The University of Osaka
Institutional Knowledge Archive

Title	On the Recently Discovered Manichaean Chinese Fragments
Author(s)	吉田, 豊
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 1997, 12, p. 35-39
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/19749
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/

The University of Osaka

On the Recently Discovered Manichaean Chinese Fragments

Yutaka YOSHIDA

In the course of my brief survey of the Chinese MSS. obtained by the German Turfan expedition, I came across two small fragments of Manichaean contents. They bear the signatures Ch 3133 (= T III T 132) and Ch 3218, and are now housed at the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. From the handwriting and the text on the other side of paper[1] it is certain that the two fragments are from the same MS., though the present author has so far had no access to the originals and has not been able to make it sure. The style of handwriting seems to suggest that the MS. was written during the period C of Fujieda's table,[2] i.e. largely corresponding to the 8th century, but one cannot be absolutely certain on this matter and the dating remains to be uncertain.

Below is the Chinese text transcribed by me from the photographs, of which the quality sometimes makes it difficult to restore the partly damaged characters[3]:

---

* The two fragments published here are deposits of Berlin–Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin–Preussischer Kulturbesitz: Orientabteilung). It gives me great pleasure to express sincere gratitude to the Academy for the permission to make use of the precious materials.

1 This text, which is comprised of prescritions of such diseases as toothache, has nothing to do with the Manichaeism and will not be discussed here. A weak trace of ruled lines makes it likely that the side bearing the Manichaean text is recto, and that the paper was reused for writing the medical text.

2 Cf. A. Fujieda, "Future problems of the researches on Chinese Buddhist manuscripts from Turfan", in: H. Klengel and W. Sundermann (eds.), *Ägypten Vorderasien Turfan*, Berlin, 1991, pp.155-160.

3 In the text (round brackets) indicate the traces of damaged characters and [square brackets] the characters wholly restored.

Text a: Ch 3138 (= T III T 132)

1 (即摧伏令其退散) [10 characters]

2 清淨寄住客性悅 (·) [9 characters]

3 如是五種極大鬪 [戰 10 characters]

4 人因此 (憐愍誠信) [10 characters]

Text b: Ch 3218

1 [· · · ·] 憐愍設有怨憎諸惡念當即摧伏

2 [令其退散？] (若) 退散已明性相體還復清淨寄

3 [住客性悅？]

寄住客性 "temporally dwelling guest nature" in text a and 明性相體 "the limbs of the nous of light nature" of text b clearly show their Manichaean affiliation. In fact one can easily find parallel sequences of characters in the Chinese version of the *Sermon of Light–Nous*, so-called *Traité manichéen* (reproduced in the *Taishō Tripiṭaka* vol.54, pp.1281-1286); the part corresponding to text a is found in p.1282, column c, *ll.*10-14 while that of text b *ibid.*, column b, *ll.*14-16.

Here I shall give Chavannes and Pelliot's French translations of the counterparts found in the *Traité* followed by my English renderings of the Berlin fragments. Unfortunately, so little of the parallel passages has survived from the Parthian and Uighur versions that they are almost of no use for our purpose to restore gaps in the Berlin fragments.[4]

---

4 Section 20 of the Parthian version as edited by W. Sundermann corresponds to our text a. Cf. Sundermann, *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous*, BTT XVII, Berlin, 1992, pp.64-65, 90-92. The Parthian counterpart of text b is lost between sections 23 and 24, while the surviving Uighur fragment ends just at the place where text b begins, cf. H.-J. Klimkeit and H. Schmidt-Glintzer, "Die türkischen Parallelen zum chineseisch-manichäischen Traktat, in: *Zentralasiatische Studien* 17, 1984, pp.82-117, esp. p.89. On the Uighur version of this section see also P. Zieme, "Neue↗

Taishō Tripiṭaka, p.1282b *ll*.9-17:

"Parfois il arrive que le vieil homme entre en lutte avec l'homme nouveau qui est sage; cela est semblable à [ce qui s'est passé] lorsque, pour la première fois, le démon de la convoitise décida d'envahir le monde de la lumière. Il y en a les signes suivants. De la pensée obscure et empoisonnée de ce vieil homme, des démons sortent par transformation, qui immédiatement luttent avec le membre de la pensée de l'homme nouveau. Si cet homme nouveau ne prend pas garde aux signes, il abolit et oublie sa pensée lumineuse, et immédiatement il y en a les signes [que voici] : un tel homme, dans sa conduite, n'aura pas de pitié; dans les affaires qu'il rencontera, il concevra de la haine; de suite il souillera le membre de la pensée pure de sa nature lumineuse, et la nature étrangère qui habite provisoirement en lui en sera aussi atteinte et endommagée. *S'il sait garder les signes, il s'éveillera, il chassera la haine et pratiquera la pitié; le membre de la pensée de sa nature lumineuse retournera à sa pureté; la nature étrangère qui habite provisoirement en lui se dégagera de tous les dangers. Heureux et trépignant de joie, il remercia en rendant hommage et s'en alla.*"[5]

↗ Fragmente des alttürkischen Sermons vom Licht-Nous", in: Ch. Reck and P. Zieme (eds.), *Iran und Turfan. Baiträge Berliner Wissenschaftler, Werner Sundermann zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Berlin, 1995, pp.251-276, esp. pp.258-260. For the overview of the Manichaean Uighur literature see now L. Clark, "The Turkic Manichaean literature", in: P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from darkness. Studies in the recovery of Manichaean sources*, Leiden/New York/Cologne, 1997, pp.89-141. This article, which is extremely helpful for non-Turkologists, needs some improvements on the information about Japanese publications.

5 Cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, *JA* 1911, p.546. Here I cite the whole paragraph in order to provide the context in which the text of the Berlin fragment is to be placed, the part actually corresponding to it being italicized.

Examination of the photogaphic reproduction of the MS of the *Traité* enables one to correct Chavannes and Pelliot's reading 記驗 "signe" to 記念 "mémoire". Although H. Schmidt-Glintzer noticed this misreading, he still followed their translation and rendered both 記驗 and 記念 as "Merkmal", cf. Schmidt-Glintzer, *Chinesische Manichaica*, Wiesbaden, 1987, pp.83-84.

Ch 3218

"... [he has no] compassion. When he has hatred as well as all (the other) evil thoughts, then he ought to suppress (it) immediately so that [the hatred(?)] might be withdrawn and scattered away. Then the limbs of the nous of one's light nature will once again become clean and pure, and the temporarily [residing "guest nature" (will escape) with pleasure ...]".

Taishō Tripiṭaka, p.1282c *ll.*9-14:

"... Si, pour cet homme, les signes ne sont pas oubliés, au cas où la sottise se lèverait, immédiatement et de lui-même il s'éveillera et pourra promtement la soumettre; avec zèle il s'efforcera à l'énergie et réalisera la sagesse. La nature étrangère qui habite provisoirement en lui, à cause de ses bonnes actions, pourra être entièrement pure. Le membre du raisonnement de sa pensée lumineuse, d'une manière limpide, sera sans souillures.

Ces cinq sortes de très grands combats, l'homme nouveau et vieil homme à tout instant s'en livrent un. L'homme nouveau, au moyen de ces cinq sortes de forces, se défend contre ses ennemis haineux. Ce sont des signes qui rappellent les saints du macrocosme ...".[6]

Ch 3138 (= T III T 132)

"... then he (ought to) suppress (the folly) immediately so that it might be withdrawn and scattered away. [Then the limbs of the understanding of one's light nature will once again] become clean and pure, and the temporarily residing "guest nature" (will escape) with pleasure [...]".

These five great conflicts [of the Old and New Man ... The New] Man, by means of the following (attributes, such as) compassion, uprightness, [perfection, patience, and

---

6 Cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, art. cit., pp.548-549.

wisdom ...]".

There remains a difficult question to answer: What is the relationship between the Berlin text and the *Traité*? Are they independent translations from the same original? Or, is one dependent on the other? Here the indications are somewhat contradictory. Berlin fragments share such technical terms as 寄住客性 and 明性相體 with the *Traité*, which strongly suggests the interrelationship between the two texts. On the other hand, what little has survived is clear enough to show that the wordings of the two versions are so different from each other that one cannot be a copy of the other. It seems to me that the two texts are independent translations from the same original executed by two groups of Chinese (or Central Asian Manichees), who shared a good deal of terminological stock. Theoretically, it is also possible that both of them were based on two different works which happened to contain the same story about the five conflicts between the Old and New Man. However, in view of the fact that the Parthian original of the *Traité* was so popular among the Central Asian Manichees[7] one may safely discard this possibility. This popularity raises the hope that Manichaean Chinese fragments of that text may yet be discovered in Turfan material so far unstudied.[8]

---

7 Cf. S. Lieu, *OLZ* 90/4, 1995, p.361.

8 On the other Manichaean Chinese documents from the German Turfan collection see Th. Thilo, "Einige Bemerkungen zu zwei chinesisch-manichäischen Textfragmenten der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung", in: Klengel and Sundermann, *op. cit.*, pp.161-170.