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Onomastica Irano-Iberica

II. The Name of a Zoroastrian “Bishop”¹

JOST GIPPETT

In his “Iranisches Namenbuch”, still indispensable for investigations into the anthropononomastics of the Iranian peoples, FERDINAND JUSTI mentions a certain “Binkar, Oberpriester” who “spread the Zoroastrian religion in Georgia under Waxtang Gurgaslan (466–499)” and whose name he considered to represent an imperative form of the verb nigarīdan in the sense of “pay attention!”² The information on the high priest Justi relied upon was taken from a short notice in a numismatic article by BERNHARD DORN³ and from MARIE-FÉLICITÉ BROSSET’s “Histoire de la Géorgie”, the French translation of the Georgian chronicle Kartlis Cxovreba, which refers three times to Bin(a)kar, styling him a “bishop of the fire worshippers”.⁴ Given that the name of the “bishop” exhibits remarkable variation in the manuscript tradition of the chronicle—apart from Binkar and Binakar, BROSSET himself mentions the forms Binkarian and Bunakar as well as Binkaran appearing in “the Armenian chronicle”,⁵ i.e., the 13th century Armenian translation of Kartlis Cxovreba, Patmowtʿiwn Vraṭ—, JUSTI’s proposal deserves to be challenged. This is all the more true as the “bishop’s” name can be shown to occur, in much more divergent forms, in other Old Georgian sources, too.

¹ For part I of the present article see GIPPETT 2011.
³ DORN 1844, p. 37: “Nun erzählt … die georgische Geschichte, dass zur Zeit Gurgarslans viele aus dem niedern Volke dem Feuerdienste huldigten, welchen ein Oberpriester Binakar in Georgien predigte …”
⁵ BROSSET 1849, p. 149 note 2: “Ou Binakar, Binkarian, plus bas; Bounakar, p. 96, et Binkaran, dans la Chron. armén.”—Cf. GIPPETT 1984, p. 38 and below for a more comprehensive list of variants.
1. The “bishop’s” record in Kartlis Cxovreba

In the Georgian chronicle, a compilation of historiographical texts from the 11th up to the 18th century, the Zoroastrian “bishop” is mentioned within the account, attributed to a certain 쬷anšer, of the Georgian king Vaxtang Gor-gasali, the legendary founder of the capital, Tbilisi, who ruled in the second half of the 5th century. According to the chronicle, the “bishop” played an important rôle indeed in the controversy between the Christian king and his Zoroastrian coevals at the Sasanian court of Iran. For the sake of convenience, the relevant passages of the chronicle are reproduced with an English translation here.

1.1 The Zoroastrian “bishop” is first introduced as being sent to the older Georgian capital, Mcxeta, as the head of a group of fire worshippers, by Barzabod, an Iranian general who was the governor of Rani, the region between Kartli, i.e. Eastern Georgia, and present-day Azerbaijan, and who was the father of Sagdux, the wife of the Georgian king Mirdaṭ and mother of Vaxtang Gorgasali. Binkaran (this is the name form adopted in the modern editions) is styled a “bishop” right from the beginning:

Then Barzabod sent out fire worshippers to Mcxeta, and Binkaran as a bishop over them, and they settled in Moguta. And Queen Sagdux conducted the reign with the power and help of her father. And Barzabod, Sagdux’s father, died, and instead of him the king of the Persians appointed (+ in his stead) a son of his, Varaz-Bakur, the brother of Queen Sagdux. And Saurmag, the commander-in-chief, the warden of Vaxtang, died.

6 Justi’s Gurgsλan represenmta later (Turkicized) form of the epithet of the king, which reflects a Persian “gurg-sar” “wolf’s head”; cf. Gippert 1984, p. 40 with note 41.
7 The exact dating remains controversial. Cf. Gippert in print as to the difficulties met with in providing a reliable chronology of 5th century Georgia.
8 The chronicle is available in two modern scholarly editions (Qauxišvili 1955 = KCQ and Meetreveli 2008 = KCM). Divergences between the two editions mostly concern the attempt to restore a more standardized Old Georgian wording in the latter, which also takes into account an important manuscript that has only recently been found (Q = Q-1219, of 1697; cf. KCM, 23). The following transcripts reproduce the text of KCQ, with noteworthy text variants from KCM being added in curly braces.—The Armenian version of the chronicle, Patmowtʿ iwv uracʾ = PV), is quoted after Abulase 1953.
1.2 Binkaran conducts Zoroastrian proselytism in Mcxeta, with much more success among the common people than the Georgian nobility:10

1 Then the king appointed another commander-in-chief, who was named Juansher. And Binkaran, the bishop of the fire worshippers {of the Mcxetians, who was a Persian fire worshipper}, taught the Georgians his faith, but none of the nobles submitted himself to it, but many {some} of the commoners were converted to fire worship. And (thus), fire worship invaded the commoners in Kartli.

1.3 Queen Sagduxt summons a Greek priest, Mikael, to support her in maintaining the Christian faith in Kartli. Mikael is appointed bishop in Mcxeta and performs his task with good success:11

Because of this, Queen Sagduxt was {+ highly} distressed, but she {nobody} could not venture anything because of the superiority of the Persians. Then she summoned (lit. brought) a true priest from Greece, by the name of Mikael, and appointed him as the bishop of (lit. in) the upper church; for bishop Mobidan had passed away, and this Mikael stood up against Binkaran, the deceitful one, in that he taught all Georgians the true faith. He biased all nobles of Kartli towards the (Christian) belief, as well as most of the (common) people, but some of the commoners were converted to fire worship.

1.4 Binkaran is still alive and active some twelve years later when Vaxtang Gorgasali has taken over rule in Kartli and has defeated the Ossetes, with strong support by Iranian troops. Binkaran acts as an envoy between Vaxtang and the Persian king, Urmizd (= Hormizd III, ca. 457–9), who gives Vaxtang his daughter Balenduxt12 in marriage in preparation of a common war against the Byzantine emperor:13

10 KCQ 145,9–12 / KCM 157,13–17
11 KCQ 145,12–19 / KCM 157,17–158,6.
12 The correct form of the name can be restituted as *šāhênduxt; cf. Gippert 2011 and below.
13 KCQ 158,4–16 / KCM 171,5–16.
ვახტანგ მეფემა მადლობა ღმრთის მიმართ მრავლით ლოცვითა და ღამის-თევითა, და გამოცდილ წყობასა შინა ოდენთა. და წარსცა ძღუენი ნატყუების გამოცდებით და ვახტანგ უწოდა ძეს თჳსსა, და წარჩინებულ-ქმნა მჴედარნი, მსახურნი მჴნედ და გამოცდილნი წყობა მას შინა ოდენთა. და წარსცა ძღუენი ნატყუების გამოცდებით და გამოცდილ წყობაზე. და დაწყების წყობა უკიდურესად გამოცდილ წყობა. და დაწყების წყობა უკიდურესად გამოცდილ წყობა. და დაწყების წყობა უკიდურესად გამოცდილ წყობა.
And king Vaxṭang’s wife gave birth to twins, a son and a daughter, and she, Queen Balenduxt, the daughter of the king of the Persians, died during the birth. And Vaxṭang gave his son the Persian name Darčil, and in Georgian, Dači.

There was not enough time for Vaxṭang then to bring the daughter of the Greek emperor home to marry her, nor the catholicos and the bishops; for he was expecting an invasion by the king of the Persians. (So) he fortified the fortresses and cities, and he equipped the equestrians, and he prepared them for the battle against the Persians. Then he threw Binkaran, the deceitful bishop of the fire worshippers, into prison and he crushed all fire worshippers and expelled them from the borders of Kartli.

1.6 With the battle upcoming, Vaxṭang sends a letter to the Byzantine emperor in which he informs him about his deeds against the Zoroastrians, among them his treatment of Binkaran who is reported to have died when he tried to leave Kartli:15

And after three years, the Persian king set out to fight against Vaxṭang, and he moved to Indabriani and encamped there. But Vaxṭang sent out (a message) to the Byzantine king and informed him:

"Look, this (is the) day for which I gave you my promise that I shall force the Persians into your hand(s). Look, (now) they are intruding into the borders of Kartli, altogether about 300,000 men with them. For he (the Persian king) had the intention to extend his troops (with people) from Armenia and the king(dom)s of Caucas architects, but they did not venture to unite with him, for some of them set their hope on (Christ) Crucified. But some were overwhelmed by the devil, the kings of Derbent united with him. Now I have fulfilled the promise I gave: For

wherever I have found a fire temple, I have filled it with urine, and their Magis and spies I have delivered to bad torturings; the deceitful Binkaran I have thrown into prison, and (thus) he escaped from death. (It was) he (who) brought the Persians to Kartli. And I have appointed Mikael as bishop, a faithful man. Finally, Binkaran has died reaching the borders of Kartli.

Quickly now send out your troops so that they may defeat all the enemies of the cross (we have) here, and that you may preempt all your enemies; for if he overcomes us, he will gain strength and invade your borders via Šimšāti.”

2. Binkaran as a “bishop”

2.1 It may appear strange at first sight that Binkaran is styled a “bishop” in the Georgian text, given that no other cases seem to be known of Zoroastrian high priests bearing that Christian title, neither in Georgian nor in any other language. As a matter of fact, not even the Armenian version of Kartlis Cxovreba, the Patmowtʿiwn Vracʿ, uses the epithet “bishop” in the given case. In the four passages relating to Binkʿaran in the Armenian version the term kʿrmapet, lit. “chief of pagan priests”, is used instead. Note that the name itself, in the form Binkʿaran, appears only once:16

16 PV 144,2–5 ~ KC 145,5–7 / 157,9–10; PV 144,10–15 ~ KC 145,9–11 / 157,13–17; PV 152,2–6 ~ KC 158,7–11 / 171,8–13; the fourth passage (PV 169,7–15), in which Vaxtān addresses the Persian king, has no exact equivalent in the Georgian text. The PV knows nothing about Binkʿaran’s death.

And then he (Barzabowt’) sent out fire worshippers to Mcxitʿa, and one kʿrmapet named Binkʿaran. And having arrived they settled in Mogtʿa. ... The commander-in-chief Sayowrmak died, too, and Jowanscher took over his honour. And the kʿrmapet tried to convert the Georgians to his faith, but no-one looked at him except for a few unimportant people, who lost their lives.

...
And he sent gifts to the king of the Persians, 20,000 horses and 10,000 servants, by the hand of (= through) the kʿrmapet. And he asked for (the hand of) his daughter for marriage.

"...Look, you know that all kings paid tribute to you while they were believers in (Christ) Crucified, and invigorated by him they defeated you who worship the fire, of whom I purged my country here, sending you their kʿrmapet, too. And now my God is Christ, and may the fire be your god!"

2.2 Nevertheless, the use of the word for “bishop”, episkopos, is not due to mere awkwardness on the side of the Georgian author, Žuanšer. On the contrary, the text passages show that he intentionally contrasts Binkaran with at least two Christian bishops, one, Mikael who was appointed by Queen Sagduxt as an opponent to Binkaran, and the other one, a certain Mobidan, the deceased predecessor of Mikael. These two bishops are mentioned in the Armenian version, too, where they are styled episkopos; the divergence in the form of one of the names (Armenian Mowšid vs. Georgian Mobidan) explains itself, at least in part, by the notorious similarity of the characters բ and ժ in the Georgian nusxa-xucuri script (ք vs. շ), which is also visible in variants such as Šinkaran, Šinakran, or Šinakar attested for the Zoroastrian “bishop’s” name, and variants with š for the name of Mobidan is also attested in manuscripts of the Georgian chronicle.

In those days bishop Mowšid died, and his place was taken by Mikʿayēl, who was from Greece and who, with his courage, protected the prominent people in the true faith.

Differently from the Georgian text, according to which Mikael “stood up against Binkaran”, the Armenian version does not thematize the interrelation between the two bishops and the kʿrmapet, and it suggests that the succession from Mobidan/Mowšid to Mikael/Mikʿayēl was instantaneous. In the Georgian text, however, we read that it seems to have taken quite some time until Mikael appeared in Kartli, summoned there from Greece by Sagduxt, with a corresponding vacancy of the see. The Georgian wording further suggests that Binkaran might have abused the vacancy to establish himself as the “bishop” of Mcxeta—at least this is what we may assume is indicated by the epithet “deceitful” (Georgian macturi) which he is given more than once in the passages quoted above. This assumption is confirmed by external evidence.

17 PV 144,16–145,2 ~ KC 145,12–19 / 157,16–158,6.
18 Cf. Gippert 1984, p. 38 for a preliminary account of the confusion resulting from this and other pairs of similar characters in the transmission of historical names in Georgian sources, and further 4.1 below.
3. The early Georgian bishops in the “Conversion of Kartli”

3.1 Bishop Mikael must have been an outstanding person in Georgian history indeed, given that he was not only the last bishop before the establishment of the office of a catholicos (Georgian katalikosoba) in Georgia but also the spiritual teacher of Vaxṭang Gorgasali in his youth, as Kartlis Cxovreba tells us:

Then Vaxṭang grew up, and he was taught by Mikael, the bishop, in all the knowledge of the Lord. And from his very childhood on he loved the faith of Christ, more than all (other) kings of Kartli.

In other sources, Mikael is even called an archbishop (Georgian mtavar-episkoposi, lit. “head-bishop”). This is true, first of all, for the “Conversion of Kartli” (Mokecevay Kartlisay), a compilatory text that comprises legendary material concerning the conversion of Georgia to Christendom by a female saint named Nino as well as an annalistic type of account of the early centuries of Georgian Christianity, the so-called “Kings’ List”. The following synopsis of the passage in question contrasts the two major redactions of the Conversion (that of Šaṭberdi, 10th century, and that of Čelişi, 14th century) with the corresponding passage from the fragmentary third redaction, which has recently been discovered among the manuscripts of the so-called “New Finds” of St. Catherine’s Monastery on Mt. Sinai (ms. Sin.georg. N48), as well as the two later “metaphrastic” versions of the Conversion. In the Sinai manuscript and the metaphrasis by a certain Arsen Beri (NA), Mikael even receives the epithet didi, i.e., “the great”.

MKS

And after some time he (Vaxṭang Gorgasali) returned (from Persia), and the archbishop was Mikael.

20 KCQ 197,9–14; KCM 213,10–14. The first catholicos was a certain Peṭre who was sent to Georgia by the Greek patriarch of Antioch; cf. 3.2.1 below.
21 KCQ 146,16–18; KCM 158,8–10.
22 Cf. Gippert 1997 and 2006 for an account of the historiographic value of the legend.
24 MKN fol. 12v, line 14–13r, line 1; readings from the fragment (hereafter: MKN) are based on an autopsy undertaken on Mt. Sinai in May, 2009.
25 NA 47,20–22 and NB 81,9–11. The two metaphrastic redactions (of allegedly the 12th–13th cc.) are quoted after the edition in Abulaʒe 1971, pp. 7–51 and 52–83.
26 Note that the Sinai fragment exhibits the remarkable spelling dit, with final devoicing and no nominative ending as if it were a proper name.
And after some time he returned, and the archbishop was Mikael. And after some time he returned, and the archbishop was Mikael the Great. 

And after some time he returned, and then, by that time, Mikael was the archbishop. And him they informed that Vaxtang had given up Christianity.

3.2 More important in the given context is the fact that the “Kings’ List” contains a consecutive register of all (arch)bishops of Mcteta, from the conversion of Georgia under King Mirian (within the first half of the 4th century) up to Mikael. Just as in the example treated above, the church dignitaries are aligned with the reigns of the kings. Similar information can, of course, also be gained from Kartlis Cxovreba; however, both chronicles diverge to a certain extent, with respect to both the sequence of kings and the number of bishops. Table 1 contrasts the data contained in the two chronicles (including the Armenian version of Kartlis Cxovreba). 

3.2.1 According to the three redactions of the “Kings’ List” in Mokcevay Kartlisay, a total of ten (Christian) kings and thirteen archbishops passed away before the instalment of the first catholicos, Petre. The synoptical arrangement of the three versions reveals that the Sinai fragment is closer to the Çelişi than to the Šaṭberdi version in its wording here: 

---

27 For a previous treatment of the lists cf. Winkler 1990 who, however, does not get into detail as to the latest bishops.

28 The legend of St. Nino within Mokcevay Kartlisay and the two metaphrastic versions mention only the first bishop, Iovane, under King Mirian. In MKS (157,21-27/353,26-30), archbishop Iakob is mentioned as the scribe of a letter sent by King Mirian to Salome of Užarma, the wife of King Mirian’s son Rev, in the heading of chapter 15 of the legend; the corresponding heading in MKC (157,21-24) mentions neither the scribe nor the addressee of the letter.

29 MKS 93,30-33/325,36-37; MKC 93,30-35; MKN 13v,4-12.
Ten kings had died, and thirteen archbishops. And the first catholicos was Petre.

From here on, the catholicoi began to rule as patriarchs (lit. heads of fathers) and shepherds of the people. The first catholicos was Petre, (still) under King Vaxtang.

In MKN the name appears as Simon (11v,12).
The number thirteen seems to contradict the data of the List itself as this mentions only twelve archbishops who had died before Petre was sent to Georgia by the Greek patriarch at Antioch, upon Vaxtang’s request. We arrive at thirteen, however, if we additionally count a monk named Samoel who came along with Petre and who became, according to *Kartlis Cxovreba*, a bishop by his side. Interestingly enough, the Chronicle tells us that all in all twelve bishops accompanied Petre:31

MKS

The latter information may well be a later addition (possibly alluding to the twelve apostles); a view that agrees with the fact that it is only in *Kartlis Cxovreba*...
that the patriarch of Constantinople is first approached by King Vaxṭang. On the other hand, it might also be interpreted as a misunderstanding of the information present in the Kings’ List, with the number thirteen (archbishops before Petre) being “corrected” to twelve (bishops accompanying him). This, however, would contradict the data contained in Kartlis Cxovreba itself as this chronicle omits at least three of the (arch)bishops named in the List, viz. Iaḳob, the second in the series, and the two bishops immediately preceding Mikael, who are indeed crucial for our topic.

3.2.2 Another major divergence consists in the fact that only Kartlis Cxovreba mentions the names of a total of four bishops for the time of King Arčil, viz. Iona, Grigor, Basili, and Mobidan. The Kings’ List names only the first one explicitly, summarizing that “under King Arčil, four archbishops passed away”. In the same context, the two older redactions of Mokevay Kartlisay state that the Zoroastrians (“Magians”) practised fire worship in Mogueta;\(^3\) in the Chronicle, however, it is one of the four bishops themselves, Mobidan, who is blamed for having been a Magian, in accordance with his Persian provenance (and his name, cf. below), and who is therefore not counted among the bishops that died under Arčil.\(^3\)

MKS

დაშხა შემდეგ მეფობდა ოთხელ, და მთავარეპისკოპოსი იყო იონა. … და მთავარეპისკოპოს თავის მერვე-არჩილ, და მთავარეპისკოპოს იყო იონა. … და შემდეგ არჩილის ოთხთხმელ მთავარეპისკოპოსნი გარდაიცვალნეს.

And after him reigned Arčil, and the archbishop was Iona. … And the Magians practised fire worship in Mogueta. And under the same Arčil passed away four archbishops.

MKC

მერვე—არჩილ, და მთავარეპისკოპოსი იყო იონა. … მათ უარყო ოთხთხმელ მთავარეპისკოპოს გარდაიცვალნეს.

The eighth (king after the conversion was) Arčil, and the archbishop was Iona. In those times four archbishops passed away.

MKN

და შემდეგიდან მისმა მერვე-არჩილ, და მთავარეპისკოპოსი იყო იონა. … და შემდეგ არჩილის ოთხთხმელ მთავარეპისკოპოს გარდაიცვალნეს.

And after him, (as the eighth (king),) reigned Arčil, and the archbishop was Iona. … And the Magians practised fire worship in Mogueta. And under the same Arčil four archbishops passed away.

---

33 KCQ 139,11–142,18 ~ KCM 151,11–154,17 (~ PV 139,4–142,4).
They appointed as king in Mcxeta the son of Trdaṭ, the nephew (lit. brother’s child) of Mirdaṭ, the captured king, by the name of Arčil. Under that Arčil three archbishops passed away: Iona, Grigoli and Basili. And after Basili, the same Arčil appointed a bishop whose name was Mobidan. This one was a Persian by provenance, and he pretended (to be) orthodox. But he was (rather) an unbeliever, a Magian, and a spoiler of morals, but Arčil and his son did not recognize Mobidan’s infidelity but believed him to be faithful...

3.2.3 The most striking difference between the sources is met with in connection with the successor of King Arčil, Mirdaṭ, who was Arčil’s son according to Kartlis Cxovreba:34

And in his stead his son Mirdaṭ was enthroned as king (became king), and he reigned, like his father, in deep (lit. great) faith.

And then Mirdaṭ ruled as king.

And the ninth (king after the conversion was) Mirdaṭ.

(As) the ninth king Mirdaṭ ruled.

For this king, only Mokeevay Kartlisay provides the name of a contemporary archbishop, but in very divergent forms in the three redactions:35

And the archbishop was Glonokor.

34 KCQ 143,2–3 ~ KCM 155,5–7 (~ PV 142,12–14); MKS 92,35 / 325,25; MCK 92,35; MKN 12v,1–2.
35 MKS 92,36–37 / 325,25; MKC 92,35–36; MKN 12v,2–3 (Fig. 1, with the name highlighted).
The archbishop was Bolnokon.

And the archbishop was Bolonkon.

These divergences notwithstanding, the three redactions of the Kings’ List agree in assigning to the archbishop a remarkable secondary function, viz. as an army commander appointed by a province governor whose name is not less divergent in the manuscripts:36

And this archbishop was also an army commander (appointed) by Barazbod, the viceregent in Kartli and Hereti.

And the same (person) was also an army commander (appointed) by Barab, the viceregent.

Considering that the dominion of the viceregent37 comprised Kartli and Hereti, i.e., Caucasian “Albania”, and was thus essentially the same as later Rani, and taking the name Barazbod appearing in the Šaṭberd redaction as the most reliable form, we can easily assume that the person meant here is the same as Barzabod, the Iranian general and governor of Rani who sent the Zoroastrian “bishop” Binkaran to Mcxeta according to Kartlis Cxovreba. This further leads to the assumption that the archbishop mentioned in the Kings’ List is identical with the very object of our study, the “deceitful” Zoroastrian “bishop” figuring among the Christian archbishops in Mokcevay Kartlisay in quite the same way as his “Magian” predecessor, Mobidan, does in Kartlis Cxovreba.

4. The name of the Zoroastrian “bishop”

4.1 If the Zoroastrian “bishop” of the Chronicle is indeed identical with the archbishop under Mirdat in the Kings’ List, how then to account for the divergent forms of the name? As was stated above, it is not only the latter source that shows considerable variation here. In addition to the forms already listed by Brosset, we find at least five more in the manuscripts of Kartlis Cxovreba, including forms with an internal o vowel such as Bonakran and Bonakaran but also several forms with initial š instead of b. The evidence is gathered in table 2, in which the witnesses are arranged according to their (presumptive) age (note that in some of the manuscripts several forms occur side by side).

It is clear from the table that nearly all the forms attested in the manuscripts of Kartlis Cxovreba share a common skeleton comprising the consonants n, k, and r (the only exception is the form Bakran occurring once in ms. Q), while the initial letter alternates between b and š; major differences consist in the vowels of the first syllable and the existence or non-existence of a syllable ending in -n after the r. This picture can be summarized by the (vowelless) formula B/Š—N—K—R (—N). In contrast to this, the forms of the three redactions of Mokcevay Kartlisay add the variant g to the initial letter, the variation in word-final r and n, as well as an l letter occurring in the first syllable; including this, the formula would be G/B/Š (—L)—N—K (—R) (—N).

Concerning the alternation of the initial letter, we have already stated that the confusion between <b> and <š> in unknown words is a notorious feature of the Old Georgian nusxa-xucuri script (y vs. ŋ); the alternation between <b> and <g>, though less frequently attested, is likewise based upon the graphical similarity of the corresponding characters, in both (nusxa-xucuri) minuscules (y vs. ŋ) and (mrglovani) majuscules (щ vs. ё). There is no a priori means of deciding which character is primary; on the other hand, it should be noted that

38 The identification of the two bishops was first proposed by the Georgian scholar K. Kekeleze (1955, pp. 37–39).
39 MK: S: ms. S-1141, 10th c.; N: Sin.georg. N.48, ca. 11th c.; C: H-600, 14th c.—KC: A: ms. Q-795, 15th c.; C: Q-207, 16th c.; M: S-30, 1633–46 ce; Q: Q-1219, 1679 ce; T: SPb. no. 13, 18th c.; m: H-2135, 1736 ad; D: S-4770, 18th c.; E: A-131, 1748 ce; b: S-25, 1761 ce; p: H-988, 1761 ce; d: S-354, 18th c.; B: SPb. no. 41, 1839 ce; k: Kut. 441, 19th c.—For other mss. (here subsumed under “cet.”) cf. the lists provided in KCQ, p. 32 and KCM, p. 23.
40 The two editions of Kartlis Cxovreba provide the following set of variants (in the sequence of the attestations treated above, with square brackets marking information only available from KCQ and curly braces, information only from KCM): [i: [добкане, C, R, Mm, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.]; II: [добгане, C, R, Mm, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.]; III: [добгане, C, R, Mm, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.]; IV: [добгане, AC, M, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.]; V: [добгане A, M, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.]; VI: [добгане AC, M, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.]; VII: [добгане AC, M, [добгане Q, B, Ja, Ja, Ja, c.].
it is not easy to confuse <g> and <š> in Old Georgian majuscules (/gif vs. /š/); the confusion occurs only in minuscules (/gif vs. /š/).

In contrast to this, the alternation in the vowels requires a different explanation. Within Old Georgian, it may be due to an accidental restitution of abbreviations, given that the suspension of word-internal vowels was the most frequent method of abbreviating.\footnote{Cf. Gippert 1984, p. 38 for similar cases in forms of names occurring in the chronicles; Gippert 2007, pp. xxix–xxxi for the principles of abbreviation in pre-10th c. manuscripts; and Boeder 1987 for the general rules of Old Georgian abbreviation.} On the other hand, we may take non-Georgian
sources into account in the transmission of historical data, especially in the case of the “early centuries” of Georgian historiography; if these were written in a Semitic script (Syriac or, later, Arabic; Middle or, later, New Persian), the omission of vowels would be natural.

4.2 Considering all this, we are forced to see the occurrence of the additional \(-\text{l}\)- in the forms of *Mokcevay Kartlisay* as a decisive factor. As a matter of fact, the evidence provided by the two sources is in this respect quite similar to the evidence of *Kartlis Cxovreba* concerning the name of Vaxṭang Gorgasali’s Persian wife, which appears partly with a word-internal \(-\text{l}\) as in *Balanduxt, Balendoxt, Balenduxt, or Šalenduxt*, partly without \(-\text{l}\) as in *Bandoxt* or *Šanduxat*. In a special treatise of this name, the present author proposed to derive it from a Middle Persian compound *šāhēnduxt*, interpretable as “daughter of a falcon”. This proposal takes into account that in both the majuscule (*mrglovani*) script and its minuscule (*nusxa-xucuri*) successor, the character that was most often confused with \(-\text{l}\) was \(-\text{h}\) (cf. \(\text{GTK}\) and \(\text{GTK}\)), and that in intervocalic position, \(-\text{h}\), but not \(-\text{l}\), was often lost in the Georgian tradition. Applying the same principles to the name of the Zoroastrian “bishop”, we arrive at *šāhīnkār* as a possible source for the variants we find in the manuscripts. A similar form (šāhīnkār) is well attested still today, as a family name, in Iran.

4.2.1 Comparing *šāhīnkār* with *šāhēnduxt*, the reconstructed name of the daughter of Hormizd III who was married to Vaxṭang Gorgasali, we must not overlook the divergence in the vocalism of the second syllable, which would be noteworthy if both names contained MPers. šābēn “falcon”. The different reconstructions are nevertheless necessary, given that an \(-\text{e}\) character is well attested in the variants of the latter name but in none of the former. We might still assume that the underlying etymon was the same, presupposing that the tradition concerning the Zoroastrian “bishop” entered Georgian later when MPers. ē had already developed into (NPers.) ē; however, given that the two persons were contemporary and are mentioned in the same contexts, this remains rather doubtful. Instead we may rather take two different derivations from MPers.

43 Cf. Gippert 2011, pp. 91–92 for the attestation of the name forms mentioned and 97–98 for the derivation of the reconstructed name.
44 The form Blonkaran established in Kekelùże 1955, p. 39 is untenable, as is the proposal by M. Andronikàšvili (1966, p. 451) to derive Binkar etc. from MPers. dīnkār < OIran. *dāinakāra* “believer”, which presupposes a substitution of *d- by *b- otherwise unparalleled in Old Georgian.
46 Cf. Gippert 1991, p. 91 and Bielmeier 2005, pp. 9–10 as to the problem of MPers. ēmēd “hope” being represented by imed- in Georgian. —A similar problem is raised by a second proposal by M. Andronikàšvili (1966, p. 451), which proceeds from MPers. Šinkār <
sāh “king” into account here, one with the suffix -ēn denoting the “falcon” and one with -īn, a plain adjective formation meaning “royal.”47 *sāhinīkār would then have denoted somebody dealing with royal affairs, an epithet well suited for the “deceitful bishop” who acted as an envoy of the Persian king.

4.2.2 We still have to account for the forms ending in -n after or instead of the -r (Bolnokon, Šinkaran etc.). The variants of the Kings’ List seem to suggest that -n simply replaced -r, possibly by assimilation to the preceding -n-. This, however, cannot explain the emergence of forms with both -r- and -n. It is therefore appropriate to consider another solution, assuming a suffixal extension *sāhinīkār-ān which might represent a hypostatic adjective formation built upon a former genitive plural (sc. “one of the sāhinīkārs”).48 This solution has a good deal in its favour, given that a similar interpretation imposes itself for the name of the “bishop’s” predecessor, Mobidan, which occurs with and without -an, too. This name has for long been deduced from MPers. *mowbed, the designation of high priests among the Magians (< *magu-pati),49 and the form in -an representing a plural formation (“one of the mobeds”) is possibly also attested as a common noun in Žuansher’s account of Vaxtang Gorgasali’s life, as the epithet of a certain Barzaban who was sent to the Georgian king from Persia. In the passage in question this is not totally certain, however, given the remarkable divergence in the manuscript tradition which is well reflected in the divergent wordings of the two editions.50

KCQ

On the next day, the king sent to king Vaxtang (a certain) Barzaban, one of his own mobeds, and he spoke thus to the Gorgasali …

KCM

On the next day, the king sent to Vaxtang (a certain) Barzaban of his, and Mobidan, and he spoke thus to the Gorgasali …

*šainakāra “შაინაკარა”, i.e. “builder”. Given that the base in question (*šain- “build”) is widely attested in Old Georgian in the forms šēn- and šen-, this is a priori unlikely; what is more, the etymology does not account for the name forms containing an <l>.

47 The formation in -in will not contain a true adjective suffix but may represent, as in the formula sāhin sāh “king of kings”, the original genitive plural of *xšāyaθiya.


50 KCQ 183,22–184,1 ~ KCM 199,4–5. Cf. the critical apparatuses of the editions for the textual variation in the manuscripts, which also includes the name Barzaban.
Nevertheless, the passage raises serious doubts as to whether *Šahinkar(an) and Mobid(an) were at all the proper names of the two Zoroastrians denominated by them. It seems rather likely that they were designations of the functions they bore—not as Georgian “bishops” but as officials of the Persian court. In any case, the etymology provided by Heinrich Hübschmann for Binkar the “Oberpriester” must be given up.
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