

UNION ACADÉMIQUE INTERNATIONALE (UAI)
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES (IUA)

Project 67: Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum

DATABASE OF MANICHAEAN TEXTS



MANICHAEISM

Classic Studies



Compiled and edited by

Samuel N.C. Lieu
FBA, FAHA, FRSN



18.06.2022

ANCIENT INDIA AND IRAN TRUST, CAMBRIDGE (UK)

Foreword

The **Database of Manichaean Texts** project was inaugurated at Warwick University in 1994 and was adopted by UNESCO as a project of the Interdisciplinary Research on the Maritime Silk Road in 1995. Its main aim is to provide an electronic database of Manichaean texts from Central Asia and from Roman Egypt as well as select passages from the writings of Christian Fathers such as Augustine and Epiphanius on the religion. The project has provided material for the **Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum** series published by Bepols of Turnhout (1966-).

In 1998 the Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum project was adopted by the International Union of Academies (UAI: Union Académique Internationale) as a long-term project (Proj. 59). Since then, the project has regularly received small grants from the UAI to add textual material to the Database of Manichaean Texts and, since 2017, to make material available for online consultation through the Union's Project Web-page:

<http://www.unionacademique.org/en/projects/65/corpus-fontium-manichaeorum>

In 2018, Ms Camilla Ferard joined the Database of Manichaean Texts project as its principal research officer. To familiarise her with the subject matter of Manichaeism, she was asked to translate from German the Pauly–Wissowa article by H.-J. Polotsky and from French the article on Saint Paul among the Manichaeans in Central Asia by H.-Ch. Puech. As her part-time position was first funded by small grants from International Union of Academies, it is only appropriate that her work should be made available on-line to scholars worldwide through the UAI Proj. 59 Web-page. To the two studies translated by Ms. Ferard, I have added the English version of an important study by Werner Sundermann (translated by Dr Barbara Hendrichke) summarizing a lifetime's research on Manichaeism in Central Asia– a work little known to Manichaean scholars as it was originally published in the proceedings of a conference on Silk Road Studies.

(Em.) Prof. Samuel N.C. Lieu
FBA, MAE, FAHA, FRSN, FHKAH (Hon.), FSA, FRHistS
Honorary President, International Union of Academies (President 2017-21)
Bye Fellow, Robinson College, Cambridge (2018-2022)
Trustee, Ancient India and Iran Trust, Cambridge
Inaugural Distinguished Professor (Emeritus), Macquarie University (Sydney)
Co-Director, UNESCO-UAI sponsored Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Project
samuel.lieu@mq.edu.au
sncl2@cam.ac.uk

Contents



- (1) Hans-Jakob Polotsky, ‘Manichäismus’ [‘Manichaïsmus’ in G. Wissowa (ed.), *A. Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. VI, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1935, cols. 241-72.] English translation by Camilla Ferard and Samuel N.C. Lieu (2022). 1
- (2) Henri-Charles Puech, ‘Saint Paul among the Manichaeans of Central Asia’ [‘Saint Paul chez les manichéens d’Asie Centrale’, Communication made at the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions (Tokyo and Kyoto, 27 August – 9 September 1958). It first appeared in the *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions*, Tokyo, Maruzen, 1960, pp. 176-187. Reprinted in H.Ch. Puech, *Sur le Manichéisme et autres essais* (Paris: Flammarion, 1979) 153-67.] English translation by Camilla Ferard. (2020). 29
- (3) Werner Sundermann, ‘Manichaeism on the Silk Road: its rise, climax and decay’ [Originally published as “Der Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße: Aufstieg, Blüte und Verfall”, in U. Hübner, J. Kamlah and L. Reinfandt (eds.), *Die Seidenstraße: Handel und Kulturaustausch in einem eurasiatischen Wegenetz*, Asien und Afrika. Beiträge des Zen-trums für Asiatische und Afrikanische Studien (ZAAS) der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Bd. 3 (Hamburg: EB-Verlag, 2001), 153-168; translated from the German by Dr B. Hendrichke and published in S.N.C. Lieu and G. Mikkelsen (eds.), *Between Rome and China: History, Religions and Material Culture of the Silk Road*, Silk Road Studies XVIII (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016) 75-90.] 37

More studies to follow.

Abbreviations



- Acta Arch.* [Hegemonius], *Acta Archelai*, ed. C. H. Beeson, GCS XVI (Leipzig, 1906).
- APAW Abhandlungen der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1815-1907; philosoph.-hist. Kl., 1908-49)
- Aug. Aurelius Augustinus.
- ___, *c. Ep. Fund.* Augustinus, *contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant 'fundamenti'*, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL XXV/1 (Vienna, 1892), pp. 193-248
- ___, *c. Faust.* Augustinus, *contra Faustum*, ed. idem, CSEL XXV/1, pp. 251-797.
- ___, *c. Fel.* Augustinus, *contra Felicem*, ed. idem, CSEL XXV/2 pp. 801-52.
- ___, *c. Fort.* Augustinus, *contra Fortunatum*, ed. idem, CSEL XXV/1, pp. 83-112.
- ___, *de nat. boni*
Augustinus, *de natura boni*, ed. idem, CSEL XXV/1, pp. 855-89.
- ___, *de util. cred.*
Augustinus, *de utilitate credendi*, ed. idem, CSEL XXV/1, pp. 3-48.
- CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna).
- GCS Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte (Leipzig and Berlin).
- CFM Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum (Turnhout).
- GLS G. Fox, J.J. Sheldon and S.N.C. Lieu, *Greek and Latin Sources on Manichaean Cosmogony and Ethics*, CFM, Series Subsidia VI (Turnhout, 2010).
- JRAS *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London).
- Mani-Fund* C. Schmidt and H.J. Polotsky, 'Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler', *SPAW* (1933), 1-90.
- MM i-iii* F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I*, *SPAW* X, 1932, pp. 175-222; II, *ibid.* 1933, VII, pp. 294-363 and III, *ibid.* 1934, XXVII, pp. 848-912.
- HR ii* F.W.K. Müller, *Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkistan. II. Teil*, APAW, Anhang, Nr. 2 (Berlin, 1904).
- Man. Hom.* *Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, Bd. I*, H.J. Polotsky (ed. and trans.), *Manichäische Homilien* (Stuttgart, 1934).
- NGWG *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (Berlin, 1884f.)
- OLZ *Orientalische Literatur Zeitung*
- SPAW *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1882-1921; philos.-hist. Klasse, 1922-49) (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften,).
- W.-L. i & ii E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. APAW (Berlin, 1926) and 'Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten', *SPAW* (1933), 480-607.

(1) MANICHAISM¹

Hans Jakob Polotsky^{1,2}



CONTENTS

1. The Sources
2. Biographical details of the Founder
3. Basic Ideas and Design of the System
4. The Myth
 - (a) The Two Principles
 - (b) The Fight and the Mixing of the Two Principles
 - (c) Creation of the World
 - (d) The Third Messenger
 - (e) Creation of Man
 - (f) Jesus and the Νοῦς
 - (g) Salvation and Damnation, Sin and Forgiveness of Sins
 - (h) Fate of the Soul after Death
 - (i) End of the World and *Apocatastasis*
5. Community Organisation, Ethics, and Culture
6. Mani's Self-Classification in the History of Religion
7. Christology outside of the Myth
8. On the Typological Determination of Manichaeism

1. THE SOURCES

For a comprehensive overview see P. Alfarcic, *Les écritures manichéennes*, I. *Vues générales*; II. *Étude analytique*, Paris, 1918-19): the sources fall into three groups: (1) Original Manichean writings, (2) Excerpts from original writings by non-Manichean authors, (3) Referential accounts, mixed with reasoning and polemics, by advocates of Manichaeism. Groups 2 and 3 often merge and there is no fundamental difference between Groups 1 and 2. A completely unusable classification principle would be the geographical origin or language of the texts. Although the system did adapt its nomenclature and terminology to the prevailing religion in some mission areas and also emphasized one or two of the teaching elements more strongly, or added some, the essential uniformity of all the branches of transmission from North Africa and Egypt to China is becoming increasingly clear. – Here I only list the most important ones:

(1) Original writings have come to light at two locations in the transmission area that are widely spaced out from each other: in Turfan (Chinese-Turkestan) and in Egypt. In addition to Turkish (Uyghur) and Chinese, there are three Iranian dialects represented in the Turfan texts: Persian, Parthian, and Sogdian. The Persian fragments from Mani's *Šābuhrāgan*

¹ 'Manichäismus' in G. Wissowa (ed.), *A. Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. VI, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1935, cols. 241-72 (reprinted in *Collected Papers by H. J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1971, pp. 699-714. The following is the only known translation of this land-mark contribution to Manichaean Studies. No attempt has been made to update its content. [SL]

² For the extraordinary life and outstanding achievements of the late Professor Polotsky whom many would regard as the greatest Coptologist and Semitic scholar of the last century see E. Ullendorf, 'H. J. Polotsky (1905-1991): Linguistic Genius', *JRAS* IV, 1994, pp. 3-13.[SL]

(*Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkistan. II. Teil*, APAW, 1904, Anhang, Nr. 2, Berlin, 1904); a Persian fragment, possibly belonging to the Schapurakan, a detailed representation of the cosmogony (C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I*, SPAW X, 1932, pp. 175-222 [= MM i]); a Turkish fragment confessional for catechumens (W. Bang, 'Manichaeische Laien-Beichtspiegel', *Muséon* XXXVI, 1923, pp. 137-242); a Chinese tract of educational content (E. Chavannes and P. Pelliot, 'Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine', *Journal Asiatique*, 10^{ème} sér., 18, 1911, 499-617) and also a Chinese collection of hymns (E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. APAW (Berlin, 1926); idem, 'Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten', SPAW (1933), 480-607); as well as many small fragments, especially hymns, of varied content and most unequal value. - The texts found in Egypt are written in the Subakhmimic dialect of Coptic. Among others, they include the *Κεφάλαια* (v. *infra*); a hymn book; Mani's letters; a collection of homilies. The indexing of these texts is still in its early stages, cf., in the interim, C. Schmidt and H.J. Polotsky, 'Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler', SPAW (1933), 1-90.

(2) Among the excerpts, to be mentioned is a first passage of the Manichaean section in the "Book of Scholia" by the Syrian Theodor bar Konai (end of 8th century A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn, 1922, 218): his special value is that he writes in a language that is at least closely related to that of Mani; evidence that he was a witness to the original wording is proven, among other things, by the fact that he does not present the two god names *Bān rabbā*, the Great Builder* and *Ṣāpēt zīuā*, Keeper of Splendour (*Splenditenens*) in Edessan Syriac (see Burkitt, *Rel. of the Manich.* 28 n.1). - Before Theodor became known (1898), the Fihrist could rightly claim first place; Muhammed b. al-Nadim (AD995. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* I, Weimar 1898, 147) communicated in his literary history (*Fihrist* "Catalogue") not only valuable historical information about Mani and Manichaeism., but also excerpts and writings of Mani; his templates are based on official translations of texts partly from Syrian (see below p. 260, 65) and partly from Iranian (v. *infra*), intended to be used by Arabic-speaking communities. Some of the templates used by al-Shahrastani (written in 1127; ed. W. Cureton, London 1846) and al-Murtada (1363-1437; the relevant section in K. Kessler *Mani. Forschungen über die Manichäische Religion*, I, Berlin 1889, 346ff.), are the same as those of al-Nadim. The *Acta Archelai* (first half of the 4th century) composed of excerpts (first half of 4th century), contain a very valuable outline of the Manichaean teaching; the Greek original of these excerpts is preserved in Epiphanius, *panar. (haer.)* LXVI 25-31.

(3) The most important, if not the oldest, polemicist is Augustine (AD 354-430), who was himself a Manichean auditor for nine years. His anti-Manichean writings – his writings from AD 391-405 in Hippo Regius alone fill a hefty volume of the Vienna corpus - are still among the most important sources of Manichaeism. - Greek writers include the Neoplatonist Alexander of Lycopolis (around AD 300?) and Bishop Titus of Bostra (+ around AD 370); approximately a third of the latter's writing is only preserved in a Syriac translation. – the commentator on Aristotle and Epictetus, Simplicius (see K. Praechter, *Die Philosophie Altertums*, Vol. V, A, Berlin, 1926, 204ff., Esp. 209, 24ff.), written in the sixth century, provides in his *in Epict. enchir.* ch. 27 a detailed refutation of the dualists. He is well informed on the details of the Manichean system; his presentation is characterized by precision, and his polemics by ingenuity, penetrating understanding, and objectivity.

Citations / References: *Acta Archelai* according to the edition of C.H. Beeson (Griech. christl. Schrittst. [Greek Christian Writings] Vol. XVI, Lpz. 1906); Alex. Lyc. according to Brinkmann (Lpz. 1895); Augustine according to J. Zycha (*Sancti Aureli Augustini Opera*, Sect VI, Pars I & II, CSEL XXV, Vienna 1891-92; also contains Euodius, *de fide*); *Fihrist* according to Flügel's *Mani*; the as yet unedited Coptic *Keph(alaia)* according to pages and

lines of the ms. which are retained in the publication;³ Simplicius according to F. Dübner, *Theophrasti Characteres ... Epicteti Enchiridion cum Commentario Simplicii*, *Scriptorum Graecorum Bibliotheca X*, Paris 1840); Theodor (bar Konai) according to Pognon (Inscr. Mand Paris 1898/99); Tit. Bostr. according to P.A. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni contra manichaeos libri quatuor syriace*, Berlin, 1859 – *Mani-Fund* cited without author = C. Schmidt and H.J. Polotsky, ‘Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler’, *SPAW* (1933), 1-90.

Other literature (overall presentation, more important individual investigations, and comments): F.C. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionsystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwickelt*, Tübingen 1831 (fundamentally and methodically exemplary; reviews by V. C[ölln], *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 1832, 426-440 and Schneckenburger, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, VI 1833, 875—898). G. Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, Leipzig 1862. F. Cumont (partly with M. Kugener), *Recherches sur le manichéisme*, I-III, Brussels 1908ff (particularly recommended for introduction). A. von Harnack, ‘Der Manichäismus’ in idem, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, IV/2, Tübingen 1909, 513—527. W. Bang, ‘Manichäische Laien-Beichtspiegel’, *Muséon XXXVI*, 1923, 137-242, idem, ‘Manichäische Hymnen’, *Muséon XXXVIII*, 1925, pp. 1-55. F.C. Burkitt, *Religion of the Manichees*, Cambridge, 1925; H.H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antiker Synkretismus*, Leipzig, 1926; idem, ‘Urform und Fortbildungen des Manichäischen Systems’, *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, 1924-5, Leipzig 1927, pp. 65-157. A.V.W. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, New York 1932. W.B. Henning ‘Ein manichäischer kosmogonischer Hymnus’, *NGWG*, 1932, pp. 214-28 and idem, ‘Geburt und Entsendung des manichäischen Urmenschen’, *NGWG*, 1933, 306-318. — Detailed bibliography in E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*. APAW, Berlin, 1926 [= W.L. i], 3–4 and idem, ‘Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten’, *SPAW* (1933) [= W.L. ii], 484, fns. 1 & 2, Jackson *Researches*, XXIVff.

2. BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS OF THE FOUNDER

According to authentic information (al-Birūni, *Chronol.* 208, 8-9), Manichaeus (in addition to Manes, -is; Μανιχαῖος in addition to Μάνης, -ης; Iran. Syr. Arab. *Mani*) was born in the year 527 in the Babylonian astronomical calendar, which is the Era κατὰ Χαλδαίους of the Babylonian Seleucid Era = AD 216/7. The information as to his place of birth fluctuates; in any case, it was in southern Babylonia. Accordingly, the language in which he wrote was Eastern Aramaic (it is not certain whether it was Syriac in the strict sense, i.e. the dialect of Edessa raised to the written language, see Burkitt, *Religion*, 116): τῇ Σύρων φωνῇ χρώμενος Tit. Bostr. I,17 p. 10, 13, *Fihrist* 72, 10-11 (as this same can mean *Chaldaeorum lingua*, *Acta Arch.* 59, 21, this passage is of dubious value); on the terms, “Syrian” and “Chaldean” see Nöldeke, *ZDMG XXV* 115ff. 129. Western writers, however, call Mani a Persian, not a Babylonian: Alex. Lyc. 4, 14. *Acta Arch.* 59, 19 (doubtful value). Secundinus, *ad Aug., epist.* p. 896, 7. *Doctrina patrum*, ed. Diekamp 306, 11; this probably only refers to the fact that, being a Babylonian, Mani was a Persian national. However, he was in fact of Iranian descent; from the maternal and apparently also from the paternal side (see Schaeder, *Urform [Archetype]* 68 n.4) he was related to the Parthian royal family of the Arsacid, which was overthrown in 226 by the Sasanian Ardashir (Artaxares) I. Mani’s father Patek (about the

³ The (Berlin) *Kephalaia* was published in fascicles over a long period of time. Cf. [H. J. Polotsky,] A. Böhlig and W.-P. Funk (eds. and transs.), *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin, Bd. I, Kephalaia*, Stuttgart, 1940-2000. Because of the Nuremberg Laws of 1935, Polotsky’s name was not given on the title page of Band I (Fasc. 1-10) published in 1940 but his name is given on p. IV as the editor and translator of (ms.) pp. 1-102. [SL]

name see Schaeder, *Iranica* 69) had emigrated to Babylonia from his median homeland Hamadan (Ecbatana) and had settled in Ctesiphon. Shortly before the birth of his son, he heard a voice in an idol temple that he would visit that commanded him to avoid meat, wine, and sexual intercourse in the future. He obeyed the command, went to Dast-i Maisān in southern Babylonia, and joined a Baptist sect whose rite complied with these regulations. Mani grew up in this environment. The fact that he was destined for the extraordinary was announced early on by his mother's strange dreams and by the wisdom of his discourses. He had his first revelation at the age of twelve; an angel of God, the “Twin” or “Consort”, a kind of *spiritus familiaris* [spirit family] of Mani (see *Mani-Fund* 72), prepared him for his mission; he should turn away from the religious community in which he lived and prepare for the task for which he was chosen, but he was still too young for a public appearance. After another twelve years, the “Twin” appeared to him again, conveyed to him the formal election for ἀπόστολος and told him to begin his activity. Thus goes the Manichaean legend, as is handed down in the *Fihrist* 49-51. Although the revelation to the twelve-year-old must be a borrowed motif (it is refuted by the Gnostic Justin according to Hippolytus. V 26, 29 p. 131, 20f. (Wendland), Jesus as παιδάριον δωδεκαετής received the revelation through Baruch), nothing prevents us from making the assumption that Mani really did develop his system at was, for occidental standards (there is no lack of oriental parallels), a very early age; that would explain the rigidity with which Mani retained, once found, a detailed form of the representation throughout his life. - Mani began operating publicly by traveling to India and starting his first church there. The reasons that prompted him to leave the country are as little known as the circumstances that made it seem advisable for him to return soon afterwards, immediately after Ardashir's death. On the coronation day of his successor Shapur (Sapor) I, - the reigning years of the first Sassanids are still not totally certain and the apparently so exact date of the *Fihrist* 51, 6 (Sunday the 1st of Nisan, while the sun was in the ram) is unusable – Mani was graciously received in Ctesiphon by the king and given permission to carry out missions in the Persian Empire. The degree to which Shapur must have been well-disposed to Manichaeism is also evident from the fact that Mani wrote for him a Persian description of his teaching under the title *Schapurakan*, the “Shapuric (-Book)”. When Shapur died after 30 years of ruling, Mani also enjoyed the favour of his successor Hormizd I. *Man. Hom.* 48, 9–10). But after only a year, Bahram I took over governance, under whom things took a different turn for Mani. The Mazdayasian priesthood, the magi (Μαξουσαῖοι), managed to get him charged and sentenced to death: in the year 276 (?) he was crucified in Belapat in Susiana (tortured according to oriental transmission) and his head was hung on the city gate.

The following writings of Mani are attested to with certainty:

- (1) the *Shapurakan* (*Šābuhraγān*), written in Persian,
- (2) the Living Gospel, to which the “Picture(-Book) (εἰκῶν)” apparently belongs as a kind of volume of plates (see *Man. Hom.* 18.5 and my comment),
- (3) the Treasury of the Life,
- (4) the *Πραγματεῖα* (“Treatise”),
- (5) the Book of the Mysteries,
- (6) the Book of the Giants,
- (7) the Corpus of Letters.

The *Epistula Fundamenti* [*Fundamental Epistle*] must probably be identified as being under the five writings listed under 2-6, which was preferred by the North African Manichaeans as a manual for teaching; in Aug., c. Felic. I 14 p 817, 18ff. it appears together with the “Treasury” as part of a canon of *quinque auctores* [*five authors*]. One could venture a guess at the *Πραγματεῖα* (also Alfaric II 59); Cumont, *Rech* 4-5 No. 2 however prefers, as the title

suggests, to identify it with the “Epistles of the Two Principles”, which is listed in first place in the Directory of Letters (Fihrist 73, 12).

From most of these writings, shorter, rarely longer, pieces are handed down directly or indirectly. For the testimonials and sources, please refer to Alfaric.

Some Western authors also include the *Κεφάλαια* [*Chapters*] (see Alfaric II 21ff), whose Coptic translation was discovered by C. Schmidt (*v. supra*). It consists of a collection of Mani’s lectures, which were compiled as an addition to his writings after his death as per his own directive, so that nothing would be lost. Given the posthumous character of this work it can by no means be considered exempt from factual criticism; unfortunately, there is no discourse that states without question that we now have “a teaching system without any distortion”. But this does not prevent them from being invaluable taken as a whole: they expand our knowledge in essential points, they confirm and explain the other transmission, they help to overcome the linguistic difficulties of the Orient, especially the Turkestan texts and sometimes enable their correct understanding (the fundamental terms *manuhmed* = νοῦς and *grīv χīvanday* = ψυχή were only able to be correctly determined with the help of the Coptic tests: Mani-Fund 69-71).

3. BASIC CONCEPT AND DESIGN OF THE SYSTEM.

The keyword used to characterize the Manichaean religion is “dualistic gnosis”; with utmost consequence it denies the possibility of attributing good and evil to one primal principle; it teaches redemption from evil through knowledge of dualism and through following the rules of life resulting from this knowledge. The fundamental theorems of its doctrinal concept, from which all others can be derived, are as follows:

(1) Evil is an independently opposing principle to Good, which is not only essential but also originally existentially separate from it (ἀρχή). Mani called the two principles, God and Hyle [Matter], the ruling powers; he saw them represented in nature by the δύο φύσεις of light and of darkness.

(2) The present world as a whole, and human beings in particular, represent a mixing of the two principles, which, due to the breaking of the borders between the two by one of the Hyles, has become a prerequisite.

(3) At the same time, the establishment of the world aims to gradually separate the two principles from one another; as soon as its purpose, which is to restore the original state, has been fully achieved, its continuing existence becomes redundant, (ἀποκατάστασις τῶν δύο φύσεων [restoration of the two principles] *Acta Arch.* 22, I), but with the condition that the evil principle is rendered harmless for the future and that the mixing is not repeated.

(4) Within this world-order the human being has the special task of actively contributing to the achievement of this goal. Due to the Νοῦς that God sent to him and which distinguishes him from the rest of creation, he must become aware of the mixing, recognize the meaning of the world order and conduct his life accordingly so that any further damage to the light is avoided and its release from mixing with the darkness is favoured. If he does this perfectly, the separation of the two principles will, immediately after his death, take place on his person; for him physical death will mean salvation, true life, and the return of the light trapped in his body. Failing that, the light contained in the person remains, even after his death, mixed with the darkness until it reaches the body of a perfect being.

It is almost impossible, as has been attempted here, to formulate these basic ideas in an abstract way. From the very start, the sensual-visual element is so strong that it cannot be excluded. For Mani, the substantiation of the concepts, the equation of the physical and the spiritual-moral (which cannot be understood as a symbolization of the latter by the former) is obviously not just a stylistic device that facilitates representation, but a necessity that makes

thinking possible. It is certain that he did not care to develop his theory in a conceptual-dialectical way; everything points to the fact that, even with the best will in the world, he would not have been able to do this. But he did take the trouble to offer a system that satisfied the ratio. Although the methods of dialectics were not available to him, he attempted to achieve the same with pragmatics. He constructed a history of the beginning, present and future of the world, which centred on the human being, and which, insofar as it was prehistory and prognosis, could claim to be credible due to four characteristics: (1) it was impressively coherent and represented the individual processes in a meaningful and understandable way; (2) it took account of all the important “world enigmas” and historically indicated their place; (3) it was built with careful consideration of symmetry and harmony - almost the entire shape and conceptual structure of the system is divided into triads, pentads or dodecades (“series”) - it seemed clear and aesthetically satisfactory and inspired a favourable preconceived notion for the correctness of what could be expressed so satisfactorily; (4) it did not bring suspicion upon itself by abruptly rejecting earlier religions, but claimed to have absorbed what was really good and essential in them; it was based, in all of its mythological character and in many individual passages, on older teachings familiar to the circles to which Mani initially turned. The extent to which Mani himself was convinced that he had reconstructed the real facts with his construction, the extent to which he considered it necessary anyway, or rather whether a certain symbolic correctness seemed sufficient to him - these are questions that are easier to ask than to answer. In any event, the judgment of Simplicius 72, 18-16 is widely recognized as being correct for the Manichean community *τέρατα γὰρ πλάττοντες τινα ἄπερ οὐδὲ μύθους καλεῖν ἄξιον, οὐχ ὡς μύθοις χρῶνται, οὐδὲ ἐνδείκνυσθαι τι ἄλλο νομίζουσιν, ἀλλ ὡς ἀληθέσιν αὐτοῖς τοῖς λεγομένοις πιστεύουσι*: cf. also Alex. Lyc. 16, 9ff.

This “cosmogonic myth”, the main achievement of Mani, is the rational, natural-philosophical foundation for Manichaeism and hope for redemption. Anyone who has internalized the “two principles” and “three periods”: *initium medium et finis [beginning middle and end]* of the knowledge brought by Mani, has the knowledge of what to do in this tenure and what to expect in the future. *Ausculata prius [listen first]*, Mani speaks to the addressees of the Epistles, “*quae fuerint ante constitutionem mundi et quo pacto proelium sit agitatum, ut possis luminis seiungere naturam ac tenebrarum*” [*what happened before the creation of the world and in what manner the battle was carried on, so that you can clearly separate the land of light from that of the nature of darkness,*] (p. 208, 28-26). “Divorce of the two natures” briefly and comprehensively describes the duties of the true Manichaean (see also Man. Hom. 12, 25f.); in the spiritual sense, he applies it by recognizing the difference and spreading this knowledge further, - in the physical, by abstaining from any damage to the light and creates the conditions through his conduct of life so that, after his death, the light contained in it is released.

The correct understanding of the myth consists in “always relating the concrete and the abstract, the mythical and the logical, the image and the concept to one another in such a way that one is balanced in the other and both forms of representation can coexist” (Baur, *Manich. Rel. System*, 9-10). To do this, it is necessary to keep an eye on the purely formal and essentially non-tangible nature of some stylistic elements of the mythological representation.

(1) The necessity of revealing the actions and sufferings of the representatives of the land of light means that anthropomorphisms and anthropopathites play a very important role. This is insofar as individual “gods” - if only to a certain extent *δοκησεῖ* - are enclosed with such hylish things as a human-like appearance, even male and female gender: *omnia corpora ex tenebrarum gente esse dicitis, quamvis substantiam divinam cogitare nisi corpoream numquam valueritis*] Aug., *c. Faust.* XXII p. 551.3-5. One may perhaps assume that Mani was clear about the lifeless hylization of all human ideas and means of expression and consciously tried to make a virtue out of necessity to help make his myth clearer.

(2) “Significant is the aspiration to leave God in the background and to insert all kinds of intermediary beings as exponents of his relationships with the world and with people, about whom one can then unabashedly invent stories. The divine properties and modes of action are hypostasized...” (Wellhausen *Isr. u. jud. Gesch.* 6 302). The Manichaean myth shares, together with all the Gnostic systems, this characteristic of late Jewish angelology, even if none other goes so far that even the “self” of God is hypostasized (*v. infra*). The expression “callings” serves to describe the act by which God affords these gods independence; they are his “callings” (Mani-Fund 66); the same relationship exists between the gods and their “sub” or “auxiliary gods”. The “callings” are often called “sons” of the “call”, but verbs such as “produce”, “give birth” or “create” are avoided. In the Greek language area, *προβάλλειν* and *προβολή* have been substituted for “called” and “call” (see *ibid.*). If one transfers the renditions “emanate” and “emanation” used for these Valentinian terms to the Manichaean myth, one has to bear in mind that Mani's god setup is somewhat different from the aeonic system of Valentinus. Above all, Mani's system is not a step sequence with progressively descending divinity; rather, the divinity of all the “gods” is fundamentally the same; they are used when the course of the mythical events so requires it, and their valuation, insofar as one can speak of one, depends only on the importance of their function. Furthermore, one has to free oneself from the idea that the meaning of the “call” is in any way subordinate or inferior to the “called”. Under certain circumstances, the opposite can even be the case; in our view, the “call” is sometimes the term that is primary - for us and certainly also in Mani's conception - and the “called” is only its mythical bearer. In other cases, the relationship between the “calls” and a plurality of the “called” is that of a whole and its parts. – The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to the Hyle and its powers.

(3) If two terms, each of which is expressed by a “set”, be connected with one another, the members of the two pentads or dodecades etc. are individually related to one another. For example, if it is expressed that the Manichaean Church is the earthly manifestation of *Noûs*, the five classes of the Manichaean hierarchy become: *διδάσκαλοι*, *ἐπίσκοποι*, *πρεσβύτεροι*, *ἐκλεκτοί*, *κατηχούμενοι* referred to one after the other as “sons”, each one being one of the five members of the *Noûs*: *νοῦς*, *ἔννοια*, *φρόνησις*, *ἐμθύμησις*, *λογισμός*, without the need for a particularly close and exclusive relationship to be set out between the *πρεσβύτεροι* and the *φρόνησις*. The extent to which the peculiarity of style is suitable for obscuring the meaning is shown by the fact that, in relation to the example given, the following has occasionally been expressed: “The five levels [of the hierarchy] are ludically related to the five “members” of the light ether [these are certainly *νοῦς*, *ἔννοια* etc.]”

4. THE MYTH

(a) The Two Principles

In the beginning, the two principles exist separately from each other in the form of two lands, one above the other and separated by a border. More precisely, the land of light extends endlessly upwards, to the right and to the left, - the land of darkness extends endlessly downwards (Fihrist 58, 6f.); geographically expressed, the light belongs to the north east and west, the darkness to the south (Sev. Ant. in Cumont, *Rech. Man.* 96; further passages at Baur 26-28). In the upper realm, the land of light, God, the “Father of Greatness”, rules. His residence is the light earth, in turn surrounded by the light ether. God's essence is described by a series of five terms that refer to the powers of the mind (documented in all sources with the exception of the Persian source, see Waldschmidt-Lentz *Jesus* 42; here according to Act Arch. 15, 11.) *νοῦς*, *ἔννοια*, *φρόνησις*, *ἐμθύμησις*, *λογισμός* In Syriac they are actually called his *šḵīnā's* (Theodor 127, 7), “dwellings”, hypostases of the divine existence (see Schaeder,

Studien, 316); in *Fihrist* 52, 15, 54, 1–2 they are referred to as the members of God and are conceived spatially as “superposed” worlds.

The land of light is inhabited by countless aeons and “aeons of the aeons” (see Henning GGN 1933, 310f; see Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* 1 3.1 from the Valentinians: ... ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας λέγοντας, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἐκείνους τοὺς Αἰῶνας σημαίνειν ... θέλουσιν). Twelve aeons surround the Father of Greatness, three of them distributed over the four heaven directions; they are named his “firstborn”, in contrast to the gods, who will only be called on after the attack of the Hyle (see *Muséon* XLVI 262f.)

The entire land of light is ruled by the “Great Spirit”, a kind of σύζυγος of the Father of Greatness, which actually represents the pre-existent form of the “Mother of Life” (see below p. 251, 25).

The realm of evil, “the land of darkness”, consists of “five worlds (κόσμοι)”, the five “dark elements”:

Smoke, fire, wind, water, darkness.

(This is the best-attested arrangement, e.g. Theodor 127, 10f. *Keph.* 68, 17 et passim; see Henning, *NGWG* 1932, 216 fn. 5. The Arabic sources (*Fihrist* 53, 3f. 54, 13f. et passim Schahrestani 191, 1-3. al-Murtada in Kessler *Mani* 347, 7f. 348, 7-12) differentiate the light elements further: instead of fire, burning, instead of wind, simoom, instead of water, mud.) These elements have “bubbled out” of five ταμειῖα, five trees have emerged from the elements, and from the trees in turn the five genera of living beings (demons, devils, archons), which populate the five worlds (*Keph.* 30, 18-22. Aug., *c. Faust.* VI 8, p. 297, 17-19. Simplicius, 71, 18-22): two-legged (demons in the narrower sense), four-legged, flying, swimming, and crawling. Each of these genera are broken down into the two genders and is therefore fulfilled by ἐπιθυμία and ἡδονή. Furthermore, the five metals belong to the realm of the Hyle, spread over the five worlds: gold, copper, iron, silver, lead and tin (these count as one), and the five kinds of taste: salty, sour, spicy (? burnt?), sweet, bitter. Each of the five worlds has a ruler, whose face corresponds to the corresponding class of living things: demon, lion, eagle, fish, dragon; all of them are ruled over by the ruler of darkness, which at the same time represents their entirety; the μορφαί of all the genera are united on its body. (*Keph.* 80, 84ff., *Fihrist* 58, 10—12 [*daubb* “reptiles” - these are already represented by the “dragon” - is corrupted: it must be named “demons”. Here is the same confusion of Middle Persian *dēv* “demon” and *dēvay* “worm”, according to a comment by Henning in the German translation in W.-L. i, 113, 4, where, incidentally, the pentad, is not commented on. An Iranian submission has thus been demonstrated for the *Fihrist* section in question]. Simplicius 72, 16-18: πεντάμορφόν τι ζῷον τὸ κακὸν ἀναπλάττοντες ἀπὸ λέοντος καὶ ἰχθύος | καὶ ἀετοῦ καὶ οὐ μέμνηται τίνων ἄλλων συγκείμενον, cf. 71, 20. [Also in the Mandeans: *Ginza Raba* 280, 2f. = trans. M. Lidzbarski, *Ginzā = Der Schatz: oder das große Buch der Mandäer*, Leipzig 1925, 278, 19-21; the Manichean source of the chapter on the ruler of darkness is retained in the *Keph.*]). In the texts, the ruler of darkness is partly the personification of the “Υλη”, the *formatrix corporum* [creator of bodies] (Aug., *de nat. boni* 18 p. 862, 9 et passim; Coptic ζωγράφος), the “Ἐνθύμησις of death” (*Mani-Fund* 78), - and partly its highest instrument.

As a result of the ἐνθύμησις of death” inherent in them, the “worlds” of the land of darkness are constantly at war with one another and continually filled with turmoil and restless movement (ἄτακτος κίνησις Alex. Lyc. 5.8).

Although the accusation of dyotheism, against which Bang *Muséon* XXXVI 1923, 204 recently wanted to defend Manichaeism, is indeed unjustified in name - insofar as the name God is reserved for the good principle - it is not in substance. Manichaeism is, in fact, that which Bang contests, “also the most consistent form of dualism”. Simplicius 72 20-24 very aptly says τὸ θαυμαστόν, ὅτι πάντα ταῦτα ἀνέπλασαν διὰ θεοσεβῆ δῆθεν εὐλάβειαν (an objectivity of consideration that one would find in vain in any other contesters of

Manichaeism) μὴ βουλόμενοι γὰρ αἴτιον τοῦ κακοῦ τὸν | θεὸν εἰπεῖν, ἀρχὴν ὑπεστήσαντο ἰδίαν τοῦ κακοῦ, ἰσότιμον αὐτὴν καὶ | ἰσοσθενῆ τιθέντες τῷ ἀγαθῷ ..; Mani attaches the essential attributes of the deity to both the good and the bad principle: 71, 41-48 ὁμοίως ταῦτα τῷ ἀγαθῷ καὶ τῷ κακῷ ὑπάρχειν φασί, τὸ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἄφθαρτον, τὸ ἀναρχον καὶ | ἀτελεύτητον: ὧν τί ἄν εἶη σεμνότερον; - see. also Aug., *c. Faust.* XXI 4 p. 572, 23-26 *et passim*.

(b) The Fight and the Mixing of the Two Principles

At its ἄτακτος κίνησις the Hyle comes into the upper limit of its realm and sees the land of light in its glory. The sight arouses its desire and it gathers its host of demons (or the five dark elements) to proceed to conquer the foreign territory.

Through the powers of the mind, knowledge of the impending danger penetrates to God and he decides to fight it off. In fact, he “does not want to send any of the Aeons (*‘ālmai* is st. cstr.) of his five *Škīnā*’(s), but “he himself “(Syr. *b-naṗš* literally “through my soul” i.e. “through myself”) sets out for the fight (Theodor 127, 16). Although this seems to be contradicted in the following by the fact that the Father of Greatness does not, according to the exact wording, set forth, but instead “emanations” - initially the “soul”, see below - are tasked with the necessary measures, this only proves the essentially formal nature of the “gods” as hypostases of God’s actions. The Father of Greatness therefore first calls the Great Spirit (who is to be thought of as “female”) as the “Mother of Life”. This latter calls the “First Man” (the sources - with the exception of the Arabic - describe him as the First Man, with the same expression that they use for Adam). The First Man calls the five elements

ἄήρ ἄνημος φῶς ὕδω πῦρ

(combined from the Coptic and the corrupted list *Acta Arch.* 10, 7 - ἄήρ [Air] is taken out and ὕλη [Matter] is added at the end; also documented in the other sources, see W.-L. ii, 506f.). These elements, which according to the *Fihrist* of Flügel, *Mani* 61 per ultimo, form the “members” of the light-earth, that is, the actual substance of the land of light, are the soul. “Soul” or rather the syr. *naṗš*’, which is only imperfectly reproduced by ψυχή and *anima*, means for Mani at the same time both the contrast to the hylian body and the “self” of God, who “sets out” himself for the fight, but at the same time, thanks to the hypostasis of his “self”, does not have to give up his transcendence. - Mani contrasted the “soul” with the Hyle, the principle of “death” (evidence from Henning *NGWG* 1933, 314 n. 1) by adding “the living” to the term. The expression comes from 1 Cor. 15, 45 ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν: Mani apparently deleted Ἀδάμ as a gloss so that the verse contained the essential core of his primeval myth (see *Mani-Fund* 71-72).

The First Man arms himself with his “sons”, the elements, as with an armour and descends to ward off the attacker. The fight does not go exactly as one might expect. The attack of the darkness is countered in a way that initially seems to amount to a defeat of the light, and in fact only achieves the aim through protracted and painful detours. The First Man throws the elements to the demons as if as bait, which they then also greedily devour. The plan is to temporarily surrender a part of the light in order to satisfy the power of darkness for the moment and thereby ward off further attacks, but at the same time to outsmart it and finally bring it into the power of the light. One parable is handed down in the *Acta Arch.* 40, 33-41, 7 and proven to be true by the Coptic texts (possibly polemized against by Aug., *c. Faust.* XX 17 p. 557, 15-18) illustrates how the surrender should be understood: *Similis est malignus leoni, qui inreperere vult gregi boni pastoris; quod cum pastor viderit, fodit foveam, quem leo invadere desiderans, cum ingenti indignatione voluit eum absorbere, et adcurrans ad foveam decidit in eam, ascendendi inde sursum non habens vires; quem pastor ad*

prehensum pro prudentia sua in caveam concludit, atque hedum qui cum ipso fuerit in fovea incolumem conservabit» Ex hoc ergo infirmatus est malignus, ultra iam leone non habente potestatem faciendi aliquid, et salvabitur omne anirmarum genus ac restituetur quod perierat proprio suo gregi [It is like a lion, the Evil One, who wants to steal from the flock of the good shepherd; so when a shepherd sees it, he digs a pit in which he threw a young goat; the lion eagerly runs to the pit and falls in, but does not have the strength to get out again; thanks to the shepherd's wisdom, he manages to draw up the young goat while the lion remains shut in the pit. Just as the land of darkness becomes harmless and the souls swallowed up by it are at last saved and brought back to their kindred habitation.] cf. Simplicius 70, 42-45 ὥσπερ στρατηγός, φασι, πολεμίων ἐπιόντων μέρος αὐτοῖς τοῦ οἰκείου στρατοῦ προίεται, ἵνα τὸ λοιπὸν διασώσῃ (this image is however a real and permanent surrender).

When the demons devoured the elements of light, the two natures were mixed. This mixing does not just represent a mere merging into each other, but leads to an impairment of the original quality on both sides; the light elements are to varying degrees subject to the influence of the Hyle: they forget their homeland (*X^uāstvānīft* I B, Bang Muséon XXXVI 145 cf. Schaeder, *Studien*, 250 fn. 6), they become unconscious (ibid. Theodor 127, 27); the dark elements do not improve, but they become so used to the symbiosis with the light that they can no longer live without it and the one-time separation from it will mean the death of the Hyle (Alex. Lyc. 5, 23—25. Tit. Bostr. I 39 p. 24, 15f.; similar to III 5 p. 68, 14). The questionable view of the deterioration of the quality of the mixed ψυχή, which is the prerequisite for the doctrine of damnation (see p.260, 12; for Augustine the *corruptibilitas* of the soul, which is supposed to be substantially identical to God, is the main point of attack and the safest way to bring down his opponents, as shown by the disputations with Fortunatas and Felix; c. *Fel.* II 21 p. 851, 22ff. he contrasts the Manichean blasphemy with the Catholic dogma: *nos autem dicimus quidem peccasse animam per liberum arbitrium et paenitendo purgari per misericordiam creatoris sui, quia non est ex deo tamquam pars eius vel tamquam proles eius, sed ex deo vel a deo facta est tamquam opus eius: quid intersit inter nostram fidem et vestram perfidiam, omnibus manifestum est* [We say that is wrong with my free will and penitence to be cleared by the kindness of his creator, because it is from God or the like as a part of his offspring; but from God or to God, as is his work; the difference between our own faith and your perfidy is clear to all] c.f. also ibid. I 19 p. 825, 16ff.), is explained in Alex. Lyc. 6, 3-6 with the following parable: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν φαύλῳ ἀγγεῖῳ συµµεταβάλλεσθαι πολλάκις |τὸ ἐνυπάρχον, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ τοιοῦτό τι τὴν ψυχὴν παθοῦσαν παρὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἠλαττωθῆσθαι φύσιν εἰς μετουσίαν κακίας. (For the assessment of Alexander's source, it should be noted that this parable does not match the “mixing” at all, but it does match the pronounced mythological “devouring”; the mythological archetype has left a residue in the “philosophical” treatment.)

Although the First Man with his “sons”, the light elements, is actually a being, in the further course of events his fate is separated from theirs. He embodies the “consciousness” - the νοῦς -, which has gone astray from him and is temporarily hidden in the land of light, in order to return to him later in due time. The myth expresses this as follows: The First Man initially totally loses his consciousness, but soon finds it again himself and prays seven times to the Father of Greatness (Theodor 127, 30f.). The latter hears his supplication and calls the “second calling” in order to free him: the Beloved of Lights → the Great Builder → the Living spirit. The Living Spirit is the main figure in this group; the role of the Beloved of Lights, on the other hand, is completely unclear, and the Great Builder only takes on his role later. (For the following, see Jackson, *Researches*. 255—270.)

The Living Spirit descends to the border of the land of darkness and “calls” to the First Man, to which the First Man replies with an “answer”. Call and answer, hypostasized to a pair of gods, rise up to the land of light, namely the call to the Living Spirit who sent him and the answer to the Mother of Life, the “mother” of the First Man. After the First Man announced

his wish to redeem himself through his “answer” to the “call” of the liberator, the Living Spirit and his five sons, whom he has called on in the interim, (*Splenditenens*, *Rex honoris*, *Adamas* [Syriac and Coptic add: of the light], *Gloriosus rex*, *Atlas* [Ἔμμοφόρος], see. Jackson, *Researches* 286-313) and the Mother of Life in the depths, liberate the First Man and lead him up into the land of light. According to *Fihrist* 56, 7, the First Man cuts through the “roots” of the five demon classes (they have already come out of the trees) in order to prevent further influx from the land of darkness.

That the Living Spirit affords any care to the elements is not reported in the previously known material, but this can perhaps be inferred. In three Iranian texts (see W.-L. ii, 571 and *Muséon* XLVI 263f.), the following series of life forces are documented:

life, strength, radiance, beauty, fragrance.

The soul, that comes out from one of the mentioned places (Andreas-Henning Mir. Man. I 201), is in possession of these powers even before the redemption measures of the third calling. This chronological reason together with the appellative meaning of Ζῶν Πνεῦμα (Syr. *rūhā hajjā* renders it conceivable that they are to be regarded as the “gift” of the Living Spirit: ψυχὴ / *napš*’ would be the substance of light, and πνεῦμα / *rūhā* would be the vital potency of the “soul”.

Notwithstanding, the liberation of the First Man is not without immediate effect for the elements left behind: “Call” and “answer” together form the Ἐνθύμησις of life (see Mani Fund 78-80) and join up the elements (the “answer” is considered to be the “sixth son” of the First Man). The Ἐνθύμησις of life is already characterized by its name as an opponent of the Hyle, the Ἐνθύμησις of death; ζωγράφος is like this (see above p. 250, 40), so ζωγραφεῖ is the Last Statue at the end of the world see below p. 262, 9). What it has to do until then is not entirely clear; it seems to be a kind of replacement for the lost νοῦς and at the same time a preparation for its future recovery, in a sense the natural feeling for affiliation to the land of light (see below p. 257, 27), and the ability to “answer” the “call” of the Νοῦς.

(c) Creation of the World

The main function of the Living Spirit, however, is the one to which it owes the designation δημιουργός in Alex. Lyc. 6, 8. With the help of his five sons, he holds a strict tribunal against the archons. He has some of them killed and flayed and used as material for the construction of the world. With the help of the Mother of Life, ten heavens are removed from the skins (with the zodiac eleven: *MM* i, 183 No. 2), eight earths made from the flesh and the mountains made from the bones (evidence from Jackson Res. 314ff.), and the archons remaining alive are crucified on the firmament. The Living Spirit entrusts its five sons to oversee the cosmos. Then he seizes those parts of the light that have not been affected by the mixing and have thus preserved their light nature (ἐκεῖνο τῆς δυνάμεως, ὅσον ἀπὸ τῆς μίξεως οὐδὲν ἦν ἄτοπον πεπονθός Alex. Lyc. 6, 9-11) and forms the sun and the moon from them, that which is ἐν μετρίᾳ γεγονὸς κακίᾳ serving as material for the stars (ibid. 12). He also creates the *tres rotas* [three wheels] (in the Coptic texts τροχοὶ) *ignis aquae et venti* [fire water and wind]; the operation of which is the responsibility of the *Gloriosus rex* [Glorious King or King of Glory]; what one has to imagine in terms of the role of these wheels is not entirely clear: somehow, they should also serve to purify the light (see Cumont 31ff.). Thus, from a prison for the powers of darkness, the world is created as a place of purification for the souls and everything is prepared for redemption. The deities of the first two callings come before the Father of Greatness and ask him to call the Redeemer.

(d) The Third Messenger

@@@ The Father of Greatness appoints the Third Messenger, whose job it is to extract the light devoured by the archons and purify it from the mixing with the Hyle, and - indirectly - effect its homecoming into the land of light. For this purpose, he uses the natural ἐπιθυμία of the archons. He takes up position in the sun and calls twelve gods of changeable sex (in themselves, however, they are “virgins”), who show themselves to the archon investes. By looking at the *virgines pulcherrimas* [beautiful virgins] the male archons pollute them, but the “sin” associated with the “stolen light” also escapes them. The “sin” falls on the earth, in part on damp land; this creates a terrible sea monster that is killed by Adamant of Light, the *heros belligerens* [warlike hero], one of the sons of the Living Spirit. Another part falls on dry land and the five types of trees and plants emerge from it (listed in Andreas-Henning Mir. Man. I 181; Theodor 180, 11 briefly, “the five trees”). Henceforth, the Third Messenger and his twelve helpers reveal their male form to the female archons, with the effect that the female archons, who are constantly pregnant as a result of the sexual intercourse in the land of darkness, abort. The aborted fall to the earth but, strangely, as Aug., c. *Faust*. XXI 12 p. 583 12f., emphasizes, without being harmed by the fall, and begin to eat the fruits of the trees created from the sperm of the male archons; as a result of their ὕλη content, they are filled with libido, mate and give birth to demon children - again five genera in the two genders (see p. 250, 7) - into the world.

Meanwhile, the Third Messenger takes additional measures to free the light. He calls on the “Pillar of Glory, the Perfect Man”, on which the liberated parts of light should rise to the light ships. He instructs the Great Builder, who is already in the second calling, to carry out the construction of the new aeon, which is intended for their abode. Above all, however, he sets the sun and the moon in motion and instructs them of their function; they are to purify the parts of the light scattered around the world - it is not entirely clear how this can be imagined - and transport them into the land of light. The moon takes them from the Pillar of Glory and brings them to the sun, from where they then cover the rest of the journey. The explanation of this purpose of the “light ships” associated with the phases of the moon is one of the points against which the anti-Manichean polemics were able to celebrate their easiest triumphs: καὶ τὸ φῶς τῆς σελήνης οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὰς εἶναι, ἃς ἀπὸ νοουμηνίας ἕως πανσελήνου ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀνασπῶσα, ἀπὸ πανσελήνου πάλιν ἕως νοουμηνίας εἰς τὸν ἥλιον μεταγγίζει cf. Alex. Lyc. 6, 25—7, 6. *Acta Arch.* 13, 4—8. Tit. Bostr. I 40 p. 25, 4. Epiph. haer. LXVI 9.8 (III 30, 17-20 Holl). *MM* i, 187 with fn. 4; incidentally, Alexander's question 31, 7-11: ὅτε τοίνυν ἀπὸ τῆς πανσελήνου ἡ σελήνη μειοῦται, <ἡ> ἀποχωριζομένη δύναμις τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ποῦ μένει ἕως ἂν μενωθεῖσα ἡ σελήνη τῶν προτέρων ψυχῶν „ δευτέραν πάλιν δέξεται ἀποικίαν; is answered by the passage *Acta Arch.*, already misunderstood by the Latin translator. 13 9—12 τῆς οὖν σελήνης μεταδιδούσης (please note the Pres.) τὸν γόμον τῶν ψυχῶν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῦ πατρός, παραμένουσιν ἐν τῷ στύλῳ τῆς δόξης, ὃς καλεῖται ἀἷρ ὁ τέλειος

(e) Creation of Man

In impotent rage, the Hyle observes how the measures taken by the Third Messenger threaten to make it lose the stolen light once again. It decides to thwart the divine plan of salvation that the world serves by a counter-creation, in which it hopes to be able to permanently bind the light to matter. From among the demons that have fallen to earth, it selects two, a male named Asaqlon and a female named Nemrael (Σακλᾶς and Νεβρώδ renunciation formula Migne PGI 1464B; Cumont Rech 42 No. 3 attested by Priscillian *Saclas* and *Nebroel*); this pair is said to have been modelled after the Third Messenger, whom the demons (actually rather their “elders” bound in the heaven; the real topic, however, is that the Hyle work in one as in the

other) have seen in the light ship, and who still employ their imagination to testify to the people. Both let the other demons give up their children, devour them to take in all the available light, mate, and Nemrael gives birth to the first pair, Adam and Eve. The duality of the genders, which the demons bequeath to humans, and the associated reproductive instinct, should ensure the permanent bondage of the “soul” to the “flesh”, the so to speak microcosmic aspect of the Hyle, and thus increasingly alienate them from the land of light ἀναδραμεῖν μὲν αὐθις αὐτὴν οὐκ ἔωντες οἱ ἄρχοντες, εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀναδράμοι, ἀναξίαν ἀποφαίνεσθαι τῶν ἄνω, μεμιασμένην σαρκί, ὡς ἀδύνατον εἶναι πάντη τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὴν παρ’ ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ὀλόκληρον διασώσθαι, ταῖς μηχαναῖς τῶν ἀρχόντων τῆς ὕλης ἡττωμένην. p. 68, 31-34.

(f) Jesus and the Noûs

The hopes of the Hyle will be put to shame. From the land of light, Jesus the Shining (see Mani-Fund 67f.) awakens Adam from the “death sleep” (Theodor 130, 24) and brings him knowledge of his situation; he teaches him about his divine origin and shows him how his - Adams, see under p. 258, 62 - “soul” is one with the divine light substance, which suffers in the entire world in the mixing with the Hyle. “Then Adam cried out (conj. Schaefer, Studien 347) and wept and raised his voice like a roaring lion, tugged his hair and beat his chest and shouted: “Woe, woe to the creator of my body and to the teaser of my soul and to the rebels who have enslaved me!” (Theodor 131, 4-7).

What Jesus accomplished in the myth in Adam is accomplished hic et nunc by the Noûs as his “emanation” (see *Mani-Fund* 68ff.). It is the Noûs to which the religious foundations return; it is “the father of all apostles”, through whose teaching it enters into man; it “clothes” the five members of the soul, i.e. the elements air, wind, light water, fire with its own members

νοῦς, ἔννοια, φρόνησις, ἐμθύμησις, λογισμός

from which the five “virtues” then emerge:

love (γάπη), faith, perfection, patience, wisdom

(Arabic, Sogdian, Chinese, Turkish documents in W.-L. ii, 574; Coptic e.g. Keph. 97, 20—21). Through these “gifts” the soul is placed in the state to resist the temptations of the flesh and to start the fight against “sin’s” attempts at rebellion. For the soul endowed with the “gifts” and its opponent, the with its blasphemers (Col. 3, 9-10 and especially Eph. 4, 22-24. νανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν ...) Mani transferred the Pauline image of the new man and the old man. The “struggle of the new man with the old man” can be found schematically exported in the Chinese treatise: Chavannes Pelliot Journ. as. 1911, 546ff. The Noûs causes the return of the “consciousness” of itself, which had been put to sleep by the mixing: the Syr. hayna passage Theodor 127, 27f. cited above at p. 252, 38, (“The consciousness of the five shining gods has been removed”) also denotes the first of the five powers of reasoning = νοῦς. It is therefore insufficient to “shake” the soul (Theodor 130, 28) so as to be ready to accept the instruction about unnaturality; it is also necessary to find out about the reason and the meaning of its present state. Mani’s teaching appeals to the soul’s natural sensibility, by virtue of which it must recognize that the path to salvation that it shows is the right one that corresponds to its nature. Those whose natural sensation has died so such an extent that they can no longer or do not want to access this knowledge, are beyond help; they must be given up as lost. [The expression “want” that I just used, was also once alluded to by Mani in one of Aug., c. Felic. II 5 p. 832, 26 passages cited from the thesaurus: legem

sibi a suo liberatore datam servare plenius noluerint [the law from the date of its liberator wants to save more]. In the mind of Mani, however, this “want” is not based on liberum arbitrium [free will], which Augustine wants to assign it to, but on degeneration as a result of the mixture that has just suffocated the ability to awaken.

In lists of gods and hymns there are several attempts to group the soteriological deities (the “third calling”) in such a way that the Third Messenger and Jesus as their leaders are arranged side by side and both receive an equal number of auxiliary deities (see Mani Fund 69 n.2. *Muséon* XLVI, 254). The reason for this is to be found in the duality of the light ships, which seemed to demand a corresponding duality from the gods who lived in them and who led the redemption project from there. The Third Messenger received the sun and Jesus the moon. In order to obtain the same number of auxiliary deities, the “Virgin of Light”, the (see Mani Fund 68), which was originally identical to the twelve virgins of the Third Messenger sent, was separated from them, and assigned to Jesus and the moon. This results in two parallel series; “third calling a and b”:

| a | b |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Third Messenger | Jesus |
| Twelve Virgins | Virgin of Light |
| Pillar of Glory | Noûç |

With the North African Manichaeans - and also with the Chinese Manichaeans - Jesus not only participates in the cosmic-physical work of redemption, but fully displaces the Third Messenger. The Third Messenger does not appear in Augustine; Christ always stands in his place; only in Euodius de fide 17 p. 958, 1 does the tertius legatus [Third Messenger] obtain a casual mention. - A representation of the work of redemption that differs from all other sources can be found in the Acta Arch. 12, 7ff. Here, the redeemer is God's Son; the expressions used in relation to him show that this is to be understood as Jesus. He executes the σωτηρία through a μηχανή ἔχουσα δώδεκα κάδους (cf. Schlier, *Rel. gesch. Unters., z. d. Ign.-Briefen* 110ff.), a cropping machine, ἥτις ὑπὸ τῆς σφαίρας στρεφομένη ἀνιμᾶται τῶν θνησκόντων τὰς ψυχὰς and conveys it to the “light ships”. The Virgin of Light and the seduction of the archons also occur here (13, 14ff.), but in a totally different context; here the myth serves to explain the death of man. The Third Messenger with his Twelve Virgins, who appear here as οἱ δώδεκα κυβερνήται (21, 11), only completely and abruptly enters onto the stage when the end of the world is described, without it being possible to see what function it has to perform alongside Jesus.]

Thanks to the saved First Man, whose own light elements of the νοῦç were rendered safe in the early stages of mixing (v. supra); he is brought back to them through Jesus. This explains the close connection, even entire identity (thus the Persian hymn p. 9, edited by Henning, NGWG. 1932, 214ff.), in which Jesus and the First Man appear in a large part of the transmission; in Augustine Jesus is repeatedly referred to as the “son” of the First Man (passages in Baur 210; of course, this term could only have been abstracted from the teaching of Jesus patibilis to be discussed immediately below); in the Coptic texts the moon is sometimes the “ship” of the First Man and sometimes Jesus; the new aeon is closely related to Jesus, who is called “new aeon” in the Persian and Parthian hymns (see *Muséon* XLVI 259f.); Hom. 41, 20 my comment); the Virgin of Light is the companion of Jesus, but in the Coptic texts (e.g. Keph. 84, 18f. and often in the hymns) she is also the “soul” (in one place specifically the element “fire”) with which the First Man lures the demons, etc. - Furthermore, this explains the creation of Jesus patibilis, the interpretation of the crucified Jesus as the soul bound in the Hyle (see Baur 71-77. 211. 395 [since Cumont Rech. 48 it has become customary to cite Theodor 130, 31-131, 3 as locus classicus for this teaching. It seems to me important to point out that the poss. suffix in *nap̄sheh* “his soul” 130, 31 does not refer to

Jesus, but to Adam, because this is the only way that Adam's outbreak of pain 131, 4ff. can be understood]: this interpretation establishes the unity of being that connects the elements with the First Man, and also with Jesus. Moreover, it is a decidedly "gnostic" feature of Manichaeism to strip the suffering of Jesus from its historicity and transform it into a symbol for the mythologoumenon of the mixed light soul (see Bousset *Art. Gnosis* Vol. VII p. 1525, 44ff.); in Alex. Lyc. 7, 17-19, however, historicity and symbolic interpretation seem to be connected to each other; the Χριστός = Νοῦς was finally crucified after the accomplishment of his work of salvation and παρασχεῖσθαι γνῶσιν τοιῷδε τρόπῳ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν θεϊὰν ἐνηρμόσθαι, ἐνεσταυρῶσθαι τῇ ὕλῃ. For Mani himself, the Jesus patibilis cannot be used with certainty.

(g) Salvation and Damnation, Sin, and Forgiveness of Sins.

Salvation means nothing more than the return of the soul to its divine home, "its first (original) οὐσία. Titus of Bostra mocked mindlessly. I 37 p. 23, 28-30: καὶ τοῦτό γε ἐστὶν ἡ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐλπίζομένη σωτηρία καὶ μακαριότης, τὸ ἀποδοθῆναι γε τῷ θεῷ τὸ οἰκεῖον αὐτοῦ. How quickly the individual achieves this goal depends on the degree to which he is able to "separate the two natures" (*v. supra*) for himself. Depending on the situation, the faithful fall into two classes: the ἐκλεκτοί-electi, who strictly follow all the regulations: these same are redeemed immediately after their death; and the κατηχούμενοι-auditores, who cannot completely free themselves from the flesh, but accept the teaching and provide for the livelihood of the electi: redemption is also a certain prospect for them, but they first have to go through a soul journey (μεταγγισμός) and, according to the principle of the talions, atone for their sins or imperfections until their souls enter the body of an electus. Sin is the natural function and actual manifestation of the Hyle. The soul as pure substance, i.e. without being armed with the νοῦς is, from the outset, completely powerless against the body and thus against sin. It can only resist if it is in the possession of the νοῦς. The body therefore strives in its aim to knock this weapon out of the hand of the soul, rob it of "consciousness" and render it "forgotten" - thus renewing the drama of primeval mixing. But that is exactly what is prevented by religion and its institutions: catechesis, liturgy and observances keep the soul "conscious", and if it does "forget", the church is ready to bring it back to consciousness.

As in the primeval struggle the two natures were blended without the fault of the light, so the human soul is not responsible for the carnal sins to which the body drives it; if it becomes aware of the sin committed, it returns ruefully - under the instructive influence of the clergy who represent the Νοῦς on earth - to the knowledge of its origin and destiny, and so its right to return to the land of light is also restored. By a sin that follows μετάνοια, this right is not forfeited but only suspended; the deserved punishment only consists in the delaying of redemption. On account of this there is no place in Manichaeism for a church discipline of penance, but instead one of confession, which serves as evidence of μετάνοια and at the same time as a renewed instruction, see Bang *Manich. Laien-Beichtspiegel, Muséon XXXVI* 1928, 137-242. — Only one spiritual sin is unforgivable if not actually non-accidental (see above p. 257, 89); turning away from the instruction of the , μὴ γνῶναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν (*Acta Arch.* 18, 10) and not accepting the γνῶσις τοῦ παρακλήτου (*ibid.* 19, 4. 45, 12), μὴ λέγειν δῶο ἀρχὰς εἶναι τῶν πάντων (*Simplicius* 71, 1); salvation is denied to those souls who are thus far deteriorated and assimilated into the Hyle (see p. 252, 34) as they are no longer able to obtain access of knowledge of themselves, that is, of their divine nature, they move from body to body and, at the end of the days, are finally bound with the defeated darkness in the βῶλος, the eternal prison (see *Muséon XLVI* 280 No. 18). Of the numerous opposing objections to this teaching, the one that has made the most impression is that of *Simplicius* 71, 4f., which is that, after apocatastasis, God must remain incomplete (ἀτελής) due to μέρη αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσας.

(h) The Fate of the Soul after Death

The Fate of the soul after death is presented in various configurations. To understand them, it is useful to start with the underlying concept; the ascent of the soul into the land of light has the prerequisite that “sinlessness” can be ascribed to it. The Aramaic expression used for this by Mani (for the following see Mani-Fund 72f.) was *zākūtā* the root means “to be pure”, “to be free from guilt”, “to be declared innocent”, “to win in court”, and finally to generally “win”, and the noun *zākūtā* can very specifically mean the “victory prize”. Two symbolizations result from these possibilities: (A) The soul comes before the “Great Judge” var. “Judge of Truth” (as per the genealogy of gods Mani-Fund 74, he is an emanation of Jesus), and from his judgement seat he sends it out in three ways (Keph. 83, 6-8. Fihrist 71, 9): one leads to “life” (redemption), the second to “mixing” (continued mixing with darkness with the prospect of later redemption), and the third to “death” (eternal damnation). The soul of the perfect one is “declared innocent”, the new man “wins” over the old man and walks the path of life. - (B) The soul of the perfect one, when it has left the body, is confronted by the “Light Form”, that is its “second self”, its embodied piety [in what follows see Muséon XLVI 1933, 270f.]. The Light Form, which, according to the genealogy mentioned above, is an emanation of the Light-(which means that the formation of the “second self” is an effect of the) carries the features of one of the three bearers of knowledge, Jesus or the *Noûç* or Mani ; it has three angels with it, who wear the insignia of the “victory” - victory prize (*βραβεῖον-zākūtā*) indirectly through the word *zakāh* foreign to Arabic Fihrist 70, 1. 6), dress and crown - and they hand these insignia over to the soul. Attired with these insignia, it is guided up the Pillar of Glory by the Light Form. Then it proceeds with the moon to the sun - if it has the misfortune of arriving at the top of the pillar after a full moon, it will find that the moon ship will have departed and it will have to wait for 14 days (v. supra) - and finally the sun brings the soul to eternal bliss in the new aeon, (In the Fihrist the “Light Form” is divided: as well as the “guiding sage” and its three angels, there is a “virgin” who embodies piety; in the Coptic (Mani Fund 73. Hom 6], the two representations - judgment before the Great Judge and presentation of the victory prize etc. by the Light form - are combined; this must have immediately suggested itself in all languages that did not have, unlike Aramaic, a word for the each one of the whole series of terms from “innocence” to “victory prize”).

These descriptions related to the electi. The other two classes of souls are correspondingly affected: the imperfect ones, the catechumens, must follow the path of “mixing”, and the sinners the path of “death” or “hell”. For details of the configuration, reference can be made to Fihrist 70, 12-71, 9.

(i) End of the World and Apocatastasis

When, through the action of the sun and moon and through the action of the *Noûç*, the purification of light has reached a certain level, the end of the world is brought about. As far as is known, Mani did not state when this was to be expected; according to Keph. c. 147 (see Mani Fund 23), he seems to have generally avoided making too certain predictions about future events. Only in later Manichaeism were speculations made in this regard: Schahrastani 192, 13ff. reports of an *ἀρχηγός* named Abu Sa'id, who in the year 271 i.e. = AD 884/85 stated that the total duration of the “mixing” was 12,000 years, of which 11,700 had already passed.

For the description of the end times, Mani took the material from the New Testament: the “synoptic apocalypse” Mt. 24. Me 13. Lc. 21 (reworked in the Coptic “Sermon of the Great War” Hom. 7ff.) and especially the “Last Judgment” Mt. 25, 31-46 (Müller Hss.-Reste [Handwritten vestiges] II 11-15. Hom. 32ff.). The impending end of the world is announced by the Parousia of Jesus. As the “Great King”, Jesus will reign among mankind for a period of

time, which, on account of the increasingly widespread knowledge, will now mainly consist of Manicheans. He will set up his judgment seat in the middle of the οἰκουμένη and separate the goats from the sheep; the catechumens will stand on the right and receive the “victory” and on the left will be the sinners; the electi are transfigured into angels. Then Jesus returns to the land of light and issues the sign of dissolution. The gods who hold together the building of the world, the Pillar of Glory and the five sons of the Living Spirit, leave their places and also proceed upwards; the entire cosmos collapses into itself; an enormous fire breaks out and annihilates the world that has now fulfilled its purpose (the duration of the burning - an explanation for the peculiar number has not been found yet - is 1468 years: Schapurakan Müller HR ii, 19 and the Arabic Fihrist 58, 4 = Shahrastani 192, 1 = al- Murtada in Kessler, Mani 348, 4, cf. below). The parts of the light that still exist in the world at the outbreak of the burning, guided to act appropriately by the Ἐνθύμησις of life (see above p. 254, 4) working in them, come together and form themselves into the “Last Statue” (see Mani- Find 79) in order to ascend to the land of light. The rendering harmless of the Hyle is brought about in the most thorough way. In addition to the separation from the light (see above p. 252, 40) and the incineration, other measures are taken, which raise the question, however, of whether they needed to be prepared by being mixed first. The Hyle is imprisoned; but that is not enough, the two genders, which together with the and that are conditional on their presence, were such an essential characteristic of the original states (v. supra), are separated from each other, so that a further mixing and reproduction can no longer take place; the male is locked in the βῶλος and the female in the “grave” (Keph. 105, 32f; other texts do not mention the separation of the sexes and either only speak of βῶλος or only of the “grave”: thus Fihrist 58, 7. Ephraem in Jackson, Researches 284f., probably also Hom. 41, 6f.). Finally, in order to prevent any escape, the “grave” is sealed with a huge stone (Fihrist see above).

5. COMMUNITY ORGANISATION, ETHICS, AND CULTURE.

The division of the Manichean believers into electi and catechumens has already been mentioned above. This inevitably results from the tension between, on the one hand, the consequent religious demand, and, on the other hand, the weakness of the flesh; their derivation from Buddhism, which has been repeatedly attempted since Baur, is thus rendered superfluous.

In addition to this division according to religious perfection, there is a classification according to the hierarchical rank. The “leader (ἀρχηγός)” of the Manichaean Church, Mani’s respective successor, stands outside the actual hierarchical ranking, which comprises the following five levels: (1) διδάσκαλοι, (2) ἐπίσκοποι (3) πρεσβύτεροι these three levels are the religious ranking of the electi; they are followed by (4) the ἐκλεκτοί, who are not office holders in the Church, and (5) the mass of κατηγούμενοι ; on this ranking and especially the second level see Schaefer, Iranica 11ff. Women are excluded from ecclesiastical office, but not from electus level.

The basic idea of Manichaean ethics, insofar as it concerns the practical conduct of life (see p. 247, 38ff.), is expressed essentially in negative form; in the demand to avoid everything that could damage the light contained in people and in the world. On the one hand, this includes lust for meat (see above p. 256, 24ff.) and everything that is suitable for arousing it and, on the other hand, all “torturing” and “damaging” of nature. The electus is strictly forbidden from having sexual intercourse and consuming meat and wine (allowed however are fresh grapes and - apparently unfermented - apple juice, see Lagarde, Mitteilungen III 47f.). The concept of “torture” is extremely wide in theory: it not only includes the abuse of animals, the uprooting of plants, the contamination of water and the like, but also , because the air is the soul of all living things [cf. Fihrist 62, 13, “and the air is the life of the world”],

Acta Arch. 17, 9f. Since vegetarian food cannot be obtained and enjoyed without such “torture”, the consequent implementation of these principles would make starvation compulsory and thus steal them away from their tasks in the teaching and church areas. In order to preserve them for these tasks, the procurement and preparation of the food is entrusted to the catechumens who are continually falling back into sin (the “sins” committed in the service of the electi are immediately forgiven), and further introduce the ancillary construction; that the passage through the pure body of an electus does not mean “damage” for the vegetables consumed by it, but, on the contrary, purification. - Incidentally, the electi have to entirely renounce the world and live exclusively from religion; they must not have a permanent dwelling, but must constantly wander around the world preaching; they are committed to poverty and must have no more than food for one day and clothing for one year (al-Biruni, Chronol. 208, 1. al-Murtada 349, 8, see Müller, HR ii, 33); they have to practice fasting for days on end (al-Biruni *ibid.* ; for this Arabic expression see Schaeder, Iranica 21 No. 2).

The relationship between the electi and the catechumens must therefore be determined in such a way that only the electi are the real Manicheans, and that the catechumens owe their belonging to the Manichean Church merely to a necessary concession to the hygienic conditions of human existence. They are supporters of Manichaeism without having to accept the practical consequences. What is strictly required of them are the “alms” for the electi; otherwise they live in the world, go about their business, have wives (they have to limit themselves to only one wife, al-Biruni Chronol. 208, 4), father children, drink wine and eat meat (but they are not themselves allowed to slaughter). - The electi [dedicate themselves] to their , and the catechumens to their “alms”, Man. Hom. 30, 24f .: these words from a description of the ideal community life characterize the situation with unsurpassed conciseness.

The various “serial” formulations of the ethical regulations are of little importance. There were five commandments for the electi, which currently only exist in Turkish and Sogdian; their linguistic interpretation has not yet been secured to the point that they are worth expressing: cf. W.-L. ii, 579ff. There were ten prohibitions for the catechumens; these are mostly complete, but not clear in every detail, in Fihrist 64, 12ff. (cf. al-Murtada 349, 9ff.; unfortunately, only a small piece of an extensive Persian listing has survived: Andreas Henning *Mit. Man. II* 296f.): Among other things, idolatry, lying, avarice [presumably in the delivering of alms to the electi], killing, fornication, theft and magic are prohibited; Schahrastani 192, 8 also lists the Golden Rule.

The series of the “three seals” is widespread across the entire transmission area: *tria signacula... oris et manuum et sinus* [three seals...mouth and hand and sinus], cf. the detailed presentation in Baur 248ff. *Oris, manus and sinus* and the three bodily regions that are “sealed” by the commandments and prohibitions and thus secured against the Hylion powers (the term “taboo” is simply not appropriate in this context; Waldschmidt-Lentz *Dogm.* 589 attempts in vain to protect Bousset against Bang *Muséon* XXXVI 230f.). - Others, such as the “four (possession) signs” (most recently Waldschmidt-Lentz *Dogm.* 527ff. Andreas Henning *Mit. Man. [Middle-Iranian Manicheism] II* 309 with No. 3), can be left aside here.

The main forms of the cult are prayer and fasting. According to Fihrist 64, 15ff. “four or seven” prayers are prescribed daily; furthermore (65, 15ff.) he only mentions four and Shahrastani does the same 192, 6. Fihrist 64 *apud* ff. provides some pieces in the wording, of which Flügel *Mani* 310 No. 241 rightly comments that they are “more hymns or canticles than prayers”: they are doxologies on Mani, the Father of Greatness, the light deities in general and the five sons of First Man, in particular.

The Fihrist 65 and ff. is the most thoroughly informed on the fasting organisation; here it suffices to mention that, as per 64, 5, seven days of fasting takes place every month; how these seven days are spread over the month is not entirely clear. The Βῆμα is the best known

of the special celebrations. According to Aug., c. Ep. Fund. 8 p. 202, 11ff. it was celebrated in memory of Mani's death; it coincided approximately with the Easter festival and was regarded as its Manichean equivalent. The Coptic hymn book contains a large number of hymns to the Βῆμα; as per these, Augustine's statements about the meaning of this festival need to be modified or at least expanded. - Schaeder *Iranica* 22ff has determined seven annual festivities in memory of the earlier ἀρχηγοί.

As concerns the Manichaean sacraments, there is still little to go on beyond Baur 273-280. There can be no doubt that the Manichaeans had no water baptism; this is a hylish institution in which the "spirit" of the dark world of water comes into expression (Keph. 30); and no other baptismal rites are attested — A Eucharistic celebration of the electi is attested by Aug., c. Fort. 3. p. 85, 9ff.: *nam et eucharistiam audivi a vobis saepe quod accipiatis; tempus autem accipiendi cum me lateret, quid accipiatis unde, nosse potui?* [For I have often heard from you that you receive the eucharist, but since the time when you receive it was kept hidden from me, how could I have known what you receive?]. Supposed Turkestan evidence for sacramental meals of the Manichaeans has been weakened by Schaeder, *Iranica* 19ff. The fact that there were cult meals that formally corresponded to the Christian Eucharist can of course hardly be doubted (see the *τραπέζα* Man. Hom. 16, 21, 28, 11; more can be learnt from the Keph.), but this does not mean that these consist of sacraments.

6. MANI'S SELF-CLASSIFICATION IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION

Mani's task is first to give a firm form to the effect of the Νοῦς in teaching and the church. Others, as ἀπόστολοι, had acted before him as special mandatees of the Νοῦς: the first Adam, the first recipient of a divine revelation, in addition, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, Noah and Sem (see Henning, SPAW 1934, 27). Buddha appeared in India, Zarathustra in Persia, Jesus in Jerusalem. Jesus' special task was to destroy the Jewish erroneous belief, Mosaism, with its νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας. But the erroneous belief only moved from Jerusalem to Babylonia (see Man. Hom. 11) and appeared here in a changed form, namely in the religion of the Magi (who, in Mani's eyes, behave similarly to the recognised Zoroastrianism, like Judaism did to the pre-mosaic pious people of the Old Testament). In this way, care had thus been taken to proclaim the true knowledge at all times and in the most varied of places. But the work of these men lacked penetration both in depth and in breadth. They had not been able to assert themselves beyond the borders of their respective home countries, and insofar as they had acted as religious founders and had left disciples behind them, they had not been able, after their death, to save their churches from decay and their ideas from falsification. The fundamental difference between Mani and his predecessors is the finality and the universality of his religious foundation (see Mani's Persian and Coptic surviving essay on the "Advantages of Manichaeism": *MM* ii, 295f., *Mani-Fund* 42ff.). He was absolutely convinced of the former; consideration for the latter guided him both in building up his teaching presentation and in organizing the mission. On the one hand, this manifests itself in "conscious syncretism" (the authorship of this keyword – the meaning is rather "eclecticism" – is claimed by Lidzbarski, *OLZ* 1927, 913 fn. 1), which Mani claims to have practiced (cf. the text just cited) and, on the other hand, in its essence in the mobility of the terminology and nomenclature, which was first recognized by Schaeder (*Studien* [281ff.]), and in its adaptation to the conceptual world of the circles to which the mission was directed: for Mazdayasnians, Mani largely uses Zoroastrian expressions and often names his gods with Avestic names, e.g. the First Man as Ohrmizd, the Third Messenger as Narisah; for Christians, Jesus is brought to the fore (cf. above p. 257, 68); for the philosophically educated "Hellenes", the "gods" disappear behind the terms they are carried by, for example the First Man behind the ψύχη.

Mani's stance towards his predecessors, his “brothers”, is essentially determined by the awareness of sharing a tradition with them and the calling for the final completion of their work (“Seal of the Prophets” al-Biruni Chronol. 207, 19. al-Murtada in Kessler Mani 349, 13); he emphatically rejects being a religious innovator (Man. Hom. 47, 18ff.). In terms of his successorship, Mani did not emphasize any other “prophet” as deliberately as he did Jesus, calling himself one of his apostles omnes... eius epistulae ita exordiantur: Minichaeus apostolus Jesu Christi [... All the messages that begin, Manichaeus apostle of Jesus Christ] Aug., c. Faust. XIII p. 331.4f. Tit. Bostr. III 1 p. 67, 15—17. IV 3 syr. p. 129, 31. W.-L. i, 59, *Mani-Fund* 26f.). There are two interrelated reasons for this: first, it can be regarded as reasonably certain that Jesus was the only previous founder of religion of whose proclamation Mani had concrete knowledge of the source (as far as the Buddha and Zarathustra are concerned, I agree with Schaefer's remarks on the *Gnom.* IX 354, also without the reservations of Henning, *SPAW*, 1934, 27); secondly, during the course of his activity, Mani found himself forced to focus his preaching on the Christian missionary areas to an extent greater than he had originally intended. For Mani, it was not a question of detracting from Jesus' rights but of securing his own; he did not infringe on the position that Jesus held in the religious consciousness that captivated the Christians, and he thus reconciled his own endeavours so as to emerge as just an apostle of Jesus with a new teaching. The means given for this was that the scriptural evidence and the places that Mani offered were those that Jesus had promised the future (Joh. 14, 16, 26. 15, 26, 16, 7). The Christian view was that this promise had already been made through the Pentecostal miracle (Act 2, 4ff, but that the apostolic story was rejected by the Manicheans, see p. Alfaric II 162ff, - nevertheless *Keph.* 13, 8 reads that the Risen One breathed his Holy Spirit into his disciples) is disproved, e.g. Felix, just as the Montanists did (Aug., c. Faust. XXXII 17 p. 777, 22ff.), with reference to 1st Cor. 18, 9f. (Aug., c. Fel. I 9 p. 811, 5-8). - Here is a brief description of how Mani's paracletianism fits into the system. The Paraclete is (not merely according to the acceptance of the church teachers, as Baur 372 inadvertently states, but) as per the wording of Joh. 14, 26 (ὁ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) the “Holy Spirit”. The consequence of Mani, as Paraclete, thus also being called “Holy Spirit” did not, as has been asserted since Baur, push the Christian polemicists towards the Manicheans but in fact they themselves drew it in; the final proof currently comes from the Coptic hymns, e.g. No. 223. Wherever Mani needed to, he identified the Christian Holy Spirit with the of his own system. (see W.-L. ii, 518. Henning, *SPAW* 1934, 27 No. 7; Gnostic terminology, on the other hand, comes from the “Holy Spirit as a variant of “Great Spirit” —see above p. 249, 51 - “to designate the pre-existent form of the Mother of Life, see Mani-Fund 66): an example in which the Holy Spirit appears entirely in the function of the , is that of Aug., c. Fel. I 16 p. 819, 14f. cited in the Ep. fundamenti pietas spiritus sancti intima pectoris vestri aperiat, ut ipsis oculis videatis vestras animas [may the heart of piety be open to the Holy Spirit, so that your own eyes may see your souls]. Just as is the “father of all apostles” (v. *supra*), so is it the Holy Spirit and Paraclete - that is, under the designation that it carries with Mani's last predecessor, Jesus - especially in this relationship with Mani As the has manifested itself in the earlier apostles, so did sanctus spiritus paracletus ...in ipso (sc. Manichaeus) venire dignatus est [In the Holy Spirit, the Advocate ... (so. Manichean) is deemed to come] Aug., c. Ep. Fund. 8 p. 201, 25f. In the Manichean phrasing this relationship is close enough for it to be represented as identity: ... superbia, mater omnium haereticorum, inpulit hominem, ut non missum se ab paracleto vellet videri, sed ita susceptum, ut ipse paracletus videretur. Sicut Iesus Christus homo non [cf. 1. Cor. 1, 24], per quam facta sunt omnia, missus est, sed ita susceptus secundum catholicam fidem, ut ipse esset Dei filius, id est in Mo ipso Dei sapientia sanandis peccatoribus adpareret: sic se Ule voluit ab spiritu sancto, quem Christus promisit, videri esse susceptum, ut iam cum audimus „Manichaeum*, [thus interpreted] spiritum sanctum intellegamus “apostolum Iesu Christi”, id est missum a Jesu Christo, qui eum se missurum esse promisit. Singularis audacia

ista et ineffabile sacrilegium! Aug., *c. Ep. Fund.* 6 p. 200, 3ff. If Tit. Bostr. IV 16 syr. P. 136, 17ff. Mani's claim to be the Paraclete is rejected by the following argument; Mani in and of himself, as the Manichaeans admit, is a human being like others and has only received the Paraclete. The receiver and the received could not be identical, "just as our eye is not the light because it receives the light"; that Titus argues that way is understandable, but it is less understandable that, in recent times, the question has also been treated seriously as to whether Mani understood the Paraclete promised by Jesus as being a human teacher or "a being of the upper sphere".

7. CHRISTOLOGY EXTERNAL TO THE MYTH.

So Manichaeism recognises two Jesus': (1) Jesus the Shining, which is one of the "gods" and belongs in the myth, and (2) Jesus Christ (or rather , as written by the Manicheans of the Greek world - perhaps according to the Marcionite model, see Harnack Marcion 128 No. 2 -: Alex. Lyc 34, 19. Man. Hom. 72, 9), which has its place in the history of religion. (The third is Jesus patibilis of the North African Manicheans, whose purpose, as one can easily see, is to balance the mythical and the historical Jesus with each other, *v. supra*). The actual Manichean Jesus, with which the system enacted in the myth is exclusively engaged, does not consist of "Jesus who appeared in Judaea" (Burkitt, *Religion* 38ff.; Church and Gnosis 79) but of Jesus the Shining; in him the divine is in the appearance of Jesus is removed from the restrictions of time, space and personality and evaporated to a redemption factor that works outside of all historical limits; the figure of Jesus as a mythological correlate of the term $\text{No}\ddot{\upsilon}\varsigma$ is a centre-piece of the Manichean system, while his personality means so little that the name Jesus can be "translated" like any other "god" name (see above p. 265, 54); in Persian texts it means "the God whose realm is the mind". What remains for history is a religion founder, who is basically on the same level as the Buddha, Zarathustra and finally Mani himself.

Mani's original view of Jesus is characterized, on the one hand, by the de-historicization of the Son of God, and, on the other hand, by the de-divinization of the religion founder. The former is not the own work of Mani; it was developed from the approaches offered by Pauline-Johannine Christology from the Gnosis, and, like so many other things, entered Mani's field of vision from this. When Mani was practising his "conscious syncretism" in Dast-i Maisan, he might have believed that he had paid attention enough to Christianity with the position he had given to Jesus the Shining in the myth and to Jesus Christ in the history of religion. Experience will soon have taught him that the gnostic heretical character of his view of Jesus narrowed down to an undesirable degree the circle of Christians that he hoped to win over. Due to this circumstance, Mani saw himself compelled to accommodate the church's view and alleviate the harsh divorce between the "God" and the founder of religion, primarily by recognizing the latter as the son of God. The secondary and inorganic character of this concession is shown by the fact that Jesus Christ still remains outside of the actual system. If the *argumentum ex silentio* is permissible, Mani did not even speak once about the mutual relationship between Jesus the Shining and Jesus Christ - and we would be making a serious methodological error if we were to try to speculatively fill this highly significant dogmatic gap.

The acknowledgment of the Son of God of Jesus Christ could not, however, take place without some reservations regarding the church teaching, especially regarding the dogma of God-manhood. For Mani there could only be an either/or: God or Man – *tertium non datur* [third party]. But that Jesus Christ was the "Son of Greatness" (Keph. 12, 20 et passim, *filius maiestati* [his majesty's son] Ang. c. *Fist* XXXII 7 p. 766, 10) and that he had thus accepted, as "his apostles preached" (Philip. 2, 7), upon entering the world, a and a Keph. 12, 24-26), could only be united under the proviso that he had come (*ibid.*).

To understand Mani's "docetism", it is useful to contrast it with the ecclesiastical teaching of the physical nature of Christ, for example in the formulation of Augustine: ...ut nos quidem nati essemus in came peccati, — Ule autem in ,similitudine camis peccati* (Rom. 8, 3); nos non solu in fixe came et sanguine, verum etiam ex voluntate viri et ex voluntate camis, — die autem tantum ex came et sanguine, non ex voluntate viri neque ex voluntate camis, sed ex Deo natus est (Joh. 1, 18) de pecc. merit [Indeed, as we were born we came into sin - He was in the likeness of the flesh to sin; out of flesh and blood that we are not to abrogate, but also by a man from the will of the flesh - the day, however, only be celebrated with flesh and blood, nor of the will of the flesh, not of the will of man, but a child of God]; II 38 CSEL LX 110. Mani is a "docetist" in the same sense in which Paul and Augustine speak of ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας *similitudo c.p.* The difference is that Mani's dualistic prerequisites simply do not allow him to limit the term *similitudo* [comparison] to the specific addition of *peccati* [sin] to *caro* [flesh], in other words to acknowledge the reality of flesh and blood and to only deny its sinfulness or sinful origin: Body and Hyle are one; a sinless body is therefore a *contradictio in adiecto*; flesh and blood that comes from God is an impossibility, of which there can be no exception. The necessary consequence is the *χωρὶς σώματος* (which also denies the birth of Jesus Christ).

With this, "docetism" is depleted. Although Mani did not agree with a positive determination of the earthly appearance of Jesus Christ, there is no statement in which he denied his real substance; applicable to Mani (as Schaefer Urform 74 No. 2 points out) is that found in Harnack "Marcion" 125f. concerning Marcion. Thus, the "docetic" view of the suffering and death of Jesus Christ does not refer to the reality of the crucifixion itself, nor to the physical effect (physical pain, etc.) that it would have had on a human body. In this regard, Faustus states: *nos speice tenus passum confitemur nec vere mortuum* [We confess that we merely suffered, but we are not truly dead] Aug., c. *Fist.* XXIX 1 p. 744, 1-2. The allegation of the renunciation formula (Migne G. I 464 D); that the Manicheans believed that someone else was crucified instead of Jesus while Jesus was watching with a sneer from afar, is found again in Irenaeus (*adv. haer.* I 24, 4 p. 200 Harvey) with regard to Basilides (the other is here Simon of Cyrene Mt. 27, 32 par.), but it finds no support in other Manichean transmission.

It is likely that the missionary purpose, which was to be served by the reception of the Church's view of Jesus, was achieved first; the fact that it met an active need is shown in the role played by Jesus Christ in the hymn literature, both Coptic and Iranian, which bore no relation to the actual Manichean premises. In the longer term, however, it was these concessions that proved to be the most disastrous for Manichaeism. That which C.H. Becker *Zschr. f. Assyrl.* XXVI 187 = *Islam Studies* I 442 stated about Mohammed has especial reference for Mani: "You could say that without these Christian compromises and borrowings from its founder, Islam would have been spared many struggles." For Manichaeism they meant a and thus brought about its disintegration in the Christian West: they forced it to commit itself to biblical theology, to deal critically, exegetically and dogmatically with the scriptural words of the Old and New Testaments and to only use the knowledge base of philosophical insight as a canon and critical principle for this work.

In the meantime, it cannot be decided the extent to which Mani himself promoted the theological discussion of Christianity and how much of this can be accounted for by his disciples. On the work of the latter cf. F. Trechsel *Über den Kanon, die Kritik und Exegese der Manichäer*, Bern 1882. A. Bruckner, *Faustus von Mileve*, Basel 1901.

8. ON THE TYPOLOGICAL DETERMINATION OF MANICHAEISM

In *De praescr. haer.* c. 7 Tertullian speaks of the historical and essential relationships of the older Gnostic heresies to Greek philosophy and of their opposition to Christianity. He finds the fundamental difference in that, instead of simply believing and, as per Sap. SaL 1, 1, seeking the Lord in the simplicity of the heart, the heretics use *sapientia saecularis* [secular wisdom] to make borrowings and introduce a *Stoicus et Platonicus et dialecticus Christianismus* [a stoic and platonian and dialectical Christianity], which professes to be *interpres divinae naturae et dispositionis* [interpreter of the divine nature and disposition]. *Eaedem materiae apud haereticos et philosophos voluntantur, iidem retractatus implicantur: unde malum et quare? et unde homo et quomodo?* [In fact, these heretics and the philosophers of matter are involved in wallowing in the same repeated statements: Whence is evil? And why? And whence is man and how?]

Contempt for the simple-minded faith *vos* [sc. Manichaei] *enim nostis, temere credentibus quam vehementer insultare soleatis* [For ye (Manicheans) know how, to triumph over believers at random which I consider to be an insult] *Aug., c. Ep. Fund.* 13 p. 210, 4f.), the building of ethics and hope of redemption on the foundations of a bold metaphysics and world interpretation, which answers the questions on the source of evil and the origin of man, is also characteristic of Manichaeism and allowed the Manichean system to be described as a philosophical one. But Mani is still not a philosopher: see above p. 246, 36ff.

As for the origin of these philosophical thoughts, those who are less concerned with investigating the penetration of the Orient by Greek thought than with identifying the sources of Mani's formation should not place too much emphasis on their Greek origin (with a tendency that is opposite to the that of Tertullian); in the form in which these philosophical thoughts entered into and acted on Mani's viewpoint, they had already ceased to be something specifically Greek and had become an integral part of the Gnosis. (In fact, emphasising Greek origin could be accused of polemical exaggeration if one is forced to confront the fact that Manichaeism, in contrast to Catholic Christianity, is completely lacking the "Hellenic element": Schaefer versus Harnack).

In Manichaeism, "willingness to know and desire for salvation" stand in a mutually functional relationship; they are inseparably connected (but not an "inseparable whole"). Neither can be understood separately, without *ipso facto* losing its specifically Manichean meaning. A pure willingness to know directed towards the causes of things and without any relation to the desire for salvation cannot be demonstrated in Manichaeism, cf. the completely unscientific character (even for the 3rd century) of Mani's unimaginable explanation of nature (one only has to think of the phases of the moon, see above p. 255, 45; see also Henning *S.Ber. Acad. Berl.* 1934, 34f.). What made Manichaeism attractive to the educated of the time was not so much the prospect of instruction about astronomical, biological, and similar things, but rather a religious system that promised to offer one path for satisfying reason and the need for redemption. Neither does the passage of Augustine in Schaefer *Gnom.* IX 362 (*de util. cred.* 2 p. 4, 10-19) say anything different: *nosti ... non aliam ob causam nos in tales homines incidisse, nisi quod se dicebant, terribili auctoritate separata, mera et simplici ratione eos, qui se audire vellent, introducturos ad Deum et errore omni liberaturos. Quid enim me aliud cogeat annos fere novem sprete religione, quae mihi puerulo a parentibus insita erat, homines illos sequi ac diligenter audire, nisi quod nos superstitione terreri et fidem nobis ante rationem imperari dicerent, se autem nullum premere ad fidem nisi prius discussa et enodata veritate?* [Know... the only reason for us humans to be involved is because they are used to be separated by the terror of authority to give ear to pure and simple reason and be led to God

and freed from all error. What else constrained me almost nine years of defiance; likes a small boy I had to listen carefully to my parents and follow them; except that we are alarmed by superstition and this is the reason we are commanded to have faith; that he himself would urge no one towards the faith, without having first discussed and clarified the truth?] The misfortune of Manichaeism was quite simply the scientific unsustainability of the myth that served as its rational foundation. This, in addition to the self-decomposition brought about by the concessions to Christianity as described above, is the main factor that can be taken to explain the downfall of western Manichaeism; it was this that made Augustine turn away from Manichaeism.

Manichaeism is determined by the relationship of consubstantiality in which God and the human soul are placed. God-childhood is natural and does not have to be created by adoption. The concept of grace has no place within this relationship; it is not out of incomprehensible love, but ultimately out of his own interest, that God saves the imprisoned soul. - The Manichaeans clarify its personal relationship with God in a rational way, through the *γνώσις*; the actual "piety" can be characterized as a "cosmic sense of responsibility"; it refers to the obligation that human beings in this world derive from their capacity as *Νοῦς*-gifted being.

(2) SAINT PAUL AMONG THE MANICHAEANS OF CENTRAL ASIA ⁴

Henri-Charles Puech
(1902-1986)



The times are no more when certain specialists, reacting against the classical conceptions inherited from heresiologists and under the influence of the first effect of the Turfan discoveries, had a tendency to minimize the role played by Christianity in the formation of Manichaeism. In fact, it appears that the religion of Mani is, in good part, perhaps even for the most part, related to the Christian, or to the apparently Christianized, Gnosis of the second century and that the Christian elements that it deliberately and systematically incorporated into its substance were, right from the start, just as numerous and extensive as were its Iranian ingredients, and without doubt much more significant than those it was able to borrow from Buddhism. Of course, it is difficult to be precise about the dosage, and this obviously varies depending on whether one is considering documents originating from the Manichaean communities of the West or those of the Far East. What is more, diversity is even found in the texts exhumed in Central Asia. Nevertheless, the influence exerted by Christianity is noticeable in the East as well as in the West. Whereas, in the latter, it is patent, more developed, and almost exclusive, in the former it is attenuated and on occasion perceptible in single traces reduced to sparse and more or less distant echoes. An adequate explanation for this diffusion and persistence can be provided by pointing to the usage of canonical literature or to common liturgical formulas. However, my aim here is not to revisit the fact or to measure its extent or to seek the reasons for it. Without resorting to other evidence or new data, it suffices for me to draw attention to the fact that several Turfan fragments also contain reminiscences, even citations, of passages taken from the canonical or apocryphal Gospels (such as the *Diatessaron*, probably, or *The Gospel of Peter*), and to highlight the position occupied there, as well as in the Chinese Hymnal of London, by the name and person of Jesus – in reference to the paper published in 1926 by E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz in the *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*.

Here, I simply want to touch on a more minor point, and one that is still poorly dealt with or, in my opinion, neglected. It consists of adapting the title of the study to which I have just alluded from "*Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*" [The position of Jesus in Manichaeism] to "*Die Stellung des Paulus im Manichäismus*" [The position of Paul in Manichaeism], and, I hasten to add, in the Manichaeism of the Far East, because in terms of the West, the subject would be too vast and less original. As with his Western disciples, it is well known that Paul, together with Mani, enjoyed in the East a prestige, and an authority similar to that which had been granted to him by Marcion and most of the earlier Gnostic schools, and that this continued to increase until becoming absolute among the Paulicians of Armenia, Byzantium, and the Balkans, the latter usually being referred to as the "neo-Manicheans" or the heirs of authentic Manichaeism. Perhaps Paul was even seen by Mani and his followers through the image that the Gnostics had made of him. His portrait was the object of adoration by the Carpocratians. For the Valentinians (*Excerpt. Theodot.* 23, 2; cf. Irenaeus,

⁴ Henri-Charles Puech, 'Saint Paul among the Manichaeans of Central Asia' ['Saint Paul chez les manichéens d'Asie Centrale', Communication made at the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions (Tokyo and Kyoto, 27 August – 9 September 1958). It first appeared in the *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions*, Tokyo, Maruzen, 1960, pp. 176-187. Reprinted in H.Ch. Puech, *Sur le Manichéisme et autres essais* (Paris: Flammarion, 1979) 153-67.] English translation by Camilla Ferard.

Adv. haer. II, 21, 2), he was *par excellence* “the apostle of the resurrection” (*anastaséōs apostolos*, we understand: of spiritual regeneration) and “in the image of the Paraclete” (*en tupōi Paraklētou*). Origen, in the XXVth of his Homilies on *The Gospel of Luke* (p. 162, 4-11 Rauer), speaks of heterodox sects (the Marcionites, very probably) that represented Paul sitting at the right of the Saviour, the left of which was occupied by Marcion. He mentions others (disciples either of Apelles or of Valentine?) who assimilated the Apostle to the Paraclete, the sending of whom had been promised by Christ, and thus, in a way, assimilating him to the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. Such traits were not without influence on Manichaeism as regards the worship it rendered to its own founder or the conception it formed of him. In any event, given that Mani included Marcion alongside Bardaisan among his immediate predecessors and knew his works, it is probable that it was Marcionism that inspired him to afford the Apostle an exceptional position and to base his anti-Judaism on him i.e., the theory of a Christianity corrupted by Jewish elements of which it needs to be rid. In any case, according to Mani himself, and as the first chapter of the Coptic *Kephalaia* (I, p. 13, 18-29) explains in particular, the message of Jesus was transmitted and preserved in its original purity up until the time of Paul, and through this same, whereas it was only after his death that the message began to be falsified i.e., the decadence of Christianity. Paul is also the great model that inspired the apostolic and missionary ideal that Mani set for himself and his Elect. He was the archetype, the eminent example of the itinerant apostle who, in defiance of fatigue and persecution, travelled the world to spread the Truth and launch the call to Salvation. The adventures attributed to him and to his spiritual companion, Thecla, in the Apocryphal Acts, are mentioned here and there in many works of the Western Manichaeans, notably in the Coptic Psalter, which widely cites and uses his letters. One of these writings, which is preserved in fragments in the Latin manuscript discovered in 1919 near Tébessa, is a categoric mixture of various extracts from the Pauline Epistles placed end to end and briefly commented upon. Thus, the influence of Paulinism on the origins of Manichaeism and the notoriety of the Apostle within the Manichaean communities of Egypt and the Western world are all well-established facts. But one question remains. Did this influence also extend to Central and East Asia? Was the memory of Paul surrounded with the same fervour? Was it even kept at all?

We have one explicit, but unfortunately all too brief, testimony. On line 15 of the Turfan fragment p.1 published in 1904 by C. Salemann in the *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg* (VIIIth Series, vol. VI, No. 6, p. 6) under the title “*Ein Bruchstück (sic) manichâischen Schriftums im Asiatischen Muséum*” [A fragment (sic) of Manichaean script in the Asian Museum], one section reads: ‘*br gwyšn ‘y p ‘wlys fry[štg?]*, “On the word of the apostle (?) Paul”. Is this the title of a sermon, an exposition, a *Képhalaïon* relating either to the Pauline Epistles, or to one of their passages? We cannot be sure. The important thing is that this provides us with proof, however inadequate it may be, that the name and writings of Paul were not completely unknown to the Manichaeans of the Far East. However, it must be admitted that it is very rare and difficult to discover in the vestiges of their literature published thus far, any citation, or reminiscences, of these Pauline “words” to which p.1 alludes.

An exception to this appears in the form of two other Turfan fragments, which are moreover more or less parallel to each other; the M551 and the M789, both of which were published by F.W.K. Müller in the *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* in 1904, on pages 67 and 68. The verso of the first fragment reads: “... I save you (from) ruin ... that which you have not seen with your eye, nor heard with your ear, nor grasped with your hand.”. And the recto of the second fragment reads: “So that I may save you from death and annihilation, I will give you that which you have not seen with your eye, nor heard with your ear, nor grasped with your hand.” This instantly brings to mind the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Chapter 2, Verse 9: *Alla kathôs gégraptai ha ophthalmos ouk eiden*

kai ous ouk êkousén kai épi kardian anthropôn ouk anébê, “But, as it is written: What the eye has not seen, the ear has not heard, and that which has not reached the hearts of men”. Let us try to untangle this. The reference here is not to Paul, but in fact to Jesus, not to *Corinthians I*, but to an apocryphal gospel, whose usage by Mani and the Manichaeans is well attested. It is *The Gospel according to Thomas*, now well-known thanks to the complete version recently found among the forty nine writings of the Coptic Gnostic library unearthed near Nag Hammâdi in Upper Egypt. We already know that the word mentioned by Paul as scriptural, or originating from some scripture, also circulated under a kind of *logion* attributed to Christ. It is presented and reported thus in *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter (Actus Petri, c. 39 = Martyrium Petri, c. 10, p. 98, 7-10 Lipsius)*: “You will obtain”, declares Peter to the crowd, “that which he speaks to you”, that is to say, “that which Jesus speaks to you” (*ékeinôn teuxesthé hôn légei humin*): “That which the eye has not seen, nor the ear has heard, and that which has not ascended into the heart of man (*ha outé ophthalmos eiden outé ous êkousén outé épi kardian anthrôpou anébê*). We therefore ask you to give us that which you promised; Jesus without stain (*Aïtoumen oun péri hôn hêmin hupeskhôu dounai, amianté Iêsou*).” But, in *The Gospel according to Thomas*, these words of Jesus are even more expressly referred to as the Word of Jesus - and this time written in a form that is closer to the text of fragment M789 than to that of the Pauline Epistle. It constitutes the seventeenth of the 114 *logia* that this so-called Gospel brings together, and is formulated as follows (plate 84, lines 5 to 9 of the photographic edition Pahor Labib): “Jesus said: *I will give you that which the eye has not seen, and that which the ear has not heard, and that which the hand has not touched, and that which has not ascended into the heart of man.*” Thus, there can be no doubt that it is these words - and not I Cor. 2, 9, as one might at first assume – that are cited or paraphrased in the two Manichaean texts in question. We therefore have to renounce them as testimony.

But the following is more encouraging.

@We know that the Manichaean Church bestowed on its Elect, its Perfects, its “Saints”, the role of cooperating in the salvation of the divine soul engulfed in Matter and that, in particular, it attributed them with the capacity to release and liberate, during their digestion, the living particles of light mixed with the substance of the food ingested by them, the latter being offered to them as “alms” by the faithful of lower rank, the “Hearers” or “Catechumens”. The meal of the Elect thus assumes the character of a sacred act, holy in its accomplishment and in the purposes for which it is ordained, but also formidable and perilous in principle, given that its failure or success depends on the internal situation of whomever is the agent i.e., the condition of impurity or purity in which this same finds himself at the time of accomplishing this act. Indeed, in the event that the Elect is defiled by sin, such an act would transform pious work into sacrilege. Instead of saving, through him and within him, the pieces of soul contained in the food he has consumed, he would destroy these latter and keep them even more tenaciously amalgamated within the body, the darkness, and Evil. He would perpetuate and increase their slavery and abjection, expose them to new sufferings and doom them to renewed trials. The operation must therefore be surrounded by extreme and strict precautions and take on the appearance and value of a rite and conform to a ritual that regulates its progression and ensures its validity. In particular, it is the very gravity of the act that the Perfect performs when he is preparing to eat the food and the decisive role that he is called on to assume, consisting of whether he has made himself worthy or unworthy of it, that leads the Elect to engage in a preliminary contemplation in preparation for the food. Before each of his meals, he undertakes a kind of examination of conscience during which, following a prayer of thanksgiving, he meditates on the significance of what he is about to do, the nature of the food to be ingested, and the responsibility that falls upon him in all of this. In my view, it is at least in this sense that one must interpret two Turfan texts, both written in Sogdian: fragment M801, paragraphs 749-767, and fragment M139, paragraphs 51-91.

The first, published by W. Henning in the *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* of 1936, No. 10, p. 41, and which was unfortunately interrupted too soon due to the mutilated state of the manuscript, forms part of a confession form intended for the Elect. It represents a special section of this same called *xw'nyzd'n*, "the table of the gods", and, as such title indicates, concerns the participation in this kind of "holy table" or "communion table" around which the Perfects eat their meal, and which is designated by the Manicheans as *xwān* in Iranian, and as *trapéza* in Greek and Coptic. It concerns the negligence or the faults of which the Elect could be guilty at the time of these more or less Eucharistic feasts. I have made a literal translation of the passage from Henning: "Likewise (Item), on receiving the daily gifts from the divine table (we understand here: the food alms brought each day by the Hearers, the *eusébéiai*, the *ruvānagān*, who are also *dōra*), I did not place myself, with a grateful heart, in a state of remembrance of God, the Buddha (perhaps, the God Buddha, *Tāngri Burxan* in Uighur, that is to say, of Mani), and men. Similarly (Item), I did not correctly retain the memory of the original battle" (the episode that dominates the entire cosmogonic and soteriological myth of Manichaeism; the combat engaged in at the dawn of time between the First Man and the Powers of Evil, which was terminated by the defeat of the former and is thus at the origin of the fall and the engulfment in Darkness of the living Soul, the latter being the portion of divine substance amassed in the First Man. In the battle that followed, in which, as Saint Augustine sums up very well in *Enarratio in Psalm. CXL*, 10 [PL, XXXVII, 1823], the limbs of God became captive, were mixed with the whole world, and are found buried in trees, grasses, and fruits: *Membra illa Dei, quae capta sunt in illo praelio, mixta sunt in universo mundo, and sunt in arboribus, in herbis, in pomis, in fructibus*). "Neither did I think," continued the Elect, "of the following: Under whose sign am I now? (implied: Under the sign of Good or under that of Evil?) What is it then that is eaten? What are the demons that we are accustomed to eat (usually eat)? Whose flesh and blood is this (which is eaten)? What obligatory debt and what offering do I therefore receive? Then: Why is it that I am not included in the category of pigs, dogs and yakṣa? Why...?"

One of these questions is very strange: *ky'y'ty xwrnyy xcy* (i.e., *kyy xwrtyy βwtwkwn*), "Whose flesh and blood (the flesh and the blood) is that (which is eaten)?" The question is surprising given that the Perfects were strictly forbidden to eat any meat. The flesh, which was formed by the Devil and its henchmen from the dregs of Matter and which reproduces itself in animals by copulation, is deemed by Manichaean dogma to be particularly filthy and absolutely defiling to the one who consumes it: *omnem carnem immundam*, declares Faustus, in the *Contra Faustum* of Saint Augustin, VI, 1 (p. 284, 16-17 Zycha; other references in P. Alfarié, *L'Évolution intellectuelle de Saint Augustine*, Paris, 1918, p. 128). As for the Manicheans, they attest to this in a Chinese testimony recorded by É. Chavannes and P. Pelliot (*Journal Asiatique*, March-April 1913, pp. 348-349), "always abstain from bloody food". I thus contend that there is only one way of explaining this question presented by the Elect, which at first sight seems paradoxical and almost inconceivable i.e., by seeing a reminiscence or an adaptation of Christian language. If one follows this line of thinking, "the flesh and blood" are those of Jesus, which are present in the Eucharistic oblates, in the bread and in the wine, or are symbolized by these same. And, in the same way that the Christian cannot participate in the "holy table" or partake in the supper as if it were just any meal, nor ingest the host or eat the bread or drink from the cup without remembering, in fear and reverence, the presence of the body of Christ within them, likewise the Manichaean Elect must be fully aware of the sacred character of the act he is going to perform and must discern, within the bread, water, vegetables and fruits that are offered to him in "alms", the presence of the living Soul, which is divine and luminous and, moreover, which is assimilated to the substance of the Son of God, the First Man or, in certain Western Manicheans, at least to that of *Jesus Patibilis*, that of Christ crucified in the world, and which is present in each of its elements. This correspondence is doubtless far from perfect and the adoption here of terms

and conceptions specific to Christianity is not without its inconsistencies. Manichaeism forbids its Saints to use wine; it professes Docetism, thus attributing Christ with only a phantom of the body and denying the reality of the Incarnation. Above all, the impression given here is that of fatty and bloody food, which were reputed to be evil, filthy, and which were expressly prohibited to the Elect, who was only allowed vegetable foods and could only exercise his liberating action on these latter? However, it is precisely these inconsistencies, this clumsiness and these difficulties that betray the borrowing.

Moreover, the interpretation that I have just proposed can neither be considered pure conjecture nor, at best, ingenious. Although it is indeed strange to find mention of flesh and blood in connection with the exclusively vegetarian meal of the Elect, one could object that it would be even stranger to discover a memory of the Christian Eucharist in a text not originating from the West but from Central Asia. To which one could already respond, for example, that one of the names given to Jesus by documents of the same origin and noted by Waldschmidt and Lentz in their paper of 1926 is that of *nigân*, "bread", which is used, among others, by the Turfan fragments M96 R, 1st stanza, and M88, 1, 1st stanza (*Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1926, No. 4, p. 35; cf. p. 65) and which is a Johannine reminiscence and, more or less distantly, even an illusion to the Eucharist. However, thanks to the Manichaean Chinese Hymnal (i.e. Hymnscroll) of London, a full translation of which was supplied in English by Tsui Chi in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London, vol. XI, Part I, 1943), we have something even better. It suffices to read stanzas 253 and 254 (p. 198 of the article of Tsui Chi, but here I use a more precise translation by Mr. Paul Demiéville).

The piece from which I have extracted these two stanzas is presented as a speech, a sermon in verse, preached by the *mouchô*, the Masters, to the Elect and to the Hearers, who are addressed, in verse 1 of stanza 249 (p. 197) by the traditional and stereotypical names of "older brothers and luminous younger brothers, with good deeds". The piece that concerns us is preached to these same, and more especially, it seems, to the Elect:

*Save those who are badly wounded and bring them out of the secretion and the wounds.
Clean the pearls of clarity and pull them out of the mud and urine.
The wonderful (transcendent) offerings (kong) exalted by the Law (or: which are received in
accordance with the Law),
Adorned and pure, return them to the original Lord. And that is the flesh and blood of Jesus.
Let those (or the one) who are (who is) able to receive them take of it as they please.
As for those (or the one) who are (who is) false and ungrateful (or turn(s) their backs on their
(his) obligations),
Jesus himself (is) weak, and there is no snow route (that is, according to a common Chinese
metaphor, there is no way to whiten, to wash away this shame or this fault).*

The beginning of the last line ("Jesus is weak") seems difficult to comprehend and would undoubtedly need to be corrected: *wei*, "weak", "subtle", could very well be substituted by the very similar character *tcheng*, "witness"; we would then understand: "Jesus himself testifies that there is no way to be cleansed, washed, from such sin."

These stanzas need no commentary. Not only are the flesh and the blood mentioned here expressly designated as being those of Jesus, but they are also related to food alms, to the "offerings" (*kong* in Chinese, *dôra* in Greek and Coptic). The Elect are exhorted to heal and save the luminous pieces of soul buried and suffering within them, release them from their gangue of material refuse, purify them and restore them to their substance and primitive source. The images and terms used are quasi-technical and familiar in the Manichaean literature. The light particles receive wounds and stains from their mixing with the Matter and the Darkness and are infected by them. Their association with "pearls" is found in particular

in the Coptic *Kephalaia* as well as in Chapter 5 of *Indiculus de haeresibus* of Pseudo-Jerome, relating to the Manichaeans (p. 287 Œhler: “God wants to free the particle of this Light, once made prisoner by Darkness, and which they call the Pearl”, *Huius luminis particulam detentam quondam a tenebris velle deum liberare, quam dicunt Margaritam*). Finally, stanza 254 insists on the necessity imposed on the Elect, their liberator, or their eventual profaner, to be himself in a state of dignity, free from all fault, and show himself neither negligent nor forgetful towards his obligations. Otherwise, no redemption or absolution is possible. Jesus himself would wish it, or (if one adopts the proposed correction) Jesus thus attests it. I therefore contend that my interpretation of Turfan fragment M801 is neither hesitant nor audacious.

It now becomes easy to access fragment M139, also published by W. Henning in issue 10 of the *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* of 1936, and which must be combined with the previous one as a parallel and complement. I retain only the second section, namely paragraphs 51 to 91 (pp. 50-51 of the edition indicated). They seem to represent the vestiges of a homily concerning the arrangements for alms food to be received and consumed. We read therein: “And receive it in offering like gold (or, more simply, according to É. Benveniste, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, IX, 1938, p. 499: “And receive it like gold”). Transfer it in the required amount and in full to its owner, so that you do not come to great hostility (into a state of enmity). Keep it with care. Preserve it with great firmness, so as not to expose it to soiling with dry or wet blood. (Preserve it) in the state such that it renders you yourself joyous and content. And likewise, all together, prevent yourselves ... birth so that ... from becoming jealous or hateful (which causes disgust or hatred). The original struggle, wound ... the fault (or the debt), contemplate the ... day, when, through Az (Concupiscence, the personification of Matter and Evil) ... Start (to contemplate this): With what sign is the own body (of each one) adorned or oppressed? Who is it serving? What is it that you are thus eating? Because any participant in the meal (word for word: “all drinking and eating”, *wyspw xwrynyy*, “whoever drinks and eats”) who is not worthy of it will, notwithstanding his laborious efforts, be excluded from the Light Paradise. (In contrast,) the righteous Elect and believing Hearers who recognize the greatness of the living Soul will be joyous within the Light Paradise in Eternal Life. (Dear brother,) refine yourself and hear the good words from my mouth ... It is a duty and a law for those who have Knowledge (are wise men) to stand in the Church and serve (Religion) under this distinctive sign.”

Here again, there are passing reminiscences to Christianity but – even better - we are now able to specify the source. However, notwithstanding the pronounced nature of the Manichaean colouring, this exhortation to prepare oneself to take part in the ritual meal is, in places, reminiscent of Saint Paul’s instructions relating to the responsibilities of whoever, worthily or unworthily, with or without discernment, eats the bread, which is the body of the Lord, and drinks the blood of Christ from the cup. For further confirmation of this, it suffices to compare the very text of Corinthians I, Chapter XI, Verses 27-31, from which it even retains certain terms in literal form: “That is why whoever eats bread and drinks from the cup of the Lord unworthily (without being worthy of it, *anaxiôs*) will be guilty (responsible, *énokhos*), will answer for the body and blood of the Lord (*tou sômatos kai tou haïmatos tou kuriou*, which is equivalent to the expression that we have noted in fragment M801 and in stanza 254 of the Chinese Hymnal: “flesh and blood”). Let each one thus discern this for himself (*dokimazêtô dé anthrôpos héauton*) and thus (*houtôs*) eat bread and drink from the cup. For he who eats and drinks (*ho gar hesthiôn kai pinôn*, exactly translated here by *wyspw xwrynyy*) without discernment of the body (*mdiakrinôn to sôma*), eats and drinks a judgment against himself (*krima héautôi hesthieï kai pineï*). This is why there are many infirm (sick persons) and weaklings (*asthêneïs kai arrhôstoi*) among you and the dead are numerous (*kai*

koïmôntai hikanoï). If we discerned ourselves, we would not be judged (*Ei de héautous diékrimén, ouk an ékrinométha*)."

Thus, there can finally be identified in the Manichaean literature of Central Asia the very probable trace of a Pauline writing, of some of these "words" of the Apostle at which was aimed the fragment 1 of Salemann. The persistence of such a reminiscence is all the more remarkable given that it is almost exceptional, and, more particularly, it is difficult to see the reasons why the Manicheans of these regions would have been under any obligation to attach themselves to it. In principle, they could just as well have dispensed with incorporating these scraps of Paulinism into the exposition of a theory for which Iran provided them with a king of equivalent; the Mazdeans also maintained that the unworthy or the unbeliever is excluded from the consumption of myazda (texts provided by R. Reitzenstein, *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, Berlin Leipzig, 1929, p. 246, which, moreover, makes the connection with the verses mentioned in the First Epistle to the Corinthians). Furthermore, Pauline doctrine and terminology are not so comparable with the beliefs and rite in question that their adoption should have been necessary or taken for granted. On the contrary, the amalgamation is not without artifice or inconsistency. There is something forced here, which would only be endeavoured under the pressure of some constraint or under the effect of some need, and for reasons that are somewhat contingent or external. In other words, the combination would seem to be less conceivable in the Far East than in the West, where, for the purposes of propaganda in particular, Manichaeism had every interest in taking on a Christian appearance and forms by adapting its dogmas, its language, and its practices to those of Christianity. Indeed, we note that, in the Western world, not only did the adversaries and the external witnesses of the movement confuse the daily or solemn meal of the Elect with a "communion", but that, especially, within such or such Manichaean community, the rite received a Eucharistic interpretation that tended to assimilate it more or less to the sacrament of the Christian Church. Thus, towards the end of the 4th century and in North Africa, the Manichaean bishop Faustus affirms, in the testimony of Saint Augustine (*C. Faust.*, XX, 2, p. 536, 21-23), that he and his coreligionists hold, with regard to all things (we understand: with regard to all things in which the *Jesus Patibilis* is crucified, "life and salvation of men"), the same attitude and the same religious respect as the Christians hold as to the place of the bread and the chalice (*Quapropter et nobis circa universa and vobis similiter erga [var. circa] panem et calicem par religio est*). Saint Augustine rejects and refutes such thesis in chapter 13 of the same book XX of *Contra Faustum* (p. 552, 22-p. 553, 15), highlighting with exactitude the incompatibilities. He emphasizes that the Christian Eucharist involves the use of wine, but that the use of wine is forbidden to the Elect. The bread and wine of communion are not, in the eyes of Christians, any kind of bread or any kind of wine, but are elements consecrated by a formula and a liturgical act, made sacred by the presence of the body and blood of Christ, which mystically produced the words of consecration within them. Whereas, for the Manichaeans, all bread, all food, all drink, everything is naturally and always a sacred thing and, one could say, already consecrated by the immanence of the particles of the living Soul or the body of Jesus Patibilis, which are concealed and held captive therein. Elsewhere in the *Enarr. in Psalm. CXL*, 12 (PL, XXXVII, 1823), Saint Augustine adds a new difference. Whereas, in the Christian conception, it is Jesus who saves the one who partakes in his body and his blood under the species of the Eucharistic oblates, in Manichaeism, on the contrary, it is considered, in a kind of monstrous paradox, that by releasing the luminous substance of Jesus from the food alms, the Elect is the "saviour of Christ" and thus the "saviour of God" (*salvator Christi, salvator Dei*). Nevertheless, while highlighting that which contrasts the Manichaean rite from the Christian sacrament, Saint Augustine did grasp the meaning of the parallel made by his adversary. Faustus wanted to insinuate, or advance, not only that which the Manicheans feel with regard to all living things in which the cosmic Christ ceaselessly undergoes the sufferings of a universal Passion, which are the same feelings and the same

reverential fear as the Christians have in regard to the Eucharistic elements, but also, and more particularly, that the participation of the Elect at the "table of the gods", the arrangements for preparing to take their meal and the very act of their ingestion of food and drink are comparable, even if not identical, to the participation of Christians at the "holy table", to the attitudes which they observe before partaking in the Last Supper and when taking Communion, and to their Eucharistic sacrament itself. We are thus quite certain that there has been – at least in a Western and familiar follower of the Pauline Epistles, as was Faustus, - a more or less artificial attempt to lend a Christian interpretation to a ritual practice specific to Manichaeism.

However, the fact that such an attempt also emerges in texts from the communities of Central Asia shows that this is something more general and deeper than it might at first appear. I therefore do not contend that one can fully explain the rapprochement in question simply by casting, at a certain time and in certain countries, the Manichaean propaganda into a Christian mould, or by supposing that our two Turfan fragments and the passage invoked from the Chinese Hymnal solely reflect views and concerns specific to Western Manichaeism. Rather, it should be accepted that, in this case, the influence exerted by Christianity on Manichaeism was powerful enough, and undoubtedly old enough, to also act or continue to be felt within communities that were less concerned than their sisters in the West with giving - not without violence - one of their rites the allure and value of a Christian sacrament. It will likewise be concluded that, at the very origins of the movement, the authority and prestige of the apostle Paul must have been sufficiently great as to ensure the subsistence of his memory - be it anonymously, as in this case, or in the form of faint traces - even within the Manichaean churches of Central Asia and the Far East.

I believe this to be the main interest of the minor problem and of the few documents that I have just presented.

Supplementary note. A remarkable parallel to some of the texts cited above (in particular, to stanzas 253254 of the Chinese Hymnal of London) is now provided by a passage from the "ManiCodex" of Cologne (p. 96, 2197, 10, ed. A. Henrichs L. Koenen, in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* V, 1970, p. 147, n. 131, and, for the commentary, p. 139) where it is reported by Alkhasaios (Elkhasai, the founder of the sect in which Mani spent his youth) that he took a piece of the earth that is supposed to have spoken to him, wept, kissed it, laid it on his chest and said: "This is the flesh and blood of my Lord" (*Haute estin hē sarx kai haïma tou kuriou mou*).

(3) MANICHAISM ON THE SILK ROAD: ITS RISE, CLIMAX AND DECAY¹

Werner Sundermann
(1935-2012)



1. The Central Asian literature of the Manichaeans

We call Manichaeism a world religion for more than one reason. The fact that it was spread over larger regions of the old world than Buddhism, Christianity and Islam is one reason. None of these religions had spread all the way from the Atlantic to inner China after 500 years of existence. However, in almost all these regions and as long as it was in existence Manichaeism remained the doctrine of a small and often persecuted minority. This was different only in the Uighur states of Central Asia, this is in the so-called Uighur Empire of the Steppes that began in Mongolia and lasted from 744 to 840, and in one of its heirs, the Uighur state of Qočo in the oasis of Turfan. The history of this state lasted from 866 until 1368, this is until the end of Mongol rule over Central Asia. Its ruling dynasty was still in existence when Le Coq worked in Qočo. Only here, and after Bögü Khagan (or Bügü Khagan) had converted to Manichaeism around the year 762 did Manichaeism become the religion of the ruler over a state and thereby also of his people. It probably remained in place until the end of the tenth century and played an important role in Qočo even later than that.

The privileged position that the Manichaeans held with the Uighurs led to a unique peak of Manichaean literary and artistic production. To a high degree Manichaeism was a religion of the book, more so than Islam. It made use of the visual arts, painting, calligraphy, the telling of parables and the singing of edifying songs in spreading its teachings. With the Uighurs, and only with them did it fully develop its spiritual force.

This statement can be made with confidence since in the meantime relicts of Manichaean congregations have come to light not only in Central Asia but also in other parts of the world, this is in Tebessa in Algeria, in several places in Egypt where treasures are preserved for millennia, and also in Medīnet Mādī, in the Dāḥla oasis, and where the *Cologne Mani Codex* was found. We are therefore now in a position to compare what the Manichaeans have transmitted in Central Asia and in other parts of the world. Each of these Manichaean findings is of inestimable value, if we just consider what the *Kephalaia* of Medīnet Mādī contributes to our knowledge of Manichaean dogmatics or what the Mani Codex in Cologne contributes to the biography of the founder of the religion. However, without any attempt to detract from the rank of these findings we may say that their great value also consists in the fact that they are relatively well preserved and less fragmentary than the findings of the Turfan oasis. The Manichaean texts that have been recovered and are still being recovered in the Turfan oasis and especially in the ruins of the old city of Qočo and the complexes of cave temples in Toyuq, Murtuk and Bāzāklik surpasses all other findings in regard to size and diversity of

¹ Originally published as “Der Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße: Aufstieg, Blüte und Verfall”, in U. Hübner, J. Kamlah and L. Reinfandt (eds.), *Die Seidenstraße: Handel und Kulturaustausch in einem eurasiatischen Wegenetz*, Asien und Afrika. Beiträge des Zen-trums für Asiatische und Afrikanische Studien (ZAAS) der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Bd. 3 (Hamburg: EB-Verlag, 2001), 153-168; translated from the German by Dr B. Hendrichke and published in S.N.C. Lieu and G. Mikkelsen (eds.), *Between Rome and China: History, Religions and Material Culture of the Silk Road*, Silk Road Studies XVIII (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016) 75-90.

subject matter. Among around 4,700 fragments in Iranian languages (in Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian, Bactrian and even in New Persian)¹ the majority, this is almost two thirds are written in characteristically Manichaean script and even among the 900 to 1,000 fragments written in common Sogdian script about half have Manichaean contents. There are also Manichaean texts in Old Turkic although they are by far fewer in number and also of smaller size than Buddhist texts.² Finally, there are a few texts with Manichaean contents among the Chinese and Tocharian texts found in Turfan and Dunhuang.³ The fact that the Manichaean literature of Central Asia has remained largely Iranian deserves to be stressed when we consider that this became the literature of the Uighurs who were of Turkic descent.

The number of identifiable manuscripts is large and so is the variety of literary genres. Quite a few literary works can be identified. If I were to start with the Manichaean writings in Iranian languages that I am most familiar with I would first mention Mani's own canonical writings. Surprisingly, in the Western tradition only the canonical collection of letters has so far been found and described.⁴ Letters by Mani and his disciples exist also in the Iranian literature.⁵ However, it has more to offer, and in particular Mani's *Šābuhragān*, which is written in Middle Persian and dedicated to King Šā-buhr I (241-271) and his *Book of Giants* that has been translated into Middle Persian and other languages. Moreover, there are other homiletic tracts which we might attribute to Mani if it were not for the fact that their titles have not been transmitted. However, we have been able to reconstruct large dogmatic treatises by Mani's disciples, this the *Sermon on the Light-Nous* and *Sermon on the Soul*. So-called cycles of hymns, lamenting the sufferings of the human or the world soul can be put next to Coptic psalms and the ecclesiastical homilies of the Iranians in Parthian, Middle Persian and Sogdian can be compared to the Coptic homilies. However, there is also a large number of Iranian fragments of *Kephalaia*, collections of parables, confessional texts, dialogues, riddles, word-lists, medical instructions, letters, magic formulas and divinatory texts. There are also texts in metric verse, meant for singing or for spoken recital. The metric homily can be mentioned next to the cycles of hymns. So can the short and long hymns that have been put together in large collections and Mani's psalms. We will only gain an adequate impression of the richness of Manichaean writings from the Turfan region once all major fragments have been identified, put in order and published. This will still demand a lot of work.⁶

The eminence of these works is also expressed in the way in which they are written. Tracts and hymns that were meant for use in communal religious service are written in the ornamental decorative script of the Manichaeans, with beautiful initials and many coloured headings whose letters are often so adorned with flourishes that they are hard to decipher.

¹ W. Sundermann, "Die iranischen Texte", in K. Schubarth-Engelschall (ed.), *Orientalische Bibliotheken und Sammlungen* (Berlin 1970), 54-61; idem, "Geschichte, Stand und Aufgaben der Turfanforschung", *Akademie-Journal* 2 (2000), 13.

² L. Clark, "The Turkic Manichaean Literature", in P. Mirecki & J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (Leiden 1997), 89-141.

³ G. B. Mikkelsen, "Skilfully Planting the Trees of Light: The Chinese Manichaica, their Central Asian Counterparts and Some Observations on the Translation of Manichaeism into Chinese", in S. Clausen et al. (eds.), *Cultural Encounters: China, Japan and the West. Essays Commemorating 25 Years of East Asian Studies at the University of Aarhus* (Århus 1995), 83-108; A. von Gabain & W. Winter, "Türkische Turfantexte IX. Ein Hymnus auf den Vater Mani auf 'Tocharisch' B mit alttürkischer Übersetzung", in *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1956 (Berlin 1958).

⁴ C. Schmidt & H. J. Polotsky, "Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler", in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl. (1933), 23-26.

⁵ M. Boyce, *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection* (Berlin 1960), 147.

⁶ Cf. summary in W. Sundermann, "The Manichaean Literature in Iranian Languages", in R. E. Emmerick & M. Macuch (eds.), *The literature of pre-Islamic Iran* (London & New York 2009), 197-265.

Moreover, such texts often have elaborate illuminations. These miniature paintings pose many riddles in that they do not seem to relate to the object of the text and in that their meaning, to the extent to which it can be recognized remains open to different interpretations. What now remains of Manichaean literature that once must have been extremely rich is sufficient to support the famous account of the Arabic historian al-Ġāhiz which says that when he lived men admired Manichaean books more because they were lavishly got up with brilliant white paper, shining black ink and perfect calligraphy than because of their contents.¹ It is not in vain that the Islamic world has retained an appreciation of *Mānī-ye naqqāš* “Mani the painter”.² Let us also consider the remnants of Manichaean frescoes from Qočo, although we must admit that their number is small. The most beautiful were published by A. Le Coq in excellent reproductions. The most famous is no doubt the picture of a high ranking Manichaean cleric and his retinue³ who was occasionally thought to be Mani himself and thus became for instance the logo of the “International Association of Manichaean Studies”. Exactly this picture that was on display in the Ethnological Museum of Berlin fell unfortunately victim to the events of the war.

As for the products of Manichaean visual arts they have only come to light in Central Asia and whoever takes an interest in Manichaean art, as did H.-J. Klimkeit in his *Manichaean Art and Calligraphy* (Leiden 1982) can only work with the Turfan materials. It is clear that such a wealth of Mani-chaeen scholarly and artistic creation could only come about under the conditions of material security and official promotion as they existed in the Kingdom of Qočo. A singular Uighur document whose importance was first pointed out by P. Zieme shows how this must be imagined.⁴ This is the so-called Manichaean Uighur monastery scroll. It contains extensive instructions in regard to the delivery of food, animal fodder and cotton to the monastery as well as in regard to services and also the performance of functions in the monastery. According to T. Moriyasu the document could date to the ninth to eleventh century, or more precisely to the beginning or the middle of the tenth century.⁵ One gains the impression that the production of many beautiful manuscripts was a specialty of Qočo, the capital of the Western Uighur Empire. The complex of caves at Toyuq to the south-east of Qočo was another centre of the Manichaean culture of handwriting. Thirty to fifty Manichaean manuscripts were found there which differ from the Qočo texts in a characteristic way and not only in regard to their amount. While the codex book is characteristic of Qočo, book scrolls are characteristic of Toyuq. In Qočo the Mani-chaeen script is dominant and in Toyuq the Sogdian. Qočo texts are as a rule calligraphically written and elaborately decorated manuscripts, in Toyuq a demotic cursive script is prevailing.⁶ The Toyuq texts give an impression of what Manichaean literature production was like under the conditions of a needy congregation in the diaspora.

The Central Asian texts stem from a later period when compared to the Manichaean findings in Egypt and Northern Africa that can all be attributed to the fourth and fifth century. Their date is not before the eighth century and some are as late as the eleventh century. There is one sad and as one is tempted to say tragic consequence to the fact that this chance came so late: it was mainly used to maintain and cultivate a rich pre-existing tradition of Aramaic

¹ K. Kessler, *Mani. Forschungen über die manichäische Religion* (Berlin 1889), 366-368.

² Cf. J. P. Asmussen, *X^Uästvanift. Studies in Manichaeism* (Copenhagen 1965), 10.

³ A. von Le Coq, *Chotscho* (Berlin 1913), 1, pl. I.

⁴ P. Zieme, “Ein uigurischer Text über die Wirtschaft manichäischer Klöster im uigur-ischen Reich”, in L. Ligeti (ed.), *Researches in Altaic Languages. Papers read at the 14th meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, held in Sgezed, August 22-28, 1971* (Budapest 1975), 331-338.

⁵ I cite Moriyasu’s Japanese work according to A. Forte, “A New Study on Manichaeism in Central Asia”, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 88 (1993), 117-124.

⁶ W. Sundermann, “Completion and correction of archaeological work by philological means: the case of the Turfan texts”, in P. Bernard & F. Grenet (eds.), *Histoire et cultes de l’Asie Centrale préislamique* (Paris 1991), 283-288.

writings from the third century, Middle Persian and Parthian writings from the third to the seventh century and Sogdian writings from about the seventh century onwards. Little new material was added. Manichaean Turkic literature is modest. Manichaean Sogdian literature was perhaps innovative in the realms of parables and texts of confession. However, the poetic texts, small in number, and the tracts seem to be nothing but translations from Western Iranian languages. We can only ascertain that when the Manichaean Church of the East, as it called itself came to power in the eighth century it did not have the energy to develop new forms and ideas in discussion for instance with local Buddhism to which its outside appearance owed so much. At its height the achievements of the Manichaean culture of writing were in collection and preservation, as well as in decoration and reproduction.

2. The history of Manichaeism in Central Asia until the end of the Uighur Empire of the steppes

THE REMARKS made so far point to documentation that makes the high point of Manichaean history easily conceivable. In the following section I will attempt to throw some light on the history of Manichaeism during the period in question and on that part of the world.

Manichaeism was drawn into the wake of Gnostic doctrines and shared with other Gnostic traditions contempt for historical thinking and historiography. Nevertheless, we know that Manichaeans transmitted the biography of their founder in form of a compilation of stories about his disciples and re-written in homiletic style. However, they did not transmit any testimony in regard to events of their later history. Manichaean hagiography did not extend to the creation of church history. We know about events of their later history from Ibn an-Nadīm's *Fihrist* or from Chinese official chronicles, this is from testimonies produced by others. This also holds true in regard to the spread of Manichaeism in Central Asia and in particular in the area which at present is made up of the Chinese autonomous region of Xinjiang and of Exterior Mongolia. This area will be the object of the following explications since it was only here that Manichaeism managed to become the religion of two consecutive states and reach a unique peak. In spite of this, Manichaean writings are of some value for historiographical purposes. In my 1992 paper "Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts concerning the Turfan region"¹ I have attempted to obtain information of historical relevance from Middle Iranian hymns, colophons, names of donors, letters, documents and word lists. The following explications rely mainly on these sources.

We do not have any evidence in regard to the question how Manichaeism came to Central Asia. A Parthian letter mentions that Manichaean religious instructors reached the city of Zamb, which was situated at the Oxus close to Āmul.² W. Henning has convincingly established the third century A.D. as date for this letter and identified it as addressed by an *archegos* to Mār Ammō, the Manichaean apostle to the East. In the seventh century (between 630 and 640) the Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang 玄奘 met with adherents of the Manichaean *tinaba* 提那跋 congregation, this is to say of the *Dīnā-warīya*,³ in "Persia",⁴ this is to say in Bactria and Sogdiana. His travel account does not mention that he also met them further east. The next account is in the *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統計, which is a late although trustworthy source from 1269. It mentions that in 694 a Persian named *fuduodan* 拂多誕 came to the Chinese

¹ In A. Cadonna (ed.), *Turfan and Tun-huang: the Texts* (Berlin 1992), 63-84.

² F. C. Andreas & W. B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, III", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl. (Berlin 1934), 854, 858.

³ Cf. W. Sundermann, "Dīnāwarīya", in *Encyclopædia Iranica* VIII (1995), 418-419.

⁴ Éd. Chavannes & P. Pelliot, "Un traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine", *Journal Asiatique*, sér. 11 (1913), 150, text I.

imperial court where he preached the mistaken religion of the “Book of the Two Principles”.¹ We know today that *fuduodan* is not a personal name but represents the Persian or Parthian Manichaean title of bishop in Sogdian form (*βτδσν*), literally “seventieth”, this is one of 72 bishops), which was supposed to create the impression of authenticity.²

A *mushe* 慕闐, this is (Sogd.) *mōžak* “teacher”, who arrived at court in 719 made more of an impression. He had been sent by the ruler of Čayāniyān in order to provide the emperor with samples of his astronomical expertise.³ In the year 732 the doctrine of Mār Māni that put on a pretence of being Buddhist was by imperial decree declared a perverse religion and prohibited in the Middle Kingdom. However, it was still permitted as the religion of *Hu* 胡 barbarians residing in China and of other Western people.⁴ One year earlier (731) an obviously Parthian “teacher” had put together the so-called *Compendium of the Doctrine of Mani* for the instruction of the Chinese court. Following the *Minshu* 閩書 the name of this teacher can be reconstructed as Mihr-Ohrmezd.⁵

The lack of continuity in this chain of events is remarkable. It does not allow us to recognize that or if Manichaeism had also been spread in Central Asia. It is as if the Manichaean missionaries had travelled from Northern Iran to China by plane. This impression is strengthened when we read what the Uighur Qarabalyasun inscription reports about the conversion to Manichaeism in the year 762/3 of Bögü khagan, the ruler over the Uighur steppe empire. He was not converted in Central Asia but during a military campaign in the Chinese capital of Luoyang 洛陽.⁶ He stayed there from November 20, 762 to March 763 and met with Manichaean clerics one of whom had the Chinese Buddhist name Ruixi 睿息 (“penetrating serenity/ quietude”). So he was obviously sinified although, as is generally assumed, a member of China’s foreign community and probably of Sogdian descent. The Manichaeans persuaded Bögü that their teachings were true and the khagan then took care to organise the collective conversion of his people this is the Uighurs whose home was in Mongolia. He took along four clerics who proclaimed the doctrine of the two principles and three eras. The dignitaries confessed to the new doctrine and renounced the service to demons, whatever this means. Idols, no matter whether carved or painted were to be burnt and the service to demons was to become a punishable offence. The eating of meat was to give way to vegetarian food. It is then said that the (Manichaean) *fawang* 法王 “king of religion”, this is either the head of the church as a whole, who at that stage resided in Babylon, or the head of church’s eastern province, whose residence must have been in Qočo heard about these miraculous events and sent a message of greetings to the Uighur khagan.

This is the traditional view of the organised conversion of the Uighurs to Manichaeism.⁷ It relies on Chinese sources whose account is unequivocal. É. Chavannes and P. Pelliot have connected them to the statements of the Chinese version of the Qarabalyasun inscription, to the extent to which they are recognisable. On their own they neither contradict nor support the Chinese sources. However, I am afraid that this account of events is not necessarily historical but instead creating a myth. This could have been initiated from the Chinese side in order to depict China as the land of origin of Uighur Manichaeism or from the side of the Uighurs in order to point out that the ruler was not converted by his subjects or relatives but by authoritative teachers from the large Middle Kingdom. L. Clark has indeed recently put forth an

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 150-151.

² Cf. *ibid.*, 150-151.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, 151-153.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 154-155.

⁵ W. B. Henning & G. Haloun, “The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light”, *Asia Major*, N.S., 3 (1952), 188 n. 1.

⁶ Cf. Éd. Chavannes & P. Pelliot, *op.cit.*, 190-199.

⁷ Cf. *ibid.*; C. P. Mackerras, “The Uighurs”, in D. Sinor (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia* (Cambridge etc. 1990), 329-335.

alternative account of the historical events, in an article entitled “The Conversion of Bögü Khan to Manichaeism”.¹ He refutes the opinion of Chavannes and Pelliot and argues that the conversion of Bögü was a longer process that began already in 755/6 and in the course of which the khagan wavered between the old pagan traditions of his people and the doctrine of the Manichaeans. In this sense the year 761 would define the conclusion of a process rather than its beginning and immediate completion. If this were true then the big Constantinian turning point of the history of Manichaeism did not take place in China but somewhere at the course of the Tarim in the country of Čahār Tuγri, to which Qočo belonged. We must however keep in mind that Clark’s results are based on fragmentary sources whose meaning is often not equivocal.

There is another question that props up in regard to Bögü’s conversion: What was it that made the ruler convert to Mani’s doctrine and to command his people to convert en masse? When we refrain from presuming that the khagan experienced a true spiritual revulsion, as did Paul we need to investigate his political motives. What made him convert to religion that taught its adherents that all killing, military service, hunting, the butchering of cattle and even the killing of ants was sin, that cultivating soil damaged the Living Soul and that it was wrong to pay taxes to the state and give alms to the poor and that even the procreation of children was a demonic action? The rulers who persecuted Manichaeans, this is Bahrām I in Iran, Diocletian and the Tang dynasty emperors were guided by social and political motives. Of course, in practical terms the Manichaeans were able to get on with those who happened to be in power at any given period. Whenever possible their missionaries first sought access to the court of a ruler, where they introduced themselves and their doctrine. Moreover, they were prepared to pardon a ruler’s sins if he would only protect and promote the Manichaean church. In spite of this they never and nowhere obtained more than a ruler’s benevolent toleration, as for instance in the case of Šābuhr I. Only in the Uighur empires did the religion become state religion. Why did Bögü choose this religion which was so unsuitable for a head of a state? The following answer can only be a hypothesis. Bögü might have considered that the duration of the steppe empires that had preceded his reign had relied on the power of the ruler, the loyalty of the tribal communities and the weakness of their adversaries. These guaranties were however not reliable when one considers that the first Turkic steppe empire had lasted around 150 years and the second one around 50 years. Religious communities lasted much longer and were moreover capable of supplying states that relied on them with duration and permanence. Byzantium had in this way found support in the Orthodox Church that promoted the unity of the empire and Islam, being a warlike and expansive political philosophy set out on its speedy and victorious advance. In China Buddhism came to support the authority of the state. Moreover, the khagans of the Khazars converted to Judaism at about the same time as the Uighurs became Manichaean. When we disregard Zoroastrianism that had been overthrown Manichaeism was the only alternative religion that was left to distance the Uighur state from the big powers. In any case it had already reached the Uighurs and had many adherents along the Silk Road.

Unfortunately little is known about the Manichaeism of the Uighur steppe empire. Let it just be mentioned that it was controversial among the Uighur leading strata and brought about the resistance of Alp Qutluγ Bilgā Qayans (Tung Baya), who reigned from 779 to 789.² It continued to exist under the subsequent rulers over the Uighur steppe empire and vanished when the Kirghiz annihilated the empire in the year 840. It has certainly left no recognisable traces except for the Qarabalyasun inscription. We must assume that Sogdian missionaries

¹ In R. E. Emmerick et al. (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997* (Berlin 2000), 83-123.

² Cf. C. P. Mackerras, *op.cit.*, 333.

spread the faith among the Uighurs. This is documented not only by Sogdian loanwords in the language of Uighur Manichaeans but also in Buddhist texts.¹

In any case, when the Arabian traveller Tamīm b. Baḥr al-Muṭṭawwiʿī visited the capital Qarabalyasun in 821 the *Zindīq* religion, i.e. Manichaeism was certainly the major religion.² However, it is equally certain that the Uighur steppe empire did not spread Manichaeism to Turfan and other oasis cities along the Silk Road but that at this time Manichaean congregations were already in existence there and must have been created earlier. This is evident from the colophon of the Middle Persian *Mahrnāmag*, which is a collection of many hundreds of hymns that was started in the year 761/2. Its manuscript then remained for many years in the *mānistān* of Ark, this is Qarašahr until it was finished under the two khagans Ai Tāngriḍā Qut Bulmiš Alp Bilgā, one of whom reigned from 808-821 and the other from 824-832.³ After the khagan of the steppe empire and his entourage the colophon mentions other eminent personages in Bišbalıq, Čnānčkanδ (Qočo), Kūča, Argi (Qarašahr), Uč (Učur), Aqsu and Kāšyar.⁴ In other words, Manichaeism was spread along the entire northern Silk Road and enjoyed solicitude and protection. Many benefactors have already Uighur names. We may assume that these powerful personages expressed their favour under the impact and following the example of the ruler of the steppe empire. For this the Uighurs created the historical preconditions at the beginning of the ninth century when they extended their sovereignty all the way to Ferghana in the west.⁵

The Manichaean diocese “East” which included the most important places on the Silk Road is of course older than the advance of the Uighurs and other Turks into this region. This is my conclusion from the very old-fashioned name of the Manichaean diocese. It retained this name until the eleventh century. At this time its head had the Middle Persian title “Teacher of the province East, head of Čahār Tugristān”,⁶ this is in Old Turkic “Great Teacher of *Tört Tuŷri”. W. Henning has pointed to the north-eastern part of the Silk Roads as the region of this diocese, this is the land from Kūča to Bišbalıq with Qočo as capital.⁷ This region was still called the “Four Tochari’s land” when the Tocharians who lived there had long become turkified. This means that a Manichaean diocese was here created when the majority of the population still consisted of Tocharians, this is in the eighth century or earlier.

In my view two letters from the Sogdian Manichaean congregation, which I have published in 1984 are historical documents from this pre-Turkic or early Turkic period.⁸ They give a lively picture of the life of Sogdian Manichaean congregations in Central Asia. They are on the subject of the conflict between adherents of the local *Dīnāwarān* and so-called

¹ T. Moriyasu, “L’origine du Bouddhisme chez les Turcs et l’apparition des textes bouddhiques en turc ancien”, in A. Haneda (ed.), *Documents et archives provenant de L’Asie Centrale* (Kyoto 1990), 147-165. See also J. P. Laut, “Der frühe türkische Buddhismus”, *Spiegel der Forschung* 4 (1987), 28-29.

² Cf. C. P. Mackerras, *op.cit.*, 328.

³ *Ibid.*, 322 n. 13.

⁴ F. W. K. Müller, “Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch (Mahrnā-mag)”, *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1912), Nr. 5, 30-31.

⁵ Cf. C. P. Mackerras, *op.cit.*, 322.

⁶ W. Sundermann, “Iranian Manichaean texts concerning the Turfan region”, in A. Cadonna (ed.), *Turfan and Tun-huang. The texts* (Florence 1992), 68.

⁷ W. B. Henning, “Argi and the ‘Tocharians’”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 9 (1938), 550-551, 559-560. When I understand Tuŷri as “Tocharian”, it is in a sense of what has become a customary equation of two peoples’ names which Henning still in his last work held was, strictly speaking, wrong in a linguistic sense (“The First Indo-Europeans in History”, in G. L. Olmen (ed.), *Society and History: Essays in Honour of K. A. Wittfogel* (The Hague 1978), 225), but which W. Thomas sees as worth considering; “Zu skt. *tokharika* and its equivalent in Tocharian”, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung (begründet von Adalbert Kuhn)* 95 (1981) [1982], 126-133; *idem*, *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen (1960-1984)* (Stuttgart 1985), 14-17.

⁸ W. Sundermann, “Probleme der Interpretation manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe”, in J. Harmatta (ed.), *From Hecataeus to al-Ḥuwārīzmī* (Budapest 1984), 289-316.

“dirty and mean Syrians”¹ who had immigrated from Mesopotamia and who in another letter are called Mihryānd and Miklāsīkt, this by the name of their sect.² The letters complain to an authority, probably the teacher of the diocese East that the Syrians in many ways violate commandments of the Elect and offend against local clerics.

In positive terms these letters show that the Manichaeans of Central Asia were not isolated from the larger community of their church and that their congregations held a considerable attraction for the congregations of the original Manichaean mother country.

3. Manichaeism in the Uighur kingdom of Qočo

WHEN the Uighur steppe empire of Qarabalyasun collapsed under the onslaught of the Kirghiz in 840 one part of the Uighur tribes moved westwards and established the Uighur kingdom of Qočo which ruled over the central and north eastern part of the Tarim Basin, the northern steppe regions and from the 10th century also Dunhuang. This did not only lead to a strengthening of Turkic but also of Manichaean presence in this region and must have provided ideal conditions for the thriving of the Manichaean church. Most texts were probably written in this period, the most beautiful pictures were painted and the many monasteries were established and endowed, if we just recall the monastery text quoted above, which contained details of an allotment of the Uighur kingdom of Qočo to a Manichaean monastery and temple.

We may assume that the turkification of the oases along the Silk Road was concluded after the collapse of the Uighur steppe empire in the year 840. However, Manichaean literature has for the most part remained Iranian which signifies that the Turks received Mani’s doctrine through Iranian and not through Chinese or any other mediation. The path of this transmission, this is from Middle Persian (and Parthian) via Sogdian and towards Turkic can at certain points be documented. The multi-lingual Turfan text M 172 is one example. It is the fragment of textbook that was designed for use in religious service. One page has a piece of the *Xwāstwānīft*, this is the formula of confession for Manichaean laymen. On another page are the prooemium and the beginning of the *Living Gospel* of Mani in a style adapted to liturgical reading. It is at first given in Middle Persian translation and then in a Sogdian version of the Middle Persian translation. So the audience would deliver their confession in their own native Turkic language and Mani’s sacred utterances were recited in Middle Persian as a quasi- canonical language. The Sogdian translation that goes back to the time when there was a Sogdian audience for the text was meant to make it more understandable.³

In the Uighur empire Manichaeism was the dominating but not the only religion. The Tocharians and Chinese who lived there were Buddhists, while a small part of the Sogdians were Nestorian Christians. There is nothing that would indicate that the Manichaeans attempted to suppress the other denominations by way of complying with the program of the Qarabalyasun inscription. However, in the course of the tenth century it became clear that Buddhism would overtake and surpass Manichaeism in the juxtaposition and togetherness of religions.

The report of the Chinese envoy Wang Yande 王延德 is like a searchlight directed on the status of religions towards the end of the tenth century. From 981 to 984 he stayed in the capital of the Uighur empire.⁴ This is a searchlight but not more. He mentions more than fifty

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 297.

² Cf. *ibid.*, 292.

³ Cf. W. Sundermann, “The Manichaean texts in languages and scripts of Central Asia”, in S. Akiner & N. Sims-Williams (eds.), *Languages and Scripts of Central Asia* (London 1997), 41.

⁴ Cf. Éd. Chavannes & P. Pelliot, *op.cit.*, 308-309.

Buddhist temples in Qočo where Buddhist scriptures were cultivated in Chinese language.¹ There were also Manichaeian temples and those of so-called Persian clerics. We don't know whether they were Zoroastrians, for whom there are no other documents in Qočo or Nestorians, whose temples the Chinese until the middle of the seventh century called temples of the Persians.² In Wang Yande's account Manichaeian sanctuaries are clearly in the background when compared to these temples of the Persians. One gains the impression that in the last decades of the tenth century Manichaeism in Qočo was still in existence but had been surpassed by Buddhism.

Not only did Buddhism surpass Manichaeism. Archaeological research in the Turfan region has documented that from the end of the tenth until the beginning of the eleventh century at many occasions and in many places Manichaeian places of worship were transformed into Buddhist places of worship. Let us start with an example for which we have the exact date. Two wooden piles with Uighur inscriptions were found in Ruin α of and the first of these is of great historical significance. It was rammed into the ground of the building when a Buddhist sanctuary was set up in its precincts. This happened, as the pile tells us, under the reign of the Uighur khagan Kōl Bilgā, the "Ocean of Wisdom". This is followed by precise data in regard to the period of his reign, the Chinese cycle of symbolical animals and the moon stations. T. Moriyasu has identified this Uighur khagan as the ruler whom the Song dynasty annals call Zhi Hai 智海 and who in the years 1017, 1020 and 1024 sent envoys to the Chinese court.³ According to these data T. Moriyasu and J. Hamilton defined October 25, 1008 as the date when the pile was set up and in line with its apotropaic function when temple α was consecrated as a Buddhist sanctuary.⁴

However, Ruin α has a history that precedes this event. Such a large amount of Manichaeian fragments were found here that it must have been a centre of the Manichaeian congregation. In α , among the fragments of frescoes there have also been recovered two pieces with the bearded heads of Manichaeian *electi* which help to strengthen this impression. However the only possible meaning of this is that α was a Manichaeian sanctuary before the eleventh century and not during or after this century.⁵

Other hints at the transformation of Manichaeian into Buddhist sanctuaries must be seen as close to the event just described. Ruin k is Qočo's only undoubtedly Manichaeian sanctuary. In its remains were found the mummified bodies of slain Buddhist monks in orange coloured robes. This is the way Le Coq's describes his discovery. They must have been the last to reside in the monastery.⁶

It is not a new insight that there is at least one cave with a Manichaeian fresco in the complex of temple caves in Bāzāklik. This is the so-called tree with three trunks.⁷ However, T. Moriyasu's comprehensive description is new, as put forth in his major work cited in note 41. He shows that caves 17, 22 as well as others were Manichaeian sanctuaries that had become Buddhist. They are decorated with Buddhist frescoes. These pictures are on a man-made wall that was put in front of the natural rock on which there are frescoes that can be interpreted as Manichaeian. In cave 2 Sogdian Manichaeian letters were discovered which have

¹ *Ibid.*, 308.

² Cf. *ibid.*, 308, n. 5.

³ Cf. Sundermann, *op.cit.* (note 12), 287.

⁴ Moriyasu's work *A Study on the History of Uigur Manichaeism: Research on some Manichaeian Materials and their Historical Background* (Osaka 1991) was first published in Japanese. A German translation is in preparation [*Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße: Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund* (Wiesbaden 2004); Ed.]. See also J. Hamilton, *Manuscripts ouïgours du IX^e - X^e siècle de Touen-houang*, I (Paris 1986), xvii-xviii.

⁵ W. Sundermann, *op.cit.* (note 12), 286-87.

⁶ A. von Le Coq, *Auf Hellas Spuren in Ost-Turkistan* (Leipzig 1926), 47-48.

⁷ Cf. W. Sundermann, "Verehrten die Manichäer einen dreistämmigen Baum?", in *Iran-zamin. Echo der iranischen Kultur*, XII. Jg., Ausgabe N. F. 6/7 (1999/2000), 211-216.

now been published in Y. Yoshida's edition.¹ Moriyasu is convinced that in future years there will be more discoveries of transformed Manichaean sanctuaries.

The Uighur text of fragment M 112 also documents the replacement of Manichaean by Buddhist sanctuaries. This passage is hard to read and quite damaged. It mentions that the buildings of Manichaean monasteries (*mānistān*) were destroyed and deprived of their ornaments and supplanted by Buddhist monasteries (*vihāra*).² M 112 has a date provided in Chinese cyclical characters which according to Moriyasu probably point to the year 983.

It is not too daring to interpret these replacements of Manichaean by Buddhist sanctuaries as the process of an ongoing removal of Manichaeism. We do not know how this process developed. However, there is no reason to suppose that it was violent and accompanied by persecutions, rather the opposite. We must assume that at least at the beginning of the eleventh century a viable and active Manichaean congregation continued to exist in Qočo. We must even assume that it enjoyed the favour of Kōl Bilgä, this is the Uighur ruler during whose reign Ruin α was transformed into a Buddhist sanctuary. We know this for certain since the Manichaean Turfan fragment M 43 is a panegyric hymn in praise of Kōl Bilgä, this is of the same Uighur ruler who established a Buddhist sanctuary in the place of an older Manichaean one. The hymn is in Middle Persian and written in decorative Manichaean calligraphy. It is free from all signs of linguistic or calligraphic decadence. Therefore, we may assume that during the times of Kōl Bilgä the production of Manichaean texts had its last peak and also that most manuscripts that are available today are from the eleventh century, even if their texts go back to the third century.

The decline of Manichaean congregations in Central Asia began afterwards. Since no violent cause can be detected we must of course raise the question of how this decline came about. In the book just quoted T. Moriyasu arrives at an answer. The disappearance of Manichaeism in the Uighur steppe empire in 840 is the result of the downfall of the Uighur empire. The disappearance of Manichaeism in the Uighur empire of Qočo can be explained by the fact that here Manichaean Uighurs came to rule over a people that consisted of Chinese, Tocharians and Sogdians. Traditionally, Tocharians and Chinese were Buddhist. From the ninth century they became Turkic in regard to their language use. They remained however Buddhist and therefore the Uighurs in Turfan and neighbouring regions became overwhelmingly Buddhist. The Manichaeans fell back to being a minority even within their own state just as was the case in other parts of the world.

T. Moriyasu sees an additional reason for this development in the moral decay of the Manichaean church of Qočo. As he puts it in piece of work that has not yet been published: "I assume that the Uighur Manichaean church was little by little corrupted and became neglectful, and finally lost its religious vitality." I am of the opinion that these considerations can be taken even further. They imply nothing less than the new sedentism of Manichaean clerics. They resided in the capital and perhaps in Bāzäklik as a privileged monastic community. However, the style of life of a triumphant church is the opposite of the itinerant style of a church in struggle. The *Compendium of the Doctrine of Mani* advises clerics to march through the world from one congregation to the next and also to stay among the infidels, with one meal per day and one gown per year. This was the lifestyle of the Manichaean sect that relied on its own resources and held out in a world where it was at best tolerated. In the Roman Empire the Manichaean congregation gained its strength from this lifestyle even after the victory of Christianity. The decay of long distance trade and the breakdown of the united empire made it difficult if not impossible to continue with the

¹ [Y. Yoshida,] *Studies in the new Manichaean texts recovered from Turfan*, by Turfan Antiquarian Bureau, 2000.

² Geng Shimin & H.-J. Klimkeit, "Zerstörung manichäischer Klöster in Turfan", *Zentral-asiatische Studien* 18 (1985), 7-11.

itinerant style of life and thereby brought to a halt the Manichaeans' free missionary activity. What remained were minorities in a hostile environment who in the long run were unable to resist the pressure to conform to the majority. P. Brown has pointed that out. He sees the transformation of long distance merchants to landowners that took place in the fifth century in the Latin West as the social cause for the downfall of Manichaeism.¹

It is certain that at least at the beginning the Uighur rulers over Qočo were in person Manichaeans. We do not know whether they remained so and for how long. It seems however that they tolerated with benevolence at least their country's Manichaeism and Buddhism. Thereby they contributed to an atmosphere of religious tolerance that helped to promote the cultural peak along the Silk Road to an extent that was rarely encountered in other parts of the world. As a result of this coexistence of religions Buddhism succeeded to the inheritance of Uighur Manichaeism and became the state religion of Qočo until the fourteenth century. At this point in time Islam brought an end to the religious diversity of the cultures along the Silk Road.

These considerations, convincing as they might be, do not explain why Manichaeism did not hold out as a minority religion, as did Christianity or Judaism. They explain even less why it was the destiny of Manichaeism to lose its missionary drive in all the regions it had spread to and to wither away.

¹ "The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire", *Journal of Roman Studies* 59 (1969), 92-103.