A ZOROASTRIAN PROPER NAME FROM THE *MAN'YŌSHŪ*

(PAHLAVICA X)

Rev. GIKYŌ ITŌ*

To the revered memory of Awestād Hisataka Omodaka

This paper advances a new interpretation of the two poems Nos. 160 and 161 of the *Man'yōshū* (萬葉集)[1] to detect not a few Zoroastrian elements as well as a Zoroastrian proper name **Mąθra-dahma-*, so that the paper treats, for a greater part, of the ancient Japanese language, because without it Iranistic conclusion cannot be deduced.

The two poems with their Prefatory Remark (hereafter: Preface) are as follows:

> A certain record tells: Two poems by Her Majesty, the Ex-Empress when the Emperor died. (Preface, translated)
>
> *moyuru* (燃) *Fï* (火) *mo* (物) *törite* (取而) *tutumite* (裹而) *Fukuro* (福路) *ni Fa* (庭) *irutö* (入澄) *iFazuya* (不言八) *meni-siru-da-kumo* (面智男雲). (No. 160)
>
> *kitayama* (向南山) *ni tanabiku* (陳) *kumo* (雲) *nö* (之) *aokumo* (青雲) *nö* (之) *Fosi* (星) *Fanareyuki* (離去) *tuki* (月) *wo* (矣) *Fanarete* (離而). (No. 161)

Words list of the poem No. 160:

1. *Fa, joshi,** see p. 4. (*ni Fa* [庭])
2. *Fï* (火),** n. 'fire'.
3. *Fukuro* (福路), n. 'bag', representing also '*farrah/xwarrah* 'splendour''.
4. *iFa* (言), an inflexional form of *iFu*, v. '(to) say'.
5. *iru* (入), v. '(to) put (in)'.
6. *meni-siru-da-kumo* (面智男雲) reproduces, according to me, Avestan **Mąθra-dahma-*; see p. 7 ff.
7. *mo* (物), *joshi*, 'too, also, even'.
8. *moyuru* (燃), participial adjective 'blazing, flaming, burning', an

---

* Professor emeritus of Kyoto University.

inflexional form of *moyu*, v. '(to) burn'.

9. *ni*, *joshi*, 'in'. (*ni* Fa [庭])
10. *te* (而)[2], *joshi* (conjunctive), 'and'.
11. *tö* (澄), *joshi*, 'so, thus, that (conj.)'; see p. 8.
12. *töri* (取), an inflexional form of *töru*, v. '(to) take, snatch'.
13. *tutumi* (裹), an inflexional form of *tutumu*, v. '(to) wrap'.
14. *ya* (八), *joshi* of rhetorical question.
15. *zu* (不), a negative auxiriary verb, 'not'.

* *joshi* (助詞) is a postpositional auxiriary word or particle of varying functions.

**Of the ancient Japanese vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, *e* and *o*, *i*, *e* and *o* had another variant represented respectively by *ï*, *ë* and *ö*, although in what articulation the differenciation lies has not been established.

In regard to the Preface, by the Emperor and the Ex-Empress are meant respectively Emperor Temmu (天武, AD 631?–686; cf. p. 10 and n. 37) and his consort (645–702). After the decease of the former, she ascended to the throne (690) as Empress Jitō (持統; cf. p. 10), but abdicated in 697 in favour of her grand son, who became Emperor Mommu (文武), and herself became the Ex-Empress. It is at this time that the Preface was composed.

The poem No. 160, with the last four Chinese characters 面智男雲 *meni-siru-da-kumo* according to my own decipherment, of which the specialists have attained no fixed reading and interpretation, means thus:

Even a blazing fire
Menisirudakumo (**Mąθra-dahma-*)
Snatches and wraps and puts in a bag —
Do they not say so?

And the poem No. 161:

May the cloud looking blue ascend higher
That is hanging over the north mountain-range,
Passing the stars, passing the moon
And up to the highest heaven!

or

The cloud looking blue that is hanging
Over the north mountain-range
Is seen ascending higher,
Passing the stars, passing the moon and up to the highest heaven.

The parts underlined are not found in the original but submitted to the readers' interpretation. The blue cloud symbolizes the soul of the departed

Emperor or it is regarded as wrapping his soul which the poetess expects to ascend from the lower sphere of the space, higher than the stars, higher than the moon, and up to the solar sphere, though not explicitly mentioned. This anti-cosmological order is stereotypically met with in the Zoroastrian literature.[2] Scholars have emphasized the occurrence of the stars and the moon due to the impact of the Chinese literature or due to the cosmogonical knowledge maintained by Emperor Temmu and his Empress-consort, but none has noticed the unnatural order unlike that arranging the cloud, the moon and then the stars in the poem No. 1068:

On the sky. (Preface)
On the sea of heaven the waves of clouds arise,
　　And the moon's ship is seen sailing
To hide in a forest of stars.[3]

In the *Man'yōshū*, the moon is frequently referred to itself alone or in combination with other element as in this poem; but the star less frequently or rather rarely, and only in the poem No. 161 that it occurs alone, in no connection with other element. In this respect too, the poem may reasonably be traced back to a foreign or Zoroastrian source.

Now return to the poem No. 160. The mention made of a 'blazing fire' and of a bag recalls us readily to the legendary accounts of the ancient Iranian prophet Zoroaster,[4] kept respectively in the *Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg*, §17 and the *Pahlavī Rivāyat*, chapter 47, §§5–7. According to the former passage, Zoroaster, in order to prove the truth of his teaching, submitted himself to an ordeal: 'he then lifted up the blazing fire, put it in the hand of Wištāsp, and Wištāsp put it in the hand of Jāmāsp, of Spandyād and of the others which did not burn the hand of any single person (*'pas ātaxš sōzāg 'ul 'dāšt 'pad 'ān 'dast ī Wištāsp 'dād ud Wištāsp 'pad 'dast ī Jāmāsp ud Spandyād ud 'ān 'anyān 'dād 'kē 'dast ī ēč 'kas 'nē sōzīd*).'[5] According to the latter passage, Ganāg Mēnōg had secretly put human bones in the leather bag which Zoroaster carried with himself. Zoroaster perceived it from the outward looking and turned upside down the bag to counterplot the intention of the Devil who had expected to prove Zoroaster's teaching only to cause the death as indicated by the bones.[6]

As is well known, Emperor Temmu not only set up to be gifted with Fire Element according to the *Ŭm-yang wu-hsing* Theory (陰陽五行說),[7] but also was recognized by others as such. The specific reference to a fire in the poem has, as is pointed out by several specialists, a relationship with it, that is to say, by

fire Emperor Temmu is alluded to.[8] But what is more important is that here the fire is a *blazing* one. Yūkichi Takeda (武田祐吉)[9] says that an only 'fire' will suffice but the epithet '*blazing*' contributes to a more vivid description of the fire's nature. His notice however seems irrelevant to this case. In the Zoroastrian altar, the sacred fire is always kept burning and in the Zoroastrian books Ohrmazd (Ahura Mazdā) is often mentioned to have created the stars, the moon, the sun (anti-cosmologically ordered!), the *blazing* fire, the dog, the bird and five sorts of useful animals (*gōspand*).[10] Thus the poems, if I tell my conclusive interpretation in advance, are of such an implication:

> Even a blazing fire cannot resist a strength stronger than itself, so also Emperor Temmu died, unable to resist his own predestined span of life. May his soul now ascend (or His soul is now seen ascending) up to the sun station, passing the stars and then the moon — the sun station, where is located the *garōdmān*, palace or garden in which Ohrmazd abides accompanied by the Splendour (*farrah* or *xwarrah*, Av. *xᵛarənah*)!

The *farrah* or *xwarrah* is here transcribed by the phonograms 福路 *Fuku-ro* which stand for 嚢 *Fukuro* 'bag' found written after an ordinary way of writing in the poem No. 746. 福路 is therefore susceptible of two different meanings 'bag' and 'splendour' with one and the same reading *Fukuro*. The same is true of *ni Fa* (庭). *ni, joshi,* denotes here the object (*Fukuro* 'bag') to which the action *iru* '(to) put' arrives, so that *ni* functions here as a sort of locative case (*Fukuro ni* 'in a bag'). *Fa, joshi,* operates to specially emphasize on the significance of the phrase *Fukuro ni* ('in a bag') as a main theme of the predicate *iru* '(to) put'. The function of *Fa* as such may to some extent be understood, when we translate *Fukuro ni Fa iru* by 'it is in a bag that he puts (even a blazing fire)'. Such *ni* is represented, if by letter, commonly by 仁, 丹, 爾 (尓) or 二 and *Fa* by 波, 者 or 婆, whereas here in the poem No. 160, *ni Fa* is expressed by one single character 庭 *niFa* which character as ideogram means 'garden'. Such a phonographical usage of 庭 for *ni Fa* is often met with but a binary usage of 庭 both as phonogram for the *joshis ni Fa* and as ideogram, meaning 'a garden' is seen in the poem only now under consideration.

To sum up, the poetess by the employment of 福路庭 for the Japanese *Fukuro ni Fa* 'not elsewhere than in a bag' has a Zoroastrian belief implied — belief that the soul of the Emperor is fixed for the paradise (garden) where Ohrmazd abides along with the *farrah/xwarrah* 'Splendour'. That the binary usage of Chinese characters owes its chance to Iranian elements is of particular impor-

tance.

As is above shown (p. 1), the Preface ascribes the two poems to the Ex-Empress. But it will come as quite a surprise that no sadness pervades for her departed Lord, unlike in her poem No. 159 mourning bitterly for his death:

A poem by the Empress-consort when the Emperor (Temmu) died. (Preface)
Oh, the autumn foliage
Of the hill of Kamioka!*
Methinks my good Lord and Sovereign
Sees it in the evening
And asks of it in the morning.
On that very hill from afar
I gaze, praying
he may see it to-day,
Or ask of it to-morrow.
Sadness I feel at eve,
And heart-rending grief at morn —
The sleeves of my linen mournings
Are never for a moment dry.(11)

* i. e. the so-called Thunder-Hill in the village of Asuka near Nara.

Without the Preface, the poem No. 161 might be taken, not for a dirge, but for a simple description of a sight in view, just as in case of her poem No. 28:

It is likely spring has passed away
And summer is come;
Look where white clothes are spread in the sun
On the heavenly hill of Kagu (香來(12))!

In the Zoroastrianism, hard weeping for a deceased is severely prohibited as is evident from Zoroastrian books.(13) In spite of the Preface, the two poems can hardly be assigned to Empress-consort Jitō, but rather to a Zoroastrian poetess.

Now turn to the treatment of the four characters 面智男雲 (p. 1), of which no variant is found in the manuscripts. Such an attempt, therefore, to part the letter 智 into two 知 and 日, or 知 and 曰, is untenable. But some scholars(14) attempt, although tentatively, to do so and read 面知日男雲, *aɾamu ɾi wokumo* 'Oh, I long for the day when I shall meet (my Lord again)!' while others(15) 知曰男雲, *siru tö iɾa nakumo* 'Oh, they do not say to know (how I may meet my

Lord again)!'

面智男雲 is generally read *ömö siranakumo*[16] which some scholars[17] interpret: 'Oh, (it has come for me) not to know his face!' i. e. 'Oh, (it has come for me) not to see him again!' while others:[18] 'Oh, it (the emperor's death) is what is not familiar (with me)!' i. e. 'Oh, it is beyond my understanding!'

Now that 智 'n. wisdom' and 知 'v. to know; n. knowledge' have something fundamental in common as is evident from their figures and that in the *Man'yōshū* the verb *siru* '(to) know' is represented by 知, if by one single letter, the letter 智 could be read *siru* too, which reading however is not allowed to mean 'to know'. Thus, 面智 cannot be read and interpreted *ömö siru* 'whose face (面 *ömö*) I know (智 *siru*)' i. e. 'known by sight, of a familiar face', although many scholars follow it. *ömö siru* is always denoted by 面知, used for the one still living or regarded as such.[19]

In deciphering 面智男雲, most important to be noticed is that to read 男雲 *naku-mo*, in which *mo* is a *joshi* denoting an exclamation, was refuted by two scholars.[20] Masatoshi Kinoshita (木下正俊) pointed out the impossibility of an unattested reading *nakumo* in the meaning 'Oh, (there is, it is) not; Oh, ... non!' and elucidated it from a phonetic point of view thus: 男 *nam* (according to the Wu [呉] pronounciation in contrast to *dam*, Han [漢] sound) can become *na* only when it is directly followed by *m*, *b* or *p* (=our *F*) (*nam*+*m*, *b* or *p* [*F*]> *na*+*m*, *b* or *p* [*F*]). His argument was recognized by Hisataka Omodaka (澤瀉久孝) who, laying stress upon the linguistic fact that *naku-* as a noun form of the negative auxiliary verb *zu* (p. 2) is not affixed with *mo*, *joshi* of exclamation, asserted that 男 cannot be read as *kana* — more correctly *kun kana* (訓仮名), originated in the Japanese rendering (uzwārišn) of Chinese characters against *on kana* (音仮名), originated in the phonetically reading of Chinese characters — other than *wo* (*wokumo*, see p. 5; *ömö siru wo*, see p. 7). Therefore, although not a few specialists despite of the Kinoshita-Omodaka theory, are accumbent to the reading *nakumo*, there are many[21] who reasonably avoid treating of 面智男雲 or of 智男雲 by carrying the letter 面 to the preceding phrase as I have shown in n. 15. For various readings of 面智男雲, unreasonable because of their adopting *nakumo*, see Matsuo Itami (伊丹末雄), *Man'yōshū Nankunkō* (万葉集難訓考 — Studies on the difficiliora lectione in the *Man'yōshū*), Tokyo 1970, p. 135 ff.; Kōji Inaoka (稲岡耕二), *loc. cit.* (see n. 14).

From what I have dealt with in detail, the following fundamentals are acquired: (1) the four characters 面智男雲 should not be altered (p. 5 f.); (2)

面智 is not to be read *ömö siru* in the meaning 'whose face I know, of a familiar face' which is denoted by 面知. If we read 智 *siru*, the *siru* should not be the verb *siru* '(to) know' (p. 6); (3) 男雲 should not phonetically be read *nakumo*. To interpret such an irrelevant *nakumo* as 'oh ... not, oh ... non!' is itself grammatically impossible (p. 6).

Recently a new interpretation was advanced by Susumu Nakanishi (中西進).[22] He read and interpreted the four characters thus: *ömö siru wo kumo* '(My Lord has died) yet (男 *wo*) in vision lies near (智 *siru*, lit. 'I know') his figure (面 *ömö*, lit. 'face'). May clouds (雲 *kumo*) (stay here, wrapping his soul)!' His reading is exempt from *nakumo* but not from *ömö siru*. According to him[23] moreover the miracles performed with a burning fire are plans for prolonging the life of Emperor Temmu fallen into a dangerous condition. A Zoroastrian was submitted to the plans but to no effect, so he says. The proposition however should be ruled out, because the Zoroastrians are satisfied with death as predestined and submitted to no such plans by fire, but pray for the soul's ascending to the paradise as is evident from the *Aogəmadaēčā*.

In spite of the varying treatments of 面智男雲, the poem No. 160 has commonly been regarded as a dirge complaining of no means, disregarding the wondrous miracles with a blazing fire, to bring the departed emperor to life and to see him again. Fundamentally however differs my understanding. In my eyes the poem is not a dirge in the truest acceptance of the term as I have pointed out above (p. 4).

面智男雲, which has thus rejected every attempt to read it as Japanese lexique, is to be read *meni-siru-da-kumo* representing a Western Middle Iranian proper name **Măns(a)r-dahm* or **Măns*ər*-dahm* to be traced back to Old Iranian **Manθra-dahma-*, Avestan **Mąθra-dahma-* '*manθra*-ductus, one well versed in *manθra-* (*manθra-*/*mąθra-* 'sacred words, logos; spell'=Skt. *mantra-*). The phonetic change *ă*>*e* (*me-*) may be due to the succeeding *nisi* with a series of palatals (note that the Iranian *s* had a palatal nuance!). The letter 面, thus far read *ömö* or *mo*, is now, according to the Chinese *mi*ɛ*n*, *meni*. In Japanese, every syllable ends in a vowel, so that *meni*, and not *men*. But the Zoroastrian poetess must have pronounced it *men*. The reproduction of the indifferent vowel (*a*)/ə ((*a*) means the insertion of *a* optional) by *i* (*si-*) is also reasonable. To read 男 *da* (<*dam*) requires explanation. In ancient Japanese, the final *ŋ* of Chinese syllabic optionally falls.[24] 男 *dam* according to the Han pronounciation (see p. 6),[25] when followed by *kumo* (雲), must have been pronounced by Iranians

like *daŋ* (*dam-kumo*>*daŋ-kumo*) which *daŋ* can in turn become *da*. It is true this ellipsis may phonetically be allowed, but the usage of the letter 男 *dam* (not *daŋ*) for *daŋ* is itself forcible, even if by 男 *dam* 'man, male' is intended to show *Mąθradahma-* male, and may rather be ascribed as a misuse to a non Japanese or an Iranian. If my proposition is right, the oft disputed problem of the character 澄 (*diəŋ*) for Japanese *tö* ('so, thus', see p. 2) may easily be solved as a like misuse by an Iranian for 登 often used as *tö*, or more reasonably for 燈 as was suggested by Prof. M. Kinoshita by his letter of June 13th, '86 who stated that the character 燈 having 火 ('fire') as the left-side radical is more suitable for the fire-worshipping Zoroastrians. And lastly but not to the least, is to be noted that as Japanese did not have *h* velar, *h* is convincingly represented by *k* (*dahm: dakumo*).

A Zoroastrian proper name **Mąθra-dahma-* I have thus unearthed from among the *Man'yōshū* poems is not found in any altiranisches Sprachgut der Haupt- oder Neben-überlieferungen; as a like form only in the former we have Av. *Mąθra-vāka-*[26] and in the latter *Manθra-* (Median) and *Manṣṣaka-/Mançaka-* (Old Persian).[27]

The last form, as is rightly pointed out by Manfred Mayrhofer,[28] will be thought 'a short form to name like Av. *Mąθra-vāka-*', and there is no reason to take the form but last for otherwise.[29] Now it is interesting that our *Man'yōshū* supplies another like full form **Mąθra-dahma-*. The reason of its having escaped the Avesta can be explained in some ways. The Sacred Book now extant is said only one third or fourth of the Sasanid Avesta which might have incorporated the name **Mąθra-dahma-* with his miracles — miracles to be taken rather as an ordeal like that of the molten metal to which Ādurbād ī Māraspandān is reported to have submitted himself.[30] Or, in the Zoroastrian community too, a short form like Median **Manθra-* must have been prevailing. He, *Mąθra-dahma-*, must have attained high popularity by his miracles to have his name prevailed under a short form **Mąθra*, which at the time of compilation must have been confused with a common noun *mąθra-* to miss the chance to be taken up as proper name. The poem No. 160 should be so interpreted as I have put forward on p. 2 (see also p. 4). At all events my interpretation of 面智男雲 as a Zoroastrian proper name **Mąθra-dahma-* is an innovation through the decipherment history of over 700 years.

Although in Yasna 45: 3[31] Zoroaster styles himself one speaking *mąθra-*, *Mąθra-vāka-* of the same meaning is not Zoroaster himself. This fact may further be reinforced with Yasna 31: 6[32] where Zoroaster wishes the best thing to one

who as one knowing (*vīdvāh-*) shall proclaim the true *mąθra-* for him — a witness to the fact that there were those who as knowing the *mąθra-* could speak it. The same is true of **Mąθra-dahma-*. In Yasna 43: 11[33] Zoroaster says: "... when I was first taught by you both (i. e. Ahura Mazdā and Vohu Manah) with (your) words (... *hyaṭ xšmā uxδāiš dīdaiŋhē paourvīm*)", that is to say, he expresses himself as it were one well versed in *mąθra-*; but **Mąθra-dahma-* of the same meaning is not necessarily Zoroaster himself, because in Yasna 31: 6 above cited Zoroaster refers to those who know the *mąθra-* so as to be capable of proclaiming it. *vīdvāh-* 'knowing' is a conception very close to *dahma-* 'well versed in (*mąθra-*)' — *dahma-*, a self-styled epithet of Zoroaster in Yasna 32: 16.[34]

From many Zoroastrian elements I have detected lurking in the two poems, ① the miracles performed with a blazing fire and with a bag, ② a proper name **Mąθra-dahma-*, ③ specific employment of the characters 福路庭 (as ideograms meaning also 'paradise where is situated the *farrah/xwarrah* 'Splendour'') instead of an ordinary writing 囊尔波 for instance (see p. 4), ④ anti-cosmological treatment (p. 2 f.) and ⑤ deficiency of lamentation for the departed emperor (p. 5), I propose that the poems were composed not by the Empress-consort Jitō though ascribed to her in the Preface, but by a Zoroastrian poetess as I have mentioned above (p. 5). Who then is the Zoroastrian poetess?

In my article 'Zoroastrians' arrival in Japan (Pahlavica I)'[35] and others,[36] I have made in relief some historical data that *Dārāy*, the *shāh* of Tuxwārestān, from the capital *Kunduz* (乾豆) came over to Japan (AD 654) accompanied by his daughter whom the Chronicle *Nihonshoki* (日本書紀) refers to as 'shāh's daughter (舍衛女)' and subjects of men and women; that afterwards (659) he got married with her (kin-marriage, *xwēdūdah*!), but he left Japan (660), leaving the conceived daughter-wife behind who bore him a daughter, named *Dārāy-duxt(ag)* (堕羅女, 'Dārāy's daughter') in 661; that no information about him thereafter is found in any material; and that *Dārāy-duxt(ag)* accompanying her mother called at the Palace of Emperor Temmu on the New Year Day, 675, to make offering of some things strange and curious. Eleven years later the Emperor died in 686, aged 56.[37] At that time, *Dārāy-duxt(ag)* was aged 26 and her mother probably in the middle of the fortieth. Born in the then cultural centre Yamato, the former attained her majority there, and the latter, who had come over to Japan early in her teens, stayed there over two decades of years. Their being unaccustomed to the Japanese language with the various ways of writing through the Chinese characters is far from reasoning. To some extent

they must have mastered details in this field. When I assign the two poems to a Zoroastrian, to whom shall I do so other than to them both, although either of them is alternatively undecided? In the poem No. 161, the author-poetess by the stars and the moon represents herself and the other one.

At first I wondered the poems were composed by the shāh's daughter, the mother of *Dārāy-duxt(ag)*, upon receipt of an information about the death of her father-husband *Dārāy*. The only thing that restrained me from it was the very Preface denoting the poems as a dirge for Emperor Temmu.

The Emperor was a brave and gifted ruler by whom was initiated the work of compiling a national history that culminated in the completion of the *Kojiki* (古事記) and the *Nihonshoki* in the Nara Period (710–784). His Empress-consort Jitō was not the only one with whom he as susceptible to female charms had liaison. He was an admirer of, and admired by, the fair sex. It is not strange, even if we suppose that there were such a delicate feeling between him and the two foreign ladies from a distinguished family as to exchange tender-hearted words or poems. In fact the flower-like beauty of Iranian ladies captivated the Chinese poets and writers who admired them blue-eyed and curly-haired having light complexion and a prominent nose. The audience the mother and daughter were granted by the Emperor could not have occurred only once, as I have just mentioned. It is quite natural that to the departed Emperor poems were dedicated by them — now preferably by *Dārāy-duxt(ag)*, because not to *Dārāy* — poems, offering benediction for his soul.

What have been thus far dwelt upon are based on the assumption that *Meni-siru-da-kumo* lived and acted in Ancient Iran. And otherwise if he is assumed himself to have come over to Japan together with the Iranians from Tuxwārestān, there is no need to deny the identity of him with the ancient Iranian prophet Zoroaster. But if a man of Zoroastrian characteristic as he is, although fairly uncertain of his priesthood, had arrived, in what way is to be interpreted the silence of the *Nihonshoki* on his name?

Be that as it may, the *Man'yōshū* has thus handed down to this day a Zoroastrian proper name **Mąθra-dahma-* unattested elsewhere which, along with Yasna 43: 11, may justify my proposition to interpret *dahma-* in Yasna 32: 16 as 'one well versed in *mąθra-*'.[38] And if so, Middle Iranian *dahm* 'virtuous, pious; a full member of the Mazdean community, initiate' may be said what such a *dahma-* has arrived at through the natural course of its semantic development.

Last of all, not to be escaped is that the two poems bear indisputable evidence of the arrival not only of Zoroastrians but also of the Zoroastrianism itself, and that our *Man'yōshū* makes evident the *Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg* of disputed authenticity still incorporating older and trustworthy material.

Notes

(1) The *Man'yōshū*, the oldest collection of ancient Japanese poems, came into being some time during the later Nara Period — the latter half of the 8th century. In it all the poems are written in the Chinese characters, used as ideogram to be '*uzwarized*' into Japanese (i. e. to be read with Japanese equivalent), or as phonogram, or in playful usage, so that not a few words or passages have undergone no fixed decipherment.

(2) Bundahišn TD_1 28:8–13=TD_2 32:12–33:2 where the six stations of the sky and the Endless Light are mentioned thus: ① the Cloud Station, ② the Sphere of the Constellations, ③ the Unmixable Stars, ④ the 'Best Existence' — the Moon is on this station —, ⑤ Garōdmān called Endless Light — the Sun is on this station —, ⑥ the Throne of the *Amәša Spәntas*, and ⑦ the Endless Light, the Throne of Ohrmazd. In spite of the forced establishment of seven factors, an ascending order of the cloud station, the star station, the moon station and the sun station is to be recognized. It is interesting to notice that the righteous soul is said to ascend with the first step up to the star-station, with the second up to the moon-station and with the third and last up to the sun-station where is situated the shining *garōdmān* 'palace' (Bundahišn TD_1 174:6–13=TD_2 203:10–204:1). See also below n. 10.

(3) The poem by the famous poet Kakinomoto no Hitomaro (柿本人麻呂, born in the reign of Emperor Kōtoku [孝徳, 645–654] or of Empress Saimei [斉明, 655–661] and died before 710). English translation is cited from *THE MANYŌSHŪ. One Thousand Poems, Selected and Translated from the Japanese....* Published for the NIPPON GAKUJUTSU SHINKŌKAI, by the Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo 1940, p. 52.

(4) On the meaning of the name 'Zoroaster / *Zaraθuštra-*', see my articles 'Pahlavica IX. On the name *Zoroaster* — An Eastern Access to *Zaraθuštra* —', Misumi 1984, and 'Myōsenjishō "Zoroaster" — Tōhō kara no approach — (名詮自性「ゾロアスター」— 東方からのアプローチ —)', *Oriento, Bulletin of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan*, Vol. XXIX, No. 1 (1986), pp. 17–31 (this srticle is an edition somewhat augmented of the preceding one. In it may be found my latest interpretation of the Ahunawar Confession as well as my etymological treatment of OIr. *dahyu-* / OInd. *dásyu-*).

(5) Marijan Molé, *La légende de Zoroastre selon les textes Pehlevis*, Paris 1967, pp. 132–133; Gikyō Itō, *Zoroaster Kenkyū*, Tokyo 1980², p. 167.

(6) Molé, *op. cit.*, p. 116f.; Itō, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

(7) The ancient Chineses thought the physical universe composed by five elements (五行, *wu-hsing*), wood, fire, earth, metal and water of which the first two belong to the *yang* (陽, active) cosmic force, the last two to the *ŭm* (陰, passive) and the middle to intermediate or neutral. The thought explains the universal phenomena by the rise and fall of these factors — the so-called Ŭm-yang Five Elment-Theory which is extended to explain the vicissitude of dynasties according to the revolution of these five elements*1. Japan was strongly influenced by the theory during the Hakuhō (白鳳) Period (645–710) and the Imperial throne was characterized by the rotation of these element natures, such as Emperor Kōtoku (see n. 3) was regarded as sovereign gifted with Water Nature,*2 Emperor Tenji (天智, who reigned 662–671; see n. 37) with Wood Nature, Emperor Temmu (天武, idem 673–686) with Fire Nature and Empress Jitō (持統, idem 690–697) with Earth Nature. See Yūko Yoshino (吉野裕子), 'Jotei Jitō no jujutsu (女帝持統の呪術 — On the conjuration of Empress Jitō)', *The Daihōrin* (大法輪),

Vol. 53, No. 8 (August '86), pp. 22–31.

*1 The revolution or rotation may be explained thus: the wood kindled emits fire, fire burnt out becomes earth, from earth is produced metal, from among metals comes out the water, the water nourishes the wood, ...

*2 The following sovereign, Empress Saimei (see n. 3) is excluded, because Empress Kōgyoku (皇極) was enthroned again as Empress Saimei.

(8) Chieko Kimura (木村千恵子), 'Temmu Tennō Banka "moyuru hi (*ғī*) mo" no uta ni tsuite no shian (天武天皇挽歌「燃ゆる火も」の歌についての試案 — A tentative interpretation of the dirge for Emperor Temmu, beginning with "Even a blazing fire"),' a paper read at the Congress of the Jōdai Bungaku-kai (上代文学会) held in May 1983 but written as the Master's thesis in the early of the same year (cf. *The Seijō Kokubun* [成城国文], No. 7 [1984], p. 85). Later on, the paper was fundamentally improved by my advice, although in some respects showing her own understanding and interpretation different from those of mine.

(9) Y. Takeda, *Zōtei Man'yōshū Zenchūshaku*, Part 3 (増訂萬葉集全註釋, 三), Tokyo 1956, p. 461.

(10) 'The red blazing fire (*āta(x)š suxr sōzāg*)' is often met with. '... the stars and the moon and the sun and the red blazing fire, the dog and the bird and the useful animals of five sorts (and) other good creatures (which are) Ohrmazd's own (... *star ud māh ud xwaršēd ud ātaš suxr sōzāg 'sag ud way gōspand ī panǰ ēwēnag abārīg 'weh dahišnān Ohrmazd xwēš*)' (*Petīt ī pašēmānīh*, Bamanji Nasarvanji Dhabhar (ed. by —), *Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk*, Bombay 1927, p. 59); 'I (Ohrmazd) created, O Spitama Zaraθuštra, the stars, the moon and the sun, the red blazing fire and the dog and the bird and the useful animals of five sorts. ... (*mən dāţ Spitama Zaraθuštra star māh u xurəšəţ ātaš suhur i soǰā u sag u vaē u gōspənd panǰ āēna...*)' (*Aogəmadeēčā*, § 30).

(11) Cf. *THE MANYŌSHŪ* (see n. 3), p. 18.

(12) Cf. *THE MANYŌSHŪ*, p. 17 f.

(13) Cf. Yasna 71:17 which is a Zoroastrian Confession to resist *xšī-* 'lament' and *amayavā-* 'lamentation'. Dēnkard ed. Madan, 810:13-15, mentions that Jam kept away from the world *šēwan* 'lament' and *mōy* 'lamentation'. In his Memoirs, Ardā Wīrāb reports distress and damage suffered by the deceased's soul because of the *šēwan* and *mōyag* (=*mōy*) the survivors made for him (her) (XVI, 2–7; LVII, 1–3. See Philippe Gignoux, *Le Livre d'Ardā Vīrāz*, Paris 1984, pp. 170–171, p. 193; Fereydun Vahman, *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag*, London and Malmo 1986, p. 200, p. 207).

(14) Hisataka Omodaka (澤瀉久孝), *Man'yōshū Chūshaku*, Book II (萬葉集注釋, 巻第二), Tokyo 1958, pp. 245–252, followed by Kōji Inaoka (稲岡耕二), *Man'yōshū Zenchū*, Book II (萬葉集全注, 巻二), Tokyo 1985, pp. 241–243. 面 means 'face' and 知 '(to) know', but Omodaka read 面知 *aғamu* 'I shall meet', resting on Moribe Tachibana (橘 守部, 1781–1849), *Man'yōshū Hinotsumade* (萬葉集檜嬬手). 日 *ғi* 'day'; 男雲 he read *wo-kumo* i. e. *woku-mo* 'I would like to make (the day) draw near'. Note that Japanese verb has no grammatical person and number. Cf. also n. 19.

(15) Umetomo Saeki (佐伯梅友) + Tomoo Fujimori (藤森朋夫) + Shōji Ishii (石井庄司) (collated and commented by —), *Shintei Man'yōshū*, Part I (新訂萬葉集, —), Tokyo 1973, p. 118, wherein the initial letter 面 of the 面智男雲 (智 parted into 知曰) is carried to the preceding phrase and 不言八面 is read and interpreted thus: *iғazuyamo* (面, *mo*) (see above p. 1) 'Oh, do they not say (so)?' 知 *siru* '(to) know'; 曰 *iғa* '(to) say'; 不 *zu* 'not'; 男雲 *na-kumo* i.e. *naku-mo* '?Oh, not'. *tö* 'so, thus' is here represented by no letter. As for the impossibility of the reading *naku-mo*, see p. 6 and n. 20.

(16) In this reading, 面 *ömö* 'face'; 智 *sira*, taken as an inflexional form of the verb *siru* '(to) know'; for 男雲 *naku-mo*, see n. 15.

(17) Ichinosuke Takagi (高木市之助) + Tomohide Gomi (五味智英) + Susumu Ōno (大野晋) (collated and commented by —), *Man'yōshū*, Part I (萬葉集, —), Tokyo 1957, p. 94 f., interpret 'Oh, I cannot do anythings with (the departed Emperor)!', in which 智 *siru* (>*sira*) is

taken for 領 *siru* '(to) treat as one wills'. But this tentative interpretation is isolated from that generally prevailing: *ömö sira naku-mo* 'Oh, (it has come for me) not to know his face!' i. e. 'Oh, (it has come for me) not to see him again!'

(18) Y. Takeda, *op. cit.*, p. 461f., followed by Mitsuru Sakurai (桜井満) (translated and commented by —), *Gendaigoyaku Taishō Man'yōshū*, Part I (現代語訳 対照 万葉集, 上), Tokyo 1974, p. 77.

(19) 面知, not to be read *aʀamu* (cf. n. 14), is twice attested: in the poem No. 3015, *ömö siru kimi* 'you (*kimi*) whose face I know (well)' and in No. 3068, *ömö siru kora* 'the dear boy (*kora*) whose face I know (well).'

(20) M. Kinoshita, 'Shinnai-imbi no shōryakusareru baai (唇内韻尾の省略される場合 — On the ellipsis of the labial final of a Chinese syllabic)', *The Man'yō* (萬葉), No. 10, January 1954, p. 25 ff.; H. Omodaka, *loc. cit.* Cf. also Noriyuki Kojima (小島憲之) + M. Kinoshita + Akihiro Satake (佐竹昭広), *Man'yōshū*, Part I (萬葉集, —), Tokyo 1961, p. 20 f.

(21) Yoshio Yamada (山田孝雄), *Man'yōshū Kōgi*, Book II (萬葉集講義, 巻第二 — Lectures on the *Man'yōshū*, Book II), Tokyo 1932, p. 259, avoids giving Japanese equivalent to 面智男雲, asserting that no reading seems to have been established and himself looking forward a better decipherment in the future. His view-point was highly estimated by M. Kinoshita, *op. cit.*, p. 31. H. Omodaka, *loc. cit.*, followed by K. Inaoka, *loc. cit.*, although he gives a tentative reading (see n. 14), must be of the same opinion. And moreover in our mind perhaps of the same opinion are N. Kojima + M. Kinoshita + A. Satake, *loc. cit.*, and Takako Aoki (青木生子) + Itaru Ide (井出 至) + Haku Itō (伊藤 博) + Katsuhiko Shimizu (清水克彦) + Shirō Hashimoto (橋本四郎), *Man'yōshū*, Part I (萬葉集, —), Tokyo 1976, pp. 122–123, although they carry the letter 面 to the preceding passage and read 不言八面 *iʀazuyamo* (cf. n. 15).

(22) S. Nakanishi, *Man'yōshū, Zen'yakuchū Genbun tsuki*, Part I (萬葉集 全訳注原文付, —), Tokyo 1978, p. 128. In his reading *ömö* (面) *siru* (智)-*wo* (男) *kumo* (雲), he took the 雲 as ideogram to be read *kumo* 'cloud' unlike all of the predecessors who had taken 雲 for phonogram denoting *kumo* (*wokumo* [n. 14], *nakumo* [nn. 15, 16, 17, 18; 20]).

(23) Seichō Matsumoto (松本清張) + Kazuo Aoki (青木和男) + S. Nakanishi + Kōichi Mori (森 浩一), 'Kodai o kenshōsuru (古代を検証する — For inspecting the antiquity)', *The Kokubungaku* (國文學), Vol. 28, No. 12 (September 1983), p. 38. The symposium was held on April 10th, 1983. Nakanishi made no reference to Zoroastrianism in his earlier work cited in n. 22, so that his reference to it in this symposium seems to rest on the Master's thesis written by Chieko Kimura in the early 83's (see n. 8), and that in his occasional interpretation of hers.

(24) M. Kinoshita, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 20), p. 25; N. Kojima + M. Kinoshita + A. Satake, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 20), p. 20. According to them, after the dropping of ŋ, there follows occasionally guttral, as in case of *da-kumo* (< *daŋ-kumo* < *dam-kumo*).

(25) The transcription of Iranian words with the Chinese character in its Han pronounciation is met with earlier in the *Nihonshoki*. In the record there, for instance, concerning the construction of the Asukadera Buddhist Temple (AD 588), we come across 貴文 *kuwi-buni* (not *kuwi-momu*) for *xumb*, meaning here 'slate, Japanese *kawara* (< Skt. *kapāla*-)' and 白加 *ʀaku-ka* (not *ʀiyaku-ka*) for *paykar* 'image (of Buddha and Bodhisattva)'.

(26) Yašt 13: 105 and 35.

(27) Walther Hinz, unter Mitarbeit von Peter Michael Berger, Günter Korbel und Annegret Nippa, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*, Wiesbaden 1975, p. 158 (**mançaka*-) and p. 159 (**manθra*-).

(28) M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana. Das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Täfelchen*, Wien 1973, **8. 949** (p. 189).

(29) Mayrhofer, *op. cit.*, **8. 950** (p. 190).

(30) Mark J. Dresden (ed. by —), *Dēnkart. A Pahlavi Text.* ..., Wiesbaden 1966, 511: 20–510: 4 = *The Complete Text of the Pahlavi Dinkard* ... under the supervision of D. M. Madan, Bombay 1911, 413: 2–8; *Ardā Wīrāb Nāmag*, I, 8–10 (ed. by Ph. Gignoux, p. 146; by Fer. Vahman,

pp. 78–79). These texts are incorpolated in H. S. Nyberg, *A Manual of Pahlavi*, I, Wiesbaden 1964, p. 109 and p. 108 respectively.

(31) Yasna 45: 3:

aṯ fravaxšyā	*aŋhāuš ahyā paourvīm*
yā mōi vīdvå	*mazdå vaočaṯ ahurō*
yōi īm vā nōiṯ	*iθā mąθrəm varəšəntī*
yaθā īm	*mānāičā vaočačā*
aēibyō aŋhāuš	*avōi aŋhaṯ apāməm*

And I (Zoroaster) will speak first (of those things) of this life,
which to me Mazdā Ahura as One knowing told.
(Those) of you who shall not carry out this sacred word (*mąθra-*)
as I both think and speak it,
the end of life shall be woe to them.
(Cf. M. W. Smith, *Studies in the Syntax of the Gathas*..., Philadelphia 1929, p. 117.) (*mąθrəm vač-* 'to speak the *mąθra-*')

(32) Yasna 31: 6:

ahmāi aŋhaṯ vahištəm	*yā mōi vīdvå vaočāṯ haiθīm*
mąθrəm yim haurvatātō	*ašahyā amərətātaṣčā*
mazdāi avaṯ xšaθrəm	*hyaṯ hōi vohū vaxšaṯ manaŋhā*

For him shall there be the best thing who as one knowing shall proclaim for me the true *mąθra-* concerning perfectness and concerning immortality arizing from the Righteousness: "That kingdom belongs to Mazdā that shall increase for Him by (our) good mind."
(*mąθrəm vač-* 'to proclaim the *mąθra-*')

(33) Yasna 43: 11:

spəntəm aṯ θwā	*mazdā mānghī ahurā*
hyaṯ mā vohū	*pairī.ǰasaṯ manaŋhā*
hyaṯ xšmā uxδāiš	*dīdaiŋ̇hē paourvīm*
sādrā mōi sąs	*mašyaēšū zrazdāitiš*
taṯ vərəzyeidyāi	*hyaṯ mōi mraotā vahištəm*

Then I (Zoroaster) recognized thee as beneficent, O Mazdā Ahura,
when (Thy Highness) wrapped me along with Vohu Manah.
(But) when I was first taught by you both with (your) words
the faith to do that which you told me (to be) best
seemed to me suffering among men.
Here Zoroaster says: "I was taught (*dīdaiŋ̇hē*, susceptive of various interpretations, I take as 1st person sing. middle, preterit [pluperfect] of *dąh-* 'to teach; to be taught', of which derivation is *dahma-* !)" by Ahura Mazdā and Vohu Manah with their words (*uxδāiš*, instr. pl. of *uxδa-* 'word'), that is to say, he recognizes himself as one well versed (*dahma-*) in the sacred word(s) which is expressed also by *vaxša-*, *mąθra-*, etc. The translation of *mąθra-* by 'spell' is not satisfactory. As for (Thy Highness), see my 'Gathica I. *xšmāvatō*', *Orient*, Vol. III (1967), p. 3f. and my *Zoroaster Kenkyū*, Tokyo 1980², p. 186f.

(34) As for my new interpretation of Yasna 32:16, see my article 'Gathica XVI. On Yasna 32: 16' to be published in the festschrift in honour of Prof. Jes P. Asmussen.

(35) *Orient*, Vol. XV (1979), pp. 55–63.

(36) '*Nihonshoki* ni kakareta Tokarajin (『日本書紀』にかかれたトカラ人 — The Tokharians in the *Nihonshoki*)', *The Higashiajia no Kodaibunka* (東アジアの古代文化 — Ancient Culture in the East Asia), No. 25 (Autumn 1980), pp. 23–31; 'Saisetsu "Zoroaster-kyōto no rainichi" (再説『ゾロアスター教徒の来日』 — Again "Zoroastrians' Arrival in Japan")', *The Asahi Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 37 (September 19, 1980), pp. 84–86; 'Iran-go Jinmeikō — *Nihonshoki* ni mieru Dachia (Dara) no baai — (イラン語人名考 — 『日本書紀』にみえる「達阿 (堕羅)」の場合 — On the Iranian proper name — referring to 'Dārāy' in the *Nihonshoki* —)', *The*

Higashiajia no Kodaibunka, No. 29 (Autumn 1981), pp. 152–158. Although my argument in the book is in some respects to be improved but I acknowledge my reasoning that Dārāy with his daughter and followers came over to Japan from Tuxwārestān and that a daughter was born to her who named her after her father-husbund Dārāy, *Dārāy-duxt(ag)*.

(37) Concerning the age, the *Honchō Kōin Shōunroku* (本朝皇胤紹運録 — A revered Record of the Imperial Lineage of Japan) of unknown date of composition (during 1336–1392) reports that he was born in 623 and died in 686 at the age of 65(?) which is however disputed by some scholars, because, otherwise, he, the younger brother of Emperor Tenji (cf. n. 7), would be senior of the latter. Some historians therefore take 65 as an error of 56.

(38) See n. 34.

(**Corrigenda** to Pahlavica IX: p. 15, l. 8, *dadāṯ* is to be emended to *dadaṯ*.)