INDIAN INFLUENCE ON MANI RECONSIDERED
THE CASE OF JAINISM

Max Deeg & Iain Gardner

In 2005 Iain Gardner published an article with the title: “Some comments on Mani and Indian religions according to the Coptic Kephalaia”.1 The most important reference point for the following paper is that he argued that some of the terms found in the Coptic text (bouddas, aurentes, kebellos / kebullos) are transliterations of Indian terms (Skt. buddha, arhat, kevala / kevalin) and that they can be traced to Buddhist or – and this is a new aspect brought into the discussion by Gardner – Jain concepts and traditions.

The following article will re-examine the hypothesis of Indian influence on Manichaeism in general and the possible share of Jainism in particular. It will take into account recent results of South-Asian philology and archaeology, and try to contextualize singular points from the previous paper in a more detailed way.

It is an interesting fact that consideration about possible Indian influence on Western (in the purely geographical sense) religions has been mainly restricted to Buddhism. This reflects, in our opinion, some of the dangers in a diffusionist approach to the history of ideas or religions; and it may be worthwhile to ponder on the pros and contras before embarking on a journey to discover such historical influence of one religious strand on another: Indian religions on Manichaeism.

To retrieve the diffusion of a certain phenomenon or concept from one cultural realm to another easily lends itself to complication through simplification.2 There is – and

---


2 The other extreme would be to question suggested ways of loans by the counter-construction of virtual scenarios and possibilities in the sense of “it could also have been …” It should be made clear here that we, in the case of Jain influence on Manichaeism, do not claim an exclusive historicity of a “how it really was” but rather attempt to question well-established perceptions – Buddhist influence on Manichaeism – of the historical context of Manichaeism in the light of the textual evidence discussed. Another point of criticism may come from a more conceptionally oriented position: that the notion of -isms like “Buddhism” and “Jainism” are modern constructs which must not necessarily have been clearly discernible in a historical context. We consciously use these -isms in a heuristic meta-terminological way without, however, giving up the claim that objectively observable and self-conscious distinctions existed between the religious
this has been one of the major criticisms against more general anthropological and cultural diffusionism – the risk of seeing an influence of one phenomenon on another on the basis of sheer, to use Wittgenstein’s term, ‘Familienähnlichkeit’ (family resemblance). The direction of loan is then (again highly problematic and linked to one of the major themes in modern philosophical discourse) very often based on an assumed hierarchy of the cultural entities involved. The one to which is ascribed a higher age, cultural development, degree of originality, purity or authenticity (all criteria frequently mutually connected) is considered to be the donor and the other the receiver.

The first indispensable check for the validity of an assumed loan process is the actual historical connection between the two entities. A best basis is, of course, the case where form and content of the borrowed ‘item’ are highly congruent. If, for instance, a linguistic transcript is also highly compatible with the original in semiotic terms. Another vital factor is to show that the presumed loan-’item’ was already extant in the donor-context before it historically appeared on the receiving side. But one has to be careful in not drawing the too hasty conclusion from such a situation that the loan-’item’ was completely adopted: It could well be that the borrowing side already had a similar concept which was enriched and / or transformed by contact with the other. This consequently means that, in the case of foreign influence on Mani, it has to be admitted that certain ideas and concepts could rather fertilize ones which were already existent in the original religious or cultural environment. In Mani’s case, whatever was taken over from a foreign cultural or religious strand had to be congruent with his system, and in some cases had to undergo certain changes to achieve this.

Max Deeg became suspicious of the tendency of Western scholarship to identify any Indian influence on Near Eastern or Mediterranean Late Antique religion as Buddhist – even and especially as a Buddhist scholar – when he read, in a German translation, the two preserved fragments from an originally longer work on India by the Syriac author Bardaisan of Edessa (154 – 222 C.E.) who had collected information from an Indian communities. It is a different matter how clearly these were noticed by an external observer – in our case Bardaisan and Mani.

3 Wittgenstein 1982. We use the term to point out the meta-terminological danger of many *termini comparisonis* like “asceticism”, “monasticism”, “magic” but also “soul”, etc., used in this article. Although we obviously cannot avoid using these we should stay aware of their fuzzy, descriptive and comparative status.

4 Winter 1999.
delegation to the court of the Roman emperor Heliogabalus (r. 218 – 222 C.E.). Here it was mainly the description of the deliberate death of the ascetics, Greek samanaioi, in which he suspected Jain rather than Buddhist origin. We will discuss this point in detail because the overlap between the lifetime of Mani (216 – 276 C.E.) and Bardaisan renders the latter’s report not only a potential support for the thesis of Jain influence on Mani, but also shows that Mani could even have learnt about Jainism in his Iranian homeland. We know that Mani was aware and to a certain extent familiar with, even influenced by, Bardaisan’s work; and so his Indian report may be considered as a direct source of information for Mani before his own tour to India.

The reason behind the fact that there is an emphasis on Buddhist influence and a neglecting of the Jain option in the case of Indian-Western (or Near-Eastern) contact is that Buddhism with its ‘enlightened’ doctrine and the Middle Path (madhyamapata) has had a better standing in the West than the minor and in doctrine and practice more

---

5 The name of the embassy’s leader is given in different forms in the Greek sources by Porphyry and Stobaeus as Σανδάλης, Σανδάνης, Δανδάμις. Fynes 1996: 39, opines that -δάμις could be an Indic -dāman which is found in Western Kṣatrapa names and could then indeed imply a Jain context. We find it, however, easier to imagine a Middle-Indian form *Candala – for Skt. *Candrala – for Σανδάλης; this would solve the odd situation that the two fragments represent two different Indian informants, Σανδάλης in the first and Δανδάμις (and the other variants starting with Δ) in the second. A Greek Σ for an Indic palatal C- is well documented, the most famous and formally very close example being Megasthenes’ Σανδράκοτος (Arrian) for the Mauryan king Candragupta. A name corresponding to Skt. *Candrala could be the shortened form of the well-documented name combination with Candra- (as in Candragupta): see Wackernagel, Debrunner 1954: 864, § 693 a) β).

6 Sundermann 1986: 11b.f., and (following him) Lieu 1992: 72, even opine that Mani read Bardaisan’s remarks on India before embarking to India; although Sundermann rather favours the possibility that Mani was inspired to make his journey to India by reading the Acts of the Apostle Thomas.

7 The early 11th century Al Biruni still knew Mani’s criticism of Bardaisan: Sachau 1910: vol.1, 55: “... in another place he [i.e.: Mani] says: ‘The partisans of Bardaisan think that the living soul rises and is purified in the carcase, not knowing that the latter is the enemy of the soul, that the carcase prevents the soul from rising, that it is a prison, and a painful punishment to the soul. ...’.” Of course, the section titles for Mani’s Book of Mysteries (as recorded by Al Nadīm in his Fihrist) - a work Al Biruni had sought out and eventually found - evidence explicitly Mani’s dispute with the school of his predecessor.

8 See e.g. Fynes 1996: 40.

9 Paul Dundas 1993: 237, with reference only to the field of Indian studies, comments: “Students of Jainism have long been inured to the somewhat peripheral position which their chosen area of research seems to occupy in the broader field of Indology and they have had to endure, without actually endorsing, often imperfect judgements about key topics in South Asian studies as a result of the exclusion of Jain evidence.”
extreme Jainism. We will argue, however, that it is exactly the more extreme degrees of asceticism and some specific features of Jain doctrine which makes the influence of Mahāvīra’s religious community more plausible. This has (as far as we are aware) previously only been stressed by Richard Fynes; although there is more evidence than that brought forward by him, as he restricts himself to the existence of plant souls in both Jainism and Manichaeism.10

By stressing this negligence of Jainism and the over-emphasis of Buddhism we do – *nota bene* – not mean to exclude Buddhist influence on Manichaeism; but would rather argue that in some cases there may be a stronger Jain influence. In some cases the distinction between Buddhist and Jain tradition is not so easily discerned, due to the ‘common treasurehouse’11 of both the Buddhists and the Jains12 or due to the *interpretatio Manichaeica* or *Christiana* of the source under discussion.

If we turn now to the relevant spread of the two religions in the period under concern, Buddhism is clearly dominant, for it is found around both the cultural centers of the ruling dynasty of the Kuṣāna: Puruṣapura (or Puṣkalāvatī) in Gandhāra, and Mathurā on the banks of the river Yamunā. However, while there is (as far as we are aware) no archaeological evidence for Jain communities in Gandhāra, their remains in Mathurā in the period of the Kuṣāna are considerable. One has to be careful not to overstress the

---

10 Fynes (1996), in his bibliography, also refers to Frye (1992) who very generally pointed out a Jain-Manichaean connection. Fynes’ article contains a very good description of the historical and archaeological situation of the period in question which will be referred to below. It is interesting to note that Dundas 1992: 92 compares Jain and Manichaean cosmology without, however, claiming any influence of either side on the other. Another attempt into the same direction but not really adding substantial new information and findings is made in the abstract of Jones 2003 (thanks to Peter Flügel for bringing this to Max Deeg’s attention and to the author who informs us that his paper has not yet been published). See also Parry 2005: 178.

11 This is clearly the case when it comes to deciding the obvious Indian influence on the fourfold communal structure of Manichaeism, as for instance represented in Kephalaiā 37, 15 – 19 for the church of Jesus as divided into “holy brothers, pure sisters, sons of the faith, daughters of the light and truth (catechumens)” (Gardner 2005: 127), that is male and female *electi*, male and female *auditores*. Both Jain and Buddhist *saṅgha* show the same structure, divided between male and female monastics (Buddhism: bhikṣu, bhikṣunī / Jainism: sādhu, sādhvī) and male and female layfollowers (*upāsaka, upāsikā*). Monastic practice is, however, another issue, because here Manichaeism is definitely more on the side of the stricter asceticism of the Jains than of the Buddhists, as already and correctly stated by Fynes 1996 and Gardner 2005: 125.

12 See the example of the parallels between the birth of Christ (Luke) and that of the arch-rival of both Mahāvīra and the Buddha, the ascetic Gosāla Mankhaliputta / Gośāla Maskarīputra, the head of the sect of the Ājīvikas, in a cowstall; as discussed by Roth 1993.
possibility of Buddhist influence, although it obviously was there, from this situation. A Jain population, after all, is more difficult to detect as its monks, due to their extremely ascetic and mendicant lifestyle, did not necessarily settle in sophisticated brick or stone monasteries or caves like the Buddhists.\footnote{Another point is the lack of excavation in certain areas; an example may be the understudied Buddhist past of the Sind-region (and other regions) in contrast with the Gandhāran northwest: see Ball 1989. In the light of this situation art historical objects, like those that depict Jain monks in Mathurā discussed by Jaini, are extremely valuable sources: see Jaini 1995. (Max Deeg thanks Prof. Jaini for presenting him with an offprint of his article and for having honoured him with an afternoon of instructive conversation at the University of California, Berkeley, in September 2007; and is also grateful to Prof. Alexander von Rospatt, his host at that time, for introducing him to one of the masters of Jain studies).}

Another problem is the literary evidence. The extant Jain literature, according to the Jain tradition itself, only to a certain part reflects the original teaching of the ‘founder’, Mahāvīra.\footnote{Note that for the Jains Mahāvīra ‘only’ has the status of the last great teacher, the “fordmaker” (tīrthaṅkara) who was preceded by 23 others reaching back into a mythical past, a tradition which the Jains consider to be historically authentic.} Both main ‘sects’, the Digambaras, the ‘air-clad’ or completely naked ascetics, and the Śvetāmbaras, whose monks and nuns wear white clothes, claim that their literature does not completely (in the case of the Digambaras not at all) reach back to the original sayings of Mahāvīra in the sense of canonical literature.\footnote{We do not intend to discuss the highly problematic subject of religious canons here but would like to point out the forthcoming volume of the fourth workshop on “Kanon und Kanonisierung” of the Arbeitskreis Asiatische Religionsgeschichte (AKAR), to be published by the Austrian Academy of Science, Vienna, where the reader can also find a paper on the Jains and the problem of canonicity by Christoph Emmrich (Toronto).} This is related to the schism which occurred between these two factions and was re-projected by both into concrete historical events.\footnote{On this see below, and Dundas 2002: 46ff.} Modern Jain Studies have, however, reached a certain agreement on a relative chronological stratification of Jain literature so that we may imply the existence of many of the main doctrinal conceptions and religious practices by the third century C.E.

Because of the historical and general parallels between Mani and Bardaisan, and in order to stress our point of a stronger Jain influence on the ‘Western’ reception of Indian religions in the world of late Antiquity, we will discuss some points in Bardaisan’s report in more detail. The relevant passage on the samanaioi, in which much of the information does not seem to refer to Buddhism at all, is as follows:
“The samanaioi are, as we said, selected ones. If someone wants to be admitted to the community he goes to the council of the city – wherever he is residing – hands over all his property and belongings, shaves the parts of his body which have unnecessary hairs, takes a cape and leaves for the samanaioi without turning to his wife or his children, speaking a word or considering them to belong to him any more. The children are taken care of by the king so that everything they need is given to them; the wife (is taken care of) by the relatives.

The life of the samanaioi is organized as follows: They live outside of the city and spend their days with conversation about the Divine. They have lodgings and temples built by the kind in which there are stewards who receive a fixed amount (of money) to sustain those who have gathered (in the community).

As food rice, bread, fruits and vegetables are prepared. By the sound of a bell the samanaioi go into the house but those who are no samanaioi leave it, and these (samanaioi) speak a prayer. After they have finished their prayer the bell sounds again and servants bring a bowl to each of them – because two of them never eat together from the same – and give them rice to eat. To the one who wishes it they give additionally different sorts of vegetables and fruits. After they have eaten they return to their (former) activities.

They all live without wives and without belongings. The other [inhabitants of India] pay them and also the Brahmins so much reverence that even the king visits them and implores them to speak prayers and to intercede for those who own the land and to advice them what to do.

Towards death they have the attitude that they consider the time of their life as a service to be given to nature and are eager to unbind the soul from the body.

Often, when they see that they are well, they depart from life, although they are not affected or driven by any harm after they have announced it to the others. And nobody will prevent them – everybody rather praises them as blessed and sends greetings and messages to the relatives. They and the other people are so convinced of a firm and secure community of souls.
After they have listened to what they were told they deliver their body to the flame in order to separate the soul from the body in as pure as possible form and depart while singing. The closest friends see them off to death easier than other people see their co-citizens depart to distant colonies. They mourn themselves because they have to stay in life; but they praise those as blissful because they have achieved the lot of immortality.\footnote{We quote the Greek text (edition Jacoby) according to Winter 1999: 42f. Σαμαναῖοι δὲ εἰσί μὲν, [ὡς ἔφαμεν] λογικὲς ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃ εἰς τὸ τάγμα τις ἐγγραφέσθαι [ἀγχεσθαι], πρόσεις τις ἀρχουσὶ τῆς πόλεως, ὅπως δ' ἄν τυχῇ τῆς πόλεως ἡ τῆς κόμης, καὶ τῶν κτιμάτων ἐξίσταται <καί> πάσης τῆς ἰλλικῆς οὐσίας, ξυράμενος δὲ τοῦ σώματος τὰ περιττὰ λαμβάνει στολὴν ἀπεις τε πρὸς Σαμαναίους, οὔτε πρὸς γυναίκα οὔτε πρὸς τέκνα (εἰ τύχῃ κεκτημένοι) ἐπιστροφῇ τίνα λόγον ἐτί ποιούμενος ἢ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς νομίζων. καὶ τῶν μὲν τέκνων ὁ βασιλεὺς κηρεῖται, ὡσα ἔχουσι τὰ ἀναγκαῖα, τῆς δὲ γυναῖκος οἱ οἰκαίοι. ὁ δὲ βίος τοῖς Σαμαναίοις ἐστὶ τοιοῦτος. ἐξ ἐς τῆς πόλεως διατρίβουσι διημερεύοντες ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ θείου λόγου, ἔχουσι δὲ ὀίκους καὶ τεμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως οἰκοδομηθέντα, ἐν οἷς οἰκονόμοι εἰσίν ἀπόστακτοι τί λαμβάνοντες παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τροφήν τῶν συνιόντων, ἡ δὲ παρασκευὴ γίνεται ορφικῆς καὶ ἀρχάς καὶ ὁπώρας καὶ λαχάνων. καὶ εἰσελθόντως εἰς τὸν οἶκον ὑπὸ σημαίνοντι καίδων οἱ μὴ Σαμαναῖοι ἔξεσοι, οἱ δὲ προσεύχονται. εὐδεμονῶν δὲ πάλιν διακω-

At first it should be noted that none of the given features exclusively refers to Buddhism and that some of the details even contradict the facts of Buddhist lifestyle which we know from Indian or Chinese sources. There are aspects in Bardaisan’s report which could equally refer to Jains, and we will discuss these points first before an analysis of those that cause problems when interpreted by a Buddhist framework.
Here we have a clear description which resembles the *upasampadā* of the Buddhists but also the formal act of ‘going into homelessness’ of other ascetic orders in India, of which the historically most influential after the Buddhists are the Jains. The fact that the hairs are shaven does not exclude the Jains from this description, who often are described of tearing out their hair during ordination: First, it is the conventional way to shave the head first before a remaining bushel is torn out, and second we do not know when it became normal for Jain ordinants to pluck out their hair. Furthermore, Bardaisan’s informant(s) could well have given a more general description of an ordination process in which the custom of the majority was related (and which would have made more sense, after all, for the Christian author).

Bardaisan’s *samanaiōi* are clearly recognizable as monastics. They live in a community outside of the settlements: This is something which both the Buddhists and the Jains did, although the Buddhist texts (and to a certain extent also the archaeological evidence) indicate that there were monastic communities in the towns and cities as well as the forest. The former were called the *grāmakavāsin*, ‘village-dwellers’, and the latter *āranyakavāsin*, ‘forest-dwellers’. In the case of the Jains we do not know exactly if they made a similar distinction between inhabitants of monastic compounds in cities and in the forest; but the more ascetic lifestyle of the Jain monks in general makes it highly probable that they were more to be found outside of the urban centres than inside or on the direct periphery. The emphasis on the fact that the monasteries and their running costs were covered by the king is clearly an idealization on the side of either Bardaisan’s Indian informant or of Bardaisan himself; although there is clear (inscriptional) evidence that monasteries of all major *śramaṇa*-denominations were indeed funded by kings and noble families (and by donors from other social groups such as rich merchants as well).

The details given for the common meal of the monks is well attested for Buddhist monasteries. Beating the bell – the *gaṇḍī* in Buddhist monasteries – is the sign for gathering in the ‘refectory’, and the description of the monks receiving the food in

18 Thanks to Peter Flügel for pointing this out. For the shaving of the head in the Jain texts see Deo 1956: 142.

19 For the problem of identification, see Karttunen 1997: 57ff.


21 The description runs almost parallel with the one given by the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Faxian for Central-Asian Khotanese monasteries at the beginning of the 4th century. See Deeg 2005: 511f. (translation), and 90f. (commentary).
their individual almbows (pattrā) represents long-established practice. But again we cannot say that this is typically Buddhists: the Jains certainly had similar customs.22

The indicated vegetarianism of the samanaioi points to Jainism rather than to Buddhism. The latter monks did not necessarily have to be vegetarians; but, according to the Vinaya, the monastic code, only had to avoid partaking of the meat of animals which were killed especially for the purpose of feeding the monks. In Jainism vegetarianism is derived from the religion’s basic and demarcative doctrine of non-violence: to refrain from killing sentient beings (ahiṃsā). Even if we have indications that there were historical and normative exceptions to this rule, it can be assumed that the Jains, not least as a clear marker of their own identity, ideally and in terms of religious propaganda fostered a strong will to vegetarian diet.

The most striking point in Bardaisan’s report is his insistence on the term soul (ψυχή) which is a separate and separable eternal entity from the body (σώμα). Even in an interpretatio Christiana on the part of Bardaisan, a report on Buddhism by an Indian informant, who probably was a follower of the religion he described, would hardly have led to the repeated insistence on the soteriologically important existence of an individual soul. The idea of a soul, especially an immortal one (ἀθάνατος), would have been an impossible interpretation for the Buddhist notion of anātman (Pāli anatta). While one could argue that the use of the term ‘soul’ could still be an interpretation by Bardaisan of an originally Buddhist concept, the idea that the soul should be separated from the body is not at all compatible with any such ontological framework. However, Bardaisan’s description that the aim of putting oneself to death is to separate the soul from the body is completely in accordance with the Jain concept of the jīva (‘life [-substance]’ = soul) of a kevalin, of an omniscient and enlightened ascetic, who leaves the body after physical death and ascends to the apex of the world where the liberated souls are said to rest into all eternity.23

22 Digambara monks eat their food out of their cupped hands, but Śvetāmbara monks use almsbowls like the Buddhists. It is not clear when historically the afore-mentioned custom of the Digambara started.

23 See Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta 1.48 sa devagandhavamaṇussapūie caittu dehaṃ malapaṃkapuvvayaṃ siddhe vā havai sāsae deve vā ‘pparae mhiddhie tti bemi (“Honoured by gods, gandharvas and men, having left this body which was previously dirt and mud, he [the ascetic] will became an eternal perfected one; or a god with small imperfections and great power. So I say.”). Prakrit text and translation by Norman 1993: 379 & 386.
The report of ascetics who deliberately bring their life to an end has caused interpreters who assume a Buddhist influence a great deal of trouble. Buddhist tradition is clearly against any suicidal ending of one’s life, even if there are some rare cases where this is tolerated. Such tolerated suicide is never performed in the way described by Bardaisan, but restricted to cases of euthanasia. It is, however, a well-known fact that Jain saints starve themselves to death (sallekhanā). Although the way in which Bardaisan describes the ‘suicide’ of the Indian saints is self-immolation and not explicitly starving to death, it nevertheless reminds one more (with the emphasis on the liberation of the soul) of Jain concepts than of Buddhist tradition according to which ending one’s own life was normatively forbidden. As for the Jains the death through fire (jala appavesa) was considered to be an improper one, but the legends reflect at least the cremation of the tīrthankaras. The earliest art-historical stratum in Mathurā (see below) and reflexes in Jain literature imply that there was stūpa (or caitya) worship in a style similar to the Buddhist which, to a certain extent, presupposes cremation. There is, however, no direct evidence from Indian sources of the period that ascetics (whether Buddhist, Hindu or Jain) actually practiced self-immolation. In Bardaisan’s report the reports of his Indian informers about cremation may then have been mingled with the classical topos of the Indian gymnosophists burning themselves. In sum, the purpose of such an ordeal as given in the text clearly points to Jain ideas: The soul should be liberated. If we accept

---

24 Vegetarianism clearly was an essential part of the Jain’s practice and dogma. See Jaini 1993.

25 On Buddhism and suicide, see Delhey 2006.

26 On this topos in Greek literature on India, see Karttunen 1997: 64ff. In the light of the use of this topos in Greek texts it cannot be excluded that it slipped into our report as such.

27 Deo 1956: 202. Disposing the dead was, at least in later periods, the normal way of funeral custom: ibid.: 428 and 461f.; thanks again to Peter Flügel for his advice in this matter.


30 This is specifically the case with the mrtaka-caityaś (“death-c.”) or -stūpas (Prakrit madaga-ceiya, madaya-thubiya) mentioned in Jain texts: Shah 1987: 11. On the decline of Jain stūpa-veneration see Johnson 2002: 224.

that it is the Jain practice of giving up one’s life that underlies Bardaisan’s account, then
further discussion about the Buddhist position towards suicide\textsuperscript{32} becomes futile.

Keeping Bardaisan’s description of Indian samanaioi and what we have argued to be its Jain background in mind, it seems strange that whilst the historical setting of Mani’s visit to India is relatively clear, there has been no extensive investigation of this background in the light of the Manichaean texts. In the early third century, the context for Mani’s visit and of Bardaisan’s report, northwest India experienced a relatively pluralistic situation under what could be called the \textit{pax kuśānica}, although the heyday of the Kuśāna rule were already over at that time.\textsuperscript{33} The Central-Asian Kuśāna had conquered this part of the subcontinent in the first century of the Christian era; and, under rulers like Huviṣka and Kaniṣka, the realm which stretched from the Inner-Asian parts of Iran to the central plain of northern India had its vivid centers in the two capitals of Puruṣapura (near to modern Peshawar in Pakistan) in the upper northwest: the cultural region of Gandhāra, and Mathurā the centre of the three religious movements of Buddhism, Jainism and Viṣṇuisom on the bank of the Yamunā river.\textsuperscript{34} The region of Gandhāra (together with Bactria and Sogdiana) was, at the time when Mani traveled, ruled by Sassanid governors who called themselves Kūshānshāh, ‘Kings of the Kuśāna’.\textsuperscript{35} The archaeological and art-historical evidence suggests that in terms of religions there had been no major change when the Sassanid rulers took over the region.

Although there are no signs whatsoever of Jainism in the region of Gandhāra, Mathurā had clearly been a Jain centre during the reign of the Kuśāna, coexisting with Buddhist and Hindu communities. Archaeological proof of the Jain presence in the Kuśāna capital includes the \textit{stūpa} of Kaṅkālī Tīlā which existed, according to inscriptional evidence, before 157 C.E.\textsuperscript{36} Inscriptions \textit{in situ} imply that the lay community

\textsuperscript{32} See, for instance, Winter 1999: 139f. On the Jain judgement on the value of \textit{sallekhanā} as being not considered as suicide see Dundas 2002: 179, and Skoog 2002.

\textsuperscript{33} At the time of Mani’s journey the last Kuśāna king ruling over an integral empire, Vāsudeva, had already been defeated by the first Sasanian king Ardashīr I (around 225). It is, however, not known what this meant in terms of territorial sovereignty: The (Indian) Kuśānas still seemed to have ruled a considerable part of their former realm until they eventually disappeared completely. See Bivar 1983: 203f.

\textsuperscript{34} On all aspects of Mathurā as a cultural centre, see Srinivasan 1989.

\textsuperscript{35} Bivar 1983: 209f.

\textsuperscript{36} A description of the earlier archaeological history of the site, with an edition and annotated translation of the inscriptional corpus (in Prakrit and epigraphic Sanskrit) is found in Lüders 1961: 39ff. For a short
consisted of merchants, artisans, jewelers and courtesans; and thus represented a prosperous middle class (quite similar – minus the courtesans – to the ‘classical’ Jain lay community of today). The fact that merchants are mentioned may indicate that knowledge about the religion was also transported beyond the frontiers of the subcontinent; one immediately thinks of Bardaisan’s Indian envoys.

Besides Mathurā there is evidence of Jain presence in the western regions of northern India, in today’s state of Gujarat, the stronghold of Śvetāmbara-Jainism. Digambara sources date the great schism to the year 609 after the passing away of Mahāvīra, which would have been around 100 C.E. (the Digambaras’ traditional date of the death of Mahāvīra being calculated to 510 B.C.E.).37 The Digambara tradition associates this schism with a famine in the heartland of Jainism which caused the sage Bhadrabāhu and his disciple Viśākha to lead a part of the Jain community to the kingdom of Punnāṭa in the south, respectively the Sindhu (Indus) region.38 In spite of the highly legendary status of this tradition, it surely reflects a movement of the Jain community to the western coastal areas of the subcontinent before or during the Kuśāna period.

The circumstances of Mani’s journey to India have to be collected from different rather fragmentary sources39 but it seems clear that it took place in the period between 240 and 242 C.E.40 This was a crucial and formative period, as Manichaean tradition in the Kephalaia reports that Mani received his decisive ‘revelation’ in 240 C.E.41 Thus one may well, supposing in reality a more gradual development of Mani’s teaching than asserted by the later tradition, suggest that the years after this date still belonged to the

discussion of this site and Mathurā as a Jain centre, see Dundas 2002: 113ff. For a short art-historical description, see Shah 1987: 9ff.

37 See Dundas 2002: 24. For different calculations, still placing the event into the first century, see Shah 1987: 6 & 27, n. 33.


39 In a Middle-Iranian text edited and translated by Sundermann 1981: 21f. See also Sundermann’s remarks on p. 20.

40 See especially Sundermann 1986: 12; also Lieu 1992: 71. We are not convinced of Lieu’s view (pp. 72ff.) that Mani’s journey was mainly undertaken for missionary purpose and that the impact of Indian ideas, practices and concepts (Buddhist, in Lieu’s opinion) was close to irrelevant: “… we can be certain that [Mani] did not spend his time sitting at the feet of great Buddhist teachers” (p. 75).

41 See Widengren 1983: 968.
formative period of his religious system; and that what came to be stylized as a mission journey by the Manichaeans themselves was rather an ‘educational’ trip to the then accessible regions east of the Iranian homeland.

Important for our question of from which religious group Mani could have borrowed ideas, concepts and practices is the question as to which port he landed in after his sea journey from Farat in southern Persia. Both W. Sundermann and S. N. C. Lieu think that this was Dēb at the estuary of the river Indus, but it is also quite possible – as Fynes may be suggesting – that it was further to the south; for instance at the harbor of Barukaccha (Barugaza or Broach at the mouth of the river Narmada) which was one of the main coastal centers in the Persian-Indian trade at that time. From there Mani could have gone to the city of Ujjayinī (Ujjain, Ujjenī) and then further to the north. The report of Mani’s conversion of the Tūrān Shāh, with Mani levitating into the air and

42 Sundermann 1986: 12b.f.; Lieu 1992: 72: this conclusion seems to be derived from a Middle-Iranian text which mentions Dēb (dyb) as the place of missionary work of Pattīg the Presbyter ((pt)yg) and Hanni (hnvy): Sundermann 1981: 56f., and Lieu 1992: 74. Another episode for which Sundermann hesitatingly gives India as the place of action (86) is the one of Mani’s encounter with and conversion of the wise Gwndyš, for whose name Sundermann carefully gives the possible Indian equivalences Govinda or Guṇādhyeṣa (p. 87, n. 3). A very fragmented report on Mani’s journey to India is found in the Cologne Mani Codex: see Henrichs and Koenen 1988: 103ff. The story of Mani’s journey clearly reflects the close connection between the flow of merchandise and the simultaneous exchange of (religious) ideas; for such an exchange in the centuries before Mani’s visit, see Ray 1998. See also Deeg 2007.

43 See Fynes 1996: 31. He is very cautious in making any concrete remark about Mani’s journey to India. But if Dēb really, as suggested by Fynes 1996: 31f., goes back to a Middle-Indic form (dvīpa, “island”, this could have been almost anywhere.

44 On the archaeological evidence, especially the occurrence of Red Polished Ware in the area which seems to indicate the exchange between Iran and the Indian western coast, see Fynes 1996, 32f. (also the map on p. 32).

45 On the situation in the areas to the south of the Kušāna-empire during the period see Fynes 1996: 27ff. If this southern route is accepted it would imply that his journey did not lead Mani as far to the north as was reconstructed by Sundermann 1986: 14. It would also mean that the conversion of the Tūrān Shāh was indeed “a hallmark of Manichaean hagiographical stylization”, as Sundermann has already suggested. Rather than being a concrete person (generally taken to be the ruler of a small Buddhist kingdom in what is nowadays Baluchistan), this Tūrān Shāh would be, in a kind of interpretatio Iranica, an Indian satrap-ruler of the Kušāna. This is even supported by Sundermann’s assumption that the conversion of the anonymous king in the Cologne Mani-Codex should refer to the same event: Manichaean “cultural memory” in general would not have specified and individualized the converted king in the same way as the Middle-Persian text.

46 S.N.C. Lieu, though reluctant to concede too much Indian influence on Mani, points out that a Syriac-Mesopotamian religious person like Mani could not have been ascribed levitation from his own cultural context alone. One could also point out the misshaped levitation of Terebinthus (Buddha) in the anti-
holding a discussion with a learned religious man as reported in a Middle-Iranian text, when stripped of its propagandistic undertones, could well point to a peripheral region of the Kuşāna empire down in the south or somewhere in the realm of the Kṣatrapa. The Tūrān Shāh would then be referring, in a kind of generalization, to a local ruler like the Kṣatrapas. Be that as it may, this region is definitely a candidate for Jain influence.

We will start with a philological investigation of the terms in the Kephalaia which are claimed to be of Indian origin. The presupposition of this investigation is that Mani should or could have borrowed these terms, which occur in a Graecized form in the Kephalaia, not from the Sanskrit, which became the literary language of the Buddhists and Jains at a later period, but from a north or northwest Indian vernacular – so-called Middle-Indo-Aryan or Prakrit – spoken and used in the period of the Kuşāna. Recent discoveries of Buddhist manuscripts, probably stemming from southeast Afghanistan (the area around modern Kandahār, maybe the site of Haḍḍa near ancient Nagarahāra) give us a firmer ground for such a philological analysis of the terms which come from a Buddhist background. The language in which these manuscripts were written is, according to the cultural homeland where it was used, labeled by Western scholars as Gāndhārī. It was obviously a kind of lingua franca in the Kuşāna empire, as manuscript finds in a slightly different variant at the archaeological sites of the southern silk road show. Even if we do not have evidence for Gāndhārī in the regions farther to the south of Gandhāra, there is no reason that a similar vernacular could not also have been in use in these regions at the time. The terms in the Kephalaia could reflect words from a northwest dialect, from


48 This does not presuppose an Indian presence in the cultural environment of the Kephalaia in Egypt, although trade certainly had brought Indian merchants to Alexandria, which is clearly shown by inscriptive evidence from the Red Sea (Salomon 1991: 731-36). On Alexandria in late antiquity cf. Haas 1997, especially on trade pp. 43f.

49 During the reign of the Gupta dynasty.

50 At least for Mathurā there seems to be a linguistic northwestern influence in inscriptions, see Damsteegt 1978: 158ff.
Sanskrit (used in an epigraphical form in Kuṣāna inscriptions;[51] or, in the case of supposed Jain origin, in Jain Prakrit (Ardhamāgadhī).

Let us start with the most obvious word, *bouddas*. The Prakrit form for Skt. *buddha* in Pāli, the language of the southern Theravāda-branch of Buddhism, and in Ardhamāgadhī, the canonical language of the Jains,[52] are identical. The Gāndhārī form of the word is *budha*.[53] It is notable – although not necessarily a claim for its linguistic origin – that the Kephalaia form of the term seems to reflect the Indic plural ending -ā(s)[54] while its singular correspondent Skt. *buddha(h)* (Sandhi-form Skt. *buddho*) is usually rendered in Greek with the -o(s) ending.

Schaeder, Sundermann, Gnoli and others[55] have argued that the term *aurentes* in the Kephalaia is originally a transliteration of the Indic term (Skt.) *arhat*.[56] Sundermann and Gnoli referred to Iranian languages (Middle Persian and Bactrian) for mediating the specific word form into Coptic, but we think that the Indian side of the phonetic question has to be considered here as well. Sundermann has pointed to metathetic development of the sequence *r(h)* into *hr* and suggested that the *u* instead of the *h* in *aurentes* may be compared to the rendering of Bactrian *h* by *v* in the Bactrian usage of the Greek alphabet.[57]

---


[53] See e.g. Allon 2001: 331b., s.v. The Kephalaia form represents the Indic word Buddha more perfectly than some of the Iranian forms; see Sundermann 1991: 427ff., who divides the different Iranian forms representing Indic Buddha into two groups: those with a unvoiced dental -t (Sogdian *pwty* / *pwty*, New Persian *but*, “idol”) and those with voiced single or geminate dental -d(d) (Bactrian *βοδδο*, *βοδο*, *βουδο*). Sundermann even goes so far (p.429) as to suggest that the form *bud(d)* in Middle Persian, replacing the “pre-Manichaean” *but*, may have been introduced into the language by Mani himself.

[54] It cannot necessarily be concluded from this that the underlying language for the term was Skt. (*buddha*) while Prakrits usually had a weakened (pronounced) vowel in the stem ending, expressed by -a, -e, -u, or -o in writing, especially reflected in inscriptive material; see Fussmann 1989. It is, however, true that the long ā plural ending Skt. -āḥ (-ās), corresponding to the form which entered the Kephalaia, was qualitatively more stable than its short equivalent.


[56] Northwestern Gāndhārī has *arahad*- in the oblique casus.

We are somewhat cautious about an explanation which relies completely on scriptural tradition. After all, the transmission of the name occurred in an oral rather than a written form – Mani or whoever it was who picked up the Indian word certainly did so by hearing it from an informant – so that one should first check the possibility of phonetic change in the original rather than in the ‘transmissional’ language. The Indic-word form which slipped into the Kephalaia would not have been a standard Sanskrit form but a Prakrit form of arhat.

We therefore propose an explanation different from the ‘Bactrian’ one. In Jain-Prakrit the word-form is araha (or arahaṇta)\(^{58}\) and is a concept for highly developed and venerated religious persons as in Buddhism.\(^{59}\) It is certainly difficult from a purely Indian standpoint to explain how the simple vowel \(a\) in arhat could be transliterated in a probably Aramaic or Greek mediating form into a diphthong au- as in aurentes; but we still see the possibility of a metathesized form *aharant- already on the Indian side in which the syllable (Skt. akṣara) -ha- then would have been pronounced with a more closed -\(a\)- – in contrast with the more open initial \(a\)- – which, after the -h- was lost, led to a diphthongic pronunciation (close to \(a > au\)) of the word. In terms of content it is difficult to decide from which religious strand, Buddhism or Jainism, Mani borrowed the word. In both Indian traditions the arhat denotes a soteriologically liberated person who has achieved the highest goal, although there seem to be slight differences in the details.

There are certain points which might suggest that the aurentes = arhat were originally taken from a Jain background rather than from a Buddhist. First of all, in Jain texts the term arhat can well be used for the tīrthaṅkaras, while in Buddhism an arhat is a person who achieved enlightenment through the teaching of a Buddha, that is a soteriologically lower position than a Buddha. Also, the rise of early Mahāyāna (however uninstitutionalised and vague it may have been in the first centuries of the Christian era) shortly before and during Mani’s stay in India\(^{60}\) definitely had already weakened the

---

\(^{58}\) Seth 1963: 71c., s.v. or: ariha / arihamta, op. cit.: 72a.f., Pāli: arahkan. See also von Hinüber 2001: 142 (§ 154). The ending -entes perfectly represents the Prakrit shift of the (Skt.) consonantal arhat-paradigm to a vocalic declensional paradigm derived from the strong stem arahanta- (acc. arahantam); compatible with this is the coexistence of the Sogdian forms rx’n and ‘r’x’n quoted by Sims-Williams 2000: 562, n. 9.

\(^{59}\) In later Jain systematized teaching the arhat belongs to the Five Supreme (Beings) (pañca-paramesṭhin): Shah 1987: 39f.

\(^{60}\) See Deeg 2006.
concept of the *arhat* in the Buddhist context.\textsuperscript{61} If now, in the Kephalaia, the term together with *kebellos* / *kebullos* is used on an equal stand with Buddha / *bouddas* then this would rather imply a stronger Jain concept underlying this loanword integrated into the Mani’s system.

There is other Indian evidence for *arhat* having been used as a Jain term rather than a Buddhist one. In Varāhamihira’s (505 – 587) mainly astrological work *Brhaddevatā* there is an iconographic description about how religious statues should be made. Concerning the non-Hindu ‘deities’ it says the following:

> “Endowed with the marks of a lotos on hands and feet, of a calmed shape and with delicate hairs, sitting on a lotos-throne, like the father of the world should be the Buddha.”\textsuperscript{62}

And in the following verse:

> “The arms hanging down to the knees, bearing the śrīvatsa-mark and with a composed figure, air-cladden, tender and beautiful should the god of the arhats be made.”\textsuperscript{63}

The description of the ‘god of the arhats’ (*<\textit{a}\text{rhat\text{"a}ṃ deva\text{"a}ḥ}>*) as a standing (*<\textit{kāyotsarga*}), naked figure with the prolonged arms and the youthful complexion clearly refers to a

\textsuperscript{61} Although scholars have become very careful in defining early Mahāyāna as a full-fledged system of religious ideas, concepts and practices, it seems to be fair to say that the term and concept of the *arhat*, called *śrāvaka*, ‘hearer’, in Mahāyāna-sūtras (and we would not imply any connections to the Manichaean term here) became inferior to the newly rising ideal of the *bodhisattva*.

\textsuperscript{62} 57.44 *padmāṃkitakaracaraṇaḥ prasannamūrtiḥ sunīcakeśaś ca, padmāsanaupaviṣṭaḥ pitā iva jagato bhavati* [var: *bhavet*] *buddhaḥ*.

\textsuperscript{63} 57.45 *ājānulambabāhuḥ śrīvatsāṅkaḥ praśāntamūrtiś ca, digvāsāḥ taruṇo rūpavāṃś ca kāryo ’rhatāṃ devaḥ*. The complete iconographical passage is quoted (with slight differences and obvious misunderstandings) by Al Birūnī in his report on India: “To the idol Jina, i.e. Buddha, give a face and limbs as beautiful as possible, make the lines in the palms of his hands and feet like a lotus, and represent him with a placid expression, as if he were the father of creation. If you make Arhant, the figure of another body of Buddha, represent him as a naked youth with a fine face, beautiful, whose hands reach down to the knees, with the figure of Śrī, his wife, under the left breast.” Sachau 1910: Vol. I, 119.
tīrthaṅkara-statue and is compared with the sitting posture (padmāsana) of the Buddha. This becomes even more clear in a following passage about the followers of the different ‘deities’:

“The Bhāgavata are known (for venerating) Viṣṇu, the Magas (for venerating) Savitṛ, the ash-smeared twice-born (for venerating) Śambhu [Śiva], and those who know the course of the sun (for venerating) the mother(-goddesses), the Brahmins (for venerating) Brahmā; the Śākyas are known (for venerating) the one who (acts) for the bliss of all and has a calmed mind, the naked ones (for venerating) the Jinas; those who rely on their god in their own way have done what should be done.”

Here again, besides the clear notion of the epitheton jina for the Jain tīrthaṅkaras, (Skt.) nagna, ‘naked’, emphasizes the nakedness of the followers which seems to refer to Digambara-monks. Varāhamira’s description clearly fits to the well-known type of tīrthaṅkara-statues rather than to real Buddhist arhat-statues for which, after all, we do not have any art-historical and archaeological evidence.

Gardner’s proposed equation kebellos / kebullos: Skt. / Prakrit kevalin makes complete sense in terms of content and conception. Phonetically there is not much of a problem: the Indic tendency to blur the distinction between -v- (in kevala / -in) and -b- (kebellos / kebullos) is well-known (and in any case -v- is necessarily represented as -b- in Coptic), and the difference in the vowels - kebellos / kebullos versus kevala / -in – is due to the indifferent vocalic quality of an unstressed weak -a- which we are familiar with in North-Western Prakrit. There is, however, a phonetic flaw in this identification: the Jain term for an omniscient being is a possessive derivation from the term kevala, ‘omniscience’ (by the secondary suffix -in). Kebellos or kebullos, however, must rather

64 On the stereotyped depiction of the tīrthaṅkaras and the possible idea behind it, see Johnson 2002: 217ff.; and on Jain art and its interpretation in general, see Leoshko 2002.
65 59.18 viṣṇoḥ bhāgavatān magāṁś ca savitūḥ śambhoḥ sabhasmadvijīn māt nām api maṇḍalakramavido viprān viduḥ brahmaṇah, sākyān sarvahitasya śāntamanaso nagnān jinānāṁ viduḥ ye yaṁ devam upāśritāṁ svavidhināṁ tāṁ tasya kāryā kriyā. In the shorter version of Al Birūnī: “The Brāhmaṇa are devoted to the Eight Mothers, the Shamanians to Buddha, to Arhant the class called Nagna” (Sachau 1910 Vol. I: 121).
66 On the identity of these slightly different terms see Gardner 2005: 133f.
67 Seth 1963: 260c., s.v.
reflect the basic term *kevala* (an Indic final -a mostly being given as -o in the Greek transliteration). One could argue that Mani adopted the term *kevala* in its adjectival meaning, “complete, perfect, unsurpassed”;\textsuperscript{68} which would fit well the way in which the word is used in the Kephalaia. Another possibility is that the Manichaeans term is an abridged version of the compound *kevalajñānin*: “(the one) endowed with complete knowledge”.

In sum: While the Buddhist provenance in the case of *bouddos* is quite clear the origin of *aurentes* / *arhat* is at least ambiguous. The Jains also use this term (AM. *araha*) to describe a *tīrthaṅkara* or an ascetic who has achieved the highest stage of liberation.\textsuperscript{69} It may even be argued that the Buddhist concept of an *arhat*, a saint who has achieved enlightenment and awaits final extinction (*parinirvāṇa*) after physical death, does not fit very well to the *aurentes*-concept in the Kephalaia where this term denotes a kind of Manichaean savior in an active soteriological function. A Buddhist arhat never corresponds to this, as he is dependent on the teaching of a Buddha. Again, we do not want to insist on a predominantly Jain influence in this matter, but just want to point out the different shades of compatibility.

After these linguistic preliminaries we can further discuss the Kephalaia passages from an Indological point of view:

“Once again they say: Twenty-four … they came to the land of the east, they chose … also they built twenty-four towers with their leaders and their presbyters and their deacons; and the righteous disciples, men of truth, that they chose in them; and the good helpers that they brought about for them, who are the catechumens of the faith that were in their generation and their people. And these twenty-four kebullos (-oi) … all their leaders, they did make manifest on account of them all. Also, for his part, the one who spoke among them … So, these seven bouddas and the x-teen (?) -entes (-ai) and these twenty-four kebullos (-oi) … are a single spirit.”\textsuperscript{70}

---

\textsuperscript{68} Seth 1963: 260c., s.v. *kevala*, meanings 2 – 4.

\textsuperscript{69} It is true that one of the epithets of the Buddha is *arhat*, but as a category *arhats* are clearly enlightened beings who have been taught the *dharma* by someone else with superior insight; later on they thus have become the objects of Mahāyāna polemic.

\textsuperscript{70} Gardner 2005: 131f.
As Gardner remarked previously, the number seven for the Buddhas of the present and the past is a stereotyped number and is well reflected in literature of an early period close to Mani’s lifetime.\textsuperscript{71} Similarly, in the fragmentary passage \textit{x-teen -entes} must be a reference to a standardized number of \textit{aurentes}.\textsuperscript{72} Early references to \textit{arhat}-worship are combined with the numbers sixteen or eighteen, but as there is no direct evidence how far the systematized \textit{arhat}-worship in India had developed up to the first half of the fourth century it is highly speculative to decide on any concrete number.\textsuperscript{73}

In the original article, Gardner speculated whether the fact that the \textit{kebulloi} are ascribed the construction of twenty-four towers, whilst their Jain correspondents are ‘ford-builders’ (\textit{tīrthaṅkara}), could be the result of a “textual corruption”;\textsuperscript{74} or whether the towers could be symbolic of each community (corresponding to the \textit{purgos} as an image of the church in the \textit{Shepherd of Hermas}). But one could also consider – with all the necessary caution of no direct textually linked evidence – whether these towers might literally refer to the huge \textit{stūpas} or \textit{caityas} which were found over Northern India during that time. They were, in the Buddhist case, clearly connected with the worship not only of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni but also of his predecessors, and it may be supposed that the Jains had this custom as well. The ‘misinterpretation’ of the Jain tradition might then indicate that the Manichaeans thought of the Jinas (\textit{tīrthaṅkara, kebulloi}) having themselves built these structures; while, at the same time, they kept the true notion that the \textit{caityas} were built and preserved by the followers of the religion and were localized

\textsuperscript{71} The main text tradition is the one of the Mahāvadānasūtra (Pāli Mahāpadānasuttānta) in the Dīrghāgama (Dīghanikāya) in which the historical Buddha Śākyamuni mentions his six predecessors – Vipaśyin, Śikhin, Viśvabhuj, Krakasunda, Kanakamuni and Kāśyapa (in the reading of the Central-Asian manuscript of the Mahāvadānasūtra) – and expounds a stereotyped biography of the Buddha Vipaśyin; the standard edition is: Waldschmidt 1953 / 1956, now to be read together with the critical edition prepared by Fukita 2003 (names of the Buddhas found on p. 38). The high age of the veneration of Buddhas of the past is shown by the two Aśokan \textit{stūpas} dedicated to Kanakamuni and (probably Krakucchanda) near the Buddha’s birthplace in Lumbini: see Deeg 2004.

\textsuperscript{72} Gardner 2005: 133. The brevity of the lacuna in the Coptic text encourages one to suppose a number such as sixteen (\textit{mntesa}) rather than, say, twelve (\textit{mntsnaus}) or eighteen (\textit{mntmēn}).

\textsuperscript{73} The tradition to which Gardner cautiously referred is too young to be of concrete value in this case, as it is a Chinese translation by Xuanzang (7\textsuperscript{th} cent.). But there are clear indications that a more or less systematized group of venerated \textit{arhats} was conceived in the Buddhist world at an earlier stage; see Lévi & Chavannes 1916.

\textsuperscript{74} Gardner 2005: 134.
objects of worship. This would be a good *interpretatio Manichaica* of what could probably be seen as religious activity in North India at that time.\(^\text{75}\)

Certain concepts of the soul which are found in the *Kephalaia* [K. = Gardner 1995] are interesting because of their possible connections with Jain concepts about the soul. In K.151.28ff. the soul is compared with the body:

“The living soul is like this, established in apparent silence. In its apparent silence it is grasped and receives blows from these five fleshes, which destroy (the soul) and strike it. It can be likened to the mystery of the [corporeal] body, as it can be grasped and mastered, can receive blows and wounds.”\(^\text{76}\)

K.191.9 – 192.3 is completely dedicated to the benefit of fasting and seems to reflect one of the basic Jain practices in an astonishing way:

“Once more the enlightener speaks to his disciples: The fasting that the saints fast by is profitable for [four] great works. The first work: Shall the holy man punish his body by fasting, he subdues the entire ruling-power that exists in him. The second: This soul that comes in to him in the administration of his food, day by day; it shall be made holy, cleansed, purified, and washed from the adulteration of the darkness that is mixed in with it. The third: That person shall make every deed a holy one; the mystery of [the children] of light in whom there is neither corruption nor […] the food, nor wound it. Rather, they are holy, [there is nothing] in them that defiles, as they live in peace. The fourth: They make a […] the Cross, they restrain their hands from the hand […] not] destroy the living soul. The fasting is profitable to the saints for these four great works should they persist; that is if they are constant in them daily, and cause the body to make

\(^\text{75}\) One could speculate in this context whether Sundermann’s 1981: 21, n. 3, has the correct wording: In his reconstruction of the highly fragmented passage in the Middle-Iranian text about Mani’s journey to India, where he meets a righteous one (*ardāw*) and causes him to levitate into the air, this is near a certain place which cannot with certainty be identified as a grave or tomb (*wxdng*). A *stūpa* would at least make perfect sense as a site for this episode. One is also reminded of the celibate monks and nuns (σεμνοί) worshipping a *πυραμίδα* in Clement of Alexandria. See Karttunen 1997: 58.

\(^\text{76}\) Gardner 1995: 159.
all its members to fast [with a] holy fast. […] faith. They who have not
strength [to fast] daily should make their fast on the lord’s day. They too
make a contribution [to the works] and the fasting of the saints by their faith
and their / alms.”

In K.234.4ff. the *catechumen*, the purified Manichaean lay-follower, is described
as moving up and reaching the ‘land of rest’; this corresponds closely to the way the
released *jīva* moves up to the heavenly abodes where it will rest eternally.

Let us now look at some of the parallel conceptions between Manichaeism and
the Jain teaching. A first immediately striking point, which can not have been derived in
its presented form from the Judaeo-Christian background of Mani, is the concept of the fate of the soul after physical death. There is, first of all, the notion of metempsychosis /
transmigration, and it is generally held that this is an idea which was integrated by Mani
into his system under Indian influence. Gardner has collected the most relevant
Kephalaia passages which partly evidence a general notion of transmigration with a
kind of karmic retribution as found in all the three major Indian religious systems:
Buddhism, Hinduism and Jainism. There are, however, some points which are more
compatible with (later documented) Jain concepts of transmigration and retribution, in
particular the idea that *karma* is actual ‘stuff’ rather than moral or ritual consequence.
Whilst the Manichaean concept of the ascension of the soul also has some clear parallels

---


78 Gardner 1995: 240: “As for the rest [of the sins committed], he shall be questioned about a single part;
and receive blows for (those sins) and retribution. Afterwards he is purified, whether indeed above or
below. He shall be purified according to the worth of his deeds, and cleansed and washed and adorned.
Afterwards, he is sculpted a light image; and he glides up and reaches the land of rest, so that the place
where his heart is, his treasure also will be there. This is, if he shall be steadfast in his catechumenate he
can receive recompense for his good things like this”. See also 235.9ff.: “… but why did you not depict the
catechumen? How he shall be released from his body, and how he shall be brought before the Judge and
[…] reach the place ordained for him and […] that he can rest in the place of rest forever” (Gardner 1995:
242).

79 This goes back to the famous statement by Al Birūnī that Mani had taken over the concept of
transmigration from India: Sachau 1910: 54: “When Mānī was banished from Êrānshahr, he went to India,
learned metempsychosis from the Hindus, and transferred it into his own system.” This quotation has been
taken as authentic: see e.g. Richard Garbe 1914: 80: “Die Vorstellungen von der Seelenwanderung und von
dem Aufsteigen der Seelen zum Monde, …, sind unverkennbar brahmanischer Herkunft.”

with ideas of the fate of the soul found in old Indo-Iranian (Zoroastrian) texts, for instance the soul’s encounter with its light-image, it is still astonishing how close it is in other respects to the Jain idea.

Parallels can also be found in the institutional and practical aspects. Klaus Bruhn, in his extensive article on the mahāvrata (the ‘great vows’) in early Jainism has already pointed to some of these; though he is careful not to claim a direct influence in one direction. This certainly would be a profitable area for some sustained research.

In sum, the need for a revision of late-antique sources on India in the light of possible influence by or reference to the ‘underdog’ of the three great Indian religious traditions, Jainism, is clearly to be seen in the light of the topics we have discussed. Jainism has been almost wholly ignored as a candidate for religious influence outside of India; and this certainly has to do not only with its status as minority religion in modern South-Asia but also with the research history of Indian Studies as an academic discipline. It is Buddhism that, as a non-Brahmanic religion, has been predominantly studied and found its way into the popular awareness of Indian religion.

Manichaean Studies also seems to reflect a certain biased treatment of the historical context in and out of which the religion developed; for, originating from the study of Late-Antique sources, it looked for the roots of the religion in the syncretistic environments of West Asia and the Mediterranean. The discovery of the “Eastern branch” of Manichaeism, with the famous manuscript and archaeological finds along the Silk-Road, tended to emphasize the Buddhist elements in the religion that were mainly explained by cultural contact in that area, mainly admitting an indirect influence of Indian religious culture. Future investigation of Manichaeism and its historical development has to find a way in which to deal with its very real connections to India.
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