

A SURVEY OF BUDDHIST SOGDIAN STUDIES

David A. Utz

BIBLIOGRAPHIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA

Series Minor

III

Tokyo • The Reiyukai Library • 1980

A Survey of Buddhist Sogdian Studies

BIBLIOGRAPHIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA

Series Minor

III

A SURVEY OF BUDDHIST SOGDIAN STUDIES

DAVID A. UTZ

Tokyo
The Reiyukai Library
1980

A SURVEY OF BUDDHIST SOGDIAN STUDIES

David A. Utz

TOKYO • THE REIYUKAI LIBRARY • 1980

Published by The Reiyukai Library:
5-3-23 Toranomom, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105, Japan

© David Anthony Utz

First published 1978

Printed in Japan at the Reiyukai Printing Office, Tokyo

Facsimile edition published 1980

Reproduced in Japan by Taiyo Printing Company, Tokyo

*Single copies of the Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica
(Series Minor) can be obtained on request free of charge
from the Reiyukai Library, Tokyo.*

*Correspondence regarding all editorial matters should be
sent to the Director of the Reiyukai Library, Tokyo.*

A SURVEY OF BUDDHIST SOGDIAN STUDIES

David A. Utz
(New York)

The study of Buddhist literary remains in the Sogdian language began in the early years of the present century with the discovery in Chinese Central Asia of manuscript fragments in the Sogdian language. Of particular importance for the discovery of Buddhist Sogdian materials were the explorations of P. Pelliot (Pelliot 1910), A. Stein (Stein 1933, 169-89), and S. Oldenburg (Rosenberg 1918, 817-8) near the oasis of Tun-huang and those of A. Grünwedel and A. von Le Coq in the Turfan depression (Grünwedel 1906 and v. Le Coq 1926). With the safe arrival of the manuscript materials discovered by these expeditions in the respective European scientific institutions, their philological investigation was begun by various scholars.

The first Buddhist Sogdian scholar was R. Gauthiot who, together with Pelliot (Pelliot 1911), began the investigation of the Sogdian material which Pelliot had brought back to the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. During the years 1911-2 he published a series of remarkable articles based on the results of his work, including editions of a Sogdian version of the *Dīrghanakhasūtra* (Gauthiot 1911-2B) and a Sogdian version of the *Vessantara Jātaka* (Gauthiot 1912), the first editions of any Buddhist Sogdian texts. When Gauthiot was killed during the First World War, it was a major blow to the new field. However, two posthumous works appeared, representing major advances in the field (Gauthiot-Pel-

liot 1920-8 and Gauthiot-Benveniste 1914-29). The former is an edition of a Sogdian translation of the Chinese apocryphal *Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Good and Evil (Actions)* (*Fo shuo shan o yin kuo ching* 佛說善惡因果經, T. 2881)* and includes facsimile reproductions of both the Sogdian and Chinese texts, transcription of the Sogdian text, translation and notes to the Sogdian and Chinese texts, and a glossary to the Sogdian text. The latter was the first grammatical description of the Sogdian language, based primarily on Buddhist Sogdian materials. Begun by Gauthiot before his death, it was completed by E. Benveniste, who later completed the publication of the Sogdian material in the Pelliot collection through a facsimile edition of all the manuscripts (except P4, published in facsimile in Gauthiot-Pelliot 1920-8)(Benveniste 1940A) and a text edition of all those texts not previously published by Gauthiot (Benveniste 1940B). The latter included descriptions of the manuscripts, transliterations, translations, a glossary, and notes. In addition, it incorporated a re-edition of the Sogdian *Dīrghanakhasūtra* (originally published by Gauthiot) and some corrections to Gauthiot's edition of the *Vessantara Jātaka*. This was followed in 1946 by a complete re-edition of the *Vessantara Jātaka* (Benveniste 1946) on the model of *Textes sogdiens* which included, as well, a new translation of the *Sūtra of Causes and Effects* together with corrections to *Textes sogdiens*. Finally, in 1970, D. N. MacKenzie produced a new edition of the *Sūtra of Causes and Effects* (MacKenzie 1970).

As interest in Buddhist Sogdian materials grew, and the

* T. stands for the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*.

circle of scholars active in their investigation gradually expanded, a number of reviews and studies of the publications of the Pelliot material appeared. These included discussions of Gauthiot's edition of the *Vessantara Jātaka* by H. Reichelt (Reichelt 1926, 239-45) and I. Gershevitch (Gershevitch 1942), discussions of his edition of the *Sūtra of Causes and Effects* by Reichelt (Reichelt 1926, 245-50, 1928B, and 1929), by W. Lentz (Lentz 1927 and 1932), and by F. Rosenberg (1931), a long study of Benveniste's *Textes sogdiens* by W. B. Henning (Henning 1943-6B), and reviews of MacKenzie's re-edition of the *Sūtra of Causes and Effects* by M. Schwartz (Schwartz 1971), by H. Humbach (Humbach 1972A and 1972B), by J. W. de Jong (de Jong 1973), and by W. Sundermann (Sundermann 1974)(to which MacKenzie returned in the first appendix to *Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library* (MacKenzie 1976, II, 153-8). Also, in the notes to *Manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*, Henning has incorporated a substantial number of comments on all Buddhist Sogdian material published previous to 1936 (see also below)(Henning 1937, 51-105 *passim*).

The investigation of the Buddhist Sogdian material from Tun-huang discovered by A. Stein and S. Oldenburg began almost as soon as that of the Pelliot material. The first manuscript fragments in the Stein collection to be published were five folios included by Gauthiot in his edition of the *Vessantara Jātaka* (Gauthiot 1912, 171-3, 182-6, 437-45, 463-6), a fragment of the *Nilakanṭhadhāraṇī* in Brāhmī characters together with an interlinear transcription in Sogdian script, published by Gauthiot together with L. de La Vallée Poussin (de La Vallée Poussin-Gauthiot 1912), and a Sogdian version

of the *Padmacintāmaṇi dhāraṇī sūtra*, published by F. W. K. Müller (Müller 1926). During the same period Rosenberg published two Buddhist Sogdian fragments from the Oldenburg collection, one from an unidentified *jātaka* or *avaḍāna*, and the other from the *Śukasūtra* (Rosenberg 1918-20). Most of the remaining material in the Stein collection was published by Reichelt (with the assistance of O. Hansen) in the period 1928-31 (including descriptions of the manuscripts, transliterations of the texts, and translations) (Reichelt 1928A and 1931). This was reviewed by Rosenberg (Rosenberg 1929 and 1932) and followed, beginning in 1928, by two series of articles, one by Benveniste (Benveniste 1928, 1933A, 1933B, and 1938), and the other by F. Weller (Weller 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1936-8). The articles by Benveniste included, in addition to revisions of the editions of various Stein fragments, the edition of four additional Stein fragments (Kao. 70-3), possibly from a Buddhist *jātaka* or *avaḍāna* (Benveniste 1928), a translation by P. Demiéville of the passage from the Chinese *Buddhadhyanasamādhisāgarasūtra*, parallel to the fragmentary Sogdian version published by Reichelt (Reichelt 1928A, 33-56) (Benveniste 1933A, 195-213), and the probable identification (by Demiéville) of the Sogdian *Dhūta*-text (Reichelt 1928A, 15-32) as a Sogdian version of the Chinese apocryphal *sūtra*, *Fo wei hsin wang p'u sa shuo t'ou t'o ching* 佛爲心王菩薩說投陀經 (T. 2886) (a fragmentary part of which survives in the Chinese Tun-huang material, although it does not correspond to the surviving Sogdian section) (Benveniste 1933A, 239-41). In the four studies by Weller, the fragmentary Sogdian versions of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* (Reichelt 1928A, 1-13), the *Vajra-*

cchedikā (Reichelt 1931, 71-5), and the *Buddhadhyānasamādhisāgarasūtra* (Reichelt 1928A, 33-56) were compared in detail with their Chinese prototypes. Finally, in 1976, there appeared a revised edition of the major Buddhist Sogdian texts in the Stein collection by D. N. MacKenzie (MacKenzie 1976). In addition to including revised transliterations and translations of the Sogdian texts, MacKenzie has provided a glossary, notes, photographic reproductions of the manuscripts (reproduced for the first time), and a special glossary of Buddhist terms in Sogdian, originally published separately (MacKenzie 1971). The notes include text and translation of the Chinese prototypes, when these exist (although no translation accompanies the Chinese text to the *Paṃmacintāmaṇi-dhāraṇīsūtra* or the *Buddhadhyānasamādhisāgarasūtra*). In the same year N. Sims-Williams published most of the remaining Sogdian fragments of the Stein collection (Sims-Williams 1976). Although many of these fragments had been published previously, some eighteen were published for the first time. Of the fragments, 2a, 7-10a (10a previously unpublished) and perhaps 11, 19 (previously unpublished) and 24-5 are Buddhist.

Not only were manuscript remains of Buddhist Sogdian literature found by various European expeditions in the Tunhuang oasis, but a considerable quantity of such material was recovered from the Turfan depression by the German Turfan expeditions sent out by the Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin. The investigation of the Turfan manuscripts was eventually entrusted to the Orientalische Kommission created in 1912 within the Königlich Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Meyer 1923 and Grapow 1950) under whose auspices

the interpretation and publication of the material in various Middle Iranian languages experienced various ups and downs (Lentz 1956 and Boyce 1960). The specifically Buddhist Sogdian material became one of the spheres of activity of F. W. K. Müller, who produced editions of four texts, included in his posthumous publication of various Buddhist and Christian Sogdian fragments (Müller-Lentz 1934). In 1936 Benveniste published a discussion of Müller's editions (Benveniste 1936, 207-27). After Müller's death, work on the Buddhist Sogdian fragments was continued by O. Hansen. Although Hansen published information concerning the progress of his work (Orientalische Kommission 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942, and Hansen 1968), only one other Buddhist Sogdian text in this collection has ever been published; and, between 1942 and 1974 no work was done. The only other text to be edited was published by Henning in 1940 (Henning 1940), seven lines of which were also published by Hansen the same year (Hansen 1940, 139-41). Early in 1974 the present writer began to investigate the considerable quantity of this material which still remains unpublished and was able to identify and edit a Sogdian version (totaling 78 lines) of the Mahāyānist *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Utz 1976).

Intermittently, various publications appeared reflecting progress in the study of the paleography and grammar of Buddhist Sogdian texts. The study of the Sogdian/Uigur script in which the texts are invariably written began with an article by Gauthiot on the Sogdian alphabet (Gauthiot 1911A), and with his study of the Sogdian transcription of the *Nīlakaṇṭhadhāraṇī* discussed above (de La Vallée Poussin-Gauthiot 1912, 630-45). This was followed by some remarks of Rosenberg on the ambiguities occasioned by the defective nature

of the script (Rosenberg 1931, 632-4), and, most recently, by two articles of Sims-Williams clarifying certain other ambiguities (Sims-Williams 1972 and 1975). A general discussion of the script and its development within the context of Aramaic scripts in Iran and Central Asia has been provided by Henning (Henning 1958). At the present time there is not any specific grammatical description of the Sogdian language of the Buddhist translation literature. Although the early grammar of Gauthiot-Benveniste (see above) was based primarily on Buddhist materials, it is, by now, obsolete. The more recent grammatical work of Gershevitch (Gershevitch 1945 and 1961), although compiled primarily on the basis of Manichean material, incorporates a substantial quantity of Buddhist material and is, therefore, useful for Buddhist texts.

The Buddhist Sogdian literature is a translation literature which reflects the Chinese Buddhist literature from which it was predominately translated. Although two Buddhist Sogdian texts are known from their colophons to have been translated from languages other than Chinese (Henning 1940, 61 and MacKenzie 1976, I, 10), almost all the texts which have been identified as one or another specific Buddhist text reflect the Chinese version(s) of the particular text to the point that various peculiarities of terminology and idiom of the Chinese version(s) are reflected directly in the Sogdian translation. Indeed, the Sogdian *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* is hardly even intelligible unless the assumption is made that it is a virtually literal character for character translation of a Chinese version (MacKenzie 1976, II, 13-27). And the translator of the *Sūtra of Causes and Effects*

has rendered several of the more obscure lexical items of this text simply by transcribing the Chinese words into Sogdian script (MacKenzie 1970, 42-77 *passim*). Even the "*Sūtra* of the condemnation of intoxicating drink," which, according to its colophon, was translated from an Indian text (MacKenzie 1976, I, 10), reflects so many features of expression peculiar to the texts clearly translated from Chinese that its most recent editor has assumed in his edition of the text that it was also translated from a Chinese original and that the term "Indian" in the colophon has been used subconsciously or to lend an air of authority to the *sūtra* (MacKenzie 1976, I, 7). It is not known with certainty when the various Buddhist Sogdian texts were translated. In only one case is the date (A.D. 728) of translation known (for the text of the "*Sūtra* of the condemnation of intoxicating drink") (MacKenzie 1976, II, 8). From this it may be reasonable to suspect that the majority of this translation literature dates from the main period of T'ang dynasty domination in Central Asia (last half of the 7th century and first half of the 8th century).

The following list (1) those Sogdian texts which can be identified with a particular extant Chinese Buddhist text (together with the corresponding Chinese passages), and (2) those for which an extant parallel text is not yet known, but for which some specific identity can be provided. In addition, there are (1) other published Buddhist texts of indeterminate identity and (2) unpublished texts (in the German Turfan collection):

(I)

- (1) *Vessantara Jātaka* (closest Chinese version = T. 171, vol. 3, 418-24)(Benveniste 1946)
- (2) P2, 603-912 = *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (T. 670, vol. 16, 513b-22-514b)(Benveniste 1940B, 30-43)
- (3) P2, 914-39 = *Aṅgulimālīyasūtra* (T. 120, vol. 2, 540c22-7)(Benveniste 1940B, 43-4)
- (4) *Sūtra* of the Causes and Effects of Good and Evil (Actions)(*Fo shuo shan o yin kuo ching*)(T. 2881, vol. 85, 1380-3)(MacKenzie 1970)
- (5) *Dīrghanakhasūtra* (T. 584, vol. 14, 968)(Benveniste 1940B, 74-9)
- (6) *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhātathāgatasūtra* (T. 450, vol. 14, 406c20-408a8)(Benveniste 1940B, 82-92)
- (7) *Amoghapāśamantrahṛdayasūtra* (T. 1095, vol. 20, 406a-407b6)(Benveniste 1940B, 93-103)
- (8) *Vajracchedikā* (T. 235, vol. 8, 749a6-21)(MacKenzie 1976, I, 3-5)
- (9) *Vajracchedikā* (II)(T. 235, vol. 8, 752b24-c2)(Müller-Lentz 1934, 544-8)
- (10) *Padmacintāmaṇīdhāraṇīsūtra* (T. 1082, vol. 20, 199b13-c24)(MacKenzie 1976, I, 12-7)
- (11) *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* (T. 475, vol. 14, 549a22-550c11)(MacKenzie 1976, I, 18-31)
- (12) *Buddhadhyānasamādhisāgarasūtra* (T. 643, vol. 15, 690c6-692c27)(MacKenzie 1976, I, 53-77)

- (13) *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra* (T. 665, vol. 16, 426a7-27)
(Müller-Lentz 1934, 539-44)
- (14) *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (T. 374, vol. 12, 585b6-c4)(Müller-Lentz 1934, 550-5)
- (15) *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (II)(T. 374, vol. 12, 437b22-c)
(Utz 1976)

(II)

- (1) The *Dhūta*-text (= a lost portion of the extant text *Fo wei hsin wang p'u sa shuo t'ou t'o ching* (T. 2886, vol. 85))(MacKenzie 1976, I, 33-51)
- (2) *Avalokiteśvarasyaṇāmāṣṭaśatakastotra* (independent recension)(Benveniste 1940B, 105-17 and Sims-Williams 1976, 51-3)
- (3) *Śukasūtra* (Rosenberg 1920)
- (4) *Samjñādharmasūtra* (?)(šm'r'kh pδkth [? pws](k'))(Henning 1940)
- (5) "The *Sūtra* of the condemnation of meat and intoxicating drink"(P2)(Benveniste 1940B, 3-58)
- (6) "The *Sūtra* of the condemnation of intoxicating drink"
(MacKenzie 1976, I, 7-11)
- (7) *Jātaka* or *Avadāna* concerning two brothers of differing qualities (cf. *Kalyāṇaṅkara* and *Pāpaṅkara*)(Rosenberg 1918, Reichelt 1928A, 57-9, and Sims-Williams 1976, 45, and (perhaps) 53)
- (8) *Prasenajit*-text (conversation of the Buddha with the king Prasenajit concerning the *cakravartin*)(Müller-

Lentz 1934, 548-50)

- (9) *Nīlakarṇṭhadhāraṇī* (Sogdian transcription of Sanskrit text)(de La Vallée Poussin-Gauthiot 1912)
- (10) *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra / Pañcaviṃśatikāprajñāpāramitānāmadhāraṇī* (P16)(Sogdian transcription of a corrupt Sanskrit text)(Benveniste 1940B, 142-3)
- (11) P18 (Sogdian transcriptions of Sanskrit *dhāraṇīs*)(Benveniste 1940B, 148-9)

There remain two particular facets of the Buddhist Sogdian literature which merit some further discussion. One is the choice of texts to be translated into Sogdian and the other is the non-identity of certain Sogdian texts with any of the extant Chinese versions of the particular Buddhist text which the respective Sogdian text presumably represents.

The Buddhist texts which were translated into Sogdian are naturally a reflection of the contemporaneous literature of the Chinese Buddhist community. It is of note that the body of apocryphal *sūtra* literature peculiar to Chinese Buddhist literature is well-represented among those Sogdian texts which have been identified with a specific Chinese prototype (see above I.4 and II.1). Indeed, the extent to which this translation literature was influenced by the particular interests and preoccupations of the Chinese Buddhists is illustrated by the inclusion among the extant texts of a Sogdian translation of the Chinese text *Fo shuo shan o yin kuo ching* (see above I.4). This text, with its detailed exposition of the workings of *karman* as the agent determining the fates of all living creatures, cannot help but strike the reader as a reply to the Confucian viewpoint of a heavenly mandate (*t'ien ming* 天命). Indeed, the opening lines (1-63) seem to plainly reflect a passage in the *Shih-i-lun* 釋疑論 of Tai An-kung 戴安公 (Ch'en 1952, 179) and to indicate that an authoritative reply to its viewpoint is presented by this *sūtra*. One can only wonder how much interest the Sogdian Buddhist community could have possibly had in one of the major Chinese intellectual controversies, one peculiar to the environment in which the Chinese Buddhist community developed.

The second facet mentioned above is one of the most vexing as well as fascinating aspects of the Buddhist Sogdian material. Its existence raises some serious questions concerning the development of the Chinese Tripitaka (see above). A couple of examples will illustrate its nature.

There is an unpublished fragment in the German Turfan collection (Tiα = 10402) which can be shown to be from another Sogdian *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhārāja* text. A careful comparison of this fragment with the other extant fragmentary Sogdian text (see above I.6) and the four extant Chinese texts in this category (T. 449, 450, 451, and 1331, chp. 12) indicates that, although the fragment corresponds generally with the text represented by the other Sogdian text and its Chinese prototype, it does not correspond exactly, but would seem to represent a shorter and less expansive recension of the same text. It is quite possible that it represents a Sogdian translation of the Chinese text of Hui-chien 慧簡, the first (A.D. 457) independent translation of this text into Chinese (Pelliot 1903, 33-4), which is no longer extant. However, it is of note that the Chinese Tripitaka presently contains no text which corresponds exactly to it.

Another similar situation is presented by the unpublished Turfan fragments TiiT = 14734-40 which all bear the title βž'yrm'y pr'tny' wyδβ'γ = *Vajraprajñāsāstra*. This text should represent a Sogdian translation of a text such as *Chin kang pan jo lun* 金剛般若論 (T. 1510) whose Chinese title corresponds exactly to the Sogdian title as it appears on the fragment. However, Professor R. E. Emmerick has informed me (in a letter dated 21.12.76) that he investigated this theory and that the two texts do not correspond.

Having described in some detail the history of Buddhist Sogdian studies and the contents and characteristic aspects of the material which constitutes its subject, it would perhaps be useful to offer at this point some remarks concerning the directions in which it might further proceed. Undoubtedly, the most pressing desideratum is the publication of the considerable quantity of manuscript material in the German Turfan collection which remains unpublished (and to some of which allusion was made above). Moreover, an effort should be made to identify as many of the texts as possible with the specific Buddhist texts from which they are translated. In addition to the various items listed above under II, there are several texts of considerable length in the Pelliot collection (especially P9) which have never been identified with the Buddhist texts from which they are translated (Benveniste 1940B, 118-29, 137-41, 145-7, and 151-2). Even in cases where such identifications cannot be made, an effort should be made to find parallel passages which correspond as closely as possible and supply some philological control for the proper interpretation of the Sogdian text. Having collected as much of this information as possible, a careful scrutiny should be made of the various texts as reflections of their prototypes for the compilation of an accurate description of the Buddhist Sogdian translation language, and, in turn, a grammatical description of Buddhist Sogdian. Such a grammatical description should emphasize the narrower scope of a translation language to render Chinese Buddhist literature into Sogdian and not the wider scope of the relation of Buddhist Sogdian to other Sogdian material. The progress in this direction begun by Weller

(Weller 1935, 1936, 1936-8, and 1937) has been continued by MacKenzie (MacKenzie 1971).

Some remarks should now be made concerning the important ramification of the study of the Sogdian Buddhist community and their literature for various subjects of wider scope. First of all, the degree to which the literature of the Buddhist Sogdians reflects the contemporaneous literature, interests, and pre-occupations of the Chinese Buddhist community has been discussed above. Consequently, it is only natural to view the Buddhist Sogdian literary remains as a mirror of some characteristic aspects of Chinese Buddhist literature in this period. In particular, although a substantial number of Buddhist Sogdian texts have been identified with specific Chinese texts, the existence of a large number of texts not so identified is indicative of the unsettled condition of the Chinese canon in this period. In effect, every Sogdian text which must go without a specific textual identification must receive an explanatory note in any comprehensive study of the history and development of the Chinese Tripitaka. Such a study must provide some explanation of what these texts are, from whence they have come into existence, and what their exact relation to the Chinese canon, if any, may be.

Finally, the roles of the Buddhist Sogdian community in three particular historical processes merit further investigation. One such process was the interaction of the Buddhist community with the Manicheans and the introduction of some Buddhist concepts, motifs, and terms into the Manichean literature of Central Asia and China. The subject of Buddhist-Manichean interaction in Central Asia in the sphere of tech-

nical terminology was explored by Gauthiot in an article of 1911 (Gauthiot 1911B). Subsequently, no systematic study of this subject has appeared. Of particular interest in this regard is the Manichean Chinese material both as an example of Buddhist influence on Manichean literature and as a reflection of Central Asian Iranian Manichean literature (see most recently Forte 1973, which includes extensive bibliographical information, and, for the Manichean Chinese literature as a reflection of its Central Asian background, Haloun-Henning 1952). The role which the Buddhist Sogdian community may have had in this process, particularly in providing the necessary terminology to express the Buddhist concepts and motifs introduced, would be worth investigation. A second process was the diffusion of various stories and story motifs through Central Asia. The activities of the Sogdians in this sphere are well-documented by various Sogdian tales, a selection of which were published by Henning (Henning 1943-6A). Considering the intimate contact of the Buddhist Sogdian community with the Chinese Buddhists, it is only natural to expect them to have become familiar with and to have assimilated a certain amount of literature of the *pien-wên* 變文 variety (for a brief description of which see Ch'en 1964, 287-9), the character of which bears some resemblance to the extant Sogdian stories. Consequently, the Buddhist Sogdians may have formed a link in the diffusion of this sort of literature through Central Asia. The third process was the transmission of various Buddhist concepts and motifs to the Near East. A case in point is the story of *Bilauhar* and *Būdāsaf*, of which three Manichean Persian verse fragments survive (Henning 1962, 91-8). If one

supposes that the Iranian Manichean community in Central Asia (which was primarily composed of Sogdians) was instrumental in the transmission of the story to the Near East, it is only natural to suspect that the Buddhist Sogdians may have been the context from which the story developed, as they would have been the primary community of Buddhists with which the Manichean Sogdians would have had contacts.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Benveniste 1928 Benveniste, E. "Notes on Manuscript Remains in Sogdian." In *Innermost Asia*, vol. 2, Appendix H, p. 1031. By Sir Aurel Stein. Oxford, 1928.
- Benveniste 1933A ----- . "Notes sur le fragment sogdien du *Buddhadhyānasamādhisāgarasūtra*." *JA* 223 (1933): 193-248.
- Benveniste 1933B ----- . "Notes sur les textes sogdiens bouddhiques du British Museum." *JRAS* (1933): 29-68.
- Benveniste 1936 ----- . "Notes parthes et sogdiennes." *JA* 228 (1936): 193-239.
- Benveniste 1938 ----- . "Notes sogdiennes." *BSOS* 9 (1938): 495-519.
- Benveniste 1939 ----- . "Notules sogdiennes." *JA* 231 (1939): 275-7.
- Benveniste 1940A ----- . *Codices Sogdiani*. Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Majoris, 3. Copenhagen, 1940.
- Benveniste 1940B ----- . *Textes sogdiens*. Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: Série in-Quarto, 3. Paris, 1940.
- Benveniste 1946 ----- . *Vessantara Jātaka*. Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: Série in-Quarto, 4. Paris, 1946.
- Benveniste 1951 ----- . "Notes sogdiennes." *JA* 239 (1951): 113-25.
- Boyce 1960 Boyce, M. *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*. Berlin, 1960. pp. ix-xxxii.
- Ch'en 1952 Ch'en, K. "Anti-Buddhist Propaganda during the Nan-ch'ao." *HJAS* 15 (1952): 166-92.
- Ch'en 1964 ----- . *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey*. Princeton, 1964. pp. 138-

42, 287-9.

- Emmerick 1969 Emmerick, R. E. "'Old Age' in Sogdian." In *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblata*, vol. 1, pp. 131-7. Rome, 1969.
- Forte 1973 Forte, A. "Deux études sur le Manichéisme chinois." *TP* 59 (1973): 220-53.
- Gauthiot 1911A Gauthiot, R. "De l'alphabet sogdien." *JA* 17 (1911): 81-95.
- Gauthiot 1911B ----- . "Quelques termes techniques bouddhiques et manichéens." *JA* 18 (1911): 49-67.
- Gauthiot 1911-2A ----- . "À propos des dix premiers noms de nombre en sogdien bouddhique." *MSL* 17 (1911-2): 137-61.
- Gauthiot 1911-2B ----- . "Le Sūtra du religieux ongles-longs." *MSL* 17 (1911-2): 357-67.
- Gauthiot 1912 ----- . "Une version sogdienne du Vessantara Jātaka." *JA* 19 (1912): 163-93 and 429-510.
- Gauthiot-Benveniste 1914-29 ----- and E. Benveniste. *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*. Première partie: *Phonétique*. Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: Série petit in-Octavo, 1. Paris, 1914-23. Deuxième partie: *Morphologie, syntaxe et glossaire*. Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: Série petit in-Octavo, 3. Paris, 1929.
- Gauthiot-Pelliot 1920-8 ----- and P. Pelliot. *Le Sūtra des Causes et des Effets du Bien et du Mal*. Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: Série in-Quarto, 2. Paris, 1920-8.
- Gershevitch 1942 Gershevitch, I. "On the Sogdian Vessantara Jātaka." *JRAS* (1942): 97-101.
- Gershevitch 1945 ----- . "Sogdian Compounds." *TPS* (1945): 137-49.
- Gershevitch 1961 ----- . *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford, 1961.

- Gershevitch 1962 ----- "The Sogdian Word for 'Advice', and Some Muy Documents." *CAJ* 7,2 (1962): 77-95.
- Grapow 1950 Grapow, H. *Die Begründung der Orientalischen Kommission von 1912*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Vorträge und Schriften, Heft 40 (1950). Berlin, 1950.
- Grünwedel 1906 Grünwedel, A. *Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten in Idikutschari und Umgebung im Winter 1902-03*. Abhandlungen der königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, I. Kl., 24. Bd., I. Abt. (1906). Munich, 1906.
- Haloun-Henning 1952 Haloun, G. and W. B. Henning. "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light." *AM N.S.* 3,2 (1952): 184-212.
- Hansen 1940 Hansen, O. "Tocharisch-iranische Beziehungen." *ZDMG* 94 (1940): 139-64.
- Hansen 1968 ----- "Die buddhistische und christliche Literatur." In *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, I. Abt., IV. Bd., 2. Abschn., Lfg. 1: *Iranistik: Literatur*, pp. 77-99. Edited by B. Spuler. Leiden, 1968.
- Henning 1937 Henning, W. B. *Ein Manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Nr. 10 (1936). Berlin, 1937.
- Henning 1940 ----- *Sogdica*. London, 1940. pp. 59-62.
- Henning 1943-6A ----- "Sogdian Tales." *BSOAS* 11 (1943-6): 465-87.
- Henning 1943-6B ----- "The Sogdian Texts of Paris." *BSOAS* 11 (1943-6): 713-40.
- Henning 1958 ----- "Mitteliranisch." In *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, I. Abt., IV. Bd., 1. Abschn.: *Iranistik: Linguistik*, pp. 20-139. Edited by B. Spuler. Leiden, 1958.

- Henning
1962 -----. "Persian Poetical Manuscripts from the Time of Rūdakī." In *A Locust's Leg: Studies in Honour of S. H. Taqizadeh*, pp. 89-104. Edited by W. B. Henning and E. Yarshater. London, 1962.
- Humbach
1972A Humbach, H. "Zu einer Neuausgabe des sogdischen Sūtra von den Ursachen und Wirkungen der Handlungen." *MSS* 30 (1972): 39-46.
- Humbach
1972B -----. Review of *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*, by D. N. MacKenzie. *ZDMG* 122 (1972): 389-90.
- de Jong
1973 de Jong, J. W. Review of *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*, by D. N. MacKenzie. *IIJ* 15,1 (1973): 74-5.
- de La Vallée
Poussin-Gauthiot
1912 de La Vallée Poussin, L. and R. Gauthiot. "Fragment final de la Nilakanthadharani en Brahmi et en transcription sogdienne." *JRAS* (1912): 629-45.
- v. Le Coq
1926 von Le Coq, A. *Auf Hellas Spuren in Ost-turkistan*. Leipzig, 1926. reprint ed., Graz, 1974.
- Lentz
1927-32 Lentz, W. Review of *Le Sūtra des Causes et des Effets du Bien et du Mal*, by R. Gauthiot and P. Pelliot, Parts 1 and 2. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (1927, 50. Heft): 2445-9 and (1932, 36. Heft): 1688-91.
- Lentz
1956 -----. "Fünfzig Jahre Arbeit an den iranischen Handschriften der deutschen Turfan-Sammlung." *ZDMG* 106 (1956): *3*-
22.
- MacKenzie
1970 MacKenzie, D. N. *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*. London Oriental Series, 22. London, 1970.
- MacKenzie
1971 -----. "Buddhist Terminology in Sogdian: A Glossary." *AM N.S.* 17,1 (1971): 28-89.

- MacKenzie
1976 ----- . *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*. Acta Iranica, 10. Tehran-Liège, 1976.
- Meyer
1923 Meyer, E. "Bericht über die Orientalische Kommission." *SPAW*, phil.-hist.Kl.(1923): xxviii-xxxv.
- Müller
1926 Müller, F. W. K. "Reste einer soghdischen Übersetzung des *Padmacintāmaṇidhāraṇī-sūtra*." *SPAW*, phil.-hist. Kl. (1926): 2-6.
- Müller-Lentz
1934 ----- and W. Lentz. "Soghdische Texte II." *SPAW*, phil.-hist. Kl. (1934): 504-607.
- Orientalische
Kommission
1939-42 "Orientalische Kommission: Bericht Lüders." *JPAW* (1939): 68, (1940): 65, (1941): 63, 101, (1942): 64-6.
- Pelliot
1903 Pelliot, P. "Le Bhaiṣajyaguru." *BEFEO* (1903): 33-7.
- Pelliot
1910 ----- . "Rapport de M. Paul Pelliot sur sa Mission au Turkestan chinois (1906-1909)." *CRAI* (1910): 58-68.
- Pelliot
1911 ----- . "Un bilingue sogdien-chinois." In *Mélanges d'Indianisme offerts par ses élèves à M. Sylvain Lévi*, pp. 329-31. Paris, 1911.
- Reichelt
1926 Reichelt, H. "Soghdisches." *ZII* 4 (1926): 239-50.
- Reichelt
1928A ----- . *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*. I. Teil: *Die buddhistischen Texte*. Heidelberg, 1928.
- Reichelt
1928B ----- . "Soghdisches II." *ZII* 6 (1928): 206-14.
- Reichelt
1929 ----- . "Soghdisches III." *ZII* 7 (1929): 140-51.
- Reichelt
1931 ----- . *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*. II. Teil: *Die nicht-buddhistischen Texte*. Heidelberg, 1931.

- Rosenberg
1918-20 Rosenberg, F. "Deux fragments sogdiens bouddhiques du Ts'ien-fo-tong de Touen-houang." *Izvestia AN* (1918): 817-42, (1920): 399-420, 455-74.
- Rosenberg
1929 ----- Review of *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*. I. Teil: *Die buddhistischen Texte*, by H. Reichelt. *OLZ* (1929, 3): 194-201.
- Rosenberg
1931 ----- "Notes sogdiennes." *Izvestia AN* (1931): 627-35.
- Rosenberg
1932 ----- "Zu Reichelts Ausgabe der soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums. II." *OLZ* (1932, 12): 758-63.
- Schwartz
1971 Schwartz, W. Review of *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*, by D. N. MacKenzie. *BSOAS* 34 (1971): 411-5.
- Sims-Williams
1972 Sims-Williams, N. "A Sogdian Ideogram." *BSOAS* 35,3 (1972): 614-5.
- Sims-Williams
1975 ----- "Notes on Sogdian Paleography." *BSOAS* 38,1 (1975): 132-9.
- Sims-Williams
1976 ----- "The Sogdian Fragments of the British Library." *IJJ* 18 (1976): 43-82.
- Stein
1933 Stein, A. *On Ancient Central-Asian Tracks*. London, 1933. reprint ed. Chicago, 1964.
- Sundermann
1974 Sundermann, W. Review of *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*, by D. N. MacKenzie. *OLZ* 69 (1974, 11/12): 581-5.
- Utz
1976 Utz, D. A. *An Unpublished Sogdian Version of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra in the German Turfan Collection*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass., 1976.
- Weber
1972 Weber, D. "Zur sogdischen Personennamengebung." *IF* 77 (1972): 191-208.
- Weber
1975 ----- "Sogdische Miszellen." *IF* 80 (1975): 90-7.

- Weller 1935 Weller, F. "Bemerkungen zum soghdischen *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*." *AM* 10 (1935): 314-64.
- Weller 1936 ----- "Bemerkungen zur soghdischen *Vajracchedikā*." *AO* 14 (1936): 112-46.
- Weller 1936-8 ----- "Bemerkungen zum soghdischen Dhyāna-Texte." *Mon. Ser.* 2 (1936-7): 341-404 and 3 (1938): 78-129.
- Weller 1937 ----- *Zum soghdischen Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. 22, Nr. 6 (1937). Leipzig, 1937.

*

List of Abbreviations for Periodicals

AM	Asia Maior
AO	Acta Orientalia (Leiden-Copenhagen)
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'école française d'Extrême-Orient
BSO(A)S	Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies
CAJ	Central Asiatic Journal
CRAI	Comptes-rendus des séances de l'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres
HJAS	Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies
IF	Indogermanische Forschungen
IIJ	Indo-Iranian Journal
Izvestiia AN	Izvestiia Akademii Nauk SSSR
JA	Journal Asiatique
JPAW	Jahrbuch der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
Mon. Ser.	Monumenta Serica
MSL	Mélanges de la société linguistique de Paris
MSS	Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft

OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
TP	T'oung pao
TPS	Transactions of the Philological Society
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZII	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik

DAVID ANTHONY UTZ (1947-)

Studied Art History and Archaeology at the University of Missouri, Columbia; Iranian Philology at Harvard University and the University of Hamburg:

B.A. (Missouri 1968), M.A. (Harvard 1973), and Ph.D. (Harvard 1976).

Teaching Assistant in Classical Armenian at Harvard University (Summer 1972); Research Assistant in Iranian Studies at the University of Hamburg (1973-75); Assistant Editor of the *Encyclopaedia Persica* (1976-); Visiting Scholar in Middle Eastern Languages and Cultures at Columbia University, New York (1976-78); Visiting Research Fellow at the Reiyukai Library, Tokyo (1978).

Publications: *apud passim* Robert W. Thomson, *An Introduction to Classical Armenian* (Delmar, New York, 1975).

ERRATA AND ADDENDA

page 3, lines 8-9: and by F. Rosenberg 1931), should read: and by
F. Rosenberg(Rosenberg 1931),

page 4, line 13: Weller 1935, should read: Weller 1935A, 1935B,

page 4, line 28: four should read: five

page 4, line 29: after Sogdian versions of, insert: the *Dīrghanakha-*
sūtra(Gauthiot 1911-2B),

page 10, line 15: [? pws](k') should read: [? pwst](k')

page 11, line 5: *tānāmadhāranī* should read: *tānāmadhāranī*

page 13, line 4: (see above) should read: (see below)

page 15, line 1: Weller 1935, should read: Weller 1935A, 1935B,

page 15, line 4: ramification should read: ramifications

page 23, line 14: Schwartz, W. should read: Schwartz, M.

page 23, lines 37-8: after Weber 1975, insert as an additional biblio-
graphical entry:

Weller Weller, F. "Bemerkungen zum soghdischen *Dīrghanakha-*
1935A *sūtra*." *AM* 10(1935): 221-8.

page 24, lines 1-2: Weller should read: Weller and Weller, F. should
 1935 1935B
read: -----.

page 24, line 14: Asia Maior should read: Asia Major

page 24, line 20: scéances should read: séances

page 25, line 4: pao should read: Pao