PERSICA ANTIQUA

A Textual Approach to the Meaning and Usage of Some Technical Terms in Religious Manichaean Texts

Author(s): Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi, Seyyed Saeed Reza Montazeri

Source: Persica Antiqua, January 2026, VOL. 6, NO. 10, 43-53.

Published by: Tissapherness Archaeological Research Group

Stable URL: https://doi.org/10.22034/pa.2024.475446.1100

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Tissaphernes Archaeological Research Group, Tehran, Iran. **Open Access.** This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.
The ethical policy of Persica Antiqua is based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (**COPE**) guidelines and complies with International Committee of Persica Antiqua Editorial Board codes of conduct. Readers, authors, reviewers and editors should follow these ethical policies once working with Persica Antiqua. The ethical policy of Persica Antiqua is liable to determine which of the typical research papers or articles submitted to the journal should be published in the concerned issue. For information on this matter in publishing and ethical guidelines please visit www.publicationethics.org.

Ministry of Science Research & Technology
Tissaphernes Archaeological Research Group
www.tissaphernesArc.ac.ir

The International Journal of Ancient Iranian Studies
January 2026, VOL. 6, NO. 10, 43-53. OPEN ACCESS
https://doi.org/10.22034/pa.2024.475446.1100

PERSICA ANTIQUA

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Textual Approach to the Meaning and Usage of Some Technical Terms in Religious Manichaean Texts

Mohammad Shokri-Foumeshi[1], **Seyyed Saeed Reza Montazeri**[2]

Abstract

Drawing on Manichaean Middle Iranian texts and adopting a textual approach, the present article tries to define the meaning and usage of some technical terms (*termini tecnichi*) in Manichaean theology, especially the words "angel" (*frystg*, *fryštg*) and "apostle, messenger" (*frystg*, *fryštg*). The use of a word for two meanings and/ or two concepts in the Manichaica was a result of the redefinition that each of the different Manichaean communities presented for the concepts of 'angel' and 'apostle, messenger'. The article shows that the Iranian term *frys*/*štg* has been redefined and expanded in meaning in Manichaean literature under the influence of Syriac writings; a redefinition that could generate an angel from an apostle / a messenger and a king from the angel. Here, we also examined the technical terms *xwd'y*/ *xwd'wn* 'lord', *by* / *bg* 'god', *yzd* 'god' and *bgpwhr* / *βγpšy* / *βγpš'k* 'son of God' (*βγpwryšt* / *βγpšyt* 'the sons of God') *βγpwr(')yc* 'daughter of God' showing the contexts in which these terms appear and what examples they refer to. Our study shows that some of them were used not only for angels and historical figures (like Mani and Manichaean leaders and *electi*, as well as previous apostles), but also included at least one of Manichaean gods, i.e. 'Third Messenger'.

Keywords: Angel; Apostle; God; Son of God; Manichaean Middle Iranian; Manichaean Terminology.

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

[1] Assistant Professor, University of Religions and Denominations, Faculty of Word Religions, Department of Eastern Religions, Qom, Iran (Corresponding Author). mshokrif@urd.ac.ir
[2] Associate Professor, Faculty of Theology, College of Farabi, University of Tehran, Iran. ssmontazery@ut.ac.ir
Article info: Received: 27 August 2024 | Accepted: 15 December 2025 | Published: 1 January 2026
Citation: Shokri-Foumeshi, Mohammad; Montazeri, Seyyed Saeed Reza. (2026). A Textual Approach to the Meaning and Usage of Some Technical Terms in Religious Manichaean Texts. *Persica Antiqua*, Vol. 6 (10), 43-53.
https://doi.org/10.22034/pa.2024.475446.1100

Introduction

A significant problem in Manichaean terminology is that in Iranian Manichaean writings, two technical terms, namely 'angel' (*frys*/*štg*, or messenger, used for spiritual, abstract, immaterial, and subtle existents that are God's assistants as well as mediators between Him and human beings, equivalent with the Semitic '*malak*'; Mosahab, 2001: 1877), and 'apostle, messenger' (again *frys*/*štg*) are not clearly distinguished, as in Middle Iranian texts they both are derived from the same root. In this context, no contribution has appeared so far. Therefore, after proposing some discussions on pre-Manichaean religious concepts, alteration in the conditions of proofs, the linguistic tendency of the word itself in both of the above explained meanings, and conditions for choosing the right meaning of a technical term, we try to make some other points in a more clear and illustrative manner about technical terms 'angel, messenger, apostle' (*frystg, fryštg*), 'God' (*by, bg*), 'Son of God' (*bgpwhr*) in Manichaean theology, so as to eliminate misunderstandings that may sometimes arise in translation and interpretation of Middle Iranian Manichaean texts; and then to make some exact references to use of the technical term for Mani herself.

Pre-Manichaean Concepts and Alteration in Conditions of Proof

Theological concepts in every religion are formed based on patterns. Hence one of the concerns in theology is recognizing innovative elements and differentiating them from old conceptual structures. Indeed, the reason why analysis of theological concepts is considered an important part of researches in Manichaean theology is because the combination of the infrastructures of pre-Manichaean theological tradition with innovative Manichaean elements generates various and expansive components that are not very easy to differentiate from one another: new concepts all of which are certainly redefined in the Manichaean teachings.[1] Nonetheless, these redefinitions, whether they were in content or structure, did not lead to a paradigm shift, i.e. a fundamental transformation in cognitive models. The reading that Mani presented in his philosophy and worldview, like in his predecessors', had a substantialist approach.

But the Manichaean cognition of prior traditions' concepts undoubtedly consisted in its particular attitude, which systematically redefined most previous concepts. In the Manichaean view, generally speaking, one tries to contrive a new system by combining historical applications of old concepts with the capabilities of the present concepts, i.e. through a synchronic vision of a set of lingual and religious mixtures and confluences.[2] This

[1] Hence, we believe that Manichaeism is an independent religious system that never did a mechanical juxtaposition of the elements of paganism, Hellenism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity. In Manichaeism there is no element which Mani did not redefine in his new system. Neither the Manichaean Jesus is exactly the same as the Christian Jesus, nor is Manichaean *bahman* exactly the same as the Zoroastrian *bahman*, etc.

[2] From a typological viewpoint, a text does not proceed from nothing, any more than an

is carried out through fine-tuning the nature and/or functions of the concepts of the old system. For example, although the Manichaean angel Jacob (*y'qwb*) is a prophet (Job) in some Jewish texts, Manichaeism, for purposes of synchronization, has taken away his apostolic traits and, after a meticulous combination of old and new functions, has made an angel out of him,[1] though not absolutely regardless of what character the hard crust of Semitic worldview has presented of him; there always remains a narrow unity between Manichaean and Semitic worldviews. It is clearly noticeable that Mani, at least because of his apparent opposition to Judaism and prophets of Orthodox Judaism (even though he benefited from Jewish sources), could not regard Jacob as a prophet in his system. The important question is what idea Mani and his followers had of a concept like 'angel', no matter what concepts (such as god, apostle, king, or hero) in previous systems the examples of the Manichaean idea were correspondent with.

The redefinitions were undoubtedly dependent upon a cycle of doctrines and religious experiences. For example, Manichaeism selected the technical term *mhr(')spnd'n* from the treasure of Zoroastrian terminology to interpret the term regarding religious thought and associated experience in other cultures. To put it the other way, Mani and his pupils adopted the meaning and function of such terms as *mhr(')spnd'n* from the Zoroastrian system and redefined them in their new analyses. Using the modus operandi of association, terms of that kind were placed in a particular dynamic system, which could disturb previous systems and create new, unheard-of models. Nonetheless, although Mani managed to design a new religion for a new era, perhaps due to his belief in the duration of the spirit of prophet-hood and of the line of prophets from Adam to the last prophet (he would see himself as the last (Stroumsa, 1986: 61-74),[2] he could not transcend previous prophets' model. He did not go beyond the view that pupils of and believers in previous prophets had offered distorted and inverted models of the prophets' true messages.

However, while new beliefs sometimes undermine traditions, they cannot completely destroy them: a type of new model is often formed which might soon be viewed as an 'exemplar'. For instance, the Jewish concept of Jacob turns from a

idea does not form of its own accord.

[1] To put it in the form of a negative argument, Mani and his pupils never awarded a place to Jacob, who is the father of Israelites, in the chain of previous prophets, and there is no mention of him in any of the didactic texts, nor in any of the lists - for example, in *Kephalaia* - of prophets prior to Mani (*1Keph.* 1, p. 12: 10-21).

[2] The expression 'seal of the prophets' or anything like that was not used by Mani himself, even though he regarded himself as the last prophet (Bīrūnī, 1879: 190). Stroumsa shows in his detailed introduction that post-Sassanid followers of Mani adopted this term as a result of their encounter with the Islamic expression *xātam al-anbīyā, xātam on-nabīyyīn*) referring to the Muslim Prophet. Subsequently, quoted from followers of Mani, the term entered into Arabic and Persian written works, although the two words 'seal' and 'ring' also meant 'the stamp of confirmation (and confirmation by previous prophets).

'commander' prophet (στρατηγός) into the commander of angels (*s'r'r ʿy prystg'n*) in Manichaean Iranians' writings (M4bIIv8), and then, now itself an 'exemplar', this new concept gives shape to a heavenly king-commander in Manichaean–Chinese documents (H215c–d). From a phenomenological viewpoint, *Yejufu / Jacob* has taken form at the same time as its hardware reliance on Manichaean models and through fine-tuning of Chinese tradition. Likewise, there have been quite a few foreign concepts and technical terms such as four the archangels Raphael (*rwp'yl*), Michael (*myx'yl*), Gabriel (*gbr'yl*), and Sarael (*sr'yl*), for which Iranian, Turkish, and Chinese Manichaeans did not have proper equivalents in their local cultures. Therefore, they assimilated them in the above explained fashion.

Still, concepts might not always be transferred through simple and smooth routes. Sometimes there is a two-sided fine-tuning. This happens when there is the possibility that a particular concept does not evolve in the original culture, but, due to lack of a proper equivalent, falls into a *static mood*, decays, and gets eliminated in the target culture. To prevent this, the lingual modus operandi of *suspense* in the target culture is used: keeping an intermediate position, the technical term in the target culture tries, in the middle of models and exemplars, both to approach the language of origin, and to keep its connections with the chain of items in the vocabulary of the target culture. An important example is the Middle Iranian word *frys/štg* and its correspondent concept. While the concept (not the term) of angel in Zoroastrianism was not used in the strict sense of the word, and therefore Mani or his disciples were not able to benefit from it, the word was for Iranians associated with both the concept of 'angel', and the concepts of 'messenger/ apostle'. Indeed, the word was of such flexibility and capacity that it allowed believers to choose to intend any of the concepts, as the occasion required.[1]

Use of same technical term for two concepts[2] and of a borrowed technical term to refer to a concept in the target culture is another problem that is always observed in textual studies. The Syriac/Aramaic word *ʿyr* (transcripted as *īr*) in Manichaean Middle Persian is a case in point. In Iranian Manichaean writings, the word slowly gave way to *kw* (in two different meanings: 'prince' and 'giant'). As soon as this word entered the treasure of Manichaean technical terms, Zoroastrian correlative concepts such as *drwj* 'demon' and *pryg* 'she-devil' which were intimately con-

[1] In absence of local examples for Manichaean characters, the Manichaean Chinese copied the original. In fact, the Manichaean Chinese view of the notion of angel was not identical to what was formulated for centuries in the minds of the Semites and used to address some mythical and magical characters. The issue is that the main source accessible to the Manichaean Chinese were the texts by Persians, who, although in some cases providing a copy of the original Aramaic (for some evidence see: Yoshida 1983: 326 ff.; Durkin-Meisterernst and Morano 2010: 10-13; Ma 2015: 455 ff), had to redefine and explain the concept of angel for the same reason that the Chinese had to do so. The notion of angel had no antecedents for them.

[2] During the phase of transition or, sometimes, afterwards

nected to other Iranian concepts made their way into Manichaeism's network of conceptual models. Pace some followers of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, a technical term transferring from one tradition to another might be accompanied by a great deal of correlative data.

Technical Terms and Particular Applications

Use of 'angel' and 'messenger'

A close examination of Manichaean western texts shows that sometimes it was possible that a group of Mani's followers used the word angel (ἄγγελος) rather than messenger (ἀπόστολος) to refer to leaders of the religion (ἐκκλησία). A prime example is *Kephalaion* 337 of *The Chapters of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani*, housed in Chester Beatty Library, Dublin. Throughout this chapter of *Kephalaia* (*2Keph.* 337, p. 390: 15 ff. [pr. 100 ff.]), a selection of high-ranking clergies is called both 'messengers' (sg. ἀπόστολος, pl. ἀπόστολοι) and 'angels' (sg. ἄγγελος, pl. ἄγγελοι). This way of referring to them certainly was not of any linguistic significance: it never meant that religion's messengers are angels by nature. They were just treated as angels, probably because they, like angels, were believed to have come from the land of light. So, it was not for no reason that Norman Ricklefs (2002: 159), not mindful of the conceptual duality of *frēs/štag*, thought that Manichaeism is the only religion that has turned the pious and *electi* into angels.[1] In relation to this, Manichaean Coptic *Kephalaia* (*1Keph.* 50, 126: 17-23) refers to an important point: angels (Copt. *n̄-aggeloc*, Gr. ἄγγελοι) have been assigned a mission or prophecy (ἀποστολή). The word mission can be clearly compared with ἀπόστολος 'apostle, messenger'. Therefore, as in Iranian sources where the same word was used for the two concepts of 'angel' and 'messenger', using these two words in the western Manichaica interchangeably has not necessarily been due to a misinterpretation of technical terms. These two words could easily be interchangeable. This, in Manichaean eastern literature, could also include the application of such words as *xwdʾwn* (lord), *xwdʾy* (lord), *by/ bg* (god), and *yzd* (god). Ibn al-Nadim too, in his *Al-Fihrist,* describing three angels on the Day of Judgment, used the word *ilah* (*thalatha āliha*[t]) [Ibn al-Nadim, 2011: 31 (in Persian translation), 55 (in Arabic original); see Ibn Nadim 2002: 596 ff.],[2] and somewhere else the words *malak* (angel) or *malāʿika* (angels) in place of *by/ bg* 'god' and *yzd* 'god' (Ibn al-Nadim, 2011: 20 [in Persian translation], 47 [in Arabic original]). This must have been the consequence of similar usage of the words among the followers of Mani themselves. However, Ibn al-Nadim did not always use the words interchangeably. In his mention of fourth prostration in Manichaean daily prayer, he distinguishes technical terms *al-āli-*

[1] Ricklefs says that this point can be inferred from Turfan Manichaean texts (Ricklefs, 2002: 159), while it is clear that he did not realize the dual meaning of *frys/štg* in Middle Persian.

[2] While he could use the words *malak* and *malāʿika*

ha^{t} (gods), *al-malāʿika*^{t} (angels), and *al-junūd* (the army of angels):

أسبح و أسجد للآلهة كلهم، وللملائكة المضيئين كلهم، وللانوار كلهم، وللجنود كلهم، الذين كانوا من الآله العظيم

I praise and pray to all gods and all illuminating angels and all lights, and all fighters who all emanate from the great God [i.e the Father of Greatness] (Ibn a-Nadim 2011: 28; for more details, see also Shokri-Foumeshi, 2024: 94).

Furthermore, Mani, in the third call for his religion, designated one of the gods as *ʾyzgdʾ* 'messenger, envoy' in his mother tounge Syriac. This is the same god who not only in Iranian versions has been called *yzd nrysẖ*, *nrysf yzd*, *rwšnšhr yzd*, and *zynʾrys by*, but whose name has also been translated as *hrdyg fryštg* in Parthian and as *ʾštykw prʾyštʾk* in Sogdian, meaning 'the Third Messenger' (Sundermann, 1979: 100). It is noteworthy that in Manichaean Iranian sources the god is also referred to as *ʿyl* (god), a word which was used for angels as well. In any case, Mani's choice of the title *ʾyzgdʾ* for the Third Messenger clearly indicates that the words *frys/štg* was used not only for angels and even for historical figures such as Mani himself, and Manichaean apostles, but also, from among gods of the three Calls, at least for the Third Messenger (*nrysẖ yzd*). Sometimes we merely imagine that with *frys/štg* we have stepped into the land of angels, while we have arrived in Manichaean pantheon or entered one of Manichaean churches (see Shokri-Foumeshi, 2024: 75-83).

Xwdʾy / *xwdʾwn* (lord), *by* / *bg* (god), and *bgpwhr*/ *βγpšy* (Son of God)

It is well known that the technical terms *xwdʾwn* (lord) in Manichaean Middle Iranian texts and 呼大渾 or 乎大渾 (*huda-hun*) in the Chinese Manichaean writings in Xiapu (e.g. in the unpublished manuscript fragment MG 3407: 273)[1] which is a transcription from Middle Iranian *xwdʾwn* have been used to refer to Mani himself and in some cases to his twin *taumā*.[2] However, in Turfan fragments, there are clear evidence like M72V1, M281Vii3, and M801a/p.20/9, which indicate that the word also was used to refer to Jesus as well. Furthermore, according to the Middle Persian manuscript M82R13-14 = M235V4, 'the Lord Jesus' is 'the commander of messengers' (*xwdʾwn yyšwʿ sʾrʾr ʿyg frystgʾn*),[3] just as according to the manuscript fragment M4bIIv8 Jacob is 'the commander of angels' (*sʾrʾr ʿyg frystgʾn*). These two evidences testify to the dual meaning of *frys/štg*. The word *xwdʾwn* in *ymg rwšn xwdʾwn* in two manuscript fragments M311V8 (see Reck, 2004: 142, l. 751) and M449aA1-2 (see Reck, 2004: 147, ll. 802-803) should mean 'the Lord, Light Twin', but not 'the Light Twin of the Lord (Mani)' (Cf. Reck, 2004: 142, l. 751, and 147, ll. 802-803).

Although one could not take a definite stand on the general application of

[1] MG 3407, 273 (unpublished): 佩耶摩尼乎大渾 (*pei-ye mua-nri hu-da-hun* [*by mʾny xwdʾwn*]).

[2] Among hundreds of examples is M3R10, the well-known text 'Mani's Last Audience with Bahram I' (published in Boyce's work: *Reader* 44, text *n*). For the use of this word in Manichaean Iranian and Chinese literatures, see Ma and Shokri-Foumeshi, 2020: 329 ff.

[3] According to the manuscript S1V15, Paul (*pʾwlys*) too was called the Messenger/Apostle (*frystg*).

the word *xwd'wn* addressed to angels (e.g. in So14415Iv1), the MP/Pth. *xwd'y* 'lord' have been used to address *tauma*, the angel of revelation to Mani,[1] probably not because he was the twin of *m'ny xwd'y*, the lord Mani.[2] Likewise, we think it unlikely that the Lord Barsimus (*xwd'y br symws*) has been exceptionally so called in M4bIIv6 because he too, like *tauma*, according to the *Cologne Mani-Codex* (*CMC* 49.3-5), has been, in another tradition, an angel of revelation. Apart from this, it seems that Manichaeans did not make any distinctions between the two words *xwd'y* and *xwd'wn*.

What do we know about the usage of the MP *by* / Pth. *bg* and Pth. *bgpwhr* in Manichaean scriptures? In Manichaean Iranian texts, although *bgpwhr* was applied both[3] to gods (such as *whrmyzd bg* 'the First Man', and to historical figures such as *bg mrym'ny* 'the God Mar Mani',[4] sometimes angels also were called by that name.[5] For example, *tauma* (MP *narǰamīg*, Pth. *yamag*) in the Middle Persian-Parthian manuscript So14415Iv1 (in Sogdian script) has been called *pγ ymk rwšn*, and Jacob the angel in the manuscript M4bIIv6 has been called *by y'qwb prystg* (the God, Angel Jacob). In these writings, *bgpwhr* appear in three positions: it was a title for angels; another title for gods who were manifestations of the Father of Greatness; and a title for Jesus. It was natural that the Father of Greatness could not be a *bgpwhr* (Son of God). He was *bg* (God) and other gods were the sons of God. The title was grammatically figurative, and therefore Sogdian *βγpwr(')yc* (with the female suffix) 'the daughter of God' (*SD* §2588; *DMT*. III/2: 52a) was made following the Parthian *bgpwhr*. Maiden of Light too, like all gods, was God's offspring. Although *bgpwhr* in Manichaean texts was mostly considered a title for Jesus,[6] the plural forms in Parthian *bgpwhr'n*[7] and Sogdian *βγpwryšt* 'the Sons of God'[8] referred both to gods and angels. The best example is the manuscript M4bIv12-13, where there is a clear mention of *hry bgpwhr'n* i.e. 'the three angels' who lead the spirits of dead *electi* to heaven. So, practically, among the Manichaeans it was possible that by the *terminus techincus* 'angel' it would also be meant 'god, deity'.

To this set of words must be added Sogdian *βγpšy* (in Manichaean script) and *βγpš'k* (in Sogdian script) 'the son of God'. Unlike the word *βγpwryšt* 'the sons

[1] The title 'lord, king' (*xwd'y*) was applied to other historical figures such as 'the king of Mishan, Mihrshah' (*myšwn xwd'y myhrš'h* in the manuscript fragment M47Ir4-5).

[2] E.g. in So14415Ir1 or M315IIv2.

[3] Benedikt Peschl has delivered a speech entitled "*Bayān ud yazdān*: Words for 'god' in Parthian" at the International Association of Manichaean Studies' ninth conference held in September 2017 in Turin, Italy.

[4] For example, in the manuscript M1/375/. To this piece of evidence, we do well to add that on different occasions Mani has also been called a god (*yzd*).

[5] For this reason, it is acceptable that we see angels as belonging to the Manichaean 'land of gods' or pantheon, *yzd* in the meaning of a 'praiseworthy being', whether heavenly or cosmic.

[6] For example, *yyšwʿ bgpwhr* (the Son of God, Jesus) in the manuscript M734R4; an error in *DMT*.III/1: 107a made clear by reference to the fifth line in the manuscript M734R5.

[7] E.g. M7Iri18 apud *DMT*.III/1: 107a.

[8] E.g. M583Iv10 apud *DMT*.III/2: 52a.

of God', which was used to address angels as well as gods, *βγpšyt*[1] 'the sons of God' referred exclusively to angels.[2] Manichaean Sogdian texts indicate that angels were not only the 'sons' of God, but some of them, according to the manuscript Ch/So14731V14, were also *δwγth βγšpšyt* the 'god-serving daughters' (see Shokri-Foumeshi, 2024: 83-85).

Mani, the Apostle of Light

Undoubtedly, no one thinks that by the Middle Persian phrase *m'ny prystg ʿyg yyšwʿ ʾryʾmʾn* (in *CMC* 66:4-5), with the Greek equivalent Μαννιχαῖος 'Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ ἀπόστολος, at the beginning of Mani's *Living Gospel* (see Shokri-Foumeshi, 2015: 165-175), Mani meant that he was Jesus Christ's 'angel'.[3] In fact, the Middle Persian *frēstag* and Parthian *frēštag* as equivalents of 'messenger' mean apostle and prophet in places where Mani is discussed, as, later on, ibn al-Nadim too called Mani *rasūl an-nūr* 'the Messenger of Light' (Ibn al-Nadim, 1997: 465). To put it differently, although the word *frys/štg* means both messenger, prophet, and angel, if it is used to refer to Mani himself, its translation as 'messenger, apostle, prophet',[4] and if the text is about the well-known abstract existents, the translation as 'angel' are preferable: *Taumā* (MP *narǰamīg*) was the *frēs/štag* 'angel' who was the *frēs/štag* 'Messenger' of Light's twin. Therefore, it is perfectly natural that we think that Manichaeans did not call their prophet 'the Angel of Light', if we are to express our meaning in English rather than Parthian. Hence the translation of *m'ny frys/štg rwšn* as 'Mani, the Angel of Light' does not sound right in English, although the later translation *philologically* is not wrong. It is clear that the Middle Persian *frēstag īg Yišō* (M17Vi12-13) addressing Mani is the same as what is called in Greek 'Ιησοῦ ἀπόστολος (*CMC* 66, 4 f, in Henrichs and Koenen, 1975: 67), in Latin *apostolus Iesu* (*Epist. Fund.* 5, 197.10 f, in Feldmann, 1987: 10, frg. 1), and in Syriac *šᵉlīḥā d-Išōʿ* (= *šᵉlīḥā dᵉ-yešūʿ*), 'the apostle of Jesus'.[5]

[1] *DMT*.III/2: 52a.

[2] M *βγpšyy* CF80, CF128 (in: *DMT*.III/2: 52a); The attestations M *βγpšyyṭ* pl. M3600A2* (unpublished) S *βγpš'kw* 10129iiR6 (of Maitreya Buddha) *apud* N. Sims-Williams, 2nd ed. of *DMT*.III/2, forthcoming (personal communication). Many thanks to Nicholas Sims-Williams for providing me (MShF) with these unpublished sections of the second edition of *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts Vol III: Texts from Central Asia and China: Texts in Sogdian and Bactrian*, coauthored by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, whose first edition was published by Berpoles in 2012. The technical term 'the sons of God' is not correspondent with *b'nē-hā-elōhīm* in Jewish writings.

[3] Mani has used the word 'the apostle of Jesus' in imitation of Paul the apostle (Shokri-Foumeshi 2015: 166 ff.).

[4] Just as Paul has been called an apostle in the manuscript S1 (S1V15: *'br gwyšn ʿy pʾwlys frystg*)

[5] For the latest restoration of this manuscript see Shokri-Foumeshi 2017: 478. Considering that not all Manichaean manuscript fragments have been completely edited and published, we have no evidence for this Parthian compound for the present. Nonetheless, the Parthian *fryštg cy pydr* in M233V3 (*Hwyadagmān* I: 1ª, in: Boyce, 1954: 66) which is addressed to Mani, and means 'Father's messenger', and, naturally, not 'angel of the Father'. Furthermore, when the Parthian text *Mihrnāmag* in M1/287/ addresses Mani with the phrase *ʿfryštg ky ʾc pydr* (the form *ʿfryštg*

In Manichaean writings, Mani has always been called ἀπόστολος in Greek and *apostolus* in Latin, meaning 'messenger, apostle', but not ἄγγελος and *angelus* meaning 'angel' (for further discussion, see Shokri-Foumeshi, 2015: 166-167, and especially Gulácsi, 2014: 164-165).[1] Also in Syriac he was called *šᵉlīḥā* 'messenger' but not *malak* 'angel'[2] (Watson, 2018: 339).[3] Although every angel is a messenger, not every messenger is an angel (see Shokri-Foumeshi, 2024: 99-100).

Last Remarks and Conclusion

Research into Manichaean theology is impossible without examining the relevant technical terms and religious concepts. In this article, first, we discussed the treatment by Manichaeans of models of the previous traditions, and tried to explain how the Manichaean view led to the redefinition of prior concepts such that it could make an angel out of a prophet and a king out of the angel. It was natural that Mani, when using and adapting the previous systems, made tweaks to them so as to found a 'new' religion. We also tried to study the specific application of some technical terms and to show with what meaning and concept in the Manichaean context they correspond. In other words, we examined technical terms *xwdʾy* / *xwdʾwn* 'lord', *by* / *bg* 'god', *bgpwhr* 'son of God', *frys*/*štg* 'angel, messenger, apostle', and showed in what contexts these technical terms appear, and to what they refer. Our study clearly indicated that all these *termini technici* were applied not only to angels and historical figures (such as Mani himself, Manichaean leaders as well as Seth and Jesus, whom Manichaean considered as the living prophets), but also to gods of three Calls. The well-known example is *ʾyzgdʾ* 'messenger, envoy', the god who is known in Iranian tradition as *hrdyg fryštg* (in Parthian) and as *ʾštykw prʾyštʾk* (in Sogdian). This article suggests that the Middle Iranian technical term *frys/štg* was redefined in Manichaean literature and, affected by Syriac writings, its meaning expanded. These conclusions also indicate that Mani's theology and technical terms in Manichaean lexicology and angelology form an independent network and system which do not easily fit into any of the Iranian or Semite theological categories.

is striking here) an apostle and messenger coming from 'the Father' is the subject of the discussion.

[1] Although the Greek ἄγγελος could be applied to a group of heavenly existents, human characters, and even prophets, at least in the Mani's era (the third century AD) it only signified the group of heavenly abstract existents that are called 'angel' in English. For further information about using the word angel in Semite and Greek, see Rickles, 2002: 40.

[2] Hebrew שליחא from the root *ŠLḤ* 'to send, dispatch' (Cf. Fitzmyer, 2004: 311).

[3] From the root L'K. This root too means 'to send, dispatch'. About the use of *malʾakh* and *šlikha* for messenger, prophet, and angel and their semantic displacements in early Judaism and the Samaritan religion, see the detailed study: Fossum, 1985: 144-145. So, it is clear that in Semitic languages, including Syriac / Eastern Aramaic, the roots of the two words 'messenger' and 'angel' are identical.

Abbreviations

CMC	*Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis*; *Kölner Mani-Kodex*; *Cologne Mani-Codex*, in: Henrichs and Koenen, 1975; Koenen and Römer, 1988; Cameron and Dewey, 1979.
DMT.III/1	Durkin-Meisterernst, 2004.
DMT.III/2	Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst, 2012.
Epist. Fund.	*Epistula Fundamenti*, Augustius, ed. by Feldmann, 1987.
H	摩尼教下部讚 *Monijiao xiabu zan* [*Mo ni chiao hsia pu tsan*] "The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns", Ms. S.2659, British Library, trnsl. by Daoming (8th c.?), ed. by Tsui Chi 1943.
1Keph.	Introduction + chapts. 1-95 (pp. 1-244), in: Polotsky and Böhlig, 1934-1940; chapts. 95-122 (pp. 244-291), in: Böhlig 1966 and Gardner, 1995.
2Keph.	Chapts. 321-347 (pp. 343-442), in: Gardner, BeDuhn and Dilley, 2018.
MG	摩尼光佛 *Moni guangfo* "Mani the Buddha of Light", ed. by Lin 2014; Yang and Bao, 2015.
Reader	Boyce, 1975.
SD	Gharib, 1995

Bibliography

Bīrūnī, Muhammad ibn Ahmad. (1879). *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, ed. E. Sachau, London.

Böhlig, A. (1966). *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin, Band 1: Kephalaia, 2. Häfte.* Stuttgart.

Boyce, M. (1954). *The Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian*. London, New York, & Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Boyce, M. (1975). *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Téhéran-Liège (Acta Iranica 9a).

Cameron R., & A. J. Dewey. (1979). *The Cologne Mani Codex* (*P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780*) *'Concerning the Origin of his Body'*, Missoula.

Durkin-Meisterernst D. (2004). *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Dictionary of Manichaean Texts III,1). Turnhout: Brepols.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. & E. Morano. (2010). *Mani's Psalms. Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian texts in the Turfan Collection*. Turnhout: Brepols (BTT 27).

Feldmann, E. (1987). *Die 'Epistula Fundamenti' der nordafrikanischen Manichäer. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Altenberg.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (2004). *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. Roma (Biblica et Orientalia 18/B).

Fossum, J. (1985). *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origins of Gnosticism*. Tübingen: Baylor University Press.

Gardner, I. (1995). *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

Gardner, I., BeDuhn, J., and Diley, P. C. (2018). *The Chapters of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani. Part III: Pages 343-442* (*Chapters 321-347*), Leiden & Boston: Brill Academic Pub.

Gharib, B. (1995). *Sogdian Dictionary. Persian-English*, Tehran: Farhangan Publications.

Gulácsi, Z. (2014). The Prophet's Seal: A Contextualized Look at the Crystal Sealstone of Mani (216-276 C.E.), *The Bibliothèque nationale de France, Bulletin of the Asia Institute* (NS) 24, 161-185.

Henrichs, A., and L. Koenen. (1975). Der Kölner Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780) Περὶ τῆς γέννης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. Edition der Seiten 1-72, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 19/1: 1-85.

Ibn al-Nadim, Muhammad ibn Ishaq. (2002). *Al-Fihrist*. Translated into Persian by Moham-

madreza Tajaddod. Tehran, Asatir Publications (in Persian).

Ibn al-Nadim, Muhammad ibn Ishaq. (2011). *Mānī be Rivāyat-e ibn al-Nadim*. Translated into Persian by Mohsen Abolqasemi. Tehran, Tahuri Publications (in Arabic and Persian).

Ibn al-Nadim, Muhammad ibn Ishaq. (1997). *Al-Fihrist*. Beirut: al-Ma'rifa (in Arabic).

Koenen, L. & Römer, C. (1988). *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex (Über das Werden seines Leibes), Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition*. Opladen.

Lin, Wushu. (2014). *Monijiao huahua bushuo* 摩尼教華化補說 [*Additional explanations of the Sinification of Manichaeism*]. Lanzhou: Lanzhou Daxue Chubanshe.

Ma, Xiaohe. (2015). On the Date of Ritual Manual for the Celebration of the Birthday of Ancestor of Promoting Well-being from Xiapu, *Open Theology*, 455–477.

Ma, Xiaohe, & Shokri-Foumeshi, M. (2020). xwd'wn (呼大渾) 及其同源詞綜考 [On *xwd'wn* (呼大渾) and its Cognates], In《敦煌學》[*Dunhuang Studies*], vol. 36, 329-345.

Mosahab, Gholamhossein. (2001). *Dā'iratulma'ārif-i Fārsī* [*Encyclopeadia of Persian language*], Vol. 2. Tehran, Amirkabir Publications (in Persian).

Polotsky, H., and A Böhlig. (1934-1940). *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin, Band 1: Kephalaia, 1. Häfte*, Stuttgart.

Reck, C. (2004). *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*. Turnhout: Brepols (BTT 22).

Ricklefs, N. (2002). *An Angelic Community: The Significance of Beliefs about Angels in the First Four Centuries of Christianity*, PhD diss., Macquarie University.

Shokri-Foumeshi, M. (2015). *Mani's Living Gospel and the Ewangelyōnīg Hymns. Edition, Reconstruction and Commentary with a Codicological and Textological Approach Based on Manichaean Turfan Fragments in the Berlin Collection*. Qom: The University of Religions and Denominations Press.

Shokri-Foumeshi, M. (2017). Identification of a Small Fragment of Mani's Living Gospel (Turfan Collection, Berlin, M5439), *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 80(3), 473-483.

Shokri-Foumeshi, M. (2024). *Manichaean Angels. A Study on Angelology and Related Concepts in Manichaeism*, Qom: The University of Religions and Denominations Press (Eastern Religions, XXXIV).

Sims-Williams, N., and Durkin-Meisterernst, D. (2012). *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Dictionary of Manichaean Texts III, 2*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Stroumsa, G. 1986. 'Seal of the prophets': The Nature of a Manichaean Metaphor, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 7, 61-74.

Sundermann, W. (1979). Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in Iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, 95-133.

Tsui, Chi. (1943). 摩尼教下部讚 Mo Ni Chiao Hsia Pu Tsan 'The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11/1, 174-215; with an appendix by W. B. Henning, "Annotations to Mr. Tsui's Translation", 216-219.

Watson, W. G. E. (2018). Terms for Occupations, Professions and Social Classes in Ugaritic: An Etymological Study, *Folia Orientalia* 5, 307-378.

Yang, Fuxue, and Bao, Lang. (2015). Xiapu Monijiao xin wenxian 'Moni guangfo' jiaozhu 霞浦摩尼教新文獻 〈摩尼光佛〉校注 [Critical Edition of 'Mani, the Buddha of Light', a New Manichaean Document from Xiapu], *Hanshan si foxue* 寒山寺佛學 10, 74-115.

Yoshida, Yutaka. (1983). Manichaean Aramaic in the Chinese Hymnscroll, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* XLVI/2, 326-331.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Tissaphernes Archaeological Research Group, Tehran, Iran. Open Access. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.
The ethical policy of Persica Antiqua is based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) guidelines and complies with International Committee of Persica Antiqua Editorial Board codes of conduct. Readers, authors, reviewers and editors should follow these ethical policies once working with Persica Antiqua. The ethical policy of Persica Antiqua is liable to determine which of the typical research papers or articles submitted to the journal should be published in the concerned issue. For information on this matter in publishing and ethical guidelines please visit www.publicationethics.org.