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Preface and Acknowledgments

Ephrem Syrus caustically remarks at one place in his *Prose Refutations* that the Manichaeans “say of Egyptian Hermes and of the Greek Plato and of Jesus who appeared in Judaea that they were heralds of that Good (Realm) to the world...” (ed. Mitchell 2.208). This observation, apparently based upon a quotation from an unidentified Manichaean source and intended by Ephrem to discredit the Manichaean concept of a periodic dispatch to earth of representatives of the supernal Realm of Light, encapsulates the thematic core of the present monograph. It offers a systematic examination, from a comparative perspective, of the extant Manichaean (as well as non-Manichaean) rosters of authentic predecessors who purportedly proclaimed the Religion of Light prior to the advent of Mani, “seal of the prophets,” and examines the implications of this particular doctrine for the origins of Manichaeism.

Chapter One collects and analyzes those texts which speak of prophetic predecessors, and isolates the credentials considered requisite for such status within Manichaeism. Especially intriguing in this list-tradition is the occurrence of the names of some prominent biblical antediluvian forefathers, such as Adam, Seth, and Enoch. Given the well documented hostility of mature Manichaeism to the personalities and teachings of the Hebrew Bible, it becomes necessary to explicate this apparent anomaly.

A survey of biblical pseudepigraphic literary activity in the late antique Near East follows in Chapter Two, with special attention being devoted to the quotations from revelatory works (“apocalypses”) attributed to five biblical forefathers which are cited in the *Cologne Mani Codex*, a relatively new source which has revolutionized the study of nascent Manichaeism. These forefathers are Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch. This descriptive sketch does not limit itself to Jewish sources alone, but draws as well upon information found in Christian, gnostic, non-biblical, and Muslim literature produced throughout the first millennium (and in some cases beyond) CE. A special section of this chapter attempts to trace the avenues for the transmission of pseudepigraphic literature and motifs from their largely Jewish cultural contexts in Palestine to the emergent gnostic milieus of Syria and Mesopotamia.

The heart of the work, comprising Chapters Three through Seven, consists of a rigorous philological, literary, and religio-historical analysis of the five pseudepigraphic citations preserved in the *Cologne Mani Codex*. Each of these chapters presents the Greek text of the excerpt, an English translation, and a lengthy detailed commentary to the passage. In addition,
these chapters offer a number of hypotheses regarding the original provenance of each citation and the means by which it has been adapted, if at all, to its present narrative context. The final chapter (Chapter Eight) briefly synopsizes the results of the present investigation, and offers some deliberately provocative assertions and suggestions to fuel further research and discussion.

The bibliographical abbreviations employed within the annotations should be familiar to students of the history of religions in late antiquity. I have endeavored in most instances to adhere to the stylistic guidelines of the Journal of Biblical Literature, a convenient exposition of which is set forth in JBL 107 (1988) 583-96. For more specialized works or journals not included in the JBL list, I have prepared a special supplemental list of abbreviations for consultation. As a concession to modern reading habits, I provide full bibliographic information for the initial citations of the scholarly literature in each chapter, even if the work was already referenced in an earlier chapter. This will permit readers to consult chapters out of their published sequence without sacrificing intelligibility.

Some of the material contained in the present work was first presented in oral form during the annual sessions of the Manichaeism Group of the Society of Biblical Literature, and I would like to thank my numerous questioners, respondents, and correspondents for their vocal (and sometimes written) interest in my work. My wife Lu and my son Daniel have patiently tolerated the many hours of cloistered rumination and composition that this project has entailed, and I am grateful for their indulgence. I also thank the interlibrary loan staff of Dacus Library at Winthrop University for their cheerful acceptance and efficient handling of what must have seemed a veritable plethora of esoteric requests. My initial labors upon the manuscript were financially underwritten by a 1994 summer stipend from the National Endowment for the Humanities, to whom I publicly tender my thanks. I am furthermore especially grateful to Jason BeDuhn, David Frankfurter, and Steve Wasserstrom, each of whom graciously consented to read and critique large portions of the present work during the early stages of its preparation, and each of whom has stimulated me in countless ways via their publications and conversations.

Finally, I dedicate this book to the memory of my father, who passed away shortly before the manuscript went to press. He always took a great interest in my scholarly labors and activities, and was a steady source of quiet encouragement and sound advice. He freely gave to me much more than I could ever hope to repay in kind. May his memory forever be for a blessing.

SUPPLEMENTAL ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT REFERENCES

- AIFON = Annali Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli
- APAW = Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin
- BHM = Bei ha-Midrasch (6 vols.; ed. A. Jellinek; reprinted, Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938)
- CMC = Cologne Mani Codex
- CSHB = Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
- E12 = The Encyclopaedia of Islam, new edition (Leiden: Brill, 1960–)
- Finkelstein = Sîre Devarim (ed. L. Finkelstein; reprinted, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969)
- Friedmann = Midrash Pesiqta Rabbati (ed. M. Ish-Shalom; Vienna, 1880)
- Ginzā = M. Lidzbarski, Ginzâ: Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925)
- Homilies = H.J. Polotsky, Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, Band I: Manichäische Homilien (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934)
- HSSCP = Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
- JE = The Jewish Encyclopaedia (12 vols.; New York & London, 1901-06)
"La théologie manichéenne est pleine de fictions hardies et bizarres, dont il est difficile de découvrir l'origine."

I. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique* - 2.554 (1739)
PART ONE

FROM FOREFATHERS TO HERALDS:

THE TRANSFORMATION OF BIBLICAL PRIMEVAL HISTORY
One of the most significant manuscript finds relating to the study of Manichaeism was the discovery and decipherment in 1969 at the University of Cologne of a diminutive Greek uncial codex containing a hagiographical recountal of the early life of Mani, the religion's founder and authoritative teacher. The actual archaeological origin of the codex was admittedly obscure. Those familiar with the history of the western spread of Manichaeism postulated that it came from Upper Egypt, probably from the area of Lycopolis, a point of entry for Manichaean missions in the third and fourth centuries CE, and a place where Manichaean communities are well attested in late antiquity. Palaeographical analysis of the Greek script employed in the newly recovered codex suggested the fourth or fifth centuries CE as the probable date of its preparation. A closer study of the narrative suggested to its modern editors that the Greek text was actually a translation of an Aramaic *Grundschrift*, an assessment which if accurate would mean that the work could originate from the earliest decades of the existence of Manichaeism in Mesopotamia. Given that much of the narrative is autobiographical in form, portions of the *Codex* may even ultimately derive from the *ipsissima verba* of Mani himself (216-276 CE). Although badly damaged, particularly in its latter half, approximately one hundred and ninety-two leaves survive for modern study.

The contents of the Cologne Mani Codex (henceforth CMC or Codex) are little short of revolutionary for the evaluation of the ideological background of the youthful Mani. Much of the extant text relates certain formative events experienced by Mani while being raised and educated among a Jewish-Christian sectarian community in southern Mesopotamia. Notices of his childhood and adolescent upbringing among such a sect had been mentioned by two of the most important heresiological sources for the recovery of Manichaean traditions and doctrines; viz., those of the Nestorian patriarch Theodore bar Konai and the Muslim bibliophile Ibn al-Nadīm, but little evidence existed outside their accounts, certainly not within authentic Manichaean writings, to confirm this tradition. Not only is the veracity of this polemical tradition affirmed by the *Codex*, but we also learn from it the identity of the sect's founder—Elchasai, an exceedingly intriguing Jewish-Christian visionary who apparently lived and taught in late first-century CE Palestine and Transjordania, and regarding whom some information is preserved by Christian (and Muslim) heresiologists. The implications of this
new knowledge are profound and far-reaching. Not the least among them is the dawning realization that there is a genetic linkage—conceptual, ideological, and most importantly, literary—between the intellectual circles of Second Temple and late antique heterodox Judaism (among which can be included the various Jesus-movements) and late antique Syrian and Mesopotamian syncretic currents (incorporating also pagan, Hellenistic, and Iranian motifs), a linkage which illuminates and explains many otherwise puzzling textual correspondences and correlations found among these regions.10

The surviving leaves of the Codex betray the editorial hands of one or more redactors who have manipulated the narrative to assume the shape it now bears. In many cases, the name of the redactor responsible for the structure of a certain block of tradition is preserved in a "section" heading, a formal practice of attribution that has been rightly compared to the ascription of traditions to named rabbinc Sages,11 or to the Islamic isnâd, the transmission of hadith through an authoritative line of traditions.12 As a result of this editorial arrangement, the contents of the Codex can be described and summarized fairly neatly as follows. Leaves 1-13 relate a detailed, largely hagiographic account of Mani's childhood among the sect. Leaves 14-44 recount the circumstances and contents of two "revelations" experienced by Mani while living among the sect—the first at age twelve, and the second at age twenty-four. There follows on leaves 45-72 a lengthy apologetic section wherein evidence is marshaled to support the authenticity of Mani's revelatory experiences. This evidence consists of quotations excerpted from five otherwise unknown Jewish pseudepigraphic "apocalypses," three citations alluding to the apostle Paul's visionary experiences, and four excerpts from Mani's later "canonical" works.13 Leaves 72-99 provide a valuable account of the customs and rituals observed by the Elchasaites, community to whom Mani belonged, and of the history of Mani's growing disenchantment and eventual opposition to them. On leaves 100-116 is the Manichaean version of Mani's departure from the sect and his initial success in winning disciples to his own teachings. The remainder of the Codex (leaves 117-192), which is very badly preserved, apparently continued with a description of Mani's subsequent missionary journeys throughout the ancient Orient.

While there is much of interest within the Codex that rightly should excite and stimulate its detailed study by students of the history of religions in late antiquity, a portion which is particularly intriguing is that apologetic section (CMC 45-72) mentioned earlier that features justificatory evidence for Mani's claimed status as the recipient of heavenly wisdom. A close examination of this section reveals that Mani regarded himself, and was so viewed by his adherents, as simply the latest (and perhaps the last) in a series of divinely commissioned emissaries to an almost hopelessly befuddled and estranged humanity. Especially interesting are the identities of the illustrious predecessors who are commemorated in the Codex. "Apocalypses" attributed to the biblical figures of Adam, Sethel (i.e., Seth),14 Enosh, Shem, and Enoch comprise the first five (and by far the most lengthy) citations.15 These are followed by three brief quotations from two of the New Testament epistles of Paul.16 The significance of Paul in Mani's intellectual development is not surprising in itself. Marcionite Christianity, whose stringent Paulinism is well known, was the strongest faction of that religion in Mesopotamia during Mani's day.17 and scholars have sometimes remarked certain concepts within nascent Manichaeanism that suggest a Marcionite patrimony.18 A clandestine study and espousal of Paul's writings by the young Mani was probably one of the factors that precipitated his rupture from his childhood community.19 Paul thus enjoyed a special status among the religious teachers preceding the mission of Mani.20 The section concludes with the elevation of Mani himself to the exalted rank of these predecessors, climactically expressed by the identification of Mani with the "Paraclete of truth."21

It is the aforementioned pentad of primordial forefathers culled from the biblical book of Genesis, along with the explicit respect accorded to literature allegedly stemming from them, that gives one pause. Manichaean literature rarely cites the Hebrew Bible. In fact, it is abundantly attested that Mani and his religion displayed a hostile, denigrating stance toward both the Hebrew Bible and the classical Judaism deriving from it. The four-century polemicist Titus of Bostra begins the fourth book of his treatise refuting Manichaeanism by stating "he (Mani) attributes the Old Testament fully and completely to the archons of Hyle (i.e., the princes of Darkness).22 This is tantamount to asserting that the Hebrew Bible is of Satan, not of God, and hence totally worthless for instruction in religious matters. Yet characters belonging to this despised corpus of documents are simultaneously lauded as exemplars and emissaries of proto-Manichaism! How can this be?

The Succession of Incarnations of the Apostle of Light

Despite Mani's avoidance of explicit citation from the Hebrew Bible, it is nevertheless plain that important characters and events mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, particularly those found within the primeval history of Genesis 1-11, play a significant role in the development of his distinctive ideology. A cursory reading of surviving Manichaean literature, as well as of the detailed reports of reliable heresiologists, readily demonstrates its biblical heritage. The Genesis accounts of creation, the experiences of Adam, Eve, and their progeny, the generational succession of the antediluvian forefathers, the angelic corruption and enslavement of humanity, the cataclysmic Flood, the preservation of wisdom for future generations of the righteous—all of these biblically based characters and episodes receive attention in Manichaean literature. Yet true to their provenance, the Manichaean texts do not relate these stories or traditions in accordance with their biblical versions. They instead employ, adapt, transmit, and further develop the interpreted forms of these stories that we often find in extra-biblical Jewish (and Christian) pseudepigraphic works and certain
agadic traditions, or alternatively, versions that we might expect to find among such sources.  

It had not escaped notice among ancient polemists that Manicheaeism credited specific biblical and historical figures with distinctive roles in a progressive pattern of religious revelation. Modern manuscript discoveries, notably those at Turfan and Medina Madi, confirmed and augmented these earlier testimonies and shed new light upon the Manichaean doctrine of "prophetic succession." According to this doctrine, a heavenly entity known as the Apostle of Light, who is in turn under the direction of the Light-Nous, has periodically manifested itself in human guise to proclaim the Manichaean message of redemption among humanity. The succession of such "prophets" is comprised initially of important biblical forefathers from primeval history and continues on to embrace renowned religious teachers of more recent vintage such as Zoroaster, the Buddha, and Jesus, before culminating with the self-declared "seal of the prophets," Mani himself. The importance of this concept for understanding why the Manichaean employed pseudepigraphic works attributed to the primal forefathers, as well as for explaining the esteem such writings undoubtedly enjoyed in Manichaean circles, demands that a comprehensive inspection be given all the relevant textual evidence that can be culled from both external and internal witnesses.

Mani almost certainly inherited the concept of the periodic dispatch and sojourn of heavenly emissaries among humanity from his Elchasaitic tutors. According to Hippolytus:

"...They (the Elchasaites) do not confess, however, that there is but one Christ, but that there is one above and that he is infused into many bodies frequently... he was begotten of God at one time and at another time he became a Spirit and at another time was born of a virgin and at another time not so. And he was afterwards continually infused into bodies and was manifested in many people at different times."

Epiphanius moreover states: "They (the Elchasaites) confess Christ in name believing that he was created and that he appears time and again. He was begotten of God at one time and at another time he became a Spirit and at another time was born of a virgin and at another time not so. And he was afterwards continually infused into bodies and was manifested in many people at different times."

This parallel, one might be tempted to assert that Islamicate Manichaism simply borrowed this doctrine from the dominant religious community in its environment, or at the very least, that the Muslim commentators have projected their own understanding of the prophetic office upon this dualistic sect. Such an argument however cannot stand. As we shall see below, the scheme is already alluded to by Ephrem Syrus in his valuable fourth-century refutation of Manichaean teachings, and it is expressly attested within the Coptic Manichaean texts of the fourth and fifth centuries CE. In fact, it is more than likely that the currents of influence flow in the opposite direction—it was Muhammad who adopted and adapted the concept of the cyclical progression of universal (as well as ethnic) prophets from Manichaism in order to construct his distinctive history of revelation.

The earliest Muslim testimony which mentions the Manichaean doctrine of the succession of prophets is that of 'Abd al-Jabbar, a tenth-century Mu'tazzilite sage who compiled a vast encyclopedia of theological doctrines (Kitab al-Maghtani) that includes valuable information about 'Abbāsid dualist sects. The information contained therein concerning Manicheaeism (as well as the other dualist movements) was apparently derived from Abu Muhammad al-Hasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhti's Kitāb al-ārā wa-l-diyānāt. Near the end of his exposition of Manicheaeism, he states the following: "The first to be sent by God for the teaching of knowledge was Adam, then Seth, next Noah. He sent Zoroaster to Persia, the Buddha to India, Jesus the Messiah to the West, (and) lastly Mani, the seal of the prophets. Adam, the first human being according to the biblical and Qur'anic creation myths, is also the first emissary to proclaim revelatory knowledge. His son Seth assumes the prophetic mantle after Adam's demise, and Seth in turn is succeeded by Noah, the hero of the scriptural Deluge-narratives. After a lengthy temporal hiatus, Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus are commissioned to proclaim the message in the geographically (or ethnically?) circumscribed areas of Persia, India (i.e., the "East"), and the West (i.e., "Rome"). The final link in the chain is Mani, who completes and confirms the work of his predecessors.

This is a reasonably clear statement of the idea of the succession of prophets, but 'Abd al-Jabbar gives us no explicit information regarding how Manichaeans understood the relationship of one "link" in the chain to another. Some things can however be inferred from the structure of the list. The roster displays what would appear to be a conscious symmetry. There are seven prophets in all: three who could be termed "ancestral" (Adam, Seth, Noah), followed by three "ethnic" or "geographic" representatives (Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus), and a single climactic conclusion with the appearance of Mani as "seal of the prophets." The number "seven" thus serves as an ordering principle for a balanced arrangement of authoritative predecessors. This could be an editorial contribution by 'Abd al-Jabbar or his source since, as we shall see, authentic Manichaean writings identify several other figures as predecessors of Mani in the proclamation of his message. Yet the arrangement of the prophets as a group of "seven" also occurs in Manichaean
writings—most importantly, in the roster supplied by the Codex itself. Hence we may have here a survival of a Manichaean textual source.39

A second informative testimony to consider is that of the eleventh-century Muslim polymath al-Birûnî. There we read:

In the beginning of his book called Shâbûrîkân, which he composed for Shâpûr b. Ardâshîr, he says: 'Wisdom and deeds40 have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messengers of God. So in one age they have been brought by the messenger, called Buddha, to India; in another by Zarûdshî to Persia, in another by Jesus to the West. Thereupon this revelation has come down, this prophecy in this last age through me, Manî, the messenger of the God of truth to Babylonia.' In his gospel, which he arranged according to the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, he says that he is the Paraclete announced by [the] Messiah, and that he is the seal of the prophets (i.e. the last of them).41

This testimony features a valuable quotation excerpted from one of the canonical scriptures reportedly authored by Mani, the Shâbûrîkân.42 This work was supposedly the only one of Mani’s compositions to be written in Persian (as opposed to Aramaic),43 presumably to facilitate its perusal by Shapur I so as to secure his favor for the expansion of the young religion. The distinctive concept of the periodic revelation (“from time to time”) of divine wisdom to humanity via the agency of chosen “prophets” (“messengers of God”) is clearly evident in this citation.44 We also learn the identity of four of these “prophets”: Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Manî, each of whom exercise their missions in designated geographic localities. This corroborates with a portion of the earlier testimony of ‘Abd al-Jabbar, and given its explicit linkage with a Manichaean scriptural text, strengthens the supposition that the latter (or his source) had access to Manichaean writings. Further, the teachings and instructions associated with each messenger do not vary according to time or place—“this revelation has come down, this prophecy—through me, Manî, the messenger of the God of truth to Babylonia.” The messengers of God have thus proclaimed a single teaching to humankind, regardless of the circumstances of their own settings or audiences. We finally learn that Manî’s mission featured an eschatological component, in that Manî is considered the messenger for “this last age.”45 This lesson is reinforced with al-Birûnî’s citation from another of Manî’s works46 wherein he declares himself to be the “Paraclete” promised by Jesus and the “seal of the prophets.”47

A testimony which coincides in part and further extends the evidence of both ‘Abd al-Jabbar and al-Birûnî is found within the important twelfth-century heresiological catalogue of al-Shahrastâni. This text reads as follows:

His doctrine regarding the Law and the Prophets was that the first whom God (may He be exalted) commissioned with knowledge and wisdom was Adam, the father of humanity; then Seth after him; then Noah after him; then Abraham after him, upon them be peace! Then He sent the Buddha to India and Zoroaster to Persia and the Messiah, the Word of God, and His Spirit, to the land of Rome and the West, and Paul after the Messiah to the same regions. Then the seal of the prophets came to Arabia.48

There are some obvious correlations with the previous statements that we have examined. God periodically dispatches select emissaries who are commissioned with “wisdom and knowledge,”49 or who at least impart a message imbued with such to humankind. Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus, the distinctively Manichaean concepts and doctrines are especially valuable in that he was undoubtedly using the original Aramaic versions of Mani’s writings and of compositions of his earliest circles of disciples. This means that a careful reading of Ephrem’s polemic will often allow us to recover the initial terminology and phrasing associated with Manichaean ideology.50 Such would appear to be the case in the present example. Although partially damaged,
enough is preserved to confirm its relevance for the present discussion: "And if they should assert out of (misplaced) reverence (?) that there were ancient teachers of (Manichaean) truth—for they say of Egyptian Hermes and of the Greek Plato and of Jesus who appeared in Judaea that 'they were heralds of that Good (Realm) to the world'..." The passage continues:

For it is so that they (ancient teachers of truth) taught these (doctrines) of the Manichaens, as they allege: if Hermes had knowledge of Primal Man, father of the ziwane, and if he had knowledge of the Pillar of Glory and of (the Realm) of Brightness and the Potter and the rest of the others regarding whom Mani taught about and also revered and addressed in prayer; if Plato had knowledge of the Maiden of Light ... [2 words illegible] ... and the Mother of Life, or the battle or the peace ... and if Jesus taught them in Judaea about refining (the Light), and if he taught the worship of those luminaries that Mani worships, the one whom they assert is the Paraclete who would come after three hundred years, and (if) then we discover that their doctrines or those of their adherents agree with one another, or (even) if one of theirs (agrees) with those of Mani, it (their allegation) is defensible. But if there is no agreement, refutation (of their allegation) is obvious.

In this passage we discern a variant form of the "prophetic succession" tradition which we have been studying via the Muslim heresiological testimonies. Ephrem provides us with what is one of the earliest attested formulations. According to the Edessene Chronicle, Ephrem died in 373 CE, which would place the composition of the Prose Refutations sometime during the mid-fourth century, barely a century removed from the floruit of Mani himself. The formal similarity of Ephrem's material to that found in the Muslim sources of half a millennium later cannot be denied. They share, for example, the affirmation made at the conclusion of their identifications of the divinely commissioned predecessors of Mani's "Paraclete" status, an affirmation which strikes one as gratuitous in Ephrem's testimony. This of the divinely commissioned predecessors of Mani's "Paraclete" status, an affirmation which strikes one as gratuitous in Ephrem's testimony. This suggests a common dependence upon Manichaen sources that conveyed this doctrine in this particular form; perhaps, as al-Biruni states, Mani's Gospel. In fact, the testimonies of Ephrem and al-Biruni are structurally identical, although their rosters of predecessors vary. Note that Ephrem gives a sequence of Hermes Trismegistus, Plato, Jesus, and Mani the Paraclete, whereas al-Biruni has the sequence Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mani the Paraclete.

Of signal importance is the terminology employed by Ephrem, which presumably reproduces the language of his Manichaen sources. The authoritative predecessors are designated "heralds (φωναὶ) of that Good (Realm)"); i.e., messengers of the Realm of Light who announce among humanity the "good news" of the Manichaean gospel. The technical use of this word for such "messengers" gains credence from Ephrem's denigrating reference to the term in another context: "Moreover we will turn and ask those advocates of error; that is to say, its 'heralds;' how the sons of Light were cast into the mouth of the sons of Darkness ..." Here the term clearly refers to proclaimers, both past and present, of Manichaen doctrines. Further, the phrase "teacher(s) of truth" (αὐτάκτος διδάσκαλος) may also indicate one or more of the same series of authoritative messengers. This last designation, if actually Manichaen, is especially intriguing in that it displays a close philological and conceptual kinship to the title borne by the Qumran personality popularly (but erroneously) termed the "Teacher of Righteousness," the מורה צדק, which would be better rendered "True Teacher," or "Teacher of Truth," as in Ephrem.

The appearance of Hermes Trismegistus and Plato in Ephrem's roster of alleged Manichaen predecessors is not as odd as it might seem at first glance. It is widely recognized that Mani derived some of his basic ideas from Bardaisan, a second-century Edessene intellectual who was thoroughly familiar with Hermetic doctrines and Greek philosophy. One of the earliest Western heresiological testimonies, the so-called Acta Archelai, asserts that Mani simply plagiarized his teachings from a collection of books which ultimately stemmed from Egypt. Moreover, the legendary tutelage of Plato by Egyptian priests, who were by definition devotees of Hermeticism, justifies his place in this chain of transmission. It seems possible that Ephrem used a Manichaen source that deliberately invoked these luminaries, as opposed to biblical figures or Eastern founders, in an attempt to gain pagan intellectual recognition for the new system. Manichaeism is based upon a "conscious syncretism," and it would appear that this syncretism did not hesitate to incorporate anything of possible utility for the advancement of its purposes. Similarly, Tardieu has argued that the inclusion of Buddha and Zoroaster in the chain cited from the Shabuhragan was expressly designed to convey an imperialistic argument to the king. Just as the Sasanian empire was comprised primarily of a union of their adherents, so too Mani's system aimed to fuse these two religions into a larger whole, thus rendering Manichaeism particularly appropriate for recognition as the Sasanian national religion. The inclusion of these pagan saints renders the religion equally attractive to a wide and influential audience in the Graeco-Roman world. The early response, albeit hostile, of Alexander of Lycopolis to Manichaen teachings suggests that literate circles were deliberately courted in Western missions.

When we turn from Ephrem and the Muslim heresiographers to consider the evidence supplied by Manichaen writings themselves, we soon discover that the sequence of prophetic forerunners, particularly its initial components, was considerably more elaborate than either Ephrem or the Muslim sources indicate. The Coptic Manichaen texts recovered from Medinat Madi in Egypt, which probably date from the fourth century CE, identify Adam, Sethel (i.e., Seth), Enosh, Enoch, Noah, and Shem as "apostle(s)" (ἀπόστολος) who preceded Mani in proclaiming the message of the Realm of Light. Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus, and Paul are also recognized members of this illustrious roster. Kephalaia 14.4-6 equates the advent of Mani "in this final generation" with the appearance of the promised Paraclete, a phrasing that is remarkably similar to al-Biruni's citations from Mani's Shabuhragan and Gospel.
The Middle Iranian Manichaean sources cohere fairly well with the evidence of the Coptic works. One particularly interesting text was published by W.B. Henning in 1934. Designated M 299a, it was part of the hoard of Middle Iranian and Old Turkish manuscripts recovered from Turfan in central Asia by German expeditions during the first two decades of the present century. This text states "and afterwards, from time to time the Holy Spirit also spoke about its greatness through the mouth of the ancestral prophets who are—Shem, Sem, Enosh, Nicotheus (?) ... and Enoch. For ... [demons (?) and was ... [a sower] of the seed of [truth (?)]. As you ...". At least two further names probably occurred between those of Nicotheus and Enoch, but the damaged state of the manuscript precludes their recovery; presumably the names of Adam and Sethel could be restored here without arouusing much dissension.

There are several things to observe about this text. The opening lines are reminiscent of the language found in al-Biruni's quotation from the Shabuhragan: "Wisdom and deeds (or: knowledge) have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messengers of God." Here in place of "God" we have "Holy Spirit" (w'kiy yw'dhr), which as Henning stated should probably be interpreted as a reference to the Light-Nous, the entity that commissions the successive Apostles of Light, here termed literally "the prophetic stations" (py'äš'n 'hyungkin). The periodicity of their missions is expressed in both using identical terminology ("from time to time"). But in al-Biruni's testimony there are no primeval forefathers listed—simply the "national" prophets Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mani, the messenger (Θεομενης, Ὀρατός) to Babylonia. Like its Coptic analogues, M 299a transmits an expanded list featuring once again the names of characters found in the early chapters of the biblical book of Genesis; namely, Enosh, Enoch, and Shem. In addition to these three figures, two anomalous entries are included—Sém, whose name occurs also in two of the Coptic lists and who is apparently identical with Shem b. Noah and Nicotheus, an otherwise enigmatic personage possessing Jewish-gnostic connections.

One is sorely tempted to see in the Manichaean duplication of Shem/Sem an allusion to the agadic identification of Shem with Melchizedek, the mysterious priestly figure of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110. However, the name (and existence of) "Sém" probably results from a scribal misunderstanding of the peculiarities in transliteration from Semitic scripts to Greek spellings. Apparently some Manichaean tradents considered Semitic שים, סם, ושמי and Greek Σήμ to be two distinct individuals due to the divergent spellings of the name. The confusion must have occurred fairly soon in the process of transmission, since Homilies 68.17 already contains both names side by side, even though Coptic script proper preserves separate signs for these sibilants.

We see therefore that authentic Manichaean texts, on the whole, display a remarkable unanimity in their articulated rosters of prophetic "predecessors." They unfailingly accord a prominent position to an initial series of primeval forefathers whose names appear in the Hebrew Bible—this despite the fact that the Bible nowhere credits them with prophetic, or even literary, prowess of any kind. That latter circumstance suggests that the biblical traditions are of miniscule interest and import for nascent Manichaism, a conclusion reinforced by the heresiological testimonies remarking its disparagement of the Hebrew Bible. Nevertheless, there exist ancient (from Mani's perspective) and persistent traditions transmitted outside the biblical canon that attribute both visionary experiences and literary productions to these same forefathers. The bulk of these traditions comprise what modern scholars term "Jewish pseudepigrapha," and it is these works which are of paramount significance for unpacking the "biblical" roots of Manichaism.

The Cologne Mani Codex and the Prophetic Succession

Among the sources utilized by the compiler(s) of the Codex is one (leaves 45-72) that consists of a series of extracts from at least five previously unattested pseudepigraphic writings. These works purportedly emanate from the primeval forefathers Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch—five of the "ancient teachers of truth" repeatedly encountered in the preserved rosters of the authoritative chain of prophets. Joined to their testimonies are citations taken from the writings of the Christian apostle Paul and lastly Mani himself, who is pointedly identified as the promised Paraclete. The structure of this portion of the Codex thus formally mirrors several of the lists examined above, save that the former includes representative evidence for the exalted status of each figure in the series, and is furthermore bracketed by introductory and concluding material that cements it within the surrounding narrative context. The lists by contrast simply assert the prophets' identities without providing justificatory evidence for the claim.

The "expanded" nature of the Codex passage suggests that this section was deliberately designed as an ἀπολογία for the religious experience and teachings of Mani, both of which receive copious attention in the Codex. This entire section (leaves 45-72) was contributed intact by "Baraies, the teacher" (Βαραίης ὁ διδάσκαλος), a prominent second-generation Manichaean leader whose name also figures in the heresiological literature. It is he who was doubtless responsible for the final integrity of this piece. However, its rhetoric probably faithfully reflects the same style of argument employed by Mani himself in establishing the credibility of his mission. Baraies says as much in the lines which introduce the section: "Know then, brethren, and understand all these things written herein concerning the way in which this apostleship in this generation was sent, just as we have been taught from him." The final clause of this statement suggests that Baraies is explicitly imitating the way that Mani himself talked (or wrote?) about what is here (and elsewhere in the Codex) termed the "apostleship" (ἡ ἀποστολή), the obvious Greek reflex of what the other traditions we have examined referred to as "teachers of truth," "heralds," "ancestral prophets," and "messengers."
Baraies now goes on to say:

Furthermore, let him who is willing hearken and pay attention to how each one of the primeval patriarchs communicated his own revelation to a select (group) of his apostles—whom he chose and gathered together from that generation during which he appeared, and after writing (it down), he left it for future generations. Each (patriarch) revealed (information) about his heavenly journey, and they (i.e., the chosen group) promulgated beyond ... to record and display afterwards, and to laud and exalt their teachers and the truth and the hope that was revealed to them. Thus each one spoke and wrote down a memoir recounting what he saw, including (an account) about his heavenly journey, during the period and cycle of his apostleship.

This passage provides an explanation for why Mani and his adherents took such interest in the “primeval patriarchs” and the pseudepigraphic writings ascribed to them. Each patriarch had made a heavenly ascent (ἡ ἀρχαῖα ἀνάβασις) during which they toured the divine realm and were made privy to esoteric knowledge. After returning to earth, they revealed their experiences and issued exhortations based upon the same to a small group of their peers, presumably selected on account of their moral fitness. In addition to promulgating their teachings orally among their disciples, each forefather also prepared a written first-person account of their experiences for future readers. The disciples apparently bore some responsibility for the faithful preservation and transmission of the inscribed testimonies to the later generations.

There are therefore several key credentials for candidacy as a representative of the heavenly Light-Nous. At their bare minimum they include an ascent-experience, the formation and supervision of a select community of adherents who cherish the teachings of the adept, and the preparation of a written “memoir” (ἀπομνημονεύματα) that faithfully records the circumstances of the ascent and some indication of the contents of the revelation. From Mani’s perspective, traditional figures who met these conditions merited consideration for apostolic status.

As we shall see in the next chapter, Second Temple and Roman era Jewish literature and early Christian pseudepigrapha provide an especially rich harvest of such traditions, a yield that Mani and his community were not adverse to co-opting and adapting to their own ends. “Apocalypses” or “testaments” emanating from pre-Mosaic biblical figures, Jesus of Nazareth, and prominent Christian apostles would have been particularly attractive to a young religious movement that was consciously seeking legitimation within scripturally grounded communities. The typically autobiographical form of these genres creates an aura of credibility. First-person narrative connotes actual experience, and it is the peculiar experience of heavenly ascent that grants prestige to the one so privileged: “For this reason we (Baraies? or the ultimate compilers of the Codex?) have transmitted the ascension and the revelation of our forefathers ... for when each of them had ascended, [all those things which he saw] and heard he recorded and revealed, and he himself bore witness to his revelation, and his disciples became the seal of his apostleship.”

The author bears personal witness to the veracity of what is recounted, and his success in winning adherents not only adds luster to his reputation, but also vindicates his authority.

We should moreover realize that the standard rhetorical settings of the genres “apocalypse” and “testament” lend themselves rather easily to “secl-arian” adaptation. Neither genre was designed or intended for mass appeal. They deliberately, often explicitly, eschew popular dissemination in favor of issuing didactic and exhortatory instruction to small circles or conventicles of disciples—the “sons” of testamentary works, the “elect” of apocalyptic. They thus foreshadow the Manichaean fascination with the motif of selective revelation, where the divine message is first communicated to chosen groups of disciples, and its emphasis upon the careful preservation and transmission of the words of the righteous elders from generation to generation.

Baraies provides quotations from “apocalypses” (ἀποκάλυψεις) attributed to Adam, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, and Shem, ascriptions which place them nominally (at least) in the category of Jewish pseudepigrapha. Each is an autobiographical description of an unsolicited angelophany that leads to a tour of the divine realm and the revelation of supernal secrets. As previously stated, they do not literally reproduce texts which correspond with other previously known writings that are attributed to these same authors. Yet as we shall see in our close analysis of their contents, they do fit within the literary universe of such texts. Comparative analysis of these five apocalypses will show that overall they share a similar formal structure, raising the suspicion that they have been artificially and secondarily fashioned by resourceful redactors who had access to reservoirs of authentic Jewish pseudepigraphic traditions. The purpose of such fabrication and manipulation of textual fragments is clear— to demonstrate that Mani, the Paraclete of truth, is an authentic link in the chain of “apostles.”

The assertion that Mani, as well as others in his Mesopotamian environment, knew and used literature and traditions associated with Second Temple and Roman era Jewish groups is not made lightly. Before proceeding with our detailed examination of the pseudepigraphic “apocalypses” contained in the Codex, it will behoove us to devote some time to the examination of the literary and intellectual traditions which accumulated around the antediluvian biblical forefathers in the late antique Near Eastern religious milieu. We will also need to speculate concerning the possible avenues of transmission through which Mani and subsequent teachers collected this useful material. Chapter Two shall explore these concerns.


1Henrichs-Koenen, ZPE 5 (1970) 100; Koenen, "Manichaische Mission" 93 n.s.


13For the identity and location of the quotations from the pseudepigraphic works and the Pauline epistles, see below. The writings of Mani which are quoted are his "Epistle to Edessa" (64.8-65.22) and his "Gospel" (66.4-68.5; 68.6-69.9; 69.9-70.10).

14The unusual form of this name will be treated in Chapter Four below.

15Adam (48.16-50.7); Sethel (50.8-52.7); Enoch (52.8-55.9); Shem (55.10-58.5), and Enoch (58.6-60.7).

16Gal 1:1 (60.18-23); 2 Cor 12:1-5 (61.2-14); Gal 1:11-12 (61.16-22).


18According to Origen (apud Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica 6.38), the Elchasaites "totally reject the Apostle" (τον ἀπόστολον τέλειον ἀδέται); i.e., Paul's Mani- chæan brethren pointedly accuse him of wishing to "go to the Greeks" or "to the gentiles." See CMC 80.16-19, 87.19-22; 89.9-92. Paul was branded as "Greek, child of a Greek mother and Greek father" by the Ebionites (φιλοκοιτούν τοῦ ἐλληνα ἐλληνίδος μητρός καὶ ἐλληνικὸς μαθητής ἐλληνος πατέρα παιδίον) (Epiphanius, Panarion 30.16.9).


20CMC 63.21-23 (τον παρακλήτον τη[ς ἀληθείας]), 70.20-22 (τον παρακλήτον τη[ς ἀληθείας]). For this discussion of this identification, see below.

21Titus Bostrensis, Titii Bostreni contra manichaeos libri quatuor syriaco (ed. P.A. de Lagarde; Berlin: C. Schulze, 1859) 129: καθὼς ἔκβιβάζεται, ὁ Καθως ἔκβιβάζεται; Syriac text also cited by K. Kessler, Mani: Forschungen über die manichäische Religion (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1889) 302. Note also the testimony of Ephrem: ηλληνικὸς πατέρας ὁ πατέρας τοῦ παρακλήτου τη[ς ἀληθείας]; ηλληνικὸς πατέρας ὁ πατέρας τοῦ παρακλήτου τη[ς ἀληθείας]. "For just as the Jews revile the New Testament, they (the Mani- chæans) revile our Old Testament." Text cited from Prose Refutations (ed. Mitchell) 1:43 lines 40-44. See also Epiphanius, Panarion 66.31.2; 66.74.1 (GCB 37; ed. K. Hoff; Leipzig: I.C. Hinrichs, 1933) 69, 114-15; Augustine, De haeresibus 46.5; "Deum qui legis per Mosyen dedit, et in hebraeis prophetic locutus est, non esse verum Deum, sed unum ex principibus tenebatur." Text cited from Adam, Texte 69 lines 160-62.

22So Reeves, Jewish Lore; idem, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha," Tardieu, Le manichéisme 43.

23The Light-Nows or Great Nows (Middle Iranian Wahman) is an emanation of Jesus the Splendor, a heavenly entity belonging to the third set of evocations ("the third creation") prompted by the original assault of the forces of Darkness upon the Realm of Light. It is significantly termed "the Father of all the Apostles" (Kephalaia 35.22). See Lieu, Manichaism 23. Numerous references to the Light-Now in Manichaean writings have been accumulated by Van Lindt, Names 154-69.

24See Kephalaia 9.24-14.4; 36.3-6; Puech, Le manichéisme 61-63, 144-46 (n.241); Reeves, Jewish Lore 4 n.3.

25Manichaean texts which stress the special status of these three "historical" or "ethnic" prophets include Kephalaia 7.18.8-7, 12.14.20; M 42 (Andrews-Henning, Mir. Man. III 878-81; M. Boyce, A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 170-73; H.-J. Klimkeit, Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from
Islamic Fihrist 9 17 7 Refutatio Milal Panarion Studia Iranica 122-23.  For this last text, see M. Tardieu, “La diffusion of Muhammad, is almost certainly of Manichaean origin and designates the teleological "seal" is frequently employed in Manichaean ideology; e.g., the "Three Seals" (μεν ανω ενα, αυτον δε μεταγγιζομεν εν σωμασι πολλοις του θεου γεγενθαι, ποτε δε πνευμα γεγονεν, ποτε δε εκ παρθενου, ποτε δε ου· και τοτου δε μετεπειτα αει εν σωμασι μεταγγιζεσθαι και εν πολλοις κατα καιρους ηγουμεν ηαι και αει ποτε φαινομεν. και πρωτον μεν πεπλασθαι αυτον εν τω 
translation cited from ibid. 196-97. Note the fragmentary incipit that concludes 68) 71.

Epiphanius, Panarion 33.1.8: Χριστον και ναον όμολογουσι, κτισμα αυτον εν τω τεω μενεγεσθαι δτε βολεται. Text and translation cited from Klijn-Reinink, Jewish Lore 1.19; 2.4-12; 3.17-28; 11.19; Αδαμ και παλιν ένδυεσθαι, δε βολεται. See also...). However, in light of the parallel expressions found in other sources, perhaps "deeds" should be emended to "knowledge" (και της αληθεια προφηται, ιτ*•^1 •• ^ 1-i•* ^ 1^Jl^li c-ijl) on the same source for this portion of their testimonies. See the remarks below regarding Ibn al-Murjâda’s reliance upon a “book of Yazdânabkht.” Coincidentally, there is within the Rasâîl of the so-called “Brethren of Purity” (IKhwân al-Safa) an attempt to connect the eschatological concepts of the Mahdî and the “Greatest Paraclete,” the former of whom also bears the sobriquet “The Seventh.” See the discussion (with references) of L. Netton, Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity (IKhwân al-Safâ) (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982) 68.

13.27-28. To the religious and political orientations found in other sources, perhaps "deeds" should be emended to "knowledge" (και της αληθεια προφηται, ιτ*•^1 •• ^ 1-i•* ^ 1^Jl^li c-ijl) on the same source for this portion of their testimonies. See the remarks below regarding Ibn al-Murjâda’s reliance upon a “book of Yazdânabkht.” Coincidentally, there is within the Rasâîl of the so-called “Brethren of Purity” (IKhwân al-Safa) an attempt to connect the eschatological concepts of the Mahdî and the “Greatest Paraclete,” the former of whom also bears the sobriquet “The Seventh.” See the discussion (with references) of L. Netton, Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity (IKhwân al-Safâ) (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982) 68.


2.4-12; 3.17-28; 11.19; Αδαμ και παλιν ένδυεσθαι, δε βολεται. See also...). However, in light of the parallel expressions found in other sources, perhaps "deeds" should be emended to "knowledge" (και της αληθεια προφηται, ιτ*•^1 •• ^ 1-i•* ^ 1^Jl^li c-ijl) on the same source for this portion of their testimonies. See the remarks below regarding Ibn al-Murjâda’s reliance upon a “book of Yazdânabkht.” Coincidentally, there is within the Rasâîl of the so-called “Brethren of Purity” (IKhwân al-Safa) an attempt to connect the eschatological concepts of the Mahdî and the “Greatest Paraclete,” the former of whom also bears the sobriquet “The Seventh.” See the discussion (with references) of L. Netton, Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity (IKhwân al-Safâ) (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982) 68.

1.59-60; G. Monnot, "Das Mahdî’s siegel," Orientalia Suecana 33-35 (1984-86) 72. Compare the testimony of al-Jabbar, that of al-Shahrastani below, as well as M. Tardieu, “Al-kifka wa-l-il-im ‘dans une citation of Mani chez al-Bīrûnî,” AIJUN 41 (1981) 477-81; idem, Le manichéisme 30. Note also M 5794 I V lines 10-14: iswm kw ‘y bnwymzn ‘yg dw bwn ‘wd nbyqng zndg ‘whd ‘whd nyl ‘mn c ‘h ‘pyynng dw fr ‘ydr ‘wd hy ndy ‘Fourth, this revelation of mine of (the) Two Principles and (the) living books and wisdom and knowledge is greater than the religions of the ancients.” Texts from M 5794 cited from Boyce, Reader 30. The converse emendation for al-Shahrastani (from "knowledge" to "deeds") was proposed by Kessler, Man 317 n.1.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE


44Compare *IQS* 8.15-16: "...this is the study of the Torah [which] He commanded from time to time, and likewise with what the prophets revealed by means of His holy spirit...." Polotsky has pointed out the similarity in his note to this Kephalaia text. Interestingly, the authors of the Qumran scrolls sometimes express the belief that they belong to "the final generation" (יוֹמֵי הַיּוֹם; see CD 1:12; *IQS* 2:7, 7:2; *IDJD* 1, p. 79).

Since all of Mani’s predecessors proclaimed an identical message despite their diverse cultural settings, one might be justified in considering all of their “teachings” to have some import for the End of Days. This is explicitly so for Enoch who, as we shall see, is one of the prominent prophetic heralds in the Manichaean chain. See 1 Enoch 1:2b: ‘και όουκ εις την νυν γενεαν διενοούμην, αλλα επι πόρρω ουσαν εγω λαλω “and not about this generation, but rather for a distant generation do I speak.”’ This (1:2b) is an obvious paraphrase of Num 24:17a: מנה את הכתובת הזאת על כל קדש קדוש derekh הוהי הוהי הוהי: See also 1 Enoch 92:1: “Written by Enoch the scribe — for all my sons who dwell upon the earth and for the last generations who will practice uprightness and peace.” The latter translation is that of M.A. Kalb, “1 Enoch,” *AOT* (Sparks) 294. Unless otherwise stated, all citations of the Greek versions of 1 Enoch are taken from *Apocryphal Henoch* *Græce* (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970), and all quotations of the Aramaic text are based upon the edition of J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

45Identified by al-Biruni as Mani’s Gospel. Other heresiographers (Epiphanius, Ya’qubi) attest the alphabetical format of this work; see also *Homilies* 94.18-19; *Psalm-Book* 46.20 for references to the twenty-two chapters. Prior to the publication of the CMC, a few fragments of the Gospel had been recovered from Turfan (M 17, M 172 I). See Boyce, *Reader* 32-33; Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 192-202. Interestingly, the comments of Baraies that synopsize the Greek citations of the Gospel in the CMC incorporate both of the claims (Paraclete-status, seal of the apostolate) contained in al-Biruni’s summary; see 70.10-23; 72.4-6.

By claiming the status of Paraclete, Mani takes his place among an illustrious roster of religious teachers who regarded themselves, or were regarded by others, as the fulfillment of Jesus’s cryptic promise (John 14:15ff.; 15:26; 16:17) of a future authoritative instructor. Apart from Mani, candidates for Paraclete-status included Paul, Montanus, Sergius (Paulicent), and even Muhammad. See especially Puech, *Le manichéisme* 147 n.250.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

48al-Shahrastani, *Kitāb al-mītal wa-al-nihāt* (2 vols.; ed. M.S. Khilani; Beirut: Dar el-Marefah, n.d.) 1:124-64: "And with respect to the Christian and the Jew, I ask: Is there anyone who has been revealed since the time of the prophets? Indeed, it was revealed to the Hebrews and the Christians and also to the people of the Arabs, and therefore I do not accept the claim of any who pretend to be Paraclete or the seal of the apostolate. And from that they are revealed, and from that they are sealed, and from that they are called, and from that they are known......"

49Assuming the aforementioned suggested emendation of “deeds” to “knowledge” is accepted.

50Tardieu considers the inclusion of these figures an illustration of the conscious “universalizing” trajectory of early Manichaeeism. Like his Jewish-Christian forebears, Mani rejects the biblical “writing prophets” (including Moses and hence Judaism), but expands the list of authentic predecessors to incorporate representatives from every portion of the late antique Graeco-Persian world.

51Colpe considers the possibility that the phrase as transmitted refers not to Muhammad, but to Mani. See his discussion in *Orientalia Suecana* 33-35 (1984-86) 75-76.

52Compare the testimony of the eleventh-century Iranian heresiographer Abū’l-Ma‘ālī in his *Bayān al-adīyn* (apud Keckes, *Mani* 371 lines 12-15): "...for a distant age the Hebrews and Christians and Persians and Arabs were revealed and their traditions were handed down to their posterity. And they believe in the prophetic status of Adam, upon whom be peace, and then in the prophetic status of Seth and Noah, upon whom be peace; then in the prophetic status of a man who was in Hindustan, named Buddha; and Zaraster was (of) prophetic status in Persia, and they call Mani ‘the seal of the prophets.’” Note too the thirteenth-century sages Ibn al-Murtadā in his *al-ṣawr al-malikī wa-al-amal* (apud Keckes, *Mani* 349 lines 11-13): "...and the book of Yazdānbakhsh declares in his book that Adam was the first prophet, then Seth, then Noah, and the Buddha was sent to India, and Zaraster to Persia, and Jesus to the West; then (finally) Mani the Paraclete, the seal of the prophets.” He cites as his authority the “book of Yazdānbakhsh,” presumably that of Abū ‘Ali Rajab b. Yazdānbakhsh, a leader of the Manichaeans during the caliphate of al-Mu‘āwī (683-833 CE). See Ibn al-Nadim, *Fihrist* (apud Flügel, *Mani* 79-80; Dodge, *Fihrist* 2:805; A. Abel, “Les sources arabes sur le manichéisme,” *Annales de l’Institut de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales et Slaves* (Bruxelles) 16 (1961-62) 63.

53Unless there were later Manichaean sects under ‘Abbāsid rule who envisioned a continuing line of prophetic guidance up to their own era, hence accepting “true prophets” after the demise of Mani. A possible analogy from the world of Umayyad Jewish elites is the Ḳiṣwiyya, a Jewish sect who accommodated both Christians and Muslims by including places in their prophetology for Jesus and Muhammad. For a recent thorough treatment of this sect, see SM. Wasserman, “The Ḳiṣwiyya Revisited,” *Studia Islamica* 75 (1992) 57-80. Note sans doute remaniement ou interpolation du texte dans un sens favorable à Mahomet (Puech, *Le manichéisme* 146 n.248). Similarly Friedlaender, *IQS* 5 (1912-13) 2:17; Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* 24; D. Gimaret and G. Monnot, *Shahrastani: Manichæisch-mittelperschen* (Le manichæisme) (Bruxelles) 16 (1961-62) 63.

54Abraham is termed אברם in Gen 20:7. The biblical context suggests that Abraham’s “prophetic” status rests upon his close relationship with a deity who has the power to heal Abimelech of his physical afflictions, thus inviting comparison with “wonder-working” prophets like Elijah and Elisha. The only biblical indication that Abraham
was granted insight into heavenly mysteries appears in Gen 15:11-21 during the so-called “covenant of the pieces,” particularly in its postbiblical exegesis—see John R.S.; Acts 7:7; 4 Ezra 3:15; Apoc. Abr. 11-32. Graeco-Jewish writers tend to attribute Abraham’s prophetic powers to his mastery of the Chaldean sciences. For exemplary discussions of this motif, see B.Z. Wacholder, “Pseudo-Eupolemus’ Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham,” HUCA 34 (1963) 101-103; J.E. Bowley, “The Compositions of Abraham,” Tracing the Threads (ed. Reeves) 226-32. Note also the “testimony” of Berossus provided by Josephus, Ant. 1.158: κατὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν δικτύτα γενεὰ παρά Χαλδαίοις τις ἦν δίκαιος ἀνήρ καὶ μέγας εμπειρος.

35However, Augustine provides some evidence that Abraham may have won some positive recognition among Manichaecans; see his contra Faustum 19.3.


37For a fresh collection and annotated discussion of this material, see J.C. Reeves, “Manichaean Citations from the Prose Refutations of Ephrem.” Emerging From the Darkness (ed. J. BeDuhn, forthcoming).

38Ephrem, Prose Refutations (ed. Mitchell) 2.208 lines 17-29: “He was called the Messiah (though falsely); he infused his prophets with a lying spirit, and broke his body for his disciples, and divided the earth among his heralds: using the name of our Lord against our Lord. When he learned that he was not being accepted, openly to many he declared himself an Apostle, the Paraclete who just recently manifested. Blessed (be you) who delayed and so trapped him,” proceeds with what he considers to be the most “obvious” rebuttals.

39Ephrem proceeds with what he considers to be the most “obvious” rebuttals.

40L. Hallier, Untersuchungen über die Edessensche Chronik (TU 9.1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1892) 149.

41The “Egyptian Hermes” (ηεωποννάων Ερμής) is a common designation in late antiquity for Hermes Trismegistus, regarding whom see especially G. Fowden, The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind (Cambridge, 1986; reprinted, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995). That the same figure is intended here is confirmed by Ephrem’s subsequent allusion to the πολυτριχος; i.e., the κρατήρ or “mixing bowl,” a reference to the tractate known now as Corpus Hermeticum IV. Curiously, L. Mistagnon has suggested that “pour des manichéens, Hermès était le premier des cinq prêcheurs, prophètes avant Mani ...” (my emphasis), but apart from Ephrem there are no other witnesses to the heretical status of Hermes within Manichaeism. Perhaps Mistagnon counted Hermes as three separate figures (3+1+1) in order to reach this sum. The quotation comes from his “Inventaire de la littérature hermétique arabe,” apud A.-J. Festugière, La révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste, 1: L’Astrologie et les sciences occultes (2d ed.; reprinted, Paris: Société d’Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983) 384.

42Yet true to Tardieu’s observation, the inclusion here of Hermes Trismegistus and Plato illustrates once again the ecumenical thrust of Mani’s mission. Hellenistic paganism has no representatives in the Muslim lists; that omission is remedied in Ephrem’s list.

43See also Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses (CSCO 169, scrip. syr. 76; ed. E. Beck; Louvain: L. Durbeq, 1957) 22-14 (pp. 82-83): “He was called the Messiah (though falsely); he infused his prophets with a lying spirit, and broke his body for his disciples, and divided the earth among his heralds: using the name of our Lord against our Lord. When he learned that he was not being accepted, openly to many he declared himself an Apostle, the Paraclete who just recently manifested. Blessed (be you) who delayed and so trapped him,” proceeds with what he considers to be the most “obvious” rebuttals. For exemplary discussions of this motif, see B.Z. Wacholder, “Pseudo-Eupolemus’ Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham,” HUCA 34 (1963) 101-103; J.E. Bowley, “The Compositions of Abraham,” Tracing the Threads (ed. Reeves) 226-32. Note also the “testimony” of Berossus provided by Josephus, Ant. 1.158: κατὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν δικτύτα γενεὰ παρά Χαλδαίοις τις ἦν δίκαιος ἀνήρ καὶ μέγας εμπειρος.
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CHAPTER TWO

THE FOREFATHERS AS AUTHORS IN LATE ANTIQUE AND MEDIEVAL NEAR EASTERN RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS

Biblical literature is totally mute regarding any scribal or literary activity during the period of the primeval forefathers. In fact, the writer's craft is barely mentioned prior to the heyday of the bureaucratically obsessed Achaemenian Empire, a dominion whose vast extent necessitated an increased reliance upon an imperial chancellory and its attendant correspondence and record-keeping for effective governance of the provinces. During this period the scribal office, along with the literature preserved and generated by it, achieves a hitherto unrealized pinnacle of status. The value of the "written word" as a testimony to historical precedent and a guide for contemporary policy invests the archival record, and concomitantly the scribal profession that produces it, with an authority and power that rivals the extemporaneous command of the king. Written literature begins to acquire an aura of prestige that is directly connected to its proven efficacy in the administrative sphere. When questions or disputes arise concerning long-standing issues, the correspondence and decrees of earlier rulers can be consulted in the official archives. Their written format suggests an official, objective status.

It is only a short step from this practical utility of the written document in establishing authority to the employment of the "written word" in order to control the composition and growth of national traditions. Once this step is taken, the notion of a national literary "canon" becomes credible. It would thus appear to be no accident that it is precisely during this period of scribal ascendancy that what comes to be termed the "biblical canon" begins to assume the shape it bears today. Most critics admit that the extant form of the canonical Hebrew Bible is the product of Second Temple scribal activity. While much of the underlying tradition may indeed extend well back into the first half of the first millennium BCE, the selection, editorial arrangement, and even the very wording of the national legends is the result of intensive activity on the part of a number of scribal circles within Judaea and diaspora communities during the postexilic period. Thanks to the recovery of the Qumran scrolls, as well as the evidence of the variant texts of works preserved in the Septuagint, we now know that the Second Temple era was a period of vibrant literary and intellectual ferment within the

---


95The term "Jewish pseudepigrapha" can be problematic, given the realization that the survival of much of the former is due to its preservation and transmission by non-Jewish scribes, historians, and communities. See the perspicacious remarks of R.A. Kraft, "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," Tracing the Threads (ed. Reesee) 55-86.

96This possibility has been independently proposed by D. Frankfurter in his "Apocalypses Real and Alleged in the Mani Codex," a paper presented before the Manichaem Group of the Society of Biblical Literature in November 1995. I thank Professor Frankfurter for sharing with me a copy of his important study, the published version of which is forthcoming in Numen.
Jewish community. The process of collecting and redacting those works which eventually came to be recognized as "sacred scripture" was coupled with (and probably not perceived as being different in kind to) the production and/or collection of a vast host of literary traditions surrounding the heroes of the national legends. Presumably at some point and within some circles these latter works too enjoyed an esteem that approached "sacral" status, prior to their eventual castigation by later generations of the orthodox as "pseudepigrapha."

Despite the prominence of the scribal office during the Second Temple period, and despite their demonstrable involvement in the creation and dissemination of the national traditions, some ambivalent attitudes toward the craft of writing and the lofty status of written literature are evident in the sources. Both the "biblical" and "pseudepigraphic" libraries were produced by scribes, but it is only in the latter collection that the biblical forefathers are imagined as authoring and passing down literature to future generations. There would appear to be some tension between the realization that the prominence of written literature was a fairly recent phenomenon, and the understandable desire to project the performance of a cherished and respected activity into the distant past. At any rate, literary works were produced that freely adapted their protagonists to a scribal model, typically identifying an early forefather as the inventor of the scribal craft.

Literate forefathers assume a literature to be read and preserved. The scribal circles responsible for the creation and production of Israelite literature soon progressed from simply asserting their protagonists' familiarity with letters to producing works allegedly authored by them. Literary works that were formally anonymous came to be ascribed to the great figures of the national legends. The foundational document of Judaism, the Torah, becomes associated with Moses. Early "historical" narratives that recount the post-Conquest and monarchical periods are attributed to Solomon's reputed wisdom finds exemplification in "his" collections of aphorisms and symbolic verse.

This pattern of the revelation, authorship, and faithful transmission of pre-Mosaic sacred literature is demonstrably present in Second Temple era literary productions such as the Book of Jubilees and the Slavonic Book of Enoch. It is however not limited to these works, as the mounting evidence from the continuing publication of the Qumran scrolls testifies. The popularity of this idea is also illustrated by its subsequent adaptation by the later Christian, gnostic, and Muslim communities to suit their distinctive ideological programs, exemplified respectively by the Cave of Treasures cycle, so-called "Sethian" gnostic currents, and the qisas-'anbiya collections. For our purposes, however, the most relevant analogue to the Jewish pattern is the Manichaean doctrine of the predecessor "heralds." There too the forefathers are depicted as authors of revelatory texts which are passed down from generation to generation; moreover, the contemporary Manichaean community retains possession of these "primal scriptures."

Hence the Manichaean esteem for ancient worthies like Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch, and their ascription to them of written literature, betrays an ultimately Jewish heritage.

Before focusing our attention upon the texts of the five biblical forefathers that are found in the Codex, it may prove useful to survey the non-Manichaean evidence regarding literary works that were allegedly authored by these figures. As we have previously mentioned, the Codex excerpts do not literally correspond with any of the previously known works that are attributed to these same authors. Nevertheless, they do exhibit certain general affinities to the pseudepigraphic traditions associated with each author, and thus can profitably be subsumed among the other accepted representatives of early pseudepigraphic literature. But this is to anticipate a portion of the argument which will be offered throughout Chapters Three through Seven of the present work.

Books of Adam

The terse biblical narrative recounting the creation of Adam and Eve, their experience in the Garden of Eden, their resultant punishment and expulsion, and the birth of three of their sons offers abundant opportunities for
supplementation and expansion by creative authors. The apostle Paul’s typological fabrication of an Adam-Christ nexus contributed considerable impetus to the Christian manufacture of an appropriately proleptic literature. A labyrinthine maze of so-called Books of Adam and Eve obligingly flourishes, almost all of which display clear signs of a Christian redaction, but some of which may ultimately stem from earlier legends current in the late Second Temple period of Judaism. The most reliable guide for negotiating this literature is M.E. Stone, who has recently provided a very useful survey of the corpus of Adam literature used by Jews and Christians in late antiquity.5

Stone arranges the sources under two broad rubrics: (1) primary Adam books, which may very well be of Jewish origin; and (2) secondary Adam literature, all of which are derivative works and probably Christian in provenance. Among the primary Adam books he lists the Greek Apocalypse of Moses, which some scholars view as the oldest example of such a text; the Latin Vita Adam et Evae and the Slavonic Vita Adam et Evae, which parallel the Apocalypse of Moses at certain points but also relay much additional material; and the Armenian Penitence of Adam and the Georgian Book of Adam, works which may, according to Stone, actually reflect the most primitive version of an Adam book.6 There is also a Coptic fragment that displays some affinities with the Armenian and Georgian Adam books. The secondary Adam literature, which is much more diffuse, includes works like the Testament of Adam, the Syriac Cave of Treasures, the Ethiopic Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan, and numerous Armenian Adamsschriften. While Stone is also aware of gnostic and Muslim allusions to “books of Adam,” he declines to address these testimonia in any systematic way “since they lead into quite other fields of enquiry.”7

One possible textual stimulus for the idea that Adam produced literature is found in the first four words of Gen 5:1: יד אדomiteד: “this is the book of the generations of Adam.” Ramban notes that this phrase is unlike those that are normally used to relate a genealogical table.8 The Sages declare that it was a “heavenly book” which God showed to Adam wherein was inscribed the names of the numerous illustrious worthies who would descend from him.9 This work therefore does not qualify as a pseudepigraphon produced by Adam, nor is there any indication that Adam received a copy of this book to pass on to posterity. But there are certain strands of Jewish tradition which are less vague about Adam as author. A pregnant biblical phrase, such as Ps 139:16, is widely held to be an utterance of Adam.10 Similarly the whole of Psalm 92 is sometimes ascribed to Adam.11 A “Prayer of Adam” (דומא שים 담) occurs in the introduction to the יד אדomiteד (Secrets of Secrets) of R. Eleazar b. Judah of Worms,12 an early thirteenth-century compilation of theological, largely esoteric lore whose initial section was first published in 1701 among the contents of the so-called Sefer Raziel.13 The text of this prayer displays several parallels with motifs found in earlier Adam traditions; e.g., the idea that Adam felt remorse for his transgression to the point that he vocally besought God for forgiveness, or Adam’s request that he be granted knowledge about the future deeds of his progeny.14 In response to Adam’s prayer (imagined as continuing for three days), the angel Raziel is dispatched to him bearing a “holy book” containing information about “what will happen to you up to the day of your death, and (what will happen to) all of your progeny who shall arise after you ...”15 Those who faithfully adhere to the precepts inscribed therein shall also acquire the same esoteric wisdom that is promised Adam. Subsequent beneficiaries of this revelation are Enoch, Noah (who requires a new gift of the book from the angel Raphael), Shem, and Abraham. The Zohar is cognizant of a similar tradition.16 Interestingly a “book of Adam” (סודן ראוזיא), apparently some sort of magical manual, was condemned by the ninth-century Karaite author Daniel al-Qamisi.17 The work which provoked his censure was probably a recension of the Sefer ha-Razim (“Book of Secrets”), a Gaonic compilation of incantations and sundry esoteric whose roots stretch back to the magical lore of late antiquity. Its modern editor has called attention to both manuscript and literary evidence that identifies Sefer ha-Razim as the heavenly book revealed to Adam by the angel Raziel.18

An Apocalypse of Adam was found among the Nag Hammadi hoard of manuscripts. From a formal standpoint, the work is actually a “testament”:19 Adam recounts the contents of the book to Seth “in the 700th year”; i.e., the 700th year after the birth of Seth, or the year of his death according to Septuagintal chronology.20 Despite some widely accepted disclaimers, this Coptic work appears to share certain motifs with the identically labelled CMC fragment.21 A mysterious quotation found in Barn. 2:10 wears the marginal gloss ἱπεραναί: “ἐστιν αὐτοῦ "Psalm 50 and in the apocalypse of Adam,”22 but the text does not verbally parallel any known Adamic work. However, its emphasis upon the efficacy of contrition and humility in winning God’s favor suggests a possible connection with the “repentance of Adam” theme that is rather popular in the Adamic books. Moreover, Epiphanius informs us that certain gnostic groups treasured books “which they call revelations of Adam,”23 from which we can infer that a healthy number of such works were circulating during late antiquity.

Interestingly, one chapter of Mani’s Book of Mysteries incorporated “the testimony of Adam about Jesus” (پهشداة آدم علي مسيحي),24 an apparent reference to the so-called “Prophecy” section of the Testament of Adam.25 Therein Adam imparts information about future events (such as the Deluge) to his son Seth, terminating with a detailed prediction about the coming of the Christian Messiah. Seth then faithfully records and preserves his father’s words for posterity. The Testament of Adam was extremely popular among eastern Christian communities, texts of which are extant in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Georgian,26 and allusions to which occur in a variety of sources that share connections with the Syriac Cave of Treasures cycle.27 In the opinion of its most recent translator, the “Prophecy” section of the Testament was originally composed in Syriac sometime during the third century CE.28 If this assessment is accurate, Mani could have indeed drawn upon and adapted material from this portion of the Testament for use in his Book of Mysteries.29
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Books of Seth

The birth of Seth, the son of Adam, is reported in Gen 4:25:

"And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son, and named him Seth, saying, "For God has granted me another seed in place of Abel, whom Cain killed.""

Gen 5:3 informs us that Seth, like his father Adam, was created in the image of God, the only forefather subsequent to Adam who is so characterized. Aside from these names, and apart from the bare mention of his name in genealogical charts, Seth plays no further role in biblical literature.

Seth however enjoys extensive development in extrabiblical traditions, particularly among later Christian and gnostic groups. A tendency to view Seth as the offspring who manages to recover, or at the very least maintain, the glory forfeited by Adam as a result of the latter's transgression of the divine commandment emerges in these circles. Among most exegetes, this understanding expresses itself in an early bifurcation of humanity between the glory forfeited by Adam as a result of his conscious decision to pursue righteousness, he too was favored with divine intimacy. Numerous "books of Seth" emerge in late antiquity, particularly among gnostic circles, for whom Seth seems to stand as a heavenly being who repeatedly manifests among fallen humanity in or by virtue of their continued residence in the proximity of Paradise and their sincere desire to pursue righteousness and devotion to God, Seth and his immediate progeny are virtual mirrors of God's presence upon earth. They fulfill, to the greatest possible extent given their circumstances, the original vision of God regarding the place of humanity in the created order. The "descendants of Cain," by contrast, represent the logical development of first Adam's and then Cain's misdeeds: an increasingly depraved community of rebels who are totally alienated from God and his terrestrial representatives. The later descendants of Seth (with the exception of only a very few) eventually succumb to the blandishments of the "daughters of Cain," abandon their previous lifestyle, and join in the general corruption of the earth, an event that is chronicled (according to this interpretive trajectory) in Gen 6:1-4. In order to insure the preservation of the "righteous seed" (personified in Noah and his son Shem), God is forced to bring the Flood, after which the history of humanity begins anew.

Seth therefore becomes an important transitional figure in the mediation of divine wisdom to future generations. Not only was Seth privy to the testimony of Adam regarding his mistakes and to the transcripts of divine commandment experienced by his father after his repentance, but as a result of his conscious decision to pursue righteousness, he too was favored with divine intimacy. Numerous "books of Seth" emerge in late antiquity, particularly among gnostic circles, for whom Seth seems to become a type of patron "saint." Since Seth is the progenitor of the "sons of God," he comes to be recognized as the ancestor (both physical and spiritual) of all the later righteous generations, including most importantly the gnostic groups themselves. Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius are familiar with certain groups whom they term "Sethians." Among these groups Seth is viewed as a heavenly being who repeatedly manifests among fallen humanity in or by virtue of the periodic mission of the "herald" or "true prophet" found in Manichaeism and Jewish Christianity.

"Books of Seth" were especially popular among gnostic communities. Epiphanius reports that the Borborite gnostics had "many books ... in the name of Seth." The Nag Hammadi library preserves several examples of this genre. There we find works like The Second Treatise of the Great Seth, The Three Stoles of Seth, and The Gospel of the Egyptians, all of which are ascribed to Seth's authorship, as well as other works like The Apocalypse of Adam and The Apocryphon of John which exhibit strong interest in the figure of Seth. Mani's disciples were familiar with a so-called "Prayer of Seth," a title which bears comparison with the Jewish "Prayer of Adam" discussed previously: "Again the disciples questioned the Adept (i.e., Mani) and said to him, We [ask] you, O Lord, to clarify for us the saying which [appears in] the Prayer of Sethel, the first-born son of Adam, the one which says 'You are magnificent, ye fourteen great Aeons of [Light]! Tell us, O Lord, the meaning of these fourteen great Aeons of Light.'" Mani proceeds then to identify the fourteen Aeons with heavenly entities drawn from his own system.

Pseudo-Chrysostom refers to a work bearing the title "Book of Seth" (scriptura inscripta nomine Seth) which describes the marvelous star that would herald the birth of Christ. Would appear to be no later Jewish references to works attributed to Seth, although there are indications in Second Temple traditions that such works may have been extant. 2 Enoch 11:29 is cognizant of at least one Sethian work. An intriguing Qumran fragment (4Q417) appears to identify the mysterious "Book of Seth" mentioned several times in sectarian literature with a heavenly book that was revealed to Seth and transmitted by him to Enosh: "For the law is etched by God for all [ ... sons of Seth. And the Book of Memory is inscribed before him (God) for those who observe his word. And it (Book of Memory?) is the Vision of the Haguy, as a Book of Memory. And he (Seth?) bequeathed it to Enosh with the people of the spirit ..."

Later tradition credits Seth with the discovery and promulgation of astronomical lore, a tradition probably indebted to Josephus, who refers to literary activity by the progeny of Seth as a whole that involves the discovery and publication of astronomical knowledge via the erection of two inscribed pillars (Ant. 1.69-71).

Books of Enoch

The only information we have regarding Enosh in the Hebrew Bible is given in Gen 4:26:

"And to Seth also was born a son, and he named him Enosh. Then he began to call upon the name of the Lord" Jewish tradition normally traces the origin of
idolatry to Enosh, interpreting the final clause of verse 26 ("then he began to call upon the name of the Lord") to Enosh’s misguided application of God’s sacred name to material objects; i.e., he “called [material objects] God.” By contrast, later Christian and gnostic traditions view Enosh as the righteous successor of Seth who carefully guarded, preserved, and transmitted the writings and teachings of his forebears. He enjoys perhaps his greatest esteem among the Mandaean sect, where he has been transformed into a heavenly ‘utra. Occasionally literary works are ascribed to him; for example, the medieval Syriac Book of the Bee attributes a series of astrological treatises to Enosh, and a section of the Mandaean Right Ginzā bears the title “Mystery and Book of the Great Anōs [i.e., Enosh].” The Armenian historian Moses of Chorene reports that two inscriptions bearing revelatory knowledge were erected by Enosh.

Books of Shem

The significance of Shem derives from his genealogical role as biological and pedagogical fulcrum. Schooled in the wisdom of his ancestral forefathers as a result of his antediluvian upbringing, he survives the Flood to perpetuate the genetic linkage with the “Semitic” tribes, but postbiblical Jewish tradition is not as reticent. Perhaps the most popular view is to regard Shem and Melchizedek, an otherwise enigmatic character appearing in Genesis 14, as actually the same individual.

Several works attributed to Shem survive from ancient and medieval tradition. The Nag Hammadi corpus contains a Paraphrase of Shem, an apocalypse featuring the heavenly voyage and divine instruction of Shem via the agency of the angel Derdekeas, a name probably derived from Aramaic דרדקאς “child.” A so-called Treatise of Shem, an astrological almanac of a form that is well attested in Coptic and Arabic literature, is found in a fifteenth-century Syriac manuscript. Its most recent translator has attempted to date the work to the first century BCE, but he has won little support for this view. Jub. 10:13-14 reports that Noah prepared a medical compendium based upon angelic revelations which he eventually bequeathed to Shem. This same tradition resurfaces during the medieval era under the rubric Sefer Asaph ha-Rophe, a medical work which allegedly stems from רפיא בן נח, a medical treatise which is well attested in Coptic and Arabic literature, is found in a compendium based upon angelic revelations which he eventually bequeathed to Shem. The tenth-century Karaite Salmon b. Jeroham also knows a “book of Shem,” perhaps the same one as the preceding medical treatise.

Books of Enoch

A cursory perusal of Jewish, Christian, gnostic, and Muslim literature emanating from the Near East during the first millennium of the Common Era produces a substantial number of citations from or references to “books of Enoch.” Interest in the figure of Enoch was apparently stimulated by the cryptic biblical notice recounting his mysterious removal from human society: ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים ואיננו כי לקח אתו אלהים "And Enoch walked with God, and then he was gone, for God took him" (Gen 5:24). A common perception developed wherein Enoch was considered to be an exemplary righteous individual who was transported to heaven and there granted access to divine secrets regarding the governance of the cosmos, the progression of history, and the final judgment of the created order. Judging from the quantity of quotations or allusions to Enochic books, a multitude of these compositions apparently circulated among learned circles during late antiquity well into the medieval period, enjoying wide popularity within diverse religious communities.

Ancient estimates regarding Enoch’s literary productivity range from the ninth-century Muslim historian al-Tabarf’s “thirty scrolls”60 to the inflated “360 books” (variant “366”) of 2 Enoch.61 Despite these testimonies to Enoch’s prolific pen, only two indubitably Enochic “books” have been recovered to date, and these are conventionally designated 1 Enoch (Ethiopic Enoch) and 2 Enoch (Slavonic Enoch). Modern scholars have expended considerable energy in the study and analysis of the two “surviving” books of Enoch. One of their more significant discoveries is the realization that these two books are themselves composite works stemming from earlier collections of Enochic lore.

1 Enoch survives in its entirety only in an Ethiopic translation, for which reason it is sometimes referred to as the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.62 Fragments of earlier versions have been discovered in Greek,63 Syriac,64 Coptic,65 and Latin,66 but the most important textual witnesses to the origin and growth of 1 Enoch were found among the Aramaic manuscripts recovered from Qumran, some of which may date to the third or even fourth century BCE.67 In its present state (108 chapters), 1 Enoch consists of a compilation of at least five originally separate compositions that are loosely joined to one another: the Book of the Watchers (6-36), the Similitudes (37-71), the Astronomical Book (72-82), the Book of Dreams (83-90), and the Epistle of Enoch (91-105). Chapters 1-5 presently stand as a redactional preamble to the assembled constituent pieces of 1 Enoch; they may have originally formed part of a longer eschatological oracle that has since perished.68 Chapters 106-107 are drawn from a source which was very similar to what is fragmentarily narrated on columns 2-5 of the Qumran Genesis Apocryphon: both relate an identical tradition regarding the marvelous birth and infancy of Noah. Chapter 108 ("Another book which
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Enoch wrote "..." is a separate eschatological oracle focusing exclusively upon the future wretched state of the wicked and the blessed rewards awaiting the pious. Even within the "classical" five subdivided divisions of the bulk of 1 Enoch, there are portions which seem to function as self-contained units, such as the so-called "Apocalypse of Weeks" found within the Epistle, or which display a thematic unity, such as R.H. Charles's infamous "Noachic Fragments."69

The work designated 2 Enoch actually survives in two distinct recensions (so-called "short" and "long"), both of which are known only from manuscripts in Old Slavonic, and hence this book is often referred to as the Slavonic Book of Enoch.70 Although opinion has fluctuated, many scholars today hold that the "short" version represents the older form of the text, and that the "long" version is an expansion incorporating largely Christian interpolations. However, the most recent study of the textual history of 2 Enoch cautions that some of these "expansions" might preserve genuinely ancient traditions.71 Despite its present Slavonic form, 2 Enoch provides clear indications of underlying Greek or even Semitic Vorlagen, and most scholars have plausibly argued for a date of composition around the turn of the Common Era in Coele Syria or Egypt.

2 Enoch is distinguished by an intense interest in cosmogonical and cosmological matters, foreshadowing in several respects the contents featured in later Jewish Hekhalot literature and classical gnostic cosmogonies.72 The present contents of the work can be summarized as follows. While Enoch is engaged in nocturnal mourning, two angels appear and summon him to a heavenly voyage. After bidding adieu to his sons Methusaleh and Rigim,73 Enoch ascends with the angels through the seven heavens (whose contents are described) to the throne-room of God. Upon beholding God, Enoch swoons: Gabriel is sent to strengthen him, and then Michael escorts him into "the Lord's presence." His clothing is removed, his body is anointed, and he receives "glorious garments" which transform his appearance into that of an angelic being: "And I looked at myself, and I was like one of the glorious ones, and there was no apparent difference" (2 Enoch 9:19).74

The angel Vrellevi (Uriel?)75 is now commanded by God to produce the heavenly library, from which Enoch receives a thirty-day intensive lesson in various secrets of the cosmos such as the motion of the heavenly bodies, time-reckoning, and the lyrics of the angelic songs of praise. A second thirty-day period is spent transcribing this information, resulting in the production of 360 (variant: 366) "books." After a final interview with God, wherein Enoch learns the mechanisms of God's creative performance, he is bidden to return to earth for a final thirty days during which he should teach his sons "everything you have heard from me." At the end of that session, I will send the angels for you, and they will take you from the earth and from your sons to me. For a place is prepared for you, and you shall live in my presence for ever and see my secrets; and you shall be my servants' scribe, for you shall write down everything that happens on earth and everything that is done by those who are on earth and in the heavens, and you shall act for me as a witness in the judgement of the great age.76

Enoch dutifully returns to earth; his farewell address to his assembled sons occupies the next six chapters (13-18) of the work. As promised, Enoch then ascends to heaven, and the people offer sacrifice at the spot from whence he was taken. Some manuscripts of the work end here, but others append some additional chapters recounting the course of events up to (and in a few cases including) the time of the Flood, focusing particularly upon the marvelous birth and preservation of Melchizedek.

Space does not permit a thorough rehearsal here of the numerous references to or citations from "books of Enoch" in the religious literatures of the Near East.77 Given the unusual status of Enoch vis-à-vis the other named representatives of the biblical antediluvian generations, it is hardly surprising that his role as revealer of supernormal mysteries and divinely authorized inscriber of esoteric wisdom has developed in the directions attested in later literatures. While rabbinic literature for the most part ignores Enoch (or in some cases deliberately disparages him), other currents of Jewish tradition report his exaltation and transformation into the angelic prince Metatron,78 a tradition which displays an obvious affinity with the material in 2 Enoch. Classical gnostic literature maintains a deafening silence on the subject of Enoch,79 although the intriguing composition known as Pistis Sophia does acknowledge that Enoch authored "two books of Yeu" during his sojourn in Paradise which he deposited for safekeeping on the slopes of Ararat.80 Among circles versed in pagan lore, Enoch is assimilated to mythological figures such as Atlas,81 Hermes, and Thoth,82 an amalgam that eventually produces his identification with Hermes Trismegistus by the Sabians of Harran.83 In Islam Enoch becomes Idris,84 renowned scribe and devotee of astronomy who contrived successfully to enter Paradise alive.85

The criteria that we have isolated for establishing the identity of an authentic "herald"—an ascent experience (or at least an angelophany), the instruction of a chosen community, and the preparation of a written testimony—appear sporadically in the literary works and testimonies identified above. Of primary relevance to our present investigation will be those traditions that invest the forefather with a special revelatory and instructional significance, usually by depicting him as one who has ascended to a heavenly academy or who has received angelic visitors bearing inscribed books of wisdom. Another important element to highlight is the concept of succession; that is, either the literal or symbolic transferal of heraldic status and/or attributes from one individual to another. This can be accomplished through a variety of means: an explicit declaration or conferral of such status, the reception and promulgation of written testimonia prepared by earlier heralds, or even the "accidental" discovery of such testimonia are all attested within those cultural units that accent this motif. Second Temple and Roman era Jewish literature is a rich repository of motifs like these, and develops them in directions that are either ignored or roundly criticized in the beneficiary traditions of Gnosticism, Christianity, and Islam.86 Conversely, the latter-
named groups each develop distinctive ways of understanding the historical progress of revelation, and it is in the juxtaposition of these rival schemes that their specific religious identity emerges. Nevertheless, the one feature that unites all of the biblically based factions is the preeminent significance granted certain biblical forefathers in the reception and transmission of divine wisdom to contemporary humanity, and it is precisely this element which Manichaism also exhibits and in turn transmits to subsequent religious movements within the Near East.

**Modes of Transmission**

One of the most significant results of the publication of the *Cologne Mani Codex* has been the clarification of the religio-historical background of nascent Manichaism. Thanks to the information supplied by this signal text, we now know that Mani spent his formative years among a southern Mesopotamian branch of the Elchasaite sect, a Jewish-Christian group with certain gnostic affinities that originated in the Transjordan sometime during the final decades of the first century CE. By the time we reach the third century, representatives of this sect had begun to expand beyond their customary haunts among the wilderness regions of Syria and Palestine. Hippolytus reported that a certain Alcibiades, a teacher of Elchasaite lore, had recently appeared in Rome to expound the doctrines there. Similarly, Origen apparently encountered an Elchasaite publicist during his sojourn in Caesarea, and included a brief synopsis of their teachings in a homily on Psalm 82. The homily has since perished, but his summation of Elchasaite doctrine survives by virtue of its quotation within the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius. The *Codex* now attests that the Elchasaite sect had expanded to the east as well, attracting to its fold Pantikios, the father of Mani, who converted to the sect’s ways from paganism and who enrolled his son among the membership at the tender age of four years. The sect continued to flourish during the succeeding centuries in its “homeland” and points eastward: Epiphanius speaks of remnants surviving in the Transjordan area of Moab in the late fourth century. John of Damascus locates them around the Dead Sea during the eighth century. Theodore bar Konai situates himself in the Arabian Hijaz “by the shore of the Red Sea” in the late eighth century, and Ibn al-Nadim calls attention to their continued existence in the marshland region of southern Mesopotamia in the tenth century.

It was once a scholarly commonplace to accept a genetic linkage between the Elchasaite sect and the earlier Second Temple Jewish sect termed “Essenes.” Certain suggestive similarities in their ritual behaviors, as gleaned from the descriptive accounts of Essene life provided by Josephus and Philo, led some scholars to postulate that the Elchasaite movement was decisively shaped by a post-*Hurban* metamorphosis of the Essene sect. This proposed identification was augmented by geographical factors as well.

According to Pliny, a large Essene settlement was located on the western shore of the Dead Sea, roughly the same area where Elchasaï reportedly flourished only a few decades later. Schismatics and disaffected sectarian members may have established rival communities in the region, and further growth would have occurred from refugees fleeing the advance of the Tenth Roman Legion during the First Jewish Revolt (66-73 CE). These communities would have provided a receptive audience for the apocalyptic message of an Elchasaï.

The discovery of the Qumran scrolls and the subsequent excavation of a settlement site apparently connected with them in approximately the same area pin-pointed by Pliny fueled interest in the scrolls’ possible Essene affiliation. In fact, a gradual consensus has emerged among scholars that the Second Temple Jewish group which best fit the profile created by the scrolls was the Essenes. Archaeological investigation of the settlement site determined that the settlement was destroyed by military action in the year 68 CE. The deposit of the scrolls in eleven caves surrounding the site was widely interpreted to be a protective measure taken by community members in order to preserve their literary heritage. Since the scrolls remained in their hiding places until the middle of the twentieth century, scholars argued that the community perished in the ensuing assault, or at least were physically restrained by the bonds of capture and eventual slavery from ever returning to rescue their precious hoard.

Lately the so-called “Essene hypothesis” has come under fire, primarily (but not exclusively) as a result of the publication of new textual fragments which call into question the presumed ideological unity of the scroll corpus. The identification of the site as an “Essene” settlement has been questioned, but given the important testimony of Pliny and some demonstrable correlations between the ancient witnesses and information found in some of the scrolls, it seems difficult to characterize the encampment by any other label. The problem would seem to lie in the assumed ideological integrity of the scrolls. We should perhaps view the scroll literature through a more inclusive set of lenses: the Qumran “library,” as it is frequently called, may in fact provide us with a representative sampling of literature emanating from a number of Jewish sects operating in the heady atmosphere of the Second Temple era. The designation “library” may not be far from the truth.

Since the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, few have concerned themselves with the possible fate of the community after the Revolt. Most of the discussion has concentrated, understandably, on situating the authors of the scrolls within their Second Temple cultural context. Nevertheless, there exists evidence that hints at the survival of the Qumran group or, at the very least, of ideological positions or of literature associated with the site during the succeeding centuries.

Prior to the amazing discovery of the Qumran scrolls, perhaps the most significant manuscript find of the modern era was Solomon Schechter’s retrieval of the bulk of the Cairo Genizah textual archive at the close of the last century. A treasure trove of written documents that illuminates the daily life of the Jewish community of Fatimid and Ayyubid Egypt, the find
consists of hundreds of thousands of manuscript fragments ranging in date from the tenth to the nineteenth centuries CE. Yet as scholars soon discovered, the Genizah also preserved medieval copies of literary texts that antedated their scrubbers by more than a millennium. Among the ancient documents recovered from the Genizah are six fragmentary manuscripts of the original Hebrew version of Ben Sira, a work previously known only from its Christian redaction(s) in the so-called Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. These finds were hailed at the time as sensational, but an even more extraordinary discovery lay ahead. In 1910 Schechter published what he called "fragments from a Zadokite Work," a set of manuscript leaves representing two different copies of a sectarian manual that described the formation of a "new covenant in the land of Damascus" (6:19). Schechter acutely discerned that the text was not of medieval origin, but apparently much older, and his intelligent analysis received eventual confirmation when fragments of this same composition, now known as the Damascus Covenant, were found among the manuscript remains of the Qumran scrolls. Soon the discovery of Qumran exemplars of Ben Sira and the Testament of Levi were also announced, a circumstance serving to reduce the idiosyncratic status of the Damascus Covenant. Today the conclusion seems inescapable that there existed a "paper trail" that stretched from Second Temple literature, and especially sectarian, circles to Islamic Jewry.

The means whereby Second Temple compositions such as the Damascus Covenant and the Testament of Levi survived into the Middle Ages has been variously explained. One current of interpretation posits the continuous, largely inerrancte, survival of Qumran-affiliated sectarian cells within classical Judaism until the Gaonic period, when this ideology re-erupted in the guise of Karaism. Proponents of this viewpoint see the undeniable similarity in terminology and cultural critique displayed within the sectarian scrolls and Karaitic literature, suggesting that the sectarian perspective persisted as a living tradition at the fringes of Tannaitic and Amoraic formulations and developments. Some support for this position might possibly come from Rabbanite polemic against the Karaitic movement. A term of opprobrium frequently wielded against Karaites arguments is the appellative "Sadducee," a label which should not be confused with that of the identically-named group featured in the New Testament and Josephus. It is an aspersion whose force depends upon Second Temple and Tannaitic testimonies regarding a series of halakhic disputes with a shadowy group bearing this name. The same group occasionally is termed "Baytusi," a designation which long ago was brilliantly connected with the name "Essene." According to rabbinic sources, the "Sadducees/Baytusin" are a religious group who are frequently at odds with the Sages with regard to two major problems: 1) the proper determination of festival dates, or calendrical issues; and 2) the proper maintenance of ritual purity. Both of these topics, interestingly enough, are major foci of a number of Qumran scrolls. It would seem then that in these disputes we possess historical reminiscences of dialogues between Pharisaic exeges and Qumran adherents.

Perhaps, so the argument runs, the Rabbanites perceptively recognized in the Karaite schism the physical renascence of their centuries-old adversary. It is however not necessary to postulate the persistent survival of the "Sadducee" sect in order to explain the eruption and spread of Karaism. Scholars have called attention to sporadic notices reporting the discovery of ancient manuscripts within the caves dotting the Judean wilderness during the first millennium CE. Eusebius, for example, mentions that Origen employed for his Hexapla a manuscript of the biblical book of Psalms that had been recovered "at Jericho in a jar during the reign of Antoninus son of Severus," a clear reference to a find predating that of the Qumran discovery. Several centuries later the Nestorian patriarch Timothy of Seleucia speaks of the recent discovery of a large number of manuscripts, both biblical and non-biblical, in a cave near Jericho. These were reportedly transported to Jerusalem for careful study; their eventual fate is unknown. Karaites and Muslim heresiologists are cognizant of a Jewish sect which flourished around the turn of the era whom they termed Maghártiya ("Cave Men"). "So called because their writings were found in a cave." All of these "archaeological" notices would seem to possess some relevance for the twelfth-century Qumran discovery, although it is difficult to integrate and synthesize the various accounts into a consistent sectarian profile. According to this line of reasoning, the formation of the Karaite sect (among others) is directly dependent upon the material stimulation of this seemingly "miraculous" recovery of authentic writings from ancient sages, a motif which is, incidentally, frequently exploited by both biblical pseudo-pigrapha and Hermetic circles.

However, it is to be explained, it is manifestly clear that Second Temple Jewish writings of a sectarian hue remained available among certain groups of Islamicate Jewry, and hence potentially accessible to non-Jewish antiquarians, intellectuals, and religious fanatics, insofar as such writings (or oral reports of them) may have circulated in a convenient vernacular format. However, to judge from the extant manuscript evidence, the number of such texts was relatively small, especially when compared to the rich corpus of Second Temple and Roman era Jewish texts preserved and transmitted among certain Jewish communities, particularly within the eastern churches. Our knowledge of the Jewish pseudepigraphic corpus would be much poorer were it not for eastern Christendom's fascination with biblical legendry. For example, the "complete" texts of 1 Enoch and Jubilees survive only in Ethiopic, 2 Enoch and the Apocalypse of Abraham have vanished apart from the Old Slavic traditions, and some of our most important witnesses to the textual traditions behind works like the Books of Adam and Eve and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs occur in Armenian and Georgian. Oftentimes recensions of pseudepigraphic works survive in several versions and linguistic traditions, attesting a lively scribal interest in the transmission and even embellishment of received wisdom.

The retention and use of nominally Jewish writings by Christian, Jewish-Christian, and especially gnostic communities is already well under way by the second century of the Common Era. The author of the New Testament...
Epistle of Jude quotes 1 Enoch as authoritative scripture; the Epistle of Barnabas also cites the work approvingly. Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria display a broad knowledge of a wide variety of literary traditions—Jewish, Christian, and pagan—and do not seem too concerned about the ultimately non-Christian origin of "sacred" literature which they cite in support of their arguments for the veracity of Christianity. By the time we reach the end of the second century, some circumspection is taking place: the compilation of lists of approved (and suspect) literature, such as the Muratorian Canon, attests the growing concern among western Christians at the proliferation and uncritical acceptance of sundry suspect traditions, and writers such as Tertullian and Irenaeus are beginning to exhibit unease in the face of an expanding body of pseudepigraphical narratives. The latter in fact condemns the Marcionist sect for forging "innumerable apocrypha and pseudepigrapha" in order to lead the faithful astray. This negative trend comes increasingly to the fore in the later western Fathers, eventually resulting in the wholesale condemnation of the pseudepigraphic library in the Byzantine list tradition.

Eastern Christianity, particularly those groups unaffected or unimpressed by Ephesian and Chalcedonian determined orthodoxy, does not share this reticence. Jewish (and Christian) pseudepigraphic works continued to be studied and transmitted within Monophysite and Nestorian communities well into the Middle Ages, and in certain cases, on down to the modern era. Moreover, the East also became the home of a variety of gnostic groups, all of which display tantalizing hints of genetic connections with earlier Jewish, Jewish-Christian, and/or pagan currents. As Stephen Gero has observed, the self-definition and development of Christianity in the East proceeded in certain respects in a manner quite different from that in the West. In particular, due to an array of special political and cultural conditions, a number of heterodox groups survived or maintained a dominant role in the general area of eastern Syria and Mesopotamia well into late antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

Some of the "heterodox groups" who flourished in the East were not autochthonous movements, but rather migrated there in the hope of escaping the waves of repression that periodically swept the West. An excellent example of such a group is the Mandaean community, 60,000 of whom according to the Haran Gawaita fled eastward from "Jerusalem" into "the Median hills, a place where we were free from domination by all other races." While the precise chronology and circumstances of this migration remain obscure, most scholars today agree that Mandaeism displays Palestinian roots. Similarly, the spurious biography of the early life of Mani that is recounted in the fourth-century Acta Archelai, and which forms the basis for similar information contained in Epiphanius and subsequent Syriac heresiological reports, alleges that Mani adapted his peculiar doctrines from "four books" previously penned during the era of the apostles by one Seythianus, a wandering Arab student of occult knowledge who partook of the wisdom of Egypt and Judaea, but who then "suddenly departed this life." His erstwhile student Terebinthius took possession of his teacher's books and brought them to Mesopotamia, where he soon suffered a mortal accident. Eventually the "four books" come into the hands of Mani, who "took these books and transcribed them in such a way that he introduced into them much new matter which was simply his own, and which can be compared only to old wives' fables." Despite its slandersome formulation in the present context, scholars have recently discovered that there is a grain of truth in the charge that Mani utilized traditions, even written texts, of ultimately Western provenance.

Ever since the basic study of I. de Beausobre,126 scholars have speculated that Mani may have relied on one or more "books of Enoch" as a source for some of his distinctive ideas. The spectacular discovery and publication of Coptic and Middle Iranian Manichaean writings finally confirmed these suspicions, but J.T. Milik's subsequent identification and publication of a Qumran Vorlage for Mani's Book of Giants has demonstrated that the textual linkages between Second Temple Jewish currents and Syro-Mesopotamian heterodoxy, both Jewish and Christian, are much more intimate than previously imagined. As we have seen, there are potentially a variety of ways by which Mani could have had access to the Jewish Book of Giants, as well as other texts or traditions of this ilk. But perhaps the most plausible explanation in this particular case, given the present state of the evidence, involves his Elchasaitic patrimony.

According to Epiphanius, in the region around the Dead Sea could be found a Jewish sect once termed "Ossaeans" (Ossaeon), a designation exhibiting a striking resemblance to that of the Second Temple era Essenes, particularly when considering that their geographical location is roughly consonant with that of the late first-century report of Pliny. "During the reign of the emperor Trajan, after the advent of the Saviour, these were then joined by one called Elksai, who was a false prophet." Epiphanius goes on to state that this sect is "now called Sampsaeans," and are considered to be "neither Jewish nor Christian." A separate entry for the "Sampsaeans" in Panarion 53 repeats much of this information, adding that "the Sampsaeans are now called Elchasaites." This testimony suggests the construction of one possible scenario for the transmission of Second Temple era Jewish texts to points eastward, eventually reaching Mani in the land of Babylon. Qumran sectarian survivors of the first Revolt regroup in the neighboring wilderness region to become (by the fourth century) what Epiphanius terms the "Ossaean sect," a name which is probably a later reflex of the sobriquet "Essene." They continue to produce, read, and carefully preserve writings and teachings of the sort that have been recovered from Qumran. Toward the end of the first century, the charismatic figure of Elchasai emerges among them and successfully convinces a significant portion of the group of the veracity of his eschatological message. This represents the genesis of the "Elchasaites" sect appearing within Christian and Muslim heresiographies. As a result of their Jewish sectarian heritage, they also retain the literature produced and revered by their "forefathers." When the Elchasaites, by now tinged with elements extracted from early Christian sects, spread beyond the Dead Sea
region to Syria and ultimately Mesopotamia, the ancestral literature accompanies them. Mani’s early education among third-century “Christianized” representatives of the sect doubtless entailed the careful study of the writings of the ancients, among which to judge from the textual echoes were numbered works like 1 Enoch and the Book of Giants. Even after his final break with the sect, he could not completely shed their formative influence. The originally Jewish Book of Giants, which he apparently encountered during his Elchasanite apprenticeship, was eventually transformed into a sacred Manichaean scripture. Other older pseudepigraphic works, particularly those associated with the primal forefathers and prominent New Testament apostles, also exerted a profound influence upon the young Mani and were successfully integrated into the conceptual background of nascent Manichaeism. The continued esteem enjoyed by such literature is witnessed by its authoritative invocation in the Cologne Mani Codex and in the Coptic Manichaica by the initial generations of Manichaean missionaries.

The popularity of Jewish pseudepigraphic traditions in the late antique and medieval Near East is not solely due to Manichaean efforts—there is ample attestation of similar preservative efforts and distinctive transformations within Babylonian and Iranian Judaism, Harranian paganism, Mandaeism, Syro-Mesopotamian Christianity, and Shi’i Islam. The ultimate result is a complex “symbiosis” wherein Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian, gnostic, and pagan currents feed off of and reinforce each other to form strange, hybrid ideological structures whose definitive statements are issued in highly mythologized tractates like Sefer ha-Bahir and Umm al-Kitāb. The very existence of such texts reinforces the vitality of the transformed traditions within their new environments, not only among the learned, but even at the level of popular culture, as attested in the corpora of incantation traditions within their new environments, not only among the learned, but even at the level of popular culture, as attested in the corpora of incantation texts and magical amulets. Much about the historical development of this transformative process remains highly opaque, but one thing appears reasonably certain: a prime vehicle through which Second Temple pseudepigraphic traditions reached Mesopotamian, Iranian, and even Arabian soil was gnostic, often Manichaean, in character, and the subsequent manipulation of these motifs was governed by principles coherent with this origin.

NOTES

1 This propensity to endow one or more forfathers with prototypical literacy suggests an origin during the Persian period. Reflecting their rise to prominence in political administration, “scribes,” or those who at least engage in activities long associated with the literate professions, begin to play a featured role in Near Eastern literature. A good example of such a hero is the Aramaean sage Ahiqar, and the resultant popularity of the cycle of legends that soon cluster around his name inspires the invention of ethnically coordinated surrogates—figures like those of biblical Daniel or Greek Aesop. It is surely no coincidence that it is during this same period that Ezra, titled “the proficient scribe of the Law of God,” receives the credit for the restoration of the authentic cultus and the recovery of the ancestral traditions after the disastrous experience of the Babylonian exile. And it is not much later that the learned Ben Sira fulsomely pens the praises of the scribal profession.

2 See, e.g., Jub. 12:27: “And he [Abram] took his fathers’ books, which were written in Hebrew, and transcribed them and began from then on to study them, and I [the Angel of the Presence] explained to him everything he could not understand; and he studied them during the six rainy months.” Translation is that of R.H. Charles and C. Rabin, “Jubilees,” AOT (Sparks) 49. Note also Jub. 7:38; 10:14; 21:10.

3 See 2 Enoch 11:25, 27, 29 (short version): “... take the books which you have written ... and go down to earth, and tell your sons all I have said to you, and all you have seen from the lowest heaven right up to my throne ... And give them the books which your hand has written, and they will read them and recognize the creator ... and they will pass on the books your hand has written to their children, and their children to their children, and next of kin to next of kin, from one generation to another ...” For what you have written, and what your fathers Adam and Seth have written, will not be destroyed to the end of time; for I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marich ... to preserve your fathers’ writing, so that it is not destroyed in the flood which is to come ...” Translation is that of A. Pennington, “2 Enoch,” AOT (Sparks) 341.


“righteous” descendants assume the form of “white bulls,” visible images of the form of Adam, who is also represented as a “white bull.”

43See Epiphanius, Panarion 39.9.35: έξω δε του Σηθα κατα σκέφτη και κατα διάδοχην γένος ο Χριστός θέλει αυτός το γένος, σοι κατα γένος, αλλά θυματιστος εν τω κόσμω πεθνός, δε έστην αυτός τον Σηθα το τέτο και Χριστός των οπωριστών τη γένει των ανθρώπων, έδε της μητρός άνθεθεν αποστολάμον (But the anointed [Christ] itself came as Jesus, a descendant of Seth by descent and by succession of peoples; it was shown forth in the world not through being born but in a mysterious way. This was Seth himself, who both formerly and at that time—as the anointed [Christ]—visited the human race, having been sent from above, from the mother.” Translation is that of B. Layton, The Gnostic Scriptures (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987) 189.

44Epiphanius, Panarion 26.8.1: τοις άνθρωποι του Σηθα πολλα βιβλια υποστηνεια. The so-called “Sethians” (Panarion 39.5.1) possess “seven books called by the name of Seth” (ζηνάμαντος μεν Σηθα έκτα λεγοντομεν και βιβλία). So too the Archontic sect employ “books” of Seth and of “his sons” (Panarion 40.3.4).


37As several have noted, this particular epithet presupposes the classical understanding of the paternity of Cain and Abel.

38Kephalaia 42.27-32. This kephalaion bears the heading “Regarding the meaning of the fourteen [great] Aeons which Sethel spoke about in his prayer.”

39Note the Naassene version of Gos. Thom. 4 that is quoted by Hippolytos, Refutatio 5.2.20: “He who seeks me will find me in children from seven years old; for there concealed, I shall in the fourteenth aeon be made manifest.” For further references to and discussion of the concept of the “fourteen aeons,” see Stroumsa, Another Seed 94 n.51.


41Sebastian Brock has suggested that the Enochic traditions have subsequently been developed by Jewish traditions in a “Sethite” direction, from which Syrian Christians have freely borrowed and further adapted (‘Jewish Traditions’ 226-32). Note also the appropriate remarks of W. Adler, Time Immemorial: Archival History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1989) 104-105.

42CD 106, 132; IQS 6:7; IQS a 1:7.
NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO


44 Compare Latin Vita Adae et Evae 49-51, where Seth prepares duplicate versions of the testimonies of both Adam and Eve on stone and clay tablets: the former to survive a flood, and the latter to endure excommunication. These writings however do not seem to be astronomical in nature. More à-propos is a tradition appearing in Syncellus's introduction to a pseudepigraphic letter that was allegedly addressed by the Egyptian priest Manetho to Ptolemy II Philadelphia, save that the author of the antediluvian inscriptions is “Thoth, the first Hermès.” See George Syncellus, Ecloga Chronographica (ed. Mosshammer) 40.31-41.19; Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings Which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes (ed. J. Fraade, G. Fowden, and this warning were given us from the earth of light. Anthropogonie in den Schriften al-Tabarl, 1965) 303. Note also that the narrative setting roughly coincides with that of Jubilees 10. According to Jab. 7:1, Mount Lubar was the landing place of the ark. See BHM 3.155 lines 1-3; S. Münzner, Mavo li-sefer Asaf ha-Rofe (Jerusalem: Geiza, 1957) 147 lines 1-2. Regarding Sefer Asaph, see now M. Himmelfarb, “Some Echoes of Jubilees in Medieval Hebrew Literature;” Tracing the Threads: Studies in he Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha (SBE/EL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 127-36, as well as the further discussion in Chapter Six below.

45 BHM 2.xxx, Sefer ha-Razim (ed. Margalioth) xiii, 37.

46“Right Ginzá 251.12-282.13 (ed. Lidzbarski); cf. 251.12: hazon ha rasa ustrida danai rba ... Text cited from the transcription of K. Rudolph, Theogonie, Kosmogonie and Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 303. Note also Right Ginzá 286.13-15 (ed. Lidzbarski): “This speech, this order, and this warning were given us from the earth of light. Anosh Uthrel, the Apostle, brought them and handed them over to the priests.” Translation from Widengren, Muhammad 57.

47 Actually the Armenian text is ambigious as to whether Seth or Enosh was the one responsible for erecting the stelae. See Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians (ed. R.W. Thomson; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978) 71. Thomson’s introduction presumes that the reference is to Enosh (p. 26).

48 Cf. Jub. 12:27; 21:10; Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 22:19; Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 24:62; Frg. Tg. and Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 25:22; Rashi ad Gen 25:27; Gen. Rab. 56.11; 63.10. The rabbinic sources characterize this instruction as “academic.”


53 Hibbertus (Refutatio 5.22) appeals to a so-called Paraphrase of Seth as crucial for gaining knowledge about the tenets of Sethian gnosticism, and the striking coincidence in title has prompted some scholars to wonder whether Hibbertus has erred in this citation. For an examination of this possibility, see D.A. Bertrand, “Paraphrase de Sem” et «Paraphrase de Seths,” Les textes de Nag Hammadi: Colloque du Centre d’Histoire des Religions (Strasbourg, 23-25 octobre 1974) (NHS 7; ed. J.-É. Ménard; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 146-57.


57 And Noah wrote down everything in a book, as we instructed him about every kind of remedy: thus were the evil spirits kept from doing harm to Noah’s sons. And he gave everything he had written to Shem, his eldest son; for he loved him most of all his sons.” Translation is that of Charles and Rabin, “Jubilees,” AOT (Sparks) 42.

58 Note that the narrative setting roughly coincides with that of Jubilees 10. According to Jud. 7:1, Mount Lubar was the landing place of the ark. See BHM 3.155 lines 1-3; S. Münzner, Mavo li-sefer Asaf ha-Rofe (Jerusalem: Geniza, 1957) 147 lines 1-2. Regarding Sefer Asaph, see now M. Himmelfarb, “Some Echoes of Jubilees in Medieval Hebrew Literature;” Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha (SBE/EL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 127-36, as well as the further discussion in Chapter Six below.

59 BHM 2.xxx, Sefer ha-Razim (ed. Margalioth) xiii, 37.

60 “And the Lord said to Vreweil, Take the books from their storeplace, and give Enosh a pen and dictate the books to him ... And all that it was proper that I should learn Vreweil explained to me in thirty days and thirty nights; his lips were never silent, as he went on speaking; and I, for my part, had no rest for thirty days and thirty nights, as I made it. And when I had finished, Vreweil said to me, Sit down; write out everything I have explained to you. And I sat down a second time for thirty days and thirty nights; and I wrote out everything exactly. And I wrote three hundred and sixty books.” Translation cited from that of Pennington, AOT (Sparks) 338; compare F.I. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Book of) Enoch” (Sparks) 42.

Aside from Jude 14-15 and patristic quotations, there are at present four surviving sources that attest the Greek rendition(s) of 1 Enoch: 1) the Gizeh or Akhmim text (Codex Panopolitanus), containing 1:1-326 and a duplicate version of 19:3-21:9; 2) the Chester Beatty text, containing 97:6-104:13, 106:1-107:3; 3) the citations found in the Apocalypsis Henochi Graece (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970), and for discussion see especially Denis, Introduction 15-28; Knibb, Book of Enoch 2.15-21. Further fragments of yet another Greek witness have been tentatively proposed by J.T. Milik ("Fragments grecs du livre d’Henoch," JTS n.s. 19 (1968) 626-31), 63: Enoch 93:3-8. See S. Donadoni, "Un frammento della versione copita del "Libro di Enoch," ActA 25 (1960) 197-202.

Aside from patristic citations, only an abridged version of 1 Enoch 106:1-18. See James, Apocrypha Anecdata 146-50; Charles, Ethiopic Version 219-22.

Fragmentsof no fewer than eleven manuscripts of Enoch were found at Qumrân; of these, seven contain material corresponding to parts of the first (cc.1-20), the fourth (cc.83-90), and the fifth (cc.91-107) sections of the Ethiopic text while four contain material corresponding to parts of the third section (cc.72-82) ... (Knibb, Book of Enoch 2.8). The editio princeps is J.T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); see also K. Boyer, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 225-58.

Given the recent discovery that the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch already attest the union of chapters 1-5 and the Book of the Watchers (6-36), there is a present tendency to argue for a thematic relationship between these two originally discrete Enochic works. See for example G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 48-49, or L. Hartman, Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5 (ConBNT 12; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979).

Charles, Book of Enoch xlv-xlvi. He postulated that "fragments" of a Book of Noah were embedded throughout the present text of Enoch, identifying as such 1 Enoch 6:11; 8:3; 12:19; 54:7-55:2; 60; 65:49-55; 106-107. See now also 1Q19 "Livro de Noé" (DID 1 84-86, 152).


Andersen, OTP 1.91-94. See also S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968 (Leiden: Brill, 1970) 72 n.1; idem, "Enoch, Slavonic Book of," EncJud 6.797: "Nonetheless the long recession seems to contain some material belonging to the original text omitted from the short recession." See the extensive list of parallels adduced by Ginzberg, Legends 5.158-62 n.60.


The "long" version adds a third son, Gaidad (see Andersen, OTP 1.108). According to the medieval Sefer ha-Yashar, Enoch had three sons (Methusalah, Eliahu, Eilemehel) and two daughters (Milkah, Naamah); see BHT 4.130. But compare 2 Enoch 57:2 (Andersen, OTP 1.882-83).

Pennington, AOT (Sparks) 338.

Ginzberg, Legends 5.159: more cautious is Andersen, OTP 1.140.

2 Enoch 11:26-37. Translation taken from that of Pennington, AOT (Sparks) 342.

In fact requires a separate monograph for the collection and analysis of these testimonies. I am presently engaged in the preparation of such a source.

Another Seed 108-110.


Most scholars consider this curious circumstance to the explosive growth in prominence of the figure of Seth, who has assumed in many gnostic texts most of the qualities traditionally associated with Enoch.

Pistis Sophia 3.134 (Schmidt-MacDermot 349-50); see also 2.99 (ibid. 246-47).

Codex Bruccianus contains two tracts which have been published under the designation "the Two Books of Jeu," but aside from their obvious affinities with passages cited in Pistis Sophia, there appear to be few (if any) links with known Enochic lore. The standard editions are Pistis Sophia (NHS 9; ed. C. Schmidt and V. MacDermot; Leiden: Brill, 1978); The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex (NHS 13; ed. C. Schmidt and V. MacDermot; Leiden: Brill, 1987). See also the remarks of Strombus, Another Seed 108-110.

Pseudo-Euplemous apud Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica 9.17.9: Ἐλλάδος δὲ λέγει τὸν Ἀτλαντα κύριους ἀνθρώπους, εἶναι δὲ τὸν Ἀτλαντα τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἑνὸς τοῦ δῆλου τοὺς ἔλλαθος τοιούτων ἐν ἑνὸς. The text from Eusebius, Die Praeparatio Evangelica (GCS 42; 2 vols.; ed. K. Miras; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954-56) 1.504 lines 7-8. For the association of Atlas with astrology, see especially Diodorus Siculus 3.60.2, 4.27.4-5, and...
the references provided by B.Z. Wacholder, “Pseudo-Europomus’ Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham,” HUCA 34 (1963) 96 n.83. Theodore bar Konai is also cognizant of this association; see below.

87Theodore bar Konai, Liber scholiorum (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussetelge, 1912) 286.5-11: \( \text{ο} \text{πόλις} \text{ο} \text{λόγο} \text{ο} \text{θεο} \text{ο} \text{πόλεις} \text{ο} \text{δί} \text{ο} \text{λό} \text{γο} \text{ο} \text{ί} \text{ο} \text{λό} \text{γο} \text{ο} \text{ς} \text{ο} \text{θεο} \text{ο} \text{πόλεις} \). The Chaldean (heresy) preceded the other heresies in its springing up, for Bardaisan says that Enoch was the name of its originator. However, a man whose name was Atlas, brother of Prometheus, became especially celebrated for it in the sixteenth year of the blessed Moses while he exercised guidance in the wilderness. After the return from Babylon, Tautos (i.e., Thoth) became celebrated (for) the reading of horoscopes.” While Theodore does not identify these figures, their association in this context is suggestive. Moreover, the reference to “Babylon” evokes the popular Hermetic notion of the “Babylonian Hermes.” Michael the Syrian also records a similar tradition about the discovery of astrology. See Chronique de Michel le Syrien, par sa pare jacobite d’Antioche, 1166-1199 (4 vols.; ed. J.-B. Chabot; reprinted, Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1963) 1.38. For further discussion of the assimilation of Enoch to Thoth, see D. Frankfurter, “The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories,” The Jewish Apocalypptic Heritage in Early Christianity (CRINT III.4; ed. J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler; Minneapolis: Fortress, in press) 147-48, 185-87.

88The earliest literary appearance of this assimilation seems to be the Kitāb al-‘ulūf of Abū Ma’shar (d. 886 CE), the renowned astrologer, that he based his remarks upon the doctrines of the Sabians. See M. Plessner, “Hirmis,” Vajda, “Idris,” ibid 1.173; J. an-Nadim (A.D. 987), in idem, Arabische Kultur und Islam im Mittelalter: Ausgewählte Schriften (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1981) 60.


90At least if we accept the testimonies preserved by Muslim commentators like al-Tabarî, Ta‘rikh 1.172: “and she bore Enoch b. Yared, and Enoch (is) Idris the prophet”; ibid. 1.173: “and another from the people of the Torah say that Enoch was born to Yared, and he is Idris”; or al-Ma‘āsidî, Marāj al-dhahab wa-ma‘āsid al-jawhar: Les praïries d’dor (9 vols.; ed. C. Breyer de Meynard and P. de Courteille; Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1861-77) 1:73, “and after he arose his son Enoch, who is Idris the prophet (upon whom be peace), and the Sabians equate him with Hermes.” For further discussion and references, see P.E. Peters, “Hermes and Harran: The Roots of Arabic-Islamic Occultism,” Intellectual Studies on Islam: Essays Written in Honor of Martin B. Dickson (ed. M.M. Mazzoni and V.B. Moreen; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990) 185-215, esp. 189-91. For a recent speculative, but stimulating, discussion of the background of Idris, see Y. Erder, “The Origin of the Name Idris in the Qur’ān: A Study of the Influence of Qumran Literature on Early Islam,” JNES 49 (1990) 339-50.

91For example, note the Qumran emphasis upon the transmission of authentic Torah through the priestly line of Levi, or late antique Judaism’s fascination with the alleged prophetic prophecies of Ezra and Baruch.

87See the discussion in Chapter One above.

88Hippolytus surely exaggerates when he states: “their hereditary priestcraft, as in the days of Moses.” Refutatio 9.13.1. Yet there is evidence that the Essenesite positions were being aggressively marketed during the first half of the third century.

89Refutatio 9.13.1ff.

90Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica 6.38: “and from the Sabaean is from the priest of a certain priest of heaven, e.g., M. Glaucius, Enoch, and the Sabians identify this man with Hermes.” For further discussion, see F.E. Peters, “Hermes and the Essenes,” The Revelation of Elchasai (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 1-37. The literature on the Essene sect is, of course, enormous.

testimony about the "cave sect" is combined with information about the Yûdghânîtes, an eighth-century Jewish messianic movement; Judah b. Elîjah Hadassi, Sefer Eshkol ha-kopher (Eupatoria, 1836; reprinted, Westmead: Gregg International Publishers, 1971) 41b, §98. Qirqisânî apparently relies upon the authority of Dâ'ûd b. Marwân al-Muqammîs, a ninth-century exegete who flirted with Christianity before returning to the Jewish fold, for his information about this sect, whereas al-Bûnî cites the famous zindiq Abî 'Isla al-Warrâq as his source. The dependencies of al-Shahrastânî and Judah Hadassi are less clear, but probably go back ultimately to the former source. See A. Harkavy, "Abî Yûsuf Ya'qûb al-Qirqisânî on the Jewish Sects," Ya'qûb al-Qirqisânî on Jewish Sects and Christianity: A Translation of "Kitâb al-anwar" Book I, with Two Introductory Essays (ed. B. Chiesa and W. Lockwood; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1984) 58-59.


[12] John of Damascus and especially Theodore bar Konai provide valuable reports about some of these later Syrian and Mesopotamian sects, occasionally providing quotations from their "sacred" texts. For a comprehensive discussion, see J.C. Reeves, "Theodore bar Konai and Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis," ANRW (forthcoming).


[12] Naosaios di metêstýrion apô 'Ioudaioum eis tênu twn Symphaiwn aîres, ótîs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs ìmûs (Panarion 20.3.4); Text from Adam-Burchard, Eusemer 53.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO


131 When this happens is unclear. Elchasai himself was Jewish, if Epiphanius can be trusted (*Panarion* 19.1.5), and there is nothing in the preserved testimonies that connotes a Christian orientation for the sect's founder.

132 References to the "commandments of the Savior" (τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ σωτήρος) are surely to Jesus, as CMC 91.19-93.23 illustrates.

133 See Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, passim.

134 The apt application of the term "symbiosis" to the intermingled currents of late antique and medieval Near Eastern religiosities appears most prominently in the influential studies of S.D. Goitein and H.J.W. Drijvers. For the former, see especially the historical analysis provided by S.M. Wasserstrom, "Recent Works on the 'Creative Symbiosis' of Judaism and Islam," *RelSRev* 16.1 (1990) 43-47. Drijvers employs the term when describing the religious influences active in late antique Edessa; see his "Edessa und das jüdische Christentum," *VC* 24 (1970) 4-33, at p. 5 ("eine Symbiose"); idem, "Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerim im ältesten syrischen Christentum," *OCA* 197 (1972) 291-308, at p. 303 ("eine Art Symbiose").

135 See Wasserstrom, *Judaism, Islam and Gnosis* (forthcoming); idem, *Between Muslim and Jew*, portions of which Professor Wasserstrom has been kind enough to share with me in manuscript form.
CHAPTER THREE

THE APOCALYPSE OF ADAM

Text

[Thus has the] first Adam [clearly] said [in] his [apocalypse:] ‘I saw an angel [...] [before] your radiant face which I do not recognize.’ Then he said to him: ‘I am Balsamos, the greatest angel of Light. Therefore receive (and) write these things just as I reveal them to you on exceedingly clean papyrus which is unspoiled and which has not harbored worms.’

Moreover there were many other things which he revealed to him in the vision. Very great was the glory that surrounded him. He beheld [...] angels and high officials and mighty powers [...] (5 lines lost) [...] Adam and was made superior to all the powers and angels of creation. Many other similar things to these are in his writings.
CHAPTER THREE

Commentary

Thus has [the] first Adam [clearly] said [in] his [apocalypse].’ The editors’ restoration of the source cited here as an “apocalypse” of Adam has much to commend it. Symmetry is maintained with the remaining four quotations of works authored by the biblical forefathers, each of which is introduced as an “apocalypse.” Moreover, the editorial frame-narrative explicitly appeals “to how each one of the primeval patriarchs communicated his own revelation (literally, ‘apocalypse’) to a select (group) whom he chose and gathered together from that generation during which he appeared.” As we have seen, several testimonies survive regarding the existence of one or more “apocalypses” of Adam among Christian and gnostic communities in late antiquity.

Of especial interest in this particular clause is the apparent designation of Adam as “first Adam”; i.e., “Adam the Protoplast,” the Greek reflex of the common rabbinic titles גבר בראשית (i.e., Adam Qadmon) or אדם הקדמון. A similar title (אָדָם קַדָּמָן) is employed by certain Manichaean Middle Persian texts when speaking of the first materially created human being: “And when the male creature was born, they named him ‘the first human being,’ namely Gēhmurd.” This distinctive nomenclature is necessary within the Manichaean system due to the prior supernatural “creation” of a heavenly prototype, Primal Man, whose pertaining form, according to at least one early testimony, stimulates the subsequent production of the human race by demonic archons. We are thus presented with a dual heavenly/earthly anthropos motif in Manichaism that is structurally parallel to the Adam Qadmon/Adam the Protoplast concept found in certain esoteric strands of late antique and medieval Judaism, a similarity that was presciently noted long before the publication of the relevant Manichaean evidence by Louis Ginzberg. The point of origin for this concept in Judaism is the curious dual notice of the creation of Adam in the biblical cosmogony (Gen 1:26-27; 2:7), usually glossed by modern critics as representative strands of two originally separate sources employed by the author(s) of the biblical book of Genesis. The first report of Adam’s creation comes to be viewed as the evocation of a “heavenly Adam” or “original Adam” (אָדָם קַדָּמָן) who serves as the model for the lineaments of the subsequent “earthly” or “material” Adam of Gen 2:7. While the earliest expression of this quasi-Platonic exegesis is found in Philo, it is clear from rabbinic sources that Philo is not totally indebted to Greek philosophical speculation for his articulation of this interpretation. Traces of a similar type of speculative exegesis manifest themselves within the aggadic literature, sometimes there explicitly associated with heretical or heterodox circles (minim). Patristic writers also vouch for the popularity of the cosmic anthropos scheme among a variety of late antique gnostic sects. Given Mani’s sectarian patrimony, which wove together a tapestry of threads emanating from Judaism, Christianity, and gnostic currents, it is not surprising to find him conversant with this concept.

Thus Adam the proprolast however subsists in a prostrate state of “deep sleep,” until visited and aroused by Jesus the Splendor, who “showed him the Fathers on high,” and “made him taste of the Tree of Life.” Given the reference to Jesus the Splendor thus functions in Theodore bar Konai’s narrative as the Manichaean counterpart to the heavenly “illuminators” of the Coptic Apocalypse of Adam, an inversion of the role played by the serpent/Samael/Satār within the Apocalypse of Adam.
the temptation-story of Jewish and Christian Adamschriften.\textsuperscript{16} These latter traditions however do reserve a locus for the intervention of divine emissaries, normally at the narrative point immediately after Adam’s repose for his disobedience. Impressed by Adam’s sincere remorse, God dispatches one or more angels to impart to the protoplast useful information that mitigates the severity of the curses laid upon Adam, Eve, and the earth.\textsuperscript{17} In some of these texts, Adam also becomes privy to knowledge about the future history of his descendants.

To which narrative tradition does our Adam fragment belong? Its poor state of preservation prevents us from making any definitive decision, but the motif of “non-recognition” hints at a gnostic, or at the very least gnostically influenced, setting. We will need therefore to pay careful attention when analyzing the remaining scraps of this citation to see whether the Adam fragment retains further clues regarding its possible conceptual affinities with a gnostic world-view.

τότε ἔφη ἀντίος ἐγὼ εἰμί Βάλσαμος ὁ μέγιστος ἄγγελος τοῦ φωτός. “Then he said to him: ‘I am Balsamos, the greatest angel of Light.’” Of especial interest here is the disclosure of the identity of the revelatory angel, a motif that is duplicated only once more in the series of “Jewish apocalypse” citations contained in the Codex. There (in the “apocalypse of Enoch”) the familiar name of Michael appears, whereas here the strange cognomen “Balsamos” is used. One should note also the distinctive epithet borne by Balsamos: he is “the greatest angel of Light.” The sudden manifestation of an “angel of Light” to the unsuspecting Adam is intriguingly reminiscent of a signal event in the life of the young Mani. According to Manichaean sources, Mani was first apprised of his apostolic status by a succession of angelophanies featuring the revelatory instruction and guidance of an entity termed the “Twin,”\textsuperscript{18} Mani’s heavenly “duplicate”\textsuperscript{19} who is ultimately an emanation of the Light-Nous, “the Father of all the Apostles” (Kephalaia 35.22). A narrative description of the initial visit of the Twin with Mani is supplied by Ibn al-Nadim in his valuable account of Manichaean teachings:

... and when he (Mani) was twelve years old, a revelation came to him. According to his account, (it was) from the King of the Paradise of Light, who is God Most High from what he says about him. The angel who brought the revelation was called al-Tawm, which is in Nabataean,\textsuperscript{20} and its meaning is “companion.”\textsuperscript{21}

Note that the language used to describe the source of Mani’s revelation faintly echoes that used within the Adamic fragment: the term “Light” serves as a circumlocution for the celestial realm in both accounts, even though it is slightly expanded in the Arabic testimony (... Paradise of Light),\textsuperscript{22} and both angelic entities are dispatched from this realm to communicate (explicitly in Mani’s case, presumably in that of Adam, save that the information has largely perished) valuable heavenly mysteries. The similarity of structure and characterization suggests a possible redactional adjustment (or perhaps even independent creation?) of Jewish pseudopigraphic fragments or works, such as this Adam fragment, to fit their new utilitarian employment within Manichaeism, a practice that is clearly visible in the surviving Middle Iranian versions of the Jewish Second Temple era Book of Giants.\textsuperscript{23} We must therefore proceed with some caution in our examination, and allow the cumulative weight of the background of the visible narrative traditions to determine whether we are dealing with an authentic survival of Jewish aggadic lore, a textual nugget that has been “lightly” manipulated, or an overt Manichaean forgery.

Manichaean angel-lists recovered from Central Asia sometimes include a figure designated “Bar-Simus” (br symws),\textsuperscript{24} a name whose form echoes that of Balsamos, but it is unclear whether there is any connection between them. A heavenly entity of similar name figures once in the collection of Greek magical papyri published by Karl Preisendanz. Therein we read: ἐγὼ εἰμί ὁ καρφύς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὄνομά μοι Βαλσάμης. “I am the one who is from heaven; my name is Balsamès.”\textsuperscript{25} The feminine form of the name occurs within a sales contract preserved among the Oxyrhynchus papyri hoard, where it is borne by a servant from Osroene, the province of Edessa.\textsuperscript{26} That circumstance suggests that the name may be of Syrian or north Mesopotamian provenance. Probably the most widely accepted interpretation of the name “Balsamos” views it as a Graecized form of the designation בַּאל-שאמה “Baal Shamayin,” or “Lord of Heaven,” the ancient Syro-Phoenician high god deified (in this case) to archangelic rank.\textsuperscript{27} However, there are no other discernible instances of analogous borrowings from the realm of Syro-Phoenician paganism within nascent or, for that matter, mature Manichaeism; rather, the Semitic roots of Manichaean ideology are demonstrably Jewish-Jewish-Christian. Nevertheless, the name “Balsamos” does look like a Semitic form with an appended Greek nominative masculine singular inflection.

There is now a more plausible interpretation of the name “Balsamos” that thoughtfully takes into account the actual religio-historical background from which Manichaeism emerged. Burt Visotzky has offered the intriguing suggestion that “Balsamos” may render the Hebrew expression בֵּית לֶא, literally “possessor of the (divine) Name,”\textsuperscript{28} thus making Balsamos equivalent to the anonymous angel of Exod 23:20-23 (וְיָדַע לֶא בֵּית לֶא ...). Who is identified in some strands of later tradition as Metatron,\textsuperscript{29} Yahoeel,\textsuperscript{30} or Michael.\textsuperscript{31} His self-declared status as “the greatest” (ὁ μέγιστος) angel of the heavenly realm strengthens this possible identity.\textsuperscript{32} Michael is frequently invoked within the aforementioned Manichaean angel-lists, and is explicitly identified as a revelatory agent in the angelophany experienced by Enoch that is quoted later in the Codex (see Chapter Seven below). Moreover, there exists some tantalizing evidence that Manichaism was familiar with the angel designated “Yahoeel” as well. According to the fifth-century report of the Byzantine heresiologist Theodoret, Manichaens sometimes referred to the “Maiden of Light,” an important heavenly entity within the Realm of Light, as “Ioel” (יויאל).\textsuperscript{33} This statement inspired Scholem to cite the Manichaean equation as a suggestive prefiguration of the later kabbalistic identification of Metatron and the Shekinah.\textsuperscript{34} Also of relevance is a valuable list of Manichaean
mythological figures supplied by Priscillian, fourth-century bishop of Avila, wherein we find both the names “Izel” and “Balsamus” mentioned. This evidence suggests that two separate entities are signaled by these designations, a situation that is remarkably similar to the distinction drawn between the angels Michael and Yoel in the Slavonic Vita Adae et Evae. On the other hand, it is fairly certain that Michael and Yahoel (= Yoel) were originally variant names for a single supernal entity. Perhaps then we should view the name “Balsamos” as a type of esoteric designation for the chief archangel, and understand his “true” identity to be an early refraction of that complex pattern of assimilations and combinations attested within late antique and medieval Judaism for the Michael/Yahoel/Metatron entity.

Another factor that augments the connection of Balsamos in the Adam fragment with Michael or Yahoel is the demonstrable frequency with which these latter names appear in some of the extant Jewish and Christian Adamschriften. In the Latin Vita Adae et Evae, which is viewed by some as an early representative example of what was once (and to a certain extent still is) a massive corpus of extrabibical Adam traditions, Michael displays a narrative prominence that underscores his exalted position among the heavenly hierarchy, one that may even approach the status of “the greatest angel of Light.” When God first created Adam, Michael compels his fellow angels to offer homage to the freshly fabricated “image of God the Lord,” meeting resistance only from Satan and his associates (13:2-16:4). Eve gives birth to Cain with Michael’s assistance (21:1-3), he instructs Adam in all the skills he would need to sustain himself in the Garden of Eden (25:2-29:1). Michael queues Eve and Seth access to oil from the Tree of Life, a remedy which they hoped would alleviate Adam’s bodily sufferings, and forecasts the protoplast’s death six days hence (41:1-43:2). When Adam dies, Michael (assisted by Uriel) oversees the funeral arrangements, and the two archangels bury both Adam and the long-deceased Abel (46:2-48:7). Prior to Eve’s demise, she informs her children of a prophecy imparted long ago by Michael predicting two universal cataclysms, first by water and then by fire (49:2-3). After Eve’s burial, Michael appears again in order to reveal to Seth proper mourning procedure (51:1-2).

The Greek Apocalypse of Moses and the Slavonic Vita Adae et Evae parallel the Latin Vita in its emphasis upon Michael as a major angelic character in the narrative movement of their respective plots. These two Adam-books moreover include notice at certain points of another interlocutor who converses with Adam, but who is distinguished from Michael, named “Yoel” (יוֹאֵל), a name that is surely a by-form of the Hebrew Yahoel familiar from late antique magical and pseudepigraphical literature. While in the Apocalypse of Moses the name “Yael” is used to address God himself (29:4; 33:5; compare Apoc. Abr. 17:11), the Slavonic Vita understands the term as a designation for a separate angelic being: “Then we heard Michael the archangel and Joel praying for us, and Joel the archangel was commanded by the Lord, and he took a seventh part of paradise and gave it to us” (31:2; see also 32:2-3).

Given the attested prominence of angelic actors like Michael and Yahoel in extant Adam-books, some of whose traditions may go back to the first century CE, and given further the inner connections and identifications within Jewish esoteric lore among entities like Michael, Yahoel, and the later Metatron, it seems possible to interpret the designation “Balsamos” as an alternate cognomen for one of those archangels. If Visotzky is correct in his reconstruction of its Hebrew origin, “Balsamos” would then most likely be the archangel Yahoel, since that name explicitly incorporates the divine consonants. This is the most satisfactory explanation for the identity of the mysterious Balsamos who reveals himself to Adam in our fragment.

Connections with Second Temple Temple Jewish angelology are also visible in the latter designation “greatest angel of Light.” The Greek phrase “angel of light” is used once in the New Testament by Paul when he is describing how Satan possesses the ability “to transform himself into an angel of light” (2 Cor 11:14). At Qumran, where with regard to heavenly entities the terms “angel” ( صلى الله عليه وسلم) and “prince” (אֱלֹהִים) are functional synonyms, a so-called “prince of light” has been appointed by God to exercise authority over the righteous, whereas Belial, “the angel of enmity” (Belial), plots to corrupt and lead astray all those who strive to adhere to God’s law.

Extremely interesting, however, for our investigation of the language of this Adam fragment is an Aramaic pseudepigraphon recovered from Qumran known as 4Q‘Amram (4Q543-548). This curious work recounts a dream experienced by ‘Amram, the father of Moses (Exod 6:20), wherein he beholds angelic beings engaged in fierce combat for exclusive control of his destiny. The frightened ‘Amram questions the combatants concerning their identities and responsibilities, and learns that they exercise sovereignty over “all the descendants of Adam.” His interlocutor informs him that while “Melchiresa” rules “Darkness,” “[I rule the whole of light ...] from the heights to the depths, I rule all of Light ....” ‘Amram asks for the name of this “ruler of Light,” he indicates that he bears “three designations,’ none of which unfortunately are preserved in the manuscript. However, using information gathered from other Qumran documents, Milik has plausibly suggested restoring one of the missing names as “Melchizedek,” an appellation that appropriately mirrors that of his wicked opponent “Melchiresa.” Support for his reconstruction is readily available from another Qumran text (11QMelch) wherein Milchizedek, the mysterious royal priestly figure of Gen 14:18-20 and Ps 110:4, appears as an angelic entity with eschatological significance. Milik goes on to propose possible restorations for the missing names of the “ruler of Light” and the “ruler of Darkness” (assuming from the principle of divine symmetry that the latter bore three names as well) — “Michael” and “Prince of Light” for the “ruler of Light,” “Belial” and “Angel of Darkness” for the “ruler of Darkness.”

Of especial relevance here is the angelic “ruler of Light,” however cleverly his cognomens might be restored. It is readily apparent that such an important heavenly entity could fittingly be termed “the greatest angel of
Light" (ο μεγατος ἅγιος τοῦ φωτός), and that we are essentially dealing with the same being in these two separate narrative contexts: Balsamos; i.e., Yahoeel or Michael in the Adamic fragment, and the "ruler of Light"; i.e., Michael/Melchizedek or the "prince of Light" in 4Q'Amram. It should also be remarked that the stringent dualistic imagery employed throughout 4Q'Amram eerily presages the ideology of gnosis,49 rendering such a text attractive to those individuals or groups operating within this worldview. Unfortunately, aside from a possible reference to the contents of 4Q'Amram by Origen,50 there is no evidence that this text ever circulated outside of Qumran circles.

Therefore receive (and) write these things just as I reveal them to you on exceedingly clean papyrus which is unspoiled and which has not harbored worms." As the editors of the editio princeps rightly emphasize, the purpose of this injunction is to insure the preservation of Adam's testimony for future generations;51 a similar command occurs later in the "apocalypse of Enosh," wherein Enosh is bidden to inscribe his experience upon bronze tablets (CMC 54.11-17). They furthermore direct attention to a number of analogous prescriptions for the recording of divinely revealed information within roughly contemporaneous Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, although none of them specifically enjoin the scribal technique recommended here.52 The use of "clean papyrus," i.e., blank or previously unused, as a writing surface is however well attested within the Greek magical papyri collection published by Preisendanz.53 A major criticism levied against the so-called "ancestral religions" by Manichaean sources is their unreliability with regard to the faithful preservation and transmission of the teachings of their founders. Figures such as Jesus or the Buddha bequeathed no written testimonies for the edification of their followers. A similar command occurs later in the "apocalypse of Enosh," wherein Enosh is bidden to inscribe his experience upon bronze tablets (CMC 54.11-17). They furthermore direct attention to a number of analogous prescriptions for the recording of divinely revealed information within roughly contemporaneous Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, although none of them specifically enjoin the scribal technique recommended here.52 The use of "clean papyrus," i.e., blank or previously unused, as a writing surface is however well attested within the Greek magical papyri collection published by Preisendanz.53

A major criticism levied against the so-called "ancestral religions" by Manichaean sources is their unreliability with regard to the faithful preservation and transmission of the teachings of their founders. Figures such as Jesus or the Buddha bequeathed no written testimonies for the edification of their followers. A similar command occurs later in the "apocalypse of Enosh," wherein Enosh is bidden to inscribe his experience upon bronze tablets (CMC 54.11-17). They furthermore direct attention to a number of analogous prescriptions for the recording of divinely revealed information within roughly contemporaneous Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, although none of them specifically enjoin the scribal technique recommended here.52 The use of "clean papyrus," i.e., blank or previously unused, as a writing surface is however well attested within the Greek magical papyri collection published by Preisendanz.53

A major criticism levied against the so-called "ancestral religions" by Manichaean sources is their unreliability with regard to the faithful preservation and transmission of the teachings of their founders. Figures such as Jesus or the Buddha bequeathed no written testimonies for the edification of their followers. A similar command occurs later in the "apocalypse of Enosh," wherein Enosh is bidden to inscribe his experience upon bronze tablets (CMC 54.11-17). They furthermore direct attention to a number of analogous prescriptions for the recording of divinely revealed information within roughly contemporaneous Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, although none of them specifically enjoin the scribal technique recommended here.52 The use of "clean papyrus," i.e., blank or previously unused, as a writing surface is however well attested within the Greek magical papyri collection published by Preisendanz.53

Consequently, when one compares this relatively terse narrative with the version of this tale that is preserved within the Syriac Cave of Treasures, a text whose essential core (the so-called Urschatzhöle) may date as early as the fourth century CE.61

And God formed Adam with his (own) holy hands, in his (own) image and in his (own) likeness. And when the angels beheld the image and glorious appearance of Adam, they trembled before the splendor of his form, for they noticed that the form of his face when lit with the splendor of glory resembled (that of) the solar disk, and that the light of his eyes (was as bright) as the rays of the sun, and that the form of his body shone like gleaming crystal. When he stretched himself out and stood up at the center of the earth, he positioned his feet at the very spot where the Cross of our Savior will be erected. There he donned royal

Further interesting motifs are uncovered when one compares this relatively terse narrative with the version of this tale that is preserved within the Syriac Cave of Treasures, a text whose essential core (the so-called Urschatzhöle) may date as early as the fourth century CE.61

And God formed Adam with his (own) holy hands, in his (own) image and in his (own) likeness. And when the angels beheld the image and glorious appearance of Adam, they trembled before the splendor of his form, for they noticed that the form of his face when lit with the splendor of glory resembled (that of) the solar disk, and that the light of his eyes (was as bright) as the rays of the sun, and that the form of his body shone like gleaming crystal. When he stretched himself out and stood up at the center of the earth, he positioned his feet at the very spot where the Cross of our Savior will be erected. There he donned royal
The angels and powers62 of heaven heard the voice of God when he spoke to him: ‘Adam, I have appointed you (to be) king, priest, prophet, lord, chief, and governor over all (those things) that have been made and created. To you alone I have given them, and to you I grant authority over everything that I have created.63 When the angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, cherubim, seraphim, and all the powers of heaven heard [this declaration, all of the celestial ranks praised and worshiped him (i.e., Adam).]

However, when the leader of the lowest celestial rank saw that awesome power had been given to Adam, he became jealous of him and refused to worship him alongside the angels. He said to his powers: ‘Do not worship him, and do not praise (him) in company with the (other) angels! Rather, it is more fitting that he should worship me, since I (was created from) fire and spirit; I shall not worship dirt (or) that which was formed from dust!’ While he thought these things, he became rebellious and disobedient, and thus of his own free will voluntarily separated himself from God, and was cast down and fell (from heaven), and the whole of his company. On the sixth day; i.e., Friday, at the second hour, they were stripped of their glory. Hence his name (their leader) is called ‘Satan’ because he ‘turned away’ (from God), ‘Demon’ [Διάκο] because he ‘was cast down,’ and ‘Devil’ [Διάκο] because he ‘lost’ his garment of glory.64 And from this time forth they (the satanic rank) became naked and of hideous appearance. After Satan was expelled from heaven, Adam was elevated to ascend to Paradise in a chariot of fire while the angels sang praises before him and the seraphim chanted the Gedashah and the cherubim praised him, and with trumpet-blasts and hymns Adam entered Paradise.65

Both versions of this story emphasize that the newly created Adam possesses a godlike status (by virtue of his endowment with the divine image and likeness) that commands adoration and worshipful homage even from the ministering angels themselves.66 However, the Cave of Treasures version foreshadows the consequences that follow the willful disobedience of divine directives: the rebellious angels forfeit their lofty position near the pinnacle of creation and are moreover stripped of their “glorious garments,” luminous coverings that emulated (to some extent) the iridescence of heaven itself that is illuminated by the divine “Glory.” Similarly Adam (and Eve) shall subsequently share an identical fate after their transgression in Paradise: a forcible expulsion (both physical and political) from their original abode and status, coupled with the removal of the “garments of light” that signaled their celestial status.68 They too shall henceforth sojourn upon earth “naked and bare” of celestial accoutrement.

Hence the “apocalypse” fragment under consideration suggests a reversal of Adam’s “earthly” (or even “earthy”) condition. The question is at what point in the broad narrative context of the formulated Adam traditions does the projected transformation occur? If the Adam fragment belongs among those traditions transmitted within eastern Christian Adamschriften, it should presuppose the same setting envisioned in works like the Apocalypse of Moses and Vita Adae et Evae: Adam no longer dwells in the Garden as before, he must now labor strenuously to procure sustenance for himself and his family (although neither Eve nor their progeny are featured in this fragment), and if the narrative tone of the aforementioned writings was maintained here, he feels intense remorse for his disobedience of God’s command. For this reason the Adamschriften characteristically portray Adam as engaged in intensive ascetic exercises of penance. Their rigor seems designed to awaken the sympathy of God for the sufferer, which in turn may lead to a restoration of good relations with God. The usual result of these entreaties is an angelophany which produces some mitigation of what seem to be hopelessly harsh conditions.

The appearance of Balsamos to Adam in our fragment may have been prompted by a similar set of circumstances, especially if Balsamos is in fact an esoteric designation for an entity like Michael or Yahoel. Yet there remains a nagging problem with this line of interpretation, one that is signaled by the final clause of this particular excerpt: “and (he) was made superior to all the powers and angels of creation” (και γέγονεν ὕπερτος χαρά κάσως τῶν δυνάμεων καί τοῦς ἐγκές τῆς κίασως). Clearly the entities whom Adam surpassed in honor and prestige were demiurgic beings, as in Apoc. Adam 64.16-19: “for we were higher than the god who had created us and the powers with him.” The Adam fragment echoes, it would appear, those gnostic currents that held that Adam (at least his material body) was created by one or more “lower” angelic entities.

When read from that interpretive stance (i.e., as a “gnostic” anthropogony), the Adam fragment begins to resemble the Manichaean myth briefly outlined above. Prior to the visit of the emissary from the Realm of Light, Adam has knowledge only of that environment in which “the powers and angels of creation” have placed him. The arrival of Balsamos (who would thus correspond to Jesus the Splendor) awakens Adam to his true status within the created order: he reveals to Adam the Realm of Light and its inhabitants (the θεοι θεωνικοι of Theodore bar Konai’s testimony), and elevates him to a position of superiority vis-à-vis the archons of Darkness (perhaps implied in Theodore bar Konai’s account by the consumption of fruit from the Tree of Life).71 Indeed, reference to this experience may have once been present in the Adam fragment, inasmuch as five complete lines of text have been lost at precisely this point in the narrative.

Given the recurrent appearance of identifiably gnostic, even Manichaean, motifs in the surviving lines of our Adam fragment, it seems logical to conclude that this textual citation stems (at least in its present form) from a gnostic milieu, perhaps drawn from that collection of “books which they (the so-called Gnostics) call revelations of Adam” (Epiphanius, Panarion 26.8.1), or perhaps adapted from the vast storehouse of traditional Jewish and/or Christian Adamic lore. While, as we have seen, there are some verbal and conceptual affinities between our fragment and portions of the Coptic Apocalypse of Adam, they are by no means variant recensions of a common Grundschritt. Further, the intriguing hints at mature Manichaean themes and
mythologoumena that I have repeatedly identified above suggest a redactional process, one that has consciously accommodated what may have been originally a classical Gnostic or even "non-gnostic" Adam fragment to its "new" ideological environment. This means then that the CMC Adam fragment cannot be accepted as an authentic specimen of Jewish pseudepigraphic discourse. While it may have originated in such a setting, perhaps as early as the Second Temple period, its present formulation even in this fragmentary state betrays its gnostic genealogy.

κολά θε και άλλα τούτους παρακλήσεως υπάρχει εν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ "Many other similar things to these are in his writings." Presumably the "things" referenced here are items like angelophanies, revelatory discourses, descriptions of visionary experiences and/or ascents to heaven, and written records of the wisdom mediated through such encounters. Extant Adam-schriften are replete with material of this sort.

APPENDIX: A TREASURY OF MANICHAEAN ADAM TRADITIONS

1. Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum (ed. Scher) 317-18:
Then the abortions took counsel together and recalled the form(s) of the Messenger that they had seen and said, 'Where is the form(s) that we saw?' And Ashaqlūn, son of the King of Darkness, said to the abortions: 'Give me your sons and daughters, and I will make for you a form like the one you saw.' They brought (them) and gave (them) to him. He ate the males, and the females he gave to Nebrūel his wife. Nebrūel and Ashaqlūn then united together, and she became pregnant from him and gave birth to a son, naming him Adam. She (again) became pregnant and bore a daughter, naming her Eve.

He (then) says that Jesus the Splendor approached the unsuspecting Adam and roused him from the sleep of death, that he might be delivered from the great spirit. As (when) one who is righteous discovers a man possessed by a strong demon and calms him by his skill, so likewise it was with Adam when the Beloved One found him prostrate in deep sleep. He roused him and shook him and woke him, and chased away from him the deceptive demon, and bound apart from him the great (female) archon. Then Adam examined himself and recognized who he was, and Jesus showed him the Fathers on high, and (revealed to him) regarding his own self (i.e., Jesus's) all that into which he (i.e., Jesus) had been cast—into the teeth of leopards and the teeth of elephants, swallowed by voracious ones and absorbed by gulping ones, consumed by dogs, mixed and imprisoned in all that exists, bound in the stench of Darkness. He (Mani) says that he raised him (Adam) up and made him taste of the Tree of Life. Then Adam cried out and wept, and raised his voice loudly like a lion that roars and tears (prey). He cast (himself down) and beat (his breast) and said, 'Woe, woe to the one who formed my body, and to the one who bound my soul, and to the rebels who have enslaved me.'

2. Ibn al-Nadlm, Fihrist (apud Flügel, Mani 58-61):
(Heading) The Beginning of Sexual Reproduction According to the Teaching of Mani.
He (Mani) said, 'Then one of those archons, the stars, urgent force, desire, lust, and sin had sexual intercourse, and the result of their intercourse was the first man, who was Adam. That which produced this (was the union of) two archons, male and female. Then intercourse took place once more, and its result was the beautiful woman, who was Eve.'
He (Mani) said, ‘When the five angels saw the divine Light and Goodness which Desire had plundered and bound as captive within those two who had been born, they asked al-Bashir (= the Messenger), the Mother of Life, Primal Man, and the Living Spirit to send to this first-created creature someone to release and deliver him, to teach him knowledge and piety, and to deliver him from the satans.’

He (Mani) said: ‘They thus sent Jesus, along with (another) deity. They approached the two archons, confined them, and rescued the two who had been born.’

He (Mani) said: ‘Then Jesus came and spoke to the one who had been born, who was Adam, and explained to him (about) the gardens (of Paradise), Jesus commanded). Then that (male) archon came back to his daughter, who was Eve, and lustfully had intercourse with her.

Engendered with her a son of white complexion, whose name was Abel, and the White Man. Then Cain, again had intercourse with his mother, and engendered with her two girls, one of whom was named Hakimat al-Dahr, and the other Ibnat al-Hirs. Then Cain took Ibnat al-Hirs as his wife and presented Hakimat al-Dahr to Abel, and he took her as his wife.

He (Mani) said: ‘In Hakimat al-Dahr there was a residue of the Light of God and His Wisdom, but there was none of this (present) in Ibnat al-Hirs. Then one of the angels, who was Adam, and explained to him (about) the gardens (of Paradise), he had sexual intercourse with her and she gave birth because of him to two girls, and she named one of them (Rau)-Faryad and the other Bar-Faryad. When Abel learned of this, rage filled (him) and grief overcame him. He said to her, “From whom did you produce these two children? I think they are from Cain; it was he who consorted with you!” Although she described to him the form of the angel, he left her and came to his mother, Eve, and complained to her about what Cain had done. He said to her, “Have you heard what he did to my sister and wife?” When Cain learned this, he went to Abel and struck him with a rock, killing him. Then he took Hakimat al-Dahr for a wife.’

Mani said: ‘Then those archons and this al-Sindid and Eve were distressed at (the behavior) they saw (exhibited) by Cain. Al-Sindid then taught Eve magical syllables in order that she might in fatuate Adam. She proceeded to act (by) presenting him with a garland from a flowering tree, and when Adam saw her, he lustfully united with her, and she became pregnant and gave birth to a handsome male child of radiant appearance. When al-Sindid learned about this, he was distressed and fell ill, and said to Eve, “This infant is not one of us; he is a stranger.” Then she wished to kill him, but Adam seized him and said to Eve, “I will feed him cow’s milk and the fruit of trees!” Thus taking him he departed. But al-

Sindid sent the archons to carry off the trees and cattle, moving them away from Adam. When Adam saw this, he took the infant and circled it within three rings. He pronounced over the first (ring) the name of the King of the Gardens, over the second the name of Primal Man, and over the third the name of the Living Spirit. He spoke to and implored God, may His name be glorified, saying, “Even though I have sinned before you, what offense has this infant committed?” Then one of the three (invoked deities) hurried (to Adam bearing) a crown of radiance, extending it in his hand to Adam. When al-Sindid and the archons saw this, they departed (and) went away.’

He (Mani) said, ‘Then there appeared to Adam a tree called the lotus, and man descended from it. And he fed the boy with it. He named him (the boy) after its name, but sometime later he renamed him Shathil (i.e., Seth). Then that al-Sindid declared enmity against Adam and those who were born, and said to Eve, “Reveal (yourself) to Adam; perhaps you may restore him to us.” Then she made haste and seduced Adam, who lustfully united with her. When Shathil saw him, he admonished and rebuked him (Adam), and said to him, “Arise, let us go to the East, to the Light and Wisdom of God.” So he left with him and resided there until he died and came to the Gardens (of Paradise). Then Shathil with Rau-Faryad and Bar-Faryad and Hakimat al-Dahr, their mother, practiced midispir, following one way and one path until the time of their deaths, but Eve, Cain, and Ibnat al-Hirs went to Gehenna.’

3. M 7984 I R ii 33-V ii + M 7982 R + V + M 7983 I R + V:

[Title]: The discourse about Gehmur (i.e., Adam) and Murdlyansa (i.e., Eve). 120

§37 Then that Az, the one who had been deceived, was filled with great anger. She began wishing (to take) step(s), and she thought, ‘I shall form two creatures, male and female, corresponding to the two forms, female and male, of the god Narish which I saw, so that they can (eventually) be my clothing and covering. I would control them ... and these [two creatures?] shall not be taken away from me, and I shall not let them experience deprivation and suffering.’

§38 Then that Az was clothed with all those progeny of the demons that had fallen from heaven to earth; (actually) that male arch-fiend and female arch-fiend who were lion-shaped, (and who) were lustful, wrathful, wicked, and thievish. And she (temporarily) made them her own covering and clothing inside these she was lustful.

§39 And even as formerly (when) Az herself in that blackness of hell, her own lair, had taught lewd behavior and sexual copulation to the demons and demonesses, wrathful demons, monsters, and arch-fiends, both male and female, so too Az again began teaching lewd behavior and sexual copulation in the same way to those other monsters and arch-fiends, males and females, who had fallen from heaven to earth so that they would become sexually aroused, copulate by joining together their bodies, and give birth to dragon children. Az could (then) take away and consume that progeny, and form from them two creatures, a man and a woman.

APPENDIX: MANICHAEAN ADAM TRADITIONS
(§40) Thus the monster and the arch-fiend, the male one and the female one, taught all (the others) lewd behavior and sexual copulations, and (those others) joined their bodies together. They gave birth to children and nurtured them. They (then) gave their own children to those two leonine arch-fiends, the male one and the female one, who were (serving as) clothes for Az, and (who were consequently) lustful. And Az (in their guise) consumed their children, and those two monsters, the male one and the female one, became (even more) lustful and were impelled to copulate. They joined their bodies together, and (from) that mixture which clothed them, (which) was from the children of the monsters and arch-fiends which she had eaten, she constructed and made in accordance with her own desire a body in male form, with bone(s), nerve(s), flesh, blood vessel(s), and skin.

(§41) And a soul was bound in that body, (the former deriving) from that light and beauty of the gods which had become mixed in the children of the monsters through the eating of fruit and bud(s). And in it (the body) were arranged their (the monsters') desire and lust, lewd behavior and sexual drive, enmity and slander, envy and wickedness, anger and impurity, ill-humor and stupor, spiritual corruption and skepticism, stealing and lying, robbery and the doing of evil deeds, obstinancy and falsehood (?), (the urge for) vengeance and conceit (?), sorrow and grief, pain and ache, poverty and want, disease and decrepitude, stench and thievishness (?).

(§42) And in correspondence with the (types of) speech and voice possessed by those monstrous abortions, from whom she had formed that body, she (Az) gave to that creature (those languages), so that it could speak and comprehend every kind of speech.

(§43) And (it was) in accordance with that male form of the gods (i.e., the male aspect of Narisah, or the Messenger) which she had seen in the vessel that she shaped and formed it (the first man). Moreover she (Az) bound to him (the first man) connection(s) and link(s) from above, from the sky—from monsters, arch-fiends, constellations, and planets—so that wrath, lewdness, and wickedness would rain down on him (the first man) from the monsters and constellations, and permeate his mind so that he would become more thievish, more monstrous, more greedy, and more lustful. And when the male creature was born, they named him 'the first human being,' namely Gêhmurd.

(§44) Then the two leonine arch-fiends, the male one and the female one, again consumed some of the children of their colleagues, and they were filled (with the urges for) lewd behavior and sexual activity. And they joined their bodies together.

(§45) And that Az, who had filled them with those children of the monsters, the ones whom they had eaten, then shaped and formed in the same way another body, which was female, with bone(s), nerve(s), flesh, blood vessels, and skin. And a soul was bound in that body, (the former deriving) from the light and beauty of the gods which had become mixed in the children of the monstrous abortions through (the eating of) fruit and bud(s). And in it (the body) were arranged their (the monsters') desire and lust, lewd behavior and sexual drive, enmity and slander, envy and
APPENDIX: MANICHAEAN ADAM TRADITIONS

CHAPTER THREE

4. Sundermann fragments:158

a. M 4500

Recto column I
1. ...
2. ...
3. a lecherous word
4. he (Šaklōn) spoke to her (Murdiyānag)
5. and immediately159 she was
6. burning with lust, and he
7. [ among all (?)160
8. ...
9. [ (Gē)hmurd]
10. ...
11. ...

Recto column II
1. ...
2. ...
3. [ thus he said:161
4. [ he has made us joyful,
5. and
6. he has (?) [ ]
7. ...
8. ...
9. ...
10. ...
11. ...
12. ...

Verso column I
1. ...
2. portrayed (?) [ ]
3. the angels [ ]
4. ...
5. invoked a name (?) [ ]
6. these angels
7. [ ] and the other
8. [ ] of (?) Gēhmurd
9. ...
10. ...
11. ...
12. ...

Verso column II
1. ...
2. [ ] were all
3. and strong
4. [ ] was made
5. ...

b. M 4500

Recto column II
1. ...
2. [ ] desirous. Then
3. [ ] they stood
4. and from afar (his) son
5. [ ], in order that when
6. Gēhmurd removed him from
7. those lines, then they
8. could kidnap167
9. him. [ ]
10. Gēhmurd turned [his] face [ ]
11. to the Realm of Light168
12. And he spoke thusly:169
13. ... you (pl.) [ ]

Verso column I
1. ...
2. ...
3. and strong
4. ...
5. [ ]...
6. [also that curse and
7. oath] he annulled
8. [that child milk
9. [g]iven. And
10. Gehmurd [bent himself] down
11. and lifted that child
12. up from the ground
13. [and] said: And

Verso column II
1. ...
2. [G]o, that ...
3. and the filth of death
4. throw into the springs
5. of water, so that if
6. that child should drink (lit. "taste") (from there)
7. he would immediately die. And he
8. ordered the female demonesses
9. 'that no one
10. of you []
11. ...
12. that child[172]
13. ...

M 5567
Recto column I
1. And eighty years, as long as
2. Murdiyânąg no longer was in contact
3. with him, he lived in righteousness[173]
4. And (even) during those many
5. years when Murdiyânąg
6. was near Gehmurd,
7. she did not become
8. pregnant by him. And
9. all the powers []
10. [were suffering.
11. ...

Recto column II
1. ...
2. and plant(s)[]
3. type []
4. ...
5. ...
6. became pregnant (?)[174]
7. ...
8. and []

Verso column I
1. ...
2. ...
3. [end
4. ...
5. ...
6. ...
7. ...
8. ...

Verso column II
1. and []
2. then Murdiyânąg was
3. grieving (?)[175] And
4. before Saklôn and
5. before all the powers
6. of Saklôn she swore
7. a mighty oath and
8. said: 'You (pl.) []
9. by this []
10. thing []
11. ...
12. ...

M 4502
Page 1
1. ...
2. ...
3. [east[177]
4. ...
5. ...

Page 2 of M 4502 and the whole of M 4503 too fragmentary for analysis.

M 2309
Verso
1. [when he arranged
2. the qîwad-world[178] the cornerstone of
3. earth and heaven, and he apportioned in it
4. four worlds, and in those four
5. worlds (?)]
6. heavens (?)[ ]

Recto
1. [the twelfth: pain and [ ]179
2. And when those first two
3. destructive creatures were born, Adam and [ ] Eve,
4. people [ ]
5. —

M 8280
Recto column I
1. [ ] those two
2. —
3. [ ] the sinful Eve
4. [ ] Adam from the religion
5. [ ] the third time and
6. [ ] purity

Recto column II
1. humans, animals (?), [ ]
2. like the seed [ ]

M 1859
Too fragmentary for reconstruction, but the names Šaktlon and Sethel (ṣyryl) appear.

NOTES


2CMC 47.3-11: ὡς εἰς ἐκάστος τῶν προγενεστέρων πατέρων τὴν ἰδίαν ἀποκάλυψιν ἔδειξεν τῇ εαυτοῦ ἑκλογῇ, ἦν ἐξελέξατο καὶ συνήγαγεν κατʼ ἐκείνην τὴν γενεάν καὶ ἦν ἑράνη.


4The entity Primal Man was “evoked” (r̲io) by the Mother of Life, who was in turn the first evocation of the Father of Greatness, the ruler of the Manichaean Realm of Light. Primal Man plays a very important role in the Manichaean cosmogonical drama, and so his name is attested in practically every linguistic tradition from which we possess Manichaean texts or testimonies. See J.C. Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 201 n.22. The Middle Iranian texts encode him as “the lord Ohrmizd,” or “the god Ohrmizd.”

testimonia identify the androgynous Third Messenger and/or the Maiden of Light as the prototypical “form(s)” copied in human creation; see the discussion below. While almost all students of Manichaean lore accept the authenticity of this latter tradition, the antiquity of the former concept (the Acta Archelai are pre-350 CE; Alexander circa 300 CE) dictates that it be accorded some respect.


7See, e.g., L. A. 1.31-32, 53-55, 88-96, 2.4; Op. 69-71, 134-47; Quest. in Gen. 1.4, 2.56.


11Apoc. 65:11. Compare the identical designation of this entity found in Man’s Skabdubragad, as quoted by al-Biruni: “The revelation has come down this prophecy in this last age through me, Mani, the messenger of the God of truth (الله الحاصل) to Babylonia” (Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Alberani (ed. C.E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923) 207.12-13). Note also Acta Archelai 124:5: τον δὲ καλλιτματι των Μωυσεως και των ουδατων και των ϕαιων των αυτων ειτε ο αν αληθειας ψως, δια τουτω σου Ϙοσα δε ιτε ουκ ήλιον του εη των Θης αληθειας. This appeal for the Father of Greatness is moreover used frequently in Coptic Manichaean literature; for a sampling of representative citations see especially P. Van Lindt, The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1992) 19-12.

12These entities are perhaps to be numbered among the “angels of the great light” who shall dwell with the descendants of Seth in “a holy dwelling-place” after the Flood (72.1-15).

13Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. ii, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Pousielgue, 1912) 317-9-15: שֶׁיֵּשׁ שֶׁיֵּשׁ לְאִנֶּפֶחָן אַחַת שֶׁיֵּשׁ לְאִנֶּפֶחָן אַחַת שֶׁיֵּשׁ. Translation adapted from Reeves, Jewish Lore 192-93; see the Appendix below for a detailed discussion of this passage.

14Note that here the slumber of Adam is termed the “sleep of death” (תֵּכֶּנֶּה), just as in Apoc. Adam 66:2-3. References to Adam’s “sleep” are presumably reflexes of Gen 22:1a: שְׁתָּא וַיִּכְרָרֵהוּ מִפָּנָיו. Visionary experiences associated with this “sleep” betray dependence upon the LXX version of Gen 22:1a: και ἐπέβαλλεν ο θεὸς σκηνήν ἐπὶ τὸν Αδὰμ καὶ πανανθεότητά. See also LXX Gen 15:12; Jud. 14:13; Apoc. 15:2ff.; Gen. Rab. 17:5 (w. 44.17).

15Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum (ed. Scher) 317.15-28. Ibn al-Nadîm in his Fihrist transmits a similar tradition: “[Various entities of the Realm of Light request that there be sent someone] to release and deliver him (Adam), to teach him knowledge and piety, and to deliver him from the satans. He (Mani) said: They thus sent Jesus, along with (another) deity. They approached the two archons (i.e., the demiurgic pair), confirmed them, and rescued the two who had been born. He (Mani) said: Then Jesus came and spoke to the one who had been born, who was Adam, and explained to him (about) the gardens (of Paradise), the deities, Gehenna, the satans, earth, heaven, sun, and moon.” Text translated from the edition of Flügel, Mani 58.15-59.7. See also Reeves, Jewish Lore 205 nn.54-55 and the Appendix below.

16An intermediate position between the characteristic “gnostic” and “non-gnostic” anthropogonic narratives is present in Sefer ha-Bahir 5200 (ed. Margaliot = Scholom §141), where Samael bears ultimate responsibility for the material fabrication of humanity (אלהי המ).[1] even though God was the actual agent of creation (אלהי המ).[2] The language of this pericope is very reminiscent of gnostic discourse: “... מעה על רבו...” He (Mani) replied: “Why do we have a body of fabricated (matter)?”

17How did this happen? He said to them: Samael the wicked went and conspired with all of the heavenly hosts against his Master ...” The reply of the teacher is simply a quotation (from Pirqah R. El. 13-14) of the aggadic narrative of the temptation of Adam by Samael. What is striking here is the juxtaposition of the students’ query, pregnantly posed in the anti-cosmic terminology of gnostics, with “non-gnostic” exegetical lore. By employing this rhetorical frame, the author(s) of Sefer ha-Bahir attribute the material body, nuanced as undesirable, to the impious machinations of Samael, a name which is (hardly coincidentally) one of those accorded the demiurge in classical Gnostic literature. See Ap. John 11.15-19; Hyp. Arch. 87.3-4, 94.25-26; Orig. World 103.8; Trim. Prot. 39.26-27.

18The role played by Michael, Yahoel, and Raziel in the texts examined below.

19Greek ουξίας; Coptic sals; Middle Persian nrjmy; presumably Syriac қәә. For a discussion and analysis of the sources that incorporates the evidence of the Codex, see Heinrichs-Koenen, ZPE 5 (1970) 161-89. The translation adapted from that of The Cologne Mani Codes (SBLT 15; ed. R. Cameron and A.J. Dewey; Minioola, MT: Scholars Press, 1979) 19. Compare Acts Thom. 112 (part of the so-called “Hymn of the Pearl”) for a
similar use of the "reflection" metaphor, and see the discussion of Henrichs-Koenen, *ZDMG* 25 (1871) 122-28.

28In this context, the term "Nabataean" signifies "Aramaic"; more specifically, the eastern Aramaic dialect(s) of Mesopotamia. See T. Nödeke, *Die Namen der aramäischen Nationen und Sprache*, ZDMG 25 (1871) 122-28.

29Ibn al-Nadim, *Fihrist* (apud Flügel, *Mani*, 50:10-13). "König der Welt der Licht". Note too that the word for "king" (الملك) can also be read "angel".


31M 20: wx'yd br symws "the lord Bar-Simus" (text apud Boyce, *Reader* 192); M 4b: pywy1y tb symws "invocation of Bar-Simus" (Boyce, *Reader* 191); M 1202: brsymws yr3'g "Bar-Simus the angel" (Boyce, *Reader* 189); M 196: mrvs nmrsws brsymws y'qwb 'wq ypnws srwds 'wrd 'hrndws syt 'wrd brsymws (3w)b'n'n nyr'n frystg pqwn 'y br brsymws "shepherds", cited by W.B. Henning, "Two Manichaean Magical Texts, with an Excursus on the Parthian Ending "endēk," BSOAS 12 (1947-48) 51. See also A. Christensen, *Uran* sous les Sassanids (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1936) 186, and especially the remarks of W. Fauth apud H.-J. Klimkeit, *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts: Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989) 276-77. Note that the androgynous "virgin" Barbelo sometimes bears the name "jolō" or "jolē" in Coptic gnostic texts: *Gos. Eg.* 44.27; 50.2; 53.22; 56.20; 59.23; 62.6; 65.23; *Zost.* 52.14; 54.17; 57.15; 62.12; 63.11; 125.14; *Anogen.* 50.20; 52.14; 55.18; 34; 57.25; and note the remarks of M. Scopello, "Youel et Barbelo dans le traité de l’Allogène," Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22-25 août 1978) (ed. B. Berc: Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 1981) 374-78. This is surely no coincidence, particularly when one considers that the Manichean "Maiden of Light" is likewise endowed with male and female attributes in order to "seduce" the archon. The correspondence warrants further investigation.


34Compare the exalted status of Metatron in 3 Enoch (Schäfer S 15): "and he (God) proclaimed me 'the lesser YHWH' in the presence of all his retina in the heavenly lights, as it is said 'for My Name is in him' (Exod 23:21)."

35*Haeticarum fabularum compendium* 1.26 (PG 83, col. 380A): καὶ τοῦ μῶν Ἀδάμ θηριόμορφον κτισθήναι, τὴν δὲ ἔδωκαν φύσιν καὶ ἄξιον τὴν δὲ αρέσχειαν χαράνθος, ἵνα τοῦ φυτοῦ οὐνάμενοι χαράντοι, καὶ Ἰησοῦ προσαγορεύοντο, μεταδοούσι φυσι τῇ Εὐα, καὶ ζωῆς καὶ φωτός. See F.C. Baur, *Das manische Religionsystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwickelt* (Tübingen: C.F. Osiander, 1831) 151; W. Boussert, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; reprinted: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 76-77. Note that the androgynous “virgin” Barbelo sometimes bears the name “jolō” or “jolē” in Coptic gnostic texts: *Gos. Eg.* 44.27; 50.2; 53.22; 56.20; 59.23; 62.6; 65.23; *Zost.* 52.14; 54.17; 57.15; 62.12; 63.11; 125.14; *Anogen.* 50.20; 52.14; 55.18; 34; 57.25; and note the remarks of M. Scopello, "Youel et Barbelo dans le traité de l’Allogène," Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22-25 août 1978) (ed. B. Berc: Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 1981) 374-78. This is surely no coincidence, particularly when one considers that the Manichean “Maiden of Light” is likewise endowed with male and female attributes in order to “seduce” the archon. The correspondence warrants further investigation.


NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

40Milik, RB 79 (1972) 86. The designations "Prince of Light" and "Angel of Darkness" are actually used in Qumran sectarian literature; see above. Belial is "le nom traditionnel du chef des mauvais esprits," and is also attested at Qumran, although a viable alternative might be Maṭṣema, the name borne by the head of the evil spirits in Jubilees, and which also is found in Qumran literature. Michael is of course well attested as the principal archangel, and the possible invocation of his name here is further abetted by hints of an assimilation or identification of the figures of Michael and Melchizedek in sectarian literature. This fusion is made conceptually possible through the idea that Michael functions as heavenly high priest: see b. Hag. 12b; b. Meḳeṭ 110a; b. Zebab 62a. For the possibility that this identification already appears at Qumran, see A.S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XL" OTS 14 (1965) 354-73; C. Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 37-38. P.S. Alexander (JJS 28 [1977] 162 n.12) quotes a late rabbinic text that explicitly states their identity.

41The following features are quite suggestive: Light and Darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (ה fullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

42Milik, RB 79 (1972) 86-92. His suggestion, while ingenious, remains dubious.

43Henrichs-Koenen, ZPE 19 [1975] 49 n.89.

44Az, Mos. 1:16-18; Adam and Eve 50:1-2; Josephus, Ant. 1.70-71 are probably the most relevant.

45F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichacca aus Chinesisch-Turkeston," II. SPAW (1932) 295 n.3.

46Middle Persian n[b]ylg[n] zdngdn (M 5794 v I lines 11-12). Text cited from Mir-Man. 112 296; see also Boyce, Reader 30.


48Note the psychopompic roles of Michael in the Latin Vita Adam et Evae 2.5-2.3, and of Yaqel in Apoc. Abr. 153-5.

49See 2 Enoch 13:27 (short); Apoc. Abr. 156: "And I (i.e., Abraham) saw in the air, on the height to which we went up, a great light, which is indescribable." Translation cited from that of A. Pennington, "The Apocalypse of Abraham," AOT (Sparks) 379.

50B.A. Pearson has noted the similarity of this transformation to Apoc. Adam 64.14-19: and we (Adam and Eve) resembled the great eternal angels, for we were higher than the god who had created us and the powers with him." See his "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 451. By contrast, G.W.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

39APOT 2.134.

39"The light and darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (ה fullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

39"The light and darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (ה fullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

39"The light and darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (הFullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

39"The light and darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (הFullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

39"The light and darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (הFullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

39"The light and darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler," the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (הFullPath); while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon:" the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosia; see Reeves, Jewish Lore 177-8 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.
MacRae has stated that the CMC Adam fragment has "nothing in common with the Nag Hammadi work" (OTP 1.170). This judgment is profoundly wrong.

60Latin Vita Adae et Evae 131-143, 161 (APOT 2.137). See also the Questions of Bartholomew 52-55 (apud E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* [2 vols.; ed. W. Schneemelcher; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963-65] 1.500), and Qur’an 2:34; 7:11-13; 15:29-35; 17:61; 20:116; 31:78-17. An exemplary discussion of this motif is that of H. Speyer, *Die biblischen Erzählungen im Koran* (reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1988) 54-58; see also L. Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 5:84-86 n.35. According to *Pirke R. El.* 14, Samael and his host were cast out from heaven because he successfully deceived Adam, an expulsion which in terms of the narrative chronology established by Genesis 2-3 occurs later than the banishment envisioned by the aforementioned texts. Rev 12:7-9 foreshadows an eschatological recapitulation of Satan's rebellion where once again he and his angelic allies will be driven from the presence of God. See 2 Enoch 29:4-5, 31:3-6 (long version) are also cognizant of the tradition of the fall of Satan(ael), although here the expulsion occurs on the second day of the week of creation; i.e., prior to the fabrication of Adam.


62Note that this syntagma (אלהים הם האדם היה כאחד ממני) parallels the supervalid vocabulary of the Adam fragment (τας δυνάμεις και τους αγγέλους). Compare 2 Enoch 30:11-12 (long): "... I placed him on earth, a second angel, honourable, great and glorious, and I appointed him as ruler to rule on earth..." (APOT 2.449).

63The Syriac text does not disclose the name of the rebel angel prior to his disobedience. The Arabic version published by Bezold (p. 17 lines 4-10; see the next note) identifies him as "Satan" (שלאטן) and records that after refusing to honor Adam, his names became "Sathanêlêl" (שלאטנַּלּ) and "Ilbîlîs" (ידבעי), the latter sobriquet of course the common Qur'anic designation for Satan. Note however Arabic Cave of Treasures (ed. Bezold) p. 3 line 7, where his original name would appear to be "Sathanêlêl," and compare 2 Enoch 3:1-4:5. Note also the additional references supplied by H.E. Gaylord, "How Satanael Lost His 'el," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303-309. According to the *Tafsir al-Tabarî*, Ilbîlîs was named "Azzîlîs (أليس) before his fall, a tradition clearly reliant on the Enochic tale of angelic perdition rather than the strand evidenced above. The identical tradition of Azazel's primordial rebellion would seem to be presupposed in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see chaps. 13-14, 20-23. For further discussion and references, see A. Netzer, "The Story of Adam in the Bereshit-Nâmah of Shăhīn," *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies*, Part 2: *Middle and New Iranian Studies* (ed. G. Gnoli and A. Panaíno; Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio e Estremo Oriente, 1990) 499-502; Wasserstrom, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha" 101-103.


65Compare *Aba R. Ratan A* 1 (ed. Schecter 3a): ושמים יי אלהים הן האדם היה כאותו לדעת טוב ורע ועתה פן ישלח ידו ולקח גם מעץ החיים ואכל וחי לעלם

66Heavenly entities are garbed in luminous garments—this is a leit-motif of Jewish apocalyptic tradition. See for example 2 Enoch 9:17-19 (short): "And the Lord said to Michael, Take Enoch and take off his earthly garments, and anoint him with good oil, and clothe him in glorious garments... and I looked at myself, and I was like one of the glorious ones, and there was no apparent difference." Translation taken from A. Pennington, "2 Enoch," *AOT (Sparks)* 337-38.

67There is a persistent tradition within both Jewish and Christian (especially Syriac) circles that Adam and Eve wore "garments of light" prior to their succumbing to the blandishments of the serpent. Note Apoc. Mos. 20:1-2: "And in that very hour my eyes were opened (i.e. when Eve partakes of the forbidden fruit), and forthwith I knew that I was bare of the righteousness with which I had been clothed... and I wept and said to him (the serpent): 'Why hast thou done this to me, in that thou hast deprived me of the glory which I was clothed in?'." ibid. 21:6: "And to me he saith, 'O wicked woman! what have I done to thee that thou hast deprived me of the glory of God?'" (APOT 2.146-47; *Pirke R. El.* 14 (ed. Luria 33b): before Adam fell, he was cloaked with "a cloud of glory" (םְנָא םְנֶא). See also 3 Apoc. Bar. 4:16: "Know therefore, O Baruch, that as Adam through this very tree obtained condemnation, and was divested of the glory of God..." (APOT 2.530); even Apoc. Adam 64-612: "When god had created me out of the earth along with Eve your mother, I went about with her in a glory which she had seen in the awn from which we had come forth" (*Nag Hammadi Library* 3 [ed. Robinson] 279). Gen 3:21: הלעתי יושב על הקרקע ולא服饰 עדו נא שמש תרמ'ב holding me, I had some role in the spread of this motif; cf. Tg. Onq. and Tg. Ps.-l. to that verse. See also Gen. Rab. 2012: "In R. Meir's Torah manuscript they found written 'garments of light.' For references to this motif within Syriac Christian literature, see S. Brock, "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," *Synkretismus im syrisch-perischen Kultureliten* (ed. A. Dietrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 98-104; ideb, "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," *JJS* 30 (1979) 221-23; ideb, *The Luminous Eye: The Spiritual World Vision of Saint Ephrem* (rev.ed.; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992) 85-97.

68Cave of Treasures (ed. Ri) 35 (4.15-17).
immortality ...." Adam thus already enjoys equality with the demiurgic entities; consumption of fruit from the Tree of Life, it is implied, would elevate him above immortality ...." Adam thus already enjoys equality with the demiurgic entities; consumption of this fruit is promised to the "victorious" among the church at Ephesus in Rev 2:7; comparison with the other rewards promised to the "victorious" in Revelation 2-3 demonstrates its superlative value. The concept of a heavenly Tree of Life (and concomitant Tree of Death) plays an important role in Manichaean cosmology. For a recent discussion, see J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," Tracing the Threads (ed. Reeves) 187-91.

Note the similar transcription ḫhw in the Middle Iranian fragments translated below, as well as the ninth-century testimony of al-Jàhiz on the term "fool"; cf. G. Scholem, "Jaldabaoth Reconsidered," Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Fuech (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974) 411; B. Barc, "Samaēl-Saklas-Yaldabaôth: recherche sur la genèse d'un mythe gnostique," Colloque international (ed. Barc) 123 n.4. Note especially the testimony of Michael the Syrian: ἀς ἄνωτον ὑπηρετεῖν ἔτη λίβαντον: "they (the Manichaeans) say that Adam and Eve stem from Sãglã, the ruler of Hyle, and from Nebrêlû (Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarque jacobite d'Antioche, 1166-1199 4 vols.; ed. J.-B. Chabot; reprinted, Bruxelles: Culture et civilisation, 1963) 4.118 (text); also Ḫpâlâlu 137:15-22; 138:1-5,17-18, wherein Saklas is termed the "archon who is the ruler of the (abortions)" For both "Sakla" and "Nebruel" as angelic rulers of "chaos and Hades," see Gos. Eg. 57.5-58.21. Priscillian also mentions "Sãclus" and "Nebroel"; see Chadwick, Priscillian 94.

There exist several variant spellings for this name ( / kîÎá / kîÎä / kîÎâ / kîÎç / kîÎû / kîÎâ / kîÎë / kîÎî / kîÎó / kîÎù / kîî / kîû / kîî / kîî); cf. Scheer's critical apparatus at the bottom of p. 317, as well as the note above on Aliqûlû. "Nebroêlû" would seem to be the best reading; note the references above to the testimonies from the Coptic Gospel of the Egyptians, the list of Priscillian, and the Chronicle of Michael Syrus. Some sources attempt to link this name with that of Nejûlû, or biblical Nimrod (Gen 10:11-12); see Reeves, Jewish Lore 204 n.53. For the possible equivalence of Nebrêlû with the Mandaean demoness Namrus; i.e., Rûhâ, see Bousset, Hauptprobleme 28, 48; M. Lidzbarski, Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer (2 vols; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1905-15) 2.6.2 n.3; K. Rudolph, Die Mandäer (2 vols; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960-61) 1.184 n.3. Middle Iranian sources refer to Nebrêlû as "Pêsûs"; see M. Boyce, Sadwês and Pêsûs. 850 (1949-51) 910-11.

The traditions preserved within this paragraph are closely paralleled in an unpublished Sogdian Manichaean fragment (M 7800) which Professor Werner Sundermann has kindly shared with me. The fragment reads as follows: They ate fruit from the forest. And when the abortions fell they began to drink water from the wells and to eat fruit from the trees. And they remembered the beauty of the sun-god. They began to look out (for him). Thereupon the Enthymesis of Death, the Greed, dressed in the two abortion demons, Šâqûûn and Pêstûs, and in Šâqûûn's voice she gave command (to the other abortions) 'You, do not look upwards, for your enemy' (?) It is but now, do go, and you, male and female ones, copulate, and fulfill one with the other (lustful desire. Give birth to children, and one by one bring me your abortions, and I will make one likeness, so that you do not need to look upwards to the sky.' And the abortions accepted the command, and so they did. They brought eight thousand abortions before Šâqûûn and Pêstûs. And they received them, and they brought completely the descendants (?) And Šâqûûn devoured forty thousand abortions, and Pêstûs forty thousand. And they copulated with each other, and thus they said: 'The spiritual thought, we have it towards the sun-god, so that what will be born from us will resemble the gods of sun and moon (?)' The English rendering is that of Professor Sundermann. Regarding the expression "Enthymesis (Îûmûrûmû) of Death," see Sundermann, "Somme Morale Remarks on Mithra in the Manichean Pantheon," Études mithráiques: Actes du 2e Congrès international, Teheran, 1er au 8 septembre 1975 (Acta Iranica 17; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 490-91.

Compare Apoc. Adam 65,26-66,8: "And I saw three men before me whose likeness I was unable to recognize, since they were not the gods of the god who had [created us]. They surpassed [glory, and] men [saying to me, 'Arise, Adam, from the sleep of death, and hear about the aeon and the seed of that man to whom life has come, who came from you and from Eve, your wife.'] Translation cited from Nag Hammadi Library 2 (ed. Robinson) 279.

Gos. Eg. 57.16-17 terms Saklas "the great [angel]" (restored from NHC IV 22); 57.17, 21-22 terms Nebrûel "the great demon." Passages cited from Nag Hammadi Library 3 (ed. Robinson) 214. In the Manichaean version of this scene, Jesus plays the role often assigned the serpent ("instructor"), "spiritual" Eve, or Epinioha of Light in classical gnosia. Compare the remarks of I. de Beaumont, Histoire critique de Manichée et du manichéisme (2 vols; Amsterdam: J.F. Bernard, 1734-39) 2.453.

Regarding this designation, see J.C. Reeves, "An Enochic Citation in Barnabas 4:3 and the Oracles of Hystaspes," Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday (SOTSup 184; ed. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampan; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 269-72.

The restriction of the demiurgic archons by the heavenly messenger(s) is mentioned also in the al-Nadîm; see below. According to the Middle Iranian version of the anthropogenic narrative, Az stations a "dragon" to guard the first human couple (Mir. Man. I 200 lines 21ff.).

Note CMC 34.1-9, which recounts in maddeningly fragmentary form an analogous "awakening" of Mani by his heavenly Twin: ... τῶν τῆς φατος πατέρων κατὰ πάντα πάντα τὰ γεννώμενα εν τοῖς πλοίοις ἀπεκλαίστη μπ. ἀνεκτείλε δ' ἀπὸ πάντων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ κίονος καί των πατέρων τα ἐσεύοντο καί ἀληθώς (τά ἁλαξικοῦτα ᾠν αὐτω τούτῳ ...) ... of the Fathers of Light and all those things taking place in the Vessels he revealed to me. Moreover he disclosed the 'Womb of the Column,' the Father's, and the mighty powers concealed in it (i.e., the 'Column')?"

Text cited from Kossen-Römer, Kritische Edition 2D. Compare the roster of supernal secrets disclosed to Adam by Jesus in the testimony of the Fihrist below.

As several scholars have suggested, this would appear to be a reference to the infamous Jesus patibulis ("suffering Jesus") doctrine of Manicheism. See Augustine, Contra Faustum 20.2, 11; F. Cumont and M.-A. Kugener, Recherches sur le manichéisme (Bruxelles: H. Lamerin, 1908-12) 48; A. Adam, Texte zum Manichäismus (2d ed.; Berlin:
Given the numerous connections with classical gnostic motifs, one might expect “Tree of Knowledge” here instead of “Tree of Life.” Yet from a literary standpoint, it could be plausibly argued that Jesus himself assumes in this narrative the function of the Tree of Knowledge. Compare Acta Archelai 11.1 (= Epiphanius, Panarion 66.29.1), where the claim is explicitly made that Manichaeans identify Jesus with the Tree of Knowledge: “εστι ο Ίησους γνώσις αυτού, ή εν τω κόσμω;” (Yoake, Reader 74), with Mir. Man. 1 201 n.1.

Given the use of this phrase below in Seth’s recommendation to his father regarding where they should dwell. Heinkel suggests that the male is “desire” and the female “lust” (e.g., Tübingen: Mohr, 1919) 90. Presumably the five “members” of the Realm of Light referred to in the previous section; see Flügel, Mani 249.

“...and after this she conceived Cain, and afterwards Adam had sexual relations with her, and she conceived Abel.” This text of passage taken from the less corrupt witness preserved in Yalq; see Theodor’s note to Gen. Rab. 18.6 [1.169]n.1.

Tremendous jealousy and hatred collected in the heart of Cain because the offering of Abel was accepted, and not only this (provoked such emotions), but his (Abel’s) wife was ravished by an angel, and exclaimed, “I have created a man with corrupt witness preserved in Yalq; see Theodor’s note to Gen. Rab. 18.6 [1.169].


Compare M 4500 recto 1 lines 3-7 below, which may recount the same scene as here.

The divine, or rather, demonic patrimony of Cain stems from a creative exegesis of Gen 4:1, which reads: “And Adam knew his wife Eve; and she conceived Cain.” Compare Tg. Ps.-J. to the same verse, with the exegetical additions italicized: והיה זרע דם אשה ואשתו ייעד בו עיני אימים אנשי האבל בהר מحقيقة י 위해서ו יiquid ייעד בו עיני אימים אנשי האבל בהר מحقيقة י 위해서ו יiquid ייעד בו עיני אימים אנשי האבל בהר מحقيقة י蛴צ

And Adam knew Eve his wife was ravished by an angel, and she conceived Cain, and afterwards Adam had sexual relations with her, and she conceived Abel.” This text of passage taken from the less corrupt witness preserved in Yalq; see Theodor’s note to Gen. Rab. 18.6 [1.169].
of the instructional curriculum in 1 Enoch 7-8, the source which lies behind these passages. See B. Pearson, “The Figure of Seth in Manichaean Literature,” Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism (ed. P. Bryden, Lund: Plus Ultra, 1988) 149.

103Note that the archetypal Genesis narrative (Gen 2-4) has been inverted in its Manichaean analogue: the temptation and corruption of Adam now transpires after the story of Cain and Abel. Al-Šīlīdī thus performs the role of the serpent in the original myth.

104The tree of knowledge in the original myth.


106Compare the wording of the Syriac Cave of Treasures narrative of the birth of Seth (ed. Ri 49 [6.2]): "and she bore Seth the handsome man, a man like Adam (his father)." So too the Book of the Bee (Anecdota Oxoioniensia, Semitic Series 1.2; ed. E.A.W. Budge; Oxford; Clarendon, 1886) 29 line 9.

107Luminosity at birth within Jewish aggadah normally marks the child so endowed as a chosen agent of God; see especially Sota 12a (Moses), but contrast Vita Adae et Evae 213 (Cain). Seth's radiance in this Manichaean narrative is reminiscent of the Shi'ite doctrine of the transmission of the Nār Muhammadi, according to which Muhammad's pure ancestors (among whom is numbered Seth) each radiated light from his forehead. See al-Ma's'id, Mu'āt al-dhahab wa-ma'dād al-ja'far: Las praeritias d'or (9 vols.; ed. C. Barbier de Meynard and P. de Courteille; Paris: Imprimerie imperiale, 1861-77) I.68; U. Rubin, “Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shi'a Tradition,” Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam 1 (1979) 43-45. However, an incandescent Seth is known outside of an Islamicate context; see the testimony of the Byzantine historian Cedrenus cited apud M.R. James, The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Their Titles and Fragments (London: SPCK, 1920) 9. The motif ultimately derives from an exegesis of Gen 5:3-3: Seth reflects the primal ḫābīr biḥārīn which the latter forfeited as a consequence of the "fall"; cf. Gen. Rab. 1.6. Unfortunately the extant lines of 1QapGen do not retain a description of the newborn Noah. Note however the appearance of Noah given in 1 Enoch 106:2: "his body was white like snow and red like the flower of a rose, and the hair of his head (was) white like wool... and his eyes (were) beautiful; and when he opened his eyes, he made the whole house bright like the sun so that the whole house was exceptionally bright." Translation taken from that of Knibb, AOT (Sparks) 314. Noah's coloration as both "white" and "red" peculiarly echoes the ascription of these same colors above to Abel and Cain respectively.

108An obvious allusion to Gen 425: "and ye shall make him a prince over my people Israel, and give him milk immediately!" Then Saqlon sought to make Adam an apostate from the tree of knowledge. However, the traditional postulate that Adam ate the fruit immediately (1QapGen 2:14-18) cannot be sustained in light of the extant lines of 1QapGen and theimports of 1QapGen do not retain a description of the newborn Noah. Note however the appearance of Noah given in 1 Enoch 106:2: "his body was white like snow and red like the flower of a rose, and the hair of his head (was) white like wool... and his eyes (were) beautiful; and when he opened his eyes, he made the whole house bright like the sun so that the whole house was exceptionally bright." Translation taken from that of Knibb, AOT (Sparks) 314. Noah's coloration as both "white" and "red" peculiarly echoes the ascription of these same colors above to Abel and Cain respectively.

109This is a puzzling response to Eve's murderous intention. However, M 528 Fragment II produces the suspicion that Ibn al-NAfdim's narrative is truncated at this point: "(R)... he appeared before Saqlon, and addressed him thusly: 'Command that she..."
apparently decided to kill the child by starving it. Adam thereupon appeals to force Eve to nurse the infant, unaware that the archon desires the child's demise as well. When Adam finally realizes this, he takes the child in order to feed him himself.


Note Homilies 61.23, which refers in a broken context to one "crowned like Sethel." It is possible that the "crown of radiance" mentioned here is destined not for Adam but Seth. On the other hand, the Syriac Cave of Treasures explicitly records the coronation of Adam: "There he donned royal garments, and had placed on his head a crown of glory..." (ed. RI 19 [2.17]).

This same legend of Adam's resuming to magical praxis in order to protect the young Seth from demonic attack also appears in the Middle Iranian fragments (M 5566 + M 4501) recently published by Sundermann; see below. However, Adam inscribes seven circles, as opposed to the three mentioned here. This legend must also lie behind the curious invocation preserved on Montgomery, #10 lines 3-4 (emended in accordance with J.N. Epstein, "Gloses REJ (forthcoming).

This episode provides an etiological explanation for the designation "Sethel," the usual name for this personage within Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic circles. According to this tradition, the name "Sethel" (here צלום) derives from a midrashic transposition and manipulation of the consonantal phonemes of the child's original name, "Lotis" צלמון.

A distorted reflection of Gen 3:15a: צלמון אתו צלש אדום ומן מבבלין צלום וודא לחיי חיות (cf. Deut. 32:1). The names "Adam" (א"ד מ), "Eve" (ב"ה נ), and "Sethel" (צלמון) are employed twice below in M 197 n.2. The names "Adam" (ד"מ) and "Eve" (ב"ה) are employed twice below in M 2309 (= Mir. Man. 1 191 n.2) and M 8280. Note also W. Sundermann, Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichaer (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973) 76 n.1 for two further fragmentary occurrences of the name "Adam." This work will henceforth be cited as Sundermann, KuP.

This line is damaged; the translation follows the suggested restoration in Mir. Man. 1 193 V 1 line 11.

The demoness "Greed" or "Lust," sometimes termed mid'd cy dymn 'mother of the demons" (Sundermann, KuP 63 line 1195). She is "...the covetous and pernicious principle of matter, ...the producer of the powers of darkness, and the exiter of greed and concupiscence, she is that which called Hyle by Mani himself." The description is that of Sundermann, "Some More Remarks on Mithra" 490. In the present account, she plays the role of the creator of humanity. For further information regarding her, see Jackson, Researches 106-108.

Middle Persian dw dys. The fabrication of the first human couple in accordance with two gender-specific divine "forms" or "images" would seem to be grounded in a literal exegesis of Gen 1:26-27: "And God said, Let there be an evening and a morning; there was evening and morning. לילו ו-exclusive... אהלים יכו אנד ברא אתו grab". The employment of two different nouns to connote the divine "image" in 1:26, plus the repetition of the word וּלֶילָה in 1:27a, may have encouraged speculation that "two forms" (ד"מ) were required for the production of "male" and "female" (ב"ה). See also Hutter, SBT 92-93 n.20.

Narishah (= Mazdean Neryosang) is a messenger deity whose role here corresponds to that of the Messenger in Theodore's account, or to that of al-Bashir in Ibn al-Nadim. See Mir. Man. 1 192 n.6. Theodore's discussion of Zoroastrianism has "Narisa" (ןַרִיסָה), created by Hormuzd in order to thwart the evil machinations of Ahriman (Liber Scholiorum [ed. Scher] 297-7.12). In Zoroastrian tradition (Bundahishn §14), Neryosang is instrumental in preserving a portion of the spilled seed of the slain Gayomard, the prototypical Urmensch. The first human couple (Malaya and Maḥšyāna) eventually sprout from another portion absorbed by Spandarmat (Earth). Convenient translations of the relevant portion of Bundahishn §14 can be found in R.C. Zaehner, The Teachings of the Magi: A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs (reprinted, New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) 75-79; Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism (ed. M. Boyce; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) 51-52. See also the remarks of Cumont-Kugener, Recherches 61-63; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, Religion of Ancient Iran (Bombay: Tata Press, 1973) 41, 218-20.

The demoness "Greed" or "Lust," sometimes termed mid'd cy dymn 'mother of the demons" (Sundermann, KuP 63 line 1195). She is "...the covetous and pernicious principle of matter, ...the producer of the powers of darkness, and the exiter of greed and concupiscence, she is that which called Hyle by Mani himself." The description is that of Sundermann, "Some More Remarks on Mithra" 490. In the present account, she plays the role of the creator of humanity. For further information regarding her, see Jackson, Researches 106-108.

Middle Persian dw dys. The fabrication of the first human couple in accordance with two gender-specific divine "forms" or "images" would seem to be grounded in a literal exegesis of Gen 1:26-27: "And God said, Let there be an evening and a morning; there was evening and morning. לילו ו-exclusive... אהלים יכו אנד ברא אתו grab". The employment of two different nouns to connote the divine "image" in 1:26, plus the repetition of the word וּלֶילָה in 1:27a, may have encouraged speculation that "two forms" (ד"מ) were required for the production of "male" and "female" (ב"ה). See also Hutter, SB T 92-93 n.20.

Narishah (= Mazdean Neryosang) is a messenger deity whose role here corresponds to that of the Messenger in Theodore's account, or to that of al-Bashir in Ibn al-Nadim. See Mir. Man. 1 192 n.6. Theodore's discussion of Zoroastrianism has "Narisa" (ןַרִיסָה), created by Hormuzd in order to thwart the evil machinations of Ahriman (Liber Scholiorum [ed. Scher] 297-7.12). In Zoroastrian tradition (Bundahishn §14), Neryosang is instrumental in preserving a portion of the spilled seed of the slain Gayomard, the prototypical Urmensch. The first human couple (Malaya and Maḥšyāna) eventually sprout from another portion absorbed by Spandarmat (Earth). Convenient translations of the relevant portion of Bundahishn §14 can be found in R.C. Zaehner, The Teachings of the Magi: A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs (reprinted, New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) 75-79; Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism (ed. M. Boyce; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) 51-52. See also the remarks of Cumont-Kugener, Recherches 61-63; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, Religion of Ancient Iran (Bombay: Tata Press, 1973) 41, 218-20.

This line is damaged; the translation follows the suggested restoration in Mir. Man. 1 193 V 1 line 11.

Restoration in Mir. Man. 1 193 V 1 line 15. The phrase "two creatures" (ד"מ) consistently designates the first human couple.

Apparently a reference to the emotional distress felt by the abortions subsequent to the sudden removal of the Messenger's pleasant form(s). See the initial line of Theodore's testimony quoted above, as well as Mir. Man. 1 192-93 R II lines...
6-15. By modeling the first human couple after the forms of the Messenger, the abortions are assured constant access to those pleasurable sights.

139 *Astrētār*: a class of demonic beings. The male and female *astrētār* correspond to Ašqalān and Nehruel in Theodore’s testimony. See *Mir. Man. *I 194.2. Sometimes the male *astrētār* is explicitly named *Śakaṅ (Iṣkaw),* an obvious reflex of the Syriac cognomen. See M 5567 below, as well as Sundermann, *KuP* 55 line 1046.

140 This depiction betrays the classical gnostic roots of Manichaean mythology. See *Ap. John* 10.8-9; *Hyp. Arch.* 94.14-17; *Orig. World* 100.7, 24-26. On the popularity of the lion-image in Manichaean demonology, see Baur, *Das manichaische Religionssystem* 57-59.

141 Compare the language of M 7800 cited above: “Thereupon the Enthrone of Death, the Greed (i.e., *Āz*) dressed in the two abortion demons, *Saqlān* and Pēšē.”

142 The original inhabitants of the Realm of Darkness prior to the mingling of Light and Darkness; cf. *Mir. Man. *I 194 n.3.

143 A different set of demons, monsters, etc. who are often referred to in parallel accounts (such as Theodore’s above) as “abortions.” The didactic activity of *Āz* is thus consistent with her original nature as a primal expression of Lust or Greed.

144 Middle Persian *wadjag,* compare New Persian *zādān,* “dragon”; *Azāhāk.*

145 A plausible textual emendation; see *Mir. Man. *I 195 n.2; Boyce, *Reader* 72.


148 Compare above ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (apud Fīgūl, Μανί 58-59): “Then it was seen to the priests of *šēr ’āla* and to the inhabitants of the forest and the world that their nature was evil and their lust was greater and more abundant.

149 See *Acta Archelai* 8.3 (in *Epiphanius, Panarion* 66.26.3): η δὲ ἡ ἄρτη τοῦ οἰκονομία προσέρχεται τοιούτῳ και συνέρχεται τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἄριστον ἔλεγον: Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 317.3-4. See also *Mir. Man. *I 66.28.9; 66.30.6). He says that these daughters of Darkness were previously pregnant of their own nature, and when they beheld the beautiful forms of the Messenger, their embryos aborted and fell to the earth. These are the buds of the trees.

149a Compare all these parallels cited in *Mir. Man. *I 196 n.1. See also the opening lines of M 7800: “They ate fruit from the forest. And when the abortions fell they began to drink water from the wells and to eat fruit from the trees.”


150 So Klimek; Andreas-Henning, Asmusson, and Boyce do not hazard a guess here.

151 According to ancient Iranian tradition, linguistic variegation is of demonic origin. See Hutter, *SBT* 102. One also thinks of the deleterious effects of the Tower of Babel episode (Gen 11:1-9).


154 A reference to those denizens of Darkness who were captured and “fastened upon” the heavens during the cosmogonic process. For discussion of this motif, see Reeves, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha” 185-87.

155 Observe that, as in Mandaeism, the “constellations and planets” are condemned as baleful influences upon terrestrial existence. Note also M 178: “The twelve constellations (signs) and the seven planets they made rulers over the whole Mixed World, and set them in opposition to each other” (W. H. Enning, “A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony,” *BSOAS* 12 [1947-48] 313; also Klimek, *Gnosis* 236). See also *Kephalaia* 87.33-88.33; 168.12-16.

156 The “connection(s)” (*nwxwr)* and “link(s)” (*pyva*) mentioned in this passage correspond to the “root(s)” (*giga*) of *Acta Archelai* 9.4-5 and the *ihmez* of the Coptic Manichaean texts; see *Kephalaia* 69; 183.1-20; 120ff.; 125; 213-16. Klimek fails to recognize this motif, and hence his translation of this section is flawed. I am grateful to Jason BeDuhn for alerting me to this problem. With regard to these “connections” linking organic life with demonic entities, see W.B. Henning, “An Astronomical Chapter of the Bundahishn,” *JRAS* (1942) 232 n.6; idem, *BSOAS* 12 (1947-48) 313 n.8; Sundermann, *KuP* 29 n.58; Hutter, *SBT* 103.

157 Middle Iranian *nwxwr,* see *Mir. Man. *I 197 n.2. Compare Hebrew מֶשֶכֶם אוּר, or Adam the protoplast.

158 Compare *Acta Archelai* 12.2 (= *Epiphanius, Panarion* 66.20.6): τὴν δὲ ἑυκαὶν ὁμοίως ἐκτισμαὶ δόντες αὐτή ἐκ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ ἐξαπατήσαμεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ “they (the archons) created Eve also after like fashion, imparting to her of their own lust, with a view to the deceiving of Adam.”


160 Compare Sundermann, *KuP* 30 lines 456-59; 31 lines 480-82.

161 ἂν is identical with Ἰάζ; it is possible that *Śakaṅ* is meant. The Middle Persian word *kftb* probably renders Syriac *šēr ’āla,* itself a borrowing of Greek *aγωγόν.* See Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 203 n.37.

162 Compare Gen 1:28-30: ὥσπερ ἐν πλάνε ἐκτισμαὶ δόντες αὐτή ἐκ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ ἐξαπατήσαμεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ “they (the archons) created Eve also after like fashion, imparting to her of their own lust, with a view to the deceiving of Adam.”
A reflex of the serpent in the Genesis narrative? Note also the references to the dispersal or binding of Adam's guardian(s) in the Syriac and Arabic traditions cited above.

"Light Elements." Whereas in Zoroastrianism the Amahraspands, or "Holy Immortals," are conceived as lesser deities (usually six in number) who assist Ahura Mazda in the creation of the physical universe, the term is employed here to denote the "five elements" of the Realm of Light that constituted the battle-armor of Primal Man. When the latter entity was defeated by the forces of the Realm of Darkness during their initial engagement, the hosts of Darkness consumed his armor, thereby ingesting the "five elements." The eventual recovery of these "elements" is the goal of Manichaean cosmogony.

For other translations of this passage, see Mir. Man. I 193-201; J.P. Asmussen, Manichaean Literature (Delmar, NY: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1975) 128-31; Klimkeit, Gnosis 232-34; Hutter, Śdt 81-104.

As Sundermann indicates (p. 70), the contents of these fragments closely parallel the material found in Ibn al-Nadim's narrative recounting the Manichaean version of the story of Adum and Eve. They thus confirm the essential veracity of his testimony.

Compare Ibn al-Nadim above: "Then that (male) archon came back to his daughter, who was Eve, and lustfully had intercourse with her."

Sundermann (KuP 71 n.2) suggests that Gehmurd is the speaker.

A reference to the garland-scene recounted by Ibn al-Nadim above? Compare that narrative: "Al-Sindid then taught Eve magical syllables in order that she might infatuate Adam. She proceeded to act (by) presenting him with a garland from a flowering tree, and when Adam saw her, he lustfully united with her." For the meaning of Middle Persian j'dwgy, see Henning, BSOS 9 (1937-39) 83.

Middle Persian qf. See the remarks of Sundermann, KuP 127.

The child is of course Seth. The Fihrist account speaks of only three circles.

In the Fihrist, it is the names of the King of the Gardens, Primal Man, and the Living Spirit.

In addition to the Fihrist account and the possible Aramaic incantation bowl reflex, this episode possesses a Sogdian parallel (M 528); see Henning, "Bet- und Beichtbuch" 47-48. For comparative evidence, see I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 185 and his n.15.


This threatening episode is severely truncated in the Fihrist narrative.

Compare Ibn al-Nadim: "Then there appeared to Adam a tree called the lotus, and milk flowed from it, and he fed the boy with it."

To judge from the similar movement of the Fihrist's narrative, the naming of Seth probably occurred here.

According to the Fihrist version, Eve resolves to kill Seth at the behest of al-Sindid, but Adam rescues the child before any harm can come to him. Perhaps this Middle Iranian version supplied information about one or more assassination attempts.

This term is equivalent to siddiqīt above in the Fihrist. This apparently refers to the time when Adam and Eve were first created. Jesus warns Adam to avoid Eve's company, and initially (at least) he enjoys success.

Note the wording of Recto column I lines 7-8.

See Sundermann, KuP 74 n.11.

Here Eve becomes a willing accomplice in the seduction of Adam. Perhaps this is the setting for Eve's instruction in magical syllables.

Compare Ibn al-Nadim above: "When Shāthil saw him, he admonished and rebuked him (Adam), and said to him, 'Arise, let us go to the East, to the Light and Wisdom of God.'"

Identified by Sundermann as the "fifth earth"; Manichaean cosmology characteristically posits "eight earths" and "ten heavens." See Sundermann, KuP 38 n.3, 57 line 1060.

See §41 above.

I.e., from the precepts of Manichaism.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE APOCALYPSE OF SETHEL

Text

Also Sethel his son has similarly written in his apocalypse, saying that 'I opened my eyes and beheld before me an angel whose [radiance] I am unable to (adequately) represent ... [ligh]nting ... to me ... (3 lines lost) ... [When I heard these things, my heart rejoiced and my mind changed and I became like one of the greatest angels. That angel placed his hand upon my right (hand) and took me out of the world wherein I was born and brought me to another place (that was) exceedingly great. Behind me I heard a loud uproar from those angels whom [I] left behind [in] the world which they possessed ... (at least 2 lines missing) ...'
CHAPTER FOUR

Many things similar to these are described in his writings, and as he was transported by that angel from world to world, he revealed to him the awesome secrets of (divine) majesty.

Commentary

The origin of the designation "Sethel" is also unclear. One interpretation understands "Sethel" to be a theophoric formation, perhaps constructed to enhance its referent's standing as an entity created "in the image and likeness of God" (Gen 5:3) who, unlike his father, never forfeited that status. Structurally the name appears to consist of the proper name "Seth" plus a variant of the popular Semitic angelic termination (i)'el. The fact that the present "apocalypse" explicitly mentions his elevation to angelic status (51.4) lends credence to this hypothesis. An alternative way of analyzing the development of the name "Sethel" from מְשֶל may have been known to Philo, but the relevant citations (Post. Cain. 10, 170; Quaest. Gen. 1.78) are extremely ambiguous. His citation of Mandaean examples only demonstrates that the Mandaeans themselves were perfectly capable of perceiving the midrashic possibilities inherent in a form like "Sitil"—the root was after all a common one in Aramaic dialects; it proves nothing about the ultimate generation of the form.

More puzzling is Stroumsa's appeal to the Manichaean protoplastic narrative preserved by Ibn al-Nadlm, the name Sethel derives from a midrashic rearrangement and manipulation of the consonants of the word "lotus." In the section that recounts the naming of Seth, we read: "Then there appeared to Adam a tree called the lotus, and milk flowed from it, and he fed the boy with it. He named him (the boy) after its name, but sometime later he renamed him Sethel." Stroumsa concludes: "Since the Manichaean source clearly linked the child's name to the growing of the tree, it probably reflected the same Hebrew etymology (from the root מָשָׂל) already known to the Rabbis and perhaps to Philo." But this explanation disregards the plain meaning of the text. It only states that Adam initially named the child "lxvtx" in order to commemorate the miraculous suckling of the child with the tree's sap. Afterwards he reversed the consonants of the boy's name to form the name "lxvtx" (i.e., Shathil). In other words, according to Ibn al-Nadlm, the name Sethel derives from a midrashic rearrangement and manipulation of the consonants of the word "lotus," the tree whose sap initially nourished the infant Seth. Neither the root מָשָׂל nor the concept of
“one planted” play any discernible role in the construction of this particular explanation, which simply functions as an etiological explanation for the curious designation “Sethel.”

There remains a third possibility for reconstructing the origin of the curious designation “Sethel.” Perhaps the impetus for orthographic symmetry or assonance among the names of the three biblical sons of Adam. Such an explanation is not as fantastic as it might initially seem. The names of the first two sons, Cain and Abel, are in fact so harmonized in Muslim tradition, appearing there under the forms Qâbîl and Hâbîl. The “-el” termination of Sethel may thus not be the angelic suffix of the theopneustic name theories, but rather may reflect the residue of an attempt to reproduce the biblical orthography of the name “Abel” (אבל).14 Perhaps this harmonization process, which is of uncertain age and origin,15 was extended to embrace the remaining biblical son of Adam, thus producing the series “the stranger” or “the alien.” It stems apparently from a Greek gloss to the ετερον (“another seed”), a phrase understood exegetically as αλλογενής (allogenes).

Creating a homophonic symmetry or assonance among the names of the three biblical sons of Adam. Such an explanation is not as fantastic as it might initially seem. The names of the first two sons, Cain and Abel, are in fact so harmonized in Muslim tradition, appearing there under the forms Qâbîl and Hâbîl. The “-el” termination of Sethel may thus not be the angelic suffix of the theopneustic name theories, but rather may reflect the residue of an attempt to reproduce the biblical orthography of the name “Abel” (אבל).14 Perhaps this harmonization process, which is of uncertain age and origin,15 was extended to embrace the remaining biblical son of Adam, thus producing the series “the stranger” or “the alien.” It stems apparently from a Greek gloss to the ετερον (“another seed”), a phrase understood exegetically as αλλογενής (allogenes).

In addition to the notice about the distinctive sectarian nomenclature for Sethel, the forefather Seth also bore in certain gnostic circles the name “Allogenes” (Ἀλλογενής); literally, “the stranger” or “the alien.” It stems apparently from a Greek gloss to the literal Septuagintal rendering of the Hebrew הבל of Gen 4:25, סאתיל (“another seed”), a phrase understood exegetically as סאתיל (“alien”) to emphasize both Seth’s “alien” status amidst a corrupt material creation and the distinctiveness of his parentage vis-à-vis an alleged demonic patrimony for Cain and Abel.16 In the course of his discussion of the Archontic sect (Panarion 40), Epiphanius provides the following pertinent testimony:

They (the Archontics) also use the word called The Strangers—for there are books entitled thus ... These folk recount another tale, according to which, they say, the devil came to Eve and united with her as a man with a woman and begot on her Cain and Abel ... and in turn, they say, Adam united with Eve his wife and begot Seth, his own physical son. And next, they say, the higher power descended, accompanied by the ministering angels of the good god, and caught up Seth himself, whom they also call “Allogenes”; carried him somewhere above and cared for him for a while, so that he would not be slain; and after a long time brought him back down into this world, having rendered him spiritual and (only) apparently physical, so that neither <the creator> nor the authorities and realms of the world-creating god could prevail over him. And they say that he no longer served the maker and craftsman (of the world); but he acknowledged the unnameable power and the higher, good god, serving the latter; and that he revealed many things to the discredit of the maker of the world, the rulers, and the authorities. <Hence> they have also portrayed certain books, some written in the name of Seth and others written in the name of Seth and his seven sons, as having been given by him. For they say that he bore seven <sons>, called “strangers”—as we noted in the case of other schools of thought, viz. gnostics and Sethians.17

This passage is of paramount importance for the interpretation, and perhaps even the sectarian provenance, of our present “apocalypse” of Sethel. In addition to the notice about the distinctive sectarian nomenclature for Seth (and his progeny), we also learn that the Archontics accorded Seth, instead of Cain and/or Abel, recognition as the first biological descendant of Adam and Eve. Seth subsequently experienced a corporeal transformation at the hands of “the higher power,” a process which involved both heavenly ascent and a temporary occultation. He ultimately returned to earth, but in a non-physical form that was immune to the blashmishments of the demiurgic archons, and revealed to his contemporaries valuable information about the supernals. The Archontics utilized a number of literary works attributed to Seth which presumably were based upon the teachings that he allegedly promulgated upon his return from heaven.

The obvious similarity between Epiphanius’ outline of Archontic ideology and the surviving contents of our fragment suggests that the CMC “apocalypse of Sethel” belongs within the orbit of this particular sectarian milieu. However, certain difficulties attend a firmer resolution of this possible nexus. Some scholars have questioned the actual existence of a separate sect of so-called “Archontics,” since it is only Epiphanius, along with those writers dependent upon his work, that record this name. Moreover, given the numerous correspondences discernible within the information that he supplies about the “Archontics” (Panarion 40) and the “Sethians” (Panarion 39), as well as certain antinomian “Gnostics” (Panarion 26), and given the prominence of what is presumably the same “Sethian” group in the writings of earlier heresiologists, it may be possible to argue that the Archontics were merely a “local” branch of the broader movement that scholars term “Sethian gnosticism.”18 Epiphanius himself informs us that the Archontics “were not commonly found in many places, only in the province of Palestine. Yet they have already somehow carried their poison into Greater Armenia.”19 He attributes its Palestinian roots to the perfidy of a certain hermit named Peter who dwelt in a cave near Hebron, and its eastern expansion to one Eutaktios, an Armenian traveler who after imbibing the “poison” of Peter subsequently infected his homeland (Panarion 40.1.2-3).

Independent evidence for the spread of “Sethian” (Archontic?) writings and doctrines into northern Mesopotamia occurs in the Scholion of Theodore bar Konai during his discussion of the Edessene heretic ‘Audi and his followers. The significance of this testimony for the eastern promulgation of Sethian currents, which was first recognized by H.-C. Puech,20 requires that we reproduce the report in its entirety:

Regarding the ’Audiants:21

‘Audi was leader of the deacons of the church in Edessa, (an office) usually termed ‘archdeacon.’ When the Nicene Council decreed the regulation that members of the Church would not celebrate the paschal festival with the Jews, he (continued) to follow the ancient customs, and contended that their rite was the proper one to hold. He (therefore) separated himself from the Church, and formed a group from those who agreed with him. And when he saw that he was being blamed by many for opposing the decision of the synod, he added another (reason) in order that he might seem to possess a pretext, saying that it was due to the dissoluteness of the clergy, for they collected interest upon loans and dwelt with women and committed adultery and frequented brothels—for this reason I separated from them.’ Yet it is well known that he was both headstrong
and boastful—headstrong because he violated a canonical decree of the Church, and boastful because he was infected by the disease of Pharisaic pride, for he deemed himself to be more righteous than the rest (of the Church).

He accepted with the Old and the New Testaments also (certain) apocalypses (ἄλλοις). He asserted that Light and Darkness were not created by God, and he taught that God was composite and possessed in all respects the appearance of a human being. He thinks this follows from the verse which states: 'Let us make humankind in our image and in our likeness' (Gen 1:26). Since the Scriptures use concrete (?) nouns about him (God), they seek to relate his manifestations and his activities.

Let us record (here) a small sample of the wickedness of 'Audi. Writing in an apocalypse which bears the name of Abraham,21 one of the creators speaks thusly: 'The world and the created order were made by Darkness and six other powers.' It says moreover: 'They beheld by how many divinities the body was formed.' It says further: 'They asked, “Who compelled the angels and powers to form the body?”’ And in an apocalypse attributed to John,22 it says: ‘(As for) those rulers that I saw, my body was created by them,’ and it lists the names of the holy creators, when it says, ‘My wisdom created flesh, understanding26 created skin, Elohim created bones, my kingdom created blood, Adonai created nerves, anger created hair,27 and thought created the brain.’28 This (material) was taken from Chaldean doctrines.

How he reviles God by (ascribing to him) a sexual relationship with Eve:

It states in the Book of the Strangers (︽��וֹשָּׁי לְחָנָּא) with regard to the character of God: ‘Come, let us cast our seed in her, and let us do it with her first so that the one who will be born from her will be under our control.’ And it says moreover: ‘They led Eve away from Adam’s presence and had sexual intercourse with her.’

Such are the polluted (doctrines) and wicked (teachings) which ‘Audi the perverted one’ has produced against God, the angels, and the world!

This important testimony provides us with not only the titles of some of the “apocalypses” used by the ‘Audians, but also a selection of quotations allegedly copied from these works. It is readily apparent that the information Theodore provides us is closely related to that contained in Epiphanius’ report about the Archontics. Both sects relied upon certain apocryphal “books” or “apocalypses” which were nominally connected with the forefather Seth and his descendents through the employment of the by-name ‘Strangers(S)’ (אֲלִיוֹנֵיָא, Ἀλυώνεις, אָלַלָא). The latter designation simply being a Syriac rendering of the Greek gloss. Both sects also embraced that strand of Jewish tradition which interpreted Gen 4:1 as implying the impregnation of Eve by a divine entity, identified there usually as Sammael. Cain and Abel are thus not Adam’s “seed”; they are the progeny, the “seed” of diabolic archons. Or, as the Apocalypse of the Strangers states in its ‘Audian recension: “Come, let us cast our seed in her, and let us do it with

The initial quotations from the “apocalypse of Sethel” are unfortunately badly preserved. There is enough however to permit a reconstruction of at least the broad outlines of the narrative. The citation opens with what appears to be a description of an angelophany experienced by Sethel. While the word for “angel” has been largely reconstructed by the editors at this juncture, its restoration is virtually certain, since 51.6 and 52.3.4 subsequently refer to “that angel” (ἕξισιν ή ἄγγελος, ἕξισιν τοῦ ἄγγελου). The luminosity of the angel which Sethel beholds is so intense that he gropes for the precise words to express its qualities, finally (apparently) settling on the meteorological phenomenon of “lightning-flashes.” The metaphor is not an uncommon one in biblical hierophanic discourse. Daniel (10:6) sees a figure whose face “was like the appearance of lightning” (ῥαπαί ἡ εἴδωλον καί ἐδικαιώθη ἐμφάσαν τῷ προσώπῳ μου [ἀνέγγελον ὡς σκότους ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἀκόμη προσέγγισεν τῷ φέγγος … ἢ ἡ θλίψις … ἢ ταὐτά] ἔρχεσθαι [ … … μον … …]” saying that “I opened my eyes and beheld before me an angel whose [radiance] I am unable to (adequately) represent … … [lightning … … to me … (3 lines lost)].” As we have previously seen, the use of Greek ἄγγελος to introduce direct discourse probably reflects the similar employment of Syriac ἄγγελος in analogous contexts in that language. It is one of the many linguistic features displayed by the Codex that suggests a secondary translation from an eastern Semitic source.

The crucial phrase in this exhortation is “our seed” (υούκ ἐδυνάμην ἀναζωίγραφήσαι τό φέγγος οὐκ ἔδειν καὶ τό ἠθήνα). We have previously seen, the form of the beast’s appearance was like that of burning coals of fire; like the sight of torches it (the fire) was moving among the beasts, and the fire was brilliant, and from the fire spewed forth lightning. And the beasts flitted to and fro like lightning (Ezek...
According to the Codex, Mani himself was even privy to an angelophany that “once came to me in the manner of lightning ...”.

Unlike the fragments of the apocalypses of Adam and Enoch that are cited in the Codex, the apocalypse of Sethel does not preserve the name of the angel who appears before the forefather. Given the extensive lacunae in these opening lines, it is certainly possible that a proper name might have originally figured in this passage, although if such were the case it would seem unlikely that the angel would simply be termed “that angel” two subsequent times in the apocalypse. The better preserved apocalypses of Enosh and Shem maintain the anonymity of their respective angelic interlocutors, but this feature is perhaps due to the relative paucity of agadic development, both Jewish and Christian, around those figures. By contrast, there are extensive extrabiblical literary traditions which link one or more specific angels with the careers of Adam and Enoch, and it is thus hardly surprising that their name(s) occur(s) in their alleged apocalypses. Since the postbiblical treatment of Seth is demonstrably much more complex than the development afforded his father or his immediate descendants, it remains unclear which, if any, angel would be specifically associated with this particular forefather.

Finally, the initial phrase “I opened my eyes and beheld before me ...” (γνώσθη τοῦ φθαρμοός μου καὶ θεασάμην έμπροσθεν τοῦ προσώπου μου) is a rather peculiar expression in this context, possessing no precise parallels in biblical literature. Hierophanies there typically involve a process of prolonged ocular focus (“I beheld in my dream ... I continued watching my dream ...”), or at least the movement of the seer’s attention from one focal point to another (“I lifted my eyes and saw ...”). The phrase in question suggests, however, that Sethel’s eyes were previously shut. Possibly Sethel was asleep, and he was awakened by his angelic visitor, much as Jesus the Splendor rouses the sleeping Adam in the Manichaean anthropogony.

Alternatively, the phrase may refer to a “metaphorical” or “spiritual” opening of Sethel’s eyes; that is, he now can perceive supernatural verities that were previously invisible to him. A possible parallel to this type of “sight” occurs in Gen 21:19, where Hagar is “shown” a source of water that will preserve the lives of herself and her son: “and God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water.” As the medieval commentator Sforno acutely notes, “God granted her the insight to recognize the spot where water was, for she was hardly blind prior to this (episode).”

Similarly, when Elisha and his servant were seemingly doomed to fall prey to a vengeful force of Aramaean warriors, Elisha calmed the frightened youth with a temporary experience of the gift of “spiritual sight”: “Is there not yet a word from the Lord?” (2 Kgs 6:17). In the present case, the absence of a clear context precludes a firm resolution of this issue.

This passage indicates that Sethel underwent a transformation from human to angelic status. We have already encountered a similar motif in the surviving fragments of the CMC “apocalypse” of Adam, wherein Adam “was made superior to all the powers and angels of creation” (CMC 50:4-5). In the latter instance, Adam’s transformation seemed to be linked to certain traditions regarding his original lofty stature within the divine world as the image of God, a position which he forfeited by his disobedience in the Garden, but which he eventually regained in the World to Come. Seth’s transformation is indebted to a certain extent to the same motif, since Gen 5:3 explicitly states that he too bore “his (i.e., God’s) image and likeness.” Yet a significant gap separates the experiences of Adam and Seth. Adam lost his status as “image,” but it was ultimately restored to him: a portrayal of his reinstatement via the imagery of metamorphosis and elevation seems entirely appropriate. However, at least according to the traditional narratives, Seth never relinquishes his status as “image” and “likeness,” and in fact must be viewed as the conduit of this particular attribute to subsequent generations of humanity. He does not require rehabilitation. Thus a transformation-story featuring Seth as protagonist must possess a deeper rationale.

Gnostic exegesis detected a disturbing textual tension within the terse biblical narrative regarding Seth. On the one hand, Seth was the biological son of Adam and Eve, engendered through their sexual intercourse (Gen 4:25). For gnostic interpreters, who disparaged sexuality and procreation as degenerate activities devised by the demiurgic archons, his body was therefore a material entity, fully subject to the corrupt whims of the demiurgic archons, the actual fashioners of Adam and Eve (Gen 1:26-27). Yet, on the other hand, the biblical narrative explicitly asserts that Seth was not simply a human being. He was literally “another seed” (also Gen 4:25); that is to say from the gnostic perspective, “not of the seed of the archons” like Cain and Abel, his older brothers. From whose “seed” then does Seth materialize? According to the Bible, it is undoubtedly Adam’s. Gnostic exegesis also seems to accept this patrimony, even though some trajectories at least toy with the notion that celestial entities normally resident in the pleroma are involved in the production of Seth. Since the biblical narrative sequence dictates the physical engendering of Seth after the corruption of Adam, the “image” must be re-implanted within humanity by the deity(s). Thefore, while Adam may indeed be responsible for the body of Seth, the “image” associated with Seth (and originally Adam) derives from the heavenly realm. Like his putative progenitor, Seth combines within his person two disparate qualities: he is a corporeal being who bears the “image” of God. This status
reinstates the hybrid position that Adam occupies prior to his own disobedience and subsequent forfeiture of the "image."

Given this circumstance, Seth is potentially subject to the same corruptive forces that overwhelmed his father. What is worse—the demiurgic archons are now cognizant of the existence of an alien presence within their world, one that is striving to thwart and ultimately overturn material creation. The archons are keenly aware that Seth is the current physical representative of that supernal infiltration; he is recognizably "another seed," ἀλλόγενής. Grave perils thus threaten Seth as long as he retains his present condition of vulnerability.

Illustrative of this type of narrative exegesis is the aforementioned testimony of Epiphanius regarding the teachings of the so-called Archontics about Seth:

And in turn, they say, Adam united with Eve his wife and begot Seth, his own physical son. And next, they say, the higher power descended, accompanied by the ministering angels of the good god, and caught up Seth himself ... carried him somewhere above and cared for him for a while, so that he would not be slain; and after a long time brought him back down into this world, having rendered him spiritual and (only) <apparently> physical, so that neither <the creator> nor <the authorities and realms of the world-creating god could prevail over him.>57

This valuable report actually resolves at least two distinct conundra embedded within the surviving fragments of the Codex "apocalypse of Sethel. First, as the immediately following fragments of this "apocalypse" express it, Seth was transported bodily from earth "to another place (that was) exceedingly great" (51.11-12) via the agency of an anonymous angel. His sudden removal produced much consternation among "those angels whom [I] left behind in the world which they possessed." (51.15-18). These latter "angels," as their epithet makes clear, are none other than the scheming demiurgic archons mentioned by Epiphanius above (the creator, authorities, realms). Moreover, their tantrum becomes intelligible: they realize that Seth has escaped (at least temporarily) their clutches. If Epiphanius' information about the teachings of the Archontics is to be trusted, it would appear that Seth risked assassination by the archons or one of their human agents as long as he remained in the material world. While the "apocalypse" fragments presented herein are silent regarding this specific threat, it is surely interesting to observe that a largely identical tradition concerning a plot by the archons to kill the forefather Seth survives in the tenth-century Muslim encyclopaedist Ibn al-Nadim's collection of Manichaean legends,58 as well as in the Aramaic incantation bowl tradition59 and in Middle Iranian sources.60

Second, and perhaps more importantly given our present context, we also learn from Epiphanius why Seth required a bodily transformation. As long as Seth retained his current material form, he could conceivably fall victim to the same types of temptations that led his father Adam astray. In order to insure Seth's safety, "the higher power ... rendered him spiritual and (only) <apparently> physical,"57 thus releasing him from the constrictive bonds of human flesh. No longer a corporeal entity, Seth was now immune to the alluring blandishments of the rulers of this world.

A thematically cognate version of this particular motif appears to be present in a literary source reproduced by the anonymous Christian compiler of the eighth-century Syriac Chronicle of Zuqnin.62 This textual fragment, which displays some intriguing indications of a heterodox provenance,62 is closely related to the material transmitted by Pseudo-Chrysostom (the Latin Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum) on the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem63 and the so-called "Prophecy of Zardûst" regarding the eventual birth and career of Jesus.65 Therein we read:

These princes (i.e., the Magi) received instructions and laws and even books from their ancestors, each generation receiving them from the one preceding, deriving ultimately from Seth, the son of our forefather Adam. For Adam revealed to Seth, his own son,66 and declared to him about his (Adam's) original majesty prior to his transgressing the commandment and his expulsion from Paradise, and he warned his son Seth not to transgress against righteousness like he (had done). Seth received the instruction of his father with a pure heart, and he was protected by the integrity and favor of the Exalted Lord of Greatness. It was granted to Seth that he might inscribe a book and promulgate wisdom and invoke the name of the Lord (cf. Gen 4:26), the Lord of every soul that seeks the Living One. It was due to him (Seth) that a book first appeared in the world, one which he inscribed in the name of the Exalted One. And Seth entrusted the book which he wrote to his descendants, and it was handed down in succession to Noah, one who also happened to be righteous, the one who escaped the waters.67

The curious allusion to the preservation of Seth's "purity" via the direct intervention of the "Exalted Lord of Greatness," a title moreover that is intriguingly reminiscent of those granted the supreme deity in Mandaeism ("Lord of Greatness") and Manichaeism ("Father of Greatness"),68 suggests that this narrative presents a lightly sanitized version of what were originally sectarian traditions expounding the authoritative transmission of gnosis from Seth to his worthy descendants. The latter groups emphasized Seth's exalted status as a heavenly entity in his own right ("another seed," Allogenos), or alternatively, his ascent to heaven and personal instruction there, as surely for the information which he revealed to subsequent generations. More orthodox interpreters grounded Seth's authority in that of his biological father in order to distance Seth from these suspicious supernal associations.69

There is consequently no need to situate the transformation of Seth, or for that matter the similar alteration in status predicated of Adam, among the superficially analogous traditions involving bodily metamorphosis that occur in both biblical and extrabiblical literature.69 To judge from the extant evidence, this motif is primarily prophylactic in function, although the idea of a bodily transformation as "reward" for exemplary service; i.e., a species of apotheosis, is occasionally visible in the sources. A temporary transformation in status serves to protect human visitors touring the heavenly realms from bodily harm, and insures that the celestial region will not be contaminated by the plethora of impurities produced and borne by corporeal beings.61 Seth's experience, however, varies significantly from these patterns. The integrity of heaven is not under assault. Nor does Seth risk attack while temporarily sequestered in the celestial heights. Rather, Seth courts archonic
malice as long as he retains his corporeal form upon earth. Ironically, he must undergo a transformation and assume quasi-angelic status in order to return and live unmolested among material beings.

εκείνος ο ἄγγελος τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν δεξίαν μου θείας καὶ ἐξέδωκε με ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξ οὗ ἐγεννήθην καὶ ἔπεσεν εἰς έτερον τόπον πάνω μέγατον "That angel placed his hand upon my right (hand) and took me out of the world exceedingly great." The actual notice of Seth's ascent occurs after his experience of corporeal transformation, a succession of events which is the reverse of the pattern typically exhibited in ascent apocalypses. Assuming (for the moment) the text's essential integrity, it would appear that Seth underwent his metamorphosis while still resident upon earth. Interestingly, an identical narrative sequence would seem to be present in the Coptic Gnostic tractate Allogenes (NHC XL.3): a heavenly emissary appears before the seer (whose cognomen significantly is “Allogenes”; i.e., a popular by-name of Seth), the seer is transformed, and he then ascends to heaven.63

As we have seen, the Archontic sect promulgated a distinctive set of traditions regarding the occultation of Seth which includes an ascent experience. In addition to that material, there are several other isolated notices featuring his ascension. The aforementioned Allogenes tractate is certainly cognizant of this motif, although it is admittedly unclear whether the title character represents Seth or one of his spiritual descendants. The Byzantine chronographer George Syncellus, a valuable tradent of numerous “lost” pseudepigraphic fragments,64 records that “in the year 270 of (the life of) Adam,65 Seth, having been taken up by angels, received instruction regarding the transgression which the Watchers were going to commit and the future Flood of water and the coming of the Savior.”66 According to this tradition, Seth spent forty days among the angels before returning to earth and teaching his contemporaries the mysteries imparted to him in heaven.67

The affinity between this notice and the CMC fragment is obvious, although nothing is said in the former passage about a bodily transfiguration of the forefather.68 The source from which Syncellus cites this tradition seems to be related to both Enochic literature (the fall of the Watchers69 and to those Adamschriften that ascribe a prophetic knowledge of the Flood and the birth of Christ to Adam).70 The latter cycle of writings characterizedly reduce the role of Seth to that of a recording scribe: he simply transcribes Adam's prophecies and archives them for a future age. Interestingly, the Syncellus passage maintains Seth's status as a revelatory authority, generically aligning it with texts emanating from a sectarian provenance.

Finally, Mandaean literature contains a curious passage that relates an ascension of “Sitil, son of Adam.” Therein the “Life,” supreme among those entities who inhabit the Mandaean Realm of Light, decides that the time for Adam’s death has arrived. Accordingly he dispatches Saurel, the angel of death,71 to summon Adam's soul back to heaven. But in a comic sequence reminiscent of the dialogues found in T. Abr. 16-20 and Deut. Rab. 11, Adam refuses to die,72 offering instead his son Sitil as a substitute. Sitil also is reluctant to leave his body, but eventually his respect for the will of the deity prompts him to overcome his fears. Casting off his “torso of flesh,” he dons a “garment of radiance” and “turban of light,” whereupon “winds, winds took up Sitil, son of Adam; storms, storms carried him away, lifted him up and placed him in a great cloud of light.”73 Sitil entreats the heavenly entities to grant Adam a glimpse of the marvelous world which he rejected by his initial refusal to die, and Adam accordingly enjoys such a vision. Regretting his recalcitrance, Adam now summons his son to return to earth so that he (Adam) can take Sitil's place in the heavenly realms. But Sitil rebukes Adam for his refusal to heed the initial command, and instead of returning proceeds onward:

Winds, winds took away Sitil, the son of Adam, storms, storms led him away, made him ascen and placed him near the watch-house of Shilmail,74 the man, the treasurer, who is holding the pins of splendour by his hand and the keys of Kushith on (his) two arms. They opened for him the gate of the treasure house, lifted up for him the great curtain of Truth, brought him in and showed him that vine whose inner part is splendour, whose sides are light, whose heels are water, and whose branches Ultras, whose leaves are the lanterns of light, and whose seed is the great root of souls.75

The use of “winds” and “storms” as the agencies of ascent is formulaic in Mandaean literature: identically language is used, for example, for the successive ascents of Dinanukht the scribe.76 However, this mode of aerial travel is reminiscent of the ascension of Enoch recounted in 1 Enoch 14:8-9: “… and in my vision the winds spread ('their wings' under me?) and bore me up and carried me into heaven.”77 Note that the physical transformation of Seth prior to his ascension correlates with the sequence of events indicated by the CMC fragment. Moreover, the cosmic “vine” ( 모습 ) which he beholds during this experience is consonant with the revelation of “awesome secrets” (مؤה ומעש) mentioned later in our fragment.78

The language employed in the “apocalypse” suggestively echoes that found within these analogues. Seth's removal is effected by the angel's grasping of his “right hand” in order to lift him physically from the surface of the earth. This particular mode of transport from earth to heaven is perhaps exegetically dependent upon Ps 73:23-24, a passage whose implications for the mechanisms of human ascent were pursued by at least one traditional commentary:79 "for I am always with You; you grasped my right hand (and) led me into your counsel,80 and afterwards granted me glory." The same means of conveyance emerges in 1 Enoch 71:3: “And the angel Michael, one of the archangels, took hold of me by my right hand, and raised me, and led me out81 from the material realm to heaven. One might note that the use of the “hand” without further qualification also figures in the ascendent mechanism of Acts 7:55-59: "And I was looking at him (the angel) when he took me by the hand … and we went up, he and I, into the vault of heaven …" Aside from the obvious physical leverage wielded by such an action, it seems likely that the Manichaean emphasis upon the symbolic salvific character of the “right hand” has governed the construction of this scene.
According to Kephalaia 39.19-24, prior to the fabrication of the material universe, Primal Man was delivered from his captivity among the hosts of Darkness by the supernal entity known as the Living Spirit, who "extended to him the second right hand" and removed him from the conflict. The ideology behind the Mandaean ritual termed kušā, or the exchange of a hand-clasp with the right hand between priest and layperson, is also relevant here. This ceremonial gesture is aetiological based upon a similar grip featured in a mythological account of the redemption of Adam, and comes to serve as a symbol for communion with the Realm of Light. The grasping of the "right hand" by the heavenly being is thus not simply a functional gesture; rather, it physically expresses a perceived unity of being between the deity and the privileged human. Note, for example, the following text from the Mandaean Left Ginzā: "They seized Adam by his right hand and took (him) up and established him in his heavenly abode, the place where the Great (Life) dwelt." A related instance occurs later in the same work within a hymn:

The Life knew about me,
Adam, who slept, awoke.
He took me by the palm of my right hand
And gave a ... (?) into my hand.
He threw light into the darkness,
And the darkness was filled with light.
On the day when light arises,
Darkness will return to its place.

As Rudolph has perceptively noted, the kušā motif signals a recognition of the embodied soul as a displaced being of Light, and presages its eventual installation within its true home. When viewed from this perspective, the clasp of Seth's right hand and his sudden removal from the material plane assume a more profound significance in the present context.

The description of the heavenly realm as "a place (that) was exceedingly great" parallels the one found in 1QH 3:19-22 quoted above, where the supernal height is depicted as "συχνάς πεδιάδας." Compare also CMC 53.11-12, where Enosh beholds, among other sights, "a flat plain" (συχνᾶς πεδιάδας).

According to Genesis 5, Seth was the founder of the fourth generation of humanity. Moreover, this same "escape-motif" may be echoed in Zost. (NHC VIII.) 4:20-31:

When he (the angel of the knowledge of eternal life) had said this to me, I very quickly and very gladly went up with him to a great light-cloud. I cast my body upon the earth to be guarded by glories. I was rescued from the whole world and the thirteen aeons in it and their angelic beings. They did not see us, but their archon was disturbed at [our passage]...

While the angels remain unaware of the seer's removal, their ruler experiences some discomfort, the precise nature of which (verbal?) remains unclear due to the fragmentary state of the text at this juncture. Given the strong likelihood that the title character "Zostrianos" (i.e., Zoroaster) is simply Seth in oriental guise, it appears possible that an identical complex of traditions lies behind the Archontic, 'Audian, Manichaean, and Nag Hammadi textual witnesses.

πάλαι δὲ τούτοις παραδιαλήψατο ἐλέξη ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς ἱσάγγει ἕκα τοῦτοι ντί κατέταν τοῦ γένους ἑκάτων καὶ ἐκκαλέσαντο αὐτῶν μέγιστα μνήμης τῆς μουσικῆς."Many things similar to these are described in his writings, and as he was transported by that angel from world to world, he revealed to him the awesome secrets of (divine) majesty." The shift in pro-nominal referent indicates that the formal first-person "citation" of the "apocalypse" ended within the lacuna preceding the present passage. The remainder of the fragment stems undoubtedly from the redactor of this section of the Codex, presumably Baraies.

The phrase "in his writings" (ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ) indicates that multiple "books of Seth" containing valuable revelatory material were potentially available for the purpose of authenticating the present "apocalypse of Sethel." This is not a surprising claim. As we have repeatedly seen, there are numerous testimonia to the popularity of allegedly Sethian compositions during late antiquity. Moreover, to judge from their proliferate composition, transmission, and translation of a wide variety of Adamschriften, Syro-Mesopotamian religious communities took a special interest in the literary vocation of this particular forefather.

The reasons for this fascination are not difficult to discern. Seth, like Adam his forefather, bore "the image of God" (Gen 5:1-3); his ill-fated brethren lacked this essential imprimatur. The Syriac Cave of Treasures, that rich depository of oriental exegetical lore, relates: "Then Adam had sexual intercourse again with Eve, and she became pregnant, and gave birth to Seth, a handsome (child), mighty and perfect like Adam. He was the ancestor of all the mighty ones before the Flood." In other words, Seth was a type of Adam redivivus, a regenerated Adam who reprises the virtues of his prototype save for his regrettable lapse in the garden. Such a status enjoys inherent privileges, not the least among which are a demonstrably close relationship with the deity as well as a position of leadership among the early generations of humanity. Moreover, given the circumstances of his birth and status, Seth becomes an obvious candidate for the reliable transmission of the repentant Adam's exhortations and testimonies, especially when Seth
himself is credited with the invention of writing. It is thus hardly surprising to discover that many of the extant Adamschriften explicitly claim a Sethian authorship.

In this latter class of writings, Seth never ascends to heaven and rarely enjoys an exclusive angelophany. Instead, he functions primarily as an amanuensis, recording information related to him by his parents in order to guide future generations. This passive, indeed subordinating, vocation appears to be a deliberate narrative devaluation of the exalted status enjoyed by Seth in sectarian and gnostic traditions, wherein Seth exercises an independent revelatory authority and forms an essential link in the chain of prophetic forebears. The more orthodox circles eventually strip Seth of all those attributes which might suggest a supernatural origin or identity.

**Excursus: Seth as Recurrent Salvific Avatar**

One intriguing aspect of late antique speculation about the character and significance of the forefather Seth is the notion that he is simply the initial material manifestation of a preexistent heavenly entity who periodically descends to the physical realm and "clothes" itself in human flesh in order to impart authoritative instruction regarding the supernal realm. This concept of the cyclical return of a discrete heavenly entity in diverse human forms is structurally congruous with the Manichaean doctrine of the recurrent incarnation of the Apostle of Light within select anedoluvian biblical forefathers and "national" religious teachers like the Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus. As discussed in Chapter One above, the Manichaean version of this teaching appears to be a variant formulation of the so-called "true prophet" doctrine of the Pseudo-Clementines and Ebionite Christianity. Given the close concord of the Sethian apostolic scheme with these attested analogues, one should probably link this latter expression of the concept to the same ideological environment.

This notion of the repeated incarnation upon earth of a "heavenly Seth" is arguably one of the constituent features of so-called "Sethian" gnosticism. B.A. Pearson has provided a concise survey of the most important places where this doctrine finds expression, calling attention to its occurrence in patristic testimonies and certain Nag Hammadi works. Sometimes by means of genealogy (Panarion 39.3.5), but more often via assimilation (Panarion 39.1.3; Gos. Eg. 64.1-3; 65.16-18). Obviously this specific correlation requires a Christian context for its construction. It is possible, as Pearson argues, that the Christian identification of Seth with Jesus may be presaged in certain Jewish traditions that apparently attach a "messianic" significance to the figure of Seth. For example, Pearson notes that the "Animal Apocalypse" (1 Enoch 85-90), a symbolic narrative composed no later than the mid-second century BCE, portrays both Seth and the future eschatological deliverer in the form of a white bull. Moreover, an early midrash (Gen. Rab. 23.5) pregnantly connects Gen 4:25, the verse relating the naming of Seth, with the appearance of the "messianic king" at the End of Days.

Reflecting the practice attested by the Pseudo-Clementines, Mani, and Muhammad, some gnostic circles apparently constructed official rosters of Sethian "prophets" or "teachers" who served as fleshly vehicles for the temporal sojourn of the "heavenly Seth." This is presumably the import of the tradition regarding the "seven sons (of Seth) termed 'strangers'" (Panarion 40.7.5); it is doubtful whether Seth's biological progeny are intended by this phrase. The enumeration of "seven" is suggestive in this context, given its demonstrable popularity as an ordering principle governing the arrangement of several other heterodox lists of authoritative spiritual instructors. Unfortunately Epiphanius does not provide the corporeal identities of these "sons." Anonymity also characterizes the thirteen separate manifestations of the "illuminator" (φωτιστής) recounted in a cryptic hymn contained within the Coptic Apocalypsis of Adam (NHC V.5), a series which is probably connected with the analogous appearance of an "illuminator" (φωτιστής) among "thirteen aeons" in the Coptic Gospel of the Egyptians (NHC III.2). Significantly, this latter text goes on to identify the φωτιστής as "Seth" and "the living Jesus" (64.1-9).

The term φωτιστής thus functions in these latter contexts as a terminus technicus for an avatar of the "heavenly Seth." Interestingly, the same Greek designation is employed by the Coptic Manichaean texts as a title for the "Apostle of Light," the supernal entity who periodically descends to earth in human guise in order to proclaim Manichaean gnosis. This can hardly be coincidental. The use of φωτιστής by both the Sethian and the Manichaean communities to signify human incarnations of their respective heavenly alter-egos (heavenly Seth/Apostle of Light) suggests an intellectual nexus, probably literary in nature, between these two groups. Their mutual recognition of both Seth and Jesus as authentic emissaries further cements this posited bond. Even though Sethian texts and testimony display some reticence in revealing the human identities of that system's salvific agents, one is able to discern an additional common φωτιστής which they share. The Apocryphon of John cites a "book of Zoroaster" as an authority for its correlation of bodily passions with archonial angels. The Coptic tractate Zostrianos seems to regard the Iranian sage Zoroaster as one of the corporeal manifestations of the heavenly Seth. As we have previously seen, Mani also views Zoroaster as an avatar of the Apostle of Light.

The resultant apostolic chain (Seth-Zoroaster-Jesus) generated by this gnostic assimilation sheds some light upon a curious text preserved within Syriac Christian literature known as the "Prophecy of Zardūšt." Its potential importance for the present topic requires its full translation at this point.

**The Prophecy of Zardūšt:**

Zardūšt is actually Baruch the scribe. When he was sitting by the spring of waters named Giola of Hörin, the place where the royal bath stood, he spoke to his disciples Ghušasaph the king, Sasan, and Mahimad, (saying) 'Listen my
Previous studies of this oracle have largely viewed it as an opportunistic combination of Zoroastrian and Christian eschatological teachings. According to this widely accepted interpretation, Zardust's declaration of his biological ascension of the Zoroastrian doctrine of the advent of the Saosyant, or World Savior, who was "to be born of the prophet's seed from a virgin mother." Be that as it may, the conceptual and linguistic affinities which we have isolated above link this text firmly with the thought-world of Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis. The "Prophecy of Zardust" is apparently a valuable survival, with only minimal adaptation, of an original gnostic source.
NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR


Ibn al-Nadîm, Fihrist (apud Flügel, Mani 613-5): “...and all is for God. The cloud is for Adam, or the heavens and the earth are for God. This is the way God directs all things, whether the living or the dead.”

Stroumsa, Another Seed 74.

Arabic, presumably from Syriac ܣܘܪܐ ܠܫܢܐ, itself loaned from Greek λέγων.

Was this designation ever more than an imaginative solution to the origin of the name “Sethel”? The initial orthography of the word matches that of the biblical name “Lot”; i.e., the nephew of Abraham who is associated with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and who becomes the ancestor of the Moabites and the Ammonites. At first glance, there would seem to be absolutely no connection between the figures of Seth and Lot, but note Gös. Eg. 609-18: “Then the great Seth came and brought his seed. And it was sown in the oaks which had been brought forth, their number being the amount of Sodom. Some say that the great Seth took his plant out of Gomorrah and planted it in the second place to which he gave the name Sodom.” Translation is taken from The Nayy Hammadi Library in English (3d ed.; ed. J.M. Robinson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 215.

Another Seed 74.


So Nöldeke, WZKM 12 (1898) 356-64.

C.C. Torrey opines that the names Qâbil and Hâbil are pre-Islamic, but offers no support to his statement. See his The Jewish Foundation of Islam (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1933) 50.

Note Epiphanius, Panarion 39.23-7.

E. G., Panarion 40.22, 5.3, 7.1-5: ἢ θεοὶ καὶ τοιοὶ Ἀλλογενεῖς καλουμένοις κέχρησιν βασιλεία γῆς καὶ αὐτοὶ καλούμεναι... ἐπεὶ δὲ πάλιν μὴν λέγουσιν οὐκ οὐ δυνάμει, ὅτι, φησίν, ὁ διαβόλος ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὴν Ευαγγελίαν συνήφθη οὕτως αὐτή ἀπὸ θεοῦ γυναῖκας καὶ ἐγένετον ἐξ αὐτῆς τὸν Καίν καὶ τὸν Ἀβέλ... πάλιν δὲ λέγουσιν οὐκ οὐ δυνάμει... ἤδη συναναπάθης τῇ ἐχθρίᾳ τῇ γυναῖκας γεννητεκνάτης τὸν Σῆρα, φύσας ἂν οὐ πάντως καὶ τότε γέννησα τῆς ἀνθρώπου τῆς ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνθρωπος και τοῦ ἰδίου γένους καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρώπου τῆς ἐναὐτῆς κυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐνα}
understanding, created a hair-soul." Translation taken from Nag Hammadi Library\(^3\) (ed. Robinson) 113.
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See Ibn Ezra ad Gen 5:1; Ramban ad Gen 5:3; Gen Rab. 23.6, 24.6; Apoc. Mos. 10.3; Adam and Eve 375.3.

Insofar as Seth is "the progenitor of Enoch," i.e., the fountainhead of "humankind," since this is the literal significance of the proper name "Enoch." The figure of Seth thus bridges the gulf between God and humanity, and the Sethite line, or "descendants of Seth," therefore retain their progenitor's "formal" association with God himself. Hence the common Oriental understanding of the infamous "sons of God" episode of Gen 6:1-4 as referring not to "angels," but instead to the progeny of Abel were biological sons of Adam. Note also ibid. 22 (ed. Luria 50a): "And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn that Cain was not of the seed, image, or likeness of Adam ..."

See Ap. John 24.34-25.1; Hyp. Arch. 91.30-33; Gos. Eg. 71.10-11; Epiphanius, Panarion 40.7.1; Ibn al-Nadim, Fibrist (apud Fligel, Mani 60.7): "And Adam [knew] his female counterpart Eve, and she became pregnant, and bore [Seth] to Adam. And she said, 'I have borne [another] man through God, in place [of Abel].'" Translation is that of Layton, Gnostic Scriptures 72, with emphasis added. Note the remark of B.A. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 468. See also Epiphanius, Panarion 39.23.4, where the so-called "Mother (of Life? cf. Gen 3:20) took thought and added ..." (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997) 91.30-33.

"And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn that Cain was not of the seed, image, or likeness of Adam ..."

See Ap. John 24.34-25.1; Hyp. Arch. 91.30-33; Gos. Eg. 71.10-11; Epiphanius, Panarion 40.7.1; Ibn al-Nadim, Fibrist (apud Fligel, Mani 60.7): "And Adam [knew] his female counterpart Eve, and she became pregnant, and bore [Seth] to Adam. And she said, 'I have borne [another] man through God, in place [of Abel].'" Translation is that of Layton, Gnostic Scriptures 72, with emphasis added. Note the remark of B.A. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 468. See also Epiphanius, Panarion 39.23.4, where the so-called "Mother (of Life? cf. Gen 3:20) took thought and added ..." (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997) 91.30-33.

"And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn that Cain was not of the seed, image, or likeness of Adam ..."

See Ap. John 24.34-25.1; Hyp. Arch. 91.30-33; Gos. Eg. 71.10-11; Epiphanius, Panarion 40.7.1; Ibn al-Nadim, Fibrist (apud Fligel, Mani 60.7): "And Adam [knew] his female counterpart Eve, and she became pregnant, and bore [Seth] to Adam. And she said, 'I have borne [another] man through God, in place [of Abel].'" Translation is that of Layton, Gnostic Scriptures 72, with emphasis added. Note the remark of B.A. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 468. See also Epiphanius, Panarion 39.23.4, where the so-called "Mother (of Life? cf. Gen 3:20) took thought and added ..." (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997) 91.30-33.


Is this a reflection of the traditions alleging a demonic parentage for Cain and Abel? Compare Chronicle of Zuqnin 1.62 lines 3-4: "he is the son of Seth..." (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1980) 4752-94, esp. 4785-86.

22 See Ibn Ezra ad Gen 5:1; Ramban ad Gen 5:3; Gen Rab. 23.6, 24.6; Apoc. Mos. 10.3; Adam and Eve 375.3.

Insofar as Seth is "the progenitor of Enoch," i.e., the fountainhead of "humankind," since this is the literal significance of the proper name "Enoch." The figure of Seth thus bridges the gulf between God and humanity, and the Sethite line, or "descendants of Seth," therefore retain their progenitor's "formal" association with God himself. Hence the common Oriental understanding of the infamous "sons of God" episode of Gen 6:1-4 as referring not to "angels," but instead to the progeny of Abel were biological sons of Adam. Note also ibid. 22 (ed. Luria 50a): "And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn that Cain was not of the seed, image, or likeness of Adam ..."

See Ap. John 24.34-25.1; Hyp. Arch. 91.30-33; Gos. Eg. 71.10-11; Epiphanius, Panarion 40.7.1; Ibn al-Nadim, Fibrist (apud Fligel, Mani 60.7): "And Adam [knew] his female counterpart Eve, and she became pregnant, and bore [Seth] to Adam. And she said, 'I have borne [another] man through God, in place [of Abel].'" Translation is that of Layton, Gnostic Scriptures 72, with emphasis added. Note the remark of B.A. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 468. See also Epiphanius, Panarion 39.23.4, where the so-called "Mother (of Life? cf. Gen 3:20) took thought and added ..." (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997) 91.30-33.

"And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn that Cain was not of the seed, image, or likeness of Adam ..."

See Ap. John 24.34-25.1; Hyp. Arch. 91.30-33; Gos. Eg. 71.10-11; Epiphanius, Panarion 40.7.1; Ibn al-Nadim, Fibrist (apud Fligel, Mani 60.7): "And Adam [knew] his female counterpart Eve, and she became pregnant, and bore [Seth] to Adam. And she said, 'I have borne [another] man through God, in place [of Abel].'" Translation is that of Layton, Gnostic Scriptures 72, with emphasis added. Note the remark of B.A. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 468. See also Epiphanius, Panarion 39.23.4, where the so-called "Mother (of Life? cf. Gen 3:20) took thought and added ..." (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997) 91.30-33.

Insofar as Seth is "the progenitor of Enoch," i.e., the fountainhead of "humankind," since this is the literal significance of the proper name "Enoch." The figure of Seth thus bridges the gulf between God and humanity, and the Sethite line, or "descendants of Seth," therefore retain their progenitor's "formal" association with God himself. Hence the common Oriental understanding of the infamous "sons of God" episode of Gen 6:1-4 as referring not to "angels," but instead to the progeny of Abel were biological sons of Adam. Note also ibid. 22 (ed. Luria 50a): "And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn that Cain was not of the seed, image, or likeness of Adam ..."
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39 Many of the surviving Christian Adamsschriften portray Seth as Adam's literary executor; i.e., he records the testimonies and warnings of his father for the instruction of future generations. Any so-called "book of Seth" is thus stripped of independent authority by this clever rhetorical tactic.


41 See also the important observations of M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 47-71.

42 See the passages cited in n.60 supra.

43 Allogenes 58.27-33: "When I was taken by the eternal Light out of the garment that was upon me, and taken up to a holy place whose likeness can not be revealed in this world ..." Translation is that of Nag Hammadi Library? (ed. Robinson) 496. The "garment" shed is that of human flesh; its replacement, if any, is not indicated. It is thus possible that only an ecstatic experience is presupposed by this passage, analogous to the ones claimed by John of Patmos in Rev 4:1-2 or described by Paul in 2 Cor 12:1-4; see the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.


45 An angel of baptism normally paired with Nidbai. See Ginza 602 (ed. Lidzbarski) sv. Šilmai; Rudolph, "Mandane Sources" 277-78. Note also Theodore bar Konai, Liber Schollarum (ed. Scher) 345.4; Noétique, WZKM 12 (1898) 356; Brand, Mandäche Religion 198; Lidzbarski, Johannesbuch xx.


47 See Right Ginza 208.16-20; 209.3-7, 21-24, 31-36; 210.3-6 (ed. Lidzbarski).

48 Translated from the Greek text, which reads: και άνεμοι εν τή όρασει μου και άνεμοι εν τή όρασει μου μέσις. See Abraham ibn Ezra ad Ps 73:24, who periphrastically interprets the example of Enoch in his discussion of this verse.


50 On this name see M. Lidzbarski, Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer (2 vols.; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1905-19) 2.119 n.3.

51 Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.

52 Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.

53 Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.

54 Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.

55 Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.

56 Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as Bereshit Rabbati. See Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (ed. H. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940) 24,22-23; 26,10-24.
similar depiction of the redemption of Primal Man, as well as our fuller discussion in Chapter Six below.


87Left Ginzä 571:13-20 (ed. Lidzbarski). Compare the translation (with a transcription of the text) of Rudolph, Theogonie 324.

88Note also CMC 194-7: Κύριος τὸ πάθος τοῦ ἡμετέρου καὶ τῆς ἀποστροφής πρώτης διέξεις ἀγαθής "from our Father and the distant; first, good right hand." See the references supplied by Henrichs-Koenen, (Theodore bar Konai, Apocalypse of Abraham: 4 which testifies that "they (Sethians) composed ... an apocalypse attributed to Abraham." 


90Preserved now only by Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum (ed. Scher) 74-75; Book of the Bee (ed. Judge) 89-90. See the bibliography provided above.

91Book of the Bee (ed. Judge) 89-90 (text) 


93See the discussions of Widengren, Mesopotamian Elementi 123-57; V. Arnold-Döben, Die Bildersprache des Manichäismus (Köln: Brill, 1978) 7-44.

94See Ginzä 610 (ed. Lidzbarski) s.v. Lichtwolke; ibid. 616 s.v. Wolke des Glanzes. Compare Apoc. Adam 71.9-10: "cloud of the great light" (cf. Gos. Eg. 49.1-2); 75.17-21: "And great clouds of light will descend, and other clouds of light will come down upon them from the great aeons."

95Compare "seed of great aeons" (Apoc. Adam 65.4-5); "seed of the great generation" (65.8); "seed of that man to whom life has come" (66.4-6); "seed of [the] man to whom passed the life of the knowledge" (69.12-15); "imperishable seed" (76.7); "the imperishable illuminators, who came from the holy seed" (85.28-29); "seed of the eternal life" (Gos. Eg. 60.32). Zardüš’s characterization of his disciples as those who "have been sown in a place of fire and water" should be compared with the account of the "sowing" of the seed of the great Seth in Gos. Eg. 60.9ff., where reference to the twin ordeals of Sodom-Gomorrah and the Deluge occurs.

96See Chapter One above.
Moreover it says thusly in the apocalypse of Enosh: 'In the tenth month of the third year I went out to walk in the wilderness, considering mentally...'
Moreover it says thusly in the apocalypse of Enosh: "..." An explicit appeal to a revelatory book allegedly authored by the forefather Enosh, who according to Gen 4:26 was the biological son of Seth, is particularly intriguing. Written works specifically ascribed to Enosh are seldom remarked among the postbiblical discussions of early literary activity by biblical figures. Jewish tradition is silent about Enosh's active involvement in the production of written literature, perhaps reflecting the popularity of that scriptural exegesis which concluded that Enosh was the first idolator to appear upon earth.

Nevertheless, some testimony does survive regarding Enosh as author. The Armenian historian Moses of Chorene mentions that two inscriptions containing revelatory knowledge were erected by Enosh, but this witness possesses little independent value, as it is simply a garbled summary of what Josephus reports of the efforts of the "descendants of Seth" in his Antiquities (1.69-71). Solomon of Basra's thirteenth-century "Book of the Bee" provides testimony regarding many of the sights which he beheld during his tour of the heavens and describes his own installation as an emissary of the principal Mandaean deity, who installs him in the supernal realms, where he continues to reside.

The initial portion of the twelfth book of the Right Ginza continues the first-person discursive style displayed in the preceding composition, identifying the speaker as "the great Anōš, the son of the great Šītīl, the son of the great Adam ..." Therein Enosh provides testimony regarding many of the sights which he beheld during his tour of the heavens and describes his own installation as an 'uthra of Light. The aforementioned Mandaean traditions preserved in the Right Ginza provide us with valuable comparative evidence for the assessment of the "apocalypse" contained in the Codex, and relevant passages from the Ginza will figure prominently in our discussion below. The implications of such a nexus, should such prove the case, are significant. The antiquity of the Mandaean textual corpus is a notorious crux, one that is complicated by the visibly complex redactional history and relative youth of the extant manuscript tradition. If a clear connection can be established between the
Codex passage and the Mandaeans Enosh material, an important step would be taken toward an improved understanding of the religio-historical relationships linking a number of Syro-Mesopotamian religious communities.

The spatial setting for Enosh's angelophany is the "wilderness." The significance of the wilderness as a favored locale for divine-human interaction has enjoyed a vogue in biblical studies, despite the trenchant criticism that has been leveled against this conception.13 It is unclear whether Enosh craves a numinous encounter, and hence directs his steps into the wilderness in order to facilitate such a meeting, or whether the experience or whether the experience repurposes or mental funk seems to afflict Enosh in our fragment.

The Mandean "book of Anô" seems cognizant of this same interpretive stream that specifically ascribes to Enosh a meditative contemplation of the mysteries of creation prior to the sudden manifestation of a revealor-figure. Enosh considers

the whole world—heaven, the stars, sun and moon, the angels appointed to oversee heaven and earth, the twelve constellations of the zodiac across which sun and moon travel, the angels appointed over water, wind, and fire, what the earth is founded upon, mountains, seas, fruits, grape-clusters, and trees. (Enosh asks): Who will tell me about these things, (such as) from where do they come? Upon what are they based? How did they come to be?23

After concluding that the created order apparently emanates from evil powers bent upon the enslavement of humanity, and while bewailing his entrapment among them, Enosh is graced with an angelophany. Mandâ de-Hayyê reveals himself to Enosh with a promise of deliverance, furthermore revealing to him the "secrets of heaven and earth" (Right Ginûa 264.4ff. [ed. Lidzbarski]). Although the contents diverge, the structure of this Mandaean narrative closely parallels the sequence of events contained within the Codex
"apocalypse." This correspondence of motifs centered upon the figure of Enosh suggests the conscious development of a relatively fixed group of traditions around that character (an Enosh-complex?), perhaps in deliberate imitation of the topos already circulating about his progenitors Adam and Seth.
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... While the word "death" is an extremely plausible reading in the present passage and the Mandaean texts is... A similar bodily reaction to the sudden appearance of the angel figures in the subsequent "apocalypse" of Shem. There Shem responds to the radiant manifestation of a "mighty angel" as follows: "Then the feature of my face changed so that I collapsed upon the ground. The vertebrae of my back shook, and my feet could not stand upon the joints." While the emotional "disposition of the recipient" is frequently remarked during the initial stages of an apocalyptic revelation, it is nonetheless rare that the seer's corporeal agitation is articulated in such graphic detail. I. Gruenwald has gone so far as to remark that "the phrase 'my feet did not stand upon their pins' is rather unusual and is not known from any other mystical text." Such an assertion however is in fact erroneous.

Very close parallels to the particular roster of physical tremors catalogued in the Codex "apocalypses" of Enosh and Shem occur in the Mandaean "book of Anôsh." After contemplating the structure and constituents of the created order, and then concluding that the world was governed by evil powers, Enosh reports: "When I saw that the world was created thusly, I trembled and shook, and my body, which had been straight, was bent. Groans came forth from my heart, my feet quaked, and they could not stand firmly in their places." Mandâ de-Ḥayyê then appears and asks Enosh: "Little Enosh, why are you frightened? Why do you shake and tremble? Why is your body bent, why does your heart groan, and why do your feet quake in their places?" The amazingly close correspondence in language between the Codex passage and the Mandaean texts is extraordinary, bolstering the growing suspicion that they derive from a common textual corpus. Yet another instance of the same anatomical diction is found in the twelfth book of the Right Ginza, where Enosh is also the speaker: "When I saw that being of Light, my body quaked and trembled, and my feet could not stand in their places. I collapsed and fell down in front of him." (270.4-6 [ed. Lidzbarski]). This latter instance is in fact even nearer in form to the scenes described in the Codex, for here as there the nuanced paroxysms of the seer are in response to the sudden manifestation of a heavenly being.

This common verbal articulation of the physical symptoms afflicting Enosh during his reception of a heavenly vision further cements the kinship which we have been positing between the pseudigraphic "apocalypse" of Enosh and the Mandaean "book of Anôsh." Close study of the language and ideology of this "apocalypse" hence has significance not only for the literary and cultural development of biblically-based pseudography, but also possesses suggestive implications for the reconstruction of the literary history of Mandaeanism.
The spirit seized me and immediately after recounting his bodily paralysis due to the sight of the angel, Enosh now speaks of a journey "to a flat plain" from which high mountains rise. One would expect instead at this narrative juncture a message of rehabilitation Enosh's precarious physical condition in order to prepare him for further events. Yet there is no mention of the angel's presence with Enosh during his sojourn upon the plain. Moreover, the immediately following passage of the "apocalypse" speaks of a "spirit" that suddenly seized Enosh and transports him "with silent power" to the summit of a mountain, where many secrets are then revealed to him.

This peculiar sequence of narrative events—(1) an ascent (2) the recipient's visceral reaction to the sight beheld (3) an incongruous travelogue (4) followed by an ascent—raises the suspicion that two variant versions of the ascent of Enosh have been clumsily combined by a subsequent textual redactor (Baraies?). In each version the agent effecting Enosh's ascent accomplishes this feat "silently" (for this odd characterization recurs in both accounts, providing the vehicle by which Levi is able to step into heaven). A matter of storm, and to a mountain the tip of whose summit reached to heaven.

On the other hand, in the interest of preserving literary integrity, one could conceivably interpret the ascent of Enosh as proceeding in two stages. Enosh is first raised to the "flat plain," and then the "spirit" (perhaps understood as an alternate designation for the revealing "angel") transports him to the mountain. Interestingly, 1QH 3:19-22 also depicts one portion of the celestial world as "a plain of limitless expanse" where the seer enjoys communion with the angelic hosts, but no "mountains" figure in the description provided by this Qumran source.36 Mountains however do form an important part of the supernal "landscape" viewed by the forefather Enosh during his tour of the heavenly heights (1 Enoch 21-36). The underworld is situated beneath "a large and high mountain" in the west (1 Enoch 22:1-5). Another locale features "seven magnificent mountains," each comprised of precious stones, and one of which will serve as the throne of God's impending judgment (1 Enoch 24-25; cf. 18:6-9). Seven "spice mountains" are traversed travelling eastward before reaching the "garden of righteousness" (1 Enoch 32:1-3; cf. 77:4).

Although somewhat damaged, this text can be reliably supplemented and readily understood with the aid of the later Greek Testament of Levi, a work which has demonstrably used the Aramaic Levi document as a source in its own construction. T. Levi 2:5-6 represents the parallel passage: τότε ένεκέσθη πάντα τό αίμα τούς ζωοὺς καὶ τό τέμον τούς ουράνιον καὶ τό χέρι τούς θεοῦ έπέσανέν με ὅτε και έφυγεν. And behold the heavens were opened, and an angel of God said to me, Levi, enter!" While the Greek and Aramaic recensions diverge regarding the precise character of the experience (was it a waking or a dream-vision?), a "mountain" plays a prominent role in both accounts, providing the vehicle by which Levi is able to step into heaven.
In the Enosh fragment, the mountain is simply the locale where the subsequent revelations are proffered. The actual means of ascent is via "the spirit," as which we suggested above in light of the "apocalypse" of Shem may be an abbreviated reference to the Manichean "Living Spirit," an alternate designation for the anonymous revealing angel who seems to figure in this "apocalypse." The language employed of this entity here is reminiscent of Acts 8:39, where "the spirit of the Lord" suddenly removes the apostle Philip from the company of the Ethiopian entity here is reminiscent of Acts 8:39, where "the spirit of the Lord" suddenly removes the apostle Philip from the company of the Ethiopian.

Moreover [he says] that 'the angel ...' The final few lines of this page are heavily damaged, but the initial words suggest that this is a redactional seam. Greek κάλαν presumably renders Syriac ֳָּ֭כָנָה "again, once more."

The modern editors offer some tentative suggestions for restoring the phrase δὲ ἄγγελος καὶ ... 1 reading perhaps καταπτάς "the angel flew" (cf. CMC 17.11), καταλθὼν "the angel descended" (cf. CMC 58.23), or καταλήκων "the angel came down" (cf. John 18:1). Each is a plausible rendering in the present context.

καὶ ἀπήλθε με ءیش کیمیا ُءیکتیکیا ُءیکسیتیکیا ُءیکیمیکیا کیژیا کیژیا کیژیا کیژیا "[and brought me to the] northern region, where I beheld immense mountains and angels and many places." The direction "north" possesses a positive connotation in Manichean cosmological texts, where it is almost certainly inherited from an analogous evaluation found in Second Temple Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, and which in turn preserve this assessment from early West Semitic religiosity. "North" is one of the spatial parameters used by Manicheans to describe the location of the Realm of Light, or alternatively, the celestial Tree of Life. Such language emerges, for example, in the fragments of an unidentified Manichean composition which are quoted within a sixth-century homily of the Monophysite patriarch Severus of Antioch. Therein we read:

They (i.e., the Manicheans) say: 'That which is Good, also named Light and the Tree of Life, possesses those regions which lie to the east, west, and north ... Its (the Tree of Life's) land encompasses three regions: that of the north which extends both beyond and below, and that of the east and west (also) extending both beyond and below."

By contrast, the Manichean Realm of Darkness (the Tree of Death) "exists eternally in the region of the south, having its own locality which it is over."49

This Manichean connection between the "Tree of Life" (i.e., the Realm of Light) and its northern provenance appears to be textually linked to 1 Enoch 25:5, whose Ethiopic version states: "From its fruit (i.e., of the Tree of Life) life will be given to the elect, and toward the north it will be planted, in a sacred place by the abode of the Lord, the Eternal King." The corresponding Greek text is apparently corrupt here, reading "food" (εἰς ἄρτος) in place of "north" (εἰς βορράν). Unfortunately, the Aramaic Urtex text does not survive for this passage. That "north" may indeed be the correct reading in this text is indicated not only by Manichaean cosmological principles, but also by passages like 1 Enoch 34:1; 61:1-5; 70:2-3; 77:7; and Orig. World 110.8-10.

Manichaean cosmology also situates its World of Light (alma dhvura) in the "north." According to the Ginzã, the Lord of Greatness, another designation for Mandã de-Ḥayyē, "is enrowned in the far north" (Right Ginzã 7.3-4 [ed. Lidzbarski]). A discussion now extant in the twelfth book of the same work labels "north" as a place of "brightness" and "living water" where the baleful "planets and signs" are powerless; whereas the "south" is the location of the "worlds of darkness" and "black water."51 Confirmation of this spatial orientation and evaluation among the Manichaean occurs in Muslim sources. According to the eleventh-century savant al-Bīrūnī, the group whom he terms the "real Sābians,"52 who are in fact the Manichaean, are the remnant of the Jewish tribes who remained in Babylonia, when the other tribes left it for Jerusalem in the days of Cyrus and Artaxerxes. Those remaining tribes felt themselves attracted to the rites of the Magians, and so they incline toward the religion of Nebukadnezzar, and adopted a system mixed up of Magism and Judaism like that of the Samaritans in Syria. The greatest number of them are settled at Wâlist, in Sawdâlīrâk ... they pretend to be the descendents of Enos the son of Seth (my emphasis). They differ from the Harrānians ... In praying, even, they turn towards the north pole (my emphasis), whilst the Harrānians turn towards the south pole.54

Interestingly, the author of the Fihrist relates on the authority of al-Kindī55 that the Harrānian Sābians "have adopted one direction for prayer, which they have fixed towards the North Star in its course."56 Other Muslim sources also remark the Harrānian esteem for the "north," but this association may be due to rife confusion regarding the distinctions between "true" and "pseudo-Sābians."

It is nevertheless evident that certain Syro-Mesopotamian religious communities adhere to a particular pattern of directional assessment that views "north" favorably and "south" unfavorably.58 The Enosh fragment seems to belong within this same interpretive trajectory, since it is that quarter to which Enosh is taken for his audience with the emissary from the "Pre-Eminent Almighty One."

διακλητησε δυ μοι και ειλέν οἱ ἄγγειλοι τῆς ὕπεροχης ἀποκαλεῖσθαι ἤπειρος αὐτῷ για ἄρει οὐκ ἐντευθέντας ἐν θεοτητῇ ἐκείμενος τῆς ἀποκαλητησε "He spoke to me and said: 'The Pre-Eminent Almighty One has sent me to you so that I might reveal to you the secret (things) which you contemplated, since indeed you have chosen truth. '" While the messenger might possibly be identified with the Living Spirit (see above, as well as the discussion in Chapter Six below), a well-known Manichean deity, the entity who has commissioned him bears the designation the "Pre-eminent Almighty One" (ὁ ἀπόκαλεσθαι τῆν ἄραρχην). The superlative language favors a possible
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identification with the Manichaean Father of Greatness (Mara Drabuta) or the Mandaean Lord of Greatness (Mara Drabuta),
the supreme ruler of the Realm of Light for each of these gnostic traditions. However, the particular epithet employed in the present Enosh fragment occurs nowhere else in the extant literature. L. Koenen has suggested that the phrase "pre-eminent high priest" encodes a reference to "Jesus the Splendor," and the divine emissary who rouses Adam from "the sleep of death" after the latter's resurrection.

The "secret (things)" (τὰ ἀπόρρητα) contemplated by Enosh are the mysteries of creation (theoria tuneon) which puzzled him at the commencement of his "apocalypse," a ruminatory process which apparently set into motion the revelatory events recounted in the present narrative. The demonstrable efficacy of this type of mystical meditation in terms of its stimulative provocation of an "ascent-experience" underscores the seriousness of the Tannaitic warnings about indulging this species of study and exposition.

The phrase apparently expressing the permanent veracity of the teachings ("for [my] revelation, which shall not pass away, is ready [to be] revealed to all the brethren..."") is heavily dependent upon the so-called "little apocalypse" of the synoptic gospel tradition, and the present clause, if accurately rendered, may be a periphrastic rendering of Matt 24:35b/[Mark 13:31b]/Luke 21:33b, probably derived from the Didascalia.

The use of bronze or copper as a writing material for archival purposes, along with its subsequent deposit in the wilderness, is hence not without parallel in Jewish literary history. The choice of this metal as a medium of preservation would seem to be based upon its durability (as opposed to perishable materials like parchment, papyrus, or leather), an important factor to consider given the valuable nature of the information that is inscribed thereon. This common concern with preservation apparently governs an intriguing correspondence with the Qumran Copper Scroll which is found in the temple at Jerusalem.

This composition allegedly describes the protective concealing of the Temple vessels at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem. Therein it states that "Shimmur the Levite and his associates listed on a copper tablet the sacred vessels and the vessels of the Temple which were in Jerusalem and in every place." Presumably this inventory would survive "until the advent of a legitimate king for Israel," when the hidden vessels will be miraculously restored to the reconstituted nation.

Apart from the aforementioned instances, the use of "bronze tablets" as a source of revelatory information appears in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue Axiochus, a work of Hellenistic provenance. Therein Socrates claims that his knowledge about the afterlife is due to his tutelage under a Persian magus named Gobryas, whose knowledge in turn derives ultimately from information inscribed upon two "bronze tablets" allegedly brought to Delos by Apollo and Artemis from the Hyperboreans.

κάντα δὲ αἱ γραφές προδηλοῦσα γόραλον, ἐτῶμοις γὰρ ἐξείλ ἐκολοχήθη τά αύτώς εὐθύς ἢ ἐμί, ἢ οὖ τελευτά τις τού αὐτών, ἀποκαλοφθηναι τοις ἀδελφοῖς [...]. Καὶ οὖ "Everything which you write record most plainly (carefully?). For [my] revelation, which shall not pass away, is ready [to be] revealed to all the brethren..."

η ἀιωνίαν ἀναθεμάτισέν τοι ὁ Παρασιτης ἡμῶν ἔναγμα τῆς ἐνωμονίας. Ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τούτη ἀμφισβήτηται ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Παρασιτήτου πρὸς τὸν Αὐτόν ἐν Κιλίταιον περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἀναθεμάτισέν τοι ἡμῶν ἐν Καναρίας ἄνω ὑποδεικνύοντα περί τῆς αὐτώς ἀρατης καὶ ἀποκαλύφθης καὶ εἶδον γόραν τούτον ἑλθέντος καὶ εἴδεν γόραν κατέλειψεν τοις μεταγενεστέροις τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῆς ἀναθεμάτισέν τοι ἡμῶν ἐν Κιλίταιον περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἀναθεμάτισέν τοι ἡμῶν ἐν Καναρίας ἄνω ὑποδεικνύοντα περί τῆς αὐτώς ἀρατης καὶ ἀποκαλύφθης καὶ εἶδον γόραν τούτον ἑλθέντος καὶ εἴδεν γόραν κατέλειψεν τοις μεταγενεστέροις.
of hearers; namely, those “belonging to the spirit of truth.” This particular expression points chronologically forward to the emergence of the Manichaean religious community. The phrase “spirit of truth” is an unambiguous reference to the Johannine Paraclete, whose true identity, according to Manichaean interpretation, is Mani himself. This final clause thus underscores the solidarity perceived to exist between the revelatory experiences and teachings of the biblical forefathers and those subsequently enjoyed and promulgated by Mani.

Summary

Close analysis of the “apocalypse” of Enosh indicates that these fragments share a number of motifs with the other allegedly Jewish “apocalypses” featured within the Codex, especially that of Shem, the composition which immediately follows the Enosh material in the Codex. Neither Enosh nor Shem receive extensive narrative development within later Jewish or Christian literary lore, at least within works associated with the classical formulations of those religions. It is only within Mandaism, a Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic community of uncertain origin, that the figure of Enosh enjoys esteem as an author of revelatory literature and eventually as an emissary of the supernal Realm of Light. Our analysis has shown that there are some significant correspondences between material that is found in the CMC “apocalypse” of Enosh and the Mandaean Ginzá, a relationship which possesses suggestive implications for the age and provenance of Mandaean literary activity. There are, moreover, some indications within the “apocalypse” that point to a Manichaean adaptation and/or reduction of its discourse. These features collectively create a suspicion that the “apocalypse” of Enosh, at least in its extant form, is not an authentic remnant of Second Temple era Jewish pseudepigraphic expression, but instead an artificial composition constructed to enhance the status of this forefather vis-à-vis his more illustrious colleagues.

NOTES

2 Although note 2 Enosh 33:10 (long version), which ascribes written works to each of Enoch’s ancestors. The parallel passage within the “short version” mentions only Adam and Seth.
3 See the discussion of Gen 4:26 in Chapter Two, and in general, S.D. Fraade, Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984). Note too 3 Enosh (Ms. Vat. 228: §8:8 (ed. Schäfer)): "והכל מסחכליץ בזיו דמות שכינתו ואין ניזוקיץ עד שבאו בני דודו של אנוש לעולם שהית ראש לכל עוכדי ע..." "and everyone beheld the glory of the image of His Shekinah and no one was corrupt until the advent of the generation of Enoch in the world, for he was the originator of all those who worship idols in the world."
5 See Chapter Two, n.48.
6 Note that the immediately preceding discussion of the accomplishments of Seth lists “knowledge of letters” (חכמת ל jm) as the significant cultural achievement of his era, but neglects to inform us just what was composed using these characters.
10 Rudolph, Theogonie 303. Compare the frequent employment of the phrase “great Seth” in Gos. Eg. 51:20; 54:11; 55:17; 56:13-14; 59:15; 60:1, 8, 9, 14, 15; 61:16, 23; 62:19, 24; 63:11; 64:2, 24; 65.17, 20; 68:2, 10; Treat. Seth 70:12; and note the remarks of B.A. Pearson, “The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature,” in idem, Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 63.
11 Compare Right Ginzá 27:19-28:7; 45:22-46:6 (ed. Lidzbarski). A tri-fold cataclysmic scheme is also featured in the Coptic Apocalypses of Adam. One wonders whether this particular structural skeleton is ultimately indebted to a similar motif found in the Old Babylonian myth of Atrahasis.
12 Interestingly rabbinic tradition also speaks of a deluge during the time of Enosh. See Mek. Bahodeš 6 (ed. Horovitz-Rabin 23:13-14): ממה שמל ש שלא אוסר עזריך שלם של...
NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN


29 CMC 57:4-11: καὶ τὸς ἡλικιώτης ὁ χαρακτήρ του προσαφόνου μου ὡς καταστέται ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ μὲν σφόδρα τοῦ νόου μου διεκλήσθησαν, οἱ δὲ δόμοι μου ὡς ἔστησαν ἐκ τῶν ὀστραγάλων. Compare the reaction of Enoch in 59:1-3: [ὅδε] αὐτός ἐκτίθησιν ὡς δός ὡς τὰ γόνατα μου ἀλλάξας ἀραβασάσθωσίν "[Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking."

30 The phrase "disposition of the recipient" was coined by J.J. Collins for use in his valuable analysis of the primary motifs found in apocalyptic literature; see his "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," Semena 14 (1979) 1-19.


44 Right Ginza 262.27-30 (ed. Liddzbarkski).

14 The similarity of this narrative sequence with the one recounting the career of Enoch in 1 Enoch 6-16 is probably not accidental.

59.1-3: [ίδων δέ] αυτοῦ ἐκτίθησιν ὡς δός ὡς τὰ γόνατα μου ἀλλάξας ἀραβασάσθωσίν "[Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking."

The similarity of this narrative sequence with the one recounting the career of Enoch in 1 Enoch 6-16 is probably not accidental.


31 Right Ginza 264.15-18 (ed. Liddzbarkski).

31c, aníza níza. This epithet is used of the human Enosh, prior to his apotheosis. See the discussion above.

32 The actual identity of the "spirit" emerges from the remarkably parallel "apocalypse" of Shem that immediately succeeds the Enosh fragment in the Codex. There we read παρ' αυτού τοῦ ζών "the living Spirit" (CMC 55:17-18), a well-assented designation for one of the important Manichaean cosmogonic entities. See our discussion below.

36 The Hadaya seer is however raised ἡμῖν ἐν ζώνι (IQH 3:20) prior to his permutation on "the plain"; compare IQSB 5:23 and the remarks of M. Delcor, Les hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot) (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962) 125. Unless otherwise noted, all textual citations from the Qumran Hadaya are taken from Delcor's edition, which is in turn dependent upon the edisko princeps of E.L. Sukkenik.

154-55; .

38 Right Ginza 262.1-7 (ed. Liddzbarkski).

145 (1979) 1-19.

40 Translation is that of M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoc," AOT (Sparks) 206. The Greek version of 1 Enoch 172 reads: καὶ ἄραθη γινείς μὲν εἰς κοψώδη τόπον καὶ εἰς δόρος ὡς ἡ καταφύγιον εἰς τῶν ὀυράνων, where suggestive echoes can be discerned. Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek text(s) of 1 Enoc derive from Apocalypsis Henochi Graece (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

32 CMC 55:15-56:3: έμοι δὲ διαλουχομένου ἐξορώσεως ἡμών πεπεσαμένων τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ ἀνίσχθηκαν βίοι μεγίστας [καὶ κατέκτησαν κατά τὸ ἄκρον δόρος υἱῆς λογίας καὶ ὠσε ἐστὸς ἀκρωτηρίου] λέγην ... ήν δὲ δός τοῦ μόστου τῆς τιμῆς θεοῦ. Compare the reaction of Enoch in 59:1-3: [ὅδε] αὐτός ἐκτίθησιν ὡς δός ὡς τὰ γόνατα μου ἀλλάξας ἀραβασάσθωσίν "[Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking."


43 Manuscripts display some divergence over what is contained at this crucial juncture of the text. The critical edition incorporates a phrase which identifies the mountain seen as "Aspis" (cf. T. Levi 6:1), but four other manuscripts do not contain this phrase, stating instead και μάρτυς ἐν οὐσίᾳ "and I was on it" (i.e., the mountain). Aramaic Levi likewise preserves no trace of the name of the mountain.


45 The translation "wind" would seem to be ruled out by the scirbal use of a nominum sacrum.


51 Right Ginzâ 280.25-282.13 (ed. Lidzbarski). Compare the similar language contained in the Manichaean fragments which were cited by Severus of Antioch. Note also the description of Mani's vision of world inundation contained in *CRTC* 77.13-79.12, as well as Apoc. Bar. 53. For speculation regarding why the southern quarter came to have such an association, see Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 179 n.27.

52 There is much confusion in Muslim (and hence modern Western) sources regarding the application of the Qur'anic appellation "Sâhihan." Regardless of whom the Qur'an (26:26; 56:56; 22:17) intended to designate by this label, later Muslim works use it to refer to (1) a religious group or identity contemporary with Muhammad, (2) adherents of the surviving vestiges of pagan religiosity centered around the city of Harran, and (3) the Mandaeans of southern Iraq. The scholarly literature focusing on this issue is immense: see especially D. Chwolson, *Die Sababer und der Ssabismus* (2 vols.; St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1856); J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (3d ed.; Berlin, 1927; reprinted, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1961) 234-42; M. Gil, "The Creed of Abû 'Amir," *IS* 12 (1992) 9-57.


54 al-Birûnî, *al-Āthar al-bâqiya 'an-il-qurün al-khäliya* (Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Alberünt) [ed. C. E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923] 188.10-13 'العوامه' تحدثت الناس إلى ما كان من فوق كورش، وأيام وظفعت إلى البيپ엘 المصلي: "... وoauthروا إلى شرارة العوامه، فأصبحت فكاً مفتها ما عئتيل من مجموعة فوفهج في كتابة كخبرة بالإسلام، وقد برر كربان بابوس وسلاحة الرحم، فشارك إلى فلورس بين كلابا فسلاحة الحنيدة - وكتبوا إلى السجن، وهو ما هو من الأهمية إلى العلماء في مهما، توجه إلى الماثص، والملائمات، وتوثيق مهية الفي التي - حياء إلى الكمال، والملائمات، والملائمات إلى التحقيق، ... Translation taken from C.E. Sachau, *The Chronicle of Ancient Nations* (London: William H. Allen and Co., 1879) 188; see also 314. Later in the same work al-Birûnî states: "I believe that the Manichaean, too, turn towards the north pole, because this is, according to them, the middle of the dome of heaven and its highest place. I find, however, that the author of the Book on Marriage, who is a Manichaean and one of their missionaries, reproaches the people of the three religions with turning to one direction to the exclusion of another. With this he reproaches them, besides other things, and he seems to indicate that a man who prays to God does not need any Kibla at all" (*Chronology* 329).


59For discussion of these designations, see especially Rudolph, Theogonie 82-83 n.3; G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (2d ed.; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965) 67 n.8; Reeves, Jewish Lore 200 n.15; and Chapter Four, n.58 above.


62BHM 2.88-91. Credit for recognizing this parallel belongs to J.T. Milik; see his “Notes d'épigraphie et de topographie palestiniennes. 8. Traité des vases (ה commerc les) du sanctuaire.” RB 66 (1959) 567-75.


65See Chapter One, n.42 above.

66See CMC 47.1-49.15; 71.6-72.7.

67John 14:16-17; see also 15:26; 16:7-14. Interestingly, the phrase “spirit of truth” (רוח חכמה) figures within Qumran literature, where it usually seems to function as a by-name.
CHAPTER SIX
THE APOCALYPSE OF SHEM

Text

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σήμ τούτον τὸν τρόπον ἔφη ἐν τῇ ἀποκάλυψις αὐτοῦ· ἐλογίζομην
περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ποίω τρόπῳ ἐγένοντο. ἤμου δὲ διαλογιζομένου ἐξαιρήθηνς
ἡρασθεὶς μὲ πλέον τό τόν καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν βίῳ μέγιστη (καὶ κατέστησαν κατὰ
tὸ ἄκρον) ὅρας ὕψος τῆς θεοῦ καὶ εἶχαν πάντα [μὲ ὅσιο] λάγημι· μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ
δόξαν δὸς τῷ μέγιστῳ τῆς τιμῆς βασιλεί. καὶ πάλιν εἶπαν ὅτι σὺν ἠρωίαν μὲν
θύραι ἀνεπέστησαν, διηρέθησαν δὲ καὶ νεφέλαι πρὸς τοῦ ἄνωμον, εἶδον δὲ
καθαυτίζουν ἐκδόξουν ἀκό τοῦ ὑψους τοῦ ἄνωτάτου κατερχόμενον καὶ μέγιστον
ἀγγέλῳ ἐνθράστας αὐτοῦ. ἡ δὲ εἰκὼν τῆς ἱδρύς τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πεθακαλλής
καὶ ὀραία ἐνθράστας μᾶλλον τῆς στιλβούσης λαμπηδόνος τοῦ ἠλίου, ἐτι δὲ καὶ
τῆς ἀστραφῆς, παραπλησίως δὲ τοῖς ἠλιαῖς [...]. δε ἦ στολή ἐν τῷ κάλ
λει τῆς θυράς ἐπιτάσθησαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρμουσκίων ἀνθών. καὶ τότε
ἐλογίζομην ὅ χαρακτήρ τοῦ προσώπου μου ὅστε καταπεσεῖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἐν
ὁφυδοῖνα τοῦ τόσου μου διακληρονήσασαν, οἱ δὲ πόδες μου οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐκ τῶν
ἀστράγαλοις, παρέκκλησεν δὲ μοι φωνὴ καλοῦσα ἀπὸ τοῦ καθαυτισμοῦ καὶ
ἐπελθοῦσα μι τῆς χειρός ἐλάβετα τῆς ἰδέας καὶ ἀνέστην, φωνῆσας δὲ κατὰ
τῆς ἰδέας μου ἀφθηβαὶ χωρὶς προσθήκην μοι δυνάμεως ἐφεξάσθαι καὶ δόξης,
καὶ τίνα ἐπέκαλυσαν αὐτῷ ὅ ἁγγελοὶ εἰπόντες γράψαι αὐτή πρὸς
ὑπομνηματισμοῦν.¹

Translation

Similarly also Shem spoke this way in his apocalypse: “I was thinking about
the way that all things came to be. While I pondered (these things), the Liv-
ing Spirit] suddenly tolok] me and [lif]ted me with great [force, and se[k] (me)
on [the summit] of a lofty mountain, [and] spoke to me thusly, saying [‘Do not be afraid; rather,] give praise to the Great King of Honor.’”

Moreover he says that “silently doors were opened and clouds were parted by the wind. I beheld a glorious throne-room descending from the heights and a mighty angel standing by it. The image of the form of his face was very beautiful and lovely, more than the bright radiance [of the sun], even more than [lightning]. Similarly [he radiated light like] sunlight, [and his robe ...] of diverse hues (?) like a crown plaited with May blossoms. Then the feature(s) of my face changed so that I collapsed upon the ground. The vertebrae of my back shook, and my feet could not stand upon the joints. A voice bent over me, calling from the throne-room, and having approached me took my right hand and raised (me and) blew a breath of life into my nostrils, increasing my power [and] glory.”

Numerous[es] other[es] similar things are in his writings, including which the angels revealed to him saying, “Write these things for a memoir!”

**Commentary**

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἴημα πουτόν τὸν τρόπον ἐτή ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ. “Similarly also Shem spoke this way in his apocalypse.” Unlike Enosh, whom later classical traditions seem loath to credit with either revelatory experience or literary production, the figure of Shem, eldest son of Noah, does attract some attention from both Jewish and gnostic scribal circles. Interest in Shem stems primarily from his liminal genealogical position straddling the antediluvian and postdiluvian eras of biblically based chronography. His birth and maturation prior to the coming of the Flood allows him the opportunity to be educated in the lore of the antediluvian forefathers, and his survival of the cataclysm guarantees that the post-Flood generations will maintain access to the authentic teachings of those primeval worthies. Recognition of Shem’s peculiar position and authority as a guarantor of ancient wisdom is already emphasized in the Second Temple era Jewish pseudepigraphic work known as the Book of Jubilees, wherein Shem inherits the literary corpus of his father (Jub. 10:14) and is expressly numbered among what L. Ginzberg has aptly termed a “prophetic succession” of early teachers (Jub. 19:24). Post-biblical Jewish tradition expresses his role in this chain of transmission through the educational mission of the so-called “academy of Shem” (בית ביתון אש載), a school of religious instruction which matriculates such later national heroes of piety as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. There is also a persistent tradition which assimilates the figure of Shem with that of Melchizedek, the enigmatic royal and priestly character who briefly appears in Genesis 14. The latter personage enjoys extensive development in post-biblical literature, a process which culminates in his close identification with, if not outright amalgamation with, types of angelic, salvific entities.

Several works attributed to Shem either survive or are at least mentioned in ancient and medieval literature. Perhaps the one with the oldest pedigree is the book that circulates under the title Sefer Asaph ha-Rophe (פְּסֵר אֲסַף הָרוּפֶּה), a medical treatise prefaced by a short historiographic recountal of the transmission of the healing arts from the era of Noah to late antiquity. Of especial interest for the present discussion are the following passages:

This is the book of remedies that the ancient sages copied from the book of Shem, the son of Noah. It was transmitted to Noah on Mt. Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat, after the Flood. For in those days and at that time the bastard-spirits (חƷרְּבִּים תּוֹפֵיה) began to attack the progeny of Noah, to lead them astray and to cause them to err, to injure and to afflict them with diseases and pains and with every kind of sickness that kills and destroys human beings ... the angel (Raphael) told him (Noah) the remedies for the afflictions of humankind and all kinds of remedies for healing with trees of the earth and plants of the soil and their roots. And he sent the leaders of the remaining spirits to show Noah the medicinal trees with all their shoots, greenery, grasses, roots, and seeds, to explain to him why they were created, and to teach him all their medicinal properties for healing and for vitality. Noah wrote all these things in a book and gave it to Shem, his oldest son, and the ancient sages copied from this book and wrote many books, each one in his own language.2

Among the foreign sages who subsequently exploit this “book of Shem” are Asclepius (אַסְכֶּלֶפִּוס), Hippocrates, and Galen. Ironically Shem’s association with this book would seem to be expressly connected with its postdiluvian revelation to Noah. His strategic genealogical position in relation to that of his father Noah mirrors the similar status enjoyed by Seth with regard to Adam, and guarantees that the work will be faithfully transcribed and transmitted to the subsequent generations.

Jellinek had already noticed that this intriguing narrative exhibited a number of verbal and thematic connections with 1 Enoch 15-16 and Jub. 10:1-14, and opined that it must be “eine hebräischen Ueberrest aus dem Buch der Jubiläen.” The influential textual and interpretive studies of R.H. Charles cautiously accept this assessment, although modifying it slightly to allow for the possibility that both Jubilees and Sefer Asaph utilized a common source.3 While recognizing the discernible parallels between the two works, M. Himmelfarb has recently directed attention to a number of subtle differences that collectively discredit Jellinek’s view regarding their direct literary relationship.4 She moreover plausibly suggests that these discrepancies reflect the divergent programs of at least two separate circles of traditions, one of which (Sefer Asaph) was primarily interested in medical secrets, whereas the other (Jubilees) focused upon religious matters. If she is right, as seems likely, Charles’s proposal of a common source to explain these texts’ kinship accrues some additional support.

The tenth-century Karaite polemicist Salmon b. Jeroham makes mention of a “book of Shem b. Noah” (_between_book_ב_נ_שמות_נ_שם) in his treatise entitled The Book of the Wars of the Lord.5 Therein he links the “book of Shem” with the infamous Sefer ha-Razim (“Book of Secrets”), a Gaonic compilation of magical incantations and other esoterica. He brands both books as works which “hint at every vile (doctrine) of your (Rabbinate) teachers ... causing Israel to incur guilt and to sin, for in these works are contained ineffable
names that arouse love for men in the mind(s) of women (i.e., love-charms). A less likely possibility for Salmon’s “book of Shem” is a Judaean-Arabic divinatory treatise, the opening sections of which are preserved on a single manuscript leaf recovered from the Cairo Genizah. According to S. Hopkins, “the text belongs to the distinct and well-known genre of Zusungsliteratur,” whereby information about future events is derived through the observation of localized muscular contractions or twitches. Entitled הַכּלָשְם יִבְנֵי נָח ("Book of Twitches"), it is expressly ascribed to Shem b. Noah, and the list of prognostications is introduced with the phrase חֶרְמֵי בַּשָּם שֶׁל יִשְׂרָאֵל "Shem b. Noah said ..." (recto line 16). This leaf contains however no magical “names,” and the remainder of the work is no longer extant. Hopkins also refers in passing to another Genizah fragment containing the beginning of an astrological work that is attributed to Shem.12

Another prognosticatory work ascribed to Shem is the so-called Treatise of Shem, an astrological almanac contained in a fifteenth-century Syriac manuscript. This document “describes the characteristics of the year according to the house of the zodiac in which it begins,”13 correlating the twelve signs of the zodiac (reversing however the sequence of Aquarius and Pisces) with a variety of human and natural calamities. A special interest is displayed in the rise and fall of the water level of the Nile River. In light of this latter interest, and given the demonstrable popularity of this genre of literature in Coptic and Egyptian Arabic sources, it seems likely that the text originated in Egypt. Its latest translator, J.H. Charlesworth, has sought to situate the text within first-century BCE Jewish circles,14 but this early date for the work is almost universally rejected: most scholars opt for a date at least half a millennium later.15 The name of Shem appears only once, in the opening line of the treatise, and there is no evidence contained within the work that inexorably binds it with the reputation of this particular forefather.

The Nag Hammadi collection of manuscripts includes a work entitled the Paraphrase of Shem (NHC VII.1). This intriguing book is a first-person account wherein Shem describes his ascent “to the top of the world, which is close to the light that shone upon the whole area there” (Paraph. Shem 1.9-11).16 He is then instructed by an angel named Derdekeas about the origin of the cosmos and of humanity, and learns important information about the future progression of history, including forecasts of the coming Flood,17 the destruction of Sodom, and the final consummation of the created order. Shem is repeatedly exhorted to promulgate the teachings which he received in his revelation to his descendants, who are characterized as the chosen “race of Light” whom Darkness will repeatedly persecute. He then “awoke as if from a long sleep (and) I marveled when I received the power of the Light and his whole thought” (Paraph. Shem 41.21-24).18 A visceral circumstance suggestive of a dream-vision or trance-like state for the reception of the revelation.

Mandaean gnosticism also expresses some interest in the figure of Shem. In Mandaic texts he is usually referred to as Šum b. Šum-Nu; i.e., Shem son of Noah, and is accorded recognition together with his father as a renewer of the world after the Flood. According to K. Rudolph, “er ist Stammvater der Mandäer, Vorbild und Repräsentant ihres Glaubens.” A prayer ascribed to him is included in the Qoḥaṣa, the standard collection of Mandaean liturgical hymns. He also appears with the designation of Šum-Kuṣṭa, under which rubric he enjoys revelatory experiences.
The Living Spirit is perhaps the most important cosmogonic agent in the Manichaean scheme of cosmic redemption. According to the important sketch of Manichaean doctrine supplied by the eighth-century Nestorian patriarch Theodore bar Konai, the Living Spirit ("]\text{rd}^\text{oi}\text{) was evoked in order to effect the rescue of Primal Man and his entourage from the clutches of the denizens of the Realm of Darkness. Primal Man and his five “sons” had previously sallied forth to engage the threatening forces of Darkness in battle, but their attempt to drive off the invaders resulted instead in an ignominious defeat: Primal Man suffered incarceration, while his “sons” were devoured by the ravenous victors. News of this catastrophe provoked a series of further evocations on the part of the Realm of Light, the last of whom was the Living Spirit. After evoking in turn his five sons, one of whom is the Great King of Honor ("]\text{k}^\text{st}\text{a}\text{) to the frontier where

[they] found Primal Man and his five sons engulfed by Darkness. Then the Living Spirit cried out with his voice, and the voice of the Living Spirit was like a sharp sword, and it uncovered the form of Primal Man, and he said to him: ‘Greetings to you, O Excellent One among evil entities, O Luminous One in the midst of Darkness, O Divine One dwelling among wrathful beasts who have no knowledge, of <his> glory!’ Then Primal Man answered him and said: ‘Come in peace, O bringer of the merchandise of tranquility and peace!’ And he said: ‘How do our Fathers, the Sons of Light, fare in their city? The Caller answered him: ‘They are faring well!’ The Caller and the Respondent joined together and ascended to the Mother of Life and the Living Spirit.

It remains unclear from Theodore’s account precisely how the deliverance of Primal Man was physically accomplished, and the corresponding portion of Ibn al-Nadîm’s Arabic narrative, which displays some points of contact with the Syriac narrative, is even more opaque. However, an earlier fourth-century variant version of the crucial final scene depicts the liberation of Primal Man in concrete terms: “... the Father heard and sent another power ... called the Living Spirit and ... descending he (the Living Spirit) gave to him (Primal Man) the right hand, and brought (him) out of the Darkness.” The import of this particular variant will emerge presently.

Having accomplished the rescue of Primal Man, the Living Spirit now takes steps to recover the five “sons” of Primal Man—those whom Mani termed the ziwane, literally “shining ones”—from their digestive ordeal. Since their consumption by Darkness makes this task a more complicated endeavor, the Living Spirit concocts and executes a complex plan of demiurgic fabrication which results in the creation of the familiar material universe. The heavens and earths are formed, the luminaries are installed, and mechanical processes are instigated by which the portions of Light trapped in the material cosmos (i.e., the ziwane) can be gradually distilled, purified, and eventually recovered. The five sons of the Living Spirit are each assigned supervisory tasks overseeing certain aspects of the refining process, with the Great King of Honor enthroned in the midst of the heavens in order to keep watch over the whole enterprise.

The explicit naming of the Living Spirit and the Great King of Honor in the “apocalypse” of Shem is thus a clear indication of this fragment’s actual provenance. One can, however, go even further in this present course of analysis by observing that the narrative movement of the “apocalypse” of Shem as rendered in the Codex mirrors several principal motifs found within the extant versions of the Manichaean myth about the redemption of Primal Man. The correspondences which link the experiences of Shem and Primal Man can be summarized as follows: 1) The Living Spirit serves as the divine emissary in each instance; 2) the Living Spirit is the agent of removal in both instances—he rescues Primal Man from the Realm of Darkness, and snatches Shem out of the material world; 3) in each case the “voice” of the Living Spirit is personified as a separate entity, and it is the “voice” that acts as an arousing stimulus (see CMC 57.11-14 below); and 4) when the earlier variant description of Primal Man’s redemption is taken into account, the grasping of the right hand (note our discussion of kūtād above!) plays a prominent role in the resuscitation of each protagonist (see CMC 57.14-17 below). Given these structural analogies, one can tentatively conclude that the Manichaean story about the rescue of Primal Man by the Living Spirit functions as the template for the formulation of the “apocalypse” of Shem.

If these similarities prove compelling, then the artificiality of the “apocalypse” of Shem, which was suspected on other grounds—specifically, in the prefaces and deliberations, becomes patent. This circumstance however need not exclude, as we shall see, the simultaneous incorporation and adaptation of authentically Jewish elements in the elaboration of the narrative. One must in fact expect that such adjustments would occur during the composition of the apocalypse in order to more securely anchor it in its purported cultural milieu.
sight,” a nuance that emerges more forcefully in the Peshitta version of the last portion of this verse.

Rev 4:1 (καὶ ὁ θάνατος ἡγημόνιας ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is particularly interesting for our present purposes, for the passage goes on to describe a disembodied “voice” which invites the seer to enter through the open door. Doing so, the seer then beholds a splendid figure seated on a throne encircled by a rainbow (cf. Ezek 1:28) and surrounded by other thrones upon which are seated “elders” clad in white robes and wearing golden crowns. Shem too is accosted by a “voice,” and also experiences a throne-vision which apparently involves the flashing of variegated colors. At first sight, this congruence seems astonishing, especially when considering that the Syriac version of the book of Revelation was probably not available before the sixth century CE.

However, given the rapid standardization of the symbolic vocabulary of theophanic visions in both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature, it should perhaps not occasion surprise that these two distinct scenes should exhibit such a uniformity of discourse.

I saw that his appearance from his loins upward was like that of a lion, like fire within it and all around; and his appearance from his loins downward was like that of fire, and brilliance surrounded him. Like the appearance of the rainbow in a cloud on a rainy day, thus was the appearance of the encompassing brilliance. This was the appearance of the likeness of the Glory of the Lord.

Of especial interest in the Shem passage is the possible reference to a multi-colored object, which the modern editors have suggested is the garment (ἡ στολή) worn by the angel. However, this seems unlikely, for entities associated with the heavens or the Realm of Light are invariably garbed in white robes, as is for example evidenced in 1 Enoch 14:20: “And He who is great in glory sat on it, and his raiment was brighter than the sun, and whiter than any snow.”

According to an Aramaic pseudepigraphon recovered from Qumran known as 4Q’Amram (4Q543-548), the wicked ruler of the Realm of Darkness was clothed in a garment of many colors (יִנְשָׁאָה נְפַרְנָהָה). The reference in the “apocalypse” of Shem is thus probably not to clothing worn by the angel, but to the rainbow, as in Ezekiel's (1:28) and John of Patmos's (Rev 4:3) visions of the throne of God.

One should also observe that the Greek translators of the Codex have employed a Coptic month-name, that of Pharmouthi, to render the floral metaphor used of the appearance of the crown. According to Kephalaia 14:26-27, “it is in the month Pharmouthi that the vegetables are harvested”; hence this month indicates the season of ingathering. As pointed out by Henrichs and Koenen, the use of this particular designation suggests that the translation of the Codex from Syriac to Greek took place in Egypt.
and Mandaeans, are here reliant upon a common cultural idiom, and it would appear that the underlying model is, once again, Ezekiel's inaugural vision: “When I saw (it; i.e., the sight described above), I collapsed upon my face...” (Ezek 1:28b).52

A voice bent over me, saying, “When I saw (it; i.e., the sight described above), I collapsed upon my face...” Echoes of the Manichaean mythos become more pronounced at this stage of the narrative's progression. Shem has collapsed and is now utterly helpless to react to further external provocation, a situation that is metaphorically parallel to that of Primal Man in the cosmic Ur-drama. Just as the “voice” of the Living Spirit is the essential agent in the arousal and redemption of Primal Man, so too here a personified “voice” (note its hypostasized attributes: it “bends over,” it “clasps,” it “lifts,” and it “breathes”) restores vitality to the prostrate Shem.

The sudden manifestation of a “voice” in a theophanic setting is paralleled in Ezekiel's influential vision. After his collapse, he hears “a voice speaking” (1:28c)! Indeed, episodes wherein this voice speaks to one or more hearers recur many times in rabbinic texts, usually in contexts where a divine pronouncement is requisite. This motif also figures in revelatory literature whose setting is similar to that of the Manichaean “apocalypse.” Compare for example the following episode from a Hekhalot text that parallels our passage: “R. Akiba said, ‘Once when I ascended to the Merkavah (i.e., the divine throne-room) a voice spoke to me, and He blew into my nostrils the breath of life and restored my breath to me, and set me back up on my feet....’” (173:17). Here, as in the Shem fragment, the voice calls to the hearer from the vicinity of a heavenly throne. However, the voice does not exhibit the hypostatic qualities displayed by the waw in the “apocalypse” of Shem: that is to say, it never “bends,” “grasps,” “lifts,” or “breathes” in classical Jewish sources. Such peculiar behavior in the Shem fragment derives, as we have seen, from its mythological prototype; namely, the Manichaean Living Spirit.

As can be observed from the underscored clauses, this particular text displays several remarkable correspondences with the latter section of the Shem fragment, even though the sequence of the events which are depicted varies between them. In both instances the setting for the theophany involves a visual experience of a heavenly throne-room. Both seers react with marked fear and trepidation, including corporeal distress and paralysis; both are greeted by an “angelic” attendant with a handclasp (although “right hand” is not specified in the 3 Enoch text); and perhaps most intriguing of all, both must have their “breath” (אָנָשׁ, Gen 2:7) restored by this attendant before regaining their composure. It would appear that all of these texts have been constructed out of a common cultural lexicon of mythical mythemes,
with variance of articulation occurring primarily at the level of one's particular religious identity.

Interestingly, there has recently emerged further evidence that one of the dangers threatening the Jewish mystics who dared to ascend and gaze upon the glorious throne-room of the deity was the loss of one's "breath" or "spirit." According to a fragment of an otherwise unattested Hekhalot tractate that has been recovered from the Cairo Genizah, the fear aroused in the visionary from the awesome sights endured in the course of the experience might actually expel the "spirit" from the body. To prevent this from happening, special instructions are given to the seer by the guiding angel Ozhayah. After assuming a prostrate position, "... stick cotton in your ears and cotton in your nose and cotton in your anus so that your breath will stay in and not go out until I reach you. And I will come and stand by you and fan you, and your spirit will return and your soul will live."61 This remarkable text, despite its relatively late date, explicates the reason why R. Ishmael (3 Enoch) and Shem (CMC "apocalypse") require the resuscitory efforts of their respective attending angels. The loss of "breath" is an inevitable result of their angelophanic experiences. One might also note that even when the requisite protective steps are taken, it is still necessary for the angel to "blow" (חנן) the escaping "spirit" (נפש) back into the body of the heavenly voyager. The Shem passage provides the earliest attested instance of this particular motif in this type of literature.62

καλέστε δὲ καὶ ὅλα τούτοις καραβόλησθαι ὑπάκουετέ ἐν ταῖς αὐτοῦ γραφαῖς, καὶ τίνα ἀπεκλάνωσαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰκόνες γράφατε αὐτῷ πρὸς ὑπομνήματι τὸν "Numerous other [similar things are in his writings, including that which the angels revealed to him saying, 'Write these things for a memoir!'" As is the case with the other forefathers whose "words" are cited in this section of the Codex, Shem too is exhorted by heavenly beings to record his experiences and wisdom for the benefit of future generations. This interest in antiquarian records accords with the Manichaean emphasis upon the production and preservation of authoritative written testimonia recounting the earlier divine revelations and teachings. Unlike the "apocalypses" of Adam and Enosh, no specific instructions are given to Shem regarding what materials to use in the preparation of his "memoir.

The imperative mood of address ('Write these things for a memoir!') possesses a verbal parallel in the aforementioned Ozhayah fragment recovered from the Cairo Genizah. Therein the angel Ozhayah commands the anonymous seer, "Record and leave the seal of the 'descent of the Merkavah' for the inhabitants of the world, for you and for whoever seeks to 'descend' and behold the King in his beauty."63

Summary

Of the five allegedly Jewish "apocalypses" cited by Baraies in this section of the Codex, the "apocalypse" of Shem displays the clearest signs of sectarian adaptation, manipulation, or perhaps even composition. The Coptic Paraphrase of Shem and this "apocalypse" are the only surviving examples of literary texts ascribed to this forefather by any religious community prior to the second half of the first millennium CE, and it is surely suggestive that both of these works belong within the general milieu of late antique gnostic religiosity. While the status of Shem undergoes a visible elevation already within certain circles of Second Temple era Jewish traditions, it is primarily among gnostic groups that Shem achieves recognition as an independent author and privileged recipient of cosmic mysteries.

The Shem fragments are thus most profitably viewed as a Manichaean (or proto-Manichaean) "forgery." Nevertheless, despite its artificial character, there are several indications that the author or compiler of the "apocalypse" of Shem was privy to a general collection of nuanced traditions surrounding the modes and media of angelophanic revelation, an assemblage of motifs and terms that was also visibly exploited by those diverse groups responsible for the production of Jewish Hekhalot tracts, Manichaean mythologoumena, and Mandaean ascent-experiences. Such affinity of expression should not be surprising, given these groups' common Syro-Mesopotamian cultural setting. Furthermore, the rhetorical similarities repeatedly discerned among certain of their textual productions prompts the religioso to conclude that at some level these different communities were consciously trafficking in discursive wares that served them all as common coin. One need only invoke the so-called "interdenominational" character of the Aramaic ritual-bowl inscriptions that have been recovered from late antique Mesopotamia,64 and the resultant difficulties scholars experience in establishing an individual bowl's actual religious provenance, in order to underscore this aspect of their ideological relationship.
consumption, of the great judgment, when the great aeon is completed" (μέχρις τοῦ μεγάλου τελεσίου, τῆς κρίσεως τῆς μεγάλης, ἕν ὁ δὲ αἰών ὁ μέγας τελεσθεὶσθαι [16:1]). Earlier in the Greek text of 1 Enoch, the giants were termed τοῦ μαγωτοῦ (109), a word long recognized as being a loan from the Syriac "bastards." Further usage of the identical Hebrew phrase (i.e., ושבעה בני אדם שקפלו את העולם כולו) to represent the same entities appears in 4Q510 1 line 5; 4Q511 35 line 7, 48-51 lines 2-3 (?), and 182 line 1 (?); for these texts see DJD VII 216, 237, 243, 261. For discussion, see J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions" (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 133 n.53.

7A similar phrase designates the "spirits" of the antediluvian giants who perished during the Flood. According to J Enoch 158:16-17 (cf. Jub. 10:1-14), these malevolent spirits will torment humankind with diverse afflictions "until the day of
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3This particular phrase designates the "spirits" of the antediluvian giants who perished during the Flood. According to J Enoch 158:16-17 (cf. Jub. 10:1-14), these malevolent spirits will torment humankind with diverse afflictions "until the day of..."
Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer

Mani: seine Theogonie

CHAPTER SEVEN

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX


2. See especially the critique of Brock and Alexander in their work...

38. "After the heavens and earths were made, the Great King of Honor took a seat in the midst of the heavens and kept watch over the whole."

39. Reves, Jewish Lore 188-89 provides a brief summary of the most important sources.

39. Psalm-Book 2.5 speaks of "the Living Spirit, our first Right Hand," a clear allusion to the earlier form of the redemption scene. However, Kephalaia 38.20 ascribes the "first right hand" to the Mother of Life. Compare CMC 19.4-7: ἐκ τοῦ πατρίδι αὐτῶν καὶ τὴς ὑποθετετυχοῦσας δόξης καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου αυτῶν τῶν ἐν χειρὶ νεφέλης, "from our Father and the distant, first, good right hand." It is unclear which entity is intended by the term "neveleth."" It is unclear which entity is intended by the Codex epithet, although in context the Living Spirit would seem to be the most suitable choice.

40. See Exod 19:9; 24:15; 40:35-38; Num 9:15-22; 11:25; 12:5; Ps 18:12-13; etc. Both "doors" and "clouds" are present in Ps 78:23 (Kephalaia 50.107), a poetic elaboration of the traditional divine provisioning of the Israelites wandering in the wilderness.

41. "The architectures of the enveloping cloud's presence, and the image of its envelopment by the Israelites' cloud, the cloud of incense produced by the Israelite high priest who accompanied them on their journey to the land of Canaan."


45. An example of the "living being" epithet, και ταύτα εἰπών βλεπόντων αυτών ἐπήρθη, καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν απὸ τῶν οφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. This cloud of incense produced by the Israelite high priest immediately prior to his entrance within the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (see Lev 16:12-13) serves the same "obscuring" function by protecting the ministerant from an accidental fatal glimpse of the divine glory.


47. Known as the Ozhayah Fragment on account of the name of the angel who delivers instructions and warnings to the initiates. See I. Gruenwald, "Manichaism and Judaism" 44. The name used here is מanna
Moreover Enoch also speaks in a similar manner in his apocalypse: “I am Enoch the righteous. My sorrow was great, and a torrent of tears (streamed) from my eyes because I heard the insult which the wicked ones uttered.”

He says: “While the tears were still in my eyes and the prayer was yet on my lips, I beheld approaching me [seven] angels descending from heaven. [Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking.”
He says moreover: “One of the angels, whose name was Michael, said to me: ‘I was sent to you for this purpose—in order that I might show you all the deeds and reveal to you the place (appointed) for the pious, and to show you the place (appointed) for the impious and what sort of place of punishment the lawless are experiencing.’

He says also: “They seated me upon a chariot of wind and brought me to the ends of the heavens. We traversed worlds—the world of [darkness], and the world of fire. And after these (worlds) they brought me into a world of extraordinary richness which was resplendently luminous, even more beautiful than the heavenly luminaries which I (also) beheld.”

All these things he saw, and he questioned the angels, and that which they told him he recorded in his writings.

**Commentary**

The same epithet figures prominently in references to this forerunner within the manuscript tradition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as in T. Levi 10:5 (καθὼς περιέχει βιβλίος ἑνών τοῦ δικαίου), T. Judah 18:1 (ὅτε κατέστη ἔνθεσις ἐν βιβλίοις ἑνών τοῦ δικαίου οὐκ ἐκεῖ κιηθεὶς ἐν ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις), and T. Dan 5:6 (ἐνθέσις γὰρ ἐν βιβλίῳ ἑνών τοῦ δικαίου ἢ).

The association of this designation with Enoch is also attested, albeit negatively, by another series of citations which criticize the lofty position this forerunner achieves among those circles of scribes who produced Enochic and related works. The first evidence of this critique surfaces within the Greek translation of Sir 44:16, wherein Enoch is termed “an example of repentance for (future) generations.” His contrition would seem to presuppose sinful behavior that required forgiveness, a lifestyle that ill accords with the usual depiction of a “righteous” Enoch. No evidence for such behavior survives in either the Bible or Enochic texts. Nevertheless, a tradition similar to that reported in Sirach is found in Philo. A further discordant note is sounded in Wis Sol 4:7, 10:11:

*But the righteous, though he die before his time, shall be at rest.... Being found well-pleasing unto God he was beloved of him, And while living among sinners he was translated: He was caught away, lest wickedness should change his understanding, Or guile deceive his soul.*

Verses 10-11 of this passage clearly allude to Enoch (compare LXX Gen 5:24) and evaluate him in terms that uncannily foreshadow subsequent rabbinic assessments of his status. Of signal importance for our present purposes is his invocation in verse 7 as “righteous” (δίκαιος). This suggests the language is intentional: the author of this passage mitigates, even denigrates, the epithet commonly applied by some of his contemporaries to the figure of Enoch.

Knowledge of the application of this epithet to Enoch is also demonstrated several centuries later in the critical attitudes of R. Hoshaya and R. Aibu preserved in Gen. Rab. 25:1: “And Enoch walked with God.” (Gen 5:24)—R. Hama in the name of R. Hoshaya said: He (i.e., Enoch) is not inscribed within the book of the righteous, but instead the book of the wicked. R. Aibu said: Enoch used to wave. Sometimes he was righteous, other times he was wicked. The Holy One thought: I will remove him (cf. Gen 5:24) while he is righteous.”

The emphasis laid upon the attribute “righteous” in both instances would seem to reflect a polemical stance against its liberal application to the figure of Enoch.

The association of this designation with Enochic sources is also signaled by S. Hopkins, who notes: Portions of this latter work appear to have survived. Another missing text calls attention to the now empty folder that once contained T-S A45.1 and an English qualifier corresponding to Hebrew εγώ εἰμι Ἐνώχ ὁ δίκαιος for Enoch in extant Enochic and cognate literature.

The association of this designation with Enoch is also attested, albeit negatively, by another series of citations which criticize the lofty position this forerunner achieves among those circles of scribes who produced Enochic and related works. The first evidence of this critique surfaces within the Greek translation of Sir 44:16, wherein Enoch is termed “an example of repentance for (future) generations.” His contrition would seem to presuppose sinful behavior that required forgiveness, a lifestyle that ill accords with the usual depiction of a “righteous” Enoch. No evidence for such behavior survives in either the Bible or Enochic texts. Nevertheless, a tradition similar to that reported in Sirach is found in Philo. A further discordant note is sounded in Wis Sol 4:7, 10:11:

*But the righteous, though he die before his time, shall be at rest.... Being found well-pleasing unto God he was beloved of him, And while living among sinners he was translated: He was caught away, lest wickedness should change his understanding, Or guile deceive his soul.*

Verses 10-11 of this passage clearly allude to Enoch (compare LXX Gen 5:24) and evaluate him in terms that uncannily foreshadow subsequent rabbinic assessments of his status. Of signal importance for our present purposes is his invocation in verse 7 as “righteous” (δίκαιος). This suggests the language is intentional: the author of this passage mitigates, even denigrates, the epithet commonly applied by some of his contemporaries to the figure of Enoch.

Knowledge of the application of this epithet to Enoch is also demonstrated several centuries later in the critical attitudes of R. Hoshaya and R. Aibu preserved in Gen. Rab. 25:1: “And Enoch walked with God.” (Gen 5:24)—R. Hama in the name of R. Hoshaya said: He (i.e., Enoch) is not inscribed within the book of the righteous, but instead the book of the wicked. R. Aibu said: Enoch used to wave. Sometimes he was righteous, other times he was wicked. The Holy One thought: I will remove him (cf. Gen 5:24) while he is righteous.”

The emphasis laid upon the attribute “righteous” in both instances would seem to reflect a polemical stance against its liberal application to the figure of Enoch in pseudepigraphical literature, as well as against the esteem Enoch enjoyed among certain groups of intellectuals and pietists.

The association of this designation with Enoch is also attested, albeit negatively, by another series of citations which criticize the lofty position this forerunner achieves among those circles of scribes who produced Enochic and related works. The first evidence of this critique surfaces within the Greek translation of Sir 44:16, wherein Enoch is termed “an example of repentance for (future) generations.” His contrition would seem to presuppose sinful behavior that required forgiveness, a lifestyle that ill accords with the usual depiction of a “righteous” Enoch. No evidence for such behavior survives in either the Bible or Enochic texts. Nevertheless, a tradition similar to that reported in Sirach is found in Philo. A further discordant note is sounded in Wis Sol 4:7, 10:11:

*But the righteous, though he die before his time, shall be at rest.... Being found well-pleasing unto God he was beloved of him, And while living among sinners he was translated: He was caught away, lest wickedness should change his understanding, Or guile deceive his soul.*

Verses 10-11 of this passage clearly allude to Enoch (compare LXX Gen 5:24) and evaluate him in terms that uncannily foreshadow subsequent rabbinic assessments of his status. Of signal importance for our present purposes is his invocation in verse 7 as “righteous” (δίκαιος). This suggests the language is intentional: the author of this passage mitigates, even denigrates, the epithet commonly applied by some of his contemporaries to the figure of Enoch.

Knowledge of the application of this epithet to Enoch is also demonstrated several centuries later in the critical attitudes of R. Hoshaya and R. Aibu preserved in Gen. Rab. 25:1: “And Enoch walked with God.” (Gen 5:24)—R. Hama in the name of R. Hoshaya said: He (i.e., Enoch) is not inscribed within the book of the righteous, but instead the book of the wicked. R. Aibu said: Enoch used to wave. Sometimes he was righteous, other times he was wicked. The Holy One thought: I will remove him (cf. Gen 5:24) while he is righteous.”

The emphasis laid upon the attribute “righteous” in both instances would seem to reflect a polemical stance against its liberal application to the figure of Enoch in pseudepigraphical literature, as well as against the esteem Enoch enjoyed among certain groups of intellectuals and pietists.
While the settings for these statements vary, an examination of their contexts may prove instructive for recovering the background of the Enochic quote. The passage in Tobit occurs within a prayer, while the citation from T. Judah introduces an oracle of the patriarch directed against his erring descendants. Either narrative setting is appropriate for Enoch as a developed literary character within the extant Enochic corpus: he frequently prays (see the section following this one), and is popularly recognized as possessing foreknowledge of future events. Our present passage deliberately combines aspects of both activities. Note the wording of what occurs after our passage: “while the tears were still in my eyes and the prayer was yet on my lips, I beheld ...”, a statement that connects the eventual angelophany with whatever setting is presupposed here. Therefore the redactor of this section of the Codex intends for the reader to interpret Enoch’s experiences as a logical narrative progression: he overhears the impious calumny, he weeps, he prays, and is granted a consolatory vision. There is thus only one setting for the entire pericope. However, one need not draw the conclusion that the scene was constructed in the same way within the underlying Enochic source. Rather, there appears to be some suggestive evidence that the Enochic “experience” recounted here was built from smaller units of tradition culled from a variety of sources.

If we temporarily bracket the urge (encouraged by the redactor) to treat Enoch’s speech as if it were prayer, and reconsider its semantic thrust in isolation from the following material, it seems to express an emotional reaction to certain habits of speech or behavior which the speaker viewed with dismay. It is thus formally similar to the passage cited above from T. Judah 23:1. In that latter citation, Judah expresses his disappointment and sorrow over the licentious behavior of a number of his descendants, and goes on to predict a disastrous fate for his straying “children.” Similarly, Enoch’s distress is provoked by certain impudent or offensive language that is uttered against God. What will we gain by praying to Him? What is Shaddai that we should serve Him? We do not want to learn your ways; we do not want to take your counsel. What profit is there to us of looking to the heavens? What is the Almighty that we should serve Him? Why do the wicked live on, Prosper and grow wealthy? Their children are with them always, Their homes are secure, without fear; Their children are with them always, Their homes are secure, without fear.

They spend their days in happiness, They sing to the music of timbrel and lute, Their homes are secure, without fear; Their children are with them always, Their homes are secure, without fear.

They spend their days in happiness, Their sing to the music of timbrel and lute, Their homes are secure, without fear; Their children are with them always, Their homes are secure, without fear.

Why do the wicked live on, Prosper and grow wealthy? Their children are with them always, And they see their children’s children. Their homes are secure, without fear; They do not know the rod of God. Their bull breeds and does not fail; Their calf calves and never miscarries; Their children run loose like sheep, And their children skip about. Their song to the music of timbrel and lute, And revel to the tune of the pipe; They spend their days in happiness, And go down to Sheol in peace. They say to God, ‘Leave us alone, We do not want to learn your ways; What is Shaddai that we should serve Him? What will we gain by praying to Him?’
According to this popular interpretation, Job 21:7-15 preserves an “historical” reminiscence of certain typical events, actions, and utterances associated with the Flood generation. The genesis of this exegetical insight should probably be traced to the characterization of this group as ענה י devis in verse 7. Having secured this identification, then the specific actions or events depicted in the text suggest aspects of the behavior or customs of that generation. Thus, for example, in a curious tradition recounting the behavior of the offspring of the most prominent members of that wicked generation, the angelic Watchers and their mortal wives, R. Levi states: "They engendered their offspring, and they multiplied like some kind of giant reptile—six (being born) at every birth. Immediately upon birth they would stand up upon their feet and speak Hebrew and cavort before them [their parents] like lambs (ה获得感 וانتشار 열מים)." The emphasized portion of this passage need not reflect the reader’s reliance upon some apocryphal literary source for this information. Its very wording invokes Job 21:11 as its inspiration: "they let their infants run loose like sheep, and their children skip about (ויליהם ירקדו וישלחו כצאן ישלחו כ)."

Especially attention should however be directed to Job 21:14-15. Whereas the preceding verses depict certain activities or events, these final two verses reproduce a retort which, from the point of the view of the ancient interpreters, emanated from the mouths of the Flood generation. "Leave us alone," they said, "we do not want to learn Your ways: What is Shaddai that we should serve Him? What will we gain by praying to Him?" It is clear from the wording of this utterance that it is directed at God Himself, thus constituting a blasphemous rejection of divine governance and guidance. Here, it seems, is a perfect example of the form of ונשדומג which would sadden a remonstrative Enoch. It thus seems plausible to interpret our Manichaean Enochic fragment in the light of this Jewish exegetical tradition. Whoever composed this particular extract was cognizant of a tradition wherein the wicked members of the Flood generation verbally reject God.

Interestingly the author of the so-called 3 Enoch confirms the relevance of this exegetical tradition within Enochic lore. In 3 Enoch 4, R. Ishmael asks Metatron why the latter is addressed by lesser angelic entities as "Youth" (יושב) ? Metatron responds: "Because I am (actually) Enoch b. Yared. When the Flood-generation acted sinfully, and committed corrupt deeds and said to God, 'Depart from us', as it is written, 'They say to God: Leave us alone! We do not want to learn Your ways!' (Job 21:14), God took me from among them to be a witness against them in the high heavens ..." This passage cements the textual identification of the דומגוס with Job 21:14-15, and explicitly connects it with an event witnessed by the earth-bound Enoch.

יָרָאֵה בָּשָׁם יִהְיֶה (and the hour of) מַעֲרָבָּה וְיֵצֵא מִכֶּם הַשַּׁעֲרָה יַעֲבֹד יָשִׁיב מִינָנוּם מִנָּנוּם מִן הַשַּׁעֲרָה יַעֲבֹד יָשִׁיב מִינָנוּם מִן הַשַּׁעֲרָה יַעֲבֹד יָשִׁיב מִינָנוּם מִן הַשַּׁעֲרָה יַעֲבֹד יָשִׁיב מִינָנוּם מִן הַשַּׁעֲרָה יַעֲבֹד יָשִׁיב מִינָנוּם מִן H: "He says: "While the tears were still in my eyes and the prayer was yet on my lips, I beheld approaching me [seven] angels descending from heaven." The incipit יָרָאֵה בָּשָׁם יִהְיֶה apparently signals a redactional seam, suggesting that the quotation which follows derives from a different Enochic document or pericope. This supposition receives some support from the manuscript itself: a vacat separates the present citation from the one that immediately preceded it. Nevertheless, a shared motif—that of "weeping"—effectively establishes a narrative linkage between these two originally disparate settings.

Here Enoch’s tears and prayer provoke a response from heaven in the form of an angelophany. Interestingly, a similar conjunction of weeping and revelatory event is found at the beginning of 2 Enoch. Therein we read: "I [Enoch] was in my house alone, weeping and grieving with my eyes. When I had lain down on my bed, I fell asleep. And two huge men appeared to me, the like of which I had never seen on earth ... And the men said to me, 'Be brave, Enoch! Do not fear! The eternal Lord has sent us to you. And behold, today you will ascend with us to heaven.'" While these two Enochic passages are not duplicates, there exists sufficient similarity to posit their common origin from an earlier source, if not a reliance of one upon the other. Prayer coordinated with weeping that leads to an angelophany is also a sequence prominent in certain apocalyptic traditions. Moshe Idel has plausibly suggested that a seer’s "weeping" should be viewed as a species of mystical technique that induces an altered state of consciousness or a theophany, compiling in the process of his investigation an impressive list of instances wherein this motif occurs. Our Enochic fragment would seem to supply another example of this phenomenon.

Seven angels descend from heaven in response to Enoch’s "summons." Since one of them bears the name "Michael" (as we learn later in this same (?) fragment), these seven are presumably to be identified with those prominent members of the angelic class usually termed "archangels." While some sources suggest a cosmological system that employs only four archangels, the most popular arrangement envisions a scheme whereby seven of these beings assist God in His management of the universe. It has been suggested that the popularity of the latter enumeration reflects the influence of Babylonian astral conceptions: the seven archangels derive from the deities associated with the seven planets of Babylonian astronomy.

However, one need not appeal to Mesopotamian ancestry for the origin of this particular idea. There is already biblical precedent for the concept of seven divine emissaries. In Ezek 9:1-2 we read: "And I beheld, and, lo, six men came from the east: the one forests had lain down on my bed, I fell asleep. And two huge men appeared to me, the like of which I had never seen on earth ... And the men said to me, 'Be brave, Enoch! Do not fear! The eternal Lord has sent us to you. And behold, today you will ascend with us to heaven.'"

The version of Targum Jonathan preserved in Codex Reuchlinianus renders Hebrew verse 55a of Ezek 9:2 as "לא תיב נא מי ידך בלע הימים המים הכדים ובית בני המשיח בראות עבודה ימי ידך בלע הימים המים הכדים ובית בני המשיח בראות עבודה ימי ידך בלע הימים המים הכדים ובית בני המשיח בראות עבודה ימי ידך בלע הימים המים הכדים ובית בני המשיח בראות عملיה ימי ידך בלע הימים המים הכדים ובית בני המשיח בראות.Works of destruction in human form." B. Sabb. 55a identifies the figure as the archangel Gabriel:
although it is not explicitly stated there, it seems reasonable to conclude that the remaining six figures are his fellow archangels.

References to seven archangels occur in a variety of literary sources, including perhaps most importantly certain texts belonging to Enochic tradition. In the so-called “Animal Apocalypse” (1 Enoch 85-90), Enoch is portrayed observing seven “white men” who descend from heaven to inflict punishment upon the wicked generation of the Flood (1 Enoch 87:2). A previous version of this same legend mentioned only four punitive agents (1 Enoch 9:10). A little later in the “Animal Apocalypse” we read: “and the Lord called those men, the seven first white ones, and commanded (them) to bring before him the first star which went before those stars ...” (1 Enoch 90:21-22).

These two verses betray a dependence upon Ezekiel 9:1-2: the angel who serves in a scribal capacity is apparently identical with the authoritative recording angel of the biblical source. Moreover, Ezekiel 9:1-2 also supplies one reason for the Enochic emissaries’ distinctive white garb. The clothing of the chief angel in Ezekiel (יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל), “clothed in white linen,” is now worn by each of the Enochic messengers. Enoch perceives them as “white” because they are wearing this distinctive garment. Note too the experience described by Levi in T. Levi 8:1ff. Therein we read: “and I saw seven men clothed in white saying to me, Get up ...” This latter passage displays an obvious dependence upon some interpretative trajectory.

Seven archangels also appear in the duplicate Greek versions of 1 Enoch 20:1-7. In this passage the names and duties of the angels are specified, and the pericope concludes with the summary statement עזות אלים שחר את הימים. 4QShirShabb mentions seven צורים י时报 who are presumably equi-valent to the seven archangels. Finally, the so-called 3 Enoch is conversant with the same scheme, yet all the named seven angels wear white robes and are described as פורים גבורים דירים נאמנים נמרים. Michael, Gabriel, Shaked, Balsamo, Barakiel, Barakiel, and Sidriel ...”

R. Ishmael said: Metatron, angelic prince of the Divine Presence (who is) the glory of the (heavenly) heights, said to me: There are seven great, beautiful, awesome, wonderful, and honored princes who are appointed over the seven heavens; namely, Michael, Gabriel, Sachi'eel, Sadaq'eel, Baradi'eel, Baraq'eel, and Sidri'eel ...”

This Hekhalot text displays a greater cosmological sophistication than the earlier Enochic literature, but a total of seven pre-eminent angelic entities, despite differences in their individual identification, remain visible. Our Enochic fragment thus belongs among those texts that bear witness to the popularity of a seven-archangelic scheme.

References to seven archangels occur in a variety of literary sources, including perhaps most importantly certain texts belonging to Enochic tradition. In the so-called “Animal Apocalypse” (1 Enoch 85-90), Enoch is portrayed observing seven “white men” who descend from heaven to inflict punishment upon the wicked generation of the Flood (1 Enoch 87:2). A previous version of this same legend mentioned only four punitive agents (1 Enoch 9:10). A little later in the “Animal Apocalypse” we read: “and the Lord called those men, the seven first white ones, and commanded (them) to bring before him the first star which went before those stars ...” (1 Enoch 90:21-22). These two verses betray a dependence upon Ezekiel 9:1-2: the angel who serves in a scribal capacity is apparently identical with the authoritative recording angel of the biblical source. Moreover, Ezekiel 9:1-2 also supplies one reason for the Enochic emissaries’ distinctive white garb. The clothing of the chief angel in Ezekiel (יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל), “clothed in white linen,” is now worn by each of the Enochic messengers. Enoch perceives them as “white” because they are wearing this distinctive garment. Note too the experience described by Levi in T. Levi 8:1ff. Therein we read: “and I saw seven men clothed in white saying to me, Get up ...” This latter passage displays an obvious dependence upon some interpretative trajectory.

Seven archangels also appear in the duplicate Greek versions of 1 Enoch 20:1-7. In this passage the names and duties of the angels are specified, and the pericope concludes with the summary statement עזות אלים שחר את הימים. 4QShirShabb mentions seven צורים י时报 who are presumably equi-valent to the seven archangels. Finally, the so-called 3 Enoch is conversant with the same scheme, yet all the named seven angels wear white robes and are described as פורים גבורים דירים נאמנים נמרים. Michael, Gabriel, Shaked, Balsamo, Barakiel, Barakiel, and Sidri'eel ...”

R. Ishmael said: Metatron, angelic prince of the Divine Presence (who is) the glory of the (heavenly) heights, said to me: There are seven great, beautiful, awesome, wonderful, and honored princes who are appointed over the seven heavens; namely, Michael, Gabriel, Sachi'eel, Sadaq'eel, Baradi'eel, Baraq'eel, and Sidri'eel ...”

This Hekhalot text displays a greater cosmological sophistication than the earlier Enochic literature, but a total of seven pre-eminent angelic entities, despite differences in their individual identification, remain visible. Our Enochic fragment thus belongs among those texts that bear witness to the popularity of a seven-archangelic scheme.
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the joys of the righteous at the End of Days (1 Enoch 24:6-25:7). Later Michael discourses with Noah about the coming day of judgment; i.e. the Deluge (1 Enoch 60:4-6). But perhaps the most pertinent episode(s) with regard to our present fragment can be found in 1 Enoch 70-71, the concluding chapters of the third discrete section of 1 Enoch termed the “Similitudes” (1 Enoch 37-71). Several items featured in these final two chapters deserve closer scrutiny, and shall be discussed in more detail below.

Incidentally, the name of Michael (alongside those of Gabriel, Raphael, and Sariel) appears in several medieval Middle Iranian Manichaean manuscripts recovered from central Asia during the first decades of the present century.44 These texts, either hymnic or incantational in genre, generally exhibit a close relationship to the Aramaic incantation bowls produced by various Mesopotamian religious communities in late antiquity,45 thereby attesting a Manichaean interest and presence in that cultural symbiosis.46 Nevertheless, the Manichaean focus upon precisely these four entities suggests that it was Enochic literature, particularly that manifested in 1 Enoch 6-16 and the Book of Giants, that is largely responsible for the transmission of these specific archangelic names to Manichaean communities.

It is surely suggestive that Sariel’s status as one of God’s four principal archangels is found only in the original Aramaic version of 1 Enoch 91,47 the Qumran War Scroll (1QM 9:14-16),48 and these Manichaean fragments.49

I have underscored several explicit correspondences linking 1 Enoch 71:3-4 and our Manichaean fragment: Enoch’s heavenly voyage, the archangel Michael as revelatory agent and tour guide, a reference to the expression “ends of (the) heavens,” even though its precise significance differs in each text,50 and the heavenly luminaries (i.e., sun, moon, planets) as one of the featured sights of his tour (see below). One might possibly contend there are further implicit parallels as well. The “secrets of mercy” and the “secrets of justice” which Enoch beholds in verse 3b above—conveniently unqualified as further implicit parallels as well. The “secrets of mercy” and the “secrets of justice” which Enoch beholds in verse 3b above—conveniently unqualified as such—can easily be interpreted as a reference to the manner in which and the locales where God “mercifully” rewards the righteous and “justly” punishes the wicked in the world to come.51 Compare, for example, the strikingly similar Enochic ascent-experience that is depicted in 1 Enoch 39:3ff., especially verses 3-5: “And at that time clouds and a storm-wind carried me off from the face of the earth, and set me down at the end of the heavens. And there I saw another vision, the dwelling of the righteous and the resting-places of the holy. There my eyes saw their dwelling with the angels and their resting-places with the holy ones.”

The expression “ends of the heavens” (τα όρια των ουρανων) corresponds to Aramaic סערה השמים.52 Interestingly, this phrase occurs in 1 Enoch 71:3-4, a narrative text and context that shares some common elements with our Manichaean fragment. Therein we read:

And Michael, an angel, one of the chief angels, grasped me by my right hand, and lifted me up and led me to where all secrets are,53 and he revealed to me all the secrets of mercy and he revealed to me all the secrets of justice. And he revealed to me all the secrets of the ends of heaven, and all the chambers of the stars, and all of the luminaries, from where they go forth to the presence of the holy ones.54

I have underscored several explicit correspondences linking 1 Enoch 71:3-4 and our Manichaean fragment: Enoch’s heavenly voyage, the archangel Michael as revelatory agent and tour guide, a reference to the expression “ends of (the) heavens,” even though its precise significance differs in each text, and the heavenly luminaries (i.e., sun, moon, planets) as one of the featured sights of his tour (see below). One might possibly contend there are further implicit parallels as well. The “secrets of mercy” and the “secrets of justice” which Enoch beholds in verse 3b above—conveniently unqualified as such—can easily be interpreted as a reference to the manner in which and the locales where God “mercifully” rewards the righteous and “justly” punishes the wicked in the world to come.

53 Compare, for example, the strikingly similar Enochic ascent-experience that is depicted in 1 Enoch 39:3ff., especially verses 3-5: “And at that time clouds and a storm-wind carried me off from the face of the earth, and set me down at the end of the heavens. And there I saw another vision, the dwelling of the righteous and the resting-places of the holy. There my eyes saw their dwelling with the angels and their resting-places with the holy ones.”

54 In this passage Enoch’s mode of travel and his destination roughly parallel what is found in 1 Enoch 70-71, but in place of the generic statements of 71:3 ("all the secrets of mercy," "all the secrets of justice") we receive more specific information regarding what Enoch is shown; viz., the locales inhabited by the pious in the afterlife. One is tempted to argue that 39:4-5 deliberately interprets some of the ambiguous
language of 71:3, particularly the significance of "secrets of mercy." Further on, during the same ascent-experience, the "secrets of justice" are also explained: "There I saw the dwelling of the chosen and the resting-places of the holy; and my eyes saw there all the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven from there, and they dragged them off, and they were not able to remain because of the punishment which went out from the Lord of Spirits." (1 Enoch 41:2)

A similar interpretation (adaptation?) of 1 Enoch 71:3 apparently occurs in the Manichaean fragment. Therein Michael shows Enoch "the place for the pious" (τον των εὐσεβῶν χώρον) and "the place for the impious and what sort of place of punishment the lawless are experiencing" (χώροιν ... τὸν τῶν δυσσεβών και ὁποῖοι τυγχάνει ὁ τῆς τιμωρίας τῶν ἁνόμων τόποι). More detailed descriptions of which follow.

And after these (worlds) We traversed worlds—the world of darkness, the world of death, and the world of fire." Enoch's itinerary consists of four "worlds" (κόσμοι) or "realms": three with negative connotations, presumably serving as places for the punishment of the "impious" mentioned above, and one of positive significance, apparently the locale where the "pious" are rewarded, which will receive further attention below. This four-fold division of the world to come may be dependent upon the similar structuring of Sheol found in the Greek version of 1 Enoch 22:2. There it states that Enoch viewed "four places" (τέσσαρες τόποι), further qualified with regard to their nature as "three ... dark and one bright" (τρεις αὐτῶν σκοτινοί και εις φωτινός).

The designations employed in our fragment for the various "worlds" (probably reflecting Syriac ḫalā or ḫalū) possess few analogues in the cognate literatures. The phrase "world of death" is a conjectural restoration by the Codex editors and hence open to emendation; nevertheless, one might compare Hebrew מָוֵת (Isa 9:1; Job 10:21), or Syriac ḫalā or ḫalū. The expression "world of darkness" (alma ḫḵūkā) occurs frequently in Manichaean texts as a designation for the evil principle of their dualistic system; another popular term is ard ḫḵūkā "place (or domain) of Darkness." Early Manichaism sometimes refers to its evil principle as the "domain of Darkness" (খὸκα ὁδήρας) and Theodore bar Konai's valuable eighth-century heresiological report identifies "world(s) of fire (and) darkness" among the five constituent Aeons of the "land of Darkness." However, neither Manichaism nor Manichaism employ these phrases to indicate particular locations or to identify types of punishment within their respective underworlds; rather, these terms are used to denote one of the fundamental elements of the structure of reality itself.

"Fire" and "darkness" as complementary aspects of the present (and future) punishment of the wicked are well attested in Second Temple era and subsequent Jewish literature. 1 Enoch 63:6 depicts fallen "rulers and mighty ones" as presently imprisoned in eternal "darkness," and 1 Enoch 54:1-2 forecasts their eventual torment in "burning fire," a fate apparently modeled upon that of the rebellious angelic Watchers at the End of Days (cf. 54:5-6; 67:4-7—both of which betray dependence upon 10:4-6). One might note the suggestive language of 1 Enoch 103:7-8: "Know (o sinners) that your souls will descend into Sheol, and there they will be in great distress—even in darkness and bondage and burning flame, and your souls shall come to the great judgment for all the generations of the world. Woe to you, for you shall have no peace." Verse 8a, with its threefold specification of the sorts of punishment that will be endured in Sheol, might conceivably have served as the model for the three dolorous "worlds" of our Manichaean fragment. Compare also 2 Enoch 5:11-13 (short version):

And those men took me from there (Paradise, in the third heaven) and carried me up to the north of the heaven and showed me there a very terrible place. Every kind of torment and torture is in that place, and darkness and mist; and there is no light there, but a dark fire flaming up eternally in that place, and there are cold and ice and prisons in that place, and fierce and cruel angels who carry weapons and inflict torments without mercy.

The same three afflictions enumerated in 1 Enoch 103:8 are present here also, suggesting that this Enochic roster of underworlds was viewed within certain scribal circles as normative. If this was indeed the case, perhaps a better restoration for the first κόσμος identified within our Manichaean fragment would be something like "world of bondage," "world of chains," or "world of imprisonment," instead of "world of death."

The radiant character of the paraisdal "world" viewed by Enoch is another motif that is well attested in Jewish sources, not the least among which are Enochic works. As we have seen, 1 Enoch 22:2, a probable sources for this section of our fragment, speaks of three "dark" sections and one "bright" (φωτινός) section within Sheol. According to 22:9, its brilliance stems upon the vocabulary of incandescence:

"Blessed are you, the righteous and chosen, for your lot will be glorious! And the righteous will be in the light of the sun, and the chosen in the light of eternal life; and there will be no end to the days of their life, and the days of the holy..."
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will be without number. And they will seek the light, and will find righteousness with the Lord of Spirits. Peace be to the righteous with the Lord of the world! And after this it will be said to the holy that they should seek in heaven the secrets of righteousness, the lot of faith; for it has become bright as the sun upon the dry ground, and darkness has passed away. And there will be ceaseless light, and to a limit of days they will not come, for darkness will have been destroyed previously; and the light will endure before the Lord of Spirits, and the light of uprightness will endure before the Lord of Spirits for ever.80

Or compare 1 Enoch 108:11-15:

And now I will call the spirits of the good who are of the generation of light, and I will transform those who were born in darkness, who in the flesh were not recompensed with honour, as was fitting to their faith. And I will bring out into shining light those who love my holy name, and I will set each one on the throne of his honour. And they will shine for times without number, for righteousness is the judgement of God, for with the faithful he will keep faith in the dwelling of upright paths. And they will see those who were born in darkness thrown into darkness, while the righteous shine. And the sinners will cry out as they see them shining, but they themselves will go where days and times have been written down for them.81

2 Enoch 13:27 (short version) states: “And from there I went up into the Paradise of the righteous; and I saw there a blessed place, and every creature is blessed, and all live in joy and gladness, and in measureless light, and in eternal life.”82

With regard to the “rich” character of the paradisaical world, one should note Odes Sol. 11:16: “His Paradise wherein is the wealth (αλλανόμονα) of the Lord’s pleasure.”83 The association of this concept with the supernal regions invokes comparisons with the Mandaeae concept of the heavenly World of Light, among whose populace are an innumerable series of spiritual entities termed ‘uhras.

πάντα ἐν ἐκδιώκεσθαι καὶ ἐξίγευσαι τούς ἄγγελους, καὶ εἰ τι αὐτῷ ἐπιδοχεύτω ἐνεχάραξεν αὐτοῦ τὰς γραμμάτεις. “All these things he saw, and he questioned the angels, and that which they told him he recorded in his writings.” Legends regarding Enoch’s heavenly education and the “books” (“writings,” “scrolls,” etc.) that result from his experience(s) abound in ancient and even medieval literature.84 There are numerous references within the extant text of 1 Enoch itself to “a plurality of [Enochic] books.”85 The original version of 1 Enoch 106:19 preserves a direct reference to his angelic instructors: “I know the mysteries — the Holy Ones have informed me and shown me.”86 Compare as well 1 Enoch 1:2: “— And I heard everything from them [the angels], and I understood what I saw ...”87 The latter clause perhaps presupposing an interrogation of the angels by the forefather. Note also Jub. 4:17-24, especially verse 21: “And he was with the angels of God these six jubilees of years, and they showed him everything on earth and in the heavens, and the power of the sun; and he wrote down everything.”88

Synthesis

The Manichaean “apocalypse of Enoch” is clearly a composite work that has been pieced together from textual traditions, motifs, and patterns found within the surviving Enochic corpus of writings; viz., the Ethiopic and Slavonic books of Enoch.89 Our analysis indicates that the “apocalypse” is heavily reliant upon 1 Enoch, and appears to be cognizant of at least four of the five classically recognized components of that work.90 Furthermore, the “apocalypse” also exhibits closer agreement (where evidence is extant; see above) with the Aramaic Vorlage of 1 Enoch than with the subsequent Greek and Ethiopic versions. These considerations suggest that the Manichaean employment of 1 Enoch (and related literature, such as the Book of Giants) goes back to the earliest Mesopotamian stages of the group’s formation, perhaps as far back as the creative activity of Mani himself. A question that remains is whether the citations of the “apocalypse” formed part of the original Aramaic Grundschrift of the CMC, or whether they were added from a secondary compilation of Enochic works by a later redactor, such as Baraias.

At any rate, a particularly intriguing result of our examination is the discernible influence of material now found only in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71) on the “apocalypse.” It is of course widely recognized that to date there is no textual evidence for the existence of the Similitudes prior to the preparation of the Ethiopic version of 1 Enoch, which took place presumably during the fifth or sixth centuries CE. No trace of this material survives at Qumran, nor is it ever quoted in those ancient sources that preserve remnants of Enochic literature.91 Nevertheless, the connections between what is recounted in the “apocalypse” and certain contents of the Similitudes, particularly the angelophany of 1 Enoch 70-71, are so intimate that we can hardly deem them coincidental. Some fresh consideration should thus be given to the vexed question of the date and provenance of the Similitudes of Enoch.

Much has been written on the relationship of the Similitudes to the other component “books” of 1 Enoch, but little has been resolved or greeted with widespread endorsement. The Similitudes is formally distinguished by its structure and phraseology. It consists of three visions, each termed “similitude” (messâlé), symmetrically framed by introductory and concluding (some would say two concluding) narrative brackets. God is almost always designated by the epithet “Lord of Spirits,”59 and frequent reference is made to a heavenly entity termed “Son of Man” (alternatively, the “Elect One”). This latter circumstance has led some to argue a Christian provenance for the Similitudes; less radically, many others have opted to view the “Son of Man” motif as an essential source for interpreting New Testament gospel usage of the concept. The Similitudes as we have them (in Ethiopic) have
clearly been translated from an earlier version, and arguments have been advanced espousing the relative merits of a Hebrew, Aramaic, or even Greek archetype. At present, the weight of evidence seems to favor an Aramaic Vorlage.93

The original date of composition has proved to be a most troublesome problem, aggravated largely by the lack of external attestation and by the use of a visionary genre. Some commentators seize upon 56:5-7, with its evidence serves to confirm those hypotheses that view the Similitudes as a product of the first or early second centuries CE, authored by one or more circles possessing certain conceptual and terminological links with the inhabitants of Qumran.100 It seems very likely that the Similitudes were produced by either the survivors or heirs of the Qumranic yahad, perhaps in a Transjordanian or East Syrian environment, from where it (along with other works possessing Qumran affinities like the Book of Giants) migrated eastward to Mesopotamian religious communities of various intellectual persuasions,101 eventually reaching Mani.

### Notes


2. See Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche Jacob de Antioche, 1166-1159 (4 vols.; ed. J.-B. Chatot; reprinted, Brussels Culture et civilisation, 1965) 4465 (text).


5. Unless otherwise stated, all citations of the Greek versions of 1 Enoch are taken from Apocalypsis Henochi Graece (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

6. Translation is that of F.I. Andersen, OTP 1.103; see also p. 102 n.a and c.

7. Unless otherwise stated, all citations from the Greek text of T. 12 Patr. rely upon M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978). In addition to the specific texts cited above, note also de Jonge's index s.v. 'Enöiq and the manuscript evidence cited at those locations.

8. The translation is that of S. Holmes, APOT 1.482.

9. ABR. 17-18 interprets Enoch as a type for "repentance."

10. The same context has served to establish that a type for "repentance."

11. Some of the Aramaic version survives, allowing us to recover the original form of this expression. Greek κρανήν ὕποδειγμα μετανοίας ταΐς γενεαϊς. The Greek rendering would seem to display a polemical edge. So too Box and Oesterley, APOT 1.482.

12. Unless otherwise stated, all citations of the Greek text of T. 12 Patr. rely upon M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978). In addition to the specific texts cited above, note also de Jonge's index s.v. 'Enöiq and the manuscript evidence cited at those locations.

13. The translation is that of S. Holmes, APOT 1.482.
you altered your behavior ... and spoke haughty and hard things with your unclean mouths; reading in accord with the Greek translation (ἐν στόμαι ἀκαθάρτως ἡ τρόπος) in place of the difficult mouths, reading you altered your behavior ... and spoke haughty and hard things with your unclean mouths, In place of the difficult mouths, reading you altered your behavior ... and spoke haughty and hard things with your unclean mouths.

16... καταπλακόμοι κόσμον σάβεων εἰς ἑαυτῷ. Cf. also Jude 14-15: προσφητεύουσα δὲ καὶ τοιούτων ἁξιώματος ἀνάμεσα ἐν ἐνίκτις λέγων, ὕσσον ἐλθὼν κύριος ἐν ἄγας μισθών αὐτῶν, κοπάω κρίνω κατά πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξω κατὰ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ἐπεὶ πάντων τῶν ἄγων σάβεων αὐτῶν ἡ ἁγιάσματα καὶ παρὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγιωτάτων ἀπεσεβήστεσθαι. Much of this is of the type that is quoted by Jude in his own social situation. Note also m. Sanh. 103a: ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ τοῦ άποστόλου ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ παρεκκλήσιον ἐπευγάλτων κατὰ αὐτὸν ἀμαρτωλοί ασεβείς. Much of this of course is a quotation of ἔστω μὴ ἄγων καὶ ἐπεὶ παρακλήσεως ἐξέπρεπεν ἐν καὶ παρὰ πάντων τῶν ἄγων κατὰ αὐτὸν ἀμαρτωλοί ασεβείς.

75-88. M. Himmelfarb has criticized Idel’s assertion, especially as it pertains to the book of Giants?”

There seems to be an attempt here to accommodate competing conceptions of “four” and “seven” archangelic entities. The four “illuminators” (φωστήρες), identified in Sethian gnostic works as Michael, Gabriel, Oriel, Davelthai, and Eleleth, are probably reflexes of the Enochic quartet of archangels: note especially the survival of Uriel in the latter list in unaltered form, as well as the name “Gabriel” among those of their “ministers.” See Ap. John 7:30-8:25; Gos. Eñ. 51:15-22; 52:10-16; 64:26; Hyp. Arch. 93:1f.; Zost. 29:2-20; 127:18-128:7; Melch. 6:4-5; Trim. Prov. 38:31-39:13, as well as G.G. Stroumsa, Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 54 n.77. Their names are visible, although in somewhat corrupt form, in Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 1.292.

Some scholars suggest that Iranian influence is the determinant factor in the development of seven-archangelic scheme in Second Temple Judaism. For a summary of this argument, along with references to the secondary literature, see M. Boyce and F. Grenet, A History of Zoroastranism, Volume Three: Zoroastranism under Macedonian and Roman Rule (Leiden: Brill, 1991) 404-405.


32An early example is Tob 12:15: εὐχέ εἰς τὴν αὐξὴν ὑμῶν ὧμιλησεν τῷ θεῷ ἀπελθοῦς ἐκ τῶν επτά ἄγων, οἱ προσαναφέρουσιν τὰς προσευχάς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἑαυτοῖς τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Version BA).


34M. Himmelfarb has recently articulated a compelling explanation for the distinctive white clothing worn by certain angels. According to her, their dress reflects their priestly status as ministers in the heavenly Temple. See her Ascent to Heaven 18-20.

35Translation is that of M. de Jonge, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” AOT (Sparks) 530.

36Only six names survive here in Ethiopic manuscripts, doubtlessly due to faulty transmission.

37The duplicate versions are largely identical, save that Renniel takes the place of Gabriel in one manuscript.


39Only six names survive here in Ethiopic manuscripts, doubtlessly due to faulty transmission.

40The duplicate versions are largely identical, save that Renniel takes the place of Gabriel in one manuscript.


42p. Enoch 17 (= Schäfer 821, from Ms. Vat. 228). For the renderings of the seven angelic names, I have used P. Alexander, OTP 1.269.

43NJPS translation.


45Perhaps the closest we come to this motif is 1 Enoch 68:4-5, where Michael refuses to serve as an advocate for the fallen Watchers. Might this explain why their hopes are pinned upon Enoch (1 Enoch 13:4)?
The image of Michael in later literature develops along at least three distinct yet concurrent tangles: (1) Michael as military commander and leader of the heavenly army, as in Rev 12:7 and PGM XIII.928; (2) Michael as heavenly high priest, as in b. Menah. 110a; b. Zebah. 62a; b. Hag. 12b; 3 Apoc. Bar. 11-17; and (3) Michael as personal communicant of divine mysteries, attested especially in 1 Enoch, Adam and Eve, and Testament of Abraham.


45There is a vast literature on this subject which I have no intention of reproducing here. For an authoritative treatment along with copious bibliography, see J. Naveh and P. Mirocki; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 419-34, a pre-publication copy of which Dr. BeDuhn has "Magic Bowls and Manichaeans," Ancient Magic and Ritual Power (ed. M. Meyer and P. Mirocki; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 419-34, a pre-publication copy of which Dr. BeDuhn has kindly shared with me.

46Of course the employment of "Manichaean script" on some of the bowls cannot be used as an argument for their "Manichaean" provenance; see J.A. Montgomery, "A Magical Bowl-Text and the Original Script of the Manichaeans," JAO 32 (1912) 433-38; J.N. Epstein, "Glosses bab yo-araménènes," REJ 74 (1922) 41. Instead, as Epstein rightly remarks, "ici c'est le contenu qui doit décider." Montgomery states: "... the bowls [i.e., from Nippur] themselves contain no traces of Manichaeism" (JAO 32 [1912] 438). While such a pronouncement might have seemed incontestable at the beginning of the present century, the subsequent Turfan, Medinet Madi, and Qumran manuscript discoveries (to mention only three of the most significant) have revolutionized our understanding of the relationship of Manichaeism to the "ancestral religions," and particularly to currents within Judaism. For example, one line of the text published by Montgomery in his 1912 JAO article refers to מַדְת הַיָּם "Shemhazai, lord of the bagdanit," a clear allusion to the infamous ringleader of the fallen Watchers who plays such a prominent role in 1 Enoch 6-16 and the Qumran Book of Giants. While Epstein argues for the Jewish provenance of this bowl on the basis of its angelological background (REJ 74 [1922] 45; cf. also idem, "Zum magischen Texte (Journal of the American Oriental Society 1912, p. 434 seq.)," JAO 33 [1912] 279-80), one could also contend, given the demonstrable popularity of Enochic literature in Manichaean communities, that a Manichaean background is equally possible. As for the bagdanit, see the important discussion of J.C. Greenfield, "Some Notes on Some Aramaic and Mandaeic Magic Bowls," JANESCU 5 (1973) 153-54. Compare also S. Shaked, "Bagdána, King of the Demons, and Other Iranian Terms in Babylonian Magic," Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce (Acta Iranica 24-25; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 151-25; idem, Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Southern Iran, (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1990) 90-91.


48Spelled here מַדְת as in the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch.
NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

63Translation from M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," AOT (Sparks) 222.
64Or alternatively, that 71:3 consciously summarizes the earlier traditions in 39:4-5 and the succeeding verses. 1 Enoch 70-71 are formally distinct from the three "parables" of 1 Enoch 37-69, and may very well have been appended to those chapters by a later editor; see the remarks of G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 221. A relationship between chapters 39 and 71 has been noticed by Caquot, "Remarques" 111.
65Knibb, AOT (Sparks) 224.
66Michael is explicitly identified as the revelatory angel in both 1 Enoch 71:3 and the CMC fragment, whereas the accompanying angel of 1 Enoch 39:40 remains anonymous (cf. 40:2). Whatever his identity, he cannot be Michael: see 41:8-9.
67See Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha" 182-83; 199 n.54.
68AOT (Sparks) 345.
69Text and translation cited from the edition of J.H. Charlesworth, *The Odes of Solomon: The Syriac Texts* (reprinted, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1977) 50-52. 70The present author is currently engaged in the task of collecting and analyzing these textual traditions which are found in later Jewish, Christian, pagan, gnostic, and Muslim sources.
71R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (2d ed; Oxford: Clarendon, 1912) xii. Charles collects a representative sampling of later citations of or allusions to works allegedly authored by Enoch (pp. xii-xiv). These can now be expanded given the archaeological and textual discoveries since Charles's day.
72AOT 5 ii 26: [ ... ] ומן מלי יברך פרדס ידרו [. . .] "the whole of it from the words of [the Watchers] and Holy Ones [I transcribed? I learned?]," a phrase that despite its brevity indicates some significant divergence from the Greek and Ethiopic versions. Aramaic text cited from Milik, *Books of Enoch* 142.
73Translation is that of R.H. Charles and C. Rabin, "Jubilees," AOT (Sparks) 23.
74We may safely ignore so-called 3 Enoch, as it is a modern misnomer. Our primary concern is with those works that claim Enochic authorship.
la Qumran) and simultaneously interpreting גברון as רוחות, the epithet “Lord of Spirits” (רוחות זקנים) emerges.


96Milik, Books of Enoch 80-98.

97See the remarks of M.A. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” NTS 25 (1979) 355. Note too the similarity between 1 Enoch 56:5 and a prophetic logion (late 1st century CE) found in the Book of Elchasai apud Hippolytus, Refutatio 9.16.4.


100Greenfield, “Prolegomenon” xvi-xvii; Greenfield-Stone, HTR 70 (1977) 56-57.

101I am thinking particularly here of the important role Enoch comes to play in late antique and medieval Harranian paganism (so-called Sabianism). See Chapter Five, nn.50-56 above.
Although Manichaeism and Mandaism are convenient taxonomic rubrics for at least two distinct systems of biblically affiliated religiosity, the evidence indicates that both of these gnostic groups (among others) espouse a particular type of speculative thought that can be termed “Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis,” a form of mythological expression and exposition which is in turn ultimately rooted in Jewish biblical exegesis. The phrase “Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis” labels a regional trajectory that expresses itself in a series of discrete ideological formulations within the religious discourse of confessionally disparate communities in Syria (including Palestine), Mesopotamia, and Iran during late antiquity and even into the medieval era. Demonstration of the appeal of gnostic streams of religiosity among certain circles within these communities is relatively straightforward and uncontested. For example, the earliest attested figures espousing a “gnostic” perspective (at least as defined by Justin and Irenaeus) hail from Palestine and Syria. Many of the so-called “classical” gnostic texts (e.g., some of the Nag Hammadi corpus) retain features which suggest an original Syro-Mesopotamian provenance. One must also take into account the proto-gnostic proclivities of Syro-Mesopotamian productions like the Odes of Solomon, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Hymn of the Pearl, certain apocryphal Adamschriften, and the Pseudo-Clementine corpus. Finally, the persistent and recurrent flowering during the course of the first post-Christian millennium of a bewildering diversity of seemingly “native” forms of gnosticism—e.g., Manichaism, Mazdakism, Mandaism, the Islamic extremist ghulat sects, the Jewish groups associated with the production of the Ma’aseh Bereshit literature (e.g., Sefer Yesirah; the sources behind Sefer ha-Bahir)—indicates the vibrant vitality of gnostic ideologies throughout this region during this period. While the careful scholarly study of possible interrelationships among this host of seemingly disparate religious formulations remains in its infancy, preliminary soundings have uncovered evidence of a sustained intellectual conversation among many of these groups throughout the first millennium of the Common Era. The precise cultural and social dynamics that undergird their cross-fertilization remain somewhat obscure, but some foundational elements in this syncretic thought-world are now beginning to be exposed.
SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

One realizes then why Baraies considered it essential to construct a catena of citations purportedly drawn from the literary testimonies of the biblical forefathers. Not only do they collectively bear witness to the apostolic credibility of Mani as a "teacher of truth," to his cultural authority, but they also firmly ensconce the Babylonian sage within the common conceptual universe of his environment. The continued currency of this ideology would receive further dramatic confirmation several centuries later, when yet another "messenger of God" would likewise proclaim the univocality of prophetic instruction with a similar vocabulary (Qur'an 2:136).

CHAPTER EIGHT

Of signal importance are the teachings associated with the primal biblical forefathers, the "heralds of that Good Realm."

Sustained analysis of the five allegedly Jewish pseudepigraphic texts cited in the Cologne Mani Codex reveals that they possess a pronounced gnostic flavor and texture. They are almost certainly not authentic products of those Jewish scribal circles responsible for the manufacture and distribution of biblically inspired pseudepigraphic literature in the eastern Mediterranean world during the Persian, Hellenistic, or Roman eras of Jewish history. Yet the types of traditions transmitted under the aegis of each forefather exhibit in most cases remarkable affinities with the extant corpora of exegetical and legendary materials surrounding these figures in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim literature. The Codex "apocalypses" are hence not simply imaginative literature; rather, they are creative adaptations of the traditional lore which had gathered about these primeval ancestors since the dawn of a scribal interest in their proleptic and homiletic value.

The motivation behind this manipulative aggrandizement of aggadic themes is not difficult to isolate. Mani repeatedly stressed the antiquity, the veracity, and the univocality of his religious message: his was not a "new" teaching or doctrinal formulation, nor an artificial, consciously crafted one, but one that was grounded in revelatory events experienced by various trustworthy adepts whose careers effectively linked the whole of human history. The religion which he proclaimed during the third century of the Common Era was supposedly identical with the uncorrupted form of the religion preached by those ancient "heralds of that Good Realm"; that is, what detritus can be recovered of it from the textually authenticated testimonia of Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch. Of these five figures, the legendary material associated with Enoch, Adam, and Seth seems to have required only minimal adjustment to Manichaean norms: a wealth of traditions, such as are visible in the Enochic library and Christian Adamschriften, was available for polemical exploitation and development; and, as we have seen in our examinations of the relevant Codex "apocalypses," the interstices between the "orthodox" and "gnostic" readings of these biblical characters are readily apparent. The figures of Enosh and Shem proved more problematic. Although not totally devoid of postbiblical attributes and development within the classical traditions, they lacked the kinds of revelatory credentials commonly associated with their more celebrated colleagues, particularly those involving an ascent-experience and the authorship of written testimonies based upon such an event. It is then small wonder that the "apocalypses" of Enosh and Shem exhibit between them the greatest number of structural and verbal parallels to be discerned among the five pseudepigraphic citations, and that they moreover retain clear evidence of a heavy redactional hand, one which did not refrain from importing motifs and terminology that derived ultimately from sectarian doctrines. These latter two "apocalypses" should thus be viewed as parade examples of gnostic, even proto-Manichaean, fabrication, and their close relationship to the types of traditions extant in Mandaean literature should not go unremarked.
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<td>24, 184, 187, 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>186, 187, 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>156, 191, 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1-7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10-14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1-2</td>
<td>192, 200, 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-4-6</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-8-9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-8-16-1</td>
<td>56, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>149, 157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-6-9</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-3-21-9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1-7</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-36</td>
<td>148, 191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23-4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>194, 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-257</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-1-3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-1</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-2</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-69</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-71</td>
<td>39, 192, 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-4-1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-3</td>
<td>137, 192, 193, 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-3-5</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-4-5</td>
<td>193, 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-2-10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-5-9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-8-9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-1</td>
<td>192, 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-1-2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-1-2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-5-6</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-7-55-2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-5</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-5-7</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-6-19</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-4-6</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-7-10</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-11</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-23</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-1-5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-6</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69-25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-9</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-4-7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-4-5</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>192, 197, 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2-3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-3-4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-1</td>
<td>195, 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-13-14</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-3</td>
<td>123, 193, 194, 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-3-4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-4</td>
<td>195, 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-82</td>
<td>39, 56, 205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-7</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-90</td>
<td>39, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-90</td>
<td>32, 126, 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-3-4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-42-49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-21-22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-105</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-107</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-3-4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-6-104-13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-7-8</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-8</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-107</td>
<td>39, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-1-7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061-18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061-107:3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061-19</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>39-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-11-15</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch (short version) prologue</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-13</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:17-19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19-40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-7-5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:29</td>
<td>37, 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:36-37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:27</td>
<td>95, 196, 203, 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch (long version)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:4-12</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:4-5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:11-12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:3-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:4-5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Enoch (ed. Schäfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1-2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>57, 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-2-8</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-203</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-210</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-137</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ezra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17-23</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17-24</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odes of Solomon</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:16</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Abraham (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:4-5</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:9-10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>122, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Abraham (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:5-16</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:14</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Adam</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Dan</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Job</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Judah</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Levi</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>Citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 2:11 — 203</td>
<td>39.5.1 — 53, 132, 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 92 — 189</td>
<td>40 — 114, 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum Ketuvim</td>
<td>40.1.1 — 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 92:1 — 50</td>
<td>40.1.2-3 — 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum Onqelos</td>
<td>40.2.2 — 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 2:7 — 181</td>
<td>40.5.3ff. — 101, 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 3:21 — 97</td>
<td>40.7.1-3 — 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 30:4 — 203</td>
<td>40.7.1-5 — 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</td>
<td>46.3 — 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 2:7 — 181</td>
<td>46.5 — 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 3:21 — 97</td>
<td>40.1.1-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 4:3 — 100, 134</td>
<td>40.1.2-3 — 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 4:8 — 102</td>
<td>40.2.2 — 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 53 — 134</td>
<td>40.5.3ff. — 101, 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 52:4 — 57</td>
<td>40.7.1-5 — 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 14:18 — 28, 55</td>
<td>40.7.4 — 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 22:19 — 54</td>
<td>16:5 — 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 24:62 — 54</td>
<td>16:6 — 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 25:22 — 54</td>
<td>40.7.5 — 127, 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum Yeruhalmi I</td>
<td>53 — 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 14:18 — 28, 55</td>
<td>53.1.1 — 59, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 25:22 — 54</td>
<td>53.1.2 — 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Rabbinic Texts</td>
<td>55 — 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abit de Rabbi Natan</td>
<td>66.14.3-9 — 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1 — 97</td>
<td>66.25.7 — 137, 179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 31 — 50</td>
<td>66.26.3 — 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 34 — 94</td>
<td>66.28.9 — 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hossafah beth — 156</td>
<td>66.29.1 — 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Eres Zuta</td>
<td>66.30.6 — 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 — 23</td>
<td>66.31.2 — 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hekhalot Zutarti</td>
<td>66.54.2 — 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>66.71.4 — 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massekhet Kelim</td>
<td>70 — 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152, 160</td>
<td>Eusebius of Caesarea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesiqta Rabbati</td>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 — 50</td>
<td>6.163 — 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer</td>
<td>6.38 — 21, 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 — 200</td>
<td>Praeparatio evangelica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 — 101</td>
<td>9.17.9 — 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14 — 91</td>
<td>Hippolytus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 — 96, 97</td>
<td>Refutatio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Thomas</td>
<td>5.2.20 — 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 — 91</td>
<td>5.22 — 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>5.26.23 — 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Faustum</td>
<td>9.13.1 — 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3 — 26</td>
<td>9.15.1 — 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2 — 99</td>
<td>9.164 — 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11 — 99</td>
<td>10.29.2 — 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De haeresibus</td>
<td>Irenaeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5 — 21</td>
<td>Adversus haereses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De morib. Manich.</td>
<td>1.20.1 — 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.73 — 104</td>
<td>1.27.1 — 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td>1.29.30 — 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.10 — 35, 51</td>
<td>1.29.31 — 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 — 63</td>
<td>1.30.1-2 — 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 — 63</td>
<td>1.30.4 — 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 — 63</td>
<td>1.30.7 — 100, 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Treasures (Riessler)</td>
<td>5.29 — 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.1.1 — 59, 63</td>
<td>66.25.7 — 137, 179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12-3.8 — 97</td>
<td>66.26.3 — 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.20 — 53</td>
<td>66.28.9 — 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>66.29.1 — 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15-17 — 97</td>
<td>66.30.6 — 107</td>
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