



A Farewell to the Khagan of the Aq-Aqatārān
Author(s): W. B. Henning
Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 14, No. 3, Studies Presented to Vladimir Minorsky by His Colleagues and Friends (1952), pp. 501-522
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/609112
Accessed: 16/03/2011 15:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and *School of Oriental and African Studies* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.*

http://www.jstor.org

A Farewell to the Khagan of the Aq-Aqatärän

By W. B. Henning

Ḥ'k'n ZY ḫwlsn YD'YTNn
Mynrskydy ŠM ZNH p'dlky
PWN krpkyḥy 'yw MKBLWNt

i

PERHAPS the most exotic among the many strange kings and rulers mentioned in the inscription of Paikuli is the Khagan of the Aq-Aqatärän or 'White Khazars'. This is the meaning which the late E. Herzfeld, in his edition of that inscription, attributed to a group of words in the Middle Persian version which he read as *ḥ'k'n ZY 'kktl'n*. As the inscription dates from the last decade of the 3rd century (probably from A.D. 293), his interpretation seems to involve a double anachronism: in the title, and in the national name.

The title of Khagan (properly *Qaγan* or *Xaγan*) [1] became known in the West first in the middle of the 6th century; it was then borne by the rulers of the Avars [2] and their enemies, the Turks. Whether it was known in Persia at an earlier date is doubtful; for the mention of a 'Xāqān, king of the Turks' under Bahrām Gōr (A.D. 420–438) in the Pahlavi *Xudāy-nāmag* [3] is probably proleptic,[4] even though among the Žuan-žuan (Avars) [5] of Central Asia Khagan was the imperial title from the beginning of the 5th century. It is certain that the Žuan-žuan were responsible for giving to the title the wider currency which it enjoyed for many centuries; but, as the late Professor G. Haloun assured

[1] Central Asian forms: Bailey, *JRAS.*, 1939, 90. The list of 'Oriental variants' given by G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, ii, 280, under χαγάνος, is strangely incomplete; not even Arabic and Persian *xāqān* is mentioned; while one and the same Armenian form (*xakʿan*) is quoted in two different transliterations.

[2] So-called Pseudo-Avars.

[3] Nöldeke, *Tabari*, 99; *Taǰārib al-Umam*, i, 153 sqq.

[4] The collocation with 'Turks' suffices to discredit the *Xāqān*; Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 52 sqq., judged differently.

[5] D. Sinor, in his paper *Autour d'une migration de peuples au v^e siècle*, *J.A.*, 1946–7, 34 sqq., has thrown doubt upon the identity of the Žuan-žuan with the (true) Avars, which I continue to regard as firmly established. The determining factor, it seems to me, is the story of the defeat suffered by the true Avars at the hands of the Turks, Theophylactus Simocatta, vii, 7. According to it, the remnants of the Avars flee to *Ταγγάστ* and the *Μουκρί*: we know now that these are the names of (Northern) China and Korea. This fits well with the history of the Žuan-žuan, but excludes the possibility of placing the Avars in the neighbourhood of the Ural.—On *Μουκρί* = Skt. *Mukuri* = Tibetan *Muglig* see Pelliot *apud* Bagchi, *Deux Lexiques*, ii, 348, cf. my *Sogdica*, p. 7. It has not so far been recognized that this name is found also in the Orkhon inscriptions, in the form *Bökli* or rather *Bükli*: the list of the nations that came to mourn the passing of Bumïn qaγan and Istämi qaγan (i E 4 = ii E 5) opens with *Bükli čölig il* (Thomsen 'das ferne Bökli Volk') and continues with *Tabγač*; the list began in the east (*öñrä kün toγusïqda*); the *Bükli qaγan* (i E 8 = ii E 8) had been the easternmost of the enemies with whom the Turks had had to fight, in former times, at the behest of the Chinese (on this passage see Schaeder, *Iranica*, 39, n. 6). Thus when the Turkish report reproduced by Theophylactus declared that the Avars fled to *Ταγγάστ/Tabγač* and *Μουκρί/Bükli*, we should understand 'to our eastern (mainly hostile) neighbours'.

me, it was unquestionably in use even before the rise of the Žuan-žuan, among the Sien-pi and the T'u-yü-hun (a branch of the Sien-pi).[1] The dominion of the Sien-pi (about A.D. 155–402) was confined to Mongolia and never extended to the area of Chinese Turkestan, which, however, was subjected to raids by the T'u-yü-hun, who on one occasion sacked Khotan; whether the Persians, by the end of the 3rd century, had ever heard of either may well be doubted. Nevertheless, as we know now that Sassanian rule, under Shapur i, reached 'to the limits of Kāš = Kashghar',[2] and that news of political developments was constantly transmitted from China to Samarkand at that very time,[3] we cannot rule out the possibility that some bearer of that title might have come to the notice of the Persians even as early as A.D. 293.

The problem posed by *'KKTL'N*, the presumed national name, is more complicated; Herzfeld hesitated between *Aq-Aqatärān* and *Aq-Katirān*, between *'Ακάτιροι* and White Khazars. The *'Ακάτιροι* or *'Ακάτζιροι*, a nation known only through Priscus (Panites) and a single reference in Jordanes, are a favourite subject for scholarly comment. According to Priscus, who mentions them six times (four times in frg. 8, once each in frgg. 30 and 37, ed. C. Müller, *F.H.G.*, iv, 82[b]19, 83[a]10, 86[b]18, 89[a]17, 105[a]2, 107[b]16), they inhabited, together with other nations, *τὴν πρὸς τὸν Πόντον Σκυθικήν*, and were compelled (except for a small portion) to submit to Attila's rule in about A.D. 448 (he deputed his eldest son); they were a *Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος*, but are once referred to as *οἱ 'Ακάτιροι Οὖννοι* (frg. 30).[4] Some ten years after Attila's death, in about A.D. 463, they were subdued, after a bitter fight, by the *Σαράγουροι*, who had been driven out from their country by the *Σάβιροι*,[5] who in their turn had been expelled by the Avars (frg. 30).[6] Even before Attila had forced the *'Ακάτιροι* to join his state, they had been in negotiation with Byzantium; there the *Σαράγουροι*, their new masters, at once sent ambassadors, who met with a friendly reception. A few years later, in about A.D. 466, the *Σαράγουροι 'Ακατίροις καὶ ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν ἐπιθέμενοι ἐπὶ Πέρσας ἐστράτευον*;

[1] See Parker, *Thousand years*, 139, 153, 161; *China Review*, 24 (1899), p. 34 (拓跋 about A.D. 265). Cf. Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 53, n. 2.

[2] See *BSOAS.*, xii, 54.

[3] *ibidem*, 601 sqq.

[4] The obvious but often challenged inference: that they were Huns, has rightly been defended by E. A. Thompson, *Attila and the Huns*, 10 sq. J. Harmatta, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, i, 1951, 137 sq., again attributes a loose use of the name 'Huns' to Priscus, on the ground that those writing 'immediately after Priscus', Malalas, Procopius, Agathias, etc., used the term as vaguely as he used 'Scythian'. He misses the point of Thompson's argument; which is precisely that these authors, in fact, wrote a long time, two and three generations, after Priscus.

[5] Re-examination of the photograph of the Sogdian *Nāfnāmak* (see my *Sogdica*, p. 8) has shown that the name in line 17 ends in *-yry* and that the preceding letter is *-p-* rather than *-k-*. The resulting *(s)[.]pyry* can hardly be restored otherwise than as *s['][pyry* = *Sabir-ē* (*-ē* is Sogdian ending). There were thus remnants of the Sabirs in the neighbourhood of Turfan long after the migration of the 5th century; it is scarcely accidental that it is precisely near Turfan that many scholars of rank have placed their home-country (cf. D. Sinor, loc. cit., 15 sqq., who disagrees).

[6] This migration has recently been discussed at length by D. Sinor in the article quoted above, p. 501, n. 5.

finding the Caspian Gates (at Derbend) too well defended, they crossed the Caucasus by the Alan Gates [1] and devastated Iberia and Armenia (frg. 37). This last passage indicates that the *Ἀκάτιροι* lived to the north of the Caucasus and, as they are also placed in the Scythian lands on the Black Sea, one would naturally localize them in the steppes between Kuban, Don, and Volga.

This conclusion, which necessarily results from the study of Priscus, is flatly contradicted by the single reference to the *Acatziri* in Jordanes. He enumerated, *Getica*, 5, 37, a number of nations, beginning with the *Vidivarii*, who occupied the mouth of the Vistula; east of them, on the coast of the Baltic, lived the *Aesti*, a peaceful people famous as the collectors and exporters of amber. *Quibus in austrum adsidet gens Acatzirorum fortissima, frugum ignara, quae pecoribus et venationibus victitat; ultra quos distendunt supra Mare Ponticum Bulgarum sedes . . . hinc iam Hunni . . . bifariam populorum rabiem pullularunt; nam alii Altziagiri, alii Saviri nuncupantur* . . . If the *Acatziri* thus adjoined the people of the amber coast on the south,[2] they must have lived in the neighbourhood of Warsaw. The difficulties to which attempts at harmonizing the data of Priscus and Jordanes lead are best illustrated by the remarks Marquart made on the problem in the preface to his *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*: on page xxii the *Acatziri* are placed around Korosten (100 miles WNW of Kiew), which is not south, but south east of Samland, and a long way off (about 400 miles); on page xxiii we find their home in the land of the Mordwins—1,000 miles directly to the east of the starting point; and on page xxiv they have moved back *viel näher* to the 'middle Dnepr'. Such perplexity is common to all authors who are not bold enough to reject Jordanes' statement altogether.[3] It goes without saying that whenever in a matter touching the Huns Priscus, a first-rate historian who wrote of the events of his own lifetime from first-hand knowledge, is in conflict with Jordanes, a compilator writing about 100 years after Attila, it is the latter that must be rejected. The paragraph under review, with its enumeration of various nations prominent in different periods, bears all the marks of hasty compilation. One could say that if in Jordanes' authority it began with *quibus*, the relative pronoun no doubt referred to some nation other than the *Aesti*; but one may retain the description of the *Acatziri* and, though with less assurance, their proximity to the Bulgars [4] (first mentioned for A.D. 482), which would date the information in the last years of the 5th century (or the first of the 6th). There is no reliance on this author of whom it has been said that 'even in the passages which are based on Priscus Jordanes displays his

[1] The names of the crossing-places are confused, here as almost always. See Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 99 sqq., who reversed the sequence of the 'Gates'.

[2] D. Sinor, loc. cit., p. 2, boldly asserts that *Jordanès . . . les* [= *Acatziros*] *situe à l'est des Estoniens.*

[3] Outright rejection has at least been envisaged by E. A. Thompson, op. cit., p. 96.

[4] Where precisely one is to imagine their seats is not by any means clear.

genius for misunderstanding the most straightforward narrative his source could supply to him '.[1]

If then the *'Ακάτζιροι*, a *gens fortissima*, occupied the area that shortly after was dominated by the *Χάζαροι*, the suspicion arises that these two nations were one and the same. The Khazars appear suddenly, in great power, in A.D. 626, when they support the Emperor Heraclius in his second campaign against Persia. As their organization at that time resembled that of the (Western) Turks, they have sometimes been regarded as an offshoot of the latter; but the coincidence in their titles (*qaγan*, *yabγu*, *šad* [2]) may equally be due to imitation of their powerful eastern neighbours. That they were not recent arrivals in the lands on the northern side of the Caucasus is suggested by the story of their origin [3] (Theophanes and Nicephorus) which let them come from *Βερζιλία* [4]: Marquart has fully proved [5] that this was a name of Daghestan; it is confirmed by a few passages that may indicate their presence in that area even before the rise to power of the Turks. The Pahlavi *Xudāy-nāmag* mentioned the Khazars not only under Hormizd iv (A.D. 578–590),[6] but

[1] E. A. Thompson, op. cit., p. 13.

[2] This title is also mentioned by Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Venice, 1865, p. 98; the translation of the passage quoted (from Brosset) by Chavannes, *Documents*, 253, n. 7, is somewhat inaccurate. ' [List of the bishops of Albania] Tēr Viroy, 33 years. He had spent many years imprisoned at the court of Xosrov the king of Persia, but after his death was freed and returned to his country. He redeemed the Armenians, Iberians, and Albanians made captives by Šat' the Xazir, the son of J̌abu-xak'ani, who had enslaved our land; he founded five [*sic*] towns in the name of Šat': Šat'ar, Šamk'or, Šak'i, Širuan, Šamaxi, Šaporan.' That Viroy returned only after the death of Khosrau ii is stated also *ibidem*, p. 30, where the last Sassanian kings are enumerated in these terms: ' After Xosrov, the king of Persia, Kawat took the kingship; he released from captivity Viroy, the Catholicus of Albania, whom his father had imprisoned. After Kawat, Artašir; then Xoṙeam by decree of Heraclius; then Xosrov, and after him Born and Zarmanduxt—all these were short-lived; and then Yazkert.'

[3] The contrary passage in Sebēos has been made to refer to the Khazars only by arbitrary emendation: by changing *i caṙayut'iwn* ' into the servitude (of the great *Xak'an*, etc.) ' into *i caṙayut'enē* ' out of the servitude ' (Marquart, *WZKM.*, xii, 1898, p. 191).

[4] The corresponding national name in pseudo-Zachariah (see presently), *B'GRSYQ*, has been restored as *B'RSYLQ* by Marquart. An even easier correction would be *B'RSYGQ*, directly = the Armenian Nom. *Barsilk'* (*Barselk'*), which occurs beside *Ba(r)silk'*; Syriac *G* = *γ* perfectly answers to Armenian *l*. If this correction is accepted, Armenian intermission will have to be assumed; this is in any case recommended by the final *-Q*, which is best explained as the ending of the Armenian nominative.—In view of the remarks made by D. Sinor, loc. cit., p. 63, it must be stressed that the *-k'* of such Armenian names as *Barsilk'*, *Sawirk'*, belongs solely to the nominative; the form in which *Barsilk'* (*Barselk'*) appears most frequently in texts is in fact *Barslac'*.—The Syriac form *BRS'LY'* (Michael and from him Barhebræus) does not go back to John of Ephesus, as K. H. Menges, *Byzantion*, xvii, 276 claims; see below.

[5] *Streifzüge*, 489 sq., cf. p. 485.

[6] Nöldeke, *Tabari*, 270 = *Taǰārib al-Umam*, i, 219[7]. Marquart's attempt to prove that Hormizd's mother had been the daughter of a Khagan of the Khazars (*WZKM.*, xii, 199 sq.) carries little conviction.—It may not be superfluous to warn students against accepting at its face value Marquart's phrase *die Chazaren welche in den gleichzeitigen Urkunden zuerst in der Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus a.* 585/86 *genannt werden* (*Streifzüge*, 46). In this form this assertion was never correct (it should have read *wurden* in the place of *werden*); it has been disproved by none other than Marquart himself. The matter stands thus: Barhebræus, in a passage about the Avars, mentions the Khazars twice, firstly in an allusion to a ' Khāqān, king of the Khazars ', secondly as having been named ' Khazars ' after the eldest of three brothers

even under Khosrau i (A.D. 531–578) [1]; yet all its undisputed references [2] are so vague that they may well be proleptic. Of far greater, indeed decisive, importance is the list of Hunnic nations in the appendix to the Syriac Chronicle ascribed to Zachariah of Mitylene [3]; the relevant part of this appendix, which was written in A.D. 555,[4] i.e. at the beginning of the Turkish expansion, well before it had any effect on the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea, is based on reports of returned prisoners of war in contact with Albanian missionaries who had laboured to the north of the Caucasus 20 to 30 years earlier.[5] One of the names in this list is *KSR* = *Xasar* (or *Xasir*),[6] evidently an early form of *Xazar*; yet Marquart,[7] not without justification, identified the name (which he transcribed *Kas(i)r*) with *Ἀκάτζιροι*, no doubt on account of the company by which *KSR* is surrounded: *Σαράγουροι*, *Ὀνόγουροι*, *Ἰτίμαροι*, etc. The truth of the matter is that here, where the historical context leads us to expect the *Ἀκάτζιροι*, we find them under a new name, *Xasar* (*Xasir*); the list thus provides the sought-for link between the two national names.

(in an eponymic story). The importance of this text was recognized by Marquart, *Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften*, 1898, 82 sqq. On reading his book, Nöldeke informed Marquart that Barhebræus' story probably derived from the *lost chapters* of the Ecclesiastical History by John of Ephesus, who wrote in A.D. 585–6; the headings of the lost chapters in question (3rd part, book 6, chaps. 45 sqq.) are preserved and give some indication of their contents; the name *Khazar* is not mentioned in them. Barhebræus, however, used John not directly, but at second hand through Michael the Syrian (end of 12th century); the latter was not then accessible to Marquart (see *WZKM.*, xii, 1898, 198 sq.). Later Marquart secured the relevant text of Michael and discussed it fully (*Streifzüge*, 1903, *Addenda*, 479 sqq.). It now emerged that in the first passage, which he in fact had copied from John, Michael had 'Khāgān the king of the Abārīs (*Ἄβαρεις*)', as was to be expected; and that the second passage (about the three brothers, two of whom came to Alān = *BRSʾLYʾ*, the eldest being named *Xazarīg*) was not derived from John at all, but from a much later source (not earlier than A.D. 678 in Marquart's judgement).

[1] Nöldeke, *Tabari*, 155, 166, 167; *Taǰārib al-Umam*, i, 181^{12}, 182^{6}, 183^{2}, 192^{10}, 198^{7}.

[2] Disputable are all passages that contain interesting details (Ṭabarī, i $895^{1\,16}$, 896^{4} = Nöldeke, *Tabari*, 157, 159): here Marquart imported the name into the text by an emendation (*WZKM.*, xii (1898), 169, n. 6 = *Chronologie der Alttürkischen Inschriften*, 96, n. 2), which, since *Taǰārib al-Umam*, i, 179^{3} (بنجر وبلنجر|بجر) agrees with the MSS. of Ṭabarī, is only acceptable if it is referred back to the Pahlavi text, in which *ʾ*PGL* and **ḤČYL* (= *Xazir* as in Arm.) were indistinguishable.—There is no certain occurrence of the name *Xazar* in an existing Pahlavi text; the curious ʾ*TWL* in *Bahman Yašt*, iv, 58, ed. Anklesaria, was emended by H. W. Bailey first into *ḤPTL* = Hephthalites (*BSOS.*, vi, 1932, 946), later into *ḤČL* = Khazars (*BSOAS.*, xi, 1943, 1 sq.).

[3] Translated by F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, p. 328.

[4] *ibidem*, p. 327.

[5] *ibidem*, p. 329. The story is extraordinarily confused, but nevertheless there is no reason to doubt the author's truthfulness; on the Albanian mission see Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 489. That the list was not derived from Greek sources is assured by the forms of the names (names transliterated from Greek into Syriac are invariably recognizable as such); to describe it as *eine aus griechischer Ueberlieferung . . . zusammengestellte syrische Völkerliste* (Schaeder, *Iranica*, p. 40) does it no justice. Attention should be paid also to the names in the lines immediately preceding the list, *Gurzān*, *Arrān*, *Sīsagān*, etc., none of which admits Greek transmission. Incidentally, Marquart was so thoroughly convinced of the independence of the passage from Greek influence that he used forms found in it to argue for *Syriac* transmission of a report on Turkish affairs preserved by Theophylactus Simocatta (see *WZKM.*, xii, 189 sq.).

[6] cf. F. W. K. Müller, *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 8, 312.

[7] *Streifzüge*, 356, n. 1.

The identity of the *Ἀκάτζιροι* with the Khazars was taken for granted by the anonymous geographer of Ravenna (end of 7th century ?), who wrote *quos Chazaros . . . Jordanis Agaziros vocat* (168[13–14]). In modern times it has been rejected as often as asserted. The case for rejection has been built chiefly on the differences between the forms of the two names [1]; it has been grossly overstated by Marquart.[2] Yet there is no sound objection to the explanation (originally put forward by H. H. Howorth) that *Ἀκάτζιροι* is a compound name consisting of *aq* ' white ' and the name that later appeared as *Xazar*. One naturally has to assume that *Xazar* is Khazarian [3] development of an earlier *Xacir* (with *c* = ц), via *Xasir*, the stages being marked by *Χότζιροι*,[4] Syriac *Xasir* (*Xasar*), and Armenian *Xazir* [5]; as virtually nothing is known of the language of the Khazars (presumably a Hun dialect), he would be a bold man who asserted that a sound change of intervocalic *-c-* to *-s-* (and further to *-z-*) was impossible in their language, or that it had not possessed the sound *-c-*. That, further, the compound name *Aq-χacir* might be pronounced as *Aqacir* (or sound like that to a foreigner) and therefore be rendered *Ἀκάτζιροι*,[6] can hardly be denied. Since history points to the Khazars' being the heirs of the *Ἀκάτζιροι*, and since the Khazars (as is well known) consisted of two distinct racial groups, White Khazars and Black Khazars,[7] this explanation is much to be preferred to the Turcologists' favourite derivation, *ayač-äri* ' wood-men ',[8] which is scarcely better than a popular etymology.[9]

[1] e.g. by Kaspar Zeuss, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme* (1837), 714 sq.

[2] *Streifzüge*, 41, n. 2, 43.

[3] To meet Marquart's principal objection.

[4] On this form see Moravcsik, op. cit., ii, 289 sq. (with references).—No weight, perhaps, should be attached to the fact that in the fragments of Priscus the name appears as *Κάτζιροι* in one place (*Κατζίρων* frg. 8 Müller, p. 83[a]10 = *Excerpta de legationibus* 130[24] de Boor).

[5] Full value should be given to the Armenian form ; of the nations whose historical records we possess none was so close to the Khazars as the Armenians. *Xazir* suffices to exclude **Qasar* (so, e.g. Pelliot, *T'oung Pao*, xxxvii, 1944, 98, n. 1) from serious consideration as the original form.

[6] *τζ* is used for *c* as often as for *č*, cf. Moravcsik, op. cit., ii, 44. Marquart's assumption that Syriac *s* may have been used to reproduce foreign *č* (*Ērānšahr*, 253, n. 5) is unacceptable.

[7] In the heat of arguing against Howorth's theory, Marquart, who otherwise admitted no connexion between *Acatziri* and Khazars, went so far as to say that, on the contrary, *die Ἀκάτζιροι entsprechen vielmehr den Schwarz-Chazaren* (op. cit., 41, n. 2, at the end).

[8] Notwithstanding the existence of such a word, both as appellative and as tribal name, 800 years and more after the time of Attila : in Houtsma's *Glossar*, p. 30[2], and apparently in Rašīd ad-Dīn, see Marquart, loc. cit. (I have not found the passage). As a tribal name it exists even nowadays, in Khūzistān, where a conglomeration of Turkish, Tājīk, and Lur tribes is called اقاجری = *Ayaǰ-eri*, *Fārsnāme-yi Nāṣirī*, ii, 270 ; O. Mann, *Mundarten der Lur-Stämme*, p. xvii ; the oilfield situated within the tribal area has recently often been mentioned in the newspapers, in the guise of Aghā Jarī (this is the spelling one finds also on maps). As I notice belatedly, the scholar to whom these pages are dedicated has already drawn attention to this name (*The Tribes of Western Iran. Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, lxxv, 1945, 77).

[9] Jordanes' description of the Acatziri, *gens . . . frugum ignara quae pecoribus et venationibus victitat*, lets one envisage them as typical nomads of the steppe, certainly not as ' woodmen '. Strangely enough, Marquart found support in it for his suggestion that they were *ein echtfinnisches Fischer- und Jägervolk* (op. cit., p. 40).

Whether the Khazars (White or Black) descended from the *Acatziri* [1] or not, it is at any rate clear that neither figured in the records of history before the middle of the 5th century ; and therefore it would be surprising to find either in the inscription of Paikuli. None the less, we are so badly informed on the northern borderlands of Iran in those centuries that we dare not talk of impossibility ; but the odds become even longer when we find that we are to credit the same passage of that inscription also with the otherwise unheard-of title of *Khagan*. Yet it must be admitted that Herzfeld was right to insist that, if in fact an inscription of certain date and indubitable authenticity (such as the inscription of Paikuli is) mentioned that title and that nation, all objections, however weighty or numerous, would have to be relinquished without demur.[2]

ii

Few scholars (if indeed any) have examined the inscription of Paikuli in proper style after it was published by the late E. Herzfeld. The reasons for this neglect of the most considerable Sassanian monument then known are not far to seek. Smallness of edition and unnecessarily lavish production led to scarcity and a high price and made the work a collector's item, generally inaccessible to scholars except in a few public libraries. Even in such a library a proper study of the inscription is barely possible ; for as the inscription is broken into numerous small blocks, each of them represented on two folio plates, one has to handle a large number of these plates at one and the same time and thus needs more table space than one may reasonably demand. Moreover, from the beginning one's work is overshadowed by the knowledge that it will be profitless, because a large section of the needed material is not available : on his last visit to Paikuli in 1923 E. Herzfeld excavated the site and found 30 additional blocks, which raise the total number of surviving blocks to 133 ; these 30 blocks, which came into Herzfeld's hands even before *Paikuli* was published (1924), have never been made accessible to the learned world. It is, then, not surprising that attention has been confined to a more or less casual use of the printed text and particularly the glossary,[3] both in vol. i ; few of those who use the printed text may realize to what liberal extent the text has been restored, without sufficient distinction of the existing, uncertain, and restored letters.

When, shortly before the war, I had for the first time an opportunity to

[1] For reasons that will become clear presently, no attempt is made here to discuss the form of the Pahlavi name, *'KKTL'N*.

[2] It is curious to note that not one of the many scholars who have discussed the problem of the *Acatziri* since the publication of *Paikuli* (1924) ever so much as adverted to the form in the Pahlavi inscription ; the times of a Marquart are indeed past.

[3] The glossary unfortunately refers only to the block numb ers, not to the lines of the printed text, in which the blocks are not marked.

read the inscription from the photographs, I copied the passage under review (last line of blocks C 2 + C 3, = line 18) in this way [1] :—

C 2](*n*) *'L ḥ'd'n ZY* . C 3 *dktl'*. *L*[. .] *p*(*t*)[

This I read innocently, without realizing that I was in the presence of so exalted a personage. Herzfeld's reading appears in the printed text in this form :—

(18) . . . . . *n 'L ḥ'k'n ZY ('kk)tl'*[*n*] . *L* . . *pḥ*[

The principal difference is that Herzfeld read *K* in two places where I read *D*, and on these letters hangs the fate of both the *Khagan* and the *Aq-Aqatārān*. Now,[2] the letters *K* and *D* resemble each other in a general way : both consist of two crescents (open to the left), a smaller one on top of a larger, but *K* has in addition a short horizontal stroke at the bottom. Whenever there is doubt about the presence or absence of the horizontal stroke (as is apt to happen particularly often in the last lines of blocks where the letters reach down to the edge of the stone), it becomes difficult to distinguish them ; there are other points of difference (e.g. the lower crescent of *D* is more rounded and its lower horn is continued further to the left ; the axis of *K* is vertical with a slight inclination to the left, while that of *D* is inclined to the right), but there is less reliance on them.

In the first word, *ḥ'k'n/ḥ'd'n*, the horizontal bottom stroke cannot be seen in either the direct photograph (plate 49) or the photograph of the squeeze (plate 48) ; if it had been present originally, it would have come to stand exactly on the edge of the stone. At any rate, it is not there ; and as the letter exhibits all the other characteristic marks of *D*, there is no good reason for adding it. The reason why Herzfeld silently added the bottom stroke, thereby changing *D* into *K*, was probably that he was not acquainted with a word *ḥ'd'n* (which in fact was nowhere attested), while the change into *ḥ'k'n* produced a word of familiar appearance. It is better to allow oneself to be guided by the facts and therefore to read *ḥ'd'n*, whether such a word is known or not.

In the second word,]*kktl'*[or]*dktl'*[, the difference between the first two letters is well marked, especially in the photograph of the squeeze (plate 50), so clearly indeed that one can assert that]*dktl'*[is without doubt the correct reading. Herzfeld himself, in his drawing of the block (plate 51 ; also plates 203–5), drew]*dktl'*(*y*),[3] but changed this in the printed text to]*kktl'*[*n*]. The change is an arbitrary one ; there is no allusion to it in Herzfeld's long

[1] Here, as always, I am using square brackets for [restored letters], round for (uncertain or damaged letters), a dot within square brackets for a missing letter, an unbracketed dot for a letter of which a small part is visible, but too little to determine its nature with reasonable certainty. Where Herzfeld's readings are quoted, his overdotted letters are replaced by letters in round brackets.

[2] The observations made here are valid for the style of Pahlavi writing employed in the inscription of Paikuli, but not necessarily for the script of other inscriptions, even those from the same period.

[3] Or]*dktl'*(*p*).

note on *'kktl'n* in the *Glossary*, p. 133 sq.; its reason appears to be again the difficulty of explaining the form which the inscription offers. As regards the first letter or letters of the word, which stood at the end of the preceding block (C 2), only a small fragment of a letter is visible; in restoring ' Herzfeld chose between several possible restorations (', *ny*, *nw*, etc.), each of which has equal claim to consideration.

There is thus no Khagan in the inscription, and there are no Aq-Aqatārān.

iii

The Khagan is not the only one among the kings and rulers of the Paikuli inscription who will have to be deposed. There are the persons, chiefly at the end of the inscription, whom Herzfeld regarded as '*Saka kṣatrapas*' from the Indo-Iranian borderlands. Outstanding among them is the *Lord of Avanti* (the country around Ujjain). I discussed him and a few of his colleagues in an article on the inscription of Shapur i at the Ka'be-yi Zardušt which I contributed to the *Volume in Memory of A. V. W. Jackson*. That article, which was sent to Bombay in March, 1939, at a time when of the inscription of Shapur the defective Pahlavi version alone was known to exist, has never been published [1]; it may not come amiss to quote the relevant paragraph here in full (with annotations), in the form in which it was written thirteen years ago:—

'We had seen that in the second and third lists an *Awandīkān Xwatāy* (*'wndykn MRWḤY*) is enumerated between the Sūrēn and the Kāren. This title is already known from the Paikuli inscription, Parthian version, line 22′ (p. 106): *'wndykn ḥwtwy*. Probably it is to be restored also in the Pahlavi version of Paikuli, line 8, B 2: [*'wnd*]*ykn MRWḤY*.[a] Herzfeld's explanation of the title as "Lord of Avanti" cannot be maintained any longer. It was perhaps never very likely that a king of Avanti, in the heart of India, should have acknowledged the Sassanian king as his suzerain; that he should have appeared as one of the highest officers of state under Ardašīr it is impossible to credit. At the end of the Paikuli inscription a great number of *MRWḤY*'s is mentioned, most of whom Professor Herzfeld has attempted to identify with Indian or Saka rulers. For instance, he takes the *zwl'dčyn MRWḤY* (line 46 = H 7) as King of Surāṣṭra, assuming *zwl'd-* to be an imperfect rendering of a Prakrit form of Surāṣṭra; but according to the rules of Pahlavi orthography, *zwl'd-* indicates the ending *-āy*, not *ā* + dental.[b] We may perhaps get a clue to the right direction where we should look for rulers such as the *zwl'dčyn MRWḤY* from the legend of a seal which, as far as I know, has not been utilized for the solution of the

[a] Herzfeld's restoration of the passage (*Warhrānīkān Xwatāy*) has not convinced me.

[b] cf. also Herzfeld, *AMI.*, vii, p. 61. The equation Pahlavi *zwl'dčyn* = Parthian *zwrdtšn* is rather doubtful.—For *zwl'd-* one might consider Armenian *Jor(ay)*, the region around Bitlis, see Hübschmann, *Indogerm. Forsch.*, vol. xvi, p. 447.

[1] I have been assured by friends that it has been set up in print; efforts to obtain a proof or a specimen copy have proved unavailing.

problem: Mordtmann, *ZDMG.*, xviii, pp. 15 sq., nr. 25, plate ii: *gwšky ZY mwks'dčyn MRWḤY* = "Gōšak,[c] the Lord (*išxan*) of Moksāy", i.e. obviously Syriac (*Bēθ*) *Moksāyē*, Armenian *Mokkʿ*, to the south of the Van lake.[d]'

[c] Scythian *Gōsakos* (Justi, p. 118; W. Miller, *Ossetisch*, p. 6); Arm. *gušak* 'informer', etc. (cf. also Schaeder, *Iranica*, p. 5).

[d] *Lšwmč'n MRWḤY* (Paikuli, line 46 = H 11) is probably 'the Lord of Lāšom' in Garamæa. I should much prefer to identify *mwk'n* (*MRWḤY*, ibid., H 6) with Mūqān, Armenian Mukan (cf. Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, p. 125).

The lists referred to at the beginning of this paragraph are those of the inscription of Shapur i, the end of which enumerates those who served meritoriously under Pāpak (first list), Ardašīr (second), and Shapur himself (third). Under both Ardašīr and Shapur the heads of the 'Great Families' (who dominated Sassanian history much as they had dominated Arsacid times) are listed, naturally in strict order of precedence, immediately after the members of the royal house. The order is this:—

Warāz[1]—*Sūrēn*—*'wndykn MRWḤY*—*Kāren*.

By the time of the Paikuli inscription it had changed, and the Sūrēn occupied the first place, the Warāz the second[2]; the place of the *'wndykn MRWḤY* is uncertain, and there is no Kāren.[3] A member of the family *Spāhpet* is mentioned under Ardašīr, in the second place after *Kāren*, and again under Narseh (placing uncertain), but not under Shapur. Of great interest is the absence of the family *Mihrān*, allegedly of Arsacid origin, but actually never mentioned before Sassanid times[4]; its first representative occurs under Shapur i, not among the 'Great Families' but in a modest position close to the end of the long list: *A(r)štāt*,[5] the secretary, the *Mihrān* from *Ray*.[6]

The Greek and Parthian versions of the inscription of Shapur, which came to light in 1939, indicate that the tentative transcription of *'wndykn*, *Awandīkān*, has to be modified. Pahlavi has *'wndykn* and *'wndyk'n*, Parthian *'ndykn* (Shapur) and *'wndykn* (Paikuli), Greek *Ανδηγαν* and *Ινδηγαν*. Hence, *Undīkān* developing to *Andīkān* (in accord with a general rule) and further *Andīgān*. No doubt *Andīkān Xwatāy* was originally a territorial title[7]; but it was often abbreviated to *Andīkān* and then misunderstood as a personal name: Armenian *Andikan*, Greek *Ἀνδίγαν* (Menander Protector frg. 60, *FHG.*, iv, 260–2, C. Müller), Persian *Andiyān* (Nöldeke, *Tabari*, 286; Hübschmann, *Arm. Gr.*, 18).

[1] It is essential for the understanding of the lists to realize that *Warāz* is a family name, and that all persons preceding the *Warāz* are members of the royal house.

[2] Ohrmizd the Warāz: line 7′ = A′2]*zd wr'z*; cf. line 16 = C 11. Herzfeld had a different explanation.

[3] His absence may well be due to a gap in our material.

[4] The name itself is old enough (see Justi *s.v.*), but the 'Great Family' of that name came to prominence only under the Sassanians; cf. Nöldeke, *Tabari*, 139 sq.

[5] Known as a name in use among the *Mihrān*, cf. Justi *s.v.*

[6] *ZY MN ldy*, only in the Pahlavi version (line 34). *Ray* is often mentioned as the seat of this family.

[7] The seat of the family is not known; perhaps *Hindiyān/Hindīǰān* (and *Hinduwān* by popular etymology) at the head of the Persian Gulf.

To come now to the other *Saka kṣatrapas*, the explanation of *zwl'dčyn MRWḤY* as ' the Lord (*išxan*) of Jor(ay) ', cf. Pʿawstos, iii, 12 (p. 29, Venice, 1832) *z-Gorutʿ išxan-n Jorocʿ ašxarhi-n*, iv, 50 (p. 159) *Joray gawaṙi-n tēr-n*, although recommended by the strikingly similar form *mwks'dčyn* (above, p. 510), remains doubtful on account of the Parthian transcription,[1] which suggests interior *-l-*. That Parthian *zwrdtšn*, as Herzfeld demanded, corresponds to *zwl'dčyn*[2] is made certain by the preceding personal names: Parthian *b'ty* = Pahlavi *bgdt*; *Bāt* from *Ba'āt* is simply a *Schnellsprechform* of *Bagdāt*[3]: I failed to realize it when I discussed Coptic *Baaτ*, Manichæan Parthian *Bāt* (*BSOS.*, x, 944 sq.); in Armenian both forms exist side by side, *Bat* and *Bagarat* (*Bagrat*).[4]

There is scarcely any doubt that the *Lšwmč'n MRWḤY* is the ' Lord of Lāšom ' (above, p. 510, n. *d*). Close by (H 8 = line 46) we find the *Bwrspčy[n MRWḤY]*, whom I now regard as the ' Lord of Borsippa '; that ancient town, which lay a little to the south of Babylon, is still mentioned several times in the Babylonian Talmud (spelt בורסיף).[5] His name, incidentally, was misread by Herzfeld; it is *Mtrḥwst* = *Mihrxwāst*. Herzfeld himself (*AMI.*, vii, 60) recognized the king of Ḥīrah in Parth. *'mrw lḥmyšn MLK'* = Pahl. *'mrw lḥmyčyn MLK'* ' Amru, the Laḥmid king '; his name occurs in the unpublished part of the inscription. As there is a small gap (with some feeble traces) in front of the first letter of *tywḥčyn MRWḤY* (Herzfeld: *Térakhčín*), one wonders whether one may read (')[*n*]*tywḥčyn* ' the Lord of Antiochia ', in spite of the unusual spelling (normally with *k* for *χ*); which of the towns of that name may have been meant (Antioch in Sittakene ? Antioch = Spasinu Charax ?), is a matter of conjecture. A name hitherto overlooked is in G'3 = line 43', where Herzfeld read *s'trp gwnk gwn[k]* and translated ' satraps of all kind[s] '; the correct reading is *s'trp dwnb'w[ntš]* ' Satarap of Dunbāwant (Demawend) ', cf. now in the inscription of Shapur, Parthian version, *s'trp* line 23, *dwnb'wntš*, lines 24 and 26.[6]

[1] Unless it is to be dismissed as mechanical transposition of a name whose true pronunciation was unknown to the translator (*-rd-* = *-l-*, but why *-t* for *-d* ?).

[2] The ending *-āy-* may be due to an intervening Syriac form (**Bēθ Zŏrāyē*), as it clearly was in the case of *mwks'dčyn*.

[3] *-gd-* has disappeared, though not without trace, also in MPers. *mādiyān* (Arm. *matean*) from *mātagdān* (originally *mātak-dān*).

[4] cf. also Inscr. of Shapur Greek 67 *Βαδου* = Parth. (28) and Pahl. (35) *bgdt*. An interesting case of an inverse spelling is found in the inscr. of Kartīr at the Kaʿbe, line 7, *ʿL bgd'n g'sy ʿZLWNt* against lines 3/4 and 5 *ʿL ʿRḤY'n g'sy ʿZLWN* ' to depart to the throne of the Gods ' = ' to die '; here *bgd'n* = actual *bayān* or *ba'ān* (< *bagān*). The forms have been misread and misunderstood.

[5] A. Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, 327, 346 sq.

[6] There are quite a few names and titles in the final list of Paikuli that require further consideration. Instead of *'štkwyn* G'11 (line 43') I read *'štb(wy)n*; in *Altpers. Inschr.*, 77, Herzfeld quoted *'štbrnn*, which appears to be intended as a new reading of this name. In G'1 (line 43'), Herzfeld's *yppt* may have to be replaced by *nppt[y]* = *nāfapati* (arm. *nahapet*). In H 5 (line 45), *ḥlw'nyk* is probably ' of Holwān ', but the reading of the title is uncertain; the name ends in *]wsydy*, which calls to mind such names as *Pūsai* ([*p*]*wsydy ?* one would expect [*p*]*wsdy*).

The reading *Mwk'n MRWḤY* (H 6/7 = line 46), which I previously accepted (above, p. 510, n. *d*), is very doubtful indeed; the supposed Parthian equivalent in G'6 (line 43'), Herzfeld's *mwkn*, does not exist: all that can be seen on that block is](*w*)š(*n*), the -š- being actually the only clearly visible letter.[1] Instead of *Mwk'n*, I should like to read *Syk'n*[2] now: this was in fact Herzfeld's original reading (in his drawing, plate 108). *Syk'n* equals Parthian *Sykn*, so the *Syk'n MRWḤY* was the 'Lord of Siwnikᶜ' (arm. *išxan Siwneacᶜ*). Parthian *Sykn* occurs only in a single passage, Inscription of Shapur, beginning of line 2, but that passage, the standard list of the north-western provinces of Sassanid Persia, suffices to prove that *Sykn* equals *Sisakan* in the Armenian Geography and *Sīsagān* in the appendix to Zachariah of Mitylene; and these names in their turn indubitably[3] mean *Siwnikᶜ* (*Siunikᶜ*), the country on the left bank of the lower Araxes. This was briefly pointed out in *BSOAS.*, xii (1947), 54[4]; the new form, *Sīkān* from *Sī* + Iranian endings *-k-ān*, also formally agrees with the Armenian name *Si-uni-kᶜ*.[5]

This identification was recently challenged by A. Maricq, who asserted that the country referred to was Mingrelia.[6] This is both right and wrong. The proposal was no doubt made in order to accommodate the Greek version of the inscription of Shapur, which offers *Μαχελονία* as translation of *Sykn*, evidently the country of the *Μαχέλονες* (also *Μαχέλωνες*). This nation, whose

[1] That was recognized by Herzfeld, who at first copied *mwšk* (plate 198).

[2] This is admittedly uncertain. The first letter is awkward: all the requisite traces for both *S* and *M* appear to be present; here, as often, it is difficult to distinguish cracks from incisions.

[3] See Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 120 sqq.

[4] The name of Albania in Parthian is spelt not *'rr'n* (as I thought), but in fact *'rd'n*, with *-rd-* as inverse spelling of *-l-*. It thus accords with the Pahlavi forms, *'ld'n* and *'l'ny*, which latter was liable to confusion with the name of the *Alans*. Cf. inscr. of Kartīr at the Kaᶜbe, line 12, *'lmny štry W wlwč'n W 'l'ny W bl'sk'n ᶜD pl'č ᶜL 'l'n'n BB'*; in the corresponding passage in Sar-Mašhad we have *'ld'n*.—I cannot let this opportunity go by without drawing attention to the Pahlavi name of Peshawar, which I have now found in the inscr. of Sar-Mašhad: it is *Pškpwly*; cf. *BSOAS.*, xii, 53 sq.

[5] The correct explanation of *Siwnikᶜ*, which is now confirmed, was found by de Lagarde. See Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 120, n. 3.

[6] *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire Orientales et Slaves*, xi (1951), *Mélanges Grégoire*, 253 n. The author has made two further interesting points in that annotation. (1) That *pryšḫwr ṬWR'* = *τὸ Πρεσσουαρ ὄρος n'est pas le Paryadres, mais bien l'Elburz.* This is correct, and was already indicated by me in *BSOAS.*, xii, 54, n. 2, perhaps in too obscure a fashion. 'The whole *Parišχwār* mountain' introduces and sums up the provinces of Media, Hyrcania, Margiane, and Areia, in the same way in which 'the whole upper countries' (a phrase that is heir to the 'upper satrapies' of Seleucid times) introduces and sums up the next following group (Kermān, Sakastān, etc.). Accordingly it would be more adequate to say that *pryšḫwr* equalled the Strabonian *Παραχοάθρας*, which it was believed stretched from Armenia and the Zagros to the Tajand. Incidentally, the inscription spells *Πρεσσουαρ*, not *Πρεσσουαρ.*—(2) That the town renamed (by Shapur) *Prgwz-Šḫypwhr* = *Πηρωσσαβουρ* is the well-known *Pērōz-Šābūr* = Anbār on the Euphrates. This I have always assumed; one can only share the author's surprise at finding so often explained a term as *Asūristān* misunderstood even now. However, the final proof of the identity of the town (and district) with *Anbār* has not been mentioned by Maricq: it lies in its ancient name, which Pērōz-Šābūr was to replace, Parthian *Mšyk* (twice), Greek MHCIXICH and MICIXH; this corresponds to *Βεσήχανα πόλις, ἐν ᾗ ἱερὸν 'Ατάργατι*, Isidorus Characenus, *G.G.M.*, i, 249, 6.

name is always coupled with that of the *Ἡνίοχοι*, inhabited a district near Colchis. Dio Cassius, lxviii, 19, mentioned *Ἀγχίαλον τὸν Ἡνιόχων καὶ Μαχελόνων βασιλέα* under Trajan, and Arrian placed his capital 40 *stadia* to the east of *Ἀθῆναι*, which is probably the modern *Antina* (*Periplus Ponti Euxini*, 8 = *G.G.M.*, i, 374[9]). According to the same authority, the *Μαχέλονες καὶ Ἡνίοχοι* bordered on the *Ζυδρεῖται*, whose eastern neighbours were the *Λαζοί* (*ibidem*, 15 = p. 378[25] sq.). The *Anonymi Periplus Ponti Euxini*, 42, confirms Arrian: *ἀπὸ οὖν Ἀρχάβεως ποταμοῦ εἰς Ὀφιοῦντα ποταμὸν πρῶτον ᾤκουν ἔθνος οἱ λεγόμενοι Ἐκχειριεῖς, νῦν δὲ οἰκοῦσι Μαχέλωνες καὶ Ἡνίοχοι* (*G.G.M.*, i, 412[9–11] = § 1, *F.H.G.* Müller, v, 174); that is precisely the coastal district of which Antina is the centre. However, the anonymous author, whose work is mainly a compilation of Arrian and Menippus, also stated that these twin nations, together with many others, had originally inhabited the north-eastern coast of the Black Sea, on either side of Tuapse, where *νῦν δὲ οἰκοῦσι Ζιχοί* (§ 18, *F.H.G.*, v, 180). In any case, at the only time when the Machelones appeared in history,[1] i.e. the second century of our era, they lived roughly half-way between the Acampsis (*Čorux*) and Trebizond; which region can scarcely be described as ' Mingrelia ', although it was reasonably close to it.

Even though we readily concede that the Greek translator of the inscription saw in *Sykn* some insignificant little district on the Black Sea coast, we are far from submitting to his judgement. To interpret this Persian inscription, an official document of the first rank, from the Greek version that accompanies it is a capital mistake. In claiming that *Sykn* is *la Mingrélie, que le nom iranien désigne comme un pays de Scythes* (*Saka*) the gifted young scholar runs into difficulties; for neither the Mingrelians nor the Machelones have ever been, or could ever have been, described as ' Sakas ', which name, needless to say, is never spelt otherwise than as *Sk-n* in Parthian and, in any case, was used exclusively for the people of *Sakastān* in Sassanid times. Most of what has been written on the trilingual inscription of Shapur i, by Orientalists and classical scholars alike, suffers from insufficient consideration of the relationship that exists between the three versions; several authors appear to have given no thought at all to the question. Yet, the work on any document should begin with the problem of its genesis.

As a working hypothesis I should like to put forward the following: the original version of the inscription is that written in the official language of the Sassanid state, in Pahlavi (Middle Persian). A written copy [2] of the Pahlavi

[1] *viz.* under this name; whether certain other names (*Μαχλυηνή*, *Μάκρωνες*, etc.) appertain to this nation is a question that does not concern us here.

[2] This is shown, e.g., by the case of *Anazarbos*. In *BSOS.*, ix (1938), 840, having only a small photograph of the defective Pahlavi version at my disposal, I rejected Sprengling's reading *ʾks . . sy* and substituted *ʾn . l . . sy*, which I then restored as *ʾn[z]l[bw]sy* = *Anazarbos*, because in the region indicated by the context that is the only town whose name fits the legible letters, *ʾn . l . . sy*. Now, having inspected the original inscription, I can confidently say that the stone actually shows *ʾnzl(pw)sy*. It is thus certain that *Anazarbos* was meant; the fact that the other

text was translated, by Ōhrmizd the son of *Šylk*, into Parthian, the *lingua franca* of Northern Persia. The Greek version, too, was made from the Pahlavi,[1] from the *same* written copy, by a Greek who was reasonably well acquainted with Syria [2] but deficient in his knowledge of Asia Minor and the more distant provinces of the Roman empire ; he may have been a native of Seleucia on the Tigris.[3] Accordingly, whenever the versions fail to agree, one should rely on the Pahlavi text ; where it is defective the Parthian and the Greek rank equally and serve to reconstruct the original text. This is not the place to go into details ; but I will cite one case to demonstrate the dubious quality of the Greek version in matters concerning Asia Minor and its neighbourhood.

The description of the battle of Edessa is introduced by a list of the Roman provinces from which Valerian drew his armies. Its nature, now confirmed by the Parthian and Greek texts, was recognized in *BSOS.*, ix (1938), 833. If one studies the Greek text alone, one will receive the impression which M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Berytus*, viii (1943), 28, put into these words : ' the list . . . is carelessly put together, . . . no geographical order is observed except at the beginning . . . there are repetitions . . . and among the larger sub-divisions of the Roman Empire appear Campania and one city of the Pontus, Amastris (spelled Amastria) '. A different view is gained when one takes into account the other versions. The provinces of Asia Minor and Syria appear in the Greek in this form :—

(1) *Βιθυνία* ; (2) *'Ασία* ; (3) *Καμπανία* ; (4) *Συρία* ; (5) *Λυκαονία* ; (6) *Γαλατία* ; (7) *Λυκία* ; (8) [*Κιλικία*] ; (9) *Καππαδοκία* ; (10) *Φρυγία* ; (11) *Συρία* ; (12) *Φοινείκη* ; (13) *'Ιουδαία*.

No doubt this may seem confused. The Parthian version offers :—

(1) Bithynia ; (2) Asia ; (3) Pamphylia (*pmp'y'*) ; (4) Isauria (*'swry'*) ; (5) Lycaonia ; (6) Galatia ; (7) Lycia ; (8) Cilicia ; (9) Cappadocia ; (10) Pharnacia (*prnk'y'*) ; (11) Syria (*swry'*) ; (12) Phœnice ; (13) Judæa.

versions have something else makes no difference. The Parthian text offers *'nglpws* : the corruption can only be understood on the assumption that the translator had a written copy before his eyes and misread *'nzlpwsy* as *'nglpwsy* ; in the Pahlavi script of the 3rd century *Z* and *G* are almost indistinguishable, and frequently have been confused with each other. They were confused in this case also by the Greek translator, who, unable to account for *'nglp-*, invented his *'Αγριππιάς* (*ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΝ* corrected into *ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΔΑ*). W. Ensslin, *Zu den Kriegen des Sassaniden Schapur i.* (*Sb. Bayer. Ak. Wiss.*, 1947, 5), 1949, 110 sq., came close to appreciating the precedence of the Pahlavi text, at least in this case.—Every line of the Parthian version shows its dependence on the Pahlavi, e.g. in the constant confusion of *R* and *L*, the mistranscription of Pahlavi *W* by *R* (e.g. in *krm'n'dy'* for Pahl. *kwm'n'dy* = Comana), the occasional reproduction of inverse Pahlavi spellings (as of *-d-* in *krm'n'dy'* or *spstyd'y'*), etc.

[1] That it was not made from the Parthian is evident by several passages where the Parthian is wrong but the Greek right. For example, Pahl. *kwm'n'dy*, *Κομανα*, but Parth. *krm'n'dy'* (see preceding annotation) ; *'Ρεφάνεαν* correctly, but Parth. *rnypws* (from **rpnyws*) ; *'Αλεξάνδριαν τὴν κατ' "Ισον* correctly, but Parth. *'lyḫsndry' W ktyswsy* ; *'Επιφάνιαν* correctly, but Parth. *'ypyn'y* (for **'pypny'y*) ; *Φλαυιάδα* correctly, but Parth. *pr'ny's* (confusion of Pahl. *W* and *N* ; mistaking Pahl. *L* for *R* where it stood for actual *L* ; the Pahlavi text had **plʒwy's*) ; etc.

[2] He was learnèd enough to replace *Mnbwk* by *'Ιεράπολις*, *Knšr'y* by *Χαλκίς*.

[3] His acquaintance with Persia and Persian affairs was very good ; in his renderings of Persian names he gave their actual pronunciation (no mean achievement).

This list is as well arranged as one may reasonably demand. The absurd *Campania* reveals itself as a foolish mistake; to have put Συρία both for *Isauria* and for *Syria* is even worse.[1] In the Pahlavi text the following only are preserved :—

(6) Galatia; (7) Lycia; (8) Cilicia; (9) Cappadocia; (10) *Plnkydy*; (11 and 12 lost); (13) Judæa.

These names were read and correctly understood in *BSOS.*, ix, 830 sq., except for *Plnkydy* which I then regarded as a corruption of Φοινίκη; now we know that the latter province was mentioned two places further on, and with better material at hand one can still read (12) (*pwnky'y*). It would be unmethodical to set aside Pahl. *Plnkydy* (and its offshoot, Parth. *Prnk'y'*) [2] in order to give preference to Φρυγία, a facile replacement of a name not understood by the translator; Φαρνακία was probably intended, as the representative of *Pontus Cappadocicus*, which has as good a claim to being mentioned in the list as Lycaonia (or Isauria).

To return now to the list of '*Saka kṣatrapas*' at the end of the inscription of Paikuli, we have seen that the princes named in it belong mostly to the western fringes of Persia[3]; as it contains also some rulers from the North (such as the prince of Dunbāwand and the king of Khwārezm) and the East (such as the king of Makurān and the two kings recognized by Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 31), it may be said to have covered the whole of the frontier regions of Iran. We cannot well leave the list without adverting to a figure that is hardly less strange than the Khagan or the 'Lord of Avanti', I mean the king of *Žand-Afrīk* = 'Zand in Africa', i.e. Zanzibar. In introducing him, Herzfeld wrote[4] 'astonishing as the following interpretation may sound, it seems to be almost certain'; one would agree with the first rather than the second half of the sentence. The explanation is based on Parthian *šndplyk* G'9 (line 42'), but the reading is doubtful. The traces rather suggest]*yndplnk*, which is easily restored as [*w*]*yndplnk* = *Windafarnak*; the Pahlavi version, which is badly damaged, appears to have[5] *gwndp*[*lk*], H 8 (line 45); thus there is here no territorial title at all, but a personal name, 'Gundofarrak the king'.[6]

[1] The other repetitions were caused by similar misunderstandings; 'Amastria' is merely another blunder of the translator's.

[2] In both cases the letter *N* is as clear as it can well be.

[3] Some further titles were mentioned by Herzfeld, *A.M.I.*, vii, 60, from the unpublished blocks.

[4] *Paikuli*, i, 244.

[5] Herzfeld *znkp*[*lyk*] in the text, *žandaf*[*rík*] in the transcription and the glossary; later *čndp*[*lyk*], *A.M.I.*, vii, 60.

[6] Possibly a descendant of the Indo-Parthian king Gondophares. The name does not occur elsewhere with final *-ak* (*-ag*). A Gondophar is mentioned also in the inscr. of Shapur, line 32, *gwndply ZY ʾdwkʾn* = Parth. *wyndprn ʾbkn* = Γυνδιφερ Αβγαν. Cf the seal inscriptions Mordtmann, *ZDMG.*, xxix, p. 207, No. 17 *gwndply ZY dpywr ZY ḥdywy BRḤ*, ibid., p. 210, No. 33, *gwndply ZY dpywr ZY ḥdwny BRḤ* (cf. Horn *apud* Justi, 369; Justi, 248, No. 23, and additions opp. p. xxvi); probably both *ḥdywy* and *ḥdwny* are misreadings of *ʾdwky*, so that the seals belonged to the man mentioned in the inscr. of Shapur.

iv

It is a good deal easier to remove the Khagan than to replace him. The correct reading, as we have seen, is *ḥ'd'n ZY .dktl'.* ; we will begin with *ḥ'd'n*. In the Pahlavi inscriptions postvocalic *-d-* invariably indicates the sound *-y-*, which may or may not have arisen from an original *-d-* ; at any rate, *ḥ'd'n* was pronounced *hāyān*. Such a word actually occurs in Manichæan Middle Persian, for certain in one passage and probably in another. The former is a line from a hitherto unpublished hymn, M 570, very likely a part of the *Gōwišn īg Grīw-zīndag*. The text is fragmentary, there are no complete lines. The Soul is speaking :—

(2) *'wm 'šn'z'd pd 'šn'zyš[n*
'yg 'c b'ryst šh[r
(3) *'wm 'hr'm'd pd pr '[yg*
'wl 'w h'y'n'n '[yg
(4) *'wm pd gnz 'y pydr n[yys'd* ?
kw gyg'n phryzyšn n[y

(2) He shall wash [1] me with a laving . . .
that is from the Land on high . . .
(3) He shall raise me on wings of . . .
upwards to the *hāyān*-s of . . .
(4) And shall [set] me in the treasure-house of the Father . . .
where [no] thieves shall loiter . . .

The second passage is in a fragment of Mani's *Šābuhragān*, M 482, which was published by F. W. K. Müller long ago (*Handschriftenreste*, ii, 1904, p. 16). It is so badly damaged that it is difficult to find out its contents. Some help is afforded by a comparable passage in the Coptic ' Sermon on the Great War ' (Polotsky, *Manichäische Homilien*, 32^{2-11}). Close to the end of the world, after the horrors of the Great War have been endured, the Parousia shall take place and peace shall reign on earth. When at that time the survivors of the Great War pass by a cemetery (482 R 1–2), they will mourn the fate of their relatives (482 R 3 *xwyš ṯwhm[g'n]*, *Homilies*, 32^{2-4}), who had had to die before happiness descended on the world, and :—

(5) *g(w)'nd kw w['y] 'wyš'n [ky pd]*
(6) *'w'm ['y] bzg mwrd 'wd ['wzyd]*
(7) *(h)yn[d]* [2] *k[y]bycwš'n sr '(z)* [3] *h'y['n]*
(8) *['w](l) [hn]'ryḫ 'wš'n 'yn š'dy[ḫ]*
(9) *ncyhyḫ [ky] nwn 'mḫ 'ndr phryzw(m)* [4] *[oo]*

' they will say : woe unto them that died and [went out (of the world)] in the

[1] See *Sogdica*, 34, and cf. Parthian *sn'c-* (M. Boyce, above, p. 441, n. 4).
[2] cf. Müller *apud* Salemann *Man. Stud.*, 27 n.
[3] Müller *'d* ; the lower part of the letter *z* is destroyed.
[4] Müller wrongly *phryzyn[d]*.

evil time[1]; but who would lift their heads up from[2] their *hāy[ān]* and let them see this joy in which we live to-day ?[3] '

In the second passage, *hāyān* (half restored) is evidently poetic substitute for ' grave ', while in the first it designates some kind of place associated with the Realm of Light; a meaning such as ' couch ', or ' resting-place ', or ' mansion ', might fit either. If *hāyān* derives from **hādān* (as the spelling in the inscription wants us to believe), an easy etymology is at hand: from **hādan-* or **hādāna-* ' scat ', cf. Skt. *sādana* , OPers., Av. *hadiš-*, ἕδος, *sēdēs*, etc. From a *Grundbedeutung* ' seat ' a wide variety of meanings opens out; it certainly includes ' mansion ', ' dwelling ', ' home ', and ' residence '. Nevertheless, in view of the multiplicity of original forms that would produce *hāyān* in Middle Persian, it would be rash to adopt any particular etymology too wholeheartedly.

V

The second word, *.dktl'.*, is evidently a proper name; there is no appellative that would fit the letters. The ' *hāyān*, mansion, residence, seat, etc., of So-and-so ' can scarcely be anything but the name of a place. That this group of words is in fact a place-name emerges clearly from a proper analysis of the context in the inscription. It is impossible to give such an analysis within the confines of this article; it would involve a re-edition of almost the whole inscription. Here only the broad lines of the argument can be indicated; the details, of reading and interpretation, have to be put aside for the present.

The inscription of Paikuli is a monument to a mean spirit. Its object is to tell us why, and how, Narseh ousted his great-nephew, Bahrām iii, from the kingship; that is all. On the death of Bahrām ii, his son Bahrām iii, long before designated as crown prince, was still a minor. A strong party, to which most of the great nobles and officers of state belonged, preferred a stronger personality and put their hope in Narseh, the youngest and last-surviving son of Shapur i, who had brought glory to Persia. Protracted negotiations and civil war resulted. Narseh was in Armenia, where he held the office of *Vazurg Armenān Šāh* ' king of Great Armenia '[4]; from the party that supported his claims :—

plys[t](ky) '*L LNH Y'TWN 'YK MLK'n MLK' PWN krpkyḥy MN '[lmny] '(w)l(w)ny* ('*L*) *'yr'n štry 'yw wḥyčyt W* (*G*)*DH W štry W NPŠH 'LŠ['] W ptḥšly ZY nyd'k'n MN yzd'n MKB[LWNt]* (line 9)

' an ambassador came to Us (to say :) may the king of kings graciously set out[5]

[1] cf. *Homilies*, 32[6–7], *Wehe euch, dass ihr gestorben und hinausgegangen seid . . .*

[2] *hn'r-* ' to lift (up) ', which I have restored from]'*r-*, is ordinarily construed with '*wl* '*w* (' up to '); it would probably be unjustified to change '*wl* '*z* (' up from ') here.

[3] cf. *Homilies*, 32[5–6], *Wer wird euch aufwecken, dass ihr das Ausmass der Freude sähet, in der wir heute sind.*

[4] Not ' Great king of Armenia ' (as has often been translated); the title equals Arm. *t'agawor Hayoc' Mecac'*. Similarly, ' king of Great Kušān ' is preferable to ' Great king of K.'.

[5] *wḥyč-*, past stem *wḥ[s]ty* (D 2/3, line 19); Pahlavi *wḥyč-*, Man. MPers. *whyz-*; Parth. past stem *wyḥšt*, Shapur, line 4 = ὁρμάομαι; not, therefore, ' move upwards '; ' wihēčakīk ' simply = ' movable '.

from Armenia hither to Ērān-šahr and accept the majesty, the realm, his throne, and the honours of his ancestors from the gods'. Narseh was ready to come :—

(*W*) *LNH 'YK ZK prwltky ḤZY[TNm] [P](W)N 'whlmzdy W wsp'n yzd'n W 'nḥyt ZY MR'T' ŠM M[N] ['']lm[n]y '[L] 'yr'n štry lwny wḥyčwmy* (line 10) 'and when We saw [1] that letter, we set [1] out from Armenia towards Ērān-šahr in the name of Ohrmizd, of All-the-Gods,[2] and of Anāhit the Lady'.[3] As is well known, especially by the Armenian historians, when one travelled from Persia to Armenia in Sassanian times, one set out from Ganzaca (Arm. *Ganjak*) in Atropatene ; Narseh, coming in the reverse direction, no doubt went first to Ganzaca.[4] From there he hastened to Asūristān/Babylonia, where the capitals lay, and where his supporters were concentrated. The shortest road from Ganzaca to Seleucia/Ctesiphon passed through the plain of Siarzūr (Shahrzūr), where one reached the half-way mark ; on that account, the chief town in that plain had been named *Nīm-az-rāh* [5] (' half of the way '). To the west and south-west the plain is closed by a double mountain range ; the pass of Paikuli, where Narseh's monument is situated, affords a passage over the southern spurs of the second range (now called Qaradaγ), which is also the last of the many chains the traveller from Atropatene has to cross before reaching the great plains of Euphrates and Tigris. That Narseh took the road through Siarzūr to Paikuli is clear from his own words :—

MPers. (16)]*ZNH plky*
Parth. (14′)]*'L ZN(H) [']*(*T*)*RH YMṬ'Hm 'YK ZNH* [

MPers. *krty YK'*[*Y*]*MWNt 'DYN šḥ*(*p*)[*w*]*ḥry* (*ZY*) *ḥlgwpt*

'[when] We had reached this place, where this monument [6] has been made, thereupon Shapur the Hargupet, etc.' With these words begins an excessively

[1] I assume now that the imperfect still existed in the earlier forms of Western Middle Iranian ; there are many cases of it in the inscriptions ; note *'kylydy* (with augment) = ' was made '.

[2] = *viśve devāḥ*.

[3] *pad . . . nām* has often been misunderstood.

[4] On the position of the town see Minorsky, *BSOAS.*, xi, 243 sqq.

[5] Heraclius (who may well have been responsible for the destruction of the monument of Paikuli) covered the distance from Siarzūr to Ganzaca in ten days (not counting days of rest), see Minorsky, loc. cit., 251.

[6] Herzfeld failed to recognize that this word, Pahl. *plky* = Parth. *plk*, is an appellative descriptive of the type of monument of which Paikuli is a specimen. We cannot translate it properly until we know the precise shape which the monument of Paikuli once possessed. Herzfeld reconstructed it as almost a cube on a square base, adorned with battlements ; the reconstruction may have to be reconsidered in the light of the excavations carried out by him in 1923.—*Plk*(*y*) is no doubt the same word as Man. MPers. and Parth. *pylg*, on which see *BSOAS.*, xi, 725 n., where I hesitated between ' altar ' and ' steps, staircase ' (Pers. *pille*). Professor G. Morgenstierne kindly suggested to me that *pylg* might be a loanword from a Middle Indian form of Skt. *pīṭha* ; one of its meanings, ' pedestal of an idol,' would fit excellently several of the passages in which *pylg* occurs. All these meanings, ' altar ' or ' pedestal ', ' a monument of the type of Paikuli ', and ' steps, staircase ', do not necessarily exclude each other ; a ' stepped altar ' (as e.g. at Tang-i Sarvak, see *Asia Major*, ii, 159) may have been meant, and the monument of Paikuli, even if it was not in the shape of a ziggurat, may have possessed a great staircase.

long sentence, in which all the principal supporters of Narseh were enumerated; the critical passage comes near its end :—

Parth. (16′) . . . *W 'p'ryk p'rs W prtw MNW 'swr*[(gap)

MPers. (18)]*n 'L ḥ'd'n ZY*

Parth. (16′)]*r ḤWHnt ḥmy'bdyn* [(gap)

MPers. (18) *.dktl'. L*[*NH*] *p*(*t*)[*y*]*lky Y'T*[*WN* (gap)

Parth. (16′)]*TNH ḥndymn YḤWH*[*n*]*t 'YK ZNH plk 'BDt*

Here, for once, the two versions supplement each other with almost no gap; ' (thereupon Shapur the Hargupet, etc.) . . . and the other Persians and Parthians that were [powerful in [1]] Asūr[istān], they all [2] came to *Hāyān* of *.DKTL'*. to meet (and receive) [3] Us [and] presented themselves [before Us] here [4] where this monument is made.'

This is perhaps the most important passage in the whole inscription : it tells us the *raison d'être* of the Monument of Paikuli, which, at first sight, seems to have been erected in a singularly ill-chosen place. Here Narseh met the leaders of his party : here he was proclaimed king of kings ; he found the event worth recording on stone. While his supporters came into the royal presence (*handēmān būdan*) at the spot marked by the monument, they had first gone to ' Hāyān of .DKTL'.,' where they assembled from all parts of the lowlands in order to receive the new king. Consequently, the place named in the inscription should be looked for to the west or south-west of Paikuli, at a moderate distance from the pass ; it would be reasonable to expect that it lay on the very road along which Narseh was travelling, on the Sassanian road from Seleucia/Ctesiphon to Siarzūr over the pass of Paikuli.[5]

When one knows how defective our historical records are for the area thus defined, one will approach the task of searching for the place-name in other sources with diffidence and little hope ; the gap at the beginning of the characteristic part of the name, *.DKTL'*., enhances the difficulty. Nevertheless, the name happily does occur elsewhere, and by careful restoration the form in the inscription can be completed with certitude. Herzfeld, it will be recalled, put *alef* (') as first letter ; but only about a quarter of such a letter is visible, namely two-thirds of its initial up-stroke : the remnant may equally well have formed part of *N*.[6] If one restores *N*, one has to supply a further narrow letter (such as *y*, *w*, *n*, *d*, *k*) in order to fill the gap. When one bears in mind all possible restorations and at the same time considers all place-names ever mentioned

[1] Or similarly.

[2] Parth. *ḥmy-'bdyn* (so to be read) = Arm. *hamaurēn*; Pahlavi *h'mwdyn*, Pahl. Psalter *h'mdwyn*.

[3] *ptylky* = Pers. *paδīre* ; = *istiqbāl*.

[4] *TNH* ' here ' is certain ; not *PNH* ' hither '.

[5] Which was no doubt followed by Heraclius in February, A.D. 628, on his march from Dastagerd to Siarzūr.

[6] cf. above, p. 509.

for the region in question, one will inevitably restore (*N*)[*Y*]*DKTL'*[*Y*] or (*N*)[*Y*]*DKTL'*[*N*][1] and identify *Hāyān īg N.* with *Nīqātōr-Āwānā* (Syriac *Nyqṭwr-'wn'*), a place of unknown situation within the confines of the Nestorian metropolity of *Bēθ Garmai*, to which Paikuli and its neighbourhood belonged, see G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus Syrischen Akten Persischer Märtyrer*, pp. 48 (n. 417), 277.

Foreign long *ī* or *ē* was regularly rendered by *-yd-* (originally = *iį*)[2] in the quaint orthography affected by the Pahlavi scribes; so *Nydktl* may be regarded as normal spelling of *Nīκάτωρ*. The identity of *Hāyān īg N.* with *N.-Āwānā* is sufficiently evident to compel us to reconsider the etymology of MPers. *hāyān*, for which we had provisionally assumed a basic meaning 'seat'.[3] Actually, there is no reason why *hāyān* should not be the very same word as Syriac *āwānā* (*awānā*), which of old[4] has been regarded as a loanword from Iranian: Old Persian *āwahana* 'settlement, village', shortened to *āwān*, which was borrowed by neighbours in East (*aʋana* 'village' in Kharoṣṭhi Documents[5]) and West (Arm. *awan* 'small market town, village', Talmudic אוונא,[6] Mandæan אואנא,[7] in addition to Syriac), but seemed to have been lost to the Iranian languages themselves. Here it appears for the first time in Middle Iranian; in MPers., *āwān* would necessarily become **āyān* and facultatively *hāyān* (with a prothetic *h-* often found before *ā-*). In support of this explanation one could point out that *āwān* occurs everywhere often in place-names[8]; as does *ḥ'd'n* in the inscription. Moreover, in the Aramaic tongues the word is mostly employed for 'a settlement on a high-road where travellers may spend the night'[9]; and as we have seen that *Hāyān īg N.* probably lay on the high-road from Seleucia to Siarzūr, we shall adopt this particular meaning for

[1] The last letter—which does not affect our argument—is doubtful. The apparent traces favour *Y*, but may be a hole in the shape of *Y*. Final *-ā* (as *-'y* is to be pronounced) would be unexpected in this name, which in any case appears without it in Syriac; though foreign names are sometimes adorned with it in Pahlavi without good reason. If Herzfeld's restoration, [*N*], is accepted, we shall regard *Nydktl'n* as an adjective of reference (commonly formed with *-ān* from proper names); hence 'the Nicatorian mansion (etc.)'.

[2] So also in Persian words, chiefly at the end of words (cf. *BSOAS.*, xii, 64 sq.), but sometimes even in their interior, cf. e.g. Pahl. Psalter *nšydm-* = *nišēm-* according to K. Barr (beside *nšdmy*, *Ka'be Kartīr*, line 10).

[3] The ending *-ān*, in place of the expected *-ăn*, made that explanation not too attractive; it was merely in the nature of a working hypothesis.

[4] de Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (1866), 148 sq.

[5] See T. Burrow, *BSOS.*, vii, 779.

[6] J. Levy, i, 41a.

[7] Nöldeke, *Mand. Gramm.*, 136, with n. 1. Nöldeke rejected the derivation from Iranian, which has now been placed beyond doubt thanks to the appearance of the word also on the eastern fringe of the Iranian language territory.

[8] So always in Kharoṣṭhi documents (see Burrow, loc. cit.), often in Armenian, sometimes in Syriac, and once in the Talmud (Levy's passage, אכבדה ואונא, invites emendation to אכברה ו' = *'Ukbarā* and Awānā [differently Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, 331 sq.; the MS. he used had *'ngr' w-'wwn'*]; these two towns lay on the Tigris, very close by each other).

[9] Brockelmann *hospitium ubi quis noctem agit*; Hoffmann (occasionally) *Post-station*; Nöldeke (for Mand.) *Quartier*; Levy *Station, Nachtherberge*,

the Middle Persian word ; which, incidentally, fits the Manichæan passages, too, better than any other.[1]

No scholar has ever examined the historical topography of the Zagros lands so thoroughly as G. Hoffmann examined it. As he resigned himself and listed Nīqātōr-Āwānā among the places *gänzlich unbekannter Lage* (op. cit., 277), one is inclined to abandon further search as useless ; for it is rarely indeed that one can add even a minor point to his incomparable work. However, in this case the inscription of Paikuli has given us a hint to the direction where this ' station ' lay ; we can now take a further step forward. The only reason that Nīqātōr-Āwānā was mentioned at all in our sources was that it was the place where a bishop of *Karxā d-Bēθ Slōx* (Kirkuk), one Isḥāq, died a martyr's death. Elsewhere, the scene of his martyrdom is called *Bēθ-Nīqāṭōr*.[2] As a rule, Syriac place-names compounded with *bēθ* ' house of ' refer not to towns but to districts or provinces ; therefore, we may safely infer that Nīqātōr-Āwānā was the centre of a district named Bēθ-Nīqātōr. Under the latter name, this district is mentioned in the *Chronicle of Arbela*[3] (which, of course, was not available to Hoffmann), as one of the Christian bishoprics, over 20 in number, which were established even at the end of the Arsacid period (spring of A.D. 224, acc. to the *Chronicle*). This bishopric was due to disappear soon ; one does not find its name in any of the later lists, of which the earliest is from A.D. 410.

Thanks to a singularly fortunate circumstance we can place Bēθ-Nīqātōr with certitude.[4] On his first visit to Paikuli, in 1911, Herzfeld, after leaving Khaniqin, was compelled (by the turbulent state of the Turco-Persian frontier) to make a detour and so travelled by way of *Binkudrah*, which he defined as *das Gebiet der Mündung des Ḥuluwān-flusses in die Diyālah*.[5] There can be no doubt that *Binkudrah* continues the ancient name, *Bē(θ)-Nīqāṭōr*.[6] The district lies on the direct line from Seleucia/Ctesiphon to Paikuli : the Sassanian road to

[1] Especially the otherwise troublesome text in which *hāyān* refers to the grave ; a word connoting temporariness well accords with Manichæan ideas about it.

[2] See the passages collected in the *Thesaurus*, col. 491.

[3] See e.g. E. Sachau, *Die Chronik von Arbela* (*Abh. Preuss. Ak. Wiss.*, 1915), p. 61.

[4] Sachau, *Die Chronik von Arbela*, p. 21, identified Bēθ Nīqātōr with Qaṭrabbul. This is inadmissible. He relied on G. Hoffmann's etymology of *Qaṭrabbul* : * *Νικατορόπολις* (*Märtyrerakten*, 41, n. 343). The acceptance of Hoffmann's etymology (which in itself is attractive enough) almost suffices to exclude Sachau's identification ; for if the Greek name persisted up to Muslim times, one would expect to find it being used in earlier centuries, and not a Syriac translation of it. The principal objection, however, is that Bēθ Nīqātōr lay in Bēθ Garmai, while Qaṭrabbul (the district immediately to the NW of Baghdad, on the western bank of the Tigris) is solidly placed in the heart of Bēθ Armāyē.—Sachau did not refer to this erroneous identification in his later work *Zur Ausbreitung des Christentums in Asien* (*Abh. Preuss. Ak. Wiss.*, 1919), in which he listed all known bishoprics of Bēθ Armāyē, pp. 26–38.

[5] *Die Aufnahme des sasanidischen Denkmals von Paikūli* (*Abh. Preuss. Ak. Wiss.*, 1914), p. 6. The name is marked on the map attached to that paper.

[6] The consonantism is exceptionally well preserved ; the ending, *-a(h)*, may hardly be used to defend the reading *N[y]dktl'[y]*, cf. above, p. 520, n. 1. Herzfeld justly recognized that *Binkudrah* represented an old name compounded with *Bēθ* ; however, the original form he posed (' Bā-Nuhadrā ') is unsupported and leaves *-k-* unaccounted for.—The form developed probably in this way : *Bēθ Nīqāṭōr—Bēnikátur—Bēnkátur—Bēnkútrə—Bīnkúdra*.

Paikuli will have passed through it (after branching off near J̌alūlā[1] from the road Seleucia—Holwān) and continued along the course of the Diyālah. It is scarcely an accident that the only reference I have seen[2] to this district, *Binkudrah*, is contained in the description of a journey which a scholar, coming from the direction of the ancient capitals, undertook for the purpose of investigating the remains of the Monument of Paikuli.

[1] cf. *BSOAS.*, x, 941 sq.

[2] [Further inquiry, in which Mr. C. J. Edmonds kindly lent me his help, has shown that the name of *Binkudrah* now chiefly appertains to the village that forms the centre of the district. It lies on the left bank of the Diyālah (Sirwān), at a distance of about half a mile from the river; measured on the excellent map in Herzfeld's *Paikuli* its position is 34° 31′ 30″ N., 45° 14′ E., its air distance from Paikuli 43½ miles. James Felix Jones, *Memoirs. Selections from the Records of the Bombay Government*, No. 43, 1857, map opp. p. 136, showed the plain of B. as running several miles along the left bank of the Sirwān, almost down to the confluence with the Holwān. C. J. Rich, who visited the village, spelt its name *Binkudreh, Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan*, ii, 271 sqq., 378–380. However, Mr. Edmonds points out that according to his recollection the name is pronounced with *-q-*, and this agrees with the spelling adopted by H. Rawlinson, *Bîn-ḳudrah* (i.e. *Bīŋqudraʰ*), *Notes on a March from Zohâb*, *JRGS.*, ix, 1839, 29, and, incidentally, with the original form posited here. There are many Sassanian ruins in the neighbourhood of the village; those now named *Kattar Tepesi* (Rich, ii, 274) may well conceal the old *Station of Nicator.*]