MANICHEANISM.

Recherches sur le Manichéisme. I. La Cosmogonie Manichéenne d'après Théodore Bar Khôni, par FRANZ CUMONT. (Lamartin, Brussels, 1908.)

THIS short pamphlet is the first of a series of works on the subject of Manicheanism, of which two more by MM. Cumont and Kugener are announced as shortly to appear, and contains a translation with interspersed commentary of that portion of the *Liber Scholiarum* of Theodore Bar Khuni which relates to the Manichean cosmogony. The Syriac text published by M. Pognon in 1899 is, in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining accurate transcripts of the Eastern MSS, in many places unintelligible; but for the purpose of this study M. Kugener has collated a MS at Berlin, and added valuable philological notes, by which light is thrown on many obscure points. Theodore's accounts of heresies are in general drawn from Epiphanius, who, in the section devoted to Manicheanism, relied upon the Acts of Archelaus, but his description of Manicheanism comes at least in part from another source, which M. Cumont believes to have been Mani's own *Epistola Fundamenti*, of which extracts are given by Augustine. With the help, therefore, of the trustworthy text of the Acts of Archelaus recently published by the Berlin Academy, and the fragments lately discovered in Turkestan, we have now ample material for the study of Manicheanism. That it was a mixture of Zoroastrianism and Christianity is obvious; and M. Cumont makes it probable that some elements in it were also borrowed from Gnosticism and the religion of Babylon, while its moral system was in part derived from Buddhism, noting that Mani himself in the preface to the book which he addressed to the Persian king, as quoted by Al Biruni, terms Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus alike emissaries of God: it might also have been noted that in the Acts of Archelaus one of Mani's precursors is termed *Bouddas*, and, though he is identified with a Persian named Terbinth, and brought down to the third century A.D., it can hardly be doubted that Buddha is meant.

At p. 44, note 2, the substitution of 'Adam' for 'Ashaq'loun' by a slip of the pen in the last line but two makes the sentence unintelligible.

E. W. BROOKS.