

particularly arresting. Martineau was notable for arguing that the Ancient Egyptians were black. Nevertheless, her theory appears to have caused her some inner disquiet which, according to Barrell, revealed itself in her description of the Sphinx. “What a monstrous idea was it from which this monster sprang!”, she exclaimed. (p. 191) Barrell refers to this reaction as “extraordinary: it seems to carry the weight of an intense anxiety about the boundaries of Western self and Eastern other, which . . . compels her to reflect upon that moment of non-recognition” (pp. 191–92). Florence Nightingale’s depiction of Luxor as “overrun, as infested, as crawling with intrusive Arabs who are figured as reptiles”, is equally startling (p. 194). While not deployed simply in the service of imperialism, Barrell concludes that such representations “may have been as serviceable as the official argument, in enabling imperialism to be thought; in permitting a general disregard for the interests of the colonized, under cover of the claim that it is primarily in their interests that their country is to be invaded and occupied” (p. 203). This is clearly relevant to Egypt which, of course, suffered this precise fate in 1882 at the hands of the British.

Luke Gibbons’ analysis of racial discourse and Irish history provides a particularly instructive contribution to the debate. In Ireland, the distinction between colonized and colonizer was blurred since “here was a colony whose subject population was both ‘native’ and ‘white’ at the same time” (p. 207). Gibbons goes on to observe that “it is clear that a native population which happened to be white was an affront to the very idea of the ‘white man’s burden’, and threw into disarray some of the constitutive categories of colonial discourse” (pp. 207–8). In colonial India, Janaki Nair sets out to demonstrate that the image of femininity, frequently applied to the Indian race, “became a complex grid of power”. “[B]y characterizing the entire Indian race as feminine – that is, weak – colonial ideology put (British) patriarchy in the service of imperialism” (p. 225).

Catherine Hall has undoubtedly compiled an impressive set of essays which cast much-needed light on the often tortuous world of post-colonial discourse. While Nancy Leys Stepan’s admission that in her offering “there is no space for historical detail and nuance” (p. 61) might alarm historians of empire, the inter-disciplinary approach which Hall has attempted to bring to the subject is one of the book’s key strengths. Possibly some of the conclusions drawn by the contributors are rather overstated, particularly in the light of the often limited range of evidence which is adduced. Patricia Hayes’ thesis about race and empire in South-West Africa, for example, is largely based on an alleged assault on one Ovambo woman. Janaki Nair’s claim that Britain feminized the “entire Indian race” is also suspect. Surely British perceptions of Indian society were far more complex and nuanced. How, for instance, would Nair reconcile her claim with the British concept of, and admiration for, India’s “martial races”. Minor criticisms aside, Hall has compiled a stimulating collection of essays which provide a useful introduction to the study of the cultural impact of imperialism.

SIMON C. SMITH

GNOSIS ON THE SILK ROAD, GNOSTIC PARABLES, HYMNS AND PRAYERS FROM CENTRAL ASIA. By H. J. KLIMKEIT. pp. xxii, 405. San Francisco, 1993.

The title of this book gives the reader the impression of a collection of gnostic texts similar to those in Coptic discovered at Nag Hammadi in Egypt found on the Silk Road and the fact that the Foreword is written by the distinguished scholar of gnosticism, Professor James Robinson, heightens this impression. However, the texts included in the volume are not eastern versions of works by known gnostic writers such as Valentinus but they are all Manichaean, found mostly at Chotcho near Turfan. Though Manichaeism is a third century gnostic religion, the absence of any mention of Mani or the religion in the title or cataloguing details could seriously mislead the student and cataloger and result

in the book not being found along with other books on Manichaeism or placed in a part of the library dealing with Nag Hammadi texts.

The discovery of Manichaean texts, many in a highly fragmentary state, in a range of Central Asian languages (Middle Persian, Parthian, Bactrian, Sogdian, Turkish, Tocharian B) by German scholars and archaeologists at the beginning of the twentieth century had given a major boost to the study of doctrines and history of this once persecuted world gnostic religion. It was fortunate that Germany then had some of the finest scholars in the study of oriental languages in the world and scholars like Müller, Andreas and von Le Coq were superbly well qualified to tackle these texts. They also trained a younger generation of scholars like Lentz, Henning and von Gabain to continue their work well into the middle of the century. The fact that the Coptic Manichaean texts found in Egypt were also conserved in Berlin and edited mainly by German scholars like Polotsky and Böhlig means that Teutonic domination of the subject is almost complete and with few notable exceptions, almost all major Manichaean texts from Central Asia and Egypt were published with German translations and commentaries.

The need for a collection of Manichaean texts from Central Asia in English translation has long been felt and for some time the gap has been filled only by the small but excellent collection published by the Danish scholar Professor Jes P. Asmussen (*Manichaean Literature, Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings*, Persian Heritage Series, XXII, New York, 1975). Professor Klimkeit who was a major scholar in the study of Manichaeism and had earlier published an excellent collection of hymns and prayers from Central Asia in German translation (*Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts. Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens*, Opladen, 1989) and who received an English-speaking education at Darjeeling in India when he was a child, was therefore well qualified to undertake the task of filling this important gap.

The book under review is more than just a re-rendering of the German collection into English as it also contains prose texts; however footnotes and other explanatory and introductory material are frequently "borrowed" from the German collection. The book begins with an excellent preface (pp. xvii–xxvi) to the main tenets and history of the religion as well as the most detailed account of the discovery of the Manichaean texts from Central Asia in English. This will be particularly valuable to students of the history of religion as Professor Klimkeit is highly observant of the relationship between Manichaeism and other major religions in Central Asia such as Buddhism, Christianity and Zoroastrianism and to the subtle but significant shifts in emphasis in the religion after it had become the official religion of the Uighur Kingdom in the ninth century AD. Texts in Middle Iranian and Turkish are presented separately which means that a reader will often have to go to two parts of the book for information on the same topic. The excellent collection of Manichaean Texts in Middle Persian and Parthian edited (but without translation) by Mary Boyce (*A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Acta Iranica 9, Teheran-Liège-Leiden, 1975) is heavily drawn on for the texts in those languages and the arrangement of the material in Klimkeit's collection often closely resembles that of Boyce which is a great help to scholars who are familiar with Boyce's standard work. The Sogdian material is drawn mainly from the editions of Henning and Sundermann, in most cases these are the only published English translations of these texts. The same is true of the Turkish material which for those unable to read the language could only be consulted mainly in German translation (with the exception of the Pothi book excellently edited and translated by L. Clark, "The Manichean Turkic Pothi-Book", *Altorientalische Forschungen* IX, 1982, pp. 145–218). At last we have English translations of important Turkish texts such as the cosmogonic fragment T II D 173b = U 169 (pp. 366–68) on the conversion of the Bögö (Moyu) Khagan to the religion, both of which are essential to students of the teaching and history of the religion. A more or less complete translation of the *Prayer and Confession Book* found in the codex M801 is a decided bonus (pp. 134–43). It is

unfortunate that Manichaean texts in Chinese from Dunhuang have not been included in the collection even though they belong spiritually and historically to the Central Asian phase of the religion. Similarly by confining himself to texts from Central Asia, Klimkeit was unable to include a translation of the key statement on Manichaean cosmogony preserved in Syriac by Theodor bar Konai (*Liber Scholiorum* XI, pp. 313.10–318.4, ed. Scher) which is almost certainly derived from a now lost canonical work of Mani.

The translations are prefaced by excellent introductions but for the specialist the lack of an index of sources arranged according to manuscript numbers and an index of subject-matter and cosmogonic terms (also a problem with the collection of Asmussen) is a major inconvenience. The present reviewer has tried to partly remedy this by including references to all the translations in both collections in his “Working Catalogue of published Manichaean texts” (S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, Leiden, 1998, pp. 196–246). Though the English translation of Klimkeit is fluent and readable, students and researchers using it as an aid to reading the texts in the original will be perplexed and disconcerted by numerous surprising and inexplicable omissions. In the Turkish fragment T II D 173a = U169 for instance lines R 10–12 are inexplicably omitted in the translation. In the case of Middle Iranian texts, the fragment on the universality of Mani’s religion M7594 has now been significantly augmented by M6062 and M5761 which effects any translation. As the latter were first published by Professor Werner Sundermann in a work well-known to Klimkeit (*Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berliner Turfantexte XI, Berlin, 1981, §24.1, pp. 132–33), the latter should have updated the edition of this important text by Boyce. Similarly Klimkeit’s translation of the much cited Parthian fragment on the descent of the Primal Man M21 (p. 224) has not been augmented by M316 and a number of other fragments from the same text which were published by Professor Sundermann as early as 1973 (*Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*, Berliner Turfantexte IV, Berlin, 1973, pp. 49–53). In the well known cosmogonic fragments in Middle Persian (= text y in Boyce’s edition), sections y.5–6 (M99 I V 16–25) are inexplicably missing from the translation given by Klimkeit on p. 227. These lines are hardly insignificant as they contain rare references to the preparation or creation by the Living Spirit of the Twelve Hells, of the Pit of Death and a prison for the Monster. The omission of these lines deprive us of a complete English translation of the important cosmogonic fragment M98 I + M99 I. An equally serious omission is the “punch-line” from the story of the conversion of the Turan Shah (p. 207) in which after witnessing Mani debating with a “righteous one” (a Buddhist monk?) the Shah confessed that Mani was “greater and brighter than all these (other heavenly spheres)” (M48 II R 17–19 = text e.2 in the edition of Boyce) as it weakens completely the gist of this moralizing story. Even more disastrous for those students who are not trained to use the original texts is the omission of a significant part of a saying from the famous Parthian version of the passion of Jesus and the visit of the women to the tomb (both likely to be derived from Tatian’s *Diatessaron*). The two fragments in question: M18 and M2753 belong to the same ms. but were published separately over a long period of time (M18 in 1904 by M. F. K. Müller, “Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkistan”, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse 1904, pp. 34–36 and M2753 in 1968 by W. Sundermann, “Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur”, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* XIV, 3, 1968, pp. 402–3). In his collection of Manichaean Hymns and Prayers in German (*op. cit.*, *supra*, p. 109), Klimkeit gave his translation of M18 as the main text and M2753 additionally in the footnotes. However, in the English version under review, he combined the two fragments in a single translation (pp. 70–71) and in doing so (inadvertently?) omitted (or electronically deleted?) M18 V 5–11 which contains most of what the angel said to the women about the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Fortunately this glaring omission has

been noticed by several Manichaean scholars and the missing lines from Klimkeit's translation can now be found in the correct textual context and in English translation by Enrico Morano ("A Survey of the Extant Parthian Crucifixion Hymns", in R. Emmerick *et al.* (edd.), *Studia Manichaica, IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997* (Berlin, 2000) p. 407):

- 5/ " Remember  
 6/ the words of Jesus that in  
 7/ Galilee unto ye  
 8/ he taught: 'They will deliver me up  
 9/ and crucify and on the third  
 10/ day I will rise from among the dead'.  
 11/ Go in haste to Galilee  
 12/ and inform Simon and  
 13/ [. . .] the others  
 14/ [. . .]"

One text in which Klimkeit made a useful correction (with the help of Professor Sundermann?) on an earlier edition is M731 in which he inverted the order of Recto and Verso as given by Müller. The recent publication of the Photo-Edition of these texts by Professor Sundermann (*Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts in early publications (1904–1934), Photo Edition, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Suppl. Ser. III, London, 1996*) has enabled scholars to make manuscriptal checks more easily. Plate 121 (Right) which shows a codex page with a tell-tale stitch mark on the left and a wider margin on the right and which is signalled by Müller as Recto (op. cit. pp. 32–33) is in fact very likely to be the Verso and the plate on the left (Verso in the edition of Müller) the Recto given the fact we are working with a codex with right-to-left pagination.

At 405 pages, Klimkeit's book is by far the longest monograph on the subject of Manichaeism in Central Asia in English and should, in many ways, be the obvious choice as principal text-book for undergraduate courses on Manichaeism in History of Religions departments and he undoubtedly had such students in mind when he planned and undertook this ambitious task. Students who are beginners in the study of the subject and who are also interested in other religions contemporary to that of Mani will find the excellent preface and the introductions to the annotated translations immensely helpful. A second and revised edition should in theory remove most of the problems, especially the inexplicable omissions, which prevent its immediate recommendation for student-use. Sadly, Professor Klimkeit passed away in tragic circumstances two years ago and the Study of the History of Religions is deprived of a senior and respected scholar whose enthusiasm for the study of religions of Central Asia, especially of Manichaeism, has inspired and whose numerous publications have assisted a whole new generation of researchers including the present reviewer. A fitting tribute to Klimkeit's scholarship and energy will be a reissuing of his book in 2–3 volumes in which revised versions of his translations are coupled with the original texts. Such an expanded revised version though, the present reviewer believes, should be more aptly and accurately retitled *Manichaeism on the Silk Road*.

SAM LIEU