1. Introduction

The discovery of Manichaean sources from Central Asia happened in a relatively short period of time, but the recovery of Manichaean discourse as preserved in those sources has been a much longer process. As with any ancient or medieval community, that discourse is only known to us through the texts left behind. And although the texts are now available to modern scholars, understanding them is not always a straightforward process. The challenges are manifold: unknown scripts and languages, a hitherto unknown religion with its unique perspective and practices, and in the case of the Central Asian sources, extreme damage to the texts. Making these unique primary sources available to the scholarly world has proceeded fragment by fragment, beginning with their decipherment and building upon accompanying historical linguistic research. As these sources have become better understood, scholars have discovered what the Manichaeans themselves had to say about their religion—a religion that had, until the twentieth century, only been known from polemical accounts. Over the past century, the editing and translation of Manichaean texts has taken various forms united by an essentially philological approach.

This approach, in Jason BeDuhn's apt formulation, is "concerned with translating Manichaean testimony into a comprehensible body of literature" (BeDuhn 2001, 5). This discipline, which may be called "Manichaean philology"—to attempt to popularize a term—is, then, one that ranges from deciphering a text to producing a translation that adheres to a standardized terminology. Though BeDuhn and others have rightly pointed out that the only sources from which we can know anything about the Manichaeans are textual, those textual sources include not only the primary sources, but are also modern scholars' editions of Manichaean texts. As the medievalist Stephen Nichols notes, "editions are indeed one of the principal ways that medieval literary artifacts survive into our time, and editing them is certainly a major vehicle for institutionalizing them within the academy" (Nichols 1994, 114). Speaking mostly of medieval European philology, Nichols emphasizes that editing texts is often seen to be the most important practice of philology, and hence to some it would seem self-evident that a text edition is a worthwhile undertaking—a claim which I clearly do not intend to contest. It has also been true for scholars of Manichaeism that text-editing is a main concern; as Sundermann once noted, "it goes without saying that the edition of texts is and remains for the foreseeable future the prime task of Turfan philology" (2009, 263). To that end even those scholars of Manichaeism who would not self-identify as linguists or even philologists have also published editions of fragments. Every scholar who has edited a Manichaean text has realized that, because of the poor state of preservation of our texts, there is not great resemblance with other philological practices. The resemblance resides mainly, to understate the point, in the fact that there are manuscripts and we want to edit them. For example, as discussed in greater depth shortly, critical editions of Manichaean texts are rarely if ever possible, while in other fields, including other Iranian textual traditions such as the Avestan and Pahlavi, they are the norm.

One of the main concerns of those working with the primary Manichaean sources has been the reconstruction and recovery of aspects of Manichaean doctrine or practice, as much as is possible on the basis of the fragmentary texts. One can therefore not exclude from a discussion of "Manichaean philology" the fact that some of the most successful applications thereof are actually not only the establishment of editions of individual texts but also the recovery of aspects of Manichaean doctrine and practice by a painstaking process of editing and comparing many texts in different languages. This has resulted in the successful reconstruction of, for example, the Manichaean commandments for Elect and for Hearers and the Manichaean daily prayers.[1] To those whose fields have an overabundance of fully-preserved textual witnesses this may seem a bit strange. But it must be emphasized that, for Manichaeism, in most cases no discussion of doctrine, depiction of ritual, or even piece of literature is completely or unambiguously preserved. As a result, one of the most important recent studies of Manichaeism and perhaps the most successful employment of the Manichaean philological method is BeDuhn's reconstruction and analysis of the central ritual of the religion: the daily meal of the Manichaean Elect. BeDuhn's study attempts to situate the textual sources in a historical community by reconstructing the disciplines and ritual systems to which they attest. "Manichaean philology" therefore can be said to have two goals that are simultaneous and inform each other: to translate the testimony of the sources, and to extract from the sources information about their historical context.

The editing of Manichaean (especially Iranian) texts must deal with a central methodological problem: the fragmentary condition of the sources. The history of Manichaean communities and corresponding chance preservation of Manichaean texts means that most manuscripts have been reduced to fragments of varying size in varying, but never complete, states of preservation. In their damaged condition it is uncommon to find multiple fragments containing overlapping text, much less multiple witnesses of a text. It has often been noted that, given the length of time that Manichaean communities survived in Central Asia in particular, and the sheer volume of the surviving fragments of books, it is reasonable to assume that most texts in fact existed in multiple copies and have since been lost, destroyed, or damaged. But that assumption, reasonable as it is, does little for text editing practices; since multiple copies of texts are preserved only rarely, the default method of text editing is therefore "diplomatic"—only a single witness is edited. It does nevertheless happen that overlapping fragments, even of some length, are found. But in fact this usually does not result in a critical edition, at least in the form those take in Avestan, Pahlavi, or medieval European text-editing practices. For example, when Henning (1945) published the two witnesses of the 'Parable of the Pearl-Borer'—one in Manichaean script and one in Sogdian script—he set them side-by-side but did not attempt to collate them into a single "text". Even in cases where fragments from more than a dozen different manuscript copies of a text are known to exist[2] the resulting edition is still not a critical one, but is more accurately referred to as "compiled", to use Sundermann's term, because the fragments do not overlap completely and the text can only be pieced together (usually with gaps) from multiple non- or partially-overlapping fragments.

Most editions of Sogdian texts—Buddhist, Christian, Manichaean, and "secular" (i.e. economic documents or inscriptions) alike—are "diplomatic" by default, as there is only one extant witness. In certain cases, notably the Buddhist and Christian, the Sogdian witnesses are translations from known Chinese and Syriac sources, respectively. This means that new or unusual words, forms, and syntax can often be interpreted with confidence by comparison with the source of the translation. As Manichaean Sogdian does to some extent consist of translations, there is also the possibility—though perhaps as likely as hoping for multiple Sogdian witnesses of one text—that both the source and the Sogdian translation are extant. A few such cases have indeed been found, such as fragments of the Sogdian

1 See Sims-Williams 1985b for the commandments and de Blois 2000 for the daily prayers.

2 See Sundermann (1991c, 108) and (2009, 200 n. 4), where he gives some examples of texts for which there are a number of witnesses, none complete or fully-preserved.

translation of the Parthian *Huyadagmān* hymn-cycle and fragments of the Sogdian translation of Mani's Middle Persian *Living Gospel*. Interestingly, it seems that no bilingual Manichaean manuscripts (that is, one manuscript containing the same text in two different languages) from Turfan are attested (excepting Sogdian–Old Turkic wordlists), even though a number of miscellanies containing different texts in different languages are now known.

Another related issue is actually reading the fragments. Many, in both Manichaean and Sogdian script, though more so the former, are often of a high quality and very carefully written, so that what is preserved can be read quite reliably. The main problem with the Sogdian script is that, being a cursive script, many letters fall together in later manuscripts and cannot be easily distinguished from each other. Very often simply reading a word means deciding which combination of letters is more correct or more explainable, with alternative possible readings relegated to the apparatus or commentary. Such cases involve an editorial judgment made on the basis of philological, linguistic, or codicological arguments—this judgment does not correct an error on the basis of other witnesses of the same text, but appeals to completely different manuscripts in order to establish the most probable reading of a given word. The editing *act* in these instances can be considered "eclectic" despite the overall edition being a "diplomatic" one.

Even reliable manuscripts nevertheless contain variation in spelling, scribal errors, and inconsistencies. In some cases it can be established that a form is an error for an expected form, and the reasons for that error might be explainable. But in some cases no explanation is to be found. Following diplomatic practice, the edited texts usually contain no emendations, but present the text (in transliteration) as it is found in the manuscript, with unclear forms and inconsistencies noted in the apparatus and explained in the commentary. However, even the processes of commenting and translating involve comparing the forms attested in one text with parallels in other manuscripts in order to analyze them in the light of the (Sogdian, Parthian, etc.) language as a whole. The edition, therefore, is never a work contained only ever within a single manuscript but rather always brings individual readings from other manuscripts into play. Nevertheless, the main advantage of our default "diplomatic" practice should be clear: the resulting edition is a closer representative of the historical reality of the text than critical or even compiled editions which in the end present a reconstructed text that probably never existed in that form. This shifts the focus for us from the text as an object abstracted from any manuscript reality to the manuscript itself as the material and historical representative of the text it contains.

The present study attempts to locate a particular Manichaean manuscript in the cultural and religious context which produced, used, and transmitted it. It approaches the manuscript not simply as the vehicle conveying a particular text, but rather as a material artifact conveying a particular literature stemming from a historical context. In this, it aims to bring material philology to bear on Manichaean texts, moving away from the predominantly linguistic aspect of textual study to an emphasis on the manuscript and discovering how it is a representative of the manuscript culture in which it was produced. Broadly stated, the manuscript raises a variety of problems and questions—the relationship between text and paratext, the issues of literacy and orality, the historical question of patronage and manuscript production, problems of paleography and codicology, to name a few—but also evokes questions about the historical moment(s) which produced and reproduced it.[3]

Yet the historical reality of a text that we purport to approximate in our editions is one in which we are also caught up. We can never surmount the problem that we, far removed from the original context of the manuscript, must continuously rely on our own judgment, as well-informed as it may be, to decide which of multiple possible readings we will uphold. These are editorial decisions that in the end may not accurately reflect the text as it was.

Mani reportedly proclaimed: "The previous religions only existed in one country and one language, but my religion is of the kind that it will be manifest in every country and in all languages, and it will be taught in far away countries".[4] If we acknowledge that text editing is the central practice in recovering Manichaean testimony, we must also acknowledge that we stand in an interesting position in relation to the sources we edit. After all, Mani wanted his writings to be promulgated in all languages and the historical Manichaean communities certainly pursued this goal. By editing Manichaean texts, we not only further the survival of Manichaean literary artifacts, but also further the self-professed goal of those texts by adding English, German, French and several other modern languages to the languages in which Manichaean texts exist. In other words, for us, the production of a text edition can be said to be as "Manichaean" as it is "philological".

3 See especially Nichols 1997, 10-14 for outlines of material philological practice and Nichols 1994, 126-36 for a more specific demonstration of material philology as applied to a particular textual tradition. For the beginnings of material philology, then referred to as 'new' philology, see the special issue of *Speculum* (1990).

4 From the Middle Persian version of the 'Ten Points' text, translation from Gardner–Lieu 2004, 109.

2. The manuscript and its context

The manuscript now known as the Parable-Book (Sogdian *āzand-nāmē*, henceforth AN) is a relatively well preserved scroll containing Manichaean parables written in the Sogdian script and language. At over two hundred lines long altogether it is the longest continuous Manichaean text in Sogdian so far known, though hardly rivaling texts the length of the Buddhist Sogdian Vessantara-Jātaka (1,800 lines extant) or the Christian Sogdian E27 (parts of 120 folios extant). This fact should help give some appreciation of the state of Manichaean textual affairs and one of the main reasons that the edition and study of the better-preserved examples of Manichaean Sogdian literature is a worthwhile endeavor. This work presents a much-needed new edition of all known fragments of the Parable-Book, supplied not only with overviews of its orthography and grammar and linguistic commentaries, but also an extended literary-critical study of the text within the context of Manichaean literature.

Although the fragments of the Parable-Book were discovered in Turfan in the early 1900s, they disappeared and were unknown to scholars of Sogdian and Manichaeism until the 1970s, when Werner Sundermann became aware of a Chinese scroll (the Sogdian verso of which had not been identified as such) which was returned to the Turfan archive by a conservator. Sundermann identified the non-Chinese side as Sogdian, but soon realized that it had never been published nor cited. He was then directed to the Nachlass of Wolfgang Lentz at the University of Marburg.[1] In Lentz' Nachlass, Sundermann found that there were in fact four preliminary studies of the text by early scholars, none of which had ever seen the light of day: 1) An exact handwritten copy of lines 9–162 (omitting 69–70) made by A. von Le Coq, probably the discoverer of the scroll, for the benefit of F.W.K. Müller, undated; 2) A series of transcriptions and notes of individual words made by Müller on the basis of Le Coq's copy, undated; 3) A transcription in Hebrew letters of lines 9–201, with a translation of some lines, and a preliminary report prepared by Lentz in 1924; 4) A transcription in Latin letters of lines 9–201 with translation of 9–155 and 188–201 made by Lentz in 1939.[2]

The dates imply that Lentz may have had access to the text as late as 1939 (if his transcription dated then was based on a new reading). In 1939, all of the manuscripts in Berlin were packed away and secured in various places, eventually to be returned after the war.[3] It is not clear when the scroll was returned to the Akademie and then sent for conservation, but it was at any rate included with the Chinese rather than the Iranian fragments, which explains why it originally had the signature Ch 5554. It was perhaps even originally kept

---

1 Wolfgang Lentz (1900–1986) was, of course, a younger contemporary of Müller's and one of the last remaining links with the earliest generation of the scholars of the Turfan materials. Importantly, he was, as Sundermann emphasizes, "the only scholar who could have had knowledge of the Turfan collection in its pre-war state" (MPB, 8).

2 Note that what is given as line 9 corresponds to line 9 in this edition but was in fact the first line of the scroll as it stood in those days.

3 For a description of what happened to various fragments during and after the war refer to Boyce 1960, xxv-xxvii.

with the Chinese fragments, and hence not photographed for W. B. Henning in the 1930s along with the other Iranian fragments.[4]

As Sundermann relates (BT 15, 7–9), the older notes that he found were still valuable, especially since they revealed that in 1924 and perhaps even in 1939, there was slightly more text preserved on the damaged edges of the scroll than there was in 1970. In the meantime, the main part of the scroll had broken in two pieces and was not restored in the correct order but with the two pieces switched, a state in which it remains today. Sundermann began working on the text already at that time, but as he was simultaneously working on a number of major texts he was not able to complete his work on it for more than decade. By virtue of his broader work in the Turfan archives, Sundermann was able not only to supplement the rediscovered long fragment with two more fragments which precede the original long fragment without a break, but also to identify two further fragments which belong to the same scroll (though he was unable to determine their order relative to the main fragment). He also identified a thin paper strip, cut from a Chinese scroll, which contains an abstract in Manichaean script of the first parable. After receiving a number of comments from both Ilya Gershevitch and Nicholas Sims-Williams, Sundermann finally published, in 1985, approximately 80 years after its discovery, the text of all the known fragments of the scroll, in the "Berliner Turfantexte" series. This publication included a glossary, brief discussion of the contents, and appendix by Friedmar Geißler containing a discussion of folkloric motifs.

Sundermann's edition of AN received two substantial reviews, one by Yutaka Yoshida (1988) which focused on philological and linguistic issues, and one by Wolf Oerter (1988) which dealt with some thematic and literary issues. Yoshida's review, which also included some further comments of Sims-Williams, improved a number of readings and translations of the Sogdian text; furthermore, Yoshida was able to identify the text on the Chinese side of the smaller fragments. In recent years, further fragments belonging to the scroll have been found. From the Berlin Turfan collection Yoshida identified two fragments (part of a group of fragments that had been stored in Leipzig but only returned to Berlin in 1993), while across the world, his work on the fragments from Turfan housed in the Ōtani collection in Japan brought a further, much smaller, fragment to light.[5] Yoshida (1999b, 195) was then able to place all of the fragments in their correct order on the basis of the Chinese text of the fragments' original recto sides. Finally, Christiane Reck (2006, 178-79) also identified another fragment in Sogdian script which seemingly preserves part of the parable of the World-Ocean, but from a different manuscript altogether. All the fragments of and related to the 'Parable-Book' are described in detail in section 2.2 and edited in chapter 4.

The past two decades have seen further corrections and improvements on Sundermann's original readings, not only in disparate articles and reviews, but also in individual entries of

4 I have attempted to track down the materials of Lentz that Sundermann consulted in Marburg, however without success. The archive librarians in Marburg are not, or are no longer, aware of any papers of Lentz kept there. According to them, Lentz' "handschriftliche Nachlass" had been sent to the Aarhus Universitet in Denmark. However, Aarhus possesses no Nachlass of Lentz as such, but only a few materials pertaining to his trip to the Hindu Kush. The sought-for materials on the Parable-Book are also not to be found among Lentz' papers in the University of Hamburg nor among Sundermann's papers now in the possession of the Turfanforschung. My thanks to Carsten Lind and Renate Stegerhoff-Raab of Marburg, Nils Arne Pedersen of Aarhus, Ludwig Paul of Hamburg, and Christiane Reck, all of whom helped me to look for these materials.

5 See Reck (2006, 11-12) for a description of the fragments from Leipzig and IFOC, 152 for the initial publication of the Otani fragment belonging to this text.

major reference works such as the *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Moreover, since linguistic and philological research on Sogdian has been continuously advancing in the past three decades, various studies have improved our understanding of individual passages. Simultaneously, the publication of Manichaean texts has increased manifold.[6] It is thus useful, from the point of view of both Sogdian linguistics and Manichaean literature, to have a new and updated edition of the Parable-Book, gathering all corrections and updates in a single place while adding further ones based on a new reading of the original manuscript. This will have the benefit of allowing old, erroneous readings (and some misleading translations) to be discarded, while providing a fresh translation that can be the basis of focused linguistic and literary studies. While a new edition can surely be considered a desideratum, it must be said that the aforementioned reasons alone are not the most compelling, for indeed any scholar with a good knowledge of Sogdian and Manichaean literature could, with time, put together their own working edition of this text.

Sundermann was the first scholar working on Iranian Manichaean texts to conceive of the parables as a Manichaean literary genre in their own right, and in fact also the first to systematically employ the texts' own literary-categorical terms (in particular 'parable' for *āzand*) in his studies.[7] However despite these achievements, he devoted comparatively less attention to the elucidation and literary analysis of the parables than he did to his important editions of Manichaean texts. That Sundermann was no doubt capable of such work is evident from his lengthy, and methodologically comparable, literary analysis of Manichaean texts containing historical information.[8] Moreover, it should not go unmentioned that he had indeed made preliminary investigations into the content and composition of the parables, as is clear from the prefaces to his editions of some Middle Persian and Parthian parables (1973, 5) as well as AN (MPB, 5-10), besides the section on parables in his paper on Manichaean prose literature (1984, 236-38). His edition of the Parable-Book, however, only included brief comments on some of the content of the texts, mostly in footnotes, besides Geißler's appendix discussing motifs in the parable of the 'Two Snakes' (apud MPB, 59-67). The origins of the two main parables of AN remained opaque for the time, but furthermore, an analysis of how the parables explained aspects of Manichaean doctrine or in what ways they exemplified and could shed light on the genre of parables in Manichaean literature was absent. The review of Oerter (1988) highlighted some of the Manichaean themes of the Parable-Book in connection with the Coptic sources, but only briefly. Sundermann did of course return periodically to philological and text-critical problems arising from the parables: in these regards one can refer especially to his analysis of the term *ršt'wc'r* 'consolation' occurring in TaleJ or his paper laying out some of the Buddhist par-

---

6 This includes two re-translations of AN as edited by Sundermann in handbooks of Manichaean texts. The first is by Hans-Joachim Klimkeit (1993, 178-83), which seems to be a translation of Sundermann's German translation, and the second is by Elio Provasi (2008) which, although not including a new edition, seems to be based on the original Sogdian.

7 See Sundermann's pioneering discussion of the categories of Manichaean literature (1984) and the expanded English version thereof (2009).

8 Sundermann first edited the texts which he identified as such (cf. BT 11), then in a later series of publications (his *Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer*) provided a running, and very detailed, commentary on the historical details of the texts.

allels to the 'Parable of the Religion and the Ocean' in AN.[9] However, until now the text has lacked a thorough and comprehensive literary study.

A number of unanswered questions have hung over the study of the Manichaean parables. Why and by whom were such texts created? What didactic, entertaining, or literary purpose did they serve? How were they used, and for whom were they intended? In my opinion, these questions can only be answered by the text-critical analysis of the parables themselves. The best text on which to base such an analysis is none other than AN, primarily because of its length, but also because two stylistically rather different parables are extant. On the one hand, its many unique words and examples of syntax are valuable not only for Sogdian linguistics, but also for Manichaean terminology in Sogdian. On the other hand, the length of each parable means that they are fruitful ground for intertextual analysis, as Colditz (2015) has already demonstrated. A new study of AN must therefore balance these opportunities. Indeed, in philological work on Manichaean texts, the linguistic and literary approaches are inextricable from one another. This study therefore attempts to provide as well-rounded an approach to the text as possible on the basis of the idea that a manuscript does not only provide linguistic details, but also can tell us about its context, while simultaneously contextualizing the works it contains. The study begins from a codicological and linguistic analysis of the manuscript as a whole (Chapter 3), attempting to shed light on the context in which it was produced. The focal point of the study is, naturally, the new and updated edition of the text (Chapter 4), furnished with commentaries which focus mainly on addressing problems of linguistic analysis and translation, with attention to more general issues of Sogdian linguistics where appropriate. The new edition is taken as the basis of the following text-critical commentaries on each parable (Chapter 5). These commentaries attempt, in the first place, to provide an exhaustive literary analysis by highlighting intertextual motifs, unpacking references to cosmology and eschatology, and comparing parallels in style and diction. They also constitute exercises in source criticism, one for a Manichaean text that has extant non-Manichaean parallels, and another for a text which has none and may not even be an adaptation of a single text as such. A final discussion (Chapter 6) attempts to address some of the issues that arise from this type of study and in its turn address some of the questions posed at the beginning of this paragraph while dispelling older notions of the parables as mere "tales" of no religious importance. The edition of the Sogdian text is completed with a glossary, while the issue of its historical context is provided by a brief historical discussion regarding the Manichaean community of Toyoq (section 2.3).

2.1 Description of the manuscript

The correct order of the fragments constituting the Parable-Book was adduced by Yoshida on the basis of the Chinese text of the recto for those fragments published by Sundermann (1988, 148) and then again (2001, 195) for fragments later discovered to belong to the text.[10] It can also be seen from the Chinese sides that the last line of Ōtani 7543 belongs

9 Sundermann (1998) and (1991a), respectively. TaleJ is more than likely a Manichaean text, as Sundermann showed by his discussion of *ršt'wc'r*, even though the Manichaean explanation that would have been preserved in the epimythion is lost. Sundermann's suggested Manichaean epimythion, though insightful, can only be highly hypothetical.

10 See Yoshida 1988, 148 for the former group and 2001, 195 for the latter group.

with the first line of Ch/So 20128, though there is a small horizontal gap between them (Reck 2006, 226). Two other relevant fragments from different manuscripts are also edited here.[11]

Table 1: Edited Fragments[12]

Shelf or ms. no.	Size (cm)	Comments	Publ.
Ōtani 7543	5 x 4.3	R: Ch. text V: 3 lines of Sogd.	IFOC, 152
Ch/So 20128	9.5 x 13	R: Ch. text V: 5 lines of Sogd.	BT 15 as ANd
Ch/So 20511	11.1 x 14.6	R: Ch. text V: 6 lines of Sogd.	—
Ch/So 20199	11 x 17	R: Ch. text V: 7 lines of Sogd.	BT 15 as ANa
Ch/So 20503	10.8 x 16.8	R: Ch. text with Sogd. V: 7 lines of Sogd.	—
Ch/U 6914 + Ch/So 15000(5) + Ch/So 20182	17.7 x 22.8 + 370 x 26.4	R: Ch. text with Sogd. V: ~200 lines of Sogd.	R: BT 15 as ANc V: BT 15 as ANb
So 18070	5 x 5.5	R: Sogd. V: Sogd.	—
M 7420	22 x 5.5	R: Ch. text V: 26 lines of Sogd.	BT 15 as ANe

Reconstructed length: ~4.35m Reconstructed width: 26.4cm

All fragments are preserved under glass with the exception of Ch/So 20182, the greater part of the scroll, which is reinforced with translucent Japanese paper and stored in a roll-case. The scroll itself is made of light brown paper, originally with Chinese written on one side and the other side blank, later used for the Sogdian. The Sogdian script is rather large and cursive, in black ink, not particularly neatly written, though not difficult to read either. The lines are broadly spaced, but quite regularly, with roughly one line per 1.7 cm. There is no lining of the margin or text-lines. Apart from the very damaged initial section of the scroll,

11 In an article published after his edition of the scroll, Sundermann edited a small fragment, Ch/So 14700(1), which he suspected to belong to the Parable-Book (1991b, 284 n. 7). However, the text on the Chinese side of that fragment does not permit such an identification (see Reck 2006, 154), and it is not included here.

12 Digital images of all the fragments in the Berlin collection may be consulted online at the Digitales Turfan Archiv (http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/).

most lines are almost completely preserved. The entire text seems to be in the same hand. Some of the notes and scribbles on the Chinese side are not in a distinguishably different hand, but some lines are in a different hand and written with a thinner pen. The only discrepancy is one line of red Sogdian script written perpendicular to the Chinese text. In several places one can see where sheets of paper were glued together by the original papermakers to form and extend the length of the scroll; such joins are visible on the fragments Ch/So 20503 at V5 and Ch/So 20511 between V1 and V2 as well as in many places on Ch/So 20182.

From the order of the shorter fragments, all of which precede the main fragment, it appears that the scroll was discovered rolled up, or that perhaps it was stored and transported rolled up, which caused the outer layers to break off first, resulting in a number of fragments as well as damage to the initial section of the main fragment. It is not known if the fragments were found with the scroll, though one presumes that they would have originally been transported together had this been the case. One can also infer, from the regular pattern of tears on the edges of the paper (which occur from the beginning of Ch/So 20182+ up to about line 47), that it was damaged while still rolled-up.[13] From that point until the manuscript breaks off at about line 202, the rest of the text is relatively well preserved. Even the damaged beginning of the scroll may be restored with some confidence by comparison with other parts of the text. It is uncertain if the Sogdian text of the scroll originally ended where the scroll ends now, or whether it would have continued. Since there is no *explicit* formula for the final parable, and since the known Chinese text continues, it is probable that there was more Sogdian text after what is currently preserved.

On the whole the edition presented here is a diplomatic one based on a single witness, with the exception that part of the text is diplomatic with recourse to a partial witness, the abstract.

Table 2: Text of Chinese recto of AN

Fragment	Text of Recto in the Taishō Issaikyō
Ōtani 7543	Vol. 9 p. 702b25 – 27
Ch/So 20128	Vol. 9 p. 702c1 – 3
Ch/So 20511	Vol. 9 p. 702c5 – 9 (approx.)
Ch/So 20199	Vol. 9 p. 702c12 – 17 (approx.)
Ch/So 20503	Vol. 9 p. 702c26 – 29
Ch/So 20182+	Vol. 9 p. 703a2 – 705a

The Chinese text preserved on the recto of the Parable-Book fragments is indicated in Table 2. Since the Chinese text is known and can be compared with the corresponding text in the Taishō Tripiṭaka (Issaikyō) which provides a useful line-numbered reference, this gives an idea of how many columns of Chinese are missing between fragments, which in turn gives a rough idea of how many lines of Sogdian text are missing between the fragments (see Kudara 2000, 340-342). The Chinese text of the recto contains the 48th chapter of the *Da fang guang fo hua yan jing* or *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*. As is the case with all Sogdian texts

13 A scroll with similar tears, also suggesting that it was damaged while still rolled up, is the illuminated manuscript 81 TB 65:01 (Letter A) from Bezeklik, on which see Gulácsi 2005, 180.

written on the versos of Chinese scrolls, the Sogdian and Chinese texts have no relationship with one another.

Considering that the two fully preserved parables are 131 and 65 lines long, respectively, it is likely that the closely-grouped fragments preceding the main part of the scroll, totaling perhaps 40 lines including text and gaps, all belong to the same, partially preserved, parable. On that basis I edit them together, with a new system of line numbering for ease of reference. The line numbers of the main part (AN) as well as ANe are unchanged from Sundermann's edition. The text on the Chinese recto edited as ANc by Sundermann is also given new line numbers, for reasons explained in section 4.4. The line numbering system of the present edition is shown in the following table.

Table 3: Line-numbering system

Fragment	New Line Numbers	Old Line Numbers
Ōtani 7543	ANj 1–3	—
Ch/So 20128	ANj 3–7	ANd1–5
Ch/So 20511	ANj 8–13	—
Ch/So 20199	ANj 14–20	ANa1–7
Ch/So 20503	ANj 21–27	—
Ch/U 6914 + Ch/So 15000(5)	ANj 28–31 AN 5–9	ANb1–202
Ch/So 20182	AN 9–202	
Ch/So 20503 r	ANci	—
Ch/So 20182 r	ANcii	ANc6–9
Ch/So 20182 r	ANc	ANc1–5, 10–26

In his initial work on the text, Sundermann discovered that the three fragments comprising the main part of the scroll had, either initially or in the years since their discovery, been assigned conflicting find-signatures.

Table 4: Find-signatures

Shelf-number	Find-signature
Ch/So 15000(5)	T III 2015
Ch/U 6914	T III T 601
Ch/So 20182 (older Ch 5554)	T II D 2
Ch/So 20199	T II T 1184
Ch/So 20128	T II T 1603
Ch/So 20511	T III 2061
Ch/So 20503	T II 2053
M 7420	T II T 22

There are several discrepancies to be noted. First, the longest fragment (Ch/So 20182) bears a find-signature D indicating a find-site of Qocho (D = Dakianus-šahr, referring to the ruins of Qocho), during the second expedition, while the find-signatures of the other two fragments which join it without a break would indicate a find-site of Toyoq during the third expedition! The fragments Ch/So 20199 and Ch/So 20128 both have find-signatures indicating Toyoq, second expedition. It seems unlikely that the scroll was broken apart and left in two sites many kilometers distant from each other.[14] As a signature D only appears once, it appears to be an erroneous exception.[15] Secondly, two of the fragments bear a signature T III (T), meaning the third Turfan expedition (1906–1907) with a find-site of Toyoq. But, as Sundermann rightly notes, the reports only mention the finding of Manichaean manuscripts in Toyoq during the second expedition (though it is also true that at the time of the third expedition, the Manichaean contents of a text would not have necessarily been identified on the spot). As will be noticed, the fragment M7420, containing an abstract of one parable, has the signature T II T, indicating, if correct, that it was found during the second expedition in Toyoq. Sundermann (1991b, 285) argued that the most probable scenario would be that all fragments of the scroll were found in Toyoq during the second Turfan expedition (1904–1905). However, it is not impossible that the fragments marked T III (T) were indeed found by the third expedition in the same location, as the fragment in the Ōtani collection was found separately from the fragments found by the German expeditions.[16]

2.2 The texts from Toyoq

An overview of the archeological, historical, and textual evidence regarding the Manichaean sources from Toyoq is worth undertaking, with the intention of problematizing some existing assumptions and balancing what is known. Owing to the nature of the source material, attempting an in-depth study of the historical religious communities of Toyoq would be difficult and require much more attention to recent archeological work than can be provided here. But since an investigation of the Manichaean aspect of the history of Toyoq is lacking in the academic literature, it is hoped that the following discussion will at least be useful in better situating the context of the Parable-Book.

In contrast to the more numerous finds at Qocho[17] the Manichaean manuscript fragments so far discovered at Toyoq[18], a small settlement about 20 km to the east of Qocho,

---

14 In the words of Sundermann: “It is rather unlikely that the manuscript of the āzand-nāme [Parable-Book] had been torn to pieces by some native people and distributed to places in- and outside Qocho” (1991b, 285).

15 Sundermann here suggests that the ‘rule’ noted by Mary Boyce–“if in doubt, put D” (Boyce 1960, xx n. 2)–may have been applied.

16 It is even possible, as N. Sims-Williams suggests to me, that the main part of the scroll, being a well-preserved specimen, may have been bought in Qocho by people who would have brought it from Toyoq. One would hope for this to have been mentioned in the records, but no clue has been found so far.

17 Qocho (in earlier works written Chotscho or Khocho) is the usual scholarly spelling, but is not actually the contemporary place name. The current name of the city is in modern Uighur *qara-ġuja* (often spelled Kara-khoja) and in Chinese 高昌 *gāo-chāng*. To be more specific, Kara-khoja is the modern city while the ruins were referred to as Dakianus-šahr. In Sogdian it was called *cynʾncknδ* [čīnānč-kaṃθ], literally ‘Chinese city’ (cf. DMT, 68a). Although Tremblay (2007, 104) states that “already in 313 Turfan was for the Sogdians the ‘Chinese town’”, I cannot find any basis for his claim, as the earliest Sogdian attestation of that name is in a Sogdian contract dated to 639 CE. His remark seems to be based on a misinterpretation of Harmatta’s discussion (in *History of civilizations of Central Asia*, 1994, II, 439) of the date of the Ancient Letters and Upper Indus graffiti.

are far fewer in number. Toyoq seems to have hosted sites of importance for various religious communities for centuries, and in modern times Toyoq is a pilgrimage site for Uighur Muslims. But a number of other traditions seem to have existed there, as indicated by the number of caves with religious art that have been attributed to both Buddhist and Manichaean communities.[19] However, the history of the Manichaean community at Toyoq, and indeed those of the other peripheral sites within Turfan such as Bezeklik and Sangim, is much less understood than that of the Manichaean community of Qocho, itself also not clearly documented.

Manichaean texts were found at Toyoq during the second German Turfan expedition. The accounts of the German excavations in Toyoq are quite general but do give the impression that all the manuscript finds there came from a single site: a so-called "library room" in a ruined monastery "filled with great heaps of old manuscripts"—in particular, "fragments of Manichaean, Syriac, Sogdian, and Uighur books and scrolls".[20] This is from Albert von Le Coq's descriptions of the finds, descriptions that postdate the actual expedition and are repeated nearly verbatim in all his various accounts. The *Acta* of the Turfan expeditions are unfortunately not much clearer, and the best detail I have been able to find is a letter of von Le Coq's (dated 29.10.1905, during the second expedition) giving a very general list of 49 items brought from Toyoq.[21] It is therefore no longer possible to attribute fragments to specific locations within Toyoq. Because of this insufficient description and the fact that the system of find-signatures was prone to mislabeling or no labeling at all, it is furthermore difficult to be completely sure which fragments were actually found in Toyoq, and which were not. One can attempt to reconstruct a larger picture of the texts to be attributed to Toyoq, but the attempt must rely on different criteria.

There are of course fragments which bear a Toyoq find-signature. Furthermore, it has often been mentioned that a feature of the Manichaean texts from Toyoq is that the prevailing book format is the scroll (contrary to Qocho where the dominant format is the codex), and that in particular these are Chinese scrolls which have been re-used to write a new text

18 Toyoq (also Tuyuq, Toyok, or Toyuq) is the usual spelling in scholarly works. The modern Uighur form is *tuyuq*, and an older form *tïyoq qïsïl* 'Toyoq valley' appears in a 13th-century Uighur Buddhist manuscript (Matsui 2010, 703).

19 For an extremely detailed discussion of the art in the Manichaean caves of Toyoq, Bezeklik, and Sangim, and discussion of whether the Manichaean caves preceded or coincided with the Buddhist ones, see Chao 1996.

20 See Boyce 1960, xvii for references to von Le Coq's accounts of the expeditions, as well as the quotations presented here (my translation from the German). Apparently T. Bartus, the only person to participate in all four Turfan expeditions, was not present at the excavation of Toyoq. As regards the site, von Le Coq's accounts are not burdened by the details of what this "library room" looked like upon discovery nor in what exact positions the fragments were found. In Sundermann's (euphemistic) words, the "remarkable results of the expeditions are quite insufficiently described from the archaeological point of view" (1991b, 283). See Boyce 1960, xxxiii-xxxv for a description of the 'system' of find-signatures applied by the excavators and later curators.

21 The Museum für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin and BBAW graciously permitted me access to the complete digitized archive of the 'Turfan *Acta*', which is a collection of the correspondence, reports, and notes of members of the Turfan expeditions, notably A. Grünwedel and A. von Le Coq. Unfortunately, there do not seem to be any archaeological descriptions or even detailed descriptions of individual fragments with regards to Toyoq. For example, in the letter of 29.10.1905 cited above, entry no. 6 on the list says simply 'Bild', while no. 31 says 'man.' (presumably 'manichäische Handschrift'). A register in which von Le Coq apparently recorded find sites and other information about hundreds of fragments seems to have been lost (Boyce 1960, xxiii).

on the verso. Sundermann mentions, for example, his estimate that of about 50 total Manichaean fragments from Toyoq, 30 are re-used Chinese scrolls (Sundermann 1991b, 286)—we will see presently that this was actually a low estimate. The fragments in Berlin collections that both bear a Toyoq find-signature and have been identified as having Manichaean contents are organized in Table 5.

It is clear that the majority of Manichaean texts with a find-signature of Toyoq are re-used Chinese scrolls. The question that then arises is whether similar fragments with non-Toyoq find-signatures (or none at all) can be attributed to a Toyoq find-site. This has in fact been argued in recent publications for several fragments that do not have a Toyoq find-signature. If carried out systematically, the number of fragments to be attributed to Toyoq will be somewhat higher than indicated in the table.[22]

Table 5: Manichaean fragments with Toyoq find-signatures

Script	Language	Book Format			Total
		Codex	Chinese scroll	Scroll	
Manichaean[23]					~9
	So.	1?	2	—	
	Pth.	1	1	—	
	MP	—	3	—	
	OTk.	—	1	—	
Uighur/Runic[24]					~18
	OTk.	~6	8	4	
Sogdian[25]					~56
	So.	1?	~51	—	
	Pth.	—	~4	—	

However, the discussion so far takes into account only the fragments in the Berlin Turfan collection, as a system of find-signatures seems not to have been developed for either the Japanese or Russian expeditions to the Turfan area, though it is clear that they did spend time in Toyoq.[26] One would therefore hope to be able to establish a likelihood that certain texts in these other collections are indeed from Toyoq. For instance, regarding the fragments now in St. Petersburg, one can add to the total 21 manuscripts, comprising a larger number of joinable fragments, that are written on the versos of Chinese scrolls.[27] Regarding

22 It can probably be increased quite significantly: besides AN, for example Ch/So 15000 (T III signature) is a Ch. scroll; Ch/So 20504 (with Toyoq signature) connects with Ch/So 20515 (without signature), both are Ch. scrolls; Ch/U 6561 (T signature) connects with Ch/U 6051 (T II signature), both are Ch. scrolls; and so on.

23 See Boyce 1960, 130-131.

24 See Wilkens 2000, 515 for catalog numbers of the Toyoq fragments. Of the 8 Ch. scrolls, 2 are in Runic, 5 are in Uighur script, and 1 is written in both Runic and Manichaean scripts.

25 See Kat., 320-322.

26 For useful summaries of the Russian and Japanese work in Turfan, see Zhang–Rong (1998, 10-16), which also provides a very useful overview of the history of the oases.

27 Yoshida (2001, 105-108) lists only those fragments which he was able to join together to form a larger text by comparing the text of the Chinese sides. However, he states that “the majority of the texts are written on the backsides of manuscripts originally bearing Chinese Buddhist texts” (2001, 105). Whether he means by this