

THE COMPENDIUM OF THE DOCTRINES AND  
STYLES OF THE TEACHING OF MANI,  
THE BUDDHA OF LIGHT

by †G. HALOUN and W. B. HENNING

The discovery, among the treasures secured by Sir Aurel Stein at Tunhuang, of a Manichaean fragment (MS. Stein 3969) constituting the beginning of the *Fragment Pelliot*<sup>1</sup> was announced by the late P. Pelliot in 1925;<sup>2</sup> he then promised the publication of a translation and commentary "in an early number of the *Journal Asiatique*". A few years later, Pelliot discussed a point which arose out of his occupation with that interesting document,<sup>3</sup> but otherwise he did not refer to it in his writings.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile K. Yabuki, who had taken a leading part in the identification of the Chinese Manichaean manuscripts as such, published a full-length facsimile of the fragment;<sup>5</sup> and, soon after, its text was printed in the *Tuishō Tripitaka*.<sup>6</sup> Dr. L. Giles described it briefly in his *Six Centuries at Tunhuang*.<sup>7</sup>

Although the Chinese document was *publici juris* ever since 1930, it remained virtually inaccessible to almost all of those who were interested in its contents. When the hope gradually receded that Pelliot would return to the study of Chinese Manichaeism, to whose exploration he had rendered such signal service, efforts to secure a translation from another hand seemed, in view of the manifest importance of the document, called for and justifiable. In the course of the last war I made the acquaintance of Mr. Tsui Chi,

<sup>1</sup> Published by É. Chavannes and P. Pelliot, *Un traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine*, 129-140 (=J.A., 1913, 1, 105-16).

<sup>2</sup> *JRAS*, 1925, 113.

<sup>3</sup> *T'oung Pao*, xxvi (1929), 248-50 (on the five grades of the Manichaean hierarchy). Cf. Waldschmidt-Lentz, *Manich. Dogmatik*, 519 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Except in passing in a review of the work named in the next annotation, *T'P.*, xxviii (1931), 237 [See Addenda].

<sup>5</sup> Yabuki Keiki, *Meisha yoin. Rare and unknown Chinese manuscript remains of Buddhist literature discovered in Tun-huang collected by Sir Aurel Stein and preserved in the British Museum*. Tōkyō, 1930. Plate 104 ii; text pt. 1, pp. 314-16. Yabuki refers to a paper by M. Ishida (see below Note 61), in which some of the Iranian words occurring in the document, such as *frēstag-rōšan* and *Fu-to-tan*, are discussed. Dr. E. G. Pulleyblank, who also in other ways very kindly helped me with the preparation of this article, secured a copy of Mr. Ishida's paper (which Haloun had been unable to obtain) and interpreted its contents for my benefit.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. 54, 1279-81 (=No. 2141a).

<sup>7</sup> 1944, p. 16.

摩尼光佛經法儀略一表

開元十九年六月八日大德律多譯奉

詔集賢院譯

訖化國主名弓宗教第一

佛成莫德鳥虛說者。詳云光明使者又号  
具智法王亦謂摩尼光佛即我光明大慈无上  
賢王應化法身之異号也當欲出世二曜降  
靈分无三體大慈愍故應設慶單親愛明  
尊清淨教命然後化誕故云光明使者有矣  
洞慧堅凝克禪故曰具智法王虛應靈聖  
覺觀究竟故号摩尼光佛光明所以徼內  
外大慈所以拯人天无上下以位西尋登王  
所以布法兼則老君託孕太陽流其晶輝也  
受胎日輪叶其為寶靈本本三聖亦何殊哉  
住存存一貫皆悟道按彼波斯婆毗長曆自  
開闢初有十二辰掌分年代至第十一辰名  
訥管代二百廿七年輝迦出現至第十二辰  
名魔謝管代五百廿七年摩尼光佛誕蘇藩  
國改帝王宮金薩健種夫人滿艷之所生也  
婆毗長曆當漢啟帝建安十三年二月八日  
而生泯然懸合矣至若寶童天符而受胎  
齋戒嚴潔而懷孕者奉清淨也自曾前化誕  
事世休倫神驗九徵靈瑞五應者生非凡也又

以三願四辯五真八種法要來德圓備其可  
 持言自二及人拔苦與樂謝德而論美若不  
 然者曷有身証王宮神樂直其明宗真不智  
 識持正體質然考量色觀坤識洞日月開兩  
 元大義示自性各殊演三際添文辭因緣无  
 合誅邪祐正歌濁揚清其詞簡其理直其行  
 正其法真六十年內開示方便感四聖以為  
 威力怖七部以作舟航應三宮而建三尊法  
 五明加列五級妙門殊持福祿存三也按  
 摩訶摩耶經云佛滅度後一千三百年袈裟  
 變白不受染色觀佛三昧海經云摩尼光佛  
 出世時常施光明以作佛事老子化胡經云  
 我乘自然光明道氣飛入西郡王界敬隣  
 國中示為太子舍家入道号曰摩尼轉大法輪  
 說經戒律定慧等法乃至三際及三宗門上  
 從明界下及幽陰所有眾生皆由此度摩尼  
 之後年乘五九純法音盛者五九四十五四  
 百五十年教合傳於中國至晉太始三年正  
 月四日乃息化身還歸真寂教流諸國接化  
 蒼生從晉太始至今開十九歲計四百六十  
 年證記合同聖跡照著教闡明宗用除暗

教法開西性分別為門故擇經云若人捨分  
 別是則滅諸法如有修行人不應共其住又  
 云鳥歸虛空獸歸林藪義歸分別道歸涅  
 槃不數宗本將何歸趣行門真實果證三宮  
 注釋無明名為一相今此教中是稱解脫略  
 敘微分以表進修竟本顯具此未繁載

形相儀第二

摩尼光佛頂圓十二光玉膝相體備大明慈  
 曼秘義妙形特絕人天蓋此中以素放微四  
 津法身其居白座像五金剛地二界合報初  
 後百趣宛在真容觀之可曉諸有靈相百年  
 眩妙究難備陳

經圖儀第三

凡七部并圖一

- |         |           |
|---------|-----------|
| 第一大應輪部  | 譯云律法根源經   |
| 第二尋提質部  | 譯云淨命寶藏經   |
| 第三泥若部   | 譯云律藏經亦稱律藏 |
| 第四阿羅漢部  | 譯云秘密法藏經   |
| 第五摩訶摩耶部 | 譯云證明過去教經  |
| 第六俱胝部   | 譯云大力坐經    |
| 第七阿佛流部  | 譯云讚頌經     |

who devoted much attention to the history of the foreign religions in China. He allowed himself to be persuaded to undertake a translation of the *Hymn-scroll*, a task fraught with difficulties; his publication of this translation<sup>1</sup> has placed all students of Manichaeism under a great debt. Later I requested Mr. Tsui to help me once more and translate also the Chinese document; with his customary amiability he responded quickly and made a draft translation, which was of great usefulness to me in my work. Unfortunately it became impossible for him to continue his labours and complete the task; for, soon after, an insidious and merciless illness claimed him, which led to his early death.

The longer I studied Mr. Tsui's draft translation, the more did I become convinced that, in order to elucidate the numerous obscurities of the document, it was imperative to gain the help of a senior Sinologist. Accordingly I turned to G. Haloun and, after much persuasion, overcame his natural reluctance to engage in a task that seemed neither inviting nor agreeable; although he never indicated it, I am certain that, when in the end he yielded, he merely followed the dictates of friendship. We soon decided that it was best to begin *ab ovo* and prepare an entirely fresh translation; and to that end, we met fairly regularly one afternoon a week for a whole year and went very slowly over the text, character by character. Towards the end of 1945 a new translation was accomplished, and, during the Christmas holidays of that year, Haloun himself wrote out a final manuscript, comprising the translation and the notes pertaining to it. All that remained to be done was to add an introduction; and to put final touches to two appendices, which fell to my part: had not one of us been compelled to go abroad at that moment, the work would have been published then and there, as indeed had been our intention.

A few weeks earlier we had received the grievous news of Pelliot's death, which seemed to remove for ever the hope that we should read a translation of the document by his master-hand. However, towards the middle of 1946 it was announced that a translation—a fragmentary one, as unhappily it turned out later—had been found among Pelliot's papers; and that the committee concerned with the editing of Pelliot's posthumous works intended to make it public;<sup>2</sup> three distinguished scholars, MM. É. Benveniste, P. Demiéville, and H.-Ch. Puech, were, it was understood, engaged upon supplementing the work in order to make it ready for printing. In these circumstances, Haloun and I at once resolved to withhold our monograph, in spite of the advanced stage which by then it had reached; for we thought that Pelliot's work should have precedence over ours and wished

<sup>1</sup> *BSOAS*, xi (1943), 174-219.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the pamphlet *Paul Pelliot. Publié par la Société Asiatique*, 1946, p. 35 and n. 51, p. 49.

大門荷英園一 詳五大三宗圖  
右七部大經及圖摩尼光律當欲降代  
衆聖贊助出應有緣置法之日傳受其級  
其餘六十年間宣說正法諸弟子等隨  
事記錄此不載列

五級條第四

第十二恭 閱 譯云承法教道者  
第三十二茂波塞 譯云持法者亦非多  
第三百字歌來奉德 譯云法堂主  
第四阿羅 緩 譯云一切純善人  
第五稱沙 啞 譯云一切淨信者

右阿羅緩已上並素冠珠雜稱沙品一  
位聽仍着服如是五位宗受相依成嚴教  
命堅持禁戒名解脫路者恭閱私式即  
不得求其教命假使精通七部才拜卓  
然若有德達五位不攝如樹滋茂皆因其  
根根若德者樹必乾枯阿羅緩犯式視  
之如死哀白衆知違命出法海雖至廣不

MS. Stein 3969. Fourth Part

to avoid any step that might impede or delay its publication. When our French colleagues became aware of the situation, they refused to accept our sacrifice; the correspondence on the matter was chiefly between M. H.-Ch. Puech and myself. *Nous ne pouvons accepter*, M. Puech wrote,<sup>1</sup> *de vous priver du fruit d'un travail dont nous savons la longueur et les difficultés, et, toute réflexion faite, il nous semble que nos deux publications peuvent aller de pair, sans qu'il y ait à renoncer à l'une ou à l'autre.* And again,<sup>2</sup> *au contraire, nous vous encourageons de tout cœur à faire paraître au plus tôt le résultat de vos recherches; deux publications ne seront pas de trop pour un document aussi difficile et aussi riche que le Catéchisme de la grotte de Touen-houang!* However much we admired the generosity of these sentiments, we nevertheless thought it better to withdraw from the scene for the time being.

The sudden death of my eminent friend has compelled me to revise my attitude. To allow his work, upon which he had lavished so much care and energy, to become lost would have been irresponsible; and, even now, Pelliot's translation has not been made accessible.<sup>3</sup> It seems, therefore, proper to publish our translation now; and it is published here unchanged, in the form given to it by Haloun in 1945.<sup>4</sup> It is scarcely necessary to state that the translation and the notes attached to it are almost entirely the work of Haloun; my contribution is confined to the explanation of purely Manichaean matters and of the foreign words in the text. The two appendices<sup>5</sup> have been re-written now; in order to bring them up to date, it proved necessary to make several additions<sup>6</sup> to the draft as it existed in 1945. That it has not been given to Haloun to go once more over his part of the work, which is the greater part of the whole, will be a cause of lasting regret; but I feel certain that it will stand.

Originally it was our intention to write an introduction, which was to contain remarks on the origin of the document, its history, and the date of

<sup>1</sup> In a letter dated October 9, 1946.

<sup>2</sup> In the same letter.

<sup>3</sup> A paper on the Chinese document was, however, read by M. Puech to the 21st Congress of Orientalists, in Paris, on July 28, 1948; see H.-Ch. Puech, *Un catéchisme manichéen chinois inédit, Actes du xxi<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Paris 1950. The same scholar has made considerable use of the document in his book *Le Manichéisme (Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de Diffusion, tome lvi)*, Paris 1950, see especially pp. 28, 62, and notes 88, 109, 110, 142, 210, 217, 241, 249, 262 [See Addenda].

<sup>4</sup> In fact, the manuscript sent to the printers is that written by Haloun himself. I am eminently grateful to Mrs. G. Haloun for generously putting at my disposal all relevant documents from among Haloun's papers.

<sup>5</sup> Only these two had originally been agreed upon. Further appendices might have been useful, but I have refrained from adding them now. For example, on the description of Mani's person (2nd Article), which in fact is a description of a picture of Mani; on the Manichaean symbolism, which obscures so many passages; on the exceptionally strictly worded rules of discipline in the 4th Article (see *BBB*, 13, 49 sq., 51; cf. *Keph.*, 232 sq. and Puech, *Le Manichéisme*, n. 369).

<sup>6</sup> The principal point now added is a new date for the death of Mani.

the surviving copy. Such remarks are now scattered throughout the Notes; it would have been possible to extract them and put them together, but I preferred to leave the Notes untouched, at the risk of causing some slight inconvenience to the reader. However, some reference is appropriate here to the use made of the document in later times. In a letter<sup>1</sup> Haloun wrote, "I have discovered in the meantime that either our compendium or some close derivative has been extensively quoted in the 閩書 of 何喬遠 and shall have to study the variants; and I should like to add in an appendix two or three T'ang texts mentioning Manichaeism and up till now unpublished". About the latter I have unfortunately no information; the former, the passage in the *Min-shu*, was published (together with an extract from it in another work of the same author) by Pelliot in his article *Les traditions manichéennes au Fou-kien*, *T'P.*, xxii (1923), 193-208. The following are the principal points which the author of the *Min-shu* has derived from our document, probably indirectly; (a) the name of Mani's country of origin, *Su-lin*; (b) his father's name, *Pa-ti* (spelt 拔帝 against 跋 in our document); (c) *Pa-ti* was a king; (d) Mani's birth took place through his mother's chest<sup>2</sup> (the *Min-shu* has further a story about miraculous conception);<sup>3</sup> (e) the connection with Lao-tzū and the reference to the *Hua-hu ching*; (f) the (converted) year dates of Mani's birth and death; (g) the Manichaeans possessed seven scriptures. The *Min-shu* has additional information, some of it of great value (especially the passages on the history of Manichaeism in China).

Anyone who has ever been concerned with the editing of a posthumous work will know of the hesitation that overcomes one from time to time and most of all when the moment of publication arrives; for one may do harm to one to whom one tries to do a service: τίς γάρ οἴσεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ? Yet I believe that Haloun's spirit would be pleased to be included among those who today offer a tribute to his distinguished predecessor in office.

W. B. H.

<sup>1</sup> Addressed to Mr. Tsui, dated January 14, 1946.

<sup>2</sup> Even the author of the *Min-shu* noticed (pp. 201-2) that the miraculous birth of Buddha had served as the model. This tale, doubtless a Central Asiatic accretion, was entirely alien to the original Manichaeism. Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai*, p. 91 ed. Beeson, confused Buddha and Mani: *dicens . . . se . . . vocari iam non Terebinthum, sed Buddam nomine sibi que hoc nomen inpositum; ex quadam autem virgine natum se esse simulavit . . .* Alfarc, *Écrit. Manich.*, ii, p. 4, n. 9, adduced St. Jerome, *Adv. Jovin.*, i, 41, but his passage certainly referred to Buddha (. . . *Buddam . . . e latere suo virgo generavit*); de Beausobre rightly insisted on it long ago (*Hist. Crit.*, i, 56 sq.).

<sup>3</sup> A Central Asiatic or even Chinese additament, which would have horrified Mani. It is probably implied in our document ("keeping the rules of abstinence and strictly purifying herself she became pregnant"), which, purposely I think, avoids the word "father" when mentioning *Pati*.

THE COMPENDIUM OF THE DOCTRINES AND STYLES OF  
THE TEACHING OF MANI, THE BUDDHA OF LIGHT

One Scroll

The Most Virtuous (*bhadanta*) Fu-to-tan<sup>1</sup> having, on the 8th day of the 6th month of the 19th year of the period K'ai-yüan (July 16, 731), received the instruction of the Emperor,<sup>2</sup> (it was) translated at the College of (the Hall) of Gathered Worthies.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Pf'ir-tā-dān* = (*A*)*jtā-dān* = episcopus, v.p. 195 (cf. Henning, *ZDMG.*, 90, 13; *BBB.*, 119). The title has undoubtedly been sometimes mistaken for a proper name, thus in the report about the arrival of the "Persian Fu To-tan" 波斯國人佛多誕 in 694, v. Chavannes-Pelliot, *Traité manichéen*, pp. 174-75 (the gloss makes him a Byzantine 大秦國人, evidently deriving the pseudo-gentilitial name Fu 拂 from Fu-lin 拂菻, Rome). [The name of the *fu-to-tan* of A.D. 694 is given in the *Min-shu*, as \*Mihr-Ormizd, see Pelliot, *T'P.*, xxii, 203.]

<sup>2</sup> 詔 is raised respectfully to a second line in the MS. It was impossible to collate the original scroll owing to war conditions, but a photograph was kindly put at the disposal of Mr. Tsui by Mr. Wang Chung-min. Deviations from the text reprinted in the *Taishō issaikyō*, vol. 54, pp. 1279-81, will be given in notes; orthographical and paleographic features will be recorded only if of special interest.

<sup>3</sup> An academic board under the T'ang dynasty, composed of high dignitaries and presided over by the respective prime ministers, which was charged *i.a.* with the collection and edition of lost and rare texts. Their activities, as far as our treatise is concerned, can have amounted hardly to more than a polishing-up of the style to the beautiful ornate prose of the first and second articles, while a first rough and much inferior translation was left as it was for the remainder. The transcriptions (such as 訥 *dōl*, 泥萬 *dēwān*) suggest that the author of this was a speaker of the "northwestern dialect" (for its transliteration the system evolved by Luo Changpeir 羅常培, *The Northwestern Dialects of T'ang and Five Dynasties 唐五代西北方音*, Shanghai, 1933, Tables pp. 163-68, has, for the sake of convenience, on the whole been adopted); such a man—an official interpreter perhaps—would have obviously commended himself to the bishop as collaborator. The editorial work of the board will also account for the shortening of the original text in the translation from the second article onward. We are not told when they finished their task and the composition was submitted to the emperor, but one feels tempted to assume that the edict of September 8, 732 (*Traité*, pp. 178-79, 345) was the result of his perusal of it. It prohibits Manichaeism to the Chinese, though allowing its practice to resident Central Asiatic adherents of the creed; the reproach that it wrongly poses as a Buddhist sect seems amply justified and, indeed, provoked by our text and especially its Chinese translation, which uses Buddhist terminology throughout. The bishop seems to have been conversant with some, at least, of the translations of Chinese Buddhist sūtras into Sogdian, v. n. 36.

*First article*: On (His) incarnation<sup>4</sup> and native country, (His) names and titles,<sup>5</sup> and (His) peculiar tenets.<sup>6</sup>

*Fo-i-sē-tē wu-lu-shēn*<sup>7</sup> [original gloss: this is transliterated from the author's native speech], in translation the Apostle<sup>8</sup> of Light,<sup>9</sup> is also called the King of Law (*dharmarāja*) of perfect wisdom, and again Mani, the Buddha of Light.<sup>10</sup> These are different designations of the *nirmānadharmakāya* of our insurpassable,<sup>11</sup> bright, and all-wise Healing King. At the time when He was about<sup>12</sup> to be born, the two radiant-ones having sent down spiritual power to lighten each part of the *trikāya*, He, because of His great compassion<sup>13</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Viz.*, by conception (not birth). Cp. Hsieh Ch'eng 謝承, *Hou Han shu* 後漢書, fragm. ed. Wang Wên-t'ai 汪文臺, (*in Ch'i-chia Hou Han shu* 1882) 8, 14b-15a: "On the 15th day of the 7th month of the year kuei-ch'ou (668 B.C.) Buddha became incarnate in the womb of Māyā, wife of the ruler \*Suddhodana, and he was born on the 8th day of the 4th month of the (following) year chia-yin, the 10th of king \*Hui of Chou" 佛以癸丑七月十五日托生於淨住國 (read 飯) 摩耶夫人腹中至周莊 (read 惠) 王十年甲寅四月八日始生。

<sup>5</sup> 号 for 號 everywhere in the MS is a short form rather than a T'ang taboo avoiding 虎.

<sup>6</sup> The title does not agree with the contents of the article as they are at present, v. notes 20, 34 (end) and 50.

<sup>7</sup> *Bud'i-šē-tōg 'a-lo-šien* = MPers. *frēstag-rōšun* or Parthian *frēstag-rōšan*.

<sup>8</sup> Literally: "delegate, envoy".

<sup>9</sup> 明 is consistently written 明 in the MS, not an erroneous form (Aurousseau, *BEFEO*, xii, 9, p. 61, n. 1), but the ancient graph developed from seal 明, v. the variant readings already in e.g. the Ch'in Shih-huang-ti edict on weights and measures, Jung K'eng 容庚, *Ch'in chin-wen lu 秦金文錄*, (1), 16a, 23a.

<sup>10</sup> A deliberate reinterpretation of the Buddhist Mañiprabhābuddha, v. p. 192.

<sup>11</sup> The MS. uses 无 in the first paragraph, changing over to 無 afterwards.

<sup>12</sup> 欲 "to set about, be on the point of" (= 將), v. P'ei Hsüeh-hai 裴學海, *Ku-shu hsi-tzu chi-shih 古書虛字集釋*, p. 63.

<sup>13</sup> 慈 keeps here the T'ang taboo form 慈, but 混 is written below. As a rule, all the taboo writings have been restored to standard again in our MS. (for the few exceptional cases v. n. 62 and 66, and cf. n. 5 and 30). Chavannes-Pelliot (*Traité*, pp. 7 [503] and 129 [105], n. 1) and again Dr. Giles (*Six Centuries at Tunhuang*, p. 16) have dated the scroll as probably eighth-century work on the evidence of paper and handwriting (and perhaps they were also influenced by the scribble in runic Turkish on the Paris fragment). The handling of the taboos seems definitely to suggest that the copy was executed not earlier than the first half of the tenth century. It thus was slightly older than the Peiping fragment (probably second half of the tenth century: *Traité*, pp. 7-8 [503-4] and Aurousseau, *loc. cit.*, p. 62) and, perhaps, just a little later than the London hymn-book (early ninth century?, Waldschmidt-Lentz, *Stellung Jesu*, pp. 8-9). The presence of a Chinese Manichaean community in the Tun-huang area at this time, which certainly may be inferred from its literature, is easily explained by the Uighur Khanate of Kan-chou (from c. 845), which may be supposed to have given shelter and protection to its co-religionists at the very moment when the persecution of 843 had destroyed their freedom in the Empire proper. Direct evidence for the existence of Manichaeans in Kan-su is provided by the report on the embassy of 951, see Chavannes-Pelliot, *Traité*, 267-8 [305-6], 278 [316]; v. also Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 88; and Hudūd *at-'Atan*, tr. Minorsky, §9, 13, 15, p. 85 (the inhabitants of Kua-chou and Sha-chou profess the faith of Mani).

opposing<sup>13</sup> the demonic forces and personally receiving the pure instructions from the Venerable Lord of Light, became incarnate and is therefore called the Apostle of Light. Being most sincere, profoundly intelligent, devoted and firm,<sup>14</sup> and strong in argument, He is called the King of Law of Perfect Wisdom. Through emptiness responding to spirituality and holiness, through *bodhi* beholding the Ultimate (*uttara*),<sup>15</sup> He is called Mani, the Buddha of Light. Brightness is that by which He penetrates the inside and outside, all-wisdom is that by which He comprehends men and gods, insurpassibility is that by which His place is high and venerable, and being Healing<sup>16</sup> King is that by which He distributes the remedy of law. Thus also, when Lord Lao<sup>16</sup> was conceived, the Great Luminary<sup>17</sup> poured out its brilliance; when Śākya was conceived, the sun-disc harmonized its manifestations:<sup>18</sup> how should, on the basis of (their) inborn spiritualness, the Three Saints<sup>19</sup> be different? since, by the maintenance of (their) perfected Nature, they all apprehended the truth.

According<sup>20</sup> to their *po-ssü p'o(\*sa?)-p'i* calendar,<sup>21</sup> there are since the beginning of the world different eras controlled by the constellations. In the 227th year of the era controlled by the 11th constellation called *no*,<sup>22</sup> Śākya was born into this world.<sup>23</sup> In the 527th year of the era controlled by the 12th constellation called *mo-hsieh*,<sup>24</sup> Mani, the Buddha of Light, was born in the country of Su-lin at the royal<sup>25</sup> palace of Pa-ti by his wife Man-yen of the house Chin-sa-chien.<sup>26</sup> The (date of) birth (as recorded) in the *p'o(sa?)-p'i* calendar is equivalent to the 8th day of the 2nd month of the

<sup>13</sup> 敵 written 敵 in the MS.

<sup>14</sup> 疑 stands in the place of 凝.

<sup>15</sup> 鑿 in the MS.

<sup>16</sup> *I.e.* Lao-tzū as Taoist deity.

<sup>17</sup> The sun.

<sup>18</sup> 象 is written 象, *cf.* BEFEO, xii, 9, p. 62.

<sup>19</sup> *Viz.* Lao-tzū, Buddha and Mani.

<sup>20</sup> This paragraph and the following are introduced by 按 "item". It is obvious that the sequence of the two is reversed in comparison with the order observed in the heading of the article.

<sup>21</sup> See appendix I, §1.

<sup>22</sup> *Nda'* = *döl*, v. appendix §1.

<sup>23</sup> The date corresponds to 1085/84 B.C. and has been computed from the birth-date of Mani and the alleged testimony about him in the *Mahāmāyāsūtra* quoted below (v. p. 192), although there the period of 1300 years is counted from Buddha's nirvāṇa (further placed 600 years before Aśvaghōṣa and 700 before Nāgārjuna).

<sup>24</sup> *Mbwa-sia* = *māsyā(g)*, v. appendix §1.

<sup>25</sup> Or "noble, fair" (literally: "jewel") if 王 = 玉, v. *Traité*, p. 297 [335], n. 2 and note 42 below.

<sup>26</sup> Sūristān (Babylonia), Patī(g), Maryam, Kamsar(a)gān, v. Henning, *BSOAS*, xi, p. 52, n. 4.

13th year of the period Chien-an of emperor Hsien of the (Later) Han dynasty (March 12, 208),<sup>27</sup> (the two systems of time-reckoning) wholly(?) corresponding.<sup>28</sup> That,<sup>29</sup> the natural endowments and the heavenly omina (being appropriate), (His mother) conceived; and that, keeping the rules of abstinence and strictly purifying (herself, she) became pregnant; (that) was because of His own pureness. That, having entered existence from (His mother's) chest, He surpassed His age and excelled everyone; and that He evidenced the spiritual verifications ninefold and answered to the supernatural auspices five-fold; (that) was because His birth was beyond the ordinary. The virtues of the three resolves, the four calmnesses,<sup>30</sup> five truths, and eight forms of fearlessness all perfectly provided (in Him), those (qualities) which can (at all) be told may be discussed by gods and men for rising above grief as well as joy and for inducing<sup>31</sup> virtuous ways. Were it not so, why should He have been bodily born in the royal<sup>32</sup> palace: accomplished in spirit and understanding the Way, perceiving the Principles and realizing the Roots, wise in counsel and extraordinarily straight, in His bodily condition singularly refined, in His reasoning embracing heaven and earth, having thorough knowledge of sun and moon; when explaining the two primeval (causes) perfectly just, when proclaiming the Self-Nature (*prakṛti=grīw*) defining everything, when expounding the Three Epochs profoundly scholarly, when arguing the primary and secondary causes (*hetupratyaya*) fully conclusive; exterminating the false<sup>33</sup> and protecting the right, removing the impure and exalting the pure; in His words simple, in His mind straight, in His conduct correct, in His testimonies true. For sixty years teaching the means of expediency (*upāya*), He imbued the four Sanctities<sup>33a</sup> with power of authority and mounted the seven sections (of the Scriptures) as sailing-vessels; in response to the Three Palaces He established the three venerable

<sup>27</sup> The computation is wrong, v. appendix I, §2.

<sup>28</sup> For 懸合 "united from the distant", *cf.* *Wên-hsin tiao-lung* 文心彫龍 7 (53), 8a: "Heaven and earth act smoothly as, in revolving, they yet support each other. Days and months come and pass as, going by intervals, they yet correspond" 乾坤易簡則宛轉相承日月往來則隔行懸合. 混 (潘) "obscure, chaotic, vast"; for the meaning "whole", proposed tentatively, *cf.* the cognate 渾. Compared with the elaborate prose of the first paragraph, this particular sentence reads surprisingly clumsily.

<sup>29</sup> The new subject is introduced by 至若 "now as".

<sup>30</sup> In spite of Chang Wei-hsiang 張惟驥, *Li-tai hui-tzū p'u* 歷代諱字譜 1, 44b and a.2, 47b, it is by no means certain that 冑 (as written also in the MS.) had replaced 寂 only as taboo form under Tai-tsong (763-79).

<sup>31</sup> The MS. reads correctly 誦 (not 諷).

<sup>32</sup> *Cf.* n. 25.

<sup>33</sup> Read 邪 for 耶.

<sup>33a</sup> [Possibly refers to the Four Gospels, *cf.* the passages discussed in *Mir. Man.*, iii, 88o, n. 5.]

(monastical officers) and taking for a model the Five Lights He arranged the five grades (of believers). The wonderful door (of His teaching) possessing exceptional character, (its) blessings extend to life and death.

The *Mahāmāyāsūtra*<sup>34</sup> says: "1300 years after the Buddha's nirvāṇa, the *kaṣāya*<sup>35</sup> will be changed into a white one and will be no (longer) dyed". The *Kuan-fo san-mei-hai ching* (Buddhāvālokanasamādhisāgarasūtra?)<sup>36</sup> says: "When the Mani (properly: 'pearl'-) lustre Buddhas<sup>37</sup> have manifested<sup>38</sup> themselves in the world, they will make emission<sup>39</sup> of light the Buddha-work". The *Lao-tzū hua-hu ching*<sup>40</sup> says: "Having mounted a vapour of the Tao of spontaneous light, I<sup>41</sup> shall fly into the country of Su-lin in the realm of the king of Hsi-na.<sup>42</sup> I shall manifest myself as the crown prince, leave family-life and enter the Way, and be called Mani. I shall turn the wheel of the great Law and shall explain the canonical commandments and regulations and the practice of meditation and knowledge, etc.,<sup>43</sup> as well as the doctrines of the three epochs and the two principles. All the beings, from the realm of light down to the dark paths, will thereby be saved. Of years five (times) nine having passed after Mani, my Law shall flourish". (Now) five (times) nine is forty-five, (which really means) four

<sup>34</sup> Nanjio No. 382, translated by T'an-ching in the period 479-502. For the text v. *Taishō-issaikyō*, vol. 12, p. 1013 c; no Sogdian translation is known so far. The title of the article does not refer to this paragraph on testimonies; the original text may have been tampered with, cf. notes 40 and 50.

<sup>35</sup> The robe of the Buddhist monk.

<sup>36</sup> Nanjio No. 430, translated by Buddhahadra in the period 420-23. Text *Taishō-issaikyō*, vol. 15, p. 688 a. For the Sanskrit title v. F. Weller, *Monumenta Serica*, ii, p. 342. There was a Sogdian translation, for which a date *ante quem* is now provided, if the paragraph is genuine.

<sup>37</sup> In full \**Maniprabhatahāgatārhasamyaksambuddha 摩尼光多陀阿伽度阿羅呵三藐三佛陀*. Cf. also No. 465 in Weller, *Thousand Buddhanamen*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>38</sup> 現 has been added in the margin in the MS.

<sup>39</sup> Read 放 for 施 in agreement with the sūtra text.

<sup>40</sup> "Sūtra of Lao-tzū's conversion of the barbarians", for which v. *Traité*, pp. 140 [116] ff., with a translation of the passage quoted here (in a slightly abbreviated form). It is highly surprising to find it in a text dated as early as 731. If it is an interpolation, as seems probable, the foregoing citations from the *Mahāmāyā-* and the *Buddhāvālokanasamādhisāgara-sūtras* (which are not covered by a section-title, v. n. 34, but alluded to elsewhere in the text, v. n. 9 and 23) may have been glosses added to the last paragraph, which itself may have ended originally with the sentence below containing Mani's death-date.

<sup>41</sup> The speaker is Lao-tzū at the assembly of P'i-mo in 1028 B.C.

<sup>42</sup> 那 is written 挪 in the MS. The version is intermediate between the "jewel realm of Hsi-nu" 西那玉國界 of the Tun-huang *Hua-hu-ching* fragment (*Traité*, pp. 144-45 [120-21]) and (the realm of) "the king of the Western Sea" 西海王 of certain ancient quotations (*ibid.*, pp. 155 [131], 156 [132], n. 1).

<sup>43</sup> I.e. of the six pāramitās.

hundred and fifty years,<sup>44</sup> (when His) religious instruction<sup>45</sup> was to be transmitted to the Middle Kingdom. On the 4th day of the 1st month of the 2nd year of the period T'ai-shih of the Chin dynasty (February 25, 266)<sup>46</sup> (Mani) ceased the transforming work and in His person returned into true Calmness, the teaching (thereupon) spreading to all countries and approaching and converting(?)<sup>47</sup> the people. From (the date in) the period T'ai-shih of the Chin until to the present 19th year of the period K'ai-yüan<sup>48</sup> one counts four hundred and sixty<sup>49</sup> years. Evidence and prophecy being in concord, the traces of the Saint have become manifest.

The teaching<sup>50</sup> expounds the principle of light, thus removing the delusion of darkness; the doctrine explains the two Natures, taking discrimination (between them) for its particular method. Thus the Buddhist sūtras<sup>51</sup> say: "If a man forsake discrimination, he destroys every law. A truly pious man must not share his dwelling-place." And again: "(As) the birds<sup>52</sup> turn to the open air, (as) game (*mrga*) turns to forest and marsh, (so) truth turns to discrimination, (so) the enlightened<sup>53</sup> turns to nirvāṇa". (Unless one) ascertains the principles and roots, whereto can one turn and tend? (If) the method of conduct is true, the reward will be realized in the

<sup>44</sup> In the original context, "five times nine" will mean 45 as certainly as "three times eight" 三八 = 24 indicates the difference in time between Lao-tzū's sojourn in P'i-mo (v. n. 41) and his return to China under king Mu of Chou (1001-947 B.C.). When one adds the sixty years of Mani's life to forty-five and the "450 and some" years which elapsed between the avatār as "Lao-tzū, the teacher of Confucius" and the next avatār as Mani, the resulting total of 555 ("and some") gives the appearance of constituting a reference to the year A.D. 67, the legendary date of the introduction of Buddhism into China; for it exceeds the interval between Confucius' death-date (479 B.C.) and A.D. 67, viz. 545 years, by just ten years. If this assumption holds good, the Chinese Manichaeans would have anticipated a claim put forward equally by the K'ai-feng Jews, among others.

<sup>45</sup> Read 命 for 合.

<sup>46</sup> This computation is also wrong, v. appendix i, §2.

<sup>47</sup> 化 seems a slip for 比, considering the well-attested compound 接比 "make contact with".

<sup>48</sup> 元 has inadvertently been omitted by the scribe.

<sup>49</sup> Actually 465. The copyist, who had become careless in the last few lines, presumably simply left out 五. [Cf. below p. 199, n. 1.]

<sup>50</sup> We miss some introduction to the paragraph (at the least 按); also, the text of the opening sentence appears disarranged. The translation is given with reserve.

<sup>51</sup> Oda, *Bukkyō daijiten*, p. 1548b quotes the four *padās* cited here from Harivarman's *Ch'eng-shih lun (satyasiddhīśāstra?)* translated by Kumārajīva (text v. *Taishō-issaikyō*, vol. 32, p. 258 a) and from Kātyāyanīputra's [*Abhidharma*] *jñānaprasthāna [śāstra]* translated by Hsüan-tsang (text *Taishō-issaikyō*, vol. 26, p. 922 c); both these versions differ slightly from our citation.

<sup>52</sup> The MS. reads correctly 鳥 (for 鳥).

<sup>53</sup> 道 is elliptic for 道者; Kumārajīva has 真人, Hsüan-tsang 聖 (arhat).

Three Palaces; (when) the Nature will be separated from the Lightless, its name will be Homomorphic.<sup>64</sup> This, in this religion, is called deliverance. (Henceforth,<sup>65</sup> we) mention points of detail in a summary way (only), to the extent (needed) to demonstrate the approach to practice: the foreign original is rather full but (our) translation does not elaborate.

*Second article:* On the style of (His) bodily signs.

The nimbus of Mani, the Buddha of Light, being twelve-fold is the excellent sign of the King of Light<sup>66a</sup>. (His) body fully displaying the Great Light<sup>66b</sup> has the esoteric meaning of the Limitless. (His) wonderful appearance is outstanding, without equal among men and gods. (His) being clad<sup>67</sup> in a white robe symbolizes the four pure *dharmakāyas*.<sup>68</sup> His occupying the white throne<sup>69</sup> depicts the five *vajra*-lands. The union and separation of the two realms and the purport and trend of the before and the after are apparent in true bearing and can be perceived if (one) looks at Him. All the spiritual signs He possesses, in (their) hundred- and thousand-fold excellency<sup>60</sup> and subtleness, are, indeed, difficult to set forth fully.

*Third article:* On the style of the canon of scriptures and the drawing.

All in all there are seven parts, together with a drawing:

the first: the great *ying-lun*,<sup>61</sup> interpreted "book of wisdom which thoroughly understands the roots and origins of the entire doctrines";

the second: *hsin-t'i-ho*, interpreted "the sacred book of the treasure of pure life";

the third: *ni-twan*, interpreted "the sacred book of discipline", also called "the sacred book of healing";

the fourth: *a-lo-tsan*, interpreted "the sacred book of secret law";

<sup>64</sup> 一相 "one-form" = Sogd. "wkršnyy, Parth. h'mcyhrg, for which *cp.* Henning in *SBAW* Berlin, Ph.-Hist. Kl., 1934, p. 849, n. 3 and *Transact. Philol. Soc.*, 1944, p. 112, n. 1.

<sup>65</sup> This gloss is now written in large characters as if it were part of the text.

<sup>66a</sup> [The Father of Light wore twelve diadems, *cf.* Henning, *NGGW*, 1933, p. 309.]

<sup>66b</sup> *V. Fragment Pelliot, Traité*, p. 140 [116], line 1.

<sup>67</sup> 串 stands in the place of 穿.

<sup>68</sup> Almost certainly: "God, Light, Power, Wisdom"; the *Fragment Pelliot* (*v. Traité*, p. 140 [116], line 6) is torn off just before the detailed enumeration began.

<sup>69</sup> Mani's βῆμα had five steps.

<sup>60</sup> Or "All the spiritual signs he possesses hundred- and thousand-fold, are, in their excellence . . .".

<sup>61</sup> 'Iān-lün = εὐαγγέλιον; si'm-tiei-yā = MPers. smjyh' (from Aramaic); ndiei-mbvān = MPers. dēvān (Pers. divān); 'ā-lā-dzān = MPers. rāsān; puā'-ka-ma-tiei-yā = πραιματεια; kü-yuān = MPers. kawān; and 'ā-pf'ū'-yān = MPers. āfrin; see appendix ii, §6. Ishida Mikinosuke's 石田幹之助 article in *Shiratori-hakase kanreki-kinen tōyōshi ronsō* 白鳥博士還曆記念東洋史論叢 (1925), pp. 157-72 could not be obtained. [*Cf.* above p. 184, n. 5.]

the fifth: *po-chia-ma-ti-yeh*, interpreted "book of instruction which testifies the past";

the sixth: *chü-huan*, interpreted "book of the strong heroes";

the seventh: *a-fu-yin*, interpreted "book of praises and wishes (vows)";

one drawing: *ta-mên-ho-i*, interpreted "the drawing of the two great principles".

The seven great scriptures and the (one) drawing mentioned above, Mani, the Buddha of Light, at the very time when He was about to descend into the world<sup>62</sup> and, all Sanctities approving, responded by birth to the causes attained,<sup>63</sup> on the day of the establishment of the law (He himself) transmitted<sup>64</sup> (them) to the five grades (of believers). As to the authorized teachings (*dharmā*) stated during the remainder of (His) sixty years, the disciples noted them down according to opportunity. Those (we) do not enumerate.

*Fourth article:* On the style of the five grades (of believers).<sup>65</sup>

The first: the 12 *mu-shê*, interpreted "trustee of the Law and teacher of the Way";

the second: the 72 *sa-po-sê*, interpreted "attendant of the Law", also called *fu-to-tan*;

the third: the 360 *mo-hsi-hsi-tê*, interpreted "principal of the hall of law";

the fourth: *a-lo-huan*, interpreted "all immaculately<sup>66</sup> good men";

the fifth: *nu*<sup>67</sup>[*now*]-*sha-an*, interpreted "all purely faithful listeners".

The *a-lo-huan* and the higher grades all wear white caps and garments, and only the grade of *nu-sha-an* are allowed to retain their ordinary dress. If these five grades trust to each other, obey all instructions, and stand firmly by the prohibitions, each (will be on)(?)<sup>68</sup> the road of deliverance. If a *mu-shê* be violating the commandments, no one shall accept his instructions.

<sup>62</sup> 代 T'ang taboo form for 世, left in the text by an oversight (世 is restored elsewhere, *cf.* n. 12).

<sup>63</sup> *Viz.* the religious merits acquired in previous existences, according to Buddhist terminology.

<sup>64</sup> 受 stands in the place of 授.

<sup>65</sup> Mbo-śia = mōšā(a): magister; sâ'-puā-sæg = *aspasag*: episcopus (diaconus; on (a)stā dān v. above n. 1); mbæg-yiei-si'-tæg = *mahistag*: presbyter; 'ā-lā-yuān = *ardāwān*: electi; ndog[ndzū]-śā-ŋgān = Parthian n(i)γōšāgān: auditores (rather than = Middle Persian *niyōšāgān*; v. note 67 on *nu*). For a discussion of the terms v. Pelliot, *T'oung pao*, xxvi, p. 249; Waldschmidt-Lentz, *Manich. Dogmatik*, pp. 42-46; and, with regard to *aspasag*, Henning, *OLZ*, 1939, 240 f. [See Addenda].

<sup>66</sup> 純 is written in the taboo form 純, used from the time of Hsien-tsung (806-20).

<sup>67</sup> The alternative pronunciation ndog < nuok is amply attested for the "North-western dialect" (Tibet. transcriptions: nog, hdog, log v. Luo, pp. 19 and 65) [See Addenda].

<sup>68</sup> If 名 "(this) is termed" is to be corrected into 各.



Even though he is well versed in the seven scriptures and eminently skilled in debate, if<sup>69</sup> he has faults<sup>70</sup> and vices, the five gradus will not respect him.<sup>71</sup> Like unto a tree that thrives by its roots; if they are exhausted, the tree withers. If an *a-lo-huan* violates the commandments, regard him as dead, expose (him) to public knowledge, and expel (him) from the faith. For, although the sea is vast, it does not suffer<sup>72</sup>; corpses for long. (Whoever covers and screens (him) commits the same breach of commandments.

## APPENDICES

### i. The Dates

§1. *The era.* The era here referred to as the "Po-ssü p'o(sa?)-p'i calendar" is the well-known Persian world-era of 12,000 years, divided into twelve millenia, each of which was called after one of the twelve signs of the zodiac. The Zoroastrians combined this world-era with the Seleucid (Babylonian) era, which began in the spring of 311 B.C., and identified the years of that era with the years of their tenth millenium (that of Capricornus).<sup>1</sup> As our text shows for the first time, the Manichaeans followed suit, with this difference that, feeling that the end of the world was near,<sup>2</sup> they put the Seleucid era=the twelfth millenium (that of Pisces).<sup>3</sup> We knew from alBeruni<sup>4</sup> that Mani, according to his own statement in the *Shābuhragān*, was born "in the year 527 of the era of the astronomers of Bābil" (*i.e.* the Seleucid era); here we learn that he was born "in the 527th year of the era controlled by the twelfth constellation called *mo-hsieh*"; therefore, Seleucid era=twelfth millenium, of *mo-hsieh*=\**mbwā-sia*, representing Parthian<sup>5</sup> *m'sy'g*=*māsyā(g)* "fish", which was used as the name of the twelfth constellation also in Sogdian.<sup>6</sup>

The preceding period, the 11th millenium, is that of *no*=\**ndo*, which

<sup>69</sup> 爲 "if" (=如), v. *Ching-chuan shih-ta'ü 經傳釋詞* 2, 16a-17a.

<sup>70</sup> 愆 is written 愆 in the MS.

<sup>71</sup> 攝 = 攝; otherwise: "not assist (him)" or "will not be at peace".

<sup>72</sup> Here the *Fragment Pelliot* begins.

<sup>1</sup> See Zoroaster—politician or witch-doctor? (1951), 38 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Mani spoke of his life-time as "this last generation" (*Āthār albāqiyah*, 207<sup>11-16</sup>, *Kephalaia*, 14<sup>6</sup>).

<sup>3</sup> The Mandaeans adopted a similar system, which, however, was distorted by secondary accretions. See *Ginzā*, transl. Lidzbarski, 408 sqq. Their last period, the millenium of Pisces, is held to have begun in 170 B.C. or 168 B.C., see Taqizadeh, *BSOS*, ix, 614 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Āthār albāqiyah*, 118<sup>11-18</sup>=208<sup>8-9</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> This word, by itself, proves that the language of the original document was not Middle Persian, where "fish" is *māhig*.

<sup>6</sup> *E.g.* several times in M 549, cf. *JRAS*, 1942, 242 sq; and in the passage quoted below, §4. The Sogdians possessed no independent names for the signs of the zodiac.

represents the name of the eleventh constellation, *dōl*=Aquarius, in Middle Persian, Parthian, and Sogdian.<sup>1</sup> Buddha, according to our document, was born in the year 10, 227 of the world-era; his birth thus preceded that of Mani, in 11, 527, by 1300 years; see above note 23 on the quotation from the *Mahāmāyāsūtra*.

Not entirely clear is the name given to the world-era: 波斯婆毘 *Po-ssü p'o-p'i*. The first word is doubtless "Persia". The second, as our French colleagues have already suggested,<sup>2</sup> may represent *Bābel*, which in Middle Persian and Parthian is spelt *b'byl*. However attractive this explanation may be, particularly in view of the terms Mani himself used in referring to the era (as that of the astronomers of *Bābil*), it cannot be regarded as certain. The Chinese transliteration would be unusually imperfect; for 毘 *p'i* has no final consonant, and a foreign syllable in *-l* should have been represented by a character whose pronunciation ended in *-t* in Karlgren's Middle Chinese, in (raised) *-r* in Luo Charngpeir's system (cf. the case of *dōl* mentioned above). There was no shortage of suitable characters; *e.g.* 勿 or 蜜 (both of which have been found corresponding to Central Asian *bir*, see *BSOS*, ix, 555 sq.) could have been used. A further point to be borne in mind is the habitual confusion of 婆 *p'o* with 婆 *sa*.<sup>3</sup>

§2. *The years.* The year of Mani's birth, 527, was hitherto known only from the *Shābuhragān* passage quoted by alBeruni (see above p. 196, n. 4), who added some subsidiary information, equally from the *Shābuhragān* (*e.g.* that Mani was in his 13th year<sup>4</sup> in 539 of the same era); the Chinese document now confirms the principal figure, 527. We are less fortunate with the year of Mani's death, for which no source seems to provide a reliable absolute date; at first sight, the Chinese document, too, seems disappointing. The date calculated by S. H. Taqizadeh,<sup>5</sup> February 26, A.D. 277, has now been widely accepted.

The Chinese years given in our document, amounting to A.D. 208 and 266 respectively, seem to be so thoroughly wrong as to deserve no consideration. Indeed, the year of Mani's birth, A.D. 208, is in conflict with the year of the world-era, 527, given in the preceding sentence; for that corresponds

<sup>1</sup> Also in M 549; and in the passage given below, §4.

<sup>2</sup> See Puech, *Le Manichéisme*, p. 115, n. 109.

<sup>3</sup> As original form, one would expect \**bavi* (\**savi*), or a similar word. As the transcription of *Pati(g)* shows, final *-g*, in the ending *-ig*, had been lost in the pronunciation of Middle Persian/Parthian (as it is lost in Persian). The foreign word thus may have been \**bāvi(g)* (\**sāvi(g)*); the former might represent a MPers./Parth. adjective meaning "complete, all-embracing" (cf. Sogdian β'w, β'wōy; Armenian *baw*, *bawakan*, *bovandak*; Pahl. *bawandak*; etc.) [See Addenda].

<sup>4</sup> *K. al-Fihrist*, i, 328<sup>10</sup> "after 12 years had become complete for him" (after he had completed his twelfth year). alBeruni actually wrote "son of 13 years", which strictly means "13 years old". The vagueness of the terms used by alBeruni throughout the quotation is presumably due to his wish to reproduce the phrasing of the original as accurately as possible, without making it more precise than it was.

<sup>5</sup> *BSOAS*, xi, 49 sqq.

with April 7, A.D. 216, to March 26, 217. Yet we should enquire into the origin of the apparent mistake. It is to be presumed that the leaders of the Manichaean Church were well acquainted with the dates of the chief events of Mani's life; in fact, both his birth<sup>1</sup> and his death<sup>2</sup> served as starting-points of eras, by which the Manichaeans, certainly in the eighth century, were accustomed to date events. Moreover, shortly before our document was translated, the Manichaeans in China had had the benefit of a visit by the *grand mou-chö, homme versé dans l'astronomie*<sup>3</sup> sent from Toxāristān in A.D. 719, who, if anyone, should have been able to instruct his brethren in matters of chronology. We may thus be assured that the Fu-to-tan gave correct dates to the translator (or translators). Presumably he said, or wrote, "It is now so many years since the birth of Mani, and so many since his death". Any moderately competent translator should then have been capable of converting the years correctly. Why then a mistake of as much as eight years? To this question there is only one satisfactory answer: the document was translated several years (namely, eight) after it had been originally drawn up, and the translator(s) took the interval into account, but failed to realize that the dates mentioned in it had been adjusted to the current year.<sup>4</sup>

If this assumption is conceded, it follows that the dates in the original document were put in such a form as to amount to  $208+8=A.D. 216$  (for the birth) and  $266+8=A.D. 274$  (for the death). That the procedure here adopted is the correct one, is as good as proved by the only other Manichaean passage which involves the date of the death of Mani: the colophon in *Türkische Manichaica*, i, 12. It was written in the 522nd year after the death of Mani; that year was a "pig" year. A. von LeCoq<sup>5</sup> rightly pointed out that the year in question was A.D. 795; accordingly, the beginning of the era was in  $795-522+1=274$ .<sup>6</sup> A further argument in favour of the assumption that

<sup>1</sup> So in the *Muhrnāmag*, 160 sqq., where, however, the year in the era of Mani's death has been left blank (which shows some hesitancy with regard to it).

<sup>2</sup> So in *Türk. Man.*, i, 12 (see presently); also in *Mir. Man.*, iii, 864 sq. and 868 (both fourth century).

<sup>3</sup> Chavannes-Pelliot, *Traité Manichéen*, 176 [152] sq.

<sup>4</sup> This hypothesis is not necessarily in conflict with the assumption (made above, p. 188 n. 3) that the study of the document led to the edict of September 8, 732. The document may well have been written long before its submission was officially demanded by the Imperial government; it would have been kept in readiness for such an occasion. One may assume that it was written in A.D. 724, demanded in 731, and actually translated at the beginning of 732. There is in fact a hint in the document itself that it was composed in 724, see below.

<sup>5</sup> *Türk. Man.*, i, 39.

<sup>6</sup> Not in 273 (as von LeCoq assumed). If Mani's death fell on March 2, 274 (as will be proposed below), then the first year of the era was that from that day to March 1, 275; the second year from March 2, 275 to March 1, 276; and the 522nd from March 2, 795 to March 1, 796: this period covers by far the greater part of the "pig" year. However, this "era" was perhaps counted in Babylonian or Persian years originally; if in Persian, the first year was that from September 14, 273 to September 13, 274, the 522nd from May 7, 794 to May 6, 795.

the document in its original form contained a date equivalent to A.D. 274 is provided by the use made in it of the "prediction" that 450 years after (the death of) Mani his religion was to be transmitted to China.<sup>1</sup> This brings us to A.D. 724, precisely the year in which (according to our hypothesis) the document was composed.

As the Manichaeans thus regarded A.D. 274 as the year in which their prophet died, we should hesitate to adopt any other date, even one argued by so able a scholar as S. H. Taqizadeh. It must not be forgotten that the Turkish colophon provided the one and only absolute date for the death of Mani; it cannot be set aside easily,<sup>2</sup> less than ever now that it is confirmed by the Chinese document. All the other indications at our disposal are affected, in varying degrees, by uncertainty. The most reliable among them are those that put Mani's death under Bahrām I, probably in his third year or towards the end of his rule. Unfortunately, the dates of the early Sassanian kings<sup>3</sup> are throughout conjectural; many of them have in fact been based on the history of Mani; one would thus be inclined to date the rule of Bahrām I by the death of Mani, in preference to the reverse procedure.<sup>4</sup> A minor, and to my mind negligible, difficulty lies in the age which, in the document (as well as in other<sup>5</sup> sources), Mani is stated to have reached: sixty years; this may well have been a round figure (Mani's actual age at death would have been a little short of 58 years).

<sup>1</sup> The garbled sentence involving the figure 460 (p. 193, lines 6-8) is to be attributed to the redactors in any case. Whether we take 266 as starting-point or 274, the addition of 460 leads to no satisfactory result (726 and 734, but nineteenth year *k'ai-yüan* = 731/2). Probably 460 is a round figure. For a different suggestion see above, Note 49.

<sup>2</sup> As attempted, e.g., by H. H. Schaefer (*Iranica*, 79, n. 4, cf. *Gnomon*, 1933, 351), on the ground that *Mani ist nicht 273, sondern 276 gestorben (a petitio principii)*. H.-Ch. Puech, *op. cit.*, 139 sq. note 216, is undecided. Both scholars (as indeed all, so far as I know, who have discussed the matter) operate with the wrong figure 273.

<sup>3</sup> See S. H. Taqizadeh, *The Early Sassanians*, *BSOAS*, xi, 6-51.

<sup>4</sup> Provisionally I assume the following scheme (which, although it owes much to the work of S. H. Taqizadeh, is on the whole in agreement with the views put forward by W. Ensslin, *Zu den Kriegen des Sassaniden Schapur I*, 1949):

Sassanian era	1st year begins	October 1, 205
Ardašir	1st year begins	September 27, 223
	King of kings	April 28, 224
Shapur I	1st year begins	September 23, 239
	Coronation	April 12, 240
Stele of Bihshapur		September 17-October 16, 262
Shapur I	Dies	May 270
Hormizd I	Dies	June 271
Bahrām I	Dies	September 274
Bahrām II	Dies	After September 291
Bahrām III and civil war		Until 293.

<sup>5</sup> *ZDMG*, 90, p. 6; cf. Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 140, n. 217. Perhaps also *Türk. Man.*, iii, p. 39, No. 22, in the margin, *altmī* [= *altmī* *t* *yl*] "sixty [years]" + *auf der Erde hat er gelebt*.

§3. *The months and days.* For both birth and death Chinese months and days are given by our document:—

birth	8th day	2nd month
death	4th day	1st month.

From the fact that in both Coptic and Parthian Manichaean texts the day of Mani's death is stated to have been "Monday the fourth", although the Coptic and Parthian months did not coincide, it had been rightly inferred that the dates were "translated", and, further, that they were originally fixed in the Babylonian calendar,<sup>1</sup> i.e. in the calendar that, without doubt, was used by Mani and his early followers. The subsequent study of the Manichaean feast-calendar (in which the dates of Mani's passion play an important rôle) proved that it was altogether based on the Babylonian calendar, and that Mani's death fell on the 4th of the last Babylonian month, Addaru.<sup>2</sup> The Chinese document again gives "the fourth": that shows that the date was "translated", in the usual way; for the fourth of any Chinese month never coincides with the fourth of a Babylonian month (and very rarely with the fourth of a Persian month). There has thus been no proper conversion in the case of the date of Mani's end: we are bound to assume that the date of his birth was treated in precisely the same fashion. On these grounds we gain the following equations:

	Chinese	Persian-Parthian	Babylonian
Death	4th day 1st month	Shahrēvar	Addaru
Birth	8th day 2nd month	Mihr	Nisannu

Here the first line is assured beyond a doubt. Mihr and Nisannu are the months that follow, in their respective calendars, upon the months of Shahrēvar and Addaru; the equation Nisān=Mihr is independently attested.<sup>3</sup> It follows that, as Mani's death took place on 4 Addaru, so his birth fell on 8 Nisannu.<sup>4</sup>

The 8th of Nisannu in the Babylonian (Seleucid) year 527 fell on April 14, A.D. 216. This date is of considerable importance for the early history of the Sassanian state: according to the *K. alFihrist* (328, 13 sqq.), when Mani had completed his 24th year, an angel came to him and commanded him to proclaim his mission in public; he did so, on the day when

<sup>1</sup> First assumed, I believe, by S. H. Taqizadeh, *BSOS*, ix, 1937, p. 127, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Manichaean Feasts*, *JRAS*, 1945, 136-64.

<sup>3</sup> See Schaefer *apud* Andreas-Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica*, iii, 882, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> H.-Ch. Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 33, has anticipated my publication of this result, which I had reached in 1945 and communicated to him in the same year. In his annotation 110, p. 116, M. Puech has acknowledged the receipt of this communication, but left it undetermined whether the date was found by S. H. Taqizadeh or by me. When I last met His Excellency Taqizadeh, in 1950, I enquired of him what he regarded as his share in the matter, and he kindly informed me that all he had done was to mention the date, which he, being at that time unacquainted with the Chinese document, had received from me, to M. Puech in a letter. This agrees with my recollection [See Addenda].

Shapur I was crowned, a Sunday, the first of Nisān, when the Sun was in *Aries*. The implication is clearly that the two events, Mani's completion of his 24th year and the coronation of Shapur, coincided or almost coincided. S. H. Taqizadeh has established<sup>1</sup> that the only possible dates of the coronation are April 12, 240 and April 9, 243. Now that we know the precise date of Mani's birth, we may confidently say that the former date alone can have been the correct one: on April 12, 240, Mani's age was 24 (Julian solar) years less two days<sup>2</sup>—a negligible discrepancy; but on April 9, 243 he was almost 27 years old—the collocation of Mani's twenty-fourth birthday and the coronation of Shapur would have been meaningless.<sup>3</sup>

The date of the death of Mani is the 4th of Addaru in the (Julian) year A.D. 274 (=4 Addaru 584 Sel. Bab.). The day corresponds, I believe,<sup>4</sup> with March 2, which is the Julian day 1,821,197, therefore a Monday (as it should be). Thus the Chinese document, in spite of appearances, establishes new terms for the life of Mani, April 14, 216 and March 2, 274, which one hopes will prove more reliable than those previously calculated.

§4. *The end of the era.* The adoption of a world-era with a limited term implies that the world will be destroyed at its end; according to Manichaean belief the world is to go up in flames and burn for 1468 years. As we have seen (§1), the last millenium (that of Pisces) began in the spring of 311 B.C.; it ended in the spring of A.D. 690. The time when the document was translated into Chinese lay some forty years after the end of the world; the Manichaeans cannot have failed to be conscious of this disconcerting circumstance. An attempt at adjusting chronology by postponing the dates of the millenia was made by the Babylonian communities. As alShahrastāni

<sup>1</sup> *BSOAS*, xi, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Or twenty-four Babylonian years less seven days.

<sup>3</sup> That in the story (which certainly emanated from Manichaean circles, probably from Mani himself) Mani should have been supposed to wait for almost three years before beginning to fulfil the divine command is incredible. The attempt to discredit the *Fihrist* passage, by A. Maricq, *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire Orientales et Slaves*, xi (1951), 245 sqq., has left me unconvinced.

<sup>4</sup> Having no tables of the Seleucid (Babylonian) calendar at hand I relied on the table of the new moons in Ginzel's *Handbuch der Chronologie*, vol. ii, p. 555. The first three new moons of A.D. 274 are given there as Jan. 25.11, Feb. 23.68, March 25.14; therefore, the next Babylonian new-year fell shortly after the March date and, as the preceding new-year occurred early in April, the month beginning after the February date was the twelfth month, Addaru (there was no intercalated month). Now, Feb. 23.68 means 24th Feb. 4<sup>h</sup>19<sup>m</sup> a.m. in Greenwich=7<sup>h</sup>31<sup>m</sup> a.m. in Bēlābād (=conjunction); the moon became first visible probably in the evening of the 26th, so that the 27th counted as 1 Addaru. It is, however, not impossible that the moon was observed already on the 25th, which would spoil the calculation, since the 4th of Addaru would then be a Sunday. There is no way of proving it: it depends chiefly on the local weather conditions on that particular day (cf. S. H. Taqizadeh, *BSOAS*, xi, 51, on a similar case). If one may rely on the observations listed by Ginzel, *Handbuch*, i, 93, n. 2, one may say that it is unlikely that the crescent was seen on the 25th; for the average interval between conjunction and visibility in February is there determined as at 40.9 hours.

reports,<sup>1</sup> the Manichaean pope Abū Sa'īd declared in A.H. 271=June 29, 884-June 17, 885 that 11,700 years had passed since creation (and added that the total period was 12,000 years). He therefore placed the beginning of the twelfth millenium in A.D. 184/5 (=495/6 Sel. Bab.), if he counted in solar (or luni-solar) years. No reason for the choice of this date is discernible; if the large figure, 11,700, was rounded off to the nearest full hundred, the point of beginning may have been the birth of Mani, in A.D. 216.<sup>2</sup>

The Eastern Manichaeans adopted a different system. Instead of changing the date of the last millenium, they changed the length of the "millenia" to 1100 years, by allowing to each an extra period of 100 years, probably called "connection" (*pačβand* in Sogdian); these extra periods, amounting to 1200 years in all, were, it seems, appended to the last millenium,<sup>3</sup> so that the world was scheduled to be burnt not before A.D. 1890. The idea of such additional periods may have sprung from acquaintance with Indian chronology. The Indians provided many portions of time with a *samdhī*, i.e. connection, and in some cases this amounted to a tenth part of the whole. For example, a *kaliyuga*, of 360,000 years, is preceded by a *samdhī* or *samdhya* "morning twilight", of 36,000 years, and followed by a *samdhyaṃśa* "evening twilight", also of 36,000 years.<sup>4</sup> The Manichaeans, however, did not insert the "connections" between the original periods, but, as indicated above, placed them together at the end of the "world-year", perhaps on the model of the Iranian year, which consisted of twelve months and five additional days (which came at the end). The final period appears to have been named *tārāč* in Sogdian, which,<sup>5</sup> if connected with Persian *tārāč*, may have meant "plunder, booty";<sup>6</sup> one could compare the name sometimes given to the five additional days of the Iranian year: "stolen

days".<sup>1</sup> The information given above is derived from a Sogdian fragment, M 767 ii, which is here published for the first time:

R

- (1) iii [z'r] srδδ oo dwlyy ii z'r oo m'sy'gyh
- (2) z'[r] srδδ oo oo c'f šw' o w'fyδδ rtyw
- (3) jmnw o myyδδ o m'x oo 'iyy srδδ o kyštškw
- (4) oo 'iyy γrf srδyt wβ' kyy xii 'nrxtyh
- (5) 'xš'wn s't nyjtyy oo kδδryy t'r'c oo
- (6) xšyyndk o[o] (c)[y](wyδδ) pyδ'r 'fcmβdy 'm'γwn<sup>sic</sup>

V

- (7) p[. . .] (w)tyy<sup>2</sup> 'styy o pww xyp[δ]'w[nd . . .] cyy<sup>3</sup>
- (8) xryy 'styy oo[in red ink] 'nrx(ty)y z'r z'r s[rδy]t oo
- (9) 'tyy ms wrg kww m'sy'g prm wyspw
- (10) 'nrxryy z'r z'r srδδ 'xš'(wn) pšmyrtyy
- (11) oo tym C C pčβndyy oo[in red ink] vii pxryt(yh) oo
- (12) 'tyy vii pxryyt pr 'f[cmβ]δδ 'xšwnyt<sup>sic</sup>

## Translation

. . . [at the beginning of Capricornus] 3000 years [remain],<sup>4</sup> of Aquarius 2000, of Pisces 1000. However much has gone, by so many *ratus*, hours, days, months, and years, it (=the duration of the world) decreases. It is many years<sup>5</sup> since the dominion of the twelve constellations went out (=came to an end) altogether. Now *Tārāč* is (?) dominating (?).<sup>6</sup> On that account the whole (?) of the world is . . . , it has been going (passing) without an overlord . . .

<sup>1</sup> Pahlavi *truftag* and *duzīdag*, Arabic *masrūqah* and *mustaraqah*. AlBeruni, *Athār al-bāqiyah*, 44<sup>2</sup>, quoted a set of five names for the whole of the five days, but erroneously believed that each of them referred to one of the days successively. This has never been understood, chiefly because in alBeruni's source the Persian *Idāfe* was spelt as a separate word, by a single *alif* (a spelling found elsewhere, but reminiscent of Middle Persian and the older Jewish Persian orthography); also, some of the words are wrongly pointed. The first name is *Panše i trufte*, read *پنجه ا ترفته*; the second, *Panše i duzi de*, read *پنجه ا دزیده*; the third, *Panše i hufaste*; the fourth, *Panše i Varvardiyān* (=Far-); the fifth, *Panše i andargāhān*.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps p[ʔ-2]'wtyy or p[1-2]rwtyy; p[s]'wtyy is a possible but unproductive restoration; p[ww]'wtyy cannot be read (also, the correct form is p[ww]'wtyy). The difficulty lies partly in 'm'γwn, which is either unknown or an odd spelling of *mywn* (M'γwny, Karabalgasun, p. 20, line 19 Hansen, is itself in doubt; it might be m'γw'y "broke"). Note that 'fcmβdyy is oblique case.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., *pww xyp[δ]'w[ndyy s']cyy* "without the need of an overlord"; or *pww xyp[δ]'w[nd sr]cyy* "without overlord or chieftain"; the last word may have been [pr]cyy "back" = "protection" (*HBB*, p. 62).

<sup>4</sup> It is doubtful whether this is the correct supplementation. The passage may have run "[the dominion of C. is] 3000 years, of A. 2000, of P. 1000". In that case the scheme here outlined would have differed from that described in the next paragraph, but agreed with that known from the Mandaeans (*Ginzā*, 408<sup>22-23</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> The text, therefore, was written "many years" after A.D. 690.

<sup>6</sup> *xšyyndk* is apparently 3rd pers. plur. (durative present) of *xšy(y)*.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Cureton, 1842, p. 192.

<sup>2</sup> A.H. 271=669/670 post *Manichaeum natum*.

<sup>3</sup> In this way the necessity of disturbing the previously established system of dates was circumvented. The Eastern Manichaeans are known to have been more conservative than their Babylonian brethren, cf. *ZDMG*, 90, 16 sq.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Sacliau, *Alberuni's India*, i, 373.

<sup>5</sup> As the word is not otherwise attested, its meaning is necessarily in doubt; a derivation from *tār*- "dark" (whence "twilight"?) is less likely.

<sup>6</sup> It is possible that Arabic *tārīj* is loan-word from *tārāč* (through \**tārēj*, by incorporation in the Arabic root-system, as *taf'il* of 'j). According to the *Qāmūs*, *tārīj* is "a well-known thing in accountancy" (Freytag omitted this meaning). The author of the *Mafāiḥ al-Olūm* (end of tenth century), pp. 54 sq., mentioned an opinion that it was a loan-word from Persian, but preferred to derive it (as *ta'rīj*) from *atwārač* (itself a Persian word). The meaning is best explained in the Persian handbook of accountancy recently edited by W. Hinz (*Die Resāle-ye Fulakīyyā*, Wiesbaden 1952, pp. 9, 25 sq.), where examples are given; it is "culling figures, that have to be added up, from an account-book, writing them on a separate piece of paper, and adding them up". Several Persian terms of accountancy were metaphors taken from low-class or criminal life; e.g. Persian *āvāre* (whence the above-mentioned *atwārač*) properly meant "driven from house and home; vagabond".

(Caption) The thousand years each of the constellations. And also, from Aries to Pisces, the dominion of each constellation is accounted a thousand years each; again, a hundred years each in connection.<sup>1</sup>

(Caption) Of the seven planets. Also the seven planets [are] rulers in the world . . .

## ii. *The Manichaean Canon*

§5. *The three categories.* There are many lists, more or less complete, of the works which the Manichaeans considered part of their sacred literature; they have been fully discussed by P. Alfarcic, *Les écritures Manichéennes*, vol. ii (1919). Authoritative lists, drawn up by Manichaeans themselves, were hitherto known only from the Coptic books; it was possible to suspect that they were, to some extent, coloured by the local development of the church in Egypt. Any such doubt can now be laid aside; for the list in the third article of the Chinese document is, in every essential point, identical with those found in the Coptic books. We can thus be assured that we possess the canon of the Manichaean sacred literature, in the form given to it in the centre of the church, in Babylonia, either within Mani's lifetime or shortly afterwards. Among the Coptic passages the most important is one in the *Homilies*, ed. Polotsky, p. 25:

*Das "Evangelium" und der "Schatz des Lebens", die "Πραγματεία" und das "Buch der Mysterien", das "Buch der Giganten" und die "Briefe", die Psalmen und die Gebete meines Herrn, sein "Bild" und seine Offenbarungen, seine Parabeln und seine Mysterien.*

Comparison of the Coptic passages with the Chinese document shows clearly that the sacred works fall into three categories, (a) the seven scriptures, (b) the *Elkōn*, and (c) the tradition.

§6. *The seven scriptures.* The Coptic lists can be tabulated in this way:

Hom. 25 =	Keph. p. 5	Hom. 94	Psalms 46 sq. and 139 sq.
Keph. ch. 148 <sup>2</sup>			
1. Great Gospel	G.G.	G.G.	G.G.
2. Treasure of Life	T.o.L.	T.o.L.	T.o.L.
3. Πραγματεία	Π.	Secrets	Π.
4. Secrets	Secrets	Πραγματεία	Secrets
5. Γραφή τῶν γιγάντων	Γραφή aus <i>Anlass der Parther</i>	Γραφή [	Book of the Giants
6. Epistles	E.	—	E.
7. Psalms and Prayers <sup>3</sup>	Psalms and Prayers	—	Two psalms and the prayers

<sup>1</sup> *πεβνδyy* (Buddh. *peβ'nty*) is mostly adverb "in connection therewith, in close succession, immediately after".

<sup>2</sup> Schmidt, *Manifund*, 35 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Missing in the MS. in *Keph.*, Ch. 148; Schmidt erroneously supplied "the Kephalaia".

There being no doubt that under (5) one and the same book is meant, the arrangement is this: at the head stand the "Great Gospel" and the "Treasure of Life", always in this order; next comes a set of three books, in variable sequence; the list concludes with the "Epistles" and the "Psalms and Prayers". In the Chinese document, the order is the same except that the "Epistles" precede the three books;<sup>1</sup> the latter are adduced in the same order as in Hom. 94, which therefore presumably constitutes the original sequence.

§6a. *The Great Gospel.* 大應輪 "the great *Ying-lun*". That the Chinese is mere transliteration of *Εὐαγγέλιον* is now certain; the imperfection of the spelling (*ieñ-lün*) may be due to mispronunciation of *'wnglywn* by the Central Asian Manichaeans.<sup>2</sup> Here, as invariably in Coptic, the name is qualified by "great"; one also finds it as "Great Living Gospel", "Living Gospel", and plain "Gospel". The *Ying-lun* is quoted in the Chinese *Traité*, see Chavannes-Pelliot, p. 59 [555], cf. p. 128 [104] n. 1 and p. 160 [136] n.

§6b. *The Treasure of Life.* 尋提賀 *Hsin-t'i-ho*. The position in the list and the gloss ". . . the treasure of . . . life" assure the identity of this work. This is one of the three works whose names are here preserved in the form given them by Mani himself (the other two are the *Εὐαγγέλιον* and the *Πραγματεία*); and of these three it is the only one whose name is in Mani's mother-tongue, about which little is known.<sup>3</sup> In most sources this particular title appears in translation, even, it seems, sometimes in Middle Persian, if *ny'n 'y zyndg'n* is so to be understood;<sup>4</sup> perhaps we may also restore *pd 'wnglywn 'wd* [*ny'n 'y*] *zyndg'n gwyd* in M 733 R<sup>5</sup> 15-16, "He says in the Gospel and in the Treasure of the Living".<sup>6</sup> It was, however, precisely in Middle Persian that the name was preserved in its original form. That we know thanks to a quotation from the book in a Sogdian fragment, M 915 (bottom of a page), which is here published for the first time:

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, Timothy of Constantinople mentioned the "Epistles" immediately after the "Gospel" and "Treasure," see Alfarcic, *op. cit.*, ii, 68.

<sup>2</sup> [See Addenda.]

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees*, 28, n. 1, 73 sq., 106 sq., 110, 111-19; Polotsky, *Manifund*, 66 sqq., *Abriss*, 242<sup>4-14</sup>, 243<sup>14-16</sup>; F. Rosenthal, *Die Aramaische Forschung*, 1939, pp. 207-11.

<sup>4</sup> See *Asia Major*, ii, 143, n. 2. The first passage in Andreas-Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica*, ii, 304, would then mean "read aloud in front (of the spirit) the (chapter) 'The assembling of the Gates' of the 'Treasure of the Living'."

<sup>5</sup> That in the same page, lines 4/5, one has to restore *prurdg 'y [m](h)yystg'n* "Epistle to the Presbyters" (the second half of *-h-* is still visible), has already been pointed out by Bang, *Le Muséon*, xxxvi, p. 192, n. 2 (= Uygur *myystk'n brwrtly*).

<sup>6</sup> The original title was ambiguous and could mean "of the Living (pl.)" or "of Life".

R		V
(1) [red ink]	]pr[ . ]'n <sup>1</sup>	(13) 'rmyn (f)[rwrtyy npyst]
(2)	]cn pnc prβγnyh	(14) w'nw 'ty fr(y)rw'n(y)[yh] <sup>2</sup>
(3)	p]r smtyh' gwyšn 'y	(15) s'st 'ty mys'[nd]
(4)	] . 'n r'y w'nw npyst	(16) βγγšt o fryt'ī w[rnyy]
(5)	]h <sup>3</sup> mys'nd	(17) 'spwrnk'(rk)[y'h]
(6)	]pnc pr]βynd pr šm'x	(18) βwrt'rmyky'[h'iyh]
(7)	] . 'nd <sup>4</sup> 't(fn) (cwp)r	(19) γrβ'ky' pr x[ypδ γryw]
(8)	]rty pīs'r	(20) ptmync'ī o [ms pr]
(9)	] . . z'ndk'm <sup>5</sup> pr šm'x	(21) sysn ptyy frwrt(y)[w'nw]
(10)	]jwn z'ī o cww 'tyh	(22) npyst mys'nd pn(c)
(11)	]i[ . . ](xnd) <sup>6</sup> xww šyryt m'n(y) <sup>7</sup>	(23) prβynd 'ty i pr δ(βt)[yk]
(12)	? p]nc nyzβ'nyt o 'rt[y]	(24) [p]tšprtyt 'sk[w'n]d

There is no need here to translate this text. Suffice it to say that it contains three quotations from Mani's works, all bearing on the "Five Gifts" (charity, faith, etc.), namely:

(a) "So He writes in the *Smtyh'*, the chapter<sup>8</sup> concerning the . . . s".

(b) "[He writes in the Epistle to] Armenia". This is No. 8 of the Epistles, according to the index in the *K. alFihrist*.<sup>9</sup>

(c) "[So] He writes in the Sisin-Patī Epistle". This is No. 24 of the Epistles, addressed, according to the *K. alFihrist*, to Sis and Patīq.<sup>10</sup> Here we are only concerned with the first quotation, from the *Smtyh'*, which spelling is perfectly in accord with the Chinese transliteration, \**Si<sup>2</sup>m-ttei-γā*. The name, *Smtyh'*, was thus pronounced \**Simtihā*. Is this, then, the form we should attribute to the Aramaic dialect which Mani

<sup>1</sup> pr [m]'n or fr[m]'n?

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps fr(y)rw'n(d); the photograph suggests pr rw'nd[, which makes no sense provided the subsequent lines are correctly restored).

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps [kδ' 'ty]h.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps [p]tmync'(c)'nd.

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps ['](y)'z'ndk'm?

<sup>6</sup> Or [(kryy)?

<sup>7</sup> m'n(d)?

<sup>8</sup> *gwyšn* here (as often)=λόγος Schmidt, *Manifest*, 37, line 2 (of the Gospel); the Treasure was divided into "chapters" (Mas'ūdi) or "books" (St. Augustine and Evodius), see Alfarić, *op. cit.*, ii, 43 sqq.

<sup>9</sup> This confirmation of the correctness of the title, and therewith confirmation of the existence of Manichaean communities in Armenia, is of some importance; cf. Alfarić, *op. cit.*, i, 70 sq., and, on a dubious reference to *Anjit*, Schaefer, *Gnomon*, 1933, 341. There may have been a Manichaean mission even to Georgia, cf. *BSOAS*, xii (1947), 49, n. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Note the loss of -g in the Sogdian spelling, *Ptyy*, compared with Middle Persian and Parthian *ptyg* (cf. *BSOAS*, x, 943, 948), but in agreement with the Chinese transliteration (see above p. 197, n. 3).

spoke? It deviates considerably from the standard form, which is *simath-hayyā* (or *-hayyē*) in Syriac,<sup>1</sup> where it actually occurs (ܣܝܡܬܗܝܝܐ Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 2564 middle). Curiously enough, this very group of words was used also by the Mandaeans, but as the name of a female divinity, ܣܝܡܬܗܝܝܐ *Simath-Haiyē*,<sup>2</sup> see Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 602; its modern pronunciation, according to Mrs. E. S. Drower, is *Simat Héi*.<sup>3</sup>

§6c. *The Epistles*. 泥萬 *Ni-wan*. This is the only title in the Chinese list that could correspond to the "Epistles", all others being securely identified. It is quoted in the Chinese *Traité*, see Chavannes-Pelliot, 60 [556], 160 [136] n., where it is written 寧 | *Ning-wan* = \**ndīyē-mbvān* (as against \**ndīē-mbvān* in our document). As was pointed out on an earlier occasion,<sup>4</sup> the name represents Middle Persian *dēwān* (\**dēbān*) "archive" (Persian *divān*)<sup>5</sup> and appears a happy choice for a collection of letters, each of which could be called *dyb*<sup>6</sup> (the word from which *dēwān* is derived). As *dēwān* was borrowed also by Syriac and Mandaean, it is not impossible that this was the very name Mani himself gave to the book.

§6d. *The three books*. 阿羅瓊 *A-lo-tsan*<sup>7</sup> represents τὰ τῶν μυστηρίων, Middle Persian or Parthian *Rāzān*<sup>8</sup> "Secrets" (not attested as a book-title); on prothetic *a-* before foreign *r-* see Dr. E. G. Pulleyblank's forthcoming work *The Background and Early Life of An Lu-shan* (provisionally see Pulleyblank, *T'oung Pao*, xli, 333 n. 1, where a case of prefixed 阿 is mentioned). 鉢迦摩帝夜 *Po-chia-ma-ti-yeh* is, of course, = Πραγματεία "the treatise",<sup>9</sup> probably, to judge by the translator's gloss, in the sense of "a systematic or scientific historical treatise" (iii 3 in Liddeil-Scott-McKenzie-Jones); the "history" in which Mani was interested was presumably that of the origin of the world. 俱緩 *Chü-huan* is the Middle

<sup>1</sup> It has often been supposed, wrongly as now emerges, that the word used by Mani for the title of this book was *ginzā/gazzā* (chiefly because the well-known Mandaean work bore that name); if that had been so, the Middle Persian equivalent would have been \**guz 'y zyndg'n*. We can now feel certain that MPers. *ny'n* = *simāh* (*simthā*). Incidentally, this equivalence strengthens the case for the etymology of *ny'n* advocated by Dr. Gershevitch (cf. also my remark *apud* Schaefer, *Iranica*, 74, n. 1).

<sup>2</sup> On the spelling ܣܝܢ see Nöldeke, *Mand. Gramm.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran*, 397 sqq., cf. p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> *BSOAS*, xiii, 44, n. 7.

<sup>5</sup> For the various forms see Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, 133 sq.

<sup>6</sup> It seems that, in the designation of the various "Epistles", this word was preferred in Parthian, but *frwrdg* in Middle Persian and *frwrtty* in Sogdian (whence Uygur *frwrtty*). The name of the *Muhr Dib* occurs in a Sogdianized form, besides in *BBB*, p. 46 (c 36-7), also in a caption in T i α (1313), *nwyst muhr dyβyy* "(Here) begins: the Letter of the Seal"; the beginning is badly damaged, apparently *M'ny frystg* ('y)[g yyšw'] 'ry' m'n *mwryzdg* (cf. *M* 17 v 8-10); the fragment shows that in *BBB*, p. 18, line 9 should be '[wδ nywš'g'n br'd](r)['n]. [On *mwryzdg* see *BSOAS*, xi, 67, n. 1].

<sup>7</sup> The Middle Chinese forms of these names have been given above in Note 61.

<sup>8</sup> On the meaning of the word see *BSOAS*, xii, 45 sq.

<sup>9</sup> Schaefer, *Gnomon*, 1933, 347; Polotsky, *Homilien*, 25 n. a.

Persian and Parthian name of the Book of the Giants, *Kawān*; its surviving fragments were published in *BSOAS*, xi, 52-74.

§6e. *The Prayers*. 阿拂胤 *A-fu-yin* is Middle Persian *āfrīn* (distinct from Parthian *āfriwan*), cf. *a-fu-yin-sa* in the continuation of the Chinese document, Chavannes-Pelliot, 137 [113], representing Middle Persian *āfrīnsar* ('*prynsr* in *BBB*, where the Parthian equivalent, '*frywnsr*, also occurs). According to the *Manichaean Psalm-Book*, ed. Allberry, 47<sup>1</sup>, 140<sup>16</sup>, Mani's work contained, apart from prayers, only two psalms; a hymn-cycle attributed to Mani himself is the *Wazargān āfriwan*, of which fragments, for the greater part unpublished, exist in Middle Persian, Parthian, and Sogdian, see *BSOAS*, xi, 217.

§6f. *Relative chronology*. At the end of the 3rd Article, the document apparently<sup>1</sup> asserts that all the "seven great scriptures" as well as the "drawing" (§7) were, like the Koran, pre-existent: Mani was possessed of them when he descended into the world. Whether this assertion is due to late exaggeration or simply to extreme abbreviation of a more elaborate original it is difficult to decide; anyone with access to the Epistles, at any rate, should have been able to convince himself that they had been written in the course of Mani's life. The true view of the early Manichaeans is more accurately reflected in the 148th chapter of the *Kephalaia*, which declares that the books were written by Mani (*diese grossen Schriften, die ich euch geschrieben habe*), but were nevertheless presents given by various donors, chiefly divine beings; namely, Gospel: Third Messenger; Treasure: Column of Glory; the three books: Twin of Light; Epistles: Mani, [Psalms and Prayers]: *ihr selbst* (?). If such a chapter was ruthlessly summarized, the result could well approach to the declaration in the Chinese document: the books, *a potiori*, are of divine origin, not conceived or composed by Mani (even if written by his hand). It seems that the account in the *Kephalaia*, rationalized, gives a hint of the dates to which the various books belonged. When Mani entered upon his mission, the *Gospel* and the *Treasure* were already completed; claims about their origin could not be gainsaid by anyone. The *three books* came later; the elder among his disciples knew that they had not existed when they joined the flock; they may have watched the prophet at his labours of composition. However, these books could be attributed to the Twin of Light. Mani possessed a split mind; he realized his condition and invented this striking term for his second personality: *the Twin*. The Twin, a divine being, gave him messages from the World of Light, he accompanied him and whispered advice and instructions in his

<sup>1</sup> It is not entirely clear whether that is meant in the first sentence, which at the beginning refers to the day of Mani's birth, but afterwards to "the day of the establishment of the Law" (which may have been here regarded as coinciding with the day of birth, cf. p. 191, lines 24-5, "for sixty years teaching . . ."); it is certainly implied in the second sentence.

ear; he also dictated the three books.<sup>1</sup> The *Dēwān* grew gradually during Mani's long life; there was no reason why it should be ascribed to any one but himself. And the *Psalms and Prayers* was the prayer-book of the early church and included hymns of many authors besides some composed by the prophet; it was thus assigned to the Church as a whole, represented (presumably) by the Noūs of Light.<sup>2</sup>

§7. *The Drawing*. 大門荷翼 *Tu-mên-ho-i* or "the *Great Mên-ho-i*". This is mentioned at the end of the list of the "seven scriptures", in such a way as to suggest that in importance it is on a level with the whole set of the books; "there are seven parts, together with a drawing", "the seven great scriptures and the (one) drawing", and in the caption "the canon of scriptures and the drawing". It is at any rate clear that the "*Drawing*" is not a written book, but literally a drawing or picture, perhaps a set of drawings or pictures. This item in the list of the sacred works has its precise counterpart in the Coptic books, where the Εἰκὼν is named immediately after the seven scriptures, *Hom.* 25 (see above §5) and similarly in *Hom.* 18: . . . [*ich weine*] *über die Gebete und die Psalmen. Ich weine über die Malereien meines "Bildes", indem ich . . . ihre Schönheit*. Polotsky (*Hom.* 18 n. a; *Abriss* 244<sup>69</sup>) took the right view in suggesting that this Εἰκὼν was a *Bilderbuch*, a kind of *Tafelband* to illustrate Mani's teachings.<sup>3</sup> The Chinese document confirms this view; its gloss, "the drawing of the two great principles", indicates that the work depicted the powers of Light and Darkness, probably in their various stages, before Creation, in the world, and after its dissolution. The work, as Polotsky pointed out, was known in Parthian under the name of *Ārdhang*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This may well have been Mani's own view of the matter; it is not assumed that there was conscious deception on his side.

<sup>2</sup> A point to which attention should be drawn here is the surprising absence from the Chinese list of the *Shābuhragān*. Not only is this certainly a book written by Mani, even one of his earliest works, but it was the most popular of all in Oriental countries; many fragments of it have survived to the present day. It must not be assumed that the *Shābuhragān* is hidden under one of the titles actually mentioned; that it is not identical with any one of them is certain, thanks to a report by alBeruni (*Risālah* on the writings of arRāzi, ed. P. Kraus, p. 4), who, after prolonged search, secured a collection of Mani's works: it contained the *Gospel*, *Treasure*, all the *three books*, *Epistles*, an unknown work (which should be the *Psalms and Prayers*), and the *Shābuhragān* as well; in short, the "seven scriptures" and the *Shābuhragān*. It is easy to understand why the book, written as it was in Middle Persian, should not be mentioned in the Coptic texts; but more difficult why it should have been omitted in the Chinese document, which was drawn up by an Iranian who was doubtless acquainted with it. The circumstance may support the opinion advanced above (§5) that the Chinese list reproduces unchanged the official list of the Babylonian church, which presumably was confined to works written in Aramaic. See further below, p. 210, n. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Kephalaia*, Ch. 154 *apud* Schmidt, *Manifund*, 43; Mani had not merely written down "his wisdom", but also painted it; the other apostles had neither written down "their wisdom", nor painted it in an Εἰκὼν. Cf. also the interesting 92nd chapter of the *Kephalaia* (in which an *Auditor* complains that his prospective fate had not been depicted in the *Great Εἰκὼν*) and the discussion in *BSOAS*, xii (1948), 310.

<sup>4</sup> On the form see *Sb.P.A.W.*, 1934, 30, n. 3.

which was preserved, in several more or less corrupt forms, in Persian literature, where the "Ertenk" of Mani enjoyed great fame. A copy still existed in Ghazna at the end of the eleventh century, according to a trustworthy Persian author, who reported<sup>1</sup> "Mani, they say, could draw a line on a piece of white silk in such a way that, if one pulled out a single thread, the whole line disappeared;<sup>2</sup> he was the author of a book with various kinds of pictures, which they called the *Erženg* of Mani; it exists in the treasury of Ghaznin". Fragments of a Parthian commentary, in which the meaning of the pictures was elucidated, have been found;<sup>3</sup> it was called *Ārdhang Wisfrās* "commentary on the Ārdhang".<sup>4</sup>

Surprisingly the name given to the work in the Chinese document is not, as one would have expected, *Ārdhang* (which too perhaps means "drawing"<sup>5</sup>). With regard to it M. Puech writes<sup>6</sup> . . . (le) "dessin" du grand men-ho-yi, c'est-à-dire, selon une interprétation de M. É. Benveniste, le *bungāhīg*, le "Fondamental", "l'écrit du Fondement". Apparently M. Puech holds<sup>7</sup>, contrary to my view, that the word "dessin" is here used metaphorically, and that in fact a written book is meant, *l'écrit du Fondement* (a phrase that immediately calls to mind the *Epistula Fundamenti*). M. Benveniste's explanation of \*mbon-γā-yīg as an adjective \*bungāhīg (not attested),<sup>8</sup> derived from Parthian *bungāh* "fundament",<sup>9</sup> is certainly attractive.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Bayānu 'l-Adyān*, ed. A. Iqbal, Tehran 1312, p. 17 (=Schefer, *Chrestomathie Persane*, i, 145).

<sup>2</sup> Because the line had been drawn on a single thread; Kessler, *Mani*, 371, misunderstood the passage.

<sup>3</sup> *BSOAS*, xi, 71, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> This Εἰκόων is distinct from the picture of Mani which, at the Bema, was placed on a throne in front of the community, cf. *BBB*, 9 sq. The second article of the Chinese document should be regarded as a description of such a picture, which doubtless formed part of the equipment of every Manichaean church.

<sup>5</sup> If -hang from OIr. *hang-* "to draw".

<sup>6</sup> *Le Manichéisme*, p. 149, n. 262.

<sup>7</sup> [See Addenda.]

<sup>8</sup> A difficulty lies in the ending; \*bungāhīg would have been pronounced \*bungāhī (see above, p. 197, n. 3), while the Chinese transliteration shows final -g (the last two characters suggest \*hāyag rather than \*gāhīg).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the word "principles" in the Chinese gloss.

<sup>10</sup> The Chinese gloss, "(the drawing of) the two great principles", inevitably turns one's thoughts to certain page-headings in fragments of the *Shābuhragān*: *dō bun wazarg* "the two great principles" and *dō bun ī Shābuhragān* "the two principles—of the Š.". These headings were combined, by Alfarc, *op. cit.*, ii, 32, with the title of a Manichaean work mentioned several times in Chinese sources, as the *Livre des deux principes*, and once in a Turkish colophon, as *İki yiltiz nom*, see Chavannes-Pelliot, *op. cit.*, 157 [133]–169 [145]. As such headings occur only in fragments of the *Shābuhragān*, it would be permissible to infer that "(the book of) the two (great) principles" was an alternative title of the *Shābuhragān*, which gradually replaced the unhandy original title, particularly in those areas where the Middle Persian name was not understood (Alfarc identified the *Livre des deux principes* with the *Kephalaia*); then the text in *Türk. Man.*, i, 23–5, would constitute the end of the *Shābuhragān* (the original end perhaps at p. 24, line 3). The coincidence of such titles, however, need not disturb our conclusion that the work here listed in the Chinese document was a *Tafelband*.

§8. *The Tradition*. The third category is vaguely defined as the teachings uttered by the prophet in the course of his life and taken down by his disciples: "those we do not enumerate". The vagueness is significant. The fact is that Mani wrote only the books enumerated in §6; all other books attributed to him, with the sole exception of the *Shābuhragān*,<sup>1</sup> are apocryphal. Here again the Chinese document is echoed in the Coptic texts. In *Hom.* 25 (§5) there is, after the mention of the Εἰκόων, a vague reference to further *Offenbarungen, Parabeln und Mysterien*; in *Hom.* 18, in the corresponding place, the Κεφάλαια are named (and some other works, but the titles are lost through gaps in the manuscript). It is, however, in the *Kephalaia*, themselves thoroughly apocryphal, that we find the prophet encouraging his faithful to the production of spurious works: *Die Welt hat mir nicht gestattet zu schreiben . . . so schreibt meine ganze Weisheit . . . Die Fragen, nach denen ihr mich gefragt habt . . . und die Deutungen, die ich euch gedeutet habe von Zeit zu Zeit, die Reden, die Worte, die ich gesprochen habe . . . sie sind nicht geschrieben. Ihr sollt euch an sie erinnern und sie aufschreiben. Sammelt sie überall, denn zahlreich ist die Weisheit, die ich gesprochen habe [zu euch]*.<sup>2</sup> This is the same Mani who wrote so many books professedly because he was anxious that his teachings should never be distorted: *Diese Weisheit, ich . . . habe sie geschrieben in die heiligen Bücher . . . damit man sie nicht verändere nach mir*<sup>3</sup> and who blamed his "brothers", the earlier prophets, for their negligence in entrusting their message to the fickle memory of their disciples: *Zarathustra . . . seine Jünger nach seinem Tode erinnerten sich und schrieben . . . Buddha . . . seine Jünger, welche nach ihm kamen, sie sind es die sich erinnerten an Etwas von Weisheit, das sie von Buddha gehört hatten, und schrieben es in Schriften . . . in die Irre gehen . . . verfälschen . . . vermischen*.<sup>4</sup> It is clear that Mani never gave any such instructions as are found in the introduction to the *Kephalaia*. Their invention enabled his disciples and their successors to issue elaborations of Mani's teachings at their convenience. All that was needed was to preface freshly thought-out theories with the words "And again the Apostle of Light addressed his disciples and said . . .". The remains of the Manichaean literature, Turkestanian and Coptic, testify that ample use was made of Mani's alleged permission. The literature that now arose on a false basis could suitably be named "the Tradition". It is as genuine and as false as the Muslimic "Tradition": it may reflect the prophet's views with perfect accuracy; or it may distort his meaning completely.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 209, n. 2, and p. 210, n. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Keph.*, 6<sup>14-27</sup>; similarly 8<sup>86-910</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> *Keph.*, Ch. 154 *apud* Schmidt, *Manifund*, 43.

<sup>4</sup> *Keph.*, 7<sup>21-812</sup> (extract).



## ADDENDA

P. 184. "Styles" has been chosen to translate the Manichaean term which is presumed to have occurred in the original, *viz.* Parthian *brahm*, which I discussed at some length in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1944 (1945), article "Brāhman" pp. 108-18, see especially p. 114 sq.

P. 184 and p. 195, n. 67. I overlooked the reference Pelliot made to the Chinese document in *Le Sūtra des Causes et des Effets*, t. 2, fasc. 2, *additions et corrections*, p. 96, where 禪沙暗 "auditores" is mentioned in connexion with a discussion of 禪, provoked by the Sogdian transcription 'n'wyt'r' of 阿禪多羅 "anuttara". The ambivalence of 禪, *ndog* and *ndzu*, makes it awkward to choose between Parthian *n(ə)γōsāgān* and Middle Persian *niyōsāgān*: either *nγō-* has suffered a metathesis to \**nōγ-* or the disyllabic *niyō-* has been shortened. Since the other Iranian words in the document, apart from the titles of the seven books, are either Parthian or Sogdian (a fact recognized also by Pelliot, *loc. cit.*), one might prefer the Parthian form. The corruption may be due to a speaker of Sogdian; for almost any labial vowel in contact with *γ* was subjected to metathesis in that language. So considered, the transcription of \**nōγsāgān* would be in consonance with 'n'wyt'r', which a Sogdian would have pronounced \**anōydrā*; for the letters -yt- almost invariably represent the sounds -γd- (never -gd-, and only exceptionally -χt-).

P. 186, n. 3. It was only after this article had been set up in print, that I secured a copy of the *Actes du xxi<sup>e</sup> Congrès des Orientalistes*, where M. Puech's paper occupies pp. 350-354. It is pleasant to see how often we have reached similar results.

P. 197. It should not be assumed that the final consonant of *Bābēl* had been lost in Sogdian. After prolonged search I found the name in an unpublished Christian Sogdian fragment (written in Sogdian script), T ii B 66 (D 147), where it is spelt *p'pyl = bābēl* (not \**p'βyl = bāvēl*, as one might have expected). It nearly occurs in a Manichaean fragment (also in Sogdian script and also unpublished), T iii D 271, in which several of Mani's epistles are cited; among them is the [ . . ] *pyl prwt'kw*, probably the "Epistle to Babel" ([*p'p*] *yl*), No. 23 in the Fihrist.

P. 200, n. 4. In his paper in the *Actes du xxi<sup>e</sup> Congrès*, p. 353, M. Puech has generously attributed to me our new date for the birth of Mani.

P. 205, § 6a. Such mispronunciation of *Εὐαγγέλιον* is indeed proved by Uigur passages. In *Türkische Manichaica*, iii, p. 12 (No. 6, ii, V 14) we find "anglion" (*i.e.* 'nhlywn); in *Türkische Turfan-Texte*, iii, line 62, the rhyme requires *onliun* or *onliun* (*cf.* the note on the passage, p. 208).

P. 210. In the *Actes du xxi<sup>e</sup> Congrès*, p. 354, M. Puech considers both the *Epistula Fundamenti* and the *Eikōn/Ārdhang*, without deciding the question.