

NAHAL TAJADOD. *Mani le Bouddha de Lumière: Catéchisme manichéen chinois* [Mani, the Buddha of light: a Chinese Manichaean catechism]. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 362 pages. Appendix with notes by P. Pelliot and P. Demiéville, indices, bibliography. Paper FFr179; ISBN 2-204-04064-9. (In French)

This book comprises volume 3 of the series "Sources Gnostiques et Manichéennes," edited by Michel Tardieu and published with the support of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. It centers on a short, one-roll Chinese text entitled *Moni guangfo jiaofayi lüe* 摩尼光佛教法儀路 [The compendium of the doctrines and styles of the teaching of Mani, the Buddha of light]. This work is known from two fragments, one at the British Library in London, the other at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The latter fragment was translated into French and annotated by CHAVANES and PELLIOT in 1913, while the former was carefully researched and translated into English by HALOUN and HENNING in 1952. Pelliot also began a French translation of the London fragment but was unable to complete it before his death in 1945; Demiéville later finished it and added a commentary, which are published for the first time in the "Annexe" of the present book.

The two fragments form a perfect fit and constitute the integral parts of a complete text, as was pointed out as early as 1925 by the Japanese scholar ISHIDA Mikinosuke. Lingering doubts on the part of certain Chinese scholars prompted a 1988 study by LIN Wushu, which demonstrates conclusively that there is no missing material between the two fragments.

Nahal Tajadod's idea of having a complete translation of the two fragments in a single volume along with an up-to-date commentary is in itself a good one. When one undertakes such a project, however, there is an important condition: that the new version represent an improvement upon earlier ones. It is my impression that the present work does not entirely fulfill this expectation. In this review I would like to examine some of the reasons why, concentrating upon matters of interpretation and source matter and leaving aside for the time being the author's consideration of doctrinal issues.

As we have seen, several important and reliable studies already exist on this Manichaean text. It thus raises questions concerning the author's approach when she comments in her foreword (5) that previous translations have no commentary ("dépourvues de commentaire"), or that the text has never attracted the attention of Sinologists ("... ce texte... n'a jamais encore attiré l'attention des sinologues").

The translation itself appears to be merely a reworking of the earlier versions, with the author's attempts to differentiate her work from that of previous translators often leading to mistakes in passages that were correctly rendered before. Let us look at the very beginning of the text, where numerous errors raise questions regarding the accuracy of the rest of the work.

After the title, *Moni guangfo jiaofayi lüe*, the Chinese manuscript reads *yi juan* 一卷 [one roll]. This does not mean "volume 1," as the author believes (45), but "one volume" or "one scroll," as it was correctly rendered by the earlier translators. The author is so convinced of the accuracy of her version that she comments (82): "Le titre est cependant précédé d'une indication qui laisse à croire que le texte aurait été écrit sur plusieurs rouleaux, dont le premier constituait l'actuel *Compendium* et le tout formait ainsi un ensemble complet concernant le manichéisme chinois." Incidentally, the characters 一卷 do not precede the title, they follow it. The author evidently

—and curiously—refers to her French text.

A few characters later the text states that “the [Chinese] translation was done by the Great Virtue [a title] *fuduodan* 拂多誕 [a title], in obeisance to an imperial order, at Jixian-yuan 集賢院.” The author translates (45): “L’extrêmement vertueux *fuduodan* reçut l’ordre impérial de compiler (les textes) qui furent traduits au collège de la cour.” In other words, she believes the *fuduodan* to be the compiler, and leaves the translator unidentified. This interpretation, repeated several times (82, 83) is simply wrong, and there is no reason for the author to alter the correct interpretation of the earlier translators. Another error involves the way she translates the term “Jixian-yuan.” This is the proper name of the institution where the translation took place. Haloun and Henning translate it as the “College of (the Hall) of Gathered Worthies” and explain what it was; Pelliot simply uses the Chinese reading, to which DEMIÉVILLE (262 of the present book) adds a useful note, used by Nahal Tajadod in her own commentary (84). It is thus incomprehensible why she has rendered the term “collège de la cour.” The author has the right to use whatever translation she likes, of course. I feel, however, that when she offers renditions different from those of previous translators (especially ones as eminent as Pelliot, Demiéville, etc.) she should inform her readers why she has done so.

Careless misreadings also mar her work. For example, she states (85) that “*guoshi* est la terre natale,” misreading *guotu* 國土 for *guoshi* 國士. In the bibliography (358) we find the title *Moni jing canjuan* 摩尼經殘卷; Nahal Tajadod translates the term *canjuan* as “rouleau nuisible” (noxious roll) instead of “fragmentary roll.” It is curious also to see Amitābha identified as a bodhisattva (19, 27, 30) instead of a Buddha, as is correctly noted on 338.

Certain problems with the use of source materials are also evident. In several places (6, 17, 83, 203–204) the author claims that the earliest date found for the transmission of Manichaeism to China is 694, the year when, according to the thirteenth-century Buddhist writer ZHIPAN, the apocryphal text *Erzong jing* 二宗經 [The scripture of the two principles] was introduced. I find no mention of the fact that, according to the traditions of Chinese Manichaeism, the diffusion of the teachings began in China with the arrival of a *mozak* (Chinese *mushe* 慕闍, the highest level of the Manichaean hierarchy) during the reign of Gaozong 高宗 (r. 649–83). Although this source (HE Qiaoyuan, 1558–1632) is rather late, it deserves to be given serious consideration since it appears soundly based on reliable ancient sources independent of Zhipan. Unfortunately, this work is not mentioned in the author’s bibliography.

This last point is indicative of another of the book’s weaknesses: its bibliography on Chinese Manichaeism is far from exhaustive, with contemporary studies in Chinese and Japanese receiving virtually no mention. Chinese and Japanese authors are ignored even when they write in European languages, with the exception of Lin Wushu’s article, mentioned above.

I must say in conclusion that, with regard to the issues considered above, this work does not in the least advance scholarly research, and may engender mistaken notions among nonspecialist readers.

REFERENCES CITED:

CHAVANNES, Édouard and Paul PELLIOT

1911 Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine. *Journal Asiatique* 10th ser. 18: 499–617

1913a Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine (Deuxième partie). *Journal Asiatique*

11th ser. 1: 90–199

1913b Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine (Deuxième partie, suite et fin). *Journal Asiatique* 11th ser. 1: 261–392

HALOUN, G. and W. B. HENNING

1952 The compendium of the doctrines and styles of the teaching of the Mani, the Buddha of light. *Asia Major* n.s. 3/2: 184–212

ISHIDA Mikinosuke 石田幹之助

1925 Tonkō hakken *Manikōbutsu kyōhōgi-ryaku* ni mietaru ni-san no gengo ni tsuite 敦煌発見「摩尼光佛教法儀略」に見えたる二三の言語に就いて [An examination of two or three languages in the Tunhuang text of *Moni guangfo jiaofayi lüe*]. In *Shiratori hakase kanreki kinen tōyōshi ronsō* 白鳥博士還曆記念東洋史論叢 [Festschrift for the sixtieth birthday of Dr. Shiratori], 157–172. Tokyo.

LIN Wushu

1988 On the joining between the two fragments of the *Compendium of the teaching of Mani, the Buddha of light*. In *Manichean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5–9, 1987*, 89–93. Department of History of Religions, Lund University, Sweden.

HE Qiaoyuan 何喬遠 (1558–1632)

n.d. *Min shu* 閩書. Preface dated 1619 by Ye Xianggao 葉向高 (1559–1627).

ZHIPAN 志磐 (n.d.)

1258–1269 *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [A general record on Buddha and the patriarchs], 54 juan. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 49, No. 2035, 325–475.

Antonino FORTE

School of East Asian Studies

Kyoto

INDONESIA

TARO GOH. *Sumba Bibliography*. With a Foreword by James J. Fox. An Occasional Paper of the Department of Anthropology, The Australian National University. Canberra: Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University, 1991. xii+96 pages. Map, plate. Paper, US\$15.00 (surface mail), US\$20.00 (air mail); ISBN 0-7315-1217-0.

On 7 October 1988 I received a letter in Japan from Goh Taro, posted from the island of Sumba in southeastern Indonesia. Dated 29 September, the letter was apparently sent from his sickbed; on 14 October, just two weeks later, the 30-year-old Goh died at the Christian Hospital of Lindimara in Waingapu, where he had been moved from the site of his research. A collection of writings in his memory by twenty-two colleagues, starting with the eulogy delivered at his memorial service by James J. Fox, was published on 25 August 1989. As Fox mentions in his foreword, Goh counted among his friends and acquaintances some of the foremost modern scholars on eastern Indonesia, such as Janet Hoskins and Joel Knipers. Much was expected of Goh's own fieldwork, given his diligence, his keen powers of observation, and his superb command of languages.

Goh originally intended to investigate the domain of Karera on the southeast coast of Sumba, but later shifted his attention to the Kapunduk region. Underlying