Foundations ›for the Salvation of the Soul‹ – an Exception in World History?
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Foundations for the salvation of the soul, as they are known from Christianity, are to be found for the first time in world history in Zoroastrianism. Though influenced by the spirit of ›Zoroaster‹, they can be proven to have existed for the first time in the age of the Sassanids. Doubtless they are a result of the revolutionary ›Axial Age‹, yet other religions of the Axial Age found other solutions for dealing with the discovery of the individual and the ethical responsibility for others (or: for empathy). This can be demonstrated via the teachings of Confucius in China.
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Foundations ›for the salvation of the soul‹ are from the perspective of medievalist scholarship well-studied, while in the religious life of the pre-modern world is assigned an even greater significance.¹ The Freiburg historian Karl Schmid in any event claimed in 1985 that all the foundations of the Middle Ages possessed »one and the same motivation, concern for the salvation of the soul.«² According to his view foundations of this type were directed at God himself; in the words of the early Christian theologian Tertullian (d. around 220) they represented a good deed, which put God in the donor’s debt and effected the forgiveness of sins as a heavenly reward for the founder.³ Medieval foundations thus bore reference to transcendence and supported or brought about the salvation of the founder’s soul on Judgment Day. Understood in this way, Christian foundations must be differentiated from related phenomena in other cultures, namely the foundations for the dead and the soul cult.⁴ Foundations for the dead were widespread for example in Ancient Egypt or pre-Christian Rome; as such the founder obligated those who survived him to cultivate his memory and his deeds for all time, or at least over the long term, for instance by visiting his tomb or...
uttering his name; one can in this context speak of memorial foundations. With regard to the cult of the soul, the accent lay upon the intended prolongation of life, which was above all enabled by the ritual meal with the deceased. The continuation of life in the hereafter was based here on the soul, without God or the gods needing to intervene in its favor or for its salvation.

To this day Schmid’s thesis has never been discussed, indeed it also remains ignored. There are various reasons for this. On the one hand among medievalists it is generally accepted that foundations in the Middle Ages were endowed for the salvation of the soul; in this sense we are dealing with what is practically a truism, that is an opinion without analytical depth. On the other hand, and more importantly, in both his time as well as today medieval foundations were discussed with regard to the »memoria« of commemorative prayer, and this is, when one includes for example »pagan« Antiquity, the general point of view as well.

In a quite unforeseen way Schmid’s thesis has become questionable for the first time through the intercultural comparative research on foundations of the last ten years. The Europeanization and globalization of our understanding of history, which has also encompassed medieval history, have brought cultures and religions into our purview, which have hitherto been ignored by medievalists and left to the agenda of other disciplines. At the beginning of the new millennium I myself ascertained that »foundations for the soul« also existed in the Persian Empire of the Sassanids (221-642/651 AD) and the religion of Zoroastrianism, as little as Karl Schmid and his contemporaries had perceived this analogy and were able to further consider it, so the Iranologists acted as well, knowing nothing of European medievalist research. After I had taken pains to call for comparative studies on Christian, Muslim and Jewish foundations of the Middle Ages, a generous grant of the European Research Council first enabled intensive examinations of medieval foundations via a universal comparison. Since 2012 I have been able to lead a working group of five excellent post-doctoral scholars from Indology, Islamic Studies, Jewish History, Byzantine Studies and Medieval Studies, which by 2017 is to produce a three-volume »Encyclopedia of Foundations in Medieval Societies«. All the articles of this work, the first volume of which appeared in the summer of 2014, consist of contributions from the five disciplines, the results of which are summa-
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5 On ancient Roman foundations recently see, for example: Von Reden, Glanz der Stadt, 29-33; on Egypt: Fitzenreiter, Statuenstiftung und religiöses Stiftungswesen; Helck, Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte II, passim.
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rirized in each case via a comparative analysis. Based on the advice of the experts from each
discipline, among whom a Sinologist for a time was included, I am working concurrently
on a monograph on the foundations of the Middle Ages from a universal perspective, which
should foray somewhat further than the encyclopedia. This essay will present the results of
this research.

The observation of the Persian analogy to Christian foundations for the soul is thus espe-
cially interesting, because Zoroastrianism is a much older religion. Its supposed founder
Zoroaster was counted by Karl Jaspers among those great geniuses, who independently of
one another in the middle of the first millennium before Christ are said to have made that
»deepest impression«, which German philosophy termed the »Axis of World History«. At
the center of the kindred breakthrough stood, according to Jaspers, the experience of tran-
scendence, which would fundamentally alter humanity’s worldview. The conception of the
cosmos, which encompassed both the world of the gods and of men, was superseded by the
division between this world and the hereafter, the holy was separated out and the world, to
use Max Weber’s words, was ›demystified‹. A single person was no longer enfolded within
a cosmic cultic society, but must instead himself bridge the resulting gap between here and
there. With the discovery of transcendence in his own case he experienced himself as subject,
person and individual that is as someone quite different from his contemporaries. Since the
search for meaning did not have to be based on an afterlife at all, which either with or with-
out divine beings would be radically different from this world, it could also lie in self-trans-
cendence, namely the overcoming of selfishness. The ethical demands of the Axial Age
were emphatically underlined only just recently as follows: »The moral moved into the center
of spiritual life. The only way to meet that which they termed ‚God‘, ‚nirvana‘, ‚Brahman‘ or
the ‚way‘ was to live a life characterized by compassion.« On the other hand the individual
was able to recognize this world as malleable, to develop utopias and consciously carry out
social changes. Thus the so-called Axial Age was also the birth of the intellectual.

Jaspers’ prescriptions have been adopted above all by social scientists and scholars of
religion; instead of breakthroughs of the Axial Age, more recently they have concentrated
on the typology of axial cultures and attempted to capture the rediscovery of axial charac-
teristics in history. Occasionally one speaks of secondary breakthroughs, among which are
counted, for example, Christianity in relation to the religion of Israel, or one stretches the
Axial Age from ca. 500 BC until the rise of Islam, i.e. until the seventh century. If founda-
tions for the salvation of the soul, such as those with which we are familiar from the Christian

15 Dr. Volker Olles.
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18 Cf. Schluchter, Entzauberung der Welt.
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ities, 195–488; Eisenstadt, Kulturen der Achsenzeit; Eisenstadt, Kulturen der Achsenzeit II.
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Middle Ages, can be proven to have existed already in Zoroastrianism or under Zoroaster himself, then foundations of this sort would belong to the practices with which one mastered the Axial Age, and perhaps from its beginning. Further down the road is the task of testing the religions of Near Eastern origin as well as those of China and India with regard to the particularities of the appearance of foundations in the most ancient period. I have conducted these investigations, yet the results are too comprehensive and complex to be presented in a single study. Thus in what follows I will content myself with a comparison of Christian with Zoroastrian foundations in Persia and Confucian foundations in China.

The model on which I am basing both other phenomena is that of the Christian foundation for the salvation of the soul; I will restrict myself to a few essential features in order to characterize it. In Latin documents «foundations for the salvation of the soul» are often addressed with formulae such as *pro remedio animae* or *pro redemptione animae*, yet also attested is the unspecific *pro anima* as well as turns of phrase which do not explicitly mention the soul at all. Whether it concerns «foundations for the salvation of the soul» or not simply cannot be deduced from the language of the sources. One must carefully differentiate foundations from donations; in contrast to the latter the former did not merely consist of one-time, but rather repeated, gift-giving, since only the income from a piece of property, not however the property itself, was consumed. The beneficiaries of foundations were usually churches or monasteries; Constantine the Great created the legal framework by granting the right to own property and testamentary capacity to the Christian community. The theological basis was laid out by Greek and Latin Church Fathers, who deduced from certain passages of the Bible that a donor could aid his salvation with a gift of his estate. From the middle of the fourth century Basil the Great and the other monastic fathers called for a share of the inheritance as a »quota for the soul«, »quota for Christ« or »quota for the poor«. In Greek Christianity one spoke of the *psychikon*, in Old Russian *zadušie*, that which was »apportioned for the soul«, found also as a loanword in Serbian and Bulgarian. The authors of documents in the area of the Orthodox Church underlined, as in the West, that a foundation was erected »for the attainment of eternal goods« and that »the perishable of this world« served the acquisition of the »everlasting«. With priests and monks founders laid claim to the experts for liturgy
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and intercession, who in exchange for a donation or endowment had to offer the Eucharist or pray; in the Western Church and Byzantium, not however in Rus, these gifts, understood as good works, supported philanthropic activities as well, after the church had from the earliest period taken over the most important tasks of social welfare. Foundations were thus such a highly sought-after means for one’s own salvation, because they were to last permanently; as long as the fate of the soul in the afterlife was undecided, as most believed. Until the Last Judgment the prayers of the survivors and the further good works of the deceased that they performed would be of assistance to the soul.

With regard to the other foundation cultures it is worth underlining that some additional tenets of faith in Christianity were operative, which for the most part were silently assumed. Thus Christians knew of only one soul, and not multiple souls, for a person, just as they knew only of one heaven and earth. They expected only one corporeal death and one resurrection, at which the body would be reunited with the soul. A personal God would decide for eternal life or eternal damnation in his court, so that at least in the West a particular judgment for each individual was differentiated from the Last Judgment at the end of time; what the just could expect as their reward was not seen simply as the greatest happiness, yet was to be received as such by them, thus it at the same time meant bliss.

If one attempts to set the parameters of the Christian model for Sassanid foundations, unexpectedly large difficulties are met: even the basic religious tenets are disputed. Rather harmless is the conclusion that Zoroaster is no longer to be dated to the middle of the sixth century before Christ, as Jaspers still believed, but five to ten centuries earlier. More serious however is that some Iranologists completely doubt the historicity of this priest and prophet or ascribe to him at most the core of a religious doctrine. The only certainty is that the Avesta, the oldest collection of Zoroastrian texts, was first made in the third Persian Empire of the Sassanids, after its transmission had occurred for hundreds of years only orally. Presumably the codification was prompted by the influence of Christianity and the religion of Mani (216-274/277), both of which contained scriptures, and was completed in the sixth century after Christ.

Naturally it is debated in the contemporary scholarship how one should imagine a compilation of teachings, stories, prayers and liturgical hymns in the course of perhaps one thousand years. With regard to foundations, with which we want to concern ourselves, it seems reasonable to sketch the teachings of Zoroastrianism and to verify in the foundation documents if and to what degree the former influenced the latter. The British Iranologist Mary Boyce,
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who passed away in 2006, has developed a model of these teachings, which is useful for our purposes, though it has meanwhile been derided by many specialists as conformist and essentializing.41

As an Iranian ›Zoroaster‹ was, if one accepts his historical existence as a given, the kinsman of a people related to the Indians, who in the third millennium before Christ migrated from the Eurasian Steppe southward. Researchers believe they can deduce the original religious beliefs and practices of these shepherds and farmers via a comparison of the Avesta with the ancient Indian tradition. According to them the ancient Iranians sacrificed to fire and water with prayers for the souls of men and animals: »So then we worship (...)/ our own souls and those of the domestic animals which nourish us (...) and the souls of useful wild animals.«42 The gifts which were offered to the many gods were to keep the world functioning as well as shape human life. According to Boyce they believed in the post-mortal existence of the individual, an existence which could at times be decisively influenced.43 Within the first three days after death the soul of the deceased had to be aided by his relatives through fasts and priestly prayers against evil forces. Relatives were to sacrifice for food and clothing to the soul of the deceased so that it might reach the subterranean realm of the dead. These activities were repeated for the first thirty days, then month after month and then on each anniversary until the 30th year. Only after a generation did the soul enjoy, so it was thought, the company of the dead without restriction, so that the family could content itself with further commemorating the deceased on ›All Souls’ Day‹. It was postulated that only dukes, warriors and priests could hope for entry into paradise; other souls, above all those of the low-born, women and children could expect only a joyless existence.44

According to these religious beliefs concerning the world of the afterlife, foundations could only be concerned with the promotion of the soul cult, by which souls were to be nourished for their continuing existence, but not with the salvation of the soul, to which it promised an enhanced existence as the gift of God or the gods. Zoroaster was supposedly responsible for the transition. ›Zoroaster‹ is thought to have been a priest, who through the revelations of the highest god Ahura Mazdā felt himself called to be a prophet for all of humanity. The hymns ascribed to him proclaim that Ahura Mazdā is the one uncreated god, who always existed and is the creator of all else that is good, including the other philanthropic divinities. At the same time ›Zoroaster‹ was said to have recognized in a vision the antagonist of the highest god, the ›enemy spirit‹, who was likewise uncreated, but ignorant and evil through and through. Both great gods of good and evil came into conflict in thought, word and action.45 An originally free decision of both of the first beings for good or evil corresponded, according to the doctrine of ›Zoroaster‹, to the choice which every person in his own life must himself make. A person must thus in the world created by Ahura Mazdā play
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41 Cf. Kreyenbroek, Zoroastrismus, 156.
42 Yasna 39.1-2, according to the English translation of Boyce, Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism, 55 (cf. the commentary ibid., 53): »(1) So then we worship Geush Urvan and Geush Tashan, then our own souls and those of the domestic animals which nourish us, for which we are here and which are here for us. (2) And we worship the souls of useful wild animals.« Cf. Boyce, Zoroastrians, 5. The citation stems from the Yasna Haptanajaiti, which was enclosed by the five Gathas, s. Macuch, Iranische Literaturen, 284.
43 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 9, 12 s.
44 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 14.
45 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 20, with the citation of Yasna 30.3-5, here 30.4, cited here after Boyce, Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism, 35: »And when these two Spirits first came together they created life and not-life, and how at the end Worst Existence shall be for the wicked, but (the House of) Best Purpose for the just man.«
his own role in the battle between good and evil. »Zoroaster« is credited with the recognition that »the worth of an individual (…) does not depend on his being a member of society.« 46 Each person must advance the physical and spiritual existence of his fellow men along with that of his own, since they as well as he were god’s creation. The »prophet« demanded of his followers that they live according to the maxims of good thoughts, words and deeds, which corresponded to the three-fold exhortation to Iranian priests, that they perform the liturgy with a good disposition, fitting words and correct rituals. 47 At one’s death everyone would be judged according to what he had done in life for the good. In contrast to the previous doctrine women as well as men, slaves as well as masters could aspire to paradise. At the »Bridge of the Separator« each person would be judged not according to the expense of his sacrifice in the previous life, but according to his ethical merits. 48 According to an individual verdict the righteous man gained paradise, while the wicked man was damned to hell. A few souls, in which good and bad deeds stood in equal weight, entered a ‘Place of Mixed Beings’, where they would lead a grey existence without joy or sorrow.

Yet according to Mary Boyce the good as well did not acquire any perfect paradisiacal joy, but rather had still to await the day of resurrection at the end of time. Thus »Zoroaster« was supposedly the first »to teach the doctrines of an individual judgment, Heaven and Hell, the future resurrection of the body, the general Last Judgment, and life everlasting for the reunited soul and body«, all doctrines which would reappear in the Mediterranean monotheistic religions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. 49 The differentiation between both days of judgment is believed by other Iranologists however not to have been an idea of »Zoroaster« himself, but rather a further development of the doctrine which he had laid down. 50

The conceptual breakthrough of »Zoroaster« according to Boyce consisted of his having opened the prospect of paradise to all people, of every social status and sex, and having called for the ethical services of the deceased in this world as merit, which would be reviewed in the postmortnal court. Works of charity during one’s earthly life and the individual judgment could thus be interpreted as indications that it no longer concerned the mere continued existence of the soul in the afterlife, but rather the earned and awarded salvation of an individual’s soul. »Foundations for the salvation of the soul« would then have had the intention, but also the power, to further the ascendance of the soul such as through prayers and sacrifice through the performance of charity even after death. Open to interpretation meanwhile is whether this type of foundation can be traced back to »Zoroaster« as well, thus to the Axial Age itself, or whether it can only be historically demonstrated much later.

The formation of the Persian empires was decisive for the expansion of Zoroastrianism; the personal attitude of the first rulers of the Achaemenids is however disputed among scholars. 51 Cyrus the Great (559-530 BC) is assigned a key role, who established the first Persian Empire by conquests which stretched in the west to the coast of Asia Minor and to Egypt. 52

---

46 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 262.
47 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 24.
48 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 27.
49 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 29.
50 Clark, Zoroastrianism, 63-65.
51 Cf. Kreyenbroek, Zoroastrians, 161; Boyce, Zoroastrians, 48-77; Boyce, Zoroastrianism, 265 s.; Wiesehöfer, Reich der Perser, 101 s.
52 Wiesehöfer, Iranische Großreiche, 53.
Apparently Cyrus and his successors did not exclusively venerate Ahura Mazdā, but rather cultivated a mixture of Zoroastrianism and ancient Iranian traditions of the Magi.53 Cyrus fell in battle against the peoples of the steppe; his body was led back to Persia and was interred in the newly-founded residence of Pasargadae. The monumental tomb still stands today out in the open.54 As Alexander the Great in 334/330 crossed over to Asia Minor and conquered Persia, he sought this final resting place. As the Greek Arrian reports, the Macedonian found that the tomb had been plundered: »Within the enclosure, and lying on the approach to the tomb itself, was a small building put up for the Magians, who were guardians of Cyrus’ tomb, from as long ago as Cambyses, son of Cyrus, receiving this guardianship from father to son. To them was given from the King a sheep a day, an allowance of meal and wine, and a horse each month, to sacrifice to Cyrus. There was an inscription on the tomb in Persian letters; it ran thus, in Persian: ›Mortal! I am Cyrus son of Cambyses, who founded the Persian Empire, and was Lord of Asia. Grudge me not, then, my monument.«55 Alexander ordered that the tomb be restored, and the Magi, who had been for the most part arrested, were then freed once again.

The Magi, the guardians of the tomb of Cyrus, were already active as priests in the Empire of the Medes which Cyrus had overthrown. According to Arrian’s testimony they received payments in kind daily and monthly from the king for the defrayal of the costs of the cult and transmitted their function hereditarily within their families. In fact it would have been around two centuries from the death of Cyrus to Alexander’s campaign. All this points to the erection of a foundation by Cambyses, for which the reigning king was active as a »foundation organ«, by financing the funerary cult from the state budget. In addition Mary Boyce has pointed out that above the entrance to the funerary chamber the sun as a symbol of immortality in luminous paradise was displayed, and speaks of a foundation for the soul for eternity;56 according to her, Zoroastrian beliefs were already at this early point tied to the cultural traditions of the Medes.57 This conclusion must however be contradicted. On the one hand an explicit indication of the salvation of a soul as a motive is lacking; on the other hand, still more importantly, is that nowhere was a service of the deceased touched upon, that was justified based on a hope for salvation, for a qualitatively improved existence in the afterlife, or the motive of judgment, against which he had to protect himself and in which the foundation would help him.

54 Wiesehöfer, Iranische Großreiche, 53, 65 (plates); Boyce, Zoroastrians, 53.
55 Arrian, History of Alexander 2, 196 (Greek), 197 (English) VI. 29.
56 Boyce, Zoroastrians, 52 s.: »The tomb of Cyrus shows, however, with what care Zoroastrian kings prepared their sepulchres (...). Over this doorway (sc.: of the tomb-chamber) was set a carving of the sun, symbol of immortality in luminous Paradise; and Cyrus’ successor, Cambyses, endowed, as well as a daily sacrifice of sheep, a monthly sacrifice of a horse, the special creature of the sun, to be made at the tomb for his father’s soul (...).« Ibid., 65 s.: »Colleges of scholar-priests must also have existed, either independently or perhaps in conjunction with the great religious foundations. Another form of pious endowment (older, evidently, than the founding of temples) is also attested in the Achaemenian period. This was the establishing of religious services and offerings on behalf of the souls of the eminent departed, to be maintained as far as possible in perpetuity«; cf. Wieschner, Reich der Perser, 101.
57 Herodotus ascribed to the Magi that the bodies of the Persians were first given over to birds and dogs to consume, then covered with wax and finally brought beneath the earth: Herodotus 1, 178 (Greek), 179 (English) I.140, cf. Boyce, Zoroastrians, 59. Regarding the sacrifices of the Persians he notes (Herodot 170 s. I.132), that they had neither altars nor did they light fires; »they use no libations, nor music, nor fillets, nor barley meal.«
Only many centuries later, in the third Iranian Empire of the Sassanids, do we again come across evidence of foundations. From the time of Ardašīr (224-239/240?) rulers ascribed divine qualities to themselves and in thanks for the favor of the gods cultivated the Zoroastrian cult, »they rendered charity to the priests, endowed fire and thus increased the sites for the worship of the gods«.58 Proof of this is offered by an impressive inscription of Ardašīr’s son Šābuhr I (240-271/272) on a tower in Persepolis. It is composed in three languages (Middle Persian, Parthian and Greek) and emphasizes the divine origin of his house as well as reverence for (Ahura) Mazdā.59 The King of Iran and non-Iran had gained renown through his military victories and conquests, at the Roman Empire’s expense as well, but had also at the same time enjoyed the protection of the gods. Šābuhr therefore erected many Wahrām-fires (sanctuaries) and assigned benefactions to the priests. Also via the inscription of Persepolis he established a fire with the name »Glorious is Šābuhr« and »for Our Souls and (Our) Fame«, as well as further sanctuaries of this sort with the same motivations for his daughter, the »Queen of Queens«, in addition to individually-named sons, among whom one was Great King of Armenia. The expense of the foundation reportedly consisted of 1,000 lambs, »which are excellently conceded to Us from the surplus«. Whether the endowment consisted of landed properties or the King of Iran and non-Iran wanted to finance the cult from reallocated incomes of the crown estates or from taxes is not stated. For Šābuhr’s soul, as already was the case with Cyrus I, each day a lamb as well as a precisely-delineated measure of bread and wine were to be sacrificed, and for the souls of the members of the ruling house along with the dignitaries of the empire the same was to occur.60 The difference to the foundation of Cambyses for his Achaemenid predecessor almost eight hundred years before lay in the double motivation for temporal fame and the soul bound up with charity for others, among whom were not simply the ancestors and other relatives of the ruler. This ethical impulse corresponded to Zoroastrian doctrine and the distinctive features of the Axial Ages; even though the judgment motive is lacking, it is this clearly religious context which allows one to define Šābuhr’s foundation for the »soul« as a »foundation for the salvation of the soul«.

Even clearer in this context is the disposition of the grand vizier Mihr-Narseh from the first half of the fifth century. He was feared as the archenemy of the Christians, yet in his own land he was famed as a philanthropist, as the Arab chronicler at-Tabarī attests.61 Fire temples which he endowed in his own memory and that of his sons have survived in his homeland, the district of Fīrūzābād. The endowment of a bridge in this city proves the spiritual sense of benefaction. The inscription reads: »This bridge was built by the order of Mihr-Narseh, the Vuzurgframadār, for the benefit of his soul, at his own expense. Whoever has come on

58 Wiesehöfer, Reich der Sasaniden, 284; in particular on the holy fires and the relevant foundations in Zoroastria-nism eps.: Boyce, On the Sacred Fires; De Menasce, Feux et Fondations Pieuses.
59 Huyse, Dreisprachige Inschrift Šāpūrs I.; with a German translation of the Middle Persian version: Back, Sassanidische Staatsinschriften; a short excerpt in English translation in: Boyce, Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastria-nism, 111. Cf. Henning, Great Inscription of Šāpūr, esp. 845-847; Macuch, Sassanidische fromme Stiftung, 33 s.; Macuch, Sassanidische Stiftung »für die Seele«, 174 s.
61 Macuch, Sassanidische Stiftung »für die Seele«, 167, 174; Macuch, Sassanidische fromme Stiftung, 32, 35.
this road, let him give a blessing to Mihr-Narseh and his sons for that he thus bridged this crossing. And while God gives help, wrong and deceit there shall be none therein.«62 In other religious contexts as well, such as among Muslims and Brahmins, endowing bridges was viewed as a work of charity.63

The primary source for Sassanian foundations »for the soul« is a collection of legal decisions, which date at the earliest from the last years before the Arab conquest of Persia.64 The text has caused Iranologists considerable problems and has not always led to clearly recognized solutions. A German translation, which has existed for two decades, reflects these difficulties as well. The text65 treats foundations for religious ceremonies, which evidently served the fire cult alone or at the same time were to be exercised for the benefit of the founder.66 Whatever remained from ceremonial foundations for the soul could be allocated to other purposes, presumably that of charity, by the endowment’s administrators.67 The incomes of the foundation could also, instead of the liturgical cult, directly support a third person; the example of the beneficiary Mihrēn refers to this: »If the founder ordained that: ›The thing, which is endowed by me for the soul, Mihrēn should possess‹, then it is valid as a pious gift for the soul. Neither Mihrēn or another person is allowed to sell the thing or to use it up.« The foundation shall pass over to the kin of Mihrēn.«68 The founder and the foundation’s beneficiaries were in turn able to profit from the religious ceremonies,69 and whoever provided for cultic activities for the benefit of another supported his own soul as well.70

64 Edition in two parts with a commentary and German translation by Macuch, Sasanidisches Rechtsbuch, and Macuch, Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis. On foundations for the soul s. also the transliterations and French translations of De Menasce, Feux et Fondations Pieuses, 5-31, cf. 59-62.
65 The following is based on a chapter of the lawbook in the edition with a German translation in Macuch, Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis, 255-257 (edition of the Middle Persian original text 252-254, commentaries 258-266, cf. also ibid., 192-219).
66 Macuch, Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis, 255: »Das Kapitel von der Stiftung für religiöse Zeremonien (yazišn nihādag); über den Besitz, der für das Feuer, und die Sache, die als Stiftung für die Seele (ruwān nihād) gegründet wird.«
67 Macuch, Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis, 255: »Wenn jemand eine Sache für religiöse Zeremonien für die Seele (ruwān yazišn rāy) stiftet (und) die Stiftung nominativ für religiöse Zeremonien errichtet, (dann ist) der Teil des Ertrages, der von der Stiftung übrigbleibt, den Gewalthabern (sālārān) eigen.«
68 Macuch, Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis, 256: »Wenn er (= der Stifter) bestimmt hat: (…) Die Sache, die von mir für die Seele (ruwān rāy) gestiftet ist, soll Mihrēn besitzen; dann wird sie der Seele (dadurch) nicht wieder weggenommen, denn sie (gilt) auch als Gabe (ahlawdād) für die Seele (…). Weder Mihrēn noch eine andere Person ist befugt, die Sache zu verkaufen und zu verausgaben (…)«
69 Macuch, Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis, 257: »Wenn er (= der Testator) bestimmt hat: (…) Die religiösen Zeremonien, die ein Mann für die Seele eines (anderen) Mannes (yazišn i pad ruwān i mard) stiftet und abhält, werden (zugleich) auch für die eigene Seele gestiftet und abgehalten.«
It appears that various layers of Iranian religious history made their mark in this Sassanian lawbook: one, from the perspective of historical development an older type of foundation, was to provide for the prosperity of the soul through the careful observation of the soul cult (nāmgānīh). Ruwānagān foundations, which ‘belonged to the soul’, were however, according to the understanding of scholarship, primarily to be created for the salvation of the soul of the founder, his family and friends. The testator determined (…), that they [rituals] would be implemented ‘for the soul’, ruwān ṭay (or pad ruwān), thus this formula was considered an act of endowment, and this diverted part of the estate was used for the establishment and endowment of a pious foundation, which seemed ‘most beneficial’ (ruwān ṭay sūdōmandtar) for the salvation of the soul of the testator. If it was expressly planned that the founder would expend set sums for alms for the benefit of the poor, this corresponded to the ethical demands of Zoroastrian doctrine. It fell explicitly to the discretion of the descendants to use the yields for purposes of common good, such as bridges, roads and irrigation canals.

In summary one can contend that ‘foundations for the salvation of the soul’ in Iran can be proven to have existed since at least the third century after Christ; even though they are clearly influenced by the religious and ethical reform which is ascribed to ‘Zoroaster’, they cannot be set chronologically within proximity of the Axial Age, irrespective of whether one dates this period to the second or first millennium before Christ. On the other hand they are certainly older than the first Christian foundations for the salvation of the soul, which hardly stretch back to the time before Constantine. Since Jewish foundations of this type are hardly older, which I cannot discuss here, everything points to the conclusion that Zoroastrian foundations for the salvation of the soul became a model for Christians and Jews as well as later (indirectly or directly) for Muslims too.

In China and Confucianism the problem in recognizing medieval foundations were constituted differently than in Ancient Iran. It is certain that foundations in Chinese Buddhism, in Confucianism and Daoism played an extremely important role, yet there is a lack of studies on the history of foundations. Some monographs are available for Buddhist and Daoist

71 Macuch, Sasanische fromme Stiftung, 26 s.; cf. Boyce, Pious Foundations of the Zoroastrians, 270 s. In an epistolary correspondence from 4.4.2014, for which I am thankful once again, Prof. Dr. Maria Macuch took a position on the differentiation, suggested above, between foundations for the soul cult and for the salvation of the soul and qualified this, stating that the endowment character of financing religious ceremonies needs to be confirmed by further studies: she however stands by ‘foundations for the salvation of the soul’ (pad ruwān, ruwān ṭay).

72 Macuch, Sasanische fromme Stiftung, 26.

73 Macuch, Sasanische fromme Stiftung, 29 s.; Boyce, Pious Foundations of the Zoroastrians, 282 s.

74 Macuch, Sasanische fromme Stiftung, 33.

75 Macuch, Sasanische Stiftung »für die Seele«, 168; cf. De Menasce, Feux et Fondations Pieuses, 15 cap. 18.2.

76 On this in the future chapter 1 of my «World History of Foundations», currently in preparation.

77 Cf. Macuch, Sasanische Stiftung »für die Seele«; Macuch, Sasanische fromme Stiftung.

78 Olles, Religiöse Stiftungen in China, at and after n. 1: «The process of founding was present in all phases of Chinese history between 500 and 1500, and played an important role in the areas of religion, politics, the economy, art, philanthropy and education, just to name a few keywords (...). It has to be emphasized that in Sinology and other China-related fields a genuine ‘research on foundations’ does not exist. As in other disciplines, focusing on foundations represents virgin territory in Sinology as well, even though massive amounts of relevant sources are available and the process of founding has already been observed and documented in the scholarly literature on Sinology (...).»

79 On Buddhist monasteries: Walsh, Sacred Economies; Gernet, Buddhism in Chinese Society; on Taoist monasteries and temples: Kohn, Monastic Life in Medieval Daoism; Bokenkamp, Ancestors and Anxiety; a new case study: Olles, Unsterblicher Lehrmeister. In the future Olles, Religiöse Stiftungen in China.
monasticism, while for Confucianism one must fall back on selective studies. The historical backdrop, against which all Chinese religions and philosophical doctrines must be viewed, is the ancestor cult.

The classical development of the ancestor cult is dated to the time of the Western Zhou Dynasty (ca. 1050-771 BC) and has retained its essential character until the present. The practices of the Zhou Period were predicated on the assumption that the spirits of deceased ancestors possessed extraordinary powers. It was thought that ancestors could assist their children and children’s children (...) for prosperity and prestige; however, they had to again and again earn the favor of their ancestors through the correct and punctual performance of the sacrificial rites. Ancestors and descendants thus lived in a symbiosis with one another, in which the living maintained their ancestors by meal offerings, and the latter by intervening on the forces of nature during life. The offerings were performed via ritual meals, in which a family gathering assembled in the ancestral temple and the ancestral spirits employed a human being as a medium. The oldest family member had to report in ritualized speech to the ancestors on the well-being and the virtuousness of their descendants: One found out the response of the divine through an oracle; his blessing and succour were the expected reward for adhering to the traditional customs and rites. As the abode of the ancestors, in which they were able to temporarily return to the world of the living, the environs of the highest heavenly god is attested by bronze inscriptions; other evidence points to a realm of the dead by the name of »Yellow Springs« (Huangquan) or »Dark City« (Fengdu), yet possibly the grave itself was understood as the last possible habitation of the dead. In any case the spheres of the living and the dead formed a unity, both zones were permeable and the task of memoria in the one corresponded to duty of the cult of memory in the other. It concerned a cosmic unity of a pre-Axial Age character, without the experience of transcendence. Offerings for ancestors had the function of making them well-disposed towards the living, not however – as is the case with foundations in favor of the soul of the deceased – of improving their situation in a separate afterlife.

A clear new orientation within Chinese thinking is dated by scholars to the Eastern Zhou Dynasty (770-221 BC), thus within the supposed span of the Axial Age. Instead of the communication between the living and dead, it came now to a starker division between the two spheres, which indicates the experience of transcendence. Emblematic of this change are the »Analects« of Confucius (550/552-479 BC). While in contrast to Zoroaster his existence and the dates for his life have essentially not been disputed, the question of authorship is however wide open. Some sayings have been traced in the scholarship back to Confucius himself, others to his disciples. The text [of the »Analects«] perhaps received its present appearance in the second, possibly also at the beginning of the first century BC, by an anonymous compi-

80 Von Falkenhausen, Ahnenkult und Grabkult im Staat Qin, 35; on the ancestor cult in the present: Reiter, Religionen in China, 52-54, 56-61.
81 Von Falkenhausen, Ahnenkult und Grabkult im Staat Qin, 35.
82 Von Falkenhausen, Ahnenkult und Grabkult im Staat Qin, 35, 40.
83 Clart, Religionen Chinas, 49.
84 Bokenkamp, Ancestors and Anxiety, esp. 51-53 und passim.
86 Cf. Von Falkenhausen, Ahnenkult und Grabkult im Staat Qin, 44.
87 Van Ess, Konfuzianismus, 10, cf. 19.
 ler.«87 ›Confucius‹ – which I use in what follows to designate the whole work – did not at all reject the ancestor cult, yet refrained from uttering concrete statements about the world of the spirits and gods, in order to even more energetically indicate one’s duties to one’s fellow man, ›society‹ and ›state‹. His aphorism on wisdom condenses his message in this sense: ›Fan Chi asked about wisdom. The Master said: ›Secure the rights of the people; respect ghosts and gods, but keep them at a distance – this is wisdom indeed.‹88 The almost agnostic attitude of the ›Analects‹ is expressed in the topic ›Life and Death‹: »Zilu asked how to serve the spirits and gods. The Master said: ›You are not yet able to serve men, how could you serve the spirits?‹ Zilu said: »May I ask you about death?« The Master said: ›You do not yet know life, how could you know death?« Instead ›Confucius‹ formulated for the first time in world history the ›Golden Rule‹ of humanity: »Zigong asked: »Is there any single word that could guide one’s entire life?« The Master said: »Should it not be reciprocity? What you do not wish for yourself, do not do to others.«89 Where one wanted to earn merit, he suggested temporal remembrance, or better yet, fame: »The Master said: ›A gentleman worries lest he might disappear from this world without having made a name for himself.‹«90

By contrast Confucius reportedly avoided questions regarding posthumous existence; as he became terminally ill and his disciple Zilu asked him whether he could pray for him to the ›gods above‹ and the ›earthly spirits‹ below, the Master reacted quite brusquely, saying that he had ›prayed for long enough«.91 Disciples and family meanwhile took pains for his memorial in Qufu, where Confucius had been born and buried; yet the decisive step for the cult of Confucius was the attention of the emperor.92 The founder of the Han Dynasty, Han Gaozu (r. 206-195 BC), was the first to personally sacrifice at the Temple of Confucius; successive emperors furnished the ›Kongs‹, the descendants of Confucius, with hereditary honors and estates as well as repeated donations for the renovation of the temple. In the Middle Han Period the Kongs already possessed over 3,800 households, which had been given to them for sacrifice to Confucius in their temple.93 Later the Emperor Ming Taizu in the year 1368 alone donated 98,400 acres of land. Naturally the giving of estates, which was complemented by tax exemption, served to maintain the Kong family itself.94 Without a doubt these material furnishing of the Confucius Temple in Qufu were foundations – foundations which however were meant ›only‹ to serve a temporal commemoration and to secure for the living relatives the succour of their ancestor. It is noteworthy that the cult of Confucius, which also included the veneration of his disciples and later additional scholars, was not limited to a single place.

88 Confucius, Analects, 8 III.12: »Sacrifice implies presence. One should sacrifice to the gods as if they were present. The Master said: 'If I do not sacrifice with my whole heart, I might as well not sacrifice.'« Cf. ibid. 8 III.11; on II.24, IV.19.
89 Confucius, Analects, 44 f. VI.20.
90 Confucius, Analects, 81 XI.11.
91 Confucius, Analects, 122 XV.23; in Van Ess, Konfuzianismus, 23, he renders the text in the following way: »[The student] Tzu-kung spoke: 'What I do not want is that others inflict on me, that which I do not want to inflict on others.' The Master spoke: 'Tz'u, that way you won't make progress.'« Cf. in addition the comments and citations ibid., 23 f.
92 Confucius, Analects, 47 XV.19.
94 On the following esp.: Lamberton, Kongs of Qufu, 297-332; Van Ess, Konfuzianismus, 55-60; Shryock, Origin and Development.
95 Lamberton, Kongs of Qufu, 319.
96 Lamberton, Kongs of Qufu, 311.
Already under the Emperor T’ai-tsung (627-649) the order was issued for a Confucius Temple to be erected in every province and district school;97 this measure was connected with the implementation of the examination system for bureaucrats. It has even been said by scholars that Confucius had been raised »to a kind of divinity of the state administration.«98

The expectation of aid by ancestors developed in China first within Daoism under Buddhist influence into a concern of the living for the dead, which at least approximated the idea of the salvation of the soul among Christians.99 With ›Confucius‹ however the adherence to ancestor worship was tied to a decisive reorientation toward temporal ethics, which can be regarded as a distinctive feature of the Axial Age. A call for »foundations for the salvation of the soul« would thus not have been able to invoke ›Confucius‹.

The résumé of the studies cited here can be summarized in short: ›foundations for the salvation of the soul‹ were not at all a general direct answer to the experience of transcendence that is the separation of the divine and heavenly from the earthly sphere. If they corresponded to the doctrine that can be traced back to Zoroaster, then they were perhaps in Iran the first result of a long religious development, which can be dated first to the period after Christ. With ›Confucius‹ the basic tradition did draw closer to the Axial Age, yet the Master did not introduce any religious change in the relation of the living with the dead. It is worth questioning whether ›foundations for the salvation of the soul‹ formed only in the Near East, particularly under the conditions of Monotheism. For a well-founded response the Jewish and Muslim traditions must still be compared critically with the Christian sources.

(Translation: Zachary Chitwood)

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 287389.
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97 Lamberton, Kongs of Qufu, 297; Van Ess, Konfuzianismus, 57.
98 Van Ess, Konfuzianismus, 59; Shryock, Origin and Development, 137: »The sage now became the patron deity of the civil administration of the government, and as such, an important feature in the state religion.«
99 On which the book of the author mentioned in n. 76 makes reference.
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