

THE HERMENEUTICS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE IN SASANIAN IRAN
THE DEATH OF MANI AND THE SEIZURE OF MANICHAEAN PROPERTY*

YUHAN SOHRAB-DINSHAW VEVAINA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

In memory of Fergus Millar.

“And if both are the same sect, why do the Magians (*mogk*) abhor the Manichaeans (*Zandik*), if they are not distinguished from each other by conduct? Perhaps it is by form, and not by truth.”

– Eznik of Kolb¹

The killing of the prophet Mani, the eponymous founder of ‘Manichaeism,’ in the 3rd century CE was one of the most discussed events of Late Antiquity and has remained so—at least in academic circles—till today. From being labeled a heretic, lunatic, seducer, maniac, and pseudo-prophet to Amin Maalouf’s sensitive treatment of Mani in his 1991 novel, *Les jardins de lumière*, his fascinating life, eclectic theology, and gruesome death have long captured imaginations. The circumstances of and motivations for his most violent end are described by a number of important authors and sources in a variety of languages and traditions, reflecting both the allure and challenge of studying Manichaeism.² In this article, I will discuss a Zoroastrian account of this event but one found in an

* The present article is based on talks given at the University of Oxford, the Library of Congress, and Yale University. I would like to thank ABBAS AMANAT, KEVIN VAN BLADEL, TOURAJ DARYAEE, HIRAD DINAVARI, and KHODADAD REZAKHANI for their kind invitations. Here at Oxford I must thank PHIL BOOTH and IDA TOTH for allowing me to present my work in the Late Antique and Byzantine Studies Seminar. I would also like to express my gratitude to JASON BEDUHN, KAYLA DANG, CHARLES HÄBERL, PRODS OKTOR SKJÆRVØ, and MIHAELA TIMUŞ for their critiques, suggestions and improvements.

¹ Transl. after BLANCHARD/YOUNG 1998, p. 103, §148.

² For the most comprehensive synthetic works on the narrative sources about the Manichaeans, see TAQĪZĀDEH/ŠĪRĀZĪ 1335/1956 and REEVES 2011. For the Manichaean sources, see GARDNER/LIEU 2004. For recent methodological articles on the co-development and relationship between Manichaeism and Zoroastrianism, see BEDUHN 2020 and REZANIA 2020.

unlikely place—the *Warštmānsr Nask* in *Dēnkard* Book 9—a Pahlavi commentary on the five *Gāθās* or ‘poems,’ ascribed to the prophet Zoroāstra, in which his Bronze Age ‘poet’s complaint’³ reflects the lack of social and political acceptance of a new religious message and messenger. Just as Mani appears to have incorporated these tropes from Zoroāstra’s plaintive words in *Yasna* 46, the *Kamnamaēzā Hāiti*, for his own origin story as a tortured prophet in Sasanian Babylonia, as we see in the *Cologne Mani Codex (CMC)*,⁴ the Zoroastrian hermeneuts in turn, read his death and the persecution of his followers right back into that very Avestan *hāiti* (*Yasna* 46.7–8) as a form of competitive and contested hermeneutics with the *Gāθās* serving as a scriptural battleground for establishing religious legitimacy and, ultimately, political primacy in one of the most dynamic moments in Iranian history.

The most evocative passages describing Mani’s death provide us with a panoply of political and religious rationales for his gruesome execution. A selection, presented here in non-chronological order, will help to better contextualize the texts being discussed and the political and religious stakes in the late 3rd century CE in the Sasanian Empire (224–651 CE).

Ibn al-Nadīm [*ca.* 932–990 CE], *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (“The Catalogue”):

“Mānī was put to death during the reign of Bahrām b. Sābūr [= Wahrām / Bahrām I, r. 271–274 CE]. After he executed him, he suspended him in two pieces, one half over a certain gate and the other half over a different gate of the city of Jundaysābūr [= Aram. Bēt Lapaṭ]. These two places received the designations ‘the upper part of the Lord’ and ‘the lower (part) of the Lord.’ It is said that he had been previously imprisoned by Sābūr, but after Sābūr died Bahrām freed him. It is also said that he died while in prison, but there is no uncertainty regarding his ‘crucifixion.’ Some people relate that he had two misshapen feet whereas others said that it was his right foot (only).”⁵

Al-Ṭabarī [839–923 CE], *Ta’rīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk* (“History of the Prophets and Kings”):

³ For the Zoroastrian term for ‘complaint’ (*garz-*) and a study of this genre in Old Avestan, see SKJÆRVØ 2001, pp. 351–375.

⁴ See DE JONG 2014, pp. 129–147 and the discussion below.

⁵ Ibn al-Nadīm = TAJADDUD 1971, p. 398; transl. in REEVES 2011, p. 39, where he suggests (fn. 134) that Mani’s deformity might be inherited from Jewish polemical tropes connected with false prophets but see also the Pahlavi sources below.

“According to what has been mentioned, Mānī the *zindīq* summoned him to his religion. So Bahrām enquired exhaustively into Mānī’s beliefs, and found that he was a propagandist for Satan. So, he ordered him to be executed and his body to be skinned and stuffed with straw, then for it to be hung from one of the city gates of Junday Sābūr, which is called Mānī’s Gate. He also killed his followers and those who had joined his faith.”⁶

Al-Bīrūnī [973–1048 CE], *Kitāb al-āthār al-bāqiya ‘ani’l-qurūn al-khāliya* (“Chronicle of Ancient Nations”):

“I heard the *isbahbadh* [= Pahl. *spāhbed*, ‘army chief’ in the Sasanian period but used as ‘ruler’ in later Islamic times] Marzubān b. Rustam say that Sābūr banished him from his kingdom, adhering to the way prescribed to them by Zarādusht; (namely, that) one should expel those posing as prophets from the land. He [= Sābūr] imposed upon him the condition that he was to never return. Hence, he [= Mani] journeyed to India, China, and Tibet, and announced his message there. Then he returned, and at that time Bahrām arrested him and put him to death for having violated the condition, for it was now permissible to take his life.”⁷

Eznik of Kolb [5th century CE], *Elc alandoc* (“Contra the Heretics”) or *De Deo* (“Against the Sects”):

“But because Mani wished by a false form to demonstrate a way of life better than theirs [= Zoroastrians] — to make known that it indeed is entirely free from desire and not only more so than those, but than all sects —, whence, reprimanded for the fondling of young girls, he was deprived of his life through death by flaying.”⁸

Michael Syrus ‘the Syrian’ [*ca.* 1126–1199 CE], *Chronicon* (“Chronicle”):

“Mānī, having promised the king of Persia that he would heal his son but then proving unable to do so, fled to Mesopotamia. However, the king of Persia found him, flayed him,

⁶ Al-Ṭabarī = DE GOEJE 1879–1901, VOL. 1/2, pp. 830, 834; transl. in BOSWORTH 1999, p. 45.

⁷ Al-Bīrūnī = SACHAU 1878, p. 109; transl. in REEVES 2011, p. 43. Marzubān appears to have been a prince of the Bāwand Dynasty in Ṭabaristān in the late 10th century CE.

⁸ Transl. BLANCHARD/YOUNG 1998, p. 104, §150. For a discussion of anti-Manichaean polemics regarding under-age sexuality, see KIEL 2019, pp. 112–136.

stuffed his skin with straw, and hung it up upon a wall. This was the end of the impious Mānī.”⁹

Coptic *Bēma* (“Seat”) Psalms 225, 226:

“I have heard concerning you Magians, the priests of the fire, that you seized my god in your foul hands; impious men, mad and godless, the brothers of the Jews, the murderers of Christ. A fire took hold of your heart, until you had murdered the righteous ambassador...

The lover of fighting [= the Sasanian monarch], the peaceless one, roared in flaming anger; he commanded them to fetter the righteous one, that he might please the Magians, the teachers of Persia, the servants of fire. In truth, this is the way that they gave judgement upon the victor, the angel, the Paraclete [= Mani]...

(226) They were stirred, they trembled, even the powers of the evil one, they turned their sword against the humble man; they were not willing indeed to see me in the streets of their cities. Lo, the sky and the earth and the two luminaries bear witness of me in the heights; that I did good among them, but they in their cruelty crucified me...

Lo, his body was brought forth in the city of these sinners, when they had cut off his head and hung it up amid the whole multitude.”¹⁰

Coptic *Homilies* 60, 1–17 (“The Section of the Narrative about the Crucifixion”):

“This is the memorial from [the day of] his crucifixion until the hour when he came forth: [On the] Lord’s Day he entered Bēlapat [= Copt. form of Bēt̄ Lapat]; on the second day (*i.e.* Monday) he [was] accused; on the third they ... he fortified his church [until the] Sabbath. They searched for him and bound him. [Afterwards ...] all his enemies. On the [Sabbath they] sealed his chains; they took [him in to the prison]. They bound him on the eighth day of [Meshir. Until] the day when he went to the heights shall make twenty-[six] days he was bound in chains of iron. At the eleventh [hour] of the day he rose from [the body] up to the dwelling-places of his greatness [in] the heights. He met his Form ... of

⁹ Michael Syrus = CHABOT 1963, VOL. IV, p. 119; transl. in REEVES 2011, p. 61.

¹⁰ Transl. ALLBERRY in GARDNER/LIEU 2004, pp. 97, 100–101. See also POLOTSKY 1934 for the last days of Mani. See now GARDNER 2020, pp. 59–82, for a discussion of Mani’s death and the variagated reception histories of the event.

the lights. He came forth and leapt to the heights [with (?)] the power who had come for him.”¹¹

These vivid yet wildly contradictory narratives of the imperial motivations for and political symbolism of Mani’s ultimate demise capture the fundamental historiographical dilemmas we face while studying the Sasanian Empire.¹² Our narrative sources for Iranian religious and political history connected with the Sasanian era were either chronicled by the much later Muslim scholars or were included in the histories written by their traditional enemies, the Romans and Byzantines, as well as often-hostile minority religious communities such as the Jews, Christians, Mandaeans, and Manichaeans, some of whom were disaffected former Zoroastrians. Additionally, we must take into account the under-appreciated sources written by former vassals in Armenian and Georgian. What we do have in the way of securely datable sources from the Sasanians themselves are royal inscriptions and reliefs, coins, seals, bullae, and papyri¹³—all of which bear witness to a rich political theology and a variegated material culture but which typically do not explicate their own repertoire of political and theological symbolism in a self-reflective manner. For that we must turn to the Zoroastrian literary sources in Zoroastrian Middle Persian or Pahlavi, though those texts were redacted in the early Islamic period from the 9th century onwards.

What I wish to demonstrate in this article is how the late antique derived hermeneutical tradition in Pahlavi literature can, nonetheless, meaningfully contribute to a richer understanding of Sasanian historiography, especially when historicized in concert with non-Zoroastrian and non-Iranian sources. No figure better embodied the religious cosmopolitanism of the Sasanian world than Mani, the founder of the world’s first universalizing ‘religion,’¹⁴ who viewed himself as the inheritor of prophets like Jesus, the Buddha, and Zoroaster, while drawing from traditions associated with Biblical patriarchs such as Adam, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, and Shem, and apostles like Paul, upon whom he seems to have partially modeled his church.¹⁵

¹¹ Transl. after GARDNER 2015, pp. 203–204.

¹² For more detailed discussions of this historiographical dilemma *vis-à-vis* Iranian religious history, see DE JONG 2013, pp. 23–53; and from the perspective of general Iranian historiography, see DARYAEE 2016, pp. 193–203.

¹³ For a discussion of the different types of ‘primary’ sources and their historiographical value, see GYSELEN 2009, pp. 163–190.

¹⁴ See BEDUHN 2015, pp. 247–275 and BEDUHN 2020 and REZANIA 2020 for discussions of Mani’s use of what we might call ‘objectified religion’ and the mutual development of the Middle Persian term *dēn* (< Av. *daēnā*- ‘vision soul’).

¹⁵ See REEVES 2011, pp. 11 and 39–41 and REEVES 1996, pp. 5–30. The Islamic heresiographer ‘Abd al-Jabbār [d. ca. AH 415 / 1024 CE] in his *Tathbūt dalā’il al-nubuwwa* (“The Confirmation of the Proofs of Prophethood”), written in AH 385

Mani's execution is discussed most often in conjunction with the Zoroastrian imperial response to religious diversity succinctly captured in the contemporaneous 3rd-century CE reliefs of the Zoroastrian priest Kerdīr (Kartīr¹⁶) where he unabashedly claims that a number of repressive actions were taken against the non-Zoroastrian religious communities living in the empire (§11; KKZ 9–10 = KNRm 29–30 = KSM 14):

... W yḥwdy W šmny W blmny W n'cl'y W klstyd'n W mktky W zndyky BYN štly
 MḤYTN YḤWWNd W 'wzdysy gwk'nyḥy W glsty ZY ŠDY'n wyšwpyḥy W yzd'n g'sy
 W nšdmy 'kylydy...

*ud yahūd ud šaman ud braman ud nāzarā¹⁷ ud kristiyān ud magdag ud zandīg andar šahr
 zad bawēnd ud uzdēs gugānīh ud gilist ī dēwān wišōbīh ud yazdān gāh ud nišēm akirīy...*

“... and Jews, Buddhists, Hindus, Nazoraeans, Christians, Baptists(?), and Manichaeans (*zandīg*) within the realm were struck down, idols were destroyed, and the dwellings of the demons were ruined and turned into thrones and seats for the gods...”¹⁸

This passage has been discussed *ad nauseum*,¹⁹ especially since it is here that we have the first attestation of the term *zandīg*, often suggested to mean a producer of a heretical or non-normative interpretation (Pahl. *zand*) of the *Avesta* or Avestan corpus (Pahl. *abēstag*), and later used more expansively by Muslims for the Manichaeans, errant dualists, freethinkers, heretics, and those espousing dubious and problematic beliefs.²⁰ What is less well known, however is the explicitly eisegetical act of reading the death of Mani *into* the *Zand* of the *Gāthās* as found in the Pahlavi

/ 995 CE in the Būyid capital of Rayy, explicitly compares Mani to Paul and equates the former's ignominious death with the latter's martyrdom at the hands of the Romans.

¹⁶ For a survey of his name, titles, and inscriptions, see SKJÆRVØ, “KARTIR,” EIr.

¹⁷ KKZ, KSM < n'cl'y > || KNRm < [n]'s[l'y] >

¹⁸ GIGNOUX 1991, p. 46. Cf. also the text and transl. in MACKENZIE 1989, pp. 42, 54, 58. For a detailed discussion of these names, see DE BLOIS 2002, pp. 1–30, in particular pp. 5–8 and DE BLOIS 2015, pp. 141–154. See also JULLIEN/JULLIEN 2002, pp. 282–335 for an analysis of the Christian names.

¹⁹ DE JONG 2013, p. 40, makes the observation that Kerdīr's hostile treatment of these minority religious communities living under the Sasanians finds scant evidence in their literature discussing that period. See also RUSSELL 1990, pp. 180–193 and SKJÆRVØ 1997, pp. 313–342 for the interactions between Mani and Kerdīr. See also BEDUHN 2020.

²⁰ But see DE BLOIS 2012a for some deserved skepticism towards such a linear genealogy: “From the vantage point of modern linguistic knowledge it would seem more likely that Middle Persian *zandīk* was borrowed from Aramaic *zaddīk* ‘righteous’... It is naturally possible that already in Middle Persian the loan word *zandīk* was reinterpreted as **zandīg* ‘follower of a *zand*’, but this is hardly the original meaning.” For the *zandīk* in Islamic sources, see also STROUMSA/STROUMSA 1988, pp. 37–58; CHOKR 1993; and KRISTÓ-NAGY 2016, pp. 56–81. For a discussion of an Avestan etymology for *Zand*, see CANTERA 2004, pp. 1–15.

hermeneutical tradition in the ninth book of the *Dēnkard* (“Acts of the Tradition”). *Dēnkard* Book 9 contains three Pahlavi versions of ‘lost’ Avestan commentaries (Pahl. *nask* < Av. *naska*-²¹) on the five *Gāθās* (*Yasna* 28–34, 43–51, 53), the *Yasna Haptaṅhāiti* (“The Ritual in 7 Sections,” *Y.* 35–41), and four shorter prayers (*Y.* 27.13–15 and 54.1) that frame them in the *Yasna* ritual. Essentially, we have these Old Avestan texts that we date back to the mid-2nd millennium BCE on linguistic grounds embedded within the *Yasna* liturgy in Young Avestan and their Pahlavi versions or *Zand* that represent orally-transmitted commentarial traditions on these most sacred of ritual texts culminating some two and a half millennia later in Sasanian and early Islamic times.²² Alongside the Avestan originals and their Pahlavi *Zand*, we also find a meta-hermeneutical tradition in *Dēnkard* Book 9 with three radically different Gathic (Pahl. *gāhānīg*) *nasks* or commentaries. These Pahlavi summaries of putative Avestan *nasks* were, in turn, finally redacted in the 9th century CE and are attested in medieval manuscripts from the late 16th century onwards, one of which contains a copy of the earliest extant colophon in Pahlavi literature, copied in Baghdad in 1020 CE.²³

While the myriad and vexing issues of the textual transmission and interpretive fidelity of *Dēnkard* Book 9 are beyond the scope of this article, what should interest us is the eisegetical technique of reading events in the Sasanian era *into* the *Gāθās*, which I believe will prove rewarding for both historians and religionists alike. A passage in *Dēnkard* Book 9 (*Dk.* 9.39.13–16²⁴) from the *Warštṁānsr Nask* nominally interprets the *Kamnamaēzā Hāiti* (*Y.* 46.1–19), the final section (Av. *hāiti*-; Pahl. *hād*) of the second Gathic poem, the *Uštāuaitī Gāθā* as follows:

(13) *ud abar nišān ī druz-xastag mānīy ud druwandān*²⁵ *ī-š niyōšāg zanišn ī-š az ōy ī dahībēd mad.* (14) *ud ēn-iz kū druwand kē ān ī man gēhān dahēd ō ān ī kēnīg ahrimen ul-iš ēstēnīd bawēd ān ī xwad rēš dēw kū rawāg kard bawēd pad margīh ī ān ī ahlawīh gēhān.* (15) *kē stāyēd ān ī ahlāyīh yazišn nē ēdōn ān <ī> zardu(x)št stāyīd radīh*²⁶ *ī*

²¹ Cf. Av. *naskō.frasa*- ‘asking (of) the *nasks*’ in *Y.* 9.22, which testifies to its antiquity if not to its precise meaning.

²² For studies on the *Zand*, see JOSEPHSON 1997; CANTERA 2004; and ZEINI 2020.

²³ B 640, 17–644, 10 in DRESDEN 1966.

²⁴ B 662 || DH 296r || DkM 857 || See JACKSON 1930, pp. 34–36, evidently unknown to TAILLIEU 2004, p. 4, when he stated: “Stricto sensu, the anti-Manichaean polemic of (Western) Zoroastrianism is preserved only in the third book of the *Dēnkard* and the *Škand-gumānīg wizār*.”

²⁵ Blurry in DH.

²⁶ DH < l’tš > and below.

*gēhānān kū gōwēd kū pad radīh ud dastwarīh man weh²⁷ +šāyam²⁸ ud nē ēdōn ān <ī>
zardu(x)št muhrišn bē jōyēnēd ō mardōmān ud ān ō awēšān gōwēd hamē-⁺zīyišnīh kū-š
hamē-⁺zīyišnīh aziš bawēd awēšān kē bē jōyēnīd muhrišn ān awēšān pas menēnd ān ī
dēwān yazišn pahlom. (16) ud rasēd pad padīrag-rasišnīh srōš-ahlīy²⁹ {xwadāy ō ōy tan
pad bēš ān} xwadāy kē ēn pad hu-⁺zīyišnīh pānagīh ud nē pad duš-⁺zīyišnīh ud pad kadār-
iz-ēw zaman bēšīdār druwandān.*

(13) “And about the sign [lit. ‘symbol’] of Mani ‘crippled by the Lie,’ the wicked ‘Hearers’ (*niyōšāg*) of his, and the violence which came upon him from the Lord of the Land [= the Sasanian monarch]. (14) And this, too, ‘He [= Mani] is wicked who gives my world [orig. ‘flocks’] to the vengeful one, Ahrimen, he will have impelled [lit. ‘raised up’] the Wound demon (*rēš dēw*) [< Av. *raēša-* ‘wound, sore’³⁰] himself, *i.e.*, he will have been set in motion for the death of the world of the Righteous. (15) The one who praises the sacrifice to Righteousness (but) does not do it the way Zardu(x)št praised the Office of the *Rad* [= the highest judicial authority] of those in the world of living beings, for he [= Mani] says: ‘I am better suited for the Office of the *Rad* and the Office of the *Dastwar* [= the high priest].’ But that is not the way Zarduxšt (did it). He [= Mani] makes humans devour *muhrišn* [= Av. *mūθra-* ‘filth, urine,’³¹ cf. Skt. *mūtra-* ‘urine’], and he says to them: ‘Eternal life,³² *i.e.*, there is eternal life from it for those who were made to

²⁷ B < ŠPYL ŠPYL > over two lines.

²⁸ B, DH < š’yym >

²⁹ Sequence omitted in DH due to a jump omission to the following / *xwadāy* /.

³⁰ For a possible allusion to the Manichaean tradition, cf. GARDNER 1995, pp. 242–245, on the chapter – ‘A Catechumen asked the Apostle: When I would give an Offering to the Saints, shall I inflict a Wound on the Alms?’ – which addresses the Hearers’ fears of wounding and harming the foodstuffs that they would prepare for the Elect to consume. The chapter also discusses the nature of matter using a metaphor of a sore and a wound that is strikingly similar to the anti-Manichaean polemic in *Dk.* 9: “For this matter is like to two people, if / a personal enemy and an opponent of their will hit o/ne first and make a sore and a wound (on) his body. Afterwards he smi(tes him) again and [...] / and he hits over his blows and [...] / blows that have made sores on him and [...] (237) strikes him these two times [...] accuses his [ene]/my who has struck him. And this judge questions him to his face about the [...] / of the sores that he has left as marks on his body. And they [...] / on him as if he had split his head. And he is led to judgement and [sent]ence, and is punished before the judge of the worl[d...]” (p. 243).

³¹ Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904 [1961], p. 1189, who has „Exkremente, faeces“ instead.

³² While this precise allusion is somewhat opaque, cf. the Manichaean Parthian text of M 6020: < [recto, 1st col.] ... (2) 'wd hw mrdwhm ky pd (3) [dyn]' bryft 'štyd '+'wḥ (4) z'nyndyḥ kw cw'gwn (5) 'stym pd rw'n [...] (6) hw 'sp's cy 'w (7) dyn'br'n pw'g'n kryd (8) oo 'wd z'nyndyḥ hw b'r (9) cy 'c d'hw'n z'yyd. (10) 'b'w kd hmg qdg (11) zryn 'wd mwrgr'rydyyn (12) bwyndyḥ 'wš rw'n r'd (13) dhyndyḥ 'b'wš ny (14) c'r 'bxš'h'd oo '[wd '+'g] (15) 'wḥ kwš pyd cy [pd] (16) tnb'r 'st ngn p[wxt] (17) kyrd šhyndyḥ 'w(š) [pd] (18) wxybyḥ dst fr[jnyndyḥ] (19) 'wš 'w dy[n'br'n] (20) dhyndyḥ [(21) c'r z'n] [d (22) cy p[(23) šh[...] [recto, 2nd col.] (24) pwnw'r 'st'nyndyḥ (25) cw'gwn qwf 'yw wzrg (26) 'wš bwj'd šhyndyḥ (27) 'b'wš wxrd c'r oo hm (28) wxd bwxsyd 'wd 'w (29) hw[yc] (b)wjyd kyš pwnw'r (30) d'd oo 'wd 'by

devour *muhrišn*. Then they think: ‘The sacrifice to the demons is the best.’ (16) And in a counter-attack [lit. ‘counter-arrival’] Srōš-Ahlīy arrives, (thus) the ruler is in a state of hostility towards that person [lit. ‘body’³³], that ruler is the one who is a (source of) protection for these ones through (their) good living—and not through evil living—and, in whichever epoch, he is (always) hostile to the wicked ones.”³⁴

Here we can observe a number of historical allusions, including the euphemistic sobriquet ‘crippled by the Lie’ (*druz-xastag*), perhaps alluding to a physical deformity or club foot, as we see in Ibn al-Nadīm’s testimony, but here being ascribed to the ultimate malevolent force in Zoroastrianism—‘the Lie.’ In addition, we find a reference to Mani being killed by the Sasanian sovereign, referred to as the ‘Lord of the Land’ (*dahībed*), in this instance, perhaps as a way of reclaiming Mani’s use of the same term to refer to the ‘Keeper of Splendour/ Splenditenens’ as < dhybyd > in his *Šābuhragān*.³⁵ We also find it stated that Mani flaunted the power of the legal and ritual priestly offices by deviating from the established priestly norms laid down by Zoroāstra himself, further testifying to the closeness of the two dualist doctrines, as suggested by Eznik.

We also find polemical denunciations of the Manichaeans misguidedly consuming ‘filth’ (*muhrišn*) and believing that such a ritual act will provide them with ‘eternal life’ (*hamē-zīyišn*). This particular polemical trope of illicit consumption finds parallels in both Christian³⁶ and

wzynd y’ dyd (31) ’w (b)g’ n ’r’ m oo > “... And the man [= Auditor] who is in the (Eastern) Manichaean Church should know how the service that he performs for the pure Elect (*dēnābars*) ultimately [accrues?] to the Soul; and should understand the fruits that are born out of the gifts: then, even if his whole house were of gold and pearls and he gave it (to the Church) for the sake of the Soul, he would not necessarily receive forgiveness. And [if it were] so that he could [bake] the flesh that is on his body into bread and would [cut] it with his own hand and give it to the Elect, he should what [half a column missing] [he who] would take *alms-food (*punwār*) as (much as) a big mountain and could redeem it, should eat it: he himself will be saved, he will also save him who gave him the *alms-food, and it [the ‘Living Soul’ in the food according to HENNING] will reach the home of the gods unharmed...” Text and transl. in HENNING 1965, pp. 29–32.

Cf. also the MPa. “Hymn of the Living Soul” in M 7, hymn 1a: < ... pdw’ g kyrbg oo ’w ’šm’ h ky b’ šyd wjydg’ ’ n y’ wyd’ n jywhr wyndyd oo > “... (will give a?) virtuous response to you who sing, O Chosen Ones! You (pl.) will find eternal life.” Text and transl. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2006, p. 23. It is worth noting that M 7, hymn 2 discusses the “testimony of the ancient fathers” (*wyghyft tšyy pydr’ n hsyng’ n*), namely, “the righteous saviour, Zarhušt” (*bwj’ gr’ rd’ w zrhwšt*) conversing with his soul (*gryw*) who states: “I, I am the the tender child of harmless Srōšāw” (’z’ z hym < srwš’ w’ n’ z’ r > n’ zwg’ z’ dg), for which, see DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2006, pp. 27–28.

³³ Perhaps specifically referencing the symbolically-charged violence inflicted upon Mani’s corpse.

³⁴ B 662 || DH 296r || DkM 857 || [N.B. the B ms. is smudged]. Cf. also WEST 1892 [1994], pp. 278–279.

³⁵ See SUNDERMANN 1979, p. 101 and see also pp. 126–127, fn. 162–163 for further details and textual citations; see also DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2004, pp. 137–138.

³⁶ Cf. VAN OORT 2016a, pp. 1–24, who cites *De Haeresibus* (“On Heresies”) 46, 9–10 of Augustine of Hippo (ca. 354–430 CE): “For this reason [the Seduction of the Archons], or rather because of some demand of their sacrilegious

Mandaean³⁷ polemics against the Manichaeans. The arrival of the divine being Srōš-Ahlīy—once again a shared deity, in this case MMP < srwšhr’y / srwš’hr’y > to refer to the ‘Column of Glory’³⁸—counteracts the sway of the Manichaeans. In the final portion of this historically inflected hermeneutical narrative explicating the Gathic base text, the ruler (or perhaps Srōš, a protector deity in Avestan and Pahlavi) is reaffirmed as a protector of those who live well—the Zoroastrians—and ever hostile to the wicked ones—the Manichaeans—‘in whichever epoch’ (*pad kadār-iz-ēw zamān*).

Besides the dense traditional intersignifications deployed by the Zoroastrian interpreters as both tools of hermeneutics and weapons of polemic, how and why is Mani found in a Gathic commentary in the first place? What word, formula, line, or concept in the *Gāthās* motivates this eisegetically driven hermeneutical praxis? The 2nd millennium BCE Avestan base text that triggers this radically anachronistic interpretation appears to be *Yasna* 46.7–8 of the *Kamnamaēzā Hāiti*, which is part of Zaratuštra’s ‘poet’s complaint’ as he was facing persecution and a lack of social acceptance in Bronze Age Afghanistan or Central Asia:

kāmnā mazdā mauuaitē pāiūm dadā
hiiat mā drəguuā dīdarəšatā aēnaiḥē
aniiēm θβahmāt āθrascā manarḥascā
yaiiā šīiaoθanāiš ašəm θraoštā ahurā
taḡm mōi dąstuuḡm daēnaiiāi frāuuuaočā

“(But) whom do You appoint (as) guardian for one such as me, O Mazdā,
 when the deceitful one tries to seize me in order to injure (me),
 (whom do You appoint) other than your fire and thought,

superstition, their Elect are forced to consume a sort of eucharist sprinkled with human seed in order that the divine substance may be freed even from that, just as it is from other foods which they receive”; see also VAN OORT 2016b, pp. 430–440, where he cites the *Catechesis* (VI, 33) of Cyril of Jerusalem (313–386 CE), who served as the Bishop of Jerusalem: “I do not dare say in what they dip the fig they give to their wretched. I can indicate it only indirectly. Let men think of the delusive dreams of the night and women of the menses.” See also PEDERSEN 2017, pp. 1265–1295, in particular, see pp. 1278–1280 and pp. 1288–1291. For a comparative analysis of Manichaean food rituals as they overlapped with and were influenced by Zoroastrian parallels, see BEDUHN 2000b, pp. 14–36. For a general study of Manichaean *somata*, see BEDUHN 2000a. For a discussion of the myth of the Seduction of the Archons perhaps being referenced in Zoroastrian literature (*viz.* *ŠGW*. 16.28–37), see TIMUŞ forthcoming, pp. 140–148.

³⁷ For a Mandaean polemic (*Ginza Rabbā* IX) regarding the consumption of seed by the Manichaeans in a deviant sexual rite, see SHAPIRA 2004, pp. 243–280, where we find: “Again I will teach you, my disciples, that there is another ‘gate’ [= ‘sect, denomination, dogma’], which emerges from Mšiha [= Jesus], who are called Zandiqs (*zandiqia*) and Manichaeans (*‘marmania*). They sow their seed secretly and allot a portion of it to the gloom, women and men sleep with one another, they take the seed and throw it into wine, and they offer it to the Souls (= Madaeans) to drink, saying that it is pure.”

³⁸ See SUNDERMANN 1979, p. 101 and see also p. 128, fn. 182–183 for further details and textual citations; see also DURKIN-MEISTERERST 2004, p. 309.

with whose actions one nourishes Truth/Order (*aša-*), O Ahura?
Proclaim a message about that to my vision soul (*daēnā-*).”

yā vā mōi yā gaēθā dazdē aēnaḥhē
nōiṭ ahiīā mā āθriš śiiaοθanāiš frōsiiiāṭ
paitiiaogəṭ tā ahmāi jasōiṭ duuaēšəḥhā
tanuuəm ā yā īm hujiiātōiš pāiiāṭ
nōiṭ dužjiiātōiš kācīṭ mazdā duuaēšəḥhā

“Or if someone aims at my herds in order to injure (them),
may destruction not reach me through his actions.
May these, in response, come upon him for that hostility
onto his body, so that they may prevent him from (living) a good life,
by which one may keep him from a bad life, O Mazdā, by any hostility at all.”³⁹

The Gathic text, in line with its epideictic genre of ‘praise and blame’ poetry⁴⁰—praise of Ahura Mazdā and scorn towards the forces of evil—suggests that the poet-priest, presumably Zaraθuštra, and his priestly ritual successors in the generations to follow will not be held liable for the misdeeds of the wicked ones and that hostility will inevitably come upon the latter instead. The late antique *Zand*—the translation with glosses of these ancient Gathic poems—renders this as follows (*PY.* 46.7–8⁴¹):

(a) *kē-t⁴² ō man ohrmazd ud manīgān [hāwištān ī man] pānag dād.*

³⁹ Text and transl. after HUMBACH *ET AL.* 1991, vol. I, pp. 169–170.

⁴⁰ See SKJÆRVØ 2002, pp. 29–67 for a discussion of this genre in the early Iranian world in comparison with related poetics found in Vedic and other Indo-European traditions. He compares the ‘singer of blame poetry’ (*naēstar-*) in Avestan with Gk. *ónēidos* ‘blame poetry’ citing NAGY 1979, p. 223, nonetheless, he suggests: “I have adopted the translation as ‘blame’ from Nagy’s work, but it may not be the one best suited to evoke to modern readers the actual semantic of the word. Translations such as ‘scorn, despise, put down, curse’ may be more appropriate” (p. 47).

⁴¹ J2 260v || K5 213r || Mf4 471 || Pt4 185v || [N.B. see <https://cab.geschkult.fu-berlin.de> for digital images of these four most important manuscripts of the Pahlavi version of the *Yasna* liturgy]. The square brackets [] are used to indicate the Pahl. glosses and brief comments on the Av. original but it should be noted that we do not know their precise age or the hermenutical processes by which they were gradually accreted into what has become the extant *Zand* and, as such, I do not mark them in the translation.

⁴² Pt4 < MNW > omitting < -t >

(b) *ka man ān*⁴³ *druwand* [*ahrimen*] *pad dārišn dārēd*⁴⁴ *kēn* [*kū-m kēn abāg dārēd ā-m pānagīh kē kunēd*].

(c) *anīy az tō*⁴⁵ *ātaxš ud wahuman* [*čē ašmāh rāy dānam kū-m pānagīh kunēd*].

(d) *kē*⁴⁶ *pad awēšān kunišn ahlāyīh parwaram*⁴⁷ *ohrmazd* [*kū kār ud kirbag kunam ā-m pānagīh kē kunēd*].

(e) *ān*⁴⁸ *ō man dastwar ī*⁴⁹ *dēn frāz gōwē* [*ēn gōwē kū dēn pad dastwar dār*].

(a) “Whom have you given to me as a protector O Ohrmazd, and to mine—my disciples?

(b) When that wicked one—Ahrimen—has me in his possession, (in) vengeance, *i.e.*, when he has (an issue of) vengeance with me, then who will protect me?

(c) Other than your fire and Good Mind, since I know that due to you, he affords me protection,

(d) the ones by whose actions I nourish Righteousness, O Ohrmazd, *i.e.*, I do work and (good) deeds, then who will protect me?

(e) Proclaim that one to me as a priest/an authority of the Tradition (*dēn*), saying this: ‘Hold the Tradition as (your) authority [alt. ‘Hold the Tradition through (a/your) high priest’]!’”

(a) *kē ān ī man gēhān dahēd ō ōy ī kēnīg* [*kū xwāstag pad dastwar ī*⁵⁰ *ahlomōyān dahēd*⁵¹ *ā-š*⁵² *pād(o)frāh kunēnd*].

⁴³ K5 < ZK Y >

⁴⁴ J2, K5 omit

⁴⁵ J2, K5 < LK' > or < LK W >

⁴⁶ J2, K5 < AMT >

⁴⁷ J2 damaged

⁴⁸ J2 < OLE Y ZK L > || K5 < ZK Y 'w' L >

⁴⁹ J2, K5 || not in Mf4

⁵⁰ J2 omits

⁵¹ J2 < YHWWNyt' > || K5 < d' lšn' >

⁵² Pt4 omits

- (b) *nē pad ān ī ōy*⁵³ *kunišn*⁵⁴ *an ōy*⁵⁵ *āhr rēš* [*kē pad tan ud*⁵⁶ *ruwān rēš kunēd*] *frāz rānēnīdār ham* [*kū-m*⁵⁷ *pād(o)frāh bowandag bē kardan nē tuwān*].
- (c) *pad padīrag-rasišnīh pad*⁵⁸ *ān ī*⁵⁹ *harw dō* [*ka*⁶⁰ *čiš ī*⁶¹ *mēnōy ud gētīy nē xūb kunēd*] *rasēd* [*ō ōy ī ahlomōy*] *pad bēš*⁶².
- (d) *ō*⁶³ *tanān*⁶⁴ [*mard xwadāy*] *rasēd* [*kū-šān pād(o)frāh kunēd*] *kē ēn pad*⁶⁵ *hu-zīšnīh pānagīh* [*kū-š ēn dādestān ēdōn kū pānagīh ī*⁶⁶ *dāmān pad frārōnīh kunēd*].
- (e) *nē pad duš-zīšnīh*⁶⁷ *ud pad kadār-iz-ēw* [*zamān*] *ohrmazd bēšīdār* [*wattarān*].
- (a) “The one who gives my world to the vengeful one, *i.e.*, the one who gives (away) property through a priest/an authority of the heretics,⁶⁸ then they punish him.
- (b) Nor due to his actions, will I be someone who causes his *āhr* [*< Av. āθri-*⁶⁹] wound to grow forth—the one who inflicts wounds upon body and soul, *i.e.*, I am unable to punish him completely (*i.e.* to kill him).

⁵³ J2, K5 < 'w' >

⁵⁴ K5 < Y >

⁵⁵ Pt4, Mf4 < Y > || K5 < 'w' >

⁵⁶ K5 < y' n lwb' n >

⁵⁷ K5 < AYK >

⁵⁸ K5 omits

⁵⁹ Mf4, Pt4 omit

⁶⁰ Mf4 < MNW > for < AMT > || Pt4 omits < AMT >

⁶¹ J2 < W > for < Y >

⁶² Pt4 < krtn' > superscripted

⁶³ Pt4 < 'w' W >

⁶⁴ Mf4 < tn' hwGBRA > mis-segmented for < tn' n GBRA >

⁶⁵ J2 < PWN W >

⁶⁶ K5 omits

⁶⁷ Pt4 < YHMTWNYt > in the margin and < W >

⁶⁸ Pahl. *ahlomōy* ‘heretic’ < Av. *ašəmaoya-* perhaps means one ‘who obfuscates Truth/Order [*aša-*], shams/pretends Truthful/Orderly behavior’ in Avestan; cf. also Old Indic *mugh-/muh-, mógha*, which seems to mean ‘wrap in darkness, obfuscate’ and is also used in the sense of ‘counterfeit, pretense,’ for which, see SKJÆRVØ 2003, pp. 401–402. For a study of the Pahlavi term, see TIMUŞ 2019, pp. 271–294. It should be noted that this term here in *PY*. 46.8a is precisely what is being interpreted in *Dk*. 9 as encoding the anti-Manichaean interpretation of the *Gāθās*. TIMUŞ’s generally applicable claim that the Manichaeans “... are never qualified as *ahlomōy* in the Zoroastrian sources” (p. 289) finds an exception here.

⁶⁹ Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904 [1961], p. 323, who has „Verderben, Unheil, Leid“; HUMBACH *ET AL.* 1991, vol. II, p. 182, suggests that *āθri-* ‘*destruction’ is derived from *ātī-* ‘fire’ and so its primary semantics ought to be connected with ‘burning.’ This might explain the / *rēš* / ‘wound, sore’ in *Dk*. 9 as an injury that burns.

- (c) Through a counter-attack [lit. ‘counter-arrival’] in both, *i.e.*, when one does nothing good in *this* world and in *that* world, it (punishment) comes to him—the heretic (*ahlomōy*)—with harm.
- (d) To the bodies (of the heretics and) the man, the ruler comes, *i.e.*, he takes retribution on them; the one who (provides) protection for these (ones) through good living, *i.e.*, this law/judgement is thus: namely, the protection of the creatures of the world through the producing of virtue,
- (e) not through evil living—and, in whichever epoch, O Ohrmazd, he (is) hostile—to the evil ones.”⁷⁰

Here in the *Zand*, the ‘world’ (*gēhān*) is glossed by the concept of ‘property’ (*xwāstag*) and it is given away to a priest/an authority (*dastwar*) of the heretics (*ahlomōyān*) and understood in the *Waršt mānsr Nask* as being none other than Mani and the Manichaeans who were notorious for their renunciationist philosophy.⁷¹ What we find in the *Waršt mānsr Nask* are bronze age references to movable property or herds and the lack of social acceptance of an archaic priestly poet-sacrificer being retasked through complex forms of allegoresis in Late Antiquity and subsequently understood as a proof text encoding political events in the early Sasanian era: (1) the tithing of property by the Manichaean followers to their Church; (2) the subsequent seizure of said property by the Sasanian authorities, just as we see with their imperial Roman counterparts; and (3) the killing of Mani by the Sasanian monarch in 274 or 277 CE.⁷²

The theological importance and economic benefit of the Catechumens (Hearers) providing alms for the Manichaean ‘Holy Church’⁷³ is stated quite eloquently in the Coptic *Kephalaia of the Teacher* 87 [216, 31–218, 32]:

“Now, the holy church / exists in two forms: in the brothers and / the sisters. Indeed, when these alms reach the holy / c[h]urch, they shall be [redeem]ed through it and purified and

⁷⁰ Cf. DHABHAR 1949, pp. 201–202 and MALANDRA/ICHAPORIA 2013, pp. 71–72; cf. also the transl. in MILLS 1894, pp. 252–255.

⁷¹ For Manichaean asceticism, see, BEDUHN 1995, pp. 513–519.

⁷² The reading of ‘problematic’ historical figures into the Pahlavi versions of Avestan texts is not unprecedented as we find a reference to Mazdak, the son of Bāmdād in *PV*. 4.49; see Moazami 2014, pp. 116–119. It is possible that these passages referencing property and the killing of the *ahlomōy* were interpreted by other strands of the Zoroastrian hermeneutical tradition as referring to Mazdak or even simply generic ‘heretics’ (MIHAELA TIMUŞ P.C.).

⁷³ For a useful diagram of the pyramidal hierarchies of the Manichaean Church, see TARDIEU 2008, p. 59. See also LEURINI 2013 for a study of the Church in the East.

rest therein. They shall come from it and [go] to the / God of truth in whose name they were given. / Thus it is this holy church itself that is the place of re[st] / for all those alms that shall rest therein; / and it becomes a doorway for them and a conveyance to that land of rest. Also, the holy church / has no place of rest in this entire world exce/pt for through the catechumens who listen to it, as [...] / only with the catechumens who give it rest. For / [it]s honour is with the catechumens, through whom it shall be pass[ed on]... Again, this is how the [ho]ly church / shall become the place of rest for the alms of the cat[e]/chumens; and the catechumens themselves become the place of rest for the holy church. Nevertheless, both the former and the [latter], / the place of rest wherein they will be at peace [is the land] / of light.”⁷⁴

Across the various genres of the extant Manichaean texts—the homilies, parables, and hymns—we find didactic references and admonishments to the Hearers to keep the commandments; and, for our purposes, the specific requirement for the Hearers to provide alms for the Elect. For instance, we find in Fragment F, believed to be from the *Book of the Giants* in Manichaean Middle Persian:

nywš’g [ky] [rw’n]g’n dyyd oo c’wn ‘š[kwḥ] myrd ky dwxt ’w š’h hn(d)[ym’n] qwnyd oo ’w wzrg pdyxšr r(s)[yd].

“The Hearer who gives alms (to the Elect) is like a man of low birth, who presents (his) daughter to the king. He reaches (a position of) great honour.”⁷⁵

The twin expectations for Hearers to both provide taxation to the Sasanian tax collectors as well as tithes to their Church leaders (MMP. *niyōšāgbed*; female leaders in the case of Sogd. *niyōšāk-patānc*⁷⁶) would have undoubtedly led these two groups with inimical socio-religious and economic interests, to find themselves in conflict, leading ultimately to Manichaean property seizures by the Sasanian authorities.

For the seizure of Manichaean property as a truly late antique phenomenon, we may look beyond the Sasanian realm to legislation issued in 381 CE by the Roman Emperor Theodosius [r. 379–

⁷⁴ Transl. after GARDNER 1995, pp. 225–226.

⁷⁵ Text and transl. in HENNING 1943, pp. 59, 63–64; cf. also M 221, recto 9–23 for an elaborated version of this metaphor. See SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985, pp. 573–582 for a survey of Mani’s commandments to the Elect and the Hearers across a number of languages; see also COLDITZ 2009, pp. 73–100, and, in particular, pp. 81–83.

⁷⁶ See COLDITZ 2009, pp. 80–81 for further details.

395 CE], in order to limit the philanthropy of Mani's *auditores* for the benefit of the *electi* of his Church:

“The same Augusti [= emperors Gratian (r. 375–383 CE); Valentinian II (r. 375–392 CE); and Theodosius I (r. 379–392 CE in the East, and then r. 392–395 CE in the whole empire)] to Eutropius, praetorian prefect. If any Manichaean—man or woman—from the day of the law enacted long ago and originally by our parents has transmitted his own property to any person whatsoever by having made a will or under title of any liberality whatsoever or by form of donation, or if anyone of these persons has been enriched by grant of an inheritance entered through any form whatsoever (since immediately from the said persons, under branded infamy's perpetual stigma, we withdraw all capability of making a will and of living under Roman law, and since we do not permit them to have the power either of leaving or taking any inheritance), the whole by an immediate investigation on the part of our treasury (*fiscus*), should be joined to its resources.”⁷⁷

From a century and a half later we also have a surviving Greek version from the first half of the 6th century based on an original Latin Mandate of Justinian I [r. 527–565 CE] regarding the wills and bequests of the Manichaean community:

“... (First part lost) Since persons who have been unfortunate in respect to the Manichaeans' impious error are worthy not only of punishment while they live, but also of the circumstance that after their death they may not give their property to whom they wish or to whom the laws give it by intestacy, we use the present divine pragmatic law to your magnificence, by which we command that the property of persons possessed by this disease should be examined; and that if their children or any of their descending relatives should be free of such sort of madness, these should be allowed to share the property given to them by law, but that if any other cognates of the deceased persons either are

⁷⁷ Transl. in GARDNER/LIEU 2004, pp. 145–146. The Roman emperor Diocletian had issued an edict against the Manichaeans earlier in 302 CE in which we explicitly find anti-Persian rhetoric being employed: “... we have heard that they have but recently advanced or sprung forth, like strange and monstrous portents, from their native homes among the Persians – a nation hostile to us ... they will endeavour, as is their usual practice, to infect the innocent, orderly and tranquil Roman people, as well as the whole of our empire, with the damnable customs and perverse laws of the Persians as with the poison of a malignant serpent.” Transl. in GARDNER/LIEU 2004, pp. 116–118; see also KADEN 1953, pp. 55–68. For the spread of Manichaeism in the West, see the overview in BROWN 1969, pp. 92–103; on imperial legislation against the Manichaeans (and other groups), see BESKOW 1988, pp. 1–11 and LIM 2008, pp. 143–167. For various *topoi* found in anti-Manichaean polemics in the Roman context, see LIEU 1999, pp. 156–202; for Roman polemics specifically tied to Mani's alterity and Persian origins, see COYLE 2004, pp. 217–234.

called to their inheritance according to those persons' last will (which indeed has been forbidden) or have accepted a donation from such a person while living or even have been honoured with a legacy from, of course, the same person, their property or the things donated or bequeathed should be taken from them absolutely and should be attached to the public treasury.”⁷⁸

Just as we observe this anti-Manichaean rhetoric in the Roman West, we find confirmation of similar property seizures within the Sasanian Empire. Here we must look to the Pahlavi legal sources, namely, the *Mādayān ī Hazār Dādestān* (“Book of a Thousand Judgements”), widely held to be a Sasanian-era work. It explicitly discusses the seizure of property due to “following the beliefs of the *zandīg*” (*zandīg-wurrōyišnīh*), with the term *zandīg* most often associated with the Manichaeans, as we saw earlier in Kerdīr’s inscriptions and in Eznik’s polemics, both of which are securely datable to the Sasanian period. We find it stated in *MHD*. 8.76–77 [A38, 12–16 and A39, 1]:

(76) *ān ī guft kū ōy ī jādūg xwāstag ī-š ast ka-šān jādūgīh ōst pad rad ēstēd. ud ka-šān marnjēnišn kard ō ōy kē marnjēnišn andar kard. ud ka-š gugāyīh abar dahēnd ud wināh andar kē kard pad nāmčišt nē paydāg ō gugāyān appār ud zandīgīh jādūgīh.*

(77) *abāg ān ī az dib ī pādixšāy-kard ud xwēškārīh-nāmag ī kār-framān ī šahrīhā paydāg kū zandīgīh ud zandīg-wurrōyišnīh rāy xwāstag [xwāstag] <ō> šāhīgān grift.*

(76) “That which is said: The property of the sorcerer (*jādūg*), which he has, when they firmly (establish) his being a sorcerer, shall be held by the *Rad*. And when (the sorcerer) has caused them damage, (then his property goes) to him whom he caused damage. And if they give testimony about him and it is not manifest exactly upon whom the crime was committed, (the property) is removed for the benefit of those who gave testimony. Manichaeism (*zandīgīh*) is sorcery (*jādūgīh*)!

(77) Together with that which is manifest from the authoritative document and the *Letter of (Proper) Duties of Officials of the Provinces*: ‘Due to (practicing) Manichaeism (*zandīgīh*) and following the beliefs of the Manichaeans (*zandīg-wurrōyišnīh*), property is seized for the palace.’”⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Transl. in GARDNER/LIEU 2004, p. 150.

⁷⁹ Cf. MACUCH 1981, p. 65; also PERIKHANIAN 1997, pp. 316–319, for slightly different texts and translations. For a discussion of anti-Manichaean tracts circulating in the Sasanian Empire, see SKJÆRVØ 1997, p. 341, where he cites *Manichaean Homilies*: “The Magians ... wrote their lying libels (*bibliodon*) [sic]... concerning you [= Mani]” = POLOTSKY 1934, p. 81, fn. 19; cf. also SKJÆRVØ, “KARTIR,” *EIr*. Cf. also DILLEY 2015, pp. 126–127, who notes: “The

Here we can clearly see the Zoroastrian legal priests explicitly claiming Manichaeism as sorcery, thus justifying the seizure of the properties of Mani's followers by the Sasanian state apparatus.⁸⁰ It is worth noting that the Islamic heresiographers, with all their attendant hostilities towards the Manichaeans, do provide us with further evidence for the socio-economic motivations behind the political decisions of the Sasanians to enforce the anti-Manichaean property seizures. The Islamic heresiographer al-Shahrastānī [AH 481–548 / 1086–1153 CE], in his *Kitāb al-milal wa al-nihal* (“Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects”) states quite unequivocally that Mani did, in fact, demand that his followers contribute to the Manichaean Church:

“Mānī imposed upon his followers a tithe upon all their property, four prayers (to be recited) daily and nightly, supplication(s) to God, abstention from deceit, killing, stealing, fornication, greed, sorcery, and worship of idols, and (to) not to do to a living being that which he would hate were it done to his own self.”⁸¹

Graeco-Coptic term ΒΙΒΛΙΔΙΟΝ suggests short texts on small-format writing materials that could be posted in public areas, much like the anti-Christian pamphlets that were distributed across the Roman empire at the beginning of the Diocletianic persecution.” DILLEY views the multiple references in Kerdīr's inscriptions to ‘documents’ (*gitt*), ‘charters’ (*pādixšīr*), and ‘records’ (*mādayān*) during his lengthy career spanning the reigns of four Sasanian monarchs as further proof of SKJÆRVØ's argument. Following HUTTER 2015, p. 480, I would reiterate that this *MHD.* passage refers to one such tract and further confirms SKJÆRVØ's original argument.

⁸⁰ It must be acknowledged that the confiscation of the property of the followers of ‘pseudo-prophets’ in the Sasanian context is also said of the Mazdakites from the late 5th and early 6th centuries CE and discussed in the Arabic historical and heresiographical sources, thus muddying the waters. For example, see al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*: “Then he [= Husraw I, r. 531–579 CE] commanded that the leaders of the Mazdakites were to be beheaded and that their property was to be divided among the poor. He executed a large group of those who had confiscated people's possessions, and he restored these possessions to their original owners,” ed. DE GOEJE 1879–1901, 1/2, p. 897; transl. in REEVES 2011, p. 271. While this passage in al-Ṭabarī is similar to the *MHD.*, the fact remains that the term used in the latter is / *zandīg* / and suggests the Manichaeans. Nonetheless, the later Mazdakites still remain a possibility, as al-Khwārazmī [AH 323–383 / 935–993 CE], *Kitāb mafātīḥ al-'ulūm* (“Keys to the Sciences”) states: “The Manichaeans are ‘the Mānī-ones’ whose name can be traced to Mānī, and it is unknown whether they have created this designation as a name following the analogy of others... The *zanādiqa* are the Manichaeans, and the Mazdakites are (also) designated with this name. Mazdak was the one who appeared in the days of Qubādh. He was the chief *mōbadh* or chief magistrate (*qādī*) of the Zoroastrians, and he asserted that possessions and women should be shared. He produced a book which he called *Zand* and maintained that it contained the (true) interpretation of the *Avesta*, which is the scripture of Zoroastrianism. It [= *Avesta*] is what Zarādusht brought, the one whom they allege is their prophet. The followers of Mazdak were named after (the) *Zand* and were called *Zandī*. Later the word was arabicized so that an individual came to be called a *zandīq* and a group *zanādiqa*.” Ed. TAQIZĀDEH-ŠIRĀZĪ 1956, p. 180, §28; transl. in REEVES 2011, p. 275 but cf. also the passage of al-Mas'ūdī below. For these striking parallelisms as they contrast with Zoroastrian norms, see the valuable articles of DE BLOIS 2012b, pp. 13–24 and 2015, pp. 141–154 on Mazdak and his place in Iranian historiography.

⁸¹ Transl. REEVES 2011, pp. 214–215.

A similar claim can be found in a later heresiography by Ibn al-Murtaḍā [d. AH 840 / 1436 CE] in his *Kitāb al-munya wa-lamal fī sharḥ al-milal wa-l-niḥal* (“Desire and Hope: A Commentary on Denominations and Creeds”):

“Mānī prescribed poverty for them. They should not accumulate things except dress for one year and food for each day. He imposed a tithe on their property and (commanded) it to be put at the disposition of its managers. He forbade them to enter idol-temples, and he prohibited fornication, theft, and causing pain to animals of any sort. He also prohibited marriage and agriculture.”⁸²

So, what do we have here in terms of the relationship between Sasanian jurisprudence administered largely by the Zoroastrian priesthood and the Zoroastrian hermeneutical tradition also produced by priests in a different sector of the sacral knowledge economy? From the perspectives of the ‘emic’ or traditional interpreters of a religious tradition, in this case the *dēn*—the ‘Zoroastrian’ one⁸³—their primary obligation was to make meaning—produce theology—by grappling with the profound hermeneutical challenge of constantly enlivening the meaning of their received past of archaic myth and ritual inherited from the Avestan world in the face of a rapidly evolving multi-religious landscape that threatened the very primacy of the Zoroastrian priesthood. This dangerous state of affairs would have been especially acute in moments where the Zoroastrian priesthood saw weakening or potentially weakening state support from Sasanian monarchs who were periodically enamored by ‘new prophets’ or simply wished to blunt the power of the Zoroastrian priests by fostering religious competition.

I would argue that the Zoroastrian hermeneuts took their sacral and scholastic responsibilities very seriously and did so assiduously using tradition-constituted forms of allegoresis to speak to their contemporary social realities by expanding—not delimiting—the spiritual and semantic range of scriptural understanding *beyond* merely the plain sense of the base text. For them, just as it was for the rabbis, scripture—in this case the *Gāthās*—spoke for and *already* encoded all forms of lived human experience within the greater arc of human history and cosmic temporality, including all future

⁸² Transl. REEVES 2011, p. 215.

⁸³ Cf. the MMP text in M 68a, hymn 1: < nyw b’ d ’ wṭ pyr’ r pyr wz gr(d’ g) ’ n ’ yg dyn m’ zdys oo frzynd’ n ’ y w’ xš ywjdhr ’ wt’ n m’ d ’ y ’ bycg pdyš wfr’ yh’ d > “... may good ... be and the omen of the victor to those returning (from?) the Mazdean *dēn*! Children of the holy religion (*wāxš*) [lit. ‘spirit’] and may your pure mother be helped through him/it!” After DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2014, pp. 232–233 and discussed in REZANIA 2020.

religious and political events. The inter-confessional challenge of the Manichaeans was clearly threatening to the Zoroastrian priesthood for both economic and doctrinal reasons, the latter of which were due to Mani's retasking of the theological terms, concepts, and deities that were inherited from the ancient Avestan tradition,⁸⁴ as best encapsulated by Mani's words found in a famous Manichaean Middle Persian text, M 5794, where he discusses the superior merits of his Church and prophetic message:

tswm kw 'yn 'bhwmyšn 'yg dw bwn 'wd nbyg'n zyndg'n whyh 'wd d'nyšn 'y mn 'c h'n
'y pyšyng'n dyn fr'ydr 'wd why hynd.

“Fourth, this revelation of the two principles/origins (*bun*), and my living books (scriptures), wisdom, and knowledge are more and better than those of the religions (*dēn*) of the ancients [lit. ‘those who came before’].”⁸⁵

This interreligious competition between the Manichaeans and the Zoroastrians is nicely illustrated, from the latter's perspective, in *Dēnkard* 3.200.1–12, an anti-Manichaean polemic with 10 propositions and refutations, the first one (1–2) being most relevant here:

(1) *10 ī druz-xastag mānīy [ud] padīrag ān ī ahlāyīh ārāstār ādurbād ī mahrspandān andarz drāyīd.*

(2) *ēk padīrag ān ī ahlāyīh ārāstār ādurbād ī pad menišn nē dāštan handarzēnīd. druz-xastag mānī kēn abārīg +druzān⁸⁶ gilistag mardōm tan handarzēnīd. druz-xastag mānīy pad [ud] a-warzišnīh čāštagīh ud +xān-hambār⁸⁷ ī mardōm ī gēhān xwarišn ud dārišn abesīhēnīdan ī +gyān⁸⁸ ī dēwān ī-š niyōšāgān nāmēnīd appurīhā hambārd +jōyīd⁸⁹.*

⁸⁴ See BEDUHN 2015, pp. 247–275; for the doctrinal overlaps, see SCOTT 1989, pp. 435–457; for the Manichaean retasking of Zoroastrian theological *termini technici*, see COLDITZ 2005, pp. 17–26 and 2006, pp. 359–364.

⁸⁵ Text: BOYCE 1975, pp. 29–30; cf. the Copt. version (*Kephalaion* no. 151: 370.29–375.15), transl. in GARDNER/LIEU 2004, pp. 265–266. See also LIEU 2006, pp. 519–528 and BEDUHN 2015, pp. 247–275.

⁸⁶ B < dlwc 'nglystk > a mis-segmentation for < dlwc'n glystk >

⁸⁷ B < Wh'nhb'l > and alternatively read as < nh'n hnb'l > for / *nihān-hambār* / ‘hoard in secret’ which would also fit the polemical tone but is less optimal syntactically. Cf. the Manichaean Middle Persian fragment, M 5265 which has references to ‘fleshly enemies’ < dwšmynwn [pd]yn > and ‘the storehouse of our souls’ < hm'byyd 'y m'n (gy)'n'n > for which, see DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2014, p. 293.

⁸⁸ B < wy'n >

⁸⁹ B < ŷwŷyt' > perhaps for < ywŷyt' > though < ywt' > would be expected.

- (1) “The 10 (propositions) of Mani, ‘crippled by the Lie’ (which he) chattered contrary to the precepts advised by the ‘Arranger of Righteousness’ Ādurbād son of Mahrspand⁹⁰:
- (2) One (proposition), contrary to that which the ‘Arranger of Righteousness’ Ādurbād advised not to keep (vengeance) in one’s mind, Mani, ‘crippled by the Lie,’ advocated for vengeance (*kēn*) and other lie-demons to dwell (*gilistag*)⁹¹ in a person’s body (*tan*). Mani, ‘crippled by the Lie’ by (his) doctrine of non-cultivation and (thereby) causing the destruction of the *storehouse of the humans of the world—food and possessions (*xwarišn ud dārišn*)—which the souls of the demons whom he called his ‘Hearers’ had stored (and) devoured through (their) thieving.”⁹²

Here we find yet another intertextual reference to ‘vengeance’ (*kēn*) also seen earlier in *PY. 46.7b*:

⁹⁰ In earlier scholarship Ādurbād being found here was simply seen as an anachronism, as he is commonly understood to be a high priest of the 4th century CE under Shapur II [r. 309–379 CE] and one of the putative transmitters of the Zoroastrian sacred corpus (*dēn*) in *Dēnkard* Book 4; see the transl. in SKJÆRVØ 2011b, p. 42. Rather than Kerđir as Mani’s Zoroastrian priestly nemesis, as we find in the well-known Manichaean sources [called < Krydyr > in the Manichaean Middle Persian text M 3 and *καρκελ* in the Coptic *Homilies*], Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba [d. AH 456 / 1064 CE] in his *Kitāb al-faṣl fī al-milal wa’l-ahwā’ wa’l-niḥal* (“Judgement regarding the Confessions, Inclinations and Sects”) also has Ādurbād son of Mahrspand as the Zoroastrian disputant: “Mānī was a monk in Ḥarrān and invented this religion. He was the one whom the king Bahrām b. Bahrām [= Wahrām II, r. 274–293 CE] put to death when he conducted in his presence his disputation with the chief *mōbadh* Ādhurbadh-Mahrspand(ān), undergoing interrogation about the prohibition of sexual relations and the rapidly approaching end of the world,” ed. TAQĪZĀDEH/ŠĪRĀZĪ 1956, p. 227, §41; transl. in REEVES 2011, pp. 43–44. In a related vein, al-Ya’qūbī [d. ca. AH 295 / 908 CE] has a narrative of the *mōbadh* at court confronting Mani and challenging him to prove his worth by pouring molten lead on himself, for which, see REEVES 2011, p. 32, an ordeal associated with Ādurbād, son of Mahrspand in the Pahlavi texts. These seemingly anachronistic identifications in these later Islamic sources can now be read in concert with the recently published Copt. text entitled *The Chapters of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani* in the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin, where we find the reading: *ἄδουρβατ ἀραϕ πδικαϑτης* “Adourbat the Judge (*δικαστής*)” in §359.3 [fragmentary in §359, 12] for which, see GARDNER/BEDUHN/DILLEY 2018, p. 39. As the editors note: “Reference is made here to several Mazdayasnian practices: a consecrated (*yašttag*, here rendered as ‘righteous’) fire, ‘gathered’ from various source fires (*ātaš buzurg kardan*; see *Vendidad* 8...); and the ritual nourishment of fire and water (*ātaš-zōhr* and *āb-zōhr*...). The latter rituals are referenced by name in the Middle Iranian Manichaean text M 95... Reference is probably also made to a judicial ordeal or oath involving the fire” (p. 39, notes to lines 6–12). The text also appears to have a variant of his name as / Ardounabat / (*ἄρδουναβατ*) in §360.29; §361.7–8; and §364.3. I must thank KAYLA DANG for suggesting this reference to me. Clearly the historical identification of the 3rd century CE *ἄδουρβατ* of the *Kephalaia* with the 4th century CE Ādurbād seems unlikely, all the more since in the *Kephalaia* he and Mani end on good terms (P.C. JASON BEDUHN). We might conjecture that the Pahlavi and Arabic sources have conflated two figures as part of later forms of polemical rhetoric that came to view the Zoroastrian priesthood as having always been inimical towards Mani and his Church. Such an example highlights the ever-present danger of using later polemical sources to historicize earlier events, as I am wont to do here.

⁹¹ Recall the ‘dwellings of the demons’ in Kerđir’s inscription cited earlier.

⁹² Text: B 169 || DkM 216. Cf. the transl. in DE MENASCE 1973, p. 209; cf. also TAILLIEU 2004, pp. 266–267; see also JACKSON 1924, pp. 213–227; and OLSSON 1991, pp. 273–293, all with slightly different texts. For a general discussion, see also HUTTER 2015, pp. 477–489, in particular pp. 485–488.

“When that wicked one—Ahrimen—has me in his possession, (in) vengeance (*kēn*), *i.e.*, when he has (an issue of) vengeance with me, then who will protect me?”

In the Pahlavi *Zand* of the Gathic base text it is the fear of the vengeance of Ahrimen on the part of the Zoroastrian faithful but in *Dk.* 3.200.2 we instead find the notion of ‘vengeance’ being attached to Mani and his commandments connected with the renunciation of food and worldly possessions that was so anathema to Zoroastrian religious and social norms that rejected sexual abstinence, fasting and all forms of asceticism.

The *Škand-gumānīg Wizār* (“Doubt-Dispelling Disquisition”), a 9th or 10th century polemical text on the ‘sorcery’ (*jādūgīh*) of Manichaean doctrine composed by Mardānfarrox, son of Ohrmazddād and surviving in Pāzand, *i.e.*, Middle Persian written in the Avestan alphabet,⁹³ quotes liberally from the *Dēnkard*, and states in *ŠGW.* 10.58–60:

buxt hom əž vas gumānī u ēraṅg u frēβ u dōšī i kēšq (59) u nāmcīšt əž q i frēftār q məhtar
+ *mazantar dušāmōžtar raṭ-mastarag mānāe (60) kē-š kēš jādūi u dīn frēftārī u āmōž dōšī*
u brahm nihq-raβəšnī...

bōxtag hom az was gumānīh ud ērang ud frēb ud dušīh ī kēšān (59) ud nāmcīšt az ān ī
frēftārān mehtar +mazandar duš-hammōxtār rad-mastarg mānāy (60) kē-š kēš jādūgīh
ud dēn frēftārīh ud hammōz dušīh ud brahm nihān-rawišnīh...

“I have completely escaped the doubt and errors and deceptions and evil of the doctrine (*kēš*) [*<* Av. *ṭkaēša-* ‘teaching’; Skt. *darśana-* ‘view, opinion’], (59) and especially from the greatest of deceivers, a *monster [= Skt. *mukhyatara-* ‘more eminent’], the worst teacher, a **Rad* (in his own) skull⁹⁴ [= Skt. *guru- mastargga-*] Mani, (60) whose doctrine is sorcery [= Skt. *rākṣasīya-* ‘demon worship’], and (whose) religion (*dēn*) is deceit [=

⁹³ With glosses from its later medieval Sanskrit version added here from DE BLOIS/SIMS-WILLIAMS 2006. For more details, see TAILLIEU 2004.

⁹⁴ Cf. the discussion in TIMUŞ forthcoming, pp. 130–132 where she translates *raṭ-mastarag* as « maître (des) crâne(s) » and suggests that the term was likely used by the Zoroastrians as a mockery of a Manichaean title for Mani. This rather opaque term (evidently from Av. *mastrəyan-* ‘skull’) does have / *rad-* / as the first member of the compound and could perhaps allude to the line in *Dk.* 9.39.15: “I am better suited for the Office of the *Rad*...” (*kū gōwēd kū pad radīh ... man weh šāyam*), in which case the mockery might conceivably reflect his pretensions to being a *Rad*.

Skt. *vipratāraka*- ‘imposter’], and (whose) teaching [= Skt. *śikṣa*- ‘teaching’] is evil, and (whose) custom (*brahm*) [= Skt. *veṣa*- ‘dress’] moves in secret⁹⁵.⁹⁶

One person’s esotericism is another’s sorcery. In an often-cited passage, al-Mas‘ūdī [AH 282–385 / 896–956 CE] in his *Murūdj al-dhahab wa ma‘ādin al-jawāhir* (“Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems”), living in 10th-century Baghdad, the precise place where the colophon of the *Dēnkard* was written some 60 years later, adds to the claims of Manichaean esotericism, but here in the context of scriptural hermeneutics:

“We report that Mānī, the son of Yazīd, disciple of Qārdūn [= Cerdo, a 2nd century CE gnostic⁹⁷], came to Bahrām and presented to him the dualist doctrines (*madhāhib al-thanawiyya*). He [= Bahrām] cunningly accepted them, until he had gathered his missionaries, who were dispersed across the lands, those of his disciples who preached the dualist doctrines to the people. Then he killed him, and he killed the leaders of his disciples. The word *zindiqa* was created in the days of Mānī, with whom, the *zanādiqa* are associated. And regarding this, when Zarādusht the son of Asbimān [= Pahl. *spitāmān*] (whose genealogy we have already mentioned) brought to the Persians a book called the *Bistā* [= Pahl. *abēstag*, ‘Avesta’] in the first language (*al-lughat al-ūlā*) of the Persians, he gave it a commentary (*tafsīr*) called the *Zand*. And he gave this commentary a gloss (*sharḥ*) called *Bāzand* [= Pāzand], as we have said before. The *Zand* was an explanation (*bayān*) for the esoteric/allegorical interpretation (*ta‘wīl*) of the ancient revelation. Whoever there was in their religion (*sharī‘at*) who adduced anything in opposition to the revelation, *i.e.*, the *Bistā*, and who turned toward the esoteric/allegorical interpretation (*ta‘wīl*), *i.e.*, the *Zand*, they would say, ‘He is a *zandī*,’ referring to (the name of) the

⁹⁵ The polemic against Manichaean secrecy finds a reference in L 68, a Manichaean Sogdian text now in Leningrad, where Mani tells a magus the parable of a deaf and dumb boy: “Then Lord Mar Mani said to the magus: ‘I together with (my) disciples (and) Electi, am like that boy who, by a *cunning* [all italics in original] stratagem, was silent, (who) did not speak and did not hear... So we too are silent, and we speak with no-one and perform good deeds and pious actions as a cunning stratagem. Moreover, that time will finally come when I shall *speak* before all, like that boy, and we *shall* demand justice for ourselves,’” transl. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1990 [1992], p. 285. Cf., once again, M 7, hymn 1n: < nyx’žyd gryw ’w pw’cyšn ’wd ’ym r’z r’št šwj d’ryd. nmwyd ’w hwyn ky bwxsynd ’wd ’ym r’z ’w hwyn wchyd > “Prepare (pl.) the soul for purification! And keep this secret (*rāz*) truly holy! Honour those who are being saved! And teach them this secret!” Text and transl. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2006, p. 27.

⁹⁶ Text after DE MENASCE 1945, pp. 116–117; cf. also TAILLIEU 2004, pp. 80, 194 and TIMUŞ forthcoming, p. 128 for a partial translation and detailed analysis of the key terms.

⁹⁷ See REEVES 2011, p. 34, fn. 97, where he notes that Irenaeus suggested that Cerdo was a follower of Simon Magus and an important intellectual influence upon Marcion.

interpretation, which shows that he had moved from the exoteric meanings (*zawāhir*) of the revelation to the esoteric/allegorical interpretation (*ta'wīl*), and this is in contradiction to the revelation. When the Arabs came, they took this term from the Persians, and they pronounced it *zindīq* and Arabized it.”⁹⁸

While many of us read this passage and others like it as part of the Manichaean – *Zandīk* question, I believe al-Mas‘ūdī is also providing us proof, through Islamic eyes no doubt, of the very contested process of allegoresis and competitive hermeneutics between the Zoroastrians and Manichaeans.⁹⁹ I would contend that ‘normative’ allegoresis as traditional intersignification—‘knowledge from the Tradition’—was used by the Zoroastrian hermeneuts as a defense of the idealized view of the Sasanian political and religious *status quo* and can be seen most clearly in another Pahlavi passage on ‘heresy’ in *Dk.* 3.390.9 in a chapter entitled the “Protection of the knowledge of the Tradition (*dēn*) from the destruction of the heretics (*ahlomōyān*),” where it is stated:

ud ēk wizīngarīh ī pad ošmurdār ud čāšīdār ī dēnīg hammōg kē aziš bawēd pānagīh ī dēn-dānāgīh az ahlomōyān +wināhišn rāstīhā pad dastwar <ī> xūb raft ī dēn ud ārāyišn ī xwadāyīh wirāyišn ī gēhān.

“And one is the discernment by the enumerators and teachers of the Tradition (*dēnīg*) from which comes the protection of the (proper) knowledge of the Tradition from the destruction of the heretics (*ahlomōyān*); in a truthful manner, through good authority, (there will be) the going forth of the Tradition, and through the arrangement of Rulership (*xwadāyīh*), (there will be) the management of the world.”¹⁰⁰

Here we see the deployment of a trope in Pahlavi much better known from its *Nachleben* in Islamic political theory from none other than al-Mas‘ūdī himself—and others like Ibn al-Muqaffa‘ [*ca.* AH

⁹⁸ Al-Mas‘ūdī = DE MEYNARD/DE COURTEILLE 1861–1877, vol. II, pp. 167–168; transl. after DE BLOIS 2012a. For a discussion of the Pāzand, see AZARNOUCHE 2014, pp. 81–99. See also VAN BLADEL 2017, pp. 190–210 for a discussion of the Perso-Arabic historians’ views on Zoroastrian scripture, hermeneutics, and textuality.

⁹⁹ *Contra* DE BLOIS 2012a: “The *zand*, which the Persians believed to have been revealed by their prophet, is not an ‘allegorical interpretation’ of the Avesta, but a translation into Middle Persian (with commentary) of what the Zoroastrians of the Sāsānid period perceived to be the literal meaning of the scripture; there can consequently be no question of the Manichaeans having turned away from the Avesta to the (Zoroastrian) *zand*, as al-Mas‘ūdī implies... Nor is there any evidence that the Manichaeans produced a *zand* of their own ... or that they considered their religion to be an allegorical interpretation of the Avesta. In fact, extant Manichaean writings make it quite clear that they did not accept the Avesta as a genuine prophetic revelation.”

¹⁰⁰ Text: B 286 || DkM 286; cf. the transl. in DE MENASCE 1973, p. 348.

103–139 / 721–757 CE] before him—who commonly cite the founder of the Sasanians, Ardāšir I [r. 224–242 CE] as saying:

“Religion (*dīn*) and Kingship (*mulk*) are two brothers, and neither can dispense with the other. Religion is the foundation of Kingship and Kingship protects Religion. For whatever lacks a foundation must perish, and whatever lacks a protector disappears.”¹⁰¹

Mani and his followers’ theological cosmopolitanism, aggressive trans-imperial proselytizing, and their non-sanctioned hermeneutics were precisely the first of many existential threats that laid bare the often fractious social interactions between Zoroastrianism and the other faiths in the empire that patently belied this highly idealized discourse of the mutually supportive relationship between priestly and royal power in Sasanian Iran.

This leaves us with one major hermeneutical desideratum that still needs answering: Why is this anachronistic interpretation of the *Waršt mānsr Nask* read into the *Kamnāmaēzā Hāiti* and not some other section of the *Gāthās*? In my experience, we are compelled to use a form of hermeneutical induction to try and motivate these radical forms of allegoreses by finding a word, phrase or strophe in the Old Avestan base text that likely served as the hermeneutical ‘trigger’ for the interpretive narrative to follow. In this case, I believe it is a *topos* and a well-known one at that. In a characteristically insightful article on the *Cologne Mani Codex*, ALBERT DE JONG persuasively argues that the accounts of the lives and travels of the founders of Manichaeism and Zoroastrianism have a shared trope of prophetic despair in the face of scepticism and ostracism in the early days of spreading their prophetic message.¹⁰² He provides *CMC* 102–104 where Mani is struggling against the Baptist community of his youth and bemoans his lack of social stature, reputation, and royal support to his divine ‘Twin’ (Gk. σύζυγος):

“Where shall I go then? All religions and sects are adversaries of the good. I am a stranger and alone in the world...

(103) How then, if these people (*i.e.* the Baptists) have given me no room to accept the truth, will the world, its princes or its teachings, receive me when it comes to hearing these secrets and to accepting (these) hard precepts? How shall I (speak) before the kings

¹⁰¹ Al-Mas‘ūdī = DE MEYNARD/DE COURTEILLE 1861–1877, vol. II, p. 162; cited in ZAEHNER 1955, p. 36; see also HUTTER 1993, pp. 2–15, in particular, pp. 9–10. For this particular theme and its transmission histories, see SHAKED 1984, pp. 31–67.

¹⁰² See DE JONG 2014, pp. 129–147, in particular, pp. 141–143.

and... and (104) of the world, and the leaders of religions? For, see, they are mighty and exercise power with their wealth, their authority and their material means; but I am alone and poor in all these things.”¹⁰³

DE JONG goes on to provide the Zoroastrian parallel—the opening two strophes of *Yasna* 46 of the *Kamnāmaēzā Hāiti*¹⁰⁴—on which Mani had seemingly modelled his religious claims, and he unequivocally states:

“This passage is, almost up to its wording, reminiscent of the famous lines of *Yasna* 46, where Zarathushtra — according to the traditional explanation, which is the one that should guide us at the moment — utters words of despair for being cast out of his land and his family, the united opposition of the evil priests and rulers of the land and his despair of ever winning an audience with a mighty patron¹⁰⁵:

+*kqm nəmōi zqm kuθrā nəmōi aiiēnī*
*pairī xʷaētēuš +airiāmanascā*¹⁰⁶ *dadaitī*
nōiṭ mā xšnāuš yā vərəzānā hēcā
naēdā daxiiēuš yōi sāstārō drəguuantō
kaθā θβā mazdā xšnaošāi ahurā

“(To) which piece of land shall I (go to) graze (my cattle)?

Where shall I go to graze (them)?

They keep (me) away from (their) family and tribe.

The community which I wish to join does not satisfy me

Nor (do) the deceitful tyrants of the land.

How shall I satisfy you, O Wise Ahura?”

vaēdā taṭ yā ahmī mazdā anaēšō

¹⁰³ DE JONG cites the transl. in GARDNER/LIEU 2004, pp. 65–66.

¹⁰⁴ For another allegorical interpretation of the opening line of *Y.* 46.1 in the *Sūdgar Nask* of *Dk.* 9, see VEVAINA 2010, pp. 208–234.

¹⁰⁵ DE JONG 2014, p. 142.

¹⁰⁶ *Zand:* / *ērmānān* / from Av. *airiāmana-* ‘tribe;’ cf. also *Y.* 54.1 – *Airiāman Išiiō* – which appears to have been borrowed by the Manichaeans as an epithet of Jesus in Manichaean Middle Persian: < *yyšw’ry’m’n* > ‘Jesus the Friend,’ for which, see DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2004, p. 53; and see also SUNDERMANN 1979, p. 103, fn. 246 with literature. For a list of Zoroastrian figures in Iranian Manichaean texts, see p. 101.

mā kamnaṣṣuuā hiiatcā kamnānā ahmī
gərəzōi tōi ā īt [a]uuēnā ahurā
raḥadrēm caguuā hiiat friiō friiāi daidūt
āxsō vaṇhāuš ašā īštīm manañhō

“I know wherefore I am lacking in vigour, O Mazdā.

(It is) on account of the scantiness of my cattle stock,

And because I am one of few men (only).

I complain to You. Look hither, O Ahura,

Extending (such) support as a friend would grant a friend.

Look upon the vigour of Good Thought, (inspired) by Truth.”¹⁰⁷

DE JONG then goes on to argue that the *topos* of a prophet going to the court of the ruling king of the land in question to preach his prophetic message is so familiar to us that scholars have not fully appreciated that it is *not* a component of the various Christian traditions from Palestine or the Graeco-Roman world,¹⁰⁸ nor do we find in those polities the expectation that if said king converted, so would the denizens of the realm then follow suit. He then suggests that these particular religio-political ideas are, in fact, omnipresent in the Christian nations of what he refers to as the ‘Parthian commonwealth.’¹⁰⁹

In my opinion, what DE JONG has seen most accurately in the *CMC* is the *imitatio zoroastris*, as it were, of Mani’s claims to being a latter-day Zoroāstra in order to appeal to the pre-existing expectations of his Iranian and Iranianized followers in the Sasanian realm—the political successor to the Parthian commonwealth. As such, it fits perfectly with Mani’s brilliant re-tasking of the sacral symbolic systems of the ‘ancients’ (*pēšēnagān*), an *Interpretatio Manichaica*, which the Manichaean scriptures state explicitly. DE JONG’s claim is buttressed by the fact that we have incontrovertible evidence that the Manichaeans were well aware of both the Zoroastrian *nasks* and the five *Gāthās*, as we find them enumerated in the Manichaean Parthian *Gyān wifrās* (“Sermon on the Soul”) [M 838 =

¹⁰⁷ Text and transl. after HUMBACH *ET AL.* 1991, vol. I, pp. 167–168; DE JONG 2014, pp. 141–142 [N.B. DE JONG cites the HUMBACH *ET AL.* 1991 translation but does not provide the Avestan text, which I have supplied here].

¹⁰⁸ The same point was argued more generally for the genre of the *CMC* in HENRICHs 1986, p. 183.

¹⁰⁹ DE JONG 2014, p. 143, fn. 40, provides a definition: “On my understanding, the ‘Parthian commonwealth’ refers to those parts of the world that were within the cultural and political orbit of the Parthian Empire, but the majority of whose inhabitants did not speak Iranian languages: parts of Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Georgia to the West, and (for some subjects) the world of the Kushans to the East.”

M 419+M 3824], which BEDUHN suggests is likely a 3rd century CE text.¹¹⁰ The hymn states that in the (unnamed) *nask* < pd nsk > in question one finds the five *Gāθās*, with each being homologized to one of the five “children of Ohrmazd” < ’w(hrm)yzd (bg)[z’ dg’n] > (§21), who constituted the natural elements: the air < frwrdyn > is “called < xrwšt bwyd > in the *nask* the *Ahunauuaitī Gāθā* < ’whnwyt g’ḥ >” (§32); the wind < w’d > is “called in the *nask* the ⁺*Uštāuuaitī Gāθā* < ’wys(t)[wyt g’ḥ] >” (§46); the light < rwšn > is “called in the *nask* the [^{*}*Spəntā.maniiu Gāθā*]”; the water < ’b > is “called in the *nask* the ⁺*Vohuxšaθrā Gāθā* < [whwxš](tr) g’ḥ >” (§65); and the fire < ’dwr > is “called in the *nask* the [^{*}*Vahištoišti Gāθā*].”¹¹¹ In WERNER SUNDERMANN’s view the references to the *Gāθās* do not presuppose that Mani composed the work in an Iranian milieu but he might well have known about the Zoroastrian sacred texts in his youth in Mesopotamia.¹¹² We also have another Manichaean Parthian fragment [M 4525] that appears to contain a dialogue between Mani and a Sasanian monarch, whom SUNDERMANN believed might refer to Wahrām I, and which appears to contain the word for /*nask*/ as well: < ’ymy(c) š’ḥ ’w (’)m(’ḥ) pydr w’xt kw ’ym (n)sq ... > “The king also said this to our father: ‘This *nask* ...’”¹¹³

We can now add significant intertextual evidence for DE JONG’s argument and the Gathic allusions in the “Sermon on the Soul” by noting that the very Gathic section (*hāiti*) which serves as the base text for the eisegesis of Mani’s death and the condemnation of his followers in the *Warštmānsr Nask*—referred to as one of the seven Gathic (*gāhānīg*) *nasks* in *Dēnkard* Book 8—is the very same *Kamnamaēzā Hāiti*, which DE JONG argues was the Zoroastrian *Vorlage* of the trope of the ‘complaining’ prophet in the *Cologne Mani Codex*.¹¹⁴ I believe this non-trivial fact lends strong support to DE JONG’s closing remarks on Mani as the son of the Parthian-Sasanian soil, as it were: “... that Manichaeism originated in Persia, and that this should mean something—they cannot be taken seriously enough: it could have come from nowhere else.”¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ BEDUHN 2020. SUNDERMANN 1997, pp. 9 stated that the Parthian version is older than its Sogdian and Old Turkic versions but he did not rule out a now lost Aramaic original. In his view the references to the *Gāθās* do not presuppose that Mani composed the work in an Iranian milieu but would have known about the Zoroastrian sacred texts in his youth in Babylonia already.

¹¹¹ See SUNDERMANN 1997 pp. 58–65 and 76–79 and BEDUHN 2020.

¹¹² SUNDERMANN 1997, p. 10.

¹¹³ SUNDERMANN 1981, p. 72 and see fn. 1.

¹¹⁴ Unfortunately, the extant *CMC* is not a witness to Mani’s death.

¹¹⁵ DE JONG 2008, p. 106.

Mani and the Manichaeans' referencing the *nasks* in the 3rd century CE finds a similar witness in the inscriptions of Kerdīr at Naqš-e Rostam and Sar-e Mašhad, where PRODS OKTOR SKJÆRVØ restored the word / *nask* / in KNRm 53 || KSM 29: < W ZK ['w]gwn cygwn [PWN n]sky nm' dty AYK A[N]ŠWT[A...] > for / *ud ān <ōw>ōn čiyōn <pad n>ask nimāyēd kū mardōm* / “And in the same way as it is revealed [in the *n*]ask that [when] people....”¹¹⁶ As SKJÆRVØ points out, although there is no direct evidence that the Avestan texts were written down by this period, it is quite possible that the accompanying Pahlavi translations and their commentaries had conceivably been written down already in the 3rd century CE.¹¹⁷ While it would be pure speculation to argue that the *Warštmānsr Nask* passage and the *Zand* it was interpreting were definitively composed in the late 3rd century following Man's execution, I would suggest that our understanding of the Manichaean-Zoroastrian hermeneutic competition for the Avestan *nasks qua* ‘scriptural proof texts’ was not limited to the well-known examples in Kerdīr's inscriptions and the Manichaean Parthian texts. We may now add the *CMC* and its *responsum* in *Dēnkard* Book 9 to this pitched hermeneutic battle claiming the contested memory of the archaic Iranian past of myth, ritual, and epic.¹¹⁸ This scriptural rivalry animated the processes which ultimately resulted in both communities *becoming* ‘late antique religions,’ and, hence, forever intertwined within the dynamic multi-cultural mosaic of the Sasanian period and surviving well into the early Islamic centuries.

While the Sasanian monarch felt entitled to execute Mani when he fell out of favor, his Zoroastrian priestly counterparts felt equally justified on hermeneutical grounds to mock and reject Mani's claims to being a *Zoroaster revivus*.¹¹⁹ From their perspective, Mani had gone so far as to craft his own illegitimate prophetic autobiography from the *ipsissima verba* of Zaraθuštra in the sacred *Gāthās* and, in doing so, had become the *zandīg* or deviant hermeneut, *par excellence*. The Zoroastrian priesthood evidently felt compelled to counteract Mani's appropriation of Zaraθuštra's ‘poet's complaint’ in the *Kamnamaēzā Hāiti* by reading his death at the hands of the Sasanian monarch into that very *hāiti* in their hermeneutical tradition, thus, implicitly praising Zaraθuštra's

¹¹⁶ After SKJÆRVØ 1983 [1985], p. 276. He suggests that the *nask* in question might be *Videvdad* 19.28–30 and justifies the early date on orthographic grounds as well. SKJÆRVØ's emendation has been largely accepted and note the further discussion in CANTERA 2004, pp. 150–154.

¹¹⁷ SKJÆRVØ 1991, p. 107.

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., SKJÆRVØ 1995a, pp. 263–284 and 1995b, pp. 187–223 and MORANO 2009, pp. 325–330.

¹¹⁹ For the figure of Zaraθuštra found in Manichaean sources, see SIMS-WILLIAMS 1976, pp. 43–82; YOSHIDA 1979, pp. 181–195; SUNDERMANN 1986, pp. 461–482 and 2004, pp. 517–530; SKJÆRVØ 1996, pp. 597–628; and DILLEY 2015, pp. 101–135.

successful conversion of royal authority while explicitly scorning Mani's failed attempt at achieving the same. 'Praise and blame' in a late antique idiom. Put simply, competitive hermeneutics as interreligious polemics *qua* scriptural hermeneutics as political historiography.

ABBREVIATIONS:

Aram. = Aramaic

Av. = Avestan

B = DRESDEN 1966

CMC = *Cologne Mani Codex*

Copt. = Coptic

DH = ANKLESARIA 1971

Dk. = *Dēnkard* ("Acts of the Tradition")

DkM = MADAN 1911

Gk. = Greek

KKZ = Kerdīr's inscription at Ka'ba-ye Zardošt at Naqš-e Rostam

KNRm = Kerdīr's inscription to the right of Shapur I's triumphal relief at Naqš-e Rostam

KSM = Kerdīr's inscription above a relief near the road from Susa to Persepolis at Sar-e Mašhad

MMP = Manichaean Middle Persian

MPa. = Manichaean Parthian

MHD. = *Mādayān ī Hazār Dādestān* ("Book of a Thousand Judgements")

OAv. = Old Avestan

Pahl. = 'Book' Pahlavi / Zoroastrian Middle Persian

Skt. = Sanskrit

Sogd. = Sogdian

ŠGW. = *Škand-gumānīg Wizār* ("Doubt-Dispelling Disquisition")

Y. = *Yasna*

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

ANKLESARIA, P. K. 1971: *The Codex DH. Being a Facsimile Edition of Bondaresh, Zand-e Vohuman Yasht, and Parts of the Denkard.* Tehran (Iranian Culture Foundation 89).

- AZARNOUCHE, S. 2014: “Deux modes de transmission dans la tradition scripturaire zoroastrienne : interdépendance du pehlevi et du *pāzand*.” In: *Eurasian Studies* XII/1–2, pp. 81–99.
- BARTHOLOMAE, CH. 1904 [1961]: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin.
- BEDUHN, J. 1995: “The Battle for the Body in Manichaean Asceticism.” In: V. WIMBUSH/R. VALANTASIS (eds.): *Asceticism*. London, pp. 513–519.
- 1996: “The Manichaean Sacred Meal.” In: R. E. EMMERICK/W. SUNDERMANN/I. WARNKE/P. ZIEME (eds.): *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung „Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung“, veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.–12. 12. 1994)*. Berlin, pp. 1–15.
- 2000a: *The Manichaean Body. In Discipline and Ritual*. Baltimore/London.
- 2000b: “Eucharist or Yasna? Antecedents of Manichaean Food Ritual.” In: R. EMMERICK/W. SUNDERMANN/P. ZIEME (eds.): *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin, pp. 14–36.
- 2015: “Mani and the Crystalization of the Concept of ‘Religion’ in Third Century Iran.” In: I. GARDNER/J. BEDUHN/P. DILLEY (eds.): *Mani at the Court of the Persian Kings. Studies on the Chester Beatty Kephalaia Codex*. Leiden, pp. 247–275 (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 87).
- 2020: “The Co-formation of the Manichaean and Zoroastrian Religions in Third-Century Iran.” In: *Formative Exchanges between the Sasanid Empire and Late Antique Rome: Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism and Christianity in Contact*. Bochum, pp. N.A. (Entangled Religions 11/2).
- BESKOW, P. 1988: “The Theodosian Laws against Manichaeism.” In: P. BRYDER (ed.): *Manichaean Studies, Vol. I. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5–7, 1987*. Lund, pp. 1–11.
- al-Bīrūnī. 1878: *Kitāb al-āthār al-bāqīya ‘ani’l-qurūn al-khāliya: Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albērūnī*. Ed. C. E. SACHAU. Leipzig.
- BLANCHARD, M. J./R. D. YOUNG. 1998: *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Eznik of Kolb (floruit c.430–c.450). An English Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Leuven.
- DE BLOIS, F. 2002: “*Naṣrānī* and *ḥanīf*: Studies on the Religious Vocabulary of Christianity and of Islam.” In: *BSOAS* 65/1, pp. 1–30.
- 2012a: “Zindīk.” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd edition. Eds. P. BEARMAN ET AL. Leiden, online.
- 2012b: “A New Look at Mazdak.” In: T. BERNHEIMER/A. SILVERSTEIN (eds.): *Late Antiquity: Eastern Perspectives*. Exeter, pp. 13–24.

- 2015: “Mazdak the Ancient and Mazdak the Last. Further Remarks on the History and Religious Typology of Mazdakism.” In: CH. JULLIEN (ed.): *Husraw I^{er}. Reconstruction d’un règne. Sources et documents*. Paris, pp. 141–154 (Studia Iranica 53).
- DE BLOIS, F./N. SIMS-WILLIAMS (eds.). 2006: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. II., *Texts from Central Iraq and Iran (Texts in Syriac, Arabic, Persian and Zoroastrian Middle Persian)*. Compiled by F. DE BLOIS/E. C.D. HUNTER/D. TAILLIEU. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum).
- BOYCE, M. 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Tehran/Liège/Leiden (Acta Iranica 9).
- BROWN, P. 1969: “The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 29, pp. 92–103.
- CANTERA, A. 2004: *Studien zur Pahlavi-Übersetzung des Avesta*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 7).
- CHOKR, M. 1993: *Zandaqa et zindiqs en Islam au second siècle de l’hégire*. Damascus.
- COLDITZ, I. 2005: “Zur Adaption zoroastrischer Terminologie in Mani’s Šābuhragān.” In: D. WEBER (ed.): *Languages of Iran: Past and Present. Iranian Studies in Memoriam David Neil MacKenzie*. Wiesbaden, pp. 17–26 (Iranica 8).
- 2006: “On the Zoroastrian Terminology in Mani’s Šābuhragān - Additional Notes.” In: A. PANAINO/A. PIRAS (eds.): *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Europaea. Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies I*. Milan, pp. 359–364.
- 2009: “Manichaean Time-Management: Laymen between Religious and Secular Duties.” In: J. D. BEDUHN (ed.): *New Light on Manichaeism. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 73–100 (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 64).
- COYLE, J. K. 2004: “Foreign and Insane: Labelling Manichaeism in the Roman Empire.” In: *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 33/2, pp. 217–234.
- DARYAEE, T. 2016: “The Limits of Sasanian History: Between Iranian, Islamic and Late Antique Studies,” *Iranian Studies* 49/2, pp. 193–203.
- DHABHAR, B. N. 1949: *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad*. Bombay.
- DILLEY, P. 2015: “Also Schrieb Zarathustra? Mani as Interpreter of the ‘Law of Zarades.’” In: I. GARDNER/J. BEDUHN/P. DILLEY (eds.): *Mani at the Court of the Persian Kings. Studies on the Chester Beatty Kephalaia Codex*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 101–135 (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 87).

- DRESDEN, M. J. 1966: *Dēnkart. A Pahlavi Text. Facsimile Edition of the Manuscript B of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute Bombay*. Wiesbaden.
- DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, D. 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian Texts*, vol. III.1, *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts. Texts from Central Asia and China*. Turnhout (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum).
- 2006: *The Hymns to the Living Soul. Middle Persian and Parthian Texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XXIV).
- 2014: *Miscellaneous Hymns. Middle Persian and Parthian Hymns in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XXXI).
- GARDNER, I. 1995: *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary*. Leiden (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 37).
- 2015: “Mani’s Last Days.” In: I. GARDNER/J. BEDUHN/P. DILLEY (eds.): *Mani at the Court of the Persian Kings. Studies on the Chester Beatty Kephalaia Codex*. Leiden, pp. 159–208 (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 87).
- 2020: *The Founder of Manichaeism: Rethinking the Life of Mani. The Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion School of Oriental & African Studies, University of London, 30 May–2 June, 2016*. Cambridge.
- GARDNER, I./ S. N. C. LIEU. 2004: *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- GIGNOUX, P. 1991: *Les quatre inscriptions du mage Kirdīr. Textes et concordances*. Paris (Studia Iranica Cahier 9).
- GYSELEN, R. 2009: “Primary Sources and Historiography of the Sasanian Empire.” *Studia Iranica* 38, pp. 163–190.
- HENNING, W. B. 1943: “The Book of the Giants.” In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11/1, pp. 52–74.
- 1965: “A Grain of Mustard.” In: *AION-L*, pp. 29–47.
- HENRICHS, A. 1986: “The Timing of Supernatural Events in the Cologne Mani Codex.” In: L. CIRILLO/A. ROSELLI (eds.): *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis. Atti del Simposio Internazionale (rende-Amantea 3–7 settembre 1984)*. Cosenza, pp. 569–590.
- HOFFMANN, K./J. NARTEN. 1989: *Der Sasanidische Archetypus. Untersuchungen zu Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen*. Wiesbaden.
- HUMBACH, H. with J. ELFENBEIN/P. O. SKJÆRVØ. 1991: *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts*, 2 vols. Heidelberg.

- HUTTER, M. 1993: “Manichaeism in the Early Sasanian Empire.” In: *Numen* 40/1: pp. 2–15.
- 2015: “Manichaeism in Iran.” In: M. STAUSBERG/Y. S.-D. VEVAINA with A. TESSMANN (eds.): *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Zoroastrianism*. Chichester, pp. 477–489.
- JACKSON, A. V. W. 1924: “The So-Called Injunctions of Mani, Translated from the Pahlavi of Denkart 3, 200.” In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 2, pp. 213–227.
- 1930: “On an Allusion to Mānī in Dēnkart 9.39. 13–16.” In: THE DR. MODI MEMORIAL VOLUME EDITORIAL BOARD (eds.): *The Dr. Modi Memorial Volume: Papers on Indo-Iranian and Other Subjects Written by Several Scholars in Honour of Shams-ul-Ulama Dr. Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., J.P.* Bombay, pp. 34–36.
- DE JONG, A. 2008: “*A quodam Persa exstiterunt*: Re-Orienting Manichaean Origins.” In: A. HOUTMAN/A. DE JONG/M. MISSET-VAN DE WEG (eds.): *Empsychoi Logoi—Religious Innovations in Antiquity. Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst*. Leiden, pp. 81–106 (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 73).
- 2013: “Religion in Iran: The Parthian and Sasanian Periods (247–654 CE).” In: M. SALZMAN/W. ADLER (eds.): *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World II: From the Hellenistic Age to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, pp. 23–53.
- 2014: “The Cologne Mani Codex and the Life of Zarathushtra.” In: G. HERMAN (ed.): *Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians: Religious Dynamics in a Sasanian Context*. Piscataway, NJ, pp. 129–147.
- JOSEPHSON, J. 1997: *The Pahlavi Translation Technique as Illustrated by Hōm Yašt*. Doctoral Dissertation, Uppsala University (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Iranica Upsaliensia II).
- JULLIEN, C./F. JULLIEN. 2002: “Aux frontières de l’iranité: « *nāšrāyē* » et « *krīstyonē* » des inscriptions du *mobad* Kirdīr: Enquête littéraire et historique.” In: *Numen* 49/3, pp. 282–335.
- KADEN, E.-H. 1953: “Die Edikte gegen die Manichaer von Diokletian bis Justinian.” In: FRIENDS AND COLLEAGUES (eds.): *Festschrift Hans Lewald bei Vollendung des vierzigstens Amtsjahres als ordentlicher Professor im Oktober 1953*. Basel, pp. 55–68.
- KIEL, Y. 2019: “Playing with Children: A Talmudic Polemic against Manichaean Sexual Ethics.” In: *Jewish Law Association Studies* 28: *The Jewish Family*, pp. 112–136.
- KRISTÓ-NAGY, I. 2016: “Denouncing the Damned *Zindīq*! Struggle and Interaction between Monotheism and Dualism.” In: C. ADANG/H. ANSARI/M. FIERRO/S. SCHMIDTKE. (eds.): *Accusations of Unbelief in Islam. A Diachronic Perspective on Takfir*. Leiden, pp. 56–81.

- LEURINI, C. 2013: *The Manichaean Church. An Essay Mainly Based on the Texts from Central Asia*. Rome (Serie Orientale Roma, New Series 1).
- LIEU, S. N. C. 1999: *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden/Boston/Köln (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 118).
- 2006: “‘My Church is Superior...’ Mani’s Missionary Statement in Coptic and Middle Persian.” In: L. PAINCHAUD/P.-H. POIRIER (eds.): *Coptica, Gnostica, Manichaica: mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk*. Leuven, pp. 519–528.
- MACKENZIE, D. N. 1989: “Kerdir’s inscription,” in *The Sasanian Rock Reliefs at Naqsh-i Rostam. Naqsh-i Rostam 6*. Berlin, pp. 35–72 (Iranische Denkmäler. Lief. 13. Reihe II: Iranische Felsreliefs I).
- MACUCH, M. 1981: *Das sasanidische Rechtsbuch Mātakdān i hazār Dātistān, (Teil II)*. Wiesbaden (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft).
- MADAN, D. M. 1911: *The Complete Text of the Pahlavi Dinkard*, 2 vols. Bombay.
- MALANDRA, W./P. ICHAPORIA 2013: *The Pahlavi Yasna of the Gāthās and Yasna Haptanḥāiti*. Wiesbaden.
- al-Mas‘ūdī. 1861–1877: *Les Prairies d’or (Murūḡ al-dahab wa-ma‘ādin al-ḡawhar)*, 2 vols. Trans. B. DE MEYNARD/P. DE COURTEILLE. Paris.
- DE MENASCE, J. 1945: *Škand-gumānīk Vičār. La solution décisive des doutes*. Fribourg (Collectanea Friburgensia, Publications de l’université de Fribourg en suisse, Nouvelle série, fascicule 30).
- 1973: *Le troisième livre du Dēnkart*. Paris (Travaux de l’institut d’études iraniennes de l’université de Paris 5. Bibliothèque des oeuvres classiques persanes 4).
- Michael Syrus. 1963: *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d’Antioche, 1166–1199*, 4 vols. Ed. J.-B. CHABOT. Bruxelles.
- MILLS, L. H. 1894: *A Study of the Five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian) Gāthās, with Text, Translations*. Erlangen.
- MORANO, E. 2009: “‘If They Had Lived ...’ A Sogdian-Parthian Fragment of Mani’s *Book of Giants*.” In: W. SUNDERMANN/A. HINTZE/F. DE BLOIS (eds.): *Exegisti Monumenta: Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Wiesbaden, pp. 325–330 (Iranica 17).
- al-Nadīm. 1971: *Kitāb al-fihrist li-ibn al-Nadīm*. Ed. R. TAJADDUD. Tehran.
- NAGY, G. 1979: *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore/London.

- OLSSON, T. 1991: “The Refutation of Manichaeic Doctrines in Dēnkard 3.200.” In: A. VAN TONGERLOO/S. GEVERSEN (eds.): *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Louvain, pp. 273–293.
- PEDERSEN, N. 2017: “Holy Meals and Eucharist in Manichaeic Sources: Their relation to Christian Traditions.” In: D. HELLHOLM/D. SÄNGER (eds.): *The Eucharist – Its Origins and Contexts. Sacred Meal, Communal Meal, Table Fellowship in Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Tübingen, pp. 1265–1295.
- PERIKHANIAN, A. 1997: *The Book of a Thousand Judgements (A Sasanian Law-Book)*. Trans. N. GARSOĪAN. Costa Mesa, CA/New York.
- POLOTSKY, H. J. 1934: *Manichäische Homilien*. Stuttgart.
- REEVES, J. C. 1996: *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*. Leiden (Nag Hammadi and Manichaeic Studies 41).
- 2011: *Prolegomena to a History of Islamicate Manichaeism*. Sheffield/Oakville, CT.
- REZANIA, K. 2020: “‘Religion’ in Late Antique Zoroastrianism and Manichaeism: Developing a Term in Counterpoint.” In: *Formative Exchanges between the Sasanid Empire and Late Antique Rome: Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism and Christianity in Contact*. Bochum, pp. n.a. (Entangled Religions 11/2).
- RUSSELL, J. R. 1990: “Kartīr and Māni: A Shamanistic Model of Their Conflict.” In: D. AMIN/M. KASHEFF/SH. SHAHBAZI (eds.): *Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*. Liège/Leiden, pp. 180–193.
- SCOTT, D. A. 1989: “Manichaeic Responses to Zoroastrianism. (Politico-Religious Controversies in Iran, Past to Present: 3).” In: *Religious Studies* 25/4, pp. 435–457.
- SHAKED, SH. 1984: “From Iran to Islam: Notes on Some Themes in Transmission.” In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 4, pp. 31–67.
- SHAPIRA, D. 2004: “Manichaeics (*Marmanaiia*), Zoroastrians (*Iazuqaiia*), Jews, Christians and other Heretics: A Study of the Redaction of Mandaic Texts.” In: *Le Muséon* 117, pp. 243–280.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N. 1976: “The Sogdian Fragments of the British Library.” In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 18/1–2, pp. 43–82.
- 1985: “The Manichaeic Commandments: A Survey of the Sources.” In: H. W. BAILEY *ET AL.* (eds.): *Papers in honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, vol. II, Leiden, pp. 573–582 (Acta Iranica 25).

- 1990 [1992]: “The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad II: Mani at the Court of the Shahanshah.” In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*. New Series 4, pp. 281–288.
- SKJÆRVØ, P. O. 1983 [1985]: “‘Kirdir’s Vision’: Translation and Analysis.” In: *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 16, pp. 269–306.
- 1991: Review of K. HOFFMANN/J. NARTEN 1989. In: *Kratylos* 36, pp. 104–109.
- 1995a. “Iranian Elements in Manicheism: A Comparative Contrastive Approach. Irano-Manichaica I.” In: R. GYSELEN (ed.): *Au carrefour des religions: Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*. Bures-sur-Yvette, pp. 263–284 (Res Orientales 7).
- 1995b. “Iranian Epic and the Manichean *Book of Giants*. Irano-Manichaica III.” In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48, pp. 187–223.
- 1996: “Zarathustra in the Avesta and in Manicheism: Irano-Manichaica IV.” In: ACCADEMIA NAZIONALE DEI LINCEI (eds.): *La Persia e l’Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Roma, 9–12 novembre 1994)*. Roma, pp. 597–628.
- 1997: “Counter-Manichaean Elements in Kerdīr’s Inscriptions: Irano-Manichaica II.” In: L. CIRILLO/A. VAN TONGERLOO (eds.): *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi “Manicheismo e oriente cristiano antico*. Louvain, pp. 313–342.
- 2001: “Rivals and Bad Poets: The Poet’s Complaint in the Old Avesta.” In: M. G. SCHMIDT/W. BISANG (eds.): *Philologica et Linguistica. Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Dezember 2001*. Trier, pp. 351–376.
- 2002: “Praise and Blame in the Avesta: The Poet-Sacrificer and His Duties.” In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 26, pp. 29–67.
- 2003: “Truth and Deception in Ancient Iran.” In: C. G. CERETI/F. VAJIFDAR (eds.): *Ātaš-e Dorun. The Fire Within. Jamshid Soroush Soroushian Memorial Volume II. Assembled Papers on History and Culture of Ancient Iran in Commemoration of the Life of Jamshid Soroush Soroushian 1914–1999*. Bloomington, IN, pp. 383–434.
- 2011a: “KARTIR.” In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* XV/6. Ed. E. YARSHATER. Costa Mesa, CA, pp. 608–628 = <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/kartir>
- 2011b: *The Spirit of Zoroastrianism*. New Haven, CT (Sacred Literature Series).
- STROUMSA S./G. G. STROUMSA. 1988: “Aspects of Anti-Manichaean Polemics in Late Antiquity and under Early Islam.” In: *The Harvard Theological Review* 81/1, pp. 37–58.
- SUNDERMANN, W. 1979: “Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos.” In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, pp. 95–133.

- 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts. Mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte XI).
- 1986: “Bruchstücke einer manichäischen Zarathustralegende.” In: R. SCHMITT/P. O. SKJÆRVØ (eds.): *Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*. München, pp. 461–482 (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 13, Neue Folge).
- 1997: *Der Sermon von der Seele: Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version mit einem Anhang von Peter Zieme. Die türkischen Fragmente des “Sermons von der Seele.”* Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XIX).
- 2004: *Zarathustra der Priester und Prophet in der Lehre der Manichäer*. In: M. STAUSBERG (ed.): *Zoroastrian Rituals in Context*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 517–530 (Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religion 102).
- al-Ṭabarī. 1879–1901: *Taʾrīkh ar-rusul wa-l-mulūk: Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari*, 15 vols. Ed. M. DE GOEJE. Leiden.
- 1999: *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 5: *The Sāsānids, the Byzantines, the Lakmids, and Yemen*. Ed. C. E. BOSWORTH. Albany.
- TAILLIEU, D. 2004: *The Zoroastrian Polemic against Manichaeism in Škand-gumānīg wizār and Dēnkard III*. Doctoral Thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- TARDIEU, M. 2008: *Manichaeism*. Trans. M. B. DEBEVOISE. Urbana, IL/Chicago.
- TAQĪZĀDEH, S. H./A. A. ŠĪRĀZĪ 1335/1956: *Mānī va dīn-e-ū*. Tehran.
- TIMUŞ, M. 2019: “Breaking the Rules: Considerations on Zoroastrian Terminology Related to the Idea of Heresy.” In: *Numen* 66, pp. 271–294.
- Forthcoming: “Reléguer crânement l’adversaire aux enfers. Polémique anti-manichéenne en terre mazdéenne.” In: F. RUANI/M. TIMUŞ (eds.): *Quand les dualistes polémiquaient : Zoroastriens et Manichéens. Actes du colloque international, 12–13 juin 2015, Collège de France*. Leuven, pp. 125–154 (Collection Orient et Méditerranée 34).
- VAN BLADEL, K. T. 2017: “Zoroaster’s Many Languages.” In: J. E. LOWRY/S. M. TOORAWA (eds.): *Arabic Humanities, Islamic Thought: Essays in Honor of Everett K. Rowson*. Leiden, pp. 190–210 (Islamic History and Civilization 141).
- VAN OORT, J. 2016a: “‘Human Semen Eucharist’ Among the Manichaeans? The Testimony of Augustine Reconsidered in Context.” In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 70, pp. 1–24.

- 2016b: “Another Case of Human Semen Eucharist Among the Manichaeans? Notes on the ‘Ceremony of the Fig’ in Cyril of Jerusalem’s Catechesis VI.” In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 70, pp. 430–440.
- VEVAINA, Y. S.-D. 2010: “Relentless Allusion: Intertextuality and the Reading of Zoroastrian Interpretive Literature.” In: C. BAKHOS/M. R. SHAYEGAN (eds.): *The Talmud in Its Iranian Context*, Tübingen, pp. 208–234 (Text and Studies in Ancient Judaism 135).
- WEST, E. W. 1892 [1994]: *Pahlavi Texts, Part IV: Contents of the Nasks*. Oxford [Delhi] (Sacred Books of the East 37).
- YOSHIDA, Y. (1979): “On the Sogdian Infinitives.” In: *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 18, pp. 181–195.
- ZAEHNER, R. C. 1955 [1971]: *Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma*. Oxford.
- ZEINI, A. 2020: *Zoroastrian Scholasticism in Late Antiquity: The Pahlavi version of the Yasna Haptañhāiti*. Edinburgh.