NAG HAMMADI &
MANICHAEAN STUDIES

Frontiers of Faith

The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus

***

Edited by
JASON BEDUHN AND PAUL MIRECKI

brill

Frontiers of Faith

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies

VOLUME 61

Frontiers of Faith

The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus

Edited by

Jason BeDuhn & Paul Mirecki

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISSN 0929-2470
ISBN 978 90 04 16180 1

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This volume contains the results of five years of closely coordinated work of eight scholars within the Society of Biblical Literature's Manichaean Studies Seminar. The seminar's earlier incarnation as the Manichaean Studies Group contributed two previous volumes to the Brill NHMS series: *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (NHMS 43, 1997) and *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World* (NHMS 50, 2001). Both of these volumes were edited by the same editorial team that is responsible for the present volume, and we are grateful to Brill Publishers and the editors of the renowned NHMS series for their continued support of our scholarly enterprise. In particular, we would like to thank Johannes van Oort for his diligent and patient oversight of the present volume.

The new seminar's commitment to closer collaboration on a single project has yielded a more integrated volume in comparison to its predecessors. Taking as their common subject the key early Christian anti-Manichaean work, the *Acts of Archelaus* (*Acta Archelai*), the contributors offered their initial analyses and tentative conclusions at the seminar's meetings, and revised their papers in light of the ideas and criticisms as well as the other contributions of the members of the seminar. The result of this work is a carefully interwoven exploration of what the *AA* has to tell us about inter-religious contact, conflict, and comprehension at a crucial moment in religious history. The contributors to this volume have produced what amounts to a detailed commentary on the text, ordered in accordance with the sequence of the underlying text of the Acts that supplies the chief focus of each chapter. With various approaches and concerns, each chapter analyzes the *AA*'s structure and strategy, identifies its possible sources, and situates it geographically and temporally at the point of encounter between the Christian West and the Manichaean East in the early fourth century CE.

The impetus for this project came from the publication of a new English translation by Mark Vermes with commentary and notes by Samuel Lieu with the assistance of Kevin Kaatz in the Brepols Manichaean Studies series in 2001, and we are grateful to those scholars for the stimulus of their accomplishment. Yet to date no book-length study of the *AA* has ever appeared, and *Frontiers of Faith* was conceived in

the immediate aftermath of the translation's publication as a concerted effort to fill that gap. The research it contains not only identifies hitherto unsuspected authentic Manichaean materials incorporated into the *AA*, but also sheds new light on the dynamics of Manichaean penetration into the Christian West and the polemical strategies unleashed in an attempt to defend against it. In the process, *Frontiers of Faith* calls attention to and challenges the degree to which modern interpretations of the Christian-Manichaean encounter largely buy into the *AA*'s construction of this historical moment; it investigates the potential of the sources buried within the *AA* to overturn that construct and to reveal the level field of competition on which the two religions met and contested the claim to be the true Christian faith.

Jason BeDuhn and Paul Mirecki
Flagstaff, January 2007

CHAPTER ONE

PLACING THE *ACTS OF ARCHELAUS*

Jason BeDuhn and Paul Mirecki

Both Christianity and Manichaeism emerged from ethnically, socially, and politically marginalized populations of West Asia. The Semitic peoples of the region, with their long history of substantial cultural unity despite mostly ephemeral political divisions, found themselves subjugated by successive waves of Indo-European conquerors emanating from the East and West. The mutual influence of these originally distinct cultural realms was profound, as each side of this interchange adopted and accommodated to whatever seemed advantageous and superior in the other. At first, the northern Semitic (Aramaic) region was incorporated substantially intact within the successive Indo-European hegemonies. But with the expulsion of Seleucid presence from Babylonia by the Parthians in the second century BCE, the Semitic world found itself politically bifurcated for the first time in history. The brunt of the battle over West Asia that ensued for the next seven hundred years was borne by the local Semitic populations, even as their respective political masters systematically penetrated the region with a colonial presence intended to shore up their rival claims to power. In this way, West Asia became a convergence zone of linguistic, cultural, social, and civic traditions—a rich breeding ground of innovation.

The Christian movement initially erupted at the edge of the western, Roman side of the frontier. Penetrating into the cosmopolitan environment of the empire's cities, Christianity entered into a Hellenistic milieu that played a large role in defining its modes of expression, that is, its context of meaning, its terminology, and its forms of practice. Birger Pearson has captured these circumstances well in stating that, "In its expansion throughout the Mediterranean world, the Christian religion takes on the shape of other 'diaspora' religions of the Greco-Roman period, religions in which native elements are either lost or reinterpreted . . . and Greek elements taken on. In other

words, Christianity emerges as one of the 'syncretistic' religions of the Roman Empire…"[1]

Yet, from the beginning, Christianity spread east as well as west. The very same links of social and economic ties that brought members of the movement to Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome led them to Damascus, Edessa, Nisibis, Dura Europos, and Seleucia. Some degree of the same Hellenistic milieu existed in these points eastward, but the mix between these elements and others deriving from Semitic and Iranian cultural realms was different. Christianity, accordingly, took different forms in these places. There was also the relatively more insular conditions of the villages where Christianity also took root. Further complicating the picture was the ceaseless interchange between city and village, between western cities and eastern cities, between local populations and itinerant visitors.

The entire history of the spread of Christianity eastward beyond the borders of the Roman empire is smothered in legend—and late legend at that. The traditions about the missionary Addai are fabrications of the fourth century, and those of Mari are later imitations of those of Addai.[2] In fact, these two fictional heroes of Christianity's spread into Asia are little more than orthodox reflections of Mani and Adda, the principal figures in the Manichaean mission in the region. The "chronicles" of some of the leading communities of the Christian east are latter-day compilations. The earliest historically reliable references we have to Christian groups beyond the Roman frontier come from the late third century.

The Syriac dialogue *The Laws of Nations* by a disciple of Bardaisan of Edessa (of unknown date, but presumably third century) makes sweeping claims of Christian presence in many eastern lands. But what does the text mean by "Christians"? It means those who share a certain code of moral conduct that sets them apart from local custom, members of a voluntary, trans-ethnic, religious movement. The definition provided here would encompass many distinct communities who at this very time were avidly pursuing inter-sectarian conflict over the claim to the Christian tradition, and who would not so much as break bread with each other.

---

[1] Birger Pearson, *The Emergence of the Christian Religion: Essays on Early Christianity* (Harrisburg, 1997), 20.

[2] H. J. W. Drijvers, "Addai und Mani, Christentum und Manichäismus im dritten Jahrhundert in Syrien," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 201 (1983) 171–185.

From the same century we have the inscription of the Zoroastrian official Kartir on the so-called "Kaʿbah of Zoroaster" at Naqsh-i Rustam. Within the bounds of the Sassanid Persian state, he knows of four different groups that we might loosely cluster within some penumbra of the Christian movement. There are the N'CL'Y (*Nāzrāy*, from Syriac *nsry'*)—apparently Syriac-speaking "Nazareans" who adhere to a form of Christianity that has not passed through the environment of the Hellenistic cities of the west. There are the KLSTYD'N (*Kristādān*, from Syriac *krystyn'*)—clearly "Christians" whose very name indicates derivation from the Greek-speaking west. This term may have been used originally for Marcionites, but by the time of the inscription probably refers as well to deportees resettled in Persia from Roman cities sacked by Shapur I. Then there are the MKTKY (*Maktaky*, equivalent to Syriac *mnqd'*), "Purifiers" or "Baptists" who may or may not have direct affiliation to the Christian movement, including such groups as the Elchasaites and Mandaeans. And then there are the ZNDKY (*Zandaky*), the "interpreters" or "heretics" that we know as Manichaeans.

Manichaean sources going back to the third century largely confirm the picture given by Kartir's inscription. They inform us of Mani's youth as a member of the Elchasaite sect within the larger Jewish- or Semitic-Christianity category (*CMC, passim*), his conflicts with "Nazoreans" (*Keph* 221.18–223.16) and various (other) "Baptists," his response to the slightly more-Hellenized but still Syriac community identified with Bardaisan, and his exposure to the work of Paul through what must have been a Marcionite medium strongest in the Greek centers of the region. The co-existence of these diverse religious communities can be seen in part as a characteristic of urban cosmopolitanism throughout Mesopotamia. But their clearly attested presence in rural areas as well points to the entire region as a convergence zone of multiple cultural and religious traditions, not excluding Kartir's own Zoroastrianism.

The particular variety of Christian communities attested beyond the Roman eastern frontier fits the famous Bauer Thesis. Walter Bauer argued that the historical evidence showed that the earliest penetration of Christianity into eastern Syria and points beyond had been made by groups history has come to label as "heretical," or "heterodox."[3]

[3] Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Robert Kraft & Gerhard Krodel, eds.). Philadelphia, 1971. Bauer's original was published (in German) in 1934.

Only later were these groups supplanted by waves of orthodox assimilation in the fourth and following centuries. Bauer's proposal can now be updated and supplemented not only by the copious supporting evidence that has been recovered in the decades since he first made it, but also by a clearer understanding of the cultural processes involved. It is not simply a matter of non-orthodox groups that had developed alongside of proto-orthodox ones in western cities having a greater interest in eastward expansion. That interest would only emerge when the Roman world became officially orthodox of a certain kind and these groups sought out safer conditions for their non-conformity. The case in the earlier period with which we are concerned is, rather, one of groups in the east being non-orthodox precisely because they had arisen in a cultural environment distinct from the one that produced Hellenized orthodoxy.

Religious innovation and development operates within the same set of forces active in other areas of culture, such as language. Because novel developments in religious history, as they spread, encountered differing antecedent conditions, and because contact over large distances was difficult to maintain in pre-modern periods, local variations readily proliferated and consolidated into distinct "dialects," by a process akin to the "esprit de clocher" operative in language (the phrase is that of Ferdinand de Saussure).

In the historical study of religion, there has been the tendency to talk of such processes in terms of syncretism. But what do we mean by this term? Historical dialectology offers useful models by which we might sharpen what we mean when we speak of syncretism. People with different traditional norms, whether it be in language or in religious observance, come into contact. The bearers of one set of norms adopt—that is, actively innovate by adopting—aspects of the others' norms as theirs and adjust their overall system accordingly. New appropriated pieces of speech or of conduct take their place within an existing system, duplicating or displacing previous forms of expression or behavior. As a consequence, the next generation learns a new system of norms without any recognition of its complex heritage; for them it is the way of the ancestors. Over time, if further adoptions continue to displace earlier elements, the original difference between the two cultural systems is eroded. There develops either a hegemonic process by which one culture largely displaces another, or a synthetic process by which a new system, a *tertium quid*, emerges with sufficient coherence

and power to challenge the original source cultures from which it grew.

To talk in terms of such processes is to abstract from a very complex and detailed story of what individuals decide and do, both as proselytizers and as active adopters of innovation. Proselytizers do not always self-consciously perform that role, but may be merely "carriers" of their own culture's norms in new areas where they add to the existing mix of cultural options. Nor are those who adopt innovation passive recipients of cultural "influence." They often consciously and actively adopt innovation for compelling reasons—for the attractiveness of the proselytizer as a model of self, for the benefits of a new identity or status within a defined sub-group different from the general society, for the advantages of assimilation to an encroaching hegemonic order. Since the adopters of a non-indigenous cultural innovation have limited access to its foreign sources, they are likely not to replicate the source model exactly or completely, even more so since their own cultural conditioning forms a different foundation for the innovation than that which the same cultural element has in its original setting. This kind of conditioned and selective interlacing of cultural elements is what we have been talking about in the historical study of religions under the label syncretism.

Understood in this way, syncretism refers not to a type of religion, but rather to a phase in the local development of a religion when the seams of its constituent elements have not yet been smoothed over by the passage of generations into a seamlessly transmitted orthodoxy. Since orthodoxies thrive on the illusion of unchanging permanence and a pure and direct transmission of truth, it is a common part of inter-religious polemic to draw attention to a rival orthodoxy's mixed heritage, while turning a blind eye to the degree of amalgamation in one's own form of faith. Adherents of regional varieties of a religion often fail to see the cultural adaptation within their local form, while quickly spotting the cultural elements alien to them in another variety that has arisen elsewhere. The early history of Christianity is very much the story of conflict among regionally developed heterodoxies, each laying claim to one degree or another to the Christian identity, each displaying a distinct syncretistic formula. As complex as these varying features could be even within the Roman west, they offer an even more dramatic confrontation of difference in the encounter between these western Christianities and those that arose beyond the eastern frontier of the Roman world.

The most historically significant of these other Christianities given birth by the orient was Manichaeism.[4] While Hellenism had a presence in Mesopotamia in the third century, it had amalgamated with local Semitic and Iranian cultural forces, forming a cultural triangulation unique to the area. Mani worked within the modes of expression available to him in that environment; he knew no others. The limits of what he could think and say and do were set by those conditions. He understood his own religious experiences and motivations in relation to this thing called "Christianity" within the terms the latter took in Mesopotamia, that is, within the context of a diverse set of Aramaic sects—Baptist, Elchasaite, Nazarean, Bardaisanite—touched by a small dose of Hellenized Marcionism, which he may have encountered for the first time when, at age twenty-four, he left his remote Elchasaite settlement for what was known, literally as The City: the huge metropolis that had built up around Ctesiphon-Seleucia. The first generation of Manichaeans were drawn from this complex mix of cultural and religious backgrounds, and gave birth to a new religion that proved immediately and widely successful.

The Manichaean sense of mission sent its emissaries throughout the Aramaic-Syriac-speaking area. The political frontier offered no obstacle; designed to stop armies, it took little notice of small groups of travelers. Manichaeism possessed a carefully articulated response to the other religious options of that environment. We know that Mani distinguished his own insights from the teaching of Bardaisan, and that he addressed an apostolic letter to Edessa. Eventually, the representatives of Manichaeism came into contact with the Hellenized proto-orthodoxy that was unknown in the Manichaean homeland. Just where and when this occurred is a problem caught up with the larger question of where proto-orthodoxy itself was established in the third century, how diverse it was, and the degree to which it was distinguishable from the loose association of "Christians" envisioned by Bardaisan.

We know at least that the Manichaean missionary Adda traveled as far as Alexandria,[5] that other Manichaean figures operated in Egypt, and that some had reached Carthage by the end of the century. In these

---

[4] On the essential Christian roots and identity of Manichaeism, see Johannes van Oort, "Mani" and "Manichäismus," in H. D. Betz et al., ed., *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, 4th ed. (Tübingen, 1998–).

[5] According to the fragment of the Manichaean church history So 18220 (Sundermann 1981, 3.2, lines 394–395).

fully Hellenized regions, the Manichaeans studied the form Christianity took, and developed their own manner of expression to adapt and respond to the existing expectations about the meaning of Christianity. The Manichaeans handled such adaptation more self-consciously than was usually the case in the general development of religions in distinct environments. They did so certainly on the foundation of the Mesopotamia-derived original formulation of the faith, but the latter itself was not a static base; it was a constantly developing norm within the lifetime of its founder that continued to change in light of the same missionary experience that depended on it as a source.

The *Acts of Archelaus*, attributed to an otherwise unknown writer named Hegemonius,[6] purports to give an account of one of these early missionary contacts between Manichaeism and the Hellenized orthodox Christianity of the West. Through its lens, we see an exotic relative of the Christian family, "gone native" in a distant land, arriving at the doorstep of the family home, claiming to be the true heir. The arrival disturbs the rooted confidence of the local Christian leaders, who consider themselves faithful maintainers of ancestral traditions. They rally the townsfolk against the intrusive stranger with his different ways. Buried beneath the rancor of this encounter is the historical realization that these two rival religions were, indeed, separated at birth, raised in different climes, acculturated to distinct views of the world—in short, *equally* shaped by and adapted to specific local conditions. Their arguments over the family documents that might prove legitimacy—that is, the Bible—are equally determined by the divergent perspectives of their backgrounds. Yet the Manichaeans, as the interlopers, have the more difficult case to make; the judges are local men. Inevitably, the case of the Manichaeans fails and they are driven back to where they came from.

History offers a more complex picture than this tidy tale, with its wishful thinking ending. Manichaeism did not prevail, to be sure; but it did not go away either. It continued to press its claims for centuries. Our task in this book is to examine how this first encounter between Christianity and Manichaeism is depicted in the *Acts of Archelaus*, admittedly from one side of the story. Our goal is to identify the sources employed in crafting the *AA*, the rhetorical strategies used to situate

[6] The name is found in both the Latin manuscript tradition and in Photius, *Bibliotheca* 85.

Manichaeism on the defensive in the meeting of religions, and the reconstructable elements of the other voice to that encounter—that of the Manichaeans themselves.

The Text of the Acta Archelai

The *Acta Archelai* is preserved in a Latin version.[7] "Version" is used here deliberately, since, as K. Kessler and L. Traube have demonstrated, the Latin *AA* shows signs of significant redaction.[8] Portions of a Greek version (from which the Latin was redacted and translated) are preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 3.66.6.1–11, 7.5, and 25.2–31.5. Other Greek writers use some of the contents of the *AA* without providing the kind of substantive extracts we find in Epiphanius. Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century CE) cites biblical passages ostensibly discussed in the *AA* not found in the Latin version. Some Coptic sources also show familiarity with the content of the *AA*.[9] The tenth century CE writer Severus of Asmonina includes narrative details missing from the Latin version, and seems not to know any of the content of the *AA* following the first debate between Archelaus and Mani.[10] Jerome (*De viris illustribus* 72) claims the *AA* was originally composed in Syriac, and Kessler sought to prove this.[11] It is unlikely, however, given the portrayal of Mani as the speaker of an exotic foreign language, and the evident Greek medium through which some of its contents have been accessed by later Syriac writers.[12]

---

[7] Edited in Beeson 1906.

[8] Kessler 1889, 166ff.; Traube 1903.

[9] W. E. Crum, "Eusebius and the Coptic Church Historians," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (Feb. 1907), 76–77; F. Bilabel, *Ein Koptisches Fragment über die Begründer des Manichäismus* (Veröffentlichungen aus den Badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen, Heft 3; Heidelberg, 1922), 8–16; W. Klein, "Ein koptisches Antimanichaikon von Schenute von Atripe," in G. Wießner and H.-J. Klimkeit, eds., *Studia Manichaica, II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus* (Studies in Oriental Religions, 23; Wiesbaden, 1992), 367–379.

[10] See the observations of Kevin Coyle, Chapter Five, 68 and 76, on a possible original ending of the *AA* at 43.3.

[11] Kessler 1889, 87–157.

[12] Lieu 1994, 46. The *AA* apparently was unknown to earlier Syriac writers, such as Ephrem Syrus (but see the duplication of the *AA*'s anachronistic date for Mani in Ephrem, below). Pennacchietti has drawn attention to the use of the name *Stranga* for the river marking the frontier between Roman and Persian territory—clearly derived from Greek accounts of the region, as another piece of evidence favoring Greek as the *AA*'s language of composition (Pennacchietti 1988, 511).

The *AA* can be dated to the first half of the fourth century, since some of its content is made use of by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses* 6.20–35) writing around 350 CE. It was not known to Eusebius two decades earlier, although that does not rule out an earlier composition.[13] Hegemonius makes the telling blunder of having Archelaus refer to "more than three hundred years" between Christ and Mani (*AA* 31.7), inadvertently placing his characters in his own temporal locale in the second quarter of the fourth century.[14] We have no other information on who Hegemonius was, or when or where he lived.

The AA's Imagined Setting of the Encounter

As the *AA* tells it, the first encounter between eastern Manichaean Christianity and western orthodox Christianity took place on Roman soil, when Mani himself invaded orthodox lands with the intention of spreading his heresy. In the Latin version, this incursion occurred in the time of the Roman emperor Probus (276–282 CE). In his work on *Weights and Measures*, however, Epiphanius places the events of the *AA* in the reign of Gallienus (260–268 CE; *De mensuris et ponderibus* 546–558). Unless he is correcting the *AA* on the basis of other information (a doubtful proposition), Epiphanius must be presumed to derive his date from the Greek version of the *AA*. This seems confirmed by Photius, who specifies the ninth year of the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus, i.e., 262 CE, as the year in which the events described in the *AA* occurred.[15] Severus of Asmonina places the debate in Mani's thirty-fifth year, although it is doubtful if he knew when exactly that would have been (circa

---

[13] The argument that the appearance of *homoousios* in *AA* 36.8–9 marks the text as post-Nicaean (Lieu 1994, 46, 136) is unsound. The term was not invented at Nicaea, and the context of its use in the *AA* shows that it has been introduced in Manichaean teaching as a designation for the shared divinity of all souls, not as a part of Christological discussion. Arian theologians accused the council of Nicaea of adopting Manichaean language in calling the Son "a consubstantial part of the Father" (Hilary of Poitiers, *De trinitate* 4.12, 6.5, 6.10; Hilary's defense amounts to rejecting the language of "part" or "portion" while affirming "consubstantial," 6.10).

[14] Curiously, the same anachronistic dating of Mani is repeated in Ephrem Syrus, *Against Mani*: "Mani, who they say is the Paraclete that comes after three hundred years" (Mitchell/Burkert, eds., vol. 2, xcviii–xcix). Ephrem otherwise shows no knowledge of the *AA*.

[15] Photius, *Narratio de Manichaeis recens repullulantibus*, ed. by Charles Astruc, et al., "Les Sources Grecques pour l'Histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure," *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970) 131–139.

251 CE).[16] It is possible that the Latin version has changed the absolute date to bring it into line with information on the date of Mani's death (e.g., that found in Eusebius, *Chron.* [Helm 1956] 223.25–26, *Hist eccl.* 7.30.22–31.2), and perhaps to more closely associate the debate with Mani's demise than it was in the original *AA*.

The *AA* places the encounter in a city called Kaschar (Κάσχαρ) in most Greek witnesses to the *AA*, including Epiphanius,[17] Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 6), and Socrates (*Hist. eccl.* 1.22). If we take this reference at face value, it locates the debate at Kashkar on the lower Tigris river in southern Mesopotamia (across the river from the later Islamic establishment of al-Wāsit). This presents a problem, however, since the story line clearly indicates that the town was on the Roman side of the border, whereas Kashkar was well within Persian territory at the time of Mani, and had only seen a Roman standard for a couple of years under Trajan, a century before Mani was born—if it was even a substantial settlement at that time.[18] If we credit this form of the name as the original, then we must imagine that Hegemonius used the name of a well-known Mesopotamian city without himself knowing its location or circumstances.

The Latin manuscripts give the town's name as Carchar, and this form is followed by the later Coptic (e.g., Shenoute)[19] and Greek traditions (e.g., Photius).[20] If there is any reason to credit this form, it should be traced back to Syriac *karka* (Arabic *qasr*), a common place name meaning "town" of which there are easily a dozen instances in the frontier regions of the Roman and Persian empires.[21] Some researchers have proposed that Carrhae stands behind the Latin text's "Carchar." The idea was already put forward by the *AA*'s first editor, Zacagni, in 1698, and has been favorably repeated by, among others, Fiey and

[16] Kessler 1889, 169.

[17] So *Pan.* 3.66.25.5, 31.5; *De mens. et pond.* 548, 550. *Pan.* 3.66.32.1 reads Καλχαρ.

[18] Kashkar seems to have developed into a significant city only in the early Sassanid period. It originally was built on the west bank of Tigris. During a flood in the later Sassanid period, the Tigris burst its banks and resettled in a new channel—perhaps following an irrigation canal—that left Kashkar on the east bank. In the early Islamic period, a new town was built on the west bank of the new channel, al-Wāsit, which gradually drew off the population of Kashkar, until it became a ghost town. A list of the supposed Christian bishops of the town exists, but is certainly legendary for the period in which the *AA* is set, so it is vain to look for Archelaus there.

[19] Klein 1992, 374–375.

[20] Astruc et al., 1970, 135.

[21] Lieu 1994, 45.

Pennacchietti.[22] Without crediting the meeting of Mani and Archelaus as an authentic historical event, Samuel Lieu has supported this possible identification as the author's intent.[23] The general geographic relation of Carrhae to the border in the time of Mani (presuming it to have been the Khabur river), the existence of a nearby "twisted" (*stranga*) waterway (applicable to the Khabur or a number of other rivers of the region) marking that border, and the presence of a Macedonian colonial population all fit elements of the *AA*'s depiction.[24] But Lieu cautions that Carrhae had no substantial Christian population, even at the time of the *AA*'s composition,[25] so that Hegemonius would have been combining the physical setting of Carrhae with a largely imagined Christian community and leadership. Hegemonius could have taken things he knew about Carrhae and used them to construct a fictional or "typical" locale for his narrative.

The scenario suggested by Lieu is to be preferred to taking either the events of the *AA* as historical fact or Carrhae as the actual locale of the story. The corruption of Greek Κάρραι to Κάρχαρ is implausible, especially with a dozen places called Κάρχα in the region that we would have to pass over in making such an identification. Likewise, the presumption that the Khabur river is the line of frontier from which all of the *AA*'s distances should be computed is misguided, given the lack of evidence that it marked such a frontier at any time, and particularly at the time in question.

The *AA* mentions two other settlements in its narrative. The first is Castellum Arabionis. Kessler, noting the role of this locale as a kind of regional headquarters of Mani, proposed to identify it with Charax Spasinou. He thought the name had been picked up from a Manichaean text and worked into the story.[26] Nöldeke, in his review of Kessler, offered the suggestion of ʿArabān on the west bank of the Khabur river (Oraba or Horaba in the *Notitia Dignitarum*), which has been taken up by Fiey.[27]

---

[22] J. M. Fiey, *Assyrie Chrétienne*, vol. III (Beirut, 1968) 152–155; F. Pennacchietti 1988.

[23] Lieu 1994, 45. Kessler attributed the confusion of Kashkar with Carrhae to the Latin translator of the *AA*, and in this way sought to explain the change in the rendering of the city's name (Kessler 1889, 96–97).

[24] Lieu 1994, 141.

[25] Lieu 1994, 45, 142–143.

[26] Kessler, 89–96.

[27] Nöldeke, in *ZDMG* 43 (1889) 541.

Pennacchietti has cited references to a "Castel Ara" in documents from Dura Europos.[28] But the *AA* clearly describes it as a settlement just across the river marking the Roman-Sassanid frontier, that is, on the Persian side. This location points instead to its identification with Dūr ʿArabāyā (Castellum Arabionis would be the literal translation of this name into Latin) on the east bank of the middle Tigris (see Ammianus Marcellinus 25.6.9–11). Nöldeke ultimately favored a settlement along this part of the Tigris as best fitting the description given by the *AA*.[29] It marked for the Iranians the frontier between their own land and the lands of the *ʿArab* people in northern Mesopotamia, including Hatra and Nisibis.[30] The other settlement mentioned in the *AA* is called Diodoris. But since this is a mere village (κώμη), we cannot expect to be able to locate it exactly.

Finally, the *AA* refers to a river named Stranga, five days from Kaschar/Carchar (approximately 120 miles, 200 km), that marked the border between Roman and Persian territory (*AA* 4.3; while a journey of six days and nights was required from the village of Diodoris near Kaschar/Carchar to reach the Persian province of Babylonia: *AA* 63.1). Several suggestions have been made as to the identity of this river, the Khabur appearing most frequently despite any and all problems with such an identification, apparently because of the certainty many have had that the Khabur marked the Roman frontier with Persia. If ever it was, it was not at the time of Mani nor at the time of the *AA*'s composition.[31] It is crucial to note that the *AA* carefully differentiates between Mesopotamia and Persia, and the Stranga is specifically said to mark the boundary between the two regions, with Mesopotamia in Roman hands (*AA* 4.1, 4.4). This distinction does not reflect political conditions at the time the story is set. Roman Mesopotamia had fallen into Persian hands in the 250s and 260s, and was only regained by Galerius in 298.[32] In fact, the river Stranga is quite simply the Tigris, given the name Stranga in such works of the time as the *History of Alexander the Great* by Ps.-Callisthenes (ed. Kroll, 2.14–15; Armenian

---

[28] Pennacchietti 1988, 505–507.

[29] Nöldeke, "Nachtrag zu der Anzeige von Kessler's *Mani*," *ZDMG* 44 (1890) 399, citing the opinion of G. Hoffmann.

[30] Javier Teixidor, "Notes hatréennes," *Syria* 41 (1964), 273–284, esp. 280–284; André Maricq, "Res Gestae Divi Saporis," *Syria* 35 (1958), 295–360, cited 305 n5.

[31] See Fergus Millar, *The Roman Near East, 31 BC–AD 337* (Cambridge, 1993), 129, 181.

[32] Millar 1993, 174.

version, 175–188),[33] more often called the *Araxās* in classical sources, both forms ultimately going back to the Iranian name *Arang*.[34] The river has taken on certain legendary features in such literature, but still closely reflects the description and placement of the Tigris in Arrian's *Campaigns of Alexander*, 3.7–8.[35] In both accounts, its dangerously swift current in its upper reaches is remarked upon, and the proximity of the Battle of Gaugamela to its banks noted.

If we were to combine all of this geographic information in a straightforward manner, we would have to identify Kaschar/Carchar with Hatra (although destroyed in 240–241), or Singara, or even Nisibis.[36] But the various pieces of information do not fit together very well, and it is unlikely that Hegemonius was working with coherent, synchronic information on the geographic setting for his story. In trying to locate the setting of the *AA*, we must contend not only with uncertainties of place, but also variables of time. There are clear anachronisms in the *AA*, and it is possible that Hegemonius' sense of the location of the border might have been similarly affected by changes between the time in which his narrative is set and his own. The border between the Roman and Persian empires shifted several times in the years intervening between the ostensible date of the story and the first external testimony to the *AA*.

The advanced border held under the Severans was overrun by the Persians in the 250s and 260s. Aurelian reestablished the Roman eastern frontier in 272 along a line that corresponded to the much older Parthian-period border. Effective control reached as far as Circesium, at the confluence of the Khabur and Euphrates, defining a wedge of trans-Euphratean land encompassing Callinicum, Carrhae, and Edessa, with the border following the Euphrates again north of Samosata. It

---

[33] The Ps.-Callisthenes Alexander Romance is of uncertain date, but generally dated before 200 CE, and around 300 CE was translated into Latin by Julius Valerius (M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 2 ed., Munich, 1914, IV, I, 47–50).

[34] Nöldeke, "Nachtrag zu der Anzeige von Kessler's *Mani*," *ZDMG* 44 (1890) 399, citing Hoffmann. See Markwart, *Wehrot und Arang. Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran*, H. H. Schaeder, ed., Leiden, 1938, 116.

[35] Pennacchietti takes the *AA*'s use of the form *Stranga* to indicate that it was dependent on Ps.-Callisthenes and therefore probably composed in Alexandria (Pennacchietti, 511).

[36] A third settlement of the area, Ur, north of (uninhabited) Hatra and south of Singara, was apparently a "Persian fortress" at the time of Julian's campaign (Am. Marc. 25.8), and so marked the western extent of Persian control under the terms of the treaty of Galerius with Narseh in 298.

was in this trans-Euphratean border region that the forces of Narseh and Galerius met in 296, with the Romans suffering a serious defeat. But Galerius returned to the offensive in 297–298, and this time prevailed. As a consequence, the border shifted radically eastward, giving Rome control over northern Mesopotamia between the Euphrates and Tigris rivers.[37]

Galerius' campaign route down the Tigris valley passed two neighboring fortified settlements on the east bank of the Tigris south of the Lesser Zab: Karka and Dūr ʿArabāyā, known to us from later reports of the Roman retreat up the Tigris following the death of Julian in 363 (Ammianus Marcellinus 25.6.9–11).[38] Whether or not Roman authority ever really extended to the east bank of the Tigris,[39] these place names would have become familiar from the official reports of Galerius' campaign, as well as from the story-telling of its veterans.

Scholarly consensus now solidly takes the position that the events as described in the *AA* are fictitious. Hegemonius drew on regional facts to set an imaginary scene in which his two protagonists could enact the clash of rival faiths at the border of two worlds. Yet although the scene is imaginary, Hegemonius did not simply make up the details of the exchange, but derived them from Manichaean and non-Manichaean sources of varying worth (see below). That fact raises the question whether any of the characters, places, and individual events of the story might come from such sources.

The Structure and Sources of the Acts of Archelaus

Different schemas have been suggested for how the content of the *AA* should be divided. It seems reasonable to see four more or less distinct parts within it.[40] Part I includes (a) the introduction of Marcellus

---

[37] See Millar 1993, 177–179.

[38] See F. P. T. Sarre, et al., *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet* (Berlin, 1911), vol. 1, 66 n1.

[39] Ammianus Marcellinus makes no mention of a Roman garrison in either town at the time of Julian's campaign; nor for that matter does he say anything about overcoming Persian garrisons in them. They may have been essentially demilitarized settlements within the trans-Tigritean regions supposedly ceded to the Romans according to the terms of the treaty of Galerius and Narseh (Millar 1993, 178). These areas were demanded back by Shapur II following the death of Julian (Am. Marc. 25.7): Arzanene, Moxoene, Zabdicene, Rehimene, and Corduene, the cities of Nisibis, Singara, and Moor's Fort, and fifteen smaller forts.

[40] For a different quadripartite division see Zittwitz 1873, 468–70.

(1–3), (b) Mani's letter to him and his to Mani (4–6), and (c) Turbo's summary of Manichaean cosmogony (7–13). Part II presents the first encounter between Archelaus and Mani (14–43.2). Part III covers (a) Mani's flight to Diodoris (43.3–5), (b) the eponymous Diodorus' (but Greek Tryphon) letter to Archelaus and Archelaus' to him (44–51), and (c) the confrontation between Mani and Diodorus (52), all as the preamble to (d) Mani's second encounter with Archelaus (53–60). Part IV is composed of an appendix that includes (a) Archelaus' presentation of Mani's antecedents and earlier life and ultimate death (61–66), and (b) a comparison of his views with those of other heretics (67–68). The arrangement is thus:

Part I: Prologue
- a. introduction of Marcellus (1–3)
- b. exchange of letters: Mani and Marcellus (4–6)[41]
- c. Turbo's summary of Manichaean cosmogony (7–13)[42]

Part II: The first encounter between Archelaus and Mani in Kaschar/Carchar (14–43.2)[43]

Part III: Mani in Diodoris
- a. Mani's flight to Diodoris (43.3–5)
- b. exchange of letters: Diodorus and Archelaus (44–51)[44]
- c. encounter between Mani and Diodorus (52)
- d. Mani's second encounter with Archelaus (53–60)[45]

Part IV: Epilogue
- a. biography of Mani (61–66), partly included in second encounter with Archelaus[46]
- b. Mani's place among the heretics (67–68)[47]

Hegemonius should be credited with the basic narrative structure of Mani's encounters with Marcellus, Archelaus, and Tryphon/Diodoris, including the introduction of Marcellus (Ia: *AA* 1–3), Marcellus' reaction and letter to Mani (from Ib: *AA* 6), and Mani's flight to Diodoris (IIIa:

[41] On this section, see Chapter Three of this volume.
[42] On this section, see Chapter Four of this volume.
[43] On this section, see Chapters Two, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight of this volume.
[44] On this section, see Chapters Six and Nine of this volume.
[45] On this section, see Chapters Two, Five, Six, and Eight of this volume.
[46] On this section, see Chapter Ten of this volume.
[47] On this section, see Chapter Eleven of this volume.

AA 43.3–5). More importantly, he probably is the author of the bulk of the anti-Manichaean argument placed in the mouth of Archelaus in the first encounter between Archelaus and Mani (II: *AA* 14–43.2), the exchange between Archelaus and Tryphon/Diodorus (IIIb: *AA* 44–51), the confrontation between Mani and Tryphon/Diodorus (IIIc: *AA* 52), and Mani's second encounter with Archelaus (IIId: *AA* 53–60). Throughout this material, Hegemonius seeks to carefully frame Mani—both in the sense of placing him within a particular manner of viewing and in the sense of associating him with the marks of a fraud and charlatan. He carefully crafts the contrast between such a man and a legitimate man of God such as Archelaus, as thoroughly explored by J. Kevin Coyle in chapters two and five of this volume.

The rest of the content of the *AA*—mostly Manichaean, but some additional polemical material—appears to depend upon sources to which Hegemonius had access in the first half of the fourth century. In chapter three of this volume, Iain Gardner finds reasons to affirm the possible derivation of Mani's letter to Marcellus (Ib: *AA* 4–5) from an authentic letter of Mani, albeit edited and adjusted to its new role in Hegemonius' narrative. In chapter six, Jason BeDuhn proposes to find in the arguments of Mani within the debates with Archelaus (II: *AA* 14–43.2 and IIId: *AA* 53–60) the bulk of the same letter, cut into pieces and interlaced with Christian rebuttals to Mani's views on dualism, Christology, the rejection of the god of the Old Testament, and his own role as an authorized interpreter of Christ. In chapter nine, BeDuhn demonstrates that the report of Tryphon/Diodorus to Archelaus about Manichaean critiques of the Old Testament (IIIb: *AA* 44–45) closely matches authentic Manichaean material on this subject, and is likely to depend on material such as the Manichaean missionary Adda's book of Old and New Testament *Antitheses* (or perhaps similar contrasts adopted by the Manichaeans from the work of Marcion).

The confrontation of such sources with carefully crafted replies from the proto-orthodox Christian position that Hegemonius created in the *AA* affords us the opportunity to see the sharp delineation of two opposing claims to the Christian heritage and to religious dominance in late antique West Asia. In chapter seven of this volume, Kevin Kaatz examines how Manichaeism demarcated its own interpretive ground within its overarching dualistic framework. In chapter eight, Timothy Pettipiece explores how this same dualistic framework yields a view of authority and the proper attributes of God radically at odds with that found in the orthodox tradition.

Three sections of the *AA* have always stood apart from Hegemonius' main narrative in the eyes of the work's readers. Researchers have long considered the account of Manichaeism supplied by Turbo, the anti-hagiography of Mani attributed to Sisinnios, and the comparative discussion of other heresies at the end of the *AA*, to reflect independent materials that Hegemonius has fitted into his main narrative.

Turbo's summary of the Manichaean belief system (Ic: *AA* 7–13) has been highly valued as a synthetic summary of the religion, but questioned as to its reliability. In chapter four of this volume, Tudor Sala demonstrates how Turbo's variation from other Manichaean sources may be considered in light of patterns of variation inherent to mythic narrative, and not necessarily mistakes or deliberate distortions of a presumed normative Manichaean myth. M. Scopello has suggested that the account of Turbo derives from a summary of Manichaeism given by Mani to his disciples for use in missionary work.[48] No dependence on any other polemical accounts can be demonstrated. In part this may reflect its early date; but it must also be said that none of its variations from primary Manichaean sources on the same subject display an obvious polemical intent.

Instead, several features of the Turbo passage make it resemble a doxographical account, comparable to the summaries of Hellenistic philosophical schools found in such writers as Arius Didymus and Aetius.[49] Hegemonius may be using some such digest summary. The hypothetical source would most closely resemble Alexander of Lycopolis' report on Manichaeism, in that it seems aware of some elements of Christian thought (e.g., Jesus, paradise, Adam and Eve, Moses) without making a comparison or assessment in light of Christianity its primary interest. The work of Alexander has been preserved because it goes on to polemicize, and to make cautiously positive remarks about Christianity by comparison; to the degree that the source behind the Turbo passage did not have such features, there was less interest and motivation in preserving it.

With two possible exceptions, no subsequent anti-Manichaean writer can be shown to use this source directly, rather than relying on the

[48] Scopello 2000, 542–543.

[49] We are grateful to Byard Bennett for this suggestion, along with some of the comparative observations on which it is based (personal communication).

AA itself. The first possible exception is *P.Rylands Gr.* 469, published by Roberts, which in lines 23–27 quotes an "Apology to the Bread" closely matching (when allowance is made for what is lost in a lacuna) that given in *AA* 10.6.[50] There is, however, a polemical addition to this statement in the *AA* not found in *P.Rylands Gr.* 469 ("When he has said this to himself, he replies to the person who brought it: 'I have prayed for you', and then the person goes.")[51] which, unless it was added by Hegemonius, would suggest that his source was secondary to *P.Rylands Gr.* 469, rather than vice versa. The second possible exception is a short text from a medieval manuscript found at the "White Monastery," *Paris Copte 131*[4] folia 157–158, published by L. Lefort[52] and subsequently shown by H. J. Polotsky to parallel portions of the Turbo passage.[53] Lefort dated the original composition on internal evidence to the fourth century. It refers to Athanasius, as if to a contemporary, as the source of its information on the Manichaeans.[54] Polotsky, without commenting on the reference to Athanasius, assumed that the text was dependent either on the *AA* itself or on the quotation of this material in Epiphanius. Since all of the parallels fall within the Turbo passage, however, it is possible that the Coptic text depends on a source it shares with Hegemonius. Is Athanasius that shared source? It would seem unlikely. Although Athanasius frequently refers to Manichaeism in his letters and other writings, he is not known to have written a systematic exposition of the religion, by itself or as part of a catalog of heresies. Moreover the relatively neutral tone of the Turbo passage (which is not maintained in the parallels of the Coptic text) does not suggest someone like Athanasius as its author. If the attribution of the information to Athanasius is to be credited, then, it is probable that Athanasius himself quoted selectively from the same source used by Hegemonius (the two were contemporaries), and the Coptic text has the information at second hand. The passage is as follows (with parallels to the *AA* in italics):

---

[50] C. H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, III* (Manchester, 1938), 38–46.

[51] Vermes, 54.

[52] As an Anhang to W. Bang and A. von Gabain, "Türkische Turfan-Texte, 2," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie* 22 (1929), 429–430.

[53] Polotsky 1932.

[54] "So have we been instructed about the mass of their impiety by one who knows all of their wickedness, the holy messenger of the Lord, Athanasius the archbishop. Moreover we know the error of many heretics through his letters."

> Now the Manichaeans say that *if it is a soul of a murderer that has died, it is transferred into a body of a leper* (= *AA* 10.1). And resorting again to their atheism, they say that *the air is the soul of animals, and humans, and birds, and fish, and reptiles, and of all that which is in the world* (= *AA* 10.8). Just as they also say that *this body is not of God but of Matter, and that it is a darkness and must again be made darkness* (= *AA* 10.8). Now about *the sky and the earth, they say that they are not of God* (= *AA* 11.1). They reject *the words of the holy prophets,* saying that *those who follow them will die* (= *AA* 11.3).

Doxographical summaries have a hit-and-miss quality in their accuracy, often arising from an effort to fit the teachings of a school into a pre-established set of topical categories: how many first principles/gods? what are the chief elements constituting the cosmos? what was the manner in which the cosmos was formed? what explanation is given for various natural phenomena or processes? what is the fate of human beings and of the world? what are the dietary and ethical teachings? how many diadochoi did the founder have, and who were the principle ones? One finds several misrepresentations of the Manichaean position in the account, not all of which can be attributed to the sort of narrative options explored by Sala: Manichaeism's substantial and ethical dualism is artificially reduced to an opposition between "two gods" and between soul and body (7.1); in the enumeration of the five elements, matter (Latin *materia*, Greek ὕλη) mistakenly takes the place of air (7.3); Jesus rather than the Living Spirit is said to construct the mechanism for the purgation and redemption of souls (8.5); the number of elect is said to be only seven, which is probably a distortion of the twelve teachers who formed the inner circle around Mani (11.4). These misrepresentations are simply factual errors and do not serve any definite polemical purpose or set up any future line of polemic later in the document.

It seems likely that Hegemonius found such a source ideal for his narrative intention of depicting Manichaeism as a religious system originally lacking any significant Christian elements that had been strategically Christianized for the purposes of leading astray a Christian audience. Because the doxographical report had been penned by either a non-Christian or at least someone disinterested in focusing on Manichaeism's Christian elements, it provided just what Hegemonius wanted to put forward as the real face of Mani's teachings. He does not need to shape it for refutation, because he does not need to refute it. It serves its purpose in his larger scheme merely by offering an account of Manichaeism relatively devoid of Christian elements.

A similar sort of doxographical account of the cosmogonical views of "barbarians" finds a place at the end of the *AA*, as a kind of appendix to the narrative serving to demonstrate Mani's similarity to other heretics (IVb: *AA* 67–68). Hegemonius attributes the cosmogony to the early gnostic Basilides, whom he seems rather deliberately to misidentify as a Persian, and then proceeds to quote a passage that has significant parallels with Manichaean views. Mani comes across as a johnny-come-lately dependent on earlier heretics. But as Byard Bennett demonstrates in chapter eleven of this volume, all is not as it seems. While the passage may be authentically from Basilides (and so from a source too early to be the same as that used to supply Turbo's account of Manichaeism), it represents not the views of Basilides himself, but rather his report of dualistic ideas found in certain "barbarian" cultures—or at least attributed to them by a familiar trope of philosophical indirection, by which reflections of philosophical ideas are projected onto various ancient and exotic cultures. As Bennett shows, the trail of these supposed "barbarians" leads right back to Middle Platonic speculations of the Hellenistic world.

The polemical biography of Mani and his heretical antecedents (IVa: *AA* 61–66) has long fascinated researchers. Sure of its intent to smear and discredit Mani, they have nonetheless wondered if any accurate and worthwhile information might be extracted from its colorful fiction. The account is attributed to none other than Sisinnios, whom we know to have been Mani's successor as leader of the Manichaean community, although he is portrayed in the *AA* as someone who had abandoned Manichaeism. It is divided into two parts, the first purporting to give an account of Mani's origins and career up to the encounter described in the preceding parts of the *AA* (*AA* 61–65), and the second claiming to describe his arrest and execution immediately upon returning to Persian territory after his defeat at the hands of bishop Archelaus (*AA* 66). In the first part of this narrative, the identification of exotic and dubious religious figures as antecedents of Mani seems to be a polemical distortion of authentic Manichaean accounts of the prophets who preceded him, such as Zoroaster and the Buddha. In chapter ten of this volume, Paul Mirecki detects in the story of one of these imagined forebears, Terebinthus, the author's familiarity with authentic practices of ecstatic ascent known from Greek magical papyri of the period. He explores the ill-defined boundary between religiously reputable visionary ascent and the sort of self-aggrandizing magical flight associated with sorcerers, and shows how Hegemonius manipulates this boundary to discredit the claims of Mani and his forebears to spiritual experiences.

The depiction of Mani's own life in this account has many points of contact with the narrative of Mani's missions and death recovered in both Coptic and Middle Iranian Manichaean literature, such as Mani's Iranian title *kirbakkar*, rendered as Corbicius (*AA* 64.2–3), his age at the time of his death as approximately sixty (*AA* 64.4), the sending out of key disciples to start new missions, including ones named Adda and Thomas (*AA* 64.4, 64.6), his reception of missionary reports from his disciples and his preparation of texts for their use (*AA* 65.1–6), his close identification with the Christian expectation of the Paraclete (*AA* 65.6), his activities as a healer to the royal court (*AA* 64.7) and the association of his disfavor at court with a death in the royal family (*AA* 64.8, 66.3), his imprisonment in heavy chains (*AA* 64.9), and the flaying of his body and its display at the gates of the capital (*AA* 66.3). Given this close correspondence of information, one has to wonder if Hegemonius actually is speaking of himself when he writes, "When Archelaus later learnt of this, he added it to the earlier disquisition" (*AA* 66.4).

In correspondence with the latter part of this biography (*AA* 66), Manichaean sources do place Mani in areas along the middle Tigris river in the months before his death. In the Coptic *Homilies*, 42ff., it is said that Mani had been turned back from traveling to the eastern territories of the Persian empire. He then turned north, traveling up the Tigris first to Ctesiphon and then to a place called "Pargalia." In *AA* 65.7, Mani travels north to *Castellum Arabionis* after being warned in a dream that the Persian emperor intended him harm. The locations given by the Manichaean narrative and by the *AA* match remarkably well. If the *AA*'s *Castellum Arabionis* is Dūr ʿArabāyā, this city would fall into the vicinity apparently indicated in the *Homilies* as Pargalia, that is, an area along the Tigris north of Kholassar or Khalassar (a city in the Diyala river basin), and south of the Lesser Zab river. The Peutinger table has a "Phalcara" in this location.[55] In the Manichaean account, Mani returns south from Pargalia, apparently in answer to the summons of the emperor. In the *AA* he is arrested at *Castellum Arabionis* and taken to the capital by force. His meeting with the emperor, death, and flaying follow in both accounts (the Manichaean narrative makes it clear that Mani died in prison, and that his flaying was post-mortem; this is left unclear in *AA* 66.3). Hegemonius' reliance on Manichaean sources—either directly or mediated by another polemicist—seems clear.

[55] The identification of Pargalia and Phalcara was first suggested by Schaeder *apud* Polotsky, *Homilies* 44n.

While caution should be observed in assuming distinct sources behind every change of direction within an ancient text, it remains true that many ancient texts were composed by a process comparable to building a new automobile out of parts scavenged from older models. The *AA* bears the weld-marks of such a process. Hegemonius has pieced together an odd assortment of parts—at times skillfully, at times haphazardly—to yield an apparently effective polemical tool. By doing so, he attempted to seize control of an historical encounter between two faiths, and rewrite it to the decisive advantage of his own. His work has been preserved as an indicator of the ultimate success of his venture, which at the same time has largely swept away the voice of his opponents. For much of subsequent history, the Manichaeans have only been able to speak as Hegemonius and other Christian polemicists like him have determined they are to be heard. To be effective in their own time and reinforce the frontiers of their own faith, however, these Christian writers had to answer some of the claims and charges of their Manichaean rivals. That led them to incorporate bits and pieces of authentic Manichaean rhetoric in their accounts, however much abbreviated and garbled for their purposes. By performing an archaeology on the *AA* and texts like it, therefore, we have an opportunity to partially reconstruct the encounter between Manichaeism and Christianity as it was unfolding at the time, to understand what the participants saw as the key issues dividing them, to see the rhetorical strategies by which each side tried to defend its own position and persuade the still undecided general population, and to catch a glimpse of two religions in the process of defining themselves in the encounter with each other.

CHAPTER TWO

HESITANT AND IGNORANT: THE PORTRAYAL OF MANI IN THE *ACTS OF ARCHELAUS*

J. Kevin Coyle

It is a commonplace that the *Acts of Archelaus* (*AA*) were highly influential in early Christian heresiology; a commonplace, too, that this influence extended mainly to the work's outline of the Manichaean cosmogony, and to the biographical details it supplied on Mani.[1] Here I will look at the agenda behind those details and the general picture of Mani they seek to convey, as a way toward a further understanding of the *AA*'s inner structure and purpose.[2]

Introducing the Antagonists

Both antagonists, Mani and Archelaus, are introduced in the way the author means them to go on. The reader first meets Mani in chapter 4, where he is quickly cast in an unfavorable light: "he debated with himself very seriously as to how he could ensnare him [Marcellus] in the nets of his own doctrine" (*AA* 4.1).[3] This despite Mani's demurral in his letter to Marcellus, where, quoting 1 Cor 7:35, he asserts that he

[1] See M. Scopello 2000, 541–44.

[2] Be it noted that, although Manes and Manichaeus are the names given Manichaeism's founder in the AA, he is commonly called Mani by modern scholars, and that is what I will call him here, except when passages cited include some other form. Mani is referred to as "Manichaeus" only in the vocative, in 20.1 and 26.2 (by the judges, who call him "Manes" in 27.1) and 27.8, 54.3, and 58.11 (by Archelaus, who otherwise calls him "Manes"). The narrator always refers to "Manes."

[3] Vermes, 39 (Beeson 1906, 4.23–24: plurimum ipse secum volvebat quemadmodum eum doctrinae suae posset laqueis inretire). Marcellus is also the name of the prominent citizen who welcomes Simon Magus to Rome, in the *Acts of Peter*, as pointed out by several commentators. See B. R. Voss 1970, 150–51. On further connections with Simon, see Spät 2004, esp. 5–18. Lim 1996, 262 n21, observes that in both cases "the issue was the securing of the foremost local notable." In any case, the link between the two Marcelluses is intentional. See *AA* 3.5 (Beeson 1906, 4.11–12: Marcelli veteris imitatus exempla).

does not need to set a snare for anyone (*AA* 5.6).[4] But, if he really is a snarer, he is portrayed as a cautious (cowardly?) one: "he feared that by an unexpected and sudden approach some harm might be generated to himself" (*AA* 4.2).[5] Then there is Mani's appearance, "clearly intended," says Lieu, "to accentuate his connections with a still hostile Persia."[6] The well-known description is short enough to be reproduced here (*AA* 14.3):

> He wore a kind of shoe usually referred to in common speech as a *trisole*; he also had a multicolored cloak, somewhat ethereal in appearance; in his hand he held a very sturdy staff of ebony wood; under his left arm he carried a Babylonian book; his legs were wrapped in trousers of different colours, one leg in red and the other in green; and his whole appearance was like that of an old Persian wizard or warlord.[7]

Since I have addressed this description elsewhere,[8] I need only point out here that, the historicity of the narrative aside,[9] the otherwise gratuitous comment that Mani resembled some sort of warlord or wizard (*artifex*) may be intended to enhance his foreignness on the one hand and, on the other, to offset his reputation as a physician.[10]

Archelaus, the otherwise unknown bishop of "Carchar," "was inwardly eager to launch an attack on Manes because of his costume and appearance" (*AA* 14.4).[11] In fact, Archelaus had been spoiling for

---

[4] This element also appears at the beginning of Mani's letter (AA 5.1, Vermes, 41): "may the Right Hand of Light preserve you…from the snares of the evil one" (Beeson 1906, 5.27–6.17: dextera lucis conservet te a…laqueis maligni). This passage also survives in Greek. Archelaus picks up on the snare theme in the second encounter (AA 59.11).

[5] Vermes, 39 (Beeson 1906, 5.2–3: verebatur enim ne forte inproviso et subito ingressu malum sibi aliquod nasceretur).

[6] Lieu, in Vermes, 58 n81. See Scopello 2000, 537–38.

[7] Vermes, 58 (Beeson 1906, 22.25–23.1: habebat enim calciamenti genus, quod trisolium vulgo appellari solet; pallium autem varium, tamquam aërina specie; in manu vero validissimum baculum tenebat ex ligno ebelino; Babylonium vero librum portabat sub sinistra ala; crura etiam bracis obtexerat colore diverso, quarum una rufa, alia velut prasini coloris erat; vultus vero ut senis Persae artificis et bellorum ducis videbatur).

[8] Coyle 2004.

[9] Lieu 1986, 489–90, regards the whole account, including "Carchar," as fictional. So does Spät 2004, who sees an influence of accounts of Simon Magus. This was already suggested by F. C. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwikelt*, Tübingen, 1831 (repr. Göttingen: 1928; Hildesheim and New York: 1973), 467–75. For other early opinions on the account's historicity, see Pennachietti 1988, 504–05; and Chapter One of this volume.

[10] On Mani as a physician in Manichaean sources see Coyle 1999, esp. 146–51.

[11] Vermes, 59 (Beeson 1906, 23.3: invehi in eum animo urgebatur ex ipso habitu ac specie eius).

a fight from the start. Before even laying eyes on his opponent, his reaction to Mani's letter, as Marcellus read it aloud, was immediate: he "received the contents as they were read without any pleasure, and gnashed his teeth like a caged lion [see 1 Pet 5:8], eager to get his hands on the author of the letter" (*AA* 6.1).[12] Again, hearing Turbo's account of Manichaean cosmogony, Archelaus was "greatly incensed" (*AA* 14.1).[13] Contrast this with the layperson Marcellus, who remained both calm and calming (*AA* 14.1). As though realizing a potentially damaging comparison, the author of the *AA*, while admitting Archelaus' lack of self-control, hastens to excuse his behavior with the aid of a curious simile: "Archelaus was anxious for his people, like a shepherd for his sheep, when traps are being set by wolves" (*AA* 14.1).[14]

The First Encounter

Such is the preamble to the two encounters between Archelaus and Mani. Mani begins the first in classic Manichaean fashion, over the issues of evil's origin and of dualism.[15] But he is confounded by the first question put to him: "At this Manes hesitated because he could not find a reply. For he was examining the conclusion that would follow from either answer, and reconsidering his position" (*AA* 17.5);[16] and he will hesitate again during the encounter (*AA* 18.2). (Here, as earlier in 4.2, we note how the author presumes to know what is going on in Mani's head: see also 53.2).

---

[12] Vermes, 42–43 (Beeson 1906, 8.6–8: Archelaus vero ea quae lecta sunt non libenter amplexus velut leo conclusus dentibus infrendebat, auctorem epistulae sibi desiderans dari).

[13] Vermes, 58 (Beeson 1906, 22.16: vehementer accendebatur).

[14] Vermes, 58 (Beeson 1906, 22.18–19: Archelao autem erat cura pro populo, tamquam pastori pro ovibus, cum luporum parantur insidiae). Vermes' translation here is somewhat misleading.

[15] See Lim 1995, 89 (evil) and 75 (dualism).

[16] Vermes, 65 (Beeson 1906, 28.8–10: At vero Manes remoratus est non inveniendo responsum; intuebatur enim quod ex utroque concluderetur, retractans). This is precisely the reaction of the Indian (or Iranian?) sage Gwndyš when challenged by Mani to explain the origins of the world, in Turfan fragment M 6041, R18 (1377)–V5 (1395), in Sundermann 1981, 86–89 (= 4b.1). See Lim 1995, 86: "Reducing someone to a state of literal *aphōnia* was a complete refutation and triumph in a public debate. To an undiscriminating audience, it did not much matter whether success came from one's own arguments, or from divine intervention."

In contrast, Archelaus loses his cool but never his confidence. His opening gambit already makes it personal. Mani, he says, seems "full of insanity" and his doctrine is "grotesque" (*AA* 17.3).[17] He is "delirious" and forgetful (*AA* 17.7;[18] see 59.10), and a devious prevaricator (*AA* 26.6).[19] In what is by now standard anti-heretical discourse,[20] he calls Mani ignorant and short on intelligence (*AA* 27.3).[21] He is a "false Christ and a false prophet" (*AA* 39.9;[22] see 42.11), a Satan and "vessel of the Antichrist" (*AA* 40.1–2; see 64.9).[23] He is more heretical and lower in intellect than Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides (*AA* 42.1). He is a barbarian Persian (*AA* 40.5), a "barbarian priest and conspirator with Mithras" (*AA* 40.7).[24] And early on, Archelaus informs the judges (without further proof) that "it is sufficient for me to have made these statements . . . to show you what sort of man he was" (*AA* 41.14).[25]

These four judges (who, though given individual names, never act as individuals) have been chosen for this encounter to project the illusion of impartiality.[26] They are clearly pagan (*religione gentiles, AA* 14.5;[27] see also 18.1), but it is also clear early in the debate whose side they are on. They even quote Scripture (*AA* 25.1 and 41.2)!—in one instance, conveniently leading into Archelaus' remark that "the Gospel is much

---

[17] Vermes, 65 (Beeson 1906, 27.30–28.2: Insaniae magis quam prudentiae videtur mihi plenus iste [. . .]. Ingentem doctrinam ferens ades).

[18] Vermes, 65 (Beeson 1906, 28.15–16: Videris mihi delirus esse et obliviscens propostitionum tuarum).

[19] Beeson 1906, 39.4: nolo moretur hic perfidus, sed iam confiteatur dualitatis suae in unum refusam esse substantiam).

[20] See the *index général* in A. Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque (IIe–IIIe siècles)* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, série Antiquité, 110–111), Paris, 1985, s.v. *altérité, Barbare, folie, ignorance, Satan, Antichrist, plagiat, falsification*, and *prophètes (faux)*.

[21] See Archelaus' condescending tone in 27.4.

[22] Vermes, 105 (Beeson 1906, 58.14: falsum Christum et falsum prophetam).

[23] Vermes, 104 (Beeson 1906, 59.1–3: anathema es, Satana [. . .]. Vas es Antichristi). The "vessel" reference plays on Mani's name: see Coyle 2004, 222.

[24] Vermes, 105 (Beeson 1906, 59.27–28: o barbare sacerdos Mithrae et conlusor).

[25] Vermes, 108 (Beeson 1906, 61.30–31: ista me sufficit protulisse . . . uti istum vobis qualis esset ostenderem).

[26] Or is this rather an example of what C. Andresen calls a "gemeinsame Abwehrfront von Christen und Neuplatonikern gegen den Manichäismus" (the title of a section in his "Antike und Christentum," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 3, Berlin, 1978, 69)?

[27] Voss 1970, 155, thinks that, given the involvement of an orthodox bishop with the *founder* of a heterodox movement, the presence of the judges is paramount. But this will not be true of the second encounter, where the crowd is the judge. *Pace* Lieu 1994, 134, the text does more than *imply* that the judges were pagan.

better understood by you than by him" (*AA* 25.3; see 26.1 and 29.4). In chapter 20 they pose a leading question that Mani answers with a single word, while Archelaus' response takes up three chapters. In 41.1 they say that, when Archelaus speaks, it is "just as if the Apostle Paul were speaking."[28] This admiration is reciprocated by Archelaus, who calls the judges "excellent gentlemen and most sagacious listeners" (*AA* 20.3),[29] and "the most intellectually gifted that God could have provided" (*AA* 26.7;[30] see 30.1). In this love-in, Mani is the outsider; and when we look at the space the text provides for his utterances in both encounters, we find that, in this respect as in others, he has been heavily outgunned by Archelaus. Further, whatever "Hegemonius'" precise agenda might be, it is clear from the start who will do most of the talking, as the chart appended to this article shows. This is not, therefore, the confident Manichaean disputational technique we know, whereby the followers of Mani get to speak at length,[31] even against the formidable Augustine.[32] Mani was not looking for a public display: debate has been "thrust upon" him.[33]

The Second Encounter

During the first encounter, the gathered public remains passive, except to once applaud Archelaus and at the same time move to take hold of Mani (*AA* 23.1), which they will attempt again at the encounter's conclusion (*AA* 43.1), forcing Mani to run away in confusion. After being declared the loser in "Carchar" (by the public, let us note, not

---

[28] Vermes, 106 (Beeson 1906, 60.5: Sicut ex te comperimus, tamquam apostolo Paulo dicente…).

[29] Vermes, 69 (Beeson 1906, 31.19–20: optimi viri et prudentissimi auditores).

[30] Vermes, 78 (Beeson 1906, 39.8–9: iudices, quos deus plenissime repletos intellectu misit). Perhaps Archelaus is not *entirely* sure of the judges' partiality: they do, after all, steer him back on track at one point (34.1).

[31] On Manichaean disputational techniques see Lim 1995, 70–108; also Lieu in Vermes, 24–31; Lieu 1994, 146–49.

[32] On Augustine's public disputations with the Manichaeans Felix and Fortunatus, see Decret, 1970, esp. 39–50 and 71–89; and Lim 1995, 93–96 and 99–102.

[33] Lim 1995, 103. It is unusual that all of this is occurring to *Mani*. Voss 1970, 151–52, remarks that "Für das beispielhaft erbauliche Moment ist von Bedeutung, daß nicht irgendein Manichäer, sondern Mani selbst es ist, der überwunden wird. Dabei ist nicht so sehr die Argumentation wichtig, sondern die Tatsache der Disputation und, selbst-verständlich, der Überwindung des Widersachers." On the reluctance of Manichaeans to be drawn into public debate see Lim 1995, 86.

the judges, 43.1), he surfaces in "Diodoris," whose presbyter (Diodorus in the Latin, but Tryphon in the Greek version known to Epiphanius) seems highly impressed by Mani's appearance and dress (*AA* 44.4). Back in "Carchar," Archelaus receives a letter from the presbyter, which he answers ("briefly," he claims in 46.3, before going on for six chapters: see 51.8). Some time later comes the first day of a disputatious encounter between Diodorus and Mani, but it is wholly one-sided: at its conclusion the former is said to have vanquished the latter (*AA* 52.2), even though Mani is not reported to have uttered a single word. As the second day of this confrontation gets under way, Archelaus appears, unexpected and unannounced, to take over the course of the debate. The public gathered for this event goes wild over this new development (*AA* 53.3), hailing Archelaus as though he were an apostle (*AA* 53.4); *they* will be the only judges this time, but scarcely less partial than those at the first encounter (see 56.1).[34] Again Mani shows reluctance: "But when Manes had seen Archelaus, he at once stopped his insulting behaviour and humbled his pride considerably; and it was plain to see that he wanted to avoid the contest" (*AA* 53.4;[35] see 54.5,9). It is difficult not to see a *contre-temps* here, since Mani has still said nothing. His reluctance to speak is justified when Archelaus immediately wades in by accusing him of "disparaging our ancestral traditions" (*AA* 54.3),[36] of being a "madman, and no real human being" (*AA* 59.10).[37] For his part, Mani accuses Archelaus of "pulverizing me with very annoying words" (*AA* 54.1).[38]

[34] This makes 53.9, 61.1,5, 66.1–2,4, and 68.5 all the more ironic.

[35] Vermes, 126 (Beeson 1906, 78.13–15: Cum autem vidisset Archelaum Manes, cessavit quidem continuo ab insultatione et supercilio non parum deiecto manifeste intellegebatur quod conflictum vellet effugere).

[36] Vermes, 127 (Beeson 1906, 79.17–18: cum detraheres de paternis nostris traditionibus). One perceives an old anti-Christian accusation here.

[37] Vermes, 137 (Beeson 1906, 87.14: Delire, non homo…). See 17.7 (Beeson 1906, 28.15–16 : Videris mihi delirus esse…).

[38] Vermes, 127 (Beeson 1906, 79.10: Verbis molestissimis obtundis).

The Final Blow

In the "biography" that closes the entire account (chaps. 61–68), Mani is depicted as an ex-slave (*AA* 64.2),[39] unoriginal (*AA* 62.2), a quack,[40] a plagiarizer (*AA* 64.5 and 67.1–3),[41] deceitful (*AA* 65.6), and (again) a false prophet (*AA* 65.8). With his forerunners Scythianus and Terebinthus, he forms an "Unholy Trinity,"[42] and in the excursus he is described as a deservedly executed criminal (66.3).[43]

Conclusions

(1) Richard Lim has invoked the *AA* to endorse his claim that, in the confrontation between Christians and Manichaeism,

> A collective catharsis was needed, one similar to the *apopompē* or communal expulsion of scapegoats, in order to bring the crisis to the forefront of people's attention and to allay the fear of the unknown. Historically, such an act might showcase a dramatic public confrontation with a representative of the Other. If no such representative could be found to take the stand for this purpose, or if the catharsis was meant to extend to several locales, then a written account could be substituted, complete with crisis, confrontation, and resolution.[44]

But there is more here than that. In the genre of *disputationes cum Manichaeis*, the *AA* stands out, in the words of Eszter Spät, as "a traditional description of doctrinal debate between an orthodox and a heretic interpolated with the elements of a romance."[45] In other words, there are aspects here (biographical details, applauding crowds, Marcellus and the Persian captives, and Turbo's journey to "Carchar")[46] not found in other *disputationes*.

---

[39] Scopello 1995, 223, suggests that this is meant to offset the claim that Mani had royal connections.

[40] See Scopello 1995, 228–29.

[41] Spät 2004 focuses on this particular accusation. See also Scopello 1995, 214–19.

[42] So Spät 2004, 15 and 23.

[43] See Scopello 1995, 230 and 233–34.

[44] Lim 1995, 76.

[45] Spät 2004, 16. Scopello 1995, 217, calls it a "roman hérésiologique."

[46] I believe that Scopello's assessment of the two latter points as explaining Mani's presence in Roman territory is essentially correct (Scopello 2000, 535): "Dans l'optique d'Hégémonius, ces événements n'ont qu'un but: créer le prétexte d'une rencontre entre

(2) Now, a long debate has ensued over the historical character of this text, the emergent options of which are that the document is entirely historical, entirely fictional, or a combination of the two, that is, a more or less fictionalized elaboration of some historical event. For present purposes, it matters little which option is followed, for the fact is that, in selecting, arranging, and presenting the components that make up the text, the author was pursuing a particular agenda, which a historical or a fictional discourse could mediate equally well.

(3) It follows that the purpose of the *AA*, whatever its sources, is not to relate history, but to demonstrate a polemic, by underscoring Mani's (and therefore Manichaeism's) alien character and by discrediting the powers of persuasion of both the founder and his system. Thus I agree with Madeleine Scopello that "Hegemonius" is targeting, not only Mani's person and teaching, but his religious structures, in speeches laced with irony and sarcasm, and in a series of contrasting notions ("vérités et contre-vérités"), whereby Archelaus means to say that he is none of the things he attributes to Mani.[47]

(4) In point of fact, despite the *AA*'s Latin *incipit*,[48] there are no real *disputationes* here. Even if the first of the two encounters between Mani and Archelaus takes place before judges, this is, as Bernd Reiner Voss has pointed out, really a "dispute" (*Streitgespräch*) masquerading as a classic *disputatio*. The second encounter appears even less formal: it is "nur mehr ein Fall von Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Manichäismus."[49] The *AA*, then, comes across exactly as it was meant to—as a demonstration to would-be polemicists of how to refute Manichaeism's fundamental doctrines. If Archelaus could defeat the founder of the movement, surely others could confound his followers.

Mani, le perse, et Marcellus, le romain." For a suggestion of geographic displacement in this constructed encounter, see Chapter Six of this volume.

[47] Scopello 1995, 207–14.

[48] 1.1 (Beeson 1906, 1.2): Thesaurus verus sive disputatio…

[49] Voss 1970, 154–55.

APPENDIX

Distribution of interventions in the first encounter between Mani and Archelaus (15–42)

Chapter	*Mani*	*Archelaus*	*Judges*
15	1–16		
16	1b–10		1a
17	2c, 6	2b, 3–4, 7–8	1–2a
18		2b–7	1–2a
19	1a, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 8b (1 word), 9a, 9c (2 words), 11a	1b–3a, 4a, 5a, 5c, 6a, 7–8a, 8c, 9b, 10, 11b	
20	2b (1 word)	3–11	1–2a
21		1–6	
22		1–7	
23		3–5	1b–2
24		1–8	
25		3–12	1–2
26		4–7	1–3
27	2	3–12	1
28	1–3, 4b, 5b, 9, 10b	4a, 5a, 6–8, 10a, 11–13	
29			1–4
30		1–6	
31		1–9	
32	1–4	5–11	
33	1–2, 3b, 5b, 6b, 6d, 7b, 8b, 9b	3a, 4–5a, 6a, 6c, 7a, 8a, 9a, 10	
34		1b–11	1a
35		1–11	
36	6b (2 words)	1–6a, 7–11	
37	1b, 2b, 4a	2a, 3, 4b–16	1a
38		1–13	
39		1–11	
40		1–8	
41		4–14	1–3
42		1–11	

Distribution of interventions in the second encounter between Mani and Archelaus (53–65)

Chapter	*Mani*	*Archelaus*
53		5b–9
54	1–2, 5, 6b, 9–10a, 11–12a	3–4, 6a, 7–8, 10b, 12b
55	1–7	
56		2–7
57		1–10
58		1–13
59	1–6	7–12
60	10b, 11a	1–10a, 10c (1 word), 11b
61		3–8
62		1–7
63		1–6
64		1–9
65		1–9

CHAPTER THREE

MANI'S LETTER TO MARCELLUS: FACT AND FICTION IN THE *ACTA ARCHELAI* REVISITED

Iain Gardner

For some years now I have been editing, in collaboration with Wolf-Peter Funk, the extant remains of probably three Coptic codices containing remains of Mani's *Epistles*. These are: Firstly, those leaves and records that still survive of the famous Berlin codex P 15998, deriving from the so-called Medinet Madi library of Manichaean texts; secondly, leaves of a codex recovered from ancient Kellis by the excavations at Ismant el-Kharab, which will be published as P. Kell. Copt. 53; and, thirdly, a single leaf also from Ismant el-Kharab, to be published as P. Kell. Copt. 54.[1] Since this editing task is now near completion I have begun to gather the material for a further volume: a synthetic study of all the remains and notices of the *Epistles* in all languages. This will include: an-Nadim's well-known Arabic list of titles in his *Fihrist*;[2] the Greek extract from the 'letter to Edessa' recorded in the Cologne *Mani-Codex*; the problematic case of the Latin 'fundamental epistle'; the 'letter to Menoch', which has been the subject of a recent study

[1] The first of these will be published by Kohlhammer as Band II in the series *Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*; whilst the second and third will be incorporated within *Kellis literary texts II*, in the 'Dakhleh Oasis Project' monograph series published by Oxbow Press. P 15998 appears, in so far as one can tell, to have been a canonical version of the work; although the entirety of what it would have contained is by no means certain (given its poor preservation and in the absence of duplicates). P. Kell. Copt. 53 contained a number of individual epistles; but how many were recorded can not be known, nor is it entirely certain if they were complete (it is conceivable—if perhaps less likely—that they were extracts). The format, especially the lack of titles, indicates that it was probably not a canonical version; but rather of more informal utility. As regards P. Kell. Copt. 54: Little can be concluded from this single leaf without title, and its identification as belonging to the *Epistles* is open to some question.

[2] In this chapter I have followed, with slight adaptations, the translation of Dodge 1970, vol. II, 1970, 799–801. See also that of M. Laffan in Gardner/Lieu 2004, 165–166.

by Geoffrey Harrison and Jason BeDuhn;[3] the 'letter of the Seal' and other fragments preserved in Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian;[4] canonical lists in various languages; and so on. Such a study will bring together the substantial evidence concerning this work, and provide a coherent picture of at least one of Mani's canonical texts; the lack of the scriptures being probably the most fundamental problem preventing the advance of our contemporary understanding of the religion. Of course, one always hopes for a major discovery!

It is apparent that one element in this projected study will necessarily be the delineation of authentic letters by Mani from spurious letters ascribed to him. It has been generally supposed that the latter existed for a variety of polemical purposes. Whilst Harrison and BeDuhn have recently defended the authenticity of the 'letter to Menoch', one need only think of the various fragments quoted by orthodox writers against their Monophysite opponents, these being from supposed letters 'to Addas', 'to the Saracen Kundaros', 'to Scythianus', and 'to Zabinas'.[5] Of course, one of the most famous examples is the 'letter to Marcellus' that is recorded in the *Acta Archelai* 5.[6] The latter complex and fascinating work, the subject of this volume, is renowned amongst modern scholars of Manichaeism for its beguiling mix of fact and fiction.[7] Thus, my basic question for this contribution is the authenticity or spurious authorship of the 'letter to Marcellus' ascribed to Mani. More exactly, we must consider a span of possibilities across the following:

---

[3] Harrison/BeDuhn 2001; see also the related study of the issues of Mani's epistolary output in Gardner 2001.

[4] At the 2005 IAMS conference, held at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, Christiane Reck detailed her reconstruction of a Sogdian version of the 'letter of the Seal'. This can be compared to the previously known opening in Middle Persian. Werner Sundermann, in a separate address, presented his reconstruction of substantial parts of two codex leaves containing what are almost certainly parts of letters by Mani (in Middle Persian). He also provided much valuable information on the titles of *Epistles* preserved in various Iranian language fragments.

[5] These can be most easily accessed in Gardner/Lieu 2004, 174–175. Jason BeDuhn has rightly cautioned against too easily presuming that the 'extracts' must be fabrications, on which see also Chapter Six of this volume, 97 and n40, 100 n41.

[6] See Vermes; Mani's letter on 41–42, with Marcellus' reply on 43. Both of these are quoted in Greek by Epiphanius in his *Panarion* (66.6–7), which should be compared; see also the translation by F. Williams, NHMS 36, Leiden 1994, 226–228.

[7] My own sub-title here is, of course, an allusion to the well-known study by S. N. C. Lieu, "Fact and fiction in the *Acta Archelai*," (Lieu 1994, 132–152).

(1) the letter is entirely a fictional creation of the author of the *AA*, utilized as a narrative device to initiate the dispute between Mani and Archelaus through the heresiarch's approach to the pious Marcellus;

(2) or, the author was familiar with Mani's missionary technique and especially the prominent use of letters, and consequently modeled (to a greater or lesser extent) his letter on authentic examples known to him;

(3) or, the author has incorporated an authentic letter of Mani's into his work, this perhaps providing evidence of an actual historical core to the whole narrative of the disputation.

This chapter will attempt to answer this fundamental question, which itself will be instructive for our reading of the entire text, as well as for my particular purpose as regards the study of Mani's canonical *Epistles*. My principal approach will be an analysis of the structure, purpose, conventions and terminology, scriptural quotations, and finally doctrine of the 'letter to Marcellus', in the light of what we now know about Mani's authentic letters.

As a preliminary, it is necessary to note that no obvious version of this letter is preserved in sources outside of the polemical Christian traditions associated with or based upon the *AA* (including here the quotations and paraphrases of that work by Epiphanius). However, amongst the titles of the *Epistles* recorded by an-Nadim there is a letter 'to Kaskar', which could very well be the location ascribed to Marcellus by the *AA* (variously: Carchar, Kaschar, etc.).[8] In general, it is important to note that the extant remains of the *Epistles* scripture, particularly in the Coptic codices, evidence that 'authentic' titles were used by the Manichaean community which do not obviously correspond to those recorded by an-Nadim. There are some important overlaps,[9] which give confidence in the immense value of the *Fihrist* record; but there are also divergences, such as 'The seventh Ktesiphon letter: that of the vigils', which is a title found in the Medinet Madi codex but not found in that form (at least) in the Arabic. All of this proves nothing except that we do not have anything like a definitive listing of fixed titles (let alone the knowledge of contents) by which we could judge the authenticity of this piece; and, of course, the *AA* does not

[8] See the discussion by Lieu 1994, 140ff., and in Chapter One of this volume.
[9] See my discussion in Gardner 2001, 96.

necessarily record the proper title for what we term the 'letter to Marcellus'[10] under which the Manichaean community itself might conceivably have preserved the letter.

Structure

It is worth noting that Mani's letter is a marked contrast to the reply recorded for Marcellus.[11] It has a complex structure that, as we shall see, accords substantially with that known of authentic examples.[12] I make the following representation:

A. *Greetings*.
   1. Sender – recipient formula.
      1.i. Manichaeus, apostle of Jesus Christ, and all the saints and virgins who are with me…
      1.ii. …to my beloved son Marcellus.
   2. Prayer formulae.
      2.i. Grace, mercy and peace from God the father, and our lord Jesus Christ.
      2.ii. And may the right hand of light preserve you from the present evil age and its disasters, and from the snares of the evil one.
   3. Closure: Amen.

B. *Content*.
   1. Introduction to the theme.
      1.i. Joy at Marcellus' immense benevolence.
      1.ii. Grief that his faith is not aright.
   2. Mani's authority to correct the human race and to rescue those in error.

---

[10] In the Medinet Madi codex there is in fact a title that can only be read as 'The epistle to Ma[-…]'. However, the admittedly poor remains do not suggest a parallel text.

[11] Noted also by Lieu in Vermes, 43 n25; see also Lieu 1994, 151.

[12] In this analysis I shall primarily use the evidence of Mani's letters preserved in Coptic (with also some reference to personal letters of Manichaean believers recovered from Ismant el-Kharab, where these illustrate the impress of a community epistolary style that can be ascribed to Mani's influence). This is because their authenticity, as preserved by members of the church, is in no real doubt (though in theory one must be prepared for the possibility of deuterocanonical works, which indeed could be the implication of an-Nadim's problematic second list of titles where he states, 'in addition to these'); and because, although no examples are preserved perfect and entire, they illustrate the total structure of the letters rather than extracts (as with the 'letter to Edessa'). The Latin 'fundamental epistle' is in many ways a special case and deserves separate treatment.

3. Purpose of the letter.
   3.i.a. For the salvation of Marcellus' soul.
   3.i.b. For the salvation of those with him.
   3.ii.a. Against the teaching that good and evil arise from a single principle.
   3.ii.b. Failure to distinguish darkness from light; good from evil; the outer man from the inner.
4. Instruction to Marcellus: 'Do not, my son, confound the two…'
5. Elaboration of the theme.
   5.i. 'Those whose end is like a curse' (Heb. 6:8) attribute evils to God.
   5.ii. They do not believe the saying of 'our lord and savior Jesus Christ' that 'a bad tree can not bear good fruit, nor a good tree bear bad fruit' (Mt. 7:18).[13]
   5.iii. They call God the maker and creator of Satan and his evil deeds.
6. Digression on the incarnation: They say that the only-begotten Christ, who descended from the bosom of the Father (Jn. 1:18), was the son of a woman Mary, born of flesh and blood and pollution.

C. *Conclusion*.
1. Mani's disavowal of natural eloquence.
2. Promise to Marcellus that he will learn everything necessary for his salvation, when Mani comes.
3. Assertion by Mani that he does not 'cast a snare on anyone' (1 Cor. 7:35).
4. Final admonition to 'Understand what I say (2 Tim. 2:7), honored son'.

This analysis of the letter's structure allows us immediately to discard the possibility that it is purely a fictional creation by the author of the *AA*, written simply for his own narrative purposes. Instead, the letter evidences substantial parallels to Mani's authentic letters to the extent that it must either be by him or modeled on known examples of such. Where it shows the impress of Paul's style, this is not the issue; because it is well known that Mani imitated Paul. The author of the *AA* can not be supposed to have imitated Paul as such; he must either imitate Mani imitating Paul, or it is Mani himself. Looking at the structure of section A, we can compare the start of a letter (title and recipient unknown) preserved in P. Kell. Copt. 53:

[13] In Epiphanius' version of the letter the clauses are reversed to accord with Mt.

A. *Greetings*.
   1. Sender – recipient formula.
      1.i. Manichaeus, apostle of Jesus Christ, and all the brothers who are with me…
      1.ii. …to -s, my loved one, and all the brothers who are with you…
   2. Prayer formulae.
      2.i. Peace through God the father, and our lord Jesus Christ, be upon you…
      2.ii. And may it guard you…

In this instance the prayer formulae are more extensive, still continuing at the point where the preserved text breaks off, so that one can not identify the point of closure (A.3).[14] However, the structure is essentially the same as in the 'letter to Marcellus'. One might also compare 'the fundamental epistle' or 'the letter to Menoch'. In short, section A is a clear imitation of Mani at least, and indeed there is no reason in terms of structure why it could not be by him. I shall leave aside the structure of section B, as this is necessarily the part most unique to this particular letter, and compare briefly section C with the conclusion of 'the letter on the ten sayings' that is preserved also in P. Kell. Copt. 53:

C. *Conclusion*.
   1. Mani has written these ten sayings to comfort 'my son'.
   2. Mani has heard them in suffering.
   3. Final admonition to 'Receive them in joy and confirmation; and you understand them'.

Although the context is different, I find the final admonition to 'understand' in this letter (as in that 'to Marcellus') as striking. Indeed, until I undertook this analysis of the 'letter to Marcellus' I had been somewhat perplexed at the lack of any final greetings or 'Amen' at the conclusion of 'the letter on the ten sayings', (as is found in other instances where a letter of Mani's ends), that conclusion being indicated by a line drawn by the scribe. This parallel I now find helps to explain this apparent abruptness; indeed, to render the sense as less abrupt and more natural. However, if this is the case, then one is drawn inevitably to the hypothesis that the *AA* example is either authentic or a really close imitation.

[14] In two instances in the Berlin codex P. 15998, Mani concludes his letter with 'Amen'.

Purpose

Here we must distinguish, in principle, the purpose of the letter for the author of the *AA* from the purpose of Mani as supposed author. If the two are the same it will aid our conclusions.

Firstly, in terms of the narrative structure of the work as a whole, we can make the following brief representation:

a. Marcellus undertakes great works of piety and charity.
b. Marcellus' reputation reaches Mani in Persia.
c. Mani hopes to convert Marcellus and through him 'the entire province'.
d. Mani adopts the circumspect policy of writing him a letter, which he sends by the hand of Turbo.
e. Turbo is ill-treated on his journey.
f. Marcellus receives the letter, and reads it out in the presence of bishop Archelaus.
g. Marcellus treats Turbo hospitably, but has to calm Archelaus' anger.
h. Marcellus writes a brief reply, claiming to have failed to comprehend Mani's meaning and asking him to come and explain.
i. Turbo refuses to return to Mani with the reply.
j. The reply is taken by Callistus, who finds Mani at the Castellum Arabionis.
k. Mani journeys with due deliberation to Marcellus.
l. Meanwhile, Turbo expounds Mani's teachings to Marcellus and Archelaus.
m. Archelaus wants to have Mani executed immediately, but Marcellus urges patience and a restrained disputation.

In this structure certain elements suggest obvious polemical intent, such as the ill-treatment of Turbo on his journey and the repeated emphasis on the zeal of Archelaus tempered by the goodliness of Marcellus. Nevertheless, the basic rationale that Mani targets Marcellus as a means to converting a larger number, also Mani's use of a letter and indeed the setting of a disputation, suggest a proper awareness of Mani's authentic missionary technique on the part of the author.[15] We know that Mani deliberately focused upon persons of authority, not least King Shapur himself. We also know from an-Nadim's list that he wrote letters to unbelievers, for he preserves the title 'to Abu Ahya the unbeliever'. There are also authentic records of disputations between Manichaean and Christian opponents. However, we should note that the purpose of the letter is purported to be as a circumspect introduction by Mani to Marcellus; whilst as a narrative device it acts as a delay that affords

[15] Similarly, see the discussion by Lieu 1994, 146–150.

the opportunity for the Christian heroes to hear the pernicious nature of Mani's teachings from the unfortunate Turbo.

We should now compare the purpose of the letter as it is recorded in its own terms, in Mani's voice as it were:

a. Mani introduces himself in high style as an 'apostle of Jesus Christ', and one 'sent to correct the human race'.
b. He praises Marcellus' benevolence, but states that he is troubled about his faith.
c. He makes a brief but direct defense of dualism against the ascription of evil (and Satan) to God.
d. He launches a strongly worded attack upon the incarnation.
e. He asserts that Marcellus will learn everything when Mani is present with him.

One problem that occurs is that this letter does not appear particularly circumspect, and another is that Mani does not properly invite a meeting (though this may be to read too much into it). The attack on the incarnation, especially, appears to be highlighted to attract the ire of a Christian audience. My hypothesis at this stage of the investigation, then, is that the narrative context for the letter is essentially fictitious. The letter, on the other hand, appears to be at least in part authentic (or modeled on an authentic example/s). However, the text may well have been tampered with to suit the redactor's purposes.

Conventions and Terminology

The most obvious convention observed by the letter's author is the initial 'Manichaeus, apostle of Jesus Christ'. If the author was not Mani, this in itself is definitive proof that he had genuine knowledge of the authentic style. The same is found in every preserved instance of a letter opening from the Berlin codex P 15998 (four instances: ⲙⲁⲛⲓⲭⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲓⲏ̄ⲥ ⲡ(ⲉ)ⲭ̄ⲣ̄ⲥ); the one example found in P. Kell. Copt. 53 (ⲙⲁⲛⲓⲭⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲓⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ); also the Latin of 'the fundamental epistle' and 'letter to Menoch'; and even the Living Gospel as quoted in the *Mani-Codex*.

In general, the conventions of the opening section A ('Greetings') accord perfectly with other examples of Mani's known style, as noted above when discussing 'structure'. Thus, Mani introduces himself, 'and all . . . who are with me'. This itself is common enough, of course; but it

is a feature of his style. Those with him are entitled 'saints and virgins', reasonable enough variations for the electi and electae, and for which there is evidence in the primary sources.[16] Equally, he addresses his recipient as 'my beloved son' (at the conclusion: 'honored'), of which there are numerous examples in the remnants of the Coptic *Epistles* codices. He concludes with an 'Amen', as does Paul in Gal. 1:5, rather than the standard epistolary χαίρειν[17] (if one were to suppose an author writing in customary Greek fashion, compare Marcellus' reply). He prays for preservation 'from the present evil age (again: Gal. 1:4)…and the snares of the evil one'. Interestingly, a parallel phrase (thus P. Kell. Copt. 25, 20–21: '…free from any evil and any temptation by Satan…') is also found in personal letters written by Manichaeans as recovered from Ismant el-Kharab, and probably evidences the impress of Mani on the community's own epistolary conventions.[18]

The cumulative evidence of these points indicates more than a passing acquaintance with Mani's style, especially when crowned with the striking: '…and may the right hand of light preserve you…'. This is not Pauline; it is Mani's own elaboration of the greetings. Whilst it has previously been noted that there is a clear parallel in 'the fundamental epistle',[19] I am not aware that the implications have been expressed. Presuming that the *AA* was authored prior to Cyril of Jerusalem's usage of it in his sixth catechetical lecture (ca. 348–350 CE), this predates Augustine's publication of that text to a Christian audience by a good fifty years; and it is from the Greek east. The parallel is such that it must indicate knowledge of 'the fundamental epistle' by our author;

---

[16] Lieu references *Hom* 22, 6 for virgin = electa (in Vermes, 41 n15); and there are many other examples. For 'saints' and 'virgins' together, see e.g. *PsBk II* 152, 2 (ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃⲉ…ⲛⲓⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ); but it may be tautological, rather than strictly referring to the two genders. Extant examples of Section A ('Greetings') from the remnants of the Coptic codices generally record ⲥⲛⲏⲩ ('brothers' [gender inclusive]); but 'the seventh Ktesiphon letter' evidences clearly enough that variations can be expected: '…and all the chosen, faithful brothers who are with me, my fellow travelers […] my loved ones who serve me…'. Equally, the doxologies to the *Psalm-Book* frequently evidence a certain looseness of terminology; e.g. (at random) *PsBk II* 61, 9–10: '…the saints and his holy elect…(ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙ̄ ⲛⲉⲫⲥⲱⲧⲡ̄ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃⲉ)'.

[17] On this the evidence of the Coptic codices is unclear, as no conclusions to the 'greetings' are clearly preserved. On one occasion we have provisionally thought to read a ⲭⲁⲓⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉ; but I am increasingly uncertain about this, as it is very doubtful and there is no other evidence for Mani doing this.

[18] See further my comments in I. Gardner, A. Nobbs, M. Choat, "P. Harr. 107: Is this another Greek Manichaean letter?," *ZPE* 131 (2000) 122–123.

[19] Thus Lieu in Vermes, 41 n16.

or, as I think more likely (in that the 'letter to Marcellus' does not especially recall 'the fundamental epistle' in other features), that this was an authentic element of Mani's style which he would have used on multiple occasions. Of course, the significance of the 'right hand' in Manichaeism is known from numerous sources,[20] but here the epistolary context and phrasing give an especial and authentic weight to the usage when this parallel is considered.

In sum, not only the structure, but all the conventions of section A are those of a genuine letter.[21] Of course, whether it is genuine text, or a clever pastiche, can not here be known. Perhaps the only feature of Mani's known phrasing that is here lacking is the ascription of the Father as 'the God of Truth'. Examples of this are found in the remnants of the Coptic codices, 'the letter to Menoch' (an indication of authenticity),[22] and personal letters written by Manichaeans.[23] However, the usage is not constant: not only does the preserved text of 'the fundamental epistle' lack it; but, crucially, so does a letter opening recorded in P. Kell. Copt. 53: 'Peace through God the Father and our lord Jesus Christ…'.

Scriptural quotations

The question of quotations and allusions to sayings of Jesus and other New Testament texts is vital to determining the matter of authorship and authenticity.[24] I refer to 'sayings of Jesus', because it is still unclear as to the exact form in which Mani accessed the Gospel tradition.[25] In this 'letter to Marcellus' a reversed form of Mt. 7:18 is signaled as 'the words spoken in the gospels by our savior and lord Jesus Christ'; and there also appears to be an allusion to Jn. 1:18. In general, the appeal to the simile of the good and bad tree is perhaps the single most worked proof text for Mani's dualism (and indeed Marcion), recorded in numerous sources both primary and anti-heretical.[26] *Kephalaion* 2

[20] See e.g. Kephalaion 9.

[21] Contrast the judgment of Lieu that it is "much more contrived and laboured than the probably genuine Manichaean formula…" (Lieu 1994, 150).

[22] Noted also by Harrison/BeDuhn 2001, 141.

[23] See my discussion in "P. Harr. 107," op. cit., 121.

[24] Compare the similar discussion re 'the letter to Menoch' by Harrison/BeDuhn 2001, 155–158.

[25] See further my comments in Gardner 2001, 101.

[26] See further my discussion (with references) in "The docetic Jesus," *Coptic theological papyri II*, MPER NS XXI Textband, Wien, 1988: 59–60; also Gardner 1995, 22ff.

purports to be an entire lesson of Mani's about this. In the sources there are various versions that can be ascribed to either Mt. 7:17–20 or Lk. 6:43–44; but, in reality, and given the problematic question of textual transmission and loose quotation, it is largely meaningless to distinguish the parallels. In any case, what is interesting about the example in the 'letter to Marcellus' is that genuine examples of Mani's *Epistles* recorded in the Coptic codices do evidence Mani quoting logia that he ascribes to 'our lord',[27] whom he elsewhere terms 'our lord Jesus Christ' and 'my savior'. Characteristically, in the examples available, these are indeed termed a 'saying (ϲⲉϫⲉ)'; and I would find the reference to 'the gospels' in the 'letter to Marcellus' an unauthentic tone, except that one of the very few references to the εὐαγγέλιον (of Jesus rather than of Mani) found in all the Coptic Manichaica is precisely where the disciples ask Mani about the simile of the two trees: 'As it is written in the Gospel…'.[28] This certainly gives cause for caution in judging this issue.

As regards the allusion to Jn. 1:18: There is nothing inherently unlikely about Mani accessing this tradition as he certainly quotes Jn. 13:18 in his genuine *Epistles* (P. Kell. Copt. 53). Indeed, the form and usage made of the allusion are striking, and do not suggest a fiction that would have come easily to a fourth century Christian author. I shall return to this in the discussion of 'doctrine' below. Other than the sayings of Jesus, sections B and C of the 'letter to Marcellus' make obvious use of Heb. 6:8 and 1 Cor. 7:35, and evidence a probable echo of 2 Tim. 2:7. Mani's whole epistolary style is, of course, modeled on Paul; and in 'the letter to Menoch' (if it be judged authentic) he directly quotes from 'the apostle'. Many of his most basic teachings, such as regards the 'old' and the 'new man', must be directly sourced to a knowledge of the Pauline corpus. So, again, there is nothing here that in itself evidences the letter to be a work of fiction. The trajectory of modern scholarship is to abandon the idea that Manichaean texts peppered with New Testament phrases must be secondary or christianised products, and the recovery of some of the genuine corpus of Mani's writings provides increasing examples of his intimate knowledge and usage of these sources; though the form in which he accessed them is still the subject of much necessary work to be done.

[27] Thus Jn. 13:18 in P. Kell. Copt. 53.
[28] *Keph* 17, 4–5.

Doctrine

In the 'letter to Marcellus' Mani introduces himself as 'Mani the living', presuming here that the form 'Manichaeus' preserves the Syriac ascription;[29] and as an 'apostle of Jesus Christ'. His theological focus is on 'God the Father and our lord Jesus Christ' in opposition to 'the present evil age…and the snares of the evil one'. A saying of Jesus and allusions to Paul are used in support of his argument. All this is just as we would expect from known genuine examples of the genre. Mani asserts his particular authority against the multitude, and again this is the characteristic theme of 'I, a single Mani' against the mass of mankind. Indeed, in 'the letter to Edessa' he speaks of being taken away 'from the council of the multitude which did not know the truth';[30] and in a letter of unknown title preserved in P. Kell. Copt. 53 he asserts: 'I have completed revelation to you of everything'. Thus, the powerful assertions of especial divine election found in the 'letter to Marcellus', that 'I have been sent to correct the human race', can easily be paralleled wherever we find Mani speaking of himself in genuine Manichaean texts; and so too can the promise to teach 'the whole' (section C.2).

However, apart from these matters of context that hit the right note, the 'letter to Marcellus' has two particular doctrinal issues: dualism and the nature of Christ. These can now be considered in some detail. The 'letter to Marcellus' categorically denies that good and evil have the same origin and that there is a single principle. Instead, it is necessary to 'distinguish darkness from light, good from evil, and the outer man from the inner; as we have described before'. Indeed, (and as the final assertion may be thought to imply), these pairings have a formulaic and even pre-creedal quality. I have previously commented as much when writing on the *Kephalaia*[31] and without thought of this present passage. For the first two pairs there are a great number of parallels; but the 'outer man from the inner man' is less usual in Manichaean

[29] See Lieu in Vermes, 40 n11. Alternately, the name may mean 'concealed mānā', following J. Tubach and M. Zakeri, "Mani's Name," in J. van Oort, et al., *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Leiden, 2001, 272–286, esp. 282–284.

[30] *CMC* 65, 4–7.

[31] Gardner 1995, xxiii, quoting 186, 27–30 and 286, 27–30. One should particularly read Kephalaion 120 as illustration of the familiar sequences of Mani's thought on this topic.

sources,[32] where the familiar contrast is between the old and the new man. However, the sentiment itself is perfectly in accord with Mani's thought; for instance, compare *Kephalaion* 83 entitled: 'Concerning the man who is ugly in his body, but beautiful in his soul'.[33]

The 'letter to Marcellus' elaborates on the dualistic theme with the familiar reference to the simile of the two trees; and, in particular, the denial that God can be the creator of Satan and his evil deeds. Reference to Satan is familiar enough from genuine Manichaean sources (i.e. rather than to Matter personified or the King of Darkness), and notably occurs twice in *Kephalaion* 2 during discussion of the two trees. The name also occurs twice in the remnants of genuine *Epistles* by Mani as preserved in the codex P. Kell. Copt. 53. In sum, the take on dualism is all perfectly in accord with what we would expect of Mani.

The brief and rather vitriolic attack on any human birth of Christ does take the reader by some surprise, and it is possible that this has been sharpened for polemical purpose (certainly if the author were a circumspect Mani it might strike one as rather odd). However, my research and thinking about this passage has led me in the opposite direction to that which I had first thought. Initially, my first superficial reading suggested a rather thin and fictionalized portrayal of Mani's supposed position; but I am now inclined to read it as something much more interesting and genuine. The various clauses can be taken in turn.

Firstly, we find the terms 'only-begotten' and 'Christ'. The latter is found numerous times in remnants of genuine *Epistles*, on one clear occasion at least without an accompanying 'Jesus'. In the Coptic Manichaica we find μονογενής applied to Jesus at various points.[34] None of this is particularly telling either way; but it is the next phrase that has excited my interest: '…who has descended from the bosom (κόλπος) of the Father'. Here there is an allusion, at least, to Jn. 1:18. The directional 'from' is striking: The Vulgate has 'qui est in sinum patris'; the Greek is εἰς rather than ἐν; the Sahidic is **ϩⲛ̄ ⲕⲟⲩⲛⲉ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲱⲧ**. However, it is most notable that 'from' is attested in the

[32] Lieu makes reference to Augustine against Faustus (thus reversing the attack) in Vermes, 41 n17.

[33] The contrast of 'outer' to 'inner' is explicit at 201, 13.

[34] Thus *PsBk II* 59, 2; 60, 8; 91, 24. At *Keph* 34, 23 the Father of Greatness is termed 'the first only begotten'; whilst in Kephalaion 119 it is one of a number of distinctly christological terms applied to the First Man. See further *Keph* 378, 6 and the comments there by W.-P. Funk.

Old Syriac;[35] and this must add weight to the arguments for authenticity. Indeed, I had immediately found this an odd phrase for a Christian author to have invented, and began to wonder if it could go back to something genuinely Manichaean (indeed to Mani himself). Cross-referencing brings one straight to the Cologne *Mani-Codex*: '(the Syzygos) disclosed the bosom of the pillar and the fathers and the powers of great strength which are hidden [in it…'.[36] The parallel is rather compelling; but, if so, why is this terminology not found more widely (e.g. in the Coptic Manichaica)? I speculate that the tradition came to avoid the term κόλπος because of its physical connotations, but that the idea is retained as the 'inner storehouses (ταμιειον)' of the Father. A good example is the account of the Great Spirit being brought forth within the Father (and subsequently the First Man in the Mother) in *Kephalaion* 24:

> He first sculpted her like this. He established her in his inner storehouses in quiet and silence. When they had need of her she was called and came forth of the Father…[37]

I think that this is the same idea, and that what we have in the 'letter to Marcellus' is actually a very valuable text for our understanding of Manichaean Christology. To continue our reading: 'the only-begotten Christ, who has descended from the κόλπος of the Father' is not 'the son of a woman called Mary, who was born of flesh and blood and all the other pollutions of women'. The image is precise: the κόλπος of the Father versus the 'womb corrupted' (to borrow phrasing from the *Psalm-Book*);[38] and the only-begotten Christ versus the son of a woman

---

[35] See F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-mepharreshe: The Curetonian version of the four gospels*, vol. I, Cambridge, 1904: 425. Burkitt gives not only the text of syr c; but references to other attestations from the early Syriac tradition, including Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron. Of course, one might also suppose that Mani's phrasing is influenced by Jn. 3:13 (as editors of the *Acta Archelai* have generally recorded). Note that he uses the same wording again when he reiterates the point in the second face-to-face dispute with Archelaus (as recorded at *Acta Archelai* 54, 11). One should also compare 36, 7 where Archelaus himself cites Jn. 1:18. In contrast to Mani (both instances and both in the Greek and the Latin) Archelaus does not use the verb 'descend', and his version is noticeably closer to the standard Greek and Latin texts.

[36] *Mani-Codex* 34, 6: ἀνέπτυξε…τὸν κόλπον τοῦ κίονος. Henrichs and Koenen (ed. princ. *ZPE* 19, 1975: 1–85) speculate that the phrasing may be influenced by the κόλπος τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, where the souls of redeemed Christians find rest (cf. Lampe s.v. 2).

[37] *Keph* 70, 28–31.

[38] *PsBk II* 52, 3 (this parallel is footnoted to both Vermes' translation of the *AA* and Williams' of the *Panarion*); and see 120, 25 and 121, 125–130, also 175, 16.

called Mary. The rejection of the Jesus 'bar Maryam' is a sign of authenticity.[39] Indeed, we must not forget that Augustine himself tells us in the *Confessions* how he had feared to envisage Jesus as mingled in the flesh, for this would mean his defilement. The only-begotten son could not be born of the virgin Mary, but was rather projected from the most luminous 'mass' of God.[40] This is very close to what we have here; but our author can not have read Augustine, and that means that they are both using the same source tradition (which must, most easily, be Mani himself).

Conclusions

In sum, this chapter began with a question that can now, to an extent, be answered. The 'letter to Marcellus' is not an entirely fictional creation of the author of the *AA*, utilised purely as a narrative device. Of course, this is not news to Manichaean scholars, as some acquaintance with Mani's genuine style is necessarily apparent from the opening phrase. However, the paper has evidenced rather more than a passing or second-hand familiarity. There is nothing here for which authorship by Mani is inherently improbable; but there are a good number of things for which a fictional creation is nearly impossible. This means that, at the very least, the author had at least one genuine example of the genre at his command; and that he has taken some care with this whole process, to the extent that we can ourselves learn something from it. However, in the present state of knowledge we can not tell precisely how close what we have is to the text by Mani himself.

For the record, and for the sense of completion, I should perhaps state my unprovable hypothesis. I do not think that the author of the *AA* has simply copied out a genuine letter by Mani for our profit. It is unlikely that he would have something so simply right for his purposes. However, I do think that he had at least one, maybe more, of Mani's *Epistles* at his desk (as it were). This he has used with some care, so that in section A ('Greetings') perhaps little more than Marcellus' name may have been added or changed. In section B there is probably more tampering: the 'I have been sent to correct the human race' strikes one

[39] See the eastern Manichaean text M 28I, R ii 24ff.; and my discussion and references throughout "The docetic Jesus," op. cit.

[40] Augustine, *Conf.* V 20: Ipsumque salvatorem nostrum, unigenitum tuum, tamquam de massa lucidissimae molis tuae porrectum ad nostram salutem ita putabam…

as somewhat bald, although Mani was no stranger to self-assertion! I suspect that the source-text would have had rather more, which our author has suppressed or paraphrased. Equally, the sudden switch to the attack on the incarnation seems especially sharpened for our author's polemical purpose. In section C the disavowal by Mani of natural eloquence strikes me as somewhat contrived; but here one is doing little more than guessing.

This hypothetical conclusion finds much more that is authentic about the letter than I would have imagined when I began the study. I have certainly not striven to find reasons for its genuineness; they have simply occurred to me the closer that I have looked into the matter. If these arguments be accepted by the scholarly community, then there are some important points that can be learnt about Mani's style, his use of scripture, and so on. More than anything else, it is the complex of christological assertions that are genuinely valuable. This helps us to understand:

> I hear that thou art in thy Father, thy Father is hidden in thee.
> When I say 'The son was begotten (?)', I shall find the Father also at his side.
> Shall I lay waste a kingdom that I may furnish a woman's womb?[41]

[41] *PsBk II* 121, 25–29 (without refrain); translation by C. R. C. Allberry.

CHAPTER FOUR

NARRATIVE OPTIONS IN MANICHAEAN ESCHATOLOGY

Tudor Andrei Sala

> For he has set a difficult beginning over against a confused ending…
>
> —Ephrem Syrus, *The Second Discourse to Hypatius*[1]

A False Witness? Re-reading Turbo's Account in the Acta Archelai

For centuries Turbo's survey of the baroque Manichaean myth in the *Acta Archelai* was the true and accurate description of Mani's teachings.[2] His words had the authority of a direct testimony provided by an alleged disciple of the arch-heresiarch. The authenticity of the material was derived from a close chain of transmission, as Turbo's account is presented as containing the teachings which Mani had imparted to his three major missionaries: Addas,[3] Thomas, and Hermas.[4] Yet the emergence throughout the twentieth century of original Manichaean texts out of the darkness of history initiated a process of corrosion and fissure upon Turbo's picture of Mani's doctrines. In subsequent scholarly editions of the text Turbo's words became heavily annotated with

---

[1] This paper was originally presented at the V Congresso Internazionale di Studi sul Manicheismo, Napoli, 3–6 Settembre 2001. The present form is a revised and expanded version. My personal thanks to Barbara Rissinger for opening the way.

[2] See Ries 1988, 17–57, esp. 21–23. Cf. also Scopello 2000. The first modern scholar who questioned the authenticity of the *Acta* was Isaac de Beausobre (Beausobre 1734, 9–154) who arrived with his keen critical eye at the following conclusion, indeed revolutionary for his time: "Toutes les Réflexions, que je viens de faire, m'ont convaincu, que les Disputes d'*Archélaüs* avec *Manichée*, ne sont au fond qu'un Roman, composé par un Grec, dans la vuë de réfuter le *Manichéïsme*, & de donner à la Foi Orthodoxe l'avantage d'en avoir triomphé, en confondant le Chef de l'Hérésie, qui la défendoit en personne." (Beausobre 1734, 152).

[3] Turbo is introduced as the disciple of Addas (*AA* 4.3).

[4] *AA* 13.4 (= Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.31.8).

references to parallel passages, concepts, or formulations in "authentic" Manichaean works.[5]

I would like to draw attention to a detail in Turbo's description of Manichaean eschatology whose anchoring in "authentic" Manichaean texts has been strongly questioned. The passage describes the closure of the cosmic conflict between Darkness and Light, the last events of the universal drama, after the Great Fire has consumed the whole world. The two versions of the text, however, do not agree on this important detail of the story. The Greek text cited by Epiphanius differs from the Latin translation of the work in a single word which, nevertheless, gives a completely different semantic turn to this dramatic final scene:

> Greek text:[6] And after this [sc. the destruction of the cosmos by the great fire] there will be a restoration of the two natures, and the archons will occupy their own realms below, while the Father will occupy the realms above, and have received his own back.[7]
>
> Latin text:[8] After this will be the restoration of the two heavenly bodies and the princes will live in their lower regions, and the father in the higher, recovering his own possessions.[9]

The two minimally different versions of Turbo's account raise the question of authenticity. The reference in the Latin version to the *restitutio* of the "two heavenly bodies" [i.e. the sun and the moon] makes little sense, as there has been no description in the text of any previous corruption of the luminaries. It is therefore highly probable that Epiphanius' Greek quotation is the original form of the text. The Latin *luminarium* is ultimately a misprision of the Greek φύσεων.[10]

It is interesting to see how the Greek version of Turbo's account describes the final stage of Manichaean eschatology as a "restoration of the two natures" (ἀποκατάστασις τῶν δύο φύσεων), a final separation

---

[5] See the dense and learned comments by Holl in his edition of the text (Holl 1933, 53–72). Cf. also the meticulous annotation of the text in Riggi 1967 and those by Lieu in Vermes 2001, 44–58.

[6] Translation by Williams 1994, 253.

[7] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.31.7 (ed. Holl/Dummer 1985): καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα **ἀποκατάστασις** ἔσται **τῶν δύο φύσεων** καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες οἰκήσουσι τὰ κατώτερα μέρη ἑαυτῶν, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ τὰ ἀνώτερα, τὸ ἴδιον ἀπολαβών.

[8] Translation by Vermes 2001, 58.

[9] *AA* 13.3 (ed. Beeson 1906): Et post haec **restitutio** erit **duorum luminarium** et principes habitabunt in inferioribus partibus suis, pater autem in superioribus, quae sua sunt recipiens.

[10] See Beeson 1906, 17.

of the two principles, and the reestablishment of the original dualism projected on a spatial dimension. The evil powers (the "archons") are envisioned as inhabiting again their own inferior realms, while the Father of Greatness, called in this summary either "Good Father" or simply "Father," is located in the upper ones.[11] This description of the final cosmic events has posed for Manichaean scholarship several intricate problems, both intratextual and intertextual.

Intratextually the narrative tension that strikes the modern reader is the apparent contradiction between this segment of Turbo's speech with its emphasis on the final ἀποκατάστασις of the two principles and a famous Manichaean mythologoumenon mentioned previously in the account. In the final clause of Turbo's synopsis, the emphasis is clearly on the "restoration of the two natures" understood as a complete disentanglement of the cosmic "mixture" (συγκράσις) of Light and Darkness leading to the reestablishment of the initial situation of two separate powers.[12] This detail is emphasised by the formulation that the Father "has received his own back" (τὸ ἴδιον ἀπολαβών), a phrase that refers to the Soul of the Primal Man, which through the primordial battle became entrapped "below" (κάτω; *deorsum*), devoured by the archons,[13] and ultimately imprisoned in the bodies of living beings.[14] In this description of the events, the restitution apparently was thought of as being complete without any remnant of Light remaining separated from the Father. However, in two previous sections in the text,[15] there is a reference to the "souls of the sinners" which shall be "imprisoned forever" in the "lump" (βῶλος). This striking imagery emphasizes the fact that a remnant of Light (inherent in every soul) shall persist separate from the Father. A final "restoration of the two

---

[11] Cf. on the spatial dimensions of Manichaean dualism the testimony of Severus of Antioch, *Hom.* 123 (ed. Brière 1960) 152, 14–16; 154, 7–18 and 154, 26–156, 8. See also the information provided by al-Nadīm (Dodge 1970, 777–778). See for a detailed discussion of the material Bennett 2001. The biting polemic of Christian heresiologists against this metaphysical topography was excellently surveyed by Wassilios Klein (Klein 1991, 59–68).

[12] For Turbo's description of the initial separation and following mixture of the two principles see Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.25.3–4 (= *AA*, 7.1–2).

[13] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.25.8 (= *AA*, 7.5).

[14] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.26.3 (= *AA*, 8.3).

[15] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.30.2 and 66.31.5. The Latin text has only one reference to the "heap of earth" (*AA* 11.3 [= *Pan.* 66.30.2]). The other passage (13.1 [= *Pan.* 66.31. 5]) is slightly corrupt, however, maintaining the concept of an eternal imprisonment of the souls of the sinners.

natures" seems hardly compatible with this imagery. Nevertheless, a detail in the text might point to an ingenious attempt to harmonize the two different concepts of eschatology. The βῶλος is said to be placed in the "middle of the new aeon" (μεταξὺ τοῦ νέου αἰῶνος).[16] Thus the concept of a final separation of the "two natures" is maintained, on a spatial dimension, with the souls of the sinners separated from Darkness, although not really part of the Light. This close reading of the text has two interesting results: 1) There is indeed a residual logical tension between two probably different eschatological scenarios (with the key terms ἀποκατάστασις and βῶλος) artificially merged together in Turbo's account; 2) however, we could also detect an ingenious, yet unconvincing, attempt to establish a certain degree of coherence and consistency between these divergent scenarios.

The intertextual tensions have been emphasised by modern scholars who read Turbo's summary of Manichaean doctrines against a background that stresses the "monolithic coherence" of Mani's religion.[17] Modern scholars have in many instances read the plurality of fragmentary sources as pieces of the same jigsaw puzzle and thus constructed a homogeneous and invariable ideological and social entity called 'Manichaeism'. The implications of this theoretical standpoint should not be underestimated, as it influences the very perception of doctrinal and social variation in Manichaeism. It is from within this paradigm that the αποκατάστασις-passage from Turbo's account has worried modern scholarship. Alexander Böhlig commented, for example, on the passage as follows:[18]

> The author has described not quite accurately the eschatological events, as he assumes a *restitutio*. This is, however, not the case. For the archons will be concentrated in the *bolos*, so that they cannot ever again initiate an attack as in the beginning.

---

[16] Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.31.5 (the Greek text is corrupted and restored in this form by the editors). Cf. *AA* 13.1.

[17] See the pertinent criticism of this widespread perspective in modern studies of Manichaeism in Lim 1989. I want to quote on this point two scholars whose work had a great impact on the modern view of Manichaeism: H. J. Polotsky, who in his landmark presentation of Manichaeism (Polotsky 1935, col. 241) emphasized "(die) wesentliche Einheitlichkeit aller Überlieferungszweige von Nordafrika und Ägypten bis China," and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, who six decades later, refers to "eine bemerkenswerte Einheitlichkeit und Homogenität" of Manichaeism (Klimkeit 1995, 387a–b).

[18] See Böhlig/Asmussen 1996, 325 n106, my translation.

As the *Acta Archelai* is a polemical work there is of course the possibility of a misrepresentation of Manichaean doctrine.[19] Böhlig's remarks, however, are expressed from a theoretical standpoint strongly challenged in this study. I attempt to move away from the question "wie es eigentlich gewesen," as it really happened, with its inherent dichotomies of "true" and "false" textual witnesses, of "valuable" and "worthless" sources.[20] This historically positivist approach assumes the "objective" existence of a historical entity called "Manichaeism" reflected more or less accurately in the literary sources we possess. In the present paper I will experiment with a different approach influenced by theories promulgated by structuralism and narratology. I will focus on the textual level of Manichaean sources and I will search for possible narratological "rules" that, I would argue, defined the narrative possibilities of Manichaean discourse.

The Manichaean Myth: the Cosmic War and Its Ending

The battle between Light and Darkness as described in the flamboyant Manichaean myth ends with the victory of the good side. That final defeat of Darkness gives to Manichaean dualism an optimistic feature, a detail often unnoticed or even misunderstood by former scholarship.[21] But what happens to the Enemy after the defeat? Almost all modern descriptions of the myth assume that "darkness is forever chained in a prison erected by the Great Architect, so that it can never again be dangerous."[22] But the imagery of imprisonment actually shows some variation.

---

[19] Cf. Michel Tardieu's attractive hypothesis on the social location of Turbo, not as a character but as a certain form of discourse: "Derrière la personalité de 'Turbon' ne se cache pas un ex-manichéen très au fait des livres et doctrines de la secte, 'Turbon' fait, lui aussi, partie du cadre romanesque des *Acta*. Cependant, sous la relation fictive, l'exposé rend bien ce qu'un observateur a pu perçevoir du manichéisme populaire dans les cités grecques d'Asie" (Tardieu 1978/79, 314). Madeleine Scopello has even suggested that Turbo's account is ultimately not a heresiological literary forgery but an authentic Manichaean document containing a summary of the main teachings to be used for missionary purposes and was integrated by the author of the *AA* to enhance the effect of authenticity. See Scopello 2000, 542–543.

[20] Cf. as a representative study for such an approach Reitzenstein 1931.

[21] On the optimistic character of Manichaean dualism see the important study: Drijvers 1984, esp. 102. Cf. also Koenen 1990.

[22] Böhlig 1991, 1520. Although there have been in the last twenty years several very detailed analyses of Manichaean eschatology (Stroumsa 1981; Koenen 1986; Hutter

The surviving fragments of Mani's first written work, the *Šābuhragān*, speak of an "impregnable prison" (*bnyst'n hwstyg'n*), which the Great Builder has built to imprison Āz and Ahriman together with the demons and the she-devils. It is in that place, the text emphasizes, that they "will be bound unceasingly for ever."[23]

The imagery of the "prison" could be used also in combination with a more gruesome picture, namely that of a "grave." This is the case in the Parthian fragment M 2 II where Ahriman is "fettered…in a prison of forgetfulness (*bnd 'n'by'd*)" so that finally the Father of Light can receive the following report of the things that happened in the end:[24]

> And that evildoer who boasted falsely and fought with your greatness is imprisoned and shut into a mighty grave (*dxmg*) from which he can never escape. […] Now you have no more foes and rivals; rather, eternal victory is yours.

A more graphic imagery is to be found in Ibn al-Nadīm's account where the Spirit of Darkness is shut in a "tomb" (*qabr*) and blocked there with "a rock the size of the world" so that she cannot escape.[25]

The most imaginative description of the final imprisonment of Darkness is to be found in *Kephalaion* 41, where the third, decisive "blow" (πληγή) against "the enemy" (𐰀𐰇𐰇𐰋) is its sterilisation. The two sexes (an essential feature of the Kingdom of Darkness)[26] are separated for ever:[27] "the male will be bound in the βῶλος ['lump'],[28] [b]ut the

---

1989; Oerter 1991; Gardner 1993; Smagina 1994; Ries 1995; and Sundermann 1998), most of them have read the sources from a unitary perspective.

[23] M 7981 I V, 334–357 (ed. Hutter 1992, 44–45; trans.: Klimkeit 1993, 229). A fragment (M 7984 I R i) identified as part of the same work refers in connection with the eschatological "renewal" (*pršygyrd*) to the *prg'r* of Āz and the demons, which most probably is to be translated as "defeat." See Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 278 (*s.v.*).

[24] M 2 II V I, 77–78 and V II, 120–138 (ed. *Mir.Man.* III, 851.853; cf. also Boyce 1975, 86 (text ac, 6.8); trans.: Klimkeit 1993, p. 255). Cf. also the Parthian hymn (M 173 R + M 94 R) which uses the same language of burial: "The demon of Darkness will be buried together with his abyss…" (Boyce 1975, 103 (text as, 3); trans.: Klimkeit 1993, 40).

[25] Dodge 1970, 783.

[26] Al-Biruni, *India* I, 39 (*apud* Adam 1969, 4–5). Cf. Puech 1937, 206.

[27] Koustaios' great eschatological sermon does not use the imagery of separation of the sexes. In his version of the imprisonment of Darkness its two sexes are confined together: "He will restrain Darkness in the G[rave, (both) its male nature] and its female nature" (*Hom* 41, 6–7). See on this Pedersen 1996, 379–380.

[28] For βῶλος as a *terminus technicus* in Manichaean discourse see Jackson 1938 and Decret 1974. Cf. also Smagina 1994.

fem[ale] w[ill be thrown] i[n] the τάφος ['tomb']" (*Keph* 105, 32–33).[29] The account concludes:[30]

> This is the way that the binding (ⲙⲣⲣⲉ) of the enemy will come about, in a fetter that is burdensome and strong, one from which there is never escape; because [they have achieved] this binding and bound him for ever. And they have achieved his being set apart, and he has been set apart for ever (106, 1–4).[31]

This short survey has shown that the final immobilisation of Darkness is attested in various sources. But is it the only ending the myth could have had?

Choices in the Narrative Maze

The relative scantiness and fragmentary nature of the different sources (be they Manichaean or foreign accounts) can render difficult the perception of deviations. To alleviate the situation I will fall back on theories put forward by the perhaps most ambitious project of modern literary theory: narratology.

The struggle between two forces (Good and Evil, Light and Darkness) represents the generative principle of the different elaborations of the Manichaean doctrine. The whole cosmos, the animals, the plants, and finally man himself, are the results of this universal combat. History in its entirety was for Mani nothing else than different stages of this struggle.[32]

While artistically weaving his *grand récit* Mani had to confine his vision of the cosmic battle to a narrative pattern.[33] This does not mean that he simply adopted some ancient story for his own teachings. His narrative is based on an original thinking through the different logical

---

[29] The same vocabulary (τάφος, ⲙⲣⲣⲉ, βῶλος), however, with a less sophisticated version of the events is used in *Kephalaion* 24 (*Keph* 75, 27–29 and 76, 4–8).

[30] Translation by Gardner 1995, 110.

[31] It is interesting to mention that Ephrem had knowledge of all these three key terms and used them in his descriptions of Manichaean eschatology: "prison" [bēt ḥbušyā] (Reeves frg. 5 [= *Hyp.* 2, 16–3, 2]), "grave" [qabrā] (Reeves frgs. 85–87 [= *Hyp.* 3, 27–35; 39, 18–22; 94, 42–47]), and "lump" [bolos] (Reeves frg. 88 [= *Hyp.* 87, 33–88, 6]). See Reeves 1997, 227 and 256–258.

[32] On Mani's vision of history see Nagel 1974. Cf. also Henrichs 1986.

[33] Modern studies of comparative literature tried to reconstruct a vast tradition of narrative called the "combat myth" and located also Mani within it. See Forsyth 1987, esp. 390–395.

possibilities of the story that unfold from some basic premises similar to the branches of a tree.[34] Yet to make a coherent story he had to choose only one way in this narrative maze. The text fragments of his *Šābuhragān* (cited earlier) might point to the path he had chosen. To understand the discursive context of this narrative choice, we have to re-read Mani's role as a "founder" of religion.

Perhaps[35] for the first time in history an individual deliberately devised a "world religion."[36] In no other religion before did the "founder" play such an important role.[37] It was Mani himself who established the three major pillars of his religion: a complex set of doctrines outlined in a series of books, a clear body of rituals and a fixed organizational structure. The most important aspect is the universality attributed by Mani to his religion, which was not perceived by him as a new creation but as the fulfilment of all the previous faiths.[38]

Mani's emphasis on the universality and ultimate nature of his teachings materialized in a series of books through which he tried to establish the textual foundation of his church.[39] The importance given to the written aspect of his religion offers an insight into an acute logophobia,[40] a strong aversion toward the plurality of the spoken word. *Kephalaion* 151 lets him say:

> My church is superior in the wisdom and [the secrets?] which I have revealed to you in it. As for this [immeasurable] wisdom I have written it in the holy books—in the great [Gospel] and the other writings—lest it be altered [after] me. As I have written it in the books, thus [I have] also ordered it to be drawn. For all the [apostles], my brothers, who have come before me, [have not written] their wisdom in the books as I have written it. [Neither have] they drawn their wisdom in the Picture(-Book) as [I have drawn] it.[41]

---

[34] Cf. Roland Barthes, *S/Z*, Paris, 1970, 209–210.

[35] This picture emerges from the surviving Manichaean sources. However, as we lack the original works of Mani, which unfortunately are extant only in a limited number of fragments, it is impossible to assert with confidence the self-conscious creation of Manichaeism as a "world religion" by Mani himself. There remains the possibility that this image is a retro-projection of a more developed stage of Manichaeism after the demise of its "founder."

[36] Cf. Jonathan Z. Smith, "A Matter of Class. Taxonomies of Religion," in J. Z. Smith, *Relating Religion. Essays in the Study of Religion*, Chicago, 2004, 169.

[37] Cf. the excellent portrait of Mani drawn in Klein 1992.

[38] See Gardner/Lieu 2004, 1.

[39] On Mani's writings see Tardieu 1997, 43–63. Cf. also Tubach 2000.

[40] I am adopting Foucault's terminology. See Foucault 1982, 228–229.

[41] *Keph* 371, 20–29, my translation following Funk 2000. Cf. for a discussion of the *Kephalaia* passage Oerter 1990. See also a similar argument for the superiority of

We can sense here the aforementioned prominence given by Mani to the written word due to the immutability associated with it. The emphasis on his personal achievement of giving to his teachings a written form is a symptom for his fear of the transitional and volatile nature of orality and the disorderly proliferation of discourse. The great importance given to his books is evident in his last exhortations to his followers before his death, in which he also asks them to "give heed to my books" (ϯϩⲧⲏⲛⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲭⲱⲙⲉ).[42] For the Christian heresiologists, Mani became the heretical author *par excellence*. Exemplary is his caricature in the *Acta Archelai* wearing high-heels, a multi-colored cloak, two-colored trousers (in scarlet and leek-green) and having a "Babylonian book" (*Babylonium librum*) under his left arm.[43] Yet, having already diagnosed Mani's logophobia, I would like to apply to him a different concept of "authorship."

In his *leçon inaugurale* at the Collège de France (1970) Michel Foucault inverted the traditional understanding of the author. Against the practice which thinks of the author as being "the source of discourse, the principle behind its flourishing and continuity," Foucault encourages us to consider the author a "principle of thrift," "the negative activity of the cutting-out and rarefaction of discourse."[44]

By reading Mani on the background of Foucault's view of the author, the traditional picture of Mani's role as a religious "founder" is reversed. Instead of describing him as a "religious genius," the actual source of Manichaean discourse, such a reading would emphasize Mani's limiting and constraining function in the proliferation of meaning. By giving to his teachings a written form, and through his attempt to implement them as the textual authority of his church, Mani tried to prevent the transformation and uncontrolled proliferation of his teachings. He hoped that the immutable aspect of a script codifying his "wisdom" would undo the network of possibilities which opened with the setting of certain premises of his teaching.

This marked determination literally invites the historian to ask: Did Mani succeed in confining the logical possibilities of the established

---

Mani's religion expounded by Mani in the same *Kephalaion*: "One has not written or revealed the books in the way I have written them" (*Keph* 372, 19–20).

[42] *Hom* 44, 25.

[43] *AA*, 14.3.

[44] Foucault 1982, 229; idem, "What Is an Author?" in M. Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. by James D. Faubion (Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984, vol. 2), New York, 1998, 205–222, esp. 221–222.

narrative structure of his myth? Did the Manichaeans really accept only one ending of their cosmic drama?

Tracing the Logic of the Ending

To answer these questions let us first take a look at a very intriguing example of Manichaean poetry, the Coptic *Bēma Psalm* 223.[45] The psalm is a concise description of the "knowledge" (ⲥⲁϩⲛⲉ) of Mani, his magnificent teaching about the "two principles" and "the three times." Following the division in different stanzas proposed by Gregor Wurst in his new edition of the *Bēma Psalms*,[46] we encounter in the sixteenth stanza the 'classic' description of what shall happen after the final defeat of Darkness:[47]

> In a moment the Living Spirit will come [—]
> [—] he will succour the Light. But the counsel of death
> and the Darkness he will shut up in the dwelling [Wurst: "tomb"]
> that was established for it, that it might be bound in it for ever.

The following stanza, the seventeenth, is a caesura in the steady narrative flow of the entire psalm. The poetic text focuses up to this point on a general survey of the major events of the Manichaean myth, following the characteristic tripartite division of time: the things that have been, those that are, and those that shall be. Suddenly, however, the narration is interrupted by a description of events which 'shall not be':[48]

> There is no other means to bind the Enemy save this means; for
> he will not be received to the Light because he is a stranger to it;
> nor again can he be left in his land of Darkness, that he may
> not wage a war greater than the first.

It is fascinating to realize that the text vehemently rejects at this point two alternative endings of the narrative, two logical solutions of the combat plot. The author of the psalm was aware that by adopting the "eternal imprisonment" solution he had made a choice—for him the only reasonable choice—between other possible variants. As Claude

---

[45] *PsBk II* 9, 2–11, 32.
[46] Wurst 1996.
[47] *Bēma Psalms* 223:16 [ed. Wurst 1996 = *PsBk II* 11, 13–16]. I am following the translation in Allberry 1938 with a possible emendation proposed by Wurst.
[48] *Bēma Psalms* 223:17 [= *PsBk II* 11, 17–20].

Bremond has shown, such a choice between narrative possibilities lies at the very heart of every narration.[49] Why, however, was it necessary exactly at this point of the retelling of the myth to deny narrative alternatives? Could these lines be polemical refutations of deviationists?

In the attempt to answer these questions it is necessary to look at the logical scheme which opened with every re-telling of the myth. I will restrict my inquiry to a specific instance of Manichaean eschatology, the ending of the cosmic battle. My focus will be for the moment not on actual texts but on a formal and abstract theoretical construct of the Manichaean myth encompassing every logical variant of the narration. This heuristic theoretical construct will facilitate the perception of the different logical possibilities of the battle and by this will make possible the search for their historical actualizations.

The sequences of action in the dualistic Manichaean myth are built on the struggle of two entities: A (Light) vs. B (Darkness), with the final victory of the good side (A) over its enemy (B). What, then, are the logical solutions of this defeat? What can happen to the vanquished enemy? Dichotomous options split up:[50]

I. B dies (= is destroyed/annihilated)
II. B does not die: a) it is imprisoned (= immobilisation)
b) it is set free (= restoration of the initial setting before the battle)

As we have seen, the *Bēma Psalm* 223 while advocating the "immobilisation" solution (II.a) repudiates the "set free" solution (II.b) and argues emphatically against it. In this venture it explores thee logical possibilities by playing the game of "what could happen if."

The first solution it offers one might call the "integration" solution:[51] the defeated adversary (B) accepts the defeat, puts aside the hostile intentions and becomes an ally. This is complete nonsense for the author, for he argues that "the enemy" (ⲡⲁⲗⲁⲗⲉ) remains "a stranger" (ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲙⲟ), something different from "the Light" (ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉ) and thus it cannot be "received to the Light."

---

[49] Claude Bremond, *Logique du récit*, Paris, 1973; idem, "The Logic of Narrative Possibilities," *New Literary History* 11 (1980) 387–411.

[50] This scheme obviously maps only the basic options of the narrative. There are numerous intermediary stages which could be interposed (wounding, running away, chasing, simulation of death etc.) which, however, can ultimately be reduced to these basic options.

[51] *PsBk II* 11, 18.

The second solution is the "reiteration of the battle" solution:[52] the defeated adversary (B) survives the battle, and he maintains his hostile intentions remaining a permanent threat in attacking again the Kingdom of Light as he did in the beginning. To prevent this he has to be bound.

So far I have made an attempt to listen to what the text tries to say. Now, however, I shall venture to be attentive to its silence. While it denies vehemently the possibility of one solution (with its two logical implications), it keeps silent on the other virtual ending of the battle, namely the final destruction of the enemy (B), the "annihilation" solution (I.). It is very interesting to find that in other contexts this ending of the cosmic battle did not remain virtual, as one finds its actualisation in Alexander of Lycopolis' description of the Manichaean myth.[53] There the evil principle, *Hylē* ("matter"), is in the end annihilated by the "dark fire, without light":[54]

> They say that when the divine power has been truly separated, the outer fire will collapse and burn up both itself and whatever is left of matter.

Already a previous section of the account alludes to the dramatic end of *Hylē*. While describing the mixture between "soul" (the "power" sent by God to ultimately defeat the opponent) and *Hylē* as an act of divine providence, the final "separation" is pictured as bringing about "the death of matter."[55]

A similar fatal outcome for "matter" is assumed in the Manichaean source[56] quoted extensively by Severus of Antioch in his lengthy refuta-

---

[52] *PsBk II* 11, 19–20.

[53] Most scholars agree that the testimony of the late third/early fourth century pagan philosopher on the doctrines of the Manichaean dualists reflects a de-mythologized philosophical transformation of the original teachings of Mani in the context of intense missionary activities in Alexandria among philosophical groups. See for an overview of the scholarship Villey 1985, 26–32, esp. 32.

[54] Alexander of Lycopolis, *contr. Manich.* (ed. Brinkmann 1895) 8, 1–4: ἀποχωρισθείσης δὲ ἀκριβῶς τῆς θείας δυνάμεως τὸ ἔξω πῦρ φασι συμπεσὸν ἑαυτό τε καὶ τὸ ἄλλο σύμπαν, ὅ τι δἄν λείπηται τῆς ὕλης, συγκαταφλέξειν. (Trans. van der Horst 1974, 57)

[55] Alexander of Lycopolis, *contr. Manich*, 5, 23–25: ἔσεσθαι γὰρ τῆς ὕλης θάνατον τὸν μετὰ ταῦτά ποτε τῆς δυνάμεως ταύτης χωρισμόν.

[56] The identity of the Manichaean work used by Severus has still not been clarified. See Reeves 1992, 165–183 with an accurate rejection of previous identifications of the work with Mani's *Book of Mysteries* or his *Book of Giants*. Tardieu 1997, 116 proposes the hypothesis that the quotations stem from Mani's *Pragmateia*. Recently, more cautious and differentiating approaches have been pursued. Bennett 2001 suggests that the source document was an epitome of Manichaean doctrine containing citations from Mani's *Living Gospel*. A recent major monograph on Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos*

tion of Manichaeism present in his 123rd homily.[57] The Manichaean work describes the outcome of the "mixture" of the two principles, the "purification" of Light, as having a devastating consequence for Hyle: "after the purification Hyle will be reduced to complete destruction."[58] A previous quotation depicts the same sequence of events emphasizing that with the purification of the "particles of Light" "Hyle will be expunged from (its) midst."[59]

There is also another text corpus which seems to have adopted the "annihilation" solution. One finds certain formulations which point in that direction in The *Psalms of Thomas*, that group of psalms which has an eccentric position in the Coptic Manichaean *Psalm-Book*.[60] At the end of the second psalm, "Concerning the Coming of the Soul,"[61] the First Man is envisioned, after his "shining robe" has been saved (an evident reference to the eschatological setting of this vision),[62] striking lethal blows against the Darkness:[63]

> Then I will strike my foot on the earth
> and sink their Darkness down.
> I will smite their height with my head
> and shake their firmament.
> And the stars shall fall down like [leaves].[64]
> And I will uproot (ϯⲛⲁⲡⲁⲣⲕ) the Darkness and cast it out (ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲁϫⲫ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ)[65]

---

has provided new insights by locating the Greek anti-Manichaean works of Alexander of Lycopolis and Titus of Bostra in the context of fourth century active Manichaean missionary activity in the Mediterranean basin among philosophically inclined circles (Pedersen 2004, esp. 88, 161, 186–199). I think that this trajectory of research will be most fruitful for the identification of the Manichaean work used by Severus in the sixth century. Cf. Pedersen 2004, 193 (n. 40).

[57] The Syriac translation of Jacob of Edessa of the original Greek text has been edited by Cumont/Kugener 1912, 89-150 (only that part of the homily dealing explicitly with the refutation of Manichaean doctrine) and Brière 1960, 122–189 (the entire homily). I am following the translation provided by Reeves 1992, 167–170, esp. 170.

[58] Severus of Antioch, *hom.* 123, ed. Cumont/Kugener 1912, 144.4–10 [= ed. Brière 1960, 174.3–7].

[59] Severus of Antioch, *hom.* 123, ed. Cumont/Kugener 1912, 127, 3–5 [= ed. Brière 1960, 166.8–9].

[60] See on the distinctive nature of the *Psalms of Thomas*: Nagel 1980, 15–27.

[61] *PsBk II* 205, 10–207, 16.

[62] See the pertinent remarks by Peter Nagel on this passage (Nagel 1980, 74–75).

[63] *Psalms of Thomas* III: 42–46.49 [= *PsBk II* 207, 5–10.13]. I follow the sequence of the verses proposed by Nagel 1980, 34–35 and the translation of Allberry 1938.

[64] Conjecture after Nagel 1980, 35.

[65] See *PsBk* II 217, 9–10. Cf. Mt. 5:29.

and plant Light in its place.[66]
I will uproot the Evil and cast it out
and plant the Good in its place.
[…]
There being no more rebel from henceforth…

Similarly in other psalms (nos. VI, VIII, IX) the end of the struggle is described with the formula "The Light shall return to its place, the Darkness shall fall and not rise again (ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ ⲛⲁϩⲉⲓⲉ ⲛϥⲧⲙⲥⲱⲧ ⲁⲧⲱⲱⲛ)";[67] or with a slightly different formulation, "Then the Light shall go to the Light and the Darkness be blotted out (ⲃⲱⲧⲉ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) from its place."[68] All these psalms share a strong emphasis on the final destruction of the Darkness, persistently depicted in a very vivid imagery.

Having explored some textual evidence for the solution tacitly omitted by the Coptic Manichaean *Bēma Psalm* 223, let us return to the "set free" solution refuted so vehemently in the same psalm. In this polemical context it is very interesting to find a Manichaean source which probably adopted this solution. The text, the Chinese *Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light*, comes, however, from the other end of the Manichaean world.[69] In it the last stage of the cosmic drama is described as follows:[70]

> In the latter period, the conversion through teaching is concluded. The true and the disordered are returned to their root; the Light is returned to the Great Light (*daming*), and the Darkness is returned to the amassed Darkness (*ji'an*). Each of the two principles has been restored, and both have returned (to their original state).

The very condensed form of the text, a summary of the central teachings and practices of the sect compiled by imperial order by a Manichaean bishop in 731 CE, denies us any certainty on the actual

---

[66] Cf. *PsBk II* 212, 28–30.
[67] *PsBk II* 215, 5–6; cf. *PsBk II* 212, 4–5 and 215, 14–15.
[68] *PsBk II* 215, 24–26.
[69] See on the importance of the text the survey by Nahal Tajadod (Tajadod 1990, 5–41).
[70] Ms. cols. 108–109. Dr. Gunner B. Mikkelsen (Aarhus) was so kind to offer me a draft translation of this passage, making me also attentive to the several possible interpretations of the Chinese. Cf. also the French and German translations: Chavannes/Pelliot 1913, 139–140, Tajadod 1990, 65, and Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, 75 (note that the German translation is missing by mistake the passage about the final fate of Darkness).

meaning of its description of the final events. I think, however, that it is quite possible that we have in front of us a piece of textual evidence for the actualization of the "set-free" solution (II.b). The account has no reference to a final imprisonment or destruction of Darkness.[71] And the text clearly imagines the two principles in this last stage of the drama as returning to "their roots" and being finally "restored." There is an obvious difference between such a testimony and the one presented in *Kephalaion* 16:[72]

> While [the li]ght goes to its country, the darkness remains in [the chain] and fetter for ever (ⲛⲧ[ⲉⲡⲟⲩ]ⲁⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲃⲱⲕ ⲁⲧⲉϥⲭⲱⲣⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ ϩⲱϥ ⲟⲩⲱ ϩⲛ[ⲧⲙⲣⲣⲉ] ⲙⲛ ⲡⲥⲛⲁϩ ϣⲁⲁⲛϩⲉ).

In this context it is worthwhile to return to Turbo's account in the *AA* with its emphasis on the "restoration of the two natures" (ἀποκατάστασις τῶν δύο φύσεων).[73] As we have mentioned previously, this version of Manichaean eschatology has been treated very sceptically by past scholarship, as an undeniably biased source.[74] However, the methodological perspective of the present paper could place Turbo's account in a different context, beyond the dichotomy of a "true" vs. a "false" textual witness. From this perspective the contested version displays an actualisation of a logical variant for the end of the struggle. Indeed we do not posses other testimonies of such a teaching in the Western Manichaean sources and the possibility of polemical distortion remains a definite possibility. However, the analysis given here enables the historian to realise that this possible "distortion" clearly followed the logic of the Manichaean myth. The (mis)representation of the polemicist traced just another possible line in "the garden of forking paths" (Borges) which is the Manichaean myth as a narrative.

Finally, I would like to draw attention to Epiphanius' refutation of the alleged Manichaean doctrine of the eschatological ἀποκατάστασις τῶν δύο φύσεων, as present in the *AA*, from which he quotes extensively.[75]

---

[71] The formulation used to describe the final state of Darkness has no connotation of any sort of confinement. Dr. Mikkelsen drew to my attention that "the word *ji* means 'to amass, store up, pile up, hoard, accumulate' and it contains no aspect of confinement" (personal communication).

[72] *Keph* 52, 17–19 (trans. Gardner 1995, 57).

[73] Riggi has already used the Chinese *Compendium*'s description of eschatology as a "textual anchor" for Turbo's account. See Riggi 1967, 157 n3.

[74] Cf., however, Scopello 2000, 542–543.

[75] Epiphanius, *Panarion* [ed. Holl/Dummer 1985], 66.58.3–6.

Interestingly enough, Epiphanius' polemical attack develops along the same teleological and ontological lines of reasoning as the earlier quoted seventeenth stanza of the Coptic Manichaean *Bēma Psalm* 223.[76] The great battler for orthodoxy scoffs at a final "apocatastatis of the two natures", saying:[77] "What a lot of trouble, and after the trouble no improvement!"[78] For Epiphanius, as for *Bēma Psalm* 223, such an ending opens up the possibility of a new beginning of the war between Light and Darkness, by this undermining in his view any sense of Mani's Great Myth. For, following Epiphanius' opinion, the restoration of the initial state (the two natures being again separated) "will serve as provocation for the evil nature to come back, start a war and seize some more power, so that there will be another world."[79]

Epiphanius' second attack parallels the first refutation of the Coptic psalm. There the final integration of the enemy is repudiated on the ground that Darkness is "a stranger" (ⲟⲩϫⲱⲙⲙⲟ) to the Light and so it cannot be received in the realm of Light.[80] Epiphanius similarly argues against this solution. For if there shall be no future war after the restoration of the two natures then

> evil will learn sense and not be provoked at goodness any more; and [so will] the evil god, who will declare no more wars on the good God. But if he is ever taught sense he will no longer be evil, since he has been changed and altered from his original evil nature (58, 5–6).

Such an ontological change in the nature of evil is perceived by Epiphanius as totally absurd.[81] Therefore he concludes: "If evil is altogether unchangeable it can never stop warring and being warred on, and there can never be a restoration of the two natures."[82]

This convergence of two utterly different texts, a Manichaean psalm and a heresiological refutation, over arguments brought against narrative solutions of the struggle between the Light and the Darkness, displays an intriguing common episteme evident in the cutting off of possible

---

[76] *PsBk II* 11, 17–20.

[77] I am using in the next passages from the *Panarion* the translation by Williams 1994, 275.

[78] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.58.3.

[79] Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.58.4. Cf. *PsBk II* 11, 19–20: "nor again can he be left in his land of Darkness, that he may not wage a war greater than the first."

[80] *PsBk II* 11, 18.

[81] See his discussion of the metaphysical implications of this ontological change (Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.58.6–7).

[82] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 66.58.8.

branches of the narrative tree. However, this interaction between the narrative and the outer systems (ideological, metaphysical, social etc.) lies beyond the limits of this study.[83]

Coda

My aim in this chapter has been to draw attention to a neglected diversity of an important aspect of Manichaean eschatology, the fate of the evil principle. Mani, by giving to his teachings the garments of myth, produced a story which became the foundation of the Manichaean semantic universe. However, stories are prone to change. Their present form is always one choice in a narrative maze, a specific option for a certain plot from a multitude of possibilities. The Manichaean myth should have been no exception in this respect. Its plot must have been both expanded and altered over time and in different social and cultural settings. Unfortunately, the scarce textual evidence from the vast expansion of Manichaeism during its long and dramatic history renders more difficult a clear picture of any doctrinal and socio-religious diversity.

The use in this chapter of heuristic instruments provided by modern narratology have made possible the perception of a narrative plurality in the Manichaean myth. It has become evident that the cosmic war between Light and Darkness could not have been restricted to a single outcome. The inherent logical alternatives in the plot pressed upon history, and in certain instances reality yielded to a different ending. The major question remains, however, whether this diversity reflects actual differences in Manichaean teaching, or just various formulations used in different discursive contexts (e.g., in missionary activities) for the final defeat of the enemy. The narratological perspective adopted in this study cannot answer such questions. Further inquiries into the social and cultural locale of the texts might provide tentative answers.

It is necessary, however, to stress that the possibility of a doctrinal difference is intimately related to the question of actual schisms in the religious community. It is well known that the Manichaean community experienced a schism into two major sectarian divisions over a difference

[83] Cf. Roland Barthes, "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives," in R. Barthes, *Image—Music—Text*, trans. by Stephen Heath, London, 1977, 115–116. This interaction will be pursued in a future study.

related to another narratological tension point of the myth. Interestingly enough this element of dissent was also part of the eschatological discourse—with important implications for general soteriology.

Several Arabic sources, mainly dependant on the account of Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq, provide us with the very interesting information about a dissent among Manichaeans on the possibility of the salvation of all the Light from its mixture with Darkness. Some maintained that in the end all the Light will be saved, while others held that a luminous part will remain damned and mingled with Darkness. The Muslim encyclopedist Ibn al-Nadīm supplies the name of the sect, called *Māsīya*, who "asserts that something of the Light will remain in the Darkness."[84] The different stages of this conflict remain elusive for the modern historian. We can discern, however, the inherent pattern of possible alternatives governing the Manichaean myth also in relation to the resolution of the mixture of Light and Darkness. The *Māsīya* clearly followed the more pessimistic of the binary options to the outcome of the cosmic mixture.

The case of the *Māsīya* shows that alternative solutions to a narrative moment could provoke a split in the community. Such valuable information about doctrinal diversity in Manichaeism is very rare. Any attempt to trace the historical changes of Manichaean religion has to make a shift to a different level of reading Manichaeism. Only a plural reading of the fragments of Manichaean texts focusing on the incoherencies, fissures, differences, and transformations can disintegrate the monolithic perception of the religion of Light. The narratological instruments presented in this paper could play a useful role in strengthening the dim and distorted voices of dissent.

---

[84] See Dodge 1970, 783. Werner Sundermann proposed deriving the term from the Sogdian *māsē* ("old; ancient") interpreting it as "altgläubig." Arguing that this group might have been "traditionalists," as the same doctrine of a remnant of Light remaining mixed with Darkness and thus unredeemed, may possibly be traced back to Mani himself. See the Parthian text M 2 II (ed. *Mir.Man. III*, 849–853; trans. Klimkeit 1993, 254–255) generally attributed by modern scholars to Mani. This attribution remains, however, questionable. See Sundermann 1986, 83 n281. François de Blois has carefully reconstructed Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq's work on Manichaeism which was the central source for the accounts of Manichaean cosmology in Arabic encyclopedic/polemical texts. See on this de Blois 2005. I have to thank Prof. de Blois for generously giving me in advance of publication a copy of his reconstructions of the passages from al-Warrāq and an-Nawbaxtī.

CHAPTER FIVE

A CLASH OF PORTRAITS: CONTRASTS BETWEEN ARCHELAUS AND MANI IN THE *ACTA ARCHELAI*

J. Kevin Coyle

My earlier contribution to this volume was an effort toward a better understanding of the inner structure and purpose of the *Acts of Archelaus* (*AA*). My finding there was that in choosing, arranging, and presenting the components that make up the text, the author was pursuing a particular agenda that could have been served equally well by either an historically-based event or a purely fictional creation.

Here I seek a closer comparison of the two main protagonists, Mani and Archelaus, with particular attention to the style and points of reference in their discourse. The present study is part of a broader attempt to understand the language of ancient heresiology, and it seems particularly appropriate that it be applied to a Christian polemical work that influenced so much of subsequent Christian anti-Manichaica.[1]

I begin with Madeleine Scopello's observation that

> The same points that attracted heresiology's attention have also seduced modern criticism. The other parts of the *Acta Archelai*, made up of the theological controversies between Mani and the bishop of Carchar, and that in fact comprise the majority of the text, were commented on only very rarely.[2]

In other words, the *AA*'s influence, considerable though it was, extended only to the more "biographical" and narrative elements; and the same

---

[1] Scopello 2000, 531: "Les *Acta Archelai* sont très vite devenus, quelques décennies après leur parution, l'indispensable outil lorsqu'on parle de manichéisme. Repris dans les catalogues d'hérésies, remaniés dans les oeuvres de réfutation plus complexes, on les a accommodés à toutes les sauces." See also 541–44; Spät 2004, 2; and Tardieu 1987, 279.

[2] Scopello 2000, 544: "Les mêmes points qui attirèrent l'attention de l'hérésiologie ont également séduit la critique moderne. Les autres parties des *Acta Archelai* constituées par les controverses théologiques entre Mani et l'évêque de Carchara, et qui occupent en réalité la plus grande partie du texte, ne furent que très rarement commentées."

is true of modern studies of the text. Thus, when Michel Tardieu says that "The literary interest of the *Acta Archelai* lies in its method of rebutting the adversary,"[3] he is only half right; that *should* be the literary interest, but it is an interest commonly expressed through little more than a marshaling of the arguments the protagonists employ. In fact, Heinrich von Zittwitz has been the only one so far to broach the text's argumentative threads, and that was well before the close of the nineteenth century.[4] Here I would like to expand on his work by examining both the content and the style of the arguments, and the discourse that mediates them, in the *AA*. The scope this time will be limited to the exchange of letters between Mani and Marcellus (chapters 5–6), and to the first of the two encounters between Mani and Archelaus (15–42). (Indeed, the *AA* begins by alluding only to the encounter in "Carchar," inferring that the first was the only one that actually took place, or at least that it was the only one the writer originally intended to report.)[5]

The key to my examination is the text's own technique of fault-finding comparison. Scopello and others have noted how the *AA* begins by describing itself as "the true treasure" (1.1)—in contrast, of course, with Mani's *Treasure* (*of Life*).[6] The negative comparison is enhanced by the respective introductions of Mani and Archelaus. The latter, orthodox bishop of "Carchar," is in the company of the devout and charitable Christian layman Marcellus, first citizen of that (possibly fictional) Roman town on the border with Persia. We find these two righteous individuals comfortably ensconced on their own turf, while the text devotes considerable space (1.2–3.6) to Marcellus' credentials. In contrast, Mani is on the move. The reader first meets him in chapter 4, where in a Persian border garrison he is scheming to construct a means of ideological ingress into the Roman Empire, for which Marcellus is to serve as the access ramp:

> he debated with himself very seriously as to how he could ensnare him in the nets of his own doctrine, hoping that Marcellus could be made a proclaimer of his own dogma. For Manes assumed that he would be

[3] Tardieu 1987, 280.

[4] Zittwitz 1873.

[5] 1.1 (Beeson 1906, 1.3–4): Thesaurus verus sive *disputatio habita in Carcharis civitate* Mesopotamiae Archelai episcopi adversus Manen…(my emphasis).

[6] Scopello 2000, 530; Hansen 1966, 475; and S. N. C. Lieu's comment in Vermes, 35 n1.

> able to seize the entire province provided he could first win over such a man to himself.[7]

To accomplish this, Mani will have to take account of Marcellus' fervent Christianity. To that end, he writes Marcellus a letter in which, as if to avert any suspicion about his intentions, he quotes 1 Corinthians 7:35 ("I do not 'cast a snare on anyone' ") as a prelude to the assertion that he needs to set no snares (5.6)[8] because, the text continues, "he feared that by an unexpected and sudden approach some harm might be generated to himself."[9] From the start, then, Mani is made to seem both temerarious and timorous.

The letter to Marcellus is possibly derived from an authentic letter of Mani[10] but, if that is the case, it has undergone some modifications. It begins as many authentic letters of Mani do, save for the mention of "all the saints and virgins with me" (5.1);[11] indeed, twenty-two young men and women "elect" are said to accompany him to "Carchar,"[12] after which nothing more is heard of them. The letter's overall purpose, it seems, is to have Mani invite himself to Marcellus' home (5.6)—after disparaging Marcellus' variety of religion (5.2). Indeed, the letter is rather short on diplomacy. Though sent, Mani says, "with a view to the salvation of your own soul, and . . . the salvation of those with you" (5.3),[13] it contains no positive teaching—only an attack on the "indiscriminate opinions" (5.3)[14] that evil and good share a common origin, that there is only one ultimate principle, and that no real distinction

---

[7] 4.1–2, Vermes, 39 (Beeson 1906, 4.23–26: plurimum ipse secum volvebat quemadmodum eum doctrinae suae posset laqueis inretire, sperans adsertorem dogmatis sui fieri posse Marcellum. Praesumebat enim universam se posse occupare provinciam, si prius talem virum sibimet subdere potuisset).

[8] The very accusation the narrator has just made. Archelaus will pick up on it in the second encounter (59.11).

[9] 4.2, Vermes, 39 (Beeson 1906, 5.2–3: verebatur enim ne forte inproviso et subito ingressu malum sibi aliquod nasceretur).

[10] See Iain Gardner's contribution to this volume, Chapter Three; also Zittwitz 1873, 474–93.

[11] Beeson 1906, 5.25–26: qui mecum sunt omnes sancti et virgines (οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἅγιοι καὶ παρθένοι).

[12] 14.2, Beeson 1906, 22.21–22: adducens secum iuvenes et virgines electos ad viginti duo simul.

[13] Vermes, 41 (Beeson 1906, 6.23–24: ad salutem animae tuae, deinde et eorum qui tecum sunt). Greek: πρὸς σωτηρίαν τῆς σεαυτοῦ ψυχῆς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἅμα σοι τυγχανόντων.

[14] Vermes, 41 (Beeson 1906, 6.24: uti ne indiscretos animos geras). Vermes' translation here more closely approximates the Greek: πρὸς τὸ<μη>ἀδιάκριτόν σε ἔχειν τὸν λογισμόν.

exists between good/evil, light/darkness, or the inner/outer person. "As we have described before," adds Mani (5.3)[15]—as if Marcellus would have known that! Mani goes on to attack the notions that God (the good principle) created Satan (principle of evil), and that (the true) Christ had Mary for a mother (5.5).

For his part, Archelaus is portrayed as confident and confrontational. On hearing Mani's letter, he "received the contents as they were read without any pleasure, and gnashed his teeth like a caged lion [see 1 Peter 5:8], eager to get his hands on the author of the letter" (6.1).[16] Then, listening to the testimony of Mani's letter-carrier Turbo, he is "greatly incensed" (14.1).[17] He and Marcellus grill Turbo about Mani's life and teaching—both apparently unknown to them before this (6.5).[18] Turbo therefore provides them (in chapters 7 through 13) with the essentials of Mani's doctrine (but nothing, we note, on Mani's life). That his cosmogonical intervention is meant to set the stage for the main event, the first encounter between Archelaus and Mani, seems clear from the timing: "That very day Manes arrived" (14.2).[19] So the speed with which Archelaus will be able to organize a rebuttal to Mani's ideas is nothing short of remarkable.

Mani does not arrive expecting a formal debate. Richard Lim has remarked that Manichaeans were not disposed to initiate public disputations;[20] that "Prominent set-piece debates with Manichaeans were initiated by their opponents, who sought through such high-profile encounters to stop the success of the Manichaeans' proselytizing efforts";[21] and that in the literature Mani is mainly depicted as preaching, not debating[22]—all certainly the case here. To Mani goes the opening statement of the first encounter (14.6) which, in classic Manichaean

---

[15] Vermes, 41 (Beeson 1906, 6.28: sicut praediximus). Greek: ὡς προείπομεν.

[16] Vermes, 42–43 (Beeson 1906, 8.6–8: Archelaus vero ea quae lecta sunt non libenter amplexus velut leo conclusus dentibus infrendebat, auctorem epistulae sibi desiderans dari).

[17] Vermes, 58 (Beeson 1906, 22.16: vehementer accendebatur).

[18] Vermes, 43: "For both of them were enquiring in great detail into Manes' practices, wanting to know who he was, where he came from and what his message was" (Beeson 1906, 9.8–9: valde enim studiose uterque de Manis studiis perquirebant, scire cupientes quis unde vel quid verbi ferat).

[19] Vermes, 58 (Beeson 1906, 22.21: Eadem autem ipsa die adventavit Manes).

[20] Lim 1995, 70–71, 74–75, and 103.

[21] Lim 1995, 71.

[22] See Lim 1995, 73. Wolf-Peter Funk informs me that the final chapter of the Coptic *Kephalaia* in Dublin shows Mani as a debater. This *Kephalaia* (II) is as yet unpublished. For the manuscript text see S. Giversen, *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in*

fashion, he delivers with a focus on the origin of evil and on its corollary, dualism,[23] the same themes with which he began his letter to Marcellus. Mani adds the accusation that Archelaus has enslaved Marcellus, whom Mani must therefore liberate (15.1) along with the entire city (15.2). For he, Mani, represents the truth (15.2, 8), since he is the Paraclete who brings to completion a hitherto unfinished revelation (15.3). One must acknowledge his status as the elect apostle, or burn eternally (15.4; see 16.3). The doctrine Archelaus represents is absurd (15.8): God is not the originator of evil (15.5,7–10, 16.1), and the Old Testament has no value (15.11–16)—points Mani presents as "obvious to those who can show discernment" (15.14).[24]

Indeed, the guiding theme of much of Mani's exposition is the wrongness of his opponent's doctrine. The judges finally have to insist that he stick to presenting his own teaching (16.1), and so he finally gets to its main pillars: radical dualism, and a source for evil other than God (16.2–10). Yet he is soon confounded by the first questions put to him, as though he has already painted himself into a corner (17.4–5):

> 'What do you say then? Are those two natures unchangeable or changeable? Or is one of them being changed?' At this Manes hesitated because he could not find a reply. For he was examining the conclusion that would follow from either answer, and reconsidering his position.[25]

The judges (who, though named as early as the *AA*'s opening passage, never act individually) have been chosen for this encounter to project the illusion of impartiality. All seem to share an expertise in public discourse. Manippus knows grammar and rhetoric, Aegialeus is the public health officer[26] and learned in letters, and the brothers Claudius and Cleobalus are rhetors (14.5). All four are clearly pagan (14.5: *religione*

---

the Chester Beatty Library, Facsimile Edition 1 (Cahiers d'Orientalisme, 14), Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1986, 335–45.

[23] See Lim 1995, 75 (dualism) and 89 (evil).

[24] Vermes, 61 (Beeson 1906, 25.17–18: Quod manifestum est his qui discretionem habere possunt).

[25] Vermes, 65 (Beeson, 28.7–10: Quid ergo ais? Duae istae naturae inconvertibiles sunt an convertibiles, aut una earum convertitur? At vero Manes remoratus est non inveniendo responsum; intuebatur enim quod ex utroque concluderetur, retractans). See Lim 1995, 86: "Reducing someone to a state of literal *aphōnia* was a complete refutation and triumph in a public debate."

[26] On the various functions represented by the term *archiater* (= ἀρχιατρός) see G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexikon*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1987, 236; and G. Wissowa, ed., *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 2 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1896), cols. 464–66.

gentiles; see 18.1); yet from the start it is also clear that they side with Archelaus (23.1–2, 26.1, and 29.4), who informs them (with no proof) that "it is sufficient for me to have made these statements . . . to show you what sort of man he was" (41.14).[27] *Was*? Why not *is*? Mani is supposedly standing right there. This inconsistency may be an indicator of the debate's non-historical character.

The judges employ a single simile (29.2–3), but the two main protagonists show a fondness for both simile and metaphor,[28] Mani three times (15.14, 16.9, and 28.2–3), and Archelaus no less than fifteen (21.5, 22.1,6, 24.6, 26.5, 27.7, 28.13, 30.1,3–6, 31.1–4, 37.12, 40.2–3, 41.10,13, and 42.4). Mani explicitly identifies "parables" (16.8: *parabolis*) or similes (28.1: *persimilitudines dicam*) as his methodology, while Archelaus invokes "examples" (22.1: *exemplis*).[29] Once, Archelaus indulges in wordplay: rather than a *paracletus*, Mani is a *parasitus* (25.3).[30]

There are some elements here of a rudimentary philosophy (kept so for the benefit of the audience?). "The judges [and we note that there is no philosopher among them] said: 'changeability transforms the person to whom it occurs into someone else'" (18.1), but they use a rather mundane verb (*transfert*) and are thinking of religious conversion.[31] In 18.2 Archelaus points out that two unchangeable natures could in fact be "one and the same,"[32] and in 20.5 he states that "anyone who yearns or desires, desires something better and different."[33] The human person (*persona*) is made up of the two elements of body and soul (21.2), though how the two relate goes unexplained. Archelaus challenges Mani to define evil rather than focus on its origin (18.7),

---

[27] Vermes, 108 (Beeson 1906, 61.30–31: ista me sufficit protulisse . . . uti istum vobis qualis esset ostenderem).

[28] Or is the fondness the author's own? See 14.1 = Vermes, 58: "Archelaus was anxious for his people, like a shepherd for his sheep, when traps are being set by wolves" (Beeson 1906, 22.18–19: Archelao autem erat cura pro populo, tamquam pastori pro ovibus, cum luporum parantur insidiae).

[29] Vermes, 71–72: "But if this seems difficult for you (sing.) to comprehend and you do not acquiesce to these statements, at least I shall try to substantiate them for you (sing.) by means of examples" (Beeson 1906, 33.24–25: Quod si id tibi difficile videtur intellectu nec adquiescis his dictis, saltem exemplis tibi adfirmabo). Note the singular person in use here: these remarks are directed at Mani.

[30] Vermes, 75 (Beeson 1906, 37.2).

[31] Vermes, 66 (Beeson 1906, 28.25–26: Convertibilitas illum, cui accidit, transfert in alium). See 18.2–3,6.

[32] Vermes, 66 (Beeson 1906, 29.3–4: Si quidem incoversibiles [sic] esse dicit utrasque naturas, quid est quod inpediat, uti ne unum atque idem eas esse opinemur?).

[33] Vermes, 69 (Beeson 1906, 31.29–30: Qui enim zelatur aut concupiscit, meliora et aliena concupiscit).

although in 23.1–2 the judges show more interest in the origin of both good and evil. In 24.6–7 Archelaus argues against the existence of two unbegotten (and opposed) beings. On at least one occasion, his attempt at logic is specious: arguing in 20.6–7 that evil cannot be uncreated because a created human being can overcome it, he opens himself to the rebuttal (which Mani does not exploit) that the same argument could prove either that humans are uncreated or that the evil they overcome is simply the created expression of something uncreated—much like humans themselves. Thus the *AA* contains nowhere near the sophisticated philosophical discourse of, say, Alexander of Lycopolis.

However, philosophical terms do occur here and there:[34] Archelaus employs *substantia* (in 18.7, 21.2–3, 26.4, 27.8, 28.10, 33.10, and 36.7–11)[35] and "person" (in 21.2).[36] The judges refer once to *accidens* (25.2).[37] Mani speaks of pre-existent matter in 16.5 (see 26.3),[38] and (once) of "philosophy," in a somewhat derogatory sense (16.7).[39] Both Archelaus (20.5 and 38.2) and Mani (19.11 and 28.4) make use of "nature," (*natura*: see also 33.10 and 36.10); but what Mani calls "the two natures" (16.1) the judges refer to as "two principles of nature" (17.1), or as the good and evil deities (23.2), and Archelaus as "two substances" (26.4, 33.10).[40] Both Mani and Archelaus refer to the *(in)convertibilitas* of both nature (17.4,6) and God (36.7), and Mani speaks of "properties" (17.6)[41]—concepts, says Archelaus, that Mani utters but does not understand (17.7–8).

---

[34] But see Voss 1970, 153: "sie sind jedoch nicht mehr als Worte."

[35] Vermes, 67, 71, 78–79, 82, 89, and 95–96 (Beeson 1906, 29.26, 33.1,3, 38.28, 40.6, 41.31, 47.22, 51.31, and 52.6,7,11,15,18). See also 21.3, and note *homousion* in 36.8.

[36] Vermes, 71 (Beeson 1906, 33.2: persona). These Latin words—"substantia" and "persona"—pose a problem, because we do not have the Greek terms they are translating. Also, the translation may reflect the Latin vocabulary, or at least usage, of a time later than that of the original composition.

[37] Beeson 1906, 36.31.

[38] Vermes, 63 (Beeson 1906, 26.25: non subsistente materia).

[39] Vermes, 64 (Beeson 1906, 27.5: philosophia).

[40] Note that in his exposé Turbo refers to Mani as worshipping "two divinities" (7.1, Beeson 1906, 9.18–19: duos colit deos innatos; Greek: δύο σέβει θεοὺς ἀγεννήτους). But Manichaean sources speak little of the two eternal principles as deities, and never of worshipping both of them. See J. K. Coyle, *Augustine's "De moribus ecclesiae catholicae": A Study of the Work, Its Composition and Its Sources* (Paradosis, 25), Fribourg: The University Press, 1978, 331–32.

[41] Vermes, 65 (Beeson 1906, 28.14: propria).

More telling than philosophy is how *Scripture* is used. Indeed, the Bible is the only source to which both sides regularly appeal,[42] in both cases with a heavy emphasis on Paul. But only Archelaus quotes the Old Testament (as in 34.5). Nowhere here is there anything approaching *exegesis*. In chapter 21, for example, Archelaus sees in the parable of new wine in old skins a simple argument for the compatibility of the human body and soul. He applies Jesus' denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 23:13–28 and par.) in similar fashion (25.1–5). At 25.4 he gives a curious interpretation of the creation of light and darkness, through an appeal to a "middle part" (*medietas*)[43] that obviously draws on ancient cosmogony (25.6–11): darkness exists because of the shadow thrown past an object in the path of light. Thus Mani will be pressed by both Archelaus and the judges to identify the builder of the "middle wall" interposed between light and darkness to keep them separated (26.6–27.1). Mani's response—that God placed the firmament in the middle—is dismissed by Archelaus as an admission that God would then be weak (27.2–4), or at least that the wall would have had to crumble for "the wicked one" to invade the rival realm (27.6, 8).

To conclude, I offer some reflections on the foregoing observations:

(1) Eszter Spät has claimed that the global emphasis in the *AA* is placed on Mani's life, work and appearance:

> The ingenuity of Hegemonius lies in the fact that this ideological attack is not so much through open statements as to the execrable nature of the heresy (as in "regular" anti-heretical writings), but through "biographical" elements that convey the same message.[44]

That claim can be true only insofar as the biographical elements were the mainstay of subsequent interest in the *AA*. In the text itself, Mani's characteristics form a framework for both debates, and the debates are mediated through rhetorical devices. On the other hand, biographically speaking the *AA* provides us with much on *Mani* and next to nothing on Archelaus. Yet *any* such description would be an anomaly in the heresiological genre, even in other public disputes between Manichaeans and Christians.

---

[42] See Hansen 1966. Note than even the pagan judges quote the Bible (25.1 and 41.2).

[43] Vermes, 76 (Beeson 1906, 37.5, 7).

[44] Spät 2004, 3–4.

(2) There are "props" here (such as biographical details, applauding crowds, and the letter-carrier's journey to "Carchar")[45] not found in otherwise similar *disputationes*. But the *AA* is not out to convey history, but polemics, a goal achieved by highlighting Mani's (and therefore Manichaeism's) alien character, and by discrediting the powers of persuasion of both the founder and his system.

(3) Nor does the *AA* constitute a true classical dialogue, even an imaginary one.[46] Unlike in other debates between individuals or groups that consider themselves Christian, the protagonists of the *AA* are not limited to pure doctrine, the assisting public and referees are free to intervene (even physically in the crowd's case), and personal jibes are liberally dispensed.[47] The purpose here is not the orderly unfolding of a debating position, but (at least from Archelaus' perspective) the simple annihilation of the opponent. The Bible is the weapon of choice. In the case of both protagonists (more obviously in Archelaus') orthodoxy, not logic, rules: error has no rights, no matter how reasoned.[48] The author's bias is also shown in inconsistencies. For instance, Archelaus claims of Mani: "In his preceding speech he stated that the darkness crossed from its own boundaries into the kingdom of the good God,"[49] although Mani has made no such claim. Again, Mani is accused of knowing no language but his own (40.5):[50] how, then, was the debate conducted?

(4) Richard Lim has remarked that "descriptions of public debates, just as much as reports of miracles, adhere to listening and narrative

---

[45] I believe that M. Scopello's assessment of the two latter points as devices to explain Mani's presence in Roman territory is essentially correct (Scopello 2000, 535: "Dans l'optique d'Hégémonius, ces événements n'ont qu'un but: créer le prétexte d'une rencontre entre Mani, le perse, et Marcellus, le romain").

[46] Voss 1970, 155: "In dem Bereich, in dem die Acta Archelai entstanden sind und für den sie gedacht waren, kannte man zwar Disputationen, der Dialog als eigenständige Literaturform aber existierte dort nicht."

[47] See Spät 2004, 16.

[48] Voss 1970, 155: "Angestrebt ist Besiegung, im Grunde Vernichtung des Gegenübers. Infolgedessen wird in zunehmender Breite vorgetragen, was für die Orthodoxie spricht. Berücksichtigt werden allenfalls Bedürfnisse der Zuhörer—das bedeutet: der Leser. Ob die Argumente vom Partner voll Verständnis und mit Überzeugung aufgenommen werden, ist innerhalb dieser Disputation nicht von Interesse."

[49] Vermes, 80 (Beeson 1906, 40.7–8): In praecedentibus professus est, quia supervenerunt tenebrae ex propriis finibus in regnum dei boni. See also 27.3.

[50] Beeson 1906, 59.19–22: Persa barbare, non Graecorum linguae, non Aegyptiorum, non Romanorum, non ullius alterius linguae scientiam habere potuisti; sed Chaldaeorum solam, quae ne in numerum quidem aliquem ducitur; nullum alium loquentem audire potes.

conventions and deliver specific messages to desired audiences."[51] But here, unlike in, say, Pseudo-Mark the Deacon's *Life of Porphyry of Gaza*, there are no miracles to carry the story forward. In fact, in the first encounter Archelaus seems to firmly rule them out (39.8–9; see 40.1,4). All is either narrative or disputation (the latter characterized by claiming logical reasoning for oneself and denying it to the other).[52] Perhaps signs are considered "unnecessary when a society's conflicting claims could still be satisfactorily adjudicated by referring to existing institutions and authorities."[53]

(5) Whether the disputes are historical or not, their recitation is what matters most here. Their language (indeed, the tone of the entire *AA*) is, to judge by the Latin, simple in style and keeps syllogistic reasoning to a minimum. While this could be interpreted as a popularized guide on how to handle encounters with Manichaeans, it is more likely aimed at those who will have to deal directly with them.

(6) Finally, since, as we noted, the *AA* begins with a reference only to the *first* encounter which, incidentally, it calls a (or "the") "disputation" (1.1), it leaves the impression that the first, in "Carchar," was the only one (assuming that any really took place). A logical original stopping point for the text (most likely before its translation into Latin) would then have been 43.3:

> Now since it has pleased Marcellus that this disputation should be recorded and written down, I have not been able to gainsay him, but have trusted in the good will of my readers, that they will pardon me, if my narration should sound at all naïve or colloquial. For my only purpose is this, that an awareness of what took place should not elude any serious enquirer.[54]

---

[51] Lim 1996, 261.

[52] On the notion of "the other" in the *AA*, see Scopello 2000, 544–45 and Scopello 1995, 210.

[53] Lim 1996, 268. However, Archelaus will demand signs in the second encounter in the town of "Diodoris" (54.4).

[54] Vermes, 110–11 (Beeson, 63.28–64.1: Quoniam vero placuit Marcello disputationem hanc excipi atque describi, contradicere non potui, confisus de benignitate legentium quod veniam dabunt, si quid inperitum aut rusticum sonabit oratio; hoc enim tantum est quod studemus, ut rei gestae cognitio studiosum, quemque non lateat).

CHAPTER SIX

A WAR OF WORDS: INTERTEXTUALITY AND THE STRUGGLE OVER THE LEGACY OF CHRIST IN THE *ACTA ARCHELAI*

Jason BeDuhn

The *Acta Archelai* dramatizes the clash, literally on the frontier between political and cultural spheres, between two rival descendants of the traditions connected with Jesus that spread and diversified throughout the region in the first two centuries CE. A teleological bias in our reading of history conspires with the scheme of the *AA* to consider one of these rivals as a true and direct descendent of those traditions while regarding the other as a contrived and mutated second cousin to them. But the *AA* itself is an event in the construction of a claim on the legacy of Christ that was only being developed in the third and fourth centuries. At the same time, it preserves fragments of the contemporaneous, competing Manichaean claim on the same legacy. Through these fragments, we catch a glimpse of how this competing claim was assembled and put forward.

This chapter examines two processes of intertextuality involved in the testimony that the *AA* affords to this war of, and over, words. The first process is the intertextuality committed by Hegemonius when he brings together a wide variety of Manichaean and anti-Manichaean sources as the raw material of his drama. It is necessary to explore the possible provenance of these sources and identify traces of them in other surviving pieces of Western Manichaean literature. The second process is the biblical intertextuality by which the Manichaean sources utilized in the *AA* assemble a systematic interpretation of the Gospel and Apostle that supports their claim to be the true adherents of the religion these textual authorities expound. This chapter analyzes these sets of proof-texts in light of other sources on Manichaean interpretation of the Bible.

By examining both the roots of the Manichaean claim on the Christian heritage in the eastern (Iranian and Mesopotamian) reading of its textual tradition, and the fruits of that claim in the products of the

western (Roman) Manichaean mission, we are able to follow the other, mostly lost side of a conflict of historic proportions when the meaning of the legacy of Christ was being contested, and the ultimate character of "Christianity" was being decided.

A Tale of Two Christianities

The cliché of Christian historiography, still largely dominant in modern historical study of religion, is that the heresiarch is a parasite on orthodoxy, taking up and reworking orthodox material and seeking to sway the already orthodox to novel ideas. In the case of Mani, this cliché must be firmly rejected. In the tale of an encounter between Mani with Archelaus, we are witness to a first contact between two independent trajectories of the traditions that are traceable to events in Galilee and Judea more than two hundred years before. This first encounter is in part imagined, but in part based upon literary traces of just such a moment of contact. We see in "Carchar," or "Kaschar," a frontier town, the meeting point and contested ground of rival occidental and oriental varieties of "Christianity," independently derived and developed from distant roots. The occidental variety derives from the churches of western Syria and the Greek Mediterranean, drawing on Jewish traditions to harmonize Christ and Moses. The oriental variety has passed by a different route through the Elchasaite communities of southern Mesopotamia, through the prism of Mesopotamian and Iranian traditions, and emerged with a stronger dualistic focus.

These are characteristic examples of how religions adapt to local conditions, particularly in their initial wave of expansion. Parallels can be cited from Buddhist expansion into East Asia, or Christian expansion into Native America. Initial contacts produce hybrids of the new religious system with existing native beliefs and practices. Only under special circumstances are these hybrids gradually replaced by more universal standards of orthodoxy. Those special circumstances include both a strong centralized authority to define and promote orthodoxy, and a sustained effort at the periphery to sift the local varieties in order to gradually differentiate an approved orthodox strain of the faith. Christianity possessed neither of these features prior to Nicaea. The Roman/Iranian frontier saw a proliferation of syncretic variations: Elchasaite, Marcionite, Bardaisanite, and Manichaean, to name a few. But we must realize that varieties of Christianity further to the west

were no less syncretic and interpretive, and at this time the ultimate destiny of any of these forms of faith was as yet undetermined.

The *AA* is an early attempt to present a picture different from the one I have just outlined. Written from the vantage point of one party among many, it attempts to paint its rivals as distortions of and deviations from the one true understanding of Christ's legacy.

> There were some parts of what he was saying which belonged to our faith, but some of his assertions were a long way distant from those that have come down to us in the tradition of our fathers. For he interpreted certain things in a strange way, and added to them from his own views, which seemed to me extremely outlandish… (*AA* 44.2)[1]

> You know that those who want to preach a certain dogma have the habit of readily corrupting by their own interpretation whatever they want to take from the scriptures. (*AA* 44.5)[2]

If this were a Bardaisanite or Valentinian text, we would look at it quite differently than we do. It is only the accident of subsequent history, and of the consequent preservation of this work rather than others, that makes us comfortable with the *AA*'s presentation of events. Admittedly, that comfort level has diminished dramatically in the last century, especially among those who specialize in Manichaean studies. We are now at a stage when the "fact and fiction" of the piece can be confronted and explored even-handedly. Yet while such elements as the fantastic biography of Mani are recognized for what they are, the last bastion, perhaps, of the old favorable reading of the *AA* is to be found in assessing the use of biblical texts by Mani and Archelaus depicted there.

The narrative of the *AA* depicts Mani, late in his career, conspiring to get his hands on the Christian scriptures for the first time in order to find passages which, when ripped from their proper context, might yield support to his independently conceived, outlandish ideas.[3] We know this element of the story to be false. Other sources have made it

---

[1] Vermes, 111.

[2] Vermes, 112.

[3] "Now at last, while languishing in prison, he ordered that the books of the law of the Christians be obtained…This astute individual received the books and began to look in our writings for passages in support of his dualism…So having put together these wicked interpretations, he sent his disciples to preach these boldly fabricated and invented falsehoods…" (*AA* 65.2–6). The account of Mani's teaching provided by Turbo, lacking any trace of biblical reference or obvious Christian imagery, should probably

clear that Mani was raised within an Elchasaite Christian sect, that he worked with Jesus traditions from the start of his career, and that even his *Šābuhragān*, written specifically for a non-Christian Iranian audience, is full of thinly veiled allusions to Christian scripture. Once we have recognized the fictitious nature of the *AA*'s portrayel of Mani's relation to biblical texts, what are we to make of the many New Testament quotations the work attributes to Mani in his debate with Archelaus? The degree of facticity in other parts of the work, for example in the wording of Mani's letter to Marcellus, or in the account of Mani's teaching delivered by Turbo, gives us reason to pause before simply assuming they are the product of the author's imagination. What is needed is further analysis of Hegemonius' sources, and a careful comparison of Mani's use of the Bible in the *AA* with its use in other Manichaean sources at our disposal.

The AA's Sources on Manichaean Biblical Interpretation

Do we have any reason to place confidence in Hegemonius' report of Mani's biblical interpretation? The answer depends on our assessment of the sources he has employed in constructing his story. G. C. Hansen[4] has argued that there are at least five distinct parts of the *AA* where Manichaean material is given, some or all of which may go back to literary sources:

1. Mani's letter to Marcellus
2. Turbo's account of the Manichaean system
3. Mani's first debate with Archelaus
4. Diodorus' letter to Archelaus
5. Mani's second debate with Archelaus

It would not be impossible for Hegemonius to have fabricated the two debates out of his own imagination. Like Serapion of Thmuis or Didymus the Blind,[5] he could have worked from a few rumors or bits of information, and simply constructed a plausible set of dualistic and docetic arguments from scripture, perhaps drawing on better-known

---

be seen as intended by Hegemonius to show the true, original form of Manichaeism before it was artificially Christianized.

[4] Hansen 1966.

[5] On the latter, see Bennett 2001.

heretics of this sort, such as Marcion or Basilides. His straw-man Mani could then be efficiently and effectively disposed of by pre-conceived refutations.

While there are many reasons to think that the narrative frame of the story, including the time, place, and characters of the encounter, are fictional, it is harder to dismiss the contents of the debates as pure fiction for two reasons. First, the biblical texts cited by Mani and his interpretation of them find abundant parallels in authentic Manichaean sources. Second, Mani's arguments from scripture are too coherent and strong to be straw-men. Indeed, Mani's effective use of biblical quotation in his argument would seem to be something of a problem for Hegemonius. This can be demonstrated by an analysis of the structure of the *AA*, which reveals a pattern of framing the debates with material that serve to challenge not the details of Mani's exegesis, but his credentials as an exegete.

As a remedy to Mani's skill with scripture in the debates, Hegemonius provides two blocks of material. First, before the debates, he offers us the Oration of Turbo. Either he found this source to be devoid of scriptural allusion or else he carefully purged it of such elements. In this way, he is able to offer his readers a supposedly "authentic" version of Mani's teachings in their true, original, non-Christian form. Second, after the debates, he puts into the mouth of Archelaus the tale of Mani's surreptitious study of Christian scripture just prior to his arrival in the west. In doing so he highlights the supposedly artificial nature of Mani's appeal to biblical authority. Because Hegemonius goes to such lengths to frame and contextualize the debate itself, in which Mani's argument is permeated with biblical allusion, we may have reason to suspect that the content of Mani's speech is an authentic source, and not the brainchild of the author.

In fact, the complex intertextuality of Hegemonius' sources, and their strategic employment in the construction of this polemical fiction, begin to suggest that the central point of the *AA* itself was to counter Manichaean biblical interpretation by creating a picture of Mani as an exotic intruder into the Christian tradition, whose use of the Bible was subterfuge and hypocrisy, not a legitimate, independent, oriental reading. The debate, in which Mani's biblical interpretation is refuted directly, is framed before and after with layers of material intended to dispose of Mani's right even to be a biblical interpreter.

That still leaves the possibility that Hegemonius' sources were Manichaean without going back to Mani himself. Certain odd and

anachronistic elements in the *AA* lend support to the idea that under the mask of Mani in the story one should look for Adda.[6] The debates are dated to the time of the Roman emperor Probus.[7] This is a close call, because Mani died either a year or two before, or in the first year or two of Probus' reign. The text mentions both Adda and Sisinnios, Mani's successor as leader of the Manichaean church. Turbo, who is sent as a messenger of Mani, is nonetheless characterized as a disciple of Adda, rather than of Mani. If we accept the reading Carchar for the locale of the debate, we know that Adda in fact did visit the town of Karkā de Bēt Selōk (Kirkuk) in 260–261, according to the acts of the martyrs of that town, although it was located well within Persian territory.[8] Finally, there are the biblical antitheses of Tryphon/Diodorus' letter, which agree in concept and in some cases in exact detail with the work of Adda as known to us through Augustine of Hippo.[9] We might be dealing, therefore, with material deriving from Adda's western mission. In this case, Hegemonius would be raising the stakes of his refutation by claiming it was the Paraclete Mani himself, rather than merely one of his functionaries, who could be demonstrated to be so in error. Yet the anachronistic elements found within the *AA* are not closely connected in the text with the content of the debates, and so within the composite nature of the document, may not tell us anything about the source of that content.

The third possibility is that most of the words put into Mani's mouth in the debates are quoted from the authentic work of Mani himself, and Hegemonius has supplied only the refutation of them. Hegemonius could have constructed a pastiche from isolated bits and pieces of biblical argument from several of Mani's writings, or he could have lifted large blocks of material from one or two pieces. The latter idea is supported by an analysis of how the biblical texts are used together

---

[6] This suggestion was first made by Kessler 1889, 109.

[7] At least in the Latin manuscript tradition, but Greek sources preserve an earlier date for the events of the narrative. See Chapter One of this volume for further discussion of this evidence.

[8] Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (1891; rep. 1968), vol. 2, 512.11–13. This date is remarkably close to the one given by Photius for the visit of 'Mani' to 'Karchar' in his *Narratio de Manichaeis recens repullulantibus*, ed. by Charles Astruc et al., "Les Sources Grecques pour l'Histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure," *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970) 131–139.

[9] See Chapter Nine in this volume.

and woven into both coherent arguments on particular points, and a larger composition directed towards a particular reading audience.

Mani quotes or alludes to thirty-eight Bible passages in the first debate, and fourteen in the second. This is a rich compendium of biblical texts, and individually they add a great deal to our understanding of Manichaean interpretation of the Bible in general. But there is something more specific, more organized and systematic here. Mani's biblical proof-texts work together in a logical order for the exposition of two key ideas: dualism and the docetic nature of Christ. Of course, these two ideas are crucial differences between the versions of Christianity represented by Mani and Archelaus, so it seems natural they would be the focus of a debate. Yet there are two more intratextual facts that may help us piece together the intertextual work going on in the *AA*.

One fact is that the two topics are neatly divided between the two debates. Too neatly, one must say. Why does the first debate deal only with dualism, and why does the second focus exclusively on Christology? The division appears artificial. We naturally suspect that Hegemonius has crafted this tidy separation of issues; the debates are fictional packaging for the two topics he wished to have addressed.

But a second fact pushes us in another direction. These two topics—dualism and docetism—are precisely those introduced in the somewhat choppy and abrupt Letter to Marcellus (*AA* 5). Several key biblical citations are repeated in both the letter and in the debate: Matthew 7:18, used in the letter, appears early in Mani's presentation on dualism in the first debate (*AA* 15); a peculiar conflation of John 1:18 and 3:13 turns up in exactly the same wording both in the letter and at the beginning of his argument for a docetic Christology in the second debate (*AA* 54); the language of not wishing to be a snare is found both at the conclusion of the letter and is alluded to again by Archelaus near the end of the second debate (*AA* 59). In *AA* 5, however, Mani breaks off discussion of the two topics almost as soon as they are raised, and quickly brings the letter to a close.[10] The brevity and unevenness of the letter has caught the attention of Iain Gardner, who surmises that

[10] At the end of the redacted "Letter to Marcellus" in *AA* 5, Mani cites the language of not wanting to be a "snare" from 1 Corinthians 7:35. This same reference is echoed in the remarks of Archelaus in *AA* 59.11 immediately following the last word's attributed to Mani in the *AA*, reflecting, I would suggest, the original placement of the citation and the end of the letter, which has been clipped off and appended to the end of the much shortened letter given in *AA* 5.

Hegemonius has edited it from a possibly authentic letter.[11] Building on Gardner's cautiously favorable assessment of the authentic roots of the Letter to Marcellus, I propose that, rather than throwing the rest of the letter away, Hegemonius has used the remaining material as the source for Mani's arguments in the two debates.[12]

In support of this hypothesis, it is possible to remove the responses of Archelaus and the judges in the debate and find that what is left over forms a coherent progression of argument. In fact, several remarks made by either Archelaus or the judges appear to be the seams of Hegemonius' editorial work, because they merely offer Mani a chance to continue, or shift topic, or return to a line of argument from which the debate in its final form has digressed. Examples of this can be seen in 16.1, 32.11, 33.3, 33.5.[13] Other statements made by Archelaus that simply restate or sum up Mani's position may be transposed from the Manichaean source (e.g., 28.4; 33.5; 33.8). The few questions raised by Archelaus that are effectively answered by Mani may be rhetorical questions raised in the original Manichaean composition (e.g., 28.5; 28.10; 54.10). For the most part, though, it must be said that Archelaus' sustained refutations go unanswered. There is no true engagement in the debate at any level, and the *AA* more closely resembles Augustine's *Contra Faustum*, a one-sided literary response, than it does his *Contra Fortunatum*, an authentic debate with give and take on both sides.

---

[11] In Chapter Three of this volume, Gardner refers to its treatment of Christology as "brief" and presented in an abrupt manner that takes the reader "by some surprise." To account for these features, Gardner suggests that, "the text may have been tampered with to suit the redactor's purposes" (40), and "it is possible that this has been sharpened for polemical purposes" (45). He concludes that, "I do not think that the author of the *AA* has simply copied out a genuine letter by Mani for our profit. . . . However, I do think that he had at least one, maybe more of Mani's *Epistles* at his desk" (47).

[12] Compare Gardner, who states, "I suspect that the source-text would have had rather more, which our author has suppressed or paraphrased" (48).

[13] 16.1 (Vermes, 62): "The judges said: 'If you have anything clearer still to say, tell us about the system of your doctrine and the description of your faith.'" 32.11 (Vermes, 88): Archelaus says, "Since you have made mention of only three passages of scripture . . .," then quotes back three passages cited by Mani in 32.4. He proceeds with "carry on adding more, and tell us all those that you think have been written against the law." Mani then proceeds to continue his argument. 33.3 (Vermes, 88): "Archelaus said: 'Are these sufficient for you, or do you have still more things to say?'" 33.5 (Vermes, 89): Archelaus says, "You say, therefore, that the law is the ministration of death," referring back to 15.12 and 32.4, allowing Mani to pick up the thread of his argument.

I would propose, therefore, that the strangely abbreviated Letter to Marcellus is merely the shell of a significantly longer authentic letter of Mani, which Hegemonius has cut up and redistributed to the two debates in his narrative. The way the *AA* tells the story, Mani sent the letter to someone he had only heard of, but never met. But in the letter itself, Mani calls Marcellus his very dear son; he mentions noticing or observing (αἰσθηθείς) Marcellus' benevolence rather than hearing of it; and he makes a cryptic allusion to his dualistic instruction to Marcellus as something "we have described before." Additionally, Mani oddly does not request the invitation that the *AA* narrative presumes he is seeking with this letter.[14] Instead, he refers matter of factly to "when I am present with you" as if his coming to Marcellus was already planned and expected. All of these details point, I think, to the letter having a different background than the one crafted for it by Hegemonius.[15] In a less than thorough manner, he has adapted it to a new use, dissecting it to provide raw material for the story he wants to tell. One more piece of evidence supports this theory. In the midst of the second debate, when Mani is ostensibly addressing Archelaus, he calls him instead "Marcellus."[16] The Latin manuscripts agree in this "mistake" (we have no Greek witnesses to this part of the text). A mistake it is, since the narrative has said nothing about Marcellus accompanying Archelaus to this second debate in another town, as noticed already by both Salmond[17] and Lieu.[18] The explanation for the occurrence here of "Marcellus" is that he is the addressee of the letter from which Mani's words have been taken.

As discussed by Gardner, there is no mention in our incomplete sources of a letter of Mani to someone named Marcellus. Yet the possibility exists that this letter passed under the title Letter to Kaskar, a title included in the list of letters given by an-Nadim.[19] This question unfortunately is tied up with the issue of the setting of Hegemonius'

---

[14] Noted by Gardner, 40.

[15] In agreement with Gardner: "My hypothesis…is that the narrative context for the letter is essentially fictitious. The letter, on the other hand, appears to be at least in part authentic" (40).

[16] "Are you thus to fix the crime of adultery on her, most sagacious Marcellus?" (55).

[17] Salmond 1987, 223, n8.

[18] In Vermes, 129 n278.

[19] Gardner, 35.

story.[20] If one prefers the reading of the Latin mss.—Carchar—it is hard to avoid its resemblance to Syriac *karka*, the ubiquitous designation of settlements throughout the region. It could be, then, that Hegemonius' geography is intentionally abstract. If, on the other hand, we credit the testimony of the Greek witnesses to the *AA*, which consistently know the town as Kaschar, we confront the problem that the city of Kashkar—the only possible referent of the Greek name—is in southern Mesopotamia, on the lower Tigris, and was never on the Roman side of the frontier except for a very brief moment of occupation under Trajan, a century before Mani was born. In that case, we would be forced to conclude that Hegemonius built his anachronistic debate around an authentic letter of Mani, which provided him with the place name Kashkar as well as with the name of a prominent local Christian, Marcellus (perhaps one Archelaus was also mentioned in the letter), without having any detailed knowledge of either the place or the persons involved.

Even when we remove the letter fragments from their narrative frame, it remains true that those addressed by Mani are not Manichaeans, but represent the western variety of Christianity with its anti-dualist and anti-docetic reading of the Bible. As Gardner has pointed out, we know that Mani did write letters to "non-believers."[21] But who could this Marcellus be? One possibility is that he is a leader or patron of refugees (note the letter's references to "those with you") brought back from the west by Shapur's successful campaigns in Syria and Anatolia, in the 250s and 260s CE. Both Samuel Lieu[22] and Markus Stein[23] have discussed the possible role of such displacements of population in bringing the western variety of Christianity into Mesopotamia and Iran. The *Chronicle of Se'ert*, section 2, reports as follows:

> In the eleventh year of his reign, Shapur, son of Ardashir, invaded the country of the Romans; he remained there a long time and destroyed many towns. He vanquished the emperor Valerian and made him captive in the country of the Nabataeans.… When Shapur returned from the territory of the Romans, he took with him prisoners whom he settled in the countries of Babylonia, Susiana, and Persia, as well as in the towns his father had founded. He also founded himself three towns and gave

[20] On which see Chapter One of this volume.
[21] Gardner, 39.
[22] Lieu in Vermes, 21. On this subject, see further Lieu 1986.
[23] Markus Stein, *Manichaica latina*, Bd. 1: *Epistula ad Menoch* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1998), 37–41.

> them names derived from his own name: one in the country of Maishan, which he named Shad-Shabur, which is Deir Mihraq; a second in Persis, still called today Shabur…; a third town on the banks of the Tigris to which he gave the name Marw Habur, which is 'Ukbara and its environs. He installed the captives in these towns, giving them land to cultivate and residence for their use. Because of this the Christians (*an-nasārā*) became numerous in Persia; they built monasteries and churches. They had among them priests who had been made captive in Antioch.… Shapur also built a town in the country of Kashkar and he called it Hasar Shabur (i.e., Khusrau-Shapur). There he established the easterners.[24]

Marcellus could have been be a leader among the deportees, or a prominent individual involved in contacts among the deportee settlements Shapur established throughout the region. He may have been sponsoring or otherwise associated with the work of the displaced Christian leadership in reorganizing itself in its new environment. Samuel Lieu has noted that, "The influx of a large number of Roman Christians added to this diverse scene a more hierarchically organized church with its Hellenized doctrines," and has remarked on the prominent place exercised by the bishops and priests in social leadership among the exiles due to their existing organization.[25] A distinct Greek-speaking church hierarchy survived in the region until it was forcibly integrated with the Syriac church at the Synod of Ctesiphon in 410.

In the scenario that emerges from this information, the first encounter between occidental and oriental forms of the Christian tradition did not occur on western ground, as Hegemonius has it, where Mani appears as an interloper, but rather in Mani's backyard, where it was the western Christians who were intruding into a missionary field where previously Mani held sway. The initial mission of Adda and Patikios into the west appears to post-date these initial forced transfers of western populations into Persian territory.

Whatever one makes of the above conjectures, it is clear that Hegemonius has copied out blocks of authentic Manichaean biblical

---

[24] A. Sher, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis* 4, 1908, 220–222. On the importance of this testimony, see F. Decret, "Les conséquences sur le christianisme en Perse de l'affrontement des empires romain et sassanide: De Shapur I à Yazdgard I" *Recherches augustiniennes* 14 (1979) 91–152. Compare the inscription of Shapur from Naqsh-i Rustam, Greek version, lines 34–35: "We led away into captivity men from the empire of the Romans, non-Iranians, and settled them into the empire of the Iranians, in Persia, in Parthia, in Susiana, and in Assuristan and in every other nation where our own and our father's and our forefather's foundations were" (the Parthian and Middle Persian versions are substantially the same).

[25] Lieu 1986, 481–482.

interpretations that he wished to refute, and then framed them with a set of other sources designed to help undermine Mani's image as "the apostle of Jesus Christ." By both direct refutation of particular interpretations, and indirect challenges to Mani's status as a legitimate interpreter, Hegemonius sought to turn back the threat of this invader from the east who brought fundamentally different readings of the Gospel and Apostle than those which had developed in the west. Our task is to recover this oriental trajectory of Christian traditions from between the cracks of Hegemonius' defenses.

Mani's Biblical Interpretation in the AA

Mani's biblical quotations

In the *AA*, Mani makes seventy-three biblical quotations or allusions, involving sixty-five distinct passages (not counting parallel passages from the gospels),[26] thirty-six of which are unique to this source. The following list is given in the order of appearance in the *AA*; parallel citations of passages in other Manichaean literature are indicated.

Source 1: Mani's letter to Marcellus (AA 5; Greek in Epiphanius, 66.6)
Hebrews 6:8 [5.4]
Matthew 7:18/Luke 6:43 [5.4]
cf. *c. Fel.* 2.2; *c. Adim.* 26; *PsBk II* 134.11–20; *Keph* 17.5–9
John 1:18 + 3:13 (conflation) [5.5]
cf. *c. Adim.* 9[27]
1 Corinthians 7:35 [5.6]
cf. *Teb. Cod.* 36

Source 2: Oration of Turbo (AA 7–13)
No biblical quotation or allusion

Source 3: First debate of Mani with Archelaus (AA 15–42)
John 16:7f. [15.3; Epiph. 66.61.1]
cf. *c. Fel.* 1.9; *Keph* 14.7–11; *c. Ep. fund.* 6–7; *c. Faust.* 32

[26] The following passages are cited more than once: Jn 1:18 + 3:13 (conflation) in *AA* 5 and 54; Mt 7:18 et par. in *AA* 5 and 15; Jn 8:44 in *AA* 15 and 33; Lk 16:16 twice in *AA* 15 and once in *AA* 45.

[27] Whereas in the *AA* it is Jesus' origin in the bosom of the Father that is drawn from John 1:18, in the *c. Adim.* it is the statement that no one has ever seen God.

1 Corinthians 13:9f. [15.3; Epiph. 66.61.2]
cf. *c. Faust.* 15; *c. Fel.* 1.9; Titus 4.86[28]
John 8:17f./2 Corinthians 13:1 [15.4]
cf. *c. Faust.* 16
1 Timothy 1:20 [15.5]
cf. *Ep. Sec.* 4
James 3:12 [15.5]
Matthew 7:18/Luke 6:43 [15.6; Epiph. 66.62.1]
cf. *c. Fel.* 2.2; *c. Adim.* 26; *PsBk II* 134.11–20; *Keph* 17.5–9
John 8:44 [15.7; Epiph. 66.63.2]
cf. *c. Adim.* 5
John 1:5 + 3:19 (conflation) [15.7; Epiph. 66.64.1]
cf. *c. Faust.* 22.8; *c. Fel.* 2.15; *Menoch* 177; *Keph* 184.11f.; 185.12f.; *PsBk II* 165.29f.; *Ep. ad Zabinam*[29]
Matthew 13:25 [15.7; Epiph. 66.65.1–3]
cf. *c. Faust.* 18; *c. Fel.* 2.2; *Ep. Sec.* 4
John 12:31/14:30/16:11 [15.7; Epiph. 66.66.1]
cf. *c. Faust.* 32
2 Corinthians 4:4 [15.7; Epiph. 66.66.1; 66.68.1; Cyril, *Cat.* 6.28]
cf. *c. Faust.* 21; *c. Fel.* 2.2; *PsBk II* 56.31, 172.26f.
Luke 16:16 [15.11; Epiph. 66.75.1]
2 Corinthians 3:7 [15.12; Epiph. 66.73.1]
cf. *c. Faust.* 15
2 Corinthians 4:16 [15.13; Epiph. 66.74.1]
cf. *PsBk II* 155.8
Hebrews 8:13 [15.13]
Matthew 3:10/7:19/Lk 3:9 [15.14]
cf. *c. Fort.* 14; *Keph* 58.18f.
Matthew 5.29f. [15.14]
Luke 16:16 [15.15; Epiph. 66.75.1, 5]
John 9:41 [15.15]
Galatians 2:18 [15.16]
Galatians 4:3–4 [15.16]
1 John 5:19 [16.1]
Matthew 5:22/18:9/James 3:6 [16.2]
cf. *PsBk II* 39.25; 39.29f.
Matthew 8:12/22:13/25:30 [16.2]
cf. *PsBk II* 164.30–165.1

---

[28] Titus appears to preserve the original wording of the *AA*'s source here, with Mani claiming that through him that which Paul knew in part is being "repaired and cleansed," rather than "destroyed" as the *AA* has it in conformity with the canonical text of 1 Cor 13:10. Compare another quote of Mani by Titus from the same source: "For I have come and been sent out to restore and cleanse the gospels, because in them—even in those—is also that of the intermingling of evil" (Titus 4.12).

[29] Translated in Gardner/Lieu 2004, 175.

Matthew 8:12/13:42/13:50/22:13/24:51/25:30/Luke 13:28 [16.2]
Matthew 15:13 [19.1]
cf. *c. Fort.* 14
Galatians 5:19ff. [19.3]
cf. *Menoch* 177
Matthew 19:11 [28.1 Epiph. 66.77.1]
Matthew 13:11/Luke 8:10 [28.1]
John 10:14 [28.1; Epiph. 66.77.4]
John 10:27 [28.1]
John 10:11–15 [28.2–3]
John 16:7f. [32.2]
cf. *c. Fel.* 1.9; *Keph* 14.7–11; *c. Ep. fund.* 6–7; *c. Faust.* 32
Galatians 3:13 [32.4; Epiph. 66.79.1]
cf. *c. Faust.* 14; *c. Fel.* 2.10
2 Corinthians 3:6f. [32.4; Epiph. 66.73.1; 66.80.1]
cf. *c. Faust.*15
1 Corinthians 15:56 [32.4]
John 8:44 [33.1–2]
cf. *c. Adim.* 5
Romans 5:14 (introduced by Archelaus, but affirmed by Mani) [33.5]

Source 4: Report of Diodorus (AA 44–45)
Matthew 5:17 (introduced by Tryphon/Diodorus, and rejected by Mani) [44.6–7]
cf. *c. Faust.*17–19
Matthew 5:3/Luke 6:20[30] [44.8]
cf. *c. Faust.* 5; *c. Adim.* 19; *Teb. Cod.* 5
Luke 14:33 [44.8]
"do not covet what belongs to a neighbor" (?)[31] [44.8]
Matthew 5:38f./Luke 6:29[32] [44.9]
cf. *c. Adim.* 8; *PsBk II* 195.16
Matthew 9:6/Mark 2:11/Luke 5:24 [44.10; Epiph. 66.82.1]
Matthew 12:1/Mark 2:23/Luke 6:1[33] [44.10; Epiph. 66.82.1]

---

[30] Vs. Prov. 22:2; Proverbs 6:11 is used for this purpose in Adimantus. In Epiphanius, *Pan.* 66.81.2, the New Testament passage is contrasted to Haggai 2:9 (cf. *c. Adim.*) and Proverbs 22:2 is quoted by Epiphanius himself in rebuttal.

[31] Vs. Exod. 12:35. No such clause appears in the New Testament. The Latin text appears to be corrupt, and Epiphanius seems to have the original reading, where Mani is quoted as saying, "Some good God of the Law! He spoiled the Egyptians (Exod. 12:35), expelled the Amorites, Girgashites and other nations, and gave their land to the children of Israel. If he said, 'Thou shalt not covet' (Exod. 20:17), how could he give them other people's land." This antithesis, then, is a contradiction within the Old Testament itself.

[32] Vs. Exod. 21:24

[33] Vs. Num 15:32; in *c. Adim.* 22, it is the next episode, Mt. 12:10ff. et par., of the man with the withered hand that is opposed to the Law's prohibition of work on the

2 Corinthians 3:6–11 [45.1–3]
    cf. *c. Faust.* 15
1 Corinthians 15:46–50 [45.4; Epiph. 66.87.1]
    cf. *c. Fort.* 19; *c. Adim.* 12; *PsBk II* 121.9
Galatians 2:18 [45.5]
Romans 2:28 [45.5]
Romans 4:1/2:27ff./7:6/2 Cor 3:6f. [45.5]
    cf. *c. Faust.* 15
Romans 4:2 [45.6]
Romans 3:20 [45.6]
Romans 7:23 [45.6]
    cf. *c. Fort.* 21
Luke 16:16 [45.7]
Matthew 14:10/Mark 6:28/Luke 9:9 [45.7]

Source 5: Second debate of Mani with Archelaus (AA 54–60)
2 Timothy 2:10 [54.1]
Matthew 10:28/Luke 12:4 [54.2]
    cf. *c. Adim.* 12
John 10:16 [54.10]
John 1:18 + 3:13 (conflation) [54.11]
    cf. *c. Adim.* 9
Matthew 10:40/Luke 10:16/John 13:20 [54.11]
John 6:38 [54.11]
Matthew 15:24 [54.11]
Matthew 12:47f./Mark 3:32/Luke 8:20 [55.1]
    cf. *c. Faust.* 7
Matthew 22:42 [55.5]
Matthew 16:16f. [55.5]
    cf. *c. Faust.* 5
1 Corinthians 8:6 [55.7]
Philippians 2:5ff. [59.3]
    cf. *c. Fort.* 7; *Keph* 12.25, 61.21; *PsBk II* 194.1–3
Matthew 17:2 [59.5–6]
Matthew 3:16/Mark 1:10/Luke 3:22/John 1:32 [59.5]
    cf. *PsBk II* 156.27

If we can be confident of the reliability of the *AA* as a source of Manichaean material, it would add significantly to our knowledge of Manichaean biblical interpretation. The case for that reliability is strengthened by the fact that the twenty-nine biblical passages in the *AA*

---

sabbath. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 66.82.1 reports that Mani also cites John 5:17 in this context; but this is not found in the Latin version of the *AA* here.

that do have parallels in other Manichaean sources are used consistently with those parallels, as is demonstrated later in this chapter.[34]

Mani's Bible

If the *AA* makes use of authentic Manichaean sources, it can provide additional information on the biblical canon known to Mani or his earliest followers in the Near East. Mani quotes extensively from the four canonical gospels. But Mani never cites a particular gospel by name, and there is strong reason to think that Mani was using the *Diatessaron* or some related gospel harmony rather than the separate gospels.[35] Strong evidence for this dependence on a harmony already has been demonstrated by Hansen in his careful study.[36] But Hansen also cautions that the form of particular biblical passages should not be automatically taken as the Diatessaronic reading. By comparing the Latin *AA* with the limited portion of the work preserved in Greek, he was able to show that the Latin translator of the *AA* frequently altered a biblical quote to make it conform to the *Vetus Latina*. It is likely that Hegemonius manipulated the biblical quotations of his sources in a similar way, conforming them to the Greek text familiar to him. It is also worth considering the possibility that Hegemonius purged his Manichaean sources of references to books outside of Hegemonius' own biblical canon, as being irrelevant to the framing of the debate.

Mani makes heavy use of the letters of Paul, and this corresponds with the strong Pauline influence evident in the opening of all of Mani's letters that have been preserved, including the Letter to Marcellus in

---

[34] Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechesis* 6.27) alludes to several OT texts critiqued by Mani in his debate with Archelaus that do not appear in the Latin version of the *AA*: Deut. 4:24 (vs. Mk. 10:17f. in *c. Adim*. 13); 1 Sam. 2:6; Deut. 32:22; Isa. 45:7 (vs. Mt. 5:9 in *c. Adim*. 27). Whether Mani opposed specific NT antitheses to these we cannot say, because Cyril does not supply them, giving us instead Archelaus' refutation with non-antithetical NT passages. Similarly, Epiphanius quotes from Mani's debate with Archelaus biblical references not found in the Latin version of the *AA*: Hag. 2:8 vs. Mt. 5:3 (*Pan*. 66.81.1; Hag. 2:8 is contrasted to Lk. 16:9 and 1 Tim. 6:10 in Adimantus *apud* Augustine, *Sermon* 50); John 5:17 as an additional contrast to Num. 15:32 (*Pan*. 66.82.1); 1 Corinthians 5:1–5 (*Pan*. 66.86.1, as part of a verbatim quote from Mani entirely missing from the Latin *AA*).

[35] For comparisons of the *AA*'s gospel material to the *Diatessaron*, see Harnack 1883. On the fluidity of the gospel traditions in the time of Mani, see Gardner's comments in Chapter Three of this volume.

[36] G. C. Hansen, 1966; see also Quispel 1993.

AA 5. No use of Colossians, Ephesians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Titus, or Philemon appears in Mani's arguments in the *AA*. With the exception of Philemon, all of these letters are used by other Manichaean sources, so their neglect in the *AA* may be circumstantial and not significant. There is an allusion to a passage from 2 Timothy in Mani's second debate with Archelaus, but we cannot be sure whether it goes back to Hegemonius' Manichaean sources, or is part of his own narrative contribution. 2 Timothy is used in other western Manichaean literature. Mani makes use of Hebrews as well in the *AA*. This is not unprecedented in Manichaean sources (*Tebessa Codex; Psalm-Book*), and makes perfect sense in the context of critiquing the Law of the Old Testament.

Consistent with all other Manichaean sources, Mani makes no use of the Acts of the Apostles in the *AA*, even though the Manichaean rejection of that book is not explicitly discussed. Of the rest of the traditional biblical canon, Mani in the *AA* makes one certain allusion to a passage from the letter of James (*AA* 15), and one to 1 John (*AA* 16). Otherwise, use of these books is limited in the surviving primary Manichaean sources to the Coptic *Psalm-Book*, where it was possible to entertain suspicions of later, assimilative developments of the tradition. In this case also, the material is quite amenable to Manichaean readings, and its use fosters no surprise. The *Tebessa Codex* makes use of 1 Peter. But so far we have not found any sure citation of 2 Peter, Jude, 2 or 3 John. Quotes from Revelation are found only in the *Psalm-Book*.

So far, Manichaean evidence has not been drawn upon in the study of canon formation. It is time to do so. Particularly noteworthy is Mani's use of the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles. Although Manichaeans practiced some level of source criticism in their reception of the books of the New Testament, there is no hint that any of these books were questioned as a whole, suggesting that the Christian canon in use in the region included this material by the early third century.[37]

Manichaean rejection of the Old Testament is well documented. The *AA*'s depiction of Mani is consistent with this position both by the total absence of Old Testament texts from the biblical repertoire he employs, and in the direct attacks he makes on the Old Testament.

[37] One must keep in mind, however, that the form in which the Manichaeans received it probably had the *Diatessaron* or something like it in place of the separate gospels, and included books ultimately excluded from the orthodox canon, such as the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the separate apocryphal acts in place of the book of Acts.

The antagonism between Christ and the Law is highlighted by Mani in *AA* 32 by referring to Paul's statement that Christ is cursed by the Law through his death on the cross (Galatians 3:13). Faustus makes the same point in his *Capitula* (*c. Faust.* 14). Felix makes the point even more sharply. How can Christ, sent by God, be cursed? Who is there who would curse the one sent by God? Certainly not anyone or anything within God's sphere of control (*c. Fel.* 2.10). Several of the New Testament passages highlighted by Mani for their contrast to the attitudes of the Old Testament are among those that feature prominently in Adda's book of antitheses, as known to us through Augustine (*c. Adim.*).

Mani's Bible-based Authority

In a striking correlation between the *AA*'s portrayal of Mani and that found in primary Manichaean texts, Mani is shown basing his authority in the Christian scriptures. Despite being the founder of a new religion that is characterized as complementary to non-Christian traditions as well as Christian ones, Mani himself is consistently "the apostle of Jesus Christ" and cites New Testament texts not only in addressing the Christian west, but in texts aimed at and preserved in the mission into the heart of non-Christian Asia. Despite Hegemonius' effort to alienate Mani from Christianity, and some arguments put forward in the early phase of modern research into Manichaeism, the evidence is now clear that Mani emerged from a religious environment in which "Christianity" in some form was the primary starting point.

Mani explicitly claims to be the Paraclete in *AA* 15, and cites a number of passages in support of this claim, including John 16:7 (cf. *Keph* 14.7–11). He considers it part of his role to complete knowledge of what Paul admitted he knew incompletely in 1 Corinthians 13:9f. The North African Manichaean leader Felix, more than a hundred years later, cites exactly this same combination of passages in justifying his belief in Mani as the Paraclete (*c. Fel.* 1.9). He further quotes John 16:13 on the same subject (*c. Fel.* 1.2). Faustus, in his *Capitula*, likewise cites John 16:13, as well as 14:26 to the same effect (*c. Faust.* 32). Interestingly enough, Augustine mentions 1 Corinthians 13:9f. as a favorite Manichaean text in his *c. Faust.* (15.6), written before his meeting with Felix. John 16:7ff. is part of Mani's detailed explanation of the relation of his mission to that of Christ in *Kephalaia* 14.3–11: "When the church of the Savior was raised to the heights, my apostolate began.... From that time on was sent the Paraclete.... Just like the Savior said: 'When I go, I will send to you the Paraclete. When the Paraclete comes, he

can upbraid the world concerning sin, and he can speak with you on behalf of righteousness.'"[38]

In making his claim to authority, Mani draws on the tradition that two or more witnesses are required to prove something (2 Corinthians 13:1; John 8:17f.). Having cited John and Paul, he feels vindicated in his claims (*AA* 15). Similarly, Faustus gives his reason for preferring the testimony of God and Jesus to that of an unknown writer of a biblical text by quoting John 8:17f. (*c. Faust.* 16).

In an interesting stylistic note, at the conclusion of his Letter to Marcellus (*AA* 5), Mani characterizes the goodness of his mission in terms of not "casting a snare" on his readers, making use of the imagery of 1 Corinthians 7:35. The same use of this verse to disavow the intention to "cast a snare" is found in the *Tebessa Codex*, col. 36. This could either support Mani's authorship of the work found in the *Tebessa Codex*, or be a feature of his style emulated by another Manichaean writer.

Mani's Biblically Justified Dualism

The proof-texts for Mani's dualism in *AA* 15 include, among others, Matthew 7:17f. on the two trees, Matthew 13:24ff. on the enemy who sows weeds among the wheat, John 1:5 on the blindness of darkness to the light sent into the world, and 2 Corinthians 4:4 on the god of this world who blinds people's minds. Felix, in his debate with Augustine, includes these same passages among others in his demonstration of the biblical authority for dualism (*c. Fel.* 2.2).

Faustus, in his *Capitula*, also uses 2 Corinthians 4:4 as a proof-text for dualism (*c. Faust.* 21), and it appears again in *Psalm-Book* 56.31 ("The god of this world has shut the heart of the unbelieving and has sunk them in error and the deceit of darkness") and 172.26f. ("the god of this world that led the whole world astray"). Faustus likewise cites Matthew 13:24ff. with dualistic purport in explaining how false passages were introduced into the text of the New Testament (*c. Faust.* 18). In the *AA*, Mani similarly refers to the devil combining false teachings with true ones in composing the Old Testament, although he does not explicitly cite the parable of the enemy sowing weeds in that context.

The two trees was a classic image of Manichaeism, appealed to time and again. *Kephalaion 2* is entirely devoted to elaborating this basic image in terms of the full Manichaean mythology. Mani draws attention

[38] Gardner 1995, 20.

not only to the existence of good and bad trees, but also to the fact that the bad tree is said explicitly by Jesus to be "not planted by my heavenly Father," and to be destined to be rooted up and cast into the fire (*AA* 15; Matthew 3:10; 15:13). Fortunatus makes use of this same crucial statement in his debate with Augustine (*c. Fort.* 14). The imagery of rooting out the evil tree is applied mythologically to the primordial battle between good and evil in *Kephalaia* 58.16ff. Mani goes on, in the *AA*, to distinguish the "fruits" of evil from those of good, in order to emphasize their antipathy to each other (*AA* 19). He seems to be alluding to Galatians 5:19f., although he has changed "works" to "fruits" under the influence of 5:21f. The Pauline passage, so amenable to a dualistic reading, is also quoted in the *Letter to Menoch* (177), put forward by Julian of Eclanum as an authentic letter of Mani.[39] The good tree is similarly analyzed according to its root, trunk, branches, and fruit in *Psalm-Book* 134.11–20. The psalmist applies the distinctively Manichaean four aspects of the divine realm—God, light, power, and wisdom—to the four parts of the good tree. The root is said to be the God of Truth, the trunk is the light, the branches are the power, and the fruit is wisdom personified in Christ. The opening of Mani's *Letter to Menoch* (172) may contain a subtle reprise of this same theme ("May grace and salvation be granted to you by our God, who is in *truth true God*, and may he himself *illuminate* your mind and reveal his *justice* to you, since you are the *fruit* of the *divine root*").

The Gospel of John's sharp opposition of light to darkness is picked up not only by Mani in *AA* 15 but also in the *Kephalaia*, where John 3.19 is twice quoted: "For the world loves the darkness, but hates the light, because its works are evil" (*Keph* 184.11f., 185.12f.). This verse is alluded to as well in Mani's *Letter to Menoch* (177), and *Psalm-Book* 165.29f. ("Men have been accustomed to darkness and have loved the burden of sins."). Mani also makes effective use of the good shepherd theme of John 10, building it into an explanation of the distinctive Manichaean view of the methods used by good to defend its realm from evil (*AA* 28). The *Psalm-Book* contains a passage that seems to come from a closely related expansion of John 10 (working in an allusion to 2 Corinthians 4:4 in the process): "The sheep bound to the tree is the Love that died; the Wisdom that reveals is the shepherd that seeks after

[39] See Harrison/BeDuhn 2001.

it. He that ate the sheep is the devouring fire, the god of this world that led the whole world astray" (172.24–27).

Mani's Biblical Christology

It seems that one of the key bases for the Manichaean docetic Christology was the distinction between statements made by Jesus about himself, and those made about him by others. The genealogies and birth stories of the New Testament cannot have the same weight as Jesus' own self-characterization. That self-characterization involves descent from heaven (John 3:13), not human birth, a fact noted by Mani in *AA* 54, and by Faustus in his *Capitula* (*c. Faust.* 7). In *AA* 55, Mani argues in detail that, on the one hand, Jesus corrected those who identified others as his mother and brothers (Matthew 12:47f.) and, on the other hand, praised Peter for identifying him as the son of God (Matthew 16:16f.). Faustus likewise alludes to both of these passages in making his own Christological arguments (*c. Faust.* 5, 7).

Philippians 2:7 remains even today the crux of conflicting Christologies, and that was no less true in the conflict between Manichaean and proto-orthodox Christologies. Mani emphasizes the wording of this verse in *AA* 59, and it is put to the same use in *Keph* 12.24ff. ("He came without a body. His apostles moreover have preached about him that he received a servant's form, a *schēma* as of men."), *Keph* 61.21ff. ("He took the likeness…he made himself like the angels…until he traveled and descended to the form of flesh."), *PsBk II* 194.1–3 ("He [took] the likeness of flesh, the *schēma* of [men.] God became man, he went about in all the world. He received a man's likeness, a slave's *schēma*."). This same use of *schēma* to highlight the docetic nature of Christ's human form appears often in Manichaean literature, as in *PsBk II* 196.22ff.: "Death…found nothing belonging to it (in Jesus). It found not flesh and blood…It found not bone and sinew…It found not its image in him…A *schēma* is what it found, like a mask." The same usage appears in a fragment cited from Mani's *Epistulam ad Zabinam*: "(The light) touched not the substance of flesh, but was veiled with a likeness and form of flesh (ὁμοιώματι καὶ σχήματι σαρκός), lest it should be overcome by the substance of the flesh, and suffer and be spoiled, the darkness spoiling its operations as light."[40]

[40] Translation from Gardner/Lieu 2004, 175. On Manichaean use of *schēma*, see P. van Lindt, "Remarks on the use of σχῆμα in the Coptic Manichaeica," in P. Bryder,

Mani's Biblical Hermeneutics

The depiction of Mani's biblical interpretation in the *AA* is not a work of polemical imagination, but represents authentic Manichaean readings of the New Testament. The consistency of these readings with their counterparts in other sources raises our confidence in those readings for which we do not yet have parallel examples. In fact, the degree of consistency in which passages are cited on a particular topic, how they are used together, and the manner in which they are read strongly suggests that later Manichaean leaders, such as Faustus and Felix in North Africa, were familiar with literature within their community closely related to the sources used by Hegemonius.

The two debates of Mani with Archelaus in the *AA* provide a good picture of Mani's overall reading of the Bible. His was a reading that had not passed through the proto-orthodox lens of the Greek-speaking Mediterranean Christian communities, but rather had been arrived at in the context of an Aramaic-speaking Mesopotamian Elchasaite, Marcionite, and Bardaisanite dialogue. Mani's reading shared elements with all three of his regional antecedents, but the focus here must be a systematic rather than comparative analysis of Mani's biblical theology.

Mani's work with the Bible is not a matter of careful selection of a handful of amenable verses. He moves throughout the entire New Testament with facility and is able to show multiple agreements between passages in support of his readings. Whether it is highlighting the promise of future completion of divine revelation, demonstrating the antithesis of Law and Gospel, showing the dualistic underpinnings of reality, or explaining the divine character of Christ, Mani consistently moves between Gospel and Apostle in crafting seamless interpretations of the scriptures. The presumed artificiality of foisting his religion on the texts is not in evidence. Rather, the key places where Mani's biblical theology departs from that of the western proto-orthodoxy turn out to be precisely those passages where ambiguity and multivalence have given rise to competing interpretations throughout Christian history. Are the good and bad trees so by nature, or by choice? Does the god of this world blind the eyes of individuals to make them unbelievers,

---

ed., *Manichaean Studies, Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism* (Lund, 1988), 95–103. The passage attributed to the *Epistulam ad Zabinam* corresponds so well with other Manichaean texts on this subject that we should reconsider the tendency to dismiss it as a forgery composed specifically to polemically associate Monophysites with Manichaeans.

or does he blind those who have already chosen to be unbelievers? Is Christ's form merely the likeness of a human being, or is it in a material sense human? These are matters that have been centers of debate throughout the history of biblical interpretation, and Mani's readings may be mapped on the spectrum of modern, as well as historical, opinion. Moreover, the Manichaean handling of the Bible confronts the orthodox one with passages the latter has struggled to qualify and downplay, such as the contrast of Law and Gospel, or the depiction of the forces of this world as at war with God. Once we set aside the *a priori* assumption that orthodox biblical interpretation is necessarily more legitimate, the Manichaean variety can be seen to have a coherence of its own that demands consideration and at times even has advantage over the weak points of its opponents.

The fragment presented by Hegemonius as the Letter to Marcellus focuses attention on dualism and Christology as the two main points of divergence between Mani's own revelation and the strange theology from the west he is confronting. The material used for the debates with Archelaus is dominated by these two elements. Mani's assertion of his own authority as fulfillment of the promises of Jesus and Paul is supplied merely as background to the main subjects of the debate. The fourth element of Mani's biblical interpretation—the demonstration of the conflict between Law and Gospel—supplies Mani's fundamental explanation for the theological differences at issue. Mani wishes to show that the non-dualistic monotheism and materialistic Christology of western Christianity arises from a misguided harmonization of the teachings of Christ with those of Moses. The eastern, Manichaean form of this religion, by contrast, emerges when the New Testament is read without such harmonization. Of course, Mani neglects the local influences that have shaped his own readings as much as different regional forces have influenced the western ones. Both Mani and his opponents claim to be the literalists, innocent of cultural bias. But Mani's observations about his opponents are astute. Reading the Old and New Testaments together does indeed pull the interpretation of the latter in the direction of the former, weakening the force of dualistic language and emphasizing Christ's fulfillment of Mosaic ethics and Messianic prophecy at some expense to the more radical elements of his message. Mani's identification of the source of conflict is cogent, therefore, even if it neglects the Jewish underpinnings of much of Jesus' teaching.

In dealing with the issue of dualism, Mani marshals his biblical texts into a compelling case for the dualistic solution to the problem of evil.

The New Testament, it seems, is full of references to actions and events at odds with the will of God. How are such things possible? How can God be defied? Most importantly, what sort of God would willfully arrange things so that evil and damnation would reign so broadly, and would include among his chief works a realm of fire, wailing, and darkness? These questions, raised by the consistent characterization of this world and humankind in the New Testament, can only be answered with some sort of qualification of God's freedom to act. Dualism provides one variety of solution; another is found in the western Christian appeal to the ethical necessity of free will. Truth be told, neither solution is upheld without deviation in the New Testament. Mani formulates a catena of passages that makes the western Christian solution problematic, and at the same time convincingly shows that dualism of some type was a strong component of the earliest Christian message.

On the issue of Christology, Mani positions himself well within the spectrum of opinion prior to Chalcedon. Mani holds a strongly Johannine view of Christ that is able to find ample support in passages from Paul as well. He exercises his greatest interpretive finesse in harmonizing other parts of the New Testament to those two authors. In this cause, he is able to cite passages where Jesus refers to being sent, rather than born, and where Jesus challenges the importance, perhaps even the fact, of the Davidic descent of the messiah. His most brilliant expository flourish comes when he sets side by side Matthew 12:47f. and 16:16f. showing two contrasting reactions of Jesus to identifications of his family connections. The first passage has Jesus rebuking someone who has suggested he has family ties to the household of Mary; the second depicts him praising Peter's identification of God as his father. We must constantly remind ourselves that there was no Christological orthodoxy in the third century CE, only a loose assortment of attempts to reconcile the tensions between key pieces of Christian tradition. Mani's Christology is higher than that of his western rivals, a fact not lost on subsequent Manichaean apologists such as Faustus.[41]

[41] There are also hints in Mani's arguments of debates to come within the western Christian fold. Mani takes the tactic of defending Mary's virginal sanctity against the false reports recorded in the gospels of her reproductive role (*AA* 55), presaging later veneration of the blessed virgin in a unique way. He further insists on the oneness of Christ (*AA* 55) in a context where he only can be opposing hybrid Christologies such as the one ultimately adopted at Chalcedon, anticipating by nearly two centuries the Monophysite position. With the latter observation in mind, it now seems necessary to reexamine those letter fragments ascribed to Mani that were used to polemical purpose

Overall, therefore, Mani's biblical interpretation shows us a coherent use of Christian scripture through the lens of a different location of reading, and as the end result of a distinct trajectory of development.[42] Mani neither subverts proto-orthodox interpretations for his own ends, nor approaches the text as a naif without presuppositions. He initially has no contact with the western interpretive trajectory. Rather he builds upon the preliminary Christianities of the eastern periphery of the tradition's expansion, taking up some interpretive paths while rejecting others in order to produce his more complete, more perfect (in his terms), more comprehensively adapted (in our terms) interpretive orthodoxy. Mani's claim to a better understanding of scripture was at first made at the expense of Elchasaite and Bardaisanite alternatives known to him. Later in his career, he became familiar with still other forms of Christian faith, either through the outreach of his own mission, or from the importation, deliberate or accidental, of these forms from the west. At this moment, Mani rejoined the hermeneutic battle over the Christian tradition, meeting the new western enemy with the full arsenal of his compelling proof-texts. The moment is captured for us in the sources used by Hegemonius in his *AA*. But to appreciate the significance of Mani as the "Great Hermeneut" on his own ground, and to understand what the two rival Christianities looked like in the second half of the third century CE, we must carefully extract these precious sources from their reuse in the *AA*, where they have been transformed by association with a more developed proto-orthodox argument from the fourth century.[43]

---

against the Monophysites with the intention of showing them to be heretics of the Manichaean variety (see Gardner/Lieu 2004, 174–175). While some of these fragments are supposedly addressed to well-known names from the heresiological legend associated with Mani, and may be doubted on that account, others have no such associations, and withstand close comparison with Manichaean Christological statements.

[42] This deft handling of scripture did not cease with Mani, but was alive and well among Manichaeans of the Latin west in the late fourth and fifth century such as Faustus, Fortunatus, and Secundinus. On the latter, see van Oort 2001.

[43] A somewhat parallel example would be the work of Celsus against mid-second century CE forms of Christianity, which was opposed after a substantial interval of time by Origen, who represented a Christianity different in significant ways from that known to Celsus. That is not to say that Hegemonius' Christianity, as put into the mouth of Archelaus, is radically different from the proto-orthodoxy confronted by Mani. On the main points, it is in continuity.

APPENDIX

The proposed larger Letter to Marcellus

Proem	AA 5.1–5
On Dualism	AA 15.1–16
	(AA 32.2–4; 33.1–2, 5–8; possibly also 37.1–2, 4)
	AA 16.1–5
	(AA 19.1, 3–4, 11, 16)
	AA 16.6–10
	AA 28.1–5
On Christ	AA 54.10–12
	AA 55.1–7
	AA 59.1–6
Conclusion	AA 5.6

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE LIGHT AND THE DARKNESS: THE TWO NATURES, FREE WILL, AND THE SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE IN THE *ACTA ARCHELAI*

Kevin Kaatz

Manichaeism identifies itself as the religion of the Two Natures and the Three Times.[1] The idea of the Two Natures, namely Good/Light versus Evil/Darkness, forms the foundation upon which everything else in the religion builds.[2] Their descriptions can be found in a variety of Manichaean texts spread throughout the Roman world, Central Asia and China. The reasoning behind the belief of the Two Natures is that the good God could not have created evil and therefore evil must have its own root or cause which must be outside the realm of the good. Although the reasoning behind this was for a good cause, i.e. to protect God from the idea that he created evil, and Mani and other Manichaeans could turn to the New Testament to back up their belief, the mainstream church saw otherwise. For them, there was only one God and thus one nature.

This chapter will examine the scriptural evidence used by the Manichaeans for the existence of the Two Natures. It will show that the *Acta Archelai*, although fictional, accurately portrays the way that

[1] See Decret 1970, especially chapter 3; Lieu 1992, 10–32; and J. C. Reeves, "Manichaean Citations from the Prose Refutations of Ephrem," in Mirecki/BeDuhn 1997, 266. For Manichaean primary sources on this subject, see *Keph* 55.16–57.32; and Felix in Augustine's *C. Fel.* 2.1 "Ista enim epistula Fundamenti est, quod et sanctitas tua bene scit, quod et ego dixi, quia ipsa continet initium, medium et finem" (Latin is taken from Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vienna, 1865–, vol. 25,2/828.23–26, hereafter CSEL).

[2] Why there are Two Natures in the first place is something that the Manichaeans felt was beyond human reasoning. Secundinus, in *ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/899.11–15) tells Augustine to stop making the two natures one "desine duas naturas facere unam, quia adpropinquat domini iudicium. Uae, qui accipient, qui, quod dulce est, in amaritudinem transferunt!" He also tells Augustine (CSEL 25,2/899.16–900.5) that it cannot be explained why there are two natures, since 'divine reason surpasses the hearts of men.' Augustine answers this in *C. Sec.* 26 (CSEL 25,2/946.21). Secundinus echoes Mani, in *Keph* 67.15–21.

the Manichaeans based the Two Natures on the scripture, especially in the use of the Gospel of Matthew and its abundant references to the Two Trees (the Good and the Evil) and their fruit. Evidence from other Manichaean texts and characterizations of Manichaeans in Augustine's writings shows similar usage of Mt. and Jn. It will also show that Archelaus' response is the same as found in other Christian anti-heretical texts where the two natures are argued against: evil is the result of man's free will and it cannot exist as a separate entity.

The *Acta Archelai* (*AA*) contains a great deal of information about the Manichaean religion, whether or not the debates between Mani and Archelaus actually took place.[3] In it there are three main sections that purportedly come from the Manichaeans: a letter from Mani to Marcellus (*AA* 5), the Manichaean Turbo's account (*AA* 7), and the rest of Mani's statements (starting at *AA* 15). In the letter that Turbo carries from Mani to Marcellus, Mani begins his main argument to Marcellus with a plea for Marcellus' salvation and subsequently begins to attack the view that there is only one principle from which everything (including evil) stems.[4] Although Marcellus sent his reply to Mani, Turbo (who for some unknown reason abandons his faith in Mani, *AA* 6.3) gives a version of the Manichaean cosmogonical story that begins with the well known eternal separation of good from evil at the beginning. Mani then arrives and picks up where his letter left off: the salvation of Marcellus' soul. He wastes no time in attacking the one-principle theory as explained by Archelaus. Mani thought that if he could convert Marcellus to his brand of Christianity, then he "would be able to seize the entire province."[5] At his defeat Mani left and soon after preached his idea of two unbegotten beings (52.2).

Throughout the *AA*, much like other texts that were written against heretics, Mani is disparaged a number of times.[6] Archelaus remarks that he should be called a parasite rather than the Paraclete (*AA*25.3) and claims that he is a vessel of the anti-Christ (40.2), a barbarian priest

---

[3] For a discussion of this subject, see Chapter One of this volume, and Lieu 1994, 132–152.

[4] See Gardner, Chapter Three of this volume; also Lieu in Vermes, 40 n13.

[5] *AA* 4.2. There is no doubt that in this text, Mani saw his religion as a Christian religion. This was undoubtedly the case for the other Manichaeans in the Roman Empire. See J. van Oort, 2001, 164.

[6] For example, see Tertullian's description of Marcion in his *Adu. Marc.* 1.1 (among others).

and conspirator with Mithras (40.7). Archelaus also tells the audience that Mani was neither the author of his own writings (*AA* 61–62) nor was he capable of understanding the scriptures. He asserted that Mani attached the weight of the Paraclete and Christ to his doctrines so that they would not be condemned outright. Twice Mani is accused of either not knowing the scriptures or of corrupting them with his own interpretations (*AA* 32.5 and 44.5). Towards the end of *AA* he is also accused of poring over the scriptures in order to find "proof" of his dualism (*AA* 65.4). By describing Mani like this, Archelaus unintentionally reveals the power that Mani and his dualistic ideas had over the general population.

The rejection by Mani (or the character portrayed as Mani) of the view of one principle from which everything comes lies at the heart of the Manichaean religion. It must have been a useful tool for attracting new Manichaeans since it is attacked by so many throughout the history of anti-Manichaean writings. This attractiveness is also shown in the *AA* since there are a few times where the audience is being swayed by Mani. The first is found in *AA* 43.5 when Tryphon/Diodorus states that Mani's confidence in his use of scripture was causing the crowd to come to Mani's side. It was not only his confidence but also his style of dress that had impressed the crowd.[7] A little later he repeats this (44.3) and adds that he was writing to Archelaus in fear that the "simple folk" were being swayed by Mani. Finally, he states that Mani expounds his doctrines "with the utmost effort and the utmost zeal" (*AA* 45). A good example of this is when Tryphon/Diodorus points out that the crowds were "deeply moved" by Mani's evidence that Christ could not have been born from a woman. The crowd was so excited by this prospect that there was some kind of uproar among them (*AA* 56.1) and this wasn't calmed until Archelaus began to speak. In these cases the crowds were moved by Mani's arguments on the antitheses between the New and Old Testaments which is intimately tied with the idea of the two natures, good and evil.

[7] For a description of Mani's clothes, see *AA* 14.3. Here Mani is wearing platform shoes, a multi-colored cloak and carrying a staff.

A Short History of the One Nature/Two Nature Argument

The idea that there were two natures, good and evil, was a dangerous one for the young Catholic Church and the struggle against it can be seen very early on in its formation. That it was such an early problem shows how popular the idea was to a number of different people, hence making it a threat to what would become orthodoxy. First we will look at examples of how groups predating the Manichaeans viewed the Two Natures, and then we will examine the Manichaean idea of the Two Natures as found in the *AA*.

The first example is Marcion. Marcion was ejected from the Roman Christian community over doctrinal issues, two of which were his rejection of the Old Testament and his idea that there were two gods, one good and the other just.[8] Although Marcion did not see these just and good gods as being at the opposite ends of the spectrum as did the Manichaeans, there are many parallels between arguments used against him and those used later against the Manichaeans: Tertullian (*Adu. Marc*. 1.2) states that Marcion had an unhealthy interest in the problem of evil, especially in terms of its origin (this was a common complaint found in other anti-Manichaean writings, especially those of Augustine). If Marcion believed that evil had a separate origin, then Marcion did not understand that there can only be one god. Tertullian also backs up his idea by referring back to the apostles whose teachings did not discuss two natures (*Adu. Marc*. 1.21). Tertullian had to do this because Marcion referred to the New Testament to show that there are two gods. One of the texts that he uses is Lk. 6:43 (the good and the corrupt tree). This verse, along with Lk. 5:36 (regarding the new wine in old skins), were favorites to the Marcionites because of their seemingly antithetical statements.[9] As will be shown, this verse and its close relative, Mt. 7:18, will also become favorite texts for the Manichaeans.

Other groups took it further than Marcion when they claimed that there was a sharp division between the body and the soul, with the body being totally evil and the soul good. This would also account for the existence of evil in the world as something separate from the good God. The *AA* itself (67.2) mentions Basilides and his two natures and

[8] See Tertullian's *Aduersus Marcionem* (*Adu. Marc*.) 1.2.

[9] See Harnack 1924 (reprint 1996), 26. All references to Harnack will be to the reprint edition.

Bardesanes, who believed there were three: the good, the evil and the space between.[10] Hippolytus mentions several groups, including the Naassenes, who believed in three principles.[11] This idea is also found in the Nag Hammadi text *Paraphrase of Shem*, which states that there are three powers or roots: the light, the darkness and the spirit between them (*Para. Shem.* 1.25–28).[12] Similar ideas of the two natures are found in Zoroastranism and evidence for this is found in the Manichaean *Homilies*, where it is said that Zarathushtra taught that there were two.[13]

Finally, we are fortunate to have a record of the later Marcionite position dating from at least the very late third to the early fourth century. This consists of a discussion between a Christian, Adamantius, two Marcionites (Megethius and Marcus) and a follower of Bardesanes (Marinus), found in Adamantius' *Dialogue on the True Faith in God* (*De Recta in Deum Fide*).[14] According to the Marcionite Megethius, there are three principles in the universe: the good God who is the father of Christ; the demiurge and the third, the evil one (*De Recta* 1.2 and 2.6). As can be seen, the views of Megethius differ slightly from that of Marcion who posited only two. Megethius, like Mani, believed that the good God was not the creator of evil. Unlike Mani, however, Megethius believed that the good God did not create the world. The next Marcionite, Marcus, states that there are just two natures, good and evil,[15] while Marinus states that there are two root causes as well (*De Recta* 3.3).

---

[10] See also P. O. Skjaervø, "Iranian Elements in Manicheism: A Comparative Contrastive Approach, Irano-Manichaica I," in R. Gyselen (ed.), *Au carrefour des religions: Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*, Res Orientalies VII, (Bures-sur-Yvette, 1995), 271, and B. Aland, 'Mani und Bardesanes. Zur Entstehung des manichäischen Systems', in A. Dietrich (ed.), *Synkretismus in syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet. Bericht über ein Symposium in Reinhausen bei Göttingen in der Zeit vom 4. bis 8. Oktober 1971*, (Göttingen, 1975), 123–43.

[11] Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*, 5.3.

[12] As noted by Skjaervø 1995, 271. We will not be discussing the possible connections between these authors and the Manichaean ideas of the Two Natures. Although there are similarities with the Manichaean idea of the two natures, especially in the idea of root for powers of light and darkness and the attack on the light by the darkness, there is no firm evidence for the Manichaeans relying on the *Paraphrase*, or vice versa. On this text, see comments by F. Wisse on the Nag Hammadi Codex VII,1: The Paraphrase of Shem, in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, vol. 4 (Leiden, 2000), 21.

[13] See Skjaervø 1995, 270 and the *Hom* 70.2–9 in Polotsky 1934.

[14] R. A. Pretty, *Adamantius: Dialogue on the True Faith in God* (Gnostica: Texts and Interpretations, 1) (Leuven, 1997), hereafter *De Recta*. On the dating, see 9–17.

[15] There seems to be some confusion in the text since later in the dialogue Marcus states that there are three (see *De Recta* 2.1).

It is clear from this short history that there were numerous groups who believed that there existed two or more natures. The foundation for their beliefs ultimately lead back to the confusing language of the New Testament (at least for the Christian dualists). Yet the mainstream church, whose language of dichotomy between the body and soul was at least partly responsible for the beliefs of these groups,[16] from at least the time of Tertullian believed that the existence of evil was a necessary condition of free will within a cosmos ruled by a single omnipotent deity.

The Two Nature Argument in the Acta Archelai

The *Acta Archelai* begins with the story of the munificence of Marcellus, who is described as a native of Carchar or Kaskar in Mesopotamia,[17] wherein he ransoms a large number of prisoners. This action comes to the attention of Mani who decides to write to Marcellus in the hope that Mani can persuade him to become a Manichaean (*AA* 4.2). Mani writes to Marcellus because he had been "sent to correct the human race" (*AA* 5.2). In trying to persuade Marcellus to become a Manichaean, Mani gives two reasons why a conversion is needed: the first and longest reason is that there are two natures, not one as some have been teaching; the second deals with the idea that Christ could not have been born from Mary (this issue will not be dealt with here). The main argument given by Mani for the existence of Two Natures is that God cannot be responsible in any way for the existence of evil. He readily admits that the majority of people believe in only one nature, but if this were true, it would "insult the goodness of God" and attribute the source of all evil to God (*AA* 5.4). Here begins the thrust of the Manichaean point of view found in the *AA*: it is impossible to contemplate that God has created evil in the form of Satan, or impossible to contemplate that God is the source of any evil. The whole point of this introductory letter is to show that there are two natures, good and evil. Mani cites Mt. 7:18 to try to convince Marcellus that there are two natures. Intimately tied in with the two natures is the idea that Christ could not have been born of a woman, and here Mani cites Jn. 1:18.

---

[16] For a good overview of these conflicting statements, see Harnack 1924, 6–7.

[17] For a discussion of the identity of this city, see Chapter One of this volume, and Lieu in Vermes, 16–23.

After Turbo delivers Mani's letter, Turbo begins to discuss the Manichaean religion with Marcellus and Archelaus. Like most Manichaean documents where the beginning is extant, his account begins with the description of the Two Natures. While most of this account is in accord with primary Manichaean sources, there are a few discrepancies. The first is in his portrayal of Mani worshipping two deities in *AA* 7.1; Mani only worshipped the Good/Light. The second is the neglect to state that the First Man gave himself to the Prince of Darkness as a means of trapping him.[18] These are fairly common inaccuracies which are found in numerous anti-Manichaean accounts. One possible explanation is that the source which Hegemonius used to create Turbo's statement was also incorrect and Hegemonius did not know that it was incorrect. Another possible explanation is that Hegemonius deliberately distorted the Manichaean account to show the "dangers" of believing what the Manichaeans believed. While both are possible, it is more probable that Hegemonius did not really know what the Manichaean belief was and he just replicated the same mistakes found in other anti-Manichaean works. Despite this, the rest of the cosmogonical story is relatively accurate compared with other Manichaean cosmogonical texts. Turbo begins by stating that there are two divinities (Light and Darkness) which were always present and in opposition to each other. Directly after this description he tells Archelaus and Marcellus that the soul is from the Light while the body and other material things are from the Darkness (which is the main reason why Christ could not have been born). He also talks about the cause of death (9.1), reincarnation (10), the creation of Adam (12) and what will happen during the End time (13). Unlike Mani's letter, Turbo did not use a single scriptural verse in his account of Manichaeism. Later we hear that Turbo converted to the religion of Archelaus, was made a deacon and remained with Marcellus.[19]

After Turbo's description, Mani arrives and judges are selected for the debate between himself and Bishop Archelaus.[20] Mani wastes no

---

[18] For another example of this same mistake in Turbo's account, see 11.2 where he states that the princes of evil "stole" from the First Man. In Manichaean texts the fall of the First Man was intentionally a trap in order to bring about the downfall of evil. Cf. *PsBk II*, 9.31–10.9.

[19] *AA* 43.4.

[20] The author of *AA* may have seen these pagan judges as impartial, but like other Christian/heretical debates, this may not have been the case in real life. See also *De Recta*, noted by Pretty 1997, 36 n7. Pretty notes that the judge in Adamantius was not

time in giving his *curriculum vitae*: he is an apostle of Christ, the Paraclete and the third witness, after Jesus and Paul, to preach the truth to mankind. Mani spends a great deal of time on his own introduction (up to at least 15.4) in order to impress upon Marcellus his own authority, since Mani knew he would be in direct competition with Archelaus. After this, he immediately attacks the idea that the father of Jesus is the source of evil (*AA* 15.5). He tells Marcellus that he must choose who he should believe: either "those who feast on meat and enjoy most abundant delights" (Archelaus and his friends) or Jesus Christ (*AA*15.6). Mani's goal is to show how absurd it is to believe that there is only one nature and like the letter that was sent by way of Turbo, he cites Mt. 7:18 and adds Jn. 8:44. Later when the judges ask Mani if he has anything more to say about his religion, he states that there are two natures and that they have separate regions, based on 1 Jn. 5:19 (the whole world is placed in the wicked one). The use of these three citations are Mani's strongest proof for the two natures and as mentioned above, his method of exegesis was a popular one for some in his audience.

Scriptural Basis for the Two Natures

Mt. 7:18: "A bad tree cannot bear good fruit, nor a good tree bear bad fruit."[21]

From the *AA* it is clear that the two-tree example was very important and popular to Mani and the Manichaeans.[22] According to Archelaus, the statement was used by them as a shield (*AA* 54.7). It is referred to both in Manichaean and anti-Manichaean texts. The designations,

---

really a judge, but "a sponsor of the Catholic disputants" (as observed in Harnack, *Marcion*, Leipzig, 1921, 57 n1). Megethius the Marcionite does not think that the judge is very partial (see *De Recta* 1.3).

[21] The text reads: non potest arbor mala bonos fructus facere, neque arbor bona malos fructus facere. The Vulgate reads: non potest arbor bona fructus malos facere neque arbor mala fructus bonos facere. See Harnack 1893, 140, for the textual origin of this verse. I have given the Vulgate for comparison only. The Vulgate (at least the Gospels) was not completed until the middle of the 380's and it was probably much later for the rest of the New Testament. See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975), 88 and F. Cavallera, "Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres, et de l'Apocalypse," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (1920): 269–292.

[22] N. A. Pedersen 1996, 306–7. For examples of these trees, see *PsBk II*, 56.15, 66.28–29 (the Tree of Life and the Tree of Death), 136.20; *Keph* 17.5ff., 54.18ff., 286.24ff.

Good Tree and the Fruit of the Flourishing Tree, were used by the Manichaean community in Kellis, Egypt, to refer to themselves.[23] Mani, in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (*Keph*), states that one will be blessed if he can understand that the two trees are eternally separated from each other.[24] Those who understand that will go to the Aeon of Light, while those who don't will go to the Land of Darkness. From the *Keph* we also know that the Manichaeans acknowledge that other sects have tried to interpret the similar passages in Mt., but that they got it wrong.[25] A number of anti-Manichaean writers mention the Manichaean use of scriptures from Matthew and Luke, including Augustine (below) and Didymus the Blind.[26]

In the *AA* Mani first makes use of Mt. 7:18 and the images of the trees in the letter that he sent to Marcellus by way of Turbo (5.4). Because it is from the mouth of Jesus, it holds special importance to Mani. Using this, Mani and the Manichaeans could not believe that God could have created Satan, the ultimate evil, when Jesus stated that the good tree could not bear bad fruit. If God created Satan, then this verse makes no sense. It also made no sense that Jesus could have been born from a woman when Satan had created the body (this is not made clear in Mani's first letter, but Turbo discusses it in *AA* 12). When he arrived in Carchar Mt. 7:18 was used again during the debate (*AA* 15.6), although this time it was phrased differently.[27]

Like most debates that involved different Christian groups, the same verse was often used to show another meaning. Archelaus is no different. He responds to Mani's exegesis of the tree imagery in Mt. 7:18 or from the related verses in Mt. 12:33, Lk. 6:44 (*AA* 19.2). He wants Mani to tell the audience what these evil fruits are and Mani responds by stating that these fruits are fornication, adultery, murder, avarice, and all evil deeds of mankind. For Archelaus, the meaning of the two trees in Mt. 7:18 points to the free will which was given to man by

---

[23] See *P. Kell. Copt.* 22, 5–6 and *P. Kell. Copt.* 32,4 in I. Gardner, A. Alcock, W.-P. Funk (ed.), *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*, vol. I (Oxbow Books, Oxford, 1999).

[24] *Keph* 22.35ff. See also *Keph* 66.28–70.7, titled the Parable of the Tree.

[25] See *Keph* 17.16.

[26] See Didymus' *Contra Manichaeos* 37.4–17 (PG 39, 1108B12–C15) as noted by Bennett 2001, 42 n14 and 15. See also P. Alfaric, *Les Écritures manichéenes*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1918), 49, and vol. 2, 161–169 and Decret 1970, 151–182 for the Manichaean use of scripture in general.

[27] "A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor a bad tree bear good fruit" (non potest arbor bona malos fructus facere, neque arbor mala bonos fructus facere) (*AA* 15.6).

God. Archelaus believes that if all men ceased to sin, all evil would cease to exist. Therefore there cannot be two independent natures and the verses in Mt. and Lk. refer to free will.

Mt. 7:18 and its related verses were a major source of problems for the early church in trying to combat the idea that there exists more than one nature. Marcion was one of the earliest examples. He had used this verse for his argument against the idea of one God.[28] It must have been a very important verse for his theology since Tertullian notes that Marcion used Mt. 7:18 to back up his idea of two gods. Tertullian, on the other hand, states that this verse applies to men and not gods and that it actually means "that a good mind or good faith does not produce evil actions, nor an evil mind and faith good ones." That Tertullian sees Mt. 7:18 as an issue of free will become a common exegetical answer for many who will fight against later heretics, as shown from Archelaus who also believed that Mt. 7:18 referred to free will. This is also the case with Augustine (discussed below).

The Marcionite use of this verse is also mentioned in Adamantius' *De Recta*, 1.28. Here the Marcionite Megethius cites Mt. 7:18[29] and pairs it with Mt. 6:24 (no man can serve two masters) to show that there are two natures. Adamantius responds by giving the same reasoning as Tertullian: this passage refers only to men and not natures because if Christ wanted to discuss natures, he would not have used the word 'fruit.' The debate with Megethius and Adamantius ends rather abruptly with Adamantius confronting him with the free will issue by asking why Paul, a bad tree, was changed into a good one, and what kind of a tree Judas was before he turned against Christ. Unfortunately Megethius does not give an answer.

There is also a large amount of evidence that this section of Mt. and other related verses to the two trees were used by other Manichaeans, especially those who were dealt with by Augustine: Fortunatus, Adimantus, Felix and Secundinus. They were all very adept at using the Gospel of Matthew.[30]

---

[28] As found in Tertullian's *Adu. Marc*. 1.2. For this work, see E. Evans, (ed. and trans.) *Tertullian: Aduersus Marcionem* (Oxford, 1972). All translations are from this work.

[29] The wording of this verse (with the evil tree mentioned first) is the same as that which Mani first uses in the *AA*.

[30] J. K. Coyle, *Augustine's De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*: *A Study of the Work, its Composition and its Sources* (Fribourg, 1978), 109, n716 notes the Manichaean fondness of Matthew. This Gospel is quoted more than the works of Paul. See Decret 1970, 169–172–174.

In 392 Augustine held a debate with the Manichaean Fortunatus. Fortunatus, in *Contra Fortunatum* (*C. Fort.*) 1.14 bases the two natures on Mt. 15:3 and 3:10 (the tree which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up and cast into the fire, because it does not bring forth good fruit).[31] The existence of a tree which God did not plant shows that there exists another nature. Like Tertullian and Adamantius before him, Augustine responds that evil exists because mankind voluntarily goes against God's law.[32] As we will see, Augustine's thoughts on this matter will remain unchanged throughout his writings.[33]

About two years after his debate with Fortunatus, Augustine wrote his *Sermon of the Lord on the Mount* (*S. Dom. mon.*). Here he specifically states that the two trees found in Mt. 7:18 "furnish no argument" for the Manichaean idea of the two natures.[34] The tree is the soul and the fruits are the person's works. This passage in Mt. refers to two people, not to two natures. Around the same time Augustine is sent a work by the Manichaean Adimantus, whereby Adimantus sets out a number of antitheses between the Old and New Testaments (much like that of Marcion). Adimantus uses Mt. 7:17–19 to compare it with Amos 2:3–6.[35] Once again for Augustine Mt. 7:17 is an issue of free will.

After dealing with Fortunatus and Adimantus' work, Augustine held another debate with the Manichaean doctor, Felix, either in 398 or 404. In *C. Fel.* 2.2 Felix tells Augustine that Mani had stated there were two natures, but was rebuked for this idea. Felix follows up his comments by citing Mt. 7:18.[36] This is proof of the existence of two natures. Felix pairs this with Mt. 13:27–28 "Did you not sow good seed in your field? Where have these weeds come from? It is the enemy's doing."[37] Augustine again was not convinced and in response cites Mt. 12:33 "You make the tree good and its fruits good, or you make the tree evil

---

[31] *Keph* 58.18–19 uses this citation also.

[32] *C. Fort.* 1.15.

[33] See also Cyril of Alexandria, who stated that the fruit (as found in Lk. 6:44) is the character of the human (*Fragments on Luke* 112 in the *Fathers of the Church* series, vol. 94:172–173), and much later Bede, in his *Homilies on the Gospels* 2.25 (in *Cistercian Studies*, vol. 111:257 (Kalamazoo, 1973–) states the same as Augustine. Here Bede is referring to Luke 6:44.

[34] *S. Dom. mon.* 2.24.79.

[35] *C. Adim.* 26.

[36] *CSEL* 25,2/829.15–17.

[37] *CSEL* 25,2/829.18–19.

and its fruits evil."[38] Augustine believes that this statement is not about God, but about man. Like his earlier responses, this citation indicates a free-will issue since each person can decide what is good and what is evil and thus can decide what type of tree he/she is going to be.

The Manichaean Secundinus, in his letter to Augustine, also gives an explanation for the two natures, and bases it on Mt. 25. He first tells Augustine that he cannot explain why there are two natures in the first place, because "divine reason is beyond the hearts of men." He then tries to help Augustine understand the battle between the Light and Dark and states

> But the Savior, for whom everything is easy, calls these two places right and left, inside and outside, come and go. Whereas you when you write a verse and take a poetic foot—for example orbis, vita, salus, lumen, lex, ordo, potestas—if it is a voiced syllable you pronounce it as silent, and a long one you pronounce short. These natures do not agree in this way, but they certainly mean two things and are separated from one another.[39]

Augustine does not accept this explanation and he responds that Christ was not using the terms "right and left" to signify something physical, and he was only discussing the "blessedness or the misery" of each person. And finally, Augustine, also in his reply to Secundinus (*C. Sec.* 2) used Mt. 12:33 to show that he changed his will when he left the Manichaeans—this was not a change of nature (see also *C. Sec.* 19 and 24).[40]

---

[38] *C. Fel.* 2.4. (*CSEL* 25,2/831.28ff.): Aut facite arborem bonam et fructum eius bonum aut facite arborem malam et fructum eius malum."

[39] *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/900.19–901.2) 'Saluator autem, cui totum facile est, duo haec dextrum uocat ac laeuum, intus ac foris, uenite ac recedite (Mt. 25). Tu autem conuersum facis et pedem ponis, ut est orbis, uita, salus, lumen, lex, ordo, potestas, si uocalem dicis et mutam, longam uocas breuem. Quae naturae hace non sonant, duo pro certo significant et ab inuicem separata.'

[40] For the same view, see Augustine's *Enchiridion* 4.15. Evodius, a good friend of Augustine (who was also probably copying ideas from Augustine's writings), in his *De Fide Contra Manichaeos* 5, also states that Mt. 12:33 proves that desire in humans is voluntary and not a nature (*Contra Fide* 5).

Jn. 8:44: The Father of the devil "is a liar and a murderer from the beginning."[41]

Mani also uses variations of Jn. 8:44 twice in *AA* to show that evil has a separate existence (in *AA* 15.7 and 33.1–2). In the first instance it immediately followed Mani's use of Mt. 7:18. If the devil is a murderer from the beginning, then it is impossible to believe that God would have created the devil evil at the very start. Because this is impossible, this leads Mani to state that the devil is the only source and cause for our evils (*AA* 15.8). For Mani and the Manichaeans there can be no other way for Jn. 8:44 to be understood. Mani also makes allusion to "the planter of weeds" (Mt. 13:27) much like Felix will do later with Augustine (see above).

Archelaus responds in *AA* 36.1, 36.5 and 36.7. As with his previous response to Mt. 7:18, the answer is that God gave free will and even gave it to the devil who was originally an angel. Thus when Jesus says "you are of your father the devil and you wish to do the desires of your father" it means that there were some people who were obeying the devil. The 'father' that Archelaus is referring to is both the serpent and Cain (37.9).

Like Mt. 7:18, Augustine was aware of the Manichaean use of Jn. 8:44. In his *Duab. An.* 7:9, he says that the Manichaeans might have cited to him "You are of your father the devil" in order to show how there are two wills, good and evil, in mankind. Augustine responds by suggesting that if there are seemingly conflicting passages of scripture, then one should seek out a teacher who can show the harmony of these passages. As with Mt. 7:18, the issue here in Jn. 8:44 is an issue of free will. Sinners and unbelievers are not from God in their nature, but because they choose to not follow the commandments. In *C. Adim.* 5, Adimantus is reported to have used Jn. 8:44 to show how this New Testament passage disagrees with Gen. 1:26 ("Let us make man in our image…"). The Manichaeans did not believe that mankind was made in God's image because Jn. 8:44 states that the father of mankind is the devil. Augustine states that when Genesis claims that mankind

[41] The text reads: patrem diaboli mendacem et homicidam ab initio. See also *AA* 33.2: Ille enim homicida est ab initio…quoniam mendax est sicut et pater eius. The *Vulgate* reads: ille homicida erat ab initio…cum loquitur mendacium ex propriis loquitur quia mendax est et pater eius.

was made in God's image, it meant mankind before it started to sin. Jn. 8:44 refers to sinners and the faithless.

Augustine once again (sometime around 416 and after) looks at this issue in his *Homilies on the Gospel of John* 42.10. He states that the Manichaeans use this verse to deceive the simple ones. Adam and Eve died because they listened to the devil and he is a murderer because he gave evil suggestions to them (42.11). Augustine also addresses the idea that there is a father to the devil (42.12). The Manichaeans ask the uninstructed if the devil was a fallen angel, and if they respond "yes" then that would assume that the devil has a father. Augustine believed the Manichaeans misunderstood and mistranslated the phrase. It should be understood that the devil is a liar and the father of *it*—i.e., lying, not as a reference to the devil and the father of *him* (42.13). For Augustine, the Manichaeans were misunderstanding, either deliberately or through ignorance the original Greek of John. Because of this they had created a theology that created a father of the devil. Augustine also shares with the responses given by Archelaus an emphasis on free will as the cause of evil in mankind.

1 Jn. 5:19: "The whole world is placed in the wicked one."[42]

In Mani's first debate, the judges ask him for more detail on his system. Mani responds again by stating that there are two natures, good and evil, both of which reside in their own regions. The region of evil is the world itself and everything in it. Mani uses scripture and cites 1 John 5:19 (*AA* 16.1). This proves the existence of two areas, good and evil. Otherwise, according to Mani, where would the hell-fire, the outer darkness and the wailing be other than in God?[43] If this were true, then even God would be tortured. Mani continues with more examples of why there must be a separate region for evil.

In his response, as in Tertullian and Augustine's writings, Archelaus believes that the two unchangeable natures cannot exist because an adversary can become a friend and this is an example of free will. The judges agree with Archelaus and give a number of their own examples on the nature of changeability of man (*AA* 18.1). Archelaus then cites Mk. 3:23 "How can Satan drive out Satan" and Mk. 3:27 "Who can

[42] Text: totus mundus in maligno est positus. *Vulgate*: mundus totus in maligno positus est.

[43] This statement by Mani is very similar to that found in *PsBk II*, 57.3ff.

enter the house of a strong man and plunder his belongings, unless he is stronger than him." He also states that if both are unchangeable natures, then they must be the same thing (*AA* 18.2).[44] But if the two natures are changeable, then the good can be made evil and vice versa. Mani, he believes, does not allow for a change of the will and Archelaus, when he meets with Mani a second time, states this again (*AA* 54.8).

Unlike Mt. 7:17 and Jn. 8:44, there is little evidence for Manichaean use of 1 Jn. 5:19, or 1 Jn. at all, for that matter. Its use in *AA* is rather surprising, but the appearance of it shows that it was at least used enough by the Manichaeans to warrant its inclusion into this fictitious debate. Neither Fortunatus, Adimantus, Faustus, nor Secundinus make use of it. Felix uses the letter of 1 Jn. only once.[45] Augustine also makes little use of this citation. Towards the end of his life, Julian of Eclanum, who had accused Augustine of being a secret Manichaean, believed that Augustine had taught that whatever is in the world belongs to the devil and that either the devil made the world or that he controls it. Augustine does not mince words when he replies to Julian: "I never said this; on the contrary, I detest, I refute, I condemn anyone who says it!" He then cites 1 Jn. 5:19 with 1 Jn. 2:16 and tells Julian that these verses mean that all those in the world are subject to eternal damnation unless they are saved by the blood of Christ.[46]

Conclusion

In the service of their idea of the Two Natures, the use of scripture by Mani and the Manichaeans was probably an important way for them to gain new adherents. The debate in the *AA* between Mani and Archelaus may have never taken place, but the author of this text was well aware of the kind of arguments that the Manichaeans use when the Manichaeans actually debated. This is clearly shown by the scriptural arguments used by "Mani." His use of Mt. 7:18 and its related verses, Jn. 8:44, and to a lesser extent, 1 Jn. 5:19 (outside of the *Acta Archelai* used only by the Manichaean Felix) have a number of parallels

---

[44] This argument is very similar to that used by both Tertullian and Ephraim against Marcion. For Ephraim's argument, see C. W. Mitchell, *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1921), xxxiv.

[45] As noted by Coyle 1978, 191, n720. See also Decret 1970, 174.

[46] *Contra Julianum* 6.2.3. Translation is taken from *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, vol. 35, St. Augustine against Julian (Washington, 1957).

in other Manichaean and anti-Manichaean texts, most notably in the debates with Augustine and the Manichaeans Fortunatus, Felix, and the writings of Adimantus and Secundinus, who all use these verses in similar ways.

Before the Manichaeans, the Church already had experience dealing with the idea of two natures and the author of the *AA* once again gives the same explanation: free will in mankind is the only source of evil. For Archelaus all of the scripture used by Mani can be shown to mean that mankind has free will and not that evil has a separate existence. This was a commonly used argument against the two-nature idea from Tertullian through to Augustine (and carried later on by Bede). The *AA* also contains the outline of the most frequently used arguments against the Manichaeans: the Old and New Testaments complement one another; Jesus was born of Mary; only God exists and there is not an opposite to God; free will is the source of evil. When the *AA* is compared to other Manichaean and anti-Manichaean documents, it reveals an accurate portrayal of the Manichaean position. As such, it is an important document not only for Manichaean scholars but also for scholars of the early church.

CHAPTER EIGHT

"ET SICUT REX…": COMPETING IDEAS OF KINGSHIP IN THE ANTI-MANICHAEAN *ACTA ARCHELAI*

TIMOTHY PETTIPIECE

Recently, a great deal of renewed attention has been paid to the early anti-Manichaean text known as the *Acta Archelai*, or "Acts of Archelaus." This fictional (or fictionalised) debate between the prophet Mani and bishop Archelaus of "Carchar"/"Kaskar"[1] has proven to be an important witness to the early controversies between mainstream Christians and Manichaeans along the eastern fringes of the Roman Empire. While much attention has been paid to the historical context and sources used by Hegemonius in the composition or redaction of the text, relatively little attention has been paid to its rhetorical or polemical strategies. For instance, during the debates between Mani and Archelaus a number of the similes and metaphors attributed to the bishop concern the nature of kingship. While on the surface such rhetorical figures may appear to be commonplaces in late antique literature, closer examination reveals that they serve a specific polemical function. By using such figures bishop Archelaus engages in a polemical discourse against the Manichaean "King of Light," exposing him as weak and ineffective when compared to Jesus, the perfect and triumphant King. These contrasting conceptions of kingship, however, point to some more general theological debates. This paper will examine how the conflicting images of kingship found within the *AA* reflect divergent views among early Christians about issues such as relation to authority and the response to suffering and persecution.

[1] For a discussion of the supposed location of the debate see Chapter One of this volume, and Lieu in Vermes, 16, 23.

Kingship According to Archelaus

The first invocation of the ideal ruler by Archelaus comes from his response to Mani's suggestion that two unbegotten beings exist at the foundation of the cosmos. He demands to know who it was that established the division between the two first principles. The bishop responds to this limiting of divine power with an *exemplum* from Hellenistic history:

> For Lysimachus and Alexander seized command of the whole world, and were able to subject all barbarian nations and indeed the entire human race, in such a way that during that period there was no one else in command under heaven apart from themselves. How shall anyone dare to say that God is not present everywhere, who is the unfailing true light, and whose kingdom is holy and eternal? Alas for this wretched man's impiety; he does not attribute to God omnipotent even power to equal that of men![2]

In this way, in order to emphasize the absurdity he perceives in the limiting of God's omnipotence,[3] Archelaus alludes to the historical ideals represented by Lysimachus, one of Alexander's successors,[4] and Alexander himself, personalities who might have elicited a favorable response from the ethnically Macedonian colonial population represented as present in Carchar.[5]

In the remaining, non-historical examples, Archelaus sets up a contrast between the defensive activities of the Manichaean God and Christ. For instance, in *AA* 27, the bishop states:

---

[2] *AA* 24 (Vermes, 75), Beeson 36: Lysimachus enim et Alexander totius mundi inperium tenuerunt omnesque nationes barbares atque omne genus hominum subicere potuerunt, ita ut non esset alius inperator per illud tempus praeter ipsos sub caelo. Et quomodo audebit quisquam dicere non ubique esse deum, qui est lumen verum indeficiens, cuius est regnum sanctum et sempiternum? Heu nequissimi istius inpietas, qui nec aequalem quidem cum hominibus potestatem omnipotenti deo tribuit!

[3] Archelaus states: "If God is placed in his kingdom, and the wicked one similarly in his kingdom, who will have built the wall between the midst of them? For nothing can divide two substances without being greater than both…" (Deo in regno suo posito et maligno similiter in suo regno, quis inter medium ipsorum construxerit murum? Non enim potest dividere quid duas substantias, nisi quod sit utroque maius [*AA* 26; Vermes, 78]).

[4] Lieu, n122 in Vermes, 75.

[5] According to Samuel Lieu, the name Archelaus "well befits the inhabitant of a former Macedonian colony " (Lieu in Vermes 18; cf. 75 n122). The remark is made in the context of a hypothesis that "Carchar" is meant to be Carrhae, but conditions would have been similar in any number of Syro-Mesopotamian urban areas of the time.

> So if God, as you say, constructed the wall, he proves himself fearful and lacking in courage. For we know that it is always those who suspect that traps are being devised against them by foreigners and who fear enemy snares that generally surround their own cities with walls. By so doing, they preserve their ignorance and equally display their own stupidity.[6]

Similarly at *AA* 28, Archelaus criticises the apparent cowardice of the good principle:

> This is just like a king, when war is declared on him, who trusts not in the slightest in his own strength, but terrified through the fear of his own weakness shuts himself up in the walls of his city and surrounds himself with ramparts and fortifications, and makes preparations with no faith in his own force of arms; whereas if he is a brave man, he goes out to meet the enemy a long way from his own borders, and does all he can until he defeats and masters his adversary.[7]

In contrast to the weakness and foolishness of the Manichaean King of Light, Archelaus invokes his conception of the strong and triumphant king, whose is exemplified by Christ:

> But just as a king arriving at his city first sends ahead his body-guard, standards, flags, and banners, his generals, chiefs and prefects, and everything at once is thrown into uproar, while some are terrified, while others rejoice at the king's expected arrival, so too my Lord Jesus, who is truly perfect, when he arrives sends ahead first of all his glory, the consecrated heralds of his uncontaminated and immaculate kingdom, and then the entire creation will be thrown into uproar and confusion, begging and beseeching until he liberates it from servitude.[8]

---

[6] *AA* 27 (Vermes, 79), Beeson, 39: Si ergo deus, ut ais, murum construxit, timidum se hic et nihil fortitudinis se habere designat. Scimus enim semper eos qui suspicantur ab extraneis sibi dolos intendi atque hostium verentur insidias ipsi solent urbes suas muris circumdare; in quo et ignorantiam habent pariter atque inbeccillitatem sui ostendunt.

[7] *AA* 28 (Vermes, 82–83), Beeson 42: Et sicut rex aliquis, bello sibi inlato, nequaquam propria virtute confisus, sed inbeccillitatis suae timore perterritus, muris ipse urbis inclusus vallos aliaque munimenta circumdat ac praeparat, manu ac viribus nihil fidens; si vero vir fortis sit, etiam porro a suis finibus in occursum hosti procedit et agit omnia usquequo vincat et obtineat adversarium.

[8] *AA* 41 (Vermes 107), Beeson, 61: Sed sicut rex adveniens ad urbem suam praemittit primo protectores suos, signa, dracones, labaros, duces, principes, praefectos, et universa continuo commoventur, aliis vero metuentibus, aliis vero gaudentibus pro expectatione regis, ita et dominus meus Iesus, qui est vere perfectus, adveniens praemittit in primo gloriam suam, incontaminati atque inmaculati regni praedicatores sacratos, et tunc universa creatura commovebitur et contrubabitur, supplicans atque obsecrans, usquequo eam a servitute liberet.

Indeed, no facet of human civilization will be able to withstand the glorious arrival of this divine ruler:

> All things will be abolished, whether prophecies or their books, or languages of the whole race; they will cease, because men will no longer be anxious to think of the things that are necessary for life; and the knowledge of all kinds of teachers will itself be destroyed; for none of these will be able to withstand the arrival of that great king.[9]

Additional developments of this theme include the following passages:

> But who would dare to speak about the substance of God, except perhaps only our Lord Jesus Christ? I affirm this not only in my own words, but confirm it with the authority of Scripture which has taught us; since the apostle says to us: "So that you may be like lights in this world, keeping the word of life so that I may glory on the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain nor laboured in vain." [Phil 2:15–16] We ought to understand the force and sense of this statement; for a word can hold the place of a leader, but works hold that of a king. So, just as someone when his king is coming strives to present all the men under his care obedient, prepared, affectionate, and jovial, devoted but also innocent and overflowing with all good qualities, so that he himself may obtain praise from the king, and be counted by him as worthy of greater honour, on the grounds that the province, entrusted to him has been governed well.[10]
>
> But it is written in the Gospel of our Saviour that also those who stand on the left hand of the king shall say: "Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty, or naked or an alien, or in prison, and did not minister to you?" [Mt 25:44] They shall plead to win his mercy, but what did the just king and judge reply to them? "Depart from me, into the eternal fire, you workers of iniquity." [Lk 13:27–28] He hurled them into the eternal fire, although they do not cease to plead with him. Do you not see what

---

[9] *AA* 41 (Vermes, 108), Beeson, 61: omnia destruentur sive prophetiae sive horum libri sive linguae totius generis: cessabunt, eo quod ultra egeant solliciti esse homines et cogitare de his quae ad vitam necessaria sunt, sive scientia quorumcumque doctorum, etiam ipsa destruetur: nihil enim horum sufferre poterit magni illius regis adventum.

[10] *AA* 42 (Vermes 108–109), Beeson, 62: Quis autem et de substantia dei dicere audeat, nisi forte solus dominus noster Iesus Christus? quae quidem ego non ex meis verbis adstruo, sed scripturae quae nos edocuit auctoritate confirmo; quoniam quidem et apostolus dicit ad nos: Ut sitis sicut luminaria in hoc mundo, verbum vitae continentes ad gloriam mihi in diem Christi, quoniam non in vacuum cucurri nec in vacuum laboravi. Intellegere debemus quae sit vis et ratio sermonis huius; verbum enim ducis obtinet locum, opera vero regis. Sicut ergo aliquis regi suo adventanti omnes qui sub cura sua sunt studet oboedientes, paratos et caros hilaresque ostendere ac devotos sed etiam innocentes ac bonis omnibus abundantes, ut ipse laudem consequatur a rege et maiore ab eo honore dignus habeatur, tamquam bene gubernata quae sibi est commissa provincia.

> the arrival of the perfect king will be? Not the kind of perfection that you claim. But if following him is to be awaited the great day of judgment, then in all events this man here is hugely inferior to that king.[11]

For Archelaus, the ideal king is most perfectly represented by Jesus, whose triumph over sin and death is in stark contrast to the cowardice of the Manichaean divinity, whom the bishop characterizes as hiding behind his defenses and, according to the classic Manichaean cosmogony, allowing himself to be defeated and partially occupied by the powers of darkness.

Manichaean Views of Kingship

According to H.-J. Klimkeit, notions of kingship are in some ways at the heart of the Manichaean world view, since Mani himself seems to have "conceived of the world of light as a court, ruled by the King of Light."[12] For instance in a fragment from Mani's canonical *Treasure of Life* preserved by Augustine, the prophet describes how "the blessed father, who has shining ships as lodgings and dwelling places according to their size, in accordance with the clemency that is attached to him, brings aid to set his vital substance free from impious bonds . . . By his invisible nod he transforms his powers which he has in his shining ship, and causes them to show themselves to hostile powers."[13] This evokes the typically veiled and hands-off approach of the Persian King of Kings, who causes his powers to act, while he himself remains hidden. In another passage, from the (apparently) canonical *Song of the Lovers*, Augustine demands of Faustus, "Do you recall your 'Song of the Lovers' in which you describe the supreme reigning monarch, forever sceptre-bearing, crowned with flowers and possessing a fiery countenance?"[14] Finally, we find in the *Fundamental Epistle* the assertion

---

[11] *AA* 42 (Vermes 110), Beeson, 63: Sed scriptum est in euangelio salvaoris nostri quia et illi qui a sinistris regis adsistunt dicant: *Domine, quando te vidimus esurientem aut sitientem aut nudum aut peregrinum aut in carcere et non ministravimus tibi*? rogantes ut sibi indulgeret; sed quid illis respondit rex iustus iudex? *Discedite a me in ignem aeternum, operarii iniquitatis*. Abiecit eos in aeternum ignem, cum illi rogare non cessent. Videsne quid sit perfecti regis adventus? non talem qualem tu adseris perfectionem. Quod si post istum expectandus est magnus iudicii dies, multo utique hic illo inferior est.

[12] H.-J. Klimkeit, "Manichaean Kingship: Gnosis at Home in the World," *Numen* 29 (1982) 17.

[13] Gardner/Lieu 2004, 159–160.

[14] Gardner/Lieu 2004, 163–165.

that "in (the Father's) splendid kingdom there is no beggar or cripple,"[15] giving the Kingdom of Light a compassionate and rather magnanimous hue. It should not be surprising that Mani used such language and imagery, especially since he initially tailored his message in order to win the support of the Sassanian court. For our purposes, however, an interesting Manichaean image of kingship is transmitted by the *AA*. In the doctrinal summary given by Turbo to Marcellus and Archelaus, Mani's messenger states explicitly that the two gods are like "two kings fighting each other, who have been enemies from the beginning and each of whom respectively has his own territory."[16] Yet in spite of the fact that each one may have been considered a king in his own right, Severus of Antioch records a Manichaean statement about how the difference between these two is "as great as that between a king and a pig." While "the one moves in a royal palace in chambers fitting for him, the other wallows like a pig in filth."[17]

Even though both principles of Light and Darkness were described with royal imagery, Mani was careful to make certain important distinctions. For instance, according to Theodore bar Khonai, while Mani called the ruler of the dark land the "King of Darkness," he called the light ruler the "Father (*abba*) of Greatness," no doubt an allusion to early Christian sensibilities about the fatherhood of God found in the New Testament. Somewhat less discriminating are Coptic sources that describe the Father of Greatness as the King of Light (*Keph* 5.18; 51.21; *PsBk II* 133.4; 136.26), King of Lights (*Keph* 35.8), King of Life (*PsBk II* 168.24), "Great King" (*Keph* 43.19; 69.27; 75.3), "Glorious King" (*PsBk* II 136.15), and King of the Aeons of Greatness (*Keph* 80.30; *PsBk II* 113.18; *PsBk II* 190.8). On the other hand, while the dark ruler is still called King of Darkness, or more precisely "King (of the Worlds) of Darkness" (ⲡⲣⲣⲟ ⲛⲛⲁⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉ) (*Keph* 31.2, 27; 32.1, 14; 33.2, 5), he is also placed at the head of a set of five "Kings of Darkness," who rule over the elemental worlds of smoke, fire, wind, water, and darkness.[18]

---

[15] Gardner/Lieu 2004, 168–172.

[16] Vermes 154; Beeson, 10: quemadmodum si duo reges sint adversum se pugnantes, qui ab initio fuerint inimici, habentes singuli suas portiones.

[17] Gardner/Lieu 2004, 160–163.

[18] See especially *Kephalaion* 6, "On the Five Storehouses which are brought forth from the Land of Darkness from the Beginning; the Five Rulers, the Five Spirits, the Five Bodies, (and) the Five Tastes."

Other divine beings are also styled with language from the royal court. For instance, First Man is compared to a king standing among his enemies (*Keph* 272.11), while Living Spirit is variously compared to a judge sent by a king (*Keph* 50.29; 51.19), an emissary sent to rescue a king's son (*Keph* 77.9), and an architect who builds a king's residence (*Keph* 131.29). Two of Living Spirit's "sons" are called kings, namely the King of Honor (second son of Living Spirit) (*Keph* 80.5; 81.11; 82.26; 83.3; 87.32, 34; 88.2, 13, 20; 89.15; 91.23; 92.24; 93.24; 170.27, 28; 171.17; 172.10; *PsBk II* 2.9; 138.35) and the King of Glory (third son of Living Spirit) (*Keph* 91.27; 93.9; 113.31; 171.4, 21; 172.16; *PsBk II* 2.15; 138.46). In the context of the Third Emanation, the Third Ambassador is described as King of the Glorious Realm (*Keph* 43.31), King of the Zone (*Keph* 82.18), and King of "these worlds" (*PsBk II* 138.62), and is compared to a great King come to inspect the work of his artisans (*Keph* 52.22, 30). Jesus the Splendor, in turn, is also described as king and Savior (*Keph* 53.31), King of the Saints (*PsBk I* 161.19; *PsBk II* 41.5; 117.32; 151.1; 154.19; 155.13; 159.19; 169.13; 170.13; 174.9; 174.31), "king on high" (*PsBk II* 12.13), and Christ the king (*PsBk II* 106.32), as is the Light-Mind, which is called King of the New Man (*PsBk II* 153.18, 20).

Even Mani does not escape the royal imaginings of his disciples, when he is described as "our King, the Paraclete" (*PsBk I* 177.28) and "my blessed king" (*PsBk II* 15.1) by the authors of the *Psalm-book*. The Prophet of Light, however, seems to have had a complicated relationship with rulers of his time. While he was born under Artabanus, King of Parthia (*Keph* 14.29), grew up and received his revelation under Ardashir, King of Persia (*Keph* 14.29, 31; 15.25), and was supported in his mission by King Shapur I (*Keph* 15.28, 31), Mani was met with stiff resistance by certain "kings of the world" who attempted to abolish his "truth" (*Keph* 101.3) and finally executed by Vahram "the Fool" in 276/77 CE (*PsBk II* 15.27).

While "Western" Manichaean texts described kingship principally in its divine and transcendent manifestations, sources from later contexts can have a more worldly tone. When Bögü Khan adopted Manichaeism as the Uighur state religion in 762 CE,[19] the movement began an entirely new relationship with the powers-that-be. Earlier texts in Coptic and Iranian, written during periods of persecution, are decidedly

[19] Klimkeit 1993, 169.

pessimistic about the rulers of the world. For instance, *Kephalaion* 6 perceives the malicious spirit of the King of the Worlds of Fire at work in "kings of the world," especially those associated with the fire worshipping sect[20]—a clear reference to the adversity experienced by the Manichaean church in Sassanid Persia. Later Turkish texts, however, can be rich with royal imagery in which, according to Klimkeit, "the virtues and duties expected of kings were derived from and related to the attributes of the Heavenly Ruler, the Father of Light."[21] Here, Klimkeit has detected a note of worldly optimism in these texts that is absent from other corpora.[22] While these texts are somewhat beyond the scope of the present study, they at least help to reveal the fact that Manichaean attitudes to kingship were often a reflection of the worldly conditions and temporal circumstances in which they were engaged. Understandably, conditions of adversity generated one set of views, while conditions of prosperity generated another.

Diverse Early Christian Responses to Kingship

In the Hellenistic tradition, monarchy came to be considered as the quintessential form of state.[23] Plato, in the *Laws*, states that "when supreme power is combined in one person with wisdom and temperance, then, and on no other conditions conceivable, nature gives birth to the best of constitutions with the best of laws" (4.712).[24] It was especially since Alexander and his successors that a form of kingship modeled on the Persian monarchy came to be viewed as the normative form of governance. This norm was theoretically supported by "Hellenistic political metaphysics" which saw the king as an agent analogous to God.[25] In particular, the Aristotelian treatise *De Mundo* described God as the Persian Great King, who governs the world indirectly, hidden

[20] *Keph* 33.13–17; Gardner 1995, 37.
[21] Klimkeit 1993, 157.
[22] H.-J. Klimkeit, "Manichaean Kingship: Gnosis at Home in the World," *Numen* 29 (1982) 28–30.
[23] Deidre J. Good, *Jesus the Meek King*, Harrisburg, 1999, 40.
[24] Plato, *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*, Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, eds. (Bollingen Series 71), New York, 1961, 1303.
[25] Per Beskow, *Rex gloriae: The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church*, Stockholm, 1962, 191.

within his palace, while the *logos* acts as his vice-regent or satrap.[26] In this way the political and theological dimensions of kingship became intertwined within the Greek tradition. According to the Hellenistic theorists, the ideal king was first and foremost victorious, although in addition to this he was seen as the protector of his people (*sōter, euergetēs*), creator of harmony, wise (*sophos*), generous (*philanthrōpos*), and magnanimous (*megalopsuchos*).[27]

With the development of the early Christian tradition, however, we find a quite different notion of kingship. According to Deidre J. Good, in her study *Jesus the Meek King*, early Christian writings, especially the Gospel of Matthew, describe Jesus as *praus* (Mt. 11:28–29), a term which, in Jewish and Hellenistic tradition evokes a meek and gentle ruler.[28] In Matthew's portrait, Jesus teaches reconciliation and non-retaliation (5:19), values which imply the "rejection of anger, withdrawal from hostility, and refusal to meet aggression with aggression."[29] Good suggests that there is a contrast in Matthew between Jesus as the *praus* king and Herod, the fearful and angry ruler.[30] This contrast is expressed at Matthew 21:6 during the entry to Jerusalem when Isaiah 62:11 is quoted: "Look, your king is coming to you, humble, and mounted on a donkey…" (NRSV). On a community level, the values of *praotēs*, especially when faced with a situation of persecution, become an important element of social cohesion.[31] Such values, it would seem, penetrated some of the earliest strata of the early Christian tradition.

---

[26] Beskow 1962, 191. Aristotle also discusses the nature of kingship in *Politics* 3.14–18.

[27] F. W. Walbank, "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas," in *Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 7.1, The Hellenistic World*, Cambridge, 1970, 75–83.

[28] Good 1999, 61. Cf. Mt. 21:4–5 and *Gospel of Thomas*, logion 90: "Jesus said, 'Come unto me, for my yoke is easy and my lordship is mild, and you will find repose for yourselves" (*The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, James Robinson, ed., San Francisco, 1990, 136).

[29] Good 1999, 91–92.

[30] Good 1999, 113. The potentially "gnostic" interpretation of this contrast is obvious, with Jesus as the envoy of the transcendent God and Herod as the representative of the worldly power of the Demiurge. A similar rejection of the prevailing view of kingship is expressed at Luke 22:25, when Jesus addresses a dispute among the disciples over who is the greatest: "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you; rather the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like one who serves" (NRSV).

[31] Good 1999, 94–111. Similar values were expressed in the Qumran community. For instance, *The Community Rule* encourages qualities such as meekness, patience, and compassion, qualities that enhanced community life "within the context of moral dualism" (Good 1999, 75–77). See *The Community Rule (1QS)*, 4: "These are their ways in

Later patristic authors, however, developed the idea of Christ's kingship in a variety of directions. Per Beskow has enumerated four main currents in later Christian thought about kingship: 1) the Alexandrian tradition which interpreted the kingship of Christ allegorically as spiritual lord over the soul, 2) the Antiochene tradition which emphasized the human dimension of Christ's kingship, 3) the Arian tradition which saw Christ as a subordinate agent to God the Father, and 4) the Nicene tradition, which identified Christ with the Father as God and King.[32] It was Athanasius especially who transferred the royal terminology, such as *pantokratōr* and *hupsistos*, typically reserved for the Father to Christ in order to emphasis the Son's co-substantiability with the Father.[33] On a more worldly level, however, this reflects a correlation that was being drawn between monarchy and monotheism as the preferred forms of government and religion[34] as well as a trend towards the harmonization of Christian theology with a new political situation after the rise of Constantine.[35] Eusebius, in his *Oration on the Tricennalia of Constantine* evokes this evolving ideology:

> The only begotten Word of God reigns, from ages which had no beginning, to infinite and endless ages, the partner of his Father's kingdom. And our emperor ever beloved by him, who derives the source of imperial authority from above, and is strong in the power of his sacred title, has controlled the Empire of the world for a long period of years. Again, the Preserver of the universe orders the whole heaven and earth, and the celestial kingdom, consistently with his Father's will. Even so our emperor whom he loves, by bringing those whom he rules on earth to the only begotten and saving Word renders them fit subjects for his kingdom.[36]

---

the world for the enlightenment of the heart of man, and that all the paths of true righteousness may be made straight before him, and that the fear of the laws of God may be instilled in his heart: a spirit of humility, patience, abundant charity, unending goodness, understanding, and intelligence…" (*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, G. Vermes, tr., London, 1987, 65).

[32] Beskow 1962, 212–294.

[33] Beskow 1962, 277.

[34] Beskow 1962, 245ff.

[35] Beskow 1962, 313.

[36] J. Stevenson, ed., *A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to AD 337*, London, 1992, 367.

Implications and Conclusions

Given the fact that a variety of interpretations of Christ's kingship existed in the early Christian tradition, it is not surprising to find competing notions reflected within a controversial text such as the *AA*. After all, this is a text that witnesses an ongoing debate between two decidedly different wings of the early Christian movement. Specifically, while the conception of Christ as triumphant king evoked by Archelaus is in continuity with later Nicene and post-Nicene theological trends, the Manichaean position which he caricatures and criticizes appears to be rooted in earlier New Testament traditions. For example, according to Manichaean cosmology, the King of Light initially responds to the dark invasion not with violent measures, but with intelligent stratagems and compassion, allowing himself to be partially conquered while at the same time setting in motion a plan of salvation. For instance, while First Man gives himself as food to the Sons of Darkness—a form of self-sacrifice—the measures used by the Living Spirit and the Ambassador are largely non-violent, in the form of self-revelation and impressive displays of divine power and beauty. In this way, the King of Light's counter-measures could be seen as more in line with the values described in the Gospels, from which the early Manichaean church took many of its ethical sensibilities. Such values are also reflected in the conditions of Manichaean community life, with its emphasis on asceticism and the non-violent liberation of the particles of light. As was shown earlier, the Manichaean view of kingship and worldly authority was shaped by the experiences of the church. It is, therefore, understandable that Manichaeans suffering from chronic persecution would make the values of *prautēs* a legitimate response to the violence of the persecutors.

Thus, it seems that within the context of the *AA*, we can perceive two competing early Christian views about the nature of kingship, one endorsed by the mainstream tradition of Archelaus with Jesus as triumphant ruler, and the other, more primitive tradition, with God as meek and suffering king. This contrast enables us to catch a glimpse of two different sets of early Christian values that ultimately reveal divergent attitudes to suffering, community, and persecution.

CHAPTER NINE

BIBLICAL ANTITHESES, ADDA, AND THE *ACTS OF ARCHELAUS*

Jason BeDuhn

Embedded in the *Acts of Archelaus* (hereafter *AA*), chapters 44 and 45, is a purported letter to Archelaus from a Christian priest of a nearby town. As with the report of Mani's teachings by Turbo (*AA* 6–14) and the two debates between Mani and Archelaus (*AA* 15–33 and 54–59), there appears to stand behind this letter an independent source. The letter takes the form of a second-hand summary of Mani's teaching regarding the contradictions and incompatibility between the Old and New Testaments. What is the relationship between this treatment of the subject, and that found in Mani's first debate with Archelaus? Does *AA* 44–45 derive from the same source as the debates? If it is independent of that material, on what sort of source is it based? Is it a reliable witness to Manichaean teaching on biblical exegesis and is it able to add anything new to our understanding of this part of Manichaean doctrine? These are the questions to be addressed in this chapter.

Textual and Source Issues in AA *44–45*

We have found reason to believe that a Manichaean source stands behind Mani's words in the two debates with Archelaus given in *AA* 15ff. and *AA* 54ff.[1] Because the topics neatly divided between these two debates match the two issues Mani raises in his letter to Marcellus in *AA* 5, it is certainly possible that the source providing Mani's exposition of these two issue is the letter itself, cut into pieces by Hegemonius and employed in the fiction of a public debate, thus affording him the opportunity to refute Mani's claims point by point. What, then, are we to make of the Manichaean material in the intervening sections of the *AA* (44–45)? This material is compositionally separated from, and

[1] See Chapter Six of this volume.

used in a different way than, the contents of the two debates. Although still ascribed to Mani, it is reported through a purported letter of a Christian priest from a town neighboring Archelaus' Carchar/Kaschar. Mani's views are merely paraphrased, and the bishop's preliminary rebuttal is given.

Our various testimony to the *AA* shows this part of the work to have significant variances between its Greek and Latin versions. The fact that the Latin *AA* has been edited and compressed was established by L. Traube.[2] Our witnesses to the Greek version are primarily Epiphanius and Cyril of Jerusalem, and these are paraphrastic and selective. Epiphanius relates that a priest named Tryphon wrote from a town called Diodoris, while the Latin version conflates the name of the priest with that of the town.[3] Epiphanius also reports that Archelaus replied to the priest's letter with "two *logoi*" of his own, as well as instructions to await his arrival. But some of this detail is missing in the Latin *AA*. When it comes to Epiphanius citing actual content parallel to *AA* 44–45, however, he has some of it out of place, seemingly integrated into the first debate between Mani and Archelaus (of the second debate he appears to know nothing). The content of *AA* 44.8, albeit with some differences of detail, appears in Epiphanius between his citation of content respectively from *AA* 15.7 and 15.12. This is exactly the point in the first debate with which Cyril's otherwise unparalleled content ostensibly from the *AA* makes contact with the Latin version (in citing 2 Corinthians 4:4, found in *AA* 15.7 and Epiphanius, *Pan*. 66.66.1 and 66.68.1). Then, after returning to the order of discussion found in the Latin *AA* for the rest of the first debate, he reaches other material paralleling *AA* 44, with significant additions not found in the Latin (e.g., *Pan*. 66.81.1: the citation of Haggai 2:9; *Pan*. 66.82.1: the citation of John 5:17; *Pan*. 66.83.2: quoting Mani, "Some good God of the Law! He spoiled the Egyptians, expelled the Amorites, Girgashites and other nations, and gave their land to the children of Israel. If he said, 'Thou shalt not covet,' how could he give them other people's land?"), with an extensive additional quote where in the Latin we find, "Why should I give more examples?" (*AA* 45.1), admittedly a bit off-topic.[4]

[2] Traube 1903.

[3] Lieu in Vermes, 9

[4] "Mani introduces yet another text by saying, 'I know that spirit is saved without body. For the Apostle teaches this,' says he, 'with the words, "It is actually reported that there is fornication among you…I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already him that hath done this deed, when ye and the Lord are gathered

Then concludes his citations with a few more elements drawn from *AA* 45. Epiphanius never indicates that any of this material belongs to the exchange of letters between Tryphon and Archelaus.

These divergences between the Greek witnesses and the Latin text highlight the rough fit of the letter to its context. It is peculiar that although Archelaus is informed by the letter that the principal issue being raised by Mani in the neighboring town is the contradiction between the Old and New Testaments, he chooses to respond to this issue entirely in his written reply to Tryphon. When Archelaus shows up in person, he says not one word more on the subject, instead picking up with the issue of Christology from Mani's earlier letter to Marcellus in Kaschar. Since Christology is the second issue mentioned in Mani's letter, and was left unaddressed in the first debate between the antagonists, there is every reason to see the material of the second debate as following immediately on the earlier material in Hegemonius' original source.

But even though the two debates between Mani and Archelaus deal mostly with the two issues raised in Mani's letter to Marcellus—namely, dualism and Christology—they also include some attention to two additional topics: (1) Mani's authority as a messenger of God, and (2) criticism of the Old Testament. It is apparent that Mani must establish these latter two points to be persuasive on the first two. Only by proving his own authority as an interpreter of scripture, and by cutting the New Testament free of the interpretive matrix of the Old Testament, can he hope to prove his position. Within the debate with Archelaus (at least in its Latin version), Mani restricts his criticism of the Old Testament to the citation of New Testament passages that seem to carry such a critique. He does not indulge in proposing specific antitheses between Old and New Testament passages. In the letter of Tryphon to Archelaus, Mani is reported to start with such antitheses, and then turn to a focus on New Testament passages critical of the Old Testament. There are a few overlapping points between what Mani says in the debate and what Tryphon reports. In the debate, Mani opens his attack on the Old Testament with Luke 16:16. Strikingly, this verse is mentioned near the end of Tryphon's report. Galatians 2:18 and

---

together with my spirit, to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord" (1 Cor. 5:1–5). But the destruction of the flesh is its entire reduction to nothing. If the flesh is reduced to nothing by the devil's agency, and the spirit is saved, how can there still be a resurrection of bodies or flesh, and a salvation of spirit'" (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 66.86.1–2).

2 Corinthians 3:6f. appear in both places (the latter passage twice in the debate and once in Tryphon's report).

Given these points of contact between what Mani says in his debate with Archelaus, and what Tryphon reports about Mani, it cannot be ruled out that Hegemonius has simply extracted a bit from his primary source to use in Tryphon's letter. But Hegemonius is usually more ham-fisted with his sources, dropping them in as large, barely-digested chunks, regardless of redundancies and contradictions between them. Moreover, what would be the purpose of his extractions? If he wanted to keep subjects clearly separated, why did he leave any discussion of the Old Testament in the debate at all? Why not extract bits of all four subjects to make Tryphon's letter more a summary of Mani's whole argument as he went from town to town? Why is the status of the Old Testament the sole issue in Tryphon's report? Leaving these questions unanswered for the moment, we can take as a first possible scenario that the material in *AA* 44–45 represents a portion of Hegemonius' main source, which he has also utilized in the debates.

But other possibilities must be considered. If the letter of Tryphon represents a source independent of that used by Hegemonius for the debates, what sort of source could this be? We could possibly credit the letter as being what it purports to be, a letter from a third century Christian priest to a regional authority providing an account of Manichaean missionary work in the area, perhaps slightly edited for integration into the *AA*. Hegemonius might have altered the identities of the sender and recipient, and may also have added the identification of the Manichaean missionary as Mani himself in order to place the letter into his narrative. A third possibility is that Hegemonius has created the fiction of Tryphon's letter and placed within it material from some less dramatic source compiled by an early Christian as a catalogue of Manichaean arguments, possibly already including the replies that are attributed to Archelaus' written reply in *AA* 46–51. A fourth possibility is that Hegemonius had direct access to a Manichaean source, unmediated by Christian reportage, in which case Archelaus' written replies would be Hegemonius' own composition, just as the spoken replies in the debate were.[5]

[5] Madeleine Scopello, although not referring specifically to AA 44–45, has suggested that the AA as a whole was in part composed as a rebuttal of Mani's *Thesaurus*. She points in particular to the title of the *AA*, which begins, "The true treasure…," and

We need at this point to bring in the evidence of Cyril of Jerusalem. Cyril is our earliest witness to the *AA*, and in his use of it provides a date *ante quem* for the composition of the *AA*. In his sixth catechetical lecture, Cyril selects material from several parts of the *AA*. But we have a problem when it comes to the subject of Manichaean attacks on the Old Testament, supposedly also drawn by him from the *AA*. Nearly all of what Cyril cites is not to be found in the Latin version of the *AA*. Only his reference to 2 Corinthians 4:4 matches a reference made by Mani in his first debate with Archelaus (*AA* 15). Cyril identifies four Old Testament passages criticized by the Manichaeans that are not mentioned at all in the Latin *AA* (Deut 4:23f.; Deut 32:22; 1 Sam 2:6; Isaiah 45:7). Yet, as Traube demonstrated, Cyril presents this material as coming from the *AA* and, in fact, as part of the public debate between Mani and Archelaus. Cyril's brief extract of the debate does not match anything found in the Latin *AA*. It is dominated by Archelaus' response to some critical citations from the Old Testament that Mani has apparently made, but not those now found in the Latin *AA* 44–45, the only place in the whole work where Mani is reported to cite from the Old Testament. Archelaus offers counter-theses, showing agreement between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Since Cyril has this discussion as an integral part of the debate between Mani and Archelaus, one might suggest, in agreement with our first hypothesis, that his version of the *AA* included such material in the body of the public debate, and that it was separated and used in the creation of Tryphon's letter in a subsequent version standing behind the Latin. But to support such a proposition, we would need something in *AA* 44–45 matching the references in Cyril, showing that material Cyril cites from the debate occurs in the Latin *AA* within Tryphon's letter. Such is not the case. To complicate matters, our other witness to the Greek version, Epiphanius, refers to the letter of Tryphon from the version of the *AA* in front of him, so it cannot be an invention of the Latin redactor, even if Epiphanius seems to cite much of the content now found in the letter as if it is being taken from the debate between Mani and Archelaus. It remains a mystery, therefore, from what part of Hegemonius' narrative Cyril may be citing his material, why it should so

---

the reference in the *AA* to the *Thesaurus* among other works of Mani known to the author (Scopello 2000, 530–532).

happen that it has so little overlap with what is preserved in the Latin *AA*, and for what reason it would be omitted from the latter.

In the current state of information we have on the *AA*, we simply cannot answer these editorial questions. We cannot decide how many redactions the *AA* went through; and this state of affairs complicates our efforts to identify the sources behind Hegemonius' original composition. We are left with a body of biblical critique and antitheses, partly in the public debates, partly in Tryphon's letter, partly in parts of the *AA* known to fourth century Greek Christian writers but missing from the surviving Latin version. So we need to step back a moment from the *AA* as a whole, and follow the thread of this thematically related material to other treatments of the same topic in Manichaean and anti-Manichaean sources of the time.

Adda's Antitheses *as a Possible Source for* AA *44–45*

The most important name in the Manichaean mission to the Roman west was Adda, or Addai, or Adimantus, regarded by Faustus as "the only teacher since our blessed father Manichaeus deserving of our attention" (*c. Faust* 1.2).[6] His name appears second only to Mani's in frequency among Christian anti-Manichaean polemicists.[7] We know from Manichaean sources that he was active in Syria and reached as far as Alexandria during the time of the Palmyrene ascendency (circa 260–272 CE).[8] These accounts emphasize his engagement in inter-religious debate, both in person and through compositions of his own.[9] It is noteworthy that the martyr acts of Karkā de Bēt Selōk (Kirkuk, administrative center of Bēt Garmai, on the upper Lesser Zab river) report that Adda(i), accompanied by Abzakya, proselytized in that town in 261/2.[10] The town bears the same generic name for a fortified

[6] Faustus' own work would appear to be written in part as a refutation of a Christian critique of Adimantus, although it fails to engage enough of the arguments of the *AA* itself to be regarded as a direct response to it.

[7] See Lieu 1994, 236 (Seven Chapters) and 239 (Long Formula).

[8] On this subject, see Jürgen Tubach, "Addā und die Schwester der Königen von Palmyra," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 23 (1996) 195–208.

[9] Gasparro 2000, 547, citing Sundermann 1981, 2.5, lines 170–187; 3.1, lines 346–358; 3.2, lines 361–395; 3.3, lines 450–480.

[10] The passage (original Syriac) in P. Bedjan, ed., *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (Paris, 1890–1897), Vol. II, 512.9–14) appears (in German) in G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer* (AKM VII, 3; Leipzig, 1880), 46, and is followed by

settlement used throughout the region that may stand behind the narrative setting of the *AA*.[11] The *AA* itself, identifies Adda as an important authority within the region's Manichaean mission (*AA* 4.3, 64.4);[12] the original Greek version apparently set its story in the time of Gallienus (and so prior to 268). Fragments of the Manichaean church history accord with this information, placing Adda in the Palmyrene court at a time when Odenath was still alive (likewise prior to 268).[13]

Adda's best known work is a critique of the Old Testament that includes a set of biblical antitheses, demonstrating contradictory values and viewpoints between the Old and New Testaments (Augustine, *c. Adim, passim*, and *c. Adv. leg. et proph.*, 2.12.41). Since this is the exclusive subject of Tryphon's letter to Archelaus, it is possible that Adda's book, either directly or second hand, stands behind *AA* 44–45. It is a simple matter to test this hypothesis by comparing the antitheses that appear in *AA* 44–45 with those known to have been made in Adda's work.

Our sources for Adda's *Antitheses* are (1) Augustine's *Contra Adimantum*, which Augustine himself admits (*Retr.* 1.22; *C. Adv. leg. et proph.* 2.12.41–42) is incomplete, (2) Augustine's explicit responses to biblical antitheses attributed to Adda or "the Manichaeans" in his sermons as well as in other writings such as the *De Gen. c. manich.*, and *C. Adv. leg. et proph.*, (3) biblical antitheses employed by Manichaean writers/speakers such as Faustus, Fortunatus, Felix, and Secundinus (some of which Augustine explicitly traces back to Adimantus), and (4) allusions in Titus of Bostra's anti-Manichaean treatise, if we can trust the statement of Heracleon of Chalcedon, as reported by Photius, that Titus "wrote against the books of Addas."[14] Our sources for the biblical antitheses

---

references to a persisting Manichaean presence in the town, 47, 49–50. On the reliability of these martyr acts, see J.-M. Fiey, "Vers la réhabilitation de *l'histoire de Karka d'Bét Slōh*," *Analecta Bollandiana* 82 (1964) 189–222. See also H. J. W. Drijvers, "Facts and Problems in Early Syriac-Speaking Christianity," *Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2 (1982), 161.

[11] See Lieu 1994, 45.

[12] *AA* 13.4 situates his mission in 'the east', assigning Thomas to Syria and Hermas to Egypt. *AA* 64.4–6 (part of a condensed Mani biography) assigns Adda to Scythia (although some manuscripts read 'Syria'), Thomas to Egypt (in accord with the testimony of Alexander of Lycopolis), and Hermas as a companion of Mani.

[13] So 18222 and So 18223 (Sundermann 1981, 3.3, lines 441–515).

[14] Gasparro, 549. Gasparro does an excellent job of examining Manichaean mythological material Titus derives from his Manichaean sources, including Addas, but does not devote attention to biblical antitheses in Titus. The latter task has now been the subject of a penetrating study by Nils Arne Pedersen (Pedersen 2004), who remains equivocal about whether Titus used the *AA* as a source or shared with it primary

material in the *AA* includes (1) those found in the Latin manuscripts of the *AA*, and (2) those found in testimony to the Greek *AA*, such as Cyril and Epiphanius. The overlap between these two sets of material is as follows (asterisks mark overlaps specifically with *AA* 44–45):

1. *c. Adim.* 5, contrasting Gen 1:26 to Jn 8:44, Mt 3:7 and 23:33, to be compared to the use of Jn 8:44 in *AA* 15 and 33.

2.* *c. Adim.* 8, contrasting Exod 21:24 to Mt 5:38ff., to be compared to *AA* 44, as well as Titus 3:76–77, *c. Faust.* 19.3, and the Coptic *Psalm-Book* 195.16.

3. *c. Adim.* 9, contrasting Gen. 3:4, 3:13, etc. to Jn 1:18 and 5:37f., to be compared to the use of Jn 5:37f. in *AA* 5 and 54; cf. also Augustine, *Gen. c. Man.* 1.17.27

4.* *c. Adim.* 12, contrasting Deut 12:23 to Mt 10:28 and 1 Cor 15:50, to be compared to the use of Mt 10:28 in *AA* 54, and the use of 1 Cor 15:50 in *AA* 45 (see also Epiphanius 66.87.1), as well as in Titus 4:97, *c. Fort.* 1.19, and Coptic *Psalm-Book* 121.9

5. *c. Adim.* 13, contrasting Deut 4:23f. to Mk 10:17f, to be compared with the allusion to Deut 4:23f. in Cyril's sixth catechetical lecture.

6.* *c. Adim.* 19, contrasting Prov 22:2 to Mt 5:3 and Lk 6:24, to be compared to *AA* 44, as well as *c. Faust.* 5, and *Tebessa Codex* 5 and 9.

7.* *c. Adim.* 22, contrasting Num 15:32–35 to Mt 12:1ff. et par., to be compared to *AA* 44, as well as *c. Faust.* 32.5.

8. *c. Adim.* 26, contrasting Amos 2:3–6 to Mt 7:17–19, to be compared to the use of Mt 7:17–19 in *AA* 5 and 15, as well as in *c. Fort.* 14, *c. Fel.* 2.2, and Coptic *Psalm-Book* 134.11, 17ff.

9. *c. Adim.* 27, contrasting Isa 45:7 to Mt 5:9, to be compared to the allusion to Isa 45:7 in Cyril's sixth catechetical lecture.

10.* The contrast of Hag 2:8 to Lk 16:9 and 1 Tim 6:10 referred to as made by Adimantus in Augustine, *Sermon* 50, to be compared to the citation of Hag 2:8 contrasted to Mt 5:3 from the Greek *AA* by Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.81.1

11.* The allusion to Exod 12:35f. made as part of a long list of discreditable deeds in the Old Testament in *c. Faust.* 22.5, to be compared to an allusion to the same passage in *AA* 44.

Manichaean sources (see esp. 146–157); he raises doubts, however, over Titus' direct use of the work of Adda (185).

Thus, eleven points of overlap can be demonstrated between the biblical antitheses of the *AA* and those of Adda's work. Although these eleven points of overlap are not confined to *AA* 44–45 (only seven out of the eleven are found there), it is remarkable that every single one of the antitheses made in *AA* 44–45 can be identified with ones found in Adda's work. If the antitheses reported by Cyril derive from the same source as *AA* 44–45, we would have a total of eight matches of this material with Adda.

This does not mean that Hegemonius had direct access to Adda's composition. He may have been using a digest by another Manichaean, or by a Christian polemicist. But in either case we can, on the basis of proven overlaps with Adda's biblical antitheses, work with the *AA* material with renewed confidence that it represents authentic Manichaean biblical critique, and not merely straw-man argument invented by Christian polemicists.

When we confine our scrutiny to the material in *AA* 44–45, however, we encounter an intriguing twist on the possible identification of its sources. The New Testament citations in Tryphon's account differ in scope from those found in Mani's debates with Archelaus. Whereas in the latter Mani draws upon the full complement of gospel material, and the Pastoral and Catholic epistles along with Paul's epistles to communities, in *AA* 44–45 he is reported as confining his citations to passages common to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke or from the core Pauline corpus of the community epistles. Upon closer examination, it turns out that all of the gospel material can be derived from Luke alone. All of a sudden, in these two chapters of the *AA*, Mani is using the *Marcionite* canon.

This discovery prompts us to look a little more closely at the relationship of Manichaeism to Marcionism in general, and to the close connection in their practice of biblical antitheses in particular. Ever since Harnack, it has been supposed with good reason that Adda's book of *Antitheses* was little more than a revised edition of Marcion's original *Antitheses* of a century earlier.[15] The revision was apparently necessary because Marcion cited as Christian scripture only the Gospel of Luke and Paul's community epistles. Since the Manichaeans accepted a larger set of Christian scriptures, including a gospel that incorporated Markan

[15] Harnack 1924, 97*, 219*, 292*, 349*–350*.

and Johannine material[16] and Paul's pastoral epistles, Adda needed to make the contrast with the Old Testament on a larger scale than that pursued by Marcion.

The evidence for Adda's work in Augustine's *c. Adim*. shows this Manichaean expansion of Marcion's project with material from parts of the New Testament not accepted by Marcion. The antitheses offered in *AA* 44–45, however, do not reflect such an expansion, adhering to the smaller Marcionite canon. Indeed, the majority of the cited passages are known to have been used in Marcion's *Antitheses*, as can be seen in the following list of the biblical citations of *AA* 44–45:

1. Mt 5:17, introduced by Archelaus, and rejected by Mani.
   Compare Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.7ff., 5.14 and *c. Faust.* 17.1, 18.1, 19.1.

2. Lk 6:20, vs. Prov 22:2
   Harnack includes this antithesis in Marcion based in part on the Manichaean evidence,[17] but also by the implications of Tertullian's comment, *Adv. Marc*. 4.14.[18] Lk 6:20 is contrasted to Prov 6:11 in *c. Adim*. 19 (cf. *c. Faust*. 5; *Teb. Cod*. 5).

3. Lk 14:33, vs. Prov 22:2
   In Marcionite sources, Lk 14:33 is contrasted to Exod 12:35.[19]

4. "Do not covet what belongs to a neighbor" (exact citation unknown) vs. Exod 12:35
   In Marcionite sources Exod 12:35 was contrasted with Lk 6:29b, 9:3, 14:33 (Adam. 1.10).[20]

5. Lk. 6:29, vs. Exod. 21:24
   The same antithesis appeared in Marcion (Adam.1.15);[21] cf. *c. Adim*. 8; *Psalm-Book* 195.16.

---

[16] For an argument that the Manichaeans employed the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, see Hansen 1966; Quispel 1993, 374–378. Faustus, in his critical remarks about the Catholic canon, seems to indicate that the Manichaean gospel began exactly where Marcion's did, lacking not only a birth narrative and genealogies, but also the baptism by John the Baptist (*c. Faust.* 32.7).

[17] Harnack 1924, 292*.

[18] Harnack 1924, 298*.

[19] Harnack 1924, 280*.

[20] Harnack 1924, 280*.

[21] Harnack 1924, 280*–281*.

6. Lk. 5:24, vs. Num 15.32
   Harnack includes this and the following antithesis in Marcion based on the Manichaean evidence.[22] In *c. Adim.* 22, it is Lk 6:6ff. that is opposed to the passage from Num.
7. Lk. 6:1, vs. Num 15:32
   Harnack attributes this antithesis to Marcion based on Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.12.[23]
8. 2 Corinthians 3:6–11 (*c. Faust.* 15)
   The Marcionite use of this passage noted by Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 5.11, implies its inclusion in Marcion's *Antitheses*, according to Harnack.[24]
9. 1 Corinthians 15:46–50 ([Epiph. 66.87.1] *c. Fort.* 19; *c. Adim.* 12; *Psalm-Book* 121.9)
   See Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 5.10.[25]
10. Galatians 2:18
11. Romans 2:28
12. Rom. 4:1/2:27ff./7:6/2 Cor 3:6f. (*c. Faust.* 15)
    For 2 Cor 3:6, see Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 5.11.[26]
13. Romans 4:2[27]
14. Romans 3:20
    This verse was apparently used by Marcion in his *Antitheses*; see Origen, *Comm. in Rom.* 3.6.[28]
15. Romans 7:23 (*c. Fort.* 21)
16. Luke 16:16
    Marcion apparently made use of this verse in his *Antitheses*; see Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.33.
17. Luke 9:9 ("Cutting off [John the Baptist's] head.")

It may be that Adda initially used Marcion's *Antitheses* as it was, before contact with Christians using a different canon inspired him to create an expanded revision. This canonical adjustment could stand behind the *AA*'s polemical tale of Mani's late-career acquisition of Christian

---

[22] Harnack 1924, 293*.
[23] Harnack 1924, 298*.
[24] Harnack 1924, 308*.
[25] Harnack 1924, 308*.
[26] Harnack 1924, 308*.
[27] Harnack 1924, 312* contends that this verse was not included in Marcion's canon.
[28] Harnack 1924, 310*.

scriptures (*AA* 55). The information in *AA* 44–45 would in that case reflect this early phase of Adda's mission. On the other hand, it could be that Hegemonius has simply made use of a Marcionite or anti-Marcionite source to supply the kind of biblical antitheses common to both Marcionites and Manichaeans. Deciding between these scenarios depends on a determination of the biblical canon known to Mani himself, and of any canonical developments within his lifetime, and that of his disciple Adda. That determination must await further investigation.

We can conclude at this stage, however, that the relationship of Manichaeism to Marcionism deserves deeper study beyond facile comparisons of general outlook. Although Mani's background in Elchasaite Christianity has drawn the greatest attention since the discovery of the *Cologne Mani Codex*, it cannot be missed that something radical happened in his thinking that drew him away from this Jewish-Christian background to an affinity for Paul and "Greek bread." The Marcionite Church represented the other major form of Christianity introduced beyond the Roman frontier alongside of Jewish Christianity in the century before Mani. Together, they contributed the religious heritage Mani knew and identified with Jesus. He knew nothing approaching Archelaus' orthodoxy until he encountered it from within the assumptions of the fully formed Manichaean synthesis.

The Character of Manichaean Biblical Antitheses in the AA

Manichaean biblical antitheses take three distinct forms: (1) citation of New Testament passages critical of Old Testament principles, values, or doctrines; (2) citation of Old Testament passages incongruent with New Testament principles, values, or doctrines; (3) direct antithetical juxtaposition of Old and New Testament passages. According to our information about Adda's book of *Antitheses*, he made use of all three forms of argumentation. The same is true of the treatment of this subject in the *AA*. In the public debates between Mani and Archelaus, only the first manner of argumentation is employed. In the letter of Tryphon, all three methods are found. The material preserved in Cyril could derive from passages employing either the second or the third technique.

The letter of Tryphon opens by reporting that Mani "professes that he completes the doctrine of the New Testament," that parts of his

teaching correspond to Christian views, but that "some of his assertions were a long way distant from those that have come down to us in the tradition of our fathers. For he interpreted certain things in a strange way, and added to them from his own views" (*AA* 44).[29] There is an anachronistic ring to the description of Christianity as a religion handed down over many generations from "our fathers," and in the characterization of the New Testament as a book rather than a new covenant. These elements are more at home in the mid-fourth century than the mid-third, and strongly suggest that the epistolary frame of this part of the *AA* is the composition of Hegemonius himself.

According to Tryphon, Mani's preaching in his town began with a denial that Moses has anything to do with the Gospel. The Christian priest claims to have cited Matthew 5:17 against this notion, only to have Mani cast doubt on the authenticity of this verse through a critical comparison of it to the recorded deeds of Christ. A remarkably similar argument about this verse is given by Faustus (*c. Faust.* 17), and ultimately derives from the opening section of Marcion's *Antitheses*. Tryphon then states in general terms that Mani contrasted Old Testament passages to ideas found in the Gospel and Paul, and provides a few examples.

The first example is a contrast of Prov 22:2, "I make the rich and the poor," to Jesus' blessing of the poor (alone) in Luke 6:20. A second contrast from the New Testament is added: Luke 14:33, "Whoever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple." When we compare the handling of this antithesis in the *AA* with that in Augustine's *c. Adim* 19, we see that Adda included the woe on the wealthy from Luke 6:24, which is the logical complement to Luke 6:20. Augustine makes no mention of Luke 14:33 in this context.

The second example is closely related to the first. Mani is said to have contrasted the story of the Israelites looting Egypt on their way out of captivity (Exod 12:35) to the instruction of Jesus "that nothing belonging to a neighbor should be coveted." The New Testament reference is not very exact. In *c. Faust.* 22.5, we are treated to a very long catalog of Old Testament passages relating the vices of the patriarchs, of which the incident in Exod 12:35 is just one instance. These are not paired with specific New Testament antitheses, and may derive from

[29] Vermes, 111.

a section of Adda's work where Old Testament material was treated alone, which could explain the vagueness of the supposed New Testament antithesis in the *AA*. In fact, Epiphanius' version of this antithesis (which appears to preserve a better reading than the Latin *AA*) makes it clear that the supposed instruction of Jesus is actually a quote of Exodus 20:17 to show the contradiction of the god of the Old Testament with himself (*Pan.* 66.83.2)

The third example opposes the commandment of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth" (Exod 21:24) with Jesus' explicit contrary command to turn the other cheek (Luke 6:29). In Augustine's *c. Adim.* 8 the same contrast is made and, as in the *AA*, no other New Testament passage is brought into the discussion.

The fourth and final antithesis is the sabbath commandment and its enforcement as related in Num 15:32ff. against Jesus' defense and even command of labor on the sabbath in Luke 5:24 (the paralytic told to take up his pallet) and Luke 6:1ff. (plucking grain). In *c. Adim.* 22, Augustine only mentions the latter New Testament incident as introduced by Adda.

At this point in his account, Tryphon breaks off the examples of direct antitheses, and turns to the citation by Mani of New Testament passages critical of the Old Testament generally, including 2 Cor 3:6–11; 1 Cor 15:46–50; Gal 2:18; Rom 2:27ff.; Rom 3:20; Rom 4:1f.; Rom 7:6; and closing with the proposition that "the law and prophets were until John" (Luke 16:16). By this method as well as the use of antitheses, Mani and the Manichaean tradition utterly rejects the Old Testament as legitimate scripture.[30]

---

[30] Commenting on Tryphon's statement that "Mani began to quote many things from the Law" in order to show their contradiction to the New Testament, Lieu makes the curious remark, "It is clear from this passage as well as what is found in Augustine's writings that the Manichaeans did not outright reject the Old Testament. Faustus certainly knew it well…" (Lieu in Vermes 112, n233). Lieu here seems to confuse rejection with ignorance. Manichaeans such as Adda and Faustus clearly studied the Old Testament to sharpen their critique of it, a critique that certainly entailed rejection of it as an invalid source of spiritual edification. The New Testament (at least the Gospel and Apostle), on the other hand, just as clearly was treated as sacred scripture, not only by Manichaean missionaries in the West, but by Mani himself. For this reason, it is misleading to speak of Mani's own writings as forming an exclusive canon. The gospels, in some form, and the writings of Paul must be considered canonical for the Manichaeans. The study of how the Manichaeans defined their scriptures, both in terms of canonical boundaries and internal authority, is in its infancy.

Two significant points of comparison between the handling of antitheses in the *AA* and in Adda deserve comment. Both often offer more than one New Testament antithesis to a single Old Testament passage. This occurs twice in the above four examples, while it is the norm for Adda as reported by Augustine. In a third instance from the overlapping examples, both the *AA* and Adda offer only the same single antithesis. The fourth example is problematic, since the antithesis in the *AA* is quite imprecise and our indirect witness to Adda leaves any specific antithesis unmentioned. Another point of comparison is the terseness of the antithetical proposition. Even though Augustine, in *Retr*. 1.22, claims to quote Adda's "own words" in the *c. Adim*, all we find in the latter work is a quoted Old Testament verse followed by one or more New Testament passages. Only in two instances, *c. Adim*. 12 and 15, does Augustine make reference to any additional argumentation on the part of Adda. Is it mere coincidence that the second-hand nature of Tryphon's letter reduces the Manichaean antitheses to the same simplicity of form? Only on Mt 5:17 is any elaboration of argument provided, and this, of course, is not strictly speaking antithesis material. Could it be that the very terseness of the biblical antitheses in Adda's work made it difficult to incorporate them into the debates between Mani and Archelaus, and Hegemonius hit upon the strategy of using it in the second-hand letter report of Tryphon to get around this problem while still affording the opportunity to refute it?

Decret has analyzed Adda's argumentation, as attested by Augustine, into three manners of critique.[31] One type of critique highlights the negative traits of the God of the Old Testament. Decret counts eleven instances of such an argument in Adda. This approach is used in three of the four parallel examples from *AA* 44, and all four of Cyril's examples of Manichean Old Testament polemic. A second type of critique focuses on the low character of the morals and rituals of the Old Testament. Decret sees this involved in sixteen of Adda's citations, and it is found in one of the four *AA* examples (the plundering of Egypt), and to a certain extent in a second (sabbath rules). Decret also singles out a critique based upon the Old Testament's curse on anyone hung on a tree (Deut 21:23), which is taken as a curse of Christ. This occurs twice in Adda, but is not found in the *AA*.

[31] Decret 1978, 96–99.

Strategies of Christian Anti-antitheses Argument in the AA

Archelaus offers a lengthy reply to Tryphon on the issues he is confronting. He relates that he had already confronted and defeated Mani, including on the subject of the two Testaments, referring back to the first debate in *AA* 15ff. He adds some suggestions for New Testament passages where approval of the Old Testament appears explicit, as well as some parables meant to illustrate the idea of temporal complementarity of the scriptures. Archelaus applies this idea in turning to the specific antitheses cited by Tryphon. He maintains that moral progress stands behind the development from "an eye for an eye" to "turn the other cheek," and that the latter goodness completes rather than rejects the former justice (*AA* 47). This same dispensationalist view of moral progress finds extensive use in Augustine's anti-Manichaean works. Archelaus goes on to quote Luke 10:7 ("the laborer is worthy of his hire") to argue that this established a just claim that can be enforced, as it was by the Israelites in taking their due from the riches of Egypt. In dealing with Christ's blessing only of the poor, he prefers Matthew's text to Luke's, identifying the poor as the "poor in spirit," or humble, rather than the materially poor. A similar argument is used by Augustine against Adda (*c. Adim.* 19). Archelaus continues by making reference to some positive notices of wealthy individuals in the New Testament. Archelaus rejects Mani's point about the sabbath by noting that Jesus, as lord of the sabbath, is able to alter its provisions as he sees fit, and does not thereby destroy it (*AA* 48).

Archelaus then turns to confuting the seemingly critical remarks made by Paul about the Old Testament. On the issue of circumcision, where Mani had cited Romans 2:28, he provides an argument for Christ providing an easier path for those of faith, as an advancement, not a rejection, of what came before. He is able to quote in support of his position Paul's instruction for each to remain as they are, circumcised or uncircumcised (1 Cor 7:18f.; *AA* 48). Against Mani's reference to 2 Cor 3:6ff., Archelaus can only stress that Moses had "glory," no matter how relative and transient, and claim that the veil over the Law reflects badly on the Jews, not on Moses (*AA* 49).

We see, then, in Archelaus as in Mani, a selective reading of the New Testament with a particular interpretive *telos* guiding it. The New Testament's own ambivalent relationship to the ideology of the Old Testament is parsed by the leaders of each camp according to their own prevailing interpretive model, according to whether Christ is conceived

to be in continuity or conflict with the religious values of Moses. There is no neutral assessment point from which to judge these opposing interpretive paradigms. They remain the unresolved battlefield of two rival Christianities, each adapted to local conditions and choices of place along a spectrum of ideological positions.

Assuming some degree of redaction in Hegemonius' composition, we might ask what sort of selection process is evident in his choice of Manichaean biblical antitheses material. Since he has Archelaus address each of Tryphon's references, he simply may have selected the arguments of Adda (or some other source) for which he could think of contrary arguments based on the scriptures. Augustine worked much the same way in his *c. Adim.*, leaving aside antitheses for which he had not yet found counter-arguments.

Adda's overall presentation deserves further study and reconstruction, so that it may be appreciated in its own right as a moment in the history of biblical interpretation, and as part of the larger Manichaean reading of the Bible. As we distance ourselves methodologically from assumptions about "true" and "false" readings of the scriptural tradition, and allow individual trajectories of interpretation to be understood within the context of the history of the communities that produced them, we are better able to perceive locally coherent truths as the intersection of regional traditions with novel ideas and practices, and the proliferation of Christian communities as arising out of the work of generating new syntheses responsive to the pressures of a religious economy in a particular region of the globe. The "Great Traditions" of religious history only attain this status by successfully coming to terms, in a multitude of "little" forms, with such temporally and geographically immediate conditions. In the historical development of religion, a "little" and local form can at any point, given the right circumstances, branch off to form a rival "great" tradition on a larger scale. Manichaeism is an example of such a development.

CHAPTER TEN

ACTA ARCHELAI 63.5–6 AND *PGM* I. 42–195: A ROOFTOP RITUAL FOR ACQUIRING AN AERIAL SPIRIT ASSISTANT

Paul Mirecki

History of Research on Acta Archelai *63.5–6*[1]

Eszter Spät has convincingly demonstrated the use of the Simonian tradition in the presentation of Mani's life as an attempt by heresiologists like Hegemonius to prove Mani and his predecessors were no more than heretics in the style of Simon Magus.[2] This is due to the influence of the story of Simon's ill-fated flight over Rome in the *Acts of Peter*. Spät skillfully interprets Terebinthus's attempt to fly, as described by Hegemonius, in reference to the Simonian tradition.

However, the purpose of this study is to argue that Hegemonius, or his source, had already misunderstood the ritual performed by Terebinthus as a ritual for vain physical flight with no redeeming value meant to impress people of his access to spiritual power and so to proselytize them. Previous research has overlooked the fact that the ritual is fully described in Greek instructional texts in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, as discussed below.[3] There the rooftop ritual is not meant to assist the ritualist in a vain attempt to fly, but rather in a serious and pious attempt to acquire an aerial spirit assistant[4] who can reveal to

[1] I am indebted for helpful suggestions related to this study to professors Jason BeDuhn (Northern Arizona University), Tony Corbeill (University of Kansas) and Marvin Meyer (Chapman University).

[2] Spät 2004, and the literature cited there.

[3] K. Preisendanz, ed. *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri.* 2 vols. (2 ed., edited by Albert Henrichs), Stuttgart, 1973; see also H. D. Betz, ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*, Chicago, 1986 (2 ed., 1992); henceforth, *PGM* and *GMPT*, respectively. See also the monumental study by William M. Brashear, The Greek Magical Papyri: an Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928–1994) in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. W. Haase and H. Temporini, eds., Part II: Principate, Volume 18.5, Berlin, 1995, 3380–3684.

[4] These spirits are variously called in the *PGM* aerial spirit, assistant, friendly assistant, angel, god/goddess, beneficent god and lord of the air.

him heavenly secrets known only to such aerial spirits. The ritual itself has no relation to the ritualist's proselytizing intent, yet, in fact, it is to be kept secret and performed privately.

In the *PGM* ritual, flight is only one benefit that the ritualist can receive, and there the emphasis seems to be on the flight of the ritualist's spirit (ecstatic ascent) not his physical body. The heresiological tradition appears to have misunderstood claims of the ecstatic ascent of the individual spirit as claims concerning vain physical flight. It seems likely that the misunderstanding was deliberate and the polemic against physical flight was meant to ridicule claims of ecstatic spiritual ascent from rooftops and relate them to the heresiological category of magic in which demons were involved.[5] In those *PGM* texts in which physical flight does occur, it seems to be an aberration caused by irresponsible use of the ritual leading to the result that the ritualist will anger the aerial spirit causing him to fall to his own injury or death.[6] Spiritual flight also seems to be the point of an unusual comment in our *PGM* text in which the ritualist—who attains spiritual flight as a successful result—is now himself called an "aerial spirit" and the aerial spirit he successfully called down is now called "a mighty assistant" (*PGM* I.179b–180a), as both seem to have been raised in status.

Spät is correct in stating that the rooftop location for the performance of the ritual in the *AA* is related to an interest in flying, but this is a heresiological construct in the *AA*.[7] The purpose of the rooftop location is that it is in fact the only appropriate location—apart from simply "a high upper place" (*PDM* xiv.876 [= *GMPT* p. 240]) which apparently could include a local hill—for a ritual to contact an aerial spirit, in much the same way that buried *lamellae* and *defixiones* were used to contact chthonic spirits.[8] Although spiritual flight is a possible experience for the ritualist with the aid of the aerial spirit, it is only one of many benefits, and yet was the primary issue on which heresiologists focused as a base for their rhetoric of ridicule.

---

[5] On the heresiological charge of magic against Terebinthus, see the discussion of Epiphanius and Cyril of Jerusalem in Spät 2004, 10–11.

[6] See the texts listed below under section e., especially *PGM* IV. 2504–2509, 2628–2629.

[7] Spät 2004, 10–11.

[8] Brashear Greek Magical Papyri, 3443–3446, and the literature cited there.

The Latin Narrative of the Ritual in Hegemonius, Acta Archelai *63.5–6*

> Tunc deinde mane primo ascendit solarium quoddam excelsum, ubi nomina quaedam invocare coepit quae nobis Turbo dixit solos septem electos didicisse.
>
> Cum ergo ascendisset ritus nescio cuius vel artificii gratia, solus autem ascendit, uti ne ab aliquo convinci possit, quod si dissimulasset vel pro nihilo duxisset, cogitabat se ab aeris principibus poenis esse subdendum.
>
> Haec eo cogitante, iustissimus deus sub terras eum detrudi per spiritum iubet, et continuo de summo deiectus, exanime corpus deorsum praecipitatem est, quod anus illa miserata collectum locis solitis sepeliit.[9]
>
> Finally then, early in the morning he climbed a high rooftop where he began to invoke certain names that Turbo told us only the seven Elect had been taught.
>
> So when he had climbed for the purpose of some ritual or artifice—moreover he climbed alone so as not to be detected by anyone—he thought if he was pretending or had considered it unimportant he could be liable to punishment by the rulers of the air.
>
> But as he was considering this, the most just God ordered (that) he be thrust down by the Spirit beneath the earth, and immediately he was thrown down from the height, the lifeless body fell down, which that old woman collected in pity (and) buried in a normal place.[10]

Primary comparative Greek instructional text in PGM *I. 42–195: "The spell of Pnouthis, the sacred scribe, for acquiring an [aerial spirit] assistant"*

This instructional text in *PGM* I. 42–195 is a complete example of the partial ritual alluded to in *AA*.[11] There, Hegemonius includes information only on the first step of the ritual that takes place just before or at dawn. It is unclear if he or his source knew of a ritual with only one step, or whether the failure of the ritual during the first of two steps is part of his rhetorical argument.

---

[9] Beeson 1906.

[10] See the English translations by Vermes, 143, and by Salmond in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*. Vol. VI, Edinburgh, 1871, 408.

[11] See the lengthy complete Greek text in Preisendanz and the English translation in Betz, as noted above in n3.

A simple outline of the ritual in *PGM* I. 42–195 demonstrates the basic structure of the ritual:

	Prologue:	"Pnouthios to Keryx…"
	Purifications:	"(after) the preliminary purification"
		"abstain from animal food and from all uncleanliness"
		"clothe yourself in a pure garment"
Step 1:	Time:	"on whatever night you want to"
	Place:	"go up to a lofty roof"
	Invocation:	"say the first spell of encounter as the sun's orb is disappearing"
		"when the sun rises, hail it…recite this sacred spell [to Helios]"
	Result:	"And as you recite this spell there will be this sign for you [falcon descends, drops a stone and ascends, engrave the stone, bore a hole through it, pass a thread through and wear it around your neck]"
Step 2:	Time:	"in the evening"
	Place:	"go up to your housetop again"
	Invocation:	"facing the light of the goddess [Selene], address to her this [hymnic spell]"
	Result:	"At once there will be a sign for you like this: a blazing star will descend to the middle of the housetop, and when the star has dissolved before your eyes, you will behold the angel whom you have summoned and who had been sent to you, and you will quickly learn the decisions of the gods."

The text continues with:

(1) the text for the morning invocation to Helios,
(2) the text of the instructions for engraving on the stone pendant the figure of Heliorus (= Helios-Horus) and its accompanying text,
(3) the text of the evening invocation to Selene, and
(4) a series of concluding explanations, instructions and promises of efficacy, including "and he will take your spirit and carry it into the air with him. For no aerial spirit which is joined with a mighty assistant will go into Hades, for to him all things are subject".

Parallels to Acta Archelai *63.5–6 in* PGM *I. 42–195 and* varia

a. Ritual Time:

AA	*"Early in the morning"*
PGM I.56a	"On whatever night you want"
See also:	"On whatever sunrise you want" (*PGM* IV.169–170 [= *GMPT* 40]).

b. Ritual Place:

AA	*"he climbed a high roof"*
PGM I.56b	"go up to a lofty roof"
See also:	"Go up to the highest part of the house" (*PGM* IV.170–171 [= *GMPT* 40]).
	"Offer it . . . on a lofty housetop" (*PGM* IV.2710–2712 [= *GMPT* 88]).
	"Stand on a high place on the top of your house" (*PDM* xiv.696 [= *GMPT* 232–233]).
	"You should take . . . to a high, upper place" (*PDM* xiv.876 [= *GMPT* 240]).
	"Invoke . . . from a high roof" (*PGM* LXXII.4–6 [= *GMPT* 298]).

c. Ritual Invocation:

AA	*"He began to invoke certain names"*
PGM I.133–144	(to Helios), 149–163 (to Selene). These are lengthy invocations that are ubiquitous in the *PGM/PDM* and are found in all cases of the roof rituals listed above.

d. Ritual Secrecy:

AA	*"He climbed alone so as not to be detected by anyone"*
PGM I.42–195	Note the use of the second person singular, indicating a private revelation to only one person, see also the following from *PGM* I.
PGM I.130–132	"Share this great mystery with no one else, but conceal it."
PGM I.185–186	"The god will be seen by you alone, nor will anyone ever hear the sound of his speaking, just you yourself alone."
PGM I.192–194	"Therefore share these things with no one except [your] legitimate son alone when he asks you for the magic powers imparted by us".
See also:	"You should do it as a vessel inquiry alone" (*PDM* xiv.695 [= *GMPT* 232]).
	"Another method of vessel inquiry being alone" (*PDM* xiv.841 [= *GMPT* 238]).

e. Warnings against Irresponsible Use of the Ritual:

AA	*"he thought if he was pretending or had considered it unimportant he could be liable to punishment by the rulers of the air"*
PGM I.42–195	[not in *PGM* I]
See also:	"Do not therefore perform the rite rashly, and do not perform it unless some dire necessity arises for you. It also possesses a protective amulet against your falling,

for the goddess is accustomed to make airborne those who perform this rite unprotected by an amulet but then to hurl them from aloft down to the ground" (*PGM* IV.2504–2509 [= *GMPT* 84]).
"Do not use it frequently . . . unless the procedure which you are performing is worthy of its power" (*PGM* IV.2569–2570 [= *GMPT* 85]).
"Do not approach the procedure carelessly or else the goddess is angry" (*PGM* IV.2628–2629 [= *GMPT* 86]).

f. Purpose and Goal of the Ritual: Divine Revelation:

AA	*"He had climbed for the purpose of some ritual or artifice"* [this is a heresiological comment that misinterprets the purpose of the ritual].
PGM I.75b–76	"You will behold the angel whom you have summoned and who had been sent to you, and you will quickly learn the decisions of the gods."
See also:	"So that I alone may ascend into heaven as an inquirer and behold the universe" (*PGM* IV.484–485 [= *GMPT* 48]). "You will see yourself being lifted up and ascending to the height, so that you seem to be in midair. You will hear nothing of either man or any other living thing, nor in that hour will you see anything of mortal affairs on earth, but rather you will see immortal things. For in that day and hour you will see the divine order of the skies: the presiding gods rising into heaven, and others setting . . . then you will see the gods looking graciously upon you" (the revelatory vision continues at great length and detail; *PGM* IV.539–547 [= *GMPT* 48–54]).

The Polemical Strategy of Hegemonius and the Ascents of Mani in the Parthian Texts

It is not clear if Hegemonius or his source had access to actual ritual texts like those collected in the *PGM*, or whether he or his source are dependent on previous and biased heresiological or even novelistic versions of such rituals. Whether or not Hegemonius is dependent on such sources, he himself is the interpreter of rituals that he knows—from whatever source—and he then interprets them according to established heresiological polemical standards.

Direct influence from the *PGM*—or similar texts known to me—is not evident in the three Parthian accounts of Mani's ascents. In the relevant texts M47 I, M48 and M8286,[12] one could argue for the general influence of popular revelatory ascent texts like those in the Enochic corpus, rather than instructional ritual texts, as conceptual and literary models for describing Mani's own ascents. In all three texts, it is not clear if the ascents of Mani are physical or spiritual—a crucial issue in Hegemonius and the *PGM*—and there is no comment supporting or denigrating either possibility. Hegemonius's account of Terebinthus's ritual could have been inspired by the texts concerning Mani's ascents now extant only in Parthian, but his account cannot be based on those texts alone since features of the ritual—clearly evident in the *PGM*—are not present in the three texts of Mani's ascent. The exhibition of spiritual power evidencing the ritualist's access to heavenly secrets was apparently a common feature in the proselytizing methods employed by Mani. In M47 I, Mani uses his ritual power to provide the ruler of Mesene, Mihr-Shah, with a visionary spiritual tour of heavenly places resulting in the conversion of Mihr-Shah. In M48, Mani similarly converts the Turan-Shah by giving him a spiritual tour of heavenly places, and in M8286, Mani also converts the Turan-Shah after Mani ascends, but with details different from those in M48. In each of the three cases, Mani proselytizes using his ritual powers to ascend and reveal heavenly secrets to the two rulers. Hegemonius seems to understand that Terebinthus also has the same proselytizing intent.

Such popular indigenous rituals with their claims of access to heavenly secrets and promises of spiritual flight into the heavens were refuted by Christian heresiologists like Hegemonius who defused Manichaean proselytizing intent by identifying the Manichaean use of such rituals with demonic magic, charlatanism, insincerity, failure and—in the case of our poor Terebinthus—death.

[12] Texts in Sundermann 1981, 102–103, 21–22, and 101, respectively; see the English translations in Klimkeit 1993, 211–212, 207, 208, respectively.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

BASILIDES' 'BARBARIAN COSMOGONY': ITS NATURE AND FUNCTION WITHIN THE *ACTA ARCHELAI*

Byard Bennett

The *Acta Archelai* (hereafter, *AA*) attributed to Hegemonius is important not only for the detailed and historically influential summary of Manichaean teaching which it provides, but also for a long fragment from the Alexandrian theologian Basilides (fl. 120–140 CE) which it has preserved. This fragment purports to describe an account given by certain barbarians concerning the origin of the sensible world. In the first section of this chapter, I will examine the introduction to this fragment in *AA* 67.4–6 (Beeson, 96, lines 10–24) to try to assess how much the author of the *AA* knew about Basilides' life, works and theological interests. Basilides' account of this barbarian cosmogony (*AA* 67.7–11; Beeson, 96, line 27–97, line 21) will then be translated and its relation to the *AA*'s broader anti-Manichaean polemic will be briefly indicated, showing why the fragment was included within the text of the *AA*. The barbarian cosmogony described in the fragment will then be analyzed and its authenticity and origin will be discussed. Some important parallels to the Middle Platonic tradition (particularly Plutarch's treatise *De Iside et Osiride*) will be noted, establishing a focus for future research on the fragment.[1]

*The introduction to the cosmogonical fragment (*AA *67.4–6)*

In the *AA*, Basilides is first introduced by name in chapter 42 in a list of the principal early Christian heretics and the cosmogonical fragment

[1] The importance of these parallels has recently been independently noted by W. A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule*, Tübingen, 1996, 233–239 (fr. 19), whose work became available to me only after I had completed the draft of this essay.

attributed to him is subsequently given in chapter 67.[2] The introduction to the fragment provided by the author of the *AA* suggests that he had little, if any, knowledge of Basilides' life and work beyond what he could deduce from the citations he gives from Basilides in *AA* 67.4–11. Basilides is described rather vaguely as a "preacher among the Persians" who lived "not long after the time of our apostles" and wrote books that contained "some difficult and very troublesome things."[3] The author of the *AA* also appears to have had little understanding of Basilides' theological interests or literary motives, contenting himself with the assumption that since Basilides "himself was cunning and had seen that at that time all things were already previously taken up, he wished to affirm that duality [i.e. dual nature] which was also found in the writings of Scythianus."[4] The author of the *AA* then criticizes Basilides for this apparent lack of originality: "And then since he had nothing of his own that he was asserting, he proposed to his adversaries things said by others."[5]

The citations given from Basilides in *AA* 67.5,7–11 may have been the only part of Basilides' treatises of which the author of the *AA* had a first-hand knowledge. What the author of the *AA* knew about this cited material is simply what is stated in the first sentence of the citation itself—namely, that the cited material claims to derive from the thirteenth book of Basilides' treatises.[6] The first sentence which the

---

[2] *AA* 42.1 (Beeson 1906, 61, lines 32–33): Et ego quidem beatifico Marcionem et Valentinianum ac Basilidem aliosque hereticos…

[3] *AA* 67.4–5 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 10–12, 15–16): Fuit praedicator apud Persas etiam Basilides quidam antiquior, non longo post nostrorum apostolorum tempore…Et omnes eius libri difficilia quaedam et asperrima continent. The translation by Vermes, 149, of *asperrima* as "very abstruse" may not sufficiently convey the negative connotation of this word; compare the unfavorable description of Basilides' writings in *AA* 68.1 (Beeson 1906, 97, lines 27–29).

[4] *AA* 67.4 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 12–13): qui et ipse cum esset versutus et vidisset quod eo tempore iam essent omnia praeoccupata, dualitatem istam voluit adfirmare quae etiam apud Scythianum erat. The word *versutus* can have the positive meaning "ingenious" or "clever," but more commonly has the negative connotation of "cunning," "crafty" or "sly."

[5] *AA* 67.4 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 14–15): Denique cum nihil haberet quod adsereret proprium, aliis dictis proposuit adversariis. The phrase *aliis dictis* is obviously corrupt, as Beeson rightly notes in his apparatus. In my translation, I have adopted Schöne's suggested emendation *ab aliis dicta*, which seems to give the best sense in context, but is not necessarily the easiest to defend from a palaeographical point of view. It is unclear to me what emendation underlies Vermes' translation, 149, "he challenged his adversaries with the sayings of others."

[6] Compare the author's introductory remarks in *AA* 67.5 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 16–17: Extat tamen **tertius decimus liber tractatuum eius**, cuius initium tale est…)

author of the *AA* quotes from this book (and which he assumes to be the first sentence of the book itself) indicates that the book will discuss the origin of the "nature without root and without place which comes upon things" by commenting upon the parable of the rich man and the poor man (possibly Lk 16:19–31).[7] This initial discussion, however, was either not included in the source used by the author of the *AA* or was judged not to suit the author of the *AA*'s purposes and therefore omitted from the *AA*.

*The cosmogonical fragment (*AA *67.7–11)*

This fragment is a doxographical account of the beliefs held by barbarous nations regarding the origin of good and evil.[8] The author of the *AA* clearly believes that Basilides assented to the beliefs that he was describing, although this is certainly not explicit in the fragment itself and may not be warranted.[9] The fragment is said by the author of the

---

with the opening sentence of the fragment itself (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 17–18: **Tertium decimum nobis tractatuum scribentibus librum** necessarium sermonem uberemque salutaris sermo praestabit…). The identification of these "treatises" with Basilides' Ἐξηγητικά has often been suggested; on the nature of this latter work, which probably consisted of explanations of Basilides' theological views, see James A. Kelhoffer, "Basilides' Gospel and *Exegetica* (*Treatises*)," *Vigiliae Christianae* 59 (2005), 115–134.

[7] *AA* 67.5 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 19–21): per parabolam divitis et pauperis naturam sine radice et sine loco rebus supervenientem unde pullulaverit indicat.

[8] *AA* 67.7 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 25–27): requiramus autem magis quae de bonis et malis etiam barbari inquisierunt et in quas opiniones de his omnibus pervenerunt.

[9] AA 67.12 (Beeson 1906, 97, line 23): ad ostendendam eius in hac parte sententiam; 68.4 (Beeson 1906, 98, lines 8–10); compare 67.4 (Beeson 1906, 96, lines 13–15). A more cautious assessment has been offered by F. J. A. Hort ("Basilides" in H. Wace and W. C. Piercy, eds., *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography*. London, 1911, 110) who notes that "there is nothing to show that… [Basilides] himself adopted the first set of 'barbarian' opinions which he reported. Indeed the description of evil… as a *supervenient* nature, *without root* and without place, reads almost as if it were directed against Persian doctrine…"; compare also J. L. Jacobi, "Das ursprüngliche Basilidianische System," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 1 (1877) 498ff. and A. S. Peake's review of Beeson in *Classical Review* 23:3 (1909) 91. Not recognizing that an ancient author can report prior views that he or she does not hold, B. Layton ("The Significance of Basilides in Ancient Christian Thought," *Representations* 28 [1989] 148 n5; *The Gnostic Scriptures*, New York, 1987, 417 n1) implausibly argues that the discrepancies between the barbarian cosmogony and other ancient reports of Basilides' teaching should lead us to distinguish between two distinct individuals—the philosopher "Basilides of Alexandria" and an otherwise unknown preacher "Basilides the Persian," whose account of Persian dualist theology is reported by the *AA*. This distinction seems unnecessary. The author of the *AA* has already referred to Basilides in ch. 42 (Beeson 1906, 61, line 3), linking him with two other figures belonging to the first half of the second century, Marcion

AA to have originally appeared "about five hundred lines" after the first sentence quoted from Basilides in 67.5 (Beeson, 96, lines 17–21).[10] The citation describes the position adopted by certain barbarians, who

> said that there are two first principles of all things, with which they associated good things and evil things, saying that the first principles themselves are without beginning and unbegotten; that is, in the beginning there was light and darkness, which existed of themselves, which were not said to be [begotten].[11] Since these existed by themselves, each one of them was leading a life of its own, [a life] which it wished and such as agreed with it. For everything is favorably inclined toward what is its own and nothing very bad for it is perceived. Yet after each came to perceive the other one and the darkness beheld the light, as if a desire for the better thing had been acquired, the darkness pursued it[12] and longed both to be mingled together with it and partake of it. And indeed the darkness acted in these ways, but the light received into itself nothing at all from the darkness nor did it come to desire it, but indeed itself only suffered a passion to gaze. And indeed it also looked at it [sc. the darkness] just as in a mirror. Only an appearance [i.e. a reflection], that is a certain hue [or: external form?] of light, was therefore committed to the darkness, but the light itself only looked and withdrew, having, of course, taken nothing at all from the darkness. The darkness, however, took from the light a look and Matter[13] an appearance [i.e. reflection] or hue [or: external form?], by means of which it [sc. the darkness] had displeased it [sc. the light]. Therefore since the worse had taken from the better not the true light but a certain form of the light and an appearance [i.e. a reflection], it [sc. the darkness], by a forceful change, carried off … [the appearance or reflection?[14]] of the good. Hence there is not a perfect good in this world and what there is is very little, because what was conceived at the beginning was also too little. Nevertheless, through this very little bit of light, or rather through a certain form of the light, it [sc. the darkness] was able to bring forth a likeness of the creation relating to that mixture which it conceived from the light. And this is that creation which we perceive.[15]

---

and Valentinus. If the Basilides described in ch. 67 as living not long after the time of the apostles were not identical with the Basilides previously mentioned in ch. 42, one might reasonably have expected the author of the *AA* to indicate this difference by way of qualification.

[10] Some caution is necessary here since as C. T. Lewis (*Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1879, 1513 *sub voce* "quingenti," II) has noted, the word *quingenti* can be used indefinitely, i.e. simply to indicate a great number.

[11] Supplying either *genitae* (Routh) or *genita* (Löhr).

[12] Emending *ea* in *AA* 67.8 (Beeson 1906, 97, line 6) to *eam* [sc. *lux*].

[13] As Löhr (222) notes, one should emend the ms. reading *ylem* to *yle* (nominative) rather than to *yles* (genitive; suggested by Traube and accepted by Beeson).

[14] Assuming with Beeson's apparatus that one should supply *et enfasin* to fill the lacuna.

[15] *AA* 67.7–11 (Beeson 1906, 96, line 27–97, line 21).

The reason for the inclusion of the fragment within the AA

This barbarian cosmogony is reproduced in the *AA* to undercut claims for the originality and uniqueness of Mani's teaching. By noting parallels between this earlier fragment and Mani's later teaching, the author of the *AA* could present the fragment as evidence for his contention that Mani's teaching was unoriginal and derived from the dubious teachings of a barbarian predecessor.[16]

The origin, identity, and authenticity of the barbarian cosmogony

The author of the *AA* is certainly right to note a number of interesting parallels with Mani's teaching. First, one might note the belief (common to Manichaeism and Zoroastrianism) that there are two first principles which are, respectively, the sources of good and evil things but were themselves without beginning and existed independently of one another, each in a way that agreed with its own nature. Second, the fragment (like Manichaean and Zoroastrian teaching) presupposes that the evil principle was originally unaware of the existence of the good principle but only came to discover the latter's existence at a later time. Third, the fragment, like Manichaean teaching, asserts that the evil principle came to desire the good principle and was able to retain something from the latter within itself, leading to the formation of this present world, in which good and evil are mixed. Finally, the fragment appears to suppose (in agreement with Manichaean teaching) that the evil principle never gains mastery over the origin of the light, but only over some derivative portion or aspect of the light which has been separated from its source.

The identity and origin of this barbarian cosmogony has been the subject of considerable debate. Mühlenberg has argued that Basilides was providing a doxographical account of Zoroastrian teaching about the two first principles.[17] As Löhr has noted, however, there are a number of problems with this identification.[18] For example, in Zoroastrian teaching, the evil principle is spiritual (Phl. *mēnōg*) in nature, transcending

[16] Cf. Löhr, 224 with nn22–23. For a detailed discussion of how the author's antiheretical strategies inform his depiction of Mani, see Spät 2004, esp. 2–7.

[17] E. Mühlenberg, "Basilides" in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, v. 5, Berlin, 1980, 300.

[18] Löhr, 233.

material existence (Phl. *gētīg astišnīh*),[19] whereas the barbarian cosmogony described by Basilides appears to resemble Manichaean teaching in identifying the evil principle with Matter (ὕλη).[20]

Another approach, taken by May, has been to deny the authenticity of the fragment, holding that the fragment's remarkable parallels with Manichaean teaching can only be explained by holding that the fragment is contemporary with and presupposes the latter.[21] Like Löhr, I do not find May's argument convincing.[22]

If the fragment were a fourth-century forgery produced to suit the needs of anti-Manichaean polemic, one would have expected a greater degree of congruity with the principal elements of Manichaean teaching. First, it is remarkable that the relation between the good and evil principles in the fragment is nowhere described as a war, nor does the evil principle gain something of the good by an assault on the realm of the good. The absence of a conflict motif clearly separates the fragment's cosmogony from that of the Manichaean and Zoroastrian traditions. The barbarian cosmogony instead uses visual terminology for describing how a form of the light was retained by the darkness, effecting a change in Matter and leading to the production of the sensible world: The light, having a passion to gaze, looked at the darkness, as if in a mirror; the darkness beheld the light and ultimately took from the light a look and an appearance, etc. This aspect of the barbarian cosmogony is alien to both Manichaean and Zoroastrian teaching.

Second, the barbarian cosmogony appears to assume that *neither* of the two first principles was initially aware of the other. The light and darkness became aware of one another only at a later time. This con-

---

[19] M. Shaki, "The Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings of Mazdak" in *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, Leiden, 1985, 531 with n30; see further S. Shaked, "The Notions *Mēnōg* and *Gētīg* in the Pahlavi Texts and Their Relation to Eschatology," *Acta Orientalia* 33 (1971) 59–107.

[20] See *AA* 67.10 (Beeson 1906, 97, lines 13–14), where darkness and matter are set in parallel to one another as receiving something from the light. Since the barbarian cosmogony has already recognized only two first principles, matter cannot be regarded as a separate co-eternal third principle but is either to be identified with darkness/evil or regarded as primitively derived from the latter. In Zoroastrian teaching, by contrast, matter is not identified with or originally derived from darkness/evil but is instead originally derived from the light/good, though it has subsequently come to exist in a state in which there is a mixture (Phl. *gumēzišn*) of good and evil.

[21] G. May, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts: Die Entstehung der Lehre von der* creatio ex nihilo, Berlin, 1978, 80 n84; ET *Creatio ex nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*, tr. A. S. Worrall, Edinburgh, 1994, 79 n84.

[22] Löhr, 233–234 n53.

flicts with the Manichaean teaching that the light was initially aware of the darkness and therefore took proactive measures, building a wall to conceal the Tree of Life from the darkness.[23] Given that the author of the *AA* elsewhere demonstrates a detailed knowledge of Manichaean beliefs, it is unlikely that he would have made such errors or produced such a crude and inaccurate forgery to support his anti-Manichaean polemic.

If one is to understand the nature and origin of the peculiar elements within the barbarian cosmogony, the latter must be placed within the broader context of the Middle Platonic interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*. In *Timaeus* 48Eff., Plato distinguishes the realm of Being (in which the intelligibles are found) from space (χώρα; 52A), which is an essential catalyst for the production of the elements which comprise the realm of becoming, i.e. the sensible world. Though space itself lacks any determining shape or form, it is receptive of likenesses (μιμήματα) of Being.[24] An analogy can therefore be drawn between the father's provision of generative principles in human conception and the way in which likenesses of Being give rise to the sensible world. The role space plays in this process can likewise be described in terms of conception within the womb: Space is the ὑποδοχή (receptacle) in which the elements are conceived and nurtured.[25]

Within the Middle Platonic interpretation of the *Timaeus*, space was identified with Matter (ὕλη).[26] Of the various Middle Platonic sources, Plutarch's treatise *De Iside et Osiride* (*On Isis and Osiris*) possibly provides the closest parallels to Basilides' barbarian cosmogony. Plutarch, following Aristotle, believed that the *Timaeus* should be read literally as an account of the origin of the sensible world in time.[27] To explain

---

[23] Cumont/Kugener 1912, 103–104,107. On this point the barbarian cosmogony also differs from Zoroastrian teaching, in which Ohrmazd in his omniscience (Phl. *harwisp-āgāhīh*) previously knew of the existence of the evil power and foresaw its assault upon the realm of the good, allowing him to take preparatory, defensive measures. See H. S. Nyberg, "Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie mazdéennes," *Journal Asiatique* 214 (1929) 209,211; Shaki, 529 with n25; Sundermann, 1997, 353 with n44.

[24] *Timaeus* 50C; compare 52C–D.

[25] *Timaeus* 50C–D; compare Plutarch *De Is. et Osir.* 373F, 374B.

[26] For the principal references, see Löhr, 235 n59. This identification of space with matter is found already in the interpretation Aristotle gives in *Phys.* IV.2 (209b) of *Timaeus* 52A.This interpretation may have some support within the *Timaeus* itself; see for example *Timaeus* 50A–B,E with the comments of Plutarch *De Is. et Osir.* 374E.

[27] See M. Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten*, v. 1, Leiden, 1976, 28ff.

the commingling of evil with good in the sensible world, Plutarch ascribed the origin of the sensible world to the mixing within a mediating principle of two opposing first principles, one of which orients matters rightly while the other leads astray.[28] As an illustration Plutarch refers to the Zoroastrian identification of Ohrmazd (Ὡρομάζης) with light and good and Ahriman (Ἀρειμάνιος) with darkness, ignorance and evil.[29] Plutarch subsequently commends the view that the good principle (insofar as it can be related to anything that is proper to the sensible world) may be conceived in terms of light.[30]

Plutarch then discusses in greater detail Plato's account in the *Timaeus* of the origin of the sensible world. Plutarch identifies space with Matter. Matter is moved in ways that are disorderly and resist the guidance of reason, producing various evils.[31] Matter is therefore not merely receptive of evil, but evil has come to inhere in it and clings to it in such a way that evil's power can only be weakened by the action of the good but never wholly eradicated.[32] Despite its limitations and propensity toward disorder and evil, Matter nonetheless also has an innate love of the good, which it subsequently longs for and pursues.[33] Since Matter is receptive of likenesses (ὁμοιότητας) (372E–373A, i.e., the forms that Matter receives from the intelligible world, which is the realm of Being), a sensible image of the intelligible world (εἰκόνα τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου αἰσθητόν) was consequently produced in it (373B–C). This image was not identical with the present sensible world but was only an image and appearance of a world to be (373C: οὐ γὰρ ἦν κόσμος ἀλλ᾽ εἴδωλόν τι

---

[28] *De Is. et Osir.* 369B–D,370F. On Plutarch's account of dualism, see J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists*, London, 1977, 202–208; C. Froidefond, "Plutarque et le platonisme" in W. Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II.36.1, Berlin, 1987, 215–224; U. Bianchi, "Plutarch und der Dualismus" in *ANRW* II.36.1, 350–365; Radek Chlup, "Plutarch's Dualism and the Delphic Cult," *Phronesis* 45 (2000) 138–158.

[29] *De Is. et Osir.* 369D–F; compare *De procr. an.* 1026B.

[30] See *De Is. et Osir.* 372A and compare *De* E *apud Delphos* 393D and *De tranq. an.* 477C.

[31] See *De Is. et Osir.* 371C–D; 372A; 373A–B; 374D; *De procr. an.* 1014D–E; 1015C–E; 1016C. Compare Calcidius *Comm. In Tim.* 298–299 (= Numenius fr. 52 Des Places) and see the discussion of the latter passage in Bennett 2001, 56–57. Since soul is for Plato the cause of all change and motion (*Laws* 896B), Plutarch (*Quaest. platon.* 1003A) explains the disorderly movements of Matter as arising from a soul which does not yet possess reason or intelligence (*De procr. an.* 1014B–C) and therefore opposes that soul which does have reason and intelligence (*De procr. an.* 1015E).

[32] See *De Is. et Osir.* 371A–B and compare 373C–D.

[33] *De Is. et Osir.* 372E: ἔχει δὲ σύμφυτον ἔρωτα τοῦ πρώτου καὶ κυριωτάτου πάντων, ὃ τἀγαθῷ ταὐτόν ἐστι κἀκεῖνο ποθεῖ καὶ διώκει. Compare 371A; 372F; 374D.

καὶ κόσμου φάντασμα μέλλοντος), serving as the model or prototype from which the sensible world as we know it has come into existence.[34] The creation and constitution of the sensible world can thus be seen to have resulted from a mixture of opposing influences (371A), with all that is good and ordered in the sensible world being an efflux (ἀπορροή) and reflected image (εἰκὼν ἐμφαινομένη) of the good principle (371B; compare 372F and 375B), while all that is harmful and disordered derives from the evil principle (371E).

In conclusion, the barbarian cosmogony which the author of the *AA* claims to cite from Basilides is unlikely to be a fourth-century anti-Manichaean forgery. The background against which the fragment is best understood is not the primal conflict narratives of Zoroastrianism or Manichaeism, but rather the Middle Platonic interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*, with the closest parallels being found in Plutarch's treatise *De Iside et Osiride*.

[34] *De Is. et Osir.* 373B; for the Platonic background, see *Timaeus* 52Eff.

APPENDIX

Basilides' Barbarian Cosmogony (*AA* 67.7–11; Beeson 1906, 96, line 27, 97, line 21)	*Plutarch* De Iside et Osiride *369–374*
96.27–97.1: Two first principles exist, one of which is with identified light/good, the other with darkness/evil.	369B–F, 372A: Two first principles exist, one of which can be identified with light/good, the other with darkness/evil.
*97.13–16: Matter is possibly identified with darkness/evil (97.13), but is able to incline toward and be informed by the good.	*370F–371A, 373C–D: Matter is receptive of evil and evil has come to inhere in it, but Matter is able to incline toward and be informed by the good.
97.6–7: The inferior principle desires and pursues the good, longing to partake of it.	372E–F, 374D: Matter desires and pursues the good, longing to partake of it.
97.10–13,20: Some aspect of the light/good goes out toward the darkness/Matter and acts upon it.	371B,372F: An effluence (ἀπορροή) emanating from the good is received by Matter and acts upon it.
97.10–11,13–16,19: A form/appearance/likeness of the good/light is brought forth and received by Matter/Darkness.	373B–C (cf. *Timaeus* 52Eff.): An image/appearance of the good is brought forth and received by Matter.
97.13–14,19–21: This imperfect/incomplete image of the good/light is distinct from but related to the present creation/sensible world (possibly being the model with reference to which the latter comes into existence).	Ibid.: This imperfect/incomplete image of the good (= first creation) is distinct from but related to the present creation/sensible world (being the model with reference to which the sensible world as we know it comes into existence).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hom Hans Jakob Polotsky, ed., *Manichäische Homilien*, mit einem Beitrag von Hugo Ibscher (Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, 1). Stuttgart, 1934.

Keph Hans Jakob Polotsky and Alexander Böhlig, eds., *Kephalaia. Erste Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)* (Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin, 1). Stuttgart, 1940.

Keph II Wolf-Peter Funk, ed., *Kephalaia. Zweite Hälfte. Lieferung 15/16*, (Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin, 1). Stuttgart, 2000.

Mir.Man. III F. C. Andreas and W. B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch–Historische Klasse*, 1934, 846–912 [repr. in W. B. Henning, *Selected Papers*, vol. 1, Leiden, 1977, 275–339].

PsBk II C. R. C. Allberry, ed., *A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II* (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, 2). Stuttgart, 1938.

Adam 1969. Alfred Adam, ed., *Texte zum Manichäismus*, 2 ed., Berlin, 1969.

Allberry 1938. C. R. C. Allberry, ed., *A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II*, (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, 2), Stuttgart, 1938.

Beausobre 1734. Isaac de Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme*, vol. 1, Amsterdam, 1734.

Beeson 1906. Charles Henry Beeson, ed., *Hegemonius. Acta Archelai* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte [GCS], 16). Leipzig, 1906.

Bennett 2001a. Byard Bennett, "Didymus the Blind's Knowledge of Manichaeism," in Mirecki/BeDuhn 2001, 38–67.

——— 2001b. Byard Bennett, "*Iuxta unum latus erat terra tenebrarum*: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers' Descriptions of the Manichaean Cosmogony," in Mirecki/BeDuhn 2001, 68–78.

De Blois 2005. François De Blois, "New Light on the Sources of the Manichaean Chapter in the Fihrist," in Aloïs van Tongerloo and Luigi Cirillo, eds., *New Perspectives in Manichaean Research. Fifth International Congress of Manichaeism—Napoli 2001—Proceedings*, Turnhout, 2005, 37–45.

Böhlig 1991. Alexander Böhlig, "Manichaeism," in A. S. Atiya, ed., *The Coptic Encyclopaedia*, vol. 5, New York, 1991, 1519–1523.

——— 1996. Alexander Böhlig and Jes Peter Asmussen, eds., *Die Gnosis, vol. III: Der Manichäismus*, rev. ed., Zürich-München.

Boyce 1975. Mary Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Acta Iranica, 9), Leiden, 1975.

Brière 1960. Maurice Brière, *Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche, traduction syriaque de Jacques d'Édesse* (Patrologia Orientalia, 29) Paris, 1960.

Brinkmann 1895. August Brinkmann, ed., *Alexandrii Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio*, Leipzig, 1895.

Chatillon 1954. F. Chatillon, "Adimantus, Manichaei discipulus," *Revue du Moyen Age latin* 10 (1954) 191–203.

Chavannes/Pelliot 1913. Édouard Chavannes and Paul Pelliot, eds., *Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine*, Paris, 1913.

Coyle 1999. J. K. Coyle, "Healing and the 'Physician' in Manichaeism," in J. K. Coyle and S. Muir, eds., *Healing in Religion and Society from Hippocrates to the Puritans: Selected Studies* (Studies in Religion and Society, 43), Lewiston, 1999, 135–158.

——— 2004. J. K. Coyle, "Foreign and Insane: Labelling Manichaeism in the Roman Empire," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 33 (2004) 217–34.

Cumont/Kugener 1912. F. Cumont and M. Kugener, *Recherches sur le Manichéisme, II. Extrait de la CXXIII^e Homélie de Sévère d'Antioche. Réfutation de la doctrine manichéenne*, Bruxelles, 1912.

Decret 1970. François Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris, 1970.

——— 1974. François Decret, "Le 'globus horribilis' dans l'eschatologie manichéenne d'après les traités de saint Augustin," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri–Charles Puech*, Paris, 1974, 487–492.

——— 1978. François Decret, *L'Afrique Manichéenne (IV^e–V^e siècles): Étude historique et doctrinale*. Paris, 1978.

Dodge 1970. Bayard Dodge, ed./tr., *The Fihrist of al-Nadim*, New York, 1970.

Drijvers 1984. H. J. W. Drijvers, "Conflict and Alliance in Manichaeism," in Hans G. Kippenberg, ed., *Struggles of Gods: Papers of the Gröningen Work Group for the Study of the History of the Religions*, Berlin, 1984, 99–124.

Durkin–Meisterernst 2004. Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, ed., *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts. III.1 Texts in Middle Persian and Parthian*, Turnhout, 2004.

Forsyth 1987. Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy. Satan and the Combat Myth*, Princeton, 1987.

Gardner 1993. Iain Gardner, "The Eschatology of Manichaeism as a Coherent Doctrine," *Journal of Religious History* 17 (1993) 257–273.

Gardner 1995. Iain Gardner, ed./tr., *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 37), Leiden, 1995.

——— 2001. Iain Gardner, "The reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from three Coptic codices (Ismant el-Kharab and Medinet Madi)," in Mirecki/BeDuhn 2001, 93–104.

Gardner/Lieu 2004. Iain Gardner and Samuel N. C. Lieu, eds., *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, 2004.

Gasparro 2000. Giulia Gasparro, "Addas-Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei: for the History of Manichaeism in the West," in R. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, and P. Zieme, eds., *Studia Manichaica, IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*, Berlin, 2000, 546–559.

Hansen 1966. G. C. Hansen, "Zu den Evangelienzitaten in den 'Acta Archelai'" in F. L. Cross, ed., *Studia Patristica 7: Papers presented to the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Oxford 1963* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 92), Berlin, 1966, 473–485.

Harnack 1883. Adolf von Harnack, "Die Acta Archelai und das Diatessaron Tatians," *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 1.3 (1883) 137–153.

——— 1924. Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott* 2 ed., Leipzig, 1924 (reprint 1996).

Harrison/BeDuhn 2001. Geoffrey Harrison and Jason BeDuhn, "The Authenticity and Doctrine of (Ps.?) Mani's *Letter to Menoch*," in Mirecki/BeDuhn 2001, 128–172.

Henrichs 1986. Albert Henrichs, "The Timing of Supernatural Events in the Cologne Mani Codex," in Luigi Cirillo, ed., *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis. Atti del Simposio Internazionale (Rende—Amantea 3–7 settembre 1984)*, Cosenza, 1986, 183–204.

Holl 1933. Karl Holl, ed., *Epiphanius. Ancoratus und Panarion, III* (GCS, 37), Leipzig, 1933.

Holl/Dummer 1985. Karl Holl and Jürgen Dummer, eds., *Epiphanius, Panarion (Adversus haereses). Cap. 65–80, De fide*, Berlin, 1985.

van der Horst 1974. P. W. van der Horst and J. Mansfeld, eds., *An Alexandrian Platonist against Dualism. Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise 'Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus'*, Leiden, 1974.

Hutter 1989. Manfred Hutter, "Das Erlösungsgeschehen im manichäisch-iranischen Mythos. Motiv- und traditionsgeschichtliche Analysen," in Karl Matthäus Woschitz, Manfred Hutter, and Karl Prenner, *Das manichäische Urdrama des Lichtes*, Wien, 1989, 153–236.

——— 1992. Manfred Hutter, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-texte* (Studies in Oriental Religions, 21), Wiesbaden, 1992.

Jackson 1938. A. V. Williams Jackson, "The Doctrine of the Bolos in Manichaean Eschatology" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 58 (1938) 225–234.

Jolivet/Jourjon 1961. R. Jolivet and M. Jourjon, *Six Traités Anti-Manichéens* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne, Oeuvres de Saint Augustin, 17), Paris, 1961.

Kessler 1889. Konrad Kessler, *Mani. Forschungen über die manichäische Religion*, Berlin, 1889.

Klein 1991. Wassilios Klein, *Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica*, Wiesbaden, 1991.

——— 1992. Wassilios Klein, "Mani," in Peter Antes, ed., *Große Religionsstifter. Zarathustra, Mose, Jesus, Mani, Muhammad, Nānak, Buddha, Konfuzius, Lao Zi*, München, 1992, 72–90.

Klimkeit 1993. Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*, New York, 1993.

——— 1995. Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, "Manichäismus," in Hans Waldenfels, ed., *Lexikon der Religionen*, Freiburg, 1995, 386b–388b.

Koenen 1986. Ludwig Koenen, "Manichaean Apocalypticism at the Crossroads of Iranian, Egyptian, Jewish and Christian Thought," in Luigi Cirillo and Amneris Roselli, eds., *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis. Atti del Simposio Internazionale (Rende-Amantea 3–7 settembre 1984)*, Cosenza, 1986, 287–332.

——— 1990. Ludwig Koenen, "How Dualistic is Mani's Dualism?" in Luigi Cirillo, ed., *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis. Atti del Secondo Simposio Internazionale (Cosenza 27–28 maggio 1988)*, Cosenza, 1990, 1–34.

Lagarde 1967. Paul de Lagarde, *Titus Bostrenus, Syriace et Graece*. Wiesbaden, 1967 (repr. of 1859 ed.).

Lieu 1986. S. N. C. Lieu, "Captives, Refugees and Exiles: A Study of Cross-Frontier Civilian Movements and Contacts between Rome and Persia from Valerian to Jovian," in P. Freeman and D. Kennedy, eds., *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East: Proceedings of a Colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986* (British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph No. 9, BAR International Series 297), Oxford, 1986, vol. 2, 475–505.

——— 1992. S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: A Historical Survey*, 2 ed., Manchester, 1992.

——— 1994. S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotomia and the Roman East* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 118), Leiden, 1994.

——— 2001. S. N. C. Lieu, "Introduction," in Vermes 2001, 1–34.

Lim 1989. Richard Lim, "Unity and Diversity among Western Manichaeans. A Reconsideration of Mani's sancta ecclesia," *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 35 (1989) 231–250.

——— 1995. Richard Lim, "Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity," in R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 23), Berkeley, 1995, 70–108.

——— 1996. Richard Lim, "'By Word or by Deed?': Two Modes of Religious Persuasion in Late Antiquity," in M. Dillon, ed., *Religion in the Ancient World: New Themes and Approaches*, Amsterdam, 1996, 257–269.

Mirecki/BeDuhn 1997. P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds., *Emerging From Darkness: Studies*

in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 43), Leiden, 1997.

——— 2001. P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds., *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and Its World* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 50). Leiden, 2001.

Nagel 1974. Peter Nagel, "Bemerkungen zum manichäischen Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis." in P. Nagel, ed., *Studia Coptica*, Berlin, 1974, 201–214.

——— 1980. Peter Nagel, *Die Thomaspsalmen des koptisch–manichäischen Psalmenbuches*, Berlin, 1980.

Oerter 1990. Wolf B. Oerter, "Die 'Vorzüge der manichäischen Religion'. Betrachtungen zu Kephalaia Cap. 154," in Peter Nagel, ed., *Carl-Schmidt-Kolloquium an der Martin-Luther-Universität 1988*, Halle (Saale), 1990, 259–271.

——— 1991. Wolf B. Oerter, "Das Motiv vom Garten. Betrachtungen zur manichäischen Eschatologie," in Aloïs van Tongerloo and Søren Giversen, eds., *Manichaica Selecta*, Louvain, 1991, 263–272.

Pedersen 1996. Nils Arne Pedersen, *Studies in The Sermon on the Great War. Investigations of a Manichaean-Coptic text from the fourth century*, Aarhus, 1996.

——— 2004. Nils Arne Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God. A Study of Titus of Bostra's* Contra Manichaeos*—The Work's Sources, Aims and Relation to its Contemporary Theology* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 56), Leiden, 2004.

Pennacchietti 1988. F. Pennacchietti, "Gli 'Acta Archelai' e il viaggio di Mani nel Bēt Arbāyē," *Rivista di Storia e letteratura religiosa* 24 (1988) 503–514.

Polotsky 1932. Hans Jakob Polotsky, "Koptische Zitate aus den *Acta Archelai*," *Le Muséon* 45 (1932) 18–20.

——— 1935. Hans Jakob Polotsky, "Manichäismus," in *Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Enzyklopädie*, Suppl. VI, 1935, cols. 241–272.

Puech 1937. Henri-Charles Puech, "Der Begriff der Erlösung im Manichäismus," *Eranos Jahrbuch* 1936, 183–286.

Quispel 1993. G. Quispel, "A Diatessaron Reading in a Latin Manichaean Codex," *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993) 374–378.

Reeves 1992. John Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the Book of Giants Tradition*, Cincinnati, 1992.

Reitzenstein 1931. Richard Reitzenstein, "Eine wertlose und eine wertvolle Überlieferung über den Manichäismus," *Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1931, 28–58.

Ries 1988. Julien Ries, *Les études manichéenes: Des controversies de la réforme aux découwertes du XX^e siècle*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988.

——— 1995. Julien Ries, "L'eschatologie manichéenne selon les textes occidentaux et orientaux," in Cäcilia Fluck, et al., eds., *Divitiae Aegypti*, Wiesbaden, 1995, 264–270.

Riggi 1967. Calogero Riggi, *Epifanio contro Mani. Revisione critica, traduzione Italiana e commento storico del Panarion di Epiphanio, haer. LXVI*, Roma, 1967.

Salmond 1987 [1871]. S. D. F. Salmond, "Archelaus, the Acts of the Disputation with the Heresiarch Manes," in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VI*, Edinburgh, 1871 [reissued: Grand Rapids, 1987].

Schmidt-Glintzer 1987. Helwig Schmidt–Glintzer, ed., *Chinesische Manichaica* (Studies in Oriental Religion, 14), Wiesbaden, 1987.

Scopello 1989. Madeleine Scopello, "Simon le Mage, prototype de Mani dans les Acta Archelai," *Revue de la Société Ernest-Renan* 37 (1989) 67–79.

——— 1995. Madeleine Scopello, "Vérités et contre-vérités: la vie de Mani selon les *Acta Archelai*," *Apocrypha* 6 (1995) 203–234.

——— 2000. Madeleine Scopello, "Hégémonius, les *Acta Archelai* et l'histoire de la controverse anti-manichéenne," in R. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, and P. Zieme, eds., *Studia Manichaica, IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18.*

Juli 1997 (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderband 4), Berlin, 2000, 528–545.

Smagina 1994. Eugenia B. Smagina,, "Manichäische Eschatologie," in Holger Preißler and Hubert Seiwert, eds., *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte*, Marburg, 1994, 297–306.

Spät 2004. Eszter Spät, "The 'Teachers' of Mani in the *Acta Archelai* and Simon Magus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 58 (2004) 1–23.

Stroumsa 1981. Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, "Aspects de l'eschatologie manichéenne," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 198 (1981) 163–181.

Sundermann 1981. Werner Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts* (Berliner Turfantexte, 11), Berlin, 1981.

——— 1997. Werner Sundermann, "How Zoroastrian Is Mani's Dualism?" in L. Cirillo and A. van Tongerloo, eds., *Manichaean Studies III. Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale di Studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico"*, Louvain: Brepols, 1997, 343–360.

——— 1998. Werner Sundermann, "Manichaean Eschatology," in E. Yarshater, ed., *Encyclopedia Iranica*, vol. 8, Costa Mesa, 1998, 569b–575b [reprinted with a short addendum in Werner Sundermann, *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. by Christiane Reck, et al., vol. 1, Roma, 2001, 59–72].

Tajadod 1990. Nahal Tajadod, ed., *Mani le Bouddha de Lumière. Catéchisme manichéen chinois*, Paris, 1990.

Tardieu 1978/79. Michel Tardieu, "Gnose et manichéisme," *Annuaire. École pratique des hautes etudes: V^e section—sciences religieuses* 87 (1978–1979) 311–316.

——— 1987. Michel Tardieu, "Archelaus" in E. Yarshater, ed., *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. 2, London and New York, 1987, 279.

——— 1997. *Le manichéisme* (2 ed.), Paris, 1997.

Traube 1903. L. Traube, "*Acta Archelai*. Vorbermerkung zu einer neuen Ausgabe," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1903, 533–549.

Tubach 2000. Jürgen Tubach, "Mani, der bibliophile Religionsstifter," in Ronald E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme, eds., *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*, Berlin, 2000, 622–638.

van Oort 2001. Johannes van Oort, "*Secundini manichaei epistula*: Roman Manichaean 'Biblical' Argument in the Age of Augustine," in J. van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst, eds., *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West, Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium on the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 49, Leiden, 2001, 161–173.

Vermes 2001. Mark Vermes, *Hegemonius: Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus)*, Turnhout, 2001.

Villey 1985. André Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis: Contre la doctrine de Mani* (Sources gnostiques et manichéennes, 2), Paris, 1985.

Voss 1970. B. R. Voss, *Der Dialog in der frühchristlichen Literatur* (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua, 9). München, 1970.

Williams 1994. Frank Williams, tr., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Books II and III (Sects 47–80, De Fide)* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 36), Leiden, 1994.

Wurst 1996. Gregor Wurst, ed., *Psalm Book Part II, Fasc. 1, Die Bema-Psalmen* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Coptica, 1). Turnhout, 1996.

Zittwitz 1873. H. von Zittwitz, "Acta disputationis Archelai et Manetis nach ihrem Umfang, ihren Quellen und ihrem Werthe untersucht," *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* 43 (1873) 467–528.

TABLE OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

GENERAL INDEX

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

NAG HAMMADI AND MANICHAEAN STUDIES

1. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi bibliography, 1948-1969*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02603 7
2. Ménard, J.-E. *L'évangile de vérité*. Traduction française, introduction et commentaire par J.-É. Ménard. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03408 0
3. Krause, M. (ed.). *Essays on the Nag Hammadi texts in honour of Alexander Böhlig*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03535 4
4. Böhlig, A. & F. Wisse, (eds.). *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 2 and IV, 2. The Gospel of the Egyptians*. (The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit). Edited with translation and commentary, in cooperation with P. Labib. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04226 1
5. Ménard, J.-E. *L'Évangile selon Thomas*. Traduction française, introduction, et commentaire par J.-É. Ménard. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04210 5
6. Krause, M. (ed.). *Essays on the Nag Hammadi texts in honour of Pahor Labib*. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04363 2
7. Ménard, J.-E. *Les textes de Nag Hammadi*. Colloque du centre d'Histoire des Religions, Strasbourg, 23-25 octobre 1974. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04359 4
8. Krause, M. (ed.). *Gnosis and Gnosticism*. Papers read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies. Oxford, September 8th-13th, 1975. 1977. ISBN 90 04 05242 9
9. Schmidt, C. (ed.). *Pistis Sophia*. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05635 1
10. Fallon, F.T. *The enthronement of Sabaoth*. Jewish elements in Gnostic creation myths. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05683 1
11. Parrott, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05798 6
12. Koschorke, K. *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum*. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag Hammadi-Traktate 'Apokalypse des Petrus' (NHC VII, 3) und 'Testimonium Veritatis' (NHC IX, 3). 1978. ISBN 90 04 05709 9
13. Schmidt, C. (ed.). *The Books of Jeu and the untitled text in the Bruce Codex*. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05754 4
14. McL. Wilson, R. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*. Papers read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976). 1978. ISBN 90 04 05760 9
15. Pearson, B.A. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06377 3
16. Barns, J.W.B., G.M. Browne, & J.C. Shelton, (eds.). *Nag Hammadi Codices*. Greek and Coptic papyri from the cartonnage of the covers. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06277 7
17. Krause, M. (ed.). *Gnosis and Gnosticism*. Papers read at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies. Oxford, September 3rd-8th, 1979. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06399 4
18. Helderman, J. *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis*. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des valentinianisch-gnostischen Heilsgutes der Ruhe im Evangelium Veritatis und in anderen Schriften der Nag-Hammadi Bibliothek. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07260 8

19. Frickel, J. *Hellenistische Erlösung in christlicher Deutung.* Die gnostische Naassenerschrift. Quellen, kritische Studien, Strukturanalyse, Schichtenscheidung, Rekonstruktion der Anthropos-Lehrschrift. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07227 6

20-21. Layton, B. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7, together with XIII, 2* Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1) and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655.* I. Gospel according to Thomas, Gospel according to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, Indexes. II. On the origin of the world, Expository treatise on the Soul, Book of Thomas the Contender. 1989. 2 volumes. ISBN 90 04 09019 3

22. Attridge, H.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex I* (The Jung Codex). I. Introductions, texts, translations, indices. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07677 8

23. Attridge, H.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex I* (The Jung Codex). II. Notes. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07678 6

24. Stroumsa, G.A.G. *Another seed. Studies in Gnostic mythology.* 1984. ISBN 90 04 07419 8

25. Scopello, M. *L'exégèse de l'âme.* Nag Hammadi Codex II, 6. Introduction, traduction et commentaire. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07469 4

26. Emmel, S. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5.* The Dialogue of the Savior. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07558 5

27. Parrott, D.M. (ed.) *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 3-4 and V, 1 with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081.* Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ. 1991. ISBN 90 04 08366 9

28. Hedrick, C.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 07825 8

29. Williams, M.A. *The immovable race.* A gnostic designation and the theme of stability in Late Antiquity. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07597 6

30. Pearson, B.A. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex VII.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10451 8

31. Sieber, J.H. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex VIII.* 1991. ISBN 90 04 09477 6

32. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1970-1994.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09473 3

33. Wisse, FFF. & M. Waldstein, (eds.). *The Apocryphon of John.* Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV,1 with BG 8502,2. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10395 3

34. Lelyveld, M. *Les logia de la vie dans l'Evangile selon Thomas.* A la recherche d'une tradition et d'une rédaction. 1988. ISBN 90 04 07610 7

35. Williams, F. (Tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis.* Book I (Sects 1-46). 1987. Reprint 1997. ISBN 90 04 07926 2

36. Williams, F. (Tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis.* Books II and III (Sects 47-80, De Fide). 1994. ISBN 90 04 09898 4

37. Gardner, I. *The Kephalaia of the Teacher.* The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10248 5

38. Turner, M.L. *The Gospel according to Philip.* The Sources and Coherence of an Early Christian Collection. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10443 7

39. van den Broek, R. *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10654 5

40. Marjanen, A. *The Woman Jesus Loved.* Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10658 8

41. Reeves, J.C. *Heralds of that Good Realm.* Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10459 3

42. Rudolph, K. *Gnosis & spätantike Religionsgeschichte.* Gesammelte Aufsätze. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10625 1

43. Mirecki, P. & J. BeDuhn, (eds.). *Emerging from Darkness.* Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10760 6
44. Turner, J.D. & A. McGuire, (eds.). *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years.* Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10824 6
45. Lieu, S.N.C. *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 10405 4
46. Heuser, M & H.-J. Klimkeit. *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 10716 9
47. Zöckler, T. *Jesu Lehren im Thomasevangelium.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11445 9
48. Petersen, S. *"Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit!".* Maria Magdalena, Salome und andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11449 1
49. Van Oort, J. , O. Wermelinger & G. Wurst (eds.). *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West.* Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht International Symposium of the IAMS. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11423 8
50. Mirecki, P. & J. BeDuhn (eds.). *The Light and the Darkness.* Studies in Manichaeism and its World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11673 7
51. Williams, F.E. *Mental Perception.* A Commentary on NHC, VI,4: The Concept of Our Great Power. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11692 3
52. Pleše, Z. *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe.* Narrative and Cosmology in the *Apocryphon of John.* 2006. ISBN 90 04 11674 5
53. Scopello, M. *Femme, Gnose et manichéisme.* De l'espace mythique au territoire du réel. 2005. ISBN 90 04 11452 1
54. Bethge, H., S. Emmel, K.L. King, & I. Schletterer (eds.). *For the Children, Perfect Instruction.* Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke on the Occasion of the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften's Thirtieth Year. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12672 4
55. Quispel, G. *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica* (in preparation) ISBN 90 04 13945 1
56. Pedersen, N., *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God.* A Study of Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* – The Work's Sources, Aims and Relation to its Contemporary Theology. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13883 8
57. Gulácsi, Z. *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art.* A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th-11th Century East Central Asia. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13994 X
58. Luttikhuizen, G.P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions.* 2005. ISBN 90 04 14510 9
59. Asgeirsson, J.M., A.D. DeConick & R. Uro (eds.). *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity.* The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14779 9
60. Thomassen, E., *The Spiritual Seed – The Church of the 'Valentinians'.* 2006. ISBN 90 04 14802 7
61. BeDuhn, J. & P. Mirecki (eds.). *Frontiers of Faith.* The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16180 1