

**Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute of Oriental Manuscripts**

**DUNHUANG STUDIES: PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS
FOR THE COMING SECOND CENTURY OF RESEARCH**

敦煌學：第二個百年的研究視角與問題

**ДУНЬХУАНОВЕДЕНИЕ: ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ
ВТОРОГО СТОЛЕТИЯ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ**

Edited by Irina Popova and Liu Yi

主編：波波娃 劉屹



St. Petersburg, 2012

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL MANUSCRIPTS

Dunhuang Studies: Prospects and Problems for the Coming Second Century of Research
Slavia, St. Petersburg, 2012

Edited by
Irina Popova and Liu Yi

English text edited by
Simon Wickham-Smith

Editorial Board:
Chai Jianhong, Hao Chunwen, Liu Yi, Irina Popova, Takata Tokio

© Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS, St. Petersburg, 2012
© Slavia, St. Petersburg, 2012
ISBN 978-5-9501-0219-6

On the Influence of the Written Form of the Word on its Pronunciation (According to Early Medieval Uighur Texts)

Liliya TUGUSHEVA

The problem of the correlation between the written forms of the words in ancient literary texts and their phonetic forms is the part of the vast field of comparative-historical linguistics. In this paper we will consider only the correlation between the graphic and phonetic forms of a single term – of the name of deity *Zervan*. Iranian in its origin, this deity was considered the supreme deity of Zervanism and the personification of *chronos* (time) and destiny. According to the data of the written sources, Sogdians knew Zervanism already in the beginning of the 4th c.,¹ and it can be supposed that in the Central Asia Zervanism was brought by people, traders in particular, from the eastern part of the Sogdiana. At any rate there can be hardly any doubt that the term *Zervan* was brought to Central Asia by some of the Iranian peoples.

In the written sources of the 10th–13th c. discovered in Eastern Turkestan, this term is widely presented in Buddhist texts, as well in Manichaean works, but everywhere it is in the modified form 'zru'; *W* in the second syllable of the word was changed to *U*: 'ZRW' > 'ZRU'. Thus we are presented with the rarely occurring case of the transformation of the name of a divinity. It is well known that the Sogdians in Eastern Turkestan were isolated from the other Iranian peoples,² and as a result they have come to be under the influence of another, non-Iranian, cultural area.

In the Turkish version of the Manichaean religious work *Xuāstvānīft*, created in Eastern Turkestan, term *ezrua* signifies one of the four essential signs of the "Fourfold God" – "The Father of Greatness".³ It is established that the Fourfoldness of God was "a dogma fundamental to Central Asian Manichaeism",⁴ and also "a major Iranian influence in the documents of the Western and Eastern Manichaeans is the doctrine of God's fourfoldness".⁵ In the Chinese sources, these four features of God were determined as his "qualities." The 10th c. Arabian author an-Nadim determines these four features in his *Fihrist* by the following terms: *allāh*, *nūruhū*, *quvvatuhū*, *hikmatuhū* – "God, his Light, his Power, his Wisdom."⁶ In the Turkish version of *Xuāstvānīft*, the passage on Fourfoldness was presented as follows: "tört y(a)ruq tamqa köngülümüz-dä tamqalad(i)m(i)z: bir amranmaq ez-rua tngri tamqasi: ikinti kértgünm(ä)k kün ay tngri tamqasi üëünè qorqmaq béš tngri tamqasi: törtünè bilgä bilig burxanlar tamqasi ("Four Light Seals have we sealed in our hearts: firstly Love, the seal of *Ezrua tngri*, secondly Faith, the seal of the God of the Sun and Moon, thirdly the Fear, the seal of the Fivefold God, fourthly Wisdom, the seal of the buddhas").⁷ The form of the construction of this passage in an-Nadim's interpretation shows that the first of this four terms means not the "quality" (feature) of God, but God himself (Allāh), and the three following terms denote his features: *nūruhū* "his Light", *quvvatuhū* "his Power", *hikmatuhū* "his Wisdom." In the Turkish version each of this four terms denoted the separate deity, that is reflected in using of the word *tngri* "deity" at each of these terms. This last fact shows that the term *Ezrua-Zervan* in East Turkestan during the 10th-11th c. could hardly denote the Manichaean supreme God ("Father of Great-

ness"), since, as it is shown from its use in Turkish version of *Xuāstvānīft*, this deity even in this Manichaean text was represented as merely one of the other deities, including the numerous Buddhas (*burxanlar*). The evolution of the meaning of this term was the natural process in the region, where Buddhism from the early times was the predominant religion. According to J.P. Asmussen's observation: "At a very early stage... Khotan was won over to Buddha's doctrine, even to such a degree that until the arrival of Islām it was considered the centre of Buddhist studies",⁸ and "...the religion on the basis of which Mani's missionaries... shaped the terminological accomodation of their preaching was Buddhism".⁹ Indeed as it can be shown from Turkic version of Manichaean works, the Buddhist terms, notions, phraseology were widely used in them. Even the messengers of God ("Father of Greatness") might be named *burxanlar* "Buddhas" (*tngri y(a) lavaëi burxanlar* "the buddhas – the messengers of God").¹⁰ In the Buddhist texts from East Turkestan everywhere the name *Ezrua* corresponds to *Brahma* of the Indian mythology. Therefore, taking into account the profundity of the influence of Buddhism in this region, it can be assumed that the *Ezrua* in the Manichaean texts also might correspond to *Brahma*. As J.P. Asmussen writes, "During this process a transfer of *Zurvān*'s and *Ohrmizd*'s names to *Brahmā* and *Indra*, as regards the technique of mission, was a felicitous choice against a background of the popularity possessed by these two old Indian gods in popular belief already in early Buddhism".¹¹

Also in this connection it is impossible pass over the unusual juxtaposition of the words *kün* and *ay* in the word combination *kün ay tngri*, where this two words form the unified attribute of *tngri*. Following on from al-Nadim's interpretation of this term of the passage as *nuruhū* "his Light," it can be assumed that in this case these two words denote the abstract notion "light", signifying the separate deity, but not the "quality" of God, since this combination of words includes the term *tngri*.

Thus the reading *ezrua*, based on the graphemes alone, and ignoring the original pronunciation of the term, could result from the loss of the original notion of this term in the regions as the Eastern Turkestan, where the supremacy of Buddhism had already been for a long time. It must also be agreed that "Central Asia was for centuries subject to a cultural and religious mixture of enormous dimensions. ...But as the most dominant factor by far in huge religio- and cultural-historical syncretism Buddhism stood firm until East Turkestan, too, became *dāru-l-Islām*."¹² Thus in 10th-11th c. the direction of the influence in Central Asia, as distinct from more early periods, was travelling in the opposite direction and already at that time the Manichaeans (Sogdians) were under the religious and cultural influence of the Eastern regions of Central Asia.

¹ ZAEHNER 1955, 166; ASMUSSEN 1965, 134.

² ASMUSSEN 1965, 138.

³ van TONGERLOO 1994, 329-342.

⁴ ASMUSSEN 1965, 220.

⁵ van TONGERLOO 1994, 336.

⁶ ASMUSSEN 1965, 221.

⁷ *Xuāstvānīft*, 15, fn. 80-83.

⁸ ASMUSSEN 1965, 139.

⁹ ASMUSSEN 1965, 136.

¹⁰ *Xuāstvānīft*, 13, fns. 25-26.

¹¹ ASMUSSEN 1965, 135.

¹² *Ibid.*, 140.

Bibliography

- ZAEHNER, Robert C. 1955: *Zurvan. A Zoroastrian Dilemma*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- ASMUSSEN, J.P. 1965: *Xuāstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*. Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard.
- van TONGERLOO, Alois 1994: "The Father of Greatness." In: *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte*. Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag. Ed. by H. Preifiler, and H. Seiwert. Marburg: Diagonal-Verlag, 329-342.

Xuāstvānīft. (Manikhejskoe pokayanie v grekhakh). Predislovie, transkriptsiya uigurskogo teksta, perevod L.Yu. Tugushevoj. Kommentarii A.L. Khosroeva. Faksimile teksta. [*Xuāstvānīft. Manichaeen Confession of Sins. Facsimile Edition. Preface, Transcription of the Uighur Text, Translation by L.Yu. Tugusheva. Comments by A.L. Khosroev*] Хуастванифт. (Манихейское покаяние в грехах). Предисловие, транскрипция уйгурского текста, перевод Л.Ю. Тугушевой. Комментарий А.Л. Хосроева. Факсимиле текста. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2008.

單詞的書寫形式對其發音的影響
——以中世紀早期的回鶻文獻為例
莉莉婭·圖古舍娃

本文對祖爾萬教最高神名字——祖爾萬——的發音與書寫形式演變緊密相連的問題進行分析研究。祖爾萬是伊朗語族從4世紀初開始就信奉的最高神之一，在10—13世紀的東突厥斯坦，該神名以新的書寫和發音形式(ezrua)出現，並被等同於印度教的三大主神之一“大梵天”。在佛教依然佔據宗教優勢的時代，這種類似的書寫形式演變，可能成為一種標誌，而其基本的語義學概念，則早已遺失。

О влиянии письменной формы слова на его произношение
(на материалах раннесредневековых уйгурских текстов)
Лилия Тугушева

В статье рассмотрен вопрос, связанный с изменением семантики и графической формы имени верховного божества Зерванизма – Зервана, зафиксированного в письменных памятниках из Восточного Туркестана X–XIV вв. В указанный период в этом регионе в новой графической и фонетической форме (*ezrua*) этот термин употреблялся в качестве наименования одного из верховных божеств индуизма – Брахмы. Подобное семантическое и графическое преобразование в данном случае может являться показателем того, что в среде, где в течение веков преобладающей религией оставался буддизм, представление о первоначальной семантике термина было уже утрачено.