

to pass when the days of his ἀνάληψις were fulfilled.' This is in harmony with the description of the scope of the Gospel in Acts i 2: 'until the day, when, after charging his apostles . . . he was taken up.'

In conclusion we may observe that the overlapping of Luke and Acts with the resulting incongruity probably affords the true explanation of the chief Old Latin variants in Acts i 1-4. The translator was undoubtedly working upon a 'Western' Greek MS. But it is not necessary to assume that he derived all his peculiarities from his original. He was quite capable of introducing improvements of his own. 'The rendering into Latin', says Ropes of the 'African' Old Latin fragments of Acts in the Fleury palimpsest, 'is often very free, although the Greek text followed can usually be discerned.'¹ 'The impression which [the Fleury palimpsest] makes', echoes Professor Clark, 'is that of a free translation with a tendency to explanation or periphrasis.'² A later passage in this same chapter of Acts affords a good example of the translator's interest in harmonization: in order to reconcile the account of Judas's death in Acts with that in Matthew, he inserts into his translation at v. 18 the words 'collum sibi alligavit'³—at any rate, it is plausible to conjecture that the insertion, which is not known in Greek texts, was his own doing. A similar harmonizing tendency may well have influenced him here. In any case, the 'African' Old Latin is a very insecure base from which to work back to the authentic Greek, and it is hazardous to follow it in the teeth of a consensus of the Greek MSS.

J. M. CREED.

MANICHAICA

IN a recent number of the JOURNAL (xxxiv 266) I gave a short account of the very important find of Manichaean documents in Egypt. It will be many years before that find is fully deciphered and expounded. Meanwhile several important works on Mani and his religion have appeared, which demand notice here. The English reader will find a full discussion of what has been hitherto known in Professor Williams Jackson's *Researches in Manichaeism*.⁴ But the most part of what has been written is in German monographs and papers. A knowledge of German is happily, possessed by many Englishmen, but for a proper appreciation of these monographs much more is required. Dr Schmidt's great find was of course in Coptic. But the paper, or rather monograph, called *Manichäische Dogmatik aus Chinesischen und Iranischen Texten*, by

¹ *Beginnings* vol. iii p. cvii.

² *Acts of the Apostles* p. 248.

³ Cf. *Beginnings* v p. 26.

⁴ *Researches in Manichaeism* by A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University Press, New York, 1932.

Waldschmidt and Lentz, issued this year by the Berlin Academy, asks far more.¹ It is an edition, with translation and full commentary, of an invocation or hymn from the great Chinese Manichæan Roll in the British Museum (B.M., Nr.S 2659). This occupies pp. 8-68. On pp. 68-108 are the corresponding Iranian texts in the Berlin Collection from Turfan together with a commentary. These texts are in Soghdian, North Iranian, and South-west Iranian; they are mostly fragmentary, but in themselves are a whole stage nearer the originals than the Chinese, which, as is the case of all translations into Chinese, are curiously allusive and paraphrastic, but being complete the Chinese text helps to give the general sense of the Iranian fragments. On p. 126 Drs Waldschmidt and Lentz promise us a further more systematic work on these texts and those published in their former work called *The Place of Jesus in Manichæism* (1926, same publishers), but they rightly felt that they had first to publish the documents, with translations and the necessary explanations, before going on to attempt to follow the development of Manichæan thought.

Another very important work is Dr Henning's publication of the late Professor F. C. Andreas's papers called *Mitteliranische Manichæica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan* i, ii (Berlin, 1932-3, same publishers: price 5 R. Marks and 5.50 R. Marks). The Turkish texts from Turfan are being cared for by Professors W. Bang and A. von Gabain (1929-31, same publishers). In all these publications we meet with a difficulty that goes beyond the extreme variety of different languages—the use by the Manichees of Buddhistic and Chinese phraseology to express their own peculiar mythology and ideas (*Bang*, 1930, p. 1 ff). Mani was Syriac-speaking by race and he understood the Persian of the Sasanian court. His works were translated into various Iranian dialects, from these into Turkish, from Turkish into Chinese. At each translation something of current phraseology borrowed from pre-Manichæan religions comes in and helps to conceal Mani's real thought.

Is there any real question of interest with which these almost over-learned works deal, which concerns students of Christian antiquity? The answer to this may be found in a short paper written by Dr Walter Henning on the Birth and Commission of the Manichæan Primal Man, published in the *Nachrichten* of the Göttingen Scientific Society (Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1933, pp. 306-318), price one mark. No one can read this and not feel that the vital question about Manichæanism is 'What think ye of Christ?', or rather (as the Manichees would certainly have framed it) 'how do the Manichees regard Jesus?'

¹ *Manichäische Dogmatik* . . . von Dr Ernst Waldschmidt und Dr Wolfgang Lentz (Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1933, xiii), Berlin 1933. Price, 10 R. Marks.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when to describe the religion of Mani as a form of Christianity seemed antiquated, the result of Church writers confusing the form of Manichaeism current in the Christian West with the true ideas of Mani. But the main result of the wonderful finds at Turfan and elsewhere has been to confirm the presentation of Augustine, and to exhibit the religion of Mani as something heretical indeed, judged by Catholic standards, but nevertheless essentially a form of Christianity. Central to it is the worship of 'Jesus'. Without Jesus, no Manichaean religion. This was the main conclusion that seemed to be indicated by the work of Waldschmidt and Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, referred to above. I may mention that it was the main conclusion of my own little book, *The Religion of the Manichees*, published in 1925. Dr Henning is concerned to expound a certain Hymn (M 10), published by Waldschmidt and Lentz, and also by Reitzenstein (*Mandäisches Buch &c.*, 1919, p. 46f) from a translation made by F. C. Andreas. Dr Henning wishes to shew that it refers to the evocation of the Primal Man, and not to Jesus or (as Reitzenstein and Andreas supposed) to the birth of Mani. I venture to think that he has made out his case, but his conclusions have to be accepted with one or two precautions by the ordinary Christian student.

The Manichaean Religion regarded the visible universe as composed of dark and evil matter made more or less bright and beautiful by the scattered particles of light imprisoned in it. Everything, not merely man, consists of body and soul. The 'soul' longs to be free from the 'body', and redemption consists in the machinery for separating them and so bringing this world as we know it to an end. This world, said the Manichees, is both good and bad mixed together: there is pain and evil in it, because the good wishes to get away from the bad, and the bad wishes to retain it. In the End, in the happy consummation, the good will all be gathered together in the region of the good and the bad will be gathered together in the region of the bad: there will be no more pain and evil, because everything will be eternally in a place appropriate to its nature.

As things are, what matters is (1) the desire of the 'soul' to be free from the dark 'body', and (2) the whole drama of the means, the *oikonomia*, the divine dispensation, by which the soul is freed.

This, says Dr Henning, is the theme of the Hymns called by the Iranian Manichees 'Hymns of the Living Ego' (*Grēvzvandyiy Bāshāh*). The 'Living Ego' is what would be in Syriac *nfesh hayyā* (1 Cor. xv 45),¹ a living soul. The living soul, whether in man, or in animals, or trees, is a fragment of the Light, and according to the Manichees came originally from the armament of the Primal Man that was devoured by the

¹ See Polotsky, *Mani-Fund* 71.

invaders from the realms of the Dark. Consequently, any single Hymn of the Living Ego may be occupied with any part of the great Manichee Drama of Salvation, just as any Christian Hymn may have for its special theme the Fall, the Coming of Christ, the Cross, the Final Judgement. In the special case of M₁₀ Dr Henning makes it very probable that the special subject commemorated is the evocation of the Primal Man and his preparation for opposing the Dark invasion. Possibly, of course, it may have been one of a series, commemorating the whole Epic of salvation act by act.¹

To come now to the Manichæan idea of Jesus. Clearly it is different from the Catholic idea of Jesus. It is also different from the modern, critical, picture of the Prophet from Nazareth, which modern critics believe lies behind the reports of Mark and Matthew and Luke. But apart from that Figure the Manichæan 'Jesus' never would have existed. 'Jesus who appeared in Judæa'—to use Mani's own phrase—was something that Mani took over and did not invent. The Jesus of Mani is very different from the Jesus of the Gospels. It is different as a variation by Beethoven differs from the original air. But the variation is inspired by the air, and similarly the Manichæan Jesus is inspired by the Gospel story. Was the Cross a victory or a defeat? The answer must be, both. The Manichæan myth of the Primal Man differs from the story of 'Jesus who appeared in Judæa', but it has analogies with it—all the more because both are schemes of Salvation, designed by the Light to overcome the ruin wrought by the Dark. Both of them, again, differ from the fruit hanging on every bough, destined to be crushed by the teeth of man and beast, but giving life to its destroyers; yet it can be viewed as a kind of analogy to them, and therefore Faustus the Manichæan in a well-known passage called it *patibilis Jesus, uita ac salus hominum*.

When we keep this way of viewing 'Jesus' in mind we can see that Dr Henning's explanation of this Hymn and that of Waldschmidt and Lentz, who regard all Hymns of the Living Ego as directed to 'Jesus', are really not far apart. The soul of the individual Manichee, 'Jesus who appeared in Judæa', the Primal Man (often called by Iranian and Turkish Manichees 'Ormuzd') are all essentially one, parts or armaments of the perfect Man, which will ultimately be united in the realm of Light, as indeed St Paul said (Eph. iv 13). And therefore Mani felt himself called in his letters to begin, like Paul, 'Mani apostle of Jesus Christ'.

¹ After stanza B—the Hymn is alphabetical—Dr Henning cuts out an ejaculation 'Praise to thee, Living Ego, holy, holy, God, Lord Mani!' Is it not possible that this is a refrain, genuine as such, but no more part of the grammatical structure than *saeculorum saeculis* in the well-known adaptation of Prudentius (*Eng. H.* 613)?

Professor Peterson, now of München, then of Bonn, when reviewing Waldschmidt and Lentz on 'the Place of Jesus in Manichaeism', was inclined to complain that they had not made this Place clear. No, indeed! But that is because 'Jesus who appeared in Judaea' is a real historical Figure, something 'given' and concrete. The 'Primal Man' of Manichaeism is, of course, something evoked by Mani, a stage in the Plan of Salvation. Nevertheless, there is a sort of analogy between the tale of the Primal Man, evoked to conquer the powers of Darkness but overcome by them, whose death nevertheless had as its result the eventual defeat of the invading powers, and the career of Jesus who was sent from on high but was rejected and was believed to have been killed, but through His death salvation came to believing souls. It is all part of the drama of the 'Living Ego'.

The chief reason I have in writing this Review is to bring the work of Waldschmidt and Lentz, of Henning, of Bang, and also that of H. Schäder,¹ before the readers of the JOURNAL, but I also hope that it may induce some young theological student to study the Manichaean Religion, now so strangely rediscovered, and not leave it all to foreign scholars.

F. C. BURKITT.

A NOTE ON טוב.

IN reading the excellent article on the root טוב in Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon, we find that it bears a large variety of meanings, such as 'pleasant, fair, sweet, pleasing, fertile, fat, valuable, happy, prosperous, &c.'

Its Aramaic cognate טובא, however, has one exceedingly common meaning lacking in the Hebrew lexicon, namely, 'good in quantity', i.e. 'very much'. This meaning, which occurs on almost every page of the Talmud, is illustrated in Ber. 30 ב טובא לבא מרירה 'very bitter at heart'—Sanh. 41 ב בה טובא אמריתו 'you have said much about it.'

Non-Semitic languages likewise illustrate the specific shade of 'much' as derived from 'good'. The French 'bien' means 'well' but also 'much, very'. The German 'gut' in such phrases as 'so gut Schuld als er', 'as much to blame as he', 'gut krank', 'very ill', are also cases in point, showing how 'good' develops the meaning of 'much, greatly'.

By predicating this meaning for the substantive טוב and for the adverb היטב and by giving the Hiph'il היטיב the force of 'become

¹ *Urform und Fortbildungen des Manichäischen Systems* von H. H. Schäder (from the Bibliothek Warburg, vol. iv): see also the same writer's critique of the Coptic finds in *Gnomon* for July, 1933.