns at Nimrud Dagh.[20] Models with just one button are known from Mathura, Hadda and Shotorak.[21] On his coins Vāsudeva invariably wears a coat of armour. His successor, Kaniṣka II, returns to the state gown on his coinage (Fig. 4), the gown apparently unfastened, with the vertical fringes folded back in the same way as we see on our silver pyxis. There is one difference: while Vāsudeva's coat ends more or less horizontally, the artists working for Kaniṣka II start to bend the hem line until it "dips increasingly at each side".[22]

On the pyxis Vāsudeva wears his usual pointed crown with two ribbons in the back. His head is enveloped by a circular solar halo as on his coins.

19 Rosenfield 1967, Pl. 121.
20 *Ibid.*, Pls. 152, 153.
21 *Ibid.*, Pls. 23, 94, 98a, 108.
22 Errington 2002, p. 105.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 4: Coin of Kaniṣka II with state gown covering the upper part of his sword

Differently from the coinage, the right shoulder is not shown as emitting flames. With his right hand he proffers a globular fumigator bowl on a long straight handle, as known from Gandhara and shown in several examples illustrated by Kurita.[23] The fumes are indicated by a series of short lines diffusing from the burner. The left hand holds on to the hilt of his sword which he wears underneath his overcoat. Its lower tip protrudes below the fringes. Similarly on the coins of Kaniṣka II (Fig. 4), whenever the king wears a state gown, his sword is half-hidden in the same way. Here Vāsudeva stands to the onlooker's right, as does the so-called "Pharro", a Kushan king in solar garb with flames springing from his shoulders, now in the Metropolitan Museum (Acc. no. 2000.42.1, http://www.metmuseum.org/collections/search-the-collections/327829).

Above his head we read "king of kings, Vāsudeva the Kushan" (ϸαονανοϸαο βοζδηο κοϸανο).

1.3.4. Rām the *hōstīg* (Fig. 5)

After the hinge, which covers part of the pilaster behind Vāsudeva, comes a man turned towards Buddha no. 2 to his right. He wears a small cap with short side flaps folded upwards. His left hand holds on to the hilt of his sword, which ends in the same rectangular scabbard as that of figure no. 1. His upper garment ends in a short crossed rectangle of unknown function above the belt. His right hand is raised in the same fashion as that of figure no. 1. There are two blossom-like round items behind him. One might expect a third flower, one covered by the hinge, judging from the three lines indicating stems leading to the flowers, but two flowers are also found in other images of worshippers. One is the well-known Kushan king on the "Kaniṣka reliquary"; flanked by the figures of the moon and sun, he holds two lotus flowers in his right hand. More similar, even in detail, is a flying genius at the Peshawar Museum, holding a shawl in his right and two lotus flowers on long stems in his left hand.[24] Above the head of the figure on our pyxis we read "Rām the *hōstīg*" (ραμο ι ωστειγο).

23 Kurita 2003, II, p. 306, nos. 955–958.
24 Bussagli 1984, p. 79.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 5: Hinge 2 and arch 4 with Rām the *hōstīg*

1.3.5. Seated Buddha no. 2 (Fig. 6)

There follows Buddha no. 2, who resembles no. 1 in every detail apart from his halo, which is not outlined in two continuous lines, but in just one, while a second inner circle is dotted.

Fig. 6: Arch 5 with second meditating Buddha

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 7: Arch 6 with Humyug-āgad

1.3.6. Humyug-āgad (Fig. 7)

The second Buddha is greeted with folded hands by figure no. 4 on his right. This person is not given any symbol of status. He is dressed in just a tunic and belt above the common trousers. He does not even have head-gear but displays short-cut hair. Above his head the text gives his name "Humyug-āgad" (ομοιογοαγαδο).

1.4. Local origin

The present owner was told about a Turkish art-dealer who received the object from Tajikistan. Since such stories are often inventions they need to be critically scrutinized.

The first point to note is that the coinage of Vāsudeva is not prominent in northern Afghanistan and further north, obviously because this king had to defend those territories until he finally lost them to the Sasanians. The language alone is not conclusive as inscriptions in Bactrian are found not only in Bactria, but also south of the Hindukush and in Gandhara; Dasht-i Nāwūr, Kashmir Smast and the Tochi valley are just a few of the better-known sites which have yielded epigraphs in Bactrian.

For independent evidence we may observe the king's long hanging hair. On the pyxis it hangs down low in two or three strands. No other Kushan king shows himself this way on his coinage. On the coinage of Vāsudeva (Fig. 8), we find

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the hanging hair as well as the traditional form with curly hair or hair covered by ear-flaps. The two forms of hairdo on the coinage correlate with two ways to arrange the same legend. The coins with hanging hair read from 1 o'clock: ϸαονανο ϸαο (feet) βαζδηο κοϸανο (head). Those with ear-flaps covering the hair read from 11 o'clock: β (head) α (top of sceptre) ζοδηο κοϸανο (feet) ϸαονανο ϸαο. There is a range of variants and mistakes. In any case, such a far-reaching and systematic divergence can safely be interpreted as indicating at least two different mints. Is it possible to locate the one where Vāsudeva was designed with hanging hair? Although the legends of all types are in Bactrian language and script, only the type with hanging hair can show Brāhmī "control" letters, either *ha* or *pri*. Vāsudeva's successor, Kaniṣka II, no longer had access to Bactria, but his early issues continue the arrangement of the legend according to Rosenfield's type III with hanging hair, and they still show Brāhmī letters, now two or even three on one obverse, being *ha-bhi*, *ha-ve*, *la-phva-pu*, or *ga-yo-pu*. Even the reverse receives Brāhmī letters, very often a *ru*. The same mint seems to be at work under both kings, definitely outside Bactria in the case of Kaniṣka II, and therefore it is most likely that the depictions of hanging hair have to be looked for outside of Bactria as well, on coins as well as on our pyxis.

Fig. 8: Gold coin of Vāsudeva with long hair, solar nimbus and long sceptre, dropping incense onto an Iranian-style altar. *Triśūla* and Brāhmī letter *ha* in the fields. Courtesy Aman ur Rahman (Dubai)

The coins from the north of Afghanistan, if clearly recognizable,[25] are not of the long-haired type. The numismatic literature seems to favour a mint in the Peshawar valley; Göbl in his usual apodictic manner called it Peshawar,[26] while the leading coins dealers in the Peshawar bazaar, who saw great numbers of all types coming in over the decades, mention Swat and Buner, and all agree on the Swabi area as a common finding-place, while Peshawar or Charsadda are ruled out. This points to a mint in Swabi furnishing the corridor from eastern Afghanistan through Bajaur, Swat, Buner and Swabi, in any case to the north of the Peshawar valley proper. The fact that hanging hair is found only on coins from that area does not automatically exclude other areas for the home of the incense container. But for the time being it is the most likely home.

25 Zejmal' 1983, Pl. 24, nos. 3–4.
26 Göbl 1984, pp. 72a, 74a.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1.5. Comparison and usage

This silver pyxis stands as the last in a series of three similar objects. First we have the golden pyxis from the Bimaran 2 stupa, which has been dated in the first half of the first century CE on account of the architecture of the building and particularly because four coins came with it, issued by Kujula Kadphises when he still issued coins in the name of the famous Azes of old. This pyxis shows, twice over, a "walking" Buddha frontally flanked by adoring Brahmā and Indra, each figure in a pointed arch and each series of three separated by a frontally facing figure resembling Maitreya with folded hands. It was used as an outer reliquary casket; however, its lid is missing, and a secondary re-use is not at all unlikely.

The container next in time is the so-called "Kaniṣka reliquary", which is in fact an incense storage container *(gandhakaraṇḍa)* from the time of Huviṣka.[27] The king is depicted standing frontally occupying the prominent position in the centre of the pyxis. Beside him are figures of the sun and moon god, all three figures being surrounded by sitting Buddhas. There is a long inscription in Kharoṣṭhī in three lines on the pyxis, one more on the lid.

Our pyxis can be linked to both predecessors. It shares with the Bimaran casket the row of pointed arches. It also shares with it the double series of a central Buddha flanked by two worshippers. Even the halos of the Buddhas can be compared, as in each case that of one Buddha is outlined in a double line, while that of the other consists of a single line at Bimaran[28] or a single line plus a dotted line on the Vāsudeva pyxis.

With the "Kaniṣka reliquary" our pyxis shares the presence of a Kushan king and the representations of sun and moon: while both gods adore the figure of Huviṣka on the "Kaniṣka reliquary", on our pyxis the *karalrang* with his crescent expresses his nearness to Nana and Vāsudeva shows his affinity to the sun-god, both venerating the Buddha between them.

From its legend we know that the "Kaniṣka reliquary" originally served as an incense container; the Vāsudeva pyxis was most likely an incense container too, as the king is shown holding a fumigator. The inevitable conclusion then is that the Bimaran gold pyxis may have been an incense container as well, in its prime function, which definitely required a lid. Where then is the lid? If it vaguely resembled that of the "Kaniṣka reliquary", which is topped with three figures, or even if it just had a pointed dome, the lid would have prevented the steatite outer casing from being closed – a sufficient reason for its removal.

Our silver pyxis shows that formal elements from the first century, like the "homme-arcade" and the repetition of a series of figures, were maintained for decorating the same sort of objects over about 150 years. It also shows that with

27 Errington 2002. Cf. also the second and uninscribed pyxis from Qunduz resembling the "Kaniska reliquary" from Peshawar, which was published in Nasim Khan 1999.

28 Kreitman 1992, p. 190a.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the "imperial" Kushans the habit arose to include a picture of the king in the decoration, thus allowing him to partake of the merit which arose from the donation of an incense container to a monastery. In what way the king participated in the donation of the pyxis is an open question; we also have no way of knowing whether Vāsudeva was at all aware of his depiction on it.

2. The inscriptions (Fig. 9)

The Bactrian inscriptions which name the four worshippers are all inscribed in pointillé technique in an early variety of Graeco-Bactrian cursive script retaining some features of the Kushan monumental script. The letters α, γ, δ, η, κ, λ, ν, σ and τ join to the right, while ζ, ι, μ, ο, ρ, ω and ϸ do not. (Whether β and ε, each of which is attested only once, join to the right is not quite clear; the remaining letters of the alphabet are not attested.) The letters στ in the word ωστειγο are joined together in a ligature which is very typical of the Bactrian cursive. On the other hand, the letters α and δ, which are generally confounded in the later (post-Kushan) cursive, remain somewhat distinct from one another and from ο: α is joined to the letter following by means of a linking-stroke which tends to slope downwards, while δ is a triangle whose right-hand point merely touches the next letter. Other letters whose shapes are still close to those of the monumental script are β, ε, ζ, ι, μ and ν. There are very few cursive inscriptions of the Kushan period with which to compare these texts, but one can at least state with confidence that the style of writing is older than that of the inscription on the bulla of Kaniṣka (II or III) in the Ashmolean Museum,[29] which attests a similar ζ, but later forms of β, ι, μ and ν. The difference is particularly marked in the case of ν, for which the Kaniṣka bulla uses a highly developed form resembling a cursive Roman *u*.

So far as the script is concerned, therefore, there seems to be no objection to attributing the inscriptions on the pyxis to the time of Vāsudeva. Linguistically too, as we shall see, they display forms which are entirely plausible for that period.

Inscription no. 1

ναρκασο καραλραγγο
(narkaso karalraggo)
"Narkas the *karalrang*"

The title *karalrang* "lord of the marches, margrave" is well-attested in inscriptions of the Kushan period. The latest occurrence so far known is on a silver bowl in the collection of Ahmad Saeedi, for which I have proposed "a fairly early Sasanian or even a late Kushan date".[30] The name ναρκασο, which was

29 Sims-Williams/Tucker 2006, pp. 587–589.
30 Sims-Williams 2013, p. 197.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 9: The four inscriptions on the silver pyxis

previously unknown in Bactrian, is the exact cognate of the Sogdian personal name *nrkc*, a derivative of **nar-* "man" with hypocoristic suffixes *-akk* and *-ič*.[31]

Inscription no. 2

ϸαονανοϸαο βοζδηο | κοϸανο
(šaonanošao bozdēo | košano)
"The king of kings, Vāsudeva the Kushan"

31 Lurje 2011, p. 278, no. 814.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

It is hardly necessary to discuss the titles ϸαονανοϸαο "king of kings" and κοϸανο "Kushan". On coins the name of Vāsudeva is spelt βαζοδηο or βαζδηο.[32] So far as I can see, no specimen is known which clearly attests the spelling βοζδηο seen on this pyxis. It is an open question whether this is merely an inexact spelling, perhaps resulting from the misreading of an even more cursive text in which α and ο were not clearly distinguished, or whether it represents a genuine variant with reduction of the long [ā] of the first syllable to [o] or [ə].

Inscription no. 3

ραμο ι ωστειγο
(ramo i ōsteigo)
"Rām the *hōstīg*"

The personal name ραμο, which derives from the name of the Zoroastrian deity Rāman, is attested in a Bactrian document of the Sasanian period. Like its variant ραμανο, it is also attested as a component of compound names.[33] The title ωστειγο has not been found elsewhere in this spelling but is clearly the same word as υωστιγο [hōstīg], a title of unknown meaning which is attested in several Bactrian letters of the Sasanian and Hephthalite periods and from which a family name Hōstīgān (υωστιγανο) is derived.[34] The differences in spelling are trivial. For the omission of the initial [h] one may compare forms in the Rabātak inscription such as αρουγο "whole" (= υαρουγο at Surkh Kotal, later υαρογο) or αρηιο "three" (= later υαρηιο); cf. inscription no. 4 for another example. The writing of the suffix -*īg* as -ειγο rather than -ιγο is paralleled by spellings such as λαδειγο "just" (Rabātak, Dasht-i Nāwūr) beside later λαδιγο.

Inscription no. 4

ομοιογοαγαδο
(omoiogoagado)
"Humyug-āgad"

This is a compound personal name consisting of two parts. The second is the common Bactrian word αγαδο, the past participle of the verb "to come", which is also found as the second element of the name ϕαρνοαγαδο (= Sogdian *prn''γt*), lit. "(to whom) glory (has) come" or "(who has) come (with) glory".[35] With regard to this element, Harry Falk draws my attention to the legend *(mahara)jasa agatasa* in Kharoṣṭhī on a so far unique coin of early Kushan times from

32 Alram 1986, pp. 310–313, 316–318.
33 Sims-Williams 2010, pp. 119–20, nos. 386–390 (especially no. 388).
34 Sims-Williams 2007, p. 273b.
35 Sims-Williams 2010, pp. 141–142, no. 490.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 10: Copper coin of Huviṣka, reverse.
Courtesy Aman ur Rahman. Drawing and reading by Joe Cribb

Sind.[36] The first component, ομοιογο, is a normal spelling variant of the personal name ομοιαγο, which is attested by a recently discovered graffito in a cave on the island of Socotra.[37] The Bactrian form is accompanied by a Brāhmī equivalent *humiyakasa* (gen. of *humiyaka-*), showing that it is to be read [humyag] or [huməyag], the initial aspirate being omitted in the writing as in the case of ωστειγο above. As was first recognized by Mikhail Bukharin, this is a widely attested Iranian personal name, cf. Avestan *Humaiiaka-*, Parthian *Hwmyk*, Armenian *Hmayeak*, etc. To judge from the sense attributed to the underlying adjective, Vedic *su-māyá-*, Avestan *hu-mǎiia-* "mit guten Kräften begabt",[38] the literal meaning of the compound name ομοιογοαγαδο would not be very different from that of φαρνοαγαδο. I am grateful to Joe Cribb for drawing my attention to a group of copper coins of Huviṣka, the reverse of which shows a man kneeling before the goddess Nana (Figs. 10–11). Both of the figures are named: Nana (νανα) in a short inscription to the left and her worshipper in a longer two-line inscription beginning at 11 o'clock. Two of these coins were published long ago by Cunningham, who read the first line of the longer inscription as

Fig. 11: The same, another specimen. Courtesy Aman ur Rahman

36 Senior 2006, p. 14.
37 Strauch 2012, pp. 202–203, no. 16:8.
38 Mayrhofer 1996, p. 349.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

οηοιαγογω and the second as ραγ ραγαν (which he took to mean "king of kings").[39] With the aid of better specimens in the Aman ur Rahman collection, Cribb has succeeded in deciphering most of this legend, which begins with ομοιαγο, evidently the name or the first part of the name of the kneeling figure, and ends with his title *karalrang* (κα|ραλραγγο, divided between the two lines; more clearly visible on Fig. 11). The intervening letters are still unclear, but it seems certain that they cannot be read as αγαδο. In any case, it does not seem likely that a man who had already reached the rank of *karalrang* under Huvishka would be referred to without a title, or depicted in such a simple costume, in the time of Vāsudeva.

In view of the suspicions which such a remarkable object as this casket inevitably arouses, it may be worth pointing out in conclusion that the name ομοιαγο in the graffito from Socotra was unknown until the publication of Strauch's book on 16th November 2012 – the coin has been known since 1892 but its legend remained undeciphered – and that the casket was first seen by us in December 2012. Thus it is scarcely possible to imagine that a forger could have taken the name from either of these sources. The plausible but previously unknown name ναρκασο, as well as the correct but previously unattested spelling of the title ωστειγο, are likewise strong indications that these inscriptions cannot be modern forgeries.

References

Alram, M. 1986: *Nomina Propria Iranica in Nummis. Materialgrundlagen zu den iranischen Personennamen auf antiken Münzen*. Vienna (Iranisches Personennamenbuch IV).

Bivar, A.D.H. 2009: "Kushan dynasty i: Dynastic history." In: E. Yarshater (ed.): *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, available at www.iranicaonline.org/articles/kushan-dynasty-i-history.

Blet-Lemarquand, M. 2003: "Analyse élémentaire de monnaies d'or kouchanes." In: O. Bopearachchi/Ch. Lande/Ch. Sachs (eds.): *De l'Indus à l'Oxus. Archéologie de l'Asie Centrale*. Lattes, pp. 175–177.

Bussagli, M. 1984: *L'arte del Gandhāra*. Turin.

Cribb, J. 2007: "Rediscovering the Kushans." In: E. Errington/V. Sarkhosh Curtis (eds.): *From Punjab to Persepolis. Exploring Ancient India and Pakistan*. London, pp. 179–210 [repr. with new pagination in V. Jayaswal (ed.): *Glory of the Kushans. Recent Discoveries and Interpretations*. New Delhi 2012, pp. 3–56].

Cunningham, A. 1892: "Coins of the Kushans, or Great Yue-ti." In: *Numismatic Chronicle*, 3rd series, 12, pp. 40–82, 98–159.

Errington, E. 2002: "Numismatic evidence for dating the 'Kaniṣka' reliquary." In: *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 8, pp. 101–120.

39 Cunningham 1892, pp. 117–118, and Pl. XXII, nos. 21–22; cf. also Göbl 1984, Pl. 87, nos. 844, 846.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Falk, H. 2002–2003: "Some inscribed images from Mathurā revisited." In: *Indo-Asiatische Zeitschrift* 6–7, pp. 31–47.
— 2015: "Kushan rule granted by Nana: The background of a heavenly legitimation." In: H. Falk (ed.): *Kushan Histories*. Bremen, pp. 265-299.
Filigenzi, A. 2005: "Gestures and Things: The Buddha's Robe in Gandharan Art." In: *East and West* 55, pp. 103–116.
Göbl, R. 1984: *System und Chronologie der Münzprägung des Kušānreiches*. Vienna.
— 1993: *Donum Burns. Die Kušānmünzen im Münzkabinett Bern und die Chronologie*. Vienna.
Kreitman, N. 1992: "Deposit from Stupa no. 2, Bimaran, Afghanistan." In: E. Errington/J. Cribb (eds.): *Crossroads of Asia. Transformation in Image and Symbol in the Art of Ancient Afghanistan and Pakistan.* Cambridge, pp. 186–192.
Kurita, I. 2003: *Gandhāran Art*. Vol. I: *The Buddha's Life Story*. Vol. II: *The World of the Buddha*. Revised and enlarged edition. Tokyo.
Lal Gupta, P. 1998: "Kushana Vasudeva and successors: Numismatic appraisal." In: A. K. Jha/S. Garg (eds.): *Ex Moneta. Essays on Numismatics, History and Archaeology in honour of Dr. David W. MacDowall*. Vol. I. New Delhi, pp. 237–270.
Lurje, P. 2011: *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts*. Vienna 2010 [2011] (Iranisches Personennamenbuch II/8).
Mayrhofer, M. 1996: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Vol. II. Heidelberg.
Mitterwallner, G. von 1986: *Kuṣāṇa Coins and Kuṣāṇa Sculptures from Mathurā*. Mathura (Growse Memorial Lectures 4).
Mukherjee, B. N. 1987: "A Mathura image inscription." In: *Indian Museum Bulletin* 22, pp. 28–29.
Nasim Khan, M. 1999: "Kaniṣka relic-casket from Qunduz, Northern-Afghanistan." In: *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 31, pp. 191–198.
Rosenfield, J. M. 1967: *The Dynastic Arts of the Kushans*. Berkeley/Los Angeles.
Satya Shrava 1993: *The Dated Kushāṇa Inscriptions*. New Delhi.
Senior, R. 2006: *Indo-Scythian Coins and History*. Vol. IV: *Supplement.* Lancaster/London.
Sims-Williams, N. 2007: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist texts*. London (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum; pt. II, vol. III).
— 2010: *Bactrian Personal Names*. Vienna (Iranisches Personennamenbuch II/7).
— 2013: "Some Bactrian inscriptions on silver vessels." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009 [2013]), pp. 191–198.
Sims-Williams, N./E. Tucker 2006: "Avestan *huuōišta-* and its cognates." In: G. K. Schweiger (ed.): *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt*. Taimering 2005 [2006], pp. 587–604.
Sircar, D. C. 1953–1954: "Mathurā image inscription of Vāsudeva." In: *Epigraphia Indica* 30, pp. 181–184.
Strauch, I. (ed.) 2012: *Foreign Sailors on Socotra. The Inscriptions and Drawings from the Cave Hoq*. Bremen (Vergleichende Studien zu Antike und Orient 3).
Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, J. E. 1949: *The "Scythian" Period*. Leiden.
Zejmal', E. V. 1983: *Drevnie monety Tadžikistana*. Dushanbe.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Middle Iranian *grīw/γrīw*: Possible Paths for Semantic Changes and Functional Shifts

Ela Filippone, Viterbo

1. In 2002 Werner Sundermann published in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica* an article entitled *Grīw* (hereafter S/*Grīw*). As an encyclopaedic article, this was rather anomalous. It was not only a scholarly presentation of a question, as encyclopaedic articles are expected to be, but it was the first organic treatment of the many problems involved in the lexical set to which Middle Iranian *grīw/γrīw* belongs.

Sundermann analysed in detail, with a rich bibliography and textual evidence, the semantic range of this word family, members of which are documented in all phases of Iranian; he outlined the areal diffusion, described senses and usages involving different semantic domains and different linguistic levels, listed possible derivatives and cognates in Modern Iranian. In what follows, I will just go over the main points treated in S/*Grīw*, some of which I had the opportunity to discuss with Werner before the publication of his paper. Of what he has already stated, I will repeat and eventually expand only those data which I consider useful for a reassessment of possible paths of semantic changes and functional shifts. The results of the present analysis, that only partially contrast with the conclusions reached in S/*Grīw*, are dedicated to the memory of Werner Sundermann as a token of deep affection and high regard for a very great scholar, who was also very much endowed with humanity, innate kindness and open-mindedness.

2. The starting point is Avestan *grīuuā-*, attested in *Vidēvdād* 3.7 as part of the name of a mythical mountain ridge *(arəzūrahe grīuuā)*. Its connection with MP *grīwag*, Prs. *garive*, etc. "hill, ridge" is self-evident. Also in view of Sanskrit *grīvā-* "nape of the neck", Bartholomae (1904, col. 530) postulated for Avestan *grīuuā-* a basic meaning "Nacken" (with a *daevic* connotation). In Middle-Iranian, *grīw/γrīw* enlargened its referential range and underwent a grammaticalization process. It acquired meanings other than "nape, neck",[1]

1 The 'original' meaning is confirmed by the heterographic spelling ⟨CWRH⟩ (< Aram. *ṣawwʾreh* "his neck"), found in Pahlavi and Sogdian in Sogdian script as an alternative to the 'phonetic' spellings; cf. S/*Grīw*, p. 364b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

ranging from "body" to "soul", and also came to function as a reflexive pronoun ("self");[2] in this case, as it is typologically frequent in the case of relational nouns centred around the person and generalized to comprise the self, *grīw/γrīw* is often accompanied by a possessive adjective.[3] But these semantic and functional developments are not parallel in all varieties and the presence of particular meanings is seemingly conditioned by the nature of the texts where the word occurs, and in particular the religious and cultural environment in which they originated.

3.1 In Zoroastrian texts, *grīw* most commonly means "neck, nape".[4] The documentation is rich enough. To the instances quoted in S/*Grīw* (p. 364b), one may add the answer given in the *Rivāyat* of Ādur-Farnbag ī Farroxzādān to the question of how the carrion inside a womb could be properly shown to the dog. It reads: *sag rasan pad grīw kardan* ("one should put a rope on the neck of the dog"), tie a knife to that rope, incite the dog to rend the womb, and then show the carrion (Rezāi Bāghbidi 2005, pp. 35–36).

Similarly, in the *Čīdag andarz ī pōryōtkēšān* we are told that when a human being passes from the loins of his father into the womb of his mother, the demon Astwihād (§31) *band-ē andar ō grīw abganēd* ("casts a noose around his neck");[5] in his lifetime he cannot *az grīw bē kardan* ("take that noose off his neck"), but after his death, if he has been a just man, the noose (§32) *az grīw bē ōftēd* ("falls from the neck").[6]

In the *Draxt ī Āsurīg*, the (originally Parthian) dispute between a palm tree and a goat, the two competitors boast of the several things for which they

2 Some scholars separated the 'neck'-line from the 'soul/self'-line in two etymologically different words. Cf. Andreas/Barr 1933, p. 147 (s.v., signed by Barr, pointing to a "lautlichem Zusammenfall" and the usage of logograms as simple phonetic symbols); MacKenzie 1986, p. 37 (presenting different dictionary entries [[1]*grīw* "neck, throat"; [2]*grīw* "self, soul"]); Skalmowski 1991 (deriving the 'soul'-*grīw* from OIr. **grə̆ᵊbĭ-* "recipient" (< **gr̥bh-*)).

3 There is no need to think that the absence of a possessive modifier guarantees the grammatical role (coreferentiality with the clausal subject) of *grīw/γrīw* (as in Sims-Williams 1985, p. 163); the original referential value is lost even in combination with the possessive element, as it happens to MP *tan* in *xwēš tan* (Prs. *xištan*), analysed as a simple reflexive pronoun. Reduced morphosyntactic behaviours, such as the omission of the possessive modifier, are optional and only point to a different degree in the grammaticalization path.

4 Cf. also *Frahang ī Pahlavīg* X.29 (Utas/Nyberg 1988, p. 77).

5 For a different report about the 'cast noose', where *gardan* replaces *grīw*, see the Phl. Rev. acc. DD 23.29: *u-š wizarš dēw band ō gardan abganēd* "and the demon Wizarš casts a noose upon his neck" (Williams 1990, I, p. 123; II, p. 50, and note 12 in *ibid.*, pp. 174–175). Similar passages (with *gardan* instead of *grīw*) are found in other Pahlavi texts.

6 Cf. Oriān 1992, pp. 88, 256.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

provide the raw materials. The palm claims:[7] (l. 15) *čōb až man karēnd kē tō grīw māžēnd* "they make clubs of me which break your neck".

In other passages, however, the interpretation of *grīw* as "neck" or "nape" is quite unsatisfactory. In the *Ayādgār-ī Zarērān*, at the sight of Zarēr's corpse on the ground, the desperate son addresses the dead father with touching words (§86): "the wind has upset your hair and beard, horses have stepped on your pure body, *u-t xāk ō grīw nišast* ('and the dust settled on your *grīw*')". He is undecided about what to do: "if I dismount from the horse, take your head in my hands, *u-t xāk az grīw bē gīrēm* ('and take out the dust from your *grīw*'), I will not be able to mount the horse again quickly". The body part referred to with *grīw* here may hardly be limited to the sole nape (as in Pagliaro 1925, p. 586, Benveniste 1932, p. 282, Monchi-Zadeh 1981, p. 49) or throat (as in Utas 1976, p. 83); it should rather be a larger area in the upper (maybe frontal) part of the body (as the chest or bosom; cf. Oriān 1992, p. 59, translating *grīw* with Prs. "*garibān*") or even the torso.

In Dk V 24, 29a (Amouzgar/Tafazzoli 2000, pp. 102–103), the reader is exhorted to fight if he aims to obtain the *abesar ud abārīg payrāyag ī pērōzīh-burdārān* ("la couronne ainsi que d'autres ornaments (appartenent) à ceux qui apportant la victoire") and put them *abar sar ud grīw* ("à la tête et au cou"). Here *sar ud grīw* could be intended as the sequence of two discrete parts (the *sar* for the crown and the *grīw* for other decorations) or as one of the many examples of hendiadys, in which the lexicon of Middle Persian (and Iranian in general) is rich, generally created for concepts with fuzzy boundaries. In our case, *sar ud grīw* "head-and-neck" could refer to an undifferentiated whole including the head, the neck and the area of the breast below the neck (i. e. an area larger than the neck proper). A similar interpretation is probably required by *war <ud> grēw* "breast-and-neck" (i. e. the upper part of the torso), in a passage of the *Draxt ī Āsurīg*, where the goat, listing the goods produced with its wool, mentions a kind of undershirt called *taškanag*,[8] (l. 84) *ān-um zanān <ud> kanīg<ān> pad war <ud> grēw stāyēnd* "just that which women and girls put on".

Sundermann (S/*Grīw*, p. 366b) convincingly suggested that *pad tan ud grīw* in Dk V 23, 29 is to be understood as "in the body and outward appearance" (rather than "dans le corps et dans l'âme" as in Amouzgar/Tafazzoli 2000, p. 77). The same expression, repeated in the relevant answer in Dk V 24, 29 (*ud tan-iz ud grīw wirāyišn pad ān čihr* […]) should refer again to the human body as a whole; we could dispense also in this case with the notion of 'soul' we find in Amouzgar/Tafazzoli (2000, p. 103: "Il est convenable de s'adapter, corps et âme, à la nature […]"). Some doubts arise from a passage in the *Wizīdagīhā ī Zādsparam* which has received different interpretations:

7 Cf. Oriān 1992, pp. 146, 327.
8 Cf. Oriān 1992, pp. 150, 332; the reading of the first part of the line is debated.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

WZ 30.20
tōhmag az hamāg grīw {ī} tanān zōr-ē ō ⁺xwad āhanǰēd[9]
"la semence attire à elle-même une force de tous les membres du corps" (Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, p. 101)
"the seed draws to itself power from the whole neck of the bodies" (Shaked 2002, pp. 131–132)

Shaked (2002, p. 132) suggests that, besides the neck, *grīw* could also denote the backbone. This assumption is based on the fact that the semen originates in the back *(pušt)* of the body. However, instead of attributing to *grīw* further, otherwise unrecorded semantic developments ("limb" or "backbone"), one could simply consider that the nape is the area where the cervical vertebrae (i. e. the upper part of the backbone) are situated. As an alternative suggestion, one could analyse *grīw (<ud>) tanān* as a variant form, with inverted position, of the compound *tan-ud-grīw* (no relative pronoun is needed in this case) and interpret correspondingly ("a force from all the bodies").

The reflexive meaning is documented in WZ.[10] Consider WZ 3.24: *Sōwar kē* […] *xwēš grīw rōšn <ud> pāk dārēd*[11] "(the lake) Sōwar which […] maintains itself bright and pure"; WZ 30.40: *grīw ⁺pahrēz ī az ardīg*[12] "refraining from fighting".

3.2 Unlike Pahlavi texts, the Manichaean documentation provides a large number of occurrences of MP/Prth. *grīw* as "soul", a core concept in the Manichaean doctrine. But in a system of thought as complicated as the Manichaeism is, "(k)omplex und kompliziert ist […] auch die Seelenvorstellung": the soul may be individual and universal and is also characterized as having a double nature, both material and spiritual (Sundermann 1997, p. 11). As often emphasized by Sundermann, MP/Prth. *grīw* denotes both the individual and the

9 The integration of the relative pronoun follows Bāhār's proposal. For Bailey's different reading *(karpān ī tanān)* see Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, p. 169, who also note how the same phenomenon had been described few lines above (§17) as follows: the four humours *az hamāg kirb tan zōr-ē abar čīnēd* ("rassemblent une force à partir de tous le corps", *ibid.*, p. 101).

10 In S/*Grīw*, p. 365a–b, Sundermann remarks that *grīw* "self" is very rare in Zoroastrian texts (also Zaehner 1955, p. 372, note to l. 11) and hypothesises that this grammatical usage in WZ might be due to alleged contacts of its author with the Manichaean community. He also mentions *gētīg grīw* in Dk III 365: *ō dāraktom gētīg grīw paydāgīh* (Zaehner 1955, pp. 373–374: "In greater detail this is what is revealed concerning the nature of the material world"; de Menasce 1973, p. 330: "pour la manifestation du moindre des éléments du gētī") translating it "the self of the material world". Here I would rather follow de Menasce, directly connecting *grīw* with *paydāgīh* (cf. his transcription *grivpaytākih*) and interpret it as "the self-manifestation of the material world" (reflexive function).

11 Cf. Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, pp. 44–45.

12 Cf. Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, pp. 106–107.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

universal soul, in the latter case mostly accompanied by honorific attributes.[13] In this, *grīw* contrasts with *gyān* and *ruwān*, which generally refer to the individual soul, though *gyān* is occasionally used to refer to the universal soul as well.[14] Being the universal soul, *grīw* is also the addressee of several hymns, a substantial part of Manichean poetry. Other senses, however, are recorded for MP/Prth. *grīw*. Durkin-Meisterernst (2004, p. 164) gives "neck, form, self, soul". The polysemy of the term generates ambiguity, also increased by the nature of the texts, crowded with concepts ('soul', 'body', etc.) which often seem to converge and to fluctuate from the corporeal to the spiritual level, also in view of the assumed corporeality and perceptibility of the soul. To this ambiguity scholars react differently. Most of them tend to choose between "Seele [Geist]/soul, etc.", "Selbst, Ich/self, etc." and the grammatical meaning "(one)self" according to the specific contexts; what determines the choice is not always easy to grasp, though. Others prefer to adopt a consistent line, as Durkin-Meisterernst 2006a and Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, who regularly render any occurrence of MP/Prth. *grīw* with "soul", with no difference with respect to *gyān* and *ruwān*,[15] or Boyce 1954, who systematically reserves "soul" for *grīw* and "spirit" for *gyān*.

Prth. *grīw* is "neck" in M 4573/V/ii 14–15: (z)yncyhr ʾc qyrb(k)r g(ryw) "die Kette von des Wohltäters (Hals)" (Sundermann 1981, p. 75 [1115–1116]). In M 4578 I, ii, which describes the nature of the worlds of darkness, Prth. *grīw* occurs four times,[16] always in the proximity of *tanbār* "body" and *gyān* "soul"; here it matches *ho* "face" in the parallel Coptic version (probably translating Syr. *appē* "face"). Sundermann suggested to interpret it as "Gestalt, Leib" in Sundermann 1981, p. 64, fn. 2 ("Parth. gryw hätte dann denselben Bedeutungsbereich wie soghd. γr(ʾ)yw"), as "person" in S/*Grīw*, p. 365b.

It could be that a body part (the nape? the neck? something else?) is referred to by MP *grīw* (interpreted as "Ich" by Andreas/Henning) in M 28/I/V/ii/32–36:[17]

13 Most frequently MP *grīw zīndag*, Prth. *grīw žīwandag* (also Sogd. *žwande γrīw*) "Living Soul", modelled upon Syr. *npšʾ ḥytʾ*. Cf. Sundermann 1979, p. 99; S/*Grīw*, p. 366a.

14 Cf. Sundermann 1997, pp. 11–14. This distinction is clear in some passages (see for example *grīw* vs. *ruwān* in Durkin-Meisterernst 2006a, pp. 88–89 [917–918] and 190, n. 305) but not always (see *ibid.*, pp. 62–63 [656–659] and 185, n. 233: "What is the significance of calling gryw gy'n? Is it simply a question of identity which may treat the two words as quasi-synonyms?"). On the difficulty of defining *grīw* as "soul" see also Gignoux 1989, pp. 144–145.

15 Exceptions are very rare; cf. Prth. *gyān* and *grīw* left untranslated ("the *gyān* and *grīw* of the worlds") in Durkin-Meisterernst 2006a, pp. 58–59 (619–620).

16 Completely reconstructed in two points and readable (slightly damaged) in two others; cf. Sundermann 1981, pp. 64–65 (848), (854), (860), (865).

17 Published as ll. 28–32 in Andreas/Henning 1933; cf. the database of the *Published Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian texts* (available at http://turfan.bbaw.de/texte/mirtext).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

wšn c'šnyg'n twhyg'n . w: zyšn'n 'y 'škmb . zdš'n dst pd gryw pd wšwbyšn:n . wzrg'n
"Wegen eitler Genüsse und *Gastmähler des Bauches haben sie mit der Hand ihr Ich unter schweren Verletzungen geschlagen" (Andreas/Henning 1933, p. 314, fn. 8)

In fact, the whole context is rather unclear[18] and one gets the impression that an (unrecognized) idiom is involved.[19]

Several instances of reflexive *grīw* are found in Middle Persian/Parthian Manichaean texts, both with and without possessive modifier (MP *xwēš*, Prth. *ʷxēbēh*), as in:

MP	(Hu 242)[20] 'wš'n xwd ''z **xwyš gryw** 'ndr 'myxt	"and unto them the same Āz mingled herself;[21]
MP	(KPT 1990–1992) 'wd **xwyyš gryw** 'c mrz 'wd wymnd dwšm(nwn) (d)[w](r q)wnynd	and they keep themselves far from the boundary of the enemies;
Prth.	(Re 1190) hyrzyd dyw'n t'r prm'ng pzdyd wyš'nyd 'z̲ **gryw wxybyh̲**	abandon the demons of the dark thought, chase (them), shake off (them) from yourselves;[22]
MP	(D-M 2006a, p. 527) d'(dy)š **gryw** 'w [dwš]mnyn	he gave himself up to the enemies;[23]
Prth.	(MKG 775–776) 'wt̲ **gryw** 'c hw p'yd	and he protects himself from him."[24]

The number of occurrences of reflexive *grīw*, however, could increase a great deal if we would interpret as containing a reflexive construction passages for which the 'soul' interpretation has been preferred by the editors. Consider:

18 See also Durkin-Meisterernst 2014, pp. 358–359, proposing a tentative interpretation ("… schlugen ihre Hände (ihr) Selbst … = ihre eigenen Hände schlugen sie und fügten ihr schwere Verletzungen zu").

19 Consider for instance that in Modern Persian *dast zadan* means "to touch" and not "to hit".

20 The abbreviations used here follow Durkin-Meisterernst 2004 (with the continuous line-numbers given in the relevant bibliographical reference).

21 Cf. Hutter 1992, p. 40: "Und in sie mischte Āz selbst ihr eigenes Ich hinein" vs. Andreas/Henning 1932, p. 181: "Und in sie selbst mischte die Āz ihr Ich hinein" (with different attribution of the emphatic *xwd*).

22 Cf. Reck 2004, p. 176: "vom eigenen Selbst".

23 I prefer the reflexive interpretation (with -yš as a suffix pronoun marking the agent) to the 'soul' interpretation adopted by Durkin-Meisterernst 2006a, p. 51: "he gave his soul to the enemies" (see also *ibid.*, p. 183, n. 200); cf. Andreas/Henning 1934, p. 877: "Er gab sein Ich (grêv) den Feinden".

24 The interpretation by Skjærvø 2009, p. 235 ("and he protects your soul from that"), with 'wt̲ explained as *u-t* "and-you", is untenable.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Prth.	(D-M/Mor 774b) ’wṯ pṯ hrw (w)[y’](g) (k)[w] prxyzyẖ • **wxybyẖ g(r)yw** pd hw brhm ’bdysyẖ	“and in every place where you will be, you will show yourself in that form (brahm);[25]
Prth.	(Re 284–286) pṯ ’m(w)[st’n] ky **gryw** pdr’ynd ’[w] bwg	… to the Believers who prepare themselves for salvation”[26]

3.3 A passage in the MP translation from Syriac of the Christian Psalter presents two occurrences of *grīw* ⟨CWLE⟩, very close each other:

> Ps. 130(2)
> BR’m nlmy klty **CWLE**, cygwn ’hšylky MDM ’MYtl. ’Pm cygwn ’hšylky MDM bwty **NPŠE CWLE**
> “Surely I have quieted myself (or [my] soul?) like a weaned baby by (his) mother and like a weaned baby was by me my soul” (Durkin-Meisterernst 2012, p. 15)[27]

The dependence on an original Syriac text is evident, though the identity of the source text is questioned.[28] MP *grīw* ⟨CWLE⟩ should parallel Syr. npš + y. One may note that in all the other Psalter passages which have survived, Syr. *napš* “soul” is regularly rendered by MP *gyān*[29] and it is difficult to understand why the translator has opted in these two cases for *grīw* ⟨CWLE⟩. If Durkin-Meisterernst’s interpretation of the text is correct, a tentative explanation could be that with the first ⟨npšy : CWLE⟩ correlation he rightly rendered the reflexive implication of the first ⟨npšy⟩ in the Syriac text, extending then his choice to the second ⟨npšy : NPŠE CWLE⟩, even though here npšy did not have a reflexive meaning.

4.1 Man. Sogd. *γrīw* (several graphic variants) is given in Sims-Williams/Durkin-Meisterernst (2012, p. 88) as “‘self, person, soul, body’; occasionally ‘(one) self’ as a reflexive pronoun”. In fact, *γrīw* is mostly found with the meaning of “body” (as in AN 140–141: rtšn ZKh CWRH ’nγtw RBkw (w)[m’t] ZY šn δwmph šyr βrzy “And their bodies were equally big and their tails very long”) and with the grammatical meaning of “self” (whether or not preceded by the possessive *xēpθ*). To define this usage as ‘occasional’ is in fact too restrictive:

25 Instead of “you will show your soul” as in Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, p. 243. In the same line one could modify the translations of D-M/Mor 776b [this passage is wrongly quoted in the *Glossary* as an instance of gryw rwšn, while rwšn here clearly belongs to the clause predication, rwšn kr-] and 778b (777b is not clear enough).

26 Instead of “die das Selbst vorbereiten” as in Reck 2004, p. 109.

27 See also Durkin-Meisterernst 2006b, p. 11.

28 In this passage, in particular, the single elements of the Syriac – i. e. at least the Syriac version in our possession – and Persian texts do not coincide perfectly, as demonstrated in Durkin-Meisterernst 2006b, p. 11 (the difference is however only in the word-order).

29 Heterographically written ⟨HY’⟩; cf. Ps 94.19; 112.4; 123.4, 5, 7; 129.5.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

M 549 ii 23–24
ʾty **γryw** prw zʾyy frpʾšʾnd[30]
"and they throw **themselves** to the ground"

AN 130
ZY ZKw **xypδ γrʾywh** γrβʾkw šmʾrʾnt
"and they consider **themselves** as wise"

Sundermann (2002b, p. 142 and fn. 55) suggested to interpret as (C)[WRH] "nape" a word in the Sogdian Book of the Limbs, following a possible term for 'neck' (ʾ(šδ)[ʾkw]) and preceding a possible term for 'shoulder' (β[ykʾ]). This remains merely a plausible hypothesis.[31] We have, however, a sure occurrence of (at least originally) "neck/nape" in the idiom *paru γrīw patγarβ-* "to accept", corresponding to Phl. *ō grīw padīr-* "id.", for which see also below §6:

AN 106–107
ZY šw **prw γrʾyw ptγrβʾtʾk δʾrʾnt** ky šw pr(w) mγwnw ʾβcʾnpδ ʾʾδy Lʾ βrt Lʾ ptγr(βʾtk) [δʾrt]
"And they accept what in the whole world no-one bears and accepts."[32]

Occasionally, Man. Sogd. *γrīw* has been understood by the text editors as "soul", but in most of these cases the 'soul' solution is not the only acceptable one,[33] as in AN 3 [6–8]: ZKw γrʾywy RBkw γyšʾyph ʾʾβr(t) "… brings damage to the body", translated as "[in] die Seele großen Schaden bringt" in Sundermann 1985, p. 19.

In almost all of its occurrences, the interpretation of *γrīw* as "body" or "figure" is not precluded. The exceptions are very few, and mostly in texts which can be considered as translated from, or modelled upon Parthian source texts, very close in content and structure to the original. In those cases, one may note the concomitant presence of Prth. *grīw* "soul" which may point to an influence by the source language:

Sogd.	§58c ʾmʾx **ʾγrywy** xwyck-kryny MN mwrtyty myδʾny	"releaser of our soul from amongst the dead" (Durkin-Meisterernst/ Morano 2010, p. 31)
Prth.	§58b **gryw**mʾn wyšʾhʾg ʾc mdy(ʾn) mwrdgʾ(n)	

30 Cf. Henning 1944, pp. 143–144.
31 Neither "Hals" nor "Oberkörper" can be envisaged in AN 161, where γrʾywh is to be understood as a reflexive pronoun, as already suggested by Sims-Williams (cf. Sundermann 1985, p. 30 and fn. 111).
32 The idiom was not recognized by Sundermann (1985, p. 26), who translated "Und sie ergreifen ständig in Person …".
33 Unlikely is the interpretation "Seele" for γrʾyw in AN 167. There the context is broken; in place of the reconstruction MN γrʾyw (sy)[xwrδ] proposed in Sundermann 1985, p. 30, Sims-Williams/Durkin-Meisterernst 2012, p. 183 (s. v. šmʾr "to think") now suggest MN γrʾyw (šy)[mʾr].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sogd. §576c tw' 'xšnyrk **CWRH** ZY ry-t[34] "your sign, **soul** and face" (Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, p. 181)
Prth. tw nyš'n **gryw** 'wd p'dgyrb[35] "your sign, **soul** and form"

4.2 The situation is similar in Christian Sogdian texts, where *γrīw* generally means "body" or "(one)self". Only in very few cases it could be interpreted as "soul" and even in some of these cases, other interpretations are admittable. Compare e.g. the C2 passage where the functions of the priests are mentioned (Sims-Williams 1985, p. 114): the first is to be "in place of (57R22–23) xwtw yšwγ γrywy, who did battle with Satan and ascended to heaven". For Sims-Williams, here *γrīw* referred to the soul of Lord Jesus; I would rather think to his person, with soul and body, exactly as Jesus was on the earth before ascending to heaven.

Interesting is also another passage from C2, where Sogd. *γrīw* parallels Syr. kyn' "nature; creature": (61R19) 't fryt't qt'wnt qt twžt qw γryw s' qt s'cy mycy' 't qw bγw s' wyny xypθ, translated "love is able to pay to the self what is (its) due and to God (what is) His own" in Sims-Williams (1985, p. 129). Interpreting *γrīw* as "creature, (human) being" rather than "the self" would perhaps fit the context better.[36] A case of *γrīw* "person" is in C3 2V4 (Sims-Williams 1995, p. 57).

4.3 In Buddhist texts, *γrīw* (*γr'yw(h)*; CWRH) means "body" (and as such it entered the Sogd. Buddhist terminology; see MacKenzie 1976, p. 210; S/*Grīw*, p. 365b) or has the grammatical meaning "self", with no exception. As "self", it may occur alone or with the possessive modifier, as illustrated by the following passages from the *Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions* (MacKenzie 1970, pp. 12, 20):

(195) *ZKw* ***γr'yw*** *'t ZKw zw'n z'ry L' ßrt* "he does not spare himself or his life"
(337–338) *mrtγm'k ZKZY ZKw* ***γypδ γr'yw*** *cnsty γwßt* "the man who praises himself much"

Examples of the pronoun *γrīw* in the Ancient Letters may be drawn from one of the formulas ('I consider myself immortal') with which the sender expresses delight at hearing good news from the other party (Sims-Williams 1991, pp. 193–194) and from other passages as well (cf. AL II, 54: 'ḤRZYšw cyty γrywyh L' w'cy "and do not send him away from yourself", Sims-Williams 2001, pp. 270–271).

34 See also 578c, 584c, 590c, 593c, 598c, 620c, 624c, 627c, 660c.
35 *Ibid.*, 660b [incomplete] and passim.
36 For the translation of the corresponding Syriac text ("Love is able to pay to (human) nature (what is) its own and to God (what is) His own") see Sims-Williams 1985, p. 132 (note to 19–20).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

What has been said in §§4.1–3 confirms that in all Sogdian varieties *γrīw* behaves in a rather consistent way. Sundermann's statement that the absence of *γrīw* as "soul" in the Buddhist texts may be easily explained by the absence of this concept in Buddhist doctrine, though undeniable, could be reversed: it is not the absence of *γrīw* "soul" in Buddhist texts that requires an explanation, but its very occasional presence in Manichaean and Christian texts. When this happens, the answer may be found in the influence exerted by the original source texts from which the Sogdian ones have been translated or upon which they have been modelled.

5. Benzing (1983, p. 293) gives Khwarezmian γryw as "Seele, Körper, Selbst"[37] and points to its grammatical usage explaining its development as "'das Selbst' > 'sich selbst'". All the several examples quoted by him, however, contain a reflexive *γrīw-*, and I am not aware of a single instance where it would have a referential value, different from the grammatical meaning "self". An original sense "neck" could however be deduced from *θ:γryw*, for which see below, §6.

6. In S/*Grīw*, Sundermann shows a particular interest in the possible paths of semantic and functional changes of MIr. *grīw/γrīw* from an original "nape, neck". He summarizes the main points of view before advancing his suggestions. In particular, he quotes Benveniste's (1966, p. 63) stance on the matter:[38]

> The nape is known as a vital center, the juncture between the head and the body, the top of the dorsal spine, the center of the spinal chord; executioners and sacrificers kill their victim with a violent blow on the neck. Hence this representation of the 'neck,' *grīvā-*, as the seat of the principle of life, and therefore as the symbol of the corporal body and of the person.

This explanation did not satisfy Sundermann, for whom "the concept that this evolution should have led by way of the concept 'life' to 'self'" would be at least problematic. However, Sundermann's interpretation of Benveniste's wording is slightly forced: what has been hinted at by the French scholar is not a 'neck' → 'life' → 'self' evolution, but rather a 'neck' → 'body' → 'self' one, with the first step of the chain ('neck' → 'body') justified by the special status of the neck, perceived as "the seat of the principle of life". And this certainly makes sense.

Cross-linguistic, typological studies (Schladt 2000) have shown that when the reflexive is the target of a grammaticalization process, body part names are the most predictable sources. Among these, the most common are the terms

37 See also Durkin-Meisterernst 2009, p. 344: "*γrīw-* (γryw) 'soul, self, he/she'".
38 Here quoted according to the English translation in S/*Grīw*, p. 365a.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

for 'body', through a direct conceptual mapping 'body' → 'self'.[39] A significant role is also played by terms for 'head'; sporadic cases of other body part terms grammaticalized into reflexive markers have been recorded, in particular, 'bone', 'skin' and 'face' (cf. Schladt 2000, p. 112). All these parts may be considered as sufficiently prominent or relevant to perform the role of 'part of body' standing by metonymy for 'body/person' and successively to be reinterpreted as standing for the subject referent; experiential motivation would favour this chain model.[40] But what about the neck/nape? Can the 'neck/nape' → 'body/person' conceptual mapping be considered as well-motivated and as having a strong experiential basis?

As already suggested by Benveniste, the neck/nape may be perceived as the seat of the life. To support this claim, one could quote *ǰudana* (i. e. 'life-container'), the denomination of the nape and the area of the jugular veins in Lāri and Gerāši, at least according to Eqtedāri 1955, p. 86.[41] The neck/nape is surely perceived as the seat of strength and power.[42] In some of the traditional lexicographical works (e. g. *Borhān-e Qat'e*), Prs. *gardan*, besides "neck", is also given as "strong, powerful; a brave, stout man; strength, power"; in Tāleši, *gardən* is also used with the sense of "vigour, strength". Saying in Persian that someone's *gardan* is *koloft*, i. e. "big, stout", one means that someone's body is big and strong and, metaphorically, that he is a powerful and reputable person. The Persian compound *gardan-koloft* "strong person" and derogatorily "bully, violent; one who uses violence" matches with similar expressions throughout Iranian; cf. Sorani Kurdish *milastûr, milqawî* "strong, powerful" (*mil* "neck, nape"), Kurmanji Kurdish *stu-yê wî qalîne* "he is strong" (*stu* "neck, nape"); Kermāni *gorm-eš koloft-e* "he is rich" (*gorm* "neck, nape"); Šuštari *gorm goloft* "strong fellow"; Hamadāni *xerxereye kasi koloft šodan* "to become a strong and powerful person" (*xerxere* "throat" used in the sense of "neck"?); Baxtiāri *garδeni* "violent;

39 In Iranian, 'body' is a common source for reflexives (OIr. *tanū-* "self", MP *tan* in *xwēš tan* "self"; Prs. *xištan* (only literary, not used in Colloquial Persian), Pašto, Ormuri *ǰān* "self"; cf. Gershevitch 1962, p. 38). Notable (though not strictly comparable) is the grammaticalization of the Prs. phrase *in tan* ("this body") into a pronoun to refer to the speaker (a substitute for *man* "I").

40 On chained metonymies in lexicon and grammar see Hilpert 2007.

41 Note however that in different volumes of his *Ganǰine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs*, Salāmi (2006–2011) records this word as "fontanel" (= Prs. *melāǰ*) in many dialects of the Lārestāni area (including Gerāši and Lāri). In general, the 'place of life' denomination pattern is common in Iranian for organs perceived as particularly vulnerable; see also Šuštari *junga* "sensitive places in the body as the side, skull, etc."

42 The conceptual extension 'neck' → 'power' is not peculiar to Iranian only: see e. g. Hittite $^{(UZU)}$*kŭt(t)ar, kuttan-* "back part of the neck", sometimes "top of the shoulders", also used with the meaning of "strength, power", developed from "une valeur élargie dérivant de la fonction exercée par cette partie du corps, c'est-à-dire 'appui, soutien'" (Dardano 2002, p. 378).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a strong person"; *garδeni kardan* "to do violence", etc. Khwarezmian *θ:γryw* "strong, powerful" is a compound where the first element is the preposition *θ-* "with", and the second is, to my knowledge, the only occurrence of *γrīw-* not working as a reflexive pronoun (as it would be "endowed with neck").

Body language with its codified gestures is mirrored in the lexicon and phraseology of any language. In this way, humility and haughtiness, willingness to obey and unwillingness to submission to the established authorities etc. may be expressed with reference to the appropriate movement of the neck. Prth. *grīwhangīft* "arrogance, haughtiness", explained in S/*Grīw* (p. 366b) as "self-stretching", could in fact be explained as originally "neck-stretching"; from a cognitive point of view, it would not be very dissimilar from the Persian expressions *gardan kešidan* "to rebel, to be restive", *gardan farāz* "arrogant", *gardan nehādan/gozāštan* "to be obedient", Tāleši *gi(y) gordonie* "to refuse to do something" and many similar Iranian expressions (and even English *stiff-necked*). Such considerations could perhaps give a clue to a better understanding of Dk III 157, 6, where *grīw*/CWLE (possibly, neck)[43] is listed after eyes, mouth, tongue and ears as one of the parts of the body which should display moderation: the eyes should refrain from envying,[44] the mouth from immoderate eating, the tongue from speaking nonsense, the ears from ?,[45] the neck from *čābukīh*. Phl. *čābukīh* is a nominalization from *čābuk*, a polysemous adjective ("agile, nimble; excellent", MacKenzie 1986),[46] often found in collocation with terms for dress and food. In the *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg* (cf. Annexe A,5 in Agostini 2013, pp. 164–170), the fact that one day abject men may become *pādixšāytar ud čābuktar* ("plus puissants et plus entreprenants") is indicated as one of the (negative) premonitory signs for a particular expected event. Phl. *čābukīh* ("agility", MacKenzie 1986) has a certain number of occurrences in the *Kārnāmag ī Ardaxšēr ī Pābagān*, always with reference to the body of a valiant man (in one case of a beautiful woman), also endowed with other qualities: good looks,

43 Generally so interpreted by scholars, with the exception of Fazilat (2005, pp. ١٤١, 228), who translates *grīw* with Prs. *nafs* ("self, essence, soul, etc.").

44 Cf. Persian *čašm zadan* "to envy someone's beauty or good luck and in this way to damage him" (Najafi 1999, p. 428). This is only one of the proposed interpretations for Phl. *zanišn*; similarly see Casartelli 1886, p. 537 ("de jeter le *malocchio*"); Sanjana 1876, p. 163 ("casting an evil eye"), Fazilat 2005, p. ١٤١ (also pp. 227–228; with doubts: "*az zaxm zadan*(?) (= *čašm zaxm*)"). Differently, see de Menasce (1973, p. 161) who translates *zanišn* as "des femmes" (if he is right, *zanišn* "woman" in Dk III would match *zanišn* "woman, wife" in the *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg* 3, 15: cf. Agostini 2013, p. 95, fn. 1097).

45 The relevant Phl. word is difficult to understand. Cf. Casartelli 1886, p. 537: "de ce qui ne veut rien"; Sanjana 1876, p. 163: "to hear what is improper"; de Menasce 1973, p. 161: "musique"; Fazilat 2005, p. ١٤١: "*nāniyušidan* (?)".

46 Differently Bailey 1971, p. xxxvi, who postulated three different bases for different words.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

strength, bravery and so on. How should one intend *čābūkīh*, generally with a positive connotation, in the Dk passage quoted above? Different interpretations have been advanced; Sanjana (1876, p. 163) gave it as "frequent motion", de Menasce (1973, p. 161) as "agilité"; Casartelli (1886, p. 537) proposed "orgeuil", conceptually not so distant from "restiveness, rebellion [Prs. *sarkeši*]" that we find in Fazilat (2005, pp. ١٤١, 228).[47] Casartelli, in particular, acknowledged with his interpretation a conceptual link between neck movements and human attitude and conduct.

The back of the neck is a place for carrying loads; it shares this function with the top of the shoulders. This fact is responsible for many metaphorical expressions common in Persian and other Iranian languages, with which assumption and attribution of responsibility, or taking up of a burden are expressed. Among these, one finds the MP idiom *(ul) ō grīw padīr-* "to take upon oneself; to accept", frequently found in Phl. texts and the equivalent Sogd. idiom *paru γrīw patγarβ-* mentioned above. Both match perfectly well with Prs. *(be) gardan gereftan*, (Sorani) Kurdish *wa asto girtin,* Baxtiāri *be garδen gerehδen*, Afghani Balochi *gardin girag*, Taleqāni *gardon* (*ha*)*gīton,* Tāleši *bə gi(y) gəte*, etc.; Tāleši, in particular, also shares with Middle Persian and Sogdian the etymon of the word for neck. Consider also Prs. *(be) gardan*(*-e kas-i*) "on responsibility (of someone)", *taqsir (be) gardan-e kasi gozāštan* "to put the blame on someone", etc., Kurmanji Kurdish *dan ser stu-yê xwe* "to take upon oneself", *xistin stu-yê kesekî* "to pin upon someone", Pašto *war pa γāra kawəl* "to pin something upon someone", Bandāri *bāre gardon* "responsibility", etc.[48]

MP *(ul) ō grīw padīr-* "to take upon (one's) neck", i. e. "to take upon (one)self" has been quoted by Sundermann (S/*Grīw*, p. 365a) in support of his thesis of a direct semantic shift 'nape' → 'self' which successively would have led "to developments in various directions towards 'body,' 'person,' and 'soul'". From this perspective, Sundermann rejected Gershevitch's assumption, to which he had previously adhered (Sundermann 1985, p. 45), of a transitional term "upper body" situated between the "neck" and "body". Gershevitch' stance rested on a personal and arguable interpretation of a rather unclear Sogd. passage (Sundermann 1985, p. 30); nevertheless, the chain of metonymical extensions 'neck' → 'upper body' (→ 'body') is in principle a fairly predictable one and seems to be documented in Pahlavi (see above §3.1). As further evidence, I cite

47 Fazilat also suggests interpreting *čābūkīh* as if it was *marčābūkīh* ("bravery, valour", MacKenzie 1986). The existence of this word, read in Dk VI 91 by Bailey (1971, p. 84), has already been disputed by Shaked (1979, p. 256).

48 Similar expressions are easily found in non-Iranian languages, as well; cf. Arabic *haδā fī riqābihum* "responsibility for it rests on their shoulders" [cf. *raqaba* "neck, nape"]; *fī ᶜunqihi damu qatīl* "he has murder on his conscience" [cf. *ᶜunuq, ᶜunq* "neck, nape"] (Wehr 1979); Italian *accollare* "to saddle, charge (responsibility etc.)", *accollarsi* "to shoulder" (cf. *collo* "neck").

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the senses "trunk; body [Russian *tulovišče, telo*]" (besides "vigour, strength", quoted above) conveyed by Tāleši *gardən* according to Pirejko (1976, p. 49), but also the idiom used to express "to put on (clothes)" we find in Waneci (cf. *γāṛē k.*, Elfenbein 1984, p. 232 [s. v. *γāṛə* "neck"];[49] *au dayə te γāṛē ko* "I put it on him" (said of a *lošī* "robe"), *ibid.*, p. 64).

7. To conclude, one may say that the word family under discussion exemplifies well how language and cultural conceptualizations relate to each other. Such conceptualizations provide experiential motivations for a chain of semantic shifts from 'nape/neck' to 'body' (conceived as a discrete physical unity, with a physical appearance, but also as a physical unity in a social dimension i. e., 'person'),[50] and from 'body' to (grammatical) 'self', with complete loss of the referential value. The grammaticalization process into reflexive marker is common to all the Middle Iranian languages, though in Pahlavi it remained halfway and *grīw* "self" (very occasionally used: dialectologically connoted?) cannot compete with *xwēš tan* in this role. Nevertheless, the reflexive function of *grīw* in (especially Manichaean) Middle Persian and Parthian would deserve a mention in the relevant grammatical descriptions, which has never had.[51] From a synchronic perspective, one may note divergences among the MIr. languages as far as the retention of the old meanings of *grīw/γrīw*, side by side the new ones, is concerned. Peculiar to Manichaean texts, and in particular to Middle Persian and Parthian ones, is the meaning "soul", possibly developed under the influence of the Syriac source texts.

Abbreviations

BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
D-M/Mor	Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
S/*Grīw*	Sundermann 2002a
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse

49 Wan. *γāṛə* is given as "neck, self" by Elfenbein (1984, p. 232) but I could not find in the Wan. texts published by the author a single case of *γāṛə* with this grammatical sense (for which *zān* "body; self" is commonly used).

50 Cf. Arabic *raqaba* "neck, nape" (also borrowed in Persian), used as "slave" and "person" in the Islamic Law.

51 See lastly Durkin-Meisterernst 2014.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

References

Agostini, D. 2013: *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg. Un texte eschatologique zoroastrien*. Roma.

Amouzgar, J./Tafazzoli, A. 2000: *Le cinquième livre du Dēnkard*. Paris.

Andreas, F. C./K. Barr 1933: "Bruchstücke einer Pehlevi Übersetzung der Psalmen." In: SPAW 1933, pp. 91–152 (plus 11 Taf.).

Andreas, F. C./W. B. Henning 1932: "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I." In: SPAW 1932, pp. 173–222.

— 1933: "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II." In: SPAW 1933, pp. 294–363.

— 1934: "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III." In: SPAW 1934, pp. 848–912.

Bailey H. W. 1971: *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books. Ratanbai Katrak Lectures*. Oxford [1st ed. 1943].

Bartholomae, Ch. 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg.

Benveniste, É. 1932: "Le Mémorial de Zarēr." In: *Journal Asiatique* 220, pp. 245–293.

— 1966: *Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien*. Paris.

Benzing, J. 1983: *Chwaresmischer Wortindex*. Wiesbaden.

Boyce, M. 1954: *The Manichaean Hymn Cycles in Parthian*. London.

Casartelli, L. Ch. 1886: "Un traité pehlevi sur la médecine. II." In: *Le Muséon* 5, pp. 531–558.

Dardano, P. 2002: "'La main est coupable', 'le sang devient abondant': sur quelques expressions avec des noms de parties et d'éléments du corps humain dans la littérature juridico-politique de l'Ancien et du Moyen Royaume hittite." In: *Orientalia* 71, pp. 333–392.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Part 1 of *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 3/1).

— 2006a: *The Hymns to the Living Soul. Middle Persian and Parthian Texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (BTT 24).

— 2006b: "The Pahlavi Psalter Fragment in Relation to its Source." In: *Studies in the Inner Asian Languages* XXI, pp. 1–19.

— 2009: "Khwarezmian." In: Windfuhr 2009, pp. 336–376.

— 2012: *The Pahlavi Psalter arranged according to units of the text; glossary and index*. http://turfan.bbaw.de/bilder/texte/psaltermpsyrgrengversesglossarysept2012.pdf.

— 2014: *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch)*. Wien.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D./E. Morano 2010: *Mani's Psalms. Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (BTT 26).

Elfenbein, J. H. 1984: "The Wanetsi Connection. Part I." In: *JRAS* 116, pp. 54–76; "The Wanetsi Connection. Part II: Glossary." *Ibid*., pp. 229–241.

Eqtedāri, A. 1955: *Farhang-e lārestāni*. Tehrān [1334].

Fazilat, F. 2005: *Ketāb-e sevvom-e Dinkard (darsnāme-ye din-e mazdāi)*. Daftar-e dovvom (pp. 113–194). Tehrān [1384].

Gershevitch, I. 1962: "The Sogdian Word for 'Advice' and Some Muγ Documents." In: *Central Asian Journal* 7, pp. 77–95.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gignoux, Ph. 1989: "Sur le composé humain du manichéisme à l'ismaélisme." In: C.-H. de Fouchécour/Ph. Gignoux (eds.): *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*. Paris, pp. 137–149.

Gignoux, Ph./A. Tafazzoli 1993: *Anthologie de Zādspram*. Paris.

Henning, W. B. 1944: "The Murder of the Magi." In: *JRAS* 1944, pp. 133–144.

Hilpert, M. 2007: "Chained Metonymies in Lexicon and Grammar: A Cross-linguistic Perspective on Body Terms." In: G. Radden/K.-M. Köpcke/Th. Berg/P. Siemund (eds.): *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Amsterdam, pp. 77–98.

Hutter, M. 1992: *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte. Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980–7984*. Wiesbaden.

MacKenzie, D. N. 1970: *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*. London.

— 1976: *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*. Leiden.

— 1986: *A concise Pahlavi dictionary*. London [1st ed. 1971].

de Menasce, J. P. 1973: *Le troisième livre du Dēnkart*. Paris.

Monchi-Zadeh, D. 1981: *Die Geschichte Zarēr's*. Uppsala.

Najafi, ᶜA. 1999: *Farhang-e fārsi-e ᶜāmiāne*. Tehrān [1378].

Oriān, S. 1992: *Matun-e pahlavi*. Tehrān [1371].

Pagliaro, A. 1925: "Il testo pahlavico Ayātkār-i-Zarērān edito in trascrizione, con introduzione, note e glossario." In: *Rendiconti della R. Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, VI ser., I, pp. 550–604.

Pirejko, L. A. 1976: *Talyšsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.

Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen – Edition der mittelpersischen und partischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout (BTT 22).

Rezāi Bāghbidi, H. 2005: *Revāyat-e Āzorfarnbaγ-e Farroxzādān (Resāle-i dar fiqh-e zardošti-ye mansub be sadde-ye sevvom-e heǰri). Āvānevešt, tarǰome, towzihāt va vāženāme*. Tehrān [1384].

Salāmi, ᶜA. 2006–2011: *Ganǰine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs.* Vols. III (2006 [1385]), IV (2007 [1386]), V (2009 [1388]), VI (2011 [1390]). Tehrān.

Sanjana, D. P. B. 1876: *The Dinkard, the Acts of Religion. Book 3*. English translation of volumes 2–4 by Ratanshah, E. Kohiyar (Electronic edition prepared by J. H. Peterson, 1999 and available at http://www.avesta.org/denkard/dk3.pdf).

Schladt, M. 2000: "The typology and grammaticalization of reflexives." In: Z. Frajzyngier/T. Curl (eds.): *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*. Amsterdam, pp. 103–124.

Shaked, Sh. 1979: *Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages* (*Dēnkard VI*). Boulder, Colorado.

— 2002: "Towards a Middle Persian Dictionary." In: Ph. Huyse (ed.): *Iran. Questions et connaissance*. Vol. I: *La période ancienne*. Paris, pp. 121–134.

Sims-Williams, N. 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C 2*. Berlin (BTT 12).

— 1991: "A Sogdian Greeting." In: R. E. Emmerick/D. Weber (eds.): *Corolla Iranica. Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie on the occasion of his 65th birthday on April 8th, 1991*. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 176–187.

— 1995: "Christian Sogdian Texts from the Nachlass of Olaf Hansen I: Fragments of the Life of Serapion." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 58/1, pp. 50–68.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2001: "The Sogdian Ancient Letter II." In: M. G. Schmidt/W. Bisang (eds.): *Philologica et Linguistica. Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*. Trier, pp. 267–280.

Sims-Williams, N./D. Durkin-Meisterernst 2012: *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian.* Part 2 of *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 3/2).

Skalmowski, W. 1991: "Le moyen-iranien *gryw/γr(')yw* 'âme'." In: A. van Tongerloo/S. Giversen (eds.): *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Prof. Julien Ries*. Lovanii, pp. 329–332.

Skjærvø, P. O. 2009: "Middle West Iranian." In: Windfuhr 2009, pp. 196–278.

Sundermann, W. 1979: "Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, pp. 95–133.

— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin (BTT 11).

— 1985: *Ein manichäisch-soghdisches Parabelbuch*. Berlin (BTT 15).

— 1997: *Der Sermon von der Seele*. Turnhout (BTT 19).

— 2002a: "Grīw." In: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. XI, Fasc. 4. New York, pp. 364–368.

— 2002b: "'The Book of the Head' and 'The Book of the Limbs'. A Sogdian word list." In: Ph. Huyse (ed.): *Iran. Questions et connaissance*. Vol. I: *La période ancienne*. Paris, pp. 135–161.

Utas, B. 1976: "Verbs and preverbs in the Ayyātkār ī Zarērān." In: *Acta Orientalia* 37, pp. 75–110.

Utas, B./H. S. Nyberg 1988: *Frahang i Pahlavīk*. Edited with transliteration, transcription and commentary from the posthumous papers of H. S. Nyberg by B. Utas with the collaboration of Ch. Toll. Wiesbaden.

Wehr, H. 1979: *A dictionary of modern written Arabic (Arabic-English)*. Ed. by J. Milton Cowan. Fourth edition considerably enlarged and emended by the author. Wiesbaden.

Williams, A. V. 1990: *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī dēnīg*. Vol. I: *Transliteration, Transcription, Glossary*. Vol. II: *Translation, Commentary and Pahlavi Text*. Copenhagen.

Windfuhr, G. (ed.) 2009: *Iranian Languages*. London.

Zaehner, R. C. 1955: *Zurvan. A Zoroastrian Dilemma*. Oxford.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mariam, the Net-Caster and Shepherd: the Further Development of the Johannine Mary Magdalene in the Manichaean Psalm Book

Majella Franzmann, Sydney

Three related passages of the Manichaean Psalm Book (187.2–36, 192.21–22, 194.19) reinterpret and extend the early canonical Christian tradition about Mary Magdalene.[1] K. Coyle,[2] S. Richter,[3] P. Nagel,[4] A. Marjanen,[5] and M. Scopello[6] have produced detailed work on the figure of Mary Magdalene in these passages over the last twenty years. While K. Coyle was not the first to note the part played by Mary Magdalene in the Manichaean tradition, he was the first to begin a detailed study with his 1991 article. This first article provided an impetus to scholarship, and his second article some ten years later formed a kind of *inclusio* as he responded to those who had commented on the earlier work. With the studies by these scholars, much of the detailed linguistic work on the passages or on the identification of the character named Mariam as Mary Magdalene was completed. They, and others before them, also observed a strong relationship between Ps 187 and Jn 20, as I will detail below, but I will argue in what follows that an even greater relationship with the Gospel of John can be identified than has been suggested.

Mary Magdalene in the Psalm Book

Apart from the solitary voice of S. Shoemaker,[7] whose argument that the character named in these passages as Mariam should be identified as Mary the Mother of Jesus has been soundly put to rest by K. Coyle,[8] all the commentators noted above relate the three passages together, and draw the conclusion that

1 Allberry 1938.
2 Coyle 1991; 2005. Now brought together helpfully with other works in Coyle 2009.
3 Richter 1994, pp. 36–59.
4 Nagel 1995.
5 Marjanen 1996.
6 Scopello 2011.
7 Shoemaker 2001.
8 Coyle 2009, pp. 184–185.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mariam is to be identified as Mary Magdalene. Ps 187.2–36 provides a reworking and extension of the Johannine post-resurrection story of the meeting between Mary Magdalene and Jesus in Jn 20; Ps 192.21–22 names Mariam as a net-caster, who hunts for the eleven who are wandering; and Ps 194.19 names her as the spirit of wisdom.

The question of the identity of Mariam is not entirely straightforward. The second and third passages introduce her in close association with a woman called Martha. Ps 192.23 follows the characterization of Mariam as net-caster by the line: "A joyous servant is Martha her sister also", and Ps 194.20 follows the description of Mariam as the spirit of wisdom with Martha as the breath of discernment. It appears, at least from these two passages, that the Psalm Book conflates Mary Magdalene with the so-called Mary of Bethany, whose sister is Martha according to the Christian canonical tradition.[9]

The conflation of Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany is attested early and prior to the generally agreed dating of the PsBk (ca. 340). J. Cerrato deals with this conflation of characters in Hippolytus' commentary on the Song of Songs 25.6 in which both Martha and Mary are referred to as "apostles to the apostles, sent by Christ".[10] Commentators on PsBk 192 and 194 note the conflation and its presence elsewhere, such as in the *Pistis Sophia*, where Mary Magdalene again plays a major role.[11] S. Richter rightly argues that the link here to the Johannine passages is so strong and foundational *(grundlegend)* that one can only say that Mary of Bethany has been identified with Mary Magdalene and not vice versa.[12]

The Johannine influence on Ps 187

That this psalm is a reinterpretation and extension of John 20:11–18 is not under dispute by any of the commentators. From the beginning of work on the text, C. R. C. Allberry had noted links in this passage to Jn 20, referring to Jn 20:17 at verse 5 and Jn 20:15 at verse 9. Major parallels are very obvious between the two texts: the naming of Mary/Mariam; the command not to touch Jesus/hold on to him; he/his body has not been taken away; he is not the gardener; a command to Mary/Mariam to go to the eleven disciples and to give them a message, and so on. A. Marjanen notes the numerous similarities and differences between the two, both in form and in content.[13]

9 „Mary of Bethany" is an anachronism, of course, as she is referred to only as Mary, both in Luke 10:38–42 and the Gospel of John.
10 Cerrato 2000, p. 294.
11 See, e.g. Coyle 2009, p. 162, n. 39 and Marjanen 1996, p. 208.
12 Richter 1994, p. 211, n. 243.
13 Marjanen 1996, p. 207, n. 15 and n. 16.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

S. Richter also concentrates on the Johannine connection: "Somit ist es Aufgabe, die Art und Weise zu bestimmen, wie die dem Psalm zugrundeliegende Jo-Perikope umgeformt wurde", suggesting that the text actually cannot be fully understood without looking back to the Johannine dialogues in Jn 20 between Mary and the angels and between Mary and Jesus and seeing how that text has been transformed or remodelled.[14] Thus, apart from the major parallels that are clear, we can also identify a particular focus on certain features of Jn 20 that are worked out here in much more detail. The depiction of Mary weeping at the tomb (Jn 20:11), for example, is taken up in Ps 187 and expanded into a much stronger line of development that moves the character of Mariam from sorrow and weeping to joy, a state strengthened by her discipleship in fulfilling the command/the task set for her. S. Richter sees this movement in emotion in parallel with the movement within Mariam from ignorance to understanding.[15]

While a link to Jn 20 has been well-documented, a more detailed analysis of the connection to the Johannine tradition has not been given enough attention, both in its implication for reading the character of Mariam and for the appropriate method for approaching this character in Ps 187. In contrast to the scene in Jn 20, Mariam is given a far more explicit and detailed task as a messenger by Jesus in Ps 187. The framework of Jn 20 is clear, yet the further detail by which Mariam's task is extended provides three further links to Jn 21 and to Jn 1 that have not been developed in any detail by other commentators, although S. Richter has made some minor comments.

The first link is provided in Jesus' call to Mariam (vv. 10–29), which mirrors the call to Peter in Jn 21:15–17 to feed/look after the sheep. Here she is called to be the interim shepherd who calls the disciples back to the shepherd Jesus, feeding the sheep (Peter and the others) with her wisdom. She is not herself one of the obedient sheep, as Salome and Arsinoe are characterized in Ps 192.24. In two connected images, she calls the disciples to the shepherd, and hunts them down and draws them in as a fisher with a net (Ps 192.21–22). The task is a kind of call and gathering: her mission to bring the sheep to the shepherd is a gathering mission (Ps 187); the net she casts to catch the Eleven is a gathering net (Ps 192).

Whatever the cause of Peter and the others straying into ignorance, and however we are to identify the traitor who has led them astray (vv. 15–17), a real calling or re-calling of them becomes necessary. It is Mariam who comes to the banks of the Jordan and re-calls them. She is not just bringing a message, but actively calling again to those who have lost their way and returned to the ignorance of their previous ways — fishing that is not spiritual fishing for souls (vv. 16–17).[16] K. Coyle describes the character of Mariam as the one who is

14 Richter 1994, p. 39.

15 Richter 1994, pp. 42–43.

16 A. Marjanen (1996, p. 213) speaks of the change in roles for Mariam and the Eleven: the latter have laid down their nets with which they have caught men into life and gone back to being ordinary fishers; they are now hunted by Mariam who has been made the

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

not just to carry a message but is to be the spokesperson for Jesus, recalling the Eleven to the real net-casting from which the traitor has lured them, and calling Peter to remembrance. She does not speak for herself, but in the name of Jesus, so that even when K. Coyle says "she is a guide, a teacher, even a stand-in for Jesus", he is careful to point out that she has no message of her own. Thus the emphasis for K. Coyle here is on "faithful (though active) obedience".[17]

The second link is made by Mariam's call to Peter (vv. 24–29). Here she calls him out of ignorance and error rather than to be the one to feed/care for Jesus' sheep as we find in Jn 21:15–17.[18] She, not Peter, is the one who has already been called to gather the sheep, as we have seen above. S. Richter also makes the link to Jn 21:15–17, commenting: "Deutlich zeigt sich in diesem Kontrast die Umformung der ntl. Aussage".[19] In linking this passage to Ps 94.19, P. Nagel makes the connection to the Gospel of Mary and the Pistis Sophia, where the wise Mary is posited over against Peter who is ignorant.[20] In the PsBk the polemic against Peter and the others is more muted but just as telling: they have gone off in error, gone back to the fishing from which they were called; Mariam is the wise one who calls them back.[21]

Let us consider more deeply Mariam the wise one. Mariam calls Peter and the others out of ignorance and feeds them like sheep with the words of Jesus. K. Coyle suggests that this raises the possibility that Mariam is to be identified with Sophia, finding a connection at this point with the wisdom of Mani's teaching, and also with the depiction of Jesus the Splendour in the *Kephalaia* as a hunter/fisher with a net, which is his wisdom, to catch the light/souls in the sea of error in which they are drowning (*Keph* 5). Like Jesus the Splendour, Mariam is a hunter and net-caster who is named as the spirit of wisdom.[22] Unfortunately K. Coyle does not draw together strongly his two sections on Mariam as the obedient believer and Mariam as the one wielding the net of wisdom. While he identifies a recall activity by Mariam, he fails to find a connection here to the activity of revelation in calling others out of ignorance/error. He notes the strong

net-caster by Jesus. He concludes this shows her faithfulness but does not confer preeminence on her.

17 Coyle 2009, pp. 171, 182–185. In similar vein, A. Marjanen (1996, pp. 212, 215) and S. Richter (1994, p. 53) see her as the ideal believer for the community. S. Richter characterizes her as a "gehorsame Schülerin" (p. 54).

18 *Pace* Marjanen 1996 who finds the assignment to approach Peter not in John but in Mk 16:7.

19 Richter 1994, p. 50, n. 62 and p. 51.

20 Nagel 1995, p. 225. While P. Nagel notes the contrast between Mariam and Peter in Ps 187, he suggests however that it is not through her intellect or her insight but rather her behaviour in relation to Jesus' command/task that her "spirit of wisdom" is to be understood.

21 By contrast, Coyle (2009, p. 185) writes that Mariam is not in conflict with Peter or any other apostle and that her teaching 'is entirely positive and non-confrontational'. Marjanen (1996, p. 212) similarly finds no tension or rivalry between Mariam and the Eleven.

22 Coyle 2009, pp. 177, 181.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

tradition about Mary Magdalene in texts like the Gospel of Mary, the Gospel of Philip, Dialogue of the Saviour, or the Pistis Sophia,[23] but notes only that the Gnostic Mary is characterized as the wisest of all the disciples or the one who knows the truth or understands everything.

There has been a degree of negative reaction to K. Coyle's rather tentative suggestion of the link from Mariam to Sophia,[24] even from P. Nagel, who finds the same connection to Jesus the Splendour and then to the Virgin of Light but suggests thereby a rather passive and obedient Mariam with no reference to her own insight that has been awakened or strengthened by her meeting with Jesus who calls her to mission. In P. Nagel's view, taking over the net of wisdom from Jesus the Splendour, her life and personality is overtaken by the spirit of wisdom, but she is not wisdom herself.[25] I would suggest, however, that K. Coyle is correct, although he reaches his conclusion from a different point of view to my own, when he sums up:

> The Magdalene, then, would serve Manichaean christology/soteriology in a dual capacity: first, as personifying Sophia and, secondly, as an essential complement to the Christ-Saviour figure.[26]

The link to Sophia is strong in Mariam's activity. Mariam undertakes one of the key roles of Sophia as revealer in the salvific process: one who calls others out of ignorance/error. Her mission is reminiscent of *Hyp. Archons* where Sophia sends Zoe-Eve to awaken Adam; or of the saviour sent to awaken the prince in the *Hymn of the Pearl*; or the bridegroom or brother sent to awaken the soul in the *Exegesis on the Soul*. These saviour revealers are all sent by another Power to awaken those in error or ignorance. In Ps 187 Jesus sends Mariam as the equivalent heavenly messenger/revealer. The words are his but the agency is hers. In this way she is another prototype for Mani who will follow after her. Mani will be the final revelatory figure, the new Jesus, just as Mariam is the new Jesus for the disciples she recalls.

A third link can be made to the Gospel of John in the midst of this post-resurrection narrative. Commentators have found in the scene on the banks of the Jordan in Ps 187 a mirroring of the call of the disciples in the early days of Jesus' ministry as depicted in the Synoptics. C. R. C. Allberry notes Matt 4:18–19 at

23 Coyle 2009, pp. 113–121; see also Richter 1994, pp. 56–57, and the detailed overview in Marjanen 1996.

24 See e. g. Richter 1994, pp. 56–57, 247; Nagel 1995, pp. 162–163; Marjanen 1996, p. 215. For A. Marjanen, the passage shows Mariam moving from an initial spiritual weakness ("immaturity and inadequacy") in vv. 7–8, 10, where she does not know that Jesus did not in fact die (pp. 208–209), to become the spirit of wisdom as "the first one to recognize the real character of the Risen Jesus" (p. 215). Here however, A. Marjanen appears to equate the spirit of wisdom with no more than having wisdom or insight in order to recognize the truth of who Jesus is, rather than the larger role that K. Coyle suggests.

25 Nagel 1995, pp. 226–228

26 Coyle 2009, p. 172.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

verses 15–17; others find Mark 1:16–17 and synoptic parallels the logical link, where disciples are originally called to be "fishers of men".[27] When commentators look back to the Synoptic accounts at this point, the strength of the Johannine influence on this psalm is diluted. The psalm thus links back to a mixture of canonical New Testament texts, i.e. the Gospel of John and the Synoptics. However there is another clue here to a Johannine tradition that should not be disregarded, and which strengthens the Johannine influence over against a lesser Synoptic memory of a tradition about "fishers of men".

The clue is contained in the use of the Jordan in this passage, instead of the Sea of Gallilee in the Synoptic accounts. Commentators have tried to explain the use of the Jordan as either a lack of geographical knowledge on the part of the psalmist or as some kind of metaphorical image. In fact the link is easy to understand when it is accepted that this passage already owes so much to the Gospel of John. Simply put, the recall of the disciples happens in the same location as their first call in Jn 1:35–39 – on the banks of the Jordan where John was baptizing (Jn 1:28).

Conclusion

While all commentators accept the use of Jn 20 in Ps 187, the use of Jn 1 and Jn 21 have been virtually ignored or not identified at all. Considering the links from these three Johannine chapters together, one has some idea of the overwhelming strength of the relationship of the Johannine tradition to this particular psalm, which aids the argument for a more fully nuanced depiction of Mariam. The psalm provides us with a greater role for Mariam than in Jn 20, in which she becomes Sophia-like, a second revelatory Jesus-figure, the net-caster and fisher of men, who is second to none, not even Peter, as well as the source of the true call to mission/apostleship of the Eleven.

If we accept the strong Johannine influence in this particular psalm, I have to disregard to some degree what has always been my primary rule in approaching the characters in any text. One normally investigates the depiction of a character by firstly seeking the inner coherence of that character within the primary text, and only then looking for the wider context to that understanding. So to seek to understand the character of Mariam, I would normally propose that we look to the three psalms in which this character occurs, and then consult the Psalm Book, followed by other related works of primary influence on the Psalm Book, both Manichaean and non-Manichaean, before thinking again about how traditions about Mary Magdalene have developed in Manichaeism and its archrival, the early Christianity of the Roman tradition. On the contrary, in this case, I must begin my investigation of Mary Magdalene in Ps 187, not from the context of the Psalm Book itself, but rather from the Johannine connection. In the end

27 See e.g. Richter 1994, p. 48.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

I must agree with S. Richter, that here the Johannine text is absolutely fundamental to our reading of the psalm and our understanding of Mariam.[28]

Appendix[29]

PsBk 187:1–36

Psalm of Heracleides

2 Mariam, Mariam, know me. Do not touch
me.
4 Stop the tears of your eyes and know me. I am your
master. Do not touch me for I have not yet seen the face of my
6 father.
Your God has not been carried away by thieves, according to the thoughts of your
8 littleness. Your God did not die; he ruled over death.
I am not the gardener. I have given; I have received the […] I did not appear
10 to you until I saw your tears and your trouble […] for me.
Throw away from yourself this sadness; serve by this service;
12 Be for me a messenger to these wandering orphans.
Make haste in your joy and go to the Eleven whom
14 you will find gathered on the bank of the Jordan.
The traitor persuaded them to be fishermen in the manner they were
16 at first; to lay down their nets with which they caught
men into life.
18 Say to them: "Get up; let us go; it is your brother who calls
you". If they scorn my role as brother, say to them:
20 "It is your master".
If they disregard my role as master, say to them: "It
22 is your lord". Use all your skill in instruction until you have brought the sheep
to the shepherd.
24 If you see that they are stupefied, draw Simon Peter
aside; say to him, "Remember what
26 I uttered between you and me.
Remember what I said between you and me on the Mount
28 of Olives: 'I have something to say; I have no one to whom
to say it'".
30 Rabbi, my master, I will serve your commandment in the
joy of my whole heart.

28 Richter 1994, p. 39. *Contra* Marjanen 1996, p. 211.
29 The Coptic text from which these translations are provided is taken from Allberry 1938, pp. 187, 192, 194.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

32 I will not give rest to my heart; I will not give sleep to my eyes; I will not give rest to my feet until I have brought the sheep to the sheepfold.
34 Glory to Mariam because she listened to her master;
she served his commandment in the joy of her whole heart.
36 Glory and victory to the soul of the blessed Maria.

PsBk 192:21–23

A net-caster is Mariam, hunting for the Eleven
who were wandering. There were
A joyous servant is Martha, her sister.

PsBk 194:19–20

He chose Mariam, the spirit of wisdom
He gave life to Martha, the breath of discernment.

Bibliography

Allberry, C. R. C 1938: *A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II*. Stuttgart (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, 2).

Cerrato, J. 2000: "Mary and Martha in the Commentaries of Hippolytus." In: M. Wiles/E. Yarnold/P. M. Parvis (eds.): *Papers Presented at the Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1999. Historica, Biblica, Theologica et Philosophica*. Leuven, pp. 294–297.

Coyle, K. 1991: "Mary Magdalene in Manichaeism?" In: *Le Muséon* 104, pp. 39–55.

— 2005: "Twelve Years Later: Revisiting the 'Marys' of Manichaeism." In: D. Good (ed.): *Mariam, the Magdalen, and the Mother.* Bloomington/Indianapolis, pp. 197–211.

— 2009: *Manichaeism and Its Legacy.* Leiden (NHMS, 69).

Marjanen, A. 1996: *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents.* Leiden, pp. 203–213 (NHMS, 40).

Nagel, P. 1995: "Mariammê – Netzwerferin und Geist der Weisheit." In: C. Fluck/L. Langener/S. Richter/S. Schaten/G. Worst (eds.): *Divitae Aegypti: Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause*. Wiesbaden, pp. 223–228.

Richter, S. 1994: *Exegetisch-literarkritische Untersuchungen von Herakleidespsalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*. Altenberge.

Scopello, M. 2011: "Relectures et réinterprétations du personnage de Marie-Madeleine dans le Psautier manichéen copte et chez Éphrem de Nisibe." In: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (janvier–mars, 2011), pp. 535–563.

Shoemaker, S. 2001: "Rethinking the 'Gnostic Mary': Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition." In: *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9, pp. 555–595.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Wer ist „der Achte“?

Ein west-östliches Rätsel manichäischer Terminologie

Wolf-Peter Funk, Québec

Bei den letzten Gesprächen, die ich mit Werner Sundermann persönlich führen durfte – das was am Rande der Konferenz in Flagstaff, Arizona, Anfang August 2005 – kamen wir mehrfach auf ungeklärte Fragen aus unseren jeweiligen Textbereichen zu sprechen. Das Spektrum von Themen, die sich zur Unterhaltung anboten, war farbenreich und in mancher Hinsicht durchaus instruktiv: von verschollenen Papyrusblättern oder etwa dem Bedeutungsunterschied bei Ethnonymen wie “Chaldäer“ und “Babylonier“ bis hin zur Rolle der verschiedenen Frauengestalten in Manis letzten Tagen. Aber es gab auch Frustrierendes, und dazu gehörte „der Achte“. Damals war gerade die prächtige Ausgabe iranischer Hymnen von Christiane Reck erschienen,[1] und das Auftauchen des geheimnisvollen „Achten“ in diesen Hymnen war für mich ebenso überraschend wie nun für Werner Sundermann die Mitteilung, die ich ihm aus der Lektüre noch unpublizierter koptischer Textstücke machen konnte – freilich ohne dass die Sache, die mir damals ohnehin nur verschwommen vor Augen stand, wesentlich klarer wurde.

Damit soll auch gleich gesagt werden, dass die im Titel formulierte Frage hier noch keine vollauf befriedigende, klare Antwort finden wird. Was dieser kleine Beitrag zeigen soll, ist in der Hauptsache, dass die Frage selbst eine breitere Basis hat, als es bisher erscheinen konnte und dass sie damit wohl auch etwas dringlicher wird. Denn der Eindruck, den wir beide zunächst hatten – dass es sich wohl um eine eher zufällige literarische Randerscheinung handelte – lässt sich kaum mehr aufrecht erhalten, wenn eine gleichermaßen so benannte Gestalt in manichäischen Texten sowohl um den Anfang des fünften Jahrhunderts herum in Ägypten wie auch im iranisch-mittelasiatischen Raum ein halbes Jahrtausend später noch auftaucht. Auch die vage Möglichkeit, dass es sich um einen „von außen“ (etwa von hermetischer oder anderweitig gnostischer Literatur her) an manichäische Texte herangetragenen Terminus handeln könnte,[2] verliert damit immer mehr an Wahrscheinlichkeit.

1 Reck 2004.

2 Um den Fragenkreis noch etwas abzurunden, gestatte ich mir auch den Hinweis auf eine Mitteilung, die mir Werner Sundermann mündlich machte: dass neben dem eindeutig

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Es handelt sich bei dem mir vorliegenden Material um die Reste zweier Papyrusblätter aus dem Bestand des sogenannten „Synaxeis-Codex".[3] Sie gehören zu einer Blattgruppe, die in Rolf Ibschers eigentümlicher Konservator-Sprache als „Zwischenlagepacken" bezeichnet wurde, und die durchweg Textstücke enthält, die ihrem Inhalt nach *außerhalb* der eigentlichen Synaxeis, also der Lesestücke aus einzelnen Kapiteln des Lebendigen Evangeliums, liegen. Auf einem der Rahmen findet sich statt dieses knappen Ausdrucks auch die etwas deutlichere Bezeichnung „Zurückgestellte Zwischenlage". Wenn man sich fragt, zu welchem Teil des in mehreren Stücken vorhandenen Codex dieser Packen nun eigentlich gehört, möchte man gern wissen, zu welchem Zeitpunkt der langjährigen Konservierungsarbeit dieser Packen „zurückgestellt" wurde. Das erfährt man jedoch nicht – nur dass er im Jahre 1957 wieder aufgegriffen und konserviert wurde. Es ist hier nicht der Ort für eine umfassende Beschreibung des komplizierten Verhältnisses zwischen Kodikologie und Konservatorik bei diesem Codex. Um dem Leser jedoch einen ungefähren Eindruck von der Lage dieser Blätter zu vermitteln, sei es gestattet, noch etwas weiter auszuholen.

Für die „Zurückstellung" eines Packens aus diesem Codex gibt es – wenn man die verschiedenen Arbeitsperioden und den Inhalt der betreffenden Handschriftenteile in Betracht zieht – im wesentlichen zwei Möglichkeiten: entweder zu Beginn von Rolf Ibschers Konservierungsarbeit nach dem Kriege (das heißt also „zurückgestellt" gegenüber dem, was bei dem von seinem Vater Hinterlassenen sozusagen obenauf liegt) oder an einem bestimmten Punkt im Verlaufe von Rolf Ibschers eigener Arbeit. Letzteres scheint mir am ehesten zuzutreffen. Als Hugo Ibscher in den 30er Jahren die ersten dreizehn Blätter aus dem Chester-Beatty-Anteil konservierte und als Probe seiner Kunst nach

bezeugten „Achten" in Zeile 1046 des mittelpersischen Hymnus aus M 785 (*hštmyg* bei Reck 2004, S. 167) auch die Möglichkeit besteht, dass noch eine andere, etwas dunklere Wortbildung mit „acht", aber in einem parthischen Hymnus (*hštyg'r* bei Reck 2004, S. 113, in den Zeilen 319 und 323), für die gleiche Sinndeutung in Frage kommt, was jedoch (nach freundlicher Auskunft von Christiane Reck) sehr unsicher ist. In dieser Frage steht mir kein Urteil zu. Der Kontext dieser Zeilen ist leider sehr zerstört. Dem Kommentar zu der in erster Linie als Kollektivum gedachten Bildung (Reck 2004, S. 116) entnehme ich, dass die Deutung als „Bezeichnung der göttlichen Ogdoade", die man sich wohl nur als von außen kommend vorstellen könnte, da sie im manichäischen System keinen rechten Platz hätte, ganz unsicher ist. Ich räume jedoch gern ein, dass ich selbst bis vor kurzem noch bezüglich des „Achten" an die Möglichkeit eines von außen herangetragenen Begriffs gedacht habe. Siehe dazu auch unten, Anm. 7.

3 Die Bestände des Codex sind auf zwei verschiedene Sammlungen verteilt: der größere Teil gehört der Chester-Beatty-Bibliothek in Dublin (dort auch der restliche unkonservierte Buchblock) und hat die *call number* PCBM 5, ein kleinerer Teil gehört der Berliner Papyrussammlung (Berlin P 15995). Die Blätter des „Zwischenlagepackens" gehören zum Dubliner Anteil, also dem früher so genannten „Göttinger Codex", der in den letzten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jahrhunderts einen Schrank des Ägyptischen Museums in Berlin-Charlottenburg füllte (wo ich mehrfach Gelegenheit hatte, Blätter zu kollationieren). Eine Ausgabe befindet sich in Vorbereitung.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

London schickte,[4] hatte er dazu einen „Packen“ aus der Mitte des Codex herausgegriffen; sie enthalten wohl, wenn ich recht sehe, den Übergang von den eigentlichen Synaxeis-Kapiteln zu den Nicht-Synaxeis-Teilen des umfangreichen Codex.[5] Demnach muss das Rohmaterial, das Rolf Ibscher nach dem Kriege vorfand, aus mindestens zwei getrennten Buchblöcken bestanden haben. Und wenn meine Deutung der Seiteninhalte zutreffend ist, konservierte er zu Beginn seiner Tätigkeit (1950/51) zunächst Teile der letzten Synaxeis – also Blätter, die jenen dreizehn mehr oder weniger unmittelbar vorausgingen – arbeitete jedoch an diesem Block dann erst wieder vom Jahre 1954 ab; was die Serien von 1952 und 1953 enthalten, sind den Kapitelüberschriften zufolge *keine* Synaxeis.[6] Wenn er sich also dann im Jahre 1957 (neben der gewöhnlichen Fortsetzung) noch einen Packen vornimmt, der wiederum keine Synaxeis enthält, und diesen Packen „zurückgestellte Zwischenlage“ nennt, so ist es wahrscheinlich, dass er ihn 1952 auf dem Nicht-Synaxeis-Teil oben aufliegend fand und zunächst beiseite legte.

Das erste Vorkommen des „Achten“[7] findet sich auf der Vorderseite des Blattes f. 11, dessen Schreiboberfläche nur teilweise – etwa für die innere Hälfte der Textkolumne – erhalten ist und dessen Vorderseite (ZLP 5)[8] besonders schlecht zu lesen ist. Was hier deutlich wird, ist nicht viel mehr als dass es sich um eine Serie von Fragen handelt: Mindestens dreimal liest man Satzanfänge mit der koptischen Fragepartikel *ê* (hier mit einem deutlichen *spiritus lenis* geschrieben, aus griech. ἦ). Beim zweiten dieser Vorkommen steht gleich hinter der Partikel „dieser Achte …“ (in einer Zeile, die man vielleicht als Z. 24 zählen kann); nähere Bestimmungen dazu sind weitgehend in Papyruslücken verschwunden, bevor sie mit „… Licht“ enden (Z. 25), wonach dann gerade noch

4 Das sind die Blätter, deren Seitenansichten allgemein zugänglich sind: von Hugo Ibscher als 50–76 numeriert, stehen sie bei Giversen 1986, auf den Tafeln 101–126.

5 Vgl. die malerische Dekoration auf Ibschers Seite 60 (bei Giversen 1986, pl. 110).

6 Dieser Umstand wurde zuerst von Paul Mirecki entdeckt, der sich in den 80er Jahren mit großer Sorgfalt um alle Kapitelüberschriften des Codex bemühte. Da die Lesung und Deutung dieser andersartigen Überschriften allzu problematisch ist, finden sich in seiner publizierten Beschreibung (Mirecki 1988) keine Beispiele dazu.

7 Von der koptischen Realisierung des Namens ist wichtig zu wissen, dass er maskulin determiniert ist: *pi-* oder *p-mah-šmoun*. Das maskuline Genus schließt aus, dass es sich um eine „Achtheit“ (Ogdoas) handelt. Dennoch ist die Parallele zu einer kosmischen Achtheit (sei es der hermetischen Ogdoas oder auch eines anderen achten Himmels, doch als Stufe, nicht als Gruppe) hier von gewissem Interesse – sicherlich nicht im direkt kosmologischen Sinne, aber in Bezug auf eine recht allgemein verbreitete Metaphorik. Wenn man sich fragt, wieso gerade die Zahl Acht zu solcher begrifflichen Vornehmheit geeignet war, dann darf man wohl nicht außer Acht lassen, dass die Überbietung der traditionellen sieben Himmel (und ihrer jüdischen bzw. archontischen Assoziationen) durch eine wie auch immer besetzte „achte“ Position diese Zahl zu einem Symbol für das absolut Jenseitige gemacht hat.

8 Der Zwischenlagepacken besteht aus 13 Folios, die wie die meisten Teiles des Codex umgekehrt zur Numerierung des Konservators zu nehmen sind (daher steht f. 10 nach f. 11).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

der Anfang des eigentlichen Fragesatzes lesbar ist: „auf welche Weise …?“ (d. h. entweder „wie?“ oder „wieso?“). Von der nachfolgenden Zeile kann man nur einen zusammenhanglosen Fetzen (etwa „… ihm aus einem …“) erkennen, und in Z. 27 wird eine neue Frage gestellt, die nicht den „Achten“ sondern „dieses Bild“ (εἰκών) betrifft, in Z. 28 dann „ausgewählt und gezeichnet/gemalt“. Auf der Rückseite dieses Blattes ist die erhaltene Halbkolumne etwas besser zu lesen; sie bietet kein Vorkommen des „Achten“ und befasst sich vermutlich mit der Beantwortung der vorab gestellten Fragen.

Zu dem Frage-und-Antwort-Charakter des Textes sei nur bemerkt, dass unter den Restbeständen des Zwischenlagepackens nirgendwo anders deutlicher zu sehen ist, ob es sich um einen echten Dialog (etwa nach dem Modell der Kephalaia) oder bloß um rhetorische Stilmittel (etwa einer Predigt[9]) handelt. Das häufige Auftreten der 2. Person Plural oder auch einer Anrede „meine Lieben“ sind ja Elemente, die in dieser Hinsicht als neutral zu gelten haben. Gelegentliche Formulierungen wie „du hast sie [wen?] über ihn/es aufgeklärt“ oder auch das Gegenüber von „wir“ und „du“ der vierten Seite (s. dazu unten) sprechen wohl eher für echten Dialog, wenngleich bei der Kürze des Lesbaren schwer zu sehen ist, wie sich der Text im einzelnen in Mani-Rede und Jünger-Reaktion aufgliedern lässt.

Von der einzigen Seite, die für unsere Frage wirkliche Informationen liefert (das ist f. 10 vert. = ZLP 7) gebe ich hier die Übersetzung der mehr oder weniger lesbaren Teile[10] zeilengetreu. Wie man sieht, wird der „Achte“ erst in der zweiten Hälfte der Seite (ab Z. 18) erkennbar. Ob oder inwiefern die in den vorausgehenden Zeilen genannten Gestalten (etwa Ende Z. 8 „der große Richter“, Ende Z. 9 „auferstand vom Tode“) etwas mit ihm zu tun haben, ist schwer zu sagen. Doch deutet das Demonstrativum, mit dem der „Achte“ in Zeile 18 auftaucht, wohl darauf hin, dass schon vorher von ihm die Rede war; und das bezieht sich vielleicht nicht bloß auf die relativ fern liegenden vorausgehenden Seiten, sondern auch auf den Text der vorliegenden Seite.

(7) [sei es] Gutes, sei es Schlechtes. Er ist es, der …
(8) … […] … der große Richter
(9) der Wahrheit (?) … […] … vom Tode auferstand
(10) … […] … indem er den Sieg den
(11) Siegreichen gibt, indem er die … stärkt, …
(12) … um seinetwillen allzeit […] …
(13) … Heil denen, die ihn (es?) verkündigen denen, die

9 Unter den isoliert konservierten Fragmenten findet sich unter anderem ein Kolumnentitel „Die Predigt vom Evangelium“ (doppelseitig lesbar). Zu welcher Blattgruppe der Nicht-Synaxeis-Teile des Codex dieser Titel gehörte, ist nicht bekannt. Der Kolumnentitel von ZLP 15 (f. 6 vert.) scheint ebenfalls Reste des Wortes „Evangelium“ zu enthalten.

10 Von den Zeilen 1–5 ist nichts mehr (und von Z. 6 nur schwache Reste) vorhanden. Auch von den letzten 10 Zeilen (29–38) sind nur karge Bruchstücke erhalten.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(14) über ihn (es?) hören werden. Sie werden … empfangen … du hast sie
(15) über ihn (es?) aufgeklärt, dass [der] …, der redet, unterschieden (?) hat
(16) … alle Dinge. Sein …
(17) … verkündet … reden …
(18) … Propheten werden (oder: würden?) über diesen Achten
(19) prophezeien. Es ist nicht möglich, dass etwas Rechtes[11] …
(20) … Vielmehr ist er es, von dem geredet wird …
(21) [sagen (?)]: „Jedes wahre Wort …
(22) … jedes Urteil (? κρίσις),[12] das von dem Achten [bei] ihnen
(23) verkündet wird. Heil uns, denn er ist es, der/den …
(24) … große … der Auflösung und der Tür des …
(25) Er ist die (Tür-)Schwelle und die Leiter …
(26) … die ihn verstanden.[13] Er erstrahlte noch mehr …
(27) … sie haben [ihn (?)] nicht verstanden. …
(28) … sie werden die Tür des Reiches (?) nicht finden …

Sonst ist auf dieser Seite bloß noch einmal in Zeile 32 „der Achte“ (mit unlesbarem Attribut) zu finden, umgeben von Lücken.

Schließlich bietet die Rückseite dieses Blattes (ZLP 8, wenig lesbar) noch zwei weitere Vorkommen des „Achten“ in lückenhafter Umgebung in den Zeilen 10 und 20. Bei letzterem scheint es sich um eine Jünger-Reaktion zu handeln (falls nicht der ganze Abschnitt überhaupt Jüngerrede ist). Lesbar ist etwa (20–23): „Dass (?) der Achte …, haben wir nun verstanden. Aber wir haben nicht … [ob (?)] … er ist ein Riese, er ist ein Starker. … und dass wir dich fragen nach …“ Und damit ist der Vorrat erschöpft.

Dem oben zitierten Textstück mag man trotz aller Lücken verschiedene Hinweise entnehmen. Am auffälligsten ist wohl die Verbindung zur Prophetie und zu deren Deutung (einschließlich des üblichen, den „Sekten“ zum Vorwurf gemachten Missverständnisses). Dabei kann es sich wohl nur um Schriftauslegung[14] handeln, und dies führt unweigerlich – ebenso wie die „Tür“- und „Leiter“-Metaphorik – zur Christologie. Ist „der Achte“ also schlicht und einfach Jesus – sei es als „Jesus der Glanz“ oder in einer anderen Erscheinungsweise? Und gehört der „große Richter“ von Zeile 8 bereits in denselben Fragenkomplex oder ist er sogar mit dem Achten identisch?

11 Oder etwa: „dass ein gerechtes [Urteil o.ä.]“? Lesbar ist nur ein unbestimmt determiniertes δίκαιον.

12 Davorstehendes unklar: vielleicht handelt es sich im διάκρισις ‚Unterscheidung‘ oder ein anderes Präfix-Wort von -κρισις.

13 Angesichts der negierten Aussage in Z. 27 und der kollektiven Bestätigung auf der nachfolgenden Seite ist das im manichäischen Koptisch recht vieldeutige Verb *r-aisthane* (eigentlich ‚wahrnehmen‘) wohl im Sinne des richtigen Verstehens aufzufassen.

14 Wie man sich das futurische Tempus der Prophezeiung (Z. 18) zurechtlegen soll, ist mir nicht klar. Aus der Sicht der Manichäer kann es sich wohl kaum um etwas Zukünftiges handeln.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In ihrer Ausgabe des mittelpersischen Hymnus hat Christiane Reck für die Deutung des „Achten" bereits unter Hinweis auf Mary Boyce und Waldschmidt/Lenz den seltenen Ausdruck „achter Erstgeborener"[15] in Anschlag gebracht und von den zwei mutmaßlichen Hauptkandidaten eines solchen Ausdrucks – Mani und Jesus – im Kontext des Hymnus letzterem den Vorzug gegeben.[16] Ich glaube ohne weiteres, dass sie damit auf dem richtigen Weg war, kann mich aber mit dem bloßen Hinweis nicht ganz zufriedengeben. Zum einen steht an den hier ins Auge gefassten Stellen eben nichts von einem „Erstgeborenen", und zum anderen ist die manichäische Literatur ja voll von Auftritten Jesu, sei es des „Christus" oder sei es der Gestalt, die so häufig „Jesus der Glanz" genannt wird (natürlich auch ohne „Glanz" oder mit anderen Epitheta), *ohne dass* ihm dabei jemals der Name „Achter" beigefügt wird. Und wenn im Munde einiger (vielleicht nicht aller) Manichäer aus bestimmten numerierten Listen (ganz gleich, ob von Erstgeborenen, Göttern, Richtern, Throninhabern oder wem auch immer) der „achte X" ausgesondert und schlicht als „der Achte" absolut gesetzt wird – mit dem Ergebnis, dass man ihn auch außerhalb jedweden Listen-Kontextes so nennen kann – dann ist dass doch ein gravierender terminologischer Schritt, den man unsererseits gern als nachvollziehbar sehen möchte. Dass der jesuanische Weg dabei wohl der richtige ist und dennoch nicht ganz ohne Fragezeichen, mag nun abschließend ein Vergleich mit den Nummern-Listen der Kephalaia zeigen.[17]

Von den insgesamt zehn Stellen, an denen Listen der koptischen Kephalaia einen „achten" Posten aufweisen (neun davon im ersten Band und mindestens eine im zweiten) sind nur wenige auf Personen bezogen.[18] Genau genommen ist es nur eine einzige: „Der achte Richter ist Jesus der Glanz" (1Keph 80:18, in Kapitel 28 „Über die zwölf Richter"). Da jedoch „Throne" ebenfalls persönlich

15 Dabei beruft sich Lentz seinerseits (in Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, S. 54) auf zwei Quellen: zum einen den chinesischen „Traktat", wo er einen indirekten Bezug auf diesen Begriff vermutet, und zum anderen auf einen Hymnus aus T II D 178 [= M6332], 4, 2, wo er ihn auf den „Gerechtigkeitsmacher" bezogen sieht – was wohl nichts anderes sein kann als die sehr wörtliche Übersetzung eines Titels, der mit „gerechtem Richter" (Jesus) oder dem „Richter der Wahrheit" gleichzusetzen ist.

16 Wie mir D. Durkin-Meisterernst freundlicherweise mitteilt, findet sich der „achte Erstgeborene" auch in dem parthischen Hymnus der Handschrift M6232 auf V 7–8; dort ist der Terminus eindeutig auf Mar Mani bezogen. Vgl. H.-J. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Parables, Hymns & Prayers from Central Asia*, San Francisco 1993, S. 85.

17 Alle hier interessierenden Stellen finden sich in der „ersten Hälfte" der Ausgabe des ersten Bandes (= Berliner Codex) der Kephalaia: Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, auf dessen Seitenzahlen ich mit 1Keph referiere.

18 Bei den anderen handelt es sich zumeist entweder um Sachverhalte (wie etwa die zehn „Werke" des Gesandten in Kap. 34 oder die zwölf der allgemeinen Reinigung dienenden Vorgänge gegen Ende des Kap. 42, auf 1Keph 110) oder um kosmische Ortsangaben (wie bei den acht Befindlichkeiten des Lebendigen Feuers, Kap. 74).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

besetzt sind, darf man wohl auch noch das nachfolgende Kapitel 29 in Anspruch nehmen („Über die achtzehn großen Throne aller Väter“), wo es zwei Listen mit jeweils neun Posten gibt. In der ersten Liste wird die achte Stelle wiederum mit „Jesus dem Glanz“ besetzt (1Keph 82:20), während die zweite Liste an achter Stelle den luftigen Thron des „Richters der Wahrheit“ nennt. Gegenüber dem Umstand, dass die individuelle Nummern-Zuweisung in solchen Listen nicht selten eigenen Gesetzen folgt oder auch bloß zufälligen Charakter trägt, ist dieser Tatbestand doch sehr auffällig.[19] Man kann sich des Eindrucks nicht erwehren, dass die achte Stelle einen besonderen Symbolcharakter trägt und dass ihre Besetzung durch „Jesus den Glanz“ wie auch durch den „Richter der Wahrheit“ gar nicht zufällig ist.

Wenn man aus den genannten Kephalaia-Stellen auf eine allgemeinere Tendenz schließen darf, gewisse „achte“ Stellen mit „Jesus dem Glanz“ *qua* „Richter der Wahrheit“ zu besetzen, so passt das ja nun erstaunlich gut mit den „richterlichen“ Kontext-Elementen der oben zitierten Textseite aus dem Synaxeis-Codex zusammen. Vielleicht wird die terminologische Überraschung des absolut gebrauchten „Achten“ eher plausibel, wenn man dabei nicht an den Glanz-Jesus schlechthin denkt, sondern an denselben speziell in seiner Richterfunktion oder auch in seiner besonderen begrifflichen und mythologischen Nähe[20] zum „Richter der Wahrheit“.

Zitierte Literatur

Giversen, S. 1986: *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library.* Vol. II: *Homilies and Varia: Facsimile Edition.* Genève (Cahiers d’Orientalisme XV).

Mirecki, P. 1988: „The Coptic Manichaean Synaxeis Codex: Descriptive Catalogue of Synaxeis Chapter Titles.“ In: P. Bryder (ed.): *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism.* Lund, S. 135–145.

Polotsky, H. J./A. Böhlig 1940: *Kephalaia I. Erste Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10).* Stuttgart (Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin I.1).

19 Vielleicht darf man noch etwas anderes zu diesen Auffälligkeiten rechnen. Lentz erwähnt beiläufig (in Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, S. 54), dass Jesus in der chinesischen Hymnenrolle auch einmal (in 16) „die achte Erscheinung des Lichts“ genannt wird (bei Schmidt-Glinzer 1987, S. 12) und dass die Reihe, an welche dabei gedacht sei, „bis jetzt nirgends belegt“ ist. Kann man das – in einer gewissen logischen Verdrehung – mit der Liste der „vierzehn Fahrzeuge, die Jesus bestieg“ in Kapitel 8 der Kephalaia in Verbindung bringen? Das „achte“ dieser Fahrzeuge ist jedenfalls „das leuchtende Licht“ (1Keph 37:9f.). Bedauerlich ist nur, dass Kapitel 8 in der Überschrift nicht (wie beim Ersten im Incipit und beim Zweiten und Siebten in der Überschrift) ausdrücklich noch einmal „Das Achte“ genannt wird.

20 Etwa im Sinne von 1Keph 35:24–27 „Die zweite Kraft, die Jesus berufen hat, ist der große Richter“; zu letzterem noch mehr bei Richter 1997, S. 51–53.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 22).

Richter, S. 1997: *Die Aufstiegspsalmen des Herakleides: Untersuchungen zum Seelenaufstieg und zur Seelenmesse bei den Manichäern*. Wiesbaden (Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients 1).

Schmidt-Glinzer, H. 1987: *Chinesische Manichaica: Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 14).

Waldschmidt, E./W. Lentz 1926: *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 4).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Some Comments on the Remnants of the Codex of Mani's *Epistles* in Middle Persian as Edited by W. Sundermann

Iain Gardner, Sydney

In 2005 the Sixth International Congress on Manichaean Studies met on the campus of Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff. This author was especially pleased to attend the paper by W. Sundermann in which the latter presented a first edition of various textual fragments from the Berlin Turfan collection, written in Middle Persian and identified as belonging to a codex containing a collection of Manichaean letters. The existence of such pieces had been known for some time, and indeed one of the fragments (M 882c) was already listed as part of a "letter of Mani" by M. Boyce in her catalogue, following W. Henning.[1] However, this occasion was the first systematic public presentation of the remnants of this codex; and I was very grateful to Werner Sundermann for discussing the contents at some length with myself after his lecture, due to my long-standing interest in the subject. Indeed, he was so kind as to give me his own copy of his paper.[2]

In this article I will make some suggestions about the order and arrangement of the texts as proposed by Sundermann; and also some comments about the contents. In brief, Sundermann collected together a series of fragments to reconstruct the remnants of two codex sheets; with two further fragments unplaced but tentatively associated together to preserve a third block of text. As follows:

1. M 5770 + M 5771 + M 5772 + M 6604. These form a significant portion of the centre of a codex sheet, but no margins are visible. 16 lines. Dimensions of 94 × 70 mm.
2. M 501p + M 882c + M 1402 + M 9152. These form a mostly complete portion of the lower part of a sheet, preserving left and right and bottom margins. 8 lines. Dimensions of 55 × 133 mm.
3. M 6935 and M 6944. Although they do not join, these can be arranged to read part of a third (?) sheet; again without margins. 5 lines.

1 Boyce 1960.
2 In this article I utilise the published version by Sundermann 2009.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sundermann made clear that the sequence of sides on each sheet, and indeed the order of the sheets themselves, cannot be determined for certain (e.g. from codicological considerations or textual continuity). Such side margins as are preserved do not provide any help. Consequently, in his edition he presented only a tentative sequence of sides derived from "the supposed and partly restored line of thought"; and the possibility that the text on sheet two might provide an answer to a question posed on sheet one. Thus, he hypothesised that sheet one preserves the latter part of one letter, addressed to a single person, which ends at sheet 1, v12. This is then followed by "the announcement of a letter" where a question is asked (he thinks by third persons not Mani) through the extant remainder of that sheet (1, v12–16). A different letter, sent to multiple persons, then runs through all of sheet 2. Sundermann speculated (on the basis of an uncertain reading) that this second letter was sent to Georgia, and that it could be an answer to the question posed at the close of sheet 1. He held the relationship of the text on the "third sheet" to those on the other two sheets to be unknown; but emphasised that it confirms the epistolary character of the whole manuscript. In sum, he concluded that the remains of this codex preserve portions "of at least two letters, both probably by Mani"; as well as the introduction of a third piece addressed to Mani by representatives of his church, which intrudes between the two letters by the apostle.[3]

The editor made no suggestion as regards the original size or structure of the codex as a whole. As to the original page dimensions, it is apparent from the plates provided in the publication that the original height must have been well over 100 mm (as shown by sheet 1); and probably at least ca. 150 × 133 mm. It is of some interest to compare the other known small codex of Mani's *Epistles* (in Coptic), published by W.-P. Funk and myself as P. Kellis VI Copt 53.[4] That artefact is similar to this in that it also appears to have contained multiple letters by Mani, but without titles or those more formal characteristics such as found in the major extant *Epistles* codex known from the so-called Medinet Madi 'library' (Berlin manuscript P. 15998). The small Kellis codex had similar dimensions to this Middle Persian example (153 × 120 mm), and I think it reasonable to regard both productions as occasional handbooks of convenient size for easy transportation and reference.[5]

It will be apparent that I think that Sundermann's reconstruction can be improved upon. A good place to start is with the unplaced fragments listed above under '3'. On one side of this reconstructed block of text there is a rather specific detail of Mani's cosmological teaching, which the editor translated as follows:[6]

3 This paragraph summarises and quotes from the argument by Sundermann 2009, pp. 261–264, which should be consulted for further discussion of his reasoning.

4 In Gardner 2007b.

5 For further discussion of this proposal, and also comment about one of the texts found in the Middle Persian codex as an example of Mani's characteristic style, see Gardner 2013.

6 Here following Sundermann at 2009, p. 275; slightly adjusted for format only.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> …] for the […] of the souls he […] the *Māzendarān* and the gods [… with] pain and unwillingly, and the […] punishment of the *Māzendarān* [… from] the *Māzendarān* and […] keep away!

These *m'zyndr'n* are known from a number of Manichaean sources. They are the demons or rulers bound in the heavens;[7] and (amongst other texts) we can suitably refer to Coptic kephalaion 47, quoting 119, 2–6:[8]

> … because of the great and cruel powers (ⲛⲛⲁϩ ⲛϩⲁⲙ), and the titanic figures (ⲛϩⲁⲗⲁϣⲓⲣⲉ), [who are] in it; they being suspended from it. So, all the first-born and the leaders of all the rulers (ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ) … were collected together, seized, bound and assigned on this wheel (ⲡⲧⲣⲟⲭⲟⲥ).

Essentially, the *Māzendarān* and the gods *(yzd''n)* of this Middle Persian text correspond to the titanic figures (ⲛϩⲁⲗⲁϣⲓⲣⲉ) and great powers (ⲛⲛⲁϩ ⲛϩⲁⲙ) of the Coptic source, referring to the leaders of the evil rulers who have been punished and controlled by being suspended from the wheel of the stars. Now, near the start of one side of sheet 1 (page 2 in Sundermann's ordering) we find the term *gardūn*, for which the editor quotes Steingass for the New Persian term meaning "a wheel; heaven, the celestial globe or sphere (etc.)".[9] This would correspond very well to the Graeco-Coptic term ⲧⲣⲟⲭⲟⲥ. It suggests that our unplaced block of text '3', concerning the *Māzendarān*, should be placed prior to that part of sheet 1. Indeed, it would seem to me possible (looking at the plates) for these fragments to be added to the reconstructed sheet 1, although their exact placing remains uncertain.[10]

However, if this is so, then the reverse side of '3' must also stand above the other side of sheet 1 (i.e. page 1 according to Sundermann). In fact, for sense we will see that this is an excellent match. The "letters" *(prwrdgyh')*[11] of the first line of '3' link with the references to the same that we find in sheet 1, to provide a coherent line of thought. However, in my understanding, we should best read this as the start of a new *Epistle* by Mani (it can hardly precede the text about the *Māzendarān* now reconstructed for the reverse of the sheet). What we find at the beginning of the page are the remnants of the familiar epistolary opening, which can in part be reconstructed from the apostle's known style. This incipit is addressed to plural recipients, after which Mani switches to his actual

7 Thus Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, s.v. *m'zyndr*; cf. Sundermann 2001, p. 699.

8 For the Coptic text see H.J. Polotsky, A. Böhlig, W.-P. Funk (eds.), *Kephalaia*, Stuttgart 1940, 1966, 1999, 2000.

9 See Sundermann 2009, p. 270, n. 74; also see Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, s.v. *grdyn'g* "revolving, wheel", i.e. the wheel of the zodiac.

10 The row of punctuation marks on the lowest extant line of sheet 1, already noted by Sundermann 2009, p. 271, n. 83, can be taken to mark this as the final line of the page. Consequently, there should certainly be room to place the fragments of '3' in the lost upper part of the sheet.

11 As Sundermann 2009, p. 274, n. 107 comments, either a late Middle Persian plural or else read an adverb: "…] by letter".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

communication to the principal recipient (whose name unfortunately is lost).[12] Notably, at the bottom of the extant text can be seen a rendering of that familiar vow of the apostle by which he often closed his introductory prayers:[13]

> And may the right hand of light preserve you from the present evil age and its disasters, and from the snares of the evil one.

In summary, what I am here suggesting is as follows:

- SUNDERMANN's unplaced third block of text does not belong to a third sheet of the codex, but rather to the upper part of sheet 1.
- The order of the pages found on sheet 1 must be reversed, so that first one reads the end of an *Epistle* where are found details of Mani's cosmological teaching about the *Māzendarān*. There follows some kind of scribal note referring to a question by members of the church; and then on the reverse side is found the opening of a new *Epistle* by the apostle (and presumably the beginning of the answer to the question that has been posed).

Therefore, a translation of sheet 1 can be provided as follows, making a number of slight adjustments[14] from SUNDERMANN's rendering:

> (Sheet 1,r, from the end of an *Epistle*)
> …] for […] of the souls he […] on account of the titanic beings *(mʾzyndrʾn)* and the gods *(yzdʾʾn)* [… with] pain and unwillingly, and the […] punishment of the titanic beings [… from (?)] the titanic beings and [gods (?) …] keeps far away. [… most] loved brother […] that their […] and when among […] the circuit of the wheel […] they will be, and great profit and betterment […] and with all conduct of wisdom […] together they will be made ready.
>
> (Final benediction?)
> Then after [… the] adornment again of propriety and […] on you propriety and perfection and […] I hear […] you remain. And amen.
>
> (Scribal note)
> And they ask, [… the] bishops and the presbyters *(mhystgʾn)* of peacefulness [… together] with the hymn-singers, likewise the brethren […] the congregations *(hnzmnʾn)*. And they sent [a letter to the …] holy dwelling (?).

12 Compare e.g. the start of the *Epistle* by Mani as preserved on p. 12 of P. Kellis Copt. 53 in GARDNER 2007b.

13 Quoting here from the *Letter to Marcellus* (very much the same is found also in the *Foundation Letter*). For further details see the discussion in GARDNER 2007a, pp. 36 and 41. See also VERMES 2001, p. 41 and n. 16.

14 I have taken a minimalist approach to such adjustments, focussing on trying to illustrate what I understand to be the structure of these text remnants. However, I do think it unlikely that the first *Epistle* would end with "Mani" (as given by SUNDERMANN, but see his note at 2009, p. 271, n. 79). There are a number of other changes that could also be considered in a full re-edition of the Middle Persian text, as well as references to parallels in the known remains of the apostle's writings.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(Sheet 1,v, the start of a second *Epistle* with sender-recipient formulae)
[Mani, apostle of Jesus Aryaman, and … with me; to the most loved …] letters/ by letter to you […] loved and most dear ones whom I, together with my own soul […] having the same body, – [you are] a visible store *(h'm'byr)* of light!

(Recapitulation of the theme of the previous letter)
[…] I teach […] children of the apostles (?) […] the command of God […] establish [the] (community of the) virtuous (i. e. the hearers). […] he (or 'you' pl.) will establish […] then you also […] thereupon be a helper everywhere […] so strive that (the first) letter […] and also this second one which I now [send …] to read it and collect with it, and to every […] to establish, and all together […] consider to make familiar with [… shall be] recited; and your reward and recompense […] and with that we too [shall be] content and grateful.

(Prayer formula)
[…] and be preserved by the right-hand of well-being and that God of [truth (?). …] my dear brother, with all righteousness […] and [may you be protected from] all misfortune, harm and doubt […

Finally, as regards these texts on sheet 1, it can be asked whether the texts can be identified. It is of interest that there are a number of examples elsewhere of Mani referring to a first and a second letter. One can note the repeated references to letters throughout P. Kellis Copt. 53, and the same thing is found in the remnants of Berlin manuscript P. 15998.[15] This was obviously part of his established style, to keep up a continuous correspondence; but I find no exact parallel to the text here.

However, the most distinctive feature of the texts on sheet 1 is the cosmological teaching. In general, the *Epistles* were focussed on pastoral and ethical matters; and those teachings often described as 'mythological' rarely intrude. But there is a very famous exception to this in Mani's *Foundation Letter*, substantial extracts of which were preserved in Latin translation in the writings of Augustine and his circle.[16] Although these remnants do not include the specific episode about the *Māzendarān* and the wheel, they do demonstrate the kind of details that would make the inclusion of such teachings in an *Epistle* of Mani's seem entirely possible. We can not know whether this Middle Persian text belongs to the same composition as the passages preserved in Latin, although I think that is less likely on balance than that it is an example of Mani returning to similar themes on different occasions. The only hint that we have about the recipient for this *Epistle* is that the apostle terms him "my dear brother". In fact,

15 For P. Kellis Copt. 53 track the references to ⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ in the index to Gardner 2007b; but see especially pp. 71–72. The remains of the large Berlin codex of Mani's *Epistles* are in the process of being edited by W.-P. Funk and I. Gardner, and there are more examples to be found there. Further, one also finds in that codex titles such as *The Seventh Ctesiphon Letter* and *The Third Sisinnios Letter*.

16 Notably Augustine, *c. Epist. Fund.* See further Feldmann 1987; Stein 2002.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mani uses the same for Patticius *(frater dilectissime Pattici)* in the *Foundation Letter*; and it provides something of a contrast to the "loved child" that is characteristic of his address in many of the extant *Epistles*. But, in itself, this is not sufficient to propose an identification for the recipient.[17]

We can now turn to sheet 2 of this reconstructed Middle Persian codex. Sundermann understood both pages as belonging to a second letter, written to multiple persons. He speculated that it was sent to Georgia,[18] and might have been the response to what I have termed a scribal note on sheet 1. However, in my understanding, the response to that scribal note is already to be found beginning on the reverse of sheet 1, with the start of a second *Epistle* demonstrated to be preserved there.

Further, in my reading of sheet 2 I find what is clearly the start of another *Epistle* in the lower part of what Sundermann lists as the first page. This would mean that the lost upper part of that page must have contained the ending of another text (presumably also an *Epistle*); and, indeed, when we look at the reverse page of sheet 2 one reads text that would well fit concluding epistolary comments by the apostle. Again, I can summarise my suggestions:

- The order of the sides in sheet 2 should be reversed, so that one first reads the ending of an *Epistle* through one page and perhaps continuing down the lost upper part of the reverse. The preserved lower portion of that reverse page then contains the start of another *Epistle* with its characteristic introductory formulae.
- The relationship of sheet 1 to sheet 2 is unknown. Conceivably, the second letter begun on sheet 1 could have been concluded in the first letter of sheet 2; but equally the second letter begun on sheet 2 might be concluded by the first on sheet 1. In either case we must reckon with the remains of at least three separate *Epistles* by Mani (and if the two sheets come from rather different portions of the original codex it could even be four).[19]

17 It is known that Mani addressed other letters to Patticius. On this whole question see I. Gardner and L. Rasouli Narimani (forthcoming).

18 I am not convinced by this identification and have omitted the suggestion in my reconstruction and reading of the text.

19 From my reading of the extant remains of Mani's *Epistles* it is apparent that his letters were sometimes quite short. Obviously there are exceptions, notably the *Foundation Letter* which is probably the same as the one recorded by Ibn al-Nadīm (number 7 in his famous list) as *The Letter of Futtuq*, "a long one"; here following the English translation by Dodge 1970, p. 799. Conversely, at number 10 on that list, is the title that Dodge translates: "Of Ctesiphon, The Note". Reeves 2011, p. 116 has "The 'one-leaf' epistle to Ctesiphon"; which he remarks (n. 209) literally means "on a sheet of paper". This means that it would be conceivable to keep the order of the pages on our codex sheet 2 as per Sundermann, and to understand the text on one side as the conclusion to the letter begun on the other (i. e. as a very short composition). But one would still need to account for the missing text above the evident start of an *Epistle*, and I have rejected this hypothesis as less likely than the reconstruction outlined above.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Here follows my translation and reordering of sheet 2, with a focus on discerning the structure of the texts involved. Again I have taken a minimalist approach to altering Sundermann's translation, although a few changes seem to me to be warranted and useful. Whether some scribal note intervened between the first and the second letter (as it does in sheet 1) can not be known:

(Sheet 2,r, from the end of an *Epistle*)
…] came to hate (?) [… they] grant that we, when from afar through a little [care (?)] from you, through your wisdom, piety, love and gentleness, – (our) honour and affection have been benefited. Then we have many [times] so planned, that the most loved brothers […] I might see with my very own bodily eyes. However, until we see each other, first [we send you] a document *(n'mg)* of love and affection, an epistle *(dyb)* of greeting and thanks and charity.

(Sheet 2,v, final benediction and/or scribal note)
[…]

(The start of a second *Epistle* with sender-recipient formulae)
[Mani, apostle of Jesus Aryaman, and … with me]; to the most loved (pl.) […, may] you remain in peace and well-being.

(Prayer formulae)
[I am praying (to the Father?)] that - with the help of the angels - you, the most loved, are healthy [in spirit (?)], content and mindful in the body, [… every (?)] brother and friend, woman and helper, male and female, be well and healthy; and to your place, most loved ones, may there be great blessing. Peace and grace through God be upon you everywhere; [and may it guard you all the time …

Unfortunately, there is little in the surviving texts on sheet 2 by which we might identify the titles of these *Epistles* by Mani, or their recipients. The primary interest lies in the information that they provide for an understanding of Mani's epistolary style, about which I have recently commented elsewhere.[20]

Bibliography

Boyce, M. 1960: *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*. Berlin.

Dodge, B. 1970: *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. 2 vols. New York.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Part 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout.

Feldmann, E. 1987: *Die "Epistula Fundamenti" der nordafrikanischen Manichäer. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Altenberg.

20 See Gardner 2013.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gardner, I. 2007a: "Mani's Letter to Marcellus: Fact and Fiction in the *Acta Archelai* Revisited." In: J. BeDuhn/P. Mirecki (eds.): *Frontiers of Faith. The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 33–48.
— 2007b: *Kellis Literary Texts. Volume 2*. Oxford [pp. 11–83].
— 2013: "Once More on Mani's *Epistles* and Manichaean Letter-Writing." In: *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 17, pp. 291–314.
Gardner, I./L. Rasouli Narimani (forthcoming): *Patīg and Pattikios in the Manichaean Sources*.
Reeves, J.C. 2011: *Prolegomena to a History of Islamicate Manichaeism*. Sheffield/Oakville.
Stein, M. 2002: *Manichaica Latina*. Vol. 2: *Manichaei Epistula Fundamenti*. Paderborn.
Sundermann, W. 2001: "Mani's 'Book of Giants' and the Jewish Books of Enoch. A Case of Terminological Difference and What it Implies." In: Ch. Reck/D. Weber/C. Leurini/A. Panaino (eds.): *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann*. 2 vols. Rome, pp. 697–706.
— 2009: "A Manichaean Collection of Letters and a List of Mani's Letters in Middle Persian." In: J.D. BeDuhn (ed.): *New Light on Manichaeism. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism organized by the International Association of Manichaean Studies*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 259–277.
Vermes, M. (ed.) 2001: *Hegemonius. Acta Archelai*. Turnhout.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Two Tablets of Enoch: The Contribution of the "Leningrad" Fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants* to the Study of the Qumran *Book of Giants*

Matthew Goff, Tallahassee

Introduction[1]

Among the many contributions of Werner Sundermann to the study of Manichaeism is his publication of a fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants (MBG)* housed at the Institut Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk (Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences) in St. Petersburg, Russia.[2] Published in 1984, this text is still generally referred to as the Leningrad fragment (or the "L" text). It consists of two pages in fragmentary condition that are written on the verso and recto in Middle Persian. The Leningrad fragment mentions two tablets written by Enoch, one of which is read aloud to giants. They become worried and one of them has visions. In a work found among the Dead Sea Scrolls known as the Qumran *Book of Giants* (*QBG*), giants also have visions. In this composition Enoch writes two tablets, as in the L text, but only the second is preserved (4Q203 8).

It has long been recognized that ancient Judaism, especially its Enochic traditions, was an important influence for Mani and that this is evident in the *MBG*.[3] Enoch appears in this composition, for example, as does the trope that two hundred watchers, conceptualized as demons, descended to the earth (M 101l; G).[4] The *MBG* has a number of affinities with the *QBG* which it does not share with other Enochic texts. The two compositions have the same names for the giants, such as Oha and Aha (*QBG*: 'Ohyah and Hahyah), for example, and these two

1 I thank Kyle Roark and Michael Tuval for their contributions to this essay. This research has been generously supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.
2 Sundermann 1984. He also produced a Russian version of this article (1989).
3 For an overview of this issue, see Reeves 1992.
4 The citation of *MBG* fragments unless otherwise stated follows Henning 1943. The L text in Henning should not be confused with the L text published by Sundermann. The Leningrad fragment is classified as the W text in Morano 2011.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

figures are brothers in both works. SUNDERMANN argued, quite rightly, that the Leningrad fragment supports the opinion that the *MBG* drew upon Enochic traditions.[5] SUNDERMANN knew of the *QBG* but never substantially engaged this composition.[6] The Leningrad fragment, I would like to demonstrate, provides additional evidence for the view that the *MBG* preserves a version of ancient Jewish giants lore found in the *QBG*.[7]

The *QBG* survives in a highly fragmentary condition. The sequence of events in its narrative cannot be established with certainty. 4Q203 8 preserves the text of one of Enoch's tablets, not the context in which its message was delivered. The L text preserves the context in which one of the sage's tablets is read, not the text of it. I argue in this essay that the L text preserves a fuller narrative context of a key scene of the *QBG*, in which the giants ʾOhyah and Hahyah have visions (4Q530 2 ii). The L text provides an impression of the narrative context of Enoch's first tablet in the *QBG*, whereas 4Q203 8 contains the text of his second, which was read by the giants after the visions of 4Q530 2 ii.

The Manichaean and Qumran *Books of Giants*

The Manichaean *Book of Giants* was probably written originally by Mani in Syriac in the third century CE.[8] In the 1940s WALTER BRUNO HENNING published fragments of this composition that were discovered in Turfan, in Xinjiang Province, China.[9] These fragments are mainly in Middle Persian; others are in Sogdian and Uighur. While this composition survives in highly fragmentary condition, several elements of it can be discerned.[10] Two hundred demons descend to earth (M 101l; H).[11] They have children, the giants (M 101k; H). The sons of the demons commit various crimes, such as murder and stealing one another's wives (M 101j). The giants are warned, presumably by Enoch, that they will be destroyed in the Great Fire, an important eschatological trope in Manichaean thought (F; N). According to an Uighur fragment, at least one giant (Sām) confesses his sins (Mainz 344a; cf. E).[12] Not all the giants are destroyed. On the contrary, thirty-two cities are established for them, implying that additional giants were spared, perhaps because they asked for and received mercy (G; I). The Jewish myths about giants who lived long ago were esteemed

5 SUNDERMANN 1984, p. 495; 1994, p. 48.
6 See, for example, SUNDERMANN 1984, p. 494.
7 WILKENS 2011, p. 64.
8 BAKER-BRIAN 2011, pp. 86–89; WILKENS 2011, pp. 64–65.
9 HENNING 1943, pp. 52–74.
10 For a proposed sequence of the *MBG* fragments, see MORANO 2011.
11 The M 101 fragments comprise the A text in HENNING 1943.
12 For Mainz 344a, see WILKENS 2000.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

by Manichaeans for their didactic value. The Henning fragments of the *MBG* include parables that teach ideals of behaviour for Hearers (M 101h–m, M 911, M 101n). There is also material on the Five Elements, the components that comprise the cosmos, which in Manichaeism correspond to the five sons of the Living Spirit (M 101e, b, k).[13]

The Qumran *Book of Giants* is an Aramaic composition that was probably written in the second century BCE. It was officially published in 2000 and 2001.[14] The fragments that comprise the *QBG* are generally recognized as 1Q23, 1Q24, 2Q26, 4Q203, 4Q530–533, 4Q206a 1–2 and 6Q8. These manuscripts are highly fragmentary. The work contains a narrative about the giants *(gbry')*, referring to the children of the angels who descend to earth and have sex with women, a myth famously recounted in Gen 6:1–4. Both the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36) and the *QBG* draw upon this scriptural tale.

The *QBG* has names for the giants, including 'Ohyah and Hahyah, Mahaway and Gilgamesh.[15] A major theme in the composition is the reception of heavenly visions by giants and their efforts to understand them. 'Ohyah and Hahyah have dreams and describe them to the other giants. The first vision (Hahyah's) is about a garden filled with trees that is destroyed by fire and water, except for one tree with three roots (4Q530 2 ii 6–12). In the second dream ('Ohyah's) God comes down to earth with his heavenly host and books are opened for judgment (ll. 15–20). Hahyah's vision prefigures the flood and the survival of Noah and his three sons. 'Ohyah's dream signifies theophanic judgment.

The giants are distressed by the two visions and want to understand them (4Q530 2 ii 20). They commission Mahaway to journey to Enoch so that he can interpret them. Mahaway is selected since he has traveled to Enoch previously (ll. 22–23; 4Q530 7 ii 7), alluding to an episode that never appears in the surviving fragments of the *QBG*.

Enoch's Second Tablet in the Qumran *Book of Giants*

Unfortunately, Enoch's interpretation of the visions is no longer extant (4Q530 7 ii 11). The sage presumably gave Mahaway the bad news that the dreams foretell the flood and that the deluge constitutes a divine sentence of judgment against the giants and their angelic fathers. This is suggested by 4Q203 8. This text claims to be a "copy" *(pršgn)* of a tablet written by Enoch himself (l. 4). It purports to be his second tablet; no information survives about his first. 4Q203 7b ii 2

13 See further below the discussion of page 2 of the L text.

14 Puech 2001, pp. 9–115; Stuckenbruck 2000, pp. 8–94. The *editio princeps* of the QBG is Milik 1976, pp. 298–339. See also Stuckenbruck 1997; Reeves 1992; Goff (forthcoming).

15 The name Gilgamesh shows reliance upon ancient Near Eastern tradition. See Goff 2009.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

mentions "two tablets." Mahaway likely brought back these two tablets from his travels to Enoch, but this is never stated in the extant *QBG* fragments.

Enoch in 4Q203 8 addresses the angels. He summarizes their crimes and pronounces divine judgment against them. He does so in a way that implicates the giants as well. Line 9 lists "your (pl.) fornication on the earth," referring to the angels' sexual union with women.[16] Enoch rebukes the watchers for their "destruction" (*ḫbl'*; l. 11). Elsewhere in the *QBG* this term denotes the violence caused by the giants (4Q532 1 ii + 2 9). The watchers, Enoch asserts, share blame for these crimes, since they brought the giants into the world. The sage also announces that an "accusation" *(qblh)* has been made against the giants and their fathers (4Q203 8 10). This likely constitutes a proclamation that their punishment, in the form of the flood, has been ordained by God.[17]

For a text that stresses divine judgment, 4Q203 8 ends on an unusual note. Line 15 contains a single expression, a plural imperative: "pray!" A large *vacat* establishes that this is the last word of Enoch's communique. It has been understood as an ironic request, emphasizing that the watchers and their sons have no chance at forgiveness.[18] It is possible, however, to interpret this in a more literal sense, as a genuine exhortation to them to pray, although there would be no guarantee that any requests for mercy would be successful (cf. *1 En.* 13:6). In the *MBG*, as mentioned above, at least one giant prays and confesses his crimes, and many giants lived long lives. This suggests that Enoch's request that the watchers and giants pray in 4Q203 8 should be taken quite seriously and that their efforts to do so may have even been successful (cf. 4Q203 9–10).

The Leningrad Fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants*

Page 1 of the L text is marked with the heading "concerning the demons *(mʾzyndrʾn)*," a broad category of spiritual being in Manichaeism that can denote both the angels and their sons the giants derived from Enochic tradition.[19] The fragment focuses on two stone tablets:

> I have brought these two tablets, one of which I shall read before the giants *(qwʾʾn)*, to the demons *(mʾzyndrʾn)*. (Ir 7–9)

16 Line 10 likewise mentions an "accusation against you (pl.) [and ag]ainst the activity of your (pl.) sons." In l. 5, which states that the tablet is addressed to "Shemiḥazah and all his com[panions]," the term "companions" probably refers to other angels.

17 This argument is made more fully below.

18 STUCKENBRUCK 1997, p. 93.

19 Numerous Early Christian authors likewise understood the Enochic angels as demons. See, for example, Justin Martyr (*2 Apology* 5) or Athenagoras (*Legatio* 25). In *1 Enoch* 15:8–16:1 the giants, as punishment for their crimes, have their bodies destroyed but not their spirits, which harass and attack people. The text provides an explanation for the origin of evil spirits.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

On the basis of the *QBG*, one can reasonably suggest that the unnamed bearer of these tablets is Mahaway.[20] Shahmizād, who corresponds to the angel Shemiḥazah, tells this figure to read the handwriting of "Enoch the Scribe" (*hwnwx ʿzwʾrg*; Ir 11). The Middle Persian *ʿzwʾrg* is from a root that means "to comprehend, show."[21] Sundermann argued that the term reflects knowledge of the Jewish tradition that Enoch is an interpreter of dreams.[22] To make this point he compared the word *ʿzwʾrg* to the expression that describes Enoch in 4Q203 8 4, the "scribe of distinction *(prš')*." The *QBG* itself attests the tradition not only that Enoch is a scribe but also that he interprets dreams. The term for "interpretation" in Aramaic (and Hebrew) is *pšr*. The epithet for Enoch in 4Q203 8 4 very likely relies upon a word-play of both terms (*prš* and *pšr*), and this double resonance appears to be reflected in the description of Enoch in the L text (Ir 11). This supports Sundermann's understanding of the epithet used for Enoch in the Leningrad fragment.

The L text never divulges what is written on Enoch's tablets. The giants apparently did not think it contained a good message, as with 4Q203 8. They did not react well to hearing the words of the tablet. One giant, Sām, encourages them to eat afterwards, but they are too distraught to do so:

> Thereupon Sām spoke to the giants: "Come here, so that we may eat and be happy". Because of sorrow *(zryg)* they did not eat bread. (Iv 1–4)

The name Sām according to a Sogdian text of the *MBG* (H) is a translation of Ohya. This name thus corresponds to that of ʾOhyah in the *QBG*, who receives one of the dream visions in 4Q530 2 ii.[23] The giant Sām in the L text has a vision as well. After the giants refuse to eat, he has a dream in which he goes to heaven (Iv 7). He gets some sort of fever *(tb)* from the earth and swallows water. "Rage" emerges from the water, which may refer to some sort of demonic entity.[24] Sām also sees "lords of heaven" in his vision (*pʾdxšʾyʾn ʿy ʾsmʾn*; Iv 12).[25]

The second page of the L text according to its heading is an "interpretation" *(wcʾryšn)* of the mythic tale in page 1. Page 2 explains the story of Enoch's tablets and the visions in terms of Manichaean teachings about the body and the cosmos.[26] It mentions the separation of the Pure Splendor from Hate and the entry of negative traits such as Sorrow, Envy and Sinfulness into the bones (IIr 1–2). As Sundermann has argued, the L fragment suggests that the *MBG* put forward a cosmogonic and anthropomorphic teaching similar to that of the 38th chapter of the *Kephalia*, a Coptic compilation of Manichaean teachings

20 So also Sundermann 1984, p. 495.
21 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 102.
22 Sundermann 1984, pp. 496–497; Reeves 1992, p. 111.
23 Morano 2011, p. 102.
24 So Sundermann 1984, p. 498.
25 Parallels between the L text and 4Q530 2 ii are discussed below.
26 Sundermann 1984, p. 498.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

composed in the late third century.[27] In Manichaeism the Light Mind dwells in the body of the believer and confronts the Old Man who represents his sinful nature and continues to dwell within the person.[28] According to the *Kephalia*, this is analogous to the myth of the five sons of the Living Spirit, who are appointed as guardians in regions of the cosmos and who occasionally must combat rebellions from the forces of darkness.[29] The giants from the older Jewish myths were likely understood as representing the base nature of the human being.[30] That some of the giants of the *MBG* overcame their inherent tendencies towards evil, represented by the confession of Sām (Mainz 344a), likely helped Manichaeans understand that they can as well.

One way the L text links allegorical teachings to stories about the giants is through the word "sorrow" *(zryg)*. This word on page 1 denotes how the giants react after hearing Enoch's tablet being read (Iv 3). On page 2 this term denotes one of the traits that separates from the Pure Splendor and becomes rooted in the bones (IIr 2). Manichaean readers of the Leningrad text may have understood Sām, because of his ascent to heaven, as signifying a lesson about the separation of Splendor from Hate, with the giant representing the possibility of a human to overcome his natural proclivities towards sin.

Page 1 of the L fragment refers to details that have no parallel in the fragmentary remains of the *QBG*. The bearer of the tablets, probably Mahaway, gives a message to Narīmān before any tablet is read (Ir 4–5).[31] Mahaway speaks with a figure named Atambish (Iv 4–5). He is probably a giant and his name derives from Utnapishtim, the flood hero in Mesopotamian myth.[32] This giant

27 SUNDERMANN 1984, pp. 498, 502; 1994, p. 48; WILKENS 2011, p. 68.

28 For an overview of this myth, see BAKER-BRIAN 2011, p. 113. This teaching is also found in a Chinese Manichaean text often called the "Traité manichéen" and a major work of Eastern Manichaeism known as the *Sermon of the Light Mind* (Nous), as SUNDERMAN 1984, p. 499, explains.

29 This chapter incorporates the Enochic Watchers myth into this cosmological framework, cast as a rebellion against one of these five sons, the Rex Honoris. See HENNING 1943, p. 71 (his text M).

30 There is a precedent in Judaism for an allegorical understanding of the giants. Philo (first century CE) in his treatise *De gigantibus* argued that the giants of Genesis 6 should not be understood as actual giants but rather as representations of worldly and sinful attitudes that should be avoided.

31 This giant corresponds to Hahyah, the brother of ʾOhyah in the *QBG*. SUNDERMANN (1984, p. 495) speculates that the first tablet of Enoch is for Narīmān and the second is intended for all the giants. But the message for Narīmān is mentioned before the two tablets are, suggesting that the missive for this giant should be distinguished from them.

32 REEVES 1993. On the basis of the Mesopotamian parallel, he argues that Atambish is a cipher for the Jewish flood hero, Noah. This patriarch, however, never prominently appears in either the *QBG* or *MBG*. HUGGINS 1995 suggests that Atambish denotes Enoch, but since this sage is mentioned elsewhere in the text by name (Ir 11), this is probably not the case. It is simplest to understand Atambish as a giant. The giants converse in both the

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

appears in M 5900, a fragment of the *MBG* published by Sundermann in 1973.[33] The name never appears in the *QBG*. This composition may have originally included both of these details in some form but they are not preserved in its extant fragments.

The Complaint, the Visions and Enoch's Second Tablet in the Qumran *Book of Giants*

To understand what the L text can contribute to our understanding of the *QBG*, it is important to establish how 4Q530 2 ii and 4Q203 8 fit into the narrative of the Qumran composition. Mahaway makes his second journey to Enoch in 4Q530 7 ii, after the visions of ʾOhyah and Hahyah in 4Q530 2 ii, as mentioned above. The key question is whether one places 4Q203 8 before or after 4Q530 2 ii. If the former, hearing Enoch's second tablet could be the occasion for the visions recounted in 4Q530 2 ii. If the latter, 4Q203 8, with its message of condemnation, may be a response to them.

This issue has been examined by scholars of ancient Judaism, although not extensively. Reeves argues that 4Q203 8 comes after 4Q530 2 ii.[34] Also in his opinion 4Q203 8 comes before 4Q531 22.[35] This fragment mentions a war waged by the giants against humankind (more on this below). In Reeves' scenario, this war is a product of the rage and defiance the giants felt upon hearing Enoch's second tablet. In 4Q531 22 ʾOhyah mentions that he has had a dream which has bothered him (l. 9). For Reeves the Leningrad fragment helps explain this detail, since in its page 1 the reading of the tablet triggers Sām (= ʾOhyah) to have a vision:

> the intriguing testimony of the Sundermann fragment [the L text] to a later dream at precisely this position in the narrative flow speaks in favor of the sequence retained here.[36]

So understood, the L text helps us understand better the narrative context of the reading of Enoch's second tablet in 4Q203 8.

Stuckenbruck interprets the data differently. For him 4Q203 8 comes before the dreams of 4Q530 2 ii.[37] The Leningrad fragment for him records not the

Qumran and Manichaean texts, as Mahaway and Atambish do in the L text. Also in the *QBG* some of the giants' names derive from Mesopotamian myth (i. e., Gilgamesh), as is the case with Atambish.

33 Sundermann 1973, pp. 77–78.

34 See his QG 8 and QG 4, in Reeves 1992, pp. 58–59.

35 They are, respectively, his QG 8 and QG 9.

36 Reeves 1992, pp. 118, 120.

37 Stuckenbruck 1997, p. 23.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

reading of Enoch's second tablet but his first. The key for him is that 4Q203 8 is addressed to the watchers, whereas L is to the giants.[38] This argument is not compelling. In the L text the giants listen to the message, but the angel Shemiḥazah is there as well. In 4Q203 8 the watchers are the addressees, but the tablet's message of rebuke clearly includes the giants as well, as discussed above. STUCKENBRUCK's opinion that the L text corresponds not to Enoch's second tablet in the *QBG* but his first, however, should be endorsed.

REEVES quite rightly emphasizes that in the L text Sām's vision comes after the reading of the tablet. For him this vision corresponds to the dream vision that ʾOhyah mentions in 4Q531 22 9. This is probably not the case. The dream of Sām is better understood in relation to those of 4Q530 2 ii, particularly that of ʾOhyah. Moreover, 4Q531 22 likely comes, *contra* REEVES, before 4Q530 2 ii in the narrative of the *QBG*. In 4Q531 22 ʾOhyah has a conversation with Gilgamesh, the only other named giant in this fragment.[39] He tells ʾOhyah about a war that the giants fought against humankind. This conflict likely denotes the violent activities of the giants, but the *QBG* does not provide enough detail to understand this war with more precision. The giants lost this conflict because the angels intervened (ll. 5–6). The beginning of 4Q530 2 ii is obscure but includes a reference to "the death of our souls" and the assertion that ʾOhyah relays to the other giants something that Gilgamesh told him (ll. 1–3). What ʾOhyah reports is not stated, but he refers to a conversation that obviously took place before 4Q530 2 ii and he was speaking with Gilgamesh. This prior discussion is most likely the one attested in 4Q531 22. It is the only text of the *QBG* that recounts a spoken exchange between these two giants. In 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 ʾOhyah probably tells the assembled giants about a war that Gilgamesh discussed with him. This would explain why they are afraid of death at the outset of 4Q530 2 ii.

ʾOhyah probably did not tell the giants in 4Q530 2 ii only about a war. 4Q531 22 also mentions a cry that comes up from the animals and men (l. 8). This is most likely a complaint uttered by the souls of those murdered by the giants. 4Q530 1 i 4 likewise mentions that the souls of those who have been murdered are crying out. Learning about this would also explain the giants' fear of death in 4Q530 2 ii. In *Watchers* the flood is reimagined as recompense against them, initiated after accusations from earth reach heaven (*1 En.* 7:6; 8:4; 9:1–2; 10:2–15). There is something similar at work in the *QBG*. 4Q203 8 12 attests the phrase "has reached Rapha'el." The subject of the verb is not extant but it was likely a complaint term, referring to an accusation from the giants' victims, perhaps including the earth, defiled by the blood of the slain. So understood, Enoch in his second tablet states that a complaint has reached Rapha'el in heaven. 4Q531 22 would then come before 4Q203 8 in the narrative of the *QBG*. In 4Q531 22 9 a cry has gone up from the earth. By 4Q203 8 12 it has reached

38 STUCKENBRUCK 1997, p. 86.
39 GOFF 2009, pp. 242–245.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

heaven. Judgment against them is at this point guaranteed, unless they can manage to obtain mercy from God.

4Q203 7b supports the view that 4Q531 22 comes before Enoch's second tablet is read. 4Q203 7b ii 3 establishes that his two tablets were read at different times: "and the second until now has not been re[ad]." The L fragment appears to presuppose this trope, since it mentions two tablets but only one is read. 4Q203 7b i 5 also provides a rare hint about the narrative context of the reading of Enoch's second tablet: "he has imprisoned us and overpowered *(tqp)* yo[u]." This statement is likely uttered by one of the watchers, who are imprisoned in *Watchers*, who is speaking with an unnamed giant (*1 En.* 10:12–13). This is suggested by the claim that his interlocutor has been physically overwhelmed. In 4Q531 22, when Gilgamesh discusses the war, he states that the giants lost because they were not strong enough (*tqypyn*; l. 7). 4Q203 7b i 5 uses the same root *(tqp)* to claim that someone was overpowered.[40] This text thus likely refers to the episode discussed in 4Q531 22. This would suggest not only that 4Q531 22 comes in the narrative before the second tablet of Enoch is read. Also, it was read once the giants and their fathers had suffered some sort of major defeat and been prevented from committing violent crimes.

The L Text, 4Q530 2 ii and 4Q203 8

Much of the giants material in the L text has affinity with 4Q530 2 ii. When the giants assemble in the Manichaean fragment, they become distressed after listening to the tablet being read, as mentioned above (Iv 3–4). In 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 the giants become afraid of death when they learn from ʾOhyah what Gilgamesh told him (the defeat and the complaint; see above on 4Q531 22). In the L text, after the giants become sorrowful, they fall asleep and Sām has a vision (Iv 7–12). In 4Q530 2 ii the giants likewise fall asleep after they become distraught. At the very least some of them do, since the visions of ʾOhyah and Hahyah, according to l. 4, wake them from their sleep (l. 4).[41]

The vision of Sām does not correspond exactly to the dreams in 4Q530 2 ii. There are, however, some striking parallels. That he acquires some sort of fever and swallows water is enigmatic, but it relies upon some sort of contrast between fire and water (Iv 8–9). The dream of ʾOhyah's brother Hahyah in 4Q530 2 ii contains a similar distinction, since in it the earth is destroyed by fire and water (ll. 10–12). That Sām in his vision sees the "lords of heaven" *(pʾdxšʾyʾn ʿy ʾsmʾn)*

40 For the argument that the speaker is Gilgamesh, see Goff 2009, pp. 242–245.

41 In the L text, after the giants become distressed and fall asleep, Mahaway tells Atambish everything (Iv 4–5). This may correspond to ʾOhyah speaking with Gilgamesh (4Q530 2 ii 1–3), if one grants that the details would have changed somewhat in the course of transmission.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in Iv 12 also resonates with 4Q530 2 ii. In ʾOhyah's vision he sees God, who is called the "ruler of heaven" *(šlṭn šmyʾ)*, along with his heavenly host of angels (ll. 16–20). In both dreams the visionary sees a large number of heavenly beings. In 4Q530 2 ii God and his angels arrive for judgment, whereas in the L text what the lords of heaven do is not explicit. That Sām ascends to heaven in the L text also provides evidence for the possibility that the *QBG* fragment 4Q531 46, in which someone in the first person claims that he went to heaven, may be a fragment of a vision report by ʾOhyah.[42]

In the L text these three details, the distress of the giants, their falling asleep and the vision of Sām, come after the reading of Enoch's tablet. They all correspond to 4Q530 2 ii, where one finds, in the same order, the giants becoming distraught, some falling asleep and the dreams of ʾOhyah and his brother. Sām's vision is one of heavenly ascent, whereas ʾOhyah in 4Q530 2 ii sees God and angels come down from heaven to earth. But there are enough parallels between 4Q530 2 ii and the L fragment to suggest that it, while some of the details changed in the process of transmission, preserves material that corresponds to 4Q530 2 ii.

It follows that the account in the L text of a tablet of Enoch being read would correspond to an episode in the *QBG* that comes *before* 4Q530 2 ii. This suggests that the reading of the tablet in the L text provides a glimpse of a scene that was in the *QBG* which does not survive among its extant fragments, as STUCKENBRUCK argued – an account of what happened when Mahaway returned after his first journey to Enoch but before his second, which occurs after 4Q530 2 ii. The internal evidence of the *QBG* suggests that the visions of 4Q530 2 ii are prompted by the giants learning of the complaint raised against them, in the context of a war mentioned in 4Q531 22. The L text of the *MBG* suggests they may have also been motivated by reading a tablet written by Enoch.

The contents of Enoch's first tablet have not survived, in the L text or the *QBG*, but some speculation on this point is possible. The text of this tablet is not that of 4Q203 8, Enoch's second tablet. Nevertheless the first tablet probably did provide a message of judgment, like 4Q203 8. There is a consistent doublet theme in the *QBG*, which has two brothers who have two visions, and Mahaway makes two journeys to Enoch.[43] Two tablets that convey divine rebuke would underscore this theme. The two visions of 4Q530 2 ii in different ways underscore that the giants are to be destroyed in the flood. The repetition of a message

42 The highly fragmentary nature of 4Q531 46 forces assessments to remain tentative. One can reconstruct the name ʾOhyah in line 1 (*ʾw*[*hyh*]), as does PUECH 2001, p. 93. He appeals to the ascension of Sām in the L text to make this claim (Iv 7–8).

43 The doublet theme probably helps establish that the dreams of the brothers are authentic visions and prefigure something that God has ordained to take place (i.e., the flood). This attitude is explained in the book of Genesis: "And the doubling of Pharaoh's dream means that the thing is fixed by God and God will shortly bring it about" (41:32). See GOFF (forthcoming).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of judgment in Enoch's tablets would highlight that the giants and watchers are not simply punished outright, but are warned of their impending fate and given the opportunity to change their ways. Since Enoch's second tablet states that a complaint from earth has reached heaven, perhaps his first tablet emphasized that this accusation was rising from earth toward heaven.

This understanding of the L text accords with the argument given above regarding the place of 4Q203 8 in the narrative of the *QBG*. The two tablets are not read at the same time (4Q203 7b ii 3). If Enoch's first tablet is read before 4Q530 2 ii, as the L text suggests, the second is likely read after this column. The giants and watchers probably heard Enoch's second tablet being read, perhaps by Mahaway, after he returns from his second journey to this sage. At the end of 4Q530 2 ii, it should be recalled, Mahaway is told to journey to Enoch and that he has done so previously. Although Enoch's interpretation of the dreams of ʾOhyah and Hahyah recounted in 4Q530 2 ii has not survived, he does offer one, and these dreams both prefigure the punishment of the giants through the flood. This is consistent with the key assertion of Enoch in 4Q203 8 12 that the complaint against the watchers and giants has reached heaven. This signals that divine punishment is imminent. This recompense takes the form of the flood. While no extant fragments of the *QBG* give prominent treatment to the flood, the message of judgment in Enoch's second tablet appears to presuppose the interpretation that the dreams of 4Q530 2 ii prefigure the flood. The emphasis in 4Q203 8 13 on the ultimate destruction *(ʾbd[nʾ])* that will come upon the earth, in both the deserts and the seas, likely reflects Enoch's interpretation of Hahyah's dream in 4Q530 2 ii in which a garden is destroyed by fire and water. The flood is not simply an increase in water but God's wrath, a cataclysm in which water destroys the deserts and fire the seas.[44] 4Q203 8 likely comes after 4Q530 2 ii in the narrative of the *QBG*.

Conclusion

The L text of the *MBG* gives an impression of the narrative circumstances surrounding the public reading of Enoch's first tablet. This fragment supports the idea that in the *QBG* the giants assembled in the context of anxiety, and that the visions of ʾOhyah and Hahyah were revealed to them as a result. 4Q203 8 contains a message of divine judgment against the giants and watchers that is based upon the interpretation that the visions of 4Q530 2 ii prefigure the flood. Enoch's second tablet was read among them after Mahaway's second journey. Enoch's first tablet was read before this, after the giant's first journey to him.

44 Divine punishment in the twin forms of fire and water is found elsewhere in ancient Judaism (e.g., *Life of Adam and Eve* 49:3; Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.70). See Goff (forthcoming).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

WERNER SUNDERMANN's publication of the L fragment is a boon not only for the study of Manichaeism. This text is also significant for the study of ancient Judaism. SUNDERMANN's edition of the L fragment of the *MBG* allows us to better understand the narrative sequence of the fascinating but enigmatic *QBG*.

Abbreviations

ACI	Acta Iranica
AAWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
DJD	Discoveries of the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
HOM	Hommages et opera minora
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplement Series
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
"L" text	the "Leningrad" text
MBG	Manichaean *Book of Giants*
MHUC	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
QG	Qumran *Book of Giants* (abbreviation used in REEVES 1992)
r	recto
SGKAO	Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients
SOR	Serie Orientale Roma
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
v	verso
VDI	*Vestnik drevnej istorii (Journal of Ancient History)*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

Bibliography

BAKER-BRIAN, N.J. 2011: *Manichaeism: An Ancient Faith Rediscovered*. London.

DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Part I: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 3/1).

GOFF, M.J. 2009: "Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran Book of Giants' Appropriation of *Gilgamesh* Motifs." In: *DSD* 16, pp. 221–253.

— (forthcoming): *When Giants Walked the Earth: The Sons of the Watchers in Enochic Literature and Ancient Judaism*. Göttingen (JAJSup).

HENNING, W.B. 1943: "The Book of Giants." In: *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946), pp. 52–74.

HUGGINS, R.V. 1995: "Noah and the Giants: A Response to John C. Reeves." In: *JBL* 114, pp. 103–110.

MILIK, J.T. 1976: *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Morano, E. 2011: "New Research on Mani's Book of Giants." In: Z. Özertural/J. Wilkens (eds.): *Der östliche Manichäismus: Gattungs- und Werksgeschichte. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 4./5. März 2010*. Berlin (AAWG, 17), pp. 101–111.

Puech, É. 2001: *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXVII. Textes Araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549*. Oxford (DJD, 31).

Reeves, J.C. 1992: *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions.* Cincinnati (MHUC, 14).

— 1993: "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" In: *JBL* 112, pp. 110–115.

Stuckenbruck, L.T. 1997: *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Tübingen (TSAJ, 63).

— 2000: "EnochGiants." In: S.J. Pfann *et al.* (eds.): *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Oxford (DJD, 36), pp. 8–94.

Sundermann, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*. Berlin (SGKAO, 8; BTT, 4).

— 1984: "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch." In: *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata*. Leiden (ACI, 23; HOM, 9), pp. 491–505 [= Sundermann 2001, II, pp. 615–631].

— 1989: "Ešče odin fragment iz *knigi gigantov* Mani." In: *VDI* 3, pp. 67–79.

— 1994: "Mani's 'Book of the Giants' and the Jewish Books of Enoch: A Case of Terminological Differences and What It Implies." In Sh. Shaked/A. Netzer (eds.): *Irano-Judaica III. Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture throughout the Ages.* Jerusalem, pp. 40–48 [= Sundermann 2001, II, pp. 697–706].

— 2001: *Manichaica Iranica: Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann*. Ed. by Ch. Reck, D. Weber, C. Leurini and A. Panaino. 2 vols. Rome (SOR, 89.1–2).

Wilkens, J. 2011: "Funktion und gattungsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des manichäischen Gigantenbuchs." In: Z. Özertural/J. Wilkens (eds.): *Der östliche Manichäismus: Gattungs- und Werksgeschichte. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 4./5. März 2010*. Berlin (AAWG, 17), pp. 63–85.

— 2000: "Neue Fragmente aus Manis Gigantenbuch." In: *ZDMG* 150, pp. 133–176.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Parthian Exposition on Mani's *Book of Pictures*

A Contextualized Study of a Fragmentary *Ārdhang Wifrās* Bifolio *(M 8255)* in the Turfanforschung of the BBAW, Berlin

Zsuzsanna Gulácsi, Flagstaff

The Parthian phrase *Ārdhang Wifrās* is a title in Manichaean literature that may be best translated as "Sermon on the *Ārdhang*" or "Oral Sermon on the *Ārdhang*."[1] Based on the unambiguous connotation of this title, it is reasonable to assume that this text was the closest and thus, the most authoritative primary source on the *Ārdhang* – Mani's collection of didactic paintings, the *Book of Pictures*. This pictorial work is attributed to Mani and is often listed together with the rest of Mani's books as part of the Manichaean canon. Its designations in a variety of languages positively confirm a painting medium by its very title – "*The Picture(s)*."[2] In Western Manichaean literature, this work was referred to as *Hikōn* in Coptic and *Yuqnā* in Syriac. Both nouns are Greek loanwords (< Gr. *eikon* 'picture, painting, image') and retain the connotation of 'picture, painting, or image' in their respective languages. The same is true for other attested versions of this title, including *Nigār* ('Picture') in Middle Persian and *Al-ṣuwar* ('Pictures') in Arabic.[3] No Greek or Latin references to this painted work survive; in other words, neither (Gr.) *Eikon* nor (Lt.) *Imago* are attested as the title of this Manichaean work of art in any historical records known today. *Ārdhang* is the Parthian version of the title in a variety of sources. It derives from what appears to be a loanword in Parthian with no known etymology.[4] The few

1 Sundermann translates *Ārdhang Wifrās* as 'Sermon/discourse/commentary of/on the *Ārdhang*' and 'Treatise (or sermon) on the *Ārdhang*' (2005, pp. 373 and 383) and 'Oral Proclamation/teaching/recitation' as the original Parthian meaning of *wifrās* (Sundermann 1984, p. 236).

2 Despite the fact that the Coptic title is in the singular, one Coptic passage (*Homilies* 18.3–6, see Pedersen 2006, p. 18) specifically mentions the multiple paintings of the *Hikōn*, while others provide indirect evidence to suggest that the *Hikōn* was a collection of paintings.

3 Ibn al-Nadim, *Kitab al-Fihrist* (987 CE), see Reeves 2011, p. 117.

4 Sundermann 2005, p. 377. As part of his study, Sundermann provides an overview of Henning's tentative etymology, which points to the Middle Persian *-hang* < Old Iranian *θang-* 'to draw' in order to explain the second part of the word *Ārdhang* (Haloun/

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Parthian Manichaean texts that mention the *Ārdhang* provide no clarification and instead take the meaning of this title for granted. The first explanations for what this title means is found in post-Manichaean Islamicate dictionaries and polemical accounts that, starting from the mid 11th century, mention the *Aržang* as the prophet-wonder of the pre-Islamic (false) prophet and admired painter, Mani. Only in such late tertiary sources is this word explained as an archaic foreign term (Ar./Pers./Chag. *Aržang* < Parth. *Ārdhang*) that connotes 'the title of Mani's collection of paintings.'[5] By this time, however, the Manichaeans had already disappeared from West and Central Asia and the authors writing about *Aržang* rarely had access to Manichaean texts, let alone (a contemporaneous copy of) Mani's canonical pictures.[6]

Troubled by the lack of images and the lack of direct references to pictures in the *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments (in addition to the lack of etymology for the term *Ārdhang*), Professor Sundermann questioned the traditional interpretation of the Parthian title *Ārdhang* as the collection of Mani's didactic paintings. Instead, he considered the possibility of translating it as "The Painstaking [Book]," to indicate the title of a lost, non-pictorial, and otherwise undocumented book by Mani.[7] He first proposed this idea at the *5th International Congress of Manichaean Studies* (Naples, 2001). At the *6th International Congress of Manichaean Studies* (Flagstaff, 2005), I presented a pilot study of a new book project, which was to systematically consider the available textual and pictorial sources on Mani's *Book of Pictures.*[8] At that time, I began a discussion with Professor Sundermann about my findings. Based on my dissertation research, published as *Medieval Manichaean Book Art* (2005), I already knew that the sideways orientation of paintings in Manichaean illuminated manuscripts has a lot to do with Mani's *Book of Pictures* and understood that the Manichaeans practiced "teaching with images" with their collection of didactic paintings. As my new project progressed, I was eager to share my findings with Professor Sundermann. In 2006–2007, my work was happily interrupted by the identification of a Manichaean Jesus image from 12th/13th-century China (2009) that belonged to a corpus of Chinese Manichaean hanging scrolls preserved

Henning 1952, p. 210 and n. 5), and notes that the first part of the word *Ārd-* remains unexplained.

5 The earliest post-Manichaean discussions include a brief entry in the Persian dictionary of *Asadī Ṭūsī* (1066 CE) and an Arabic passage about Mani and his prophetic miracle by Abū al-Maʿālī (1092 CE), see Reeves 2011, p. 121; and Pellò 2013, p. 254.

6 Although while discussing Mani's legendary skill as a painter in his *Religions of the World* (Pr. *Bayânu al-Adyan,* 1092 CE), Abu al-Maʿālī does mention the existence of a volume of Mani's paintings in the imperial treasury of Ghazna, he does not claim to have seen it (Reeves 2011, p. 121; and Haloun/Henning 1952, p. 210).

7 Sundermann 2005, p. 383.

8 Gulácsi 2011, pp. 233–262.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in Japan;[9] again in 2009–2010 by the identification of a Diatesseronic depiction of the *Life of Jesus* in Manichaean art (2012), and most recently in 2012 by the identification of a unique sealstone in the Bibliothèque nationale de France that belonged to "Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ" (2014). Neither of these art historical advances would have been possible without the foundation Prof. Sundermann had provided on material related to Jesus in Middle Iranian Manichaean texts, which I used extensively in these studies. Our correspondence continued on the subject of the *Ārdhang*, and he generously shared with me his preliminary edition of fragments of the *Ārdhang Wifrās*, with permission to incorporate selections in my chapter on this source in my forthcoming book. I was able to show him a draft of this study in June 2012, which gave me the chance to present a strong argument in support of the traditional interpretation of the *Ārdhang* and to convince him to reconsider his hypothesis – which he did. Therefore, I find it appropriate to focus on one of these fragments as my contribution to the memorial volume celebrating Professor Sundermann's lifework in Manichaean studies.

In the collection of the *Turfanforschung*, Werner Sundermann identified parts of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* on 15 pieces of torn paper fragments that match only in content **(Table 1)**.[10] While one of them derived from a *pustaka* folio (M 871m),[11] the rest are codex fragments, including 13 folio fragments and one bifolio fragment with its two folia still attached to one another. Four fragments retain the phrase, *Ārdhang Wifrās*, in the header of their respective folia. The phrase was written along the upper margin of the codex page in order to identify the content of that page: *Ārdhang* on the verso (on the right) and *Wifrās* on the recto (on the left page of the open codex, see Fig. 1).[12] Since these fragments

9 The identification of this corpus began with the work of Takeo Izumi (2006), and was continued by Yutaka Yoshida (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) and Gulácsi (2009). Subsequent studies focused on various artistic and iconographic concerns in publications by Yoshida (2009, 2013), Gulácsi (2008, 2009), Yorinde Ebert (2009, 2013), Shoichi Furukawa (2010, 2011), and more recently by Gábor Kósa (2013). For a full bibliography, see Gulácsi 2013, pp. 57–58.

10 Sundermann lists 14 *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments (2005, pp. 374–375). Based on the internal catalogue assembled by the Turfan Research Group of the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit also lists some of these texts (1982a, p. 16, n. 4). The 15th fragment, M 416, is noted by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (2004, p. 52) and discussed in a footnote by Sundermann (2005, p. 373).

11 The codicological characteristics of the double-sided paper fragment, M 871m, are analogous to other Manichaean *pustaka* (i. e., book in palm-leaf format) folia surviving from Turfan (see Gulácsi 2005, pp. 188–191).

12 Written across the upper margin, the single line in the header was to be read continuously from right to left across the two facing pages of the open book. Accordingly, the verso of the previous page contained the one word *Ārdhang* while the recto of the following page contained *Wifrās*. Based on this practice, the headlines on the two sides of a single folio fragment always features *Ārdhang* on its verso and *Wifrās* on its recto.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

did not contain regular literary prose, but instead what appears to be a series of terse references in forms of expository lists to explain, inform, or describe a topic, Sundermann grouped them based on the two thematic patterns attested in their texts: (1) *a list of references to parables/stories*, *each beginning with the phrase "of/about,"* as documented on six fragments (M 186, M 258, M 4637, M 6061, M 6898 and M 8255 folio 1); and (2) *a list of references to similes of various eschatological subjects introduced by the comparative phrase "(it is) like"* as seen in a total of nine fragments (M 35, M 205, M 740a, M 833, M 836, and M 852, M 871m, M 907, and M 8255 folio 2).[13] One fragment retains only the header (M 416).

Table 1: Fifteen Fragments of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* (16 texts)

Fragments with Lists of Stories (6 texts)	Fragments with Lists of Similes (9 texts)[14]
1. M 186 (codex folio) 2. M 258 (codex folio) 3. M 4637 (codex folio) 4. M 6061 (folio) 5. M 6898 (codex folio) 6. M 8255 folio 1 (bifolio with header)	1. M 35 (codex folio with header) 2. M 205 (codex folio) 3. M 740a (codex folio) 4. M 871m (pustaka folio) 5. M 833 (codex folio) 6. M 836 (codex folio) 7. M 852 (codex folio) 8. M 907 (codex folio with header) 9. M 8255 folio 2 (bifolio with header)
Fragments with Header only (1 text)	
1. M 416 (codex folio with header)	

One of the most informative *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments is a bifolio labeled M 8255. My current goal is to assess the data preserved in this fragment about Mani's *Ārdhang*. In addition to certain codicological characteristics of the manuscripts and the content of the text, I consider its title and language in order to determine how this text relates to Manichaean didactic art. I am aware of numerous obstacles that stand in the way of analyzing and interpreting what the *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments convey about the *Ārdhang*: (1) the complete critical edition of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments is yet to be published; (2) the already published material indicates a highly fragmentary survival; (3) the original length of the text is undocumented; and (4) the surviving text preserves only a few intact sentences at a time, making it impossible to determine the significance of the available content in relation to the original composition – now lost. Nevertheless, by focusing on the best-preserved fragment (M 8255), my analysis

13 Sundermann 2005, p. 375.

14 Although these fragments do not physically match one another (i. e., they represent folio fragments of different codices that included the *Ārdhang Wifrās* text), Sundermann notes the overlapping content among some of the texts, which give two continuous passages from the end of the *Ārdhang Wifrās*: one on M 35 + M 740a + M 871m + M 907 and another on M 8255 + M 205 (2005, p. 374).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

yields critical new data regarding the questions of the appearance, content, and function of Mani's collection of didactic paintings, called *Ārdhang* in Parthian Manichaean sources.

The Codicological Features of M 8255 and the Appearance of the *Ārdhang*

Codicological data documents how the *Ārdhang Wifrās* manuscripts were incorporated into the physical context of their codices, which also contained other texts. The bifolio fragment, M 8255, is especially informative in this regard **(Fig. 1)**. This torn paper fragment (H: ca. 8.3 cm, W: ca. 21.8 cm) constitutes an undetermined portion from the upper part of a bifolio. What survives today may represent as little as one-third of the original height (i. e., if ca. 3 x 7 lines = 21 lines were on each page) or as much as one-half of it (i. e., if ca. 2 x 7 lines = 14 lines were on each page).[15] On each side of each folio (i. e., on all four fragmentary pages), a text of seven lines is preserved in a single column flanked by side margins and topped by a headline (header) written across the upper margin. Two long headlines in red ink distinguish the outer side of this bifolio, indicating the content of the first page, referred to as "folio 1" recto, as "Begun (is) the *Ārdhang Wifrās*," and of the last page, referred to as "folio 2" verso, as "Ended (is) the *Ārdhang Wifrās*" **(Fig. 1a)**. On the inner side of this bifolio, the two headers read continuously across the two pages: "*Ārdhang*" on the verso of folio 1 and "*Wifrās*" on the recto of folio 2 **(Fig. 1b)**.

This bifolio retains no evidence that would allow us to confirm where it was located within its quire. It is possible that these four pages constituted the very middle of the quire (with the bifolio's inner side constituting actual facing pages), since the words in these two headers can be read together. If so, the *Ārdhang Wifrās* text was only four pages long in this quire that contained other texts both before and after the *Ārdhang Wifrās* **(Fig. 1c: minimum length)**. It is also equally possible, however, that this bifolio was located at any other part of its quire, which in Manichaean Turfan are proven to contain as many as 15 paper bifolia. It is also equally possible that the four pages of M 8255 formed the very last bifolio in the quire – as Sundermann hypothesized in 2005 **(Fig. 1c: maximum length)**. If so, the *Ārdhang Wifrās* text was as long as 60 pages (4 pages per each of 15 bifolia) in this quire. Sundermann considers

15 Assuming that this was neither a horizontal codex nor a square-shape codex (with seven lines of text on each page), but rather a vertical codex (the shape most commonly used in Turfan), the surviving seven lines still could have been on a page with as many as 28 lines (if one quarter of the original height survives) or as little as 14 lines (if one-half of the original height survives). For codicological diagrams illustrating the proportions on non-illuminated Manichaean codices, see Gulácsi 2005, Figs. 3/9–3/11.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a: Outer side of bifolio fragment M 8255 (H: 8.3 cm, W: 21.8 cm)
Header on folio 1 recto: "Begun (is) the *Ardhang Wifrás*"
Header on folio 2 verso: "Ended (is) the *Ardhang Wifrás*"

b: Inner side of bifolio fragment, M 8255
Header on folio 1 verso: "*Ardhang*"
Header on folio 2 recto: "*Wifrás*"

c: Diagram of quire with undetermined location of bifolio fragment, M 8255

Fig. 1: Codicological analysis of the Ardhang Wifrás bifolio fragment
(M 8255, Depositum der BBAW in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung)

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

this substantial length for the *Ārdhang Wifrās* possible, based the 15 bifolia that survive from a single quire of the so-called BBB (Germ. *Bet-und Beichtbuch*, MIK III 53 [M 801a]).[16] If so, the first two and the last two pages of a ca. 60-page long *Ārdhang Wifrās* text are preserved by *M 8255*. According to Sundermann, this codex contained a minimum of three quires and a minimum of three texts as suggested by the two texts that preceded and followed the *Ārdhang Wifrās*, from which only a few lines remain on *M 8255* folio 1 recto and *M 8255* folio 2 + *M 205* verso, respectively.[17] The bifolia of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* quire that nested within this outermost bifolio in the quire contained headers that read across the facing pages identical to the ones that are preserved on folio 1 verso and folio 2 recto. In short, codicological data confirms only that this text occupied a minimum of four pages (equal to one bifolio) or any multiple of four pages (8 pages = 2 bifolia, 12 pages = 3 bifolia, 14 pages = 4 bifolia, etc.,) up to a maximum of 60 pages (= 15 bifolia). It remains unclear, however, in what part of the intact quire M 8255 was located. It could have been anywhere within its quire, depending on not only the length of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* prose, but also the thickness of this quire as well as the length of the pages in this codex – all of which remain unknown.

The codicological features of M 8255, just as the other currently known 14 *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments retain no evidence of pictorial art in the physical context of any of this text. On the contrary – they provide a dual body of evidence to question Sundermann's hypothesis that the text of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* might have been in the physical context of the *Ārdhang* itself.[18] First, the codicological data preserved in these fragments give no indication that the *Ārdhang Wifrās* texts were accompanied by any paintings within their manuscripts. Having been written in plain columns, all currently known *Ārdhang Wifrās* manuscripts indicate regular religious books that contained only texts. In other words, the *Ārdhang Wifrās* was not combined with the *Ārdhang* to form an illuminated manuscript. Instead of being a luxurious painted book that supplements its prose with illustrations, the *Ārdhang Wifrās* is preserved in a format that suggests a mostly utilitarian function, providing subjects to be discussed in the course of (oral) sermons given on the *Ārdhang* – a collection of images displayed in the course of such an instruction. Second, the textual content of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* also supports this claim. As we shall see below, the *Ārdhang Wifrās* was not written in regular religious prose, but instead as a set of notes that can be consulted by an elect in preparation for or during an exposition, an "oral sermon," i.e., a *wifrās*. This practical function does not justify

16 For a description and a codicological diagram that illustrates the quire structure of the BBB with its 15 bifolia and color coded headers, see Gulácsi 2005, p. 61ff. and Figs. 3/1 and 3/2.

17 Sundermann 2005, p. 375.

18 Sundermann 2005, p. 376.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the luxury of an expensively produced illuminated book. Whatever luxury was involved in a *wifrās* given on the *Ārdhang* came from the images of the *Ārdhang* itself, displayed as an essential visual aid of the teaching in a medium physically independent from the *Ārdhang Wifrās* text. All these considerations therefore lead to the conclusion that the *Ārdhang Wifrās* was a plain text that guided the oral expositions of a solely pictorial work.

Based on what is known today about Manichaean codicology and Manichaean pictorial art, there is no reason to assume that any figural decoration adorned and/or illustrated (i. e., visually commented upon) the passages of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* either in codex or in *pustaka* formats.[19] Instead, the currently known fragments are best interpreted as practical texts written to aid the preparation or guide the performance of those learned elects who were entrusted with the task of delivering oral sermons *(wifrās)* with the aid of didactic pictorial art *(Ārdhang)* displayed in the course of their instructions. While none of the currently known *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments mentions paintings, the stories and similes listed on many of them seem to indicate a culturally and religiously appropriate repertoire of references that can be called upon to aid oral instruction in core teachings of Mani as depicted in the *Ārdhang*.

The Content of M 8255 and the Scenes Depicted in the *Ārdhang*

Sundermann's research showed that the beginning portion of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* (as seen on M 8255 folio 1 recto and verso) contained an at least two-page long list of brief references to a set of parables/stories that mention the Third Messenger, who is called after his Parthian name *Mihr Yazad* (lit. 'God Mithra'). In Sundermann's translation, the surviving portions of the text read:

> *Bifolio fragment from the Ārdhang Wifrās mentioning the Third Messenger (M 8255 + M 205)*[20]
>
> Folio I recto /hl/ The beginning of *Ārdhang Wifrās*
>] *grew hot. About a golden *substitute which is reckoned as flint. About a man who is granted much desire(?), and they bind him secretly at a finger's hint. About a ruler who [gave] a meal to the noblemen [and ?]. And [
> *(lacuna)*

19 For a monograph on Manichaean codicology based on a systematic analysis of Turfan Manichaean book art, see Gulácsi 2005 with special attention to chapter 5. For a monograph on Manichaean didactic painting, see Gulácsi 2015.

20 The translation of M 8255 + M 205 was kindly provided by Sundermann (personal communication), from his preliminary work on the critical edition of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* texts.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Folio I verso /hl/ *Ārdhang*
] who is in the garden. About the heart in the body. About the pure pearl which stays in water and mud. About Mihr Yazad who is near to men and far away. About the sea and [
(lacuna)

These two pages note parables/stories as if referring to titles, which may be best compared to the lecture notes of a teacher, written for review before an oral instruction or used as a reference during the instruction. Each parable/story starts with the phrase "about/of" such as: "About a man who is granted much desire […]," or "About a ruler who [gave] a meal to the noblemen […]." In these cases, we remain in the dark not only about the details of the referenced subsidiary stories, but also about the main didactic theme that brought them together for an oral sermon.

Sundermann identified parts of the ending portion of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* (M 8255 folio 2 recto and verso) and discovered that the text on the latter fragment partially overlaps with the sentences preserved on the two sides of an independent folio fragment (M 205 recto and verso), which represents another copy of the same text. These two fragments together (M 8255 folio II + M 205) document the ending portions of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* and contain a list of similes, each of which begins with the phrase "like [it is]," and mention again the Third Messenger.[21] Sundermann's translation reads:

M 8255 folio II + M 205 (matching only in content)

Recto /hl/ *Wifrās*
] the pious man who is righteous to God and well attending his own soul. And the work of all these, one by one, becomes manifest. (It) is like the body, which is divided into five limbs. The heads of [the Church] are like the head, [
(lacuna)

Verso /hl/ The end of *Ārdhang Wifrās*
] like Mihr Yazad when he goes forth from this world; like a bright lamp when it is taken out from a dark house; like a house which people leave (so that) it becomes deserted and *dangerous. So (it is with) the soul. When it abandons the body, (the body) becomes small and despised with every fleshly creature. Truly, in [
(lacuna)

This part of the text also gives the impression of a note with a list of brief references, rather than regular prose. On the very last page, where the *Ārdhang Wifrās* concluded (M 8255 folio II verso + M 205 verso), a main theme can be recognizable. It concerns individual eschatology, "the soul departing the body," which is compared to a variety of human experiences through a set of similes. The soul departing the body is "like a bright lamp when it is taken out from a dark house," "like a house which people leave (so that) it becomes deserted," and "like Mihr Yazad when he goes forth from this world."

21 Sundermann 2005, p. 374.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Two similar lists are preserved on yet another *Ārdhang Wifrās* folio fragment (M 35). In this case, the two passages preserved deal with events of cosmic eschatology to take place at the end of time, including the theme of Jesus' second coming (M 35 recto) that remains a still largely unexplored theme of Manichaean teaching, and the theme of "the Great Fire" (M 35 verso) that is, the "World Fire," which consumes the universe at the Eschaton. Sundermann's translation reads:

> *Folio fragment of the Ārdhang Wifrās mentioning Jesus (M 35)*[22]
>
> Recto /hl/ *Wifrās*
> [Ninth …*greed] disappears, and belief descends to humans. Tenth, that Jesus' wound becomes visible to everyone. Eleventh, that the religious (Parth. *dinawar*) become rulers over (the time of) their bodily exit. Twelfth, that they become painless, without cold and heat, and without lust, become angels (lit. apostles) and …. . And the Messiah (Jesus) dwells for 120 years together with (the community of the) righteous. And 100 years the world will remain void of (its) inhabitants. The trees will … and tremble *(lacuna)*
>
> Verso /hl/ *Ārdhang*
> will be consumed. And there will be no plants/trees anymore. But they will pass away. [double punctuation][23] And the story *(āzend)* about the *Great Fire*: like (the way in which) the fire, with powerful wrath, swallows this world and enjoys it; like (the way in which) this fire that is in this body, swallows the exterior fire that is (lit. comes) in fruit and food, and enjoys it. Again, like (the story in which) two brothers, who found a treasure, and a pursuer lacerated each other, and they died; like (the fight in which) Ohya, Leviathan (lit. Lewyātīn), and Raphael lacerated each another, and they vanished; like (the story in which) a lion-cub, a calf in a wood (or in a meadow), and a fox, who lacerated each another, [and they vanished, or died]. Thus [the *Great Fire* swallows, etc.] both of the fires. … *(lacuna)*

Instead of providing the entire prose of a sermon text on this fire, here the character of the fire is referenced through a series of allegories. When printed in modern formatting, "The story of the Great Fire" on M 35 verso shows the nature of this composition with greater clarity. In Henning's translation the text reads:

> "The story of the *Great Fire*:
> Like (the way in which) the fire, with powerful wrath, swallows this world and enjoys it;
> Like (the way in which) this fire that is in this body, swallows the exterior fire that is (lit. comes) in fruit and food, and enjoys it;
> Like (the story in which) two brothers, who found a treasure were lacerated by a pursuer, and they died;

22 Since M 35 verso mentions some figures from the Hebrew Bible, Henning gives its translation in his study on Mani's *Book of the Giants* (1943, pp. 71–72).

23 English translation after Sundermann 2003, pp. 423–424.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Like (the story in which) Ohya, Leviathan, and Raphael
lacerated each other, and they vanished;
Like (the story in which) a lion-cub, a calf in a wood (or in a meadow),
and a fox, who lacerated each another, [and they vanished or died];
So [the *Great Fire* swallows] both of the fires."[24]

Although the subjects of these brief references are clearly stated (alluding to elements of local popular culture and Manichaean religious folklore that were readily comprehensible in the world of the intended audience), their nuanced meanings are not self-evident today. For example, the text may refer to a list of stories, as noted above. In other cases, the text may mention something that was done by a well-known Manichaean deity, such as the Third Messenger (M 8255 folio 1 and folio 2) or Jesus (M 35 recto). It is clear that all such references were meant to elucidate major didactic themes that remain evident only rarely in what survives from the original text. Therefore, we cannot assume that all figures mentioned in the allegories listed in the *Ārdhang Wifrās* (Ohya, Leviathan, and Raphael; lion-cubs, calves, and foxes; or even Manichaean figures such, as the Third Messenger or Jesus) were necessarily depicted within the corresponding image of the *Ārdhang* **(Diagram 1)**.[25] An example of this is seen above on the verso of M 35. The main theme of this passage is cosmic eschatology, in the course of which the Great Fire will consume the universe at the end of time, while the stories of Ohya, Leviathan, Raphael, and the lion-cubs, calves, and foxes are used only to further explain Mani's teaching on cosmic eschatology.

Diagram 1: Textual Content of *Ārdhang Wifrās*
vs. Pictorial content of *Ārdhang*

Main themes	=	Main themes
written about in the *Ārdhang Wifrās*		depicted in the *Ārdhang*
Figures mentioned	≠	Figures depicted
in analogies listed in *Ārdhang Wifrās* as possible explanations of a theme		in corresponding pictorial theme of the *Ārdhang*

While considering the content of the *Ārdhang Wifrās*, it is reasonable to assume that, at the time when its Parthian prose was written, the "main themes" (i.e., large thematic units that regard the main religious teachings) of the text corresponded with the main themes depicted in the *Ārdhang*. An important task of future studies will be to identify all main themes of the surviving *Ārdhang*

24 Henning 1943, pp. 71–72.
25 Six passages preserved on the two largest *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments are quoted below. One of them mentions the Third Messenger (M 8255), while the other mentions Jesus (M 35) in the context of eschatological discussions with recognizable themes.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Wifrās fragments, along with the decoding of its numerous concise references to what we may call "subsidiary stories" (i. e., tales or anecdotes that add succinct cultural/religious allegories in individual sentences in order to help explain a main theme).

Title and Language of M 8255 and the Didactic Use of the *Ārdhang*

Besides the four pages of M 8255, another three *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments retain headers (M 35, M 416, and M 907). They all use *Ārdhang* in the role of a title. This role is analogous to what is seen in the only additional occurrences of *Ārdhang* in two Parthian texts from Turfan (M 5569 and M 5815).[26] While *Ārdhang* is undoubtedly a loan word in Parthian with no known etymology,[27] its meaning is taken for granted in all Parthian Manichaean sources – none of the Manichaean authors see a reason to provide a clarification on what the *Ārdhang* was. In sharp contrast to this practice of the primary texts are the post-Manichaean Islamicate accounts found in tertiary literature written by authors who had no access to Manichaean literature, let alone a copy of the *Ārdhang*.[28] Starting from the mid 11th century, when the *Ārdhang* starts to be mentioned in Persian, Arabic, and Chagatai texts, it had to be explained as the title of Mani's collection of paintings. This connotation is routinely volunteered not only in dictionaries, but also in historical and literary writings alike.[29] Thus, this data does *not* support the questioning of the *Ārdhang*'s connotation as the Parthian title of Mani's collection of didactic paintings, as Sundermann hypothesized.[30]

The term *wifrās* indicates a practical, didactic, and originally oral context. This word is well-attested in the Parthian Manichaean literature surviving from Turfan. In its verbal form, *wifrās-* is a transitive verb with meanings such as 'to teach something, to show something, to proclaim something.' As a noun, it connotes 'teaching, instruction, sermon, homily,' and 'oral sermon.'[31] It is

26 M 5569 verso lines 18–19: "After the Parinirvāṇa of the Apostle of Light, the *Gospel*, the *Ārdhang*, the garment, and the hand [were taken to] the province … Sisin" (Klimkeit 1993, p. 215). M 5815 lines 112–223: "He [brother Zurvāndād] has taken the *(Book of) the Giants* and the *Ārdhang* with him. I have made another (copy of the Book of) the Giants and the *Ārdhang* in Merv" (Klimkeit 1993, p. 260). Klimkeit's mistaken transliteration *("Ārdahang")* was corrected by Sundermann (2005, p. 373), which I follow here.

27 Sundermann 2005, p. 377.

28 As noted in M 2, see Gulacsi 2015, p. 108.

29 Asadī gives a succinct explanation with a brief etymological remark concerning the Darī language used in the Sasanian court. In his *Lughat-i Furs*, he writes: "It was (the title) of a book of figures by Mānī. And I have seen the same word in the Darī language, from which it derives" (Reeves 2011, p. 121; and Pellò 2013, p. 254).

30 Sundermann 2005, p. 383.

31 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 352.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

also used as the name of a distinct literary genre. As noted by Sundermann in his 1984 study on the genres of Manichaean literature, *wifrās* is originally an oral preaching that became reduced to a written form in the formalization of Manichaean liturgy.[32] Its original connotation as an 'oral sermon' is especially relevant in connection with the *Ārdhang*, since the mere existence of a *wifrās* on the *Ārdhang* implies the practice of giving an 'oral sermon' on the *Book of Pictures*. In this sense, the connotation of the Parthian Manichaean "*Ārdhang wifrās*" may be best compared to the linguistically unrelated Japanese term, *etoki*. Used as a verb, *etoki* connotes 'oral instruction with religious pictures,' that is, the act of religious (Buddhist) teaching with images.'[33] Although the Parthian Manichaean "*Ārdhang wifrās*" and the Japanese Buddhist "*etoki*" are culturally, geographically, and historically remote; they nevertheless constitute synonymous descriptive designations of an identical practice – giving an oral sermon with the aid of pictorial art.[34]

Among the distinct phases of Manichaean history, the *Ārdhang Wifrās* text survives only in the Parthian language and only from among the mediaeval manuscript remains discovered in and around Turfan. Its Parthian language implies the early origin of this text, most likely within the era of Mesopotamian and West Central Asian Manichaeism, sometime during the mid-third and fourth centuries. Parthian was the vernacular spoken from what is now northern Iraq, across northern Iran, to the Afghan border until its gradual disappearance from everyday use under the dominance of the Persian language in the Sasanid period (224–651 CE). Although it is unconfirmed whether Mani himself spoke Parthian, a variety of documentary evidence records his initiative to have church materials rendered into Parthian for missionary work among Parthian speakers.[35] The survival of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* as a Parthian text from Turfan seems to suggest a continued use of this language through the Uygur era (755/762–1015 CE). This could hardly be the case, however. After the 7th century, Parthian was no longer a living language, but remained in use in the

32 Sundermann 1984, p. 232.

33 As a noun, (Jp.) *etoki* connotes 'the painting used for religious instruction' and also 'the person giving the sermon (Kaminishi 2006, pp. 4–8). Attested since the Tang Dynasty (618–907 CE), the Chinese terms *bienwen* ('transformation texts') and *bienxiang* ('transformation scene or tableau") document a different terminology while referring to analogous practices – secular story telling with pictures and Buddhist sermonizing with pictures. The earliest surviving examples of Chinese Buddhist painted scrolls *(bienxiang)* are known from Dunhuang (see Mair 1988, pp. 1–37)

34 For a study of a Chinese Manichaean hanging scroll from the Yuan dynasty (1271–1368 CE) used in the context for teaching with images, see Gulácsi 2008 and 2011.

35 As suggested for example in *Kephalaia* 5.25: "… the writing which I [Mani] wrote on account of the Parthians [i. e., the *Book of Giants*]" (Gardner 1995, p. 11; Tardieu 2008, p. 51, Fig. 3); and M 2: "And when the Apostle of Light was in the provincial capital of Holvān, he let the teacher Mār Ammō come, who knew the Parthian script and language and was familiar with … He sent him to Abarshahr" (Klimkeit 1993, p. 203).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Manichaean Church as its *lingua sacra*.[36] Therefore, in a culture where Uygur and Sogdian were spoken, a Parthian text could not have had much practical use to aid oral teachings. It is quite possible that the paper codices, to which the 15 *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments belonged were complied relatively early during the Uygur era as sacred literature rather than a practical didactic resource.

Conclusions

The Parthian *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments contain a unique set of early Manichaean data about the *Ārdhang*'s function. They point to the performance of an "oral sermon" *(wifrās)*, in the context of which the *Ārdhang* was designed to be used. One Coptic text describes especially clearly such an oral instruction conducted by Mani himself while using his collection of paintings. During that instruction, a group of disciples listened to the explanation of Manichaean teachings delivered to them with the help of a visual aid. They asked questions and received answers about the religion, while referencing didactic images displayed in front of them.[37] *Ārdhang wifrās*, therefore, is the only currently know Manichaean phrase to connote giving a teaching (*wifrās* 'sermon') with the aid of images (*Ārdhang*, the title of Mani's collection of didactic paintings).

This very didactic practice seems to be confirmed by the unusual compositional style of the *Ārdhang Wifrās*. The assessment of the text above showed that the *Ārdhang Wifrās* contains various listings, and thus it could not have been intended for use as regular religious prose to be read out verbatim. The *Ārdhang Wifrās* was not a text that can be read as such – it was not designed to be used for public readings or even self-study. Instead, it contains a systematic set of references to Mani's teachings that are brief and coded, requiring background knowledge, since the bulk of their contents (the actual stories) come from the memory of the elect, i. e., they have to be brought to the performance of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* by an elect. Occasionally, the references are enumerated (M 35 recto), as if to help the instructor to remember them, when needed. All this suggests that this text contains notes to be consulted in preparing to give a sermon *(wifrās)* on the *Ārdhang*, or as an *aide memoire* consulted during the sermon, confirming that the *Ārdhang Wifrās* functioned as a resource for oral instruction.

Based on the above conclusions one may find the fact that the *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments are not illuminated, less surprising. The literary genre of this text and its intended context of use eliminate this assumption. Nevertheless, the study of the *Ārdhang Wifrās* fragments is essential for Manichaean art for another

36 Lieu 1992, pp. 106–107.

37 The much-cited 92nd chapter of the *Kephalaia* describes Mani using paintings in the course of his teaching, see *Kephalaion* 92: 234.24–236.6 (Gardner 1995, pp. 241–241).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

reason. Once all currently known fragments are identified and published in an expert critical edition, they will show a set of main themes, which not only were discussed in Manichaean literature, but also depicted in Mani's collection of paintings and later, subsequently-developed, other formats of Manichaean didactic art.

Bibliography

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Part 1 of *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 3/1).

Gardner, I. 1995: *The Kephalaia of the Teacher: The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary.* Leiden.

Gulácsi, Zs. 2001: *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections: A Comprehensive Catalogue.* Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1).

— 2005: *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art: A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th–11th Century, East Central Asia.* Leiden.

— 2008: "A Visual Sermon on Mani's Teaching of Salvation: A Contextualized Reading of a Chinese Manichaean Silk Painting in the Collection of the Yamato Bunkakan in Nara, Japan." In: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 23, pp. 1–16.

— 2009: "A Manichaean *Portrait of the Buddha Jesus*: Identifying a Twelfth-Thirteenth-century Chinese Painting from the Collection of Seiun-ji Zen Temple." In: *Artibus Asiae* 69/1, pp. 91–145.

— 2011: "Searching for Mani's *Picture-Book* in Textual and Pictorial Sources." In: *Transcultural Studies* (Thematic issue: *Byzantium beyond its Eastern Frontier*, E-Journal of the University of Heidelberg Research Cluster "Asia and Europe in a Global Context") 2011/1, pp. 233–262.

— 2012: "The Life of Jesus according to the *Diatessaron* in Early Manichaean Art and Text." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 22, pp. 143–169.

— 2013: "Contextualized Studies on the History of Manichaean Art Across the Asian Continent." In: *Annuaire de l'EPHE, Section des sciences religieuses* 120, pp. 51–62.

— 2014: "The Prophet's Seal: A Contextualized Look at the Crystal Sealstone of Mani (216–276 CE) in the Bibliothèque nationale de France." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 24, pp. 161–185.

— 2015: *Mani's Pictures: The Didactic Images of the Manichaeans from Sasanian Mesopotamia to Uygur Central Asia and Tang-Ming China*. Leiden (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 90).

Haloun, G./W. B. Henning 1952: "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light." In: *Asia Major* [N. S.] 3, pp. 184–212.

Henning, W. B. 1943: "The Book of the Giants." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 52–74.

Kaminishi, I. 2006: *Explaining pictures: Buddhist propaganda and* etoki *storytelling in Japan*. Honolulu.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1982: *Manichaean Art and Calligraphy.* Leiden.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Lieu, S.N.C. 1992: *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Tübingen.

Mair, V.H. 1988: *Painting and Performance: Chinese Picture Recitation and its Indian Genesis.* Honolulu.

Pedersen, N.A. 2006: *Manichaean Homilies: with a Number of Hitherto Unpublished Fragments.* Turnhout.

Pellò, St. 2013: "A Paper Temple: Mani's *Arzhang* in and around Persian Lexicography." In: P.B. Lur'e (ed.): *Sogdijcy, ich predšestvenniki, sovremenniki i nasledniki: na osnove materialov konferencii "Sogdijcy doma i na čužbine", posvjaščennoj pamjati Borisa Il'iča Maršaka (1933–2006)*. Sankt-Peterburg, pp. 252–265.

Reeves, J.C. 2011: *Prolegomena to a History of Islamicate Manichaeism*. London.

Sundermann, W. 1984: *Studien zu Geschichte und Wert historiographischer Traditionen der Manichäer unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der iranischen Überlieferungen*. Berlin.

— 2003: "Jesus' Rulership at the End of the World: A New Piece of Manichaean Evidence." In: C.C. Cereti/M. Maggi/E. Provasi (eds.): *Religious Themes and Texts of Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in Honor of Gherardo Gnoli on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday on 6th December 2002*. Wiesbaden, pp. 421–427 (+ plates 13–14).

— 2005: "Was the *Ārdhang* Mani's Picture-Book?" In: A. van Tongerloo/L. Cirillo (eds.): *Il Manicheismo: nuove prospettive della richerca.* Turnhout, pp. 373–384.

Tardieu, M. 2008: *Manichaeism.* Urbana.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Eine khotanische Bilingue aus Triratnadāsas *Guṇāparyantastotra**

Jens-Uwe Hartmann, München / Ruixuan Chen, Leiden

Als man in Indien begann, das Sanskrit auch außerhalb der vedischen Überlieferung für Dichtung und Wissenschaft zu verwenden, waren die Buddhisten anscheinend rasch bereit, diesem Trend zu folgen und das neue Medium für ihre eigenen Zwecke nutzbar zu machen. Die frühesten erhaltenen Beispiele für Kunstepos und Schauspiel sind mit dem Namen eines buddhistischen Dichters, Aśvaghoṣa, verbunden. Als besonders populär und produktiv erwies sich das Genre der Hymnen (*stava* oder *stotra*), vorzüglich solcher auf den Buddha; es bot in sprachlich ansprechender Form eine Möglichkeit, sich den Stifter zu vergegenwärtigen, indem man seine Qualitäten und die seiner Lehre schilderte und verherrlichte, und es erlaubte gleichzeitig wie kein anderes Genre, bereits auf der sprachlichen Ebene in eine unmittelbare Beziehung zum Buddha einzutreten, die sich in der Dialogform und der der damit verbundenen Verwendung der Pronomina „ich" *(aham)* für den Preisenden und „du" *(tvam)* für den Gepriesenen manifestierte. Gerade diese Unmittelbarkeit prädestinierte die Hymnen zur Verwendung ebenso im Ritual wie in der persönlichen Frömmigkeit.

Schon die Zahl der im indischen Original erhaltenen Werke zeigt, dass Preisgedichte sich außerordentlicher Beliebtheit erfreuten. Als Hymnendichter *(stotrakāra)* schlechthin galt der Dichter Mātṛceṭa; folgt man dem chinesischen Pilger Yijing, der Ende des 7. Jahrhunderts Indien bereiste, dann wurden Mātṛceṭas zwei Hauptwerke von allen Mönchen in Indien auswendig gelernt, und in den Uposatha-Nächten konnten sie rezitiert werden, ein stimmungsvoller Vorgang, wie Yijing schreibt. Yijings Angaben werden indirekt durch die erstaunliche Zahl von Zitaten aus Mātṛceṭas Werken bestätigt,[1] bei denen es sich keineswegs um zwei, drei Standardzitate handelt; ganz im Gegenteil wird eine Vielzahl von Strophen in sehr unterschiedlichen Kontexten herangezogen, so dass man fast sicher sein darf, dass die jeweiligen Verfasser nicht nur einzelne Strophen auswendig kannten, sondern das gesamte Werk. Diese Zitate zeigen

* Wir danken Mauro Maggi (Rom) sehr herzlich für wertvolle Hinweise und Verbesserungsvorschläge.

1 Zuletzt Hartmann 2009, S. 230–233. Seither sind weitere Zitate hinzugekommen: *Varṇārhavarṇa* 1.8–9 im *Kāyatrayastotra-vivaraṇa*; *Prasādapratibhodbhava* 10 in der *Akṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā* sowie 35, 59 und 126 im *Amṛtakaṇikodyotanibandha*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

noch einen weiteren bemerkenswerten Umstand: Einige Hymnen gewannen einen solchen Bekanntheitsgrad und eine solche Verbindlichkeit, dass man sie als Referenz in Kommentarwerken benutzen konnte, und daher verwundert nicht, dass gerade zu solchen Hymnen wiederum eigenständige Kommentarwerke verfasst wurden. Schließlich lässt sich die Popularität und die Wichtigkeit der Hymnen auch an den Übersetzungen in andere Sprachen der buddhistischen Überlieferung ablesen; im tibetischen Kanon etwa ist eine eigene Abteilung des Tanjur den Übersetzungen von Stotras und ihren Kommentaren vorbehalten.

Das *Guṇāparyantastotra*, der „Lobpreis auf den, dessen Qualitäten unendlich sind", zählt zu den herausragenden Hymnen. Es ist mehrfach zitiert worden;[2] es ist kommentiert worden, wobei der Kommentar sogar von dem berühmten Philosophen Dignāga verfasst oder ihm zumindest zugeschrieben ist; und es ist in mindestens zwei Sprachen übersetzt worden. Über seinen Verfasser Triratnadāsa ist so gut wie nichts bekannt und wenig mehr über seine Entstehungszeit: Falls es tatsächlich der Philosoph Dignāga war, der das *Guṇāparyantastotra* kommentiert hat, und falls es sich bei dessen Verfasser um denselben Triratnadāsa handelt, der seinerseits ein Werk von Dignāga kommentiert hat,[3] dann waren die beiden Zeitgenossen, und Triratnadāsa wäre ins 5. Jahrhundert zu datieren. Tāranāthas Geschichte des Buddhismus enthält einen kurzen Abschnitt über Triratnadāsa, in dem von einer Freundschaft der beiden Gelehrten und dem Vorgang des wechselweisen Kommentierens berichtet wird;[4] ferner erklärt Tāranātha, dass Triratnadāsa bei Vasubandhu das Abhidharmapiṭaka gehört habe und dass er nicht, wie von anderen Autoren irrtümlich angenommen, mit Śūra identisch sei – wobei er diesen hier offensichtlich mit Mātṛceṭa gleichsetzt. Wenn ferner die – durchaus begründete – Annahme zutrifft, dass die Anordnung der Stotras in der entsprechenden Tanjur-Abteilung u. a. auch eine von den Redaktoren vermutete zeitliche Reihenfolge widerspiegelt, dann ist Triratnadāsa nach Mātṛceṭa und vor Candragomin einzuordnen. In jedem Fall wird der *terminus ante quem* von den zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Handschriften bestimmt, die wohl ab dem 6. oder 7. Jahrhundert zu datieren sind. In Indien selbst ist das Werk nämlich nicht erhalten, und das Sanskritoriginal lässt sich bislang nur sehr fragmentarisch aus den Manuskriptfunden an der Seidenstraße rekonstruieren.[5]

Stotra-Werke finden sich zahlreich und beinahe ausschließlich in den Handschriften aus den Oasen am Nordzweig der Seidenstraße. Soweit bisher bekannt,

2 Bisher haben sich in den folgenden Werken Zitate nachweisen lassen: *Viśeṣastavaṭīkā* (Strophe 12), *Jātakamālāṭīkā* (Strophe 14), *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* (Strophe 33), *Tattvasiddhi* (Strophen 34–35), *Amṛtakaṇikodyotanibandha* (Strophe 34).

3 Das *Prajñāpāramitā-saṃgraha-kārikā-vivarana* (Peking-Tanjur, Nr. 5208) zu Dignāgas *Prajñāpāramitā-saṃgraha-kārikā* (Peking-Tanjur, Nr. 5207).

4 Schiefner 1896, S. 140–141.

5 Eine Ausgabe dieser Handschriften und der tibetischen Übersetzung durch Michael Hahn † und J.-U. Hartmann ist bereits weit fortgeschritten.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

bietet das *Guṇāparyantastotra* eine der ganz wenigen Ausnahmen von dieser Regel. Schon das erste Sanskrit-Fragment, 1911 von Louis de La Vallée Poussin publiziert,[6] entstammte einer Handschrift in südturkistanischer Brāhmī, die Marc Aurel Stein aus Khadaliq mitgebracht hatte. Warum dieses Stotra auch am Südzweig überliefert wurde, lässt sich derzeit nicht wirklich erklären; grundsätzlich muss man bei solchen Überlegungen aber wohl immer auch die letztendliche Zufälligkeit der Handschriftenfunde mit in Betracht ziehen. Jedenfalls zeigt ein weiteres Fragment inzwischen sehr deutlich, dass das Werk in Khotan nicht nur abgeschrieben, sondern auch gelesen und studiert wurde. Im Jahr 2002 gab Prods Oktor Skjærvø in seinem Katalog khotanischer Manuskripte aus der British Library unter der Nummer Or.12637/41 ein kleines Fragment aus einer Sanskrit-khotanischen Bilingue heraus.[7] Als Fundort war Jigdaliq[8] angegeben, was das Fragment überraschenderweise an den Nordzweig der Seidenstraße nach Kucha verlagern würde. Wahrscheinlicher ist freilich eine Herkunft aus Khotan, wie Skjærvø vermerkt.[9] Er stellte es unter den Titel „Guṇāparyanta-sūtra", gab jedoch keine Erklärung für diese Zuordnung.[10] Während Sanskrit-tocharische und Sanskrit-uigurische Bilinguen, darunter auch solche aus Stotra-Werken, am Nordzweig nichts Ungewöhnliches

6 La Vallée Poussin 1911, S. 1064–1067. Die Signatur ist Kha i.199b; es handelt sich um zwei Bruchstücke aus einem Blatt, das vierzeilig beschrieben ist und die Blattziffer 12 trägt.

7 Skjærvø 2002, S. 136, Nr. Or. 12637/41. Zu diesem Katalog s. a. von Hinüber 2007.

8 Bei Jigdaliq (wörtlich „l'endroit des oleasters", s. Paul Pelliot *apud* Hartmann/Wille 1992, S. 20) handelt es sich offenbar um einen in Ostturkistan nicht ungebräuchlichen Ortsnamen; in der unmittelbaren Nähe von Kucha gibt es mindestens zwei so benannte Orte, nämlich Jigdeliq oder Jigdiliq auf dem westlichen Ufer des Qizil-Flusses und Jigdiliq östlich der Stadt Bai. Daher bleibt eine genaue Bestimmung des Fundorts ohne weitere Feldforschung unmöglich, vgl. Peyrot 2008, S. 228. Einige Anhaltspunkte, z. B. die Entfernung von Bai (ca. eine Tagereise nach Sahib Ali, siehe Hartmann/Wille, a. a. O., S. 19), die Existenz eines bisher unbekannten Ortes Kaya in der Nachbarschaft (s. Hoernle 1916, S. 357) und die ausführliche Beschreibung des Ortes von Marc Aurel Stein (1928, S. 832) wären auf der weiteren Suche nach diesem obskuren Ort zu berücksichtigen.

9 Vergleiche p. lv unter Jigdaliq und xli unter H. 149 zum Fundort Jigdaliq. Unter der Signatur „Jig. I. i.02" stehen neben der vorliegenden Bilingue acht weitere Sanskrit- und Tocharisch-Bruchstücke (jetzt Or. 8212/1668 [A]–[H], aber sieben [sic!] in Stein 1928, S. 1028), die ausschließlich in nordturkistanischer Brāhmī geschrieben sind. Die Möglichkeit einer irrtümlichen Zusammenstellung zur Zeit der Einordnung ist nicht auszuschließen. In der von Stein als „Jig. I" bezeichneten Höhle (Stein 1928, S. 832), der das vorliegende Fragment zu entstammen scheint, hat Sahib Ali die meisten der unter der Hoernle-Nummer 149 eingeordneten Bruchstücke entdeckt. Darunter sind auch vier Sanskrit-Fragmente des *Guṇāparyantastotra* in nordturkistanischer Brāhmī (jetzt Or. 15009/58, 122, 586 und 659) zu finden, vgl. Hartmann/Wille 1992, Index, S. 59 unter Guṇāparyantastotra.

10 Sie kann eigentlich nur von Skjærvø selbst stammen, denn in Baileys Erstpublikation findet sich nichts zum Inhalt, vgl. Bailey 1963, S. 296, Nr. 646.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

darstellen, handelt es sich bei dem vorliegenden Fragment doch um einen außergewöhnlichen Fund. Zwar bot Skjærvø eine Übersetzung der khotanischen Wörter, unternahm aber keinen Versuch, die khotanischen Wiedergaben mit ihrer Sanskrit-Vorlage abzugleichen. Das Fragment enthält nicht nur einige Sanskrit-Wörter, die in den anderen Handschriften bislang nicht bewahrt waren; es erlaubt gleichzeitig einen kleinen Einblick in das Verhältnis zwischen einer poetischen Sanskrit-Vorlage und ihrer khotanischen Bearbeitung, und aus diesen Gründen erscheint es uns wichtig genug für eine genauere Vorstellung. Möge die Beschäftigung mit dem „Preis auf den, dessen Qualitäten unendlich sind" die Erinnerung an Werner Sundermanns gleichermaßen menschliche wie wissenschaftliche Qualitäten wach halten.[11]

Seite b bei Skjærvø ist tatsächlich die Vorderseite des Fragments; der erhaltene Text entstammt den Strophen 3a bis 5a. Ihr Sanskrit-Text lässt sich anhand der vollständigen tibetischen Übersetzung aus insgesamt sechs Fragmenten zentralasiatischer Handschriften[12] zum größten Teil wiedergewinnen. Hinzu kommt eine in Tibet erhaltene Sanskrit-Handschrift des Kommentars von Dignāga; dieser Kommentar ist allerdings sehr komprimiert und bietet zu jeder der vorliegenden Strophen nur die ersten Wörter. Für eine genaue Beschreibung und eine Transliteration aller dieser Textzeugen sei auf die in Vorbereitung befindliche Ausgabe von Hahn/Hartmann verwiesen. Gleiches gilt für die tibetische Übersetzung, die hier nur als zusätzliche Verständnishilfe angeführt wird, und daher wird auf die Beigabe von Lesarten und Folionummern in den verschiedenen Kanonausgaben verzichtet. In den Sanskrit-Strophen sind die in der Bilingue belegten Wörter und Silben durch Fettdruck hervorgehoben. Kleinere Korrekturen an Skjærvøs Edition (etwa Worttrennungen im Sanskrit usw.) sind stillschweigend vorgenommen.

Or. 12637/41

recto

1 /// .. bhavagatiṣu duḥkhair bahuvidhair mayā ttat tad duḥ[kh]. ///
2 /// + [m] iti • tvam ā .u .. yatnaṃ śamasukhavidhā ///
3 /// + + + ysaṃtha vīrä dukha • maṃ vā vaysña ttānu ///
4 /// + + + + .ibhir bandhar iti yair mayi premṇā satvai ///

verso

1 /// + + + + nirmokṣāya praṇihita[ṃ] anāthasya ///
2 /// + + re karä • samu-ṃ rro ttanda āspāta muho jsa ///
3 /// + ṣvīdu śo .e .ä .. nu kho muho pāḍāndä • ne ///
4 /// ṣṣā • || purā me saṃs[ā]ravyasanaparibhogeṣu śata[ś]. ///

11 Er hat sich übrigens auch mit Hymnen beschäftigt, wenngleich nicht mit buddhistischen, vgl. Sundermann 1990.

12 Zwei Handschriften aus der Berliner Turfansammlung (SHT 197 und 705), zwei Fragmente aus Paris („Pelliot, Petits fragments Sanskrits sur fiches", 737 und 1305) und zwei aus London (Or. 15009/122 [= H 149/283] und Or. 12637/41).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Zum besseren Verständnis werden im folgenden der Sanskrit-Text, soweit rekonstruierbar, und die tibetische Übersetzung angeführt; die anschließende deutsche Wiedergabe folgt, wo immer möglich, dem Sanskrit. Es bestehen kleinere Abweichungen zwischen dem Sanskrit und dem Tibetischen, die hier aber nicht besprochen werden.[13] Im Anschluss an die deutsche Übersetzung werden die khotanischen Wörter unter Verweis auf die jeweiligen Entsprechungen angeführt und kommentiert.

Strophe 3[14]
kṣatānāṃ bhūtānāṃ **bhavagatiṣu duḥkhair bahuvidhair**
mayā tat tad duḥkhaṃ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ta(ṃ) raudram(ati)nā |
ma(yā teṣāṃ) [t]asmāt su[kha]m a(p)[i] ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ **m iti**
tvam ā(y)**u**(kto) **yatnaṃ śamasukhavidhā**[n](ā)[ya] jagataḥ || 3

| srid pa'i 'gro ba dag tu sdug bsṅal rnams kyis rmas pa'i sems can la |
| bdag gis blo gros rtsub pos sdug bsṅal rnam maṅ de daṅ de bsgrubs pas |
| de phyir bdag gis de dag rnams la bde ba bskyed phyir bzod bya źes |
| de slad khyod ni 'gro la źi ba'i bde ba bskyed slad brtson pa lags |

„‚Da ich den Lebewesen, die in den [einzelnen] Wiedergeburtsformen von mannigfachem Leid getroffen waren, aufgrund meiner Hartherzigkeit Leid von dieser und jener [Art] zugefügt habe, will ich es deswegen auf mich nehmen, ihnen Glück zu bereiten.‘ Aus dieser Überlegung heraus mühst du dich darum, den Lebewesen das Glück der Abgeklärtheit zu verschaffen.“

(ca. 22 Akṣaras) … ysaṃtha vīrä[1] dukha .
Cf. Pāda 3a: *bhavagatiṣu duḥkhair.*
maṃ vā vaysña ttānu[2] … (ca. 18 Akṣaras)
Cf. Pāda 3c: *ma*(*yā teṣāṃ*) *tasmāt*, Tib. *de phyir bdag gis de dag rnams la.*

1. Zur Konstruktion Akk. + Postposition *vīrä*, vergleichbar mit Avestisch *upa*[i]*ri* und Altpersisch *upariy* (nur mit Akk.!), vgl. Bailey 1979, s. v. *vīra*; Emmerick 1965, S. 27 unter II. 7.(b).
2. Skjærvøs Übersetzungsvorschlag „Let not now for me of those“ interpretiert *maṃ* als *ma-ṃ* (Prohibitivpartikel + Enkl. zu *aysu* „ich“), was in Anbetracht der Sanskrit-Parallele zu korrigieren ist. Vielmehr ist *maṃ* hier als Gen.-Dat. zu *aysu* „ich“ aufzufassen, während ein dazugehöriges *Participium necessitatis* auf *-āña(a)-* wohl zu ergänzen ist: „Doch von mir [ist] nun ihnen (Glück zu bereiten?) …“, vgl. Emmerick 1965, S. 30 unter III. 11.(b). Für *maṃ* anstelle der im Altkhotanischen zu erwartenden Form *mamä* vergleiche z. B. *maṃ väte* (*Book of Zambasta* [Emmerick 1968a] 22.224c, 230d, 232a).

Strophe 4
avidyāndhair āśā[k]ṛpaṇama[t]**ibhir bandhur iti yair**
mayi premṇā sattvai(ḥ) ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – (upakṛta)m (|)
na tān hitvā moktuṃ mam[a] ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ –
tvayā **nirmokṣāya praṇihitam anāthasya** jagataḥ || 4

13 Beispielsweise gehört *bahuvidhair* zu *duḥkhair* in Pāda 3a, während es die tibetischen Übersetzer zu *duḥkhaṃ* in Pāda 3b ziehen *(sdug bsṅal rnam maṅ).*
14 Das Metrum aller Strophen ist Śikhariṇī.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

| sems can gaṅ dag ma rig ldoṅs pas bsam pa rgud pa'i blo gros can |
| pha daṅ bur gyur rnams kyis bdag la gñen mñam byams pas phan btags pa |
| de dag btaṅ nas gcig pu thar par byed pa bdag gi tshul min źes |
| de slad khyod kyis 'gro ba mgon med ṅes thar bgyi slad smon lam btab |

„‚Die Wesen, die aus Unwissenheit blind sind und deren Sinn voll kläglicher Hoffnungen ist, die mir [aber früher], sei es als Väter, sei es als Söhne, als einem Familienangehörigen liebevoll geholfen haben – die zu verlassen und allein die Erlösung zu erreichen ist nicht meine Art.' Aus dieser Überlegung heraus hast du das Gelübde abgelegt, die schutzlosen Lebewesen zur Erlösung zu führen."

(ca. 22 Akṣaras) … -(ā)re karä .
Zu Pāda 4a: *avidyāndhair*? *karä* deutet auf ein vorangehendes (*ne*) hin.
samu-ṃ rro ttanda āspāta muho jsa[1] … (ca. 26 Akṣaras)
Cf. Pāda 4a: *āśākṛpaṇamatibhir*, vgl. 4d: *anāthasya jagataḥ*.
… ṣvīdu śo (n)e(h)ä[2] (ttā)nu kho muho pāḍāndä[3].
Cf. Pāda 4b: Tib. *bdag la gñen mñam* (s. Skt. *bandhur iti*) … *phan btags pa*.
ne … (ca. 26 Akṣaras) … -ṣṣā . ||
Cf. Pāda 4c: Tib. *bdag gi tshul min* (siehe Skt. *na* … *mama* …) + Pāda 4d?

1. Skjærvøs Übersetzungsvorschlag „and I only have so much refuge. From me …" setzt einen syntaktischen Einschnitt zwischen *āspāta* und *muho jsa*, während das mehrdeutige Enkl. *-ṃ* als 1. Sg. *mä*, *-ṃ* verstanden wird. Dennoch erscheint die Formel *samu … āspāta* + Instr.-Dat. mehrfach in ähnlichem Kontext, vgl. IOL Khot 141/6, v6 [= H. 147 NS 113]: … *mamä vaysña* ***uho jsa āspāta samu*** „… for me now only with you (is) refuge" (übers. Skjærvø) bzw. *Book of Zambasta* 24.248 [= Fol. 406, r3]: *ttandiya vaysña ysamaśśandei biśye* ***samu*** *anāhä yserä* ***uho jsa āspāta*** *śśäna* „Such a refuge now for the whole protectorless, pitiable world is by you alone" (übers. Emmerick 1968a), wobei klar von der Schutzlosigkeit der bejammernswerten Lebewesen (siehe Khot. *anāhä yserä*) die Rede ist. Deshalb ist das Enkl. *-ṃ* im vorliegenden Satz vielmehr als 3. Pl. *nä*, *-ṃ* zu bestimmen: „Und *für sie* (ist) so eine Zuflucht nur bei mir …". Dabei handelt es sich wohl um eine Paraphrase des Bahuvrīhi-Kompositums *āśā-kṛpaṇa-mati-* „die, deren Gedanken jämmerlich in [ihren] Erwartungen sind", dazu vgl. *anāspeta* = Skt. *nirāśa*, *nai nä … āspāta* = Skt. *nirāśatā* (*Saṅghāṭasūtra* [Canevascini 1993], §§ 99[3], 253[71] usw.).
2. **nehä* (= Skt. *bandhu-*, Tib. *gñen*) < **nāfya-*, vgl. Avestisch *nāfīm*, *nāfiiō-* „familienangehörig, geschlechtsverwandt"; Ableitung von *nāfa-* „Nabel; Verwandtschaft, Familie", von Vedisch *nā́bhi-* „Radnabe, Nabel; Verwandtschaft, Sippe" (< idg. *$h_3$nob^h-, vgl. Mayrhofer 1996, s. v. *nábhya-* mit Lit.) nicht zu trennen. Die letztere Bedeutung ist in mittel- und neuiranischen Sprachen ererbt, vgl. Mittelpersisch *n'p* „relatives", Parthisch *n'p* „family", Armenisch-Lehnwort *naha-pet* „chief of family" (s. Bailey 1979, s. v. **nāha-*), Sogdisch *n'β*, *n'f* „people" (< **nāfa*, s. Gershevitch 1954, § 311), Pashto *nuy*, *nyāyə/i* „maternal uncle" (< **nāfya*, s. Morgenstierne *et al.* 2003, S. 60) usw.
3. Wohl Relativsatz: „(die …) durch Milch einen Familienangehörigen von ihnen wie mich ernährt haben" *pace* Skjærvø: „milk one … if they have raised me". Die hier in Frage kommende Verbalhandlung „helfen, pflegen" (Skt. *upa-kṛ-*, Tib. *phan btags*) ist in der khotanischen Version zu „säugen" konkretisiert.

Strophe 5
purā me saṃsāravyasanaparibhogeṣu śataśa(ḥ)
(kṛtaṃ yaiḥ sā)[h]āy[y]aṃ (c)[i](ra)paricayas(n)i(gdhamatibhiḥ |)

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

◡ – – – – – – ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ [v]inā tair iti bhavān
samaṃ [sarv]aiḥ sat<t>vai(r amṛtam a)pi bhoktuṃ vyavasita<ḥ> || 5

| sṅon chad 'khor bar sdug bsṅal kun tu myoṅ gyur tshe na bdag la ni |
| gaṅ dag yun riṅ ṅo śes byams sems ldan pas lan brgyar grogs byas pa |
| bde ba thob tshe de dag bkol nas ji ltar yoṅs su spyad bya źes |
| de slad khyod ni bdud rtsi'aṅ sems can kun daṅ thun moṅ gsol bar brtson |

„‚Wie könnte ich die, die mir früher, als ich im Kreislauf der Existenzen leidvolle Erfahrungen machte, Hunderte von Malen aus dem liebevollen Geist langewährender Vertrautheit heraus geholfen haben, nun, da ich das Glück [des Erwachens] erlangt habe, [übergehen] und [es] ohne sie genießen!' Aus dieser Überlegung heraus bist du entschlossen, sogar den Nektar [der Todlosigkeit] mit allen Wesen gemeinsam zu genießen."

Der letztlich doch zu geringe Befund macht es praktisch unmöglich, aus den Textresten grundsätzliche Schlussfolgerungen für das Verhältnis zwischen dem Sanskrit-Original und dem khotanischen Text zu ziehen. Der obere und der untere Rand des Fragmentes sind erhalten und legen nahe, dass es sich um eine lediglich vierzeilige Handschrift handelt, mithin ein relativ schmales Blatt; weitere Aussagen über die Lage im Blatt erlaubt das Fragment nicht, da weder ein Seitenrand noch ein Schnürlochraum zu sehen sind. Es hat den Anschein, dass eine Sanskrit-Strophe jeweils vollständig angeführt wird und dass erst dann der zugehörige khotanische Text beginnt: ein solcher Übergang ist in v4 bewahrt, wo der khotanische Text endet und Strophe 5a der Sanskrit-Fassung beginnt. Wenn diese Überlegung zutrifft, lässt sich die zwischen den Zeilen r1 und r2 bzw. r4 und v1 fehlende Akṣara-Zahl aufgrund des Metrums (4 x 17 Silben) eindeutig bestimmen: Demnach würden zwischen r1 und r2 insgesamt 26 Akṣaras fehlen, zwischen r4 und v1 insgesamt 30, und dies könnte angesichts des größeren Blattverlustes in v1 sehr gut zusammenpassen. Allerdings würde sich als Konsequenz daraus ergeben, dass für die Wiedergabe von Strophe 3 zwischen den Zeilen r2 und r4 Platz für lediglich rund 50 Akṣaras zur Verfügung stünde, für die Wiedergabe von Strophe 4 zwischen den Zeilen v1 und v4 mit rund 110 Akṣaras allerdings etwa die doppelte Menge. Dies spräche gegen eine Übersetzung im engeren Sinne.

Dass es sich beim khotanischen Text aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach um Verse handelt, lassen die Wörter vor den Satzzeichen erkennen. Die jambische Kadenz der geraden Pādas im Metrum[15] C ◡ ◡ ◡ ≏ dürfte sowohl in v2 *-(ā)re karä* als auch in r3 *ysaṃtha vīrä dukha* vorliegen. Versausgänge auf fast gleiche Wörter lassen sich im *Book of Zambasta* gut nachweisen.[16] Überdies wäre v3 *kho muho*

15 Zur Rekonstruktion der altkhotanischen Metrik vgl. E. Leumann 1919, S. 117–172; E. & M. Leumann 1933, S. XXII–XXXIX; Emmerick 1968b; M. Leumann 1971; Emmerick 1973; Hitch 2014. Hier folgen wir den Schemata des Systems von Emmerick.

16 Zu v2 vgl. *ysyāre karä* (*Book of Zambasta* 3.62d [Emmerick 1968a]); darüber hinaus ist der Ausgangstypus *Verbum finitum* + *karä/i*, der eine in der khotanischen Prosa

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

pāḍāndä auch als metrisch anzusehen. Der Typus *-ṼK-tāndä/i* (3. Perf. Pl.), der am Ende eines ungeraden Pāda im Metrum B oder A vorkommt, ist im *Book of Zambasta* keineswegs isoliert.[17] Damit liegt es zumindest nahe, dass die khotanischen Zeilen metrisch sind. Für eine eindeutige Bestimmung des zugrunde liegenden metrischen Schemas reichen die Textreste nicht aus, aber man gewinnt gleichzeitig den Eindruck, dass dieses Schema offenbar nicht völlig mit einem der im *Book of Zambasta* bezeugten Schemata übereinstimmt. Allerdings ist das im *Book of Zambasta* belegte metrische System auch nicht als erschöpfend für die khotanische Metrik anzusehen.[18]

Die Ausdeutung des Befundes bleibt mithin spekulativ, und das genaue Verhältnis zwischen der poetischen und durchaus schwierigen Sanskrit-Vorlage und dem metrisch anmutenden khotanischen Text lässt sich aufgrund des fragmentarischen Charakters nicht endgültig bestimmen.[19] Lediglich soviel ist sicher: eine mehr oder minder wörtliche – etwa der tibetischen Technik folgende – Übersetzung liegt hier jedenfalls nicht vor, ebenso wenig eine lediglich aneinanderreihende Wiedergabe der einzelnen Sanskrit-Wörter. Ob es sich bei dem Khotanischen aber um eine Paraphrase, um Erläuterungen oder um eine Nachdichtung handelt, muss einstweilen offen bleiben. Einen anderen Punkt jedoch führt uns das Fragment sehr deutlich vor Augen, und das ist die Zufälligkeit und die Begrenztheit des Ausschnittes aus der Literatur der khotanischen Buddhisten, den uns die Handschriftenfunde vermitteln. Nichts spricht gegen die Annahme, dass das hier behandelte Fragment aus einem Werk stammt, in dem das gesamte *Guṇāparyantastotra* enthalten war. Wenn dies zutrifft und man den Textumfang des Fragmentes hochrechnet, dann müssten die 51 Sanskrit-Strophen des *Guṇāparyantastotra* zusammen mit ihrer khotanischen Wiedergabe mindestens zwanzig Blätter umfasst haben. Natürlich wird man

---

ungewöhnliche Wortstellung darstellt, reichlich belegt, s. *niśtä/i k.* (11-mal): 3.105d, 3.136b, 7.8b, 7.17b, 7.44b; 8.23d, 8.39d, 8.40b, 8.41b, 8.45b, 24.321; *byaude/byode k.* (2-mal): 7.7d, 8.33b; *yīndä k.* (2-mal): 7.21b, 7.35d; *āya k.* (2-mal): 8.20d, 20.55d; *butte k.* (1-mal): 2.121b; *nāste k.* (1-mal): 3.146d; *kṣīma k.* (1-mal): 21.19b.

Zu r3 vgl. *ysäru vīri dukhä* (*Book of Zambasta* 20.21d [Emmerick 1968a]); s. *dukha/u/ä* an Pāda-Ende (11-mal): 3.20b, 3.28b, 3.54b, 3.145b, 7.1d, 17.33b, 18.3b, 18.15b, 20.10d, 20.17d, 20.69b.

17 Dazu vgl. im Metrum B: *späte bāḍāndä* (*Book of Zambasta* 24.225a [Emmerick 1968a]); im Metrum A: *balysa pätāstāndi* (2.160a), *ggāha naljsondāndi* (2.166a), *kalpa ttuvāstāndä* (9.23a), *ttarandaru byodāndi* (22.222c), *ātama sīyāndi* (22.223a), *dātu paysāndāndi* (22.226c), *ggarcha padandāndä* (23.38a) usw.

18 Mauro Maggi weist uns darauf hin, dass auch nicht alle khotanischen Übersetzungen der Sanskrit-Strophen im *Saṅghāṭasūtra* mit der im *Book of Zambasta* belegten Metrik übereinstimmen, vgl. Canevascini 1993, S. xvii.

19 Michael Hahn (Marburg) machte uns auf einen möglicherweise ähnlich gelagerten Fall aufmerksam, nämlich die Sanskrit-uigurische Bilingue aus *Haribhaṭṭas Jātakamālā*, siehe die einleitenden Bemerkungen zur Edition in Maue 1996, S. 104. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung zur Wiedergabetechnik in den zentralasiatischen Bilinguen ist ein Desiderat.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

bedauern, dass nicht mehr davon erhalten ist, und gleichzeitig muss man außerordentlich dankbar für die Existenz des einen kleinen Fragmentes sein, das uns sozusagen durch einen winzigen Türspalt den Blick auf die Interessen, die Sanskrit-Kenntnisse und die bemerkenswerte Gelehrsamkeit gebildeter Buddhisten in Khotan erlaubt.

Bibliographie

Bailey, H. W. 1963: *Indo-Scythian Studies: Being Khotanese Texts.* Vol. V. Cambridge.

— 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge.

Canevascini, G. 1993: *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra. A Critical Edition.* Wiesbaden.

Emmerick, R. E. 1965: „Syntax of the cases in Khotanese." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 28.1, S. 24–33.

— 1968a: *The Book of Zambasta. A Khotanese poem on Buddhism*. Oxford.

— 1968b: „Khotanese Metrics." In: *Asia Major* 14.1, S. 1–20.

— 1973: „Khotanese metrics again." In: *Asia Major* 17.2, S. 137–153.

Gershevitch, I. 1954: *Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford.

Hartmann, J.-U. 2009: „Neues zum Varṇārhavarṇa." In: M. Straube/R. Steiner/J. Soni/M. Hahn/M. Demoto (Hrsg.): *Pāsādikadānaṃ. Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*. Marburg (Indica et Tibetica 52), S. 229–241.

Hartmann, J.-U./K. Wille 1992: „Die nordturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Hoernle (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, II)." In: *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen.* Zweite Folge. Göttingen, S. 9–64.

Hinüber, O. von 2007: „Ein Meilenstein in der Erforschung des zentralasiatischen Buddhismus." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 157, S. 385–394.

Hitch, D. 2014: "Meter in the Old Khotanese Book of Zambasta." In: *Ars Metrica* 2014/11, S. 1–43.

Hoernle, A. F. R. 1916: *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. Oxford.

La Vallée Poussin, L. de 1911: „Documents sanscrits de la seconde collection M. A. Stein." In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1911, S. 1063–1079.

Leumann, E. 1919: *Maitreya-samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten. Die nordarische Schilderung in Text und Übersetzung*. Straßburg, S. 117–172.

Leumann, E./M. Leumann 1933: *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*. Leipzig.

Leumann, M. 1971: „Zur altkhotanischen Metrik." In: *Asiatische Studien* 25, S. 456–480.

Maue, D. 1996: *Alttürkische Handschriften.* Teil 1: *Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,9).

Mayrhofer, M. 1996: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. II. Heidelberg.

Morgenstierne, G. *et al.* 2003: *A New Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto*. Wiesbaden.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Peyrot, M. 2008: *Variation and Change in Tocharian B.* Amsterdam.
Schiefner, A. 1896: *Târanâtha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*. St. Petersburg.
Skjærvø, P. O. 2002: *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library. A Complete Catalogue with Texts and Translations*. With Contributions by U. Sims-Williams. London (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II: *Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*, Vol. V: *Saka*, Texts VI).
Stein, M. A. 1928: *Innermost Asia, Detailed Reports of Explorations in Central Asia, Kan-su and Eastern Īrān*. Vol. II. Oxford.
Sundermann, W. 1990: *The Manichaean Hymn Cycles* Huyadagmān *and* Angad Rōšnān *in Parthian and Sogdian*. London (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Supplement Series II).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Buddha in Iranian Manichaean Writings

Manfred Hutter, Bonn

Buddha and Buddhism are often mentioned in Manichaean texts since the founding of that religion, and Ferdinand Ch. Baur has already correctly described the partial importance of Buddhism for Manichaeism in the 19th century;[1] Baur even saw that also Jainism must not be totally neglected, and recently Iain Gardner concluded "that we have to move beyond the general relationship Buddhism/Manichaeism, but also take Jainism into account, which is a better model for some aspects of the community".[2] In general there has been less interest in the position of Buddha in Manichaeism, compared to the various functions and figures of Jesus. This may be due to the well-known fact that the influence of Buddhist elements in Western Manichaean texts is less significant than in the Eastern ones,[3] but as Majella Franzmann correctly mentions in her study of Jesus in Manichaeism, "in eastern texts, the idea of multiple descents of Jesus is caught up in the idea of multiple appearances of Buddha".[4] I will take up the question of Buddha in (mainly Iranian) Manichaean texts and I will do this in the following sections: the historical Buddha as an apostle and the idea that Mani is a "Buddha *revivus*"; the eschatological Buddha Maitreya who also functions in Manichaean eschatology; Buddha and Buddhist ethics and behaviour as a model that has been adopted by Manichaeans. Thus my contribution to this memorial volume is an overview of known aspects which have been made known in a substantial way by Werner Sundermann,[5] but presenting them in this systematic way can bring some new attention to the relationship of the two religions, Buddhism and Manichaeism.

1 Cf. Baur 1831, pp. 433–451; for research history cf. also Ries 2011, pp. 259–272.

2 Gardner 2005, p. 135; cf. Deeg/Gardner 2009. Also Sundermann (1997, p. 652) correctly mentioned that aspects like transmigration in Manichaeism are closer to Jain thought than to Buddhist doctrine; cf. also Baur 1831, p. 449f.

3 Sundermann 1991, p. 426.

4 Franzmann 2003, p. 37; there Franzmann refers to the Turkic text TM 164 (+ 174)/R?/11–14: "The divine *Mani …, Jesus, Kanig (the Maiden of Light), … the … Buddhas (divine Messengers) that have descended repeatedly … may they (all) bestow blessing" (Klimkeit 1993, p. 358).

5 Cf. for example, Sundermann 1982, 1991 and 1997.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1 The historical Buddha

1.1 Buddha as an Apostle/prophet before Mani

Buddha as the founding figure of Buddhism is mentioned on the same level with Zarathustra, Jesus and Mani in several texts. As we see in Mani's *Šābuhragān* from the early forties of the 3rd century, Mani gave the following sequence of the appearance of these founders of religions and "prophets" or "apostles". The textual sequence is only transmitted in quotations by Arabic authors, but not in the Middle Persian texts; Reeves recently documented this data anew;[6] just to mention for example the text from as-Šahrastani's *Kitāb al-milal wa'l-niḥal*:[7]

> His doctrine regarding the Law and the prophets was that the first whom God Most Exalted commissioned with knowledge and wisdom was Adam, the ancestor of Humanity; the [He commissioned] Seth after him; then Noah after him; then Abraham after him; upon them be blessings and peace! Then he sent the Buddha to India, Zoroaster to Persia, the (Christian) Messiah – the Word of God and His Spirit – to Rome and the West.

Despite the Islamic setting of the quotation it is obvious that Šahrastani refers to proper Manichaean thought which is also attested by other Muslim authors, but also in original Manichaean texts: the sequence Buddha – Zoroaster – Jesus – Mani is also given in the Berlin Coptic *Kephalaia*[8], a sequence that might literally depend on the *Šābuhragān*.[9] But here we face the first problem from the historical point of view. We know that Zarathustra predates the historical Buddha by several centuries, so Mani's reference to this prophetological chain[10] proves incorrect from a historical perspective which leads to a first result: As Mani in his early text intended for Šābuhr obviously presents a "wrong" prophetological chain, we can conclude that his encounter with India in 240/241 did not provide him with detailed information about the historical Buddha[11] at the beginning of this decade. Later when he gained "new" knowledge of the Buddha, he apparently corrected his view.

There are other testimonies[12] which show the sequence Zarathustra – Buddha – Jesus – Mani:[13] In Mani's *Book of Giants* the sequence is given thus:

6 Reeves 2011, pp. 102–104.
7 Reeves 2011, p. 104.
8 Cf. the translation by Gardner 1995, p. 18 for the *Kephalaia* section I 12,9–20.
9 Sundermann 1991, p. 429f.
10 Cf. Reeves 2011, p. 68; Franzmann 2003, p. 60f.
11 I am more sceptical than Sundermann 1991, p. 429f.
12 They are mentioned in Sundermann 1991, pp. 431–435.
13 Mani's forerunners were also illustrated in Manichaean art, as can be seen from the image of Buddha, which is the surviving fragment (MIK 4947 & III 5d, edited by Gulacsi 2001, pp. 146–148, fig. 66; cf. Gulácsi 2005, p. 205) of a composition; the Buddha is identified by the Sogdian word *pwt* written on his chest. Most probably the image is part of a painting originally including all the apostles – Buddha, Zarathustra, Jesus and Mani.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> But God [Zrwān ?], in each epoch, sends apostles: Šit[il, Zarathushtra], Buddha, Christ, …[14]

Also the well-known Parthian text M 42 mentions the sequence Zarathustra – Buddha, just like in the Coptic *Kephalaia* texts in Dublin.[15] The tradition reflected in the *Acta Archelai* (and in the dependent *Chronicon Maroniticum*[16]) mentions Zarathustra and Buddha disguised under the names Scythianos and Terebinthos as "teachers" of Mani Qur(u)biqos.[17] Such references show that at some stage of history, Mani himself got to know more historical details about the Buddha and he was able to change the sequence of "prophets" to the "correct" chronological order. Also his missionaries[18] in eastern Iranian areas and along the Silk Road kept this sequence, when they came into further contact with Buddhists. It is difficult to give an exact date when this improved knowledge about the Buddha was acquired by Mani. One can only speculate if that information reached Mani as a consequence of the eastward spread of his religion (through Mar Ammo) or if some Buddhists – e.g. like Gundeš – made Mani already aware of this chronological problem in the early years. In any case, for the question of "Buddhism" and Mani it is important to note that Mani "updated" his point of view, in order to avoid criticism that his prophetological chain might be proven "wrong" and therefore also his argument that he himself is the successor of these divine messengers might be shown to be a false argument. We can conclude that at some unknown point (but my impression is not too long after the authoring of the *Šābuhragān*) Mani corrected his position about the Buddha, maybe even at the end of the forties of the 3rd century.

Two encounters between Mani and his potential converts mention the relation between the two prophets. In the (legendary) story of the conversion of the Turan Shah we can read:[19]

> And when the Turan-Shah saw that the Beneficent One had risen, then he stood on his knees from afar and entreated him, speaking to the Beneficent One … You are the Buddha and we are sinful men.

In another conversion story the "Indian" Gundeš says to Mani: "You are the Buddha and the apostle".[20] Such texts clearly show that the historical Buddha

14 Henning 1943, p. 63 [= Henning 1977, p. 126]. The Sogdian poem M 5264/R/3f. also mentions Zarathustra before Buddha.
15 Tardieu 1988, pp. 162–164.
16 Reeves 2011, p. 48f.
17 Cf. Klein 2005, pp. 224, 232.
18 Hutter 2002a, pp. 22–25.
19 Klimkeit 1993, p. 208; cf. the study of this text (M 8286) by Sundermann 1971, pp. 102–104; cf. also Sundermann 1981, p. 21 (M 48+, l. 56).
20 Sundermann 1981, p. 89 (M 6041, ll. 1403–1405); cf. Sundermann 1997, p. 647 and Tardieu 1988, p. 161f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

was some "kind of Manichaeus ante Manichaeos"[21], so it was necessary to acquire knowledge about this religion to propagate Mani's teachings. Whether Mani himself or his missionary Mar Ammo was at first hand responsible for this cannot be proven in detail. But from Mar Ammo's journey to eastern Iran we can conclude with certainty that Manichaeism was presented in a way which perfectly matched with Buddhism. When Mar Ammo describes his religion to the guarding spirit of the border of Chorasan, we learn from Mar Ammo's dialogue with this spirit:[22]

> Then on the following day the spirit appeared again and said to me: Why did you not return to your country? – I said: I have come from afar because of the religion. – The spirit said: What is the religion you bring? – I said: We do not eat meat nor drink wine. We (also) keep away from [women]. – The spirit said: In my kingdom there are many like you.

Mani's (and Mar Ammo's) description of religion fits with Iranian Buddhism[23] which allows us to say that Buddha (and his doctrines) were obviously incorporated into Manichaeism; in this way, the historical Buddha and his teachings gain an important function within Mani's missionary account. Therefore Buddhism must be given more weight for propagating the Manichaean religion than merely reducing it to the Buddha himself as part of the prophetological chain.[24]

1.2 Mani as Buddha and Maitreya

As mentioned before, Mani can be attributed to be the "Buddha" referring to the historical Buddha.[25] This topic is taken up in the Sogdian "Tale of the Five Brothers" (So 18058 + 8197), recently studied by Ch. Reck. The parable tells us that the five brothers are five Buddhas and apostles, who guide the souls to paradise during seven periods.[26] Most probably the five "Buddhas" refer to the four "apostles" Zarathustra, Buddha, Jesus and Mani, with the addition of a fifth one, either Adam or Šitil. Reck leaves open what exactly is meant by the seven periods, as other texts speak either of three periods or more generally mention the coming of the apostles just "from time to time".[27] But maybe – because the

21 Sundermann 1991, p. 437 referring to the Sogdian text M 5030/V/4–12.
22 Klimkeit 1993, p. 204 (M 2); cf. also Sundermann 1981, p. 27f. (M 216a) and the Sogdian version M 18220 (Sundermann 1981, p. 39f.).
23 Sundermann 1997, p. 647f.; Hutter 2002a, p. 24. On Iranian Buddhism in general cf. Hutter 2013, pp. 206–210 with further literature.
24 Tardieu (1988, p. 168) correctly remarked: "La bouddhisation de la prophètologie n'est donc peut-être pas un phénomène aussi tardif qu'on a bien voulu le dire, et limité à la seule documentation manichéenne ouïgoure."
25 Cf. Franzmann 2003, p. 26.
26 Reck 2009, p. 245f.
27 Cf. Reck 2009, p. 248f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Buddhist tradition knows seven Buddhas – the seven periods might be a Buddhist tradition in this text from Central Asia.[28] For the historical Mani and the first generation, these seven periods are not relevant, but the text clearly corresponds to an already early stratum of Manichaean thought, comparing the historical Mani to the historical Buddha.

For such an early Buddhist setting of references to Mani, it is quite in line that Mani's death can be compared to Buddha's death as "parinirvāna".[29] Again Buddha becomes the model for the contemporary prophet Mani as revived Buddha, as is said in M 5569/R/1–21:[30]

> He [Mani] left behind the whole flock of the righteous, orphaned and sad, for 'the master of the house' had entered Parinirvana. … After the Parinirvana of the Apostle, Uzzi, the teacher, gave this testimony to the whole Church with regard to what he had seen among the soldiery, for on that Saturday night he, Uzzi, had been left there with the Apostle of Light.

According to the testimony of the "teacher Uzzi" Mani's death is described as "parinirvāna": as Uzzi's name does not have a Buddhist flavouring[31] we can conclude that this testimony regarding the "parinirvāna" should not be taken as a late Buddhification (from Central Asia), but extends the prophetological line of Mani as Buddha whose death matches the death of his predecessor. For Manichaeans of the first generation after the prophet's death who are aware of Buddhism as one of the central religions in eastern Iranian areas, this comparison might also prove to be an advantage for the further spread of their religion in eastern Iran.

As we can see from such references, already for the first generation Buddha's image is highly applicable to the historical Mani, therefore texts which refer to Mani as future Buddha Maitreya can be taken as an early documentation of Mani's Buddhification. In the Bema festival – commemorating Mani's death – the prophet is invoked as Buddha Maitreya:[32]

> Buddha Maitreya has come, Mar Mani, the Apostle: he brought Victory from the righteous God (the Father of Light). I would honour you, oh God. Grant remission of my sins, redeem my soul, lead me up to paradise.

28 Reck 2009, p. 250.

29 The death of Jesus is described as parinirvāna, too, see Klimkeit 1986 in general and Klimkeit 1993, p. 71 for the translation of M 104/R/18 to /V/22. It is important to mention that the word "parinirvāna" (Parthian: prnybr'n) is already attested in the third century in Manichaean Parthian texts (M 104; M 5569), cf. Sims-Williams 1983, pp. 133, 140.

30 Klimkeit 1993, p. 215; see further Franzmann 2003, p. 84f.

31 It is a Biblical name meaning "the Strong One", cf. Tubach 1997, p. 388 with literature.

32 Klimkeit 1993, p. 134 (M 801, ll. 90–97); cf. generally Hutter 2002b. For some other references from hymns of the Bema festival cf. for example, Reck 2004, p. 146, ll. 788–791 (M 341a) and p. 148, l. 824f. (M 486).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

2 Buddha Maitreya in Manichaean eschatology

Maitreya the future Buddha is an important figure in Mahayanic Buddhist doctrine, which was incorporated into Manichaean teaching to argue that Mani's advent fulfilled the expectations of Buddhists. Manichaean texts expressly mention that "Buddha Maitreya has come and has appeared", commemorating Mani in hymns of the Bema festival.[33] But it is my impression that, besides the identification of Mani's coming as Maitreya, there are arguments for Buddha Maitreya having a function of his own in Manichaean eschatology. The notion of Mani as Maitreya is not documented in early Manichaeism (in Mani's lifetime or in the first generation) but seems to be an innovation (or innovative addition) in Central Asia. Several texts illustrate this.

The best known text is the Parthian dialogue M 42 between the "boy", as a symbol for the soul who is seeking salvation, and the redeemer, who probably is Jesus the Splendour. When the Buddha entered Nirvana, he told the boy to wait for the future Maitreya. While the text goes on, it also mentions the coming of Jesus and Mar Mani, but the text does not make – contrary to others – a connection between Mani and Maitreya. I would like to interpret this as meaning that Maitreya in this hymn simply recalls Buddhist eschatological thought which is added to Manichaean eschatological thought. As Maitreya is not equated with Mani, Maitreya here does not refer to Manichaean eschatological thought. This interpretation can be supported by a Turkic text, which is critical towards the Buddhist concept of Maitreya and shows the difference between the Manichaean and the Buddhist understanding of Maitreya; the false teacher is accused as follows:[34]

> By the power of Šimnu (the Devil) he will be able to do everything. This [he told] all the people, and to the Teacher of the Law he said: The Buddha Maitreya, the Son of God, will come. … I am the true Son of God.

It can be said that eastern Manichaean Texts, at least in a few cases, are fully in line with the Buddhist ideal of Maitreya's eschatological function, which is not taken over by Mani Maitreya, but the Buddha Maitreya can function as an independent deity in Manichaean eschatology. But – as we see from the Turkic texts – the function of Jesus in Manichaean eschatology (as the final Judge already "canonized" by Mani in the *Šābuhragān*) is not to be superseded by Buddha Maitreya. The eastern Manichaeans present an innovation: they remain faithful to Mani's teaching about Jesus as the eschatological judge, but they add Buddha Maitreya as the eschatological saviour who represents hope for the soul and leads the soul to "nirvana" as a preliminary redemption before the final judgement. In this

33 Cf. Hutter 2002b, p. 116.
34 Klimkeit 1993, p. 327 (TM 180/R/5–16); cf. Franzmann 2003, p. 91f.; Hutter 2002b, p. 117.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

way, eastern Manichaeism pushes Buddhism to make a (slight) dogmatic change or addition to doctrine. Therefore I think Buddha Maitreya can be added as a separate figure to the Manichaean pantheon besides Mani Maitreya.

3 Conclusion: Buddha's function in Manichaeism

Since the beginning of his teaching, Mani took Buddha into account as one of his predecessors, but obviously his knowledge about Buddha was limited at first and increased soon afterwards, maybe partly due to more information provided by Manichaean missionaries who went to north-eastern Iranian Parthian-speaking areas[35], where they were confronted with Buddhists and learnt more about them.[36] In this way it is also worth mentioning that – contrary to Manichaean reactions against other religions – no substantial polemics against Buddhism exist.[37] So even Maitreya as an eschatological figure can play a redemptive role in the end of the world, even though this function remains secondary to that of Jesus. Interesting in connection with this integration of Buddha as an eschatological redeemer is the fact that Manichaeans did not incorporate the Zoroastrian saviour Sošyans into their eschatology. So on the dogmatic level Buddha has a higher relevance than Zoroaster in (eastern) Manichaeism, but even Buddha was never on the same level as the Jesus figures for Manichaeans, not even in the East. But on the other hand, Buddha's activities can be taken sometimes as parables for correct ethical behaviour – when Buddha asks his disciples to give food even to animals[38] or when in the Bactrian fragment Buddha is said to have given his body to save living beings.[39] Such Jataka-like stories however are only taken as examples to compare Manichaean behaviour in part with Buddhist ethics, as it also remains clear that such deeds do not lead to the redemption of the living soul and cannot provide salvation. In this way, references to Buddhist stories – mainly in Central Asian transmission – remain a superficial flavouring of eastern Manichaeism.[40] The main topics – going back to Mani's life-time – are the historical apostle Buddha, his (symbolic) equation with the historical Mani, and the eschatological Maitreya in a double way – who has already appeared in the history of Manichaeism in the person of Mani and who will come as Buddha Maitreya at the end of history contributing then to Manichaean eschatology.

35 This matches well with the textual evidence as most texts mentioned above are in Parthian (and not in Middle Persian).
36 Cf. also Sundermann 1997, p. 650.
37 Sundermann 1997, p. 650; Hutter 2002a, pp. 28, 31.
38 Cf. Sundermann 1991, p. 437f.
39 Sims-Williams 2009, pp. 253, 255.
40 In this way, Sundermann's (1997, p. 655) statement is still valid: "The Manichaean adaptation to Buddhism was an outward one. The Buddhist teachers could not be impressed by what must have been in their eyes a naïve, superstitious religion."

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliography

Baur, F. Ch. 1831: *Das Manichäische Religionssystem: nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwickelt.* Göttingen.

Deeg, M./I. Gardner 2009: "Indian Influence on Mani Reconsidered. The Case of Jainism." In: *International Journal of Jaina Studies (Online)* 5, no. 2, pp. 1–30.

Franzmann, M. 2003: *Jesus in the Manichaean Writings*. London.

Gardner, I. 1995: *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary.* Leiden (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 37).

— 2005: "Some Comments on Mani and Indian Religions According to the Coptic Kephalaia." In: van Tongerloo/Cirillo 2005, pp. 123–135.

Gulácsi, Zs. 2001: *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections.* Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1).

— 2005: *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art. A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th–11th Century East Central Asia.* Leiden (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 57).

Henning, W. B. 1943: "The Book of the Giants." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 52–74 [= Henning 1977, pp. 115–137].

— 1977: *Selected Papers II*. Leiden (Acta Iranica 15).

Hutter, M. 2002a: "Die frühe manichäische Mission unter Buddhisten im Ostiran." In: *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 10, pp. 19–32.

— 2002b: "Mani als Maitreya." In: W. Gantke/K. Hoheisel/W. Klein (eds.): *Religionsbegegnung und Kulturaustausch in Asien. Studien zum Gedenken an Hans-Joachim Klimkeit*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 49), pp. 111–119.

— 2013: "Minderheitenreligionen im Iran: Buddhismus, Judentum, Christentum, Baha'itum." In: L. Paul (ed.): *Handbuch der Iranistik*. Wiesbaden, pp. 206–221.

Klein, W. 2005: "The Epic Buddhacarita by Aśvaghoṣa and its Significance for the 'Life of Mani'." In: van Tongerloo/Cirillo 2005, pp. 223–232.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1986: "Jesus' Entry into Parinirvāṇa. Manichaean Identity in Buddhist Central Asia." In: *Numen* 33, pp. 225–240.

— 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco.

Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 22).

— 2009: "Snatches of the Middle Iranian 'Tale of the Five Brothers'." In: J. D. BeDuhn (ed.): *New Light on Manichaeism. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism*. Leiden (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 64), pp. 241–257.

Reeves, J. C. 2011: *Prolegomena to a History of Islamicate Manichaeism*. Oakville.

Ries, J. 2011: *L'église gnostique de Mani*. Turnhout (Homo Religiosus; Série II, 11).

Sims-Williams, N. 1983: "Indian Elements in Parthian and Sogdian." In: K. Röhrborn/W. Veenker (eds.): *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposiums vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981.* Wiesbaden, pp. 132–141.

— 2009: "The Bactrian Fragment in Manichaean Script (M 1224)." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst/Ch. Reck/D. Weber (eds.): *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit.* Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 31), pp. 245–268.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sundermann, W. 1971: "Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis." In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24, pp. 79–125.
— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 11).
— 1982: "Die Bedeutung des Parthischen für die Verbreitung buddhistischer Wörter indischer Herkunft." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 9, pp. 99–113.
— 1991: "Manichaean Traditions on the Date of the Historical Buddha." In: H. Bechert (ed.): *The Dating of the Historical Buddha.* Göttingen, pp. 426–438.
— 1997: "Manichaeism Meets Buddhism: The Problem of Buddhist Influence on Manichaeism." In: P. Kieffer-Pülz/J.-U. Hartman (eds.): *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Odendorf (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp. 647–656.
Tardieu, M. 1988: "La diffusion du Bouddhisme dans l'empire Kouchan, l'Iran et la Chine, d'après un Kephalaion Manichéen inédit." In: *Studia Iranica* 17, pp. 153–182.
Tongerloo, A. van/L. Cirillo (eds.) 2005: *Quinto congresso internazionale di studi sul Manicheismo. Atti: Il Manicheismo nuove prospettive delle richerca*. Turnhout (Manichaean Studies 5).
Tubach, J. 1997: "Die Namen von Manis Jüngern und ihre Herkunft." In: L. Cirillo/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico", Arvacata di Rende-Amantea, 31 agosto–5 settembre 1993*. Turnhout (Manichaean Studies 3), pp. 375–393.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Manichaean Ritual of Ascent?

A Discussion of T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5 in the Light of Other Coptic Gnostic Materials*

Julia Iwersen, Hamburg

Kellis text Copt. 2 A 5 is a unique Manichaean document giving a hymnic account of an ascent through the spheres of the Manichaean cosmos. On her journey, the ascended person or soul encounters important beings of the Manichaean pantheon, including even the Father of Light, whose revelation puts her to rest. The whole report of the ascent is given in the first person singular, i. e. by the ascended character herself, and in the perfect tense.

The literary genre of A 5 cannot be clearly determined as a psalm – due to the absence of any doxologies; nor as a prayer , – since praying to the Third Ambassador is announced only in the first two lines of the text, but not carried out. The position of the text within a codex otherwise containing hymns to Jesus (T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 1), to Christ (A 2) and to the soul (A 3 and A 4) suggests its liturgical context and use, even though the very personal tone of A 5 is striking, as Iain Gardner remarked in a first comment on the Codex.[1]

Unfortunately we know little about how Manichaean ceremonies were conducted. Placing a presumably liturgical piece of Manichaean literature into a concrete ritual context is therefore a most difficult, and to a certain degree a speculative undertaking. However, careful scholarly work on Coptic Manichaean materials has reconstructed details of the Bema festival[2] and a Manichaean 'Seelenmesse'[3], that corresponds to the Mandaean *masiqta*.

The ascent of the soul freed from the material body by death is the central theme of the 'Seelenmesse'. Siegfried Richter has identified a group of psalms, all ascribed to Mani's immediate disciple Herakleides, that are very likely to have been used for such a ceremony. However, apart from the common theme of the ascent, the Psalms of Herakleides differ considerably from

* Many thanks to Volker Bach, who helped me with the English style of this article.

1 Gardner 1996, p. 17.

2 Wurst 1995.

3 Richter 1997.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Kellis Copt. 2 A 5. The latter contain no self-justifications of the one praying, no prayer of intercession for the ascent but only the announcement of a prayer of thanksgiving, and no doxologies. The steps of the ascent are named in succession, whereas the Psalms of Herakleides designate only one or two steps that are often very difficult to determine. A 5 is an account rather than a prayer in itself. It seems to be a sort of preparation for an individual or communal prayer by giving a description of what a community member has experienced. So the prayer announced in the first two lines cannot be interpreted as a prayer of intercession like the prayers of the Psalms of Herakleides. If one reconstructs the verbal prefix in line 109 as a third person perfect instead of a first person future referring to the soul, this assessment does not change. If we assume that the future tense introduces a prayer, then this change in tense makes the reporting aspect of the text even stronger. In any case, T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5 definitely does not fit the pattern Richter has developed for the 'Seelenmesse' from the Psalms of Herakleides.

In this essay I am going to suggest that T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5 belongs to a context of initiation rites, rather than eschatology, as assumed by Richter and Gardner. However, it has to be kept in mind that initiation and death are very close to each other, particularly in Egypt. Jan Assmann has shown the parallels between Egyptian death rituals and patterns of shamanic initiations. When the body is laid in the coffin, the soul of the dead ascends to the sky goddess Nut and is reborn as a star.[4] In an examination of cenotaphs in Abydos, Heinrich Wendel found some indications for rituals that imitated death for initiatory purposes, i. e. a symbolic death acted out in a tomb-like cave.[5] In Roman Egypt the ascent of the soul is a prominent theme and widely attested. As the initiatory ascent of Apuleius (2nd century) in the course of his participation in the Isis-Mysteries shows, and as cross-cultural research on initiation-processes have confirmed, initiation is frequently intertwined with death-like experiences. Aside from Hebrew Merkavah-literature, Jewish-apocalyptic and Hermetic sources written in Greek it becomes particularly clear from a number of Coptic texts from the 3rd or 4th century, that a heavenly journey was carried out as a ritual by people who are and stay alive on earth. This is particularly evident in *The Discourse of the Eighth and the Ninth* (Nag Hammadi Codex, further NHC, VI, 6), *The Three Steles of Seth* (NHC VII, 5), *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII, 1), and *Allogenes* (NHC XI, 3). These texts also show that the ascent was frequently accompanied by invocations of heavenly beings.

It is a feature of Gnosticism that salvation can be reached here and now, and not only after the more or less irreversible physical death. The Gnostics tend

4 Assmann 1983, pp. 340–341.
5 Wendel 1976.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

to think in cycles: salvation is modelled in the myth of descent and ascent of a pleromatic or light-being, and it is or it will be repeated by the light-world as a whole and by every single soul belonging to it. In this way, eschatology, rather than presupposing a linear course of events, becomes embedded into circular structures[6]. Manichaeism is no exception from this mythic pattern of thought. The Manichaeans even strengthened this tendency through their admittance of sin, even for an Elect, and their rites of confession that can take sins away. In Manichaean rituals the cycle of descent from the light and ascent back to it is eternally repeated. Within this structure of thought and ritual practice the experiences of ascent and salvation are not limited to the path the soul takes after death. And even death itself can mean a return to a new body and cycle. A lot of the Manichaean hymns could be interpreted as responses to the experience of encounters with light-beings and salvation in this life – reported in the first person singular and in the perfect tense. At least, it seems very unlikely that they all anticipate the after-death-situation. The most likely occasion for such experiential encounters is rather a ritually performed ascent in Manichaean communities.

In the course of his reconstruction of the 'Seelenmesse', Richter takes the view that stages of the ascent are reported by the community that liturgically accompanies the soul of the dead person on its path. Here the community speaks in the place of the one redeemed. In his comments on the Kellis text T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5, Gardner has argued for a poetical use of the perfect tense due to the fact that Coptic does not possess a future tense. However, the Coptic language is able to describe ongoing procedures by using the na-form. It is true that it has no means of expressing the future perfect, but by using the Second Present or even the Stative it could indicate a state of being, e.g. the situation after death. However, the author of T. Kell. Copt. A 5 employs the First Perfect which is the narrative tense. Since a more reasonable alternative for describing a state in the future exists, the argument for a merely metaphorical use of the perfect tense in such a text does not seem overly strong. In any case, I find it hard to believe that a theme such as the ascent, which is so widely recorded in Coptic Manichaean literature and in which the community actively participated in the Seelenmesse-liturgy, should be entirely eschatological and not related to ritual experience.

The assumption that the Egyptian Manichaeans had a ritual of ascent is strongly supported by Keph. 9. This lecture describes five mysteries or seals that are related to the descent and ascent of the First Man, and it frequently refers to the existence of the same mysteries within the Manichaean communities. The five mysteries are:

6 Cf. my chapter on gnostic understandings of history in Iwersen 1994, pp. 74–90.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1. peace
2. the first right hand
3. the kiss
4. the salutation
5. the laying on of hands.

On the mythical level all these mysteries concern interactions between First Man and beings of the world of light, especially Mother of Life and Father of Life.

Each mystery is correspondingly related to one stage of the descent and to one of the ascent. Peace is given to First Man by an assembly of gods and angels; the first right hand is received by him from Mother of Life before he goes out to the contest against the forces of Darkness. With the first kiss, Mother of Life embraces First Man. The salutation then is an act of obeisance toward God of Truth by First Man. After that Mother of Life lays hands on him, and he descends.

On his way back up the world of light, First Man experiences the same mysteries, with the exception that the second right hand and the second laying on of hands are performed by Living Spirit instead of by Mother of Light.

Interestingly, only in the course of describing the second mysteries, i. e. those of the ascent, does Mani, the speaker in Keph. 9, refer to ritual activities within the Manichaean community. The peace of which it is said that it is already spent when First Man has not yet entirely left the realms of Darkness, has no counterpart in Manichaean community life. But among Manichaeans, giving the right hand corresponds to the raising up of First Man by Living Spirit. The kiss also has a symbolic meaning, corresponding to the kiss between Mother of Life and First Man. Showing obeisance among Manichaeans equals the obeisance of First Man towards Father of Life on a different level. The practice of laying on of hands seems most interesting. It is performed on a member of a Manichaean community in order "that he becomes a leader" (Keph. 9, 40, 15). Henry-Charles Puech argued convincingly that Keph. 9 allegorizes a Manichaean rite of initiation, at the end of which a person is raised up to the status of an Elect after having had the experience of rest in the household of light and a vision of the supreme god.[7]

Those Manichaeans who attained salvation from the powers of darkness were primarily the Elect, who formed a separate kind of caste as the elite of the Manichaean communities. However, thus far, we have no clear information about how someone was promoted from an Auditor to an Elect. Puech assumed that during the Bema festival, after the confession, new Elects were initiated. In Bema psalm 227, verse 11, the soul is called upon to receive a seal *(sphragís)*. If she keeps the commandments, she is promised the "three presents"

7 Puech 1979, p. 359 ff.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

that will guarantee her journey to the upper heavens. Placing such a passage in the context of a death ritual, as Wurst did in his interpretation of this psalm[8], is not necessarily warranted. The connection drawn by Puech to Keph. 9, for example, is much more convincing. Bema psalm 227 clearly mentions an ascent but does not tell us in detail about all of its stages, as T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5 does. If we align the Kellis text, Bema psalm 227, verse 11 and Keph. 9, we can connect a certain phase of the Bema festival, an ascent, that cannot have an exclusively eschatological meaning, to the initiation of new Elects.

The only traceable ritual action that matches the proceedings surrounding the confession during the Bema festival is the reception of a seal. For Manichaeans and other Gnostics, "seal" is a synonym or a cipher for mystery or sacrament. In the *Books of Jeu* it takes on the meaning of a protective magic code or sign that can be shown to the guardians of the heavenly spheres in order to be admitted to them. By using magic signs and sequences of letters the Gnostics mark themselves and can be identified as those belonging to the realms of the world of light. The same meaning of marking oneself as belonging to the good God occurs in the *Odes of Solomon*. The four symbolic gestures common among Manichaeans are described in Keph. 9 as giving the right hand, kissing each other when someone is going away, showing obeisance to each other and receiving a laying on of hands. We have seen that every mystery corresponds to a certain stage of ascent (not of descent!) in Manichaean myth. The occurrences of laying on of hands frame the battle of First Man against the forces of Evil. He receives the first laying on of hands as a form of armour from Mother of the Living before his descent. The mythical etiology for the second laying on of hands is that Living Spirit brings First Man upward and so removes him from the cosmic war. First Man is placed before Father of the Lights and receives the laying on of hands in order to become a leader (Keph. 9, 10–19). Here it is clearly stated that the experience of ascent following the descent and battle against Darkness, finally "sealed" by Father of the Lights, and coming to rest in his realms, qualifies First Man to be a leader. This seems to be the crucial information for interpreting the function of ascent-related ideas and activities within the Manichaean communities. The second laying on of hands is acted out by an "immensely great one … upon his inferior" (Keph. 9, 38, 2) and the inferior one is made (equally) great by it (Keph. 9, 38, 3). This practice was introduced by Mani himself to the Manichaean community and was performed on the teachers, the deacons and the presbyters, i. e. the Elects (Keph. 42, 4–5). The rite of a laying on of hands was apparently performed in the presence of the Manichaean community. Keph. 40, 17–18 mentions a laying on of hands on each other within a group, and everyone is exhorted to esteem the occurrence of the ritual in their midst and on each other. On the

8 Wurst 1995, p. 134f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

other hand, Keph. 9, 5–7 stresses the spiritual authority of those on whom the ritual was carried out. From that we may conclude that only Elects were present during the ceremony.

The stages of the ascent described in T. Kell. Copt. 2 A 5 obviously do not correspond exactly to those of First Man in Keph. 9. The ascent of First Man and that of a Manichaean believer are not entirely the same, which is already indicated by the fact that First Man himself appears during the ascent of the Manichaean, here welcoming the Manichaean who comes with the ship of the living water and giving him his image, blessing and love. Before that, the one reporting his ascent perfected himself by washing in the pillar (= the Milky Way), which symbolizes the body of First Man in the reunified shape it took on after his ascent. At this point it is obvious that the ascent of First Man is not only an archetypical model for the ascent of the Manichaean. Manichaean mythology is very elaborate and does not simply repeat exactly the same procedure on every level of its system. The mythic speculation is related to the construction of the cosmos, which develops only in the course of the mythic battle. So the cosmic sphere through which the Manichaean has ascended are necessarily different from and more differentiated in terms of existing light-beings and cosmic levels than those of the archetypical path of First Man.

Following Puech's reconstruction, the initiation of the new Elect took place after the great confession and the forgiving of sins. Bema psalm 227, line 11 indicates the initiation by the seal, the three presents and the baptism in Perfect Man (= pillar = Milky Way). The form of the initiation was apparently a ritual of ascent led by celestial beings, the most important of which may have been Third Ambassador. He and his companions of the world of light might have been represented by one or more mystagogues out of the circle of the Elects. The hints in Keph. 9 point to the presence of a group of people, probably Elects, who accompany a joint initiation of new Elects. The ritual activity of this group of already established and new Elects was concerned with the transmittance of spiritual power and the establishment and/or confirmation of hierarchies within the community.

A very similar kind of procedure, with exactly the same meaning and communal function, is attested in Sethian Gnostic texts from Nag Hammadi. Zostrianos, Allogenes and Marsanes are called by heavenly beings and then raised up to receive a vision of the immaterial worlds. After their ascent and returning descent, they write down their experiences. Zostrianos hides the text for those "who come after him", for the "Chosen Ones" (NHC VIII, 1, 130, 1–4), which can only mean: for the Sethians. Somewhat differently, Allogenes gives his text to a person called Messos, whom he names his son (NHC XI, 3, 68, 26–31). Thus these reports of ascent and vision establish a kind of claim or promise that the information contained therein is given by a legendary figure like Zostrianos or Seth (= Allogenes) to the Sethians or to one of their representatives in order to enable the community to participate in this kind of secret knowledge. The

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

secret knowledge about Allogenes' ascent, transmitted by Messos, defined the community of the Sethian Elects, but whether this refers to all Sethians or to an elite circle within the larger group is not clear. Thus, the experience of ascent creates spiritual – and perhaps also communal – authority. The communal aspect comes out more clearly in *The Discourse of the Eighth and Ninth*. This Nag Hammadi text provides concrete information on the spiritual teacher's leading role in a Gnostic group. The content of the text is an instructional dialogue between a mystagogue and his pupil which takes place in a concrete historical context. Together they undertake a celestial journey up to the spheres of the Ogdoad and the Ennead. Richard Valantasis' semiotic study of *The Discourse of the Eighths and Ninths*[9] has shown how the transition of spiritual power and ability, the giving and receiving of divine forces/energy is encoded as a laying on of armour between the two persons involved (NHC VI, 6, 55, 7–8). The closeness to the teacher and the shared experience during the ascent initiates the pupil into a group of chosen disciples, whom he calls "brothers". All these "brothers" are begotten/procreated by their father, who is the teacher, for the teacher bore their inner power "like children get born" (NHC VI, 6, 54, 26–29). In the course of the ritual undertaking, the teacher, whose human name is not mentioned in the text, is equated with Thoth-Hermes and also with the Nous that the pupil is envisioning. Thus the teacher himself takes on the role of a being of light who is worshipped by the pupil.

Looking back from this evidence to the case of Allogenes and Messos in the Sethian text, we can reconstruct a very similar picture: Messos receives an explicit commandment by the Sethian ancestor Allogenes to proclaim what was previously proclaimed to him by his exclusive contact with the divine being. Accordingly, Messos had to look for disciples who were willing to share with him a secret knowledge consisting of visions received through an ascent. The esoteric message that he is expected to transmit is named "the five seals" (NHC XI, 3, 69, 16–17; "the five" had to be restored in the text). Again, "seals" are the code for an ascent.

Keph. 9 says that the five seals "were proclaimed in this world by an apostle" and that the church of the Light Mind shall be chosen by these five marks (40, 19–26). In his lecture Mani used the ascent of the mythical drama to announce his own apostleship. He is the one able to testify to the possibility of a return to the world of light on the mythical and communal level, because he is called upon to proclaim the visionary ascent, as was Messos in Allogenes.

It is very likely, and the Greek Sethian fragment found in Kellis (P. Kell. Gr. 93) definitely supports this idea, that the Manichaean community in Kellis had contact with other Gnostic groups in Egypt. It also seems likely from the evidence we have considered that all these groups, including the Manichaeans,

9 Valantasis 1993, pp. 94ff.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

shared the same organizational features, i.e. a strong position of the spiritual teachers (elects) that gives the community a hierarchical structure.

All of this can open up a view to some considerations undertaken by Hans Kippenberg in an article entitled "Gnostiker zweiten Ranges: Zur Institutionalisierung gnostischer Ideen als Anthropolatrie"[10]. On the grounds of Catharic, Valentinian and Manichaean materials, Kippenberg presents the hypothesis that later forms of Gnosticism flourished in rural areas and under those conditions developed a particular organizational structure, i.e. institutionalization. The basis of this institutionalization was the devotion of the community members towards a group of teachers or guides with special spiritual power and authority. While the Gnostic groups of the 2nd century declared themselves a spiritual elite by virtue of descent, in this later form that Kippenberg is describing they developed hierarchical structures with different classes of Gnostics and correspondingly different ethical norms. Later Sethian and Hermetic writings show that the spiritual teachers or masters of the community legitimized their position by their experience of a celestial ascent. *The Discourse of the Eighth and Ninth* in particular makes it evident that the ascent-experience created a very intimate relationship between the mystagogue and his pupil and initiated the adept into a process of becoming a spiritual leader.

The picture outlined by Kippenberg's thesis seems to fit very well with the general conditions of the Kellis community. It was situated in a relatively remote area, and the community depended strongly on its ability to institutionalize and create a sense of togetherness while incorporating different levels of affiliation. Wurst has stated that the main purpose of the Bema festival, as a part of which the initiatory ascent probably took place, was the formation and support of the community ("Gemeindebildung").[11] The community participated liturgically in the victory of mythological light beings, in particular the apostle Mani to whose memory the Bema festival was dedicated. The experience of ascent to the world of light and the liberation from the forces of Darkness were obviously rehearsed through the various levels of the Manichaean cosmos down to the community life, where it was ritually acted out in order to reestablish the superiority of the circle of the elect and to introduce new members to it.

In her article on "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean world"[12], Martha Himmelfarb pointed out the importance of the initiatives of heavenly beings who actually cause an ascent. This function is fulfilled in our text by Third Ambassador; I think this is the reason why he is mentioned at the beginning of our text. The particular structure of ancient Mediterranean ascents Himmelfarb is describing is probably also responsible for the fact that ritual actions are not mentioned in A 5, apart from the reference to the seals.

10 Kippenberg 1983.
11 Wurst 1995, p. 148.
12 Himmelfarb 1995.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Seals however "do not cause the ascent; they are called upon when the ascent is already underway"[13]. Accordingly, the rituals accompanied and supported the ascent, but in the first place a call from a heavenly Being, e.g. a Manichaean saviour figure such as Third Ambassador was needed. Therefore the person who experienced an ascent due to his initiative, as the text says, has good reason to praise Third Ambassador and to pray to him. However, it is still possible that Third Ambassador was represented by a Manichaean Elect during the ritual, as in *The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth* the Hermetic teacher is representing the Nous.

It is very likely that Kellis T. Copt. 2 A 5 reports the ascent-experience in order to testify and/or reconfirm the authority of the elect. In my view, eschatology must not be overemphasized in interpretations of Manichaean literature. As I have argued above, Gnostic movements used to place their hopes for salvation within this life. Most often they even explicitly declared themselves to be the only ones who are always in a state of salvation. The early Gnostics of the 2nd century justified their superior position with their origin from the world of light, later on they developed ritual means to establish and/or reconfirm their spiritual status. The Manichaeans in particular were in need of such rituals in order to support their hierarchical community structure. In particular, an interpretation of liturgical texts should take such sociological factors into account. Still, an eschatological reading of T. Copt. 2 A 5 is not entirely excluded but only modified. There is a great deal of evidence in the environment of Manichaeism showing that the path of the soul after death was ritually anticipated. This was the core principle of pagan Mystery Religions. The Kellis text T. Copt 2 A 5 is an indication that Manichaeism participated in the widespread practice of ritual ascent in antiquity.

Bibliography

Assmann, J. 1983: "Tod und Initiation im altägyptischen Totenglauben." In: H.-P. Duerr (ed.): *Sehnsucht nach dem Ursprung. Zu Mircea Eliade*. Frankfurt a.M., pp. 336–359.

Gardner, I. 1996: *Kellis Literary Texts.* Vol. 1. Oxford.

Himmelfarb, M. 1995: "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean world." In: J.J. Collins/M. Fishbane (eds.): *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Albany, pp. 123–137.

Iwersen, J. 1994: *Gnosis und Geschichte. Gnostisches Ich- und Weltverständnis im Spiegel der Geschichte des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes von Alexander dem Großen bis ins zweite nachchristliche Jahrhundert*. Hamburg.

Kippenberg, H. 1983: "Gnostiker zweiten Ranges: Zur Institutionalisierung gnostischer Ideen als Anthropolatrie." In: *Numen* 30, pp. 211–231.

13 Himmelfarb 1995, p. 127.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Puech, H.-Ch. 1979: *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais*. Paris.
Richter, S.G. 1997: *Die Aufstiegspsalmen des Herakleides. Untersuchungen zum Seelenaufstieg und zur Seelenmesse bei den Manichäern*. Wiesbaden.
Valantasis, R. 1993: *Spiritual Guides of the Third Century: A semiotic study of the Guide-Disciple-Relationship in Christianity, Neoplatonism, Hermetism, and Gnosticism*. Minneapolis.
Wendel, H. 1976: "Eiszeitliche und altägyptische Sanktuare, gesehen als Orte einer Wiedergeburtsreligion." In: *Almogaren* V–VI (1974/1975), pp. 294–299.
Wurst, G. 1995: *Das Bemafest der ägyptischen Manichäer*. Altenberge.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

On the Choice between Good and Evil in an Essay in Book 3 of the *Dēnkard*

Judith Josephson, Göteborg

1 Introduction

Book Three of the *Dēnkard* (Dk 3) has long been recognized as a book of apologetics in which the educated Zoroastrian is made familiar with the beliefs of his own religion and learns how best to defend them from the arguments of adherents of other religions. It is however much more than this: It is a book about how to live and even thrive in this world (*dārišn ī tan* 'maintenance of the body') but more importantly to save one's soul (*bōzišn ī ruwān* 'salvation of the soul). It illustrates how the believer's own tradition and revelation relate to the issues discussed in society at large. It is written in the spirit of the late Hellenistic worldview which held that a certain number of truths about God, creation, man and his moral situation can be derived from reason and that these constitute basic facts that all religions are agreed on. This knowledge is complemented and put in context by revelation which is special to each religion. Dk 3 is built up of three sections in which the first and longest (§§ 1–195) introduces the reader/auditor to definitions of the basic concepts of reason and the truths of religion and demonstrates how they are in harmony with each other. The second section (§§ 196–286) defines and discusses those concepts which are most important for guiding the believer to lead a moral and upright life in this world. The third and last section (§§ 287–410) leads to a deeper level in which concepts from the first two sections are related to each other and to Zoroastrian revelation for a better understanding of the mysteries of religion.[1]

However, history has not been kind to the books of the Zoroastrians and especially not Dk 3 which was reassembled from the scattered leaves lying in disarray in the office of the leader of the Zoroastrian community in Baghdad in the first half of the 9th century, Ādurfarnbay ī Farroxzādān, following the accident which befell his son Zardošt. This is according to the account by Ādurbād ī Ēmēdan, the second named editor who was active sometime in the mid or late 10th century. Despite his efforts, the leaves of some of the essays have been

1 Josephson 2015.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

rearranged in the wrong order (§§ 74 and 107) and some belonging to the older edition have been expanded by simply adding text to the original essay at a later period (§ 142). It is also possible that essays treating of subjects which were important at a later period have been inserted among older essays. Thus while the general division of the book into three sections is clear there are many instances of wrong order and incomplete or deficient texts. In the present paper I would like to analyse a text from the first section of the book in which the general principles underlying man's ontological condition are defined. This is the essay § 75 in the SANJANA/DE MENASCE enumeration of the essays which describes how man makes a choice by weighing the moral value of an act which he contemplates doing.[2]

The title of the essay gives a very succinct summary of what principles are being discussed here. It refers namely to the lively debate in which various schools of thought within Islam worked to find the best understanding of how human acts are constituted and establish to what degree man is an autonomous agent with the choice to perform a proposed act or not in view of God's omnipotence and complete control over creation.

There were different solutions depending upon whether one held that man had a free will and was responsible for the choices he made or if one held that man was predestined to heaven or hell but in which there was a danger that God would then be responsible for what the evil man does. In all of these discussions the question of how the moment directly preceding the act itself was conceived was crucial in that a power either to perform the act or not presented itself to the mind of the individual and he decided whether the act was good or evil and whether he would do it or not.

The Pahlavi text treats not only of how the Zoroastrians viewed this moment but also coordinates it with an old and central concept of how the collected acts of the individual, the result of all the decisions he has made during his lifetime, will meet him after death in the form of a beautiful maiden or an old hag, the *daēna-* of the Old Avestan texts. The Pahlavi text is concise on the border of terse in the manner of notes for a teacher to remind him of which topics need to be expanded and explained in a lecture. The sudden shift from the process of decision-making by an individual in a single instance of how to act to the moment after his death when the *kanīg* 'maiden' made up of his collective good deeds or the *carātīg* 'ugly hag' made up of his evil deeds is rather startling and leads one to suspect that perhaps there were originally two longer essays which were melded into one. The point of putting the two together is to point out that each little decision is part of a pattern of decision-making that each individual develops during his lifetime and which he comes face to face with in the afterlife. Within each of the two sections the

2 Ms. B 785.15–784.9; MADAN 66.1–67.2; SANJANA, § 75; DE MENASCE 1973, pp. 80–81.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

parallelism in structure of the statements is nearly complete but not in the structure of the essay as a whole. However the concept *nērōg* 'power' to do an individual act or to decide not to occurs at every level of the essay and ties it all together.

Already in the title our attention is caught by the words *pēš ud pas-iz az kardan* 'before as well as after the doing' which refer to these two stages a) how an act is conceived in the mind of the individual before it is done and b) how the total sum of decisions the individual has made during his life determines the experience of the soul after death. I have translated the word *nērōgīgīh* 'powers' as a plural form given that the author will go on to posit two separate powers with two different origins. The purpose of the phrase *az nigēz ī wehdēn* is to assure that the particular interpretations which appear in the essay have been sanctioned by the spiritual authorities.

> *abar ān ī kirbag wināh pēš ud pas-iz az kardan ī mardōm nērōgīgīh ud pad-iš winirdīh ud nigārag padīruftārīh ast az nigēz ī wehdēn*
> "On the powers of the good deed and the sin both before and after their being done by man in which [the act] is established and its image is accepted, according to the teachings of the Good Religion."

2 The text with commentary and translation

Before being done each act originates as a power either with the Holy Spirit or with the Evil Spirit depending on the moral value of the as yet unperformed deed. I have translated *pad nērōg* as 'as a power, capability' but in this passage it could just as well be 'in potentiality' which is often its sense in Dk 3. The word occurs four more times in the text (ll. 6, 7, 12 and 14) and in these occurrences 'power' suits better. Also in a look at contemporary discussion in Arabic among the Muslims one finds that the term 'power' *(qudra, quwwa)* is used by the Muʿtazila or a 'capability' *(istiṭāʿa)* is used by al-Ašʿarī in his writings.[3] This 'power' is created for each individual act a man plans to undertake and it is referred to as the power to do a thing but also not to do it. In other words the power to do an act is created by God but the responsibility for choosing to do it or not to do it if it is evil belongs to man. The Zoroastrian discussion is very similar but with the premise that there are two principles from which the power to act originates as we see in the first proposition in lines 1 and 2 below. This is the general rule that before an act is done, if it is a good deed it originates as a *nērōg* 'power' of Spenāg mēnōg 'the Holy Spirit' who represents Ohrmazd while if the projected act is evil it originates as a 'power' of the principle of evil, Gannāg Mēnōg, the Evil Spirit.

3 Watt 1998, p. 235.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

[1] *hād pēš az kardan kirbag fradomīg pad nērōg ī bun kirbakkar spenāg mēnōg*
[2] *ud bazag-iz fradomīg pad nērōg ī bun bazakkar gannāg mēnōg*
"[1] Now before being done, the good deed [exists] first as a power of the primeval doer of good, the Holy Spirit, [2] and, likewise, the sinful act [exists] first as a power of the primeval evil-doer, the Evil Spirit."

The next step described in lines 3, 4 and 5 below is that the two spirits (the good and the evil) come to the will of the individual when he is preparing to perform the act. If it is a question of a good deed the power follows a path from the primal creation of virtue and reaches *(rasišnīg)* the mind of man where it is established *(winārišn)*. With its establishment in the mind the act is conceptualized. If, however, it is a sinful deed its path is from the principle of human sin where it is poured *(rēxtan)* into man and established *(winirdan)* through the evil of the assault. With the coming of the two spirits the deed is thus conceptualized in the mind of the individual. These lines contain multiple allusions to other themes both in Dk 3 and in the Zoroastrian tradition as a whole. A main idea in Dk 3 is that the good deed is part of the good creation, Ohrmazd's *bundahišn*, and is thereby part of nature moving continually toward the Restoration *(frašgird)*. Sin on the other hand comes from the human condition as a result of the evil of the Assault *(ēbgadīg ak)*; man with his free will can choose evil and thereby temporarily disrupt or slow the march of nature toward the Restoration *(frašgird)*. At another level the text is referring to the traditional explanation that with the breaking of the demons by Zoroaster the demons and their evil offspring can only be active in the world by adhering in man and influencing through him.

[3] *ud madan kāmīg ō kardan ī har dō mēnōg* [4] *kirbag az kirbag bun-dahišn ō mardōm axw rasišnīg padiš winārišn* [5] *ud bazag *az*[4] *bazag bun-mardōm ō mardōm rēxtan pad ēbgadīg ak ī andar mardōm winirdan*
"[3] And in the coming of the two spirits to the will for the doing (of the intended deed), [4] the good deed reaching the minds of men from the principle of good deeds through which it is established [5] and sin is poured into man from the human principle of sin and is established in man by the evil of the Assault."

Line 6 describes the next step. After the good or evil deed has been conceptualized in the mind of man he must come to a decision as to whether to carry out the act or not based on a consideration of the moral value of the act. At this point the individual makes his decision in the light of his wisdom and knowledge and ability to judge (see §79). In the mind of men the two spirits present themselves to the two separate, receivers of the spiritual power to do good and evil acts. This is the moment of decision. The *mēnōgīg nērōg padīriftār* 'receiver of the spiritual power' is the faculty in the mind of man where the decision is made,

4 Ms. B and MADAN write ⟨MNW⟩.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

where he assents to the power to act or refuses it. At this moment he receives responsibility for it, that is he agrees to it.

> [6] *ud madan ō kāmag kardan ī ō mardōm har dō kanārag ō mēnōgīg nērōg padiruftārān rasišn*
> "[6] and in the coming to the will to act which is in man there is the arrival of both sides (both the good and evil conceptualizations) to the receivers of the spiritual power"

If the individual chooses or accepts to perform a good deed or a virtuous act *(kirbag)* he evokes the presence of the good spirit. The words *kirbag nērōg padīriftār* in line 7 below are followed directly by the words 'good spirit' *(weh mēnōg)* '(there is) a good spirit), a noun phrase which indirectly evokes Wahman who is said to dwell in the mind of the good man *(mehmānīh)* when good deeds are performed and one could even interpret the *kirbag nērōg padīriftār* to be the locus in the mind of an individual where Wahman takes up his dwelling. One is reminded of the beginning of the collection of sayings of *Dēnkard* book 6: *andar axw wārom-ē wahman gāh dārēd* "In the mind there is recollection, Wahman holds a throne (in it)" (Dk 6.1b).[5] I would like to emphasize already here that it is the individual who chooses which of the two spirits, *weh* 'good' or *wattar* 'evil' (line 14) who will receive the power *(nērōg)* depending upon the nature of the deed which the individual decides to do or not. This is a decision which is made with every voluntary act.

> [7] *kirbag ō kirbag nērōg *padiruftār*[6] *weh mēnōg*
> "[7] the good deed to the receiver of the power for good deeds, the good spirit,"

In line 8 the result of a lifetime of decisions is mentioned and the fate of the soul after death is explained. The *kirbag nērōg padīriftār* or *weh mēnōg* is accompanied by the image of a beautiful female form whose name is given in Avestan letters as *kainō*.[7] She is the personification of the collective good deeds of the individual who will appear to him when he has died.

> [8] *ud pad-iš hucihr *kanīz*[8]*kirb ī nigārd* ***kainō*** *nāmihist*
> "[8] together with the image of the beautiful form of a girl who is named Kainō."

After the redeemed soul whose good deeds outnumber the evil deeds has died and who is thereby righteous and worthy of paradise she will come toward him and will accompany this doer of good deeds. In this statement the individual is referred to with three different terms, *wizārd ruwān* 'redeemed soul', *kirbag warz* 'doer of good' and *ahlaw ruwān* 'righteous soul'.

5 Translation by Shaked 1979, p. 3. See also his commentary placing it in a wider context (pp. 227–228).
6 Ms. B and Madan write ⟨pt'l⟩.
7 Bartholomae 1961, col. 439: *kainya-*, *kaini-* '(unmarried) maiden'. The form *kainō* is not attested in the extant literature.
8 Ms. B and Madan write ⟨nkyc⟩.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

[9] *wizārd ruwān kē widard ō padīrag* [10] *ud abāgīh ī ōy kirbag warz madan* [11] *pad frāy kirbag az bazagīh ahlaw ruwān*
"[9] She will come toward the redeemed soul who has died [10] and accompany that performer of good deeds. [11] With more good deeds than sinful ones his soul is righteous."

The power that the beautiful maiden has in crossing the Cinwad bridge or, in other words, the power that the collective number of the good deeds of the individual has is that he will be raised to the highest place, that is paradise. In other words the *nērōg* 'power' to do the good act which came to him when he was considering his options for acting in life, when collected after his death and which appear to him in the form of the beautiful maiden also have *nērōg* 'power' to lift him up to enjoy eternal bliss.

The words *xwāyišn ud dādārīh* 'requests and giving' in line 13 invoke a popular tradition which is also alluded to in the somewhat popular Persian version of Ardā wirāz' visit to the afterworld in which he and Srōš visit the section of paradise where the priests *(mowbad)* and the spiritual authorities *(dastwar)* dwell. Srōš asks them if they have any requests or desires which have not been met so that he can ask Ohrmazd to grant them using the same verbs *tā man az hormazd dar xwāham tā ān ārzūhā be šumā dehad* 'so that I will request [them] from Ohrmazd so that he will grant you your desires'.[9]

[12] *nērōg ī-š pad widār ī abar cīh widarag ul uzišnīh ī ō abartar gāh* [13] *ud jāwēdān xwāyišn ud dādārīh*
"[12] her power in crossing the Cinvat bridge is to raise [him] up to the highest place [13] with eternal granting of requests"

In the same way as a good spirit is in the company of the conceived good deed likewise the evil spirit accompanies the conceptualized sin which goes to the receiver of sins. The identity of the *wattar mēnōg* 'evil thought' is certainly Akōman as a hint is given in line 5 with the *ēbgadīg ak* 'the evil of the Assault' and in many other passages where Akōman is named as the evil force continually striving to replace Wahman in the mind of the individual.

[14] *ī pad abāgīh bazag-iz ī ō bazag* {y} *nērōg padīruftār wattar mēnōg*
"[14] and accompanying the receiver of the power for sinful acts is evil thought,"

The *wattar mēnōg* is also accompanied by the image of the ugly form of a woman who is the impersonation of the evil deeds here named *carātīg*,[10] glossed by the word *itiiō* written in Avestan letters.[11]

9 KARGAR 2009, ll. 344–345. This passage is not found in the Pahlavi *Ardā Wirāz nāmag*.
10 Of the late Pahlavi books only *Dādestān ī dēnīg* uses the terminology *kanīg-carātīg*. While the term *kanīg* is generally used for the good deeds, the figure of the evil deeds is expressed in several different ways. See also discussion by PIRAS 2000, p. 93 on *kainīn-* and *carāitī-*.
11 I have been unable to identify this word in the extant Avestan texts.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

[15] *ud pad-iš *duš-cihr*[12] *carātīg kirb nigārīhist ēd rāy* ***itiiō*** *nāmīhist*
"[15] and through it the *ugly form of a woman is portrayed; for this reason she is named *itiio*"

The description of the evil soul in lines 16 and 17 below is exactly parallel to that of the good soul above with three noun phrases *winast ruwān* 'corrupt soul', *bazag-warz* 'committer of sins' and *druwand ruwān* 'evil soul'. The evil soul has more sins than good deeds in its collective works of a lifetime.

[16] *ud winast ruwān kē murd tan padīrag ī ān bazag warz* [17] *pad frāy bazag az kirbagīh ī druwand ruwān madan*
"[16] As for the corrupt soul upon the death of the body, toward this committer of sins [17] she will come, the evil soul with more sins than good deeds."

The collective evil deeds of the individual have prepared him for being thrown into the darkness of hell where he will remain until the Restoration. During that time he will not experience any change for the better in that he will not be redeemed or converted. I have interpreted the third verb in the series as a denominalized form from *wēš* 'much' as something of a synonym of the transitive verb *abzāyēnīdan* 'to increase'.

[18] *pad-iš ārāst pad cīh widarag frōd ō tam axwān hilēnīd* [19] *tā frašgird u-š nē wizārd ud gardēnīd ud wēšēnīd* [20] *weh dēn āgāhīh*
"[18] by which he is readied on the Cinvat bridge to be cast down into the dark existence. [19] Until the Restoration he will be neither redeemed nor converted nor made to increase. [20] [This is] the revelation of the Good Religion."

3 Web of references

This essay is extremely compact and compressed and the syntax is somewhat unclear in places.[13] In spite of this it invokes other texts and ideas at several different layers. It explains how the individual conceives of an action, judges it and then does it or leaves it. In essay § 76 directly following it we find a kind of catalogue of virtues accompanied by their near-related sinful activity the purpose of which is to guide the believer in choosing ways to act. In § 79 there is a discussion of how the individual will be judged after death depending on how he has used his will, knowledge and ability to learn to know the creator and gain an understanding of how he is to relate to the moral life in this world.

In the analysis of the structure of the human act and the relation between human responsibility and the Creator's omnipotence this essay is firmly anchored in the context of the society in which the Zoroastrians lived. In the 9th

12 Correction by de Menasce. Ms. B and Madan write ⟨'wšh'cl⟩.
13 Noted by de Menasce 1973, p. 389, who also describes the essay as a "vue systématique et théologique … du fameux mythe …".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and 10th century among the Muslims proponents of *kalām*, the followers of al-Aš'arī and the Mu'tazila there was an intensive and often extremely subtle, even obscure, debate on exactly this point. The Zoroastrians were in contact with several of these groups but it can be suggested that they were intensively in contact with the Mu'tazila.[14] This group originated in Basra in the 8th century among Aramaean and Iranian converts to Islam. They were merchants but also missionaries whose goal was to convert their own people to Islam from Christianity as well as Zoroastrianism. Their prominent position at the caliphal court in Baghdad declined after the mid 9th century but by this time they had spread and were active in many parts of the Islamic world, especially in western Iran in the provinces of Kerman, Fārs and Khuzistān.[15] They were among the first to use and develop the term *qudra* 'power' to do an act while other groups, especially the followers of al-Aš'arī used the Arabic/Koranic term *kasb* 'acquisition, appropriation' to designate the relationship between man and his voluntary actions, meaning that man wills his action and acquires it *(iqtisābī)* but that it is created by God.[16]

While in detail these groups differed from one another the general framework of the theory ran as follows: The individual receives from God a momentary power *(qudra)* enabling him to perform one specific act. This power or capacity is given one instant before the intended action so that the individual can choose whether to perform it or to leave it. The choice is between two alternatives, the action and its contrary, both of which present themselves as an idea in his mind.[17] The freedom to choose is entirely understood in the context of moral decision. The mind judges the act in its possibility and the act is known and judged as good, wrong, obligatory, etc.[18]

One can readily identify elements which are the same as in essay §75 in Pahlavi presented above. The one big difference is that there are two powers which originate from two different principles, the one good, Spenag Mēnōg representing Ohrmazd, and the other evil, Gannāg mēnōg representing Ahriman, but otherwise the sequence of events is similar. These two principles create a power *(nērōg)* or powers *(nērōgīgīh)* to do an act which presents itself as an idea in the mind of the individual *(winārišn, winirdan)*. At this point the individual has the will to act *(kām)* an idea of the action *(kunišn)* as well as the power to perform it *(nērōg)*. Now the idea which has been established or conceptualized presents itself to one of the 'accepters of the power' *(nērōg padīriftārān)* in the mind of the individual for acceptance or rejection and at that moment he judges the moral

14 DE MENASCE 1973 identifies several essays in Dk 3 as responses or comments on different arguments central to Mu'tazilite thinking (§§ 138, 147, 172, 253, 294).
15 VAN ESS 1987, p. 222.
16 GARDET 1978, p. 692.
17 VAN ESS 1987, p. 227.
18 FRANK 1971, p. 11.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

quality of the act, if it is good or evil, etc. and makes a choice to do it or not to do it. In the words of the Zoroastrian traditional worldview he chooses between the *weh mēnōg* or the *wattar mēnōg*. The Zoroastrian author is describing a process of how the idea presents itself to the mind of an individual and he makes his choice in a manner which is the same for all human beings regardless of religion. Just as in the other religions man is held responsible for the choices he makes, here expressed by which of the spirits, the good or the evil, he allows to dominate his mind.

At the deeper level the essay interacts with larger overarching beliefs in which the individual is part of the struggle of nature and man against the Assault by Ahriman. With *weh mēnōg* and *wattar mēnōg,* which are other ways of indicating Wahman and Akōman, the Zoroastrian author indirectly evokes the indwelling of the good or evil spirit in the soul of man, a central theme which is reiterated at all three levels of discussion in Dk 3. Essay § 75 describes briefly how this indwelling is the result of the choices that man makes in the face of each and every action he performs, an idea which underlies the whole discussion in Dk 3.[19] This is illustrated by the way in which the indwelling of the one or the other spirit is conceived in each of the three sections of this work and it will be clear that in Dk 3 the ontological situation of the individual is seen as resulting from how he uses his free will. In part one of Dk 3 in which the general truths of reason and religion are presented, the influence of the indwelling of the one or the other spirit on an individual is summarized in the quotation from § 33 below. In general Wahman is described as having the upper hand in the mind of the person who through continuous choice of virtue over sin is described as harmonious and well-adjusted while the person whom Akōman is trying to take over is sad, self-indulgent and lying. The quotation from part two of Dk 3 which describes more concretely how man should live in this world is from § 235 where the two spirits are contrasted in regard to how an individual chooses to control his eating habits. A healthy diet of bread, meat and drink *(nān, gōšt, xwarišn)* eaten in moderation and with meditation while eating leads to the pleasant odors associated with the indwelling of Wahman. Where Akōman is dominant the diet consists of meat polluted by carrion and excrement (*nasā* and *hixr*) and the meal accompanied by loud speech leading to the giving off of a foul smell. In part three of Dk 3 the more theological discussion found in essay § 383 ties all of the concepts introduced earlier in this discussion together. Here the emphasis is on the fact that there are two principles, one of which leads to virtue *(kirbag)* and the other to sin *(wināh)* and that Zoroastrianism differs radically from the other religions which maintain that there is only one principle which is then made responsible for all evil and suffering in the world.

19 See the discussion by Shaked 1994, pp. 62–63, who concludes that the presence of the spirits within the person is not a cause but an effect … of the person's moral and religious situation.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

[§ 33] *kē-š wahman mehmān abar axw … āštīh kadag nišēm menišn rāstīh mēnōg mānag ī gōwišn xrad dastūr kunišn kē-š akōman andarag axw menišn … pazm ud waran pādixšā abar kām … xwad-dōšagīh dastwar ī kunišn (*B 813.8–11; M 28.2–6)

"He whose mind is inhabited by Wahman … peace is the house and home of his thought, the spirit of truth the home of his speech and wisdom the authority of his deeds. He in whose mind and thought Akōman is sadness and lust rule over his will … self-indulgence the authority over his deeds."

[§ 235] *ud gyān bōy az wahman padiš mehmānīh bōyān bun u-š gand az akōman abar-dwārišnīh jōyān drāyēd* (B 636.1–3; M 260.17–19)

"the scent of the soul is from the habitation in it by Wahman, the principle of scents. The foul smell is from the invasion by Akōman shouting while eating."

[§ 383] *kirbag wihān ī andar mardōm ī ast wahman xrad wināh wihān ī andar mardōm ī ast akōman waran … ud az-iz ēn paydāg dō bun* (B 553.10–12; M 361.19–21, 362.7)

"The cause of virtue in men is the wisdom of Wahman. The cause of sin in men is the lust of Akōman … and from this it is obvious that there are two principles."

While there are reasons to question whether or not essay § 75 in the form we now have it is actually the original form it had at an earlier time, it provides an interesting insight into the debate on the question of the free will of the individual in relation to both Zoroastrian teachings and those of groups outside of it. The language of the essay with its large number of infinitives, verbal nouns and participles rather than inflected forms suggests a late date while the unclear syntactic relations within both segments of the text suggest that it was poorly tradited. At some time it could have actually been two essays which were combined to serve the present purpose and possibly added at a later date than the surrounding essays. If it does originate from two essays it is interesting to observe that thematically it is held together by the repetition of the word *nērōg* 'power to do, act' in the first section (ll. 6 and 7) and 'capability to do an act, i. e. raise the person up to paradise' in the second (ll. 12 and 14). With all its references to both traditional, learned and popular lore it demonstrates how the author/s of Dk 3 created resonances between different spheres by an extremely skilled use of language which is the hallmark of this work.

References

BARTHOLOMAE, CHR. 1961: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, 2. unveränderte Auflage. Berlin.

DRESDEN, M. 1966: *Dēnkart: A Pahlavi Text.* Facsimile edition of the Manuscript B of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute Bombay. Wiesbaden.

ESS, J. VAN 1987: "Muʿtazilah." In: *Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 10, pp. 220–229.

FRANK, R. A. 1971: "Several Fundamental Assumptions of the Baṣra School of the Muʿtazila." In: *Studia Islamica* 33, pp. 5–18.

GARDET, L. 1978: "*kasb*." In: *Encyclopedia of Islam*[2], vol. 3, pp. 692–694.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Josephson, J. 2015: "Ohrmazd's Plan for Creation according to Book Three of the Dēnkard." In: A. Krasnowolska/R. Rusek-Kowalska (eds.): *Studies on the Iranian World: Before Islam. Proceedings of the 7th European Conference of Iranian Studies (Cracow 2011)*. Krakow, pp. 153–161.

Kargar, D. 2009: *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma: Iranian Conceptions of the Other World*. Uppsala (Studia Iranica Upsaliensia 14).

Madan, D. M. 1911: *The complete text of the Pahlavi Dinkart*. 2 vols. Bombay.

Menasce, J. de 1973: *Le troisième livre du Dēnkart. Traduit du pehlevi*. Paris.

Piras, A. 2000: *Hādōxt Nask 2. Il racconto zoroastriano della sorte dell'anima. Edizione critica del testo avestico e pahlavi, traduzione e commento*. Roma (Serie Orientale Roma LXXXVIII).

Sanjana, P. 1876: *The Dînkard. The original Pahlavi Text; the same transliterated in Zend characters; translations of the text in the Gujrati and English languages; a commentary and a glossary of select terms.* Vol. II. Bombay.

Shaked, Sh. 1979: *The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages. (Dēnkard VI) by Aturpāt-i Ēmētān*. Boulder, Colorado (Persian Heritage Series 34).

— 1994: *Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran*. London.

Watt, W. M. 1998: *The formative period of Islamic Thought*. Oxford [1st edition 1973].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Ein Erzähltext unter den altuigurischen Fragmenten mit Brāhmī-Elementen*

Yukiyo Kasai, Berlin

Einleitung

Professor Werner Sundermanns hervorragende Forschung zum östlichen Manichäismus ist wohl bekannt unter den Wissenschaftlern und genießt große Wertschätzung in verschiedenen Fachbereichen.[1] Sein Interesse war jedoch nicht auf dieses Thema beschränkt. Er leistete darüber hinaus auch einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Erforschung der sogdischen buddhistischen Texte.[2] Dazu zählen die Editionen des *Araṇemi-Jātaka* oder der *Kāñcanasāra*-Legende, die zur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* gehört. Diese Erzählungsliteratur ist von besonderer Bedeutung für diejenigen, die sich mit dem Buddhismus in Zentralasien beschäftigen, denn sie ist nicht nur im Sogdischen, sondern auch in anderen Sprachen Zentralasiens wie im Altuigurischen überliefert. Ihre Erforschung kann einen Beitrag zur Erläuterung der buddhistischen Überlieferungsgeschichte leisten.[3]

Das altuigurische Fragment Ch/U 6114 [T III M 173/139], das im vorliegenden Aufsatz vorgestellt wird, steht möglicherweise auch in der Tradition der Erzählungsliteratur. Erwähnenswert ist, dass dieses Fragment zum Teil in Brāhmī-Schrift geschrieben ist. Unter Fragmenten mit diesem besonderen

* Ich bedanke mich herzlich bei Herrn Prof. Dr. Hirotoshi Ogihara (Kyoto) für seine fachliche Unterstützung bei der Lesung der Brāhmī-Schrift. Mein herzlicher Dank gilt auch Herrn Prof. Dr. Peter Zieme, der nicht nur fachlich sondern auch sprachlich wertvolle Hinweise gegeben hat. Für alle Fehler bin ich natürlich verantwortlich.

1 Die bedeutendsten Forschungsergebnisse dazu sind in seine *Ausgewählte Schriften* aufgenommen worden, vgl. Sundermann 2001a.

2 Verschiedene Arbeiten zu den buddhistischen sogdischen Texten wurden zusammen mit seinem japanischen Kollegen Kōgi Kudara verfasst, vgl. zum Beispiel Kudara/Sundermann 1987; 1998. Darüber hinaus edierte er zusammen mit Kōgi Kudara und Yutaka Yoshida die gesamten sogdischen Fragmente in Ōtani-Sammlung, vgl. Kudara/Sundermann/Yoshida 1997.

3 Zu den sogdischen Versionen des *Araṇemi-Jātaka* und der *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* vgl. Sundermann 2001b; 2006. Zu ihren altuigurischen Versionen, vgl. zum Beispiel Hamilton 1986, I, Nr. 1, S. 1–20; II, S. 267–268, 270; Zieme 2001; Shōgaito/Tugusheva/Fujishiro 1998; Wilkens 2016.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Merkmal wurde bereits ein Text gefunden, der eine Episode des Buddhalebens erzählt.[4] Mit dem vorliegenden Fragment kann man die Liste der altuigurischen Fragmenten mit Brāhmī-Elementen, die der Erzählungsliteratur zuzuordnen sind, erweitern.

1 Fragment Ch/U 6114 [T III M 173/139]

Auf der Vorderseite des Fragments Ch/U 6114 steht ein Abschnitt aus dem chinesischen buddhistischen Text (T. 1509 *Dazhidulun* 大智度論), auf der Rückseite ein altuigurischer Text in uigurischer Schrift. Die Schrift ist zwar als kursiv zu bezeichnen, aber man hat den Text mit relativer Sorgfalt geschrieben. Da keine Datumsangabe erhalten ist, ist weder das Abfassungs- noch das Abschreibedatum bekannt. Die Brāhmī-Schrift ist nur in zwei Zeilen, in den Zeilen 7 und 8, verwendet, es handelt sich dabei sehr wahrscheinlich um ein Sanskrit-Zitat. Einzelne Wörter indischer Herkunft sind in uigurischer Schrift geschrieben. Die Größe des Fragments beträgt 16,2 (b) × 14,1 (h) cm. Außer dem vorliegenden gibt es kein weiteres Fragment aus dieser Handschrift in der Berliner Turfansammlung. Die ursprüngliche Länge des vollständigen Textes bleibt deshalb unklar.

Text[5]

01 [ ]*m*[ ]*m*[ ] lyk ʾyqʾčy *y*[ ]
[ ]*M*[ ]*M*[ ]-LYK ıgačı *Y*[ ]

02 [ ]/ yʾrmʾnw trmʾnw tyny bwš ʾ tytynnw /[ ]
[ ]/ yarmanu t(a)rmanu tını buša tıḍın{n}u(?) /[ ]

03 [ ]//dyn pʾrw ʾʾqdlmʾ*q t*ʾ ʾwq ʾʾ*l*qw ʾtʾ*wy*z y ʾ/[ ]
[ ]//DYN bärü agḍ(a)lma*k*-*t*a ok a*l*ku ätözi ʾ/[ ]

04 [ ]mʾnw syn ʾwmwnw . ʾʾntʾ kyčyk ʾnkynč*yk* //[ ]
[ ]M'NW sın umunu . anta kičig änjinč*ig* //[ ]

05 [ ]*k*syk ky ʾ ʾwyz ʾ čyrylnʾyw(?) čʾqylʾyw[6] . ʾʾdynčyq /[ ]
[ ]*K*SYK-KY-ʾ üzä ČYRYLN'YW(?) čagılayu . adınčıg /[ ]

06 [ ]*kw*lwk . tʾkrʾ twqdʾčy tʾlym ʾwykwš qwš qwz qwn lʾr q/[ ]
[ ]*K*WLWK . tägrä tugdačı tälim üküš kuš kuzgun-lar Q/[ ]

4 Vgl. Kasai 2015.

5 Das Transkriptionssystem folgt Röhrborn 1977–1938. Die fettgedruckten Zeilen in der Transkription entsprechen dem Teil in Brāhmī-Schrift. Das Fragment Ch/U 6114 [T III M 173/139] wird in der Edition der Fragmente mit Brāhmī-Elementen, die von mir jetzt vorbereitet und in der Reihe „Berliner Turfantexte“ veröffentlicht werden wird, als Text Db enthalten sein, vgl. Kasai (i. V.).

6 Der *l*-Haken ist etwas niedriger gesetzt.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

07 [ ]*nč*wl'yw 'wq ym' pu rva ja nma su bo ddha śā sa nā pṛ vrā ji [ ]
[a]*nč*ulayu ok y(e)mä **purvajanma suboddha śāsanā pṛvrā ji**[ ]

08 [ ] *y*/ tra nna pa ri da ya tva ku śa la ka rma saṃ bhū /i [ ]
[ ] ***y*[a]tra=nna paridayatva kuśala-karma saṃbhū[t]i** [ ]

09 [ ] *t*nkry pwrq'n nynk š'ẓ ynynt' 'vtyn p'rq tyn [ ]
[ ] *t*(ä)ŋri burhan-nıŋ šaẓinintä ävtin bark-tın [ünüp(?)]

10 [ ]*w lwq* ''š tytyp 'yd'l'p . ''ryq 'ydwq s'kyz [ ]
[ ]*w-*LWQ aš titip ıdalap . arıg ıdok säkiz [tüzün yolta yorıp(?)]

11 [ ]m'k[7] t'pl'm'q t' qylmyš twyṣ̌wt lwk pwlm'q lyq . 'ylky qyl[ ]
[säv]mäk(?) taplamak-ta kılmıš tüṣ̌üt-lüg bolmak-lıg . ilki kıl[ınč(?)]

12 [ ]/ 'yntky lyk 'dkw ''tlq mnkk'l lyq 'w*ykw*š k' 'wykydy*l*[ ]
[ ]/ intki-lig ädgü atl(ı)g maŋgal-lıg *üküš*-kä *ö*giṭi*l*[miš]

13 [ ]*d/w* qylynč lyq 's rynkw 'yš lyk vyṣ̌v'k'rmy tnk*r*y nyn*k* [ ]
[ä]*d*[g]*ü* kılınč-lıg äsriŋü iš-lig viṣ̌vakarmi t(ä)ŋ*r*i-ni*ŋ* [ ]

14 [ ] ṣ̌mnw tnkry plkwrtmyš 'wtwn *y*'vyz 'wvw*t*[ ]
[ ] ṣ̌(i)mnu t(ä)ŋri b(ä)lgürtmiš utun *y*avız uvu*t*[lug ıyatlıg(?)]

15 [ ]/ l'ryq 'yldynm'dyn . ((*m*'yty)) pwd*ystv* t'nwq lwq v'yp'*ṣ̌y*k*y p'q*ṣ̌[ ]
[ ]/-L'RYQ ilṭinmädin . ((*ma*it(r)i?)) bod*is(a)t(a)v* tanuk-lug vayba*ṣ̌iki bah*ṣ̌[ı]

16 [ ] ''ryš ''ryq sym čyz yq l'ryq twtm'q lyq ''qm'q syz kw/[ ]
[ ] arıš arıg sım čızıg-larıg tutmak-lıg agmak-sız KW/[ ]

17 [ ] 'rdyny lyk t'y'q q' 'w*qš*[ ]
[ ] ärdini-lig tayak-ka o*kš*[atı(?)]

18 [ ]*k*ynlyk 'ryp . pwdynk' /[ ]
[ ]KYNLYK ärip . bodiŋa /[ ]

Übersetzung

(01–02) … der Baum mit … (02–03) … sich erhebend und sich ausstreckend, atmend und sich betrübend, sich fernhaltend(?) … (03–04) … beim Herumgewirbeltwerden vom … her … nun sein ganzer Körper … (04–05) … das Körperglied vertrauend … dort … klein und wunderbar … (05–06) … durch … und babbelnd … auserwählt … (06–07) … viele$_2$ Vögel und Raben, die … ringsherum geboren werden, …
(07) Ebenso auch:
(07–08) *purvajanmasu buddha-śāsanā(t)pravraji[ta-] … y[a]trā=nna parideyatva-kuśala-karma-saṃbhū[t]i …*
(08–09) … (09–11) In der Disziplin des göttlichen Buddha [ist(?)] … [derjenige], der den Gedanken hat, [dass man] aus dem Haus und Hof [gegangen ist], … das … Essen aufgegeben hat$_2$, [auf] dem reinen und heiligen achtfachen [edlen Pfad gewandelt ist(?)], … beim [Lieb]en und Billigen … gemacht hat.

7 Zwischen den Buchstaben *m* und *k* stehen zwei *Alif*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(11–12) [Als] die erste Ta[t(?)] … glückselige, gute und glückliche$_2$, von vielen gepries[ene] … (12–13) … des mit der g[ut]en Tat und der geschmückten Arbeit ausgestatteten Gottes Viśvakarman … (13–16) Ohne den sündigen, schlechten und scham[haften$_2$] … zu tragen, den der Gott Mārā hervorgebracht hat, … der Vaibhāṣika-Meist[er] mit dem Zeugen des Bodhisattva Maitreya(?) … die reine$_2$ Linie haltend und unveränderlich … (16–17) … ähnli[ch] zum Stock mit Juwelen … (17–18) … ist … und … zu seinem Körper …

Kommentar

(05) čyryln'yw(?): Ein unbekanntes Verb. Da das Verb *čagıla-* „babbeln, rauschen" danach folgt und wahrscheinlich zusammen mit dem vorliegenden ein Hendiadys bildet, wird auch eine ähnliche Bedeutung für dieses Verb erwartet.[8]

(09) ävtin bark-tın [ünüp(?)]: An dieser Stelle ist sehr wahrscheinlich vom Eintritt in die Hauslosigkeit die Rede. Da *t(ä)ŋri burhan-nıŋ šaẓinintä* „In der Disziplin des göttlichen Buddha" unmittelbar vor dieser Phrase steht, und danach wahrscheinlich von der Aufgabe der verschiedenen weltlichen Dinge und der Wanderung auf dem achtfachen edlen Pfad die Rede ist, bezieht sich diese Stelle sicher auf eine Erörterung des Wegs zur Erleuchtung in der buddhistischen Lehre. Ob man dabei eine bestimmte Figur als Beispiel namentlich genannt hat, bleibt unklar.

(13) viṣvakarmi: Name einer Gottheit, die „divine creative architect or artist"[9] ist. Sie kommt in vielen buddhistischen Erzählungen vor.[10]

(15) ((*ma*it(r)i?)) bod*is(a)t(a)v* tanuk-lug: Die Lesung des Wortes, das später an der linken Seite hinzugefügt wurde, *mait(r)i*, ist nicht vollkommen sicher. Wegen des darauf folgenden Wortes *bodis(a)t(a)v* ist jedoch ein Name eines Bodhisattva denkbar. Diese Phrase bezieht sich als ganzes auf *vaybaṣiki bahṣ̣[ı]* „Vaibhāṣika-Meister".

2 Inhalt

Aufgrund des fragmentarischen Zustandes ist der Inhalt des Textes schwer zu erfassen. Die Brāhmī-Phrase in Z. 07–08: *purvajanmasu buddha-śāsanā(t)-pravraji[ta-] … y[a]trā=nna parideyatva-kuśala-karma-saṃbhū[t]i …* „In früheren Geburten (= Existenzen) auf Geheiß eines Buddha in die Hauslosigkeit gezogen. … in dem Fall, dass das gute Werk aufgrund des Spendens von Speisen

8 Dieses Verb könnte möglicherweise mit dem Verb *čık-* „get moistured" in Verbindung stehen, denn es sollte eine flüssigkeitsrelevante Bedeutung haben.

9 Monier-Williams 1899, S. 994, Kol. 2.

10 Vgl. zum Beispiel Akanuma 1931, S. 774; Malalasekera 1937–1938, II, S. 906–907.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

entsteht …"[11] bietet keine große Hilfe für die Identifizierung des Inhaltes, denn die normalerweise darauf folgende altuigurische Übersetzung fehlt.[12] Die Erwähnungen der vielen Vögel und Raben in Z. 6, des Eintritts in die Hauslosigkeit in Z. 9 und des Gottes Viśvakarman in Z. 13 weisen jedoch auf die Möglichkeit hin, dass der vorliegende Text entweder einen Teil einer gewissen buddhistischen Erzählung oder deren Zusammenfassung enthält. Da diese drei Elemente in vielen Erzählungen vorkommen, bleibt es unklar, aus welcher dieser Textteil stammt. In Z. 15 kommt darüber hinaus der Vaibhāṣika-Meister vor, so dass der Text auch einen Kommentar enthält, der sich möglicherweise auf die zitierte bzw. zusammengefasste Erzählung bezieht.

3 Schlussbemerkung

Unter den Fragmenten mit Brāhmī-Elementen wurden einige Texte gefunden, die mit der Erzählungsliteratur in enger Beziehung stehen.[13] Die buddhistischen Erzählungen sind nicht nur als selbständige Texte überliefert, sondern werden auch in vielen anderen buddhistischen Texten wie Lobpreisen oder Segen zitiert bzw. zusammenfassend erwähnt.[14] Somit bleibt die Frage, zu welcher Gattung der vorliegende Text gehört, unbeantwortet.

Literatur

Akanuma, Ch. 1931: *A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names*. Delhi.

Bazin, L./P. Zieme (Hrsg.) 2001: *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout (Silk Road Studies 5).

Hamilton, J. R. 1986: *Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe–Xe siècle de Touen-Houang*. 2 Bde. Paris.

Kasai, Y. 2015: „The Old Turkish explanation on Buddha's reunion with his father Śuddhodana." In: M. Malzahn/M. Peyrot/H. Fellner/Th.-S. Illés (Hrsg.): *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture, June 25–29th, 2013*. Bremen, S. 99–108.

— (i. V.): *Die altuigurischen Fragmente mit Brāhmī-Elementen*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte).

11 Diese Interpretation verdanke ich Herrn Dr. H. Ogihara und Herrn Dr. D. Maue.

12 Bei den Fragmenten mit Brāhmī-Elementen ist es oft der Fall, dass einem Sanskrit-Zitat unmittelbar entsprechende altuigurische Übersetzung folgt, vgl. zum Beispiel Laut/Zieme 1990.

13 Vgl. Kasai 2015.

14 Als Beispiel zu dem ersteren kann man die Buddhabiographie nennen, in der das Zusammentreffen des Buddha Śākyamuni mit seinem Vater dargestellt wird, vgl. Kasai 2015. Was die letzteren angeht, so wurden einige Lobpreise bereits erforscht, vgl. zum Beispiel Laut/Zieme 1990, S. 23, 26–27.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Kudara, K./W. Sundermann 1987: „Zwei Fragmente einer Sammelhandschrift buddhistischer Sūtras in soghdischer Sprache." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 14, S. 334–349.

— 1998: „A Second Text of the Sogdian Viśeṣacinti-brahma-paripṛcchā-sūtra." In: 内陸アジア言語の研究 *Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 13, S. 111–128.

Kudara, K. (百済康義)/W. Sundermann/Y. Yoshida (吉田豊) 1997: イラン語断片集成：大谷探検隊・龍谷大学所蔵中央アジア出土イラン語資料 *Irango danpen shūsei. Ōtani tankentai, Ryūkoku daigaku shozō Chūō ajia shutsudo Iran go shiryō [Iranian fragments from the Ōtani Collection. Iranian fragments unearthed in Central Asia by Ōtani Mission and kept at the Library of Ryūkoku University].* Kyoto.

Laut, J. P./P. Zieme 1990: „Ein zweisprachiger Lobpreis auf den Bäg von Kočo und seine Gemahlin." In: J. P. Laut/K. Röhrborn (Hrsg.): *Buddhistische Erzählliteratur und Hagiographie in türkischer Überlieferung.* Wiesbaden, S. 15–36.

Malalasekera, G. P. 1937–1938: *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names.* 2 Bde. New Delhi.

Monier-Williams, M. 1899: *The Sanskrit-English dictionary. Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages.* Oxford.

Röhrborn, K. 1977–1998: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien.* Lieferung 1–6. Wiesbaden.

Shōgaito, M. (庄垣内正弘)/L. Tugusheva (リリヤ・トゥグーシェワ)/S. Fujishiro (藤代節) 1998: ウイグル文 Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā の研究 サンクトペテルブルグ所蔵『十業道物語』 *Uigurubun Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā no kenkyū. Sankuto peteruburugu shozō Jūgōdō monogatari [The Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā in Uighur. From the Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies Russian Academy of Sciences].* Kyoto.

Sundermann, W. 2001a: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften.* Hrsg. von Chr. Reck, D. Weber, C. Leurini und A. Panaino. 2 Bde. Rom.

— 2001b: „Eine soghdische Version der Araṇemi-Legende." In: Bazin/Zieme 2001, S. 339–348.

— 2006: „A Fragment of the Buddhist *Kāñcanasāra* Legend in Sogdian and its Manuscript." In: A. Panaino/A. Piras (Hrsg.): *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa held in Ravenna, 6–11 October 2003.* Vol. I: *Ancient & Middle Iranian Studies.* Milano, S. 715–724.

Wilkens, J. 2016: *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā.* 3 Bde. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 37).

Zieme, P. 2001: „Araṇemi-Jātaka und ein Sündenbekenntnistext in einer alttürkischen Sammelhandschrift." In: Bazin/Zieme 2001, S. 401–433.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Who Is the King of Honour and What Does He Do?

Gleanings from the New Chinese Manichaean Sources*

Gábor Kósa, Budapest

The five sons of the Living Spirit play a pivotal role in the Manichaean cosmogonical myth: after the cosmos had been created by their father and the Mother of Living, they sustain the universe: Splenditenens holds the ten firmaments from above, while Atlas bears the earths from below, Gloriosus Rex turns the Three Wheels to maintain the process of light liberation, while Adamas of Light fights with various evil forces to protect the created cosmos.[1] The functions of the fifth son of the Living Spirit, usually referred to as Rex Honoris in Manichaean studies, will be the subject of the present study.

1 The new Chinese sources

The traditionally known Chinese Manichaean sources are rather laconic on the figure of Rex Honoris. The *Traité* (T109–110) mentions Rex Honoris only *en passant* when discussing the various fights between the New and the Old Man. The former possesses five types of powers (*wu zhong shili* 五種勢力), which help him to defeat the latter; among them the second is sincere trust (*chengxin* 誠信), which, according to the *Traité*, makes him similar to the Great King of the Ten Firmaments (*shitian da wang* 十天大王). Condensing the enumeration of all the five sons of the Living Spirit into one single verse, the entire *Hymnscroll* (H130) devotes only one line to Rex Honoris: "the boldly valiant and unrestrained King of the Ten Firmaments" (*xiongmeng zizai shitian wang* 雄猛自在十天王).

The Cosmology painting (colors on silk, 137.1 × 56.6 cm, Japanese private collection; Jap. *uchū zu* 宇宙図; hence abbreviated as CP) is one of the ten new Chinese

* The topic of the present paper was part of a research project which was supported by the European Institutes for Advanced Study (EURIAS) Fellowship Programme (cohort 2014/2015). My research project, entitled "A Comparative Analysis of Manichaean Texts and Paintings; New Discoveries from China and Japan (2006–2012)", was conducted at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (Cambridge, UK).

1 Jackson 1932b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Manichaean paintings, all of which are preserved in Japan.[2] Five of these paintings, including the CP, are kept in an anonymous Japanese private collection. The CP, which is dated to the 14th–15th centuries,[3] can be divided into four major sections:

1. The uppermost section visualizes the Manichaean New Paradise, the Sun and the Moon;
2. The section below it depicts the ten firmaments with figures of various functions;
3. The third section gives a visual representation of the sphere between the firmaments and the earths, including "a world of snakes," the Virgin of Light, a Judgment scene, and Mount Sumeru with four continents;
4. The lowermost section depicts the eight earths with three individual scenes on the fifth earth from below: the rescue of the First Man (in my interpretation), Atlas, and Gloriosus Rex with the Three Wheels.[4]

The CP visualizes all the five sons of the Living Spirit, with Rex Honoris, as expected, appearing in the seventh firmament.[5] The otherwise rather precise pieces of visual information in the CP[6] make it probable that in this case we will again find reliable visual information about the King of Honour. As will be discussed below, Manichaean sources unanimously claim that Rex Honoris dwells in the seventh firmament. In the CP, the seventh firmament from below features two seated figures. The similarities shared by these two figures include the green halo, the red robe with spiral motifs, the blue upper garment and a pink lower garment. The left and the right figures are both seated (on a stool and a lotus throne, respectively), showing different hand gestures. Since the colour of the halo and the clothing, as well as the decorations on the latter, are demonstrably crucial in individualizing the ca. 500 figures in the CP, thus it is not far-fetched to surmise that the two figures, clad in clothing of the same colour with exactly the same decoration, in fact, represent one and the same figure.[7] The multiple appearance of an ultimately single figure is exemplified by Mānī, who appears 13 times in the CP in a purely white robe with a red border.[8] The reasons for the double appearance of Rex Honoris will be clear later on.

The seated figure on the left is flanked on either side by four soldiers, all clad in golden armour and wearing a helmet. The figure on the right has a huge circular object in front of him. In both scenes, one can spot a group of three figures consisting of Mānī and two attendants, who, similarly to the other instances in the CP, witness the mythological events.

2 Yoshida 2010.
3 Furukawa 2010.
4 Kósa 2010. For the identifications of these motifs, see the relevant parts of Yoshida 2010.
5 Yoshida 2010, p. 17b.
6 Yoshida 2010, Kósa 2014, pp. 63–74.
7 Rex Honoris is the only one of the five sons of the Living Spirit who appears twice in the CP.
8 Yoshida 2010, pp. 9a–10a.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Another major discovery of the past years was the textual corpus of new Chinese Manichaean materials, published by Chen Jinguo 陈进国 and Lin Yun 林鋆 in 2010. Their article explored the new written and visual Manichaean remains preserved in Xiapu 霞浦 county, Fujian 福建 province of China (hence abbreviated as the Xiapu texts).[9] The manuscripts themselves were copied in the 18th–20th centuries, but can ultimately be traced back to Lin Deng 林瞪, a 13th century Manichaean missionary in Fujian, who became famous for his wonderworks (especially warding off fire) in the region. Admired and later venerated for his local miracles, the Manichaean texts (ritual texts, invocations, and prayers) associated with him were also preserved through family transmission, and are owned by two ritual masters (*fashi* 法师) called Chen Peisheng 陈培生 and Xie Daolian 谢道琏.

These syncretic ritual texts sometimes contain remarkably genuine material: precise names of the members of the Manichaean pantheon, precise and little known details of the Manichaean cosmogony, Semitic names of angels and Middle Iranian hymns transcribed into Chinese, etc. Based on the phonetic transcriptions in these texts, Yoshida Yutaka concluded that some parts of the manuscripts most probably go back to the Tang dynasty (AD 618–907).[10] The passage which follows was preserved on the 13th–14th pages of the manuscript entitled 'Moni guangfo 摩尼光佛' ('Mānī, the buddha of Light'), in the hymn 'Zan tianwang 赞天王' ('In praise of the Heavenly Kings'). This manuscript is currently preserved in the collection of ritual master Chen 陈法师 (Chen Peisheng 陈培生) from Baiyang 柏洋 village of Xiapu county.

> 十天王者，梵名阿薩漫沙也。是故道教稱為昊天玉皇大帝。住在第七天中，處在大殿，管於十天善惡之事。此天內有十二面宝鏡，上面觀於涅槃，下面照于陰司地府，十面鑒於十天諸魔背叛等事化。四天王管四天下。嚧嚩逸天王管北鬱壇界，弥訶逸天王統禦(東弗婆提，嚩嚧逸天王管)南閻浮提，娑囉逸天王掌握西瞿耶尼。四天大明神若見諸天惡魔起奸計，搔[=騷]擾天空地界諸聖，應時展大威神，折挫調伏，速令安定，急使調伏。一心虔恭，合掌皈依，同降道場，加彼下界福德男女長福消灾，增延福壽。[11]
>
> "As for the King of the Ten Firmaments [Rex Honoris], his foreign [Iranian] name is Asamansha. This is why the Taoists call him the Jade August Great Emperor of

9 Chen/Lin 2010.

10 Yoshida 2013.

11 Chinese text from Chen/Lin 2010, pp. 379–380; Ma 2010, p. 119; Yuan 2011, p. 178; Yang 2011, p. 148. In square brackets, I added interpretations of the preceding word. I am extremely grateful to Wang Yuanyuan for sending me Prof. Lin Wushu's accurate transcription of the text before the publication of his book. Due to technical reasons, here I reproduce the standard forms of the Chinese characters. The last part of the text seems to be the prayer of the priest, cf. *Mingfu qingfo wen* 冥福請佛文 (owned by Chen Peisheng 陈培生): "Respectfully trusting the mercy of the divinities ('buddha-jewels'), at this hour of the auspicious day (night), please, descend to the holy place! 恭望佛寶慈悲, 是日(夜)今時請降道場" (Chen/Lin 2010, p. 352); *Jixiang daochang menshu* 吉祥道場門書 (1786, owned by Xie Daolian 谢道琏): "At this hour of the auspicious day, please, descend to the holy place! 良日今時, 請降道場" (Chen/Lin 2010, p. 377).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the Bright Heavens. He dwells in the seventh firmament, resides in a great palace, and he is in control of the good and bad events of the ten firmaments.

In this firmament, there is a jewelled mirror with twelve faces: the upper face observes the *nir(vāṇa)* [the Realm of Light], the lower face reflects the netherworld, and the ten (remaining) faces inspect [reflect] the rebellions of the various demons and similar events of change in the ten firmaments.

The four heavenly kings [*tianwang* = Skt. *devarāja*] govern the four worlds [continents]: the heavenly king Lufuyi [Raphael] governs the northern Uttarakuru, the heavenly king Mikeyi [Michael] rules (the eastern Pūrvavideha, Gabriel rules) the southern Jambudvīpa, the heavenly king Suoluoyi [Sarael] the western Aparagodānīya.

If the four heavenly, great, luminous spirits notice that the evil demons in the various firmaments launch evil plans to stir the saints of the celestial and earthly spheres, they immediately exhibit their great majestic powers to restrain them [the demons] and make them surrender, they quickly pacify them, swiftly make them surrender.

(We) pay respect with our entire heart, (we) put our hands together to take refuge. (Please,) descend together to the holy place (of the ritual), and for the blessed and virtuous men and women of the world below grant extended bliss, put an end to disasters, and increase (our) blissful, long life!"

Especially remarkable is the beginning of the passage above. As Yoshida Yutaka suggested in private correspondence (3 Oct. 2011), the first sentence contains the Chinese transcription of the hitherto unattested Parthian form *ʾsmʾn šʾh* (Asamansha [*asmān šāh* = LMC ʔa-sat-muan`-ʂa: Yuan: ɔ-saˇ-mɔn`-ʂa][12] 阿薩漫沙). This form is the Parthian equivalent of the attested Sogdian *smʾn xšyδ* ('Himmelsherr', attested in M178/107 and M583/I/R/7).[13] Although the word *fan* 梵 originally refers to an Indian (usually Sanskrit) language, in the Manichaean context it invariably seems to denote an Iranian language: Daoming's 道明 postscript to the Chinese Manichaean *Hymnscroll*, for example, also states that the hymns were translated from a *fan* original, which in the latter case meant a Middle Iranian (most probably Parthian) original.[14]

The second sentence of the passage equates this transcribed form with the Daoist deity Haotian Yuhuang Dadi 昊天玉皇大帝 ("Jade August Great Emperor of the Bright Heavens"). What is noteworthy here is that the latter form is introduced by "this is why" (*shigu* 是故), which clearly indicates that the author of the passage knew the meaning of the Parthian word, since *ʾsmʾn* ('heaven') nicely parallels *haotian* 昊天 ('heaven'), while *šʾh* ('lord') parallels *(da)di* (大)帝 ('emperor').[15]

12 Pulleyblank 1991.
13 Sundermann 1979, p. 131, n. 225.
14 Kósa 2012, p. 54; Provasi 2007, p. 310, n. 97.
15 In the last case, great (*da* 大) is added, though here the Manichaean designation itself does not contain this modifier, which is, however, present in the *Traité* (T110), and also in the *Liber scholiorum*, where only this son of the Living spirit is called great ('Great

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Furthermore, it may be noted that the Chinese form also offers a *terminus post quem* for this version of the text, since it was only after Emperor Zhenzong 眞宗 (r. 997–1022) had declared Yuhuang 玉皇, the Jade Sovereign, to be the supreme god by imperial decree that Huizong 徽宗 (r. 1100–1125) conferred upon him the title of Haotian Yuhuang shangdi 昊天玉皇上帝 (Jade August Highest Emperor of the Bright Heavens).[16] Thus this note on the equation of the Manichaean and the Daoist deity cannot be earlier than the 12th century, which naturally does not mean that the entire passage derives from this period.

2 Comparing the new data with the available sources

In the following, I will compare the text cited above, as well as my interpretation of the visual information in the CP, with other data on the functions of Rex Honoris.

2.1 Rex Honoris in the seventh firmament

The Xiapu passage clearly states that Rex Honoris dwells in the seventh firmament (*zhu zai di qi tian zhong* 住在第七天中). The CP places two depictions of this seated figure in the seventh firmament from below. This notion is also recorded in other Manichaean sources, especially the Coptic ones.

> They seated him on a throne in the seventh heaven and made him the lord and king over all the ten Firmaments.[17]

> The second Son of Light. The King of Honour, who is …, who is in the seventh heaven, who looks after the root of Light (?). His Gods and his angels.[18]

> The [fif]th [j]udge is the great King of Honour, he who dwells and is established in the seventh firmament.[19]

> Also, the seventh throne is established in the seventh firmament. The great King of Honour sits upon it.[20]

> The great King of Honour, [who is the thought that exists i]n the seventh firmament.[21]

King of Honour'; Jackson/Yohannan 1932, p. 236); furthermore, Coptic ⲛⲁϩ ('big') appears 12 times before Rex Honoris in the Coptic material (van Lindt 1992, p. 98).

16 Yamada 2008, p. 63.

17 M178/R/107–111 (trans. Henning 1947, p. 313).

18 *Psalm-book* 138,34–39 (Allberry 1938, p. 138).

19 *Kephalaia* 80,5–6 (Gardner 1995, p. 83).

20 *Kephalaia* 83,2–4 (Gardner 1995, p. 85).

21 *Kephalaia* 91,23–24 (Gardner 1995, p. 96). Although the Greek P.Kell.Gr. 97/B.I/v erroneously mentions darkness instead of light (Gardner/Worp 1997, p. 154), it also

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In light of the depiction of the CP, the famous "erratic" passage of the *Kephalaia* seems to be less problematic. Here someone, who probably contemplated Mānī's Picture-book, exclaims:

> Again, look, see! The great King of Honour, who is the thought, he is in the thi[r]d firmament.[22]

This statement is usually taken as a slip of the pen: Gardner adds that this is "probably an error for the seventh firmament".[23] This might be true, but it is strange to see that only some lines above in the same chapter (and twice in another chapter of the same *Kephalaia*), the scribe still knew that Rex Honoris dwells in the seventh firmament. Furthermore, Coptic 'seventh' (ⲡⲙⲁϩⲥⲁϣϥ̄) and 'third' (ⲡⲙⲁϩϣⲁⲙⲧ) are not that similar (ⲡⲙⲁϩ- expressing ordinal numbers, seven = ⲥⲁϣϥ̄, three = ϣⲁⲙⲧ). Henning remarked that

> Mani here made a little mistake, by confusing cardinal and ordinal numbers (10–7 = 3, but the seventh from below is the fourth from above).[24]

Whoever made the mistake here (most probably not Mānī himself), the depiction of the ten firmaments in the CP, which can probably traced back to the Picture-book,[25] seems to offer a clue to the source of the error: though there are ten strips of the firmaments themselves, there are only nine taller internal stripes in-between. Since the firmaments themselves only feature small palaces, and all other figures, including those of Rex Honoris, are placed in the nine stripes in-between, therefore Rex Honoris is indeed placed in the third inner stripe counted from above. Thus anybody looking at the CP would intuitively say that Rex Honoris is in the third stripe from above, i. e. in the third firmament (Pl. 1). Thus, Henning was right in assuming that the problem fundamentally lay in the direction of the counting; however, taken the method how the ten firmaments might have been depicted in the Picture-book, the expression "third firmament", referring to the third inner stripe counted from above, is highly understandable. The expression "Again, look, see!" (Keph. 92,24: ϫⲱϣⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲕⲛⲉⲩ; 92,12: ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲱϣⲧ ⲛ̄ⲕⲛⲉⲩ) suggests that these descriptions might have derived directly from the inspection of the Picture-book.

Sources differ on the extent of authority attributed to Rex Honoris. The Xiapu passage ("he is in control of the good and bad events of the ten firmaments"), the M178 text ("made him the lord and king over all the ten Firmaments") and

---

seems to refer to this characteristic: "Much praised: the most great thought clothed you, who dwells in the seventh darkness [τὸ ἕβδομον (…) [τὸ] ἐρέμνιον] where was established his throne with truth (5) [–] the King of Honour restrains all the worlds, who prevails over all the worlds" (Gardner/Worp 1997, p. 151; Gardner 2007, p. 103).

22 *Kephalaia* 92,24–25 (Gardner 1995, p. 97).

23 Gardner 1995, p. 97.

24 Henning 1947, p. 313, n. 6.

25 Yoshida 2010, pp. 4a–5a, 2015; Kósa 2014.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

some parts of the *Kephalaia* (e.g. 80,6–7: "judge of all the firmaments") clearly state that Rex Honoris is the lord of all the ten firmaments. On the other hand, other parts of the same *Kephalaia* (170,28–30) claim that he controls only the lower seven firmaments:

> The second watch, of which the Great King of Honour is master, his own authority (extends) over the seven firmaments beneath him.

This latter type of division invariably presupposes that the upper three firmaments belong to the authority of Splenditenens, another son of the Living Spirit.[26]

© Japanese private collection (Yoshida 2010, Pl. 3)

Pl. 1: The ten firmaments of the Cosmology painting
with the upper part of the snake world below it
(colours on silk, 137.1 × 56.6 cm, Yuan or Ming dynasty, detail,
Japanese private collection)

26 *Kephalaia* 170,23–26; van Lindt 1992, p. 95.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

2.2 The mirror in front of Rex Honoris

The Xiapu passage mentions a jewelled or precious mirror (*baojing* 寶鏡) with twelve faces (*shi'er mian* 十二面). In front of Rex Honoris, the CP presents a circular object on a demon-like stand. The object has twelve human heads with alternating green and orange halos. The Sogdian M178 evidently refers to the same mirror-like object as a Lens *(myj')*:[27]

> Thereunder they formed ten Firmaments, set up one magic twelve-faced *Lens.

The Coptic *Kephalaia* first calls it a wheel (ⲧⲣⲟⲭⲟⲥ), but later identifies it as a mirror (ϊⲉⲗ):

> [Agai]n the [apostl]e speaks about the wheel that exists in front [of the King of Honour who dwells in] the seventh firma[ment]. (…) Now, there are twelve seals in it. (…) [As] the wheel is like a great mirror, for [the di]scrimination of all things.[28]

Uniquely, the Chinese passage from Xiapu also specifies that the functions of the twelve faces can be divided into three categories: "the upper face observes the *nirvāṇa* [the Realm of Light]" (上面觀於涅槃), "the lower face reflects the netherworld" (下面照于陰司地府), while "the ten (remaining) faces inspect [reflect] the rebellions of the various demons and similar events of change in the ten firmaments (十面鑒於十天諸魔背叛等事化)". This type of exact specification of the 12 faces is, to my knowledge, unknown in other sources.[29]

2.3 Rex Honoris as the overseer of the demons

The Xiapu passage which refers to Rex Honoris as being charged with the supervision of all the ten firmaments (管於十天善惡之事), resonates well with the designations of this figure in the Dunhuang material as the "(Great) King of the Ten Firmaments" (T110: *Shitian dawang* 十天大王, H130: *Shitian wang* 十天王).

The same function is referred to in the Sogdian M178:

> There they seated a Son of God as watcher, so that in all the ten Firmaments the demons could do no harm. (…) Thereupon the All-maker (Wišparkar = Living

27 On this word, see Henning 1947, pp. 315–316.

28 *Kephalaia* 87,33–35; 88,5–6; 88,31–32 (Gardner 1995, p. 92).

29 There is only one possible exception, the somewhat fragmentary 36th *kephalaion*, which mentions 12 seals (ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲛⲁⲩⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲃⲉϩ) in the wheel and seems to make a distinction among the function of ten of them ("every firmament", and the remaining two): "Now, there are twelve seals in it [the wheel in front of the King of Honour, GK]. The seal between i[s] every [fi]r[ma]ment and the rulers who are there. (…) The twelf[t]h seal that is in it is its five shining men that are conjoined and enmeshed through the entire zone" (Keph. 88,5–6, 14–15; Gardner 1995, p. 92).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> Spirit) called the Lord of the Firmaments (Rex Honoris). They seated him on a throne in the seventh heaven and made him the lord and king over all the ten Firmaments.[30]

The *Liber Scholiorum* similarly states:

> The Great King of Honor, after the heavens and the earths were made, sits in the midst of heaven and keeps guard over them all.[31]

The passage from the *Kephalaia* quoted above specifies that this function is executed through the mirror in front of him:

> As] the wheel is like a great mirror, for [the di]scrimination of all things.[32]

The Coptic sources seem to link the act of judging (+ϩⲉⲡ) with Rex Honoris, and occasionally call him a judge (ⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ).

> The King of Honour, the strong God, who is in the seventh heaven, judging the demons, the creatures of abyss(?).[33]

> The [fif]th [j]udge is the great King of Honour, he who dwells and is established in the seventh firmament. He is the judge of all the firmaments who gives a true judgment, according to [a] judgment of righteousness, upon all powers and all the [king]doms [of the] firmaments.[34]

As can be seen from the 28th *kephalaion* (Keph. 79,13–81,20), which altogether lists twelve judges, the function of judgement is not restricted to the weighing of someone's deed; it seems to imply any kind of conscious act, based on righteousness, which is performed against Darkness and which, ultimately, leads to the separation of the two mixed principles. Sometimes it is understood as a kind of righteous punishment, a virtue frequently emphasized in connection with the judgments. Among the judges, one can, among others, find the First Man who humiliated the ruler of Darkness (Keph. 79,23–24), the Mother of Life, who fettered them in the firmaments (Keph. 79,31–33), or the Great Builder, who constructed a prison for them (Keph. 79,34–80,1). The act of separation, which is the fundamental goal of all protagonists originating in the Realm of Light, appears several times: Jesus the Splendour "separated the steadfast from the convicted" (Keph. 80,24–25), the Judge separates the good and the evil, the righteous and the sinner (Keph. 80,31–32), the Light Mind separates light from darkness, truth from lawlessness (Keph. 80,36–81,1), the Great Counsel separates the good from the evil, light from darkness (Keph. 81,1–4).

30 M178/79–82, 106–111 (trans. Henning 1947, p. 313).
31 *Liber Scholiorum* 128; Jackson/Yohannan 1932, p. 236.
32 *Kephalaia* 88,31–32 (Gardner 1995, p. 92).
33 *Psalm-book* 2,9–11 (Allberry 1938, p. 2).
34 *Kephalaia* 80,5–9 (Gardner 1995, p. 82).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In sum, the act of judgment, associated among others with the King of Honour, seems to refer to any act of separation between light and darkness. Therefore, when the Xiapu passage mentions that the King of Honour "is in control of the good and bad events of the ten firmaments", this means something similar: he is charged with spotting the acts of evil and separating them from those of the good ones.

2.4 Rex Honoris as the commander of angels

The Rex Honoris on the left side of the seventh firmament of the CP is on either sides flanked by four angels, all clad in armour. Rather infrequently, the presence of angels around Rex Honoris is mentioned in other sources as well:

> Hast thou, then, seen face to face (...) and the other, the King of Honor, surrounded by armies of angels?[35]

> And Rex Honoris then said to the four angels: ...[36]

The Xiapu passage does not explicitly mention that Rex Honoris is the commander of the angels but it does seem to indicate this connection by naming four heavenly kings (angels) precisely after it referred to the mirror, which, placed in front of Rex Honoris, is capable of revealing the evil uprisings. The subsequent sentences then describe how the angels fight against the evil forces. This double function of Rex Honoris, i. e. revealing the possible uprisings with the help of the mirror, and defeating the rebels through the angels, are present both in the CP and the Xiapu passage. It could be even surmised that the CP portrays Rex Honoris twice in the seventh firmament precisely in order to convey this double function. While the other four sons of the Living Spirit, the CP seems to suggest, have only one major duty, Rex Honoris is charged with two different, though related, tasks.

Altogether there are sixteen similar armoured angelic figures in the CP. Two groups of four flank the figure of Rex Honoris in the left side of the seventh firmament, four can be seen at the foot of Mount Sumeru, and four individual angels can be detected at various places associated with the firmaments.[37] Considering the narrative nature of the CP, it seems probable that this unique painting ultimately presents eight angels, each in two positions: the first is the place

35 *Contra Faustum* XV,6 (trans. Jackson 1932b, p. 300).

36 U217/R/5–7 (Wilkens 2000, p. 161).

37 Adamas beside Mount Sumeru is also clad in armour in the CP, however, as Ulf Jäger pointed out to me in private correspondence (14 March 2012), he belongs to the infantry who do not wear helmets. Simply put, the 16 angelic figures wear helmet, while Adamas does not; nevertheless, what connects them is that all wear an armour, which expresses their military function.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

where they are basically stationed, i. e. beside Rex Honoris, while the second is their depiction during performing their duties. In his talks about the relationship of the CP and the *Book of Giants* tradition, Yoshida Yutaka has already pointed out that the four angelic figures at the foot of Mount Sumeru must represent the four angels sent by Rex Honoris to punish the demons and the giants on the earth.[38] These four angels (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Sarael) are named several times in the Xiapu corpus. In the passage cited above, probably by mistake, only three of them are mentioned in the Chinese transcription, but in other Xiapu texts all the four archangels of the *Book of Giants* traditions are present.[39]

What I would suggest here is that these four angels are the same as the ones stationed on one side of Rex Honoris, and, furthermore, that the other four angels placed in the fourth (right), the third (left), and the first (middle) firmament, plus the middle part of the so-called snake-world, are shown in action, while originally they are stationed on the other side of Rex Honoris. Thus I suggest that the CP ultimately pictures eight angels,[40] all shown as warriors, once in their original position beside Rex Honoris, and secondly, following a temporal sequence of events, in the performance of their duties: four in the human world, and four in the areas associated with the firmaments.

In the following chart, I summarized the sources of information about Rex Honoris:

1. Seated in the seventh firmament: M178, *Kephalaia, Psalm-book*, Xiapu, CP;
2. Surrounded by an army of angels: *Contra Faustum*, Xiapu, CP;
3. Supervising demons: *Liber Scholiorum*, M178, Xiapu, (CP);
4. Presence of a wheel/lens in front of him: M178, Xiapu, CP;
5. Mirror-like object: *Kephalaia,* Xiapu;
6. Twelve seals/lenses/faces in it: *Kephalaia*, M178, Xiapu, CP;
7. Explanation of the 12 faces: Xiapu, *(Kephalaia).*

These data suggest that the new Chinese discoveries, which are much later than the Coptic, Latin, Syriac and Sogdian ones, at present provide us with the richest sources of information on the King of Honour.

38 Yoshida 2011.

39 *Xingfu zuqing danke* 興福祖慶誕科 4b–6a: 'Qing hufa wen 請護法文', 'Song tudi zan anwei 誦土地讚安慰' (Ma 2010, p. 119). The *Qinghu fawen* 請護法文 describes these angels as wearing armour (*jia chuan shen* 甲穿身), holding a blade in their hand (*rui chi shou* 銳持手), and thus they fight the enemy. All angels are indeed clad in armour in the CP, and two of the four angels in the firmaments indeed hold a sword in their right hand while fighting hostile entities.

40 Interestingly, the Birth of Mānī painting also features eight angelic figures, divided into two groups of four (Yoshida 2012, Pl. 1). On earlier Manichaean tradition of the four guardian deities, see Ebert 1992.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

References

Allberry, Ch. R. C. 1938: *A Manichaean Psalm-Book.* Part II. Stuttgart (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection 2).

Chen Jinguo 陈进国/Lin Yun 林鋆 2010: "Mingjiao de xin faxian – Fujian Xiapu xian Monijiao shiji bianxi 明教的新发现 – 福建霞浦县摩尼教史迹辨析 [New Manichaean Discoveries – an Analysis of the Relics of Manichaeism in Xiapu County, Fujian]". In: Li Shaowen 李少文 (ed.): *Bu zhi yu yi – Zhongyang meiyuan "yiwen ketang" mingjia jiangyan lu* 不止于艺 – 中央美院"艺文课堂"名家讲演录. Beijing, pp. 343–389.

Clackson, S. 1998: "Manichaean texts and citations in Coptic." In: S. Clackson *et al.* (eds.): *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. 1: *Texts from the Roman Empire. Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin*. Turnhout, pp. 59–185.

Ebert, J. 1992: "Die 'Vier lichten Götterkönige' als Schutzgottheiten in einem manichäischen Seidenbildfragment?" In: T. W. Gaehtgens (ed.): *Künstlerischer Austausch/Artistic Exchange. Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin 15–20 Juli 1992.* Berlin, pp. 489–512.

Furukawa Shoichi 古川 攝 2010: "Shinshutsu Manikyō kaiga shiron – seisaku nendai o megutte 新出マニ教絵画試論 – 制作年代をめぐって [Preliminary study of the newly discovered Manichaean paintings concerning their dating]." In: *Yamato Bunka* 大和文華, pp. 35–52.

Gardner, I. 1995: *The Kephalaia of the Teacher: The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary.* Leiden.

— 2007 (ed.): *Kellis Literary Texts.* Vol. 2. With contributions by M. Choat, M. Franzmann, W.-P. Funk, K. A. Worp. Oxford.

Gardner, I./K. A. Worp 1997: "Leaves from a Manichaean Codex." In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 117, pp. 139–155.

Henning, W. B. 1947: "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12 (1947–1948), pp. 306–318.

Jackson, A. V. W. 1932a: *Researches in Manichaeism. With Special Reference to the Turfan Fragments*. New York [repr. 1965].

— 1932b: "The Five Sons of the Living Spirit." In: Jackson 1932a, pp. 296–313.

Jackson, A. V. W/A. Yohannan 1932: "Theodore bar Khoni on Mānī's Teachings. Translated from the Syriac by Dr. Abraham Yohannan, with notes by A. V. W. Jackson." In: Jackson 1932a, pp. 219–254.

Kósa G. 2010: "Translating a Vision – Rudimentary Notes on the Chinese Cosmology Painting." In: *Manichaean Studies Newsletter* 25 (2010–2011), pp. 20–32.

— 2012: "Buddhist and Pseudo-Buddhist Expressions in the Chinese Manichaean *Hymnscroll*." In: I. Bellér-Hann/Zs. Rajkai (eds.): *Frontiers and boundaries: Encounters on China's Margins.* Wiesbaden, pp. 49–69.

— 2014: "Translating the *Eikōn*. Some considerations on the relation of the Chinese Cosmology painting to the *Eikōn*." In: J. P. Laut/K. Röhrborn (eds.): *Vom Aramäischen zum Alttürkischen. Fragen zur Übersetzung von manichäischen Texten. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 29./30. September 2011.* Berlin/New York (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, N. F.), pp. 49–84.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Lieu, S.N.C. 1994: "An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism: The Capita VII Contra Manichaeos of 'Zacharias of Mitylene'." In: S.N.C. Lieu: *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East.* Leiden/New York/Köln (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 118), pp. 203–305.

Lindt, P. van 1992: *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: a Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental religions 26).

Ma Xiaohe 马小鹤 2010: "Monijiao shitian wang kao – Fujian Xiapu wenshu yanjiu 摩尼教十天王考 – 福建霞浦文书研究 [The King of the Ten Firmaments in Manichaeism – a Study of a Document from Xiapu (Fujian)]." In: *Xiyu wenshi* 西域文史 5, pp. 119–130.

— 2013: "Monijiao si tianwang kao – Fujian Xiapu wenshu yanjiu. 摩尼教四天王考 – 福建霞浦文书研究 [The four heavenly kings in Manichaeism – a study based on the documents from Xiapu, Fujian]." In: *Viae Sericae, Sici zhi lu – gudai zhongwai guanxi shi yanjiu* 絲瓷之路 – 古代中外關係史研究 III, pp. 122–155.

Provasi, E. 2007: "A Son of the Manichaean Living Spirit." In: M. Macuch/ M. Maggi/W. Sundermann (eds.): *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume.* Wiesbaden (Iranica 13), pp. 297–316.

Pulleyblank, E.G. 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin.* Vancouver.

Sundermann, W. 1979: "Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, pp. 95–133.

Wilkens, J. 2000: "Neue Fragmente aus Manis Gigantenbuch." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 150.1, pp. 133–176.

Yamada Toshiaki 2008: "Deities: The pantheon." In: F. Pregadio (ed.): *The Encyclopedia of Taoism.* Vol. 1. London/New York, pp. 61–63.

Yang Fuxue 杨富学 2011: "Leshantang shenji yu Fujian Monijiao – Xiapu yu Dunhuang, Tulufan deng Monijiao wenxian de bijiao yanjiu 《乐山堂神记》与福建摩尼教 – 霞浦与敦煌吐鲁番等摩尼教文献的比较研究 [The 'Spirit records of the Leshan Hall' and Manichaeism in Fujian – a comparative analysis of the Xiapu and the Dunhuang, Turfan (etc.) Manichaean documents]." In: *Wenshi* 文史 97 (2011.4), pp. 135–173.

Yoshida Yutaka 吉田豊 2010: "Shinshutsu Manikyō kaiga no keijijō 新出マニ教絵画の形而上 [The cosmogony (and church history) of the newly discovered Manichaean paintings]." In: *Yamato Bunka* 大和文華 121, pp. 1–34.

— 2011: "Kōnan no uchū zu to Torufan no Manikyō kaiga: 'Kyojin no sho' o megutte 江南の宇宙図とトルファンのマニ教絵画：『巨人の書』をめぐって [The Cosmology Painting from southeastern China and the Turfan Manichaean paintings: the Book of Giants]." (Talk at the "Symposium on the Newly Discovered Chinese Manichaean Paintings in Japan", Yamato Art Museum, Nara, 5–6 June 2011).

— 2012: "Mani no kōtan zu ni tsuite マニの降誕図について [On the 'Birth of Mānī' painting]." In: *Yamato Bunka* 大和文華 124, pp. 1–10.

— 2013: "Middle Iranian terms in the Xiapu Chinese texts." (Talk at the "8th International Conference of the International Association of Manichaean Studies", School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London, 9–13 September 2013).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2015: "Southern Chinese version of Mani's Picture Book discovered?" In: S. G. Richter/Ch. Horton/K. Ohlhafer (eds.): *Mani in Dublin. Selected Papers from the Seventh International Conference of the International Association of Manichaean Studies in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 8–12 September 2009*. Leiden, pp. 389–398.

Yuan Wenqi 元文琪 2011: "Fujian Xiapu Monijiao keyi dianji zhongda faxian lunzheng 福建霞浦摩尼教科仪典籍重大发现论证 [On a significant discovery of Manichaean ritual documents from Xiapu (Fujian)]." In: *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 2011.5, pp. 169–180.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Ein Riesenengel flog vom Himmel herab*

Claudia Leurini, Aarhus

Es war um ca. 220 n. Chr. als Hippolyt seinen Ἔλεγχος schrieb (oder vielmehr wurde ihm dieses Werk von den Wissenschaftlern im 19. Jahrhundert zugeschrieben):[1] Er besteht aus einer langen Folge von Beschreibungen von damals verbreiteten Häresien, oder besser religiöser Gruppen und ist zweifellos eine Kampfschrift, obwohl der Verfasser jene kaum als Häresien verstand, sondern mehr als Doktrinen, die mit der christlichen Religion eigentlich sehr wenig zu tun hatten und somit natürlich falsch waren. Tatsächlich hielt Hippolyt alle jene Häretiker für ἀθεοί:

> Wir wollen also die Gottlosigkeit der Häretiker in ihrer Denkart, ihrem Charakter und ihrer Handlungsweise aufzeigen, sowie die Quellen, aus denen sie ihre Erfindungen schöpften. Sie sind ans Erfinden gegangen ohne Anlehnung an die Hl. Schrift, und ohne sich auf einen Heiligen berufen zu können; ihre Lehren stammen aus der Griechenweisheit, aus philosophischen Anschauungen, aus Mysterien und aus der Irrwege gehenden Astrologie.[2]

Unter anderen werden im Ἔλεγχος auch die Elchasaiten dargestellt, und zu meinem Zweck ist der Bericht über ihren Offenbarungsmythos sehr interessant.[3] Hippolyts Darstellung dazu ist irgendwie dunkel. Aus dem Text geht nicht klar hervor, ob Elchasai selbst die Offenbarung in einem *Seres* genannten Ort in

* Dieser Artikel wurde innerhalb des Projektes *Biblia Manichaica* von der Universität Aarhus, unterstützt von dem „Danish Council for Independent Research" verfasst. Ich danke Prof. Nils Arne Pedersen, meinem Projektleiter, Prof. Elio Provasi, und Prof. Ela Filippone für ihre Bereitschaft, mit mir den Gegenstand dieses Beitrages zu diskutieren, und für ihre wertvollen Ratschläge.

1 Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος ist der eigentliche Titel der weltbekannten *Refutatio omnium haeresium* (Castelli 2012, S. 29); cf. Scholten 1997. Ein aus dem 14. Jahrhundert stammender und die Kapitel IV–X der *Refutatio* enthaltender Kodex auf Griechisch wurde 1842 im Kloster am Berg Athos entdeckt, und erstmals von Miller (1851) irrtümlich als Werk Origenes veröffentlicht. Aber schon 1859 erkannten Duncker und Schneidewin Hippolyt die Autorenschaft des Werkes in einer neuen Edition zu. Hier wird die Übersetzung von Preysing (1922) verwendet. Über die Identität des Verfassers besteht eine langjährige wissenschaftliche Auseinandersetzung, vgl. Amore 1954; Frickel 1988; Simonetti 2000, S. 70–139, 2011; Aragione 2011; Castelli 2012, S. 34–46, alle mit detaillierter Literatur.

2 *Ref.* 1.2 (Preysing 1922, S. 17).

3 Luttikhuizen 1985 (mit Literatur) und 1987. Cf. Cirillo 1984; Stanley Jones 1987; Merkelbach 1988; siehe auch Pedersen 2013, S. 190.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Parthien erhielt, oder ob er das die Offenbarung enthaltende Buch von einem vermutlich orientalischen bzw. chinesischen Volk im Ostiran übernahm.[4] Diese Auskunft, die uns jedoch Epiphanius nicht mitteilt, will entweder betonen, dass diese Doktrin aus dem Osten stammt, oder vielleicht auch, dass es Alcibiades von Apamaea, Nachfolger des Elchasai in Rom, war, der diese Vorstellung vermitteln wollte.[5] Das Ziel von Hippolyt ist es, einen unchristlichen Ursprung zu bestätigen (möglichst aus polemischen Gründen), wie es in der Einführung seines Werkes offen erklärt wird. Wie es auch sein mag, Hippolyt erzählt in Bezug auf Elchasais Buch von einem Riesenengel:

> Das Buch sei von einem Engel inspiriert, dessen Höhe 24 Schönen = 96 Meilen, dessen Breite 4 Schönen beträgt und der von Schulter zu Schulter 6 Schönen mißt. Seine Fußlänge betrage 3½ Schönen, was 14 Meilen gleichkommt, die Breite 1½ Schönen, die Höhe ½. Es befinde sich bei ihm auch ein weibliches Wesen, dessen Maße mit den obengenannten übereinstimmten; das männliche Wesen sei Gottes Sohn, das weibliche werde Heiliger Geist genannt.[6]

Eine damit übereinstimmende Beschreibung des Offenbarungsengels steht auch in Epiphanius:[7]

> Then he describes Christ as a kind of power, and even gives his dimensions – his length of 24 schoena, or 96 miles, and his width of twenty-four miles, or six schoena, and similar prodigies about his thickness and feet, and the other stories. (2) And the Holy Spirit – a feminine one at that – is like Christ too.[8]

Die von Hippolyt und Epiphanius mitgeteilten Maße des Offenbarungswesens sind hyperbolisch, wahrscheinlich mit kosmologischen Nummern zu verbinden. Dieselben Maße weist Epiphanius auch dem Christus der Ebioniten zu, der eigentlich aus Elchasais Lehre stammt.[9] Jedoch sind riesengroße Boten schon in der babylonischen Überlieferung bekannt:

4 Siehe Hilgenfeld 1881, S. 232; Schwartz 1932, S. 195; "Serre" in *Pauly-Wissowa*, II, col. 1744; Reininck 1975.

5 Kessler 1889, S. 56f.; Brandt 1921, S. 10f.; Festugière 1950, S. 19; Strecker 1979; Georgi 1964; Speyer 1970, S. 36f. und 123; Reininck 1975, S. 84, Fn. 22.

6 *Ref.* 9.13.2–3 (Preysing 1922, S. 252).

7 „After an analysis of Hippolytus account we reached the conclusion that Hippolytus has not read the book itself (i.e. the Book of Revelation). His knowledge of this writing rests mainly on a document designated by him τὰ αὐτοῦ ἔγγραφα ‚his (i.e. Alcibiades') written words'. In this document … several passages of the book were quoted or referred to … As far as our second major source is concerned, we could not answer the question whether Epiphanius has read a copy of the book or whether he owes his information to an intermediate source … In other words, Epiphanius' source was either the book itself or a collection of excerpts from the book" (Luttikhuizen 1985, S. 190; Pourkier 1992, S. 74–75).

8 *Pan.* 19.4.1; GCS 221.6–12 4; Williams 2008, S. 50–51.

9 *Pan.* 30.17.5–6; Williams 2008, S. 145. Über die Sekten, die sich an Elchasai anknüpften, siehe Merkelbach 1988, S. 107–110.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> Ein Traum am Morgen, ersch[eint zweimal ?] in gleicher Weise (?): Ein Mann, dessen Bau übergewaltig, mit riesigen Gliedern …[10]

Ich verzichte hier auf die Erwähnung von riesigen Göttlichkeiten aus der griechisch-römischen Tradition,[11] möchte aber *Poimandres* 1, 1–2 einführen, wo erzählt wird, dass ein gigantisches Wesen erschien, und sich als Nous vorstellte.[12] So etwas ähnliches kommt auch in dem jüdischen Enochbuch vor, als Selbstbeschreibung des Engelprinzen Metatrons mit der Darstellung seiner kosmischen Ausmaße.[13] Daraus schließt sich, dass der Gigantismus der himmlischen Wesen eine in verschiedenen Regionen und Zeitaltern verbreitete Vorstellung darstellte.

Zwei Merkmale dieser Geister stehen im Vordergrund: Auf der einen Seite sind der Engel und der ihn begleitende Heilige Geist nicht menschlich, und sie sind viel größer als normale Menschen.[14] Auf der anderen Seite setzt sie ihre Größe in unmittelbare Verbindung zum Himmel, woher sie auch stammen.

Der Offenbarer ist also nun in Hippolyt ein Engel, ein Bote, der einen Titel trägt, der dem jüdischen Messias eigen ist: Gottes Sohn.[15] Zusätzlich wird er auch als ‚Großer König' bezeichnet:

> So soll er (der Sünder), sobald er von diesem Buch gehört, sich ein zweites Mal taufen lassen im Namen des großen und höchsten Gottes und im Namen seines Sohnes, des großen Königs.[16]

Im *Panarion* ist das Offenbarungswesen sowohl „Christus" als auch δύναμις genannt. Es besteht eine enge Verbindung zwischen dem Engel in Hippolyt und dem Messias in Epiphanius, und sie ist klar und unumstritten, weil beide als Könige dargestellt werden:

10 Tafel 3, 8–10 in Grassmann 1926, S. 277.
11 Zum Beispiel Iris in *Ilias* 4, 442; Kall. *Hymn.* 6, 58; Tac. *Ann.* XI, 21.
12 Nock/Festugière 1960, Traktat 1; Reitzenstein 1904, S. 12. Siehe Iambl. *Myst.* II, 4.
13 III *Enoch* IX, Odeberg 1928, S. 14–15, 25–26. Schäfer 1981, § 12; Knibb 2010, S. 86. Auch im Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1381 wird eine mirakelhafte Erholung einem von ‚mehr als menschlichen Maßen' begabten Wesen, Asclepius, zugeschrieben. Siehe Speyer 1970, S. 37, Fn. 21.
14 In der iranischen, schon sowohl seleukidischen bzw. parthischen als auch später sasanidischen künstlerischen Überlieferung kennzeichneten Götter und Könige außerordentliche Ausmaße. Als Beispiele seien genannt die Riesenstatuen von Antiochus von Kommagene und die mit ihm abgebildeten Götterbilder von Nimrud-Dagh oder auch u. a. die Statue von Šabūhr I. in seiner Grabstätte. Das könnte auch als mögliche Verbindung angesehen werden zwischen der Offenbarung des Elchasai und dem iranischen Milieu, wie es Hippolyt behauptet.
15 Aus einer umfangreichen Literatur werden hier nur folgenden Werke erwähnt: Yarbro Collins/Collins 2008; Collins 1993 und 1995; Dunn 1997; Fitzmyer 2007; Horbury 1998; Mowinckel 1956.
16 *Ref.* 9.15.1 (Preysing 1922, S. 253).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> In turn, moreover, he supposedly confesses Christ by name when he says 'Christ is the great king'.[17]

Das Königtum von himmlischen Wesen ist mit der Funktion des eschatologischen Weltretters eng verbunden, was eigentlich schon in den hellenistisch-iranischen Hystaspen-Orakeln klar dargestellt wird.[18]

Dem *Panarion* nach hat der Christus der Elchasaiten anschaulich kaum mit dem christlichen Jesu zu tun:

> But from the deceitful, false composition of the book of his foolishness, I am not quite sure whether he taught this of our Lord Jesus Christ. For he does not specify this either, but simply says 'Christ', as though – from what I can gather – he means someone else, or is awaiting someone else.[19]

Eine solche Äußerung muss mit einem weiteren Abschnitt in Epiphanius selbst in Verbindung gesetzt werden:

> This, then, is the sect of those Ossenes, which lives the Jewish life in Sabbath observance, circumcision, and the keeping of the whole Law.[20]

Deutlich wird, dass Epiphanius wie auch Hippolyt diese Sekte als jüdisch und nicht als christlich verstand:

> Er wirft die Befolgung des Gesetzes als Köder aus und behauptet, es müssen sich die Neuchristen beschneiden lassen und nach dem Gesetze leben.[21]

Dem Alten Testament nach war ein jüdischer Messias[22] tatsächlich ein Mensch, ein von Gott gewählter Mann, der seine Position entweder als Priester in der Linie von Aaron oder als König in der Linie von David einnahm. Die Wahl Gottes äußerte sich durch die Salbung des Auserwählten, und der Messias, der Gesalbte,

17 *Pan*. 19.3.4; GCS 220.8–13; Williams 2008.

18 Lact. VII, 17, wo ein von Himmel kommender Prophet einem König, der sich lügnerisch als Gottessohn vorgestellt habe, aber ein Sohn des Teufels gewesen sei, gegenübergestellt wird. Was die Hystaspes-Orakeln betrifft, handelt es sich um apokalyptische Texte, die einen östlichen bzw. iranischen Hintergrund für sich in Anspruch nehmen wollen. Tatsächlich wurden sie in hellenistischer Zeit (2.–1. Jh. v. Chr.) im nahen Osten niedergeschrieben und nahmen iranisch-apokalyptische Motive auf, die dann mit dem Namen des zoroastrischen Königs Hystaspes in Verbindung gesetzt wurden, so dass sie nach alter Weisheit klangen. Sie verbreiteten sich nach Westen und wurden schnell akzeptiert, gerade weil sie den Apokalypsen iranischer Herkunft einen hellenistischen Hintergrund gaben. Sie beeinflussten sowohl die jüdischen als auch die jüdisch-christlichen Apokalypsen. Die Literatur über die Hystaspes-Orakel ist sehr zahlreich. Ich beziehe mich hier der Kürze halber auf den Beitrag von Sundermann 2004.

19 *Pan*. 19.3.4 *supra*.

20 *Pan*. 19.5.1; GCS 222.14–16; Williams 2008.

21 *Ref*. 9.14.1 (Preysing 1922, S. 252). Auf die Diskussion, ob die Elchasaiten und die ihnen ähnlichen Sekten Juden-Christen waren oder nicht möchte ich hier aus Platzgründen verzichten.

22 Yarbro Collins/Collins 2008, Fitzmeyr 2007, Horbury 1998, Mowinckel 1956.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

wurde dann mit Gottes Geist erfüllt. Dieser Begriff erlebte eine Weiterentwicklung nach der babylonischen Gefangenschaft und später in hellenistischer Zeit, als die Juden auf einen befreienden davidischen König verzichten mussten. Damals entwickelte sich die Gestalt des ‚Erwarteten Königs', der in der Zukunft aus dem Himmel kommen würde und sich mit menschlicher Gestalt sichtbar (‚so wie ein Menschenkind') machen würde. Deswegen kennzeichneten diesen ‚Erwarteten König' Präexistenz und Engelförmigkeit.[23] Er war ein Kind Gottes, wurde aber nie Messias genannt. Im Enochbuch verschmolzen die Kennzeichen des ‚Gesalbten' des Alten Testaments mit denen des ‚Erwarteten Königs'.[24] Der ‚Erwartete König' wurde zugleich zum Gesalbten, und der daraus entstandene Messias war nun kein Mensch mehr, sondern eher ein himmlischer König, ein Sohn Gottes, dennoch sowohl in Menschen- als auch in Engelsgestalt sichtbar.[25] Das alles ist später teilweise auch im Neuen Testament, bzw. in der Johannes-Offenbarung und auch in Paulus' Briefen zu erkennen.

Daraus kann man schließen, dass sich dieser Messias der Elchasaiten sowohl von dem rein Jüdischen als auch teilweise vom Christlichen vor allem wegen eines weiteren Merkmals entfernt: Er stellt eine zyklisch wandernde göttliche Epiphanie dar, die in verschiedenen Personen Mensch wird:

> But they do not confess that Christ is one, but that there is one on high, and that he is transferred into many bodies many times, and now in Jesus. Likewise (they confess) … that he is since then continuously transferred into bodies, and that he appears in many at different times.[26]

Es sei mir nun erlaubt, die Aufmerksamkeit erneut auf zwei bestimmte Kennzeichen des elchasaitischen Christus zu lenken: seine präexistente Engelförmigkeit und seine Ausmaße. Zwei Abschnitte aus zwei mitteliranischen manichäischen Fragmenten von Manis Psalmen dienen dazu, wichtige Parallelen zwischen der elchasaitischen und der manichäischen Tradition hervorzuheben. Das erste ist das mittelpersische Fragment M 842/r/1–2:

> dryst wys'y bšnywm wzrg „Welcome, my great height!"[27]

Dieser Text wird mit dem parthischen Fragment M 215/r/10–11 verbunden, in dem aber ‚Statur' bzw. ‚height' mit ‚Körper, body' ersetzt wird:

> [drwd] 'br tw mn tn wzrg „Welcome to you, my great body."[28]

23 Carrell 1997, Colpe 1972, Gieschen 1998, Hannah 1999.
24 VanderKam 1992.
25 Für normale Menschen ist er nach der Ebioniten/Elkhasaiten Offenbarung jedoch unsichtbar. (*Pan*. 30.17.6; Williams 2008).
26 *Ref*. 10.29.2–3 (Preysing 1922, S. 282). Auch *Pan*. 53.1.8; GCS 2.315.25–316.7; Williams 2008. Über dieses Kennzeichen des Elchasaitischen Messias siehe auch Cirillo 2005, S. 47ff.
27 Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, S. 95; Henning 1958, S. 103: „Sei mir gegrüßt, meine große Statur".
28 Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, S. 95, §§323a und 323b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mp. *bašn* bedeutet außer „Statur", „Spitze" und „Gipfel (von Bergen)"[29], auch „Baumwedel" und „Mähne"[30], aber *bašnāy* bedeutet eigentlich „Statur, Höhe"[31]. Die einfache Gleichung zwischen prth. *tan* und mp. *bašnāy* kann vielleicht ein wenig erweitert werden, zumindest in einem manichäischen Kontext.

Das Lexem *tan* „Körper" gibt es auch im Mittelpersischen. Es stellt sich die Frage, warum der Verfasser des mp. Textes dann *bašnāy* gewählt hat, was der parthische Dolmetscher nicht verwendete. Außerdem wird *bašnāy* von *wuzurg* begleitet, was überflüssig scheint, weil dieses Wort in sich selbst schon eine mit körperlicher Höhe verbundene Vorstellung enthält. Um eine Antwort darauf vorzuschlagen, ist es nun Zeit sich mit der Offenbarung Manis auseinander zu setzen. Mani erzählt im *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* sein eigenes Offenbarungserlebnis:

> Zu dem Zeitpunkt also, als mein Leib die Vollendung ganz erreicht hatte, flog sofort jenes sehr hohe, sehr schöne Spiegel(bild) meiner Person herab und erschien vor mir …[32]

Man kann vermuten, dass Mani die Offenbarungsgeschichte des Elchasai kannte und für sich in Anspruch nahm, einfach auch deswegen weil im *CMC* und im *Fihrist* bezeugt ist, dass Mani in einer elchasaitischen Gemeinschaft aufgewachsen ist, die Elchasai als Begründer anerkannte.[33] Manis Geist und Zwilling ist

29 Ind. Bd. 10, Ir. Bd. 9.38; erwähnt von Filippone 2015, S. 336 mit Literatur. *Bašn* ist in der Pahlavi Literatur bezeugt, aber sehr selten und in unsicherer Weise in den mittelpersischen manichäischen Texten. Das einzig sichere Zeugnis befindet sich im Fragment MIK III 7285/v/ii/6 (Gulácsi 2001, S. 122–123), wo dieses Wort in einer Art Liste vorkommt. In der vorangehenden Zeile steht ⟨bwrzyy⟩ „Höhe". Ihm folgt ⟨tnw'r⟩ „Körper" auf der nächsten Zeile. Das ist eine sehr interessante Folge, die aber nicht zur Erklärung beiträgt. Der Beleg in M 725/v/i/4 ist leider kontextlos. Außerdem könnte man vermuten, dass es sich vielleicht eher um ⟨bšn(y?)⟩ handelt, weil der letzte erhaltene Buchstabe kein End-n ist und eine Spur eines weiteren Buchstabens einleitet, der möglicherweise auch ein ⟨y⟩ sein könnte. Die Lücke erlaubt es nicht festzustellen, was es eigentlich ist. Mit Sicherheit aber nicht ⟨bšn⟩. (Provasis persönliche Mitteilung, wofür ich ihm dankbar bin.)

30 MacKenzie 1971. Über die Bedeutung „Mähne" besteht es keine Einigkeit, Shaki 1975 widerspricht dieser Stellungnahme. Siehe Diskussion in Filippone 2015, S. 337–338.

31 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, S. 11.

32 Vergleiche Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοίνυν καθ'ὃν συνεπεράνθη μου τὸ σῶμα ἐν τέλει, παραχρῆμα καταπτὰς ὤφθη ἔμπροσθέν μου ἐκεῖνο τὸ εὐειδέστατον καὶ μέγιστον κάτοπτρον τ[οῦ προσώ] που μ[ου….. „Zu dem Zeitpunkt also, als mein Leib die Vollendung ganz erreicht hatte, flog sofort jenes höchst wohlgestaltete und machtvolle Spiegelbild [meiner Gestalt] herab und erschien vor mir …" (Koenen/Römer 1988, S. 10–11). Ich denke, dass sowohl μέγιστον als auch εὐειδέστατον als Attribute mit κάτοπτρον zu verbinden sind. Somit schlage ich eine etwas abweichende Übersetzung vor.

33 *CMC* 94.9; *Fihrist* (Dodge 1970, S. 774 und 811). Der Name ⟨'lxs'⟩ kommt auch im parthischen Fragment M 1344/v/3 vor, ist aber leider kontextlos (Sundermann 1981, S. 19 (26)). Luttikhuizen (1985, S. 182–188) versteht „Elchasai" als den Namen des Riesenengels auf Grund der Etymologie des Wortes, „verborgene Kraft", und daraus als Titel des vom Himmel herabgefallenen Buches seiner Veröffentlichung. Dass Hippolyt, Al-Nadīm und der *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* ihn für den Lehrer und Begründer

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dem *CMC* Text nach sehr hoch, und in dieser Hinsicht dem Engel von Elchasai ähnlich. Die folgenden Verse aus dem oben genannten mittelpersischen Text M 842 und seiner parthischen Version M 215 unterstützen dies:

M 842/r/13–15 (mp.)
dryst (w)ys'y / [py](d) r(w)šn 'wd ywjdhr º / [nrjm](g) wzrg
„Welcome, light and holy father, great twin."[34]

M 215/v/1 (prth.)
[pw']](g) ºº ymgwm wzrg
„My great twin"[35]

Eine solche Tradition wird auch in einem anderen mittelpersischen Fragment bewahrt:

M 394/2.S./9–10/
'md 'c b'ryst p[rystg] wzrg
„Es kam aus dem Paradies der große [Apostel]"[36]

Anschaulich ist die im *CMC* enthaltene Geschichte der Offenbarung auch in Manis Psalmen zu lesen. Deutlich hervorgehoben sind die Ausmaße dieser göttlichen Wesen. Dafür findet man in den manichäischen Texten einen weiteren Beleg, der vielleicht noch bedeutender ist:

M 413 + M 2086/A/1–6
'w(t̲) [fry]štg'n{?} ky 'wwd / pd'xš'(h)[ynd 'b](j)yrw'ng 'hynd cy / [····](.r º) [···· ···· ····] _____º / [···· ···· ····](b)wyd pd bšn'n / [···· ···· ···· frsn](g){?} º 'wt̲ pt̲ / [···· ···· ····](d) frsng
„Und die Engel, die dort herrschen; sie sind Jünger von … der Statur nach … Parasange und … nach … Parasange."[37]

Wäre auch „Höhe" eine mögliche Übersetzung für *bašnān*, halte ich für sehr interessant, dass in diesem Zusammenhang „Engel", „Statur" und „Parasange" als Längenmaß zusammen vorkommen, was uns zurück zu den Texten des Hippolyt und des Epiphanius führt. Das ist aber in der iranischen Überlieferung nicht so ungewöhnlich, wie es im *Draxt ī asūrīg* 22–23[38] auch vorkommt, wo

hielten, käme seiner Meinung nach aus einem Missverständnis. Vergleiche Cirillo 1984, S. 52ff., der Elchasai als Begründer der Elchasaiten versteht; Merkelbach (1988, S. 106–107) billigt die Ansicht Luttikhuizens nicht und stimmt mit Cirillo überein; s.a. Stanley Jones 1987 und Pedersen 2013, S. 190.

34 Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, S. 97, § 330a.

35 Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, S. 97, § 330b.

36 Reck 2004, S. 153–154.

37 Colditz 1987, S. 298. Elio Provasi hat meine Aufmerksamkeit auf diesen Abschnitt gelenkt.

38 Über die sehr komplizierte Überlieferung dieses ursprünglich vielleicht auf Parthisch in Nordwest-Iran verfassten Werkes, siehe z.B. Boyce 1968, S. 55, Fn. 2; Shaki 1975 und Cereti 2001, S. 186.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

eine Ziege eine Palme anredet und meint ihre Statur, *bašn*, sei so hoch, dass sie derjenigen der Dämonen gleicht.[39] So wird der Begriff „Höhe/Statur" nochmals mit überirdischen Wesen in Verbindung gebracht.

Die manichäische Tradition trägt nochmals dazu bei, gerade wo die Erzählung der endlichen Erlösung des Lichtes ganz ähnlich lautet:

M 2/II/v/i/17–19
[ʾ]wṯ ʿsṯwmynyc yzd pṯ bšnʾn hynzʾwrystr ʾwyš(ṯ)ʾd °
„e quando l'Ultimo Dio si erge con forza piena in (tutta) la (sua) statura."[40]

Der Letzte Gott, das vollständig befreite Licht, steht in voller Kraft in seinem Körper bzw. in seiner Statur da. „Körper" kann sicher als Bezeichnung der menschlichen Gestalt Gottes angenommen werden, aber das halte ich für zu allgemein. Jener Gott erhebt sich hoch und widerspiegelt den früher erwähnten Offenbarer als zwei Seiten derselben Medaille, bzw. der Anfang und das Ende des Erlösungsprozesses. Ich denke, dass unter diesen Umständen folgendes betrachtet werden soll: die hoch reichende Vertikalität, die als roter Faden den semantischen Hintergrund von *bašn*, *bašnāy* und *bašnān* kennzeichnet,[41] die Vertikalität von Menschen, Bäumen und Bergen und die Höhe der überirdischen Wesen auch dazu. Deswegen ist in diesen speziellen Fällen die Verwendung von „Statur" und „Höhe" berechtigt und angemessener als ein mehr generelles Lexem wie z. B. „Körper".

Die Übereinstimmung von M 842/M 215 mit dem Inhalt des *CMC* leitet zur Schlussfolgerung, dass in diesem bestimmten Fall Jesus als Adressat des Willkommens zu verstehen ist. Das kann dadurch bestätigt werden, dass der Titel von M 842 den Namen Jesu beinhaltet. Ist er der Adressat des Gebets, dann darf man behaupten, er sei mit einer großen bzw. sehr hohen Statur ausgestattet, genau wie der Engel in Hippolyt und der Christus in Epiphanius.

Die Wahl von prth. *tan* in M 215 verzichtet auf die Wiederholung des Begriffes „Höhe", der sowohl in *wuzurg* als auch in *bašnān* enthalten ist. Der Verfasser beschränkt sich auf die Tatsache, dass jener Körper groß ist, dass es sich um ein großes „Selbst" handelt. Da die Anrede in diesen Fragmenten aus den Psalmen in der 1. Pers. Sing. ausgedrückt wird, kann man daraus schließen, dass der Absender der Begrüßung und des Willkommens Mani selbst sein könnte, der als Verfasser des mittelpersischen Textes anzunehmen ist. Dieser Text wurde dann fast wortgetreu ins Parthische übersetzt.

39 Diskussion in Filippone 2015, S. 337–338.

40 „Und wenn der Letzte Gott mit vollster Kraft in seinen Gliedern dasteht" (Andreas/Henning 1934, S. 852). Genauso Klimkeit 1993, S. 255. Ich ziehe die Übersetzung von Provasi (2008, S. 192) vor, der statt „Glieder" (*bašnān* wurde von Andreas/Henning als Plural verstanden) „Statur" gewählt hat. Cf. Filippone 2015, S. 342. Siehe auch Stroumsa 1981, S. 176ff.

41 Siehe auch Filippone 2015, S. 337–338.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Somit wird es deutlich, dass der riesengroße Offenbarungsbote, der Messias des Elchasai, neues Leben in der manichäischen Tradition fand, und zwar so sehr, dass auch seine Verwandlungsfähigkeit mit übernommen wurde. Nach Manis Tod verstand ihn tatsächlich die manichäische Gemeinschaft als Nachfolger Jesu und neue Erscheinung des Messias. Also wurden auch für ihn anschaulich die Merkmale des großen Engels übernommen, wie es dann auch für den Letzten Gott am Ende der Zeit sein wird:

> M 749/r/7–10
> ʾz(d)[ygr ʾgd ʾ] (c) wzrg / šh[rdʾryf](t) ʾmʾẖ / pydr mry mʾnyy / ʾfrynʾm wzrgyft
> „Der Bote ist gekommen, vom großen Kö[nigreich], unser Vater, Mar Mani, lasst uns die Größe preisen.“[42]

Im Andenken an einen Riesengeist: Werner Sundermann.

Abkürzungen

BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
Iambl. *Myst.*	Iamblichos, *De mysteriis*
Ind. Bd.	Indian *Bundahišn*
Ir. Bd.	Iranian *Bundahišn*
Kall. *Hymnus*	Kallimachos, *Hymni*
Lact.	Lactantius
mp.	Mittelpersisch
Pan.	Epiphanius, *Panarion*
prth.	Parthisch
Pauly-Wissowa	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
Ref.	Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*
Tac. *Ann.*	Tacitus, *Annales (ab excessu divi Augusti)*
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Literatur

Amore, A. 1954: „Note su S. Ippolito martire.“ In: *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 30, S. 63–97.

Andreas F.C./W.B. Henning 1934: „Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III.“ In: *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1934, S. 846–912.

Aragione, G. 2011: „Bibliographie sur l’Elenchos et la question de l’auteur (1940–2010).“ In: Aragione/G.-E. Norelli 2011, S. 315–324.

42 Reck 2004, S. 156.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Aragione, G./G.-E. Norelli (Hrsg.) 2011: *Des évêques, des écoles et des hérétiques. Actes du Colloque International sur la „Réfutation de toutes les hérésies", Genève, 13–14 juin 2008*. Prahins.

Boyce, M. 1954: *Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian*. London (London Oriental series 3).

Brandt, A.J.H.W. 1889: *Die mandäische Religion. Eine Erforschung der Religion der Mandäer, in theologischer, religiöser, philosophischer und kultureller Hinsicht dargestellt.* Leipzig [Neudruck Amsterdam 1973].

Carrell, P.R. 1997: *Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. Cambridge (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph series 95).

Castelli, E. 2012: „L'*Elenchos,* ovvero una ‚biblioteca' contro le eresie." In: C. Magris (Hrsg.): *'Ippolito'. Confutazione di tutte le eresie*. Brescia (Letteratura Cristiana Antica, Nuova serie 25), S. 21–56.

Cereti, C.G. 2001: *La letteratura pahlavi*. Milano.

Cirillo, L. 1984: *Elchasai e gli Elchasaiti*. Cosenza.

— 2005: „From the Elchasaite Christology to the Manichaean Apostle of Light." In: A. van Tongerloo/L. Cirillo (Hrsg.): *Il Manicheismo: Nuove prospettive della ricerca. Atti del Quinto congresso internazionale di studi sul manichesimo, Napoli, 2–8 settembre 2001*. Turnhout (Manichaean Studies 5), S. 47–55.

Colditz, I. 1987: „Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen." In: Altorientalische Forschungen 14 (2), S. 274–313.

Collins, J.J. 1993: „The ‚Son of God' Text from Qumran." In: M.C. de Boer (Hrsg.): *From Jesus to John. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Sheffield, S. 65–82.

— 1995: *The Scepter and the Star. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature*. New York.

Colpe, C. 1972: „ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." In: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8, S. 419–420.

Cruice, P. 1860: *Philosophumena sive haeresium omnium confutatio opus Origeni adscriptum e codice Parisino productum recensuit*. Paris [engl. Übers. F. Legge, London 1921].

Dunn, J.D.G. 1997: „‚Son of God' and ‚Son of Man' in the Dead Sea Scrolls? A Response to John Collins on 4 Q246." In: S.E. Porter/C.A. Evans (Hrsg.): *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Sheffield, S. 198–210.

Dodge, B. 1970: *The Fihrist of al-Nadim. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. 2 vols. New York/London.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Part 1 of *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*, hrsg. von N. Sims-Williams). Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia).

Durkin-Meisterernst, D./E. Morano 2010: *Mani's Psalms. Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian Texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (BTT 27).

Duncker, L./F.G. Schneidewin 1859: *Refutationis omnium haeresium librorum decem quae supersunt latine verterunt, notas adiecerunt*. Göttingen.

Festugière, A.-J. 1950: *La révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste*. Bd. I: *L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*. Paris.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fitzmyer, J. A. 2007: *The One Who Is to Come*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge.
Filippone, E. 2015: „Kurdish *bažn*, Persian *bašn* and Other Iranian Cognates." In: U. Bläsing/V. Arakelova/M. Weinreich (Hrsg.): *Studies on Iran and the Caucasus: In Honour of Garnik Asatrian*. Leiden, S. 325–350.
Frickel, J. 1988: *Das Dunkel um Hippolyt von Rom. Ein Lösungsversuch: Die Schriften* Elenchos *und* Contra Noetum. Graz.
Georgi, D. 1964: *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*. Neukirchen.
Gieschen, C. A. 1998: *Angelomorphic Christology*. Leiden.
Grassmann, H. 1926: *Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament*. Berlin.
Gulácsi, Zs. 2001: *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections: A Comprehensive Catalogue*. Turnhout (CFM, Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1).
Hannah, D. D. 1999: *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. Tübingen.
Hilgenfeld, A. 1881: „Elxai libri fragmenta." In: *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum. III: Hermae Pastor Graece*. Leipzig, S. 220–240.
Henning, W. B. 1958: „Mitteliranisch." In: *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. Bd. 4, 1. Abt.: *Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, Iranistik: Linguistik*. Leiden, S. 20–130.
Horbury, W. 1998: *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London.
Kessler, K. 1889: *Mani. Forschungen über die manichäische Religion.* Berlin.
Klimkeit, H.-J. 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco.
Knibb, M. 2010: *The Books of Enoch*. [e-book].
Koenen, L./C. Römer 1988: *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes. Kritische Edition*. Opladen (Papyrologia Coloniensia 14).
Luttikhuizen, G. P. 1985: *The Revelation of Elchasai. Investigations into the Evidence for a Mesopotamian Jewish Apocalypse of the Second Century and Its Reception by Judeo-Christian Propagandists*. Tübingen (TSAJ 8).
— 1987: „The Book of Elchasai. A Jewish Apokalypse." In: *Aula Orientalis* 5, S. 101–106.
MacKenzie, D. N. 1971: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London.
Merkelbach, R. 1988: „Die Täufer, bei denen Mani aufwuchs." In: P. Bryder (Hrsg.): *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*. Lund, S. 105–134.
Miller, E. 1851: *Origenis Philosophumena sive omnium haeresium refutatio e codice Parisino nunc primum edidit.* Oxonii.
Mowinckel, S. 1956: *He that Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. Oxford.
Nock, A. D./A. J. Festugière 1960: *Corpus hermeticum*. Vol. I: *Pimander*. Paris.
Odeberg, H. 1928: *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Cambridge.
Pedersen, N. A. 2013: *Manichaean Texts in Syriac*. Turnhout (CFM, Series Syriaca 1).
Preysing, K. 1922: *Des heiligen Hippolytus von Rom Widerlegung aller Häresien.* München/Kempten (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter II, Bd. 40).
Provasi, E. 2008: „Testi medio-iranici III." In: Gh. Gnoli (Hrsg.): *Il Manicheismo.* Vol. III: *Il mito e la dottrina. Testi manichei dell'Asia Centrale e della Cina*. Milano, S. 109–225.
Pourkier, A. 1992: *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine*. Paris.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags- Montags und Bemahymnen.* Turnhout (BTT 22).

Reininck, G.J. 1975: „Das Land ‚Seiris' (Sir) und das Volk der Serer." In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 6, S. 72–85.

Reitzenstein, R. 1904: *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur.* Leipzig.

Schäfer, P. 1981: *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur.* Tübingen (TSAJ 2).

Scholten, A. 1997: „Der Titel von Hippolits Refutatio." In: *Studia Patristica* 26, S. 343–348.

Schwartz, E. 1932: „Unzeitgemäße Beobachtungen zu den Clementinen." In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32, S. 151–199.

Shaki, M. 1975: „Observations on the Draxt ī asūrīg." In: *Archív Orientální* 43, S. 64–75.

Simonetti, M. 2000: *Contro Noeto*. Bologna.

— 2011: „Per un profilo dell'autore dell'*Elenchos*." In: Aragione/Norelli 2011, S. 233–255.

Speyer, W. 1970: *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike*. Göttingen.

Strecker, G. 1959: „Elkesai." In: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* IV, Kol. 1171–1186.

Stanley Jones, F. 1987: Rez. von Luttikhuizen 1985. In: *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 30, S. 200–209.

Stroumsa, G. 1981: „Aspects de l'eschatologie manichéenne." In: *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 198/2, S. 163–181.

Sundermann, W. 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin (BTT 11).

— 2004: „Hystaspes, Oracles of." In: *Encyclopaedia Iranica* XII, Fasz. 6, S. 606–609.

VanderKam, J.C. 1992: „Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71." In: J.H. Charlesworth (Hrsg.): *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis, S. 169–191.

Wendland, P. 1916: *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Leipzig [Neudruck Hildesheim/New York 1977].

Williams, F. 2008: *The* Panarion *of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book I (Sects 1–46)*. Second Edition, Revised and Expanded. Leiden/Boston.

Yarbro Collins A./J.J. Collins 2008: *King and Messiah as Son of God*. Oxford.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

West of Parthia – Han China's Knowledge of the Graeco-Roman East*

Samuel N. C. Lieu, Sydney and Cambridge

Background

The Han Dynasty is vital to the self-definition of the vast majority of the present day population of China. The term 'Han-ren' 漢人 (lit. "people of Han") is commonly used to designate people of Chinese origin who are not members of an ethnic minority. However, few neighbouring countries to the West of Han China seem not to have paid much attention to the Han 'name-tag' during and after the Han Dynasty despite the rapid growth of the influence of China in Central and West Asia under the Han and the dynasty's relative longevity. In contemporary Central Asian sources, it was Qin 秦, the dynastic predecessor of the Han, which won the 'name-tag' race. One of the best examples of this preference for Qin over Han and one which has a direct impact on the name of 'China' in Western languages, can be seen in the Sogdian Ancient Letters. These were found in 1907 by Aurel Stein in a Chinese watch-tower just west of the Jade Gate (*yumen* 玉門), a fortified outpost guarding the western approaches to Dunhuang 燉煌.[1] They consisted of a small dossier of five well-preserved and some other fragmentary letters written to friends and relatives at Loulan 樓蘭 (Sogd. *kr'wr'n*)[2] and Samarkand, by Sogdian merchants who traded along the land-routes between Loulan and a number of key Chinese cities such as Dunhuang (Sogd. *drw''n*),[3] Luoyang 洛陽 (Sogd. *srγ*),[4] Chang'an 長安

* The author is grateful to the Australian Research Council and the Chiang Ching Kuo Foundation for financial support for the research for this article undertaken in Tianjin, Beijing, London and Cambridge.

1 The standard edition of all five letters remains Reichelt 1928–1931, II, pp. 1–35. New editions of the letters are currently being published by N. Sims-Williams (see below). Colour photographs of the manuscript of Letter II can be found in Juliano/Lerner 2001, pp. 47–48. Digital images of the letters are available on the site of the International Dunhuang Project.

2 On Loulan see Enoki 1963.

3 *Anc. Lett.* II.23, see Sims-Williams 2001, p. 270.

4 *Anc. Lett.* II.11, *ibid.*, p. 268.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(or Xianyang 咸陽, Sogd. *ʾzxwmtʾn*),[5] Guzang 姑臧 (Sogd. *kcʾn*),[6] Ye 鄴 (Sogd. *ʾnkpʾ*), Jiuquan 酒泉 (Sogd. *cwcn*)[7] and Jincheng 金城 (Sogd. *kmzyn*).[8] The letters in the dossier are collectively known as *Ancient Sogdian Letters* because they are written in one of the oldest known forms of the Sogdian script. Despite the antiquity of the script, the date of these letters has long been a source of scholarly debate, especially because one of the letters mentioning the destruction of the city of Ye by the *Xwn* – the Middle Iranian name for Huns and probably used by the author of the letter to mean the Xiongnu 匈奴, the Central Asian tribe most feared by the Chinese – is of considerable historical value.[9] Internal evidence points to a date of composition for the five letters to c. 313/314 CE, viz. the end of the short-lived Western Jin (Xijin 西晉) Dynasty (265–316 CE). The Sogdian merchants refer to China as '(The Land) Inside' (Sogd. *[c]ntry*).[10] which is highly appropriate as China was then probably referred to by the Chinese as "within the Passes" (*guanzhong* 關中). However, in one of the letters, the author refers to the Chinese as "Čīn *(cyn)*", and to the land of the Čīn as Čīnastan.[11] There is little doubt that the *Čīn* of the Ancient Sogdian Letters refers to the now historical Qin Dynasty. The latter had made an indelible mark on China's neighbours through her energy and military prowess despite its short *durée*. It is not surprising that in the Syriac part of the famous "Nestorian" Monument in Xi'an from the Tang period, the Christian monks who erected it in 781 CE and who probably spoke a number of languages including Syriac and Sogdian, called China by two names *Zinaye (zÿnyʾ)*,[12] which is normal in Syriac *bt zÿnyʾ* and *Zynstan (zynstʾn)*, which is clearly loaned from Sogdian. The names of the capital cities, *xwmdʾn* for Chang'an and *srγ* for Luoyang, given in the Syriac part of the "Monument" were most likely to have been derived from Sogdian.[13] Scholars had expressed doubt about the simple *Čīn* or *Cyn* = Qin (Ch'in in the older Wade-Giles system of transcription) = China equation by pointing out that the Chinese were rarely referred to as *Qinren*, i. e. 'people of Qin' in written texts. The eminent French Sinologist P. Pelliot, who was a devotee of the *Cyn* = Qin = China equation throughout his long scholarly life, drew attention to several mentions of *Qinren* 秦人 in historical and administrative documents of both Qin and later periods.[14] Moreover, the

5 *Anc. Lett.* II.15, see Sims-Williams 2001, p. 268.
6 *Anc. Lett.* II.6, *ibid.*
7 *Anc. Lett.* II.5, *ibid.*
8 *Anc. Lett.* II.23, *ibid.*, p. 270.
9 *Anc. Lett.* II.14, 16, see Sims-Williams 2001, p. 270. On dating see Henning 1948, pp. 603–611 and Grenet/Sims-Williams 1987.
10 *Anc. Lett.* II.32, see Sims-Williams 2001, p. 270f.; III.9, see Henning 1948, p. 604f.
11 *Anc. Lett.* II.17 and 30, see Sims-Williams 2001, pp. 268–271.
12 *Jingjiao liuxing Zhongguo bei* 大秦景教流行中國碑, Syriac Text line 10, see Saeki 1951, p. 1 (Chinese Text section).
13 *Ibid.*, Syriac Text line 1, see Saeki 1951, p. 11 (Chinese Text section).
14 Pelliot 1912, pp. 736–739.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

term is found in Han historical records, sometimes substituted by *Hanren*, which is not surprising given the fact that Han was the successor-dynasty to Qin.[15] Recently my notice has also been drawn to a number of references to Qin being used unambiguously to designate both the Chinese people and the Chinese language in a collection of Buddhist colophons conveniently published together in the Buddhist Canon.[16]

This onomastic material from the Sogdian Ancient Letters has important bearing on names for China and the Chinese as found in Greek and Latin sources. Terms such as *Serikon* in Greek and *Serica* in Latin, i.e. "the land of silk", and the *Serikoi* and *Seres*, the "people of Silk" may at first sight to be derived from *si* 絲 the Chinese word for "silk".[17] However, I would like to draw attention to a little known but significant study by the late Dr. J. Hamilton. In this Hamilton made the following insightful observation on the relationship between the word for silk and the name of China:[18]

> As for Latin *serica*, 'silk', it was borrowed from the Greek *serikon* of the same meaning, just as Latin *Seres* 'China', was borrowed from the Greek *Seres*. Now the Greek name *Seres* for China, which goes back to at least the 2nd century B.C., must have come from the name of the great Qin dynasty that founded the first Chinese Empire towards the end of the 3rd century B.C. Indeed, at the time when the Chinese name Qin (EMC: **dzin* < **dzen*), was borrowed into Greek as *Seres*, the final *-n* of the Chinese must have sounded very much like the final *-r* of other languages, for it was then used regularly in Chinese to transcribe a foreign *-r*.

Hence, the well known names *Ser* or *Seres* in Classical and Medieval sources for China and the Chinese, are not derived from the Chinese word for silk (*si* 絲) but from the dynastic title of Qin 秦 – thus underscoring further the importance of Qin both onomastically and politically across the Eurasian landmass. Cosmas Indicopleustes, the Byzantine mariner and cosmographer who wrote in the 6th c. CE, refers to China as Tzinitza: there is little doubt that the form of the name as it is spelt in Greek is derived from Qin and not from the Sanskrit form of the name *Maχi Čina*.[19] The similarity in sound between *-r* and *-n* in Early Middle Chinese is well attested in the name Anxi 安息 (W-G: An-hsi, EMC: ʔan-sik), the name for Parthia in Han Dynastic texts, which is derived from

15 See especially *HS* 94a3782 and 96b3913. On this see Enoki 1983, pp. 12–13 [= Enoki 1998, pp. 299–301].

16 *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (Tokyo, 1936–): T 2145, 55.64c29: 秦沙門道養; 64c4: 轉胡為秦. The brief revival of (Later) Qin 後秦 as a dynastic title from 399–416 during the Five Dynasties and Sixteen Kingdoms period (304–439 CE) might have helped to perpetuate the equation of Qin = China and the Chinese. On this see Tsui 2012, p. 135.

17 See sources collected in Coedès 2010, pp. 1–74. On the difficulty of deriving 'Seres' from *si* see Pelliot 1912, pp. 741–742; 1959, pp. 264–265.

18 Hamilton 1995, p. 27. I have referred to this important article several times in recent publications to draw attention to its important findings and conclusions.

19 *Topographica Christiana* I, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 88, col. 137. Cf. Coedès 2010, p. 130.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Aršak, the name of the ruling dynasty of the Parthian Empire, and from which the royal family name of 'Arsacids' is derived.[20]

Though the Han Dynasty appears to have lost the "nation-naming" game among Central Asian states to her dynastic predecessors, it is largely thanks to the industry and compilation skills of her office-scholars that we have a number of important treatises on the history, geography and anthropology of the countries to China's Far West. The German scholar F. Hirth conveniently collected together and made available in English translation almost all the relevant passages from the *Shiji* 史記 and Han Dynastic histories (*viz*. the *Han Dynastic History, Han Shu* 漢書, by Ban Gu 班固, and from the *Later Han Dynastic History, Hou Hanshu* 後漢書, by Fan Ye 范曄), relating to Da Qin 大秦 and Fulin 拂林, both of which he believed to be the Chinese names for the Graeco-Roman Near East.[21] A more up-to-date collection and translation of the same material, but without the original texts in Chinese characters, has been prepared by two Australian Sinologists, D. Leslie and K. Gardiner.[22] A critical evaluation of the information provided by these two collections of Chinese sources on the Roman Near East has now been undertaken by Professor D.F. Graf, in collaboration with a Sinologist, E. Dreyer.[23] However, because their joint-work appeared in a conference volume on *Palmyra and the Silk Road* published in Damascus, it too is little known to Sinologists. Their important work, however, did not escape the notice of an Australian scholar, J.E. Hill, whose privately produced edition and translation of Ch. 88 (*viz*. "Chronicle on the Western Regions") of the *Hou Hanshu* is a substantial contribution to the study of Chinese sources on Central Asia and the Near East.[24]

The apogée of Han political influence in Central Asia coincided with the fall of the Hellenistic Empires in the Near East and the rise of states like Bactria and, above all, Parthia in Central Asia. Rome was a relative late-comer to the Near Eastern scene. The famous Eastern Settlement of Pompey (67 BCE) gave Rome political influence over the Mediterranean littoral but many of the cities and kingdoms of Mesopotamia and adjacent Iran such as Adiabene and Osrhoene looked to Parthia as the dominant force and political patron.[25] The kingdom of Anxi 安息 is attested in Chinese annals of the Han period and the relevant sections have now been conveniently collected together and translated into English in an important book-chapter by Dr. Wang Tao of SOAS.[26] Wang has followed the majority of scholars in treating *Anxi* as a transliteration for Aršak and he has also noted that the now common name of Bosi 波斯 for Persia was not used

20 On this see also Henning 1938.
21 Hirth 1885.
22 Leslie/Gardiner 1996.
23 Graf/Dreyer 1996.
24 Hill 2009. See especially pp. 254–256 for his use of the work of Graf/Dreyer 1996.
25 On this see esp. Millar 1993, pp. 1–126.
26 Wang 2007. See also Posch 1998.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

until the sixth century.[27] One of the earliest witnesses to the use of the name of the province of Fars for Iran was the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Xuanzang 玄奘. In his famous account of his travels in Central Asia and India, the *Record of Buddhist Kingdoms* compiled c. 629 CE, he has given us an even more accurate form of the name: *Bolasi* 波剌斯 which uniquely preserves the medial *-r-* of OIr. *pārsa-*, MPe. *p'lsy* and Pth. *p'rs*.[28]

China and the Ancient Mediterranean World – La Chine et le Monde Méditerranéen

Since 2010, the present author has been joint co-ordinator of an international project of the Union Académique Internationale (UAI) "China and the Mediterranean World – archaeological sources and literary documents up to the 10th C CE (La Chine et le Monde Méditerranéen: sources archéologiques et documents écrits jusqu'au 10e siècle)". The project was launched at the 78th session of its General Assembly held at Barcelona in May, 2004. The aim of this new project is to promote closer (and long overdue) collaborative research between scholars in China working on the history and archaeology of pre-Islamic Central Asia and on Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine history, with their opposite numbers in countries in which research in these areas is more developed. Currently scholars from China are involved in only a handful of the sixty-five major international projects of the UAI, and "China and the (Ancient) Mediterranean World" has been given considerable priority by the Union as an international research project (Category B) in the hope that major funding bodies will be interested in supporting it.

Funding from the Australian Research Council and from the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for the project (2008–2012) has enabled the present author to work on inscriptions found in Iran and Central Asia in Greek, Aramaic and Middle Iranian, especially royal inscriptions and inscriptions on trade between East and West, especially on bilingual (Greek and Aramaic) inscriptions from key caravan cities like Palmyra and Dura Europos, both in Syria. Work on the inscriptions has made him realize their value as contemporary sources on place- and ethnic-names in Central Asia. A multilingual inscription like the trilingual (Greek, Middle Persian and Parthian) inscription of the early Sasanian monarch Shapur I (popularly known as the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis*) at the Kaʿba-i Zardušt, which provides lists of Sasanian provinces as well as names of Roman cities captured by Shapur I in his successful campaigns (252–260 CE), is a major *onomasticon* in its own right. Despite its obvious usefulness to scholars of the historical geography of West Central Asia, the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* is

27 *Ibid.*
28 *DTXYJ* 37.1.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

still little known to Anglophone scholars of East-West Studies because the only two full critical editions of this complex trilingual inscription, viz. by M. Back[29] and P. Huyse,[30] are both in German and the two editions are published in monograph series subscribed to mostly by research libraries in Iranian Studies.

A multilingual Gazetteer of Central Asian Place-names

Central to the project is the compilation of a multilingual Gazetteer on ethnic and place-names, now partially online,[31] which is arranged around the standard forms of the names in English. Thus for an important caravan city like Samarkand, the user of the Gazetteer will find the material grouped under 'Samarkand', the most commonly attested form of the word in usage in English, and not under Smarakanse or Maracanda or Samojian 颯秣建, although there will eventually be separate indices to all the ancient and medieval languages represented in the Gazetteer (i. e. Old Iranian, Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian, Greek, Syriac, Chinese etc.). The entry for Samarkand in the Gazetteer currently reads:

Samarkand (city in mod. Uzbekistan, also known as Smarakanse)
Gr. Μαρακάνδοι (ethn. pl. as place-name) Arr. *Anab.* IV,3,6
Syr. (1) smrqnd *Vit. Alex. Mag. Syr.* 204.7
Syr. (2) smyrqyr(d) *Vit. Alex. Mag. Syr. Abbrev.* 207.2
Sogd. sm'rkndh *Anc. Lett.* II.20
Chin. (1) Kangju 康居 *SJ* 123
Chin. (2) Samojian 颯秣建 *DTXYJ* I,21.9

The use of epigraphical material, especially in Iranian languages, as the basis of this Gazetteer has already led to confirmations and rejections of older identifications as well as intriguing new discoveries. Take for instance the names for Antioch-on-the-Orontes, the metropolis of Hellenistic and Roman Syria given in the Gazetteer:

Antioch-on-the-Orontes (metropolis of Roman Syria, mod. Antakya in S. Turkey)
Gr. (1) Ἀντιόχεια Procopius, *De Aedificiis* II.10.23
Gr. (2) Ἀντιόχια *RGDS* (Gr.) 15
Syr. 'ntywky, 'ntyky' *Peshitta* Acts 11:26
Aram. (Palmyrene) 'nṭky' *Inv.* 10 29:2
Pe. 'ndywk (Andiyōk) *RGDS* (Pe.) 9
Pth. 'ndywk (Andiyōk) *RGDS* (Pth.) 6
Chin. Andu 安都 *WS* 102

29 Back 1978.
30 Huyse 1999. On the importance of the *RGDS* as a multilingual document see Rubin 2002.
31 http://www.mq.edu.au/research/centres_and_groups/ancient_cultures_research_centre/research/cultural_ex_silkroad/serica/.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Many scholars have dismissed Andu 安都, the Chinese name for the capital of the state of Da Qin 大秦, as being a reasonably accurate phonetic transliteration for Antioch as this would imply a good knowledge of the Seleucid Empire of which Antioch-on-the-Orontes was its western capital. As the characters for Andu literally mean 'Capital of Peace', it has also struck some scholars as an idealized name for the capital of the utopian state of Da Qin. However, one glance at the Middle Iranian versions of the Seleucid capital will show that like the Chinese it has a medial *-d-* instead of *-t-* which underscores the Middle Iranian origin of the Chinese transliteration.

West of Parthia

West of Anxi [Parthia], according to the *Shiji*, "lies Tiaozhi 條枝 and to the north Yancai 奄蔡 and Lixuan 黎軒. Tiaozhi is situated several thousand li west of Anxi and borders on the Western Sea …".[32] Of the three ethnic- *cum* place-names, Yancai is the least controversial. It is generally agreed that it is the name of a country northwest of Samarkand and inhabited by a people known in classical sources as the Aorsoi (Gr.) or Aorsi (Lat.).[33] A great deal more controversy, however, surrounds the other two names as the *Shiji* reference cited above is the oldest Chinese sources for place-names west of the Tigris and both Tiaozhi and Lixuan are relevant to our knowledge of Da Qin 大秦.

An early suggestion, still current among scholars, is that the toponym Tiaozhi is derived from Jazîrah the name given by the Arabs to Upper Mesopotamia. Al-Jazîrah means "the island" or "peninsula" which fits well with a description of the land between the two rivers given in later Han sources.[34] The problem with this identification is that while proto-Arabic was spoken in the Arabian Peninsula and in S. Mesopotamia during the Han period, we have no evidence before the Tang of Upper Mesopotamia – known to the Romans as Osrhoene and Mygdonia – being called Jazîrah. The description of Tiaozhi as a large island also fits well with the important trading city Charax Spasinou, the capital of Mesene (or Maišan in Aramaic). Tiaozhi as a toponym bears little resemblance to Charax or Maišan. Supporters for this identification suggest that Tiaozhi is simply the Chinese for the Tigris (OIr. *Tigrā*, MPe. *dglty*).[35] It must be remembered, however, that while the term Parapotamia "along the river" was used in the Parthian period of the Middle Euphrates,[36] river-based terms for regions like "Euphratensis"[37]

32 *SJ* 123.3162–3; see Pulleyblank 1999, p. 74.
33 Pulleyblank, *op. cit*. See also Hill 2009, pp. 377–380.
34 *HHS* 81.2918, tr. Hill 2009, p. 21. On Al-Jazîrah see esp. Le Strange 1905, pp. 86–114.
35 Graf/Dreyer 1996, p. 203.
36 On Παραποταμία see *PDura* 20.5 in Welles 1959, p. 115.
37 On "Euphratensis" or "Euphratesia" see Procopius, *De Bello Persico* I.17.2, ed. and trans. Dewing 1914, pp. 144–145.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

or "Transtigritana"[38] belong the Late Roman period. Moreover, the Tigris as the river demarcating the western boundaries of the Parthian Empire is transliterated unmistakably as *Daheshui* 達曷水 in later Chinese sources.[39]

PULLEYBLANK, in his review of the work of LESLIE/GARDINER (1996), suggests Seleukeia (Gr. Σελεύκεια), the Greek capital city on the Tigris 15 miles south of modern Baghdad, as the source of the Chinese toponym Tiaozhi.[40] According to PULLEYBLANK, the Early Middle Chinese pronunciation of the name would have been *dɛw tçiă* and, bearing in mind the common *d* and *l* switch in Middle Iranian, especially in Bactrian, this might well have been pronounced more anciently as **(s)ləw-kjia*, i. e. Seleukeia, especially if *tiao* 條 was originally written as *xiao* 篠 (EMC: *sɛw*). The most likely source for the name of the city for the information-gathering Chinese envoys would have been in Aramaic, viz. *slwky' (sēlōkyā)*. In fact the vast majority of Aramaic-speaking merchants would have used the more precise form *bt slwk* (*bēṯ sēlōk* "the place of Seleucus") for Seleukeia.

Seleukeia was, by the Han period, already a capital city in decline and was replaced in importance as the chief trading city in this central sector of Mesopotamia by Ctesiphon (Gr. Κτησιφῶν) on the opposite bank of the Tigris from Seleukeia. Ctesiphon, a name of Greek origin, was referred to in Syriac as *tysifōn* or *(Q)tyspwn*, which could just as easily have been the source for the name Tiaozhi, although the toponym *Sibin* 斯賓 (W-G: Ssu-pin) is found in the *History of the Later Han Dynasty* (*Hou Hanshu*).[41] Less commonly suggested for Tiaozhi is the region known to the Greeks as Sitakene (Gr. Σιτακηνή), named after the river Sitake (Gr. Σιτάκη) which empties into the Persian Gulf.[42] The initial sibilant in foreign names often causes problems of pronunciation with the Chinese and by dropping the initial *s(i)-*, Sitakene would have yielded a name strikingly close to Tiaozhi. However, a historical and phonetic explanation for the original of the name Tiaozhi as pertaining to the Arab Emirate of Charax Spasinou[43] is, to my mind possible, and this will be discussed below along with the Chinese name for Arabs, i. e. *Dashi* (see below).

As for Lijian 梨鞬, HIRTH has argued for it being the phonetic transliteration of *Rekem*, the Semitic name for Petra, one of the great trading cities on the so-called Frankincense Road and famous for its rock-cut tombs.[44] However,

38 On the "regiones Transtigritanae" see esp. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* XXV.7.9; ed. and trans. ROLFE 1940, pp. 532–533.
39 *Suishu* 隋書 83.1856.
40 PULLEYBLANK 1999, p. 74.
41 *HHS* 88.2918.
42 Strabo, *Geographia* XVI.17. For the ethnic see Arrianus, *Anabasis Alexandri* III.8.5. On Sitakene see 'Σιτάκη' in *RE*, 2nd ser. 5 (1927), col. 377.
43 Cf. Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis historia* XVII.739.
44 HIRTH 1885, pp. 160–161.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

other scholars, including Pelliot, favoured Alexandria (Gr. Ἀλεξάνδρια, MPe. *'lhsndly'y* and Manichaean MPe. *'lxsyndrgyrd* [see below], Pth. *'lyhsndry'*), the chief city of Egypt under the Ptolemies. Because of her undoubted importance as a port, Alexandria appeared therefore to Pelliot as more likely to have been known to envoys from China than Petra-Rekem.[45] Hirth's effort to identify Lijian with Rekem has in recent years been revived by Graf. The latter has argued that the commercial empire of Petra was very much on the ascendant at the time when the Han Dynasty in China first established contact with the Graeco-Roman East.[46] Graf's argument for *Rekem* = *Lijian* on linguistic grounds is well summarized in a joint-authored chapter on Nabatean trade in a collaborative volume on Petra.[47]

Rekem or Reqem certainly shows some phonetic approximation to Chinese Lijian, but it must be pointed out that the local Nabateans used a differently vocalized form for the chief city of their kingdom, *viz*. Raqmu.[48] Raqmu bears far less resemblance to Lijian than Reqem – a form of the Semitic name for Petra known to us largely through the Hebrew *Rāqām*.[49] The city of Seleukeia, to my mind, rather than the Seleucidae, i. e. the Seleucids, could be the origin of the name Lijian. While we normally give Greek proper names in the nominative case in learned studies, ancient speakers of the language were more likely to give them in the locative or accusative case indicating direction. Σελεύκειαν, the locative case of Seleukeia, would give us the *-kian* ending in Lijian or Likan, and, if the initial sibilant (*s-*) was lost, as was often the case in transliterations of foreign names in the Han period, then we would have **leukeian* which comes very close to Lijian or Likan.

By the late Han period, a major new power had emerged West of Parthia, and according to the *Hou Hanshu,* west of Parthia lies Da Qin 大秦 which literally means 'Great China'. Geographically and historically this could only be the Graeco-Roman East. The Gazetteer entry for the Roman (and Byzantine) Empire currently reads:

Roman (and Byzantine) Empire, the,

Gr. (1) ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή (lit. "the rule of the Romans" = the Roman Empire) *RGDS* (Gr.) 7
(2) Ῥωμανία (late classical, < Lat. *Romania*) Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum* 35, *PG* 1.733C

Syr. (ethn.) rhwmy' "Romans" *Doctrina Addai* 1.10

45 Pelliot 1915.
46 Graf/Dreyer 1996, pp. 209–210.
47 Graf/Sidebotham 2003, pp. 65–66.
48 See e. g. the much visited and viewed Nabataean inscription in the Bāb as-Sīq, cf. Hackl/Jenni/Schneider 2003, pp. 220–221.
49 *Ibid.*, p. 221, commentary to l. 3 of inscription.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

MPe. (1) hlwmy (Hrōm) *RGDS* (MPe.) 4, hrwm ʾdyn štry (Hrōmāyīn šahr, lit. "kingdom of the Romans") *RGDS* (MPe.) 16
(2) (Manich.) hrwm (Hrōm) M2 I R i 2

Pth. (1) prwm (Frōm) *RGDS* (Pth.) 3, prwmyn hštr (Frōmāyīn šahr, lit. "kingdom of the Romans") *RGDS* (Pth.) 12
(2) (Manich.) frwm (Frōm) M216c+M1750 R 12

Sogd. (Manich.) *βrʾwm- KG* 350 (cf. *βrʾwmʾyk* "Roman")

Turk. purum KT E4

Chin. (1) Da Qin 大秦 (lit. "Great Qin (Dynasty)" or "Great China") *HHS* 88 (N. B. the term might have originally been applied to the Seleucid Empire before it was transferred to the Romans)
(2) Fulin 拂林 *JTS* 198, also (Buddh.) Fulin 拂懔 *DTXYJ* 11, p. 37.9 (= *T* 2087, 938a25)
(3) Lumei 蘆眉 (< Arab. *Rum*, i. e. former Roman Asia Minor) *ZFZ*, p. 231

While the list does not help to solve the problem of Da Qin, the possibility of the name Fulin which is found in sources from the Tang period onwards as a transliteration for 'Rome' from a Middle Iranian language, especially Parthian, is very high indeed.[50]

The name Da Qin 'Great *or* Greater China' as used of a major but mythical empire west of Parthia, is at first sight a backhanded compliment and this is certainly the way it was interpreted by the dynastic historians and by later writers of geographical treatises. The compiler of the *Hou Hanshu* readily espouses this view: "They (the Romans) resemble the Chinese (lit. 'people of the Middle Kingdom'), and that is why the country is called Da Qin."[51] In the *Zhufanzhi*, an important navigational work of the early 13th C CE, the compiler Zhao Rugua 趙汝适 had his own ethno-centric explanation of the name Da Qin. According to Zhao, "The inhabitants of (Da Qin) are tall and of fair complexion, somewhat like the Chinese, which has been the reason for their being called Da Qin."[52] These explanations of the origin of the name Da Qin in ancient and medieval Chinese sources are ample acknowledgement of the Qin part of the name as pertaining to China and the Chinese. There are however attempts to uncover the phonetic origin of the term. No less eminent a scholar than Needham suggested that the name Da Qin originated from the Greek name for the Arabs of Mesopotamia *Taïēnos* (Ταϊηνός) but few scholars of East-West contacts have taken the suggestion seriously.[53]

Rarely cited, however, is the well-researched effort to find a phonetic-cum-historical solution for the name Da Qin by the Greek scholar M. Kordosis.

50 On this see esp. Schaeder 1934, pp. 50–68.
51 *HHS* 88.2919, trans. Leslie/Gardiner 1996, p. 49. Cf. Chen 2006, p. 521.
52 *ZFZ* 142. Engl. trans. Hirth 1885, p. 92 (revised by author).
53 Needham 1954, p. 174, n. f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

He has published a series of articles in both English and in his native language, Modern Greek, on East-West contacts, but his publications in English are often found in journals containing mainly articles in Modern Greek. As a result his work is little known outside Greece because of the relative unavailability of his publications. Kordosis argues that the Qin in Da Qin may conceal a phonetic transliteration of the name for (ancient) Greeks used in Central Asian languages i. e. *Yana* (from OIr. *Yauana* < Gr.Ἴωνες, i. e. Ionians). He has noticed that in the Pali version and Chinese translation of the Buddhist work, the *Milindapañha* (Questions of Milinda) cast in the form a dialogue between the Greek Menander (Milinda), the famous Indo-Bactrian King, and the Buddhist sage Nāgasena, there appears to be a clue to the origin of the name Da Qin:

Pali Version:
There is in the country of the *Yonakas* (i. e. Greeks), a great centre of trade, a city that is called Sâgala …

Chinese translation (trans. Demiéville):
Or, au royaume de *Ta-ts'in* (i. e. *Da Qin*) des region du Nord, un pays appelé Chökie residence d'anciens rois …

According to Kordosis, the contemporary (i. e. Han) pronunciation in China of the character *qin* was probably *dzan* in ancient Chinese and a Hindu coming to China was said to have referred to the Roman Empire as *Djawan*.[54] It takes a modern Greek scholar to remind us that in Da Qin we are dealing with an empire which was still predominantly Greek-speaking and which was nominally under Greek Seleucid rule until the annexation of Syria by Rome through the famous Eastern Settlement of Pompey the Great (ca. 63 BCE). However, I believe the name *Yana* or *Yauana* is indeed used phonetically in the transliteration of an important Central Asian state involving "Greeks" though not in relation to Da Qin but to the Chinese name for Bactria, viz. Da Yuan (see below).

The Chinese character *da* 大 'great' prefixes at least four other frequently encountered toponyms or ethnic names in Chinese sources on Western Regions from the Han period and these are: 1. Da Yuan 大宛 (W-G: Ta-yuan), 2. Da Yuezhi 大月支 (W-G: Ta-yüeh-chih), 3. Da Xia 大夏 (W-G: Ta-hsia) and 4. Dashi 大食 (W-G: Ta-shih).

Of the four Central and West Asian place-names in Chinese beginning with Da, Dashi 大食, which literally means "Great Eat(ers)", is most obviously a phonetic transliteration from the Pahlavi (i. e. Middle Persian) *Tāzīg*, i. e. Arabs.[55] The accounts of the Dashi nation/people in Chinese sources from the Tang period onwards certainly agree with what is generally known of the early history of the Arabs.[56] *Tāzīg* is derived originally from the Arabic tribal name of *Ṭaiyi'*

54 Kordosis 1992, pp. 203–204. On the Yonas in the *Milindapañha* see also now Karttunen 2015, pp. 245–260, especially pp. 246–247.

55 On this see the important study of Sundermann (1993, pp. 166–167).

56 See esp. *JTS* 198.5315 etc. On identification of *Dashi* with Arabs see Chavannes 1903, pp. 203–205.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and the term might have also given rise to the place-name Tiaozhi in Chinese for the region of Southern Mesopotamia, especially for the kingdom of Charax Spasinou. This is not a new identification and has been rejected by a number of scholars.[57] However, the argument for the identification made by Blochet using an impressive array of forms of the name *Ṭaiyi'* in a number of ancient and medieval languages has remained almost completely unnoticed because it was obscurely published.[58] Moreover it must be remembered that Charax or Characene as the region was known, became a major centre of international trade thanks to its being ruled by a Semitic and Arabic-speaking dynasty,[59] in the first century CE.[60] The region was far better known during the Han period as Maishan and it is surprising that this was not the name encountered by Chinese envoys or traders in the Han period.

The toponym Da Yuan 大宛 is commonly associated with Ferghana – a land famous for its 'blood horses'. The latter were the mainstay of the Chinese cavalry of the Han Empire and therefore an important commodity for China's trade with Central Asia.[61] The Chinese character *yuan* 宛 is rare and is found only in the name of a commandery (*xuan* 縣) in Henan 河南 established during the Qin Dynasty and has no real literary meaning. It is possible therefore that the term Da Yuan is also a phonetic transliteration for a foreign place-name, but for what?[62] Pulleyblank believes Da Yuan (EMC: dajh -ʔwian < *das-ʔwàn) stands for **taxwar*, the underlying form for the Greek Τόχαροι, i. e. Tocharians.[63] Ferghana was for centuries the seat of the Bactrian Kingdom and it is with the Bactrians, I believe, that the phonetic link with *Yauna* suggested by Kordosis for Da Qin has considerable validity. The kingdom of Bactria was known in its time as the Greek kingdom of Bactria[64] and the Chinese character *yuan* 宛 was very probably used for the phonetic transliteration of *Yauna*. As Thucydides (I.3.1–3) has reminded us, the name "Hellene" (i. e. "Greek") used as a common ethnic term for Greek-speakers was a late phenomenon. The first major group of Greek-speakers whom the Achaemenid Persians encountered as their empire extended to the eastern shores of the Aegean were the Ionians and many Old Iranian proper names in Greek show Ionian phonetic peculiarities. While the Greeks who conquered Iran and Central Asia called themselves Hellenes

57 For a summary of earlier views on Tiaozhi see Shiratori 1956, pp. 2–3.
58 Blochet 1895, p. 184, n. 9.
59 Viz. the Mesenian Arabs of Strabo, *Geographia* XVI.1.8, ed. and trans. Jones 1930, p. 203.
60 On the history of Charax Sapsinou see the authoritative monograph of Schuol 2000, pp. 291–378.
61 On the relationship between Da Yuan and Da Xia with China see esp. Gardiner-Garden 1986, pp. 66–70.
62 *Hanyu Da Cidian* 漢語大詞典, ed. Luo Zhufeng 羅竹風, Beijing 1986–1994, vol. 9/i, col. 353a.
63 On this see Pulleyblank 2000, p. 89.
64 Wiesehöfer 2001, pp. 17–18.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

on their inscriptions,[65] the Old Iranian name of Yauna (derived from Greek Ἴωνες "Ionians") had preceded them into Asia, and derivatives of Yauna are found in almost all Semitic and Central Asian languages. The term Da Yuan therefore is likely to be a phonetic transliteration for a foreign place-name and not a 'mirror-reflection' of a Chinese place-name because of the total unimportance of the commandery of Yuan in Henan. I am aware of the fact that scholars had earlier tried (unsuccessfully) to equate *Yauana* (Ἰάϝονες) with Da Xia[66] but *Yauna* could phonetically be comfortably accommodated by the single Chinese character *yuan*. The character *da*, i.e. 'great' was added as a prefix as a compliment (i.e. the Great [Kingdom] of the Greeks) or simply as a means to make it a two-syllable or two-character place-name – the minimum normally required in the transliteration and recognition of foreign ethnic and place-names in Chinese.[67]

The problem of the identification of the Central Asian ethnic name Da Yuezhi 大月支 has occupied scholars using Chinese sources for the study of the early history of Central Asia for more than two centuries.[68] The Da Yuezhi were the Central Asian tribe whom the Han government in China tried to make contact with in order to make an alliance with them against the Xiongnu and it was for this purpose that the imperial envoy Zhang Qian 張騫 made his exploratory visit to Central Asia. It was Zhang's own records and memoirs of his eventful visit that formed the basis of much of what was recounted about the 'Western Regions' in both the *Shiji* and the *Hanshu*. The people or nation known as the Da Yuezhi 大月支 (EMC: dajh ŋuat-tçiă) or Da Yueshi 大月氏 in Chinese sources have now generally been identified ethnically and historically with the Tocharians. Much more problematic to my mind however is the attempt by modern scholars to read the ethno-linguistic name of 'Tochar' into the characters *yue* + *zhi*. This is done by resorting to the reconstructed Early Middle Chinese pronunciation of these characters: **tokwar* or **togwar*.[69] The warning given by the eminent Iranologist, the late Professor W. B. Henning, that the names for the Tocharians, for the Tocharian language and for Tocharistan may all be derived from the same root **txu̯ār* but could historically be unrelated to each other, has been heeded by few.[70]

Yuezhi and Yueshi are clearly phonetic transliterations and I have often wondered if originally all three characters of the ethnic name, viz. Da Yuezhi, were

65 See e.g. Rougemount 2012, p. 37.
66 Cf. Tarn 1951, pp. 296–297.
67 The identification of Chinese *Yuan* with Iranian *Yavana* has also been independently (but using different sources) suggested by Lebedynsky (2006, p. 61).
68 The bibliography on the identification of the 'western' equivalent(s) of Da Yuezhi is vast. See e.g. Haloun 1937, pp. 246–256 and 260–261; Enoki 1959; Lyonnet 1991; Benjamin 2007, pp. 21–28, and Beckwith 2009, pp. 380–383.
69 See e.g. Beckwith 2009, pp. 381–382.
70 Henning 1938.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

part of a single phonetic transliteration. If this was indeed the case then we would have in the first character *da* 大 the *d/t-* sound so important for identifying the Yuezhi with the Tocharians. One must bear in mind that Chinese bureaucrats in the Tang period had no difficulty in transliterating Tochara (i. e. Tocharistan) into Chinese as Tuhoulou 吐火羅. The latter is instantly recognizable as being derived from Tochara, especially from the *to-* part of the name. I am aware of the existence of the ethnic name Xiao Yuezhi 小月支, i. e. 'Lesser Yuezhi', but here we may have an example of the Chinese bureaucrats not being cognizant of the *raison d'etre* of the original phonetic transliteration and, separating Da from Yuezhi and applying the latter to a related tribe of the Tocharians.

The name Da Xia 大夏 poses similar problems for place-name researchers as Da Qin. It literally means "Great Summer" but just as likely it was meant to imply 'Great China' as *xia* 夏 besides meaning 'summer' is the name of an ancient, and until recently regarded as mythical, dynasty of China (ca. 2070–ca. 1600 BCE).[71] As a Central Asian place-name, Da Xia is often identified with the Indo-Greek kingdom of Bactria (OIr. *Bāxtriš*, Gr. Βάκτρα or Βακτριανή) but the identification might not have been based purely on phonetic grounds. As Gardiner-Garden has well observed, reports on foreign kingdoms and peoples by Han Chinese envoys to the Western Regions such as Zhang Qian were often highly ethnocentric and in them foreign states were given names plucked out of Chinese mythological and geographical traditions to imply that they had been contacted earlier or even civilized by earlier Chinese rulers.[72] The late Professor G. Haloun of Cambridge University had already stressed as early as 1926 that though the name Da Xia may once have represented some real people in the North in the third and second centuries BCE, they had by the time of the arrival of the Han envoys, become a people of fable on the western edge of the world. The pronunciation of this old-established, mythological term need not have been anything like an approximation of the name of an actual country because Da Xia is good Chinese, Xia being the old dynastic name.[73] His view was immediately endorsed by Maspero[74] and was re-endorsed more recently by Hulsewé and Loewe.[75] Pulleyblank is also of the opinion that Da Xia must be taken to mean 'Great China', i. e. not as a transliteration of any foreign name.[76] However, in Herodotus' account of the revolt of Cyrus against the Medes we encounter a tribe known as the Daoi (Gr. Δάοι or Δάαι).[77] In Old Persian inscriptions they were known as the Dahā and their land of origin constituted a

71 On this see Pulleyblank 2000, p. 89.
72 Cf. Gardiner-Garden 1986, p. 79.
73 Haloun 1926, pp. 136, n. 1, 151–172, 192 and 201–202.
74 Maspero 1927.
75 Hulsewé/Loewe 1979, p. 145, n. 387.
76 Pulleyblank 2000, p. 89.
77 Herodotus, *Historiae* I.125.4. See also Strabo, *Geographia* XI.8.2 and Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* XXII,8,21. The latter placed the Dahae near the Tauric mountains.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

province of the Achaemenid Empire.[78] The Da Xia = Dahae equation has been dismissed as meaningless jingle by the eminent Hellenistic historian Sir William Tarn on the simple ground that the Dahae did not live in Bactria.[79] However, two German Iranologists have since then placed the land of the Dahae to the west of the River Oxus (Amu Darya) on linguistic grounds, thus bringing them geographically very close to the same area assigned to the Da Xia by modern scholars.[80] Since the Dashi 大食 = *Tāzīg* derivation for Arabs has never been challenged, it is time, perhaps, to revisit Daxia = Dahae.

The majority of scholars would agree with Graf and Dreyer that Da Qin perhaps should best understood as simply a reflection of Ch'in (Qin) as the (Far) Western region of China and it "represents the country beyond and comparable to Ch'in (PY: Qin)."[81] The two scholars have also reminded us that "the accounts of Da Qin bear a deep resemblance to the Taoist Utopia and are therefore not to be completely understood literally, i.e. they represent a fictitious religious world and not a real one."[82] However, the arguments put forward by Kordosis cannot easily be dismissed when we look at other examples of foreign place-names beginning with the character *da* 大. The material now presented in the Gazetteer may provide scholars with new ways forward in reassessing the problem.

Conclusion

Although Professor Werner Sundermann is best noted as a scholar of the textual history of religions (especially of Manichaeaism and Christianity), his contribution to the study of the history and geography of the Near East and Central Asia in the pre-Islamic period is also profound. His regular use of geographical data from the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* in his commentaries to Manichaean texts from Turfan alerted me to the importance of this trilingual document as an onomasticon. He also kindly and unhesitatingly answered many of my queries on historical and geographical matters in the days when scholars communicated by letter. I hope that in this study I have showcased the China and the Ancient Mediterranean World project sufficiently to demonstrate its long-term value and usefulness to all scholars who are actively engaged in research on East-West contacts – a subject which Professor W. Sundermann had made uniquely his own.

78 XPh 26, in Kent 1952, p. 151.
79 Tarn 1951, p. 295, n. 7.
80 Eilers/Mayrhofer 1960, pp. 118–120 and map on p. 109. See also Lecomte 2007, pp. 298–300.
81 Graf/Dreyer 1996, p. 200.
82 *Ibid*. See also Barrett 2002, pp. 557–558.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Abbreviations

Anc. Lett.	Ancient Letters
BSO(A)S	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*
CII	Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum
DTXYJ	*Da Tang Xiyuji* 大唐西域記 *(= Daito Seiki)* by Xuanzang 玄奘. Kyoto 1911
EMC	Early Middle Chinese. Cf. PULLEYBLANK 1984
HS	PAN GU 班固 (ed): *Han Shu* 漢書. Beijing 1962
HHS	FAN YE 范曄 (ed.): *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書. Beijing 1965
Inv.	*Inventaire des inscriptions de Palmyre*. Beirut/Damascus 1930–
JTS	LIU XU 劉昫 (ed.): *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書. Beijing 1975
KG	W. SUNDERMANN: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin 1981 (Berliner Turfantexte XI)
KT	The Kül Tigin Inscription. In: T. TEKIN: *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Bloomington 1968, pp. 231–242
PY	Pinyin (system of phonetic transcription of Chinese characters)
RE	*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Ed. by A. PAULY, G. WISSOWA *et al*. Stuttgart 1893–
RGDS	*Res Gestae Divi Saporis.* Ed. and trans. by P. HUYSE: *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Kaʿba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ)*. 2 vols. London 1999
SJ	SIMA QUAN 司馬遷: *Shiji* 史記 *(The Records of the Grand Historian).* Beijing 1982
W-G	Wade-Giles (system of phonetic transcription of Chinese characters)
WS	*Wei Shu* 魏書. Compiled by Wei Shou 魏收 (506–572). In: *Sanguozhi* 三國志. Beijing 1974
XPh	Xerxes at Persepolis
ZFZ	*Zhu Fan Zhi* 諸蕃志. Compiled by Zhao Rugua 趙汝适. Ed. by HAN ZHENHUA 韓振華: *Zhu Fan Zhi Zhubu* 諸蕃志注補. Hong Kong 2000

Bibliography

BACK, M. 1978: Die *sassanidischen Staatsinschriften. Studien zur Orthographie und Phonologie des Mittelpersischen der Inschriften zusammen mit einem etymologischen Index des mittelpersischen Wortgutes und einem Textcorpus der behandelten Inschriften*. Téhéran/Liège (Acta Iranica 18).

BARRETT, T.H. 2002: "Buddhism, Taoism and Chinese Christianity: a response to recent work by A. Forte and others." In: *BSOAS* 65, pp. 555–560 [Reprinted with Chinese characters added into the text by Prof. R. MALEK. In: R. MALEK/P. HOFRICHTER (eds.): *Jingjiao. The Church of the East in China and Central Asia.* Sankt Augustin 2006, pp. 45–53].

BECKWITH, C. 2009: *Empires of the Silk Road. A History of Central Eurasia from the Bronze Age to the Present.* Princeton.

BENJAMIN, C. 2007: *The Yuezhi. Origins, Migration and the Conquest of Northern Bactria.* Turnhout (Silk Road Studies XIV).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Blochet, E. 1895: "Textes Pehlvis historiques et legendaires." In: *Revue Archéologique*, Troisième Série, T. 28 (Janvier-Juin 1896), pp. 177–193.

Chavannes, E. 1903: *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux.* Paris.

Chen Zhi-Qiang 2006: "Narrative Materials about the Byzantines in Chinese Sources." In: J. Burke *et al.* (eds.): *Byzantine Narrative. Papers in Honour of Roger Scott*. Melbourne (Byzantina Australiensia 16), pp. 505–521.

Coedès, G. 2010: *Texts of Greek and Latin Authors on the Far East From the 4th C. B.C.E. to the 14th C. C.E.* Translated by John Sheldon. Turnhout (Studia Antiqua Australiensia 4).

Dewing, H.B. 1914: *Procopius*. Vol. I. London/Cambridge.

Eilers, W./M. Mayrhofer 1960: "Namenkundliche Zeugnisse der indischen Wanderung? Eine Nachprüfung." In: *Die Sprache. Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 6, pp. 107–134.

Enoki Kazuo 1959: "The Yüeh-shih-Scythians Identity. A Hypothesis." In: *International Symposium on History of Eastern and Western Cultural Contacts. Collection of Papers presented*. Compiled by the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO, 1957. Tokyo/Kyoto, pp. 227–232 [Reprint in: Enoki 1998, pp. 22–29].

— 1963: "The Location of the Capital of Lou-lan and the date of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions." In: *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, No. 22, pp. 125–171 [Reprint in: Enoki 1998, pp. 211–256].

— 1983: "On the Relationship between the *Shih-chi* 史記 Bk. 123 and the *Han-shu* 漢書, Bks. 61 and 96." In: *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, No. 41, pp. 1–31 [Reprint in: Enoki 1998, pp. 286–317].

— 1998: *Studia Asiatica. The Collected Papers in Western Languages of the Late Dr. Kazuo Enoki*. Tokyo.

Gardiner-Garden, J.R. 1986: "Chang Ch'ien and Central Asian Ethnography." In: *Papers on Far Eastern History* 33 (March 1986), pp. 23–79.

Graf, D.F./E.L. Dreyer 1996: "The Roman East from the Chinese Perspective." In: *Palmyra and the Silk Road.* Special Issue Documenting the Activities of the International Colloquium, Palmyra 7th–11th April 1992. Damascus (Les Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes 42), pp. 199–216.

Graf, D.F/S.E. Sidebotham 2003: "Nabataean Trade." In: G. Markoe (ed.): *Petra Rediscovered: the Lost City of the Nabataeans*. New York, pp. 65–73.

Grenet, F./N. Sims-Williams 1987: "The historical context of the Sogdian Ancient Letters." In: *Transition periods in Iranian history. Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau (22–24 Mai 1985).* Paris/Leuven, pp. 101–122.

Hackl, U./H. Jenni/Ch. Schneider (eds.) 2003: *Quellen zur Geschichte der Nabatäer. Textsammlung mit Übersetzung und Kommentar.* Freiburg/Göttingen (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 10).

Haloun, G. 1937: "Zur Üe-Tṣï-Frage." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 91, pp. 243–318.

— 1926: *Seit wann kannten die Chinesen die Tocharer oder die Indogermanen überhaupt*? Leipzig.

Hamilton, J. 1995: "East-West Borrowings via the Silk Road of Textile Terms." In: *Diogenes. A quarterly publication of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies* 171, pp. 25–33.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Henning, W. B. 1938: "Argi and the Tocharians." In: *BSO(A)S* 9 (1937–1939), pp. 545–571.
— 1948: "The date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters." In: *BSOAS* 12, pp. 601–615.
Hill, J. E. 2009: *Through the Jade Gates to Rome. A Study of the Silk Routes during the Later Han Dynasty 1st to 2nd Centuries CE. An Annotated Translation of the Chronicle on the 'Western Regions' in the* Hou Hanshu. Cookstown.
Hirth, F. 1885: *China and the Roman Orient*. Shanghai/Hong Kong.
Hulsewé, A. F. P./M. A. N. Loewe 1979: *China in Central Asia. The Early State: 125 B.C.–A.D. 23. An Annotated Translation of Chapters 61 and 96 of the History of the Former Han Dynasty.* Leiden (Sinica Leidensia 14).
Huyse, P. 1999: *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Kaʿba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ).* 2 vols. London (CII, pt. 3: *Pahlavi inscriptions*, vol. 1: *Royal inscriptions, with their Parthian and Greek versions*, texts 1).
Jones H. L. 1930: *The Geography of Strabo*. Vol. VII: *Books XV–XVI*. London/Cambridge.
Juliano, A. L/J. A. Lerner 2001: *Monks and Merchants. Silk Road Treasures from Northwest China*. London/New York.
Karttunen, K. J. 2015: *Yonas and Yavanas in Indian Literature*. Helsinki (Studia Orientalia 116).
Kent, R. G. 1952: *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon.* New Haven (American Oriental Series 33).
Kordosis, M. 1992: *China and the Greek World. An introduction to Greec* (sic)-*Chinese Studies with special reference to Chinese sources.* Vol. I: *Hellenistic-Roman-Early Byzantine period (2nd c. B.C.–6th c. A.D.).* Thessalonica (Historico-geographica Meletemata 2).
Le Strange, G. 1905: *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*. Cambridge.
Lebedynsky, I. 2006: *Les Saces. Les "Scythes" d'Asie. VIIIe siècle av. J.-C.–IVe siècle apr. J.-C.* Paris.
Lecomte, O. 2007: "Gorgân and Dehistan: The North-East Frontier of the Iranian Empire." In: J. Cribb/G. Hermann (eds.): *After Alexander. Central Asia before Islam*. Oxford (Proceedings of the British Academy 133), pp. 295–312.
Leslie, D./K. Gardiner 1996: *The Roman Empire in Chinese Sources.* Rome (Studi Orientali XV).
Lyonnet, B. 1991: "Les nomads et la chute du royaume gréco-bactrien: quelques nouveaux indices en provenance de l'Asie centrale orientale. Vers l'identification des Tokares – Yueh-Chi?." In: P. Bernard/F. Grenet (eds.): *Histoire et Cultes de l'Asie Centrale Préislamique. Sources écrites et documents archéologiques.* Paris, pp. 153–161, pls. LXI–LXIII.
Maspero, H. 1926: Review of Haloun 1926. In: *Journal Asiatique* 1927, pp. 144–152.
Millar, F. G. B. 1993: *The Roman Near East 31 BC – AD 337.* Cambridge, Mass.
Needham, J. 1954: *Science and Civilization in China*. Vol. 1: *Introductory Orientations*. Cambridge.
Pelliot, P. 1912: "L'Origine du nom de 'Chine'." In: *T'oung Pao* 13, pp. 727–742.
— 1915: "Li-kien, autre nom de Ta-Ts'in (Orient méditerranéen)." In: *T'oung Pao* 16, pp. 690–691.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1959–1973: *Notes on Marco Polo*. Ouvrage posthume publié sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres et avec le concours du Centre national de la Recherche scientifique. 3 vols. (1959, 1963, 1973). Paris.

Posch, W. 1998: "Chinesische Quellen zu den Parthern." In: J. Wiesehöfer (ed.): *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse. The Arsacid-Empire: Sources and Documentation.* Stuttgart (Historia, Einzelschriften 122), pp. 355–364.

Pulleyblank, E.G. 1984: *Middle Chinese. A Study in Historical Phonology.* Vancouver.

— 1999: "The Roman Empire as known to Han China." In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119, pp. 71–79.

— 2000: "The nomads in China and Central Asia in the post-Han period." In: H.R. Roemer (ed.): *History of the Turkic Peoples in the Pre-Islamic Period. Histoire des Peuples Turcs à l'Époque Pré-Islamique*. Berlin (Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta 3), pp. 76–94.

Reichelt, H. (ed.) 1928–1931: *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums. In Umschrift und mit Übersetzung.* Vol. I: *Die buddhistischen Texte* (1928). Vol. II: *Die nicht-buddhistischen Texte und Nachtrag zu den buddhistischen Texten* (1931). Heidelberg.

Rolfe, J.C. 1940: *Ammianus Marcellinus History.* Vol. II: *Books 20–26*. London/Cambridge, Mass.

Rougemount, G. 2012: *Inscriptions grecques d'Iran et d'Asie centrale.* London (CII, pt. 2: *Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*, vol. 1: *Inscriptions in non-Iranian languages*).

Rubin, Z. 2002: "Res Gestae Divi Saporis: Greek and Middle Iranian in a Document of Sasanian Anti-Roman Propaganda." In: J.N. Adams *et al.* (eds.): *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word.* Oxford, pp. 267–297.

Saeki, Y.P. 1951: *The Nestorian Monuments and Relics in China.* Tokyo.

Schaeder, H.H. 1934: *Iranica: 1. Das Auge des Königs*; *2. Fu-lin*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 3. F., Nr. 10).

Schuol, M. 2000: *Die Charakene. Ein Mesopotamisches Königreich in hellenistisch-parthischer Zeit*. Stuttgart (Oriens et Occidens 1).

Shiratori, K. 1956: *A Study on Tiao-chih.* Tokyo (Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 15).

Sims-Williams, N. 2001: "The Ancient Sogdian Letter II." In: M.G. Schmidt/W. Bisang (eds.): *Philologica et Linguistica. Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag am 4 Dezember 2001.* Trier, pp. 267–280.

Sundermann, W. 1993: "An early attestation of the name of the Tajiks." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Medioiranica. Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990.* Leuven (Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta 48), pp. 163–171.

Tarn, W.W. 1951: *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. 2nd ed. Cambridge.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tsui Chung-hui 崔中慧 2012: *A Study of Early Buddhist Scriptural Calligraphy: Based on Buddhist Manuscripts Found in Dunhuang and Turfan (3–5 Century).* PhD thesis. Hong Kong University.

Wang Tao 2007: "Parthia in China: a Re-examination of the Historical Records." In: V. S. Curtis/S. Stewart (eds.): *The Age of the Parthians. The Idea of Iran. Vol. II.* London, pp. 87–102.

Welles, C. B. *et al.* (eds.) 1959: *The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report V.* Part 1: *The Parchments and Papyri.* New Haven.

Wiesehöfer, J. 2001: "Griechen, Iraner und Chinesen an der Seidenstraße." In: E. Hübner *et al.* (eds.): *Die Seidenstraße.* Hamburg, pp. 17–33.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Источники хорезмийской письменности

Владимир А. Лившиц †, Санкт-Петербург

Хорезмийский язык — один из восточноиранских языков, на котором говорило население страны, расположенной в нижнем течении Амударьи и у ее устья. Близкородственные ему языки не засвидетельствованы, прямые его потомки отсутствуют. По некоторым историко-фонетическим признакам и морфологическим формам хорезмийский сходен с согдийским языком.

Точные временные границы существования хорезмийского языка неизвестны. Наиболее ранние дошедшие до нас хорезмийские тексты — надписи на двух серебряных фиалах, найденных в 1989 г. при раскопках Исаковского могильника № 1, находящегося вблизи Омска; надписи на керамических сосудах и остраки из раскопок, проводившихся Хорезмской археолого-этнографической экспедицией на городищах Кой-Крылган-кала, Калалы-гыр 2, Гяур 3, Бурлы-кала, Хумбуз-тепе, можно датировать предположительно периодом от III в. до н. э. до I–II вв. н. э. К III в. н. э. относятся документы на дереве и коже (они хранятся сейчас в Институте восточных рукописей Российской Академии Наук) и отпечатки документов на глине из дворца Топрак-калы. Наиболее интересны из этих документов списки мужчин больших патриархальных семей, с разделением на свободных и рабов. В этих списках, составлявшихся, возможно, для переписи мужчин, годных для несения военной службы, приведены имена домовладыки, его сыновей и рабов и рабов главы семьи, его жен, сыновей, матери, причем указаны впервые переписываемые лица. Они обозначены словом ʾγt/*āγat*, которое В. Б. Хеннинг (1965, С. 172–173) предложил переводить как «присутствующий (впервые при переписи)»; ср. абстрактное имя ʾγdkʾwk/*āγdakāwek* «присутствие» в хорезмийских текстах XII–XIV вв. До нас дошли пять таких списков.

К VI–VII вв. можно отнести два фрагмента датированных документов на коже из раскопок поселения Якке-Парсан и надписи на шести серебряных сосудах, найденных в Прикамье и хранящихся в Отделе Востока Эрмитажа. Один такой сосуд, также с хорезмийской надписью, находится в Британском Музее, два с надписями начала VIII в. (вероятно, 709 и 714 гг.), в Государственном Историческом музее (Москва).

Более ста эпитафий, начертанных на стенках и крышках алебастровых и каменных оссуариев, найдены при раскопках некрополя Ток-кала в

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Северном Хорезме (14 км от Нукуса). Опубликованы чтения лишь 10 таких надписей (более двух десятков токкалинских надписей сейчас хранится в отделе Востока Эрмитажа, остальные в Нукусе в Каракалпакском филиале Академии Наук Узбекистана и в Государственном Музее искусств им. Савицкого). 24 надписи на фрагментах керамических оссуариев обнаружены при раскопках некрополя Миздахкана.

Хорезмийские документы из дворца Топрак-калы, надписи на серебряных сосудах VI – начала VIII в. и оссуарные эпитафии Ток-калы имеют даты по хорезмийской эре, отсчет лет по которой велся в течение восьми столетий. Начало этой эры, связанное, вероятно, с приходом к власти новой династии, можно отнести к 30–40-м годам I в. н. э. Хорезмийские монеты, выпускавшиеся с I до середины VIII в., имеют легенды, содержащие титулы и имена царей. На монетах Азкацвара (I или II) и Савашфана, выпускавшихся в первой половине VIII в., имеются хорезмийские и согдийские легенды.

Абу Рейхан Бӣрӯнӣ в «Памятниках минувших поколений» сообщает о трех системах летосчисления в доисламском Хорезме, из которых первые две несомненно легендарные: от начала заселения Хорезма, происшедшего за 980 лет «до Александра», то есть в 1292 г. до н. э., и от прихода в Хорезм Сиявуша, сына Кейкавуса и воцарения Кейхусрава и его потомков — это произошло спустя 92 года от начала заселения Хорезма, то есть около 1200 года. Далее, после длительного перерыва, в течение которого считали годы по правлениям царей, хорезмийцы стали вести счет от царствования Афрӣга и его потомков.

Афрӣг, по свидетельству Бӣрӯнӣ, строил дворец над ал-Фиром в 616 г. по «эре Александра», что соответствует 304 г. н. э. Около этого времени, согласно Бӣрӯнӣ, установилась «эра Афрӣга», применявшаяся вплоть до похода Кутейбы в Хорезм в 712 г. Бӣрӯнӣ не знал о реально существовавшей эре домусульманского Хорезма — только так можно объяснить отсутствие упоминаний о ней в «Памятниках минувших поколений».

Все перечисленные хорезмийские эпиграфические памятники можно именовать раннехорезмийскими.[1] По принятой в настоящее время лингвистической классификации как раннехорезмийский, так и позднехорезмийский, лексика которого засвидетельствована у арабских географов X в., у Бӣрӯнӣ, в глоссах юридических сочинений XII–XIV вв. и в хорезмийской версии арабского словаря «Муḳаддимат ал-адаб» аз-Замахшарӣ, относятся к среднеиранским языкам.

1 О раннехорезмийских эпиграфических текстах и монетных легендах см.: Толстов 1938, 1948, С. 220–222; Вайнберг 1977; Гудкова 1964; Смирнов 1909, табл. III, XX, L, CXIV; Бадер/Смирнов 1954; Бадер 1960; Azarpay 1969; MacKenzie 1983; Толстов/Лившиц 1964; Лившиц 1970, 1970a; Лившиц/Мамбетуллаев 1986; Лившиц 2009; Henning 1958, С. 26, 1965. О хорезмийской эре см. Гудкова/Лившиц 1967; Henning 1965, С. 168–170; Вайнберг 1977, С. 77–80, 2001; Altheim/Stiehl 1965, С. 658–660; 1970, С. 190, Anm. 2.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Раннехорезмийские эпиграфические тексты начертаны письмом арамейского происхождения, насчитывавшим 21 букву (арамейское <*ṣādē*> отсутствует), с многочисленными идеограммами. Буквы <*ʿayin*>, <*qōp̄*> и <*ṭēṭ*> употреблялись только в идеограммах; буква <*šīn*> в раннехорезмийском служила для обозначения фонем |*š*| и |*č*|, как это было и в парфянской письменности арамейского происхождения.

Первая публикация позднехорезмийских текстов была осуществлена Зеки Велиди Тоганом в 1927 г.[2] В его статье приведены материалы из юридического сочинения XII в. «Йатимат ад-Дахр» Тарджумāнӣ (ум. в 1266/1267 г.) и из хорезмийской версии арабского словаря «Муқаддимат ал-адаб» Абу-л-Қāсима аз-Замахшарӣ (1075–1144), которую Зеки Велиди нашел в одной из турецких библиотек.

Памятники позднехорезмийского дошли до нас в арабо-персидской графике с добавлением букв, обозначающих глухую аффрикату |*c*|, звонкую |*dz*| и щелевую фонему |*β*|. Знак для фонемы |*g*| в графике отсутствует — этот звук передавался буквой <*k*>. Надстрочная диакритика *ташдид*, употреблявшаяся в арабско-персидской графике для обозначения геминации согласных, в позднехорезмийских текстах, как предположил Д. Н. МакКензи, использовалась для маркировки места ударения. Долгие гласные передавались *харакатами* — надстрочными и подстрочными знаками огласовки. Существовали орфографические правила, довольно единообразные для всех текстов, что может свидетельствовать о разработанной орфографической системе, ставшей традиционной, как это показано в работах В. Б. Хеннинга, А. А. Фреймана, М. Н. Боголюбова, Д. Н. МакКензи, Д. И. Эдельман, Д. Дуркин-Мейстерэрнста. Эти правила отражают не только фонетический состав хорезмийских слов, но и перемещение ударения, а также некоторые фонетические изменения согласных и гласных в процессе речи. Одной из характерных особенностей позднехорезмийского является передвижение ударения и, как следствие, удлинение гласного в зависимости от положения слова в предложении. Например, *zádek* «сын» (авест. *zātaka-*, согд.-ман. z'ty/ *zātē*) — в конце фразы или в обособленной позиции *zādík*; *apána* «одна из жен» (авест. *hapaϑnī-*, ягн. *pinónč*) — *panā-mi* «одна из моих жен».

Изучение хорезмийского языка началось во второй половине 20-х годов прошлого века с упоминавшейся статьи Зеки Велиди Тогана. В 1930-е годы было положено начало лингвистическому анализу хорезмийского работами В. Б. Хеннинга и А. А. Фреймана. Исследования А. А. Фреймана, опубликованные в 1930–1950-е гг., посвящены изучению петербургских рукописей Института востоковедения (ныне Институт восточных рукописей РАН) сочинения хорезмийского законоведа XIII в. Надж ад-дӣна Абӯ Раджā Муҳтара б. Маҳмӯда ал-Захидӣ ал-Ґазмӣнӣ (ум. в 1260 г.) *«Кунйат ал-Мунйа ли татмӣм ал-ґунйа»* («Приобретение желаемого для полноты достатка»)

2 Walidi 1927.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

и трех трактатов *(рисāла)* ал-ʻИмāдӣ, содержащих хорезмийскую лексику из «Ḳунйат» и других сочинений хорезмийских юристов XII–XIII вв.[3] Эти рукописи хранятся в Институте восточных рукописей РАН.

В 1951 г. А. А. Фрейман опубликовал монографию «Хорезмийский язык. Материалы и исследования. I»[4]. Работы В. Б. Хеннинга[5] значительно продвинули изучение хорезмийского языка. В них установлены основные синхронные и сравнительно-исторические данные, характеризующие структуру хорезмийского и его историческую фонетику и морфологию, а также проведен исторический анализ большого пласта хорезмийской лексики. В 1971 г. усилиями Д. Н. МакКензи был издан фрагмент хорезмийского словаря Хеннинга (словарные статьи от ʾ- до ʾkw- и дополнение МакКензи).[6] Словарь Хеннинга включает в себя лексику хорезмийских глосс в юридических сочинениях и хорезмийской версии арабского словаря «Муḳаддимат ал-Адаб», опубликованной Зеки Велиди в 1951 г.[7] и переизданной с большими дополнениями И. Бенцингом в 1968 г.[8] Д. Н. МакКензи значительно улучшил толкования лексики «Муḳаддимат» в пяти статьях «The Khwarezmian Glossary».[9]

В 1960–1980-х гг. была опубликована серия статей М. Н. Боголюбова, посвященная орфографии позднехорезмийских текстов, анализу хорезмийских местоимений, частиц, пролептических конструкций и лексики сочинений Бӣрӯнӣ.[10] «Индекс хорезмийских слов» И. Бенцинга, опубликованный в 1983 г., представляет собой полный словарь всех словоформ позднехорезмийских текстов.[11] Синхронный и исторический анализ фонетики и

3 Лучшая из этих рукописей — C2311 — была издана Д. Н. МакКензи (факсимиле, текст, английский перевод 413 глосс, комментарий, глоссарий) по микрофильму, посланному ему из Ленинградского Отделения Института востоковедения АН СССР (MacKenzie 1990). В архиве Института восточных рукописей РАН хранится работа арабиста и тюрколога С. Л. Волина, погибшего в одном из лагерей Красноярского края (о Волине и его трудах см.: Васильков/Сорокина 2003, С. 103–104), «Материалы по хорезмийскому языку по ленинградским и ташкентским рукописям» (393 листа). В этой работе (ею пользовался Фрейман) содержится детальное исследование сочинений хорезмийских юристов, предшественников ал-Ґазмӣнӣ, и приводятся хорезмийские глоссы из этих сочинений. Волин использовал 10 рукописей «Ḳунйат ал-Мунйа», в том числе манускрипты C2311, C223, C224 Института востоковедения, 4 рукописи Публичной библиотеки Узбекистана (Ташкент), рукописи научной библиотеки Татарстана (Казань). Эта работа Волина заслуживает публикации.

4 Смотри Боголюбов 1953. В статьях В. Б. Хеннинга (Henning 1955а; 1955б) содержится неоправданно суровая критика исследования А. А. Фреймана.

5 Henning 1936; 1955а–б; 1958; 1965; 1971.

6 Henning 1971; MacKenzie 1970, 1971а–г, 1972.

7 Zeki Velidi Togan 1951.

8 Benzing 1968.

9 MacKenzie 1970, 1971б–в, 1972.

10 Боголюбов 1962б, 1961а–б, 1963, 1965, 1985а–б.

11 Benzing 1983.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

грамматики позднехорезмийского языка содержится в работах Х. Хумбаха[12], М. Самади,[13] Д. Дуркин-Мейстерэрнста[14] и Д. И. Эдельман[15].

Хорезмийские глоссы показывают, что в XIV в. хорезмийский был еще языком значительной части населения Хорезма, хотя его уже потеснили тюркские языки. Фраза в «Кунйат ал-мунйа»: «Если хорезмиец скажет по-тюркски (*fy zβ'k fy trk'nk*) „мой милый мальчик …“» показывает, что часть хорезмийцев уже в XIII в. была двуязычной. В XIV в. процесс вытеснения хорезмийского языка, по-видимому, прекратился. В хивинских говорах узбекского языка отмечены лишь немногие слова хорезмийского происхождения, например, *yap* «оросительный канал, арык».

Азами и Виндфур предположили, что сангесари, принадлежащий к диалектной группе на территории к востоку от Семнана, имеет фонетические, грамматические и лексические особенности, сближающие его с восточноиранским языковым массивом, в частности, с хорезмийским. К историко-фонетическим признакам такого сходства относятся: *ϑr > š — в сангесари *šy* «три», хорезмийское *šy* (< *ϑray-); послеложный показатель прямого объекта в сангесари *-də* (< dar), хорезмийское *-δāra*; потенциальные конструкции с вспомогательным глаголом — сангесари *šaš-* «разрушаться; разбрасываться», хорезмийское *š'šy-* «разбрасывать», сангесари *āšax* «бабка, игра в бабки», хорезмийское *'škk* «копыто» (букв. «маленький сапог»); сангесари *šəkāyīn* «женщина» (наряду с *žən*); хорезмийское *'šcʸk* «женский» (ср. также: Windfuhr 1975).

Небольшой объем сходств такого рода не позволяет реконструировать историческую картину взаимоотношений сангесари с хорезмийским. Следует учитывать, что в позднехорезмийском ясно проступают признаки диалектного смешения (см. Henning 1958, С. 109–110). Так, в количественных числительных: хорезмийское *šy* «три» (< *ϑray-); *hrδʸs* «тринадцать» (< *ϑrai-dasa-); *šys* «тридцать» (< *ϑri-sat-) (см. Эдельман 2008, С. 39; Durkin-Meisterernst 2009, С. 338).

Насколько можно судить, наиболее раннее свидетельство хорезмийской ономастики относится к V в. до н. э. В ахеменидском гарнизоне Элефантины, на юге Египта, среди воинов-колонистов упоминается хорезмиец drgmn b' ḥršyn/*Dargamănah puϑr* (или *puhr*) *Xwaršaina* (Cowley 1923, 6.2; 7.8; 17.22; 8.5.3; Боголюбов 1967).

Имя *Dargamănah* имеет прозрачную этимологию: «Долгомысл», ср. авест. *darəga-*, *darəγa-* (AWb. 694–695); древнеперс. *darga-* (Kent 1953, С. 190), древнеинд. *dīrghá-*, осет. *darǰ* «длинный, долгий» (ИЭСОЯ I, С. 344–345), *därǧ*, *därǧčä* «длина» (там же); курд. (курманджи) *därg*, *derg*; ормури *räγ*

12 Humbach 1989.
13 Samadi 1986.
14 Durkin-Meisterernst 2005 и 2009.
15 Эдельман 2000 и 2008.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

«длинный», шугн. *δargi* «длина; медлительность»; пашто *lārga* «промедление; прежде»; среднеперс. *dagr* «длинный» (MacKenzie 1971, C. 23); новоперс. *dēr*; среднеперс.-ман. dgr/*dagr*, dyr/*dēr* (Boyce 1977, C. 34, 38), греч. δολιχος, лат. *longus*, ст.-слав. *длъгъ*, русск. *долгий*. Г. Шедер (Schaeder 1930, C. 29; ср. Grelot 1972, C. 470; Kornfeld 1978, C. 104; Hinz 1975, C. 83) предлагал толковать это имя как «Долготерпящий», но такая этимология не кажется мне убедительной (ср. Δαργαμάνης — название реки в Бактрии, Ptol. VI. 11.2, см. Markwart 1938, C. 25).

Имя отца Даргаманаха *ḥršyn* Боголюбов (1967, C. 22, прим. 7) предложил читать *Xwaršaina-*, в эламских передачах *Maršena*, *Pairšena* (On. P. 8.918; 8.1299).

Второе хорезмийское имя, засвидетельствованное для ахеменидского периода, известно в греческой передаче Φαρασμάνης. Ф. Юсти определял носителя этого имени (Φαρασμάνης, сын Φραταφέρνης) как ахеменидского сатрапа хорезмийцев (Justi 1895, C. 91; см. Arrian, *Anabasis* IV.15.4; Curtius Rufus VIII.1.8; варианты у Арриана: Φαραμάνης [VI.27.3], Φραδασμανης [VII.6.4]).

Следует скорее полагать, что это имя имеет буквальное значение «(Стоящий) перед небесным сводом», авест. *asan-*, *ašn-* «камень» (AWb. 207–208), древнеперс. *asman-* (Kent 1953, C. 173); древнеинд. *áśan-*, *aśman-* «камень; небо»; среднеперс., новоперс. *āsmān* (MacKenzie 1971, C. 12); среднеперс.-ман., парф.-ман. ʾsmʾʾn, ʾsmʾn/*āsmān* «id.» (Boyce 1977, C. 15). Ср. авест. *Asmō.xᵛanuuaṇt-* «личное имя зороастрийца» (AWb. 221). Ф. Альтхайм (Altheim/Stiehl 1970, C. 188) предлагал возводить имя Φαρασμανης к древнеиранскому **Xwārazmaina-* «Земля солнца (?)»; ср. авест. *zəmaēna-* «земляной» (AWb. 1690).

Несколько хорезмийских личных имен засвидетельствовано в аккадских передачах (см. Dandamayev 1992, C. 164–165). В вавилонском документе ИСР 9/2, 38, датированным пятым годом правления Кира (534 г. до н. э.), упоминается хорезмиец (стк. 7: [LÚ Ḫur-zi]ma-a-a) по имени *Dadaparna-/*Dātafarnah-* «Созданный с харизмой/славой», греч. Δαταφέρνης, среднеперс. *Dādfarn*. В вавилонском документе, датированном правлением Кира или Камбиза (Michigan Collection 89, стк. 51) упомянут хорезмиец (LÚ Ḫur-zi-ma-a-a) по имени Ukiriya — **Hukṛya-*, букв. «Хорошо сделанный» (Dandamayev 1992, C. 164).[16] В вавилонском документе Dar. 458 в заключительной части текста, датированной 565 г. до н. э., упомянут в качестве свидетеля хорезмиец (стк. 14: LÚ Ḫur-zi-ma-a-a) Ubaratta — **Hufrata-* «Хороший (и) милый» рядом с неким киммерийцем и другими свидетелями.

16 Таверье предлагал читать *Údiriya-* — древнеир. **Udrya-* «Выдра» (имя-прозвище?) вместо *Ukiriya-* (Tavernier 2007, 4.2.798). Ср. авест. *udra-* «выдра» (AWb. 337), древнерусск. «выдра», древнеинд. *udrá-* «водяное животное; гидра»; греч. ὕδρο, ὕδρα «гидра; водяная змея»; греч. ὕδωρ «вода».

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Хорезм был завоеван персами в 534 г. до н. э. — хорезмиец **Dātafarnah-* в этом году был в Вавилоне в ахеменидском воинском обряде (там же).

Проведенные мною и П. Б. Лурье исследования эпиграфических материалов с городищ Топрак-кала, Кой-Крылган-кала, Калалы-гыр 2, Гяур-кала, перечня хорезмийских имен на остраке из Хумбуз-тепе, имен в хорезмийских монетных легендах III–VIII вв., а также в хорезмийских надписях на серебряных чашах и блюдах и в оссуарных эпитафиях из некрополей Ток-калы и Мидахкана, показало, что в этих материалах содержится более 400 хорезмийских имен — теофорных и нетеофорных, в том числе имен-прозвищ, гипокористиков — уменьшительно-ласкательных имен и личных имен других структур.

Хорезмийские личные имена по своей семантике и морфологической структуре делятся на следующие основные группы:

– Односоставные полные имена, образованные через усечение двуосновного имени. Это обычно шутливые имена или прозвища. Различаются бессуфиксальные односоставные имена и односоставные имена-гипокористики — ласкательные и уменьшительные имена, с суффиксами и без суффиксов. В хорезмийских гипокористиках наиболее часты суффиксы *-ek*, *-ēn*, *-ič*, *-ičak*, *-ǐk*.
– Односоставные имена без суффиксов: ʾptr/*Əptar* «отец»; ʾrm/*Arm* «рука»; ʾrtʾw/*Artāw* «Праведный», из древнеир. **Ṛtawān-*, древнеперс. *artavān-* «праведный, счастливый» (Kent 1953, C. 171), авест. *ašǎuuan-* «преданный истине; праведный» (AWb. 246–254); brzʾwn/*Vərzāwan* «Высокий» или «Длинный», из древнеир. **bṛzawan-*, позднехорезмийское (ʾ)βž- «длинный».
– Суффиксальные гипокористики: brwrtyk/*Frawartek* «(Обладающий) душой умершего (?)», от древнеир. **frawarti-*, авест. *frauuašaii-* (AWb. 992–995); bʾmk/*Vāmek* «Сияющий», от древнеир. **[1]bā-*, **bi-* «сиять; светить» (ЭСИЯ 2, С. 154–158); авест. *bā-* «светить; сиять» (AWb. 952); хот. *bā-* «светить(ся)» (DKhS, C. 274); позднехорезмийское bβʾs- «становиться бледным, светлым» (Samadi 1986, C. 13); согд.-будд. prβʾs-/*parfās-* (< **pari-apa-*) «изменять цвет; бледнеть, светлеть» (Gharīb 1995, C. 282, No. 2044); осет.-ирон. *ivajyn: ivad*, диг. *ivajun: ivad* «бледнеть; вянуть; рассветать» (ИЭСОЯ I, С. 553); хот. *vīv-* «освещать; светить» (DKhS, C. 388); хот. *ḫāyä*, *ḫāya-*, *ḫāyi* «луч света» (DKhS, S. 277); *bveya-* «свет» (там же, С. 320). Вах. *voyn* «свет; огонь; луч света» (< **bāhana-*) (ЭСВЯ, С. 321); ср. также авест. *bāma-* «свет; сияние; блеск» (AWb. 954); *vīspō. bāma-* «имеющий весь/полный свет» (AWb. 1468); среднеперс., новоперс. *bāmdād* «рассвет; утро» (MacKenzie 1971, C. 17); среднеперс. bʾm/*bām* «сияние; блеск» (Boyce 1977, C. 26).

Хорезмийское имя *Tūtīxas* ⟨twtyḫs⟩, имеющее буквальное значение «Учащийся (у) попугая» или «Смотрящий (на) попугая», в первом компоненте имеет *tūtī* «попугай» — слово, заимствованное из новоперсидского или

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

согдийского и не имеющее достоверной иранской этимологии. Хорезмийское имя *Bēwar* ⟨Bywr⟩, буквально «мириад; десять тысяч, несметное множество», возникло в результате сокращения засвидетельствованных в эпиграфических материалах имен *Bēwarsar* ⟨Bywrsr⟩ «(Обладающий) мириадом связей (с божеством)» и *Bēwarsawak* «(Обладающий) тысячью связей». Имя *Srōšek* ⟨Srwšk⟩ образовано от теонима **Srauša-*, авестийского *Sraoša-*, среднеперсидского Slwš/*Srōš*, новоперс. *Surōš* «Божество послушания; 17-й день зороастрийского календаря» (MacKenzie 1971, С. 77); парф.-ман. srwš'w/*Srōšāw* «имя Отца величия», среднеперс.-ман. srwš'hr'y/*Srōšahrāy* «Праведный Sraoša; имя Столпа света» (Boyce 1971, С. 82); позднехорезмийское 'srwf (см. Henning 1958, С. 115; Лившиц 1970б, С. 168); парфянские имена в хозяйственных документах на остраках из раскопок Старой Нисы: sr(wš?)/*Srōš*, srwšdt/*Srōšdāt*; srwšk/*Srōšak*; srwšdtk/*Srōšdātak*; srwšk/*Srōšak*; şrwšssnk/*Srōšsāsānak*; srwšyk/*Srōšīk* (Лившиц 2010, С. 149, Nos. 594–599).

Хорезмийское имя *Āϑru* ⟨'trw⟩, букв. «огонь», образовано от древнеир. **ātr̥-*, **ātr-* «огонь»; среднеперс. 'twr/*Ādur*, новоперс. *ādar* «божество огня; название 9-го месяца и 9-го дня зороастрийского календаря» (MacKenzie 1971, С. 5), парф.-ман., среднеперс.-ман. 'dwr/*Ādur* «огонь»; 'dwr m'h/*Ādur māh* «месяц огня; 9-й месяц»; парф.-ман., среднеперс.-ман. 'dwryn, ''dwryn/*ādurēn* «огненный; сгоревший» (Boyce 1977, С. 8); среднеперс.-ман. 'dwrystr/*ādurestar* «пепел, зола» (там же). Позднехорезмийское 'rw «название 9-го месяца и 9-го дня зороастрийского календаря» (Henning 1971, С. 30; Benzing 1983, С. 81; ср авест. *āϑrī*); в «Памятниках минувших поколений» Бӣрӯн: 'rw, в оссуарных эпитафиях: *'trw*.

Имя *Āϑru* ⟨'trw⟩, по-видимому, возникло в хорезмийском в результате усечения двухкомпонентного имени **Āϑrusawak-* ⟨*'trwswk?⟩ «(Обладающий) связью (с божеством) огня».

Здесь приведено лишь несколько примеров, показывающих структуру и семантику хорезмийских личных имен и их связь с зороастризмом и позволяющих еще раз задуматься о гипотезе В. Б. Хеннинга (1951, С. 45; ср. MacKenzie 1988) о Хорезме как возможной родине зороастризма — гипотезе, сформулированной в середине прошлого века.

В заключение приведу три перевода раннехорезмийских эпиграфических текстов:

> *Оссуарная эпитафия № 25 из некрополя Ток-калы*[17]
> [1] BŠNT 3+3+(1)×100 YRH' [2] βrwrtn BYWM βrwrtn ZNH tpnkwk [3] NPŠY 'y srwywk tyšy'n'nw 'rw'n [4] 'D hy'n 'y 'rw'n 'L nwš γrδm'n [5] m'ny'ty
> «[1] Год 706 (хорезмийской эры), месяц [2] фравартин, день фравартин. Этот ящичек [3] принадлежит (букв. „собственный“) душе Сравӣōка, сына Тӣшӣāна. [4] Пусть их души (букв. „душа“) в вечном раю пребывают (букв. „пребывает“)!»

17 Толстов/Лившиц 1964, С. 60–62; Tolstov/Livshits 1964; Henning 1965, С. 179; MacKenzie 1983, С. 1241.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Список членов семьи и домашних рабов в топраккалинском документе Д-II (на арчевой дощечке)[18]

Recto
[1] BYT' xrk [2] xrk [3] βywrsr 'γt [4] p(y?)k 'γt < [5] 'BDn' [6] m'mk [7] rzm'γtk [8] k'k'nšk [9] 'prtγrywk [10] 'wpnyštk [11] 'rtxw(t'w?) [12] wnynk [13] trmtk

Verso
[14] t'tk [15] k'šβrzk < [16] 'BDn' ZK 'NTTYH [17] krtyw'nk [18] mršpk
«Дом Xareka: Xarek; (сыновья) — впервые присутствующий [при переписи] Bēwarsar; впервые присутствующий [при переписи] Pēk; рабы: Māmek, Razmāγatek, Kākānaček; Āpartγrīwek; Up(a)ništek; Artaxwatāw; Wanēnek; Tarmatek; Tātek; Kašvarzek; эти рабы жены [домовладыки] Kartyawanek; Marčpek.»

Надпись на серебряной чаше № 1 из Первого Исаковского могильника[19]
tšt ZNH wtykny MN βrz'wny tḥwmkn (*или* tswmkn) WKN 'ḤRY MR'Y MLK' 'mwrzm BR MLK' wrdn mzd'ḥy 'BDw QPD (*или* QPR) GYN 3 prwrtyn
«Эта пиршественная чаша от Барзавāна, (сына) Тахумака (*или* Тасумака). И вот затем: государь царь Амуржам, сын царя Вардана, (в) дар ему (сосуд) сделан … 3(-го месяца) фравартӣн.»

Для меня большая честь опубликовать эту статью в сборнике памяти Вернера Зундермана. Я познакомился с ним в 1992 г. и встречался с ним в 1993, 1996 и 2000 г. на конференциях по иранистике. В. Зундерман, ученик Ф. Юнкера, автор многих превосходных работ по истории манихейства, манихейской литературе, истории парфянского и среднеперсидского языков (Sundermann 1973, 1981, 1985, 1989 и многие другие его монографии и статьи) останется в памяти всех востоковедов как пример неутомимого служения науке.

Сокращения

ВДИ	*Вестник древней истории*
ВЯ	*Вопросы языкознания*
ИЭСОЯ	Абаев В. И.: *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка*. Т. I–IV. Москва/Ленинград, 1958–1988
ЭСВЯ	Стеблин-Каменский И. М.: *Этимологический словарь ваханского языка*. Санкт-Петербург, 1999
ЭСРЯ	Фасмер М.: *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения О. И. Трубачева. Т. I–IV. Москва, 1964–1973

18 Лившиц 1984, С. 269.
19 Лившиц 2010, С. 278–289.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

AcIr	Acta Iranica
AM	*Asia Major*
AWb	Bartholomae, Ch.: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. 2. unveränderte Auflage. Berlin, 1986
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CLI	*Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Hrsg. von R. Schmitt. Wiesbaden 1989
DKhS	Bailey, H. W.: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne, 1979
OnP	Mayrhofer, M.: *Onomastica Persepolitana. Das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Täfelchen*. Unter Mitarbeit von J. Harmatta, W. Hinz, R. Schmitt und J. Siebert. Wien, 1973 (SÖAW 286)
SÖAW	Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

Литература

На русском языке

Бадер, О. Н. 1960: «Камская археологическая экспедиция в 1957 г.» // *Краткие сообщения Института истории материальной культуры*, вып. 78, С. 90–99.

Бадер, О. Н./А. Н. Смирнов 1954: *«Серебро закамское» первых веков нашей эры. Бартымское местонахождение*. Москва (Труды ГИМ: Памятники культуры, Вып. 13).

Боголюбов М. Н. 1953: [рец.] Фрейман А. А. / *Хорезмийский язык. Материалы и исследования I*. Москва/Ленинград, 1951 // ВЯ, № 6, С. 147–151.

— 1961а: «О некоторых особенностях арабо-хорезмийской письменности.» // *Народы Азии и Африки*, № 4, С. 182–187.

— 1961б: «Частицы в хорезмийском языке.» // *Языки народов Востока.* Уч. зап. ЛГУ, № 305. Серия востоковедческих наук, вып. 12. Ленинград, С. 81–84.

— 1962а: «Древнеперсидские этимологии.» // *Древний мир. Сборник статей академику Василию Васильевичу Струве*. Москва, С. 367–370.

— 1962б: «Личные местоимения в хорезмийском языке.» // *Филология стран Востока*. Уч. зап. ЛГУ, № 306. Серия востоковедческих наук, вып. 16. Ленинград, С. 6–15.

— 1963: «Местоимения в хорезмийском языке.» // *Краткие сообщения Института народов Азии АН СССР*, № 67, С. 99–103.

— 1965: «Пролептические конструкции в иранских языках.» // *Филология и история стран зарубежной Азии и Африки*. Тезисы научной конференции Восточного факультета ЛГУ 1964/1965 учебного года. Ленинград, С. 10–11.

— 1967: «Почетный титул ахеменидского военачальника в Верхнем Египте.» // *Палестинский сборник*. Вып. 17 (80): *История и филология стран Ближнего Востока в древности и средневековье*. Ленинград, С. 20–25.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1971: «Молитва Ахурамазде на древнеиранском языке среди арамейских надписей из Арбесуна.» // *История иранского государства и культуры. К 2500–летию иранского государства*. Под ред. Б. Г. Гафурова. Москва, С. 277–286.
— 1985а: «Хорезмийские календарные глоссы в „Хронологии“ Бируни I.» // ВЯ, № 1, стр. 28–33.
— 1985б: «Хорезмийские календарные глоссы в „Хронологии“ Бируни II.» // ВЯ, № 6, стр. 35–39.
— 1999: «Хорезмийская глагольная глосса.» // *Изучение культурного наследия Востока. Культурные традиции и преемственность в развитии древних культур и цивилизаций*. Санкт-Петербург, С. 14–16.
Вайнберг Б. И. 1977: *Монеты древнего Хорезма.* Москва.
— 2001: «Хорезмийская эра.» // *Древние цивилизации Евразии. История и культура*. Под ред. А. В. Седова. Москва, С. 136–141.
Васильков Я. В./М. Ю. Сорокина 2003: *Люди и судьбы. Биобиблиографический словарь востоковедов–жертв политического террора в советский период (1917–1991)*. Санкт-Петербург.
Гудкова А. В. 1964: *Ток-кала*. Ташкент.
Гудкова А. В./В. А. Лившиц 1967: «Новые хорезмийские надписи из некрополя Ток-калы и проблема „хорезмийской эры“.» // *Известия Каракалпакского филиала Академии наук Узбекской ССР*, вып. 1, С. 3–19.
Лившиц В.А. 1970а: «Приложение. Хорезмийские надписи на оссуариях с некрополя Миздахкана.» // В. Н. Ягодин, Т. Х. Ходжайов / *Некрополь древнего Миздахкана*. Ташкент, С. 247–252.
— 1970б: «Хорезмийский календарь и эры древнего Хорезма.» // *Палестинский сборник*. Вып. 21 (84): *Ближний Восток и Иран*. Ленинград, С. 161–169.
— 1984: «Документы.» // *Топрак-кала. Дворец (Труды Хорезмской археолого-этнографической экспедиции XIV)*. Отв. ред. Ю. А. Рапопорт, Е. Е. Неразик. Москва, С. 251–286.
— 2004: «Надписи и документы.» // *Калалы-гыр 2. Культовый центр в Древнем Хорезме IV–II вв. до н. э.* Отв. ред. Б. И. Вайнберг. Москва, С. 188–212.
— 2009: «Памятники хорезмийской письменности.» // ВДИ, № 3, С. 108–113
— 2010: *Парфянская ономастика. Отечественные исследования*. Санкт-Петербург.
— 2011: «Личные имена в хорезмийском языке.» // ВДИ, № 4, С. 156–166.
Лившиц В. А./М. М. Мамбетуллаев 1986: «Острак из Хумбуз-тепе.» // *Памятники истории и литературы Востока. Период феодализма. Статьи и сообщения*. Москва, С. 34–45.
Смирнов Я. М. 1909: *Восточное серебро. Атлас серебряной и золотой посуды восточного происхождения, найденной преимущественно в пределах Российской империи*. Санкт-Петербург.
Толстов С. П. 1938: «Монеты шахов древнего Хорезма и древнехорезмийский алфавит.» // ВДИ, №3154, С. 120–145.
— 1948: *Древний Хорезм. Опыт историко-археологического исследования*. Москва.
Толстов С. П./В. А. Лившиц 1964: «Датированные надписи на хорезмийских оссуариях с городища Ток-кала.» // *Советская Этнография*, № 2, С. 50–69.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Эдельман Д.И. 2000: «Хорезмийский язык.» // *Языки мира. Иранские языки. III. Восточноиранские языки*. Москва, С. 95–104.
— 2008: «Хорезмийский язык.» // *Основы иранского языкознания. Среднеиранские и новоиранские языки*. Москва, С. 6–60.

На западноевропейских языках

Altheim, F./R. Stiel 1965: *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*. Bd. II: *Bis zur Reichstrennung*. Berlin.
— 1970: *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum*. Berlin.
Azami, Ch./G. Windfuhr 1972: *A Dictionary of Sangesari. With a Grammatical Outline*. Tehran.
Azarpay, G. 1969: «Nine inscribed Choresmian bowls.» // *Artibus Asiae* XXI, 2/3, C. 185–203.
Benzing, J. 1968: *Das chwaresmische Sprachmaterial einer Handschrift der "Muqaddimat al-Adab" von Zamaxšarī*. Bd. I: *Text*. Wiesbaden.
— 1983: *Chwarezmischer Wortindex*. Mit einer Einleitung von H. Humbach. Hrsg. von Z. Taraf. Wiesbaden.
Boyce, M. 1977: *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Téhéran/Liège (AcIr 9a).
Cowley, A. 1923: *Aramaic Papyri of the fifth Century B.C. Edited, with Translation and Notes*. Oxford.
Dandamayev, M.A. 1992: *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*. Costa Mesa, Cal./New York (Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6).
Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2005: «Khwarezmian lexicology.» // *Middle Iranian Lexicography. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Rome, 9–11 April 2001*. Ed. by C.G. Cereti and M. Maggi. Roma (Serie orientale Roma 98), C. 144–146.
— 2009: «Khwarezmian.» // *The Iranian Languages*. Ed. by G. Windfuhr. London/New York, C. 336–376.
Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian–Persian–English*. Tehran.
Grelot, P. 1972: *Documents araméens d'Égypte*. Paris (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 5).
Henning, W.B. 1936: «Über die Sprache der Chwarezmier.» // ZDMG 90, C. *30*–*34*.
— 1951: *Zoroaster. Politician or Witch-doctor?* London (Ratanbai Katrak Lectures 1949).
— 1955a: «The structure of the Khwarezmian verb.» // AM [N.S.] 5.1, C. 43–49.
— 1955б: «The Khwarezmian language.» // *60. doğum yılı münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Togan'a armağan: Symbolae in honorem*. Istanbul, C. 421–436.
— 1958: «Mitteliranisch.» // *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. T. 1, Bd. IV: *Iranistik*. 1. Abschnitt: *Linguistik*. Leiden/Köln, C. 20–130.
— 1965: «The Choresmian Documents.» // AM [N.S.] 11, C. 166–179.
— 1971: *A Fragment of a Khwarezmian Dictionary*. Ed. by D.N. Mac-Kenzie. London (Publications of Tehran University 1317; Ganǰine-ye zabān va loghat-e Iran 16).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Hinz, W. 1975: *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. Unter Mitarbeit von R.-M. Berger, G. Korbel und A. Nappe. Wiesbaden (Göttinger Orientforschungen, III. Reihe: Iranica).

Humbach, H. 1989: «Choresmian.» // CLI, C. 193–203.

Justi, F. 1895: *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.Marburg.

Kent, R. 1953: *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. 2nd edition. New Haven (American Oriental Series 33).

Kornfeld, W. 1978: *Onomastica Aramaica aus Ägypten*. Wien (SÖAW 333).

MacKenzie D. N. 1970: «The Khwarezmian Glossary – I.» // BSOAS 33.3, C. 540–559.

— 1971а: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London [Reprinted with Addenda and Corrigenda 1986].

— 1971б: «The Khwarezmian Glossary – II.» // BSOAS 34.1, C. 74–90.

— 1971в: «The Khwarezmian Glossary – III.» // BSOAS 34.2, C. 314–330.

— 1971г: «Supplement: Cross-references.» // *A Fragment of a Khwarezmian Dictionary*. By the late W. B. Henning. Ed. by D. N. MacKenzie. London.

— 1972: «The Khwarezmian Glossary – IV.» // BSOAS 34.3, C. 56–73.

— 1983: «Khwarazmian language and literature.» // *Cambridge History of Iran*. Vol. 3.2, ed. by E. Yarshater. Cambridge, C. 1244–1249.

— 1988: «Khwarezmian and Avestan.» // *East and West* 38, C. 81–92.

— 1990: *The Khwarezmian Element in the* Qunyat al-Munya. London.

Markwart, J. 1938: *Wehrot und Arang. Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran*. Hrsg. von H. H. Schaeder. Leiden.

Samadi, M. 1986: *Das Chwaresmische Verbum*. Wiesbaden.

Schaeder 1930: «Iranische Beiträge I.» // Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 6. Jahr, Heft 5 [Nachdruck Hildesheim/New York 1972].

Sundermann, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*. Berlin (BTT IV).

— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin (BTT XI).

— 1985: *Ein manichäisch-sogdisches Parabelbuch, mit einem Anhang von Friedmar Geissler über Erzählmotive in der Geschichte von den zwei Schlangen*. Berlin (BTT XV).

— 1989: «Westiranische Sprachen»; «Parthisch»; «Mittelpersisch.» // CLI, C. 106–165.

Tavernier J. 2007: *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550–330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts*. Leuven (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 158).

Tolstov, S. P./V. A. Livshits 1964: «Decipherment and interpretation of Khwarezmian inscriptions from Tok-kala.» // *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, t. XII, fasc. 1–2, C. 231–251.

Walidi = Zeki Validi = Zeki Velidi Togan

Walidi, A. Z. 1927: «Khwarezmische Sätze in einem arabischen *Fiqh*-Werke.» // *Islamica. Zeitschrift für die Erforschung der Sprachen und Kulturen der islamischen Völker* 3, C. 190–213.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Windfuhr, G. 1975: «Isoglosses: A sketch on Persian and Parthians, Kurds and Medes.» // *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*. Vol. II, Ed. by J. Duchesne-Guillemin. Téhéran/Liège (AcIr 5), C. 457–472.

Zeki Validi, A. 1936: «Über die Sprache und Kultur der alten Chwaresmier.» // ZDMG 90, C. *27*–*30*.

Zeki Velidi Togan 1951: *Horezmçe tercümeli Muqaddimat al-Adab. Khorezmian Glossary of the Muqaddimat al-adab*. Istanbul (Horezm kültürü vesikalari 1; Documents on the Khorezm Culture 1).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Myth of Sogdian Lambdacism

Pavel Lurje, Saint-Petersburg / Ilya Yakubovich, Moscow

1. It is a well-known fact that the inherited Indo-European phoneme **l* merged with **r* in Proto-Iranian in the majority of cases.[1] The phoneme /l/ is absent from Avestan and in Old Persian it is limited to the borrowed stratum of lexicon. On the other hand, it is commonly assumed that in some instances the inherited IE **l* was preserved in Iranian languages up to the modern times, as is the case of Farsi *leštän* 'to lick' or Ossetian *læsæg* 'salmon'. In order to reconcile these ideas one would have to assume that the retention of **l* in isolated lexemes was a dialectal phenomenon within Proto-Iranian (Mayrhofer 1989, p. 10).

In a later period, the lateral phoneme increased its frequency in individual parts of the Iranian-speaking world through a number of language-specific processes. In the history of Middle Persian, for example, the secondary *l* developed from clusters **rd* and **rz* (Rastorgueva/Molchanova 1981a, p. 46). In Yidgha and Munji the lateral sonorant represents the default reflex of initial and intervocalic **d* > **δ* (Griunberg 1987, pp. 174–175), while in Pashto it is also the standard outcome of initial and intervocalic **θ*, as well as intervocalic **-t-* (Skjærvø 1989, pp. 402–403). In the Ishkashimi language of the Pamir area the phoneme *l* appears to represent the reflex of intervocalic **š* (Pakhalina 1987, p. 494).

In contrast with the above cases, *l* remained a marginal phoneme in the attested varieties of the Sogdian language. Although the Sogdian National Script has no special grapheme for the lateral sound (cf. below), the Sogdian adaptations of the Manichaean and Estrangelo Scripts, which feature such a grapheme, can be used to ascertain the rarity of this segment. Based on their evidence, there seems to be no assured instances of Sogdian *l* that would reflect an Indo-European archaism. Only exceptionally do we find this phoneme in inherited lexemes. Thus in the instance of *wlrz-* 'to tremble' (C) it is reasonable to assume secondary dissimilation, while *wyr'rz-* (S) 'id.' likely represents a more archaic state of affairs, because the unreduplicated form of the same root is attested in

1 Subject to the usual disclaimers. We are deeply grateful to Professor Nicholas Sims-Williams (Cambridge) for a number of helpful references and comments in response to our specific queries, L. E. Kogan (Moscow) for helpful information on the Semitic side of the problem, and D. Hitch (Whitehorse, Yukon) for numerous stylistic corrections. Ilya Yakubovich would like to acknowledge the support of the Humboldt Fellowship and the academic hospitality of the Philipps-Universität Marburg, which were both essential for completing this project.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Khotanese *rrīyz-* 'id.' (Yoshida 2010, p. 286).[2] Rather more frequent is the preservation of *l* in loanwords. Thus in Christian texts one finds *ʾwnglywn* 'Gospel', *qndylyt* 'candles', *qθwlyqyt* '*catholici*' etc. (for more examples see Sims-Williams 1988), while in the Manichaean texts one encounters the same *ʾwnglywn* 'gospel', as well as *δwlyy* 'Aquarius', *šqlwn* 'demon Shaklon' etc. So far as one can judge, the Sogdian forms of foreign origin that preserve /l/ are from the domain of specialized religious terminology and this phoneme tended to be lost with the integration of loanwords (on which see Section 6 below).

2. Despite this descriptive evidence, claims have been made that certain Sogdian dialect(s) featured the phenomenon of lambdacism, or the change $*d > l$ and $*\theta > l$. The rationale for such a theory was a seeming convergence between the treatment of alleged Sogdian loanwords in Early New Persian and the way alphabets of Aramaic origin were adapted to the Sogdian language. Its most distinguished proponent was Walter Bruno Henning, who without a doubt represented the leading figure in Sogdian philology in the mid-twentieth century. His groundbreaking work on East Iranian loanwords in Early New Persian contains the following statement:

> It seems that in most Sogdian dialects Old Iranian *d* (*δ*) and *θ* had merged into one sound which was very near to *l* in the West (as shown by Persian loan-words as well as by the Sogdian system of writing: letter *δ* = Aramaic *l*), whilst it was pronounced more like *d* in some Eastern dialects (for the Uyghur employed the Sogdian letter *δ* for their *d*). (Henning 1939, p. 7)

Henning was not the first one to advocate Sogdian lambdacism, which had already been invoked by the Sogdianists of the first generation, such as Friedrich Andreas and Frederic Rosenberg (for the summary of their views see Kaufman 1956, pp. 460–464). But Henning's unique place in Sogdian studies has no doubt contributed to the longevity of this hypothesis in Iranological literature. The latest sources known to us where it is cited with approval are Gharib (2013) and Nóvak (2013, p. 113ff.).[3]

2 Here and below we use the abbreviation (S) for the Sogdian forms recorded in the Sogdian National Script. The abbreviations (M) and (C) mark respectively the Sogdian forms recorded in the local adaptations of the Manichaean and Estrangelo Scripts. The traditional use of letter (C) reflects the fact that the use of the Estrangelo script among the Sogdians was restricted to the Christian community. The abbreviations (B) and (M) next to the Bactrian forms indicate that they are transmitted in the National and Manichaean scripts respectively. Unless stated otherwise, all the Sogdian forms are quoted in Gharib (1995), while the Bactrian forms are taken from Sims-Williams (2007). The primary reference for New Persian forms is *Luγatnāma* of Alī Akbar Dihxudā which can be consulted easily now at www.loghatnaameh.org. Almost everything can also be found in bilingual dictionaries of Vullers (1855–1864), Steingass (1892) or Rubinchik (1970).

3 Compare also the discussion of alleged Sogdian loanwords with lambdacism in de la Vaissière 2002, p. 286. These examples were omitted in the English version of the same

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The concise formulation of Henning's hypothesis naturally requires some clarifications. The Sogdian National Script, employed for secular purposes and within the Buddhist tradition, represents an evolved version of the Official Aramaic Script of Achaemenid chanceries. The Aramaic *lamedh* continues to be used there in heterograms, which are conventionally transliterated in capital letters, e.g. *L'* 'not', *MLK'* 'king'. But if a Sogdian word is spelled phonetically, *lamedh* is normally used there for the reflexes of Iranian interdental fricatives. For example, the Sogdian reflex of Ir. **madu-* 'wine' and Ir. **θanjaya-* 'to pull' was recorded in the National Script through the evolved form of the Official Aramaic sequence ⟨m⟩-⟨l⟩-⟨w⟩ and ⟨l⟩-⟨y⟩-⟨n⟩-⟨ṣ⟩ respectively. Nevertheless, the standard convention from the times of Henning up to now is to transliterate these lexemes as *mδw* (not ***mlw*), and *δync-* (not ***lynṣ-*). The motivation for this decision comes not only from the Uighur Script but also from alternative writing systems used for transmitting Sogdian texts. For example, the Sogdian variety of the Estrangelo Script, in use by the local Christians, rendered the word for 'wine' as *mdw* (C), although the grapheme ⟨l⟩ was also available in this writing system. In a similar fashion, the Sogdian spelling *myθ* (C) 'day' vindicates the reading *m'yδ* (not ***m'yl*) for the rendering of the same word in the National Script.

Now a common phonological feature of several East Iranian loanwords in Early New Persian is the reflection of Proto-Iranian **d* (East Iranian **δ*) as *l*. For example, Pers. *mul* 'wine' reflects a foreign rendering of Ir. **madu-* 'id.', whose normal development in New Persian yielded *may* 'id.'. In a few instances one also finds the reflection of Proto-Iranian **θ* as /l/: *linj-* 'to pull out, extract' < Ir. **θanjaya-*. One assumes that Early New Persian lexemes with lambdacism are East Iranian in origin because they display other formal features typical of East Iranian loanwords. For example, the alternation *alfaxt- ~ alfaγd-* in the preterit stem of the verb 'to acquire, gain, earn, collect, save' (Ir. **θwax(š)ta-*) reflects the typical East Iranian voicing of the cluster **xt*. Early New Persian *γūlīn* 'a type of vessel', compared with Sogdian *γwδ'k* (S) 'a type of vessel', *γwd'k* (C) 'a measure', displays the initial voiced fricative *γ-*, which is likewise regarded as an East Iranian feature.

There are also sociolinguistic reasons to accept the East Iranian origin of Persian lexemes with **d > l*. The relevant loanwords are absent in Middle Persian and first attested in the Early New Persian texts recorded in the adapted Arabic script. Early New Persian literacy, and presumably also the new literary *koine*, emerged first in the Samanid State in the 10th century AD. The core of

monograph (id. 2005, p. 289) at the personal recommendation of Ilya Yakubovich. Interestingly enough, Henning's conclusion about the lambdacism in "West Sogdian" dialect was accepted even in the ground-breaking paper by Martin Schwartz, which demonstrated that the source of East Iranian loanwords with lambdacism in Tocharian, Khotanese, and Northwestern Prakrit is not Sogdian, but Bactrian (1974, p. 406).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the Samanid realm was Tokharistan and Sughd,[4] the regions close to the middle course of Amu-Darya, where East Iranian languages had formerly been in use. The Islamization of these regions in the wake of the Arab conquest went hand in hand with a language shift from the local vernaculars to Persian. Presumably, the migration of a limited number of converted Persian civil servants in the footsteps of Arab armies was followed by the conversion to Islam and gradual acquisition of the Persian language on the part of the native population, beginning with the elites.[5] An argument for such a scenario is the extension of the term Tajik, originally an Iranian exonym for the Arabs, to all the present-day Persian speakers in Central Asia (Perry 2009).[6]

Thus the assumption that the Central Asian dialect to which the Official Aramaic Script was initially adapted is identical with the dialect of East Iranian loanwords in Early New Persian yields a logically consistent hypothesis. In Henning's view, it implied the existence of a Sogdian dialectal isogloss, to the west of which one would say [malu] and [le:nʧ-], and to the east [maðu] and [θe:nʧ-]. This geographic orientation was largely based on the assumption that the Persian speakers had to be in contact with the *l*-dialect. Presumably, the Sogdian National Script was based in the western norm, while the Sogdian adaptation of the Estrangelo Script and the Uighur adaptation of the Sogdian National Script emerged in the east. Pushing Henning's hypothesis to its logical conclusion, one could assign an intermediate position to the dialect where the Sogdian adaptation of the Manichaean alphabet took place. Although this

4 The terms Bactria and Sogdiana are used with reference to the areas where the Bactrian and Sogdian languages were spoken during the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods. It is assumed that for Alexander's historians the boundary between the two regions was the river Oxus (Amu-Darya). But from the viewpoint of later historians and archaeological data the northern tributaries of the Oxus up to the Hissar range belonged to Bactria (which corresponds to later Tokharistan) and not Sogdiana (later Sughd).

5 It has to be acknowledged that the available evidence for language contact between Early New Persian and its East Iranian substrate is essentially limited to lexical borrowings, such as those discussed in Henning (1939). These lexical transfers do not seem to be matched by substrate influence on Early New Persian phonology, morphology, or syntax. In sociolinguistic terms this must imply that the shift from the local vernaculars to Persian in the Early Islamic period had a gradual character. This is compatible with the scenario of extended bilingualism, where the bilingual individuals gradually shift to the language of a socially dominant group (Muslim Persians) but retain a number of native lexical items as badges of identity (Borrowing 2 in terms of Ross 1991). The presence of Sogdian speakers outside urban centers of Sughd more than two centuries after the Islamic conquest is advocated on historical grounds in de la Vaissière (2005, pp. 189–190).

6 The situation when military conquest triggers, in the long run, a spread of the language(s) of "middlemen" rather than that of the conquerors, has a number of parallels in world history. A salient parallel, which is reasonably close in time, is the spread of Turkic languages across Eurasia in the wake of Mongol invasions of the 13th century AD.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

alphabet featured a separate grapheme ⟨δ⟩, its shape can be described as a modified form of the letter ⟨l⟩ (Livshits/Khromov 1981, p. 369).[7]

The intrinsic disadvantage of Henning's hypothesis lies in the necessity to postulate dialects of the Sogdian language that are not aligned with particular textual corpora. It would be, for example, impossible to claim that all the texts in the National Script reflect the "West Sogdian" dialect, since the area where this writing system was in use stretched from Bukhara to Dunhuang, and even farther east to the Chinese capitals. The difference between Sogdian communities associated with particular writing systems was not dialectal, but sociological: the National script was in use by the Buddhists and practitioners of traditional Sogdian religion, while the Manichaean and Christian communities had their own scripts (alongside more or less extensive usage of the National script). Therefore the proponents of Sogdian lambdacism must always reason in historical terms, resorting to speculations about the areas where individual writing systems may have originated. If one can account for the observed set of facts without making such hypothetical assumptions, this will yield a superior explanation. In what follows we shall endeavour to accomplish this goal.

3. What Henning could not have known in 1939 is that there is an alternative plausible source for the East Iranian lexemes borrowed in Early New Persian. This is the Bactrian language that was spoken in early medieval Tokharistan. The structure of the Bactrian language could be first approached only after the discovery of the monumental Surkh-Kotal inscription in 1957, while its lexicon became reasonably well known only following the publication of the Bactrian documents in cursive script from Northern Afganistan (Sims-Williams 2000, 2007). Although the absolute majority of Bactrian texts are recorded in the Bactrian National Script, which is derived from the Greek alphabet, the interpretation of Bactrian phonological system is greatly facilitated by a Bactrian text from Turfan recorded in the Manichaean script (Sims-Williams 2009). In particular, one can now be sure that the derived form of the Greek lambda was used for marking /l/ in the Bactrian National Script, because in a number of lexemes it corresponds to the grapheme ⟨l⟩ of the Manichaean text.

The etymological analysis of the Bactrian lexicon reveals that Bactrian /l/ was a nearly ubiquitous reflex of Proto-Iranian **d*. Thus *λαυ-* (B) = *lh-* (M) 'to give' goes back to Pre-Bactrian **daθa-*, *μολο* (B) = *mwwl* (M) 'wine' represents the reflex of Iranian **madu-*. The second element of *(α)βηλαδο* (B) = *ʾβylʾd* (M) 'iniquity' and the first element of *λαδοβαρο* (B) = *lʾdβr* (M) 'judge' go back to

7 The grapheme ⟨l⟩ of the Manichaean Sogdian Script can be described as "lamed with a hook" 𐼰, while ⟨δ⟩ of the same script represents "*lamedh* without a hook" 𐼱. The first letter is shared with the variety of the Manichaean alphabet used for rendering West Iranian languages, while the second one is limited to its Sogdian adaptation and graphically resembles the grapheme ⟨δ⟩ of the Sogdian National Script.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Ir. **dāta-* 'judge'. The forms *γαλιγο* (B) and *γlyh* (M) 'theft' reflect different stages in the phonological development of the same lexeme, whose root cannot be separated from Avestan *gaδa-* 'robber'.[8] In certain environments, the change **θ > l* is also attested in Bactrian, as in the present stem *αλφανζ-* < **θwanja-* 'to acquire'. This lambdacism precisely matches the phonological development postulated for Early New Persian lexemes of East Iranian origin and, unlike the hypothetical Sogdian development, is fully demonstrable. Therefore one may wonder if there are empirical reasons to assume that the relevant loanwords are borrowed from Sogdian and not from Bactrian.[9]

Henning (1939) cites the following eight Early New Persian lexemes with lambdacism, which have attested Sogdian counterparts: *alfaxtan ~ alfaγdan* (present stem *alfaz- ~ alfanj-*) 'to save, acquire' vs. Sogd. (C) *θfyž- / θfxšt-* 'id.', *balād ~ balāda ~ balāya* 'contemptible, corrupted, perverted' vs. Sogd. (S) *(ʾ)pδʾty* 'illegal', *γūlīn* 'a jug with a wide mouth' vs. Sogd. *γwδʾk* 'a type of vessel', *linj-* 'to pull out, extract' vs. Sogd. (S) *δync-* 'id.', *mul* 'wine' vs. Sogd. (C) *mdw* 'id.', *p/balandin* 'door frame' vs. Sogd. (M) *pδynd* 'threshold', *pālik* 'shoes' vs. Sogd. (S) *pδy* 'id.', and *pil* 'heel' vs. Sogd. (C) *pdn(y)* 'heel, kick'. Three out of these eight forms have superior counterparts in Bactrian. The verb *αλφανζ-* / *λφαχτο* (B) 'to acquire' displays the present stem formation matched by its Persian but not Sogdian cognate. The Bactrian origin of Persian *alfanj-* has already been acknowledged in Sims-Williams (2007, p. 190a). Bactrian *μολο* 'wine' and *(α)βηλαδο* 'illegal' are phonetically closer to their Persian synonyms than the Sogdian comparanda proposed by Henning.[10]

8 Many other indications come from loanwords into Bactrian and Bactrian lexemes in foreign transmission. Cf. Bactrian *Ηρακιλο* < *Ἡρακλῆς*, *βαλακο* 'boy' < Indian *bālaka*, *υιλιτοβηρο* < Turkic title *eltäbär* (Sims-Williams 2002, tables). The transfers in the opposite direction are Bactrian *αγαλγο* 'wish' > Tocharian B *akāl(k)*, *λαβνο* 'gift' > Gāndhārī *laṣi* (Schwartz 1974), Bactrian *λαναγγο (βαυρο)* 'city of Lan' > Chinese *Lan*, 蘭 (Sims-Williams 2007, p. 225), Bactrian *Ζολαδο* (PN) > Arabic *zlʾd* (Sims-Williams 2010, p. 66).

9 Interestingly A. A. Frejman (*apud* Kaufman 1956, p. 462) was very close to this solution noting that "there is no indication to suggest that [these] borrowings […] were acquired particularly from Sogdian language (and not from, e. g., Afghan or other Eastern Iranian dialects possessing the shift *d* → *l*) …". At the final stage of the preparation of this paper, is authors became aware of the Persian article Jaafari-Dehaghi/Sadri (2012), which likewise argues for the Bactrian origin of New Persian lexemes displaying the development of the etymological voiced dental stop into the lateral sound. Our hypothesis, which is presented immediately below, had been advanced without the benefit of familiarity with Jaafari-Dehaghi/Sadri (2012, cf. fn. 3 above), and the reverse is, naturally, also true. We acknowledge that Jaafari-Dehaghi and Sadri have the priority in publishing comprehensive evidence for the main phonological correlate of Bactrian loanwords in Old Persian. We hope at the same time that our independent replication of the same results will make them all the more convincing to other scholars.

10 A case not treated by Henning is Pers. *laxšīdan* 'to burn', cf. also modern Tajiki *laxša, laxča* 'live coal, spark of fire'. The same root is attested in the Bactrian derivative *λαχβατανιγο* 'place for cremation', while Sogd. *δxš-* is only known in the figurative meaning 'to give pain, hurt'.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In four cases the Bactrian sources of Persian loanwords remain unattested thus far in our limited corpus, but the formal discrepancy between Persian lexemes and their Sogdian cognates suggests a source of borrowing different from Sogdian. Thus the difference in suffixation precludes direct comparison between Pers. *γūlīn* vs. Sogd. *γwδ'k* or Pers. *p/balandin* vs. Sogd. *pδynd*. The same sort of morphological mismatch separates Persian *pālik* and *pil* from Sogdian *pδy* and *pdn(y)* respectively.[11] Incidentally, the opposite case is that of Pers. *malax* 'locusts', apparently borrowed from Bactr. *μαλαχο* 'id.', whose Sogdian cognate is not attested (for lambdacism in this noun cf. Avestan *maδaxa-* 'locusts'). In this case the correspondence between the Persian and Bactrian forms is flawless. One hopes that new textual discoveries will supply the missing attestations of Bactrian lexemes, just as the recent finds confirmed the Bactrian sources of the Tocharian words, reconstructed in Schwartz (1974).

Only in the case of *linj-* 'to pull out, extract' is it possible to claim that the shape of this lexeme is incompatible with its Bactrian origin. Sogd. *δync-* represents a derivative of Ir. **θanǰ* 'to pull, draw', whose initial voiceless fricative is unambiguously reflected, e.g. in Khot. *thaṃj-* (Cheung 2007, p. 391). The initial **θ-* before a vowel should yield Bactrian /h-/, which one indeed finds in the verbal noun *vαγγο = /hang/* (B) 'load'. Note, however, that after the removal of *alfanj-* from the list of Sogdian loanwords *linj-* would remain the only case illustrating the alleged sound change **θ- > l-* in a Sogdian dialect. Rather than proposing a Sogdian sound law on the basis of a single example, it is easier to assume that *linj-* was borrowed into Persian from a language similar to Pashto, where such a change is independently attested (cf. Pashto *lănga* 'lace or rope for tightening the web of a charpoy'). This case should be compared with Persian *sapal* 'hoof' vs. Sogd. (S) *'spt(')* 'hoof'. Here, too, inventing a Sogdian dialect with **-t- > -l-* would be a strictly *ad hoc* solution given that such a change is attested in Pashto (Skjærvø 1989, pp. 402–403). Yet another loanword in Early New Persian, whose source is neither Sogdian nor Bactrian is *γōl* 'ear' (in dictionaries), which cannot be separated from Parthian *'zgwl-* 'to listen' (Durkin-Meisterernst 2013, pp. 99–100). Both words are ultimately derived of Ir. **gauša-* 'ear' and thus display the sound change **-š- > l*, which in modern times is typical of the Pamir language Ishkashimi (Pakhalina 1987, p. 494).

The items discussed above can be contrasted with the pair of Pers. *xaδūk* 'disappointment, grief, anger' and Sogd. *xδwk* (S, M) 'anger, worry'. In this case one observes the precise match between Early New Persian and Sogdian nouns, and no lambdacism. The absence of the sound change **-δ- > l* precludes Bactrian as

11 Both lexemes are ultimately derived from Ir. **pād-/*pad-* 'foot'. The only known reflex of this root in Bactrian is παλο < **pada-*'family' (presumably via the stages *'trace' > *'progeny'). Unfortunately, the word for 'foot' is not attested in the available Bactrian corpus, although one can strongly suspect that it was the reflex of the same root **pād-/*pad-* as was the case in virtually all the other Iranian languages.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a source of the Persian word. Henning (1939, p. 94) cautiously entertained the hypothesis that *xaδūk* was inherited by Persian, but the presence of intervocalic *-*δ*- speaks for the East Iranian origin of this lexeme. If one accepts that forms with lambdacism come from Bactrian, the problem disappears: *xaδūk* represents a genuine loanword from Sogdian, which shows more conservative treatment of intervocalic *-*δ*-.

Summing up, three of the eight items in Henning's list have Bactrian etymologies that are superior to their Sogdian counterparts, four resist the proposed Sogdian etymologies for morphological reasons, and one was apparently borrowed from a language other than Bactrian or Sogdian. There is not a single instance where a Persian form with lambdacism could be borrowed from Sogdian but not from Bactrian. The only assured borrowing of a Sogdian word containing *δ* in Early New Persian shows no lambdacism.

4. The evidence offered thus far introduces a preferable alternative to the hypothesis of Sogdian lambdacism. In what follows we will attempt to show that the analysis of place-names provides an independent way to control the area where lambdacism had taken place in Early Medieval Central Asia.

The toponymy of Tokharistan of the Early Islamic period shows many regular examples of the development **d > l*: *Baγlān* (Bactrian *βαγολαγγο* 'temple'), *Balx* (Bactrian *Βαχλο*), *Mūlīna* (from Bactr. *μολο* 'wine'), *Sanglān* (from **sankadāna-* 'containing stones'), *Lēwkand* 'town of daewas', *Mēla* (Bactr. *μιλανο, μιλαγγο*) 'middle' (Kamaliddinov 1996, pp. 291, 338, 344, 197, 199), etc. In a few cases, however, the Bactrian name was used interchangeably with another one, Sogdian or Middle Persian. This is, for example, the case of *Āmul/Āmūya*, Sogdian **Āmuδ,* a town on the Oxus more or less between Sogdiana, Parthia and Bactria (see details in Lurje, forthcoming a). A certain *Šālix/Šāδyāx* was located near Termez (Kamaliddinov 1996, p. 119), and *Ṭāliqān* is sometimes rendered as *Ṭāyiqān, aṭ-Ṭāyikān* (Kamaliddinov 1996, pp. 265–266). *Badaxšān* has the common parallel name *Balaxš*, which is well attested in Persian dictionaries.

This situation is in sharp contrast with the medieval toponymy to the north of the Hissar Range, in Sughd and the adjoining territories. In the assured cases, only Arabic, Turkic and Persian names can contain *l* (still quite few in number), but no local Sogdian ones:[12] so, *ǰū-i Mūlīyān* near Bukhara is Arabo-Persian 'canal of clients', *Īlāq* is Turkic *yaylaq* 'summer camp'. More problematic could be *Balāndarīn* (Ibn Ḥauqal, ed. de Goeje 1873, p. 377; Iṣṭakhri Pers., ed. Afshār 1304, p. 255)[13], a canton around Keš, and *Sarsanda/Salsanda Bulis*, the old name of Zāmīn in Ustrushana, to which a Greek etymology can be

12 The old conclusions (Lurje 2004, pp. 199–200) have recently been re-checked with material available in Barthold 1900.

13 Absent in the better manuscript edited by Kramers 1939, p. 502.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

applied (Markwart 1946, p. 290; Lurje 2004, pp. 161–171). On the other hand, the preservation of *δ* or *d*[14] in place of Sogdian *δ* is attested by a great number of toponyms of all parts of Sogdiana, such as *Fayīdēza* or *Fayndēza* in Samarkand 'lord's castle' or 'castle with a temple', *Maδyāmjkaθ* or *Madyānkaθ* 'Middletown' in Central Sogdiana, *Daymūn* near Bukhara (Sogdian *δym* 'face'), *Padyāna* 'Pied(mont)' in Southern Sogdiana, *Dīzak* 'small castle' in Ustrushana, *(A)δaxkaθ* 'town of Dahae' in Chach (Barthold 1900, pp. 93, 100, 118, 140, 166, 175), to name only few examples from various territories inhabited by the Sogdians.

To the north-east of Sughd, in Farghana (and to some extent in Chach/Ilaq) there were toponyms with *l*, but here it corresponds to Sogdian *r*, not *δ* (Lurje 2003, p. 193, n. 33; 2004, p. 201). The only exception is *Dāyiǰ* (from Sogdian *δʾyh* 'slave-woman'?) to the west of Samarkand, modern *Loyiš*. However the toponym is rendered in the form *Dāyiǰ* in 15th century documents (Chekhovich 1974, p. 383), and the shift of *d* to *l* here might be even a later development; other examples (of 15th century or later) show *l* from *r* (often in contact with another *r*, see Lurje 2004, p. 200 with n. 278). It is clear that in the 9th–13th centuries, when these loans entered Persian and when the geography of Sughd was described with great precision, there was simply no place for an *l*-dialect on the Sogdian map.[15]

5. After dismantling the etymological argument adduced for Sogdian lambdacism, it is necessary to turn to the orthographic one. If the source of the Early New Persian words with **d* > *l* is Bactrian rather than Sogdian, can this also imply that Bactrian mediation could be instrumental in the evolution of the Sogdian National Script? The answer is yes, in principle, but it would require the reconstruction of a virtually unknown entity: the Bactrian language recorded in Official Aramaic letters.

We have seen that *lamedh* was used for rendering **d* > *δ* in the Sogdian adaptation of the Official Aramaic Script, which we call the Sogdian National Script.

14 In Arabic script *δ* and *d* differ only with one dot (د versus ذ) and can easily interchange with one another. Moreover in the large portion of early New Persian manuscripts /*δ*/ذ appears to be a postvocalic allophone of /*d*/ د in genuine Iranian words, and this usage, of course, reflects the early Persian pronunciation, including its Transoxian variants (cf. Lazard 1963, pp. 143–144). Thus the correct distribution of *d* and *δ* is dependent on a variety of factors that cannot be addressed in any detail in this paper.

15 The same is true of Chorasmia. Only *al-Fīl*, var. *al-Fīr*, the by-name of the capital *Kāθ* (modern *Pil-qala* near Biruni), exhibits variation of *l* and *r*. In the late Chorasmian language, *l* is attested to our knowledge in *lkc* 'mit dem Fuß schlagen', *lyγ* 'Fuß-Stellen' (onomatopoeic?, Benzing 1983, p. 373) and in *yᵢlᵢ* 'they are' (Durkin-Meisterernst 2009, p. 355), as well as in loanwords. The situation in Yagnobi is basically similar: *l* appears in numerous loan-words and onomatopoeic formations, such as *laks-* 'wander, lollop'. The theory that internal **θr* yields *l* in Yaghnobi has to be abandoned (Livshits 2008, pp. 303–304).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

If we assume that the Bactrian adaptation of the Imperial Aramaic Script ever existed, the same letter was probably used there for Bactrian **d* > *l*. In practice this would mean that a number of Bactrian and Sogdian lexemes with the reflexes of Iranian **d* would have identical or similar spellings. For example, if the Bactrian word for 'hand' (λιστο in the National Script) had the spelling **lst*, it would be graphically undistinguishable from the stem of Sogdian (S) *δst-* 'hand', since both nouns would be rendered with the evolved form of the Official Aramaic sequence ⟨l⟩-⟨s⟩-⟨t⟩.

Given the genetic proximity of the Bactrian and Sogdian languages, the number of lexical pairs whose only distinction was the Bactrian lambdacism must have been large. If one makes an assumption that the Imperial Aramaic Script was first adapted to Bactrian, its further adaptation to Sogdian could imply the transfer of *lamedh* to *δ* via the mediation of cognates. For example, the bilingual scribe(s) could assume that the Bactrian spelling **lst-* 'hand' could also be used for Sogd. *δast-* 'hand', because Sogd. /δ/ was perceived as a variant of Bactrian /l/. In a sense, Bactrian would play the same role under the proposed scenario as the hypothetical "West Sogdian" dialect according to Henning's views.

There is much on the historical side that is compatible with the proposed analysis. The ties between Bactria and Sogdiana in the second half of the first millennium BC were very close and Bactria dominated over Sogdiana more often than vice versa. In the Achaemenid period (by the time of the late Achaemenids at least) Sogdiana formed a part of the Bactrian satrapy. This conclusion was reached based on the study of Classical sources by Paul Bernard (1990, p. 26) and later Pierre Briant (2002, pp. 743–754), and now it is wholly supported by Aramaic documents from Bactria. It is now clear that the towns Kesh and Nakhshab in Sogdiana were under the control of the governor of Khulm, who was in turn dependent on the Bactrian satrap (Shaked 2003, p. 1520ff.).

Later on, both Bactria and Sogdiana come under the power of Alexander, who appointed Clitus the governor of both lands, to be later replaced with Philip and then Stasanor. Then the control over Bactria passed to the Seleucides and later to the Graeco-Bactrian Kingdom. The latter initially also included Sogdiana, even if the Greek rule there was weak (see Zeimal 1983, p. 235ff). The geographical distribution of coin finds indicate that until Diodotes (ca. 250–230 BCE) Sogdiana was part of Greek Bactria (Naymark 2005, especially p. 137; 2008, p. 56), while the stylistic analysis of the first Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus's coins would hint at about 206–208 (Bopearachchi 1991–1992, pp. 11–13). Archaeological research also supports the late 3rd century as the time of the subjugation of Sogdiana to nomadic hordes as well as Graeco-Bactrian reoccupation of Samarkand in the time of Eucratides before mid-2nd century BCE (cf. Lyonnet 1998–2001; Rapin 2007, pp. 47, 51, 65).

Furthermore, an independent linguistic argument could potentially offer a degree of support to the mediation of the Bactrian language in the history of the Sogdian alphabet. Another feature of the Sogdian National Script that

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

approximates Bactrian rather than Sogdian phonology is the convention to use *tsade* to render the voiceless affricate *č*.[16] The Sogdian pronunciation of this affricate as /ʧ/, not /ʦ/, is supported through a variety of considerations. In Yaghnobi, a modern continuation of a dialect close to literary Sogdian, it is still pronounced as /ʧ/, while the Chinese renderings of Sogdian words, e.g. *čʾč* = *Zheshi* (柘時 /ʧia^{b}-ʤi/ʤi/), *čmwkyʾn* = *Zhimuyan* 之目延 /ʧi/ʧi-muwk-jian/,[17] etc. all plead for the palato-alveolar articulation of Sogdian *č* in the first millennium AD. In Bactrian, on the other hand, Old Iranian */č/ was realized as /ʦ/, spelled with Greek *sigma*. We cannot date this development precisely, but it should antedate the reign of Kaniṣka (early 2nd century), since Indian *Śrī-Campā* is rendered as *Ζιριταμβο* in the Rabatak inscription (Sims-Williams/Cribb 1995–1996, p. 83), which implies that the value of Bactrian *σ* was clearly different from that of Middle Indic *c* /ʧ/.

The phonetic realization of the "emphatic" *tsade* in Aramaic is a matter of discussion. There are numerous facts indicating that *tsade* was an affricate in Eastern Aramaic since the 3rd century CE[18] (as well as in Ethiosemitic since about the same period, and in both medieval Hebrew and Phoenician since the 1st century CE), but there are even earlier indications of such an articulation (Steiner 1982, pp. 90–91 *et passim*). Overall, the reconstruction of Proto-Semitic *ṣ* as /ʨ/ has become popular in the Semitology of recent decades (Kogan 2011, pp. 61–62). Unfortunately, the main source of the articulatory reconstruction in this case is the loans in the neighbouring languages, which usually have one affricate at best, and this frequently prevents one from deciding whether the place of articulation was alveolar or post-alveolar. But the borrowings into Old Armenian, which has no fewer than 6 affricates, regularly show the alveolar *c* /ts/ as the reflex of the Aramaic or Hebrew *tsade* (Steiner 1982, p. 47). This articulation is compatible with the initial adaptation of *tsade* to rendering the Bactrian rather than Sogdian affricate. Otherwise one would have an alternative option of using *shin* for the Sogdian /ʧ/, the convention that is well known for Parthian and Old Chorasmian.[19] Later, however, the grapheme *tsade* could be extended to the Sogdian palato-alveolar affricate through the same mechanism of cognate identification that was already discussed in the case of *lamedh*.

16 In transliteration the sign ⟨c⟩ is usually employed instead.

17 Early Middle Chinese forms are taken from Pulleyblank 1991, s.uu.

18 Steiner's main argument here is the usage of *tsade* for rendering affricates in the Iranian languages since the Sasanian period (1982, p. 52ff.). While it is certainly true for the invention of the Manichaean script and its adjustment to the Iranian languages, we suspect that the convention of using *tsade* for /č/ in Middle Persian attested from the 3rd century reflects in fact an earlier tradition, attested, for example, in. *mnṣtr(y)/Manučihr*, the name of three kings of Persis of the 2nd century CE on their coins (Alram 1986, pp. 180–183).

19 In Chorasmian of the Islamic period, Old Iranian /ʧ/ realized as /ʦ/, but this could be a later phenomenon. For the usage of *tsade* in Middle Persian, see the following section.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Thus the reconstruction of Bactrian mediation would provide a more plausible philological scenario for the development of the Sogdian National Script than the agency of a hypothetical "West Sogdian" dialect. What is needed is empirical evidence for the adaptation of the official Aramaic script for writing Bactrian.[20]

There are numerous indications that the shift **d > l* took place in Bactrian long before it is first attested in texts. According to de Blois (2013, pp. 269–270), who analyses Old Persian borrowings in Bactrian, it was already in progress in the Achaemenid period. Further indirect evidence for its early date is supplied by Indian loanwords from the neighbouring Iranian ("Arachosian") dialect, e. g. *lipi* 'text' in Aśoka's edicts = Bactrian λιβο < Old Persian *dipī̆-*, and the toponym *Χολβησινη* (Ptolemy VI.12.5) which is probably equal to medieval *Hulbuk* in Northern Tokharistan (Tomaschek 1899).

Nonetheless, this is not what we consistently observe in the Official Aramaic documents of the 4th century BCE discovered in Bactria (Naveh/Shaked 2012). They contain a great number of Iranian loanwords, but the majority of them show *daleth* in place of Iranian **d*, e. g. *dšny* = MPers. *dʾš(y)n*, Bactr. *λαϸνο* 'gift', or *dyzk* = **daiza-ka* 'related to fortress', Bactr. *λιζγο*, and many others. The reason is that these renderings mirror not the local Bactrian dialect but rather the Old Persian standard *koine* of that time, as was also the case of Imperial Aramaic texts found in other parts of the Achaemenid Empire.

The only[21] exception is *ḥlmy*, the place where the archive once belonged, evidently modern Khulm (Tashqurghan) in northeastern Afghanistan. Here we have a local, Bactrian place-name, spelled consistently (7 attestations) with *lamedh*. Etymologically one can trace it back to Old Iranian **xauda-* 'helmet' (with suffix **-ma-*), as there are similar toponyms in other parts of the Greater Iran, most prominent being *Khoy* to the north of Urmia. Presumably the Bactrian form of the toponym was borrowed into the local variety of Late Old Persian.

Some hundred years later Aramaic reappears in the edicts of Aśoka found in today's southern Afghanistan. Here, too, we are probably dealing with Imperial Aramaic texts with Iranian loanwords, rather than Iranian texts with Aramaic heterograms. Iranian */*d/* here is rendered with *daleth* in *dmydty* (Old Iranian

20 Cf. the hypothesis of Urartean influence on Old Persian cuneiform writing and stylistic conventions, which implies the mediation of the Median cuneiform script. The existence of such a writing system remains likely on historical grounds but cannot be documented (Diakonoff 1970).

21 Unclear is the personal name *ʾlkm* (C5:3). Naveh and Shaked (2012, p. 215) tentatively suggest that it could contain Semitic *ʾl* 'god' in the beginning. In another place (p. 60) they include it into the list of unexplained names. Along the lines of the present argumentation one can seek here Bactrian **al-kām-* from **hada-kāma-*, Bactr. *αλογαμο* 'possessing (one's) desire, successful'. This explanation would also imply an early loss of initial **h-*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

**dāmi-dāta-*[22] = Brāhmī *bhūtānāṃ* 'of living beings, creatures', see Humbach 1974, p. 259). This is in sharp contrast with Iranian loans in Aśoka's Indian inscriptions: *lipikara-* 'scribe' (< *dipĭ-kāra-*), *dhammalipi* 'text of the dharma' with the same *lipi* < *dipĭ-*. This implies that Iranian loanwords in the Aramaic text again reflect the Late Old Persian *koine* and not local vernacular.

The only assured text in an Aramaic-derived script known from Hellenistic Bactria is a fragmentary ostracon of three lines from Ai-Khanoum, which was found in the layer of 200 BCE or earlier (Bernard 1971, p. 432). Although it is not published yet, I. M. Diakonoff and V. A. Livshits who examined it concluded that "likely its script can be explained as Bactrian on an Aramaic base, close to early Parthian" (Livshits *apud* Rastorgueva/Molchanova 1981b, p. 155).[23] Thanks to the help of Prof. Frantz Grenet and Dr. Michael Shenkar we had an opportunity to get a photo and a tracing of the ostracon together with its preliminary reading by Diakonoff and Livshits. The fifth letter of the second line looks most close to *lamedh*[24], but we cannot suggest a reading of the relevant word with any degree of certainty.[25]

22 Cf. also *dmydt-* in Aramaic text C4:18 from Bactria.

23 "… с письмом на остраке из Ай-Ханум (Сев. Афганистан), которое, по-видимому, может быть определено как бактрийское на арамейской основе, близкое к раннепарфянскому". Letters extracted from the ostracon are represented in the table between pages 152 and 153 of the same work. A single ostracon in Aramaic script from Ai Khanoum is, in any event, no match to more than 60 Greek inscriptions from Bactria (53 of them from Ai Khanoum, see Rougemont 2012, pp. 187–258, 274). Note that another exceptional inscription from Ai Khanoum is in runiform script (Rapin 1992, pp. 139–142).

24 Diakonoff and Livshits read it as *ʿayin*, but this letter is usually located lower within the line, whereas here it is much higher.

25 Other alleged Aramaic inscriptions from Bactria are even more problematic and fragmentary. A "Parthian (?)" ink inscription and seal with Aramaic inscription from Kampyr-tepe (the Hellenistic site at an Oxus crossing, see Rtveladze 2002, pp. 104–108; figs. 12, 14) do not appear to us as resembling any Aramaic script. The photo of another pottery fragment was kindly sent to Pavel Lurye in July 2011 by its excavator, Viktor Mokroborodov. It comes from Shortepa, a site in Surkhandarya (Termez) province of Uzbekistan. One can see there three Aramaic letters (*wdy* vel sim), but the Achaemenid date of the archaeological stratum to which it belongs renders it irrelevant for the present discussion.

The reported medallion with Aramaic inscription, an incidental find from the village of Alijon near Dangara in southern Tajikistan seems to contain a Manichaean or Syriac inscription or rather its imitation (photo in Denisov 1999, fig. 22). The archaeologist Nigora Dvurechenskaya kindly sent to Pavel Lurje in November 2014 an image of a khum (pithos) sherd discovered at the site of Kampyrtepa (the hellenistic fortress on Oxus crossing somewhat west of Termez) and datable probably to the 3rd century BCE. One can see here Aramaic letters *](p)zl (ii)*; we cannot give any interpretation of these sequence of strokes, which look nevertheless quite similar to an Aramaic-derived script.

The imitative coins with Aramaic (and often rudimentary Greek) inscriptions labelled by Alram (1986, pp. 282–290) as originating from "Sogdisch-baktrischer Überschneidungsbereich" are in fact all coming from Sogdiana.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In general, inscriptions in the derivatives of the Official Aramaic Script are extremely rare in Hellenistic Iran. We have only one Sogdian two-word inscription on a goblet from Afrasiab datable to the 2nd century BCE–2nd century CE (Grenet 2006), apart from coin legends from this period, which cannot be read with certainty. Nevertheless, we are sure that Aramaic writing was evolving in Hellenistic Central Asia, because later it emerges as the Sogdian National Script. Thus the absence of evidence for Bactrian texts recorded in Aramaic letters need not be regarded as evidence for their absence, as it may merely reflect the bad luck of archaeologists, the propensity for writing such texts on perishable materials, or both. But an additional dimension of the problem that deserves separate discussion is the likelihood of such a writing system from a sociolinguistic perspective.

If the adaptation of the Official Aramaic Script to writing Bactrian did take place, this presumably happened in the Hellenistic or Graeco-Bactrian period. The preservation of Aramaic-based writing systems after the collapse of the Achaemenid Empire is indeed well documented in various parts of the Hellenistic Near East (Skjaervø 1995). But all the instances of adapting the Aramaic alphabet to particular vernaculars appear to have occurred in the situation when the new phonetic writing gained some official status. In particular, this was the case of Parthia, where the evolved script is first attested in Arsacid palatial administration,[26] and of Sogdiana, where it appears on coin legends in the post-Hellenistic period (cf. above). In other words, the adaptation of the Official Aramaic script to Iranian vernaculars seems always to have reflected a reform from above, and not an initiative from below. When Aramaic writing was used merely by tradition, as was probably the case in the western provinces of Aśoka's Empire, it was associated with the same conventions as in the Achaemenid period.

If Aramaic literacy survived in the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom, its scope was probably similar to that of its counterpart in Aśoka's domains. While Greek at that time was the main official language, Aramaic must have persisted as a medium for civil documents among a local population who did not know Greek. If it lingered on in Bactria until the Kushan period, its status must have been marginal, as the new Iranian rulers instead adapted the Greek alphabet for the purpose of writing Bactrian.[27] Under such conditions one might really wonder whether the reform of the Official Aramaic Script could have taken place in

26 Note that at that time it coexisted with Greek as language of coin legends.

27 The earliest Bactrian text in Greek script belongs to Vima Taktoo, of about 100 CE. The documentation is more abundant under Kanishka after 127 (Sims-Williams, Cribb 1995–1996, pp. 95–96 *et passim*). After this article was completed we knew that N. Sims-Williams in his contribution "From Aramaic to Manchu: Prehistory, Life and After-life of the Sogdian Script" (in: Rong, X./F. Luo (eds.): *Sogdians in China: New Evidence in Archaeological Finds and Unearthed Texts*, vol. II, Beijing 2016, pp. 419–420) briefly pointed out this conclusion that Sogdian script was initially invented in Bactria, where satrapal administration was located.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Hellenistic Bactria, and even if it happened, whether their Sogdian neighbours were likely to be interested in its product.

The considerations offered above need not preclude scholars from keeping their eyes open for a possible emergence of Bactrian texts continuing the Official Aramaic scribal tradition. But given the present state of our knowledge, a hypothesis that would not require Bactrian mediation in the evolution of the Sogdian National Script would have an advantage of being more economical.

6. A line of enquiry leading to a new proposal concerning how the Aramaic *lamedh* could acquire the reading ⟨δ⟩ in the Sogdian National script is mentioned in the recent doctoral dissertation of L'ubomír Novák. After an inconclusive discussion regarding the origin of "*lambda Sogdica*", he remarks:

> Finally, a theme for reflection – do we really know what kind of sound has been spelled by the Aramaic letter *lāmaḏ* in the period when the Sogdians adopted the Aramaic alphabet for their language? In the presented work I will not deal with this problem, I will leave it to the Semitic scholars … (Novák 2013, p. 113)

In fact, being a Semiticist is not necessarily the best qualification for deciding on the pronunciation of the Aramaic *lamedh* in Hellenistic Central Asia. One can strongly suspect that the Aramaic scribes in Central Asia were Iranian rather than Aramaic speakers already in the Late Achaemenid period, because the scribes mentioned in the Khulm archive have Iranian names (Naveh/Shaked 2012, p. 23). This tendency could only have become more pronounced after the collapse of the Achaemenid Empire, when the transmission of Aramaic literacy in Central Asia lost external institutional support. The grammatical mistakes that occur in the Aramaic inscriptions of Aśoka suggest at the very least an imperfect acquisition of Aramaic on the part of their translators (cf. Humbach 1974; Livshitz/Shifman 1977). Although comparable evidence for Sogdiana is not documented, it is reasonable to assume that the situation there was parallel, i.e. two or three generations after the conquest of Alexander all the Aramaic scribes in the region were Sogdian native speakers.

It is a well-known fact that non-native transmission of a language of tradition exposes it to phonological interference from the vernacular(s) of those who transmit it. An obvious example is the variation in rendering palatalized velars in Medieval Latin, which directly reflects the linguistic history of the underlying Romance languages, e.g. /ʧentum/ in Italy or /θentum/ in Spain for *centum* 'hundred', while in Germany the same sequence was pronounced as /ʦentum/. Following the same logic, it seems perfectly plausible that the Sogdian native speakers came to pronounce *tsade* as /ʧ/ when they read Aramaic documents, simply because this was the only voiceless affricate available in their native language. If the adaptation of the Official Aramaic script to writing Sogdian occurred at this point or thereafter, there would be nothing more natural than

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

extending the use of this letter to Sogdian /ʧ/.[28] Incidentally, the same new value of *tsade* is independently attested in the Pahlavi script and may reflect a similar process of imperfect learning on the part of Early Middle Persian native speakers acting as Aramaic scribes.

In order to decide whether the new phonetic value of the Aramaic *lamedh* could develop along similar lines, it is necessary to address again the status of the Sogdian /l/, whose marginal character can, in principle, be interpreted in two different ways. Either this is a mechanical consequence of the Proto-Iranian sound change **l* > *r*, or there were synchronic constraints on the articulation of the lateral phoneme in Sogdian. If one wishes to argue for the second alternative, one has to trace evidence for the constraint on **l* in Sogdian, which postdates the Common Iranian period.

The most transparent example in favour of such a constraint is Sogd. *δmtyr* (M)/ *dmtyr* (C) 'lamp'. This noun represents an assured loanword from Greek λαμπτήρ, which is independently borrowed into Parthian as *lmtyr* (Gharib 1995, p. 140a). Such an act of borrowing obviously could not take place before the Hellenistic period. Since the Sogdian adaptations of the Manichean and Estrangelo scripts both feature a grapheme ⟨l⟩, there is no doubt that the Greek word was adapted into Sogdian with the modification of the initial lateral. The Manichaean texts distinguish between ⟨d⟩ and ⟨δ⟩, while the Christian ones do not, and therefore one has to reconstruct the adaptation of foreign [l] to native /δ/.[29]

It is possible to show that this process was not limited to the treatment of loanwords from Greek. The Christian Sogdian texts have competing forms *wlrz-* and *wdrz-* for the present stem 'to shake, tremble' (Gershevitch 1954, § 60, fn. 1). As mentioned in Section 1, these variants are further compared with *wyrʾrz-* (S) 'id.' and treated as a result of secondary dissimilation in the Iranian root **rarz-* (cf. Cheung 2007, p. 314). One has to conclude that the output of this dissimilation underwent the same sound change **l* > *δ* as the Greek loanword. One can further hypothesize that the variant *wlrz-* persisted among the more educated Sogdian Christians, who integrated the lateral sound into their phonological inventory together with Syriac borrowings, whereas the variant *wdrz-* reflects a more colloquial pronunciation.

Another lexeme that likely features the adaptation **l* > *δ* in Sogdian is *ptγʾδ* (S, M) and *ptγʾd* (C) 'cup'. The commonly acknowledged cognates of this noun include Middle Persian (Pahlavi) *pygʾl* and Persian *paiγāla*, *piyāla*. A number of scholars converge in assuming the etymological **l* in this Iranian lexeme, although the etymologies they have proposed do not always match (Benveniste

28 Independent evidence for syntactic interference between the Sogdian vernacular and non-natively transmitted Aramaic is discussed in Yakubovich 2005.

29 A different development is attested in Sogd. (S) *nksyntr* 'Alexander'. In this case, however, we are probably dealing with a distant assimilation, cf. Sogd. (S) *ʾncn* '*añjali*' with a similar development (Lurje 2010, p. 268 with references).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1936, pp. 233–234; Schwartz 1970, p. 292, fn. 12; Sims-Williams 1990). But etymological considerations aside, reconstructing the etymological **d* in this noun would force one to assume that a Middle Persian appellative is borrowed from an unknown Iranian dialect with lambdacism and the development of the prefix **pati-* into *py-* (the normal development of **pati-* in Bactrian is πιδο). By contrast, the reconstruction of Ir. **pati-gāla* will simply imply that it is one of several lexemes that resisted the Proto-Iranian change **l* > *r*, and subsequently fed the later Sogdian change **l* > *δ*.

The development of **l* in the Sogdian lexemes that are attested exclusively through the National Script is less obvious, because this alphabet had no ⟨l⟩ in its inventory. Only some late Sogdian texts replicate the orthography of the Uighur Script by using "*r* with a hook", sometimes transliterated as ⟨ṛ⟩, as a device to mark /l/ in loanwords (cf. Gershevitch 1954, §61). Consequently one can suspect that in other texts this phoneme simply remains without unambiguous graphic expression. It is, however, possible to argue that in such cases it is approximated as ⟨r⟩ and not ⟨δ⟩. First of all, there is no such thing as "δ with a hook" or any other diacritical device giving the value /l/ to the grapheme ⟨δ⟩. Second, and more importantly, there is a distribution between the use of ⟨r⟩ and ⟨δ⟩ for rendering etymological **l* in Indic loanwords in Sogdian. The first strategy is commonly used in Buddhist and other specialized terms, which were probably restricted to literary texts, e.g. *šrwkʾ* '*śloka* (poetic meter)', *rwkδʾt* 'element of the world' < Skt. *lokadhātu-*, *rwkpʾr* '*Lokapāla* (Buddhist mythological figure)'. The second strategy is limited to a small set of loanwords denoting more general concepts: *δwkʾ* 'world' < Skt. *loka-*, *kδpʾ* 'era, epoch' < Skt. *kalpa-*, *δykH* 'writing' < Skt. *lekhā-* (Kaufman 1956, pp. 462–463). It is quite likely that the words of the second group were part of the spoken language in at least some of the Sogdian communities. Thus ⟨r⟩ can be interpreted, at least in some cases, as the written approximation of /l/, while ⟨δ⟩ is always likely to reflect its adaptation in the spoken language.[30]

If the above conclusions are correct, adapted Indic loanwords such as *δwkʾ* 'world' (S) can be used as additional evidence for the change **l* > *δ* in Sogdian.

30 This is not to deny that in some cases, perhaps in a majority of them, the development **l* > *r* in Sogdian words of Indic origin was phonetically real. Particularly telling here is *mxʾqr* (C) 'Apollo', occurring in the Sogdian translation of the Life of Saint George (C1:238) and ultimately representing an adaptation of the Indian deity *Mahākāla-* (see Lurje, forthcoming b). The Sogdian version of the Estrangelo script features the grapheme ⟨l⟩, and therefore the use of ⟨r⟩ in this theonym must reflect phonetic reality. In order to become known to the Sogdian Christians, the deity *mxʾqr* must have enjoyed a degree of popularity within Sogdiana, which in turn implies that his name was part of the spoken language. One also has to stress that the distribution between the two strategies of rendering foreign **l* was not strict and there were cases of overlap. Thus the same person bearing the Turkic title *eltäbär* is called both *ryttpyr* or *δyttpyr* in the cohesive corpus of texts found on Mount Mugh (Livshits 2008, p. 158).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Yet another example that supports the same conclusion is *pyδH* (S) 'elephant'. This noun ultimately goes back to Akkadian *pīlu-* or Aramaic *pīl-ā* 'elephant', perhaps via Parthian or Middle Persian *pyl* 'id.', and provides a likely source for Chorasmian *pyz* 'elephant' (Benzing 1983, pp. 20, 719–720). Chorasmian *z* does not normally develop from **l* but represents the regular reflex of East Iranian **d* > **δ* in a palatalizing environment, cf. *zyw* 'crazy' < **daiwiya-*, *'βz'n* 'bridle' < **abi-dāna-* (Benzing 1983, pp. 20, 719–720). Therefore the Sogdian source of the Chorasmian noun for 'elephant' had to be articulated with the dental fricative and not the lateral sound.

Thus all the three main writing systems that were in use for recording Sogdian texts converge in bearing witness to the sound change **l* > *δ*, which represents the very opposite of the alleged "lambdacism".[31] It can be no longer regarded as a dialectal phenomenon, but rather emerges as the mainstream development within Sogdian, while the exceptions from this development mostly concern unassimilated loanwords in expatriate Sogdian communities. The synchronic constraint on **l* was operative in Hellenistic times and later, in the period of contact between Sogdian and Indic languages. Therefore it must also have been present in the idiolects of those Sogdian speakers who continued to act as Aramaic scribes in Samarkand and the surrounding area after the collapse of the Achaemenid Empire. The expected result of phonetic interference between the natively transmitted Sogdian and non-natively learned Aramaic would be, for example, the pronunciation [ðā] and [maðkā] of *l'* 'not' and *mlk'* 'king' respectively. Under such conditions, the reform of writing leading to the creation of the Sogdian phonetic script merely extended *lamedh* to the same Sogdian sound [ð] that had already been its reading in the local Aramaic dialect.

As for the further extension of *lamedh* to marking the voiceless dental fricative, it does not reflect the original state of affairs. Although *lamedh* was used for rendering [þ] in the Sogdian National Script since the Ancient Letters (early 4th century CE), the earlier texts on bricks from Kul-tobe display the use of *tau* for [þ]. For example, we find there *kntH* 'town' (later *knδH*) and *-mytn* 'settlement' (later *-myδn*), see Sims-Williams/Grenet 2006, p. 96. This practice is comparable to the use of ⟨t⟩ for (historical) **θ* in Parthian, Middle Persian and Chorasmian. Thus the graphic merger of [þ] and [ð] represents a later innovation within the Sogdian National Script. One can observe here an analogy with the graphic mergers of other voiced and voiceless pairs of fricatives in the same writing system: /f/ is commonly rendered as ⟨β⟩, while ⟨γ⟩ and ⟨x⟩ do not differ from one another in initial and medial position after the Ancient Letters (Sims-Williams 1981, p. 194). It is commonly assumed that none of these mergers

31 Under the proposed analysis, a common feature of Bactrian and "standard" Sogdian was the elimination of the phonological contrast between /l/ and /ð/. Thus one can say that the Bactrian and Sogdian sound changes were phonologically similar but phonetically went in different directions.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

reflects phonetic reality, because the relevant graphic distinctions were faithfully preserved, for example, in the writing system of the Sogdian Christians. Individual Iranian alphabets of Aramaic origin are deficient to various extents, and here the Sogdian National Script clearly trails behind the Pahlavi Cursive, where one observes the massive merger of graphemes, which clearly has nothing to do with the phonetic reality of Middle Persian.[32]

Thus all the evidence for Sogdian lambdacism adduced by Henning may be differently interpreted. The source of East Iranian loanwords with lambdacism in Early New Persian is not Sogdian but Bactrian, while the changing value of *lamedh* in the Sogdian National Script merely reflects the absence of the phoneme /l/ in the standard variety of Sogdian. In neither of the two cases is there any need to resort to reconstructing the "West Sogdian" dialect, which is not otherwise attested through either texts or toponymic evidence.

Bibliography

Afshār, Ī. (ed.) 1304: *Masālik wa mamālik. Anonymous Persian Translation From V/VI Century A. H. by Abū Isḥaḳ Ibrāhīm Isṭaḵhrī.* Tehrān.

Alram, M. 1986: *Nomina Propria Iranica in Nummis. Materialgrundlagen zu den iranischen Personennamen auf antiken Münzen*. Wien (Iranisches Personennamenbuch, Bd. IV).

Barthold, V. V. [Бартольд В. В.] 1900: *Туркестан в эпоху монгольского нашествия.* Часть вторая. Санкт-Петербург.

Benveniste, É. 1936: "Notes Parthes et sogdiennes." In: *Journal Asiatique* 228, pp. 193–235.

Benzing, J. 1983: *Chwaresmischer Wortindex*. Prepared for publication by Z. Taraf. Wiesbaden.

Bernard, P. 1971: "La campagne de fouilles de 1970 à Aï Khanoum (Afghanistan)." In: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 115/2, pp. 385–453.

— 1990: "Alexandre et l'Asie Centrale: reflexions à propos d'un ouvrage de F. L. Holt." In: *Studia Iranica* 19/1, pp. 21–38.

De Blois, F. 2013: "Bactria, Bāxδī-, Balx." In: Tokhtasjev/Lurje 2013, pp. 268–271.

Bopearachchi, O. 1991–1992: "The Euthydemus' Imitations and the Date of Sogdian Independence." In: *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 2, pp. 1–21.

32 In any case, modern scholars must be grateful to the Sogdian scribes for using *lamedh* for two very common phonemes. This tall, prominent letter is clearly visible in any kind of Western Semitic alphabet, from Phoenician to Aramaic, Hebrew rectangular script, Estrangelo and Arabic. In Iranian derivatives of Aramaic, with their ongoing tendency for cursive writing, *lamedh* remains *lamedh*. For those working with Sogdian economic documents or Pahlavi papyri *lamedh*s are a kind of landmark which helps identifying many words otherwise consisting of indistinguishable strokes. And *lamedh* in this respect is much better than *daleth*, the letter which merges with *resh* and many others.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Briant, P. 2002: *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*. Transl. by P. D. Daniels. Winona Lake, Indiana.

Chekhovich, O. D. [Чехович О. Д.] 1974: *Самаркандские документы XV–XVI вв. Факсимиле, критический текст, перевод, комментарий*. Москва.

Cheung, J. 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden.

Denisov, Je. P. [Денисов Е. П.] 1999: *Могильник Ксиров в контексте погребальных памятников кочевников Северной Бактрии – Тохаристана II в. до н. э. – III в. н. э.* Ставрополь.

Diakonoff I. M. 1970: "The Origin of the 'Old Persian' Writing System and the Ancient Oriental Epigraphic and Annalistic Traditions." In: M. Boyce/I. Gershevitch (eds.): *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume*. London, pp. 98–124.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2009: "Khwarezmian." In: G. Windfuhr (ed.): *The Iranian Languages*. London/New York, pp. 336–376.

— 2013: "*l* in Manichaean Parthian words." In: Tokhtasjev/Lurje 2013, pp. 92–101.

Gershevitch, I. 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford.

Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary*. Tehran.

— 2013: "Sogdian Language i. Loanwords in Persian." In: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/sodgian-language-i-loanwords.

de Goeje, M. J. 1873: *Viae et Regna. Descriptio ditionis moslemicae*. Auctore Abu'l-Kásim Ibn Haukal. Lugdini Batavorum (Biblotheca geographorum arabicorum, pars secunda).

Grenet, F. 2006: "La plus ancienne inscription sogdienne." In: M. Compareti/P. Raffetta/G. Scarcia (eds.): *Ērān ud Anērān. Studies presented to Boris Il'ič Maršak on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Venezia, pp. 223–230.

Griunberg, A. L. [Грюнберг А. Л.] 1987: "Мунджанский язык." In: Rastorgueva 1987, pp. 155–235.

Henning, W. B. 1939: "Sogdian Loanwords in New Persian." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10 (1939–1940), pp. 93–106.

Humbach, H. 1974: "Arameo-Iranian and Pahlavi." In: *Hommage universel II*. Téhéran/Liège (Acta Iranica 2), pp.237–243.

Jaafari-Dehagi, M./A. Sadri 2012: "Vāmvāžehā-ye balxi dar pārsi-ye now." In: *Zabānšenāxt* 2/2, pp. 1–9.

Kamaliddinov, Sh. S. [Камалиддинов Ш. С.] 1996: *Историческая география Южного Согда и Тохаристана по арабоязычным источникам IX – начала XIII вв.* Ташкент.

Kaufman, K. F. [Кауфман К. Ф.] 1956: "Некоторые вопросы истории согдийского языка." In: *Труды института языкознания АН ССР* VI (1956), pp. 458–498.

Kogan, L. 2011: "Proto-Semitic Phonetics and Phonology." In: S. Weninger (ed.): *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook*. Berlin/Boston, pp. 54–150.

Kramers, J. H. 1939: "Abū al-Qāsim Ibn Ḥauqal al-Naṣībī." In: J. H. Kramers (ed.): *Kitāb ṣūra al-Arḍ*. Leiden.

Lazard, G. 1963: *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane*. Paris.

Livshits, V. A. [Лившиц В. А.] 2008: *Согдийская эпиграфика Средней Азии и Семиречья.* Санкт-Петербург.

Livshits, V. A./A. L. Khromov [Лившиц В. А./А. Л. Хромов] 1981: "Согдийский язык." In: Rastorgueva 1981, pp. 347–514.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Livshits, V. A./I. Sh. Shifman [Лившиц В. А./И. Ш. Шифман] 1977: "К толкованию арамейских надписей Ашоки." In: *Вестник древней истории* 2 (140), pp. 7–24.
Lurje, P. 2003: "The Element *-kaθ/-kand* in the place-names of Transoxiana." In: *Studia Iranica* 32/2, pp. 185–212.
— 2004: [Лурье П. Б.] *Историко-лингвистический анализ согдийской топонимии*. Диссертация кандидата филологических наук. Санкт-Петербург [Unpublished, available at http://orientalstudies.ru/rus/ index.php?option =com_publications& Itemid=75&pub=1367].
— 2010: *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts*. Wien (Iranisches Personennamenbuch, Bd. II, Fasz. 8).
— forthcoming a: "Cisoxian cantons of Sogdiana." In: V. Sadovski (ed.): *Gedenkschrift Xavier Tremblay*. Wien (Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik).
— forthcoming b: "Mahākāla in Sogdiana." In: *Journal of the Inner Asian Art and Archaeology*.
Lyonnet, B. 1998–2001: "Les Grecs, les Nomades et l'independence de la Sogdiane d'après l'occupation comparèe d'Aï Khanoum et de Maracanda au cours des derniers siècles avant notre ère." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 12, pp. 141–159.
Markwart, J. 1946: "Die Sogdiana des Ptolemaios." In: *Orientalia* [N.S.] 15, pp. 286–323.
Mayrhofer, M. 1989: "Vorgeschichte." In: Schmitt 1989, pp. 4–24.
Naveh, J./Sh. Shaked 2012: *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria.* London.
Naymark, A. I. [Наймарк А. И.] 2005: "Находки греческих монет в Согдиане." In: *Нумизматика и эпиграфика.* Т. XVII. Москва, pp. 116–138.
— 2008: "О причинах появления подражаний эллинистическим монетам в Согдиане." In: *Вестник Древней Истории* 1 (264), pp. 55–70.
Novák, L. 2013: *Problem of Archaism and Innovation in the Eastern Iranian Languages*. Charles' University Doctoral Thesis. Prague.
Pakhalina, T. N. [Пахалина Т. Н.] 1987: "Ишкашимский язык." In: Rastorgueva 1987, pp. 474–536.
Perry, J. 2009: "Tajik i. The Ethnonym: Origins and Application." In: *Encyclopedia Iranica*, online at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/tajik-i-the-ethnonym-origins-and-application.
Pulleyblank, E. G. 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.
Rapin, C. 1992: *La Trésorerie du palais hellénistique d'Aï Khanoum. L'Apogée et la chute du royaume grec de Bactriane*. Paris (Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum VIII; Memoirs de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan 33).
— 2007: "Nomads and the shaping of Central Asia (from the early Iron Age to the Kushan period)." In: J. Cribb/G. Herrmann (eds.): *After Alexander: Central Asia before Islam*. Oxford (Proceedings of the British Academy 133), pp. 29–72.
Rastorgueva, V. S. [Расторгуева В. С.] (ed.) 1981: *Основы иранского языкознания.* Кн. 2: *Среднеиранские языки*. Москва.
— 1987: *Основы иранского языкознания*. Кн. 4: *Новоиранские языки: восточная группа*. Москва.
Rastorgueva, V. S./E. K. Molchanova [Расторгуева В. С./Е. К. Молчанова] 1981a: "Среднеперсидский язык." In: Rastorgueva 1981, pp. 6–146.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1981b: "Парфянский язык." In: Rastorgueva 1981, pp. 147–232.
Ross, M. D. 1991: "Refining Guy's Sociolinguistic Types of Language Change." In: *Diachronica* 8/1, pp. 119–129.
Rougemont, G. 2012: *Inscriptions grecques d'Iran et d'Asie Centrale.* London (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, part II: *Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*, vol. 1: *Inscriptions in non-Iranian languages*).
Rtveladze, É. V. [Ртвеладзе Э. В.] 2002: "Знаки и надписи Кампыртепа." In: *Материалы Тохаристанской экспедиции*. Вып. 3. Ташкент, pp. 101–108.
Rubinchik, Iu. A. [Рубинчик Ю. А.] 1970: *Персидско-русский словарь*. 2 т. Москва.
Schmitt, R. (ed.) 1989: *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum.* Wiesbaden.
Schwartz, M. 1970: "On the Vocabulary of the Khwarezmian Muqaddimatu l-adab, as edited by J. Benzing." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 120/2, pp. 288–304.
— 1974: "Irano-Tocharica." In: Ph. Gignoux/A. Tafazzoli (eds.): *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*. Louvain, pp. 399–411.
Shaked, Sh. 2003: "De Khulmi a Nikhšapaya: les données des nouveaux documents araméens de Bactres sur la toponymie de la région (IVe siècle av. n. è.)." In: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 147/4, pp. 1517–1535.
Skjærvø, P. O. 1989: "Pashto." In: Schmitt 1989, pp. 384–416.
— 1995: "Aramaic in Iran." In: *Aram 7*, pp. 283–318.
Sims-Williams, N. 1981: "Remarks on the Sogdian letters g and x (with special reference to the orthography of the Sogdian version of the Manichaean church-history)." Appendix to: W. Sundermann: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts.* Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 11), pp. 194–198.
— 1988: "Syro-Sogdica III: Syriac elements in Sogdian." In: W. Sundermann *et al.* (eds.): *A green leaf. Papers in honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*. Leiden (Acta Iranica 28), pp. 145–156.
— 1990: "Old Persian *patišuvarna* 'cup'." In: D. Amin *et al.* (eds.): *Iranica Varia: Papers in Honour of Professor Ehsan Yarshater.* Leiden (Acta Iranica 30), pp. 240–243.
— 2000: *Bactrian documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*. Oxford (Studies in the Khalili Collection III; Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, part II: *Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*, vol. VI: *Bactrian*).
— 2002: "Ancient Afghanistan and its invaders: Linguistic evidence from the Bactrian documents and inscriptions." In: N. Sims-Williams (ed.): *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples.* Oxford (Proceedings of the British Academy 116), pp. 225–242.
— 2007: *Bactrian documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist Texts*. Oxford (Studies in the Khalili Collection III; Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, part II: *Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*, vol. III: *Bactrian*).
— 2009: "The Bactrian Fragment in Manichaean Script (M 1224)." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst/Ch. Reck/D. Weber (eds.): *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden, pp. 245–268.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2010: *Bactrian personal names*. Wien (Iranisches Personennamenbuch, Bd. II, Fasz. 7).
Sims-Williams, N./J. Cribb 1995–1996: "A New Bactrian Inscription of Kanishka the Great." In: *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 4, pp. 75–142.
Sims-Williams, N./F. Grenet 2006: "The Sogdian Inscriptions of Kultobe." In: *Shygys* 1, pp. 95–111.
Steiner, R. C. 1982: *Affricated* Ṣade *in the Semitic Languages.* New York.
Steingass, F. 1892: *Persian-English Dictionary*. Beirut [repr. 1970].
Tokhtasjev, S. R./P. B. Lurje [Тохтасьев С. Р./П. Б. Лурье] (eds.) 2013: *Commentationes Iranicae: Сборник статей к 90-летию В. А. Лившица*. Санкт-Петербург.
Tomaschek, W. 1899: "Cholbesina." In: *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Sechster Halbband, col. 2368.
de la Vaissière, É. 2002: *Histoire des marchands sogdiens*. Paris.
— 2005: *Sogdian Traders: A History*. Leiden.
Vullers, J. A. 1855–1864: *Lexicon persico-latinum etymologicum*. 2 vols. Graz [repr. 1962].
Yakubovich, I. 2005: "The Syntactic Evolution of Aramaic *ZY* in Sogdian." In: *Studia Iranica* 34/2, pp. 199–230.
Yoshida, Y. 2010: "Sogdian." In: G. Windfuhr (ed.): *The Iranian Languages*. London, pp. 279–335.
Zeimal, E. V. 1983: "The political history of Tranoxiana." In: *The Cambridge History of Iran*. Vol. 3/1. Cambridge, pp. 232–262.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Manichaean "Wheel of *Karma*" (Zodiac)

A Study on the Cosmology Painting and *Scripture of Buddha-nature*

Ma Xiaohe, Cambridge, Massachusetts

The Cosmology Painting

Professor Y. Yoshida published an article studying the Manichaean Cosmology Painting (henceforth abbreviated as CP) and 4 other Manichaean paintings in 2010. He believes that it depicts the cosmos as described in the Manichaean texts.[1] It was painted during the late Yuan to early Ming Dynasty, i. e. late 14th to early 15th century by painters belonging to the ateliers based in the area around Ningbo 寧波.[2] Professor G. Kósa wrote rudimentary notes on this painting[3] and gathered information in support of the hypothesis that the CP ultimately derives from Mānī's *Eikōn*.[4] This article focuses on the zodiac section of the CP. I thank both Prof. Yutaka Yoshida and Prof. Gábor Kósa for reading and commenting on the present paper.

The Ten Heavens are very clear on the painting. A wheel in the middle of the lowest Firmament should be the zodiac. There is an armor-clad god on the left side of zodiac and another god on its right side. In the center of the zodiac there are five demons. Some of the signs of the zodiac are damaged. According to what we can see, the sequence of the signs is little different from the usual one, because mistakes perhaps happened during the process of the spread of the idea of the zodiac.

The Sogdian fragment M 178 II is one of the important sources for the understanding of the CP. Part of M 178 II/69–72/ and /111–129/ reads as follows:

> Thereupon at once the Lord of the Seven Climes (the Living Spirit) and the Mother of the Righteous began to plan how to arrange this world …

1 Yoshida 2010.
2 Furukawa 2010.
3 Kósa 2011.
4 Kósa 2013.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> Then, below the ten Firmaments, they fashioned a rolling wheel and (*sic*) zodiac *(nʾšnyẖ cxryy ʾty ʾnxrwzn)*. Within the zodiac *(ʾnxrwznyy)* they fettered those of the demons of Darkness that were the most iniquitous, vicious, and rebellious …
>
> From all the demons that had been imprisoned in the zodiac *(ʾnxrwznyy)* they wove to and fro the roots *(wyx)*, veins *(rʾk)*, and links *(ptβnd)*. In the lowest Firmament they bored a hole and suspended the zodiac *(ʾnxrwzn)* from it. Two Sons of God *(ii βγpšyy)* were placed by them (there) as watchers, so as to … the Superior Wheel continually.[5]

The *Scripture of Buddha-nature* (BD9401) among Dunhuang manuscripts recently published by Cao Ling [6] with the CP and M 178 II may help us to identify *yelun* 業輪 with the zodiac and understand the zodiac's role in Manichaean metempsychosis.

Scripture of Buddha-nature

The photograph of the fragment BD9401 is in v. 105 of *Guojia Tushuguan Cang Dunhuang Yishu* 國家圖書館藏敦煌遺書 *[Manuscripts from Dunhuang in the National Library of China]*.[7] Its annotated catalog record gave the title *Foxing jing* 佛性經 *[Scripture of Buddha-nature]* to this fragment according to "*Scripture of Buddha-nature*, Book Nine: Discourse on the Deeds of the Heretical Monks Who Break the Commandments" on line 18 of the manuscript.[8] Cao Ling suggested that *Foxing jing* may be an abbreviation of *Mile Monifo shuo kaiwu foxing jing* 彌勒摩尼佛說開悟佛性經 *[Scripture Preached by Maitreya Mani Buddha for Awakening the Buddha-nature]* which is listed among the titles of apocryphal Buddhist sūtras collected in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao Lu* 開元釋教錄 (Catalogue of Śākyamuni's Teachings, Compiled during Kaiyuan Era) compiled in 730 CE. *Foxing jing* was possibly a scripture written by *Aftādān* (Chin. *Fuduodan* 拂多誕) *Mihr-Ormuzd* (Chin. *Miwumosi* 密烏沒斯), a Manichaean monk, during the reign of Wu Zetian 武則天 (684–705). This document containts 2 pieces of paper totalling 28 lines.[9]

5 Henning 1948, pp. 310–313; Yoshida 2010, pp. 5–6, 29, n. 14.

6 Cao 2012. I appreciate that Mr Fang Guangchang and Mr Cao Ling sent the draft of this article to me before it was published.

7 *Dunhuang Manuscripts*, v. 105, p. 342. I appreciate that Prof. Fang Guangchang and Dr Cao Ling sent its color photograph to me through e-mail in 2012.

8 *Dunhuang Manuscripts*, v. 105, "Tiaoji mulu 條記目錄 [annotated catalog record]", p. 76, line 18 we find"佛性經說外道破戒僧業行品第九", therefore we decided to use this name.

9 For the whole document, cf. Ma 2014.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Scripture Preached by Maitreya Mani Buddha for Awakening the Buddha-Nature

1. …] be short of, even a piece of bread and a cup of water, such [alms-givers[10]] …/
2. Furthermore, it should be known that deeds of the Hearers[11] make degrees of ascension and descent (of their souls) in the Law[12] [… there are]/
3. sincere persons who support the Law, there are also those who believe (the religion) wholeheartedly, Hearers as stated above, souls[13] […]/
4. when the judgments are made, some crimes are serious and some are not. It is also like the differing filthiness[14] of clothes. If washed […]/
5. greater or lesser urgency. According to their deeds[15], all the Hearers suffer or are saved[16] slowly [or fast differently …]/
6. suffering[17], great regret is perceived. The first place of suffering and regret is when the souls leave the bodies in the days at the end of their lives[18]. [The second place of suffering and regret is when …]/
7. The third place of suffering and regret is when the souls reach the sky and transform. The fourth place of suffering and regret is when the souls enter into the [w]heel of rotations (zodiac)[19] with the suffering of the two opposing principles in nature[20]. The fifth place of suffering

10 *shizhe* 施者 'almsgiver(s), donor(s), patron(s)' (Buddh. Skt. *dātṛ*). Cf. *shizhu* 施主, DMT III/4, p. 62.

11 *tingzhe* 聽者 'hearer(s), auditor(s)', 5th Manichaean grade; 耨沙喭 < Parthian *ngwšʾgʾn*, Middle Persian *nywšʾgʾn*; Chavannes/Pelliot 1911–1913, p. 582, n. 1; DMT III/1, pp. 241, 256; DMT III/4, pp. 68, 106–107; Latin *auditor*, DMT I, pp. 186, 197; Cao 2012, pp. 313–314.

12 *fa* 法 'law, religion, doctrine, teaching' (Buddh. Skt. *dharma*) 2, 3, 12; DMT III/4, pp. 18–19. Cf. *fofa* 佛法.

13 *xing* 性 'nature' (i. e. soul) 3, 6, 7^2, 8^2, 10, 11, 17; DMT III/4, p. 81. Cf. *foxing* 佛性.

14 *gouni* 垢膩 'deposits of sweat, dirt, filth, blemish' (Buddh. Skt. *malinatā*) 4, 16.

15 *ye* 業 'actions, deeds, conduct, work' (Buddhi. Skt. *karma*) 5, 7, 10, 12; DMT III/4, p. 84. Cf. *zuiye* 罪業; *xingye* 行業.

16 *jietuo* 解脫 'salvation, liberation, deliverance, emancipation; saved; to be saved, be released, be delivered, be set free' (Buddh. Skt. *vimokṣa*, *mokṣa*) 5, 10^2, 11^2, 12^2, 13, 17; DMT III/4, p. 32.

17 *ku'nao* 苦惱, Skt. *duḥkha*; Pāli *dukkha*; basic meaning: 'suffering'. Other meanings: 'misery and trouble; distress, afflictions' 6^3, 7^3, 8^2, 9; DMT III/4, p. 38.

18 *mingzhong* 命終 'end of life, death' (Buddh. Pāli *maraṇa*; Skt. *maraṇa*); DMT III/4, p. 44.

19 *yelun* 業輪 'wheel of *karma*' (equiv. to Parthian *ʿspyr* 'sphere' or 'globe'; cf. Lieu 1998, p. 69; Buddh. 'Wheel of retribution'; Skt. *saṃsāracakra*); DMT III/4, p. 84; Cao 2012, pp. 314–315.

20 *yinyang* 陰陽 'yin and yang, the two opposing principles in nature, the former feminine and negative and the latter masculine and positive'. Their activity is first defined extensively in the *Yijing* 易經 (Classic of Changes).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

8. and regret is when the souls endure cold and heat in the open sky[21]. The sixth place of suffering and regret is when the souls are suspended from the five kinds of plants and trees[22]. The seventh place of suffering and regret is when the souls take the five
9. kinds of bodies[23] and transform into their shapes. These seven kinds as stated above are all the places where the Hearers with sins[24] of their own have their fill of suffering. Nevertheless, (the souls) which carry on merit[25] cultivated in the former existences are constantly rescued and freed[26] from various sufferings[27],/
10. until (they) become Buddhas[28], and (they) are distributed to five places according to their deeds[29] respectively to obtain liberation. For the persons with the first rank of deeds, their souls will arrive at Ten Heavens[30], be cleansed[31] and then obtain liberation. [For the persons with the second rank of deeds, their souls will]
11. come to descend on saline-alkaline soil and get liberation. For the persons with the third rank of deeds, their souls will enter plants and trees, temporarily become fragrant flowers and then obtain liberation. The persons with the fourth rank of deeds become fruits [… their souls then]/

21 *xukong* 虛空 'open sky' (Buddh. Skt. *ākāśa*); DMT III/4, p. 82.

22 *wuzhong caomu* 五種草木 'five kinds of grasses and trees'; DMT III/4, p. 72; Syriac *ḥmšʾ ʾyln'* 'five trees'; Arabic *al-ʾašj āru l-xamsah* 'five trees'; DMT II, pp. 2, 43. Cf. *Xᵘāstvānīft* III C: "if we should somehow have sinned against the dry and wet earth, against the five kinds of living beings, against five kinds of herbs and trees, (then) we now pray, my God, to be liberated from sin." Asmussen 1965, pp. 171–172, 195, 216; Cao 2012, pp. 316–317.

23 *wulei shen* 五類身 'five kinds of bodies'. Arabic *al-ḥayawānu l-xamsah* 'five [sorts of] animals)', '(the queen of Darkness went into the abyss) and thereupon there came into existence the five (sorts of) trees and (of) animals: the flying ones, the creeping (reptilian) ones, the swimming ones, those with legs, and the insects'. DMT II, pp. 43–44. Cf. *Xᵘāstvānīft* V A & B: "(About sins) Against the five kinds of living beings. And (that is) firstly, against the two-legged human beings, secondly, against the four-legged living beings, thirdly, against the flying living beings, fourthly, against the living beings in the water, (and) fifthly, the living beings creeping on the ground on their belly." Asmussen 1965, pp. 172, 195; Cao 2012, pp. 316–317.

24 *zuiyang* 罪殃 'sin, disaster' (Buddh. Skt. *sāvadya*).

25 *gongde* 功德, Skt. *puṇya*, basic meaning: 'merit(s)'. Other meanings: 'that which is accumulated according to one's good actions'. DMT III/4, p. 23.

26 *jiuba* 救拔 'to rescue, uplift' (Buddh. Skt. *paritrāṇa*); DMT III/4, p. 35.

27 *ku* 苦 'suffering, sorrow, pain, distress, torture, hardship' (Skt. *duḥkha*); DMT III/4, p. 38.

28 *chengfo* 成佛 'becoming a Buddha, accomplishing Buddhahood' (Buddh. Skt. *abhisaṃbuddha*).

29 *xingye* 行業 'deeds, (moral) actions' (Buddh. Skt. *karman*). Cf. *yexing* 業行.

30 *shitian* 十天 'ten heavens'; DMT III/4, p. 62; Greek οἱ δέκα οὐρανοί; DMT I, p. 42; Arabic *ʿašru samāwātin*, DMT II, p. 63; Asmussen 1965, pp. 171, 194, 215; Cao 2012, p. 314.

31 *xizhuo* 洗濯 'to wash away, cleanse' (Buddh. Skt. *prakṣālya*) 10, 14; DMT III/4, p. 77.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

12. obtain liberation. For the persons with the fifth rank of deeds, (their souls) will assume human bodies again, cultivate morality[32] in the practice of the religion and then will begin to be liberated. Therefore we should know the combination. The souls according to their sinful actions[33] in various heavens endure […]/
13. […] one] million and four hundred thousand kinds[34] of suffering of cyclical existence[35], then assume human bodies and afterwards obtain liberation. Just as some persons who commit crimes are judged respectively and still [remitted …]/
14. […] souls] are injured, but are washed and cleansed[36] and wounds are cured in the wheel (of zodiac) by Guanyin[37] and Shizhi[38] and recovered again. Just as […]/
15. prisoners are free from cangues and chains[39] and liberated from bandages and fetters. Also as medicines heal sores and wounds, carrion is cut out of the bodies, and the flesh is healed. Then (they) wear[40] [robes and crowns … dignified and]/
16. solemn,[41] will return to eternal happiness.[42] Also as parents are merciful, punish the sons and daughters who make mistakes, but then soothe them. It is comparable to some persons' bodies with filth […]/

32 *xiuxing* 修行 'to cultivate morality, cultivate oneself in the practice of religion' (Buddh. Skt. *caryā*).
33 *zuiye* 罪業 'sin, sinful actions' (Buddh. Skt. *pāpa-karman*); DMT III/4, p. 98.
34 Cf. *Xᵘāstvānīft* IB: "And being mixed with the evil knowledge of the uppermost one of all devils (and) shameless Āz devil's 140 myriads of devils, he became witless and weak-willed." Asmussen 1965, p. 193; Cao 2012, p. 332, n. 1.
35 *shengsi zhi ku* 生死之苦 'torture of birth and death' (Buddh. Skt. *saṃsāra*). Cf. *shengsi ku* 生死苦, DMT III/4, p. 59.
36 *qingjing* 清淨 'purity; pure, purified; to purify' (Buddh. Skt. *pariśuddhi*) 14, 17; DMT III/4, p. 50.
37 *guanyin* 觀音 lit. 'Observer of the voice' (i. e. Call, deity of the second emanation; Buddh. Skt. *Avalokiteśvara*); Cf. Bryder 1985, pp. 103–105. DMT III/4, p. 23; Cao 2012, pp. 318–319.
38 *shizhi* 勢至 lit. 'One whose power reaches everywhere' (i. e. Answer, deity of the second emanation; Buddh. Skt. *Mahāsthāmaprāpta*); Cf. Bryder 1985, pp. 103–105. DMT III/4, p. 63; Cao 2012, pp. 318–319.
39 *jiasuo* 枷鎖 'cangue and chains' (Buddh. Skt. *pāśa*, *bandhana*). Cf. *jiasuo* 枷鎖, DMT III/4, p. 31.
40 *chuandai* 串帶 'to wear'; Cf. *chuandai* 串戴, DMT III/4, p. 11.
41 *[zhuang]yan* [莊]嚴 'solemn, majestic, dignified' (Buddh. Skt. *alaṃkāra*). DMT III/4, p. 97.
42 *changle* 常樂 'eternal happiness, constant joy; eternally happy' (Buddh. Skt. *abhirata*, *nitya-kālaṃ sukham*); DMT III/4, p. 7. Cf. H. 234 cd: "All recovering their original bodies, wonderful, dignified, and solemn, and wearing robes and crowns, and being eternally happy." Tsui 1943, p. 196; Cao 2012, pp. 317–318.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

17. is cause and effect[43]. The hearers are likewise: because they have their filth of sins, the souls are made to become pure through cleansing and washing, will be liberated then and return to [the world of light …]/

Lines 6–9 of the *SB* lists seven places of suffering and regret, and *yelun* 業輪 is one of the places where the Buddha-nature of the Hearers arrives after they die. But the *SB* does not list these places top-down. "The *SB* thinks that the Buddha-nature leaves the fresh body after people die; it rises, goes down, and enters a new body of plant or animal."[44] *Yelun* 業輪 is in the middle of the seven places of suffering and regret and is the turning point from ascent to descent. *Yelun* 業輪 appears in the *Traité* twice and academic circles still need to do more research to decide what astronomical object *yelun* 業輪 is and readers can consult the opinions of Henning and Lieu.[45] Mikkelsen pointed out: *yelun* 業輪 'wheel of rotations' (probably equiv. to Pth. *'spyr* 'sphere' or 'globe'; Buddh. 'wheel of retribution'; Skt. *saṃsāracakra*).[46] The *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* notes: "The basic meaning of *yelun* 業輪 is the wheel of karma which turns men into the six paths of transmigration."[47] This article researches the CP, the *SB* and other related materials to explain why the Chinese Manichean texts borrowed the Buddhist term *yelun* 業輪 to designate the zodiac.

Manichaean Iranian, Uygur and Coptic texts

Lines 13–16 of the *Traité* say:

> The Pure Wind and the Benign Mother – using skillful means – created the ten heavens, next they placed (there) the *yelun* (業輪 wheel of Deeds [Zodiac]) and the palaces of the Sun and the Moon. They also (established) the eight earths below, the Three Garments, the Three Wheels and also the Three Calamities [Ditches] and the Four Courtyards with the iron enclosure, the *Weilaojufu* 未勞俱孚[Sumeru] mountain and all minor mountains, the ocean and the rivers.[48]

Sundermann collected, deciphered, edited and translated Parthian and Sogdian fragments which correspond to the *Traité*. *Yelun* 業輪 appears in the *Traité* twice and is equivalent to Parthian *'spyr* 'sphere, globe' which can be explained

43 *yinyuan* 因緣 'primary and secondary causes, cause and effect' (cf. Buddh. Skt. *hetupratyaya*); DMT III/4, p. 86.
44 Cao 2012, p. 316.
45 Cao 2012, pp. 314–315.
46 DMT III/4, p. 84. Middle Persian *gyrd'sm'n* 'circle of the Zodiac', cf. DMT III/1, p. 170; Yoshida 2010, pp. 7, 9; 29, n. 25.
47 http://www.buddhism-dict.net.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E6%A5%AD%E8%BC%AA.
48 Cf. Chavannes/Pelliot 1911–1913, pp. 19–23 [515–519]. *Yelun*, DMT III/4, p. 84.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

as "Rad des Zodiakus" (wheel of Zodiac) here.[49] Lieu believes that *Yelun* 業輪, i. e. the wheel of karma which turns men into the six paths of transmigrations, is undeniably a Buddhist term and the suggested Parthian gap-filler by Sundermann *ʿspyr* means 'globe or sphere' without any concept of a wheel. However the Sogdian equivalent does mean a 'rolling wheel'. The word *ʿspyr* which might have already been in standard use for the translation of the Buddhist concept into Parthian offers here a convenient equivalent with religious overtones for what would have otherwise been a difficult term to approximate in Chinese.[50]

There is close relationship between the zodiac and the transmigrations of souls in Manichaean materials, for examples, in the Manichaean hymn-cycle in Parthian *Angad Rōšnān* Ia, and its Sogdian version[51]; and in chapters 46 and 48 of Coptic *Kephalaia*.[52]

Uyghur document U 169 II[53] clearly illustrates the relationship between the souls and the zodiac. It says:

> … And the Messiah Buddha (Jesus) has called men who give alms in faith and who pray fervently "friends of his friends."… And furthermore he deigned to say this: "… And with your whole heart believe this: the reward for (a piece of) bread and a cup of water (given as alms) will never vanish, but is sure."
>
> And in the Scripture he deigned to say: "The auditors are not all alike. (For) there are 'perfect auditors'. Furthermore there are those of disposition. Then there are those who (just) accept the Law (religious teaching). The way their souls ascend to the zodiac (aχrwznγaru), and the way they reach it, and the way they are transformed into another self, and the way they descend (again), is not the same. There are many differences between them, just as fetters, shackles and foot-tethers of a sinful man are either heavy or light…"

Conclusion

The metempsychosis with the relationship of the celestial phenomena, especially the zodiac, was a common concept in the ancient world. Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians all believed in it. This concept influenced Manichaeism and there are many discourses about the relationship between metempsychosis and the

49 Sundermann 1992, pp. 62–63, 79, 144. *ʿspyr*, cf. DMT III/1, p. 87.
50 Lieu 1998, pp. 69, 72.
51 Boyce 1954, pp. 122–123.
52 Polotsky 1940, pp. 117–118, 120–123; Gardner 1995, pp. 124, 127–132.
53 Cao Ling already recognized the importance of Uighur document U 169 II [T II D 173 b, 2] for our understanding the chapter 8 of the *Scripture of Buddha-nature*. Cf. von Le Coq 1922, pp. 11–12; Klimkeit 1993, pp. 326–327. Cf. Kósa 2013, p. 62. n. 63. Wilkens 2000, #89 (pp. 105–106). Regarding color photograph of U 0169 Seite 2 cf. http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/u/images/u0169seite2.jpg (accessed on 16th September 2015).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

zodiac in Coptic materials. This concept spread eastward to Central Asia and China and there are its equivalents in Iranian, Chinese, and Uyghur materials and in the CP. We can reconstruct the information expressed by the *SB* and the CP as follows:

Manichaean catechumens were called *tingzhe* 聽者 'hearers' and according to their *ye* 業 'karma', all the Hearers suffer or are saved slowly or fast differently. Their souls should suffer and regret their *zuiye* 罪業 'sinful actions' done by them when they were alive. The first place of suffering and regret is when the *foxing* 佛性 'Buddha-nature' (i. e. light-souls) leave the bodies in the days of their lives' end. The souls of the hearers ascend into the sky and are judged before the Impartial King (*Pingdeng wang* 平等王, i. e. the Just Judge). The image of the Impartial King is closely analogous to that of *Yanluo wang* 閻羅王 (Yama) under the influence of Buddhist paintings. This scene of judgment depicted on the CP is similar to that in the illustrations to the Buddhist *Scripture of the Ten Kings*. But the CP's scene of judgment is not in hell. The Impartial King sits in a building between earth and heaven. An assistant of the Judge holds the logbook of actions of the defendants which is similar to the *yebu* 業簿 held by the so-called Twin Children in the fourth court in the *Scripture of the Ten Kings*. *Yebu* 業簿 'tally of karma' is the record or account book, kept by the rulers of Hades, recording the deeds of all sentient beings. In front of the steps of the building, there are five human heads on green stalks and two four-footed animals, a snake, a bird, and a fish on the ground. They may respectively represent the *wuzhong caomu* 五種草木 'five kinds of plants and trees' and the *wulei zhongsheng* 五類衆生 'five kinds of living beings' which the Hearers neglected or damaged. I suppose that the five heads represent five kinds of plants and trees because there are two trees with three heads on both sides of Mount Sumeru and that the heads may represent the light elements in the trees.[54] On the right side of the building, there is a device which is like a ventilating fan. Yoshida recognized a bird, a four-footed animal, a snake, and a crab in the mirror. This mirror is similar to *yejing* 業鏡 'the Karmic mirror' in the court of Yama, which reveals all that one has done in prior lifetimes according to the *Scripture of the Ten Kings*. On the left upper side of the Judge, a small figure with a halo stands on a trailing cloud. It may represent the soul which ascends towards the zodiac. It is similar to the donor who ascends by clouds to the paradise in front of the sixth king in the *Scripture of the Ten Kings*. After their judgment, the souls reach the sky and transform in the third place of suffering and regret.

After this, souls continue to ascend and enter into the wheel of karma (zodiac) in the fourth place of suffering and regret. Waldschmidt and Lentz suggested that the gods Call and Answer appear in *Hymnscroll* (l. 391) as

54 Cf. Yoshida 2010, p. 12b; Kósa 2015, pp. 137–148.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the Bodhisattvas Guanyin 觀音 and Shizhi 勢至, i.e. Avalokiteśvara and Mahāsthamaprāpta.[55] Bryder and Mikkelsen agreed with this suggestion.[56] Now the *SB* and CP confirm that they are right. Two gods beside the zodiac in CP are Guanyin, the god Call, and Shizhi, the god Answer, i.e. Two Sons of God in M 178. Line 14 of the *SB* says: the souls are injured, but are washed and cleansed and wounds are cured in *lun* 輪 'the wheel' by Guanyin and Shizhi and recovered again. *Lun* 輪 'the wheel' definitely should mean *yelun* 業輪 'wheel of karma'. Therefore the souls enter into the wheel of karma, are cured by Guanyin and Shizhi, and still have the chance "to be freed from cangues and chains and liberated from bandages and fetters just as medicines heal sores and wounds, carrion is cut out of the bodies, and the flesh is healed" (*SB*, l. 15). All recover their original bodies, wonderful, dignified, and solemn, wear robes and crowns, and "will return to eternal happiness also as parents are merciful, punish the sons and daughters who make mistakes, but then soothe them" (*SB*, l. 16).

Hearers "are distributed to five places according to their deeds to obtain liberation". "For the persons with the first rank of deeds, their souls will arrive at Ten Heavens, be cleansed and then obtain liberation" (*SB*, ll. 10–11). Above the wheel of karma (zodiac) and from the second to the tenth heavens, there is a boat in the middle of each heaven. A person in red clothes and another in white clothes sit in each boat. Above the tenth heaven, two streams of light meet in the middle and end up in the inversed triangle-shaped body of the Perfect Man (the Milky Way). Three similar boats with two persons in red and white clothes respectively are on the merged streams of light.[57] These twenty four persons with halos on twelve boats may symbolize of the souls which arrive at the Ten Heavens, obtain liberation, ascend through the Milky Way, Sun and Moon and return to eternal happiness.

For the persons with the 2nd–5th ranks of deeds, their souls will go through transmigrations. They all "endure cold and heat in the open sky" (*SB*, l. 8) – the fifth place of suffering and regret.

For the persons with the 2nd–4th ranks of deeds, their souls will come to descend on saline-alkaline soil, or enter plants and trees, temporarily become fragrant flowers, or become fruits, and only then obtain liberation. The three places all relate to five kinds of plants and trees (the sixth place of suffering and regret).[58] There are two strange trees with three human heads on both sides of Mountain Sumeru in the CP.[59] The human head may symbolize Buddha-nature (light-soul).

55 Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, p. 9.
56 Bryder 1985, pp. 103–105, 122; DMT III/4, pp. 23–24, 63.
57 Yoshida 2010, p. 6, pls. 2, 3; p. 17.
58 Cf. Cao 2012, p. 332.
59 Yoshida 2010, p. 11, pl. 4.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

"The persons with the fifth rank of deeds will assume human bodies again, cultivate morality in the practice of the religion and then will begin to be liberated" (*SB*, l. 12). They should be among the souls which take five kinds of bodies and transform their shapes (the seventh place of suffering and regret). On the left of the snake-cage there are four kinds of men portrayed as seated on a red cloud: one official with a black hat, one soldier with armor, one merchant with three-cornered hat and one farmer with white clothing.[60] They may symbolize the souls which assume human bodies.

The CP is one of the most complex paintings in Chinese art history and there are more than 500 figures (including divine figures, monsters and animals, but not the objects) in the painting.[61] We can understand its main ideas according to the excellent research of Yutaka Yoshida and Gábor Kósa, but the meaning of many details still needs to be explained. This article identifies the zodiac in the painting with *yelun* 業輪 and points out that it is the turning point of the transmigration of souls. May the present study serve as a modest spur encouraging other scholars to come forward with their valuable contributions.

References

Asmussen, J.P. 1965: *Xᵘāstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*. Copenhagen (Acta Theologica Danica 7).

Boyce, M. 1954: *The Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian*. London/New York/Toronto (London Oriental Series 3).

Bryder, P. 1985: *The Chinese Transformation of Manichaeism. A Study of Chinese Manichaean Terminology*. Löberöd.

Cao, Ling 曹凌 2012: "Dunhuang yishu *Foxing jing* canpian kao 敦煌遺書《佛性經》殘片考 [A Study of a Fragment of the Scripture on Buddha's Nature Recently Discovered in Dunhuang]." In: *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 中華文史論叢 [*Journal of Chinese Literature and History*] 2, pp. 309–337.

Chavannes, E./P. Pelliot 1911–1913: "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine." In: *Journal Asiatique* 18 (1911), pp. 499–617; 1 (1913), pp. 260–394.

DMT I = S.N.C. Lieu/S. Clackson/E. Hunter: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. I: *Texts from the Roman Empire (Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin)*. Turnhout 1999 (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 2).

DMT II = F. de Blois/N. Sims-Williams: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. II: *Texts from Iraq and Iran (Texts in Syriac, Arabic, Persian and Zoroastrian Middle Persian)*. Turnhout 2006 (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 4).

DMT III/1 = D. Durkin-Meisterernst: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III/1: *Texts from Central Asia and China (Texts in Middle Persian and Parthian)*. Turnhout 2004 (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 3).

60 Yoshida 2010, pp. 12–13, pl. 4.
61 Kósa 2011, pp. 21–22.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

DMT III/4 = G.B. Mikkelsen: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III/4: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Turnhout 2006 (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 5).

Dunhuang Manuscripts = Zhongguo guojia tushuguan 中國國家圖書館: *Guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang yishu* 國家圖書館藏敦煌遺書 *[Manuscripts from Dunhuang in the National Library of China]*. Beijing 2005.

Furukawa, Shoichi 古川攝一 2010: "Shinshutsu Manikyō kaiga shiron – seisaku nendai o megutte 新出マニ教絵画試論 – 製作年代をめぐつて [Preliminary study of the styles and techniques found in the newly discovered Manichaean paintings – With special reference to their dating]." In: *Yamato Bunka* 大和文華 *[Biannual Journal of Eastern Arts]* 121, pp. 35–52.

Gardner, I. 1995: *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary*. Leiden/New York (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 37).

Henning, W.B. 1948: "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12 (1947–1948), pp. 306–318.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco.

Kósa, G. 2011: "Translating a Vision – Rudimentary Notes on the Chinese Cosmology Painting." In: *Manichaean Studies Newsletter* 25, pp. 20–32.

— 2013: "Translating the *Eikōn*. Some considerations on the relation of the Chinese Cosmology painting to the *Eikōn*." In: J.P. Laut/K. Röhrborn (eds.): *Vom Aramäischen zum Alttürkischen: Fragen zur Übersetzung von manichäischen Texten. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposium vom 29./30. September 2011*. Berlin/New York (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, N.F. 29), pp. 49–84.

— 2015: "The Iconographical Affiliation and the Religious Message of the Judgement Scene in the Chinese Cosmology Painting." In: Zheng Xiaogui 张小贵/Wang Yuanyuan 王媛媛/Yin Xiaoping 殷小平 (eds.): *San yi jiao yanjiu – Lin Wushu jiaoshou guxi jinian wenji* 三夷教研究—林悟殊教授古稀纪念文集 *[Researches on the Three Foreign Religions – Papers in Honour for Prof. Lin Wushu on His 70th Birthday]*. Lanzhou (Ou-Ya lishi wenhua wenku 欧亚历史文化文库 [Treasures of Eurasian History and Culture]), pp. 77–161.

Le Coq, A. von 1922: "Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho, III." In: *Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, *Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 2, pp. 1–49.

Lieu, S.N.C. 1998: *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. Leiden/Boston.

Ma, Xiaohe 2014: "*Scripture of Buddha-nature*: A Newly Recognized Chinese Manichaean Manuscript from Dunhuang." In: *Eurasia Studies* II (English Edition), pp. 189–218, pl. III–1.

Polotsky, H.-J. 1940: *Kephalaia*. Ed. by H.-J. Polotsky and A. Böhlig. Stuttgart (Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin 1).

Sundermann, W. 1992: *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 17).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tsui, Chi 1943: "Mo Ni Chiao Hsia Pu Tsan 摩尼教下部讚 [The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns]." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 (1943–1946), pp. 174–219.

Waldschmidt, E./W. Lentz 1926: *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 4).

Wilkens, J. 2000: *Alttürkische Handschriften*. Teil 8: *Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,16).

Yoshida, Yutaka 吉田豊 2010: "Shinshutsu Manikyo kaiga no Keijijo 新出マニ教絵画の形而上 [Cosmogony and church history depicted in the newly discovered Chinese Manichaean paintings]." In: *Yamato Bunka* 大和文華 *[Biannual Journal of Eastern Arts]* 121, pp. 3–34, pls. 1–9.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Case of Loan and Mortgage in a Late Pahlavi Text

Maria Macuch, Berlin

The Pahlavi texts known as *rivāyats* or "traditions" were mostly compiled or composed in the post-Sasanian period with the main goal of preserving ancient Zoroastrian traditions as well as explaining age-old institutions, which would have otherwise fallen into oblivion in the wake of the fundamental changes after the Muslim conquest of Iran. Besides religious and ritual matters, in these late redactions of the 9th–13th centuries a large spectrum of inquiries regarding legal problems were also put to one or several religious authorities, usually in the form of question and answer. These passages bear witness to both the astonishing tenacity of certain legal institutions of the Sasanian period as well as to the vulgarization of a once complex, sophisticated legal system, which had been for many centuries the solid foundation upon which the Iranian Empire was built. Despite their goal to conserve Zoroastrian traditions, the *rivāyats* show in many details how religious and legal institutions had gradually changed over the centuries. They also reveal how disputes in civil cases were dealt with in the Zoroastrian communities of the early Muslim era, allowing to a certain degree insight into both the juridical problems as well as the daily life of these communities. The present contribution dealing with a topic from this field is dedicated to the cherished memory of Werner Sundermann as a token of my heartfelt gratitude for his invaluable scholarly advice, his loyal friendship and his unwavering support as a teacher and colleague across many years.

One of these texts containing interesting legal material is the *Pahlavi Rivāyat of Ādurfarrbay and Farrbay-srōš* (RivAF), comprising two treatises transmitted together in the manuscripts, with questions put to two religious authorities of the post-Sasanian era, the high-priest Ādurfarrbay ī Farroxzādān (9th century), and the chief-mobed Farrbay-srōš ī Wahrāmān (11th century). The first authority, Ādurfarrbay, son of Farroxzād, was a religious leader, who is well known as one of the two compilers of the monumental *Dēnkard* and one of the chief actors in the small Pahlavi treatise *Mādayān ī gizastag Abālīš* ("Book of the accursed Abālīš") from the time of the Caliph al-Ma'mun (815–833 CE).[1] In his *Rivāyat* Ādurfarrbāy discusses a large number of legal problems relating particularly to Zoroastrian family law, but also to matters of property and

1 According to Anklesaria 1969, II, pp. 1–2, 4. On this text see overview in Macuch 2009b, p. 136, with further references.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

credit law, areas, which obviously remained within the jurisdiction of the Zoroastrian communities after the Muslim conquest of Iran. The questions 66–69 in his treatise are specifically dedicated to disputes from the field of obligations, particularly credit law. These cases probably reflect concrete legal disputes subject to his jurisdiction as "leader of the adherents of the Good Religion" *(hudēnān-pēšōbāy)*[2] in Pars in the first half of the 9th century, at the time of the said Caliph.

In the following I will discuss one of the cases (*Pursišn* 68) which seems particularly intriguing due to the precise use of Sasanian legal terminology, on the one hand, and the strange, unexplained verdict of the high priest, on the other. Moreover, the content of this *Pursišn* can now be elucidated in the light of a new Pahlavi original document (Tab. 18) from the collection of legal texts from eighth century Tabarestān (corresponding roughly to Māzanderān south of the Caspian sea today) in which a comparable case of loan and mortgage is recorded, allowing insight into the specific conditions of this kind of legal transaction. The original documents from Tabarestān, written in the Pahlavi cursive script, were introduced to the scholarly community in 2012 by Philippe Gignoux and Rika Gyselen in the series Res Orientales. We are not informed on the provenance of this truly spectacular find, due to the fact that they belong to a private owner, who does not wish to be revealed, but the texts were made available for study and have been partly edited and discussed with largely divergent readings and results by Gignoux, Weber and myself.[3] The Tabarestān documents are particularly important, not only because they show exactly how courts functioned in the eighth century and how legal transactions were recorded, but since they offer the first irrefutable proof for a long standing hypothesis, namely that Sasanian law continued to be practiced practically unchanged in certain regions of Iran in the first centuries of Islam, long after the downfall of the Sasanians.

The *Pahlavi Rivāyat* of *Ādurfarrbay* has been edited and translated by Anklesaria in 1969 together with the text attributed to *Farrbay-srōš*.[4] This source has been transmitted in the well-known manuscript TD2, written by the Dastūr of Kermān, Frēdōn Marzbān, between 1626–1629 CE (= Y. 995–998), belonging to the private collection of B.T. Anklesaria (a copy is in the Dastur Meherjirana Library in Navsari).[5] A facsimile of the whole manuscript has been published in 1978 in the *Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches* Series,

2 On the title see Anklesaria 1969, II, p. 3, and Boyce 1979, p. 147. This was a new epithet which came into being in the Abbasid period possibly in correspondence with the Muslim title *amīr al-muʿminīn* "Commander of the faithful".

3 See Gignoux 2012, 2014 and 2016; Weber 2016 and Macuch 2016a. The text comparable to *Pursišn* 68, Tab. 18, will be edited and discussed by Dieter Weber and myself (with completely divergent readings from those of Gignoux 2014, pp. 49–53) in the forthcoming volume of Res Orientales (2017).

4 Anklesaria 1969.

5 Anklesaria 1969, II, p. 26.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

volume 54. In his edition of the text Anklesaria has also used an older manuscript (G) from his own collection, copied by Gōbadšāh Rūstam Bundār from an earlier version by Hōšang Sīyāwaxš Šahrīyār, written possibly sometime between 1471–1481 CE (= Y. 840–850) according to the incomplete colophon.[6] Since Anklesaria's translation of the *Pursišn*[7] is unreliable and lacks a commentary (he obviously had neither exact knowledge of legal language, nor of Sasanian law in general), I will first present a new translation of the passage, then discuss the technical terms and the legal background of the case, including the material from Tab. 18, from the perspective of Sasanian jurisprudence.

I. Text and translation

RivAF, *Pursišn 68*[8]

Pursišn. mard-⁺ē[9] *kē xwāstag* (hw'stk) *pad mard-⁺ē*[10] *grawgān kunēd ud abām stanēd ud az-iš*[11] *padīrēd ud xwāstag* (hw'stk) *and-čand pad ān xwāstag* (NKSY') *arzēd pad hunsandīh ī abām-dādār pad mērag (pad mērag)*[12] *grawgān kunēd ud abām ēk az dō bawēd pas ān xwāstag* (hw'stk) *bun arzēd ud waxš nē arzēd mērag ī abām-dādār xwāstag* (hw'stk) *wēš pādixšāy xwāstan ayāb ka-š ān xwāstag* (hw'stk) *ī grawgān be abespārd was u-š any tōzišn kunišn ayāb nē.*

Pasōx. ka mērag xwāstag (hw'stk) *ī-š pad grawgānīh padīrift andar ān rōz pad arz mar pad bun ud waxš pasandīd u-š be grift ka xwāstag* (hw'stk) *az ān arz be šawēd mard kē abām stad u-š xwāstag* (hw'stk')[13] *grawgān kard hamē ka bun pad ān xwāstag* (hw'stk) *drust mard pad gyāg pad abām abāz dādan a-tuwānīg ud grawgāndār ⁺rāh*[14] *ō xwāstag* (hw'stk) *ī-š pad grawgānīh be padīrift bē ka tuwānīg tā bun ud waxš be tōxtan dādestān ōh dahišn čē ēdōn bēd ka-š abām stad hē u-š grawgān nē dād hē u-š pas-iz abām ud waxš ōh tōzišn pad čār ud tuwān.*

6 Anklesaria 1969, II, pp. 28–31.
7 *Ibid.*, pp. 78–79.
8 The following transcription is based on a collation of mss. TD2 (PCIR 54, pp. 322.10–402.15) and G (according to Anklesaria 1969, I, pp. 36–37).
9 Both mss. ⟨HN'⟩ *ēd.*
10 Both mss. ⟨HN'⟩ *ēd.*
11 TD2: ⟨W hc-š⟩/⟨'P-š⟩; G: ⟨W '-š⟩ (according to Anklesaria 1969, I, p. 36, fn. LXVIII, 4).
12 TD2: ⟨PWN mylk⟩ *pad mērag* twice (!); G: only once (according to Anklesaria 1969, I, p. 36).
13 G has the correct spelling ⟨hw'stk'⟩ (according to Anklesaria 1969, I, p. 37, fn. 12), whereas TD2 has ⟨NKSY'⟩, which, written as an ideogram always means "money" in legal texts, never "property, thing, *res*".
14 TD2: ⟨l'd'⟩; G: torn (according to Anklesaria 1969, I, p. 37, fn. 14).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Question. A man *(mard)* who mortgages the usufruct *(grawgān kunēd)* of a property *(xwāstag)* to a man *(mard)* and takes out a loan *(abām stanēd)* and he (= the lender/creditor) accepts it from him *(ud az-iš padirēd)* and he (= the borrower/debtor) mortgages the usufruct *(grawgān kunēd)* of the property to the extent that corresponds to the value of the money (= loan, NKSY') to the partner *(mērag)* with the consent *(pad hunsandīh)* of the creditor *(abām-dādār)* and the loan counts as one from two *(abām ēk az dō bawēd)*, then afterwards that property has the value of the principal *(bun)*, but does not cover the value of the interest *(waxš)*, is the partner-creditor *(mērag ī abām-dādār)*, entitled to claim more property or does it suffice, when he (= the debtor) has delivered the mortgaged property *(grawgān)*? And should he (= the debtor) make another kind of redemption *(tōzišn)* or not?

Answer. If the partner *(mērag)* has approved *(pasandīd)* of the property that he has accepted as mortgage *(pad grawgānīh padirīft)* according to the calculation of the value *(pad arz mar)* of the principal *(bun)* plus interest *(waxš)* on that day *(andar ān rōz)* (of the contract) and has taken it *(u-š be grift)*, if the (mortgaged) property loses that value (and if) the man *(mard)* who has taken out the loan (= the debtor) and mortgaged the usufruct *(grawgān kard)* of property during the whole period, in which the principal *(bun)* (is kept) intact *(drust)* by that property, is unable to pay back the debt immediately *(pad gyāg)* and the mortgagee *(grawgāndār)* has access to the property *(+rāh ō xwāstag)*, which he had accepted as mortgage *(pad grawgānīh be padīrift)*: unless he (= the debtor) is solvent *(tuwānīg)*, in order to repay (both) principal *(bun)* and interest *(waxš)*, judgement is to be given as if he (= the debtor) had taken out the loan and not given usufruct as mortgage *(u-š grawgān nē dād hē)*. And afterwards the debt plus interest are to be paid according to his (= the debtor's) means and ability.

II. Legal terminology

One of the astonishing aspects of this passage is its consistency in using Sasanian legal terminology as attested in the chapters and sections on pledge and mortgage in the Sasanian Law-book of "One Thousand Judgements"[15] and in the original legal document Tab. 18 (from the Tabarestān collection described above). Obviously the technical language of Sasanian jurisprudence was still well known in the 9th century and employed with the same legal implications. That this is nevertheless a late juridical text, is revealed by the discrepancy between the accurate use of legal terms and the confusing presentation of the case due to a lack of precision in describing the legal problem. The curious, unexplained ruling suggested by the high priest is another puzzling feature of this passage, to which

15 Edition Macuch 1993, particularly chapters XIII and XVIII, pp. 220–239 and 277–298.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

we will return later. The most important technical terms, phrases and formulae are (in alphabetical order):

1. *abām stadan* "to take out a loan"; *abām-dādār* "lender; creditor" (*abām dādan* "to grant a loan"; also *abām-xwēš,* lit. "loan-owner", for "creditor"[16]); *mard kē abām stad* "borrower; debtor" (another term for "debtor" is *abāmōmand* in the *Dēnkard*[17]); *abām tōxtan* "to repay a debt"; *abām ud waxš ōh tōzišn* "loan plus interest should be repaid"; *abām ēk az dō bawēd* "the loan counts as one from two" (lit. "the loan becomes one from two"). The last phrase is not explained, but it most probably designates the ratio between the total amount of the loan, principal plus interest, and the income *(bar)* the mortgaged property produces twice a year, as exemplified in MHD 38.3–6. There is a similar phrase in Tab. 18.24–25: *ān xwāstag* (NKSY') *ēk rāy dō ē bawēd* "that money shall be doubled", which is, however, used in a different context (see case study under III).[18]

2. *bun* "substance, principal, capital"; *bun ud waxš* "principal (debt) and interest"; *ka bun pad ān xwāstag* (hw'stk) *drust* "when the principal (debt) is kept intact by that property". Every "legal object" or "thing" (*xwāstag*; see 6 below) was divided theoretically into two main categories: the "substance, capital, principal, base" *(bun)* on the one hand and its "fruit, increase" *(bar)* or "income, interest" *(windišn, waxš, waxt)* on the other. This basic division of "things" into "substance" and "fruit" was one of the most important theoretical precepts of Sasanian law and had significant implications in all areas of property law (particularly with regard to the institutions of "substitute succession" or "succession by proxy", *stŭrīh,* and the "pious foundation for the soul", *ruwānagān*).[19]

3. *drust; drustīh* "warranty; safekeeping"; *ka bun pad ān xwāstag* (hw'stk) *drust* "when the principal (debt) (is kept) intact by that property"; compare Tab. 18.21: *ud grawgānīh pad Farroxgušnasp drust[īh]* "and the antichresis (is kept) intact by Farroxgušnasp", and MHD 6.13–14: *drust darēm* "we guarantee (for the goods)"; *drust darišnīh* "warranty, guarantee".

4. *grawgān* "mortgage/pledge of the usufruct; *antichresis*"; *grawgāndār* "mortgagee"; *grawgān kardan* "to grant the usufruct (of a certain property) as mortgage; to grant an *antichresis*"; *pad grawgānīh padīriftan* "to accept as *antichresis*"; *xwāstag* (hw'stk) *ī grawgān* "property whose usufruct is mortgaged". Sasanian law distinguished between various forms of pledge and mortgage, differentiating meticulously between three forms called *āgraw* "hypotheca",

16 DkM 767.15, 17, 19; 770.4f., 10; 769.17.
17 DkM 767.15, 18, 22; 770.4, 8, 10; 769.17.
18 All the attestations of these terms must be taken into consideration, see *Index* in Macuch 1993, p. 685.
19 On the legal implications of the division of "things" into "substance" and "income" see Macuch 2015.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

grawgān "antichresis" and *graw* "pledge, pawn". The term *āgraw* designates the mortgage of the "substance" *(bun)* of a certain property, granting the creditor (or mortgagee) a title to the mortgaged property in case the debtor (or mortgagor) fails to repay the debt. In contrast, the *grawgān* type grants only the "produce" *(bar)* of the mortgaged property as security to the lender (or mortgagee) with no access to the substance *(bun)* itself; *graw* "pawn, pledge" usually refers to chattels and designates objects (including animals and slaves) handed out to the creditor (or pledgee, *grawdār)* by the debtor (pledgor) as security (the "deposit", *ǰām,* was also known). Although we may assume that usually the harvest of a piece of agricultural land or crop yields of orchards and vineyards were mortgaged as *antichresis (grawgān),* the work force of slaves and animals or other kinds of property yielding some kind of income (e. g. the rent of a house) could also be granted as security in this manner. On the difference between mortgages of the *āgraw* and *grawgān* type see the explicit definition in the Sasanian Lawbook:

> MHD 40.3–4
> *ka grawgān kunēd bar grawgān kard bawēd ud ka āgraw kunēd bun āgraw kard bawēd*
> "If he (= the borrower) mortgages the usufruct *(grawgān kunēd)*, (then) the produce *(bar)* has been mortgaged and if he (= the borrower) mortgages the principal *(āgraw kunēd),* (then) the substance *(bun)* has been mortgaged."[20]

This exact use of this terminology in the sense described above is confirmed in Tab. 18, in which a security of the *grawgān* type is given for a loan (see case study under III).

5. *padīriftan* "to accept, agree (with binding force)"; *az-iš padīrēd* "he (= the creditor) accepts it from him (= the debtor)"; *pad grawgānīh padīrift* "he accepted it as *antichresis*". Transactions in Sasanian law were only valid if the recipient (in our case the creditor, who is granted a security) gave his explicit consent (*padīrišn* or *sahišn*) by accepting the transaction with the words *dōšīd* "it is sanctioned" or *kāmag dōšīd* "the will is sanctioned"[21] or *andar abāyēd* "it is necessary"[22] or, as in our case, *pasandīd* "he has approved". A transfer or contract was legally valid only after the recipient had explicitly stated his consent by using one of these formulae, which had binding force.[23]

6. *tuwānīg* "capable" in the sense of "solvent" (= able to pay); *a-tuwānīg* "insolvent, incapable" (with reference to the debtor); *pad čār ud tuwān* "according to (one's) means and ability/solvency".

20 Transliteration, translation and commentary see Macuch 1993, pp. 280, 285, 295 (no. 17).
21 Macuch 1993, p. 454, no. 1.
22 Attestations see Macuch 1993, p. 686.
23 For an overview of the formal procedure see Macuch 2009a, pp. 190–191.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

7. *xwāstag* (written ⟨hw'stk⟩) "thing, legal object, property", (written ⟨NKSY'⟩) "money". The legal term *xwāstag,* written ⟨hw'stk⟩, corresponds almost exactly to the term *res,* lit. "thing", in Roman property law and is used in the threefold sense of:

1. "object, thing", comprising legal objects of a completely different nature, both immovable property (real estate, agricultural land, orchards, trees, canals, houses etc.) and movable property (goods and chattels, cattle, slaves, money etc.);
2. "object at issue, matter in dispute", designating everything that could be the object of civil litigation;
3. "property, wealth, object of value", including the whole mass of family property or inheritance *(abarmānd).*[24]

The fourth meaning "money" is written with the ideogram ⟨NKSY'⟩ in legal texts and documents and hence clearly distinguished by the Pahlavi script from its homonym. This differentiation may also be observed in Tab. 18.[25]

III. Background and case study

Our passage does not describe the economic background of the case, neither are we directly informed of the living conditions of Zoroastrians in the Muslim era in any of the *rivāyat* texts. We know, however, that agriculture was the main means of sustenance and remained the social and economic foundation of the Zoroastrian communities in Iran up to the 20th century, which is also indirectly confirmed by the Tabarestān documents. Moreover, promoting farming and agriculture was one of the central religious precepts of Zoroastrianism within the ethical framework of a religion bent on preserving life and creation. Hence cultivating the land, tilling the ground, fertilizing the soil, reaping the harvest and producing crops played a significant part in the religious life of the communities as one of the two principal means of promoting life and supporting the good creation of Ohrmazd (the other one being the procreation of offspring).[26] In a rural community with agriculture as its main form of sustenance we would in fact expect to find legal transactions of the kind transmitted in the sections on debt and credit law in *rivāyat* literature and in legal documents. We can confidently assume that taking out a loan and granting security was the normal procedure, that particularly farmers and peasants, besides others, were often forced to take recourse to a money-lender for a loan in order to be able to continue their work, to supply livestock, agricultural implements, for seed and other expenses.

24 See Macuch 2015, p. 247.
25 On ⟨NKSY'⟩ in documents in the Pahlavi cursive script see Macuch 2008, pp. 264–265.
26 On Zoroastrian ethics see now Cantera 2015.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The money-lender was most probably usually an affluent co-religionist, who could have been a fellow peasant, a landowner, a wealthy priest or a prosperous merchant subject to Zoroastrian jurisdiction. In Tab. 18 the money-lender is a scribe called Farroxgušnasp; the borrower a shield-maker called Dēlgušnasp. The most usual form of real security in these cases would have been the next harvest and the rates of interest would have been often based on the average crop yields per year (see below). Given the important religious significance of agriculture, we would not expect these interest rates to be exorbitant, although they must have sufficed to satisfy the lender and keep this type of transaction going.

As to the legal background, different forms of security with the primary purpose to ensure the payment of a debt are known in all juridical systems. A man who lends money (the money-lender or creditor) to another one (the borrower or debtor) would often wish to obtain some kind of additional guarantee for repayment of the loan plus interest instead of just having to rely on the willingness and the ability of the debtor to pay the money back on time. The creditor would wish to be protected against loss, against the possibility that the debtor may be insolvent or unreachable when called upon to repay the loan. In this case the debtor usually has to provide some kind of security for the borrowed money, which can be real or personal. Whereas personal security permits a creditor to look to a third party for satisfaction (guarantee or suretyship)[27], real security consists of a grant of either ownership, possession or another specific right to particular funds or to a certain property of the debtor (such as mortgage, pledge, pawn, lien, deposit, etc.), entitling the creditor to retain or recover this property in satisfaction of the debt. These methods of securing a loan were all well known in Sasanian law, which distinguished exactly between different forms of mortgage and pledge, using specific technical terms. As elucidated above, the term *āgraw* designated a form of mortgage similar to the *hypotheca*, the conveyance of land, real estate or an assignment of chattels, giving the creditor (or mortgagee) a title to the substance *(bun)* of the mortgaged property on default of the debtor (or mortgagor). This was distinguished exactly from the *grawgān* type, or *antichresis,* which granted the creditor (or mortgagee) only access to the produce *(bar)* of the mortgaged property, that is, the harvest of certain pieces of agricultural land, crop yields of orchards or vineyards, but also the rent of a house, the produce of an animal, the work force of a slave, etc., without pledging the principal or substance of the property *(bun)* itself.

The *grawgān* type of real security *(antichresis)* is exemplified perfectly in Tab. 18, which records minutely how the usufruct of property was assigned by the borrower to the money-lender. In this case the borrower, a shield-maker *(spargar)* called Dēlgušnasp, provides security for a loan of 6 staters and one drachm, taken out from a scribe called Farroxgušnasp, in the following manner:

27 On Sasanian suretyship see Macuch 2016b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(1) *māh Ādur abar sāl 101 ud rōz Aštād Dēlgušnasp ī* (2) *spargar Dērā pus az ān *Haspīn-raz deh ī* (3) *pad xanag ī Dēl-Dēlān pad dar-spās ī yazdān-bānag* (4) *Parišwārgar šāh ī pad Halīg pēš kē xwēškār[īhā]* (5) *guft kū man xwāstag* (NKSY') *arz sazēd s(atēr) 6 [drahm 1]* (6) *ō Farroxgušnasp ī dibīr ī az *Haspīn-raz deh abām* (7) *dādan ān xwāstag* (NKSY') *ǰādag pad bun ī ān *Haspīn-raz deh* (8) *az ān man xweš zamīg ī kišwzār ēw-kardag taxlīh* (9) *xwānēnd k(abīz) 9 āhang kē az ēw zayt ī darrag az ēw* (10) *zayt ī zamīg ī xwāstagdārān ī mardān ī a-ǰomāyīg ī andar* (11) *būd az ēw zayt ī zamīg ī ham Farroxgušnasp az ēw zayt ī* (12) *zamīg ī mardān ī Windāspagān nām sāmān pas zamīg ēw-kardag* (13) *Dašt-sag-kam-ī-ul xwānēnd k(abīz) 8 āhang kē az ēw zayt ī* (14) *zamīg ī {mardān ī} xwāstagdārān ī mardan ī Dērā nām būd* (15) *az ēw zayt ī zamīg ī Dēlxwašīh nām būd any mard* (15bis) *az ēw zayt ī zamīg ī mardān ī Āzādmard nām any mard* (16) *āmān az ēw zayt ī zamīg ī mardān ī Dadōy nām būd sāmān pas* (17) *zamīg ēw-kardag ēwēn pid xwānēnd k(abīz) 3 āhang kē az ēw zayt ī* (18) *zamīg ī mardān ī Windāspagān nām az ēw zayt ī zamīg ī mardān ī Yazdāngird* (19) *nām būd az ēw zayt ī zamīg ī mardān ī Gōr (nām az) ēw zayt ī zamīg* (20) *ī mardān ī Xwaršēd nām sāmān tā ān xwāstag* (NKSY') *s(atēr) 6 drahm 1 abāz dādan* (21) *pad Farroxgušnasp grawgān ud grawgānīh pad Farroxgušnasp drust[īh] harw kē* (22) *pad-iš pahikarēd az Farroxgušnasp abēzār ud Farroxgušnasp pad ān xīr* (23) *zyān sazēd ǰud (az) ān-iz xwāstag* (NKSY') *hamē ka Farroxgušnasp xwāhēd* (24) *abāz ō Farroxgušnasp dahēm agar čiš-iz ǰuttar kunēm ān xwāstag* (NKSY') (25) *ēk rāy dō ē bawēd s(atēr) 12 drahm 2 ō Farroxgušnasp dahēm (… …)*

"(1) Month *Ādur* in the year 101 and day *Aštād*: *Dēlgušnasp* (2) the shield-maker, son of *Dērā* from the village of **Haspīn-raz*, who (3) (is) in the house of *Dēl-Dēlān* in the service of the protector of the gods, (4) King *Parišwārgar* in Halīg, before whom he spoke regarding his area of responsibility *(xwēškār[īhā])* (5) thus: 'It is my obligation to give (back) money, a sum worth 6 staters [and one drachm] (6) to *Farroxgušnasp*, the scribe from the village of **Haspīn-raz*, for a loan *(abām)*. (7) That money (is) a share in the substance *(bun)* of the village **Haspīn-raz*. (8) From the cultivated land *(zamīg ī kišwzār)* of my own *(man xwēš)* in one piece *(ew-kardag)* called *taxlīh*: a measure (*sāmān*, line 12) of the (9) crop yields *(āhang)* (consisting) of 9 *kabīz*, which (are) from one olive-tree of the "canyon", from one (10) olive-tree on the land of the heirs *(xwāstagdārān)* of men, who are not shareholders *(a-ǰomāyīg)*, (11) from one olive-tree on the land of the same *Farroxgušnasp*, from one olive-tree on (12) the land of the men called *Windāspagān*. Then (from) the land in one piece *(ew-kardag)* (13) called *Dašt-sag-kam-ī-ul*: a measure (*sāmān*, line 16) of the crop yields *(āhang)* (consisting) of 8 kabīz, which (are) from one olive-tree on (14) the land of the {men, who} are heirs *(xwāstagdārān)* of the men called *Dērā*, (15) from one olive-tree on the land of (those) called *Dēlxwašīh* (and) another man, (15$^{\text{sup.lin.}}$) from one olive-tree on the land of the men called *Āzādmard* (and) another man, (16) a measure *(sāmān)* from one olive-tree on the land of the men called *Dadōy*. Then (17) (from) the land in one piece *(ew-kardag)* called lawfully *Pid*: a measure (*sāmān*, line 20) of the crop yields (consisting) of 3 *kabīz*, which (are) from one olive-tree on (18) the land of the men called *Windāspagān*, from one olive-tree on the land of the men called *Yazdāngird*, (19) from one olive-tree on the land of the men called *Gōr*, (from) one olive-tree on the land (20) of the men called *Xwaršēd*. Until that sum

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of 6 staters, one drachm, is given back, (21) the usufruct is mortgaged *(grawgān)*. And the *antichresis (grawgānīh)* (is kept) intact *(drustīh)* by *Farroxgušnasp*. Anyone (22) who disputes this *(pahīkārēd)*, (is) without expedient *(abēzār)* against *Farroxgušnasp*. And (if) *Farroxgušnasp* by that property (23) suffers a loss, I will give back that money to *Farroxgušnasp* any time when *Farroxgušnasp* requests it. (24) If I act otherwise, that sum (25) shall be doubled *(ēk rāy dō ē bawēd)*. I will give 12 staters, 2 drachms, to *Farroxgušnasp*.' (… …)"[28]

This remarkable document illustrates exactly how a *grawgān* or *antichresis* was recorded. The borrower *Dēlgušnasp* offers the crop yields of olive-trees *(zayt)* as security for the loan he has received from the money-lender *Farroxgušnasp*. The olive-trees are on three undivided *(ēw-kardag)* estates, consisting of cultivated land *(zamīg ī kišwzār)*. Each of these three estates with olive-trees is in turn parceled among four different shareholder families. The debtor *Dēlgušnasp* has the right of disposal of the crops of the olive-trees listed in the document, even though he himself is only the proprietor of the first estate (see the differentiation between *bun* and *bar* above). The document groups the olive-trees on these three estates into three sets of four trees each according to the measure *(sāmān)* of their yields: the first group produces 9 *kabīz* of olives (lines 8–12); the second group 8 *kabīz* (lines 13–16); the third group only 3 *kabīz* (lines 17–20). The produce (olives) of these trees is mortgaged *(grawgān)* to the measure specified in the contract until the loan is paid back.[29]

This is exactly the kind of security referred to in RivAF *Pursišn* 68: a man (= the borrower or debtor) takes out a loan *(abām stanēd)* and grants real security to the money-lender (or creditor) by mortgaging the usufruct of a certain property *(grawgān kunēd)*. The text does not specify the type of property mortgaged in this manner, but it would not be too far-fetched to assume that loans in a rural community were usually raised on the security of the next harvest, as in Tab. 18. The use of the correct terminology is important: as already indicated, *grawgān* implies that the debtor gives the creditor access to the increase or fruits *(bar)* of the mortgaged property. The word employed for "property" *(xwāstag)* is an abstract general technical term ("thing"; *res)* denoting both movable and immovable assets (land, real estate, houses, trees, chattels, animals, slaves etc.), which in our case must refer to some kind of property yielding an income (harvest, crops, fruit, rent, the work force or issue of slaves and animals, etc.). The creditor explicitly agrees to this form of real security for the loan, hereby entering a binding contract with the debtor. His acceptance is expressed in our passage (in the "question" part) by the formula *az-iš padīrēd*, "he (= the creditor) accepts it from him (= the debtor)", in the "answer" part by *pad grawgānīh padīrift* "he accepted it as *antichresis*" with binding force. The debtor mortgages the usufruct

28 Gignoux 2014, pp. 49–53, has completely different readings and a divergent understanding of the text.

29 For an extensive discussion of the whole document, see the forthcoming articles by Weber and Macuch in Res Orientales, vol. XXV (2017).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of the said property to the extent of the value of the loan (hier: *xwāstag* written as a heterogram ⟨NKSY'⟩with the meaning of "money", see above under II.6) to the creditor *(abām-dādār)* with the latter's explicit consent *(pad hunsandīh).*

The next part of the sentence is problematic, since the phrase *abām ēk az dō bawēd* "the loan counts as one from two" (lit. "the loan becomes one from two") is elliptical and not explained here or, as far as I can see, elsewhere. (Tab. 18.24–25 *ān xwāstag* [NKSY'] *ēk rāy dō ē bawēd* "that money will be doubled" is similar, but not identical, and is used in a different context, referring to the penalty the borrower is willing to pay on default.) Taking all the available information on the *grawgān* type of mortgage into consideration, the phrase seems to refer to the ratio between the total amount of the loan, principal plus interest, and the income *(bar)* the mortgaged property produces in one year, as in the following example from the Law-book:

> MHD 38.3–6
> *xwāstag ī grawgān ka az ān ē har {sāl bar 2 gīred} pad 6 māh ud ka har sāl bar ēk gīrēd pad 12 māh {ka pad 1 sāl} ēk gīrēd ka tangīh ī zamīg rāy kam gīrēd az ān ciyōn zamīg ka-iz abēr tanuk ēg-iz hamē bar čiš-1 bawēd pad ē(w) sāl ud ka nē bawēd tā āb rāy kam gīrēd pad 2 sāl baxšišn.*
> "An *antichresis (xwāstag ī grawgān)*: if from the time (of mortgage) it yields produce *(bar)* twice a year, (then) it (= the produce) should be (apportioned) every six months and if it yields produce *(bar)* once every year (it should be apportioned) every twelve months. If in one year it yields (produce) once – if it yields little because of the sparseness of the soil, since the soil, even if it is very meager, still yields some produce – (then) it should be apportioned once a year. And if it does not (yield any produce in one year), as long as it yields little because of (a lack of) water, it (= the produce) should be apportioned every two years."[30]

If we apply this information to our case, *abām ēk az dō bawēd* ("the loan counts as one from two") would mean that the mortgaged property yields produce (harvest, crops) twice a year, corresponding in value to the total amount of the loan plus interest at the time of concluding the contract.[31] The legal question

30 Transliteration, translation and commentary see Macuch 1993, pp. 278, 283, 290 (no. 6).

31 Far less probable would be an explanation of the phrase as referring to the two self-evident elements of a loan: (1) the principal amount owed *(bun),* that is, the exact sum of money the debtor has received from the creditor, plus (2) interest *(waxš).* Another (unlikely) explanation (which I had originally taken into consideration, but later refuted) is to interpret the term *mērag* ("man, partner, associate") as a reference not to the two main parties to the transaction, the creditor and debtor, but to a third party, a "partner" of the creditor (on this meaning of the word *mērag* see Macuch 1993, pp. 602–603, no. 6). This would imply that the debtor extends the mortgage of usufruct to the extent of the value of the loan to a "partner" *(mērag)* of the creditor *(abām-dādār)* with the latter's explicit consent *(pad hunsandīh).* The phrase *abām ēk az dō bawēd* ("the loan counts as one from two") could mean that the debtor grants access to the usufruct as security for the same loan to two partners, the original creditor and his associate. Although this fits in well with the "question" part, no third party is mentioned in the "answer" part of the text (or is even necessary in this case), making this interpretation rather improbable.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

ensuing from this constellation is: if the usufruct of the *antichresis* later loses value and only covers the principal debt *(bun)*, but not the interest *(waxš)*, would the contract with the creditor be fulfilled, when the debtor delivers the produce as agreed (twice a year), or is the creditor *(abām-dādār)*, entitled to claim additional property? Is the debtor obliged to pay an additional redemption *(tōzišn)*? In Tab. 18.24–25 the debtor obliges himself to double the sum he owes (12 staters, 2 drachms for a loan of 6 staters, 1 drachm) as redemption if the creditor suffers a loss and the debtor fails to pay back the money immediately upon request by the former. In our *Pursišn*, however, there is no kind of self-obligation on part of the debtor comparable to the one in the Tabarestān document.

The answer to this question first lists several important features of the case, which taken together are detrimental to the interests of the creditor, creating a legal impasse:

1. The creditor has explicitly approved of the property mortgaged in this manner *(pad grawgānīh padīrift)* according to the calculation of the principal loan *(bun)* plus interest *(waxš)* when he entered the contract with the debtor. He has already taken possession of the mortgaged property *(u-š be grift)*.[32]
2. The property later loses this value: it only covers the principal amount owed. The debtor is during the whole period *(hamē)* in which the principal is being kept intact *(drust)* by this security incapable of repaying the whole debt *(pad abām abāz dādan a-tuwānīg)*.
3. The creditor or mortgagee *(grawgāndār)* has access to the property whose usufruct he had accepted as security *(rāh ō xwāstag ī-š pad grawgānīh be padīrift)*.

The legal problem is: the creditor has bindingly agreed to the conditions of the loan and has explicitly accepted the amount of security the debtor has granted for the whole debt, the produce of a certain property twice a year. Moreover, he has taken possession of and has access to the mortgaged property. This security, however, at a later period no longer suffices to cover both principal debt *and* interest. If the debtor remains insolvent, the surprising solution suggested by the high priest Ādurfarrbay under these conditions is: the case should be judged as if the debtor had taken out the loan *(čē ēdōn bēd ka-š abām stad hē)*, but *not* delivered the usufruct of the mortgaged property *(u-š grawgān nē dād hē)*.[33]

32 Not to be confused with "ownership"! Sasanian law distinguished exactly between "possession" and "ownership", see Macuch 2015, pp. 248–251.

33 Is there a (significant?) difference between the use of the verbs *dādan* and *kardan* with *grawgān*? The formula *grawgān kardan* "to grant the usufruct as mortgage" is well attested in legal literature and refers to the act of granting the revenue of a certain property as security; *grawgān dādan* (lit. "to deliver the usufruct of mortgaged property") is, as far as I know, only attested here and could refer to the act of handing out the produce *in lieu* of payment (that is, repaying the creditor in kind at harvest time). If there is a difference between the two phrasings, it is unfortunately not explained.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The reason for this curious judgement is not explained, but we may conclude that the creditor, being only entitled to the *antichresis* agreed upon, would lose the interest on the loan, since his right to take the usufruct twice a year would only cover the principal debt. Since contracts and agreements in Zoroastrian law were absolutely binding and the creditor had explicitly given his consent to the amount of security granted by the debtor, fulfilment of contract would in fact be to the disadvantage of the creditor. The strange solution suggested here is to give judgement *as if* the debtor had taken the loan, but *not* granted a security or delivered the usufruct.

This judgement leaves us with a problem: does it mean that the binding agreement between creditor and debtor should be ignored? Or does it assume a default on part of the debtor although it is known that he has fulfilled the contract (by giving the creditor access to the usufruct of the security granted in the contract)? Again, there are no explanations, but a judgement implying that a valid contract should be regarded as null and void would be as a rule impossible in Zoroastrian law, even at this late date. It would be just as impossible to accuse the debtor of defaulting knowing exactly that the opposite is true. How can this decision be explained?

Sasanian jurisprudence knew several methods of diverging from strict adherence to legal requirements according to doctrine. Legal practice *(kardag)* did not always correspond to legal theory *(čāštag)* due to the myriad of possible unpredictable difficulties, which could emerge in all kinds of legal transactions and the Sasanian Law-book mentions a number of cases, in which there was a considerable discrepancy between the two.[34] Moreover, one of the main tasks of jurisconsults was to find out the intention of the parties involved in concluding a contract, especially if the phrasing was ambiguous or the exact terms of the contract led to a disagreement between the parties, as we may assume in our case. There were means of diverging from strict judicial interpretations of contracts and agreements to the advantage of one or both of the parties for the sake of "better justice", which were explicitly recognized. These are denoted by the technical terms *passand* (lit. "pleasure, liking") and *wehdādestānīh* (lit. "better justice, law; better decision, judgement"). Explanations of these legal terms, which fit in well with our case, are given in Jesubōxt's *Corpus Juris,* a Law-book based on Zoroastrian jurisprudence, written originally in Middle Persian by the archbishop of the Christians for the Christian community of Pars in the 8th century. Only the Syriac translation of the Pahlavi original has survived, which, however, in several cases retains the original Sasanian legal terminology with short translations: Pahlavi *passand* is rendered by the Syriac *ḫasīrūt dīnā* "decrease, reduction of justice" (translated as "Rechtsminus" by Sachau) and *behdādestanīh* (the later form of MP *wehdādestānīh),* as *yaṯīrūt*

34 On *kardag* versus *čāštag* see Macuch 1981, pp. 146–149 (no. 1).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dīnā, "extension of justice" ("Rechtsplus" according to Sachau's German translation).[35] Jesuboxt exemplifies the principle of *passand* by a case of loan and debt: if a man owns both money and interest to another man and the debtor cannot pay back both the sum he has borrowed and the interest because of poverty, illness or the like, and asks the creditor to rest content with only the capital, this is called *passand*, lit. "leniency (in justice)", with the technical meaning of "reduction of justice to the minimum required by law".[36] It denotes a legal procedure in which one of the involved parties *renounces a certain legal right* given to him by contract or agreement, because the other party is not able to fulfil the conditions both had originally agreed upon. MP *wehdādestānīh* (lit. "better justice"), on the other hand, designates a legal procedure in which one is willing to go beyond the boundaries of formal prescriptions by *extending a certain legal right* given to another person, with the technical meaning of "going beyond the minimum prescribed by law, doing more than legally required".[37]

Although these technical terms are not used in our passage, the opposite principles of *passand* and *wehdādestānīh,* the possibility of *renouncing* and *extending* a legal right in order to achieve "better justice", was well known in Iranian law and could have been the theoretical background of the judgement given by Ādurfarrbay. But even if these theoretical considerations had become irrelevant by this late period, his verdict complies with an important means of finding solutions for civil controversies by taking the intent of both parties involved in a contract into consideration. In our case the creditor has granted a loan with the intention of collecting interest and – in contrast to the lender in Jesuboxt mentioned above – he does not renounce this right; he does not forego payment of interest in favour of the debtor. The debtor, on the other hand, has agreed by contract to pay interest on the loan, granting a security not only for the principal, but for the whole sum. Ādurfarrbay's ruling could have taken recourse to the original intention of the parties in the interest of "better justice" by *extending* the rights of the creditor. In any case, it enables the latter to collect interest on the loan, which would have been lost to him under the strict conditions of the contract. The debtor, on the other hand, is given more time to repay the principal loan *(bun)* plus interest *(waxš)* at a later period according to his means and ability *(pad čār ud tuwān)*. This means *de facto* that the obligation of the debtor to pay interest on the loan remains in force for an unlimited period despite the terms of the contract. These are the implications of Ādurfarrbay's peculiar judgement of the case. Is this a Solomonic verdict, striving to take the concerns of both parties into consideration, or rather a decision in favour of the money-lender to the disadvantage of the borrower? Given the need to uphold economic and social cohesion among co-religionists in post-Sasanian

35 Sachau 1914, p. 13f.
36 Sachau 1914, pp. 13f. and 289f.
37 On this expression see Macuch (forthcoming).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Zoroastrian communities in an increasingly hostile Muslim environment, it is not too far-fetched to assume that the high priest would strive to find a just solution. Solidarity among Zoroastrians could have hardly been encouraged if certain poorer members of the community, who, moreover, practised an important religious duty by cultivating the land, remained permanently in debt.[38] Be it as it may, the case nevertheless illustrates the difficulties involved in freeing oneself from debt, once a person was forced to take out a loan, even if the conditions of the contract were as favourable as in our case for the borrower.

References and abbreviations

Anklesaria, B.T. 1969: *The Pahlavi Rivāyat of Ādurfarnbag and Farnbag-Srōš.* 2 vols. Bombay.

Boyce, M. 1979: *Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices.* London.

Cantera, A. 2015: "Ethics". In: M. Stausberg/Y. S.-D. Vevaina (eds.): *The Wiley Blackwell Companion Volume to Zoroastrianism.* Oxford, pp. 315–332.

DkM = *Dēnkard,* cited according to D.M. Madan: *The complete Text of the Pahlavi Dinkard*. 2 vols. Bombay 1911.

Gignoux, Ph. 2012: "Une archive post-sassanide du Tabaristān (I)." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Objets et documents inscrits en Pārsīg*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales XXI), pp. 29–96.

— 2014: "Une archive post-sassanide du Tabaristān (II)." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Documents, argenterie et monnaies de tradition Sassanide*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales XXII), pp. 29–71.

— 2016: "Une archive post-sassanide du Tabaristān (III)." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Words and Symbols: Sasanian Objects and the Tabarestān Archive*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales XXIV), pp. 171-184.

Macuch, M. 1981: *Das sasanidische Rechtsbuch Mātakdān i hazār Dātistān (Teil II)*. Wiesbaden (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLV, 1).

— 1993: *Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis zu Beginn des siebenten Jahrhunderts in Iran: Die Rechtssammlung des Farroḫmard i Wahrāmān.* Wiesbaden (Iranica 1).

— 2008: "Zur juristischen Terminologie der Berliner Pahlavi-Dokumente." In: D. Weber: *Berliner Pahlavi-Dokumente. Zeugnisse spätsassanidischer Brief- und Rechtskultur aus frühislamischer Zeit.* Wiesbaden (Iranica 15), pp. 249–266.

— 2009a: "Judicial and Legal Systems. iii. Sasanian Legal System." In: E. Yarshater (ed.): *Encyclopædia Iranica.* Vol. XV. New York, pp. 181–196.

— 2009b: "Pahlavi Literature." In: R.E. Emmerick/M. Macuch (eds.): *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran.* Companion Volume I to *A History of Persian Literature*. London (History of Persian Literature XVII), pp. 116–190.

— 2012: "The *adwadād* Offence in Zoroastrian Law." In: Sh. Secunda/S. Fine (eds.): *Shoshannat Yaakov. Jewish and Iranian Studies in Honor of Yaakov Elman.* Leiden/Boston (The Brill Reference Library of Judaism 35), pp. 247–269.

38 On the duties of the Zoroastrian towards his needy fellow co-religionists see Macuch 2012.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2015: "Substance and Fruit in the Sasanian Law of Property and the Babylonian Talmud." In: M.J. Geller (ed.): *The Archaeology and Material Culture of the Babylonian Talmud.* Leiden/Boston, pp. 245–259.

— 2016a: "The Legal Context of the Tabarestān Court Records (Tab. 1–8, 10)." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Words and Symbols: Sasanian Objects and the Tabarestān Archive*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales XXIV), pp. 145–170.

— 2016b: "'This is the Law of the Persians' – An Allusion to the Sasanian Law of Surety in the Babylonian Talmud." In: *Iran Namag.* New Series. Vol. 1, No. 2 (Summer 2016) [= *Memorial Volume in Honour of Professor Amnon Netzer (1934-2008)*], pp. XVIII–XXVIII.

— forthcoming: "A Pahlavi Legal Term in Jesubōxt's Corpus Iuris." In: Sh. Shaked (ed.): *Irano-Judaica VII (Proceedings of the Sixth Irano-Judaica Conference held in Hamburg, Sept. 10–12, 2006).*

MHD = *(Mādayān ī) Hazār Dādestān,* cited according to J.J. Modi: *Mâdigân-i-Hazâr Dâdistân. A Photozincographed Facsimile of a Ms. belonging to the Mânockji Limji Hoshang Hâtariâ Library in the Zarthoshti Anjuman Atashbeharâm*. Poona 1901.

PCIR 54 = *Ms. TD2: Iranian Bundahišn & Rivāyat-i Ēmēt-i Ašawahištan etc.* Ed. by K.M. JamaspAsa, Y.M. Nawabi and M. Tavousi. Shiraz 1978 (see *Rivāyat ī Ādurfarrbay ī Farroxzādān,* pp. 322.10–402.15).

RivAF = *Pahlavi Rivāyat of Ādurfarrbay and Farrbay-Srōš,* see Anklesaria 1969.

Sachau, E. 1914: *Syrische Rechtsbücher.* Vol. 3: *Corpus Iuris des persischen Erzbischofs Jesubocht.* Berlin.

Tab. 18 = Document from the Tabarestān collection, introduced to the public by Gignoux 2012, 2014 and 2016.

Weber, D. 2016: "Court Records of Lawsuits in Tabarestān in the Year 86/7 PYE (737 CE): A Philological Examination." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Words and Symbols: Sasanian Objects and the Tabarestān Archive*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales XXIV), pp. 121–144.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Two Fragments of the Khotanese *Saṅghāṭasūtra* in the Turfan Collection in Berlin

Mauro Maggi, Rome

Among the manuscript treasures that were recovered by the German expeditions to Eastern Central Asia in the early twentieth century and which now form the so-called Turfan collection of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, there are the two so far unpublished and unidentified Khotanese fragments KS 6 and KS 8, which clearly belong together. I publish them here as a small tribute to the memory of Werner Sundermann, who devoted a whole life of research to the study of the Turfan materials written in Iranian languages and who was always prepared to listen and offer advice to others on these matters with kindness and generosity, as I experienced myself when, still a student in Milan, I first corresponded with him about the Berlin Tumshuqese manuscripts in the early 1980s.[1]

Once the fragments KS 6 and KS 8 are joined (Fig. 1), they form what is likely to be the right half of a folio, although the right margin is lost. The joined fragments have the following characteristics:

- dimensions: 8.8 × 18.9 cm;
- lines per page: 5;
- script: early variety of South Turkestan Brāhmī script in Lore Sander's classification (eighth century);[2]
- orthography: Old Khotanese orthography, type I (single *ś* for both voiceless and voiced palatal sibilants /ʃ ʒ/, e.g. r3 *biśi*); Late Khotanese influence betrayed by the odd shape of v5 *palsārā* (see below).[3]

Fragments KS 6 + 8 cover the thus far unattested paragraphs 121.5–124.3 (beginning) of an Old Khotanese translation of the *Saṅghāṭasūtra*, a Mahāyāna text which is also preserved in the Sanskrit original and in a Tibetan and two Chinese translations[4].

1 I am grateful to Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Douglas A. Hitch, and Prods O. Skjærvø for reading the first draft of this article and making useful suggestions.
2 See Sander 2005, pp. 135 (table 1) and 138–140 with reference to earlier literature. For the periodisation see Sander 1989, pp. 112–118.
3 Cf. *SDTV* 3.17 (where "type I" and "type II" have been interchanged by mistake).
4 The Sanskrit text was first edited and translated by Gunatilaka (1967). Von Hinüber (1973) re-edited the parts corresponding to the then identified portions of the Khotanese

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The formal characteristics of fragments KS 6+8 indicate that they are from a folio belonging to the manuscript numbered as ms. 9 by Giotto Canevascini: same folio height, same number of lines per page, same script and hand, and same orthography.[5]

In particular, the contents of fragments KS 6+8 indicate that they immediately precede the folio made up by fragments FK 914 Kh. 29 + Khot. (IO) 16 + 18.8 + 19.4[6]. In actual fact, the text continues seamlessly from KS 6+8 to FK 914 etc. Since folio FK 914 etc. bears the number 57, the now lost folio number of KS 6+8 must have been [56]. Recognition that fragments KS 6+8 belong to the *Saṅghāṭasūtra* ms. 9, which has 30/35 akṣaras per line and 6/8 akṣaras before the string hole, makes it possible to estimate with confidence the approximate extent of the gaps in the lost half of folio [56]. Canevascini's theoretical restoration 124.3 *[kho nä ye] pārśu tīndä* '[as one] does service [to them]' at the boundary between the two folios[7] may now be replaced by (v5) *kho ye pīsā[nu]* (r1) *pārśu tīndä* 'as one does service to teache[rs]'. This confirms that fragments KS 6+8 are the right half of the folio.

Two previously unattested forms contained in KS 6+8 are (1) the defective but certain genitive-dative plural r4 *ha]ṣṭūśänu* from *haṣṭūsu* 'eighteen' and (2) the third singular indicative present active v5 *nä]r[ś]ātätä* from *närśāy-* 'to present, offer'[8], which is largely restored but is made very probable by the peculiar form of *r-ā* in the akṣara *rśā* which is also to be found, for instance, in the first singular perfect transitive masculine *Suvarṇabhāsasūtra* 13.1 *närśāyätaimä* 'I presented' in Or. 67v1 ( ).[9]

As far as spelling is concerned, v5 *palsārā* is written with the *s* on the line and the *lā* exactly above instead of with the usual ligature (*l-* on the line and

translation. On the basis of these editions, Canevascini (1993) re-edited an entire Sanskrit text and reconstructed it "[i]n passages in which the Khot. text is extant" so as to provide "the closest possible approximation to the text from which the Khot. was translated" (p. 1). See *Tōhoku* 102 = *Ōtani* 770 for the Tibetan and *Taishō* 423–424 for the Chinese.

5 Cf. the general description of the *Saṅghāṭasūtra* ms. 9 in Canevascini (1993, p. 186): 9 cm in height; 5 lines per page; South Turkestan Brāhmī script (see p. xiii) with "early *kha* ending below in a straight line and dots of *ä* kept separated"; "preserves almost entirely the old orthography [see pp. xv–xvi]; influence of Late Khot. … in *käḍyāne*". Prods O. Skjærvø informs me that he had reached the same conclusions with regard to the location of KS 6+8 within the *Saṅghāṭasūtra* and their belonging to ms. 9.

6 See the edition of FK 914 Kh. 29+Khot. (IO) 16+18.8+19.4 in Canevascini (1993, p. 191) and the more complete edition by Skjærvø (2002, p. 395 under IOL Khot 177/7).

7 Canevascini 1993, p. 55.

8 See *SGS* 56 and Emmerick 1970, p. 123.

9 The present whereabouts of folio Or. 67 is unknown, see Skjærvø 2004, I, p. 256 (edition); and II, p. 16 (information on the manuscript). The akṣara *rśā* is taken from Lore Sander's unpublished study of the Khotanese formal script.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

s below to the right, cf. v4 *palsāryau*). Such a shape for *ls* is uncommon and it looks as if the copyist first wrote *pasa*, most likely because of the Late Khotanese equivalent he had in mind (cf. *Bhadracaryādeśanā* 9a [45r2] *pa' sārā*[10]), and immediately adjusted the spelling by writing *lā* above *sa* instead of writing the *ā*-diacritic alone.

Also to be noticed is the fact that four subparagraphs (123.2–4 and 124.1) were apparently omitted by the copyist. Paragraph 123.1, where the twenty million buddhas called Śikhin are introduced, ends at v3 with *ha]*sta*mo rraṣṭo ba#lsyūśtu busta* 'they had realised [b]est, right awakening' (see the text and the translation below). As can be seen from its use here and at the end of paragraphs 125.1, 126.1, 128.1, 130.1 and 131.1,[11] this expression is a rendering of Skt. *samyaksaṃbuddhāḥ* 'completely awakened ones' (cf. the Sanskrit text below). The same expression at the end of 123.1 is immediately followed by v3 *pātcu ays*u *[…]*, whose *pātcu* 'again' does not seem to correspond with anything in the Sanskrit original of 123.2 *pūjitā me te buddhā bhagavanto …* 'I did honour to those lord buddhas …', while it might well mirror Skt. *api* 'too' in 124.2 *tatrāham api pradānaśūro 'bhūvaṃ* 'Then too I was an exceedingly generous man'. The Buddha Śākyamuni is explaining to the Bodhisattva Sarvaśūra that he himself was a generous man first under the buddhas called Ratnottama (121.4) and again (Skt. *api*, Kh. *pātcu*) under the buddhas called Ratnāvabhāsa (122.2) and Kāśyapa (124.2). On the other hand, in 123.2 Śākyamuni only says that he honoured the buddhas called Śikhin and does not mention himself having been a generous man. More significant, however, is the fact that, in the Sanskrit original, 'perfumes, garlands' etc. occur in 124.3 *(gandhena, mālyena, …)* but not in 123, while the Khotanese already has them in v4 after a comparatively short gap of half a line. Since it is impossible to accommodate the four subparagraphs 123.2–4 and 124.1 in the gap, one is bound to conclude that the copyist omitted them and jumped from *ha]*sta*mo rraṣṭo ba#lsyūśtu busta* at the end of 123.1 to what followed the same expression at the end of 124.1 and went on writing 124.2. This is confirmed by the fact that 'buddhas' and 'teachers' are already mentioned in v5 etc. in *kho # ye pīsā[nu] / pārśu tīndä kho ne gyasta balysa* āṣa*ṇa tta aysu yäḍ[aimä]* 'as one does service to teache[rs], as lord buddhas are worthy of those (perfumes etc.), so I did (service to them)' as a rendering of Skt. *tathāgata-gurūpasthānenopasthitāḥ*, which is to be found in 124.3 but not in paragraph 123.

10 See Asmussen 1961, p. 10.
11 See Canevascini 1993, pp. 56–58.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Saṅghāṭasūtra 121.5–124.3: combined text of fragments KS 6 + 8[12]

Transliteration

f. [56] recto

1 (121.5) … [+++++++++++++ pal]*sā*ryau nä suhäta därätemä ku *n*[ä] p[ār]śu # *y*uḍu *y*[aḍai]-
2 [mä (6)+++++++++++++++ varā]l[st]o *na*-ro mä hāḍe bāḍä skyätä ā#tä śtä || (122.1) byāta *ya*-
3 [ne++++++○++++++++++] biśi ratnāvabhā#sa nāma väta *gyasta bal*[ysa]
4 [(2)+++++++++++++++++ (3) ++ ha]*ṣṭ*ūśänu kūlānu gyastānu balysānu [+]
5 [++++++++++++++++++ palsā]ry[au] vilīvanyau āysärūṇyau ā*laṃ*[gā]-

verso

1 [ryau+++++++(4)++++++++++ varāl]*s*[to] na-ro mä hāḍe bāḍe skyätä ā[tä śtä ||]
2 [(123.1)++++++++++++++++++++ bä]*st*ä kūla biśi śikha nāma väta +
3 [++++++○++++++++++ ha]*sta*mo rraṣṭo ba#lysūśtu busta < (2–4) … (124.1.) … > (2) pātcu ays*u*
4 [++++++++++++ (3)+++++ gyastā]nu balysānu pajsama bu#śañyau palsāryau [+]
5 [+++++++++++++++ nä]*r*[ś]ātätä kho groṇe o vā palsā*r*ā kho # ye pīsā[nu]

f. 57 recto

1 pārśu tīndä kho ne gyasta balysa *āṣa*ṇa tta aysu yä*ḍ*[aimä] (4) …

12 The beginning of f. 57 r1 (FK 914 Kh. 29 + Khot. (IO) 16 + 18.8 + 19.4, see CANEVASCINI 1993, p. 191 and SKJÆRVØ 2002, p. 395) is appended for the sake of completeness. Conventions: ( ) = (sub)paragraph number; [abc] = restoration of a lacuna; [+ + +] = conjectured number of akṣaras in a lacuna; *italics* = consonant bases and vowel marks not clearly legible or partly preserved, whose traces may be interpreted differently; < > = omission in the manuscript; # = joint of fragments belonging to one and the same folio (after the akṣara when this is divided between two fragments); ○ = blank for the string hole.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Recto

Verso

© Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

Fig. 1:
Folio fragment reconstructed from fragments KS 6 and KS 8:
Saṅghāṭasūtra 121.5–124.3 (ms. 9, f. [56])

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Translation[13]

121.1. *Then the Lord also said to the Bodhisattva Sarvaśūra*: 2. *"Formerly, Sarvaśūra, in the past, I remember ninety-nine countless aeons.* 3. *Then there were twelve crores of buddhas. They were called Ratnottama. They were tathāgatas, arhats, completely awakened ones.* 4. *At that time, at that moment, I was an exceedingly generous man called Candra.* 5. *And I worshipped those twelve crores of buddhas and, with solid and soft food, perfumes and ointments, with fine food at will,* with [garlan]ds, I kept them pleased. Once I had done serv[ice to th]em, 6. *then, Sarvaśūra, I obtained a prophecy* [towa]rds *best, complete awakening,* but the time, the moment had not yet come for me.

122.1. "[I re]member, *Sarvaśūra, that there came in the world eighteen crores of buddhas.* They all were lord buddhas called Ratnāvabhāsa. 2. *Then too I was an exceedingly generous man called Garbhasena.* 3. *And I did service, as is appropriate to tathāgatas,* to *those* [ei]ghteen crores of lord buddhas *and honoured them with perfumes,* [garla]nds, ointments, ornaments, decor[ations]. 4. *And then I obtained a prophecy* [towar]ds *best, complete awakening*, but the time, the moment [had] not yet c[ome] for me.

123.1. "*I remember, Sarvaśūra, that there came into the world* [twe]nty crores *of buddhas.* They were all called Śikhin. *They were tathāgatas, arhants,* they had realised [b]est, right awakening. 2. *I did honour to those lord buddhas with appropriate paying of homage.* 3. *And then I obtained a prophecy towards best, complete awakening.* 4. *But the time, the moment has not come for that prophecy to this day.*

124.1. "*I remember, Sarvaśūra, that there came into the world twenty crores of buddhas. They were called Kāśyapa. They were tathāgatas, arhats, completely awakened ones.* 2. Again I *was an exceedingly generous man then.* 3. *I did* honours *to those* lord buddhas. With perfumes, garlands, *ointments did I honour them.* [As one pres]ents [perfumes], as (one presents) garlands or chaplets, as one does service to teache[rs], as lord buddhas are worthy of those (perfumes etc.), so I did (service to them). 4. …"

Sanskrit text[14]

121.1. *tatra khalu ⁺bhagavān punar api ⁺sarvaśūraṃ bodhisatvam āmantrayate sma:* 2. *bhūtapūrvaṃ sarvaśūrātīte 'dhvani navānavaty asaṃkhyeyān kalpān anusmarāmi;* 3. *tatra dvādaśa buddha-koṭyo babhūvan, ratnottama-nāmānas,*

13 For the sake of easy reading I give, in italics, a translation of the Sanskrit whenever the Khotanese is missing (cf. the Sanskrit text below). That part of the translation which is printed in roman type is translated from the Khotanese.

14 The Sanskrit text is taken from Canevascini 1993, p. 55.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

tathāgatā, arhantaḥ, samyaksaṃbuddhāḥ. 4. *ahaṃ tena kālena tena samayena pradānaśūro 'bhūvaṃ candro nāma.* 5. *te ca me dvādaśa buddha-koṭya paryupāsitāḥ; khādanīya-bhojanīya-mālya-gandha-vilepanena, yathāsukhaṃ praṇītenāhāreṇa, sarvasukhopadhānenopasthitāḥ; upasthāpya ca,* 6. *tatraiva mayā sarvaśūra vyākaraṇam anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau pratilabdham.*

122.1. *anusmarāmy ahaṃ sarvaśūra: aṣṭādaśa buddha-koṭya, sarve ratnāvabhāsa-nāmānas tathāgatā loka utpannā abhūvan.* 2. *tatrāham api pradānaśūro +'bhūvaṃ garbhaseno nāma.* 3. *te cāṣṭādaśa buddha-koṭyo mayā paryupāsitāḥ, pūjitāś ca, yathā tathāgatānāṃ pratyarhaṃ, gandha-mālya-vilepanālaṃkāra-vibhūṣaṇaiḥ.* 4. *tatra ca me vyākaraṇam anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau pratilabdhaṃ.*

123.1. *anusmarāmy ahaṃ sarvaśūra: viṃśati buddha-koṭyaḥ śikhisaṃbhava-nāmānas, tathāgatā, arhantaḥ, samyaksaṃbuddhā loka udapadyanta.* 2. *pūjitā me te buddhā bhagavanto yathā pratyarheṇa pūjasatkāreṇa.* 3. *tatraiva ca me vyākaraṇam anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau pratilabdham;* 4. *na cādyāpi kāla-samayam abhūd vyākaraṇāya.*

124.1. *anusmarāmy ahaṃ sarvaśūra: viṃśaty eva buddha-koṭyaḥ kāśyapa-nāmānas, tathāgatā, arhantaḥ, samyaksaṃbuddhā lokaudapadyanta.* 2. *tatrāham api pradānaśūro 'bhūvaṃ.* 3. *kṛtaṃ me teṣāṃ tathāgatānām upasthānaṃ; gandhena, mālyena, vilepanena, tathāgata-gurūpasthānenopasthitāḥ; yathā tathāgatānāṃ gurugauravaṃ kartavyaṃ tathā kṛtaṃ.* 4. *…*

Glossary[15]

aysu 1S personal pron. 'I': N *aysu* *124.2; encl. GD *mä* 121.6, 122.4

ah- : *väta-* vb. 'to be': 3S indic. pres. encl. *śtä* 121.6, *122.4; 3Pm perf. intr. *väta* 122.1, 123.1

āta- see *hīs-*

āysärūṇa- m. 'ornament': IAP *āysärūṇyau* 122.3

ālaṃgāra- m. 'ornament, decoration', LW ← Skt. *alaṃkāra-* (Skjærvø 2004, II, p. 244): IAP *ālaṃgāryau* *122.3

o conj. 'or': *o vā* 'or (else)' 124.3

ku conj. 'when': 121.5

kūla- card. num. 'crore, ten million', LW ← Skt *koṭi-* (Konow 1916, p. 343): NA *kūla* 123.1; GDP *kūlānu* 122.3

15 An asterisk * precedes references to partly restored or imperfectly preserved words. The meanings refer essentially to the words as they occur in *Saṅghāṭasūtra* 121.5–124.3, though they may have further meanings in other texts. Only the ultimate Sanskrit origin is given for Indian loanwords (LW). Grammatical abbreviations: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, A = accusative, f(.) = feminine (noun), GD = genitive-dative, IA = Instrumental-ablative, L = locative, m(.) = masculine (noun), N = nominative, nt. = neuter noun, P = plural, S = singular. Other abbreviations are self-evident.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

kho conj. 'as': 124.3 (2×)
groṇa- m. 'garland' (Maggi, in: *Studies* 3, pp. 51–52): NAP *groṇe* 124.3
gyasta- m. 'lord': NAP *gyasta* *122.1; GDP *gyastānu* 122.3, *124.3
däräta- see *d̥rjs-*
d̥rjs- : *däräta-* vb. 'to keep': 1Sm perf. tr. *därätemä* 121.5
na-ro adv. 'not yet': *121.6, 122.4
nāman- nt. 'name': AS *nāma* 122.1, 123.1
nä 3P encl. personal pron. 'them': A 121.5; GD *121.5
närśāy- vb. 'to present', LW ← Skt. *niryātayati* (*SGS* 56): 3S indic. pres. act. *närśātätä* *124.3
pajsama- m. 'honour': NAP *pajsama* 124.3
palsāraa- m. 'garland, chaplet': NAP *palsārā* *124.3; IAP *palsāryau* *121.5, *122.3, 124.3
pātcu adv. 'again': 124.2
pārśa- m. 'service': AS *pārśu* *121.5
pīsaa- m. 'teacher': GDP *pīsānu* *124.3
balysa- m. 'buddha': NAP *balysa* *122.1; GDP *balysānu* 122.3, 124.3
balysūsti- f. 'awakening *(bodhi)*': AS *balsyūśtu* 123.1
bāḍa- m. 'time': NS *bāḍä* 121.6, *bāḍe* 122.4
biśa- pronominal adj. 'all': NAPm *biśi* 122.1, 123.1
bästä card. num. 'twenty': NA *bästä* *123.1
bud- : *busta-* vb. 'to know, realise': 3Pm perf. intr. *busta* 123.1
buśañyau see *busi-*
busi- f. 'perfume': IAP *buśañyau* 124.3
busta- see *bud-*
byāta yan- phrase with mid. vb. 'to remember': 1S indic. pres. *byāta yane* *122.1
yan- vb. 'to make, do': 1Sm potential perf. tr. *yuḍu yäḍaimä* *121.5. Phrase: *byāta yan-* (mid.) see *byāta*
ye indefinite pron. 'one': 124.3
ratnāvabhāsa- pr. n. (Skt.): NAP *ratnāvabhāsa* 122.1
rraṣṭa- adj. 'right': ASf *rraṣṭo* 123.1
varālsto posp. + A 'towards': *121.6, *122.4
vā encl. conj. 'but': *o vā* 'or (else)' see *o*
väta- see *ah-*
vilīvana- m. 'ointment', LW ← Skt. *vilepana-*: IAP *vilīvanyau* 122.3
śikha- pr. n. (Skt. *śikhin-*): NAP *śikha* 123.1
suhäta- adj. 'pleased', LW ← Skt. *sukhita-* (Leumann 1933–1936, p. 514): NAP *suhäta* 121.5
skyäta- m. 'time': *skyätä* 121.6, 122.4
haṣṭūsu card. num. 'eighteen': GD *haṣṭūśänu* *122.3
hastama- superlative adj. 'best': ASf *hastamo* *123.1
hāḍe encl. conj. 'but': 121.6, 122.4
hīs- : *āta-* vb. 'to come': 3Sm periphrastic perf. intr. *ātä śtä* 121.6, *122.4

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

References

Asmussen, J. P. 1961: *The Khotanese Bhadracaryādeśanā: text, translation, and glossary, together with the Buddhist Sanskrit origina*l. København.

Canevascini, G. 1993: *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra: a critical edition*. Wiesbaden.

Emmerick, R. E. 1970: *The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra*. London.

Gunatilaka, R. A. 1967: *An edition with translation of the Buddhist Sanskrit text Saṃghāṭasūtra*. Unpubl. diss. Cambridge University.

von Hinüber, O. 1973: *Das Saṃghāṭasūtra: Ausgabe und kommentierte Übersetzung eines nordbuddhistischen Lehrtextes in Sanskrit und Sakisch*. Unpubl. habilitation thesis. University of Mainz.

Konow S. 1916: "Vocabulary to Vajracchedikā and Aparimitâyuḥ Sūtra." In: A. F. R. Hoernle (ed.): *Manuscript remains of Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan: facsimiles with transcripts, translations and notes*. Ed. in conjunction with other scholars. Oxford, pp. 330–356.

Leumann, E. 1933–1936: *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus: Text und Übersetzung*. Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von M. Leumann. Leipzig [repr. Nendeln 1966].

Ōtani = Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan zō eiin Pekimban Chibetto daizōkyō sō-mokuroku, sakuin = The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking edition kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto: catalogue and index. Tokyo 1962 (quoted by catalogue number).

Sander, L. 1989: "Remarks on the formal Brāhmī of Gilgit, Bāmiyān and Khotan." In: K. Jettmar (ed.): *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: reports and studies*. Vol. 1: *Rock inscriptions in the Indus valley*. Pt. 1: *Text*; pt. 2: *Plates*. In collaboration with D. König and V. Thewalt. Mainz, pp. 107–130, pls. 196–215.

— 2005: "Remarks on the formal Brāhmī script from the Southern Silk Route." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 19 [= *Iranian and Zoroastrian studies in Honor of Prods Oktor Skjærvø*. Bloomfield Hills 2009], pp. 133–144.

SDTV 3 = Emmerick, R. E./M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: *Saka documents. Text volume III: the St. Petersburg collections*. With contributions by H. Kumamoto *et al*. London 1995.

SGS = Emmerick, R. E.: *Saka Grammatical Studies*. London 1968.

Skjærvø, P. O. 2002: *Khotanese manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in The British Library: a complete catalogue with texts and translations*. With contributions by U. Sims-Williams. London.

— 2004: *This most excellent shine of gold, king of kings of sutras: the Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Studies 3 = Emmerick, R. E./P. O. Skjærvø: *Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese III*. Ed. by R. E. Emmerick, contributed by G. Canevascini *et al*. Wien 1997.

Taishō = Taishō shinshō daizōkyō. 100 vols. Tokyo 1924–1934 (quoted by text number).

Tōhoku = A catalogue-index of the Tibetan Buddhist canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur). Sendai 1934 (quoted by catalogue number).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Die syrische Epistolographie

Miklós Maróth, Budapest

1. Die Griechen sind, wie bekannt, die Stifter vieler Wissenschaften, darunter auch die Begründer der Wissenschaft der Epistolographie, deren Zweck war, die Leute darüber zu unterrichten, was Briefe sind, wie man Briefe schreibt, wie viele Unterarten des Briefes existieren, usw. Die wichtigsten Quellen der klassischen Epistolographie wurden schon im 19. Jahrhundert veröffentlicht.[1] Die Wissenschaft der Epistolographie war der Wissenschaft der Rhetorik untergeordnet, und diese Tatsache erklärt, warum einige Lehrbücher der klassischen Rhetorik, wie z. B. das rhetorische Handbuch von Julius Victor, ein Kapitel der Epistolographie gewidmet haben.[2]

Die Existenz der auf Aristoteles zurückgeführten griechischen und lateinischen Wissenschaft der Epistolographie macht es verständlich, dass die klassische Philologie dem Briefeschreiben besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmete, und demzufolge ist eine umfangreiche wissenschaftliche Literatur zustande gekommen, die die Frage der Briefe von allen Seiten gründlich behandelt.[3] Als Ergebnis hat man nachgewiesen, dass nicht nur die Briefe aus dem Privatleben, sondern auch literarische Briefe, wie z. B. diejenigen, die in Horazens poetischem Nachlass als *Epistulae* erscheinen, wirkliche Briefe sind, die den formalen und inhaltlichen Regeln der Epistolographie entsprechen. Diese Behauptung ist auch im Falle von Briefen Ovids und anderer Dichter und Schriftsteller gültig.[4] Die Untersuchungen haben die sogenannten „wissenschaftlichen Briefe", wie z. B. die Briefe des Epikuros, die er an Herodotos, Pythokles und Menoikeus gerichtet hat,[5] nicht außer Acht gelassen, und bewiesen, dass sie eine Unterart der Epistel bilden: sie sind die unterrichtenden Briefe, die „Lehrbriefe".

Natürlich haben die Verfasser die apostolischen Briefe, die man im Neuen Testament findet, nicht nur auf Griechisch, sondern auch den griechischen literarischen Anforderungen entsprechend geschrieben.[6] Die Tatsache, dass die Apostel, die Träger einer fremden Tradition waren, als sie griechisch schrieben, sich die Vorschriften der klassischen Epistolographie vor Augen halten mussten,

1 Hercher 1873.
2 Giomini/Celentano 1980, S. 105–106.
3 Hier kann man nur ein grundlegendes Buch erwähnt werden: Koskenniemi 1956.
4 Thraede 1970.
5 *De vitis*,, 35–117.
6 Berger 1984, S. 1031–1432.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

beweist, wie groß der Einfluss der griechischen Rhetorik in der ganzen antiken Welt, sowohl im Morgenlande als auch im Abendlande, war. Das Neue Testament jedoch, das das heilige Buch der Christen war, diente Jahrhunderte lang als Modell für breite Kreise in den christlichen Ländern.

Die Grundkenntnisse in der Kunst des Briefeschreibens beinhalten die Unterscheidung zwischen einem gelegentlichen Brief *(litterae)* und einem Brief, der als „Geschenk" *(epistula)* an Mitglieder der Familie, Freunde, ältere und jüngere Kollegen geschickt wird, die aus irgendwelchen Gründen fern sind.[7] (In dem letzteren Fall können die älteren Kollegen ihre jüngeren Freunde oder Schüler unterrichten, in diesem Fall spricht man von Lehrbriefen.) Die Epistel wird als eine Hälfte des Zwiegesprächs von Freunden definiert, folglich ist der Stil der Briefe ziemlich einfach, er steht dem Stil der gesprochenen Alltagssprache nahe. Die Themen dieser Briefe sollen auf die Ereignisse des Alltagslebens begrenzt sein.

Daraus folgt, dass die inhaltlichen Forderungen die obligatorischen Themen der Briefe vorschreiben, wie z. B. der Ausdruck der Liebe *(philia)* zwischen den Freunden, die Sehnsucht nach dem Freund, der sich in der Ferne aufhält, usw. Zu den formalen Vorschriften gehören die Gruß- *(Cicero Memmio salutem)* und Schlussformeln *(vale)*.

Die Wissenschaft der Epistolographie und die Praxis des Briefeschreibens wurde den Völkern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens zusammen mit der griechischen Kultur auf der einen Seite, und durch die Verbreitung des christlichen Glaubens und der Kenntnis des Neuen Testaments auf der anderen Seite weitergegeben. Die Völker im Osten verfügten über ihre eigene, althergebrachte Kultur, die sich auch auf dem Gebiet ihrer epistolographischen Tradition geäußert hat. Die Kunst und die Tradition der Epistolographie der östlichen Völker, wie die der Ägypter, Juden, Aramäer, Babylonier, oder der Leute in Ugarit wurde in der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts Gegenstand wissenschaftlichen Interesses und philologischer Untersuchung, und im Laufe dieser Arbeiten haben sich die Orientalisten die Ergebnisse der klassischen Philologie vor Augen gehalten, und ihre Forschungsmethoden angewendet.

Die Gründung der Forschungsgruppe „Society of Biblical Literature's ‚Ancient Epistolography Group'" bedeutete einen wichtigen Schritt vorwärts auf dem Gebiet der epistolographischen Forschungen in der Orientalistik.[8] In der vorliegenden Arbeit werde ich meine Aufmerksamkeit nur der syrischen Epistolographie widmen. Natürlich ist es im Zuge dieser Arbeit nicht erlaubt, weder die hebräische Tradition des Alten Testaments, noch die allgemeinen epistolographischen Gewohnheiten der Aramäer außer Acht zu lassen. Die Syrer sind nämlich Träger einerseits der griechisch-christlichen, andererseits der alten

7 Siehe die Definition in Deissman 1927, S. 228: „a means of communication between persons who are separated from each other"; Fitzmyer 1982, besonders S. 27.

8 White 1982b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

aramäischen Kultur. Die christliche Kultur schöpfte aber sowohl aus den alttestamentlichen hebräischen, als auch gleichzeitig und hauptsächlich aus den hellenistischen neutestamentlichen Quellen.

Die vergleichende Untersuchung ist unter anderem erforderlich, weil die genannten Völker sich verschiedener Sprachen bedient haben, aber trotzdem lebten sie im Becken des Mittelmeers nicht weit voneinander. Folglich haben sie spezielle Nationalkulturen entwickelt, aber die Entwicklung wurde oft durch die Nachbarschaft mit anderen Kulturen tief beeinflusst, und produzierte ähnliche Erscheinungen, hauptsächlich in den Gewohnheiten des Alltagslebens.

Im Falle der Briefe beförderte die praktische Vernunft die allgemein verbreitete Gewohnheit, dass man am Anfang des Briefes den Absender und den Empfänger nennt, dann als Schreiber des Briefes den Leser begrüßt, und erst dann der Text des Briefes folgt. Zum Schluss soll der Schreiber seine guten Wünsche für den Leser zum Ausdruck bringen.

Wenn man die oben genannte Praxis der Briefschreiber in verschiedenen Sprachen und Kulturen untersucht, kann man sehen, dass sowohl in der griechischen als auch in der orientalischen Tradition im Wesentlichen dieselben Elemente die Hauptbestandteile des Briefes bilden.[9] Im Laufe der Untersuchung der charakteristischen Merkmale der syrischen Epistolographie sollte man eigentlich die Unterschiede zwischen den im Wesentlichen identischen Elementen der Briefe wahrnehmen.

2. Wenn man die epistolographische Tradition der aramäischen Dialekte untersucht, stößt man auf eine spezielle Schwierigkeit. Die Ursache für diese Schwierigkeit besteht darin, dass die aramäische Sprache durch viele Jahrhunderte hindurch auf unterschiedlichen Kontinenten für verschiedene Zwecke gebraucht wurde. Trotz dieser Schwierigkeiten darf man von einer speziellen aramäischen Tradition des Briefeschreibens sprechen, wie es die bisherigen Forschungen bewiesen haben.

Die erste große Arbeit, die die formalen Eigenschaften des aramäischen Briefes untersucht, behandelt die Briefe der persischen Ära.[10] Spätere Untersuchungen haben nachgewiesen, dass man diese Pionierarbeit, trotz ihrer Verdienste, nicht für befriedigend halten kann, da der Autor die syrischen Briefe völlig außer Acht gelassen hat.[11] Diese Kritik zeigt, dass ein sachkundiger Forscher die syrischen Briefe für einen wesentlichen Bestandteil der aramäischen Epistolographie hält.

9 Baneth 1919, S. 55–58; Knutson 1982, S. 15–23, wo der Verfasser die Briefe aus Babylon, Ugarit and el-Amarna untersucht; Salonen 1967.

10 Fitzmyer 1974.

11 Alexander 1978, besonders S. 156: „Fitzmyer's corpus of texts does not provide an entirely satisfactory basis for study. Since he comes down as late as the eighth-tenth centuries A. D., it is curious that (apart from Pap. Mird A) he has not included any Syriac letters."

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Alexander weist in seinem Aufsatz nach, dass die aramäischen Briefe traditionell vier Teile haben: der erste Teil besteht aus den Eröffnungsformeln, den zweiten Teil bildet der Text des Briefes, im dritten Teil findet man die Schlussformeln, und der vierte Teil ist die Adresse.[12] Die Einleitung *(praescriptio)* beinhaltet sowohl den Namen des Absenders als auch den des Empfängers in der Form „dem Y, von X" oder „dem Y, von deinem/Diener Bruder/Sohn X" oder „von X, dem Y Grüße", und dann kommt ein Gruß oder eine Reihe von Grüßen.[13] Die Grundformeln können durch Hinweise auf den Rang oder die Stellung des Empfängers erweitert werden („meinem Mann Y" oder „meinem Bruder Y" usw.). Zusätzliche Adjektive können auch bei dem Namen des Absenders stehen („meinem Herrn Jašebjah, von seinem Diener Mannuk").[14] In diesen Briefen bezeichnen die Wörter „Herr" und „Diener" nicht den realen gesellschaftlichen Rang des Absenders und Empfängers, sondern sie wollen vielmehr auf eine gewisse Art die Höflichkeit des Briefschreibers ausdrücken, wenn der Absender eine nicht so hoch stehende Person ist, wie der Empfänger. Menschen gleichen Ranges bedienen sich lieber anderer Wörter, die diesen Status besser ausdrücken, und nennen einander „Bruder" oder „Schwester".[15]

Die Einleitung kann aus zwei Teilen bestehen. Bisher wurde der erste, obligatorische Teil beschrieben. Darauf können die „Friedensformeln" *(šlōmō)* folgen. Eventuell kann der Absender dem Empfänger Segen wünschen.[16] Im letzten Teil des Briefes wünschte der Sender dem Adressaten wieder Frieden, aber in einer anderen Form: „für den Frieden deiner Seele schicke ich diesen Brief".[17]

Später hat Fitzmyer die formale Beschreibung der aramäischen Briefe weiter verfeinert, und er stellte fest, dass zu Briefen folgende Teile gehören können: *praescriptio*, oder einleitende Grüße, sekundäre Grüße, der Text des Briefes, die Schlussformeln, die Erwähnung des Schreibers oder des Sekretärs, Datum und die Schluss- oder Außenadresse.[18] In seiner Analyse entspricht die *praescriptio*

12 Alexander 1978, S. 161: „The principal parts of the Aramaic letter are: (1) the opening; (2) the body; (3) the close; (4) the inscription. (The last item used to contain the address.)"

13 Alexander 1978, S. 161: „The opening contains two basic conventions: (1) a parties' formula, which announces the names of the sender and the recipient; and (2) a salutation, or series of salutations." Auf derselben Seite schreibt der Autor wie folgt: „The parties' formula: To Y, X; To Y, from X; From X to Y."

14 Alexander 1978, S. 162: „In the expanded form a term is added to one or both of the names. This term may be one of respect (‚my lord'); of office/rank; or of kinship/affection (‚brother', ‚sister', ‚mother'). Sometimes the terms are paired: e. g. Hibeh 1–2: ‚To my lord Yashebyah, your servant Mannuk." Ein bekanntes Beispiel ist der Brief, den König Adon dem ägyptischen Pharao sandte (s. S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1975, S. 513).

15 Fitzmyer 1982, S. 33.

16 Alexander 1978, S. 162: „Salutation to the recipient. When this is found it occurs after the parties' formula. It usually embodies a wish for the health and prosperity (שלם) of the recipient, or invokes a blessing (ברכת) on him."

17 Alexander 1978, S. 166: „Only in private letters; it takes the form, ‚For your peace/welfare (or ‚to greet you') I have sent this letter'."

18 Fitzmyer 1982, S. 25–57.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dem, was Alexander als ersten Gruß oder Einleitung beschrieben hat, und die darauf folgenden „sekundäre Grüße“ entsprechen dem zweiten Teil der Einführung. Wie Fitzmyer bemerkt, kann der zweite Teil der Einleitung hauptsächlich in den weniger persönlichen und mehr formalen Briefen ausfallen.[19] Die sekundären Grüße wurden den gemeinsamen Freunden und Bekannten zur Übermittlung durch den Empfänger geschickt. Der Absender wählte zur Übermittlung seiner Grüße durch den Adressaten die folgende Form: „Sag Grüße (שלם) dem Z …“, oder „X sendet Gruß an Y, Z …“ und so weiter.[20] Die Beschreibung der Schlussformeln – zusammen mit den gerade zuvor genannten Beispielen – deckt sich mit denen, die man in Alexanders Aufsatz finden kann. Dann folgen die abschließenden Teile, denen wir hier keine besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmen wollen: der Schreiber, das Datum und die Außenadresse.

Diese Grußformeln sind auch aus dem Alten Testament bekannt, wo die aramäisch zitierten Briefe in den meisten Fällen auch die *šlōmō*-Formel (den zweiten Teil der Einleitung) beinhalten.[21]

Mit Hinweis auf manche Briefe spricht Fitzmyer auch über „erweiterte Grußformeln“. Im Laufe der Behandlung dieses Teiles der Briefe zitiert er das folgende Beispiel:

> Möge der Herr des Himmels viel Sorgen um das Wohl unseres Herrn [Bagohi] zu allen Zeiten haben, und möge Er seine Gnade vor Darius, dem König und den Fürsten des Palastes tausendmal mehr als jetzt zeigen, und möge er Ihm ein langes Leben gewähren, und seid glücklich und wohlhabend zu allen Zeiten.[22]

Einige Teile des aramäischen Briefes, wie die einleitenden Grüße, werden von den folgenden Teilen nicht durch Punkte, sondern durch bestimmte Wörter, die die Punkte ersetzen, getrennt. Diese Wörter, die Trennungsmerkmale sind, können die folgenden sein: כעת, כען, וכען כענת, וכעת (*und so, danach,* etc).[23]

3. Nach der kurzen Zusammenfassung der unerlässlichen grundlegenden Kenntnisse der aramäischen Epistolographie sollten wir uns nun den syrischen Briefen zuwenden. Um die folgende Diskussion zu erleichtern, scheint es angebracht zu sein, einige konkrete Beispiele auszuwählen, und unsere Schlussfolgerung auf die Erkenntnisse, die sie anbieten, zu beschränken.

19 Fitzmyer 1982, S. 32–35.
20 Fitzmyer 1982, S. 35–36; Dion 1982, besonders S. 61.
21 Zum Beispiel:
Daniel 3.31: נבוכדנצר מלכא לכל־עממיא אמיא ולשניא די־דארין בכל־ארעא שלמכו ישגא
ܢܒܘܟܕܢܨܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܠܟܠ ܥܡܡܐ ܐܡܝܐ ܘܠܫܢܝܐ ܕܕܪܝܢ ܒܟܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܫܠܡܟܘ ܝܫܓܐ ܠܟܘ
Daniel 6.26: באדין דריוש מלכא כתב לכל־עממיא אמיא ולשניא די־דארין בכל־ארעא שלמכון ישגא
ܗܝܕܝܢ ܕܪܝܘܫ ܡܠܟܐ ܟܬܒ ܠܟܠ ܥܡܡܐ ܐܡܝܐ ܘܠܫܢܝܐ ܕܕܪܝܢ ܒܟܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܫܠܡܟܘܢ ܝܫܓܐ ܠܟܘ
22 Fitzmyer 1982, S. 34.
23 Alexander 1978, S. 164: „Transition-markers: It is used in two ways: 1. like a full stop, to mark the end of every sentence; 2. like a paragraph marker, to indicate the broad divisions of the letter.“; Fitzmyer 1982, S. 35.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

3.1 Werfen wir zunächst einen Blick auf den ersten bekannten syrischen Brief, der von Mara bar Sarapion an seinen Sohn Sarapion geschrieben wurde.[24] Der Brief, der nicht sehr lang ist, ist jedoch viel länger als die Beispiele, die man in Handbüchern der Epistolographie finden kann. Auf Grund dieser Tatsache kann man den Verdacht hegen, dass der Brief kein echter Brief von einem Vater an seinen Sohn ist. Der Brief sieht vielmehr wie ein fiktiver, literarischer Brief aus. Diese Hypothese wird durch eine Anzahl von Fakten bestätigt. Der erste Fakt, der in Betracht gezogen werden sollte, ist die Einleitungsformel, die sich von den im vorherigen Abschnitt beschriebenen alten aramäischen Formeln unterscheidet und der klassischen griechischen und römischen Tradition entspricht: ܡܪܐ ܒܪ ܣܪܦܝܘܢ ܠܣܪܦܝܘܢ ܒܪܝ ܫܠܡ. (Marā bar Sarapion dem Sarapion, meinem Sohn, Grüsse.) Diese Formel klingt wie Ἀριστοτέλης βασιλεῖ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ εὖ πράττειν,[25] oder: *Cicero Attico salutem*.

Die aramäischen Briefe, die wir im vorangehenden Teil sahen, behandeln wirkliche Probleme, die zwischen dem Absender und dem Empfänger des Briefes diskutiert werden sollten, während der syrische Brief, den wir jetzt untersuchen, wie die griechischen Lehrbriefe, die angeblich von einer älteren, respektvollen Person an einen Jungen geschrieben wurden, den er in seinem Brief unterrichtet. In diesem Brief schreibt ein Vater an seinen unerfahrenen Sohn, der von ihm Lebensweisheit lernen soll. Das Ziel des Briefes ist, dem Sohn beizubringen, wie man die Welt sehen soll, und wie man die Schwierigkeiten des Lebens lösen kann. Dieser Brief, den Vorschriften der klassischen Rhetorik entsprechend, befasst sich mit Fragen der praktischen Philosophie, in diesem Fall nicht mit der Politik, sondern mit manchen Problemen der Ethik. Der Schreiber dieses Briefes ermahnt seinen Sohn (und alle Leser des Briefes), dass er Wissen und Weisheit suchen soll.[26] Die Menschen, die sich mit der Philosophie befassen, wenden sich von dem Elend dieser Welt ab und bleiben tugendhaft.[27]

Der Brief warnt vor der vergeblichen Suche nach trügerischem Reichtum und Ruhm. Der Schreiber erinnert seine Leser daran, wie krank sich die Leute fühlen, wenn sie alles verlieren, wodurch sie sich an diese Welt gebunden fühlen, oder was sie entbehren müssen, wenn sie ins Gefängnis geworfen worden sind. Der Weise, ganz egal wo er oder unter welcher Art von Menschen er lebt, wird von tugendhaften Menschen überall als ein Mitglied ihrer Familie

24 *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 43–48 (Syrischer Text), und 70–76 (Englische Übersetzung).
25 Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, XX, 5.11–13.
26 *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 70/43: „Be careful, therefore, my son, of those things which are suitable for such as be free, to meditate upon learning, and to pursue after wisdom: etc."
27 *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 70/43: „For such men are called to discipline, seek to disentangle themselves from the struggle of the time; and such as lay hold upon wisdom are elevated by the hope of righteousness; and those that stand in the truth exhibit the standard of their virtue; and those that devote themselves to philosophy look to escape from the miseries of the world."

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

akzeptiert, und die rechtschaffenen Menschen werden überall eine Familie um ihn bilden.[28]

Diese moralischen Ausführungen werden durch die Weisheit eines nicht genannten Philosophen abgeschlossen: auf welche weltlichen Güter kann sich ein Mensch verlassen? Auf Reichtum? Er wird entrissen. Auf eine Festung? Sie wird geplündert. Auf Städte? Sie werden verwüstet, etc. Die angeführten Maxime der Weisen sollen die Gültigkeit der guten Ratschläge am Ende dieses Abschnittes im Text unterstützen.

Die Beweiskraft der verschiedenen, in den Maximen steckenden Ratschläge wird durch historische Beispiele erhöht. Der Autor des Briefes beruft sich oft auf Helden, die nicht in seiner Ära lebten, aber trotzdem im Allgemeinen durch ihre häufige Erwähnung in der griechischen Literatur wohl bekannt waren. Er bezieht sich zum Beispiel auf Darius, oder auf die Helden des trojanischen Sagenkreises, wie Agamemnon oder Priamos, oder auf die Weisen, wie Archimedes, Sokrates oder Pythagoras.[29]

Nach diesem Exkurs empfiehlt der Autor des Briefes seinem Sohn (und den Lesern), nicht verderbliche weltliche Güter zu sammeln, weil man von Gott für diesen Verzicht belohnt wird. Wo man eine Menge von weltlichen Gütern findet, erscheinen dort zusammen mit ihnen auch eine große Anzahl der Probleme. Der Rang wird mit Schmerzen verbunden, dem Reichtum folgt Bitterkeit. Darüber hinaus können alle diese Güter verloren gehen, im Gegensatz zur Weisheit. Man soll sich mit dem Wenigen begnügen, was man hat. Wenn man sich wie ein Weiser benimmt, wird man von Gott nicht verlassen, und die Leute werden denjenigen gern haben, und nach seinem Tode wird er für ein gesegnetes Wesen gehalten. Kein Mensch wird nach seinem Tod Besitzer seiner diesseitigen Güter bleiben.

Dann werden auch diese Ratschläge durch historische Beispiele bestätigt, indem der Verfasser sich wieder auf Personen wie Sokrates, Pythagoras oder Platon beruft, aber hier wird auch die Geschichte der Juden aus dem Alten Testament erwähnt. Seit den alten Zeiten sind Athen, die Insel Samos, und auch die Gesetze der Juden in Vergessenheit geraten, aber die griechischen Weisen und die weisen Könige der Juden nicht.[30]

Wie wir aus dem Vorangehenden sehen können, haben wir es hier nicht mit einem persönlichen Brief zu tun, sondern mit einem, der den Anforderungen der griechischen Epistolographie sowohl in Bezug auf Form, als auch Inhalt entspricht. Diese Anforderungen wurden oben kurz genannt, hier ist nur eine Eigenschaft der moralisierenden Lehrbriefe hervorzuheben: ein Gemeinplatz dieser Briefe war die Suche nach der Weisheit und den moralischen Werten, und die Betonung der Rolle der Tugenden, im Gegensatz zu den materiellen Werten

28 *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 71–72/44.
29 *Ibid.*
30 *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 73–74.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

und Gütern, wie es auch in diesem Brief geschieht. In der griechischen rhetorischen Tradition gehört es zu den Elementen der Kunst, Hinweise auf dieselben historischen Personen und auf dieselben weisen Männer zu geben, die auch in dem behandelten Brief erwähnt und oben aufgezählt wurden.

Unsere erste Beobachtung können wir in den folgenden Worten zusammenfassen: Dieser Brief trägt nicht die Zeichen der ehemaligen alten orientalischen, in diesem Falle der aramäischen epistolographischen Traditionen. Er folgt eher den Vorschriften der klassischen griechischen literarischen Traditionen.

Gleichzeitig muss man feststellen, dass dieser Brief nicht mit den Musterbriefen der Handbücher der griechischen Epistolographie, und auch nicht mit dem oben von Aulus Gellius zitierten Brief vergleichbar ist.[31] Er ist eher mit jenen Lehrbriefen vergleichbar, die Aristoteles zugeschrieben wurden und philosophische Lehren enthalten, und die im Briefroman, der wahrscheinlich in einer der Schulen der Rhetorik in Syrien im Laufe des 6. Jahrhunderts zusammengestellt wurde, gefunden werden können. Unter diesen Briefen sollen vor allem die am Anfang des Romans stehenden „Ermahnungen von Aristoteles an Alexander den Großen" genannt werden.[32]

3.2 Der nächste Brief, den ich hier behandeln möchte, befindet sich in Form eines Fragments unter den syrischen Handschriften der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung. Der Brief blieb in Form einer Kopie, die sich in einem Sammelband befand, erhalten.[33] Das Fragment ist beschädigt, folglich sind manche Wörter unlesbar. Diese wurden in der Übersetzung durch Punkte ersetzt.

Bemerkenswert an diesem Brief ist die lange, in der klassischen Tradition unbekannte Form der weitschweifigen Adresse, und der darauf folgende ähnliche Gruß. Nach den verlorenen ersten Zeilen lautet der Text wie folgt:

> An NN, der seines Dieners Abscheulichkeit rügt, … der den Schmach seines sündigen Schülers und des elenden Betrügers tadelt, von X, der nicht verdient genannt zu werden, von Ihrem Sklaven, von Ihrem ewigen Diener.

Nach diesen Worten folgen die Worte der Begrüßung:

> Ich grüße Eure Herrschaft, sich verbeugend und auf Knien stehend. Erstens, wie die Boten, möchte ich Lob wegen Ihrer Erhebung sagen. Ich bitte und erflehe für … unseres Herrn, niederbeugend vor seiner Herrlichkeit, damit Er Ihr gesegnetes Leben länger macht, wie einst das Leben von Methusalem, und Er Ihren glänzenden Ruhm vor dem Autokrator und seinen Fürsten erhöht, [wie es getan wurde dem] Joseph. Er soll eurer Herrschaft heilige Vollkommenheit geben, wie in allen Tagen Ihres Lebens … Möge Er von allen Arten des Bösen und des Betrugs schützen, und vor in die Menschen gesetzten Vertrauen und vor Eitelkeit hüten, Amen.

31 Siehe Hercher 1873, S. 1–15.
32 Maróth 2006, S. 12–19 im arabischen Text.
33 Maróth 1985.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Einen ähnlich langen Gruß kann man weder in den objektiven klassischen Briefen, und nicht einmal in den zeitgenössischen byzantinischen Briefen finden, obwohl in den letzteren man oft Wendungen findet, die den Schreiber geringschätzen und den Adressaten übertrieben schmeichelhaft anreden.[34]

Vergleicht man diesen Brief mit den früheren aramäischen Briefen, die in diesem Aufsatz oben in der Einleitung vorgestellt wurden, dann ist es unvermeidlich, trotz der offensichtlichen Unterschiede, wahrzunehmen, dass sie auffallende Ähnlichkeit aufweisen. Vor allem ist die erweiterte Formel der Adresse zu erwähnen, die auch in einem der oben zitierten Briefe vorhanden ist, und auch hier eine wichtige Rolle spielt. Es war möglich, an den Namen des Absenders und des Empfängers weitere Adjektive hinzuzufügen, die die Beziehungen zwischen ihnen andeuten sollten.

Die Formel in dem jetzt zitierten syrischen Brief knüpft an diese Tradition an. Sie ist lang und kompliziert, viel länger, als die Formel im oben angeführten aramäischen Brief an Bagohi, die abweichend von den griechischen, byzantinischen, und sogar den aramäischen Briefen der älteren Zeit mit Adjektiven und Nebensätzen, die Adjektive ersetzen, überfüllt ist. Die übertriebene Höflichkeit des Schreibers scheint auf frühere Ereignisse und auf eine aus diesen Ereignissen stammende persönliche Beziehung zwischen Schreiber und Empfänger hinzudeuten, und dadurch bekommt der Brief einen individuellen, persönlichen Charakter.

Sowohl in den klassischen als auch in den byzantinischen Briefen folgt der wesentliche Teil des Briefes auf die Anrede des Adressaten. Hier wird aber eine, aus den aramäischen Briefen schon gekannte *šajel šalom* Grußformel eingeschoben. Der syrische Brief ist also mit dem Text des oben zitierten Briefes an Bagohi vergleichbar, auch in der Hinsicht, dass der Schreiber sowohl dort als auch hier die zunehmende Achtung des Adressaten vor dem König und seinen Fürsten erwähnt. In Kenntnis der Paralleltexte kann man nur die Schlussfolgerung ziehen, dass dieser Brief auf die alte aramäische epistolographische Tradition zurückgeht, und der byzantinische Einfluss, wenn es einen gibt, höchstens im hohen Stil und im komplizierten Wortlaut nachweisbar ist.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist es unvermeidlich an den Brief zu erinnern, den man in dem schon zitierten anonymen Briefroman finden kann. Der fiktive Brief wurde von Alexander an Dareios gerichtet. Die ersten Worte des Alexander lauten im Brief folgendermaßen:

> Von Alexander, der an seiner Religion hängt, und bemüht ist, die Wahrheit zu verteidigen und die Ungerechtigkeit zu besiegen, der die Tugend verteidigt, der dem Weg seiner Vorfahren und der besten Perser folgt, an Dareios, den Führer des persischen Volkes, der ohne Verdienste über sie herrscht, der die Religion in den Dienst des Schutzes seiner eigenen Regierung stellt, dessen Gesinnung seinem Bauch, und dessen Vernunft für seine Sinne dient.[35]

34 Darrouzès 1960. Im Buch werden Kopien vieler byzantinischer Briefe publiziert, aber ohne epistolographische Analyse.

35 Maróth 2006, S. 16, in der englischen Einleitung.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Auf diese Adresse folgt die traditionelle Grußformel der aramäischen Briefe, die aber in der klassischen und byzantinischen Tradition unbekannt ist:

> Grüße (salām) von ihm, der den Sieg der Gerechtigkeit unterstützt und die Tradition stärkt, die keine Scham verursacht.[36]

Dieser Brief, als Beispiel gewählt, scheint nahe zu legen, dass die aramäische epistolographische Tradition auch in der Schule der Rhetorik bekannt war, wo der Briefroman zusammengestellt wurde. Die offizielle Sprache der Schule der Rhetorik war Griechisch. Sie befand sich aber in der syrischen Provinz, wo die Einwohner in zwei Kulturen, in der griechischen und syrischen erzogen wurden. Auch der Übersetzer des Briefromans Sālim abū ʾl-Aʿlā war in drei Sprachen (Griechisch, Syrisch und Arabisch) bewandert.[37] Der Anfang dieses Briefes zeigt, dass die gewöhnlichen Adress- und Grußformeln samt der Friedensformel *(šlōmō)* des aramäischen Briefes auch am Hofe der Omajjaden bekannt wurden; Sālim abū ʾl-Aʿlā war der Leiter der Schreiber – *kuttāb* – am Hofe, die diesen Briefroman teilweise unmittelbar aus dem Syrischen, teilweise mittelbar aus dem Griechischen ins Arabische übersetzt haben.

Die Fortsetzung des Textes im jetzt zitierten Brief ist erwähnenswert: nach der Begrüßung und der erweiterten *šlōmō*-Formel kann man die Worte *ammā baʿad* finden, die in den anderen Briefen des Briefromans nur selten vorkommen. Diese Formel trennt die einleitenden obligatorischen Teile vom wesentlichen Teil des Briefes. Oben haben wir schon gesehen, dass ähnliche (und dieser Wendung genau entsprechende) Wortverknüpfungen, die die Trennung zwischen unterschiedlichen Teilen des Briefes anzeigen, auch in der Tradition der aramäischen Epistolographie bekannt sind.

3.3 Ich möchte die dritte Art von Briefen an einem besonderen Stück veranschaulichen, das aus dem Griechischen übersetzt wurde. Dieser Brief wurde unter dem Namen des Aristoteles, des Vaters der Kunst des Briefeschreibens, als eine wissenschaftliche Abhandlung in der griechischen philosophischen Tradition mit dem Titel *De mundo* bekannt. Dieses Büchlein, das eine kurze Beschreibung des Universums enthält, war Gegenstand einer Reihe eingehender philosophischer Behandlungen.[38] Diese Arbeit wurde aus dem Griechischen ins Syrische durch Sargis von Rišʿainā übersetzt.[39]

Der Brief beginnt mit einer kurzen Einführung, die uns über die Gründe und Umstände der Übersetzung informiert. Darauf folgt die Übersetzung des Textes: ܐܓܪܐ ܕܐܪܝܣܛܘܛܠܝܣ ܠܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܘܣ (Der Brief, den Aristoteles an Alexander sandte). Auf diesen einleitenden Satz folgt sofort der bekannte Text

36 Maróth 2006, S. 47, im arabischen Text.
37 Maróth 2006, S. 2 und 97, in der englischen Einleitung.
38 Strohm 1970, S. 237–352 und Schönberger 2009, um nur zwei Werke zu nennen, die auch eine Forschungsgeschichte und Bibliographie enthalten.
39 De Lagarde 1858, S. 134–158; Baumstark 1922, S. 168.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

der Abhandlung. Das heißt, die offiziellen Formeln eines persönlichen Briefes fehlen sowohl am Anfang als auch am Ende des Textes. In diesem Fall müssen wir in Betracht ziehen, dass der Brief letztlich eine an die ganze Welt gerichtete wissenschaftliche Abhandlung ist, die in Form eines Briefes geschrieben wurde, die der Verfasser jedoch nicht mit der Post an eine bestimmte Person abschicken wollte. In der Tat kann man ein ähnliches Phänomen im Fall der bekannten Briefe des Epikur beobachten: nach einer kurzen Einführung (Epikur grüßt Herodot) beginnt sofort die Beschreibung der physischen Welt.[40] Der griechische Text endet ohne Abschlussformel.

Ein ähnlicher Lehrbrief über die alte syrische Liturgie wurde von Jacobus Edessenus an seine Anhänger gesandt.[41] Auch in diesem Fall beginnt und endet der Text ohne die traditionellen Formeln. Man kann lediglich den für einen wissenschaftlichen Zweck geschrieben Text in der für die Nachwelt überlieferten Version des Werkes finden. Es sieht so aus, als würden die in Briefform geschriebenen Traktate die traditionellen Briefformeln entbehren, oder sie sind zumindest ohne sie überliefert worden. Jedenfalls gehörten sie nicht zu den wesentlichen Teilen der als Brief getarnten Traktate, weder bei den Griechen noch bei den Syrern.

4. Mir ist nur ein Werk bekannt, das seine Aufmerksamkeit ausschließlich dem Problem der syrischen Briefe widmet. Es wurde von Gregorius Paulus Behnam, dem Erzbischof der Ostsyrischen Kirche geschrieben.[42] In dieser kurzen Arbeit gibt der Autor einen Überblick über die syrische Briefliteratur, er hat aber die Problematik nicht aus der Sicht der Kunst der Epistolographie dargestellt, die die Briefe im Hinblick auf formale Kriterien untersucht. Er stellt eine Liste der hervorragenden Gestalten der syrischen Literatur zusammen, die im Titel ihrer Werke aus irgendwelchem Grund das Wort „Brief" gebraucht haben, und gibt eine kurze Beschreibung der genannten Schriften. Daher kommt er zu dem Schluss, dass Briefe in vier Kategorien unterteilt werden können: Es gibt philosophische, theologische, dialektische (d. h. eine Diskussion enthaltende) und literarische Briefe. In dieser Aufteilung können die philosophischen und theologischen, so wie auch die eine Diskussion enthaltenden Briefe sofort als Lehrbriefe oder Traktate unter einem Stichwort zusammengefasst werden, während die literarischen Briefe getrennt behandelt werden sollen.

Dies zieht aber zwei Konsequenzen nach sich. Erstens bedeutet diese Aufteilung, dass die Arbeit jene Briefe, die an eine bestimmte Person geschickt wurden, in den Hintergrund drängt. Kurz gesagt: der Verfasser vernachlässigt die wichtigste Gruppe der Briefe, die wirklichen Briefe. Zweitens erklärt dieses

40 *De vitis*, 34.

41 Assemani 1719, S. 479–486; Oberleitner 1826, S. 206–215.

42 Behnam 1980. Das Büchlein stellt eigentlich die Reedition eines Aufsatzes des Verfassers dar, der ursprünglich in einer in Basra herausgegebenen und inzwischen schon längst eingestellten Zeitschrift veröffentlicht wurde.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Verfahren, warum die wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen in der arabischen Literatur als *risāla* bezeichnet werden, und welche Beziehung zwischen diesem Wortgebrauch und der griechischen literarischen Tradition nachzuweisen ist.

Zusammenfassend kann man kurz die folgenden Schlussfolgerungen ziehen:

- Im Falle der kurzen Briefe, die man wirklich an einen Adressaten schicken wollte, haben sich die Syrer der griechischen epistolographischen Tradition angeschlossen, da auch ihre Briefe mit Grüßen an den Adressaten beginnen. Die Mehrzahl der Briefe gehört offensichtlich zu dieser Art von Briefen. Diese Behauptung ist wahrscheinlich auch im Falle der Lehrbriefe gültig.
- Vermutlich kann es im Fall der feierlichen oder literarischen Briefen Praxis gewesen sein, dass die Menschen hier die alte, auch in der Bibel erhaltene aramäische Tradition berücksichtigt haben, und nach der ausgedehnten, für die syrischen Briefe charakteristischen Begrüßung des Adressaten zusätzlich eine traditionelle *šlōmō*-Formel einfügten.
- Schließlich, im Falle wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen, galten die Formeln als völlig irrelevant, und daher wurden sie ausgelassen. Diese Praxis leitet zu der arabischen wissenschaftlichen Literatur über.

Gleichzeitig kann man die Vermutung äußern, dass die traditionelle *ammā baʿad*-Formel der arabischen Briefe von der altorientalischen Tradition der aramäischen und syrischen Briefe nicht unabhängig sein kann.

Bibliografie

Alexander, P.S. 1978: „Remarks on Aramaic Epistolography in the Persian Period." In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 23, S. 155–170.

Assemani, G.S. 1719: *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana. In Qua Manuscriptos Codices Syriacos, Arabicos, Persicos, Turcicos, Hebraicos, Samaritanos, Armenicos, Aethiopicos, Graecos, Aegyptiacos, Ibericos, & Malabaricos. Jussu Et Munificentia Clementis XI. Pontificis Maximi Ex Oriente conquisitos, comparatos, avectos, & Bibliothecae Vaticanae addictos. Recensuit, digessit & genuina scripta à spuriis secrevit, Addita Singulorum Auctorum Vita Joseph Simonius Assemanus Syrus Maronita Sacrae Theologia Doctor, atque in eadem Bibliotheca Vaticana linguarum Syriacae & Arabicae Scriptor.* T. 1: *De Scriptoribus Syris Orthodoxis*. Romae (Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide).

Baneth, D.H. 1919: „Zu dem aramäischen Brief aus der Zeit Assurbanipals." In: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 22, S. 55–58.

Baumstark, A. 1922: *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, mit Ausschluß der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*. Bonn.

Behnam, G.P. 1980: *Adab al-risālat ʿind al-Sirjān*. Aleppo.

Berger, K. 1984: „Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament." In: H. Temporini/W. Haase (Hrsg.): *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. T. II, Bd. 25/2. Berlin/New York, S. 1031–1432.

Darrouzès, J. 1960: *Épistolaires byzantins du Xe siècle*. Paris.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

De vitis = Diogenes Laertios, *De vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus clarorum philosophorum*. Librum X, capita 35–133. Deutsche Übersetzung in: F. Jürss/R. Müller/E. G. Schmidt (Hrsg.): *Griechische Atomisten. Texte und Kommentare zum materialistischen Denken der Antike*. Leipzig 1988, S. 205–240.

Deissman, A. 1927: *Light from the Ancient East*. London.

Dion, P. E. 1982: „The Aramaic ‚Family Letter' and Related Epistolary Forms in Other Oriental Languages and in Hellenistic Greek." In: White 1982a, S. 59–76.

Fitzmyer, J. A. 1974: „Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography." In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93, S. 201–225.

— 1982: „Aramaic Epistolography." In: White 1982a, S. 25–57.

Giomini, R./M. S. Celentano (Hrsg.) 1980: *Iulius Victor: Ars rhetorica*. Leipzig.

Hercher, R. (Hrsg.) 1873: *Epistolographi Græci. Recensuit, recognovit, adnotatione critica et indicibus instruxit*. Parisiis.

Koskenniemi, H. 1956: *Studien zur Ideologie und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis auf 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, t. 102/2).

Knutson, F. B. 1982: „Cuneiform Letters and Social Conventions." In: White 1982a, S. 15–23.

de Lagarde, P. 1858: *Analecta Syriaca*. Lipsiae/Londini.

Maróth, M. 1985: „Ein Brief aus Turfan." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 12, S. 283–287.

— 2006: *The Correspondence Between Aristotle and Alexander the Great. An Anonymous Greek Novel in letters in Arabic Translation*. Piliscsaba.

Oberleitner, A. 1826: *Chrestomathia Syriaca*. Viennae.

Salonen, E. 1967: *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen*. Helsinki.

Schönberger, O. 2009: *Aristoteles*: *Über die Welt. Übersetzt und kommentiert*. Stuttgart.

Spicilegium Syriacum = W. Cureton (Hrsg.): *Spicilegium Syriacum. Containing remains of Bardesan, Meliton, Ambrose and Mara Bar Serapion, now first edited, with an English translation and notes*. London 1855.

Strohm, H. 1970: *Aristoteles*: *Meteorologie. Über die Welt*. Darmstadt (= *Aristoteles: Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. Hrsg. von E. Grumach. Bd. 12, Teil I und II).

Thraede, K. 1970: *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik*. München (Zetemata 48).

White, J. L. (Hrsg.) 1982a: *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing*. Chico, Cal. (Semeia 22).

— 1982b: „The Ancient Epistolography Group in Retrospect." In: White 1982a, S. 1–14.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Strategius' Assignment: an Inquiry into Manichaeism and the Manichaean Churches of the Roman East, during the 4th Century*

Rea Matsangou, Leiden

The Emperor Constantine, as Ammianus Marcellinus reports in his *Res Gestae*[1], was, at some time during his reign, desirous of obtaining a more concrete knowledge of the different sects in the empire, the Manichaeans and other similar sects included. Strategius, having been recommended as competent, was chosen to carry out this task. Indeed, Constantine was so pleased by his skilful conduct of the research, that he gave him the honourable name 'Musonianus'[2].

Unfortunately, Strategius' report has not survived, so neither the outcome of his investigation is known, nor even if his research did actually concern Manichaeans. This is because a different interpretation of the event has been suggested by at least one modern scholar[3]. However, seizing upon the incident that Ammianus Marcellinus reports, the aim of this paper is to make an inquiry into Manichaeism and the Manichaean churches of the Roman East, during the 4th century, a task, which in the event of Ammianus' report being accurate, coincides with Strategius' assignment. In addition, as I will argue below, there are reasons to believe that the research did indeed take place and primarily concerned Manichaeans, since Constantine had good reasons for instigating such a survey[4].

* An earlier shorter version of this paper in Greek was presented at the one-day conference "Constantinean Era: Issues of Historiography and Art", held at the University of Thessaly, Department of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology, on January 1, 2014.

1 Amm. Marc. 15.13.1–2.

2 A name that recalls the Muses, see Jones 1971, p. 611.

3 Woods 2001, pp. 255–264. Woods supports the view that Strategius' investigation concerned the intra-Christian doctrinal dispute between Arians and Catholics, and not the Manichaeans. That the investigation did concern Manichaeans is not questioned by other researchers: Drijvers (1996, pp. 532–537), Lieu (1992, pp. 96, 121–150; 1994, p. 101f.), Sundermann (2009). According to Sundermann, Strategius 'informed and advised the emperor Constantine the Great (r. 305–337, sole ruler from 324) on Manichaean affairs', see Sundermann 2009.

4 A different opinion has been expressed by Woods, see *id.* 2001, p. 261.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Thus, undertaking Strategius' assignment, my aim in this paper is firstly to attempt a reconstruction of Strategius' lost report, with the assistance of sources from the era that have survived. Then, based on these findings, I will make certain assumptions about the feasibility, scope and objectives of Strategius' research, re-contextualizing it within the wider framework of Constantine's political and religious policies.

The context: Constantine's religious policy

It is important in the first instance to locate the investigation in its specific context. To this end, the examination of the following questions, already discussed in the relevant academic discourse[5], will prove illuminating. Did Constantine have good reasons to be interested in a thorough/*limatius*[6] investigation into Manichaeism? And if so, what interested him more: to carry out a survey of Manichaean doctrine or of the Manichaean activities (religious and political), or both? When did the research take place? And where exactly was the research conducted?

As stated previously, I believe that Constantine had serious reasons for wanting such an investigation. Firstly, since Constantine, for whatever reasons (political or religious), had decided to promote the establishment of Christianity as the sole religion of the empire, logically he was interested in the activities of all the empire's 'heretical' groups. For Manichaeans in particular, there was an extra reason behind his interest. During Constantine's era, Manichaeans were related to Persia, Rome's eternal enemy. It was only a few years since Diocletian had unleashed a harsh persecution against Manichaeans, maintaining that they were acting as Persian spies and that by their proselytizing activities, were disturbing the social peace and undermining the sovereignty of the state[7]. Moreover, as Drijvers notes, in the context of Constantine's religious project, i. e. the Christianization of the empire, Manichaeans were deemed to be religious 'enemies', in addition to political enemies[8]. Furthermore, as is suggested by Lieu, Constantine's special interest in Manichaeans could have been roused by the frequent use of the word 'Manichaean' in the religious discourse between Arians and Catholics, in which it was often used as a term of abuse. Both Athanasius and Arius made accusations accusing each other of verging on Manichaeism[9]. The latter, i. e. that Manichaeans were seen as a threat by all Christian parties, indicates that Manichaeans were actively engaged in missionary work. Lastly,

5 Drijvers 1996, pp. 532–537; Woods 2001; Lieu 1992, pp. 96, 121–150; *id.* 1994, p. 101.
6 As Ammianus describes the inquiry, in Amm. Marc. 15.13.1–2.
7 Diocletian's edict cited in Gardner/Lieu 2004, pp. 116–118. See also Lieu 1992, p. 121f. and Drijvers 1996, p. 533f.
8 Drijvers 1996, p. 534.
9 Lieu 1994, p. 101f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Constantine's interest in Manichaeans might have been a part of a broader investigation into the factors configuring his foreign policy and the empire's relations with Persia.

We do not have information on the exact date of the survey. I believe Drijvers is right in connecting it with Constantine's negotiations with Sapur II. He places both events around the year 330[10]. For the moment, suffice it to say that the investigation took place between 324 and 337, the years of Constantine's monarchy.

But what exactly was the survey about? Was Constantine more interested in examining Manichaean doctrine or Manichaean activities? According to Lieu, the fact that Constantine, after Strategius' investigation, did not take any measures against Manichaeans, means that he found the Manichaean doctrine to be in accordance with the Nicene Creed[11]. The same assumption is adopted by Drijvers, who without excluding the possibility that the investigation concerned the political activities of Manichaeans, concludes that, since the research also involved other 'heretics', its target should have been Manichaean doctrines[12]. Woods, in supporting his view that the inquiry did not concern Manichaeans, examines only the case of an investigation of doctrines. So, he concludes that there was no reason for Constantine to interrogate Manichaeans in order to test the correctness of their dogmas, because he could just condemn them, as church fathers did in their discourse[13].

However, for the reasons I have outlined above, questioning the reasons why Constantine ordered such an inquiry, I consider it more likely that the emphasis of the research was on the activities, rather than on the doctrines of the sect, specifically, on its religious activity (proselytizing) since, as Drijvers put it, the inquiry concerned other heretics too[14]. So, although I cannot exclude the possibility that it was a *limatius* survey containing everything (dogmas, matters of worship and churches, the religious and political activities of Manichaeans), for reasons I will develop below, I believe that Constantine was mainly interested in Manichaean gatherings, congregations, and churches.

The geographical field of that research would ordinarily have been the eastern provinces of the empire, since Strategius' route – both his origin and his career as a state officer (*comes*, *proconsul* and *Praefectus Praetorio Orientis*) – is mapped to this territory[15]. However, it is plausible to suggest that Constantine's scope at that time, was especially focused on a specific place: Palestine, particularly Jerusalem. Within the framework of the Christianization programme, Constantine aimed to establish Jerusalem as *the* religious centre. For that purpose, obtaining

10 Drijvers 1996, p. 534.
11 Lieu 1992, p. 127.
12 Drijvers 1996, p. 535.
13 Woods 2001, p. 261.
14 Drijvers 1996, p. 535.
15 See the entry for Strategius in PLRE (Jones 1971, p. 611f.); Drijvers 1996, p. 535.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a thorough knowledge of its religious landscape, of the various religious groups operating in the city and of their meeting places, was of paramount importance.

Thus, it is probable that in Strategius' report, a separate chapter was devoted to Manichaean and other heretic churches of Jerusalem and it is on this imaginary chapter that I will focus in the present paper.

Manichaeans and other heretics in Jerusalem's religious landscape

Drijvers describes in a very fascinating manner how, thanks to Constantine, in a short period of time, Jerusalem was transformed from an insignificant provincial town into the religious centre of Christianity. Churches were erected to denote landmarks of the life of Jesus, Christian monasteries mushroomed, and hostels were built for pilgrims. However, as Drijvers notes, despite the Christianized image highlighted by Christian sources, the religious landscape of Jerusalem, Palestine, and the rest of the empire, throughout the 4th century remained culturally rich and religiously diverse[16]. It was a transitional era, in which the passage from a dominant pagan culture to Christianity took place. Christianity had not yet been established as the official religion of the State and the Christian dogma had not yet been fully formulated. In such an environment of religious diversity, freedom and tolerance, the various religious groups rivaled each other for dominance. Among them Christians who, so it seems, were still the minority.

This religious pluralism of Jerusalem is amply recorded by Cyril, the bishop of the city (350–386), in his *Catecheses*. *Catecheses* were the lectures that Cyril delivered daily during Lent for those catechumen Christians prepared to be baptized. According to a note in the manuscript, *Catecheses* are the shorthand notes of Cyril's oral teachings[17]. The latter is also testified to by Cyril's vivid language. As Cyril underlines, the ultimate goal of his teaching was to protect the catechumens from heretics[18]. To fulfill this purpose, Cyril taught them what Christianity is, by explaining what it is not. For every Christian doctrine he developed, he juxtaposed heretic 'fallacies'. For example, in his lecture on the Holy Spirit he explains: '… I will not analyze the precise meaning of his [Holy Spirit] hypostasis; this is ineffable; I will expose the seducing teachings of heretics on this topic, so that no one could be misleading by ignorance'[19]. Thus, Cyril was 'forced' to expose the 'deluded' dogmas in order to educate his students on how to protect themselves from the other religious groups who lived and acted in the

16 Drijvers 2004, pp. 1–30.
17 Drijvers 2004, p. 53.
18 Catech. 4.2.14–19.
19 Catech. 16.5.1–9.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

city: the pagans, the Jews, the Samaritans, the heretics. In actual fact, Cyril's audience consisted of converts of the aforementioned religious groups.

Concerning the heretics, it must be clarified that in Cyril's language the word 'heretics' means mainly Gnostic and dualistic groups such as Marcionites and Manichaeans. Arians, at that time, were not always considered heretics since the Christian doctrine had not yet been formulated[20].

Among the heretics, the Manichaeans were apparently the greatest threat to Cyril's disciples. Cyril's references to contemporary Manichaeans are more frequent than to any other religious group. Indeed, Cyril devoted almost the entire sixth lecture, the one against heretics, to the refutation of Manichaeism.

Cyril's presentation of Manichaeism is not a theoretical theological refutation. The fact that he confronted a real problem is repeatedly stressed: 'Even now, there are people who have seen Mani with their own eyes'[21]; 'Even now, Manichaeans, reject as a phantom Jesus' resurrection'[22]; 'Even now, Manichaeans invoke the daemons (during a mysterious ceremony)'[23]. From Cyril's records, the image of an active Manichaean community emerges. Firstly, intensive missionary activity is noted. Cyril gives the impression that there was systematic Manichaean propaganda in the area, supported by books that Manichaeans were carrying with them. During his time, Cyril notes, that they were carrying the *Thesaurus of Life*[24]. Furthermore, as Cyril argues, Manichaeans performed some occult rituals which threatened Christian mores[25]. An additional threat was social interaction. It seems that some of Cyril's disciples were associating with Manichaeans. Some of them may well have been former, converted, Manichaeans. This latter group was the most precarious among Cyril's catechumens[26]. Cyril admonished his disciples, to stand apart from those who were suspected of belonging to the Manichaean heresy; at least until it was made sure that they truly repented[27]. The latter can be interpreted as a hint to Crypto-Manichaeans.

It becomes apparent from Cyril's account on Manichaeism that the Manichaean community in Jerusalem was strong and active. Through their mission, rites and social interaction, it seems that Manichaeans exerted influence upon Cyril's new Christian proselytes.

20 Although condemned at the synod of Nicaea (325), Arianism prevailed throughout the period from Constantius II to Theodosius, and was supported by emperors and the majority of the bishops of the Eastern churches.
21 Catech. 6.20.3–5.
22 Catech. 14.21.5–7.
23 Catech. 6.23.9–11.
24 Catech. 6.22.7–8.
25 Catech. 6.33.1–17.
26 Catech. 15.3.29–32.
27 Catech. 6.36.3–4. Although Cyril does not mention it explicitly, I believe is referring to former Manichaeans since his admonition is just after an extensive presentation of the Manichaean heresy. On this matter, see also Lieu 1994, p. 205.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Testimonies for Manichaean and other heretical churches

Among with the many other things Cyril says about Manichaeans, he warns the students that in the cities, apart from the Catholic Christian churches, there were other heretical churches; he specifically mentions those of Marcionites and Manichaeans which could mislead the Christian neophytes who were possibly not able to distinguish them from the μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ('One Holy Catholic Church'). For that reason, he advised his disciples, 'when they visit or sojourn in another city, to inquire not merely where the congregation for the κυριακόν takes place (for other profane sects attempt to call their 'caves' κυριακὰ), nor simply where the Church is, but to seek out the Catholic Church, because', as he argues, 'this is the specific name of the true Church'[28].

Cyril is the only church father who provides such concrete testimony for the existence of Manichaean churches – not only in Jerusalem, but in other cities too – and his testimony is of particular importance. The value of *Catecheses* as a source is significant because, as mentioned, they were Cyril's live lectures delivered to a live audience and reflected the historical reality in a specific time and place.

Cyril's testimony for the existence of Manichaean churches is confirmed by subsequent imperial laws and edicts, which finally prohibited the functioning of these churches. Gratian's law, in 378/379 forbade Manichaeans to congregate in houses of worship and practice their religion, while other religious groups were allowed to, with special permission[29]. According to the edict of Valentinian II and Valens (372), when a congregation of Manichaeans was detected, their house of worship was confiscated; the leaders of the sect were punished with severe penalties and the followers were socially isolated[30].

Legislation against Manichaeans provides us with valuable information about them in a way that neither the patristic texts, nor even the genuine Manichaean sources themselves do. So, a survey of legislation against Manichaeans during the 4th century will give us an overall picture of the state's attitude towards Manichaeans, which in turn will throw light on our subject, i. e. the existence or otherwise of Manichaean churches.

The first imperial edict against Manichaeans was issued by Diocletian in 302 with the accusation that the Manichaeans, as Persian agents, sought to disrupt the social peace and to undermine political authorities. The penalties were especially harsh: the death sentence for the leaders and the followers of the sect. Only top-ranking officials were exempted, although even they were sentenced to forced labour in the mines. The confiscation of their property applied to all[31].

28 Catech. 18.26.1–16.
29 Soc. HE: 5.2.1–8; Soz. HE: 7.1.3.
30 IMS CTh.: 16.5.3; Pharr *et al.* 1952, p. 479; Gardner/Lieu 2004, p. 118. See also Lieu's comments in *id.* 1992, p. 143f.
31 Edict of Diocletian cited in Gardner/Lieu 2004, pp. 116–118.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

After Diocletian's edict, it is reasonable to assume that the Manichaean congregations continued secretly until the edicts of 'religious toleration' (311 and 313), which granted all religious groups the right to meet freely and practice their religion and cults in public[32].

Later, however, Constantine, as monarch, changed his religious policy and probably sometime after Strategius' research issued a decree against five specific heresies. These were: Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians and those called Cataphrygians. The list of heretics concluded with the general wording '… and against all heresies'[33]. Manichaeans were not included among the five heresies. The decree forbade congregations and confiscated houses of worship of the above heretics[34].

In any case, Constantine's edict did not explicitly mention the Manichaeans. The first edict against Manichaeans by a Christian emperor, was that, mentioned above, of Valentinian II and Valens, in 372, and some years later, Gratian's law in 378/379. During Theodosius' reign, things became worse for all heretics, but judging from a series of decrees issued in 381, 382, and 383, his main target initially seemed to be only the Manichaeans[35]. In his first two decrees, Theodosius forbade Manichaeans to transfer their property by will or donation to their community. The last edict in 383, in addition to Manichaeans, also condemned Arians, Semi-Arians and other ascetical groups. The decree prohibited the above heretics: a) to congregate, b) to build private churches or use private homes as churches, c) to conduct any proselytizing activity, and d) to practice their religion publicly or privately[36]. So, after Theodosius' decrees, it is logical to presume that Manichaean gatherings continued in secret, at least until Justinian's reign[37].

Recapitulating, it seems that from 313 until 373, at least as far as the state's attitude is concerned, there was tolerance towards Manichaeans who, logically, should have benefited and as Cyril claims, practiced their religion openly in their own churches. After 372, the state's religious policy against Manichaeans was differentiated. The target of all the subsequently-issued decrees, in which there was a gradual climax in the severity of the penalties[38], was mainly the Manichaean churches, i. e. their gatherings/assemblies and proselytizing activities, rather than the doctrines of the sect.

32 Galerius' Edict (311) and the Edict of Milan (313), in Eus. HE: 8.17 and 10.5, respectively.
33 The precise wording of the ending phrase is: 'and all those who through your systems fulfill heresies'.
34 Eus. VC: 3.63–66. Modern scholarship dates the edict to between 324 and 330. Eusebius places it after Nicaea (325) and the synod of Antioch (326), see Cameron/Hall 1999, p. 306f.
35 Beskow 1988, pp. 2–5.
36 CTh. 16.5.7 (381), CTh. 16.5.9 (382), CTh. 16.5.11 (383), in Pharr *et al.* 1952, p. 451f. See also Beskow 1988, pp. 3–5.
37 According to John of Ephesus, during Justinian's reign Manichaeans still 'used to meet in houses and hear the mysteries of that impure doctrine', see Bury 1958, p. 365.
38 The apex had been Justinian's death penalty, CJ I.5, see Kruger 1967, pp. 50–60.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Manichaean *loci cultus*

But what was the form of these churches? Archaeological findings relating to Manichaean churches in the Roman territory do not exist. Neither do Manichaean sources with specific information about this subject, up to now. What is once more illuminating, though, is the legislation against Manichaeans and, in addition, the Christian churches of the era, which must have looked like the Manichaean churches judging by Cyril's warning of the catechumens against such a confusion. The type of Christian church that existed until the beginning of the 4th century was the house-church (κατ' οἶκον Ἐκκλησία), which initially were the houses of wealthy Christians and later houses that some Christian individuals offered to their community for religious purposes. Those places which did not differ in appearance from simple houses were called by Christians 'churches' (ἐκκλησίες), or 'Kyriaka' (Κυριακά), or 'praying houses' (εὐκτήριοι οἶκοι). By the end of the persecutions, and in particular with the promotion of Christianization of the empire by Constantine, independent churches began to be built alongside the home-churches.

Manichaean churches which, as indicated, apparently existed throughout the 4th century and beyond, whether their existence was permitted or not, did not cease to be considered as the churches of heretics, by both the State and the official Church. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that Manichaeans did not ever erect separate temples, as were the Christian churches that began to be built under Constantine, but that their churches always had the form of house-churches. The latter hypothesis is reinforced by the state legislation in which Manichaean churches were always described as private places: homes, houses, private residences, donations of private houses, etc.

Manichaean churches as congregations

The Greek word ἐκκλησία ('church'), apart from signifying the specific building, means also 'gathering, congregation'. I have argued above that the target of all decrees against Manichaeans was these congregations, where the mysteries of the sect were celebrated. What is important here is whether these gatherings affected the Christianization programme of Constantine. In other words, to what extent was their function and activity an attraction for converts to Christianity, forming a disruptive factor for Constantine's religious vision.

As Drijvers points out, the biggest obstacle to the Christianization programme was the exclusivity required by the new religion. Even those who preferred Christianity, who at the time of Cyril were probably in the minority, apparently had a problem with the strict Christian rule of monotheism. Conversion to Christianity meant a change of lifestyle; they had to get used to the one

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and unique worship, something difficult to achieve overnight. Therefore, for a long time, it is likely that Christians continued to visit other religious congregations too[39]. Something similar had happened with the early Jewish-Christians (Judeo-Christians), who continued to participate in traditional Jewish worship, i. e. continued to go to the synagogue. At the same time, however, they participated in the new worship, meeting each other in the Christian house-churches (κατ' οἶκον Ἐκκλησίες) for the Eucharist meal.

It is quite probable then that one could meet Cyril's catechumens or even Christian neophytes in Manichaean churches. Some of them might have been former Manichaeans. This could be inferred from Cyril's instructions to his disciples. At the end of a long list of forbidden things that his students were supposed to avoid, including astrologers, diviners, Samaritans, Jews and their Sabbaths, Cyril underlines that above all they had to avoid going to heretic congregations[40]. Furthermore, in the lecture concerning the Manichaeans, Cyril wonders: 'Are you receiving, oh man, the teaching of such a mouth? On meeting him, do you greet him with a kiss?'[41]. 'Let him who is in communion with them, realize among whom he places himself'[42].

The above could refer to social interaction. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that it is a reference to congregations of Manichaeans. What we learn about these congregations from researchers working on Manichaean sources is illuminating.

According to BeDuhn, the Manichaean ritual meal of the elects consisted of two parts: a) the offering of the food by the auditors/catechumens to the elects (alms-service), and b) the central ritual, the holy meal, during which the auditors had to withdraw and only the elects participated. The same dual structure exists from the 2nd century onwards in the ritual meal (Holy Eucharist) of Eastern Christianity. For both ritual systems, the two parts are phases of the same ceremony. The catechumens participated only in the first phase, at the end of which a petitionary prayer over the catechumens takes place (δέησις ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων) [43].

Cyril 'reveals' some information about a petitionary prayer by Manichaean elects over their catechumens, which, as he comments with sarcasm, is a curse rather than a blessing. As he claims, strengthening the reliability of his source, this was confessed to him by former Manichaeans[44]. Cyril is referring to the *apology to the bread*, as this 'prayer' is referred to by scholars. However, the

39 Drijvers 2004, p. 115f.
40 Catech. 4.37.16–17.
41 Catech. 6.33.14–15.
42 Catech. 6.25.4–5.
43 For the Manichaean holy meal see BeDuhn 2000, pp. 144–148. For the dual stucture of the Christian Eucharist see Justinus Martyr, Apol. A: 65–67, and the text of the Divine Liturgy – attributed to Chrysostom – which is still in use in Eastern Christian worship.
44 Catech. 6.32.6–7.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

apology to the bread is a testimony known to us only by anti-manichaean writers, at least for the moment[45]. For this reason, one may not take Cyril's allegation at face value, as in the context of his pastoral concern he might have circulated such a text in order to ridicule the mysteries of his religious opponent.

However, in order to draw some conclusions, it would suffice to say that Cyril's disciples could probably stay during the first phase of the Manichaean ritual: the teachings and the offerings. So what they saw was definitely confusing because it was something very similar to what they knew from the Christian churches. Therefore, it was not only the names which were common (Κυριακόν, Ἐκκλησία) and the buildings which were similar, but the structure of the rites was also identical; and this was the problem. Because while the content, i. e., the theology of worship of the Manichaean and the Christian holy meal, differed radically[46], the similarity in form, structure, and terminology made this difference indiscernible for catechumens and naive Christians.

Strategius the *comes* reports to Constantine the Emperor

Let us now return to Strategius' investigation. After what was exposed above, what could Strategius possibly have reported to Constantine, concerning the Manichaeans of Jerusalem and other cities of Palestine or eastern provinces, where Manichaean propaganda might have been more intensive?

It has been argued that the fact that, after Strategius' report, Constantine did not take any measures (i. e. did not issue an edict) against Manichaeans, probably meant that he did not regard the Manichaean threat as serious enough to disrupt the religious peace he had attempted to establish with the edict of Milan[47].

This, in my opinion, is one possible interpretation. Before providing a different interpretation, it should be borne in mind that, as stated previously, Constantine did renounce the policy of religious tolerance, as he issued a decree against heretics[48] similar to Manichaeans, which in my opinion is an act directly related to the inquiry of Strategius.

According to Cyril's lectures, delivered about twenty years after Strategius' inquiry, Manichaean activities seriously threatened the Christian community in Palestine. This could not have occurred suddenly. I guess that, given the fact that Manichaeism had mission and proselytizing in its DNA, the Manichaeans

45 Rylands Greek 469: 12–42; [Hegem.] Arch.: X.6; Epiph. Adv. Haer.: 66.28.65; Cyril Cathech.: 6.32. See also Vermes 2001, p. 54, n. 69.

46 BeDuhn 2000, pp. 20–29. As BeDuhn points out, in the Christian Eucharist, holiness enters the cosmos, consecrates the material (bread) and saves the participant by his divinization. In Manichaeism, on the contrary, it is the participant (elects) who liberate and save the divine elements already present in the material food.

47 Lieu 1994, p. 102.

48 Eus. VC: 3.63–66.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

benefited from the policy of religious freedom after 313, by intensifying their mission, as other religious groups similar to Manichaeans also did. Thus, according to a second interpretation, there was a serious problem with the Manichaean activities and gatherings, which would not escape the attention of the competent Strategius.

What happened then? Why did Constantine not take any measures against Manichaeans? Some alternative hypotheses could be suggested here. Firstly, maybe he did, but Eusebius (our source for the edict) or a later copyist omitted the name of the Manichaeans. Alternatively, Constantine, for some reasons, decided not to name Manichaeans explicitly in the decree.

A re-contextualization of Strategius' inquiry

As it is meaningless to comment on the first possible interpretation, the question is: Why did Constantine avoid explicitly naming the Manichaeans in his edict? It must be underlined once more that there is something which set the Manichaeans apart from other heretics. The Manichaean issue was more complex because besides being a religious matter, it was a political matter too. At the beginning of the 4th century, Manichaeans were almost entirely identified with Persians. Constantine knew very well that, a few years previously, Diocletian had persecuted Manichaeans because he considered them to be a fifth column of the Persians in the Roman territories[49]. Constantine himself, in his relations with Persia, seemed to keep a balance and maintained peace during the years of his reign. Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, on the occasion of an epistle that Constantine addressed to Shapur II, speaks about peace negotiations between the two monarchs, which he places in the context of Constantine's vision: the universalism of Christianity and the pursuit of world peace[50].

Since the Manichaean question, apart from the religious dimension, also had a political facet, the research had to be undertaken by a man competent in both religious affairs and foreign policy. The profile of Strategius, as we know from his subsequent career, shows him to be the right person. Strategius combined the two qualities: religious correspondent and diplomat. In the years of Constantine, he was the *comes* in Antioch. As a religious correspondent, he participated in different synods of the Church, at the service of Constantine and Constantius II. Under the latter's reign, he reached the highest rank, that of *Praefectus Praetorio Orientis* of the East (354–358) and was officially responsible for the negotiations with the Persians[51]. In his new duties 'during the mid-350s … he is

49 Lieu 1992, p. 121f.; Drijvers 1996, p. 533f.
50 Eus. VC 4.8–13. Further comments on this epistle: Cameron/Hall 1999, pp. 313–315 and Barnes 1981, p. 258f.; *id.* 1985, p. 131f.
51 Jones 1971, p. 611f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

reported to have investigated Persian plans through the agency of spies (speculatores) … [and] initiated secret negotiations with a Persian official'[52].

Maybe these skills of Strategius were detected by Constantine, and therefore he chose him for the mission. It might also be the case that because the research was an issue of foreign policy, Eusebius preferred to conceal the existence of the inquiry[53].

The fact that the survey was undertaken by a high standing officer (a diplomat) is an additional argument in favour of the hypothesis that the investigation concerned the activities of the Manichaeans, both political and religious, and not merely their dogmas. If only their doctrines were under investigation, logically Constantine could have had consulted one of the trusted bishops of the Church, as he had done in the case of Arianism with Ossius of Cordova.

But this case transcended the boundaries of an intra-Christian doctrinal dispute. The issue required delicate handling. Thus, it is not unlikely that in the context of policies concerning peace negotiation with the Persians, Constantine, acting diplomatically, purposely omitted Manichaeans from his edict.

In such a decision, an additional factor might have played a decisive role. This is the Christian community in Persia. In the aforementioned letter to Sapour II, Constantine presented himself as the protector of Christianity globally, and therefore, of Christians in Persia. With a polite and diplomatic manner and above all in a friendly tone (he calls him 'my brother'), Constantine asked Shapur II to love and protect the Christians under his dominion. Speaking the language of political theology, Constantine firstly reminded Shapur II of the bad end of the persecutors of Christians, and then 'appointed' him the protector of Christians in Persia and entrusted him with their lives.

Let us put the events in a sequence. During the same period (324–337) three events, crucial to our issue, took place: Strategius' inquiry, Constantine's edict against heretics, and Constantine's epistle to Shapur II. The logical sequence is that the inquiry preceded the decree against heretics. If the epistle to Shapur II was composed at the same time as the edict against heretics (probably between 326 and 330[54]), it is reasonable to assume that, for one more reason, the omission of the Manichaeans from the decree was a deliberate and diplomatic move. How could Constantine ask Shapur II to protect Christians in Persia while at the same time be issuing an edict against Manichaeans? Regardless of Shapur's II policy towards Manichaeans, for the Church fathers and the emperors of the era Manichaeans were always suspect of being agents of Persia. In any case, Constantine had to be cautious. Apart from being a competent religious

52 Amm. Marc, 16. 9.2–3 in Lee 1993, p. 106.

53 Eusebius does not mention Strategius' inquiry into Manichaeism and this was one of the reasons that led Woods to support the view that the investigation did not concern the Manichaeans (Woods 2001, p. 260).

54 See fn. 34.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

leader, he was a capable diplomat and politician. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that Constantine, weighing the pros and cons of the specific period, rather than explicitly naming Manichaeans preferred to add at the end of his decree the diplomatic general wording '… and against all heresies', which gave him the flexibility to act accordingly.

List of Abbreviations

Amm. Marc.	Ammianus Marcellinus
Catech.	Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, *Catecheses ad illuminados* 1–18
CTh	*Codex Theodosianus*
Epiph. adv. Haer.	Epiphanius Constantensis, adversus Haereses
Eus. HE	Eusebius Caesariensis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*
Eus. VC	Eusebius Caesariensis, *Vita Constantini*
IMS	Internet Medieval Sourcebook (Fordham University)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller
[Hegem.] Arch.	[Hegemonius], *Acta Archelai*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
PLRE	*Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*
PPO	Praefectus Praetorio Orientis
Soc. HE	Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*
Soz. HE	Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*

Primary Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus: Res Gestae. Transl. by J.C. Rolfe. 3 vols. Cambridge 1935. Retrieved from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Ammian/15*.html.

Codex Theodosianus. In: *Medieval Sourcebook: The Codex Theodosianus: On Religion, 4th Century CE.* Retrieved from http://www.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/codex-theod1.asp.

Corpus Iuris Civilis ii: Codex Justinianus. Ed. by P. Kruger. Dublin 1967.

Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus: Catecheses ad illuminandos 1–18. Ed. by W.K. Reischl and J. Rupp. 2 vols. Munich 1848–1860 [Repr. Hildesheim 1967].

Epiphanius: De Haeresibus (Panarion). Ed. by K. Holl, rev. by J. Dummer. Berlin 1985 (GCS iii).

Eusebius Caesariensis: Life of Constantine. Ed. and transl. by A. Cameron and S.G. Hall. Oxford 1999 (Clarendon Ancient History Series).

Eusebius Caesariensis: Vita Constantini. Ed. by F. Winkelmann. Berlin 1975 (GCS).

Eusebius Caesariensis: Historia Ecclesiastica. Ed. by G. Bardy. Paris 1952 (Sources chrétiennes).

[Hegemonius]: Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus). Ed. by S.N.C. Lieu, transl. by M. Vermes. Turnhout 2001 (Manichaean Studies 4).

Justinus Martyr: Apologia. Ed. by E.J. Goodspeed. Göttingen 1915.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

'P. Rylands Greek 469.' In: *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library of Manchester (III).* Ed. and transl. by C.H. Roberts. Manchester 1938, pp. 38–46.

Socrates: Historia Ecclesiastica (v). Ed. by P. Maraval and P. Périchon. Paris 2006 (Sources chrétiennes 505).

Sozomenus: Historia Ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte. Ed. by J. Bidez and G.C. Hansen. Berlin 1960 (GCS 50).

The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions: A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography. Ed. by C. Pharr, T. Sherrer Davidson, M. Brown Pharr and J. Sirmond. Princeton 1952.

Bibliography

Barnes, T.D. 1981: *Constantine and Eusebius.* Cambridge, Mass/London.

— 1985: 'Constantine and the Christians of Persia.' In: JRS 75, pp. 126–136.

BeDuhn, J.D. 2000: 'Eucharist or Yasna?' In: R.E. Emmerick/W. Sundermann/P. Zieme (eds.): *Studia Manichaica. IV Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus (Berlin, 14–18 Juli 1997).* Berlin, pp. 14–36.

— 2000: *The Manichaean Body in Discipline and Ritual.* Baltimore.

Beskow, P. 1988: 'The Theodosian Laws Against Manichaeism.' In: P. Bryder (ed.): *Manichaean Studies Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism.* Lund (Lund Studies in African and Asian Religions 1), pp. 1–11.

Bury, J.B. 1958: *History of the Later Roman Empire.* New York.

Drijvers, J.W. 1996: 'Ammianus Marcellinus 15.13.1–2: Some Observations on the Career and Bilingualism of Strategius Musonianus.' In: *Classical Quarterly* 46(ii), pp. 532–537.

— 2004: *Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City.* Leiden (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 72).

Gardner, I./S.N.C. Lieu (eds.) 2004: *Manichaen Texts from the Roman Empire.* Cambridge.

Jones, A.H. 1971: *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire.* Vol. I. Ed. by J.R. Martindale and J. Morris. Cambridge.

Lee, A.D. 1993: *Information and Frontiers. Roman Foreign Relations in Late Antiquity.* Cambridge.

Lieu, S.N.C. 1992: *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. A Historical Survey.* 2nd ed. Tübingen (WissUNT Neuen Testament Series 63) [1st ed. Manchester 1985].

— 1994: *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East.* Leiden (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 118).

Sundermann, W. 2009: 'Manicheism iv. Missionary Activity and Technique.' In: *Encyclopædia Iranica.* Retrieved from http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/manicheism-iv-missionary-activity-and-technique-.

Woods, D. 2001: 'Strategious and the 'Manichaeans'.' In: *Classical Quarterly* 51/1, pp. 255–264.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

An Old Uigur Account Book for Manichaean and Buddhist Monasteries from Temple α in Qočo*

Dai Matsui, Osaka

Preface

I was a doctoral course student when I had the first chance to audit a lecture by Prof. Werner Sundermann, which was given at Ryukoku University (Kyoto) on the 29th of October, 1996. Arranged by the late Prof. Kōgi Kudara, I introduced myself to him at the gathering after his lecture. He kindly persuaded me to visit Berlin to investigate the Old Uigur documents of the Berlin Turfan collection. His encouragement pushed me forward to visit Berlin for the whole of February of the following year, and my investigations into these original documents brought me plenty of new results, which enabled me to finally accomplish my doctoral dissertation in 1999. Thus my memory of Prof. Sundermann always goes back to our first encounter, which led me to the first step to becoming an academician.

His lecture was published the following year, dealing with various aspects of the religious and doctrinal contacts between Manichaeism and Buddhism and concluded that:

> Manichaeism and Buddhism remained extremely different religions … So far as we know, such intelligent and noble discussions on an equal level … cannot be thought of in the Manichaean encounter with Buddhism.[1]

Even so, through the Old Uigur secular documents we can observe that the Manicheans and Buddhists coexisted and contacted each other in their material aspects of life, especially in the Turfan region under the rule of the West Uigur Kingdom during the ninth and tenth centuries. For example, the leading Manichaean monastery in the capital city, Qočo, was accompanied by a group of Buddhists including medical doctors or workers,[2] and the cultivated

* I would express my gratitude to Prof. Dr György Kara and Mr Leland Liu Rogers (Bloomington) for improving my English. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP26300023, JP26580131, JP26284112, and by the Asian History Research Aid (2014:6) of JFE 21st Century Foundation.

1 Sundermann 1997, especially pp. 655–656.

2 GUM, pp. 51, 117–118.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

lands possessed by the Manichaean monastery were tenanted by the Buddhist farmers.[3] Recently I published a Sogdian-Uigur bilingual fragment *U 9248, revealing that the Manichean monastery could have been an investor for caravans conducted by Buddhist merchants.[4]

In this contribution I would present another Old Uigur document *U 9271, which also concerns the socio-economic relationship between Manichaeans and Buddhists, whereby I would honour the memory of our most esteemed colleague.

*U 9271: Description

The original of *U 9271 was unfortunately lost from the Berlin Turfan collection during the Second World War. However, Prof. Reşid Rahmeti Arat, the great Turkish scholar who had worked on the Old Uigur texts in the Berlin collection during 1928–1933, had taken the photographs which he brought back to Istanbul. Here I would express my deep gratitude to Prof. Osman Fikri Sertkaya (Istanbul) for offering me permission to investigate the photographs and to publish it here.

On the photographs we find the Uigur texts on both sides of the paper. They are written in the so-called Semi-Square script, which allow us to date the texts to the West Uigur period (from the ninth to the tenth centuries).[5] We can observe that the paper consists of two sheets, whose joint runs horizontally. Thus we should regard the side with sixteen lines on the upper half above the joint as the *recto*. Afterwards the sheet was jointed with another, on whose reverse side the new text was written upside down over the joint.

In the upper right of the *verso* side we can recognize the old site number T I α, which denotes that the document was obtained by the First German Turfan expedition at the ruin of Temple α in Qočo (i.e., Idikutšahri or 高昌故城 Gaochang gucheng).

Now, since we cannot investigate the original manuscript, my edition and translation presented below remain tentative.

Recto

/r1/ tngri moẓak qutï-n[ï]ng qul[u]tï [ ]
/r2/ [ạ]vtadan ilig labï o[n] (qu)anpu biš (u)[uč-luγ]
/r3/ tupruš on quanpu on quanpu bir uu[č-luγ]
/r4/ (..)ZLYX on quanpu on quanpu (b)ir uuč-luγ
/r5/ käd änüg on quanpu o(n) (q)[uanpu] (b)ir uuč-luγ

3 GUM, pp. 105–108. Cf. Matsui 2011, pp. 154–158; 2015a, pp. 279–280.
4 Matsui 2012, pp. 121–123.
5 Moriyasu 2004, pp. 228–229. See also note /r2/ below.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

/r6/ quzluγ qutluγ bört on q [on q] (bi)r uuč-luγ
/r7/ qan qulï on q on quanpu bir [uuč]-l(u)γ
/r8/ ädgü bört on q on quanpu bir (uu)č-luγ
/r9/ qutadmïš bört altï • biš q bir uuč-luγ
/r10/ üztämiš tonga altï • biš quanpu bir uuč-luγ
/r11/ qavšurmïš altï • biš quanpu bir uuč-luγ
/r12/ inäčük altï • biš quanpu bir uuč-luγ
/r13/ vazïn biš • biš quanpu
/r14/ [ ] üč quanpu
/r15/ [ ](.) q üč q
/r16/ [ ](.)(....)
/r17/ PY(...)

Translation of recto

/r1/ Servant of His Highness of Holy Teacher, ... /r2/ The King's donation (to) the bishop (was) ten *quanpu* (in the form) [having one end]. /r3/ (Donation to) Tupruš (was) ten *quanpu* and ten *quanpu* (in the form) [having one end]. /r4/ (Donation to) (..)ZLYX (was) ten *quanpu* and ten *quanpu* (in the form) having one end. /r5/ (Donation to) Käd-Änüg (was) ten *quanpu* and ten *quanpu* (in the form) having one end. /r6/ (Donation to) Qutluγ-Bört of the North (was) ten *q[uanpu]* and ten *q[uanpu]* (in the form) having one end. /r7/ (Donation to) Qan-Qulï (was) ten *q[uanpu]* and ten *quanpu* (in the form) having one [end]. /r8/ (Donation to) Ädgü-Bört (was) ten *q[uanpu]* and ten *quanpu* (in the form) having one end. /r9/ (Donation to) Qutadmïš-Bört (was) six *(quanpu)* and five *q[uanpu]* (in the form) having one end. /r10/ (Donation to) Üztämiš-Tonga (was) six *(quanpu)* and five *quanpu* (in the form) having one end. /r11/ (Donation to) Qavšurmïš (was) six *(quanpu)* and five *quanpu* (in the form) having one end. /r12/ (Donation to) İnäčük (was) six *(quanpu)* and five *quanpu* (in the form) having one end. /r13/ (Donation to) Vazïn (was) five *(quanpu)* and five *quanpu* [in the form having one end]. /r14/ [Donation to ... was ...] three *quanpu*. /r15/ [Donation to ... was ...] *q[uanpu]* and three *q[uanpu]* [in the form having one end]. /r16–17/ ...

Verso

/v1/ [iki? šïγ tar]ïγ iki šïγ üür-tä säkiz quanpu
/v2/ [ ] (o)tr(a)-lïγ-ta iki (yụz) [q]uanpu tägdi
/v3/ šazïn ayγučï bašlap säkiz [o](n) (q)[u]vraγ-qa biš yụz [q]u(an)[p](u) yụz biš ygrmi quanpu-luq
/v4/ qarï ud birdi :
/v5/ ärän qïrqïn tört ygrmi tngr[i]-(l)[är](..) (T)[ ]
/v6/ qoyn yïl törtünč ay on yangï-qa üč yïl tusu-sï qïlïp

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

/v7/ ạvtadan bašlap ärän qïrqïn tngri-lär altï älig ärti ašanïp bizingä
/v8/ on quanpu qalmïš quvraγ-qa toquz on quanpu lab birdi •
/v9/ sučaḍi ačari bašlap toyïn quvra(γï) yụz ašanturdï biš yụz quanpu
/v10/ ilig labï iki šïγ tarïγ iki šïγ üür otra-lïγ birsär yitmädin
/v11/ adaq-tïn üür-üg üläšmiš-l[är]

Translation of verso

/v1/ [… two? *šïγ* of] wheat and two *šïγ* of millet, eight *quanpu* … /v2/ [……] two hundred *quanpu* in/from *otra-lïγ* arrived (= were given). /v3–4/ To eighty (Buddhist) monks headed by the *šazïn ayγučï*, (we) gave five hundred *quanpu* and an adult ox worth one hundred fifteen *quanpu*. /v5/ Fourteen (Manichaean) monks and nuns […] /v6/ The Sheep year, the fourth month, on the tenth (day). (We) made the benefit for three years: /v7/ The (Manichaean) Bishop and monks and nuns were fourty-six (persons in total). They ate (= we served them): /v8/ To us ten *quanpu* (was given), and to the remaining (Manichaean) community (we) gave the donation of ninety *quanpu*. /v9/ Sučaḍi-*ačari* and the Buddhist monastic community (had) one hundred (persons in total). We had (them) eat (= served them). /v9–10/ Although *otra-lïγ* gave five hundred *quanpu*, and King's donation of two *šïγ* of wheat and two *šïγ* of millet, they were not sufficient (for the monks), /v11/ and (the monks) shared the millet from the bottom (= all of the millet in the storehouse?).

Notes

/r1/ *mož̥ak*: "Teacher," the highest-ranking cleric in the Manichaean ecclesiastical hierarchy, only twelve in the world contemporaneously existed. One of the twelve *možak*s was to supervise the "Eastern patriarchate." Among the Manichaean temple ruins in Qočo, Temple K was certainly the residence of the *možak*.[6]

/r2a/ *[ạ]vtadan ilig labï o[n] (qu)anpu biš (u)[uč-luγ]*: Uig. *ạvtadan* (< Sogd. *ʾβtʾδʾn*) means "Bishop," the second highest-ranking Manichaean cleric after a *možak*. Following *ilig labï* (< *lab* < Skt. *lābha* "donation, offering") seems to be "donation from the (Uigur) king" to the Bishop; as well known, the Manichaean doctrine prohibited their clerics from engaging in any productive works,[7] so that the Manichaean bishop here could not offer but only receive a donation of *quanpu* (~ *qanpu* ~ *qunpu* < Chin. 官布 *guan-bu*) "official cotton cloth used as currency."[8]

6 GUM, pp. 87–88; Moriyasu 2003, pp. 56–59. See also Moriyasu 2013, pp. 132–133, for the bases of *možak* in the East Turkestan.
7 GUM, pp. 69.
8 Moriyasu 2004, p. 228, for *quanpu* as a marker for dating the Uigur texts to the West Uigur period; Matsui 2006, p. 35. See also Matsui 2005b, pp. 70, 78; 2006, p. 49; 2010, pp. 40–45, for *quanpu* as a term of annual tax in the West Uigur Kingdom.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

At the line end, I would restore *(u)[uč-luγ]* "having end," to interpret the context here as *biš (quanpu) (bir) uuč-luγ* "five *quanpu* in the form having one end," in comparison with lines /r3–11/; otherwise the preceding *biš* "five" should be a mistake of *bir* "one". Cf. the next note /r3–8/.

/r3–8/ In each line of /r3–8/, we find an entry of a personal name followed by *on quanpu on quanpu bir uuč-luγ*. The term *bir uuč-luγ* "having one *uuč*" should be derived from *uuč* ~ *uč* "end, tip, edge." Even though Uigur Buddhist literatures frequently attest *bir učluγ* "entirely, solely, exclusively, wholeheartedly,"[9] *bir uuč-luγ (~ učluγ)* here must be explained that the preceding *quanpu* had the form "having one end." Noteworthy is the fact that *quanpu (~ qanpu ~ qunpu)* as the means of payment is often described as *iki učï kinlig otra tamγalïγ* "having protective bands *(kin)* at two (= both) ends and the (official) seal on its center" in Uigur contracts.[10] It suggests that the *quanpu* (and *böz* "cotton cloth" in later period) usually had the form of being rolled up from both the ends, stamped with the official seal at the center, and that it could be cut into two rolls, each of which was valid as a unit of currency.[11] Consequently, I would suppose that in each entry in this text, the preceding *on quanpu* "ten *quanpu*" was in the original form (with two rolls), and the next *on quanpu* "ten *quanpu*" was in the form *bir uuč-luγ (~ učluγ)* "having one end" or a half-cut-roll of *quanpu*.

The personal names as seen in these lines /r3–8/, as well as those in /r9–12/, seem not to be Manichaean cleric,[12] but rather ordinary Uigurs. Therefore we cannot completely exclude the possibility that they were laypersons offering donations of *quanpu*. However, the amount of *quanpu* in each entry is not very different from that of the "King's donation" to the Bishop in line /r2/: we may expect that the "King's donation" could have been much more abundant than those from ordinary laypersons; and the entries on the *recto* as a whole are written down according to a single formula, to suggest that the application of the mentioned *quanpu* should be similar to the case of the Manichaean Bishop of line /r2/. Thus, I would consider that the persons in lines /r3–8/ were also Manichaean clerics, who received donations (from the King?) together with the Bishop.

/r3/ *tupruš*: seemingly a personal name.

9 BT III, p. 68; Semet 2005, p. 207; Shogaito 2008, p. 697.

10 SUK Sa01, $_4$*qočo kiṭ[in]indä yorï[r] iki učï kinlig otra yirtä* $_5$*tamγalïγ yu̱z [qan]pu* "one hundred *qanpu*, which are valid in the market of Qočo, with protective bands at two (= both) ends and the (official) seal on its centre"; SUK Sa03, $_5$*[…] kiṭini yorïr iki učï kin-*$_6$*lig otra tamγalïγ üč ming iki {P..} yu̱z 'älig qunpu* "3250 *qunpu*, valid in the market of […], with protective bands at two (= both) ends and the (official) seal on its center"; SUK Sa04, $_5$*qočo kidini yorïr iki učï kin-*$_6$*lig otura tamγalïγ üč ming biš yu̱z quanpu* "3500 *quanpu*, valid in the market of Qočo, with protective bands at two (= both) ends and the (official) seal on its center." See Moriyasu 1989, pp. 59–60.

11 Cf. Tasaki 2006, pp. 010–014; Raschmann 1995, pp. 46–47; Matsui 2015b, p. 101.

12 Cf. Sundermann 1996.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

/r4/ *(..)ZLYX*: it must be a personal name but illegible.

/r6a/ *quzluγ*: "belonging to the north; coming from the north," to describe the following person Qutluγ-Bürt.

/r6b/ *q*: abbreviation of *quanpu*, found also in lines /r7–9/ and /r15/.

/r9–12/ The entries in these three lines refer to personal names followed by *altï* and *biš quanpu bir uuč-luγ*. I would suppose that this format is parallel to those of lines /r3–8/, and that *altï* after the names means "six (*quanpu* in the original form with two rolls)." Here the amount of *quanpu* for each person is reduced nearly by half than those in lines 3–8. It might well reflect that their ecclesiastic ranks differed in the Manichaean monastery. Cf. note /r3–8/ above.

/r9/ *qutadmiš bört*: the face of letters for the second onomastic element looks like *PWY'N'* = *buyana*, though I regard it as a miswriting for a common name *PWYRT* = *bürt*. We find a person with the same name in a Buddhist colophon.[13] Even so, reading *buyana* (< Uig. *buyan* < Skt. *punya* "religious merit") may be also possible, since we find the word *buyan* or its derivation *buyančï* in Manichaean and Christian Uigur texts.[14]

/r10/ *üztämiš tonga*: the personal name *üztämiš* seems to be derived from verb *üztä-* ~ *üstä-* "to add an additional piece; to increase."[15]

/r12/ *inäčük*: we find the same personal name in SUK $Ex01_{28}$ (= U 3907) and U 5783.[16]

/r13/ The personal name at the line's top, *vazïn*, seems a borrowing from Sogd. *βz'yn* "son, offspring."[17] I would interpret following *biš biš quanpu* as "five (*quanpu* in the original form) and five *quanpu* (having one end)."

/r17/ Belonging to another text written on the jointed sheet of paper. It may be read as *bičin* "monkey (year)."

/v1/ *[iki? šïγ tar]ïγ*: supplemented in comparison with /v10/ *iki šïγ tarïγ iki šïγ üür* "two *šïγ* of wheat and two *šïγ* of millet."

/v2/ For *(o)tr(a)-ïγ* see note /v10a/ below. The face of letters of *(yu̯z)* "a hundred" here is similar to other attestations on the *verso* text.

/v3/ *šazïn ayγučï*: "Commander of the (Buddhist) doctrine" is used as the title of the highest-ranking leader in Uigur Buddhist hierarchy. For the historical importance of *šazïn ayγučï* attested here, see analysis below.

13 BT XXVI, pp. 251–252.
14 Zieme 1974, pp. 662, 666; BT V, pp. 38, 78.
15 Shogaito 2008, p. 714.
16 VOHD 13/22, p. #389.
17 Gharib 1995, p. 121.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

/v3–4/ *yu̧z biš ygrmi quanpu-luq qarï ud birdi*: since *qarï ud birdi* "(we) gave an old ox" is written in the line bottom, this entries might be inserted later than the next line.

/v5/ *ärän qïrqïn tört ygrmi tngr[i]-(l)[är]*: Uig. *tngri* "Heaven, Sky; God" means "cleric, monk, nun" here. Undoubtedly they were Manichaean cleric, since they were referred together with *a̧vtadan* in line /v7/. The notorious Manichaean charter bestowed from the West Uigur rulers (K 7709 in National Museum of China) refers to $_{62}$*ärän tngrilär qïrqïn tngrilär* "male and female clerics (= monks and nuns)" in the Manichaean temple, and its mention to $_{26}$*iki ančmn tngrilär* "clerics of two monasteries" can be a paraphrase of the "male and female monasteries."[18]

/v6a/ A blank line is left between lines /v5/ and /v6/.

/v6b/ *üč yïl tusu-sï qïlïp*: here Uig. *tusu* "benefit" seems concerning economic "profit" gained through the management of capital for "three years *(üč yïl)*." We may refer to an Uigur contract SUK Mi23, which concerns the return of a vineyard after the tenant for four years.[19]

/v8/ *quvraγ*: "gathering, assembly; monastic community." Here it should be used for Manichaean as a paraphrase for *a̧vtadan bašlap ärän qïrqïn tngri-lär* in the preceding line /v7/. Supposedly they were originally allotted with the donation *(lab)* 100 *quanpu* in total, but they consumed only ninety *quanpu* and ten *quanpu* was left.

/v9/ *sučaḍi*: a personal name derived from Toch. *sujāte* < Skt. *sujātā* "well born or produced or made, of an excellent kind of nature, fine, beautiful."[20] We find the attestations of *sučaḍi xan ~ sučaḍi bäg* (< Chin. 善生王 *shan-sheng wang*) in the Uigur version of *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-Sūtra*.[21]

/v10a/ *otra-lïγ*: derived from *otra* "middle, center" with the suffix *-lïγ*, it should mean "who/what is in the middle, midst, center". From the contexts of line /v2/, *(o)tr(a)-lïγ-ta iki (yu̧z) [q]uanpu tägdi* "200 *quanpu* in/from *otra-lïγ* arrived (= were given)" and here, *otra-lïγ* should apparently concern any person(s), institute or facilities in charge of payment, receipt and stock of *quanpu* and grain to the Buddhist monastery, though it is most difficult to know what it really means. As shown in the analysis below, the verso text should belong to a period when the Manichaeism had declined but coexisted with the Buddhism:

18 Zieme 1975, p. 332; BT V, p. 30; UW, II, p. 135; GUM, pp. 47, 63, 65; Yoshida *apud* TXM, p. 42.

19 See Matsui 2005a, pp. 28, 30–31, 35, for the improved understanding of the function of SUK Mi23.

20 Monier-Williams 1899, p. 1223; Adams 2013, II, p. 760.

21 Zieme 1991, p. 285; Kaya 1994, p. 669; BT XXVI, p. 103.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

can we consider *otra-lïγ* as "storehouse between (= shared by) the Manichaeans and Buddhists"?

/v10b/ *birsär*: this reading is tentative: the final letter is slightly different from other *-R* in /v7/ *-lär* and /v10/ *üür*.

/v10c/ *yitmädin*: derived from verb *yit-* ~ *yet-* "to catch up with what is required; to be sufficient."[22]

/v11/ *adaq-tïn*: literally "from foot, from end; from the bottom," but it should be related with *baš-tïn adaq-qa tägi* ~ *baš-ïndïn adaq-ïnga tägi*, etc. "from head to foot; from beginning to end," thus understood as "all, completely."[23]

Analysis

The *recto* text seems to be an account book of donations of *quanpu* as cash for a Manichaean monastery. From the context, it seems not /r1/ *tngri moẓak* "Holy Teacher" but /r2/ *[ạ]vtadan* "Bishop" who was the head of the Manichaeans mentioned here. Here we should note that the notorious Manichaean charter refers at once to *možak* and *ạvtadan* as the leaders of the Manichaean monastery in Qočo (K 7709$_{68, 71, 76, 93}$), while their accommodation is generally called as *uluγ manistan* "Major Temple" and *kičig manistan* "Minor Temple" (K 7709$_{80–81}$).[24] The former must be the residence of a *možak* as a chief of "Eastern patriarchate," identified as Temple K.[25] Thus, we may assume that the *ạvtadan* mentioned here (and on *verso*) should be the head (perhaps under the supervision of a *možak*) of the "Minor temple *(kičig manistan)*," which I identify with Temple α, the finding site of our text.

The fact that the *ạvtadan* received *ilig labï* "King's donation" allow us to date the text to the period when Manichaeans enjoyed the patronage of the West Uigur kingdom, i. e. before the latter half of the tenth century.

Similar to the *recto*, the *verso* text is also an account book of donations of *quanpu*, wheat *(tarïγ)* and millet *(üür)*. However, the most interesting fact is that it mentions Manichaean and Buddhist clerics at once in both of the two entries, /v1–5/ and /v6–11/: The first shows "Fourteen (Manichaean) monks and nuns" (/v5/ *ärän qïrqïn tört ygrmi tngr[i]-(l)[är]*) and "eighty (Buddhist) monks headed by the *šazïn ayγučï*" (/v3/ *šazïn ayγučï bašlap säkiz [o](n) (q)[u]vraγ*), and the second, "the (Manichaean) Bishop and monks and nuns" (/v7/ *ạvtadan bašlap ärän qïrqïn tngri-lär*) and "Sučaḍi-*ačari* and the Buddhist monastic community" (/v9/ *sučaḍi ačari bašlap toyïn quvra(γi*). In other words, the scribe

22 ED, p. 884.
23 ED, p. 45; UW, I, pp. 45–46.
24 GUM, pp. 48–49.
25 GUM, pp. 155–156.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of the *verso* was in charge of the donation or financial support for both of the Manichaean and Buddhist monasteries.

The second entry (v6–11) describes the Manichaean clerics as headed not by a Teacher *(možak)* but by a Bishop (/v7/ *ạvtadan*). It suggests that the Manichaeans, just similar to those on the *recto*, belonged to Temple α. Since we find *otra-lïγ* (v2, v10), a term seemingly concerning any kind of storehouse (see note /v10a/) in the both entries, the first entry (v1–5) also should be the financial record of the same temple, i. e. Temple α. Probably the two entries were record with a certain interval,[26] as suggested especially by the difference of the number of Buddhists, eighty (v3) and one hundred (v9).

Thus we can date the *verso* text to the period when the Manichaeans and Buddhists coexisted at Temple α. In my opinion, the period should be after the early eleventh century. My grounds are as follows:

- At the turn of the tenth and eleventh century the Manichaean Temple α experienced violent changes: in 983 CE, it was still functioning as a Manichaean temple (called *taš manistan* "Outer Temple"), but under the severe persecution by the Uigur rulers who had converted into Buddhism. After a couple of decades, in 1008 it was finally turned into a new Buddhist temple.[27] The presence of over one hundred Buddhist monks at Temple α could not have been possible before such decline of Uigur Manichaeism.
- In the *verso* text, the leader of the Buddhist community has the title *šazïn ayγučï* "Commander of the (Buddhist) doctrine" (v3). According to T. Moriyasu, *šazïn ayγučï* as the highest-ranking leader in the Uigur Buddhist hierarchy did not appear until the early eleventh century.[28]
- The text shows the numbers of the Manichaeans, fourteen (v5) and forty-six (v7), considerably less than those of the Buddhists, eighty (v3) and one hundred (v9).
- The second entry (v6–11) shows that the one hundred Buddhist clerics are provided with five hundred *quanpu* as a donation, while the forty-six Manichaeans with only ninety or one hundred *quanpu* (see note /v8/), and the donations per person for the Buddhist (5 *quanpu*) is nearly the double of that for the Manichaeans (ca. 2.17–1.96 *quanpu*).
- If I understand lines /v9–10/ correctly, the Buddhists could obtain extra provision of millet *(üür)* from what was originally intended, which were not sufficient for the monastery.
- The donation to the Buddhists called "King's donation" (/v10/ *ilig labï*), which had been used for those for the Manichaeans in *recto* (r2) but not for the Manichaeans in *verso*.

26 *U 9248 may well be an similar example of the account book used for a considerably long period. See Matsui 2012, pp. 116, 121–123.

27 Sundermann 1984, p. 291; GUM, pp. 174–183; Moriyasu 2003, pp. 86–89, 90.

28 Moriyasu 2008, pp. 204–210.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Everything said above also suggests that the *verso* text was recorded during the period when Manichaeism had been declining and losing favor and support in the West Uigur Kingdom, while Buddhism became the prevailing religion in Uigur society. At the same time, however, we can point out that the Manichaeans were still allowed, at least, to be financially supported by the same fund together with Buddhists, and presumably to dwell contemporaneously in Temple *α* under the superiority of the Buddhists.[29] It might support the speculation that in the early eleventh century some Uigur kings were still promoters of Manichaeism.[30] Anyway, our text provides a historical moment of the religious transition of the Uigurs from Manichaeism to Buddhism.

We still have many problems in the understanding of the texts edited here. We need further materials and attestations to solve them and to enrich our knowledge on what was happening when the "Manichaeans meet Buddhists" in such a transition period.

Abbreviations & Bibliography

Adams, D.Q. 2013: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. 2 vols. Amsterdam/New York.

BT III = S. Tezcan: *Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra.* Berlin 1974 (Berliner Turfantexte 3).

BT V = P. Zieme: *Manichäisch-Türkische Texte.* Berlin 1975(Berliner Turfantexte 5).

BT XXVI = Y. Kasai: *Die uigurischen buddhistischen Kolophone.* Turnhout 2008 (Berliner Turfantexte 26).

Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian-English Dictionary*. Tehran.

ED = G. Clauson: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford 1972.

GUM = T. Moriyasu: *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße.* Transl. by Ch. Steineck. Wiesbaden 2004 (Studies in Oriental Religions 50).

Kaya, C. 1994: *Uygurca Altun Yaruk*. Ankara (Türk Dili Kurumu Yayınları 607).

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1990: "The Donor at Turfan." In: *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 1, pp. 177–201.

Matsui, D. 2005a: "Four Remarks on the Uigur Contract Documents." In: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 20, pp. 27–64.

— 2005b: "Taxation Systems as Seen in the Uigur and Mongol Documents from Turfan: An Overview." In: *Transactions of the International Conference of Eastern Studies* 50, pp. 67–82.

— 2006: "Six Uigur Contracts from the West Uigur Period (10th–12th Centuries)." In: *Jinbun shakai ronsō* 15, pp. 35–60.

— 2010: "Three Uigur Administrative Orders for Delivery of the 10th–12th Centuries." In: *Jinbun shakai ronsō* 24, pp. 25–53.

29 Such situation could have been resulted in a violent conflict such as speculated by GUM, p. 182.

30 Klimkeit 1990, p. 190; cf. Zieme 1992, p. 327; Sundermann 1992, p. 70.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2011: "*Ning-rong* and Bezeklik in Old Uighur Texts." In: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 26, pp. 141–175.
— 2012: "A Sogdian-Uigur Bilingual Fragment from the Arat Collection." In: *The History behind the Languages: Essays of Turfan Forum on Old Languages of the Silk Road*. Ed. by Academia Turfanica. Shanghai, pp. 115–127.
— 2015a: "Old Uigur Toponyms of the Turfan Oases." In: E. Ragagnin/J. Wilkens (eds.): *Kutadgu Nom Bitig: Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 87), pp. 275–304.
— 2015b: "Eski Uygur hukuk belgelerinde geçen *borun* ve *borunluq* üzerine." In: A. Mirsultan/M. Tursun-Aydin/E. Aydin (eds.): *Eski Türkçeden Çağdaş Uygurcaya: Mirsultan Osman'ın doğumunun 85. yılına armağan*. Konya, pp. 89–106.
Monier-Williams, M. 1899: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford.
Moriyasu, T. 1989: "Notes on Uighur Documents (I)." In: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 4, pp. 51–76.
— 2003: "History of Manichaeism among the Uighurs from the 8th to the 11th Centuries in Central Asia." In: T. Moriyasu (ed.): *World History Reconsidered through the Silk Road*. Toyonaka, pp. 23–111, 15 pls.
— 2004: "From Silk, Cotton and Copper Coin to Silver." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* (eds.): *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Berlin (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17), pp. 228–239.
— 2008: "Chronology of West Uighur Buddhism: Re-examination of the Dating of the Wall-paintings in the Grünwedel Cave No. 8 (New: No. 18), Bezeklik." In: P. Zieme (ed.): *Aspects of Research into Central Asian Buddhism. In Memoriam Kogi Kudara*. Turnhout (Silk Road Studies 16), pp. 191–227.
— 2013: "New Developments in the History of East Uighur Manichaeism." In: *Tôhôgaku* 126, pp. 142–124.
Raschmann, S.-Ch. 1995: *Baumwolle im türkischen Zentralasien. Philologische und wirtschaftshistorische Untersuchungen anhand der vorislamischen uigurischen Texte*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 44).
Semet, A. 2005: *Lexikalische Untersuchungen zur uigurischen Xuanzang-Biographie*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 34.8).
Shogaito, M. 2008: *Uighur Abhidharma Texts. A Philological Study*. Kyoto.
SUK = N. Yamada: *Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte*. 3 vols. Ed. by J. Oda *et al.* Suita 1993.
Sundermann, W. 1984: "Probleme der Interpretation manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe." In: J. Harmatta (ed.): *From Hecataeus to al-Ḫuwārizmī*. Budapest, pp. 289–316.
— 1992: "Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts Concerning the Turfan Region." In: A. Cadonna (ed.): *Turfan and Tun-huang: the Texts. Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route*. Firenze, pp. 63–84.
— 1996: "Iranische Personennamen der Manichäer." In: *Die Sprache* 36/2 (1994), pp. 244–270.
— 1997: "Manichaeism Meets Buddhism: The Problem of Buddhist Influence on Manichaeism." In: P. Kieffer-Pülz/J.-U. Hartmann (eds.): *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Odendorf (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp. 647–656.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tasaki, Ch. 2006: "On the Term *baγ* Found in Old Uighur Documents." In: *Tōyō gakuhō* 88/3, pp. 01–026.

TXM = *Studies in the new Manichaean texts recovered from Turfan*. Ed. by Turfan Antiquarian Bureau. Beijing 2000.

UW = K. Röhrborn: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch*. 6 vols. Wiesbaden 1977–1998.

VOHD 13/22 = S.-Ch. Raschmann: *Alttürkische Handschriften*. Teil 14: *Dokumente*. Teil 2. Stuttgart 2009 (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 22).

Zieme, P. 1974: "Zu den nestorianisch-türkischen Turfantexten." In: G. Hazai/P. Zieme (eds.): *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker*. Berlin, pp. 661–668, 4 pls.

— 1975: "Ein uigurischer Text über die Wirtschaft manichäischer Klöster im uigurischen Reich." In: L. Ligeti (ed.): *Researches in Altaic Languages*. Budapest, pp. 331–339.

— 1991: *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhunag*. Budapest (Bibliotheka Orientalis Hungarica 33).

— 1992: "Manichäische Kolophone und Könige." In: G. Wiessner/H.-J. Klimkeit (eds.): *Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 6.–10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 23), pp. 319–327.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tumschukische Miszellen III*

3. Tumshukese Dental Affricates**

Dieter Maue, Cölbe / Hirotoshi Ogihara, Kyoto

In August 2013, when the authors discussed new Tumshukese documents which had become known from China only recently,[1] it appeared that both of us had very close views on the topic. So we decided to write the present joint article which we dedicate to the memory of Werner Sundermann who, though not working himself in the Tumshukese field, was vividly interested in the least attested member of the medieval East Iranian language family.

The traditional doctrine (§ 1) is no longer sufficient. A new sign for *dz* has to be determined (§ 2). The candidates are examined (§ 3). The relevant material is presented (§ 4). Finally symbols and references are compiled.

§ 1

When Sten Konow definitively recognized[2] Tumshukese as an East Iranian language closely related to Khotanese he had no doubt that dental affricates, both voiced and unvoiced, belonged to the phoneme inventory.

> Für *tc* und *js* [des Khotanischen] habe ich, Saka Studies[3] S. 11, nachzuweisen versucht, daß sie *ts* bzw. *dz* bezeichnen … Was tc … betrifft, scheint unsere Sprache [i.e. das Tumschukische] dies … zu bestätigen, denn wir finden *tsahari* "vier" … Es liegt dann nahe in dem vorletzten Fremdzeichen *dz* zu suchen, für welchen

* The first two articles are: D. Maue: "Tumschukische Miszellen I: Beobachtungen zur Metrik," in: *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, ed. by M. Macuch, M. Maggi and W. Sundermann, Wiesbaden 2007 (Iranica 13), pp. 225–238; and D. Maue: "Tumschukische Miszellen [2.] The Haṃsasvara puzzle," in: *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture, Vienna, June 25–29th, 2013*, ed. by M. Malzahn *et al.*, Bremen 2015, pp. 117–126.

** We are thankful for the opportunity to discuss the paper with Prof. Mauro Maggi and Doug Hitch, who was also so kind as to polish the English.

1 Tx **1–4**, see Abbreviations below.

2 As was already guessed by F. W. K. Müller, see Konow 1935, p. 772.

3 I.e. *Saka Studies* by S. Konow, Oslo 1932.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Laut wir sonst keine Entsprechung haben würden. Und Worte wie *dzaḍi*, Kh. *jsāti* "geht"; *dzanande*, Kh. *jsanīnda* "sie schlagen"; *dzara-*, Kh. *jsāra-* "Korn" machen diese Vermutung zur Gewißheit.[4] [In Saka Studies, p. 11, I tried to show that Khotanese *tc* and *js* stand for *ts* and *dz* respectively. Our language [i. e. the Tumshukese] seems to confirm *tc* as we meet with *tsahari* "four". It suggests itself to look for *dz* in the last but one Fremdzeichen (foreign signs) as this sound would otherwise not be represented. And words such as *dzaḍi*, Kh. *jsāti* "goes"; *dzanande*, Kh. *jsanīnda* "they beat"; *dzara-*, Kh. *jsāra-* "grain" make this guess a certainty.]

Shortly after Konow's pilot study the Karmavācanā text of the Pelliot Collection was published, again by Konow.[5] One of its peculiarities is that no Fremdzeichen was used except one.[6] Accordingly there was only one grapheme for the affricates, <ts>, no matter whether the Khotanese etymological cognates pointed to /ts/[7] or /dz/[8]. As the Kv manuscript does not differentiate between voiced and voiceless consonants at all, it is reasonable and commonly accepted that the deficiency is a matter of the writing system and not of the underlying language.

§2

Maue proposed that sign no. 11, which had been transcribed *dz* since Konow, is in fact a representative of /w/.[9] If that identification is correct, and assuming that /d^{z}/ was an element of the Tumshukese phonemic system, then which of the undetermined Fremdzeichen represents it?

No. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

© Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

Fig. 1: List of Fremdzeichen (detail from DTA TS 5)

4 Konow 1935, p. 780.
5 Konow 1941–1942. The text was repeatedly studied before Emmerick's re-edition (1985) which entailed two highly important reviews, Skjærvø 1987 and Schmidt 1988.
6 I. e. no. 5, first noticed by Hitch 1985, K:x; clearly stated by Schmidt 1986, p. 143 (only implicitly adopted into Schmidt 1988, p. 312); first made public by Skjærvø 1987, p. 84.
7 In *tsāri* "to be done" / Kh. *tcera-*; *tsāta-* "property" / Kh. *tsāta* "rich" (since Bailey 1950, p. 666, but problematic because of the incompatible initials).
8 In *tsäṇakai* "tiny" / Kh. *jsei'ṇa-*; *tsatänayyā* "killing" / Kh. *jsan-* "to strike, to kill"; *tsenā-* "life" / Kh. *jsīnā-*; *tsi* "from" / Kh. *jsa*, and possibly *paṃtsi* "five" / Kh. *paṃjsa*.
9 Maue 1996, p. 215ff.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

No.	Description	Transliteration symbol
1	voiced dental sibilant	z
2	voiced guttural *fricative*	g_1
3	voiced guttural[10]	g_2
4	voiced retroflex sibilant	ẓ
5*	not yet determined	x_5
6*	not yet determined	x_6
7	voiced dental *fricative*	d_1
8*	not yet determined	x_8
9*	not yet determined	x_9
10	voiced palatal sibilant	ź
11	bilabial semivowel	v_1
12	*guttural fricative with non-dental sibilant*	χš

Fig. 2: Presumable phonic[11] values of Fremdzeichen[12] with transliteration symbols

Fig. 1 is assumed to be a list of Tumshukese Fremdzeichen, their current interpretation is in Fig. 2.

In Fig. 2 our candidates for /d^z/ are marked by an asterisk (*). Of these four x_9 can be discarded at once. Its status is unclear. One is not able to describe certain features of x_9 which distinguish it from x_7. In addition, there are no occurrences of the sign(s) where a value different from voiced dental would be required. For the time being they must be reckoned variants of the same sign.

The next sign to be removed from the list of candidates is x_5. It was shown by Schmidt[13] that Kv 20 *pyex$_5$u* means "listen!"[14] and corresponds to Kh. *pyūṣ-*[15] "to hear", going back to **pati-gauša-*.[16] Skjærvø[17] corroborated through more samples[18] that x_5 represents the outcome of an old intervocalic non-dental sibilant. Whatever its phonetic realisation in Tumshukese may have been, it can be taken as certain that it was not an affricate.

10 The feature which distinguishes g_1 from g_2 is unclear.
11 I.e. phonetic or phonemic.
12 Uncertain features in *italics.*
13 Schmidt 1986, p. 143.
14 As equivalent of Skt. *śṛṇu*, TochB *päklyauṣ*.
15 DictKS 252a s.v. *pyūv′*. Hitch (forthcoming).
16 SGS 87.
17 Skjærvø 1987, p. 84.
18 *Ibid.*: Tq. *ux$_5$ye* "memory(?)" – Kh. *ūī′* "senses", Tq. *gax$_5$a* "assembly"(?) – Kh. *gäṣā-* "assembly", Tq. *hvax$_5$e* "man" – Kh. *hve′* "man".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

For x_6 Konow's proposal, *ẓ*,[19] was mostly[20] accepted, but can no longer be upheld since it is clear that *ẓ* was represented through x_4.[21] So principally x_6 would be free for *dz*. It is well attested both in literary texts and documents. Two words with perspicuous meaning are *gix$_6$ye (sālye)* "of the sheep (year)"[22] and *tsvix$_6$ānañye (māste)* "of the (month) Ts."[23] Both are etymologically unclear or at least dubious[24] if read in the old way. The situation does not change if we hypothetically read *ʾgidzye* and *ʾtsvidzānañye*.

§ 3

Thus x_8 should be *dz* unless it was a variant of x_4 as was suggested by Hitch.[25] If he was right, our search for *dz* would be stopped immediately and unsuccessfully. But Hitch's thesis was questioned by Skjærvø[26] who argued that "the akṣaras are quite distinctive"[27] as may be seen from the sign table (Fig. 1) and even more obviously from Figs. 3 and 4. And what is more substantial, "it would be necessary to show that the signs are actually interchangeable in the same

19 Konow 1935, p. 779.

20 Only Hitch (1981, p. 69) and later, following the method of comparative character morphology, linked x_6 up with the similar grapheme <k^h> and transcribed it through *kh*.

21 Maue 2004, p. 209.

22 TS **4** 1; the first akṣara was read *śi* by Konow 1935, p. 808 with note: "Der Querstrich in *śi* ist sehr undeutlich [the bar in *śi* is very unclear]". This reading, which induced him to connect the word with TochB *śaiyye* "ovicaprid (i. e. ‚sheep/goat', perhaps any smaller herd animal", DTB^2 695), was annihilated, however, by several occurrences in TS **10** and **11**, where <g> is undebatable; correctly read by Bailey (1968, p. 44 f.) but wrongly understood as "bell", it was appropriately read and interpreted by Hitch (1981, p. 4.iv), who – with reference to Konow's note – could see "absolutely no cross-stroke [in TS **4** 1]. The photograph is clear and the manuscript not faded at this point." Worthless as Konow's reading is his etymology.

23 TS **2** 2; **3** 1, with different spelling *tsiwix$_6$ānane* in Tx **2a** 2.

24 As to "sheep" see n. 22. Concerning *tsvix$_6$ānañye* Henning (1936, p. 12) remarked: "In der Tat kann man den *Tsviẓānana* bei gutem Willen dem 6. soghdischen Monat *χəzānān* gleichsetzen, wobei freilich das lautliche Verhältnis noch unklar ist. [By some stretch of the imagination one can, in fact, identify *Tsviẓānana* with *χəzānān*, name of the 6th month in Sogdian, though the phonetic relation is not yet clarified.]"

25 Hitch 1981, pp. 62 and 66. Konow would certainly have agreed if he had realized that there stood *pux$_8$o* in TS **8** b 1 (correctly seen by Skjærvø 1987, p. 90) which he transcribed as if it were *pux$_4$o* (1935, p. 813); he asserted that x_8 was absent from his material (*ibid.*, p. 776). – Hitch (personal communication, 5th February 2014) now agrees "that they [x_4 and x_8] are distinctive and would transliterate x_8 *ḡḫa* as the shape is identical with usual *g^{b}a* with a tail. The central vertical line is drawn with two strokes, that is, *gha* is written, then a tail is attached. This is not at all apparent from Fig. 1, but is from the other instances. But Tq already has graphs for /g/ and /γ/ so x_8 is unlikely a voiced velar consonant." We do not follow Hitch's graphematic transliteration because it would unnecessarily suggest a wrong interpretation.

26 Skjærvø 1987, p. 79 f.

27 *Ibid.*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fig. 3: x_4a
(DTA TS 21c b 2)

© Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

Fig. 4 : x_8o
(DTA TS 21c b 1)

Tum(shuqese) word. I have not yet noticed any such cases."[28] Indeed, no such cases exist even after the available Tq. material has increased considerably. In contrast to x_4, x_8 occurs as word initial and never in consonant clusters before *d*, the main domain of x_4. In addition, both signs occur jointly in not a few manuscripts. All that leads to the conclusion that x_8 stands for a sound which is different from *ẓ* (*ʒ*) represented by x_4, namely for *dz*.
The lexical comparison of the Kv and non-Kv texts is negative. None of the Kv words with <ts> → /dz/[29] is met with elsewhere. This may be coincidential in view of the small number of items.

More surprising is the fact that the often used Kv postposition after I-A , *tsi (= dzi)* "from", equivalent of Kh. *jsa* "from, with", has no counterpart at all in the other manuscripts. All Kv instances are of the same type. I-A with *tsi, /dzi/* is used as *casus separativus* to express the offences **from which** an Upāsaka is bound to refrain. Lack of the construction elsewhere points to that (1) the postposition is restricted to the meaning "from" in Tq. and (2) no separative is attested in Tq. outside the Kv. The latter conclusion, strange as it may be, is not refutable from the material. Therefore we have no sufficient reason to believe that Kv displays a syntactic peculiarity which is principally absent from the other Tq. texts.

Outside the Kv we find *adzo* followed by I-A in the meaning of "together with". The asymmetry is caused by the fact that no *casus sociativus* is required in the Kv. We cite two instances from Konow (using the actual transcription of the Fremdzeichen and replacing Konow's *ź* by *dz*): TS **1** 6 *adzo padāñyo*[30] and TS **4** 2–3 *ceg$_1$utki adzo nāre smaśire taro hvañid$_1$i*.[31] Konow translated "samt den Fässern [together with the barrels]" and "C. spricht nun so, zusammen mit der Frau S. [thus speaks C. together with the woman S. resp.]", suggesting in the

28 Skjærvø 1987, p. 80.
29 Listed above in n. 8.
30 Konow 1935, p. 803.
31 *Ibid.*, p. 808.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

glossary (s. v. *aźo*) that *adzo* means "vielleicht 'mit, zu' [probably 'with, to']". The sociative function is inforced sometimes by postpositive *hmalo*[32], *hamalo*[33] (Kh. *hamāla-*) "together".[34] Tq. *adzo* is reminiscent of the Kh. prepositive *haṃtsa* "together"[35] in both form and function. But the words cannot be formally related.[36] Leumann thought Kh. *haṃtsa* was from ***sam-čyā*[37], while Tq. *adzo* can be easily connected with OIran. **hačā* through EIran.[38] **hatsā* with later voicing of intervocalic *ts* > *dz*. The loss of initial *h-* is not uncommon,[39] whereas final *-o* is unexplained so far.[40] One might see a semantic problem in Tq. *adzo* "together with" vs. OPers. and Av. *hačā* "from". If "from" was the Grundbedeutung [original basic meaning], it must have been eroded in the course of linguistic history, probably under the influence of the merging of instrumental and ablative into I-A, in a way that *adzo … (hamalo)* and MPers. *az … hammis* "together with"[41] could be coined.[42]

Another word with *dz* and a definable meaning is *dzārsu*.[43] Appearing in the section of a contract where punishment is determined for breach of contract, it gives the number of sticks,[44] certainly "forty", which perfectly fills the gap between *drisu* "thirty"[45] and *patsasu* "fifty".[46] The voiced initial needs explanation. One could perhaps think of influence from *drisu* whose voiced *dr-* is regularly developed from **tr-*.[47]

32 Tx **1a** 9, 10: *adzo puryo dud$_1$aryo hmalo* "together with sons and daughters".
33 Tx **2a** 8: *adzo zād$_1$yo azad$_1$yo puryo dud$_1$aryo hamalo* "together with born and unborn sons and daughters".
34 As free adverb it appears in TS **3** 2 and **4** 10.
35 DictKS 452a.
36 The only possibility to reconcile Tq. *ax$_8$o* with Kh. *haṃtsa* would be to assume that *x$_8$* represented the counterpart of Kh. <ts>, /tˢ'/, entailing, however, more problems than *x$_8$* → /dᶻ/. First, the initial of *x$_8$ārsu* "40" would be difficult to explain. Next, nasal before affricate is written in Tq., though inconsistently, *patsi*, *paṃtsi* "five"; well attested *ax$_8$o* never has *ṃ*, an etymon without a nasal would be preferable. Third, it would have been superfluous to create or introduce a new sign while <c^h> was already established in this function. Finally, if *x$_8$* was claimed for a doublet of <c^h> there would be no sign left for the voiced dental affricate /dᶻ/.
37 Leumann 1933–1936, p. 518a; more precisely Bailey (DictKS 452a): "from *ham-* 'together' with inst. sing. *-čyā*".
38 Exempted from the depalatalisation is Sogdian.
39 Konow 1949, p. 18: "an initial *h* is occasionally dropped" in Kh.; the same is true for Tq.
40 Synchronically *-o* seems to be used as an adverb marker, cp. *h(a)malo* "together" and *surwedzo* "forcibly(?)".
41 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, pp. 21b; 179b.
42 In spite of the OPers. and Av. evidence Nyberg (1974, p. 88) expresses the opinion that *az* (< **hačā*) originally meant "accompanying, with".
43 Tx **2a** 16.
44 On "penalty clauses" see Hitch 1988.
45 TS **11** 5.
46 TS **1** 13; **3** 7.
47 Emmerick 1989, p. 213.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A third word, *dzo*, is discussed in § 4.

Based on x_8 → /dz/ one can speculate on more etymological correspondences between Tq. and Kh, which can not be conclusively verified from the damaged or poorly understood contexts.[48] These are Tq. *dzer-* / Kh. *jsīr-* "to deceit"[49], Tq. *dzā-* / Kh. *jsā-* "to go"[50], Tq. *surwedzo* "by force, forcibly(?)"[51] / Kh. *sūrä pe′jsä* "strong (and) powerful"[52].

§ 4

adzo "together with"

1. TS **1** 6–7: *adzo padāñyo* "together with the vessels(?)"
2. TS **4** 2–3: *Ceg$_1$utki adzo nāre Smaśire taro hvañid$_1$i.* "Ceg$_1$utka together with (his) wife Smaśire says thus."
3. Tx **1a** 2–4: *Räkutadewi adzo parid$_1$yo Lekāñyo bisvaryo*(1) "Räkutadewa, together with his … kinsmen of Leka"
   (1) Tq. *bisvara-* corresponds exactly with Kh. *bisvāra-* "kinsman", DictKS 293b
4. Tx **1a** 9: *adzo puryo dud$_1$aryo hmalo* "together with (his) sons and daughters"
5. Tx **1a** 10: *Kusācā ṣe puri Shāci adzo puryo dud$_1$aryo hmalo* "Shāca, son of Kusāca, together with (his) sons and daughters"
6. Tx **2a** 8: *adzo zād$_1$yo azad$_1$yo puryo dud$_1$aryo hamalo* "together with (his) born and unborn sons and daughters"
7. Tx **3a** 2–3: *Yaśowana adzo puräna Cuṅgana hvād$_1$arna*(1) *Batākye taro hvanandi*(2) *ṣte.* "Yaśowana, together with (his) son Cuṅga and (his) daughter(!) Batāka, say thus."
   (1) *hvād$_1$arna* is a scribal error for *dud$_1$arna* (inst. sg.) "daughter" induced by the contamination with *hvā* "sister". From **3b** 4 and 6 we know that Yaśowana is forty and Batāka eight years of age, which points clearly to "daughter".
   (2) Ungrammatical plural by *constructio ad sensum*, again in ll. 7–8.
8. Tx **3a** 7: *azu Yaśowana adzo puräna Cuṅgana* "I, Yaśowana, together with (my) son Cuṅga"
9. Tx **3a** 9: *Kusāci adzo purä*<na>(1) *Shācana* "Kusāca together with (his) son Shāca"
   (1) Scribal error, correctly written in l. 2, see no. 7.

48 See § 4.
49 DictKS 115b. Possibly borrowed into TochB *tser-eññ-* "trick, deceive, lead astray", DTB² 811.
50 DictKS 114b.
51 TS **1** 6, 8.
52 DictKS 427b. Bailey takes it as two words *sūra-* and *pe′jsa-* (DictKS 241a s.v. *päṣā′-* "force power"). The internal development -w- < -p- points to a compound (or close junction?) in Tq.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dzā- "to go(?)"

TS **18j** a2: [...] *x̣āma* | *dzād₁ä* | *koṭīśparä* [...] "... (has) gone the millionaire ..."

If understood correctly, *dzā-* would correspond with Ks. *jsā-* "to go"

dzārsu: 002a16

Tx **2a**15–16: *rordu rid₁e daṇḍu bārre dase, Kusācā bistä, χšerā bandina*(1) *ṣe dzārsu hvayi*(2). "As punishment he should give ten *bārrā*s to the king, twenty *(bārrās)* to Kusāca. As public recompense (?), he should be beaten: forty (sticks)."

(1) Hitch (1990) related *bandina-* to KharInscr *aviṃdhama-* "recompense, penalty". T. Burrow (*The language of the Kharoṣṭhi documents from Chinese Turkestan*, Cambridge 1937, p. 78) remarks that "the term *aviṃd*(*h*)*ama* includes ... also punishment, retribution in the form of beating, etc." The formal correspondence is less satisfying. For the apocopation one could compare Sogd. *βnd'm* "punishment" (Gharib 1995, no. 2646). The reverse vocalism and the second nasal *n* instead of *m* are unexplained.

(2) Gerund. m. sg. nom. of *hvay-* "to beat", Kh. *hvah-* "to strike" (SGS 156), for details see Ogihara/Ching (forthcoming).

dzer- "to deceive"

TS **18d** b4: [...] + ×*yā c*[ ] *dzeräma.*

The fragment belongs to the Haṃsasvara-Avadāna. If Ts. *dzer-* corresponds with Ks. *jsīr-* "deceive", "we betray" might belong to the scene where Haṃsasvara offered 500 gold coins to the executioners to redeem the victim. The Uigur version of the story makes clear that the executioners at first rejected the money from fear of the cruel king.[53] They could have answered something like: "If we accept the money, we shall betray the king."

dzo ≈ "however"

From TS **11** 19 *ṣo nu yi dzo a rtʰa* one can isolate the monosyllabic *dzo.* It is placed between two separable elements, *yi* (encl. pron.) and unclear *artʰa* whose initial <a> marks the word boundary though. As the whole phrase is not well understood, the semantics of *dzo* is obscure here. But it is probable that the same particle appears in a stereotypical juridical formula which is attested four times:

1. Tx **1**a 15–16: *biśa wa hale Kusāci pud₁e v₁aṣtid₁u, ṣonanu dzo zamye sima ud₁i.*
2. Tx **2a** 11–13: *biśa wa hale cesumki pud₁e v₁aṣtid₁u, Kusācā dzo zamye sima ud₁u.*
3. Tx **3a** 15–17: *biśa (wa ha)le paratʰāka pud₁e v₁aṣtandu, grinākyā dzo zame [sima] ud₁i.*
4. TS **13** 1–2: *p*[a]r[a]*tʰāka pud₁e v₁*[a]*ṣt*[andu grinākyā dzo zame si](2)*ma v₁ad₁i*

53 Cp. Wilkens 2010, p. 24.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The structure of the formula is as follows: *biśa wa hale*[54] X (nomin.) *pud$_1$e v$_1$aṣtid$_1$u/ v$_1$aṣtandu*[55], Y (gen.-dat.) *dzo zam(y)e sima ud$_1$i (= v$_1$ad$_1$i)/ud$_1$u.*[56] "In all directions/respects X has (nos. 1, 2) / have (nos. 3, 4) to remain *pude*, to Y … is (nos. 1, 3, 4) / has to be (no. 2) *zam(y)e sima*."

The difficult expressions *pude* and *zam(y)e sima* have been left untranslated. Necessary as they are for full comprehension of the formula[57] they can remain out of consideration here as we are focussing on the meaning of *dzo* (= …). The position of X is filled with *parat^{b}āka-* "seller(s)"[58] or proper names who act as sellers; Y stands for *grināka-* "buyer(s)"[59] or buyer's names. The structure of the formula makes it clear that there is something prescribed to the seller(s), whereas something different is valid for/or prescribed to the buyer(s). It seems apparent that the particle *dzo* underlines the contrast between the contracting parties and respective decrees: "however" seems to be an adequate expression for that.

With the particle *jso* Khotanese has a formally perfect counterpart. Since Leumann[60] it has been defined as an emphasizing particle. Emphasis is often explicitly or implicitly connected with the feature "contrast", just as what we took as the context-dependent semantics of *dzo*. Both particles – a further common characteristic – tend to the second position in the sentence, which is typical of sentence-related[61] enclitics.[62]

nādzād$_1$i "?"

TS **10** 12: *ano paranenu yi ṣe mare nādzād$_1$i*(1) […]

(1) Possibly a verb form, either PP or 3. Sing. Pr. If contracted from the negation *ne* and *ādzād$_1$i, ā-dzā* "to come" would be possible.

pudzo "?"

TS **8** b1: *dī*(1) *uzanvara pudzo śindäryo* […] "he saw(?) living beings …"

(1) From preceding *χšerū did$_1$änā acc^{b}i* "he went to see his country" the meaning of *dī* "he saw" seems to be clarified though its history is not (< **(a)dayat*?).

54 *hala-*, Kh. *hālai* "direction", DictKS 480a; Tq. *biśa wa hale* corresponds to Kh. *biśä hālä* "in/to all directions, on all sides".

55 Tq. *v$_1$aṣt-*, here as 3. sg. and pl. imper., corresponds to Kh. *vaṣṭ-* "to remain, be" (SGS 120–121).

56 *v$_1$a-, u-* "to be", here 3. sg. prs. *v$_1$ad$_1$i, ud$_1$i* and 3. sg. imper. *v$_1$ad$_1$u*, derived from OIran. *bū-* "to be(come)". No corresponding forms in Kh. where mainly the PPP *väta-* survived.

57 It will be discussed by Ching in Ogihara/Ching (forthcoming).

58 Nomen agentis on *-āka-* derived from the verb *parath-* "to sell", Kh. *parāth-* "id."

59 Nomen actoris from *grin-* "to buy", Kh. *ggän-* "id."

60 Leumann 1933–1936, p. 429: "eben, da"; DictKS 116b: "indeed".

61 Vs. phrase-related enclitics such as Kh. *jsa* which is never separated from the I-A.

62 This word-order rule ("Wackernagel's law") was described in detail by J. Wackernagel: "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung", in: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1892), pp. 333–436.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

surwedzo "by force, forcibly(?)"

1. TS **1** 6–7: *surwedzo ṣe Ip^{b}atki ma parrod$_{1}$u*(1). "It should not forcibly(?) fall to Ip^{h}atka's share."
   (1) The verb is once more attested in the same phrase (see no. 2). Konow translated it by "zuteilwerden [to fall to one's share]" connecting it with Av. *ar-* (2), prs. *ərənav-*[63] "to allot, apportion".
2. TS **1** 8: *surwedzo ṣe V$_{1}$ātsyā ma parrod$_{1}$u.* "It should not forcibly(?) fall to V$_{1}$ātsi's share."

Instances from fragmentary or incomprehensible contexts with unclear word separation:

dza

TS **24** a3: *mo dza ra anid$_{1}$i*
TS **29** a6: *dza mo g$_{2}$ā gorsi acc^{b}i nä pme(ñci)* […]

dzä

TS **28** b2: × *d$_{1}$vo ñi ra dzä a* × […]

dzo

TS **14** 11: […] *dzo ac^{b}ād$_{1}$o renda nā rämyād$_{1}$a*
TS **2** 6–7: *tsa yi bārre ne rordu are o hā dzo ñi tu*

Symbols

/a/	*a* as a phoneme
<a>	1. graphematic representation in the manuscript
	2. restored by emendation
(a)	*a* added by the scribe
[ ]	loss
[a]	1. phonetic value *a*
	2. lost *a* restored by conjecture
**pati-*	reconstructed form
ˀgidze	questionable form
x_8 → /dz/	x_8 representing /dz/
†aṃdzo	unattested/ghost form

General abbreviations

Av.	Avestan
EIran.	East Iranian
I-A	instrumental-ablative
Kh.	Khotanese, Khotanese Saka

63 AirWb 184.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

KharInscr	Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions
MPers.	Middle Persian
OIran.	Old Iranian
OPers.	Old Persian
PP	participle perfect (passive)
Skt.	Sanskrit, Sanskritic
TochB	Tocharian B, West Tocharian
Tq.	Tumshukese, Tumshuqese Sakan

Bibliographical abbreviations

AirWb	Chr. Bartholomae: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg 1905
DictKS	H. W. Bailey: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge 1979
DTB²	D. Q. Adams: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged.* 2 vols. Amsterdam/New York 2013 [running pagination]
DTA	Digitales Turfan Archiv [Digital Turfan Archive], online at http://www.bbaw.de/bbaw/Forschung/Forschungsprojekte/turfanforschung/de/DigitalesTurfanArchiv
Kv	Tumshukese Karmavācanā, ed. in: R. E. Emmerick: *The Tumshuqese Karmavācanā Text*. Mainz 1985
SGS	R. E Emmerick: *Saka Grammatical Studies*. London 1968
TS **1–42**	Tumshukese texts, publ. in D. Maue: *Corpus of Tumshuqese fragments: Introduction, Handlist, Transliteration.* Online edition 2009, available at http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/texte2.htm#tumshuq
Tx **1**	Tumshuqese contract, ed. in H. Ogihara/C.-J. Ching: "新出据史德语寺院契约文书及其他 [A newly found Tumshuqese monastic contract and other related findings]." In: *Xiyu Wenshi* 西域文史 *[Literature and History of the Western Regions]* 7 (2012), pp. 43–61 [in Chinese]
Tx **2–4**	Tumshuqese contracts, ed. in: Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City, Center for Research on Ancient Chinese History, Peking University, Institute for Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions, School of Chinese Classics, Renmin University of China: "新出三件據史德語契約 [Three newly found Tumshuqese sale contracts]." In: 西域歷史語言研究集刊 *Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions* 7 (2014), pp. 63–105 [in Chinese]

Bibliography

Bailey, H. W. 1950: "The Tumshuq Karmavācanā." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13/3, pp. 649–670.

— 1968: *Saka documents. Text volume.* London.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts From Central Asia And China*. Pt. 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian.* Turnhout.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Emmerick, R.E. 1989: "Khotanese and Tumšuqese." In: R. Schmitt (ed.): *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum.* Wiesbaden, pp. 204–229.

Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian-Persian-English.* Teheran.

Henning, W. 1936: "Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 90, pp. 1–18.

Hitch, D. 1981: *Central Asian Brahmi Palaeography: the Relationship among the Tocharian, Khotanese, and Old Turkic Gupta Scripts*. Master's thesis, University of Calgary.

— 1985: *Tumshuqese Transcriptions*. Wateringen [unpubl. typed manuscript].

— 1988: "Penalty clauses in Tumshuqese, Khotanese and Shanshan Prakrit." In: *Studia Iranica* 17, pp. 147–152.

— 1990: *Prakrit Administration at Tumshuq*. Paper read at the 33rd ICANAS, July 1990. Online available at http://www.ynlc.ca/ynlc/staff/hitch/hitchindex.html.

— forthcoming: "Old Khotanese verb stems in -ṣ-."

Konow, S. 1935: "Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt." In: *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* XX, pp. 770–823, 8 pls.

— 1941–1942: "Note sur une nouvelle forme aberrante du khotanais." In: *Journal Asiatique* 233, pp. 83–104.

— 1949: "Primer of Khotanese Saka. Grammatical sketch, chrestomathy, vocabulary, bibliography." In: *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 15, pp. 5–136.

Leumann, E. 1933–1936: *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus. Text und Übersetzung.* Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von M. Leumann. Leipzig.

Maue, D. 1996: "Zu den uigurischen und iranischen Brāhmī-Handschriften der Berliner Turfanfunde." In: R.E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.): *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung "Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung", veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.–12.12.1994).* Berlin, pp. 211–220.

— 2004: "Konows Zeichen Nr. 10." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* (eds.): *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road.* Berlin, pp. 208–212.

Nyberg, H.S. 1974: *A Manual of Pahlavi.* Vol. II: *Ideograms, Glossary, Abbreviations, Index, Grammatical Survey, Corrigenda to Part I*. Wiesbaden.

Ogihara, H./C.-J. Ching (forthcoming): "Some Observations from the Tumshuqese Documents Newly Published in China." Published in this volume.

Schmidt, K.T. 1986: *Fragmente eines buddhistischen Ordinationsrituals in westtocharischer Sprache. Aus der Schule der Sarvāstivādins. I. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Indizes*. Postdoctoral thesis. Saarbrücken [unpubl.].

— 1988: "Ein Beitrag des Tocharischen zur Entzifferung des Tumšuqsakischen." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15, pp. 306–314.

Skjærvø, P.O. 1987: "On the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā text." In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 19, pp. 77–90.

Wilkens, J. 2010: *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 10: Buddhistische Erzähltexte.* Stuttgart.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Динамика погребальной лексики у современных зороастрийцев Ирана

Елена К. Молчанова, Москва

Я рада, что мне довелось встретиться с одним из выдающихся исследователей-иранистов XX- начала XXI века профессором доктором Вернером Зундерманном. Это было четверть века тому назад, встреча произошла в доме другого ираниста – обаятельного профессора доктора Манфреда Лоренца в Берлине. Несмотря на мимолетность нашего знакомства, доктор В. Зундерманн произвел на меня очень приятное впечатление: культурного, сдержанного и скромного человека. Позже я активно пользовалась его трудами.[1] Я нашла подтверждение своим первым впечатлениям от д-ра В. Зундерманна: в статье «Werner Sundermann und die persische Literatur» его друг и коллега д-р М. Лоренц характеризует его как «immer freundlich, liebenswürdig, selbstlos».[2] По поводу его профессионального мастерства д-р М. Лоренц пишет: «Mit ihm verlor die Iranistik einen der besten Kenner des Mitteliranischen und vor allem des Manichäismus.»

Вскоре после кончины д-ра В. Зундерманна на церемонии, посвященной его памяти, крупнейшая иранистка профессор Бадри аз-заман Гариб (Иран) назвала его «the best Manichaeist in the world who had expertise on Sogdian and Manavi languages»[3].

Манихейские штудии д-ра В. Зундерманна имеют широкую известность среди иранистов разных стран. Приведу лишь один пример. Профессор Тегеранского университета потомственная зороастрийка доктор Кетаюн Маздапур, толкуя названия святых мест *(pir)* зороастрийцев в окрестностях г. Йезда (Иран), ссылается на парфянский материал д-ра В. Зундерманна: й. *Pir-e hrišt* (в районе Ардекана), где определение *hrišt*, возможно, связано с ман. парф. *frēštag* ‘апостол, ангел’.[4] На манихейский парфянский материал д-ра В. Зундерманна (а именно слово *zādmurd* «Geburtstod») я также

1 Именно: Sundermann 1989a–c.

2 *Spektrum IRAN: Zeitschrift für islamisch-iranische Kultur* 2 (2013), 26. Jahrgang, С. 5–9.

3 *Iran Book News Agency*, 3th November 2012 (Manavi means «Manichaean» mentioned here for «other Middle Iranian languages used for writing Manichaean texts», i. e. Middle Persian and Parthian).

4 Mazdāpūr 1995, С. 25 по Зундерманну (Sundermann).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

ссылаюсь в предлагаемой статье, посвященной некоторым ритуалам и терминологии погребения.[5]

Известно, что Иран – многонациональное государство и в нем представлены разные конфессии. Государственной религией Исламской Республики Иран является шиитский толк ислама. Известно также, что в Сасанидском Иране государственной религией был зороастризм. После завоевания Ирана арабами (VII в. н. э.) зороастрийцы подвергались гонениям, их богатые библиотеки и ценности уничтожались и разграблялись. Иранское население обращалось в ислам. Часть зороастрийцев ушла в Индию (образовав там колонию *парсов* в районе Бомбея); часть укрылась в труднодоступной пустыне Ирана (районы гг. Йезда и Кермана). Они сохраняли и сохраняют свои традиции. В XX и начале XXI вв. отношение иранских властей к зороастрийцам стало более толерантным. Но последствием этого явилось более тесное общение зороастрийцев с иранскими мусульманами (например, в рамках одного города: Йезда или Кермана) и влияние, оказываемое последними на зороастрийцев. К этому надо добавить миграцию зороастрийцев из Йезда и Кермана и окрестных деревень в другие крупные города Ирана и за рубеж, изменение населения прежде многочисленных зороастрийских деревень и их вхождение в городскую черту, смешение и нивелирование зороастрийских говоров, повсеместное двуязычие зороастрийцев (персидский язык и зороастрийский дари) и влияние глобализации на язык зороастрийцев.

Ниже приведены образцы модификации погребальной лексики в зороастрийском дари, обусловленные указанными социальными факторами.

Обстоятельное исследование самих погребальных обрядов зороастрийцев с подробной литературой см. в одноименной книге ученицы известного историка и археолога Б. А. Литвинского М. Б. Мейтарчиян.[6]

Самое главное в рассматриваемом процессе – изменение места и способа захоронения зороастрийцев: почти полностью отошли в прошлое *дахмы* (прежнее место трупоположения зороастрийцев), так называемые «башни молчания». Изображения (скорее всего, рисунки) дахмы, сделанные с близкого расстояния в конце XIX в., в том числе с лежащими на них трупами и сидящими рядом стервятниками, представлены в книге Ф. Вахмана и Г. Асатряна, издавших не опубликованные ранее материалы, собранные Д. Л. Лоримером в Йезде в 1914 году.[7]

Дахмы и сейчас можно увидеть в заброшенном состоянии, например, в г. Йезде (фото, снятое автором статьи в 2006 г., см. ниже рис. 1–3), на холме за запертым забором. По соседнему холму катались мотоциклисты.

5 Sundermann 1989b.
6 Мейтарчиян 2001 и 2011.
7 Vahman/Asatrian 2002.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Автор

© Автор

© Автор

Рис. 1–3: Башня молчания

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Покойных хоронят ныне на кладбищах *(ārāmgāh)* такого же типа, как и мусульманские, само слово *ārāmgāh* с точки зрения фонетики представляет собой персизм (в йезди основа *ārām-* «отдых, спокойный» выглядит как *vurum-*).

Наименования дахмы: й. *déma* (Iv.), *dema* (V.-A., S.) «башня молчания», *dama* (S.) «дахма (возвышенная площадка для трупоположения у зороастрийцев)», см. ср.-перс. *daxmag* ⟨dhmk'⟩ < парф. ⟨dxmg⟩, классический перс. *daxma* «id.».

Еще одно наименование дахмы: *dōdgah* (M.) «дахма». Ср.-перс. *dādgāh* «proper place, храм огня».[8] У Д. Л. Лоримера имеются пояснения к этому термину:

> K. Keshavarz maintains that **dōdgah** is another name for **dèma** (i. e. **dakhma**) in Yazd … However, as it is obvious from the context (i. e. III, 53, 55), this word, it seems, must have a different *denotatum*. First of all because no one, including close relatives of the deceased and even priests, is allowed to climb up a *dakhma* (except *nasāsālārs*) and, moreover, to eat fruits there. Probably **dōdgah** (also **dūzgah**, **dōzgah**) is a form of **ātāšdādgāh** which is the sacred fire ceremonially established in a proper place.
>
> Avesta must be read at **dōdgah** for the sake of the deceased's soul 3rd, 4th, 10th and 30th of month, then month by month to end of the first year. Then yearly as long as there are any relatives.[9]

В словаре Дж. Сорушияна лексемы к. *dādgāh*, й. *dōdga* (а также *dama)* объяснены следующим образом: «огороженная площадка в горах, куда помещают тела умерших, дахма».[10] Образец употребления лексемы й. *dōdgah* у К. Маздапур: й. *gahin tōbuti yon ge hado vō-š vrun e brɛn tō dōdgah* (M.) «*gahin* – это носилки (букв. „гроб“), на которых покойника переносят к дахме» (в персидском переводе фразы использовано слово перс. *daxme*). Как видим, толкование термина й. *dōdgah* у разных авторов различается; можно заметить также, что авторы-зороастрийцы (Дж. Сорушиян, К. Кешаварз, К. Маздапур) едины в том, что признают за этим словом значение «дахма». Можно предположить также, что в связи с введением кладбищ для захоронения зороастрийцев термин й. *dōdgah* выходит из употребления и значение его постепенно стирается.

Во время пребывания в г. Йезде я посетила расположенное недалеко от дахмы действующее зороастрийское кладбище (*ārāmgāh,* букв. «место отдыха, покоя») с обычными могилами и надгробиями, а также с проточной водой и деревьями (вопреки предписаниям «Авесты»). Мои снимки этого кладбища см. ниже (рис. 4–7).

8 MacKenzie 1971, C. 23.
9 Vahman/Asatrian 2002, C. 56, п. 19.
10 Sorūš Sorūšiyān 1956, C. 74, 81, 80.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Автор

© Автор

© Автор

© Автор

Рис. 4–7: Кладбище

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Автор

Рис. 8: Насасалар

Первое кладбище зороастрийцев было устроено в Тегеране в 1937 г., затем в Кермане (в 1939 г.) и в Йезде (в 1957 г., по другим сведениям – в 1975 г.). За этим последовало закрытие дахм в городах и деревнях в силу трудностей их сохранения. По некоторым сведениям, в 1975 г. дахму использовали лишь в оплоте зороастризма – Шарифабаде. На кладбище *(ārāmgāh)* хоронили в гробах, но стенки и дно погребальной камеры обмазывали цементным раствором, предохраняя землю от осквернения.[11]

Итак, термин й. *ārāmgāh* – кладбище в современном понимании, захоронение в землю. В случае с этим термином наблюдаем реальное изменение обряда и изменение фонетической формы слова.

Приведем еще несколько терминов из погребального круга слов (связанных с дахмой), которые либо вышли из употребления, либо стали архаизмами: й. *srōda* (по говорам: *srāza, sroza, srōza*) – центральный колодец дахмы для сброса костей покойников, свободных от плоти. См. *saruda* (Iv.) «башня молчания, склад, хранилище костей покойников». Ср. й. *astadun* (S, 7) углубление в дахме, куда ссыпали кости усопших, от *asta* (K, 11) «кость»; й. *taš-suǰna* (S.) (к. *taš-suǰ*) «человек, который возжигает огонь в помещении вблизи дахмы в течение трех ночей после того, как в дахму положили покойника».

Труп покойного зороастрийца/-ки называется й. *nesō* (K.), по говорам *nesã, neso* «труп» (ср.-перс. *nasā* «труп, падаль», ср. *nesa* (Iv.) «ritual impurities (зороастрийский ритуальный термин)». Для обозначения человека, который переносит и помещает труп покойника в дахму или могилу, используется сложение й. *nesōsōlōr* (K.), см. также й. *sōlōr* – лицо, обслуживающее похороны зороастрийцев с момента кончины до трупоположения в дахму;[12] Дж. Сорушиян добавляет к этому значение лица, охраняющего дахму (рис. 8).

Анализом института насасаларов и погребальными обрядами (в сравнительном плане: у зороастрийцев Ирана и у парсов Индии) занимается исследователь из России, сейчас он аспирант Сорбонны, Антон Зыков.[13]

11 Мейтарчиян 2001, С. 113 по М. Бойс (Boyce).
12 Vahman/Asatrian 2002, С. 53.
13 Zykov 2012 и Зыков 2012.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Автор

© Автор

© Автор

Рис. 9–11: Фигура сидящей собаки

Еще об изменении традиционных обрядов и процедур у иранских зороастрийцев. В основном, вышел из употребления важный обряд погребального ритуала – так наз. *sagdid*, что можно объяснить как «показ трупа собаке», см. «оглядывание собакой» (Мейтарчиян). Известно, что собака высоко почиталась зороастрийцами за ее преданность человеку, благожелательность, храбрость и послушание. В «Археологическом Музее Ирана» в Тегеране есть экспонат: крупная черная (бронзовая?) фигура сидящей собаки – скульптура времен Ахеменидов (снимки из музея и репродукцию картины современного иранского художника Имана Малеки с использованием этой скульптуры см. рис. 9–11).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Автор

Рис. 12: Собака

Однако в следующем за зороастризмом мусульманском культе[14] отношение к собаке стало негативным; в Тегеране и в других иранских городах почти не было видно собак – они использовались лишь как сторожевые в местах, связанных со скотоводством, т.е. в деревнях и на летовках. Я видела двух собак внутри большого зороастрийского дома в Йезде, в саду. Они были на привязи, не лаяли, я их спокойно сфотографировала (рис. 12). Могу еще добавить кстати, что на прогулочной аллее элитного дома в Тегеране я видела молодого мужчину с миниатюрной собачкой на рулетке (очевидно, распространяется новая мода).

В погребальном обряде зороастрийцев использовалось свойство собаки различать живого от мертвого. Зороастрийцы считали, что, глядя на мертвого или приближая к нему свою морду, собака поражает *nasu-* – демона нечистоты и скверны, заключенной в мертвом теле, и изгоняет злых духов.

По сведениям д-ра К. Маздапур обряд *sagdid* в обязательном порядке исполнялся в Йезде до 1950 года и, возможно, сохранился сейчас кое-где в окрестных деревнях.[15] Традиционно процедура *sagdid* проводилась у иранских зороастрийцев трижды в течение всего погребального обряда. Установлено, что она восходит к «Авесте», где имелось предписание приводить к каждому покойнику «желтую четырехглазую собаку» или «белую собаку с коричневыми ушами».[16] Благодаря своему высокому статусу, собака могла заменять самого человека в религиозных обрядах: если в ритуале требовалось участие двух человек, а одного недоставало, оставшийся мог сделать *payvand* («связь») с собакой, держа ее на веревке, и таким образом осуществить ритуал.[17]

14 Об оппозиции «собака – кошка» у зороастрийцев и у мусульман см. Мейтарчиян 2001, С. 198, сноска 105 по М. Бойс (Boyce). Зороастрийцы считали собаку принадлежащей Ормазду, а кошку – Ахриману; таким образом кошка – создание тьмы, нечистое существо; нельзя было особенно допускать ее в комнату, где лежал умерший: ее взгляд предоставлял возможность демонам войти в тело покойника.

15 Mazdāpūr 2004.

16 Мейтарчиян 2001, С. 115 со ссылками на предшествующую литературу.

17 Там же, С. 115–116.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

М. Б. Мейтарчиян приводит (со ссылками на Б. А. Литвинского и др.) сравнение с ролью собаки в грузинском фольклоре, где имя собаки означает «Я тоже человек».[18]

В случае смерти собаки иранские зороастрийцы выполняли для нее также процедуру *sagdid* и хоронили, как и человека, со священным поясом *kusti, kušti*, *košti* (ср.-перс. *kustīg*) и одеждой *sedra, sidr(a)*, *sudra*. По всей вероятности, речь идет здесь не о *sedra*, но о *sedr*, т. е. саване. В йезди имеется слово *sedr*, означающее белую стираную и несшитую ткань, в которую заворачивают тело усопшего для погребения, т. е. саван.[19] Ср. *sedr* «белый саван, стираный и старый, в который завертывают покойника».[20] Едва ли эти процедуры по отношению к собаке выполняют в настоящее время.

Ритуал *sagdid* происходил следующим образом: если предполагалось, что зороастриец умер, его переносили на железные носилки (*gahin/gehin/gɛhɛn*, см. ниже), клали ему на грудь (варианты: вокруг покойника, в ногах) три куска хлеба (варианты: четыре, один, несколько) и приводили собаку. Если собака съедала хлеб (считают, что три куска – традиционная порция собаки), это служило подтверждением смерти человека; если не съедала, умирающего переносили обратно в постель.

Выше упоминались погребальные носилки: *gehen* (S.) – металлические носилки, на которые кладут покойника и переносят его; *gahin/gehin/gɛhɛn* (M.), *gehɛn* (K.): *gahin tōbuti yon ge hado vō-š vrun e brɛn tu dōdgah* (M I, 19) «*gahin* – это носилки (букв. „гроб“), на которых покойника переносят к дахме». См. ср.-перс. *gahīg* «похоронные дроги».

Помимо й. *gahin*, в словаре В. А. Иванова зафиксирована лексема *dōdgar* (Iv.) – носилки для перенесения умершего. Эта лексема, вероятно, утрачена; она трудно поддается этимологии.

В словаре К. Кешаварза упоминается термин й. *peǰgaun* – название для людей, переносящих на плечах носилки с покойником. Их количество должно быть четным. Этимология слова неясна.

По-видимому, выходит или вышел из употребления зороастрийский термин й. *zōd-marg* – специальное помещение для трупов (во время посещения зороастрийского кладбища я не заметила там какого-либо специального помещения, и хранитель кладбища *(sōlōr)* не упоминал об этом). Вариант этого термина *zōd-o-marg*, по говорам *zãz-o-marg, zoz-o-marg, zōz-o-marg*, букв. «рождение и смерть» (K.). Это помещение из двух частей, где происходит ритуальное омовение тел умерших и проводятся религиозные церемонии перед захоронением покойников. Предположительно, в прошлом это

18 Мейтарчиян 2001, С. 199, примечание 110.
19 Kešāwarz 1992, C. 63.
20 Sorūš Sorušiyān 1956, C. 98.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

помещение использовалось как для новорожденных, так и для умерших: там происходила регистрация их имен.[21]

Д-р В. Зундерманн приводил в своем разделе о парфянском манихейское парфянское слово *zādmurd* «Geburtstod, saṃsāra» с значением «переселение душ».22 Модели двух сложений – парф. *zādmurd* и й. *zōd-marg* – различаются в плане исторической диалектологии, ср. ср.-перс. *marg* «смерть» и то же значение в среднеперсидских памятниках, испытавших парфянское влияние: *murd*.[23]

Упомянутый выше синоним й. *parseš* – согласно К. Кешаварзу, это особое место, куда помещают для сохранности тело покойного до момента похорон, а в другое время там хранят железные носилки *(tābut)*, называемые *gehɛn* или *gaun*.[24] В словаре В. А. Иванова имеется слово й. *parsiš* «прием друзей в связи с годовщиной чьей-либо смерти».[25]

В словаре К. Маздапура лексема й. *parseš* объясняется двояко: 1) в следующей фразе: *ya yōgih-y ge tōq dōra o vrun tu rah-ye dōdgah šo zvin e nōd o vestō šo xɛn, di šo parseš e vōt …* (M 1, 492) «Одно место, имеющее свод/арку, [и где] тело покойника, по дороге к дахме, опускали (букв. клали, ставили) на землю и читали Авесту, тоже называли *parseš…*»; 2) вместе с тем это же слово К. Маздапур объясняет как эквивалент совр. перс. *porseš*.[26] См. совр. перс. *porseš*: 1) «вопрос, спрашивание» и 2) (то же, что *porseš-e bimār*) редко «визит к больному, посещение больного». Таким образом, разные исследователи по-разному толкуют последний термин.

См. также й. *sart-xuna*[27] с персидским переводом *sard-xāne* (в современном персидском «холодильник, ледник; рефрижератор», а также «морг» – Словарь Хасана Анвари [Anwarī]).

Еще два термина, связанные с обмыванием покойного: й. *pōkšur* (K.) – обмыватель трупов; количество обмывателей трупов во время процедуры должно быть четным; й. *kaft o zaft* – обмывание, обертывание в саван и закапывание в землю *(dafn nemudan)* тела покойного и связанные с этим процедуры. Обмывание и завертывание в саван проводится двумя лицами *(pōkšur)*, а закапывание – двумя или четырьмя *nesōsōlōr*'ами.[28] См. также с изменением порядка компонентов сложения *zaft o kaft* «различные этапы обряда обмывания, обертывания в саван и закапывания тела покойного».[29]

21 См. также Sorūš Sorušhiyān 1956, C. 92, 30. См. ниже синоним этого слова й. *parseš*.
22 Sundermann 1989b, C. 135; аналогично Rezā'ī Bāġhbīdī 2002, C. 114.
23 MacKenzie 1971, C. 54, 57.
24 Kešāwarz 1993, C. 21.
25 Ivanow 1939, C. 28.
26 Mazdāpūr 1995, C. 491.
27 Mazdāpūr 2006, C. 202.
28 Kešāwarz 1993, C. 80.
29 Kešāwarz 1993, C. 61.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Я ограничилась в этой статье лишь некоторыми погребальными терминами, но даже и фрагментарные сведения свидетельствуют о постепенном стирании зороастрийской специфики в обрядовой стороне жизни.

Сокращения

Iv.	= Ivanow 1935–1939	й.	йезди
K.	= Kešāwarz 1993	к.	кермани
M.	= Mazdāpūr 1995, 2006	парф.	парфянский
S.	= Sorūš Sorūšiyān 1956	ср.-перс.	среднеперсидский
V.-A.	= Vahman/Asatrian 2002		

Литература

На русском языке

Мейтарчиян, М. Б. 2001: *Погребальные обряды зороастрийцев*. 2-е издание. Москва/Санкт-Петербург.

— 2011: «О роли собаки в зороастризме.» // *Древность: историческое знание и специфика источника. Материалы международной научной конференции, посвященной памяти Эдвина Арвидовича Грантовского и Дмитрия Сергеевича Раевского*. Выпуск V. Москва, С. 142–144.

Молчанова, Е. К. 2009: «Йезди, или зороастрийский дари, – бесписьменный иранский язык: динамика развития и взаимодействие с персидским языком.» // *Миноритарные языки Евразии. Проблемы языковых контактов*. Москва, С. 52–69.

— 2011: «Изменения в обрядах и терминологии у зороастрийцев Ирана под влиянием глобализации.» // *VI Международная научная конференция «Язык, культура, общество» (22–25 сентября 2011 года). Тезисы докладов*. Москва, С. 43–44.

Зыков, А. 2012: «Грифы улетели, трупы остались.» // *Смерть в Махараштре. Воображение, восприятие, воплощение*. Под ред. И. Глушковы. Москва, С. 686–702.

На западноевропейских языках

Boyce, M. 1979: *Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*. London/New York.

Ivanow, W. 1935–1939: «The Gabri Dialect Spoken by the Zoroastrians of Persia.» // *Revista degli Studi Orientali* 16 (1935), C. 31–97 (grammar); 17 (1938), C. 1–39 (texts); 18 (1939), C. 1–59 (vocabulary).

MacKenzie, D. N. 1971: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London.

Sundermann, W. 1989a: «Westmitteliranische Sprachen.» // *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Ed. by R. Schmitt. Wiesbaden, C. 106–113.

— 1989b: «Parthisch.» // *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Ed. by R. Schmitt. Wiesbaden, C. 114–137.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1989c: «Mittelpersisch.» // *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Ed. by R. Schmitt. Wiesbaden, C. 138–164.
Vahman, F./G. Asatrian 2002: *Notes on the Language and Ethnography of the Zoroastrians of Yazd*. Copenhagen.
Zykov, A. 2012: «Corpse-bearers (nasusalars) in the Zoroastrian Communities of India and Iran: Origins and Transformation.» // *Hamazor* 65/4, C. 33–37.

На персидском языке

Anwarī, Ḥ. 2004 [1383]: *Farhang-e kuček-e Soxan*. Tehrān.
Kešāwarz, K. 1993: *Farhang-e zartoštiyān-e ostān-e Yazd*. Eskilstuna.
Mazdāpūr, K. 1995: *Wāženāme-ye gūyeš-e behdīnān-e šahr-e Yazd*. Vol. I: *(Ā–P)*. Tehrān.
— 2004: «Tadāvom-e ādāb-i kohan dar rasmhā-ye mo'āṣer-e zartoštiyān dar Īrān.» // *Farhang: Quarterly Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, Issue Topic: Linguistics* 17/49–50, C. 147–179.
— 2006: *Wāženāme-ye gūyeš-e behdīnān-e šahr-e Yazd*. Vol. II: *(T–Ḫ)*. Tehrān.
Rezā'ī Bāġhbīdī Ḥ. 2002: *Dastūr-e zabān-e pārtī (pahlawī-ye aškānī) [A Grammar of Parthian (Arsakid Pahlavi)]*. Tehran.
Sorūš Sorūšiyān, Ǧ. 1956: *Farhang-e Behdīnān*. Tehrān.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

An Antiphonal Body and Soul Hymn in Manichaean Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian

Enrico Morano, Turin and Berlin

Beside the major festivities of the ecclesiastical calendar, such as the weekly Sunday and Monday holidays,[1] and the annual celebrations, such as the *Yimki* fast days, the Manichaeans had other festivals, mostly connected with the ritual meal of the Elect.[2]

In 1937 Henning published a trilingual text,[3] written in Sogdian, Middle Persian and Parthian on a page of a bifolio from the Berlin Turfan collection.[4] In it a liturgy of a festival is described, whose central point was a Body-Soul rite:

M 114/I/R/5/–/V/8/

/R/5/ {Sogd.}cywyδyy tn gy'n pδk' βwṭ 'ṭy
/R/6/ 'fṭmw cn xrwhxw'n tn gy'n wyδ(β)['γ]
/R/7/ 'kṭyy γwṭ ○ kδ' myδ kβn 'skw('ṭ) ○ 'yw
/R/8/ ''znd frm'yδ 'kṭy {Parth.}wyspwh(r) '(d)
/V/1/ cnd'(ṭy) z'dg ○○ ○○ {Sogd.}(cywyδyy) [ṭ](n) gy'n
/V/2/ p'šynd ○ qβnyy xwyck'wyy frm'yδ
/V/3/ '(k)ṭy ○ c('nw mwnw) pṭš'k pṭy'myy
/V/4/ (pr) xw'(n nyδ) [.....](ry'm pš'x')rycyk
/V/5/ 'frywn (kwn') ○○ 3 (p)'šyk mwnw xcy ○○
/V/6/ {Parth.}'(rw'n rw)šn' (kl')n g(r)yw' (rw)šn(') {MP.}dw
/V/7/ [j'r °°] {Parth.}(mry m'ny) mn 'sṭ'r (h)yrz ṭw
/V/8/ (mry m'ny) (mn' rw)'n bwj ○○ {Sogd.}m'šk

1 See Sundermann 1999, pp. 546–549.
2 See BeDuhn 2000, pp. 149–157.
3 A valid explanation of these "polylingual" texts is given by Henning 1937, p. 14: "Persisch, als die Sprache, in der Mani *auch* schrieb ist […] die heilige Kirchensprache der turkestanischen Manichäer, neben ihm steht die parthische Sprache, in der die Apostel Manis seine Religion im Osten von Iran gepredigt hatten. Die Umgangssprache der turkestanischen Manichäer, soweit sie Iraner waren, war das Soghdische; der nicht gelehrte Electus und selbstverständlich der Auditor verstand im allgemeinen nur das Soghdische; das Gros der turkestanischen Manichäer bestand aus Soghdern."
4 M 114/I/ is described, published and translated by Henning 1937, pp. 46–47. Commentary on pp. 99–100.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Translation (following Henning's German translation)[5]

Thereafter is the body-soul rite and first the body-soul sermon has to be preached by the preacher. When the day is ending, you should have a parable recited, "The Prince with the Caṇḍāti(?)[6] child". Then they should sing the body-soul hymn. Then let a short explanation[7] be given. When you finish this order of service, sit at table … recite the postprandial blessing. This consists of three hymns: "O Light Soul, Great Light Self", two times, "Lord Mani, remit my sins"; "Lord Mani, redeem my soul". The basis …

On the second page, so far unpublished,[8] which we may assume was one of the following pages in the book,[9] an incomplete Middle Persian hymn in the form of a dialogue between the Body and the Soul is preserved.

M 114/II/[10]

{beginning of page}
/R/1/ ʾw (t)[w](mʾ)nd ʿy šʾdyẖ bwd
/R/2/ hym ○○ ʾwt zʾynʾgʾn[11] pd mn
/R/3/ prystʾd hynd ○○ xwnk mn hʾn
/R/4/ rwc ʾwd zmʾn ○○ kmʾn ʾʾgnyn
/R/5/ mʾnyšn bwd ○○ ʾfryd hʾn rwc
/R/6/ kʾ ʾw mn md hy ○○ ʾwd ʾʾgnyn
/R/7/ pd yq kdg mʾnd hwm ○○ mn
/R/8/ hr(w) hnʾm pd tw dysyd hy(nd)
{end of page}

5 Henning 1937, p. 47.
6 The last two letters of the word are almost completely effaced, and the reading *cndʾ(ti)*, although possible, is not at all certain. For possible identifications of this name with Indian Buddhist persons see Henning 1937, p. 99 on d 9.
7 For what is meant here by *xwyckʾwy*, see Henning 1937, p. 99 on d 10 : "Hier scheint es sich um Erläuterungen zu handeln, die der Gemeinde nach Absingen des Hymnenzyklus 'Leib (und) Seele' über den Inhalt dieser Lieder, etwa vom Predigter oder einem gelehrten Electen, gegeben werden sollen."
8 I am very grateful to the *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften* and to the *Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preußischer Kulturbesitz* for allowing me to study and publish these texts from their collection, and to all the staff of the *Akademienvorhaben Turfanforschung* for the help and kind hospitality they always offer me in Berlin.
9 Both Henning (1937, p. 46) and Boyce (1960, p. 10) consider the two sheets a double folio, and Boyce adds: "*now* [my italic] separated into 2 sheets, glassed together". I could not find, though, any old photograph attesting that it was a bifolio. The two sheets are written by different hands.
10 Boyce 1960, p. 10. The measures of the page are 7.5 x 10.6 cm. A photograph of the two sheets is published in Weber 2000, pl. 26.
11 *zʾynʾgʾn*: lit."those who make give birth", but difficult to contextualize here. On *zʾy-* and *zʾyn-* see Henning 1933, p. 213, 11; and Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 380f.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

{beginning of page}
/V/1/ ○○ (ʾwm prwyry)šn pd tw (przʾf)t
/V/2/ (ʾbysr) hy hwzrgwn ○○ ʾwd
/V/3/ (.)[..](n)[…](.) pdyš šʾyhysṭ
/V/4/ (hym)[12] ○○ (pymw)g hy rwšn ʾwd
/V/5/ b(rʾzʾʾg) ○○ ʿy mn pd ʿyn šhr
/V/6/ (pymwxṭ hy) (○○) brʾzyšn hy ʿy mn
/V/7/ (hnʾ)[m](ʾn) (○)○ (ʾ)wd hwcyhryẖ
/V/8/ (ʿy m)[n] (bš)nʾy wzrg[13] ○○ ʾ(pwr)yd
/V/9/ hyb byẖ gyʾn ○ kw ʾ(c)
{end of page}

A Sogdian translation of some verses of the hymn, along with the Middle Persian text, is found in two bilingual fragments from the Berlin Turfan Collection: M 776[14], and M 625a[15] (Sogdian text given in italics):

M 776

{beginning of page}
/R/1/ *myδδ ʾṭy jmnw cʾʾnw*
/R/2/ *mnʾ δn ṭwʾ pryw ʾskwʾmc*
/R/3/ *wβʾ* ○○
/R/3a/ *{red}ṭmbʾry pṭškwʾn*[16]
/R/4/ mn hrw hnʾm pd tw d[ysyd]
/R/5/ hynd ○○ ʾwm prwyry(š)[n pd]
/R/6/ ṭw przʾfṭ ○○ ○○ *ṭm(b)[ʾr]*
{end of page}

{beginning of page}
/V/1/ *wʾnw pṭškwyṭ kṭ mnʾẖ*
/V/2/ *wyspw pyšyṭ ʾnδmyṭ*
/V/3/ *pr ṭwʾ γryw cwpr δyšṭyy*
/V/4/ *(x)[cy]y ʾṭy myy prwyjʾmndy*
/V/5/ *[pr ṭ]wʾ cwpr ʾspṭww*
/V/6/ *[ʾqr]ṭyy* ○○ *{red}rwʾn ṭmbʾryy ʾwcʾw*
{end of page}

12 Reading very uncertain, since the letters are almost completely effaced.
13 Lines 6 to 8, from brʾzyšn to wzrg, are published in Colditz 2000, p. 378, but the word (bš)nʾy is read (b)[.]hny.
14 Boyce 1960, p. 52. The almost entire page measures 8.7 x 9 cm.
15 Boyce 1960, p. 43, where it is erroneously ascribed to the *Gōwišn īg grīw zīndag*. The fragment measures 5.2 x 5.7 cm.
16 Headline written in the space between the third and the fourth grid-line.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

M 625a[17]

{lines missing}		{lines missing}	
/A/1/	*[.ʔ. ṭ](r)γṭy'ẖ*	/B/1/	kw 'c[mn j'yd'n jwd ny]
/A/2/	*[.ʔ.](γ)rywyyẖ*	/B/2/	bw'y ○○ [{blank}]
/A/3/	*[.ʔ. r'](mnd pnd xwʔʔ)*[18]	/B/3/	*○ kṭ qδryy[kw mn' s'r]*
/A/4/	[.ʔ.](y) t'ryg ○○ 'wd	/B/4/	*pṭy'm s'r pn(d .)[... cn]*
/A/5/	[.ʔ.]''g[19] pwr shm ○○ ○	/B/5/	*mn' ''ykwn pṭy(n)[ny wβy]*
/A/6/	*[.ʔ.rw']n w'nw frm''yṭ ○*	/B/6/	{blank}
/A/7/	*[.ʔ.](cn ')[.](ṭ. fṭ)[.....]*	/B/7/	[10](qr)[.ʔ.]
{lines missing}		{lines missing}	

Translation of the /A/ side

/1/ […] grief /2/ […] of the soul /3/ […] always near (??) /4/ […] dark. And /5/ […] full of terror. /6/ [… The Sou]l thus spoke: /7/ […] from …]

The beginning of the hymn appears to be contained in a very damaged little fragment, M 266, in which the initial verses of several Middle Persian hymns, accompanied by preceding and following red rubrics, are given:[20]

M 266/R/ii/

/1/	{blank}
/2/	{blank}
/3/	{red}nwysṭ tngy'nyq[21]
/4/	'b'c 's'ẖ
/5/	'r'm qyrbg
/6/	'w tw wynd'm by
/7/	qyrb(k)r b(w)d hy
/8/	{red}hnjfṭ[22] ṭngy'ny
/9/	{red}IIII

17 If the /B/ side is the verso and contains the end of the hymn, see below the reconstructed text, then the /A/ side, i. e. the recto, contains a part of the hymn which was before all the given reconstructed text. The manuscript may therefore have been in several columns and the pages very large, so that there is much text missing between the two sides.

18 This line is almost completely erased. Readings uncertain.

19 Restore *[.ʔ. ''w]''g pwr shm* "[voi]ce full of terror"?

20 See Boyce 1960, p. 19: "V blank. R has side m., and is written in 3 cols., lines of 3rd col. not quite complete, small tears and some letters erased, 8. 9. 8. Pers., part of index to hymn-book, 1st words of hymns, including 'body-soul' hymns and hymns to the Father of Greatness *(zarwānagānī)* grouped under headings." Although the verso is almost illegible, it is not blank at all, but it has, like in its recto, 3 columns of verses of hymns preceded and followed by red rubrics. The measures of the fragment are 5.1 x 8.6 cm.

21 This line is published by Boyce (1960, p. 19) as ii 1.

22 Spelt with *-j-* as in Parthian.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Translation

/3/ The Body-Soul (hymn) has begun. /4/ "May thou come back, /5/ blessed place, /6/ to thee we pray, God, /7/ beneficent thou hast been." /8/ The Body-Soul (hymn) is ended. /9/ 4.[23]

A slightly different[24] Parthian version of the beginning of the hymn is given in another double sheet containing opening verses of groups of hymns, M 4a:[25]

M 4a/I/R/1–7/ (Parthian)

/1/ {red}nysʾrʾd tngyʾny bʾšʾẖ
/2/ ʾrʾm qyrbg cy bwdystʾn
/3/ bwʾẖ ʾw mn ʾʾrʾm kyrbg
/4/ °° °° ʾbʾc ʾʾsʾẖ
/5/ pd mn mʾnʾʾẖ bwʾʾm
/6/ hʾmʾxwnd pd tw qyrbg ° °
/7/ {red}hnjft ṭngyʾnyg bʾšʾhʾn[26]

Translation

/1/ The Body-Soul Hymn has begun. /2/ "Holy resting place, (place) of the garden! /3/ Mayest thou be for me a holy resting place! /4–6/ Come back, remain with me! May we be of one spirit in thy holy (blessing)!" /7/ The body-soul hymns are ended.

Finally, the small fragment M 6451[27] bears a headline, running from verso to recto, *tngyʾnyy pyδʾr/(xw)ycqʾwyẖ* "Explanation on account of the Body-Soul (rite)". It contains only one line of text on each side of the sheet, Middle Persian on the recto, and Sogdian on the verso, the rest being lost. Could this be the "short explanation" *(qβnyy xwyckʾwyy)* which, according to M 114/I/V/2/, should be given after singing the Body-Soul hymn?[28] Sundermann[29], though, has questioned Henning's opinion:

23 This number, always written after the final rubrics throughout the sheet, indicates probably the tune with which the hymn should be sung, or the number of times the strophe should be repeated.

24 The two texts are similar, but not identical. If the Parthian of M 4a is not a translation of the beginning of our Persian hymn, may we assume that the Body-Soul Hymn was in fact a hymn-cycle, and that the two texts are the beginning of two different cantos?

25 Boyce 1960, p. 2. The text was re-published in Boyce 1975, p. 161, text cv 15–16.

26 It is not clear why in line /1/ bʾšʾẖ is singular and in line /7/ plural (bʾšʾhʾn).

27 Boyce 1960, p. 123. See also Morano 2007, p. 263. Its measures are 4 x 8.3 cm.

28 See Henning 1937, p. 99: "Hier scheint es sich um Erläuterungen zu handeln, die der Gemeinde nach absingen des Hymnenzyklus 'Leib (und) Seele' über den Inhalt dieser Lieder, etwa vom Prediger oder einem gelehrten Electen, gegeben werden sollen."

29 Sundermann 1997, p. 50.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In der Liturgie für den Leib-Seelen-Ritus, die uns fragmentarisch in M 114 erhalten ist, wird in der Tat "ein wenig Auslegung" *(qβnyy xwyck'wyy)* vorgeschrieben, was nicht unbedingt, wie Henning meinte, die Auslegung des zuvor gesungenen Hymnenzyklus sein muß. Gemeint sein könnte auch eine Predigt über das besondere Anliegen des Feiertages. Wenn M 6451 Teil einer solchen Predigt ist, so ist seine Zugehörigkeit zum "Sermon von der Seele" nur denkbar, wenn dieser Sermon eben eine Predigt zum Leib-Seele-Ritus war. Darauf fehlen uns aber die Hinweise.

M 6451 [T II D 406a]

/R/		/V/	
/R/H/	{red}[.?.](xw)ycq'wyẖ ❀	/V/H/	❀ tngy'nyy pyδ'r[.?.]
/R/1/	[.?.]'yg ky psfyd w: wbdyd[30]	/V/1/	nšṭfrn (p)rwrṭ ○○ ○○ m'(.)[.?.]
/R/2/	{traces}	/V/2/	{traces}
{lines missing}		{lines missing}	

Translation

Headline V/R: "Explanation on account of the Body-Soul (rite?)"
/R/1/: "[…] then who *** and *** […]"
/V/1/: "becomes unlucky […]"

What follows is a tentative reconstruction of the hymn, with its interlined Sogdian translation given in italics, if extant. I numbered the lines for the sake of clarity, without any pretention to reconstruct the metrical structure of the hymn. The signature of the manuscript in which the text is preserved is given in the right column.

Reconstructed text:

1. 'b'c 's'ẖ 'r'm qyrbg — M 266/R/ii/4/
   "Mayest thou come back, blessed place"
2. 'w tw wynd'm by qyrb(k)r — M 266/R/ii/6/
   "To thee we pray, beneficent god"
3. b(w)d hy […] — M 266/R/ii/7/
   "thou hast been"

   […]
   {Body}
4. 'w (t)[w](m')nd 'y š'dyẖ bwd hym ○○ — M 114/II/R/1/
   "By thy house of joy I have been"
5. 'wt z'yn'g'n pd mn pryst'd hynd ○○ — M 114/II/R/2/
   "And thy *birth-givers were sent to me"

30 These two words are of obscure meaning: *psfyd* occurs another time, out of context, in a poor fragment, M 918b/A/3/: *psfyd '[.?.]*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

{Soul}

6. xwnk mn hʾn rwc ʾwd zmʾn ○○ M 114/II/R/3/
[…] myδδ ʾṭy jmnw M 776/R/1/
"Happy that day and time of mine!"

7. kmʾn ʾʾgnyn mʾnyšn bwd ○○ M 114/II/R/4/
cʾʾnw mnʾ δn ṭwʾ pryw ʾskwʾmc wβʾ ○○ M 776/R/2/
"when our/my dwelling was together with thee"

8. ʾfryd hʾn rwc kʾ ʾw mn md hy ○○ M 114/II/R/5/
"Blessed that day in which thou hast come to me"

9. ʾwd ʾʾgnyn pd yq kdg mʾnd hwm ○○ M 114/II/R/6/
"And we dwell together in one house"

{Body}

{red}ṭmbʾry pṭškwʾn {before the MP} M 776/R/3a/
"The body's speech"
{red} ṭm(b)[ʾr] wʾnw pṭškwyṭ kṭ{before the Sogd.} M 776/V/1/
"The body so spoke:"

10. mn hrw hnʾm pd tw dysyd hy(nd) ○○ M 114/II/R/7/–
mnʾẖ wyspw pyšyṭ ʾnδmyṭ pr ṭwʾ γryw cwpr δyšṭyy (x)[cy]y M 776/R/4/
"All my limbs are constructed on thy self" M 776/V/1/

11. ʾwm prwyryšn pd tw (przʾft) ○○ M 114/II/V/1/–
ʾṭy myy prwyjʾmndy [pr ṭ]wʾ cwpr ʾspṭww [ʾqr]ṭyy ○○ M 776/R/5/
"And my sustenance is completed by thee"[31] M 776/V/4/
{red}rwʾn ṭmbʾryy ʾwcʾw [32] M 776/V/6/
"The Soul […] the Body's righteous …"

{Body}

12. (ʾbysr) hy hwzrgwn ○○ M 114/II /V/2/
"Thou art the green crown"

13. ʾwd (.)[..](n)[...](.) pdyš šʾyhysṭ (hym) ○○ M 114/II /V/2/
"And […] with which I triumphed […]"

14. ○○ (pymw)g hy rwšn ʾwd b(rʾzʾʾg) ○○ M 114/II /V/4/
"Thou art the light and shining garment"

15. ʿy mn pd ʿyn šhr (pymwxṭ hy) (○○) M 114/II /V/5/
"which thou hast put on me in this world"

16. brʾzyšn hy ʿy mn (hnʾ)[m](ʾn ○)○ M 114/II /V/6/
"Thou art the radiance of my limbs"

17. (ʾ)wd hwcyhryẖ (ʿy m)[n] (bš)nʾy[33] wzrg ○○ M 114/II /V/7/
"and the beauty of my great body"

31 This, and what follows, reminds one of the old *topos* found in Menenios Agrippa's story (Livy, II, 32) and in Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2.3.18; Cicero, *De Officiis*, 3.5.22; and, ultimately, in *1 Corinthians* 12–31.

32 On *ʾwcʾw* see Sims-Williams/Durkin-Meisterernst 2012, p. 34.

33 On the meaning of this word see Morano 2013, p. 88 with n. 1.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

18. ʾ(pwr)yd hyb byẖ gyʾn ○ M 114/II/V/8/
"Blessed be the Soul."

[...]
○ *kṭ qδryy[kw mnʾ sʾr] pṭyʾm sʾr pn(d)* M 625a/B/3/
"Then, when, toward the end, thou wilt be near [me,]"
19. kw ʾ(c) [mn jʾydʾn jwd ny] bwʾy[34] M 625a/B/1/–
[… cn]mnʾ ʾʾykwn pṭy(n)[ny wβy] M 114/V/9/
"may thou not be forever separated from me." M 625a/B/4/

Bibliography

BeDuhn, J.D. 2000: *The Manichaean Body. In Discipline and Ritual*. Baltimore/London.

Boyce, M. 1960: *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichean Script in the German Turfan Collection*. Berlin.

— 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes*. Téhéran/Liège.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III/1: *Texts from Central Asia and China (Texts in Middle Persian and Parthian)*. Turnhout.

Henning, W.B. 1933: "Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente." In: *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 9, pp. 158–253.

— 1937: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Berlin.

Morano, E. 2007: "A Working Catalogue of the Berlin Sogdian Fragments in Manichaean Script." In: M. Macuch/M. Maggi/W. Sundermann (eds.): *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*. Wiesbaden [2008], pp. 239–270.

— 2013: "Some Aspects of the Translation into Iranian Languages of the Works by Mani." In: J.P. Laut/K. Röhrborn (eds.): *Vom Aramäischen zum Alttürkischen. Fragen zur Übersetzung von manichäischen Texten. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 29./30. September 2011*. Berlin, pp. 85–91.

Sims-Williams, N./D. Durkin-Meisterernst 2012: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III/2: *Texts from Central Asia and China (Texts in Sogdian and Bactrian)*. Turnhout.

Sundermann, W. 1997: *Der Sermon von der Seele. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version mit einem Anhang von Peter Zieme: Die türkischen Fragmente des "Sermons von der Seele"*. Turnhout.

— 1999: "Festivals ii. Manichean." In: *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. IX, Fasc. 5, pp. 546–550.

Weber, D. (ed.) 2000: *Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts in Publications since 1934. Photo edition*. London.

34 I think that the sentence beginning with *kw ʾc[* is the same in M 625a/B/1/ and M 114/V/9/, although the preceding words are different in the two manuscripts. They both, however, seem to be the end of the hymn, with slightly different ending formulae.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Some Observations on the Tumshuqese Documents Newly Published in China*

Hirotoshi Ogihara, Kyoto / Ching Chao-jung, Paris

1. Introduction

With Sten Konow's decipherment of the Tumshuqese documents stored in the *Turfanforschung*, Berlin, Tumshuqese was identified as an Eastern Iranian language closely related to Khotanese. Konow dated these documents to after the Tang Conquest, most probably after 692 CE, by taking *Cāṃṣi-* < Chin. *Zhangshi* 長史 [official title] and other evidence into consideration.[1] In 1991, Rong Xinjiang pointed out that Konow's reading *Gyāźdiyā riḍe* must refer to the King of Jushide 據史德 and dated them to the period of Tang rule – more precisely after 658 CE and up to the 790s – by historical and philological means. His argument was then supported by Dieter Maue's correction of the reading to *Gūẓdiyā rid₍e*.[2]

After the upgrade of Tumshuk to the status of a city in 2002, the authorities started to investigate historical remains more intensively. In August 2011, we were asked by Telet Obul (Xinjiang Kucha Academy) to identify the scripts and languages of some locally published manuscripts, therefore we noted that two photographs marked as TUMXUQ 001a and TUMXUQ 001b published

* This article is one of the results of the collaborative research project of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City(1), the Center for Research on Ancient Chinese History, Peking University(2) and the Institute for Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions, the School of Chinese Classics, Renmin University of China(3). As a token of respect, we dedicate these new materials to the memory of Prof. Werner Sundermann for his great achievements in Middle Iranian languages and his successful leadership of the *Turfanforschung*, to which we are deeply grateful for our consultation of the originals stored there. Special thanks are due to Dr. Dieter Maue for hospitality and encouragement in the course of the preparation of this article, in addition to our sincere gratitude to Prof. Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst and Prof. Yoshida Yutaka for their comments on our initial draft.

1 Konow 1935, p. 774.

2 Rong 1991, 2005; Maue 2004. "Jushide" was the Tang period transliteration of the name of the local capital. It should represent the same name of the country that had been transliterated as *Yutou* 尉頭, etc. since the Han period. Cf. Rong 1991, pp. 5–6; 2005, pp. 121–123.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

by Xie Jiagui are very likely the former and latter halves of a contract, i. e. TUMXUQ 001.[3] Afterwards, we found two more Tumshuqese fragments among local publications that came to our attention.[4] In winter 2012, a plate with the caption Xinjiang Tumushukeshi Tangwangcheng faxian xinziliao 新疆圖木舒克市唐王城發現新資料, lit. "New data found from the Tangwangcheng ruins, Tumshuk City, Xinjiang" was published in *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究, year 2012, issue 5 that contains four photographs of Tumshuqese documents (i. e. TUMXUQ 001b, 002a, 002b and 003b)[5]. These new materials have enticed us to study Tumshuqese documents from a broader view, that is to say, to read them within the historical context of the Yutou Prefecture in the Area Command of Qiuci (i. e. Kucha) of the Anxi Protectorate.

The main goal of this article is to explain how we come to identify TUMXUQ 001~004 as contracts.[6] The focus is on TUMXUQ 002~004, since they are sale contracts that are thus far unknown to scholars.[7] TUMXUQ 001 is a deed between a monastery and a family concerning an incomplete transfer of a man from the family. The family has close relationship with – if not the actual ownership of – the monastery, hence the representatives of the monastery left finger-measures *(kapci)* and signatures on the document in order to assure the man's original owner, *Yāna* the *Kusāca*, that the monastery will not arbitrarily change the identity of the transferred man

3 Xie 2005, pp. 180–181; edited in Ogihara/Ching 2012. We owe our gratitude to Dr. Maue for checking our reading of TUMXUQ 001 before its publication.

4 Photographs in Xie/Yang 2009, pp. 43, 71. Edited in Ogihara/Ching 2012, pp. 59–61.

5 Tangwangcheng 唐王城, lit. "the city of the Tang king", is a conventional name for a certain district, now in ruins at the foot of Toquz-sarai Mountain, because people found Tang bronze coins there. Cf. Huang 1958, p. 61; Rong 2005, p. 122.

6 See our full transliteration and word lists in Ogihara/Ching 2012 and TPR. Further analysis of contract formulae and a provisional transcription of the full text are given in Ogihara/Ching 2014. Readers should note that our papers have resulted from a steady progress of work since 2011, thus several new words and grammatical forms were not yet put in the word lists in Ogihara/Ching 2012 and TPR. At that stage we were still troubled by the word-divisions and the interpretation of some passages, thus some of our tentative suggestions about them were put in the main text and footnotes. For more discussion on linguistic and philological aspects, cf. Maue/Ogihara (in this volume); Ogihara (forthcoming).

7 **Sale contract**: in most publications concerning Bactrian, Sogdian and other texts, "purchase contract" is a common term. However, thus far it seems that in Bactrian and Kuchean (i. e. Toch. B) contracts, the seller is invariably expressed by the grammatical first person. In Niya contracts the scribe is the grammatical first person, but the seller can be seen as the active side who first explains the sale. In Old Uyghur contracts, the grammatical first person is shared in turn by the seller and the buyer (see note 12 for an example), but the seller generally appears first, cf. Ching/Ogihara 2010b, especially p. 110.

It is noteworthy that buyers are the active side in Chinese contracts, and the Sogdian contract 69TAM 135:1~2 (639 CE) from Turfan also observes this tradition. These may be called "purchase contracts" in the strict sense. More and more published Khotanese contracts reveal that the tradition in Khotan was variable and changing. For the most recent publication, see Duan 2012.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and his descendants or deny the authority of the *Kusāca*-official's family over that man. Furthermore, the identification of four limits in TUMXUQ 002 and 004 helps to discuss Tumshuqese words about real estate.

2. TUMXUQ 001~004: features of contracts

The use of finger-measures on TUMXUQ 001~004 indicates that they were legally prepared as HL 1~4[8]. In Chinese documents processed in this way, the relevant parties can often be diagnosed by the terms found together with the marks for the knuckles. Therefore we can recognize the new words "seller" (*parat^{b}āka-, parat^{b}ākya-* < *parat^{b}-* "to sell") and "buyer" (*grinākya-* < *grin-* "to buy") which imply that TUMXUQ 002~004 are sale contracts.[9] They encourage us to continue the comparison between these documents and the ones written in other languages.

Needless to say, Tumsh. *kapci* is borrowed from Toch. B *kapci* as initially pointed out by Konow. The ultimate etymon is Chin. *huazhi* 畫指 "finger-measure", a Chinese legal procedure that was widely practiced in Xinjiang in the 7th–8th centuries.[10] Accordingly, the hapax *awatsi* thus far only attested in TUMXUQ 001a.18 and 001b.1 may denote "signature" by comparing the formulae "*kapci* of someone" (*kapci* + gen.) and "*awatsi* of someone" (*awatsi* + gen.) there. If so, *awatsi* may be another loanword from Chin. *yazi* 押字 "signature" (EMC ʔaɨp/ʔɛ:p-dzɨ^{h}/dzi^{h}, LMC ʔja:p-tsʰz̩˩), which renders *ab-dzi* in Old Tibetan contracts.[11]

Confirmation of the transaction and declaration of new ownership

In a sale contract, usually there is a crucial sentence to declare that the deed has been concluded or the payment has been made *as a fact*.[12] The following

8 The Tumshuqese documents thus far known to scholars until 2009 will be referred by the number in the handlist provided by Maue 2009. HL 1~4 in Maue's list denote the shelf numbers TS25+28, 29, 24, and 31 in the *Turfanforschung*.

9 As a result, Ogihara suggests that the word *kruṣta-* means "contract", see section 5.

10 See Ching's discussion in Ching/Ogihara 2010a, pp. 117–127, in addition to that of Hansen 1995, pp. 9–10, and others.

11 Cf. Takeuchi 1994, p. 114. On the reconstruction of Early Middle Chinese (EMC) and Late Middle Chinese (LMC), see Pulleyblank 1991.

12 For instance, the typical phrase in Niya-Pkt. *taha sarajitaṃti* "so they agreed on equal terms", which is further confirmed in some contracts, e.g. *KI* No. 587: *taha Lýipta vikrida, suvikrida. Ṣoṭhaṃgha Ramṣotsa krida, sukrida* "so *Lýipta* has sold and sold well, the *Ṣoṭhaṃgha Ramṣotsa* has bought and bought well" (Burrow 1940, p. 124, with slight modification). In Chinese there are many variants, e.g. "the silk bolts have been paid immediately; the coffin has been given immediately" (練即畢,棺即過, *TTD3* No. 1, 273 CE); see also Ching/Ogihara 2010b, p. 111. Old Uyghur examples include Sa04:

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

sentences may be identified as such, and here is our tentative transcription and translation:[13]

TUMXUQ 002.a7–8: *meñye azñe g$_2$i ♦ tawā{le} mā kuẓdä ♦ Kusācā grid$_1$i renda ax$_8$o zād$_1$yo azad$_1$yo puryo dud$_1$aryo hamalo.* "Today, this *kuẓda*[14] has been bought by *Kusāca* together with these born [and] unborn sons [and] daughters."

TUMXUQ 003.a10–11: *mñe azñe g$_2$i m[ā] w[e] ♦ mā hampari Kusācā grid$_1$i rend[a].* "Today, this *hampara* has been bought by the *Kusāca*-official."

TUMXUQ 004.a6–7: *meñye azñye g$_2$i mā we ♦ mara biṣtye histanaki ṣe ♦ Kusācā grid$_1$i renda.* "Today and here, this private(?)[15] *histanaka* has been bought by the *Kusāca*-official."

In the contracts influenced by Indian or Iranian cultures, the declaration of the buyer's ownership often comes after the confirmation and forms an important part of the text. For example[16]:

Niya-Prakrit
KI No. 590: *taya striya Lýipaae vaṃti, ajuvadae atra Tivira Ramaṣotsaṣa eśvari huda taḍaṃnae, baṃnaṃnae, vikranaṃnae, aṃña no va prahu*[17]*deyaṃnae, namaṃniya deyaṃnae, badho deyaṃnae, ṣarva boga kikama karaṃni siyati.* "Concerning this woman *Lýipaae*, from now on the scribe *Ramṣotsa* has ownership of that woman, to beat her, to bind her, to sell her, to give her to others as a present, to exchange(?) her, to pledge(?) her, to do whatever he likes with her."

---

bu quanpuγ bitig qïlmïš kün üzä män basmïl tükäl birtim, män šabi ymä bir ägsüksüz tükäl sanap altïm "Diese *quanpu* habe ich, Basmïl, am Tag der Ausfertigung des Kontrakts vollständig gegeben. Auch ich, Šabi, habe sie ohne daß eins fehlt vollständig abgezählt erhalten" in *SUK* and many others.

13 Due to scholars' limited knowledge of Tumshuqese at the present stage, it is usually impossible to translate these contracts word by word. For the convenience of reading, we leave out the translation of some particles. We try to incorporate our suggestions into the translation of the passages that can be more easily inferred from the context or other contracts, while leaving more obscure ones to the readers. The convention is as follows: [ ] = restored part of an akṣara; × = broken part of an akṣara; + = equivalent of an akṣara; { } = akṣara added under a line by a scribe as a correction. The scribe's punctuation marks ♦ are retained in the transcription here in order to show the underlying structure of the text in the manner of a diplomatic edition. Brackets in our translation denote an interpretation from the context.

14 A kind of real estate, cf. Khot. *kūṣḍa-* "mansion, palace". The Khotanese contract published by Duan 2012 also concerns the purchase of a *kūṣḍa*.

15 See *biṣtye*, section 5.

16 Cf. Burrow 1940, pp. 126–127 (with slight modification), Sims-Williams 2000, pp. 118–119 (revised edition, pp. 120–121). In this paper, the dating of Bactrian contracts follows Sims-Williams 2012. Here we omit the corresponding clauses in Sogdian and Khotanese contracts. For this clause in the Sogdian contract found at Turfan, cf. Yoshida *et al.* 1989, pp. 5–8, 21–22. The clause in Mugh Document V-8, i.e. a Sogdian contract concerning a purchase of a burial plot(?), can be found in Yakubovich 2006, p. 326. Generally such a specification is not found in Chinese ones.

17 Sic! For *prahuḍa* "gift".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bactrian
Document V (probably 729 CE): *ωσο παδαχϸανηι{ι}ο τοο* [part of the original omitted] *ασο ανδορονιγο ρωσο παρσο μα(βα)ρο ζαμανο οδασο μωσο αβο ιαοηδανο ζοραγο αγγαραγο ασιδαβο μασκο ναβισιδο χοαδο χοαδρο οδο δδριγδο παρσο παραλαδο ναβαγο ωσταδο οιχαρηγανο κιρδο αλο ανδαρο ζαμιγο μιγδο βαναρο οδο βαγαλαγγο κιρδο λαχμιγο οδο λαχϸατανιγο κιρδο αβο πορο οολοβαρο λαδο ναβανδο λογδο ναμαγγο αβαδο κιρδο ναρδδιγανο νιρτο νωιο νακαν(δ)ο ασιδο ναρσο χοαδο ριμαδο σαγονδο χοβαοανδο αβο χιρσαγο βονο πιδαργανο πα̣δαχϸανινδο* "Now you have authority – you, [part of the original omitted] – from tomorrow (and) for (all) future time, and from now until eternity, (over) the property which is described herein, to have and to hold (it) yourselves, (and) afterwards to sell (it), to pawn (it), to put (it for) hire, to exchange (it) for another (piece of) land, to make a monastery or temple, to make a place of burial or crematorium, to give (it) for a son's bride-price (or) with a daughter (as) a dowry, to cultivate (it), to leave (it) fallow, to dig a channel, whatever may suit yourselves, just as owners (customarily) have authority over what is purchased (and) ancestral estates."

A simplified version is frequently seen in Old Uyghur, e.g. *SUK* Sa02: *taplasar özi tarïzun, taplamasar adïn kišikä öḍkürü saḍzun* "Wenn es ihm gefällt, möge er es selbst bebauen, wenn es ihm nicht gefällt, möge er es einem anderen weiterverkaufen". We think the following sentences are the Tumshuqese counterpart of this, even though several new words such as *grap^{b}ā*, *rād$_{1}$a* and *paṣto* are obscure: from the Bactrian example cited above one can see how broad the range of vocabulary can be. Here are our tentative reading:

TUMXUQ 002a.10–11: *bid$_{1}$i anix$_{6}$ā parād$_{1}$äne ruru rordane bśi Kusācā pad$_{1}$itu.* ♦ *pud$_{1}$e yi g$_{1}$i ma v$_{1}$aṣtid$_{1}$u.* "Moreover, to sell [it] to another person, to give [it as] a gift, all [right] must yield(?)[18] to *Kusāca.* He (= buyer) should not be involved."

TUMXUQ 003a.11–12: *bid$_{1}$i añix$_{6}$ā grap^{b}ā u parād$_{1}$ne rād$_{1}$a paṣto rordane bśi ci Kusācā pad$_{1}$itu.* ♦ "Moreover, to sell [it] to another person and to …, to give [as] a gift(?) …, all [right] must yield(?) to the *Kusāca*-official."

TUMXUQ 004.7–8: *bid$_{1}$i añix$_{6}$ā grap^{b}ā u parād$_{1}$ane rād$_{1}$a paṣto rordane bśi rāzi Kusācā pad$_{1}$itu puranu yi ṣe.* "Moreover, to sell [it] to another person and to …, to give [as] a gift(?) …, all right[19] must yield (?) to the *Kusāca*-official and his sons."

As translated above, *anix$_{6}$ā/añix$_{6}$ā* presumably means "another (person)", cf. Bactr. ανιγο, νιγο, ανιιο, ανιυο < **anya-ka* "other" and other Iranian forms.[20] We

18 Tumsh. *pad$_{1}$-* would be OIr. **pat-* "to fly, rise; (?) fall", cf. Cheung 2007, pp. 299–301. Here and in the following all such 3rd singular imperatives are translated with "must".

19 The nominal form *rāzi* (nom.sg.?) can be related to Khot. *rrays-* "to direct" and *rrāś-* "direct", cf. Bailey 1979, pp. 358b–359a. It probably means "right, authority", cf. Khot. *rrāśa-* "control" in Bailey 1979, p. 362a.

20 Sims-Williams 2000, p. 180; 2007, p. 192. Following Ching's suggestion to compare it with the use of Niya-Pkt. *aṃña* "other", Ogihara assumes that the phonetic value of x_{6} may be approximately [ɟ], i.e. palatal voiced fricative, but we are still searching for more evidence for this phonological issue.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

translate *ruru* (HL 6.3; TUMXUQ 002a.10) as "gift" by taking it as a derivative from *ror-* "to give". TUMXUQ 003.a11, 004.7 *rād₁a* may be a synonym (cf. Av. *rātā-* "gift", Sogd. *rʾt(h)* "id."). It is remarkable that the new forms *rordane* "to give" and *parād₁ane, parād₁äne, parād₁ne* "to sell" are infinitives, a construction that is parallel to the clauses in Niya-Prakrit and Bactrian.

Before or after the declaration there are usually passages that prevent the seller or his/her relatives from reclaiming the object. This kind of specification is highly developed in Bactria.[21] Therefore we tentatively read:

> TUMXUQ 002a.8–10: *ma g₁i re[nd]u mye Cesumkyā ♦ puri dud₁a ♦ brād₁e howa, ki marye śindaye awale palaci pandamid₁i.* "There should be no son, daughter, brother [nor] sister of me *Cesumäki* who argues(?) over this piece of real estate(?)."[22]

> TUMXUQ 003a.12–13: *ma g₁i rendu ñiwānā horri haṣki hvax₅e, ki maru kruṣtu bijāne aperā [pʰ]ārdi ardane.* ♦ "There should be no *ñiwānā* …, a man who … to do … to this contract and the witnesses."

> TUMXUQ 004.8–10: *ma g₁i rendu ñiwānā Hvunāsye gūtrana horri haṣki hvax₅e + puri brād₁e wa, ki maru kru*[23] *bidruhvid₁ane pʰārdi.* ♦ "There should be no *ñiwānā* …, a man, a son [and] a brother belonging to *Hvunāsa*'s house, who … to make false accusation/counterfeit(?) to this contract."

pandamid₁i in TUMXUQ 002 is obscure[24], but it should mean "argue" when combined with *palāci*. According to Maue, *pʰārdi* seems to be 3rd sg. prs. act. of an unknown verb which would express a mood of some kind, e.g. "to dare".[25] These sentences can be further compared with HL 1.8–10 and HL 3.4–5, which

21 Bactrian Documents J, L, Nn, P, R, S, V, W, see also the donor's guarantee in Documents C and T in Sims-Williams 2000 (revised edition in 2012) and 2005, etc. One may also consult the Sogdian clause in the Mugh guarantee letter (Nov. 4) accompanying the marriage contract Nov. 3 (Yakubovich 2006, pp. 313–314).

22 We relate the new word *śindā* to Khot. *śśandaā-* "(piece of) ground". In TUMXUQ 002 we find sg. nom. *śindā*; sg. acc. *śindu*; sg. gen. *śindaye. awale* may mean "concerning, about". It is known that *palaca-* is from Toch. B *plāce* "word, speech", but here it is rather to be construed as "legal dispute or argument" (Ogihara/Ching 2012, pp. 49–50), cf. the variants of *ma(ṃ)tra nikhaleyati* "shall bring up arguments" in *KI* Nos. 419, 437, 568, where Niya-Pkt. *ma(ṃ)tra* normally means "word(s)". See also Konow (1935, p. 820) who has indicated that Tumsh. *palaca/palaci* contains the meaning of objection or contradiction. However, Konow (1947) did not give a uniform translation of *ṣu nu bā placa ma chiḍu*, e.g. "… for ourselves there should not be any thought" (HL 1.13–14) and "… shall not be our concern"(HL 3.7). The formula (with variants) recurs in HL 1, 3, 4 and TUMXUQ 001~004, which we translate "there should be no arguments about this", presumably no objection or legal dispute to the penalty clause.

23 Here taken as scribal error of *kruṣtu*.

24 Konow (1935, p. 820b) regards it as a cognate of Khot. *padam-* "to make". See also Bailey 1979, p. 208a, and Skjærvø 1987, p. 80.

25 Maue (p.c. August 2013).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

seem to be two deeds made between brothers but not concerning a purchase. We temporarily translate a clause of the latter as follows:[26]

> HL 3.4–5: *ma g$_1$i rendu ṣe ñiwānā amāne puri brād$_1$e handare hodamā gūtrā ki ṣu maranu bisanu pasunu palaci hampā pandamid$_1$i.* "There should be no *ñiwānā*, our son, brother, relative within the seventh agnation who shall argue with (?) the other party over the houses and small cattle."

Here Tumsh. *hampā* construed as gen. sg. may be interpreted as "the opposite side" (cf. Bactr. *αμβαγο* "partner" and Parth. *'mb'γ* "rival"), thus we translate it as "the other party". However, we hesitate to translate *ñiwānā*. Konow suggested "guarding, caretaker"[27], more or less someone who has the right of occupancy or even inheritance. Nevertheless, from the context it is not impossible to interpret it as someone who challenges or disagrees, e. g. "claimant" or "dissenter". In practice, the one who argues over the ownership is usually a person who claims to have the right to do so, frequently a seller's relative or one who claims to be such.[28] Nevertheless, for the moment we cannot rule out other possibilities, such as to take *ñiwānā* as a broader term that includes the categories of heirs, relatives, neighbors and even creditors. For instance, *alïmči* "Gläubiger, Kreditgeber", *birimči* "Gläubiger, Kreditgeber", *yüzlüg* "Hunderterschaft" and *onluγ* "Zehnerschaft" are frequently mentioned in the corresponding clause in *SUK* Sa10, 15, 16, 26, 28, 29, while in Bactrian Document O the word *βαριγο* "(fellow-)citizen" is attested in a similar context.

It is noteworthy that in TUMXUQ 001, the original owner's family retains some rights to or over the given (donated?) person:

> TUMXUQ 001a.10–11: *Kusācā ṣe puri Shāci* ♦ *ax$_8$o puryo dud$_1$aryo hmalo* ♦ *meñye azñe g$_2$i tawāle biś va hale hawi rāza ud$_1$i.* ♦ "This *Kusāca*-official's son, *Shāca*, together with [his] sons [and] daughters, today, in all respect, [still] have [their] own authority [over *Wag$_1$ereźa*]."

Since the party who made the finger-measures is the monastery rather than the giver, we think it was a deed of incomplete transfer.

26 Cf. *mag^{y}i rendu ṣe ñiwānā amāne puri brāḍe handare hodamā gyātrā ki ṣu mara nu bisanu pasunu palaci hampā pandamiḍi* "And for us shall remain as caretakers our son or brother within the seventh agnation who now here makes performance of forethought about our houses and cattle" (Konow 1947, p. 167). We change *mara nu* to *maranu* (pl. gen.) to group it with *bisanu* and *pasunu*. Obviously Konow's translation of *pasu-* as "cattle" is not exact, cf. Av. *pasu-* "small cattle" as well as Konow 1947, p. 185. Niya-Pkt. *paśu-* means "small cattle". The word for "ox" or "cattle" in Tumshuqese is now known to be *gūha-*, see section 5.

27 Konow 1947, p. 185.

28 Ogihara/Ching 2014, p. 33, especially n. 52. Prof. Durkin-Meisterernst kindly pointed out that *ñiwānā* may indicate "dispute, objection" or "disputer, objector" derived from OIr. *ni-xwan-* "to call" (p. c. September 2014).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Guarantee and penalty

Before the Tang Conquest of Gaochang (Turfan) in 640 CE, the seller's guarantee was already common both in Chinese contracts found in China as well as in Bactrian contracts found in the west in order to ensure that buyers would be free from any liability if the sold object became problematic.[29] After the middle of the 7th century, such a clause was still common in Bactria, while several variants appeared in the Chinese contracts made in Xinjiang. In these Chinese contracts, the guarantors/ co-signers (*baoren* 保人) were usually also responsible. For example:

> Bactrian
> Document Nn (659 CE): *ακιδο πιδο μασκο ναβιχτιγο ζαμιγο αβαφαγο βραμαρζο κισο ηβαδο ιωλαδο οισηραδο λαδο χοιναδο λαστανο κιραδο ταδασο οισπο παδαρλιγανο αβηβινδο κιριμο* "Whoever may dispute with you, Bramarz, concerning the (piece of) ground described herein, (or) may fight, argue, invoke the law (or) cause litigation, I shall cause (this property to be) detached from every opponent."[30]
>
> Chinese
> *TTD3* No. 32 (733 CE): 如後有人寒盜識認者，一仰主保知當，不關買人之事。 "If afterwards someone claims or recognizes [it] as booty or personal property, all is the responsibility of the seller and guarantors (lit. 'all depends on the original owner and guarantors to know and confront it'), [and] it has nothing to do (*guān* 關, lit. 'to close, to intervene') with the buyer."

In Tumshuqese, the clause can be found either after the declaration of the buyer's ownership (TUMXUQ 002) or close to the end (TUMXUQ 003):

> TUMXUQ 002a.11–13: *kä wa g_1i ñiwānā marā kuẓdā pursāki rende, ji biśa wa hale Cesumki ♦ pud$_1$e v$_1$aṣtid$_1$u Kusācā x$_8$o zamye sima ud$_1$u.* "If there is [any] *ñiwānā* [or anyone] enquiring [about/into] this *kuẓda*, in all respects *Cesumäki* must be responsible(?) [for solving the problem], [and] it should be of no concern to(?) the *Kusāca*-official."
>
> TUMXUQ 003a.15–17: *[k]w[a] g_1i marā hamparā pursāki kuzā[ki] rende, biś [wa ha]le parat^{b}āka pu[d$_1$]e v$_1$aṣtandu, grinākyā x$_8$o zame [sima] ud$_1$i.* "If there is [anyone] enquiring [about/into] this *hampara*, in all respects the sellers must be responsible(?) [for solving the problem], [and] it is of no concern to(?) the buyer."

After identifying *sima-* as an Indian loanword (cf. Skt. *sīmā-* "boundary"; Khot. *sīmā-* "id.", see *infra*), we presume that *zam(y)e sima* means approximately

29 E.g. *TTD3*, Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15. Here we offer only one example: *TTD3*, No. 3, 509 CE: 若後有何 (for 呵) 盜仞 (for 認) 名，仰本主了。不了，部 (for 倍) 還本買 (for 價) "If afterwards someone claims or recognizes [the woman slave] as booty or personal property, (all) depends on the original owner to solve it. If it cannot be solved, [the buyer] must be reimbursed the double of the original price". For the ones in Bactrian, see Documents J (517 CE) and L (602 CE, text L').

30 Sims-Williams 2005.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

"absolved from", namely the buyer will be out of range of any dispute or punishment, although the exact meaning of *zam(y)e* ("outside(?)" perhaps a preposition) awaits determination.

As to the penalty, Hitch gave a detailed discussion of HL 1, 3, 4. Here only the punishment by flogging will be compared:

> TUMXUQ 001a.14: *mena bāzanā ṣe χšiṣta kaṇe hvardu* "By this …, he must take sixty strokes."
>
> TUMXUQ 002a.16: *χšerā bandina ṣe x_8ārsu hvayi* "He is to be beaten [with] forty [strokes] as the punishment of the state."[31]
>
> TUMXUQ 003a.14–15: *bāzane yi ṣe χšiṣta hvendu* "In (?) … they must beat him [with] sixty [strokes]."
>
> TUMXUQ 004.11: *bāzane yi ṣe χśiṣta hvendu* "In (?) … they must beat him [with] sixty [strokes]."

Tumsh. *hvayi* (HL 1.13, TUMXUQ 002a.16) is probably a gerundive,[32] while the new word *bāzana-* (sg. loc.(?) *bāzane*, sg. instr.(?) *bāzanā* < **bāzananā* [by haplology]) is difficult. As to the payment of a fine, *t^heśa* (HL 1.13, 3.6; TUMXUQ 001a.14) remains obscure, whereas in TUMXUQ 003a.14 a hapax *ārrunde* also occurs with *bārrā-*[33]. *ārrunde* may be related to Sogd. *ʾrn-* "drive, urge on"[34].

The four limits of real estate

The identification of seller's guarantees impedes our analysis of the endings of TUMXUQ 002 and 004, since, at first glance, in the guarantees *sima* seems to be describing a person (i. e. the buyer). It is known that the official position *Sima* 司馬 was established in Kucha under Tang rule.[35] However, the parts before the list of witnesses are very likely the description of the transacted object. In other words, Tumsh. *sima* derives from Sanskrit *sīmā-* "boundary" as Kuchean (i. e.

31 On Ogihara's identification of *x_8ārsu* as "forty", *x_8o* as a particle "however" (cf. Khot. *jsau*, *jso*) and the phonetic value of *x_8*, see Maue/Ogihara in this volume.

32 Hitch (1988) did not translate the penalty clause in HL 1, and he (1990) omitted *hvayi* from his discussion. Following on Ching's comparison with the gerundive usage in *KI* No. 571: *satati 20 20 20 10 prahara dadavo* "(he) shall receive seventy strokes" (Burrow 1940, p. 571; lit. "seventy strokes [are] to be given", cf. Burrow 1937, p. 56), Ogihara thinks the verb is to be compared with Khot. *hvah-* "to beat". See section 5.

33 Unit of price. Previously analyzed as *bārra-* (cf. Hitch 1988), although this word was assigned to the ā-stemed nouns by Konow (1935, p. 815).

34 Cheung 2007, p. 165.

35 For a *Sima*-official called *Kurriṅkāte** in Ot. 12, see Ching/Ogihara 2012, pp. 83, 104–106. *Sima* as an official title or a traditional Chinese surname is also attested in the fragment Pelliot Chinois D. A. 126 (Trombert 2000, p. 106).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tocharian B),[36] and the parts can be segmented to four phrases corresponding to "four limits" (Chin. *sixian* 四限, *sizai* 四在, *sipan* 四畔; Bactr. *δ' παδουαμονδο* "four boundaries").[37] They can be compared as follows:

TUMXUQ 002	TUMXUQ 004
(a.17) *mare ṣe simanu gūnā.*	(12) *ate marye biṣdaye histankyā ṣe tshāryo diźo sime gūnā hva*(13)*ñyo.*
sanondye g_2*i* s_i*ma Kusācā biṣtye histankyā.*	*sanondye* g_2*i sima Bāṅgukotā paṛaṅgi.*
(a.18) *ṣe ṛawiye* g_2*i* Mud_1*ikyā paṛaṅga.*	*ṛawiye* g_2*i Cāṃṣyenā* (14) *paṛaṅkyā ñi wā ju ka*
ñyerāñye g_2*i* Mud_1*ikä* + (a.19) *le ju ka*	*ñoṛañye* g_2*i* k^b*o śe paṛaṅgi*
garyo g_2*i sima pa wa ju ka.*	*gaṛayo* g_2*i pa wa* +
tsahāryo diźo simanu gunā $hvad_1$*a rmyenda.*	(15) *hvad*$_1$*e ṛamyenda tshāryo diźo sime gūnā.*

As a result, the terms for the four directions in Tumshuqese can be identified as follows: Tumsh. *sanondye* "eastern" (cf. Bactr. *μιυροασανο* < **miθrāsāna-* "sunrise"; Khot. *san-* "rise"), *räwiye* "southern" (Khot. *rravye*, invar.?), *garyo* "northern" (lit. "at/toward mountains") and finally the problematic spellings for "western", *ñoräñye* and *ñyerāñye*, one of which may involve scribal error (cf. Bactr. *μιυροναφρανο* < **miθra-nifrāna-* "sunset").[38] Consequently we compared *diźā-* (pl. instr. *diźo*) with Khot. *diśā-* "direction" and *gūnaa-* (pl. nom. *gunā/gūnā*) with Khot. *ggūnaa-* "mark, sign". Therefore, the objects transacted in TUMXUQ 002 and 004, namely *kuẓda* and *histanaka* respectively, must denote two kinds of real estate that were defined by their four limits, such as a house (see n. 14 above) or a farm that were registered in this way in Bactria and Turfan.[39]

It is known that Khotanese *sīmā-* "boundary" is also borrowed from Sanskrit.[40] However, this word is not attested in the Khotanese contracts about real estate that have been published thus far, nor in the specification of four limits. This phenomenon leads us to suggest that the land system in Khotan was somehow different from that of its neighbours on the northern rim of the Tarim Basin.[41]

36 Cf. Toch. B *sim* < Skt. *sīmā-* for four boundaries in Ot. 19.1 as discussed by Pinault 1998.

37 On Chinese terms, see *TTD3*, Nos. 4, 5, 7 for examples. See Mori (1967) on Old Uyghur *sičï* < Chin. *sizhi* 四至. *δ' παδουαμονδο* is only found in Document V (probably 729 CE) despite many examples of four limits being attested in Bactrian contracts concerning real estate. See Ching (forthcoming) for more discussion.

38 See Sims-Williams 2000, p. 205; 2007, p. 234; Skjærvø 2004, p. 333. It is noteworthy that the four directions use different cases: sg. loc. *sanondye*, *räwiye*, *ñoräñye/ñyerāñye*; instr. pl. *garyo*, *tshāryo diźo*.

39 Prof. Durkin-Meisterernst kindly indicated (p.c. September 2014) that *histanaka* may approximately mean "base", "place of staying" or "field" as a derivate of the verb "to stand" (Khot. *ṣṭ-* "to stand, be"), although he also pointed out the difficulty that **hi-sta-* (> **hi-šta-*) in Tumshuqese should yield **(hi-)ṣta-*.

40 For examples, see De Chiara 2013, p. 205; 2014, p. 214. See also Or. 8212/162.27 in Skjærvø 2003, p. 46, for the usage of *sīma-* as a Buddhist term in a monastic letter.

41 As indicated by Yoshida (2006, p. 158, n. 42), the boundary of estate is briefly mentioned in the Khotanese sale contract of Or. 6397/1 (G.1). However, it is not defined according to the four limits. See Ogihara/Ching 2014, pp. 44–45, n. 85.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Needless to say, the connection between "darkness", "mountain" and "north" is common in the Altaic and Tocharian languages.[42] Yet it is difficult to determine the ideal form between *ñoräñye* and *ñyerāñye*. According to Prof. Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst,[43] the word for the "west" may be also compared with MP *xwrnwʾr* /xwar-niwār/ "west, sunset" and MP *xwrprʾn(yg)* /xwarfrānīg/ "western", which suggests two different derivations from the Old Iranian verb **bar-* "to bring, carry"[44]. The meaning of Toch. B *oṣṣale* "north" (derived from *ṣale* "mountain", previously interpreted as "west, evening; westerly") solved by Pinault in 1998 may help to understand the complex of Tumsh. *ñoräñye/ñyerāñye*, Khot. *nihujsanda-/nyehujsaṃda-* "western" and Khot. *nyūvajsa, nyūvaṃjsa* (invar.) "northern" and the reason why the speakers of Tumshuqese chose another term for north.[45]

3. TUMXUQ 001~004: a tentative translation

TUMXUQ 001

(a.1–4) In the 2nd regnal year of *Wāsudewa*, the ruler [and] the king of Jushide, the year of ox, in the 6th month, on the 3rd day. The *Pramuk^{b}a*-monk of *Leka* Monastery [called] *Räkutadewa*, by agreement(?) with the relatives of *Leka* [entitled to manage this monastery](?),[46] due to [the fact that] *Brikana* [is] (with) a disease(?), [the men] *Utpala, Hvunāca, Bati, Hurzarka, Helac^{b}orra, Brig$_{1}$icki* speak thus: "(a4–5) Our *Leka* Monastery was … Then, *Yāna* the *Kusāca*-official made … (a.5–6) In the monastery, due to a harvest failure (?), the relatives of the monastery(?) were … (a.6–7) Then, there is a son of this *Yāna* the *Kusāca*-official called *Shāca*. Then, he (= *Yāna*) wished to give a *ñizeja*[47] called *Wag$_{1}$ereźa* as a *bimex$_{6}$a* of the monastery under the management of the son *Shāca*." (a.7–8) Today and here, the business(?) of this *Wag$_{1}$ereźa* here is [to be taken as] a *bimex$_{6}$a* under *Shāca*'s management. (a.8–10) Moreover,[48] to sell [him] to another person

42 For an example, see Pinault 1998, p. 366. On the order of four directions in Chinese, Old Uyghur, Old Tibetan and Bactrian as reflected in the four limits of real estate, see Ogihara/Ching 2014, pp. 42–45.

43 Personal communication, September 2014.

44 Cheung 2007, pp. 6–10.

45 On the Khotanese forms, see Bailey 1979, pp. 188a, 194b; Skjærvø 2004, pp. 290, 292.

46 *parid$_{1}$a-* "be entitled to(?)" would be related to Bactr. *πορδο* "proper" and Khot. *puḍa-* "promised, having committed oneself". For Bactr. *πορδο*, see Sims-Williams 2007, p. 257b; for Khot. *puḍa-*, see Emmerick/Skjærvø 1997, pp. 96–100.

47 It is uncertain if this noun may be somehow related to Bactr. *νιζαδαγο* "born (in one's own house)". Cf. Sims-Williams 2007, p. 239. However, from the context of TUMXUQ 001a.6–7 and 004.1–2, *ñizeja* seems to denote personal identity rather than a non-human commodity.

48 Tumsh. *bid$_{1}$i* "then, moreover", cf. Parth. *byd* "again, then".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and to …, [to treat him as] *bimex$_6$a* together with his (= *Wag$_1$ereźa*'s) sons [and] daughters, must be a business(?) [to be treated] in the monastery. (a.10–11) This *Kusāca*-official's son, *Shāca*, together with [his] sons [and] daughters, today, in all respects, [still] have [their] own authority [over *Wag$_1$ereźa*]. (a.11–13) There should be no *ñiwānā* … a *rämyākya* [or] a *ṣona* of *Leka* Monastery, as …, who … to do … to the business(?) of *Shāca*, who is an immoral *ṣona* [as] a relative of *Leka*. (a.13–15) Whoever … to do … to this contract [or] the witnesses, there is punishment as follows: he must give fifty *bārrās* as/to *t^{h}eśa* of the king; [and] by this … he must take sixty strokes. There should be no arguments about this. (a.15–16) If this *Wag$_1$ereźa* would be recognized(?) as another one's own property, in all respects the *Kusāca*-official must be responsible(?) [for solving the problem], [and] it is of no concern to(?) the *ṣona*s. Let it be such as we have decided. (a.17) [Here] came the witnesses who have understood [and] recognized this contract. Witness: *Jompaska*, son of *Prawāre*, (a.18) belonging to *Leka*.

Signature(?) of *Räktadewa* as the *Pramuk^{h}a*-monk in the *Leka* [Monastery]. [signum]

(a.19) Witness: *Klimadu*, son of *Mat^{h}ora*. [signum]
(a.20) Witness: *Ñyoñya*, son of *Kāmadewa*. [signum]
(b.1) Witness: *Ulāṅga*, son of *Tsumiśki*. Signature(?) of *Kalyenayyeśa* the master and *ācārya*. [signum]
(b.2) Finger-measure of *Brikana*, belonging to *Leka*, aged 32.
(b.3) [signum] Finger-measure of *Utpala*, belonging to *Leka*, aged 17.
(b.4) [signum] Finger-measure of *Hvunāca*, aged 17.
(b.5) [signum] Finger-measure of *Helac^{h}orra*, belonging to *Leka*, aged 21.
(b.6) Finger-measure of *Bati*, aged 14.
(b.7) Finger-measure of *Hurzarka*,[49] aged 13.
(b.8) [signum] Finger-measure of *Brig$_1$icki*, aged 65.
(b.9–12: scribe's summary) In the 2nd regnal year of *Wāsudewa*, the ruler [and] the king of Jushide, the year of ox, in the 6th month, on the 3rd day. The *Pramuk^{h}a*-monk of *Leka* Monastery [called] *Räkutadewa*, due to [the fact that] *Brikana* [is] (with) a disease (?), [and] these relatives, who are entitled to [manage this monastery](?) and who have this desire here accepted(?) the agreement(?) of the *Kusāca*-official, the leader(?). Let it be. The witnesses' scribe *Sud$_1$iśki* wrote this contract.

TUMXUQ 002

(a1–3) In the 11th regnal year of *Yonduya* (or *Yondwi*, *Yondu*), the king of Jushide, the year of horse, in the *Tsiwix$_6$ānana* month, on the 27th day. At this moment, *Cesumäki* speaks thus: "(a.3–4) As a …, I bought a *kuẓda* from *Śira*(?). It belongs

49 Although *hurzā* is given here, it is rather a scribal error for *hurzarkā* (gen. of *hurzarka-*) according to the list of names given in TUMXUQ 001a.4.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

to the houses/village … piece of real estate(?) … (a.4–7) This *kuẓda* … (as) piece of real estate(?) which I [want to] sell to the *Kusāca*-official of *Leka*, *Kusāca* buys this *kuẓda* (as) piece of real estate(?) … (for) thirteen …" (a.7–8) Today, this *kuẓda* has been bought by the *Kusāca*-official together with these born [and] unborn sons [and] daughters. (a.8–10) There should be no son, daughter, brother [nor] sister of me *Cesumäki* who argues(?) over this piece of real estate(?). (a.10–11) Moreover, to sell [it] to another person, to give [it as] a gift, all [right] must yield(?) to the *Kusāca*-official. He (= *Cesumäki*) should not be involved. (a.11–13) If there is [any] *ñiwānā* [or anyone] enquiring [about/into] this *kuẓda*, in all aspects *Cesumäki* must be responsible(?) [for solving the problem], [and] it should be of no concern to(?) the *Kusāca*-official. (a.13–16) Whoever does … to this contract [or] to the witnesses, … makes false accusation/counterfeit(?)[50], does deception …, there must be punishment as follows: he must give 10 *bārrā*s to the king as fine, 20 [*bārrā*s] to the *Kusāca*-official [as recompense]. He is to be beaten [with] 40 [strokes] as the punishment of the state. There should be no arguments about this. (a.17–19) Here are the marks of the boundaries: the eastern boundary to the *Kusāca*-official's private(?) *histanaka*, the southern [is] *Mud$_1$iki*'s *paräṅga*, the western [is] *Mud$_1$iki*'s …, the northern boundary … The marks of the boundaries of the four directions have been said. (b.1–2) Here are the eyewitnesses [as] witnesses who have watched, understood [and] recognized [this/the contract]. Witness: *Briki*, son of *Āba*. [SIGNUM]
(b.3) Witness: *Bakāci*, son of *Hotäbag$_1$i*. [SIGNUM]
(b.4) Witness: *Briya*, belonging to *Leka*. [SIGNUM]
(b.5) Finger-measure of *Cesumäki* the seller, aged 59. [SIGNUM]

TUMXUQ 003

(a.1–3) In the 2nd regnal year of *Wāsudewa*, the ruler [and] the king of Jushide, the year of horse, in the *Ahvarjana* month, on the 3rd day. *Yaśowana*, together with [his] son *Cuṅga* [and] daughter *Batāka*, speaks thus: "(a.3–4) My brother *Mudik$_1$i* had a *hampara*. The brother was hard-pressed(? *bardu*; cf. Khot. *baḍa-* 'captive'). He was not … (a.4–6) Then, the brother, as a debtor (? *purtsi*, lit. 'the demanded'[51]), was(?) owing 3 *bārrā*s to the *Kusāca*-official [secured by] this *hampara*. (a.6) Then, as the debtor he was [again] hard-pressed(?). … of the *hampara*. (a.6–8) Then I, *Yaśowana*, together with my son *Cuṅga*, sell the *hampara* for 5 *bārrā*s. (a.8–9) We shall obtain 2 *bārrā*s. The debtor takes

50 Although HITCH (2009, p. 13) regards *biźo* as acc. sg. f., it would be the pl. instr.-abl.
51 *purtsi* derives from Tumsh. *purs-* "to ask" (cf. *kṛri* "scribe" < Tumsh. *kur-* "to write"), see TPR, p. 83. However, it is worthy to note that *purtsi* may be alternatively explained as a word borrowed from Sogd. *pwrc* "debt" (YOSHIDA, p. c. May 2014, *apud* OGIHARA/CHING 2014, p. 20, n. 28), while Prof. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST kindly suggested another solution that it may be derived from OIr. **par-* "to get even, equalize, commit oneself (to a legal obligation, contract)" (p. c. September 2014). For **par-*, see CHEUNG 2007, p. 293.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

3 *bārrā*s.[52] (a.9–10) The *Kusāca*-official buys this *hampara* together with [his] son *Shāca* for 5 *bārrā*s." (a.10–11) Today, this *hampara* has been bought by the *Kusāca*-official. (a.11–12) Moreover, to sell [it] to another person and to …, to give [as] a gift(?) …, all [right] must yield(?) to the *Kusāca*-official. (a.12–13) There should be no *ñiwānā* …, a man who … to do … to this contract and the witnesess. (a.13–15) If …, the punishment [is] thus: he must give 20 *bārrā*s as *ārrunda* to the king, in(?) … they must beat him [with] 60 [strokes]. There should be no arguments about this. (a.15–17) If there is [anyone] enquiring [about/into] this *hampara*, in all respects the sellers must be responsible(?) [for solving the problem], [and] it is of no concern to(?) the buyer. (a.17) Here [are] the witnesses who have understood [and] recognized [this/the contract].
(b.1) Witnesses [sic!][53]: *Karluka*, son of *Jompalla*. [SIGNUM]
(b.2) Witnesses [sic!]: *Xšandā*, son of *Werdix*$_6$*ośpila*. [SIGNUM]
(b.3) Witness: *Jompawi*, son of *Jompaska*.
(b.4) Finger-measure of *Yaśowana* the seller, aged 40.
(b.5) Finger-measure of *Cuṅga* the seller, aged …
(b.6) Finger-measure of *Batāka*, aged 8.

TUMXUQ 004

(1–2) In the 4th regnal year of *Wāsudewa*, the ruler [and] the king of Jushide, the year of rabbit, in the *Ahvarjana* month, on the 15th day. A *ñizeja* [called] *Hvunāsa* speaks thus: "(2–3) As a …, I have a private property(?), a *tirama naräma histanaka*. (3–4) Then I want to sell this private(?) *tirama naräma histanaka* for 9 *bārrā*s in total(?).[54] (4–5) The *Kusāca*-official buys this private(?) *tirama naräma histanaka* [that was] bought by/for/from(?) *Bāṅgukota*.[55]" (6–7) Today

52 On this sentence, see the discussion in section 6 concluding remarks.
53 Scribal errors *bijāne* (pl.) and *bijā* (pl.) in TUMXUQ 002b.1 and 002b.2, respectively.
54 *śome* "in total(?)" would be related to Khot. *śuma-* "solitary, only, as soon as", see Bailey 1979, p. 402a.
55 It is difficult to explain the sg. gen. *Bāṅgukotā* here. We read the whole sentence as *grinda maru histanku* ♦ *biṣtyu* ♦ *tiramu naṛamu* ♦ *Bāṅgukotā* (gen.) *grid*$_1$*u* ♦ *Kusāci* (gen.), where *grinda* is 3rd sg. of injunctive of *grin-/grid*$_1$*a-* "to buy", and the past participle *grid*$_1$*u* "bought" is in the adjectival usage to modify the preceding nouns, i. e. *maru histanku biṣtyu tiramu naräm*u "this private(?) *tirama naräma histanaka*" (all in the accusative). Theoretically, if *Bāṅgukota* (a neighbour of this real estate on sale, as defined in its four limits) is the present owner, i. e. if *Bāṅgukota* had bought the object when *Kusāca* came to buy, it would be very unlikely that the woman *Hvunāsa* could identify herself as the "seller" at the end of contract (004.17). The more desirable solutions seem to be either (1) previously this old woman, being 61 years old, had bought the object for the sake of (i. e. gen.-dat.) *Bāṅgukota*; or (2) previously she had bought it from *Bāṅgukota*, namely to take *Bāṅgukotā* as a scribal error for **Bāṅgukotäna* (sg. instr.-abl.). Since in this contract she neither gave a guarantee to *Kusāca* that he will be free from any liability, nor did *Bāṅgukota* present himself as a witness or guarantor, it

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and here, this private(?) *histanaka* has been bought by the *Kusāca*-official. (7–8) Moreover, to sell [it] to another person and to …, to give [as] a gift(?) …, all right must yield(?) to the *Kusāca*-official and his sons. (8–10) There should be no *ñiwānā* … , a man, a son [and] a brother belonging to *Hvunāsa*'s house, who … to make false accusation/counterfeit(?) to this contract. (10–11) If …, the punishment is thus: he must give 20 *bārrā*s as/to *tʰeśa* of the king, in(?) … they must beat him [with] 60 [strokes]. There should be no arguments about this. (12–15) Then the marks of the boundaries of the four directions of this private(?) *histanaka* is to be said: the eastern boundary [is] *Bāṅgukota*'s *paräṅga*, the southern [is] the *paräṅga* … by the *Cāṃṣi*-official, the western is … *paräṅga*, the northern … The marks of the boundaries of the four directions have been said. (15–16) Here [are] the witnesses who have understood [and] recognized [this/the contract]. Witness [sic!]: *Māg₁uni* [and] *Zaṅgari*.
(17) Witness [sic!]: *Cewarmi* [and] *Anaräki*.

Finger-measure of *Hvunāsa* the seller, aged 61.

(18) Witness: *Ulāṅgi*.

4. Dating and internal relationships of Tumshuqese contracts

As mentioned above, Konow initially dated the Tumshuqese documents he edited to after 692 CE. Afterwards he explained that although Tumshuqese seems to be more archaic, it was reduced to writing later than Khotanese. In his view, Khotanese was used in documents and literature at least from the beginning of the 8th until the end of the 10th century, and probably reduced to writing sometime before the oldest and best written texts known to scholars.[56] Here it is impossible to review all the relevant paleographical and philological works, yet it is noteworthy that Sander avoids drawing conclusions on this issue and prudently places Tumshuqese texts in the 7th ~ 14th century.[57] Some scholars think they may be as late as after 900 CE[58], while some others tried to date them before the Tang period.[59] Towards the end of his life, Emmerick was

is not impossible that there was a complicated background to this transaction, and her identity as a *ñizeja* may have to be taken into consideration.

56 Konow 1947, pp. 161–162. The initial date for writing Khotanese has now been revised to the 5th century, see Maggi 2004.

57 Sander 1986, pp. 163, 166; 2005, p. 135.

58 For example, Tamai 2011, p. 528, n. 73. He presumes that Kuchean documents should be later than 900 AD by taking Tumshuqese ones as such. This view actually follows the one expressed in Schmidt 2001.

59 Lin (1995) dated Tumshuqese texts to the middle of the 4th century; however see Rong/Duan 1996.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

inclined to assign the majority of Tumshuqese documents to the late seventh or the eighth century.[60]

From the evidence of unearthed documents, the practice of the finger-measure is a characteristic feature from the early seventh century to the beginning of ninth century in Xinjiang. The seller's guarantee for the buyer also suggests a comparison of TUMXUQ 002~004 with medieval Chinese and Bactrian contracts. While the early Prakrit contracts from Niya, Endere and Lop Nor just emphasize the absolute authority of the deed – in several cases with an accompanying penalty clause – such a guarantee is not common in Old Uyghur contracts.[61] Therefore, it is not impossible that HL 13.7 *pʰaṃ kwāṃ* (restored from the sg. gen. *pʰaṃ kwā nā*) and HL 3.8 *hvū ṣi* respectively could be matched with Chin. *Panguan* 判官 (the title of an official in the Tang period who made a judgement and submitted it to his supervisors for approval) and *Fushi* 副使 "Vice-Commissioner", although it is not sure whether these attestations in Tumshuqese actually meant personal names or not.[62]

TUMXUQ 001~004 seem to be a group of documents kept by the family of a *Kusāca*, which is likely to be an official title. The proper name of the *Kusāca* is specified as *Yāna* in TUMXUQ 001a.5–6 (cf. Sogd. *yʾnʾkk*).[63] The personal name *Mud₁iki* found both in TUMXUQ 002 and 003 also implies that TUMXUQ 001~004 were written within a limited period. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the newly attested king *Yonduya* (or *Yondwi*, *Yondu*)[64] is another local ruler under overall Tang rule. In other words, we may regard HL 1~5 as documents kept by *V₁ātsi* the *Cazba* and his descendants and TUMXUQ 001~004 as ones kept by *Yāna* the *Kusāca* and his descendants.

As yet, the chronological order between *Yonduya* (or *Yondwi*, *Yondu*) and *Wāsudewa* is unknown. It is not clear where and when TUMXUQ 001~004 were unearthed exactly, a situation which applies to most Tumshuqese texts known to scholars. According to the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City, the photographs published recently belong to a group of old color photographs that were handed over to the authorities; they are now kept in the archive of the bureau. It is easy to see that these old photographs are themselves remade from earlier black-and-white ones after the signatures TUMXUQ 001a, 001b, 002a, 002b, 003c and 003b were written at the bottom in ink. TUMXUQ 004 is our

60 Emmerick 2009, p. 379.

61 In *SUK* the sale contracts Sa21 and Sa23 can be found with such guarantees.

62 On the Khotanese and Kuchean forms of *Fushi*, see the recent discussion in Ching/Ogihara 2010b, p. 112. On the non-native official positions and titles used by Kucheans and other non-Chinese as personal names, cf. Ching 2013, pp. 339; 360, n. 101.

63 Ogihara/Ching 2012, p. 56; 2014, p. 11, n. 13. For this name, see also Lurje 2010, p. 453 (No. 1491) and Ching 2013, p. 341, based on Yoshida's earlier identification between Sogd. *yʾnʾkk* and Chin. 野那 *Yena*.

64 Gen. sg. *Yonduyā* (TUMXUQ 002a.1). The possibility *Yondwi* was contributed by Dr. Maue (p. c. August 2013)

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

provisional number, but it is unknown whether there is such a signature on the initial photograph. Local scholars in Tumshuk vaguely state that the documents were found 100 years ago at the same time as the ones now kept abroad but that they were later burnt and lost.[65] However, we need more evidence to prove this statement. The district had caught the attention of westerners by the end of the 19th century before the German and French excavations. After Huang Wenbi's visit in 1929, there was a systematic excavation in 1958.[66] Tracing the precise origins of these new materials is not an easy task.

5. Some other linguistic observations

5.1 *kruṣta-* "contract/document" and agent nouns

The word *kruṣta-* has been regarded as the past participle of *krus-* (Khot. *grūs-/ggurṣṭa-* "to call") since 1935.[67] However, historical phonology does not support this equation, namely the initial fricatives of Khotanese and Tumshuqese followed immediately by /r/ became voiced, /χr/ > /γr/: *grūs-* < **xraus-*.[68] TUMXUQ 001~004 enable a detailed comparison of the scribe's self identification with HL 1~4 at the end of contracts, which reveals three significant nouns: (1) *kruṣta-*, an a-stem noun meaning "contract, document";[69] (2) nom. sg. *kṛri*, an agent noun meaning "scribe"; (3) nom. sg. *kurāki* "scribe" (*kur-* "to write"[70]), it is not certain if it is an exact synonym of *kṛri*.

In fact, two suffixes are attested in TUMXUQ 001~004 other than the *-āka* identified by Bailey as characterizing agent nouns:[71] *-ākya* and *-i* (or *-ia*). As for *-āka*, new words include *diyāka-* (*di-* "to see"); *kuzāki* nom. sg. "one who seeks(?)" (*kuz-* "to seek(?)"[72]); *pursāki* nom. sg. "one who asks" (*purs-* "to ask"[73]). *kurāki* also has this suffix. However, because the nom. sg. of this type could have the same form as that with the suffix *-ākya*, it is usually difficult to determine their actual suffixes due to their limited attestation. As for *-ākya*, certain examples include *rämyāki* nom. sg. "title of a monastery" (*räm-* "to be") in addition to

65 Xie/Yang 2009, p. 144. Cf. Ogihara/Ching 2012, p. 44.
66 Rong 1991, p. 1; 2005, pp. 119–120, though there he gave the year as 1928.
67 Konow 1935, p. 819a; 1947, p. 179; Bailey 1958, pp. 150–151, and Skjærvø 1987, p. 84.
68 Emmerick 1989, p. 213.
69 Sg. acc. *kruṣtu*; sg. gen. *kruṣtā*; sg. instr.-abl. *kruṣtana*; sg. loc. *kruṣte*, cf. TPR, pp. 91–93; Ogihara/Ching 2014, pp. 39–41.
70 We owe the suggestion about this verb to Dr. Maue (p.c. March 2013). Because the nom. sg. of this type could have the same form as that derived by the suffix *-ākya*, it is difficult to decide by which suffix of *-āka* or *-ākya* these agent nouns are derived.
71 Bailey (1968, p. 50) to account for *barāka*.
72 Cf. Khot. *kūys-* "to seek" (Bailey 1979, p. 62a) and *kūś-* "to seek" (Emmerick 1968, p. 23).
73 Cf. Skjærvø 1987, p. 85.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

"seller" indicated in section 2. As for *-i* (or *-ia*):[74] *kṛri*, in addition to *pursi*, *purtsi*, *pʰursi* nom. sg. "debtor" (*purs-* "to ask"), perhaps the original meaning is "the one who requests" or "the one being demanded".

5.2 Words and forms newly attested in TUMXUQ 001~004

Here are a selection of the most important words and grammatical forms newly attested in TUMXUQ 001~004 in addition to the ones that have been mentioned above, including: (1) nouns, (2) verbs and (3) other parts of speech.

(1) New Tumshuqese words include *aśa-* "horse" (sg. gen. *aśā*, TUMXUQ 002a.1, 003a.1; Khot. *aśśa-*) and *gūha-* "ox" (sg. gen. *gūhā* TUMXUQ 001a.1, 001b.9; Khot. *gūha-*), as well as adjectives such as *azad₁a-* "unborn" (pl. instr.-abl. *azad₁yo* TUMXUQ 002a.8; Khot. *aysāta-*), *zād₁a-* "born" (pl. instr.-abl. *zād₁yo* TUMXUQ 002a.8; Khot. *ysāta-*)[75], and *purra-* "full" (sg. loc. *purrye*, TUMXUQ 004.2; Khot. *purra-*). It is also remarkable that *hvā* "sister" has *howa* as a variant for the sg. nom., the corresponding form of which is not attested for Khot. *hvar-*.

(2) Various verbal forms are identified with the following four verbs:

u-, *v₁a-* "to be(come)" (3rd sg. prs. act. *ud₁i*, *v₁ad₁i*; 3rd sg. impv. act. *ud₁u*, *ūd₁u*, *v₁ad₁u*; Khot. *väta-* used only for the past stem of *ah-* "to be") < OIr. **bū-* "to be(come)".

biṣt- "to place, establish(?)". 1st pl. prs. act. *biṣtama* (HL 1.14) has been construed as a past tense since Konow. However, a noun *biṣtye* is frequently attested in TUMXUQ 002 and 004 and suggests a verb *biṣt-*,[76] so that *biṣtye* can be explained as its gerundive, namely the participle of necessity which corresponds to that derived from the suffix *-ya* in Khotanese.[77] From the context *biṣtye* seems to mean "private" after a comparison of four limits of real estates in other languages. A hapax *biṣtakye* (sg. gen., TUMXUQ 001b.11) would also derive from the same verb by *-ākya*.

hvay- "to beat" (ger. m. sg. nom. *hvayi*, HL 1.13, TUMXUQ 002a.16 and 3rd pl. impv. act. *hvendu*, TUMXUQ 003a.14, 004.11), see above about the penalty clause.

74 It is also difficult to decide by which suffix, *-i* or *-ia*, the following agent nouns are derived, because only the nom. sg. is attested. Concerning Khot. *-ia*, see Degener 1989, pp. 115–126.

75 It is striking that the privative *azad₁a-* has a short vowel as opposed to *zād₁a-*. This distinction may shed light on the phonology of Tumshuqese.

76 The verb *biṣt-* would be related to OIr. **abi-štā-* "to place, set", cf. Cheung 2007, pp. 358–361. See also Bactr. *αβιþταδο* "master (craftsman)" < **abi-štāta-*, Sims-Williams 2007, p. 185b.

77 On the Khotanese gerundive, cf. Emmerick 1968, pp. 217–218. This derivation in Tumshuqese was first pointed out by Bailey 1958, pp. 150–151.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

hvardu (TUMXUQ 001a.14) is the 3rd sg. impv. act. of *hvar-* "to take", see above about the penalty clause.

(3) Newly attested numerals: *hoda-* "seven" *(hodyo)*, *ne- (nä-)* "nine", *bid$_1$a-* "second" *(bid$_1$ane)*, *dṛdwe* "third" (sg. loc.!)[78], *śowarsama-* "eleventh" *(śowarsamane)*. Tumsh. *mā* construed as "thus, so" by Konow should be a demonstrative pronoun. Its declension is attested as follows: sg. nom. *mā*; sg. acc. *maru*, *marä*; sg. gen. *marā*, *marye*; pl. nom./acc. *mare*; pl. gen. *maranu*.

6. Concluding remarks

In this article we tried to demonstrate the value of the newly identified Tumshuqese contracts. Some of the most remarkable findings that will be developed farther in the near future are summarized here.

First of all, it seems that the Tumshuqese contracts are relatively close to Bactrian and Chinese ones of the 7th–8th century. In other words, they reflect socio-cultural influences both from east and west. Many similarities can also be found in earlier (esp. Niya-Prakrit) or later (esp. Old Uyghur) contracts, as well as other more or less contemporary ones (e. g. Kuchean, Sogdian and Khotanese) that cannot be fully discussed here. Nevertheless, from the common features of TUMXUQ 002~004 one can assume that HL 13 (= TS 23) and HL 33 (= TS 15) are also damaged sale contracts.

The identification of the four limits in TUMXUQ 002 and 004 implies that the new words *paräṅga* and *histanaka* are certain kinds of real estate, while *hampara* – the object of sale in TUMXUQ 003 – seems to be a property of which the definition of four limits is unnecessary. A *hampara* can very probably bring yearly profit (cf. HL 3). In HL 1, two brothers made a deal to define their share of the profit from a *hampara*. There are some candidates in addition to Konow's suggestion of "store"[79] or Bailey's one of wine industry.[80] For example, mills and oil presses were both valuable properties in the medieval economy.

One may relate Tumsh. *hampara* to Sogd. *pāra-* "loan, money"[81]. However, since this word is indicated as the object of sale in TUMXUQ 003 without further specification, *hampara* is rather to be understood as a concrete noun than an abstract term such as "mortgage" or "deposit". We suggest that in this contract, *Mudik$_1$i* previously pawned a *hampara* owned communally by him and his brother *Yaśowana* in exchange for 3 *bārrā*s from the *Kusāca*-official. Because *Mudik$_1$i* could not pay the loan back in time, the *hampara* must be sold. Thus, TUMXUQ 003 was made in order to show that *Yaśowana* and his

78 We owe the reading *dwe* to Dr. Maue (p. c. October 2012).
79 Konow (1947, p. 189) listed the word as *haṃpara* and equated it with Pers. *ambār* "store".
80 Bailey 1958, pp. 152–153.
81 Durkin-Meisterernst (p. c. September 2014).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

children agreed to sell it off as a whole. From the context it is uncertain whether the *hampara* was actually sold for 8 *bārrā*s (i.e. 2 *bārrā*s taken by *Yaśowana* and his children, 3 taken by *Mudik$_1$i* and 3 counted as the debt paid back to the pawnbroker) or 5 *bārrā*s (i.e. *Mudik$_1$i* finally obtained nothing after the transaction). Nor is it clear whether *Mudik$_1$i* and his pawnbroker made another contract concerning the sale of this *hampara*. However, it is noteworthy that *Yaśowana* and his children said *dvi bārre hu ñesamanāne* (subj.) "we shall obtain 2 *bārra*s" and *dre ṣe bārre p^{h}urtsi ñesta* (inj.) "the debtor (=*Mudik$_1$i*) takes 3 *bārrā*s" before confirming the purchase. The function of the injunctive in Tumshuqese loan contracts will be an interesting issue concerning the daily language and the economy in this area[82].

Moreover, if the interpretation of *niraṅga* approximately as "owing" (cf. Skt. *niraṅga-* "incomplete, having no resources or expedients") in TUMXUQ 003a.5–6: *maru hamparu Kusācā we dre bārre we ñir̲a̲ṅgu v$_1$asti* "[the brother] was(?) owing 3 *bārrā*s to the *Kusāca*-official [secured by] this *hampara*" is acceptable, HL 2 may refer to *Briki*'s loan of cash from his brother *V$_1$ātsi* the *Cazba*, while HL 4 may have resulted from a previously unpaid loan so that the creditor *V$_1$ātsi* the *Cazba* used the debtor's *hampara* and took profit generated by it for one year. In other words, HL 2.5–6: *ate V$_1$ātsiyā Cazbye we dre bārre we ñir̲a̲ṅgi v$_1$astamyāne* could be translated approximately as "Then I would like to obtain 3 *bārrā*s [as my debt] owed to *V$_1$ātsi* the *Cazbā*" (i.e. *V$_1$ātsi* lent out 3 *bārrā*s to the speaker). Accordingly HL 4.4–6: *ate maru hamparu V$_1$ātsiyā Cazbye we ñir̲a̲ṅgū v$_1$astamyāne dvi bārre χši pmaiñci* would mean "Then I would like to obtain 2 *bārrā*s [and] 6 *pmaiñci*s [as my debt] owed to *V$_1$ātsi* the *Cazbā* [secured by] this *hampara*" (i.e. *V$_1$ātsi* lent out 2 *bārrā*s and 6 *pmaiñci*s to the speaker). It was easy to observe that *maru hamparu* is found both in TUMXUQ003 and HL 4, thus the accusative of this phrase very probably denotes that the debtor's *hampara* was secured for a cash loan.[83]

The meaning of Tumsh. *niraṅga* would differ from that of *av$_1$andane*. The latter may be locative, and its meaning may be "(with) a disease; (with) disability; (in the situation of) deficiency or failure" as attested in TUMXUQ 001a.3–4: *Brikanonā av$_1$andane* ♦ *Utpali* ♦ *Hvunāci* ♦ *Bati* ♦ *Hurzarka* ♦ *Helac^{h}orri* ♦ *Brig$_1$icki ṣe* ♦ *taro hvanandi ṣte* "due to [the fact that] *Brikana* [is] (with) a disease (?), [the men] *Utpala, Hvunāca, Bati, Hurzarka, Helac^{h}orra, Brig$_1$icki* speak thus: [the main text contract]", and this situation is repeated in TUMXUQ 001b.10–11. Another usage of this word is found in TUMXUQ 001a.5–6:

82 Concerning the Tumshuqese verbal system, see Ogihara (forthcoming).

83 Accordingly, Yoshida (p.c May 2014) kindly suggested that Tumsh. *ñir̲a̲ngu v$_1$asti* attested in TUMXUQ 003a.5–6 could indicate "he put up [this *hampara*] as security" (*apud* Ogihara/Ching 2014, p. 25, n. 33). In this case, HL 11.17: *maryo mryo cila niraṅga nizeja arda* may be understood as "he put up this money as security for *cila* and *nizeja*", and the verb *v$_1$ast-* may mean "to place, establish".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

saṅgarme nu kʰāzanā av₁andane ♦ *saṅgyā* ♦ *bisvara* za g_2e d_1a g_2o *mā parenda* "In the monastery, due to a harvest failure (?), the relatives of the monastery(?) were …". In this phrase, *kʰāzanā* is instrumental-ablative of *kʰāza-* as *Brikanonā* (instr.-abl.), thus *kʰāzanā av₁andane* may just mean "because of the deficiency in food".[84]

We suggest that the stem of *av₁andane* may be related to Bactr. *βονδο* "completely",[85] to which a negative prefix *a-* has been added. However, we are not sure if this word can be further etymologically compared with Sogd. *βnd'm* "punishment" or Bactrian *αβινδαμο* "penalty". According to Hitch,[86] the Tumshuqese word functionally corresponding to Niya-Pkt. *aviṃd(h)ama* is *tʰeśa*, for example he translated HL 1.13: *ride tʰeśa bārre roro patsasu* as "I should give as *theśa* (?) fifty *bārrā*s to the king", but we would rather translate it as "we should give fifty *bārrā*s as/to *theśa* (?) of the king". In this phrase, both *tʰeśa* and *bārre* are in the accusative. According to Yoshida, *ride tʰeśa* may indicate "treasury of the royal family (in contrast to governmental treasury)" as well as *rid₁e ārrunde* in TUMXUQ 003a.14, based on his distinction between *rrvī(ya)* "royal" and *kṣīrū* "of state" in the taxation system of Khotan.[87]

Interestingly, the Tumshuqese terms for the four directions differ from Khotanese. The Tumshuqese link between "north" and mountains can be understood from the local landscape as well as from related concepts in Altaic languages and Tocharian.

Obviously, a lot of work remains to be done in order to fully understand the Tumshuqese documents in their historical and linguistic context. We wish that this preliminary report will show how the new materials from Tumshuk can shed light on the study of Tumshuqese and Middle Iranian.

Abbreviations

BAI	*Bulletin of the Asia Institute*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
SIAL	内陸アジア言語の研究 *Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyū – Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*
XYWS	西域文史 *Xiyu wenshi – Literature and History of the Western Regions* [in Chinese]

84 Other attestations include the obscure phrase HL 5.1–2: *mye Ulāṅgi brād₁e ayi dase sāli yi a rje bi v₁e jo g₁i av₁andane χšere …* "I, *Ulāṅgi* had a brother [being] 10 years old, … *av₁andane* … in the country …", and the sentence HL 6.7–8: *pesonā avandañe ṣona v₁ara ād₁a* "Because of the teacher [being] with a disease (?), the *ṣona*s have arrived there."

85 From **bawant-a-*, cf. Sims-Williams 2007, p. 204a.

86 Hitch 1990, p. 3. According to Sims-Williams (2007, p. 184), Niya-Pkt. *aviṃd(h)ama* is borrowed from Bactrian.

87 Yoshida, p.c. May 2014 (*apud* Ogihara/Ching 2014, p. 35, n. 57). See also Yoshida 2008, p. 108.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

References

Bailey, H. W. 1958: "Languages of the Saka." In: K. Hoffmann *et al.* (eds.): *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. 1. Abt. Bd. 4: *Iranistik*. 1. Abschnitt: *Linguistik*. Leiden, pp. 131–154.
— 1968: *Saka Documents. Text volume.* London.
— 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. London.
Burrow, T. 1937: *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* Cambridge.
— 1940: *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* London.
Cheung, J. 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden.
Ching, C.-J. 2013: "The activities of Sogdian Buddhists in Kucha as observed in the Tocharian B secular documents." In: M. De Chiara/M. Maggi/G. Martini (eds.): *Buddhism among the Iranian peoples of Central Asia*. Wien, pp. 333–383.
— forthcoming: "The four directions in Tumshuqese." Paper to be submitted to the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies, 15–19.09.2015 at St. Petersburg, Russia, organized by Societas Iranologica Europaea.
Ching, C.-J./H. Ogihara 2010a: "Internal relationships and dating of the Tocharian B monastic accounts in the Berlin collection." In: *SIAL* 25, pp. 75–142.
— 2010b: "A Tocharian B sale contract on a wooden tablet." In: *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 5 (2010 [2012]), pp. 101–128.
— 2012: "On a Tocharian B monastic account kept in the Otani Collection." In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13, pp. 77–115.
De Chiara, M. 2013: *The Khotanese Sudhanāvadāna*. Wiesbaden.
— 2014: *The Khotanese Sudhanāvadāna. Commentary*. Wiesbaden.
Degener, A. 1989: *Khotanische Suffixe*. Stuttgart.
Duan, Q. 2012: "尉遲曜11年裴捺賣地案牘 [A Contract for purchase of an estate dated to the 11th year of the Khotanese king Viśya Vāhaṃ]." In: *XYWS* 7, pp. 123–137.
Durkin-Meisterernst, D. *et al.* (eds.) 2004: *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road.* Berlin.
Emmerick, R. E. 1968: *Saka Grammatical Studies*. London.
— 1989: "Khotanese and Tumšuqese." In: R. Schmitt (ed.): *Compendium linguarum Iranicarum.* Wiesbaden, pp. 204–229.
— 2009: "Khotanese and Tumshuqese." In: G. L. Windfuhr (ed.): *The Iranian Languages*. London, pp. 377–415.
Emmerick, R. E./P. O. Skjærvø 1997: *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese III*. Wien.
Hansen, V. 1995: *Negotiating Daily Life in Traditional China. How Ordinary People Used Contracts, 600–1400*. New Haven.
Hitch, D. 1988: "Penalty clauses in Tumshuqese, Khotanese and Shanshan Prakrit." In: *Studia Iranica* 17, pp. 147–152.
— 1990: "Prakrit Administration at Tumshuq." Text of paper read at the 33rd ICANAS. Available at http://www.ynlc.ca/ynlc/staff/hitch/hitchindex.html.
— 2009: *The special status of Turfan.* Philadelphia.
HL = D. Maue 2009: *Tumshuqese Manuscripts. A provisional Handlist*. Available at http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/iranica/tumshuq/handlist.pdf.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Huang, W. 1958: 塔里木盆地考古記 *Talimu pendi kauguji*. Beijing.
KI = A. M. Boyer/E. J. Rapson/E. Sénart/P. S. Noble: *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*. Parts I–III. Oxford 1920–1929.
Konow, S. 1935: "Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt." In: *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Jahrgang 1935, XX, pp. 770–823, 8 pls.
— 1947: "The oldest dialect of Khotanese Saka." In: *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 14, pp. 156–190.
Lin, M. 1995: "疏勒語考 Shuleyu kao." In: 傳統文化與現代化 *Chuantongwenhua yu xiandaihua* 1995.4, pp. 55–64.
Lurje, P. 2010: *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts.* Wien.
Maggi, M. 2004: "The Manuscript T III S 16: Its Importance for the History of Khotanese Literature." In: Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* 2004, pp. 184–190.
Maue, D. 2004: "Konows Zeichen Nr. 10." In: Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* 2004, pp. 208–212.
— 2009: *Corpus of Tumshuqese fragments. Introduction, Handlist, Transliteration.* Available at http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/texte2.htm#tumshuq.
Maue, D./H. Ogihara (forthcoming): "Tumschukische Miszellen III. Tumshukese Dental Affricates." Published in this volume.
Mori, M. 1967: "Sïči と四至 Sïči to shishi." In: 古代トルコ民族史研究 *Kodai Toruko Minzokushi Kenkyū* I. Tokyo, pp. 477–493 [Originally published in: 東洋史論叢: 和田博士古稀記念 *Tōyōshi ronsō: Wada hakase koki kinen*. Tokyo 1961].
Ogihara, H. (forthcoming): "The injunctive in Tumshuqese." Paper to be submitted to the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies, 15–19.09.2015 at St. Petersburg, Russia, organized by Societas Iranologica Europaea.
Ogihara, H./C.-J. Ching 2012: "新出據史德語寺院契約文書及其他 [A newly found Tumshuqese monastic contract and other related findings]." In: *XYWS* 7, pp. 43–61.
— 2014: "新出トゥムシュク語契約文書について [On the Tumshuqese contracts newly published in China]." In: *SIAL* 29, pp. 7–55.
Pinault, G.-J. 1998: "Tocharian languages and pre-Buddhist culture." In: V. H. Mair (ed.): *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Eastern Central Asia.* Vol. I: *Archaeology, Migration and Nomadism, Linguistics.* Washington, DC, pp. 358–371.
Pulleyblank, E. G. 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin.* Vancouver.
Rong, X. 1991: "所謂'Tumshuqese' 文書中的 '*gyāźdi-*' [On *gyāźdi-* found in the so-called Tumshuqese documents]." In: *SIAL* 7 (1991 [1992]), pp. 1–12.
— 2005: "The name of the so-called 'Tumshuqese' language." In: *BAI* 19 (2005 [2009]), pp. 119–127.
Rong, X./Q. Duan 1996: "據史德語考 Jushideyu kao." In: 中亞學刊 *Zhonaya xuekan* 5, pp. 9–21.
Sander, L. 1986: "Brāhmī scripts on the Eastern Silk Roads." In: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 11–12, pp. 159–192.
— 2005: "Remarks on the formal Brāhmī script from the southern Silk Route." In: *BAI* 19 (2005 [2009]), pp. 133–144.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Schmidt, K. T. 2001: "Zeitenwende an der Seidenstraße. Zur Sprachgeschichte des Westtocharischen nach der Schlacht von To-ho (648 n. Chr.)." In: L. Deitz (ed.): *Tempus edax rerum, le bicentenaire de la Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg (1798–1998)*. Luxembourg, pp. 151–162.

Sims-Williams, N. 2000: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents.* Oxford [Revised edition London 2012].

— 2005: "Before the quarrel: a Bactrian purchase contract." In: *BAI* 19 (2005 [2009]), pp. 191–197.

— 2007: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist Texts.* Oxford.

— 2012: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan III: Plates.* Oxford.

Skjærvø, P. O. 1987: "On the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā text." In: *JRAS* 1987.1, pp. 77–90.

— 2003: *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library. A Complete Catalogue with Texts and Translations.* London [Reprinted with corrections].

— 2004: *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: the Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. 2 vols. Duxbury.

SUK = N. Yamada: ウイグル文契約文書集成 [*Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte*]. Edited and revised by J. Oda, P. Zieme, H. Umemura and T. Moriyasu. 3 vols. Suita 1993.

Takeuchi T. 1994: *A Study of the Old Tibetan Contracts*. Doctoral thesis. Department of the Central Asian Studies, Indiana University.

Tamai, T. 2011: *Paläographische Untersuchungen zum B-Tocharischen.* Innsbruck.

TTD3 = T. Yamamoto/O. Ikeda: *Tunhuang and Turfan Documents Concerning Social and Economic History*. Vol. 3. Tokyo 1986.

TPR = Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City, Center for Research on Ancient Chinese History, Peking University, Institute for Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions, Renmin University of China: "三件新出據史德語契約 [Three newly found Tumshuqese sale contracts]." In: 西域歴史語言研究所集刊 *Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions* 7 (2014), pp. 63–105.

Trombert, É. 2000: *Les manuscrits chinois de Koutcha. Fonds Pelliot de la Bibliothèque nationale de France.* Paris.

Xie, J. 2005: 圖木舒克史話 *Tumushuke shihua*. Urumchi.

Xie, J./Z. Yang 2009: 絲路中道名城據史德 – 圖木舒克歴史文物概覽 *Silu zhongdao mingcheng Jushide – Tumushuke lishi wenwu gailan*. Peking.

Yakubovich, I. 2006: "Marriage Sogdian style." In: H. Eichner *et al.* (eds.): *Iranistik in Europa – Gestern, Heute, Morgen.* Wien, pp. 307–344.

Yoshida, Y. 2006: 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 chutsudo 8–9 seiki no kōtango sezoku monjo ni kansuru oboegaki*. Kobe.

— 2008: "On the taxation system of pre-islamic Khotan." In: *Acta Asiatica* 94, pp. 95–126.

Yoshida, Y./T. Moriyasu/Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Museum 1989: "麹氏高昌国時代ソグド文女奴隷売買文書 [A Sogdian sale contract of a female slave from the period of the Gaochang 高昌 kingdom under the rule of Qu 麹 clan]." In: *SIAL* 4, pp. 1–50.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 1: TUMXUQ 001a

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 2: TUMXUQ 001b

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 3: TUMXUQ 002a

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 4: TUMXUQ 002b

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 5: TUMXUQ 003b

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 6: TUMXUQ 003a

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Photograph courtesy of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City

Fig. 7: TUMXUQ 004

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Order of Climes in Nezāmi's *Haft peykar*

Paola Orsatti, Rome

In a passage from the poem *Haft peykar* devoted to the praises of the dedicatee, the Atābek ʿAlā al-Din Mohammad b. Aq-Sonqor Korp (or Korpah) Arslān of the Ahmadili dynasty, ruler of Marāghe in Azerbaijan (r. before 1188–1207),[1] Nezāmi says:

همه عالم تن‌اند و ایران دل / نیست گوینده زین قیاس خجل
چونکه ایران دل زمین باشد / دل به از تن بود یقین باشد
زان ولایت که سروران دارند / بهترین جای بهتران دارند
دل تویی وین مثل حکایت توست / که دل مملکت ولایت توست

[24] *hame ʿālam tan-and o Irān del / nist guyande z-in qiyās xejel*
[25] *čun-ke Irān del-e zamin bāšad / del beh az tan bovad yaqin bāšad*
[26] *z-ān velāyat ke sarvarān dārand / behtarin jāy behtarān dārand*
[27] *del to-yi v-in masal hekāyat-e to-st / ke del-e mamlekat velāyat-e to-st*

[24] "The entire world is the body, and Iran is the heart; the poet does not feel ashamed for this comparison.
[25] As Iran is the heart of the earth, that the heart is better than the body is certain.
[26] Of that territory which the leaders possess, those (among them) who are the best, rule over the best place.
[27] You are the heart, and this comparison (*masal*, also 'proverbial saying') refers to you. Indeed the heart of the country is your territory."[2]

In this passage the poet refers to the traditional Iranian concept of the world: the world is divided into seven countries *(kešvar)* with Iran – the best country – in the middle, as is the heart in the body. Though some Medieval Persian authors – and Nezāmi among them –sometimes used the term of Greek origin *eqlim* "clime" as an equivalent of *kešvar*, the Hellenistic-Ptolemaic concept of clime implies an idea of the world different from the Iranian one: it refers to a division into seven climatic zones parallel to the Equator, with each climatic belt including – from west to east – different towns and countries.[3] In his poem *Haft peykar* Nezāmi – though occasionally also using the term *eqlim* – mainly refers to the Iranian concept.

1 See Luther 1987, p. 900.
2 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1389, ch. 6, ll. 24–27.
3 See Miquel 1971.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In line 26 the poet develops a further concept: of the territory *(velāyat)* ruled by the leaders *(sarvarān)*, those who are the best dominate over the best place. This is a quasi-riddle, but can be solved with reference to a well-known proverbial saying *(masal)*: the "territory which the leaders possess" is Iran, not the entire world or the different realms, as it has sometimes been interpreted; and the best part, the heart of the country *(mamlekat)* is the territory *(velāyat)* ruled by Korp Arslān , the best among the rulers of Iran.

The idea of Iraq and western Iran as the heart of Iran *(del-e Irānšahr)* is very ancient, and represents a sort of proverbial saying. It goes back to Sasanid times, when the axis of Iranism moved from east to west as an essential part of the Sasanids' political programme:

> While Seleucid and Parthian Ariana did not organically include Western Iran, Sassanian Ērānshahr extended so far as to include the western regions of the Iranian world and, for obvious political reasons, the heart of the empire, Iraq, which was significantly described as *del-e Irânshahr*.[4]

This idea formed the basis of and probably merged into the Islamic concept of Iraq as the best part of the fourth clime, the intermediate one among the seven parallel belts.[5] It is also voiced by a number of Arabic and Persian-Islamic authors. Ibn Khurdādbih (10th c.), in his *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*, says that the Kings of the Persians considered the Sawād (i. e. Iraq[6]) as the heart of Īrānshahr, and even identifies Īrānshahr with Iraq.[7] Also Hamd Allāh Mostowfi Qazvini (d. 1344 ca.), probably quoting from this work, considers Arabic Iraq *(ʿErāq-e ʿarab)* as the heart of Iran.[8] With a shift from (Arabic) Iraq to north-western Iran, Nezāmi praises the dedicatee's city, Marāghe, as the heart of Iran.

A little further on, in the same chapter of *Haft peykar* devoted to the praises of the dedicatee, Nezāmi amplifies his praise extolling Korp Arslān as the sovereign from whom the seven countries, that is the entire world, receive their fortune and happiness:

> هر ولایت که چون تو شه دارد / ایزد از هر بدش نگه دارد
> زان سعادت که در سرت دانند / مقبل هفت کشورت خوانند
> [31] *har velāyat ke čun to šah dārad / Izad az har bad-aš negah dārad*
> [32] *z-ān saʿādat ke dar sar-at dānand / moqbel-e haft kešvar-at xwānand*
> [31] "Every territory which has a king like you, God preserves it from every evil.
> [32] For that glory which is acknowledged to you, you are called 'the fortunate/ the ruler of the seven countries'."

4 Gnoli 1989, pp. 156–157.
5 Cf. Miquel 1971, p. 1104A.
6 See Schaeder 1998.
7 de Goeje 1889, pp. 5, 10.
8 Le Strange 1915, p. 28.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

This idea is further expanded in line 33, where Nezāmi says that the fifth country is prosperous and the other six countries are happy thanks to the dedicatee:

> پنجمین کشور از تو آبادان / وز تو شش کشور دگر شادان
> [33] *panjomin kešvar az to ābādān / v-az to šeš kešvar-e degar šādān*
> [33] "The fifth country is prosperous thanks to you, and from you the other six countries are happy."[9]

But what is the fifth country? Commentators propose different explanations. According to Hasan Vahid Dastgerdi, the fifth country is Azerbaijan: an explanation perhaps dictated by the simple fact that Korp Arslān was the ruler of that region;[10] whereas Behruz Sarvatiyān quotes a series of countries which were comprised into the fifth clime, clearly understood, however, according to the Greek concept of a climatic belt.[11] But Nezāmi seems to have had mainly the Iranian concept in mind: in his poem, he mentions only one country associated with every princess, thereby excluding any reference to the concept of clime intended as a climatic belt. Moreover, the image of Iran as central country, surrounded by the other six, is a clear reference to the Iranian concept of the world. The explanations proposed as to the identity of the fifth country are not convincing.

In the chapter in praise of Korp Arslān, Nezāmi insists on the importance of number five. Indeed, a little further on in the same chapter, when highlighting analogies between Korp Arslān and the great kings of the Iranian myth, Nezāmi presents Korp Arslān as the fifth king in a series of great kings: Eskandar, who was advised and taught by Aristotle; Nushirvān, with his minister Bozorjmehr; (Khosrow) Parviz with his musician Bārbad; Malekshāh, advised and taught by Nezām al-Molk, and Korp Arslān advised by Nezāmi.[12] Though Nezāmi does not say this, one should not forget that the hero of the poem, Bahrām-e Gur "Bahrām the onager / of the onager(s)", according to the traditional explanation, was the fifth Sasanid sovereign of this name: Bahrām V (r. 421–438). Also for this reason Nezāmi's statement that "The fifth country is prosperous thanks to you (Korp Arslān)" must have a particular meaning in the context of the poem.

As is well-known, in Nezāmi's poem, each of the seven princesses of the seven countries narrates a tale to Bahrām in the palace named *Haft gombad* "The Seven Cupolas, The Seven Heavens": a palace composed of seven domed pavilions of different colors, each associated with a planet. On each day of the week Bahrām, dressed up in the color related to the dominant planet of that day, takes himself to the pavilion of the same color, where one of the seven

9 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1389, ch. 6, ll. 31–33.
10 Nezāmi *apud* Vahid Dastgerdi 1376, p. 31.
11 Sarvatiyān 1389, p. 419.
12 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1389, ch. 6, ll. 35–40.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

princesses resides. Whereas the country of the princesses Bahrām visited on Saturday (India), Sunday (Rum), Tuesday (Slavonia) and Thursday (China) is clearly expressed in the text, for the other days of the week such identification is not directly deducible. In chapter 15, Nezāmi quotes the seven princesses, with their countries of origin, in this order: India, China, Choresmia, Slavonia, Maghreb, Rum and Iran.[13] In chapter 29, he quotes the countries from which Bahrām asked for the princesses' hand in this order: Iran, China, Rum, Maghreb, India, Choresmia and Slavonia.[14] And in chapter 31 the seven cupolas' colors and the planets linked to each color are given in the following order: Saturn (black), Jupiter (sandalwood), Mars (red), Sun (yellow), Venus (white), Mercury (turquoise) and Moon (green), without any reference to the countries.[15]

The identity of the princesses' countries and the coupling of the countries with the day of the week, already implicitly stated by Alessandro Bausani,[16] has been finally established by Nosratollah Rastegar.[17] Though some scholars have proposed a different identification,[18] the schema which has been reconstructed is the following (it corresponds to the list of the countries Nezāmi gives in ch. 15, with the inversion of China and Rum, respectively):

Table 1

Day of the week	Planet	Colour	Country of the princesses	Series of the countries (according to manuscripts)
Saturday	Saturn	Black	India	[I]
Sunday	Sun	Yellow	Rum	[II]
Monday	Moon	Green	*Choresmia	[III]
Tuesday	Mars	Red	Slavonia	[IV]
Wednesday	Mercury	Turquoise	*Maghreb	[V]
Thursday	Jupiter	Sandalwood	China	[VI]
Friday	Venus	White	*Iran	[VII]

13 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1389, ch. 15, ll. 10–16.
14 *Ibid.*, ch. 29, ll. 6–19.
15 *Ibid.*, ch. 31, ll. 7–13.
16 Bausani 1960, p. 669.
17 Rastegar 2002, 2008.
18 See for example Qarib 1376, pp. 11–17. By taking the location of the narrated tale as an indication as to the princesses' country, Badr al-Zamān Qarib proposes the following schema: Saturday (India), Sunday (Iran), Monday (Rum), Tuesday (Slavonia), Wednesday (Maghreb), Thursday (China), Friday (Choresmia).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The problem of titles in Nezami's poem

The titles which in the manuscripts and in the different editions of the poem introduce the seven tales put the climes in the same order as the days of the week (see Table 1 above, fifth column). For example, in the Sarvatiyān's edition the title of the Saturday's tale is: *Nešastan-e Bahrām ruz-e šambe dar gombad-e meškin va hekāyat kardan-e doxtar-e malek-e eqlim-e avval* "On Saturday Bahrām goes to the black pavilion; the daughter of the king of the first clime recounts a tale." Whereas the princess which recounts the Sunday's tale is defined as *doxtar-e Qeysar-e Rum* "the daughter of the Qeysar of Rum", the princesses which narrate the other tales are called respectively "the daughter of the king of the third clime" (tale of Monday), "of the fourth clime" (tale of Tuesday), "of the fifth clime" (tale of Wednesday), and so on, therefore implying that the order of the countries/climes is the same order of the days of the week. Likewise, in the Vahid Dastgerdi's edition, the titles introducing the seven tales are: *[…] afsāne goftan-e doxtar-e pādšāh-e eqlim-e avval* "the daughter of the king of the first clime recounts a tale", *[…] afsāne goftan-e doxtar-e pādšāh-e eqlim-e dovvom* "the daughter of the king of the second clime recounts a tale", and so on, with the countries/climes disposed according to the same sequence of the days of the week: Saturday (I clime), Sunday (II clime), Monday (III clime) etc.

If we give credit to the titles, then, we should think that the fifth country in Nezāmi's schema of the world is the Maghreb; and we should conclude that, in the introductory chapter of the poem, Nezāmi praises Korp Arslān as King of the Maghreb; which seems highly improbable. The titles introducing the seven tales in the poem must be wrong. Indeed, some scholars have already expressed doubts about the originality and reliability of the titles given by the manuscripts of Nezāmi's poems.[19]

Mechthild Pantke, deceived by the titles introducing the seven tales in the poem, writes: "Bei der Zuordnung der Einzelnen Klimata zu den 7 Planeten weicht Niẓāmī stark von der Tradition ab". Indeed, this scholar knows very well that the traditional series of the climes follows the order of the planets, from Saturn to the Moon, and not the sequence of the days of the week.[20]

It must be stressed that the list of the different countries/climes, and their place in the list, may vary from author to author. For example, according to Biruni the seven climes are: 1. India; 2. Maghreb; 3. Syria; 4. Irānshahr; 5. Rum and Slavonia; 6. Turkestan and Khazarestan; 7. China and Tibet.[21] It is a list of

19 See for example Grobbel 2010, pp. 95–97.
20 Pantke 1974, pp. 170–172.
21 Cf. Pantke 1974, pp. 169–173; Mo'in 1338, pp. 105–106. Other different schemes are given by Dehkhodā 1325–1358, s.v. *Keshvar*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

countries which only partially coincides with that given by Nezāmi. However, if the identity of the seven countries and their respective place in the list may vary according to the different sources, the series in which they are arranged is certainly not that of the days of the week. We can doubt, therefore, that Iran is the seventh country/clime, as indicated almost invariably by the titles borne by manuscripts.

Werner Sundermann, in his fundamental essay on Nezāmi's *Haft peykar*, considers the information given in the text as insufficient to establish the sequence and possible symbolic meaning of the countries' order in the poem – though the poet certainly complied with the principles of astrology in his representation of the world's parts. The present work is a little contribution in this direction of research, at least as far as the solution of a textual problem, the identification of the fifth country, is concerned. Sundermann is certainly right when he adds that one should avoid too many geographical speculations concerning this poem, given that Nezāmi himself did not attach much importance to the subject.[22]

Iran as the fifth country

Some references to the number five are to be found again in the story of Friday, narrated by the princess of Iran in the white pavilion. The tale's main character is a young man who possesses a beautiful garden surrounded by other gardens: a clear allusion to Iran surrounded by the other countries. At the beginning of the story, when Bahrām enters the pavilion, the poet says:

زهره را برج پنجم اقلیمش / پنج نوبت زنان به تسلیمش
Zohre-rā borj-e panjom eqlim-aš / panj nowbat zanān be taslim-aš
"Venus, having her declination *(eqlim)* in the fifth constellation (Leo), was beating the five rolls of drums as a sign of submission (to Bahrām/the planet Mars)."[23]

The hint to the number five at the beginning of the tale narrated by the princess of Iran confirms what could be supposed from the beginning of the poem: when Nezāmi says that – thanks to Korp Arslān – the fifth country and the other six ones are prosperous, it is clear that he is referring to Iran and to the six countries surrounding it. Korp Arslān is considered not only king of western Iran, the best part of Iran, but king of Iran *tout court*, and, as such, is praised for bestowing prosperity to the entire world: a hyperbolic praise not infrequent in Persian eulogistic poetry as well as in the chapters devoted to the praise of

22 Sundermann 1980, p. 146
23 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1389, ch. 38, l. 3. For the first half-line, Vahid Dastgerdi gives the following reading: *Zohre bar borj-e panjom eqlim-aš* (Nezāmi *apud* Vahid Dastgerdi 1376, p. 292).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the dedicatee in Nezāmi's poems. For example, in the chapter on the "Reasons for composing the book" from *Leyli va Majnun* the poet imagines that his son Mohammad encourages him to accept the king's invitation to compose a new poem, "especially (as it comes from) a king like the King of Sharvān; not of Sharvān only, of all Iran!"[24]

In Nezāmi's schema of the world, then, Iran is the fifth country/clime, not the seventh. On the other hand, the text of the poem gives no reason for thinking that the countries should be arranged according to the same sequence as the days of the week. Rather, the poet clearly states that the countries must be arranged in a series according to the seven planets:

> هست هر کشوری به رکن و اساس / در شمار ستاره‌ای به قیاس
> *hast har kešvar-i be rokn o asās/ dar šomār-e setāre-i be qiyās*
> "Each country, in (its) basis and foundation, is (placed) in analogy according to the number of a star/planet."[25]

The true order of the countries, therefore, is that of the planets, from Saturn, the most distant one, to the Moon, the closest to the earth, the same order of the planets as given in chapter 31 of the poem (see above):

Table 2

Series of the countries	Planet	Day of the week	Country
I	Saturn	Saturday	India
II	Jupiter	Thursday	China
III	Mars	Tuesday	Slavonia
IV	Sun	Sunday	Rum
V	Venus	Friday	Iran
VI	Mercury	Wednesday	Maghreb
VII	Moon	Monday	Choresmia

We can conclude that titles in Nezāmi's poem *Haft peykar* can well be considered unoriginal, given the fact that – in the cases discussed above – they turn out to be erroneous. This poses further problems for the study and edition of the text of this poem.

24 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1364, ch. 5, l. 46.
25 Nezāmi *apud* Sarvatiyān 1389, ch. 30, l. 86.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliography

Bausani, A. 1960: "La letteratura neopersiana." In: A. Pagliaro/A. Bausani (eds.): *Storia della letteratura persiana*. Milano, pp. 149-898 [reprinted as *La letteratura neopersiana*, Roma 2011].

Dehkhodā, A. 1325–1358 [1946–1979]: *Loġatnāme*. 40 vols. Tehrān.

Gnoli, Gh. 1989: *The Idea of Iran. An Essay on its Origin*. Roma (Serie Orientale Roma LXII).

de Goeje, M. J. (ed.) 1889: *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*. By Abu'l-Kasim Obaidallah ibn Abdallah Ibn Khordādhbeh. Lugduni-Batavorum.

Grobbel, G. 2010: "Probleme des ethisch-didaktischen persischen *Matnawī* anhand des *Maṭla'ul-Anwār* des Amīr Ḫusrau-i Dihlawī." In: R. Forster/R. Günthart (eds.): *Didaktisches Erzählen. Formen literarischer Belehrung in Orient und Okzident*. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 85–107.

Le Strange, G. (ed.) 1915: *The Geographical Part of the of the "Nuzhat-al-Qulub" composed by Hamd-Allah Mustawfi of Qazwin in 740 (1340)*. Leyden (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series 23).

Luther, K. A. 1987: "Atābakān-e Marāḡa." In: *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. II, Fasc. 8, pp. 898–900.

Miquel, A. 1971: "Iklīm." In: *Encyclopédie de l'Islam.* Nouvelle édition. Vol. III, pp. 1103–1105.

Mo'in, M. 1338 (1959): *Tahlil-e Haft peykar-e Nezāmi/An Analysis of Nizami's Haft-paykar (Seven images)*. Tehrān.

Pantke, M. 1974: *Der arabische Bahrām-Roman. Untersuchungen zur Quellen- und Stoffgeschichte*. Berlin/New York.

Qarib, B. 1376 (1998): "Hafte dar Irān-e qadim. Pazhuhesh-i dar Haft peykar-e Nezāmi va neveshtehā-ye mānavi." In: *Nāme-ye Farhangestān* III/4 (Ser. No. 12), pp. 11–39.

Rastegar, N. 2002: "Zum Namengut in Niẓāmīs Xamse." In: M. Szuppe (ed.): *Iran questions et connaissances*. Vol. II: *Périodes médiévale et moderne*. Paris (Studia Iranica, Cahier 26), pp. 35–54.

— 2008: "Die Identität von Niẓāmīs sieben Prinzessinnen." In: M. Ritter/R. Kauz/B. Hoffmann (eds.): *Iran und iranisch geprägte Kulturen. Studien zum 65. Geburstag von Bert G. Fragner*. Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 27), pp. 155–165.

Sarvatiyān, B. (ed.) 1364 (1985): *Leyli va Majnun*. By Elyās ibn Yousef Nezāmi Ganjavi. Tehrān.

— 1389 (2010): *Haft peykar.* By Elyās ibn Yousef Nezāmi Ganjavi. Edition, introduction and explanation by Dr. Behrouz Sarvatiyān. 2nd edition. Tehrān.

Schaeder, H. H. 1998: "Sawād." In: *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*. Nouvelle edition. Vol. IX, pp. 90–91.

Sundermann, W. 1980: Nachwort zu Ilyâs ben Jûssuf Nisâmî, *Die sieben Prinzessinnen*, ed. by B. Alavi. Berlin, pp. 133–159.

Vahid Dastgerdi, H. (ed.) 1376 (1997): *Haft peykar.* By Elyās ibn Yousef Nezāmi Ganjavi. Reprinted with a preface by S. Hamidiyān. Tehrān.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Multilingualism and Empires: Byzantium and Sasanian Persia

Antonio Panaino, Bologna

The long and bitter confrontation between Byzantium and the Sasanian Empire was one of the most important historical phenomena of Late Antiquity;[1] it was also very significant for the development of later mediaeval societies and institutions in East and West, although the real impact of this tremendous legacy has not yet been fully recognized in the scholarly literature. In fact, in the course of this "dialogue", sometimes violent and brutal, between the "two eyes of the world",[2] the pillars of modern diplomacy[3] were erected: the two courts established a series of rules based on reciprocity; regular exchanges of ambassadors, particularly after the accession of a new emperor, were initiated;[4] rules for the protection of diplomats and messengers were shared; and a well-defined protocol for epistolary exchanges was determined and approved,[5] so that we find emperors and empresses greeting each other as "brother" and "sister". The progressive definition of protocols and agreements concerning practical matters connected with reciprocal economic and religious interests became normal, as did the creation of a staff of specialists, including spies, who had a fundamental role[6] in studying the enemy and understanding his mentality and point of view. The evidence thus presents a reality very far from that of two archaic powers merely fighting each other. On the contrary, the attested scenario is one in which two different state entities tried to overcome each other and determined

1 A previous version of the present paper was presented at the 32nd Congress of German Orientalists, Panel *Multilingualism and Social Expertise in Pre-Modern Societies of Ancient Eurasia: Socio-Economic, Linguistic and Religious Aspects*, Münster 2013. I want to thank Prof. Dr. Velizar Sadovski (Vienna) for a number of suggestions and pertinent considerations on this subject. Bibliographical references have been limited to the minimum for reasons of space.

2 As stated by Theophylact Simocatta, *Historiae*, 4, 11 (see the English translation in Whitby/Whitby 1997, p. 117); cf. Carile 1994, pp. 53–54; Dujčev 1966, pp. 276–277.

3 Güterbock 1906; Gray 1930; Verosta 1965, 1966; Blockley 1985b; Synelli 1986; Angeli Bertinelli 1989; Schmidt 2002, p. 131; Winter/Dignas 2001, pp. 164–177; Dignas/Winter 2007, pp. 138–148; Panaino 2009; 2010a; 2014.

4 See the chapter concerning the Persian ambassadors in the *Liber de cerimoniis* by Manini 2006.

5 See Shahbazi 1990.

6 See Lee 1986 and Lieu 1986.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a political game, whose dimensions were, for those times, worldwide. But, although the main Byzantine-Persian frontier was in the region of Mesopotamia, we cannot forget that such distant territories as the Caucasus, the Arabian peninsula and the Horn of Africa were also more or less directly involved. The examples of the Lazica War and the struggles involving the Arab tribes of the Lakhmids of Ḥira, clients of the Sasanians, and those of the Ghassanids, clients of the Byzantines, should be sufficient to show the ethnographic complexity that the two Empires had to face. This consideration does not of course reduce the significance of the rest of the geographical framework, in which the Romans had to resolve problems in Western Europe, in Italy in particular, as in the case of the Gothic wars, while the Persians had to resist the overwhelming impact of certain Central Asian tribes, such as that represented by the Hephthalites and other nomadic peoples, not to mention their intricate relations with the Sogdian confederations and the Chinese Empire. If one tries to understand the extent of the multicultural and multi-ethnic relations involving the two Empires, we feel somewhat overwhelmed, and this feeling becomes more pronounced when we observe that every country had its local religious, political, economic and, inevitably, linguistic problems, which, although apparently *minima* from a macroscopic point of view, could become significantly dangerous if they took place in border areas or if they involved religious communities which were a minority in one empire but which could be used as an important *casus belli* in the relations with the other "power". In such a case we do not have to reckon with logical coherence but rather with political expediency. For instance, for Justinian the fate of the Christians of Iran, most of them duophysites, might be a fitting topic for accusations against Xusraw, notwithstanding the patent fact that all of them would have been severely punished as heretics by Byzantine orthodox tribunals. And, in fact, we may reasonably suspect that the Christians of Persia were not so thrilled to be "liberated" by Byzantine soldiers.[7]

In the present discussion we must start from an apparently simple, but not really self-evident, consideration, that, when we have to do with an Empire, we necessarily enter a multilingual and multicultural reality, a subject to which our late colleague and friend, Prof. Werner Sundermann, dedicated many of his researches,[8] particularly in respect of the circulation of religions and texts in Iran and Central Asia, above all those of the Manichaeans.[9] The main difference between a national state (or confederation) and a State entity definable as an "empire"[10] lies in the objective complexity of its ethno-religious and

7 On these controversial problems see Panaino 2010b, where the contrary thesis suggested by Brock (1982) is discussed.

8 Cf., for instance, Sundermann 1997.

9 See his two volumes of *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Sundermann 2001), where most of his studies on Manichaeism have been collected.

10 For the historical, political and economic determination of the State form of the Sasanian power see now Gariboldi 2011.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

linguistic make-up, a fact that can produce paradoxes and contradict many classic and standardized distinctions between political tolerance and intolerance. In some cases, e.g. empires are "compelled" to be more "tolerant" in situations that would be differently treated in a "national" (mono-ethnic) society. If we look at modern examples, we cannot forget that the Italian liberators of the "Risorgimento", although in love with the abstract idea of freedom and respect for all the peoples of the world, were not able to manage (or even to foresee) the new complexity emerging from local linguistic minorities, in particular if these were not protected by other strong state realities, as in the cases of the French or German speaking peoples. A case in point is that of the Slovenians and the Croats, the final result unfortunately being that determined by the Fascist government, which officially forbade the languages of these minorities from schools and even prevented Catholic priests from celebrating the mass in these languages.[11] It is a reality, even if a crude one, that to a certain extent, an Empire such as Austria-Hungary might be much more tolerant and capable in the management of its subject linguistic minorities. Empires are necessarily multilingual and multi-ethnic, although we must postulate the presence of at least one ethno-linguistic group, sometimes (but not always or necessarily) a majority, which dominates the rest of the population, perhaps in cooperation with some elite groups within the subject linguistic minorities. We may say that one of the fundamental conditions for the durable governability of an Empire is a certain linguistic tolerance and ability to manage its differences – unless of course the political project is some sort of (criminal) ethnic elimination of certain minorities, as a kind of "final solution", either by cultural and linguistic absorption or by physical eradication.

The intention of these remarks is to underline that the problem of multilingualism in the Persian and Byzantine Empires is inevitably a political matter,[12] which cannot be separated from a number of non-linguistic considerations. Let us consider the problems emerging from the mutual dialectic attested in the two Empires of Late Antiquity. In addition to a number of local traditions, idioms and dialects, the Byzantine Empire had to resolve the complex question of the role to be attributed to Greek and Latin in their respective functions.[13] At the beginning of the Sasanian period, the trilingualism attested in the official inscriptions, Middle Persian, Parthian and Greek, more probably corresponded

11 It is impossible to deal with this subject in all its complexity in the framework of the present article, but I would just like to quote a relevant novel by Boris Pahor (2009), one of the most famous (still living) Slovenian writers, who suffered Nazi deportation. In his *Parnik trobi nji* [*The steamship does not blow; Qui è vietato parlare* (the most explicit Italian re-denomination of the title)], Pahor describes the brutal linguistic limitations suffered by Slovenian peoples and other minorities in Italian Istria.

12 It is fitting to mention here the Proceedings of the Conference *East and West: Modes of Communication* (Chrysos/Wood 1999), where similar problems are discussed in the framework of the Roman Empire.

13 The historical complexity of the adoption of Greek and/or Latin in the framework of the Eastern Roman Empire has been deeply analysed by Van Dam 2007, *passim*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

to a desire for internal and international recognition and prestige than to any actual requirement of comprehensibility. I am thinking not only of the "limited" access to the Sasanian official inscriptions, the content of which was probably promulgated in other forms, but also of the places where the texts were physically engraved, so that one cannot seriously suppose that everyone would really have had the possibility to go and read for himself each line of these inscriptions. Their presence was again political and mostly symbolic; by using Parthian and Greek as well as Middle Persian, it was made clear to everybody, and in particular to visitors from abroad, ambassadors and spies, that the new dynasty had its own language, but that it had also absorbed the traditions of the previous rulers, as shown by the fact that Parthian, their language, was considered worthy to be used as a second text in the inscriptional *corpus*. A Greek version was also provided in order to demonstrate that the Sasanians were not a provincial family, but that, in so far as their chancellery was able to master one of the most important languages of diplomacy in the Mesopotamian and Western-Iranian area, they were able to perform on an international stage. If the presence of Parthian probably had an internal function too, symbolically confirming the privileges maintained by the Parthian elites which were willing to collaborate with the new power, that of the Greek language contains a "message" for the Roman Empire, a strong *memento* for a potential enemy, which might have considered the Persians as minor or provincial barbarians. When the two Empires eventually had direct knowledge of each other, the public use of Greek ceased to be necessary in Iran. In fact, I do not think that it was a lack of competence which induced the Persians to renounce the use of Greek in their inscriptions from the time of Narseh, but rather a calculation that it was politically unnecessary or even dangerous, as an implicit act of submission. In the case of the famous magus Kirdēr, whose inscriptions were engraved only in Middle Persian, it would be ridiculous to suppose that the high priest was not able to order a text in Parthian, a language that he surely knew or at least was in position to understand with (or even without?) some help. His four inscriptions concern matters which, seen from the national, i. e. "Persian", point of view, are of internal character. The international, universalistic trends inaugurated by Šābuhr I, as emphasized by Gh. Gnoli,[14] were extinguished, while the elimination of Mani patently inaugurated a new phase of the Sasanian dynasty. The role of the Mazdean Church of Persia was strengthened and thus the Mazdean high priest had no need to emphasize external centres of power such as those in Northern Iran with their prestigious sanctuaries (and dialect). On the other hand, the profound efforts of the Manichaeans to create a multilingual network of communication are noteworthy.[15] Not only did Mani himself probably write some of his works, such as his book in honour of Šābuhr, in Middle Persian, i. e.

14 Gnoli 1984.
15 Panaino 2004.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in a language which was not his own mother-tongue, but he certainly favoured the adoption of a new way of writing Middle Persian, which, by abandoning the use of the Aramaic heterograms of the Pahlavi script, made its comprehension and subsequent diffusion much easier.[16]

These are only few examples of the political and religious complexity we have to face when we try to analyse the multilingual situation in Western Iran in Late Antiquity. Following along this path, I would like to insist again on the fact that the absence of official documents in Greek should be connected with a more general trend attested among the Sasanians, who from a certain point in time no longer ordered new official inscriptions to be engraved. This (apparently) "regressive" phenomenon should have a meaning or, at least, a reason, but for the moment there is no definitive or compelling explanation for it. One possible explanation is that the function of these inscriptions was considered less important or less efficient than that of monumental reliefs, as if the royal power was aiming at a larger and more popular form of propaganda. In any case, to come back to the multilingual competence of the Sasanians, any theory based on the idea that the Persian chancellery was no longer able to create a text in Greek is ruled out by other evidence which demonstrates the linguistic mastery demanded by the enormous and increasing needs of diplomatic relations between the two Empires.

To this general reflection on the multilingual complexity of the Sasanian Empire in its relations with that of Byzantium, I would like to add some thoughts on the practical modalities which were adopted for the final redaction of the Peace Treaty signed by the Persians and Romans after the long negotiations that finally concluded the conflicts over Lazica in the year 561. When after a truce the two delegations finally met in order to establish a firm peace, the Romans were led by Peter, master of offices *(magister militum per Orientem)*, who was sent by Justinian to negotiate directly with Xusraw. He met the Persian king at the frontier of Dara,[17] where he was received by Zīg Yazdegušna(s)p[18] (ὁ Ζὶχ ὁ Ἰεσδεγουσνάφ),[19] the king's chamberlain (παρευναστήρ). From this moment, a series of meetings took place until all the individual items (exactly 13 points) of the "Fifty-years Peace" were jointly agreed. "Official Letters" *(Litterae Sacrae)*[20] were sent by both rulers in order to ratify the decisions that the envoys were authorised to conclude, while other details were fixed as well.[21] Then, according to Menander the Guardsman, this is what happened before the ratification of all

16 These problems have been already discussed by Bausani 1980; see also Sundermann 1997, pp. 39–40 [= Sundermann 2001, I, pp. 537–538].

17 Cf. Blockley 1985a, pp. 54–55.

18 The Middle-Persian forms of the personal names have been restored.

19 Menander was convinced that Zikh (Zίχ) was a title and not a name. Cf. Blockley 1985a, pp. 54–55; 254, n. 31.

20 See Blockley 1985a, pp. 62–63; 258, n. 66.

21 Cf. Blockley 1985a, pp. 62–63.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the points of the peace treaty (i. e. the 13 articles plus a final *addendum* concerning religious minorities):

> Τούτων διαμφισβητηθέντων καὶ ἑτέρων, ἐγράφησαν αἱ πεντηκοντούτιδες σπονδαὶ περσιστὶ καὶ ἑλληνιστί, μετεβλήθη τε τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν εἰς Περσίδα φωνὴν καὶ τὸ Περσικὸν εἰς Ἑλληνίδα. οἱ δὲ τὰς ξυνθήκας βεβαιοῦντες Ῥωμαίων μὲν Πέτρος ὁ τῶν περὶ βασιλέα καταλόγων ἡγεμὼν καὶ Σουρήνας καὶκαὶ ἕτεροι, Περσῶν δὲ ὁ Ζὶχ ὁ Ἰεσδεγουσνὰφ καὶ Σουρήνας καὶ ἕτεροι. τῶν οὖν ἐξ ἑκατέρου μέρους ὁμολογιῶν ἐν συλλαβαῖς ἀναληφθεισῶν, ἀντιπαρεβλήθησαν ἀλλήλαις τῷ ἰσοδυνάμῳ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων τε καὶ ῥημάτων […][22]
>
> "When these and other issues had been argued out, the fifty-year treaty was written out in Persian and Greek, and the Greek copy was translated into Persian and the Persian into Greek. For the Romans the documents were validated by Peter the master of the offices, Eusebius and others, for the Persians by Zig Yezdegušna(s)p, Surenas and others. When the agreements had been written on both sides, they were placed side-by-side to ensure that the language corresponded […]"[23]

In Menander's fragment concerning these events, it follows a detailed summary of each point of the treaty and the description of a protocol concerning the religious minorities in the two Empires which was appended to the final document. (I have studied this important diplomatic document in detail in another work, so that its analysis is unnecessary here.[24]) At the end of this *addendum*, Menander noted that the *Litterae* sent by both rulers were at hand and then added, with a certain taste for the analytic, the following description of the practical procedure:

> Τούτων οὕτω προελθόντων καὶ ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ τάξει γενομένων, ἐπεὶ ἀνεδέξαντο οἵ γε ἐς τοῦτο τεταγμένοι τὰς συλλαβὰς τοῖν δυοῖν βιβλίοιν καὶ ἀπηκρίβωσαν τῷ ἰσορρόπῳ τε καὶ ἰσοδυνάμῳ τῶν ῥημάτων τὰ ἐνθυμήματα, αὐτίκα οἵ γε ἰσόγραφα ἕτερα ἐπετέλουν. καὶ τὰ μὲν κυριώτερα ξυνειληθέντα τε καὶ κατασφαλισθέντα ἐκμαγείοις τε κηρίνοις ἑτέροις τε οἷς εἰώθασι Πέρσαι χρῆσθαι, καὶ ἐκτυπώμασι δακτυλίων ὑπὸ τῶν πρέσβεων, ἔτι γε μὴν καὶ ἑρμηνέων δέκα πρὸς τοῖς δύο, ἓξ μὲν Ῥωμαίων, οὐχ ἧττον δὲ Περσῶν, ἀμοιβαίᾳ τῇ δόσει τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης βιβλία παρέσχοντο ἀλλήλοις. καὶ τὸ μὲν τῇ Περσῶν φωνῇ γεγραμμένον ἐνεχείρισε Πέτρῳ ὁ Ζίχ, καὶ Πέτρος δὲ τῷ Ζὶχ τὸ τῇ Ἑλληνίδι, καὶ αὖθις τοῦ Ζὶχ τὸ ἰσορροποῦν τῇ γραφῇ τῇ Ἑλληνίδι βιβλίον γράμμασι Περσικοῖς διασεσημασμένον ἄνευ τῆς τῶν ἐκτυπωμάτων ἀσφαλείας εἰληφότος, <ἐς> τὸ σωθήσεσθαί οἱ τὰς μνήμας, καὶ Πέτρος οὐκ ἄλλως ἐπετέλεσεν ἀμοιβαίως […][25]
>
> "When matters had progressed to this stage of orderly development, those whose task it was took the texts of the two documents and polished their contents, using words [ῥήματα][26] of equivalent force. Then they made facsimiles of both. The

22 Blockley 1985a, p. 70. See also Müller 1851, pp. 211–212.
23 Blockley 1985a, p. 71. Cf. Greatrex/Lieu 2002, p. 134; Doblhofer 1955, p. 107; Winter/Dignas 2001, p. 168; Dignas/Winter 2007, p. 141.
24 Panaino 2009; 2014.
25 Blockley 1985a, p. 76. See also Müller 1851, pp. 203–214.
26 I prefer to translate ῥήματα with "words" instead of "language", because what we have to do with here is the description of a literal translation (or κατὰ πὸδα), a technical process

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> originals were rolled up and secured by seals both of wax and of the other substance used by the Persians, and were impressed by the signets of the envoys and of twelve interpreters, six Romans and six Persians. Then the two sides exchanged the treaty documents, Zīg handing the one in Persian to Peter, and Peter the one in Greek to the Zīg. Then Zīg was given an unsealed Persian translation of the Greek original to be kept as a reference for him, and Peter likewise was given a Greek translation of the Persian […]"[27]

In Menander's presentation the two passages clearly concern different phases of the meeting, although D. A. Miller[28] tried to suggest that the first process of validation would correspond to the second one, which, in reality, took place at the end of the ratification of the single points and of the already mentioned *addendum*. We will verify whether Miller's hypothesis is reasonable or not and whether this complicated procedure had its own reasons. In any case, we must observe that the procedure was very rigorous and complex; after a long and detailed discussion on political and military matters in all their details, the two delegations, we must assume, sent a precise report about the conclusion of a possible agreement to their kings, so that both delegations were able to receive back the *Sacrae Litterae* with a sort of official statement confirming that any decision they were ready to sign with close regard to the points already described would be regarded as having been authorized by their respective kings. Already this part of the meeting presupposes the presence of a complex and structured staff of negotiators on both sides; not merely scribes, but also geographers, priests, translators, interpreters, astronomers (for calendrical matters and, for instance, for synchronising the application of the agreement)[29] and high officers were present. Some of them necessarily mastered the enemy's language, at least in oral form during the phases of discussion that fixed the agenda and produced the written minutes on which a more professional staff was working in order to resolve any potential inconsistencies which might lead to future quarrels and polemics, incomprehension and/or misinterpretation, elements of invalidity or just errors of interpretation in one of the two versions or even in both. The *addendum* too probably implies the presence not only of high Zoroastrian priests, but also that of Persian Christian authorities, who, in some cases, played a supportive diplomatic role for the Persian king in his relations with Byzantium.[30]

---

which was already formulated in the *Constitutio Tanta* (by Justinian, December 16th 533); amongst other items, this law strictly concerned the rules for the translation of the *Digestum* from Latin to Greek without additional glosses and comments (cf. Mommsen/Krüger 1966, § 21, p. 22, ll. 21–24; cf. also Pieralli 2006, p. 20, n. 67). I thank Paola Degni for this kind remark.

27 Cf. Blockley 1985a, p. 77; Doblhofer 1955, pp. 110–111; Winter/Dignas 2001, p. 171; Dignas/Winter 2007, p. 143.

28 Miller 1971, p. 72, n. 69; cf. also Blockley 1985a, p. 225, n. 47.

29 See Panaino 2010a.

30 Cf. Sako 1986.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

If we follow Menander's description of the procedure we can try to reconstruct its rationale. It is clear that neither language was considered superior to the other and that both were treated as having the same formal dignity. Two versions of the treaty were prepared; one in Middle Persian and one in Greek. The Greek copy was translated into Persian and the Persian one into Greek. This procedure had a profound significance, i. e. that of verifying that the content of each version exactly corresponded in detail to that of the other, as it was understood by each delegation. If only one version had been translated, inevitably we would have a "primary" (i. e. superior) language of the treaty, and, then, the (secondary) language of the translation. Clearly this would be diplomatically unacceptable. On the contrary, the description of the protocol presupposes that one delegation prepared one text in one particular language and that the other delegation prepared another text in the "other" language; only at that point were the two versions translated again.

In this way, we would have four texts:

- the first text in Persian (A);
- the first text in Greek (B);
- then, a Greek translation from the Persian text (C);
- and Persian translation from the Greek text (D).

At least this is what I understand from a close analysis of the first passage, assuming that this description is not an (improbable) anticipation of what is presented in the second passage. Only at this stage, the leaders of the two delegations verified and validated the whole text of the agreement in both versions. Then, after their authorization, the scribes started to check word for word the two texts in each single point. Menander describes also a technical step, in which the two texts were placed side-by-side in order to be controlled in every aspect. But one essential point is not very clear: whether, at the beginning, the Persians had to write the first version in Pahlavi and only then received the Greek version which they had to re-translate again, while, symmetrically, the Roman delegation undertook the corresponding task (firstly the redaction of the Greek version, then the Greek translation of the Pahlavi original); or whether the procedure was just the opposite, i. e. the Persians would have written down the first version of the Greek text and then translated the Pahlavi text (N. B. "the one prepared by the Roman delegation") into Greek, while the Roman staff, for its part, would first have written the Pahlavi version of the treaty and only then translated into Pahlavi the Greek version prepared by the Persian delegation. Although a definitive solution remains open for lack of compelling evidence, I would prefer the second possibility, never advanced before, according to which each delegation had to write the first version of the treaty in the language of the enemy. Only through this way of working would every doubt about the mutual clarity of the individual aspects of the established treaty have been eliminated. It is clear that this solution implies a very high degree of linguistic mastery of the language

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of the enemy, but I do not see any serious reason to deny the presence of such competence in both Empires.

We have also to take into consideration the fact that Menander writes that the first phase, that of the initial redaction of the two versions of the text and then the translation of each redaction into the other official language, did not yet produce a definitive text, but only a provisional written minute in four versions, two in Greek and two in Pahlavi. Only at this point, the individual clauses were definitively reformulated in the two languages and in accordance with the authorization contained in the *Litterae Sacrae*,[31] which are in fact mentioned again at this stage of the redaction of the treaty. Thus, the definitive formulation would correspond to the work, which Menander correctly presents in his second description of the procedure, after carefully listing one by one the agreed points of the treaty and the additional protocol (which was surely another matter of discussion and of mutual redaction). Again, the two groups of six scribes and interpreters,[32] whom we must assume to be perfectly bilingual or at least highly competent, with active mastery of the two languages in both oral and written forms, started the final delicate work, the redaction of the two final official versions, one in Pahlavi, one in Greek. The four working minutes should already have been reduced to two basic versions, which were again "polished" (ἀπηκρίβωσαν), "using a language of equivalent force" (καὶ ἰσοδυνάμῳ τῶν ῥημάτων).

Now the terminal phase of redaction started: two originals, one in each language, were rolled up and sealed, as Menander states, with "wax and the other substance used by the Persians" (ἐκμαγείοις τε κηρίνοις ἑτέροις τε οἷς εἰώθασι Πέρσαι χρῆσθαι).[33] Probably this means that two kinds of sealing, one according to the Roman use, the other according to the Sasanian one, were affixed. Then the twelve interpreters, six Persians and six Romans, plus (presumably) other authorities had to impress their own signets (ἐκτυπώμασι δακτυλίων) on the documents. The presence of some twenty stamps implies a large space and thus a wide surface. Only at this point were the two delegations ready to exchange the two documents fully signed and with the necessary seals; Zīg handed the officially sealed treaty in Pahlavi to Peter, and Peter the one in Greek to Zīg. Contrariwise, Zīg received an unsealed Pahlavi translation of the text in Greek

31 Cf. Blockley 1985a, pp. 74–75; 258, n. 66.

32 The presence of interpreters (ἑρμηνευταί or *interpretes diversarum gentium*) in the Byzantine Imperial administration was under the direct supervision of the *magister officiorum* and their activities were developed in the framework of a special office denominated *scrinium barbarorum*, as also confirmed in the *Novella* 21 (*De Scholaribus et Comitibus Scholarum* […], year 401), which Theodosius II addressed to the *magister officiorum* (Mommsen/Meyer 1905, pp. 48–49). On this subject see the important data collected by Bury 1906, pp. 540–541; 1911, p. 93; cf. also Pieralli 2006, pp. 82–83 (with references also to later times). Very interesting is also the *Notitia Dignitatum*, *Or.*, XI, 52, which mentions the presence of *Interpretes diuersarum gentium*. Again I must thank Paola Degni, who drew my attention to these sources.

33 Cf. Blockley 1985a, p. 259, n. 69.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

from Peter, and, in his turn, Peter was given a Greek translation of the Pahlavi original. These secondary (translated) versions were additional working documents to be preserved as a means of reference for both sides in the unfortunate event of a future disagreement, but also as a document whereby the internal administration might be able to recheck and control the work done by the two delegations.

The complex activity developed during the redaction of the two parallel versions of the treaty (reduced from four to two through a continuous work of clarification and semantic determination) shows clearly that the objective comprehension of the enemy's culture had evolved to a point at which mutual cooperation seems to have been the fundamental rule. The description of the various steps of the work we have followed demonstrates that the complexity of the political relations between the two Empires favoured a significant evolution in their respective administrations and that both sides were ready to undertake a sort of practical, modern diplomatic procedure, which demanded a high level of respect and of mutual knowledge. Although many scholars have insisted and continue to insist on the fact that the Sasanian Empire must have been a kingdom of which orality was an essential ingredient, a fact which I do not mean to deny, the source discussed here, which comes from the side of a secular enemy, shows that at the same time a high level of multilingual literacy was mastered, at least in certain professional strata of Persian society.

Bibliographical references

Angeli Bertinelli, M.G. 1989: "Al confine tra l'impero romano e la Persia in età tardoantica: la questione della Lazica." In: *Quaderni Catanesi di Studi Classici e Medievali* 1, pp. 117–146.

Bausani, A. 1980: "La scrittura pahlavica." In: *Atti del Seminario di Studi su Bilinguismo e Traduzione nell'Antico Oriente. Roma, 20–22 marzo 1980*. Roma, pp. 269–276.

Blockley, R.C. 1985a: *The History of Menander the Guardsman*. Introductory Essay, Text, Translation, and Historiographical Notes by R.C. Blockley. Liverpool.

— 1985b: "Subsidies and Diplomacy: Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity." In: *Phoenix* 39, pp. 62–74.

Brock, S. 1982: "Christians in the Sasanian Empire. A Case of Divided Loyalties." In: St. Mews (ed.): *Religion and National Identity*. Oxford, pp. 1–19.

Bury, J.B. 1906: "The treatise De administrando imperio." In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 15, pp. 517–577.

— 1911: *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century. With a Revised Text of the Kletorologion of Philotheos*. London.

Carile, A. 1994: *Materiali di Storia Bizantina*. Bologna.

Chrysos, E./I. Wood 1999: *East and West: Modes of Communication. Proceedings of the First Planetary Conference at Merida*. Leiden.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Dignas, B./E. Winter 2007: *Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity. Neighbours and Rivals*. Cambridge.

Doblhofer, E. 1955: *Byzantinische Diplomaten und östliche Barbaren. Aus den Excerpta de legationibus des Kostantinos Porphyrogennetos ausgewählte Abschnitte des Priskos und Menander Protector.* Graz.

Dujčev, I. 1966: "Il mondo slavo e la Persia nell'Alto Medioevo." In: *Atti del Convegno sul tema: La Persia e il Mondo Greco-Romano (Roma 11–14 aprile 1965)*. Roma, pp. 243–318.

Freeman, P./D. Kennedy (eds.) 1986: *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East. Proceedings of the colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986*. Vol. II. Oxford.

Gariboldi, A. 2011: *La monarchia sasanide tra storia e mito*. Milano/Paris.

Gnoli, Gh. 1984: "Universalismo e nazionalismo nell'Iran del III secolo." In: L. Lanciotti (ed.): *Incontro di religioni in Asia tra il III ed il X secolo d. C. Atti del Convegno Internazionale*. Firenze, pp. 79–97.

Greatrex, G./S. N. C. Lieu 2002: *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars*. Pt. II: *Ad 363–630: A narrative Sourcebook*. London/New York.

Gray, L. H. 1930: "Formal Peace-Negotiations and Peace-treaties between Pre-Muhammadan Persia and Other States." In: *Modi Memorial Volume. Papers on Indo-Iranian and Other Subjects*. Ed. by The Dr. Modi Memorial Volume Editorial Board. Bombay, pp. 136–153.

Güterbock, K. 1906: *Byzanz und Persien in ihrer diplomatisch-völkerrechtlichen Beziehung im Zeitalter Justinians. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts*. Berlin.

Lee, A. D. 1986: "Embassies as evidence for the movement of military intelligence between the Romans and Sasanian Empire." In: Freeman/Kennedy 1986, pp. 455–461.

Lieu, S. N. C. 1986: "Captives, Refugees and Exiles: A Study of cross-frontier civilian movements and contracts between Rome and Persia from Valerian to Jovian." In: Freeman/Kennedy 1986, pp. 475–505.

Manini, M. 2006: "Pietro Patrizio ed il solenne cerimoniale d'accoglienza riservato all'ambasciatore illustre dei Persiani (*De Caer.* I, 89–90)." In: A. Panaino/A. Piras (eds.): *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa held in Ravenna, 6–11 October 2003*. Vol. I: *Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies*. Milano, pp. 599–610.

Miller, D. A. 1971: "Byzantine Treaties and Treaty-Making 500–1025 A. D." In: *Byzantinoslavica* 32, pp. 56–76.

Mommsen, Th./P. Krüger (eds.) 1966: *Corpus Iuris Civilis editio undecima lucis ope expressa*. Vol. I: *Institutiones*. Recognovit Paulus Krueger. *Digesta*. Recognovit Theodorus Mommsen. Retractavit Paulus Krueger. 2nd ed. Dublin/Zürich.

Mommsen, Th./P. M. Meyer (eds.) 1905: *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constivtionibvs Sirmondianis et Leges Novellae ad Theodosianvm pertinentes; consilio et avctoritate Academiae litterarvm regiae borvssicae.* Edidervnt Th. Mommsen et Pavlvs M. Meyer. Vol. II: *Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes*. Berolini.

Müller, C. (ed.) 1851: *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Vol. IV. Paris [Reprint Frankfurt a. M. 1975].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Pahor, B. 2009: *Parnik trobi nji*. Ljubljana.
Panaino, A. 2004: "Strategies of Manichaean Religious Propaganda." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* (eds.): *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Berlin, pp. 249–255.
— 2009: "Il duplice volto del protocollo aggiuntivo sulle minoranze religiose nella 'Pace dei 50 anni'." In: *Bizantinistica* 11, pp. 273–299.
— 2010a: "Secondo l'uso antico. A proposito del Calendario comune adottato nel XIII punto del Trattato di Pace del 561 tra Sasanidi e Romani." In: *Bizantinistica* 12, pp. 115–148.
— 2010b: "The Persian Identity in Religious Controversies. Again on the Case of the Divided Loyalty in Sasanian Iran." In: C. G. Cereti (ed.): *Iranian Identity in the Course of History. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Rome, 21–24 September 2005*. Roma, pp. 227–239.
— 2014: "Christians and Zoroastrians in the Fifty-Years Peace Treaty." In: *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 11/2 [= *Christianity in Ancient Iran. Papers of the International Conference "Ad ulteriores gentes: The Christians in the East (1th to 7th century)", Rome, March 13–14, 2009*], pp. 67–90.
Pieralli, L. 2006: *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino con le potenze estere del XIII secolo (1204–1282)*. Città del Vaticano.
Sako, L. 1986: *Le rôle de la hierarchie syriaque orientale dans les rapports diplomatiques entre la Perse et Byzance aux Ve–VIIe siècles*. Paris.
Schmidt, K. 2002: *Friede durch Vertrag. Der Friedensvertrag von Kadesch von 1270 v. Chr., der Friede des Antalkidas von 386 v. Chr. und der Friedensvertrag zwischen Byzanz und Persien von 562 n. Chr.* Frankfurt a. M.
Shahbazi, Sh. 1990: "Byzantine-Iranian Relations." In: E. Yarshater (ed.): *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. IV. New York, pp. 588–599.
Sundermann, W. 1997: "The Manichaean Texts in Languages and Scripts of Central Asia." In: Sh. Akiner/N. Sims-Williams (eds.): *Languages and Scripts of Central Asia*. London, pp. 39–45 [= Sundermann 2001, I, pp. 537–544].
— 2001: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften*. 2 vols. Ed. by Chr. Reck, D. Weber, C. Leurini, A. Panaino. Roma.
Synelli, K. 1986: *Οἱ διπλωματικες σχέσεις Βυζαντίου και Περσίας ἕως τον στ αἰώνα*. Athens.
Van Dam, R. 2007: *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*. Cambridge.
Verosta, S. 1965: "Die oströmisch-persischen Verträge von 562 n. Chr. und ihre Bedeutung für das Völkerrecht." In: *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, *Philologisch-historische Klasse* 102, pp. 153–156.
— 1966: *International Law in Europe and Western Asia between 100 and 650 AD*. Leyden.
Whitby, M./M. Whitby 1997: *The History of Theophylact Simocatta. An English Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford [1st ed. Oxford 1986].
Winter, E./B. Dignas 2001: *Rom und das Perserreich. Zwei Weltmächte zwischen Konfrontation und Koexistenz*. Berlin.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mani's Journey to India: Mission or Exile?

Timothy Pettipiece, Ottawa

In 1983 Werner Sundermann gave a talk to the Society for South Asian Studies in London which was later published as "Mani, India, and the Manichaean Religion."[1] In this talk, Sundermann argues that Indian influences on Mani's thought have been greatly overstated and that based on the available evidence Mani seems to have gone to India to "teach rather than learn."[2] Others, such as Deeg and Gardner, have suggested that Mani went specifically to learn about Indian religions. While it is hard to gauge Mani's actual motives, a re-examination of the historical circumstances surrounding his voyage can be illuminating.

In the surviving Manichaean sources we are reasonably well informed about the beginning and end of Mani's prophetic career. Thanks to the *Cologne Mani Codex* we possess a fascinating hagiographic portrait depicting Mani's life among the baptizing sect known as the Elchasaites. Similarly, due to the Coptic *Homilies* codex from Medinet Madi we have a vivid, albeit fragmentary, picture of his imprisonment and execution – which his followers styled as his "crucifixion." What we lack is substantial evidence, other than a few scattered stories, of the middle part of Mani's career. There are some occasionally picturesque moments, as in the *Kephalaia*, when Mani is depicted in Ctesiphon standing on the banks of the Tigris with his disciples and contemplating the floodwaters (Chapter 61), or when he keeps getting called in for audiences with King Shapur and his disciples wish there was another Mani to keep them company (Chapter 76), but these are few and far between. In the Iranian texts, we see Mani commissioning various missionaries (M 2 I; M 216c; M 1750; M 18), his conversion of the Turan Shah (M 48), and the healing of Nafsha of Tadmor (M 566).[3] The vast majority of Manichaean writings that we possess are primarily concerned with doctrine, liturgy, and ritual. As a result, some seemingly important episodes in his life are difficult to reconstruct and interpret. One prime example is Mani's journey to India very early in his apostolate. This episode, which is recorded in several places, leaves a number of unanswered questions. For instance, what was the motive for this voyage? What did Mani do there? And why, by his own

1 Sundermann 2001.
2 Sundermann 2001, p. 211.
3 See Sundermann 1981.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

admission, was it such a resounding failure? This article will examine the circumstances surrounding Mani's Indian mission before exploring of the question of whether it was a mission at all.

1. Mani's mission to India

Mani's journey to India is mentioned in *Kephalaia* Chapter 1 "On the Advent of the Apostle." Here Mani explains:

> ϩⲡ ⲧϩⲁⲏ ⲛⲛⲣⲙⲡⲑⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲧⲁϫ[ⲟⲟⲥ] / ⲡⲣⲣⲟ ⲁ⏲ⲉⲓ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲁⲧⲁϣⲉⲁ⏲ϣ ⲁ⏲ϫⲓⲟⲣⲉ ⲁⲧϫⲱⲣⲁ ⲛⲛϩⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲁ[⏲] / ⲧⲁϣⲉⲁ⏲ϣ ⲛⲉⲩ ⲛⲧϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲙⲡⲱⲛϩ ⲁ⏲ⲥⲱⲧⲡ ⲙⲡⲙⲁ ⲉ̣ⲧ̣ⲙ̣ⲙ̣ⲉ̣ⲩ̣ / ⲡ̣ⲟ̣ⲩ̣ⲙⲛ̣ⲧ̣ⲥ̣ⲱⲧⲡ ⲉⲥⲁⲛⲓⲧ[4]
>
> "In the final years of King Ardashir I began to preach. I sailed to the land of the Indians. I preached to them the living hope. I made a good selection there." (15.24–27)

He most likely departed from the port of Pharat, where he seems to have met up with a merchant ship, although the account in the *Cologne Mani Codex* (144–145) is fragmentary and difficult to interpret. Disembarking at Dēb on the mouth of the Indus he began his visit,[5] although it is difficult to know just what Mani did while he was there.[6] He is said to have preached, but his final statement in the passage above is somewhat ambiguous. What exactly does Mani mean when he says "*I made a good selection there*"? Does he mean that he recruited a good group of followers, or that he made a good choice in going to India? The Coptic term ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ is likely a rendering of Greek ἐκλογή (Crum 365b) which implies a deliberate "selection." Shortly after this passage, Mani says: "[I have chosen] you, the good election, the [Holy Church]" (16.3), while elsewhere in the *Kephalaia* Mani states: "I chose with my power this whole great election (ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ)" (144.3). The Coptic *Sermon on the Great War*, for its part, makes reference to the "fruits of election (ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ)" (27.2) and to Mani "choosing his election (ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ)" (33.21), while the *Psalm-Book* evokes the "name of Election (ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ) that we wear" (38.22) and calls Mani the "apostle of Election (ⲙⲛⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ)" (144.3).[7] Thus it would seem that Mani's "selection" refers

4 Polotsky 1940.

5 Deeg and Gardner suggest he may have sailed further south to Barukaccha (2009, p. 13). He may have only visited those regions already under Iranian influence, such as Turan, Makran, and Kushan (Widengren 1961, p. 35). These regions had submitted to Ardashir ca. 225 (Bosworth 1999, p. 15, n. 60).

6 Tardieu (1981, p. 28) suggested that Mani sought out Syriac speaking Christian communities from the alleged mission of Thomas.

7 In Middle Iranian fragment M 306/V/ repeated reference is made to the "elect religion" *(dēn wizīdag)* (Durkin-Meisterernst/Morano 2010, p. 231), while Sogdian 14570 refers to the "beloved ones chosen from the flock of righteous who were chosen from amongst the chosen ones" (*ibid.*, p. 123).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

specifically to the results of his recruitment efforts in India. According to the Middle Persian text M 4575, after Mani came back to the port city of Rev Ardashir he sent some disciples back to India, presumably to oversee the community which he "selected" there.

It seems, however, that Mani's "mission" to India had somewhat mixed results. For instance, in a passage from the Coptic *Synaxeis* codex published by Wolf-Peter Funk, Mani states:

> I … their(?) … in the countries of the land(?) of the east, of In[dia]. In which place [I encountered(?)] many sects *(dogma)* and castes [which(?) …] … except for [their] *nomos*, while the … … through one another, according to the … … that place, the ones that I distinguished – caste by caste, *dogma* by *dogma*. In that place I took a close look at the caste of the Brahmans (and found out) that there were strong and settled in their … in the land of the east. They are respected in their [caste(?)…] … other *dogma(ta)*. Now, their *nomos* is the following. I took a close look at their *nomos* and found that (?) the leaders and teachers … in prophecy and ascesis, in special skills … the hair of their head. It is to their own teachers that they listen – ever since(?) [their] prophets, their fathers. When I saw myself that they were in such a manner opposed and incapable of listening to any other but their own … and their *nomos*, that they are lined up ("in rank and file"?) and are … their caste and did not search outside of … … their *nomos*.[8]

This passage gives the distinct impression that the Indian ascetics[9] were set in their ways and not at all interested in Mani's message. As a result, he left disappointed, probably after a stay of less than two years (between 240–242 CE).[10] In *Kephalaia* Chapter 76 he tells his disciples that the wise men of India were set against him. As a result, he says: "I stopped searching for Light (and) I ceased speaking freely with the voice of truth" (185.1–2). After all, he quips with a tone of bitterness, "the world loves [the] Darkness [and] hates the Light" (185.12–13). On his way home, however, Mani encountered the *shah* of Turan, a Buddhist kingdom just west of the Indus, where he was identified as "the Buddha." The king and his nobles, we are told, "accepted the faith and became benign towards the Apostle and the religion" (M 48).[11] It could be that Mani did not consider Turan to be part of "India" proper and therefore considered this encounter a success. Still, his sense of disappointed in his Indian mission could explain the fact he does not included India in his list of "four great kingdoms" from *Kephalaia* Chapter 77 – Persia, Rome, Axum, and China. Nevertheless, after the death of Ardashir in 242 CE Mani had returned "to the land of the Persians" (*Kephalaia* 15.29) and eventually did receive permission from Shapur I to proclaim his message in Sasanian territory.

8 Funk 2009, p. 121. See also King 1992, pp. 286–287.
9 The question of which religious group Mani encountered (Hindu, Buddhist, Jain?) is beyond the scope of this study (see Deeg/Gardner 2009 and Gardner 2005).
10 Sundermann 2001, p. 201.
11 Klimkeit 1993, p. 207.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

2. Mission or exile?

While it seems clear that Mani was somewhat let down by his journey to India, what is less clear is why he went there in the first place.[12] Sundermann suggested that Mani was inspired by the example of the apostle Thomas,[13] whom Christian tradition portrays as travelling to India and whose legacy has important connections to Manichaeism more generally.[14] Some of his impressions of India might have been gained from his reading of Bardaisan,[15] who had interviewed an Indian embassy to Heliogabalus in the early 3rd century.[16] Of all possible regions to venture into, why was India first on his missionary program? As a resident of Persia, Roman territory was inadvisable, but perhaps there was something preventing his activities closer to home.

According the 10th-century Islamic historian al-Tabari, when Ardashir took power in 224 CE "he wrought great slaughter among the Arsacids *(al-Ashakāniyyah)*" in order to prevent any future resurgence of Parthian power.[17] Allegedly he "massacred the Arsacids en bloc, women and menfolk alike, not sparing a single one of them".[18] What does this have to do with Mani? According to al-Nadim, another 10th-century Islamic scholar, Mani belonged to the house of the "Haskāniyya" (i. e., the Arsacids)[19] through his mother Maryam, who seems to have died early in his childhood. Could she have been killed during this anti-Parthian purge? Moreover, when Mani's father, Pattik, took the boy to live with him among a Mesopotamian baptizing sect,[20] could

12 Deeg and Gardner (2009, p. 13) suggest that this was more of an "educational trip", assuming that Mani's central ideas were not fully formulated by 240.

13 Sundermann 2001, p. 200; Widengren 1961, p. 35.

14 Mirecki 1991; Funk 2002; Coyle 2008.

15 Indian ascetics *(śramaṇa)* are attested elsewhere in Graeco-Roman literature, as in the case of the famous inscription to Zarmanochegas (thought to be a Greek transliteration from Sanskrit: *śramaṇācāyra*), the Indian ascetic who, according to Strabo, burned himself alive at Athens during an embassy to Augustus around 13 CE (Strabo, xv, 1.73). This relatively specific knowledge of Indian religious classifications became commonplace in later discussions of Indian asceticism, such as those by Porphyry (*On Abstinence* 4.17) in the 3rd century CE and Jerome (*Against Jovinian* 1.42) in the late 4th century, although both of these authors cite Clement's Syrian contemporary, Bardaisan, as their primary source. See M'Crindle 1979, p. 78. See also Deeg/Gardner 2009, pp. 3–6.

16 Sundermann 2001, p. 200.

17 Bosworth 1999, p. 23.

18 Bosworth 1999, p. 24.

19 Gardner/Lieu 2004, p. 46.

20 How old would Mani have been at this time? There is something of a puzzle around the date of Mani's birth. The conventional date of 216, accepted by most scholars, is based on late Arabic and Chinese sources (see Tardieu 1981, pp. 3–4). All the *Kephalaia* says is that Mani was born "in the years of Artabanus, the King of Parthia" (14.28–29), which could be anytime between 213–224 CE (Wiesehöfer 1996, p. 317). The *Cologne Mani Codex*, however, clearly states that Mani joined the Baptist sect at age 4 (10.1, 12.8; Henrichs/Koenen 1988, pp. 6–9).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

this have been his way of escaping Sasanian retribution? Some years later,[21] Mani received his first revelations from his divine twin. Then, as an adult, he broke with the community and began his prophetic career. It was around this time, according to the *Cologne Mani Codex*, that Ardashir finally took the city of Hatra, one of the last bastions of Parthian influence,[22] after a four year siege:[23]

> [When] I was twenty[four(?)] years old, in the year in which Dariadaxar, the king of Persia, conquered the city of Hatra, and in which his son King Sapores assumed the mighty diadem, in the month Parmouthi, on the eighth day according to the moon, the most blessed lord had compassion on me and called me to his grace and sent to me [my] *syzygos*. (*Cologne Mani Codex* 18)[24]

The fall of Hatra must have been significant enough to be mentioned by Mani's biographers. It could even be that Mani's Elchasaite community was located somewhere near Hatra, since the sect's presence is sometimes linked to northern Mesopotamia,[25] although al-Nadim records that the community was to be found near Dastumīsān (near Basra).[26] A clue can be found in the *Cologne Mani Codex*, since after his departure from the Elchasaite community he says: "We travelled until we crossed and came to Ctesiphon" (109).[27] If he were coming from northwest Mesopotamia to the capital, he would have had to cross the Tigris and from there made his way to a southern port. Therefore, the conquest of the area by the armies of Ardashir could have made it unsafe for Mani to remain. Indeed, a sense of danger and insecurity is expressed in some of Mani's statements in the *Cologne Mani Codex*. For instance, he says: "I came abroad

21 Al-Nadim suggests that Mani was 12 when he received his first revelations (Gardner/Lieu 2004, p. 47). A fragmentary passage from the Coptic *Homilies* (87.7–24) mentions Shapur and a "great sword", a "sect of baptists" and a "child" who after "seven years" finds a "date palm". This could be interpreted as an allusion to Mani's first revelations around age 11 if he came to the community at age 4 in a context of persecution (Petersen 2006, p. 87).

22 Millar 1993, pp. 150–151.

23 Wiesehöfer 1982, p. 441; Lieu 1985, p. 5. Ardashir's efforts to check Roman expansion in Mesopotamia and to regain lost Achaemenid territory motivated his siege of the city (Potts 2013, p. 842).

24 The editors of the *Cologne Mani Codex* suggested that the fall of Hatra occurred when Mani was "24", introducing a reconstruction intended to harmonize with al-Nadim (18.1; Henrichs/Koenen 1988, p. 10). Yet if the text states that Mani was 20, then this would mean that Mani might actually have been born in 220, not 216. Such a date, although equally conjectural, would fit with the alternate chronology I am proposing, which places the key milestones in Mani biography in conjunction with the rise of the Sasanian dynasty (see Appendix below). Unfortunately, due to the lacuna in the *Cologne Mani Codex* and the prominence of 216 in other sources, this is merely a hypothesis.

25 Henrichs 1973, p. 44; Yamauchi 1970, p. 63; Segelberg 1948, p. 176.

26 Gardner/Lieu 2004, p. 47. Later Islamic authors probably only knew of "baptisers" in the southern marshlands.

27 Gardner/Lieu 2004, p. 67.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and into foreign lands, like a sheep in sight of the wolves" (*Cologne Mani Codex* 108).[28] Other passages present a more defiant tone:

> I was [sent out] according to the good will of my most blessed Father to travel about [in the world] so that creation might be [sanctified] by me, and so that [through] me he might let the truth of his [own] knowledge be visible among the religions and peoples, and use me to make a stand before the kings of the earth and the princes of the world in order to take his own from all of them. (*Cologne Mani Codex* 109)[29]

Here, Mani seems to see himself not only on a religious mission, but on a political one as well. He is one called to stand up against tyranny and speak for the righteous. Such political instability, however, as much as any sense of missionary fervor, could have led Mani to choose India as his first destination. As a result, Mani's journey to India could be seen as a sort of self-imposed exile, which allowed him not only to hone his preaching skills among a famously religious foreign people, but to bide his time until more favorable conditions presented themselves at home.

Appendix

Chronology of Mani's early life

Traditional Chronology		*Alternate Chronology (?)*	
216	Mani is born		
220	Pattik takes Mani (age 4) to the Elchasaites	220*	Mani is born
224	Beginning of Ardashir's reign	224	Beginning of Ardashir's reign Pattik takes refuge with Mani (age 4) in Elchasaite community
228	Mani (age 12) has first visions	230/1	Mani's first visions (age 11/12)
240	Capture of Hatra by Ardashir Shapur made co-regent Return of syzygos to Mani (age 24) Mission/flight to India ca 240?	240	Capture of Hatra by Ardashir Shapur made co-regent Return of syzygos to Mani (age 20) Mission/flight to India ca 240?
242	Death of Ardashir Coronation of Shapur Return of Mani (age 26) to Persia	242	Death of Ardashir Coronation of Shapur Return of Mani (age 22) to Persia

*see note 24

28 Gardner/Lieu 2004, p. 67.
29 *Ibid.*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliography

Bosworth, C.E. (transl.) 1999: *The History of al-Tabari.* Vol. V: *The Sasanids, the Byzantines, the Lakmids, and Yemen*. New York.

Coyle, K. 2008: "The Gospel of Thomas among the Manichaeans?" In: L. Painchaud (ed.): *Colloque International "L'Évangile Selon Thomas et les Textes de Nag Hammadi" (Québec, 29–31 mai 2003)*. Québec, pp. 75–92.

Deeg, M./I. Gardner 2009: "Indian Influence on Mani Reconsidered: The Case of Jainism." In: *International Journal of Jaina Studies* 5.2, pp. 1–30.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D./E. Morano 2010: *Mani's Psalms. Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian Texts in the Turfan Collection.* Turnhout.

Funk, W.-P. 2002: "Einer aus tausend, zwei aus zehntausend: Zitate aus dem Thomasevangelium in den koptischen Manichaica." In: H.-G. Bethge *et al.* (eds.): *For the Children, Perfect Instruction. Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke on the Occasion of the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften's Thirtieth Year.* Leiden, pp. 67–94.

— 2009: "Mani's Account of Other Religions according to the Coptic *Synaxeis* Codex." In: J.D. BeDuhn (ed.): *New Light on Manichaeism. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 115–128.

Gardner, I. 2005: "Some Comments on Mani and Indian Religions according to the Coptic *Kephalaia*." In: A. van Tongerloo/L. Cirillo (eds.): *Il Manicheismo: Nuove prospettive della ricerca. Quinto Congresso internazionale di studi sul Manicheismo, Napoli, 2–8 settembre 2001*. Turnhout, pp. 123–135.

Gardner, I./S.N.C. Lieu 2004: *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.

Henrichs, A. 1973: "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation." In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 77*, pp. 23–59.

Henrichs, A./L. Koenen 1988: *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex.* Opladen.

King, K. 1992: "A Progress Report on the Editing of the Manichaean *Synaxeis* Codex." In: M. Rassart-Debergh/J. Ries (eds.): *Actes du IVe congrès copte. Louvain-la-Neuve, 5–10 septembre 1988*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road*. San Francisco.

Lieu, S.N.C. 1985: *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. A Historical Survey.* Manchester.

M'Crindle, J.W. 1979: *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature*. New Dehli.

Millar, F. 1993: *The Roman Near East: 31 BC–AD 337*. Cambridge.

Mirecki, P.A. 1991: "Coptic Manichaean Psalm 278 and Gospel of Thomas 37." In: A. van Tongerloo/S. Giversen (eds.): *Manichaica Selecta. Studies presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Louvain, pp. 243–262.

Petersen, N. 2006: *Manichaean Homilies.* Turnhout.

Polotsky, H.J. 1940: *Kephalaia*. Mit einem Beitrag von H. Ibscher. Stuttgart.

Potts, D.T. (ed.) 2013: *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford.

Segelberg, E. 1958: *Masbuta: Studies in the Ritual of the Mandaean Baptism*. Uppsala.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sundermann, W. 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin.
— 2001: "Mani, India and the Manichaean Religion." In: Chr. Reck/D. Weber/C. Leurini/A. Panaino (eds.): *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann.* Rome, pp. 199–216.
Tardieu, M. 1981: *Le manichéisme*. Paris.
Widengren, G. 1961: *Mani und der Manichäismus.* Stuttgart.
Wiesehöfer, J. 1982: "Die Anfänge sassanidischer Westpolitik und der Untergang Hatras." In: *Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte* 64, pp. 437–447.
— 1996: *Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD*. London/New York.
Yamauchi, E. M. 1970: *Gnostic Ethics and Mandaean Origins*. Cambridge, Mass.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Theatre Jargon and Literary Language in Tocharian

Georges-Jean Pinault, Paris

§1. Werner Sundermann had a keen interest for all aspects of Central Asiatic languages. I hope that the following investigation[1] will be received as a modest tribute to his memory and to his outstanding scholarship. The language of the Tocharian texts is technical in many aspects, because the scope of literary genres as represented in the Tocharian (TA and TB) manuscripts is quite large. Among these genres, which are borrowed from Indian literature, the dramatic texts have always attracted much interest. These texts follow the conventions of the Indian drama and they use several technical terms of classical dramaturgy. Among the findings of the Turfan expeditions, the discovery of fragments of dramas authored by Aśvaghoṣa (2nd century CE)[2] have proved the significance of dramatic literature in Buddhist circles, as an efficient means of dissemination of the Law. The plot of these dramas is based on the extensive repertoire of Buddhist edifying narratives, which were otherwise told in collections of Jātakas and Avadānas. This evidence has been confirmed by the recent identification of the single fragment (dated 5th or 6th century CE) of a play among Buddhist manuscripts found in Afghanistan and belonging to the Schøyen collection.[3] Tocharian literature, known from the 5th century CE onwards, shows in different genres the strong impact of Indian belles-lettres, so that it comes as no surprise to find among the fragments in both languages parts of dramas, which have no direct match in known Buddhist dramas, however. Due to broken and worn materials, it is not possible to give a definitive list of plays in TB and TA with titles, except for the well-known *Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka* in TA, the title of which is found in several colophons of chapters. Nonetheless, the genre identification of several Tocharian dramas is made certain through internal criteria: the indication of specific divisions of the text, the mention of stage directions and the presence of typical figures of the Indian drama.[4] The relevance of the Tocharian texts for the history of Buddhist dramatic literature is unmistakable, but this issue lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

1 I thank the anonymous reviewer of the first version of the present paper, which was written in April 2014. I bear alone the responsibility of all remaining errors.
2 Edited by Lüders 1911. In addition to the *Śāriputra-prakaraṇa* by Aśvaghoṣa, these fragments contain parts of two other plays by the same author or by contemporary poets of his school. See also Keith 1924, pp. 80–90.
3 Most recent translation and commentary by Franco/Schlingloff 2012.
4 See Thomas 1992, p. 545, and Pinault 2008, pp. 405–407.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

§ 2. The Tocharian dramatic texts that have been identified so far mention the main and secondary or supporting characters which are known in the classical treatise (NŚ, chap. XXXIV) as well in Sanskrit and Prākrit plays, including the fragments that have been found in Central Asia.[5] The list that can be reconstructed is of course limited by the fragmentary nature of the data. Nonetheless, it is possible to identify the following items with the corresponding Skt. terms in the classical nomenclature: TB *nāyake* (< Skt. *nāyaka-*) "hero", TB *viduṣake*, archaic *viduṣäke* (< Skt. *vidūṣaka-*) "jester, buffoon", TB *amāc*, pl. *amācänta*, TA *āmāś* (< Skt. *amātya-* through a MInd. intermediary) "minister", TB *purohite*, TA *purohit* (< Skt. *purohita-*) "chaplain", TB *śilpakārika* (< Skt. *śilpakārikā-*) female "expert in crafts" (acting also as escort), TB *kañcuki*, TA *kāñcuki* (< Skt. *kăñcukīya-*) "chamberlain".[6] I leave aside nouns such as "king", "queen", "prince", or "servant", since these characters are not unique to the dramatic genre. As one can see, all these terms are loans from Sanskrit. There is a significant exception, met with in a secondary character which is quite typical of Skt. drama, the "female door-keeper" (G. "Türhüterin"), Skt. *pratīhārī-*, the equivalent of which is TB *plaktukäññа/plaktukiññа*. This noun has not yet received a convincing interpretation. The so-called "female door-keeper" belongs to the group of supporting female characters. According to the treatise (NŚ, XXXIV.61) this feminine role has the function of announcing to the king matters relevant to the state and such political events as the declaration of war and the conclusion of peace. As reflected by the plot and the course of actions in actual plays, this function is akin to the one of an "usher" or "hostess",[7] who is able to welcome visitors to the palace and to convey their requests to the king or queen. She does not remain standing day and night at the portal, but she moves constantly from there to the interior of the royal apartments, and vice versa, in order to transmit all sorts of messages and orders from the court.

§ 3. The expected form of the nominative singular is *plaktukäññа*, but it shows some variation: classical *plaktukäññа* (THT 81b3), *plaktukäṃñа* (THT 516a1!, 4), *plaktūkäññа* (PK AS 17C a1, PK NS 29 b2.3), archaic *plaktukiññа* (PK AS 12A a3.b6, 12B a2, 12J b1!). In addition, the allative singular *plakt(ū)käñaiś*, attested in PK AS 16.4B a6 (in a fragment that completes PK NS 29 on the right) proves that the oblique singular was *plaktukäññai* in classical spelling: as expected, the noun belongs to the class II.1 of feminine nouns, cf. TB *aśiya* "nun", obl. sg. *aśiyai*, TB *mñcuṣka* "princess", obl. sg. *mñcuṣkai*, etc.[8] In PK NS 29 b5,

5 Lévi 1890, pp. 122–128; Konow 1920, pp. 13–16; Keith 1924, pp. 305–313.
6 About the latter, see below more precisely (§ 9).
7 Compare the fitting translation by G. "Empfangsdame" and the commentary of Franco/Schlingloff 2012, p. 20, n. 5. The analysis given there of Skt. *pratīhārī-* is not correct, however.
8 Krause/Thomas 1960–1964, I, pp. 120–121 (§ 163.1).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

that belongs to a leaf of the *Supriya-nāṭaka*, one reads with quasi certainty the genitive singular *plaktūk[iṃ]ñantse*, which would show the palatalization of the high vowel /ɨ/ (written <ä> in TB unaccented syllable) before palatal nasal, for classical *platkūkäṃñantse* or *plaktūkäññantse*, the latter being the expected form with respect to the nominative singular *plaktūkäññа* attested in this manuscript. This may be interpreted as a late and colloquial feature,[9] or alternatively as a sporadic imitation of the archaic form *plaktukiññа*. Otherwise, all the occurrences of this noun in this manuscript of the *Supriya-nāṭaka* consistently have the writing °*käñ(ñ)*° (PK AS 17Ca1, AS 16.4B a6, NS 29b2.3, quoted above). Conversely, the archaic[10] manuscript PK AS 12, which contains fragments of a *Bauddha-nāṭaka*, a drama about the Life of the Buddha, features the writing *plaktukiññа* in all occurrences of the word. We shall go back later to this discrepancy, which will prove decisive for the interpretation of the derivation of the noun.

§4. As for the usage, the identification of the *plaktukäññа* as the female door warden of the Indian drama is absolutely warranted. This can be shown by an extract of the dramatized version of the *Araṇemi-jātaka*. The brahmins, having reached the city, require that somebody shall announce their arrival to the king Araṇemi: it will be done immediately by the lady in question.

> THT 81b3–5
> || *tane plaktu(kä)ññа brāhmaṇeṃ lyelyakormeṃ kercīyenn(e) yopsa śle-yärke lāntaś weṣṣäṃ ñakta alyek-ypoyṣi brāhmaṇi parna klyenträ säswеṃ lkātsi ñäskenträ* • || *walo weṣṣäṃ ramer ecce pwāyar-me*
> "Darauf trat / die Türhüterin, die Brahmanen erblickt habend, in den Palast ein [und] spricht mit Verehrung zum König: 'Majestät! Ausländische Brahmanen stehen / draußen; den Herrn zu sehen begehren sie.' Der König spricht: 'Führe sie schnell herein!'"[11]

The following fragment of another drama gives commonplace dramaturgical indications about the entrance and departure of the door warden named Priyaśāriṇī: THT 516a1: || *tumeṃ yänmaṣṣäṃ priyaśāriṇi pla(ktukäṃña)* "Thereupon the door warden Priyaśāriṇī enters", and later a4: *(antiṣpū)rmeṃ l(ac) plaktukäṃña* • "the door warden has gone out of the harem (?)". The *Supriya-nāṭaka* has several instances of the role played by the door warden to convey information between the main characters of the drama. It suffices here to quote an extract from:

9 Peyrot 2008, p. 35. Actually, the same leaf shows at least another colloquial feature in a neighbouring context, precisely in direct speech: *se wäntare* (b3) for classic *kᵤse wäntare* "what [is] the matter?", that shows the simplification of the initial cluster of the interrogative pronoun. On this point, see Peyrot 2008, pp. 71–72.

10 Peyrot 2008, p. 225.

11 Translation after Schmidt 2001, p. 310.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

PK AS 16.9C+NS29+AS16.4B a6
||te keklyauṣormeṃ brahmada(tt)e walo arwāre kercīyeṃne y(aipu) plakt(ū)-käñaiś weṣṣäṃ
"Having heard this, the king Brahmadatta readily entered into the palace [and] says to the door warden."

Somewhat later, the door warden informs the cakravartin king Supriya, who stays inside the palace, about the presence of the king Brahmadatta, who desires eagerly to see him. In the *Bauddha-nāṭaka* (PK AS 12) about the Great Departure, the following extract illustrates again the intermediary role played by the door warden in the royal court:

PK AS 12B a2
///wakitsäññe rāhuleṃ yaitormeṃ rämer ecce pkälar-ne • plaktukiññna weṣṣäṃ • mänt tākaṃ
"(The king Śuddhodana [father of the Bodhisattva] says): 'After having adorned Rāhula [the son of the Bodhisattva], the excellence (of childhood), bring him quickly here!' The door warden says: 'So it will be!'"

The last sentence is of course the plain translation of Skt. *evam astu*, which can alternatively be *tathā* as a more vivid formulation.

§5. By contrast with most of the terms of Sanskrit drama quoted above (§2), TB *plaktukäññna* is not a loan from Sanskrit. The final suffix *-ññna* is evidently of Tocharian pedigree, and the preceding part cannot be seen as a false Sanskritization of any MInd. form. Nor is it a direct calque from Skt. *pratīhārī-*, of feminine gender, which is the feminine *devī*-derivative[12] of Skt. *pratīhāra-* (variant of *pratihāra-*) masc. "door-keeper, porter", attested from Skt. Epic onwards and current in Classical Sanskrit.[13] See further Prākrit *paḍihāra-* masc. "door-keeper". This noun means also "door, gate", but mostly in compounds that mean "door-keeper" or "portress", "door warden": *pratīhāra-goptrī-* fem., *pratīhāra-tara-* masc., *pratīhāra-pa-* masc., *prati-hāra-rakṣī-*, fem. ; the compound *pratīhāra-bhūmi-* fem., lit. "the place of the door-keeper" refers to the threshold of any building, for instance a palace, as attested in dramatic literature ; it means also "the office of a porter or a portress". Skt. *pratĭhāra-* "door, gate, closure" is an agent noun (lit. "shutting, closing, stopping", as recorded in late Vedic) based on Skt. *prati-hr̥-/-har-* in the sense "to keep shut, close". The Skt. term *pratīhārī-* has not been understood by Tocharian speakers as based on a designation of the door or gate. Tocharian in fact has nouns that refer to "door, gate, portal": TB *yenme*, TA *yokäm* and TB *twere*.[14] As a matter of fact, there

12 Debrunner 1954, p. 404.
13 Monier-Williams 1899, p. 673a; Turner 1966, p. 487a, no. 8618.
14 The issue of the distribution of TB *yenme* and *twere* lies outside the scope of the present paper, but it seems that TB *twere*, the term inherited from PIE, refers to the door of a house, while TB *yenme*, which is related to the root TB *yäp-* "to enter", means basically

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

exists a designation of the warder of a gate, TB *yenme*$_{u}$ (PK AS 18B a2).[15] It is derived from TB *yenme* with the suffix *-*went*- (< CToch. *-*wænt*-,), and is clearly a calque of Skt. *dvārika*- masc., as derived from Skt. *dvāra*- "door, gate".[16] In Sanskrit and MInd. narratives, the office of "door-keeper" is not restricted to women, of course. But in dramatic literature, the "door-keeper" or "usher" is a specifically female character, as shown by the NŚ and her appearance in many plays. Therefore, it is commendable to interpret TB *plaktukäññа/plaktukiññа*, matching Skt. *pratīhārī*-, as a feminine noun, and not as a collective/abstract formation, that may refer to males as well to females.[17] There is no counter-evidence to the fact that the TB noun refers always to the female character of a play. This point does not settle by itself the issue of the derivation of this noun, but it should not be forgotten if one wants to reach a realistic interpretation of the facts.

§ 6. One cannot deny an intuitive relationship of TB *plaktukäññа* with the verbal root TB/TA *plāk*- act. "to agree, receive agreement", mid. "ask for permission".[18] This remains at the level of the so-called *Wurzeletymologie*, because there is no living derivational process that would account for the formation of TB *plaktukäññа* from the root in question. On the side of the suffix, if one looks for a formal link inside the Tocharian derivational system, the synchronic connection of TB *plaktukäññа* with the agent noun derivatives in *-uki* is near at hand, all the more so if one considers the archaic form *plaktukiññа*. However, explanations with the suffix *-uki* have remained so far unsuccessful. The scenario of Van Windekens is strange on the formal side: TB *plaktukäññа* would be based on **plākte* or **plākätte* "authorization, permission", an abstract from the root *plāk*- found in the privative adjective TB *amplākätte* "without asking authorization or permission", by means of the agentive suffix *-uk(i)* and addition of the feminine suffix *-äññа*. The whole construction would mean "one asking for another's authorization or permission".[19] Actually, this is quite appealing from the semantic point of view, even though it ought to be formulated quite differently.

"entry, portal", and is preferred for designating the gate of a city. Both nouns may also be used in metaphorical sense. See Adams 1999, pp. 324 and 505.

15 Adams 1999, p. 505; Pinault 2008, p. 80.

16 Monier-Williams 1899, p. 504c.

17 *Pace* Hackstein 2012, p. 169.

18 Malzahn 2010, pp. 739–741; revising Krause 1952, p. 264; Krause/Thomas 1960–1964, II, pp. 121 and 216; Adams 1999, pp. 423–424.

19 Van Windekens 1976, pp. 376–377. This is reported with skepticism by Adams (1999, pp. 422–423). His later proposal (Adams 2013, p. 456) of a connection with the alleged root *plātk*- "to spread (out), extend" faces the same difficulty due to the lack of palatalization before the suffix *-uki* if it is a deverbative formation according to the living pattern of these agent nouns (see § 7). In addition, this hypothesis entails an *ad hoc* dissimilation and presupposes a poor etymological meaning as "the one who spreads [wide the doors]".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

As a matter of fact, Skt. *pratihāra-* "usher" served in Buddhist Sanskrit as the basis of a denominative verb, *pratihārayati*, meaning "to announce", precisely the presence of some person that asks for an audience at the royal court.[20] This is consistent with the role of the *pratīhārī-* as "usher" or "reception lady". Therefore, it is conceivable that *pratīhārī-* had long ago lost any connection with "door" or "entry", and was currently understood as the (female) agent noun of the autonomous verb *pratihārayati*. Now, the notion of "agreement" or "permission" would make sense for the prevalent role of the female usher in the drama, since she is often in charge of delivering to the visitor the king's agreement to enter the court and to have an encounter with him. In addition, she conveys orders and messages from the king, that corresponds as well to some agreement granted by the supreme power. I may quote a textual connection that speaks in favour of this assumption. In THT 516a2, in the extract of drama that we have already mentioned (§3), one reads: *ṣīto śem säswenäś plāktsi watkäṣṣäṃ* "a messenger[21] came [and] he commands to the lord to be permitted", understood "to be allowed to deliver his message in person". This speech should certainly be attributed to the *plaktukäṃña* who has been introduced in the preceding line. In that case, TB *plaktukäññа/plaktukiññа* would be somehow related to the root *plāk-*, in the sense "to receive agreement or permission", and would be an indirect calque of the Skt. term *pratīhārī-*, as interpreted from its use in typical palace scenes of the dramatic literature.

§7. The question of the derivation becomes then more crucial. Any connection with the privative adjective *amplākätte* should be left aside, because this is a regular formation built with the prefix CToch. **æn-* (< PIE **n̥-*) and the suffix TB *-tte* < CToch. **-tæ* (< PIE **-to-*) and associated with the subjunctive stem.[22] This cannot be the source of the form *plākt°* in TB *plaktukäññа*. In addition, CToch. has no recorded suffix **-t-*, that would make an abstract or action noun **plāk-t-* "agreement". The action noun that is known for this root is TB *plāki*, TA *plākäm* "permission, agreement", which still lies far from the basis of TB *plaktukäññа*. The connection with the derivatives with suffix TB *-uki* has long been entertained.[23] It is impossible at first glance, since these are always based on present stems with suffix in *-s-* or *-sk-* (present classes VIII, IXa, IXb, Xa

20 Edgerton 1953, p. 373b.

21 The reading *ṣīto* is safe, and is preferable anyway to *[p]īto*, as per Sieg/Siegling 1953, p. 320; because TB *pīto* "price" would not make any sense in this context. As for the noun TB *ṣīto* "envoy, messenger", which is attested also elsewhere (obl. sg. *ṣitai*, gen. sg. *ṣitaintse*), see Pinault (forthcoming).

22 Krause 1952, pp. 41–43, §33; Malzahn 2010, pp. 269–273.

23 Winter 1968, p. 64. I fail to understand the connection proposed by Winter with the root TB *plätk-*, that means "to overflow, develop, arise" (TA *plätk-* "to swell"), about which see Malzahn 2010, p. 744. Leaving aside the metathesis of the consonant cluster, the vocalism of the first syllable would remain unexplained by any account.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and XI), e.g. *weṣṣuki* "speaking" from *we(ñ)-* "to speak", pres. IXa, 3rd sg. act. *weṣṣäṃ*, *klāṣṣuki* "bringing" (to memory) from *kälā-* "to bring", pres. Xa, 3rd sg. act. *kälāṣṣäṃ*.[24] The examples belong to all stages of TB: a) archaic *aksaṣṣuki* (THT 133 b5) from *āks-* "to announce", *yamaṣuki* (THT 132 b6) from *yām-* "to make"; b) classical *weṣṣuki* (IOL Toch. 43 b1); c) late and colloquial *aksaṣṣuki* (THT 331 b3), *klāṣṣuki* (THT 330 b5), *tanmaṣṣuki* (for *tanmäṣṣuki*, THT 197 b3) from *täm-* caus. "to beget", *yirpṣuki* (THT 465, and other business texts) from *yärp-* "to care for", *ṣärpṣuki** (THT 330 a2) from *ṣärp-* "to indicate", *kälpaṣṣuki* (THT 330 a5) from *kälyp-* "to steal", *ṣparkäṣṣuki* (THT 330 a5) from *spärk-* caus. "to cause to disappear". As compared with other formations of agent nouns, this one seems to have been moderately productive, and only relatively late, in the translation and commentary of Vinaya texts (THT 330–331) pertaining to everyday life. It is striking that the majority of instances belong to two leaves of the same manuscript (THT 330–331). From the semantic point of view, this formation in *-uki* refers to occasional or potential agents.[25] The prehistory of this suffix TB *-uki*, which is devoid of any match in TA, is still in the dark.[26] The idea of some connection with the preterit participle ending in *-u*, from which TB *-uki* would be some kind of enlarged form, somehow comparable to TB *-auca*, another agent noun suffix, as related to the preterit participle in *-au* (e.g. TB *kälpauca* "one who obtains" besides participle *kälpau*),[27] leads to nowhere.[28] Alternatively, one may consider some relationship of TB *-uki* with Skt. suffixes, either *-uka-* or *-ūka-*. The deverbative agent nouns in Skt. *-uka-* are attested from Vedic onwards, e.g. *kāmuka-* "loving", *varṣuka-* "rainy, causing to rain".[29] They have the same syntax as participles. But their productivity declines drastically in Epic and Classical Sanskrit; among the few new examples, the best known instance in Buddhist Sanskrit is *upapāduka- (aupapāduka-)* "born by spontaneous generation".[30] As for the adjectives in Skt. *-ūka-*,[31] they are built on reduplicated stems, often with intensive value, e.g. *jāgarūka-* "wakeful, watchful", *vāvadūka-* "eloquent, garrulous". In any case, this connection with Skt. suffixes remains quite tenuous, because one would require a loanword as the model of the TB formation. Furthermore, neither of these suffixes would account by itself for TB *-uki*. Except for the proper names, the final vowel of thematic nouns is regularly lost in Toch. loanwords, e.g. TB/TA *gaṅgavāluk*

24 Thorough survey in Krause 1952, pp. 45–46, § 37; Schaefer 1997, with philological discussion of several forms.
25 Schaefer 1997, p. 165.
26 No explanation is ventured by Schaefer (1997, p. 164), while mentioning in passing TB *plaktukäññä* after Winter 1968, p. 64.
27 Krause 1952, pp. 44–45, § 36.
28 Unlikely combinations due to Van Windekens 1979, pp. 126–127, § 246.
29 Debrunner 1954, pp. 480–483; Kim (2009) for the Vedic data.
30 Edgerton 1953, pp. 139a and 162b.
31 Debrunner 1954, p. 498.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

< Skt. *gaṅgāvāluka-* "resembling [in number] Ganges' sand".[32] The final *-i* of TB loanwords may have different sources. It suffices here to give a sample of the possibilities: *śreṣṭhi* < Skt. *śreṣṭhī*, nom. sg. of *śreṣṭhin-* "foreman of a guild"; *Sundari*, fem. proper name < Skt. *Sundarī* ; *pratihari* < Skt. *prātihārya-* "miracle"; *indri* < Skt. *indriya-* "organ of sense"; *ṣaḍvargi* < Skt. *ṣaḍvargika-* "member of the group of six [monks]" through MInd. **ṣaḍvargiya-*. Therefore, TB *-uki* would require a source suffix in Indo-Aryan such as *-ŭkī*, nom. sg. of *-ŭkin-*, alternatively, for argument's sake, the nom. sg. of stems in *-ukīya-*, *-ūkīya-*, *-ukya-*, etc. Due to the productivity of *-(i)ka-* suffixation in MInd., one may imagine some renewal of *-ūka-* as *-ūkika-* > MInd. *-ūkiya-* > TB *-uki*. As for the latter option, a suffix of this shape is nearly unknown in Buddhist Sanskrit. The weak point common to all these options is the absence of any noun as the missing link that would possibly account for the TB formation from some MInd. or Skt. model.

§ 8. A valuable and hitherto neglected form supports the notion of a precise connection between TB *plaktukäññа/plaktukiññа* with the agent nouns in *-uki*. These are mostly attested as masculines. But there is a possible reflex of a feminine form *-ukiññа* in the perlative sg. form *ṣärpṣukiññai-sa*, written °*ukiññesa* in THT 330 a2: *ṣamāne ytāri mā aiśtär klyiye ytāri ṣärpṣūkiññesa yaṃ-ne anāpatti* "[if] a monk does not know the way, [and] if a woman goes his way [only] in manner of indicating [the correct way], [there is] no offense". In this late text, it is possible to take *-e-* as a misspelling for *-ai-* or as the result of colloquial monophthongization.[33] A feminine form *ṣärpṣūkiññа* would fit as referring to the woman who shows the way to the monk. As an alternative, one can take *ṣärpṣūkiññe* as an abstract derived from *ṣärpṣūki** and meaning "the role proper to a guide",[34] but the construction with the perlative would be less clear. My hypothesis is that the archaic form *plaktukiññа* has been the point of departure of the whole formation. From this word, which designates a female agent, the feminine suffix *-ukiññа* spread as to build agent nouns from present stems. The form *-uki* is the masculine that has been back-formed from the feminine *-ukiññа*. This process is by no means unknown, compare Ved. *sapátna-* "rival" after *sa-pátnī-* "fellow-wife, female rival", Gk. ἑταῖρος "companion, comrade" after ἑταίρᾱ "female companion", and in Tocharian, TA *pats* "husband" (instead of **pac* < PIE **póti-*), under the influence of the feminine TA **apats*, reflected by TB *epetsa**, obl. sg. *epetso* "bride"[35]. It is not so difficult to find in the above list the first instance based on a sigmatic present stem: *aksaṣṣuki*, occurring at archaic stage and known again at late stage, and derived from *āks-* "to announce",

32 Pinault 2013, p. 219.
33 As suggested by Peyrot *apud* Malzahn 2013, p. 111, n. 17.
34 Krause/Thomas 1960–1964, II, p. 250; followed by Schaefer 1997, p. 166.
35 Pinault 2014, p. 294, with previous literature.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

pres. 3rd sg. act. *aksaṣṣäṃ*.[36] This would be the masculine match of the feminine *aksaṣṣukiññä**, which had been very close semantically to *plaktukiññä*, and even some kind of indigenous gloss thereof: "the one (female) supposed to announce, in charge of announcing". This makes easy to understand the use of *-uki*, fem. *-ukiññä*, as based on sigmatic present stems with palatalization. The palatalization of the final consonant or consonant cluster is characteristic of regular agent nouns formations where it can be explained as belonging to the stem, cf. for example *-eñca*, which can hardly go back to **-ēnt-*,[37] to wit those in TB *-ñca* (giving the so-called "active" present participle) and *-nta* (giving lexicalized agent nouns), e. g. for thematic stems, from TB *kau-* "to kill", pres. act. 3rd sg. *kauṣäṃ*, TB *kauṣeñca* "killing" and TB *kauṣenta* (TA *koṣant*) "killer". Tocharian has a wide array of agent noun formations, with quite different specializations.[38] Therefore, it is likely that the suffix *-uki* has been substituted to *-eñca* of sigmatic presents in order to make an agent formation with a different function. If one takes *aksaṣṣuki* as the prototype, there exists precisely from this verb a parallel participle *aksaṣṣeñca*. It has been shown that the *-nt*-participle, normally used with transitive verbs, is specialized for the generic and habitual agent.[39] By contrast with °*ṣṣ-eñca*, the type °*ṣṣ-uki* would be formed as to express the potential and occasional agent. The back-formation of the masculine *-uki* vis-à-vis of the feminine *-uki-ññä* complies nicely with the productivity of the suffix *-ññä* (< CToch. **-ññā*) as to make the feminine counterpart[40] of masculine substantives ending in *-e* or *-i*, see for instance TB *ñakteññä* "goddess" vs. *ñakte* "god", and TB *käryor-pläṅṣiññä* "female trader" vs. *käryor-pläṅṣi** "trader", lit. "business-seller",[41] verbal governing compound. From this we can account for the classical form *plaktukäññä*. Once the suffix *-uki* had become associated with a present stem in the type *aksaṣṣuki*, *plaktukiññä* was simply a lexeme isolated from the agent noun formation, and belonging moreover to the technical part of the vocabulary. Then the final *-iññä* has been replaced by *-äññä* after the model of other learned nouns that translated feminine Skt. nouns in *-ī* based on thematic masculine, cf. *yakṣaññä* (< **yākṣäññā*) translating Skt. *yakṣī-*, feminine match of *yakṣa-* masc. "demon", the latter being transposed by TB *yākṣe*.[42] This formation belongs neatly to the learned vocabulary. According to correct and standard grammatical analysis, Skt. *pratīhārī-* was the feminine counterpart of the noun *pratīhāra-* "door-keeper", which was thematic.

36 It is striking that the lone new form occurring at classical stage, *weṣṣuki*, is derived from a *verbum dicendi* as well. The direction of spread is quite obvious.
37 Pinault 2012, p. 193.
38 Krause 1952, pp. 44–48, and Pinault 2012.
39 Pinault 2012, p. 182, with previous literature.
40 Malzahn 2013, pp. 111 and 115–116.
41 Malzahn 2012, p. 118.
42 Malzahn 2013, pp. 107–110.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

This confirms that the spelling *platkukäññna* is due to the literate education of Toch. monks, or at least to some scholastic tradition of Buddhist communities.

§ 9. As a consequence, the quest for the origin of the suffix TB *-uki* should now concentrate on TB *plaktukiññna* itself. I would see the origin of *-uki* in the designation of a drama character whose role is nearly identical to the one of the female usher. In theatre jargon, this man was named TB *kañcuki*,[43] TA *kāñcuki*.[44] This is clearly a loan from Skt. *kañcukin-* (through nom. sg. *kañcukī*) or better *kǎñcukīya-*. This masculine noun is currently translated as "chamberlain".[45] The form *kañcukīya-* is the one given by the NŚ. Since it is also attested, besides the variant *kāñcukīya-* in Buddhist Sanskrit,[46] it is definitely to be preferred as the source of the Toch. words. This person appears also in Buddhist narratives as "eunuch, attendant in a harem", being the overseer of the women's apartment. The etymology of this noun is not relevant in the present argument, but *kǎñcukīya-* (as well as *kañcukin-*) is based on *kañcuka-* masc., described as "a dress fitting close to the upper part of the body", "bodice" or "coat of armour", alternatively some kind of tight jacket.[47] This person would have been named from his garment. The treatise classifies him among the inmates of the harem, and also as reliable and wise men, that the king should employ in business connected with policy.[48] In Sanskrit plays, this supporting character has a role quite similar to the one of the *pratīhārī-*, as the *kǎñcukīya-* is currently charged of conveying king's commands in the royal apartments. As a matter of fact, the two characters do meet quite often at the door of the harem or of the palace, see for instance the scene of the *Pratimā-nāṭaka* by Bhāsa, at the beginning of the 1st act, that takes place in the king's palace:

A Female Door-keeper:	Sir, which of the chamberlains is present here?
Chamberlain:	Lady, here I am. What is to be done?
A Female Door-keeper:	Noble one, the great king Daśaratha (…) orders: "Let all the materials (required) for the coronation of Rāma, which is to invest him with sovereign power, be brought in at once."
Chamberlain:	Lady, what was ordered by the great king has been fully got ready …[49]

43 Several occurrences in the manuscript PK AS 12: 12 J a5, b2.3, to be restored in 12A a1, 12J a1.
44 Carling 2009, p. 110b.
45 Monier-Williams 1899, p. 243b ; "chambellan" (Lévi 1890, p. 128), "Kämmerer" (Konow 1920, p. 16).
46 Edgerton 1953, pp. 164a and 176a.
47 This noun is further cognate with *kañcūla-*, *kañculikā-* "bodice, corset, jacket", cf. Mayrhofer 1956–1976, I, pp. 140–141.
48 NŚ, XXXIV.71, 75.
49 See Kale 1930, translation, p. 2. Similar dialogues can be found in the other acts of the play.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Both characters have in common to transmit orders of the king or queen to various persons, and also to take care of official duties. In some sense, the *kǎncukīya-* acts often as the male counterpart of the *pratīhārī-*.

Therefore, I would assume that the loan TB *kañcuki* (older **kāñcuki*) served as the model to coin in Tocharian the equivalent of Skt. *pratīhārī-*, by adding *-uki* to a form of the root *plāk-* "to receive agreement or permission". In the cast of secondary characters, the *pratīhārī-* was a distinctly female character by contrast with the *kǎncukīya-*, her closest partner, hence the Toch. feminine suffix *-ñña* added to the *°uki* term. This would yield **plak-ukiñña* (< **plāk-úki-ñña*, with regular accent on the second syllable), which is a hybrid formation. This process can be well understood as happening in the special language connected with the theatre and with the writers that composed dramas in Tocharian along the rules of Sanskrit dramaturgy. The choice of the root *plāk-* as the lexical basis is not unexpected. We have seen above (§6) that it occurs in the context of the description of the activities of the female usher. It should be understood as "to receive agreement" for entering (Skt. *pra-viś-*) the palace and getting an audience. Let us quote a typical scene of granting a visit, in the 6th act of the *Pratimā-nāṭaka*:

A Female Door-keeper:	May the prince enter?
Kaikeyī (a queen):	Go, usher him in.
A Female Door-keeper:	Mistress, so I will. *(Having walked forth and approached.)* Victory to the prince! You may, indeed, enter.
Bharata:	What! Did you inform her?
A Female Door-keeper:	Yes.
Bharata:	Let us enter then.[50]

Now, one may take this lexical basis **plāk* as the root noun of the root *plāk-*, with the meaning of an action noun.[51] One can then gloss **plāk-uki-ñña* as "the one (female) in charge of the agreement". Sooner or later, this noun was remade as **plākt-ukiñña*. It would be odd to extract this basis **plākt-* from the infinitive *plāktsi* or from the privative *amplākätte* by metaanalysis, since these regular formations are clearly analyzable in synchrony, with suffixes *-tsi* and *-tte* respectively. The idea of an alternative root **plākt-* as enlarged doublet of *plāk-* would be somewhat speculative, although it could be supported by some parallels, e.g. TB *kau-* "to destroy, kill" vs. *kaut^{ā}-* "to split", TB *kärs^{ā}-* "to know" vs. *kärst^{ā}-* "to cut off", TB *käs-* "to come to extinction" vs. *käst-** as basis of *käst-wer* "by night". As an alternative, I would tentatively assume that **plākt°* was based on *plākät**, the 2nd sg. act. of the subjunctive (class I) of *plāk-*,

50 Kale 1930, translation, p. 54.
51 This type of formation does exist in Tocharian, cf. Krause 1952, p. 48, §42.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

3rd sg. *plākäṃ*, that meant "you will receive agreement", understood "to enter the palace and to meet the lord". This would be the polite formulation to let someone enter. To put it differently, TB *plakt-ukiññа* was at some anterior stage a delocutive formation, based on an utterance instead of a lexical morpheme. This would reflect the language of the stage.

§ 10. To conclude, I would sketch the whole process that includes the formation of TB *plaktukäññа* and of the TB agent nouns in *-uki* according to the following steps:

1. In the special idiom of dramaturgy, TB *kañcuki*, masculine, loan from Skt. *kăncukīya-*, triggers the formation of **plāk-uki*, with addition of the feminine suffix *-ññа*, in order to match the Skt. feminine term *pratīhārī-*.
2. TB **plākukiññа* is remade as *plaktukiññа* after some formation of the root *plāk-*.
3. In the meantime, the suffix *-uki*, fem. *-ukiññа*, is interpreted as agent noun suffix, and it becomes productive as added to present stems in *-ṣṣä-*, hence the type *°ṣṣ-uki*.
4. Since TB *plaktukiññа*, which is not based on a present stem, now diverges obviously from the current type *°ṣṣ-uki*, it is further reshaped in the learned classical language as *plaktukäññа* after the model of other feminine nouns in *-äññа*.
5. The classical form TB *plaktukäññа* has now a vulgar match *plaktukiññа* in the colloquial language, that coincides with the original form.

One may surmise that the latter form was actually in free use among theatre people, but that the literate writers preferred to use *plaktukäññа* as the correct form. If my argument is accepted, the history of the formation of TB *plaktukiññа/plaktukäññа* would add some supplementary evidence to the picture of the history of TB language, at the crossroads of sociolinguistics and morphological restructuring. It confirms that the Tocharian writers tried to normalize their own idiom as a literary language. To put it differently, one cannot sensibly reconstruct linguistic history while ignoring cultural history.

Abbreviations

CToch.	Common Tocharian
G.	German
Gk.	Greek
IOL	India Office Library, London
MInd.	Middle Indic
NŚ	*Nāṭyaśāstra* by Bharata
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PK	Pelliot Koutchéen (AS = Ancienne Série, NS = Nouvelle Série)

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Skt.	Sanskrit
TA	Tocharian A
TB	Tocharian B
THT	Tocharische Handschriften aus den Turfanfunden (Berlin)
Toch.	Tocharian
Ved.	Vedic

References

Adams, D. Q. 1999: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam/Atlanta.

— 2013: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. 2nd edition, revised and greatly enlarged. 2 vols. Amsterdam/New York.

Carling, G. 2009: *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian B*. Vol. 1: *a–j*. Compiled in collaboration with G.-J. Pinault and W. Winter. Wiesbaden.

Debrunner, A. 1954: *Altindische Grammatik*. Vol. II/2: *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen.

Edgerton, F. 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. II: *Dictionary*. New Haven, Conn.

Franco, E./D. Schlingloff 2012: "Zu dem buddhistischen Schauspielfragment aus Afghanistan." In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 54, pp. 19–33.

Hackstein, O. 2012: "Collective and Feminine in Tocharian." In: Hackstein/Kim 2012, pp. 143–177.

Hackstein, O./R. A. Kim (eds.) 2012: *Multilingualism and History of Knowledge*. Vol. 2: *Linguistic Developments Along the Silkroad: Archaism and Innovations in Tocharian*. Wien.

Kale, M. R. 1930: *Pratimānāṭakam. Pratimā of Bhāsa*. Edited with a short Sanskrit commentary, English translation and critical notes. Bombay.

Keith, A. B. 1924: *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice*. London.

Kim, J.-S. 2009: "Zur Syntax der Nomina auf *-uka-* im Veda." In: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 26, pp. 75–82.

Konow, S. 1920: *Das indische Drama*. Berlin/Leipzig (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, II. Band, 2. Heft D).

Krause, W. 1952: *Westtocharische Grammatik*. Vol. I: *Das Verbum*. Heidelberg.

Krause, W./W. Thomas 1960–1964: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Vol. I: *Grammatik*. Vol. II: *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg.

Lévi, S. 1890: *Le théâtre indien*. Paris [reprint 1963].

Lüders, H. 1911: *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*. Berlin (Königlich Preussische Turfan-Expeditionen; Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Heft 1).

Malzahn, M. 2010: *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden/Boston.

— 2012: "Verbale Rektionskomposita im Tocharischen." In: V. Sadovski/D. Stifter (eds.): *Iranistische und indogermanische Beiträge in memoriam Jochem Schindler (1944–1994)*. Wien, pp. 113–135.

— 2013: "Of demons and women – TB *yakṣa-* and oppositional feminine forms in Tocharian." In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14, pp. 105–121.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mayrhofer, M. 1956–1976: *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Vol. 1: *A–Th* (1956), vol. 2: *D–M* (1963), vol. 3: *Y–H. Nachträge und Berichtigungen* (1976). Heidelberg.

Monier-Williams, M. 1899: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford.

Peyrot, M. 2008: *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam/New York.

Pinault, G.-J. 2008: *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven/Paris.

— 2012: "Tocharian *-nt*-participles and agent nouns." In: Hackstein/Kim 2012, pp. 179–204.

— 2013: "Contribution de *Maitrisimit* à l'interprétation de textes parallèles en tokharien." In: Y. Kasai *et al.* (eds.): *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anlässlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen (Berlin, 3. und 4. April 2008)*. Turnhout, pp. 183–234.

— 2014: "Distribution and origins of the PIE suffixes *$*$-ih$_2$-*." In: N. Oettinger/Th. Steer (eds.): *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*. Wiesbaden, pp. 273–306.

— forthcoming: "Current issues in Tocharian etymology and phonology." Paper delivered at the "Scientific Conference dedicated to the Centenary since the Beginning of the Deciphering of the Tocharian Texts", Moscow/Saint Petersburg, August 25–28, 2008.

Schaefer, Ch. 1997: "*waṣiḵ ḵalpaṣṣuki*. Zu den westtocharischen Nominalbildungen auf *-uki*." In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 7, pp. 163–176.

Schmidt, K. T. 2001: "Die westtocharische Version des Araṇemi-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung." In: L. Bazin/P. Zieme (eds.): *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout, pp. 299–327.

Sieg, E./W. Siegling 1953: *Tocharische Sprachreste*, *Sprache B*. Heft 2: *Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von W. Thomas. Göttingen.

Thomas, W. 1992: "Die tocharische Literatur." In: W. Jens (ed.): *Kindlers Neues Literatur-Lexikon*. Bd. 20. München, pp. 544–547.

Turner, R. L. 1966: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. Vol. I: *Text*. London/New York.

Van Windekens, A. J. 1976: *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. I: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain.

— 1979: *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. II/1: *La morphologie nominale*. Louvain.

Winter, W. 1968: "Archaismen in der tocharischen Adjektiv- und Nominalbildung." In: J. C. Heesterman *et al.* (eds.): *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday*. The Hague/Paris, pp. 60–64 [= *Kleine Schriften/Selected Writings*, vol. I, Bremen 2005, pp. 136–140].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Writing Hearer. A Suggested Restoration of M 101d

Andrea Piras, Bologna

I am glad to participate in this volume in honour of a colleague and a friend, whose high competence and warm generosity in sharing his knowledge have fostered our scholarship with counselling and encouragement. His cherished memory is particularly dear for the University of Bologna, and the former Faculty for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage (Ravenna), because of the "Laurea ad Honorem in Conservazione dei Beni Culturali" that was awarded to him in Ravenna on Tuesday the 15th of November 1994. This was a small token of admiration and gratitude for a pious and wise Electus.

The aim of the present contribution, in line with previous works,[1] is to highlight a Manichaean Middle Persian text belonging to the set of fragments put together by Henning, under the heading "Fragments of the Kawān", wherein a section about the Hearers is included.[2] The role of the Hearers within the community is widely described by a rich literature, pointing to their duty of providing assistance to the Electi, with the obligation of giving alms and other kinds of goods to support the life of the Electi in their devotion to the holy practices of meditation, prayer, liturgical chants and spiritual digestion, in order to release the light imprisoned in worldly matter.

The literary structure of this section is based on a series of parables formed with the simile figure of speech, marked by the words *mānāg* and *čōn* ("like … such a one"). The point of emphasis of the whole section is the general attitude of charity, altruism and unselfishness to which the Hearers are obliged, especially for almsgiving, the backbone of the Manichaean economical system of donation (Hearer) and atonement (Elect), forming a reciprocity of material and spiritual goods[3].

The passage included in "fragment d" tells us about a particular activity of high intellectual and cultural value, i. e. writing. After mentioning the Hearer's copying work, the simile is introduced by the preposition *čōn*:

> *m[ʾnʾg nywš]ʾg ky nbyg nby(sy)[d] [cʾw]n myrd ʿy wymʾr ky zy[m]yrd dʾd*
> "The Hearer that copies a book, is like unto a sick man that gave his … to a … man."[4]

1 Piras 2012, 2014.
2 Henning 1943, pp. 59–60, 63–65.
3 Tardieu 1981, p. 87.
4 Henning 1943, ll. 230–233, p. 59 (text), p. 64 (translation).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

According to Henning, the word *zy[* might be restored as "weapons" and this is a plausible solution, given the damaged condition of the fragment and the supposition it permits us to make. Thanks to the Digital Turfan Archive (Texte in Manichäischer Schrift) everybody can look at the immense heritage of the German expeditions and verify the status of the fragments, in their state of preservation, with damage and gaps. This is also the case for this fragment (M 101d: m0101d_seite2) and for the fifth line with the word *zy[* at the end of the damaged line, the **zyn* of Henning's restitution. In my opinion, looking at the damaged margin of the page, there is more space than is needed just for *n* alone. In suggesting a restoration of the lacuna I will put forward two alternative solutions, based on paleographical grounds, considering the shape of the letters and the space they would need.

There are two feasible combinations of *zy* plus two alphabetical signs in each word, *hr* and *ʾn*, providing two forms such as *zyhr* and *zyʾn*. A third option could also be possible, *zyrd*, but I am inclined to rule it out, because it being about someone who gives his "heart" *(zīrδ)* somebody (in a sentimental nuance?) is more nonsensical. It sounds too vague in the context, despite the paleographical grounds enabling such a possibility (there is also the question of a Parthian origin for *zīrδ*).

So the object of the action performed within the simile – the giving of something to someone – requires in my opinion a different explanation, involving the weak condition of the man and the meaning of his deed. The "weapons" or "armour" do not seem to have any particular relation with the sickness of a disable man, unfit for holding weapons.

The different passages of this text about Hearers are composed to present a situation – at least, where we can recognize the sense in between the lacunae – of offering something of value, or managing something connected with the wise Hearer and his generosity: being like a farmer who sows seed or a poor man who presents his daughter to the king (Frg. F), or like a branch of a fruitless tree, expected to produce fruits, i.e. the desired for pious deeds (Frg. A). What gift could a sick man, afflicted by illness, have offered in accordance to the Manichaean conception of donation prescribed to generous Hearers? Both alternative proposals, zyʾn/*zyān* and zyhr/*zīhr*, show a certain semantical nexus with man's illness and his faculty of donation.

The word *zyān* "loss, harm, damage" is strictly related to the Hearer's condition. But giving of *zyān* is hardly an act of compassion in the eyes of mankind, or better of the Manichaean community which is the first target of the Hearer's munificence. It could point to a sort of apotropaic transfer of harm, due to his good action, but it looks like an evil (and even magical) act of doing injury to somebody, and as such, a patent violation of the second commandment.

The bestowal of *zīhr* "life" indicates the high offering of himself, as an act of self-donation signifying the helpfulness and the willingness of the good Hearer, always ready to support the Elects, and devoted to the maintenance of

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the community. The gift of life (of health) from an unhealthy man is a metaphor of sacrifice, diligence and unselfishness, in the style of the genre of parables, with emphatic and often paradoxical comparisons in its allegories, to convey a didactic *exemplum*. This is the option I suggest. The parabolic style sounds often illogical, at a first sight. The tone of this text on the Hearers describes an overall situation of lacking for the auditor: he is like a poor man, or a fruitless tree, or a sick man. But his pious deeds bring merit and fruit, because he offers that which is most dear to him (his daughter, his life), in his condition of poverty. The offering of own's vital energies, even in weakness but for a pious duty, is then a metaphor of extreme altruistic disposition, echoing the precept of M 135:

> And now I command you, Hearers, that so long as there is strength in your bodies, you should strive for the salvation of your souls.[5]

This strenuous attitude is referred to in a Sogdian text (T i α) too:

> Even [if] ever so many illnesses come which may cause sore tribulation, always keep your mind firm (?), never let your body grow weak. So make efforts, in grief and feebleness.[6]

The radical Buddhist sacrifice of the body also is recorded in the Bactrian fragment M 1224, but is considered worthless for the Manichaean salvation of the Living Soul.[7]

A further item has to be taken into consideration, in order to connect this self-donation to the phrase quoted before the simile: "the Hearer that copies a book" *(niyōšāg kē nibēg nibēsēd)*, which implies a lot of details to clarify the following simile (*mānāg … čōn merd ī wēmār* "is like unto a sick man"). In Manichaeism the human condition is marked by the stigma of ignorance, sleep and unconsciousness, whereby the human being is unaware of his heavenly origin and still intoxicated, in a state of illness. Human life untouched by gnosis is a venomous condition of infection, broadly described within the Gnostic and Manichaean medical imagery, first of all according to Mani's own self-designation as a physician,[8] and in further medical images recorded in a huge amount of literature, from Greek to Coptic, Iranian, Turkish and Chinese texts.[9]

The toxic effect of the *hyle* can be annihilated thanks to self-discovery and gnosis, a willingness to accept the doctrine and then become an Auditor, an intermediate level between the Elects and the common people. This first step towards the pious life represented by Manichaean gnosis is often described as a stage of continuous imperfection, recurrently exposed to sinful behaviour and

5 Klimkeit 1993, p. 195.
6 Henning 1945, p. 481.
7 Sims-Williams 2009, pp. 253, 255.
8 *CMC* 122.4–17: ἰατρὸς τυγχάνω "I am a doctor"; M 566: *bizišk hēm až bābel zamig* "I am a doctor, from the land of Babylon".
9 Cf. Klimkeit 1996, van Tongerloo 2000, Scopello 2005, Coyle 2009.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

violation of ten commandments, and as a situation of permanent illness. Evil and sickness are the opposite of salvation and health, in soul and body, a constant preoccupation of the Manichaeans in everyday life, with the longing for safety in this world and beyond. The Hearer and the imperfect Hearer is the core concern of the pedagogical teaching conducted in the community to foster a moral code of generosity and munificence. Unlike the bad Hearer, the perfect Hearer is the ideal follower presenting the best behaviour, described in many texts for giving prominence to the inner disposition of helpfulness, a desideratum to resolve the most urgent concern to sustain the community, as is shown by Manichaean didactic literature (parables, homilies).

Many activities deal with the pious and willing Hearer, not limited just to almsgiving but also consisting of collaborating in various tasks, including the copying of texts, a practice far from being an exclusive duty of the Elects, notwithstanding the fact that the class of Scribes belongs to the "ordres mineurs" (Master of the chorus, Preacher, Scribe, Singer) of the Elects, according to the Manichaean pyramidal scheme.[10] So, the action of writing puts this Hearer among an elevated class of perfect Hearers, sharing some moral merits for partaking in monastic activities, such as writing. From the Coptic texts of Kellis to the Central Asian texts there are remarkable data referring to scribal activity involving the Auditor: the presence of monasteries in Kellis,[11] and the hopeful attention for holy books (Coptic *jōme*) and letters, denote the joint participation of Elects and Catechumens in the scribal activities of the community. Additionally, in the first colophon of the *Iki yïltïz nom*, the Uigur auditor *(niγošak)* Yapγun longs for the future acknowledgment of his meritorious deed of reciting and copying the texts:

> May everyone who recites it after me deign to name me on account of the five (phrases?) that I have written (here) respectfully.[12]

The Hearer who writes a book is surely like a sick *(wēmār)* man, intrinsically, because of the cosmic illness of ignorance infecting the human condition[13] (a risk of decay for everybody, the Elects included). But he is a sick man yearning for healing, who made a choice and decision, at the very first step of his religious endeavour, by becoming a humble follower. And he realizes the moral act in a concrete way, subduing his hyliac nature through spiritual discipline: offering himself to a transpersonal duty at the service of the community and obtaining merit (Sanskrit *puṇya* > Parthian *pun*) for that. In this way, by means of a mild effort of dedication – unlike the hard religious training of the Elect – the Hearer

10 Tardieu 1981, p. 77.
11 Gardner/Alcock/Funk 1999, pp. 76–77.
12 Klimkeit 1993, p. 376. Cf. also Colditz (1995, pp. 51–52) for the involvement of Auditors in scribal activities.
13 Rescuing someone from sickness *(wēmārīh)* is one of Mani's powers, cf. his last audience with Wahrām I (M 3).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

can partake of a certain degree of perfection, by purifying his material nature (in body, mind and soul) with the help of the spirit and its intellectual qualities. And becoming a perfect Hearer in a temporary state of health, as is well described in a Parthian parable (M 580)[14]: he is without pain and healthy *(društ)*, but one limb causes him to scratch himself a little; he gets up nervously and considers when it will be that this scratch will be healed so that he will be healthy and painless in his whole body. The process of salvation is a never-ending work of vigilance and attention, with the permanent danger of failing.

It is also very likely that a condition of illness, humility and poverty belonged to a stereotyped language of self-depreciation, to underscore the modesty and inadequacy of a scribe, imploring pardon for his careless work; to obtain forgiveness and salvation, according to a Buddhist style[15] which was probably shared by Manichaeans in the multicultural area of Central Asia with its religious heterogeneity.

The act of writing is a kind of spiritual deed, a practice imbued with religious intentions, like other exploits related to craftsmanship or arts, well represented within a Manichaean imagery employing metaphors of artisans, such as a house builder, a tailor and a painter, or a goldsmith. The first three are mentioned in a text close to the *Šābuhragān* (M 7983)[16], in order to illustrate Āz's cosmogonical enterprise of fashioning the human body of the child: just like an architect who builds a palace and who uses his knowledge to divide the palace into different buildings; or like a tailor who makes a gown from different materials; or like a painter, who uses his skill to paint a picture with different colours. Notwithstanding this devilish context, the metaphors of artisans point to a positive attitude towards handiwork as being anything but demonic, as is demonstrated by Mani's own activity of painting, being an artistic work subjected (like every human effort) to the twofold aspect of the Hyle or of the Nous, and obviously performed by Mani under the enlightening influence of the latter, a condition shared by everybody conforming to the ascetic observances of precepts and practices, becoming then an artist (painter, illustrator, scribe) under the aegis of the Nous.[17]

The *opus* of the formation of New Man, remaking the soul and mastering the body by means of an ascetic effort, is a pragmatic operation that needs a practical enterprise and not a speculative philosophy: the creative mind and the skilful means of wisdom effect the domination over the mind and the body by subjugating the hyliac nature with spiritual forces, of self-edification, willingness and donation. The strong and unceasing work applied to the soul is a polishing

14 Sundermann 1973, pp. 104–106; translation in Asmussen 1975, pp. 34–35.

15 Hamilton 1971, pp. 51, 93: "scribe dégénéré et vieux" *(ayduq qarï bitkači)*, cf. the frequent use of the adverb *tägintim* "humblement" and the concluding formula of the scribal work "(il) trouva le salut" *(qut bulmïš)*.

16 Hutter 1992, pp. 105–115.

17 Nagel (1979, pp. 220–223) has underlined this aspect well.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of a rough material to make it clean and shiny: this is described in a masterly way by the metaphor of the goldsmith *(zarnegar)* in the *Sermon of the Light Nous* (§ 16): "[das Werk des Licht-Nous ist der Kunst] vergleichbar, mit der der G[oldschmied Gold reinigt]".[18] Within the same category of texts related to the *Sermon*, wisdom is very fittingly outlined by a series of metaphors of artisans such as a painter and a tailor, two efficacious similes to expound the practical action of the knowledge and the artistic work of beauty and concrete utility, by fashioning a rich clothes from brocade.[19]

In a similar way, the skilfulness in writing and copying is a good therapy to cure the individual and the community as well. The objects of cultural activities and education deserve an efficacious tool of *karmayoga* with altruistic and transpersonal consequences of charity.[20] As far as medical symbolism is concerned, writing and the book are both the tool and the remedy: the human condition of illness is counteracted by the act of writing (with zeal, accuracy, precision) and transformed by a self-dedication, like an offering of life from a sick man devoted to his religious brotherhood. This labour implies a transformation of materials, and of the human mind as well: such as the music is an acoustic phenomenon of high education, but emerging from animal substance (bones, sinews, leather) – a paradox of the Manichaean culture rightly pointed out by Puech[21] – the same goes for writing, as stated by Klimkeit in his well-observed elucidation of the psychological process of copying, wherein "the beautifully written and embellished page of a handwritten and illustrated book is a mirror" of the soul, well trained and arrayed in such a discipline.[22]

Besides, the final product of this oblatory disposition (the book) is "medicine" in itself and frequently named with words and expressions of a medical sphere of knowledge and practices, widely attested in Manichaeism, as stated above. This is the individual and social value of copying, for the transmission of Mani's spiritual heritage to mankind, and the books are the achievement of this complicated process of inner perfection. The auditor Yapγun again, in the book *Iki yiltïz nom* (MIK III 198 = T II D 171), tells us about the book he has recited

18 Sundermann 1992, pp. 64–65: *(m)'nh'g (pd) cy (z)[rngr (?) zrn pw'cyd(?)].*

19 M 133, Sogdian, Sundermann 1992, pp. 128–130 (107–112). I have taken this clothing metaphor into account in Piras (2014, pp. 36–39), showing its link with a series of book metaphors.

20 The Manichaean and Buddhist colophons are a very remarkable proof of this charitable sentiment, cf. Klimkeit 1990.

21 Puech 1995, p. 171.

22 Klimkeit/Heuser 1998, p. 288. To match Puech and Klimkeit's statements with a recent opinion of Sims-Williams (2009, p. 253), which sounds very insightful (more than an apparent witticism), the use of leather for the writing of the manuscript is somewhat surprising in a Manichaean context. This is very correct, in the way of the above mentioned paradox of an earthly and corrupted material, but managed and transformed by means of a practical gnosis into a culturally good thing (book, music, painting) used for educating.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

twice upon his return from China: the Uigur word *namk* "book", according to a correction of Zieme accepted by Klimkeit,[23] is a reading which departs from the word *äm(i)g* "medicament" given in Le Coq's edition, and, more recently, that of Özertural.[24] Both forms are very meaningful and suggest a noteworthy juxtaposition of two realia (a book, a medicine) which are given for the community, and prepared in a Uigur monastery called "sanatorium" *(otačilïqï)*, the pure, clear, undefiled monastery *(arïγ toruq suzük manistanlar)* to heal the imprisoned light of the world. It pairs with the Chinese Manichaean building where a distinct room to heal the monks was provided (*Compendium of the teachings of Mani the Buddha of Light*, 5th article). Moreover, monastic life with its multifarious activities is a special place to realize the most excellent therapy for the cosmic light, with better conditions than those provided by the external world.[25]

On the western side of the Manichaean Commonwealth, the Coptic texts show an analogous frame of reference,[26] which has been studied in-depth by Scopello.[27] In Bema Psalm (241), the books of the great physician Mani are compared to medical tools in order to heal mankind: the *Living Gospel*, the *Treasure*, the *Pragmateia*, the *Book of Mysteries*, the *Book of Giants*, the *Letters*, the *Psalms* and the *Prayers*, are powerful antidotes and the ingredients, the bistoury, the sponge, the bowl of water, for the treatment of body and spirit. The symbolism of writing as a remedy is also emphasized by the "living" character of living books and "living words" (Augustine's *salubria verba* of *Contra Epistula Fundamenti*, 11, 12) which are luminous substances, and then needing respectful behaviour: it explains the passage in the Sogdian confessional text about the commandment of non-violence (M 801a = MIK III 53, §§525–529), mentioning the sin of laziness in scribemanship *(δpyr'ẖ)*, and the sin of damaging the implements of writing (a brush, a slate, a piece of silk and paper). These implements are cultural tools for learning and for saving people from ignorance, in other words: they are medical instruments for healing, which have to be handled with care (non violence) because they cure and give life.[28]

23 Klimkeit 1993, p. 376, n. 41.

24 Le Coq 1911, pp. 25–30; Özertural 2008, pp. 62–79.

25 The world as both a prison and infirmary is described in the Chinese and Uigur versions of the *Sermon of the Light-Nous*: I refer to Provasi's synoptical translation (§2) and commentary on the Sogdian, Parthian and Uigur texts (2008, pp. 198, 459, n. 322): the world is the herbarium *(yào táng; asaγlïq tusuluq)* to heal the light. In Chinese terminology, the herbarium implies a medical wisdom linked with Taoistic and Alchemical conceptions of purification and the search for immortality. (I owe this information to my kind sinologist colleague Antonello Palumbo.)

26 See Lieu (1998, p. 73) for the echoing between the Coptic psalms and the Parthian and Chinese versions of the *Sermon*.

27 Scopello 2005, pp. 247–248.

28 It must be stressed that in ancient Greek culture the bistoury and the pencil are the same tool for two similar operations, namely, cutting and arranging the something corporeal

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Similarly, a certain parallelism between book and medicine seems to be alluded to in a hymn to the Living Soul (M 8110 I = MIK III 103),[29] where a divine gift to the Elects consists of some medicinals herbs (*rūrag ī bišehkīh*, ll. 1597–1598), of revealed secrets and precepts (ll. 1603–1605), and of all the writings and the books (*harw nibēg ud mādayān*, ll. 1606–1608). The relationship does not appear to be fortuitous and points to a further noteworthy link, between book, healing and body, included in a Parthian text (M 5860/I/r/i/6–20) about fasting before the Bēma celebration, wherein we find the recommendation to read scriptures *(nbyg pdbwrsyd)* and to teach wisdom, but not to write a book and not (to heal) the body.[30] Book and medicine are strictly connected, from the point of view of a disciplinary regimen of practices directed to improve the faulty "Manichaean body" of each follower, to quote the well-known work of Jason BeDuhn.

To sum up, the self offering, the Auditor's helpfulness is a proof of devotion, comparable to a paradoxical gift of life/health from a sick man. The patient work of zeal and generosity allows him to purify his inner *hyle* by virtue of a practice of writing (or other crafts), imbued with intellectual and volitional qualities. His personal existence is involved in spiritual work in making progress in education, which ensures his health and saves him temporarily from the obscurity of ignorance. To draw a triangular scheme:

1. the body and the mind are the subject;
2. the art is the skilful means;
3. the book is the object and the final achievement of a process of healing, and a medicine of redemptive living words *(saxwanān zīndagān)*[31] of wisdom for the community.

Abbreviations

AI	Acta Iranica
APAW	Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CMC	*Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis*
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
SRAA	*Silk Road Art and Archaeology*

(surgery) or something intellectual (writing), as Vegetti (1996, pp. 120–123) has brilliantly pointed out. In Manichaean culture there are many hints that allow us to detect a likely frame of minds and practices, despite an ambivalent conception of medicine well noticed by Coyle (2009, pp. 107–108).

29 Durkin-Meisterernst 2006, pp. 156–157.

30 Reck 2004, p. 127 (570, 15–16): *nbyg (m)ʾ nbysyd u {ʾwd} mʾ ṯnbʾr.*

31 M 1 *(Mahrnāmag)*, Boyce 1975, p. 53 (text s, § 1).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliography

Asmussen, J.P. 1975: *Manichaean Literature. Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings*. Delmar/New York.

Boyce, M. 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Téhéran/Liège (AI 9).

Colditz, I. 1995: "… werdet mit den Schriften vertraut! Schriftgelehrtheit, Mehrsprachigkeit und Bildungsvermittlung in manichäischen Gemeinden." In: Ch. Reck/P. Zieme (eds.): *Iran und Turfan. Beiträge Berliner Wissenschaftler, Werner Sundermann zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 2), pp. 35–57.

Coyle, J.K. 2009: "Healing and the 'Physician' in Manichaeism." In: *Id.*: *Manichaeism and its Legacy*. Leiden (NHMS 69), pp. 101–121.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2006: *The Hymns to the Living Soul. Middle Persian and Parthian Texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (BTT 24).

Gardner, I./A. Alcock/W.P. Funk 1999: *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*. Vol. I: *P. Kell V (P. Kell. Copt. 10–52; O. Kell. Copt. 1–2)*. With a contribution by C.A. Hope and G.E. Brown. Oxford.

Hamilton, J.R. 1971: *Le conte bouddhique du Bon et du Mauvais Prince en version ouïgoure*. Paris.

Henning, W.B. 1943: "The Book of the Giants." In: *BSOAS* 11, pp. 52–74.

— 1945: "Sogdian Tales." In: *BSOAS* 13, pp. 465–487.

Hutter, M. 1992: *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte. Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M98/99 I und M7980–7984*. Wiesbaden.

Klimkeit, H.J. 1990: "The Donor at Turfan." In: *SRAA* 1, pp. 177–201.

— 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Parables, Hymns & Prayers from Central Asia*. San Francisco.

— 1996: "Jesus, Mani and Buddha as Physicians in the Texts of the Silk Road." In: *La Persia e l'Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo*. Roma, pp. 589–595.

Klimkeit, H.J./M. Heuser (eds.) 1998: *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*. Leiden/Boston (NHMS 46).

Le Coq, A. von 1911: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho I*. Berlin (APAW 6).

Lieu, S.N.C. 1998: *Manichaeism in Central Asia & China*. Leiden/Boston (NHMS 45).

Nagel, P. 1979: "ΖΩΓΡΑΦΕΙΝ und das 'Bild' des Mani." In: H. Goltz (ed.): *Eikon und Logos. Beiträge zur Erforschung byzantinischer Kulturtraditionen*. Halle, pp. 199–238.

Özertural, Z. 2008: *Der uigurische Manichäismus. Neubearbeitung von Texten aus Manichaica I und III von Albert v. Le Coq*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 74).

Piras, A. 2012: *Verba lucis. Scrittura, immagine e libro nel manicheismo*. Milano/Udine.

— 2014: "Shared Terminologies between Christianity and Manichaism." In: *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 12/1–2, pp. 25–46.

Provasi, E. 2008: "Testi medio-iranici III: testi dottrinali." In: G. Gnoli/A. Piras (eds.): *Il Manicheismo*. Vol. III: *Il mito e la dottrina. Testi manichei dell'Asia centrale e della Cina*. Milano, pp. 159–225.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Puech, H. C. 1995: *Sul manicheismo e altri saggi*. Torino [translation of *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais*, Paris 1979].

Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout (BTT 22).

Scopello, M. 2005: "Images et métaphores de la médecine dans les écrits manichéens coptes." In: V. Boudon-Millot/B. Pouderon (eds.): *Les Pères de l'Église face à la science médicale de leur temps*. Paris, pp. 231–252.

Sims-Williams, N. 2009: "The Bactrian fragment in Manichaean Script (M 1224)." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst/Ch. Reck/D. Weber (eds.): *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit. Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann*. Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 31), pp. 245–268.

Sundermann, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*. Berlin (BTT 4).

— 1992: *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*. Berlin (BTT 17).

Tardieu, M. 1981: *Le manichéisme*. Paris.

Tongerloo, A. van 2000: "Manichaeus Medicus." In: R. E. Emmerick/W. Sundermann/P. Zieme (eds.): *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin, pp. 613–621.

Vegetti, M. 1996: *Il coltello e lo stilo. Le origini della scienza occidentale*. Milano.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Is There an Eclipse Dragon in Manichaeism?

Some Problems Concerning the Origin and Function of *āṯālyā* in Manichaean Sources*

Adrian Pirtea, Berlin

The Syriac word *āṯālyā*[1] is attested only a few times in Manichaean literature: once in the Coptic *Psalm-Book*, twice in Parthian fragments from Turfan, and again on a small piece of parchment reedited recently by Nils Arne Pedersen and John Møller Larsen.[2] Unfortunately, with the exception of the Coptic psalm none of the extant fragments are long enough to allow for a proper contextualization of the term and its significance for Manichaeism. Given the precarious state of these sources, it is all the more remarkable that both the Coptic and the Parthian texts use the same expression: Copt. ⲁϥϩⲟⲣⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲑⲁⲗⲓⲁ "[the sun] wore *āṯālyā*" (*Ps.-Bk.* 196.8), and Pth. ʾʾt'ly' pdmwcy(d)/*āṯālyā padmōžēd* "it(?) clothes *āṯālyā*" (M728/v/8, unpublished). A confirmation of this use comes from an illustrated list of omens in Frg. M556 (ed. Reck/Sundermann 1997), in which ManMP *gōzihr* "eclipse", "eclipse dragon" (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 166) clearly replaces the Syriac term:

> *dahōm murwāh zamīg ǰumbehēd ayāb xwarxšēd ud māh gōzihr paymōzēd*
> "the tenth omen: the earth is shaken or sun and moon put (lit. 'puts') on Gōzihr"[3]

* I would like to thank Dr. Sonja Brentjes (MPIWG, Berlin), Prof. Dr. Mark Geller (FU Berlin), Tomoki Kitazumi (FU Berlin), Prof. Dr. Francesca Rochberg (UC-Berkeley), Dr. Stefanie Rudolf (FU Berlin), and Dr. Emilie Villey (CNRS, Paris) for their helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper. I also wish to thank Prof. Raymond Mercier (Cambridge) for his useful remarks regarding the Indian astronomical sources. I remain solely responsible for any inaccuracies or errors.

1 There are some uncertainties regarding the length of the vowels, which make an exact transliteration problematic. Nau (1910b) opted for two short vowels, i.e. *aṯalyā*. However, the Manichaean Parthian spelling *ʾʾt'ly'* (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 5) indicates that the first two vowels were long *(āṯālyā)*, at least as read by Parthian-speaking Manichaeans. I will use the latter variant, even though any attempt to reconstruct the exact form must for now remain tentative.

2 Pedersen/Larsen 2013, pp. 30–31; see "Appendix" below, for references.

3 Reck/Sundermann 1997, p. 10; for the illustrations in the fragment, see Gulácsi 2005, pp. 202, 209.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Since both Syr. *āṯālyā* and ManMP *gōzihr* (Ar. *jawzahr*, NP *gawizahr*) are well-known from Syriac, Persian, Arabic, and Byzantine astrological treatises, it seems only natural to assume that Manichaeans understood them in exactly the same way, i. e. as the "eclipse dragon" who devours the sun and the moon and whose "head" and "tail" (the lunar nodes)[4] came to be seen, at least in some traditions, as real planetary bodies.[5] But did *āṯālyā* necessarily refer to this mythical creature alone? And if not, what other meaning might it have had for the Manichaeans? Of what importance are the garment metaphors present in the texts or, in other words, what does it exactly mean to "clothe *āṯālyā*"? In the following paper, I would like to point out some of the problems with the assumption that *āṯālyā* refers exclusively to the eclipse dragon of astrology. After a review of the Babylonian, Mandaean and Syriac evidence relevant for the context of Manichaean astrological terminology, I will discuss the occurrence of *āṯālyā* in the Coptic psalm mentioned above and propose a different solution as to what this term initially meant for Mani (d. 274/7 CE) and his disciples.

4 Gr. ἀναβιβάζων and καταβιβάζων σύνδεσμος "ascending" and "descending node"; see Bouché-Leclercq 1899, pp. 122–123; Furlani 1947, pp. 591–596, and the various texts cited by them, esp. *CCAG* V/2, pp. 130–137; VII, pp. 123–125; VIII/1, pp. 194–196, etc., where an eclipse dragon is mentioned. However, these late Byzantine texts all derive from Islamic astrological treatises, which in turn are dependent on previous Indian, Sasanian, and perhaps Syriac models. A good overview on this subject is given by Pingree 1997, pp. 63–77; see also Pingree 1976b and 2001. The reference to a dragon (Ar. *tinnīn*) in Dorotheus of Sidon (1st century CE) is found only in the caption given by the Arabic translator of *Carmen Astrologicum* V.43 (ed. Pingree 1976a, p. 157.20–21; cf. R. Beck 1987, p. 195, n. 6). This translator was possibly ʿUmar b. Farrukhān al-Ṭabarī who died ca. 816 CE (Ullmann 1972, p. 280). The original Greek text only mentions the "nodes" (σύνδεσμοι), which Hephaestion (early 5th century CE) in his quotation from Dorotheus writes out as Ἀναβιβάζων and Καταβιβάζων (*Apotelesmatica* III.16.11, ed. Pingree 1973–1974, I, p. 271.5–7; likewise Vettius Valens, *Anthologiai* I.16, ed. Pingree 1986, pp. 28–29). Ptolemy uses the same terms in connection with *nodes* only (ἀναβιβάζων/καταβιβάζων σύνδεσμος, e. g. *Syntaxis Mathematica* IV.9, ed. Heiberg 1898–1903, pp. 333.3–4). It is thus certain that in the Greek astrological tradition of Antiquity, the pair Ἀναβιβάζων and Καταβιβάζων was used only as shorthand for ἀναβιβάζων/καταβιβάζων σύνδεσμος, without any reference to a mythical dragon-like creature. While the term ἀναβιβάζων famously appears in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (*Keph.*, Ch. LXIX, ed. Böhlig/Polotsky 1940, p. 168.7–9) and was taken by Roger Beck to be irrefutable evidence for the dragon- theory, I do not think that this identification is stringent. I intend to address this problem in a sequel to this study (see below). It should be noted that the reference to Ἀθαλία being attested already in the 4th century BCE (Mastrocinque 2005, p. 162, n. 726) is incorrect. The magical lamella from Crete cited as evidence (ed. McCown 1923) reads Αἰθαλίαν γᾶν "Aethalian country", which could refer to several different islands (cf. Wünsch 1900, p. 75), but certainly not to the eclipse dragon.

5 See Hartner 1938, 1965, who coined the term "pseudo-planets" to designate them; Gail 1980; MacKenzie 2002.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

§ 1. Babylonian astronomy and the etymology of *āṯālyā*

Although scholars are in agreement on the etymological derivation of Syr. *āṯālyā* from OB *namtallûm*, NB/NA *anta(l)lûm*, *attalû* "eclipse", the process of associating *āṯālyā* with a dragon remains largely unexplained. Reviewing the Babylonian material in his study, Furlani had already concluded that there was no evidence for *attalû* to mean "dragon" or "serpent" in Akkadian.[6] Indeed, as indicated by its ideographic spelling, the word simply means "darkening of a celestial body, eclipse".[7] Metaphorical expressions in Babylonian texts also show that eclipses were generally thought to be produced through the agency of the sun- or the moon-god themselves, as an expression of their power to convey omens to mankind.[8] One may find rather neutral formulations such as "the Moon brings about (lit. 'sets, places') an eclipse *(attalû)*",[9] but also metaphors like "the Moon god set in distress",[10] or even "the Moon casts off and throws away his eclipse *(attalû)*" in a Neo-Babylonian text.[11] While it is true that in the story of *Utukkū Lemnūtu* (tablet XVI), seven monsters – among them a dragon *(ušumgallu)* and a serpent *(šibbu)* – attack and darken the moon, there is no attempt to personify the word *attalû* itself, which only appears once (tablet XVI, line 105) and simply means "eclipse".[12] Likewise, in a much later apotropaic eclipse ritual dating from the Hellenistic period (Brown/Linssen 1997), there is no indication of *attalû* being transformed into a mythical creature of any kind.

6 Furlani 1947, pp. 584–588; Kaufman 1974, p. 40; Pedersen/Larsen 2013, pp. 31–32. See *AHw*,vol. I, p. 54, *s. v.* anta(l)lûm, attalû; *CAD*, vol. 1/2, pp. 505–509, *s. v.* attalû, with numerous references. None of the cited examples suggest an association with a celestial dragon. Neither was I able to find any indication of *attalû* meaning "snake", or "Milky Way", as affirmed by Schlüter (1982, p. 130) and Hayman (2007, p. 125).

7 The word is usually written in its Sumerian form as an.mi or an.ge$_6$ (< Sum. *an-ĝi$_6$* "eclipse", cf. *an* "heaven", *ĝi$_6$* "night"), but also as an.ta.lù, most likely a "learned Sumerian creation to render *antalû*" (*CAD*, vol. 1/2, p. 509). On the Sumerian etymology, see Goetze 1947, p. 251, n. 2 with bibliography.

8 On the metaphorical language in Babylonian celestial omens and the agency of the moon-god, see Rochberg 1996, 2010; Koch-Westenholz 2001; Al-Rawi/George 2006, pp. 33–34.

9 E. g. *Enūma Anu Enlil*, Tabl. XX, § VII, l. 1: [diš *ina* ᵢ]ᵀᴵ *tašrīti*(du$_6$) *ud.14.kam attalâ*(an.mi) *iškun*(gar)-*ma* "[(if) on] 14th Tašrītu (the moon god) brings about an eclipse […]" (Al-Rawi/George 2006, pp. 25 [text], 31 [translation]).

10 BM 22696:22 (Old Babylonian): dingir-*lum ina lu-mu-un* šà *it-ba-al* (Rochberg 1996, p. 478). Cf. the similar expressions for eclipses in Ancient Hebrew: *wĕ-hēḥēʾṯî haš-šemeš baṣ-ṣohŏrāyim* "I will make the sun go down at noon" (Amos 8,9), or Ugaritic: *ʿrbt špš* "the sun set (lit. 'entered')" (tabl. Gordon, Nr. 143, *apud* Sawyer/Stephenson 1970, pp. 467–468).

11 *ABL* X, Nr. 1006,4: ^{d}*Sîn attalû-šú iššaḫḫaṭu-ma inassuku* (*AHw*, vol. I, p. 54; cf. *CAD*, vol. 17/1, p. 94, *s. v.* šaḫāṭu B).

12 See Geller 2007, pp. 178–188 (transliteration), 251–258 (translation); see also Azarpay/Kilmer 1978, pp. 372–374.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

It is not difficult to imagine how myths such as the one in *Utukkū Lemnūtu* could alter the meaning of an initially neutral term like *attalû*. However, judging by the long chronological gap between the Hellenistic material just cited and the first explicit mention of *āṯālyā* as an eclipse dragon in the 6th–7th centuries CE, it is legitimate to ask whether the shift of meaning from "eclipse" to "eclipse dragon" is explainable within the Babylonian tradition alone, and if so, whether the change already occurred before Mani's lifetime or not. If it can be shown that the earliest Manichaean use of *āṯālyā* in the fragments quoted above is fully consistent with the older attested meaning "eclipse", and if there are no indications for the term to mean "dragon", then the shift must have taken place *after* these early Manichaean texts were written (i.e. after ca. the 4th century CE). There are, moreover, good reasons to believe that the astrological concept of the "eclipse dragon" was foreign to Babylonia and that it was most likely adopted under the influence of Indian and/or Iranian theories in Late Antique astrology. It also appears that for a considerable period of time, *āṯālyā* and its equivalents were only used as *termini technici* among a minority of scholars and experts.

To begin with, it is very significant that the mentions of *āṯālyā* in Manichaean literature – fragmentary as they are – display a consistent use of *clothing metaphors*. Despite the very tenuous evidence available, the recurrence of the very same expression in texts from both the Egyptian desert and the Turfan oasis strongly suggests an underlying Aramaic/Syriac phrase **lbeš āṯālyā* "to put on, wear *āṯālyā*"[13], going back to the earliest Manichaean writings, as the source of both expressions. Such a formulation is not only congruent with the widely spread garment-imagery of Early Syriac literature,[14] but also with some of the metaphors cited above: In Babylonian formulaic expressions *attalû* is very often used together with the plurivalent verb *šakānu*, meaning "to put, to place, to set", but also "to put on, to wear", which also explains why it can be "cast off" by the moon-god.[15] I would therefore interpret *āṯālyā* in the Coptic and Parthian fragments as "veil/cover of darkness" and link it directly to the original meaning of Akk. *attalû*, i.e. "darkening, eclipse". In order to see if such a meaning can be confirmed by other evidence, I will first offer a brief survey of references to *āṯālyā* in Mandaean and Syriac literature, and then analyse the context of the Manichaean Coptic psalm itself. I will subsequently discuss a non-Manichaean Greek source that might be decisive for the issue at hand and finally summarize the arguments put forward in this essay.

13 See the wide semantic range of the Akkadian and Mandaean cognates (*CAD*, vol. 9, pp. 17–22, *s. v.* labāšu; *MD*, p. 229, *s. v.* lbš).

14 Garment metaphors feature prominently, e.g. in Ephrem the Syrian, see Brock 1992, pp. 60–66, 85–97 *et passim*.

15 Cf. *CAD*, vol. 17.1, pp. 116–157, *s. v.* šakānu.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

§ 2. The Mandaean evidence

Although I cannot attempt to offer here a thorough analysis of Mandaean vocabulary regarding eclipses and dragons, it might prove useful to point to some interesting examples in Mandaean literature. In magical texts and on incantation bowls, generally dated to the 4th–7th centuries CE, dragons are normally designated with the common Aramaic form *tannīnā*.[16] This is also the usual term for "dragon" in later Mandaean scriptures (*MD*, p. 480, *s. v.* tanina). In the case of *talia* – probably the Mandaean derivation of Akk. *attalû* – Drower and Macuch only cite a few examples with the meaning "dragon", some of which are problematic.[17] In fact, the unambiguous references to *talia* as the eclipse dragon mainly derive from the *Mandaean Book of the Zodiac (Aspar Malwašia)*, which in its present form is a late redaction and clearly exhibits the influence of Sasanian and Early Islamic astrology.[18] In several other instances however, *talia* seems to preserve an older semantic stratum reminiscent of earlier Babylonian expressions, e. g. *atuat ḏ-sin kḏ iatib btalia* "omens of the moon (*sin*) when it is (lit. 'sits') in eclipse" or *sira ʿtib btalia* "the moon was (lit. 'sat') in eclipse".[19]

16 See e. g. the text edited by Drower 1937, pp. 595 (text), 608 (tr.); 1938, pp. 5 (text), 14 (tr.). Cf. also the bowls in Manichaean script edited by Müller-Kessler 2005, nos. 32, 32a, 33, with the recurring expression *bḥtmh dtnynʾ* "with the seal of the dragon".

17 The ambiguity stems from the homonymy between *talia(1)* (< akk. *attalû*) and *talia(2), (3)* (< root *tlʾ* "to hang"). Thus in one of the cited examples (*kbaštḏ ltalia rba ḏ-alahia* "I subdued the great dragon of the gods"), Macuch and Drower also suggest *talia(3)* "hook, sceptre" as a possible translation (*MD*, p. 479, *s. v.* talia(1)). In another interesting passage of the *Right Ginzā*, Lidzbarski (1925, pp. 103–104) translates *talia rba* as "great dragon": "Sie [sc. Aṭarpan und Lufan] umkreisten den großen Drachen *(talia rba)*, stiegen empor und stellten sich an die Wölbung" (*Gy* 97:24–98:3). Furlani (1947, p. 590) apparently interprets this passage as referring to the planets and the zodiac encircling the constellation *Draco* near the North Pole. However, the context makes it clear that the *talia rba* being encircled is the demiurge-god Ptaḥil himself; thus the translation "great dragon" would give him an unusual and otherwise unattested epithet (I am not aware of any identification of Ptaḥil with *Draco*; see Kraeling 1933; *MD*, p. 384, *s. v.* ptahil, with further references). Since in the immediate context Ptaḥil is said to stretch and set up the firmament, to bind the planets to their orbits, etc., perhaps *talia(2)* "the one who hangs" might be a more adequate translation. Moreover, when the *Ginzā* speaks about dragons in other places, it always uses the consecrated term *tanina*. An adequate answer to this problem would require not only a thorough analysis of the published and unpublished Mandaean materials, but also a comparison with the equally problematic Hebrew cognate *tli* (see "Appendix" below).

18 Nöldeke 1875, pp. xxiv–xxv; *MBZ* (Drower 1949, pp. 1–4, 110–119); Pingree 1997, p. 44; Rochberg 2010, pp. 223–235, esp. 234.

19 *MBZ* 211.9, *MJb* 79:7 (*apud MD*, p. 479, *s. v.* talia(1)). Notice that Akk. *šakānu* also comprises the meaning "to be located in a particular place" (*CAD*, vol. 17.1, p. 142; cf. Heb. *šakan*, Ar. *sakana*, etc.), which closely corresponds to Mand. *ytb* in this context. Lidzbarski (1905–1915, II, p. 84) translates "saß im Drachen", referring to Nöldeke (1911), but this presupposes the eclipse dragon theory already attached to the word *talia*, which is, as I try to argue, not self-evident. See also Greenfield/Sokoloff 1989.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In my view, this suggests that Mandaeans reinterpreted the older, neutral term *talia* ("eclipse") to mean "dragon" only at a later stage and under the influence of external astrological traditions. Since the dating of Mandaean texts must often rely on conjecture and context, it is obviously difficult to obtain any precise answer on this issue. Nevertheless, if further research could disentangle the different meanings of *talia* in Mandaean and confirm the chronological priority of the meaning "eclipse" for *talia(1)*, by tracing it back to Akk. *attalû*, not only would there be support for the thesis that the Mandaeans had access to Babylonian astrological materials (see Müller-Kessler 2004; Rochberg 2010, pp. 223–235), but also for the fact that at least some Aramaic dialects preserved an archaic understanding of *āṯālyā*/*talia* during the Parthian and Sasanian periods. If this is indeed the case, then the Mandaean usage of the term would prove to be an important parallel to what I argue was a very similar development in Manichaeism.

§ 3. Christian Syriac literature

The first explicit reference to *āṯālyā* as the eclipse dragon in Christian Syriac literature appears more than three centuries after Mani, in an astronomical treatise attributed to Severus Sebokht (d. 666/7 CE), but recently reassigned to an earlier, anonymous author (late 6th century?).[20] The chronological gap between Mani and (Pseudo-)Severus is in itself telling and should preclude us from simply transferring the later definition of *āṯālyā* unto earlier usage, especially given the significant developments in astrology after the 3rd century. Furthermore, a closer look at this early Syriac account on the eclipse dragon suggests that the author was dealing with a relatively recent phenomenon. For example, the following passage gives the strong impression that the author (a) assumed his readers to be unfamiliar with the word *āṯālyā*, that he (b) clearly distinguishes it from the usual word for dragon *(tannīnā)*, and finally (c), that he links the theory to a *specific group of astrologers*:

> For men of no little renown in this science [i.e. astrology] say that the occurrence of eclipses *(eqlipsīs)* and the covering of the luminaries *(taḥpīṯā ḏ-nahhīrē)* is caused by *āṯālyā*; and to support their words, they draw a shape *(eskīmā)* and

20 On Severus' life and works, see Baumstark 1922, pp. 246–247; Nau 1910a. The Syriac astronomical corpus composed in the 6th and 7th centuries has been recently studied and partially edited by Emilie Villey (2012). The text quoted here, which summarizes and refutes the theory of *āṯālyā*, bears no title and is transmitted together with Severus' authentic writings in the ms. *Paris, BNF, syr. 346* (1309 CE), ff. 172r–177v. However, due to internal evidence Villey (2012, pp. 359–362) casts doubt on Severus' authorship and dates the text a few decades earlier (late 6th century CE?). The question of the real authorship and precise dating of this text cannot be discussed extensively at this point. For convenience, I will refer to the author as (Pseudo-)Severus.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> form *(dmūṯā)* of this kind, saying that *āṯālyā* is a certain body *(gūšmā meddem)* and its shape and form *(eskīmēh wa-ḏmūṯēh)* is that of a dragon *(tannīnā)*. Very often they call it dragon *(tannīnā)* and serpent *(ḥawyā)*. (ms. *Paris*, *BNF, syr. 346*, fol. 174v; Syriac text in: Nau 1910a, p. 253)

Since the author mentions "renowned astrologers" as the source of this belief, it is very unlikely that he was merely addressing popular superstition.[21] But can we infer something more precise about this group of astrologers? They hardly could have represented Greek astrology in its traditional form. As I have pointed out, we lack any evidence for terms like "dragon", "head", and "tail" in Greek astrological texts before the Byzantine reception of Arabic astrology (from ca. 9th–10th centuries onwards), even though lunar nodes were certainly considered important in Late Antique Greek horoscopy.[22] The sources criticized by (Pseudo-)Severus must therefore be astrological treatises in Syriac (or Middle Persian?) that incorporated non-Greek traditions, either Babylonian, Zoroastrian, or Indian.

Can we know which astrological tradition it was? A first possible hint lies in the fact that *āṯālyā* is described as a *body* (Syr. *gūšmā*) which is in some way analogous to the other planets. This idea closely resembles the Indian theory according to which eclipses were caused by a planetary body (Skr. *graha*), situated in the lower atmosphere and identified with the demon Rāhu of the *Mahābhārata* (*MBh* I.17.4–8).[23] In spite of the fact that Indian astronomers like Varāhamihira

21 In another treatise attributed to Severus in the same manuscript (ff. 51v–60r), there is a description about how the theory of *āṯālyā* was inferred by earlier generations from the movement of the lunar nodes (Nau 1910b, pp. 222–223; Villey 2012, pp. 179–186). The description given is very similar to the one above, but the terms "dragon" and "snake" are notably absent. Villey (2012, pp. 355–359) dates this spurious text to another anonymous author of the first half of the 6th century, different from the author of the treatise on ff. 172r–177v. The author speaks again of a "certain body" *(gūšmā meddem)* whose two ends stand "in opposition" *(eskīmā ḏ-diāmeṭrōn)* and are called "head" *(rīšā)* and "tail" *(dūnbā)*. This body "rises" *(qām)* in front of the luminaries to darken them. Significantly, the author also refers to "the books of Chaldaeism", i.e. astrology, in which the position of the nodes is calculated, due to their relevance for casting horoscopes (*ibid.*).

22 See above, n. 4. It is true that in the Mithraic Ponza zodiac (discussed by R. Beck 1976 and 1978), there is a representation of a serpent, very probably in connection with a solar eclipse of 212 CE. However, I do not think that Beck's conclusions regarding this serpent as being *in every respect identical* with the eclipse dragon follow with necessity. The descriptions Beck uses to explain the representation at Ponza derive from much later and heterogenous sources, and while there were undoubtedly various cults in Antiquity that interpreted snakes, dragons, etc. in cosmological terms (Mastrocinque 2005), the total silence of contemporary Greek and Latin sources concerning an eclipse dragon-theory should compel us to consider other explanations for the isolated representation in the Ponza zodiac.

23 See Hartner 1938, Azarpay/Kilmer 1978. According to Pingree (1981, p. 83), the inclusion of Rāhu and Ketu in the Indian planetary system must have occurred in the 4th or 5th century CE. This was possibly inspired by the rising interest to calculate the

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(d. 587 CE) already criticized this idea,[24] it eventually gained wide acceptance in Medieval astrology.[25] The adoption of this theory in Sasanian Persia could have taken place during the reign of Khosrow I. Anūšīrwān (r. 531–579 CE), at a time when a number of Greek, but also Indian scientific texts were apparently translated into Pahlavi.[26] The influence of Indian astrology is readily discernible, for example, in some sections of the *Greater Bundahišn*.[27] The astrological parts of the *Bundahišn* show that Zoroastrian scholars displayed a great interest not only for the Indian system of lunar mansions (Skr. *nakṣatra*, Pahl. *xwurdag*),[28] but also for the idea that the serpentine "dark planet" *rāhu* (Pahl. *gōzihr/gōčihr*) was the cause of eclipses. It is thus probable that during this transfer of scientific knowledge, a new, technical meaning was attributed to the ancient term *āṯālyā* by astrologers living in the Sasanian Empire,[29] and that (Pseudo-)Severus was engaged in an argument against those recent developments (Pingree 1976b, pp. 147–148).

The possibility that *āṯālyā* was introduced by astrologers in ca. the 6th century CE as a rather obscure *terminus technicus* for the eclipse dragon is supported

nodes, present in Greek astrological works transmitted to India. But while many of the technical terms of Sanskrit astronomy and astrology were simply transliterations of the Greek (see Pingree 1997, pp. 34–38), the lunar nodes could have easily been "indianized", by associating them with the "lasting feud between Rāhu's head *(rāhumukha)* and the Sun *(sūrya)* and the Moon *(candra)*", who even today "swallows *(grasati)* them both" (*MBh* I.17.8). An analogous phenomenon was, e.g. the "indianization" of the decan imagery (Pingree 1963a). It should be also noted, that the Indian origin of the eclipse dragon theory has been contested (see Gail 1980, pp. 133–140). However, Gail does so by appealing to Bouché-Leclercq's unfounded assertion that the *caput/cauda* terminology goes back to Ancient Babylon (p. 135).

24 Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* V.1–13 (tr. Iyer 1884, pp. 22–23, text/tr. Bhat 1986, pp. 42–45). Varāhamihira first points out the inconsistencies of the theory of Rāhu (V.1–7) and then offers a scientific explanation of eclipses (V.8–11).

25 Roger Billard argues (1971, p. 125) that it was mainly Brahmagupta (d. ca. 668 CE) who was responsible for the "theologico-scientific compromise" which made the doctrine of *rāhu* and *ketu* acceptable for Hindu astronomers and religiously-minded astrologers alike.

26 On this issue, see Nallino 1922; Pingree 1963a, 1964–1966; Sezgin 1979, pp. 30–97; Pingree/Brunner 1987, pp. 859, 863.

27 See Henning 1942; MacKenzie 1964, pp. 513–517; Pingree 1964–1966, p. 120; Pingree/Brunner 1987, pp. 862–868.

28 See *GrBd* II.2 (ed. Anklesaria 1956, pp. 25.14–26.3); Pingree/Brunner 1987, p. 866; Henning 1942, pp. 242–246, who also mentions the MSogd. frg. M549 with a list of 28 lunar mansions, as opposed to the 27 mansions of the *GrBd*.

29 It is striking that the term *āṯālyā* is attested in early Manichaean texts (see "Appendix" below), but, to my knowledge, absent in any Syriac sources before the 6th/7th century. One tempting hypothesis is that it was precisely Manichaean astrologers who reinterpreted the archaic term *āṯālyā* found in their canonical texts in light of the new theories regarding the eclipse dragon.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

by later references in Syriac literature which show that the term posed some difficulties to Syriac writers. Thus, Īšōʿdād of Marw (9th century), who gives an interesting explanation of eclipses in his *Gospel Commentary*, describes *āṯālyā* in similar terms as (Pseudo-)Severus (e.g. as a *taḥpīṯā*, "veil"), but does not refer to it as a dragon or serpent.[30] The anonymous philosophical compendium *Causa causarum*, which Baumstark dated to the 10th/11th century, gives a classic description of the eclipse dragon theory, but uses *rīšā/dunbā ḏ-tannīnā* with no mention of *āṯālyā*.[31] Ḥasan bar Bahlūl (10th century) in his Syriac-Arabic dictionary also explains *āṯālyā* simply as Ar. *kusūf al-qamar* "darkening of the moon, eclipse". He does however fleetingly mention that the "head" and "tail" are called by some astrologers *āṯālyāwāṯā*, a rare occurrence of the word in plural.[32] It is fairly clear that these later reports rely on Arabic and Persian astrological texts rather than on an alleged remnant theory from Ancient Babylon. Finally, examples of *āṯālyā* simply meaning "dragon" are, to my knowledge, attested only for the 13th and 14th centuries, indicating a long period of time before the word became common.[33]

Although the above considerations are not meant as final conclusions concerning the conceptual and terminological history of *āṯālyā*, I think that the cited Babylonian, Mandaean, and Syriac sources provide enough evidence to reject an *a priori* identification of *āṯālyā* with the eclipse dragon of astrology in the case of the earliest Manichaean documents. Moreover, as I will further argue, there are good contextual and theological reasons for rejecting the equivalence between *āṯālyā* and the "dragon" in these Manichaean sources. Not only is it the general conception of Mani's followers that the sun and the moon are "living ships" and therefore impenetrable to evil (i.e. that they cannot be "devoured" by a dragon), but the specifics of Manichaean Christology, as expressed in the Coptic *Psalm-Book*, also play a defining role in shaping the symbolism attached to this elusive word.

30 Īšōʿdād of Marw, *The Gospel Commentaries* (ed. Gibson 1911, II, pp. 187.19–188.18). What Īšōʿdād portrays is possibly a "pseudo-planetary" interpretation of *āṯālyā*, most likely borrowed via Islamic astrology. Gibson (1911, I, p. 112) translates the word as "obscuration". See also the astrological treatise in Berlin, *Staatsbibliothek*, ms. syr. 108 (= Sachau no. 88), fol. 13v (Sachau 1899, I, p. 373); cf. Furlani 1947, p. 582; Nöldeke 1911, p. 356, n. 3; and Budge 1913, I, p. 469, where *āṯālyā* is counted with the other planets.

31 *Causa causarum*, fol. 101a (Kayser 1889–1893, I, p. 222). On the possible date of composition, see Baumstark 1922, pp. 280–281.

32 Duval 1901, I, cols. 124, 330, *s.v.* ānābībazōn; āṯālyā. See also n. 49 below.

33 Theodor Nöldeke cites examples from Siberian tomb inscriptions in Syriac, where *āṯālyā* appears in the expression *šatt āṯālyā* "year of the dragon", referring to the Chinese calendar (cf. Nöldeke 1911, p. 356). However, like the account of Yahbalāhā III (d. 1317 CE) about a "dragon" *(āṯālyā)* living under Mt. Aetna (or Stromboli?) (ed. Bedjan 1895), these references are too late to serve as evidence for the early usage of the term (cf. Nöldeke, *ad loc.*; Furlani 1947, p. 582).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

§ 4. The theological context

The Coptic reference to *āṯālyā* quoted in the beginning is found in a manuscript dating to the 4th century CE,[34] in a cycle known as *The Psalms of Lord Herakleides*. Herakleides was one of Mani's disciples appointed as a missionary for Egypt. In a long psalm of praise dedicated to "the Son of the living God" (*Ps.-Bk.* 193.13, cf. Matth. 16,16), the story of Jesus' earthly ministry is recounted in detail, culminating with the Passion narrative, the Harrowing of Hell, and Jesus' ascent to the right hand of the Father (*Ps.-Bk.* 196.30–31). The brief mention of the sun's darkening during the crucifixion is found at the end of a section which describes, through a series of inversions,[35] the thwarted plans of those who had sought to kill the Messiah:

> They went that they might kill him, they made him a king./ They put a garland on his head because he humbled their kings./ They put a cloak upon him because he stripped (?) their authorities (ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ) […] They pierced him with a spear because he destroyed their creation (ⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ). / The sun withdrew its light, it wore (ⲫⲟⲣⲉ) the *athalia*. He disguised himself from those murderers, he was caught up from their presence. (*Ps.–Bk.*196.1–8, tr. Allberry 1938)

"They", meaning "the scribes" (*Ps.–Bk.* 195.23), allegorically stand for the archons and their "authorities", who wish to crucify Jesus in order to trap the divine light in matter. However, in concord with the tenets of Manichaean 'Docetism', the crucifixion could only have been a *ruse*: The demons were deceived into believing that they had defeated the Messenger of Light, but were actually defeated themselves.[36] This is clearly expressed a few verses later:

> Death sought in him, it found nothing belonging to it. […] It found not its likeness in him – the fire, the lust (ⲏⲇⲟⲛⲏ). A *figure* (ⲥⲭⲏⲙⲁ) is what it found, *like a mask* (ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲓⲟⲛ). (*Ps.–Bk.* 196.22–26, tr. Allberry 1938, my emphasis)

As can be seen from the symmetrical construction of the psalm, the verse referring to the sun putting on *āṯālyā* (cf. Luke 23,45) stands as a direct parallel to

34 This is the dating proposed by the editor of the Coptic text, who assumed a Greek intermediary between the supposed Syriac original and the Coptic translation (Allberry 1938, pp. xix–xx).

35 For an exegetical and literary study on the *Psalms of Herakleides*, see Richter 1994 and 1998.

36 A concise formulation of this doctrine is to be found in a Latin quotation from Mani's *Epistula fundamenti*: Inimicus quippe, qui eundem saluatorem iustorum patrem crucifixisse se sperauit, ipse est crucifixus, *quo tempore aliud actum est atque aliud ostensum*. "The enemy, who hoped to have crucified that same Redeemer, the Father of the Righteous, was himself crucified, *at that time when one thing happened but another thing appeared to happen*." (Augustine, *De natura boni*, § 46 [= Frg. 10 in Lieu 2010, pp. 10–11; my emphasis]). On the 'Docetic' Christology of Marcion and Mani, see Gardner 1988, pp. 57–85.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Christ clothing a "disguise" on the cross. Consequently, because neither the sun nor Jesus could effectively be engulfed by darkness according to Manichaean theology, *āṯālyā* represents here a "veil" or an "apparent body", by means of which the sun protects itself from the powers of darkness.[37]

This Manichaean interpretation is in many ways reminiscent of the emerging Syriac commentary tradition on Tatian's *Diatessaron* and mirrors Early Christian treatments of the episode. A century after Mani, Ephrem the Syrian (d. 373 CE) uses very similar imagery in interpreting the darkening of the sun that occurred at Jesus' death.[38] The underlying theological debate between the Manichaean and the Christian position is apparent in both readings: if for Ephrem the sun "withdrawing its light" symbolises the *real* death of Jesus, for Herakleides the sun only puts on *āṯālyā* as a "veil" *(taḥpīṯā)* or "mask" (προσωπεῖον), mimicking Jesus who in turn only *feigned* his death. This strongly suggests that in the Coptic psalm (and very likely in the Aramaic sources of the psalm), *āṯālyā* simply meant "cover, veil", a meaning versatile enough to function as an analogy to Jesus' "phantom body".

§ 5. The criticism of Simplicius

Perhaps the most interesting piece of evidence supporting the early Manichaean understanding of *āṯālyā* proposed here comes from a 6th century Greek philosophical work. In his *Commentary on the Encheiridion of Epictetus*, Ch. XXXV, the Neoplatonist Simplicius of Cilicia (d. ca. 560 CE) addresses the problem of the ontological status of evil. In this context, Simplicius criticizes the dualism of the Manichaeans, a group of which, so the text suggests, Simplicius met personally.[39] Among the cosmological theories ridiculed by Simplicius, we find a detailed description of how Manichaeans explained the cause of eclipses:

37 While I agree with Franklin Trammell (2009, pp. 346–347), that Jesus' crucifixion may in some sense reflect the primordial descent of Ohrmazd in the Manichaean myth, there cannot be a direct parallel between the "swallowing of the sun" by *āṯālyā* and the crucifixion. As the text shows, there is first of all no mention of a dragon devouring the sun, but rather the exact opposite: it is the sun itself that uses *āṯālyā* as a cover. Moreover, the crucifixion is in so far different from the primordial capture of Ohrmazd in that Jesus is never actually captured – only his simile is.

38 Ephrem Syrus, *Commentarium in Diatessarone* XXI.5 (ed. Leloir 1953–1954, pp. 314–315); see *id.*, *Hymni de Crucifixione* 4.14 (ed. E. Beck 1964, I, p. 58; II, p. 46), where the Sun extinguishes itself *(adʿeḵ napšēh)* and "spreads on its face a covering of darkness" *(taḥpīṯ ḥšāḵā šqal pras ʿal parṣūpēh)*.

39 Michel Tardieu (1986) suggested the possibility that Simplicius and his school settled in Ḥarrān after returning from Persia, but this is far from certain. For a detailed discussion of Simplicius' refutation of Manichaeism, see Hadot 1996, pp. 114–144; Lieu 2010, pp. 188–191.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> And as for their explanation of the cause of eclipses they also show a marvellous excess of cleverness. They say that when the evil ones who have been chained in creation cause upheaval and disorder (ταραχὴν καὶ θόρυβον) by their own movements, *the luminaries throw curtains in front of themselves* (παραπετάσματά τινα τοὺς φωστῆρας ἑαυτῶν προβάλλεσθαι), so as not to share in their confusion, and *these are the eclipses, their concealment beneath curtains* (τὰς ὑπὸ τοῖς παραπετάσμασιν ἀποκρύψεις αὐτῶν). (tr. Lieu 2010)[40]

Simplicius' knowledge of Manichaeism is generally reliable and is confirmed by other extant non-Manichaean polemical texts, as well as by Manichaean sources. Hence, there is no reason to suspect a deliberate falsification from Simplicius' part. In fact, several of the terms used by Simplicius when describing the theories of his adversaries seem to reflect genuine Manichaean terminology. In light of this, Simplicius' choice of words in this passage is highly significant: the luminaries are said to hide "beneath curtains" (παραπετάσματα). The term παραπέτασμα is relatively frequent in the Church Fathers with the meaning "veil", "curtain" (referring to the Temple in Jerusalem, but also as a metaphor).[41] At the same time, the word could also be used in the sense of "cover, pretext" (similar to Germ. "Vorwand"), a meaning Simplicius would have found in Plato (*Protagoras*, 316e). It is of course impossible to know whether the word reflected Simplicius' own interpretation of the Manichaean theory, or if it was used by his adversaries as such. Still, it is perhaps no coincidence that the term παραπέτασμα comprises a similar range of meanings as Syr. *taḥpīṯā* "veil, mask", and that Simplicius' description fully agrees with the function of *āṯālyā* in the Coptic psalm.

Moreover, the fact that Simplicius makes no mention of an eclipse dragon – a feature that would have undoubtedly served his polemical purpose – indicates that at least the one Western branch of Manichaeans did not hold to the *āṯālyā*/eclipse dragon theory of later times, and that they probably did not understand *āṯālyā* to be a dragon at all. On the contrary, according to Manichaeism, it is the sun and the moon themselves who use "curtains" in order to protect themselves against the upheaval of the archons.[42] Simplicius' account thus

40 Simplicius, *In Epictetum encheiridion*, § 35 (= ed. Hadot 1996, pp. 325–326): Αἱ δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐκλείψεων αἰτιολογίαι, θαυμαστὴν σοφίας ὑπερβολὴν ἐνδείκνυνται. Λέγουσι γὰρ τῶν ἐν τῇ κοσμοποιίᾳ συνδεδεμένων κακῶν, ταραχὴν καὶ θόρυβον ποιούντων ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν συγκινήσεσι, παραπετάσματά τινα τοὺς φωστῆρας ἑαυτῶν προβάλλεσθαι διὰ τὸ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ταραχῆς ἐκείνων, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὰς ἐκλείψεις, τὰς ὑπὸ τοῖς παραπετάσμασιν ἀποκρύψεις αὐτῶν (text also in Lieu 2010, p. 104).

41 For instance, Basil of Caesarea (d. 379 CE) speaks of the soul being stripped of the "coverings of the flesh" (τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς παραπετάσματα, PG 30.320B), while John Chrysostom (d. 407 CE) mentions the "curtains of heaven" (τὰ παραπετάσματα τῶν οὐρανῶν) being removed, alluding to the curtains in the tent of the covenant (PG 49.247D). Unfortunately, Hadot does not discuss the problem of the παραπετάσματα in her treatment of Simplicius' account (see Hadot 1996, pp. 138–144).

42 One might recall that the Babylonian Talmud defines the lowest heaven as a "curtain" (JBA *wēlā, wilon* < Lat. *velum*) and places it under the firmament (JBA *raqīʿā*), where

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

corroborates the hypothesis that in the Parthian and Coptic Manichaean fragments *āṯālyā* is not to be translated as "dragon", but rather as "veil", "cover", or simply "eclipse".

§ 6. Conclusions

The purpose of this essay was to discuss the few occurrences of *āṯālyā* in Manichaean literature, a term usually assumed to refer to the eclipse dragon of Medieval astrology. A brief survey of the term's etymology and its cognates in Mandaean and Syriac, as well as an analysis of Manichaean descriptions of eclipses, have revealed some problems with this assumption. The findings of the study can be resumed as follows:

- As already observed by Furlani and other scholars, the original Akk. *attalû* "eclipse" appears to be unrelated to any dragon imagery; on the contrary, some expressions indicate that eclipses were understood as "veils" or "garments" drawn or "put on" by the sun- or moon-gods themselves;
- The old meaning of the term possibly left its traces in the Mandaean usage of *talia*, even though the difficulties of dating Mandaean material preclude us from reaching any definite conclusions in this respect;
- The first occurrences of *āṯālyā* in the context of a complex eclipse dragon theory is only attested in Syriac texts of the 6th/7th centuries CE, as the trademark of a specific group of astrologers;
- The sources used by this group are likely to ultimately go back to Indian astrology, where we find 1) the earliest securely dated occurrences of the dragon theory (before Varāhamihira), 2) a complex myth embedded in the epic tradition (e.g. the *Mahābhārata*) to undergird the theory, and 3) specific cosmological features which demonstrably migrated to Iran and Babylonia (e.g. the lunar mansions, the nodes as "pseudo-planets");
- A number of Syriac authors appear to have certain difficulties with the term *āṯālyā*, its non-astrological usage with the meaning "dragon" being relatively late (13th–14th centuries);
- The theological context of the Manichaean psalm mentioning *āṯālyā* is much better understood if we interpret the word as "veil of darkness" (or even "mask"), as a metaphorical continuation of Akk. *attalû*, and *not* as "dragon".
- This understanding is confirmed by Simplicius' account on how Manichaeans explained eclipses: Simplicius only mentions solar/lunar curtains or covers (παραπετάσματα) and makes no reference to a dragon.

---

the sun, the moon, and the stars are located. However, its function is different from the παραπετάσματα in Simplicius (*bḤag.*, fol. 12b; see Séd 1981, pp. 263–270).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Several of these conclusions are obviously open to debate, and there are other astrological terms which require careful investigation, e.g. the *gōzihr* ("eclipse dragon") in M556 and the two *Anabibazontes* in the Coptic *Kephalaia*, Ch. LXIX (cf. R. Beck 1987). These issues will be addressed in a future study, although some remarks can perhaps be made in advance: the text in M556 probably reflects a later stage of Manichaean literature which postdates the adoption of the eclipse dragon theory from India. Therefore, the fragment cannot be adduced as evidence for the 3rd–4th century use of *āṯālyā* in the earliest Manichaean texts. What is more, some fragments concerning *gōzihr* in Zoroastrian texts also indicate the existence of a certain "curtain/veil" imagery.[43] Similar precautions should be taken regarding the *Anabibazontes*. While it is evident that this Coptic Manichaean word is a strange reduplication of the Greek term for the ascending node (ἀναβιβάζων), there are internal and external difficulties with assuming that it represents *the same concept* as the eclipse dragon of later astrology. A closer look of the function and attributes of the *Anabibazontes* in *Keph.*, Ch. LXIX will show that they can be better explained against the background of Judaeo-Christian pseudepigraphic accounts on cosmology and astral symbolism.

Appendix: Occurrences of *āṯālyā* in Manichaean Sources

Language	Form	Source and Context
Syriac	ʾtlyʾ	/1/ […] ʿl ʾtlyʾ /2/ […] s̈wrtʾ ẅḥwdrʾ /3/ […] (dm)t[. .](pn) bhwn /1/ […] on *āṯālyā*, /2/ […] halos[44] and circles, /3/ […] which are […] in them.[45] (Fr. 1, hair side [= Burkitt A], ed. Pedersen/Larsen 2013, pp. 30–31)

43 See e.g. *GrBd* V.3, V.22; *Dēnkard* III (§329, ed. De Menasce 1973). These and other passages will also be discussed in the follow up of this study.

44 In *MBZ* (pp. 127–128) the same word *ṣūrtā* appears as a technical term for phenomena with ominous character observed on or around the luminaries (cf. *MD*, pp. 391–392, *s. v.* ṣurta(2)). Ethel Drower translates the term as "halo" and points out its connection to Akk. *uṣurtu* "halo" (see *MBZ*, p. 127, n. 5; cf. Rochberg 2010, pp. 231–232 for a comparison of *MBZ* with an Akkadian omen series). Since the *MBZ* discusses the "halos" together with eclipses (cf. *MBZ*, pp. 128–134), their close association in the Manichaean Syriac fragment indicates that it was probably part of a similar astrological treatise.

45 Francis Burkitt had reconstructed the line as ⟨(dm)t(ḥzy)n bhwn⟩ "which are *seen* in them" (1925, p. 114), but this reading is rejected by Pedersen and Larsen (2013, p. 33). Given the presence of the two technical terms *āṯālyā* and *ṣūrtā* (see previous note), it is likely that "in them" refers to the sun and the moon.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Language	Form	Source and Context
Coptic	ⲁϴⲁⲗⲓⲁ	/8/ ⲁⲡⲣⲏ ⲥⲁⲕ ⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲓ̈ⲛⲉ • ⲁϥⲣ̅ⲫⲟⲣⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲁϴⲁⲗⲓⲁ /9/ ⲁϥϣⲃⲧϥ̅ [ⲁ]ⲛⲓⲣⲉϥϩⲱⲧⲃⲉ • ⲁϥϭⲱⲡⲉ ⲥⲁⲡⲟⲩⲙⲏ[ⲧ] /8/ The sun withdrew his light, it wore (φορεῖν) the *athalia*. /9/ He (i. e. Jesus) disguised himself from those murderers, he was caught up from their presence. *(Ps.-Bk.*, tr. Allberry 1938, p. 196.8–9)
Parthian	ʾʾtʾly̱ʾ ʾʾt̲ʾly̱ʾh̲[46]	/5/ ptbg dhyd wyst ʾwt̲ nw(h̲) /6/ qj snyd hrystwm k(w)[….] /7/ snyd hryst ʾw(t̲)[ʿyw …..] /8/ ʾʾtʾly̱ʾ pdmwcy(d)[……..] /9/ hryst w: dw kw yd ʾ[w ……..] /10/ mʾwsnyd hry(st)[ʾwt̲ hry …] /5/ <it> gives radiance. Twenty-nin(e): /6/ <it> ascends in a wrong manner(?) *(kažž)*.[47] Thirty: […] /7/ <it> ascends; thirty-[one …..] /8/ <it> put(s) on *āt̲ālyā* ……..]; /9/ thirty-two: that u[ntil ……..] /10/ <it> descends. Thir(ty)[-three …] (Frg. M 728/v/5–10/ [unpublished][48])
Parallels in other Astrological Traditions		
Mandaean	*talia*	*MBZ*, p. 62 (see above, n. 17)
Hebew	*tli*	*BdRŠ* 542b (ed. Eisenstein 1915) *SY*, § 59 (ed. Hayman 2004)[49]
Greek	ἀθαλία	*CCAG*, vol. VIII, p. 195 (see above, n. 4)

46 This second occurrence is attested on the small Frg. M 2755/a/3, which unfortunately provides no context (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 5).

47 Cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 205.

48 Cf. Reck/Sundermann 1997, p. 12. I have only transcribed the few lines which were immediately relevant for the present purpose. An edition of the entire fragment was beyond the scope of this study.

49 It is not certain whether the *Tli* in *SY* § 59 refers to the eclipse dragon or not (Hayman 2007, pp. 113–127). The *Baraita d-Rabbi Šmu'el* (9th century CE?) contains the earliest clear description of the *Tli* as the eclipse dragon. In the 10th century Šabbatai Donnolo gave a lengthy description of the *Tli* which became very influential for later Jewish astrology. It is very likely that Donnolo used Indian and Persian material, via Arabic, Hebrew, or Greek intermediaries (see Mancuso 2010, p. 229, n. 47). See, e. g. Donnolo's statement that some books mention "two dragons" (Heb. *telayyim*), recalling the Manichaean pair of dragons in *Keph.*, Ch. LXIX (168.12–16), and in M98/I/R/1–6 (Hutter 1992, pp. 10–11), but also the "two Rāhus" in Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* V.7 (Iyer 1884, p. 23); cf. Mancuso 2010, pp. 346–347, n. 162.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Abbreviations

General abbreviations

Akk.	Akkadian	MSogd.	Manichaean Sogdian
Ar.	Arabic	NA	Neo-Assyrian
Aram.	Aramaic	NB	Neo-Babylonian
Copt.	Coptic	NP	New Persian
Gr.	Greek	OB	Old Babylonian
Heb.	Hebrew	Pahl.	Pahlavi
JBA	Jewish Babylonian Aramaic	Pth.	Parthian
Lat.	Latin	Skr.	Sanskrit
Mand.	Mandaean	Sum.	Sumerian
ManMP	Manichaean Middle Persian	Syr.	Syriac

Bibliographical abbreviations

bḤag	*Talmud Bavli*, tractate Ḥagigah
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
EIr	*Encyclopædia Iranica*. Ed. by E. Yarshater. London/New York
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JMS	*Journal of Mithraic Studies*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
ZfA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*

Bibliography

ABL = R.F. Harper: *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum*. Vol. 10. Chicago 1911.

AHw = W. Von Soden: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden 1965–1981.

Al-Rawi, F.N.H./A.R. George 2006: "Tablets from the Sippar Library XIII: 'Enūma Anu Ellil' XX." In: *Iraq* 68, pp. 23–57.

Azarpay, G./A.D. Kilmer 1978: "The Eclipse Dragon on an Arabic Frontispiece-Miniature." In: *JAOS* 98/4, pp. 363–374.

Baumstark, A. 1922: *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluß der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*. Bonn.

BdRŠ = J.D. Eisenstein (ed.): *Ozar Midrashim, a Library of Two Hundred Minor Midrashim*. Edited with Introduction and Notes. 2 vols. New York 1915.

Beck, E. 1964: *Des heiligen Ephrem des Syrers Paschahymnen (De azymis, de crucifixione, de resurrectione)*. 2 vols. Louvain (CSCO 248–249).

Beck, R. 1976: "Interpreting the Ponza Zodiac (I)." In: *JMS* 1, pp. 1–19.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1978: "Interpreting the Ponza Zodiac (II)." In: *JMS* 2, pp. 87–147.
— 1987: "The Anabibazontes in the Manichaean Kephalaia." In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 69, pp. 193–196.
Bedjan, P. (ed.) 1895: *Histoire de Mar-Jabalaha de trois autres patriarches, d'un prêtre et des deux laïques, nestoriens*. Leipzig.
Bezold, C. 1911: "Aus der Antwort auf diesen Brief." In: *ZfA* 25, pp. 357–358 [response to Nöldeke 1911].
Bhat, M. R. 1986: *Varāhamihira's Bṛhatsaṁhitā, with English Translation, Exhaustive Notes and Literary Comments*. Part I. Delhi.
Billard, R. 1971: *L'astronomie indienne. Investigations des textes sanskrits et des données numériques*. Paris (Publications de l'École française d'Éxtrême-Orient 83).
Bouché-Leclercq, A. 1899: *L'astrologie grecque*. Paris [reprint Bruxelles 1963].
Brock, S. 1992: *The Luminous Eye. The Spiritual World Vision of Saint Ephrem*. Kalamazoo, MI (Cistercian Studies Series 124).
Brown, D./M. Linssen 1997: "BM 134701 = 1965–10–14,1 and the Hellenistic Period Eclipse Ritual From Uruk." In: *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 91/2, pp. 147–166.
Budge, E. A. W. 1913: *The Syriac Book of Medicines. Syrian Anatomy, Pathology, and Therapeutics in the Early Middle Ages*. 2 vols. London *et al.* [repr. Amsterdam 1976].
Burkitt, F. C. 1925: *The Religion of the Manichees. Donnellan Lectures for 1924*. Cambridge.
CAD = I. J. Gelb *et al.* (eds.): *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. 21 vols. Chicago *et al.* 1956–2010.
Causa Causarum = K. Kayser (ed.): *Das Buch von der Erkenntnis der Wahrheit, oder, Der Ursache aller Ursachen*. Vol. 1: *Syriac text*. Leipzig. Vol. 2: German transl. Straßburg 1889–1893.
CCAG = F. Cumont/F. Boll (eds.): *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*. 12 vols. Bruxelles 1898–1953.
Drower, E. S. 1937: "Shafta ḏ Pishra ḏ Ainia." In: *JRAS* 4, pp. 589–611.
— 1938: "Shafta ḏ Pishra ḏ Ainia (Concluded from October, 1937, p. 611)." In: *JRAS* 1, pp. 1–20.
Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 3; Dictionary of Manichaean Texts 3.1).
Duval, R. (ed.) 1901: *Lexicon Syriacum auctore Hassano bar Bahlule*. 3 vols. Paris.
Furlani, G. 1947: "Tre trattati astrologici siriaci sulle eclissi solare e lunare." In: *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche)* 344, pp. 569–606.
Gardner, I. 1988: *Coptic Theological Papyri II. Edition, Commentary, Translation. With an Appendix: The Docetic Jesus*. Vienna.
Geller, M. J. 2007: *Evil Demons: Canonical Utukku-Lemnutu Incantations. Introduction, Cuneiform Text and Transliteration with a Translation and Glossary*. Helsinki (State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 5).
Gibson, M. D. (ed.) 1911: *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Ḥadatha (c. 850 A. D.)*. 3 vols. Cambridge.
Goetze, A. 1947: "Akk. *antalū* and *namtallūm* ‚eclipse'." In: *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 1, pp. 251–252.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

GrBd = B.T. Anklesaria: *Zand-ākāsih: Iranian or Greater Bundahišn. Transliteration and Translation in English*. Bombay 1956.

Greenfield, J.C./M. Sokoloff 1989: "Astrological and Related Omen Texts in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic." In: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 48/3, pp. 201–214.

Gulácsi, Zs. 2005: *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art. A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th–11th Century East Central Asia*. Leiden (NHMS 57).

Gy = M. Lidzbarski: *Ginzā. Der Schatz, oder das große Buch der Mandäer*. Göttingen/Leipzig 1925.

Hadot, I. (ed.) 1996: *Simplicius: Commentaire sur le Manuel d'Épictète*. Leiden (Philosophia Antiqua 66).

Hartner, W. 1938: "The Pseudoplanetary Nodes of the Moon's Orbit in Hindu and Islamic Iconographies." In: *Ars Islamica* 5/2, pp. 112–154.

— 1965: "Djawzahar." In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. II, pp. 501–502.

Hayman, P. 2007: "The Dragon, the *Axis Mundi*, and *Sefer Yeṣira* § 59." In: W. Watson (ed.): *"He unfurrowed his brow and laughed": Essays in Honour of Prof. Nicolas Wyatt*. Münster (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 299), pp. 113–140.

Heiberg, J.L. 1898–1903: *Claudii Ptolemaei Opera quae extant omnia.* Vol. 1, pts. 1–2: *Syntaxis Mathematica*. Leipzig.

Henning, W.B. 1942: "An Astronomical Chapter of the Bundahishn." In: *JRAS* 3, pp. 229–248.

Hutter, M. 1992: *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte. Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980–7984*. Wiesbaden.

Iyer, N.Ch. 1884: *The Brihat Samhita of Varaha Mihira. Translated into English*. Madura.

Kaufman, S. 1974: *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Chicago/London (Assyrological Studies 19).

Keph. = H.J. Polotsky/A. Böhlig (eds.): *Kephalaia.* Stuttgart 1940 (Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin I, 1. Hälfte [Lieferung 1–10]).

Koch-Westenholz, U. 2001: "Babylonian Views of Eclipses." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Démons et merveilles d'Orient*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales 13), pp. 71–84.

Kraeling, C. 1933: "The Mandaic God Ptahil." In: *JAOS* 53/2, pp. 152–165.

Leloir, L. (ed.) 1953–1954: *Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant*. 2 vols. Louvain (CSCO 137, 145).

Lieu, S.N.C. (ed.) 2010: *Greek and Latin Sources on Manichaean Cosmogony and Ethics*. Translated by G. Fox and J. Sheldon. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 6).

MacKenzie, D.N. 1964: "Zoroastrian Astrology in the *Bundahišn*." In: *BSOAS* 27, pp. 511–529.

— 2002: "Gōzihr." In: *EIr* XI, fasc. 2, p. 184.

Mancuso, P. 2010: *Shabbatai Donnolo's Sefer Ḥakhmoni. Introduction, Critical Text, and Annotated English Translation*. Leiden (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 27).

Mastrocinque, A. 2005: *From Jewish Magic To Gnosticism*. Tübingen (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 24).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

MBh = J. A. B. Van Buitenen (tr.): *The Mahābhārata*. Vol. I: *The Book of the Beginning*. Chicago 1975.
MBZ = E. S. Drower (tr.): *The Book of the Zodiac (Sfar Malwašia)*. London 1949.
McCown, Ch. 1923: "The Ephesia Grammata in Popular Belief." In: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 54, pp. 128–140.
MD = E. S. Drower/R. Macuch: *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford 1963.
de Menasce, J. (ed.) 1973: *Le troisième livre du Dēnkart: traduit du pehlevi*. Paris (Bibliothèque des oeuvres classiques persanes 4).
MJb = M. Lidzbarski: *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*. 2 vols. Giessen 1905–1915.
Müller-Kessler, Ch. 2004: "The Mandaeans and the Question of their Origin." In: *ARAM* 16, pp. 47–60.
— 2005: *Die Zauberschalentexte der Hilprecht-Sammlung, Jena und weitere Nippur-Texte anderer Sammlungen*. Wiesbaden (Texte und Materialien der Hilprecht-Collection 7).
Nallino, C. 1922: "Tracce di opere greche giunte agli arabi per trafila pehlevica." In: T. W. Arnold/R. Nicholson (eds.): *A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Edward G. Browne on His 60th Birthday (7 February 1922)*. Cambridge [reprint Amsterdam 1973], pp. 345–363.
Nau, F. 1910a: "La cosmographie au VIIe siècle chez les syriens." In: *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 2ème sér., 5 (15), pp. 225–254.
— 1910b: "Notes d'astronomie syrienne." In: *JA*, 10ème sér., 16, pp. 209–228.
Nöldeke, Th. 1875: *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle.
— 1911: "Aus einem Briefe des Herrn Prof. Th. Nöldeke an C. Bezold." In: *ZfA* 25, pp. 355–357.
Pedersen, N. A./J. M. Larsen: *Manichaean Texts in Syriac. First Editions, New Editions, and Studies*. With contributions by Zs. Gulácsi and M. Krutzsch. Turnhout (CFM, Series Syriaca 1).
PG = J. P. Migne (ed.): *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*. 166 vols. Paris 1857–1866.
Pingree, D. 1963a: "The Indian Iconography of the decans and Hōras." In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26, pp. 223–254.
— 1963b: "Astronomy and Astrology in India and Iran." In: *Isis* 54, pp. 229–246.
— 1964–1966: "Indian Influence on Sasanian and Early Islamic Astronomy and Astrology." In: *Journal of Oriental Research Madras* 34–35, pp. 118–126.
— 1973–1974 (ed.): *Hephaestionis Thebani Apotelesmaticorum libri tres*. 2 vols. Leipzig (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana).
— 1976a (ed.): *Dorothei Sidonii Carmen Astrologicum. Interpretationem arabicam in linguam anglicam versam una cum Dorothei fragmentis et graecis et latinis*. Leipzig.
— 1976b: "The Indian and Pseudo-Indian Passages in Greek and Latin Astronomical and Astrological Texts." In: *Viator* 7, pp. 141–195.
— 1981: *Jyotiśāstra. Astral and Mathematical Literature*. Wiesbaden.
— 1986 (ed.): *Vetii Valentis Antiocheni Anthologiarum Libri Novem*. Leipzig.
— 1997: *From Astral Omens to Astrology, From Babylon to Bīkāner*. Roma.
— 2001: "From Alexandria to Baghdād to Byzantium. The Transmission of Astrology." In: *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 8/1, pp. 3–37.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Pingree, D./C.J. Brunner 1987: "Astrology and Astronomy in Iran." In: *EIr* II, pp. 858–871.

Ps.-Bk. = C.R.C. Allberry: *Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection. II: A Manichaean Psalm-Book*. Stuttgart 1938.

Reck, Ch./W. Sundermann 1997: "Ein illustrierter mittelpersischer manichäischer Omen-Text aus Turfan." In: *Zentralasiatische Studien* 27, pp. 7–23.

Richter, S. 1994: *Exegetisch-literarkritische Untersuchungen von Herakleidespsalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*. Altenberge.

— 1998: *Die Aufstiegspsalmen des Herakleides. Untersuchungen zum Seelenaufstieg und zur Seelenmesse bei den Manichäern*. Wiesbaden (Sprachen und Kulturen des Christlichen Orients 1).

Rochberg, F. 1996: "Personifications and Metaphors in Babylonian Celestial Omina." In: *JAOS* 116/3, pp. 475–485.

— 2010: *In the Path of the Moon. Babylonian Celestial Divination and Its Legacy*. Leiden.

Sachau, E. 1899: *Verzeichnis der syrischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. 2 vols. Berlin.

Sawyer, J.F.A./F.R. Stephenson 1970: "Literary and Astronomical Evidence for a Total Eclipse of the Sun Observed in Ancient Ugarit on 3 May 1375 B.C." In: *BSOAS* 33/3, pp. 467–489.

Schlüter, M. 1982: *Deraqôn und Götzendienst. Studien zur antiken jüdischen Religionsgeschichte, ausgehend von einem griechischen Lehnwort in mAZ III 3*. Bern/Frankfurt a.M.

Séd, N. 1981: *La mystique cosmologique juive*. Paris.

SY = P. Hayman: *Sefer Yeṣira. Edition, Translation and Text-Critical Commentary*. Tübingen 2004 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 104).

Tardieu, M. 2009: "Ṣābiens coraniques et 'Ṣābiens' de Ḥarrān." In: *JA* 274, pp. 1–44.

van Tongerloo, A. 1993: "Coptic Manichaean Texts." In: *EIr* VI, fasc. 3, pp. 260–264.

Trammell, F. 2009: "The God of Jerusalem as the Pole Dragon. The Conceptual Background of the Cosmic Axis in *James*." In: A. DeConick (ed.): *The Codex Judas Papers. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex held at Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13–16, 2008*. Leiden (NHMS 71), pp. 337–349.

Villey, E. 2012: *Les textes astronomiques syriaques (6e et 7e s. AD): établissement d'un corpus et de critères de datation. Édition, traduction et lexique*. PhD Thesis. Leuven.

Wünsch, R. 1900: "Neue Fluchtafeln." In: *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 55, pp. 62–85, 232–271.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

L'obstruction de l'abîme d'après Titus de Bostra (*Contre les manichéens* I, 42)

Un aspect de l'eschatologie manichéenne

Paul-Hubert Poirier, Québec

Malgré sa très grande richesse documentaire, le traité *Contre les manichéens* (Κατὰ Μανιχαίων) de Titus de Bostra,[1] rédigé *sub Iuliano et Ioviano principibus,*[2] donc entre novembre 361 et février 364 mais plus probablement durant l'année 363,[3] est demeuré jusqu'à ce jour largement inexploité par les spécialistes du manichéisme, sans doute faute d'une traduction dans une langue moderne.[4] Dans ses *Texte zum Manichäismus,*[5] Alfred Adam n'a retenu que trois lignes et demie tirées du début du chapitre 36 du livre I. Plus généreuses, les *Greek and Latin Sources on Manichaean Cosmogony and Ethics* citent, sur un peu plus d'une page, une douzaine d'extraits du livre I (ch. 1, 2, 4, 6, 17, 21, 22 et 36).[6] Un inventaire des matériaux manichéens contenus dans le *Contre les manichéens*, basé sur les indicateurs de citations (dont φησί / φασί pour le grec et la particule ܠܡ, *lam*, pour le syriaque), a permis d'isoler près de 150 extraits dans lesquels l'auteur prétend rapporter, parfois littéralement, les propos ou les doctrines

1 Nous citons le *Contre les manichéens* selon les livres, chapitres et lignes de l'édition de Roman/Poirier/Crégheur/Declerck (2013), qui remplace désormais celles de Paul de Lagarde (1859a et 1859b). Sur le *Contre les manichéens* et son auteur, on se reportera à l'importante monographie de Nils Arne Pedersen (2004).

2 Jérôme, *De viris inlustribus* 102 (éd. Richardson 1896, p. 48).

3 Le *terminus ante quem* est fourni par Jérôme, *loc. cit.* Quant au *terminus post quem*, il peut être établi à partir d'une indication du *Contre les manichéens*, qui, en II, 28.1–3 (gr.), mentionne un tremblement de terre qui se produisit « tout récemment sous le règne de celui qui fut par trop impie et rappela l'erreur des idoles »; il s'agit fort probablement, comme le pense Pedersen (2004, p. 126), du tremblement de terre qui détruisit Nicomédie et Nicée le 2 décembre 362, et qui est mentionné par Ammien Marcellin (*Histoire* XXII, 13.5). L'ouvrage a donc été composé très vraisemblablement, pour l'essentiel, au cours de l'année 363 et plutôt dans la seconde moitié de l'année.

4 Traduction française des deux versions du *Contre les manichéens* (Roman/Schmidt/Poirier 2015).

5 Adam 1954, p. 60.

6 Lieu 2010, pp. 56–59. Celui qui semble avoir utilisé le plus l'ouvrage de Titus est Beck (1978), qui en cite au-delà d'une cinquantaine de passages.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

de Mani et de ses disciples.[7] Plusieurs de ces extraits recoupent des données connues par des sources directes ou indirectes mais d'autres attribuent à Mani des doctrines ou des formulations tout à fait inconnues par ailleurs, ainsi, à la fin du traité, l'affirmation selon laquelle « le Christ est le cinquième élément » (IV, 115.10–11)[8], ou l'épisode de la fin du livre I auquel nous nous intéressons ici. Le *Contre les manichéens* de Titus de Bostra est construit comme un diptyque, dont la première partie – les livres I et II – constituent une réfutation rationnelle du manichéisme, à la lumière des κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι, et la seconde partie – les livres III et IV –, une critique de l'exégèse de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament.[9] Alors que le livre II porte essentiellement sur le gouvernement divin et la raison d'être des créatures dans leur diversité et leur apparent désordre, le livre I, d'où est tiré le passage qui nous commenterons, s'attaque aux fondements mêmes de la doctrine de Mani, à savoir la thèse des deux principes (ch. 6–25) et le mythe du désordre primitif de la ὕλη et de l'attaque de la lumière par celle-ci.

Titus conclut le livre I (ch. 36–42) en évoquant, dans un passage introduit comme une citation aussi bien en grec (ὡς) qu'en syriaque (ܐܝܟ), la finalité de la démiurgie manichéenne :

> Il dit que « Dieu s'efforce de reprendre à nouveau auprès de lui la puissance avalée », qu'il appelle « l'âme du tout, afin que ce qui provient de lui ne continue pas toujours, à l'infini, de se trouver enchaîné à la Matière et châtié. » (I, 36.1–5, gr.)

Et il se fait fort de démontrer la contradiction du « discours tout à fait ridicule de Mani », qui affirme du même souffle que Dieu est le créateur et que « "ceux qui appartiennent à la Matière, percevant qu'ils seront misérablement perdus parce que la Lumière leur est enlevée peu à peu, ont imaginé en retour la fabrication de la chair, un très grand lien pour les âmes" » (I, 38.1–5, gr.) :

> Que pourrait dire quelqu'un qui se rend compte qu'il n'y a pas un mot de Mani qui tienne debout en aucune manière mais que, variant de-ci de-là, il se réfute lui-même? Car en affirmant que « Dieu est le créateur du monde », il dit à nouveau que « ceux qui proviennent de la Matière lui ont, de quelque façon que ce soit, opposé la chair », comme si Dieu partageait avec eux la création et que, par là, il endurait de la violence, et qu'il complétait l'univers par concession à leur égard, non pas selon sa propre décision. Comme si le trompeur avait oublié sa propre hypothèse, il dit qu'il sera funeste pour la Matière de lui ôter la puissance mêlée à elle, par laquelle il a supposé que (la Matière), qui au début était en désordre, a été ramenée à la raison. (I, 39.1–12, gr.)

7 Cet inventaire, rédigé par P.-H. Poirier et T. Pettipiece, paraîtra dans la collection des « Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia » (Turnhout, Brepols). Sur la délicate question du repérage des citations et matériaux manichéens chez Titus de Bostra, voir Poirier 2009.

8 Voir Dubois/Poirier 2012.

9 On trouvera un plan du *Contre les manichéens* dans Roman/Poirier/Crégheur/Declerck 2013, pp. lxxxix–xcviii.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Parvenu au terme du livre I, Titus évoque, en point d'orgue, deux épisodes de l'eschatologie manichéennes particulièrement propres à démontrer, selon lui, le ridicule de la doctrine de Mani. Le premier (I, 41) est bien connu : il s'agit du βῶλος, le *globus horribilis* ou *horrendus* d'Augustin,[10] attesté, entre autres, dans les *Acta Archelai* (βῶλος, *massa*)[11] les *Kephalaia* coptes (ⲃⲱⲗⲟⲥ)[12] et dans le troisième discours *Ad Hypatium* d'Éphrem (ܥܠܒܐ)[13], c'est-à-dire la masse ou la boule dans laquelle seront enfoncées et retenues les âmes irrécupérables pour le monde lumineux.[14] Comme plus tard Augustin, Titus y voit l'aveu qu'à la fin, « Dieu devra punir ses propres membres avec la nation des ténèbres, qui, disent-ils, ennemie de Dieu » :[15]

> Mais il faut encore demander ceci, à savoir si les âmes qui ont péché et qui ont été amenées à des myriades de maux dans la vie seront châtiées ou non pour les fautes qu'elles ont commises. Si donc elles sont châtiées, ce qu'assurément il concède lui-même lorsqu'il dit qu'« elles seront enfoncées dans la masse en même temps que le Mal », Dieu se trouvera à punir sa propre nature : qu'y aurait-il de plus déplacé que cela? Si, en revanche, elles demeurent impunies, non seulement le péché sera sans affliction ni châtiment, mais encore il semblerait être supérieur à la justice, puisque dans le temps présent, il procurerait le plaisir à celui qui le commet et que, dans le temps à venir, il ne deviendrait pas cause de châtiment. (I, 41, gr.)

Notons que la version syriaque du *Contre les manichéens* rend le grec βῶλος par ܪܘܠܒܐ (41.4) et non par ܥܠܒܐ, comme chez Éphrem.[16]

Le second épisode (en I, 42), en revanche, qui représente pour Titus de Bostra un sommet de folie, s'il évoque, comme nous le verrons, la finale du drame eschatologique, n'est pas attesté comme tel dans les sources manichéennes directes ou indirectes, du moins pas dans les termes qu'emploie Titus. Citons tout d'abord le passage dans les deux formes sous lesquelles il nous est parvenu :

10 Cf. Clackson/Hunter/Lieu 1998, p. 202b.
11 Cf. *ibid*., p. 32a.
12 Cf. *ibid*., p. 64a.
13 Éd. Mitchell 1912, pp. 87, 43; trad., p. lxxii.
14 Pour d'autres références, voir Jackson 1938.
15 *Contra Adimantum* VII, 1 (éd. Zycha 1891, p. 127, ll. 13–15, trad. Jolivet/Jourjon 1961, pp. 244–245).
16 Comment expliquer cette forme syriaque? Si, avec Payne Smith (1879–1901, I, col. 468), on la vocalise *būlārā'*, on peut y voir la transcription du grec βωλάριον, un diminutif de βῶλος (Liddell/Scott 1996, p. 334a), dont le *Thesaurus linguae graecae* répertorie sept occurrences et qui signifie « petite motte » ou « petite boule ». C'est ainsi que Marc-Aurèle (*Pensées* 6.36), désigne l'Athos comme « une petite motte dans l'univers » (Ἄθως βωλάριον τοῦ κόσμου) et que StraBon (*Géographie* 3.2, 8) oppose des boules ou pépites d'or (βώλους) à des « pépites plus petites en forme de mamelons (βωλάρια θηλαῖς ὅμοια) ». Le terme βωλάριον pour βῶλος n'est cependant pas attesté dans les sources manichéennes grecques.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἅπασι, θαυμάσιον αὐτοῦ δὴ κἀκεῖνο, ἔνθα φησὶν ὡς τῆς κακίας ἐνταυθοῖ ἀσχολουμένης, εἴτ'οὖν δεδεμένης, θεὸς ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τὸ βάθος ἀναπληροῖ χώματι, ὅθεν ἀνέκυψεν ἡ ὕλη, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ δεινοτάτην ἔκστασιν μὴ συνιέντος ὡς τὸ ἐπιβαλλόμενον, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἴη τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, τίνα τρόπον ἔχει χώραν ἐν τόπῳ γε ἐναντίῳ. Εἰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν μερῶν τῆς κακίας, τὸ οἰκεῖον οὐκ ἐγκλείσει τῆν αὐτόθεν ὡρμημένην. Κάθηται δὲ θεὸς κατὰ τὸν Μάνεντα δι'αἰῶνος μεταφέρων χώματα καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ προσχωννύων βάθη τινά. Ὦ τῆς ἀλόγου μανίας, πρὸς ἣν ἐν τοῖς πλείοσι καὶ γέλως τὸ γοῦν ἀποκρίνασθαι.

« Outre tout cela, il y a également ceci d'étonnant chez lui, lorsqu'il dit que, ‹tandis que le Mal est occupé ici-bas, à savoir emprisonné, Dieu, dans l'intervalle, remplit l'abîme d'un amas de terre, d'où la Matière a levé la tête›, selon la terrible folie de celui qui ne comprend pas de quelle façon ce qui y est jeté, s'il vient de la terre du Bon, aura une place dans un lieu opposé. Mais, si cela vient des parties du Mal, ce qui lui est propre n'enfermera pas ce qui s'efforce d'en sortir. Mais, selon Mani, ‹Dieu reste assis à déplacer pour l'éternité des mottes et à obstruer petit à petit d'amas quelque abîme›. Ô folle déraison, à laquelle il est même ridicule de répondre sur la plupart des points! »

ܗܘܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܥܡ ܬܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܡܫܬܥܒܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܛܒܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܒܝܫܐ ܕܗܘ

Ce chapitre du livre I du *Contre les manichéens* a été cité et traduit par A. V. Williams Jackson[18] et Edmond Beck[19], qui ont bien vu qu'il décrivait l'ultime mesure à laquelle le Dieu Bon recourt pour éviter une nouvelle agression de la Matière contre la lumière : son enfermement dans une fosse ou une prison. Le stratagème est bien documenté par les sources directes et indirectes. Même s'il recourt à un autre vocabulaire, il ne fait pas de doute que Titus de Bostra évoque l'aménagement d'une espèce de fosse ou de tombe destinée à retenir la Matière et les âmes damnées, comme le montre la comparaison du texte de Titus avec les sources manichéennes directes ou indirectes où apparaît le thème de la tombe eschatologique.

De la vingtaine d'occurrences de ⲧⲁⲫⲟⲥ que l'on retrouve dans les textes de Medinet Madi, trois renvoient clairement à un contexte eschatologique et à l'emprisonnement de l'élément adverse. Dans le *Kephalaion* 24, dont le titre a disparu, il est question de la manière dont la dernière statue (ἀνδρίας) sera édifiée (ζωγραφεῖν) à partir du résidu de toutes choses et dont la lumière remontera dans son royaume et les ténèbres (ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ) seront « retournées et emmenées dans la tombe (ⲛ̅[ⲧⲉ ⲡⲕ]ⲉⲕⲉ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲡ[ⲱⲛ]ⲉ̣ ⲛⲥⲉϫⲓⲧϥ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲡⲧⲁⲫⲟⲥ) »[20]. Dans le *Kephalaion* 41, le troisième « coup » (πληγή) qui fut porté contre l'ennemi à cause de la lumière est « l'enroulement [de la] fin, quand toute chose sera séparée et qu'on séparera le mâle [de la] femelle : le mâle sera lié dans la masse (βῶλος), mais la femelle sera jetée dans la tombe (τάφος) ».[21] Dans le *Sermon de*

18 « Besides all these things wonder also at that (passage) of his (i. e. Mānī's) where he says that, Darkness being occupied thither (ἐνταυθοῖ, i. e. in the Bolos), God in the interval fills up with a mound (χώματι) the depth whence Matter raised its head, according to his (Mānī's) most dreadful imaginings, whereas he does not comprehend that what is thrown on – if it should be from the earth of Good, how is there room for it in a place of the opposite sort; if from the quarters of Evil, it will not shut out its own (i. e. the Evil) which has set out from the same place. But, according to the Maniac (Mānī), God is through eternity seated carrying about mounds and little by little filling up certain depths. O the madness of the senseless one, to which it were ridiculous to reply at greater length » (Jackson 1938, p. 227).

19 « Zu all dem staune auch über jene (Lehre) von ihm (Mani), wo er sagt, daß Gott in der Zwischenzeit, während das Böse hier beschäftigt ist, die Tiefe, aus der die Hyle aufgetaucht war, mit einem χῶμα (Aufschüttung, Grabhügel) füllt, ohne in seinem Wahnsinn (die Schwierigkeit) einzusehen: wenn das, was man darauf wirft, aus der Erde des Guten wäre, wie findet es dann Platz im feindlichen Raum? Ist es aber aus den Teilen des Bösen, dann wird das Eigne die Hyle, die von hier aus aufbrach, nicht hindern (wieder aufzubrechen). Gott aber sitzt, nach jenem Wahnwitzigen, den ganzen (Äon) hindurch da, indem er Erdmaßen bewegen (läßt) und langsam irgendwelche Tiefen aufschüttet! » (Beck 1978, pp. 160–161). À noter qu'aussi bien Beck que Jackson traduisent le texte de de Lagarde (1859b, p. 25, ll. 24–33), qui n'a pas εἴτ'οὖν δεδεμένης (42.3), expression absente du manuscrit de Hambourg qu'il édite.

20 Éd. Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, p. 75, ll. 26–27, compte tenu des *Addenda et Corrigenda* inédits de W.-P. Funk.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 105, ll. 30–33.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

la Grande Guerre, ce sont les ténèbres (ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ) qui sont « enfermées dans la t[ombe (τάφος), (avec) leur mas]cu[linité] et leur féminité ».[22] Même si le terme τάφος n'y figure pas, le *Kephalaion* 40 (« Sur les trois choses qui ont été formées dans la lumière »[23]) aborde également le thème de l'emprisonnement du principe mauvais puisqu'il y est question du « cercueil (ou coffre) ténébreux qui est la prison de l'ennemi (ϯⲧⲉⲓⲃⲉ ⲛ̀ⲕⲉⲕⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̀ⲧⲁⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡϣⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲙⲡⲭⲁⲭⲉ) ».[24]

Dans les discours *À Hypatius* d'Éphrem[25], on relève plusieurs mentions de la tombe réservée au principe mauvais. Il y est en effet question de « la prison (ܒܝܬܐ ܕܚܫܘܟܐ, 2 *Hyp.* 3.21) construite pour les ténèbres », que, d'après Éphrem qui cite sa source (ܡܢܝ), les manichéens appellent la « tombe des ténèbres » (ܩܒܪܐ ܕܚܫܘܟܐ, 2 *Hyp.* 3.29, 34–35). La même expression revient vers la fin du deuxième discours (39.22). À la fin du troisième discours (90.17–18) et au début du quatrième (91.12 et 93.43–44), il est à nouveau fait mention d'une « tombe pour les ténèbres » (ܩܒܪܐ ܠܚܫܘܟܐ).[26]

La tombe destinée au résidu des ténèbres est également attestée dans les sources arabo-musulmanes. Il suffira de citer le témoignage d'an-Nadīm dans le *Fihrist* :

> [The Spirit of Darkness] will retreat to a tomb prepared for her and this tomb will be blocked with a rock the size of the world, which will barricade her in it, so that the light will be set free from anxiety due to the Darkness and its injury.[27]

Ainsi donc, le chapitre 42 du livre I du *Contre les manichéens*, en évoquant le thème de l'emprisonnement de la lumière et en le confirmant par deux citations de Mani (φησὶν, 42.2; κατὰ τὸν Μάνεντα = ܡܢܝ, 42.2, 3, 4 et 9), n'ajoute rien à ce que nous connaissons par les sources, qu'elles parlent de « tombe » (sources coptes, Éphrem, an-Nadīm) ou de « prison », comme, par exemple, Augustin, chez qui le terme *carcer* apparaît.[28] Il y a cependant trois points sur lesquels le témoignage de Titus de Bostra s'avère original. Le premier concerne la désignation du réceptacle eschatologique de la Matière irrécupérable, appelé βάθος (syr. ܥܡܩܐ), c'est-à-dire « profondeur » ou « abîme », au lieu de « prison » ou « tombe ». Le deuxième point vise la manière dont cet abîme est

22 *Sermon de la Grande Guerre* 41.6–7 (éd. Pedersen 2006).

23 Polotsky/Böhlig 1940, p. 104, ll. 22–23; titre traduit d'après les *Addenda et Corrigenda* de W.-P. Funk.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 105, ll. 11–12, là aussi en tenant compte des *Addenda et Corrigenda* de W.-P. Funk. Le terme ⲧⲉⲓⲃⲉ apparaît également en p. 104, l. 35, mais dans un contexte très lacuneux.

25 Éd. Mitchell 1912.

26 Sur ces passages, voir Beck 1978, pp. 164–165.

27 Éd. Flügel 1862, p. 58, trad. Dodge 1970, p. 783; cf. de Blois/Sims-Williams 2006, p. 69b, *s. v. qabrun*, où on trouvera signalées d'autres attestations de la tombe.

28 Voir notamment *De haeresibus* 49.19: *… in globo quodam, tamquam in carcere sempiterno …* (éd. Vander Plaetse/Beukers 1969, p. 319, ll. 200–220).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

fermé. Chez an-Nadīm, la tombe est obstruée par « une pierre de la dimension du monde », alors qu'Augustin se contente de mentionner que le *globus* aura « une sorte de couvercle *(coopertorium)* ou de revêtement *(tectorium)* formé d'âmes certes Bonnes par nature, mais qui ne pourraient cependant se purifier de la contagion de la nature mauvaise ».[29] En un autre endroit, Augustin ironise sur l'Atlas manichéen qui, après la conflagration finale, « ne peut parvenir jusqu'au couvercle supérieur (*catastolium* = καταστόλιον) de ce dernier globe ».[30] D'après Titus, qui prétend citer Mani, Dieu obstrue l'abîme par un apport continuel de « mottes – ou d'amoncellements – de terre » (χώματα, ܬܠܐ)[31], procédé dont Titus montre l'impossibilité si les mottes proviennent des parties du Mal (42.7, gr.), car le Mal ne saurait s'emprisonner lui-même, et l'inconvenance si elles proviennent de la terre du Bon, car celui-ci se retrouverait alors dans un lieu opposé à lui et, qui plus est, « Dieu se trouverait à punir sa propre nature » (41.5–6, gr.), hypothèse scandaleuse contre laquelle s'insurgeront aussi bien Augustin que Simplicius.[32]

Si ces deux points ne constituent, somme toute, qu'une variante d'éléments du mythe manichéen connus par ailleurs, le troisième, en revanche, ne semble pas être autrement attesté. Il s'agit de l'endroit où se situe le lieu de confinement de la Matière. Titus, ou plutôt Mani, affirme que, pendant que le Mal est « occupé ou emprisonné ici-bas » (ἐνταυθοῖ; d'après Jackson, il s'agit du βῶλος), « Dieu, dans l'intervalle, remplit l'abîme d'un amas de terre, d'où la Matière a levé la tête (ὅθεν ἀνέκυψεν ἡ ὕλη) » (42.3–4). Si l'on se fie à cette dernière précision, l'abîme serait situé là d'où la Matière a émergé ou relevé la tête, entendons au début, pour regarder vers la lumière et concevoir ainsi son agression contre la terre du Bon. Le verbe ἀνακύπτω, employé ici, décrit assez exactement le moment initial de l'assaut des ténèbres contre le royaume de la lumière, présenté comme

29 *De haeresibus* 49.19 (éd. Vander Plaetse/Beukers 1969, p. 320, ll. 203–204).

30 *Contra Faustum* 20.9 (éd. Zycha 1891, p. 546, ll. 6–7; trad. d'après Blaise 1954, p. 138a).

31 Le terme χῶμα désigne tout amas de terre, qu'il s'agisse de terrassement, notamment à des fins stratégiques, pour se défendre contre l'ennemi ou pour approcher une ville, ou encore une jetée ou un môle, toute élévation de terre naturelle ou artificielle, comme un tertre funéraire, mais aussi de la terre qu'on entasse au bord d'un trou où l'on fait une plantation (Bailly 1959, p. 2163ab). Absent du Nouveau Testament, le terme revient à plusieurs reprises dans la Septante, où il désigne une levée de terre (Ex 8.12–13), le tertre qui recouvre une ville incendiée (Jos 8.28); en Ha 1.10 et Ez 21.22, on trouve l'expression βάλλειν χῶμα, « faire (jeter) un terrassement (amoncellement) ». Dans le passage qui nous occupe, comme il est question de « déplacer » ou de « transporter » (μεταφέρων) des χώματα, nous comprenons qu'il s'agit de mottes ou de monceaux de terre destinées à couvrir ou à obstruer le trou où sont enfermées la Matière et les âmes damnées. Quant au syriaque ܬܠܐ (ou ܬܐ), *te(l)lā'*, il signifie un amoncellement de terre, une colline, un tumulus, un tertre ou ce que l'archéologie appelle un tell (Payne Smith 1879–1901, II, col. 4438; cf. Sokoloff 2009, p. 1646b).

32 *Contra Secundinum* 20 (éd. Zycha 1892, pp. 935–936), *Commentaire sur le* Manuel *d'Épictète* 35.49–55 (éd. Hadot 1996, p. 324, trad., *ibid*., p. 120).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

un « désir de gagner le lieu d'en-haut »[33] et comme le fait que « les membres de l'arbre de la mort » se rendirent « jusqu'aux frontières de la terre glorieuse de la lumière » et jetèrent sur elle « un regard insensé ».[34] En d'autres termes, l'abîme ou la fosse où sont reléguées la Matière et les âmes non purifiées ne serait autre que le royaume originel des ténèbres. Quoi qu'il en soit du sens à donner à ὅθεν ἀνέκυψεν, l'endroit où le *Contre les manichéens* situe le βῶλος évoque ce qu'indique d'autres sources, comme le fragment moyen-perse M 7981 I V i 15–ii 1, qui situe la prison infernale « au milieu » de l'édifice construit par le Dieu artisan du monde nouveau, dans la région méridionale, donc là où se trouvait le royaume des ténèbres.[35] De même, d'après les *Acta Archelai*, c'est « au milieu du nouvel éon (*inter medium novi saeculi* = μετα<ξὺ> τοῦ νέου αἰῶνος) » que sera abandonné le βῶλος (ainsi le grec; d'après le latin, il s'agit de l'âme), « afin que toutes les âmes des pécheurs soient enchaînées pour l'éternité ».[36]

À la lumière de la précision donnée par les *Acta* (*inter medium* = μεταξύ), on pourrait être tenté de comprendre le ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ de la citation manichéenne, en I, 42.3, dans un sens local plutôt que temporel. Le sens local (« au milieu ») est même premier pour μεταξύ et il est attesté aussi pour la forme avec préposition et article (ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ) que nous avons ici. Mais, pour traduire par « l'abîme qui se trouve au milieu » ou « dans l'entre-deux », on s'attendrait à une expression enclavée (τὸ ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ βάθος). Quoi qu'il en soit, la version syriaque interdit une interprétation locale puisqu'elle rend le grec dans un sens temporel (ܒܟܠܗ ܙܒܢܐ ܡܨܥܬܐ ܗܢܐ, « pendant tout ce temps médian »), et une telle interprétation est difficilement envisageable du point de vue du grec car l'expression ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ne veut pas dire « au milieu de quelque chose », mais « (qui se trouve) entre deux choses », « dans l'intervalle (de deux choses) »; on s'attendrait donc à une formulation comme « dans l'intervalle entre le monde inférieur et quelque chose d'autre ». Autrement dit, il manque un deuxième terme de comparaison. Il convient donc de conserver à ἐν τῷ μεταξύ sa valeur temporelle.

Relevons enfin une dernière précision qu'apporte le témoignage de Titus et qui semble bien être inédite. Elle concerne la durée de l'intervention du Dieu

33 Alexandre de Lycopolis, *Contre la doctrine de Mani* 3 (éd. Brinkmann 1895, p. 5, ll. 15–16, trad. Villey 1985, p. 59).

34 Sévère d'Antioche, *Homélie* 123 (éd. et trad. Kugener/Cumont 1912, pp. 123–125).

35 Éd. Andreas/Henning 1932, p. 184 (« nach der südlichen Weltgegend hin » [V I 22–23]); Boyce 1975, p. 66, texte y, l. 17; trad. Klimkeit 1993, p. 229; et Asmussen 1975, p. 125; cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2014, pp. 322 (citation n° 356), 329 (citation n° 413) et 336 (citation n° 463). Sur la localisation géographique des deux principes – le Royaume du Bien au nord, celui du Mal au sud –, voir Puech 1949, pp. 75–76 et notes 294 et 299, qui indique les sources, dont le *Contre les manichéens* I, 11.1–2 (… τὸ μεσημβρινὸν μέρος τῇ κακίᾳ διδόντες …).

36 *Acta Archelai* 13.1 (éd. Beeson 1906, p. 21; pour le grec, voir Holl/Dummer 1985, p. 70, ll. 2–3).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bon en vue d'obstruer l'abîme et d'empêcher une résurgence de la Matière. La source citée par Titus affirme en effet que Dieu « reste assis » (κάθηται, 42.9–10), sans doute tout juste à côté de l'ouverture de l'abîme, à transporter des mottes ou des monceaux de terre δι'αἰῶνος, « pendant l'éternité » ou « pour toute la durée du temps », pour réussir ainsi à « couvrir d'un amas de terre » (προσχωννύων) « petit à petit » (κατὰ βραχὺ; ܚܠܠܐ ܡܠܠ) « quelque abîme » (ou « l'abîme » d'après le syriaque). Il en résulte une mise en scène étonnante et même incongrue – car comment Dieu peut-il à la fois rester assis et transporter les mottes de terre? – au point qu'on se demande si ce que Titus avance comme une citation de Mani n'est pas tout simplement une élaboration de son cru destinée à montrer le ridicule de la doctrine de Mani. Cependant, si l'on considère le caractère graphique et dramatique du mythe manichéen, on hésitera à accuser Titus de falsification. La finale du livre I illustre en tout cas la manière de procéder de Titus dans sa réfutation du manichéisme : tout en se faisant fort de ramener le mythe manichéen à ses présupposés philosophiques et théologiques pour montrer l'impossibilité logique de la thèse des deux principes subsistants et coéternels, la nécessité du libre arbitre et l'harmonie de l'univers, il ne se prive jamais de rapporter les épisodes les plus susceptibles à ses yeux de jeter le discrédit et le ridicule sur la doctrine de « Mani le fou », ainsi qu'il se plaît à l'appeler en reprenant le jeu de mot bien connu, comme l'explication de l'origine de la pluie par la sueur des archontes (en II, 56) ou la thèse de l'âme des pierres et des animaux (II, 60–62).

Les deux citations manichéennes par lesquelles Titus conclut le premier livre de sa monumentale réfutation montrent bien que, dans l'eschatologie manichéenne, la victoire de la lumière est en fin de compte une victoire imparfaite puisque, d'un côté, une partie de la nature du Dieu Bon restera prisonnière de la Matière et que, d'autre côté, celui-ci sera éternellement occupé à prévenir un nouvel assaut de la Ténèbre. Titus anticipe ainsi la conclusion à laquelle arrive Augustin quand il interpelle les manichéens :

> Mais quelle est la fin [de votre doctrine]? Quelle est-elle sinon que Dieu n'a pas pu purifier tout le divin? Et vous dites qu'ayant échoué, il doit faire comme une sorte de couvercle à la nation des ténèbres pour que soit à tout jamais puni là ce qui n'a pu être purifié et n'a commis aucun Mal volontaire.[37]

On rejoint ainsi, en partie du moins, l'enseignement original de Mani, tel qu'il s'exprime dans le *Šābuhragān*[38], ainsi que l'a noté Werner Sundermann dans sa remarquable synthèse de l'eschatologie manichéenne.[39]

37 *Contra Felicem* 2.7 (éd. Zycha 1892, p. 835, ll. 9–13, trad. Jolivet/Jourjon 1961, p. 717).
38 En particulier aux lignes 313–360 (éd. MacKenzie 1979, pp. 516–519).
39 Sundermann 1998, pp. 572b–573a. J'adresse mes remerciements à Michel Tardieu, Wolf-Peter Funk et Thomas S. Schmidt pour les remarques qu'ils m'ont faites.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliographie

Adam, A. 1954 : *Texte zum Manichäismus*. Berlin (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 175).

Andreas, F.C./W.B. Henning 1932 : « Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I. » Dans : *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 1932, pp. 173–222.

Asmussen, J.P. 1975 : *Manichaean Literature. Representative Texts, chiefly from the Middle Persian and Parthian Writings*. Delmar/New York (Persian Heritage Series 22).

Bailly, A. 1959 : *Dictionnaire grec français*. Édition revue par L. Séchan et P. Chantraine. Paris.

Beck, E. 1978 : *Ephräms Polemik gegen Mani und die Manichäer im Rahmen der zeitgenössischen griechischen Polemik und der des Augustinus*. Louvain (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 391, Subsidia 55).

Beeson, C.H. 1906 : *Hegemonius: Acta Archelai*. Leipzig (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 16).

Blaise, A. 1954 : *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens.* Revu spécialement pour le vocabulaire théologique par H. Chirat. Strasbourg.

de Blois, F./N. Sims-Williams 2006 : *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. II : *Texts from Iraq and Iran (Texts in Syriac, Arabic, Persian and Zoroastrian Middle Persian).* Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 4).

Boyce, M. 1975 : *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes*. Téhéran/Liège/Leiden (Acta Iranica 9).

Brinkmann, A. 1895 : *Alexandri Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio*. Leipzig.

Clackson, S./E.C.D. Hunter/S.N.C. Lieu 1998 : *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. I : *Texts from the Roman Empire (Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin).* Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 2).

Dodge, B. 1970 : *The Fihrist of al-Nadim. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. New York (Records of Civilisation, Sources and Studies 83).

Dubois, J.-D./P.-H. Poirier 2012 : « "Le Christ est le cinquième élément" (Titus de Bostra, Contra Manichaeos IV, 116). Notes de christologie manichéenne. » Dans : M. Knüppel/L. Cirillo (éds.): *Gnostica et Manichaica. Festschrift für Aloïs van Tongerloo. Anläßlich des 60. Geburtstages überreicht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 65), pp. 39–46.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2014 : *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Partisch und Mittelpersisch).* Vienne (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse 850; Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik 28).

Flügel, G. 1862 : *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*. Leipzig.

Hadot, I. 1996 : *Simplicius. Commentaire sur le Manuel d'Épictète. Introduction et édition critique du texte grec*. Leiden/New York/Köln (Philosophia Antiqua 66).

Holl, K./J. Dummer 1985 : *Epiphanius.* Vol. III : *Panarion haer. 65–80. De fide*. Berlin (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 37).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Jackson, A.V.W. 1938 : « The Doctrine of Bolos in Manichaean Eschatology. » Dans : *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 58, pp. 225–234.

Jolivet, R./M. Jourjon 1961 : *Œuvres de saint Augustin, 17. Deuxième série : Dieu et son œuvre. Six traités anti-manichéens.* Paris.

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1993 : *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco.

Kugener, M.-A./F. Cumont 1912 : *Recherches sur le manichéisme.* II : *Extrait de la 123e homélie de Sévère d'Antioche*. III : *L'inscription de Salone*. Bruxelles.

de Lagarde, P. 1859a : *Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos libri quatuor syriace*. Berlin.

— 1859b : *Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice hamburgensi servata sunt graece e recognitione Pauli Antonii de Lagarde*. Berlin.

Liddell, H.G./R. Scott 1996: *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Revised and augmented throughout by Sir H.S. Jones, with the assistance of R. McKenzie. With a Revised Supplement. Oxford/New York.

Lieu, S.N.C. (éd.) 2010 : *Greek and Latin Sources on Manichaean Cosmogony and Ethics*. Translated by G. Fox and J. Sheldon, introduction and commentary by S.N.C. Lieu. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 6).

MacKenzie, D.N. 1979 : « Mani's Šābuhragān. » Dans : *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42, pp. 500–534.

Mitchell, C.W. 1912 : *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan Transcribed from the Palimpsest B.M. Add. 14623*. T. I : *The Discourses Addressed to Hypatius*. Londres/Oxford.

Payne Smith, R. 1879–1901 : *Thesaurus syriacus*. 2 vols. Oxford.

Pedersen, N.A. 2004 : *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God. A Study of Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeos. The Work's Sources, Aims and Relation to its Contemporary Theology*. Leiden/Boston (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 56).

— 2006 (éd.) : *Manichaean Homelies. With a number of hitherto unpublished fragments*. (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Coptica 2, The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library). Turnhout.

Poirier, P.-H. 2009 : « L'identification des citations et matériaux manichéens dans le *Contra manichaeos* de Titus de Bostra. Quelques considérations méthodologiques. » Dans : *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,* 153e année, N. 4, pp. 1657–1688.

Polotsky, H.J./A. Böhlig 1940 : *Kephalaia. 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)*. Stuttgart (Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin 1).

Puech, H.-C. 1949 : *Le manichéisme. Son fondateur – sa doctrine*. Paris (Publications du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de diffusion 56).

Richardson, E.C. 1896 : *Hieronymus, Liber de viris inlustribus. Gennadius, Liber de viris inlustribus*. Leipzig (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 14/1).

Roman, A./P.-H. Poirier/ É. Crégheur/J. Declerck 2013 : *Titi Bostrensis Contra Manichaeos libri IV, Graece et Syriace*. Turnhout (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 82).

Roman, A./T.S. Schmidt/P.-H. Poirier 2015 : *Titus de Bostra. Contre les Manichéens*. Turnhout (Corpus Christianorum in Translation 21).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sokoloff, M. 2009 : *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, IN/Piscataway, NJ.

Sundermann, W. 1998 : « Manichaean Eschatology. » Dans : E. Yarshater (éd.) : *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. VIII. Costa Mesa, pp. 569–575.

Vander Plaetse, R./C. Beukers 1969 : « De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum liber unus. » Dans : M. P. J. van den Hout *et al.* (éds.) : *Sancti Aurelii Augustinii : De fide rerum invisibilium; Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate; De catechizandis rudibus; Sermo ad catechumenos de symbolo. Sermo de disciplina christiana; De utilitate ieiunii; Sermo de excidio urbis Romae; De haeresibus*. Turnhout (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 46; Aurelii Augustinii Opera, Pars 13/2), pp. 283–342.

Villey, A. 1985 : *Alexandre de Lycopolis. Contre la doctrine de Mani*. Paris (Sources gnostiques et manichéennes 2).

Zycha, J. (éd.) 1891 : *Sancti Aurelii Augustini: De utilitate credendi; De duabus animabus; Contra Fortunatum; Contra Adimantum; Contra Epistulam Fundamenti; Contra Faustum*. Vienne (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 25 [VI/I]).

— 1892 (éd.) : *Sancti Aurelii Augustini: Contra Felicem; De natura Boni; Epistula Secundini; Contra Secundinum; accedunt Euodii De fide contra Manichaeos et Commonitorium Augustini quod fertur*. Vienne (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 25 [VI/2]).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Literary Motifs in the Sogdian "Job Story"

Elio Provasi, Pisa

خانهٔ دوست کجاست؟
در فلق بود که پرسید سوار
آسمان مکثي کرد
(سهراب سپهري)

In the literary production of Eastern Manichaeism, parables *(āzend)*, which accompanied and illustrated the exposition of doctrine, constituted an important means of catechesis, designated mainly for Hearers.[1] To this well-attested type of text Werner Sundermann has dedicated a significant part of his scholarly activity.[2]

Manichaean parables, or tales, in Sogdian were first made known by Henning (1945). Among the texts he published, the fragment to which he gave the title "A Job Story" is of particular interest. The fragment (T II D), written on the verso of a Chinese scroll, now bears the new signature Ch/So 13400.[3] In 1984, Yutaka Yoshida announced the discovery of photographs of two joining fragments from the same scroll,[4] which immediately precede, without a break, the story published by Henning. Subsequently, he published the fragments with a

1 This narrative genre is known mainly through Iranian and Turkish texts, but parables (παραβολή) are cited also, among other kinds of texts, in *Kephalaion* CLIV, cf. Schmidt/Polotsky 1933, p. 42, 86.1–6. On Iranian Manichaean literature, cf. Sundermann 1984 and 2009. On Manichaean Turkish tales, cf. Bang 1931.

2 Cf., for example, Sundermann 1973, 1985, 1991 and 1995.

3 Judging from its old signature, it was apparently found or acquired in Qocho (Dakianus-Shahr) during the second Prussian expedition (September 1904–December 1905). However, according to Reck (2006, p. 76), the signature could be also read as T III D, hence it cannot be excluded that the fragment belongs to the finds of the third expedition (December 1905–June 1907), which worked briefly in Qočo but mainly in Murtuk and other sites (cf. Boyce 1960, pp. xviii–xx).

4 These are the so-called Kyodai fragments. The two photographs are housed in Kyoto University, Department of Oriental History. The present whereabouts of the fragments are uncertain (but cf. Reck 2006, pp. 76–77, n. 4). It is probable that also the Kyodai fragments were acquired in Qocho, either by the Otani expeditions or in some other way. The Japanese expeditions worked in Chinese Turkestan, including Turfan, in 1902–1904, 1908–1909 and 1910–1914; on the Japanese expeditions, see Kudara 1999.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

translation and full commentary.[5] The interest of this text lies not only in the obvious parallels with the biblical *Book of Job* (further Job), which prompted Henning to give it the title "A Job Story", but also in the way various Manichaean concepts are interwoven into it. First, I will give here a continuous translation of the combined fragments,[6] followed by a comparison with the biblical text.

Translation

(1) [...] and they shall come to nought. Just as for the risen sun (2) [the sunset is close by], and, alongside the bright day, the dark night (3) is imminent, and the arrow which has been shot is bound to stop, and the ripe (4) [fruit] is destined to shrivel and drop, and the clay vessel (5) is ready to be [smashed], thus for all living beings death is forthcoming. (6) [... And] altogether[7] those giants, those kings, rulers (7) [and] sovereigns and also other people of many kinds who ruled in this (8) world did not become immortal, but at the end, on the day of (their) death, (9) they acquired a [...] soul (for) all the people because of (their) good deeds and meritorious acts. (10) And as for the one who was blessed and (11) [...] detached (himself) from the worldly good, (12) [he acquired] eternal bliss and [reached] the everlasting good, (13) the fragrant paradise. However, the one who did not [...] (14) and was not confident [in ... and indulged in(?)] carnal (15) [pleasures and] various kinds of heresy (16) and deception, at the end they left here (all of it). And they departed against their will, (17) resignedly, and they could not fight death, (18) but they died and were destroyed. Now then, as for that (19) sinner and unbeliever who does not [perform] good actions (20) and does not believe in charity because (21) [he ... and] regards himself as immortal, either he should dare to declare so (22) in his mind: "(things) will always prosper for me here", or else (23) he should bear gratitude to whomever granted (him) these useless things.

5 Yoshida 1994.

6 An English translation accompanies Henning's edition of Ch/So 13400 (1945, pp. 486–487), and a Japanese translation of the Kyodai fragments is given in Yoshida's edition (1994, p. 21). An Italian translation of the whole text was published in Provasi 2008, pp. 130–132 (text), 387–389 (commentary). The present translation is based on the published texts and on the photographs, taking into account the integrations by Yoshida (/1/ *[tx'yz pcp'n]*; /4/ *[βr'k]*; /5/ *[ptšk'β]*; /42/ *[yw']r*) and the corrections by Reck (2006, p. 77, which in a few cases confirms Henning's readings) and by Sims-Williams/Durkin-Meisterernst (2012, s.v. *''frywncyk*, *'nγ'δcyk*, *'wyn*, *'M*, *βrxs-*, *c'nw*, *jmnw*, *kwn-*, *mrtxmy*, *n'-'sp'xšt*, *prw*, *-š*, *¹x'*, *xw*, *¹yw'r*). I use a continuous line-numbering, whereby the first line of Ch/So 13400 (line 1 in the edition, line 2 in Reck 2006) becomes line 28 of the joined text, and so on. The first line of Ch/So 13400, not counted by Henning, preserves traces of the bottoms of letters which complete line 27 of the Kyodai fragment. The line numbering of the translation follows, as far as possible, that of the Sogdian text.

7 The text has *(')ywp't* "at one time, once (only)", but cf. Chr. Sogd. *ywp'tqy* "altogether" (Gershevitch 1948, p. 64; Sims-Williams 1985, p. 163).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(24) As much as he may accomplish, he does not get any satisfaction at all (from it). A perishable and (25) utterly ephemeral (thing) is (even) a good gift (like) the beloved sons, since (26) they will be taken back from him. He will be deprived of (his) beloved ones, friends and (27) relatives, like travellers and merchants who for a short (28) time dwell and gather under the same roof but afterwards they separate, (29) each one from the others, so that they do not see each other easily. (30) [And] if a man toils with much effort and, with a lot of labour, acquires (31) a great substance and wealth, becomes rich and sets up (32) a house and a great household and marries many wives, (who) (33) bear (him) many sons and daughters, and he gives brides to (his) (34) sons, and bridegrooms to (his) daughters, and he makes a great wedding-feast, (35) (then) many people defer to him on account of (his) superior authority, (36) (his) happy life, (his) great house, (his) household, (his) ample (37) wealth and affluence, (his) many sons and daughters, (38) (his) sons-in-law and grandsons, (his) numerous maids and servants, (39) (his) cattle, (his) great prosperity and good equipment, and they (40) mention him with blessings and praise in the whole city and among (41) people. But thereupon, eventually, (42) [he becomes separated] from his sons, daughters, sons-in-law and grandsons, (43) and then they begin to die. (People) (44) defer to (a person) to whom children have been born and who has not been separated (45) from them. And the moment arrives when he is stricken with poverty and indigence. (46) He becomes destitute and in need of everything. He does not (47) find assistants nor helpers. He becomes forsaken and lonely. He (48) remains without service and does not find any servant. At that moment, even the baker (49) himself [refuses him(?)] bread, he drinks (only) cow's milk, he lies down (50) in the shadow of a tree and shows deference to […] poor men and to maids […].

Parallels with the *Book of Job*[8]

(1) Even the natural phenomena of this world are destined to end (text, 1–4); cf. Job 7:9: "As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away: so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more."[9]; Job 8:11–12: "Can the rush grow up without mire? Can the flag grow without water? (12) Whilst it is yet in his greenness, and not cut down, it withereth before any other herb."[10]; Job 14:2:

8 The Biblical quotations in the text are from the King James version; I give in the notes the relevant passages in the Peshitta (P), Septuagint (S) (for the OT) and Novum Testamentum Graece (NTG), ed. Nestle/Aland (for the NT).

9 (P) *ʾyk dṡypʾ ʿnnʾ wʾżlʾ. hkn ʾmn dṅḥt lšywl lʾ ṡlq*. (S) ὥσπερ νέφος ἀποκαθαρθὲν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. ἐὰν γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καταβῇ εἰς ᾅδην, οὐκέτι μὴ ἀναβῇ.

10 (P) *dlmʾ ṡgʾ ʾgmʾ bʾtrʾ ṣḥyʾ. ʾw ẏʿʾ ʾrbnʾ ʾykʾ dlyt m̈yʾ*. (12) *dʿd hw bʾbh lʾ mtqṭp. wqdm kwl ʿmyr ẏbš*. (S) μὴ θάλλει πάπυρος ἄνευ ὕδατος ἢ ὑψωθήσεται βούτομον ἄνευ πότου; (12) ἔτι ὂν ἐπὶ ῥίζης καὶ οὐ μὴ θερισθῇ, πρὸ τοῦ πιεῖν πᾶσα βοτάνη οὐχὶ ξηραίνεται.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

"He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not."[11]

(2) The rulers of the world, like all human beings, will be destroyed at the end (text, 6–8, 16–18); cf. Job 3:13–15: "For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept: then had I been at rest, (14) With kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves; (15) Or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver."[12]; Job 4:19–21: "How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth? (20) They are destroyed from morning to evening: they perish for ever without any regarding it. (21) Doth not their excellency which is in them go away? They die, even without wisdom."[13]; Job 34:20: "In a moment shall they die, and the people shall be troubled at midnight, and pass away: and the mighty shall be taken away without hand."[14]

(3) Social and familiar bonds are ephemeral; the seemingly prosperous man will be deprived of relatives and friends (text, 26–27); cf. Job 19:13–14: "He hath put my brethren far from me, and mine acquaintance are verily estranged from me.(14) My kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar friends have forgotten me."[15]

(4) He acquires wealth, sons and daughters (text, 30–33); cf. Job 1:2–3: "And there were born unto him seven sons and three daughters. (3) His substance also was seven thousand sheep, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she asses, and a very great household; so that this man was the greatest of all the men of the east."[16]

11 (P) *wʾyk ʿwpyʾ ṅpq wẏbš wḥṁʾ. wʿr̈q ʾyk ṭllʾ wlʾ q̇ʾm.* (S) ἢ ὥσπερ ἄνθος ἀνθῆσαν ἐξέπεσεν, ἀπέδρα δὲ ὥσπερ σκιὰ καὶ οὐ μὴ στῇ.

12 (P) *kbr dyn hšʾ škyb hwyt wšlʾ. wdmyk hwyt wnyḥ.* (14) *ʿm m̈lkʾ wšlÿṭnʾ dʾrʿʾ dbn̈ÿn lhwn ḥr̈bẗʾ.* (15) *ʾw ʿm šlÿṭnʾ ddhbʾ ʾyt lhwn. wmlyn bẗyḥwn kspʾ.* (S) νῦν ἂν κοιμηθεὶς ἡσύχασα, ὑπνώσας δὲ ἀνεπαυσάμην (14) μετὰ βασιλέων βουλευτῶν γῆς, οἳ ἠγαυριῶντο ἐπὶ ξίφεσιν, (15) ἢ μετὰ ἀρχόντων, ὧν πολὺς ὁ χρυσός, οἳ ἔπλησαν τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν ἀργυρίου.

13 (P) *ʾp ʾylyn dšryn bẗʾ dṭynʾ dbʿprʾ mškllyn. ntmkkwn qdm ʿrplʾ.* (20) *mn ṣprʾ lrmšʾ ntmkkwn. dlʾ nttsymwn ʿmẅrÿn lʿlm wnʾbdwn.* (21) *hʾ šql ywrtnẗwn mnhwn. wšrkhwn bhwn nmwtwn wlʾ bḥkmtʾ.* (S) τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας πηλίνας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἐσμεν, ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον· (20) καὶ ἀπὸ πρωίθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας οὐκέτι εἰσίν, παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῆσαι ἀπώλοντο· (21) ἐνεφύσησεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν, ἀπώλοντο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς σοφίαν.

14 (P) *mn tḥyt šlyʾ mytyn. wbplgh dllyʾ sypyn wʾbdyn. wmštwdʿyn lḥsynʾ lʾ bḥylʾ.* (S) κενὰ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀποβήσεται τὸ κεκραγέναι καὶ δεῖσθαι ἀνδρός· ἐχρήσαντο γὰρ παρανόμως ἐκκλινομένων ἀδυνάτων.

15 (P) *ʾḫy ʾrḥqw mny. wydʿÿ ʿbrw.* (14) *psqw qr̈yby mn lwty. wydʿÿ ʾtnšywny.* (S) ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ δὲ ἀδελφοί μου ἀπέστησαν, ἔγνωσαν ἀλλοτρίους ἢ ἐμέ· φίλοι δέ μου ἀνελεήμονες γεγόνασιν. (14) οὐ προσεποιήσαντό με οἱ ἐγγύτατοί μου, καὶ οἱ εἰδότες μου τὸ ὄνομα ἐπελάθοντό μου.

16 (P) *wʾtyldw lh šbʿʾ bnÿn wtlt bn̈n.* (3) *whwʾ qnynh šbʿʾ ʾlp̈yn ʿnʾ. wtltʾ ʾlp̈yn gm̈lʾ. wḥmšmʾʾ pdnÿn dtwr̈ʾ. wḥmšmʾʾ ʾïnyn. wʿbdtʾ swgʾʾ dṭb. wgbrʾ hw rb hwʾ mn klhwn bn̈y mdnḥʾ.*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(5) He makes a great wedding-feast for his sons (text, 34); in the biblical text, the banquet is held in turn by the sons, cf. Job 1:4: "And his sons went and feasted in their houses, every one his day; and sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to drink with them."[17]

(6) People regard him with respect because of his social status (text, 35–41); cf. Job 11:19: "Also thou shalt lie down, and none shall make thee afraid; yea, many shall make suit unto thee."[18]

(7) However, his sons soon die (text, 41–43); the reason is not given in the text, but cf. Job 1:18–19: "While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and said, Thy sons and thy daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house: (19) And, behold, there came a great wind from the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon the young men, and they are dead."[19]

(8) Afterwards, people's deference is withdrawn from him (as implied by the text, 43–45); cf. Job 30:9–10: "And now am I their song, yea, I am their byword. (10) They abhor me, they flee far from me, and spare not to spit in my face."[20]

(9) He is deprived of servants, and in his turn he must show deference to them (text, 46–50); cf. Job 19:15–16: "They that dwell in mine house, and my maids, count me for a stranger: I am an alien in their sight. (16) I called my servant, and he gave me no answer; I entreated him with my mouth."[21]

(S) ἐγένοντο δὲ αὐτῷ υἱοὶ ἑπτὰ καὶ θυγατέρες τρεῖς. (3) καὶ ἦν τὰ κτήνη αὐτοῦ πρόβατα ἑπτακισχίλια, κάμηλοι τρισχίλιαι, ζεύγη βοῶν πεντακόσια, ὄνοι θήλειαι νομάδες πεντακόσιαι, καὶ ὑπηρεσία πολλὴ σφόδρα καὶ ἔργα μεγάλα ἦν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος εὐγενὴς τῶν ἀφ᾽ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν.

17 (P) *wʾzlyn hww bn̈why. wʿbdyn mšty ʾ byt gbr dywmh. wmšdryn hww wqryn ltlt ʾ ̣wthwn. lmʾkl wlmšt ʾ ʿmhwn.* (S) συμπορευόμενοι δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐποιοῦσαν πότον καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν συμπαραλαμβάνοντες ἅμα καὶ τὰς τρεῖς ἀδελφὰς αὐτῶν ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν.

18 (P) *wlyt dmʿyr lk. nbʿwn ʾp̈yk s̈gyʾ.* (S) ἡσυχάσεις γάρ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ πολεμῶν σε· μεταβαλόμενοι δὲ πολλοί σου δεηθήσονται.

19 (P) *wʿd hw mmll ʾt ʾ ʾ ̣rnʾ wʾmr lh. bnÿk wbn̈tk ʾklyn hww wštyn byt ʾ ̣whwn qšyšʾ.* (19) *whʾ rwʾ̣ tqypt ʾ ʾtt mn ʿbr̈ʾ dmdbrʾ. wʾt̤tryt bʾr̈bʿ zwÿth dbytʾ. wnpl ʿl t̤lÿʾ wmytw.* (S) Ἔτι τούτου λαλοῦντος ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἔρχεται λέγων τῷ Ιωβ Τῶν υἱῶν σου καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων σου ἐσθιόντων καὶ πινόντων παρὰ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῶν τῶν πρεσβυτέρῳ (19) ἐξαίφνης πνεῦμα μέγα ἐπῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ ἥψατο τῶν τεσσάρων γωνιῶν τῆς οἰκίας, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἡ οἰκία ἐπὶ τὰ παιδία σου, καὶ ἐτελεύτησαν·

20 (P) *whšʾ rnyhwn hwyt. whwyt lhwn ltmhʾ.* (10) *ʾslywny wʾtrḥqw mny. wmn ʾp̈y lʾ ḥskw rwqʾ.* (S) νυνὶ δὲ κιθάρα ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμὲ θρύλημα ἔχουσιν· (10) ἐβδελύξαντο δέ με ἀποστάντες μακράν, ἀπὸ δὲ προσώπου μου οὐκ ἐφείσαντο πτύελον.

21 (P) *tẅtby byty wʾm̈hty ʾyk nwkryʾ ḥšbwny. wnwkry hwyt bʿÿnyhwn.* (16) *lʿbdy qryt wlʾ ʿnny. wʾtkšpt lh bm̈ly pwmy. wʾtḥnnt lh.* (S) γείτονες οἰκίας θεράπαιναί τέ μου, ἀλλογενὴς ἤμην ἐναντίον αὐτῶν. (16) θεράποντά μου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν· στόμα δέ μου ἐδέετο.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(10) He becomes utterly destitute (text, 45–47); cf. Job 20:10: "His children shall seek to please the poor, and his hands shall restore their goods."[22]; Job 15:29: "He shall not be rich, neither shall his substance continue, neither shall he prolong the perfection thereof upon the earth."[23]; Job 18:19: "He shall neither have son nor nephew among his people, nor any remaining in his dwellings."[24]

(11) He even lacks his daily bread (text, 48–49); while in the text this is ascribed to poverty, in the Biblical text it is a consequence of Job's illness, cf. Job 33:20: "So that his life abhorreth bread, and his soul dainty meat."[25]

Although sharing significant narrative details with the biblical story, the underlying structure of the text is unmistakably Manichaean, as shown by the presence of typical Manichaean themes and phraseology, such as the detachment from worldly interests,[26] the involvement in fleshly pleasures,[27] heresy and deceit,[28] the neglect of good actions and alms,[29] the fragrant paradise[30] as a destination for the blessed *(prnxwnty)*.

In his two articles on the Kyodai fragments, Yoshida pointed out[31] a remarkable similarity between lines 26–29 and a stanza of the Chinese Manichaean

22 (P) *ḃnwhy nttbrwn bmsknwt'. w'ÿdwhy nwšṯn byldh.* (S) τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ὀλέσαισαν ἥττονες, αἱ δὲ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ πυρσεύσαισαν ὀδύνας.

23 (P) *l' nktr wl' nqwm ḥylh. wl' nrm' m̈l' 'l 'r'.* (S) οὔτε μὴ πλουτισθῇ, οὔτε μὴ μείνῃ αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα· οὐ μὴ βάλῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν σκιὰν.

24 (P) *l' šm lh wl' dwkrn b'm'. wl' nhw' lh sryd' bm'mrh.* (S) οὐκ ἔσται ἐπίγνωστος ἐν λαῷ αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ σεσῳσμένος ἐν τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ ζήσονται ἕτεροι.

25 (P) *ngmr bsrh mn dḥlth. wnpšh l' nsb' lḥm'. wnpšh m'kwlt' trg.* (S) πᾶν δὲ βρωτὸν σίτου οὐ μὴ δύνηται προσδέξασθαι καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ βρῶσιν ἐπιθυμήσει.

26 Line 11: *(c)nn 'βc'mpδ'yk šyr'kk yxwst[y].*

27 Lines 14–15: *tnp'rmync [š't'wxy'kh]*; cf. note 60 below.

28 Lines 15–16: *''y'mpnwh ZY βn's*; cf. Copt. *ñdogma ñtplanē* "the sects (δόγμα) of error (πλάνη)", both in the Psalms (Allberry 1938, pp. 26.17, 86.14) and the Kephalaia (Böhlig/Polotsky 1940, pp. 33.30, 95.28, 160.14 [*m̄planos*]). Cf. also Parth. *dēnān*, Sogd. *''y-βt'kw δy-n[y]kth* in §94 of the Treatise on the Light-Nous (Sundermann 1992, p. 74).

29 Lines 19–20: *ZKw šyr'krtyh L' [kwnty] rtxw L' ZKh rw'nymynch 'rkh wrnty.* The expression *rwānemēnč arḵ* "charity, alms" (lit. "work for the soul") correspond to MPers. *ruwānēn kirdagān*, attested once in a hymn for a church leader (M 74 /I/v/13/, Müller 1904, p. 76; the standard Parth./MPers. term is *ruwānagān*, used also in Sogdian). The whole phrase in /19–20/ has a parallel in a Turkish text on the conversion of Bügü Xan: *özütlüg iškä ädgü kılınčka katıglantılar* "they strived for soul-work and good deeds" (U 72 [= TM 276b] /v/14–15/, Bang/von Gabain 1929, p. 418).

30 Line 13: *βwδ'nty wštm'x.* Cf. Ch/So 14731 [+ other fragments] /v/23/ (Reck 2003, p. 337) and Ch/So 15000(5) /55/ (Sundermann 1985, p. 23). For further references on the "fragrance" of divine essence, cf. Provasi 2008, p. 383, n. 52.

31 Yoshida 1984, p. 990; 1994, pp. 26–27, 31, n. 36.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Hymn scroll, from the "Lament on impermanence" (歎无常文 *tàn wúcháng wén*) (H. 83–119)[32], attributed to Mār Sīsīn (末思信 *Mò Sìxìn*):[33]

> 世諦暫時諸親眷 豈殊客館而寄住 暮則眾人共止宿 旦則分離歸本土
> *hìdì zànshí zhū qīnjuàn / qǐ shū kèguǎn ér jìzhù / mù zé zhòngrén gòng zhǐsù / dàn zé fēnlí guī běntǔ*
> "the wordly truth[34] of transitory family relationships, / how is it different from temporarily residing in a guesthouse? / In the evening, many people stay there for the night; / in the morning, they separate and go to their homeland."[35]

Where the Sogdian text has the adjective *ʾʾwxʾnʾy* (in the pl.) "having the same house, living under the same roof"[36], the Chinese text has more specifically 客館 *kèguǎn* "guesthouse, inn". This word is widely used in Old Chinese literature,[37] but in this context it acquires a distinctively Manichaean flavour. Within the

32 TT no. 2140, vol. 54.1270b22–1279c10; Lin 1997, pp. 292–295; English translation in Tsui Chi 1943, pp. 183–186; German translation in Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, pp. 21–25. In the Chinese hymn in question one can find other similarities with phrases of the *Book of Job*, e.g. 88cd: 如雲涌起四山頭 聚以風吹速散罷 *rú yúnyǒng qǐ sì shāntóu / jù yǐ fēng chuī sù sàn bà* "like a mass of clouds arising everywhere from mountain tops, gathered by the winds and then quickly dispersed" (Lin 1997, p. 293), cf. Job 7:9 quoted above; 89cd: 如春花葉暫榮柯 豈得堅牢恒青翠 *rú chūn huā yè zàn róng kē / qǐ dé jiānláo héng qīngcuì* "like spring flowers and leaves, which temporarily adorn the stem, how can they remain always strong and verdant?" (Lin 1997, p. 293), cf. Job 8:11–12 and Job 14:2 quoted above.

33 Stanza 102: TT no. 2140, vol. 54.1272c16; Lin 1997, p. 294.

34 Here 世諦 *shìdì* "worldly truth" exemplifies the application of the interpretatio manichaica to a Buddhist concept, that of conventional reality *(saṃvṛti-satya)* as opposed to the transcendental, ultimate truth *(paramārtha-satya)*, as developed originally in the Mādhyamika school, and exemplified primarily by Nāgārjuna in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 24.8: *dve satye samupāśritya buddhānāṃ dharmadeśanā / lokasaṃvṛtisatyam ca satyaṃ ca paramārthataḥ* (de la Vallée Poussin 1913, p. 492); Chinese translation by Kumārajīva: 諸佛依二諦 為眾生說法 一以世俗諦 二第一義諦 *zhū fó yī èr dì / wèi zhòngshēng shuō fǎ / yī yǐ shìsú dì / èr dìyī yìdì* "The Dharma taught by Buddhas relies on two truths: the worldly conventional truth and the supreme truth" (*Zhōnglùn* 中論, TT no. 1564, vol. 30.32c16–17).

35 "Homeland" is probably an allusion to the Kingdom of Light, where the light particles will return after having temporarily gathered in the "inn" of the material world.

36 The word occurs also in Manichaean script as *ʾʾwxʾnyy* in M 549i + M 1760 /r/8/ (cf. Gershevitch 1945 [1946], p. 144, and 1954, § 351), where it refers to the lunar mansions (cf. also Boyce 1960, p. 78).

37 The word 客館 *kèguǎn* is well attested with its primary meaning "hall for guests" in classical Chinese, especially in historical texts, e.g. *Chūnqiū Zuǒzhuàn* 春秋左傳 V.33.2 (4th cent. BCE); *Guóyǔ* 國語 IV.8(106) (4th cent. BCE); *Yántiělùn* 鹽鐵論 VI.2(30).3 (3rd–2nd cent. BCE); *Hànshū* 漢書 IV.28.18, 20 (1st–2nd cent. CE); *Qiánhàn jì* 前漢紀 12.7 (2nd cent. CE); *Xījīng zájì* 西京雜記 3.8, 4.5, 12 (4th cent. CE); *Shìshuō xīnyǔ* 世說新語 25.58 (5th cent. CE). In a Buddhist text, Xuánzàng's translation of the **Nyāyānusāraśāstra* (阿毘達磨順正理論 *Āpídámó shùnzhènglǐ lùn*, TT no. 1562, vol. 29), a passage is found where, in the Buddha's words, there is possibly a comparison of the world to a hostel:

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

framework of the typical equivalence between macrocosm and microcosm, it probably alludes to the "foreign" nature of light in the material world on one plane and of the individual light particles in the human body on the other. In another verse of the Hymn scroll (H. 260a), the human souls are described as "wandering guests in an alien land for one day" (流浪他鄉一朝客 *liúlàng tāxiāng yīzhāo kè*), and in the section of the "Treatise on the Light Nous" on the five battles between the Old Man and the New Man,[38] 客性 *kèxìng* "the temporarily residing guest-nature"[39] is the sum of the particles of the Living Soul residing in the body.

Another parallel to the above-mentioned passage of the "Job story", which to my knowledge has so far gone unnoticed,[40] is found also in the Coptic *Kephalaion* XCI[41]. Here, too, social relationships are compared to those of strangers who meet for a while and will soon part company, and residing in the world is likened to living in a rented lodging:

> The sign of that perfect catechumen *(pikatēkhoumenos … ēnteleios)* is this: You shall find (his) wife in the house with him, and beside him she is like these strangers *(šmmo)*. His house shall be considered by him like these lodging houses (*mancaïle* = παροικία). He says: I am living in a house for rent *(ēï apšcar)* by days and months. His brothers *(snēu)* and his relatives *(suggenēs)* shall be considered by him as foreign people who associate with him *(hnrōme ne ñšmmo eulačt araf)*, while travelling on the road with him. He […] they will separate from him *(senapōrč araf)*, and each one […] may […]. (228.22–30) To him, they shall be like borrowed vessels *(hneeu mpoušep nahref)*; he takes them, is served by them, and afterwards gives them to their owner. He does not place his trust on them, nor his treasure. (229.1–3)[42]

我於往昔佛一時住釋種大城。居彼所營大客館內 *wǒ yú wǎngxī fó yīshí zhù Shìzhǒng dàchéng. jū bǐ suǒ yíng dà kèguǎn nèi* "Long ago, before attaining buddhahood, I lived temporarily in the capital city of the Śākya clan. I lived there, (as if) camping in a big guesthouse" (604c19–20).

38 T. 82–111 (Lin 1997, pp. 271–271; TT no. 2141B, vol. 54.1282b9–c17; Chavannes/Pelliot 1911, pp. 546–550; Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, pp. 83–85). Parthian text in Sundermann 1992, pp. 64–65, §§20–23. For a concordance of the published fragments of the Turkish version, see Provasi 2008, pp. 220–221.

39 This is a precise equivalent of *widāragān mehmān* in the Parthian text of the Treatise (cf. Sundermann 1992, p. 91) and to *bo ätözdän ärtigli beš täŋri küči* "the force of the Fivefold God which passes through this body" in the Turkish text TM 300 /r/2–3/ (von Le Coq 1922, p. 17; Klimkeit/Schmidt-Glintzer 1984, p. 89). Cf. also, in a Parthian Monday hymn, *mehmān rōšan, mardōhm paštag* "the light guest, the fettered man" (M 763 /v/i/25–27/, Reck 2004, p. 121).

40 Cf. Provasi 2008, pp. 388–389, n. 80.

41 Böhlig/Polotsky 1940, pp. 228.5–234.23.

42 Another parallel with lines 14–16 of the "Job story" is found further on in the same *Kephalaion*, where sins committed before becoming hearers are described (231.17–23): "Some of them serve idols first, worshipping and adoring […] Others among them stood firmly in the teaching of the sects *(ptisbō ññdogma)*, blaspheming God. They even profaned the lightgivers that are in the heavens. And some of them have committed other sins […] murder (φόνος) or a sin of adultery (μοιχεία)."

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Kephalaion CI deals specifically with the "perfect Hearers" (*nikatēkhoumenos etčēk*)[43], those who, by their righteous behaviour, will escape further rebirths.[44]

The main concept emphasised in the "Job story", in the "Lament on impermanence" and in *Kephalaion* XCI is the fundamental alienness of man[45] in the material world, where even his relationships with relatives and friends are those of strangers temporarily living in the same lodging: hence the necessity of a total renunciation of the world and all that belongs to it.[46]

Both in Iranian and in Coptic Manichaean texts, the theme of light/the soul/man as an exile (MPers./Parth. *uzdeh*), a stranger (Copt. *šm̄mo*), a wanderer (MPers. *kārdāg*) in the material world is frequently encountered. In the *Šābuhragān*, Jesus the Splendour *(Xradešahr yazad)* says to the helpers of the religious ones (i. e. the Hearers): "I was an exile and a wanderer *(uzdeh ud kārdāg)*, and you took me into your house."[47] The same idea is often encountered in the Manichaean Coptic Psalm-Book, e. g.: "O soul, whence art thou? – Thou art from high. – Thou art a stranger *(oušm̄mo)* to the world, a sojourner *(r̄m̄ñcaïle)*[48]

43 The Coptic phrase corresponds closely to Sogdian *ʾsptyy nγwšʾk* "perfect Hearer", mentioned in a homily on confession (M 139 /I/r/4/, Henning 1936, p. 49), and to Turkish *tükällig nigošak* in a fragment on alms (U 169 [= T II D 173b] /II/v/10/, von Le Coq 1922, p. 12). This is a somewhat idealised category of laypeople who, besides their primary duty of almsgiving, conform to the strict regulations required of Elects. Their qualities are described in a Middle-Persian homily (M 221, Sundermann 1973, pp. 102–104); cf. also Colditz 1987, pp. 299–304 (fragment M 44; also *ibid.*, pp. 296–297, n. 30) and Sundermann 1973, pp. 102–106 (fragment M 580). On the perfect Hearer, often dubbed *iškōh* "poor, of humble origin" in Parth. and MPers., cf. Colditz 2000, pp. 195–196.

44 "The Hearer who will be saved in a single body" (*pkatēkhoumenos … ete šafnouhme hn̄ ousōma ñouōt*, Böhlig/Polotsky 1940, p. 228.6–7).

45 For the theme of alienness in Manichaeism, cf. Puech 1979, pp. 11, 24–26; Arnold-Döben 1978, pp. 116–119; and, in a general Gnostic context, Puech 1978, pp. 207–213.

46 The rejection of the world, as pointed out by Puech (1979, pp. 64, 74–76), is a constituent part of the discipline of "fasting" in a broad sense, a means for achieving the control of the spirit, in other words for defeating the Old Man. In the case of the Manichaean texts examined here, as well as of other Gnostic texts, the implication is that this discipline should be applied also to social relationships. The last point is made clear in a passage of the so-called "Testimony of Truth" from Nag Hammadi (Cod. IX, 3, 44.13–16), which describes the archetypal gnostic in these terms: *auō fo ñharšhēt / ečñ ouon nim· ftantñ m̄maf / eouon nim· auō fpōrč on m̄/mof eroou* "And he is patient with everyone: he makes himself equal to everyone, and he also separates himself from them." (Pearson 1981, pp. 154–155).

47 M 475a /I/v/11–13/ (MacKenzie 1979, p. 506). Cf. also, in one of the Parthian hymns to the Living Soul from M 7: "I am from the Light and the gods, and I have become an exile *(uzdeh)* from them" (M 7 /II/v/i/27–29/, Durkin-Meisterernst 2006, pp. 34–35), and in a MPers. hymn, where probably First Man is speaking: "I am the first exile *(uzdeh ī naxwistēn)*, the son of god Zurwān, a son of kings" (Lb /2–5/, Müller 1904, p. 29 [lost fragment, cf. Boyce 1960, p. xxxi]).

48 Cf. *mancaïle* in the passage from *Kephalaion* XCI quoted above.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

on the earth for men" (Ps. *Sarakoton*, Allberry 1938, p. 181.21–23)[49], and parallels can be found in New Testament literature,[50] e. g. Heb. 11:13: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth"[51] and 1 Pet. 2:11: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."[52]

The same theme occurs also in Mandaean literature, e. g. in the Oxford liturgical compilation (Book 1, LVI, 2–3):

> *ania ana ḏmn piria / umšania ana ḏmn mrahqia / ania ana ḏʿniun hiia / umšania ḏʿutria šaniun*
> "I am a poor man, from the fruit, an exiled, from afar. I am a poor man, to whom Life answered, an exile, whom the Uthras exiled." (Lidzbarski 1920, p. 223)

The image of the world as a guesthouse where the soul resides only temporarily occurs as well in the gnostic Hymn of the Pearl: *wdḥd hwyt mšwḥd hwyt / lḇny ʾšpzy nwkry hwyt* "and since I was alone, I was lonely, / for my fellow-dwellers of the inn I became a stranger."[53]

The same metaphor is sometimes found in Pahlavi texts, e. g. in the *Handarzīhā ī pēšēnīgān* 5:

> *ud har rōz abāg xwēš-tan āmār be kardan kū īm-rōz čē sūd ud čē zyān čē kirbag ud čē wināh ud čand pad rāh ī frārōn raft hēm ud čand pad rāh ī abārōn, čē ēn gētīg aspinǰ ī ēk-rōzag hōmānag, ǰāwēdān ānōh abāyēd būdan.*
> "And every day consider within yourself: 'what benefit and what damage, what good deed and what sin (have I accomplished) today, and to what extent I have proceeded on the way of the righteous or on that of the wicked?' Because this world is similar to a guesthouse for one day." (Jāmāspāsanā/ʿUryān 2003, p. 248)

49 Cf. also: "I became a stranger *(aïr̄šm̄mo)* in the world for thy name's sake" (Ps. to Jesus CCLI, Allberry 1938, p. 60.28–29, and similarly p. 175.26); "Thou art a stranger *(oušm̄mo)*, housed in a body of the earth defiled" (Ps. to Jesus CCLXV, *ibid.*, p. 82.15–16); "I became a stranger *(aïr̄šm̄mo)* to the parents of the flesh, my brothers, my kinsmen" (Ps. to Jesus CCLXVIII, *ibid.*, p. 86.6–7). On the metaphor of the stranger and his homeland in Manichaean literature, cf. also Arnold-Döben 1978, pp. 116–119.

50 On quotations from the New Testament in Manichaean literature, see Sundermann 1968.

51 (P) *bhymnwtʾ mytw hlyn klhwn wlʾ nsbw mwlknhwn ʾlʾ mn rwḥqʾ ḥzʾwhy wḥdyw bh wʾwdyw dʾksnÿʾ ʾnwn wtwtḇʾ bʾrʿʾ*. (NTG) Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

52 (P) *ḥbybÿ bʿʾ _ʾnʾ mnkwn ʾyk ʿrṣʾ wʾyk twtḇʾ ʾtprqw mn klhyn rgyg̈th dpgrʾ hlyn dʿbdn̈ qrbʾ lwqbl npšʾ*. (NTG) Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.

53 Line 23; Syriac text in Poirier 1981, p. 330. The Greek text is slightly different, mentioning solitude and estrangement but not the inn: μόνος δὲ ὢν ἐξενιζόμην τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀλλότριος ἐφαινόμην (*ibid.*, p. 353). The Syriac text uses the Iranian loanword *ʾšpzʾ* /ešpzā/ (cf. MPers. *aspanz* and NPers. *sepanǰ*, on which see below). On the metaphor of the world as a guesthouse, cf. also Widengren 1952, pp. 111, 113 and n. 54.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and in the *Handarz ī Husraw ī Kawādān* 10:

> *gētīg pad aspinj dār ud tān pad āsān*
> "Hold the world as a guesthouse, and the body as a resting(-place)." (Jāmāspāsanā/ʿUryān 2003, p. 268)

This was probably a traditional Iranian motif, since it frequently resurfaces in New Persian poetry, first of all in Firdawsī, e.g.: *ki na pasandad az mā badī dādgar / sipanǰ ast gētī u mā dar-guẕar* "God reprobates the evil that we carry out: / the world is a guesthouse and we are passers-by" (*Šāhnāma*, *Dāstān-i Dawāzda Rux*, 132; Mohl 1838–1878, III, p. 422); *ki gētī sipanǰ ast pur dard u ranǰ* "because the world is a guesthouse, full of pain and toil" (*Šāhnāma*, *Dāstān-i Siyāwuš*, 2131; *ibid.*, II, p. 376]; *či bandē dil andar sarāy-i sipanǰ / či nāzē ba ganǰ u či nālē zi ranǰ* "why do you rely upon the temporary abode? / why do you boast about wealth and complain about trouble?" (*Šāhnāma*, *Dāstān-i Siyāwuš*, 1793; *ibid.*, II, p. 346), but also, among others, in Rūdakī, e.g.: *mihr ma fgan bar īn sarāy-i sipanǰ / k īn ǰahān hast bāzi-yi nayranǰ* "Don't throw affection on this guesthouse: indeed the world is a play of illusion" (*Dīwān*, Mirzoev 1958, p. 52); *ba sarāy-i sipanǰ mihmān-rā / dil nihādan hamēšagī na rawā-st / zēr-i xāk-andarūn-t bāyad xuft / gar či aknūn-t xʷāb bar dēbā-st* "It is not suitable for the guest to set his heart forever on the guesthouse; / below under earth you will sleep, / even though now you sleep on brocade" (*Dīwān*, *ibid.*, p. 47), and Xʷāǰū-yi Kirmānī: *rux zi mihmānxāna-yi gētī bi gardān čū masīḥ* "turn your face away from the guesthouse of the world, like the Messiah" (Xʷāǰū-yi Kirmānī, *Dīwān*, 516).

In New Persian poetry, we even find references to the typically Manichaean concept of the body as a guesthouse, with the parallelism macrocosm-microcosm which recurs in Iranian thought of all periods:[54] *hast mihmānxāna īn tan ay ǰawān / har ṣabāḥ-ē żayf-i naw āyad dawān* "This body is a guesthouse, young man: every morning a new guest enters, running" (Rūmī, *Maẕnawī*, Book 5); *tu-rā īn tan yak-ē xāna-y sipanǰ ast / muzawwar ham muγarbal čūn kabāra* "this body of yours is but a guesthouse, crooked and leaking like a sieve" (Nāṣir-i Xusraw, *Dīwān*, qaṣīda 214).

The phrasing of the "Job story" presents marked similarities, both of content and linguistic form, with the first part of a "Homily addressed to Hearers" *(nγʾwšʾkʾnʾk wyδβʾγ)* (So 18248 [= TM 393/ /I/) published in Henning 1944, pp. 137–142).[55] In lines /2–12/ of the latter we read:

> while (you were) (2) in that body, you were arrogant,[56] and for the pleasure (3) of the body you have taken the lives of many living beings, (4) and you (even)

54 Cf. Widengren 1983, p. 978.
55 Cf. also the brief remark in Yoshida 1994, p. 26.
56 Cf. lines 21–22 of the Job story and Hymn-scroll 97c: 捨除憍慢及非為 *shěchú jiāomàn jí fēiwéi* "give up pride, arrogance and wrong-doing" (Lin 1997, p. 293).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

enjoyed (doing) it.[57] (5) But now you have remained alone, in the (6) demons' hands. Neither son nor (7) daughter will be of use to you, neither wife nor concubine[58], neither (8) assistant nor associate nor friend, (9) neither treasure and wealth nor a rest-house[59] or (10) a firm tower, neither a good (11) equipment or a saddled horse. Indeed you (12) have become separated from everything you loved.

The expressions employed in this text bear a close resemblance to those of the "Job story"[60] and in a way resume and conclude it. The end of the fragment on the Hearers contains a passage in the typical style of the *Kephalaia*:

[the pure-]hearted King of the Law,[61] the (47) […] Apostle of Light, Mār (48) [Mani] spoke thus to the Hearers: (49) "[If you] so desire, listen and I shall explain to you." (/46–49/)

57 Cf. Hymn-scroll 91b: 煞害眾生无停住 *shāhài zhòngshēng wú tíngzhù* "one murders living beings without end" (Lin 1997, p. 293).

58 Cf. Hymn-scroll 98cd: 男女妻妾嚴身具 死後留他供別主 *nánnǚ qīqiè yán shēn jù / sǐhòu liú tā gōng biézhǔ* "sons and daughters, wives and concubines, who were of his own, after death will stay to serve other masters" (Lin 1997, p. 293); 103ab: 妻妾男女如債主 皆由過去相侵害 *qīqiè nánnǚ rú zhàizhǔ / jiē yóu guòqù xiāng qīnhài* "wives and concubines, sons and daughters are like creditors, all of them resulting from mutual wrongs in the past" (*ibid.*, p. 294); 116cd: 親戚男女及妻妾 无常之日不相替 *qīnqī nánnǚ jí qīqiè / wúcháng zhī rì bù xiāngtì* "relatives, sons and daughters, wives and concubines will not take your place on the day of impermanence" (*ibid.*, p. 295).

59 Sogd. *ʾspʾnch*; cf. MPers. *aspanz* and n. 53 above.

60 E.g. Homily for Hearers (further H.) /2–3/: *tnpʾrmyc šʾtʾwxyʾkh* "the pleasure of the body", cf. Job story (further J.) /14–15/: *tnpʾrmync [šʾtʾwxyʾkh]*; H. /5/: *rty ʾkδry xwδkʾr pʾrʾxsδ* "you have remained alone", cf. J. /47/: *rtxw βwt xwδkʾr ZY ʾyw-tʾ(c)* "he becomes forsaken and lonely"; H. /6–7/: *ʾtβn xw Lʾ zʾty Lʾ δwγth pcʾyty* "neither son nor daughter will be of use to you", cf. J. /42/: *βwt … [ywʾ]r cnn zʾtʾyty ZY cnn δwγtr(ty)* "[he becomes separated] from his sons and daughters"; H. /8–9/: *Lʾ mrʾz Lʾ xwtyxwyštʾkw ZY Lʾ šyrxwz-ʾkw* "neither assistant nor associate nor friend", cf. J. /46–47/: *rtxw Lʾ [mrʾ] z ZY Lʾ pstkʾrʾk βyrt* "he does not find assistant nor helper" and J. /26–27/: *cnn ZKw pryw ZY cnn šyrxwz-ʾk ZY ZK γwtm wxsty* "he will be deprived of (his) beloved one, friend and relative"; H. /9/: *[L]ʾ ʾxw γz-ny γ-rʾmʾkw* "neither treasure and wealth", cf. J. /31/: *ZKw γrβ γz-nw ZY γrʾmʾk* "a great substance and wealth" (also J. /36–37/, and cf. Hymn-scroll 96cd: 一切財寶及田宅 意欲不捨終相別 *yīqiè cáibǎo jí tiánzhái / yìyù bù shě zhōng xiāngbié* "all wealth and treasures, lands and houses that we do not wish to forsake, at the end we shall part from them"); H. /10–11/: *šyrʾkk prštʾkw* "a good equipment", cf. J. /39/: *šyrʾkk prštʾk* "id."; H. /11/: *ʾxw z-yncykw ʾspy* "a saddled horse", cf. J. /39/: *ʾstwrpδʾk* "cattle".

61 On the expression *[…]kw pʾz-ny δrmʾykw xwβw* (equivalent to Buddh. Skt. *citta-dhārmarājā*), cf. Henning 1944, p. 142, n. 2. The analogous *δrmʾyk xwtʾw* occurs twice, as a translation of Chin. 法王 *fǎwáng* (and of 心王 *xīnwáng* = *cittarājā*), in the Sogdian *Dhūta-sūtra* (ll. 40, 261, MacKenzie 1976, pp. 36, 48 and n. 41). In the corpus of Chinese Manichaean texts 法王 *fǎwáng* occurs four times as an epithet of Mani (Compendium, 6.10; Hymn-scroll 84c [first stanza of the "Lament on impermanence"], 373), while in other instances it is an appellation of Jesus (Hymn-scroll 76b) or the Light-Nous (Hymn-scroll 229c).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The similarities between the first part of So 18248 and Ch/So 13400, as well as those with *Kephalaion* XCI, make it likely that the "Job story" as well was part of a homily addressed to Hearers. It is even possible that the two Sogdian fragments belong to different redactions of one and the same text, of which So 18248 contains the conclusion. The Manichaean authors of the story may have taken a hint from the *Book of Job* in order to elaborate a parable or homily about the virtue of "patience" (Parth. *drgmnyft* ~ *bwrdryft*, Sogd. *wytʾwpʾznyʾkh* ~ *βwrtʾrmykyʾ*).[62] However, despite the similarities in important details of the story, the ideological background is quite different: while in the biblical story Job's tribulations are caused (or at least allowed, by giving a free hand to Satan) by God in order to test Job's faith, in a Manichean context in contrast, evil cannot proceed from the Good Principle.[63] The sufferings of the main character are caused both by shortcomings in religious observance and by the inherent evil of the material world.

Abbreviations

AcIr	Acta Iranica
AKGWG	Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
AoF	*Altorientalische Forschungen*
APAW	Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
MIO	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
TPhS	*Transactions of the Philological Society*
TT	Taishō Tripiṭaka
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*
ZS	*Zentralasiatische Studien*

62 Cf. Sundermann 1992, pp. 109, 137.
63 Cf. the strongly anti-monotheistic traits in *Kephalaion* CXX (Böhlig/Polotsky 1940, pp. 286.24–288.18).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliography

Allberry, C. R. C 1938: *A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II*. With a contribution by H. Ibscher. Stuttgart (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection 2).

Arnold-Döben, V. 1978: *Die Bildersprache des Manichäismus*. Köln (Arbeitsmaterialien zur Religionsgeschichte 3).

Bang, W. 1931: "Manichäische Erzähler." In: *Le Muséon* 44, pp. 1–36.

Bang, W./A. von Gabain 1929: "Türkische Turfan-Texte. II. Manichaica." In: SPAW 1929/22, pp. 411–430.

Böhlig, A./H. J. Polotsky (eds.) 1940: *Kephalaia. 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)*. Stuttgart (Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin 1).

Boyce, M. 1960: *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*. Berlin (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 45).

Chavannes, É./P. Pelliot 1911: "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine." In: *JA* 10, sér. 18, pp. 499–617.

Colditz, I. 1987: "Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen." In: *AoF* 14/1–2, pp. 274–313.

— 2000: *Zur Sozialterminologie der iranischen Manichäer. Eine semantische Analyse im Vergleich zu den nichtmanichäischen iranischen Quellen*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 5).

Durkin-Meisterernst, D 2006: *The Hymns to the Living Soul. Middle Persian and Parthian Texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (BTT 24).

Gershevitch, I. 1945 [1946]: "Sogdian Compounds." In: *TPhS* 44/1, pp. 137–149.

— 1948: "Iranian Notes." In: *TPhS* 47/1, pp. 61–68.

— 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford.

Henning, W. B. 1936: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Berlin (APAW 1936, Nr. 10).

— 1944: "The Murder of the Magi." In: *JRAS* 2, pp. 133–144.

— 1945: "Sogdian Tales." In: *BSOAS* 11/3, pp. 465–487.

Jāmāspāsanā, J. M./S. ʿUryān (eds.) 2003: *Matnhā-yi pahlavī. Tarǰuma, āvānivišt*. Tehrān.

Klimkeit, H.-J./H. Schmidt-Glintzer 1984: "Die türkischen Parallelen zum chinesisch-manichäischen Traktat." In: *ZS* 17, pp. 82–117.

Kudara, K. 1999: "Silk Road and its culture. The view of a Japanese scholar." In: *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Berichte und Abhandlungen*. Vol. 6. Berlin, pp. 331–347.

la Vallée Poussin, L. de (ed.) 1913: *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. St. Petersburg.

Le Coq, A. von 1922: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho III. Nebst einem christlichen Bruchstück aus Bulayïq*. Berlin (APAW 1922, Nr. 2).

Lidzbarski, M. 1920: *Mandäische Liturgien*. Berlin (AKGWG, N.F. 17/1).

Lin Wushu 林悟殊 1997: 摩尼教极其東漸 *Mónijiào jí qí dōngjiàn [Manichaeism and Its Eastward Expansion]*. Taibei [1st ed. Beijing 1987].

MacKenzie, D. N. 1976: *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*. Téhéran/Liège (AcIr 10).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1979: "Mani's *Šābuhragān*." In: *BSOAS* 42, pp. 500–534.
Mirzoev, A. (ed.) 1958: *Āṯār-i bāqīmānda-i Abū ʿAbdallāh Jaʿfar-i bni Muḥammad Rūdakī*. Stalinobod.
Mohl, J. (ed. and transl.) 1838–1878: *Le livre des rois par Abou'lkasim Firdousi*. 7 vols. Paris.
Müller, F. W. K. 1904: *Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan. II. Teil*. Berlin (APAW 1904, Anh. 2).
Pearson, B. A. (ed.) 1981: *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*. Leiden (NHS 15).
Poirier, P.-H. 1981: *L'Hymne de la Perle des Actes de Thomas. Introduction, texte, traduction, commentaire*. Louvain-la Neuve (Homo religiosus 8).
Provasi, E. 2008: "Testi medio-iranici III. Parabole, Testi dottrinali." In: Gh. Gnoli (ed.): *Il Manicheismo*. Vol. III: *Il mito e la dottrina. Testi manichei dell'Asia Centrale e della Cina*. Milano, pp. 109–225 (transl.), 374–478 (commentary).
Puech, H.-Ch. 1978: *En quête de la Gnose*. Vol. I: *La Gnose et le temps et autres essais*. Paris.
— 1979: *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais*. Paris.
Reck, Ch. 2003: "Die Beschreibung der Daēna in einem soghdischen manichäischen Text." In: C. Cereti/M. Maggi/E. Provasi (eds.): *Religious Themes and Texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia*. Wiesbaden, pp. 321–336.
— 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen – Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout (BTT 22).
— 2006: *Mitteliranische Handschriften*. Teil I: *Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 18/1).
Schmidt, C. G./H. J. Polotsky 1933: "Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler." In: SPAW 1933/1, pp. 4–90.
Schmidt-Glintzer, H. 1987: *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 14).
Sims-Williams, N. 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2*. Berlin (BTT 12).
Sims-Williams, N./D. Durkin-Meisterernst 2012: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Pt. 2: *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 7).
Sundermann, W. 1968: "Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur." In: *MIO* 14, pp. 386–405.
— 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*. Berlin (BTT 4).
— 1984: "Die Prosaliteratur der iranischen Manichäer." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*. Leuven (OLA 16), pp. 227–241.
— 1985: *Ein manichäisch-soghdisches Parabelbuch*. Berlin (BTT 15).
— 1991: "Eine buddhistische Allegorie in manichäischer Überlieferung." In: R. E. Emmerick/D. Weber (eds.): *Corolla Iranica. Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday on April 8th, 1991*. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 198–206.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1992: *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*. Berlin (BTT 17).
— 1995: "Die Parabel von den schätzesammelnden Kaufleuten." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Au carrefour des religions. Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*. Bures-sur-Yvette (Res Orientales 7), pp. 285–296.
— 2009: "Manichaean literature in Iranian languages." In: R.E. Emmerick/M. Macuch (eds.): *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran*. London/New York (A History of Persian Literature 17), pp. 197–265.
Tsui Chi 摩尼教下部讚 1943: "Mo Ni Chiao Hsia Pu Tsan 'The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns'." In: *BSOAS* 11/1, pp. 174–219.
Widengren, G. 1952: "Der iranische Hintergrund der Gnosis." In: *ZRGG* 4, pp. 97–114.
— 1983: "Manichaeism and its Iranian background." In: E. Yarshater (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Iran*. Vol. 3/2: *The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanid Periods*. Cambridge, pp. 965–990.
Yoshida, Y. 1984: "On Manichaean Sogdian fragments – the lost part of the Sogdian Tale K, 'a Job story'." In: T. Yamamoto (ed.): *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa (Tokyo-Kyoto, 31st August–7th September 1983)*. Vol. II. Tokyo, pp. 989–990.
Yoshida Yutaka 吉田豊1994: "無常を説くマニ教ソグド語文書 – 京都大学文学部所蔵の写真資料から Mujō o toku manikyō sogudo-go monjo – Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu shōzo no shashin shiryō kara [On a Manichaean Sogdian fragment expounding vanity of earthly life – Text preceding Henning's 'Job story']." In: *Oriento* 37/2, pp. 16–32.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Lobpreis des Mannes (II)

Simone-Christiane Raschmann, Berlin

Es ist eine späte Entdeckung, die ich unlängst bei einer erneuten Durchsicht der Ch/U-Gruppe in der Berliner Turfansammlung (Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung) machte. 1995 edierte ich unter dem Titel „Dies ist der Lobpreis des Mannes" das kleine Bruchstück Ch/U 6620 verso und widmete den Aufsatz Werner Sundermann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag.[1] Die zuvor erwähnte erneute Durchsicht brachte die Erkenntnis, dass sich unter den Berliner Turfanfragmenten noch ein zweites, größeres Bruchstück dieses Textes befindet. In Erinnerung an eine freundschaftliche, vertrauensvolle und für mich sehr gewinnbringende Zusammenarbeit kann ich diese Neu-Edition nun meinem langjährigen Kollegen Werner Sundermann bedauernswerter Weise nur noch posthum widmen.[2]

Das Fragment Ch/U 6916 verso lässt sich mit dem bereits edierten Fragment Ch/U 6620 verso in der 8. erhaltenen Textzeile unmittelbar zusammensetzen. Der Text des Fragments Ch/U 6916 verso setzt den Text des Fragments Ch/U 6620 verso direkt fort. Diese Zusammensetzung wird durch den chinesischen Text auf der Vorderseite, bei dem es sich um einen Abschnitt aus dem *Miao fa lian hua jing* (Skt. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-Sūtra*) handelt, bestätigt. Die Fragmente entstammen einer chinesischen Buchrolle. Aufgrund der entgegengesetzten Schriftrichtung des Chinesischen geht der Text des Fragments Ch/U 6620 recto (Taishō 262, Bd. 9, 56b 09–15) dem Text von Ch/U 6916 recto (Taishō 262, Bd. 9, 56b 15 – c 03) unmittelbar voran.[3] Das Gesamtmaß der zusammengesetzten Fragmente beträgt 13,7 cm (h) × 40,6 cm (b).[4]

1 Raschmann 1995.

2 An dieser Stelle möchte ich meinen herzlichen Dank an Jin-il Chung, Siglinde Dietz, Tsuneki Nishiwaki, Klaus Wille und Peter Zieme für ihre wertvollen Hinweise zur Strukturierung, Lesung und Interpretation des Textes aussprechen.

3 Vgl. BTT 6, S. 104, mit einem bisher unbeachteten Hinweis auf die Zusammengehörigkeit der Fragmente.

4 Die getrennt verglasten Fragmente weisen folgende Einzelmaße auf: Ch/U 6620: 13,7 cm (h) × 10,4 cm (b); Ch/U 6916: 13,7 cm (h) × 31,7 cm (b). Digitale Bilddateien: http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/ch_u/dta_chu_index.html.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

Fig. 1: Ch/U 6620 verso + Ch/U 6916 verso

Insgesamt sind nunmehr durch die Zusammensetzung 35 Textzeilen erhalten. Der obere Blattrand der Rückseite ist nahezu unbeschädigt. Auf Höhe der Zeilen /v/4/–/5/ führte ein tieferer Einriss am Oberrand auch zu einem Textverlust, umfangreicher in Zeile /v/5/. Der untere Rand ist durch Abbruch durchgängig verloren. Die Schrift des altuigurischen Textes ist semikursiv.

Auffällig in der äußeren Textgestaltung sind breitere Absätze nach den Zeilen /v/2/, /v/3/, /v/8/, /v/9/, /v/27/ und /v/28/. Sie dienen wohl dazu, die Zeile zu markieren, in der der Titel des neuen *stotra*s mit folgenden Worten abgeschlossen wird: X *ögdisi ol*. Problematisch erweist sich diese Interpretation im Hinblick auf den dritten Lobpreis. Bei der nachfolgend in der Edition vorgelegten Strukturierung des Textes, wäre durch die Hervorhebung dieser Zeile der angenommene Gesamttitel des dritten erhaltenen *stotra*s optisch unterbrochen.

Der altuigurische Text weist, wie aus der nachfolgenden Transkription ersichtlich wird, an zwei Stellen chinesische Textelemente auf.

Möglicherweise um eine nachträgliche Textergänzung oder Korrektur handelt es sich bei der unvollständig erhaltenen Textpassage in Zeile /v/8/, die auf den Titel des zweiten Lobpreises *čambudivip [ö]g[d]isi ol* folgt und die mit zwei chinesischen Zeichen einsetzt. Die Schriftgröße und der Schriftduktus dieses Zusatzes weichen von der Schrift des Haupttextes ab.

Mit dieser neuen Zusammensetzung hat sich die im ersten Teil der Textedition geäußerte Vermutung bestätigt, dass hier ein Bruchstück einer altuigurischen Lobpreis-Sammlung vorliegt.

Der ursprüngliche Umfang der Sammlung ist unklar. Im jetzigen zusammengesetzten Zustand der beiden Bruchstücke sind drei Lobpreise fragmentarisch überliefert: 1. Lobpreis des Mannes (3); 2. Lobpreis des Jambudvīpa

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(9)[5] und 3. Lobpreis der Güte der Buddhas (31). Es wird davon auszugehen sein, dass die ersten beiden erhaltenen Zeilen (1)–(2), die dem Lobpreis des Mannes vorangehen, den Schlussteil eines weiteren Lobpreises bilden.

Als Schreibmaterial wurde in Sekundärnutzung die Rückseite der oberen Blatthälfte einer chinesischen Buchrolle verwendet. Für einen im Hinblick auf die Weiterverwendung, vor allem für die Niederschrift altuigurischer Texte, gezielten Zuschnitt chinesischer Buchrollen finden sich zahlreiche Beispiele in der Berliner Turfansammlung.[6] Auf die Zeile /v/35/ folgt ein unbeschädigter natürlicher Blattrand. Klebereste lassen erkennen, dass an dieser Stelle die überlappende Verklebung mit einem weiteren Blatt vorlag.[7] Ob diese Ablösung vor der Niederschrift des Textes eingetreten war und die altuigurische Lobpreis-Sammlung hier endete oder auf einem nachfolgenden Blatt fortsetzte, kann hier, auch bedingt durch den Abbruch am Ende der letzten erhaltenen Textzeile, nicht bewertet werden. Faltspuren, die auf ein Faltbuch-Format hindeuten könnten, sind nicht erkennbar. Der Umfang des Textverlusts an den Zeilenenden kann an keiner Stelle sicher rekonstruiert werden. Wie aus der Kennzeichnung in der hier vorgelegten Transkription ersichtlich ist, wird der Textverlust hier als wenig umfangreich eingeschätzt.

Es wird davon ausgegangen, dass mit der hier publizierten Lobpreis- Sammlung ein Originalwerk der altuigurischen Literatur vorliegt. Wie bereits in dem ersten Teil der Edition angemerkt, ist der überwiegende Teil der bislang bekannt gewordenen altuigurischen Lobpreisdichtung in alliterierenden Doppelversen verfasst. Ein durchgängiger Stabreim kann im vorliegenden Text nicht nachgewiesen werden und die Feststellung aus der ersten Teiledition, dass eine poetische Struktur vorliegt, auch wenn die strophische Alliteration nicht immer zum Tragen kommt, behält ihre Gültigkeit.

Obwohl im vorliegenden Rahmen nicht alle Probleme der Interpretation des Textes geklärt werden können, soll hier die Edition der nunmehr erweiterten Lobpreis-Sammlung erfolgen.[8]

5 Klaus Wille verdanke ich den Hinweis auf ein kleines Sanskrit-Bruchstück mit einem Kolophon „Jambudvīpastava“: SHT 2959/Seite A/Zeile y: *[jamb](u)dv[īpa]s[ta] va samāpta* „Der Jambudvīpastava ist beendet“; vgl. VOHD 10,9, Nr. 2959 (E-Mail K. Wille 16.04.2014).

6 Vgl. dazu u.a. Raschmann 2012.

7 Der Umfang der ursprünglichen Textrolle kann durch den identifizierten chinesischen Text auf der Vorderseite rekonstruiert werden. In der Ch/U-Signaturengruppe der Berliner Turfansammlung belegen jedoch zahlreiche Fragmente, dass die chinesischen Buchrollen vor der Wiederverwendung der unbeschriebenen Rückseiten für die Niederschrift altuigurischer Texte neu zugeschnitten wurden und so manchmal durch Faltung auch zur Herstellung kleiner Bücher dienten.

8 Die Edition setzt mit dem bereits publizierten Fragment Ch/U 6620 verso ein. Auf eine Wiederholung kann aufgrund der unmittelbaren Zusammensetzbarkeit und zur Darstellung der Struktur und des Inhalts der Lobpreis-Sammlung hier nicht verzichtet werden.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Transkription[9]

(01) Ch/U 6620/v/1/ alkıš-larıg alkaṭma[k]
(02) /v/2/ alk(a)p adın ada tuda bolmamakı [*bo*]*l*[*zun*]

(03) /v/3/ är ögdisi ol

(04) /v/4/ alku-sı täŋik[m]iš ašayı adurum •
(05) adın-*t*[*akı*] /v/5/ [k]utluk-ı aḍurum
(06) koturu taŋl(a)nčıg kör[*ki üzä*] /v/6/ sävitmiš
(07) alčakı üzä adın-ka taplaṭıl[*mıš*] /v/7/ küsätilmiš
(08) köŋül-i-niŋ arıg-ı üzä [ ]

(09) Ch/U 6916/v/1/ + Ch/U 6620/v/8/ čambudivip [ö]g[d]isi ol .
{ 十四 ınandačı-nıŋ kayu nomı T[ ] }

(10) Ch/U 6916/v/2/ kim inčip ol
(11) alkuḍın sıŋar-kı lokadat[u*lartın*] /v/3/ ašunmış
(12) yagız yer arkasındakı känt *so[zaklar üzä*] /v/4/ säčilmiš •
(13) tört mantal-lıg eṭigin töpö[*sindä*] /v/5/ t(ä)ŋri yer-i-lig törüm yoklamış
(14) töpölü[g] /v/6/ arslan-larnıŋ ornagı •
(15) käntün tuyunmış-[*larnıŋ*] /v/7/ ärigi •
(16) yeti bölökin bölünsär ymä
(17) [*kün*] /v/8/ t(ä)ŋri üzä örṭänsär ymä
(18) eṭlinip baṭ[*maz*]
(19) [ ] /v/9/ -NYNK bugrayu sısguluk köznäki
(20) ädgü /[ ] /v/10/ ärkäčlängülük yulak-ı
(21) altmış tört *tü[rlüg]* /v/11/ aḍırtlıg •
(22) aẓaglı köni-li nom-lug-*la*[*rlıg*]
(23) [*kut*] /v/12/ bulmış arhant toyın-lar-lıg •
(24) kotuz *b[uka*] /v/13/ örü tikgülük oron–nı
(25) y(a)laŋuzın yörö[g] /v/14/ hanı-nıŋ yavalturmak-lıg y(a)rl(ı)g-ın
T[ ] /v/15/ -kä tapıg-lıg-lar üzä
(26) aẓay-ları taplag-*l[arı*] /v/16/ <getilgt> tägšürmäk-läri üzä
(27) altı *käsö[k*] /v/17/ -L'R-LYQ
(28) čambunad suv altun *käz*[*miš*] äŋ [ ]

9 Eine durchgehende Versstruktur kann nicht nachgewiesen werden. In runden Klammern werden von der Bearbeiterin im Rahmen der Edition für die Übersetzung herausgearbeitete Struktureinheiten des Textes durchnummeriert, die nachfolgend in der Übersetzung und für die Anmerkungen weiterverwendet werden. Die hochgestellten Angaben zeigen die Lage der Textstellen in den beiden Fragmenten an.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(29) /v/18/ č(a)ram(a)baviki-lıg sut *köküš*[10]-lär-niŋ [ ]
(30) /v/19/ bo kutluk-ta kutlug čambudivip *yert[inčü yer]* /v/20/ -intä • ʾärtäči

(31) /v/21/ burhanlar-nıŋ ädgüsi-niŋ ögdisi ol

(32) /v/22/ kim inčip
(33) bo 十種大 力似日光輪 [ ] /v/23/ edilmiš
(34) y(a)rlıkančučı köŋül-lüg isig [ ] /v/24/ üzä
(35) nizvani-lıg üšümäk-lärin *tark[arıp]*
(36) [*kün*] /v/25/ t(ä)ŋri-tä artokr(a)k čoglug yalın-lıg *y(a)rl[ıka…]*
(37) /v/26/ tört türlüg korkınčsız bilgä biligli[g] /v/27/ üzä
(38) tört tugum-takı tınl(ı)g-lar /[ ] Ch/U 6916/v/21/ -YNTYN
(39) sogančıg ediz sumer tag-ta [

Übersetzung

(1–2) Segen und Elogen … preisend, und ferner mögen keine Gefahren und Nöte sein.

(3) Dies ist der Lobpreis des Mannes.

(4) Alles an ihm ist ausgeglichen und sein *āśaya* ist eine Besonderheit.
(5) Und weiterhin … seine Würde ist eine Besonderheit.
(6) Wegen seiner ganz wunderbaren Schönheit … ist er beliebt.
(7) Wegen seiner Freundlichkeit wird er von anderen angenommen … und ersehnt,
(8) (und) wegen der Reinheit seines Sinnes …

(9) Dies ist der Lobpreis der Jambudvīpa(-Welt).
{Zu welcher Lehre auch immer die vierzehn Zufluchtnehmenden …}
(10) Welcher folgendermaßen ist:
(11) (Jambudvīpa), der die Welt-Elemente *(lokadhātu)* aller (Himmels-) Richtungen übertrifft,
(12) (der) auserwählt (ist) durch die Städte und Dörfer auf dem Rücken der braunen Erde,
(13) (der) mit dem Schmuck der vier Maṇḍalas auf seinem Gipfel aufgestiegen (ist) zum Götter-Land-Existenzbringer;

10 Hier lag wahrscheinlich eine weitere Verschreibung vor. Ursprünglich geschriebenes *kümüš* wurde nachträglich zu *köküš* geändert.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(14) Wohnsitz der (einen hohen) Scheitel habenden (Mann-)Löwen.
(15) Aufenthaltsort der von selbst Erleuchteten.
(16) Selbst wenn er sich in sieben Teile aufsplittet,
(17) selbst wenn er durch die Sonne verbrannt ist,
(18) vergeht (er) nicht und geht nicht unter.
(19) Die gezeichnet anschwellende Widerspiegelung des [ ]
(20) die aufwallenden Bäche der gut [ ]
(21) sind durch vierundsechzig Arten der/des [ ] ausgezeichnet.
(22) Ausgestattet mit häretischen und wahren Lehrern,
(23) mit [Heil] erlangten Arhats und Mönchen.
(24) Einen von Yak-Stieren aufzurichtenden Ort,
(25) allein [ ] der Bedeutung der durch den Herrn (erteilten) Anweisung zum „Beruhigen" durch die den T[ ] Dienenden,
(26) durch die Änderungen ihrer *āśaya*s, ihrer Wünsche [ ],
(27) mit den [… der] sechs Teile(?),
(28) aus dem Jambu-Fluß-Gold geschnittenes(?) [ ],
(29) die zur *caramabhavika*(-Existenz) gehörige *sudhā*(-Speise) der Bläulichen [ ]

(30–31) Dies ist der Lobpreis der Güte der Buddhas, der auf dieser allerglücklichsten Jambudvīpa-Welt Weilenden.
(32) Welcher folgendermaßen (ist):
(33) Sie sind mit den <Anfang Chin.> Zehn Arten von großen Kräften (Skt. *daśabala*), dem Rad der Sonne (d. h. Sonnenscheibe) gleich, <Ende Chin.> ausgestattet;
(34) (Dadurch, dass sie) mit der Hitze-[ ] der Barmherzigkeit
(35) die Kälte der *kleśa*s entfernen,
(36) [geruhen sie?] glanzvoll und strahlend, stärker als die Sonne [zu sein].
(37) (Dadurch, dass sie) mit der Weisheit-[ ] der viererlei Furchtlosigkeiten
(38) die [Ängste?] der Lebewesen der vier Geburtsformen [vertreiben?],
(39) (sind die) auf dem wunderbaren hohen Sumeru-Berg [ ]

Anmerkungen

(04) *ašay* < Skt. *āśaya* „Denkweise; Absicht; Einstellung; Disposition; Neigung", wieder in (26), vgl. auch Raschmann 1995, S. 188.

(09) Jambudvīpa: „**Jambudvipa** is the region where the humans live and is the only place where a being may become Enlightened by being born as a human being. It is in **Jambudvipa** that one may receive the gift of Dharma and come to understand The Four Noble Truths, the Noble Eightfold Path and ultimately realize the Liberation from the cycle of Life and Death." (Zitat aus

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

www.chinabuddhismencyclopedia.com, s. v. Jambudvipa). Der Begriff Jambudvīpa findet sowohl im konkret-geographischen Sinne von „Indien" als auch in der Bedeutung des kosmologischen „Rosenapfelkontinents" (südlich des Zentralberges Sumeru gedacht) Verwendung, vgl. Deeg 2005, S. 497, Anm. 2234, S. 522, Anm. 2348.

(11) Zu *lokadatu* vgl. die Beschreibung in Suv 508.12–13: *üč miŋ yertinčü ičintäki sav atl(ı)g lokadatu*. Die Rekonstruktion der Rektion lokadat[u*lartın*] erfolgt in Anlehnung an den Eintrag für das Lemma *ašun-* „übertreffen" in UWVerb, S. 96–97.

(12) Zu dem Ergänzungsvorschlag *känt so[zaklar üzä] säčilmiš*, vgl. zum Beispiel Ht III, 0555: *[ädr]ämi üzä säčilmiš* „hervorragend durch seine Tugend", Ht VIII, 1020–1021: *biligi bošgutı üzä säčilmiš* „durch sein Wissen$_2$ auserwählt". Das Wortpaar *känt sozak* ist gut belegt, vergleiche u. a. SuvKaya 34ğ.6, 251.1–2, 406.22, 479.22, 528.4 und 531.19. Die Zahl der 84000 Städte des Jambudvīpa-Landes findet u. a. im 15. Kapitel der Maitrisimit Erwähnung, vgl. Geng/Klimkeit/Laut 1993, S. 211.

(13) *tört mantal-lıg eṭigin töpö[sindä]* „mit dem Schmuck der vier Maṇḍalas auf seinem Gipfel". Im AYS wird der zentrale Weltberg Sumeru mit einer Erweiterung gegenüber der chinesischen Yijing-Version folgendermaßen beschrieben:

> Suv 206.7–8
> *inčä k(a)ltı tört divip ärdinin etiglig taglar hanı sumer tag*
> „genau wie der Berg Sumeru, der König der Berge, mit den vier Insel-Juwelen ausgestattet ist"

Nach NobelChin (S. 127) stellt *tört divip ärdinin etiglig* "mit den vier Insel-Juwelen ausgestattet" eine Erweiterung dar. Dabei handelt es sich wohl um die vier um den Berg herum liegenden Inseln Jambudvīpa, Apara-Godanīya, Uttara-Kuru und Pūrva-Videha (Anmerkung S. Dietz, E-Mail 13.10.2014). Der höchste Gipfel des Jambudvīpa ist der Himavat (Himalaya), vergleiche u. a. Kirfel 1959, S. 24. Es bleibt unklar, ob sich die Beschreibung auf den Himavat (Altuig. *kar tag*) oder direkt auf den zentralen Weltberg Sumeru bezieht, vgl. Sadakata 1997, S. 36. Zu dem Bild der Ausstattung mit den vier Maṇḍalas verdanke ich S. Dietz folgende Anmerkung (E-Mail 13.10.2014):

> Der Berg Sumeru hat vier „Gipfel" *(kūṭa)*, die von Yakṣas bewohnt werden. *mantal-lıg* könnte durch die vier übereinander um den Berg Sumeru führenden Terrassen *(palaṣaṇḍa)*, die von den Caturmahārājika-Göttern, den Karoṭapāṇis, Mālādharas, Sadāmattas und Mahārājika-Göttern bewohnt werden, beeinflusst sein (Brauen 1992, S. 4, 5, 69 etc.) Allerdings, auch wenn man das Maṇḍala von oben betrachtet, liegen die Kreise um den Berg Sumeru und nicht auf seinem Gipfel. Der Berg Sumeru besteht aus den vier Edelsteinen Gold, Silber, Beryll und Kristall. Statt Beryll auf der Südseite findet man auch Lapislazuli.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

törüm: Es wird hier davon ausgegangen, dass in *törüm* die Bildung eines deverbalen Nomens vorliegt, *törü-* „zur Existenz kommen, kreiert werden" und -(X)m, vgl. OTWF II, S. 290ff. (Ergative formations, 3.106 *-(X)m*).

(14) *arslan-larnıŋ ornagı*: Ein weiterer Beleg für die Darstellung Buddhas als Löwen der Männer: *äränlärniŋ šardul arslanı* „(Buddha) … der Tiger (und) Löwe der Männer ist", zitiert nach BTT 26, S. 104, 108 (Belegstelle: Suv 681.17–18). Die Lücke vor *arslan-larnıŋ* kann nicht sicher ergänzt werden. Es bleibt daher auch unsicher, ob die Interpretation *töpölü*[*g*] „der (einen hohen) Scheitel habenden" entsprechend dem Buddha-Epitheton (und gleichzeitig auch Buddha-Namen) *ediz töpölüg* (Skt. *ūrṇa*) „der mit dem hohen Scheitel" hier gerechtfertigt ist, vgl. dazu z. B. BTT 25,2, S. 362.

(16) *yeti bölökin bölünsär*: Zu diesem Bild des Zerspringens in sieben Teile, vgl. eine Textstelle aus dem 25. Kapitel (Buch IX) des AYS:

> U 730/v/6/–/7/
> *yarılgay olarnıŋ bašları yeti pen öŋi adrılıp*
> „ihre Köpfe werden sich spalten, indem sie in sieben Teile zerfallen" (zitiert nach UWVerb, S. 17)

Zu dem Text des Fragments, das das in der Petersburger Handschrift verlorene Ende der IX. Buchrolle ergänzt, vgl. VOHD 13,15, # 567. In U 730 entspricht *pen* < Chin. 分 *fen* dem in unserem Text vorliegenden *bölök*, vgl. auch Uçar 2013, S. 304. In diesem Zusammenhang sei auch auf eine Belegstelle im *Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruk Sudur* hingewiesen: /375/ *ol yavlak yäk ičgäkniŋ bašı yeti öŋi* (Variante: *yeti ülüš*) *yarılgay*, vgl. TT VI, S. 136 mit Anm. 375; Oda 2010, S. 155 (Text vol.). K. Wille machte mich auf den Pāda *saptadhāsya sphuṭen/sphalen mūrdhā* aufmerksam: "Let his head split into seven parts …!" Übersetzung nach Schmithausen 1997, S. 56, Anm. 126 mit Angabe der Belegstellen. Zu weiteren Belegstellen vgl. Skilling 1992, S. 148, Anm. 2; weiterhin ausführlich mit Textbeispielen: Witzel 1987, S. 381–385. Im vorliegenden Lobpreis wird der in Erwägung gezogene prädikative Fall der Spaltung in sieben Teile wohl auf Jambudvīpa zu beziehen sein, auch wenn sich einem beim Lesen des Lobpreis-Textes das bekannte, mit der Fluchformel verbundene Bild sofort aufdrängt. S. Dietz bestätigte diese Annahme mit dem Hinweis auf die in (17) folgende Anspielung auf die „Zerstörung durch Feuer" *(tejaḥsaṃvartanī)* am Ende eines Weltzeitalters. Diese Zerstörung erfolgt durch das Aufgehen von sieben Sonnen, vgl. Dietz 2007, S. 93–112.

(17) Am Ende des 16. Kapitels des Lotussūtras mit dem Titel „Die Lebensspanne des Tathāgata" fasst Buddha in Versen den Sinn des zuvor Gesagten zusammen. Zwei Belegstellen in diesen Versen können als Parallele zu der Aussage in (16) und (17) des hier vorliegenden Lobpreises herangezogen werden und die Aussagen verdeutlichen:

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Wenn die Lebewesen das Ende des Zeitalters sehen,
bei dem alles von einem großen Feuer verbrannt wird,
dann ist mein Land sicher …

und

Mein reines Land wird nicht zerstört,
auch wenn die Lebewesen es völlig verbrennen sehen,
so voll von Sorge, Angst
und anderen Leiden" (zitiert nach Deeg 2007, S. 242).

Witzel zitiert in seinem Aufsatz "The Case of the Shattered Head" interessanterweise eine Belegstelle aus Buddhagoṣas Dhammapada-Kommentar, in der die Sonne als Agens für die Spaltung des Kopfes in sieben Teile in Betracht gezogen wird:

The sun with its thousand rays and hundreds of flames, which is the dispeller of darkness, when it rises in the morning, may split your head into seven pieces. (Witzel 1987, S. 383)

(19) *köznäk*: Vielleicht kann eine Textstelle aus dem Blatt 6 des „Großen Hymnus auf Mani" (U 87/v/5/) zur Interpretation dieser Textpassage herangezogen werden. Dort ist *köznäk* in folgendem Kontext belegt: *küvänčlig suv köznäkiŋä suklunmıšlarka* "To those who had plunged themselves into the reflection of pride" (Clark 2013, S. 156, 170). Es ist bekannt, dass dieser Text stark von einer buddhistischen Terminologie geprägt ist und daher auch hier zum Verständnis eines buddhistischen Textes herangezogen werden kann.[11] Auch in der vorliegenden Textstelle wird es sich um den Widerschein von etwas Schlechtem handeln, dass es zu überwinden oder abzulegen gilt, um, wie es später im Text heißt, zur letzten Existenz (im Kreislauf der Existenzen) zu gelangen.

(20) Zu *ärkäčlän-* hier „wellig sein, Wellen schlagen" vgl. UWVerb, S. 179. Der in den im Wörterbuch angeführten Belegstellen häufig angezeigte *kleśa*-Kontext ist vielleicht auch im vorliegenden Fall zu erwarten. Vgl. auch weiter BTT 25,1: 0388 *az nizvanilıg ämgäklig taloyda uzatı [är]käčlänürlär* „deshalb werden sie lange im Ozean des Leidens des Gierkleśas umhergetrieben". In einem Wunschgelübde im 7. Kapitel des Goldglanz-Sūtras heißt es: „Ich möchte die sechs *pāramitā*s vollständig ausüben, den Wesen aus dem Meer der Nöte heraushelfen …" (NobelChin, S. 161).

(22) Zu *azag* „häretisch, Häretiker-" vgl. UW, S. 319b.

(24) kotuz *b[uka*]: Das Wortpaar *kotuz buka* ist belegt, z. B. *kotuz bukača yer kazınu* (Zieme 1981, S. 225). *ṛṣabhasya* "(31) Of him who is a bull (most excellent)" ist als eines der 100 Epitheta des Buddha belegt, vgl. hier Waldschmidt 1979, S. 7–8. Vielleicht kann der wiederum aus dem Blatt 6 des „Großen Hymnus

11 Vgl. zuletzt auch Wilkens 2008, S. 209–210.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

auf Mani“ (U 87) zitierte Beleg: *[bilgä] biliglig šatu tikt[in]g[iz]* hier zur Interpretation herangezogen werden (Clark 1982, S. 169). Möglich ist aber auch, dass *örü tikgülük oronnı* hier die verdienstvolle Tat des Errichtens eines Stūpas umschreibt. Erinnert sei an die Legende der 84000 stūpas, die Aśoka in ganz Jambudvīpa errichtet haben soll, vgl. Deeg 2005, S. 68.

Deeg führt in diesem Zusammenhang aus:

> An dieser Stelle wird auch die Bedeutung des *stūpa* als verbindendes Symbol zwischen Herrscher und Buddhismus deutlich: durch das Errichten von *stūpa*s wird der Herrscher zum (idealisierten) buddhistischen *cakravartin*, zum legitimen Herrscher über den Erdkreis *Jambudvīpa*. (Deeg 2005, S. 69)

(27) *käsök* Lies so? *üz- käs-* „zerteilen$_2$, zerschneiden$_2$“ ist als Synonymkompositum belegt. In OTWF, S. 259 wird auf den Ersatz *üzüksüz* durch *käsöksüz* in QB hingewiesen. Eine Ergänzung und Interpretation der defekten Textstelle *altı käsö*[*k*]-*L'R-LYQ* kann hier nicht geboten werden.

(28) *čambunad* < Skt. *jāmbūnada*, vgl. SWTF II, S. 299: „1 mfn. aus dem Jambu-Fluß stammend (als wesentliches Merkmal einer bestimmten Art von Gold)“.

käs[miš]: Ergänzungsvorschlag nach Suv 658.14: *käsmiš suo altun täg* „wie ein geschnittener Goldriegel(?)“ (nach UW, S. 113a). Es bleibt aber unklar, ob an dieser Stelle im Manuskript ein nur partiell aufgetretener Abrieb vorliegt oder mit dem Auslöschen der Schrift hier eine bewusste Korrektur oder Tilgung vorgenommen wurde.

(29) *č(a)ram(a)baviki-lıg*: *čaram(a)baviki* < Skt. *caramabhavika* „die letzte Lebensstufe/Stätte (vor dem Erlangen der Buddhaschaft)“. Zu einer Belegstelle vgl. Suv 314.18–21: *čaram(a)baviki atl(ı)g äŋ kenki bir tugum ažunlug ikinti oronlug tokuzunč orontakı bodis(a)t(a)vlarka …* Die altuigurische Version weist hier gegenüber der chinesischen Yijing-Version eine detailiiertere Bezeichnung für die neunte Stätte (*oron*, Skt. *bhūmi*) auf.

sut: Belegt ist altuigurisches *sut* als Entlehnung für Skt. *sudhā*, der Bezeichnung für die Speise der Götter bzw. ein spezielles Getränk, Nektar, Milch (SH, S. 148a; MW, S. 1225b). Nach SH kann diese Speise verschiedenfarbig sein, wobei die weiße Speise den höchsten Rängen vorbehalten ist. Vgl. BTT 20, S. 79, Anm. 0246; BTT 25,1, S. 274–275 (3709).

köküš „bläulich“: Zu dieser Farbbezeichnung und entsprechenden Belegstellen vgl. BTT 13, S. 37 (1.100); OTWF, S. 102. Gemäß den Vorstellungen der buddhistischen Kosmologie ist Jambudvīpa südlich des Berges Sumeru gelegen und aus dieser Lage resultiert direkt die Tatsache, dass der Jambudvīpas Himmel blau ist, da er das Lapislazuli der südlichen Seite des Berges Sumeru reflektiert (Sadakata 1997, S. 26). Es bleibt aber aufgrund der Versehrtheit des Manuskripts unklar, ob sich die Belegstelle direkt auf die Eigenschaften Jambudvīpas bezieht oder ob hier ein Bezug zu den auf Jambudvīpa Verweilenden vorliegt. *köküšlär* „die Bläulichen“ könnte ein Epitheton sein, dass auf der Grundlage

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

eines der 32 *lakṣaṇa*s gebildet wurde, vgl. zum Beispiel Suv 346.22–347.3: *yaltrıyur t(ä)ŋrim sačıŋız kara kabuŋlar eliginiŋ öŋi täg oŋaru ävrilmiš ävirlig kök ražavrt öŋlüg tetir.* Kirfel (1959, S. 35) beschreibt diese Körpermerkmal in der Symbolik des älteren Buddhismus folgendermaßen: „13. Jedes Körperhaar steht einzeln und ist blau (nīla), und zwar wächst aus einer Pore nur ein Haar.“ Ein weiterer möglicher Hinweis findet sich in der Cuṇḍīdevīdhāraṇī. In der Darlegung des *abhicāraka* genannten Ritual heißt es (in Übersetzung der altuigurischen Version):

> … wenn man den Sinn nach der Buddhaschaft hervorbringen und nach guten Taten streben will, dann soll man einen barmherzigen Sinn hervorbringen und der Ritualist soll seinem eigenen Körper ein blaufarbenes Gewand anlegen … Alle zu verwendenden Dinge vom Weihrauch, Blumen, Speisen und Getränken, Früchten bis zur Erde soll man bläulichfarben machen.“ (BTT 23, S. 74–75)

(30) *čambudivip yert[inčü yer]intä*: Andere Varianten zur Ergänzung der vorhandenen Textlücke sind möglich, die jedoch in der Interpretation der Textstelle nicht variieren, z. B. *čambudivip yert[inčü ič]intä, čambudivip yert[inčü yer suv]-ınta*, vgl. DTS, S. 138a.

(33) 十種大　力似日光輪: Tsuneki Nishiwaki verdanke ich den Hinweis auf inhaltliche Parallelen zur vorliegenden chinesischen Textzeile in den von Mañjuśrī in Verehrung des Tathāgata gesprochenen *gāthā*s im 大薩遮尼乾子所說經 *Dasazheniqianzi suoshuo jing* (Taishō 272, Bd. 9), 2. Abschnitt 問疑品第二 *Yiwenpin dier* 318c 25–27:

> 如來十力淨　智慧月明朗
> 神通弟子眾　亦如星宿光
> 譬如日光輪　照曜諸世間
> „[Wie …,] so **die Zehn Kräfte** des Tathāgata sind rein,
> und der Mond seiner Weisheit leuchtet so hell (wörtl.: ist hell und klar),
> dass seine Schülerschar selbst mit supranormalen Fähigkeiten
> wie das Funkeln der Sterne wirkt.
> Wie das **Rad der Sonne** (d. h. die Sonnenscheibe)
> die ganze Welt erleuchtet […]“[12]

Vgl. zu einem altuigurischen Beleg für dieses Bild z. B. auch folgende Passage aus dem 15. Kapitel der Maitrisimit: „… erscheint in der Welt als Buddha-[Son]ne, die alle$_2$ Welten mit dem Glanz der Weisheit, welche mit allen Gunas *(ädgü)* ausgezeichnet ist, erleuchtet$_2$“ (Geng/Klimkeit/Laut 1993, S. 209).

(36) *üšümäk*: Zu *üšü-/üši-* „gefrieren; frieren; erstarren, steif/starr werden“ vgl. DTS, S. 628b.

12 Die deutsche Übersetzung verdanke ich Jin-il Chung. Er vermutet, dass 日光輪 als chinesische Wiedergabe von Skt. *sūryamaṇḍala* bzw. *sūryabimba* „Sonnenscheibe“ zu betrachten ist.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(37) Zu *tört türlüg korkınčsız bilgä biligli[g]* (Skt. *caturvaiśāradya*) „das vierfache furchtlose Wissen / vier Furchtlosigkeiten" vergleiche u. a. Geng/Klimkeit/Laut 1993, S. 201 *(tört törlüg korkınčsız bilgä bilig)*, 213; BTT 25,1, S. 272–273 *(tört törlüg korkınčsız bilgä biliglig)*. Weitere Belege finden sich auch im AYS: Suv 69.18–19 *(tö[rt] korkınčsız bilgä biliglär)*, Suv 311.1–2 *(tört törlüg korkınčsız bilgä bilig)*.

(38) *tört tugum* (Skt. *caturyoni*, Chin. 四生) „die vier Geburtsarten": Geburt aus dem Ei, Geburt aus dem Schoß, Geburt aus dem Schweiß und spontanes Entstehen, vergleiche u. a. SH, S. 178b; BTT 21, S. 172 (0141–0142).

(39) *sumer tag* „Sumeru-Berg". In einigen Texten ist auch die Form *sumur tag* belegt, vgl. dazu BTT 8, S. 31: Text A, Z. 22 und Anm. A 22.

Abkürzungen und Bibliografie

AYS = *Altun Yaruk Sudur*
BTT = Berliner Turfantexte

Brauen, M. 1992: *Das Mandala. Der heilige Kreis im tantrischen Buddhismus*. Köln.
BTT 6 = G. Schmitt/T. Thilo/T. Inokuchi: *Katalog chinesischer buddhistischer Textfragmente*. Bd. 1. Berlin 1975.
BTT 8 = G. Kara/P. Zieme: *Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas „Tiefer Weg" von Sa-skya Paṇḍita und der Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. Berlin 1977.
BTT 13 = P. Zieme: *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*. Berlin 1985.
BTT 20 = P. Zieme: *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra. Edition alttürkischer Übersetzungen nach Handschriftfragmenten von Berlin und Kyoto*. Turnhout 2000.
BTT 21 = J. Wilkens: *Die Drei Körper des Buddha (trikāya). Das dritte Kapitel der uigurischen Fassung des Goldglanz-Sūtras (Altun Yaruk Sudur). Eingeleitet, nach den Handschriften aus Berlin und St. Petersburg herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Turnhout 2001.
BTT 23 = P. Zieme: *Magische Texte des uigurischen Buddhismus*. Turnhout 2005.
BTT 25,1–2 = J. Wilkens: *Das Buch der Sündentilgung. Edition des alttürkisch-buddhistischen Kšanti Kılguluk Nom Bitig*. Teil 1–2. Turnhout 2007.
BTT 26 = Y. Kasai: *Die uigurischen buddhistischen Kolophone*. Turnhout 2008.
Clark, L. 1982: „The Manichean *Pothi-Book*." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 9, S. 145–218.
Deeg, M. 2005: *Das Gaoseng-Faxian-Zhuan als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle. Der älteste Bericht eines chinesischen Pilgermönchs über seine Reise nach Indien mit Übersetzung des Textes*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 52).
— 2007: *Das Lotos-Sutra*. Übersetzt von M. Deeg. Mit einer Einleitung von M. Deeg und H. Schmidt-Glintzer. Darmstadt.
Dietz, S. 2007: „The Saptasūryodayasūtra." In: K. Klaus/J.-U. Hartmann (Hrsg.): *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn, zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66), S. 93–112.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

DTS = V. M. Nadeljaev *et al.* 1969: *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*. Leningrad 1969.

Geng Shimin/H.-J. Klimkeit/J. P. Laut 1993: „Das Erlangen der unvergleichlichen Buddhawürde. Das 15. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der Maitrisimit." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 20, S. 182–234.

Ht III = M. Ölmez/K. Röhrborn: *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie III. Nach der Handschrift von Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie von Gabain herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden 2001 (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 34,7).

Ht VIII = K. Röhrborn: *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VIII. Nach der Handschrift von Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie von Gabain herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden 1996 (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 34,5).

Kirfel, W. 1959: *Symbolik des Buddhismus*. Stuttgart.

Maue, D./K. Röhrborn 1979: „Ein *Caityastotra* aus dem alttürkischen Goldglanz-Sūtra." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 129, S. 282–320.

— 1984: „Ein ‚buddhistischer Katechismus' in alttürkischer Sprache und tibetischer Schrift. I." In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 134, S. 286–313.

MW = M. Monier-Williams: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford 1899.

NobelChin = J. Nobel: *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra. Ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. I-tsing's chinesische Version und ihre tibetische Übersetzung*. Bd. 1: *I-tsing's chinesische Version. Übersetzt, eingeleitet, erläutert und mit einem photomechanischen Nachdruck des chinesischen Textes versehen*. Bd. 2: *Die tibetische Übersetzung mit kritischen Anmerkungen herausgegeben*. Leiden 1958.

Oda Juten 小田寿典著 2010: 仏説天地八陽神呪経一巻 トルコ語訳の研究 *Bussetsu tenchi hachiyō shinju kyō ikkan: torukogoyaku no kenkyū [A Study of the Buddhist Sūtra Called Säkiz yükmäk yaruq or Säkiz törlügin yarumiš yaltrïmiš in Old Turkic]*. Text volume und Facsimile volume. Kyoto (*Bayangjing* Series 1).

OTWF = M. Erdal: *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. Vols. I–II. Wiesbaden 1991.

Raschmann, S.-Ch. 1995: „Dies ist der Lobpreis des Mannes." In: Ch. Reck/P. Zieme (Hrsg.): *Iran und Turfan. Beiträge Berliner Wissenschaftler, Werner Sundermann zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 2), S. 183–191.

— 2012: „Some Interesting Aspects of Old Uighur Manuscript Culture." In: 黄建明 Huang Jianming/聶鴻音 Nie Hongyin/馬蘭 Ma Lan (Hrsg.): 首屆中国少数民族古籍文献国际學术研讨会论文集 *Shoujie zhongguo shaoshu minzu guji wenxian guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji [Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Ancient Manuscripts and Literatures of the Minorities in China]*. Beijing, S. 366–383.

Sadakata, A. 1997: *Buddhist Cosmology. Philosophy and Origins*. Tokyo.

Schlingloff, D. 1963: *Die Religion des Buddhismus*. Bd. II: *Der Heilsweg für die Welt*. Berlin (Sammlung Göschen 770).

Schmithausen, L. 1997: *Maitrī and Magic. Aspects of the Buddhist Attitude Toward the Dangerous in Nature*. Wien (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 652).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

SH = W. E. Soothill/L. Hodous: *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms with Sanskrit and English Equivalents and a Sanskrit-Pali Index*. London 1937 [Nachdruck Delhi 1997].

Skilling, P. 1992: „The *Rakṣā* Literature of the *Śrāvakayāna*." In: *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16, S. 109–182.

Suv = W. Radloff/S. E. Malov: *Suvarṇaprabhāsa (sutra zolotogo bleska). Tekst ujgurskoj redakcii*. 2 Bde. Sankt-Peterburg 1913 (Bibliotheca Buddhica 17).

SuvKaya = C. Kaya: *Uygurca Altun Yaruk. Giriş, metin ve dizin*. Ankara 1994 (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınlar 607).

SWTF II = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule*. Begonnen von E. Waldschmidt, hrsg. von H. Bechert. Bd. II: *k–dh*. Göttingen 2003.

TT VI = W. Bang/A. von Gabain/G. R. Rachmati: „Türkische Turfantexte VI: Das buddhistische Sūtra Säkiz yükmäk." In: *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* 10 (1934), S. 93–192.

Uçar, E. 2013: *Uygurca Altun Yaruk Sudur IX. Tegzinç,* 金光明最勝王經卷第九*, Diplomatik Neşir Usûlüyle Yayını. Tercüme, Açıklamalar ve Dizin*. İzmir.

UW = K. Röhrborn: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Lfg. 1–6. Wiesbaden 1977–1998.

UWVerb = K. Röhrborn: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. I: *Verben*. Bd. 1: *ab- – äzüglä-*. Stuttgart 2010.

VOHD 10,9 = *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*. Teil 9: *Die Katalognummern 2000–3199*. Beschrieben von K. Wille. Stuttgart 2004.

VOHD 13,15 = *Alttürkische Handschriften.* Teil 7: *Berliner Fragmente des Goldglanz-Sūtras.* Teil 3: *Sechstes bis zehntes Buch, Kolophone, Kommentare und Versifizierungen, Gesamtkonkordanzen*. Beschrieben von S.-Ch. Raschmann. Stuttgart 2005.

Waldschmidt, E. 1979: *The Varṇaśatam. An Eulogy of One Hundred Epitheta of Lord Buddha Spoken by the Grhapati Upāli(n)*. Göttingen.

Wilkens, J. 2008: „Musings on the Manichaean ‚pothi' book." In: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 23 [= *Papers in Honour of Professor Takao Moriyasu on His 60th Birthday*], S. 209–231.

Witzel, M. 1987: „The Case of the Shattered Head." In: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14, S. 363–415.

Zieme, P. 1981: „Ein Hochzeitssegen uigurischer Christen." In: K. Röhrborn/H. W. Brands (Hrsg.): *Scholia. Beiträge zur Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde. Annemarie von Gabain zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Juli 1981 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 14), S. 221–232.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Zwei weitere kleine Bruchstücke soghdischer Versionen des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtras* in der Berliner Turfansammlung

Christiane Reck, Berlin

Werner Sundermann hat mich von Studienbeginn an bis zu unserer letzten Begegnung im September 2012 gefördert und gefordert. Ich bin ihm in tiefer Dankbarkeit für meine berufliche Entwicklung verbunden. Meine Arbeit an der Edition der Montags- und Bemahymnen wie am Katalog der mitteliranischen Turfanfragmente in soghdischer Schrift wäre ohne seine Unterstützung nicht möglich gewesen. Für den Katalog der buddhistischen soghdischen Fragmente stellte er mir seine Manuskripte zur Edition einer knapp 80 Fragmente umfassenden Handschrift einer soghdischen Version des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtras*, die er zusammen mit Kōgi Kudara vorbereitet hatte, zur Verfügung. Einen Überblick über diese Handschrift hatte er auf der von Kōgi Kudara organisierten Tagung *„The Way of Buddha" 2003: Cultures of the Silk Road and Modern Science* in Kyoto vorgestellt.[1] Dies war auch unsere letzte Begegnung mit Kōgi Kudara. Ebenso war es auch Werner Sundermanns letzte Reise in das von ihm sehr geliebte Japan. Mit Kōgi Kudara verband ihn eine enge Freundschaft und erfolgreiche Zusammenarbeit bei der Edition der buddhistischen soghdischen Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung. In seinem Artikel „Ānanda enters into the Buddha's service. Edition of a Sogdian fragment from the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*" im von Peter Zieme herausgegebenen Gedenkband für Kōgi Kudara (Turnhout 2008) veröffentlichte Werner Sundermann eines der größten und repräsentativsten Fragmente dieser Handschrift.

Vom *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* ist bereits 1934 ein großes Fragment einer anderen Handschrift von W. Lentz aus dem Nachlass von F. W. K. Müller publiziert worden: So 14851 recto (Fundsigel: T II Y 50b).[2] Es ist ein großes Fragment einer ursprünglich einseitig beschriebenen Rolle, deren Rückseite zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt für die Niederschrift eines alttürkischen Textes in uigurischer Schrift genutzt wurde. Zugleich wurde ein weiteres Fragment

1 Sundermann 2010.

2 Müller 1934, S. 49–54 [= 550–555], Frg. 10; Fotos unter http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/so/images/so14851_seite1.jpg, bzw. ~so14851_seite2.jpg.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dieser Handschrift zugeordnet: So 14865 recto (Fundsigel: T II Y 63).[3] Beide Fragmente stammen aus Yarchoto, einer großen Ruinenstätte nahe der heutigen Stadt Turfan. Das große Rollenfragment (So 14851/r) beinhaltet „ein Gespräch des Buddha mit dem Bodhisattva Kāśyapa über die vier Arten von Handlungen und ihre Wirkungen".[4] Die bei Müller angeführte Identifikation wurde von Utz korrigiert. Diese ist jetzt allgemein anerkannt: Die chinesische Vorlage der soghdischen Version ist *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* in der Übersetzung von *Dharmakśema*, Taishō Tripiṭaka (weiter T.T.) 374, Bd. 12, 585b6–c4.[5] Für das kleinere Fragment (So 14865/r) „Aus einem Gespräch über das Bodhisattva-Gebot"[6] liegt nun auch eine Identifikation von Kudara vor: T.T. 374, Bd. 12, 467a14–15.[7]

Die alttürkischen Texte auf den Rückseiten der beiden Rollenfragmente sind in zwei verschiedenen Formen kursiver Schrift geschrieben. Bei dem Text des großen Rollenfragmentes (So 14851 verso) handelt es sich nach Aussage von Peter Zieme um einen tantrischen Text. Der Text auf der Verso-Seite von So 14865 stellt einen Kontrakt über Baumwolle dar.[8] Das Stück ist vermutlich direkt für die Verwendung als Vertrag zugeschnitten worden. Eine weitere Randbeschneidung in den alttürkischen Text hinein lässt eine nochmalige Weiterverwendung vermuten.[9]

Fragment So 10239(4)

Mit dem Fragment So 10239(4) (Fundsigel: T I α) liegt offenbar ein weiteres Bruchstück dieser Rolle vor.[10] Das Fundsigel T I α weist aus, dass das Fragment während der 1. Expedition in der Ruine α in Qočo gefunden worden sei. Dies mit den während der 2. Expedition in Yarchoto gefundenen Rollenfragmenten in Verbindung zu bringen, ist nicht unproblematisch. Die Handschrift der soghdischen Recto-Seite entspricht aber der der beiden oben besprochenen Rollenfragmente.[11] Sie weist sogar deutlicher gemeinsame Merkmale mit So 14851/r auf als So 14865/r. Dies betrifft die markante Ausführung des ʾ, des y und des

3 „… höchstwahrscheinlich von derselben Rolle wie Nr. 10 …", Müller 1934, S. 55 [= 556], Frg. 10a; Fotos unter http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/so/images/so14865_seite1.jpg, bzw. ~so14865_seite2.jpg.

4 Müller 1934, S. 49 [= 550].

5 Utz 1978, S. 10.

6 Müller 1934, S. 55 [= 556].

7 Sundermann 2010, S. 79, s. a. Yoshida 2009, S. 319.

8 Publ.: Raschmann 2010, S. 108–113; Kat.: Raschmann 2009, S. 78, Nr. 343.

9 Raschmann 2010, S. 108.

10 Darüber habe ich kurz in Reck 2012, S. 384 mit Fn. 5 berichtet, ohne auf die Begründung und die Probleme einzugehen.

11 Dies hatte auch W. Sundermann in seiner handschriftlichen provisorischen Übersicht über die verschiedenen Handschriften der Fragmente in soghdischer Schrift vermerkt.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

recto verso

© Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

Taf. 1: So 10239(4)

finalen h, sowie den gesamten etwas kantig wirkenden Duktus. Das Fragment ist 12,3 cm × 4,3 cm groß. Der Zeilenabstand von 1,3 cm stimmt mit dem der beiden anderen Fragmente überein, ebenso der Abstand der Zeilenliniierung von 1,7 cm. Mit einer Höhe von 2,9 cm ist der gut erhaltene untere Rand etwas niedriger als der ebenfalls sehr gut erhaltene von So 14865 mit 3,2 cm. Die Höhe des Fragmentes entspricht mit 12,3 cm fast der Hälfte der vollständigen Rollenhöhe von knapp 26 cm. Vom soghdischen Text auf der Recto-Seite sind somit die unteren Zeilenhälften bewahrt. Auf der Verso-Seite befindet sich wie bei den beiden anderen Fragmenten alttürkischer Text in kursiver Schrift, die wiederum verschieden ist von den beiden anderen. Es handelt sich bei diesem Text vermutlich um einen Darlehenskontrakt.[12]

Da der Text des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* sehr lang ist, umfasste er vermutlich zahlreiche Rollen, die nach ihrer Aussonderung für die verschiedensten Weiterverwendungszwecke zerschnitten wurden. Sie helfen uns im Gegensatz zur Rekonstruktion von soghdischen (überwiegend manichäischen) Texten, die auf die Verso-Seiten von chinesischen Sūtra-Texten geschrieben wurden, nicht weiter.

Der erhaltene soghdische Text weist kaum signifikante Merkmale auf.

12 Raschmann 2009, S. 59–60, Nr. 320.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Transliteration und Übersetzung von So 10239(4) recto (Taf. 1)

/1/	](p/k)[5](p/k)[2](.)[2]	/1/	
/2/	](δ) pyδ'r KZNH 'PZY r'm'nt	/2/	] wegen so und immer
/3/	]prw'yδt 'YKZYšw ptxwstw wn'n	/3/	er]sucht, „Könnte ich ihn töten."
/4/	]h 'ywγwnc'yδ pr'w 'PZY ms	/4/	] ebenso/derart dafür/weil und ferner

Kommentar

Neben der üblichen Menge an satzfüllenden Adverbien, Konjunktionen und Partikeln, die die Lektüre soghdischer Fragmente erleichtern, aber nichts zum Verständnis beitragen, finden sich zwei bzw. drei finite Verbformen: prw'yδt und ptxwstw wn'n, wovon die dritte als Hilfsverb fungiert. Zunächst kann prw'yδt als 3. Sg. Ind. von prw'yδ- „(to) seek, (to) look for, to search, to investigate" erklärt werden. In dem hier vorliegenden Zusammenhang ist das Verb weniger im Sinne des physischen Suchens nach etwas als mehr im Sinne von „überlegen, trachten nach" zu verstehen.[13] Das folgende Verb setzt sich zusammen aus dem Präteritalstamm ptxwst von ptxw'y- „(to) kill"[14] mit einer alten, inzwischen bedeutungslosen Akkusativendung -w anstelle der für einen leichten Präteritalstamm zu erwartenden Endung -' und 1. Sg. Konj. von wn- „to do". Diese Kombination bildet den Potentialis „ich kann töten".[15] Somit leitet 'YKZYšw, das für kδwty steht, eine direkte Rede ein, die den Gedanken des leider nicht erhaltenen Protagonisten dieses Satzes ausdrückt. Eine ähnliche Konstruktion findet man in der manichäischen Parabel vom Jungen, der sich taubstumm stellte:

> rty 'ynch βyks'r nyẓ-ty kt z'kty ẓ(γ)yr'n
> „Then the woman went outside (thinking): ‚I shall call the boys,' …"[16]

Das nicht sehr gewöhnliche Ansinnen „wie/ob/dass ich töten könnte" ist ebenfalls in einem anderen Textfragment der Pustaka-Handschrift des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* belegt:

> So 15200 + So 15201 + So 15214/r/1–2/
> /1/] 'yw(γ)wnc(yδ) prw 'PZY nwšw prm (w)'tδ'r ''z'wnt ZK(w)h [
> /2/] yt'kh prw'yδt 'YKZYšn ptxwy'n …[17]

Die entsprechende Passage lautet in der englischen Übersetzung der chinesischen Version von K. YAMAMOTO:

13 GHARIB 1995, S. 292–293, Nr. 7281, 7308–7312, SIMS-WILLIAMS/DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2012, S. 145 und SUNDERMANN 2012, S. 166, Anm. 3 zu 44so.

14 GHARIB 1995, S. 322, Nr. 8012.

15 GMS, § 881.

16 SIMS-WILLIAMS 1990, S. 283–284. Für den Hinweis auf diesen Text danke ich D. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST.

17 Vgl. http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/iran/miran/sogd/sogdnswc/sogdn.htm, s. a. UTZ 1976, S. 19.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> O good man! The same is the case with the enemy of death. It always looks for a chance to kill beings, …[18]

Hier ist auch dieselbe Kombination von 3. Sg. Prät. (prw'yδt) und 1. Sg. Subj. mit der Endung -'n (ptxwy'n).[19] Das Objekt in Form der enklitischen Personalpronomina ist in der von Utz edierten Passage des Pustaka-Buches 'YKZYšn 3. Pl., in dem kleinen Rollenfragment 'YKZYšw 3. Sg. Das ist bemerkenswert, muss aber die Entsprechung nicht ausschließen, da die Kongruenz der Numera nicht immer eingehalten wird.[20] Leider ist das Bruchstück So 10239(4) nur sehr klein und kein weiterer substantieller Kontext erhalten, der hinreichend beweisen würde, dass es sich hier um dieselbe Stelle handelt. Die, wenn auch nicht wörtliche, so doch sinngemäße Übereinstimmung der beiden soghdischen Passagen ist in jedem Fall bemerkenswert. So könnte es sich bei unserem Fragment um eine soghdische Version der chinesischen Passage T.T. 374, vol. 12, 437b22–23 handeln: 善男子。死怨亦爾。常伺衆生而欲殺之。. Bisher konnten unter den vielen anderen Belegen für „töten" in diesem Sūtra keine andere so passende Stelle gefunden werden. Die Form der direkten Gedankenwiedergabe, wie sie im Soghdischen benutzt wird, liegt im Chinesischen nicht vor.

Als soghdischen Versionen des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* zugehörig wurden von Yoshida weitere Fragmente erkannt: drei Fragmente in der Ōtani-Sammlung (Ōtani 1734, 2099 und 2919), die zu der Pustaka-Handschrift (Nr. 2) gehören, und wovon eines (Ōtani 2919) identifiziert werden konnte,[21] ein Fragment in der Kyoto-University,[22] und das Fragment SI KrIV/800, Inv. Nr. 3547 (L 58) in St. Petersburg.[23] Es ist nicht einfach, die Handschriftenzugehörigkeit zu entscheiden. Beide Fragmente, das aus Kyoto und das aus St. Petersburg, haben einen Zeilenabstand von 1,3 cm. Aber die Schrift des Fragmentes in Kyoto unterscheidet sich doch mehr von So 14851 als die von L 58, welches durchaus zur Handschrift der Berliner Rollenfragmente gehören könnte, zumal es ebenfalls eine alttürkische Rückseite aufweist.

So liegen uns bisher mindestens drei verschiedene Handschriften von soghdischen Versionen des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* in der T.T. 374 vor.[24]

18 Yamamoto 1973, S. 301. Dies ist eine Übersetzung der „Südlichen Edition" des Sutra, (T.T. 375), die aber weitgehend mit der „Nördlichen Edition", Dharmaraksas Übersetzung aus dem Sanskrit ins Chinesische von 416–423, (T.T. 374) übereinstimmt, und daher hier herangezogen werden kann.

19 GMS, § 685.

20 Belege für die Verwendung von -(')šw im Pl. siehe GMS, § 1388, VJ 60 und 42c.

21 Kudara/Sundermann/Yoshida 1997, S. 65–67 und Yoshida 2008, S. 344.

22 Yoshida 1994 (T.T. 374, Bd. 12, 456b).

23 Yoshida 2013, S. 158, Fn. 16 (T.T. 374, Bd. 12, 588a–5). Dazu siehe auch Ragoza 1980, S. 42–43 und Taf. 31 oben.

24 Sundermann 2010, S. 76.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Fragment Mainz 154

Zu ergänzen wäre noch ein weiteres Fragment, Mainz 154 (Fundsigel: T II D). Es ist ein Bruchstück (5,9 × 8,3 cm, Zeilenabstand: 1,2 cm) vom unteren Rand (Höhe: 1,8 cm) einer ursprünglich einseitig beschriebenen Rolle. Die Handschrift des soghdischen Textes auf der Recto-Seite konnte bisher keiner anderen Handschrift zugeordnet werden. Die Verso-Seite bewahrt wiederum einen alttürkischen Text in uigurischer Schrift. Das Papier dieser Rolle ist ungewöhnlich stark dunkelbraun. Dieses Fragment ist insofern für uns von Bedeutung, als auf Z. 1 vermutlich ein Teil des Titels des *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* erhalten ist, der auf Z. 2 seine Fortsetzung gefunden haben könnte: m](z'y)xw (p)'n [nyrβ'n pwstk]. Das entscheidende Indiz ist das Wörtchen p'n nach](z'y)xw, das zu m]z'yxw ergänzt werden kann. Bemerkenswert ist, dass WERNER SUNDERMANN eine Diskrepanz zwischen den Titelangaben in den Überschriften und im Text der Pustaka-Handschrift beobachtet hat: Das Wörtchen p'n tauche nur in den Überschriften auf. Dies sei allerdings auch schon in den chinesischen Vorlagen zu beobachten.[25] In unserem Fragment ist, wenn die Rekonstruktion zutrifft, der Überschriftentitel des Werkes angegeben. Leider ist der darüber hinaus erhaltene Text zu gering, als dass man weitergehende Aussagen machen könnte.

Transliteration und Übersetzung von Mainz 154 recto (Taf. 2)

/1/		m](z'y)xw (p)'n
/2/	nyrβ'n pwstk	](..)''ch
/3/		](.)t s''r
/4/		](')PZY ZKw
/5/		pt]β'yr('t)
/6/		](.)xz nxy
/7/		](.)'t 'z(w)
/1/	*Mahā]pari*	
/2/	*nirvāṇasūtra*	]…
/3/		]… hin
/4/		]und den
/5/		dar]lege
/6/		]er stieg ab/steige ab!, tief
/7/		]… ich

Kommentar

/2/](..)''ch ist vermutlich eine am Zeilenende sehr gedehnte Schreibung eines Wortes, das auf -'c endet. Die beiden vorangehenden Buchstaben sind nicht verifizierbar. Sichtbar ist ein relativ kleiner unterzeiliger Bogen.

25 SUNDERMANN 2010, S. 77.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

recto

verso

© Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

Taf. 2: Mainz 154

/3/ s''r ist ebenfalls eine platzfüllende Schreibung am Zeilenende für s'r.

/5/ pt]β'yr't wird hier ergänzt, da das Verb ptβ'yr- „darlegen, lehren" häufig in Sūtra-Texten auftritt. Die Form ist 3. Sg. Konj.

/6/](.)wz könnte sowohl als eine Form von 'nxz- „sich erheben, aufsteigen", möglicherweise 3. Impf. mnxz, oder auch von 'wxz- „absteigen", möglicherweise 3. Impf. w'xz, ergänzt werden. Im Zusammenhang mit dem folgenden nxy „tief" ist wohl eher letzteres anzunehmen und „er stieg ab", oder unter Annahme des Imperativs „Steige ab!" zu übersetzen. Die Wortstellung ist dann schwierig zu interpretieren, da man normalerweise von einer Finalstellung der finiten Verbform ausgeht, welche](.)xz möglicherweise gar nicht ist.

/7/]'t ist vermutlich wieder die 3. Sg. Konj./Subj. eines Verbes, siehe ptβ'yr't. Verwirrend ist hier dann das unvermittelt folgende 'zw „ich", das Teil einer direkten Rede sein müsste.

Bibliografie

Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian–Persian–English*. Tehran.

GMS = I. Gershevitch: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford 1961.

Kudara, K./W. Sundermann/Y. Yoshida 1997: *Iranian Fragments from the Ōtani Collection. Iranian Fragments Unearthed in Central Asia by Ōtani Mission and kept at the Library of Ryūkoku University*. 2 Bde. Kyoto.

Müller, F. W. K. 1934: *Soghdische Texte II*. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von W. Lentz. Berlin (Sonderdruck aus den *Sitzungsberichten der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* 1934, Nr. XXI, S. 504–605).

Ragoza, A. N. 1980: *Sogdijskie fragmenty Central'no-aziatskogo Sobranija Instituta Vostokovedenija*. Moskva.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

RASCHMANN, S.-CH. 2009: *Alttürkische Handschriften*. Teil 14: *Dokumente. Teil 2*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,22).

— 2010: „Herbst-Baumwolle *(küzkikäpäz)*." In: M. KAPPLER/M. KIRCHNER/P. ZIEME (Hrsg.): *Trans-Turkic Studies. Festschrift in Honour of Marcel Erdal*. Istanbul, S. 103–116.

RECK, CH. 2012: „The Fragments of Sogdian Versions of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* in the Berlin Turfan Collection." In: 黄建明 HUANG JIANMING/聶鴻音 NIE HONGYIN/馬蘭 MA LAN (Hrsg.): 首屆中国少数民族古籍文献国际學术研讨会论文集 *Shoujie zhongguo shaoshu minzu guji wenxian guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji [Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Ancient Manuscripts and Literatures of the Minorities in China]*. Beijing, S. 384–400.

SIMS-WILLIAMS, N. 1990: „The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad II: Mani at the Court of the Shahanshah." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4, S. 281–288.

SIMS-WILLIAMS, N./D. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2012: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Pt. 2: *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 7).

SUNDERMANN, W. 2010: „A Sogdian *Mahāyānamahāparinirvāṇasūtra* Manuscript." In: T. IRISAWA (Hrsg.): *"The Way of Buddha" 2003: The 100th Anniversary of the Otani Mission and the 50th of the Research Society for Central Asian Cultures*. Kyoto, S. 75–83.

— 2012: *Die Rede der Lebendigen Seele. Ein manichäischer Hymnenzyklus in mittelpersischer und soghdischer Sprache*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 30).

UTZ, D. A. 1976: *An Unpublished Sogdian Version of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra in the German Turfan Collection*. Unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass.

— 1978: *A Survey of Buddhist Sogdian Studies*. Tokyo.

YAMAMOTO, K. 1973: *The Mahayana Mahaparinirvana-sutra. A Complete Translation from the Classical Chinese Language in 3 volumes, annotated and with Full Glossary, Index, and Concordance*. Tokyo.

YOSHIDA, Y. 1994: „ソグド語の『涅槃経』の断片 Sogdogono ‚Nehangyō' no danpen [A Sogdian Fragment of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra*]." In: *Seinan azia kenkyū [Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies, Kyoto University]* 41, S. 57–62 [in Japanese].

— 2008: "Die buddhistischen sogdischen Texte in der Berliner Turfansammlung und die Herkunft des buddhistischen sogdischen Wortes für Bodhisattva." In: *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 61/3, S. 325-358 [übers. von Y. KASAI in Zusammenarbeit mit CH. RECK].

— 2009: „Buddhist Literature in Sogdian." In: R. E. EMMERICK/M. MACUCH (Hrsg.): *A History of Persian Literature*. Companion Volume I: *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran*. New York, S. 288–329.

— 2013: „Buddhist Texts Produced by the Sogdians in China." In: M. DE CHIARA/M. MAGGI/G. MARTINI (Hrsg.): *Multilingualism and History of Knowledge*. Vol. 1: *Buddhism among the Iranian Peoples of Central Asia*. Wien, S. 155–179.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Re-Examination of the Problem of the So-Called "Tocharian" Languages and the Meaning of "Tugristān" between Kucha and Beshbaliq*

Rong Xinjiang, Beijing

In the field of the historical studies of Xinjiang (Chinese Turkestan), the topic of the "Tocharian" languages and the "Tocharians" has always been one meriting deep discussion by scholars. In this paper, I will go through the sources concerning the important word *toγri*, and discuss the problem of "Tugristān/ Tohuristan" in a bid to put forward my view on this topic.

I. The name of the so-called "Tocharian" languages and related academic debates

Before discussing the keyword *toγri* of this paper, we ought to give a brief review of previous research on the so-called "Tocharian" languages (i. e. "Tocharian A" and "Tocharian B"). In 1907, Müller noticed an as yet unknown language called *toγri* mentioned in a colophon of the Uighur *Maitrisimit* (T II S 2) discovered in Sängim by the German Turfan Expeditions. He then named this unknown Indo-European language of the northern route of the Silk Road in Xinjiang "Tocharisch".[1] In their decipherment published in 1908, Sieg and Siegling agreed with Müller's suggestion, naming the two language varieties in these manuscripts "Gruppe A" and "Gruppe B".[2] In 1913, Lévi identified the personal name "Swarnate" on a wooden tablet discovered by Pelliot in Kucha as being Sufadie 蘇伐疊, a king of Kucha during the Zhenguan era (627–649 AD) according to the Chinese sources of the Tang Dynasty (618–907). Thus, he concluded that the variety of "Gruppe B" (now often called "Tocharian B") should be the language that prevailed in Kucha in the 7th century.[3]

* I am grateful to Dr. Wang Yuanyuan for translating this paper and to Dr. Ching Chao-jung for giving advice.

1 Müller 1907.

2 Sieg/Siegling 1908.

3 Lévi 1913. According to H. Lüders and G.-J. Pinault, the king's name should be Swarnatepe. For a detailed review of this issue, see Ching 2013.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In 1916, Sieg and Müller made comparative analyses of "Gruppe A" manuscripts found in Shorchuk (Yanqi district, China) and the Uighur *Maitrisimit* from Turfan, in an attempt to confirm that the name of the unknown language was "Tocharian". It was noted in the colophon of the *Maitrisimit* that the work was transposed by the Nakridiš-born Āryacandra Bodhisattva from the "Indian" language into the *toγri* language. Sieg and Müller identified Nakridiš as Nagaradeśa/Nagri/Nakri, that is, the Najie 那竭 in the Chinese travel notes of Faxian and Xuanzang. Nagaradeśa, near modern Jalalabad in the Kabul River basin, is in the territory of *Tuhuoluo guo* 吐火羅國 (Tocharistan) according to the *Books of Tang*[4]. Sieg and Müller then claimed that the so-called "Tocharian" manuscripts found in Shorchuk originated from the region of Tocharistan.[5] In 1918, Müller adduced another Uighur colophon, of what was later recognized to be the *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* (T III 84–68 = U 1899), as evidence to support their view. The sutra was said to be translated firstly from the language of Uguküšän into the *toγri* language, and then from that into Old Turkish. Müller identified the name "Kuišan/Küšän" (cf. Arabic *kušāniya*, Persian *Kušānī*) in pre-modern historical texts as well as the "kuisan (küsän)" of the "tört kuisan (küsän)" seen in newly-found Uighur manuscripts as the Kushan Empire during the time of the Han Dynasty (202 BC – 220 AD). He believed that one of the founders of this empire was the "Tocharians" (Greek *Τόχαροι*), so that the territory of Kushan was later also known as Tocharistan.[6]

In 1930, however, Haneda proved with conclusive evidence that "Küsän" and "tört Küsän" were just the Uighur names of Kucha. They corresponded respectively to Chin. *Quxian* 曲先 / *Kuxian* 苦先 and *si Quxian* 四曲先 "four Quxian" / *si Kuxian* 四苦先 "four Kuxian" in the 10th to 13th centuries. Therefore these names have nothing to do with Kushan.[7] This view was supported by Pelliot.[8] According to a bilingual hymn to Mani in Tocharian B (i.e. Kuchean, see *infra*) and Uighur unearthed in Turfan and published in 1958, the Uighur word *küsän* was used to indicate Tocharian B.[9]

As to the variety of "Gruppe A" (now often called "Tocharian A"), many scholars have accepted Müller and Sieg's view that it is to be identified with the *toγri* language. However, Bailey suggested that it should be called "Agnean".[10] In 1949, Henning pointed out that the birthplace of Āryacandra should be

4 As explained by Zhang (1992), *Tuhuoluo guo* is a Chinese term in the Sui-Tang period to indicate a specific region to the west of Pamirs, approximately equivalent to Bactria, i.e. the historical Tocharistan of the classical sources.
5 Müller/Sieg 1916.
6 Müller 1918.
7 Haneda 1930a, b.
8 Pelliot's review was published in *T'oung Pao* 28 (1931). See also Pelliot 1934.
9 von Gabain/Winter 1958, No. 2; Pinault 2008a.
10 Bailey 1937.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

''knydyš "Agnideśa" rather than Nakridiš.[11] As implied by Xuanzang's record, Agnideśa was the Sanskritized name of the kingdom of Yanqi (Agni). Moreover, Henning disapproved of the parallel between the name *toγri* and the Sogdian form *'tγw'r'k*, i. e. inhabitants of Tocharistan. In other words, he broke the link between the "Gruppe A" and the historical Tocharistan (Bactria), but he did not offer an explanation as to why the "Gruppe A" was called *toγri* among the Old Uighurs.[12]

Nowadays, it can be concluded from the research of Lévi, Haneda, Pelliot and Henning that *toγri* is not related to the historical Tocharistan west of the Pamirs, but to a region probably between Beshbaliq (Beiting) and Kucha, including Karashahr (Yanqi).[13] Regrettably, no indications have so far been found to render *toγri* more adequately than with "Tocharian". Therefore, Sieg published a paper titled "Und dennoch 'Tocharisch'" in his old age.[14] Ji Xianlin, as Sieg's student, recalled Sieg stamping the floor with his walking stick as he said this word. On the other hand, Henning changed his view in his final days. In a posthumous paper published in 1978, Henning admitted that the word *toγri*, in the sources dated in the period of the Uighur Kingdom (866–1283), could share the same origin as the "Tocharistan" to the west of the Pamirs, and could be traced back to the Kingdom of *Tukriš* recorded in Babylonian materials. In the meantime, he stressed that the "tört Küšän" are today's Kucha, Karashahr (Yanqi), Turfan and Beshbaliq.[15] In 1980, Tugusheva published an Uighur manuscript of *The Biography of Xuanzang* preserved in Russia,[16] in which *toγri* was used to translate *Duhuoluo* 睹貨邏 (i. e. *Tuhuoluo* 吐火羅).

At first glance, the usage found in Tugusheva's edition permits Chinese scholars to render "*toγri* language" as *Tuhuoluo yu* 吐火羅語, lit. "the language of *Tuhuoluo* (Tocharistan)" and then to adopt the Western convention of calling Tocharian A and Tocharian B both *Tuhuoluo yu*, i. e. the "Tocharian" languages.[17] However, this terminology causes difficulties when scholars discuss the history of Central Asia. While some scholars prefer to call Tocharian A "Agnean" (Chin. *Yanqi yu* 焉耆語) and Tocharian B "Kuchean" (*Qiuci yu* 龜茲語),[18] other scholars, especially the ones observing the German conventions, still use the name "Tocharian" *(Tuhuoluo yu)*,[19] which is also customary in Indo-European

11 Henning 1949.
12 Henning 1938, p. 545.
13 *Ibid*., p. 559.
14 Sieg 1937.
15 Henning 1979.
16 Tugusheva 1980, p. 29.
17 Huang 2002.
18 Geng/Zhang 1980, p. 156, n. 14.
19 For example, Ji Xianlin adopts this term in his works; see the entry "*Tuhuoluo yu*" (i. e. the Tocharian languages) written by him in the volume of languages and scripts of *Zhongguo dabaike quanshu* 中國大百科全書 *[Encyclopedia of China]*, p. 390; Ji/Winter/Pinault 1998.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

linguistics. Some specialists, such as Georges-Jean Pinault, try to find a compromise, using "Tocharian" as a general term for the two languages, and when necessary, "Kuchean" for Tocharian B. However, the Tocharian A language is seldom called "Agnean", and in many cases – especially in the studies of *Maitrisimit* – it is simply referred to as "Tocharian", as a convenient term designating the *toγri* language.[20]

Nevertheless, the meaning of *toγri* is questionable. According to Henning, *toγri* referred to the geographical area from Kucha to Turfan (Qočo, namely Gaochang in Chinese) and Beshbaliq, including Karashahr (Yanqi). On the other hand, the Chinese names Yanqi and Tuhuoluo appear side by side in the official documents of the Tang Dynasty discovered in Turfan.[21] These documents prove that the two Chinese names are not interchangeable but distinct from each other and that the concept of Tuhuoluo in Tang Chinese was applied strictly to the Tocharistan (Bactria) in the West of the Pamirs. In other words, if Tocharian A was *the* dominant language of Yanqi, I think the name "Agnean" rather than "Tocharian" or "Tocharian A" is adequate. Moreover, if "the *toγri* language" refers to the language of Tocharistan, then it is not correct to call the local language in Yanqi "Tocharian". I shall return to this later.

The history and function of Tocharian A has been an issue under debate. It has often been claimed that Tocharian A was only used in Buddhist texts, and that such texts were copied or brought directly from the west of the Pamirs, so that the language found in Yanqi would be "Tocharian", so to speak "the language of Tocharistan". But the colophon of the Tocharian A *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* found in Yanqi reads "This book … ordered (to copy). Kāṣṣar Kalyāna Gautami (?) … and … *āk* the *čor. May we all become Buddhas!*"[22] This colophon shows clearly that Tocharian A was a living and popular language in Yanqi. Furthermore, Ogihara found a Tocharian A secular document (THT1519) from Shorchuk (Yanqi district) in the German Turfan collection. It is an account fragment listing expenses, proving that Tocharian A was a major language in the daily life of the Yanqi kingdom at least from the 7th century on. As a consequence, Ogihara and Ching suggest in a Chinese article to bring back the name "Agnean" *(Yanqi yu)* instead of Tocharian A.[23]

However, what to call this group of Indo-European languages is still a difficult problem in the eyes of historians. So far scholars have not found any specific term to denote "the language of the Yanqi/Agni kingdom" from historical sources

20 For examples, see Pinault 1984; 1994; 1995; 2008b.

21 For instance in the application of a Sogdian traveller called Kang Yiluoshi 康義羅施 from 685 for a pass to travel into mainland China, see Tang *et al.* 1996, pp. 346–350. In this document, some of Kang's partners are from Tuhuluo. They found a few inhabitants of Gaochang, Yanqi and other districts under Tang rule to fill their application as their "guarantors" (*baoren* 保人).

22 Ji/Winter/Pinault 1998, p. 65.

23 Ching, p.c. Jan. 6, 2014; see also Ogihara 2014.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

written in Chinese, Uighur or other languages.[24] But, Sieg in his "Und dennoch 'Tocharisch'" emphasizes that the self-designation of Tocharian A is the "*Ārśi* language". In Tocharian A, *Ārśi* refers to local residents of Yanqi/Agni and to the language that they spoke, not to "the holy language" (i.e. Sanskrit) as Bailey supposed.[25] Next to Agni in Sanskrit, we also find the toponym "Solmi" in Uighur in the colophon of the *Maitrisimit*. Zhang Guangda and Geng Shimin have made contributions by identifying the Chinese placename Suolimi 唆里迷 since the Yuan dynasty and Uighur Sulmi/Solmi as Yanqi. In the colophon of the Uighur *Maitrisimit*, if the term *toγri* was used to denote *the* main language in Yanqi, one may ask why the Uighurs did not call it the language of *Solmi* or the language of *Agni*, since both *Solmi* and *Agni (Agnideśa)* are mentioned in the Uighur colophon published by Müller in 1918 as well as the colophon of the Hami version of the *Maitrisimit* published by Geng and Zhang in 1980.[26]

The academic debate over the name of "Tocharian" is complicated, and no conclusive results have been obtained so far, necessitating the above introduction. From a different perspective, I will here try to supplement the previous research with a study on the keyword *toγri*.

II. Related materials about *toγri* and "Tugristān/Tohuristan"

Let us have a look at the original meaning of *toγri* and "Tugristān/Tohuristan" firstly in their original context and then move on to the discussion.

(i) The colophon of the Uighur *Maitrisimit*

The name "Tocharian" given to "Gruppe A" and "Gruppe B" derived from the Uighur word *toγri*, which was initially found in the colophon of the Uighur *Maitrisimit*. Here I provide an English translation of Geng's Chinese translation of the colophon at the end of Chapter 27 published in 2008:

> Being proficient in Dharma from the interior and the Eighteen Logics from the exterior, Agni(Yanqi)-born Āryacandra Bodhisattva ācārya composed (this) in the Tocharian *(toγri)* language out of the Indian language. Ilbaliq(Beiting?)-born Prajñāraksita ācārya translated from the Tocharian language into the Turkish *Maitrisimit*.[27]

24 Unlike the ruins in the Turfan, Kucha and Khotan regions, Karashahr (i.e. the ruins of ancient Yanqi City and its surrounding sites), which is close to the Bosten Lake, is a low-lying area. So less documents were found in Karashahr probably because of its damp weather. The presently-known manuscripts from Yanqi are mainly discovered in the temple site of Shorchuk and in the grottoes of Qigexing (Shikchin) in an elevated position.

25 Cf. Ogihara 2012.

26 Cf. Müller 1918, pp. 581–582; Geng/Zhang 1980, p. 154.

27 Geng 2008, pp. 536–537.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gaochang 高昌 and Beiting 北庭 were the capitals *(Ilbaliq)* of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom. Being an alternative capital, Beiting was less important than Gaochang, so as HAMILTON initially suggested, I think Ilbaliq here is more likely to refer to Gaochang.[28] Moreover, the geographic records in the Staël-Holstein miscellany show that the prefecture of Xizhou (Turfan) was the capital of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom in 925 AD.[29] The above colophon implies that the language of *toγri* remained popular in Yanqi and Gaochang. The mother tongue of Aryacandra from Yanqi was the *toγri* language, and some Buddhist masters from Gaochang also knew this language.

(ii) The Sogdian part of the Karabalgasun Inscription

According to YOSHIDA, the following is mentioned in col. 19 of the Sogdian part of the Karabalgasun Inscription erected on the Mongolian steppes:

> … Again, many times he smashed the mighty Tibetan army out of Kucha and himself took their realm, (i.e.) that of the Four Tuγri country and many other regions.[30]

Here, 'four Tugri' is written *ctβ'r twγr'k(c')ny* in Sogdian. YOSHIDA believes this sentence corresponds to col. 16 of the Chinese part 復吐蕃大軍攻圍龜茲，天可汗領兵救援 "Again, the mighty Tibetan army invaded and surrounded Kucha. Tien Kehan led his army and gave relief (to the local people)".[31] This describes back-and-forth warfare between the Uighurs and the Tibetans in the north Tarim Basin after the battle of Beiting. So the "four Tugristan" here probably denotes an area ranging from Beiting, Gaochang to Kucha.

(iii) A Manichaean hymn to a Church leader in Middle Persian (MIK III 8259)

This Manichaean hymn, preserved in Berlin, contains praise of some important persons. Here is the translation of SUNDERMANN:

> Mār Wahman Xwarxšēd by name teacher of the province "East", famous hea[d of Č]ahār Tu(g)ristā[n], and …[32]

In order to decide the date of the head of [Č]ahār Tu(g)ristā[n], SUNDERMANN, with the help of ZIEME, restores the honorific title of the Uighur Khan mentioned on the fragment as *[Ay] tängridä qut [bulmiš qut o]rnan[miš alpïn ärdämin il tutmiš alp arslan]*, who was on the throne from 1007 to 1019.

28 HAMILTON 1958, p. 443. I owe many thanks to Dr. YUKIYO KASAI for reminding me of this article. When I discussed this issue in the Chinese version of this article (submitted in January 2014), it unfortunately escaped my eye.
29 BAILEY 1951, pp. 3, 13–14.
30 YOSHIDA 2009, p. 350.
31 YOSHIDA 1988, pp. 34, 39, 47–52; 2009, p. 350.
32 SUNDERMANN 1992, p. 68. As to this fragment, please refer to GULÁSCI 2001, pp. 56–61, fig. 28, and see also BEDUHN 2001.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Henning discusses this passage, pointing out that the "Teacher" (*hmwc'g*, i. e. *Možag*) of the province "East" is the religious head of Čahār Tugristān, which seems to be some place near Beshbaliq (Beiting), Kucha and Turfan (Gaochang). He adds that Čahār Tugristān was the original name of the patriarchate before the conversion of Bögü Khan in 762, and therefore there is no ground for the usual assertion that Mār Wahman Xwarxšēd was the *Možag* of Tocharistan. The latter, residing in the historical Tocharistan and sent by king Tēš to China in 719, has no relationship with Mār Wahman Xwarxšēd, who resided in Gaochang City (Qočo) and was probably a predecessor or a successor of the *Možag* mentioned in the Karabalgasun inscription.[33] Disagreeing with Henning's viewpoint that Čahār Tugristān was four areas including Kucha, Karashahr, Turfan and Beshbaliq, Huang Shengzhang thinks that Čahār Tugristān just refers to Yanqi/Karashahr.[34] Based on the fact that a Manichaean temple had been established in Yanqi before the year 762, Wang Yuanyuan infers that Yanqi might have been an early religious center for Manichaeism in the Western Regions (Xinjiang) before the hierarch took up residence in Gaochang, so that perhaps Čahār Tugristān referred to Yanqi. According to MIK III 8259, the *Možag* of the early 11th century who resided in Gaochang then still used a title bearing the name of Čahār Tugristān, probably used as an inheritance or reminiscence of the past.[35]

This Middle Persian fragment dated in the early 11th century was discovered in Turfan, so the *Možag* of Čahār Tugristān must have been the highest priest of the Manichaean church in Gaochang. Therefore, Čahār Tugristān would not have been far away from Gaochang and would likely have been near Kucha, Yanqi (Karashahr), Beiting (Beshbaliq) and Gaochang (Turfan) as Henning supposed.

(iv) The colophon of Uighur *Iki yiltiz nom*

The Manichaean text labeled T II D 171 (now MIK III 198) was unearthed in Dakianus (Qočo), namely the ruins of the city of Gaochang. It includes a colophon with rich information, given various interpretations by different scholars. Here is the English translation by H.-J. Klimkeit:

> … (written) at a good time, on an auspicious day, in the blessed month, and in the victorious, joyous year, under the patronage of the exalted, blessed, mighty Turkish Realm *(uluš)* of Arγu Talas – in the North and in the South, in the East and in the West its name has been heard and its fame has spread – and under (the care of) the Altun Arγu Turks who are endowed with a blessed realm, in Qašu, Yägänkänt, Ordukänt and Čigil, at the abode of the god Nom Quti (the Great Nous), at the sanitorium of the Mardaspant gods, at the dwelling of the pure, bright, strong angels, in the pure, undefiled (Manichaean) monasteries …

33 Henning 1938, pp. 550–552. Cf. Klimkeit 1993, p. 376, n. 35.
34 Huang 2002, pp. 210–213.
35 Wang 2012, pp. 39–40.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> … the victorious angels, … the venerable, sweet, famous, divine Mar Wahman Xiar Yazd Toyin, the great Tocharian teacher, and the king *(xan)* of the Altun Arγu … tribe, and of Qašu, the sovereign of Čigilkänt, the great Supervisor (of Religion) *(bašdang)* among the Turks, Čigil Arslan Iltirgüg Alp Bürgücän Alp Tarxan Bäg, on the occasion of his assuming power and rule.[36]

Henning argues that the word *toyin (toin)* identified by von Le Coq should be *tört* "four", and that it, together with the word *twγry*, actually forms the term "Four-Twγry". So the title could be interpreted as "Mar Wahman Hayaryazd, the great patriarch (archbishop, teacher) residing in Four-Twγry".[37] Moriyasu accepts the designation of "four Tuγri", but suggests the reading "Wahman Hayaryazd" should be "Wahman Xwarxšēd", who is in fact the same person praised in the fragment MIK III 8259.[38]

As to the places mentioned in the colophon, we can refer to Wang's review of previous research: Arghu is usually believed to be the region between Ïspïjab and Balāsaghūn. Yigänkänt (i.e. new city) is probably present-day Khan Abad of Tashkent in the middle reaches of the Syr-Darya River. Čigilkänt is a small town near Talas. Qašu is in the vicinity of Yigänkänt, and Ordukänt is a town in the area of Ïspïjab. We know that "the sovereign of Čigilkänt" ruling these places is honored as "Čigil Arslan Iltirgük Alp Bürgücän Alp Tarxan Bäg". Čigil was a tribe of the Qarluq confederation, and inhabited a wide area around Talas, Ili River, Issik kul and Kashgar according to Mahmud Khashgarī's *Türki Tillar Diwani*. Therefore, the above towns are all in Arghu, which was controlled by the Qarluq.[39]

About the date of the colophon, scholars' viewpoints are varied: von Gabain places it within the period of 766–780 or around 780.[40] Klyashtornyj dates it in the middle of the 9th century.[41] Moriyasu insists the colophon was composed in the first half of the 11th century.[42] Yoshida provides more evidence from linguistics and history to support Moriyasu's idea, regarding the Sogdian words in the colophon as the latest Sogdian materials so far.[43] Wang assumes it was written after the 830s.[44]

MIK III 198 was discovered in the city of Gaochang, where the *Možag (mwžʾk)* resided. The "sovereign of Čigilkänt" here might be a local ruler under the administration of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom, and his realm was in

36 von Le Coq 1911, pp. 25–30; Klimkeit 1993, pp. 374–375; Wang 2002, p. 32.
37 Henning 1938, pp. 551–552.
38 Moriyasu 2003, pp. 90–92.
39 Klyashtornyj 2000, pp. 375–377; Wang 2012, pp. 33–36.
40 von Gabain 1949, pp. 54–55.
41 Klyashtornyj 2000, p. 375.
42 Moriyasu 2003, pp. 93–96
43 Yoshida 2004, pp. 21–24.
44 Wang 2012, pp. 36–37.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the north of Mt. Tianshan even extending to the area of the Talas River. In a Dunhuang manuscript (S.6551) in praise of the Gaochang Uighur Khan, there is a sentence in Chinese 遂得葛祿、藥摩、異貌達但，競來歸伏，爭獻珠金 "Hence the Qarluq, the Yaghma and the Tatar with strange looks all rushed to surrender and offered pearls and gold".[45] As an affiliated political member of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom, the Čigil tribe was possibly also a branch under the leadership of the Manichaean teacher in Gaochang. Thus, "the great patriarch *('wlwγ mwž'k)* of the Four-Twγry" here should be the highest priest of Manichaean Church of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom, and the connotation of "the Four-Twγry" is identical with that of the hymn MIK III 8259.

(v) The Uighur fragment on the introduction of Manichaeism in the Uighur Realm (81TB10:06–3)

Zieme has recently published a fragment on the introduction of Manichaeism in the Uighur Realm in Mongolia from the findings of Bezklik Grottoes in 1981. Here is the translation of some sentences:

> For inviting three teachers to the city of El Orkun, praying piously. Since the *dentar*s of the Western Regions [...] teachings, ... they came via Tohuristan, by way of Kara kangli, Artiš ... Bögü Khan came out to welcome them personally.[46]

The *Kara kangli yolin* denotes the road to Heichezi 黑車子. Artiš, as an important pass from the north route of the Silk Road into the Mongolian Plateau, is now in the upper reaches of the Irtysh River at the southern foot of the Altai Mountains.[47] Obviously, the word "Tohuristan" refers to a certain area in the "Western Regions" (*xiyu* 西域) around the Eastern Tianshan Mountains, especially the area around Yanqi and Gaochang. Yoshida holds that "Tohuristan" should be read as "Tuγristan". The latter also appears in the Karabalgasun Inscription referring to the areas of Kucha, Yanqi and Gaochang along the north route of the Silk Road.[48]

(vi) The Uighur manuscript of the *Biography of Xuanzang*

As I mentioned before, in the Uighur manuscript of the *Biography of Xuanzang*, the word *toγri* is used to render *Duhuoluo* 睹貨羅 "Tocharistan", i. e. the region of city-states to the west of Pamirs, as well as *Duhuoluo guguo* 睹貨邏故國 "the former/original land of Tuhuoluo".[49] The more common form in Chinese for *Duhuoluo* 睹貨邏(羅) is no doubt *Tuhuoluo* 吐火羅.

45 Zhang/Rong 1989, pp. 24, 32–33.
46 Zieme 2009, p. 4.
47 Zieme 2009, pp. 5–6.
48 Yoshida 2011, pp. 83–84.
49 Tugusheva 1980, p. 29. On the question of locating *Duhuoluo guguo* 睹貨邏故國 near Niya in Chapter V in the bibliography, see Ching's comment in Falk 2016, p. 118.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

III. Origin of the word *toγri* and "Tohuristan" on the northern route of the Silk Road

From the above sources concerning *toγri* and from previous studies, it can be concluded that:

1. The word *toγri* was mainly used in the period of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom (866–1283), with related materials mostly dated in the 10th–11th centuries.
2. The above sources are Manichaean and Buddhist texts. It can be judged from the contents and historical background that the Manichaean texts were composed earlier than Buddhist ones, though they may have been copied around the same time. Of Buddhist texts, the *Biography of Xuanzang* translated by Šingqo Šäli is generally viewed to have been finished in the 10th century.[50] Likewise, the *Maitrisimit* is assumed by Hamilton[51] to be a translation of the 10th century while the Hami version was in Moriyasu's opinion copied in 1067.[52] It can thus be concluded that the Uighur word *toγri* used as the name of a language originates from the name "Tuγristan" or "tört Twγry".
3. The Manichaean manuscripts concerning the names "Tuγristan" or "tört Twγry" all belong to the Manichaean Church of the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom. Since "Tuγristan" is mentioned in relation with the city of Gaochang, it must have been well known to the Uighurs and geographically not far from Gaochang. The *Maitrisimit* shows that the Buddhist masters of Yanqi (Agni) and Gaochang could respectively translate into and from the *toγri* language, that is to say, Yanqi and Gaochang were in the geographic scope of "Tuγristan". Previous studies even assume a much wider area from Kucha to Beiting (Beshbaliq).
4. Since *toγri* originated from "Tuγristan", it is likely to be a large area, not a specific place such as Karashahr, i.e. the capital of Yanqi kingdom. In addition, there are place-names like "tört Küšän" and "üč Sulmi/Solmi" in the colophon of the *Maitrisimit*.[53] As Küšän and Sulmi/Solmi refer to Kucha and Yanqi respectively, the word *toγri* in those Uighur colophons does not exclusively denote Kucha nor Yanqi.
5. So far we do not find a historical term that satisfactorily matches the word *toγri* found in Uighur texts. In the Uighur *Biography of Xuanzang*,

50 Zieme 1976; Hamilton 1984.

51 As to the date, please refer to J.R. Hamilton's review of S. Tekin's edition of the Berlin Maitrisimit manuscripts (*Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhasika-Schule*, 2 vols., Berlin 1980) in: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1985), Nr. 6, cols. 591–592.

52 Moriyasu 1989, p. 21.

53 Geng 2008, pp. 536–537.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Duhuoluo 覩貨羅 (i.e. Tuhuoluo 吐火羅) is rendered with *toγri*, and Duhuoluo/Tuohuoluo specifically denoted Tocharistan (Bactria) in Tang Chinese.

As early as 1948, Bailey made an assumption discussing the problem of "Tokharian": was it possible for those Manichaeans from the Tocharistan west of the Pamirs to introduce the place-name *toγri* into the Manichaean Church of Gaochang?[54] Ching Chao-jung also agrees that *toγri* might once have been an expression for a certain people or language of the Tocharistan to the west of the Pamirs. She stresses that the Uighur and Sogdian materials mentioning "(the language of) *toγri*" all date from the 9th century on. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the historical event that after the eastward invasion of Islam in the early 8th century, probably a number of non-Muslims in Tocharistan moved to the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom seeking religious tolerance. Furthermore, she noted that in *Zhenyuan Shijiao Lu* 貞元釋教錄 (T.2157) "the language of Tuhuoluo" (*tuhuoluo yan* 吐火羅言) was different from the ones spoken in the four garrison commands of Anxi. Thus, *tuhuoluo yan* in Tang Chinese is likely to refer to a language of the historical Tocharistan in the 7th–8th centuries, and therefore it is possible that the so-called "*toγri* language" was originally the name of a language used in that area.[55] Consequently, she wondered if there might have been some manuscripts written in this language that were then brought to the regions between Kucha and Gaochang by these immigrants which resulted in the diffusion of this language there. If this scenario is plausible, it is reasonable to suggest that at this stage, some literature had been translated from the *küšän* language into that *toγri* language (i.e. a language used in Tocharistan/Bactria) before it was introduced among the Old Uighurs. As to the complicated migration and cultural exchange from the end of the 8th century to the beginning of the 9th century and the formation of the Uighur term "the *toγri* language", Ching admits more evidence and historical research are necessary to confirm this idea.[56]

54 Bailey 1947, p. 152.

55 Ching (2014, p. 487) indicates that the term *tuhuoluo yan* "the language of *Tuhuoluo*" found in Tang Chinese is probably Bactrian, but she avoids of making an arbitrary assertion.

56 Ching 2012, pp. 9–14. The revised version is forthcoming. Given that most specialists of the *Maitrisimit* agree that this work is basically translated from a Tocharian A version, Ching supposes that the meaning of *toγri* may have shifted from the 9th to 11th century among the Uighurs: Initially *toγri* may have denoted certain non-Muslim immigrants and their origin (i.e. Tocharistan). Then it became used to denote the location of their new settlements, including Yanqi, which seems to be an important cultural and religious center under Uighur rule. Finally it was widely accepted among the Uighurs as the name for Tocharian A, a dominant language in Yanqi and its neighbouring regions (Ching, p.c; the same point was discussed at "Überlieferung der buddhistischen Texte in Zentralasien: Tocharischer Buddhismus und seine Rolle", Munich, 3–4 April 2014).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

On the basis of the studies by Bailey and Ching, I want to offer some remarks to this problem from the perspective of the spread of Manichaeism.

Since the word *toγri* originated from Manichaean "Tugristān" or "Čahār Tugristān", what is the meaning of this geographical term in the Manichaean world? The above Manichaean manuscripts implies that "Tugristān" was very likely somewhere around Kucha, Yanqi, Gaochang and Beiting. There were different Manichaean bishoprics in the Uighur realms. In the colophon of the *Mahrnāmag* (M1), the names of some royals, noblemen, and officials of Beiting, Gaochang, Kucha (including Kashgar and today's Aqsu), Karashahr and Uč (Shorchuq) are listed. These oasis towns are not political divisions, but Manichaean bishoprics.[57] They are almost the same as the regions of "Tugristān" since "Tugristān" refers to Kucha, Yanqi (perhaps including both Karashahr and Uč), Gaochang and Beiting. If we have to specify four towns for the name "Čahār Tugristān", they should be Kucha, Karashahr, Gaochang and Beiting, not the four garrison commands of Anxi i. e. Kucha, Khotan, Kashgar and Yanqi.

Why did Manichaeans call the regions "Tugristān"? The historical Tocharistan was in Bactria, where a high-level diocese was established with a Manichaean *Možag* in residence. This can be proved by the fact that Tēš, king of Čaγānīyan and Tokhāristān, sent a Manichaean *Možag* in 719 as ambassador to the Chinese emperor according to the *Cefu Yuangui* 冊府元龜.[58] Thus Tocharistan (Bactria) was very probably the original seat of the eastern Church of Manichaeism. After achieving its success along the northern rim of the Tarim Basin, Manichaeans relocated the seat of the eastern Church into the Western Regions (Xinjiang), and the name "Tugristān" was then also borrowed to denote the regions along the north rim of the Tarim Basin.

Though the Uighurs recanted the faith of Manichaeism to embrace Buddhism, they retained some Manichaean terms. The compiler of the *Maitrisimit* borrowed the originally Manichaean term *toγri* to indicate a language used in the region approximately located around Yanqi and Gaochang. In fact, the self-designation of the language of Yanqi seems to be something other than *toγri*, and we have to pursue this question in the Tocharian A manuscripts.

If the original versions of the Uighur *Maitrisimit* and *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* were really written in Tocharian A, *toγri* must be a name given by the Uighurs to indicate this language at a later stage. Even though it was called by the same name as that used for denoting the territory of Tocharistan (Bactria), it was not spoken by the people of Bactrian Tocharistan so far as we can conclude from historical material. It is not convincing to view the ancient inhabitants of Kucha, Karashahr and Turfan as "(Proto-)Tocharians" based on the so-called "Tocharian" *(toγri)* language found in Xinjiang.

57 Henning 1938, p. 567.

58 *Songben Cefu Yuangui* 宋本冊府元龜 [Outstanding Models from the Storehouse of Literature], vol. 971, Beijing 1989, p. 3848. Cf. Henning 1938, p. 552.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

These are my remarks on the Uighur name *toγri* based on the perspective of religious changes in the Gaochang Uighur Kingdom. In a word, *toγri* was used to denote "Tocharistan", but this phenomenon is due to the immigration from the historical Tocharistan (Bactria) to Chinese Turkestan, as supposed by Bailey and then again by Ching. In my opinion, *toγri* in the Uighur context referred to a language used by some inhabitants in the region between Kucha, Yanqi and Gaochang. I suppose that it is an Indo-European language, but not the so-called "Tocharian" languages as presently accepted among Indo-Europeanists.

Abbreviations

AM	*Asia Major*, New Series
APAW	Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
BÉI	*Bulletin d'études indiennes*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
SIAL	*Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
TPS	*Transactions of the Philological Society*

Bibliography

Bailey, H. W. 1937: "Ttaugara." In: *BSOAS* 8/4, pp. 883–921.
— 1947: "Recent Work in 'Tokharian'." In: *TPS* 46/1, pp. 126–153.
— 1951: "The Staël-Holstein Miscellany." In: *AM* 2/1, pp. 1–45.
BeDuhn, J. D. 2001: "Appendix I: Middle Iranian and Turkic Texts Associated with Manichaean Art from Turfan." In: Zs. Gulácsi: *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*. Turnhout (CFM, Series Archaeologica et Iconografica 1), pp. 221–223.
Ching Chao-jung 慶昭蓉 2012: 吐火羅語世俗文獻與古代龜茲歷史 *[Tocharian Secular Documents and the Ancient History of Kucha]*. Postdoctoral report of Peking University. Beijing [in Chinese].
— 2013: "從龜茲語通行許可證看入唐前後之西域交通 [The Traffic in the Western Regions before and after the Tang conquest: a reflection on the Kuchean *laissez-passer*s]." In: 西域文史 *Xiyu wenshi [Literature and History of the Western Regions]* 8, pp. 65–83 [in Chinese].
— 2014: "龜茲僧利言的生平事業(上)—兼論唐人所謂 '吐火羅言' [The Life and Career of the Monk Liyan from Kucha (I): Note on *Tuhuoluoyan* 'the "Tocharian" Language' in Tang Chinese]." In: 唐研究 *Tang yanjiu [Journal of Tang Studies]* 20, pp. 469–490 [in Chinese].
Falk, H. (ed.) 2016: *Kushan Histories. Literary Sources and Selected Papers from a Symposium at Berlin, December 5 to 7, 2013.* Bremen.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gabain, A. von 1949: "Steppe und Stadt im Leben der ältesten Türken." In: *Der Islam* 29, pp. 30–62.

Gabain, A. von/W. Winter 1958: *Türkische Turfantexte IX. Ein Hymnus an den Vater Mani auf "Tocharisch" B mit alttürkischer Übersetzung*. Berlin.

Geng Shimin 耿世民 2008: 回鶻文哈密本《彌勒會見記》研究 *[Studies on the Uighur Manuscript Maitrisimit from Hami]*. Beijing [in Chinese].

Geng Shimin 耿世民/Zhang Guangda 張廣達 1980: "唆里迷考 [On the Solmi]." In: 歷史研究 *Lishi yanjiu [Historical Research]* 1980/2, pp. 147–159 [in Chinese].

Hamilton, J. 1958: Review of A. von Gabain: *Maitrisimit. Faksimile der alttürkischen Version eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule [I]*. Wiesbaden 1957. In: *T'oung Pao* 46, pp. 440–445.

— 1984: "Les titres *säli* et *tutung* en ouïgour." In: *JA* 272/3–4, pp. 425–437.

Haneda Tōru 羽田亨 1930a: "大月氏及び貴霜に就いて [A propos des Ta Yue-tche et des Kouei-chouang]." In: 史學雜誌 *Shigaku-Zasshi [Historical journal of Japan]* 41/9, pp. 1025–1054 [in Japanese; reprinted in: 羽田博士史學論文集 *Haneda hakusi shigaku ronbunshu*, vol. 1, Kyoto 1957, pp. 538–561].

— 1930b: "吐魯番出土回鶻文摩尼教徒祈願文の斷簡 [A propos d'un texte fragmentaire de prière manichéenne en ouigour provenant de Tourfan]." In: 桑原博士還曆紀念東洋史論叢 *Kuwabara Hakushi kanreki kinen Toyoshi Ronso*. Tokyo, pp. 1345–1368, [in Japanese; reprinted in: 羽田博士史學論文集 *Haneda hakusi shigaku ronbunshu*, vol. II, Kyoto 1958, pp. 325–347].

Henning, W. B. 1938: "Argi and the 'Tokharians'." In: *BSOAS* 9, pp. 545–571.

— 1949: "The Name of the 'Tokharian' Language." In: *AM* 1/2, pp. 158–162.

— 1979: "The first Indo-Europeans in History." In: G. L. Ulmen (ed.): *Society and History. Essays in Honor of Karl August Wittfogel*. The Hague, pp. 215–230.

Huang Shengzhang 黃盛璋 2002: "試論所謂吐火羅語及其有關的歷史地理和民族問題 [On the So-called 'Tokharian' and Related Topics on Historical Geography and Nationalities]." In: *id.*: 中外交通與交流史研究 *Zhongwai jiaotong yu jiaoliushi yanjiu*. Hefei, pp. 195–241 [in Chinese].

Ji Xianlin 季羨林/W. Winter/G.-J. Pinault 1998: *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitrisimit-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum*. Berlin/New York (Trends in Linguistics; Studies and Monographs 113).

Klimkeit, H.-J. 1993: *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco.

Klyashtornyj, S. G. 2000: "Manichaean Monasteries in the Land of Arghu." In: R. E. Emmerick/W. Sundermann/P. Zieme (eds.): *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus. Berlin, 14–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderband 4), pp. 374–379.

Le Coq, A. von 1911: "Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho I." In: *APAW* 1911, pp. 393–451.

Lévi, S. 1913: "Le 'tokharien B', langue de Koutcha." In: *JA* 1913/II, pp. 311–380.

Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫 1989: "トルコ佛教の源流と古トルコ語佛典の出現 [L'origine du Bouddhisme chez les Turcs et l'apparition des textes bouddhiques en turc ancien]." In: 史學雜誌 *Shigaku-Zasshi [Historical journal of Japan]* 98/4, pp. 453–487 [in Japanese].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 2003: "The Decline of Manichaeism and the Rise of Buddhism among the Uighurs with a Discussion on the Origin of Uighur Buddhism." In: T. Moriyasu (ed.): シルクロード世界史 *Shiruku Rōdo to sekaishi [World History Reconsidered through the Silk Road]*. Osaka (Osaka University, The 21st Century COE Program Interface Humanities Research Activities 2002–2003, vol. 3), pp. 84–111.

Müller, F. W. K. 1907: "Beitrag zur genaueren Bestimmung der unbekannten Sprachen Mittelasiens." In: SPAW 1907, pp. 958–960.

— 1918: "Toxri und Kuišan [Küšän]." In: SPAW 1918, pp. 566–586.

Müller, F. W. K./E. Sieg 1916: "Maitrisimit und Tocharisch." In: *SPAW* 1916, pp. 395–417.

Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏 2012: "一件吐火羅A語—梵語雙語律藏殘片 [A Bilingual Fragment on Vinaya-pitaka in Tocharian A and Sanskrit]." In: 西域歷史語言研究集刊 *Xiyu lishi yuyan yanjiu jikan [Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions]* 5, pp. 135–142 [in Chinese].

— 2014: "《塔里木盆地考古記》《新疆考古發掘報告》所刊載的吐火羅語資料 [Tocharian Materials Published in *Talimu Pendi Kaoguji* and *Xinjiang Kaogu Fajue Baogao*]." In: X. Rong/Y. Zhu (eds.): 西域考古·史地·語言研究新視野—黃文弼與中瑞西北科學考察團國際學術研討會論文集 *[New Perspectives on Archaeology, History, Geography and Language of the Western Regions. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Huang Wenbi and the Sino-Swedish Northwest China Scientific Expedition]*. Beijing, pp. 267–275 [in Chinese].

Pelliot, P. 1931: Review of Müller/Sieg 1916. In: *T'oung Pao* 28, pp. 493–495.

— 1934: "Tokharien et Koutcheen." In: *JA* 224, pp. 58–62.

Pinault, G.-J. 1984: "Fragment d'un drame bouddhique en koutcheen." In: *BÉI* 2, pp. 163–191.

— 1994: "Aspects du bouddhisme pratiqué au nord du désert du Taklamakan, d'après les documents tokhariens." In: F. Fumimasa/G. Fussman (eds.): *Bouddhisme et cultures locales. Quelques cas de réciproques adaptations. Actes du colloque franco-japonais de septembre 1991.* Paris, pp. 85–113.

— 1995: "Une nouvelle inscription koutchéenne de Qumtura." In: *BÉI* 11–12, pp. 171–220.

— 2008a: "Bilingual Hymn to Mani: Analysis on the Tocharian B Parts." In: *SIAL* 23, pp. 93–120.

— 2008b: *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven (Collection linguistique de la Société de linguistique de Paris 95).

Sieg, E. 1937: "Und dennoch Tocharish." In: SPAW 1937, pp. 130–139.

Sieg, E./W. Siegling 1908: "Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen, vorläufige Bemerkungen über eine bisher unbekannte indogermanische Literatursprache." In: SPAW 1908, pp. 915–934.

Sundermann, W. 1992: "Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts concerning the Turfan Region." In: A. Cadonna (ed.): *Turfan and Tun-huang. The Texts: Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route*. Florence, pp. 63–84.

Tang Changru *et al.* 唐長孺 （主編）(eds.) 1996: 吐魯番出土文書 *Tulufan chutu wenshu [Newly Discovered Turfan Documents]*. Vol. 3. Beijing [in Chinese].

Tugusheva, L. Yu. 1980: *Fragmenty Ujgurskoj versii biografii Sjuan-Czana*. Moscow.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Wang Yuanyuan 王媛媛 2012: 從波斯到中國：摩尼教在中亞和中國的傳播 *Cong Bo si dao Zhong guo: Mo ni jiao zai Zhong ya he zhong guo de chuan bo [From Persia to China: the Spread of Manichaeism in Central Asia and China]*. Beijing [in Chinese].

Yoshida Yutaka 吉田豊 1988: "カラバルガスン碑文のソグド語版について [Some New Readings of the Sogdian Version of the Karabalgasun Inscription]." In: 西南アジア研究 *Seinan ajia kenkyū [Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southeastern Asiatic Studies, Kyōto University]* 28, pp. 24–52 [in Japanese].

— 2004: "シルクロード出土文獻における言語變化の年代決定—ウイグル語文獻中の借用形式の例から [Dating of Linguistic Changes Encountered in the Texts Unearthed from the Silk Road: With special reference to the foreign elements found in Uighur texts of the 10th–14th centuries]." In: 大阪外國語大學言語社會學會誌 *Ōsaka Gaikokugo Daigaku Gengo Shakai Gakkaishi [= Ex Oriente]* 11, pp. 3–34 [in Japanese].

— 2009: "The Karabalgasun Inscription and the Khotanese documents." In: D. Durkin-Meisterernst/Ch. Reck/D. Weber (eds.): *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit. Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann*. Wiesbaden, pp. 349–362.

— 2011: "Some New Readings in the Sogdian Version of Karabalgasun Inscription." In: M. Ölmez *et al.* (eds.): *From Ötüken to Istanbul, 1290 years of Turkish (720–2010)*. Istanbul, pp. 77–86.

Zieme, P. 1976: "Sïngqu Säli Tutung, Übersetzer Buddhistischer Schriften ins Uigurische." In: W. Heissig *et al.* (eds.): *Tractata Altaica. Denis Sinor, sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata*. Wiesbaden, pp. 767–775.

— 2009: "有關摩尼教開教回鶻的一件新史料 [New Materials concerning the Introduction of Manichaeism into the Uighurs]." In: 敦煌學輯刊 *Dunhuangxue jikan [Journal of Dunhuang Studies]* 3, pp. 1–7 [transl. into Chinese by Wang Ding].

Zhang Guangda 張廣達 1992: "吐火羅 *Tuhuoluo*." In: 中國大百科全書 *Zhongguo dabaike quanshu [Encyclopedia of China]*. 1st ed. Vol. 2: 中國歷史 *[History of China]*. Beijing, p. 1165.

Zhang Guangda 張廣達/Rong Xinjiang 榮新江 1989: "有關西州迴鶻的一篇敦煌漢文文獻 [A Dunhuang Chinese Documents concerning Xizhou Uighur]." In: 北京大學學報 *Beijing daxue xuebao [Journal of Peking University]* 2, pp. 24–36.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Parth. *šāhīgān*, MP *šāhīgān*, Sogd. *š(ʾ)yk/qn(h)*

Adriano V. Rossi, Naples

My earliest recollections of Werner Sundermann go back to the 1970s, when my career was at its early phases and I had with him an intense correspondence on matters of Middle Persian linguistics. I had the pleasure to meet him personally only in the early 1980s. Since then, we have never ceased to exchange opinions, comments, publications; over a certain period we have also exchanged drafts of our essays before publication, and also in this way I have learned from Werner the smallest details of his masterly philological teaching. In remembrance of our meetings, in which I had the opportunity to appreciate his humour, affability and generosity, I dedicate to Werner the few lines below, containing some considerations inspired by the reading of his "Soghdisch *š(ʾ)yk/qn*(*h*) 'Palast'" which I hope he would have appreciated.[1]

1. Reviewing the treatment of the lexical family of Sogd. š(ʾ)yk/qn(h) (viz. Mugh Sogd. šʾykn, Ancient Letters Sogd. šʾykn-, Buddhist Sogd. šʾykn(h), šʾykn-, Manichaean Sogd. in Sogd. writing šʾykn-, šykn-, Manichaean Sogd. in Manichaean writing šʾykn-, Christian Sogd. šyqn), Sundermann (1984) contrasted the *communis opinio* ("bisher [...] einhellig") according to which the Sogdian word would represent a Sogdian endogenous development ("echt soghd. Wort"), and proposed to consider it as a Parthian borrowing which entered the Sogdian lexicon at an unknown time ("die [...] parthischer Ursprung wahrscheinlich zu machen versucht wird").

The etymology of Sogd. š(ʾ)yk/qn(h), first introduced by Gauthiot[2] and Benveniste[3] on the basis of many passages of the *Vessantara Jātaka* and

1 The abbreviations are those common in Manichaean studies. Note that $_0$ placed before the abbreviated title of a text or the signature of a manuscript indicates that the word is incompletely attested in the manuscripts (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. xiii). I am deeply indebted to D. Durkin-Meisterernst, C. Leurini, E. Morano, N. Sims-Williams and Ch. Reck for providing bibliographical materials wanting in my library, carefully reading a preliminary draft, and suggesting many improvements.

2 Gauthiot 1914–1923, p. 163, § 171.

3 Benveniste 1929, p. 97, § 76.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

prevailing till the late 1970s,[4] connected it to Ir. √*šai* "settle". This etymology has been criticized by Sundermann 1984, p. 178: "wie plausibel diese Verbindung mit *šay-* auch ist, so unklar bleibt doch die Bildung des Wortendes. Benveniste postulierte […] ein Suffix *-kn*, *kan*, aus **-ka-na-* […] [d]iese Suffixfolge **-ka-na-* existiert wirklich, aber tatsächlich bildet sie Adjektive oder Adverbien von Substantiven"[5]), and was recently abandoned by Livšic.[6]

2. Sundermann's proposal is built upon "die fast vollständige Übereinstimmung der Bedeutungen"[7], on the one hand, and on a possible adaptation of the Parthian word to Sogdian phonetics,[8] on the other.

As far as phonetic questions are concerned, I do not see any particular difficulties in explaining, with Sundermann's arguments (1) the disappearance of the glide *-h-* and the subsequent syllabic contraction (**šāhān°* > *šān°*, cf. Sogd. š'nš'y); (2) the rendering with <k> ~ <q> of either a possible (Arsacid) **šāhīkān* or a possible later **šāhīgān*, the latter better corresponding to the Parthian spelling[9] ⟨š'hyg'n⟩; (3) the shortening of the syllable *-k/gān* > *-k/gă̆n*, which could be expected in a syllable following a long one;[10] (4) fronting and raising (> /ē/) of a vocalic nucleus originally containing /ā/.[11]

3. The semantic side of the problem is a bit more complex than described thirty years ago by Sundermann. For the documentation of a Parth. š'hyg'n meaning "Palast" he quotes the following occurrences:

> M 44/V/3–4/
> kd š'h̲ pd 'rg'wyft ' c š'hyg'n byh̲ 'zgd
> "als der König in Herrlichkeit aus dem Palast heraus fortging"[12]

4 Previous studies: Sundermann 1984, pp. 177–178. MacKenzie (1976, p. 58) is the only scholar showing some perplexity (as remarked by Sundermann 1984, p. 178: "Dieselbe Erklärung wird, allerdings mit Zurückhaltung, von D.N. MacKenzie geboten"). On √*šai* "settle" see most recently Cheung 2007, pp. 370–371.

5 Gershevitch 1961, p. 84, § 1031, quoted by Sundermann 1984, p. 178, fn. 15, refers to *-(a)n* derivatives, and no modern grammar of Sogdian includes Benveniste's formation.

6 Livšic 2008, p. 106: "iz srednepers., parf.-man. *šāhīgān* 'dvorec', sm. Sundermann 1984", and *ibid.*, p. 140: "*š'ykn* 'dvorec', iz srednepers. *šāhīgān*"). Livšic (1962, p. 101) had originally supported – cf. Sundermann 1984, p. 178 – Gauthiot-Benveniste's hypothesis.

7 Sundermann 1984, p. 178.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 178–179.

9 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 314, s.v.

10 Gershevitch 1961, pp. 16–17, §§ 121–122.

11 Skjærvø 2007, *Complete Glossary*, s.v. š'ykn transcribes *šāykən*.

12 Published in Colditz 1987, pp. 299–304, especially pp. 300–301; cf. Sundermann 1984, p. 178, fn. 16. Sundermann represents the trajectory of the sovereign from a different perspective in comparison with Colditz's translation reproduced above (Sundermann: "der König […] aus dem Palast hinausging").

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

T ii D 163 /V/8–10/ = $_0$M 6031 I B i (9) 2–4
p(t̲) || 'drg'wyf(t) pd [?š'](h)yg'n || br fr'x 'dyhyd u 'zyhyd
"majestically he enters and leaves[13] the wide Royal (?)[14] Gate"

To these Sundermann adds the phrase 'pdn š'hyg('n) "königlicher Palast"[15] quoted from:

M 35/R/12–13/[16]
'pdn š'hyg('n o)[prw(n(?))] || šhrd'r kd 'syd °
"a royal palace [before] a ruler, when he comes"

To Sundermann's documentation one could add the following fragmentary attestation, published by the same scholar, quoted together with the preceding three passages under š'hyg'n/*šāhīgān* in the *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* with the English gloss "palace; royal"[17]:

$_0$M 6041/V/25/
['']w š'h(yg)['n] "[z]um Königs[ ].

The context is fragmentary, the only sure reading being the initial part of the word, and Sundermann comments with this footnote:[18] "[š'](h)yg'n br vermutete Henning bekanntlich in dem zur Passion Manis gehörenden Fragment M 6031/9–10/ […] und dachte an ein Tor von Bēt̲ Lāpāṭ. […] *Šāhīgān* dürfte hier […] eine ganz andere Bedeutung haben, z. B. "Königspalast" (vgl. MacKenzie Dictionary 79)".

Sundermann's view emerges clearly from the following statement: "Parth. *šāhīgān* 'Palast' ist jedenfalls elliptische Kürzung des ebenfalls bezeugten 'pdn š'hyg('n) 'königlicher Palast' (M 35/R/12/)". In his opinion, therefore, in Parthian a phrasal designation would have originated with the meaning "Royal Palace": to Parth. *'pdn* – which anyhow never appears alone as the designation of the "Royal Palace" par excellence[19] (as against e. g. the common Parth. designation

13 Henning (1942, p. 949, fn. 2) notes: "Probably = 'he passes through the gate'. Read 'rg'wyft", becoming *apud* Boyce 1975, p. 44, fn. 2 to text **m**: "(probably) 'he passes under and through the gate'."
14 Henning (1942, p. 949, fn. 3) notes: "Partially illegible word. Probably the name of one of the gates of Belapat. The passage evidently refers to the imprudently ostentatious entry into the capital by Mani. Cf. *Man. Hom.*, 45[11] sqq."
15 Sundermann 1984, p. 178, fn. 16.
16 Now published in Sundermann 2003, p. 424.
17 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 314, s. v.
18 Sundermann 1981, p. 89, fn. 2.
19 While in M 4579/R/i/1/: 'wš hw 'pdn zmyg knd "Er grub die Erde jenes Palastes aus" 'pdn is referred to a real residence, or at least to the location of the Court, in M 4570/V/i/18–19/: 'dg hym (kw) 'y(m) 'pdn wyg('')n'n "Fähig bin ich, diesen Tempel zu zerstören" the reference is clearly to the temple (this explains the gloss in Sundermann 1981, p. 152, s. v. "Palast 975, Tempel 1181"; as against Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 50, s. v. "palace").

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

for "palace", *talwār*) – the qualification "royal" would have been added, and subsequently, by ellipsis, "royal" par excellence would designate the "Royal Palace", a process similar to that generating Gk. βασιλήϊον, βασιλέων, usually pl. -ήϊα, -εια "königlicher Palast" (Ionic, Attic)[20] and Lat. *regia*[21].

Parth. *šāhīgān* is conceived by Sundermann as "eine[r] wörtl. 'königlich' bedeutende[n], substantivierte[n] Adjektivableitung mit Suffix *-īgān* von *šāh* 'König'",[22] according to a Parthian adjectival formation classified e.g. as "neproduktivnyj" by Rastorgueva/Molčanova, who quote our *šāhīgān* as sole example of this derivational type.[23] Actually, evidence for a Parth. derivational suffix *-īgān* is so scanty[24] to leave open the possibility that the formation may not be Parthian but originally Middle Persian, a language providing more documentation for this type of derivation.[25] In this case one could assume that the Parthian word was a borrowing from the Middle Persian derivative.

4.1. Since the passages in which MMP *šāhīgān* occur are too fragmentary to provide understandable contexts,[26] it is to Phl. *šāhīgān* that one has to resort to better define the semantic implications of this MP term in the Sasanian period.

Passages such as M 5/R/i/17–19/: mn dyšt 'pdn 'wd m'nysṯ''n "Ich habe einen Palast und eine liebliche Wohnstatt [...] gebaut" (Andreas/Henning 1934, pp. 102–103) or M 10 /R/22/: wyhm 'wstyg 'pdn 'wd tlw'r "Die breiten und festen Paläste und Hallen" (Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926; Klimkeit 1989, p. 75) refer to Court scenes in a general way by means of hendiadys, typical of the stereotyped style prevailing in the hymns. On 'pdn/*appadan* and suggested connections to OP apdan/*apadāna-*, cf. Sundermann 1981, p. 152, s.v., and Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 50, s.v.; on denominations of estates, vineyards and villages containing Parth. 'pdn (for which a connection with the "Royal Palace" is hardly probable, differently Gignoux 1972, p. 46, s.v. 'pdn° "palais"), cf. Diakonoff/Livšic 2001, p. 185.

20 Frisk 1960, p. 223.

21 Walde 1954, p. 426.

22 Sundermann 1984, p. 178.

23 Rastorgueva/Molčanova 1981, p. 195, §6.

24 Basically limited to the adjective 'mwstyg'n translating MP hwstyg'n in M 215/V/9/: mgynd[wm] hwstyg'n 'mein fester Schild' (Henning 1958, p. 104 and fn. 3, commenting the obscure gloss in M 875 + M 699/i/R/5/, first published in Henning 1940, pp. 24–25). ['ws](t)yg'n is almost wholly reconstructed in M 351, cf. Sundermann 1992, p. 46, fn. 31: "Da zynd'n 'Gefängnis' in M 5187 sicher lesbar ist, sollte](w)yg'n oder](t)yg'n in M 351 zu einem Wort gleicher Bedeutung ergänzt werden. Etwa ['ws](t)yg'n 'die feste (Stätte)' o.ä., als Ableitung von parth. 'wstyg 'fest' ?". d'ryg'n possibly '*dareikos* (gold coin)' (on which cf. Henning 1940, p. 25) is another isolated gloss with the corresponding Sogdian word lost in *Glossary c* $_0$M 875 + M 699/i/R/4/. On all these words see the articles in Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, s.vv.

25 Cf. Weber 2007, p. 962, §6.2.2.1.16.

26 M 903/R?/5/, where only (parts of) single words are preserved (Sundermann 1981, p. 142, translates "] königlich ["); M 1753/3/ (Boyce 1960, p. 78) where the fragmentary document does not allow to understand if the mentioned dbyr 'yg š'hyg'n is a Royal *Debīr* or a *Debīr* of the Court/Palace.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The occurrence of *šāhīgān* in the Pahlavi texts is rather limited. In the following occurrences (the only ones I found in a cursory search) the meaning of "Royal Goods", "Royal Treasury" appears rather constant:

Dd Intr. 15
xwāstārīh ī az šāhīgān pad se sālag bahr ī sālag-e
"the demand of the royal treasury was for the amount of three years (tax?) in a single year" (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998, pp. 34–35)

N 52.12
pad xānag ī šāhīgān ōh āyēnd ud ōh šawēnd
"(people) when they leave and enter the house of a Great Fire"[27] (Kotwal/Kreyenbroek 2003, p. 241)

MHD 65.10
ān xwāstag abāz ō šāhīgān kard
"this thing has been confiscated ('taken away') into the royal treasury" (Perikhanian/Garsoïan 1997, pp. 164–165)

MHD 77.7
tā ān xwāstag abāz ō šāhīgān kard
"when this thing is returned to the treasury" (*ibid.*, pp. 188–189)

MHD A 27.3
kad pad šāhīgān
"had these been matters regarding the royal treasury" (*ibid.*, pp. 294–295)

MHD A 27.13
ō šāhīgān mad ī xwāstag ēwar
"what regards the entry of property/money into the royal treasury" (*ibid.*)

MHD A 28.2
ka-č kas pad xīr ī šāhīgān ziyān kard
"the loss caused to the royal treasury by this or that person" (*ibid.*)

MHD A 28.3–4
pad xīr ī šāhīgān "to the royal treasury" (*ibid.*)

MHD A 38.17
xwāstag ō šāhīgān abāz kard[28]
"the property is confiscated for the royal treasury" (Perikhanian/Garsoïan 1997, pp. 318–319)

MHD A 39.9
āzādīh […] *az šāhīgān be dād*
'is made free by the royal treasury' (*ibid.*)

27 So translated by Kotwal-Kreyenbroek 2003, p. 241 and fn. 977, with the comment: "Lit. 'the palace', i.e. the house of a king among fires"; but, according to the authors, a reference to a Great Fire funded by the Royal Treasury is also possible.
28 Reconstructed text.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

PRDd 28c1
ā-š xwāstag abāz o šāhīgān gīrēnd
"they take his wealth away to the royal treasury"[29] (Williams 1990, I, p. 131; II, p. 54)

AWB (= Pahlavi Texts 85), ll. 8–9
pad ganǰ ī šāhīgān nihād
"I put in the Royal Treasury"[30] (Orian 1992, pp. 124 [Persian: *be ganǰ-e šāyagān nehādam*], 299)

4.2. The only passage in which the meaning "Royal Treasury" would appear rather problematic is *Draxt ī āsūrīg* l. 99 (= distich 47): *dūγ-um kašk karēnd* || *wasnād šāhgānān*[31] "From my buttermilk they produce *kašk* || for the Royal Court"[32], but since "[t]his text is a Middle Persian redaction of a Parthian original",[33] it is obvious that the choice of words intentionally evokes a Parthian scene. Consequently, in this case a reference to the Royal Court as a whole could be envisaged, and the possible subsistence of a double semantics within Middle Persian would be easily explained in terms of the Parthian elements in it.

4.3. The Pahlavi dictionaries reflect the scholars' different opinions and the variegated Middle Persian documentation. MacKenzie (1971) mentions the sole meaning "palace".[34]

29 Williams (1990, I, p. 131) translates "take his wealth away to the palace", but also in view of the previous line (where *dar* "ruler's gate" is mentioned), the confiscation of the possessions of the common people *(mard)* by the rulers *(xwadāyān)* is clearly alluded here. This interpretation is also adopted by Mirfaxrâi (2011, p. 280: *xâste-ye u-râ be ganǰ-e šâhi bâz gardânand*), with a reference (n. 4 at p. 448) to *Aogemadaēcā*, Pazend § 54: *x^{v}āsta aβāž o šāigąn nahəṇd [= xwāstag abāz ō šāhīgān nihēnd]*, on which cf. JamaspAsa 1982, p. 37.

30 Cf. already Bailey 1971, p. xliii: "Another reference to a depository of documents is the *ganǰ ī šāhīkān* (*šhyk'n*) (Pahlavi Texts 85). […] the *Aβiyātkār ī Vazurg-miθr* […] was kept in the 'Royal Treasury'", cf. Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998, p. 176: "*šāhīkān* [*š'hyk'n'*] 'royal treasury': literally 'kingly'; cf. NP *šāygān*. CPD, 79 gives the translation 'palace', which is a specialization of this basic meaning. For the etymology of this word see Bailey 1971, 231".

31 Navvābi 1967, p. 77; I would not pay particular attention – as Navvābi (1967, p. 131) does in his comment s. v. *šāhgānān* – to the *variae lectiones* of Pahl. 𐭧𐭩𐭧𐭩𐭩𐭩 which in some ms. variants seem to point to an intentional š'y°/*šāy*° under influence of NP شایگان (as suggested by Navvābi, *ibid.*).

32 Brunner (1980, p. 294) translates: "My buttermilk they make porridge || for royalty".

33 Boyce 1968, p. 55, cf. also Tafazzoli 1996, p. 547: "Bartholomae […] was the first scholar to identify the language of the text as Parthian. His identification is confirmed by the presence of words and grammatical constructions that are exclusively Parthian".

34 MacKenzie's gloss "palace" (1971, s. v. *šāhīgān*) is explicitly mentioned only in Sundermann 1981, p. 89, fn. 2 (not in Sundermann 1984). Note also Boyce 1977, p. 84, s. v. "š'hyg'n [šāhīgān] c.[ommon, i. e. occurring in both Middle Persian and Parthian] 'palace'".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Abramjan (1965, p. 236, s. v. *šāyekān*) translates *šāhīgān* as NP *šāhgān* "anything worthy of a king; royal treasury", Armenian *ark'ayakan ganjaran* "royal treasury", Russian *korolevskaja kozna* "royal treasury" and *čto-nibud' bol'šoe i blagorodnoe* "anything great and noble", English "royal treasury".

Under NP *kāx*, Faravaši (1979) records five Pahl. equivalents: *čār*, *hadiš*, *darpās*, *šāhīkān*, *srād*; *šāhīkān* however is missing in his earlier *Pahlavi-Persian Dictionary*. On the basis of the available documentation, one should agree with Shaki's comment: "*A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, London 1971 s. v. has 'palace'; untenable. *šāhīgān* is an elliptic form of *ganǰ ī šāhīgān* 'royal treasury', which is correctly interpreted by A. Perikhanian, *l. c.*[35]" (1984, p. 96).

A separate issue is the appearance of [36] in the second chapter of the *Frahang ī pahlavīg*. Here the judgement depends on the reconstruction of the original order to be given to the glosses of the *šāhīgān* section. Nyberg (1988, p. 63, no. 13) reconstructs a **šāhīgān gāh* "royal seat, throne", and consequently emends the first element of the sequence of glosses to ⟨*MRK̲Y⟩ "royal"; Junker, followed by the Iranian editors,[37] rested on an assumed **manâ* as accepted in the *Borhan*, and, through this, pointed to the meaning "royal treasury".

To sum up, from the Pahlavi documentation one gathers the impression that the *šāhīgān* par excellence was rather the Royal Treasury than the Royal Palace; even if this gives no clue to explaining the use of "door, gate" in the sense of "royal court", a use well known from Middle and Modern Iranian languages[38] (and other Middle Eastern languages, cf. Aramaic, Arabic, Turkish etc.). With reference to the designation of the "Royal Palace" as the "Royal Gate", one has to remark that what Sundermann considered as "eine ganz andere Bedeutung" in the passage M 6041/V/25/ is reminiscent of the "Royal (?) Gate" which Henning proposed to read at the end of M 6031/9/: in both cases a reference to the Royal Gate viz. the Royal Court could be understood.

4.4. Whatever developments may have occurred in MP, it is certain that the meanings "anything of big dimensions, worthy of a king", "(great) treasure", "treasure worthy of a king" are the core meanings in classical NP *šâygân* and classical Tajik *šoygon*. At least since the *Borhan-e Qate'*[39] its semantic range remained unvaried, while in the contemporary language dictionaries the word is labelled as "literary, bookish, archaic".[40] In New Persian echoes of the word are present

35 I. e. Perihanjan 1973, p. 424.

36 Written in ms U_2, cf. Junker 1912, p. 114.

37 Junker 1912, p. 114; 1955, p. 29; Mashkur 1968, p. 142, s. v. [H̲]ML': *šahīkān*; Orian 1998, p. 54, s. v. (H̲)ML'/*šāhīgān*.

38 Skjærvø (1985, p. 63 and fn. 6) observes that this use, appearing in the MP and Parth. texts of the Paikuli inscriptions, is common also to OP and Sogdian.

39 Cf. Dehxodâ 1958–1966, pp. 30 s. v.; see also Steingass 1892, pp. 728–729.

40 Cf. Rubinčik 1970, s. v. *šâygân*; Nazarzoda 2010, s. v. *šoygon*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in numerous toponyms showing both the modern, disyllabic type *šâygân* and the Arabicized (but syllabically closer to the MP/Parth. form) *šâhiǰân*[41]; both types also appear as current surnames in various regions of modern Iran.

Lastly, the absence of cognates of this word in the Armenian lexicon, otherwise full of Parth. and MP palatial terminology, is not insignificant.

5. As far as Sogd. documentation is concerned, it is beyond doubt that, at least in the Man. and Chr. texts, š(')yk/qn(h) denotes the "large, impressive building forming the official residence of a sovereign" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*, definition of "Palace"), and (immaterially) the "Court" (Henning: "normally *š'ykn-* is 'palace' or 'castle'",[42] followed by Sundermann: "Sogd. *š(')yk/qn(h)* ist gewöhnlich 'palace' oder 'castle'"[43]). A few examples:

C1 174–175
frm'd'rt qt 'nynt qw šyqn s'r
"Er [= König Dadianus] befahl, dass man [ihn] zum Palast bringe"[44]

T ii T 17 [Ch/So 20000]
zyw'rt kw xypδ šykny tys
"He [= the king] returned and entered his palace"[45], etc.

Particularly interesting are the Man. enumerations of buildings and architectural structures such as:

M 178 I/V/36–38/ = MIK III 4990 I/V/3–4/
pww#s'q 'spnctt šyknd 'ṯy γ'δwqṯ 'ṯy prṯ'wṯ
"countless rest-houses and palaces, thrones and *benches"[46] (or perhaps better "countless rest-houses, palaces and thrones and *benches"[47])

So 18248 I/R/9–10/
[L]' 'xw γzny γr'm'kw L' 'sp'nch L' (Z)K š'yknw L' xns s'r'βγ
"neither treasure nor wealth, neither hostel nor palace nor firm tower"[48]

Remarkably, in the last example the three architectural terms 'sp'nch, š'yknw and s'r'βγ are all of probable Parthian origin.

41 Dehxodâ 1958–1960, s. vv. Hübschmann (1897, p. 210, no. 466) considers as anomalous the substitution of the glide *-y-* for *-h-* in the title of the Pahl. booklet *Ganǰ-e šâyagân* (on which cf. West 1896–1904, pp. 111–112, §70 and fn. 1; the title appears anyhow to stem from Zoroastrian milieus speaking NP).
42 Henning 1940, p. 34, fn. 2.
43 Sundermann 1984, p. 178; see also Sundermann 1997, p. 140 *ad* 115, 3.
44 Hansen 1941, p. 12.
45 Henning 1945, pp. 483–484.
46 Henning 1948a, pp. 307–308 (translation marked with *); "rest-houses" after Sims-Williams 2012, s. v. *'spnc*, "mansions" (Henning).
47 Re-establishing a possible phrasal unit "palace and throne", as kindly suggested to me by Ch. Reck in her e-mail of 28 May 2014.
48 Henning 1944, pp. 138–139.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

More complex appears the use of šʾykn (and variants) in the Buddhist texts. Here, since the earliest publications, the meaning "palais" was taken for granted: cf. Benveniste 1933, p. 228: "le sogdien emploie *šʾykn*, indubitablement 'palais' d'après *V.J.*, 22, 60, 17[a], 22[a], etc."; Gershevitch 1962, p. 85: "*šʾykn* is not only the well-known word for 'palace'"; MacKenzie 1976, ii, p. 58: "宮 'palace' is surely the corresponding character to *šʾykn* in VJ, and possibly at Padm. 3"[49], etc.

However, while most occurrences of šʾykn in the *Vessantara Jātaka* do actually refer to the Royal Palace and/or the Court,[50] there are at least two passages clearly documenting a wider semantic range:

VJ 79–80
βrʾk sʾt kʾw šʾykn δβrw ʾʾysʾnt
"qu'ils viennent tous demain à la porte du palais"[51],

but the continuation of the story shows that the poors are admitted *inside* the Palace.

VJ 375–378
ZK ʾβtmw nmʾcyw βrʾ ZKn ʾBYʾ ʾPZY ʾwy mʾtyh prn rty ZK δβtyw nmʾcyw βrʾ ZKn šʾykny prn ʾPZY ʾtδrtyw nmʾcyw βrʾ ʾwyn nʾβ prn
"[Sudāšan] fit hommage en premier lieu à la gloire de son père et de sa mère, deuxièmement à la gloire de son palais, et troisièmement il fit hommage à la gloire de son peuple"[52],

but the decreasing hierarchical ordering shows that at a medium level between "family" and "common people" the "Court" (as the retinue of a sovereign) should be envisaged.

A further doubt on the semantics of šʾykn derives from the comparison of the Sogd. text of the *Vessantara Jātaka* with the Chinese version.

Commenting on Benveniste's interpretation of VJ 22,[53] Weller (1938, p. 86) remarked: "Benveniste, *JA* stößt sich daran, dass im Chinesischen von 'plates-formes' die Rede ist, während das übersetzende *šʾykn* sicher 'Palast' bedeutet."

49 MacKenzie (1976, ii, p. 10) considers the Sogdian translation at line 3 of the fragment of the *Padmacintāmaṇi-dhāraṇī-sūtra* from the British Library as a case of discrepancy with the Chinese text (which has the correspondence 宮門 "palace door"). MacKenzie's hypotheses are now superseded by the brilliant proposal of Sims-Williams (1990, pp. 284–285, 287 *ad* l. 84) based on Sankt-Petersburg L83a, ll. 84–85: ʾkw šyrʾkk δʾβ(r)w šwym "let us go to the royal court"; consequently also šyrʾk δ(β)r of Padm. 3 (MacKenzie 1976, i, p. 14, l. 3) should be "royal court" (Sims-Williams 1990, p. 287 *ad* l. 84: "I take *šyrʾk*(*k*) to be ultimately derived from WMIranian […] **šīr* ~ *šahr* 'realm'").

50 Also in the adjectival form šʾykn'yk *"de cour"* (Gershevitch 1961, p. 150, § 994 i, a), referred to clothes, jewels, etc. (VJ 1355, 1420, 1438; 1422: šʾynkn'yk).

51 Benveniste 1946, p. 7.

52 Benveniste 1946, p. 24.

53 Benveniste 1933, p. 228 *ad* l. 178: "[l]e chinois parle de 'plates-formes' là où le sogdien emploie *šʾykn*, indubitablement 'palais' d'après *V.J.*, 22, 60, 17[a], 22[a], etc.".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

From this Weller deduced that *š'ykn* in VJ 22 was the same thing as the "pavillon élevé" called *'sk' w'txr* at VJ 15,[54] and tried to interpret as referred to elevated locations (platforms, socles, etc.), since its meanings also include "tower", and what is more, at VJ 285, corresponding to (or translating?) the same Chinese word we find Sogdian *kwn'k'r* "palanquine". While agreeing with Weller on the ambiguity of the Chinese expression, MacKenzie adds that, however, "a 'tower' is not quite a 'palace'".[55]

As far as "castle"[56] is concerned, this meaning, not documented (at least in its more technical sense) either in Manichaean[57]/Christian or in Buddhist texts, could only be envisaged in the setting of some Sogdian Letters, viz. in the two passages of Ancient Letter 2.11–13 and V-17.13–14.

However, in the first passage, which reads:

> AL 2.11–13
> 'ḤRZYš 'LZK š'yknw 'PZY 'LZK knδh '('trw)h wγt 'ḤRZY swγt 'xw š'ykn 'PZY 'LZK knδh
> "and fire was set to his palace and to the city, and the palace was burnt and the city [destroyed]"[58]

the reading 'LZK "in/or + def. article" (in: 'LZK š'yknw 'PZY 'LZK knδh), brilliantly suggested by Skjærvø[59], superseded the unconvincing reading rδnk (from a metathesized **dranga-*)[60] proposed by Reichelt (in: rδnk š'yknw 'PZY rδnk knδh)[61], and evoking fires in the "fortified residence/palace" ("castles") and the "fortified town" of the Chinese Emperor. Note that knδh could refer to the fortified citadel even by itself,[62] so that 'LZK š'yknw 'PZY 'LZK knδh could be interpreted with reference to the "citadel" as a whole by endiadys.

54 It is clear from the context that the King, after going up the "pavillon élevé", came down, and gave orders to summon his experts and counsellors to the *š'ykn* ("Palace", "Court").

55 MacKenzie 1976, ii, p. 58. I remark incidentally that MacKenzie's suggestion to consider "*š'ykn*, if < √*šay* 'settle', like OP *hadiš-* 'palace' < √*had* 'sit', […] perhaps […] basically a 'resting place' and so to be understood in the context as 'socle'" *(ibid.)*, was based on the etymology formulated by Gauthiot (1914–1923, p. 163) and Benveniste (1929, p. 97), for which see above.

56 Henning 1940, p. 34, fn. 2: "normally *š'ykn-* is 'palace' or 'castle'", cf. above fn. 42–43.

57 On TM 393 (cf. Henning 1940, pp. 33–34) see fn. 69 below.

58 Sims-Williams 2001, pp. 268–269.

59 Skjærvø 1976, pp. 114–115.

60 Henning 1948b, p. 605, fn. 4: "[w]ith some hesitation I have accepted Reichelt's explanation of *rδnk* as from *drang-*".

61 Reichelt 1931, p. 12.

62 Sundermann (1984, p. 178) hints at a possible interpretation of the "platforms" of the Buddhist texts in terms of "jenes Städte und Siedlungsland überragende, platformartige Gebiet der 'Zitadellen', auf dem die Paläste der Fürsten im vorislamischen Mittelasien sich gewöhnlich erhoben".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

As for the second passage, its interpretation could be conditioned by the existence in Sogdian of a second šykn meaning "military officer, army commander"[63], attested in two passages in Mug A-9.5, 7[64], as proved by the alternative translation proposed by Grenet (1989, pp. 167–168):

> V-17.13–14
> rtcnn ZK βrγʾnk MLKʾ ZKn ʾʾpwxʾ rwc mδyδ kw xwnʾnkw šʾykn ʾʾys rty ʾzw mrδpʾr šʾykn ʾzy/rtw δʾrm
> "et de là, le jour Āpwakh, le roi du Ferghana est venue ici auprès du commandant (ou: 'au quartier général') des Huns,[65] et moi j'ai ici (…) le commandant (ou: 'j'ai ici planté (mon) quartier général')"

Gershevitch proposed half a century ago to recognize in ʾzytw a form of the verb *zyn-/zyt-* "to struck" and consider šʾykn in construction with that verb, thinking to "a temporary royal dwelling […] of which it could be said that it had been 'struck' = 'pitched', cf. Pers. *čādor zadan*".[66] Grenet comments:

> [O]n serait plus à l'aise en supposant que le champ sémantique de *šʾykn-*, étymologiquement "résidence royale" (< parthe *šāhīgān*) […], déborde ce que nous appelons "palais" et peut s'appliquer à un camp de grandes tentes, du type de celles où les rois sassanides passaient une bonne partie de leur existence […]: je proposerais de traduire "quartier général". Rien en ce cas s'opposerait à l'idée de Gershevitch qui a proposé pour *ʾzytw* le verbe déjà attesté *zyn-/zyt-* < *ǰan-* "frapper", qui serait ici employé avec le sens de "planter" (cf. pers. *čâdor zadan*).[67]

Also in this case, independently from the morpho-syntactic reconstruction preferred for this difficult and damaged passage,[68] it is highly improbable that any certain reference to 'fortified residences' could emerge.

63 As already notified by Livšic to Gershevitch (1962, pp. 84–85) before the publication of Livšic (1962), now listed as an autonomous article in Gharib 1995, p. 371, no. 9180: šʾykn "army commander". Sims-Williams (2012, p. 182) prefers a unified article "MS šʾykn, S šʾykʾn *n.* 'palace; (military) officer'".

64 Not "B-16.9" as misprinted in Gharib 1995, p. 371, no. 9182: šʾykn(h). An asserted occurrence of šʾykn(h) in "Anc. Lett. 3.37" (there quoted) is also due to misprint, and should be cancelled.

65 At this point Grenet (1989, p. 167, fn. 9) inserts the following footnote: "Ou, en construisant comme Gershevitch et Livšic: 'et de la part du roi de Ferghana, le jour Āpwakh, un commandant est venue ici chez les Huns'."

66 Gershevitch 1962, p. 85.

67 Grenet 1989, pp. 166–167.

68 Rather improbable – notwithstanding some valuable suggestions accepted by Grenet *(ibid.)* – appears the interpretation by Bogoljubov 1985, p. 14: "k nam v tjurkskuju rezidenciju prišel ihšid Fergany. Ja ne ukrasil zdešnij dvorec".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

6. The only possible conclusion on the Sogd. word discussed so far[69] appears at this point Weller's[70] statement: "Das soghdische Wort heißt gewiss 'Palast', aber [...] nicht immer oder nicht ausschließlich."[71] Possibly, similar conclusions are to be extended to the whole Middle Iranian documentation, without prejudice to Sundermann's etymology: Parth./MP *šāhīgān*, originally an adjective meaning "royal/de cour", extended in different times, milieus and languages and developed different senses, being applied to different institutions, goods and buildings pertaining to the Court. In Christian and Manichaean Sogdian, in particular, it was specialized as a denomination for the "Court" or the "Palace". From the sense "royal/de cour" an inner Sogd. development probably produced a term for military officers by royal appointment *Königs(mann).*[72] Further semantic implications may be occasionally found in the available documentation.

As for Pahlavi, the dominant (or exclusive) use is that of *šāhīgān* in the sense of "Royal Treasury", "Royal Treasure"; it is hardly conceivable that this (imperial, Sasanid) term had no influence on the other Middle Iranian languages.

Abbreviations

Texts

AWB	*Ayādgār ī Wuzurgmihr i Boxtagān*
Dd	*Dādestān ī dēnīg*
MHD(A)	*Mādigān ī Hazār Dādestān*
N	*Nērangestān*
Padm.	*Padmacintāmaṇi-dhāraṇī-sūtra*
PRDd	*Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādestān ī dēnīg*
VJ	*Vessantara Jātaka*

69 Reck (2009, p. 378 and fn. 53) reads at So 14185(1)/R/90/ the word (mostly illegible: "only very small traces of š'yk'n are preserved") preceding ZY γ'δwky "and the throne" as a further occurrence of our š'ykn, and underlines that, if this is the case, š'yk'n would be a variant of the common form of the word, because "a small point of the second ' is visible". However, notwithstanding the frequent association of "thrones" and "palaces", "halls" and the like in the Manichaean literature (Reck 2009, p. 387), I am not aware of any other attestation of the isolated phrase š'ykn ZY γ'δwky (barring the enumeration 'spnctt šyknd 'ṯy γ'δwqṯ 'ṯy prṯ'wṯ, on which see fn. 46 above).

70 Weller 1938, p. 86.

71 Analogously, Grenet 1989, p. 166, fn. 5: "[i]l reste que dans les textes bouddhiques traduits du chinois *š'ykn-* ne rend pas seulement 'palais' mais aussi 'socle, platforme'".

72 Livšic (2008, p. 106), even if problematically ("[s]ogd. š'ykn 'voenačal'nik' zaimstvovano, vozmožno, iz kit. *chi guan* (< **ṣi kuân*) 'načal'nik vojska'"), continues to prefer a Chinese etymology; I agree with Sundermann (1984, p. 179; 1997, p. 140 *ad* 115, 3) and Grenet (1989, pp. 166–167), who quote Sinological expertise against this hypothesis. The only occurrences of this word in Man. Sogdian are TM 393.3ff. = So 8248/II/V/3ff., where Henning (1940, p. 34) tried to see "camps" now interpreted as "Königsmänner" (Sundermann 1997, p. 140 *ad* 115, 3).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Bibliographical abbreviations

AcIr	Acta Iranica
AoF	*Altorientalische Forschungen*
APAW	Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BTT	Berliner Turfantexte
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
CII	Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse
StIr	Studia Iranica

Bibliography

Abramjan, R. 1965: *Pahlaweren-parskeren-hajeren-řouseren-angleren baŕaran [Pehlevijsko-persidsko-armjano-russko-anglijskij slovar]*. Erevan.

Andreas, F.C./W.B. Henning 1934: "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III." In: SPAW 1934, pp. 848–912.

Bailey, H.W. 1971: *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth Century Books*. 2nd ed. Oxford.

Benveniste, É. 1929: *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*. Vol. I. Paris.

— 1933: "Notes sur le fragment sogdien du *Buddhadhyānasamādhisāgarasūtra*." In: *Journal Asiatique* 223, pp. 193–245.

— 1946: *Vessantara Jātaka. Texte Sogdien*. Paris.

Bogoljubov, M.N. 1985: "Otraženie nazvanij zvezd i sozvezdij lunnogo zodiaka v sogdijskoj onomastike." In: *Iranskoe jazykoznanie. Ežegodnik 1981*. Moskva, pp. 9–16.

Boyce, M. 1960: *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection.* Berlin.

— 1968: "Middle Persian Literature." In: HdO I.4.2.1, pp. 31–66.

— 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Téhéran/Liège (AcIr 9).

— 1977: *A Word-list of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Téhéran/Liège (AcIr 9a).

Brunner, C.J. 1980: "The Fable of the Babylonian Tree, Part II: Translation." In: *JNES* 39, pp. 291–302.

Cheung, J. 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden/London.

Colditz, I. 1987: "Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen." In: *AoF* 14, pp. 274–313, pls. i–xi.

Dehxodā, ʿA.A. 1958–1966: *Loġatnāme*. Tehrān.

Diakonoff, I.M./A.V. Livšic 2001: *Parthian Economic Documents from Nisa. Texts I*. London (CII, part II, vol. II), pp. 161–215.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Pt. 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 3).
Faravaši, B. 1979: *Persian-Pahlavi Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Tehrān.
Frisk, H. 1960: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. I: *α-κο*. Heidelberg.
Gauthiot, R. 1914–1923: *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*. Vol. II. Paris.
Gershevitch, I. 1961: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford.
— 1962: "The Sogdian Word for 'Advice' and some Muγ Documents." In: *Central Asian Journal* 7, pp. 77–95.
Gharib, B. 1995 [1374 h. š.]: *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian-Persian-English*. Tehran.
Gignoux, Ph. 1972: *Glossaire des inscriptions pehlevies et parthes*. London (CII, Supplementary Series I).
Grenet, F. 1989: "Les 'Huns' dans les documents sogdiens du Mont Mugh." In: *Etudes irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*. Réunies par C.-H. de Fouché-cour et Ph. Gignoux. Paris (StIr, Cahier 7), pp. 165–184.
Hansen, O. 1941: *Berliner soghdische Texte I: Bruchstücke einer soghdischen Version der Georgspassion (C 1)*. Berlin (APAW 1941, Nr. 10).
Henning, W. B. 1940: *Sogdica*. London.
— 1942: "Mani's Last Journey." In: *BSOAS* 10 (1939–1942), pp. 941–953.
— 1944: "The Murder of the Magi." In: *JRAS* 2, pp. 133–144.
— 1945: "Sogdian Tales." In: *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946), pp. 465–487.
— 1948a: "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony." In: *BSOAS* 12 (1947–1948), pp. 306–318.
— 1948b: "The Date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters." In: *BSOAS* 12 (1947–1948), pp. 601–615.
— 1958: "Mitteliranisch." In: HdO I.4.1, pp. 20–130.
Hübschmann, H. 1897: *Armenische Grammatik*. Teil I: *Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig.
Jaafari-Dehaghi, M. 1998: *Dādestān ī dēnīg*. Pt. I: *Transcription, Translation and Commentary*. Paris (StIr, Cahier 20).
JamaspAsa, K. M. 1982: *Aogəmadaēcā. A Zoroastrian Liturgy*. Wien.
Junker, H. F. J. 1912: *The Frahang i Pahlavīk*. Heidelberg.
— 1955: *Das Frahang i pahlavīk in zeichengemäßer Anordnung*. Leipzig.
Klimkeit, H.-J. 1989: *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts. Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens*. Opladen.
Kotwal, F. M./P. G. Kreyenbroek 2003: *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān*. Vol. III: *Nērangestān, Fragard 2*. Paris (StIr, Cahier 30).
Livšic, V. A. 1962: *Sogdijskie dokumenty s gory Mug*. Vyp. II: *Juridičeskie dokumenty i pis'ma*. Moskva.
— 2008: *Sogdijskaja ėpigrafija Srednej Azii i Semirec'ja*. Sankt-Peterburg.
MacKenzie, D. N. 1971: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London.
— 1976: *Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*. Téhéran/Liège (AcIr 3).
Mashkour, M. J. 1968 [1346 h. š.]: *Farhang-e hozvāreshā-ye pahlavi*. Tehrān.
Mirfaxrâi, M. 2011 [1390 h. š.]: *Revāyat-e pahlavi*. Tehrān.
Navvābi, M. 1967 [1346 h. š.]: *Manzume-ye deraxt-e āsurig*. Tehrān.
Nazarzoda, S. 2010: *Farhangi tafsirii zaboni tojikī*. Dušanbe.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Nyberg, H.S. 1988: *Frahang i Pahlavīk*. Edited from the posthumous papers of H.S. Nyberg by B. Utas with the collaboration of C. Toll. Wiesbaden.
Orian, S. 1992 [1371 h.š.]: *Motun-e pahlavi. Tarǰome, āwā-nevešt*. Tehrān.
— 1998 [1377 h.š.]: *Vāženāme-ye Pahlavi*. Tehrān.
Perihanjan, A. 1973: *Sasanidskij sudebnik*. Erevan.
Perikhanian, A./N. Garsoïan 1997: *The Book of a Thousand Judgements (A Sasanian Law-Book)*. Costa Mesa, Cal./New York.
Rastorgueva, V.S./E.K. Molčanova 1981: "Parfianskij jazyk." In: *Osnovy iranskih jazykov*. Vol. II: *Sredneiranskie jazyki*. Moskva, pp. 147–232.
Reck, Ch. 2009: "The Ascension of the Light Elements and the Imprisonment of Ahriman. The Cosmogonical and Eschatological Part of a Sogdian 'Sammelhandschrift'." In: W. Sundermann/A. Hintze/F. de Blois (eds.): *Exigisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 17), pp. 369–398.
Reichelt, H. 1931: *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums. In Umschrift und mit Übersetzung*. Teil II: *Die nicht-buddhistischen Texte und Nachtrag zu den buddhistischen Texten*. Heidelberg.
Rubinčik, Ju.A. 1970: *Persidsko-russkij slovar*. 2 vols. Moskva.
Shaki, M. 1984: "A Few Unrecognized Middle Persian Terms and Phrases." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*. Leuven, pp. 95–102.
Sims-Williams, N. 1990: "The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad II: Mani at the Court of the Shahanshah." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4, pp. 281–288.
— 2001: "The Sogdian Ancient Letter II." In: M.G. Schmidt/W. Bisang (eds.): *Philologica et linguistica. Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Dezember 2001*. Trier, pp. 267–280.
— 2012: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Pt. 2: *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. Turnhout (CFM, Subsidia 7).
Skjærvø, P.O. 1976: "Sogdian Notes." In: *Acta Orientalia* 37, pp. 111–116.
— 1985: "Khotanese *v-* < Old Iranian **dw-*." In: *BSOAS* 48, pp. 60–73.
— 2007: *An Introduction to Manichean Sogdian*. Available at https://www.fas.harvard.edu/~iranian/Sogdian/sogdiancomplete.pdf
Steingass, F. 1892: *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*. London.
Sundermann, W. 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Berlin (BTT 11).
— 1984: "Soghdisch *š(ʾ)yk/qn(h)* 'Palast'." In: *AoF* 11, pp. 177–179.
— 1992: *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*. Berlin (BTT 17).
— 1997: *Der Sermon von der Seele. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version mit einem Anhang von Peter Zieme: Die türkischen Fragmente des "Sermon von der Seele"*. Turnout (BTT 19).
— 2003: "Jesus' rulership at the end of the world: a new piece of Manichaean evidence." In: C.G. Cereti/M. Maggi/E. Provasi (eds.): *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia. Studies in honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the occasion of his 65th birthday on 6th December 2002*. Wiesbaden, pp. 421–427, pls. 13–14.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tafazzoli, A. 1996: "Draxt ī āsūrīg." In: E. Yarshater (ed.): *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. VII. Costa Mesa, pp. 547–549.

Walde, A. 1954: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd rev. edition. Ed. by J.B. Hofmann. 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Waldschmidt, E./W. Lentz 1926: *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. Berlin (APAW 1926, Nr. 4).

Weber, D. 2007: "Pahlavi Morphology." In: A.S. Kaye (ed.): *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*. Winona Lake, Ind., pp. 941–973.

Weller, F. 1938: "Bemerkungen zum soghdischen Dhyāna-Text." In: *Monumenta Serica: Journal of Oriental Studies* III, pp. 78–129.

West, E.W. 1896–1904: "Pahlavi Literature." In: W. Geiger/E. Kuhn (eds.): *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*. Vol. II, pt. 2. Strassburg, pp. 75–129.

Williams, A.V. 1990: *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg*. 2 vols. Copenhagen.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Great Hymn of Wisdom

The First Manichaean Manuscript Fragment Unearthed in Iran*

Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi, Tehran

Introduction

It was in the last days of December 2009 that my calligrapher friend Mr. Bahrâm Boroumand Amīn informed me that a young man named Vahīd Sâlehī had phoned him from the city of Shiraz and claimed that he owned a Manichaean manuscript fragment, which he was able to identify as such because he had seen a painting of a similar sheet among Mr. Boroumand's artworks in a newspaper. After a couple of contacts, the young man sent an image of one side of the sheet to Mr. Boroumand. The latter contacted me immediately and a few days later we travelled to Shiraz to see the original manuscript fragment and ask about its discovery. In Shiraz, after my preliminary reading of the text, I took numerous images of the sheet and some other objects unearthed with it and brought them to Berlin.

* The present paper was written prior to the demise of the Late Prof. Werner Sundermann, who had seen a version of it. The frequent mention of his name throughout this article indicates his major influence on the improvement of my text. Obviously the author bears the responsibility for any mistake which may remain. I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to Prof. Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, who was not only a great help in reading, reconstructing and interpreting the text, but who also provided me with an opportunity to introduce this newly discovered Manichaean manuscript fragment through a lecture at the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Department Turfan studies (see www.bbaw.de/turfanforschung/collegium/turfanicum48). I also wish to thank Prof. Nicholas Sims-Williams, whose kindly advice, comments and corrections contributed enormously to the final shape of the article. I would like to reserve a special word of thanks to Mr. Shervin Moazami Goudarzi who has kindly proofread the first draft of the article.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Unearthed objects

We found that Vahīd had unearthed a number of funerary objects from different parts of a Sasanian grave. He informed us that the unearthed objects were not in one spot but scattered over a space of about 3–4 m in length and 6–7 m in depth: a small jar, four rings made of different alloys, six small metal rings (a bit bigger than finger rings), colourful stone beads originally belonging to two necklaces, one rather smaller than the other, a patterned silk fabric with a length of ca. 1.5–1.7 cm and a width of 1.1–1.2 cm (approximately the size of a finger knuckle), two metal arrowheads 6.1 cm long, a thin, pointed stick 6.2 cm in length, a silver coin, a thin wire 6.2 cm long, seven further metal rings, a wooden ladle ca. 23 cm long, a segment of the upper part of a glass vessel like a small snuffbox, a remnant of a very thick fabric that was passed through two rows of metal wires in a spiral shape, and finally two small bronze cylinder-shaped containers with lids: a bigger container 5.7 cm long and a smaller one 4.2 cm long. It seems that the latter contained powder of burnt bones.

In the bigger cylinder the following items were discovered: two pieces of animal skin the size of a finger knuckle, a piece of a pale brown wood (similar to soft cork) 3 cm in length that was apparently used as a holder, and most importantly a tiny scroll-like sheet of leather. Three small holes were drilled in this cylindrical container and it seems likely that a lace was passed through them so that it could be hung round the carrier's neck. Therefore, the sheet in the cylinder was in fact an amulet.

The site of discovery

According to Vahīd's account all the objects were found in a grave adjacent to the village of Shūl near Naqš-e Rustam (Marvdašt, Fārs). The grave has the form of a catacomb such as is specifically used by the Zoroastrians, and also lies among other Zoroastrian catacombs.

The manuscript fragment

This sheet, which the author names *Shiraz fragment*, is made of leather and is written in Middle Persian. It is ca. 7.4 cm in length and ca. 5.8 cm in width; each line is ca. 3.7–3.8 cm long and the space between the lines is ca. 3–4 mm. It is about half the size of the palm of a hand.

Both the main text and the headline are written in black ink. The manuscript page lacks any decoration beyond a small ornamental circle at each end of the headline. Apart from the two characters <g> and <h̲> in the headline, which are a bit taller than in the text (which is a common feature of the headlines of

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Photos: Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi

Fig. 1

Manichaean manuscripts), the font sizes of the headline and text are the same. In spite the fact that a few lines of the verso side of the sheet are totally illegible, all eighteen lines survive, while only sixteen lines remain on its recto. As a result of the penetration of air into the grave and consequently into the cylinder, some parts of the sheet have unfortunately been oxidized. For the same reason, the middle of the folio has been totally destroyed and transformed into a pile of powder, which can be seen at the bottom of the cylinder, and the other oxidized parts of the sheet have turned black.

Almost all of the oxidized parts of the verso can be read, though sometimes only with difficulty. As for the oxidized parts of the recto, not even a single word can be read with absolute certainty. In addition, as a result of the

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Photo: Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi

Recto Verso

Fig. 2

oxidization and the fact that the parchment or leather has been folded, we cannot be sure that the number of lines has been correctly counted. When the manuscript is properly restored, this matter should become clearer. Moreover, it should then be possible to read a considerable number of letters which are at present hidden where the edge of the sheet is folded over (in the middle and damaged area).

Although no trace of binding can be seen on the fragment, the fact that the headline only makes sense if it is read in the order verso–recto indicates that it is a page from a codex. Consequently, there is no reason to suppose that the text as we have it is a complete work.

The theme of the text is the reward of the believers who obtain salvation through the righteous (Manichaean) religion and the punishment of those who are condemned in the clash between the World of Light and the World of Darkness.

Some problems

Along the left margin of the recto and the right margin of the verso there appears to be a line of joined characters in an unknown script. Prof. D. Durkin-Meisterernst and Prof. N. Sims-Williams (personal communication) believe that these characters do not represent any specific script or alphabet and perhaps they may represent some decorative 'pseudo-writing'. However, Prof. W. Sundermann and Dr. D. Weber (personal communication) do not reject the possibility of an early type of cursive Pahlavi script.

This feature raises important questions. Why did the scribe or any other person place this writing on the margins of a text that was supposed to be buried with the deceased? Or is it a later addition? And importantly, if these signs represent a specific script, in particular a variety of Pahlavi cursive, what time should we assign to the writing of this folio? Should it be a date as late, for example, as the end of the Sasanian period?

Another issue is that some traces of at least two letters, <'> and <d>, can be seen in the space between the headline and the first line. These letters, the

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Photo: Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi

Fig. 3

writing of which is unusually asymmetrical, certainly do not belong to the headline or the first line. In this connection it is worth mentioning that a number of inkblots are visible in the empty space near the top of the recto and one inkblot on its lower part, though these stains cannot be seen in the photographs. At any rate, these characters are not part of the original manuscript.

A further problem is that the place where this manuscript and other objects were found is a grave of a specifically Zoroastrian type and lies among other Zoroastrian graves. Why has a Manichaean been buried in a Zoroastrian cemetery? Does the fact that a text in Manichaean script was placed in his grave necessarily prove that the deceased was a Manichaean? Could the manuscript have belonged to a Zoroastrian person? The answer to the last question is undoubtedly negative: a Zoroastrian would never have employed the Manichaean script as it belonged to a heretical religion.

Palaeographical examination

In order to assess the antiquity of the manuscript, as well as the other archaeological objects, the script employed in this folio should be scrutinized. The following features of this fragment are remarkable:

1. The letter <z> is surprisingly short; such a shape has not been noticed in any other Manichaean fragment.
2. The upper right part of the letter <p> is unusually and very noticeably flattened.
3. The abbreviation *w* for *ʾwd* "and" lacks any dots here. All other Manichaean texts, whether early or late (e. g. those in Classical New Persian), write this abbreviation as *ẅ*, i. e. *w* with two diacritic dots above the character, or in rare cases with one dot above and one dot below. Except in the case of the letters <r> and <x>, the diacritic dots used to distinguish other Manichaean characters are of late origin; therefore, the abbreviation *w* without dots should be considered as an archaic form.
4. The upper stroke of the letter <š>, which is normally soft and rounded, is strikingly angular in this manuscript.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

5. In this fragment the character <ʾ> is archaic, a very remarkable point made by Prof. W. Sundermann in his first letter to me.[1]
6. The form *ʾmẖ* "we" (1. pl. pers. pron.) instead of *ʾmʾẖ* is known only from this fragment and from the *Šābuhragān* (where it is frequent), a very important point to which Prof. D. Durkin-Meisterernst drew my attention.[2] As is well known, the *Šābuhragān*, the only work of Mani that was written in Middle Persian (his other six books being written in Syriac), is one of the earliest works of Manichaean literature.
7. In writing *bwxtgn* for *bwxtgʾn* the scribe has intentionally omitted the letter <ʾ> of the plural suffix *-ʾn* in order to keep the line within its margins. In such cases, the scribe usually applies a double elision dot below the following letter or sometimes below the preceding one to show the omission (though scribes did not always observe this rule). The important point is that the scribe of our folio has employed neither the elision dots nor abbreviation dots, which probably means that such "techniques" were not used at the time of writing but appeared only later. Hence, this manner of writing is evidence for the antiquity of the manuscript.

Text: transliteration and translation

Headline

/V+R/{black} ○ mhr wzrg ʿy ○[3] | ○ wyhyẖ[4] ○
The Great Hymn of Wisdom

Recto

(01) /01/ (ʾr•••••wd)[5] przʾmyd cʾr ʾwd
… ends the remedy and

(02) /02/ (4–6 ʾwd)[6] qyrbqr
… and the beneficent

1 Letter dated 10 Feb. 2010.
2 See also Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 38a.
3 Due to oxidation, the izafet *ʿy* and an ornamental ring (punctuation) have slightly blackened.
4 All the characters except the last are oxidized, as is the first ornamental circle of the headline.
5 This part of the sheet is oxidized and the letters are very badly preserved. The reading of <ʾ> and <w> is slightly doubtful and <r> may be <n>. The upper part of the last letter is hardly recognizable; it might be <r>. It seems that one of the illegible letters is <b> or <q>.
6 The letters are entirely blackened and the reading is accordingly somewhat doubtful; perhaps *ʾwy*?

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Photo: Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi

Recto

Fig. 4

(03) /03/ (....b..w.'w.)[7] (p)yrw(z)[yẖ] pdyr'd
... receives the victory

(04) /04/ (š'd'n)(?)[8] (°) (drd)(?)[9] ('y)[.][10][4–6]yẖ[11]
joyful (?) ... Pain (?) ...

(05) /05/ [2–4](8–10)[5–7] (k)s[12]
... anyone

7 Entirely blackened; only <b> is certain.
8 The first two letters have turned black and are very hard to recognize. The reading of the whole word is therefore very doubtful.
9 Reading slightly doubtful.
10 Due to oxidation, the letters are entirely blackened and very hard to read. *'y* does not seem to be the *izafet* but the first part of an incomplete word.
11 <y> can be seen on the folded edge of the sheet.
12 The first parts of both letters are recognizable on the folded edge of the folio; but it is also possible that these are the two last letters of an unknown word.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(06) /06/ [+½](••)g[13]
<two lines are wholly oxidized and destroyed>
(07) /07/ (s)hyn (’)[wd ky +½]
prominent and [anyone who] …
(08) /08/ ’bz’r[14] (3–4)[15] k’[16] w[1–3][17] ’y’byd
means … when/if … acquires,
(09) /09/ whyryd ’wd bwyd[18] (q)[’rd]’g[19] ◦
is confused and becomes a wanderer.
(10) /10/ hrw ky bwxsyd pd (r)zm’h̲[20]
Everybody who is saved in battle
(11) /11/ ’wd ’wdrnzyd dwšmyn p(dy)ryd
and defeats the enemy, receives
(12) /12/ pyrwzyh̲ ’c dst ‘y yzd’(n)
victory from the hand of God.
(13) /13/ ’wd ’b’ryg’nc dwdy ky
Secondly, the others too, who
(14) /14/ w(hyry)nd ’c pyš mwrzyšn ‘y
are confused/changed in face of the persecution of
(15) /15/ dw(šmn)wn[21] pd d’d ‘y r’st ’yrxt
the enemies, will be damned by the just judgement
(16) /16/ (bw’nd)[22] (’)wd[23] rs’nd ’w h’n ṭ’r
and arrive at that dark

Verso

(17) /01/ dwšwx ‘yg ’(yry)n ◦ (wysp) (?)[24]
hell below. Be joined for all

13 Hidden under the folded edge of the sheet. The second half of the upper stroke of the first unknown letter shown here as (.) may be a part of <k> or <x>.
14 The *r*-point is hidden under the folded edge of the sheet.
15 The edge of the folio is so tightly folded that no letter is recognizable, but small parts of the first two letters and of the last one (maybe <d>) can be seen.
16 Of the letter <k> only a part of the right stroke can be seen and the remaining characters are hardly visible through the extremely small aperture at the folded edge of the sheet.
17 Only the lower part of <w> can be seen under the folded edge. The reading is a bit doubtful.
18 Originally written as *bwwd*. See commentary.
19 See commentary.
20 The *r*-point, which would have been in the damaged portion of the sheet, cannot be seen.
21 The letters <šm> are blackened and almost unrecognizable.
22 SUNDERMANN’s reading.
23 The letter <’> is severely damaged.
24 The reading of <p> is entirely doubtful. It seems that it is followed by another letter: *wysp’n* or *’ysyd*? The letters are completely blackened and damaged, so that the reading of the whole word is quite uncertain.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Photo: Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi

Verso

Fig. 5

(18) /02/ zm'n hymwxt bwy(d)[25] ('ndr) (dyn)[26] ('yg)
time in the religion of

(19) /03/ 'rd'y(h̲) cyt('n)[27] (h'mzryg)[28] ('yn)
righteousness, for your sympathizer

(20) /04/ 'st dyn[29] 'wt'n (šhry'r)[30]
is the religion[31] *and your king*

25 After this word the sheet is entirely oxidized and turned to black.
26 Badly preserved.
27 After this word the letters are completely blackened and illegible.
28 Wholly blackened.
29 <d> can be seen in the folded part of the sheet. See commentary.
30 Badly preserved, but the reading is certain.
31 Or: the religious community of the Manichaeans?

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(21) /05/ xwd[32] (•)[4–6](3–5) ʿy ʾ[3–5]
himself (?) … of
(22) /06/ ywnyd[33] (h)[6–8](5–7)
(23) /07/ (prn)[[34] 12–14](4–6)
(24) /08/ (ʿy)[35] [12–14](4–6)
of …
(25) /09/ nw(n)[36] [6–8](•)[37] (b)wxt[38] (hynd)[39] (ʾndr)[40]
now … are saved in
(26) /10/ (r)zm[41] ʾw[d] (ʾr)dyg pdyrynd pyrwzyẖ
fight and battle; they receive the crown of victory
(27) /11/ ʾb(y)[sr][42] (ʾ)wd dydym ʾwd ky[43]
and diadem; and he who
(28) /12/ swyyʾd ʾwd whyrʾd ʾc dyn ʾwy
feels regret and strays from the religion
(29) /13/ ʾpyrʾd[44] pyrwzyẖ w[sic] pd dʾdystʾn
will be deprived of victory and at the true
(30) /14/ ʿy rʾst ʾndrxt bwʾd ʾwd
judgement will be condemned and
(31) /15/ rsʾd (ʾ)w pšymʾn ʿy jʾydʾn ○
come to eternal penitence[45].
(32) /16/ hrdw pʾdyšyn ʿy bwxtgn[46] ʾwd
Both the reward[47] *of the Saved and (that of)*

32 The final stroke of <x> can be seen under the folded part of the sheet, where it is followed by the right edge of another letter of another word. See commentary.
33 See commentary.
34 Visible in the folded part of the folio.
35 The letters are totally blackened and therefore illegible. The apparent izafet *ʿy* may in fact be the first two letters of another word.
36 Badly blackened. Of the last <n> the lower edge survives.
37 This seems to be the lower stroke of a letter such as <k>, <x>, <b> , <q>, or the more suitable <ẖ>.
38 Except for the lower stroke of <x>, these letters are visible in the folded part of the sheet.
39 Characters slightly blackened and compressed. The sheet is a little crumpled, but the reading is certain.
40 Apart from the first letter, the characters are a bit blackened and deformed. The reading is certain.
41 The upper portion of the word is slightly blackened. The *r*-point cannot be seen.
42 Sundermann's restoration. See commentary.
43 As suggested by W. Sundermann and D. Durkin-Meisterernst, the point above <k> is a scribal mistake.
44 W. Sundermann and D. Durkin-Meisterernst reminded me that the first letter should be <ʾ> and not <d>.
45 In the text, *pašēmān* "penitent"; see commentary.
46 In order to keep the line within its margins, the scribe has intentionally omitted the letter <ʾ> of the plural suffix -*ʾn* without adding the normal two omission dots.
47 Recompense.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(33) /17/ ʾndrxt[g](ʾ)n[48] my(z)dgṭʾc ʿy (rw)šn[49]
the Condemned, the Messenger of Light
(34) /18/ ʾbr ʾmẖ pydʾg qy(rd) (ʾst)[50]
has revealed to us.

Commentary

A notable feature of the text is its dialectal nature, employing forms that are not attested in Turfan Middle Persian but in Zoroastrian Pahlavi. This is of course quite natural if the Shiraz fragment was written in Pars (Fārs), in the heart of which it was discovered; and in fact, an examination of its vocabulary leads to the conclusion that this text was written in a linguistic environment different from that of the emigrants who went to the East. Some dialectal words such as *ʾpyr-* or *whyr-* are only found in the Zoroastrian Middle Persian books and not in the Manichaean Turfan texts (where these words have the forms *ʾpwr-* and *whwr-*); although the text also contains one word, *hʾmzryg*, which is found neither in Manichaean nor in Zoroastrian Middle Persian.

In addition, it is noteworthy that a large number of words employed in this text are attested in two books of Mani, i. e. *Šābūhragān* and the *Book of Giants*. Statistically speaking, a considerable amount of the vocabulary is similar to that used in these two books.

Headline: If *wzrg* "great" is an adjective applying to the noun *mhr* "hymn", as seems to be the case, then one expects the izafet *ʿy(g)*. But another much more important problem is that *mahr* (Pth. equivalent *bʾšʾẖ /bāšāh/ "hymn"*) in the Manichaean literature is a type of hymn and poem in structure, and not prose, whereas the text of this fragment is prose. Could a prose text be entitled "*mahr*"? This usage has not been attested previously in any Manichaean text and I have at the moment no suggestion for its appearance here. It is hardly to be considered as evidence against the genuineness of the manuscript, for which there are no other linguistic or palaeographical indications.

(1) The present stem *przʾm-* was not previously attested in Manichaean Middle Persian, though the past stem *przʾpt/frzʾpt* is well attested and the noun *przʾm* "end" occurs once, in a fragment relating to the *Book of Giants*: M 101j/V/4.[51] The word *cʾr /čār/* "remedy, means", cf. MPB *čārag* (NP *čāra*)

48 The letter <ʾ> of the plural suffix *-ʾn* is partly obscured by dirt. The scribe has omitted the <g>.
49 The first two letters are entirely blackened and very badly preserved.
50 Very badly preserved.
51 Henning 1943, A 36.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

"means, remedy",[52] is found a few times in the Turfan texts, including once in the *Book of Giants*.[53]

(8) *ʾbzʾr* is usually translated "skill, power; powerful".[54] This word occurs not only in the Middle Persian texts, but also in Classical New Persian, where its meaning is "tool, instrument, means".[55]

(9) This is the first occurrence of the present stem *whyr-* in Manichaean Middle Persian. This verb is attested in Parthian in the form of the pp. *whyrd* "disordered, changed",[56] and in Zoroastrian Middle Persian through the present stem *wihīr-*[57] and infinitive **wihīrīdan*[58] "to confuse, disarrange, to be changed".[59] In Turfan Middle Persian, the dialectal variant *whwr-* "to confuse, mingle, change" is used instead of the above-mentioned form.[60] Dr. M. Hassan-Doust reminds me that both forms have survived in New Persian: the two forms *gauharīdan* and *gahūlīdan* "to change" as well as two nominal forms: *gauhar* and *gahūlī* (*Borhân-e Qâteʿ* and *Nâḏem al-ʿAṭebbâʿ*).[61] He also drew my attention to the fact that this verb survived in Kurdish too in the form *gōřīn*: *gōŕ* "to change", *gōřān*: *gōřē-* "to be changed, to be transformed", *guhēřīn* "to change, transform".[62] Cf. also Zoroastrian MP *vihīrēh* "change"[63], *wihīrišn* "change"[64] and Manichaean MP *(ʾ)ʾwhr- /āwuhr-/* "to be converted, to do penance".[65]

The form *bwwd* (instead of *bwyd*) is very scarcely attested in the Manichaean texts.[66] Here it is probably a mistake, which, as suggested to me by Prof. W. Sundermann, should be corrected to *bwyd* in order to conform with the verbs of the preceding and following sentences.

The word *(q)[ʾrd]ʾg* is found once in the Parthian fragment M 4577/B/i/3/[67] and twice in the Middle Persian fragments M 475a/I/V/12/ and M 273/V/9/[68]

52 MacKenzie 1971, p. 21. See also Sundermann 2002, p. 213, n. 26.
53 Henning 1943, A 138.
54 MacKenzie 1971, p. 4: *abzār*[2]. See also Gershevitch 1971, p. 275.
55 Cf. also MacKenzie 1971, p. 4: *abzār*[1].
56 Sundermann 2004, p. 528, see also Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 341a, s. v. *whwr-*.
57 MacKenzie 1971, p. 91.
58 Cf. Turfan MP: *whwrydn* (Inf.II), M8251/I/R/12/ (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 341a).
59 See Ghilain 1939, p. 97; Nyberg 1974, p. 212; MacKenzie 1971, p. 91.
60 Cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 341a.
61 I would like to thank Dr. M. Hassan-Doust for the references. See also Vullers 1867, pp. 1057, 1059, 1061.
62 MacKenzie 1961–1962, p. 228; Asatrian/Livshits 1994, p. 95. Both references *apud* Hassan-Doust 2015, § 4564. For *gahūlī*, see *ibid.*, § 4569.
63 Nyberg 1974, p. 212a.
64 MacKenzie 1971, p. 91.
65 Ghilain 1939, p. 49; Henning 1940, p. 19; Sundermann 2003, p. 232.
66 For instance, in the following fragments: M 92 + M 898/R/6a/(unpubl.): *ẅ bwd ʾbyrʾḥ ʾc rʾštyf(t);* M 92 + M 898/V/6b/: *ẅ bwd dw(šm)nyn ʾw rʾštyft.*
67 Sundermann 1981, l. 790.
68 Reck 2004, l. 1115.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(in the plural form). The first fragment belongs to the *Šābūhragān*.[69] Sundermann (personal communication) pointed out that this "very convincing reconstructed" word refers to *metaggismos* "transmigration" and can be compared with the *w(y)dʾrgʾn myhmʾn* "wandering guest", i.e. the sinful and perplexed ghost, in the *Sermon vom Licht-Nous*.[70]

(10) *bwxsyd* (pres. 3. sg. of *bwxs-* "to be saved, rescued" from *bwz-* "to save, redeem") has previously been attested once in the *Šābūhragān* (M 8256/V/2) and once in M 47/II/V/12/.[71] *rzmʾẖ* is the MP equivalent of Parthian *rzmgʾ(ẖ)*. Eight occurrences of this word are available to us up to the present time, of which one is in the *Šābūhragān* and another in the *Book of Giants*.[72]

(11) Skjærvø[73] provides two transliterations for *ʾwdrnz-*: *ōdranz-* "to suppress, subdue" and *udranz-* "to condemn". Durkin-Meisterernst[74] has *ōdranz-* "to condemn".[75] Up to now only two occurrences of this verb have been found.[76]

(14) Although the present stem *mwrz-* "to persecute, harm" and the past participle *mwrzydg* are attested in the Turfan Manichaean texts,[77] the nominal form *mwrzyšn* is found here for the first time.

(15) The past *ʾyrxt* from the present stem *ʾyrnz-* is already attested in the form *ʿyrxt*. I would like to thank Prof. W. Sundermann for reminding me of this fact.[78]

(16) The letters of *bwʾnd* are poorly preserved and when I saw the sheet for the first time, I could recognize only <w>. Prior to my second attempt, Sundermann had already conjectured *bwʾnd*.

(17) The first <y> in *ʾ(yry)n* is badly preserved and only the dot and upper edge of the <r> are recognizable. From this word onwards, the letters have turned black and are scarcely legible due to the oxidization of the folio.

(19) The words *cyt(ʾn) (hʾmzryg)* are very poorly preserved, but it seems that Sundermann has confirmed my reading in one of his letters, where he translated these words as "denn euer Mit-Leidender". The compound *hʾmzryg* "co-sorrowing, co-suffering, sympathetic" was not previously attested in any Manichaean or Zoroastrian text.

69 All references in Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 202b.
70 Sundermann 1992, p. 64, § 20 and p. 91, no. 2. On this term, see BeDuhn 2001, pp. 27–30.
71 Sundermann 1973, l. 1733; *apud* Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 119a.
72 For the references, see Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 304b.
73 Skjærvø 1997, p. 249; cited *apud* Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 66b.
74 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 66b.
75 *Ibid.*
76 For the references, see *ibid.*
77 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 234b.
78 For this form, see Reck 2004, l. 1107.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(20) In my first reading, under difficult conditions, I had read *dyn* as *d[• •]*. From this, bearing in mind the context and the space available, Sundermann reconstructed *d[yn]*. When I succeeded in seeing the manuscript once again, I found that the letters <y> and <n> can be seen easily.

(21) After the three letters <*xwd*> one sees a very small space; accordingly it is possible that it is simply to be understood as *xwad* "self, himself". Another possibility is that two small characters <ʾ> and <y> have been placed over the stroke <x>. In that case, this word may be actually be *xwd[ʾy]* "Lord, God", which would be fitting in the context of the preceding *(šhryʾr)* "king".

(22) Except for its first letter and a part of the second, *ywnyd* stands on the folded part of the sheet. This word is not known from any Manichaean or Zoroastrian MP text. Is it a true *hapax legomenon* or a mere scribal error for *wynyd* "(s)he sees"? The latter is certainly possible in view of the scribe's other mistakes, including writing *xy* instead of *ky* (erroneous addition of a diacritic dot over <k>) in l. 27 and the omission of <g> in *ʾndrxtgʾn* in l. 33. As the preceding and following words have been completely destroyed, we have no context, so I prefer confine myself to record the reading of the manuscript as it is. Due to the severe damage in this area, I am not sure whether what is given above as ll. 23–24 is really two lines or just one.

(27) Sundermann reconstructed the first word as *ʾb(y)[sr] /abesar/* "tiara, crown", which fits well with the following *dydym* "diadem". I concur with Sundermann and Durkin-Meisterernst that the dot over <k> in *ky* (which should strictly be read as *xy*) is one of the scribe's mistakes.

(28) For the first time, we encounter with verb *swyyʾd* (subj. 3. sg.). It is possible that this word is a variant of Zoroastrian MP **swahistan* from stem *swah-*[79] "sigh [seufzen], complain [klagen]", as W. Sundermann cautiously suggested in a letter to me. Cf. also Pth. **swahišn* "sigh, pity, regret".[80]

(29) In my first reading, I had hesitantly read the first letter of *ʾpyrʾd* (subj. 3. sg.) as <d>, but Sundermann and Durkin-Meisterernst assured me that the letter is <ʾ> rather than <d>, as was confirmed when I examined the manuscript for the second time. In addition, Sundermann reminded me that this verb should be compared with *ʾpwr- /appur-/* "to carry off, steal" in the Turfan texts[81] and translated as "wegnehmen [to take away]". Cf. also Zoroastrian Pahlavi *appurdan/appardan* "to steal".[82]

(31) Here *pšymʾn* (adjective) "penitent, regretful" is used instead of *pšymʾnyẖ* (abstract noun) "penitence, regret, repentance". This is not a problem, however,

79 MacKenzie 1971, p. 78.
80 Boyce 1977, p. 83.
81 See Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 50b.
82 MacKenzie 1971, p. 10.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

as in Persian literature *pašīmān* can be used as a gerund with the same function as *pašīmānī*.

(32) Concerning *hrdw* "both" it should be said that in Turfan Middle Persian, as in Parthian, *hrw* "all, every" is used as indefinite pronoun. I know of one instance where it is used in combination with a number (M 35/V/18/: (*h*)*rw dw*). In the same manner, the combination of *hr* (not *hrw*) with a number is attested just once in a late Manichaean text in New Persian (M 9130/B-side/2a/: *hr sẖ* "all three").[83] As for *pʾdyšyn* "reward, recompense", Sundermann suggested to me that this may be a case of *ʿimāla* for *pʾdʾšyn*, though he also considered that it might be a scribal error.[84] Yet another possibility is that this form is a dialectal variant. Durkin-Meisterernst[85] points out that *pʾdʾšyn*, which also occurs in the Turfan fragments in the form *pʾdʾšn*, can be compared with MP/Pth. *dʾš(y)n* /*dāšin*/ "present, gift".

(33) *myzdgṭʾc* functions as a messenger in this text. It is likely that the "Messenger of Light" *(mizdagtāz ī rōšn)* is Mani, as Prof. N. Sims-Williams suggested (personal communication). It is the first time that the phrase *mizdagtāz ī rōšn* occurs in a Manichaean text.

(34) A stain is seen over the letter <d> in the word *qyrd* but a reading <r> seems to be far-fetched. Unfortunately, the final letters of the line, after which the text ends, have been oxidized, blackened and a bit deformed. The reading *ʾst* / *ast*/, pres. 3. sg. of the copula *h*- "to be", is a suggestion by Sundermann, which seems to fit the context and the other words in the sentence. I cannot put forward any further suggestion for reading such illegible letters until the folio has been restored and placed between sheets of glass.

Glossary

ʾbʾryg /*abārīg*/ adj. "other, remaing", *ʾbʾrygʾnc* pl. (13)
ʾbr /*abar*/ prep. "upon, on to, to", *ʾbr* (34)
ʾbysr /*abesar*/ n. "crown", *ʾb(y)[sr]* (27)
ʾbzʾr /*abzār*/ n. "means, instrument", *ʾbzʾr* (8)
ʾc /*az*/ prep. "from, of, on", *ʾc* (12), (14), (28)
ʾmẖ /*amāh*/ pron. 1. pl. "we, us, our", *ʾmẖ* (34)
ʾndr /*andar*/ prep. "in", *(ʾndr)* (18); *(ʾndr)* (25)
ʾndrxs- /*andraxs-*/ v. tr. "to be compressed, constricted", *ʾndrxt* pp. I (30)
ʾndrxtg /*andraxtag*/ pp. Ia "condemned, damned", *ʾndrxt[g](ʾ)n* pl. (33)
ʾpyr- /*appīr-*/ v. tr. "to take, take away, deprive", *ʾpyrʾd* subj. 3. sg. (29)

83 Henning 1962, p. 98 (as *text C*, *second page*, 1.32a).
84 Per email (10.02.2010): "Ich würde auch mit lautlichen Besonderheiten, etwa der *Imāla* (*ā* > *ē*), oder gar Schreibfehlern rechnen."
85 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 257b.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

ʾrdʾyẖ */ardāyīh/* n. "justice, righteousness"; coll. "community of the righteous", i. e. "Manichaean church", *ʾrdʾy(ẖ)* (19)
ʾrdyg */ardīg/* n. "battle", *(ʾr)dyg* (26)
ʾw */ō/* prep. "to, at, in", *ʾw* (16); *(ʾ)w* (31)
ʾwd */ud/*, */u-/* conj. "and", *u-* before enclitics. *ʾwd* (1), (9), (11), (13), (27), (28), (30), (32); *(ʾ)wd* (16); *ʾw[d]* (26); *(ʾwd)?* (2); *(ʾ)[wd]* (7); *ʾwtʾn* conj. + encl. pron. 3. pl. (20). See also → *w*
ʾwdrnz- */ōdranz-/* v. tr. "to condemn", *ʾwdrnzyd* pres. 3. sg. (11)
ʾwy */ōy/* dem. adj., pron. "that, the, he, she, it", *ʾwy* (28)
ʾyʾb- */ay(y)āb-/* v. tr. "to obtain, acquire, attain, achieve success", *ʾyʾbyd* pres. 3. sg. (8)
ʾyrnz- */ēranz-/* v. tr. "to conquer, defeat, condemn, damn", *ʾyrxt* pp. I (15)
ʾyryn */ērēn/* adv. "below", *ʾ(yry)n* (17)
ʿy , ʿyg */ī, īg/* *izafet*, *ʿy* Hdl., (12), (14), (15), (30), (31), (32), (33); *(ʿy)* ? (24); *ʿyg* (17); *(ʿyg)* (18)
ʿyn */ēn/* dem. pron. "this", *(ʿyn)* (19)
bw-, b-*/baw-, b-/* v. aux. "to become, be", *bwʾd* subj. 3. sg. (30); *bwyd* pres. 3. sg. (originally *bwwd* pp. I) (9); *bwy(d)* impv. 2. pl. (18)
bwz- */bōz-/* v. tr. "to save, rescue, redeem", *bwxsyd* pres. 3. sg. (10); *(b)wxt* pp. I (25); *bwxtgn* pp. Ia. pl. (32)
bwxtg → bwz-
cʾr */čār/* n. "means, remedy", *cʾr* (1)
cy */čē/* conj. "for, because", *cyt(ʾn)* (19)
dʾd */dād/* n. "law, justice", *dʾd* (15)
dʾdystʾn */dādestān/* n. "judgement", *dʾdystʾn* (29)
drd */dard/* n. "pain", *(drd)* (4)
dst */dast/* n. "hand", *dst* (12)
dw → hrdw
dwdy */dudī/* adj. "second, other", *dwdy* (13)
dwšmyn, dwšmn */dušmen/* n. "enemy", *dwšmyn* (11); *dw(šmn)wn* pl. (15)
dwšwx */dušox/* n. "hell", *dwšwx* (17)
dydym */dīdēm/* n. "diadem, garland", *dydym* (27)
dyn */dēn/* n. "religion, the religious community (of the Manichaeans)", *dyn* (20), (28); *(dyn)* (18)
h- */h-/* v. cop. "to be", *ʾst* pres. 3. sg. (20); *(ʾst)* (34); *(hynd)* pres. 3. pl. (25)
hʾmzryg */hāmzrīg/* n. "co-sorrowing, co-suffering, sympathetic one", *(hʾmzryg)* (19)
hʾn */hān/* pron. dem. "that, the", *hʾn* (16)
hrw */harw/* pron. "all, every, each", *hrw* (10); *hrdw* */har-dō/* "both" (32)
hymwxt */hēm(m)uxt/* pp., adj. "joined", *hymwxt* (18)
jʾydʾn */jāydān/* adj. "eternal", *jʾydʾn* (31)
kʾ */ka/* conj. "when, if", *kʾ* (8)
kʾrdʾg */kārdāg/* n. "wanderer", *(q)[ʾrd]ʾg* (9)
kr- */kar-/* v. tr. "to do, make", *qy(rd)* pp. I (34)
ks */kas/* pron. "anyone", *(k)s ?* (5)
ky */kē/* pron. rel. "who", *ky* (10), (13), (27); *[ky] ?* (7)
kyrbkr */kirbakkar, kirbaggar/* n. "beneficent, pious", *qyrbkr* (Hdl./R/2/)
mhr */mahr/* n. "hymn", *mhr* (Hdl./V/)

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

mwrzyšn /*murzišn*/ n. "persecution", *mwrzyšn* (14)
myzdgṭʾc /*mizdagtāz*/ n. "messenger", *my(z)dgṭʾc* (33)
nwn /*nūn*/ adv. "now", *nw(n)* (25)
pʾdyšyn /*pādēšin*/ n. "reward, recompense", *momāl* (s. v. *ʿimāla*) of *pʾdʾšyn* (32)
pd /*pad*/ prep. "in, at, on, with", *pd* (10), (15), (29)
pdyr- /*padīr-*/ v. tr. "to take, receive, accept", *pdyrʾd* subj. 3. sg. (3); *p(dy)ryd* pres. 3. sg. (11); *pdyrynd* pres. 3. pl. (26)
(prn)[/*?*/ "?", (23)
przʾm- /*frazām-*/ v. tr. "to end", *przʾmyd* pres. 3. sg. (1)
pšymʾn /*pašēmān*/ adj. "pentitent", *pšymʾn* (31)
pydʾg /*paydāg*/ adj. "visible, obvious, revealed", *pydʾg* (34)
pyrwzyẖ /*pērōzīh*/ n. "victory", *pyrwzyẖ* (12), (26), (29); *(p)yrw(z)[yẖ]* (3)
pyš /*pēš*/ prop., adj. "before", *ʾc pyš* "from in front of, in front, in face of" (14)
rʾst /*rāst*/ adj. "just, right, true", *rʾst* (15), (30)
rs- /*ras-*/ v. tr. "to arrive, reach, come", *rsʾd* subj. 3. sg. (31); *rsʾnd* subj. 3. pl. (16)
rwšn /*rōšn*/ n. "light", *(rw)šn* (33)
rzm /*razm*/ n. "fight, battle", *(r)zm* (26)
rzmʾẖ /*razmāh*/ n. "fight, battle", *(r)zmʾẖ* (10)
shyn /*sahēn*/ adj. "apparent, prominent", *(s)hyn* (7)
swyy- /*sway-*/ v. intr. "to sigh, regret", *swyyʾd* subj. 3. sg. (28)
šʾdʾn /*šādān*/ adj. "happy, joyful", *(šʾdʾn)?* (4)
šhryʾr /*šahryār*/ n. "ruler, king, landholder", *šhryʾr* (20)
ṭʾr /*tār*/ adv. "dark", *ṭʾr* (16)
w /*ud*/ conj. "and", *w* (29); cf. *ẅ*, *w* → ʾwd
whyẖ /*wehīh*/ n. "wisdom", *wyhyẖ* (Hdl)
whyr- /*wihir-*/ v. tr. "to be confused, change, convert, stray", cf. *whwr-*, *whyrʾd* subj. 3. sg. (28); *whyryd* pres. 3. sg. (9); *w(hyry)nd* pres. 3. pl. (14)
wysp /*wisp*/ adj. "all, every", (*wysp*)? (17)
wzrg /*wuzurg*/ adj. "great, big", *wzrg* (Hdl)
xwd /*xwad*/ adv. "self, himself", *xwd* ? (21)
ywn- /?/ "?", *ywnyd ?* pres. 3. sg.? mistake for *wyn-* "to see" ? (22)
yzd- /*yazad*/ n. "god", *yzdʾ(n)* /*yazdān*/ sg., and not pl.
zmʾn /*zamān*/ n. "time, hour, moment (of time)", *zmʾn* (18)

Bibliography

Asatrian, G/V. Livshits 1994: "Origine du système consonantique de la langue kurde." In: *Acta Kurdica* 1, pp. 81–108.

BeDuhn, J. 2001: "The Metabolism of Salvation. Manichaean Concepts of Human Physiology." In: P. Mirecki/J. BeDuhn (eds.): *The Light and the Darkness. Study in Manichaeism and its Word*. Leiden, pp. 6–37.

Boyce, M. 1977: *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Leiden.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Pt. 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 3).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Gershevitch, I. 1971: "Iranian Words containing *-a/ān-*." In: C. E. Bosworth (ed.): *Iran and Islam. In memory of the late Vladimir Minorsky*. Edinburg, pp. 267–292.
Ghilain, A. 1939: *Essai sur la langue Parthe. Son système verbal d'après les textes manichéens du Turkistan Oriental*. Louvain.
Hassan-Doust, M. 2015: *An Etymological Dictionary of the Persian Language.* 5 vols. Tehran (Iranian Academy of Persian Language and Literature 130).
Henning, W. B. 1940: *Sogdica*. London.
— 1943: The Book of the Giants. In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 (1943–1946), pp. 52–74.
— 1962: "Persian Poetical Manuscripts from the Time of Rūdakī." In: W. B. Henning/E. Yarshater (eds.): *A Locust's Leg. Studies in Honour of S. H. Taqizadeh*. London, pp. 89–104.
MacKenzie, D. N. 1961–1962: *Kurdish Dialect Studies*. 2 vols. London.
— 1971: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London.
Nyberg, H. S. 1974: *A Manual of Pahlavi.* Pt. II: *Glossary*. Wiesbaden.
Reck, Ch. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 22).
Skjærvø, P. O. 1997: "On the Middle Persian Imperfect." In: E. Pirart (ed.): *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes. Colloque international à Sitges (Barcelona) 4–5 mai 1993*. Barcelona, pp. 161–188.
Sundermann, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische, kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer mit einigen Bemerkungen zu Motiven der Parabeltexte von Friedmar Geissler.* Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 4).
— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 11).
— 1992: *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 17).
— 2002: "Das Leiden und Sterben Jesu in manichäischer Deutung." In: W. Gantke/K. Hoheisel/W. Klein (eds.): *Religionsbegegnung und Kulturaustausch in Asien. Studien zum Gedenken an Hans-Joachim Klimkeit*. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 49), pp. 209–217.
— 2003: "Notulae etymologicae." In: A. van Tongerloo (ed.): *Iranica Selecta. Studies in honour of Professor Wojciech Skalmowski on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Turnhout (Silk Road Studies 8), pp. 219–224.
— 2004: "Zarathustra der Priester und Prophet in der Lehre der Manichäer." In: M. Stausberg (ed.): *Zoroastrian Rituals in Context*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 517–530.
Vullers, I. A. 1867: *Verborum linguae persicae radices: e dialectis antiquioribus Persicis et lingua Sanscrita et aliis linguis maxime cognatis erutae atque illustratae.* Bonnae ad Rhenum.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

La correspondance Edmond Drouin / Willi Bang [Kaup]*

Aloïs van Tongerloo, Gheel / Herman Seldeslachts, Louvain-la-Neuve

Johann Wilhelm Max Julian (dit Willi) Bang naquit le 9 août 1869 à Wesel (Allemagne).[1] En 1892 un décret royal l'autorisa à adjoindre à son nom celui de Kaup en référence à son grand-père, l'illustre (paléo)zoologiste Johann Jakob Kaup (1803–1873), dont le patronyme risquait de tomber dans l'oubli.

Passionné d' « orientalisme », le jeune Bang s'adresse, sur les conseils de Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, à Mgr Charles de Harlez de Deulin[2] (1832–1899), professeur à l'Université de Louvain en Belgique, dont il devient l'élève favori et qui lui fait découvrir les études iraniennes, sinologiques, mandchoues et paléo-américaines. Avec une rapidité étonnante il devient un iranisant accompli : à peine âgé de vingt ans, il publie sa première contribution sur les inscriptions achéménides et l'Avesta. En 1889 paraissent six opuscules consacrés à des questions iraniennes.

Dès 1890, il publie sur les langues ouralo-altaïques et le mandchou et prépare par ailleurs, en collaboration avec Franz Heinrich Weis(s)bach[3] (1865–1944), une édition des inscriptions vieux-perses. Au moment de l'apparition de la section de philologie germanique à la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, l'Université de Louvain lui confie la chaire de langue et littérature anglaises. La création des *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas* lui confère rapidement une autorité internationale dans sa nouvelle spécialité. Insatiable, il fait siens trois domaines de la turcologie ancienne : les inscriptions, les textes de Tourfan et la langue co(u)mane. Il y prend le parti de Vilhelm Thomsen et des Berlinois Friedrich Wilhelm Karl Müller et Albert von Le Coq contre les Pétersbourgeois Wilhelm Radloff et Carl Salemann.[4]

À son départ pour Darmstadt en 1914, l'Université de Louvain perdit une personnalité scientifique de renommée internationale.

* Nous remercions vivement Madame Isabelle Valloton pour la relecture d'une version antérieure de cet article et pour ses précieux conseils stylistiques.

1 A. van Tongerloo : *Willi Bang Kaup : Eine bibliographische Skizze* (en préparation).

2 Cf. H. Seldeslachts/A. van Tongerloo : *Lettres de Charles de Harlez de Deulin à Willi Bang Kaup* (en préparation), avec une bio-bibliographie.

3 Cf. Weissbach/Bang 1893–1908 ; H. Seldeslachts/A. van Tongerloo : *Der Briefwechsel Franz Heinrich Weis(s)bachs mit Willi Bang Kaup*. (en préparation).

4 Cf. Knüppel/van Tongerloo 2012 et 2014.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Willi Bang laissait dans la ville où il avait vécu un quart de siècle ses livres et affaires personnelles. Pendant et après la Grande Guerre, il pria à plusieurs reprises son élève, collègue et successeur à la chaire d'anglais Henri De Vocht (1878–1962) de lui envoyer ses livres et quelques objets personnels ; mais ces demandes répétées ne concernèrent jamais son importante correspondance privée et scientifique. Les archives de l'Université de Louvain conservent une carte postale et quatre lettres envoyées par Edmond Drouin à Willi Bang (collection [nouvelle] PU / Bang [= ancienne collection avec signature P 56] : Section V / Correspondance [2, sans numéro] = Boîte 38 [n°s 343–619], cinq n^os^ classés alphabétiquement sous « D » : n°s 489–493 [sous le nom de « Drouin, Ed. »]).

Edmond (ou Edme[-]Alphonse) Drouin (1837–1904)[5] était avocat par profession, orientaliste et numismate par passion. Homme d'une immense érudition, son domaine s'étendait de la Mésopotamie à la Chine, sans dédaigner l'Éthiopie ou l'Inde. Cheville ouvrière du *Journal Asiatique*, il y publiait régulièrement des articles et des notices à caractère numismatique, historique et linguistique.[6] Parmi ses publications, qui ont bien résisté aux épreuves du temps, mentionnons ses travaux sur l'histoire éthiopienne,[7] sur le calendrier perse,[8] sur les légendes monétaires en pehlevi[9] ou en araméen,[10] sur les rois indo-scythes[11] et les Hephtalites (« Huns blancs »),[12] sur l'épigraphie sassanide,[13] sur les monnaies tangoutaines[14] ou sur l'origine du titre βασιλεὺς βασιλέων (« roi des rois »).[15] Il fournit également quelques contributions à la *Grande Encyclopédie*.[16]

5 On trouvera une esquisse de sa vie et une appréciation de son œuvre scientifique (avec une liste de ses principales publications reprise de la *Revue numismatique* de 1904) dans la notice : « Edmond Drouin », dans : *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1904), pp. 529–532. Ses qualités personnelles et scientifiques et ses mérites pour le *Journal Asiatique* sont évoqués par Charles Barbier de Meynard dans *JA* X/3 (janvier–février 1904), pp. 150–151, et *JA* X/4 (juillet–août 1904), p. 6. Le texte commémoratif de Barbier de Meynard a été réimprimé avec deux autres notices nécrologiques dans : Ch. Barbier de Meynard, E. Babelon et R. Serrure, *Notices sur Edmond Drouin, avocat, secrétaire-adjoint de la Société Asiatique de Paris, lauréat de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1837–1904*, Versailles 1904. Il y a enfin la brève notice par H. Cordier : « Edmond Drouin », dans : *T'P* II/5 (1904), p. 115. Pour ses publications, on consultera aussi la notice bibliographique sur http ://www.idref.fr/057099006.

6 Par exemple Drouin 1889a, 1895a, 1895b, 1895c.

7 Drouin 1884, 1888a.

8 Drouin 1888–1889.

9 Drouin 1884–1885.

10 Drouin 1889b.

11 Drouin 1888b, 1901.

12 Drouin 1895d. « The best study of the history of the Ephthalites » selon J.B. Bury : *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. II, New York 1923, p. 5.

13 Voir n. 28.

14 Drouin 1899a.

15 Drouin 1899b.

16 Drouin 1887, 1894.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Polyglotte enthousiaste, le jeune Drouin composa un remarquable *Dictionnaire comparé*[17] des langues orientales et occidentales, anciennes et modernes, qui reprenait le programme de son maître le chanoine Latouche, ardent défenseur du renouveau de l'enseignement des langues en France. Dans les années 1870, il publia en outre des ouvrages de linguistique anglaise,[18] allemande[19] et française.[20]

Ses dessins de plusieurs membres illustres de la Société Asiatique (1899)[21] attestent de son talent artistique. Lauréat du prix Allier de Hauteroche à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (1900), il instaura enfin un prix de numismatique orientale qui porte son nom.[22]

Nous dédions cette publication à la mémoire de Werner Sundermann qui partageait la passion de Willi Bang et Edmond Drouin pour les langues et cultures du monde iranien et de ses voisins.

Édition des documents[23]

Chronologie

(1) N° 489 : 31 janvier 1898 ;
(2) N° 490 : 3 mai 1898 ;
(3) N° 491 : 4 février 1899 ;
(4) N° 492 : 19 décembre {19}02 ;
(5) N° 493 : non daté.

(1) N° 489 (1 feuille = 2 pages)

p. 1 recto

11, rue de Verneuil
PARIS

31 Janv{ier} 1898

Monsieur et cher Confrère,

Je suis bien en retard pour répondre à votre aimable lettre du 26 décembre {1897}. J'ai reçu, depuis, votre petit article Altpersisches[24] que j'ai lu avec plaisir. Je crois

17 Drouin 1866.
18 Drouin 1873.
19 Drouin 1876.
20 Drouin 1878.
21 Voir http ://www.aibl.fr/societe-asiatique/histoire/membres-illustres-de-la-societe/?lang=fr.
22 À propos de ce prix Edmond Drouin, cf. le Palmarès des prix et récompenses décernés pour l'année 1910, dans : *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 54e année, 8 (1910), pp. 677–695 (spécialement p. 693).
23 {xxx} = complété par les éditeurs.
24 Cf. Bang 1898a.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

que vous avez raison pour abashtâ. La forme pehlvi avistâk et la prononciation parsie avesta, comme la traduction de Neriosangh *avista* supposent bien un primitif avi ou abiy, quoique au point de vue du sens « substare, substratum » upasta vaudrait mieux. Comment traduire en effet abiy-sta autrement que « ad-stare » ce qui ne va guère pour désigner une chose établie, la loi.[25]

Vous dites que la version de Foy,

p. 1 verso

arštam au lieu de abaštam est ~~höchlich~~ höchst einfach ? Je préfère votre interprétation.[26]

Je n'ai pas encore reçu de Petersbourg les « Neue Folge » de Radloff[27] en sorte que je ne peux pas suivre vos corrections. Je m'y mettrai d'une seule fois quand j'aurai reçu vos autres observations. Je ne connais pas la « West-östliche Rundschau »[28]{.} Je crois même que cette Revue est tout à fait inconnue en France et ne se trouverait pas à Paris. Si vous aviez une couverture ou un prospectus, vous me feriez plaisir de me l'envoyer avec l'adresse du libraire.

Mgr de Harlez m'a écrit au commencement du mois qu'il avait {été} très malade[29] mais qu'il allait mieux, je pense qu'il est maintenant tout à fait rétabli. Voudriez vous [*sic*] bien lui présenter mes hommages et lui rappeler que

p. 2 recto

je lui ai demandé 1 ou 2 exempl{aires} du texte mandchou qu'il a publié dans le WZKM[30] ?

25 W. Foy : « Avesta. », dans : *ZDMG* 52 (1898), p. 254, critique (en n. 1) l'explication par **abištā* soutenue par W. Bang ; son interprétation par un **avista-* « inconnu » ne vaut toutefois pas mieux. L'étymologie d'*Avesta* reste incertaine, bien que la dérivation d'un avestique **upa-stāu̯aka-* « louange » (Bartholomae 1906, p. 108) ait convaincu la plupart des spécialistes (cf. par exemple Hintze 2009, p. 1).

26 Foy 1898, pp. 45–46, avait proposé de corriger en *arštām* « justice » le *abaštām* de Rawlinson dans Behistun, col. IV, 64, alors que Bang (1898a, p. 292) lisait *abištām* qu'il comparait au nom de l'*Avesta*. Une autopsie de l'inscription permit quelques années plus tard à A.V. Williams Jackson de confirmer la conjecture de Foy ; cf. Williams Jackson 1903, pp. 91–92 ; 1906, p. 205 : « he [= Foy] is to be heartily congratulated on his shrewd conjecture ».

27 Cf. Radloff 1897.

28 Le mensuel *West-östliche Rundschau : Monatsschrift für Politik, Literatur und öffentliches Leben* parut en 1894 à Berlin, puis à Leipzig et à Dresde, et de 1895 à 1898 à Budapest.

29 Cf. de Harlez 1898, p. 255 : « le mauvais état de ma santé m'interdit tout travail prolongé ». Mgr de Harlez mourra en 1899.

30 Cf. de Harlez 1898. La première partie de cet article est consacrée à la publication (avec traduction française) de la « Préface impériale du *Manju gisun-i baleku bithe* (Dictionnaire mandchou) » (pp. 249–255).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Je suis en correspondance avec le Dr Marquart[31]. C'est un esprit très fin et très suggestif, peut-être un peu trop hardi. J'attends avec impatience le travail qu'il m'a annoncé sur les rapports de l'Irân ancien avec les peuples voisins.[32]

Si vous avez occasion d'aller chez M. Istas imprimeur du Museon [*sic*], faites moi [*sic*] le plaisir de lui dire qu'il m'envoie (s'il est encore temps) une épreuve de la couverture de mon article sur l'Epigraphie sassanide.[33]

Dans le cahier de Janvier 1898 du Journal asiatique[34] vous verrez une série de petites notices bibliographiques mais je ne parle pas de vos Etudes parce que ces notices sont rédigées depuis 2 à 3 mois. Ce sera pour les prochaines notices que je ferai en avril ou mai.

p. 2 verso

Veuillez me rappeler au souvenir de MM Colinet[35] et Hebbelynck[36] et agréer, mon cher confrère, l'expression de mes sentiments dévoués

Ed. Drouin

(2) N° 490 (1 feuille = 2 pages)

p. 1 recto

11, rue de Verneuil 3 Mai 1898
PARIS

Monsieur et très cher Confrère,

Il existe en effet dans la « Revue critique du 5 avril 1897 » un article de M. E. Beauvois sur l'ouvrage de V. Thomsen[37]. M. Beauvois[38] est probablement le seul en France

31 Sur Josef Marquart (Markwart), cf. les deux ouvrages de Knüppel/van Tongerloo 2012, 2014.
32 Cf. Marquart 1901.
33 Cf. Drouin 1898a.
34 Cf. Drouin 1898b (brefs comptes rendus des dernières publications dans les domaines iranien, arabe, égyptien et anatolien).
35 Philémon Colinet (Alost 1853 – Sleidinge 1917) étudia l'indologie sous la direction de Charles de Harlez de Deulin à Louvain. Il fréquenta Johannes Schmidt à Berlin et Michel Bréal à Paris avant de devenir l'assistant de Charles de Harlez. Nommé professeur à Louvain, il prit part à la création de la nouvelle section de philologie germanique ; il dispensa des cours aussi différents que le sanskrit, le pali, le grec ancien, le vieux slave, le gotique, la dialectologie flamande et l'histoire des religions et écrivit une monographie sur le dialecte d'Alost.
36 Adolphe Hebbelynck (Merelbeke 1859 – Rome 1939), coptisant, professeur de patrologie à l'Université de Louvain à partir de 1890 et recteur magnifique entre 1898 et 1909.
37 Cf. Beauvois 1897/1901.
38 Sur Pierre-Eugène Beauvois (1835–1912), voir Bouley 1993 ; Mouillebouche 2007.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

qui sache le suomi, il connaît aussi très bien les langues scandinaves et, depuis 30 ans c'est lui qui fait connaître à la France les travaux des savoirs [*sic*, pour « savants »] Danois, norevégiens [*sic*], suédois et finlandais tant en histoire, anthropologie qu'en linguistique et géographie. Vous avez pu lire il y a 2 ou 3 ans, dans le Museon [*sic*],

p. 1 verso

une série d'articles sur les migrations des Scandinaves en Amérique.[39]

Son c{om}pte rendu du mémoire de Thomsen est une simple analyse du volume comme il eût fait de tout autre mémoire car M^r^ B{eauvois} n'est pas orientaliste, mais simplement un scandinavian scholar, a very distinguished man. Quant à M Blochet[40] c'est un iraniste très capable mais qui a le tort suivant nous tous ses collègues, d'éparpiller son temps et sa science dans des branches très différentes, l'arabe, le turc et le chinois. A vrai dire nous n'avons personne en France de capable d'apprécier convenablement vos recherches et vos tentatives d'explications nouvelles du turk sibérien – sauf bien entendu Mr J. Halevy [*sic*][41] qui est professeur de turc oriental mais qui s'occupe surtout de sémitique dans la Revue Sémitique qu'il dirige et qu'il rédige même presque tout seul.

p. 2 recto[42]

Je vous remercie de votre bienveillante appréciation sur mon travail concernant les légendes sassanides. Je suppose que vous voulez parler de mon Mémoire qui paraît en ce moment dans la Revue archéologique[43] et dont je vous enverrai un tirage à part, probablement à la fin de ce mois ci [*sic*].

Je n'irai pas en Belgique cette année – je veux dire au mois de Juin, parce que je suis obligé d'aller faire à la même époque, un voyage en Vendée.

Je recevrai avec plaisir votre Mémoire sur les Köktürk[44]. Je suis en ce moment attelé à un travail très ennuyeux : le compte rendu pour la Revue Numismatique, du « Katalog der Orientalischen Münzen » du musée de Berlin, dont le 1er vol. vient de paraître.[45]

Veuillez agréer mon très cher confrère l'expression de mes sentiments bien dévoués

Ed. Drouin

mes amitiés je vous prie à MM Colin{et} & Hebbelynck et de Harlez

39 Cf. Beauvois 1885, 1890, 1892.
40 Edgard Blochet (1870–1937), iranologue. Il publia par ailleurs des catalogues des manuscrits turcs et arabes.
41 Joseph Halévy (1827–1917), orientaliste français d'origine juive, né à Andrinople en Turquie. Chercheur polyvalent, il s'attacha surtout à l'histoire des juifs éthiopiens, aux inscriptions sabéennes du Yémen et à la critique historique de l'Ancien Testament.
42 Page 2 verso : blanche.
43 Drouin 1898c.
44 Bang 1897.
45 Nützel 1898.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(3) N° 491 (1 feuille = 2 pages)

p. 1 recto

11, rue de Verneuil 4 février 1899
PARIS

Mon cher Confrère,

Je reçois votre aimable petit mot d'hier. Je suis étonné que l'ex. de la Revue critique ne vous soit pas parvenu, je l'ai mis à la poste en même temps que ma carte, le 31 janvier. La Poste l'aura donc égaré ? Si dans quelques jours vous n'avez pas reçu ce n° je tâcherai d'en obtenir un autre de l'éditeur.

Le même jour j'en envoyais un exemplaire à M Marquart {;} il ne m'a pas encore avisé de sa réception.

p. 1 verso

Il ne m'a pas non plus fait don de son article « Historische Glossen »[46] j'espère qu'il ne m'oubliera pas car il m'a promis de m'envoyer ce Mémoire. Si vous lui écrivez veuillez lui rappeler sa promesse.

J'ai vu M E. Leroux l'éditeur du Voyage Dutreuil de Rhins Grenard[47] et lui ai demandé un exemplaire pour vous. Il m'a répondu qu'il avait fait un service de presse très important : près de 40 exemplaires ont été distribués surtout à l'étranger (je n'en ai pas reçu – mais j'ai celui de la Société asiatique). Il a pris cependant note de votre demande pour la transmettre au Ministère de l'Instruction publique. Je crois que si, personnellement, vous adressiez une lettre à notre Ministre rue de Grenelle à Paris, ou

p. 2 recto

si vous la faisiez écrire par le doyen de votre Université, le Ministre, s'il n'a pas encore tout distribué, vous ferait don sûrement d'un exemplaire de cet ouvrage.

En ce qui concerne le Mas'oudi 9 vol. texte arabe & trad{uction} française[48] je pourrai, comme secrétaire de la Société asiatique, faire avoir un exemplaire à la bibliothèque de l'Université de Louvain mais alors à titre d'échange contre une des publications orientales de l'Université, d'une valeur à peu près égale (50 fr{anc}s environ). Voyez à négocier la chose. Nous possédons déjà le BarHebraeus de Mgr Lamy.[49]

J'ai en double un exemplaire 1° La stèle de Si-Hia leang-tcheou par M Deveria [*sic*] 2°

46 Cf. Marquart 1898.
47 Cf. Dutreuil de Rhins 1897–1898.
48 Cf. Barbier de Meynard/Pavet de Courteille 1861–1877.
49 Cf. Abbeloos/Lamy 1872–1877.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

p. 2 verso

2° Musulmans & Manichéens chinois[50] – par le même.

Si M Devéria ne vous a pas déjà fait hommage de ces 2 petits mémoires, je serai très heureux de vous faire cadeau des doubles.

Veuillez agréer, mon cher Confrère, l'expression de mes sentiments bien dévoués

Ed. Drouin

(4) N° 492

recto

/Cachet de départ : / PARIS XVI PL{ACE} CHOPIN 19 – 12 {19}02

/Cachet d'arrivée : / LOUV{AIN} 20 DEC 0{2}

/Destinataire : / Monsieur W. Bang
Professeur à l'Université
22 rue des Récollets
(Belgique) Louvain

verso

Paris 19 Décembre 1902

Cher confrère et ami. Je reçois votre aimable carte, mais je suis en ce moment en plein[51] emménagement ; avec des ouvriers, une bibliothèque et des papiers au pillage. En outre très loin du Cabinet des médailles. Il m'est donc impossible de faire votre commission, à mon grand regret. Je crois que vous ferez mieux et plus vite en faisant (de ma part) la demande à Mr de la Tour au Cabinet des médailles 56 rue Richelieu – Le Cabinet est habitué à ces sortes de demandes et ne refuse jamais

Tout à vous votre dévoué

Ed. Drouin

50 Cf. Devéria 1897, 1898.

51 W. Bang a collé ici un extrait de journal : « BIBLIOTHEQUE ROYALE. – M. Alvin, conservateur adjoint à la Bibliothèque royale est nommé conservateur de la section des médailles et monnaies ».

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(5) N° 493 (1 feuille = 2 pages)

p. 1 recto

11, rue de Verneuil
PARIS

Cher Monsieur & aimable Confrère

J'ai bien reçu vos deux honorées lettres du 22 novembre et 28 Décembre et vous prie de m'excuser d'avoir tant tardé de répondre à la première.

Je vous remercie d'avoir bien voulu lire mon article sur les monnaies mongoles[52] & suis heureux d'avoir votre approbation sur ce petit travail, approbation qui m'est d'autant plus précieuse que, comme je viens de l'écrire à Mr E. Wilhelm d'Iena [*sic*], elle émane d'un altaïscher Fachmann si l'expression est correcte. Vous avez raison pour la monnaie d'Abaga : il ne faut faire qu'une seule phrase & traduire :

p. 1 verso

« monnaie d'or veritable [*sic*] frappée au nom du khan Abaga »

J'ai lu le travail de Mr Donner[53]. il est fort bien fait et contient des remarques très judicieuses en même temps qu'il donne de nombreux spécimens d'écritures touraniennes, mais il y a quelques erreurs dans le tableau comparatif des alphabets, je le lui ai écrit. A la page 35 il attribue à M. de Markoff[54] la lecture mazdā hodād qui est de moi. Je l'ai publiée en 1892 et en 1896. On voit qu'il n'est pas très au courant de l'épigraphie monétaire : il parle par exemple de l'alphabet arsacide – mais nous n'en avons que des lambeaux ; il rassemble en outre des alphabets qui sont d'une époque très différente les uns des autres. C'est comme si l'on comparait l'écriture latine du IIIe IVe ou VIe s{iècle} avec celle du XVe. Si l'on admet que les Turcs ont pris

p. 2 recto[55]

leur écriture en Asie centrale au Ve ou VIe s{iècle} de notre ère, il faut prendre les types qui avaient alors cours – et non ceux de 7 ou 800 ans auparavant. Mais ce sont des critiques de détail, quoiqu'elles aient leur importance. J'ai dit tout cela à M. Donner quand je l'ai vu à Paris au mois de Juin dernier, mais son livre était imprimé

52 Cf. Drouin 1896.

53 Cf. Donner 1896. À propos d'Otto Donner (1835–1909), voir *Memoria saecularis Ottonis Donner*, Helsinki 1936.

54 Alexis de Markoff, professeur de numismatique ancienne à l'Institut archéologique et conservateur du Cabinet des Monnaies Orientales au Musée Impérial de l'Ermitage. Successeur de Boris Andreevič (Bernhard) Dorn (1805–1881), il publia le *Catalogue des monnaies arsacides, subarsacides, sassanides, dabwihides, ainsi que des pièces frappées par les ispehbeds arabes du Tabaristan et les gouverneurs de la Perse et du Maverannahr au nom des khalifes*, Saint-Pétersbourg 1889.

55 Page 2 verso : blanche.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Vous me demandez s'il y a à Paris un homme très compétent pour faire un c{om}pte-rendu sérieux de vos Kökturkische [*sic*] Inschriften.[56] Hélas non ; nous n'avons personne. M^r B{arbier} de Meynard[57] ne connaît que le turc de C. P[58] et il ne s'intéresse pas – n'en a pas le temps – à l'ancien turc{.}

Avec l'expression de mes meilleurs vœux pour l'année qui commence, veuillez agréer, cher Monsieur mes bien amicales salutations

Tout à Vous

Ed. Drouin

Liste des abréviations

JA	*Journal Asiatique*
T'P	*T'oung Pao*
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

Bibliographie

Abbeloos, J.-B./T. J. Lamy 1872–1877 : *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum*. 3 vols. Louvain.

Bang, W. 1897 : « Köktürkisches. » Dans : *WZKM* XI, pp. 198–200.

— 1898a : « Altpersisches. » Dans : *Indogermanische Forschungen* 8, pp. 291–295.

— 1898b : « Zu den köktürkischen Inschriften. » Dans : *T'P* 9, pp. 117–141.

Barbier de Meynard, Ch./A. Pavet de Courteille 1861–1877 : *Maçoudi. Les Prairies d'Or (Murūǧ al-ḏahab wa-maʿādin al-ǧawhar)*. Paris.

Bartholomae, Ch. 1906 : *Zum altiranischen Wörterbuch. Nacharbeiten und Vorarbeiten*. Strasbourg.

Beauvois, E. 1885 : « Les deux Quetzalcóatl espagnols : J. de Grijalva et F. Cortés. » Dans : *Le Muséon* 4, pp. 466–495 et 572–593.

— 1890 : « Voyages transatlantiques des Zeno. Leur relation est-elle véridique et leur carte authentique? » Dans : *Le Muséon* 9, pp. 351–474.

— 1892 : « La découverte du Groenland par les Scandinaves au Xe siècle. » Dans : *Le Muséon* 11, pp. 273–288.

— 1897/1901 : Compte rendu de V. Thomsen, *Les Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, Helsingfors 1896. Dans : *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature*, pp. 268–270.

Bouley, B. 1993 : « Un Bourguignon en Kabylie : Eugène Beauvois. » Dans : *Mémoires / Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Beaune* 74, pp. 84–90.

56 Cf. Bang 1898b.

57 Charles Barbier de Meynard (1826–1908), orientaliste français, spécialiste du turc, du persan et de l'arabe.

58 = Constantinople.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Devéria, G. 1897 : « Musulmans et Manichéens chinois (tirage à part, revu et augmenté de l'article paru). » Dans : *JA* IX/10 (novembre–décembre), pp. 445–484.
— 1898 : « Stèle Si-Hia de Leang-tcheou, avec une notice de M. S. W. Bushell. » Dans : *JA* IX/11 (janvier–février), pp. 53–74.
Donner, O. 1896 : « Sur l'origine de l'alphabet turc du nord de l'Asie. » Dans : *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja)* 14/1, pp. 1–71.
Drouin, E. 1866 : *Dictionnaire comparé des langues française, italienne, espagnole, latine, allemande, anglaise, grecque, hébraïque et arabe, menées à leur unité primitive et naturelle*. Caen.
— 1873 : *Recherches historiques et étymologiques sur la langue anglaise (histoire et grammaire)*. Meaux (Extrait du *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie, sciences, lettres et arts du département de Seine-et-Marne*).
— 1876 : *Grammaire théorique et raisonnée de la langue allemande : rédigée d'après la méthode comparative et les travaux philologiques les plus récents*. Paris.
— 1878 : *Sur l'ancienne déclinaison et les origines du pluriel dans les substantifs français*. Meaux (Extrait du *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie, sciences, lettres et arts du département de Seine-et-Marne*).
— 1884 : « Deux chroniques éthiopiennes. » Dans : *Le Muséon* 3, pp. 253–268.
— 1884/1885 : « Observations sur les monnaies à légendes en pehlvi et pehlvi-arabe. » Dans : *Revue Archèologique* III/4 (1884), pp. 150–165 et 223–236 ; III/5 (1885), pp. 204–225 et 372–379 ; III/6 (1885), pp. 1–15 et 142–166.
— 1887 : « Notice géographique et historique sur la Bactriane. » Dans : *La Grande Encyclopédie*. Paris.
— 1888a : « Les listes royales éthiopiennes et leur autorité historique. » Dans : *Revue Archéologique* [N. S.] 44, pp. 99–115, 153–172, 206–224.
— 1888b : « Chronologie et numismatique des rois indo-scythes. » Dans : *Revue numismatique* III/6, pp. 8–52 et 185–231.
— 1888–1889 : « L'ère de Yezdegerd et le calendrier perse. » Dans : *Revue Archéologique* III/12, pp. 333–343 ; III/13, pp. 353–368 ; III/14, pp. 42–54.
— 1889a : « La numismatique araméenne sous les Arsacides en Mésopotamie. » Dans : *JA* VIII /13 (avril–mai–juin), pp. 376–402.
— 1889b : « Essai de déchiffrement des monnaies à légendes araméennes de la Characène. » Dans : *Revue numismatique* III/7, pp. 211–254.
— 1894 : « Notice sur les Huns et Hioung-nu. » Dans : *La Grande Encyclopédie*. Paris.
— 1895a : « Sur quelques monnaies en bronze de l'époque sassanide. » Dans : *JA* IX/5 (janvier–février), pp. 165–168.
— 1895b : « Notice sur l'ouvrage de I. Ghâlib Edhem : ‹Musée impérial ottoman. Monnaies anciennes de l'Islam, etc.›. » Dans : *JA* IX/5 (mars–avril), pp. 364–371.
— 1895c : « Le nom de *Mazda* sur une monnaie indo-scythe. » Dans : *JA* IX/5 (mai–juin), pp. 519–520.
— 1895d : « Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites dans leurs rapports avec les rois perses sassanides. » Dans : *Le Muséon* 14, pp. 73–84, 141–161, 232–247, 277–288.
— 1896 : « Notice sur les monnaies mongoles faisant partie du ‹Recueil des documents de l'époque mongole› publié par le Prince Roland Bonaparte. » Dans : *JA* IX/7 (mai–juin), pp. 486–544.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1898a : « Histoire de l'épigraphie sassanide (Aperçu sommaire) (Mémoire lu à la section Iranienne du Congrès des Orientalistes tenu à Paris en Septembre 1897). » Dans : *Le Muséon* 17, pp. 5–14 et 108–121.
— 1898b : « Notices bibliographiques. » Dans : *JA* IX/11 (janvier–février / mars–avril), pp. 347–353.
— 1898c : « Les légendes des monnaies sassanides. » Dans : *Revue Archéologique* III/32, pp. 62–84 et 169–202.
— 1899a : « Monnaies tangoutaines ou Si-Hia. » Dans : *Revue numismatique* IV/3, pp. 235–240.
— 1899b : « Sur l'origine du titre βασιλεὺς βασιλέων. » Dans : *Gazette numismatique de Bruxelles*.
— 1901 : « Le nimbe et les signes de l'apothéose sur les monnaies des rois indo-scythes. » Dans : *Revue numismatique* IV/5, pp. 155–164.
Dutreuil de Rhins, J.-L. 1897–1898 : *Mission scientifique dans la Haute Asie 1890–1895*. 4 vols. Paris.
Foy, W. 1898 : « Beiträge zur erklärung der altpersischen keilinschriften. » Dans : *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen [= Kuhns Zeitschrift]* 35 [N.F. 15], pp. 1–78.
De Harlez, C. de 1898 : « Miscellanées Chinois. » Dans : *WZKM* 12, pp. 249–260.
Hintze, A. 2009 : « Avestan Literature. » Dans : R.E. Emmerick/M. Macuch (eds.) : *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran.* Companion Volume I to *A History of Persian Literature*. London/New York, pp. 1–71.
Knüppel, M./A. van Tongerloo 2012 : *Die orientalistische Gelehrtenrepublik am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkrieges. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Willi Bang(-Kaup) und Friedrich Carl Andreas aus den Jahren 1889 bis 1914*. Berlin/Boston.
— 2014 : *Albert von Le Coq (1860–1930) – der Erwecker Manis im Spiegel seiner Briefe an Willi Bang Kaup aus den Jahren 1909–1914*. Berlin/Boston.
Marquart, J. 1898 : « Historische Glossen zu den alttürkischen Inschriften. » Dans : *WZKM* 12, pp. 157–200.
— 1901 : *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i. Mit historisch-kritischem Kommentar und historischen und topographischen Excursen*. Berlin.
Mouillebouche, H. 2007 : « À propos du fonds Eugène Beauvois. » Dans : *Revue d'histoire nordique* 2007, pp. 241–251.
Nützel, H. 1898 : *Katalog der orientalischen Münzen.* Vol. 1: *Die Münzen der östlichen Chalifen*. Berlin.
Radloff, W. 1897 : *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei. Neue Folge nebst einer Abhandlung von W. Barthold : Die historische Bedeutung der alttürkischen Inschriften*. Saint-Pétersbourg.
Weissbach, F.H./W. Bang 1893–1908 : *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
Williams Jackson, A.V. 1903 : « The Great Behistun Rock and Some Results of a Re-Examination of the Old Persian Inscriptions on It. » Dans : *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 24, pp. 77–95.
— 1906 : *Persia Past and Present. A Book of Travel and Research*. New York/London.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

On the Title Indication of the "*Chusheng Zanwen* 初聲讚文" in the Chinese *Hymnscroll*

Wang Yuanyuan, Guangzhou / Lin Wushu, Guangzhou

The manuscript *Hymnscroll*, totaling 11,000 words, is a collection of 28 hymns written in 423 columns (= col.). Except for three phonetically-transcribed hymns, most of them are liberal translations. The "*chusheng zanwen* 初聲讚文" discussed here is a transliterated one. We would like to offer a new explanation for its title indication which has been an argumentative question in academia for a long time.

The title indication of the "*chusheng zanwen*" at col. 176 of the scroll is: 初聲讚文　夷數作　義理幽玄　宜從依梵 "*chusheng zanwen*, composed by Jesus, with abstruse and profound teachings, have to follow the Sanskrit version". The hymn (cols. 177–183) includes 175 transliterated words and some instructive Chinese characters and numbers. According to the numerical order, the transliterated words of this hymn can be divided into 22 segments or verses.

Though the content of the "*chusheng zanwen*" is phonetically transcribed, its Chinese title indication is quite accurate and idiomatic. It is noticeable that the Chinese character *wen* 文 in smaller size is inserted between the characters of *zan* 讚 and *yi* 夷. The indication is easy to understand for anyone knowing ancient Chinese: the title of this hymn is the "*chusheng zanwen*", and its author is Jesus. Because of its abstruse and profound meaning, it must be transliterated on the basis of its versions in other languages. However, Waldschmidt and Lentz, as the pioneers of the researches on *Hymnscroll*, translated the indication into German as "Uranfänglichkeitsanrufungen, die Jesus, den gerechtrichtenden, den geheimnisvollen, preisen. Im Anschluß und in Anlehnung an das Pähläwi".[1] Morano gives the English translation as "The first voice; praising Jesus; (it) creates a meaning that is very mysterious; (it) should follow the Parthian (language or phonetics)".[2] Bryder's translation is "Primal Voice, in praise of Jesus, the Creator of the Mysterious Principles".[3] In a word, they all regard the hymn as the first voice in praise of Jesus who created the mysterious teachings. The only difference is rendering the Chinese character *fan* 梵

1 Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, p. 85; Schmidt-Glintzer (1987, p. 33) agrees with the German translation.
2 Morano 1982, p. 10.
3 Bryder 1985, p. 48.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

as Pahlavi or Parthian. Obviously, the character *fan* 梵, originally referring to the Sanskrit, was borrowed by Manichaean priests of China to indicate Manichaean classics in foreign languages. As to the above views of mistaking Jesus for the praised object of the hymn, Ma Xiaohe has already pointed that out in his research.[4] What we want to add is that, western scholars' misinterpreting of Jesus as the object of praise is not due to their carelessness in research or poor comprehension of ancient Chinese. Instead, we would be better off looking for the cause as stemming from the convention of respecting Jesus as God, who is definitely not a hymn-writer. Probably, such misinterpretation results from western scholars' less attention to the sinicization of Manichaeism. In fact, there are a large number of pseudographs in ancient China, and it is common for an author not to sign his own name to the book but to assume the name of luminaries of the past. Thus, Liang Qichao, a well-known scholar of the late Qing dynasty (1636–1912), stresses that a very important task in approaching traditional Chinese studies is to identify the pseudographs.[5] There are more pseudographs in Chinese religious scriptures, which are claimed to be written by the supernatural, departed one or even the immortals. Therefore, it is quite understandable that Manichaean priests of China followed the tradition of making pseudographs by assuming the name of Jesus. As a hymnal for Chinese auditors, *Hymnscroll* has another two possible pseudographs besides the "*chusheng zanwen*", one said to be composed by Buddha Narayan (col. 164) and another by the Great Light Messenger (col. 168).

Waldschmidt and Lentz interpret the 175 transliterated words of the "*chusheng zanwen*" into 48 phrases. Among them, the Chinese characters *hesineng* 喝思嗫 appearing for 22 times were recognized by them as *ho-sē-noγ* in Pahlavi.[6] Morano thinks it to be *hsyng* in Parthian and *pyrnmcyk* in Sogdian, both of which mean "primeval".[7] The word *hsyng* [hasēnag] is an adjective which means "earlier, ancient, primeval" or "first". And it is also an adverb meaning "firstly" or "originally".[8] It frequently comes up in Parthian Manichaean manuscripts unearthed in Turfan.[9] More specifically, the word *hsyng* means "primeval" or "first" in the concept of time, and it corresponds well with the meaning of "first" (*chu* 初) in the hymn-title "*chusheng zanwen*". This is not a unique instance, but has its counterpart. On the verso of a Dunhuang manuscript labeled as Pelliot Chinois 3049, there are five Old Uighur texts without headings. In one of them (cols. 27–46), a word *ašnuqï* appears 22 times.[10] Here, *ašnuqï* is interpreted as *hsyng* in Parthian, i. e. *hesineng* 喝思嗫 in the "*chusheng zanwen*". Hamilton

4 Ma 2008, pp. 197–198.
5 Liang 1996, pp. 274–286, especially p. 274.
6 Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, p. 85ff.
7 Morano 1982, p. 10.
8 Boyce 1977, p. 47.
9 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 186.
10 Hamilton 1986, I, pp. 39–40 (text); p. 43 (French translation).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

explains it (in French) as "premier, primordial" or "antérieur".[11] Through comparative research, Hamilton figures that Pelliot Chinois 3049 is a parallel to the "*chusheng zanwen*". Besides *ašnuqï*, some other terms in this manuscript can also be identified with the Parthian ones preserved in the "*Chusheng zanwen*".[12] Therefore, it is partially agreed that Pelliot Chinois 3049 is an Old Uighur version of the "*chusheng zanwen*". But in contrast to the "*chusheng zanwen*", the content of Pelliot Chinois 3049 is comparatively clear despite the lack of headings. It has 103 words in all, and nearly half of them cannot be compared to the "*chusheng zanwen*" except for some parallels picked out by Hamilton.

What makes scholars believe Pelliot Chinois 3049 is the Old Uighur version of the "*chusheng zanwen*" is not only the match between *ašnuqï* and *hesineng* 喝思唏, but also the same meaning of the first word of these two texts. In Pelliot Chinois 3049, the first sentence is *ün ašnuqï ög tängri*[13] in which the first word *ün* means "voice". Hamilton's French translation of this sentence is "La voix, c'est la déesse Mere primordiale"[14], while Ma Xiaohe translates it into *chusheng shi muqinshen* 初聲是母親神 "the first voice is the Mother God".[15] The first sentence of the "*chusheng zanwen*" is *yuren hesineng* 于呣喝思唏 in Chinese, and *yuren* 于呣 is identified as the parallel to Parthian *wcn* [wažan][16] which means "voice" or "word".[17] That is to say, the Old Uighur word *ün* has the same meaning as *yuren* 于呣, i. e. the Parthian word *wcn*. According to Ma Xiaohe, *yuren* 于呣 at the beginning of the "*chusheng zanwen*", refers to *sanchang qingjingyin* 三常清淨音 "the pure voice from the Three Constancies" or *miaofayin* 妙法音 "voice of the wonderful religion" which is to awaken the souls,[18] so the "*chusheng zanwen*" is a hymn in praise of the first voice. This assumption, however, is not in line with the patterns of other headings in the *Hymnscroll*. The grammatical pattern of other headings, like a verb-object phrase, is a verb being followed by a praised object. For example, *lanzan yishuwen* □□□覽讚夷數文 "Praise of Jesus" (col. 6), *zan yishuwen* 讚夷數文 "Praise of Jesus" (col. 45), *chengzan mangni juzhiwang* 稱讚忙你具智王 "Praise of Mani, the King of Perfect Wisdom" (col. 159), *tan zhuhufa mingshiwen* 歎諸護法明使文 "Praise of all Law-Protecting Messengers of Light" (cols. 84, 197, 209), *tan wushang mingzun jiwen* 歎无上明尊偈文 "Praise of the Unsurpassed Venerable Lord of Light" (col. 222), *tan wumingwen* 歎五明文 "Praise of the Five Lights" (cols. 235, 248), *tan mingjiejiewen* 歎明界界文 "Praise of the World of Light" (col. 261). There is no exception for such a pattern. Literally, the Chinese heading *chusheng zanwen* 初聲

11 Hamilton 1986, I, p. 47; II, p. 211.
12 Hamilton 1986, I, pp. 47–49.
13 *Ibid.*, p. 39.
14 Hamilton 1986, I, p. 43.
15 Ma 2008, p. 170.
16 Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, p. 85; Morano 1982, p. 17ff.
17 Boyce 1977, p. 90.
18 Ma 2008, p. 171.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

讚文 might be interpreted as a hymn in praise of the first voice, but this interpretation is presumably not the author's original intention. It is reasonable for Ma Xiaohe to infer that the Old Uighur word *ün* or the Chinese *yuren* 于呛 (i. e. *wcn* in Parthian) refers to the pure voice in *sanchang qingjing yin* 三常清淨音 or *miaofayin* 妙法音. But the first voice cannot be regarded as the pure voice in *sanchang qingjing yin* 三常清淨音 or *miaofayin* 妙法音. In the *Hymnscroll*, *sanchang qingjingyin* 三常清淨音 "the pure voice from the Three Constancies" appears at col. 10,[19] while *miaofayin* 妙法音 "the voice of the wonderful religion" at col. 57.[20] They all come up before the "*chusheng zanwen* 初聲讚文" at col. 176. Usually, in order to keep a consistent wording or style in the writings, it is logical for Chinese people to use the character *yin* 音 instead of *sheng* 聲. That is to say, it should be *chuyin zanwen* 初音讚文 in Chinese expression, not *chusheng zanwen* 初聲讚文. All of these can be proof to support the point that the first voice is not the hymn's object of praise.

About the first sentence of Pelliot Chinois 3049, we know that Hamilton explains it as "La voix, c'est la déesse Mère primordiale" and Ma Xiaohe's translation is the "First voice is the Mother God". But both of them are quite incomprehensible to Chinese people. According to Manichaean original teachings, there is no relation between the Mother God and the voice. Even if *Shamu* 善母 "the Good Mother" in the creation myth of Chinese Manichaean manuscripts can be compared to *ög tängri* in Pelliot Chinois 3049, it is not described as the first or primeval one at all. Supposing there is a "first (or primeval) Mother God" in the Manichaean pantheon, then in Chinese logic there should be some non-primeval mother gods. But it is really hard to figure out what role the non-primeval mother gods played in the Manichaean world and how they are associated with the voice. Furthermore, the name of "the first voice" itself makes people consider the possibility of finding the mid voice or the final voice in Manichaean context. If the first voice is the Mother God, how to designate the mid voice or the final voice? Are they "the Son God" or "the Grandson God"?

The French translation of Pelliot Chinois 3049 shows that this Old Uighur text is full of determinative sentences featured with words meaning "is" or "are", such as the second sentence *saß ašnuqï xormuzta tängri*[21] which Hamilton translates as "La parole, c'est le dieu Ohrmizd primordial".[22] If the French

19 我今蒙開佛性眼，得覩四處妙法身；又蒙開發佛性耳，能聽三常清淨音。"By Him have now been opened my Buddha-natured eyes, and thus they can see the four-placed wonderful Law-body; Through Him also, my Buddha-natured ears have been enlightened, and can hear the clear and pure voice from the Three Constancies." (Tsui 1943, p. 176).

20 開我法性光明耳，无礙得聞妙法音；无礙得聞妙法音，遂免万般虛妄曲。"Open my Light-ears of the Law nature, so that they hear without obstacle the voice of the wonderful Law; that they hear without obstacle the voice of the wonderful Law, I am therefore spared a myriad kinds of fallacious songs." (Tsui 1943, p. 181).

21 Hamilton 1986, I, p. 39.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 43.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

translation is faithful to the Old Uighur text, we tend to regard the text as an inductive and reasoned writing on abstruse teachings rather than a passionate hymn. But the "*chusheng zanwen*" is a typical hymn which is different from the genre of Pelliot Chinois 3049, and *ög tängri, xormuzta tängri* and other deities mentioned in Pelliot Chinois 3049 do not have parallels in the "*chusheng zanwen*" at all. In addition, the "*chusheng zanwen*" has title indications, while Pelliot Chinois 3049 gives no titles. The lack of titles is not an omission. We would like to mention here a similar Old Uighur text on the verso of Pelliot Chinois 3407. It is a complete one with 15 lines of writings in which the word *ašnuqï* appears for 17 times, also without titles at all.[23] In the face of so many dissimilarities between Pelliot Chinois 3049 and the "*chusheng zanwen*", researchers should be more cautious to say they are just different versions of the same text.

Though the Chinese words *chusheng* 初聲 appear in pair in the "*chusheng zanwen*", in other existing Dunhuang Manichaean manuscripts the two characters *chu* 初 and *sheng* 聲 come separately. The character *chu* 初 "first" or "primeval" at cols. 16, 54, 97, 101 and 102 of the *Compendium* is an adjective, such as *chuji* 初際 "the primeval moment" (cols. 101 and 102). But no *sheng* 聲can be found in the *Compendium*. The character *chu* 初 representing the concept of time appears respectively in cols. 82, 217, 218 and 227 of *Traité*. As to the character *sheng* 聲, it appears only once at col. 209 in *Traité*. The character *chu* 初 appears 2 times in the *Hymnscroll*:

> Col. 124
> 復啓初化顯現尊，具相法身諸佛母，與彼常勝先意父，及以五明歡喜子。
> "I also petition the venerable Lord, the first to transform, reveal and appear, the Mother of all Buddhas, who has the perfect forms and the august and supreme presence , and the Ever-victorious: the Father who anticipates thoughts, and the Five Lights: the sons of happiness."

> Col. 132
> 復啓特勝花冠者，吉祥清淨通傳信，最初生化諸佛相，及与三世慈父等。
> "I also petition the upholder of the floral crown of triumph, the auspicious, clean and pure communicator of messages, the many first-born and transfigured Buddha-forms, and the compassionate Fathers of the three epochs."

Here, *chu* 初 indicates the creation period of Manichaean myth.

The character *sheng* 聲 (voice) occurs many times in the *Hymnscroll*, e.g. cols. 5, 133, 202, 238, 321, 327, 351 and 397. In col. 133 we find *youqi huanying jingjuesheng* 又啓喚應警覺聲 "I also petition the awakening voices of call and echo". Here the character *sheng* refers to the pair of the Call and the Echo gods in Manichaean cosmogony. The name of these gods are transliterated in Chinese as *Hulusede* 呼嚧瑟德 and *Boloupude* 嗸嘍口稞德 (cols. 18, 74, 75, 76

23 Hamilton 1986, I, pp. 55–56.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

and 207 in *Traité*), which are respected as *Xrōštag Yazd* and *Padwāxtag Yazd* in Parthian.[24] If the first voice was a praised subject of the hymn, it could be traced out in Chinese Manichaean manuscripts. Let's make an assumption: *huanying jingjuesheng* 喚應警覺聲 "the awakening voices of call and echo" is related to *chusheng* 初聲, for they share the same character *sheng* 聲 in the god names. In case "the awakening voices of call and echo" is *chusheng* 初聲, it becomes the object of praise of the hymn. Going through the whole hymn, however, we find no phonetically-transcribed expression that can be matched with the foreign names of the gods Call and the Echo which prevailed in the churches of Central Asia. Interestingly, this pair of gods is mentioned in Pelliot Chinois 3049 as *xrwštg tängri* (col. 43) and *pdw'xtg tängri* (col. 44) in Old Uighur. Thus, it can be decided that the Chinese words *chusheng* 初聲 in the title do not refer to the object of praise.

As a typical Chinese expression, *chusheng* 初聲 is very common in Chinese ancient classics. For instance, there is a sentence *chusheng pofuxianhuan* 初聲頗復閑緩 "(The voice) in the beginning sounds very relaxed and slow" describing the music played by the instruments introduced from the Western Regions.[25] *Chusheng* 初聲 here means the voice in the beginning. *Chusheng* 初聲 is also employed in a poem written by Ma Ge 麻革 of the Yuan Dynasty (1271–1368). In Ma's book of poetry *Yixi Ji* 貽溪集, there is a quatrain:

> 一夜睡不著，小窗天忽明。林塘寒鳥聚，聽得最初聲。[26]
> "With a restless night, it is suddenly dawn seen from the small window, cold birds gather around the woods and pond, and their first chirps can be heard."

Here, *zuichusheng* 最初聲 means the chirps of birds in early morning. In Dunhuang *Bianwen* 变文 (i.e. a wording style adopted by temples to deliver ideas to commoners in the form of story telling and singing to tell Sutra stories), we find:

> 樓頭纔打三更鼓，寺裏初聲半夜鐘。[27]
> "The drum is just beaten at the gate tower announcing the fall of midnight, the first chime of midnight struck comes from the temple."

In this couplet, *chusheng* 初聲 refers to the first chime of bell at midnight in the Buddhist temple everyday. The Chinese character *chu* 初 in above examples indicates time, and *chusheng* 初聲 means the voice comes earlier or first. Apparently, with this meaning, western scholars translated the hymn title as "the first voice".

24 In Parthian, *Yazd* means "god", *xrōštag* means "call" and *padwāxtag* means "answer". Please refer to Boyce 1977, pp. 99, 69.

25 *Tong Dian* 通典 *[Comprehensive Statutes]*, Beijing 1992, vol. 142, Music 2, pp. 3614–3615.

26 *Yuanshi xuan sanji* 元詩選三集 *[Three Volumes of Selected Poems in the Yuan Dynasty]*, Beijing 1987, vol. Jiaji 甲集: Gan Yong 甘泳: *Dongxi Ji* 東溪集, p. 78.

27 Pan 1983, p. 582.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In Chinese, *chusheng* 初聲 can also be explained as a creature's voice in its early stage of growth. There is a kind of bird called *Xiuliu* 鵂鶹 in Chinese (i.e. Glaucidium cuculoides), and the name is believed to be derived from its voice as a nestling according to the Chinese dictionary *Shishi mingjie* 詩識名解.[28] A Chinese expression *yaya chizi zhi chusheng* 啞啞赤子之初聲[29] is often used to describe the voice of a new born infant. In Chinese sources, *chusheng* 初聲 is a neutral word without positive or negative sense. It has nothing to do with wonderful things or virtues, not to mention the Sages. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that *chusheng* 初聲 can be particularly eyed as an object of praise by the religion's followers.

Ancient Chinese literati paid more attention to the title in literary writings. Most of them preferred a plain and clear wording of the title, but subtle and obscure style was also favoured. In the context of the extensive and profound Chinese language, the latter one seems to be more thought-provoking and interest-stirring. The *Hymnscroll* is probably written in this style because its Chinese title *xiabu* 下部 is not self-explanatory.[30] Hence, the "*chusheng zanwen*" is neither for Jesus nor some deity or sound named as the first voice, and we have to find another way to explore the real connotation of the title.

There is a term *shengwen* 聲聞 (Skt. *śrāvaka*) in Chinese Buddhist sutras which refers to the enlightened disciples of Buddha. The *Mahāvaipulyamahāsaāghāta-sūtra* translated by Dharmakṣema (385–433) includes a sermon delivered by the Buddha to the new followers which titled as *chushengwen* 初聲聞 in Chinese.[31] With the inspiration of it, we infer that the title of the "*chusheng zanwen*" is a metonymy which actually means the hymns for the new religion followers to study and chant. Such understanding echoes with above explanation that *chusheng* 初聲 is the voice of a nestling or new born infant.

If the "*chusheng zanwen*" is prepared for Chinese new followers and the author is said to be Jesus, it should not be a purely phonetically-transcribed work. In order to meet the teaching needs, the author Dao Ming 道明 probably adapted and edited the original version on the basis of some hymns in foreign languages, then transliterated and included them into the *Hymnscroll*.

As to the "*chusheng zanwen*", based on its Parthian version worked out by western academics, a Chinese scholar has found parallel terms in Dunhuang Manichaean manuscripts in Chinese.[32] From the content already interpreted,

28 See Yao Bing 姚炳: *Shishi Mingjie* 詩識名解 (a work of textual researches on animals and plants written in the Qing Dynasty), vol. 3, p. 27, in: 景印文淵閣四庫全書 *Jingyin wenyuange siku quanshu [Photo facsimile reprint of the Wenyuan Pavilion copy of the Siku Imperial Library]*, Taipei 1986, vol. 86, p. 359.

29 Yan Sisheng 晏斯盛: *Yiyizong* 易翼宗, vol. 6, p. 2, in: 景印文淵閣四庫全書 *Jingyin wenyuange siku quanshu [Photo facsimile reprint of the Wenyuan Pavilion copy of the Siku Imperial Library]*, Taipei 1986, vol. 49, p. 428.

30 Lin 2005, pp. 255–262.

31 TT, vol. 13, No. 397, 154a15.

32 Lin 2014.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the hymn just offers high respect to Manichaean deities, disciplines, virtues and the whole Church. The teaching involved is much simpler than those of *Compendium* and *Traité*, and it is not profound at all comparing to other hymns in the *Hymnscroll*.

Bibliography

Boyce, M. 1977: *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Leiden.

Bryder, P. 1985: *The Chinese Transformation of Manichaeism. A Study of Chinese Manichaean Terminology*. Lund.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China.* Pt. 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout.

Hamilton, J. 1986: *Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe–Xe siècle de Touen-houang*. 2 vols. Paris.

Liang Qichao 梁啓超 1996: 中國近三百年學術史 *Zhongguo jin sanbai nian xueshushi [Chinese Academic History of the Recent 300 Years]*. Beijing [in Chinese].

Lin Wushu 2005: "Notes on the Title of the Dunhuang Manichaean Hymnscroll (S.2659 摩尼教下部讚 Mo-ni chiao hsia-pu tsan)." In: A. van Tongerloo/ L. Cirillo (eds.): *Il Manicheismo. Nuove prospettive della ricerca*. Turnhout, pp. 255–262.

— 2014: "摩尼教〈下部讚〉三首音譯詩偈辨說 [Researches on the Three Transliterated Hymns in Manichaean Hymnscroll]." In: *Wen Shi* 文史, vol. 3, pp. 5–57.

Ma Xiaohe 馬小鶴 2008: "摩尼教〈下部讚·初聲讚文〉新考 Monijiao *Xiabuzan* 'Chusheng zanwen' xinkao [A new study of the hymn 'First Voice' in the Manichaean *Hymnscroll*]; 摩尼教〈下部讚·初聲讚文〉續考 Monijiao *Xiabuzan* 'Chusheng zanwen' xukao [Further Study of the hymn 'First Voice' in the Manichaean *Hymnscroll*]." In: Ma Xiaohe 馬小鶴 (ed.): 摩尼教與古代西域史研究 *Monijiao yu gudai xiyu shi yanjiu [Manichaean Studies and Ancient Western Regions Studies]*. Beijing, pp. 164–205 [in Chinese].

Morano, E. 1982: "The Sogdian Hymns of *Stellung Jesu*." In: *East and West* 32, pp. 9–43.

Pan Zhonggui 潘重規 1983: 敦煌變文集新書 *Dunhuang bianwen ji xinshu [A New Collection of Transformation Texts from Dunhuang]*. Vol. 3. Taipei [in Chinese].

Schmidt-Glintzer, H. 1987: *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*. Wiesbaden.

Tsui Chi 1943: "Mo-ni chiao hsia-pu tsan. The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns." In: *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946), pp. 174–219.

TT = Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 (ed.): 大正新脩大藏經 *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō [Taishō Revised Tripiṭaka]*. Tokyo 1924–1934.

Waldschmidt, E./W. Lentz 1926: *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichaismus*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1926, Nr. 4).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

A Pahlavi Query*

Dieter Weber, Berlin

In economic documents from the so-called "Pahlavi Archive"[1] as edited during the last decade[2] two terms denoting "expense(s)" seem to be attested: one is *uzēnag* and the second *uzēnišn*. Whereas the first one is well known from Pahlavi scriptures and clearly to be noted in the documents the second one is but an assumption based on the similarity of most of the letters and on the possible suffix *-išn* forming abstract nouns.[3] Here follow the extant occurrences of the first term (Figs. 1–4):

⟨'wcynk'⟩ *uzēnag* "expense, cost; exit" (CPD)

P. 193, 5	Berlin 7, 2	Berk. 89, 2	Berk. 243, 3
Fig. 1	Fig. 2	Fig. 3	Fig. 4

There is another occurrence in Per. 9, 4 which is restored and doubtful.

* The following *sigla* will be used: Berk. = Pahlavi documents, Berkeley (partly published); Berlin = Pahlavi documents, Berlin (ed. Weber 2008); P. = Pahlavi papyri and parchments (ed. Weber 2003, P. 125–P. 343); Per. = Pahlavi papyri and parchments, Moscow (ed. Perixanjan 1961); P. Pehl. = Pahlavi papyri and parchments of the *Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, Vienna (with original inventory number, mostly unpublished); Tab. = Pahlavi documents from Tabaristan (8th cent., ed. Gignoux 2012).

1 The documents in question are housed mainly at the Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA, and, to a minor extent, at the Institute for Iranian Studies of the Free University of Berlin. There are also some documents in the Los Angeles Museum of Arts and in private collections in Europe and Iran. They date mostly to the second half of the 7th century CE (Weber 2012).

2 Partly edited by Gignoux during the years 2001 through 2010 (see "References" below) and Weber 2008.

3 Weber 2007a, p. 963, ch. 6.2.2.1.19.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

P. 193, 5
uzēnag pad mōg-pōš "expenses for footwear"[4]

Berlin 7, 2–4
[2] *uzēnag* [3] *ī pad garmīh ī ham-farroxtar ōstāndār* [4] *rāy*
"for the costs of the bath(room) of the most fortunate *ōstāndār*"[5]

Berk. 89, 2–4
[2] *uzēnag* [3] *ī dūdag ī farroxtar ōstāndār* [4] *rāy*
"for the expenses of the family of the most fortunate *ōstāndār*"[6]

Berk. 243, 3–6
[3] *čiyōn-am uzēnag ī* [4] *Dādēn-panāh-gušnasp pad framān ī man kard* [5] …
[6] *rāy*
"as I (ordered to give) for the expenses of *Dādēn-panāh-gušnasp* because of the order I made …"[7]

It is clear that this word is derived from a present stem *uzēn-* as a causative formation,[8] cf. ʾwzyn- prs. "hinauslassen, erlösen" (T II D 126 I V 9), and Pahl. Ps. *ʾwcynšny* (134 Kan., see Fig. 5).[9] The meaning must be, in the special context of the documents, not a religious one as in Manichaean but a very secular one like "to let out > give out" thus giving the word *uzēnag* "expense, cost; exit" (CPD).

The second word with a comparable meaning, viz. *ʾwcynšn/**uzēnišn*, was met with in other documents from the "Pahlavi Archive"; it is relatively frequent but, what is extremely striking, never written with final *vertical stroke* (Figs. 6–20):

Ps. fol. 10 R 6: ⟨ʾwcynšn(y)⟩	Berlin 28, 4	Berk. 10, 5	Berk. 25, 3
Fig. 5	Fig. 6	Fig. 7	Fig. 8

4 WEBER 2003, p. 79.
5 The reading ⟨pṭ' dlm'n⟩ (WEBER 2008, p. 35) is obsolete now because the phrase runs ⟨pṭ' glmyh⟩ as is also shown by the other occurrences in Berk. 48, 11. Berk. 106, 6 and 8 as well as in Berk. 141, 3; Berk. 143, 5 and Berk. 237, 1; it will denote a bathhouse (possibly a kind of Turkish bath or stew).
6 Unpublished letter.
7 Unpublished letter.
8 For this formation, see SALEMANN 1901, p. 305; and HENNING 1933, p. 212f.
9 HENNING 1933, p. 168.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Berk. 33A, 6

Fig. 9

Berk. 35, 5

Fig. 10

Berk. 42, 9

Fig. 11

Berk. 62, 2

Fig. 12

Berk. 69, 5

Fig. 13

Berk. 79, 4

Fig. 14

Berk. 86, 6

Fig. 15

Berk. 91, 3

Fig. 16

Berk. 105, 4

Fig. 17

Berk. 143, 5

Fig. 18

Berk. 184, 7

Fig. 19

Berk. 247, 2

Fig. 20

It is noteworthy that in the cases of Berk. 33A, 6, Berk. 35, 5, Berk. 69, 5 and particularly Berk. 247, 2 the final stroke down is explicitly bent to the right which is, in some cases, a conspicuous trait of a final ⟨t⟩ or ⟨ṭ⟩.[10] Consequently the assumed ending ⟨-šn⟩ is impossible. Already in 2008[11] I expressed doubts about the reading ⟨'wcynšn⟩ because of the missing final *vertical stroke* which is obligatory with nouns in *-išn*;[12] but at that time no other possibility could be envisaged.

Now the immense material provided by the "Pahlavi Archive" enables us to understand better the variety of possible ligatures. In this case the ligature at the

10 See Weber 2007b, p. 187, and 2008, p. 223 with fn. 15.
11 Weber 2008, p. 120f.
12 To my knowledge there are no exceptions in the documents; the only one given in the word ⟨plc'mšn⟩ Berlin 30a V 1 (Weber 2008, p. 127) is to be read otherwise, certainly not ⟨plc'mšn⟩ but rather beginning with ⟨'pl-⟩.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

end of the word cannot be anything else but ⟨y-ṭ⟩ which is well illustrated by a list of examples for the 3rd sg. prs. ending in -yṭ/-*ēd*:

⟨-yṭ⟩ ligature for 3rd sg.

Berlin 1, 7: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berlin 2, 9: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 75, 5: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 78, 9: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)
Fig. 21	Fig. 22	Fig. 23	Fig. 24
Berk. 82, 7: ⟨YḤWWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 86, 11: ⟨ŠDRWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 121, 8: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 126, 9: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)
Fig. 25	Fig. 26	Fig. 27	Fig. 28
Berk. 167, 9: ⟨YḤWWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 200, 5: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 241, 11: ⟨YḤBWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	P.Pehl. 566, 1: ⟨YḤWWNyṭ⟩[13] (preceded by *ē*)
Fig. 29	Fig. 30	Fig. 31	Fig. 32

13 It is to be noted here that all occurrences in the Berlin Papyri of ⟨YḤWWNšn⟩ (P. 297, 2); ⟨YḤWWNš(n)⟩ (P. 139, 5; P. 270, 1); ⟨YḤWWNšn'⟩ (P. 165a 2) will presumably contain again the ending ⟨-yṭ⟩. There is another example of a possible reading ⟨YḤWWNšn⟩ in Per. 1, 4 where the ending again must be ⟨-yṭ⟩ and nothing else though the writing seems rather awkward.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Berlin 3, 7: ⟨YḤWWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berlin 3, 9: ⟨YḤWWNyṭ⟩ (preceded by *ē*)	Berk. 10, 7: ⟨'MYṭl⟩	Berk. 24, 4: ⟨'MYṭl⟩
Fig. 33	Fig. 34	Fig. 35	Fig. 36

Furthermore the ligature ⟨y-ṭ⟩ is also documented in the spelling of ⟨'MYṭl⟩ (Figs. 35 and 36). Now the ending ⟨-yṭ⟩ being established the question is whether or not a 3rd sg. is indeed intended in the texts. There is only one occurrence which must be interpreted in this way because the verbal form in question is preceded by the optative particle *ē*, viz. in Berk. 184[14]: [5] *garmak pad sang ī* [6] *dūdag ham g(rīw) 1 Xusrō ē* [7] *uzēnēd 12 sang* "*garmak*[15] according to the weight (used) in the family *Xusrō* should expend 1 *grīw*, too". Then all other examples ⟨'wcynyṭ⟩ must be a secondary preterite suffixed by *-īd* which is attached to causatives in *-ēn-*.[16] The extant occurrences may be given here in full:

> Berlin 28, 1–6
> [1] *ēn māh Ādur ī sāl* [2] *39 padīrēd* [3] *Dādēnwindād ī pad Yazdān-ābestān ī* [4] *bunkadag uzēnīd ī pad Yazdān-ābestān* [5] *rāy az Tahmtan ī āsyābbed* [6] *garmak grīw 20*
> "this month *Ādur* of the year 39 *Dādēnwindād* of *Yazdān-ābestān*, the house of the *bun*,[17] will receive 20 *grīw* of *garmak* from *Tahmtan*, the guardian of the (water-)mills, because of what he expended for *Yazdān-ābestān*"[18]

14 Published in Gignoux 2009, p. 129. The relatively well preserved part in the middle of the document which contains the major informations of the message has not been read by the editor; the numbers do not refer to a given year but to the amount (weight) of *garmak*.

15 Possibly "(broad) beans, *Vicia faba*"; cf. Weber 2012, p. 220, fn. 21.

16 See Weber 2007a, p. 950, ch. 4.4. The assumed occurrence of *uzēnišn* in Tab. 22, 11 (Gignoux 2012, p. 76) is to be read 'wcyṭk'/*uzīdag* but the semantics will not change seriously.

17 The term *bun* is understood here as denoting the "basic equipment" (food and beasts etc.) as a kind of cooperative of a village to which the peasants deliver a certain amount of the crops and get back according to their necessity. This would coincide with the system of the so-called *bune* of more recent times, see Bulliet 2009, pp. 25–26.

18 Published in Weber 2008, pp. 119–121; improvements in Gignoux 2010b, p. 118.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Tehran C, 1–4
[1] *padīrēd Frāy ēn* [2] *māh Ardwahišt ī sāl 32* [3] *uzēnīd ī dūdag ī ōstāndār* [4] *pad Yazdān-ābestān rāy*
"*Frāy* will receive this month *Ardwahišt* of the year 32 of what he expended for the family of the *ōstāndār* in *Yazdān-ābestān*."[19]

Berk. 10, 4–7
[4] *čiyōn mādar ī Dōst* [5] *uzēnīd ī x*^{w}*ēš rāy* [6] *x*^{w}*āst sik 3* [7] *dōlag*
"as the mother of *Dōst* asked for 3 *dōlag* vinegar because of what she expended for herself"[20]

Berk. 25,[21] 3–4
[3] *uzēnīd ī dūdag ī* [4] *ōstāndār rāy*
"because of what he expended for the family of the *ōstāndār*"

Berk. 33A,[22] 6–8
[6] *uzēnīd ī* [7] *pēš mādar ī* [8] *Xusrōyān rāy*
"because of what she expended for the mother of *Xusrōyān*"

Berk. 35,[23] 5–7
[5] *āb ī pad uzēnīd ī andar rōzgār* [6] *ud abar abāyist pad-iš āwurdan* [7] *rāy*
"(2 skin bags of) water he expended for daytime and was necessary for this to bring"

Berk. 42, 9
uzēnīd ī dūdag rāy "because of what he expended for the family"[24]

Berk. 86,[25] 5–7
[5] *ēn māh šahrewar ī* [6] *sāl 47 uzēnīd ī* [7] *dūdag rāy*
"because of what you (Sir, *x*^{w}*adāy*, l. 4) expended for the family this month *Šahrewar* (6th month) of the year 47"

Berk. 91,[26] 1–4
[1] *padīrēd Dādēnwindād ī pad* [2] *Namēwar dārīg ēn māh Tīr* [3] *ī sāl 47 uzēnīd ī dūdag* [4] *ī ōstāndār rāy az Āzādmard …*
"*Dādēnwindād* the manager on *Namēwar* will receive this month *Tīr* (4th month) of the year 47 because of what he spent for the family of the *ōstāndār* from *Āzādmard …*"

19 The interpretation given in Weber (2008, p. 172) is obsolete now.
20 Published in Gignoux 2010b, p. 96.
21 Unpublished; *uzēnišn ī dūdag* already in Gignoux 2004, p. 41.
22 First published in Gignoux 2001, 2003 (no. 1).
23 Edited by Gignoux 2010b, p. 22. For corrections see Weber 2011, p. 293. Gignoux' reading ⟨mšk'⟩ in lines 2, 4 and 10 has to be maintained, however.
24 Published in Gignoux 2010b, p. 66.
25 Unpublished letter.
26 First published in Gignoux 2010b, p. 102.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Berk. 105,[27] 4–5
[4] *uzēnīd ī dūdag ī ōstāndār pad Yazdān-ābes*[*tān*] [5] *rāy*
"because of what he expended for the family of the *ōstāndār* in *Yazdān-ābestān*"

Berk. 143,[28] 1–6
[1] *Ōhrmazd-abzānēd az ān ī* [2] *ō bun ēn māh Tīr ī* [3] *sāl 35 namak* [4] *k(abīz) 6 ō Pērōz* [5] *ī pad garmīh uzēnīd rāy* [6] *dād*
"this month *Tīr* (4th month) of the year 35 from what (belongs) to the *bun Ōhrmazd-abzānēd* gave 6 *kabīz* of salt to *Pērōz* because of what he expended for the *bathhouse"

Berk. 247,[29] 2–3
[2] *uzēnīd* [3] *ī andar Yazdān-ābestān*
"(because of)what he expended in *Yazdān-ābestān*"[30]

References

Bulliet, R. W. 2009: *Cotton, Climate, and Camels in Early Islamic Iran: A Moment in World History*. New-York.

CPD = D. N. MacKenzie: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London 1971.

Gignoux, Ph. 2001: "Nouveaux documents pehlevis sur soie." In: M. G. Schmidt/ W. Bisang (eds.): *Philologica et Linguistica (Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas). Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag*. Trier, pp. 281–301.

— 2003: "Sept documents économiques en pehlevi." In: A. van Tongerloo (ed.): *Iranica Selecta. Studies in honour of Professor Wojciech Skalmowski on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Turnhout, pp. 79–89 (+ pls. I–VIII, pp. 273–280).

— 2004: "Aspects de la vie administrative et sociale en Iran du 7ème siècle." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Contributions à l'histoire et la géographie historique de l'empire sassanide*. Bures-sur-Yvette, pp. 37–48.

— 2009: "Les comptes de Monsieur Friyag: Quelques documents économiques en Pehlevi." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Sources pour l'histoire et la géographie du monde iranien (224–710)*. Bures-sur-Yvette, pp. 115–142.

— 2010a: "Un nouvel ouvrage de référence de la papyrologie pehlevie: Note de lecture. [Review of Weber 2008.]" In: *Studia Iranica* 39.1, pp. 111–120.

— 2010b: "La collection de textes attribuables à Dādēn-vindād dans l'archive pehlevie de Berkeley." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Sources for the History of Sasanian and Post-Sasanian Iran*. Bures-sur-Yvette, pp. 11–134.

— 2012: "Une archive post-sassanide du Tabaristān (1)." In: R. Gyselen (ed.): *Objets et documents inscrits en pārsīg*. Bures-sur-Yvette, pp. 29–96.

27 First published in Gignoux 2010b, p. 28.
28 Unpublished.
29 Published in Gignoux 2010b, p. 62.
30 The governing *rāy* stands in line 10 after this and three other phrases including a verbal one ending in *abāyēd*; for a comparable construction see, e. g. Berlin 9, 10f. (Weber 2008, p. 45).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Henning, W. B. 1933: "Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente." In: *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 9, pp. 158–253.

Perixanjan, A. G. 1961: "Pechlevijskie papirusy sobranija GMII imeni A. S. Puškina." In: *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1961/3, pp. 78–93.

Salemann, C. 1901: "Mittelpersisch." In: W. Geiger/E. Kuhn (eds.): *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*. Vol. I.1.1. Straßburg, pp. 249–332.

Weber, D. (ed.) 2003: *Papyri, Pergamente und Leinenfragmente in mittelpersischer Sprache*. In collaboration with W. Brashear. Photographs by M. Büsing and E. M. Borgwaldt. London.

— 2007a: "Pahlavi Morphology." In: A. S. Kaye (ed.): *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*. Winona Lake, Ind., pp. 941–973.

— 2007b: "Remarks on the development of the Pahlavi script in Sasanian times." In: F. Vahman, C. V. Pedersen (eds.): *Religious Texts in Iranian Languages. Symposium held in Copenhagen, May 2002*. København, pp. 185–195.

— 2008: *Berliner Pahlavi-Dokumente. Zeugnisse spätsassanidischer Brief- und Rechtskultur aus frühislamischer Zeit*. With contributions by M. Krutzsch and M. Macuch. Wiesbaden.

— 2011: "Philippe Gignoux' Beitrag zur Interpretation der Dokumente des "Pahlavi Archive" in Berkeley, Ca." In: *Florilège offert à Philippe Gignoux pour son 80e anniversaire*. Textes réunis par R. Gyselen et Ch. Jullien. Paris, pp. 283–303.

— 2012: "New Arguments for Dating the Documents from the 'Pahlavi Archive'." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 22 (2008 [2012]), pp. 215–222.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Weitere Parallelen in Tocharisch B zur altuigurischen *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*: Mahendrasena- und Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna

Jens Wilkens, Göttingen / Michaël Peyrot, Leiden

Werner Sundermann hat mit seiner Bearbeitung der sogdischen Fassung des Kāñcanasāra-Avadāna einen bedeutenden Beitrag zur Erhellung der Textgeschichte der in verschiedenen zentralasiatischen Sprachen überlieferten Erzählungssammlung *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā (DKPAM)* geleistet.[1] Wie die erhaltenen altuigurischen Kolophone deutlich machen, kann die Version in Tocharisch B als die ursprüngliche gelten. Alle anderen Fassungen in indigenen Sprachen Zentralasiens (Tocharisch A, Sogdisch, Altuigurisch) sind direkt oder indirekt von dieser abhängig. In vorliegendem Aufsatz möchten wir Werner Sundermann zum Gedenken einige Fragmente in Tocharisch B vorstellen, die mit entsprechenden altuigurischen Passagen verglichen werden können.

1. Mahendrasena-Avadāna

Es konnten drei tocharische Fragmente des Mahendrasena-Avadāna genau identifiziert werden: IOL Toch 1 und IOL Toch 173, die zum Anfang der Vergangenheitserzählung gehören (1.1), und IOL Toch 29, das das Ende des Avadāna enthält (1.2). Zwei kleinere Fragmente konnten nicht, bzw. nicht genau zugeordnet werden (1.3). Es wird stets zunächst der relevante altuigurische Textabschnitt vorgestellt, gefolgt vom jeweiligen tocharischen Fragment. Da IOL Toch 1 und IOL Toch 173 zu unmittelbar aufeinander folgenden Blättern gehören, wird die altuigurische Parallele im Zusammenhang angegeben.[2]

1 Sundermann 2006.

2 Mainz 741, U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971, U 1049, U 1078 + U 1136 + U 2073 + Mainz 810a + U 1086 + Mainz 48, U 1651 + U 1957 + U 1960b: Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung; MIK III 1054: Museum für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin (vormals Museum für Indische Kunst).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1.1 Aus dem Anfang der Vergangenheitserzählung

Da das Avadāna von Mahendrasena eines der am besten zu rekonstruierenden der gesamten Erzählungssammlung und zudem noch ausgesprochen umfangreich ist, verbietet sich an dieser Stelle eine vollständige Edition des altuigurischen Materials. Im Folgenden wird nur so viel Text geboten, um den Kontext verdeutlichen zu können, in den die Parallele in Tocharisch B zu stellen ist. Das Blatt, das heute die Standortsignatur Mainz 741 trägt, wurde von F. W. K. Müller in U III 37–40 ediert.[3] Das Fragment Kr II 2/28 aus der Petersburger Sammlung wurde erstmalig in DKPAMPb 1136–1157 publiziert.[4]

Die tocharischen Fragmente IOL Toch 1 und IOL Toch 173 und dessen altuigurische Entsprechung gehören zur Vergangenheitserzählung des Mahendrasena-Avadāna. Thema der Gegenwartserzählung ist die Heilung eines kranken Mönchs durch den Buddha. Letzterer berichtet den anwesenden Mönchen von einer Krankenheilung, die er in seiner früheren Existenz als König Mahendrasena vollbracht hat. Diese Vergangenheitserzählung ist eine typische Selbstaufopferungsgeschichte eines Bodhisattva. Die Szene setzt ein, als der Protagonist gerade Almosen verteilt. Bemerkenswert ist die Umstellung einiger Krankheiten in der altuigurischen Übersetzung in der zweiten Strophe des Tocharischen.

Mainz 741[5]

Rückseite

07084 31	bo [mun]*t*ag m(a)hen̤dra-[6]
07085 32	*se*[ne] elig bäg kay b(ä)lt*ı*[r sayu] bušı berü
07086 33	[turur ärkä]*n* anıŋ arası*nta* ülgüsüz san-
07087 34	[sız iglig]lärig tušup öŋi öŋi törlüg
07088 35	[ačıg ämgä]*k* ämg*än*mišlärin kördi :
07089 36	[ ]/ **kök ražv(a)v(a)rt öŋlüg közin**
07090 37	**[igliglär] üzä tur*gurup yürä*kintä öt-**
07091 38	**[gürü**[7] inč]*ä* tep tedi : anča

3 Vgl. *ebd.*, S. 40 für den Textauszug, der hier re-ediert wird.
4 Hier wird nur die Vorderseite berücksichtigt (= DKPAMPb 1136–1146). Im Faksimileteil (Taf. 68) sind – wie so oft in dieser Edition – Vorder- und Rückseite falsch bezeichnet.
5 Die Transkription folgt dem *Uigurischen Wörterbuch* (UW). Nicht zu ergänzende Wortreste werden nur transliteriert. Gänzlich unleserliche Grapheme sind durch einen Schrägstrich (/) repräsentiert. Mit runden Klammern werden Defektivschreibungen angezeigt. In eckigen Klammern stehen Ergänzungen. Schwer lesbare Grapheme werden kursiviert. (P) gibt die Position des Schnürlochkreises an. Die Zeilennummern 07084ff., 07398ff. etc. sind die der kürzlich erschienenen Edition (Wilkens 2016). Fett gedruckte Wörter – dies gilt auch für sicher zu ergänzende – haben eine Entsprechung im Tocharischen.
6 In dieser Zeile zu Beginn noch: *berip barčasın berür ärti* :. Dies wird hier ausgelassen.
7 Ergänze eventuell noch: *ulug tına* („tief seufzend“).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971

Vorderseite[8]

07092 01 (03)	[ig]*l*[ä]*p* yatur	U 1018 /r/1/
07093 02 (04)	**[: amar]*ıla*[rnı]*ŋ* ičägüläri**	U 1197 /r/1/ + U 1018 /r/2/
07094 03 (05)	**[se]*k*[r]*i*yü sučıyu** *i*sig tutup **öŋ-**	
07095 04 (06)	**[läri] kırtıš-(** P **)-ları sargarıp**[9]	
07096 05 (07)	**[agı]*r* ig** (P) **igläyürlär :**	
07097 06 (08)	**[amarı]ları-(P)-nıŋ iki ägin-**	
07098 07 (09)	**[lärin ör]*ü* tartıp** sarangu [sarı]*p bir-*	
07099 08 (10)	[ärläri] ay-a ämgäk-a	
07100 09 (11)	[tın]l(ı)glar **kšay atl(ı)g** *u*z-	
07101 10 (12)	[un]/ kirip **kürüm yumgak-**	
07102 11 (13)	[**lıg** ärt]*i*ŋü **ämgäklig** ärmäz	
07103 12 (14)	[mü]*ʟ*[ ]/*ᴛ'* ötgürü	
07104 13 (15)	[ätö]*zlä*[rin]	U 1197 /r/12/
07105 14 (16)	täprä[tü] *umadın* **ya[turlar :**]	U 1971 /r/1/
07106 15 (17)	ätözläri isig *t*[utup]	
07107 16 (18)	či*bık* täg t*äp*räy*ü*[r : bol]-	
07108 17 (19)	up ınaru *b*[ärü agnayu]	
07109 18 (20)	yaturlar : **a*n*[ta ötrü mahenḍraṣ]-**	
07110 19 (21)	**ene elig bäg** /[ ]	
07111 20 (22)	*äm*gäkiŋä Q[ ]	
07112 21 (23)	[ ]/ ***y*(a)[rlıkančučı köŋül]-**	U 1971 /r/8/

Kr II 2/28[10]

Vorderseite

07113 01	[k]*özü*[n]ü turur : ötrü mahenḍrasene[11]
07114 02	[elig bäg ka]*ŋ*lısıntın kudı enip iglig-
07115 03	[lärkä yakı]n barıp biläzökin karıltarak-
07116 04	[ın yüzüki]n[12] etiglig yaratıglıg ačılmış
07117 05	[lenhw]*a* t*ä*g yumšak äligin[13] bašların töpö-

8 Die ursprüngliche Position einer Zeile auf einem Blatt wird in runden Klammern angegeben. 01 ist z. B. die erste erhaltene Zeile, (03) zeigt an, dass es sich um die dritte Zeile des Blattes handelt.

9 Geschrieben: ⟨s'rq̈'ryp⟩.

10 Da Kr II 2/28 das etwas besser erhaltene Textzeugnis ist, wird dieses Fragment hier zugrunde gelegt.

11 Ab hier beginnt eine Parallele in U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971 /v/2ff./, nach der auch die Lücken ergänzt werden. In /v/2/ die Schreibung *m(a)henḍraṣ[ene]*.

12 Wohl so zu ergänzen. Nicht in der Parallele U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971 /v/4–5/.

13 *elgin* in U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971 /v/7/.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

07118 06 [lärin y(a)rlı]kančučı köŋülin suvadı[14] sıkadı :
07119 07 **[amarılarını]*ŋ* ymä bašların** kartların
07120 08 [bäzin kanın yi]riŋin arıtıp aš kılıp
07121 09 [ičürdi : olar]*k*[a a]dın*lar*ıŋa ymä
07122 10 [datuka tör]t kata
07123 11 [bašl*arın arıt*ıp] *i*nčä

U 1018 + U 1197 + 1971

Rückseite
07124 15 (17) [ ] *kä*lürüp sačtı : amarı- U 1971 /v/2/
07125 16 (18) [larınıŋ] bažlarınta te*ŋ*sim
07126 17 (19) [ ]/ türtüp
07127 18 (20) [ ]y : amarıların
07128 19 (21) [ ]ynk' yaraşı
07129 20 (22) [ ]/ : kim bir*ök*
07130 21 (23) [ ]l'r '/[ ] U 1971 /v/8/

U 1049

Vorderseite
Paginierung: [yüz tokuz yet]miš
07131 01 **közi*n*** [yüzü]*m* tapa čıngaru **körür** : b*ir*[ök]
07132 02 tsuylug ämgäklig tınl(ı)gag umugsuz ınagsız
07133 03 kılıp igintä ozguru umasar m(ä)n : maŋa
07134 04 ymä tirig öz nägü*lük ol* : **ötrü m(a)henḍras*ene***[15]
07135 05 **elig bäg büt*ü*n balı[kdakı otačı]*ları*[g okıp]**
07136 06 tözün yumšak savın *ola*rka inčä tep t[edi :]

Übersetzung

(07084–07088) [Als] s[olcher]maßen König$_2$ Mahendrase[na an jeder] Straße und Kreuzu[ng gerade] Almosen verteilte, traf er plötzlich auf zahllose$_2$ [Kranke] und sah ihre verschiedenartigen [schlimmen Gebreche]n, an denen sie litten. (07089–07091 ~ tochB IOL Toch 1 a1) **Als er [...] seine Augen, die blau wie Lapislazuli waren, auf [die Kranken] gerichtet hatte**, sprach er (zu sich), **vo[n] Herzen [traurig]**: (07091) „Wie sehr [...]. [Lücke][16] (07092–07093) [...] liegen s[ie kr]a[n]k da. (07093–07096 ~ IOL Toch 1 a4, a5) **Die Eingeweide von [eini]gen**

14 *suvıdı* in U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971 /v/9/.
15 Kr II 2/28 /v/1/ mit Pleneschreibung.
16 Die Rede wird nicht unterbrochen. Offenbar fehlt die erste Strophe (~ tochB IOL Toch 1 a2–3) ganz. Eventuell gehört die A-Seite von U 1174 in diese Lücke: 11834 01 p/[... 11835 02 nynk ton [... 11836 03 amarıları /[... 11837 04 ayaların [... 11838 05 yıglayu /// [... 11839 06 ///[... (11834–11839) „[...] Gewand des [...] einige von ihnen [... legten] ihre Handflächen [zusammen ...] weinend [...]“.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

[si]n[d] in Aufruhr$_2$ (wörtl. **springen$_2$**), sie haben Fieber, **[ihre] Haut- und ihre Gesichtsfarbe ist gelblich** und **sie leiden an einer [heftig]en Krankheit**. (07097–07103 ~ IOL Toch 1 a5–b1) **[Manch]e ziehen [ihre] Schultern [hoc]h,** eine Binde [festbinden]d, ein[ige von ihnen …,] o weh, [… die Leb]ewesen sind in **das Tuberkulose *(kṣaya)* genannte** lan[ge Leiden] geraten und **[sie haben] Tumore$_2$** – ist dies nicht [über]aus leidvoll[?] (07103–07104 ~ IOL Toch 1 b1) […] durch […]. (07105 ~ IOL Toch 1 b1) [… einige] **l[iegen an ihre Betten gebunden da],** ohne [sich] beweg[en] zu können. (07105–07107) […] ihre Körper h[aben] Fieber […] und wie ein Zweig [im Wind] zitter[n sie.] (07107–07109) [… gewor]den liegen sie da […, indem sie] sich hin und h[er wälzen].“ (07109–07112 ~ IOL Toch 1 b2–3) **Da[raufhin] König$_2$ [Mahendras]ena [… aus] M[itleid]** über ihr Leiden […].[17] [Lücke von ca. 10 Zeilen] (07113) „[… er]scheint.“ (07113–07118) Da stieg [König$_2$] Mahendrasena von seinem [Wa]gen herab, [nähe]rte sich den Krank[en] und strich$_2$ [mitl]eidig mit seiner weichen Hand, die mit Armreifen, Spangen und [Ringe]n geschmückt$_2$ war und die (zart) wie ein (gerade) erblühter [Loto]s war, (über) ihre Köpfe$_2$. (07119–07121 ~ IOL Toch 173a2) **Von [einigen] die Wunden**, Geschwüre, [Schwellungen], (sowie) [ihr Blut] und ihren [E]iter reinigte er, bereitete ein Essen [und gab ihnen zu trinken]. (07121–07124) [Ihnen …] für ihre [a]nderen [… dem Körpersaft *(dhātu)* … vie]r Mal [ihre Wunden reinigend] so […] brachte er […] herbei und streute (es). (07124–07127) Auf die […] Wunden [von] einigen [von ihnen …] Lampenruß […] strich er […]. (07127–07129) Einige von ihnen […] dem […] angemessen […]. (07129–07130) Wenn jemand […]. [kleine Lücke][18] [Mahendrasena dachte:] (07131 ~ IOL Toch 173 b4) ‚**Mit Augen [voller Hoffnung] blickt er** direkt auf [mein Gesicht]. (07131–07134) We[nn] ich (dieses) sündige und leidende Wesen hoffnungslos$_2$ mache und ich (es) nicht von seiner Krankheit erretten kann, was nützt mir dann noch das Leben?‘ (07134–07136) **Da [rief] König$_2$ Mahendrasena alle [Ärz]te [in] der Sta[dt]** und sagt[e] mit edlen und sanften Worten zu ihnen.

Anmerkungen

(07085) *[sayu]*: Keine Ergänzung in U III 40.32.

(07086–87) Zeilenanfänge nicht ergänzt in U III 40.33–34.

(07088) Die Ergänzung der Lacune zu Beginn der Zeile ist relativ sicher. Ab hier beginnt die Parallele in IOL Toch 1 /r/ in Tocharisch B.

17 Es ist denkbar, dass in die folgende Lücke die B-Seite von U 1959g gehört, die somit eine Parallele zu IOL Toch 1 b4–5 darstellt. Seite A: 12299 01 …]/ //-L'RYN [… 12300 02 …] tägirmiläyü //[… 12301 03 …]/[… // Seite B: 12302 01 … elig b]*äg* inčä *t*[ep tedi : … 12303 02 … buy]*r*uklar-a : tıdıg[sız … 12304 03 … ye]*rgülük* [täg … Trifft die Ergänzung *[ye]rgülük [täg]* zu, dann ist die B-Seite zu übersetzen: „(12302) [Kön]ig[$_2$] [Mahendrasena] s[prach zu seinen Ministern]: (12303–12304) ‚[Schaut,] o [Min]ister, grenzen[los ist dieser *saṃsāra* …] und [zu ve]rabscheuen‘.“

18 Der Inhalt der Lücke ist: Mahendrasena kann einen Kranken nicht heilen.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(07090) *[igliglär] üzä* wurde nach tochB *alāṣmontaṃtsa* (IOL Toch 1 a1) ergänzt. Kein Ergänzungsvorschlag in U III 40.37.

(07090–91) *yüräkintä öt[gürü]* wurde nach tochB *po araṃśmeṃ* (IOL Toch 1 a1) ergänzt.

(07091) Keine Ergänzung der Lacune in U III 39.38 und Elmali 2016, Z. 2769.

(07092ff.) Die tocharische Parallele setzt in IOL Toch 1 a4 wieder ein, so dass zuvor nur wenige Zeilen der altuigurischen Fassung fehlen. In der Übersetzung sind einige Sätze umgestellt.

(07094) *sekriyü sučıyu* entspricht tochB *pruknānträ* (IOL Toch 1 a4). Zu *sučı-* vgl. Clauson 1972, S. 794a: „to move to one side, shy away from something". Der ebd. zitierte Beleg aus dem *Dīwān luγāt at-Turk* bezieht sich auf das Scheuen eines Pferdes. In der *Maitrisimit* ist *sučı- sekri-* belegt: *ulug bädük ärkäčlänmäkin sučıyu sekriyü* „indem (die Höllenwesen) durch das gewaltige$_2$ Aufwallen auf- und abtauchen". Vgl. Geng/Klimkeit/Laut 1998, S. 51 (25. Kapitel, Blatt 7 verso 19–20).

(07096) *[agı]r ig igläyürlär*: Die Lacune wurde tentativ ergänzt nach tochB *räskre māka tsärkalyi*. Vgl. auch den Beleg im Instrumental in U 1173 + Mainz 111 + U 411 + U 1142 /r/18–19/ *bo yertinčüdäki näčä ag(ı)r igin iglädäči igliglär bar ärsär* „Welche Kranken es in dieser Welt auch geben mag, die an einer schweren Krankheit leiden, […]".

(07097) *[amar]ılarınıŋ* wurde nach tochB (IOL Toch 1 a4) *ṣemeṃts* ergänzt; das Zahlwort *iki* wurde vom Übersetzer vermutlich *ägin-* hinzugefügt, weil im Tocharischen ein Dual *(āṃtsne)* steht. In der *DKPAM* sind paarweise vorhandene Körperteile systematisch mit dem Numeral *iki* versehen. Vgl. beispielsweise *iki ämigläri* „ihre zwei Brüste" (00270, 03476), *iki kolların* „seine beiden Arme (Akk.)" (00325), *iki karakların* „ihre beiden Augäpfel (Akk.)" (02307–02308), *iki közläri* „ihre beiden Augen" (03092), *iki koolıčakın* „seine beiden Ärmchen (Akk.)" (03726), *iki közintin* „aus seinen beiden Augen" (03911), *iki tizin* „ihre beiden Knie (Akk.)" (04783), *iki közi* „seine beiden Augen" (04836), *iki biläkim* „meine beiden Handgelenke" (06056), *iki adakıŋın* „deine beiden Füße (Akk.)" (06124) usw.[19]

(07098) *[ör]ü tartıp* kann sicher nach tochB (IOL Toch 1 a5) *kauc … musnānträ* ergänzt werden; *sarangu* entspricht wohl *sarıngu*; die Ergänzung *[sarı]p* ist tentativ.

(07100) *kšay*: Auch in der tocharischen Parallele in IOL Toch 1 b1 der aus dem Sanskrit entlehnte Terminus *kṣai*.

(07101) *kirip*: Das Konverb wurde vom Übersetzer ergänzt, um die unter Tuberkulose leidenden Kranken von den unter Tumoren laborierenden zu trennen.

19 Zeilenangaben nach Wilkens 2016.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

kürüm: Man ist zunächst versucht, *körüm* „Blick, Ansicht" zu lesen, doch die tocharische Parallele mit dem Adjektiv *kurmaci* macht deutlich, dass zunächst das Fremdwort *kurum* (tochB *kurm* < skt. *gulma* „Schwellung im Unterleib, Tumor") vom Abschreiber fehlerhaft mit einem Yod in der ersten Silbe versehen wurde ⟨kwyrwm⟩, worauf dann der einheimische Terminus *(yumgak)* folgt. Da im Tocharischen ein Adjektivsuffix vorliegt, ist zu *yumgak[lıg]* zu ergänzen. Im Brāhmī-Uigurischen ist *kurum yumgak* („Tumor$_2$") belegt (korrigiere die Deutung in Maue 1996, Kat.-Nr. 47 B–1, Anm. 14 und 15).

(07102–03) *ärmäz [mü]*: Sicher so zu ergänzen. Im Tocharischen ist der Satz nicht als Frage formuliert.

(07103) Nach der tocharischen Parallele wäre vor *ötgürü* ein Wort für „Durst" zu erwarten, aber die Wortreste sehen nicht so aus, als könnten sie zu *suvsamakta* ergänzt werden.

(07107–08) *[bol]up* wurde nach tochB *tatākaṣ* (IOL Toch 1 b2) ergänzt.

(07112) *y(a)[rlıkančučı köŋül]-* wurde nach tochB *āñmalāṣṣälñesa* (IOL Toch 1 b3) ergänzt, wobei offen gelassen wurde, ob der Terminus ursprünglich ein Possessiv- bzw. Kasussuffix trug.

(07113) *[k]özü[n]ü*: Es kann kaum anders gelesen werden, obwohl das Graphem nach dem ⟨z⟩ eher wie ein ⟨y⟩ aussieht.

(07115) Keine Ergänzung der Lacune zu Beginn der Zeile in Elmali 2016, Z. 2772; *karıltarak*: das Wortbildungsmorphem *+(l)dArXk* ist nach Erdal 2004, S. 146f. eine Variante von *+(l)dUrXk*. Der Etymologisierungsversuch in DKPAMPb 140 (Anm. zu Z. 1138), *karı* „Unterarm" + *yaltrık* „glänzend, glänzendes Objekt" ist aufzugeben.

(07118) *suvadı*: So ist wohl zu lesen. DKPAMPb 1141: *sürdi*, Elmali 2016, Z. 2775: *sürti*. Zu vergleichen ist čagataisch *suva-* „verputzen, streichen", neuuigurisch *suwa-* „schmieren, streichen", osmanisch/türkeitürkisch *sıva-* „bestreichen, verputzen, streichen, aufstreichen", schorisch *šuba-* „stuckieren" und auch mongolisch *siba-* „streichen, Salbe auftragen".

(07119) *[amarılarını]ŋ*: So ist zu ergänzen. In der Parallele in U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971 /v/9/ ist ʾмʾ[… erhalten.

(07119–20) *bašların kartların [bäzin kanın yi]riŋin*: Vgl. zur Ergänzung *Altun Yaruk* 614.3–4 (ed. Kaya 1994): *kartıg bäzig yiriŋig kanıg*.

(07123) *[bašların arıtıp]*: Hier wurde die Lacune nach U 1018 + U 1197 + U 1971 /v/14(16)/ ergänzt (dort: *bažların*). Zwei Zeilen weiter (Z. 07125) hat dieselbe Handschrift wiederum ⟨ž̧⟩ für ⟨š⟩ (*bažlarınta*). Dies sind die einzigen Belege für eine solche Schreibung, die in dem gesamten Werk nachgewiesen werden können. Insgesamt sieben Mal haben wir in der *DKPAM* hingegen die Schreibung ⟨ž̧⟩ für ⟨z⟩. Der Textverlauf ist in den ersten beiden Zeilen dieser drei Fragmente im Vergleich mit dem Ende der Vorderseite von Kr II 2/28 nicht ganz deutlich.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

(07125) *teŋsim* „Lampendocht; Lampenruß“ (< chin. 燈心; moderne Aussprache: *dēng xīn*) ist zwei Mal in der *DKPAM* belegt. Vermutlich ist an dieser Stelle Kollyrium (skt. *kajjala*) gemeint.

(07131) Vor *közin* hat sicher *umuglug* gestanden, wie andere Passagen mit ähnlichem Kontext zeigen. Vgl. auch tochB *(pärma)ṅkäcce* (IOL Toch 173 b4). Mainz 659 /v/30–31/ zeigt eine ganz ähnliche Formulierung: *yüzüm tapa umuglug közin čıngaru körür.* Nach dieser Stelle wurde auch zu *[yüzü]m* ergänzt. Der Graphemrest nach der Lacune ist recht sicher ein finales ⟨m⟩; ansonsten wäre auch *[men]i* denkbar, wie in U 1147 /r/5–6/ (*umuglug kö[zin] meni tapa körüp*); *bir[ök]*: Lies und ergänze so! U III 41.1 (oben) und Elmali 2016, Z. 2781: *bo*.

IOL Toch 1

Das Fragment IOL Toch 1 aus der British Library Collection mit den alten Katalognummern H 149.14 und H.149.X.14 wurde ediert und übersetzt von Broomhead,[20] der es aufgrund des Eigennamens Mahendrasena zu den Fragmenten IOL Toch 29 und IOL Toch 63 (siehe unten §§ 1.2 bzw. 2), in denen dieser Name ebenfalls vorkommt, gestellt hat. Konkrete Hinweise auf einen Paralleltext gibt er jedoch nicht, und das Fragment IOL Toch 63 gehört nicht, wie die ersten beiden, zum Mahendrasena-Avadāna, sondern zum Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna.

Das Fragment misst 8,0 × 22,6 cm und bewahrt auf der Rückseite die Blattzahl 103 (obwohl der untere Strich des Zeichens „3“ abgerieben ist, ist die Lesung sicher). Anhand der metrischen Zeilen ist eine Schätzung der ursprünglichen Breite des Blatts möglich. Wie die metrische Analyse der drei Strophen in a2–b2 zeigt, fehlen am rechten Ende des Fragments 12 bis 17 Silben pro Zeile. Rechts von Zeile a2 fehlen 12 Silben, von Zeile a3 13 Silben, von Zeile a4 14 Silben, von Zeile a5 14 Silben und die Strophennummer „2“, während 17 Silben der Zeile b1 verloren gegangen sind. Auch die Analyse der fragmentarischen Strophe in b4–5 weist darauf hin, dass am rechten Ende der Zeile b4 14 Silben fehlen. Da mit Ausnahme der Zeilen a3 und b3, die das Schnürloch enthalten, im Durchschnitt ungefähr 25 Akṣaras jeder Zeile bewahrt sind, während durchschnittlich etwa 16 Akṣaras fehlen, wird die Originalbreite des Blatts um die 37 cm gewesen sein.

Transliteration[21]

a1 ll[ā]s̱s̱aṃ – naṃ pilko wa alāṣmontaṃtsa śeśśamormeṃ po araṃśmeṃ mantsana ///

20 Broomhead 1962, I, S. 143–146; siehe auch Peyrot 2007, № 1.

21 Die für das Tocharische üblichen Konventionen werden beibehalten: – = unleserliches Akṣara; · = unleserlicher oder fehlender Teil eines Akṣaras; ˇ = Virāma mit übergestelltem Punkt; [] = unsichere Lesung; () = Ergänzung; ⸗ = Sandhi; ○ = Schnürlochraum.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a2 yau ste se śaiṣṣe || gautamakapilne || raiweñ ṣemi lkāntra cai katkri eśne ///
a3 wlauwa aścī cets˸· pi ○ lentaccī ywārc no ksa ṣemeṃts˸ katsāñ śa ///
a4 yetse ceṃts˸ : ṣemeṃts käryāñä˸ pruknāntra raskre māka tsarkalyi : alyaik˸ [t]· ///
a5 kt-āñmä satāṣlñe kauc ka ṣ āṃtsne musnāntra : som˸ halimak˸ alyeṅkaṃ(–)˸ ///
b1 kṣai kurmaci tallāñco : aswa lymine yokaisa tswoṣ ka ṣ˸ lakleñä˸ leki ///
b2 t ṣemi tatākaṣ˸ alpanaṃ ka ṣ˸· īwat[e] 3 || tumeṃ mahendrasene wa ///
b3 ts·naṃ pilkosa yo ○ kamane ram no āñmalāṣṣalñesa – ///
b4 m[ane] – mācäntaś weṣṣaṃ || strivighātne || palkas˸ karpye-saṃsār ce māka ⸗m[p]e ///
b5 [l]· – – ceṃts˸ m[y]āska weṣanma laklessonta : ṣñār yāmorntse calamtsa – ///

Transkription

a1 (kä)llāṣṣäṃ (tse)naṃ pilko wa alāṣmontaṃtsa śeśśamormeṃ po araṃśmeṃ mantsana(tär) ///
a2 (wawā)yau ste se śaiṣṣe || gautamakapilne || raiweñ ṣemi lkānträ cai kätkri eśne ///
a3 wlauwa aścī cets pilentaccī ywārc no ksa ṣemeṃts katsāñ śa- ///
a4 yetse ceṃts : ṣemeṃts käryāñ pruknānträ räskre māka tsärkalyi : alyaik t· ///
a5 (ṣemeṃts yä)kt-āñmä satāṣlñe kauc ka ṣ āṃtsne musnānträ : som halimak alyeṅkäṃ(ts) ///
b1 kṣai kurmaci tallāñco : aswa lymine yokaisa tswoṣ ka ṣ läkleñ leki(ne) ///
b2 -t ṣemi tatākaṣ alpanaṃ ka ṣ īwate 3 || tumeṃ mahendrasene wa(lo) ///
b3 ts(e)naṃ pilkosa yokamane ram no āñmalāṣṣälñesa – ///
b4 mane (a)mācäntäś weṣṣäṃ || strivighātne || palkas kärpye-saṃsār ce māka ⸗mpe(le :) ///
b5 l· – (se) ceṃts myāska weṣanma läklessonta : ṣñār yāmorntse calämtsa – ///

Metrische Analyse

Der erste metrische Abschnitt des Fragments in den Zeilen a2–b2 umfasst drei Strophen in der Melodie *gautamakapilne*. Diese Melodie begegnet auch in Tocharisch A, wo sie das Metrum 4 × 7 ¦ 7 Silben hat.[22] Auch hier scheint eine Analyse mit 4 × 7 ¦ 7 Silben die einzige Möglichkeit: die Strophenzahl *1* ist im Text anscheinend versehentlich hinter *yetse ceṃts* : (am Ende der ersten Strophe in Zeile a4) ausgelassen worden.

22 Carling 2009, S. 190b; Poucha 1955, S. 100. Die Angabe „4×18“ in Poucha 1955, S. 445 ist falsch. In der metrischen Analyse steht „–“ für eine Silbe, während „¦“ die Zäsur bezeichnet.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

		Anzahl der fehlenden Silben
raiweñ ṣemi lkānträ cai ¦ kätkri eśne – – –	[1a]	3
– – – – – – – ¦ – – [a3] *wlauwa aścī cets*	[1b]	9
pilentaccī ywārc no ksa ¦ ṣemeṃts katsāñ śa – –	[1c]	2
– – – – – – – ¦ – – – – [a4] *yetse ceṃts :*	[1d]	11
ṣemeṃts käryāñ pruknānträ ¦ räskre māka tsärkalyi :	[2a]	0
alyaik t· – – – – ¦ – – – – – – –	[2b]	12
(ṣemeṃts yä)[a5]*kt-āñmä*[23] *satāṣlñe ¦ kauc ka ṣ āṃtsne musnānträ :*	[2c]	3
som halimak alyeṅkäṃ(ts) ¦ – – – – – – –	[2d]	7
– – – – – – – ¦ [b1] *kṣai kurmaci tallāñco :*	[3a]	7
aswa lymine yokaisa ¦ tswoṣ ka ṣ läkleñ leki(ne)	[3b]	1
– – – – – – – ¦ – – – – – – –	[3c]	14
– – [b2]*t ṣemi tatākaṣ ¦ alpanaṃ ka ṣ īwate 3*	[3d]	2

Vom zweiten metrischen Abschnitt in der Melodie *strivighātne* ist nur der Anfang erhalten. Das Metrum ist hier a, c, d: 7 ¦ 4, b: 7 ¦ 7.[24]

		Anzahl der fehlenden Silben
palkas kärpye-saṃsār ce ¦ māka ⸗mpe(le :)	[1a]	1
– – – – – – – ¦ – – – – – [b5] *l· –*	[1b]	12
(se) ceṃts myāska weṣanma ¦ läklessonta :	[1c]	0
ṣñār yāmorntse calämtsa ¦ – – – –	[1d]	4

Übersetzung[25]

a1 … bringt … als er den blauen Blick auf die Kranken gerichtet hatte, ist er von ganzem Herzen traurig … (und sagt zu sich: „…)
[~ altuig. 07089–90]

a2 … wird diese Welt geführt! || in *gautamakapilne* || Einige sehen träge aus, mit niedergeschlagenen Augen … [1a]

23 Das Metrum verlangt die Lesung *(yä)kt-āñm*, der Virāma ist versehentlich ausgelassen.
24 Für *strivighātne* sind daneben auch Varianten mit a, c, d: 8 ¦ 3 oder b: 8 ¦ 8 Silben belegt; siehe Adams 2013, S. 779.
25 Für ein Verzeichnis verstreuter Übersetzungen einzelner Zeilen siehe CETOM unter IOL Toch 1.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a3 … zerschlagen [sind] ihre Köpfe. [1b] Einige sind halb bedeckt mit Wunden, die Bäuche einiger …[26]

a4 … ihre Haut. [1d] Die Eingeweide (?) einiger springen, [und] sie werden sehr heftig gequält. Andere …

[~ altuig. 07093–94, 07096]

a5 Das Ausatmen einiger ist schwach und sie heben nur ihre Schultern hoch. [2c] Andere haben *soma* Gelbsucht …

[~ altuig. 07097–98, 07094–95][27]

b1 … elend [durch] Tuberkulose, [oder] mit Tumoren. [3a] [Ihre] Lippen [sind] vor Durst ausgetrocknet und aus Leid sind sie an [ihre] Bett[en] gebunden …

[~ altuig. 07100–02, 07105]

b2 … einige sind … geworden und widerspiegeln nur Angst. 3“ || Darauf … König Mahendrasena …

[~ altuig. 07109–10]

b3 … mit [seinem] blauen Blick gleichsam trinkend aus Mitleid …

b4 … er sagt zu den Ministern || in *strivighātne* ||: „Sehet diesen gemeinen *Saṃsāra*, [diesen] sehr schrecklichen! …

b5 … [1b] Er (= der *Saṃsāra*) hat ihr Aussehen leidvoll gemacht, [1c] durch die Abscheulichkeit (?) der eigenen Tat jedes einzelnen …“

Anmerkungen

a1 *llāṣṣäṃ*: die Stelle ist abgerieben und verwischt, aber dies scheint die einzig mögliche Lesung.

a4 *käryāñ pruknānträ*: die genaue Bedeutung dieses Ausdrucks ist unklar; wahrscheinlich handelt es sich um eine bestimmte Krankheit, weil der nächste Pāda mit *alyaik* „andere“ anfängt und somit eine neue Gruppe von Kranken beschreiben muss. Die Verbform *pruknānträ* findet sich genau in altuig. *sekriyü sučıyu* (07094) „springen“ wieder. Das Wort *käryāñ* ist ein Hapax legomenon, dessen Bedeutung von Hilmarsson aufgrund seiner (an sich durchaus überzeugenden) indoeuropäischen Etymologie als „hearts“ angesetzt wurde.[28] Da aber *kri*, das Äquivalent in Tocharisch A, „Wille“ heißt und in beiden Sprachen die Bedeutung „Herz“ für das Etymon tochA *āriñc*, tochB *arañce* gesichert ist, wird hier sicherheitshalber dem *ičägüläri* (07093) „ihre Eingeweide“ der altuig. Version gefolgt.[29]

26 Die altuigurische Entsprechung der ersten Strophe hat wahrscheinlich in der Lücke zwischen altuigurisch 07091 und 07092 gestanden. Sie ist offenbar vollständig verloren gegangen.

27 Innerhalb der zweiten Strophe sind die Zeilen im Altuigurischen umgestellt.

28 Hilmarsson 1996, S. 100.

29 Sollte „Eingeweide“ tatsächlich die richtige Bedeutung von tochB *käryāñ* sein, ist das wahrscheinlich die ältere Bedeutung im Tocharischen, aus der sich das abstraktere tochA „Wille“ entwickelt hat. Eine Parallele bietet Eng. *guts*, u. a. „Eingeweide; Courage“.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

a5 *som halimak*: *halimak* ist aus skt. *halīmaka* entlehnt, eine Art Gelbsucht,[30] nach Hoernle genauer „malignant jaundice".[31] Das vorangehende *som* ist unklar. Broomhead sieht darin eine Entlehnung aus skt. *soma*, „a disease of the mouth", was nicht richtig sein kann.[32] Wahrscheinlicher ist es, dass *som* die Krankheit *halīmaka* näher spezifiziert: skt. *soma* und das abgeleitete Adj. *saumya* können die Eigenschaften „kühl" und „feucht" bezeichnen. Das Demonstrativpronomen *samp* „jener", f. *somp*, dessen finales *-p* oft fehlt, scheidet aus syntaktischen Gründen aus.

b1 *kṣai*: entlehnt aus skt. *kṣaya*, hier in der Bedeutung „Tuberkulose".

b1 *kurmaci*: Adj. abgeleitet von *kurm* oder *kwarm* „Tumor" (Entlehnung aus skt. *gulma*, dasselbe).

b2 *alpanaṃ*: die Bedeutung des Verbs *alpa-* ist umstritten. Mit Adams[33] ist an dieser Stelle „widerspiegeln", oder freier „strahlen aus, zeigen", der Alternative „tasten, streichen" vorzuziehen.

b4 *mane*: die Stelle ist sehr abgerieben. Wenn die Lesung richtig ist, handelt es sich sicher um das Suffix eines Präs. Ptz., das sich auf König Mahendrasena bezieht. Der Verbalstamm ist leider völlig verloren gegangen (vor *weṣṣäṃ* ist das Ptz. *lkāskemane* „sehend, blickend" am häufigsten belegt).

b4 *(a)mācäntäś*: die Lesung ist sicher, die Form würde aber richtig *(a)mācäntaś* lauten, für *amācäntaśc*.

b5 eigentlich: „Er hat ihr leidvolles Aussehen [toch. Pl.] vertauscht."

b5 *calämtsa*: dieses Hapax legomenon ist wegen seiner phonologischen Struktur mit stammfinalem *-lm* (*-sa* ist das Perlativsuffix, *-t-* epenthetisch) wahrscheinlich ein Lehnwort. Möglicherweise ist die Quelle skt. *jālma* „verachtenswert", dessen Bedeutung hier passt.

IOL Toch 173

Das Fragment IOL Toch 173 aus der British Library Collection mit der alten Katalognummer H 149.add.133 muss zu derselben Handschrift wie IOL Toch 1 gehören.[34] Da es sich anscheinend um ein Fragment des unmittelbar folgenden Blatts handelt, kann die Blattzahl als 104 angesetzt werden. Es ist ein Fragment

30 Monier-Williams 1899, S. 1293b.
31 Hoernle 1893–1912, S. 342b.
32 Broomhead 1962, II, S. 217. Wenn Broomhead für seine Edition dieses Fragments Notizen von Walter Couvreur benutzt hat (vgl. insbesondere Broomhead 1962, I, S. iii), ist zu erwägen, dass irgendwie dt. *Mond* mit *Mund* oder mit ndl. *mond* „Mund" verwechselt wurde (Hinweis von Alexander Lubotsky, Leiden).
33 Adams 2013, S. 59–60.
34 Es wurde ediert und übersetzt von Broomhead 1962, I, S. 238–239 (siehe auch Peyrot 2007, № 173), aber nicht identifiziert.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

aus der Mitte des Blatts, rechts vom Schnürlochraum, das 8,5 × 9,0 cm misst und die volle Höhe bewahrt hat.

Transliteration

a1 /// tsärkalyi tākoyeṃ [c]· ///
a2 /// y·ṃ omte sū ṣemeṃts pile ///
a3 /// – me tawak ompostäṃ saṃtkenta – ///
a4 /// ñantsa pittākänta tāṣi · ·e – ///
a5 /// raitwentasa tekanma wī ///
b1 /// mp·lye tekisa memī – ///
b2 /// ·[e]ki cwī alāṣmontse 1 || tu [l]· ///
b3 /// ṣṣaṃ || cañcamaniyaine || arañc[u] ///
b4 /// [ṅ]k[ä]cce pilkosa se wa lkāṣṣä – ///
b5 /// [l]o po yapoyne yātka saṃ – ///

Transkription

a1 /// tsärkalyi tākoyeṃ c· ///
a2 /// y·ṃ omte sū ṣemeṃts pile(nta) ///
a3 /// – me tawak ompostäṃ saṃtkenta – ///
a4 /// (ampo)ñantsa pittākänta tāṣi · ·e – ///
a5 /// raitwentasa tekanma wī(kässi) ///
b1 /// (e)mp(e)lye tekisa memī(yu) ///
b2 /// (t)eki cwī alāṣmontse 1 || tu l(yelyakormeṃ) ///
b3 /// (we)ṣṣäṃ || cañcamaniyaine || arañcu ///
b4 /// (pärma)ṅkäcce pilkosa se wa lkāṣṣä(ṃ) – ///
b5 /// (wa)lo po yapoyne yātka saṃ(tkinantäṃ) ///

Übersetzung

a1 … wenn sie gequält würden …
[~ Lücke zwischen altuig. 07112 und 07113]
a2 … Da … er von einigen die Wunden … [~ altuig. 07121]
a3 … eben danach … Medikamente …
a4 … auf Abszesse machte er …
a5 … mit [Medikamenten]mischungen (konnte er ?) die Krankheiten vertreiben (?) …
b1 … gepeinigt von schrecklicher Krankheit …
[~ Lücke zwischen altuig. 07130 und 07131]
b2 … die Krankheit dieses Kranken. 1“ || Als er das gesehen hatte, …
[siehe oben]
b3 … sagt: || in *cañcamaniyaine* ||: „O Herz! … [siehe oben]
b4 … mit vertrauensvollem Blick schaut er …“ [~ altuig. 07131]
b5 … König (Mahendrasena) befahl in dem ganzen Land Ärzte (herbeizurufen) … [~ altuig. 07134–36]

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Anmerkungen

a1 *tsa̱rkalyi*: Die ersten zwei Silben sind deutlich zu lesen, wenn man ein kleines Stück, das zur Rückseite umgefaltet ist, in Betracht zieht. Diese Zeile gehört möglicherweise zu der Strophe in *strivighātne*, die in IOL Toch 1 b4 anfängt. Da sie keine Interpunktion enthält, gehört in diesem Fall die ganze Zeile entweder zu Pāda 2c oder zu 2d. Der Rest der Zeile IOL Toch 1 b5 muss nämlich die letzten 4 Silben von Pāda 1d sowie 10 bis 12 weitere Silben umfasst haben. Von Zeile IOL Toch 173 a1 ist zumindest der Text bis zum Ende des Schnürlochraums verloren gegangen, etwa 13 Silben. Da Pādas 2a und 2b zusammen 25 Silben lang sind, bewahrt Zeile a1 also womöglich Reste von Pāda 2c, wenn das Fragment aus der Mitte des Blatts, unmittelbar rechts vom Schnürlochraum, stammt. Es handelt sich eher um Pāda 2d, wenn das Fragment weiter nach rechts zu positionieren ist. Auf jeden Fall würde der Schluss der Strophe ungefähr am Ende der Zeile a1 gewesen sein.

a4 Die Ergänzung des ersten Wortes ist relativ sicher, da die erhaltenen Buchstaben nur zu diesem zu passen scheinen und die Bedeutung im Kontext sinnvoll ist. Der hier anzunehmende Obl. Pl. *ampoñaṃ** wird vom schon belegten Gen. Sg. *ampoñaṃtse* vorausgesetzt. Das zweite Wort, *pittākänta* (eine Lesung *pintākänta* ist ebenfalls möglich), ist ein Hapax legomenon. Wenn die Ergänzung des ersten Wortes stimmt, würde man erwarten, dass es sich um ein Medikament und nicht um eine Wunde oder Krankheit handelt (vgl. Adams „blister, swelling“[35]). Vielleicht ist an skt. *pītaka* zu denken, die Bezeichnung verschiedener gelber Bäume, Pulver und Mineralien.[36] Das Verb *təs-*, eigentlich „setzen“, scheint hier im Sinne von „auftragen“ verwendet zu sein. Auf jeden Fall bestätigt die altuig. Parallele, dass *tāṣi* Imperfekt statt Optativ ist.[37]

a5 *wī(kässi)*: Die Ergänzung der Wurzel basiert auf Broomhead.[38] Allerdings verlangt der Kontext statt der Präsensform *wī(käṣṣäṃ)* „er vertreibt“, die er ansetzt, eine Vergangenheitsform, z. B. *wī(kässi campya)* „er konnte vertreiben“. Diese Zeile gehört zu dem Schluss der erfolgreichen Heilung aller Kranken bis auf einen, dessen besonders schreckliche Krankheit in b1–2 weiter beschrieben wird.

b1 Diese Zeile gehört wahrscheinlich zur der Strophe, die in b2 endet.

b2 Für diesen Ausdruck vgl. B 239 b5 *k(e)st tekisa alāṣmoṃ* „krank durch Hunger und Krankheit“.

b3 *cañcamaniyaine*: Name einer Melodie von wahrscheinlich 4 × 7 ¦ 7 Silben (vgl. PK NS 79.1 a4).

35 Adams 2013, S. 412.
36 Vgl. Monier-Williams 1899, S. 630a.
37 Vgl. Peyrot 2013, S. 432.
38 Broomhead 1962, I, S. 239.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

b3 *arañcu*: Die Lesung ist nicht ganz sicher. Diese Vokativform ist sonst auch in PK AS 16.7 b1 belegt, ein Glaubens- oder Sündenbekenntnis ebenfalls in der Form eines inneren Monologs. Vgl. aus der altuigurischen *DKPAM* ferner die Belege *ay mänıŋ yüräkim* (U 1910 /r/2–3/) bzw. *ay mänıŋ yüräkim-a* (Mainz 62 /r/10–11/, verbessere so U III 31.10–11 oben) „O mein Herz!" oder *alp katıg mänıŋ köŋülüm-a* (Kr II 2/1 /v/4/, ed. DKPAMPb 852) „O mein tapferes$_2$ Herz!"

b4 Vergleiche für die Ergänzung B 99 b4 *pärmaṅkä(c)ce pilkosa*. Mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit wird die Strophe in dieser Zeile fortgesetzt. Wenn das Metrum richtig bestimmt ist, befinden wir uns mitten in Pāda 1c. Die Zäsur ist dann nach *pilkosa* anzunehmen und zwischen den Zeilen b3 und b4 würden 27 Silben fehlen (die Zeilenlänge von insgesamt 36 Silben für b4 passt gut zu den Zeilenlängen in IOL Toch 1). Sprecher der Strophe ist Mahendrasena, der wahrscheinlich zu sich selbst spricht.

1.2 Das Ende des Mahendrasena-Avadāna

Die folgende Passage ist offenbar im Altuigurischen gegenüber dem Text in Tocharisch B erweitert. Es kommt aber keine andere Stelle als Parallele in Frage. Vor allem die vom Buddha vorgenommene Verbindung der Vergangenheitserzählung mit der Gegenwartserzählung (skt. *samavadhāna*) scheint in Tocharisch B ganz zu fehlen und könnte vielleicht ein Zusatz der bisher nicht identifizierten und wahrscheinlich nicht erhaltenen Version in Tocharisch A sein. Die Erklärung des Buddha ist eigentlich redundant, da die Mönche als Zeugen der vom Buddha bewirkten Krankenheilung explizit nach der „*jātaka*-Kette" des kranken Mönchs gefragt hatten, nachdem der Buddha sie darauf aufmerksam gemacht hatte, dass er ihn in einer früheren Existenz schon einmal geheilt habe.[39]

U 1078 + U 1136 + U 2073 + Mainz 810a + U 1086 + Mainz 48[40]

07398 10	kayu m(ä)n öz[41]	Mainz 810a /r/2/
07399 11	[eligi]*n* iglig är*kä* ätözü*m*-	
07400 12	[dä]ki ätimin äs[i]*rk*[änč]*s*iz köŋülin	
07401 13	bušı berdim : birök čı*n* [kert]ü	
07402 14	bo buyan küčintä *o*[ḍgurak tüz]-	
07403 15	gärinčsiz burhan k*u*[tın tilär]	
07404 16	ärsär m(ä)n **ätözümdäk*i* [bıš]*m*ıš**	
07405 17	**[ä]*t*imin** tanču tan[ču üzüp]	

39 Vgl. U III 39.12–19.

40 Zur Zusammensetzung der sechs Fragmente U 1078 + U 1136 + U 2073 + Mainz 810a + U 1086 + Mainz 48 vgl. Wilkens 2010, Nr. #198.

41 In dieser Zeile zu Beginn noch: *[-gä in]čä tep tedi :*. Dies wird hier ausgelassen.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

07406 18 [s]üŋökümkätägi ĸ[ ]
07407 19 [ ]// näčük ätözüm [ ]
07408 20 [ar]ıg *sil*ig[42] ärdi ä*r*[sär] Mainz 810a /r/12/
07409 21 [anta]g[43] ok kirsiz tapčasız arıg U 1086 /r/2/
07410 22 [ätözü]*m* yinim b(ä)lgülüg bolzun <:>
07411 23 [anč]a sözlämišdä **ök** : : Mainz 48 /r/1/ + U 1086 /r/4/
07412 24 [m(a)henḍ]*r*aṣene elig bägniŋ ätö[zi]
07413 25 [yini] *ö*ŋräkidä yegräk b(ä)lgülüg
07414 26 *bol*tı : anı körüp alku tınl(ı)glar-
07415 27 nıŋ ögrünčülüg köŋülläri asıl- Mainz 48 /r/5/ + U 1086 /r/8/
07416 28 ıp ämgäklig äsürmäkläri kalısız Mainz 48 /r/6/
07417 29 tarıkıp bardı : ötrü tükäl bilgä
07418 30 t(ä)ŋri t(ä)ŋrisi burhan toyınlarka
07419 3 inčä tep y(a)rlıkadı : nä sakınur Mainz 48 /r/9/

Rückseite
Paginierung: altınč ülüš yeti yetmiš : U 1136 /v/ + U 1078 /v/Pag./
07420 01 sizlär toyınlar-a kim ol üdtäki
07421 02 m(a)henḍraṣene[44] atl(ı)g elig bäg ärdi : U 1136 /v/2/
+ U 2073 /v/1/ + U 1078 /v/2/
07422 03 ol amtı m(ä)n ärür m(ä)n : kayu ol U 2073 /v/2/ + U 1078 /v/3/
07423 04 üdtäki iglig är ärdi : ol am*t*[ı]
07424 05 bo agır igintin (P) ketip ar*ha*[nt]
07425 06 kutıŋa (P) täg*miš* [toyın]- U 2073 /v/5/ + U 1078 /v/6/
07426 07 ıg bilmiš (P) k(ä)r[gäk :]
07427 08 anča sözläp (P) /[ ]
07428 09 *t*(ä)*ŋ*ri burhan ornıntın [turu y(a)rlı]-
U 2073 /v/8/ + Mainz 810a /v/2/
07429 10 kap k(ä)ntü toyın tetsi kuv*r*[agı]
07430 11 *bir*lä öz *u*[lu]šıŋa barı *y*(a)[rlıkadı :]
07431 12 *ö*trü **te*tsisı*** tükäl bilgä t(ä)*ŋ*[ri]
07432 13 *t*(ä)*ŋ*[risi bur]*h*anka **artokrak süz*ö*[k]**
07433 14 ***k*[öŋülin]** *ba*hšısıŋa inčä tep
07434 15 *ö*[tünti : bahšı-]*a* ymä yeg ädgü
07435 16 ärmä[z mü] kim **mahenḍraṣene elig**
07436 17 **[bä]*g*** [bo ča]ṭiklıg iš išlä[ti]
07437 18 **[ ]** yertinčüdäki[45] tın*l*(ı)[g]-
07438 19 [lar]/ mu*ŋ*[a]*d*guluk ta*ŋ*[laguluk]

42 U 1086 /r/1/ mit dem rechten Teil der ersten drei Grapheme dieses Wortes.
43 Das Graphem ist doppelt punktiert.
44 U 2073 /v/1/ mit dem rechten Teil einiger Grapheme.
45 U 1128a + U 1128b + U 1165 + U 1899 /r/ ab hier mit einer Parallele.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

07439 20	[o]*l* ädgülüg iš[46] iš[lämišin/]	Mainz 810a /v/13/
07440 21	ogšatı ärmäz mü **burha*n* [kutın]**[47]	U 1086 /v/2/
07441 22	bulmıšı :[48]	

Übersetzung

[Rede des Lehrers] (07398–07410 ~ tochB IOL Toch 29 a1–2) [Mahendrasena sagte:] „Da ich dem kranken Mann [mi]t eigener [Hand] das an meinem Körper [befin]dliche Fleisch ohne Reue als Almosen gegeben habe, und [wenn ich] kraft dieses wahrhaftigen[$_2$] Verdienstes (skt. *puṇya*) g[ewiss] die [un]ergr[ündliche] Buddhasch[aft erstrebe,] **mein [gekoch]tes F]leisch auf meinem Körper** in Stück[e abschneidend], bis hin zu meinen Knochen […] insoweit mein Körper [… immer re]in$_2$ gewesen [ist, …, ebens]o sollen mein [Körper] und meine Haut (wieder) makellos$_2$ und rein zum Vorschein kommen!“ (07411–07414) **Kaum** hatte er [die]s gesagt, da kamen Körper und [Haut] des Königs$_2$ [Mahend]rasena schöner als [v]orher zum Vorschein. (07414–07417) Als sie dies sahen, da vermehrte sich die Freude aller Wesen und ihr Trunkensein von Leiden verging restlos. (07417–07419) Da sagte der vollkommen weise Göttergott Buddha zu den Mönchen: (07419–07422) „Was denkt ihr, o (ihr) Mönche, derjenige, der der König$_2$ namens Mahendrasena in der damaligen Zeit war, der bin jetzt ich. (07422–07426) Welcher der kranke Mann jener Zeit war, jenen soll man als [den Mönch] erkennen, welcher sich (jetzt) von dieser seiner schweren Krankheit gelöst und die Arha[t]schaft e[r]langt hat.“ (07427–07430) Nachdem er so gesprochen hatte, [… geruh]te sich der Gott Buddha von seinem Platz [zu erheben] und g[eruhte], gemeinsam mit der Scha[r] seiner Mönche und Schüler in ihr jeweiliges L[a]nd zu gehen. (07431–07434 ~ IOL Toch 29 a3) Da sagte **der Schüler [mit] entschiedener Gläubig[keit]** in Bezug auf den vollkommen weisen Gö[tter]go[tt] Buddha e[rgebenst] zu seinem Lehrer: (07434–07436 ~ IOL Toch 29 a4) „O [Lehrer], ist es nicht ausgezeichnet und gut, dass **König[$_2$] Mahendrasena** [dieses … *jā*]*taka*-Werk vollbra[cht hat]? (07437–07441 ~ IOL 29 b1) Und ist es nicht angemessen, dass er (in einer folgenden Existenz) die **Buddha[schaft]** erlangt hat, [indem] er [jen]es Heilswerk vollbracht [hat, das von] den Lebewe[sen] in dieser Welt bewundert und besta[unt werden muss]?“

Anmerkungen

(07430) *öz u[lu]šıŋa barı y(a)[rlıkadı]*: Elmali 2016, Z. 2887: *öz ä[dgü]siŋä barı […]*.

(07431) *ötrü tetsisı*: Elmali 2016, Z. 2888: *tetrü tet[rü …]*.

(07432) *süzö[k]*: Elmali 2016, Z. 2889: *söz*.

(07433–34) Keine Ergänzung des Zeilenanfangs bei Elmali 2016, Z. 2890–2891.

46 U 1086 /v/1/ mit dem rechten Teil der Grapheme dieses und des Anfangs des folgenden Wortes.

47 U 1128a + U 1128b + U 1165 + U 1899 /r/4/: das Wort ist hier erhalten.

48 In dieser Zeile am Ende noch: *amtı y(a)vlak sa[vlıg tınl(ı)g]-*. Dies wird hier ausgelassen.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

IOL Toch 29

Das Fragment IOL Toch 29 aus der British Library Collection mit den Maßen 7,7 × 8,5 cm und der alten Katalognummer H 149.78 kann anhand der Kombination von a1: *p(e)pekusai kektseñmeṃ* „vom gekochten Körper" und a4: *(ma)hendrasene walo* „König Mahendrasena" als zum Mahendrasena-Avadāna gehörig identifiziert werden.[49] Dass das Fragment das Ende der Erzählung enthält, wird zum einen deutlich durch a3: *akalṣälle* „der Schüler", da diese Figur zur Rahmenerzählung gehört, zum andern durch die Tatsache, dass die Rückseite größtenteils leer geblieben ist.

Transliteration

a1 /// [p]·pekusai kektseñmeṃ ce n[o]
a2 /// nte istak̲ astarya
a3 /// akal̲ṣ̲alle olyapo
a4 /// hendrasene walo
a5 /// – (–) hen·asene lāṃ
b1 /// – – – – ṣṣe akā

Transkription

a1 /// p(e)pekusai kektseñmeṃ ce no
a2 /// -nte istak astarya
a3 /// akalṣälle olyapo
a4 /// (ma)hendrasene walo
a5 /// – (ma)hen(dr)asene lāṃ(t)
b1 /// – – (perne)ṣṣe akā(lksa)

Übersetzung

a1 … von [meinem] gekochtem Körper … dies … [~ altuig. 07404–05]
a2 … auf einmal rein [f.] … [~ altuig. 07411–14]
a3 … der Schüler (war?) sehr (gläubig?) … [~ altuig. 07431–34]
a4 … der König Mahendrasena … [~ altuig. 07435]
a5 … den König Mahendrasena …
b1 … in dem Wunsch zur (Buddhawürde) … [~ altuig. 07440–41]

Anmerkungen

a3 *olyapo*: vgl. wahrscheinlich altuig. 07432: *artokrak* in *artokrak süzök köŋülin* „mit entschiedener Gläubigkeit".

49 Das Fragment wurde ediert, aber nicht genau identifiziert, von Broomhead 1962, I, S. 144, 146 und Peyrot 2007, № 29.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

1.3 Weitere möglicherweise zum Mahendrasena-Avadāna gehörige Fragmente in Tocharisch B

IOL Toch 397 ist ein winziges Fragment (2,9 × 3,5 cm), das wegen b1: *(e)mp(e)lye* „schrecklich" wohl am ehesten, jedoch mit großer Vorsicht, dem Mahendrasena-Avadāna zuzuweisen ist.

IOL Toch 397

Transliteration

a1 /// or[o] – ///
a2 /// [l](·)ātsi ste ///
b1 /// mp·lye [t]e ///
b2 /// hendra·[e] ///

Transkription

a1 /// oro(tstse) ///
a2 /// (kä)l(l)ātsi ste ///
b1 /// (e)mp(e)lye te ///
b2 /// (ma)hendra(s)e(ne) ///

Übersetzung

a1 … groß …
a2 … ist zu erlangen …
b1 … schrecklich …
b2 … (König) Mahendrasena …

IOL Toch 614

Das kleine Fragment IOL Toch 614 (3,8 × 4,1 cm) kann leider nicht identifiziert werden.

Transliteration

a1 /// || tane ña ///
a2 /// [s]u p[·]ā ·ä ///
b1 /// [y]n· – ///
b2 /// mahendra ///

Transkription

a1 /// || tane ña(ke) ///
a2 /// su p·ā ·ä ///
b1 /// yn· – ///
b2 /// mahendra(sene) ///

Übersetzung

a1 … Hier [und] jetzt …
b2 … Mahendrasena …

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

2. Ṣaḍḍanta-Avadāna

In diesem Abschnitt werden zwei weitere tocharische Fragmente, in denen der Name Mahendrasena begegnet, vorgestellt. Diese gehören aber nicht zum Mahendrasena-Avadāna, sondern zum Ṣaḍḍanta-Avadāna, in dem Mahendrasena der Vater der eifersüchtigen Bhadrā ist. Die relevanten altuigurischen Abschnitte werden wieder vorangestellt. Es wird jedoch verzichtet auf eine Wiedergabe der Zeilen 02681–02704, da der Text sehr fragmentarisch ist und keine erkennbare Parallele zum tocharischen Text bildet.

U 1651[50] *+ U 1957 + U 1960b*

Vorderseite

02661 01	[ ]/TYN [ ]	U 1651 /r/1/
02662 02	**m(a)henḍarase[ne elig bäg**]	
02663 03	***bit*ig ı[dtılar : kunčuy]-**	
02664 04	***l*ar ärd*i*nis[i**]	
02665 05	[ ]/[ ]//[ ]	U 1651 /r/5/
02666 0	…]/[…	U 1957 /r/1/
02667 07	…]/ *kö*ŋülin […]	
02668 08	…] biziŋ […]	
02669 09	…]Y bo muntag [ ]/[…	
02670 10	…]/ DYN kälmiš /[…	
02671 11	…]/ **kasıgın** ////[…	
02672 12	…] könülin sakınč[ın …	
02673 13	… **nä] *üč*ün tep tesär :** […]	U 1960b /r/1/ + U 1957 /r/8/
02674 14	…]-L'R mäni*ŋ* kızımı*n* […]	
02675 15	…] *:* ärtiŋü […]	
02676 16	…]/ : *birök* […]	
02677 1	… kä]lmiš **bäg*l*[är** …	
02678 18	…]LWP YYL/[…	
02679 19	…]/Y L'R : am[tı …	
02680 20	…]/ m(ä)n nätäg k[ılayın …	U 1960b /r/8/

Übersetzung

(02661–02663 ~ tochB IOL Toch 63 a1, tochA 403 b5[51]) […**an König$_2$] Mahendra]sena** […] **Briefe sc[hickten sie]** (mit dem Inhalt): … (02663–02665 ~ IOL 63 a2, A 403 b5) „[… **Frauen]perle** […]." (02666–02672 ~ IOL 63 a3, A 403 b7) […]

50 Ziemlich sicher ein Blatt mit U 1957 + U 1960b. Möglicherweise gehört die Zeile 02665 zu Zeile 02666.

51 Die Verweisungen auf die Fragmente A 403 und A 66 beziehen sich auf die Fassung in Tocharisch A, vgl. insbesondere Sieg 1952, S. 7–9.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

mit einem […] Herzen [dachte **Mahendrasena**:] „Unser […] diesen derartigen […] gekommen aus […] **mit dem Kinn [in der Handfläche**[52] …] mit Herz und Gedanken […]. (02673 ~ A 403 b7) **[W]eshalb?** […] (02674–02675) die […] meine Tochter […]. (02675–02676 ~ tochA 66 a1–2) Außerordentlich […]. (02676–02679 ~ A 66 a2) Wenn […] **die Fürsten** […]. (02679–02680 ~ A 66 a4) Jetzt […] was [soll] ich t[un]?“

MIK III 1054

Vorderseite

02705 16 anta ötrü[53]
02706 17 **m(a)henḍrasene**[54] **elig** tört yıŋak*t*[ı]*n* kälmiš
02707 18 **arkıš yalavačlarıg** okıp üč ayta[55] *ke*n
02708 19 svayambar yaŋı kün kılguluk *sa*vlarıg barča
02709 20 olarka tüzü tükädi sözlädi : a*n*[ı] *ä*šidip
02710 21 ol **yalavačlar** ymä [t(ä)r]kin ök öz *öz* ulušl[ar]-
02711 22 ıŋa **bardılar**[56] : ö**tr*ü*** **anta** üč ay ärtmä*ki*[n]-
02712 23 gä čambudivipdakı bäglär kalısız va*i*d[e]*h* ulušk[a]
02713 24 kältilär : svayambar yaŋı kün kılg[uluk] *oron*-
02714 25 ta : öz öz körünčlägülük kalık*l*[arta olurdı]-
02715 26 lar : strayastriš t(ä)ŋri yerintäki t(ä)ŋr[ilär]
02716 27 täg bir ikintikä yegädmäkläšü[57] yırın [oyunın]
02717 28 ilinčülädilär : anta ötrü yaŋı [kün kılguluk][58]

Rückseite

Paginierung: üčünč bir otuz :
02718 01 oronta šaži hatun täg baḍra kız yorıyu
02719 02 kälti : tägräki tapıgčılarıŋa inčä tep ayıtdı <:>
02720 03 tözünlärim b*r*(a)[hma]*d*[a]te eligniŋ körünčlüki
02721 04 kayu ärki : kamini atl(ı)g *e*nč tapıgčısı inčä
02722 05 tep tedi : hatunum br(a)hmadate e*lig*[n]*iŋ* [ka]*lık*ı
02723 06 una ıraktan közünü turur : *b*[o ugurda]
02724 07 baḍra kız ärdinilig (P) kaŋ*l*[ıda] *o*lur*up*
02725 08 eyin käzigčä (P) yorı*y*[u] *br*(a)*h*madate[59]

52 Hier und in Z. 02673, 02676–79 nur eine Parallele in TochA.
53 In dieser Zeile zu Beginn noch: *y(a)vlak sa[kınč] tur[gurmagaylar :]*. Dies wird hier ausgelassen.
54 U 1655 + U 1801 /r/4/: *m(a)henḍarasene*.
55 U 1655 + U 1801 /r/6/: *ayda*.
56 U 1655 + U 1801 /r/10/: *bartılar*.
57 Hier offenbar eine Korrektur des Schreibers.
58 Ergänzung des Zeilenendes nach Z. 2713.
59 U 1655 + U 1801 /v/2/: *br(a)hmaḍaṭe*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

02726 09 eligniŋ körünč-(P)-[lük]i tu*š*ušınta
02727 10 kälti : p(a)ḍum lenhwa täg t*ü*[p] *tüz* säviglig
02728 11 közin br(a)hmadate[60] elig tapa tetrü körmäk-
02729 12 lig yarukın ıdtı[61] : täv [k]*ür* y(a)vlak sakınč
02730 13 köŋülintä yašuru kiz[läyü] turur ärdi[62] : öŋrä
02731 14 ažuntakı öötč[63] käk üz *b*[oz tı]*l*tagınta br(a)hmadate[64]
02732 15 eligig artok*rak* t[okulug yakı]n[65] yorıyu barıp
02733 16 **s*up*ušup** atl(ı)[g čäčä]*k*[in[66] etig]*l*[i]*g* psakın
02734 17 br(a)hmadate *e*ligkä atdı :[67]

Übersetzung

(02705–02709 ~ tochB IOL Toch 1094 a1) Daraufhin rief **König Mahendrasena Boten und Herolde**, die aus allen vier Himmelsrichtungen herbeikamen, herbei und teilte ihnen ausführlich die Dinge mit, die für die drei Monate später (stattfindende) *svayaṃvara*-Zeremonie durchzuführen waren.[68] (02709–02711 ~ IOL Toch 1094 a2, tochA 66 b6[69]) Nachdem jene **Boten** dies vernommen hatten, **begaben sie sich** [sc]hnell in ihre jeweiligen Länder. (02711–02713 ~ IOL Toch 1094 a2, A 66 b6) **Dann,** nachdem die drei Monate vergangen waren, kamen die Fürsten von (ganz) Jambudvīpa ins Reich von Vaid[ehī]. (02713–02715) Am Platz, an dem die *svayaṃvara*-Zeremonie durchgeführt [werden sollte, setzten] sie [sich] auf ihre jeweiligen Schautribünen. (02715–02717) Wie [die] Götter im Himmel Trāyastriṃśa wetteiferten sie miteinander und vergnügten sich an Gesang und [Spiel]. (02717–02719) So kam am Platz, an dem die Zere[monie abgehalten werden sollte,] das Mädchen Bhadrā wie die (Götter)königin Śacī schreitend herbei. (02719) Die in der Nähe befindlichen Diener fragte sie: (02720–02721) „Meine Edlen, welche ist wohl die Tribüne des Königs Bra[hma]d[a]tta?“ (02721–02722) Ihre Zofe Kāminī sagte: (02722–02723) „Meine Dame, schaut, die [Tr]ibüne des Königs Brahmadatta ist von fern sichtbar!“ (02723–02727) [In] d[em Moment] setzte sich das Mädchen Bhadrā in einen mit Juwelen (besetzten) Wagen und (die anderen Tribünen) der Reihe nach abfahrend kam sie genau vor der Tribüne des Königs Brahmadatta (zum Stehen). (02727–02729) Mit ihren ganz ebenmäßigen und

60 U 1655 + U 1801 /v/5/: *br(a)hmaḍaṭe*.
61 U 1655 + U 1801 /v/6/: *ıḍdı*.
62 U 1655 + U 1801 /v/8/: *ärti*.
63 Geschrieben: *ʾwwč*. Siehe U II 23, Anm. 1. Elmali 2016, Z. 1159: *öč*.
64 U 1655 + U 1801 /v/10/: *br(a)hmaḍaṭe*.
65 Mainz 790 /r/ ab hier mit einer Parallele.
66 In der Parallele U 1655 + U 1801 /v/12/: *hwa čäčäk[…* . Für *hwa* ist in Z. 02733 vermutlich nicht genug Platz.
67 In dieser Zeile am Ende noch: *anta ok br(a)hmadate*. Dies wird hier ausgelassen.
68 In tochA 66 b3–5 in direkter Rede.
69 Siehe Fußnote 51.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

lotus$_2$gleichen lieblichen Augen entsandte sie einen konzentrierten Sehstrahl auf König Brahmadatta. (02729–02730) Ständig pflegte sie, Trug[$_2$] und üble Absichten in ihrem Herzen zu verbergen$_2$. (02730–02734 ~ IOL Toch 1094 b2) Auf Grund des Rachedurstes$_2$ und des Hasses$_2$ in (ihrer) früheren Existenz (als Elefantenkuh) näherte **sie** sich dem König Brahmadatta sehr w[ürdevoll] und warf den Kranz, der aus [Blüten] namens ***supuṣpa*** [gefertig]t war, dem König Brahmadatta zu.

Anmerkungen

(02709) *tükädi*: Elmali 2016, Z. 1137: *tükätü*.

(02710–11) *öz öz ulušl[ar]ıŋa*: So ist zu lesen. In den früheren Editionen: *öz öz ulušıŋa*.

(02712) *vaideh*: Elmali 2016, Z. 1140: *vaıd (?)*; *ulušk[a]*: So ist zu lesen.

(02714–15) *kalıkl[arta olurdı]lar*: So ist sicher zu lesen und zu ergänzen.

(02715) *t(ä)ŋr[ilär]*: Elmali 2016, Z. 1143: *t(ä)ŋr[i]*.

(02716–17) *yırın [oyunın] ilinčülädilär*: Vgl. den Beleg *yırın oyunın ilinčüläyü* in U 1900 + U 986 /r/2–3/. Müller hatte noch *yegädmäkläšü* und *yerin* verbunden und „auf dem Wettstreitsplatze“ übersetzt (U II 22.27). Elmali (2016, Z. 1144) vermutete den Rest eines Verbums (*yerin-*) und übersetzte „kızarak“ (p. 241).

(02721) *enč*: Die Lesung ist nicht ganz sicher. Die alte Lesung *ärinč* kommt auf Grund der Semantik nicht in Frage. Zu vergleichen ist sogdisch *ʾync* „woman“ (Gharib 1995, Nr. 2189). Hier markiert *enč* das Femininum. Siehe zu dieser Stelle auch Wilkens 2015, S. 319–320.

(02722) *[ka]lıkı*: Wohl so zu ergänzen.

(02723) *una*: So ist zu lesen.

(02725) *yorıy[u]*: Ergänze nach U 1655 + U 1801 /v/2/. Weitere Ergänzungen nach dieser Parallele.

(02726) *tušušınta*: In U II 22.9 und Elmali 2016, Z. 1154: *tö[r]ösintä* gelesen.

(02727) *p(a)ḍum*: vermutlich über tocharische Vermittlung (siehe TochB *padum*, Adams 2013, S. 379) geht das Wort auf Mittelindisch *paduma* zurück; *tü[p] tüz*: Diese Lesung ist jetzt vorzuziehen. Die alten Editionen haben *т[…] töz*.

(02730) *kiz[läyü]*: Vermutlich so zu ergänzen.

(02731) *üz b[oz]*: So ist zu lesen und zu ergänzen.

(02732) *t[okulug]*: Ergänzung nicht sicher.

(02733) *supušup atl(ı)[g čäčä]k[in etig]l[i]g psakın*: So ist vermutlich zu ergänzen. Botanisch ist unter *supuṣpa* Pterospermum Suberifolium, L. zu verstehen. Vgl. Monier-Williams 1899, S. 1228a.

(02734) *eligkä atdı*: Verbesserung schon in UW 254a s. v. *at-*.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

IOL Toch 63

Das kleine Fragment IOL Toch 63[70] (4,0 × 7,0 cm) aus der British Library Collection mit der alten Katalognummer H 149.221 gehört sicher zum Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna: es kommen sowohl Bhadrā, eine der Hauptfiguren des Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna, als auch Mahendrasena, ihr Vater, vor. Die ursprüngliche Anzahl der Zeilen ist unbekannt. Der einzige Anhaltspunkt ist ein Rest der Blattzahl, der „7“, „8“ oder „9“ gewesen sein könnte. Da die Blattzahl gewöhnlich am linken Seitenrand auf mittlerer Höhe steht und dieses Zahlzeichen sich links von der dritten Zeile von unten befindet, ist die Zeilenanzahl mit 5 angesetzt und die Zeile als b3 gezählt. Es können aber noch weitere Zahlzeichen, z. B. eine Zehnzahl oder auch eine Hundertzahl, darüber gestanden haben, in welchem Fall das Blatt 6-zeilig (weniger wahrscheinlich 7-zeilig) gewesen ist. Mithilfe der Spur der Blattzahl können jedoch Vorder- und Rückseite zweifelsfrei bestimmt werden. Das Fragment IOL Toch 1094 (siehe unten) stammt wahrscheinlich vom unmittelbar folgenden Blatt derselben Handschrift.

Transliteration

a1 mahendraseneṃ lāntäśco ṣī ///
a2 śpālmeṃ lāntsoś tā$_u$ ñäske[m]̱ ///
a3 nd·ase[n]e – [lo] ·e ·eṃ ///
b3 ·[y]· ·[u] //
b4 mtsi · || tumeṃ bhādra mñcuṣka lā ///
b5 tai plāwa kwri ñī tkāceṟ kwäl·e ///

Transkription

a1 mahendraseneṃ lāntäśco ṣī(taiñ) ///
a2 śpālmeṃ lāntsoś tā$_u$ ñäskem ///
a3 (mahe)nd(r)asene (wa)lo ·e ·eṃ //
b3 ·y· ·u ///
b4 (śa)mtsi · || tumeṃ bhādra mñcuṣka lā(nt·) ///
b5 (ṣi)tai plāwa kwri ñī tkācer kwäl(yp)e(lya) ///

Übersetzung[71]

a1 … zu König Mahendrasena (kamen) Boten … [~ A 403 b4, altuig. 02661–63]
a2 … zu einer vorzüglichen Königin verlangen wir sie … [~ A 403 b5–6, altuig. 02663–65]
a3 … König Mahendrasena … [~ A 403 b7, altuig. 02666–72]

70 Das Fragment wurde ediert, aber nicht richtig identifiziert, von Broomhead 1962, I, S. 144, 146 und Peyrot 2007, № 63.
71 Siehe Fußnote 51.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

b4 … zu kommen (?). Darauf … Prinzessin Bhadrā den König …
[~ A 66 a6, gleich nach altuig. 02680]
b5 … sende einen Boten! Wenn meine Tochter verlangt … [~ A 66 b2]

Anmerkungen

a1 *ṣī(taiñ)*, b5 *(ṣi)tai*: *ṣito* „Bote", Obl. Sg. *ṣitai* ist ein Wort, das lange verkannt war, aber von Ogihara ohne Zweifel richtig angesetzt ist.[72] Die Passage in PK AS 7M a5, wo das Wort auch vorzukommen scheint, bleibt aber dunkel. Ein weiterer Beleg findet sich möglicherweise in B 211 b2 *abhiṣekṣeṃ ṣitaiṃ*, das vielleicht als *abhiṣekapravāha* „Besprengungsstrom" zu verstehen ist,[73] wobei *pravāha* als *pravāhaka* oder *pravaha*, u. a. „bringend", aufgefasst sein könnte. Es ist dieses Wort, das die Identifizierung des Fragments IOL Toch 1094 als Teil der Ṣaḍdanta-Geschichte möglich macht (s. unten). Auch Adams[74] setzt ein *ṣito* an, jedoch ist seine Übersetzung „field, crop" kaum richtig.

a2 *lāntsoś*: Obwohl der Kontext klar scheint, ist es schwierig zu verstehen, warum *lāntsa* „Königin" statt *mñcuṣka* „Prinzessin" gebraucht ist und wie der Allativ *lāntsoś* mit dem Verb *ñəsk-* „verlangen" zusammenhängt. Möglicherweise bezieht sich „Königin" darauf, dass die Prinzessin Bhadrā Königin eines der Prinzen werden soll. In dem Sinne ist hier auch der Allativ aufgefasst: die Prinzen wollen sie *als* Königin. Für den Ausdruck *śpālmeṃ lāntsoś* vgl. insbesondere altuig. MIK III 1054 /v/19/ (= 02736) *üstünki yeg kuñcuy* „Hauptgemahlin" (skt. *(agra)mahiṣī*).

b4 *(śa)mtsi*: mehrere Ergänzungen sind möglich. Am häufigsten sind *śamtsi* „zu kommen" und *yāmtsi* „zu machen".

IOL Toch 1094

Dass das Fragment IOL Toch 1094[75] (3,9 × 2,6 cm) ebenfalls zur Ṣaḍdanta-Geschichte gehört, wird nahegelegt durch das Nebeneinander von *(mahendra)-s(e)n(e) walo* „König Mahendrasena" und *ṣitaiṃ* „Boten" (siehe die Anmerkung oben). Die Bestimmung von Vorder- und Rückseite erfolgt aufgrund der Annahme, dass die Zeile mit *supuṣpäṣṣe* „mit *supuṣpa*-[Blumen]" in die *svayaṃvara*-Passage gehört. Das Fragment IOL Toch 63 (siehe oben) stammt wahrscheinlich vom unmittelbar vorhergehenden Blatt derselben Handschrift.

72 Ogihara 2009, S. 443; 2013, S. 207–208. Er führt die Belege B 333 a2, PK NS 397 frg5 a4, THT 1663 + 2373.c.g b1 und B 316 a1 an. Ching (2010, S. 316–317) gibt noch SI B Toch./13, 2. Auch Pinault und Malzahn haben dieses Wort aufgrund von B 492 a3 angesetzt (CETOM unter *ṣito*).
73 SWTF, I, S. 126b.
74 Adams 2013, S. 719.
75 Das Fragment wurde ediert, aber nicht identifiziert, von Tamai 2007, № 1094.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Transliteration

a1 /// s·n· walo ṣit[ai]ṃ ///
a2 /// lateṃ ṣitaiṃ || om no – ///
b1 /// [m]k·ṣṣ· [: ok]· [ṣ]· – ///
b2 /// [ṣk]· supuṣpäṣṣe – ///
b3 /// ·ai – ///

Transkription

a1 /// (mahendra)s(e)n(e) walo ṣitaiṃ ///
a2 /// lateṃ ṣitaiṃ || om no – ///
b1 /// mk·ṣṣ· : ok· ṣ· – ///
b2 /// (mñcu)ṣk(a) supuṣpäṣṣe – ///
b3 /// ·ai – ///

Übersetzung[76]

a1 … König Mahendrasena … Boten … [~ A 66 b2, altuig. 02705–07]
a2 … die Boten gingen fort. Da nun … [~ A 66 b6, altuig. 02709–02711]
b2 … die Prinzessin … mit schönen Blumen … [~ A 58 b2–3?, altuig. 02733]

Anmerkungen

b1 Diese Zeile enthält wahrscheinlich Reste einer Strophe. In der Fassung in Tocharisch A sind für die *svayaṃvara*-Passage im Fragment A 58 Reste von nicht weniger als vier Einzelstrophen bewahrt.

Literatur

Adams, D. Q. 2013: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B.* Revised and greatly enlarged. 2nd ed. Amsterdam/New York (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10).

Broomhead, J. W. 1962: *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts.* 2 Bde. PhD Thesis, Trinity College, Cambridge [unveröffentlicht].

Carling, G. 2009: *A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A.* Vol. 1: *A–J.* Wiesbaden.

CETOM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts.* Abrufbar unter www.univie.ac.at/tocharian.

Ching, Ch.-j. 2010: *Secular Documents in Tocharian. Buddhist Economy and Society in the Kucha Region.* Thèse de doctorat, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris [unveröffentlicht].

Clauson, G. 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish.* Oxford.

76 Die Verweisungen auf die Fragmente A 66 und A 58 beziehen sich auf die Fassung in Tocharisch A, vgl. insbesondere Sieg 1952, S. 8–10.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

DKPAMPb = M. Shōgaito/L. Tuguševa/S. Fujishiro: *Uigurubun Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā no kenkyū. Sankuto Peteruburugu shōzō "Jūgōdō monogatari"* [Engl. Nebentitel: *The Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā in Uighur from the Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences*]. Kyoto 1998.

Elmali, M. 2016: *Daśakarmapathaavadānamālā. Giriş-Metin-Çeviri-Notlar-Dizin-Tıpkıbaskı.* Doktora Tezi, T.C. Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, Türk Dili Bilim Dalı. İstanbul.

Erdal, M. 2004: *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden/Boston (Handbook of Oriental Studies = Handbuch der Orientalistik 8/3).

Geng, Sh./H.-J. Klimkeit/J.P. Laut 1998: *Eine buddhistische Apokalypse: Die Höllenkapitel (20–25) und die Schlußkapitel (26–27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen Maitrisimit*. Opladen/Wiesbaden (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 103).

Gharib, B. 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian – Persian – English*. Tehran.

Hilmarsson, J.G. 1996: *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary.* Reykjavík (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies Supplementary Series 5).

Hoernle, A.F.R. 1893–1912: *The Bower Manuscript*. Calcutta.

Kaya, C. 1994: *Uygurca Altun Yaruk: Giriş, Metin ve Dizin*. Ankara (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu; Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 607).

Maue, D. 1996: *Alttürkische Handschriften*. Teil 1: *Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,27).

Monier-Williams, M. 1899: *A Sanskṛit-English Dictionary.* London.

Ogihara H. 2009: *Researches about Vinaya-Texts in Tocharian A and B.* Thèse de doctorat, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris [unveröffentlicht].

— 2013: „Tocharian fragment THT333 in the Berlin collection." In: *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 33, S. 205–217.

Peyrot, M. 2007: *An Edition of the Tocharian Fragments IOL Toch 1 – IOL Toch 822 in the India Office Library, London*. Abrufbar unter http://idp.bl.uk.

— 2013: *The Tocharian Subjunctive. A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation.* Leiden/Boston (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 8).

Poucha, P. 1955: *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A.* Praha.

Sieg, E. 1952: *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II.* Berlin (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1951, Nr. 1).

Sundermann, W. 2006: „A Fragment of the Buddhist Kāñcanasāra Legend in Sogdian and its Manuscripts." In: A. Panaino/A. Piras (Hrsg.): *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa, held in Ravenna, 6–11 October 2003*. Vol. 1: *Ancient & Middle Iranian Studies*. Milano, S. 715–724.

SWTF = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. Begonnen von E. Waldschmidt, hrsg. von H. Bechert, K. Röhrborn und J.-U. Hartmann, bearbeitet von G. von Simson u.a. Göttingen 1973ff.

Tamai, T. 2007: *An Edition of the Tocharian Fragments IOL Toch 853 – IOL Toch 1247 in the India Office Library, London.* Abrufbar unter http://idp.bl.uk.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

U II = F.W.K. Müller: *Uigurica II*. Berlin 1911 (Abhandlungen der Königlich-Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1910, Nr. 3).

U III = F.W.K. Müller: *Uigurica III. Uigurische Avadāna-Bruchstücke (I–VIII)*. Berlin 1922 (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1920, Nr. 2).

UW = K. Röhrborn: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Lfg. 1–6. Wiesbaden 1977–1998.

Wilkens, J. 2010: *Alttürkische Handschriften.* Teil 10: *Buddhistische Erzähltexte*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,18).

— 2015: „Some Indo-European Loan Elements in Old Uyghur." In: A. Mirsultan/M.T. Aydin/E. Aydin (Hrsg.): *Eski Türkçeden Çağdaş Uygurcaya: Mirsultan Osman'ın Doğumunun 85. Yılına Armağan*. Konya (Kömen Yayınları 122), S. 319–334.

— 2016: *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. 3 Bde. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte 37).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

An Old Uyghur Fragment of an Astrological Treatise Kept in the Beijing National Library*

Abdurishid Yakup, Berlin and Beijing

One small Old Uyghur fragment preserved in Beijing National Library (signature number BD14741L) presents part of a star omen in Early Old Uyghur. The text consists of 13 lines: the beginning 11 lines are well preserved, whilst a considerable number of words in line 12 is not fully visible and in the 13th line only two words remained. The facsimile of this fragment is published in volume 133 of the book series *Guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang yishu* 国家图书馆藏敦煌遗书 "Remains of Dunhuang manuscripts preserved in Beijing National Library" edited by Beijing National Library and Professor Ren Jiyu 任继愈, former director of Beijing National Library.[1]

The text is written in the archaic type of Old Uyghur script, which Professor Takao Moriyasu calls semi-square script (Han-kaisho 半楷書) of Old Uyghur script.[2] The text does not differentiate between aleph and *r*, and the spelling of *s* and *r* in word-final position usually also has no difference. The fragment shows the archaic form *-saz* of the privative suffix in the word *ašsaz* "foodless (line 08), without food", demonstrating its early Turkic characteristics. The word *boγay* "low" (line 06) of Mongolian origin occurring in this text perhaps is a Mongolian loan borrowed into Turkic before the Yuan-Mongolian period, thus it should not be taken as evidence for its late Old Turkic dating.

* This paper presents part of the research being carried out within the Specially Funded Research Project "Etymological Investigations on the Turkic Languages in China" supported by the National Social Sciences Foundation of China (Founding No. 11&ZD130) and the project "Research on the Old Uyghur Texts Kept in the Beijing National Library" supported by Centre for Research on the Western Regions Literature and History of Xinjiang Normal University (Founding No. XJEDU040213B04).

1 See Beijing National Library/Ren 2010, p. 45.

2 For Moriyasu's classification of Old Uyghur script, see Moriyasu 2004, pp. 232–233; Moriyasu/Zieme 1999, p. 74.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Content and the source text

The text is on meteors, which were understood as a fiery phenomenon in the sky and were known as shooting stars or falling stars in Ancient India and China. As the beginning lines of the text state, the text tells the story, movement, sign, good sides and bad sides of the meteor. Clearly, it is a part of a description of meteors from an astrological treatise. Although we failed to identify the whole text with any specific astrological treatise, we found that descriptions of meteors in this fragment are similar to those found in some Chinese classics, some of them basically identical with the descriptions in this Old Uyghur fragment. For instance, lines 2–3 of our fragment tell that "If the falling star flies in the night and has a long light and its colour is red, an army will appear, blood spills, and there will be murder and a lot of war." A very similar description is found in the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 "Astrological treatise of Jingzhou" compiled by Liu Biao 劉表 (142–208), which is also known as *Jingzhou zhan* 荊州占 (cited from *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經):

> 流星前赤後青黑者，客軍敗死。[…] 流星夜見，光尾長，如厚布，其蒼白，為使；赤、有兵；黑，死喪。
>
> "If the front side of the falling star is red and its back side is bluish or blackish, the troops transferred from other provinces will be defeated and die. […] If one looks at the falling star at night, (and sees) its light tail is long, like a thick cloth, and if it is paleness, it is a messenger; (if it is) red, troops will come; (if it is) black, there will be death and mourning." (my tentative translation)

Lines 7–9 of the Old Uyghur fragment tell that if the falling star falls, the people at that place will be without food and water. In the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 we also found a very similar description, e.g. (cited from *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經):

> 名曰降石。搖頭，乍上、乍下；大飢，人相食。[…] 人食不足
>
> "It is called falling stone. One shakes head up and down; (this signifies) great hunger, people will eat each other. […] People will not have enough food." (my tentative translation)

For further lines of the fragment we found corresponding parts in the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 and they will be mentioned in our notes to the Old Uyghur text. It is difficult to judge whether the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 compiled by Liu Biao 劉表 which was one of the three most popular astrological treatises during the Tang period, together with the *Yisizhan* 乙巳占 "Wood-Snake omen" compiled by Li Chunfeng 李淳风 in 565 and the *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經 compiled during the Tang period by Gautama Siddha (Chin. 瞿曇悉達 Qutan Xida, second half the 7th century to the first half of the 8th century), served as the direct source of the Old Uyghur text, because the chapters 71–75 of the *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經 include a lot of citations from the *Jingzhou Xingzhan*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

荊州星占, including the passages mentioned above. Thus we can not exclude the possibility that the translator or compiler of the Old Uyghur text may have only consulted the *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經. Nevertheless, it is true that Old Uyghurs had translations from or compilations based upon some important Chinese astrological and divination classics, the *Yijing* 易經 "Classic of Changes" and the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占, perhaps also of the *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經. The Old Uyghur version of *Yijing* 易經 was edited by Bang and von Gabain[3] and our fragment presents a small part of the latter.[4]

Text in transliteration, transcription and translation

Below are the transliteration, transcription and translation of the Old Uyghur fragment of astrological content from Beijing National Library. My transliteration and transcription are based on my notes done in Beijing National Library and the facsimile of the fragment included in the afore-mentioned book edited by Beijing National Library and Ren Jiyu.

Signature: BD14741L

01 amtı učar yultuz *s*[a]vın yorıqın b(ä)lgüsin ädgüsin yavuzın
ʾmty ʾw*c*ʾr ywltwz s[]vyn ywryqyn plkwsyn ʾdkwsyn yʾvwz {nn} yn
02 ayu berälim . učar yultuz tün*l*ä učup yaruqı uzun
ʾʾyw pyrʾlym . ʾwcʾr ywltwz twyn*l*ʾ ʾwcwp yʾrwqy ʾwz wn
03 ärip öngi qızıl ärsär süü bolur qan aqar ölüt bolu*r*
ʾryp ʾwynky qyz yl ʾrsʾr sww pwlwr . qʾn ʾʾqʾr ʾwylwt pwlw*r*
04 üküš süü bolur . učar yultuz uluγ küp täg ärip
ʾwykws sww pwlwr . ʾwcʾr ywltwz ʾwlwq kwyp tʾk ʾry*p*
05 kedini y(a)ruq öngtüni kičig ärsär yana kedini ediz ärip
kydyny yrwq ʾwynktwny kycyk ʾrsʾr yʾnʾ kydyny ʾydyz ʾryp
06 öngtüni boγay ärsär ölüt üküš bolu*r* süng[ü]š aṭıṡ
ʾwynktwny pwqʾy ʾrsʾr ʾwylwt ʾwykws bwlw*r* s[ ]ynk[ ]s ʾʾdys
07 qılγu ärmäz učar yu*l*tuz bašı ty[ ]ʾyw kälip yertä türgälir
qylqw ʾrmʾz ʾwcʾr yw*l*twz pʾsy ty[ ]ʾyw kʾlyp yyr tʾ twyrkʾlyr
08 ürpärgälir täg bo*l*up tüšsär o*l* yertäki bodun boqun ašsaz
ʾwyrpʾrkʾlyr tʾk pwlwp twyssʾr ʾw*l* yyrtʾky pwdwn pwqwn ʾʾssʾz

3 See Bang/von Gabain 1929.

4 There are further Old Turkic texts displaying astrological terms, a rather complete list of these texts, including texts in other scripts is given in Clauson (1964). Now we may add at least a Chagatay text kept in Paris, which is the most comprehensive star omen, to Clauson's list. An edition of this book manuscript has been carried out by M. Sugahara and myself.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

09 azuqsuz suvsuz bolur učar yultuz küp täg ärip kedini
’’z wqswz swvswz pwlwr . ’wc’r ywltwz kwyp t’k ’ryp kydyny
10 yürüng uzunı on čıγča bolup tüššär ol yultuz tüšmiš
ywrwnk ’wz wny ’wn cyq c’ pwlwp t*w*yss’r ’wl ywltwz twysmys
11 yerdä ölüg üküš bolu*r* . qan aqar učar yultuz {oot}
yyrd’ ’wylwk ’wykws pwlw*r* . q’n ’’q’r ’wc’r ywltwz ’wwt
12 öngdüni uluγ küp täg ked*ini* udira*ša*[t](?) täg ärsä*r yerkä*(?) *tüš-*
’wynkdwny ’wlwq kwyp t’k kyd*yny* ’wdyr’*s*’[] t’k ’rs’*r yyrk*’(?) *twys*
13 sär(?) ol yerkä(?)[ ]
s’r ’wl yyrk’(?) [ ]

Translation

Now let us tell the story, movement, sign, good side and bad side of the falling star. If the falling star flies in the night and its light is long and its colour is red, an army will appear, blood spills and there will be murder and a lot of war. If the falling star is like a big jar and its back side is brilliant and its front side is small, again, if its back side is high and its front side is low, there will be a lot of slaughter. One should not battle and shooting. If the head of the falling star comes [ ] and rolls up, giving the impression that it intends to bristle on the ground, the people at that place will be without food, meals and water. If the falling star is like a jar and its back side is white and its length is approximately ten feet (and) if it falls down, in the place where it falls down will give much death and spill blood. If the front side of the shooting star is like a big jar and its back side is like the *uttarāṣāḍhā* and it falls(?) to the ground(?), to that place(?) [… …]

Notes

01 učar yultuz: literally can be translated as “flying star”, clearly it is the word for word translation of the Chinese term 飛星 *feixing*, which refers to the falling star or meteor in some Chinese texts. It does not occur in the astrological sources discussed in Clauson (1964). The Old Uyghur term *učar yultuz* hardly can be traced back to the Sanskrit word *ulkā* or *ulkā-pāta*, which has the meanings “firebrand”, “dry grass and set on fire”, “a torch”,[5] for which one may expect **ot yultuz*. The logical rendering of the Chinese standard term 流星 *liuxing* for meteor in Old Turkic seems also to be *aqar yultuz*, which still survives in some modern Turkic languages, e. g. Turkish *akan yıldız*, Modern Uyghur *aqar yultuz*, a term which has a very similar structure to the Old Uyghur *učar yultuz*. The only word which corresponds word for word to *učar yultuz* is the Chinese term 飛星 *feixing*, which has been used as alternative term for 流星 *liuxing* in

5 Monier-Williams 1899, p. 218c.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the Chinese classics *Hanshu* 漢書,[6] in the well known poetic work *Zhongxiao* 中霄 written by the famous Tang dynasty poet Du Fu 杜甫, as well in many other Chinese classics, including astrological treatises such as the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 and the *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經, even in some works of Chinese scribes of the Yuan period.

In Old Uyghur Buddhist texts *učar yultuz* is used to translate 流星 *liuxing*, the most common Chinese term for falling star or meteor. In *Altun Yaruq* we find the following two instances:

A. 流星崩落… 大地震動發大音聲。(*Taisho* Nr. 663, vol. 16, 0343c02–04)
učar yultuzlar tüšgäy, yer täprägäy (*Altun Yaruq* 434.22–23)
"Falling stars will fall down and will give big earthquake."

B. 兄弟姊妹 眷屬妻子 孤迸流離 身亦滅亡 流星數墮 二日並現 (*Taisho* Nr. 663, vol. 16, 0343c02–04)
eči ini ymä qa qadaš äkä balḍır birgärü bolar tüšär adrılmaq alp ačıγ tarqa ämgäkkä .. ängmi<n>tin ätözi isig özi ymä birgärü alqınur, **učar yultuz** üstürti üzüksüz tüšär čözülüp iki kün t(ä)ngri birgärü yana üdün üdün közünür .. (*Altun Yaruq* 554.15–23)
"Elder and younger brothers, relatives, elder sister and step daughter will experience the bitter and grievous pain of separation together, even their body and life will also extinguish together, the falling star will fall down uninterruptedly from on high; being dispersed, two suns will appear together now and again."

Note, however, that 飛星 *feixing* only occurs 8 times in the Chinese Buddhist canon *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, and interestingly only in the collections of rather late Buddhist works and notes but not in *sūtra*s or commentaries. It is very possible that the term *učar yultuz* first came into existence as literal translation of the Chinese term 飛星 *feixing* and then is used to translate the standard term 流星 *liuxing* which frequently occurs in Chinese Buddhist texts.

03–04 süü bolur: Literally might be translated as "there will be an army", in the text the phrase occurs twice: In the first case it seems to be the word for word translation of the Chinese expression 有兵 *youbing* "there will be an army" which occurs in the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占; in the second case, it occurs as part of the phrase *üküš süü bolur*, in which it clearly means "there will be (a lot of) war". The first one we translate as "an army will appear" and the second one we will render as "there will be (a lot of) war".

ölüt bolur: Might be translated as "there will be slaughter" or "there will be a murder". Presumably, *ölüt* just like its medieval form *ölät* may also refer to "epidemic" or "sudden death" (see Clauson 1972, p. 130ab). The corresponding Chinese word in the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 to it is 死喪 *sishang* "death and mourning". It should be noted that in line 11 of our fragment we find *ölüg bolur* instead of *ölüt bolur*.

6 See *Hanshu* 漢書, Tianwenzhi 天文志.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

04 uluγ küp: might be translated as "big jar" or "big earthenware jug". The text describes the size of meteor by means of this phrase or using the word *küp* without any attribute. According to the explanation by Clauson, *küp* means "earthenware jar or jug" (1972, p. 687a). Interestingly, 缶 *fou* of similar meaning is used to describe meteor already in *Hanshu* 漢書, e. g.:

〔陽朔〕四年閏月庚午， 飛星大如缶， 出西南， 入斗下 (cited from *Hanshu* 漢書, Tianwenzhi 天文志)
"(In the Yangshuo 陽朔 era), fourth year leap month seventh (day), meteor is as big as a pottery jar, it came out of the South-west, and fell down like a Chinese peck."

In the description of meteor in the *Huangdi zhan* 黄帝占 "Omens of Yellow Emperor" we find exactly the word for jar, namely 甕 *meng*, e. g. (cited from *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經):

流星大如甕，頭大尾小
"The falling star is as big as an earthen jar, its head is big and its tail is small."

This also goes of the description in another omen book *Shengqiafu* 聖洽符, in which we read 飛星如甕 "falling star is like a jar". Interestingly, in the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 both 缶 *fou* and 甕 *meng* are used, e. g. (cited from *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經):

流星大如缶，其光赤黑，有喙者；名曰梁星，其所墜之鄉，有兵，君失地。
"If the falling star is as big as a pottery and a jar, and its back side is white, really white, and if its front side is low and its back side is high, and again if its light is red and black, there someone will pant; (this star) is called blessing star, in the place where it falls down, troops will come, and the ruler will lose his land."

Similar descriptions do also occur in other passages of the same work. Nevertheless, a similar passage just like the cited one above from the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 must have served as basis for lines 4–6 of our fragment.

10 kedini yürüng uzunı on čıγča: might be translated as "its back side is white and its length is approximately ten feet". As reference to this we find the following description in the *Jingzhou Xingzhan* 荊州星占 (cited from *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經):

大而赤，若甕。後皎然白，長可一丈。
"(The falling star) is big and red, like a jar. Its back side is white and really white, its length is ten feed."

Presumably, this or a similar passage served as the basis for the Uyghur expression discussed here. It should be noted that *čıγ* used in the Old Uyghur sentence originates from Chinese 尺 *chi*, a length unite referring to circa 30 cm or 1 feet. Here in this Old Uyghur fragment length of the falling star was described as *on čıγča* "approximately ten feet", this fits close to the description in the cited Chinese sentence above.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

12 udiraša[t]: The reading is not certain, perhaps it is a variant of *udarašat* or *udrašat*, which originates from Sanskrit *uttarāṣāḍhā*, name of a lunar mansion (see Monier-Williams 1899, p. 179a). Thus far, as far as I know, this word is only found in a star omen edited by Rahmati (Arat) as TT VII, Nr. 2 (l. 21); see Rahmati 1936.

References

Altun Yaruq = C. Kaya: *Uygurca Altun Yaruk. Giriş, Metin ve Dizin*. Ankara 1994 (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 607.)

Bang, W./A. von Gabain 1929: "Türkische Turfantexte I. Bruchstücke eines Wahrsagebuches." Berlin (Extract from: Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1929, Nr. 15, pp. 242–268).

Beijing National Library/Ren Jiyu 任继愈 (eds.) 2010: *Guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang yishu* 国家图书馆藏敦煌遗书 *[Remains of Dunhuang manuscripts preserved in Beijing National Library]*. Vol. 133. Beijing.

Clauson, G. 1964: "Early Turkish astronomical terms." In: *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 35, pp. 350–368.

— 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford.

Kaiyuan Zhanjing = *Kaiyuan Zhanjing* 開元占經 *[The Treatise on Astrology of Kaiyuan Era]*. Vol. 71. Available at http://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&chapter=150182.

Monier-Williams, M. 1899: *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Oxford.

Moriyasu, T. 2004: "From Silk, Cotton and Copper Coin to Silver. Transition of the Currency Used by the Uighurs during the Period from the 8th to the 14th Centuries." In: D. Durkin–Meisterernst/S.–Ch. Raschmann/J. Wilkens/M. Yaldiz/P. Zieme (eds.): *Turfan Revisited – The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Berlin, pp. 228–239.

Moriyasu, T./P. Zieme 1999: "From Chinese to Uighur documents." In: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 14, pp. 73–102.

Rahmati, G.R. 1936: *Türkische Turfantexte VII.* Mit sinologischen Anmerkungen von W. Eberhard und Index. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1936, Nr. 12).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

The Xiapu 霞浦 Manichaean text *Sijizan* 四寂讚 "Praise of the Four Entities of Calmness" and Its Parthian Original*

Yutaka Yoshida, Kyoto

Werner Sundermann's contribution to Manichaean studies is enormous. In particular his numerous works on Manichaean Middle Iranian texts, both philological and religious, have benefitted all those who are interested in the Iranian languages and Manichaeism. When the late Professor Kogi Kudara and I decided to publish all the Iranian fragments belonging to the Otani collection in the late 1980s we asked him for help not only because of his unsurpassable experience and competence in editing similar texts of the German Turfan collection but also for his unique willingness to assist others by giving his own ideas so generously, with which everyone who knew him is well acquainted.[1]

It is really a pity that due to his illness I was not able to benefit from his advice when during the last few years I discovered in Japan several well-preserved Manichaean paintings of Southern Chinese origin. I am pretty sure that his profound knowledge of Manichaeism could greatly contribute to the elucidation of the details of these paintings, in particular the one that meticulously depicts the Manichaean cosmology.[2] Yet another new discovery to which Sundermann did not have access is a group of very late Chinese Manichaean texts discovered in Southern China.

Since October 2008 a considerable number of Chinese Manichaean texts originating from Xiapu 霞浦 district in Fujian 福建, China, have come to light and a number of articles discussing their contents have been published by Chinese scholars.[3] These manuscripts have been kept by the descendants

* It is my pleasure to thank Professor N. Sims-Williams, who, with his accustomed generosity, not only gave me valuable suggestions but also corrected my English. I am also grateful to Dr. Ma Xiaohe for his assistance in getting access to the Xiapu texts.

1 The Iranian section of the collection, except for the Khotanese texts, was eventually made public in 1997 by the jointly authored Kudara/Sundermann/Yoshida 1997.

2 For general information on these paintings, see Yoshida 2007; Gulácsi 2008–2009; Kósa 2010.

3 Kósa circulated an exhaustive list of the relevant publications during his presentation "Bibliography of the new findings from Xiapu (Fujian)" at the 8th International Conference of International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS), September 2013. For a brief overview of the manuscripts and their discovery, see Yang 2011, pp. 137–138.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

of local priests and many of the manuscripts seem to date back to the Qing Dynasty (1616–1912). However, as far as I can see, no exhaustive description of the entire corpus has been made public and none of them has been edited as a whole.

1. *Sijizan* 四寂讚 and its previous studies

As I have shown in a forthcoming study,[4] the Xiapu texts contain a considerable number of Middle Iranian terms phonetically transcribed into Chinese characters, such as *a sa man sha* 阿薩漫沙 for Western Middle Iranian [asmān šāh] "heavenly king, i. e. Rex Honoris" and *ye fu luo yi luo* 囈嚩囉逸囉 standing for [gabraēl(ā)] "(archangel) Gabriel". The latter term clearly indicates that the basis of the transcription is Middle Chinese rather than a later form of Chinese such as Early Mandarin, because the character *ye* 囈, whose form is **ngiɐp* in Middle Chinese and **jɛ* in Early Mandarin,[5] represents a syllable [gab].

In one of his articles on the Xiapu texts, Ma Xiaohe refers to a phonetically transcribed hymn called *Sijizan* 四寂讚 "Praise of the four tranquillities" and discusses the Iranian counterpart of its first line: *ao he fu he lu shen cuo hu luo er li* 奥和匐賀盧詵嵯鶻囉[6]哷哩.[7] Ma Xiaohe proposes to see Aramaic and Middle Persian words corresponding to the four aspects of the Father of Greatness: *ao he fu* 奥和匐 / *ʿylʾhʾ* "god", *he lu shen* 賀盧詵 / *rwšn* "light", *cuo hu luo* 嵯鶻囉 / *zwr* "power", and *er li* 哷哩 / *whyḫ* "wisdom".

Fortunately, a small photograph of two manuscript pages comprising the entire hymn was reproduced by Chen Jinguo and Lin Jun in their studies of the Manichaean materials handed down in Xiapu and this enables one to investigate the whole hymn.[8] As I show in my forthcoming paper, it is the Parthian forms that are represented in the transcription. According to my reconstruction, the first 13 characters of the *Sijizan* correspond to Parthian terms in the following way:

4 Cf. Yoshida (forthcoming), based on my paper read at the 8th International Conference (IAMS) held at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, September 2013.

5 In this article Middle Chinese forms are cited from Karlgren 1957. For the Early Mandarin form, see Pulleyblank 1991.

6 A few characters provided with an additional radical *kou* 口 meaning "mouth" are not found in dictionaries. This practice of adding 口 is often observed among the characters employed to phonetically transcribe foreign sounds, cf. Yoshida 1983, p. 328, n. 17. They are in most cases homophones with those without the radical. In this study, I give the Middle Chinese forms reconstructed for the characters without the radical.

7 Ma 2009. Incidentally, he translates *Siji(zan)* as "(Praises of) the Four Calmnesses".

8 Cf. Chen/Lin 2009, p. 378.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

奥和 *·âu γuâ : ʾw-ʾ [ō-w-ā]
匐賀 *b'i̯uk γâ : bg-ʾ [baγ-ā][9]
盧詵 *luo ʂi̯ɛn : rwšn [rōšn-ā]
嵯鶻囉*dz'â γuət lâ : zʾwr-ʾ [zāwar-ā]
哂哩弗哪 *ńźi lji pi̯uət nâ : jyryft-ʾ [žīrīft-ā]

In my opinion all except for *rwšn* are provided with what Henning calls a Ruf-Alef.[10] Possibly *rwšn* was also followed by a Ruf-Alef and was originally spelled *lu shen nuo* 盧詵哪, of which the last character was later omitted. Similarly, the last character of 哂哩弗哪 standing for *jyryftʾ* is likely to be an error for *duo* (MC **tâ*) 哆. In what follows I shall discuss the remaining part of the hymn.

2. Text of the *Sijizan* 四寂讚

First I give my reading of the entire hymn. As far as I can see from the photograph there is practically no problem in identifying the Chinese characters except for the second character in column 12, which looks like either *sha* 沙 or *yong* 泳. The published photograph is too reduced for me to read three small characters placed under the title of the hymn *si ji zan* 四寂讚 of column 1, which are not likely to be a part of the hymn itself but a kind of commentary or instruction for those who recite it.[11]

1. 四寂讚 送佛用
2. 奥 和 匐 賀 盧 詵 嵯 鶻 囉 哂 哩
3. 弗 哪 嵯 里 能 阿 淡 渾 湛 摩 和 夷
4. 数 謹 你 門 乎 弥 特 末 羅 摩 尼 弗
5. 里 悉 徳 健 那 代 醯 潭 摩 阿 訶
6. 特 伽 稽 羅 縛 居 陣 那 南 無 波 耶
7. 特 羅 緩 步 哂 代 醯 潭 摩 阿 訶 特
8. 伽 稽 羅 縛 居 陣 那 南 無 波 耶 駄
9. 羅 緩 步 哂 戒月結
10. 阿 咈 哩 特 菩 和 末 羅 摩 尼 里 [口+在]
11. 伽 度 師 伽 度 師 勿 那 阿 羅 緩 那
12. 菩 *沙 遮 伊 但 伽 度 師

The hymn contains two parts. The first section comprises lines 2–9 ending with a note in Chinese *jie yue jie* 戒月結 "Conclusion of the month of fasting(?)". In

9 The postvocalic [g] was pronounced as a fricative [γ]. Transcriptions of Middle Persian and Parthian are cited from Durkin-Meisterernst 2004.
10 Cf. Henning 1937, p. 21, n. 1.
11 In a personal communication Dr. Ma Xiaohe was kind enough to share with me his reading of this short comment: *songfoyong* 送佛用 "(used) for sending off the Buddhas".

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

the second part *qie du shi* 伽度師 (MC **g'i̯a d'uo ṣi*) is repeated three times. MA XIAOHE correctly compares it with *qie lu shi* 伽路師 (MC **g'i̯a luo ṣi*) attested in the *Hymnscroll*, which transcribes *kʾdwš* [kādūš].[12] While *lu* 路 (MC **luo*) of the Dunhuang form corresponds to a post vocalic *d*, which was pronounced as a fricative sound, i.e. [δ], the Xiapu counterpart employs *du* 度 (MC **d'uo*) instead. This difference seems to indicate that the two systems of transcription differ from each other, and that the Xiapu system is slightly earlier than that of the Dunhuang texts. Since the voiced obstruents of early Middle Chinese changed into voiceless counterparts,[13] the Xiapu material showing the voiced pronunciation of the character is likely to be slightly older. However, in view of *qie* 伽 (MC **g'i̯a*) representing [kā] in the both forms, what I call "system" is more like a tendency than a strict rule.

3. Columns 3–9

Two approaches to the task of reconstructing a phonetically transcribed hymn are possible. One is to consider the possible Middle Iranian, in this case Parthian, words or sounds represented by the Middle Chinese pronunciation of the characters employed in the hymn. The other is to search for the original text of the hymn among those found at Turfan.[14] So far a considerable number of short Iranian hymns or *mahr*s have been published, some of which are known to have been translated into Uighur.

3.1. Plausible reconstructions

Before *jie yue jie* 戒月結, a sequence of twenty-three characters 訶特伽稽羅縛居陣那南無波耶特(馱)羅緩步哆 is repeated in columns 5–7 and 7–9. Therefore, the sequence can be seen to represent a semantic unit, most likely a verse. Before this verse one finds familiar transcriptions *yishu* 夷数 "Jesus" and *moni* 摩尼 "Mani". Since there is no discernible indication of word boundary, for the sake of convenience I divide the characters of columns 2–5 into three sequences, the first before 夷数 and the third after 摩尼.

a.	嵯	里	能	阿	淡	渾	湛	摩	和
	cuo	li	neng	a	dan	hun	dan	mo	he
	dz'â	lji	nəng	·â	d'âm	γuən	tậm	muâ	γuâ

12 MA 2009, p. 93.
13 On this sound change, see PULLEYBLANK 1984, pp. 63–68.
14 I must confess that to begin with I neglected this procedure. It was Professor N. SIMS-WILLIAMS who advised me to search for the original hymn among the so far published texts.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

This is what follows the naming of the four aspects of the Father of Greatness. Although it is difficult to discern Iranian forms here, the preposition *ʾwʾ* [ō-w- ā] preceding *bgʾ*, etc. suggests that one should restore a verb governing that phrase. The first two characters *cuo li* 嵯里 (MC **dzʾâ lji*) can easily be reconstructed as *zʾryẖ* [zārī] "sorrowfully". In view of the Middle Chinese form of *neng a dan* 能阿淡 (MC **nəng ·â dʾâm*), a Parthian verb form ending with *-ām,* 1st sg. present indicative or 1st pl. present indicative/subjunctive, readily comes to mind. However, the verb stem in question is difficult to restore. For the time being, by way of a mere guess, I suggest **ngʾdʾm* "I/we supplicate", although one expects *ngʾyʾm* instead.[15]

I have no idea for what stands before *yishu* 夷数 for [yišō]: *hun dan mo he* 渾湛摩和 (MC **γuən tậm muâ γuâ*). Is it another verb ending with *-ām*, perhaps followed by a pleonastic vowel? The Middle Chinese form looks somewhat like *wyndʾm* [wendām] "I/we praise". If this should be the case, the sequence of sounds **mʾwʾ* suggested by *mo he* 摩和 (MC **muâ γuâ*) may again contain **ʾwʾ* [ō-w-ā], i. e. the preposition *ʾw* [ō] followed by a pleonastic vowel. This highly hypothetical reconstruction suggests that a new verse begins here with *wyndʾm ʾwʾ* "I/we praise ~".

b.	夷	数	謹	你	門	乎	弥	特	末	羅	摩	尼
	yi	shu	jin	ni	men	hu	mi	te	mo	luo	mo	ni
	i	ṣi̯u	ki̯ən	ńi	muən	γuo	mjię	d'ək	muât	lâ	muâ	ńi

Yishu 夷数 for [yišō] is obvious and *mo luo* 末羅 (MC **muât lâ*) preceding *mo ni* 摩尼 (MC **muâ ńi*) "Mani" is most likely to represent [mār] "my lord" followed by the vowel *-ā*. Thus *mo luo mo ni* 末羅摩尼 is to be reconstructed as [mār-ā mānī]. We are left with the words in between: *jin ni men hu mi te* 謹你門乎弥特 (MC **ki̯ən ńi muən γuo mjię d'ək*). Since the Middle Chinese form of *jin ni* 謹你, **ki̯ən ńi* sounds like Middle Persian *kanīg*, of which the contemporary pronunciation is known to have been *kanī* without final *-g*,[16] one may certainly expect the triad Yišō, Kanīg Rōšn, and Wahman here. The following *men hu mi te* 門乎弥特 (MC **muən γuo mjię d'ək*), which only slightly resembles Wahman, is much closer to Manōhmēd, another designation of Wahman. In fact, a somewhat vulgar form of this name *mnγwmyδ* is encountered in a Manichaean Uighur text once edited by Peter Zieme.[17] Although I have no idea as to why *te* 特 (MC **d'ək*) with its ending *-k* was employed for transcribing the final *-d*, the context and the phonetic resemblance are enough to persuade one that Parthian *mnwhmyd* must lie behind this transcription.

15 Cf. the Parthian forms *ngʾd* "prayer" and *ngʾy-* "to pray, supplicate".

16 For the late Central Asian pronunciation of Western Iranian *-g* following long vowels, see Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, p. 83.

17 Cf. Zieme 1975, p. 45 (375).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

c.

弗	里	悉	德	健	那
fu	li	xi	de	jian	nuo
pi̯uət	lji	si̯ĕt	tək	g'i̯ɐn	nâ

MA XIAOHE compares *fu li xi de* 弗里悉德 (MC **pi̯uət lji si̯ĕt tək*) with *fo yi se de* 佛夷瑟德 (MC **b'i̯uət i si̯ɛt tək*) for *fryštg*, which is found in the Compendium (cf. MIKKELSEN 2006, p. 103b). This is basically correct, but the Middle Chinese form **si̯ĕt* of *xi* 悉 instead of *se* 瑟 (MC **si̯ɛt*) points to the Middle Persian form *prystg* rather than Parthian *fryštg*. However, it is followed by *jian nuo* 健那 (MC **g'i̯ɐn nâ*). *Jian* 健 (MC **g'i̯ɐn*) is known to transcribe the Iranian syllable *gān* in the Dunhuang texts, cf. *e huan jian* 遏換健 (MC **·ât γuân g'i̯ɐn*) transcribing *'rw'ng'n* "soul-work, i.e. gifts" (cf. MIKKELSEN 2006, p. 103a). Therefore, *fu li xi de jian nuo* 弗里悉德健那 represents a plural form *frēstagān* ending with a final vowel: *frēstagān-ā*. The occurrence of a Middle Persian word in the Parthian hymn looks strange, but such a mixture of the two Western Iranian languages is also not uncommon in Turfan texts.[18]

d. After this, a long sequence of characters is repeated twice, but I cannot restore the verse or verses entirely. Let us first see the Middle Chinese forms of the characters:

代	醯	潭	摩	阿	訶	特	伽	稽	羅	縛	居
dai	xi	tan	mo	a	he	te	qie	ji	luo	fu	ju
d'ậi	xiei	d'ậm	muâ	·â	xâ	d'ək	g'i̯a	kiei	lâ	b'i̯wak	ki̯wo

陣	那	南	無	波	耶	特	羅	緩	步	哤
zhen	nuo	nan	wu	bo	ye	te	luo	huan	bu	er
d̂'i̯ĕn	nâ	nậm	mi̯u	puâ	ia	d'ək	lâ	γuân	b'uo	ńźi

It is not at all obvious where each word begins and ends. Of these twenty-three characters the last four, *luo huan bu er* 羅緩步哤 (MC **lâ γuân b'uo ńźi*) sound like *rw'n bwj/bwjyd* [ruwān bōž/bōžēd] "save (my) soul", which is not out of place in this context. I wonder whether *jie lu fu (ju)* 稽羅縛(居) (MC **kiei lâ b'i̯wak (ki̯wo)*) stands for the adjective *kyrbg* [kirbag] "pious". If this idea is correct, the preceding word is likely to be a noun modified by *kyrbg*. This noun ending with a character *qie* 伽 (MC **g'i̯a*) seems to be followed by a Ruf-Alef. As shown by MA XIAOHE *qie* 伽 stands for [kā] in the combination of *qie du shi* 伽度師 standing for [kādūš]. However, as is mentioned above, the Middle Chinese voiced initial **g'-* can represent both *g(ā)* and *k(ā)*. As very few Parthian words end with *-k*, one is induced to reconstruct a noun with the suffix *-ag*. Nevertheless, one cannot still see where it begins. What precedes *qie* 伽

18 Cf. BOYCE 1974, p. 192.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

comprises as many as seven characters and they are unlikely to stand for just one Parthian word.

The first two characters *dai xi* 代醯 (MC **d'ậi xiei*) suggest a pronunciation such as [dah(i/e)], [dāh(i/e)], [dax(i/e)], [dāx(i/e)], etc. Since not many Parthian words begin with *dʾh-* (e.g. *dʾhwʾn* "gift"), *dh-* (e.g. the verb stem *dh-* "to give") and *dyh-* (e.g. *dyh* "village"), it is tempting to reconstruct the first word as an inflected form of the present stem *dh-* "to give". The initial sound *d'-* of the third character *tan* 潭 (MC **d'ậm*) and *dai xi* 代醯 (MC **d'ậi xiei*) may combine to give *dahēd* "give (2nd pl. imperative)". If this is correct, one may suppose that the coda of the character 潭 (MC **d'ậm*), i.e. *-ậm*, should represent *-wm*, an enclitic pronoun of the 1st person sg. Thus 代醯潭摩 (MC **d'ậi xiei d'ậm muâ*) as a whole could stand for *dahēd-um-ā* "Please give (2nd pl.) me", again with the final pleonastic vowel *-ā*. In that case, the noun modified by *kyrbg* is to be seen in *a he te qie* 阿訶特伽 (MC **·â xâ d'ək g'i̯a*), and it should denote the object that one asks Jesus and the other apostles to grant. The most promising candidate for 阿訶特(伽) in this context seems to me to be *āγādag* "wish". *He* 訶 (MC **xâ*) transcribing *γā* is not expected but one may consider a miscopying of *he* 何 or 呵 (MC **γâ*).

So far what I have reconstructed from the twenty-three characters yield the following sequence of words: *dhydwm-ʾ ʾʾgdgʾ kyrbg … rwʾn bwj/bwjyd*. It is almost impossible to restore the rest of the verse(s): *ju zhen nuo nan wu bo ye te* 居陣那南無波耶特 (MC **ki̯wo d̂'i̯ĕn nâ nậm mi̯u puâ ia d'ək*).[19] However, the combination *bo ye* 波耶 (MC **puâ ia*) does remind one of a verb *pʾy-* "to guard, protect", which could be paralleled by *(rwʾn) bwj/bwjyd* "to deliver (one's soul)". In light of the above discussed *men hu mi te* 門乎弥特 transcribing *mnwhmyd*, the character *te* 特 (MC **d'ək*) could represent *-d*; accordingly one may identify *bo ye te* 波耶特 (MC **puâ ia d'ək*) with *pʾy(y)d* [pāyēd]. It is to be noted that in the second occurrence the last character is not *te* 特 but *tuo* 駄 (MC **d'â*), which is more in accordance with the suggested reconstruction. This in turn suggests *bwjyd* rather than *bwj* for *bu er* 步咡 (MC **b'uo ńźi*). What is protected, the direct object of the 2nd pl. imperative verb *pʾyd*, is to be seen in *(ju) zhen nuo nan wu* (居)陣那南無 (MC **(ki̯wo) d̂'i̯ĕn nâ nậm mi̯u*). As with the case with *tan* 潭 (MC **d'ậm*), the coda of the syllable *nan* 南 (MC **nậm*) may again transcribe the 1st sg. enclitic pronoun *-(w)m*. However, I still cannot propose a possible noun.[20]

19 If *ju* 居 **ki̯wo* belongs to the preceding *jie lu fu* 稽羅縛 and combines with it to give *kyrbg*, the object noun is represented by *zhen nuo nan wu* 陣那南無. See note 32 below for this enigmatic transcription.

20 On an apparently unwanted *wu* 無, see n. 31 below.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

3.2. The original hymn in Manichaean script and its Uighur translation

Since the words reconstructed by me are such common terms in the Western Middle Iranian hymnody, it raises the hope that one may really find the original hymn among the hitherto published texts. As it happens, the exact counterpart is attested on one side of M 1367 and was published by WALDSCHMIDT and LENTZ as long time ago as 1933.[21] Here follows the text of M 1367.

M1367

recto[22]

1. ʿyn yk pd (x)[wy](š) nwʾg (in red ink)[23]
2. ʾw bg rwšn zʾʾwr
3. jyryft̲ zʾry ngʾyʾm
4. oo wyndʾm ʾw yyšwʿ
5. qnyg mnwhmyd mry (m)ʾny
6. ʾd fryštgʾn[24] oo dh(yd)wm
7. [ʾʾg](ʾ)dg qyrbg tnwm
8. [pʾy](d ʾ)[wm] r(w)ʾn bwjyd
9. [oo dhydwm](ʾ)ʾgʾd(g) kyrbg[25]
10. [tnwm pʾyd](ʾw)m[rwʾn][26]

21 WALDSCHMIDT/LENTZ 1933, p. 551. In the meantime yet another manuscript M 361 has turned out to contain the same hymn, cf. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2014, pp. 284–285.

22 The verso side contains a Middle Persian hymn, which reads as follows: *0/ [… šʾdyh̲] 1/ ʾc wʾxš ywjdh̲r 2/ ʾʾyʾd pd nwg nyw mwrwʾ 3/ oo wdyrʾd ʾbr prh̲ ʾwd 4/ wʾxš ʿy ʿyn šhr ʾwd 5/ ʾbr šhryʾr ʿy frwx 6/ oo kw pdyrʾd dyny(w)[j]dhr 7/ ʾwš bwʾ pʾs[bʾn] 8/ ʾwd wynʾrʾg [z]ʾ[mʾg ʾw] 9/ zyhr ʿy j[ʾydʾn]*, cf. WALDSCHMIDT/LENTZ 1933, p. 551, and HENNING 1934, p. 9. It is obvious that the text of the verso side does not help us to reconstruct ll. 10–12 of the *Sijizan*.

23 The reading *(x)[wy](š)* is not certain, but a similar way of indicating a tune is known: *ʿyn pd xwyš nwʾg srʾyy* "Sing this to its own tune", cf. SUNDERMANN 1993, p. 163. WALDSCHMIDT and LENTZ read *k[ ]ny*.

24 In the Chinese transcription the preposition *ʾd* [ad] is not found and *fryštgʾn* is replaced by its Middle Persian equivalent *frystgʾn*. This may be due to corruption of the text transmission, but the exact reason is not clear to me.

25 The gap is restored by me according to the Chinese transcription.

26 What I read *](ʾwm)[* is read by WALDSCHMIDT and LENTZ as *](nwm)[*, which suggests the restoration *[t](nwm)[pʾyd …]*. However, the size of the gap is big enough for more than five letters. Moreover, while *m* is absolutely certain, what they read *(n)* looks more like *d* or the left half of a letter *ʾ* (alif). My restoration is a sheer guess but may get some support from a slight variant of this verse attested in BBB 64–67: *tn pʾyd ʾwm rwʾn bwjyd dhydwm ʾgʾdg qyrbg.*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

As Boyce states in her catalogue, the Uighur translation is also known.[27] It is encountered in MIK III 200 I (T II D 169, I), recto, ll. 11–16. Incidentally, this comes from the same double folio as So 14411. I here cite Clark's new text and translation.[28]

11. pγ rwšn z-ʾwr ẕ-yryβt nwʾk pʾštʾ[29]
12. tnkry yrwq kwyčlwk pylkʾ-kʾ ylvʾrʾr pyz oo
    täŋri yaruk küčlük bilgäkä yalvarar biz oo
13. ʾwytnwr pyz kwyn ʾʾy tnkry-kʾ o yʾšyn tnkry
    ötnür biz kün ay täŋrikä o yašïn täŋri
14. nwm qwty o mrmʾny pryšty-lʾrqʾ o qwt qwlwr
    nom kutï o mar manï firištilärkä o kut kolur <biz>
15. tnkrymʾ o ʾtʾwyz-wmwz-ny kwyz-ʾdynk o ʾwyz-wtwmwz-ny
    täŋrim-a o ätüzmüzni küzätiŋ o üzütümüzni
16. bwšwnk o **qyv qwlwr pyz o yrwq tnkry-lʾrk**ʾ o
    bošuŋ o **kïv kolur biz o yaruk täŋrilärkä** o
17. **ʾʾdʾswz-yn twrʾlym** o **ʾwykrynč-lykyn**
    adasuzïn turalïm o **ögrinčligin**
18. **ʾrʾlym** o
    ärälim

"Sing, you (pl.), to the melody of *bag rōšn zāwar žīrīft*!
We beseech and we pray to God, Light, Power, Wisdom.
<We> ask for the divine blessing of the Sun and Moon Gods,
of the God(dess) of Lightning, and of the Glory of the Doctrine
(i. e. Wahman), Lord Mani, and the Angels.
O! My God! Deign to protect our bodies, and deign to liberate our souls!
We ask for the divine blessing of the Gods of Light.
May we live safe from danger! May we be joyful!"[30]

The discovery of the original text and its Uighur version indicates that my reconstruction of the phonetically transcribed hymn is correct, and that (居)陣那南無, the part which has remained unreconstructed, corresponds to *tnwm* [tanum] "my body". Out of four or five characters (*ju) zhen nuo nan wu* (居)

27 Cf. Boyce 1960, p. 70.
28 Clark 2013, pp. 194–200, Text B. One of the editors draws my attention to Clark's idiosyncratic transcription *küčlük*, which would be transcribed as *küčlüg* by the majority of scholars.
29 For this line, I cite Reck's text and translation (2006, p. 122), which are different from Clark's. Cf. also Durkin-Meisterernst 2014, pp. 137b–138a, 127a, 133b. Clark reads as *βaγ rōšn zāwar žīrīftnuŋ pāš tan* and translates "Sing, you, of God, Light, Power, Wisdom!".
30 The boldfaced part has no counterpart in the Parthian hymn.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

陣那南無 (MC *(kiwo) ɗ'iěn nâ nậm miu) only *nan* 南 (MC *nậm*) appears to be correct, the others being either a miscopying or a corruption of the original. Nevertheless, I cannot see what the original transcription looked like, nor can I imagine what has happened in the process of transmission.[31] Since the Xiapu texts seem to preserve numerous phonetically transcribed hymns, the recognition that such a radical and unexpected corruption could happen is discouraging for those who would like to reconstruct them.

4. Columns 10–12

As mentioned above, the second hymn begins in column 10. For the sake of convenience, I repeat columns 10–12 here:

10.	阿	哺	哩	特	菩	和	末	羅	摩	尼	里	[口+在]
	a	fu	li	te	pu	he	mo	luo	mo	ni	li	zai
	·â	piuət	lji	d'ək	b'uo	γuâ	muât	lâ	muâ	ńi	lji	dz'ậi

11.	伽	度	師	伽	度	師	勿	那	阿	羅	緩	那
	qie	du	shi	qie	du	shi	wu	nuo	a	luo	huan	nuo
	g'ia	d'uo	ṣi	g'ia	d'uo	ṣi	miuət	nâ	·â	lâ	γuân	nâ

12.	菩	*沙	遮	伊	但	伽	度	師
	pu	sha	zhe	yi	dan	qie	du	shi
	b'uo	ṣa	tśia	·i	d'ân	g'ia	d'uo	ṣi

In the final section of the *Sijizan*, one finds a few combinations of characters with which we are already familiar: *mo luo mo ni* 末羅摩尼 for [mār-ā mānī], *qie du shi* 伽度師 (three times) for [kādūš], and *luo huan* 羅緩 for [ruwān]. The last term is preceded by *a* 阿 (MC *·â*) and followed by *nuo* 那 (MC *nâ*); this *nuo* 那 is likely to represent a Ruf-Alef following [ruwān]. The character *a* 阿 stands for [a/ā], which is not to be equated with a Ruf-Alef, because this is already represented by the preceding *nuo* 那. If one considers the fact that in the Dunhuang texts an Iranian initial *r-* is always preceded by a character beginning with a

31 I am grateful to Dr. MA XIAOHE for drawing my attention to the fact that 南無 is an ordinary Buddhist expression of everyday use transcribing Sanskrit *namo* "homage". 無 is likely to have been introduced when the entire hymn became incomprehensible to the local Manichaeans. See a similar case with *qie du shi luo po suo* 伽度師囉婆娑 discussed below. Professor SIMS-WILLIAMS draws my attention to the possibility that the coda of *ju* 居 (MC *kiwo*) represnts the preposition *'w*. Meanwhile I came across in one Xiapu text entitled *xing fu zu qing dan ke* 興福祖慶誕科 another *zhen nuo* 陣那, which is followed by *yu er te he luo* 喻哖特核囉 (MC *iu ńźi d'əak γək lâ*). The combination no doubt represents *dyn ywjdhr* [dēn-(ā) yōždahr]. Accordingly, one may suspect that the original transcription such as *dan nuo nan* 鄲那南 (MC *tân nâ nậm*) was replaced by 陣那南 just by mistake.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

glottal stop, e.g. *a luo suo di fu duo* 阿羅所底弗哆 (MC *·*â lâ ṣi̯wo tiei pi̯uət tâ*) for *r'štyft*,[32] it is plausible that 阿羅緩那 transcribes [ruwān-ā].[33]

Of the remaining characters *a fu li te* 阿咈哩特 (MC *·*â pi̯uət lji d'ək*) can easily be reconstructed as *āfrīdag*. The next word *pu he* 菩和 (MC **b'uo γuâ*) is likely to represent *bawā* (2nd/3rd sg. subj. of *bw-* "to become").

It is difficult to understand the remainder of column 10, *li zai* 里[口+在] (MC **lji dz'ại*), which must be an independent word, because what follows is 伽度師伽度師 *kādūš kādūš*. It may be a miscopying, but I am not certain. In another phonetically transcribed hymn in the Xiapu texts one comes across *fu li zai de jian* 弗哩[口+在]德健 (MC **pi̯uət lji dz'ại tək g'i̯ɛn*, which most likely corresponds to *frēstagān*.[34] In my opinion *li zai* 里[口+在] is a corruption of **fu li zai de* 弗里[口+在]德 representing *frēstag*, or even of **fu li zai de lu shen* 弗里[口+在]德盧詵 for *frēstag rōšn*. It should be noted that this section of the *Sijizan* is not in Parthian but in Middle Persian. I think this hypothesis of mine gets some support from another Xiapu text reproduced by Chen/Lin (2009, p. 382, fig. 34). There one reads as follows: *a fu li te pu he mo luo mo ni fu li xi de lu shen* 阿弗里特菩和末羅摩尼拂里悉德盧詵. The first half is identical with column 10 of the *Sijizan* and the latter half *fu li xi de lu shen* 拂里悉德盧詵 can easily be reconstructed as *frēstag rōšn*.[35]

As I mentioned above, of the following six characters *wu nuo a luo huan nuo* 勿那阿羅緩那 (MC **mi̯uət nâ ·â lâ γuân nâ*), the last four *a luo huan nuo* 阿羅緩那 transcribe *ruwān-ā*. The Middle Chinese pronunciation as reconstructed by Karlgren may suggest that *wu nuo* 勿那 should stand for *man-ā* "my", the two words combining to give *man-ā ruwān-ā* "my soul". However, this assumption confronts us with a serious difficulty, because the initial consonant of *wu* 勿 (MC **mi̯uət*) is expected to have become a labiodental fricative *v-* by the time the original of the hymn was composed in the Tang period.[36] Nevertheless, the exact pronunciation of the Chinese characters employed for the phonetic transcriptions and accordingly the system of transcription of the Xiapu texts as a whole are still not entirely clear. For example, as we have seen, *fu he* 匐賀 (MC **b'i̯uk γâ*) of column 1 represents *bg'* [baγā] and in this case the character fu 匐 (MC **b'i̯uk*), of which the initial was to become a labiodental fricative, is employed for rendering the initial voiced stop [b]. Thus, it is not out of the question to reconstruct [man-ā] for *wu nuo* 勿那.

32 On this point see Yoshida 1986, p. 5.

33 One may also refer to *'rw'n*, a variant form of *rw'n* attested in Turfan texts.

34 Cf. Lin 2012a, p. 401, where he cites another phonetic hymn from one of the Xiapu texts. I must confess that the phonetic hymn cited by Lin Wushu is largely incomprehensible to me.

35 Another attestation of this same phrase is encountered in the text reproduced by Yang Fuxue (2011, p. 143). It reads as follows: *a fu li de pu he mo luo mo ni fu li zai de lu shen* 阿咈哩特菩和呣囉摩尼咈哩[口+在]特嚧詵.

36 Cf. Pulleyblank 1984, pp. 68–69. In the Dunhuang texts the Middle Chinese labiodental initials transcribe either [f] or the postvocalic *b*, which was pronounced as a fricative sound [β], cf. *e wu* 阿勿 (MC **·â mi̯uət*) for *'br* [abar > aβar].

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Even more difficult is *pu sha* 菩*沙 (MC **b'uo ṣa*). The reading of *sha* 沙 is not absolutely certain, but the character is very common in phonetic transcriptions of not only Iranian but also Sanskrit terms. Not knowing how to reconstruct it, I again assume the two characters to be a corruption of a longer sequence, such as **pu he sha di* 菩和沙地 (MC **b'uo γuâ ṣa d'i*). This could be the transcription of *bwʾšʾd(yẖ)* "May (my soul) be joyful!" or "May there be joy (for my soul)!"[37]

The penultimate combination *zhe yi dan* 遮伊但 (MC **tśi̯a ·i d'ân*) transcribes a pronunciation such as **čāidān/čaidan*. This would be spelled **cʾyδʾn* in Sogdian script and in fact such a word is attested once. Sims-Williams discovered the word in a manuscript belonging to the Russian collection and proposed to translate it as "Bema".[38] He identified the word with Parthian *jʾydʾn* once discussed by Henning, who derived the word from Chinese *zhai tan* 齋壇 (MC **tṣai d'ân*) "altar".[39] Since *jie yue jie* 戒月結 "conclusion of the fast month" in line 9 precedes the hymn in question, the word denoting Bema is not out of context; the Manichaean Bema festival in fact follows a month of fasting. However, a word of Chinese origin is not expected in a hymn which is otherwise wholly in Middle Persian; a Middle Persian word with a similar pronunciation is wanted here. One can easily think of *jʾydʾn* [ǰāidān] "eternal(ly)", which is quite common in Middle Persian hymns. Possibly when this hymn was first transcribed in Tang times, the transcriber found it difficult to reproduce an affricate consonant [ǰ], which was foreign to Middle Chinese. Having no exact fit, he was forced to select an approximation, in this case its voiceless counterpart [č]. Incidentally, the same word is transcribed as *re yi lan* 喏夷囉 (MC **ńźi̯a i lân*) in the Dunhuang *Hymnscroll* at a time when the initial consonant of *re* 若 (MC **ńźi̯a*) was pronounced with a voiced fricative [ž]. On this point see *pu er* 步咘 above standing for *bwjyd* [bōžēd].

5. The system of transcription: Xiapu texts as compared with those from Dunhuang

In one of the Xiapu texts Mani's mother Maryam is named *mo yan* 末艷 (MC **muât i̯äm*),[40] whereas she is called *man yan* 満艷 (MC **muân i̯äm*) in the Compendium. Obviously *mo yan* 末艷 is more accurate transcription and *man yan* 満艷 seems to have been modified to make the name more attractive

37 While the assumption that 菩 is corrupted from *pu he* *菩和 seems to be supported by several occurrences of the combination in the various Xiapu texts cited above, the restoration of *sha di* *沙地 is a sheer guess. However, the sequence does appear twice in another phonetic hymn found in a Xiapu text cited by Lin (2012a, p. 401), though the contexts are not comprehensible to me.

38 Cf. Sims-Williams 1981, pp. 236–237.

39 Cf. Henning 1945, p. 155.

40 Cf. Yuan 2011, p. 167.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in Chinese.[41] As a whole the phonetic transcriptions found in the Xiapu texts are similar to what we find in the Dunhuang texts but not identical with them. Some peculiarities of the Xiapu forms may be mentioned briefly.

1. In the Dunhuang texts the Chinese initial nasal *n-*, which was de-nasalized to become *nd/d-*, is sometimes employed to transcribe the Iranian voiced stop *d*, e.g. *nuo hu he* 那呼和 (MC **nâ xuo γuâ*) for *d'hw'n* [dāhwān] "gift" (Mikkelsen 2006, p. 106), while the instance of de-nasalization has not been met with in the Xiapu materials, e.g. 弗里悉德健那 for *frystg'n'* [frēstagān-ā]. Cf. also my restoration of *dai xi tan mo* 代醯潭摩 (MC **d'ại xiei d'ạm muâ*) as [dahēd-um-ā]. This peculiarity obviously indicates that the Xiapu texts are slightly earlier than the Dunhuang ones. It is also noteworthy that in a few cases like *fu he* 匐賀 representing [baγā], even labiodentalization does not occur.[42]
2. The Iranian postvocalic *d*, which was pronounced as a fricative, is transcribed with characters beginning with *l-* in the Dunhuang texts, but with those with initial voiced stop *d'-* (in Karlgren's system) in the Xiapu manuscripts: *qie du shi* 伽度師 vs. *qie lu shi* 伽路師 for *k'dwš* [kādūš] "holy". Cf. also *zhe yi dan* 遮伊但 (MC **tśị̈a ·i d'ân*), which I proposed to reconstruct as [ǰāidān], as compared with *re yi lan* 喏夷嚂 (MC **ńźị̈a i lân*). A parallel phenomenon is observed in the case of the postvocalic *b*, on which see below my discussion of the Xiapu transcription of Aramaic *l'b'* "to the father".
3. In the Xiapu texts one often finds Iranian forms followed by a pleonastic vowel *-ā*. Examples are numerous. This peculiarity may explain a curious designation of Jesus in the Xiapu texts, which is often spelled *yi shu he* 夷数和 (MC **i ṣị̈u γwâ*) instead of simple *yi shu* 夷数. In my opinion the extra vowel of *yišō-w-ā* later came to be regarded as a part of his name.[43] One may also note that *yyšw'*, the form with a "Ruf-Alef", is actually attested in the Turfan texts, cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, p. 376a.
4. Iranian words beginning with *r-* are mostly not preceded by an extra character representing the prothetic vowel, while such spellings are attested without exception in the Dunhuang texts. One good example is *lu shen* 盧詵 (Xiapu) vs. *wu* (MC **·uo*) *lu shen* 烏盧詵 (Dunhuang) for *rwšn* [rōšn].
5. Obviously, we are forced to suppose relatively numerous copying errors and corruptions due to the long period of handing down the phonetically transcribed hymns, which must have made no sense for the local Manichaeans.

41 As it stands, *mo yan* 末艷 means "end-beautiful" while *man yuan* 滿艷 "full-beautiful".
42 In most cases, however, the development to a labiodental fricative is observable, e.g. *lu fu yi luo* 盧縛逸羅 (MC **luo b'ị̈wak ị̈ět*) transcribing [rufaēl].
43 Differently, Lin 2012b, pp. 115–117.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

In a personal communication, Dr. MA XIAOHE recently drew my attention to one Xiapu text entitled *xing fu zu qing dan ke* 興福祖慶誕科 and I noticed that the recto of folio 8 contains the same hymn as the second phonetic hymn of the Dunhuang *Hymnscroll* once studied by myself.[44] A detailed comparison of the two texts may be expected to reveal peculiarities of the phonetically transcribed hymns of the Xiapu texts. As an example we may take the first verse in Aramaic: *k'dwš l'b'* "Holy to the Father". In the Xiapu text it reads *qie du shi luo po suo* 伽度師囉婆娑 (MC **g'i̯a d'uo ṣi lâ b'uâ sâ*) while its Dunhuang counterpart is *qie lu shi luo wang* 伽路師羅[口+亡] (MC **g'i̯a luo ṣi lâ mi̯wang*). A miscopying or corruption of the original peculiar to the Xiapu texts is also to be noticed: an extra character *sa* 娑 was added to the last character 婆 by an inadvertent scribe who may have been thinking of the common Buddhist spell *suo po he* 娑婆訶 (MC **sâ b'uâ xâ*) standing for *svāhā*.

6. Conclusion

I now summarize my study by giving the proposed reconstruction in Middle Iranian spelling verse by verse.[45]

四寂讚 送佛用 "Praise of the Four Entities of Calmness. (Used) for sending of the Buddhas"

1. 奥 和 匐 賀 盧 詵 嵯 鶻 囉 唎 哩 弗 哪 嵯 里 能 阿 淡
   ao he fu he lu shen cuo hu luo er li fu nuo cuo li neng a dan
   'w' bg' rwšn' z'wr' jyryft' z'ry *ng'y'm'
   ō-w-ā baγ-ā rōšn-ā zāwar-ā žīrīft-ā zārī niγāyām-ā

   To God, Light, Power, (and) Wisdom, we pray humbly.

2. 渾 湛 摩 和 夷 数 謹 你 門 乎 弥 特 末 羅 摩 尼 弗 里 悉 德 健 那
   hun dan mo he yi shu jin ni men hu mi te mo luo mo ni fu li xi de jian nuo
   wynd'm' 'w' yyšw knyg mnwhmyd mr' m'ny frystg'n'
   wendām-ā ō-w-ā yišō kanī(g) manōhmēd mār-ā mānī frēstagān-ā

   We give praise to Jesus, Maiden, (and) Light-Nous, Mar Mani (and) the apostles.

44 Cf. YOSHIDA 1983. Incidentally, the Middle Persian counterpart of the four aspects of the Father of Greatness is found in this hymn. It reads as follows: *yi zai lu shen su lu he xi* 夷[口+在]嚧[口+先]蘇路和醯 (MC **i dz'ə̂i luo ṣi̯ɛn suo luo γwâ xiei*), while the Dunhuang equivalent is *yi sa wu lu shen zuo lu yu yu xi* 夷薩烏盧詵祚路鬱于㔾 (MC **i sât ·uo luo ṣi̯ɛn dz'uo luo ·i̯uət jiu xji*).

45 In the reconstructed text a form preceded by an asterisk (*) indicates that the form in question is not entirely based on the corresponding Chinese characters.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

3. 代 醯 潭 摩 阿 訶 特 伽 稽 羅 縛 居
dai xi tan mo a he te qie ji luo fu ju
dhydwm' 'g'dg' kyrbg
dahēdum-ā āγādag-ā kirbag

Grant me (my) pious wish.

4. 陣 那 南 無 波 耶 特 羅 緩 步 咥
zhen nuo nan wu bo ye te luo huan bu er
*tnwm' p'yd rw'n bwjyd
tanum-ā pāyēd ruwān bōžēd

Guard my body (and) save (my) soul.

5. 代 醯 潭 摩 阿 訶 特 伽 稽 羅 縛 居
dai xi tan mo a he te qie ji luo fu ju
dhydwm' 'g'dg' kyrbg
dahēdum-ā āγādag-ā kirbag

Grant me (my) pious wish.

6. 陣 那 南 無 波 耶 駄 羅 緩 步 咥
zhen nuo nan wu bo ye tuo luo huan bu er
*tnwm' p'yd rw'n bwjyd
tanum-ā pāyēd ruwān bōžēd

Guard my body (and) save (my) soul.

戒月結 "Conclusion of the fast month"

7. 阿 咈 哩 特 菩 和 末 羅 摩 尼 里 [口+在]
a fu li te pu he mo luo mo ni li zai
''frydg bw' mr' m'ny *frystg *rwšn
āfrīdag bawā mār-ā mānī frēstag rōšn

Blessed be Mar Mani, Apostle of Light!

8. 伽 度 師 伽 度 師
qie du shi qie du shi
k'dwš k'dwš
kādūš kādūš

Holy! Holy!

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

9. 勿 那 阿 羅 緩 那 菩 *沙
wu nuo a luo huan nuo pu sha
mnʾ rwʾnʾ *bwʾ *šʾd(yẖ)(?)
man-ā ruwān-ā bawā šād(īh)

May my soul be joyful!

10. 遮 伊 但 伽 度 師
zhe yi dan qie du shi
jʾydʾn kʾdwš
ǰāydān kādūš

(Be) holy eternally!

As I mentioned above, our Chinese colleagues refer to a number of other phonetically transcribed hymns attested amongst the unpublished Xiapu texts. I hope this study of mine will contribute to the elucidation of these as yet unpublished hymns.

Bibliography

BOYCE, M. 1960: *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichean Script in the German Turfan Collection*. Berlin.

— 1974: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Leiden (Acta Iranica 9).

CHEN JINGUO 陳進國/LIN JUN 林鋆 2009: "明教的新發現：福建霞浦摩尼教史迹辨析 Mingjiao de xin faxian — Fujian Xiapu xian Monijiao shiji bianxi." In: LI SHAOWEN 李小文 (ed.): 不止于藝：中央美院"藝文課堂"名家講演錄 *Bu zhi yu yi — Zhongyang meiyuan "yiwen ketang" mingjia jiangyan lu*. Beijing, pp. 343–389 [in Chinese].

CLARK, L. 2013: *Uygur Manichaean Texts. Texts, Translations, Commentary*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Turcica II).

DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China.* Pt. 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 3).

— 2014: *Miscellaneous Hymns. Middle Persian and Parthian Hymns in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XXXI).

GULÁCSI, Zs. 2008–2009: "A Newly Identified Manichaean Silk Painting of Jesus." In: *Manichaean Studies Newsletter* 23, pp. 4–6.

HENNING, W. B. 1934: "Zum zentralasiatischen Manichäismus." In: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 37/1, pp. 1–11.

— 1937: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1937.10).

— 1945: "The Manichaean Fasts." In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1945.2, pp. 146–164.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Karlgren, B. 1957: *Grammata Serica Recensa.* Stockholm (Reprinted from the Museum of Far Eastern Antuquities, Bulletin 29).

Kósa, G. 2010: "Translating a Vision. Rudimentary Notes on the Chinese Cosmology Painting." In: *Manichaean Studies Newsletter* 25, pp. 20–32.

Kudara, K./W. Sundermann/Y. Yoshida 1997: *Iranian fragments from the Ōtani Collection. Iranian Fragments Unearthed in Central Asia by Ōtani Mission and kept at the Library of Ryūkoku University.* 2 vols. Kyoto (Facsimile Series of Rare Texts in the Library of Ryūkoku University 17).

Lin Wushu 林悟殊 2012a: "明教五佛崇拜補說 Mingjiao wufo chongbau bushu [Additional Explanations of the Cult of the Five Buddhas in the Religion of Light]." In: 文史 *Wen Shi* 2012.3, pp. 385–408 [in Chinese].

— 2012b: "霞浦科儀本《奏教主》形成年代考 Xiapu keyiben 'Zoujiaozhu' xingcheng niandai kao [On the Date of a Ritual Manuscript from Xiapu: 'Memorial to the religion's founder']." In: 九州學林 *Jiuzhou Xuelin [Chinese Culture Quarterly]* 31, pp. 102–135 [in Chinese].

Ma Xiaohe 馬小鶴 2009: "Remains of the Religion of Light in Xiapu (霞浦) County, Fujian Province." In: 欧亚学刊 *Ou-Ya xuekan [International Journal of Eurasian Studies]* 9, pp. 81–108.

Mikkelsen, G.B. 2006: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China.* Pt. 4: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts in Chinese*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 5).

Pulleyblank, E. 1984: *Middle Chinese. A Study in Historical Phonology*. Vancouver.

— 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.

Reck, Ch. 2006: *Mitteliranische Handschriften*. Teil I: *Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*. Stuttgart [Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XVIII,1].

Sims-Williams, N. 1981: "The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 44, pp. 231–240.

Sundermann, W. 1993: "An Early Attestation of the Name of the Tajiks." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Medioiranica. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990*. Leuven (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 48), pp. 163–171.

Waldschmidt, E./W. Lentz 1926: *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1926.4).

— 1933: *Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten*. Berlin (Extract from: Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1933.13, pp. 480–607).

Yang Fuxue 楊富學 2011: "〈樂山堂神記〉与福建摩尼教—霞浦与敦煌吐魯番等摩尼教文献的比较研究 Leshantang shenji yu Fujian Monijiao – Xiapu yu Dunhuang Tulufan deng Monijiao wenxian de bijiao yanjiu [Leshantang shenji and Manichaeism of Fujian]." In: 文史 *Wen Shi* 2011.4, pp. 135–174 [in Chinese].

Yoshida Yutaka 吉田豊 1983: "Manichaean Aramaic in the Chinese Hymnscroll." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46, pp. 326–331.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

— 1986: "漢訳マニ教文献における漢字音寫された中世イラン語について（上）Kanyaku Manikyō bunken ni okeru Kanjionshasareta Chūsei Irango ni tsuite (Jō) [Remarks on Manichaean Middle Iranian Terms Transcribed in Chinese Script (1)]." In: 内陸アジア言語の研究 *Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 2, pp. 1–15 with tables [in Japanese].

— 2007: "Discovery of Mani Image in Japan." In: *Manichaean Studies Newsletter* 22, pp. 21–24.

— forthcoming: "Middle Iranian Terms in the Xiapu Chinese texts: Four aspects of the Father of Greatness in Parthian." In: S.N.C. LIEU/N.A. PEDERSEN/E. MORANO/ E. HUNTER (eds.): *Manichaeism East and West*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Analecta Manichaica 1).

YUAN WENQI 元文琪 2011: "福建霞浦摩尼教科儀典籍重大發現論證 Fujian Xiapu Monijiao keyi dianji zhongda faxian lunzheng [On a Significant Discovery of Manichaean Ritual Documents from Xiapu (Fujian)]." In: 世界宗教研究 *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu [Studies in World Religions]* 5, pp. 169–180.

ZIEME, P. 1975: *Manichäisch-türkische Texte. Texte, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 5).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Mānīstān „Kloster“ und manichäische Kolophone

Peter Zieme, Berlin

Einleitende Bemerkungen

Werner Sundermanns Ausführungen zum manichäischen Kloster ranken sich um einen hagiographischen Bericht, dem zufolge Mani selbst in einem *m'nyst'n* Zuflucht gesucht habe, als er sich in Ohrmezd Ardašīr aufhielt.[1] Diesen Bericht hatte Sundermann in seinen Kirchengeschichtlichen Texten ediert, wo wir lesen: „in der Stadt Ohrmezd-Ardaxšihr war er [i]m Klostergebäude[2] [verbor]gen (?) [ ]“.[3] Dieses Zeugnis ist bedeutsam, weil es belegt, daß es schon zu Lebzeiten Manis Klöster gab.

Utas hatte Wort und Bedeutung gründlich untersucht[4] und den Widerspruch aufgedeckt, daß es auch bei Abwägung aller Argumente unklar bleibt, ob im Kloster tatsächlich Electi lebten oder nicht. Er kommt zu dem Schluß, daß „a *mānīstān* in Central Asia in later centuries might very well have changed to comprise almost everything except a hospice for *electi*“[5]. Dagegen hatte schon Bang 1925 geschrieben: „denn ein *mānīstān*, dem man die Epitheta ‚heilig, goettlich‘ usw. beilegen darf, kann nur ein Kloster sein“[6]. Leurini vergleicht das Almosenspenden zur Errichtung manichäischer Klöster, wie es in Texten wie M 47 beschrieben wird,[7] mit dem schon im Zoroastrismus üblichen Spenden zum Bau von Tempeln etc.[8] Sie schreibt:

1 Sundermann 2001, S. 290, 388, 434, 551.
2 Mp. m'nyst'n (qdg). Belege bei Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, S. 227a.
3 Sundermann 1981, S. 70, Z. 980–983.
4 Hier seien die etymologischen Erwägungen von Utas (1985, S. 657) erwähnt, wo er *mānīstān* mit dem iranischen *mān* „Haus“ verbindet und *xānaqāh*, den Konvent der Sūfīs, diskutiert. Interessant ist auch der Hinweis auf das von G. Jarring herangezogene osttürkische Kompositum Manaka und Khaneka, worin Utas (1985, S. 658) einen Nachklang von *mānīstān* und *xānaqah* erkennen will.
5 Utas 1985, S. 664.
6 Bang 1925, S. 31.
7 Sundermann 1973, S. 88, Z. 1725–1726.
8 Leurini 2013, S. 270–313. Auf S. 274, Fn. 582 diskutiert sie Asmussens These (1965, S. 260–261), daß die manichäischen Klöster auf buddhistische Vorbilder zurückgehen könnten. In dieser Frage kann man vermutlich keine einseitige Position beziehen, denn der Manichäismus war immer von vielseitigen Einflüssen geprägt.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

> The Manichaean monasteries must be compared to this kind of institutions and more specifically to the Zoroastrian fire-temple, its institutional framework, estate and administration. We possess only one document that allows a comparative analysis capable of giving satisfactory results: the Turkish Uighur *Erlaß*.[9]

Welche Rolle Klöster im Leben der manichäischen Gemeinden spielten, erfahren wir aus altuigurischen Texten des 10. oder 11. Jahrhunderts, die HUANG WENBI (1954) zum ersten Mal zugänglich gemacht hat. Inzwischen sind über die sogenannte „Klosterrolle"[10], ein Text aus dem Wirtschaftsleben der Klöster in der Turfanoase, eine Fülle von Arbeiten entstanden, von denen vor allem TAKAO MORIYASUS Buch über den uigurischen Manichäismus[11] genannt werden muß. Seine Arbeit hat den von mir[12] allenfalls erahnten Wert der Handschrift deutlich hervortreten lassen. Unter Berücksichtigung dieser Klosterrolle und anderer Zeugnisse sieht MORIYASU in den *mānīstān*s tatsächlich bewohnte manichäische Klöster, zumindest für die Periode des Westuigurischen Königreichs im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert.[13]

In der „Preisung der Lichtwelt" werden die Klöster als Wohnungen vorgestellt, was man ja auch durchaus als eine Projektion der irdischen Welt auf die himmlische ansehen könnte. In der chinesischen Hymnenrolle heißt es:

> H 324[14]
> Die heiligen Scharen sind einmütig und alle in Harmonie,
> Von Anbeginn ohne Aufruhr, nicht über Ruf oder Profit eifernd.
> Gleichermaßen sind sie alle vollkommen,
> Friedlich bewohnen[15] sie die geräumigen und zahlreichen Klöster[16].

Manichäisch-türkische Belege für *manistan*

I. MIK III 198

Von den altuigurischen Zeugnissen ist besonders wichtig die Prachthandschrift[17] MIK III 198 (T II D 171) mit einem Kolophon. ÖZERTURAL[18] und RÖHRBORN[19] sind der Meinung wie auch dezidiert seinerzeit HENNING[20], daß das Buch nicht

9 LEURINI 2013, S. 274–275.
10 Oder „Erlaß", wie LEURINI sie nach MORIYASU (2004) nennt, vgl. LEURINI 2013, S. 424.
11 MORIYASU 2004.
12 ZIEME 1975a.
13 MORIYASU 2004.
14 SCHMIDT-GLINTZER 1987, S. 50. Leider gibt es dazu keine anderssprachliche Parallele.
15 安居 *anju* „to live in peace, live safely" (MIKKELSEN 2007, S. 1a).
16 伽藍寺 *qielan si* „monastery, convent" (MIKKELSEN 2007, S. 101b).
17 RÖHRBORN 2011, S. 161.
18 ÖZERTURAL 2008, S. 62.
19 RÖHRBORN 2011.
20 HENNING 1938, S. 552.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

an dem Ort der Herkunft, also in Dakianusšahri (= Qočo = Gaochang), geschrieben wurde, sondern im Karlukenreich, weil ein im Kolophon gepriesener Herrscher der Čigil genannt wird. Bei allen Argumenten, die dafür zu sprechen scheinen, bleibt es aber doch eine seltsame Sache, daß ein Karlukenherrscher die Herstellung eines manichäischen Buches im Habitus der Turfaner Manichäer beordert, dieses nach Fertigstellung dann auch nach Westen, ins Siebenstromland, gelangt sein soll, wenig später aber wegen der Islamisierung wieder nach Turfan zurückkam, um tausend Jahre später wieder entdeckt zu werden.

Hier soll in erster Linie der Titel des Buches und die Einleitung des Kolophons erörtert werden, soweit es zum Verständnis der erwähnten Klöster notwendig ist.[21] Bei der prächtigen Gestaltung des Blattes mit den unterschiedlichen Tuschfarben wurde auf die Struktur des Inhalts keine Rücksicht genommen, denn die Farben wechseln sich alle 6 Zeilen ab. Das Blatt hatte eine prächtig gestaltete Überschrift, die Wilkens wie folgt beschreibt:

> Beidseitig Verzierungen rechts von der Überschrift erkennbar, von der nur noch die l-Haken erhalten sind; (…) recto ist die grüne Überschrift mit ihren roten Verzierungen abgebrochen, verso ist die rote Überschrift mit ihrer blauen Verzierung ebenfalls fast zerstört.[22]

Eine komplette Wiederherstellung der Überschrift ist nicht möglich, doch ergeben die Buchstabenreste vielleicht folgenden Text (verso + recto): *[… bitil]m[i]š*[23] *b[o]ltı*[24] *[u]l[u]g [e]l[i]g*[25] + *[…]l[…]g […]l[…]* „[… Geschrie]ben wurde (des) [gro]ß[en] [Kö]nigs […]“ (Abb. 1).

Ausgehend von der Satzeinleitung *y(ä)mä* ist diese Einleitung[26] in drei Abschnitte gegliedert:

1. (1–2) *y(ä)mä ulug elig äzrua t(ä)ŋri atıŋa* „Nun, im Namen des Großen Königs, des Gottes Zurvān!“ Schon die äußerliche Gestaltung macht es unwahrscheinlich, daß man diesen Teil als zum folgenden Satz zugehörig rechnen darf.
2. (3–10) *y(ä)mä agazlanmıš boltı [ulu]g ögrünčün, y(ä)mä bitilm[iš] boltı agır s(ä)vinčin, y(ä)mä amtı tükäl türlüg etigin bitilmiš boltı [ulu]g yeg[äd]mäkin utmakın bo […] türkčä t(ä)ŋridäm u[lug] nom bitig* „Und verkündet[27]

21 Eine neue Gesamtedition legt demnächst T. Moriyasu vor, vgl. Moriyasu 2014.
22 Wilkens 2000, S. 137, Nr. 124. Özertural erwähnt die Überschrift gar nicht.
23 Vgl. die Schreibung von *bitilmiš* in Zeile 7.
24 Vgl. die Schreibung von *boltı* in Zeile 2.
25 Vgl. die Schreibung von *ulug elig* in Zeile 1.
26 Die Interpunktion, zweimal zwei blaue Kreise mit roter Innenausmalung, verdeutlicht, daß ein erster Abschnitt, eine Art Einleitung, vorliegt.
27 Wie von Le Coq (1911, S. 25, Z. 3. Ableitung von *agız* „Mund“) möchte ich doch lieber bei der alten Übersetzung „aussprechen“ oder „verkünden“ bleiben. Zwar ist die Annahme, daß der Beginn der Aufzeichnung gepriesen wurde, nicht ausgeschlossen, aber die Parallelsetzung des Buches am Ende von II mit der Göttlichen Weisheit am Ende

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

in [groß]er Freude und geschrieben in starker Ekstase und jetzt mit vollkommener Ausstattung geschrieben[28] wurde im großen[29] Siegesbewußtsein[30] dieses […][31] türkische[32] göttliche g[roße] Lehr-Buch,“[33]

3. (10–20) *kim y(ä)mä bar[ča äg]sük tolu ärüš üküš türlüg ažun (?) üzütlärig odguruglı, köŋülüg ačıglı y(ä)mä kögüzüg y(a)rutuglı köni kertü aŋlag törülüg üč üdki ad(ı)rtlag ödürtlüg yörüglüg, tirig öz berigli y(a)ruk t(ä)ŋri yeriŋä tägürdäči, nošda tataglagrak t(ä)ŋridäm bilgä bilig* „das auch al[le mangel]haften[34] und vollen, in vielerlei[35] Existenzen (?) (seienden) Seelen erweckende, die Herzen öffnende, die Brust erleuchtende, die wahre und richtige Verständnisrichtschnur[36] habende, die unterscheidende und differenzierende Deutungen der Drei Zeiten habende, die das Lebendige Selbst verleihende, die in das lichte Götterland führende süßer als das Himmelselixier seiende göttliche Weisheit ist.“[37]

---

von III macht das „Verkünden“ wahrscheinlicher. Man erkennt, daß das Buch und die Göttliche Weisheit identisch sind. Das spiegelt wahrscheinlich auch das Anliegen Manis wider, denn seine Lehre ist die Offenbarung der Göttlichen Weisheit.

28 Da im altuigurischen Text dasselbe Verb verwendet wird, belasse ich es hier auch bei „geschrieben“.

29 Die wahrscheinlichste Emendation ist die zu *ulug*, wie schon von Le Coq angenommen hatte. Özertural hat keine Ergänzung vorgeschlagen.

30 Altuig. *ye[gä]dm[ä]k utmakın* (so trotz ’wytm’q̈y-n, einen ähnlichen Fall gibt es sogar in manichäischer Schrift: ’wytlyy für *utlı* in M III Nr. 1, III Seite b verso 2). Wegen *yegädmäk*, das mit *utmak* eine stabile Verbindung eingeht, ist die Interpretation als *uy(a)tmakın* (so Özertural) sehr unwahrscheinlich, auch gegen Clauson (1972, S. 269).

31 Leider habe ich für diese Lücke keine Ergänzung.

32 Als Sprachbezeichnung kommt *türkčä* neben *türk tili, türk uygur tili, uygur tili* oder *uygurča* am häufigsten vor. Ich denke, man kann die Buchstaben č’ (Abb. 2) eindeutig erkennen. Auch in einem anderen manichäischen Text wird diese Bezeichnung verwendet (M II 10 u. 1: *adınčıg türkčä bašik*). Sie war nicht auf manichäische Texte beschränkt, denn es gibt 13 Belege in buddhistischen Schriften sowie einige in den syrisch-türkischen Grabinschriften.

33 Özertural 2008, S. 77: „[Diese Lehrschrift] wurde im Namen des Großen Herrschers, des Gottes Äzrua, mit großer Freude begonnen, und sie wurde mit großer Begeisterung geschrieben. Und jetzt ist sie in Bescheidenheit (Scham) mit verschiedenartigem Schmuck geschrieben wurden, diese … [genannte] göttliche, heilige, große (?) … Lehrschrift, das heißt die göttliche Weisheit, süßer als Nektar, die … voll und [mit] sehr verschiedenartigen … die Seelen erweckt, das Herz erleichtert und die Brust (das Denken) erhellt, die richtige und wahre Grundsätze (Hend.) [hat], die eine klare (Hend.) Deutung über die Drei Zeiten [hat], die den lebendigen Geist (das Leben) gibt, die in das lichte Götter-Land hinführen wird.“

34 Die Lesung *[äg]sük* ist nicht ganz sicher.

35 Übersetzung für *ärüš üküš türlüg*.

36 So für *aŋlag törü*.

37 Die verschiedenen Attribute werden durch -{(X)glı} (viermal), +{lXg} (zweimal), -{dAčI} (einmal) differenziert. Damit soll die Struktur des Satzes übersichtlicher gestaltet werden. Alle genannten Eigenschaften der Göttlichen Weisheit kommen damit auch dem Buch zu. Im Verständnis des Autors dieses Kolophons lag also ein grundlegendes Werk über die Göttliche Lehre vor.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Soweit zum Anfang dieses Kolophons, der das Buch ausführlich preist. Die wenigen Reste des Buches selbst gestatten nicht, weder eine klare Aussage zum Inhalt zu treffen noch zu sagen, ob es eine Übersetzung war oder nicht. Unter Hinweis auf *türkčä* neige ich zu der Ansicht, daß es sich um die eigenständige Arbeit eines uigurischen Manichäers handelt. Aber beweisen läßt sich das nicht!

Es folgen dann Angaben zu Zeit und Ort der Entstehung des Buches wie in einem normalen Kolophon. Die erste Zeitangabe nennt ganz pauschal nur einen glücklichen Zeitpunkt:

> (20–24) *ädgü üdkä koluka, y(ä)mä irülüg ädgü künkä, y(ä)mä alkatmıš ayka, y(ä)mä yegädmiš kutlug yılka*
> „Und zu einer guten Zeit und Stunde, und an einem guten Tag mit einem (guten) Omen, und im gesegneten Monat, und im siegreichen und charismatischen Jahr.“

Der nächste Passus birgt zahlreiche Schwierigkeiten:

> (24–26) *y(ä)mä ögütmiš alkatmıš črk twrk uluš argu t(a)las kögüz ičintä*
> „Und in der Brust (= im Zentrum?), die (das) gepriesene und gelobte Reich der Gemeinden und Türken (wie auch) Argu und Talas (umfaßt).“[38]

Es dürfte sicher sein, daß „Brust“ hier in übertragener Bedeutung gebraucht ist, am ehesten wohl im Sinne von „Zentrum“.

Ein schwieriges Wort ist crk. Von Le Coq übersetzte es durch „kriegerisch“, Özertural nahezu identisch als „kampfbereit“, doch die Schreibung von *čärig* ohne jeglichen Vokal ist verdächtig. Auch das Wort adjektivisch zu übersetzen scheint mir nicht möglich zu sein, denn in der Regel bezeichnet es das Heer, die Soldaten, die Truppe etc.[39] Eine völlig andere Lösung bietet sich an, wenn man crk als Entlehnung von mp./parth. crg „pasture, grazing, flock“[40] annimmt. Ähnlich in seiner Bedeutung ist mp.T *hanzaman*, parth. *anǰaman* „Gesamtheit der Electen eines kleineren Bezirks“, beeinflußt durch syr. *marʿīṭā* „meadow, herd, diocese“. Wichtig ist vor allem in diesem Zusammenhang eine Passage im Bet- und Beichtbuch: crg ʾnjmn u mʾnyst̲ʾn „(samt ihren) Sprengeln, Konventen und Klöstern“[41], vor allem auch, weil uns hier sogleich der zentrale Begriff des Beitrags begegnet. Dieselbe Bedeutungsübertragung kommt auch in den christlichen Texten vor, und im Deutschen ist „Herde“ und „Gemeinde“ immer noch dasselbe. Wenn man diese Bedeutung auf alttürkisch *ögür* und *sürüg*, zwei Wörter für „Herde“, überträgt, kann man vermuten, daß auch das eine oder andere, hier aber *sürüg*, für die „Gemeinde, Kongregation“ gebraucht werden konnte. Ein Beweis dafür findet sich unter den christlich-türkischen Grabinschriften

38 Özertural 2008, S. 78: „im Herz [lies: Herzen] des gepriesenen, gelobten, kampfbereiten (?) türkischen Stammes Argu-Talas“.
39 User 2009, S. 310 (asker).
40 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, S. 126a.
41 Henning 1936, S. 26, Z. 275; vgl. S. 109: „Weide, Herde; Gemeinde, Kirche, Diözese“.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

aus Quanzhou (Zaytun). Dort heißt es in einem Epitaph von 1305[42] (Z. 2), wo drei Datierungen genannt werden:

1. nach der seleukidischen Ära: *ʾlksndrws elig han sakıšı yıl miŋ altı yüz on altıta* „Zeitrechnung des Königs Alexander: im Jahr 1616",
2. *tavgač sakıšı loo yılı onunč ay on altı kečäsi* „chinesische Zeitrechnung: Drachen-Jahr, zehnter Monat, Nacht des Sechzehnten",
3. *sürüg sakıšı yıl tokuz ay on iki kečäsitä* „Zeitrechnung der Kongregation: Jahr, neun(ter) Monat, in der Nacht des Zwölften".[43]

Das ist allerdings das einzige Beispiel für eine dreifache Datierung. Da im dritten Fall der Zeitpunkt gegenüber den beiden anderen Datierungen, die den 16. Tag nennen, um 4 Tage früher liegt, könnte es sich eventuell um den Tag der Aufbahrung gehandelt haben.

Auch twrk ist schwierig, denn sonst ist *türk* mit y (twyrk) geschrieben. Trotz dieser graphischen Abweichung ist hier wohl das Wort *türk* gemeint.

Faßt man crg twrk als parallele Einheiten im Sinne von „(manichäische) Gemeinden und (ganz allgemein) Türken" auf, aus dem das Reich *(uluš)* besteht, könnte man weiter folgern, daß *argu talas* als besondere Region genannt wird, weil zu ihr eine herausragende Beziehung bestand, die vielleicht daraus resultierte, daß sie gerade zur Zeit der Niederschrift als eine neue Region hinzugekommen ist. Damit ist die komplizierte These der Wanderung der Handschrift von Qočo in das Reich der Karluken und zurück nicht vom Tisch. Wie schon gesagt, ist weitere Forschungsarbeit notwendig.

Nun folgt ein längerer Passus zum Ort:

> (26–36) *y(ä)mä yokaru kodı ilgärü kerü atı ištilmiš y(ä)mä küsi sorulmıš kutlug uluš y(a)raglag altun arugu uluš kašu y(ä)gänk(ä)nt ordu k(ä)nt čigi[l] balık nom kutı t(ä)ŋri-niŋ ornangusı m(a)rdasp(a)nt t(ä)ŋrilärn(i)ŋ otačılıkı arıg y(a)ruk küčlüg frešti-lärn(i)ŋ kongusı arıg turuk süzük manistanlar ičintä*
> „Und in den reinen, geklärten, lauteren *manistan*s – Siedlungsorte[44] des Gottes Nomkutı (Großer Nous), Heilorte[45] der Mardaspant-Götter, Wohnorte der reinen lichten mächtigen Engel – des charismatischen Reichs[46] – dessen Name im

42 NIU 2010, S. 236: fälschlich 1304.

43 LIEU 2012, S. 189–190 (einschließlich einer Diskussion von NIUS Lesungen). Alle Lesungen sind nur vorläufig, denn das Original konnte noch nicht eingesehen werden (LIEU vermutet, daß es im Museum für Geschichte in Beijing aufbewahrt wird).

44 Um ihre Deutung von *balıg* zu rechtfertigen, übersetzt ÖZERTURAL (2008, S. 78) *ornangu* durch „Ruheort". Die Grundbedeutung von *ornan-* ist aber „to place or instal oneself; to be placed or installed" (CLAUSON 1972, S. 236a). Natürlich kann man sich auch an einem Aufenthaltsort ausruhen, aber das ist hier nicht gemeint.

45 ÖZERTURAL (2008, S. 78) übersetzt *otačılık* als „Krankenhaus", CLAUSON als „place of healing" (1972, S. 44a).

46 Der Begriff *uluš* ist in erster Linie „Land, Reich" (CLAUSON 1972, S. 152b). Für die Übersetzung als „Stamm" finde ich keine Belege, vgl. USER 2009, S. 241.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Norden, Süden, Osten und Westen gehört und nach dessen Ruhm gefragt wird – und der passenden[47] (Orte wie) dem Altun Argu[48]-Reich[49] und den Städten Kašu, Y(ä)gänk(ä)nt, Orduk(ä)nt und Čigil[50].“[51]

Aus dieser Beschreibung erfahren wir drei herausragende Merkmale des *manistan*s, die bereits von Bang[52] erörtert wurden. So sind diese Klöster 1. der Sitz des Nomkutı, 2. der Mardaspant-Götter und 3. der Engel. Damit soll wohl die besondere Heiligkeit der Klöster verdeutlicht werden. Das schließt aber nicht aus, daß sie auch Wohnorte der Electi gewesen sein könnten.

Es folgen dann zwei Passagen zur Zeit, nach dem historiographisch relevanten Aspekten von (1) Innen/Religion und (2) Außen/Gesellschaft. Zuerst also die Zeitangabe des religiösen Herrschers:

(1) (36–42) *y(ä)mä eli bodunı kutlug ötmiš ötmiš [= utmıš] yegädmiš b[u]lgaks(ı)z ayaglıg tataglag atlag t(ä)ŋri m(a)r w(a)xm(a)n xorxšid [k]ün tugsukd[ı]nkı u[l]ug [mo]žak [ugurın]ta*

47 Geschrieben ist yr’ql’q. Wie Röhrborn (1977–1998, S. 178a) liest Özertural (2008, S. 71) *y(a)rašlag* und übersetzt „friedlich“. Da sich aber beim besten Willen nicht s/š lesen läßt, muß man von *y(a)raglag* „passend“ etc. (vgl. Schönig 2010) ausgehen. So auch schon Erdal 1991, S. 216. Berta führt noch die komanischen Bedeutungen „anständig, tugendhaft“ an (1996, S. 444). Hamilton übersetzt *y.* durch „convenable, approprié, utile, bénéfique“ (1986, S. 259b). Es bleibt zu erwähnen, daß das Nomen *yaraš* „Frieden“ *(yara-š)* nur im Tschagataischen vorzukommen scheint (Radloff 1893–1911, II, S. 115).

48 Merkwürdigerweise in der Schreibung ’’rwqw, nicht ’’rqw.

49 Clauson (1972, S. 152b) schreibt dem Wort *uluš* in der Sprache von Čigil die besondere Bedeutung „Dorf“ zu sowie „among the people of Balāsāǧun, and the towns of Arǧu associated with it, al-balda ‚town‘“. So kommen hier zwei Nuancen zusammen: *uluš* als „Reich, Gesamtreich“ (Westuigurisches Königreich) und *uluš* als „Stadt oder Distrikt“.

50 Es wäre möglich, *balık* (die Punkte des q̈ wurden vergessen, allerdings ist zu bemerken, daß der Schreiber die über dem zweiten -q- von t’t’ql’qr’q̈ gesetzten Punkte getilgt hat, um die richtige Aussprache als -g- anzugeben) auch nur auf Čigil zu beziehen. Özertural (2008, S. 71) wählt einen anderen Weg. Sie will in Zeile 30 (= Özertural 2008, Z. 219) nach Čigil noch knt/*k(ä)nt* lesen. Da am Zeilenende nicht so viel Platz ist (selbst für eine sehr gepreßte Schreibweise von cykylknt reicht er nicht aus, da der Schreiber sehr streng auf den Rand des Schriftspiegels achtete) und der letzte Buchstabe am ehesten nach einem zeilenfüllenden langgestreckten -y- einem finalen -l nahekommt, scheint dies nicht möglich zu sein. Wegen der fehlenden Punkte über dem -q von *balık* liest Özertural *balıg* „verwundet“ und baut eine Theorie über den „verwundeten Gott Nom-kutı“ auf, vgl. Özertural 2008, S. 149–150.

51 Zum Vergleich zitiere ich Özertural 2008, S. 78: „und (in den Städten) Kašu, Yägänk(ä)nt, Ordokänt und Čigilkänt des gesegneten Stammes, des friedliebenden Stammes Gold-Argu, dessen Namen man hört und nach dessen Ruhm man fragt oben (im Norden) und unten (im Süden), vorn (im Osten) und hinten (im Westen), in den [dortigen] reinen (Hend.) und lauteren Klöstern, die der Ruheort des verwundeten Gottes Nom-kutı [sind], die das Krankenhaus der Mardaspant-Götter [sind], die der Wohnort der reinen, lichten und mächtigen Engel [sind]“.

52 Bang 1925, S. 30–33.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

„zu [der Zeit, da] der im Osten seiende[53] Große Možak Mar Wahman Xorxšid[54], dessen Volk glücklich, siegreich[55] und unaufrührerisch[56] (?) ist, der geachtet, lieblich[57] und berühmt ist“[58],

53 Mit der Lesung *kün tugsukdınkı* „im Osten seiend“ entfallen die bisherigen Spekulationen über einen Možak im Land der Tochrı, vgl. zuletzt Röhrborn 2011, S. 165: „Diese Manichäer [Verfasser meint die Manichäer des Siebenstromlandes] verwendeten also die Sprache der östlichen Manichäer, wie man sie aus den Turfan-Dokumenten kennt. Sie scheinen auch unter der Jurisdiktion *des Možak des Tochre-Landes* [Hervorhebung PZ] gewesen zu sein, denn der Kolophon enthält auch einen Segensspruch für diesen Možak.“

54 Zur richtigen Lesung vgl. Moriyasu 2003, S. 92–94. Vergleiche auch Abb. 3. Gegen Moriyasus Lesung argumentiert Özertural (2008, S. 151): „Wir ziehen Le Coqs alte Lesung vor, denn in diesem Wort ist der einzige sicher zu lesende Buchstabe *d*, vor dem offensichtlich eine Lücke zu sehen ist. Das bedeutet, daß der vor *d* stehende Buchstabe nicht ein *y*, sondern aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach ein *z* ist. Moriyasu berücksichtigt diesen Umstand nicht. [Biz yine Le Coq'un eski okuyuşunu tercih ediyoruz. Nitekim bu sözcükte net olarak okunabilen ve kendisinden önce boşluk görülen tek harf sözcüğün sonundaki *d* harfidir. Yani *d* harfinden önceki harfin *y* değil *z* harfi olması kuvvetle muhtemeldir. Moriyasu'nun okuyuşunda bu durum hesaba katılmıyor.]“ Zwar sind die einzelnen Buchstaben etwas versehrt, der Lesung xwrxšy-d steht aber nichts im Wege, weil der Buchstabe *y* in dieser Handschrift meist in seiner finalen Form gebraucht wird, so daß vor dem letzten Buchstaben *d* eine Lücke sein muß. Diese Schreibung entspricht genau der parth./mp. Form, zu Belegen vgl. Sundermann 1979, S. 100.

55 Für das Paarwort *utmıš yegädmiš* (geschrieben: ʾwytmys ʾwytmys [Dittographie, zweimal, letzte Zeile der ersten Kolumne, wiederholt als erstes Wort der ersten Zeile der zweiten Kolumne, irrtümlich ʾwytmys für ʾwtmys] yykʾdmys). Özertural übersetzt das erste *ötmiš* durch „gelehrt“, vermutlich nach dem Paarwort *öt- topul-* „durchdringen“. Es scheint mir aber nicht sicher, daß auch unabhängig von dem, was man an Büchern etc. durchdringt, *ötmiš* „gelehrt“ bedeuten kann.

56 Von Le Coqs Lesung war *brišti*, und Özertural akzeptiert diese Lesung (2008, S. 151). Sie übersetzt „[von den] Engeln geehrt“ und lehnt die nach von Le Coq gemachten Lesungsvorschläge ab, auch den von Wilkens (2000, S. 138): „utmıš *yeg*ädmiš *frešti ulug*“. Vergleiche Abb. 4. In der Tat, ist es schwierig, zwei Wörter zu lesen, *frešti ulug* wäre einfach zu lang. Der erste Buchstabe ist sicherlich p, der dritte ziemlich sicher l. Da bei den folgenden Buchstaben keine Ausschläge nach unten zu sehen sind, kann es sich nur um ʾ, n, q handeln, dann kommt ein Buchstabe mit einer deutlichen Spitze nach unten, so daß nur s in Frage kommt. Der linke Abstrich hat eine ungewöhnliche Rundung, der ein finales z folgt. So kommt man zu der Lesung *b[u]l[g]aks(ı)z*. Wenngleich *bulgak* als Aufruhr belegt ist (vgl. User 2009, S. 305), so kann ich jedoch keinen Beleg für *bulgaksız* finden (auch nicht in Oturakçı 2006).

57 Vgl. gr. ἡδύς.

58 Özertural 2008, S. 78: „des Großen Možak aus dem [Land] Toxri (?), **225–226** dessen Volk (Hend.) glücklich [ist], der gelehrt, **227** erfolgreich (Hend.), [von den] Engeln **228** geehrt, angenehm (?) und berühmt [ist]“. Statt [*kara b*]*o*dunı schlage ich die Lesung *eli bodunı* vor, was aber nicht viel an der Übersetzung ändert. Welche der auf *kutlug* „glücklich“ folgenden Wörter auf das Volk und welche auf den Možak zu beziehen sind, öffnet der Interpretation mehrere Möglichkeiten. Während Özertural nur „glücklich“

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

dann (2) die Angabe der weltlichen Herrscher, von denen vier aufgezählt werden:

1. (42–43) *[a]ltun argu [ta]las kašu xanı* Xan des Reiches Altun Argu Talas und Kašu,
2. (43–44) *ordu čigil k(ä)nt ärkligi* Herrscher der Region Ordu Čigil,
3. (44–45) *ulug twrkdün bašdaŋı* Führer der Großen Türk,
4. (45–46) *čigil arslan el tirgük alp burgučan alp t(a)rxan bäg* der Bäg Čigil Arslan El-tirgük Alp Burgučan Alp Tarxan.

Ich halte es für recht unwahrscheinlich, daß der „kleine Fürst“ (Nr. 4) drei weitere Herrschertitel (1. *xan*, 2. *ärklig* und 3. *bašdaŋ*) führte und daß ihm sozusagen die ganze „türkische Welt“ unterstand. Die größte Schwierigkeit bereitet zugestandenermaßen der „Führer der Großen Türk“ *(ulug türkdün bašdaŋı)*, den Röhrborn nach Özertural als „der große Schützer des Ostens“[59] wiedergibt. Özertural übersetzt twrkdwn/*türkdün* als „Türklerin aşağısında“.[60] Özerturals Lesung *pr(a)sda[nk]ı* ist zu bezweifeln, weil der zweite Buchstabe ein ’, nicht ein -r- ist (vgl. Abb. 5). Demzufolge ist die Herleitung des Wortes aus einem imaginären mp. prsd’k[61] aufzugeben, vielmehr handelt es sich um das genuin-türkische Wort *bašdaŋ / bašdıŋ.*[62]

II. Kolophon zu M III 27

Ein zweiter wichtiger Beleg steht in dem in manichäischer Schrift geschriebenen Kolophon, den von Le Coq in M III Nr. 27 (U 65)[63] veröffentlicht hatte. Die entsprechende Passage lautet:

---

dem Volk zugesteht, möchte ich auch *utmıš yegädmiš* „siegreich“ und *b[u]lgaks(ı)z* „ohne Konfusion, ohne Aufruhr“ auf das Volk beziehen. Erst die dann folgenden Attribute sind auf den Možak gemünzt.

59 Röhrborn 2011, S. 164.

60 Özertural 2008, S. 154. Das soll wohl „die Gegend der Türken“ bedeuten. Sie zitiert Dankoff/Kelly 1982–1985, III, S. 273–274. Die zweite Bedeutung „East“ ist nicht belegt, wahrscheinlich hat die Autorin auf die Legende Bezug genommen, der zufolge die Türken im Osten angesiedelt wurden, Dankoff/Kelly 1982–1985, III, S. 274: Sie wird Ibn al-Gharbī zugeschrieben, der sie wiederum in dem Buch *On the End of Time* des Abī-d-Dunyā gesehen haben will: „God, exalted and mighty, says, ‚I have a host whom I called at-Turk and whom I have set in the East; when I am wroth over any people I will make them sovereign above them‘.“ Vgl. Doerfers Übersetzung (1963–1975, II, S. 487): „Ich habe ein Heer, das ich die Türken nenne und dem ich im Osten seinen Wohnsitz gegeben habe. Wenn ich über ein Volk zornig bin, gebe ich ihnen (den Tü.) Gewalt über es.“ Daraus zu folgern, daß *türk* die Bedeutung „Osten“ hat, erscheint mir doch etwas gewagt.

61 Solch ein Wort ist im Mittelpersischen nicht belegt.

62 Erdal 1991, S. 156: „leader“.

63 Wilkens 2000, S. 257–258 (Kat.-Nr. 278).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

verso 4–8
[bük]ünki[64] *kutlug kün t(ä)ŋri[däm] k[///]*[65] *[m]anistangaru tir(i)ltiŋ(i)zl[är] [yıgılt](ı)ŋ(ı)zlar : t(ä)ŋri*[66] *ma[ni///]*[67] *[////////]r'r kötürür 'yt[///] [/////////]gwz*
„(Am) [heu]tigen charismatischen Tag habt ihr euch zum göttli[chen M]anistan versammelt. Gott Ma[ni] trägt [ ]."

Wenn man diesen Satz auf die zuvor genannten hochrangigen Auditores, die nur pauschal unter den Titeln wie *tarkan*, *kunčuy* etc. genannt sind, bezieht, bedeutet dies, daß es, wie zu erwarten, eine Wechselbeziehung zwischen Electi und Auditores gab, kulminierend in dem vielmals in den Texten thematisierten Angebot der Katechese durch die Electi für die von den Hörern dargebrachten Almosen-Leistungen.

III. Kolophon zum *Irk Bitig*

Im berühmten Kolophon zum *Irk Bitig* aus Dunhuang liegt *manistan*[68] vor, hier in Runenzeichen geschrieben: *t(a)ygüntan m(a)nist(a)ntakı kičig de(n)tar Burwa Xorušid* „Der Junior-Elekte Burwa Xorušid (= Xoršid[69]) im Kloster Taygüntan". Das Vorkommen des Wortes hat bisher oft als Argument dafür gegolten, daß das *Irk Bitig* manichäischen Inhalts sei. Wahrscheinlich hat dieser junge Klosterschreiber einfach für seine älteren Brüder, deren Namen keinerlei Beziehung zum Manichäismus verraten, das Omenbuch geschrieben. Zwar weist prinzipiell das Wort *manistan* auf manichäische Prägung eines Textes hin, doch handhabten die Uiguren offenbar auch religiöse Termini recht großzügig, wofür ein Beispiel das Wort *dendar* ist. RYBATZKI sah in dieser Großzügigkeit eine Möglichkeit, das *Irk Bitig* aus der manichäischen Zuweisung zu lösen, er schreibt: „Moreover, Manichean terms such as *dintar* ‚monk' or *manistan* ‚monastery' can be found also in Buddhist (and Nestorian) sources. For these reasons it is possible to assume that the text originates from another religious environment."[70] Dieser These folgt auch YILDIRIM[71], wobei er die Klammer von „Nestorian" wegläßt und damit den Sachverhalt noch weiter verallgemeinert, obwohl ein Nachweis für einen nestorianischen Ursprung völlig fehlt.

64 Die ganz am Anfang der Zeile stehenden schwarzen Punkte sind als Interpunktion zu betrachten. Sie sind eher ausnahmsweise nicht von roten Kreisen umgeben, eines der üblichen Merkmale manichäischer Handschriften.
65 VON LE COQ las ạ[rïγ], doch kann der erste Buchstabe kein Alif sein.
66 Geschrieben tngdyy, der Punkt über dem r wurde vergessen.
67 VON LE COQ ergänzte zu Ma[ni], aber möglich wäre auch wieder ma[nistan]. Das bleibt unklar.
68 Der einzige Beleg in Runenschrift: mn^{1}ist^{1}n^1, vgl. Abb. 6.
69 Die „neuere" Form des parth./mp. Wortes xwrxšyd, die praktisch schon der neupersischen entspricht, vgl. RECK/SUNDERMANN 1997, S. 8.
70 DE RACHEWILTZ/RYBATZKI 2010, S. 46.
71 YILDIRIM 2013, S. 144.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Jetzt folgen einige weitere Belege für das aus dem Mittelpersischen entlehnte *manistan*[72], wenn wir von einer altuigurischen Lesung ohne die ursprünglichen Langvokale der Gebersprache ausgehen.

IV. Ch/U 7183[73]

In Zeile 05 steht: *[ädg]ü etmiš mani-stan* „[gute]s geschmücktes Manistan“.[74] Da dieser Text auf der Rückseite einer chinesischen Abschrift des *Lotos-sūtra* steht, ist festzustellen, daß nur die Hälfte der Blatthöhe genutzt wurde. Wegen der daraus resultierenden Lücken bleibt unklar, in welchen Kontext das *manistan* des Textes gehört.

V. M 112

Die Rückseite von M 112 etc. enthält einen Text, der als „Zerstörung eines manichäischen Klosters“[75] bezeichnet wurde. Dem Text zufolge hatte man ein „heiliges Stein-Kloster“ *(ıduk taš manistanıg)*[76] (Z. 11) errichtet, das man zerstörte (Z. 15: *manistanıg buzup*), weil man anstelle dessen ein buddhistisches Kloster (*v(a)rhar* < Skt. *vihāra*) baute. Dabei wurde selbst die Ausstattung des Klosters zerbrochen (Z. 16–17: *manistan[nıŋ] etigin y(ä)mä sökü̈p*). Der Verfasser nennt es „dieses heilige große Kloster“ (Z. 17–18¨: *bo ıduk ulug manistannıŋ*), womit er sich zweifellos gegen die Zerstörer wenden wollte.

VI. Ch/U 7081

turpantakı mani[stan] (kopfständig auch in manichäischer Schrift) „das in Turpan befindliche Kloster *(manistan)*“.[77]

VII. U 219 b

Ohne Kontext ist in einem nicht identifizierten Hymnusfragment *manistan* zu rekonstruieren, doch ist weder der Kontext klar noch die Lesung. Die Lesungsvariante *[ ]myšt[äg]*[78], wie von Wilkens vorgeschlagen, hat Clark nicht übernommen.[79]

VIII. MIK III 8453

Auf einem Wandgemälde aus Bäzäklik[80] steht ein stabreimendes Gedicht, das kürzlich Matsui reediert hat.[81] Es handelt sich um einen Lobpreis auf die

72 Zieme 1975b, S. 414.
73 Wilkens 2000, S. 88 (Kat.-Nr. 64).
74 Leider sind keine vollständigen Zusammenhänge erhalten, in jeder Zeile nur einzelne Wörter.
75 Geng/Klimkeit 1985; Moriyasu 2004, S. 174–181; Zieme 2014, S. 244–253.
76 Moriyasu 2004, S. 176: „dieses heilige Außen-Kloster“.
77 Clark 2013, S. 133.
78 Wilkens 2000, S. 296 (Kat.-Nr. 327).
79 Clark 2013, S. 355–356.
80 Matsui 2011.
81 *Ibid.*

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Sukhāvatī, das Reine Land des Amitābha-Buddhismus. Die erste Zeile enthält folgende Wendung: *una bu manisṭan öṣän-tä* „nun in diesem Kloster-Inneren". Das ist ein erster Hinweis darauf, daß der Begriff *manistan* zu einem Lehnwort geworden ist, das über das manichäische Kloster hinaus auch Klöster oder ähnliche Einrichtungen anderer Religionen bezeichnen konnte.

In einem Fragment der Turfansammlung des Instituts Orientalischer Manuskripte der Russischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (SI Kr IV 585 = SI 5283 [Inv. 5339]) begegnet uns ein sehr bemerkenswerter Begriff, der möglicherweise *manistan* erklärt. Dieses einseitig beschriebene Bruchstück macht nicht gerade den Eindruck eines typisch manichäischen Textes. In der zweiten Zeile liest man jedoch eindeutig: *[…]-ta t(ä)ŋri barkı manistan* „in […], Wohnort Gottes *manistan*". Das Wort *bark*, von dem Clauson zurecht bemerkt, ist „hardly ever used by itself"[82], doch Beispiele aus den Inschriften[83] und aus dem *Kutadgu Bilig* aus dem letzten Viertel des 11. Jahrhunderts sind eindeutige Zeugnisse für ein Eigenleben des Wortes.

Hier seien die etymologischen Erwägungen von Utas erwähnt, wo er *mānīstān* mit dem iranischen *mān* „Haus" verbindet und auf *xānaqāh*, den Konvent der Sūfīs, verweist.[84] Interessant ist auch der Hinweis auf das von Jarring erwähnte osttürkische Kompositum Manaka und Khaneka, worin Utas einen Nachklang von *mānīstān* und *xānaqah* erkennen will.[85]

Dokumente über die wirtschaftlichen Aktivitäten der Klöster

Da die Klöster einen wichtigen Platz im Leben der manichäischen Gemeinden einnahmen, gibt es auch einige Zeugnisse über die bisher genannten hinaus, die von den diesbezüglichen Aktivitäten berichten.

1. Der schon eingangs erwähnten Klosterrolle widmete Moriyasu sein Buch über den uigurischen Manichäismus[86]. In diesem Text kommt das Wort *manistan* in folgenden Zusammenhängen vor. „Ärzte, die dem Kloster angehören" (Z. 120), ähnlich auch „Holzarbeiter" (Z. 110). Was dem Kloster oder den Klöstern geliefert wird, wird durch „hinbringen" oder „einbringen" ausgedrückt. In der Rolle werden drei Orte mit Klöstern genannt, und so nimmt es nicht wunder, wenn von den „Gärten und Weingärten" der Klöster die Rede ist (Z. 85–86). In einem Dokument wird die Pacht auf ein Landstück eines Klosters genannt *(manistantakı yer yakası)*.[87]

82 Clauson 1972, S. 359b.
83 Vergleiche auch User 2009, S. 300.
84 Utas 1985, S. 657.
85 Utas 1985, S. 658.
86 Moriyasu 2004.
87 図80 (K7717), vgl. Moriyasu 2004, S. 105–107, 108.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Die in dieser Rolle genannten Gegebenheiten sowie der erwähnte Landbesitz brachten Moriyasu zu der Schlußfolgerung, daß die Realität des im Westuigurischen Königreich praktizierten Manichäismus anders aussah als man nach den Vorschriften für die manichäischen Gebäude, wie sie im chinesischen Kompendium genannt werden, erwarten würde. So kann man nicht ausdrücklich auf Gebäude schließen, in denen Electi auch wohnten.[88] Doch allein in Qočo gab es vermutlich mehr als ein manichäisches Kloster.[89]

2. Ein kleines Buch aus Dakianusšahri (U 303-U 317)[90]

Das Wort *manistan* kommt mehrmals vor, meist aber ohne irgendeinen sicheren Kontext, obwohl es in diesem Buch wohl um die Ordnung in einem Kloster ging. In U 307 lesen wir immerhin: (4) *[…] : ät'özlüg közin [ ]* (5) *[manis]tangaru tersär* „wenn sie (?) mit körperlichen Augen [ ] zum [Manis]tan hin sammeln (?)“. Auf der anderen Seite steht: (5) *ol [m]anistanta bolmazun* „im [M]anistan sollen (sie) nicht sein!“ Das Fragment U 309 b hat: (1) *kam[a]g manis[tan]* „alle Manis[tans]“. Vollständig als Wort bezeugt ist es in U 313c: (6) *[ ]y manistan*.

Weiterleben des Terminus manistan ohne manichäischen Hintergrund

1. Ein Dokument aus der Yuan-Zeit (U 5288), ist eine Liste über Personen, die ein Gefäß voll Alkohol abzugeben haben, darunter ist auch ein gewisser Manistanlıg.[91]

2. Ein Stabreimgedicht, das sicherlich aus der Yuan-Zeit stammt, vermittelt einen Einblick, wieweit die spezifischen Termini vermischt gebraucht werden konnten.[92]

kutlug nom šasın ol üt-tä .
31 *kočo kısıl bašdaš arayadan*
kunsukmak-sız 32 *öglüg käd toyın*
kut täŋri-sin-tä külälgäy
„Zu dieser Zeit werden die charismatische Lehre *(dharma-śāsana)*
(wie auch) das allerbeste Kloster *(āraṇyayātana)* (im) Kočo-Tal
(und) die tüchtigen Mönche von unraubbarem Verstand
vom Gott des Glücks gepriesen werden.“

88 Ausführlicher Moriyasu 2004, S. 75–77.
89 Moriyasu 2004, S. 155; Yoshida 2008, S. 57.
90 Wilkens 2000, S. 110–125 (Kat.-Nr. 95–109).
91 Vgl. Raschmann 2007, S. 32–33 (Kat.-Nr. 13); Matsui 2011, S. 158.
92 SI Kr I 9 (SI 4485 [Inv. 4541]).

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

33 *gumur-a mačid manisṭan*
kurug [ ][93]
34 *kulak [ ]gučı*[94] *bakgučı bolmadın*
kopurg-a 35 *ötläyü enčikgäy ::*
„Kirche, Moschee und Kloster
[bleiben (?)] leer.
Es sind keine das Ohr [Gebrauchende (?)] und Schauende,
die Eulen rufen und werden leise."

3. Alphabetisches Gedicht aus Dunhuang

manu lavkun-nı mantılmış terlär
manisṭanta mu ol nämän kanda
„Man sagt, Manu Lavkun[95] sei beglückt,
ist er im Kloster oder wo sonst ist er?"[96]

Im ersten Beleg handelt es sich um einen Personennamen, sozusagen „Der vom Manistan". Im zweiten Fall zeigt schon das Nebeneinander von syrischem Kloster, arabischer Moschee und manichäischem Kloster, daß hier nur das Wort überlebt hat. Und schließlich im dritten Fall scheint es sich nur noch um eine Ortsangabe zu handeln. Ich denke nicht, daß man aus diesen Beispielen auf einen real existierenden Manichäismus schließen kann, auch wenn die uigurischen Manichäer sicher nicht von einem auf den anderen Tag verschwanden.

Bibliographie und Abkürzungen

ASMUSSEN, J. P. 1965: *X^{u}āstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*. Copenhagen.
BANG, W. 1925: „Manichaeische Hymnen." In: *Le Muséon* 38, S. 1–55.
BERTA, Á. 1996: *Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschakisch-Türkischen*. Wiesbaden (Turcologica 24).
CLARK, L. 2013: *Uygur Manichaean Texte.* Vol. II: *Liturgical Texts*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Turcica II).
CLAUSON, G. 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford.
DANKOFF, R./J. KELLY 1982–1985: *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk)*. 3 Bde. Cambridge.
DOERFER, G. 1963–1975: *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. 4 Bde. Wiesbaden.
DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China.* Pt. 1: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 3).

93 Zwei Wörter, etwa *silkin-mäk-siz* zu lesen.
94 Der Verbstamm ist mir nicht klar.
95 Gemeint ist Konfuzius.
96 ZIEME 1991, S. 276.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Erdal, M. 1991: *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. 2 Bde. Wiesbaden.

Geng Shimin/H.-J. Klimkeit 1985: „Zerstörung manichäischer Klöster in Turfan.“ In: *Zentralasiatische Studien* 18, S. 7–11.

Hamilton, J. 1986: *Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-Houang*. 2 Bde. Paris.

Henning, W. B. 1936: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1936.10).

— 1938: „Argi and the ‚Tokharians‘.“ In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 9, S. 545–571.

Huang Wenbi 黃文弼 1954: 吐魯番考古記 *Tulufan kaogu ji [Notes on the Archaeology of Turfan]*. Peking.

Le Coq, A. von 1911: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho I*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1911.6).

— 1919: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho II*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1919.3).

— 1922: *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho III. Nebst einem christlichen Bruchstück aus Bulayïq*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1922.2).

Leurini, C. 2013: *The Manichaean Church. An Essay Mainly Based on the Texts from Central Asia*. Rom.

Lieu, S. N. C. *et al.* 2012: *Medieval Christian and Manichaean Remains from Quanzhou (Zayton)*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Archaeologica et Iconographia 2).

M I–III = von Le Coq 1911–1922

Matsui, D. 2011: „松井太「古ウイグル語文獻にみえる「寧戎」とベゼクリク Ko Uighur go Bunken ni mieru ‚Neikai‘ to Bezeklik [Ning-rong 寧戎 and Bezeklik in Old Uighur Texts].“ In: 内陸アジア言語の研究 *Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 26, S. 141–175 [auf Japanisch].

Mikkelsen, G. 2007: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*. Pt. 4: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts in Chinese*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia 5).

Moriyasu, T. 森安孝夫 2003: „The Decline of Manichaeism and the Rise of Buddhism among the Uighurs with a Discussion on the Origin of Uighur Buddhism.“ In: T. Moriyasu (Hrsg.): シルクロードと世界史 *Shirukurōdo to sekaishi [World History Reconsidered through the Silk Road]*. Osaka, S. 84–111.

— 2004: *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße. Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund*. Übersetzt von Ch. Steineck. Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 50).

— 2014: „西ウイグル王国におけるマニ教の衰退と仏教の台頭 Nishi-Uiguru-ōkoku ni okeru Mani-kyō no suitai to Bukkyō no taitō [The Decline of Manichaeism and the Rise of Buddhism in the West Uighur Kingdom].“ In: T. Moriyasu (Hrsg.): 東西ウイグルと中央ユーラシア *Tōzai Uiguru to Chūō Yūrasia [The East and West Uighurs and Central Eurasia]*. Nagoya, S. 590–617 [auf Japanisch].

Niu, R. 2010: *La crois-lotus. Inscriptions et manuscrits nestoriens en écriture syriaque découverts en Chine (XIIIe–XIVe siècles)*. Shanghai.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

OTURAKÇI, N. 2006: *On Beşinci Yüzyıla Kadar Tarihi Türk Lehçelerinde +sIz/+sUz*. Adana.

ÖZERTURAL, Z. 2008: *Der uigurische Manichäismus. Neubearbeitung von Texten aus Manichaica I und III von Albert v. Le Coq*. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 74).

RACHEWILTZ, I. DE/V. RYBATZKI 2010: *Introduction to Altaic Philology. Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu*. Leiden/Boston (Handbuch der Orientalistik; Achte Abteilung: Zentralasien, Bd, 20).

RADLOFF, W. 1893–1911: *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. Sanktpeterburg.

RASCHMANN, S.-CH. 2007: *Alttürkische Handschriften.* Teil 13: *Dokumente. Teil 1*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,21).

RECK, CH./W. SUNDERMANN 1997: „Ein illustrierter mittelpersischer manichäischer Omen-Text aus Turfan [M 556]." In: *Zentralasiatische Studien* 27, S. 7–23.

RÖHRBORN, K. 1977–1998: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Lieferung 1–6. Wiesbaden.

— 2011: „Zum Schrifttum der westtürkischen Manichäer." In: Z. ÖZERTURAL/J. WILKENS (Hrsg.): *Der östliche Manichäismus. Gattungs- und Werksgeschichte. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 4./5. März 2010*. Berlin/Boston (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, N.F. 17), S. 161–167.

SCHMIDT-GLINTZER, H. 1987: *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*. Wiesbaden.

SCHÖNIG, C. 2010: „Einfach nützlich: *yaraġ*." In: M. KAPPLER *et al.* (Hrsg.): *Trans-Turkic Studies. Festschrift in Honour of Marcel Erdal*. Istanbul, S. 281–298.

SUNDERMANN, W. 1973: *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer mit einigen Bemerkungen zu Motiven der Parabeltexte von Friedmar Geissler*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte IV).

— 1979: „Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, S. 95–133.

— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte XI).

— 2001: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann*. Hrsg. von CH. RECK, D. WEBER, C. LEURINI und A. PANAINO. 2 Bde. Rom (Serie Orientale Roma 89).

USER, H.Ş. 2009: *Köktürk Ve Ötüken Uygur Kağanlığı Yazıtları. Söz Varlığı İncelemesi*. Konya.

UTAS, B. 1985: „Mānistān and Xānaqāh." In: J. DUCHÈSNE-GUILLEMIN/P. LECOQ (Hrsg.): *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*. Leiden, S. 655–664.

WILKENS, J. 2000: *Alttürkische Handschriften.* Teil 8: *Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,16).

YILDIRIM, F. 2013: „On the Titles *Ten-si* and *Kan* in the Irk Bitig." In: *Dil Araştırmaları* 13, S. 141–150.

YOSHIDA, Y. 2008: Rezension von CH. RECK: *Mitteliranische Handschriften*. Teil I: *Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*, Stuttgart 2006. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 51, S. 51–61.

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Zieme, P. 1975a: „Ein uigurischer Text über die Wirtschaft manichäischer Klöster im uigurischen Reich.“ In: L. Ligeti (Hrsg.): *Researches in Altaic Languages. Papers Read at the 14th Meeting of the PIAC Held in Szeged, August 22–28, 1971*. Budapest, S. 331–339.
— 1975b: *Manichäisch-türkische Texte. Texte, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte 5).
— 1991: *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung*. Budapest.
— 2014: „Some Remarks on the Old Uigur Report on the Destruction of a Manichaean Monastery.“ In: Zhang Xiaogui 张小贵/Wang Yuanyuan 王媛媛/Yin Xiaoping 殷小平 (Hrsg.): 三夷教研究—林悟殊教授古稀纪念文集 *San yi jiao yanjiu – Lin Wushu jiaoshou guxi jinian wenji [Researches on the Three Foreign Religions. Papers in Honour for Prof. Lin Wushu on His 70th Birthday]*. Lanzhou, S. 244–253.

Abbildungen

© Mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Museums für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin. Ausschnitt Peter Zieme

Abb. 1: MIK III 192 Überschrift verso + Überschrift recto

© Mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Museums für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin. Ausschnitt Peter Zieme

Abb. 2: MIK III 192 verso Zeile 9

Abb. 3: MIK III 192 verso Zeile 40

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

© Mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Museums für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin. Ausschnitt Peter Zieme

Abb. 4: MIK III 192 verso Zeile 38, zum Vergleich prysty in Zeile 34

© Mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Museums für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin. Ausschnitt Peter Zieme

Abb. 5: MIK III 192 verso Zeile 45

© Mit freundlicher Genehmigung der British Library, London. Ausschnitt Peter Zieme

Abb. 6: Or. 8212/161, 56v°

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Iranica

Herausgegeben von Alberto Cantera und Maria Macuch

21: Thomas Jügel

Die Entwicklung der Ergativkonstruktion im Alt- und Mitteliranischen

Eine korpusbasierte Untersuchung zu Kasus, Kongruenz und Satzbau

2015. XXXIV, 968 Seiten, 1 Abb., 12 Diagramme, 75 Tabellen, Ln
170x240 mm
ISBN 978-3-447-10470-8
⊙E-Book: ISBN 978-3-447-19431-0
je/each € 178,– (D)

Ergativität ist ein grammatisches Phänomen, das in der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft und in der Iranistik im Besonderen kontrovers diskutiert wurde. Die wissenschaftliche Diskussion zeichnet sich durch mangelnde Berücksichtigung der alt- und mitteliranischen Daten aus. Die vorliegende Studie schafft hier Abhilfe durch die vollständige Datenschau awestischer, altpersischer, baktrischer und parthischer Belege sowie durch eine umfangreiche Untersuchung der mittelpersischen Daten. Neben den für Ergativität relevanten Aspekten wie Kasus, Kongruenz, Wortstellung, Konstituentenaussparung und Reflexivität werden sowohl die Entwicklung syntaktischer Strukturen besprochen als auch die des Verbal- und Nominalsystems. Ergebnisse werden reichhaltig mit einschlägigen Belegen illustriert, deren Aussagekraft immer wieder kritisch anhand ausführlicher philologischer Diskussion überprüft wird. Der Materialteil dient zugleich als Vademecum, das parallel zur Lektüre des Hauptteils benutzt werden kann und die Illustration des Materials übernimmt, als eigenständiges Nachschlagewerk und das die Geschichte der Ergativkonstruktion in den Objektsprachen systematisch veranschaulicht. Die vollständige Listung der Daten z.B. nach der Wortstellung bereitet so den Weg zu weiterführenden Forschungsfragen.

22: David Buyaner

Penitential Sections of the *Xorde Avesta (patits)*

Critical Edition with Commentary and Glossary

2016. X, 519 pages, 1 schema, 2 tables, clothbound
170x240 mm
ISBN 978-3-447-10603-0
⊙E-Book: ISBN 978-3-447-19491-4
je/each € 98,– (D)

The *Zand ī Xorde Awestā* with the traditional name "Small Avesta" (*Xorde Awestā*) is one of the main monuments of the corpus of Pahlavi translations and commentaries of Avestan original texts. Since the *Xorde Awestā* and its Pahlavi version consist of a variety of heterogeneous texts which belong to different strata of Zoroastrian literature, they are not only sources of utmost importance for Avestan and Pahlavi philology, but also for the history of Zoroastrianism, and for the reconstruction of Zoroastrian law. The recitals of repentance called *Padēd ī pašēmānīh* ("Penitentiary prayer for repentance") and *Xwad padēd* ("Penitentiary prayer for oneself"), which are the main focus of this project, are of great interest for the reconstruction of Zoroastrian jurisprudence, since they contain the most extensive enumeration of sins and offences, using the specific terminology of religious and criminal law. The semantic and etymological analysis of legal vocabulary is one of the most urgent desiderata of Iranian Studies. Two other significant problems in this context concern the date of the composition of the *Xorde Awestā* and the underlying principle of its compilation. An exact analysis of those sections without a prototype in the Avestan original, such as the Padēd texts, which are also known in their Pāzand version, would shed light on the question as to why these compositions were included in a zand compilation and the problem of the origins of this unique source.

VERLAG PUBLISHERS
HARRASSOWITZ

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2

Iranica

Herausgegeben von Alberto Cantera und Maria Macuch

23: Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo

The Zoroastrian Law to Expel the Demons: Wīdēwdād 10–15

Critical Edition, Translation and Glossary of the Avestan and Pahlavi Texts

2016. IX, 394 pages, 2 schemes, 3 tables, clothbound
170x240 mm
ISBN 978-3-447-10604-7
⊙E-Book: ISBN 978-3-447-19490-7
je/each € 78,– (D)

The text *Wīdēwdād* – "Law Serving to Keep the Demons Away" – is one of the longest and most important sources for the study of the Zoroastrianism of the ancient Iranian and the Middle Iranian periods. The ancient Iranian text, written in Avestan, was in the Sassanid era (3rd–7th centuries) translated into Middle Persian (Pahlavi) and provided with glosses and extensive commentaries. The Pahlavi version, called *zand*, is of particular interest for two reasons: firstly, it is the oldest Middle Persian translation of an Avestan text, and thus of major importance for the linguistic reconstruction of Middle Persian; secondly, the annotations approach complex theological, ritual, and legal questions that examine numerous insufficiently studied areas of the Sassanid society. Despite its outstanding importance, this primary source has, due to the high degree of difficulty of the subject matter, until recently attracted hardly any attention.

Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo's book, based upon a careful collation of all 44 still existing manuscripts, is the first critical edition of the Avestan and the Pahlavi text of the *Wīdēwdād*.

24: Almut Hintze, Alan Williams (Eds.)

Holy Wealth: Accounting for This World and The Next in Religious Belief and Practice

Festschrift for John R. Hinnells

2017. XXXIV, 294 pages, 34 ill., 7 schemes, 3 tables, clothbound
170x240 mm
ISBN 978-3-447-10746-4
⊙E-Book: ISBN 978-3-447-19626-0
je/each € 78,– (D)

This volume, presented to John R. Hinnells on his 75th Birthday, focuses on the interface between material and spiritual wealth, a theme that runs across many religions and cultures and that incorporates a major strand of John R. Hinnells's particular fascination with the Zoroastrians of ancient and modern times, and his more general interest in the positive and life-affirming aspects of religious traditions across many domains. The volume includes seventeen studies by leading scholars exploring ideas of and attitudes to material wealth and its use for promoting spiritual benefits in Zoroastrian, Mithraic, Christian, Buddhist and Islamic traditions.

VERLAG PUBLISHERS
HARRASSOWITZ

© 2017, Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden
ISBN Print: 978-3-447-10884-3 — ISBN E-Book: 978-3-447-19693-2