


WRITTEN MONUMENTS OF THE ORIENT

VOLUME 7

No.2 (14)

2021



PUBLICATIONS OF TEXTS

■ SOURCE STUDIES

■ HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

■ COLLECTIONS AND ARCHIVES

■ REVIEWS

WRITTEN MONUMENTS OF THE ORIENT, VOLUME 7, No. 2 (14), 2021



RUSSIAN ACADEMY
OF SCIENCES

Institute of Oriental
Manuscripts
(Asiatic Museum)

Founded in 2014
Issued biannually



Institute of Oriental
Manuscripts
RAS
2021

WRITTEN MONUMENTS OF THE ORIENT

VOLUME 7

No.2 (14)

2021

Editors

Irina Popova, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg (Editor-in-Chief)
Svetlana Anikeeva, Vostochnaya Literatura Publisher, Moscow
Tatiana Pang, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Elena Tanonova, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg

Editorial Board

Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Turfanforschung,
BBAW, Berlin
Michael Friedrich, Universität Hamburg
Yuly Ioannesyan, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Karashima Seishi, Soka University, Tokyo
Aliy Kolesnikov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Alexander Kudelin, Institute of World Literature,
RAS, Moscow
Simone-Christiane Raschmann, Akademie
der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Katalogisierung
der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland
Nie Hongyin, Beijing Normal University, Sichuan Normal
University, Beijing
Georges-Jean Pinault, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Stanislav Prozorov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Rong Xinjiang, Peking University
Nicholas Sims-Williams, University of London
Takata Tokio, Kyoto University
Stephen F. Teiser, Princeton University
Hartmut Walravens, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin
Nataliya Yakhontova, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Peter Zieme, Freie Universität Berlin

IN THIS ISSUE

Olga Lundysheva, Dieter Maue, Klaus Wille

Miscellanea in the Brāhmī Script from the Berezovsky and Krotkov Collections (IOM, RAS) with an Appendix: BΦ-4190

3

Mark Dickens, Natalia Smelova

A Rediscovered Syriac Amulet from Turfan in the Collection of the Hermitage Museum

107

Alexey Lushchenko

The *Heike Monogatari Hyōban Hidenshō* Commentary in the Edo Period: Discussion, Criticism, and Education

148

ON THE COVER:

The manuscript of Persian translation of the Greek treatise on medical herbs by Dioscurides from the collection of the IOM RAS, Arab D-143.

Olga Lundysheva, Dieter Maue, Klaus Wille

**Miscellanea in the Brāhmī Script
from the Berezovsky and Krotkov Collections (IOM, RAS)
with an appendix: BΦ-4190 (Part II)¹**

DOI 10.17816/wmo90084

Abstract: The main part of this article provides a complete edition (description, transliteration, transcription, preliminary translation, annotation as well as the reproduction of the photographs) of forty-two fragments in different literary languages, circulated along the northern Silk Road, today in the territory of modern Xinjiang (PR China) in pre-Mongolian times: Sanskrit, Tocharian A/B, Old Uyghur [hereafter: Uyghur]. Their common feature is the use of the standard North Turkestan Brāhmī and its Tocharian and Uyghur varieties. In terms of content, the fragments include extracts from Buddhist texts such as Abhidharmadīpavibhāṣaprabhāvṛtti, Prajñāpāramitā, Prasādapratibhodbhava, Prātimokṣasūtra, Pravāraṇasūtra, Saṃyuktāgama, Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra, Udānavarga. There are also some Tocharian B document fragments. Several of these texts are found on the back of Chinese scrolls. The Chinese texts have been identified. Where possible, a reconstruction of the relevant section of the scroll has been added. An introduction provides general background information. The lexis of the edited manuscripts is given in concordances.

Key words: Sanskrit, Tocharian A, Tocharian B, Uyghur, North Turkestan Brāhmī, Buddhist literature, Mātṛceṭa, Prasādapratibhodbhava, bilinguals (Sanskrit — Tocharian A, Sanskrit — Tocharian B, Sanskrit — Uyghur, Tocharian B — Uyghur).

© Olga Lundysheva, junior researcher of the Laboratoria Serindica, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences; Russian Federation, Saint Petersburg (olga-vecholga@gmail.com)

© Dieter Maue, Dr. phil., independent scholar (dmaue@t-online.de)

© Klaus Wille, Dr. phil., retired, formerly research fellow, Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities (k.wille@t-online.de)

¹ Since, according to the requirements of the journal, the paper should not exceed a certain size, the article has been divided into two parts. The first one includes monolingual manuscripts (nos. 1 to 25), the second one includes bilingual manuscripts (nos. 26 to 38), manuscripts in unidentified language(s) (nos. 39 to 42), an appendix containing a Sanskrit fragment of the Prasādapratibhodbhava (= Śatapañcāśatka) of Mātṛceṭa with scribal notes in Uyghur and Tocharian B, now kept in the State Hermitage (no. 43) as well as concordances.

Part I²

- 1 Introduction
- 1.1 The Berezovsky andKrotkov collections
- 1.2 Notes on the script, language and paper
- 1.3 Technical instructions
- 2 Manuscripts
- 2.1 Monolingual
- 2.1.1 Sanskrit
- 01 Buddhist
- 02 Abhidharmadīpavibhāṣaprabhāvṛtti
- 03 Table of contents?
- 04 Larger Prajñāpāramitā
- 05 Grammar
- 06 Scribal exercises
- 07 Prātimokṣasūtra
- 08 Pravāraṇasūtra
- 09 Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra
- 10 Text with dhāraṇī
- 2.1.2 Tocharian B
- 11 Udānavarga?
- 12 Buddhist
- 13 Undetermined
- 14 Undetermined
- 15 Document
- 16 Document
- 17 Document
- 18 Document
- 2.1.3 Tocharian A
- 19 Undetermined
- 20 Undetermined
- 2.1.4 Uyghur
- 21 Confession of sins
- 22 Buddhist
- 23 Undetermined
- 24 Undetermined
- 25 Undetermined
- 3.1 Literature and abbreviations (Part I)

Part II

- 2.2.2 Bilingual
- 2.2.1 Sanskrit — Tocharian A
- 26 Undetermined
- 2.2.2 Sanskrit — Tocharian B
- 27 Udānavarga
- 28 Buddhist
- 29 Buddhist
- 30 Undetermined
- 31 Undetermined
- 32 Undetermined
- 2.2.3 Sanskrit — Uyghur
- 33 Prasādapratibhodbhava
- 34 Saṃyuktāgama?
- 35 Grammar
- 36 Undetermined
- 2.2.4 Tocharian B — Uyghur
- 37 Narrative text?
- 38 Narrative text?
- 2.3 Undetermined language
- 39 Undetermined
- 40 Undetermined
- 41 Undetermined
- 42 Undetermined
- 3.2 Literature and abbreviations (Part II)
- 4 Appendix
- 43 BΦ-4190
- 43.1 Sanskrit
- 43.2 Varia
- 5 Concordances
- 5.1 Concordance of the manuscripts
- 5.2 Concordance of the identified texts
- 5.2.1 Chinese
- 5.2.2 Sanskrit
- 5.3 Concordances of word forms
- 5.3.1 Sanskrit
- 5.3.2 Tocharian B
- 5.3.3 Tocharian A
- 5.3.4 Uyghur
- 6 Addenda et corrigenda to Part I

² Part I has been published in WMO, 1(13).

2.2 Bilingual

2.2.1 Sanskrit — Tocharian A

26 SI 6378/13 (B/без шифра)

Part of a folio of unknown format, inscribed on both sides apparently by two different scribes with (a) Tocharian A text(s), of which remains of 5 to 6 lines are preserved. The scribe of side A used a calamus, that of side B a brush.

Provenance: Tajik Ming öy, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.


Size: 12.8 cm × 13.8 cm.

Language: Tocharian A³ with a quotation in Sanskrit⁴.

Undetermined

A

Pl. 26-1: SI 6378/13 A



³ Partly in verses.


⁴ S. B 04.

Transliteration

- 01 [...] ʃu l[]⁵ ×ś[] l[]⁶ nt⁷ su rma ri-s mrā cam ×ñ[] × [...]
 02 [...] lme⁸ e ka pu ṇḍa⁹ ri-k [...]
 03 [...] × [+] ×r[] ga-rb^h ma lse pnām¹⁰ tsu • [...]
 04 [...] ×pā lmeṃ wā kma-tṣ • 1 tma¹¹śa ltā¹²skmām śka ta rm[] [...]
 05 [...] ...¹³ [...]

B

Pl. 26-2: SI 6378/13 B



⁵ Or: o.

⁶ Or: o.

⁷ l[ā]nt is also possible to form l[ā]nt Sumeris mrācam ‘on the head of King Sumeru’ (in TUMSHUKESI & KONOW 1935: Text VIII, there is mentioned the coronation of King Meru = Sumeru).

⁸ Or: lm[o].

⁹ The akṣara is misshapen.

¹⁰ Or: ptām.

¹¹ Or: nma.

¹² Or: lnā.

¹³ Unusable traces.

Transliteration

- 01 [...] ...¹⁴ [...]
 02 [...] × nt[] pa ltske-ṣ lyu tā rtā¹⁵ ka ṣlu ne × [...]
 03 [...] × i¹⁶ -ñc¹⁷ kra-ś¹⁸ || 20 8 pi n × []¹⁹ [...]
 04 [...] × ye nā²⁰ pi sa ra svatī [...]
 05 [...] × []v[] [+] yā mu warsa × [...]
 06 [...] ... • cā × llyī × [...]

Commentary

A 01 **su rma ri-ṣ mrā caṃ**: Erroneously for Sumeris mrācaṃ ‘on the summit of Sumeru’. However, the presumed superscript r- in rma might be a very idiosyncratic diacritic -e, cf. line 4. Accordingly, ṣul[áś]ś[i] l[ā]nt ‘king of the mountains’ can be restored from the preceding remains.

A 02 [] **lme**: Probably [śpā]lme or [śpā]lme[ṃ] ‘superior, excellent’ as in A 04.

e ka pu ṇḍa ri-k: ekapuṇḍarik is also attested in A156 (=THT 789) a1, where it is supposed to mean ‘very best’;²¹ if so, equivalent to preceding śpālme(ṃ). But due to the lacking context the elephant of king Prasenajit cannot be excluded here.²²

A 03 [+] × r[] **ga-rb^h**: Perhaps [ca]ndr[a]garbh or [va]jr[a]garbh, both are names of a Bodhisatva.

pnām tsu: Perhaps °p nām̐tsu, PPP of nas- ‘to be’. Preceding mālsep is unclear.

A 04 × **pā lmeṃ wā kma-tṣ**: Certainly [ś]pālmeṃ wākmats, both meaning ‘superior, excellent’, s. A 02.

tma śa ltā skmām: tmaśal tāskmām, inferior spelling of tmaśśal tāskmām ‘comparable to this’, attested several times.²³

¹⁴ Unusable traces.

¹⁵ Or: rnā.

¹⁶ Or: []i ×.

¹⁷ Virāma with trema.

¹⁸ Virāma with trema; the sibilant not written through the special sign. Below, a sign looking like the numeral ‘9’.

¹⁹ Or: t×.

²⁰ Or: tā.

²¹ DHTA 2009: 71a.

²² BHS-D 1953: 153b.

²³ S. CEToM. Words s.v. tāskmām.

śka ta rm[]: Should rm[] stand for m[]e (see line 1 above), śka-tampeyum or śka-tampeṣi (~ Skt. daśabala-) ‘possessing the ten strengths’ would be an obvious restoration.

B 02 **pa ltske-s**: pältskes, gen. sing. of pältsäk ‘thought, mind’.

lyu tā rtā ka šlu ne: lyutār tākāšlune represents the well attested syntagm lyutār nas-/tāk- ‘to be superior’ which excludes the possible reading nākāšlune, nāk- ‘to blame’. Lyutār tākāšlune is the causative counterpart of lyutār naslune ‘the being superior, superiority’ and is attested here for the first time.²⁴

B 03 **×i-ñc kra-ś** || **28**: Obviously the end of a verse. The additional subscript numeral ‘9’ might be a separate numbering of verses within a chapter while 28 could refer to the number of verses from the beginning of the text. Kraś is variant of or mistake for kraṃś ‘the good ones’, nom. pl. m. of kāsu ‘good’. The preceding []iñc is most probably 3rd pl. prs., e.g. trānkiñc ‘(they) say’. The same sequence, verb + kraṃś, in the end of a pāda also occurs in A 2 (= THT 635) a 1 ktānkeñc kraṃś : ‘the good ones traverse’; A 9 (= THT 642) a2 pālkāc kraṃś : 1 || ‘look, o good ones’.

pi n× []: Most likely pintwat or a derivative of it is to be restored.

B 04 **yenāpi sarasvatī** ‘whereby even Sarasvatī’: The only occurrence of Sanskrit in the text and no evidence for a true bilingual text; perhaps an isolated quotation.

B 05 **yā mu**: yāmu ‘(having) done’, nom. sg. m. PPP of yām- ‘to do’

wa rsa: warsa[], case form of or adjective (-ṣi) derived from wars ‘dirt, impurity’.

2.2.2 Sanskrit — Tocharian B

27 SI 6378/12 (B/без шифра)

SI 6378/12 continues immediately the lines r01–r03 and v05–v07 respectively of the bigger fragment SI 2996/1, s. pl. 26-1 and 26-2. It is now clear that the preserved fragments form part of the folio left to the string-hole area which interrupts the lines 03–05 and a major part of which is broken away.

²⁴ A 54 (=THT 687) b 2.

SI 2996/1 (B/120-1) has been edited in CEToM.²⁵ The edition comprises transliteration, transcription, English translation of the Tocharian part, philological and linguistic comments. Another edition (transcription, notes and full Sanskrit text) was published by H. Ogihara.²⁶ Therefore we can limit the editing of SI 2996/1 to the transcription of those lines to which the so far unpublished SI 6378/12 contributes. The text of the latter is highlighted in the transcription.

Provenance: Tajik Ming öy, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.

Size: SI 6378/12 ∞ SI 2996/1 8.1 cm × 10.3 cm.


Joining: SI 6378/12 ∞ SI 2996/1.

Language: Sanskrit — Tocharian B bilingual.

Udānavarga, cf. UVSKT (ED. B) XXXI 32b–39d

Recto


Pl. 27–1: SI 6378/12 ∞ SI 2996/1 R



²⁵ <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?m-sib1201>. CEToM uses the older press mark SI B 120(1).

²⁶ OGIHARA 2016: 232–234.

Pl. 27-2: lska (a) from the manuscript (b) as drawing



Transliteration

SI 6378/12

r01 [...] *ha taḥ ku sī da* : ×e [...]

r02 [...] *vā²⁷ pi sū kṣmaṃ × ×²⁸* [...]

r03 [...] *lska²⁹* ⊙ [...]

Transcription

r01 [...]]ñ[] • sadaiva saṃkalpa**hataḥ kusīda**<ḥ> : *ṣe*[k ...]

r02 [...] 32 sthūlān vitarkān atha **vāpi sūkṣm ā ṃ** [...]

r03 [...] vitarkayan vai satataṃ vitarkāṃ • *pālskā*-⊙ [namane ...]

Commentary

r01 []ñ[]: So maybe with Ogihara (2016: 232) or else []k[?], certainly not with CEToM []y[] and tentative restoration of *snai maiyya* ‘without strength, energy’ as inconvincing translation of Skt. *nirāśaḥ* ‘without (false) hope, expectation’. In case of []ñ[] one might consider **snai-pākwalñe* ‘without confidence’, in case of []k[?] **snai-pārmañk* ‘without hope’.

sadaiva: CEToM has *sadaivaṃ*. There is no *anusvāra* visible, Bernhard³⁰ also reads *sadaiva*.

kusīda<ḥ>: Principally <: > could represent *visarga* or punctuation. We decided for *pausa* form (with restored *visarga*³¹) followed by the punctuation mark at the end of the *pāda*. Bernhard³² has adopted the *sandhi* form *kusīdo*.

ṣe[k] ‘always’, translation of Skt. *sadā* ‘id.’.

²⁷ The akṣara is partially preserved on SI 2996/1. The diacritic <-ā> seems to be added by another hand.

²⁸ Traces of one or two akṣara-s.

²⁹ The akṣara is partially preserved on SI 2996/1 (s. Pl. 27-2). The readings *lsk* (CEToM l. c.) and uncertain *lks* (Ogihara l. c., with note: “scribal error”) are outdated. The ligature *lska* is only found here.

³⁰ UVSKT (ED. B) 1965-1968: XXXI 32c.


³¹ *Visarga* is often omitted in Central Asian manuscripts.

³² UVSKT (ED. B) 1965-1968: XXXI 32c.

r03 **pālskū**[namane]: As translation of Skt. vitarkayan ‘thinking, reflecting’ Ogihara's restoration of pālskānamane³³ ‘id.’ is certainly correct, while CEToM suggests ungrammatical pālskemane.

Verso

Pl. 27-3: SI 6378/12 ∞ SI 2996/1 V



Transliteration

SI 6378/12

v05[...]jñ[]³⁴ [...]

v06[...]ye³⁵ śā ntu • ka []ä [...]

v07[...] ta : snai e ñka lñe sai [...]

Transcription

v05[...] pālsko eñku śāp • yudhyeta māraṃ prajñā- o [yudhena...]

v06[...] kārsormem 38 saṃbodhya³⁶ ŋgeṣu yeṣān tu • kāk []ä [...]

v07[...] •³⁷ anupādānam āsrit^{<a>} <ḥ>.³⁸ snai-eñkālñe sai [...]

³³ Elsewhere attested pālskānamane, KRAUSE 1952: 261; MALZAHN 2010: 721.

³⁴ The main part of <j> is on SI 2996/1.

³⁵ Part of <y> and trace of <e> on SI 2996/1.

³⁶ The ms reads °dhyā.

³⁷ Or virāma dot as Ogihara (o.c. note 7) takes it, in any case the end of the TochB translation. According to Bernhard's edition the following Skt. excerpt should read cānu° (ca+anu°), not anu°. The main function of ca was to prevent sandhi between the preceding °jya and anu°

Commentary

06 **kä[]ä[...]** Here one expects the translation of *saṃbodhyaṅga-* ‘member of enlightenment’. Perhaps *kä[rs]ä[lñeṣṣe]* ‘pertaining to knowledge’ might be restored.

07 **snai-enkälñe** ‘without grasping or clinging to existence’ corresponds to Skt. *anupādāna-* ‘the non-clinging to existence’. Bernhard's edition had accepted *anupādāyam* against the *varia lectio anupādānam* of ms AD61 (SHT 449 fol. 61r5 = idp SHT 449/11). The “sonst nirgends belegte” (elsewhere not attested) substantive *anupādāya-* was questioned in SWTF 1994–2018 (I 65) and even “should be abandoned” according to Ogihara.³⁹ As to *anupādāyam*, M. Balk,⁴⁰ like Pauly before him⁴¹, convincingly advocates the well attested negative gerund *an-upādāya* ‘not taking up, not clinging to’;⁴² the following nasal *m* is used in prevocalic position to avoid a hiatus or *sandhi*⁴³ and was later misunderstood as case ending. Thus, a new noun *anupādāya-* was born, which was mostly replaced by the usual *anupādāna-*.

sai[...] The TochB verb translating Skt. *ā-śri* ‘to betake one's self, resort to’ may have been *saim yām-* ‘to take refuge’.

28 SI 3717/4 (Kr VII/1)

Tiny fragment of a folio, presumably of *poṭhī* format, just big enough to recognize traces of carefully written Tocharian B. But the sequence of *akṣara-s* in A01 can hardly be TochB, but easily Sanskrit, which leads us to suspect that the text is bilingual. The mention of the *Gautama* indicates a Buddhist topic.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

(> °*jyānu*°) resulting in metrically unwelcome loss of a syllable. It is not clear whether *ca* was forgotten here or was part of the preceding excerpt or we are dealing with a text variant without *ca* implying, however, hiatus without *sandhi*. The latter is attested by ms AD61 (SHT 449 fol. 61r5 = idp SHT 449/11) *-jya an-* (not quoted by Bernhard).

³⁸ Cf. above comm. on r01 *kusīda<ḥ> :.*

³⁹ OGIHARA 2016: 233 note 8.

⁴⁰ UV (BALK) 1988: 471.

⁴¹ UVSKT (ED. P) 1960: 248 note 6.

⁴² ²*an-upādāya*, SWTF 1994–2018: I 65b.

⁴³ BHS-GR 1953: 35b § 4.59.

Size: 3.5 cm × 2.8 cm.

Language: Bilingual(?) Sanskrit(?)⁴⁴ and Tocharian B.

Undetermined **Buddhist** text

A

Pl. 28-1: SI 3717/4 A

Transliteration


01 [...] × s[] ti me [...]

02 [...] ne ntse gau ta [...]

Transcription

01 [...] s[a]ti me [...]

02 [...]nentse gauta[m- ...]



B

Pl. 28-2: SI 3717/4 B

Transliteration

01 [...] × • ai śamñe [...]

02 [...] yī • klā [...]

Transcription

01 [...] × • aiśamñe [...]

02 [...] yī • klā [...]



Commentary

A 02 contains some case form or derivation of Gautame*, preceded by a genitive on -ntse (ṣamānentse?).

B 01 aiśamñe ‘wisdom’ is the only complete form.

B 03 klā[] might be part of klāwi ‘fame’, but there are other options.

⁴⁴ A 01 is rather Skt. than TochB.

29 SI 3717/6 (Kr VII/1)

Fragment whose bizarre shape is similar to that of no. 22, which allows the conclusion that they were deposited together at the same site. Both sides are carefully inscribed with formal NTB, alternating between Sanskrit and Tocharian B translation; remains of five to six lines are preserved.


Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size: 4.4 cm × 5.7 cm.

Language: Sanskrit — Tocharian B bilingual.

Buddhist**A**

Pl. 29-1: SI 3717/6 A

**Transliteration**


- 01 [...] ś× ×m[] [...]
 02 [...] • ra ska re te ki ññe [...]
 03 [...] × • yśe lmem ne [+ +] l[?]e [...]
 04 [...] × t[] • sva b^h[] [] ts[] × [...]
 05 [...] × i ske ma ne [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...] ś× ×m[] [...]
 02 [...] • räskare tekiññe [...]
 03 [...] × • yśelmenne [+ +] l[?]e [...]
 04 [...] × t[] • svabh[āp]ts[a] × [...]
 05 [...] × iskemane [...]

B

Pl. 29-2: SI 3717/6 B

**Transliteration**

- 01 [...] × t[] × [...]
 02 [...] • ka t^ha yā • pe lai k[]e × e [...]
 03 [...] × s[] r[] [] t[]⁴⁵lñe • × [...]
 04 [...] × [+ +] × × e pa rsā tsñe •[?] a nu n[] ya [...]
 05 [...] × ri sra ve⁴⁶ ṣ[] • k[?]e × [...]
 06 [...] l[] [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...] × t[] × [...]
 02 [...] • kathayā • pelaik[n]e[ṣṣ]e [...]
 03 [...] × s[] r[] [] t[]⁴⁷lñe • × [...]
 04 [...] × [+ +] × × e pārsā(n)tsñe •[?] anun[a]ya[...]
 05 [... pa]risraveṣ[u] • k[?]e × [...]
 06 [...] l[] [...]

Commentary

A 02 **rāskare tekiññe** ‘vehemently sick’, both lexemes well attested.⁴⁸

A 03 **yśelmenne**: Loc. pl. of yśelme ‘(sexual) pleasure’.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Or: []n[].

⁴⁶ Or: vai.

⁴⁷ Or: []n[].

⁴⁸ DTB² 2013: 578 and 321.

⁴⁹ DTB² 2013: 564.

A 04 **svabh[āp]ts[a]**: ‘by self-nature’, Perlative of the loan word svabhāp < Skt. svabhāva.⁵⁰ Only one loop of the following grapheme is visible, which, however, could belong to an <u>. This recalls the word sequence THT 197a2 svabhāpṣa upekṣ wārpālñe ‘by self-nature, the sensation (Skt. vedanā-) of indifference (Skt. upekṣā-)’. There it is about the status of indifference in relation to the sensations of happiness and sorrow. This problem might also have been dealt with here, which could speak for an Abhidharma text.

A 05 ×**iskemane**: PPrMP of an *-sk-stem, the root is unclear.

B 02 **kathayā • pelaiḱ[n]eṣ[ṣ]e** [...]: TochB ‘dharma-’ clarifies that kathā- (here instr. sg.) ‘telling’ is shortened from or stands for dharmakathā- ‘dharma preaching’.

B 03 ... **lñe**: The preserved graphemes point to rittālñe, abstr. of the verb ritt-, here because of the presumably preceding genitive (-[nt]s[e]) meaning ‘to be suitable for’.⁵¹

B 04 **pārsā(n)tsñe**: First attested nomen abstracti from pārsāntse ‘resplendent’,⁵² type astarñe ‘purity’ ← astare ‘pure’.

anun[a]ya [...]: A form of the verb anu-nī ‘to bring near, to conciliate’⁵³ or the derived noun anunaya- ‘conciliatory; conciliation, friendliness and sim.’.⁵⁴

B 05 [pa]**risraveṣ[u]**: Etymologically parisrava- means ‘flowing, streaming’, but in Buddhist Sanskrit “it seems used in the sense of pariśraya = Pali pariṣaya, *difficulty, trouble*”.⁵⁵ In this sense and in the same case as in our manuscript, viz. loc. pl., the word is attested in AVDH 1992: 31.9 [a]ntarāya-parisraveṣu vya[thā] ‘pain on the occasion of obstacles and troubles’.⁵⁶ It is even tempting to consider whether the fragment contains excerpts from the cited sūtra since B 04 anunaya- also belongs to its lexis.

⁵⁰ DTB² 2013: 794. CEToM s.v.

⁵¹ DTB² 2013: II 580.

⁵² DTB² 2013: 402.

⁵³ MW 1899: 34a.

⁵⁴ MW 1899: 34a; BHS-D 1953: 28a; SWTF 1994–2018: I 63a.

⁵⁵ BHS-D 1953: 332a; cf. SWTF 1994–2018: III 99a.

⁵⁶ Likewise, but largely restored, in o.c. 33.9 in connection with avyathā- ‘absence of tremor’. — Interestingly, the Tibetan translation has thos na ‘on hearing,’ indicating that the Sanskrit original read pariśraya- or that parisrava- was interpreted as pariśraya-.

30 SI 3716/3 (Kr VII/1)

Left upper/lower corner of a folio, presumably of poṭhī format. Traces of two lines on A and one line on B.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size: 2.5 cm × 5.5 cm.

Language: Sanskrit — Tocharian B.

Undetermined


A

Pl. 30-1: SI 3716/3 A

Transliteration

-02 [?]t[]⁵⁷ × [...]

-01 vā • kra ŋkai ṅṅ[] × [...]




B

Pl. 30-2: SI 3716/3 B

Transliteration

01 pra ×ā [+] ×e [...]



Commentary

The only certainly identifiable word is TochB krāṅkaiṅṅ[] ‘pertaining to a chicken’, so far only attested as an attribute of weṃṣṣiye ‘excrement, dung’.⁵⁸ Unfortunately the qualified substantive is lost. A-01 vā can not be or belong to a TochB word. It is Skt. vā ‘or’ or the end of a word which points to a bilingual text. Another Skt. word might be B01 prasā[+]×e though a loan word is not excluded here.

⁵⁷ Or: [?]n[].

⁵⁸ DTB² 2013: 229; CEToM s.v.

31 SI 3717/5 (Kr VII/1)

Fragment with similar damage as no. 22 and no. 29 and therefore from the same place of discovery as the latter. Both sides are carefully inscribed with formal NTB, alternating between Sanskrit and Tocharian B translation; remains of four to five lines are preserved.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size: 4.0 cm × 4.2 cm.

Language: Sanskrit — Tocharian B bilingual

Undetermined**A**

Pl. 31-1: SI 3717/5 A

Transliteration

- 01 [...] []du × [+] × [...]
 02 [...] × na • ṣa me m× [...]
 03 [...] × • p̄a ly×[] [+] ykām [...]
 04 [...] × lai⁵⁹[...]
 05 [...] × [...]

**Transcription**

- 01 [...] []du × [+] × [...]
 02 [...] × na • ṣamem× [...]
 03 [...] × • p̄āly×[] [+] ykām[ṣ- ...]
 04 [...] × lai⁶⁰[...]
 05 [...] × [...]

⁵⁹ Or to be read after 90° with clockwise rotation: × []ai.

⁶⁰ Or to be read after 90° with clockwise rotation: × []ai.

B


Pl. 31-2: SI 3717/5 B

Transliteration

- 01 [...] × ×⁶¹ [...]
 02 [...] ta rśau na [++] × × [...]
 03 [...] × pra hā ṇam [...]
 04 [...] []e [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...] × × [...]
 02 [...] tarśauna [++] × × [...]
 03 [...] × prahāṇam [...]
 04 [...] []e [...]

**Commentary**

A 01 Probably Skt.

A 02 TochB **ṣamem**× makes no sense; if -e was corrected to -r-, one could suppose ṣarmampa (for ṣārmampa), comitative of ṣarm, ‘(together) with the cause’, which would be in accord with restored Skt. [pratya]**yena**.

A 03 While the restoration of TochB **pālys**[alñe] ‘(lit.) burning, torture, ascetic’,⁶² is relatively clear, TochB **ykām**[ṣ-] may be part of a form of the substantive ykāmṣe ‘aversion’ or of the verb ykāmṣaññ- ‘to be disgusted’.⁶³

B 02 TochB **tarśauna** ‘deceptions’.⁶⁴B 03 Skt. **prahāṇam** ‘abandonment; exertion’.**32 SI 3717/7 (Kr VII/1)**

Fragment of a folio of poṭhī format. Part of the upper/lower edge has been preserved, as well as part of the string-hole area that interrupts the second and third lines from the top/bottom. The number of lines should have been four.

⁶¹ To be read after 90° counterclockwise rotation.

⁶² DTB² 2013: I 404; CEToM s.v.

⁶³ For both s. DTB² 2013: 558.

⁶⁴ DTB² 2013: 303 s.v. tārsī*.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size: 4.8 cm × 5.7 cm.

Language: Sanskrit — Tocharian B bilingual.

Undetermined

A

Pl. 32-1: SI 3717/7 A

Transliteration

01 [...] × ma sa lle • na⁶⁵ pa [...]

02 [...] ⊙ smī ti [...]

03 [...] ⊙ ma 2 [...]

Transcription

01 [...]maṣālle • na pa[...]

02 [...] ⊙ smīti [...]

03 [...] ⊙ ma 2 [...]



B

Pl. 32-2: SI 3717/7 B

Transliteration

01 [...] ⊙ ×py[] [...]

02 [...] []sa ⊙ lñe • p[] [...]


03 [...] t^h[] ye yaṃ⁶⁶ • re ki ×[...]

Transcription

01 [...] ×py[] [...]

02 [...]lñe • p[] [...]

03 [...]t^h[]yeyam • reki ×[...]



⁶⁵ Or: ta?

⁶⁶ Or: ye.

Commentary

A 01 []**maṣālle**: Restoration to ger.I of yām- ‘to do, make’, yamaṣālle, is trivial.

na pa[]: Negation na and an undeterminable subsequent word. In case of reading ta instead of na almost certainly a form of tap- ‘to heat etc.’ or some deverbal noun from this root.

A 02 []**smīti**: [a]smīti ‘I am’ (asmi) followed by the particle iti marking the end of direct speech.

B 02 []**sālñe**: TochB abstract noun of some verb.

B 03 []^h[]**yeyam**: Probably 1st sing. opt. prs. act. **kathayeyam** ‘I might tell’ which is well compatible with the beginning of the TochB rendering.

reki ‘word, command’⁶⁷ translates a lost Skt. word.

2.2.3. Sanskrit — Uyghur

33 SI 3715/3; SI 3715/7 (Kr VII/1)

Two matching fragments from a Chinese scroll with the text of Bodhiruci’s translation of the [Mahā]ratnakūṭa (T 310). The right end forms a gluing edge. The gluing must have been intact when a piece of unknown width was cut out of the scroll to write on the blank reverse. For this purpose, the sheet leaf was turned over the lower / upper edge and rotated 90° clockwise. After the Varṇārḥavarṇa⁶⁸ another work of the famous Buddhist poet Mātr̥ceṭa,⁶⁹ Prasādapratibhodbhava,⁷⁰ is now attested in the Uyghur literature.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size(s): SI 3715/3 3.8 cm × 5.0 cm; SI 3715/7 3.9 cm × 8.0 cm.

Joining: SI 3715/3 ∞ SI 3715/7.

Language(s): Chinese (recto), Sanskrit — Old Uyghur bilingual (verso).

⁶⁷ DTB² 2013: 585.

⁶⁸ On Varṇārḥavarṇa HARTMANN & MAUE 1991; MAUE 2002B.

⁶⁹ On Mātr̥ceṭa HARTMANN 1987: 12ff.

⁷⁰ On the Prasādapratibhodbhava HARTMANN 1987: 23ff.


Recto

Pl. 33-1: SI 3715/3 ∞ SI 3715/7 R
(reconstruction)

2	1
至命難諸 所受用終 無愛染於 諸惱辱具 忍	綺繪異詞 構飾文句 於他則物 不起貪著 乃

Verso

Pl. 33-2: SI 3715/3 ∞ SI 3715/7



T 310 XI 260c17-18.

**Prasādapratibhodbhava (= Śatapañcāśatka) of Mātṛceṭa
verses 28-29 (= 2.2-3)**

Transliteration

01 [...] *b^hū⁷¹-t • i ctiṃ i ci ka my[] × [...]*

02 [...] [] *ā • kyo ṇi eya wri śi-ñ uyu zyā • tva yi • se ntyā • ni ṣṭ^hā ṅga tā*
tyu × yu [...]

03 [...] × *ni ta • e-ḷ ti-ñ • stva yā × e × [+] × yā • su ca ri tai-ḷ • eya d^hg₁yu*
kī lā-ñc lā[] ḷ uy[] × [...]

04 [...] × *tu p×ā-k la ri⁷²-ñ • te • syā ṇi-ñ 3 × [...]*

⁷¹ The shape and position of the <-ū> leave no doubt about <b^h->.

⁷² Or: r[r]i.

Transcription

- 01 [...']*bhūt* • iĉtin iĉikm[äk ...]
 02 [...]*ā* • köni ävriſiſiſ üzä • tvayi • sentä • niſthāṅgatā tü[z]ü [...]
 03 [...] n^ĉ*tā*- • el(t)iſiſ • -s *tvayā se*[ni ü]zä • *sucaritair* • ädgü kılınĉlar
 ü[zä ...]
 04 [...]*si*• tupraklarıſiſ • te • säniſiſ 3 × [...]

Translation

- 01 (Skt.) was • (Uygh.) the entering inside
 02 (Skt.) ... (Uygh.) by your honest conduct • (Skt.) in you, (Uygh.) in you • (Skt.) having arrived (Uygh.) complete...
 03 (Skt.) (was) lead (Uygh.) you carried • (Skt.) by you (Uygh.) by you • (Skt.) by good actions, (Uygh.) by good actions
 04 (Skt.)..., (Uygh.) your impurities • (Skt.) your, (Uygh.) your 3

Sanskrit text with translation

For convenience and better understanding of the fragment the complete text and translation of the two śloka are presented.⁷³ The preserved parts of our ms. are marked as follows:

bold	Sanskrit only
<u>underlined</u>	Uyghur only
<u>bold underlined</u>	Sanskrit and Uyghur.

- (a) hetuſv abhiniveſo **'bhūt** (b) guṅānāṃ na phaleſu te |
 (c) tena samyakpratipadā (d) **tvayi niſthāṅ gatā**⁷⁴ guṅāḥ || [2] (=28)

(d) ShB: tvayi niſthāṅ guṅā gatāḥ (Ms. A); SHT 709v1: [...] + guṅā gatāḥ 28; SHT 224rx (IDP 224/1): [...] ſ[th]āṅ gatā guṅā [...]; SHT 440v5: niſthāṅ ga[t]ā g[u ...]; Pell. Skt. bleu 168vc [...] niſthāṅ gatāṃ [...]; SHT 519 fol. 3r4

⁷³ Underlying text established by Shackleton Bailey=ShB [PPUSKT (ED. SHACKLETON BAILEY) 1951: 54f.], various readings provided by K. Wille. The translation is by Shackleton Bailey (PPUSKT (ED. SHACKLETON BAILEY) 1951: 157).

⁷⁴ Or: *niſthāṅgatā*. For the interpretation as compound may speak the inner sandhi (m+g>ṅg), parallel formations of the type pāramita- 'gone to the opposite shore' and perhaps also the exception as a unit by the Uyghur translator. But the text variant niſthāṅ guṅā gatāḥ could only arise from the interpretation as syntagma niſthāṅ gatā.

(IDP 519/2): niṣṭhāgatā ((gu)ṇāḥ 2 (read niṣṭhā<ṃ>gatā?); ShB Ms. H (= H.149.x.17 = Or.15011/13r5; ed. Hoernle in Hoernle, MR: 64): niṣṭhāṃ gat[ā] guṇā 28; Or.15004/42v3: [...] × yi niṣṭhāṃ gat[] + [...]; SHT 356v2 (IDP 356/1): niṣṭh[ā] + + guṇā 28.

(b-) Your (a) devotion was to the causes (-b) of virtue[s], not to their results. (c) Therefore, by means of your perfect way of conduct (d) the virtues attained in you their culmination.

*

(a) tathātmā pracayaṃ **nītas** (b) **tvayā sucaritair** yathā |
(c) puṇyāyatanatām prāptāny (d) api pādarajāmsi **te** || 3 (=29)

(a–b) You raised yourself to such a height by good actions that (d) even the dust of your feet (c) became a receptacle of merit.

*

Commentary

01 **ičtin ičikm**[äk] is a felicitous rendering of the not preserved Skt. abhiniveśa- liter. ‘entering’, usually metaphorically ‘devotion, adherence’, accordingly Uygh. ičik- ‘to enter’ and especially ‘to capitulate, submit’.⁷⁵ Uygh. ičtin ‘inside’ reflects the Skt. preverbs abhi-ni-.

02 **köni ävrišij üzä**: köni ‘upright, honest’ renders Skt. samyak- as in köni tüz(üni) tuymak ~ Skt. samyaksambodhi-. Ävriš ‘behaviour, conduct’⁷⁶, here equivalent of the rather sophisticated Skt. pratipad-, is possibly a calque of TochA spārtwlune (~ TochB spārttalyñe) ‘conduct’ from spārtw- (~ TochB spārtt-) ‘to turn, behave’, as Uygh. ävriš from ävir- ‘to turn’, cf. also the parallel syntagmata ‘conduct’ + ‘make, do’ A (= THT 886) 253 a 5 spārtw-lune yatār⁷⁷ ‘leads his life’ — MaitrUigT I p.112 l.17 ädgü ävriš kılur ‘leads a good life’. The Tocharian for its part imitates the Indian pattern vṛtti- et al. ‘conduct’ ~ vṛt- ‘to turn’.⁷⁸

sentä: The Brāhmī spelling confirms -e-⁷⁹ as against -i-;⁸⁰ also acc. seni in l. 03.

⁷⁵ Cf. GOT 2004: 495.

⁷⁶ Not in ED 1972; cf. GOT 2004: 271; UW² 2010–2021: II.2, 347.

⁷⁷ In a passage from the end of chapter 11 of the Maitreyasamitināṭaka.

⁷⁸ Another calque based on the (artificial) equivalence of the roots Skt. vṛt- and Uygh. ävir- is Uygh. **ävriš** as rendering of Skt. itivṛttaka-, a literary genre of stories (virtually) ending with the words itivṛttam ‘thus it happened’.

⁷⁹ E.g. ED 1972: 831b.

tü[z]ü ‘complete’ is the beginning of the translation of Skt. *niṣṭhā-* ‘completion, perfection’.

03 **elt(t)ıñ**: From the Sanskrit it is clear that *eltıñ* can not be imperative pl., but must be the preterit form *elt(t)ıñ* ‘you (sing.) carried’. The Uygh. translator has transformed the Skt. passive sentence ‘your self was lead’ into ‘you carried yourself’. The Skt. agentive instrum. *tvayā* ‘by you’ survived in the Uygh. *seni*⁸¹ *üzä* ‘by you(rself)’, beyond the Sanskrit emphasizing that the action happened without outside help.

04 **tupraklarıñ**: *tuprak* ‘dust’, rendering the Skt. equivalent *rajas-*, here not used metaphorically as e.g. in TT VIII A 7 f. Skt. *vigatarajā(h)*, Uygh. *tar[ı]k[m]ıñ toz tupraklıglar* ‘those whose (moral) impurities₂ have gone away’.

säniñ: The gen. has -ä- as usual, opposed to acc. and loc. s. above l. 02 ad *sentä*.

34 SI 2965/1 (B/29-1); SI 2965/2 (B/29-2)

Two perfectly fitting fragments (s. pl. 34-2) are part of a Chinese scroll containing Kumārajīva’s *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāmahāprajñāpāramitā* (T 223) or his *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (T 1509), for the reconstruction s. pl. 34-1. Of the height of the scroll, whose upper edge is almost reached at the highest preserved point, 15 of about 26 cm remain, from which it can be concluded that the scroll has not been cut in half horizontally before being re-used, as is often the case. The scroll or a piece of unknown width was turned over the upper/lower edge and rotated 90° clockwise. The blank reverse was used to write on a bilingual Sanskrit — Uyghur text which presents excerpts from *Sūtra-s* of the *Samyuktāgama*.

Provenance: On *baš Ming öy*, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.

Size(s): SI 2965/1 11.5 cm × 8.6 cm; SI 2965/2 10.2 cm × 8.1 cm; after joining: 15 cm × 15.4 cm.

Joining: SI 2965/1∞ 2965/2.

Language(s): Chinese (recto), Sanskrit — Uyghur bilingual (verso).


⁸⁰ E.g. ATÜGR 1974: § 189; GOT 2004: 192.

⁸¹ Cf. l. 02 ad *sentä*.

Saṃyuktāgama

Recto


Pl. 34-1: SI 2965/1 ∞ 2965/2 R (reconstruction)



T 223 VIII 18a8-12 or T 1509 XXV 735a18-23 (with var.)

Verso

Pl. 34-2: SI 2965/1 ∞ 2965/2 V



Transliteration

- 01 [...] kr[] m[] t[] k[] [?]g₁[]⁸² [+] × [...]
 02 [...] a śi-g₁ te-p • ta trā svā da ma la ×e⁸³ [...]
 03 [...] × la mā sā dya • tā śi-g₁ tu śu- × [...]
 04 [...] ×⁸⁴ va⁸⁵ ×⁸⁶ tu [+ + +] × ?⁸⁷ ma hā b^hū ttyo zly[] g₁yo n⁸⁸ • ū
 ktā nām • ×i [...]
 05 [...] pra paṃ ca • a zyā ryu-_r • ā zu tu tñā klām mā rū⁸⁹ lū-hk^h tu tñā
 qyā ryu-_r⁹⁰ ca kṣ[] • kyo-z myo⁹¹ • ru pa nām s[]_m [...] [...]
 06 [...] pyo tām pā lmī śpo lsā rlā-_r • ta⁹² tta⁹³yo • o lo lā rri⁹⁴ ki ñyu-n •
 saṃ yo ja ti • pā g₁i eya r[] [...] [...]
 07 [...] ×i kyo tryo lmī śñi-n⁹⁵ ca kṣu rā nye ṣām • k[?]o [...] [...]
 08 [...] l⁹⁶ ×o ×⁹⁷ vi ca⁹⁸ rā n[]a⁹⁹ ri kā yām [...]

Transcription

- 1 [...]kr[a]m[]t k[ar]g[a] [+] × [...]
 2 [...] aśiḡ tep • tatrāsvādam alab[dhv]ai[va ...]
 3 [...] śailam āśadya • taśiḡ tuśu[p ...]
 4 [...] × catu[r- + + +] × <4> mahabut tōzl[ō]ḡ ṅ • <ū>ktānām • ×i [...]

⁸² Or: [?]k[].

⁸³ Or: incomplete -ai.

⁸⁴ Vertical stroke as separator?

⁸⁵ Or: ca? If so, clearly different from ca in l. 05 prapaṃca, cakṣu[], l. 07 cakṣur; s. comm.

⁸⁶ Blurred, possibly crossed out: [+].

⁸⁷ The perfectly preserved akṣara is ambiguous. It might be p^hu or hu, which are, however, meaningless in this context, or else the improperly executed number 6, or a misshaped 4.

⁸⁸ Without virāma stroke.

⁸⁹ Error for: g,u.

⁹⁰ Virāma dot lacking or lost.

⁹¹ The form of <m> is unusual.-Original <-u> has been subsequently changed to <-y>. So perhaps <mu> corrected to <myo>? The dot above could be part of the vowel diacritic -o or the virama dot belonging to the preceding -z.

⁹² Or: na.

⁹³ Or: nna, tna, nta.

⁹⁴ Certainly, incomplete rr- because simple r- can be excluded.

⁹⁵ The presence of the virāma stroke is uncertain though.

⁹⁶ Only a small but significant remainder: the long hasta represents <|>, the slash branching off from it <-|>, cf. <lm̄> in the preceding line.

⁹⁷ Two options: p- or ṣ-.

⁹⁸ Or: ci va.

⁹⁹ Or: t[]a.

5 [...] prapaṃca<ḥ> • az ärür • azu tutñaklanma<g>uluk tutñak ärür
caḥs[u]<ḥ> • köz mö • r^up^añāṃs[a]ṃ[...]

6 [... tō]pōtan balmiṣ bolsarlar • tat tayo(ḥ) • ol olar ikinüḥ • saṃyojati •
baḡi är[ür ...]

7 [... at]_i kötrölmüṣniḡ caḥsur anyeṣāṃ • k^lö^l[zi ...]

8 [... Ka]_i^u[ṃ]gop[a]vic^arān[t]arikāyāṃ [...]

Commentary

The manuscript shows some remarkable features. Regarding paleography, it should be noted that the virāma dot and virāma line are sometimes lacking. As a result of scriptio continua words appear connected, 04 mahabut tōzl[ö]g öḡ, 05 az ärür, tutñak ärür, 06 balmiṣ bolsarlar, ol olar ikinüḥ. The linguistic characteristics are as follows: There is met with (1) persevering vowel assimilation in 05 köz mö, 07 kötröl- and (2) the unusual genet. suffix -nUḡ after unrounded vocalism, 06 ikinüḥ. Tutñak versus usual tutyak and abl. suffix +tAn vs. +tIn count as archaisms.¹⁰⁰

1–3 The first three lines of our ms. belong to the final stanzas of the Sūtra, which survives under number 246 in Guṇabhadra's Chinese version of the Saṃyuktāgama [= SĀ] (T 99 II 59a3-b7), 59b2–7.¹⁰¹ The notoriously free Chinese rendering does not reflect the wording of the original and is therefore text-critically irrelevant. It is supplemented by two Pali stanzas¹⁰² which, although belonging to a different tradition, harmonise better in wording with the fragmentary Sanskrit version:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | medavaṇṇañ ca (va Sn) pāsāṇaṃ vāyaso anupariyagā |
| 2 | ap' ettha mudu vindema apī assādanā siyā |
| 3 | aladdhā tattha assādaṃ vāyas' etto apakkame (°mi Sn) |
| 4 | kāko va selam āsajja nibbijjāpema Gotamā (°maṃ Sn) ti |

(1) A crow circled a stone which looked like fat (2a) (thinking:) “Perhaps we shall find something soft here; (2b) perhaps there may be (something) sweet.” (3a) Not obtaining (anything) sweet, (3b) the crow went away from there. (4a) Like the crow having attacked the rock (went away disappointed), (4b) we (i.e. Māra) will go away from Gautama (after having unsuccessfully attacked him).¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Cf. GOT 2004: 174.

¹⁰¹ Another shorter variant is found in Sūtra 1092 T 99 II 286c17–19, cf. CHUNG 2008: 77.

¹⁰² SN (ED. PTS) Vol. I 1884–1898: 124₅₋₈; SN (RE-ED. PTS) Vol. I 1998: 272 verses 504–505; SN (ED. PTS) 1913: verses 447–448.

¹⁰³ Tr. after Norman SN (TR. PTS) 2001: 53.

1 [...]**kr[a]m[]t k[ar]g[a]**: At the beginning of the Sanskrit part must have been excerpted the equivalent of Uygh. k[]g[], the completion of which to karga ‘crow’ only became evident after the identification. Coincidentally, the relevant passage is completely preserved in SHT V 1441r1: vāyaso ’nuparākrame, which according to the editors is to be completed to anuparākramet. The combined preverb anu-parā-, however, is rarely used and never attested with kram or any other verb meaning ‘to go’, while anu-pari-kram-/gam-/gā-/i- ‘to go around’ occur regularly, so too in the parallel Pāli versions, anupariyagā ‘went around’. Doubts are also expressed by SWTF,¹⁰⁴ which tries to do justice to anu-parā- with the translation “zufliegen auf [fly towards](?), drauflosgehen [go at](?)”. Another difference is the hypothetical optative compared to the narrative aorist in Pāli, which might have a good equivalent in Skt. *anuparyakramīt, for example. Neither the Chinese while paraphrasing nor our manuscript, which has been destroyed at the crucial parts, are informative on these points.

2 **aṣig tep**: Uygh. tep ‘(literally) saying’ marks the end of direct speech act or thought and often corresponds to the Skt. iti (Pā. iti, ti). In our case, the thought of the crow remains unmarked in the Pāli text (l. 2). Assuming the same in the Skt. version, Uygh. tep is added for clarification; the same effect is achieved by the Chinese translator through 想 ‘think’. Uygh. aṣig ‘food (acc.)’ may also be explanatory, since at least in Pāli such a noun is missing. The Chinese translator has 食 ‘food’, but before and not within the quotation of the crow’s thought. Without the Skt. original, we cannot know whether with Uygh. tep the thought of the crow is completed as a whole or only the first part of his reflection. In the first case, the accusative aṣig as object of a transitive verb would indicate that Pā. 1. 2 pāda b (with the intransitive verb as- ‘to be’) would not be present in the Skt. original or would have exchanged places with pāda a.

tatrāsvādam alab[dhv]ai[va]: The excerpt is undoubtedly the equivalent of Pā. 1. 3 pāda a: aladdhā tattha assādam ‘without getting/having got an agreeable taste’; accordingly, the restoration of alabdhvā (Pā. aladdhā) ‘without taking, or getting/ having taken, or got’ is certain. To complete the pāda, it must have been followed by a two-syllable word beginning with i or e, the initial sound of which is contracted with the final ā of alabdhvā to e (ā+i) or ai (ā+e). The reinforcing particle eva is the most likely candidate.

¹⁰⁴ SWTF 1994–2018: I 502b.

3 [ś] *ailam āsādyā*: Equivalent of Pā. I. 4 pāda a: *selam āsajja*. The restoration of śaila- ‘stone, rock’ had already succeeded with the help of Uygh. **tašig** ‘stone (acc.)’ before the parallel was found. The trace of diacritic upon the akṣara preceding la could easily be part of <-ai>. *Āsādyā* is formally the absolutivum (or gerund) of the causativum *ā-sādaya-* from *ā-sad-* ‘to sit (down)’, often like the causative in the meaning ‘to meet, to approach (also: with physical or verbal violence)’. The context shows that ‘having attacked (with the beak)’ is meant, which the Uygh. translator renders by the neutral **tušup** ‘meeting with’. The accusative (*tašig*) in place of the usual dative (*taška*) is seemingly due to the Sanskrit model.

4 **catu**[r-]: The first akṣara looks more like *va*, but the only way to make a meaningful connection with the Uygh. rendering is *ca*. If read and completed correctly and taking into account the Uygh. text, this should be an excerpt from *Sūtra* 248, the equivalent of 四大色 (59b24). In consequence, the numeral 4 was also conjectured for the Uygh.:

<4> **mahabut tözl[ö]g öñ** ‘the form having the 4 great elements as basis’.

<ü> **ktanām**: ‘of the said (pl.)’ without an obvious localisation of the excerpt. No presumption about the Uygh. equivalent is possible since no word with the meaning ‘to say’ has an *i/i* in the first syllable.

5 **prapañca**<ḥ>: On a secure basis rests the assumption that this excerpt is connected with the Chin. *Sūtra* 249. The Pāli parallel¹⁰⁵ proves this with the several times occurring *papañca-*. Edgerton remarks that “*papañca* ... is a word which in Pali and BHS is very hard to define ... Northern translations are unusually bewildering.”¹⁰⁶ The Uygh. translation **az ärür** ‘is greed’, though somewhat surprising because commonly used to render Skt. *ṛṣṇā* ‘(lit.:) thirst; craving’ and *rāga* ‘(lit.:) colour; passion’,¹⁰⁷ may be connected with an exegetical tradition which perhaps also appears in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (ed. Suzuki) 186.8f. *jalpaprapaṇcābhiratā hi bālās ... jalpo hi traidhātukaduḥkhayonis* ‘fools delight in jalpa and idle fancies (?...) ... for jalpa is the source of the misery of the universe’.¹⁰⁸ When agreeing with Edgerton (l. c.) that “[t]his [i.e. jalpa-] seems more naturally to mean desire

¹⁰⁵ AN (ED. PTS) 1885–1900: 161ff.

¹⁰⁶ BHS-D 1953: 380b.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. UW² 2010–2021: II.2, 103ff.

¹⁰⁸ Tr. Edgerton BHS-D 1953: 239b.

than (idle) talk”¹⁰⁹ one is inclined to think that the same is true for prapañca- which then would form together with jalpa- a synonym dvandva comparable with lobha-jalpa- “greed₂” (l.c.). The Uygh. translator continues with an alternative rendering:

azu tutñaklanma<g>uluk tutñak ärür. There is undoubtedly a reference to Pa. appapañcaṃ papañceti¹¹⁰ (nominalized *appapañco papañco), which e.g., Bhikkhu Bodhi¹¹¹ renders by “one proliferates that which is not to be proliferated” and further explains (o.c. 1710 fn. 881): “The Pali word papañca suggests mental fabrication, obsessive mental construction, and deluded conceptualization, which the commentaries say arise from craving, conceit, and wrong views (taṇhā, māna, diṭṭhi)”. The Chinese translator Guṇabhadra takes a similar view, using 虚言 ‘empty words’ (60a19) and 虚僞¹¹² ‘(lit.:) empty (and) false (scil. concepts, words)’ (60a20). As expected, due to the preceding az ‘greed’, the Uyghur gives a different interpretation for *aprapañcaḥ prapañcaḥ. Tutñak and the denominative verb tutñaklan- are obviously corresponding with elsewhere attested tutyak¹¹³ and tutyaklan-. Tutyak seems to be a nominal derivation from tut- ‘to hold, grasp, seize’ and is understood as ‘grasping, Skt. upādāna-; grahaṇa-’.¹¹⁴ Clauson¹¹⁵ took the extraordinary suffix -yak as “[s]ec(ondary) f(orm) of ... -yok” “with an early example of the sound change -o- > -a-”. But the per se artificial derivation cannot ex-

¹⁰⁹ SUZUKI 1932 — Internet versions: http://lirs.ru/do/lanka_eng/lanka-contents.htm, <http://www.buddhistische-gesellschaft-berlin.de/downloads/lankavatarasuzuki.pdf>, however, translates: “The ignorant are delighted with discoursing and false reasoning [but] they are unable to raise any great intelligence towards truth (*tattva*), discoursing is a source of suffering in the triple world, while truth is the extinguisher of suffering.” jalpaprapañcābhiratā hi bālās tattve na kurvanti matim viśālām | jalpo hi traidhātukaduḥkhyonīs, tattvaṃ hi duḥkhasya vināśahetuḥ || The Chinese translation supports Suzuki, s. the following fn.

¹¹⁰ AN (ED. PTS) 1885–1900: 161₂₈.

¹¹¹ SN (TR. PTS) 2000: 540.

¹¹² “Appears in the Chinese renditions of *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* attributed to Guṇabhadra [T 670] and Śikṣānanda [T 672] as a translation of the Sanskrit word *prapañca*” (DDB s.v.).

¹¹³ M. Erdal (p.c. 20.12.2019) invitingly considers that what was read tutyak (U II 1911: 6, 9–10) so far and declared “mis-spelt (or mistranscribed)” by Clauson (ED 1972: 462b) might be read tutnyak thus being directly comparable with the Brāhmī spelling. Accordingly, WILKENS (2021: 763b) with “tutayag† → tutñak → tutyak”.

¹¹⁴ ED 1972: 462b; OTWF 1991: 515; UW² 2010–2021: II.1, 47 s.v. adkanmak: Abhi a 41b4 tutyak tegüci savta adkanmak tutyaklanmak tep yörüg ol “im Wort ‘tutyak’ liegt die Bedeutung das ‘Greifen’, das ‘Nehmen’” (tr. UW² 2010–2021: l.c.). Tutyak is elsewhere also dyadically connected to az ‘greed’, as in our manuscript, cf. WILKENS 2021: 93b seq.

¹¹⁵ ED 1972: 462b.

plain ñ (> y). The word remains morphologically obscure. The form *tutyaklanmak* of the denominative verb *tutyaklan-* stands for Skt. *upādāna* as well.¹¹⁶ The rendition of *tutñaklanmaguluk* *tutñak* would then be ‘the grasping of what should not be grasped’.

cakş[u]<ḥ> • köz mö: The combination of the partly preserved Skt. and Uygh. parts lead to the respective lexemes for ‘eye’. Uygh. *mö*, if read correctly, can hardly be anything other than the enclitic interrogative particle *mU*, which is subject to synharmonisation and appears here fully assimilated to the *-ö-* of *köz*.

r^{<ü>} p^{<ä>} nām s[a]m[yogaḥ] ‘the bond of the forms (visible objects)’. It is tempting to restore *saṃyogaḥ* and connect this excerpt with the previous one: ‘is the eye the connection to the forms?’ If so, we can see in it the correspondence to the initial question of Sūtra 250: 眼繫色耶 (60a29) ‘is the eye connected to the form?’ or vice versa. Then the same is asked for the other 5 senses and their objects.

6 Properly understood, the connection between sense organs and their objects can be compared to that which exists in a team of two oxen: What is ‘yoke and harness’ (軛鞅 60b6) in the latter is ‘longing and desire’ (欲貪 60b5) in the former. The excerpts of line 6 belong to the oxen simile.

[tö]pötan balmış bolsarlar ‘when they are attached from the head’. The restoration of *töpö-* ‘top; head’ is certain because there is no other noun ending in *-öpö*. The preclassic abl. suffix *+tAn* does not show the expected front vocalism.

ol olar ikinüñ ‘that, of these two’: The Uyghur disambiguates the ambiguous Skt. spelling which must accordingly be read **tat tayo(ḥ)** ‘id.’. — Noticeable is the rare realization *+nüñ* of the genitive morpheme *+nXñ* in unrounded milieu.¹¹⁷

saṃyojati • bağı är[ür ...] (Skt.) ‘binds together’; (Uygh.) ‘is the bond of’. The Uygh. part could be united with the previous phrase: ‘that is the bond of these two’, but the Skt. syntax contradicts because in this case ‘these two’ would have to be in the accusative as the object of *saṃyojati*.

¹¹⁶ For the equivalence cf. U II 1911: 11,2–4 az kılınč tıltagınta **tutyaklanmak** bolur. **tutyak** tıltagınta kılınč bolur. “From *tṛṣṇā-* comes *upādāna-*. From *upādāna-* comes *bhava-* (Uygh. liter. ‘action’).” Erdal (OTWF 1991: 515) tries to do justice to the intransitive value of the composite suffix *+lan-* by translating ‘to get befallen by *upādāna*’.

¹¹⁷ Cf. GOT 2004: 169.

7 At the end of the short Sūtra (60b17ff.) it is said that the eye of the **Exalted One** does not give rise to longing and desire when seeing forms, unlike the eye of other beings, which is why the Exalted One teaches liberation from longing and desire.

[at]r kötrölmīṣṇiṅ ‘of the Bhagavant’, liter. ‘of the one whose name is exalted’.

caḅṣur anyeṣām • k^lō^l[zi ...] (Skt.) ‘eye of others’; (Uygh.) ‘eye of’.

8 [Ka]l^lī [m]gop[a]vic^ārān[t]arikāyām: ‘in the Kaliṅgopavicāra’¹¹⁸
From the beginning of the Sūtra 252, the Upasenasūtra, which was apparently very popular in Central Asia and has also been transmitted separately,¹¹⁹ part of the very detailed indication of the Upasena’s whereabouts. Here and in the British Library fragment Or. 15009/662 a3¹²⁰ its spelling is Kaliṅgo°, which is preferable to Kalimko° in Waldschmidt’s manuscript, 1423, 1.3: kalimko° (= idp SHT 61/1 r3).

35 SI 2965/3 (B/29-3)

Fragment from a scroll with the Chinese translation of the Saddharmapuṅḍarīka by Kumārajīva (T 262) or Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta (T 264). The free reverse was used to write a bilingual Sanskrit — Old Uyghur text on containing a piece of grammar, possibly on sandhi rules.

Provenance: On baš Ming Öy, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.

Size: 6.0 cm × 5.7 cm.

Language: Chinese (recto), Sanskrit — Old Uyghur bilingual (verso).

¹¹⁸ The exact meaning and closer localisation of the place, which has so far only been documented in the Upasena-Sūtra, is unknown. The Chin. has 迦陵伽行處 according to WALDSCHMIDT 1967: 334 ‘im Spazierbereich von Kaliṅka / 1989: 186 ‘at the walking place of Kaliṅka’.

¹¹⁹ On the Central Asian Skt. manuscripts and the parallels in other languages and their editions, see CHUNG 2008: 77–79. On p. 78 l.14, entry Sūtra 252 BL Or.: 15009/662 (= H.149.x.11) verso.

¹²⁰ Digital photo sub: <http://idp.bl.uk>, search value: Or. 15009/662.

Grammar


Recto

Pl. 35-1: SI 2965/3 R (reconstruction)

4	3	2	1
者 豈 異 人 乎 今 此 妙 音 菩薩 摩訶 薩 是 華 德	雷 音 王 佛 所 妙 音 菩薩 支 樂 供 養 奉 上 寶 器	智 佛 國 有 是 神 華 德 於 汝 意 云 何 爾 時 雲	四 千 七 寶 鉢 以 是 因 緣 果 報 今 生 淨 華 宿 王

Verso

Pl. 35-2: SI 2965/3 V



T 262 IX 56a8-11 or T 264 IX 191a2-5

Transliteration

- 01 [...] × *nI*-ñ • *y*[] t^hā kr[] [...]
 02 [...] × *kā* re • śa u ṣi-k [...]
 03 [...] u pa di li g₁lā [] *i* [...]
 04 [...] r̄ kem le g₁tyā • sa [?]v[] [...]
 05 [...] × × ṣi-× × [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...] *nI*ḥ • *y*[a]thākr[amaṃ ...]
 02 [...] × *kā*re • śa uṣik [...]
 03 [...] upadilīgla[r]i [...]
 04 [...] r̄ kenleṭyā • sa[r]v[a- ...]
 05 [...] × [u]ṣi[k] × [...]

Commentary

01 The Uygh. gen. is certain, the restoration of Skt. *yathākramaṃ*, or *yathākramaṇa* ‘in due succession’ quite likely.

02 × **kāre • śa użik**: (Skt.) ‘before the letter []’, (Uygh.) ‘the letter, or akṣara śa’. × is definitely not part of <ś> and thus Uygh. *śa użik* does not translate × *kāre*. The *sūtra* could have been something like ‘before the letter (-*kāre*) [X the letter Y changes into] the letter ś’. This sandhi rule would be of the type *Kātantra* I 5,1 *visarjanīyaś ce che vā śam* ‘visarga (changes) into ś before c or ch’. × might in fact be the right loop of <c^h>.

03 **upadihḡla[r]** ‘those of [] which have [...] upadi’. The loanword *upadi* is a crux. Under the premise that we are concerned with a grammatical text on sandhi, borrowing from *upadhi*- BS ‘fundament (of the worldly existence)’¹²¹ is out of place as well as *upādhi*- ‘specification’ which is used as grammatical *terminus technicus*,¹²² but not in the context of sandhi rules. A suitable etymon, but formally difficult because of the final -i, would be *upadhā*- ‘the penultimate letter, or sound’.

04 **r kenlegtä** ‘in [...] with final r’. The interpretation is hypothetical.

05 The preserved traces are well compatible with < u ṣi-k > in line 2.

36 SI 3716/7 (Kr VII/1)

Fragment from a scroll with Saṅghabhadra’s Chinese translation of either *Nyāyānusāraśāstra*[?] (T 1562) or *Abhidharmapiṭakaprakaraṇaśāśanaśāstra* (T 1563). The free reverse was used to write on a Sanskrit — Old Uyghur bilingual text.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size: 3.2. cm × 8.2 cm.

Language(s): Chinese (recto), Sanskrit (?) — Uyghur bilingual (verso).

¹²¹ SWTF 1994–2018: I 384.

¹²² RENO 1957: 109.

Undetermined


Recto

Pl. 36-1: SI 3716/7 R
(reconstruction)

2	1
名色界又於彼觸有成外用謂成宮殿及衣	大種應元則諸所造亦應非有便同无色何

Verso

Pl. 36-2: SI 3716/7 V



T 1562 XXIX 349b17-18 or T1563 XXIX 788a11-12.

Transliteration

01 [...] • ā tmo pa¹²³ yā te¹²⁴ • × tyo zyu¹²⁵ myo ltyo × [...]

02 [...] [] āṃ • myā ñi lya yiṃ [...]

¹²³ Or: ha?

¹²⁴ Or: ne.

¹²⁵ Or: zyuṃ.

Transcription

01 [...] • *ātmopāyāt*<i> • *ātözüm öltö* [...]

02 [...] *ām* • *māñiläyin* [...]

Translation

01 (Skt.) the self approaches, (Uygh.) my self died

02 (Skt.) may I [...], (Uygh.) may I be happy!

Commentary

01 Skt. excerpt and Uygh. translation individually are not clear, the combination of both helps to exclude some readings, but leads to no conclusive understanding. After Uygh. ‘my self died’¹²⁶ one would expect something like Skt. **ātmāpayātaḥ* ‘the self has gone away’. But *o* in *ātmo°* only admits of *upāyā-* ‘to approach (scil. death?)’. Next difficulty is final <te> which cannot be taken as PPt., but must be 3rd sing. Pr. middle, maybe erroneously for act. -ti.

02 From the Uygh. it appears that Skt. [...] *ām* is the remainder of the 1st sing. opt. prs. act. on -yām (athematic) or -eyām (thematic). Several verbs come into question, *tuṣ-*, and inter alia.

2.2.4 Tocharian B — Uyghur**37 SI 3715/1; SI 3716/4; SI 3717/1 (Kr VII/1);
SI 3754 (Kr VIII/6-3)**

It was Ogihara who established that the fragments listed were taken from a Chinese scroll with Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Pañcaviṃśati-sāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (T 222). The first three fragments form an almost complete series; the fourth fragment follows at a greater distance (see pl. 37–1). A longer strip was cut from the lower edge of the scroll. Length and width cannot be determined. Nothing indicates that this strip was cut up any further; it served as a scroll again. After it had been turned over the long

¹²⁶ *öltö*, usually *ölti*, with persevering assimilation *ö - i> ö - ö*.

edge and rotated 90° counterclockwise, the blank reverse was used to write a bilingual on, in which individual words from a Tocharian B text were translated into Uyghur. So far, no text known from elsewhere could be recognized in the incoherent words; preterital verb forms might indicate a narrative text.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size(s): SI 3715/1 15.1 cm × 7.8 cm; SI 3716/4 8.8 cm × 6.9 cm; SI 3717/1 3.6 cm × 4.7 cm; SI 3754 8.7 cm × 8.7 cm.

Joining: SI 3715/1 + 3716/4 + 3754 + 3717/1

Language(s): Chinese (recto), Tocharian B — Old Uyghur bilingual (verso).

Published in: OGIHARA 2018: e31–e35.

Narrative text?

Recto

Pl. 37-1: SI 3715/1 + 3716/4 + 3754 + 3717/1 R (reconstruction)


何色爲菩薩乎痛痒思想生死識爲菩薩蒙	別曉了一切諸法因緣假號於須菩提意云	如是須菩提菩薩摩訶薩行般若波羅蜜分行	羅三藐三菩阿惟三佛諸總持門諸三昧門	所說經典已速聞法未嘗斷絕速得便從聞	命則速自然无量之德親近諸佛便得從聞	速得功德善本便當供養諸佛世尊禮首歸	皆親見於時菩薩亦復遙見諸佛大聖亦欲	淨諸佛國土已能嚴淨諸佛國土諸佛世尊	化衆生已化衆生則便供養諸佛世尊則能嚴	阿惟越致神通具足神通以具則遊佛國教	波羅蜜便得長益入于寂然得菩薩道入于	蜜羅提波羅蜜性速波羅蜜禪波羅蜜般若若	無所著爲行般若波羅蜜檀波羅蜜尸波羅	持者如是須菩提菩薩摩訶薩於一切法而	口有故當所著者亦无所著亦无所行處可	不著著開化衆生亦不著著佛土無淨之不	猶著溫口拘舍羅所以者何用一如法苑珠	極亦不著著內外亦不著著處於兩間亦不	猶著於內之空亦不著著於外之空亦不猶	口口著无形之緣亦不著著自然之空	極亦不著著內外亦不著著處於兩間亦不	猶著慧度無極亦不著著神通之空聲聞緣	於肉眼亦不著著天眼慧眼法眼佛眼二不	亦不著著相亦不著著菩薩之身二不著著	亦不著著禪波羅蜜亦不著著般若波羅蜜	亦不著著禪波羅蜜亦不著著般若波羅蜜	亦不著著檀波羅蜜亦不著著尸波羅蜜	亦不著著檀波羅蜜亦不著著尸波羅蜜	痛痒及與苦樂不苦不樂行者於彼無死	苦無樂無不苦樂乃至意識所習習味甜香	不猶眼習五陰之事而无所猶不起痛痒無	識不猶舌味識不猶身細滑識不猶香	身意亦不猶眼色識不猶耳聲識不猶鼻香	色不猶痛痒思想生死識不猶於眼耳鼻舌
34	33	32	31	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

T 222 VIII 163b12ff. [b11–c17, DM] (Ogih.)

Verso

37.1 SI 3715/1

Pl. 37-2: SI 3715/1 V



Transliteration

- 01 [...] ×yu kyā¹²⁷ ni¹²⁸ ×r[]¹²⁹ • e k[]¹³⁰ [...]
 02 [...] × • si s̄gā¹³¹ yā g₁u hoṃ [...]
 03 [...] lg₁ā li • sa-rk̄ • a rkā si ndā [...]
 04 [...] l[] rtg₁yā¹³² li • wa wā ntsa ñe • b^hyo zci¹³³ • × [...]

¹²⁷ Or: rkyā.¹²⁸ Or ti.¹²⁹ Or: rr[]; rri O.¹³⁰ Or: rk[] O.¹³¹ Or: mg₁ā O, s̄g₁ā, bg₁ā.¹³² rkyā O.¹³³ gci O.

- 05 [...] *k*[] ×¹³⁴ *ki* [] *i* [+] • *te saṃ va*¹³⁵ *ra*¹³⁶ • *ya rri kci*¹³⁷ • *o* × [...]
 06 [...] [] *s*[] [ca. 5 akṣ.] -*r* *spa rta ñe* • *mo ño*-¹³⁸ [...]
 07 [...] × *i* • *lyo*¹³⁹ × *u*¹⁴⁰ [?] *k* × • *t*¹⁴¹ *t**i* *g*₁ *ci* • *lu wa kwā t* × *e*¹⁴² [...]
 08 [...] [] *ā*¹⁴³ *i* *śki rtti* • *pa* *rsa-nt* • × [...]
 09 [...] • *ṃyū*¹⁴⁴ -*ñ* *u*¹⁴⁵ *rmi-ṣ* *kyu syāṃ sa*¹⁴⁶ *g*₁ []¹⁴⁷ [...]
 10 [...] *pa*¹⁴⁸ [?] *e* *tt*[]¹⁴⁹ • *to ki mā-k* • *śā-k*¹⁵⁰ • *se*¹⁵¹ -*g*₁ • *wa la* × [...]
 11 [...] ¹⁵² *yā* [ca. 6 akṣ.] × × *ka ñi n* []¹⁵³ [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...] *ü* *kā ni* × *r*[]¹⁵⁴ • *ek*[...]
 02 [...] × [+] × × • *s*₁ *ṣga*¹⁵⁵ *ya gu hon* [...]
 03 [...] *lga*₁ • *sark* • *arkasinda* [...]
 04 [...] *l*[] *rtgāli* • *wawāntsaṅe* • *bözç*₁ • × [...]
 05 [...] × × *ki* [+ +] • *te saṃvara* • *yarıkç*₁ • *o* [...]
 06 [...] *s*[ca. 5 akṣ.] *r sparttaṅe* • *mono*[] [...]

¹³⁴ Or: × •; *s*[?][] O.

¹³⁵ *ṣa* O.

¹³⁶ Or: *nu*?

¹³⁷ *k^hci* O; misreading.

¹³⁸ *ñ*[]o O. No trace of a subscript; the virāma stroke is well visible.

¹³⁹ Or: *lpo* O.

¹⁴⁰ *tt*[] or *nt*[] O.

¹⁴¹ *tai* O.

¹⁴² Or *n*[]e, *n*[]*ai*, *t*[]*ai* O. The second consonant of the ligature may be *s*.

¹⁴³ + O.

¹⁴⁴ Though only a small loop of the basis sign is preserved Ogihara was most probably right to determine it as *y*- If need be, *s*- would be another, but fruitless option.

¹⁴⁵ Or: *ru* (only theoretically as initial *r*- “was a sound entirely foreign to the Turkish language”, ED 1972: 780a).

¹⁴⁶ *ca* not excluded, cf. comm.

¹⁴⁷ Or: [-]*g*₁, *k*[], [-]*k*.

¹⁴⁸ Or: *ya*?

¹⁴⁹ Or: *nt*[]. The vowel is -*a* or -[*ā*].

¹⁵⁰ Or: *śā-k*; *śā-k* O. A vowel diacritic, either -*ā* or -*ī*, is sufficiently clear as well as -*k* though it is different from that in l. 03 (*sark*); the rival -*ñ* can be excluded.

¹⁵¹ *sā* not excluded.

¹⁵² + O.

¹⁵³ Or: *t*[] O.

¹⁵⁴ For possible alternative readings s. translit.

¹⁵⁵ Or: *mga*, *bga*.

- 07 [...] ×i • lyo[]uk[]¹⁵⁶ • t[i]tigči • luwa kwātse[...]
 08 [...]ā išKirti • pärsant • × [...]
 09 [...] yüñ urmiš kūsän sag¹⁵⁷ [...]
 10 [...] pa l[?]e tta • tokımak • śāk¹⁵⁸ • sıg¹⁵⁹ • walā × [...]
 11 [...] yā [ca. 6 akş.] × × kañi n[]¹⁶⁰ [...]

Commentary

01 []ü kã ni ×r[]: Unclear.

ek[...] or **er[k[...]]**: Both alternatives admit of various restorations.

02 **sı ŝga ya gu hon** [...]: One could try to analyse the series of akşara-s into sıŝgay¹⁶¹ ‘will swell’, agug (acc.) ‘poison’, on ‘ten’. But the resulting sequence of words appears to be senseless.

03 [...]lgalı: Converb on +gAll¹⁶² from any verb stem with final l and back vocalism, e.g. kılğalı, kıl- ‘to do’.

sark • arkasında: Uygh. ‘on (+da) the back (arka) of (+ın)’ clarifies that TochB sark¹⁶³ represents the obl. used in local sense. By and large in accordance with Ogihara.

04 [...]l[]rtgäli: Again (s. l. 03) converb on +gAll, this time better determinable; there are only three verbs attested which match the preserved sequence of consonants, viz. bälgürt- ‘make manifest’, kälürt- ‘to bring’, ölürt- ‘to get so. killed’.

wawāntsañe • bözçi: Uygh. bözçi¹⁶⁴, nomen actoris (+čI)¹⁶⁵ from böz ‘cotton’, means ‘weaver of cotton cloth’¹⁶⁶ and would perfectly correspond with TochB wawāntsa (younger variant of wapāntsa¹⁶⁷) ‘weaver’. The

¹⁵⁶ Ogihara reads uninterpreted lpo tt[] [?][k[].

¹⁵⁷ Or: čag, č/sag[], č/sak, č/sak[].

¹⁵⁸ Or: śtk.

¹⁵⁹ Or: sag?

¹⁶⁰ Or: t[] O.

¹⁶¹ The alternative readings, sımga°, sıbga°, are completely uninterpretable.

¹⁶² ATÜGR 1974: § 233.

¹⁶³ DTB² 2013: 740.

¹⁶⁴ Ogihara's reading böğči and his attempt of interpretation can be discarded without discussion.

¹⁶⁵ For the productive suffix and its semantics s. GOT 2004: 110ff.

¹⁶⁶ Or ‘seller of cotton cloth’, ED 1972: 390a.

¹⁶⁷ DTB² 2013: 626.

TochB derivation on -ññe, either abstract formation¹⁶⁸ or adjective, is not included in the Uygh. rendering.

05 **te saṃvara • yarıǵçı**: As already seen by Ogihara, the Uygh. *yarıǵçı* is nomen agentis (+ǵI) from *yarık* ‘(body) armour’¹⁶⁹, thus meaning ‘armourer’.¹⁷⁰ The TochB part is difficult in itself. Ogihara acceptably defined *te* as nom./obl. ntr. of the pronoun *se* ‘this’ and did not try to make sense out of what he read *saṃṣara*. The here favoured reading *saṃvara* looks like the Skt. lexeme ‘restraint, control, discipline’. Admittedly, it would be surprising to see the word in its Skt. form while it occurs elsewhere in TochB habit as *saṃvār*;¹⁷¹ therefore, perhaps *saṃvar a°*, <-a> belonging to the following word.¹⁷² In addition, there is an obvious asymmetry between the TochB excerpt and the Uygh. rendering. If at all, *saṃvar* and *yarık* are connected by the way of allegory, ‘armour’ standing metaphorically for ‘discipline’ just as for ‘endurance’ in the “Gleichnis vom Wagen (chariot-simile)”.¹⁷³ *Yarıǵçı* might accordingly be abridged from **sanvarlıǵ yarıǵçı* ‘someone who makes discipline his armour’. If so, the adjective TochB *saṃvar<ä>[ṣṣe-]* “consisting of discipline” might be considered.

06 [...]**r sparttañe • mono**[ṅ ...]: Both phrases are incomplete. In TochB *sparttañe* (<°alñe)¹⁷⁴ one recognizes *spärttalñe*¹⁷⁵ ‘behaviour’, without the correct *ā*-diacritic in the first syllable. The Uygh. equivalent is lost. Slightly damaged, but easily restorable is Uygh. *monuṅ*, the gen. sing. of *bo* ‘this’, *monuṅ*¹⁷⁶, here with persevering assimilation *o-u > o-o*. The TochB counterpart is lacking.

¹⁶⁸ Thus Ogihara; DTB² 2013: 627 refers to parallel abstract *wāpāmtsune* in TochA s. OGIHARA 2010: 866.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. n. 173.

¹⁷⁰ ED 1972: 962 b provides evidence from non-Uygh. texts.

¹⁷¹ DTB² 2013: 733.

¹⁷² For an alternative see below.

¹⁷³ The chariot simile, belonging to the *Saṃyuktāgama*, is attested in the Skt.-Uygh. bilingual TT VIII A 32–37, analysed by WALDSCHMIDT 1955: 10ff. The parts of the *brahmayāna* ‘the best of the (wordly) cars’ are compared with the constituents of the *dharmayāna* ‘the car, or vehicle of doctrine’. Inter alia, the latter is described in l. 35f. as *titikṣā-varma-sannāho* ‘whose coat of mail is endurance’, Uygh. *särinmäklig yarık üzä yarıklandıǵ ärür* ‘it is armoured by the armour consisting of endurance’.

¹⁷⁴ On this development PEYROT 2008: 64–65, referred to by Ogihara.

¹⁷⁵ The formation is described by Ogihara as gerundive II (corr.: I) of *spärtt-* ‘to turn (itr.)’.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. <mo ñu-ñ> in TTVIII G 59, remarkably also spelled with ñ.

07 **lyo**[**luk**] • **t[i]tigči**: The Uygh. nomen actoris (+čI)¹⁷⁷ from titig ‘mud, clay’ occurs in a list of workmen and may mean “Ziegelhersteller”¹⁷⁸ (brickmaker) or “a man who makes mud walls”¹⁷⁹ or generally ‘someone working with clay’. For the restoration of the TochB part it is no help that kārkkälle is known as equivalent of Uygh. titig.¹⁸⁰ As to our -uk-, deverbal nomen agentis on -uki comes to mind, which would perfectly correspond with Uygh. +čI. Since the -uki-formation is derived exclusively from *-s- and -sk-presents, the suffix should be preceded by -(š)š-.¹⁸¹ Palaeographically justifiable is lyo[pš]uk[i] from lup-, laup- which forms the -s- present lup-s/š-. Thus *lupšuki would be expected from which the attested form deviates in the root vowel and in the palatalization of the l-. The former, -o < -au-, could be transferred from the causative, the latter could be due to the influence of the semantically similar lyu- ‘to rub’.¹⁸² The semantic side is relatively unproblematic: ‘one who smears (scil. clay)’ can very well be someone ‘who works with clay’. The close relationship between ‘clay’ and ‘to smear’ is based on the matter and is linguistically shown by the fact that words for clay can be derived from a root ‘to smear’, such as the Germanic *laima/ōn > German Lehm, English loam from *h₂leǵH- ‘to smear’, cf. LIV² 277.

luwa looks like the obl. sing. of luwo ‘animal’. The rest is unclear; kwāts (cf. DTB2 I 254) e[...] is too uncertain. But if kwātsi could be read, perhaps nebenform of kautsi, infin. of kau- ‘to kill’.

08 **iškirti**: Principally possible iš kirti ‘work entered’ makes poor sense. Therefore, the word for ‘a kind of Chinese embroidered silk brocade’¹⁸³ is preferable, as was proposed by Ogihara. The latest publication¹⁸⁴ has the lemma ešgirti. In the Orkhon inscriptions, according to the kind information

¹⁷⁷ The derivation suffix was also recognized by Ogihara, but he could not interpret the basis word which he read taytig.

¹⁷⁸ UW² 2010-2021: II.2: 46 (s.v. atsiz); WILKENS 2021: 723b.

¹⁷⁹ ED 1972: 455b.

¹⁸⁰ MAUE GLOSSEN I 2009: 22f.

¹⁸¹ Cf. KRAUSE 1952: 45, SCHÄFER 1997. “The suffix was rare in the archaic and classical language, but became productive in the late language”. PEYROT 2008: 96.

¹⁸² The word initial lyo reminds strongly of TochA lyom whose meaning ‘mud’ was determined by means of a Chinese parallel: špät koṃsā lyomaṃ kälk (A 1 (= THT 634) b 1), 泥(ni)中行七日 (T 1509 XXV 151 c 14) ‘he (the Bodhisattva Sarvārthasiddha) went seven days in mud (泥)’, SIEG 1944: 4; DSCHI 1943: 308.

¹⁸³ ED 1972: 261a.

¹⁸⁴ WILKENS 2021: 4.

of M. Ölmez (p.c.), the initial sound is always written with the i-rune; the Uygh. Script has <y> without exception. This tends to argue for /i/ which is confirmed now by the present manuscript. The only counter-instance occurs in Kashgari's Divan, <'škurty>, which is transcribed by the editors — omitting the -r- which disturbs the systematics — as ešgūti, DLT (ed. D&K) I 164. In this the e- is a compromise owing to Old Uygh. testimonies; for *äšGü(r)ti would be the first choice. However, since Kashgari's lexeme is probably taken from Karakhanid, its value for the Uyghur is less than that of the Brāhmī spelling. The Brāhmī middle -k- is also to be taken seriously: in our manuscript it stands for the voiceless palatal velar, while its voiced counterpart is represented by g₁(y). However, it cannot be ruled out that the k spelling comes from another orthographic tradition where <k> ⇒ /k', g'/; in this case, the g of the Orkhon inscriptions would also apply to the Uygh. Thus, it is advisable to keep the question of velar open in Uyghur for the time being.

pärsant (read: pärsānt) appears to be the basis substantive of the adjective (-tstse¹⁸⁵) pärsāntse 'resplendent'. Ogihara refers to the verb pärs- 'to sprinkle, splash', but does not interpret the word.

09 **yüñ urmiš**: 'on which a wool (or: feathers) is/are placed, or who has placed wool (or: feathers)'. Yüñ seems to be the palatal variant of yuñ 'wool, feathers'¹⁸⁶; urmiš '(having) put, or placed', deverbative noun on -mīš from ur- 'to put, place' was also recognized by Ogihara while he left yüñ uninterpreted.

küsän s/čak/g[?]¹⁸⁷: The first obvious idea was küsäncig¹⁸⁸ 'desirable'. But there is no trace of -i (or any other) diacritic connected with s- or c- so that only inherent -a is possible. Consequently, there must be a word boundary after küsän which is known as name of Kucha; a place name would be odd at this point, though. The following (part of a) word is too uncertain for a reasonable guess.

10 **tokimak** 'to hit, knock'¹⁸⁹ or as substantive 'club, mallet'.¹⁹⁰ The TochB word is obscure.

¹⁸⁵ TEB I 1960: § 222.

¹⁸⁶ ED 1972: 941b.

¹⁸⁷ Or variants (s. transcr.). Ogihara reads küsäns[], without interpretation.

¹⁸⁸ ED 1972: 751b. For the suffix -(X)nčig s. GOT 2004: 363ff.

¹⁸⁹ ED 1972: 467a

¹⁹⁰ ED 1972: 470b.


śā/īk • sī/ag: Ogihara inacceptably thinks that TochB śāk stands for śak ‘ten’; for it is unconceivable that a common word like ‘ten’ could have been misspelled and misunderstood by the translator. Uygh. sig, with /i/ written through <e>, could be ‘shallow’ or ‘stalk(?)’.¹⁹¹ The former is well attested in Uyghur, for the latter Clauson (l.c.) has only a single instance from a medical text, kántir sīgnī üč öñi käsip ‘cutting a stalk of hemp into three pieces’.¹⁹² A second instance comes from a collection of excerpts from the Samyuktāgama, kāmā sīg ‘cut branche(s)’.¹⁹³ If the present manuscript contains the third instance of this word, we can explain TochB śāk as a loanword from Skt. śākhā- ‘branch’.

walā × [...]: Ogihara suggests derivation from wāl- ‘to curl’.

11 [...]**e[+]kañi:** Unclear.

37.2 SI 3716/4

Pl. 37-3: SI 3716/4 V



¹⁹¹ ED 1972: 804 s.v. 1 sī:k and 2 sīk.

¹⁹² Hk I 1930: 122.

¹⁹³ MAUE 2015: 59: no. 89 r3 with comm. and addendum.

Transliteration

- 01 [...] ska lñe • yā¹⁹⁴ rmā¹⁹⁵-hk¹⁹⁶ [...]
 02 [...] • bi lykā¹⁹⁷ ñi¹⁹⁸ • uyu ndyu rti • plyam̄ si • s[] tk[]¹⁹⁹ [...]
 03 [...] tam̄²⁰⁰ ti-k̄ myā-k̄ • kra²⁰¹ tsa²⁰² nam̄²⁰³ • bi cmā-k̄ [...]
 04 [...] ntā²⁰⁴-r²⁰⁵ • tyu rtyā-r̄ lyā-r̄ × rtyā-r̄ l[] ā- [...]
 05 [...] sa rkne • ucā si ndā • mo ri ñk[?]i [...]
 06 [...] lai k[?]o²⁰⁶ ×²⁰⁷-r̄ • pi lyā ki ñy[] [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...]skalñe • yarmak [...]
 02 [...] • bilgāni • üntürti • plyam̄si • s[a]tg[...]
 03 [...] t̄/am̄²⁰⁸ t̄ikmāk • kra^{t̄}/ntsa^{n̄}/am̄ • bičmak [...]
 04 [...]ntār • türtär^[ä] r̄ [sü]rtär^[ä][r ...]
 05 [...] sarkne • ucasında • mo ri ñk[?]i [...]
 06 [...]lai^{ko} şar • biläkiñ[ä] [...]

Commentary

01 []skalñe • yarmak: Ogihara had no explanation for Uygh. yamak (his reading) and had to limit himself to determining the incomplete TochB word as abstract noun from a gerundive. The by him ignored yamaG²⁰⁹ ‘patch’ is thereby excluded. The reading yarmak would be nomen actionis on -mAk (~TochB -lñe) from yar- ‘to split, cleave’. Among the attested gerundives with middle -skal- it is trāskalye ‘chewable, edible’ (Skt. khādanīya-) which is semantically closest to the Uygh., but by no means convincing.

¹⁹⁴ Or: ye.

¹⁹⁵ Or: mā O.

¹⁹⁶ Virāma dot lost.

¹⁹⁷ Misspelling for lkyā.

¹⁹⁸ mi O.

¹⁹⁹ [?]tk[?][] O.

²⁰⁰ Or: nam̄. śam̄ O.

²⁰¹ ka O. -r- seems to be sufficiently sensible.

²⁰² Or: ntsa.

²⁰³ Or: tam̄, thus O without alternative reading.

²⁰⁴ Thus O as alternative, in the text: n[][].

²⁰⁵ Without virāma dot.

²⁰⁶ t[?]o O.

²⁰⁷ Possibly p[] or ş[].

²⁰⁸ Or: nam̄. śam̄ O.

²⁰⁹ ED 1972: 935b; OTWF 1991: 345.

02 **bilgäni üntürti** ‘brought forth knowledge’: While Ogihara understood *üntürti* correctly as 3rd sing. perf. of *üntür-* ‘to bring forth, produce (liter. to cause to rise)’, he could make nothing out of <bi lkyā mi>. The situation changes when *ñi* is accepted instead of *mi*. *Bilgäni* is the acc. sing. of *bilgä* ‘wise’ with the late originally pronominal ending +nI.²¹⁰ What is striking is *bilgä* instead of the usual dyadic *bilgä bilig*; but it does exist, albeit rarely, for instance *v(a)žir bilgä nom ičintä* ‘within the Vajra-wisdom-sūtra’²¹¹ (p.c. J. Wilkens and P. Zieme).

plyaṃsi • s[a]tg[]: Ogihara's accurate definition of TochB *plyaṃsi* as infin. K of *plänk-* K. ‘to sell’²¹² clarifies that the mutilated Uygh. word must be some formation (e.g. -gAll, -gU, -gUIUk) of *sat-* ‘to sell’.

03 [...]’*ṃaṃ ičmāk*: Ogihara's *šamntikmāk* [sic!] is an impossible chimaera and requires no discussion. *ṃaṃ* belongs to the TochB part, cf. the following excerpt; the interpunction is lacking or lost. Uygh. *tik-* ‘to insert (in the ground)’ “with a wide range of specialised meanings”²¹³ is no sound basis for suggestions on the underlying TochB word.

kra t_ntsaⁿ/ṃaṃ • bičmak: Uygh. ‘cutting’ is as clear as the TochB excerpt is obscure. Ogihara's attempts at explanation are based on presumably inaccurate reading.²¹⁴ Expected would be a form of *kärst-* ‘to cut off’.

04 [...]’*ntär • türtärlär* [sü]rtärl[ä]’[r] ‘they rub₂’, 3rd pl. aor. of partly synonymous *türt-*²¹⁵ and *sürt-*.²¹⁶ Of the TochB excerpt the medio-passive personal ending of the 3rd pl. is preserved, obviously the end of [sonopa]ntär from *sanāp-* ‘to rub in, anoint’²¹⁷ with medio-passive inflection. The corresponding 3rd. sing., *sonoptär*, is attested. If reflexivity is a permanent feature of the medio-passive forms²¹⁸ it is not expressed in Uygh. A few words must be said on Ogihara's proposal. Palaeographically his *tütörlär tütörlä[r]* is not really excluded even though the alleged -o-diacritics look sensibly different

²¹⁰ ATÜGR 1974: § 181.

²¹¹ BT XXIX 2011: 138 l. 504.

²¹² MAHLZAHN 2010: 742f.

²¹³ ED 1972: 476b.

²¹⁴ Ex conl. *kantsate* from *känts-* ‘to sharpen’.

²¹⁵ ED 1972: 535a.

²¹⁶ ED 1972: 846b. — *sürt-* seems to be less striking than the mere repetition of the preceding *türtärlär*.

²¹⁷ DTB² 2013: 737; or *sanāp-* Malzahn 2010: 934. Alternatively, *kantanantär* could be restored, s. 38 v06.

²¹⁸ S. MALZAHN 2010. 934.

from that in mo of the next line and the first syllable of the second form is rather guesswork. Definitely impossible is his analysis of tütörlär as 3rd pl. prs. of tütür- ‘to fight’²¹⁹ without a temporal affix.

05 [...] **sarkne • ucasında**: The correspondence between TochB ‘on the back’ and Uygh. ‘on one's back’ is perfect, as was already seen by Ogihara. Uygh. uça occurs alone²²⁰ or connected with arka ‘back’.²²¹

mo ri ñk[?]i: Unknown. A certain similarity with murañgī-, muruñgī- ‘Moringa oleifera (syn. M. pterygosperma) may be accidental.

06 [...] **laiko şar • biläkiñ[ä ...]**: Completely uninterpreted by Ogihara. Uygh. biläkiñä ‘to one's wrist (biläk)’ raises no difficulties. TochB. laiko if seems to be derived from lik- ‘to wash’ either as the noun laiko ‘bath, washing’(?) or ‘lotion(?)’²²² or as part of the PPt nom. sing. m., provided that la-laiko stands for the classical lalaikau. If the latter applies, şar ‘hand’ might be the object, while the TochB excerpt corresponding with Uygh. biläkiñä is lost. Presumably, the phrase was as follows: ‘he washed his hand up to the wrist’.

37.3 SI 3754

Pl. 37-4: SI 3754 V



²¹⁹ Thus, Ogihara referring to Russ. натравлять which, however, means ‘to incite’. From the Russian verb it becomes apparent that his source was DTS 1969: 602. There is quoted a sentence from the DLT 1982: 306: olañ arit tütürdi ‘he set the dog on him to catch him’. The non-Uygh. ἄπαξ λεγ. is highly problematic, cf. e.g. GOT 2004: 723, and just for that reason not suitable to throw light on another unclear context.

²²⁰ E.g. TT VII 1937: text 20 l. 7.

²²¹ E.g. BT XIII 1985: text 1 l. 74.

²²² DTB² 2013: 600.

Transliteration

- 01 [...] × []ky[] × []yu ×y[] × [...]
 02 [...] ×u ci • ka rṣa lya na • yyo lyā ṅyo • ke ś[]²²³ [...]
 03 [...] l[?]ā l[]²²⁴ • [+ + +] × • syu ṅyu pa śim • śu tka ske [...]
 04 [...] lñe wa []×ai • tu tmā-hk d^hā ulā d^hi • ś[] [...]
 05 [...] lko • tyu ṅyu-r̄ pyu śyo-k²²⁵ • e²²⁶ pe-s²²⁷ ya × [...]
 06 [...] × yu rlyā-r̄ • pra mā nta • kī zhu²²⁸-t • yā ṣa²²⁹ ñe • [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...] × []ky[] × []yu ×y[] × [...]
 02 [...]UčI • kārṣālyana • yōlāṅō • keś[...]
 03 [...] l[?]ā l[] • [+ + +] × • sūṅū bašin • śutkaske[...]
 04 [...]lñe wa[r]ñai • tutmakta ulatī • ś[...]
 05 [...]lko • tūṅūr büšök²³⁰ • epes ya × [...]
 06 [...] ...ürlär • pramānta • kīzgut • yāṣañe • [...]

Commentary

02 **kārṣālyana** • **yōlāṅō**: Following Adams²³¹, Ogihara interpreted the TochB word as *gdv. nom./obl. pl. fem. of kārsk-* ‘to throw, spread, shoot’; for *yōlāṅō* he gave ‘rest’. The latter is undocumented, the former anything but certain. Certain is that both forms are gerundives on TochB -lye and

²²³ Or: g[].

²²⁴ []: [?]p[] lyā lya O, does not represent the present state of the fragment.

²²⁵ -z O (misread).

²²⁶ Or: ca O.

²²⁷ Or: -m̄ O. -s̄ of the manuscript is not inclined, but more rounded than m̄ should be.

²²⁸ ghu O (misread).

²²⁹ Or: p̄a O.

²³⁰ p̄üşöz O.

²³¹ DTB² 2013: 177. The lemma *kārsk-* (practically unchanged reproduced from DTB¹ 1999: 167f.) is full of inaccuracies: instead of *sumāna* one should read (Skt.) *sumanā* or (TochB) *sumān*, on p. 762 correctly translated through ‘great flowering jasmine’ but provided with the wrong botanical name ‘*Chrysanthemum indicum* Linn.’ instead of ‘*Jasminum grandiflorum* L.’. Next is the word of unknown meaning, which Adams misspells as “Mālaṅḍi” (against *māladaṅḍi* of the ms.) in the first TochB quotation and as “Mālaṅḍika” in the translation of the second quotation from M-3a5/PK-AS-8Ca5 (not °8Ga5 with Adams), while the (perhaps) correct, but unattested form Skt. **māladaṅḍikā* is found on p. 482. An even more serious shortcoming is the lack of an indication that the lemma form and the meaning of the verb which underlies *kārṣālyana* are disputed.

Uygh. +gU resp. The Uygh. form is derived from *yöläŋ*- ‘to lean on’²³², *yöläŋgü*, with crasis *ng > ŋ* and perseverative assimilation *ö-ü > ö-ö*. It is semantically incompatible with **kärşalye* whichever of the proposed interpretations one would accept. They were shortly presented by M. Malzahn²³³: Filliozat’s ‘à reconnaître’²³⁴ from the root *kärs*- ‘to know’ (formally excluded), Sieg’s derivation from *kärk*- ‘binden (to bind)’²³⁵ Adams’ aforementioned view. She herself refrained from any semantic determination, setting a second root *kärsk*- with unknown meaning. Recently G.-J. Pinault, M. Malzahn and M. Peyrot returned to Sieg’s ‘to bind’.²³⁶ Provided that *kärşalye* means ‘to be bound’ in our ms., the same could be expressed by Uygh. *ulangu* from *ulan*- ‘to be joined or attached to’.²³⁷ Spelled in cursive Sogdo-Uygh. script, *’wl’nkw*, it would be confusable with *ywl’nkw*, *yöläŋgü*.²³⁸ Thus it is conceivable that the scribe of our ms. had a draft before his eyes where the Uyghur part was written in informal Sogdo-Uyghur script and he — unaware of the TochB — misread *’wl’nkw* as *ywl’nkw*. But it may be wise to wait for a simpler solution.

03 **süñü başm** ‘spearhead or top of a banner (Skt. *dhvajāgra*-) (acc. or instr.)’.²³⁹

śutkaske[...]: With Ogihara probably an incomplete form of the so far unattested causativum of *kutk*- ‘± to give substance to, cast in a mold; embody, incarnate’²⁴⁰ though *śutka* (3. sing. pret. I) with following e.g. *ske*[*ye*] ‘zeal, or sim.’²⁴¹ cannot be excluded.

04 [...]**lñe wa[r]ñai • tutmakta ulatı** ‘grasping, or holding etc.’ As was pointed out by Ogihara Uygh. +*ta ulatı* helps to restore TochB *warñai* ‘etc.’ as well as Uygh. *tutmak* points to TochB *eñkalñe* ‘grasping’.

²³² OTWF 1991: 630.

²³³ MALZAHN 2010: 582.

²³⁴ FILLIOZAT 1948: 101 and 114.

²³⁵ SIEG 1955: 81; KRAUSE 1952: 230. In DTB² 2013:171 it is ²*kärk*-, one of four homonym verbs.

²³⁶ <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?m-pkas8c> (Date of online publication: February 2014. Date of access: 2019-12-28.): a5 text and translation.

²³⁷ OTWF 1991: 623.

²³⁸ “generally written as *YWL’N’*” (OTWF 1991: 630) without the elsewhere usual palatal marker *y*.

²³⁹ No interpretation by Ogihara.


²⁴⁰ DTB² 2013: 194.

²⁴¹ DTB² 2013: 773.

05 [...]lko • tūñür büšök: Each of the Uyghur words²⁴² stands for a special “relation by marriage”, the difference discussed by Clauson²⁴³ s.v. böšük. Noticable is the erroneous(?) metathesis of the vowels in büšök. A corresponding TochB word ending in lko is unknown.

epes: Ogihara tries to connect his reading capem with cämp- ‘to be able’. The 1. pl. prs.I/II act. would be *campem; lacking -m- is unexplained. The here accepted epes has a parallel in THT 110 a 9 (s. pl. 37–5) which, however, was disqualified in the edition²⁴⁴ as mistake for eše ş ‘together’ + ‘and’. The conjecture is unconvincing as it implies that two ordinary lexemes (eše and ş) would have been substituted by an extraordinary word or even something meaningless (epes). Segmentation after epe ‘or, otherwise’ leaves -s unexplained. Due to the lacking context in THT 110 and missing Uygh. translation here, epes remains obscure.

Pl. 37–5: SI 3754 v05 (detail); THT 110 a9 (detail) © BBAW



06 **pramānta • kizgut:** Uygh. ‘torment; punishment’²⁴⁵ does not support Ogihara’s assumption that the TochB *pramātta* (his reading) represents borrowed Skt. *pramatta-* ‘careless’. Being certainly a loanword, *pramānta* appears to be the plural on -nta of *pramān* (<**pramān-nta* <**pramānānta*). Such a word is attested in THT 110 a 4 after *yarm* (ms.: *yarām*) ‘measure’ and is regarded as its synonym and borrowing from Skt. *pramāṇa-* ‘(right) measure’.²⁴⁶ Uygh. ‘punishment’, though no obvious rendering of the TochB word, could be understood as the ‘right measure(s)’ against an evil-doer. Another conceivable homonymous *pramān*, borrowed from Iranian, cf. MPers. *pr̥m'n*, *framān* ‘command, injunction’, would not have the advantage to be semantically closer to Uygh. *kizgut*.

²⁴² Ogihara identified the first and misread the second one.

²⁴³ ED 1972: 380b.

²⁴⁴ TochSprB I 1983: 133 n. 10. CEToM reproduces the spelling of the ms. without commentary.

²⁴⁵ OTWF 1991: 313.

²⁴⁶ Cf. DTB² 2013: 444.

yāṣaṇe ‘the dressing, putting on a dress’: abstract noun (-ṇe) on the basis of *yāṣalle*, gdv. I of *wās* ‘to be, or get dressed, wear, put on’²⁴⁷, *yāṣaṇe* < **yāṣalṇe*. Ogihara reads *yāpāṇe* instead which he identifies with *yapālṇe* ‘the entering’, verbal abstract from *yāp-* ‘to enter’.

37.4 SI 3717/1

Pl. 37–6: SI 3717/1 V



Transliteration

- 01 [...] × -g₁ • le *wlām̄*²⁴⁸ × × [...]
 02 [...] × ko • [ta rra]²⁴⁹ *lmi* [+] []u²⁵⁰ [...]
 03 [...] × [...]

Transcription

- 01 [...]g • le *wlām̄* × × [...]
 02 [...]ko • *taralmi*[š +] []u [...]
 03 [...] × [...]

Commentary²⁵¹

01 **le *wlām̄*** ×: The only word which comes in mind is *wlaṃṣke* ‘soft, pliable’. × is part of a ligature which could have been *śke*. The crux is that the

²⁴⁷ For the formation cf. TEB I 1960: § 319, for the verb cf. DTB² 2013: 649.

²⁴⁸ Or: *wpām̄* O; -p- would be the prima facie option; by comparison with the preceding l, however, -l- is well conceivable and certainly preferable because p should be attached to the end of w.

²⁴⁹ []: *sya* O; misreading.

²⁵⁰ The lost consonant being k, d, ḍ or r. Or else: u.

²⁵¹ No interpretations by Ogihara.

thus isolated *le* means nothing. Changing into *le(n)* ‘(monastic) cell, resting place’²⁵² would be a slight emendation, a more serious one *le(ke/i)* ‘bed, resting place’.²⁵³

02 [...]ko • *taralmi*[š]: Uygh. ‘dispersed; confused’.²⁵⁴ The first meaning could point to ToChB *käskau*, PPT of *käsk-* ‘scatter’²⁵⁵ which, however, cannot be represented by []ko since the ligature *sk-* would be expected. The metaphorical meaning reminds of ToChB *triko-* ‘confused’ which has to be excluded because the trace of the *akṣara* preceding *ko* can’t be part of the ligature *tri*.

38 SI 3716/5-6; SI 3718 (Kr VII/1)

Three fragments, two fitting together, the third a little distant from them, were recognized by Ogihara as pieces of the same scroll containing a passage of T 220 (s. pl. 38–1). The blank verso was used for writing down excerpts from a ToChB text with added Uyghur translations. For that purpose, the piece was cut off the scroll, turned over the upper (or lower) edge and rotated by 90° counterclockwise.

Provenance: Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.

Size(s): SI 3716/5 6.3 cm × 7.7 cm; SI 3716/6 10.5 cm × 9.0 cm; SI 3718 3.3 cm × 6.2 cm.

Joining: SI 3716/5 ∞ 3718 + 3716/6 ∞ “3718-(1)”²⁵⁶

Language(s): Chinese (recto), Tocharian B — Old Uyghur bilingual (verso).

Published in: OGIHARA 2018: e28–e31.

Narrative text?

²⁵² DTB² 2013: 608.

²⁵³ DTB² 2013: 607.

²⁵⁴ GOT 2004: 674.

²⁵⁵ DTB² 2013: 189; MALZAHN 2010: 596.

²⁵⁶ The fragment so designated by Ogihara is untraceable. The two *akṣara*-s it contains are given below as line 18 according to Ogihara's reading.

Recto


Pl. 38-1: SI 3716/5 ∞ 3718 + 3716/6 R (reconstruction)

13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
一切智智清淨若受想行識清淨若四无色	受想行識清淨故四无色定清淨何以故若	別无斷故一切智智清淨故受想行識清淨	若色清淨若四无色定清淨无二无二分无	故四无色定清淨何以故若一切智智清淨	復以善現一切智智清淨故色清淨色清淨	无二分无別无斷故	佛无上正等菩提清淨若四无量清淨无二	四无量清淨何以故若一切智智清淨若諸	正等菩提清淨諸佛无上正等菩提清淨故	別无斷故善現一切智智清淨故諸佛无上	訶薩行清淨若四无量清淨无二无二分无	淨何以故若一切智智清淨若一切菩薩摩

T 220 VI 345c8 ff. (Ogih.)

Verso

Pl. 38-2: SI 3716/5 ∞ 3718 + 3716/6 V

**Transliteration**01 [...] × []u²⁵⁷ [...]02 [...] a mpa²⁵⁸ lyi škai²⁵⁹ • tā²⁶⁰ ((ta))²⁶¹ wsi²⁶² ki[...]03 [...] ×k[]²⁶³ rā²⁶⁴ k[]²⁶⁵ • [× u]²⁶⁶ hrā y[] × [...]

²⁵⁷ Alternatively, | after Ogihara; but the sign is written below the line which speaks against |.

²⁵⁸ Or: mp[i], mp[e].

²⁵⁹ Or: ške? The first bow of -ai is very faint but seems not to have been deleted.

²⁶⁰ Or: nā O.

²⁶¹ na O, which Ogihara interprets as correction of nā; that could also apply to ta (for tā) although it is not clear what was intended by such a correction since vowel quantity has no relevance in Uyghur. A substantial reading aid would be: “read t(a), not n(ā)”. But for this purpose, the two akşaras are not distinct enough. Or else ta (or na) was omitted somewhere and had to be inserted there.

²⁶² + O, with note: perhaps w[?][], w[?]i or /[?]. There can be little doubt about wsi, however.

²⁶³ Or: k×, with × = o or i. [?]k[] O.

²⁶⁴ r[] O. The lower end of -ā is visible.

²⁶⁵ [?]k[] O.

²⁶⁶ | : a ru O.

- 04 [...] g i ñā • mā ma nta-s [...]
 05 [...] × y[]²⁶⁷ •²⁶⁸ mā e ñka sta-r • pū²⁶⁹ [...]
 06 [...] []mā-c²⁷⁰ • ka nta na nta-r • sy[]²⁷¹ r×[]²⁷² [...]
 07 [...] × śi lā × l[] × o²⁷³ -l²⁷⁴ [...]
 [Two or three lines are lost:]
 08 [...]
 09 [...]
 10 [...] × p[]²⁷⁵ [?]ku²⁷⁶ ×²⁷⁷ [?]d^h[] mi-s ×²⁷⁸ [...]
 11 [...] wa ññe • tu wā-k̄ • ta²⁷⁹ (da)²⁸⁰ wa sa • tyo × [...]
 12 [...] pa ñā śkai • vi²⁸¹ lā pci • wa rtse • ke-ñ • [...]
 13 [...] × ku ri śke ne • a wā stā²⁸² • ra tre × śe²⁸³ [...]
 14 [...] -g₁ yā ñli-g₁ • muo²⁸⁴ ra-p • kya ñryā-k || || [...]
 15 [...] pra st^h aṃ • śi²⁸⁵ ñ²⁸⁶ • × e²⁸⁷ sa sma ññe × [...]
 16 [...] × []o²⁸⁸ × tam²⁸⁹ tā ki²⁹⁰ pra st^h o-l • a-z × i [...]

²⁶⁷ Or: ×p[], + O.

²⁶⁸ Punctuation uncertain.

²⁶⁹ ra O.

²⁷⁰ Or: -v.

²⁷¹ Eligible vowel: a (inherent) or u.

²⁷² r[?][] or m[?][] O.

²⁷³ Most likely × = k or k̄.

²⁷⁴ ×o-l s[?]o-+ O.

²⁷⁵ pi O. What is visible apart from p does not seem to be part of an -l, but of a consonant.

²⁷⁶ The head of k is on the virtual writing line which would make only r an eligible superscript consonant.

²⁷⁷ a O. In principle, []u would also be possible.

²⁷⁸ [?][]m[] O.

²⁷⁹ Or: na, but cf. the following note.

²⁸⁰ Or: ca. If da, possibly for disambiguation of the akṣara ta, s. note 261; if ca, unknown function. Not mentioned by O.

²⁸¹ Or: ci. O conversely.

²⁸² Or: snā.

²⁸³ śśe O.

²⁸⁴ mo O. Additional -u is clearly visible.

²⁸⁵ ś[] O.

²⁸⁶ Most probably virāma stroke lost.

²⁸⁷ × = ś or p. se O.

²⁸⁸ [] [?]o O.

²⁸⁹ Or: nam, [-]t, not ta (pace O.).

²⁹⁰ [] []i O.

- 17 [...] × *i* × *ā* × *i* [+²⁹¹] × *i*²⁹² • *yā ye* × *o* [] *i* [...]
 18²⁹³ [...] *si rki*²⁹⁴

Transcription

- 01 [...] × [] *u*²⁹⁵ [...]
 02 [...] *ampalyiškai*²⁹⁶ • *tavsıki*[*ya ...*]
 03 [...] × *k* [] *rak* [] • × × *ugray*[*u*] + [...]
 04 [...] *giŋa* • *māmantaş* [...]
 05 [...] × *y* [] • *mā eŋkastar* • *bu*[...]
 06 [...] *mač*²⁹⁷ • *kantanantar* • *süırt*[...]
 07 [...] *şilā* [] [] *ol* [...]
 08 [...]
 09 [...]
 10 [...] *p* [] *ku a*[?] *T* [] *miş* ×²⁹⁸ [...]
 11 [...] *waññe* • *tuvak* • ¹/_n *awasa* • *tö*[...]
 12 [...] *pañāškai* • *wilapçı* • *wartse* • *keŋ* • [...]
 13 [...] × *kuriškene* • *avazta* • *rätre* [] *şe*²⁹⁹ [...]
 14 [...] *g yaŋlıg* • *muorap* • *käŋräk* || [...]
 15 [...] *prast*^h *an* • *şıŋ* • *şesa smaññe* • [...]
 16 [...] × [] *o*³⁰⁰ × *tam*³⁰¹ *taki* *prast ol* • *azki*[*ya ...*]
 17 [...] × *i* × *ā* × *i* [+³⁰²] × *i*³⁰³ • *yā ye* × *o* [] *i* [...]
 18 [...] *sırki*

²⁹¹ Possibly two lost akşaras as O supposes.

²⁹² *s*[?] *i* O.

²⁹³ Ogihara's reading, s. introduction to this item.

²⁹⁴ Or: *rko*, *rkaui*.

²⁹⁵ Alternatively, *ı* after Ogihara; but it is written below the line.

²⁹⁶ Or: ^o *ške*?

²⁹⁷ Or: ^o *w*.

²⁹⁸ [?][] *m* [] O.

²⁹⁹ *şe* O.

³⁰⁰ [] [?] *o* O.

³⁰¹ Or: *nam*, [-] *t*, not *ta* (pace O.).

³⁰² Possibly two lost akşaras as O supposes.

³⁰³ *s*[?] *i* O.

Commentary

02 **ampalyiskai • tavsıktı**[ya]: Ogihara determines the TochB form as obl. sing. fem. of a diminutivum on -ške, derived from so far unknown *ampalyi. TochB -škai (or -ške) helps to restore the end of the Uygh. word as the semantically corresponding +kIyA. The remaining tawsı might be a borrowing from Chin. 桃子 táozı ‘peach’ (LMC³⁰⁴ tʰaw tsz̩³⁰⁵).³⁰⁵ If so, TochB *ampalyi could be associated with the first term of the compound ampalak-kesar,³⁰⁶ which is itself an Indian loan word, cf. Pa. ambāṭaka- ‘Spondias mangifera (alias: pinnata) or hogplum’.³⁰⁷ The material correspondence between the two fruits is very weak; but since neither the peach nor the hogplum were native to the Tarim basin, factual and linguistic inaccuracies must be viewed as possible.

03 **ugray**[u] ‘especially, particularly’.³⁰⁸

04 [...] **gıñā**: Dat. sing. with preceding pron. suff. 3rd of a back vocalic noun on final g.

māmantaş ‘evil, malicious’; nom. pl. or obl. sing. masc. PpT mǎnt- MP ‘to be stirred, angry’;³⁰⁹ with erroneous metathesis quantitatum for mamāntaş, as was observed by Ogihara.

05 **mā ɛnkastar • bu**[lmazsǎn]: TochB ‘you do not take’³¹⁰ which allows to restore the Uygh. form from bul- ‘to find, obtain’. As to the personal ending one can doubt whether °tar is used instead of °tǎr (3rd. sing.), cf. next line kantanantar.

06 [...] **mač**³¹¹: Unclear.

kantanantar • s[ü]rt[ǎrlǎr...]: TochB ‘they rub’ (3rd pl. Prs. MP)³¹² of kǎnt-, with °ntar instead of °ntǎr. For sǎrt- cf. 37.2 v04.

07 [...] **šilā []l[] ol**: It would be tempting to restore [Takşa]šilā [ba]l[ı]k ol ‘is the town Takşašilā’. But there is no clear evidence for that.

10 []p[]ku a[?]T[]miš: Both parts are damaged; some relevant informations can be gathered nevertheless. Uygh. -miš points to TochB -u, mor-

³⁰⁴ PULLEYBLANK 1992: 303 and 420.

³⁰⁵ The fruit is also referred to by tülüg ärük ‘hairy stone fruit’, ED 1972: 222a.

³⁰⁶ DTB² 2013: I 21.

³⁰⁷ S. e.g. CDIAL 1966: no.1275.

³⁰⁸ GOT 2004: 428. — Ogihara’s reading makes no sense.

³⁰⁹ MALZAHN 2010: 753.

³¹⁰ Of course, also correctly seen by Ogihara.

³¹¹ Or: °w.

³¹² Ogihara erroneously 2nd. sing. which would be *kantanatar.

pheme of PpT, and eo ipso to a verb stem with final k which also contains p. As no Uygh. verb with initial Cu is eligible, thus initial a is left with the following candidates: adın- (1) ‘to sober up’,³¹³ adın- (2) ‘to be overwhelmed (by joy or fear)’.³¹⁴ There is no attested TochB verb that formally and semantically matches Uygh. adın- (1) or (2).

11 [...] **waññe • tuvak**: TochB -ññe formations are very numerous, the ones preceded by wa are still half a dozen, the most prominent being on(u)waññe ‘immortal; immortality’.³¹⁵ Uygh. tuvak does not appear in the dictionaries. A back vocalic variant of tūvāk ‘a blow-pipe’³¹⁶ is not more than a vague possibility.³¹⁷ But if so, it would not translate the preceding TochB word which, however, could be a descriptive attribute (‘consisting of iron’??) of the lost TochB ‘blow-pipe’. Howsoever, Ogihara considers reading the word as TochB tuwak, tu (ntr. of su ‘this’) + enforcing enclitic particle -k.

¹/_nawasa³¹⁸ • tō[...]: The TochB excerpt possibly also occurs in THT 324 b4, read as nawasa and not interpreted so far.³¹⁹ The context there allows or even suggests the name of a part of the body in the perl. on -sa. It is preceded by the obl. tottemās ‘top of the head’. Both expressions could form a hendiadys so that the meaning of ¹/_nawa would be ‘± crown of the head’. Its Uygh. equivalent tōpō would be partly preserved in our manuscript. The whole chain of considerations is fragile and, of course, one can doubt whether there is room for a third ‘crown of the head’ beside tarne³²⁰ and mrāce.³²¹

³¹³ ED 1972: 61b; UW² 2010–2021: I.1 8.

³¹⁴ ED 1972: 61b; UW² 2010–2021: I.1 8.

³¹⁵ The others are: eñkwaññe ‘male’ ← eñkwe ‘man’; eñc(u)waññe ‘iron-’ ← eñcuwo ‘iron’; täñwaññe ‘loveliness’ <täñkwaññe ← täñk-waññ- ‘to love’; tañkwaññe ← tankw ‘love’; enaiwaññe ‘?’.

³¹⁶ ED 1972: 439a.

³¹⁷ The word can hardly be separated from Pers. tufak, tupak, tufang ‘musket’ and cognates, s. TMEN 1965–1975: II, no. 868. If Brockelmann's etymological derivation from Turkic *top ‘ball’ with diminutive suffix +ak was correct, the searched for back vocalism would even be original. However, Doerfer refuted Brockelmann with strong arguments (unexplained o > u in the first syllable; late attestation in Turkic; -f- unusual in Turkic). His own explanation by onomatopoesis is all but convincing.

³¹⁸ Or: na°.

³¹⁹ DTB² 2013: 351.

³²⁰ DTB² 2013: 298.

³²¹ DTB² 2013: 514. Mrāce is also attested in hendiadys with tarne in TT IX p. 12 l.25; the Uygh. translation is baš tüz tōpō ‘Kopf-Scheitel’.

12 [**pañāśkai • wilapči**: The Uygh. word is a nomen agentis on +čI. Residual *wilap*³²² must be a Tocharian style borrowing from Skt. *vilāpa-* ‘idle talk’.³²³ The Uygh. translator could have built **savıklatači* from *savıkla-* ‘to talk idly, or incoherently’.³²⁴ The reason why he didn’t may perhaps be searched in the TochB excerpt if *p* represents the end of **vilāp*. The rest is, however, morphologically unclear apart from the diminutive or adjectival suffix *-ške* (obl. fem. *-škai*), not rendered in Uygh.

wartse • keŋ: TochB³²⁵, Uygh.³²⁶ ‘broad, wide’, already identified by Ogihara.

13 **kuriškene • avazta**: Ogihara convincingly analyses the TochB as locative (*-ne*) of the deminutive (*-ške*) of previously unattested **kuri* of so far unknown meaning. The TochB locative should have prevented him from identifying the Uygh. word with Skt. *avasthā-* ‘state, position’ and could have led him to the Uygh. locative +tA from *avaz*.³²⁷ This clarified, TochB *kuri* can be identified as Indian loan-word, corresponding with Skt. *kuṭī-* ‘hut, cell, esp. of a monk’³²⁸ (For intervocalic Skt. *-ṭ-* ~TochB *-r-* cf. also Skt. *kūṭāgāra-* ‘roofed pavillion’³²⁹ ~TochB *kwrakar*, TochA *kurekār*; **kākoṭī-*³³⁰ ‘Luvunga scandens (?)’³³¹ ~*kākori*;³³² Skt. *koṭi-* ‘a crore, ten millions’

³²² Alternative *čilap* is senseless.

³²³ This meaning seems to prevail in the Buddhist language, cf. PED 1921–1925: 635b; SWTF 1994–2018: IV 132a *vilapita-* ‘dahergeredet’, while elsewhere *vi-lap-* usually means ‘to lament, wail’.

³²⁴ Cf. MAUE 1996: 46 no. 64; MAUE 2008: 162.

³²⁵ DTB² 2013: 139 s.v. *aurttse*.

³²⁶ ED 1972: 724b.

³²⁷ UW² 2010–2021: II.2 53 s.v. *avaz*; KNÜPPEL 2002. The voiced sibilant was accepted there because of the consistent spelling with *z*. The word is of Indian origin and corresponding with Skt. *āvāsa-* ‘abode’ (UW¹ 2010: 299a s.v. *ayaz*); that it came to the Uygh. through TochA *āvās* ‘abode’ could have been known to Knüppel (through MAITR TOCHA 1998: p. 40 a3) and Röhrborn (also through DThTA 2009: 54a). */z/* is not contradicted by our ms., which uses <*s*> as phonetic variant before *t* or follows the TochA orthography. The meaning of the Uyghur word will be discussed below in the main text.

³²⁸ BHS-D 1953: 184b; SWTF 1994–2018: II 82a. As to the TochB ‘little hut’ s. ROSEN 1959: 62f.

³²⁹ SWTF 1994–2018: II 101a.

³³⁰ Usually *kākoṭī-*, once *kākoṭi-* BOWERMS 1893: II 33 § 128.

³³¹ According to Hoernle (BOWERMS 1893: 259b), but the identity is not ascertained, cf. the following note.

³³² Beside *kākoṭi*, FILLIOZAT 1948: 112f. ‘*Gymnema balsamicum*’, thus also IMM 1954: I 596.

~TochA³³³/B³³⁴ kor.). To translate the specific TochB ‘little hut’ the Uygh. uses the generic term Skt. *āvāsa-* ‘a monk’s abode’ or more detailed ‘a place which is suitable for temporary or permanent residence of religious persons’. It is advisable to start from this meaning when interpreting the instances. The Uygh. word was already known from the Uygh. version of Xuantsang’s biography. It occurs in two contexts³³⁵ where the Chin. original has 龕 *kān* and 龕室 *kānshi*.³³⁶ The former, 龕,³³⁷ serves to designate niches on the outside of a *stūpa* base³³⁸, the latter, 龕室, niches on a sacred mountain where monks came to sit down for meditation. The Uyghur translator adds *ürüñ* ‘cave’ in the latter case; that is for explanation as it seemed plausible to him that the holy men resided in caves. Pace Knüppel and Röhrborn in both instances the primary meaning of *avaz* is sufficient, the specific semantic nuances are determined by the context.

rätre×še: Ogihara suggests derivation from *ratre* ‘red’ with suffix *-še* which perhaps also appears in *wāntareše~wāntare* ‘thing, affair etc.’³³⁹ The meaning is unclear.

14 [...] **gyaṅliḡ:** Ogihara plausibly proposes restoration of *montag*, or *antagyaṅliḡ* ‘suchlike, of his sort’.

muorap • kāṅrāk: TochB, Uygh. ‘drum’, as Ogihara correctly saw, Uygh. *kāṅrāk* translates Skt. *murava-*, the etymon of TochB *muorap*. The double vocalisation *-uo-*,³⁴⁰ overlooked by Ogihara, is still waiting for a convincing explanation.

15 [...] **prast^han • šīṅ:** Ogihara had no lucky hand in deriving TochB *prast^han* from Skt. *prasthāna-*. Correctly read and interpreted, Uygh. *šīṅ* points the right way. The word is long known³⁴¹ and was determined by

³³³ DThTA 2009: 165a.

³³⁴ Beside *koṭ*, DTB² 2013: 215.

³³⁵ Ht III 2001: 240 and 243; Ht V 2015: 1870 and 1875. The passages were discussed in some detail by M. Knüppel (KNÜPPEL 2002).

³³⁶ Remarkably they occur nowhere else in the biography.

³³⁷ In the beginning of the 11th chapter of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (T 262 IX 32b 19 = T 264 IX 167a 2) 龕室 is used instead. Interestingly the Sanskrit text (SPSKT (ED. K&N) 1908–1912: 239,3–4) reads *torāṇa-*, which was understood by the Chinese translators, Kumārajīva as well as Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta, not in the original sense of ‘an arch, arched doorway, portal’, but of a niche which was shaped in form of a *torāṇa*.

³³⁸ Not within a *stūpa* as said by Röhrborn, UW² 2010–2021: II.2 51.

³³⁹ For both s. DTB² 2013: 643f.

³⁴⁰ For more instances in Uygh. Brāhmī mss. s. MAUE 1996: XXIV.

³⁴¹ U II 1911: 77, l. 26.

F.W.K. Müller as Chinese measure of capacity and translated by “Scheffel” (bushel), until it was corrected by Bang & von Gabain³⁴² into šīṅ ‘Liter’ < Chin. 升 shēng. The Chin. word is also met with in the Khotanese as śīṅga- for which R.E. Emmerick has shown that its Indian (approximative) equivalent was *prastha-*.³⁴³ The latter is the etymon of TochB **prast*^h, here in the form of the obl. sing.

ṣesa smaññe ‘together with, soup’. Ogihara is right that something is wrong with the excerpt. *ṣesa* requires the comitative. If used as postposition the antecedent is lacking; if used as preposition the comitative suffix *-mpa* was not excerpted together with *smaññe*.

16 [...] × []o³⁴⁴ × *taṃ*³⁴⁵ **taki prast ol • azki**[ya ...]. Ogihara wrongly thinks that there is a choice between Uygh. *az* ‘greed’ and *az* ‘little’. The following *kı* decides clearly for the latter, *azkiya* ‘a little bit’. What precedes is not as obscure as Ogihara suspects: +*tAkI* forms denominal nouns meaning ‘being in’; <*prast*^h-> is again *prastha-*, this time as Uyghur word and therefore transcribed *prast*; the pronoun *ol* forms together with *prast* the predicate of a nominal sentence.

2.3 Undetermined language

39 SI 6378/11 (B/без шифра)

Provenance: Tajik Ming öy, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.

Size: 3.7 cm × 2.2 cm.

Language: Tocharian A or B.

³⁴² BANG & VON GABAIN 1931: 500b.

³⁴³ Final version in SVK 1982–1997: II 139f.

³⁴⁴ [] [?] o O.

³⁴⁵ Or: *nam*.

Undetermined**A**

Pl. 39-1: SI 6378/11 A

**Transliteration**01 [...] sa³⁴⁶ || [...]02 [...] rwa şta³⁴⁷ [...]**B**

Pl. 39-2: SI 6378/11 B

**Transliteration**

01 [...] × [...]

40 SI 6378/6 (B/без шифра)**Provenance:** Tajik Ming öy, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.**Size:** 2.1 cm × 1.3 cm.**Language:** Tocharian?**Undetermined****A**

Pl. 40-1: SI 6378/6 A

**Transliteration**01 [...] × • t[]³⁴⁸ [...]

02 [...] × to × [...]

B

Pl. 40-2: SI 6378/6 B

**Transliteration**

01 [...] × ×k[] × [...]

02 [...] × w[] ×i [...]

³⁴⁶ Or: [-]š.³⁴⁷ Or: şwa. ş[u].³⁴⁸ Or: n[].

41 SI 6378/10 (B/без шифра)

Provenance: Tajik Ming öy, coll. by Berezovsky, in 1905–1907.

Size: 2.5 cm × 2.2 cm.

Language: Unclear.

Undetermined**A**

Pl. 41-1: SI 6378/10 A

**Transliteration**

01 [...] ×i škā [...]

02 [...] ×ā [...]

Commentary

Assuming that the reading 01 -iškā- is correct, it seems to be Skt., part of pariškāra-, niškāsa- etc. etc.

B


Pl. 41-2: SI 6378/10 B

**Transliteration**

01 [...] mi × [...]

42 SI 3716/1 (Kr VII/1)**Provenance:** Turfan, coll. by Krotkov around 1907.**Size:** 2.7 cm × 3.9 cm.**Language:** Tocharian B(?), Old Uyghur(?).**Undetermined****Recto**

Pl. 42-1: SI 3716/1 R



Traces of three lines. Special sign <ṛ> in the first line might point to Tocharian or Uyghur; but it rarely occurs even in Skt. manuscripts, e.g. SHT VII 1642 Bl. 38r2 ṛddhi-. Other readable akṣaras *i*, *l*[?]e []i in line 02 and ×e in line 03 are ambiguous as to the language.

Verso

Blank.

3.2 Literature and abbreviations (Part II)

Abbreviations

AAWG: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse

AKPAW: Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

APAW: Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

BHS: Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

BT: Berliner Turfantexte

CEToM: A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts, s. Electronic resources

DDB: Digital Dictionary of Buddhism, s. Electronic resources
DTA: Digitales Turfan-Archiv
idp: International Dunhuang Project
LMC: Late Middle Chinese after PULLEYBLANK 1991
ms: manuscript
NTB: North Turkestan Brāhmī
Pa.: Pali
r: recto
SHT: Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
Skt.: Sanskrit
s(ub) v(oce): under the specified word
SPAW: Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.- hist. Klasse
SWTF: Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden
T (no.) (vol.) (p.): Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō (大正新脩大藏經), alias Taishō Issaikyō (大正一切經). I–C. Tōkyō 1924–1935, s. also Electronic resources
THT: Tocharische Handschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Berlin, s. also Electronic resources
TIES: Tocharian and Indo-European Studies
TochA: Tocharian A
TochB: Tocharian B
TT: Türkische Turfan-Texte
v: verso
VOHD: Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland

References

- AI_{GR} 1957–1975: Wackernagel, Jacob; Debrunner, Albert. *Altindische Grammatik*. Bd. I–III. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- AN (ED. PTS) 1885–1900: *Aṅuttara-Nikāya*. Ed. by R. Morris, E. Hardy. 5 Vols. PTS.
- AT_{UGR} 1974: Gabain, Annemarie von. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. 3. Auflage. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium Neue Serie; XV).
- AV_{DH} 1992: Arthavistaradharmaparyāya (= Arthavistarasūtra) in: Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. *Untersuchungen zum Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins*. Göttingen. [unpubl. Habilitationsschrift].
- BANG & VON GABAIN 1931: Bang, Willy; Gabain, Annemarie von. “Analytischer Index zu den fünf ersten Stücken der Türkischen Turfan-Texte”. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 17: 461–517.
- BHS-D, BHS-GR 1953: Edgerton, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 1: *Grammar* [=BHS-GR]; vol. 2: *Dictionary* [=BHS-D]. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- BT XIII 1985: Zieme, Peter. *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. (BT; XIII).
- BT XXIX 2011: Kasai, Yukiyo. *Der alttürkische Kommentar zum Vimalakīrtinirdeśastra*. Turnhout: Brepols. (BT; XXIX).
- CDIAL 1966: Ralph L. Turner, A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
-

- CHUNG, Jin-il 2008: *Zaahanjing xiangdang fanwen duanpian yilan 雜阿含經相當梵文斷片一覽* = A survey of the Sanskrit fragments corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- CLEAVES, Francis W. 1977: "Uighuric mourning regulations." *Journal of Turkish Studies* 1: 65–93.
- DLT 1982: *Maḥmūd al-Kāšvarī, Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luṣvāt at-Turk)*. Ed. and transl. by Dankoff, Robert; Kelly, James. Part I. Harvard University Printing Office. (Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures; 7).
- DSCHI, Hiän-lin 1943: "Parallelversionen zur tocharischen Rezension des Punyavanta-Jātaka". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 97: 284–324.
- DTB¹ 1999: Adams, Douglas Q. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- DTB² 2013: Adams, Douglas Q. *A dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and greatly enlarged*. I–II. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi.
- DThTA 2009: *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. I: A–J. Compiled by G. Carling in collaboration with G.-J. Pinault and W. Winter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- DTS 1969: *Drevnetiurkskii slovar'*. Redaktory V.M. Nadeliaev, D.M. Nasilov, E.R. Tenishev, A.M. Shcherbak [Old Turkic dictionary. Ed. by V.M. Nadeliaev, D.M. Nasilov, E.R. Tenishev, A.M. Shcherbak]. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie [Nauka Publishers, Leningrad department].
- ED 1972: Clauson, Gerard. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- FILLOZAT, Jean 1948: *Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie*. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire par J.F. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- GOT 2004: Erdal, Marcel. *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8 Uralic & Central Asia).
- HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe 1987: *Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra des Mātṛceta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden; XII. — Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philol.-histor. Kl. 3. Folge; 160).
- HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe & MAUE, Dieter 1991: "Neue Spuren von Mātṛcetas Varṇārhavarṇa". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 141: 69–82.
- HK I 1930: Rachmati, Gabdul R. "Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren [I]." *SPAW* 24.: 451–473. (Repr. in *Sprachwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der deutschen Turfan-Forschung*. Vol. III. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1985: 549–571).
- HT III 2001: *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie III. Nach der Handschrift von Leningrad, Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von A. v. Gabain*. Herg., übers. u. komm. von M. Ölmez u. K. Röhrborn. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- HT V 2015: *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie V. Nach der Handschrift von Leningrad, Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von A. v. Gabain*. Herg., übers. u. komm. von S. Dietz, M. Ölmez, K. Röhrborn. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- IMM 1954: *Dr. K.M. Nadkarni's Indian materia medica: with Ayurvedic, Unani-Tibbi, Siddha, allopathic, homeopathic, naturopathic & home remedies, appendices & indexes*. Rev. & enl. by A.K. Nadkarni. I–II. Bombay: Bombay Popular Prakashan.
- KNÜPPEL, Michael 2002: "Zu uigurisch avaz". In: *Splitter aus der Gegend von Turfan. Festschrift für P. Zieme anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstags*. Ed. by M. Ölmez, S.-C. Raschmann. Istanbul/Berlin: M. Ölmez: 111–117. (Türk dilleri araştırmaları dizisi; 35).

- KONOW, Sten 1935: *Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt*. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl. 1935; XX).
- KRAUSE, Wolfgang 1952: *Westtocharische Grammatik. Bd. I: Das Verbum*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- MAITRTOCHA 1998: Ji Xianlin. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*. Transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji, X. in collaboration with W. Winter, G.-J. Pinault. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter Mouton. (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs; 113).
- MAITRUIT 1980: Tekin, Şinasi. *Maitrisimit nom bitig: Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule. 1. Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen. 2. Analytischer und rückläufiger Index*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. (BT; IX).
- MALZAHN, Melanie 2010: *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden: Brill. (Brill's studies in Indo-European languages and linguistics; 3).
- MAUE, Dieter 1996: *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 1. Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift. [Teil 1.]* Beschr. u. hrsg. v. D.M. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (VOHD; XIII, 9).
- MAUE, Dieter 2002: “Ein weiteres sanskrit-ugurisches Fragment zu Mātṛceṭas Varṇārha-varṇa”. In: *Splitter aus der Gegend von Turfan. Festschrift für P. Zieme anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstag*. Hrsg. v. M. Ölmez, S.-C. Raschmann. Istanbul–Berlin: M. Ölmez: 139–152. (Türk dilleri araştırmaları dizisi; 35).
- MAUE, Dieter 2008: “An Uighur version of Vāgbhaṭa’s Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā”. *Asian Medicine* 4: 113–173.
- MAUE, Dieter 2015: *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 19. Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift. Teil 2*. Beschr. u. hrsg. v. D.M. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (VOHD; XIII, 27).
- MAUE GLOSSEN I 2009: Maue, Dieter. “Uigurisches in Brāhmī in nicht-Uigurischen Brāhmī-Handschriften”. Teil 1. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 62 (1): 1–36.
- MORIYASU, Takao 2019: *Corpus of the Old Uighur letters from the Eastern Silk Road*. Turnhout: Brepols. (BT; XLVI).
- MW 1899: Monier-Williams, Monier. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. New ed., greatly enlarged and improved with the collaboration of E. Leumann, C. Capeller and other scholars. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Repr. 1970).
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi 2016: “Sanskrit–Tocharian B bilingual Udānavarga fragments kept in the Russian collection”. In: Sergei Fedorovich Ol'denburg — uchenyi i organizator nauki. Sost. i otv. red. I.F. Popova. [Sergey Fedorovich Oldenburg: Scholar and Academic Research Organizer. Ed. by Popova, Irina F]. Moscow: Nauka: 223–235.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi 2018: “Roshia shozō tokarago bunken ni kansuru oboegaki” ロシア所蔵トカラ語文献に関する覚え書き [Remarks on the Tocharian manuscripts housed in the Russian collection]. *Tōkyō daigaku gengo-gaku ronshū* 東京大学言語学論集 [The University of Tokyo Journal of Linguistics] 40, 2018.9: e1–e41.
- OTWF 1991: Erdal, Marcel. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon*. I - II. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (Turcologica; 7).
- PHELIN, Nikolai & RASCHMANN, Simone-Christiane 2016: “Turfan manuscripts in the State Hermitage — a rediscovery”. *Written Monuments of the Orient* 2: 3–43.
- PED 1921–1925: *The Pali Text Society's Pali–English dictionary*. Ed. by T.W. Rhys Davids; William Stede. London: Chipstead. (Repr. 1979).
- PEYROT, Michael 2008: *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi. (Leiden studies in Indo-European; 15).

- PPUSKT (ED. SHACKLETON BAILEY) 1951: *The Śatapāñcāśatka of Mātṛceṭa. Sanskrit text, Tibetan translation & commentary and Chinese translation; with an introduction., English translation and notes.* Ed. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: University Press.
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin G. 1991: *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in early Middle Chinese, late Middle Chinese, and early Mandarin.* Vancouver: UBC Press.
- RENOU, Louis 1957: *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit.* Paris: Champion.
- ROTH, Gustav 1986: "Mangala-symbols in Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts and inscriptions". In: *Deyadharmā. Studies in Memory of Dr. D.C. Sircar.* Ed. by G. Bhattacharya. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications: 239–249. (Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series; 33).
- SIEG, Emil 1944: *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen. I.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag. (APAW 1943; 16).
- SIEG, Emil 1955: "Die medizinischen und tantrischen Texte der Pariser Sammlung in Tocharisch B". *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 72: 63–83.
- SN (ED. PTS) 1884–1898: *Saṃyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka.* Ed. by L. Feer. 5 Vols. Oxford: PTS.
- SN(RE-ED. PTS) Vol. I 1998: *The Sagāthavagga. A Critical Apparatus* by G.A. Somaratne. Oxford: PTS.
- SN (TR. PTS) 2000: *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha. A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya.* Transl. from the Pāli by Bhikkhu Bodhi. 2 Vols. PTS.
- SN (ED. PTS) 1913: *Sutta-nipāta.* Ed. by D. Andersen, H. Smith. PTS.
- SN (TR. PTS) 2001: *The group of discourses (Sutta-nipāta).* 2nd ed. Tr. with introd. & notes by K.R. Norman. Oxford: PTS.
- SPSKT (ED. K&N) 1908–1912: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.* Ed. by H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio. St.-Petersbourg, 1908–1912 (Bibliotheca Buddhica; X).
- SUK 1993: Yamada, Nobuo. *Uiguru bun keiyaku bunsho monjo shūsei* ウイグル文契約文書集成 / Sammlung uigurischer Kontrakte. Ed. by J. Oda et al. I–III. Osaka: Ōsaka Daigaku Shuppankai.
- SVK 1982–1997: Emmerick, Ronald; Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. *Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese. I–III.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- SWTF 1994–2018: *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule, begonnen von E. Waldschmidt, hrsg. von H. Bechert, K. Röhrborn, J.-U. Hartmann.* Bd. I–IV. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- TEB I 1960: Krause, Wolfgang; Thomas, Werner. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Bd. I: Grammatik.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- TMEN 1965–1975: Doerfer, Gerhard. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit.* Bd. II–IV: *Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen.* Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. (Ak. d. Wiss. u.d. Lit., Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission; 19).
- TOCHSPRB I 1983: *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Teil I: Die Texte. Band 1: Fragmente Nr. 1–116 der Berliner Sammlung.* Hrsg. v. E. Siegling† u. W. Siegling†, neubearb. u. m.e. Kommentar nebst Register versehen v. W. Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (AAWG 3. Folge; 133).
- TT VII 1937: Rachmati, Gabdul Rašid. *Türkische Turfan – Texte VII.* Mit sinologischen Anmerkungen von W. Eberhard. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften. (APAW; 1936, 12).
- U II 1911: Müller, Friedrich Wilhelm Karl. *Uigurica II.* Berlin: G. Reimer. (AKPAW 3, 1910).

- UVSKT (ED. B) 1965–1968: *Udānavarga*. Ed. by F. Bernhard. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden; X), (AAWG; 54).
- UVSKT (ED. N) 1987: *Udānavarga*. Ed. by H. Nakatani. *Udānavarga de Subaši*. Édition critique du manuscrit sanskrit sur bois provenant de Subaši. Tome I. Texte et facsimilés. Paris: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne.
- UVSKT (ED. P) 1960: Pauly, Bernard. “Fragments sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot).” *Journal Asiatique* 248: 509–519.
- UV (BALK) 1988: Balk, Michael. *Untersuchungen zum Udānavarga, Unter Berücksichtigung mittelindischer Parallelen und eines tibetischen Kommentars*. Bonn. (Ph.D.Diss.). (Repr. in: *Indica et Tibetica*, 53. Marburg, 2011).
- UW¹ 1998: Röhrborn, Klaus. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien. [Vol. I: a – ärjäk]*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. [Discontinued, superseded by UW²].
- UW² 2010–2021: Röhrborn, Klaus et al. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien. Neubearbeitung. I. Verben: 2010 I.1: ab- – äziğlä-; 2020 I.2: edäd- ıztä-. II. Nomina – Pronomina – Partikeln: 2015 II.1: a – asvık; 2017 II.2: aš – äzüük. III. Fremdelemente: 2021 III.1: eč – bodis(a)v(a)tv*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst 1955: “Zu einigen Bilinguen aus den Turfan-Funden”. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 1955, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 1–20. = (Repr. in:) *From Ceylon to Turfan. Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes*. Göttingen, 1967: 238–257.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst 1967: “Das Upasenasūtra, ein Zauber gegen Schlangenbiß aus dem Saṃyuktāgama”. (First publ. in:) *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1957: 27–44, 2 tables. = (Repr. in:) *From Ceylon to Turfan. Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes*. Göttingen, 1967: 329–346. Engl. version: “The Upasenasūtra. A charm against snake-bites from the Saṃyuktāgama”. (First publ. in:) *Jñānamuktāvalī. Commemoration volume in honour of J. Nobel on the occasion of his 70th birthday offered by pupils and colleagues*. Ed. by C. Vogel. New Delhi, 1959: 234–253. = (Repr. in:) *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften, hrsg. von H. Bechert und P. Kieffer-Pülz*, Stuttgart, 1989 (Glasenapp-Stiftung, 29): 180–200.)
- WILKENS, Jens 2021: *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch – Deutsch – Türkisch. Eski Uyğurcanın el sözlüğü. Eski Uyğur-Almanca-Türkçe*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag. s. Electronic resources.

Electronic resources (checked 09-17-2021)

CEToM: <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?home>

DDB: <http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/>

DTA: <http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta-i>

idp: <http://idp.bl.uk> or <http://idp.bbaw.de>

T: https://21dzk.l.utokyo.ac.jp/SAT/index_en.html

THT: The Berlin Tocharian manuscripts are accessible at the internet addresses of CEToM or DTA

WILKENS 2021 online version: https://www.univerlag.uni-goettingen.de/bitstream/handle/3/isbn-978-3-86395-481-9/Wilkens_handwoerterbuch.pdf?sequence=4&

4 Appendix

43 ВФ-4190 (Т II Y4/ ТII Y7)

© Государственный Эрмитаж, Санкт-Петербург, 2021

“Chinese manuscript of the 妙法蓮華經 Miao fa lianhuajing (Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-Sūtra) on the recto (Taishō vol. 9, no.262). In addition, 3 lines in Brāhmī script are written on the upper margin of the Chinese manuscript. Different texts in Brāhmī script on the verso: ll. 6–32: Prasādapatibhodhava (= Śatapañcāśatka) of Mātṛceṭa (verse 1–13c, identified by Klaus Wille). Two fragments of a scroll.”³⁴⁹ Mātṛceṭa's text is given in 43.1, the other Brāhmī inscriptions in 43.2.

Provenance: 2nd Prussian Turfan expedition, Yarkhoto.

Size(s): 71.5 cm × 26.6 cm; 13.1 cm × 26.1 cm.

Language(s): Sanskrit, Old Uyghur, Tocharian B.

43.1. Sanskrit

Verso

**Prasādapatibhodbhava (= Śatapañcāśatka) of Mātṛceṭa
verses 41 (= 3.15) and 1–13c (= 1.1–2.3c)**

³⁴⁹ Pchelín & Raschmann 2016: 26.

Transliteration

Preliminary remarks: Mistakes concerning the quantity of vowels (a instead of ā or vice versa etc.), mostly missing visarga-s (ḥ) and anusvāra-s used against sandhi rules also for final n are not mentioned in the apparatus.

01 • || ā tme cc^ha cc^ha la mā tra [[toṃ³⁵⁰]] ntu³⁵¹ : sa (ma)) nyo pām śu kiṃ ca nā | pa³⁵² ya

02 tro pa ni kṣi pya ka ye ta : sa va ntu³⁵³ ra di³⁵⁴ lo la ta :

03 ki ri na³⁵⁵ nā³⁵⁶ raṃ yo-nt sa raṃ yo pra ta³⁵⁷ yi ri a pi

04–05 The blank was used by other hands for various scribal notes,

s. 43.2.4

06 || sa rva dā sa rva t^hā sa rve • ya sya do śā na sa ntī ha • sa rve sa rvā

06as. 43.2.4

07 b^hi (b^hi)³⁵⁸ sā re ṇa ya tra cā va st^hi tā gu ṇā : ta me va śa ra ṇaṃ ga

08 ntum taṃ sto tum ta mu pā si tum • ta syai va śā sa ne st^hā tum :

09 nyā yaṃ ya dya sti ce ta nā : sa vā sa na śca te do śāḥ •

10 na sa ntye ka sya tā yi nā • sa rve sa rva vi da sa nti gu ṇā

11 ste cā na pā yi na 3 na hi pra ti ni vi ṣṭo pi ma no vā [[kā

12 ya (ya)]³⁵⁹ kā ya ka rma su • sa ha d^ha rme ṇa la b^ha te ka ci db^ha

13 ga va to nta ra maṃ³⁶⁰ 4 so haṃ pra pya ma nu ṣya tvaṃ : sa sa

14 dd^ha rma ma ho tsa va-m ma hā ṇa va yu ga cc^hi dra ku rma gri vā

15 rpā ṇo pa ma maṃ³⁶¹ 5 a ni tya tā vya nu ṣṭāṃ ka rma cc^hi dra

16 sa saṃ śa yā-m ā tta sā raṃ ka ri pyā³⁶² mi : ka t^ha nne māṃ

17 sa ra sva ti-m 6 i tya saṃ k^hye yā vi ṣa yā ma

18 vī³⁶³ dyā³⁶⁴ pi gu ṇaṃ mu ne ta de ka de śa pra ṇa ya kri ya

³⁵⁰ Or: tau. Seems to be crossed out.

³⁵¹ -n t- from -m # t- according to the older sandhi rule, cf AIGR 1957–1975: I § 283b.

³⁵² Or unfinished ya.

³⁵³ Or: ttu, wrong for: ktu.

³⁵⁴ Wrong for: ti.

³⁵⁵ Or: ta.

³⁵⁶ Or: tā.

³⁵⁷ Or: na.

³⁵⁸ The reason why b^hi is repeated is unclear.

³⁵⁹ Dittographical kā ya (ya) has been crossed out.

³⁶⁰ Instead of -m; the lacking virāma stroke makes an anusvāra out of the virāma dot.

³⁶¹ S. previous note.

³⁶² Wrong for similar: ṣyā.

³⁶³ Wrong for: ve.

³⁶⁴ Wrong for: tyā.

- 19 ti³⁶⁵ sva rt^ha gau ra va-t 7 sva yaṃ b^hū vi³⁶⁶ na ma s×e s[]
 20 pra b^hū tā db^hū ta ka rma ṇe ya sya saṃ k^hyā pra b^h[] [+]
 21 b^hyāṃ na gu ṇe ṣva sti ni śca ya : 8
 22 i ya nta i ti nā stya nta i dī³⁶⁷ śa i ti kā ka t^hā •
 23 pu [[ya]]³⁶⁸ ṇyā i tye va tu gu ṇāṃ pra ti te mu k^ha rā vā ya
 24 maṃ³⁶⁹ 9 || a d^hyā rd^ha śa ta ki³⁷⁰ bu dd^ha sto tre ū po dg^hā ta sta va
 25 ×o × [+ +] × × ri []e × ||
 (After a blank the text continues with the second Stava)
 26 [16 akṣara-s³⁷¹] × yaṃ a b^hya
 27 [16 akṣara-s] []ā []i
 28 [+ + +] []v[] [15 akṣara-s]
 29 a na va skṛ ta ba nd^ha 2 × sva mā s[] []y[] [+ + + +]
 30 [+] stu ṣva nye ṣu kā ka t^hā : pra ṇai ra pi × [+ +]
 31 [+ + + +] × ye ja na 3 svai śa ri rai śa ri rā ṇi
 32 [+ + + + +] × i []i []ā × ji g^hā³⁷² su b^hi ru pā

Transcription

Preliminary remarks: Mistakes or idiosyncrasies mentioned in the preliminary remarks or apparatus to the transliteration are silently emended or normalized, except for -m # t- > -n t-, -m # n- > -n n-.

- 01 • || ātmeccchāchalamātran tu | sāmānyopāṃśu kiṃcana | ya-
 02 tropanikṣipya ka<th>yeta | sā vaktur atilolatā < || >
 03 †ki ri na³⁷³ nā³⁷⁴ raṃ yo-nt sa raṃ yo pra ta³⁷⁵ yi ri a pi†³⁷⁶

³⁶⁵ Wrong for: te.

³⁶⁶ Wrong for: ve.

³⁶⁷ Corrected from: dra.

³⁶⁸ The akṣara ya has been crossed out. While going to write puṇya the scribe might have thought the Uygh. equivalent buyan.

³⁶⁹ Instead of: -m; s. above fn. 360.

³⁷⁰ Wrong for: ke.

³⁷¹ The lost part of the line contained pāda a and b of str. 10 which must have been closely written.

³⁷² Wrong for: g^hāṃ (lacking anusvāra).

³⁷³ Or: ta.

³⁷⁴ Or: tā.

³⁷⁵ Or: na.

³⁷⁶ † ... † not consistently understandable. After the previous strophe, the last one of the Nirupamastava, the colophon would be expected, cf. l. 24.

04-05 s. 43.2.4

06 || sarvadā sarvathā sarve • yasya doṣā na santi ha³⁷⁷ • sarve sarvā-
06as. 43.2.4

07 bhisāreṇa <•> yatra cāvasthitā guṇāḥ : (1) tam eva śaraṇaṃ ga-

08 ntum <•> tam stotum tam upāsītum • tasyaiva śāsane sthātum :

09 nyāy<y>aṃ yady asti cetanā : (2) savāsanās ca te doṣāḥ •

10 na santy ekasya tāyinaḥ • sarve sarvavidāḥ santi <•> guṇā-

11 s te cānapāyinaḥ 3 na hi pratiniviṣṭo 'pi manovākkā-

12 yakarmasu • saha dharmeṇa labhate <•> ka<ś>cid bha-

13 gavato 'ntaram 4 so 'haṃ prāpya manuṣyatvaṃ : sasa-

14 ddharmamahotsavam <•> mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvā-

15 rpāṇopamam 5 anityatāvyanusṛtāṃ <•> karmacchidra-

16 sasamśayām <•> āttasāraṃ kariṣyāmi : kathan nemāṃ

17 sarasvatīm 6 ity asaṃhyeyaviṣayā<n>³⁷⁸ <•> a-

18 vetyāpi guṇān muneh <•> tadekadeśapraṇayaḥ <•> kriya-

19 te svārthagauravāt 7 svayaṃbhuvē namas [t]e 's[tu] <•>

20 prabhūtādbhutakarmaṇe <•> yasya saṃkhyāprabh[āvā-]

21 bhyām <•> na guṇeṣv asti niścayaḥ : 8

22 iyanta iti nāsty anta <•> īdṛśā iti kā kathā •

23 puṇyā ity eva tu guṇān <•> prati te mukharā vaya-

24 m 9 || adhyardhaśatake buddhastotre upodghātastava

25 ×o × [+ +] × *pari*[cch]ed[a]ḥ ||

26 [16 akṣara-s³⁷⁹] s[va]yaṃ abhya-

27 [16 akṣara-s] [p]ā[r]i-

28 [+ + +] [t]v[am] [15 akṣara-s]

29 anavaskṛtabāndha<vaḥ> 2 × svamā<ṃ>s[ān]y[+ + + +]

30 [va]stuṣv anyeṣu kā kathā : prāṇair api [t]v[+ +]

31 [+ + + + +] *ṇayī* janaḥ 3 svaiḥ śārīraiḥ śārīrāṇi <•>

32 [+ + + + +] i[r]i[ṇ]ām <•> jighā<ṃ>subhir upā-

³⁷⁷ The reading of the ms points to metrically abnormal santīha (santi + iha).

³⁷⁸ om ms.

³⁷⁹ The lost part of the line contained pāda a and b of str. 10 which must have been closely written.

In the following the text is presented in strophes according to the critical edition by Shackleton Bailey.³⁸⁰ The line numbers of the ms are inserted and repeated on the left.

- 01 ātmecchācchalamātram tu sāmānyopāṃśu kiṃcana |
 02 ya(2)tropakṣipya³⁸¹ kathyeta sā vaktur atilolatā || 41
 nirupamastavo nāma tṛṭiyaḥ paricchedaḥ ||³⁸²
- 06 sarvadā sarvathā sarve yasya doṣā na santi ha |
 07 sarve sarvā(7)bhisāreṇa yatra cāvasthitā guṇāḥ || 1
 08 tam eva śaraṇaṃ ga(8)ntuṃ taṃ stotuṃ tam upāsituṃ |
 09 tasyaiva śāsane sthātuṃ (9) nyāyayaṃ yady asti cetanā || 2
 10 savāsanaś ca te doṣā (10) na santi ekasya tāyinaḥ |
 11 sarve sarvavidāḥ santi guṇā(11)s te cānapāyinaḥ || 3
 12 na hi pratiniṣṭo 'pi manovākkā(12)yakarmasu |
 13 saha dharmeṇa labhate kaścid bha(13)gavato 'ntaram || 4
 14 so 'ha ṃ prāpya manuṣyatvaṃ sasa(14)ddharmamahotsavam |
 15 mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvā(15)rpaṇopamam || 5
 16 anityatāvyanuṣṭāṃ karmacchidra(16)sasaṃśayām |
 17 āttasārāṃ kariṣyāmi kathaṃ nemāṃ (17) sarasvatīm || 6
 18 ity asaṃkhyeyaviṣayān a(18)vetyāpi guṇān muneḥ |
 19 tadekadeśapraṇayaḥ kriya(19)te svārthagauravāt || 7
 20 svayaṃbhuve namas te 'stu (20) prabhūtādbhutamāṇe |
 21 yasya saṃkhyāprabhāvā(21)bhyāṃ na guṇeṣv asti niścayaḥ || 8
 22 iyanta iti nāsty anta īdṛśā iti kā kathā |
 23–24 puṇyā ity eva tu guṇān prati te mukharā vaya(24)m || 9
 25³⁸³ upodghātastavo nāma prathamāḥ **paricchedaḥ** ||³⁸⁴
 26 viśahyam aviśahyaṃ vety avadhūya vicāraṇām |

³⁸⁰ SHACKLETON BAILEY 1951: 64; 28–42.

³⁸¹ Our ms reads °panikṣipya which makes pāda c with nine syllables hypermetrical.

³⁸² Instead of the colophon the ms has a line which is not understood or identified.

³⁸³ Lines 25–32 are incomplete in the ms. The passages attested there are marked in bold.

³⁸⁴ The colophon of the ms is different: 'in the Buddhastotra consisting of 150 (strophes) [the first] section [named] Upodghātastava ('introduction')'. Cf. the colophon of Prasādapratibhodbhava (chapter 9) in SHT 519r5 (= idp SHT 519/4): 9 || varṇārharṇe buddhastotre harṣas[ta]vo nāma navama<h> pariccheda<h> ||.

- 27 **svayam abhy**³⁸⁵u(27)papannaṃ te nirākrandam idaṃ jagat || 10 (= 2.1)
 28 avyāpāri(28)tasādhus tvam tvam akāraṇavatsalaḥ |
 29 asaṃstutasakhaś ca tvam (29) **anavaskṛtabāndhavaḥ** || 11 (= 2.2)
 30 **svamāṃsāny** api dattāni (30) **vastuṣv anyeṣu kā kathā** |
 31 **prāṇair api** tvayā sā(31)dho mānitaḥ **praṇayī janaḥ** || 12 (=2.3)
 32 **svaiḥ śārīraiḥ śārīraṇi** (32) prāṇaiḥ prāṇāḥ śārīriṇām |
jighāṃsubhir upāttānām krītāni śataśas tvayā || 13 (=2.4)

43.2 Varia

Recto

43.2.1 Uyghur scribal note on the upper margin

[+ + ³⁸⁶] × pra pta ti³⁸⁷ (blank) ka • a cā³⁸⁸ ryā ba le³⁸⁹ ślā va nti pti-m pa la
 cōk³⁹⁰ da-s pa sa kai miś sa ṅ^ha siṃ pa pa la pa la •
 ... • ačaryabale š(i)lawanti b(i)t(t)im balačokdas basa kaymiś saṅasın...
 ...I, the Śilavant Ācāryabala,³⁹¹ have written (that); Balačokdas³⁹² Basa³⁹³
 Kaymiś³⁹⁴ Saṅhasena...³⁹⁵

³⁸⁵ The ms reads with Shackleton Bailey's ψ (s. his ed. p. IX) abhya[vapannaṃ].

³⁸⁶ Maximal capacity of the lacuna is two akṣaras, but it is unclear whether anything was written there.

³⁸⁷ Or: ni.

³⁸⁸ Unusual form of -ā.

³⁸⁹ The function of the final hook is unclear, marker of vowel length, lē?

³⁹⁰ Or: voḥ. The usual reading would be cōk or vōk; but v 06a points into the other direction.

³⁹¹ Or perhaps: Ācāryapāla?

³⁹² Seemingly a hybrid compound of the vernacular pr. n. Balačok and das << Skt. dāsa- 'slave'.

³⁹³ As pr.n. cf. SUK 1993: II 246b; cf. next note.

³⁹⁴ As pr.n. cf. SUK 1993: II 275a. We owe thanks to P. Zieme who refrained us from interpreting basa and kaymiś literally and pointed to CLEAVES 1977: 70, where a certain Basa(r) Kaymiś (八撒海迷失) occurs in a Chin. text.

³⁹⁵ Perhaps also proper names, but the analysis is unclear.

43.2.2 Beginning of a syllabary on the lower margin

sidd^ha-m³⁹⁶ a ā i ī³⁹⁷ ṛ × ×

43.2.3 Scribal note on the left margin

si ha gu pti kṣi a sam
 si<n>hagupti³⁹⁸ kṣi³⁹⁹ asan
 Siṃhagupta, the teacher,⁴⁰⁰ Āsān(?)⁴⁰¹

Verso

43.2.4 Scribal notes in Uyghur and Tocharian B within the main text

04 mya myaṃ ā cā ryā dā-s ((śi)lā vā nti pti-p pa sa kai miś yima⁴⁰² +⁴⁰³
 pa +⁴⁰⁴ pa ca⁴⁰⁵ hka ya sa ṅ^h a sā ka mi le⁴⁰⁶ ha[?]

³⁹⁶ The final sign of siddham is unusually formed. Usually an anunāsika-like diacritic (◌̣) is placed above the -m; the diacritic has — according to ROTH 1986: 242 (cf. signs 36 and 37) — developed and transformed from virāma dot into a maṅgala symbol. Here the diacritic has the form of a circle with a central dot placed under the -m and connected with <dd^ha> by a small line as if in virāma position. The circle with a central dot reminds one of being a part of the old maṅgala symbol “ma” found in inscriptions, for which cf. also ROTH 1986: 241 (sign 22) and 247 (sign 51). In an unpublished article (Die Maṅgala-Silbe *tha* in Verbindung mit *atha khalu*: Festgruß an Karl Hoffmann zur Vollendung seines achtzigsten Lebensjahres am 26. Februar 1995. Lengler 17.10.1994) Gustav Roth mentions G. Bühler (Indische Palaeographie, Strassburg 1896: 85), who views the akṣara *tha* — a circle with a central dot — in pre-Christian Brāhmī inscriptions as origin of the *tha*-symbol in later manuscripts. Bühler writes “In späterer Zeit kommen gleichfalls bisweilen im Texte, nach grösseren Abschnitten und öfter am Ende von Documenten, Symbole vor, die meist sehr abgeschliffene Formen haben. Das gewöhnlichste besteht aus einem grossen Kreise mit einem kleineren, oder auch mit mehreren Punkten in der Mitte. Diese kann entweder aus dem Dharmacakra entstanden sein, der sich noch vor CII, 3. Nr, 63, deutlich findet, oder aus dem Lotus, der auch vorkommt. Da der Kreis mit einem Punkte ☉ dem alten *tha* entspricht, so werden andere, späteren *tha* ähnliche, oder gleiche Zeichen dafür gebraucht und in den modernen MSS. erscheint schliesslich das dem *tha* sehr ähnliche *cha*”.

³⁹⁷ u, ū erroneously left out.

³⁹⁸ Missing or lost anusvāra above si leads to a n. pr. of Indian origin.

³⁹⁹ TochB loanword kṣṣī ‘teacher, master’ (DTB² 2013: 187), pace Adams (l. c.) attested in Brāhmī (kṣṣī MAUE 2015: 170r1) and Uyghur script (e.g. MAITRUIGT 1980: Index 58a s.v. kṣ’y, kṣy).

⁴⁰⁰ Or part of the name.

⁴⁰¹ Either Āsān (as part of proper names, cf. UW² 2010-2021: II.2 294) without marked front vocalism or an incomplete word.

⁴⁰² With incorrect -i, or ymā with wrong -ā.

⁴⁰³ Unclear akṣara, perhaps incorrect ma.

⁴⁰⁴ Perhaps deleted ra.

{mä} män ačaryadas⁴⁰⁷ šilawantı b(i)t(t)i<m>⁴⁰⁸ basa kaymiš
ymä(?)⁴⁰⁹ + pa + bačak <k>aya saṅas<n>ka mileg

I, the Śīlavant Ācāryadāsa, have written (that), and(?) Basa Kaymiš ...
Bačak Kaya(?)⁴¹⁰ for Saṅhasena ...⁴¹¹

05 ā || ā cā ryā ba le śi(la)⁴¹² wnā skau || ā ×⁴¹³ ā cā rya ba le śla wnā
skau ||

ā || ācāryābale śila(vānde)⁴¹⁴ w(i)nāskau || ā × ācāryābale
ś(i)la(vānde) w(i)nāskau

(TochB) I, the Śīlavant Ācāryabala, venerate.

06a || pā la cau⁴¹⁵-k⁴¹⁶ da tā-s⁴¹⁷ || pa ca⁴¹⁸-⁴¹⁹hka yā sa ṅ^ha siṃ ka mi
le-g₁

|| balačokdas⁴²⁰ || bačak <k>aya saṅasinka mileg

⁴⁰⁵ Or: va.

⁴⁰⁶ The function of the final hook is unclear, marker of vowel length, lē?

⁴⁰⁷ Or unmarked spelling for °z.

⁴⁰⁸ The ms reads rather b(i)tip, but certainly error for bittim ‘I have written’.

⁴⁰⁹ The following text is full of errors and needs l. 06a to be understood.

⁴¹⁰ Bačak and Kaya are used in proper names (e.g. SUK 1993: II 245a and 274b), perhaps spelled here in one; or else bačakaya stands for the diminutivum Bačakkyā.

⁴¹¹ From v 06a it seems that the -a of ha is erroneous. It would be tempting to take mileg as spelling of 彌勒 mīlè, LMC mjiləšk ‘Maitreya’ with preserved final velar or rather accusative suffix -Xg.

⁴¹² Or: śila, while the caret would point to <vānde> intended, however, not executed.

⁴¹³ Unclear sign.

⁴¹⁴ Rather an abbreviation (for śila cf. MORIYASU 2019: 229a) than an uncorrected mistake.

⁴¹⁵ Or: cō?

⁴¹⁶ Without dot above.

⁴¹⁷ Without dot above.

⁴¹⁸ Or: va.

⁴¹⁹ Erroneous virāma stroke.

⁴²⁰ <da, tā> dittography for /da/. The name consists of Balačok and -das << Skt. dāsa-
‘slave’.

Concordances

5.1. Concordance of the manuscripts

Current shelf no.	Old shelf no.	Catalogue no.
SI 2964	B/28	25
SI 2965/1	B/29-1	34
SI 2965/2	B/29-2	34
SI 2965/3	B/29-3	35
SI 2965/4	B/29-4	13
SI 2966	B/30a1	04
SI 3713/1-2	Kr XXXa/4-1	05
SI 3714	Kr XXXa/4-2	06
SI 3715/1	Kr VII/1	37.1
SI 3715/2	Kr VII/1	01.3
SI 3715/3	Kr VII/1	33
SI 3715/4	Kr VII/1	01.2
SI 3715/5	Kr VII/1	01.3
SI 3715/6	Kr VII/1	01.1
SI 3715/7	Kr VII/1	33
SI 3716/1	Kr VII/1	42
SI 3716/2	Kr VII/1	01.4
SI 3716/3	Kr VII/1	30
SI 3716/4	Kr VII/1	37.2
SI 3716/5	Kr VII/1	38
SI 3716/6	Kr VII/1	38
SI 3716/7	Kr VII/1	36
SI 3717/1	Kr VII/1	37.4
SI 3717/2	Kr VII/1	23
SI 3717/3	Kr VII/1	02
SI 3717/4	Kr VII/1	28
SI 3717/5	Kr VII/1	31
SI 3717/6	Kr VII/1	29
SI 3717/7	Kr VII/1	32
SI 3717/8	Kr VII/1	24
SI 3717/9	Kr VII/1	21
SI 3717/10	Kr VII/1	01.3
SI 3717/11	Kr VII/1	01.4

SI 3717/12	Кр VII/1	22
SI 3717/13	Кр VII/1	03
SI 3717/14-1	Кр VII/1	14.1
SI 3717/14-2	Кр VII/1	14.2
SI 3718	Кр VII/1	38
SI 3722	Кр XIII/1a	07
SI 3726/1	Кр XIII/1д	08
SI 3726/2	Кр XIII/1д	08
SI 3728/1	Кр XIII/1ж	10
SI 3728/2	Кр XIII/1ж	09
SI 3754	Кр VIII/6-3	37.3
SI 6378/1	В/без шифра	15
SI 6378/2	В/без шифра	16
SI 6378/3	В/без шифра	17
SI 6378/4	В/без шифра	12
SI 6378/5	В/без шифра	18
SI 6378/6	В/без шифра	40
SI 6378/7	В/без шифра	11
SI 6378/8	В/без шифра	19
SI 6378/9-1	В/без шифра	20.1
SI 6378/9-2	В/без шифра	20.2
SI 6378/10	В/без шифра	41
SI 6378/11	В/без шифра	39
SI 6378/12 ⁴²¹	В/без шифра	27
SI 6378/13	В/без шифра	26
ВФ-4190	Т II У4/ ТII У7	43

Old shelf no.	Current shelf no.	Old shelf no.	Current shelf no.
Кр VII/1	SI 3715/1	В/28	SI 2964
	SI 3715/2	В/29-1	SI 2965/1
	SI 3715/3	В/29-2	SI 2965/2
	SI 3715/4	В/29-3	SI 2965/3
	SI 3715/5	В/29-4	SI 2965/4
	SI 3715/6	В/30a1	SI 2966
	SI 3715/7	Кр VIII/6-3	SI 3754
	SI 3716/1	Кр XIII/1a	SI 3722

⁴²¹ SI 6378/12 ∞ SI 2996/1 (В/120-1)

SI 3716/2	Кг XIII/1д	SI 3726/1
SI 3716/3		SI 3726/2
SI 3716/4	Кг XIII/1ж	SI 3728/1
SI 3716/6	Кг XXXа/4-1	SI 3713/1-2
SI 3716/7	Кг XXXа/4-2	SI 3714
SI 3717/1	В/без шифра	SI 6378/1
SI 3717/2		SI 6378/2
SI 3717/3		SI 6378/3
SI 3717/4		SI 6378/4
SI 3717/5		SI 6378/5
SI 3717/6		SI 6378/6
SI 3717/7		SI 6378/7
SI 3717/8		SI 6378/8
SI 3717/9		SI 6378/9-1
SI 3717/10		SI 6378/9-2
SI 3717/11		SI 6378/10
SI 3717/12		SI 6378/11
SI 3717/13		SI 6378/12 ⁴²²
SI 3717/14-1		SI 6378/13
SI 3717/14-2	Т II Y4/ ТII Y7	ВФ-4190
SI 3718		

5.2 Concordance of the identified texts

5.2.1 Chinese

Taisho no.	Catalogue no.
T 220 VI 345c8ff.	38
T 223 VIII 18a8–12 ⁴²³	34
T 222 VIII 163b12ff.	37
T 223 VIII 219b5–23	01
T 223 VIII 419a09–11	09
T 262 IX 17b03–06	10
T 262 IX 56a8–11 ⁴²⁴	35

⁴²² SI 6378/12 ∞ SI 2996/1 (B/120-1)

⁴²³ Or T 1509 XXV 735a18–23 (with var.).

⁴²⁴ Or T 264 IX 191a2–5.

T 264 IX 191a2–5 ⁴²⁵	35
T 310 XI 260c17–18	33
T 310 XI 666c25–667a03	06
T 374 XII 418b23–c01	07
T 374 XII 562a28–b1 ⁴²⁶	13
T 375 XII 758a11–15	05
T 375 XII 808c2–5 ⁴²⁷	13
T 664 XVI 368b6–7	21
T 1509 XXV 735a18–23 ⁴²⁸	34
T 1562 XXIX 349b17–18 ⁴²⁹	36
T 1563 XXIX 788a11–12 ⁴³⁰	36

5.2.2 Sanskrit

Identified texts	cat. nos.
Abhidharmadīpavibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti	02
Prajñāpāramitā	04
Pravāraṇasūtra	08
Prasādapratibhodbhava (= Śatapañcāśatka) of Mātṛceṭa verses 28–29	33
Prasādapratibhodbhava (= Śatapañcāśatka) of Mātṛceṭa verses 41 (= 3.15) and 1–13c (= 1.1–2.3c)	43
Prātimokṣasūtra	07
Samyuktāgama	34
Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra, Deśanāparivarta (chapter 3)	09
Udānavarga?	11
Udānavarga	27

⁴²⁵ Or T 262 IX 56a8–11.

⁴²⁶ Or: T 375 XII 808c2–5.

⁴²⁷ Or: T 374 XII 562a28–b1.

⁴²⁸ Or: T 223 VIII 18a8–12.

⁴²⁹ Or: T 1563 XXIX 788a11–12.

⁴³⁰ Or: T 1562 XXIX 349b17–18.

5.3 Concordances of word forms⁴³¹

5.3.1 Sanskrit

...āṇām]āṇām	03 A04
...dadhe	dadhe	03 A03
...graparyāpannatvāt	graparyāpannatvāt	01.1 02
...hṛdayam]hṛdayam	10 v04
... kārasya	k[ā̃]r[a]sy[a]	05 (3713/2) v01
... kāre	kāre	35 v02
...lavṛkṣavat	lavṛ[kṣa]vat	01.4 02
...maye	maye	02 v05
...nayaḥ	naya	01.3 03
...rttimayam	rttimayam	02 v02

a, ā

abhūt	[']bhūt	33 v01
abhyavapannam	abhya[vapannam]	43.1 26f.
adhyardhaśatake	adhyardhaśatake	43.1 24
aham	aham	06 v02
aham	aha<ṃ>	06 v03
aham	aham	06 v06
aham	aham	06 v08
aham	aha<ṃ>	08 r03
aham	'ham	43.1 13
ajānanto	-m-ajān[ant]o	09 v03
ākrośet	ākrośed	04 r02
ākruṣya	-āk[ru]ṣ[ya]	04 r04
alabdhvā	alab[dhv]ai[va]	34 v02
alobhaḥ	alobhaḥ	02 r02
amūḍhavinayam	am<ū><ḍh>avinayam	07 v03
amūḍhavinayārhasya	am<ū><ḍh>avinayārhasya	07 v02f.
anapāyinaḥ	cānapāyinaḥ	43.1 11
anavaskṛtabāndhavaḥ	anavaskṛtabāndha<vaḥ>	43.1 29
anityatāvyanusṛtām	anityatāvyanusṛtām	43.1 15
antaḥ	anta	43.1 22
antaram	'ntaram	43.1 13
anunaya...	anun[a]ya...	29 B04

⁴³¹ The order is that of the Latin alphabet without regard to diacritics.

anupādānam	anupādānam	27 v07
anuparākramet(?)	[anuparā]kr[a]m[e]t(?)	34 v01
anyeṣām	anyeṣām	34 v07
anyeṣu	anyeṣu	43.1 30
api	apy	08 r03
api	-āpi	26 B04
api	-āpi	27 r02
api	‘pi	43.1 11
api	-āpi	43.1 18
api	api	43.1 30
ārūpyotpādanam	ārūpyotpād[anam]	02 r03f.
āsādya	āsādya	34 v03
asaṃkhyeyaviṣayān	asaṃkhyeyaviṣayā<n>	43.1 17
asmi	[a]smīti	32 A02
āśritāḥ	āśrit<ā><ḥ>	27 v07
aṣṭau	’ṣṭāv	02 r02
asti	nāsti	01.1 04
asti	asti	43.1 09
asti	asti	43.1 21
asti	nāsty	43.1 22
astu	’s[tu]	43.1 19
āsvādam	-āsvādam	34 v02
atha	atha	27 r02
atilolatā	atilolatā	43.1 02
ātmānām	ātmānām	02 v02
ātmecchācchalamātram	ātmecchācchalamātran	43.1 01
ātmā	ātmopāyāt<i>	36 v01
āttasāram	āttasāraṃ	43.1 16
āva...	āva...	01.1 01
avasthitāḥ	cāvasthitā	43.1 07
avaśyam	a[va]śyam	04 r03
avetya	avetyāpi	43.1 17f.
avicintya	avicintyoktam	01.1 03
āviśa	āviśa	10 v03
āviśa	āviś[a]	10 v03
avyāpāritasādhuḥ	[avyāp]ā[r]i[taśādhus]	43.1 27f.
ayam	ayaṃ	01.1 03

b, bh

bahuśrutaḥ	bahu[śruta]	08 r06
bhagavataḥ	bhagavato	43.1 12f.
bhikṣavaḥ	bhikṣava[ḥ]	01.4 04

bhūyaḥ	<i>bhūy[a]ś</i>	01.3 01
bodhisatvayānikānām	bodhisatvayānikānām	04 r01
brūmaḥ	brūmo	01.3 02
buddhastotre	buddhastotre	43.1 24
c		
ca	ca	03 A04
ca	ca	04 r01
ca	c[a]	09 v01a
ca	cā-	43.1 07
ca	ca	43.1 09
ca	cā-	43.1 11
caḥṣuḥ	caḥ[ṣu(h)]	34 v05
caḥṣuḥ	caḥṣur	34 v07
catur-	catu[r-]	34 v04
catvāraḥ	catv<ā>ra	01.3 04
cem...	cem...	01.3 01
cetanā	cetanā	43.1 09
d, dh		
daśabalāgrataḥ	daś[abalāgrataḥ]	09 v02
dāsyāmaḥ	dāsyāma<ḥ>	07 v02
dāsyāmaḥ	d<ā>syāma<ḥ>	07 v03
dāsyāmaḥ	dāsyāma<ḥ>	07 v06
deśayīṣyāmi	[de]śayīṣyāmi	09 v02
dharmā...	dharmā...	01.4 03
dharmāḥ	dharmā(h)	01.3 03
dharmāḥ	dharm<ā>	06 v02
dharmeṇa	dharmeṇa	43.1 12
dhyānādhyayanalakṣaṇam	dhyānāddhyayanalakṣa[ṇam]	02 r04f.
doṣāḥ	doṣā	43.1 06
doṣāḥ	doṣāḥ	43.1 09
dṛṣṭ...	dṛṣṭ...	01.1 03
durlabhā	durla[bhā]	02 r05f.
e		
ekasya	ekasya	43.1 10
etat	etad	02 r05
eva	eva	04 r03
eva	sadaiva	27 r01
eva	alab[dhv]ai[va]	34 v02
eva	eva	43.1 07
eva	tasyaiva	43.1 08
eva	eva	43.1 23

g		
gantum	gantum	43.1 07f.
gatāḥ	s. niṣṭhāṃgatāḥ	
gomān	gomān	05 (3713/2) v02
gomantau	go[mantau]	05 (3713/2) v02
guṇāḥ	guṇāḥ	43.1 07
guṇāḥ	guṇās	43.1 10f.
guṇān	guṇān	43.1 18
guṇān	guṇān	43.1 23
guṇeṣu	guṇeṣv	43.1 21
h		
ha	ha	43.1 06
hetoh	[dh]<e>[tos]	08 r05
hetuprabhāvāḥ	h<e>tupra[bhāvā]	06 v02
hi	hi	43.1 11
i		
īdṛśāḥ	īdṛśā	43.1 22
iha	ihā	01.1 05
iha	ihā-	02 v01
imām	nemām	43.1 16
iti	iti	01.3 02
iti	iti	01.3 04
iti	i[t]i	01.3 04
iti	it[i]	01.3 07
iti	iti	03 A03
iti	[a]smīti	32 A02
iti	ity	43.1 17
iti	iti	43.1 22
iti	iti	43.1 22
iti	ity	43.1 23
iyantaḥ	iyanta	43.1 22
j		
janaḥ	janaḥ	43.1 31
janmavṛkṣasya	janmavṛkṣasya	01.1 04
jighāṃsubhir	jīghā<ṃ>subhir	43.1 32
k		
kā	kā	43.1 22
kā	kā	43.1 30

kalahayitvā	ka ^h lahayitvā	04 r02
Kaliṅgopavicārāntarikāyāṃ	Ka]l̥i̇[m]gop[a]vic ^ā rān[t]arikāyāṃ	34 v08
kariṣyāmaḥ	kariṣyāma<ḥ>	07 v04f.
kariṣyāmi	kariṣyāmi	43.1 16
karma	ka[rma]	05 (3713/1) v01
karma	ka[r]ma	09 v01
karmabhiḥ	k[arma]bhi(ḥ)	05 (3713/1) v02
karmabhyaḥ	karmabhya(ḥ)	05 (3713/1) v03
karmabhyām	k[armabhyā]m	05 (3713/1) v02
karmabhyām	karmabhyā[m]	05 (3713/1) v03
karmacchidrasasaṃśayām	karmacchidrasasaṃśayām	43.1 15f.
karmaṇā	[karma]ṇ[ā]	05 (3713/1) v02
karmaṇaḥ	karmaṇa(ḥ)	05 (3713/1) v03
karmaṇām	k[a]rma[ṇā]m	05 (3713/1) v04
karmaṇi	karma[ṇi]	05 (3713/1) v04
karmaṇoḥ	karmaṇo(ḥ)	05 (3713/1) v04
kaścit	ka<ś>cid	43.1 12
kasmāt	kasmā[d]	08 r05
katame	katame	01.3 03
kathā	kathā	43.1 22
kathā	kathā	43.1 30
katham	kathan	43.1 16
kathayā	kathayā	29 B02
kathyeta	ka<th>yeta	43.1 02
kāyikam	[k]āyik ^ā ṃ	08 r02
kāyikam	k ^ā yikaṃ	08 r04
kiṃcana	kiṃcana	43.1 01
kriyate	kriyate	43.1 18f.
kṛtaṃ	kṛtaṃ	09 v01
kuśāstratimirotsādī	kuśāstr[a]ti[mirotsādī]	02 v04
kusīdaḥ	kusīda<ḥ>	27 r01
kutaḥ	kuto	02 v01
l		
labhate	labhate	43.1 12
m		
mā	mā	08 r01
mahārṇavayugacchidrakūr	mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvārpā	
ma-grīvārpāṇopamam	ṇopamam	43.1 14f.
manovākkāyakarmasu	manovākkāyakarmasu	43.1 11f.
manuṣyatvam	manuṣyatvaṃ	43.1 13
māram	māraṃ	27 v05
mātāpitr̥n	[mātāpi]tṛ-m-ajān[ant]o	09 v03

me	<i>m[e]</i>	09 v01
mukharāḥ	mukharā	43.1 23
muneḥ	muneḥ	43.1 18
n		
na	nāsti	01.1 04
na	na	01.1 05
na	na	43.1 06
na	na	43.1 10
na	na	43.1 11
na	nemāṃ	43.1 16
na	na	43.1 21
na	nāsty	43.1 22
namaḥ	namas	43.1 19
niḥsaraṇam	[niḥ]s[a]raṇam	04 r03
niścayaḥ	niścayaḥ	43.1 21
niṣṭhām	s. niṣṭhāmgatāḥ	
niṣṭhāmgatāḥ ⁴³²	niṣṭhāngatā	33 v02
nītaḥ	n ^{<ī>} tas	33 v03
nūnam	n ^{<ū>} naṃ	01.3 02
nyāyāyam	nyāy<y>aṃ	43.1 09
p		
pādarajāṃsi	[pādarajāṃ]si	33 v04
paṇḍitopajātāḥ	pa]ṇḍitopajā[t]ā	01.3 04
pāpakam	pāpaka[m]	09 v01
pāra...	pāra...	01.4 03
paribhāṣeta	paribhāṣ<e>ta	04 r02
paricchedaḥ	pari[cch]ed[a]ḥ	43.1 25
parisraveṣu	[pa]risraveṣ[u]	29 B05
prabhūtādbhutamārmaṇe	prabhūtādbhutamārmaṇe	43.1 20
prahāṇam	prahāṇam	31 B03
prajñāyudhena	prajñā[yudhena]	27 v05
prāṇaiḥ	prāṇair	43.1 30
praṇayī	[pra]ṇayī	43.1 31
prapañcaḥ	prapañca<ḥ>	34 v05
prāptatvam	[p]rāptatv[aṃ]	01.4 03
prāpya	prāpya	43.1 13
praśāstā	praśās[t]ā	01.3 08
prathamadhyānabhaumena	[pra]thamadhyānabhaumena	01.2 03
prathamadhyānalābhina	prathamaddhyānalābhina(ḥ)	01.2 02

⁴³² Or: niṣṭhāṃ gatāḥ.

prati	prati	43.1 23
pratijñāvinayam	pratijñāvinayaṃ	07 v04
pratijñāvinayārhasya	pratijñāvinayārhasy ^{ā}	07 v03f.
pratiniviṣṭaḥ	pratiniviṣṭo	43.1 11
pratyekabuddhayānikānām	praty ^[ye] kabuddhayānikānām	04 r01
pravārayāmi	[pravāra]yāmi	08 r01
praviviktaḥ	pravivi[ktaḥ]	08 r07
pudgalānām	pudgalān[ā]ṃ	04 r01
pudgalena	pudgalena	04 r03
punaḥ	puna<ḥ>	01.1 04
puṇyāḥ	puṇyā	43.1 23
pūrvam	pūrv[am]	09 v01
	r	
rūpāṇām	r ^{<ū>} p ^{<ā>} ṇāṃ	34 v05
	ś, s	
sā	sā	43.1 02
sadā	sadaiva	27 r01
saḥ	so	43.1 13
saha	saha	43.1 12
śailam	[ś]ailam	34 v03
sajjanaprasāstāḥ	sajjanapr[a]śāsā	01.3 03
saṃ...	saṃ...	01.1 04
saṃ...	saṃ...	01.4 02
sāmānyopāṃśu	sāmānyopāṃśu	43.1 01
samāptam	samāpta<ṃ>	10 v04
saṃbandhaḥ	saṃbandho	01.1 05
saṃbodhyaṅgeṣu	saṃbodhy ^{ā} ṅgeṣu	27 v06
saṃkalpahataḥ	saṃkalpahataḥ	27 r01
saṃkhyāprabhāvābhyām	saṃkhyāprabh[āvā]bhyām	43.1 20f.
saṃtuṣṭaḥ	sa<ṃ>tuṣ[ta]ḥ	08 r07
samyakpratipadā	[samyakpratipad]ā	33 v02
saṃyogaḥ	s[a]ṃ[yogaḥ]	34v 05
saṃyojati	saṃyojati	34 v06
santi	santi	43.1 06
santi	santy	43.1 10
santi	santi	43.1 10
śaraṇam	śaraṇam	43.1 07
sarasvatī	sarasvatī	26 B04
sarasvatīm	sarasvatīm	43.1 17
śāriputra	ś[āri]putra]	08 r03
śāriputra	[śāri]putra	08 r06

śarīraiḥ	śarīraiḥ	43.1 31
śarīrāṇi	śarīrāṇi	43.1 31
śarīriṇām	[śar]i[r]i[ṇ]ām	43.1 32
sarvā...	sarvā...	01.4 05
sarva-	sa[r]v[35 v04
sarvābhisāreṇa	sarvābhisāreṇa	43.1 06f.
sarvadā	sarvadā	43.1 06
sarvadharmā	sarvadharmā	01.3 08
sarvajñāḥ	[sarvaj]ñ[ah]	02 v03
sarvathā	sarvathā	43.1 06
sarvavidaḥ	sarvavidaḥ	43.1 10
sarve	sarve	43.1 06
sarve	sarve	43.1 06
sarve	sarve	43.1 10
sasaddharmamahotsavam	sasaddharmamahotsavam	43.1 13f.
śāsane	śāsane	43.1 08
śāstrajñānamaye	[śāstrajñāna]maye	02 v05
satatam	satatam	27 r03
satyatvāt	satyatvād	01.4 04
savāsanāḥ	savāsanāś	43.1 09
śīlavān	śīlavām	08 r06
smṛtivinayam	smṛti(vina)y[am]	07 v01f.
smṛtivinayārhasya	[smṛtivinayārhas]y[a]	07 v01
śreyasī	ś[r]e[yasī]	02 v02
sthāpayitvā	sthāpayit[v]ā	01.4 02
sthātum	sthātum	43.1 08
sthītaḥ	sthīto	09 v02
sthūlān	sthūlān	27 r02
stotum	stotum	43.1 08
sucaritaiḥ	sucaritair	33 v03
sūkṣmān	sūkṣmāṇ	27 r02
sūtracandramāḥ	[s]ūtracandramā<ḥ>	02 v03
sūtram	[s]ū[tram]	03 A01
sūtram	sūtram	03 A02
sūtram	[sū]tram	03 A05
svāhā	sv[ā]hā	10 v02
svaiḥ	svaiḥ	43.1 31
svamāṃsāni	svamā<ṃ>s[ān]y	43.1 29
svārthagauravāt	svārthagauravāt	43.1 19
svayam	s[va]yam	43.1 26
svayambhuve	svayambhuve	43.1 19
syāt	syād	01.1 05

t

tadekadeśapraṇayaḥ	tadekadeśapraṇayaḥ	43.1 18
tadyathā	ta[d]y[athā]	10 v02
tam	tam	43.1 07
tam	taṃ	43.1 08
tam	tam	43.1 08
tasmāt	tasmād	01.1 03
tasya	tasyaiva	43.1 08
tat	tad	01.3 02
tat	tat	08 r05
tat	tat	34 v06
tatra	tatra	01.3 04
tatra	tatrā-	34 v02
tatsvabhāvaiṣīyam	tatsv ^ā bh ^ā vaiṣ ^ī yam	07 v05f.
tatsvabhāvaiṣīyārhasya	tatsvabh ^ā vaiṣ ^ī y[ā]rh[a]sy ^ā	07 v05
tava	tavā-	08 r03
tāvataḥ	tāvata[ta]	04 r03
tāyinaḥ	tāyinaḥ	43.1 10
tayoḥ	tayo<ḥ>	34 v06
te	te	33 v04
te	te	43.1 09
te	te	43.1 11
te	[t]e	43.1 19
te	te	43.1 23
tebhyaḥ	tebhyo	02 r02
tena	tena	04 r03
tu...	tu...	07 v03a
tu	tu	27 v06
tu	tu	43.1 01
tu	tu	43.1 23
tvam	[t]v[am]	43.1 28
tvayā	tvayā	33 v03
tvayā	[t]v[ayā]	43.1 30
tvayi	tvayi	33 v02

u

ucyatām	ucyatām	01.3 02
uktam	avicintyoktam	01.1 03
uktānām	<u>ktānām	34 v04
upanikṣipya	yatropanikṣipya	43.1 02
upāsituṃ	upāsituṃ	43.1 08
upāttānām	upā[ttānām]	43.1 32
upāyāti	ātmopāyāt<i>	36 v01

upodghāstavaḥ ūrdhv...	upodghāstava... ūrdhv...	43.1 24 01.2 02
v		
vā	[v]ā	04 r02
vā	vā	04 r02
vā	vā	04 r02
vā	vā	08 r02
vā	vā	08 r04
vā	vāpi	27 r02
vacanāt	[va]canāt	01.3 07
vadāmi	[vadā]mi	04 r03
vai	vai	27 r03
vaktuḥ	vaktur	43.1 02
vāmam	vāma<ṃ>	02 v03
vastuṣu	[va]stuṣv	43.1 30
vayam	vayam	02 v01
vayam	vayam	43.1 23f.
vigarhāmi	vigarh<ā> m<i>	08 r04
vinayam	vinayaṃ	07 v03a
vineyāḥ	vineyā	01.3 02
vitarkān	vitarkān	27 r02
vitarkān	vitarkāṃ	27 r03
vitarkayan	vitarkayan	27 r03
vivādya	vivādya	04 r02
vivādya	[v]i[v]ādya-	04 r04
y		
yadbhūyaiṣīyārhasya	[ya]ḍbhūyaiṣī yā[rhasya]	07 v06f.
yadi	yady	43.1 09
yasya	yasya	43.1 06
yasya	yasya	43.1 20
yathābalaṃ	yathābalaṃ	02 r05
yathākramam	y[a]thākr[amam]	35 v01
yathoktam	[ya]tho[ktam]	01.3 08
yathoktam	yatho[kta]ṃ	01.4 04
yatra	yatropanikṣipya	43.1 01f.
yatra	yatra	43.1 07
yāvat	yāvad	02 r04
ye	ye	06 v02
yena	yenā-	26 B04
yeṣāṃ	yeṣān	27 v06
yudhyeta	yudhyeta	27 v05

5.3.2 Tocharian B

...×iskemane	...×iskemane	29 A05
...kañi	...kañi	37.1 v11
...ko	...ko	37.4 v02
...laiko	...lai ^{ko}	37.2 v06
...lko	...l ^{ko}	37.3 v05
...lñe	...lñe	37.3 v04
...n	...n	11 A01
...ñc or ...ñcam	...ñc or ...ñcam	18 r 02
...ñ[]ntä	...ñ[]ntä	11 B01
...nentse	...nentse	28 A02
...nt	...nt	13 v01
...psā	...psā	16 r01
...sālñe	...sālñe	32 B02
...skalñe	...skalñe	37.2 v01
... ^t / _n aṃ	... ^t / _n aṃ	37.2 v03
...waññe	...waññe	38 v11
a, ā		
aiśamñe	aiśamñe	28 B01
aknātsa	aknā[tsa]	12 A02
alyenkām	[{] ā ¹ lyenzkā[m]	11 B01
ampalyiškai ⁴³³	ampalyiškai ⁴³⁴	38 v02
āyor	āyor	11 A01
c		
Caitike or Caiyitiška ⁴³⁵	cai...	15 r02
e		
ekaññe	ekaññe	13 v01
empelye	[e]mpelye	11 A02
eñkastar	eñkastar	38 v05
epes	epes	37.3 v05
g		
Gautam...	gauta[m- ...]	28 A02

⁴³³ Or: °ške?⁴³⁴ Or: °ške?⁴³⁵ DTB² 2013: 275.

k		
kantanantar	kantanantar	38 v06
kärsälñeşşe	kä[rs]ä[lñeşşe]	27 v06
kärşälyana	kärşälyana	37.3 v02
keş...	keş...	37.3 v02
klä...	klä...	28 B02
kränkaiññ...	kränkaiññ...	30 A-01
<i>kra</i> ^l / _n <i>tsa</i> ⁿ / _i <i>aṃ</i>	<i>kra</i> ^l / _n <i>tsa</i> ⁿ / _i <i>aṃ</i>	37.2 v03
kuriškene	kuriškene	38 v13
kuse	kuse	12 B01
kwätse...	kwätse...	37.1 v07
l		
le⟨n⟩ ⁴³⁶	le⟨n⟩ ⁴³⁷	37.4 v01
*lupşuki	lyo[pş]uk[i]	37.1 v07
luwa	luwa	37.1 v07
m		
mā	mā	11 B-02
mā	mā	38 v05
māmantaş	māmantaş	38 v04
mo ri ñk[?]i	mo ri ñk[?]i	37.2 v05
muorap	muorap	38 v14
n		
nawasa ⁴³⁸	nawasa ⁴³⁹	38 v11
o		
o...	o...	11 B-02
ol	ol	38 v16
p		
pa...	pa...	12 B02
pa l[?]e tta	pa l[?]e tta	37.1 10
pälyşalñe	pälyş[alñe]	31 A03
pälskänamane	pälskä[namane]	27 r03
pañäşkai	pañäşkai	38 v12
pärsänt	pärsänt	37.1 v08

⁴³⁶ Or: le⟨ke/i⟩.

⁴³⁷ Or: le⟨ke/i⟩.

⁴³⁸ Or: tawasa.

⁴³⁹ Or: tawasa.

pärsāntsñe	pärsā(n)tsñe	29 B04
pelaikneṣṣe	pelaik[n]e[ṣṣ]e	29 B02
pkānte	pkānte	12 B02
plyaṃsi	plyaṃsi	37.2 v02
plyecyem	plyecyem	11 A01
po	po	11 B01
pramānta	pramānta	37.3 v06
prast	prast	38 v16
prast ^h an	prast ^h an	38 v15
r		
rāskare	rāskare	29 A02
rātre[]še	rātre[]še	38 v13
reki	reki	32 B03
rittālñe	r[i][t][ā]lñe	29 B03
ś, ṣ, s		
ś...	ś...	37.3 v04
śāk ⁴⁴⁰	śāk ⁴⁴¹	37.1 v10
ṣamem×...	ṣamem×...	31 A02
ṣaṃvarāṣṣe...	ṣaṃvar<ā>[ṣṣe-]	37.1 v05
ṣaṃmirentse	ṣaṃmire[nts]e	12 B03
ṣaṃmirentse	[ṣa]ṃmir[e]ntse	12 A01
ṣar	ṣar	37.2 v06
sark	sark	37.1 v03
sarkne	sarkne	37.2 v05
śarsa	śarsa	18 r01
saim yām-?	sai[m yām-]?	27 v07
ṣek	ṣe[k]	27 r01
ṣesa	ṣesa	38 v15
śle	śl<e>	13 v01
smaññe	smaññe	38 v15
snai-eṅkālñe	snai-eṅkālñe	27 v07
sonopantār	[sonopa]ntār	37.2 v04
spārttalñe	sparttañe	37.1 v06
spe...	spe...	14.1 A02
śutkaske...	śutkaske...	37.3 v03
svabhāpṭsa	svabh[āp]ṭs[a]	29 A04

⁴⁴⁰ Or: śīk.

⁴⁴¹ Or: śīk.

t		
taršauna	taršauna	31 B02
tawasa ⁴⁴²	tawasa ⁴⁴³	38 v11
te	te	37.1 v05
tekiññe	tekiññe	29 A02
tu	tw	11 B01
w		
walä...	walä...	37.1 v10
Waṃṣi	wa[ṃṣ]i	16 r01
wapāntsañe	wawāntsañe	37.1 v04
warñai	wa[r]ñai	37.3 v04
wartse	wartse	38 v12
wasto	[wa]sto	12 A02
wlām...	wlām...	37.4 v01
y		
ya...	ya...	37.3 v05
yamašälle	[ya]mašälle	32 A01
yarponta	yarponta	13 v01
yäšaṅe	yäšaṅe	37.3 v06
yirmakkai	yirmaḱai	15 r01
yirmakkai	yirmaḱai	16 r02
yirpṣuki	[y]irp[ṣu]ki	15 r02
yirpṣuki	yirpṣ[uk]i	16 r03
yirpṣuki	[y]i[rpṣuk]i	17 r02
ykāmṣ...	ykām[ṣ-...]	31 A03
yšelme?	yše[lme]?	12 B01
yšelmenne	yšelmenne	29 A03

5.3.3 Tocharian A

...iñc	...iñc	26 B03
...nt	...nt	19 A01
...yā	...yā	19 B01
...yme	[y]m	19 A02

⁴⁴² Or: nawasa.

⁴⁴³ Or: nawasa.

	a	
āñcām	ā[ñcām]	20.2 A02
	c	
Candragarbh ⁴⁴⁴	[ca]ndr[a]garbh ⁴⁴⁵	26 A03
cemäk	cemä[k]	19 A02
	e	
ekapuṇḍarik	ekapuṇḍarik	26 A02
	k	
kalkar	kalkar	19 A02
kapśāññāṣ?	[kapśāñ]ñ[ā]ṣ?	20.1 A01
klopant	klopant	19 B01
kraṣ	kraś	26 B03
	l	
lānt	l[ā]nt	26 A01
lyutār	lyutār	26 B02
	m	
mā	mā	19 B02
mrācam	mrācam	26 A01
mālsep ?	mālsep ?	26 A03
	ñ, n	
nākām	nākām	19 A03
nākām ⁴⁴⁶	nā[kā]m ⁴⁴⁷	19 B02
nāmṭsu?	nāmṭsu?	26 A03
ñareyaṃ	ñareyaṃ	19 B03
nāṣ	nāṣ	19 A04
neṣiṃ	neṣiṃ	19 A04
nunak	nunak	19 A03
	p	
pālk...	pā[l]k ...	19 A03
pālkāt	pālkāt	19 B02
pālke	pāl[k]e	19 B04
pālkoraṣ	pālkoraṣ	19 A04
pāltskes	pāltskes	26 B02
pin×...	pin×...	26 B03

⁴⁴⁴ Or: Vajragarbh.

⁴⁴⁵ Or: [va]r[a]garbh.

⁴⁴⁶ Or: nā × m.

⁴⁴⁷ Or: nā × m.

ś, ṣ, s		
sārki	s[ārki]	19 A04
sumeris	sum<e>ris	26 A01
ṣulaśśi	ṣul[as]ś[i]	26 A01
śka-tampe	śka-ta[m]p<e>	26 A04
ṣñi	ṣñi	20.2 A02
śpālme ⁴⁴⁸	[śpā]lme ⁴⁴⁹	26 A02
śpālmeṃ	[ś]pālmeṃ	26 A04
t		
tākāṣlune	tākāṣlune	26 B02
tāskmām	tāskmām	26 A04
tmaṃ	[t]m[a]ṃ	19 A03
tmaṃ	tmaṃ	19 B02
tmaśal	tmaśal	26 A04
v		
Vajragarbh ⁴⁵⁰	[va]jr[a]garbh ⁴⁵¹	26 A03
w		
wākmats	wākmats	26 A04
wārpñāntrā	wārpñāntrā	19 B01
warsa...?	Warsa...?	26 B05
y		
yāmu	yāmu	26 B05
yok	yok	20.1 A01

5.3.4 Uyghur

...gay	...gay	23 A
...gıja	...gıja	38 v04
...k[]rak[]	...k[]rak[]	38 v03
...l[]rtgäli	...l[]rtgäli	37.1 v04
...ları	...ları	22 A02
...lgalı	...lgalı	37.1 v03
...mač	...mač	38 v06
...nduka...	...nduka...	22 A03
...nIṅ	...nIṅ	35 v01

⁴⁴⁸ Or: śpālmeṃ.

⁴⁴⁹ Or: śpālmeṃ.

⁴⁵⁰ Or: Candragarbh.

⁴⁵¹ Or: [ca]ndr[a]garbh.

...önläri	... ^[ü] nlär[i]	22 A03
...or	...or	24 A04
...rip	...rip	24 B02
...tantakı	...tantakı	38 v16
...ükät[]r[]	...ükät[]r[]	37.1 v01
...ürlär	...ürlär	37.3 v06
...yü	...yü	25 A02
a, ä		
a[?]T[]mıš	a[?]T[]mıš	38 v10
Ačaryabale	Ačaryabale	43.2.1
Ačaryadas	Ačaryadas	43.2.4 04
ädgü	ädgü	25 A02
ädgü	ädgü	33 v03
Amogašri	Amo<g>ašr[i]	04 v interlinear note
antapurike	[anta]puri[k]e	22 B03
ärdäni	[ä]rdäni	22 B02
ärdni	[ä]rdni	24 A03
ärdni	ä[r]dni	22 B02
arkasında	arkasında	37.1 v03
artokı	artokı	21 v04
ärür	ärür	22 A02
ärür	ärür	34 v05
ärür	ärür	34 v05
ärür	är[ür]	34 v06
Äsän(?)	Äsän(?)	43.2.3
aşıg	aşıg	34 v02
atı	[at]ı	34 v07
atlıg	atlıg	22 A02
atlıg	[atlı]g	22 B03
ätözüm	ätözüm	36 v01
avazta	avazta	38 v13
ävrişiŋ	ävrişiŋ	33 v02
az	az	34 v05
azkıya	azkı[ya]	38 v16
azu	azu	34 v05
ažun	a[žun]	21 v02
b		
Bačak	Bačak	43.2.4 04
Bačak	Bačak	43.2.4 06a

bağı	bağı	34 v06
Balačokdas	Balačokdas	43.2.1
Balačokdas	Balačokdas	43.2.4 06a
balmiř	balmiř	34 v06
Basa	Basa	43.2.1
Basa	Basa	43.2.4 04
bařın	bařın	37.3 v03
biläkiŋä	biläkiŋ[ä]	37.2 v06
bilgäni	bilgäni	37.2 v02
bittim	b(i)t(t)im	43.2.1
bittim	b(i)t(t)im	43.2.4 04
bıçmak	bıçmak	37.2 v03
bo	bo	04 v interlinear note
bo	b[o]	21 v02
bo	bo	24 A04
bolsarlar	bolsarlar	34 v06
bözçi	bözçi	37.1 v04
bulmazsän	bu[lmazsän]	38 v05
büşök	büşök	37.3 v05
	d	
darani	[dara]ni	04 v interlinear note
Dırıtařtı	[D]rı[ta]rařtı	22 B04
	e	
elttiŋ	el(t)iŋ	33 v03
	g	
gandarwılar	gandarwılar	22 A04
gandarwılar	[ga]ndař[w]ı[la]r	22 B04
	i, ı	
içikmäk	içikm[äk]	33 v01
içtin	içtin	33 v01
ikinüŋ	ikinüŋ	34 v06
iřKirti	iřKirti	37.1 v08
	k	
käŋräk	käŋräk	38 v14
karga	k[ar]g[a]	34 v01
kata	kata	04 v interlinear note
Kaya	K(a)ya	43.2.4 04
Kaya	<K>aya	43.2.4 06a
Kaymiř	Kaymiř	43.2.1

Kaymiš	Kaymiš	43.2.4 04
käzigčä	[kã]zigčä	24 A02
kenlegtä	kenlegtä	35 v04
keŋ	keŋ	38 v12
kim	kim	21 v02
kiši	kši	43.2.3
kılınč	kılı[nč]	23 B01
kılınčlar	kılınčlar	33 v03
kızgut	kızgut	37.3 v06
köni	köni	33 v02
kötrölmišniŋ	kötrölmišniŋ	34 v07
köz	köz	34 v05
közi	k ^[ö] [zi]	34 v07
küsän	küsän	37.1 v09
	m	
mahabut	mahabut	34 v04
maharaĵ	ma[haraĵ]	22 B04
män	män	04 v interlinear note
män	män	06 v05
män	män	06 v06
män	män	21 v02
män	män	43.2.4 04
mänĵiläyin	mänĵiläyin	36 v02
Mileg	Mileg	43.2.4 04
Mileg	Mileg	43.2.4 06a
mö	mö	34 v05
monoŋ	mono[ŋ]	37.1 v06
munta[g]	munda[g]	24 A04
	n	
nizvanelarıg	nizvanelarıg	21 v04
	o, ö	
ol	ol	21 v02
ol	ol	34 v06
ol	ol	38 v07
ol	ol	38 v16
olar	olar	34 v06
öltö	öltö	36 v01
on	o[n]	21 v04
öŋ	öŋ	34 v04
öŋrä	öŋrä	21 v02

		P	
prast	prast		38 v16
		S, Š	
s/čag...	s/čag...		37.1 v09
šabı	šab<ı>		06 v02
šabı	šabı		06 v06
sadu sadu	sadu sadu		25 A02
säkiz	säkiz		21 v04
säniñ	säniñ		33 v04
Saņasın	Saņasın		43.2.1
Saņasınka	Saņas<ın>ka		43.2.4 04
Saņasınka	Saņasınka		43.2.4 06a
satg...	s[a]tg...		37.2 v02
sävinčtä	sävinčtä		21 v03
seni	se[ni]		33 v03
sentä	sentä		33 v02
šilawantı	š(i)lawantı		43.2.1
šilawantı	šilawantı		43.2.4 04
Sinhaguptı	Si<n>haguptı		43.2.3
šiñ	šiñ		38 v15
sıg	sıg		37.1 v10
sudur	sud[u]r		22 A02
süñü	süñü		37.3 v03
sürtärlär	[sü]rtär[ä][r]		37.2 v04
sürtärlär	sü[r]t[ärlär]		38 v06
		T	
tägindim	tägindim		25 A02
täñri	[t]ä[ŋ]ri		21 v03
taralmış	taralmı[š]		37.4 v02
tarkarıp	tarkarıp		21 v04
taşıg	taşıg		34 v03
tavsı	tavsı kı[ya]		38 v02
tep	tep		34 v02
tikmäk	tikmäk		37.2 v03
titiğçi	t[i]tiğçi		37.1 v07
tokımak	tokımak		37.1 v10
töpö	tö[pö]		38 v11
töpötan	[tö]pötan		34 v06
tözlög	tözl[ög]		34 v04

tüŋür	tüŋür	37.3 v05
tupraklarıŋ	tupraklarıŋ	33 v04
türtärlär	türtäri ^l ä ^l r	37.2 v04
tušup	tušu[p]	34 v03
tutmakta	tutmakta	37.3 v04
tutñak	tutñak	34 v05
tutñaklanmaguluk	tutñaklanma<g>uluk	34 v05
tuvak	tuvak	38 v11
tüzü	tü[z]ü	33 v02
	u, ü	
učasında	učasında	37.2 v05
ugrayu	ugrayu	38 v03
ukıdım	ukıdım	04 v interlinear note
uladı	uladı	37.3 v04
üntürti	üntürti	37.2 v02
upadiligları	upadiligla[r]ı	35 v03
urmiš	urmiš	37.1 v09
utlı	utlı	21 v03
utun	utun	21 v04
üzä	üzä	33 v02
üzä	[ü]zä	33 v03
üzä	ü[zä]	33 v03
užik	užik	24 B03
užik	užik	35 v02
užik	[u]ži[k]	35 v05
	w	
wilapçı	wilapçı	38 v12
	y	
yaŋlıg	yaŋlıg	38 v14
yarıkçı	yarıkçı	37.1 v05
yarmak	yarmak	37.1 v01
yerindin	yerindin	21 v03
yimä(?)	yimä(?)	43.2.4 04
yme	yme	21 v03
yöläŋö	yöläŋö	37.3 v02
yüŋ	yüŋ	37.1 v09

6 Addenda et corrigenda to Part I

- p. 20 Transcription: l. 01 ihā > ihā-; l.02 ś[r]e > ś[r]e-
- p. 24.19–20: Delete: and the minimal width of the folio (38–40 cm)
- p. 26.5: [v]i[v]ā dyāk[ru]ś[ya] > [v]i[v]ādyāk[ru]ś[ya]
- p. 26.6: Delete: + fn.: =
- p. 26.12: **bodhi[satva**(ed. °ttva) > **bodhi[satva**-(ed. °ttva-)
- p. 26 footnote 35: PVSP(K) 2006. > PVSP(K) 1992.
- p. 27 Transcription: Amogaśr[i] > Amo<g>aśr[i]
- p. 31.13: Add after the Transcription:

Commentary

In l. 01 the accusative sing. is preserved. L. 02 contains the instrumental forms. L. 03 shows the dative pl., ablative sing. and dual, l. 04 the genitive dual and plur., followed by the locative sing.

- p. 32.6: Sanskrit > Sanskrit and Uyghur
- p. 39.10: dh]<e>[tos ...] > dh]<e>[tos ...] or: dh]<e>[t]o[s ...]
- p. 41.5 Transliteration: 01° > 01a
- p. 41.12 Transcription l. 02: sth{ī}to > sth{ī}to
- p. 51.10 and 11: (SI 6378/1) > **15** (SI 6378/1)
- p. 54 Transliteration l. 04: spa > spa
- p. 54 Transcription l. 04: pā[l]ke > pälke
- p. 58.27: biligsizbilig > biligsiz bilig
- p. 64 note 111 l.3 ff.: The first to determine ... (through the end) > The first to determine the figure of the South Turkestan Brāhmī (s. pl. 24-4) was VOROBIOV-DESIATOVSKII (1958: 283 and 288), while K.T. SCHMIDT (2001: 23 fn.19; 2021: 111 f.) identified that of the NTB (s. pl. 24-3). SCHMIDT (2021: 111 f.) and CHING & OGIHARA (2010: 108) described its distinctive feature.
- p. 66.5: Abbreviation > Abbreviations
- p. 66.32: Abhisamaya. > Abhisamaya. Ed. and tr. by E. Conze.
- p. 68.25: *Alttürkische Handschriften* > *Alttürkische Handschriften*
- p. 68.35: manuscript > manuscripts
- p. 69.9: PVSP(K) 2006: *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā V–VIII*. Ed. by T. Kimura. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing Co. > PVSP(K) 1992: *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā V*. Ed. by T. Kimura. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing Co.
- p. 69.12: Kaiserlichen > Kaiserliche
- p. 70.5–9: For the correct bibliographic data of UW¹ and UW² see the references of this article.

Mark Dickens, Natalia Smelova

A Rediscovered Syriac Amulet from Turfan in the Collection of the Hermitage Museum¹

DOI 10.17816/wmo65952

Abstract: Item ВДсэ-524 in the State Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg is an amulet scroll written in Syriac which was discovered by the Second German Turfan Expedition (1904–1905) and kept afterwards in the Museum of Ethnology (Museum für Völkerkunde) in Berlin. The artifact originates in the Turkic-speaking Christian milieu of the Turfan Oasis, probably from the Mongol period. The text, however, reflects a long tradition of magical literature that goes back to ancient Mesopotamia and can be categorised as a piece of apotropaic (protective) magic. The article contains an edition of the Syriac text with translation and a discussion of its place of discovery, its overall composition and specific words and expressions found in the text. The authors point out likely connections between the Hermitage amulet and the Turfan fragments SyrHT 274–276 kept in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin — Preußischer Kulturbesitz and briefly discuss its similarity with amulet H彩101 discovered in Qara Qoto by the 1983–1984 expedition of the Institute of Cultural Relics, Inner Mongolia Academy of Social Sciences.

Key words: Chinese Turkestan, German Turfan Expeditions, The State Hermitage Museum, Syriac, scroll, amulet, protective magic, folk religion, Old Uyghur, Church of the East

© Mark Dickens, PhD (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies), Visiting Researcher, Centre for East Asian Studies, University of Groningen (dickens@ualberta.ca)

© Natalia Smelova, PhD (History), Research Fellow, Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo; (natalia.smelova@teologi.uio.no)

With contributions by Gideon Bohak, PhD, Professor, Department of Jewish Philosophy and Talmud, Tel Aviv University.

¹ We would like to express our gratitude and appreciation for all the help and support that we received from our colleagues while working on this article. First and foremost, we acknowledge the kind assistance of Nikolai Pchelin, curator of the Turfan Collection at the Hermitage. We are thankful also to Kees den Biesen, Aphrem Dawood, Jonathan Loopstra, Sergei Minov, Adrian Pirtea, Dmitrii Rukhliadev, William I. Sellers, Anna Turanskaia, Peter Zieme and His Holiness Mar Awa III, Catholicos-Patriarch of the Assyrian Church of the East.

The image of ВДсэ-524 was provided by the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg (photographer D.A. Bobrova) and is published with its kind permission.

The authors are also grateful to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin — Preußischer Kulturbesitz and the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften for access to and permission to reproduce images of SyrHT 274–276, which are part of the Depositum der BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN in der STAATSBIBLIOTHEK ZU BERLIN — Preußischer Kulturbesitz Orientabteilung.

Introduction

Following in the footsteps of our colleagues Nikolai Pchelin and Simone-Christiane Raschmann,² Ayşe Kılıç Cengiz and Anna Turanskaia,³ we continue the series of publications dealing with materials from Chinese Turkestan discovered by the German Turfan Expeditions and now kept in the State Hermitage Museum. Here we publish for the first time the text (along with translation and commentary) of the only Syriac manuscript in the cohort, a unique amulet scroll which bears the Hermitage Turfan Collection shelfmark ВДсэ-524, as well as the original German expedition find number D (II) 134. This latter is particularly informative, as demonstrated below. We start with a discussion of the modern history of the manuscript, gathered from the scroll itself, as well as external accounts. We then pass on to the formal description of the amulet, the publication of its text and accompanying translation, followed by textual and stylistic analysis of the artefact, and a discussion of particular features in this remarkable source.

The most recent history related to the rediscovery of Turfan materials in St. Petersburg — as well as the subsequent partnership between the State Hermitage Museum, the Berlin–Brandenburg Academy of Sciences (BBAW) and the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation (Preußischer Kulturbesitz) — is described in detail in the aforementioned article by Pchelin and Raschmann.⁴ From this most valuable overview of written materials now stored in the Hermitage, we learn that 23 manuscripts and block prints (along with numerous art objects), were kept and exhibited in the Museum of Ethnology (Museum für Völkerkunde, later the Museum für Indische Kunst, now the Museum für Asiatische Kunst), from the time of their arrival in Berlin until the end of the Second World War. While the majority of manuscripts found by the German Turfan Expeditions were transferred to the Prussian Academy of Sciences for research purposes in 1926, the objects in question were left on display in the Museum.⁵

These objects still preserve the Museum's original wooden frames, some of them with markings indicating room (*Raum*) and exhibition bay (*Koje*).⁶

² PCHELIN & RASCHMANN 2016.

³ KILIÇ CENGİZ & TURANSKAIA 2019.

⁴ PCHELIN & RASCHMANN 2016: 3–5.

⁵ *Ibid.*: 5.

⁶ KILIÇ CENGİZ & TURANSKAIA 2019: 7, esp. note 5.

Based on Albert von Le Coq's original photographs, we can assume that the manuscripts were fixed on the walls alongside the murals brought back from Turfan.⁷ Regarding their whereabouts towards the end of the war, we rely on the account of British journalist, author and historian Peter Hopkirk, in his book *Foreign Devils on the Silk Road*. As the bombing raids on Berlin intensified, all movable objects, including manuscripts, sculptures and murals, were packed in crates and stored in bunkers, one of them located in the Berlin Zoo. The museum itself was bombed continuously between 1943 and 1945 by the Allied forces, resulting in the destruction of the monumental painting affixed to the Museum walls. After Soviet troops captured Berlin in 1945, they gained access to the bunker and partially removed its contents.⁸ At a later stage, these valuable historical objects were deposited in the Hermitage, alongside those discovered in the Turfan area by the Russian expeditions under Dmitrii Klementz and Sergei Oldenburg.⁹

As we go further back in time, the history of the scroll is clearly traceable from its original German expedition find number. This appears twice on the scroll, written vertically next to line 16 as D 134 and again next to line 66 as D II 134. The three components of the number are as follows (in reverse order). The number 134 indicates the packet in which the item was stored while en route back to Berlin from Turfan; the Roman numeral II stands for the Second Turfan Expedition (November 1904–August 1905), led by Albert von Le Coq; and the letter D stands for the find-spot, Dakianus-shahri¹⁰ (the city of Dakianus). According to both von Le Coq (leader of the Second and Fourth Expeditions) and Albert Grünwedel (leader of the First and Third Expeditions), the name was used by locals to designate the ruins of the old city of Gaochang (高昌), also known as Qocho, Qara-khoja and Idiqut-shahri.¹¹

⁷ LE COQ 1926: plate 22.

⁸ HOPKIRK 2006 (1st ed. 1980): 229–231.

⁹ Peshchery tyciachi Budd 2008: 207–240, 426–455. Some objects in the Hermitage Turfan collections come also from Nikolai Krotkov, a Russian consul in Ürümqi.

¹⁰ Hereafter, we reproduce this place-name as it was spelled by Grünwedel and von Le Coq.

¹¹ GRÜNWEDEL 1906: 4–7, 107, 172; LE COQ 1926: 56. Grünwedel also points out that the Turks traditionally apply this name to old ruined cities (Ibid.: 5). We can find a parallel in Uzbek (a Qarluq language and a relative of Modern Uyghur) where derivatives of the name Дакёһуц have the meaning of something particularly old, archaic or antediluvian (BOROVKOV 1959: 123); we owe this information to Dmitrii Rukhliadev of the Moscow Institute of Linguistics, RAS.

We do not know why von Le Coq and Grünwedel chose this rather peculiar name of the former Uyghur capital to designate their finds. We can only conjecture that this appellation was the most popular in use among the local Muslim population, due to the long-time fascination with the legend behind it.

Dakianus (Uyghur *däqyanus*) is a form of the name Decius, a Roman emperor (249–251) and persecutor of Christians. His name often appears in Christian hagiography and martyrdoms, most prominently in the legend of the Sleepers of Ephesus. The legend tells the story of seven (or eight) young Christian men who refused to sacrifice according to the emperor's edict and instead found refuge from persecution in a cave just outside the city of Ephesus. They all fell fast asleep in the cave, which was subsequently sealed up, waking up some 300 years later, during the reign of Theodosius II (408–450). The legend was very popular in the broader Christian community and was transmitted from the 5th c. onwards in a variety of languages, with the earliest attested evidence being in Syriac.¹² Interestingly, the legend was subsequently translated from Syriac into Sogdian and found among the Christian manuscript fragments brought back from Turfan to Berlin.¹³

The legend was also incorporated into the preaching of Islam at an early stage; it can be found in the Qur'an, in Sūrah 18 "The Cave" (الكهف), verses 9–26. Subsequently, the legend enjoyed great popularity in the Muslim world, resulting (quite apart from the abundant literary tradition in Arabic and other languages) in a symbolic translation of the sacred space of the cave to various regions where Muslims ruled. To mention just a few, there are Caves of the Sleepers (or "Companions of the Cave": Arabic أصحاب الكهف, Persian *Ashāb-e Kahf*, Turkish *Yedi Uyuyanlar*) near Amman, Jordan; Maymana in north-western Afghanistan; Afşin and Tarsus in Turkey, and Chenini in Tunisia.¹⁴ What is particularly interesting in connection with most of these locations is that, when there are ruins of a city or a village nearby, these are known among the locals as the city of Decius or, in some cases, Ephesus.¹⁵

¹² The earliest known text of the legend is preserved in the 5th c. Syriac manuscript of the Russian National Library, Syr. New Series 4. For the edition and translation of the text, see TONDELLO 2018 and the bibliography in this article; see also VAN ESBROECK 1994; PAIKOVA 1990.

¹³ SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985: 154–157.

¹⁴ See, for example, BALL 2000: 134; PAIKOVA 1983.

¹⁵ BALL 2000: 134.

The location which interests us most here is the shrine of the Companions of the Cave in the Valley of Toyuq, some 60 km east of Turfan and 20 km from Qocho.¹⁶ Von Le Coq mentions it in connection with the name Dakianus-shahri (or *Apsūs* for Ephesus) and emphasizes it as a place of special veneration and pilgrimage for Muslims.¹⁷ Grünwedel adds an interesting detail; a stone at the entrance of the cave symbolises the dog who accompanied the young men, a Qur'anic motif added to the Christian legend.¹⁸

As a result of the archaeological investigation of Dakianus-shahri by the German Turfan Expeditions, a considerable number of manuscript fragments were unearthed in the city ruins. Although most are Middle Iranian texts in Manichaean and Sogdian scripts and Old Turkic in Uyghur script, there are also Chinese and Indian texts in Brahmi script.¹⁹ The majority of Christian finds from Dakianus-shahri were made by von Le Coq in the course of the Second Expedition. These include six Syriac fragments (T II D = SyrHT 273, T II D 319 = SyrHT 274–276, T II D 114 = SyrHT 277, T II D20i 5+6 = SyrHT 386)²⁰ and three bilingual Syriac-Sogdian fragments (T III D 61 = n190, T II D 14 = n214, T II D 67 = n223 & n224).²¹ Although von Le Coq mentions in his account the discovery of Christian fragments in the same location as Buddhist, Manichaean and Zoroastrian ones, resulting in his assumption that the same religious buildings could have been used by believers of different faiths, he does not specify the exact find spots. Neither are the archaeological layers indicated, so there is no external clue for dating any of these fragments. We can guess that perhaps some of the Christian fragments were found within a small structure outside Qocho city walls on the east bank of the river, considered to be a Christian church building due to

¹⁶ For local legends connected with the shrine in Toyuq and the city of Dakianus, see KATANOV 1894; YAKUP 2005: 264–271.

¹⁷ LE COQ 1926: 56, 93–94; see also PARRY 2012: 167–168.

¹⁸ GRÜNWEDEL 1920: 167. He, however, was convinced that the shrine was of Manichaean rather than Muslim origin.

¹⁹ SUNDERMANN 2004.

²⁰ SyrHT 273 is a small fragment of a calendrical table (see DICKENS & SIMS-WILLIAMS 2012: 282); SyrHT 274–276 are addressed below, as these fragments are relevant to the Hermitage scroll; SyrHT 277 is a fragment from a lectionary containing the Gospel reading for the First Sunday of the Annunciation/Advent (see DICKENS 2016: 32–33); and SyrHT 386 is a folio containing Psalm 148:1–3, with the verses written in reverse order (see DICKENS 2016: 29–30). For the overall survey and description of the Syriac manuscripts from Turfan, see HUNTER & DICKENS 2014.

²¹ SIMS-WILLIAMS 2012: 24–26.

the discovery of the famous mural with unusual iconography interpreted by von Le Coq as a fragment of the Palm Sunday scene.²²

The best-known Christian site on the Silk Road consists of the ruins of a monastery near Bulayïq, to the north of Turfan, excavated for the first time by Theodor Bartus during the Second German Expedition. However, traces of a Christian presence are attested in various other locations in the Turfan area, including Qocho, Toyuq, Sängim and Kurutka. Taking into account all the above evidence, we cannot rule out the possibility that a Christian community existed in the important caravan city of Qocho. In addition to Christian texts from Qocho written solely in Syriac and a few examples of bilingual Syriac-Sogdian texts, there are also examples of Syriac interacting with the predominantly Turkic milieu of the city. One such witness will be examined in the present article, a discovery made all the more interesting by the fact that it provides further evidence of the use of Syriac not only in an ecclesiastical or liturgical context, but also in the realm of magic and folk practices.

These are just some snapshots of the historico-cultural context from which the Syriac amulet scroll emerged. We turn now to the description of the manuscript.

The scroll BДсэ-524 measures 89.5 cm long by 7.0 cm wide²³ and is written on one side of thin cotton paper. Originally, the scroll was folded several times, probably in a style resembling Chinese harmonica books. The traces of folding can be observed, at roughly equal intervals, between lines 8 and 9, 19 and 20, 29 and 30, across line 39, between lines 48 and 49, 57 and 58, 67 and 68. The paper is slightly damaged on the edges where it was folded. The upper part of the scroll also shows some damage from insects. In the course of restoration, the original scroll was glued on white opaque paper. For the purpose of display, it was further glued onto two overlapping sheets of modern paper, dark beige in colour.

The amulet is lacking its initial and final parts and contains 78 lines, the first of which preserves only one recognizable letter. The text is written in black ink with occasional use of red ink. There is a word in red ink that is

²² LE COQ 1926: 77–78, plate 9. On this mural, thought to have been created during the T'ang period, a priest holding a vessel and a censer with incense stands in front of a group of three people with branches of green leaves in their hands. See also PARRY 2012: 170.

²³ These measurements are taken from PCHELIN & RASCHMANN 2016: 14. It is not possible at present to provide more precise measurements, including line length and spacing.

repeated continuously throughout the text, on ll. 17, 19, 23, 31, 48, 62 and 78 (on the nature and function of this word, see below). Moreover, there are punctuation signs in red ink on ll. 24, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76 and 78. The text is written in an irregular script of East Syriac origin with elements of monumental and cursive writing; it shares common features with some Syriac and Old Turkic texts in Syriac script found in Qara Qoto (also referred to as Khara Khoto or Khara-khoto in the literature), an abandoned city located in Inner Mongolia.²⁴

We have been able to identify three or possibly four different scribal hands. There seems to be a slight palaeographic change between lines 4 and 5, although this might be the result of the scribe changing pens. A more distinct change which looks like a new scribal hand is apparent on lines 57 and 58 (although it is difficult to spot exactly where the change occurs, the hand on line 56 seems quite different from that on line 59). Finally, another change in hands is evident between lines 68 and 69.

A distinctive feature which is observed throughout the manuscript is the use of ligatures, such as ܐܘܢ (ll. 16, 21, 23, 27, 34, 44, 46(?), 52, 53, 54, 73), ܐܘܢ (l. 48; this seems to be accidental due to the shortage of space at the end of the line), and ܐܘܢ (ll. 39, 55; this is used exclusively in the word ܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ, “which expelled” and is a ligature less commonly seen in Syriac manuscripts). The use of diacritics throughout the text is irregular. In some cases, *seyame* (a plural indicator) may be used as an indication of vocalization, e.g. in the demonstrative pronoun ܐܘܢܐܘܢ (l. 31)/ܐܘܢܐܘܢ (l. 62, placed above the letter instead of below it). In some other instances, however, we cannot explain their use.²⁵

The authors are deeply indebted to Professor Gideon Bohak of Tel Aviv University for his assistance in deciphering the text, improving our initial readings, outlining the structure of the text, tracing the parallels in Jewish magical texts and discerning the role of several important words used in this amulet, notably the recurrent rubric.

²⁴ YOSHIDA & CHIMEDDORJI 2008: 9, 407–409.


²⁵ For more on what seems to be the same phenomenon, see DICKENS 2013: 12.

כתיב ויבא אל המלך וישמעו המלך ויהי עמו (32) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (31) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (30)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (35) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (34) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (33)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (36) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (37) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (38) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (39)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (40) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (41) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (42)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (43) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (44) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (45)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (46) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (47) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (48)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (49) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (50) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (51)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (52) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (53) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (54)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (55) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (56) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (57)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (58) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (59) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (60)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (61) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (62) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (63)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (64) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (65) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (66)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (67) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (68) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (69)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (70) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (71) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (72)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (73) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (74) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (75)
 ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (76) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (77) ויהי עמו ויהי עמו (78)

⁴⁰ Misplaced עמו, “and from”.
⁴¹ Read עמו, “their contrivances”.
⁴² Read עמו, “and slanderers”.
⁴³ Read עמו, “from enemies”.
⁴⁴ The ע at the beginning of this verb seems misplaced; in all other instances in this series of clauses it occurs before the subject, not the verb. Thus, it should read עמו, in parallel with e.g. עמו and עמו.
⁴⁵ Read עמו, “were cleansed”. This may be an indication of /d/ assimilating to /t/, assuming that this text would be spoken aloud by a Uyghur native speaker in the actual ritual it was meant to be used with. Uyghur does not have the sound /θ/, so the beginning of the word would have been pronounced /etd/, which would have inevitably been shortened to just /εt/.
⁴⁶ Read עמו, “in the abyss”.
⁴⁷ Read עמו, “tombs”.
⁴⁸ Read עמו, “victorious”.
⁴⁹ Read עמו, “and solitaries”.




Pl. 1. ВДсэ-524 (with line numbers).
 © The State Hermitage Museum,
 St. Petersburg, 2017




Pl. 2. ВДсэ-524. Lines 1–13.

© The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, 2017




Pl. 3. ВДсэ-524. Lines 14–26.

© The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, 2017




Pl. 4. ВДсэ-524. Lines 27–39.

© The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, 2017




Pl. 5. ВДсэ-524. Lines 40–52.

© The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, 2017



Pl. 6. ВДсэ-524. Lines 53–65.

© The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, 2017



Pl. 7. ВДсэ-524. Lines 66–78.

© The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, 2017

Translation⁵⁰

(1) [...] [if] (2) a person has written (a spell against the client) on gold, may he (the client) be loosened, (3) and if a person has written on silver, (4) may he (the client) be loosened, and if a person has written on bronze, (5) may he (the client) be loosened. And if a person has written on lead, (6) iron or an earthen vessel,⁵¹ may he (the client) be loosened. (7) And if a person has written on the leaf of a tree, (8) may he (the client) be loosened. And if (a spell has been) spoken in jealousy (9) by a person, may he (the client) be loosened. And if (10) spoken on food and drink by a person, (11) may he (the client) be loosened. And if spoken on anything (12) by a person, may he (the client) be loosened.

By the great power of our Lord (13) Jesus Christ, our Lord and our God, (14) just as the companions of Ḥananiah were released (15) from the fiery furnace, so may (16) the bonds of sorcery be loosened from he who puts on (this amulet), (17) Ögünč. Just as He (God) set free (18) the Sons of Israel from the subjugation (19) of the Egyptians, so may Ögünč be loosened (20) from the chains of the bonds (21) of sorcery, Amen!

In the name of (22) I AM WHO I AM, may Ögünč be loosened (23) from the bonds of sorcery. (24) In the name of Adonai, may he be loosened. (25) And in the name of Gabriel and Michael, (26) may he be loosened. In the name of thrones, (27) dominions and [sic] may he be loosened. And (in the name of) cherubim, (28) seraphim, principalities, rulers, (29) powers, arch(angels), angels (30) and all of the saints, may (31) he who puts on this (amulet), Ögünč, be loosened (32) from evil deeds of enchantment, (33) Amen!

It was by the secret power (34) of the praiseworthy Trinity (35) of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, (36) that the holy apostles turned back (37) the nations (38) from the false worship of demons⁵² (39) and it (the Trinity) drove out darkness from (40) the face of the whole earth. By

⁵⁰ Sigla used in the translation are as follows:

[text] translation of the reconstructed text;

(text) semantic additions by the translators;

text rubric

⁵¹ Variant: “a potsherd”.

⁵² Lit. “false worship that is after demons”, with the words for “false worship”, “after” and “demons” all marked for plural. Compare the Syriac text of 1 Tim. 4:1 — ܡܬܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܝܢ, “and they will go after deceiving (erroneous, heretical) spirits”. Note that, in the biblical text, none of the words of interest are marked for plural.

this (41) secret power may evil demons be driven away (42) and all their sorcery, (43) their stratagems and their contrivances, (44) the evil eye and demons of lunacy, (45) slanderers and jealousy and every-(46)thing that is evil from enemies (47) before the eyes of him who puts on (48) this (amulet), Ögünč.

Just as, by the power (49) of the giver of life, our Saviour Jesus Christ, demons (50) went out (i.e. were expelled), the sick were healed, (51) lepers were cleansed, devils fled, (52) evil spirits fell into the deep abyss (53), indeed by the living and holy word (54) of our Lord Jesus, (55) which (word) expelled the Legion to (56) its (proper) dwelling from that (man) who lived in (57) the tombs, so (58) may the evil demons (59) and their stratagems and the bonds (60) of sorcery and grievous illnesses, (61) accidents and (all) his sadness be driven away and loosened from him who puts on (62) this (amulet), Ögünč, from everything (63) that he has.

This anathema (64) is sealed and confirmed by the seal (65) of the victorious Cross⁵³ of the Lord (66) and by the horns (67) of the glorious altar and by the medi-(68)ation of the venerable Gospel (69) of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy (70) Spirit, Amen. And by the prayer (71) of all the teachers, solitaries, pilgrims (72) and ascetics, Amen. And by the prayer (73) of the Blessed Holy Lady (74) Mary, the mother of Christ, Amen.

(75) In the name of the Father, may he (the client) be loosened, Amen.
 (76) And in the name of the Son, may he (the client) be loosened, Amen.
 (77) In the name of the Holy Spirit, may Ögünč be loosened, (78) Amen.

And from chains...

The overall text and its structure

Syriac amulets (along with incantation bowls, which are very similar genre-wise to amulets) have received sporadic scholarly interest in the past,⁵⁴ but that interest has increased in recent decades, thanks to the work of scholars like Tapani Harviainen, Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, Philippe Gignoux, Erica C.D. Hunter, Lucas van Rompay, J.B. Segal and Ali Faraj.⁵⁵

⁵³ Lit. Mar Šaliba.

⁵⁴ Important exceptions include HAZARD 1893; GOLLANCZ 1912 and MONTGOMERY 1918.

⁵⁵ HARVIAINEN 1978; NAVEH & SHAKED 1985; GIGNOUX 1987; HUNTER 1987; HUNTER 1990; VAN ROMPAY 1990; HUNTER 1993; NAVEH & SHAKED 1993; HUNTER 1999; SEGAL 2000, 147–150; HUNTER 2009; FARAJ 2010.

Several other Syriac amulets found at Turfan are extant in the Berlin Turfan collection, housed in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin — Preußischer Kulturbesitz, the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften and the Museum für Asiatische Kunst. A number of these amulets have been published by Hunter, including two fragments of a Syriac amulet (SyrHT 99 and SyrHT 330)⁵⁶ containing portions of “The Prayer of Mar Tamsis”,⁵⁷ a very small personal amulet (SyrHT 152)⁵⁸ with only two Syriac words and a beautifully drawn cross on it,⁵⁹ two fragments from an amulet (n364 and n365)⁶⁰ containing part of the “Anathema of Mar Cyprian”,⁶¹ and a fragment from another amulet (SyrHT 102),⁶² also containing text from the same Anathema.⁶³ Additionally, a Christian Sogdian amulet (n396) that mentions Mar Cyprian has been published by Nicholas Sims-Williams.⁶⁴

Other Syriac scroll amulets described in the literature, albeit not from Turfan, include 1) one from Urmi, Persia (most probably from the 19th c.), published by Willis Hatfield Hazard;⁶⁵ 2) one inscribed on a silver sheet and published by Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked (the provenance and current whereabouts of which are unknown);⁶⁶ 3) three written on animal skin, most probably from 6th or 7th c. Iran and published by Philippe Gignoux;⁶⁷ and 4) two from the 19th c. Kurdistan, published by Hunter.

It needs to be remembered that the complete scroll amulet from the Hermitage is no longer extant; as noted above, the beginning and ending of the text are missing. Nonetheless, what remains of the scroll, one of the longer Christian texts found at Turfan, is fascinating and full of language and themes typically found in such amulets.

Our scroll amulet begins with a list following the general formula “if a person has written (a spell against the client) on/with ____, may he (the cli-

⁵⁶ Prayer-amulet B in HUNTER & DICKENS 2014: 453.

⁵⁷ HUNTER 2013.

⁵⁸ Prayer-amulet E in HUNTER & DICKENS 2014: 453.

⁵⁹ HUNTER 2017: 82–83.

⁶⁰ Prayer-amulet F in HUNTER & DICKENS 2014: 453.

⁶¹ HUNTER 2017: 85–86, 88.

⁶² Prayer-amulet C in HUNTER & DICKENS 2014: 453.

⁶³ HUNTER 2017: 86–88. See also HUNTER 2018, which discusses the aforementioned amulets as well.

⁶⁴ SIMS-WILLIAMS 2020.

⁶⁵ HAZARD 1893.

⁶⁶ NAVEH & SHAKED 1985: 62–68.

⁶⁷ GIGNOUX 1987.

ent) be loosened”. This is followed by a list following the formula “if (a spell has been) spoken in/on ____ by a person, may he (the client) be loosened”.

The scroll then invokes the power of Christ, continuing to use the phrase “let him be loosened”, after which it transitions to a section of Old Testament *historiolae* (narrative incantations). Reference is made to two examples of deliverance from the Hebrew Bible: that of the three young men from the fiery furnace (Dan. 3) and that of the Israelites from Egypt (Ex. 12–15). This is followed by an invocation involving some of the divine names in the Hebrew Bible, after which the archangels Gabriel and Michael and then the nine angelic ranks are invoked.

After this there is a turn from Old Testament to New Testament *historiolae*, beginning with references to the name of the Trinity, the apostles and the one “who drives out darkness from the face of the earth”. These invocations lead to a list of magical practices and entities that the wearer of the amulet is to be protected from.

After a list of miraculous deeds performed by Christ, the amulet refers to his encounter with the Gadarene⁶⁸ demoniac⁶⁹ recounted in Matt. 8:28–34; Mark 5:1–20; Luke 8:26–39. Once again, a list is given of demonic activity from which the amulet is to protect its wearer. The extant part of the amulet concludes with references to a seal, the altar, the Gospel, the prayers of the saints and a three-fold loosening in the name of the Trinity.⁷⁰

Specific terms in the text

A number of terms in the text deserve special mention. First is the Syriac word ܠܘܫܘܢܐ, “let him be loosened”⁷¹ (ll. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 75, 76 and 77), along with its variant ܠܘܫܘܢܐܝܢ, “let them be loosened” (ll. 15 and 58), from ܠܘܫܘܢܐ, “to loosen”. The language of binding and loosing is very common in Christian amuletic texts and can be traced back in a Christian sense to the words of Jesus in two different contexts. Matt. 16:19⁷²

⁶⁸ Textual variants have “Gerasene” or “Gergesene”.

⁶⁹ Again, textual variants mention two demoniacs.

⁷⁰ As noted above, this overview of the structure of the amulet is strongly informed by observations from Gideon Bohak.

⁷¹ Or “dissolved, unsealed, opened”.

⁷² All biblical passages in Syriac are taken from the Peshiṭta text.

Caesarea Philippi that Jesus was the Messiah, in response to which Christ pronounced Peter to be blessed and awarded him “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” mentioned above. From this verse comes the idea that binding and loosing are ultimately connected to authority and concerned with allowing or not allowing things to take place, based on a verbal formula in which the thing to be desired is loosened or the thing to be avoided is bound. Interestingly, the extant portion of our amulet scroll does not include any references to binding, which typically employ the Syriac verb ܐܘܒܘܢ, “to bind, fasten, tie, take into bondage, compel”.

The word ܐܘܒܘܢ occurs four times in the text (ll. 16, 31, 47 and 61). As far as we can tell, it appears to be an acronym for ܐܘܒܘܢ ܕܚܘܡܐ “he who puts on (this amulet)”.⁷⁶ In several places where this term occurs in the text, it is followed by the word ܐܘܒܘܢ, “this (f)”, obviously referring to the amulet.

Another prominent word in the text is a recurring rubric (ll. 17, 19, 23, 31, 48, 62 and 78). In most cases it is badly faded and barely legible, but image enhancement has confirmed what the authors suspected through visible inspection of the digital images.⁷⁷ The word can be read as ܐܘܒܘܢܝܢܝܢ, representing the transliteration into Syriac script of the Turkic word *ögünč*,⁷⁸ a noun formed from the verbal stem *ögün-*, “to praise oneself, boast”,⁷⁹ itself derived from the stem *ög-*, “to praise”.⁸⁰ Although the standard meaning of the noun *ögünč* was “self-praise”,⁸¹ it seems to have had an alternative meaning in Christian texts, where it was used as simply a word for “praise, glory”. This can be seen most clearly in the 14th c. *Codex Cumanicus*, as Kaare Grønbech noted in his *Komanisches Wörterbuch*: “*ögünč, öjgünč* [137,18] Lob. *ataya ögünč... bolsun* dem Vater sei Lob 151,17. *ögünč berlobpreisen*, ‘laudem dare’ 141,9”.⁸² The first two examples of *ögünč* occur in the following lines from a hymn to the Virgin Mary:

⁷⁶ The authors are indebted to Gideon Bohak for this suggestion, which fits the context of the places where we find this word in the amulet.

⁷⁷ The authors are grateful to Professor William I. Sellers of the University of Manchester for his assistance.

⁷⁸ The authors wish to thank Dmitrii Rukhliadev for this suggestion, which has proven to be the most likely reading.

⁷⁹ CLAUSON 1972: 110–111.

⁸⁰ Ibid.: 100.

⁸¹ Ibid.: 110.

⁸² GRØNBECH 1942: 182.

*Sionda biz kim turalim, ögünč yir̄in saa aytalim! We will live in Zion; we will sing to you with songs of praise!*⁸³

*Barča birgä qopsap turur, ögünč tekši berip turur. All together chanting Psalms; uniformly giving praise.*⁸⁴

A third instance of the word in the *Codex Cumanicus* is found in a prayer directed to Christ:

*Tuvurur Ataya ögünč, tuvyan Ovuluna beyenč. Praise to the Father who begets; joy to the Son who was begotten.*⁸⁵

However, the rubric in our text represents more than just a word meaning “praise, glory”. It is in fact the name of the client for whom this scroll amulet was made.⁸⁶ Indeed, it may well have been a common name amongst the Uyghurs.⁸⁷ It is recorded in Juwayni’s *History of the World Conqueror* (1260) as the name of the brother of the *idi-qut*, the ruler of the Uyghur Kingdom of Qocho, allied with the Mongols after submitting to them in 1209. In the wake of a Uyghur plot to kill all the Muslims living in Beshbaliq (an important city in the Uyghur Kingdom), a plot that involved the *idi-qut*, himself, Ögünč was the one who cut off his brother’s head and subsequently succeeded him as the next *idi-qut* (the events in question took place in 650 AH/1252–53 CE).⁸⁸

The recurring phrase ﷲ “in the name of” (ll. 21, 24, 25, 26, 75, 76 and 77) is not surprising to find in an amulet that is concerned with battling spiritual enemies. Invoking the name (and hence the spiritual authority) of God is a concept that has deep roots in the Judeo-Christian scriptures. Thus, David meeting Goliath in battle does so “in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel” (1 Sam. 17:45) and the Davidic king celebrated in the Messianic psalms cuts off the nations “in the name of the Lord” (Ps. 118:11).

⁸³ GARKAVETS 2019: 98.

⁸⁴ Ibid.: 104.

⁸⁵ Ibid.: 122. The authors thank Peter Zieme for his assistance with philological matters related to these quotations from the *Codex Cumanicus*.

⁸⁶ The authors once again thank Gideon Bohak for this observation.

⁸⁷ RÁSONYI & BASKI 2007: 592.

⁸⁸ References to Ögünč in the Persian text can be found in QAZVĪNĪ 1912: 38–39; see BOYLE 1958: 52–53 for the English translation.

Similarly, in the New Testament, Christ exhorts his followers to pray in his name (John 14:13–14; 15:16; 16:23–27) and the disciples, after the day of Pentecost, heal others “in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth” (Acts 3:6). Later on, Paul exorcises evil spirits “in the name of Jesus Christ” (Acts 16:18). Just as the aforementioned Gospel passage on binding and loosing was easily incorporated into amuletic material, so too was the notion of performing an action in the name of one with more spiritual authority than the agent. However, in the case of our amulet, performing the action in the name of angels and other supernatural beings that are considered to have more spiritual authority than the speaker (in order to make the invocation more powerful in the popular mind) testifies to folk beliefs rather than the traditions of the Judeo-Christian Scriptures.

We come now to words that are found in specific places in the text, in contrast to those above that are scattered throughout it. As Bohak notes,

The first twelve lines of the amulet (as well as previous lines, which are missing) take the format of “If a person worked witchcraft (on the client) by method X, may he (the client) be loosened”, with each sentence covering a different type of aggressive magic, in the hope of covering all possibilities. This format — whose origins go back to Akkadian magical texts, such as the Maqlû-spells — is well known in Jewish magic. The clearest example is found in the *Pishra de-Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa*, a late-antique magical text in Aramaic which aims to dissolve (*pšr*) and loosen (*šry*, the same verb as in the Syriac amulet) every possible act of witchcraft performed against the client.⁸⁹

We have translated the phrase ܘܟܝܘܢ ܕܢܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ (ll. 2–7) as “and if a person has written”, with the following parenthetical phrase “a spell against the client” not included in the text, but understood from the context. In this case, ܘܟܝܘܢ, “a person” stands for a perpetrator of magic against the client for whom the amulet was written.

The references to writing on (using ܥܘܠܡܐ or ܥܘܠܡܐ) gold (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ), silver (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ), bronze (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ), lead (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ), iron (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ) and earthenware/pot sherd (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ), or a tree leaf (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ) (ll. 2–7) all refer to the material that is being

⁸⁹ Personal correspondence, Feb. 6, 2021. On the *Pishra de-Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa*, see TOCCI 1986 and BOHAK 2019.

written upon (rather than the material that is used for the writing).⁹⁰ They seem to cover a wide spectrum of materials on which magical texts could be written in antiquity. Note the following regarding things written on various metals in the ancient Mediterranean:

Among the types of metal used for incantations or amulets in Egypt, lead was reserved for binding incantations, as was customary elsewhere in the Graeco-Roman world... In Egypt, as elsewhere, bronze, silver, and gold strips of metal were used for incantations for healing, deliverance, or favour.⁹¹

Although use of the last three metals typically did not involve maleficent examples of magic that would necessitate protection of the type offered by our amulet, lead and clay are notable exceptions:

In the competitive face-to-face societies of the ancient Mediterranean it was not uncommon for people to try to handicap a competitor and gain an advantage by what are called curses or ‘binding spells’... The preferred medium for these incantations was a thin sheet of lead, lead alloys, or other metals — more for practical reasons, initially, than ritual ones — though pottery sherds, limestone, gems, and papyrus were also used. The inscribed object was then deposited close to the underworld deities or untimely dead being summoned to help — in a chthonic sanctuary, a grave, or an underground body of water (a well, a fountain, baths). The object might also be buried close to the target being hindered — in the hippodrome or the stadium, for incantations against competitors; near the home or place of work of an adversary.⁹²

Pot sherds, also known as ostraca, were cheap and readily available in the ancient Mediterranean, ensuring their use for all sorts of writing, including incantations:

⁹⁰ The one possible exception to this might be the reference to gold, given the practice of chrysography (writing in gold ink on blue paper), but we have no indication that this technique was used in magical texts.

⁹¹ DE BRUYN 2017: 46.

⁹² *Ibid.*: 121–122.

They were favoured in areas where pottery was plentiful but papyrus had to be brought in, as in the Egyptian desert. Numerous texts written on ostraca have been found, for instance, among the remains of the monasteries in the region of Thebes. Many of the texts are letters or short documents, but the finds also include biblical and liturgical texts. Ostraca were not as malleable or easy to carry as papyrus, which limited their usefulness for amulets. They were more suited to binding incantations, antagonistic devices that were deposited in earth or water (a grave, the baths, the target's house or workplace) in order to take effect.⁹³

These observations of materials used in the Graeco-Roman world are complemented by what we know about materials used for magical texts in a Jewish context. Thus, Jewish amulets crafted between biblical times and the Byzantine period were

made of metal lamellae, that is, thin plates or pieces of foil made of gold, silver, bronze, copper or lead... A few amulets made of lead are particularly interesting as these are meant to invoke a curse on someone. While lead amulets — so-called *defixiones* — were very popular in Roman culture, they were rather unusual in ancient Jewish culture, it seems. ...a variety of metals are mentioned in instruction texts describing writing materials, such as gold, silver, bronze, iron, lead, tin and copper... The purpose of these so-called *defixiones* was an aggressive one, viz. to harm or even kill somebody. The rather rare evidence of a Jewish lead amulet has a fine counterpart in an instruction text from the Cairo Geniza: For extermination: [Take] a lamella of lead [and] write [on it] in the first hour of the day and bury it in a fresh grave.⁹⁴

In addition to possible spells that were written down, our amulet also concerns itself with potential incantations that were spoken. It specifically singles out **רצון**, “competition, envy, jealousy” (l. 8, see also l. 45), that most basic of human passions. Indeed, these amuletic texts make frequent mention of envy, jealousy and covetousness, along with the relational difficulties that come in their wake. Thus, in a 72-page codex containing various amulets,

⁹³ Ibid.: 45.

⁹⁴ REBIGER 2017: 341–342, 349–350.

written in 1802/03 in Turkish Kurdistan and published by Hermann Gollancz, we read the following, more extensive description of what many amulets seek to guard against: “may there too be annulled from the house of him who beareth these writs, jealousy and enmity, disputes, strifes, and divisions; by that Word which spake to the water and it became wine, may (men) be at peace with one another, may the gates of mercy and compassion be opened, and the mouth of evil men be stopped from off him”.⁹⁵

Spells spoken **על אכילה ושתיה** “on food and drink” (l. 10) are also listed as a specific concern in the amulet. Again, Bohak’s observations are pertinent:

Unlike the Syriac amulet, in the *Pishra* it is angels who are asked to dissolve the spells, so that a typical sequence runs as follows “If on food and drink they worked (witchcraft) upon him, Zarhiel will loosen him; and if on mustard and on a seed they worked (witchcraft) upon him, Qatriel will loosen him; and if on tail-fat and wax and bitumen and all (kinds of) oil and fat they worked (witchcraft) upon him, Zarqiel will loosen him”. The specific methods of witchcraft supposedly used by the client’s enemies show an exact overlap in the case of “food and drink” (אם על מיכלא ומישתיא עבדו ליה **על אכילה ושתיה** and **על אכילה ושתיה**), and diverge in other instances, but the magical techniques listed by the Syriac text (writing on gold, brass, lead, leaves, and so on) are paralleled in numerous Jewish magical texts.

The format of “If a person worked witchcraft (on the client) by method X, may he (the client) be loosened” recurs in medieval Jewish magical texts as well. In a long amulet found in the Cairo Genizah, the appeal is that “all types of witchcraft and all types of sorcery, and all evil writings, and all evil bindings that were done to (the two clients) or that will be done, whether by day or by night, whether in a tomb or under a tree, whether *by food or by drink* (בין במיכל בין במשקיי), whether in a home or in a field, whether under the moon or (under the stars), will be annulled and loosened”.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ GOLLANCZ 1912: xxxvii.

⁹⁶ Personal correspondence, Feb. 6, 2021. On the Cairo Genizah amulet, Cambridge University Library, T-S K 1.168, see SCHIFFMAN & SWARTZ 1992: 149, 153.

other angels.¹⁰⁵ Of the four classical archangels — Gabriel, Michael, Raphael and Uriel — only the first two are named in the Bible (Gabriel in Dan. 8:15, 16; 9:21; Luke 1:19, 26; Michael in Dan. 10:13, 21; Dan. 12:1; Jude 1:9; Rev. 12:7).

The nine ranks of angels are occasionally mentioned in Syriac amulets, where we encounter phrases like ܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ, “the nine orders of angels”,¹⁰⁶ but that phrase does not occur in our amulet. Instead, the names of the nine ranks in the angelic hierarchy are given in descending order: ܩܕܝܫܐ, “thrones”, ܩܕܝܫܐ, “dominions”, ܩܕܝܫܐ, “cherubim”, ܩܕܝܫܐ, “seraphim”, ܩܕܝܫܐ [sic], “principalities”, ܩܕܝܫܐ, “rulers”, ܩܕܝܫܐ [sic], “powers”, [ܩܕܝܫܐ],¹⁰⁷ “archangels” and ܩܕܝܫܐ, “angels” (ll. 26–29). These terms also find their origins in the Bible (e.g. Ps. 148:2; Isa. 6:1–3; Ezek. 10:1–22; Rom. 8:38; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10, 15; 1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Pet. 3:21–22; Jude 9).

Lists of the angelic ranks are found in early patristic and liturgical literature. Examples include the *Apostolic Constitutions* (4th c.);¹⁰⁸ John Chrysostom’s (d. 407) *Homily Against the Anomoeans*;¹⁰⁹ the *Mystagogical Catechesis* V, attributed to either Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) or his successor John of Jerusalem (d. 417);¹¹⁰ and different versions of the Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James¹¹¹ (this list of sources is by no means comprehensive). It is commonly accepted that the author of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* (early 6th c.), referred to as Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, was the first to develop a systematic structure of the angelical hierarchy in the treatise *On the Celestial Hierarchy* (hereafter: *CH*), which involved three ranks with three angelic orders in each of them and which greatly influenced subsequent Christian writings.¹¹²

¹⁰⁵ GOLLANCZ 1912: xxix, xxxiii, xlvi, xlix, lxvi, lxxi, lxxv, lxxix, lxxxv; HUNTER 2009: 201.

¹⁰⁶ GOLLANCZ 1912: lxiv, lxxviii, 45, 82.

¹⁰⁷ As noted above, there seems to be an instance of haplography in the text here, with the scribe missing out one of two adjacent instances of the word ܩܕܝܫܐ, “angels”.

¹⁰⁸ *Const. Apost.* VII 35. 3 (9 ranks); VIII 12. 8 (10 ranks including Ages and Armies); VIII 12. 27 (11 ranks). METZGER 1985: III, 76, 182, 192.

¹⁰⁹ *Contra Anom.* II 279–280. MALINGREY 1970: 164.

¹¹⁰ *Cat. Myst.* V 6.4–11 (9 ranks). PIÉDAGNEL 1966: 154.

¹¹¹ FENWICK 1992: 88–89 (generally 9 ranks).

¹¹² These ranks include: I) Seraphim (1), Cherubim (2), Thrones (3); II) Dominions (4), Powers (5), Authorities/Rulers (6); III) Principalities (7), Archangels (8), Angels (9) (*CH* VII–IX). See ARTHUR 2008: 43.

The ranks are present in various pieces of Syriac literature, of different kinds and genres, from apocrypha to encyclopaedic works of the Syriac Renaissance. Below, we compare a few instances with the list found in our amulet. We have deliberately selected different literary forms and traditions (East Syriac and West Syriac; native Syriac works and those translated from Greek) to show their unity on the one hand and some differences in terminology and listing order on the other. 1) The *Testament of Adam* is an apocryphal compilation, thematically close to the *Cave of Treasures* and thought to have been originally composed in Syriac, which includes a section on the angelical hierarchy.¹¹³ 2) The *Liber Patrum* is a treatise dealing with both the angelic and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, influenced by Pseudo-Dionysius and attributed to the East Syriac author Simeon Shanqlawi (late 12th — early 13th cc.).¹¹⁴ 3) Pseudo-Dionysian ranks of angels also appear in a Syriac version of the treatise *De gemmis* (“On gemstones”, since the ranks of angels are connected here to the gemstones of the ephod). The treatise is included in the so-called *Syriac Masora*, in its West Syriac form (probably early 11th c.).¹¹⁵ 4) Our last point of comparison is a list of angelic orders in the *Pre-Sanctus* (priest’s prayer before the *Sanctus*) in the West Syriac version of the Anaphora of St. James.¹¹⁶ The mention of the celestial ranks here reflects the biblical context of the *Sanctus* hymn (Isa. 6:2–3).

<i>Amulet, BДсэ-524</i>	<i>Testament of Adam</i>	<i>Liber Patrum</i>	<i>De gemmis in the Syriac Masora</i>	<i>West Syriac Anaphora of St. James</i>
ܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ thrones (3) ¹¹⁷	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ angels (9)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ cherubim (2)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ seraphim (1)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ angels (9)
ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ dominions (4)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ archangels (8)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ seraphim (1)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ cherubim (2)	ܘܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ archangels (8)

¹¹³ This section is found in one manuscript only, Vatican Library, Vat. sir. 164 (1702 AD). KMOŠKO 1907: col. 1353–1360; see also ROBINSON 1982.

¹¹⁴ Vatican Library, Vat. sir. 568, ff. 3r–7v; see also VOSTÉ 1940: 11, 16–20. We are grateful to Fr. Aphrem Dawood who pointed out this work and manuscript to us.

¹¹⁵ British Library Add. 7183, f. 131r; see also ROSEN & FORSHALL 1838: 70. The information on this treatise and manuscript was kindly provided by Jonathan Loopstra, who is preparing an edition and translation of it.

¹¹⁶ HEIMING 1953: 142. We quote here the list of angelic ranks as it is preserved in the long version of the Anaphora (according to British Library Add. 14499, 10th century). We acknowledge the generous help and valuable advice of Kees den Biesen.

¹¹⁷ Numbers in parentheses indicate the order of the ranks according to *CH*.

<i>Amulet, B/Дс9-524</i>	<i>Testament of Adam</i>	<i>Liber Patrum</i>	<i>De gemmis in the Syriac Masora</i>	<i>West Syriac Anaphora of St. James</i>
ܘܚܝܘܬܐ cherubim (2)	ܘܥܫܝܩܐ principalities (7)	ܘܫܘܬܐ thrones (3)	ܘܫܘܬܐ thrones (3)	ܘܫܘܬܐ principalities (7)
ܘܫܪܦܝܡ seraphim (1)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ rulers (6)	ܘܕܘܡܝܢܐ dominions (4)	ܘܕܘܡܝܢܐ dominions (4)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ rulers (6)
ܘܥܫܝܩܐ principalities (7)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ powers (5)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ powers (5)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ powers (5)	ܘܫܘܬܐ thrones (3)
ܘܩܘܪܝܐ rulers (6)	ܘܕܘܡܝܢܐ dominions (4)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ rulers (6)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ rulers (6)	ܘܕܘܡܝܢܐ dominions (4)
ܘܩܘܪܝܐ powers (5)	ܘܫܘܬܐ thrones (3)	ܘܥܫܝܩܐ principalities (7)	ܘܥܫܝܩܝܐ principalities (7)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ powers (5)
ܘܩܘܪܝܐ [ܘܩܘܪܝܐ] ܘܩܘܪܝܐ archangels (8)	ܘܫܪܦܝܡ seraphim (1)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ archangels (8)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ archangels (8)	ܘܫܘܬܐ cherubim (2)
ܘܩܘܪܝܐ angels (9)	ܘܫܘܬܐ cherubim (2)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ angels (9)	ܘܩܘܪܝܐ angels (9)	ܘܫܪܦܝܡ seraphim (1)

As can be seen from the above table, *De gemmis* seems to preserve the Pseudo-Dionysian order most accurately, although *Liber Patrum* is very close, differing only in the order of cherubim and seraphim. Interestingly, the *Testament of Adam* demonstrates the ranks in the reverse sequence, which is also partially reflected in the Anaphora. There are also some differences in terminology. Thus, the loanword ܘܥܫܝܩܐ (Greek ἀρχαί) is not present in the West Syriac Anaphora, which uses Syriac ܘܫܘܬܐ (“principalities”) instead. Our Turfan amulet lists the angelic hosts in random order. Apparently, it was not the intention of the scribe or compiler to follow any established sequence; most likely, he did not have any literary template in front of him, but rather relied on oral tradition.

It is hardly surprising to find a reference in the amulet to ܘܫܘܬܐ ܘܩܘܪܝܐ ܘܫܪܦܝܡ “the praiseworthy Trinity of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (ll. 34–36). Indeed, the invocation of the Trinity in Syriac amulets is extremely common (nearly every example published by Gollancz starts with the phrase).

Also foundational to the Christian tradition is a reliance on and reverence for ܘܩܘܪܝܐ ܘܩܘܪܝܐ “the holy apostles” (l. 37), whose efforts at turning the nations away from demonic worship is viewed as a template for the work of the amulet in driving away ܘܩܘܪܝܐ ܘܩܘܪܝܐ “evil demons” (ll. 41–42). In fact, the amulet uses three different terms to describe the spiritual adversaries that it

purports to guard against; the other two are ܕܘܢܝܝܢ “devils” (l. 51) and ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ “evil spirits” (l. 52).

In addition to the sorcery, stratagems and contrivance(s) of demons, the amulet also protects against ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ, “the evil eye” (l. 44) a stock phrase found in these Syriac amulets¹¹⁸ which reflects a commonly-held belief from antiquity onward “that some persons may produce malevolent effects on others by looking at them, based on the supposed power of some eyes to bewitch or harm by glance”.¹¹⁹ Other specific foes mentioned are ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ “demons of lunacy” (l. 44), literally “sons of the roof”, also known as rooftop demons and attested in Hebrew sources, as well as “Mandaic, Syriac and various Babylonian Aramaic idioms”.¹²⁰ The term refers to epilepsy, as is clear from the Peshiṭta text of Matt. 17:15 — ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ, “My son has epilepsy”. The equation with lunacy is standard in late antique texts.

Our amulet focuses extensively on the healings and exorcisms of Christ (ll. 49–52), with a series of clauses in which (in contrast to standard Syriac syntax) the noun precedes the verb. Could this indicate some form of language interference from Uyghur, which has verb-final syntax? Significant space is given to the New Testament pericope of the expelling of ܕܘܢܝܝܢ, “the legion [of evil spirits]” from the aforementioned Gadarene demoniac (ll. 55–57). The vocabulary of the amulet closely follows the Peshiṭta, particularly the words ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ, “that (man) who lived in the tombs”, quoting the text in Mark 5:3, ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ (cf. Luke 8:27).

In the sealing section of the amulet, two interesting references are made: ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ “the seal of the Holy Cross” (ll. 64–65) and ܕܘܢܝܝܢ ܕܘܢܝܝܢ “the horns of the glorious altar” (ll. 66–67). The former is presented as *Mar Ṣaliba*, which refers not to a saint, as one might expect — the title ܕܘܢܝܝܢ *Mar* is typically used for saints and bishops and ܕܘܢܝܝܢ *Ṣaliba*, meaning “cross”, is a common name in the Syriac tradition — but rather to the cross itself, which is personalized by adding *Mar* in front of it in colloquial usage. Indeed, some Syriac manuscripts refer to the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross in the liturgical calendar of the Church of the East (September 13th) as “*Mar Ṣaliba*”.¹²¹ However, in this case, such a personification seems

¹¹⁸ HAZARD 1893: 285, 291; GOLLANCZ 1912: xl, xlvi, lviii, lxx–lxxi, lxxxii–lxxxiii; HUNTER 1999: 167.

¹¹⁹ NOY 2007: 584.

¹²⁰ KWASMAN 2007: 165–169, 183.

¹²¹ Our thanks to His Holiness Mar Awa III and Sergey Minov for their help in deciphering the meaning of this phrase, including references. See VAN DER PLOEG 1983: 89.

to testify to popular practice rather than the formal way of referring to the Holy Cross.

Regarding the horns of the altar, Bohak observes that

the same phrase occurs in an ancient Jewish amulet, as part of a long series of sacred objects, “and by the rod of Moses, and by the golden plate of Aaron the high priest, and by the signet-ring of Solomon, and by the [shield] of David, and by the horns of the altar (ובקרנתה דמדבחא), and by the Name of the living and existent God”.¹²²

This expression alludes to particular places in the Old Testament where the altar is described as having one horn on each of its four corners (Ex. 27:2; 38:2); the practice of blood sacrifice on the altar horns (Ex. 29:12; Lev. 4:7; 8:15) made them, along with the rest of the altar, objects of extreme holiness and mercy. The example of biblical personalities, such as Adonijah and Joab (1 Kings 1:50–51; 2:28), who took hold of the horns of the altar as a means of appealing for mercy, explains the presence of this symbol in the amulet.

After reference to *ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ* “the venerable Gospel of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit” (ll. 68–70), the amulet invokes the prayers of Christian saints: *ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ* “teachers, solitaries, pilgrims and ascetics” (ll. 71–72). The phrase *ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ* “by the prayer of the Blessed Holy Lady Mary” (ll. 72–74) is exceedingly common in Syriac prayer amulets, especially at the end of the text.¹²³ The words *ܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ* “the mother of Christ” (l. 74), which constitute clear evidence of the origins of the amulet within the Church of the East, occur less frequently in Syriac amulets.¹²⁴ We do, however, find them in several Turfan texts: remnants of a Syriac prayer booklet to the Virgin Mary (SyrHT 279, SyrHT 280), two fragments from the Syriac liturgical text designated as *Ḥudra N* (SyrHT 337, n421) and another Syriac liturgical text with Sogdian instructions for the priest (n395).¹²⁵

¹²² Personal correspondence, Feb. 6, 2021. The Jewish amulet was published in NAVEH & SHAKED 1993: 91–95.

¹²³ HAZARD 1893: 286, 289, 292, 294; GOLLANZ 1912: xxvi, xxvii, xxix, xxx, xxxi, xxxvi, xxxix, xl, xli, xlii, xlv, l, lii, liii, lxii, lxx, lxxvii, lxxi, lxxvi, lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxii; HUNTER 1987: 101, 103; HUNTER 1993: 251, 252; HUNTER 1999: 167, 169, 170, 171. Occasionally the simpler phrase *ܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ* “in the name of Lady Mary” is used (GOLLANZ 1912: xxxix).

¹²⁴ GOLLANZ 1912: lxx, lxxvii.

¹²⁵ HUNTER & DICKENS 2014: 264, 265, 307–308, 402, 412.

Connection with SyrHT 274–276

A case can be made for connecting the scroll now in the Hermitage with three Syriac fragments in the Berlin Turfan Collection (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin — Preußischer Kulturbesitz), glassed together and assigned the new signature numbers SyrHT 274, SyrHT 275 and SyrHT 276.¹²⁶ The visible text and translation are as follows (they are affixed to yellow pasteboard, so there is no verso, as is the case with the Hermitage scroll).



Pl. 8. SyrHT 274, 275, 276.

© Depositum der BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHEN AKADEMIE
DER WISSENSCHAFTEN in der STAATSBIBLIOTHEK ZU BERLIN –
Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

¹²⁶ Prayer-amulet D in HUNTER & DICKENS 2014: 453.

SyrHT 274:**Syriac Text**

ܠܥܠܡܐ (ܐ) [...] (3) ܩܘܠܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ [...] (2) [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ [...] (1)
ܩܘܠܘܢ [...] (5) [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ (ܩܘܠܘܢ) [...] (4) ܡܢ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܡܢ

Translation

(1) And it has struck [...] (2) animals and cattle that have put down feet [...] (3) Lu[ke, Ma]tthew and Mark [...] (4) [...] (5) and knots [...]

SyrHT 275:**Syriac Text**

(4) [...] ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ (3) [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ (2) [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ [...] (1)
[...] (6) [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ 5 [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ ܩܘܠܘܢ

Translation

(1) Jesus [...] (2) of sorceries [...] (3) and loosened the well [...] and [...] and loosened [...] (4) and loosened the dry land and [...] loosened [...] (5) and the young [...]

SyrHT 276:**Syriac Text**

[...] ܩܘܠܘܢ [...] (2) [...] ܩܘܠܘܢ [...] (1)

Translation

(1) [...] My daughter... (2) in his name...

Could these fragments come from the scroll, the beginning and end of which are now missing? Indeed, there are a number of common features that can be noted:

1. The original find number given to these three fragments by the Second Turfan Expedition is T II D 319. Thus, as noted at the beginning of this article, they were also discovered by von Le Coq in Dakianus-shahri.
 2. In terms of paleography, the scribal hand represented in these fragments can be compared favourably with the last hand on the amulet (ll. 69–78).
-

Notable common features include distinctive shapes of the letters **z** (throughout BДсэ-524 and the Berlin fragments), **ı** (particularly in BДсэ-524, l. 76–77 and SyrHT 275, l. 2–4) and **đ** (BДсэ-524, ll. 70, 72 and SyrHT 275, l. 3–4), along with the plural marker *seyame* (throughout BДсэ-524 and the fragments), and particularly the ligature **zđ** (BДсэ-524, l. 73, SyrHT 274, l. 2, SyrHT 275, l. 2); on the use of the latter throughout the scroll, see the Introduction above.

3. As noted above, like the scroll, the fragments are one-sided and are written on a similar type of cotton paper. The width of the largest fragment SyrHT 274 is 7.5 cm, which roughly corresponds to the width of the scroll, although we cannot rule out the possibility that there was more text on the right-hand side.
4. The language of the fragments fits nicely with that in our amulet, particularly the references to knots (**zđ**), sorceries (**zđ**) and loosening things (**đ**). In terms of phraseology, there is nothing in these fragments that would disqualify them from having originally come from the scroll. Nonetheless, rather than the word commonly used in the amulet **zđ** (“may he be loosened”), we find instead another form of the same verbal stem. Neither can we explain the word **đ** (“my daughter”) that appears after the rubric (SyrHT 276, l. 1), if the client is a male, as is clear from the scroll.
5. Finally, there are remnants of faded rubrics visible in two places (SyrHT 274, l. 4 and SyrHT 276, l. 1) that might match portions of the rubric on the amulet (in particular, the initial **z** and possibly **o** visible on SyrHT 274).

Thus, we can confirm that the paleographical features and some common vocabulary may well testify to the Berlin fragments and the Hermitage scroll belonging together. However, there still remain unanswered questions regarding their relationship.

Connection with Qara Qoto manuscript H^彩101

In the course of preparing this article for publication, the authors became aware of some striking similarities between the amulet discussed above and another text, H^彩101, discovered in Qara Qoto by the 1983–1984 expedition

of the Institute of Cultural Relics, Inner Mongolia Academy of Social Sciences. Although several of the texts unearthed are in Syriac script, only one is actually in the Syriac language (the others are in Old Uyghur). The Syriac text, which is very difficult to decipher due to damage from fold lines and insects, as well as smudged ink, was examined by Shinichi Muto, who initially considered it to be a theological tract, based on the discernible words.¹²⁷ He later adjusted this evaluation, viewing the text as having something to do with exorcism, albeit divorced from earlier Syriac literature, due to its “magical” terminology.¹²⁸

We can now confirm that H¹⁰¹ from Qara Qoto is also an amulet, made for a different client, which shares much of the same terminology as that found in the Hermitage amulet. Paleography-wise, both amulets feature a similar writing of East Syriac origin. H¹⁰¹ is thought to date from the Mongol period (13th–14th cc.); our conjecture is that the Hermitage scroll from Turfan belongs to the same period. That H¹⁰¹ is, like the Hermitage scroll amulet, also concerned with protective magic is now beyond doubt in our minds. The similarities between the two texts are such that whole sections of one are duplicated (frequently word for word) in the other. Although we cannot say at this point what the exact relationship between the two texts is, there is no question that some sort of relationship does exist (most likely, they both descend from a common version of the text). This is a line of inquiry that we intend to explore in a future article, in which we will present a comparison of the two.

Conclusions

The Syriac amulet discussed in this article is notable for a number of reasons. It is one of the longer Christian texts found at Turfan (despite missing its beginning and ending) and is unique in its format — no other scroll amulet has been unearthed there. Also distinctive is the fact that the main body of the text is now housed in St. Petersburg, whereas fragments that were likely parts of that same text reside in Berlin.

The text is also significant in terms of the insights it gives into the various cultural influences present in the Christian community at Turfan. Although

¹²⁷ MUTO 2013.

¹²⁸ MUTO 2016; see also SMELOVA 2015: 232–233.

the amulet was obviously written in Turfan, as the Uyghur name of the client makes clear, its appearance there is the culmination of a long trajectory of magical texts in various Aramaic dialects (e.g. Jewish Aramaic, Mandaic and Syriac), ultimately stretching back to the time of ancient Assyria and Babylonia, where the origins of so many magical texts can be found. The many parallels between our amulet and magical texts found throughout the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia (dating from Late Antiquity to the 19th c.) connect the amulet with a broader family of magical texts that have common themes and terminology.

Thus, we are struck by reflections of both Judaism and Christianity, traces of both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, with *historiolae* selected from each. The fiery furnace, slavery to the Egyptians and the archangels Michael and Gabriel from the former are complemented by the miracles of Christ, the witness of the apostles and the nine ranks of angels rooted in the latter. The amulet invokes the Old Testament names of I AM WHO I AM and Adonai along with the New Testament Trinitarian formula. In parallel with references to the evil eye and the demons of lunacy, both also found in Jewish magical texts, the healings and exorcism of Christ are highlighted as precursors of the authority with which our amulet is able to loosen the client from the effects of evil.

In addition to the general Christian nature of the text, the amulet has several specific connections with the Church of the East, the Christian community which was predominant in Turfan. In the sealing section near the end of what remains of the scroll, in addition to the horns of the altar, the seal of Mar Ṣaliba is referred to, by which is understood the cross itself, celebrated during the Church's Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. Further on in the text, we encounter Mary referred to as the Mother of Christ, a term that is deeply embedded in the Antiochian exegetical tradition that the Church of the East champions.

Despite the amulet's Near Eastern pedigree, linking it with Jewish and Christian ideas from Late Antiquity, the Uyghur Christian community where the text was copied and used appears to have left several marks on the artefact we are concerned with. It is evident from the multiple spelling errors — ܟܘܨܬܝܢ for ܟܘܨܬܝܢ on l. 19; ܟܘܨܬܝܢ for ܟܘܨܬܝܢ on l. 29; ܟܘܨܬܝܢ for ܟܘܨܬܝܢ on l. 43; ܟܘܨܬܝܢ for ܟܘܨܬܝܢ on l. 45; ܟܘܨܬܝܢ for ܟܘܨܬܝܢ on l. 57; ܟܘܨܬܝܢ for ܟܘܨܬܝܢ on l. 71 — as well as numerous instances of misplaced or missing α , “and”, that the scribe or scribes involved in copying the amulet

were not native speakers of Syriac. Moreover, as noted above, the series of clauses in ll. 49–52, all following a noun-verb pattern (rather than the typical Syriac syntax of verb-noun) may indicate grammatical interference on the part of the Uyghur language. It also seems possible that there is phonological influence in the way that some Syriac words are written, specifically in the likely assimilation of /d/ to /t/ in *ܐܘܚܪܝܢ* (in place of *ܐܘܚܪܝܢ*, “were cleansed”). This phonological assimilation is all the more likely assuming the text was being spoken aloud by a Uyghur native speaker in some sort of exorcism ritual.

Finally, we may note the long journey of the text and its antecedents, from its origins in the Ancient Near Eastern matrix, though the Mesopotamian heartland of Syriac Christianity, eastward through Persia and along the Silk Road network plied by monastic and mercantile adherents of the Church of the East, all the way to the heart of the Uyghur Kingdom on the borders of the Chinese Tang Empire (later to be incorporated into the Mongol Empire). Finally, after centuries of lying beneath the Central Asian sands, it was dug up by German explorers and carried back to Europe, where it survived the bombings of the Second World War and from whence it was taken once again, to be deposited in its new home in the Hermitage.

References

- ARTHUR, Rosemary A. 2008: *Pseudo-Dionysius as Polemicist: The Development and Purpose of the Angelic Hierarchy in Sixth Century Syria* (Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Religion, Theology and Biblical Studies). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- BALL, Warwick 2000: *Rome in the East. The transformation of an empire*. London & New York: Routledge.
- BOHAK, Gideon 2019: “An Ancient Babylonian Text on a Modern Jewish Amulet”. *Windows on Jewish Worlds: Essays in Honor of William Gross Collector of Judaica, on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*. Ed. by Shalom Sabar, Emile Schrijver and Falk Wiesemann. Zutphen: Walburg Pers: 350–361.
- BOROVKOV, Aleksandr K. 1959: *Uzbeksko-russkii slovar* [Uzbek-Russian dictionary]. Ed.-in-chief Aleksandr Konstantinovich Borovkov. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo inostrannykh i natsionalnykh slovarei.
- BOYLE, John Andrew 1958: *The History of the World-Conqueror* (2 vols). Trans. by John Andrew Boyle. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- CLAUSON, Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
-

- DE BRUYN, Theodore 2017: *Making Amulets Christian: Artefacts, Scribes, and Contexts* (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DERRETT, John Duncan Martin 1983: "Binding and Loosing (Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 29:23)". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102.1: 112–117.
- DICKENS, Mark 2013: "Scribal Practices in the Turfan Christian Community". *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 13: 3–28.
- DICKENS, Mark 2016: "Biblical Fragments from the Christian Library of Turfan, an Eastern Outpost of the Antiochian Tradition". In: *The School of Antioch: Biblical Theology and the Church in Syria* (The Bible in the Christian Orthodox Tradition, vol. 7). Ed. by Vahan Hovhannessian. Bern: Peter Lang: 19–47.
- DICKENS, Mark & SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2012: "Christian Calendrical Fragments from Turfan". In *Living the Lunar Calendar*. Ed. by Jonathan Ben-Dov, Wayne Horowitz & John M. Steele. Oxford: Oxbow Books: 269–296.
- EMERTON, John Adney 1962: "Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining". *Journal of Theological Studies* 13.2: 325–331.
- FARAJ, Ali H. 2010: "An Incantation Bowl of Biblical Verses and a Syriac Incantation Bowl for the Protection of a House". *CAMSEMUD 2007: Proceedings of the 13th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics* (History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs, Vol. X). Ed. by Frederick Mario Fales & Giulia Francesca Grassi. Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria: 205–212.
- FENWICK, John R.K. 1992: *The Anaphoras of St Basil and St James: An Investigation into their Common Origin*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale.
- GARKAVETS, Aleksandr 2019: *Codex Cumanicus: vtoroe polnoe izdanie* [Codex Cumanicus: the second complete edition]. Almaty: Almaty-Bolashak.
- GIGNOUX, Philippe 1987: *Incantations magiques syriaques*. Louvain: Peeters.
- GOLLANZ, Hermann 1912: *The Book of Protection, Being a Collection of Charms*. London: Oxford University Press.
- GRÖNBECH, Kaare 1942: *Komanisches Wörterbuch: Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* (Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris, Subsidia, vol. 1). Kopenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.
- GRÜNWEDEL, Albert 1906: *Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten in Idikutschari und Umgebung im Winter 1902–1903* (Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 24.1). Munich: Verlag der K.B. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- GRÜNWEDEL, Albert 1920: *Alt-Kutscha. Archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Forschungen an Tempera-Gemälden aus Buddhistischen Höhlen der ersten acht Jahrhunderte nach Christi Geburt*. Berlin: Otto Elsner Verlagsgesellschaft.
- HARVIAINEN, Tapani 1978: "A Syriac Incantation Bowl in the Finnish National Museum, Helsinki". *Studia Orientalia* 51.1: 1–29.
- HAZARD, Willis Hatfield 1893: "A Syriac Charm". In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15: 284–296.
- HEIMING, Odilo 1953: "Anaphora Syriaca Sancti Iacobi fratris Domini". In: *Anaphorae Syriacae*, vol. 2.2. Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies: 109–179.

- HIERS, Richard H. 1985: "'Binding' and 'Loosing': The Matthean Authorizations". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104.2: 233–250.
- HOPKIRK, Peter 2006 (1st ed. 1980): *Foreign Devils on the Silk Road. The Search for the Lost Treasures of Central Asia*. London: John Murray.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 1987: "Saints in Syriac Anathemas: A Form-Critical Analysis of Role". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 32.1: 83–104.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 1990: "Genres of Syriac Amulets: A Study of Cambridge MS. Syr. 3086". In: *V Symposium Syriacum, 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236). Ed. by René Lavenant. Rome: Pontificio Institutum Studiorum Orientalium: 355–368.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 1993: "A Scroll Amulet from Kurdistan". *Aram* 5: 243–254.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 1999: "Another Scroll Amulet from Kurdistan," in *After Bardaisan: Studies in Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor Han J.W. Drijvers* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 89). Ed. by Gerrit J. Reinink & Alexander Cornelis Klugkist. Leuven: Peeters: 161–172.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 2009: "Magic and Medicine amongst the Christians of Kurdistan". In: *The Christian Heritage of Iraq* (Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 13). Ed. by Erica C.D. Hunter. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press: 187–202.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 2013: "Traversing Time and Location: A Prayer-Amulet of Mar Tamsis from Turfan". In: *From the Oxus River to the Chinese Shores: Studies on East Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia* (Orientalia–Patristica–Oecumenica, vol. 5). Ed. by Li Tang & Dietmar W. Winkler. Wien: LIT Verlag: 25–41.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 2017: "Syriac Manuscripts from Turfan: Public Worship and Private Devotion". In *From Ancient Manuscripts to Modern Dictionaries: Select Studies in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek* (Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages 9). Ed. by Tarsee Li & Keith Dyer. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press: 77–96.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. 2018: "Syriac Prayer-Amulets from Turfan". *The Harp* 33: 413–431.
- HUNTER, Erica C.D. & DICKENS, Mark 2014: *Syrische Handschriften. Teil 2. Syriac Manuscripts from the Berlin Turfan Collection* (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 5,2). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- KATANOV, Nikolai F. 1893–1894: "Tatarskie skazaniia o semi spiashchikh otrokakh" [Tatarian legends on the Seven Sleepers]. *Zapiski Vostochnogo otdeleniia Imperatorskogo Russkogo Archeologicheskogo obshchestva* [Proceedings of the Oriental department of the Imperial Russian Archaeological society], 8(3–4): 223–245.
- KILIÇ CENGİZ, Ayşe & TURANSKAIA, Anna A. 2019: "Drevneuygurskie fragmenty Sitātapatrā dhāraṇī v kollektzii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha [Old Uyghur fragments of Sitātapatrā dhāraṇī in the collection of the State Hermitage Museum]". *Pismennye pamiatniki Vostoka* 4 (issue 43): 5–23.
- KMOSKO, Michael 1907: "Testamentum patris nostri Adam". Ed. by M. Kmosko. In: *Patrologia Syriaca* 1.2. Paris: Firmin-Didot et socii, col. 1307–1360.
- KWASMAN, Theodore 2007: "The Demon of the Roof". In: *Disease in Babylonia* (Cuneiform Monographs 36). Ed. by Irving L. Finkel & Markham J. Geller. Leiden: Brill: 160–186.
- LE COQ, Albert von 1926: *Buried Treasures of Chinese Turkestan: an Account of the Activities and Adventures of the Second and Third German Turfan Expeditions*. Trans. by Anna Barwell. London: George Allen & Unwin.
-

- MALINGREY, Anne-Marie 1970: *Jean Chrysostome. Sur l'incompréhensibilité de Dieu. Tome 1 (Homélie I–V)* (Sources Chrétiennes, 28bis). Ed. by A.M. Malingrey Paris: Les éditions du CERF.
- METZGER, Marcel 1985: Les Constitutions Apostoliques. Tome 3: Livres VII et VIII (Sources Chrétiennes, 336). Ed. by M. Metzger. Paris: Les éditions du CERF.
- MONTGOMERY, James A. 1918: "A Syriac Incantation Bowl with Christian Formula". *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34.2: 137–139.
- MUTO, Shinichi 2013: "The Triune God in the Tripartite World in a Syriac Manuscript found at Khara-Khoto". In: *From the Oxus River to the Chinese Shores: Studies in East Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia* (Orientalia–Patristica–Oecumenica, vol. 5). Ed. by Li Tang & Dietmar W. Winkler. Wien: LIT Verlag: 381–386.
- MUTO, Shinichi 2016: "The Exorcism in the Newly Found Khara-Khoto Syriac Document". In: *Winds of Jingjiao: Studies on Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia* (Orientalia–Patristica–Oecumenica, vol. 9). Ed. by Li Tang & Dietmar W. Winkler. Wien: LIT Verlag: 147–151.
- NAVEH, Joseph & SHAKED, Shaul 1985: *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Jerusalem & Leiden: The Magnes Press & E.J. Brill.
- NAVEH, Joseph & SHAKED, Shaul 1993: *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.
- NOY, Dov 2007: "Evil Eye". In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2 ed., vol. 6: 584–585.
- PAIKOVA, Aza V. 1983: "Tunisskaia versiia legendy o semi spiaschchikh otrokakh Efesskich" [A Tunisian version of the legend on the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus]. In: *Pismennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kultury narodov Vostoka* [Literary monuments and problems of history and culture of the East]. Moscow: Nauka, Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury: 167–174.
- PAIKOVA, Aza V. 1990: *Legendy i skazaniia v pamiatnikakh siriiskoi agiografii* [Legends and tales in Syriac hagiography] (Palestinskii sbornik 30(93)). Ed. by Elena N. Meshcherskaya. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie.
- PARRY, Ken 2012: "Reflections on a Silk Fragment from Toyuq: Christian or Manichaean?" *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology*, 7: 167–192.
- PAYNE SMITH, Robert 1879–1901: *Thesaurus Syriacus* (2 vols.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- PCHELIN, Nikolai G. & RASCHMANN, Simone–Christiane 2016: "Turfan Manuscripts in the State Hermitage — a Rediscovery". *Written Monuments of the Orient*, 4: 3–43.
- Peshchery tyciachi Budd* 2008: *Rossiiskie Ekspeditsii na Shelkovom Puti. K 190-letiiu Aziatskogo Muzeia. Katalog vystavki* [The Caves of One Thousand Buddhas: Russian Expeditions on the Silk Route. On the occasion of 190 years of the Asiatic Museum. Exhibition catalogue]. St. Petersburg: The State Hermitage Publishers.
- PICCALUGA, Giulia 2005: "Knots". *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2 ed., vol. 8: 5196–5199.
- PIEDAGNEL, Auguste 1966: *Cyrille de Jérusalem. Catéchèses Mystagogiques* (Sources Chrétiennes, 126). Ed. by A. Piédagnel. Paris: Les éditions du CERF.
- QAZVINI, Mīrzā Muḥammad 1912: *Tā'rikh-i-Jahān-Gushā of 'Alā'u 'd-dīn 'Aṭā-Malik-i-Juwaynī, Part I* (E.J.W. Gibb Memorial, Vol. XVI,1). Ed. by Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī. Leyden: E.J. Brill.

- RÁSONYI, László & BASKI, Imre 2007: *Onomasticon Turcicum: Turkic Personal Names (2 vols)* (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 172/I & II). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- REBINGER, Bill 2017: “‘Write on Three Ribs of a Sheep’: Writing Materials in Ancient and Mediaeval Jewish Magic”. In: *Jewish Manuscript Cultures: New Perspectives* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 13). Ed. by Irina Wandrey. Berlin: De Gruyter: 339–359.
- ROBINSON, Stephen Edward 1982: *The Testament of Adam: an examination of the Syriac and Greek traditions* (Dissertation series (Society of Biblical Literature), 52). Chico: Scholars Press.
- ROSEN, Friedrich & FORSHALL, Josiah 1838: *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium qui in Museo britannico asservantur. Pars 1: Codices syriacos et carshunicos amplectens*. London: Impensis Curatorum Musei Britannici.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H. & SWARTZ, Michael D. 1992: *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah: Selected Texts from Taylor-Schechter Box K1* (Semitic Texts and Studies 1). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- SEGAL, J.B. 2000: *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*. London: British Museum Press.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2* (Berliner Turfantexte XII). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2012: *Mitteliranische Handschriften: Teil 4. Iranian Manuscripts in Syriac Script in the Berlin Turfan Collection* (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 18,4). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2020: “The Sogdian ‘Book of Life’ Reconsidered”. In: *Artifact, Text, Context: Studies on Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia* (Orientalia–Patristica–Oecumenica, vol. 17). Ed. by Li Tang & Dietmar W. Winkler. Wien: LIT Verlag: 113–119.
- SMELOVA, Natalia 2015: “Manuscripts chrétiens de Qara Qoto: nouvelles perspectives de recherche”. In: *Le christianisme syriaque en Asie centrale et en Chine* (Études syriaques, 12). Ed. by Pierre Marsone & Pier Giorgio Borbone. Paris: Geuthner: 215–236.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner 2004: “Turfan expeditions”. In: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, <<https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/turfan-expeditions-2>>.
- TOCCI, Franco Micheli 1986: “Note e documenti di letteratura religiosa e parareligiosa giudaica”. *Annali dell’Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Nuova Serie*, 46: 101–108.
- TONDELLO, Marco 2018: “The Story of the Sleepers of Ephesus According to the Oldest Extant Text: Manuscript N.S.S. 4”. *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, 70 (1–2): 29–92.
- UTAS, Bo 1968 [1969]: “The Jewish-Persian fragment from Dandan-Uiliq”. *Orientalia Suecana*, 17: 123–136.
- VAN DER PLOEG, J.P.M. 1983: *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and Their Syriac Manuscripts* (Placid Lecture Series 3). Rome: Center for Indian and Inter-Religious Studies.
- VAN ESBROECK, Michel 1994: “La Légende de Sept Dormants d’Éphèse selon de Codex Syriaque N.S. 4 de Saint-Petersbourg”. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 247: 189–200.
-

-
- VAN ROMPAY, Lucas 1990: “Some Remarks on the Language of Syriac Incantation Texts”.
In: *V Symposium Syriacum, 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236). Ed. by René Lavenant. Rome: Pontificio Institutum Studiorum Orientalium: 369–381.
- VOSTE, Jacques-Marie 1940: *Liber Patrum* (Fonti, ser. 2, fasc. 16: Caldei – diritto antico).
Ed. by J.-M. Vosté. Vatican City: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis.
- YAKUP, Abdurishid 2005: *The Turfan Dialect of Uyghur* (Turcologica 63). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- YOSHIDA, Jun’ichi & CHIMEDDORJI, Jakhadai 2008: *Harahoto shutsudo mongoru bunsho kenkyū* [Study on the Mongolian documents found at Qaraqota], Tokyo.
-

Alexey Lushchenko

**The *Heike Monogatari Hyōban Hidenshō*
Commentary in the Edo Period:
Discussion, Criticism, and Education**

DOI 10.17816/wmo80207

Abstract: This article presents several passages from the anonymous 17th c. commentary *Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō*. This understudied commentary on the medieval *Tale of the Heike* shows the didactic aspect of this work’s reception in the Edo period. Based on comparison with similar texts, such as the commentary *Teikanhyō*, the claim is made that didactic works of this kind have group authorship and are related to group discussions (*kaidoku*) by warriors interested in matters of leadership and statecraft. Commentaries such as the *Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō* were linked with educational settings throughout the Edo period: in the 17th c. they were used for lectures to daimyo lords, and in the 18th–19th cc. they were found in domain schools (*hankō*) since their content made them suitable for educating young warriors.

Keywords: Japan, Edo period, *gunsho*, didactic commentaries, *Heike monogatari*, *Teikanhyō*, group discussion (*kaidoku*), domain schools (*hankō*), education

1. Introduction

The *Commentary with Evaluations and Secret Transmissions about the Tale of the Heike* (*Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō* 平家物語評判秘伝抄, 1650) is a 24-volume anonymous commentary on the famous *Tale of the Heike* (*Heike monogatari* 平家物語, 13th c. CE). It belongs to the “military texts” (*gunsho* 軍書) category of didactic works for warriors of the Edo period (1603–1868). These texts were a part of so-called “military studies” (*gungaku* 軍学, *hyōgaku/heigaku* 兵学), a scholarly field closely related to

warrior education dealing especially with statecraft, leadership, and ethics. In general, military studies were organized as the world of secret transmission (*hiden* 秘伝) with various schools, masters, disciples, levels of initiation, secret texts and teachings transmitted in person (*kuden* 口伝). Some texts, such as the *Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō* (henceforth, *Heike hyōban*), were published. The commentary is structured as a collection of didactic essays based on specific passages from the *Heike monogatari*. Its “evaluation” (*hyō* 評) comments discuss characters and their behaviour, while “transmission” (*den* 伝) comments contain fictional inside stories, legends, and other plausible content that reinterprets the original work.

In this article, I examine several passages from the *Heike hyōban*, suggest a connection with group discussions (*kaidoku* 会読), and discuss this commentary’s educational role in the Edo period.

2. Several passages from the *Heike hyōban* commentary

1) Discussing military strategy: fortresses

The entire *Heike hyōban* commentary can be described as a long discussion of military, political, and ethical matters based on the content of the *Heike monogatari*. Some passages actually take the form of conversations between a famous person and one or several people. In accordance with the overall didactic quality of the work, such conversations serve the purpose of instructing readers about a particular topic. For example, the following example featuring the famous general Minamoto no Yoshitsune 源義経 (c. 1159–1189) is a small piece of a typical military studies text dealing with fortresses.

傳曰。或時佐藤兵衛つぎのぶ嗣信。義経に申上げるは。鎌倉の城墩を
 みるに。地形ぎやうよろし宜からず。江のしまの地ひろき時は。よき城地
 たるべしと申ければ。義経仰られけるは。城に大小の地とて二
 つ有。かゝる処は小うちの中の小地とてさのみ善地形よきとは云べから
 ず。いかんとなれば。三方は深海じんかいけん險難にして。敵寄よせがたしとい
 へ共み。又味方も出がたし。一方の地は平地也といへども。是は

又隘路也。故に敵外より其道を切ふさぎ。強兵を纒にすぎり。
 其口をませ。残処の人数をもつて。其國を治とる時は。何十
 万騎有とも。討て出る事叶べからず。故に能城地とはすべから
 ず。但時に寄。かやうの所を城とする事有。是は其國を攻んと
 する者。付城と云にかやうの所をとる事有。又暫難を避て後
 攻の助を待。地となすべし。城の生地と云は秘術の傳有。凡
 下の知処にあらずと云。爰をもつて見る時は。能遠が城。地
 形の理是に応ず。然らば是難を避るに安き便有。只將の不才
 による時は。善地も悪地となり。將才智有時は。全地形の
 煩なし。法曰。知則勝事安し。智不智密なる時は。是を
 守て己を正すと云り。然ば良將の勝事を知事。愚をもつて
 計がたし。是によつて勝事をしらざるは。必良將にあらず。後
 世の人主如何々々

Transmission says: Once Satō Hyōe Tsuginobu¹ said to Yoshitsune: “When one looks at the Kamakura fortress, its terrain is not good. If the land of Enoshima would be wide, it would be a good land for a fortress.” Yoshitsune said: “There are two kinds of fortresses: on large and small areas. Such a place is a small area among small ones, and it cannot be said to be a very good terrain. Why is it so? Its three sides are deep sea and steep slopes, although it is difficult for an enemy to approach, own forces have trouble going out, too. Although one side is level ground, it is also a narrow road. Thus, when an enemy shuts this path from outside, selects a few strong warriors making them guard the entrance, and takes control of the land with the remaining forces, one cannot fight and go out no matter how many thousands of horseback warriors one has. For this reason, it should not be considered a good area for a fortress. However, depending on a situation, such a place can serve as a fortress. One who is going to attack a province takes such a

¹ Satō Tsuginobu 佐藤繼信 (1158–1185), a retainer of Minamoto no Yoshitsune who was killed by an arrow in the Yashima battle saving Yoshitsune’s life.

place to make a fort [for attack]. Also, one should use such a place to avoid trouble for a while and wait for reinforcements for a later attack. There are transmissions about secret techniques concerning the true quality of fortresses. Commoners do not know them.” Considering it like this, the terrain of the Yoshitō’s fortress² corresponds to this one. So, it can be easily used for avoiding trouble. However, in case the general is incompetent, even a good terrain becomes a bad one. When a general is skillful and wise, there is absolutely no worry about terrain. The *Rules* says: “When one knows, winning is easy. When it is not known whether one is wise or not, one is careful about this and rectifies oneself”. So, a good general knows how to win, it is difficult to plan being foolish. Thus, if one does not know how to win, one is certainly not a good general. How about rulers of the later era?³

Fictional legends such as this one instruct Edo-period warriors about castles. Making the famous general Yoshitsune one of the characters is a way to attribute the content to a very authoritative source. Also, it may be the case that the *Heike hyōban*, perhaps meant as an introductory text to military studies, seeks to raise interest in military studies in an entertaining way and to draw readers (or listeners) to continue their studies with a more advanced, systematic, and expensive treatises or teachings acquired from a master in person.

2) Criticism of the retired emperor Go-Shirakawa 後白河 (1127–1192, r. 1155–1158)

In general, there is no single character evaluated as perfect in the commentary. Even imperial figures become the object of criticism, which is likely inspired by a Confucian attitude to moral qualities of rulers. The rise to power of the Heike leader Taira no Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118–1181) casts

² In the *Heike*, Chapter 11:2 “Katsu-ura and Ōzaka Pass,” Yoshitsune lands on Shikoku island and attacks a defensive position or a fort of a Heike supporter Sakuraba no Suke Yoshitō 桜庭介良遠 (years unknown) also known as Taguchi no Yoshitō 田口良遠. The fort was surrounded by a marsh on three sides and a moat on the fourth side. Genji forces swiftly attacked it across the moat and took the fort making Yoshitō flee.

³ *Heike hyōban*, vol. 21 (comment on the *Heike*, Chapter 11:2 “Katsu-ura and Ōzaka Pass”).

doubt on the ability of the retired emperor to appoint able and virtuous people to high posts:

(...) 然に清盛大政大臣となりぬる事。是れ帝王の御不徳故
じやう てい とく
 成べし。たとひ帝不徳にまし / \ て。時の媚によつて此官を御
みかど こび
 許れ有と云とも。清盛徳有時は。又大官にのぼるべき道にあ
ゆるさ くわん
 らず。されば天下に官位を定る心。いかなる故ぞと云事をし
みやうもん よく ほまれ
 ざれば。人々一世の名聞利欲の誉とのみおもへり。故に世に
かう い くわいらく つい
 高官高位の人出来ぬれども。其人一世の快樂のみにして。終
 に天下の為とはならず。是代々あきらかに人の知処にあらずや。
 (...)

[...] Kiyomori, however, became the Grand Minister due to the Emperor's lack of virtue. Even though the Emperor lacked virtue and granted this post by occasional flattery, [in case] when Kiyomori had virtue, it is also not the way by which he should have risen to an important post. Thus, if the meaning of establishing offices and ranks in the state is not known, people only think of [office and rank] as fame and greed of one lifetime. Because of this, although people of high office and rank appear in the world, they only spend lifetime in pleasure and eventually this does not benefit the state. Isn't this known clearly by generations of people? [...]⁴

Unlike the *Heike monogatari* in which imperial figures are usually depicted as suffering from arrogant warrior leaders, the *Heike hyōban* commentary openly points out wrong decisions of emperors that weakened imperial rule and allowed warriors to gain excessive power in the state. As is typical in this commentary, from a specific action or decision the commentator derives a general didactic point. The topic of appointments is one of the recurring themes in this work, and in *gunsho* texts in general, and it constitutes an important part of the analysis of causes of disorder in the state.

A similar idea is discussed in the following comment:

⁴ *Heike hyōban*, vol. 1 (comment on the *Heike*, Chapter 1:5 “One Man’s Glory”).

評曰。 (...) 此時あたつに当さいれいて。此祭例もなく。藤氏の公卿も参ら
 れざる事は。是皆上かみの不徳とく故はてに。かくは成果ぬるもの也。其
 源みなもとを尋たづねるに。是一院あやまりの御きげん 謬まかせより出たり。機嫌けんいにのみ任うはは給
 ひ。平氏じに過分くはの賞しやうろく 禄あたへを与けんい。天下うははの権威けんいを奪うははれさせ給ふに
 よつて。今かくのごとくに成行ゆくもの也。 (...)


Evaluation says: [...] At this time there was no such ceremony and custom, and the Fujiwara court nobles also did not attend. Everything ended up like this because of the lord's lack of virtue. When one seeks the origin of this, it has come from the errors of the First Retired Emperor [Go-Shirakawa]. The present situation developed like this due to him acting only according to his own mood, giving excessive rewards and fiefs to the Heike, and being deprived of the power over the state. [...]⁵

In fact, criticism of Go-Shirakawa was quite common in historical texts of the Edo period, such as the *Grove of Critical Comments on the History of Great Japan* (*Dai Nihonshi sansō* 大日本史賛藪, written in 1720, as separate work in 1746), and his mistakes were seen as one of the major causes of trouble in the late Heian period, including the Genpei war.

3) Praise of Yoritomo

Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147–1199) is one of the central figures in the *Heike hyōban*. His evaluations differ from one case to another, but in the following episode he is praised for being a wise general and ruler who knows how to manage his vassals.

⁵ *Heike hyōban*, vol. 11 (comment on the *Heike*, Chapter 6:1 “The Death of Retired Emperor Takakura”).



A comment praising Yoritomo
from the *Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō* (volume 21)⁶

評日。 (...) 惣じて軍の道。権謀を用るの心は。仁義の衰疲
 を助 べき 志 第一也といへども。又衆を自在につかふ事を得
 ざる時には叶ず。衆を自在につかはんと欲せば。常に是を愛し
 錬べし。然ども義経の大將を承給ふごときんば。平生錬ざる士
 卒に。今俄に仁義を施すと云とも。其澤よく上下に及がた
 し。故に先権謀をもつて。諸人を従。下の気を吞得て。次
 仁徳日々に施べし。義経虎韜巻を見て。鬼一が兵法を傳
 といへども。いまだ智権の骨を悟ず。故に弱弓強弦を張
 がごとし。されば頼朝智権の骨を用ゐられたる例有。寿永三

⁶ Image from the website of the National Archives of Japan, Digital Archive, <https://www.digital.archives.go.jp/das/image-j/M2015071311021857032>.

年十一月二十一日に御用の事有て。筑後守俊兼ちくごの としかねをめさる。此者
 常におごり くは驕長過して。衣服花美いふく び このみを好し。出仕しの時にはまい毎度小袖そでを十
 ほどちやく着し。其袖妻つまに至るまで。色々ともを尽せり。頼朝御覽らん有て。
 先俊兼としかねが刀ごを御覽有すなはちべきよしを仰出としされ。即とし刀をもつて。俊
 兼が小袖のつまをおしときらせ給て。頼朝内とに入らせ給ひ。仰出
 されける様は。汝富才翰とみ かんなりといへども。何ぞけん儉約をは存ぜざ
 るや。千葉助ちばの。土肥次郎とひのなどが所領りやうは。汝なんぢと同じかるべから
 ず。然に此君とも衣服以下常にそひん もちゆ まつたく び このま籠品を用。全花美を好このまざる
 故に。家内富有ふくゆうにして。数多すたの郎等どうを扶持ふちし。常にくんこう勲功はげまを励
 す。汝財産ざいさんを費ついでやす処をじしらず。是何の忠義じといはんや。自今以
 後此事ちやうじ停止とすべしと仰出としされければ。俊兼理りに赤面せきめんして。
 謹つゝしんて仰を承る。折節有合処ふし あふの武士おそれは是を見て恐つたへ。傳て是を
 聞所きいたがふるの者は。制せされども花美せいを好びずと云り。是良将このまの人を
 従したがふるの心をのれ。己たに行じて人にしめす時は。其法立たずと云事なし。
 末世まつに至て然る心さとらを悟かみずして。上には花美好色びかうしよくを事しもとし。下
 を制せんと欲す。故に其法せいたゞさとざるをもつて悟せ給へ。故に無制
 の法をもつて人おさむるを治こつずい事。是兵法の骨髓とするもの也。太公曰。
 三皇ことはは言くはなふして。化四海なかるに流およそと云り。凡衆くはを治る事。寡
 を治るがごとくなるものは。分数ふんすう是也。故に是こに至てじん / \甚深思議しいぎ
 すべからず。必傳受する事有べし

Evaluation says: [...] Overall, in the Way of the Military, the mean-
 ing of using schemes is primarily [reaching] the goal of sustaining be-
 nevolence and justice that decline, but [this goal] is not achieved when
 one cannot use troops at will. When one wants to use troops freely, one
 should always show affection and train them. However, in the situation
 like this one when Yoshitsune accepted to be a general, even if one
 suddenly spreads benevolence and justice now to officers and warriors

that do not usually train, its blessing will have difficulty reaching the high and low. So, first one uses schemes, makes some people follow, gains control of the subordinates' spirit, and then one should spread benevolence and justice every day. Yoshitsune saw the scroll with the *Tiger Secret Teaching* and was initiated into the military strategy of Kii-chi,⁷ but he still does not perceive the essence of wise schemes. Thus, it is like stretching a strong string with a weak bow. So, there is an example of Yoritomo using the essence of a wise scheme. In the year Juei 3 (1184), in the eleventh month, on the twenty-first day, there was an official matter and he summoned Toshikane, the lord of Chikugo.⁸ This person was always excessively extravagant, liked luxurious clothes, and every time he went into service he was wearing as much as ten short-sleeved garments devoting attention even to the colours of the sleeves' hems. Yoritomo saw it, and saying first that he had to see Toshikane's sword, he then cut off the hem of Toshikane's garments with the sword. Yoritomo entered inside and said: "Your wealth is learning, but why don't you know about frugality? Chiba governor,⁹ Doi no Jirō,¹⁰ and other lords' landholdings are certainly not the same as yours. However, these lords always wear humble clothes and such, and they don't like luxury at all. For this reason, their houses are rich, they sustain numerous retainers, and always encourage distinguished service [by giving rewards]. You don't know how to spend your fortune. What kind of loyalty is that? From now on, you have to stop it".¹¹ When he said so, Toshikane certainly blushed and humbly accepted the order. Those warriors who were present at that time saw it and were afraid. Those who heard others tell about it, did not like luxury even without [direct] commands, it is said. The [essential] meaning of a good general making others follow is to practice oneself and show others. When he does so,

⁷ Kii-chi Hōgen 鬼一法眼, a late-Heian semi-legendary monk of the Kurama temple, yin-yang master knowledgeable in civil and martial matters. According to a legend in the *Gikeiki* 義経記 (15th c.), Yoshitsune managed to gain access to his secret military texts.

⁸ Fujiwara no Toshikane 藤原俊兼 (years unknown), an official of the early Kamakura period, Yoritomo's secretary, lord of the Chikugo province.

⁹ Chiba Tsunetane 千葉常胤 (1118–1201), a general of the late Heian and early Kamakura periods.

¹⁰ Doi Sanehira 土肥実平 (?–1191), a general of the late Heian and early Kamakura periods.

¹¹ The original source of this story is the *Mirror of the East* (*Azuma kagami* 吾妻鏡), entry for Genryaku 1 (1184)/11/21.

his laws are always maintained. In the Latter Age, this meaning is not perceived, those on top indulge in luxury and lust, and wish to command those below. For this reason, their laws are not maintained. Understand it! Thus, ruling others by laws without [direct] commands is considered the essence of military studies. Taigong said: “The Three Emperors did not speak, but the changes flowed in the Four Seas”.¹² Overall, controlling [numerous] troops is like controlling a few people, it is [called] “dividing numbers.” So, at this point, one should not think profoundly [about it]. One should definitely be initiated [into this matter].¹³

The central episode with Yoritomo is a retelling borrowed from the historical record *Mirror of the East* (*Azuma kagami* 吾妻鏡, late 13th — early 14th cc.). In a spectacular fashion Yoritomo cuts off with a sword the hem of a dress of one of his vassals Toshikane reproving him for excessive luxury and sending an effective indirect message to all his followers that they must be frugal. The commentator approves of this method to make subordinates follow laws without direct orders and even calls it “the essence of military studies.” In general, one of the central ideas of the commentary is the concept of the ruler being a model for subordinates: only when the ruler leads by example will vassals make effort to follow his rules. Rulers of the “Latter Age,” which includes the Edo period, are criticized for living in luxury and yet issuing laws about frugality to subordinates.

4) Criticism of Yoritomo

In the *Heike hyōban* Yoritomo is not evaluated consistently as an ideal general and ruler. For example, the following passage criticizes Yoritomo for misusing power for private benefit after defeating the Heike.

頼朝。日本のさうつゐふし惣追補使を給て。段別にべつ兵糧米らうまいを宛あてをこなふ行へき
由そうもん奏聞せられし事

評曰。頼朝平家をほろぼし給ふ事。其功他に異也。然といへども是朝敵てうを退治たいちせんが為也。朝敵てうを退治たいせしむる事は。君を

¹² A quote from the *Three Strategies*, “Middle Strategy.” See SAWYER 1993: 300.

¹³ *Heike hyōban*, vol. 21 (comment on the *Heike*, Chapter 11:1 “Bow Oars”).

やすん 安じ奉らんが為也。然に頼朝君恩をぬすんで私曲に用。是
 前代未聞の無道也。されども天運時を勸るに此君天下を保
 給ふにおいては自今以後。兵乱たゆべからず。故に武家天下の
 惣追補使をとつて。天下を治べき事を察して。万民の為に是を
 奏する時は。是。外不義に似たりといふとも。内に誠を存る故
 成べし。是さへ始は人のうたがふへき所也。されども良將は。
 己が身を謙り。儲王撰家の長子を申下し奉つて。天下の將軍
 をそなへ奉り。其身は下位有て。天下の權威をとつて。正政を
 行給はゞ。是則万代の忠臣名将と云べき者ならん。然に頼朝是
 を私になし給ふ事。大きな非義也

Yoritomo applied [to the retired emperor Go-Shirakawa] for appointment of constables across Japan with authority to levy military provisions from land area.

Evaluation says: Yoritomo's merit in destroying the Heike is greater than anybody else's. However, this is because he suppressed enemies of the court. Having court enemies destroyed is meant to relieve the lord. Yoritomo, however, stole the lord's favour and used it for own benefit. This is outrageous and unprecedented. Nevertheless, when one considers the will of Heaven at the time, if this lord [Go-Shirakawa] continued to keep [control of] the empire, the military disorder would not cease. So, when a military house perceives that the empire should be governed by taking constable offices [under control], and reports to the emperor about this for the sake of all the people, this appears to be an injustice on the surface, but at a deeper level it certainly has validity. Even this, at first, is certainly suspicious to others. A good general, however, behaves humbly, appeals to imperial princes and heirs of regent families, assumes the [post of] the empire's shogun, and if he, having a low rank, takes power in the empire and rules correctly, then he will be called a loyal retainer and a famous general of all times. Yoritomo, however, did it for private benefit, and this is a great injustice.¹⁴

¹⁴ *Heike hyōban*, vol. 23 (comment on the *Heike*, Chapter 12:6 "The Yoshida Grand Counselor").

In addition, Yoritomo is criticized for persecuting and destroying the Heike and their retainers.

まさ そくたうばつ
時政平家の子息討罰有し事

評曰。是頼朝ともの不徳とくなる制罰せいばつ也。兵法曰罪つみは一人ひとりに在。なんぞ衆類しゆるいのなす所ところならんや。仁徳じんとく天下てんかをおほひなば。誰か敵たれする者ものあらんや。尤平家頼朝ともを助置たすけをき。今却かへつて頼朝ともにほろぼされたりといへども。是まつた全く頼朝よりともの威功いこうにあらず。平家の驕おこり長じ。法くわをみだり天下てんかを苦くるしむ。故ゆゑに天下てんかの上下じやうげ平家へいけを背そむく。是まづ即平家へいけをほろぼしたるにあらずや。孟子曰。六国りくごくを亡ほろぼすは是こゝ六国りくごく也と云々。頼朝せい聖道しゆしを修給しゆふにおいては。天下てんかに免札めんを出し。吾平家われを亡まつたす事まつた全私まつたの意趣いしゆにあらず。一ひとつには朝敵てう。二ふたつには天下しよしの諸士しよし人民みんくるしむるによつて。世よを安やすんぜんが為ために是こゝを滅ほろぼす。天下てんか既すで正制せいに帰きするにおいては。縦平氏たどひの子孫そんと云とも。何ぞみだりに是こゝを罰ばつすへけんや。若ごと其身徳とくを長ながじ。大道だうを修しゆする人ひとにおいては。何ぞ此人こゝに天下てんかをおしむべき。況平氏いはんやの郎等らうとうにおいて。何ぞ誅戮ちうりくを加くはん。義えんにより縁おにちうじて住きよ居せしむべきもの也。若ごと逆心もしげきをさしはさみ。不義したひを慕たづね。正義てきに敵ともする輩がら是こゝにあるにおいては。速すみやかに忠進しやうせしむべし賞あては功をこなによつて宛行せいきんるべしと。制禁せいを出いさるゝにおいては。いかんぞこれ良将いと云いはざるべけんや。然しかといへども。頼朝ま其人つりことにあらず。其政まつりこと短たんなるものは。其代たも亦短けん也。太公曰。賢人けんの政まつりことは。人ひとを降くだすに體たいをもつてす。聖人せいのまつりごとは人ひとを降くだすに心こゝろをもつてす。體たいに降くだる則すなはち始はを謀はかるべし。心こゝろに降くだる則すなはち終おはりを保たもつべしと云々

Tokimasa destroyed and punished Heike descendants

Evaluation says: This is an immoral punishment by Yoritomo. The *Military Strategy* says: “The guilt lies with one man.”¹⁵ How can [a crime] be something done by a multitude of people? If benevolence and virtue cover the empire, who will oppose this? Although the Heike, who had spared Yoritomo, are now destroyed by Yoritomo, it is not Yoritomo’s achievement at all. Since the Heike’s arrogance grew, they put laws in disorder and troubled the empire, the high and low in the empire turned away from the Heike, and this is what destroys the Heike, isn’t it? The *Mencius* says: “What destroys the Six States are the Six States themselves.”¹⁶ Yoritomo, cultivating the Way of the Sages, should have placed a pardon notice saying: “My destruction of the Heike is not my private revenge at all. Since, first of all, they are court enemies, and second, they trouble gentlemen and all the people of the empire, I destroy them to calm the society. As the empire already returns to correct laws, although being Heike descendants, why should they be punished arbitrarily? If they are virtuous and practice the Great Way, why should they not be in the empire? Even more so in case of Heike retainers. Why should they be executed? They should be allowed to settle according to their righteousness and affiliation [to the Heike]. If there are fellows who harbour treachery, like injustice, and oppose righteousness, they should be quickly brought to loyalty. Reward will be given according to merit.” If [Yoritomo] had issued [such] a ban [on execution], how could one not call him a good general? However, Yoritomo is not such a person. His rule is short and his life is short, too. Taigong says: “A wise person’s rule makes others submit with their bodies. A sage’s rule makes others submit with their minds. When their bodies submit, one can plan the beginning. When their minds submit, one can keep the end”.¹⁷

The harshness of Yoritomo’s revenge is linked with brevity of his rule and life. Criticizing the persecution of the Heike the commentator may also hint

¹⁵ A quote from the *Six Secret Teachings*, “Tiger Secret Teaching,” section “Occupying Enemy Territory”. See SAWYER 1993: 87.

¹⁶ This quote is not from the *Mencius*, but from the “Fu on the Epang Palace” (Ch. *Epang gong fu* 阿房宮賦) by the Tang poet Du Mu 杜牧 (803–852 CE).

¹⁷ *Heike hyōban*, vol. 23 (comment on the *Heike*, Chapter 12:6 “The Yoshida Grand Counsellor”). Final quote is from the *Three Strategies*, “Inferior Strategy.” See SAWYER 1993: 303.

indirectly at measures taken by the Tokugawa in the first half of the 17th c. to suppress or weaken daimyo and their retainers who opposed the Tokugawa. This kind of criticism is not surprising at all since a large portion of *gunsho* works, perhaps including the *Heike hyōban*, was written by *rōnin* scholars many of whom served discontented *tozama* 外様 daimyo. At the same time, the commentator suggests that former retainers of the losing side should be integrated into the new hierarchy as long as they do not cause trouble.

3. Context for the *Heike hyōban* — group discussion (*kaidoku*)

Gunsho texts, and evaluative commentaries (*hyōban*) in particular, were not always created by a single author, but often involved a group of people, and they were not only silently read by individuals, but also used in group settings, such as lectures and discussions involving a daimyo lord and his retainers. One famous example of using a medieval history or “war tale” for lectures is *Taiheiki yomi* (太平記読み) based on the *Taiheiki* (14th c.) and its early-Edo commentary *Taiheiki hyōban hiden rijinshō*.¹⁸ It is possible that the *Heike hyōban* grew out of group discussions about the *Heike monogatari* and was intended for lectures and discussions. The practice of group readings and discussions known as *kaidoku* (会読) is a significant phenomenon in Edo-period education and I suggest that *hyōban* commentaries are linked with it.

Kaidoku is a format of group study consisting of debate and exchange of opinions about a passage from a text. Unlike lectures, *kaidoku* was a joint activity of equal participants. This educational method was widely used in domain schools (*hankō* 藩校) for warriors and also in private schools in the late 18th and 19th cc. The origins of *kaidoku*, however, are most often tied with the philosopher Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728) in the early 18th c. The intellectual historian Maeda Tsutomu suggests that the philosopher Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎 (1627–1705) practiced *kaidoku* earlier in the 1660s, although similar approaches can be traced back to even earlier Heian-era ceremonial debates held after the festival in honour of Confucius, or debates held in Buddhist temples.¹⁹ I propose a hypothesis that *kaidoku* in domain

¹⁸ WAKAO 1999.

¹⁹ MAEDA 2012: 69.


schools for warriors is, in part, a continuation of the early-Edo practice of discussing the *Taiheiki*, the *Heike monogatari*, and similar texts, producing *hyōban* commentarial works on them, and using these commentaries for educational purposes such as discussions on governance.

Before the Edo period, warrior lords invited military advisors (*gunshi* 軍師) and this practice continued in the Edo period with daimyo lords hiring learned warriors who wrote historical and military texts (*gunsho*) and gave lectures. Throughout the Edo period, warrior education involved discussion of statecraft, history, and ethics. This practice, seen as useful for contemporary governance, was based not only on medieval Japanese works such as the *Taiheiki* and *Heike monogatari*, but also on many ancient or recent texts related to East Asian and Japanese history. For example, let us briefly consider the *Evaluative Commentary on the Imperial Mirror* (*Teikanhyō* 帝鑑評, mid-17th c.).²⁰ Unlike the obscure background of the *Heike hyōban*, this commentary's context and even names of commentators are known. Since this commentary's content and style are close to those of the *Heike hyōban*, this work clarifies the circumstances in which such works were created in the 17th c. The *Teikanhyō* was created by a discussion group led by the prominent daimyo Ikeda Mitsumasa 池田光政 (1609–1682). In the period from 1630s to 1650s (exact years are unknown), Ikeda Mitsumasa and a group of four bakufu vassals jointly created this *hyōban*-style commentary on the Chinese didactic text *Illustrated Imperial Mirror* (Ch. *Dijian tushuo*, J. *Teikan zusetsu* 帝鑑図説, published in 1572, and in Japan in 1606) compiled by the Ming scholar Zhang Juzheng 張居正 (1525–1582) with positive and negative examples drawn from the imperial history of China. Ikeda Mitsumasa wrote the preface of the *Teikanhyō* and the other four members contributed their comments (*hyō* 評) on specific sections of the original text (they completed only 35 out of 117 sections). All the parts were later compiled into a single manuscript kept for private use by Ikeda Mitsumasa who perhaps intended to publish it later.

The *Teikanhyō* commentary is significant as a text produced by a discussion circle headed by an acting daimyo in the mid-17th c. It is important that the commentary also functioned as a tool to discuss governance, both past and present. In addition to themes such as virtuous rule based on benevolence and frugality, many comments express discontent with the present situation. Japanese scholar Iriguchi Atsushi notes that bold criticism was

²⁰ *Teikanhyō* 1937.

expressed by a bakufu vassal who later assumed the post of a senior councillor (*rōjū* 老中), one of the highest posts in the bakufu hierarchy.²¹ Officials of the bakufu (including some daimyo) held discussions among themselves disagreeing with some of the current policies. Although the bakufu was concerned with internal tensions and discontent, some criticism was welcome within the bakufu as a way to improve the situation. For example, Ikeda Mitsumasa himself was open to complaints from subordinates and it is known that he also admonished the shogun and top bakufu officials on several occasions.



Preface of the *Teikanhyō* commentary by Ikeda Mitsumasa²²

²¹ IRIGUCHI 2013: 244.

²² Image from the National Diet Library, Digital Collection website. <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1114904>.

In the preface, Ikeda Mitsumasa writes about the purpose of the *Teikanhyō* commentary:

夫帝鑑はもろこしの代々の御門の御鑑なり今蘆原にても国君世主の日々のかゝみとして心の垢を洗ひ給ふへき者也[...]

凡上古の神聖世にあらはれ給ひし本地を思ひみるも世界は唯是慈悲の一脈のみ也[...]

人として賢をこひねかふ志なきは不生日在かことし君として堯舜の昔を学ひ給はさるは君の天にそむき給へる也不生年在かことし[...]

The *Imperial Mirror* is a mirror of many generations of Chinese emperors. Now, in Japan as well, as a daily mirror of rulers it can wash away dirt in the hearts. [...]

In general, when one thinks about the original nature of divine sages of High Antiquity appearing in the world, [one sees that] the world is nothing but a sequence of benevolence. [...]

Being a human and not having ambition [that consists in] wishing for wisdom is like not living for days. Being a ruler and not studying the past of Yao and Shun is to go against Heaven. It is like not living for years. [...]²³

Ikeda Mitsumasa explains the importance of the *Teikan zusetsu* describing it as a text that can “wash away dirt in the hearts” of rulers in Japan, including himself. He emphasizes the need for rulers to have aspiration for wisdom and benevolence modeled on the rule of ancient sages. The preface does not clarify why the group of commentators led by Ikeda Mitsumasa decided to record their opinions about the *Illustrated Imperial Mirror* in the form of the *Teikanhyō*, but it seems that by means of this commentary Ikeda Mitsumasa wished to improve himself and possibly the governance of other daimyo lords, too.

Several short passages given below are meant to illustrate the style of this commentary and the topics discussed. Kuze Yamatonokami (Hiroyuki) 久世大和守 (1609–1679) wrote the first part of the commentary. He was a bakufu vassal who later became a senior councillor (*rōjū*) and even a daimyo in 1669. In one of the comments he writes:

²³ *Teikanhyō* 1937: 1–3.

[...] 聖人の天下を治めたまふ御心さし名にあらず利にあらず
 仁愛をもつて本としたまふその仁愛を天下に行へきはしめは臣
 下に聖人賢人を求めるにあり [...] 天下の民をやすくせん事をはか
 りたまふに賢人をあけたまふよりさきなるはなし末代の国君世
 主かゝ見たまふへきところなり

The ambition of a sage to rule the empire rests not on fame or gain, but on benevolence. Acting benevolently toward the empire begins with seeking sages and wise people as vassals. [...] When one plans to make life easier for people of the empire, the primary matter is to employ wise people. This point should be taken as a model by rulers of later generations.²⁴

This passage mentions the key points of sage rule: benevolence and employment of wise people rather than personal fame and gain. This view of governance is repeatedly presented in *gunsho* works, including the *Heike hyōban*. The last sentence is direct advice to later rulers, although the ruler addressed in this case is likely Ikeda Mitsumasa.

The following comment by the same person, Kuze Yamatonokami, takes up the topic of disorder and restoration of order:

[...] 乱は変にして治は常なり人病疾は変なり無病は常なり病
 あれば薬あり乱あれば道あり病者は薬師にあふて無病の常にか
 へり乱国の君は道を学ひて太平の常にかへしたまふへし乱国と
 は兵乱にあらず人心まとひ風俗乱たる国なり [...]]
 国君世主先達て恥をおもひたまふへきことにや

[...] Disorder [in a state] is irregular and order is normal. Human illness is irregular and lack of illness is normal. In case of illness there is medicine. In case of disorder there is the Way. An ill person meets with a physician and returns to the normal state without illness. A lord of a disordered state should learn the Way and return [the state] into a normal state of peace. A state in disorder does not mean military disturbance, it means a state in which human minds are in confusion and manners are in chaos. [...] A ruler, first of all, should perhaps feel shame [for lacking virtue and not fixing disorder].²⁵

²⁴ *Teikanhyō* 1937: 3–4.

²⁵ *Teikanhyō* 1937: 10.

Responsibility for disorder, defined as the confusion of human minds and manners, is placed on the ruler who should feel “shame” for not preventing chaos. This and other views are strongly influenced by Confucian ideals.

The following comment is by Kuze Sanshirō (Hiromasa) 久世三四郎 (1598–1660), elder brother of Kuze Yamatonokami. He was a bakufu vassal and a warrior who fought in the Osaka siege in 1615.²⁶ This experienced warrior (40–60 years old) was also interested in expressing his views using this format of group discussion. One of his comments is as follows:

良將は衆と心を同じ用を同して独すゝます独退かさらしむ
[...]

かくのこことくなる国を伐法は孫呉か術にもなき事也是聖賢の君天下を威す処なり其上文武は天の陰陽にして治国の大事なれば弓馬を習はしむる事勿論の事也軍国は文を以本とし武を以用とす治国は武を以備として文を行もの也[...]

A good general has the same mind with warriors and has the same task. He does not advance alone and does not retreat alone. [...] There is no way to attack such a state [with ruler and subjects unified] even among the techniques of Sunzi and Wuzi.²⁷ This is how a wise lord rules over the empire. Moreover, since the civil and the martial are the yin and yang of Heaven and important matters of statecraft, one certainly makes people learn archery and horsemanship. A state at war considers the civil its basis and uses the martial. A state in order thinks of the martial as preparedness and practices the civil. [...] ²⁸

Kuze Sanshirō emphasizes the unity of a ruler and his subjects and the necessity of keeping balance between the civil (*bun*) and the martial (*bu*).

These brief samples show the style and content of the *Teikanhyō*. This work and its context suggest that commentaries of this kind 1) could be created by daimyo and bakufu vassals, 2) could have multiple authors, and 3) discussed statecraft and various ethical and political topics to advise rulers. The production process of the *Teikanhyō* and identities of commentators provide useful hints about the creation of similar texts, such as the *Heike hyōban*. Both the *Teikanhyō* and the *Heike hyōban*, among other works, sug-

²⁶ KURACHI 1937: 37.

²⁷ This is a reference to two of the *Seven Military Classics*, the *Sunzi's Art of War* 孫子 and the *Wuzi* 呉子.

²⁸ *Teikanhyō* 1937: 16–17.

gest that *kaidoku* discussion of texts has roots in the early-Edo practice of discussing historical texts and producing *hyōban* commentaries on governance and ethics to admonish rulers of different levels. *Gunsho* authors, ranging from unemployed *rōnin* to high-level bakufu vassals, applied this commentarial approach to discuss various texts and produce commentaries on statecraft and ethics. The content of these commentaries may seem idealistic, but participants who produced them apparently attached importance to discussions and the process of joint creation of such works. Commentaries of this type were valued in the Edo period as didactic guides and tools of admonition and political advice. These commentaries, considered serious and practical scholarly works, are a valuable window to Edo-period reception of historical texts.

4. The *Heike hyōban* in the Edo period and education in domain schools (*hankō*)

Didactic *gunsho* texts, including *hyōban* commentaries produced by warrior scholars in the 17th c., were created to advise rulers, officials, and warriors, and their content remained a part of warrior education throughout the Edo period.

The sociologist Ronald P. Dore, in his monograph on education in the Edo period, describes the military aspect of the traditional curriculum in domain schools (*hankō* 藩校) of the 18th and 19th cc. as follows:

They mixed practical advice on the development of troops, the building of fortifications, moving camp, mobilizing supplies [...] with a great deal of moral advice on the importance of using force only in just wars, or of character training as the sole means to military success, and not a little mystical discussion of the nature of military luck. [...] The teachers of *heigaku*, however, were somewhat outside the ambience of Confucianism proper [...] These studies, however, were only for the upper samurai. For the vast majority military studies meant acquiring certain physical skills.²⁹

The *Heike hyōban* commentary, among other numerous *gunsho* texts, was kept in libraries of several domain schools across Japan, such as those in the Hikone, Kishū (Kii), and Sendai domains. Moreover, the commentary was

²⁹ DORE 1965: 148–149.

kept in the library of the Shōheizaka Academy (Shōheizaka gakumonjo 昌平坂学問所, 1790–1870), the central bakufu educational institution in Edo and the influential model for other domain schools.

To understand how *gunsho* commentaries fit the curriculum of domain schools, it is useful to investigate educational practices of these institutions. Curriculum of domain schools was centered on mostly Confucian “Chinese studies” (*kangaku* 漢学) with a focus on Chinese and Japanese history. Other traditional core subjects were military studies, etiquette, and calligraphy, to which new subjects were added at the end of the Edo period: National Learning (the study of ancient Japan and Japanese classics), Western studies, medicine, and mathematics.

Typically there were five modes of study in domain schools: 1) the initial stage, usually starting at the age of eight, involving reading and memorization of texts by repetition after the teacher, so-called rote reading (*sodoku* 素読); 2) the later stage when a teacher lectured on a text (*kōgi* 講義, *kōshaku* 講釈); 3) group members take turns to explain parts of a text (*rinkō* 輪講) and participate in group discussion and exchange of opinions about a text (*kaidoku* 会読); 4) self-study and reading on one’s own (*dokken* 独見, *dokudoku* 独読); and 5) questions and reasoning based on texts studied on one’s own (*shitsumon* 質問). These were initially developed for the Chinese studies (study of Confucian classics and other texts), but came to be used in disciplines such as history, medicine, Japanese studies (*wagaku* 和学), and Western studies.³⁰ Thus, educational process had three stages that progressed from studying under a teacher’s guidance (*sodoku* and lectures) to group study and debate (*rinkō* and *kaidoku*) and then to independent study and research. All these stages constituted the education of members of the warrior class in domain schools and private schools.³¹ Famous *terakoya* 寺子屋 schools for commoners covered a much more limited content and focused on *sodoku* and lectures without reaching the *kaidoku* level.

³⁰ INAGAKI 2002: 20.

³¹ It can be added that “[...] scholarship remained, indeed, a vital part of the work of most of the domain schools. Most had groups of advanced pupils, some well into their 20s or even older; many of them boarded at the school, often working as teaching assistants. They would spend most of their time in private study, and the remainder in regular study in groups that worked their way steadily through difficult classical texts — historical texts, philosophical texts, sometimes astronomical or mathematical texts — taking turns to expound them to each other”. *Kodansha encyclopedia of Japan* 1983: 174. In this quote, “study in groups” certainly refers to *rinkō* and *kaidoku*.

In domain schools, the purpose of studying Chinese classics was moral cultivation with a special focus on the attitude of a ruler or official who was to follow the principles of virtuous rule. Therefore, the subject was seen as highly practical since it was tied to the overall goal of raising good officials and loyal retainers. As for history, its study was meant to enable students “to discern signs of [stable] rule and disorder, rise and fall [of states]”.³² As can be seen, the goals set by domain schools quite closely match those of *gunsho* writers. *Gunsho* texts like the *Heike hyōban* commentary were kept in libraries of domain schools because their content and format fit the schools’ curricula. I suggest that these commentaries could be used as reading materials for disciplines of history and military studies. It is quite possible that they were materials that helped students prepare for *kaidoku* debates.

Gunsho commentaries mixing evaluations of political and military stratagems, discussions of famous historical figures, and analyses of human nature provided entertaining educational material that could improve one’s abilities to debate and assess opinions. Similar to Chinese classics and histories, these texts focus on moral cultivation, governance, and analysis of reasons for the rise and fall of states. Thus, *gunsho* commentaries matched well with other types of educational materials and the overall purpose of educating virtuous and able officials. This practical didactic usefulness of *gunsho* may explain their continuous popularity among warriors throughout the Edo period.

5. Conclusion

In this article I suggest that, unlike modern books mostly used for individual silent reading, some *gunsho* texts of the Edo period, including the *Heike hyōban*, were produced by a group and were linked with group discussions (*kaidoku*). Much of the background of the *Heike hyōban* remains unknown, but judging from its content and similar texts of the same period, it was likely produced by a circle of warriors who were interested in matters of

³² INAGAKI 2002: 12. The quote is from SATŌ 1832, the *Program of Elementary School-work* (*Shogaku kagyō shidai* 初学課業次第): “Oyoso shi o yomu no kokoroe wa, chiran kōbō no ato o wakimauru ni ari”. (凡史ヲ読ムノ心得ハ治乱興亡ノ跡ヲワキマフルニ在リ). Its author was Satō Issai 佐藤一斎 (1772–1859), a son of the chief retainer (*karō* 家老) of the Iwamura domain in the Mino province, Neo-Confucian scholar. As the official Confucian teacher of the bakufu, he served at the Shōheizaka Academy and influenced educational policies of the bakufu.

leadership and statecraft. *Gunsho* texts could function as tools of criticism and advice. Throughout the Edo period, commentaries of this kind had educational functions: they were meant for lectures to daimyo lords and later they were used in domain schools. Their educational content was meant to enlighten daimyo rulers and local warriors, to reinforce their martial identity, and to preserve warrior qualities seen as endangered by bureaucratization and comfort of the mostly peaceful Edo period. Further research on group discussions (*kaidoku*) and the use of didactic commentaries in educational settings is required for clarifying the role and functions of the *Heike hyōban* and similar texts in the Edo period.

Abbreviations

Heike: *Heike monogatari* (13th c.)

Heike hyōban: *Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō* (1650)

References

- DORE, Ronald P. 1965: *Education in Tokugawa Japan*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Heike monogatari hyōban hidenshō* 1650: 平家物語評判秘伝抄 [Commentary with Evaluations and Secret Transmissions about the Tale of the Heike]. Volumes 1–24. National Archives of Japan, <https://www.digital.archives.go.jp/das/meta/F100000000000042995>.
- INAGAKI Tadahiko 稲垣忠彦 2002: “Hankō ni okeru gakushū naiyō, hōhō no tenkai” 藩校における学習内容・方法の展開 [Development of learning content and methods in *hankō* domain schools]. *Teikyō daigaku bungakubu kiyō kyōikugaku* 帝京大学文学部紀要教育学 [Bulletin of the Teikyō University, Department of Literature, the Study of Education], 27: 1–22. <https://apps.main.teikyo-u.ac.jp/tosho/inagaki27.pdf>.
- IRIGUCHI Atsushi 入口敦志 2013: “*Teikan zusetsu* no yomarekata: *Teikanhyō* o chūshin ni” 『帝鑑図説』の読まれ方—『帝鑑評』を中心に— [Reading *Teikan zusetsu*: focus on *Teikanhyō*]. In: *Buke kenryoku to bungaku* 武家権力と文学 [Authority of warrior houses and literature]. Ed. by Iriguchi Atsushi. Tokyo: Perikansha ぺりかん社: 225–257.
- Kodansha encyclopedia of Japan* 1983: Volume 2, “Education”. Tokyo–New York: Kodansha Ltd.
- KURACHI Tadashi 蔵知矩 1937: “*Teikanhyō kaidai*” 帝鑑評解題 [Review of the *Teikanhyō*]. In: *Teikanhyō* 帝鑑評 [Evaluative commentary on the Imperial Mirror]. Ed. by Ikeda Mitsumasa 池田光政. Okayama: Ikeda-ke Okayama jimusho 池田家岡山事務所, 29–40. National Diet Library, <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1114904>.
- MAEDA Tsutomu 前田勉 2012: *Edo no dokushokai: kaidoku no shisōshi* 江戸の読書会 会読の思想史 [Edo reading groups: intellectual history of *kaidoku* group reading]. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社.

-
- SATŌ Issai 佐藤一斎 1832: *Shogaku kagyō shidai* 初学課業次第 [The program of elementary schoolwork]. University of Hiroshima Library, <http://dc.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/text/metadata/302>.
- SAWYER, Ralph D. 1993: *The Seven Military Classics of Ancient China*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Teikanhyō* 1937: 帝鑑評 [Evaluative commentary on the *Imperial Mirror*]. Ed. by Ikeda Mitsumasa 池田光政. Okayama: Ikeda-ke Okayama jimusho 池田家岡山事務所. National Diet Library, <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1114904>.
- WAKAO Masaki 若尾政希 1999: *'Taiheiki yomi' no jidai: kinsei seiji shisōshi no kōsō* (太平記読み)の時代—近世政治思想史の構想 [The era of “*Taiheiki* readings”: conception of early modern political intellectual history]. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社.
-

© Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS, 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Editorial Office address: Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
Dvortsovaya emb., 18, Saint Petersburg 191186, Russia
Tel. 7 812 3158728, Fax 7 812 3121465
www.orientalstudies.ru
email: ppv@orientalstudies.ru

Print Subscription/Distribution: Please send all inquiries relating to subscriptions to:
Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Dvortsovaya emb., 18, Saint Petersburg 191186, Russia
Журнал «Письменные памятники Востока», т. 7, № 2 (14), 2021 (на английском языке)
