

MANICHAËISM IN THE EARLY SASANIAN EMPIRE

MANFRED HUTTER

Summary

It is well-known that Mani knew Christian Gnosticism, Zoroastrianism and also a little of Buddhism and used different items from these religions. As we can see from the Šābuhragān, the central themes of Mani's teachings at the Sasanian court were the "two principles" and the "three times", but he reworked them and brought them close to Zurvanism, because King Šābuhr did not favour 'orthodox' Zoroastrianism but 'heretical' Zurvanism. Thus Manichaeism could flourish for thirty years within the Sasanian empire. After Šābuhr's death the Zoroastrian priest Kirdīr gained influence at the court, thus Manichaeism—and Zurvanism—met restrictions which finally led to Mani's death. In consequence Manichaeism and Zurvanism, which always favoured universalism, were put aside in order to establish Zoroastrianism as a nationalistic religion in Iran.

1. Mani—the interpreter of religion

It is a well-known fact that the Manichaean religion depends on many different roots:¹ Mani himself was born into an Iranian family, but at the age of four his father took him to the religious community of the Elchasaites as has become apparent from the publication of the famous Manichaean Codex from Cologne. The location of the Elchasaites in South Mesopotamia bears its influence on Mani because South Mesopotamia was at that time the crossroads of religious thought between the West and the East. On the other hand when Mani had grown up he went to north west India where he encountered Buddhism. Therefore Mani knew Christian Gnosticism, Zoroastrianism and also a little of Buddhism which enabled him to use different items from these religions for his preaching and his interpretation of the former religions. A Manichaean text puts it thus:² "Great noble Maitreya, messenger of the gods, grea[est]³ among the interpreters of Religion, Jesus—Maiden of Light, Mār Mani, have mercy on me." The epitheta given to Mani in this text clearly relate to Buddhism (cf. *mytr*), Zoroastrianism (cf. *yzd'n*), and Syrian Christianity (cf. *yyšw*). The apostle of light, Mani, is the interpreter of the former religions (*dyn* *šy pyšyng'n*) and he himself brings the best religion to the world,

because “the former religions (existed) as long as they had the pure leaders, but when the leaders had been led upwards (i.e. had died), then their religions fell into disorder and became negligent in commandments and works. ... This revelation of mine of the two principles and my living books, my wisdom and knowledge are above and better than those of the previous religions.”⁴ So Mani finally brought to perfection what all other religious leaders before him had started; the teachings of Zarathustra, Buddha, Jesus, and the other prophets were in imperfect order, but they all had some kernels of truth. This topic of sending former prophets to various peoples in various times and languages can be found very often in Manichaean scriptures. Only recently a new text of this kind became known through the publication of the Coptic texts from Dublin showing again the coming of Zarathustra to Persia, of the Buddha to India and of Jesus to the West.⁵ Mani is the legitimate successor of those prophets and the restorer of the true religion whom the god Xradešahr sent to fulfill the religions. To join the Manichaean religion is the best one can do, because Manichaeism is the only door of redemption and Xradešahr will summon all people at the end of time for the last judgement. This is evident in Mani’s Šābuhragān:⁶ “Then Xradešahr (the god of the world of Wisdom)—he who first [gave] that male creation, the original First Man, wisdom and knowledge, and (who) afterwards from time to time and from [age] to age sent wisdom and knowledge to mankind—in that last [age] also, close to the Renovation, that lord Xradešahr, together with all the gods and the religious [exiled?] ... will then stand [up?] in the [heavens].” It is Mani’s teaching that gives the clue to passing this judgement because his teaching shows the real interpretation of the older doctrines. Therefore he adopts and adapts these older doctrines in order to form an entire new religion; in the Sasanian Empire he especially takes into account the teachings of Zurvanism—with all consequences, namely the favour of Šābuhr I. for his religion and the hatred of the Zoroastrian priesthood.

2. Zoroastrian and Zurvanite Mythology and Mani’s Šābuhragān

In Ibn an-Nadīm’s *Fihrist* we find the following reference: “Mani wrote seven books, one of them in Persian and six in Syriac, the

language of Syria.”⁷ This Persian book, the Šābuhragān, Mani wrote for his audiences with the Sasanian king Šābuhr I., hence the title “Šābuhragān”, i.e. the book dedicated to Šābuhr. Various manuscripts of it have been preserved in the findings from the Turfan oasis now housed at Berlin and Göttingen. Already in 1904 F.W.K. Müller managed to publish some fragments from this book but it took until 1979/1980 for D.N. MacKenzie to prepare an almost entire edition and translation of “Mani’s *ipsissima vox*”.⁸ In it Mani described his eschatological teachings. This however was only half the story, because Manichaean eschatology does not work without cosmogony and anthropogony. These missing parts of Mani’s Šābuhragān have been known for a long time but have not been joined to the Šābuhragān. Recently I was able to show—following proposals by W.B. Henning, Mary Boyce, and W. Sundermann⁹—on the account of linguistic and stylistic arguments¹⁰ that the Middle Persian fragments M 98/99 I and M 7980-7984 from the Turfan collection which give a full account of cosmogony and anthropogony are, in fact, also part of Mani’s teachings composed on behalf of Šābuhr I. Therefore the contents of the Šābuhragān can be sketched as follows: The first chapter of the book deals with Mani’s forerunners as we mainly know from Arabic references, but there are no Middle Persian texts of this part available. Then we read about cosmogony and the mixture of the principles of light and darkness wherefrom the material world and mankind originated. To redeem mankind from the bondage of the darkness a saviour figure brings *gnosis* to the world. Thus all human beings can take part in salvation and can return to their divine origin. The same will happen universally when at the end of time light and darkness will be separated again and all the gods of light and the souls of men, who have attained *gnosis*, will dwell in the abodes of paradise, as we are told in the eschatological part of the Šābuhragān.¹¹

What are the main topics in Mani’s teaching in the Sasanian Empire at the court of Šābuhr?¹² The central themes are the “two principles” (*dw bwn*) of light and darkness and the “three times”, the original time when the realms of light and darkness existed side by side, with equal strength but separated by a boundary, the time of mixture after the combat between light and darkness, and finally

the time of the renewed separation of the two principles. Having this in mind we can see that Mani largely depends on Iranian religious thoughts as K. Rudolph has stressed just recently.¹³ It is everybody's task to remember the two principles and the three times and to remember that one has his own roots in the principle of light. Knowing this man has *gnosis* and because of this *gnosis* every man is obliged to fight against the principle of darkness during his whole life; Mani's ethical commandments are a proper guide for this fighting.¹⁴ Thus it is not difficult to see how Mani reworked Zoroastrian mythology in his own cosmogonical and eschatological myth: The strong dualism is well known from Pahlavi sources and the best "parallel" account to Mani's teaching can be found in the (Greater) Bundahišn.¹⁵ In chapter one of this Pahlavi text which can be assigned to the late Sasanian period but certainly contains older materials we read about the primordial fight between Ohrmazd and Ahreman. Since this fight good and evil have been intermingled in the world. For every good creation which Ohrmazd had brought forth Ahreman, the Evil Spirit, made an evil counter-creation to disturb the world of light and goodness. Until the end of time, at the renovation (*frašegird*) of the Zoroastrian cosmos, evil will remain within the good creation. Only then will the demons' strength fade away and Ohrmazd together with the divine beings (*yazadān*) will dwell in his realm of truth and happiness.¹⁶

There is also another important trait in Mani's Iranian version of his teachings, namely a special Iranian style as can be seen from the names of the Manichaean gods. In an important study W. Sundermann has shown¹⁷ that in the whole Šābuhragān there are no Syrian names; all Manichaean gods bear names which show an identification with gods of the Zoroastrian pantheon even in those cases where Mani incorporates divine beings from a non-Iranian tradition: Jesus, Adam or Eve are called Xradešahr, Gēhmurd or Murdiyānag. Because of this terminology Mani's teaching was able to avoid the impression of being alien to the Sasanian empire.¹⁸ Thus Mani not only adopted the terminology and the dualistic mythology of the Zoroastrians but went even farther: Whereas the Zoroastrians thought a kind of dualism which showed good and evil in the spiritual (*mēnōg*) and in the material (*gētīg*) world, Mani's

dualism was more exclusive: The material world, i.e. the realm of Ahrmen, king of darkness, is considered evil; on the other hand the spiritual world, i.e. the realm of the Father of Greatness (*zurwān*) and of the gods of light, is good. From this novel perspective Mani modified the Iranian dualism. It was not however entirely new because the dualism of light and darkness was already in his time a commonplace in gnostic thought and teaching.

What impression did this make on Šābuhr? We know from the Dēnkard that Šābuhr was interested in knowledge of any kind:¹⁹ “Šābuhr, the king of kings, son of Ardašīr, further collected the non-religious writings on medicine, astronomy, movement, time, space, substance, accident, becoming, decay, transformation, logic and other crafts and skills which were dispersed throughout India, Rome and other lands, and collated them with the Avesta and commanded that a copy be made of all those [writings] which were flawless and be deposited in the Royal Treasury. And he put forward for deliberation the annexation of all those pure [teachings] to the Mazdean religion.” This text shows that Šābuhr tried to acquire and introduce new knowledge into his empire. So we think that Mani knew that the ruler would lend his ear to the new teaching and would tolerate Mani. The reason for Šābuhr to act in this way is not absolutely clear. We may, however, suppose the following: When Mani met the ruler he stressed the fact that the Manichaean religion is nothing else than a “reform” of Zarathustra’s ancient teachings, because we have seen that Zarathustra plays—inter alia—a dominant role within Mani’s prophethology; Mani is a “*Zoroaster revivus*” who gives new life to the old creed. But the way in which Mani revived Zarathustra’s teachings must have been still more fascinating for Šābuhr: The king was faced with an empire consisting of various peoples of very different creeds. For all these peoples the new religion offers a common bondage: Besides the Christians who lived in Syria and Mesopotamia within the borders of the Sasanian Empire, Šābuhr’s political encounters with the Romans resulted in the deportation of many Christians to the Sasanian Empire so that the number of Christians increased.²⁰ The Šābuhragān not only shows a close connection to Iranian mythology but also gives an elaborated citation from the New Testament. On the other hand we also have to

acknowledge the general gnostic traits in Manichaeism, parts of which were not unfamiliar to the Syrian Christianity. Thus Manichaeism seemed to be the best religion for the parts of western Sasanian Iran in which Christianity prospered. An analogy can be found in Eastern Iran with its Buddhist population: Mani not only sent his pupil Mār Ammō to them but the Parthian texts which have been composed probably by Mār Ammō himself, already tried to take Buddhist terminology²¹ into account in order to make Manichaeism fitting for “Buddhist ears”. All this fits together: Just as Mani saw his religion as a perfection of all the former religions, so to speak—within the Sasanian borders—as the perfection of Zoroastrianism, Christianity, and Buddhism, Šābuhr intended to see in Manichaeism a suitable syncretistic but Iranian religion for “Greater Iran” partly related to his own Zurwanite views of Zoroastrianism. For although we read in his inscription that he brought forward the Mazdayasnian Religion we have no doubt in saying that Šābuhr did not favour ‘orthodox’ Zoroastrianism but ‘heretical’ Zurwanism. Although the king himself could not convert to Manichaeism for political reasons, Mani’s teachings were a useful tool for his imperial politics.²² Thus Manichaeism could flourish for thirty years within the Sasanian empire. Mani himself stayed in the Persis and Western Iran, where he developed a good deal of his missionary work and his church organisation.²³

3. Kirdīr—Mani’s Zoroastrian Counterpart

The situation changed after Šābuhr’s death. His son Ohrmazd still favoured Mani, but he favoured the Zoroastrian priest Kirdīr as well. This enabled Kirdīr’s religio-political career to start. After Ohrmazd’s short reign his elder brother Wahrām I. became king who held totally different religious ideals than his father Šābuhr. Very probably Kirdīr influenced the king in order to strengthen Zoroastrianism and thus to weaken Manichaeism. We know about Kirdīr’s religious efforts from his four inscriptions²⁴ and also from Manichaean texts, but it is interesting to observe that the further Zoroastrian tradition in Pahlavi—for unknown reasons—never mentions him. From these sources it can be seen that Kirdīr was

probably as old as Mani and that he began his career already under the reign of Šābuhr but did not have a prominent religious position then.²⁵ It was only Ohrmazd who made Kirdīr the “*mowbed of Ohrmazd*” and Mosig-Walburg comes to the conclusion that he was nearly absolutely free as regards religious activities from that moment on, i.e. he became the leading priest of the Sasanian state church.²⁶ But if we take into account the Manichaean materials we see that this cannot be the case because at the time of Wahrām I., when Mani was summoned to the court at Bet Lapat (i.e. Gundešābuhr) Kirdīr was only one among a certain number of Zoroastrians who constituted the juridical court; Kirdīr alone did not have the right to put Mani to trial. Therefore it is highly improbable that he was the highest Zoroastrian priest and judge (*dēnwar* and *dastwar*).²⁷ It took until the reign of Wahrām II.—after Mani’s death—for Kirdīr to come to the climax of his religio-political career.²⁸ In those days he was given the title *buxt-ruwān-Wahrām*, he got a rank in the Sasanian nobility as we can see from Wahrām’s rock relief at Naqš-i Rostam and also from Kirdīr’s own inscriptions. From the latter ones two important facts are evident for Sasanian Zoroastrianism: Kirdīr describes his vision²⁹ through which he saw heaven and hell, and his “double” (pahl. *hnglpy*)³⁰ being led to paradise by a young maiden, who is nobody else than the *dēn*, Kirdīr’s own conscience and the Zoroastrian religion. This visionary extraterrestrial journey to the otherworld has rightly been compared with shamanistic practices and visionary journeys but it seems too far-fetched to conclude that this vision has been modelled to react to comparable shamanistic traits of Mani himself.³¹ W. Sundermann states that Mani’s twin (*narjamīg*) can better and more easily be interpreted in terms of gnosticism and apocalypticism than within a shamanistic framework.³² But nevertheless Kirdīr’s vision gives an important insight into his Zoroastrian belief and clearly shows his “dogma”: Good or evil done in this world will be rewarded in the otherworld. The good man will reach heaven but the evil-doer will go to hell. This is a much simpler ethical and religious teaching than Mani’s sophisticated mythology of the redemption of the divine light which is in everybody’s soul and thus incarcerated in every material body. Kirdīr’s theology, which we can see in his vision and from the political power he had gained at the Sasanian court, also led to the persecution of other religions as he openly states in his inscriptions.³³ All non-Zoroastrian religions

within the Sasanian empire are mentioned, among them of course the Zandīqs, i.e. the Manichaeans, but the great persecution of Manichaeans only took place after Mani's death within the reign of Wahrām II. In conclusion we can say that Kirdīr made an astonishing career in the Sasanian court: Under Šābuhr he was a mere Zoroastrian priest of the lower hierarchy but then he steadily gained influence from the reign of Ohrmazd to the reign of Wahrām I. and II. On the other hand Mani lost—after his success during Šābuhr's reign—increasingly his influence until his death under Wahrām I.

About Mani's last days the Manichaean texts give the following picture: When he arrived at Bet Lapat he was not welcomed by Wahrām at the court as we read in M 3, a Middle Persian text.³⁴ Wahrām questions the need of men like Mani who neither go hunting nor fishing nor give healing to sick people. Mani replies that he had already freed many of Wahrām's servants from demons and witches and had removed fever from them. But nevertheless Wahrām put him to prison to please the Magians—thus we read in the Coptic Psalm-Book.³⁵ “The lover of fighting, the peaceless one, roared in flaming anger, he commanded them to fetter the righteous one that he might please the Magians, the teacher of Persia, the servants of fire. This is the way that they gave judgement upon the victor, the angel, the Paraclete.” But we have another important source about Mani's encounter with Wahrām: in the Coptic homilies³⁶ Wahrām questions why Mani has received this divine knowledge rather than the king. Mani's answer was that it was the choice of the gods to reveal their knowledge and truth to whosoever they may wish. Gods do not care for political hierarchies. This answer finally shows the ideological differences between Mani and Wahrām: The Zoroastrian ruler being invested by Ahura Mazdā (Ohrmazd) cannot bear a rival like Mani, who has closer connections to god than the king. Thus there is no longer any common bond between Mani's teaching and Wahrām's politico-religious theology. Wahrām's theology neatly runs in these lines which we also read in the “Testament of Ardašīr”:³⁷ “Know that kingship and religion are twin brothers, no one of which can be maintained without the other. For religion is the foundation of kingship, and kingship is the guardian or religion. Kingship cannot subsist without its foundation, and religion cannot subsist without its guardian.”—In Sasanian Iran the religious leader had to be at

the side of the political leaders. This was the case with Mani and Šābuhr, with Kirdīr and Ohrmazd, Wahrām I. and II., but not with Mani and these later kings. Mani's death in prison—his return to the Realm of Light, as Manichaean texts put it—was thus only the logical consequence of his political interference in the early Sasanian history.

4. Manichaeism, Zurwanism, and Zoroastrianism in the Early Sasanian Period

One problem within the history of Iranian religions is the question of the relationship between Zoroastrianism and Zurwanism. After having analysed Mani's own contribution to the religions in the Sasanian empire we think that we can also offer some insight into trends in this religious history. Mary Boyce who certainly knows the material best argues that in the early Sasanian empire Zurwanism was the leading religion favoured by the kings besides the "orthodox" Zoroastrianism.³⁸ But a great number of Iranists, even if they acknowledge the importance of Zurwanism, hold the opposite to be true. Thus Gh. Gnoli says that the development of orthodox Zoroastrianism took place in the third century together with the political and politico-religious propaganda of the Sasanian rulers.³⁹ J. Duchesne-Guillemin assigns the spread and prospering of Zurwanism to the Arsacid period and to the beginning of the Sasanian era thus Zoroastrianism necessarily being revived by the kings and the Zoroastrian priests in early Sasanian times.⁴⁰

From the Manichaean texts we can see that Mani was clearly aware of Zurwanism, because otherwise he never would have used the name "Zurwān" (*zrw³n*) for his highest god, the Father of Greatness. But this name also shows that Zurwanism was spread only in the south-western part of the empire, i.e. in Fārs, because Parthian Manichaean texts never use the name Zurwān for this god. It can therefore be concluded that in north-eastern Iran, i.e. Parthia, Zurwanism had not spread in a manner comparable to that in the south-west.⁴¹ But also from the cosmogonical and eschatological texts of the Šābuhragān we can see that Mani mainly uses Zurwanite traditions when he relies on Iranian mythologoumena,⁴² possibly because Zurwanism in general accomodated his gnostic teachings more adequately.⁴³ When we

relate these Manichaean data to Šābuhr's reign we arrive at the conclusion that Šābuhr indeed followed Zoroastrianism in Zurwanite lines as M. Boyce had already suggested. But to my knowledge Šābuhr seemed to have been the only Zurwanite king in the early Sasanian empire. His father and predecessor Ardašīr favoured orthodox Zoroastrianism as can be derived from the *Dēnkard* and the "Letter of Tansar"⁴⁴ which describe the religious reforms of Zoroastrianism undertaken by Tansar on behalf of Ardašīr. Given such political and religious circumstances it was certainly better for Mani to stay outside the Sasanian borders at that time and to wait until a new ruler would ascend the throne. This happened when Šābuhr became his father's successor as can be read in a Coptic Kephalaion:⁴⁵ "In the year in which the king Ardašīr died his son Šābuhr became king and he [succeeded] him. I went from the land of the Indians to the land of the Persians ... and I appeared in front of king Šābuhr."—Šābuhr's successors and sons Ohrmazd and mainly Wahrām I. lent their ears again to the Zoroastrian clergy as was shown above. Wahrām being older than Ohrmazd was first put aside from ascending the throne so that I want to propose⁴⁶ that this must have happened on account of his Zoroastrian views that did not please his Zurwanite father Šābuhr who therefore preferred his younger son Ohrmazd to be a—Zurwanite—ruler of the state. When Kirdīr gained influence at the court of Ohrmazd, the king slowly changed his attitudes towards Zoroastrianism. After his sudden death Wahrām I. raised Zoroastrianism to the rank of a state church thus having no more place for alien religions and opening the door to intolerance and consequently to persecution of other creeds.⁴⁷

Thus the following conclusion may be drawn: In the early Sasanian empire religion and politics are brothers and we can see that each king had a kind of "court theologian". Ardašīr went with Tansar, Šābuhr went with Mani, Ohrmazd (in his later days) and Wahrām I. (and II.) went with Kirdīr. But their relevant theology was always different: While Ardašīr, Ohrmazd and Wahrām were "orthodox" Zoroastrians, Šābuhr favoured the "heretical" Zurwanism, the religion which was closer to Mani's teaching than Zoroastrianism was. Thus it becomes clear why Mani himself could make his politico-religious way only during the reign of Šābuhr. It also becomes clear why Mani adopted and adapted especially Zurwanite ideas for his teachings where he relies upon Iranian tradi-

tions. Otherwise later Manichaeism in Iran discarded Zurwanism and we always find traces of anti-Zurwanite polemics in Manichaean texts, e.g. we read in M 28: “And they assert that Ohrmīzd and Ahrmēn are brothers. It is consistent with such ideas that they will come to an evil end.”⁴⁸—Besides this religious tradition another fact within Early Sasanian Iran can be traced: Šābuhr, Zurwanism and Manichaeism favoured—each one on another level—universalism, while the orthodox *mowbeds*’ Zoroastrianism was nationalistic.⁴⁹ Thus Zoroastrianism remained a national Iranian religion without missionary proselytism not only within the Sasanian empire but—in theory—up to the present days within the Parsi community. Mani’s religion on the other hand became an international world religion spreading from Spain to China even though Mani’s success in Iran was only a very limited and temporary one.

Institut für Religionswissenschaft
Karl-Franzens-Universität
Halbärthgasse 2
A - 8010 Graz

MANFRED HUTTER

¹ M. Hutter, *Mani und die Sasaniden. Der iranisch-agnostische Synkretismus einer Weltreligion*, Innsbruck 1988, 7-10 gives a short outline of the connections between Manichaeism and other religions.

² The Parthian fragment M 38, edited by M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaeism Middle Persian and Parthian*, Téhéran/Liège 1975 (= AcIr 9), 196.

³ Restore *trkw m² n² n² dyn w[zrg]*.

⁴ M 5794 cited after J.P. Asmussen, *Manichaean Literature*, Delmar 1975, 12; the Middle Persian text has been edited by Boyce, *Reader* 29sq.; cf. Hutter, *Mani* 49-53.

⁵ On Mani’s propheticology according to the Kephalaia cf. most recently M. Tardieu, “La diffusion du Bouddhisme dans l’empire Kouchan, l’Iran et la Chine, d’après un Kephalaion manichéen inédit”, in: *StIr* 17 (1988) 153-182, 162sq. and W. Sundermann, “Manichaean Traditions on the Date of the Historical Buddha”, in: H. Bechert (ed.), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, Göttingen 1991, 426-438, 430-435 with references to older literature.

⁶ D.N. MacKenzie, “Mani’s Šābuhragān”, in: *BSOAS* 42 (1979) 500-534, 505, ll. 17-28; II., in: *BSOAS* 43 (1980) 288-310; cf. Asmussen, *Literature* 104.

⁷ S.H. Taqizadeh / A.A. Širāzī, *Mānī wa Dīn-e, ū*, Teheran 1335/1956-57, 161; B. Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm. A Tenth Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. Vol. 2, London 1970, 797sq.

⁸ F.W.K. Müller, *Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkistan*. II. Teil, Berlin 1904, 11-25; MacKenzie, *Šābuhragān* I, 504-522; II, 289-301.

⁹ W.B. Henning, "Review of A.V.W. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*", in: *OLZ* 37 (1934) 749-756, 751; M. Boyce, *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*, Berlin 1960, 132; W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berlin 1981 (= BTT 11), 92.

¹⁰ M. Hutter, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte. Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980-7984*, Wiesbaden 1992 (= StOR 21), 124-134.

¹¹ Cf. Hutter, *Šābuhragān-Texte* 142-144. — A brief outline of the Manichaean Myth has been given in Hutter, *Mani* 32-42 and in Boyce, *Reader* 4-8.

¹² Mani did not only teach the king but also other members of the royal family, e.g. Šābuhr's brothers Pērōz or Mihršāh, cf. Hutter, *Mani* 19sq, 23sq.

¹³ K. Rudolph, "Mani und der Iran", in: A. van Tongerloo/S. Giversen (eds.), *Manichaica Selecta. Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Lovanii 1991, 307-321, 316-319.

¹⁴ The importance of Manichaean ethics for salvation has been shown by M. Hutter, "Das Erlösungsgeschehen im manichäisch-iranischen Mythos. Motiv- und traditionsgeschichtliche Analysen", in: K.W. Woschitz/M. Hutter/K. Prenner, *Das manichäische Urdrama des Lichtes*, Wien 1989, 153-236, 201-210, cf. also N. Sims-Williams, "The Manichaean Commandments. A Survey of the Sources", in: *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, Leiden 1985 (= AcIr 24), 573-582, 573-579.

¹⁵ B.T. Anklesaria, *Zand-Ākāsih. Iranian or Greater Bundahišn. Transliteration and Translation in English*, Bombay 1956, 4sqq.; M. Boyce, *Textual sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*, Totowa 1984, 45sqq.; cf. Hutter, *Erlösungsgeschehen* 166sqq.

¹⁶ GrBd XXXIV, Anklesaria, *Zand-Ākāsih* 282sqq. and Boyce, *Sources* 52sqq.; cf. further Zādspr. XXXIV, ed. R.C. Zaehner, *Zurvan. A Zoroastrian Dilemma*, Oxford 1955, 343-354; for a detailed analysis and comparison of the Manichaean and Zoroastrian (Zurwanite) eschatology cf. Hutter, *Erlösungsgeschehen* 214-216, 219sq.

¹⁷ W. Sundermann, "Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos", in: *AoF* 6 (1979) 95-133, 95sqq.

¹⁸ Cf. Sundermann, *Namen* 106: "Wenn er [i.e. Mani] sich in seinem Šb. so weitgehend von syr. Mustern unabhängig machte, so gewiß, um unter Iranern und Mazdayasniern verständlich zu sein und den Eindruck der Fremdheit zu mindern."

¹⁹ DkM 412, 17-413, 2; cf. M. Shaki, "The Dēnkard Account of the History of the Zoroastrian Scriptures", in: *ArOr* 49 (1981) 114-125, 117 and Boyce, *Sources* 114.

²⁰ On the spread of Christianity in Iran cf. M.L. Chaumont, *La christianisation de l'empire iranien. Des origines aux grandes persécutions du IV^e siècle*, Louvain 1988 (= CSCO 499, Sub. 80).

²¹ N. Sims-Williams, "Indian Elements in Parthian and Sogdian", in: K. Röhrborn/W. Veenker (eds.), *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*, Wiesbaden 1983, 132-141.

²² Cf. also A. Böhlig, "Der Manichäismus", in: M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Die orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich*, Leiden 1981, 436-458, 436-447.

²³ A detailed historical outline of Mani's relations with Šābuhr is given by Hutter, *Mani* 16-24.

²⁴ KKZ, KSM, KNRa & KNrb; cf. editions and translations by M. Back, *Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften*, Téhéran/Liège 1978 (= AcIr 18), 384-489 and the study by K. Mosig-Walburg, *Die frühen sasanidischen Könige als Vertreter und Förderer der zarathustrischen Religion*, Frankfurt/Main 1982, 77-105.

²⁵ Cf. also J.R. Russell, "Kartīr and Mānī. A Shamanistic Model of their Conflict", in: *Iranica Varia. Papers in Honour of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*, Leiden 1990 (= AcIr 30), 180-193, 183: Kirdīr and Mani accompanied Šābuhr on his campaigns against the Romans.—We cannot accept Mosig-Walburg's proposal (Könige 66sq. 93sq; cf. Boyce, *Zoroastrians* 109sq.) that Kirdīr held a very high priestly rank already during Šābuhr's reign.

²⁶ Mosig-Walburg, *Könige* 97sq.

²⁷ Cf. H.J. Polotsky, *Manichäische Homilien*, Stuttgart 1934, 45, 14-18; further W. Hinz, "Mani and Kardēr", in: *La Persia nel Medioevo*, Roma 1971, 485-499, 488sq.

²⁸ Russell, *Kartīr* 187sq. sometimes confuses Wahrām I. and II. so that the conclusions drawn by him are not always exact.

²⁹ On the textual studies of the important but fragmentary and difficult text KSM see Back, *Staatsinschriften* 384sq. and P.O. Skjaervø, "'Kirdīr's Vision': Translation and Analysis", in: *AMI NF* 16 (1983) 269-306; important recent analyses of this vision were given by P. Calmayer/H. Gaube, "Eine edlere Frau als sie habe ich nie gesehen", in: *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, Leiden 1985 (= AcIr 24), 43-60, 51-60 and Russell, *Kartīr* 183-187.

³⁰ Cf. R.N. Frye, "Two Iranian Notes", in: *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, Leiden 1985 (= AcIr 24), 185-190, 189.

³¹ Pace Russell, *Kartīr* 184; Russell also mentions the following shamanistic elements in Manichaeism: Mani's twin, his visionary appearance in front of Mār Ammō and his journey through the air.

³² W. Sundermann, *OLZ* 86 (1991) 310sq.

³³ Back, *Staatsinschriften* 414-416.

³⁴ Asmussen, *Literature* 54sq.; for the historical setting of Mani's death cf. Hutter, *Mani* 27-31.

³⁵ C.R.C. Allberry, *A Manichaean Psalm-Book II*, Stuttgart 1938, 16, 19-23, cf. 15, 5-12; further Hinz, *Mani* 491.

³⁶ Polotsky, *Homilien* 47, 22-24.

³⁷ Cited after Gh. Gnoli, *The Idea of Iran. An Essay on its Origin*, Roma 1989, 170, cf. Russell, *Kartīr* 181. Something similar is stated in the "Letter of Tansar": "For church and state are born of the one womb, joined together and never be sundered", cited after Boyce, *Sources* 109.

³⁸ M. Boyce, *Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*, London 1979, 112sq.; M. Boyce, "Some Further Reflections on Zurvanism", in: *Iranica Varia: Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*, Leiden 1990 (= AcIr 30), 20-29, 25sq.

³⁹ Gnoli, *Idea* 140.

⁴⁰ J. Duchesne-Guillemin, "Zoroastrian Religion", in: E. Yarshater (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran. Vol. 3(2). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*, Cambridge 1983, 866-908, 901.

⁴¹ On the divine name *zrw'n* in Manichaean texts see Sundermann, *Namen* 124 notes 138-142 and Boyce, *Zoroastrians* 112.

⁴² I have analysed these traditions in a separate study, see Hutter, *Erlösungsgeschehen passim*, cf. also Rudolph, *Mani* 314sq.

⁴³ Cf. also Frye, *Notes* 190 who suggests Zurvanism being part of the gnostic

milieu at Mani's time.—One also might ask whether gnosis as a "Weltanschauung" gave an impulse for the prospering of Zurwanism in the first centuries A.D.

⁴⁴ The text from the *Dēnkard* has been translated by Shaki, Account 118sq. and Boyce, Sources 114; for the Letter of Tansar see Boyce, Sources 109-111.

⁴⁵ H.J. Polotsky/A. Böhlig, *Kephalaia*. 1. Hälfte, Stuttgart 1940, 15, 27-31; the text is restored according to W. Sundermann, "Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis", in: *AOH* 24 (1971) 79-125, 95 with references to A. Maricq and L.Th. Lefort.

⁴⁶ Cf. already Hutter, Mani 27.

⁴⁷ Cf. also Gnoli, Idea 140, who however does not give an exact date within the third century for this politico-religious development.

⁴⁸ Cited after Asmussen, Literature 13sq.; we can also mention the Uygur *Xwāstwānīft* text which has an obvious Iranian background and shows also anti-Zurwanite polemics; here we read: 'If we should have said: 'He (= Āzrua = Zurwān) is the one who has created the immortal gods' or we should have said: 'Xormuzta tānri and Šimnu are brothers', ... (then), my God, I repent.' (J.P. Asmussen, *Xwāstwānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965, 194 I C).

⁴⁹ On Zoroastrian nationalism see Gnoli, Idea 158.