

## Preface

This catalogue covers manuscript fragments in Iranian languages in Syriac script found by the 2nd and 3rd German Turfan expeditions (1904-1905 and 1905-1907) at sites in the Turfan oasis. Most of the manuscripts concerned were found at Shui-pang<sup>1</sup> near Bulayiq, the site of a Christian monastery, a very few at other nearby sites such as Qocho and Toyoq. Two of these manuscripts are in New Persian (E7, E37), the rest in Sogdian; all of them were no doubt written by Christians, as is indicated by the use of the Syriac script and, in most cases, by their contents. Christian texts in other scripts and languages were found at these and other sites in the Turfan oasis, but these are not included in the present catalogue (except incidentally, in cases where the same fragment bears text in more than one language or script).<sup>2</sup>

As will be explained below, the work on this catalogue has extended over many years. Early stages of the project were supported financially by the British Academy, the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. More recently, the completion of the catalogue was made possible by a grant from the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council to Dr Erica C. D. Hunter and the School of Oriental and African Studies for a project entitled “The Christian Library of Turfan”. I am grateful to all these institutions and to my colleagues in England and Germany, in particular Sebastian Brock, Mark Dickens, †Ronald Emmerick, Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Erica Hunter, †Neil MacKenzie, Simone-Christiane Raschmann, Christiane Reck, Lilla Russell-Smith and Peter Zieme, without whose freely-given help this catalogue would have been less accurate and less complete—if, indeed, it could ever have been completed at all. Above all, I must express my deepest gratitude to my dear friend and colleague Werner Sundermann, who was involved in this project from the very beginning and who has contributed more than I can express to the compilation of this catalogue. It is only fitting that the final version should be dedicated to him to whom it owes so much.

Nicholas Sims-Williams, Berlin, July 2011

---

<sup>1</sup> This name is spelled in various ways, including Šipang, which occurs as part of the signature of one fragment (T III Šipang (B) 100 = E27/91). For simplicity, the site is usually referred to as Bulayiq, and this practice will be followed here.

<sup>2</sup> The Syriac texts will be catalogued in Hunter–Dickens forthcoming. Christian Iranian texts from the Turfan oasis written in scripts other than Syriac include the famous Middle Persian psalter in Pahlavi script (Andreas–Barr 1933) as well as several fragmentary Sogdian psalters and other texts in Sogdian script, all of which will be described in Christiane Reck’s *Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 3* (see also below on E17 and E43). For the Christian texts in Uygur Turkish (in both Uygur and Syriac script) we have at present only a preliminary survey (Zieme 1974).



## INTRODUCTION



## Introduction

### *Origin and history of the collection*

Most of the manuscripts described in this catalogue were found at Bulayïq by the 2nd Turfan expedition of 1904-1905. This expedition was led by A. von Le Coq, but the excavation of the monastery at Bulayïq was entrusted to his assistant Th. Bartus, whose discovery of a large cache of Christian manuscript fragments at this site is described in Le Coq 1926, 88. Immediately after their discovery, the manuscripts were numbered and packed ready for dispatch to Berlin; a partial list of packet numbers, from [T II] B 1 to [T II] B 56, is included in the *Acta* of the expedition, now preserved in the Museum für Asiatische Kunst. Photographs of some of the finds were also sent by Le Coq to Berlin, with the result that E. Sachau was able to publish a first sample of Sogdian in Syriac script as early as 1905.<sup>3</sup> The 3rd Turfan expedition of 1905-1907, which was led by A. Grünwedel, also worked in the area around Bulayïq. A significant number of further Christian manuscripts was obtained, but the *Acta* of this expedition unfortunately do not include any find-lists.<sup>4</sup>

The finds of the 2nd Turfan expedition reached the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin in several batches between 1905 and 1906, to be followed some time later by those of the 3rd expedition, which ended in June 1907.<sup>5</sup> In the Museum the individual fragments were numbered with signatures beginning with T II or T III (= 2nd or 3rd Turfan expedition respectively), usually stamped in ink; a letter indicating the place of discovery (e.g. B = Bulayïq) and a packet number were written by hand in ink or pencil. The fragments were then preserved between sheets of glass, either individually or, in the case of smaller fragments, in large “Sammelplatten”. The signatures of the fragments were also recorded on labels attached to the glasses; in some cases this was the only record of the signature, the fragment itself being left unmarked.

Following the establishment of an Orientalische Kommission by the Königlich Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften in 1912, the majority of the Turfan manuscripts were entrusted to the Kommission for study. The Museum für Völkerkunde retained only a small number of manuscripts for exhibition purposes, and these have remained with its successor institution, the Museum für Indische Kunst in Berlin-Dahlem (where they were given new signatures beginning MIK), now part of the Museum für Asiatische Kunst.

The manuscripts which had been placed in the care of the Orientalische Kommission have a more complicated history. During the Second World War they were packed into crates and moved to a place of safety; in 1946, shortly after the end of the war, most of the crates were returned to the Orientalische Kommission in what was then the Russian sector of Berlin, but one crate found its way to West Germany. As a result, the collection was divided for more than forty years between two countries, the smaller part being eventually housed in the

---

<sup>3</sup> [T II] B 49[a] = E27/31, Verso, in Sachau 1905, 973-8 with Pl. II.

<sup>4</sup> Boyce 1960, xix.

<sup>5</sup> Boyce 1960, xxii n. 1.

Staatsbibliothek in West Berlin (after sojourns in Mainz, Marburg and, in the case of certain manuscripts, also Hamburg) and the larger part in the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR in East Berlin. Moreover, some Christian Sogdian fragments belonging to the manuscript then known as C2 (here E27) were taken by Olaf Hansen when he fled from East to West Berlin in the late 1940s and subsequently deposited in the Museum für Indische Kunst. Some manuscripts were unfortunately lost or damaged, presumably as a result of the chaotic situation in Berlin at the end of the war.<sup>6</sup>

In 1992, after the reunification of Germany, the part of the Turfan collection which had formerly been entrusted to the Orientalische Kommission was also reunited. Its current status is as property of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften on deposit in the Orientabteilung of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz. In practice, the Iranian and Turkish material is mostly housed in the BBAW, while the material in other languages including Syriac is mostly housed in the Staatsbibliothek. (Since some manuscripts are bilingual and some Sammelpfatten contain fragments in more than one language, this division is not quite complete.) The Museum retained its old collection, but the “Hansen-fragments” were handed over to the BBAW. Thus the present catalogue covers material in three locations: the BBAW, the Staatsbibliothek and the Museum für Asiatische Kunst.<sup>7</sup>

Apart from Sachau, whose 1905 publication was mentioned above, the first scholars to work on the Iranian texts in Syriac script were F. C. Andreas and F. W. K. Müller. Andreas never published any Christian Sogdian texts, but many photographs were made for him, most of which passed after his death to the library of the University of Göttingen.<sup>8</sup> Müller on the other hand was responsible for important editions of Christian Turfan texts in both Sogdian (Müller 1907, 1913; Müller–Lentz 1934) and New Persian (Müller 1915). Müller’s collection of photographs passed to Wolfgang Lentz and is now preserved in the Asien-Afrika-Institut of the University of Hamburg, together with transcripts of some of the texts by both Müller and Lentz.<sup>9</sup> Since some of the original manuscripts were lost or damaged during the war years, these old photos and transcripts, together with the published editions, sometimes attain the status of primary sources for the texts.

After Müller and Lentz, the next scholar to work intensively on the Christian Sogdian texts was Olaf Hansen. He too left a collection of photographs and transcripts, which are now preserved in the Handschriftenabteilung of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.<sup>10</sup> Many of the photographs are duplicates of those in Hamburg and Göttingen, but some of Hansen’s transcripts are important because they have proved to be of texts which are no longer extant (see Sims-Williams 1995a, 1995b). In addition to two substantial text-editions (Hansen 1941, 1955), Hansen was responsible for the first serious attempt to sort and classify the texts, introducing a new classification consisting of a capital C followed by numbers 1-109. (On

---

<sup>6</sup> Boyce 1960, xxv.

<sup>7</sup> Digital images of the manuscripts in the BBAW and the Staatsbibliothek can be found under <http://idp.bl.uk/> or <http://idp.bbaw.de/>.

<sup>8</sup> The photographs are preserved in a box labelled “Andreas 11:1”.

<sup>9</sup> Some of these papers are contained in folders labelled “61” and “Ma V”. Many of the old photographs are mounted on cards and preserved separately.

<sup>10</sup> The relevant papers are to be found in the Hansen-Nachlass, folders 65-69 and 81-82.

this system see further below.) His other major contribution was to rejoin some of the torn fragments into larger units or even, occasionally, complete folios. This work was continued, in the case of the manuscripts in the possession of the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, by Werner Sundermann, who also published a series of important editions of Christian texts in both Sogdian (Sundermann 1974, 1975a, 1981, 1988, 2002) and New Persian (Sundermann 1974a).

My own work on the Christian texts of the Turfan collection began in the early 1970s, from which time onwards I paid many visits to Berlin, Hamburg, Göttingen and Kiel (where the Nachlass of Olaf Hansen was then housed) in order to study the relevant manuscripts, photos and transcripts. The present catalogue was first projected in 1983, when its compilation was entrusted by the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR jointly to Sundermann and myself. Our collaboration on the catalogue continued until 1987, when Sundermann withdrew in order to concentrate on other tasks and I took over sole responsibility for this project. By this time, draft descriptions of almost all the Iranian fragments in Syriac script had been composed by one or the other of us and great progress had been made in the joining and identification of the Christian Sogdian fragments. Many elements of the descriptions in the present catalogue are therefore due to Werner Sundermann, though by now it is impossible to attribute credit accurately for particular discoveries.

My work on the catalogue continued intermittently after the reunification of the collections in 1992. The fact that the great majority of the fragments formerly in East and West Berlin were now housed under the same roof naturally made the work easier in some respects. At this time it was decided that fragments should no longer be joined physically, but only in the form of photo-montages, so that fragments which could theoretically have been joined had to be catalogued as separate items. So far as I am aware the only case in which fragments from the former East and West Berlin collections have been physically joined is the group described below under the number E28/5b.

The completion of this catalogue, nearly thirty years after the initiation of the project, was made possible by a grant from the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council to the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. This award enabled me to work intensively on the Sogdian and New Persian Turfan texts for a period of three and a half years from 2008 to 2011. As part of the same project my colleagues Erica Hunter and Mark Dickens were able to devote their time to studying and cataloguing the Syriac texts of the Turfan collection. As a result of the simultaneous appearance of the two catalogues, it should now be possible to gain a more accurate idea of the nature and vitality of the Christian community in the Turfan oasis towards the end of the first millennium A.D.

#### *Signatures and classification systems*

The original signatures, which were given to the fragments in the field and applied to them soon after their arrival in Berlin, typically consist of a sequence such as T II B 66, which means: 2nd Turfan expedition, find-spot Bulayīq, packet number 66. Sometimes part of the signature is missing, as in B 66 (for T II B 66) or T III 52 (for T III B 52). Some packets contained many fragments, so additional numbers or letters were often added later to distinguish them, resulting in complex signatures such as T II B 66 No.48a or T III 52a(β). Since

these additions were not assigned in a systematic way, the same fragment was sometimes given different extensions by different scholars. Sometimes all or part of the signature was written on the fragment itself, sometimes only on a label on the glass plate under which it was preserved. In the latter case, there was a risk that a signature might eventually be lost or wrongly assigned, for instance when a fragment was transferred from one glass to another, and it is clear that such accidents have sometimes occurred. Some fragments therefore have no old signature, while others are preserved under signatures whose accuracy may be doubted. For instance, if two fragments of the same manuscript bear signatures indicating different find-spots, one is bound to suspect that one or other signature is a mistake. Such problems are luckily rare in the case of the Iranian texts in Syriac script, nearly all of which come from the single site of Bulayïq.

The find-spot is generally indicated in an abbreviated form, usually by a single letter. In the case of the Iranian texts in Syriac script, the only find-spot which is named at all commonly, apart from the ubiquitous “B” = Bulayïq, is “T.V.B.,” usually as part of the signature T III T.V.B. The abbreviation “T.V.” alone is known to stand for “Turfaner Vorberge”,<sup>11</sup> a general designation for the area north of Turfan which includes the site of Bulayïq. The added “B” perhaps stands for “Bulayïq”. In any case, it seems certain that the fragments with the signature T III T.V.B., many of which belong to the same manuscripts as fragments with T II B or T III B signatures, ultimately come from Bulayïq and were found or acquired in its vicinity by the 3rd Turfan expedition.

At least one Christian Sogdian manuscript, the gospel lectionary E2, must come from Qocho, since the three surviving fragments all bear signatures containing the letter “D” (= Dakianus-shahr, a traditional name for Qocho).<sup>12</sup> Apparently these fragments were not found in the Christian church just outside the walls of Qocho, of which Le Coq wrote: “die Ruine ergab nicht eine einzige Aufschrift auf ihren Mauern und nicht ein einziges Manuskript aus ihren geringen Schuttmassen”.<sup>13</sup> They may perhaps have been found in the only other building at Qocho with a demonstrable Christian connection, the “Ruine eines großen Klosters”, where a Christian Sogdian inscription<sup>14</sup> and a wooden key bearing a Christian cross (and an Uygur inscription)<sup>15</sup> were also discovered. Several other Christian Sogdian fragments are preserved under signatures implying that they come from Qocho, but in some cases it is doubtful whether the signatures are correct (see discussion under E10/1, E27/131, E53 and E57). Even more problematic is the case of the fragment E3, which consists of two joined fragments with contradictory signatures. One of the two bears the signature T II S 25, which should indicate that it was found at Sängim,<sup>16</sup> the source of a number of Buddhist and Manichaean manuscripts, but in view of the fact that another part of the same folio was found at a different site, probably Bulayïq, it seems likely that the signature T II S 25 is erroneous. A somewhat similar problem is presented by the New Persian pharmacological fragments

<sup>11</sup> Thus Müller 1908, 13.

<sup>12</sup> Boyce 1960, xii (and passim).

<sup>13</sup> Le Coq 1913, text accompanying Pl. 7.

<sup>14</sup> MIK III 365 = [T] II D 416A, see DTS, 38, and Sims-Williams 1992b, 58.

<sup>15</sup> MIK III 5977 = “T II D R. e. g. K.”, see Raschmann 2009a, 253-4.

<sup>16</sup> Boyce 1960, xxxiv.



E37/1-2, whose signatures appear to indicate that one folio (E37/1) was found at Toyoq and the other (E37/2) at Bulayiq. In this case, however, the appearance of the folios suggests that the codex from which they derive may have been broken up already in antiquity, so that it is possible that the two folios may have been found at different sites. The only other Christian Sogdian manuscript which seems to have been found at Toyoq is E32, a text with highly unusual linguistic and orthographical features, the fragments of which bear the signature T II T 21.<sup>17</sup>

The first attempt to give each fragment a unique number seems to have been that of Müller, who assigned individual signatures from M 1 to M 919 to a series of fragments, mostly in Manichaean script, all of which had been brought from Qocho by the 1st Turfan Expedition.<sup>18</sup> It was apparently in continuation of the M-series that a system of signatures consisting of numbers running from 1000 to 1907 (with no preceding letter) was created, perhaps by Lentz, and applied to glasses containing fragments from the finds of all three expeditions. These numbers seem never to have come into general use, but some glasses still bear the labels on which they are written. In this system, according to a list preserved in the BBAW, the Christian fragments mostly fall within the range 1625-1907.

In more recent times, each of the three institutions in charge of the Turfan texts in Syriac script has adopted its own system of shelf-marks which provide a unique identifier for each fragment. The fragments in the Museum für Asiatische Kunst bear numbers preceded by MIK (= “Museum für Indische Kunst”); those in the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften bear numbers preceded by a lower-case n (= “nestorianisch”); while those in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, most of which are in Syriac, bear numbers preceded by SyrHT (= “Syrische Handschriften aus den Turfanfunden”). The “Hansen-fragments” returned by the Museum to the Academy bear both MIK- and n-numbers. A very few fragments in the BBAW bear shelf-marks belonging to other series (M = “Manichaica”, So = “Sogdica”, U = “Uigurica”), either because their script was not recognized as Syriac or because they also contain text in another script.

In addition to the original find-signatures and the modern shelf-marks, the Sogdian texts in Syriac script have often been cited by signatures consisting of a capital C (= “Christlich-soghdisch”?) followed by numbers from 1 to 109. These C-numbers, which were introduced by Hansen, were not intended as individual signatures but rather as a classification system. In principle, it is clear that Hansen intended that each C-number should identify a group of fragments belonging to a single manuscript or at least to the handwriting of a single scribe. To some extent this intention was realized: certainly there is little doubt that the fragments which Hansen published under the signatures C1 (Hansen 1941) and C2 (Hansen 1955) each belong to a single manuscript (here E23 and E27 respectively). But the problems start already with C3, which is applied not only to a series of fragments in a distinctive tiny hand (here E26) but also, perhaps by a mere clerical error, to two fragments which belong to the gospel lectionary published in Müller 1913 (Hansen’s C5, here E5). Conversely, the signature C4 is assigned to a single folio (here E28/1), even though its

<sup>17</sup> For T = Toyoq see Boyce 1960, xxxv.

<sup>18</sup> Boyce 1960, xxi. This series included a few Syriac and Turkish fragments in Syriac script (M 151, 152, 155, see *ibid.*, 12, 57, and Müller 1904, 107).

handwriting cannot be distinguished from that of C6, C15, C18, C20, and many other texts with different C-numbers. Hansen himself changed his mind many times about the details of his classification system, so that some fragments have been referred to under two or more C-numbers.

In order to avoid adding to this confusion, it was decided already in the 1980s that the catalogue then under preparation by Sundermann and myself would not be arranged by the C-numbers, but according to a new classification system based on the same principle. As a temporary measure the fragments were assigned to groups (each representing a particular manuscript or handwriting) under signatures consisting of a number preceded by a capital N. This was intended as a private and therefore flexible system, which could evolve as necessary during the course of the research for the catalogue; owing to a misunderstanding, however, some N-numbers were cited in print on at least one occasion (Dickens 2009). The definitive version of this classification system, which appears in print for the first time in the present catalogue, uses a capital E (= “[Church of the] East”) followed by a number from 1 to 57. It differs in two significant ways from Hansen’s system of C-numbers. In the first place, the opportunity was taken to arrange the manuscripts in a systematic order, beginning with Biblical texts (E1-E7), and continuing with Liturgy, hymns and prayers (E8-E22), Hagiography, homilies and general Christian literature (E23-E36), and finally Miscellaneous, secular and indeterminate texts (E37-E57). Secondly, the entry for each manuscript is subdivided in such a way that each folio (e.g. E1/1) and even each fragment (e.g. E1/1a) has a unique number.

#### *Formal aspects of the catalogue*

In principle, each item—whether a single fragment or composite of two or more joined fragments—is described as it now stands. If the item in question is the only surviving example of a particular manuscript or handwriting it bears a number such as “E3”. If parts of more than one folio survive, the folios are distinguished as “E2/1”, “E2/2” etc. The folio numbers do not always begin at “1” and are not necessarily consecutive: where possible they are arranged in their likely original order, with appropriate gaps for missing folios. If a particular folio is represented by more than one fragment or group of joined fragments, the separate items are distinguished as “E2/2a”, “E2/2b” etc.

The catalogue entry for each manuscript is divided into several parts. The first part concerns the manuscript as a whole and is headed by the manuscript number, e.g. “E5” or “E27” and, where possible, a brief characterization of its contents, e.g. “**Gospel lectionary**” or “**Miscellany**”. If the manuscript in question had a consistent number in Hansen’s classification system this is indicated by the addition of the words “*formerly C5*”, “*formerly C2*” etc. Under this heading some general information may be added about the contents, reconstruction, format, orthography etc. of the manuscript; this is generally omitted in the case of manuscripts represented by a single folio or a single fragment, since it is sufficient to give the relevant information under the entry for that folio or fragment.

The following parts of the entry concern individual folios (occasionally: double-folios); groups of fragments which are not joined but which belong to a single folio; and individual fragments (or groups of joined fragments). Taken together, these sections provide

the numbers and signatures of the fragments (present and former classification numbers, shelf-marks and find-signatures), together with references to any surviving old (pre-war) photos and transcripts; descriptions of the fragments, their dimensions and the number of lines of text preserved, and details of their contents, including a list of any proper names which occur in them. In the case of unpublished fragments a citation from the text (or occasionally the complete text of a very small fragment) is included, as well as a list of any quotations from the text in the secondary literature. In the case of published fragments the bibliographical details of the edition are given instead of a citation and quotations from publications earlier than the edition are generally omitted as superfluous. In the case of significant inaccuracies in the current editions or published quotations, the necessary corrections are indicated.

Under which heading all of this information is given varies somewhat from case to case. For instance, if two fragments of the same folio have been published separately, it has usually seemed more convenient to give the publication details under the entries for the individual fragments, whereas in other cases the publication details may rather be given under the entry for the complete folio.

Certain features of the entries need to be explained.

Where several *signatures* are listed for a single item, this implies that it is a composite put together from several fragments. The signatures are listed in a fixed order beginning at the top righthand corner of the Recto. Since the complex find-signatures are quite inconsistently written, they have been slightly regularized: for instance “.9” is used rather than “,9”, “a” rather than “.(a)” or “<sup>a</sup>”, and “No.” rather than “Nr.” or “N<sup>o</sup>”. A long dash (—) indicates a fragment without any signature, while [square brackets] indicate a part of the find-signature which is not visible on the fragment itself but only known from a label on the glass or from a photo or publication. Square brackets are not used in this way for the classification numbers (the 1000-series and the C-series), which are hardly ever written on the fragments. Thus the sequence “T II B 13 + C11 = [T II] B 66[.1] + T II B 66” (E5/73) implies a composite of three fragments, the second of which bears the signature “B 66” but which is referred to elsewhere both as “T II B 66.1” and as “C11”. It would not have been incorrect to have expressed this series of signatures as “C5 = T II B 13 + C11 = [T II] B 66[.1] + C5 = T II B 66”, but in view of the fact that the manuscript E5 is identical with that formerly known as C5 (as recorded at the very beginning of the entry for E5) such formulations have been avoided as redundant.

The *locations* of the manuscripts are not specifically indicated, since they may be deduced from the shelf-numbers: fragments with n-, M-, So-, or U-numbers are in the BBAW, those with SyrHT-numbers in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, and those with MIK-numbers in the Museum für Asiatische Kunst (unless they also have an n-number, in which case they are in the BBAW). Old photos are listed according to their location and old transcripts according to their author (from which the location follows automatically: those by Müller and Lentz are in Hamburg, those by Hansen in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin).

*Dimensions* are given in the form (height) x (width), to the nearest half-cm. A measurement is indicated as approximate (“ca.”) if it is partially calculated, e.g. because part of the text is known only from a photo or copy or to make allowance for the fact that a

fragment is distorted. All measurements are maximal and are taken between the extreme points in each direction, even if the extreme points (left and right or top and bottom) are not directly opposite one another.<sup>19</sup>

*Line-numbers* are consistently counted separately for each side of the fragment or folio, beginning with the first line of which some trace survives; where they have been cited according to a different system in the standard edition of the text, the line-number of the edition is added in italics, e.g. IV9, IIR2 (= 114, 122). The leaves of double-folios are distinguished as I and II and the two sides of each folio as R (= Recto) and V (= Verso) (or, where it is not sure which side is which, A and B). The *number of lines* is given in the form “R + V” (or “A + B”). Partial lines, quire-numbers etc. (but not marginal notes or corrections added between the lines) are included in the count.

In the list of *proper names* etc. the common forms yšwγ “Jesus”, mšyh’ “Christ” and šmnw “Satan” are ignored. The prefixed definite articles n-, w-, y- are omitted, e.g. ymyk’ (E27/94V24) is cited as myk’. Otherwise, names which occur only once in a particular fragment are cited exactly as they appear, with the attested pointing and inflexion and the usual brackets to indicate the state of preservation, e.g. “m(w)[š](‘)y (V16)”. Names which occur more than once in a particular fragment are cited in a standardized form before a list of references, e.g. “mwš’ (R18, 19)”, with \* marking passages where the name is substantially illegible or restored.

In *citations* of the texts the following conventions are employed: (xyz) = letters partly legible; (xyz) = uncertain traces compatible with the reading proposed; [xyz] = letters wholly restored; ••• or [•••] = (approximate) number of illegible or missing letters. In this context a long dash ( — ) represents a line-filler. For technical reasons, certain diacritic points have had to be reproduced after rather than, as would be more accurate, above and below the letters to which they apply.

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the diagram in Ehlers 1987, 26.