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INTRODUCTION

THE LIGHT AND THE DARKNESS: STUDIES IN MANICHAEISM AND ITS WORLD

PAUL MIRECKI AND JASON BEDUHN

This is the second volume of scholarly studies in Manichaeism which were originally presented before the Manichaean Studies Group of the Society of Biblical Literature from 1997 through 1999. Like its predecessor, Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources (NHMS 43; Brill, 1997), this volume presents the latest international scholarship from leading researchers in the growing field of Manichaean studies. Here we move from the continuing foundational work of recovering Manichaean sources to the necessary task of understanding the relationship of Manichaeans to the larger world in which they lived. That relationship took several distinct forms, and the contributions in this book analyze those forms, examining the relationship of Manichaeism with diverse cultural, social and religious traditions.

The Manichaean community was a self-contained entity, holding itself apart from the world by fostering internal cohesion. To maintain this seclusion, the Manichaean leadership employed several techniques. One of the earliest was initiated by its founder Mani, who himself wrote letters encouraging others in the faith, providing instruction, correcting error, and warning of harmful ideas that might infiltrate the community from the outside. Like nearly all of Mani’s writings, the majority of his letters have been lost. Iain Gardner, in “The Reconstruction of Mani’s Epistles from Three Coptic Codices (Ismant el-Kharab and Medinet Madi),” surveys the few surviving Coptic fragments of those letters and how such scarce texts can take us directly to the teachings of Mani himself and within defined social and political contexts. Gardner indicates that the recovery of such information is the necessary precursor to understanding the origins and development of Manichaeism and its relationship to its world.
Geoffrey Harrison and Jason BeDuhn discuss another possible letter of Mani in “The Authenticity and Doctrine of (Ps.?)Mani’s *Letter to Menoche*” a letter quoted by Julian of Eclanum in his treatise against Augustine of Hippo. Harrison and BeDuhn argue that the preserved portions of the letter discuss the principal topic of the differences between Manichaean and Bardaisanite understandings of sin and the nature of the body, showing close relations between the two religions.

After Mani’s death in 277 C.E., his successors employed additional means of defending and nurturing the community. The efforts of Manichaean leaders to settle internal disputes and defend the community against intrusive ideas from the outside world are the subject of a papyrological study by Peter Zieme. He joins together two fragments containing a Manichaean debate in runic script, the text of which he then edits and interprets in “A Manichaean Turkish Dispute in Runic Script.” Werner Sundermann’s first of two contributions in this book, “A Manichaean Liturgical Instruction on the Act of Almsgiving,” examines an Iranian Manichaean text for what it can tell us about the role of ritual interdependence in the Manichaean community. The text, argues Sundermann, contains part of a script for the ceremony in which the laity brought offerings to the Elect.

The Manichaean response to the world was more complex than simple rejection. Mani considered all of human history moving toward the same goal his religion envisioned, and so Manichaeans took what was useful from surrounding cultures and made it their own. In art history, the Manichaeans appropriated and adapted existing artistic techniques. In “Reconstructing Manichaean Book Paintings through the Technique of Their Makers,” Zsuzsanna Gulácsi not only discerns the methods and stages of artistic production among East Central Asian Manichaean artists, but uses that understanding to repair, in our imagination, the ravages of time upon a rare surviving example of Manichaean art. In his study, “Manichaean Allusions to Ritual and Magic: Spells for Invisibility in the Coptic *Kēphalaia*,” Paul Mirecki continues his discussion of the Manichaean knowledge and use of rituals typically found in the magical papyri. He demonstrates a Manichaean familiarity with the details of popular ritual, as well as the diversity of Manichaean theory and practice concerning such forbidden religious practices. Yet Manichaeans also showed interest in antecedent cosmological traditions and in the popular genre of the fantastic, as illustrated by Werner Sundermann in his second
contribution to this volume, “On Human Races, Semi-Human Beings and Monsters.” In many ways, Manichaeans prove to have engaged in religious, literary and artistic practices that transcended cultic boundaries and were part of the larger cultural heritage of the ancient world.

Manichaeism also related to its world as it dealt with religious and social issues common to all people. In recent decades, researchers have begun to study attitudes toward the body, sexuality and gender roles in ancient society. To find a clear answer to the question of Manichaeism’s view of women, J. Kevin Coyle surveys relevant sources and outlines the priorities and possibilities of research in a first scholarly analysis of this issue in “Prolegomena to a Study of Women in Manichaeism.” As part of the contemporary scholarly interest in ancient attitudes toward the human body, Jason BeDuhn offers a systematic answer to the question of Manichaeism’s view of the body in “The Metabolism of Salvation: Manichaean Concepts of Human Physiology.” His discussion takes a few unexpected twists in its treatment of how the body interacts with the soul in Manichaean anthropology; but even these twists place Manichaeism comfortably within the interactive medical and philosophical views of the ancient world.

Finally, the partisan outsiders’ view of Manichaeism adds yet another dimension to the still emerging story of Manichaeism’s relationship to its world. This topic is dealt with in two contributions by Byard Bennett. In his study, “Didymus the Blind’s Knowledge of Manichaeism,” he examines references to Manichaeism in the works of the fourth-century Christian theologian Didymus the Blind of Alexandria. Bennett demonstrates that Didymus had a limited understanding of some basic features of Manichaean thought, that he confused Manichaean ideas with those of some of Origen’s opponents (Hermogenes and the Marcionites), and that modern researchers like J. Leipoldt had misidentified Didymus’ unnamed opponents as Manichaeans, when in fact they belonged to other groups, such as the Valentinians. In Bennett’s second contribution, “Iuxta unum latus erat terra tenebrarum: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers’ Description of the Manichaean Cosmogony,” he reevaluates the long-standing hypothesis of Camont and Keugner that certain Greek anti-Manichaean writers had access to a lost Syriac work of Mani, probably the Book of Giants. Bennett argues that the unidentified source document used by anti-Manichaean writers was
instead a Greek text known in Western Manichaean communities from the first half of the fourth century onward, and may have contained materials excerpted from Mani’s lost Living Gospel.

It is in the nature of the scarce Manichaean sources currently available that all of these studies are partial, preliminary and, in some cases, seminal. The field of Manichaean studies is characterized by, indeed dominated by, fragmentary texts and fragmentary art, accumulated data with problematic gaps, and ancient testimonies which are biased, ambiguous and often contradictory. The contributors to this volume, even in the recognized diversity of their approaches and interests, share an optimism and a determination to proceed to the questions one would ask about any religious tradition, and to rise to the challenges offered by problematic sources. These studies exhibit a cautious and conservative attitude toward interpretation so that questions can be asked and answers can be elicited which provide a secure base for future scholarly investigations, as the story of Manichaeism and its relationship to its world continues to emerge.

Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn
Boston, November 1999
THE METABOLISM OF SALVATION: MANICHAEAN CONCEPTS OF HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY

JASON BEUHN

The Manichaeans were thoroughgoing materialists. That aspect of their religion must be taken seriously and followed in its impact on all areas of Manichaean doctrine and practice. This study pursues the implications of Manichaean materialism inside the Manichaean body itself to see how it actually functions, and specifically how physiology is related to the path of salvation Manichaeans see themselves traveling. It begins with an overview of the human person in terms familiar to those who study Western religious traditions, that is, the person as constituted of body and soul. But these comfortable distinctions quickly break down, since Manichaeism defines soul as a substance beside others in the body and in the world, impacting upon and in turn impacted by them. The heart of this study examines the physiological production, dissemination, and recycling of soul in both ordinary and Manichaean bodies. From this discussion, the study concludes with some observations on the integral value of physiology for the Manichaean doctrine and practice of salvation and, consequently, for the understanding of Manichaeism as a system by modern researchers.¹

Body and Soul

It is appropriate to begin with one of the rare surviving writings of Mani himself, the Middle Persian Šabuhragan. The portion of the

¹ In the pages that follow, I make frequent references to one or another individual chapter (kēphalaiōn) of the Coptic Manichaean work known collectively as the Kēphalaiōn, for which the reader is here referred to Iain Gardner, The Kēphalaiōn of the Teacher, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995. Other frequently cited works are the Cologne Mani Codex (CMC), for which see L. Koenen and Cornelia Römer, Der Kölnische Mani-Kodex: Uber das Werden seines Leibes, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988; and the Prose Refutations of Ephrem Syrus, for which see C. W. Mitchell, S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations, London: Williams and Norgate, 1912.
composition dealing with the character and operation of the human body has been edited and translated recently by Manfred Hutter, and reads as follows:

And when (the human child) is born, it nourishes the body and soul from these very miscarriages of the deus and from the mixture of the gods, and (by these means) it lives and reaches maturity. And it becomes a garment for Az and a vessel for desire. And water, fire, wind and the (living) creatures—its own family—it strikes and torments. And Az and desire become happy through it, because it fulfills their will and instruction. But neither water nor fire nor wind nor (living) creatures become happy through it, because it is their enemy and tormenter. And according to the hour and the constellation in which that child is born, no affliction comes to it from the companions which are greater than it, as long as that child lives and exists, until vengeance and affliction reach (it); then that child dies. And it ascends, and for atonement of its own deeds it is purified. And human beings, male and female, who are born in the whole world, are all a construction of Az. And from water, plants, and nourishment of every kind, which through humans reach Az and are consumed by her, that Az forms and builds that child by means of her delusion. And whenever that water and (those) plants are found at (various) places on mountains and steppes, and do not come to humans and to Az, then the human (child) will not be born. Whatever comes to humans, however, there Az arranges and builds that child by means of her deception... (Šabuhragan, lines 1204-1273)²

The human exists ordinarily as an instrument of evil, guided by greed and desire, governed by astrological forces, taking nourishment from plants and animals which are themselves “the mixture of the gods” containing both light and darkness, and reproducing on the basis of this same nourishment which is appropriated by the personified greed Az and formed into another useful vessel for her purposes.

In the Coptic Képhalaion 4, we are told that “the five fleshes” and “the five senses” of the human body derive from Hyle, the same personified evil called Az in the Šabuhragan. These fleshes and senses are distinct for male and female bodies, and yet are drawn together by the common forces of “the fire and the lust in the human body.” The list of five fleshes is known widely in the Manichaean literature: bones, flesh, skin, veins, and sinews/tendons. A slightly expanded list

of seven body substances appears in Kephalaion 42: marrow, bones, sinews/tendons, flesh, veins, blood, skin. This longer list shows strong points of comparison with lists found in Plato\(^3\) and in Zoroastrian literature.\(^1\)

Manichaeans also produced more anatomically precise descriptions of the body’s parts, as in Kephalaion 38, which mentions head, neck, ribs, navel, abdomen, loins, shins, and feet on the outside of the body, and heart, liver, lungs, spleen, kidneys, skin, gall-bladder, intestine, and veins within it. Due to manuscript damage, neither of these lists is complete. Another list of body parts can be found in Kephalaion 70 in association with a system of macrocosm/microcosm correspondences. The macrocosmic matches of the body are those of the Manichaean mythic cosmos, and will not be detailed here. But the body is said to consist of head, neck and chest, heart, lower torso, genitals, abdomen (?) and thighs, shins, and soles of the feet. The passage goes on to say that the liver, flesh, and blood of the body correspond respectively to the vessels of fire, wind, and water which operate in the larger cosmos to purify light from darkness. Yet another exercise in Listenwissenschaft in this fascinating Kephalaion divides the body into four “worlds.” The neck and head constitute the first world, ruled, it is said, by two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and the mouth. The upper torso is the second world, ruled by two arms, two breasts, two “eyes” of the heart, and the gullet. The abdomen occupies the position of third world, ruled by fat, lung, spleen, liver, gall-bladder, and two kidneys. Finally, the fourth world is that of the lower body, ruled by two buttocks, two testicles, two loins, and penis.

Clearly, these are ad hoc systems concocted for specific lessons with no lasting dogmatic function within the Manichaean faith. We can derive from them only two general points. First, that the human body held a fascination for the adherents of the religion, and was considered worth knowing in detail. Second, that the body was intimately connected to the larger universe, and in fact mirrored it in great detail. In Kephalaion 64 Mani goes even further, characterizing the human body as, in effect, the key to the secrets of the cosmos. The evil forces model Adam on a divine form, and then scrutinize what they have made for a better understanding of what they have seen. Even though

\(^3\) Plato, Timaeus: marrow, skin, veins, sinew, bone, flesh, hair.

\(^4\) Zatspram: marrow, bone, flesh, fat, veins, skin, hair; Denkart M. 278.7: marrow, blood, veins, sinews, bone, flesh, hair; Greater Bundahishn 189.8ff.: skin, flesh, bones, veins, blood, stomach, hair.
they are the body's creators, they act in ignorance and sheer imitation, without knowing what they are making. The human remains mysterious to them, most of all because it does not operate the way it is supposed to, that is, as their servant and a prison for light. The human body is supposed to be a permanent receptacle for the trapped light. Instead, the body is a battleground of contrary forces, and the body's operation is just as apt to lead to the liberation of light as to its continued imprisonment.

When we talk about Manichaean physiology, we must talk about the Manichaean soul, and that fact might surprise the reader. But this necessity is a direct consequence of Manichaean materialism. The distinction between matter and spirit is not the key one in Manichaeism; rather light and darkness, good and evil, are the distinctions of consequence. There are fairly solid elements among the good, and fairly non-corporeal, ethereal forces among the evil. Everything is a substance, even God. The soul is very much a part of physiology, or vice versa, as we shall see. In the Manichaean view the human soul is not a discrete, eternal monad, but simply a fragment or piece of the same soul substance that pervades the entire universe, and all living things in it. The human can most properly be said to have a quantity of soul stuff, rather than to have an individual soul. This depersonalized concept of the soul goes hand in hand with a traducian view of soul formation—that is, a belief that the soul within an individual is produced in the reproductive process, and is inherited from one's parents.⁵

Mani said: “You yourselves must be purifiers and redeemers of your soul, which is established in every place, so that you [may be counted] to the company of the fathers of light” (Kephalaion 26, 77.18-20). What does it mean to have one’s soul “established in every place”?⁶ According to the Manichaean myth as related by Theodore bar Konai, when Jesus descends to awaken Adam, he shows Adam his soul (napšēh) spread out in the world. In the Manichaean account Adam perceives that his soul is but a fragment of an original, larger soul invested in the whole cosmos (contrast Augustine, who sees all human souls as fragments of Adam’s original soul). This universal entity is called the Living Soul or the Living Self. This entity is dispersed through the world, but a higher concentration of divine elements within Adam, and following Adam all humans, creates a crit-

⁵ See, e.g., Augustine, De mor. man. 50: “Your idea that all the souls of animals come from the food of their parents...”
ical mass for consciousness. “As for Adam, the formation of his soul fits over the correct distribution of the elements; therefore, he has intelligence surpassing that of the other creatures and beasts” (Kephan·lon 64, 157.12ff.). When Manichaean sermons and hymns call upon the believer to “remember”, he or she is to remember not a story of a personal soul’s life in heaven and subsequent fall, but the common story of the five elements as a collective self, torn and tossed and mixed in with evil. One remembers that one is identical to a greater whole, a being suffering from fragmentation.

For the Manichaecnans, therefore, the soul is simply that divine substance which has become enmeshed with darkness and evil and in that mixed condition has produced all that we see around us in the cosmos. This divine substance is usually described in terms of five elements: ether, wind, light, water, and fire. These living, energized materials are what sustain the universe, and when we look inside ourselves, they are what sustain us as well. The Turkic X vocalist says simply, “the five gods, our soul” (I B), and in fact it is a sin “if we should have said, ‘Our self is different from the sun and moon’” (II C). This materialism, which sees soul as well as body as a substance and insists that the soul must be a substance to affect the body, is common to Manichaeism and Stoicism. According to the Stoic Chrysippus, “Not only is every soul a fragment of the world’s soul, but each soul is a bit of unified pneuma, and all psychic phenomena—including the passions and emotions—are states of this pneuma.” The Chrysippean notion of χρυσίς (or μίξις) —a blending of two substances which retain their distinctive identity—was postulated expressly to explain how pneuma interpenetrates the body,7 and was adopted by the Manichaecnans to account for the mixture and coexistence of light and darkness in the body and the world without a loss of the distinctive character of the light—a distinction that must be maintained if redemption of the light was to be possible.

Modern researchers have been too quick when they see the word “soul” (psyche) in Western Manichaecn text to think of it as an individualized, immortal spirit. A close examination of the words for “soul” used in other parts of the Manichaecn world shows how far off the mark the usual understanding has been. In Iranian, for example, the Manichaecnans used three different terms roughly equivalent to “soul”: gyn, gryw, and neh. Fortunately, we actually have en-

---

7 Gould 1970, 111.
tire pieces of literature dedicated to this subject in Iranian. If we read the *Songs of the Living Self* (where “self” translates *gryw*), we discover that these songs are entirely devoted to the tragedy of the five divine elements struggling to free themselves from darkness. Nothing in them reflects the ruminations of an individual human soul. Werner Sundermann has given us an edition and translation of the Iranian versions of the *Sermon on the Light Nous*.

Here, in the clearest terms, we read about the formation of the first human bodies by the forces of evil, the entrapment of the five divine elements in them as the soul, and their accompaniment by five evil elements meant to be a kind of anti-soul that dominates and controls the body. Dr. Sundermann’s recent edition and translation of the *Sermon on the Soul* (*Gy’n Wyfr’s*)

has shown conclusively that the Manichaeans saw all life-forces in the universe as intimately connected, and that the same five divine elements were believed to percolate in all things. The text informs us that if we are to be saved, we must know the names of the soul. What are they? Ether, wind, light, water, and fire.

These five elements are themselves merely five manifestations of a single universal soul that was captured and cut into pieces by the forces of evil at the dawn of time. All of the differentiations of profane existence derive from evil, especially that most significant differentiation between male and female, but including “all the likenesses and images of every shape” (*Kephalaion* 40, 105.7).

For all these names [...] are a single [...] since the beginning... but they separated into all these parts in this first contest. They became set in all these altered forms, and these many names. Of course, if now all these varieties are laid bare, and stripped of all these appearances (*n.schēma*), [and] parted from all these names, they will gather together [and] make a single form, and a single name, unaltered and unchangeable forever in the land of their original essence, from which they were sent forth against the enemy. (*Kephalaion* 72, 178.13ff.)

Ephrem Syrus reports that the Manichaeans insist that “honor and dignity should not be given to humanity alone, but rather to all the portions of light because they all derive from a single great and glorious essence” (*Prose Refutations*, 115.9-18).

---


The ordinary "person of the world" does not possess integrity, because he or she is constituted of mixed elements. The demonic drive, \( \Delta z \), is "mixed into this body... (and) scans for what her concupiscenses and passions can provoke" (\( M 801;^10 \) cf. Augustine, \textit{C. Faustum} 20.15). The "damaged vessel" scatters the mind, and is filled with spirits which "draw him hither and thither" (\textit{Kephalaion} 38). The buffeted divine identity within prays to the gods to "put my self in order (\textit{grw}m'n \textit{wyn}r'h)" (\( M 680.23;^11 \) Salvation requires that the body be trained, like a king's horse (\textit{CMC} 14), until it becomes a fully functioning instrument (\textit{organon}: \textit{CMC} 22). As a divided entity, the individual contains fragments of the five elements mixed in with all kinds of contrary forces. The sheer quantity of divine material in the human does allow a certain level of consciousness to emerge, but that consciousness is always being coopted by the brute drives. Contact with the world means contact with elements of both good and evil. These contrary forces travel everywhere together. We are born from their mixture in reproduction, and we sustain our lives by eating food which itself has both qualities in it.

The soul does not stand apart from the body or the world, nor is its history distinct from physiology and the larger processes of nature. At one and the same time, the Manichaean soul is more, and less, than what we in the West are used to thinking of as the soul. And this means that the Manichaean soul, in its involvement with physiology, is open to imports from the larger world, and itself contributes exports to it.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Imports and Exports of the Body and Soul}
\end{quote}

Imports into the soul come primarily from three sources. First of all, humans are connected to the zodiac through channels sometimes called "roots", \( ^{12} \) "life-lines", "pneumatic veins", \( ^{13} \) "bindings", or "con-

---


\(^{12}\) According to \textit{Kephalaion} 46 the "root" of a person is bound up with his or her zodiacal sign (118.3).

\(^{13}\) A fragmentary passage from the Sogdian manuscript M 363 reads: "...in the world they became excited and irritated, for their life-lines (\textit{kw \textit{jw}m\textit{ynyc p\textit{t}\textit{b}n\textit{d}}) and the connections of their pneumatic veins (\textit{w\textit{\'yn}\textit{\'r}k\textit{\'r}xw \textit{p\textit{t}\textit{b}n\textit{d}}) are joined to the
Astrological thinking applies here, and the signs to which one is connected in the zodiac shape human physiology and psychology. One account of the manner in which the zodiac affects living creatures (in this case the sea giant) applies to human beings as well.

The sea giant had stamped upon him the seal of the seconds [and the hours], the seal of the days [and the months and] years, the impression of the stars and the signs of the zodiac... The images and the seals and the aspects and doctrines and counsels of [...] were sealed upon the body of that giant, because he is the residue of them all. Consequently, each star that will shine, and each sign of the zodiac that will turn: of one he shall be the inducement, and of another its confirmation. (Kephalaion 44, 114.12-20)

Like Adam, “the sea giant... was molded and sculpted by the power of the lust inside him from many doctrines and counsels that belong to the residue of the wheel of the sphere” (Kephalaion 44, 115.1-4). In his Šābuhragān, Mani describes the crucial moment in the creation of Adam when Az “connected to him bindings (ιωνής) and connections (πύεπ) from the sky above, from Mazans and Asreshtars and constellations and planets, so that wrath, desire, and sin from the Mazall and constellations would rain down upon him and fill his mind, so that he would become thievish, monstrous, greedy, and...

14 Šābuhragān, line 1004 (Hutter 1992, 88).
15 Kephalaion 86 mentions lihme alongside of roots, both being attached to the heavens. According to Kephalaion 49 these lihme are not cut or tangled by the spinning of the zodiac, because they are not solid physical channels but spiritual (incorporeal) in nature.
16 “The occasion when an upheaval will arise before [him] and he is disturbed, this upheaval comes into him in [two ways]. First through his zodiac and his stars, which are troubled, which... as they go around him, and they move him, and they disturb him in lust and wrath and gloom and grief... There is another occasion when you find the [powers of the] sky still, quieting him...” (Kephalaion 85, 215.1ff). Kephalaion 64 makes clear that Adam’s interconnection to the zodiac is a reciprocal arrangement; he is not just the passive victim of astrology. “The creators, who set him in order, gathered them (i.e., “the teachings and counsels and the seal of all the powers above and below”) and sealed them in him. He and his consort Eve became a dwelling and a home for the signs of the zodiac and the stars, and the months, the days and the years. For the seal of the entire universe is stamped upon Adam. Indeed, due to this, heaven and earth moved because of him” (157).
lustful" (lines 999-1013).\footnote{Hutter 1992, 88-89.} What flows down the lihm from the zodiac is described in the Coptic Kephalaia as the dark substances being gradually eliminated from the world above through the spinning of the zodiac, something like a centrifuge at work.\footnote{According to Kephalaion 47, the zodiac is the midpoint between heaven and earth, and forces of evil are bound up in it. Purified light passes through the zodiac on its ascension; and the darkness being swept from above is distributed below by the spinning of the zodiac. Kephalaion 48 discusses three lihm connecting the evil forces above (bound to the zodiac) to the earth, plants, and animals. Waste descends from above through them into the earth, plants, and animals.}

The association of particular parts of the macrocosm with specific parts of the human microcosm was not limited in Manichaean thinking to form and appearance, but also involved function and interaction. The Manichaean incorporated the science of melothesia, that is, the impact on parts of the body by astrological signs, in their appropriation of ancient astrological concepts. Kephalaion 70 offers two distinct systems of Manichaean melothesia.\footnote{This subject has been explored previously by Ernst Nagel, “Anatomic des Menschen in gnostischer und manichäischer Sicht”, in Studien zum Menschenbild in Gnosis und Manichäismus, Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1979, 85-92.} In the first, the head is influenced by Aries, the neck and shoulders by Taurus, the arms by Gemini, the upper torso by Cancer, the stomach by Leo, the belly by Virgo, the spine and intestines by Libra, the genitals by Scorpio, the loins by Sagittarius, the knees by Capricorn, the shins by Aquarius, and the soles of the feet by Pisces. In its general scheme, this melothesia matches that of the first century authority Manilius (II, 453-465),\footnote{G. P. Goold, Manilius: Astronomica, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.} but it differs in some details which find parallels elsewhere in ancient astrology.\footnote{In the Manichaean scheme Leo is paired with the stomach, against Manilius who pairs Leo with the flanks, but in agreement with the Liber Hermetis (Codex Harleyanus 3731, A. J. Festugière, La Révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste, Paris: Société d’édition les belles lettres, 1983, 129), and with the fourth century writer Firmicus Maternus (Jean Rhys Bram, Ancient Astrology Theory and Practice: Matheseos Libri VIII by Firmicus Maternus, Park Ridge: Noyes Press, 1975, 56). Libra is paired with the spine and intestines, against Manilius’ choice of the loins, but similar again to Firmicus Maternus, who connects the sign with the spine and kidneys (Bram 1975, 56). Sagittarius is paired with the loins by the Manicheans, while Manilius and Firmicus Maternus match that sign with the thighs. Firmicus Maternus does have differences with the Manichaean melothesia; the latter ascribes both neck and shoulders to Taurus, and assign the arms to Gemini, while Firmicus Maternus limits Taurus to the neck alone, ascribes the shoulders to Gemini, and ignores the arms completely (Bram 1975, 56). On melothesia in the Platonic, Gnostic, and Zoroastrian traditions,
A second system of melothesia preserved in Kephalaion 70 is formed by placing the human figure within the zodiacal circle, so that the signs descend on one side of the body and ascend on the other, rather than following a simple course from head to feet. In this scheme, then, the right temple is influenced by Aries, the right shoulder by Taurus, the right arm by Gemini, the right ribs by Cancer, the right stomach by Leo, the right reproductive organs by Virgo, something on the left side (lost in a lacuna) by Libra, the left ribs by Scorpio, the left breast and kidney by Sagittarius, the left elbow by Capricorn, the left shoulder by Aquarius, the left temple by Pisces. The links on the two sides of the body are not exact mirror-images of each other, and the system is peculiarly unsystematic. Nevertheless, it must be supposed that in either model of melothesia subtle channels link the human body to the zodiac, and that imports of substance flow into the body by these channels.

A second source of imports is food. For the Manichaeans you are what you eat, and food contains both light and dark substances in relatively random combinations. If the food one eats just happens to predominate in dark substances, it will disturb one's physical and psychological health, and abet the strength of evil within. If the food happens to have a preponderance of light substances, it will contribute to the health and stability of that new and improved person that Manichaeism promotes. Certain kinds of food, such as meat, were


22 Ephrem, Prose Refutations, 51.11-12: "They assert that evil collects and increases within us from foods"; cf. T II D 173d (A. Von Le Coq, Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho, II, APAW 1911, Anhang 6, 15-17) on conjunction between evil in food and inherent evil in the body.

23 "There is another occasion when you find the [powers of the] sky still, quieting him, and... [a] troubled limb comes into him in the food that he has eaten, or rather in the roots?... or in the water that has been drunk... disturbed and troubled. And the wrath increases in him, and the lust multiplies upon him and the gloom and the grief because of the food of the bread that he eats and the water that he drinks, which are full of troubling limbs, a hardening counsel. They shall enter the body, [mixed in] with these foods, and they become blended also with the evil limbs of the body. And the sin that is in him, changes into wrath and lust and gloom and grief, these wicked thoughts of the body... There is an(other) occasion, however, when you shall find that the food that comes into you is pure [...] excelling in light and life; the error, however, being scarce in it, and the bad less [in it]... And they find you quiet, at rest, well-governed (politeue) in your behavior (anastrophe) because of [the] living limb, which excels in the light of these justified souls that are in it, the ones that have perfected their deeds. Their dues have ceased, while their soul is light-
avoided due to their known preponderance of negative qualities.\textsuperscript{24}

The Manichaean concern with the positive and negative effects of food fit perfectly with what amounted to an international obsession with dietetics in Hellenistic and Late Antique times. One of the most influential physicians of ancient Greece, Praxagoras of Cos, focused almost exclusively on dietetics in his medical practice and writing. For him, the body’s health or lack thereof was largely at the mercy of the food one ate. Illness resulted from an excess of certain humors in the body, but “there is no indication of a special activity of the body in the formation of the humors in general. What happens in the body is in direct proportion to what is thought of as being contained in the food.”\textsuperscript{25} “The humors which arise within the body are not any specific new and unknown substances, but they are all present in some way in the food that is being taken.”\textsuperscript{26} Texture and taste were keys to identifying the characteristics of food for Praxagoras, as they were for the Manichaeans.\textsuperscript{27}

The third major source of imports to the soul are the senses. Each of the sense organs has a memory storehouse associated with it, depositories of both the good and the evil in the world (Kephalaion 56, 138.20ff.). Everything one experiences through sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch enters into these sensory repositories in the body and shapes one’s overall attitudes and behaviors.\textsuperscript{28} All of these ex-
experiences become part of the individual, but the regime within the body determines which memories, the good or the evil, are to be consulted and used. When the body is under the regime of evil, the senses are prone to take in and focus upon experiences that foster negative attitudes. In the Sogdian confession script for the Elect in M 801, it is said,

If I have left open my eyes to sight, my ears to sound, my nose to smell, my mouth to improper food and ugly speech, and my hands to improper contact and touch, (so that) the demonic Az, who has built this body and enclosed herself within it, produces through these five gates constant strife, (and) brings the inner demons together with the outer ones, between which a portion (of light) is destroyed daily, if I thus should have kept my gates open and Az should have provoked all of the desire-affected spiritual demons, so that the soul-treasure, the Living Self, has gone astray from me: for all these things, (grant) forgiveness!

When the Light Mind takes over, the sensory censorship works in the opposite way, being inclined to take in positive experiences that fill up the repositories and to concentrate on those experiences so that they influence us towards the good. But in either case, these sensory repositories are part of physiology, and contribute contents to an individual’s character and soul.

The openness of the soul, and its interaction with the outside world means that the soul also has exports. These exports take a number of forms, but can be categorized roughly as exports into the surrounding earthly world and exports into the heavenly world. All actions...

are internal storehouses and repositories and cavities; [and] what is received into them is stored in them” (Kephalaion 56, 138.20-29). Everything that is seen, good or evil, is kept in “houses and cavities and repositories and stores within.” Likewise everything that is heard, everything that is smelled, everything that is tasted, and everything that is touched (140.16-19). These constitute the “thought of the eyes, the thought of the ears, the thought of scent, the thought of taste, the thought of touch.” “And the thought of the heart that rules over them all is much the most like this (i.e., as a kind of repository). Everything that these five thoughts will receive and put in store for the thought of the heart it shall receive and guard” (141.2ff). So who masters this heart is the key to the whole sensory process. The “thought of the body” sets watchmen at the gates of the senses (141.15ff.), who only open to their own (i.e., evil sights, sounds, etc.).

29 In Kephalaion 56, Mani describes how the Mind of Light institutes a reform of the senses (142.12ff.), and places its own watch over the gates, now only opening them to good sights, sounds, etc.
of the individual involve exports into the surrounding earth. These include the more obvious exertions of force on fellow human beings and animals, but also involve acts as subtle as touching a leaf, or a bit of snow, walking on grass or bathing in a stream (cf. M 807). Every time one comes into contact with things around him or her, it seems, one leaves a bit of soul like a fingerprint. Humans become linked with these objects in the responsibility and consequences of our actions. Most usually, these linkages hold one back from attaining liberation; they are a burden that must be rectified.

For the ordinary human, digestion is a crucial part of exporting soul to the surrounding world. Our actions are made possible by the energy that we get from food. Even the bit of nutriment that is not expended in this way gets recycled in reproduction, and a child is one of the more obvious, concrete exports of body and soul into the world. But for the reformed, perfected bodies of the Manichaean Elect, metabolism does not end in reproduction or in deeds inflicted on surrounding things; instead it is redirected and becomes a totally different sort of export, namely, the ascension of soul back to the realm of light.

Another kind of soul export occurs at death. But we will delay a treatment of this topic until we have understood better the metabolic process that manages the imports and exports of the body and soul.

This brief survey of the soul's imports and exports indicates how different the Manichaean soul is from the traditional Western concept. The location and extent of the "soul" defies our own cultural

---

30 Augustine, *De mor. man.* 37: "Some portion of that divine part escapes in the eating of vegetables and fruits; it escapes while they undergo the affliction of rubbing, grinding, or cooking, as well as biting and chewing. It escapes, too, in all motions of animals, in the carriage of burdens, in exercise, in toil, or in any sort of action. It escapes, too, in our rest, when digestion is going on in the body by means of internal heat."

31 We must be careful not to turn technical descriptions of physical processes into metaphorical moral maxims, as in the following case: "You have... [told] us that every person shall follow after his deeds, whether to life or else to death" (*Kephalaion* 90, 224.8-9). As the passage continues, Mani spells out how "deeds" are redeemed from the world as substances.

32 "And as the divine nature escapes in all these ways, some very unclean dregs remain, from which, in sexual intercourse, flesh is formed" (Augustine, *De mor. man.* 37); cf. *Kephalaion* 104 on the five "births" from food.

33 "The souls that ascend... together with the alms that the catechumens give, as they are purified in the [holy] church" (*Kephalaion* 2, 20.21-23). "This soul that comes into him in the metabolism of his food day by day, shall be made holy, cleansed, purified, and washed from the adulteration of the darkness that is mixed in with it" (*Kephalaion* 79, 191.16ff.).
expectations. All of one’s actions are an investment of soul stuff into the larger world, back into mixture from which it is trying to free itself. This is why the Elect practice “the rest of the hands” and cease to act upon the world as much as possible. All of the substances and energies of our physical presence, those we are born with and those which build us up through eating, are part of the “soul” for which we are responsible. One’s “soul” is not complete without an account and a “collection” of all these deeds, the behaviors that are the manifestation of one’s self.

The Metabolism of Soul in the Body

Digestion, of course, figures largely in this Manichaean physiology of psychic imports and exports. As I have indicated, food contains a combination of light and dark substances, which means that any meal will involve imports potentially having both positive and negative effects on the body. Dark substances in food will naturally join and supplement dark substances in the body; and likewise light substances in food will work together with light substances in the body. So one of the things that happens in digestion—and here any modern scientist would agree with the Manichaeans in principle—is that food is broken down into its constituents, and these constituents are employed in the body in different ways and to different ends. Ancient physicians such as Galen thought along the same lines: the two basic operations of metabolism are the assimilation of what has affinity (οἰκεῖος) and the expulsion of what is alien (ἄλλοτριος). One way of describing digestion that we find in Manichaean texts, is that the grosser, more corporeal substances are stripped off of the subtler, less corporeal substances. These stripped off byproducts of digestion produce all kinds of ill effects in the body in the manner of toxins, or we might say, cholesterol. But the more incorporeal com-

---

34 In Kephalaion 110, Mani states that 250,000 (light) seals are extracted from food and 250,000 (dark) rulers purged from it and expelled.
36 One account is given in Kephalaion 94, which makes clear that one divine element, Ether/Air, is not bound with evil, but the other four are encased in it, and through digestion strip off these evil accretions: 1. from fire: blood, anger, and humors; 2. from water: lust, bitterness, and fever; 3. from light: flesh, gloom, and obstinacy; 4. from wind: “winds of shame”, [...] and [...]. There is no obvious rhyme
ponents of food, what we would call the caloric energy, includes not only light substances, but also dark substances, so that this energy might come out in good thoughts or bad thoughts, in good deeds or evil deeds. Remember, there are two wills at war in the body. So portions of this raw energy will be supplied to both sides. And as long as soul material is bound up with evil substances, it is in danger of being exported in a harmful way.

The reformed, perfected Manichaean body is so well mastered and governed that the light substances get the upper hand, and so the whole process of digestion not only strips off the corporeal components of food in a relatively safe manner—we might say, locks the toxins in the liver or binds oxidizing free radicals—but also allows for the safe separation of the negative psychic elements, the spirits of evil which find expression in anger, impatience, greed, fear, and lust. These join their “soul-mates” locked in parts of the body under the hegemony of the Light Mind. Only the purest light elements complete the traversing of the digestion process within the Manichaean Elect and, at its end, either join and reinforce the hegemony of the good over the body (the New Human Being), or flow out of the body through the songs, prayers, or meditations of the Elect.

or reason to this list. For another account, see CMC 80ff. The Stoics, influenced by Greek medicine, spoke in similar terms: “A fragment of Chrysippus who, as we know, studied Praxagoras, states (V. St. frg. II, frg. 88b): λυπῶν, φόβον, ὁργῆς, θυμοῦ are μαλλιστα forms of διάνοιαν παθῶν which arise as a sort of ἀναιθμίασις. The passions are explained in this passage as diseases were explained by Praxagoras and Hippocrates... The Stoics could apparently refer to the medical authorities of their times in propounding their materialistic interpretation of the passions. The soul is an ἀναιθμίασις of the blood” (Steckerl, 43-44). Plato also, in the Timaeus, contends that “diseases of the soul are caused by bodily condition”, including folly, madness, stupidity, and excessive pleasure or pain. He states that vapor from bile and phlegm mixes with the soul and produces irritability, depression, timidity, forgetfulness, and dullness (86-87). Striking a note very closely emulated by the Manichaean, Plato asserts that “no one wishes to be bad, but a bad man is bad because of some flaw in his physical makeup and failure in his education” (Timaeus 86).

37 In the words of Kephalaios 85, alms are “purified in the image of the saints” (212.15-16).

38 “These... elements... are gathered in (and) are found by the metabolism of this soul food [that] enters the body. When they enter the body, they are cleansed and purified and established in their living image, which is the New Man. They shall live [...] and receive the Light Mind and be purified in their image; and they come forth, being cleansed and holy. They attain their original rest. So, when they shall reach the Elect, this is how they shall be cleansed and go up [to] the land of the living ones; but these that come to [...] the sinners and pass through them and [...] in sins. Their end will occur in metaggismos and spirit.” (Kephalaios 94, 239.24ff.)
These purified exports make use of the channels, the *lihme*, to ascend above, no doubt passing the impure materials flowing down these same channels.

The perfected body of the Manichaean Elect is one that has been given over entirely to a total and precise regimen of dietetics. The reader may object that the parallels between a religious discipline and a medical regimen are superficial at best. But I would urge such an objector to look more closely at the state of affairs in the ancient world, wherein the great masters of medicine urged a total dedication to a strict dietetic regimen for the healthy as well as the sick, in order to bring the body to a peak efficiency of operation. The exact same goal was enunciated by any religious tradition that did not eschew the body as irrelevant to spiritual practice; and one would be hard pressed to identify an ancient religion that held to the latter position. Ludwig Edelstein captures the religion-like fervor of the ancient dieticians when he writes,

Their demand at first glance may sound reasonable enough. Yet it seems less convincing as soon as one begins to realize its implications. Since health was considered a balance of the various constituents of the human body, at every moment upset by man’s actions, by his taking any food or drink, it had at every moment to be restored consciously. Consequently, a healthy person had to watch himself continuously, he had to subject himself to minute rules, he had to guard against any deviation from the prescribed regimen.39

Edelstein’s words easily could be lifted from his discussion and placed unchanged in an account of the life of the Manichaean Elect.

A physiology which may sound peculiar to those steeped in the typical Western body-soul dualism was well at home in its own cultural environment. The Manichaean concept of an extraction of soul from food and its gradual purification as it passes through the body can be compared with the system of Praxagoras of Cos. Praxagoras believed the body to be animated by *pneuma*, which was the active product of digestion (the non-active product being the material substances that build up the mass of the body). He considered the production of this *pneuma* in the form of bubbles in the blood stream to be a normal everyday process involved in the metabolism of food.40

---

40 Steckerl 1958, 20. This idea appears to have been widespread. For example,
These bubbles move in the blood which flows from the digestive system through the veins, which in turn ramify into the arteries, thus linking the two systems. The peculiar view of Praxagoras was that the arteries, full of pneuma, become nerves which direct the motion of the body.

[T]he (pneumatic) arteries are the means of communication through which the impulse of the intentional, voluntary movement is imparted to the body... [N]erves are tendons which lead to the extremities... [T]he confusion of nerves with tendons was very general at this time... The whole theory that the air-filled arteries turn into nerves apparently is the result of the opinion that the nerves (the tendons) as the movers of the bones must be connected anatomically with the apparatus of the pneuma, the initiator of movement.

As proof of his theories, Praxagoras pointed to the evidence of the pulse. The beating of the heart, as well as the independent pulse of the arteries, is caused by the passage of bubbles of pneuma from digestion. The pulse is an activity of freeing pneuma from the bubbles.

Examination of corpses found the arteries of the dead to be empty of blood, while the veins were full of it. Logically, then, the veins transmitted the cruder substance of blood, while the arteries passed on the refined pneuma freed from the blood by the pulse. Praxagoras concluded that “the mechanical destruction of the bubbles by the arterial walls is the source of air in the arteries.” He demonstrated that the pulse is not linked to breathing, since suspension of breath does not alter the pulse, nor is the pulse at the same rhythm as breath. Therefore the pneuma in the arteries is not inspired, and must be produced by the body’s metabolic processes. This latter conclusion is supported by the fact that internal illnesses will affect the pulse. Praxagoras theorized that such variations of the pulse in acute ill-

---

41 Stecker 1958, 21.
42 Stecker 1958, 18.
43 Stecker 1958, 23.
44 Stecker 1958, 25.
45 Stecker 1958, 25.
ness were caused by morbid gases entering the arteries from defective digestion.46

This complete physiological system allowed Praxagoras to account for epilepsy, paralysis, and other failures of human mobility, coordination, and function as due to blockage of pneumatic flow. In many cases, a chilling of the system by food or climate causes a failure in blood and *pneuma* production with all sorts of dire consequences.47 Without any recourse to supernatural explanations, Praxagoras built a complete physiology that bears striking similarity to that employed by the Manichaeans. Some of the vocabulary of the Manichaean system seems a bit more suited for religious discourse; some of the elements involved become somewhat personified. Yet even Manichaean physiology stays close to natural, physical processes of the body. Human ills are largely a result of food and digestion. The addition of astrological influences to this system sets it apart from the medicine of Praxagoras, but not from the medical thought of Mani’s own time, which was also heavily caught up in astrology. What is distinctly Manichaean in the physiology employed by this religion is the view that the body is inherently defective, that by its very nature it produces harmful vapors and humors that affect the functioning of both body and soul.

The Manichaean intention to liberate the elements in nature and especially in food, is thwarted so long as the individual is dominated by evil.

Because of the evil deeds and sin we incur agony upon our own selves, and the light of the five gods, which we in the course of the day have eaten, goes to the evil place, because we ourselves, our souls, lived according to the love of the insatiable and shameless demon of desire... looking with its eyes, hearing with its ears, speaking with its tongue, seizing with its hands, walking with its feet. (*Xuāstuānti*i XV B-C)

The Manichaeans believed that the body not only was antagonistic to good congenitally, but also was prone to rebellion once it had been pacified by Manichaean disciplines. The never-ending “battle for the body” is described in great detail in *Kēphalaion 38*. Mani describes sinful impulses as “rising up” in the body, and one would expect from such language an image of sin starting deep down in the body and

46 Steckerl 1958, 26.
47 Steckerl 1958, pp. 80ff.
coming to the surface. But when the reader charts the step-by-step course of this “rising” through the five constituents of the body, it becomes clear that these sinful impulses actually move in the opposite direction, that is, from the surface into the depths of the body: from skin to flesh to vein to sinew to bone. Although it is not made explicit in this kēphalatōn, I think it likely that this course of human corruption is directly connected to the Manichaean view that evil within the body has to be supplemented and abetted by evil outside of the body in order to dominate the human individual. However docile the Manichaean body may be, it is constantly subjected to imports which upset its hard-won and carefully maintained balance of power.

Birth means further division and entrapment of the light substances. For Manichaens, true selfhood is not the individual but the collective, the reunification from the many to the one: 48

The birth by which we are made male and female, Greeks and Jews, Scythians and Barbarians, is not the birth in which God effects the formation of man; but... the birth with which God has to do, is that in which we lose the difference of nation and sex and condition, and become like him who is one, that is Christ. For “all are one in Christ” (Gal. 3.27-28). Man, then, is made by God not when from one he is divided into many, but when from many he becomes one. The division is in the first birth, or that of the body; union comes by the second, which is immaterial and divine. (C. Faustum, 24)

This second, divine birth is a conversion which allows some control over the body by overthrowing and suppressing the negative forces

48 Salvation is the restoration of “homomorphic” (h'mycyhrn) light (M 2.R.i.4, 20, 24; see Mary Boyce, A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian: Texts with Notes, Acta Iranica 9, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975, 84ff.); “the nature (hsing) will be separated from the lightless, its name will be ‘one-form’—in this religion, this is called deliverance” (Compendium, section 1; see G. Haloun and W.B. Henning, “The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of Mani, the Buddha of Light”, Asia Major 3 [1952] 194). According to the Chinese Hymnscroll (see Tsui Chi, “Mo ni chiao hsia pu tsan: The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns”, BSOAS 11 [1943-46] 174-219), this saved condition is one in which “Every thought and reflection obtained and all intentions in mind/Are mutually shown and observed, and no suspicion and misunderstanding exist” (stanza 318), all dwell “harmonious in mind” (stanza 320), “every one of them looks the same without exceptional appearance” (stanza 334), “all natures and forms are equal; and all places bear no differences” (stanza 336); cf. al-Biruni, Indo, 19: The living bodies obtained in heaven “do not differ from each other in weakness and strength, in length and shortness, in form and beauty; they are like similar lamps” Eduard Sachau, Alberuni’s India, London: K. Paul, Trench and Trubner, 1888, 39).
within it. The Light Mind awakens the sleeping and gathers the scattered (*Kephalaios 11*, 44.11-12) and takes control of the gateways of the body (*Kephalaios 56*, 142.12ff.). Freeing and gathering the light within the body, the Light Mind puts it into shape, adds complementary qualities, and thus forms the New Man. The ideal form of this new life is that of the Elect, who by complete mastery of their behavior are able to perform the all-important task of liberating the divine elements from food offered to them at the ritual meal.\(^{49}\)

The process of liberation is a massive undertaking for which the entire cosmos is organized. The best summation is that of Augustine: "This purification and liberation of good from evil is brought about, according to their doctrine, not only by the forces of God throughout the world as a whole, and as regards all its elements, but also by their Elect, through the food which they take to themselves... This in their view is purified in their Elect as a result of the way of life adopted by the Elect of the Manichaeans" (*De haer. 46*).\(^{50}\)

\(^{49}\) Returning to the microcosm/macrocosm correspondences of *Kephalaios 70*, we find that the discipline of the Elect establishes five watch posts over the body, which are paired with five posts in the macrocosm supervised by members of the Manichaean pantheon. The Elect control and subdue the face (like Splendor-holder in the watch post above "the zone"); they master the heart (like King of Honor in the watch of the seven heavens); they master the genitals (like Adamant of Light in his watch over matter (*kylë*); they subdue the stomach and its fire (like King of Glory who watches the three wheels that turn); they master the feet (like Porter in the watch of the abysses).

\(^{50}\) A more elaborate, insider account is found in *Kephalaios 86*, 215.1ff.: "The soul that wears the body, when the Light Mind will come upon it in the power of wisdom and obedience, shall be purified and sealed and made a New Man. There is no trouble in it, nor confusion nor disturbance... (At other times) the wrath increases in him, and the lust multiplies upon him, and the gloom and the grief, because of the food of the bread that he eats and the water that he drinks, which are full of troubling limbs, a hardening counsel. They shall enter the body, [mixed in] with these foods, and they become blended also with the evil limbs of the body. And the sin that is in him changes into wrath and lust and gloom and grief, these wicked thoughts of the body... There is another occasion, however, when you shall find that the food that comes into you is pure [...] excelling in light and life; the error, however, being scarce in it, and the bad less [in it]... And they find you quiet, at rest, well-governed (*politeue*) in your behavior (*anastrophave*) because of [the] living limb, which excels in the light of these justified souls that are in it, the ones that have perfected their deeds. Their dues have ceased, while their soul is light-weight [...] They become associates with these living souls that exist in you. Because of this you find them quiet, in a rest, and they come out of you without disturbance. And you are found healthy in your body, your deeds also orderly, well established in their fashion, and your wisdoms established, your words [...] your soul is light-weight to you, ascending like a bird."
For the Manichaeans, “This soul that comes into him in the metabolism of his food day by day, shall be made holy, cleansed, purified, and washed from the adulteration of the darkness that is mixed in with it” (Kēphalaion 79, 191.16ff.). And further:

These... elements... are gathered in (and) are found by the metabolism of this soul food [that] enters the body. When they enter the body, they are cleansed and purified and established in their living image, which is the New Man. They shall live [...] and receive the Light Mind and be purified in their image; and they come forth, being cleansed and holy. They attain their original rest. So, when they shall reach the elect, this is how they shall be cleansed and go up [to] the land of the living ones; but these that come to [...] the sinners and pass through them and [...] in sins. Their end will occur in transfusion and spirit. (Kēphalaion 94, 239.24ff.)

Just as in all bodies, digestion supplies the body of the Elect with the substance and energy it requires; but by controlling how those substances and energies are used, the Elect can transmit the Living Soul to its proper heavenly home.

According to Kēphalaion 114, food coming into the body is processed through three images: (1) the fleshly (somatic), the realm of dark and evil substances, (2) the psychic, for materials which cannot be incorporated in the New Man because they are not suitably prepared to be liberated, (3) the spiritual (pneumatic), the New Man itself, “which the Light Mind forms in him.” At each stage, the food sloughs off the nutriment appropriate to each image; the rarefied and pure substance that reaches the spiritual image is on its way to liberation.

Then a [Light] Virgin [comes and] reveals [the] spiritual image that is [there], which [is] the New Man. That Virgin acts as a guide. [She] goes on before it and it is extended to the heights above, [and] receives it into this spiritual image. And she sculpts it and adorns it in the New Man within. It is sealed with all the limbs of this Light Virgin who is present and dwells in the New Man. So this is how the living limb shall be [purified] and live, the one that comes into the body of [the] righteous one from without through the digestion of food of various kinds in this way. The living soul is cleansed entirely every day and traverses

51 Cf. Kēphalaion 2, 20.21-23: “The souls that ascend... together with the alms that the catechumens give, as they are purified in the [holy] church”; Kēphalaion 85, 212.15-16: Alms are “purified in the image of the saints.”
these three images. So it shall divest itself of the body, which is not its own, in the corporeal. It shall also divest itself of the souls that are not its own, those that are mixed with it in the psychical [...] anger and desire and [...] and foolishness and envy and strife; and these other wicked knowledges that are not its own. However, in [the] spiritual image it lives and is joined with patience, perfection, faith, and love that reigns over them all. It is the Virgin of Light who robes the New Man and who shall be called ‘the hour of life.’ (Kephalaiion 114, 269.34ff.)

Remember, this is all just an account of digestion!\(^{52}\)

The blending of what the West came to divide into distinct spiritual and physical realms is characteristic of the dominant cosmological and anthropological models of the ancient world. The position of Hippocrates on pneuma can be summed up as, “health comes from its free flow, and disease from its impeded flow.”\(^{53}\) Pneuma was regarded as a vapor (ἀναθυμίας) of digestion by Aristotle, Philistion, Diocles, and at least partly so by Galen. The traducian theory, according to which the soul of the child derives directly from the pneuma of its parents, was also widely held, for example by the Stoics\(^{54}\) and by the Aristotelian Straton.\(^{55}\) In Stoic philosophy, as in Manichaean religion, the activity of pneuma within the human body is merely a stage in a much larger process involving as well the exhalations of the earth and plants. Galen even held a theory of pneumatic exports from the human body, a process of exudation, or ekptosis, from the top of the head.\(^{56}\)

But if the generic Living Soul or Living Self is released from bondage through the digestive services of the Elect, what about the human individual?

---

\(^{52}\) Galen employed a similar model of a tripartite refinement of digested material into pneuma physikon, pneuma zōlikon, and pneuma psychikon; this model was the result of a fusion of ideas in Plato’s Timaeus with the Greek medical traditions. The Manichaean idea, expressed in Kephalaiion 114, that there are fragments of psyche which cannot yet be integrated into the pneumatic perfection of the New Man perhaps reflects a similar model to that of the Stoic Chrysippus, who believed that the human soul (psyche) was constituted of pneuma, but that this unified substance splinters into distinct pneumatia or air currents with specialized functions within the body (Gould 1970, 102).


\(^{54}\) Gould 1970, 111.


Because the body is interconnected with the larger physical processes of the world, through links to the zodiac, sensory experience, and the ingestion of food, it cannot isolate itself as a pure vessel, but must endure the indignities of intrusion, impingement, and inconstancy. That is why the baptismal practices of the Elchasaites or the naive asceticism of the Christians cannot solve the problem. One can never totally escape imports into the soul. Manichaean practice focuses instead on control over one’s exports of soul, avoiding the re-investment of it into the world, and channeling it along a path towards liberation.

Death is the ultimate export of soul. At death, the elements which make up the soul of an unrepentant, unreformed individual flow out into a process known as “transfusion.” *Kēphalaion 90* distinguishes fifteen paths on which the substance of the dead person is sorted and processed. “Four paths are pure and belong [to the] light, leading up to life” (223.25-26). So the forces of good manage to extract some particles of light even involuntarily from the ordinary mortal. The bulk, however, is recycled within the mixed cosmos.

Eight other paths are [mixed], leading above from that place. The light shall go up and become free through them, be purified and go in[to the] ships (of light). But the waste is separated and thrown [down] to transfusion (*metaggismos*). (223.26-30)

Finally, a portion of the deceased is irredeemable. “The other three paths of [...] are] discharged to the gehennas” (223.30-31). They are “drawn from the fleshes”, and consist of 1. “the appetite for lawlessness of all flesh”; 2. “slaughter, with which all flesh is consumed”; 3. “damaging word which harms the Cross of Light... together with the error and blasphemy that wounds the gods” (223.31 - 224.6). Notice that these paths are not described as individual ways of individual souls, but paths for various deeds and elements.

For the Manichaean Auditor, “transfusion” also awaits, heading in its many different directions. Most of the light elements of the Auditor’s soul are still enmeshed with dark elements, which means that together these mixed substances will be recycled as other lives upon earth, to continue the struggle to separate one from another.\(^57\)

\(^{57}\) “The Auditors are not all alike, one to another. There are complete Auditors,
But the Auditor also contributes some quantity of purified soul as an export to final rest in the realm of light, which shows yet again how different the Manichaean soul is from the expected monad. It is a quantity of material that may be separated into discrete portions. Furthermore, the Auditor has started down a path which, over the course of many lifetimes, will gradually liberate all of that individual’s soul exports in the surrounding world. A link is maintained among all the bits of soul that have been exported and spread throughout the world—a link that will facilitate their common salvation when one bit of them finds the right path to liberation. This combination of facts—the divisibility of the individual’s soul on the one hand, and the continued links between the embodied soul and the dispersed traces of one’s deeds on the other—is why I say that the Manichaean soul is both more and less than the idea of a soul commonly found in Western cultures.

In Kephalaion 90 Mani enunciates the peculiarly Manichaean view of the dispersion and “collection” of the soul for his chosen ones. At the time of conversion, all former deeds “shall be freed from every place wherein they are bound and snared... from the heaven and the earth, from the trees and the fleshes” (226.13-17). The three places named from which the “deeds” are withdrawn correspond to the anchor points of the three lohme. The passage goes on to say:

\[
\text{When he (the apostle of light) chooses them and makes them free from the error of the sects, all their deeds that occur in madness come to}
\]

and there are such as are well-intentioned, and there are such as love the religion. And the ascending of their souls to the zodiac, the transforming (tagilmak), and their changing into another body, their ascent and descent is not a single change\(^5\) (T II D 173b, 2 verso.8ff.; see Albert von Le Coq, Türkische Manichaica aus Choischo, III, APAW 1922, Nr.2, 11-12); cf. Kephalaion 92 where Mani says exactly the same thing.\(^6\) Acta Archelai 10: “I shall tell you also this, how the soul is transfused (metaggizetai) into five bodies. First of all some small portion of it is purified...” The passage goes on to specify that the soul itself has five constituents: intelligence, reflection, prudence, consideration, and reasoning.

\(^5\) See Kephalaion 90, 225.8-29, quoted below.

\(^6\) “For his deeds shall not continue outside, awaiting him in each place, until he comes out of the body and frees them all and sends them to the heights. That Catechumen has the ability to free all his deeds by his own hand, while being in his body” (Kephalaion 90, 226.23-27). “There are some among his limbs and his deeds that shall be purified while he is set in the body. They are cleansed in [the] firmaments of the heavens and go before him. There are some also among his limbs that shall be freed with him, at the time when he comes out from his body. There are others that shall be freed after him from the bonds of the earth and of the creatures. [They] go and reach him in the land of the living” (Kephalaion 90, 227.19-26).
him through transfusion. The angels shall guide them to the places wherein they will be purified; because for the catechumen, none of his deeds shall go to the gehennas, on account of the seal of the faith and the knowledge that is stamped on his soul... Rather, they shall be drawn only to the transfusions and suffering. Afterwards they come into the hands of the angels and are purified... (Kephalaion 90, 225.8-29)

This process is further described later in the same text:

They shall loosen their bond and ascend from heaven and earth, from the trees and the fleshes. They are loosened from every place wherein they are and go to the heights with this first fasting and this first prayer; the principal (portion) of all his deeds... They are cleansed in [the] firmaments of the heavens and go before him. There are some also among his limbs that shall be freed with him, at the time when he comes out from his body. There are others that shall be freed after him from the bonds of the earth and that of the creatures. [They] go and reach him in the land of the living... He is healed, so that he will be gathered in, all of him, and go up to the land of the living. (Kephalaion 90, 226.16-20, 227.20 - 228.2)

Let us be honest to our earnest Auditor: when the Manichaean authorities say that “he” or “she” will be purified, given a light form, and transported to heaven, whom do they actually mean? A close examination of what the Manichaens are saying reveals that nothing like a fixed identity passes through this process. Ordinary humans, even Manichaean Auditors, do not experience metempsychosis at death, that is, their intact souls do not transmigrate to other bodies. Rather, the separable divine elements are reprocessed into new forms through “transfusion” (metaggismos). The individual identity of the Auditor is disassembled in the metaggismos and recycled through a multitude of pathways to a variety of destinies. This is why Mani begged off the obligation to depict the destiny of the Auditor in his Picture Book. The fate of the Elect and the inveterate sinner can be shown quite clearly: unified salvation and unified damnation respectively. But the post-mortem experiences of the soul of the Auditor cannot be shown, “because he shall not be purified in a single place” (Kephalaion 92, 236.1ff.). By definition, an Auditor is an as yet unresolved mixture of good and evil forces. If the person in his or her own lifetime fails to sort these contrary forces out, then separation will occur after life, through metaggismos, which will stir the mixture, so to speak, in an
attempt to produce a life more capable of successful liberation of good from evil.

The “souls” of Auditors are reprocessed into plants or into a human life as an Auditor once again (Acta Archelai 10) or an Elect (Homi­lies, 27.11-18). But this is not rebirth or reincarnation or metempsy­chosis or transmigration. The material which constitutes the human soul does not cohere in the ordinary passage from life to life. Manichæans taught a traducian theory of the generation of personal identity, i.e., the personality of the child derives from the reproductive material of the parents, and does not enter into an independ­ently formed body from elsewhere. The physical and psychical prop­erties of a child arise together through the ordinary process of hu­man reproduction, ultimately descending from the material which constituted the parents’ bodies, that is, food. That is why the reproc­essing of what we can only loosely call the souls of ordinary people follows exactly the pattern by which the Elect reprocess the divine elements in their food.

Augustine remarked on more than one occasion, with typical sarcasm, that the Manichæan Auditors wished and prayed for a kind of transmigratory shortcut into the vegetables that the Elect would eat and purify. But what Augustine and the North Afri­can Manichæans were expressing in the language of a popular devotionalism actually has very clear foundation in the exact and technical description of “transfusion” in surviving Manichæan primary texts. In Kephalaion 91, where unusually disciplined and able Auditors are said to potentially achieve liberation at the end of their life, rather than passing into the usual “transfusion” pathways, we are told:

 When they come forth from their body, they travel on their way and pass by in the place above, and go into the life. They shall be purified in the heavens. In just the way that this alms-offering that passes over to the Elect is given likeness in many forms, is purified, and goes into the land of the living, so the souls of the Catechumens who shall not enter a body (again) resemble them.” (Kephalaion 91, 230.12-19)

This is just a special case within the normal process of “transfusion”, where, the passage continues, the typical Auditor

---

61 Contra Faustum 5,10; De haer. 46.
is purified, whether indeed above or below. He shall be purified according to the worth of his deeds, and cleansed and washed and adorned. Afterwards, he is sculpted in a light image, and he glides up and reaches the land of rest. (234.3-8)

This rhetoric of being collected, purified, formed and sculpted according to an ideal image is exactly the same as that used to describe what happens to food in the bodies of the Elect. Even those fortunate Auditors who gain liberation without the necessity of entering new bodily forms, do so in the manner of the substance of the ritual meal. The elements in nature are saved through the digestions of the Elect. The elements of the ordinary individual are processed in a similar way, so much so that the Manichaean Auditor prays for the good fortune of being reprocessed into fruits and vegetables that will be brought to the ritual meal of the Elect.

The divine elements within the human body are liberated and saved just as are their counterparts dispersed in the larger world. The Iranian term *mardyšn* is employed for both meditative solidification of identity within the individual Manichaean Elect and delivery and processing of alms-offerings in the ritual meal (cf. *M 6650.V.3-6*; *Pothi-Book* 28-33, 226-231). This conflation of natural processes of salvation and personal ones is found throughout Manichaean and anti-Manichaean literature; but modern scholarship has ignored the unity of this system by artificially personalizing human salvation in line with Judaeo-Christian concepts of soul and selfhood.

As a conglomeration of divine substance, concentrated in sufficient quantity to cross the threshold to consciousness, the human soul possesses the potential to hold itself together and continue along a process of ever-increasing re-unification. If it fails to hold on to that consciousness, or if it fails to find “the open gate” through which it can continue its ascent, that soul will, at death, fly apart once again into its separate components. It needs to find a form, a permanent cohesiveness that survives mortality, a “body” divested of the pollutants which undermine its unity and clarity. This is the need Mani

---

62 “In this way also Righteousness (the Elect) gathers the Five to it. So it shall be chosen by the teachers [and the] Elect; and they gather it in and ornament it... [and] it is well established” (*Kephalaion* 108, 261.26-29).

63 E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu in Manichäismus*, APAW 1926, Nr.4, 115-116.

proposes to resolve. He brings the true “commandments of the savior, [so that you] may redeem the soul from [annihilation] and destruction” (CMC 85). Salvation comes by means of establishing an integrity for the self, an identity beyond contingency.

The Manichaean Elect form a perfected soul within themselves, that is, a full collection of all of the soul substance within their bodies, solidified and sealed in its ideal form, and so able to hold together as a packet at death and ascend directly to the realm of light, without any part passing through “transfusion.” The Elect form the soul or self through a rigorous process of sorting out the psychic constituents of their bodies (cf. Kephalaion 70, 172.4ff.). Manichaean practices identify, mark, define, promote, circumscribe, and valorize particular traits of the human body, specific sensations and thoughts within human experience; these are “collected” as a unified self that, by its emergence from mixture with other, non-approved traits and experiences, attains self-consciousness. Only in Manichaean funeral hymns do we find the voice of what we might call an individual soul, at its moment of crisis, trying to preserve its unity against the onslaught of divisive forces, wishing to save itself from dismemberment and destruction.65 According to the Chinese version of the Sermon on the Light Nous: “If there is one from the pure Elect who... until the end of life does not fall backwards, then after death that person’s Old Man with the dark, non-luminous force of its mob of soldiers will fall into hell from which it will never come out. At the same moment, the beneficent light, rousing the pure kinsmen of its own luminous army, will go completely straight into the world of light.”66

The analogy between digestion and death is maintained consistently throughout the Manichaean literature. This is yet another example of how processes within the human individual are made to replicate larger cosmic processes in the Manichaean system.67 But this is more than mere analogy, and more than just a parallel con-

67 According to Kephalaion 70 wisdom circulates in the body, corresponding to the Maiden of Light. Moreover, love, joy, faith, and truth in the body correspond to the two light ships, based on the following analogy: “For the Living Soul should go up in them and become free through them; and it ascends from the abysses below and arrives at the heights above” (172.26-29).
struct in the system. Death and digestion are actually interrelated in the functioning of the cosmic machine.\textsuperscript{68} In fact, all of the soul’s imports and exports are joined together through the “transfusion” system that recycles the substances of the cosmos. The souls of the dead and the soul stuff liberated from food travel on the same pathways, and are perfected in the same ways.\textsuperscript{69} When one donates food as alms to the Elect, the result, Mani tells us, is that you have saved the “souls” in that food from further travails in “transfusion.”\textsuperscript{70} Ephrem Syrus grasped this interconnection, which led him to the objection that the individual’s soul should flow out with the light liberated from food, since there was nothing to distinguish the one from the other, and they were in fact the same substance.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{68} This is made perfectly clear by the identical function of the Maiden of Light with regard to the soul of the perfected Elect at death, and with regard to the perfected soul stuff of metabolism in the body. “Then a [Light] Virgin [comes and] reveals [the] spiritual image that is [there], which [is] the New Man. That Virgin acts as a guide. [She] goes on before it and it is extended to the heights above, [and] receives it into this spiritual image. And she sculpts it and adorns it in the New Man within. It is scaled with all the limbs of this Light Virgin who is present and dwells in the New Man. So this is how the living limb shall be [purified] and live, the one that comes into the body of [the] righteous one from without through the digestion of food of various kinds in this way. The living soul is cleansed entirely every day and traverses these three images. So it shall divest itself of the body, which is not its own, in the corporeal. It shall also divest itself of the souls that are not its own, those that are mixed with it in the psychical [...] anger and desire and [...] and foolishness and envy and strife; and these other wicked knowledges that are not its own. However, in [the] spiritual image it lives and is joined with patience, perfection, faith, and love that reigns over them all. It is the Virgin of Light who robes the New Man and who shall be called ‘the hour of life’” (Kephalaion 114, 269.34ff.).

\textsuperscript{69} Kephalaion 2 sets out the path to the heavens in five stages, which have both an internal and an external form (the five mentalities and the more familiar five points of travel from church to pillar to moon to sun to the acons of light). These five stages serve “for the souls that ascend... together with the alms that the catechumens give, as they are purified in the [holy] church” (20.12-31).

\textsuperscript{70} “They release that soul [in the food], and it comes out from this affliction to breadth. This Living Soul, then, which has been freed because of this other soul, and it, that Living Soul which has been rescued in the name [of] that man, and it has been rescued, purified, and [established in] its original essence, it becomes [his fellow] assistant, and it entreats for the soul of the one who has been freed from his body” (Kephalaion 115, 279.18-25). The soul in the food, the Living Soul, has also been going through the process of “transfusion.” Therefore, “a great good [it is that] you bring for this Living Soul, the one that has [wandered] in the metaggismos... which you rescue from a thousand afflictions and ten thousand metaggismoi, and you cause it to reach this brother” (280.9-14).

\textsuperscript{71} See esp. Mitchell 1912, xxxi.
Conclusions

One can spend a lifetime searching for parallels and antecedents to Manichaean ideas in the surrounding cultures. There are, indeed, dozens of parallels between Manichaean physiology and the medical traditions found from the Roman West to India and beyond. But to devote modern research to the goal of establishing a single, clear-cut source for a particular Manichaean doctrine, that is, to pursuing the question of from where Mani borrowed his ideas, would be largely a waste of time. In most cases, a particular Manichaean concept differs in some small way from its supposed antecedent, a difference that must be attributed either to a lost intermediary source, or to the originality of Mani’s own mind. Even when an exact match can be established for a particular Manichaean doctrine, the source for the next doctrine must be searched for elsewhere, with the result that Manichaeism looks like a bizarre patchwork quilt, and we must imagine Mani having access to the equivalent of a modern research library to account for his vast knowledge of every philosophical and medical school of the ancient world.

But the majority of people of Mani’s time, like those of our own, knew medicine and other sciences not by a close intellectual study of them, but by hearsay. The ancient world had its own “common knowledge” that can explain many of the parallels between elaborated systems quite remote from each other in time and place.72 Manichaeism displays strong similarities with Stoicism and heavily Stoicized Middle Platonism. The ancient opponents of Manichaeism also recognized this similarity, and many of the philosophical arguments employed by Alexander of Lycopolis, Augustine of Hippo, and others derive from originally anti-Stoic argumentation. For a Neo-Platonist like Augustine, Manichaeism represented quite simply the last gasp of a bygone era of thinking. David Hahm has characterized the situation aptly:

72 “Philosophy included what the ancients called ‘physics’, a rational account of the physical universe; and just as in our own time most educated people have some ideas of atoms and molecules, and even of more fundamental particles, and of the theory of evolution, so in Ptolemy’s day the cultured man had an eclectic philosophy drawn from many schools, which made up a general picture of himself and his world” (S. J. Tester, A History of Western Astrology, Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987, 58-59).
For half a millennium Stoicism was very likely the most widely accepted world view in the western world... from the third century B.C. to the second century A.D. more people in the Mediterranean world seem to have held a more or less Stoic conception of the world than any other... in fact, in view of its pervasiveness, it may not be much of an exaggeration to say that the Stoic physical world view was the ancient counterpart of our current, popular, scientific world view.73

Mani’s actual sources must have been the popular and popularizing philosophical and medical digests which get so little attention in modern scholarship precisely because they are unoriginal and often distort the original views of the great thinkers we really want to know about. These digests are themselves products of an extensive oral tradition of instruction that must have produced dozens of permutations of every idea. Religious writers, astrologers, and other members of a huge amorphous category of literati incorporated and adapted physiological models in their own tracts. This was the intellectual climate in which Mani lived.

Mani communicated his ideas in a sort of koine intellectual language of his time. Similarly, a modern metaphysician scarcely can write on the nature of reality without addressing quarks, quantum mechanics, or the Big Bang. The popular science of the day is the necessary starting point from which anyone wishing to describe reality must begin, however far they intend to depart from the normal application of the existing models. Mani obeyed this principle, and the publicly accessible terminology and imagery to which he appealed can be called neither marginalia nor essence of his teaching. They are, rather, the exigencies of expression, the dynamics of the language available to him; and in their connections to contemporaneous discourses they offer the modern researcher an avenue by which to access Mani’s as yet poorly understood conceptualization of the human. But great caution must be taken in the use of these pathways to Mani’s system, for Mani appears to have employed a constant habit of catachresis in his appropriation, redefinition, and reapplication of the intellectual materials of his age. Just as any new philosophical or scientific paradigm redefines elements and data by placing them in a system different from their previous home, so Manichaeism controls the sense presumably familiar terms can have when used by a

Manichaean, rather than by a Stoic philosopher, or a Hellenistic physician, or a Roman astrologer.

So if we can assert anything about the origins of Manichaean physiology, it is that Mani was a man of his time, breathed the intellectual atmosphere around him, and communicated his original ideas in language and images available to him. His concern to safeguard his insights into truth from corruption and distortion led him to cultivate strict literalism in his followers, and a devotion to his formulations as the last word on every subject. This made Manichaean concepts about the cosmos vulnerable to the advances or supposed advances of science. Mani's attempt to mold all of reality into a single system and to incorporate all knowledge into a great truth, and his necessary use of models and understandings of the human body or of the cosmos current in his own time and environment, need not be fatal to the religion for all of its factual errors, so long as the compelling idea and the captivating image rather than the brute fact shapes human lives.

We see a determined consistency in the Manichaean conception of salvation—not just human salvation, but the salvation of all life from death (food in the Elect, “soul” in the individual, all elements at the eschaton). All the elements of life, then, are processed in analogous ways: extracted, collected, purified, unified, formed, and so in the perfected form of “souls” or “angels” transmitted to the divine realm. The analogy between these processes is not accidental, or merely formal; it is a consequence of the fact that all of these processes are part of a vast apparatus of purification operating on a cosmic scale. As centered as Manichaean discourse is on the human, and the essential role played by humans in universal salvation, Mani also enunciated a cautionary note, found in Kephalaion 112: regardless of our pretensions, the human is the least of all things in the universe. Naturally, as humans we must focus on our role in cosmic salvation, and that is what Mani and the other prophets and their religions are all about. Nevertheless, the universe is sorting itself out and the elements and agents of light are working out their own salvation all around us, with or without our help. The metabolism of

---

74 It must be said, however, that someone like Augustine used scientific knowledge very selectively, ridiculing Manichaean ignorance about the scientific relationship between the sun and moon, while himself embracing all kinds of irrationalities and unscientific beliefs.
salvation is merely an alignment of the human body with these larger natural forces of salvation.

So we come back to the principal insight of Hans Schaedler in his classic work *Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems*,\(^{75}\) namely, that Mani strove always for a unified system. In this, we may say that Mani was a product of his culture. In the words of a recent study of Mesopotamian astrology, “correlating all possible things was a pastime in which Babylonian scholars excelled.”\(^{76}\) Everything had to be interconnected completely, and it is especially so that Manichaean anthropology reflects Manichaean cosmology and vice versa. But, to quote Schaedler, “The work of light-liberation is not an image of individual salvation projected onto the cosmos, but in Mani’s mind one is permitted to say rather the opposite, that this individual salvation represents only a partial process of the real cosmic light-liberation.”\(^{77}\) The research reflected in this study, and in my book *The Manichaean Body in Discipline and Ritual*\(^{78}\) has merely elaborated and followed out the consequences of Schaedler’s point, and has made it impossible for us to go back to a spiritualized or metaphorical understanding of these very concrete and physical operations at the center of the Manichaean path to salvation.

---


\(^{77}\) Schaedler 1968, 74.

DIDYMUS THE BLIND’S KNOWLEDGE OF MANICHAEISM

BYARD BENNETT

Greek Christian anti-Manichaean writings have often been used as sources of information about Manichaean belief and practice, complementing and supplementing the reports found in the extant Manichaean texts. At the same time, there has been little systematic analysis of these anti-Manichaean writings, so that their value as historical sources has yet to be critically assessed. Before information from an anti-Manichaean writer is used in reconstructing aspects of Manichaean belief and practice, three questions should be asked:

(1) How much did the writer know about Manichaeism and how did he arrive at that knowledge? For example, had the writer met or debated with proponents of Manichaeism? Did the writer claim to have access to Manichaean writings or was his knowledge of Manichaeism derived from another anti-Manichaean work (or works)?

(2) Were the beliefs which the writer attributed to the Manichaeans substantially correct or did he confuse the Manichaeans’ beliefs with those of other groups?

(3) Did the writer’s reliance on earlier heresiological works shape how he understood and responded to Manichaean claims?

This essay will examine the references to Manichaeism in the works of the fourth-century Christian ascetic theologian Didymus the Blind of Alexandria.1 The three critical questions listed above will be ap-

1 Didymus’ treatise Contra Manichaeos (hereafter abbreviated CM) will be cited by the section and line numbers of the critical edition found in B. Bennett, “The Origin of Evil: Didymus the Blind’s Contra Manichaeos and Its Debt to Origen’s Theology and Exegesis” (Ph.D. diss, Univ. of Toronto, 1997), 287-301. K. Staab (Pauluskomentare aus der griechischen Kirche [Münster: Aschendorff, 1933], XX) has argued that a catena fragment on Romans 7 ascribed to Didymus was originally part of the Contra Manichaeos (cf. Bennett, “Origin”, 263-266); this fragment will be cited by the page and line numbers of the critical edition provided by Staab (1-6). In referring to Didymus’ biblical commentaries, it is useful to distinguish between the fragments transmitted by the catenae and the text of the commentaries given in the papyrus codices found at Tura. Thus, Comm. Gen., Comm. Job, Comm. Ps., Comm. Act. Apost. and Comm. 2 Cor. will be used to
plied to the case of Didymus: How much did Didymus know about Manichaeism? Was his account of Manichaean beliefs accurate? Did Didymus’ familiarity with Origen’s writings shape his understanding of Manichaeism and affect the accuracy of his presentation of the Manichaean position?

The investigation of these questions will fall into four parts. First, I will examine Didymus’ discussion of the Manichaean account of evil in the *Contra Manichaeos* and the ten passages in Didymus’ biblical commentaries where the Manichaeans are mentioned by name. From these accounts, it will be seen that Didymus had a limited understanding of some of the basic features of the Manichaean account of evil. Didymus’ contact with members of the Manichaean community will then be examined. Next, I will note Didymus’ tendency to confuse the teachings and exegesis of the Manichaeans with those of certain heterodox figures opposed by Origen (namely, Hermogenes and the Marcionites). I will conclude by examining some additional passages in Didymus’ biblical commentaries in which the opponents are not identified, but which the editors of Didymus’ commentaries have assumed to be references to Manichaeism. I will suggest that these passages refer not to the Manichaeans but to other groups (Valentinians, Marcionites, Platonists and Epicureans).

Didymus regarded Manichaean doctrine and exegesis as one of


the most important threats to the orthodoxy of his day. In his *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, for example, he remarked:

Thus, “by the things” which one “removes, one ventures into danger.” You know that impious doctrines have grown up at the side—those of the Arians and Manichaens and those of Eunomius—and many people remove passages from the confine of truth and of Scripture and transfer impious thoughts into other ones. And “by” these very passages which they removed do they “venture into danger.”

Since Didymus was concerned about the dissemination of Manichaean teachings and exegesis, it is therefore not surprising to find references to Manichaeism interspersed throughout Didymus’ biblical commentaries.

Didymus’ works show that he was aware of some of the principal features of the Manichaean account of evil. He knew that the Manichaens rejected the Christian position that God was the creator of all beings and argued that if God had created the Devil, God himself would be the origin of evil and responsible for all the harm that ensued. Thus, in Didymus’ *Contra Manichaeos*, his opponents asked, “Why did the good God bring into existence one who was going to be so harmful and destructive?”

---

4 *Comm. Eccl. T.* 302.12-16. The editors suggest that the manuscript’s reading τριμμο (i.e., εφρμο, “confine”) in 302.14 is a mistake and propose the emendation ειρημο (“[logical] sequence”).

5 In referring to the Coptic Manichaean codices found at Medinet Madi (Egypt), the following conventions will be observed. References to the *Kephalaia* (hereafter abbreviated K) will indicate the chapter number followed by the codex page and line numbers, as reported in the edition of H.J. Polotsky, *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Musäen Berlin. Band 1: Kephalaia. 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1-10)* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1940) and A. Böhlig, *Manichaïsche Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin. Band 1: Kephalaia. Zweite Hälfte. Lieferung 11/12 (Seite 244-291)* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1966). The *Psalm Book* (hereafter abbreviated P) contains several different psalm-collections. In referring to the main psalm-collection, the psalm number will be given, followed by the page and line numbers in the edition of C.R.C. Allberry, *Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection. Volume II. A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938). In referring to the smaller psalm-collections (in which the psalms are generally unnumbered), the name of the psalm-collection will be given (Heracleides, Thomas, etc.), followed by the page and line numbers in Allberry’s edition. The *Homilies* (hereafter abbreviated H) will be cited by the page and line numbers in the edition of H.J. Polotsky, *Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty. Band I: Manichaïsche Homilien* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934). The Coptic Manichaean papyri recently discovered at Kellis in the Dakleh Oasis (=P. Kell. Copt.) will be cited according to the edition of I. Gardner, *Kellis Literary Texts. Vol. 1* (Oxford: Oxbow, 1996).

6 CM 23.1-3 (PG 39, 1100D6-8).
Didymus similarly recorded, “The Manichaeans and their followers say, ‘The Devil, who was created for the ruin of all, ought not to have been created.” When Didymus expounded his own view of the Devil, he was therefore careful to repudiate the position which the Manichaeans attributed to the Christians—namely, that God was responsible for creating something evil which would cause harm.

This line of argument appears to have been a staple of Manichaean anti-Christian polemic. In the Acta Archelai, for example, Mani is represented as criticizing his Christian opponents for holding God to be “the maker and contriver of Satan and his evil deeds.” Augustine likewise observed, “Again they [sc. the Manichaeans] say, ‘Who made the Devil?...God should not have made him if he knew that he would sin.’” In John of Damascus’ Contra Manichaeos, the Manichaean opponent advanced a similar argument, asking, “Since he foreknew that the Devil would be evil, why did God create him?”

Didymus was aware that the Manichaeans regarded good and evil as unoriginate first principles. In his Commentary on Zechariah, Didymus remarked:

Is their speech not spurious, that of those who posit two unoriginate first principles, [one] of good and [one] of evil? (These are the Manichaeans).  

---

8 See Comm. Ps. 5:5-7 (PG 39, 1169C3-5; Mühlenberg, v. 1, 132, lines 1-2): “Since this is true, evil is not from God, as those who posit that wickedness is substantial think.” Compare Comm. Job T. 2.5-16: “Therefore a rational substance became a rebel against God, ‘having exalted himself before the Lord Almighty.’ This is the Devil, who was not created a devil—for ‘God did not make death’—but perfect and virtuous—for ‘God made all things very good’—who, having fallen from an upright condition and blessedness, envies those who are turning towards this.”
12 Comm. Zech. T. 309.21-23 (4.125): even if the words “These are the Manichaeans” should prove to be a gloss, the identification of the opponents as Manichaeans is certainly
Didymus also knew that the Manichaeans associated evil with Darkness and regarded this Darkness as the substance (οὐσία) of the Devil.  

Didymus asserted that the Manichaeans used two types of arguments to defend their belief that good and evil were independent, co-existing principles. In his *Contra Manichaeos*, Didymus referred to his opponents’ use of Jesus’ teaching about the two trees (Mt. 3:10; 12:33) as a proof-text. This parable played an important role in Manichaean literature, where it was understood as supporting the Manichaean belief that good and evil were independent, co-existing principles.

Didymus noted that the Manichaeans also defended their belief in an independent evil substance by pointing to the existence of harmful creatures: Since we recognize that certain creatures are harmful in nature, we must regard these as evil substances and trace their origin back to an original evil substance—i.e. Matter—rather than to God. God’s opponent is likewise called “the Devil” (i.e. “Accuser” or “Slanderer”) and “the Evil One”, indicating an evil substance.

This type of argument is not attested in the published Egyptian
Manichaean texts but can be paralleled in accounts of Manichaean teaching found in Christian anti-Manichaean literature. The argument that harmful creatures are derived from the evil substance (i.e. Matter) and are proof of the latter’s existence is found in Epiphanias, Titus of Bostra, Epiphanius and Augustine. In his De moribus Manichaeorum, Augustine remarked:

For what other answer will you give to the question, What is evil? but either that it is against nature, or that it is hurtful, or that it is corruption, or something similar? But I have shown that in these replies you make shipwreck of your cause, unless, indeed, you will answer in the childish way in which you generally speak to children, that evil is fire, poison, a wild beast and so on. For one of the leaders of this heresy, whose instructions we attended with great familiarity and frequency, used to say with reference to a person who held that evil was not a substance, “I should like to put a scorpion in the man’s hand, and see whether he would not withdraw his hand; and in so doing he would get a proof, not in words but in the thing itself, that evil is a substance, for he would not deny that the animal is a substance. The argument concerning the names of the Devil is more difficult to document. It is clear from the published Coptic Manichaean texts that the principal evil power was designated “the Devil” and “the Evil One” and was held to have been formed from the original evil

Manichaean texts were in view; in each instance, Didymus observed that the names referred not to an evil substance, but to a quality arising from purposive choice.

18 According to Epiphanias’ Fourth Discourse to Hypatius, the Manichaeans pointed to “harmful creeping things” (such as serpents) as evidence for the existence of a separate evil principle (C.W. Mitchell, S. Ephraim’s Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan, v. 1 [London: Williams and Norgate, 1912], 108-111 [Syrac]; lxxxiii-bxxiv [Eng]). The same argument is given in greater detail in Titus of Bostra Adversus Manichaeos 1.3 and 2.41 (P. de Lagarde, Titus Bostromhus syriaco et grece [Berlin, 1859; repr. Osnabrück: O. Zeller, 1967], 3, lines 16-19; 50, lines 22-29), whose remarks are reiterated in Epiphanias Panarion 66.17.4-7. See also Augustine’s presentation of the argument in Contra Faustum 21.1,4,10,12-13 and De moribus Manichaeorum 11, 14, 18. Compare also P. Kell. Copt. 2, line 37 (Gardner; Kellis, 37), which is fragmentary; John the Grammarian Second Homily Against the Manichaeans 16 (M. Richard, Ioannis Caesariensis presbyteri et grammatici Opera quae supersunt, CCSG 1 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1977], 99, lines 251-252, erroneously published under the name of Paul the Persian in PG 88, 576D14-15); Zacharias of Mitylene Adversus Manichaeos μιδραζ (Demetrakopoulos, 13, lines 3-4)=Paul the Persian Capita slix contra Manichaeos μβ (PG 88, 568B8).

19 Augustine De moribus Manichaeorum 11; tr. of R. Stothert, Augustine. Works; A New Translation. Vol. 5: Writings in Connection with the Manichaean Heresy (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1872), 57-58.
substance, i.e. Matter. It is not clear, however, whether the Manichaean combined these two beliefs in the interest of anti-Christian polemic, treating the names of the evil power as proof of the existence of an evil substance.

Didymus may also have been familiar with the Manichaean belief in the primordial invasion of the realm of Light by the powers of Darkness. In the Contra Manichaeos, Didymus alluded to his opponents' belief that the Devil had risen up against God and, by assailing the Godhead, claimed a portion for himself. Didymus did not clarify what he meant by "portion" but a part of the Godhead (i.e. the divine substance) seems to be intended.

Didymus knew that the Manichaecans believed that, as a result of this assault, souls of the same substance as God had been joined to bodies. At the same time, Didymus acknowledged that he was not familiar with the details of the Manichaean account. Didymus did recognize, however, that if two opposing natures were present in each agent, two contrary inclinations—one toward good and one toward evil—would necessarily arise within each agent.
Didymus knew that the Manichaeans associated the inclination toward evil with one's fleshly body. He recognized that they viewed the flesh as evil in nature but the spirit (i.e. the entrapped particles of Light) as good in nature. Didymus was also aware that the Manichaeans viewed marital intercourse as evil because it produced bodies of sinful flesh.

Didymus recognized that this negative view of the flesh led the Manichaeans to adopt a docetic Christology. According to Didymus,
they supported this position by referring to Rom. 8:3, where Paul spoke of Jesus receiving "the likeness of sinful flesh."30 The Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book offers a similar account, asserting that when God became man in Jesus he received the "likeness of the flesh (eine ἐνταρξύς), the σώματος [material shape] of [manhood]."31 The expression eine ἐνταρξύς is reminiscent of the phrase eine ἐνταρξύς, which the Coptic versions of the Bible used to render ὁμοιομοίων σαρκός in Rom. 8:3.

Didymus was aware that the Manicheans rejected the Old Testament.32 In the Contra Manichaeos, for example, he criticized the Manicheans for appealing to the words of John the Baptist, since John was a prophet belonging to the Old Testament dispensation, whose authority the Manicheans refused to recognize.33 The repudiation of the Old Testament was a staple of Manichaean anti-Christian polemic.

30 CM 12.1-13.3 (PG 39, 1093D2-9). In Zoepfl's edition of the Commentary on the Catholic Epistles, which contains some material derived from Didymus' Old Testament commentaries, there is an anonymous Greek catena fragment which deals with the Manicheans' docetic Christology: "There were certain persons who said that the Lord had come down from heaven in the appearance of a man, whose opinions the Manicheans further asserted" (Comm. I 3n. 4.2-3; Zoepfl, 66, lines 10-13). Whether this fragment is to be ascribed to Didymus or some other writer will only be known when the contents of the Commentary on the Catholic Epistles have been further analyzed.

31 P Heracleides; 194.1-3. For the use of σώματος in the Coptic Manichaean texts from Medinet Madi to indicate the "material shape" which the historical Jesus assumed for the duration of his apostolate and then put off, see Paul Van Lindt, "Remarks on the Use of σώματος in the Coptic Manichaica" in Peter Bryder (ed.), Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, Lund Studies in African and Asian Religions 1 (Lund: Plus Ultra, 1988), 95-103; see also Gardner, Kellis, 5 and compare Acta Archelaei 8.4 (Beeson, 12, lines 24-26) ; Epiphanius Panarion 66.26.5 (Holl, 59, lines 5-8). In discussing P Heracleides; 194.1-3, Van Lindt ("Remarks", 100) suggests reading Ῥ[T]ΑΝΤΡΟΠΟΣ "of [manhood]" (cf. P 226; 19.27-28) at the end of the passage.

32 See P 248:57.3-14 (with Allberry's note); Acta Archelaei 15.9-10 (Beeson, 24, line 30-25, line 5); Seraphon of Thmus Adversus Manicheos 25 (R. P. Casey, Serapion of Thmus Against the Manichees [Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1931]), 41, lines 8-18; Titus of Bostra Adversus Manicheos 3.2 (Lagarde, 67, lines 18-20); 3.8.1 (P. Nagel, "Neues griechisches Material zu Titus von Bostra [Adversus Manicheos III.7-29]" in J. Irmscher and P. Nagel, Studia Byzantina. Folge II (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973), 300, line 6); Euphrasian Syrus Hymnen contra haereses 51.14 (E. Beck, Des heiligen Euphrasen des Syrers "Hymnen contra omnès haereses", CSCO 169 [Scriptores Syri 76] [Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1957], 198, lines 18-23); Secundinus Epistola 3 (Zycha, 896, line 15-897, line 2); Augustine De haeresibus 46; Ep. 296.2; Contra Adumantum 13.4 (Zycha, 146, line 28-147, line 19); Contra Faustum 4.1; 6.2; 15.1; 18.2; and the passages cited in A. Anthony Moon, The "De natura boni" of Saint Augustine: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1955), 175. See also A. Villey, Alexandre de Lycopolis. Contre la doctrine de Mani [Paris: Cerf, 1985], 194 and W. Klein, Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1991), 176-189.

33 CM 31.10-13 (PG 39, 1:04D9-1105A2); see Lk. 16:16 and compare Mt. 11:13.
Augustine, for example, remarked, “For you well know that the Manichees move the unlearned by finding fault with the Catholic Faith, and chiefly by rending in pieces and tearing the Old Testament...”  

This kind of polemic may have originated at an early date within the Manichaean community. The short and long formulae for the abjuration of Manichaeism asserted that Mani’s book of Mysteries contained a refutation of the Law and the Prophets. The Seven Chapters attributed to Zacharias of Mitylene and the long formula for the abjuration of Manichaeism also referred to a similar refutation written by Adda, the disciple whom Mani had sent to establish Manichaean communities in the Roman Empire.

In the Contra Manichaeos, Didymus asserted that the Manichaeans disparaged the Jewish people by pointing out that John the Baptist had referred to Abraham’s descendants as “serpents” (Mt. 23:33) and the “offspring of vipers” (Mt. 3:7). Augustine asserted that a similar polematic identification of the Jewish people with the serpents mentioned in Mt. 3:7 and 23:33 was found in the treatise of his Manichaean opponent Adimantus.

---

36 Lieu, 178, lines 46-48; 179 [1466D]. According to these texts, the book in question was written by “Adda and Adeimantos.” It is unclear whether these were two names of the same person or whether the book is to be identified with the treatise refuted by Augustine in his Contra Adimantum. Nonetheless, Augustine appears to have identified this Adimantus with Addas, the disciple of Mani; see Contra adversarium leges et prophetarum 2.12.42.1321-1322 (K.-D. Daur, Sancti Aurelii Augustini Contra adversarium leges et prophetarum, CCSL 49 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1983], 131); Retractiones 1.22.1.2 (A. Mutzenbecher, Sancti Aurelii Augustini Retractionum libri II, CCSL 57 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1984], 63).
37 CM 34.1-4,18 (PG 39, 1105B5-8, C11).
38 Augustine Contra Adimantum 5.1 (Zycha, 124, lines 3,9-10); compare Contra adversarium leges et prophetarum 2.5.17. Cf. also Augustine Ep. 236.2: “They [sc. the Manichaecans] speak evil of the patriarchs and the prophets” (tr. of J.P. Asmussen, Manichaean Literature: Representative Texts chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings [Delmar, New York: Scholars’ Facsimiles and Reprints, 1975], 15). Abraham’s character was also called into question by the Manichaecs Faustus (Contra Faustum 22.5; 32.4) and Secundinus (Epistola 3; Zycha, 896, lines 22-23; compare Acta Arachelai 45.6 [Beeson, 69, lines 17-18], the Seven Chapters attributed to Zacharias of Mitylene and the long formula for the abjuration of Manichaeism [Lieu 180, lines 90-91; 181]. In his Tathbit dala ‘il al-mubazzaa, the tenth-century Mu’tazilite theologian ‘Abd al-Jabbar also alluded to the Manichaecs’ criticism of Abraham and their association of him with the evil
Didymus recognized that the Manichaeans’ rejection of the Old Testament also involved a repudiation of the Law. In the catena fragment on Romans 7, for example, Didymus’ opponents noted that Paul spoke unfavorably of the Law, describing it as “the law of sin and death” (Rom. 8:2) and “the law which wars against the law of my mind” (Rom. 7:23) and asserting that the commandment provided sin with opportunities to deceive him (Rom. 7:11). Similar exegesis was advanced by Augustine’s Manichaean opponent Faustus, who distinguished three laws, of which the first was “that of the Hebrews, which the apostle calls the law of sin and death”; Rom. 7:23 was likewise advanced as a proof-text by Fortunatus, another one of Augustine’s Manichaean opponents.

From the material that has been examined above, it is clear that Didymus was familiar with some of the basic features of the Manichaean account of evil and that some of the proof-texts and arguments he attributed to the Manichaeans are attested in other accounts of Manichaean polemic. At the same time, there is no evidence that Didymus knew the names of the various mythological figures who appeared in the Manichaean account of evil and redemption. This suggests that Didymus had not read any Manichaean literature or any anti-Manichaean work which contained a detailed account of Manichaean beliefs (for example, the Acta Archelai used by Epiphanius and Cyril of Jerusalem). Didymus’ discussion therefore centers around a more basic question—namely, how one can account for the origin of evil in a way that recognizes the necessity and importance of ascetic practices yet maintains a satisfactory theodicy.
Although Didymus’ knowledge of Manichaeism was admittedly limited, it is possible that some of it was derived from contact with members of the Manichaean community. Didymus claimed to have conversed with a Manichaean on at least one occasion. In his Commentary on Ecclesiastes, Didymus alluded to a discussion he had had with a Manichaean regarding the propriety of marital intercourse and the value of the Old Testament. Although the passage has a number of lacunae and in some places its sense is obscure, the broad lines of the argument remain clear.

In the passage in question, Didymus was commenting upon Eccl. 9:9a (“And experience life with a wife, whom you have loved”) and therefore discussed the place of marital intercourse in the Old Testament and in contemporary Christian practice. Didymus recognized that the Old Testament saints had had intercourse with their wives, but emphasized that this was only for the acceptable end of procreation, not for the base end of seeking pleasure.45 Didymus argued that a marriage characterized by this kind of continence was not inferior to virginity. He then alluded to a discussion he had once had with a Manichaean about this subject:

This I also once said to the Manichaens...: “Consider how great this chastity is! For a man is not subjected to punishment if he has intercourse with his own wife at the right time [i.e. at a time when conception can take place]. No blame is attributed to him, for no transgression is ascribed to him. But since he transcended this law and devoted himself to another, angelic law, for this reason he abstained from this [i.e. marital intercourse] as an act inappropriate [for him].”

Then in a sophistical manner he [sc. the Manichaean] questioned me... premise. He said to me, “What is the will of Jesus?” He wished that I might say, e.g., “To be celibate” and he might bring forward the an-

---

cient fathers [i.e. the Old Testament patriarchs]. He said, “What is the will of Jesus?” I said, “To do the works of Abraham and to believe in Moses.” Immediately was his sophism resolved....the word and said to me, “You [have brought together] the boxer and the tragedian.” [I said] to him, “I have not brought together the boxer and the tragedian or the tragedian and the boxer but I have paired the tragedian with the tragedian and the boxer with the boxer. For I am eager to be a truthful judge.”

Despite the obscurity of the passage, it is clear that Didymus was claiming to have conversed with a Manichaean, who was promoting abstinence from marital intercourse and questioned the value of the Old Testament, taking a negative view of the patriarchs. Since these positions are attested in Manichaean literature and were elsewhere attributed to the Manichaeans by Didymus, Didymus’ claim to have conversed with a Manichaean is plausible.

In the discussion above, it has been shown that Didymus was familiar with some of the basic features of the Manichaean account of evil and may even have had some contact with members of the Manichaean community. At the same time, Didymus’ reports of Manichaean teaching need to be treated with caution, since their testimony is not uniformly accurate. To illustrate this point, it will be useful to translate and discuss three passages in Didymus’ Old Testament commentaries in which the beliefs and exegesis attributed to the Manichaeans actually belonged to earlier figures opposed by Origen.

---


45 Presumably the Manichaean argument is to be reconstructed as follows: We commend those who take up the ascetic life in obedience to the commands of Jesus and practice celibacy; what then are we to make of the Old Testament patriarchs who married and had sexual relations with their wives? Compare Titus of Bostra Adversus Manichæos 3.7.12 (Nagel, “Neues”, 298, line 12), where the fecundity (πολυγονία) of the Old Testament saints is sufficient to show them worthy of blame.

The argument advanced by Didymus’ Manichaean opponent was clearly intended to leave Didymus in an awkward position, compelling him either to embrace the ascetic ideal and abandon the Old Testament or embrace the Old Testament and abandon the ascetic ideal. An argument of similar design appears in CM 33.1-39.12 (PG 39, 1108D1-1109A10), where promise and punishment are opposed to one another in such a way that the Christian will be obliged to give up one of his or her beliefs to save the other.
The first passage appears in Didymus' *Commentary on Job*, where an argument for the co-existence of an evil principle with God was discussed. In commenting upon Job 5:18 ("For he causes one to be in pain and restores one again; he struck and his hands healed"), Didymus observed:

Moses himself...says, "I kill and I will cause to live, I will strike and I will heal" (Dt. 32:39). For it is not, as the Manichaeans hold, that one causes the suffering of pain but another heals. For there is one who heals, who also permitted the introduction of hurtful things, guiding the evil spirits according to the aim of providence...they introduce the things connected with affliction with a view to health...."

Despite the lacunae in the text, the character or the argument attributed to the Manichaeans is clear: In administering justice, the God of the Old Testament causes harm by inflicting corporal punishment and death; since only an evil being is capable of producing harmful effects, harm must be traced back to an evil principle, not to God.

The argument that Didymus here attributed to the Manichaeans is remarkable because there is no evidence that the Manichaeans used either Dt. 32:39 or Job 5:18 as proof-texts. Dt. 32:39 was used by the Marcionites, however, to demonstrate the existence of an agency which was separate from God and responsible for worldly evils. Tertullian reported that Marcion had adduced this passage in his *Antitheses* to establish the capricious character of the Demiurge (i.e., the being who created the world) and thus to show the need to posit a God superior to the latter. Origen similarly asserted that Dt. 32:39 was used by the Marcionites to demonstrate the cruel and inhumane character of the God of the Law and the Prophets. Origen also


48 Origen *Contra Celsum* 2.24 (M. Borret, *Origène: Contre Celse*, v. 1, SC 132 [Paris:
linked Dt. 32:39 with Job 5:18, the same combination of texts which appears in Didymus but is not found in other Greek writers of the first four centuries. This suggests that in writing his Commentary on Job, Didymus reproduced exegetical material from Origen; through some confusion or lapse of memory, however, Didymus attributed the views discussed there not to the Marcionites, but to opponents of his own day who held analogous beliefs.

The argument which Didymus attributed to the Manichaeans is also remarkable because in the Coptic Manichaean Kephalai Mani explicitly rejects the Marcionite position when it is set forth by one of his opponents. Mani instead defends a position similar to that of Didymus, arguing that God, as a just judge, rightly condemns the wicked and sees that they suffer the appropriate penalties. This further supports the thesis that Didymus was not reporting Manichaean arguments but instead drawing upon Origen’s earlier discussion of the Marcionite position.

Two passages in Didymus’ Commentary on Genesis appear to involve a similar confusion. The first passage deals with the interpretation of Gen. 1:2:

But one must not think, as the Manichaeans do, that the word ‘was’ (Gen. 1:2a) indicates the unoriginate character [of matter].

---


49 Origen Contra Celsum 2.24; Hom. Jert. 1.16; 16.6; Comm. Mt. 15.11; Comm. Rom. 6.5 (Hammond Bammel, Römerbriefkommentar. Buch 4-6, 474, lines 57-59). Only one other occurrence of this combination of Dt. 32:39 and Job 5:18 is listed in the first five volumes of the Biblia Pastrica (Paris: C.N.R.S., 1975-1991): Basil of Caesarea Hom. in Ps. 39 (PG 29, 313C14-D4). Since Basil appears to have been reproducing material from Origen (Hom. Jert. 1.16; 16.6) and Didymus is not known to have read Basil’s works, this exception can be set aside as irrelevant to the present inquiry.

50 K 89;221.18-223.16 (especially K 87;22.14-15) and compare K 82;199.24-26; 99;250;20-30.

51 Comm. Gen. 1.2 (Petit, La chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale I, 11-12). Since the section of the Tura papyrus containing this passage (Comm. Gen. T. 3A.4-5) had been
The second passage concerns the interpretation of Gen. 6:12:

But one must not think, as the Manichaeans do, that the unqualified matter which has been left behind causes the "corruption of the earth" by revolving around it. For this would make people blameless, if what was unable to be set in order by God caused the spoiling. 52

These two passages are remarkable because the information they provide is not attested in the published Manichaean texts but can be paralleled in accounts of the views held by earlier figures.

As Nautin and Doutreleau have noted, the interpretation of Gen. 1:2a given in the first passage belongs not to Mani or the Manichaeans but to Hermogenes of Carthage, a Christian writer who flourished around 200 A.D. and was heavily indebted to Middle Platonism. 53 Both Hippolytus and Tertullian, who are the principal sources for reconstructing Hermogenes' thought, asserted that Hermogenes had taught that matter was unoriginate and thus contemporaneous with God. 54 Tertullian also recorded that Hermogenes had interpreted the word "was" in Gen. 1:2a as "indicating that it [sc. matter] has always existed in the past, being unborn and unmade", an interpretation which appears to have been unique to Hermogenes. 55

badly damaged and Petit's edition of the catena fragment had not yet been published, Nautin and Doutreleau were obliged to restore the text of the Tura commentary by reference to Procopius' epitome (PG 87, 41C4-7), which reads, "But the enemy of God Mani says that the word 'was' (Gen.1.2a) indicates the unoriginate character of matter." 52


53 Nautin and Doutreleau, p. 1, 25-26, 39 n.

54 Hippolytus Refutatio 8.17.1-2 (M. Marcovich, Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium, PTS 25 [Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1986], 336-337); Tertullian Adversus Hermogenem 1.4; 4.1; Theodoret Haer. 1.19 (PG 83, 369B). The idea that matter was contemporaneous with God (σύγχρονος τῷ θεῷ) was regarded by the doxographers as a Platonic doctrine; see Hippolytus Refutatio 1.19.4 (Marcovich, 76, lines 12-13) and compare Adamantius De recta fide in Deum 4.4 (W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, Der Dialog des Adamantius [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1901]), 144, line 6; Vincentz Buchheit, Tyranni Rufini librorum Adamantii Originis adversus haereticos interpretatio [Munich: W. Fink, 1966], 62, line 9). Unformed matter was also described as "unoriginate" by the Middle Platonist Atticus (in Proclus Comm. in Tim. 1.276.30-1.277.7; 1.283.27-29; cf. Eusebius Praep. evang. 15.6.3-4); compare Plutarch (De animae procreatione in Timaeo 5 [1014B]) and Calcidius (Comm. in Tim. 293), who say simply that matter was always available to the Demiurge.

55 Tertullian Adversus Hermogenem 23.1 (tr. of J.H. Waszink, Tertullian: The Treatise against Hermogenes [Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1956], 57); compare 27.1 and Gerhard May, Schöpfung aus dem Nichts: Die Entstehung der Lehre von der "creatio ex nihilo" (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978), 147 (ET "Creatio ex nihilo": The Doctrine of "Creation out of Nothing" in Early Christian Thought, tr. by A.S. Worall [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994], 144). It is likely that all the known instances of this interpretation in Greek writers can
There is no evidence that Didymus had read either Hippolytus or Tertullian; Theodoret, however, reported that Origen (whose works Didymus is known to have read) had also written against Hermogenes. This suggests that in writing his *Commentary on Genesis* Didymus reproduced exegetical material from Origen but ascribed the opponent’s position to a group of his own day who held a similar view.

The second passage from Didymus’ *Commentary on Genesis* contains two ideas which are attested in Middle Platonic interpretation of Plato’s *Timaeus* and also appear to have been endorsed by Hermogenes:

1. Prior to being ordered by the Demiurge, matter was unqualified (αποτομος);
2. The Demiurge did not set in order all this unqualified matter.

Each of these points will be examined in turn.

The idea that matter was “unqualified” (αποτομος) was a Stoic doctrine. This term was subsequently adopted by the Middle Platonists, who used it to describe the character of matter prior to its reception of any form, treating αποτομος as similar in meaning to the phrase ὁμορφὸν ὑπό υποσέλευτον τῶν ἰδεῶν found in *Timaeus* 50D. Hermogenes also appears to have regarded matter as being unqualified before it was set in order.

be traced back to Hermogenes, whose views were known through the critical accounts given by Hippolytus and Origen. See Origen’s commentary on Gen. 1:2 in Eusebius *Præp. evang*. 7.20.1-9 (G. Schroeder and É. des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique. Livre VII*, SC 215 [Paris: Cerf, 1975], 270-276); Adamantius *De recta fide in Deum* 4.4 (Sande Bakhuizen, 144, lines 6-9; Buchheit, 62, lines 9-14); and Ambrose *Hexameron* 1.7.25 (C. Schenk, *Sancti Ambrosii episcopi Meditamentos Opera I. Examen* [Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 1979], 54). Hermogenes’ interpretation of ἦν (“was”) in Gen. 1:2a may have a Platonic background. Compare Plotinus *Enneads* 3.7.6.50-57, where the word ἦν (“was”) in *Timaeus* 29E1 was similarly discussed; see M. Baltes, *Die Weltausstehung des Platonischen Timaeos nach den antiken Interpreten*, v. 1 (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976), 133-134.

56 Theodoret *Haer.* 1.19 (PG 83, 369C5).
57 See Diogenes Laertius 7.134.
58 See Plutarch *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* 6 (1014F-1015A); Albinus (Alcinous) *Didaskalikos* 8.2-3; 11.1; Hippolytus *Refutatio* 1.19.3; and Calcidius *Comm. in Tim.* 310, 319, 331. Compare Methodius *De autexousio* (A. Vaillant, *Méthode d’Olympe. Le “De autexousio”*, PO 22.5 [Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1930], 743, line 5; 755, lines 1-2; 757, line 14).
59 Tertullian’s discussion of this point is admittedly rather vague. It is clear from *Adversus Hermogenem* 23.1 that Hermogenes interpreted the words “invisible and unfinished” in Gen. 1:2a as meaning that matter was “shapeless.” Tertullian understood this to mean that matter lacked form (*Adversus Hermogenem* 25.1; 26.1; 28.1; 30.2) and
The belief that the Demiurge set in order only a portion of the existing matter was held by some Middle Platonists. Hermogenes also believed that only a part of matter had been set in order:

Seeing it [sc. matter] boiling in the manner of a heated cauldron, he [sc. the Demiurge] divided it into two parts and, taking one from the whole, he tamed it, but the other he let move in a disorderly manner. He [sc. Hermogenes] says that this one that has been tamed is the κόσμος [i.e. world or order] but the part which remains wild [and disordered] is called unordered (ἀκόσμος) matter. Didymus also attributed to his opponents a further view which, for the purposes of analysis, can be divided into two parts:

(3) The motion of the matter which was not set in order caused the corruption of the earth;
(4) Matter effected this corruption by revolving around the earth.

Since Didymus’ account of his opponents’ position is exceedingly brief and provides no information about the opponents’ reason for holding these views, any reconstruction of the opponents’ position is necessarily hypothetical. Nonetheless, like points (1) and (2), points (3) and (4) can plausibly be understood against the background of the Middle Platonic interpretation of the Timaeus. It is uncertain, however, whether (3) and (4) can be attributed to Hermogenes; while Hermogenes may have endorsed a position similar to (3), there is no evidence to show that he endorsed (4). Nautin and Doutreleau’s suggestion that the position discussed in the second Commentary on Genesis passage be ascribed to Hermogenes therefore cannot be decisively confirmed from the extant evidence.

The belief that the motion of unordered matter was responsible for thus presumably also quality. By analyzing the Middle Platonic background of Adversus Hermogenem 35-37, Waszink (Treatise, 5-6) concluded: “As to the condition of matter, it may be regarded as certain that he [sc. Hermogenes] asserted it to be without any quality.”

60 See Calcidius Comm. in Tim. 298 (reporting the views of Numenius) and Plutarch De Iside et Osiride 49 (371A-B).
61 Hippolytus Refutatio 8.17.2 (Marcovich, 336, lines 6-10); compare also 2.17.1 and Tertullian Adversus Hermogenem 38.2-4. The likening of turbulent, unformed matter to boiling water may have a Platonic background; the comparison of unformed matter to fluid in motion is also found in Numenius (in Calcidius Comm. in Tim. 296 and Eusebius Praep. evang. 15.17.2).
the corruption and evils found in the terrestrial realm can be understood against the background of the Middle Platonic interpretation of the Timaeus. The Middle Platonists held that prior to being ordered by the Demiurge, matter was characterized by disorderly motion. This belief was based upon the Middle Platonists’ interpretation of Timaeus 30A:

Desiring, then, that all things should be good and, so far as might be, nothing imperfect, the god took over all that was visible—not at rest, but in discordant and unordered motion (ὅν· ἦσυχίαν ἄγον ἀλλὰ κινούμενον πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως)—and brought it from disorder into order, since he judged that order was in every way the better.

Hermogenes similarly held that before matter was set in order, it was characterized by wild and disorderly motion (ἀεὶ...ἀγρίως καὶ ἀτάκτως φερομένην). Those Middle Platonists who believed that the Demiurge had not wholly ordered matter naturally held that disorderly motion persisted after the formation of the cosmos and was therefore a potential source of corruption and worldly evils. Numenius, for example, asserted that since the Demiurge was only able to form matter to a limited extent, he was unable to eliminate the disorderly motion by which matter resisted Providence and produced evils. Hermogenes may also have taken a similar position. According to Tertullian, Hermogenes had claimed that unordered matter, by its disorderly and irregular motion, aimed at formlessness; this has usually been un-

---

63 Phìtarck Quaestiones coniviales: 8.2 (719E); Platonicae quæstiones 4 (1003A); De animae procreacione in Timaeus 5 (1014B); Albinus (Alcinos) Didascalikos 12.2; 13.3; Calcidius Comm. in Tim. 300-301.
64 Plato Timaeus 30A (tr. of F.M. Cornford, Plato’s Cosmology: The “Timaeus” of Plato [London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1937], 33. I have altered Cornford’s “is visible” to “was visible” to more accurately render Plato’s ηῆ. See also Timaeus 34A; 43B; 52C-53B (especially 52E) and 69B. For a brief summary of Plato’s account of disorderly motion, see E. Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung, 5 ed. (Leipzig: O.R. Reisland, 1922), 719-744.
65 Hippolytus Refutatio 8.17.2. Compare Tertullian Adversus Hermogenem 41.1; cf. 43.1.
67 Tertullian Adversus Hermogenem 42.1. For matter’s resistance to the formative power
understood to mean that Hermogenes held the unformed portion of matter and its disorderly motion responsible for corruption and worldly evils.68

The idea that matter effected this corruption by revolving around the earth is more difficult to understand. Presumably, Didymus’ opponent(s) regarded some of the celestial bodies which revolved around the earth as exercising a malignant influence upon the terrestrial realm and associated these celestial bodies with matter and its disorderly motion. A similar position is found in a passage in Calcidius’ Commentary on the Timaeus, in which the Middle Platonist Numenius discussed the Stoics’ treatment of astrological fatalism:

So, according to Plato, the world received its good things from the munificence of God as a father; evil clung to it through the evilness of matter, its mother. And thus we understand why the Stoics vainly put the blame on a certain ‘perversity’ when they say that things happen by virtue of the stars. Now the stars are bodies (v.i.e., heavenly fires), and of all bodies matter is the foster-mother, so that also the unhappy confusion caused by the movement of the stars seems to originate from matter, in which there is much instability, blind impetuosity, change and arbitrary recklessness.69

Similar ideas appear in the Peratic system refuted by Hippolytus, which presents an idiosyncratic amalgam of Middle Platonic and astrological concepts. In the Peratic system, matter was regarded as unqualified

of the Demiurge and his providential designs, see Porphyry De antro nympharum 5 and 9 with the remarks of Jean Pépin, “Porphyre, exégète d’Homère” in H. Dörrie et al., Porphyre: Huit exposés suivis de discussions, Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique 12 (Geneva: Vandoeuvres, 1965), 244-245 (especially 245 n.1).


69 Calcidius Comm in Tim. 298=Numenius, fr. 52 (Des Places) (tr. of van Winden, 114-115). On the translation and interpretation of this difficult passage, see also J. den Boeilt, Calcidius on Plato: His Doctrine and Sources (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970), 76. This passage in Calcidius appears in the middle of a section which reports Numenius’ “Pythagorean” responses to Stoic teaching; see Comm. in Tim. 295-297 and 299, where Numenius is mentioned by name. In Comm. in Tim. 298, immediately after the section quoted, Pythagoras is invoked as an authority when the interpretation of the Timaeus is being discussed. This suggests that 298 may also report the views of Numenius and his reflections upon Stoic teaching, as van Winden (115) holds.
and the stars were held responsible for the corruption and destruction occurring in the terrestrial realm. The Peratic explanation of how these two points were related is rather obscure, but it is clear that the power of corruption was likened to water in motion and was believed to move around the celestial sphere in (or among) the wandering stars.

In summary, although the second passage from Didymus’ *Commentary on Genesis* poses some challenges for the interpreter, the passage appears to make use of terminology and concepts found in the Middle Platonic interpretation of Plato’s *Timaeus*. Parallels were noted in the works of Hermogenes and Numenius and in the Peratic system discussed by Hippolytus.

Didymus’ ascription of this Middle Platonic material to the Manichaeans is puzzling, but could be explained if one assumed that Didymus knew that his Manichaean contemporaries were interested in astrology and that astrological lore played a certain role in Manichaean mythology. According to the Coptic Manichaean *Kēphalaia*, the five

---

70 Hippolytus *Refutatio* 5.14.5; 5.16.6; 5.17.2 (Marcovich, 179, lines 27-28; 183, lines 30-31; 185, line 11).

71 Hippolytus *Refutatio* 5.16.2-3 (Marcovich, 182, lines 7-13); compare 5.14.1-14. There may be an echo of these Peratic ideas in the Manichaean conception of the “black waters.” In the accounts of the Mandaean cosmogony given in the *Ginza Rha*, the black waters are the primordial stuff out of which the world is made; after the creation of the world by the demiurge Puhil, they encircle the earth. Seething with a turbulence like that of boiling water, the black waters are the source of evil and, together with the seven planets and the twelve constellations, bring about corruption in the terrestrial realm. See M. Franzmann, *Living Water: Mediating Element in Mandaean Myth and Ritual* (Adelaide: Charles Strong Trust/Australian Association for the Study of Religions, 1989), 2, 9 n.14; I am indebted to Brian Mubaraki of the Mandaean Research Centre for sending me a copy of this monograph.

planets and the twelve signs of the zodiac were formed from and belonged to the five worlds of Darkness, as such, they were creatures of Matter and, being evil in nature, gave rise to worldly evils (war, hunger, lust, etc.) and spiritual error. In forming the cosmos, the Demiurge (i.e. the Living Spirit) had imposed important constraints upon these evil agents, seizing and binding them and affixing them to the wheel of the stars, i.e. the celestial sphere. According to the account given in the Kephalaia, the zodiacal signs were suspended from the celestial sphere and rotated with it, while the planets moved upon the sphere. By this motion, particles of light which had been trapped in fleshly bodies were drawn up to the powers affixed to the wheel of the stars; these light-particles were then plundered and taken away by the good guardian (ἐπιτρόπος) who had been set over the sphere. The light which had been plundered was then apparently passed to the sun and moon for purification. The waste resulting from the purification of the light then flowed down to earth via the wheel of the stars; this downpouring of waste gave rise to evils in the terrestrial realm. The Manichaens believed that over time this removal of light and return of waste had an important cumulative effect, producing a gradual decline in vitality in
the terrestrial realm.\textsuperscript{81} If Didymus was aware that such concepts played a role in the Manichæan account of evil, this might explain why he attributed to the Manichæans Middle Platonic material containing broadly similar ideas.

In conclusion, from the three passages from Didymus' biblical commentaries which have been analyzed above, it is clear that Didymus' reports of Manichæan teaching were not uniformly accurate. In each case, views belonging to earlier figures were seen to have been erroneously ascribed to the Manichæans. These incorrect attributions may have arisen from the fact that the views espoused by these earlier figures were in some respects comparable to those later held by the Manichæans. In two of the three cases examined, Origen's writings could plausibly be regarded as the source of Didymus' information.

The editors of Didymus' works have suggested that some further passages, in which the opponents are not identified, are also references to Manichæan teaching. These passages can be sorted into four groups on the basis of their content. The first group of passages addresses the question of whether human action arises from one's nature or constitution or from one's purposive choice. By analyzing the concepts and terminology found in these passages, it can be seen that Didymus was referring not to the Manichæans but to the Valentinians, whose views were known to Didymus through the writings of Origen.

The most detailed and interesting of these passages is found in Didymus' \textit{Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles}:

Since after he became an apostle of Jesus Paul says that he himself believes in the God of his forefathers and in the Law and the prophets, he makes it plain that he recognizes one God of the Old and New Testaments. For this reason, he also agrees with the Pharisees who also themselves hope for the resurrection of all people, the just and the unjust. And since some heretics say that resurrection pertains not to the body but to the purified soul, one must inquire what they will say about the unjust persons who are resurrected, since, according to them, those who are earthly are by nature not purified. For Paul said that the unrighteous are raised; is the resurrection indicated not of bodies? Then they say about the intermediate state—which indeed they call the psychic nature—that in this case this intermediate state undergoes a change, which indeed is called “raising”, as what is written above.

\textsuperscript{81} Cf. K 57; 144.22-146.22; 57; 147.1-17.
shows: "And some of the scribes, rising up, contended, 'We find nothing evil in this man'" (Acts 23:9). And again they say that the "raised" are more advanced because of their speaking perverted things (cf. Acts 20:30).82

In this passage, Didymus has thrown together beliefs belonging to the Valentinians and the Marcionites in a rather careless fashion. The first two premises are to be ascribed to the Marcionites:
(1) The God who spoke through the Law and Prophets is different than the God who revealed himself in the New Testament;83
(2) There will be a resurrection not of bodies, but of purified souls;84

The remaining premises, however, are to be ascribed to the Valentinians:
(1) The earthly (χοικός) nature is unable to be purified;85
(2) The intermediate state (μεσότης) or psychic nature (ψυχική φύσις) is capable of undergoing change;86
(3) This change can be described as "raising" or "awaking" (ἔγερσις).87

Several other passages in Didymus' biblical commentaries which have been thought to refer to the Manichaeans actually concern the Valentinians. In these passages Didymus referred to "those who

---

83 Irenaeus Adversus haereses 1.27.2; Tertullian Adversus Marcionem 1.19.4-5; 4.34.15; ps.-Tertullian Contra omnes haereses 6.1-2; Epiphanius Panarion 42.4.1-2; A. von Harnack, Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott, 2 ed., TU 45 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1924), 106-117. According to Irenaeus Adversus haereses 1.7.3, Valentinus offered a different analysis, asserting that the contents of the Old Testament were derived from three different sources; a threefold division is also found in Ptolemaeus Epistula ad Florum (in Epiphanius Panarion 33.4.1-2; 33.5.1-7; 33.6.1-5). Didymus' confusion may have arisen from acquaintance with a heresiological work which attributed the Marcionite position to Valentinus; see, for example, Hippolytus Refutatio 6.35.1.
84 Irenaeus Adversus haereses 1.27.3; Tertullian Adversus Marcionem 1.24.3; Hippolytus Refutatio 10.19.3; Adamantius De recta fide in Deum 5.20 (Sande Bakhuyzen, 214, lines 3-10); Epiphanius Panarion 42.3.5; Harnack, Marcion, 136-137.
85 Irenaeus Adversus haereses 1.6.1-2; 1.7.5.
86 See Irenaeus Adversus haereses 1.6.1; 1.6.4; 1.7.1; 1.7.5; Clement of Alexandria Strom. 4.13.91.2; Ptolemaeus Epistula ad Florum (in Epiphanius Panarion 33.7.4-5).
87 In early Christian literature ἔγερσις ("raising" or "awakening") was used as a synonym for ἀνάστασις (ἀνέκρατον) ("resurrection [of the dead]"); a usage which appears already in the New Testament itself (Mt. 27:53). The persons to whom Didymus referred appear to have believed in a spiritual resurrection occurring in this present life, through which one received knowledge and became enlightened. See Excerpta ex Theodoto 3.1-2; 7.5 and the Nag Hammadi Treatise on the Resurrection (NH 1.4) 49.15-26 with the parallel passages cited in M. Malinine et al., De resurrectione (Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1963), 42 (on 49.13-16); M.L. Peel, The Epistle to Rheginus: A Valentinian Letter on the Resurrection (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), 96; J.E. Ménard, Le traité sur la Réurrection (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1983), 79-81; H.W. Attridge, Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), 205-206.
introduce the natures” (οἱ τὰς φύσεις εἰσόγονες), a stock phrase which Didymus, like Origen, used to designate the Valentinians. In discussing this idea of “natures”, Didymus attributed to these opponents beliefs which he held to be characteristic of Valentinian thought: There are certain persons who possess a spiritual nature; those who have such a nature are incapable of vice and are saved by nature. Other persons are evil by nature as a result of their constitution; the latter are incapable of virtue and salvation. In some cases, Didymus alluded to these views simply as a foil, contrasting the idea of being evil by nature with his own conviction that evil originated from an agent’s purposive choice. This suggests that Didymus was not combating contemporary opponents but reproduced material from Origen about the Valentinian idea of fixed natures whenever this facilitated the introduction and development of his own views about the moral nature of human agents.

The second group of passages deals with the ascription of the Old Testament to a God other than the Father of Jesus Christ; these passages are probably to be ascribed to the Marcionites rather than

---


92 Comm. Gen. T. 143.15-144.1; 144.3-4; Comm. Zech. T. 133.2 (2.175); Comm. Act. Apost. 10:10 (PG 39, 1676B-D; Cramer, v. 3, 175-176). Compare Irenaeus Adversus haereses 1.6.1-2; 1.7.5; Excerpta ex Theodoto 56.3; Tripartite Tractate (NH 1.5) 106.6; 109.18-19; Origen Comm. Jn. 32.19.246; Corpus Hermeticum 9.5.

93 Didymus Comm. Ps. 2:8 (PG 39, 1160B; Mühlenberg, v. 1, 1, 124, lines 7-30); Comm. Ps. 22:3a (PG 39, 1289C; Mühlenberg, v. 1, 236); 52:4 (PG 39, 1401D; Mühlenberg, v. 2, 6).
the Manichaeans. Didymus summarized his opponents’ beliefs as follows:

Many of the heretics divide the Godhead, saying that there is one god who made the world and another who is the Father of Christ. For this reason, having also divided Scripture, they say that the Old Testament belongs to the one who made the world, but the New Testament belongs to the Father of Christ. In accordance with their impious opinion, they say that these two gods and their scriptures are opposed to one another, so that those who flee to the Lord for refuge are enemies of the one who created the world and are better than he, as in turn the people who belong to the one who created the world are at variance with Christ and his teaching.\footnote{Comm. Act. Apost. 4:24-25 (PG 39, 1664A3-14; Cramer, v. 3, 79, lines 22-31).}

The proclamations of the God of the Law and the Prophets, it was claimed, show his arbitrary and vengeful character:

When Jesus said to Paul, “Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?”, he became a cause of his not seeing, though the heretics denounce the one who said, “Who made the sighted and the blind? Was it not I, the Lord God?” (Ex. 4:11b). Such passages reduce to perplexity those who say that there are different gods and denounce the one as the cause of not seeing, but favorably receive the other because he furnishes sight.\footnote{Comm. Act. Apost. 9:6 (PG 39, 1669D1-1672A1; Cramer, v. 3, 152, line 33-152, line 5), reading καταγγέλλωντως with Wolf at PG 39, 1669D6 (=Cramer, v. 3, 153, line 3). Cf. Comm. Act. Apost. 13:10-11 (Cramer, v. 3, 216, lines 25-26): “This passage also refutes the view of those who say that making one sighted and blind does not belong to the good God.”}

The opponents also claimed that the legislation produced by this erratic and wrathful deity was a cause of death:

The heterodox also use this passage to slander the Old Testament, saying that that scripture brings death, but the New Testament brings life, since it belongs to the life-giving Spirit.\footnote{Comm. 2 Cor. 3:4-6 (PG 39, 1693C10-13; Staab, 22, lines 1-4).}

With the advent of Jesus, who revealed the good God, the proclamations and legislation of the Demiurge were to be abandoned, having been replaced by the Gospel:
And if one says that “the old things” (2 Cor. 5:17) are the books of the Law and the prophets, these passed away when the Gospels succeeded them, though these old and new books differ not in subject but in conception. For the same teaching belongs to the two testaments, at one time in a veiled manner, at another time plainly.97

One must not pay attention to those heterodox persons who say that those who are apostles in Christ are teaching in opposition to the god who is other than the Father of the Savior, i.e. “We utter things contrary to him.”98

Harnack has noted the importance of Didymus as a source for documenting Marcionite beliefs.99 In the passages translated above, beliefs can be observed which were held by the Marcionites but not by the Manichaeans. In the first passage quoted, for example, the being who made the world is opposed to the good God who is the Father of Jesus. No such opposition existed in Manichaean mythology, since the Manichaeans believed that the world had been created by emanations of the good God in accordance with the divine purpose. The remark that those who flee to the good God are better than the Demiurge is also intelligible in terms of Marcionite belief; the Marcionites held that the Demiurge was not evil, strictly speaking, but only inferior in character.

The proof-texts cited in the above passages are also attested in reports of Marcionite exegesis but are not found in Manichaean texts. Origen’s discussion of Ex. 4:11b, for example, strongly suggests that that verse had been used as a Marcionite proof-text.100 The Marc-
cjonite Marcus in the dialogue *De recta fide in Deum* likewise identified the "old things" which have passed away (2 Cor. 5:17) with the books of the Law and the Prophets. In conclusion, it appears that the second group of passages should be understood to refer to the Marcionites rather than the Manichaeans.

In Didymus' *Commentary on Job*, there are two passages which allude to persons advocating the doctrine of transmigration:

For it was fitting for the saint to pray for rational beings to push on toward virtue and no longer suffer a return to an inferior condition—for it is not the same [condition] [i.e. terrestrial life], as those who introduce transmigration think.

...then that when a man has died, he will not, as many men hold, come to spend time here again.

While it is true that the Manichaeans did believe in transmigration, there is no evidence to show that Didymus has the Manichaeans in view in the above passages. The idea of transmigration was accepted by a wide variety of groups in the ancient world, including the Pythagoreans, Platonists, and a number of figures who have often been grouped under the rather vague rubric of "Gnosticism." Furthermore, the word used by Didymus in these passages is μετενσωμάτωσις, the word used in the Platonic tradition, rather than μεταγγισμός, the word which appears in Manichean texts and the principal anti-Manichean sources. There is thus no compelling reason to interpret Didymus'
remarks about transmigration as references to Manichaean teaching.

Two passages in Didymus’ *Commentary on the Psalms* which deal with
the denial of providence have also been interpreted as references to
Manichaean teaching. In the first passage, the Devil is said to have
been responsible for

decreeing a lack of providence (ἀπρονοσία). He [sc. the Devil] per­
suaded many people, at any rate, to lay down the doctrine that the
world is without a guardian, having himself previously departed from
the correct view about God’s administration and judgment. 106

Didymus made a similar parenthetical remark in the second passage:

Contemplating the previously-mentioned things, men, who long ago
attested to their own cleverness, [were troubled], no longer abiding by
the deluded opinions which were held by the sophists, being seized with
fear on account of their assent to impious doctrines of this sort. For
they were learning from them that there would be no providence, since
all things are moved spontaneously (ἐκ ταύτων)... 107

It is likely that both of these references concern the views of the
Epicureans rather than the Manichaeans. The word ἀπρονοσία, which
appears in the first passage, is routinely used in doxographical literature
to indicate the Epicurean position. 108

The same is true of the phrase ἐκ ταύτων which appears in the
second passage. Aristotle had attributed to the atomists the view that
things were moved “spontaneously” (i.e. of themselves, not by an
external agency in accordance with a conscious purpose) 109; from
Plutarch onwards, this phrase was routinely used to describe Epicurus’
atomism, an account of the world in which divine providence played
no part. 110 In his *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, Didymus himself likewise
attributed to Epicurus the opinion that things were moved spontaneously rather than by divine providence.\footnote{Didymus Comm. Eccl. 209.26ff. (cf. 24.7).} It is therefore likely that the two passages from Didymus’ \textit{Commentary on the Psalms} refer to Epicurean rather than Manichaean teaching.

In conclusion, by examining Didymus’ references to Manichaeism, it can be seen that Didymus had a limited knowledge of some of the principal features of the Manichaean account of evil. This knowledge of Manichaean teaching may have been derived in part from interaction with members of the Manichaean community, since Didymus claimed to have conversed with a Manichaean on at least one occasion. Didymus’ testimony regarding Manichaean beliefs and exegesis is nonetheless not uniformly reliable. Didymus’ attribution to the Manichaeans of beliefs and exegesis actually belonging to earlier figures opposed by Origen was noted. Finally, a number of passages were examined in which Didymus criticized the views of certain unnamed opponents, whom the editors of Didymus’ works had tentatively identified as Manichaeans. This identification was rejected and these passages were instead seen to refer to other groups; in some cases, Didymus’ references to these groups reflected his dependence upon Origen.
JUXTA UNUM LATUS ERAT TERRA TENEBRARUM: THE DIVISION OF PRIMORDIAL SPACE IN ANTI-MANICHAEAN WRITERS’ DESCRIPTIONS OF THE MANICHAEAN COSMOGONY

BYARD BENNETT

In 1912 Franz Cumont and Marc-Antoine Kugener noted some striking parallels in the descriptions of the Manichaean cosmogony given by three Greek anti-Manichaean writers—Titus of Bostra, Severus of Antioch and Theodoret of Cyrrhus.¹ Cumont and Kugener noted that among the material cited by these three writers were certain quotations which had been excerpted from an unidentified Syriac-language work (or works) of Mani.² Cumont and Kugener hypothesized that Titus had access to a collection of Manichaean texts, probably in the original Syriac, and that the source document used by Titus, Severus and Theodoret was in fact one of Mani’s principal works, namely the Book of Giants.³

In this essay I will evaluate Cumont and Kugener’s hypothesis by reexamining one of the sets of parallels noted in their study, namely reports about the Manichaean division of primordial space into four quarters corresponding to the four cardinal directions. It will be seen that Titus, Severus and Theodoret are not the only writers to dis-

---

¹ F. Cumont and M.-A. Kugener, Recherches sur le manichéisme II. Extrait de la CXIIIe Homélie de Sévère d’Antioche. Réfutation de la doctrine manichéenne (Brussels: Lamertin, 1912).
² Cf. Titus Adversus Manichaeos 1.17 (P.A. de Lagarde, Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi servata sunt graece [Berlin: C. Schultze, 1859; repr. Osnabruck, 1967], 10, line 13): ... γράφει [Μάνις] η Σύρων φωνῇ χρόμενος...
³ Cumont and Kugener, 153, 159, 161: “L’exposé succinct du Traité contre les hérésies permet d’affirmer que Sèvère a suivi dans ses extraits le texte de Mani, sans en troubler l’ordre et sans y faire de coupures considérables....La seule conclusion probable c’est que les deux écrivains ecclésiastiques [sc. Severus and Theodoret] ont mis à contribution, pour combattre ses doctrines, un des livres capitaux du prophète....Il [sc. Titus] semble bien, en effet, avoir eu sous les yeux un recueil d’écrits manichéens, peut-être même les originaux syriques—car l’évêque de Bostra connaissait certainement cette langue comme le nabatéen...Sans que nous prétendions l’affirmer positivement, il nous paraît donc probable que les extraits reproduits et réfutés par Sèvère sont tirés du Livre des Géants.”
cuss this division, suggesting that the source document used by these three authors was also available to other anti-Manichaean writers. All the extant reports about this division of primordial space into four quarters will be collected and translated. From an analysis of this material it will be argued that the source document used by these writers was in Greek (not Syriac), was in use in Western Manichaean communities from the first half of the fourth century onward, and, although not itself a work of Mani, may have contained some material excerpted from Mani’s Living Gospel.

Most of the anti-Manichaean writers who provide details about the Manichaean cosmogony assert that the Manichaean believed that primordial space was divided into four quarters corresponding to the four cardinal directions (north, east, west, and south). This division is reported by a number of writers who are not obviously dependent upon one another. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, writing c. 453, remarked:

'Αφεστηκέναι τής Ἡλίας ἐφησε τὸν θεὸν καὶ παντάπασιν ἁγνοεῖν καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν Ἡλίαν καὶ τὴν Ἡλίαν αὐτῶν· καὶ σχεῖν τὸν μὲν θεὸν τὰ τε ἄρκτῶνες καὶ τὰ ἔως καὶ τὰ ἐσπέρια, τὴν δὲ Ἡλίαν τὰ νότια.

He [sc. Mani] said God stands aloof from Matter and is wholly ignorant of Matter and Matter of him and God occupied the northern, the eastern and the western parts, but Matter occupied the southern ones.4

Severus of Antioch (Monophysite patriarch from 512-518) also reported:

And they [sc. the Manichaes] say: That which is Good, also named Light and the Tree of Life, possesses those regions which lie to the east, west, and north; for those (regions) which lie to the south and to the meridian belong to the Tree of Death, which they also call Hyle [i.e. Matter], being very wicked and uncreated.5

---

4 Theodoret Haer. fah. 1.26 (PG 83, 378B9-13). For the dating of this work, see O. Bardenhewer, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur, v. 4 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924), 244.
5 Severus Homily 123 (M. Brière, Le: Homiliae cathedrales de Sèvère d'Antioche, PO 29 [Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1960], 153, lines 16-20); tr. of J.C. Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992), 167. The words “to the south and to the meridian” reflect the Syriac translator’s uncertainty about how to render the Greek adjective μεσημβρινός (τὸ μεσημβρινόν=“the southern part” while ὁ μεσημβρινός [κύκλος]=“the meridian”).
The Neoplatonic philosopher Simplicius, writing in the second quarter of the sixth century, similarly observed:

"Ὅπως δ’ οὖν ἔχει τούτο, πρὸ τοῦ κόσμου παρ’ αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι ὡς ἐν γῇ τὴν διανομὴν ποιοῦσι, τὰ μὲν τρία μέρη, τὸ ἀνατολικὸν καὶ δυτικὸν καὶ βόρειον, τῷ ἀγαθῷ διδόντες, τὸ δὲ μεσομεσιάν τῷ κακῷ.

However this may be, before the world, in their judgement, came into being, they [sc. the Manichaeans] make the division as if they were making it on earth, because they give three parts—the eastern, western and northern—to the good, but the southern one to evil.\(^6\)

In the *Debate of John the Orthodox with a Manichaean* (sixth to eighth century), we find the following exchange:

O. Διηρήσθαι τὴν ὕλην καὶ τὸν θεόν ιδίους τόποις οἴδα, πολλάκις ἀκρικώς παρὰ τῶν Μανιχαίων, καὶ ὡς τὸ μὲν νότιον τῇ ὕλῃ, τὸ δὲ βόρειον καὶ ἀνατολικὸν καὶ δυτικὸν προσένεμεται τῷ ἀγαθῷ θεῷ.
M. Οὕτως γὰρ ὀμολογοῦμεν.

O. I know, having heard many times from the Manichaeans, that Matter and God were separated in their own places, and that the southern part belongs to Matter, but the northern, eastern and western parts are allotted to the good God.
M. For thus do we confess.\(^7\)

The *Chronicon Maroniticum*, written in Syriac in the eighth century by a Maronite writer who was dependent upon Greek sources, asserted:

Mani says in his teaching that there were two original beings: God and Hyle [i.e. Matter]. The former was good and possessed the eastern, northern, western and upper regions; and the latter being, which he called Hyle which was evil, possessed the southern regions.\(^8\)

---


\(^8\) I. Guidi, *Chronica minora. Pars secunda*, CSCO Scriptores Syri ser. 3, v. 4 (Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1903), 60 (text); 48 (Latin tr.); Eng. tr. of Reeves, 177 n.20 (slightly adapted). As Reeves notes, this notice is reproduced in essentially similar terms in the universal chronicle of Michael the Syrian [J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien patriarche jacobite d’Antioche* (1166-1199)], v. 4 [Paris, 1910; repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1963], 118 (text). For the identification of the *Chronicon Maroniticum* with a lost historical work of Theophilus ibn Tuma (695-785), a Maronite writer conversant with Greek literature and astrological writings, see M. Breydy, *Geschichte der syro-arabischen Literatur*
An abbreviated report of the teaching about the four quarters, identifying the southern region as the abode of the evil one, appears in Cyril of Jerusalem, Titus of Bostra and Grigor Abu’l-Faraj Ibn al-Ibri (Bar Hebraeus), who again are not obviously dependent upon one another. Cyril, writing in 348, attacked the Manichaeans with the following words:

Καὶ βλέπε τὴν τοῦτον ἀνοησίαν. Ποτὲ μὲν λέγουσι τὸν πονηρὸν μὴ δὲν ἔχειν κοινὸν πρὸς τὸν σῖκο θεοῦ εἰς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν, ποτὲ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν τὸ τέταρτον μέρος μόνον ἔχειν.

And consider their [sc. the Manichaeans'] want of understanding: at one time they say that the evil one has nothing in common with the good God in regard to the creation of the world, but at another time they say that he [sc. the evil one] has only the fourth part.9

In Titus of Bostra’s Adversus Manichaeos, written sometime between 363 and 378, we find the following remark:

Αὐθε ν τὸ μεσημβρινὸν μέρος τῇ κακίᾳ δίδοντες, ὡς ὄναρ τῆς δημιουργίας διαγράφουσι. ποῦ γὰρ ἦν μεσημβρία πρὸ μεσημβρίας;

Again, by assigning the southern part to evil, they describe it as if it were a dream of creation. For where was the South before there was a south?10

Grigor Abu’l-Faraj al-Ibri (Bar Hebraeus), in his History of Dynasties, an Arabic abridgement of his Syriac chronicle which he produced shortly before his death in 1286, remarked:

Then evil moved to the south to establish a world there and rule over it.11

Since the reports presented above are consistent in content but do

10 Titus Adv. Manich. 1.11 [Lagarde, 6, lines 3-5].
not display obvious literary dependence upon one another, it is reason­able to assume that they are all summaries of information found in some common source document. All of the early citations are found in Greek writers and there is no evidence that these writers were conversant with Syriac; it is therefore reasonable to assume that the source document was in Greek. Furthermore, this source document must have been produced before 348, the date of the earliest extant citation.

The identity of this source document remains unclear, although it is not necessary to identify it with one of Mani’s works. The anti-Manichaeans who quote from this source document constantly oscillate between summary statements beginning, “The writer says” or “The Manichaeans say...” and illustrative quotations beginning, “For Mani said...” This suggests that the source document was a summary which contained some citations attributed to Mani, but was not itself identical with one of Mani’s works.

This hypothesis would also explain why Titus of Bostra was able to describe his source only by using the most circuitous of phrases. In *Adversus Manichaeos* 1.20, for example, he calls his source simply

---

12 Cumont and Kugener (159) had assumed that as bishop of Bostra Titus would have been familiar with Nabataean, a Western Aramaic dialect which was the written language used by the Arabic-speaking tribes of northern Arabia until the third century A.D. Cumont and Kugener then speculated that Titus would have had little difficulty in reading Syriac, an Eastern Aramaic dialect. This chain of inference rests upon a faulty premise. In Titus’ day, both the spoken and the written language of Bostra would have been Arabic; the last dated inscriptions in Nabataean script, which belong to the first half of the fourth century, are almost entirely in Arabic. There is thus no reason to think that Titus was conversant with either Nabataean Aramaic or Syriac.

13 Thus, for example, Severus usually refers to “the Manichaeans” (Brière, 149, line 27; cf. 151, line 7; 153, lines 13,22-23,28,31-32; 163, line 6; 165, line 12) or “the writer” (i.e. the author of the document presenting the Manichaeans’ views: 167, line 25; 169, line 22; 171, line 6), but in a few cases cites sayings which are attributed to Mani and said to be found in one of his writings (155, lines 4,7,24-26,30; 157, lines 16-17; 159, line 31; 161, lines 16-17,33; cf. 171, lines 11,18-19). In Titus of Bostra one finds the same dichotomy between sayings of Mani (1.6 [Lagarde, 4, line 15]; cf. 1.17 [10, line 13]; 1.19 [11, line 39]) and views which are ascribed to the author “who describes the [doctrines] of Mani” (ο το τον μανιαντος συγγραφον) (1.21 [13, line 2]; cf. 1.21 [12, line 22]; 1.22 [13, lines 6-7]) or, more vaguely, to “those who issue from Mani” (οι έκ τον μανιαντος ορμομενου) (1.16 [9, line 2]; cf. 1.9 [5, line 9]; 1.11 [6, lines 4-5]). It appears that in a few cases the origin of the citations given in the source document was not clearly indicated, forcing Titus to take a more cautious approach; in *Adv. Manich.* 3.4 (68, lines 10-11), for example, Titus introduces a quotation in the source, “He [sc. Mani] or another one of his followers (έτερος τς των άλ έκτίνοι) says...”

14 Reeves (170-174) has shown that Cumont and Kugener’s identification of this summary with the Manichaeans *Book of Giants* is unconvincing for other reasons.
“the book in their [sc. the Manichaeans’] hands”; in 1.22, he is forced to describe it as “the same writing from which we have provided the [sayings] issuing from Mani.” Had the source document been a Greek translation of a well-known work by Mani, such carefully qualified phrases would not have been necessary. Cumont and Kugener’s assumption that the source document was itself a work of Mani must therefore be rejected.

Nonetheless, Cumont and Kugener are probably correct to assume that the source document was a Manichaean text rather than a hostile account by a Christian writer. The source document’s description of the Manichaean cosmogony contains no obvious distortions or polemical elements. Furthermore, it corresponds quite closely to the description of the Manichaean cosmogony given in Augustine’s *Contra epistulam fundamenti*, where Augustine quoted from the *Epistula fundamenti* and referred to certain other writings attributed to Mani.

Augustine’s description of the Manichaean cosmogony arose out of his discussion of the following passage from the *Epistula fundamenti*:

On one side of the border of the shining and sacred region was the region of darkness, bottomless and boundless in extent.16

Augustine remarked that this idea was expounded in greater detail in other writings of Mani; these teachings, however, were revealed by the Manichaeans only to the most attentive and studious inquirers.17

---

15 *Adv. Manich.* 1.20; 1.22 (Lagarde, 12, line 22; 13, lines 6-7).
17 Augustine *Contra epistulam fundamenti* 21, 23 (Zycha, 219, lines 5-6; 220, lines 4-6).
Augustine then summarized the description of the Manichaean cosmogony given in these other writings. Augustine’s account of the cosmogony coheres with the Greek and Arabic accounts translated above but also provides some additional information which helps one to form a more accurate picture of the cosmogony as a whole. The four cardinal directions were evidently understood as being inscribed on a vertical plane; Augustine’s discussion seems to presuppose that north and south are to be identified with above and below respectively and this identification is made explicit in the accounts of the Manichaean cosmogony given by Titus of Bostra and a number of Arabic Muslim writers.18

Like the Greek and Arabic sources, Augustine affirmed that the realm of Light was thought to extend through infinite space in every direction except down (=south).19 Below (i.e., to the south of) the realm

---

18 Compare the illustration given by Augustine in Contra epistulam fundamenti 21 (Zycha, 218, line 22-219, line 3) with Titus Adversus Manichaeos 1.9,11 (Lagarde, 5, lines 23-24; 6, lines 3-5); cf. the passage from the Chronicon Maroniticum translated above, where the author recognized that the northern and upper regions were associated with the realm of Light. One also finds Light associated with north and above and Darkness with south and below in the reports of the Manichaean cosmogony given by the Muslim writers al-Nawbakhti (cited by Ibn al-Jawzi in Vajda, 13); Abu 'Isa al-Warraq (cited by 'Abd al-Jabbar in Vajda, 115); al-Biruni (cited in Vajda, 22); al-Shahristani (Gimaret and Monnot, 656 [621]); Ibn al-Murtada (cited in Vajda, 14); al-Maturidi (cited in Vajda, 32); see D.N. MacKenzie, “Mani’s Subhuragal,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 42 (1979), 529 n.186. The association of the realms of Light and Darkness with above and below respectively is also attested in a number of other sources: Alexander of Lycopolis Contra Manichaeos opiniones disputato 2, 9 (Brinkmann, 5, lines 11-13; 14, lines 18-21); the Nestorian History (A. Scher, Historie Nestorienne [Chronique de Sïrê], PO 4,3 [Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1908], 227); Ibn al-Nadim (Dodge, 778, 788); al-Biruni (cited in M. Browder, “Al-Biruni as a Source for Mani and Manicheism” [Ph.D. diss, Duke Univ., 1982], 57); al-Maturidi (cited in Monnot, 147, 148); al-Mutahhar b. Tahir al-Maqdisi (cited in Vajda, 10); Ibn Hazm (cited in Vajda, 11); Al-Qasim b. Ibrahim (cited in Vajda, 21).

19 Augustine Contra epistulam fundamenti 19-21 (Zycha, 216, lines 13-14; 217, lines 13-15; 218, line 25-219, line 1); De vera religione 49 (96) [J. Martin, Sancti Aurelii Augustini De doctrina christiana, De vera religione [Turnhout: Brepols, 1962], 249, lines 36-37; Conf. 5.10.20 (L. Verheijen, Sancti Augustini Confessionum libri XIII [Turnhout: Brepols, 1981], 68, lines 50-51,55-57). Cf. the Nestorian History (Scher, 227); Ibn al-Nadim (Dodge, 778, 788); 'Abd al-Jabbar (cited in Vajda, 115); al-Maturidi (Monnot, 147); al-Shahristani (Gimaret and Monnot, 661 [629]); al-Murtada (cited in Vajda, 14); 'Abd al-Qahir al-Baghdadi (cited in Vajda, 11); Ibn Hazm (cited in Vajda, 11); Ibn Abi l-Hadid (cited in Vajda, 13); the anonymous commentator on al-As'ari's Kitab al-Luma ' (cited in Vajda, 23); and the Christian theologian Mahbub (Agapius) of Mabboug (cited in Vajda, 9). Allusions to the Manichaean belief that the realms of Light and Darkness are at once unlimited and infinite and yet also limited and finite are found in Augustine (Contra Faustum 25) and the Zoroastrian polemic Skand-gamanik vicar (16.4; West, 243); see also
of Light lay the realm of Darkness, which was infinite in depth and length,\textsuperscript{20} since the realm of Darkness occupied the lowest quarter of space and was thus bordered on two sides by the Light, Augustine compared it to a wedge.\textsuperscript{21}

Augustine also added one further detail which is not explicitly mentioned in the Greek sources translated above but is found in the accounts of the Manichaean cosmogony given by Arabic Muslim writers: Above the realm of Darkness was a void which was infinite in extension and separated the realm of Light from the realm of Darkness.\textsuperscript{22}

Although Augustine does not identify the writings in which this account of the cosmogony was presented, one can formulate a reasonable hypothesis by comparing his testimony with that of Titus of Bostra and the Muslim doxographer al-Shahrastani. Describing the infinite extension of the realm of Light in every direction save that in which it was bounded by the realm of Darkness, Augustine commented that this doctrine was expounded in certain writings of Mani which were known to only a few of the elect.\textsuperscript{23} Al-Shahrastani's report is more explicit, indicating that this doctrine was set forth in

\footnotesize{É. Chavannes and P. Pelliot, "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine," \textit{Journal Asiatique} ser. 10, v. 18 (1911), 527.}

\textsuperscript{20} Augustine \textit{Contra epistulam fundamenti} 21 (Zycha, 218, lines 18-19; 219, lines 2-3); \textit{De moribus Manichaeorum} 9 (PL 32, 1351); Ibn al-Nadim (Dodge, 778, 788). Cf. the \textit{Nestorian History} (Scher, 227); Ibn Abi-l-Hadi\lil (cited in Vajda, 13); the anonymous commentator on al-Ash'ari's \textit{Kitab al- Luma'} (cited in Vajda, 23); compare also the Mandaeans Right \textit{Ginza} 7 (Lidzbarski, 277, line 27). This unequal allocation of primordial space (with the forces of evil initially occupying only one quarter) may explain the curious remark in Alexander of Lycopolis about "the measure of God's goodness far surpassing that of the evilness of matter" (C. Man. opin. 2; Brinkmann, 3; tr. of P.W. van der Horst and J. Mansfeld, \textit{An Alexandrian Platonist against Dualism} [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974], 52).

\textsuperscript{21} Augustine \textit{Contra epistulam fundamenti} 21-25 (Zycha, 218, lines 21-22; 219, line 12; 220, line 11; 222, lines 3-4; 224, line 21); \textit{Contra Fausstum} 4.2 (Zycha, 271, lines 2-3); \textit{De vera religione} 49 (96) (Martin, 249). For the division of space into quarters, see \textit{Contra epistulam fundamenti} 21, 23 (Zycha, 218, lines 23-24; 219, line 2; 220, lines 9-10).

\textsuperscript{22} Augustine \textit{Contra epistulam fundamenti} 21, 22, 26 (Zycha, 218, lines 19-20; 219, lines 3-4,13-14,18; 225, lines 8-9); compare the reports of 'Abd al-Jabbar (cited in Vajda, 116 and G. Monnot, \textit{Pensees musulmans et religions iraniennes: 'Abd al-Jabbar et ses devanciers} [Paris: Vrin, 1974], 153-154); Ibn al-Murtada (cited in K. Kessler, \textit{Mani. Forschungen über die manichäische Religion} [Berlin: G. Reimer, 1889], 351); and al-Maturidi (Monnot, \textit{Islam}, 151). The Zoroastrian polemic \textit{Skand-gumanik vicar} (52; West, 246) and the Muslim historians Ibn al-Nadim (Dodge, 777-778, 787-788) and al-Shahrastani (Gimaret and Monnot, 656 [621]) were apparently not familiar with this idea; they inferred from the fact that the Light was bounded by the Darkness that these two realms must be contiguous.

\textsuperscript{23} Augustine \textit{Contra epistulam fundamenti} 25 (Zycha, 224, lines 23-27).}
the first chapter (chapter αλήθεια) of Mani's *Living Gospel* and in the beginning of his *Shabuhragan*. Titus of Bostra believed that the Greek source document's Mani quotations were derived from a Syriac-language work of Mani; if he was correct, one could plausibly identify this latter work with the *Living Gospel*.

This identification cannot be confirmed from the extant Eastern Manichaean texts, which include only a few fragments of the *Living Gospel* and provide relatively limited information about the primordial state which existed before the invasion of the realm of Light by the forces of Darkness. At the same time, the description of this primordial state (as reported by the anti-Manichaean writers) is unlikely to have been a teaching formulated and introduced by Western Manichaean communities of the Roman Empire.

There is instead reason to assume that this description of the primordial state arose in a Persian milieu and this may provide some incidental support for the hypothesis that it was ultimately derived from one of Mani's writings. Greek and Latin writers were quick to reject the idea that the domains of good and evil occupied divisions of primordial space which were infinite in extension but finite at their point of contact; lacking the frame of reference necessary to understand or appreciate this teaching, they regarded it as nothing more than a curious barbarian superstition. There are, however, some remarkable parallels for this teaching in both the Mandaeian and Zoroastrian cosmogonies, suggesting that this teaching may have been formulated for an eastern audience who had the background beliefs

---

24 Al-Shahrastani (Gimaret and Monnot, 654 [*619]) asserted that his information was derived from a (now lost) work of the Shi'ite scholar Muhammad ibn Harun Abu 'Isa al-Warraq (d. 861?), an exponent of dualism who had originally been a Zoroastrian and was well-informed about Manichaean teaching; cf. 'Abd al-Jabbar (cited in Vajda, 117); Ibn al-Nadim (Dodge, 804); and al-Biruni (cited in Browder, 61-62). Regarding al-Warraq's knowledge and use of Mani's *Shabuhragan*, see C. Colpe, “Der Manichäismus in der arabischen Überlieferung” (Phil. diss., Göttingen, 1954), 218-220. This same teaching was also attributed to the *Living Gospel* and the *Shabuhragan* by Ibn al-Murtada (cf. Vajda, 14), who was also dependent upon al-Warraq (Colpe, 245). As Gimaret and Monnot (660 n. 36) note, Mas'udi, likewise drawing upon al-Warraq, offered an abbreviated version of this report, omitting the reference to Mani's *Living Gospel*. 'Abd al-Jabbar (cited in Vajda, 121) reproduced this abbreviated report, making the same omission.


26 If Titus' testimony is accepted, the *Shabuhragan*, which was written not in Syriac but in Middle Persian and consequently remained little known in the Western Manichaean communities, could not be regarded as the origin of the Mani quotations given in the Greek source document.
necessary to comprehend and value it. The interpretation of the four cardinal directions as lines inscribed on a vertical plane (so that north and south are identified with above and below respectively) is found in the Mandaean cosmogony.\textsuperscript{27} Several other features can be paralleled in Middle Persian accounts of the Zoroastrian cosmogony:

(1) light above and darkness below;\textsuperscript{28}
(2) light and darkness being unlimited in all directions except that in which they meet;\textsuperscript{29}
(3) the separation of the light and darkness by the interposition of a void.\textsuperscript{30}

These parallels suggest that the description of the primordial state found in anti-Manichaean writers’ accounts of the Manichaean cosmogony was formulated in a Persian context and did not originate in the Western Manichaean communities of the Roman Empire. The hypothesis of a Persian origin for this description of the primordial state would cohere with the claim of Augustine and al-Shahrastani that it was derived from Mani’s writings.

In conclusion, Cumont and Kugener were correct to recognize that Titus of Bostra, Severus of Antioch and Theodoret of Cyrrhus reproduced reports about the Manichaean cosmogony which were drawn from a common source. Their hypothesis about the nature of this source document was evaluated by analyzing one of these sets

\textsuperscript{27} North and south are identified with above and below respectively in the Mandaean Right Ginza 1.11; 12.6-7 (M. Lidzbarski, \textit{Ginza. Der Schatz oder das Grosse Buch der Mandaer} [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1925], 7, line 3; 277, lines 16-17; 280, lines 3,32-33; 281, line 17). This identification may have arisen from the use of north and south as astronomical references (i.e. “north”=toward the north pole star; “south”=toward the south pole star); compare Mas‘udi \textit{Kitab al-tambih wa-al-istraf} 4.21 (B. Carra de Vaux, \textit{Ma‘ṣūdī. Le livre de l’avertissement et de la révision} [Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1897], 221), where the religious practices of the marsh-dwellers of southern Iraq are discussed.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Selections of Zadspam} 1.1; cf. \textit{Bundahishn} 1.3.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Bundahishn} 1.5. For the idea that the evil realm is infinite in depth and length, cf. also the Mandaean Right Ginza 12.6 (Lidzbarski, 277, line 27).

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Bundahishn} 1.4-5; \textit{Selections of Zadspam} 1.1. The source document’s description of the invasion of the realm of Light by the forces of Darkness, which lies outside the scope of this study; also contains a number of features which can be paralleled in Zoroastrian and Mandaean texts: the good is aware that the evil one exists but the evil one is not initially aware of the existence of the good (\textit{Bundahishn} 1.8-9; \textit{Selections of Zadspam} 1.2; cf. the Mandaean Right Ginza 12.6 [Lidzbarski, 277, lines 19-23; 278, lines 23-24; 279, lines 8-14]); the evil one discovers the light accidentally while venturing near the border (\textit{Bundahishn} 1.9; \textit{Selections of Zadspam} 1.3; cf. the Mandaean Right Ginza 12.6 [Lidzbarski, 279, lines 15-16]); the evil one invades, believing that the good is helpless and lacks the means to resist him (\textit{Bundahishn} 1.15); etc.
of parallels, namely reports about the division of primordial space into four quarters which were unequally allotted to the realms of Light and Darkness. Contrary to Cumont and Kugener, it was argued that this source document was in Greek (not Syriac) and was a summary of Manichaean teaching which contained some quotations attributed to Mani but was not itself identical with one of Mani’s works. Augustine’s description of the Manichaean cosmogony was seen to parallel the accounts found in the Greek and Arabic anti-Manichaean writers. Augustine’s account also provided some additional details which facilitated the reconstruction of the Manichaean division of primordial space between the realms of Light and Darkness. By comparing the testimonies of Augustine, Titus of Bostra and al-Shahrastani, it was suggested that the Greek source document’s Mani quotations might have been ultimately derived from Mani’s Living Gospel. Although this hypothesis could not be confirmed from the extant Eastern Manichaean texts, it was shown that the source document’s account of the division of primordial space was most likely formulated in a Persian milieu; this would cohere with the claim of Augustine and al-Shahrastani that this account was derived from Mani’s writings.
PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF WOMEN IN MANICHAEISM

J. KEVIN COYLE

The word “prolegomena” did not find its way lightly to my title, but it is apt. There was even a moment when I thought of adding “Virgin Territory” as a subtitle and a means of emphasizing how inattentive scholars have been to the place of women in a religion associated in the modern mind with extreme dualistic asceticism. This scholarly oversight strikes me as strange for several reasons. First, because it is as much a commonplace to hold Augustine of Hippo responsible for much of current Christianity’s perceived shortcomings where the role of women is concerned, as it is to ascribe his own perceived “misogyny” to his never-quite-repudiated Manichean loyalties. Yet no one has bothered to winkle out what Manichaeism itself really had to say on the subject of women.

A second reason why the silence is puzzling is the attention scholars have devoted in recent decades to women and the feminine in Gnosticism. Whether or not Manichaeism really constitutes Gnosticism’s final performance on the stage of late classical antiquity, there are

---


undeniable points of similarity between the two, but so far the affinities have failed to move anyone to compare their understanding of women. And a third component in the mystery is that the authors of those studies which address women in medieval “Neo-Manichaean” sects have not attempted to ferret out parallels among the Manichaean roots whence the medieval groups purportedly sprang.

Still, the “Manichaean” (or “Neo-Manichaean”) label at least serves to remind how readily conventional wisdom affixes it to any méprise of women, the body, and sexuality. One might be excused, therefore, for concluding that the usual accusations against a movement as ascetical as this one is considered to have been—particularly in its cosmogony and related moral code—must imply an undervaluing of woman as both symbol and reality. Such seems to be the inference of Henry Chadwick’s curt summation: in the Manichaean creation theory, he says, “the differentiation of gender [is] a particularly diabolical invention.”

But what do modern assertions such as this have to do with the

---

7 For instance, L.F. Cervantes, in “Woman”, New Catholic Encyclopedia 14 (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) 994, confines his remarks on the subject to the following: “The irony of accusing the early Church of antifeminism is that there was a curious and powerful force in the world, outside and in opposition to, historical Christianity, that was undoubtedly antiseual, antifeminine, and anti-familial. This was Manichaeism...” See also P. Brown, The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 200-201 and 391-392.
8 Again, there is surprisingly little literature that directly addresses Manichaean asceticism, a topic most seem to have taken for granted. See J.K. Coyle, Augustine’s “De moribus ecclesiae catholicae” : A Study of the Work, Its Composition and Its Sources (Paradoxis 23, Fribourg: The University Press, 1978) 194 n. 733, for bibliography available to 1975; and now S.N.C. Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 63, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992) 80-187.
reality of women Manichees? This question, as I see it, would ultimately engage three lines of inquiry: Manichaeism’s idea of femaleness; its view of women in general; and the role(s) to which its female followers were permitted access. The last line will be lightly addressed here, in the framework of delineating considerations which need to be taken into account in any serious scholarly approach to the question. These considerations are: the data already available, the methodology to be assumed, and the indicators for future research.

1. What is known

Despite the obvious difficulties in gleaning information from primary sources which are now lacunary at best and which seldom seem to give specific attention to the topic of women, some constants do appear:

1.1. We know for a fact that there were women Manichees, and that like their male counterparts they were divided into Hearer(s) and Elect. The existence of both groups is attested by Mani-

---


11 Electae are shown in frescoes (9/10 cent.) at Kara-Kotscho in Chinese Turkestan: see H.-J. Klimkeit, Manichaean Art and Calligraphy (Iconography of Reli-
cheers themselves, as well as by Christian opponents. 12

1.2. On the other hand, nothing has yet come to light which unequivocally demonstrates that women held rank in the three-tiered Manichaean hierarchy of presbyters, bishops, and apostles. 13 Nor do they appear to have shared the rootlessness which often characterized male Elect, 14 at least in the West. 15 And no evidence has yet emerged

---

12 See Ephrem, in C.W. Mitchell, S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Manxian and Barhaian I (London-Oxford: Williams and Northgate, 1912) 128;2; and the second Greek formula of abjuration (PG 1, col. 1468). Augustine refers several times to Manichaean sanctimoniales, even providing the name of one of them (De haeresibus 46, CCL 46, 315.73): “Eusebian quandam manichaeam quasi sanctimoniam...” See the reference to women Elect in an anti-Manichaean letter written in Egypt ca. 300 (Papyrus Rylands 469, ff. 31-32) in C.H. Roberts, Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester III (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938) 42 and 45; also in A. Adam, Texte zum Manichäismus (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1954) 53.

13 On these ranks see Coyle, Augustine’s 348-351. In Turfan fragment M 801a women Elect are named after all the ranking males, including male Elect: see Klimkeit, Hymnen 172 (ident, Gnosis 137); and Henning, “Ein manichäisches” 24-25. The only text which might indicate higher ranks for women is the ambiguous passage (85 c22) of the Chinese treatise (ca. 900) first edited by Chavannes and Pelliot, “Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine I”, Journal Asiatique Xe série, t. XVIII (1911) 585: “and the community of the Four Groups, men and women...”. (Schmidt-Glentzner, Chinesische 101). This document, known as the “Compendium of Mani, the Buddha of Light”, (Moni quang fo jiao fa i liuh, British Museum Or. S.3969), and written in 731 C.E., according to Schmidt-Glentzner, op. cit. 73, or in 724, according to G. Haloun and W.B. Henning, “The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light”, Asia Major n.s. 3, part 2 (1952) 198 n. 4, refers to these groups (the fifth comprises the Hearers) again in verses 80 b27 - c6 (Schmidt-Glentzner op. cit. 73; Haloun and Henning, op. cit. 195).

14 What Abels and Harrison affirm of Catharism (“The Participation” 226) also seems applicable to Manichaeans, even if no true historical link exists between the two groups: “Clearly, then, perfectae were far less active than their male counterparts. A partial explanation may be in the nature of their respective activities. While the perfecti, especially the bishops and deacons (positions filled only by men), traveled extensively, preaching and administering the consolamentum, female perfects [...] by and large, did not.” In fact, the Cathar perfectae seem to have become wanderers only after the Inquisition made their settled communal lifestyle impossible.

15 One must therefore be wary of Brown's assertion (The Body and Society 202) that “throughout the late third and fourth centuries, Paul and Thecla walked the roads of Syria together, in the form of the little groups of ‘Elect’ men and women, moving from city to city. As members of the ‘Elect,’ Manichaean women traveled on long missionary journeys with their male peers.” What sources support this?
that women exercised “special” ministries carried out by the Elect, such as preacher, lector, scribe, or cantor.16

1.3. Yet Manichaean literature offers no explicitly “misogynistic” texts. There is none of the “devil’s gateway” rhetoric of a Tertullian,17 nor even—whatever its intended meaning—the Gnostic symbol of the female having to become male in order to attain perfection, as in the Gospel of Thomas.18 A well-known passage in a Coptic Manichaean Jesus-psalm appears to be directed against the Christian doctrine of Incarnation, rather than against women and/or childbirth

\[
\text{Shall I lay waste a kingdom that I may furnish a woman’s womb?...}
\]

\[
\text{Thy holy womb is the Luminaries that conceive thee. The trees and the fruits—in them is thy holy body.19}
\]

While, as we have seen Chadwick observe, sexual differentiation was to Manichaean thinking probably not a good thing,20 Manichees seem to have resigned themselves to its inevitability; and women, their childbearing capabilities notwithstanding,21 were not only tolerated in the Coptic Manichaean tradition, but specific women were even revered.22 (Still, women do not figure very much in the Manichaean “biographies” of their founder.)23

---

16 See Turfan fragment M 801a (Boyce, A Reader 158; Klimkeit, Hymnen 172; idem, Gnosis 137). But see also below, note 24.
17 Tert., De cultu feminarum I,1:2 (CCL 1, 343.16).
19 C.R.G. Allberry, A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection II, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938) 121.29-32; see also 52.22-26 and 122.19-25.
20 See Coptic Kephalaia 41 in C. Schmidt et al., Kephalaia: 1. Hälfte, Liefungen 1-10 (Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin I, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1940) 105.31-33; English in Gardner, The Kephalaia 110); and Augustine, De continenta 10:24 (CSEL 41, 171.8-10).
1.4. The absence of specifically “mysogynistic” literature suggests, in fact, that Manichees were no more “anti-women” than any other religious group of their time(s), and possibly less so than some. But if there was no blatant “misogyny” as such in Manichaeism, there also appears to have been less scope for female than male initiative. There is no clear indication of a woman having authored any of its major literature,24 nor of women’s independent missionary activity.

1.5. In contrast to Gnostic speculation, the female figure Psyché/Sophia of Manichaeism has never fallen.25 Here Douglas Parrott suggests an interesting avenue of research, as he speculates on why this figure was the one to fall in Gnostic reflection: “It seems to me that the reason was that the Gnostics found that a basic conviction about women converged with their basic attitude about the soul. They were therefore able to use the story of a female to tell about the soul [...] becoming male.”26

If what he says rings true, might not the omission of a feminine

---

23 Jan Bremmer may have lapsed into generalization when he says, in “Why Did Early Christianity Attract Upper Class Women?” in Fructus Centesimus: Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M Bartelink à l’occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire eds. A.A.R. Bastiaensen et al. (Instrumenta Patristica XIX, Steenbrugge, Belg.: in Abbatia S. Petri, 1989) 39: “Mani also paid attention to women, who proved to be so important for his religion that the Manichaean tradition related the simultaneous conversion of his father Pattikios and an unnamed woman.” He refers here to the Cologne Mani-Codex, 117, and the commentary of A. Henrichs and L. Koenen in “Der Kölner Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)” Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 44 (1981) 308.

24 Although, on phonetic grounds, Peter Bryder considers verses 120-153 of the Chinese hymn-scroll (Schmidt-Glintzer, Chinesische 26-29) to have been composed by a Manichaean “teacher” named Maria, “contrary to earlier translations” (E-mail message of August 9, 1994, ID <0IHPF6S66UJE000RC6$ gemini.ldc.lu.se>). Similarly, Jason BeDuhn has identified the names of women at the end of two Iranian Manichaean hymns in M 797 (Kanig Wilast at I.R.7 and Isprahm Naz at II.V.12) as the authors of those hymns in “Appendix I: Middle Iranian and Turkic Texts associated with Manichaean Art from Turfan”, in Zsuzsanna Gulácsi, Medieval Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections (Turnhout: Brepols 1999) Text 13. One cannot, of course, conclude from these possibilities that women authors were more widely active in Manichaeism; but the subject should be explored.


26 D.M. Parrott, response to M. Scopello in King (ed.), Images 93-94.
symbol of a “fall” which, after all, Manichees held to be real, indicate a different attitude toward both the soul and the female? However that question should be answered, one cannot exclude the possibility of Gnostic influences on the role certain female figures are given in Manichaeism, including Mary, Martha, Salome, and Arsinoe.27

2. Hermeneutical considerations

There are, of course, principles of interpretation to be applied in any scholarly endeavor. But what principles are particularly germane to a study like this, especially given the dearth of previous work on the subject? Though far from exhaustive, here is a list of hermeneutical considerations the researcher ought to bear in mind:

2.1. In 1992 Winsome Munro wrote: “Crucial to feminist scholarship is obviously its selection of subjects for investigation. Who and what to notice or overlook, what questions to ask, what to leave unasked, what to highlight or ignore, all have much to do with the life stance, values, and interest of the researcher. Feminist scholars consciously bring their stance with them into their scholarship. The stance of androcentric scholars, on the other hand, is almost always unconscious, because androcentrism is still the unacknowledged norm that passes for objectivity in New Testament scholarship as elsewhere in the academy.”28

Conscious or not, androcentrism must be counted among the hazards the would-be investigator could risk. There are other perils as well; that, for example, of forgetting that Manichaeism was a phenomenon marked by great geographical diversity and impressive longevity, encompassing in both respects a vista more sweeping than Gnosticism ever did. It would therefore be too much to expect to find, throughout Manichaeism’s entire tenure, a single, homogene-

27 They appear together in the Coptic Psalms of Thôm (Allberry, A Manichaean 192.21-24 and 194.19-22), Mary, Salome, and Arsinoe are named together in Turfan fragment M 18 (Parthian), verse 3 (Müller, “Handschriften-Reste” 35; Boyce, A Reader 126; another German translation in Klimkeit, Hymnen 109; English in idem, Gnosis 70); and—probably influenced by Mark 16:1—“Mariam, Shalom, Mariam” are mentioned on the reverse side of the same fragment (Müller, ibid., 34, Klimkeit, loc. cit., and Boyce, loc. cit.).

ous approach to a matter with such practical implications as the role of women. Should evidence eventually come to light to alter the observations made in the first section of this article, any definitively identified witnesses must still be placed within a range of religious, social, and anthropological assumptions differing according to the contemporary societies of which Manichaeism was a component.

2.2. Careful reflection is also required before extrapolating from the recoverable elements of defunct cultures to self-assured assertions regarding a smaller group within those cultures. It is no exaggeration to stress that the elements which particularize a smaller group are precisely those which distinguish it from the larger, surrounding community. We may not assume, for instance, that we know all about women in mystery religions simply because we have recovered considerable data about women in Greco-Roman society; just as knowing about Collyridians would not necessarily provide much general information about women of fourth-century Roman Arabia.

In the case of Manichaean women, the alternative would be to assume that their coreligionists viewed them (or that they saw themselves) in the same way women lived and were regarded in contiguous societies of the ancient world. That would be an assumption in search of a foundation, since the available details about Manichaean social life are both sparse and inconclusive. Moreover, the assumption, as phrased, itself supposes one or more of three implausible scenarios: that women did not exercise different social roles in different areas of the ancient world; that they all shared the same or similar views regarding their societal role; and that such common views remained constant throughout Manichaeism’s entire existence, from the 3rd to the 14th centuries, and in diverse cultural settings, ranging from North Africa to China.

Besides, the assumption would merely lead to a still broader line of interrogation: how did Manichaeism itself fit into those various ancient societies wherein it moved? Or, as François Decret has put

29 Pace Madeleine Scopello, who asserts in “Jewish and Greek Heroines in the Nag Hammadi Library” in King (ed.), Images 87: “It is a matter of fact that we lack texts describing common gnostic ways of life, their habits and daily customs. So, it is more difficult than with other groups of people, for example, the Manicheans [sic], to learn about the style of life they lived and, as is our purpose here, to know which roles women played in gnostic ‘society’ and, more specifically, in the society of their time.” Scopello goes on to suggest (90) that women would have been attracted to Gnosticism in part “by a mythology where feminine figures played such an important role.”
it: “Nos nouveaux philosophes et théologiens, avec la formation plus modeste qui est souvent la leur, tentent habituellement [...] de dresser un système, une sorte d’épur doctrinale, dégagée des contingences de l’histoire. Exercices fort vains, en réalité, que ces «montages» prétendent, à travers des opuscules, présenter, exposer le manichéisme, un manichéisme coupé de tout substrat d’époque et de région, un manichéisme a-historique et de nulle part. Or, l’hérésiologue Saint-Epiphane ne qualifiait-il pas la secte d’«hérésie à plusieurs têtes» et de «serpent polychrome se confondant avec le milieu qui l’entoure» [Haer. 66:87, PG 42, c. 171]? Au lieu d’un essai de synthèse accolant des éléments disparates, d’époques diverses et provenant de milieux différents, il importe, pour une étude cohérente, de situer le mouvement manichéen dans l’histoire des mentalités, au coeur des patrimoines culturels de populations où il s’est diffusé, avec des bonheurs inégaux, qu’il a, peu ou prou, marqués et dont il porte lui-même l’empreinte.”

Decret’s warning should be heeded, not because the experience of women in any particular group would have gone totally unrelated to the experience of women in other contemporary groups within the same society, but because ancient authors who broached (however marginally) the topic of women and their activities must have operated from rather precise (and perhaps unchallenged) premises regarding the particular societal role women were expected to play, a role defined according to an ideological perspective which surely did not always represent the views nor the experience of women themselves, and was not overly concerned with referring to women’s own language, symbols, or frames of reference.

Indeed, even what we know about women (or the feminine) in Manichaean literature is usually applicable only to a narrow band of time and space. For example, more than other Manichaean literature, the Coptic Manichaica single out individual women for special mention, be they figures borrowed from Christian writing, or heroes from Manichaeism’s own martyrlogy. And doxologies which

---


31 The influence of apocryphal Acts of apostles on the Coptic Psalmbook is interesting in this regard; see Coyle, “Mary Magdalene” 45.

32 Coyle, “Mary Magdalene” 51.
consistently speak of women—and always one particular woman—appear to be a feature confined to the Coptic Manichaean Psalmbook.33

2.3. As Isaac de Beausobre pointed out long ago, the reports of their adversaries have to be distinguished from what Manichees themselves taught and believed.34 Yet, if an ancient society held to the view that women should play no role in public life, while Manichaean adherents to the same society entertained a different perspective on that issue, we would expect that adversaries would have lost no time in publicizing the fact. This seldom seems to have been the case. Augustine, for one, confines himself mainly to portraying women as victims of Manichees, even in those passages—of dubious worth, one might add—where he speaks of their participation in obscene rituals.35 Augustine’s sympathetic approach was not, of course, shared by all Manichaeism’s adversaries. In a statement that smacks more of rhetoric than reality, Jerome in 384 informed the young woman Eustochium that “virgins such as are said to associate with diverse heresies, and those in league with the vile Mani, are to be considered not virgins, but prostitutes.”36 Writing some twenty years earlier, Ephrem was scarcely kinder. His Fifth Discourse to Hypatius compares “those idle women of the party of Mani—those whom they call ‘the Righteous Ones’ (zaddiqāṯā)” to “those vain mourning women who were bewailing the god Tammuz [cf. Ezek. 8:14].”37

---

33 Coyle, “Mary Magdalene” 51-53. One name which appears in every (legible) doxology of the Psalmbook is that of Mariamme; next in frequency is that of Theona. On this, McBride, “Egyptian Manichaeism” 91, observes: “When one considers that the references to Mary and Theona are more than double those of all the other members of the Manichaean church, one may conclude that these women occupied a position of great importance in the Manichaean church in Egypt [...]. This stands in marked contrast with Manichaeism outside of Egypt which, while certainly affording women the roles of Elect teachers and missioners, did not go so far as to venerate historical women in their liturgy.”

34 See Histoire critique de Manichée et du manichéisme, for example t. II (Amsterdam: Bernard, 1739) 404-418 (on the formation of the human race).

35 See Aug., De moribus Manichaeorum 19:67-20:75 (CSEL 90, 148-156), some of which is repeated in De haeresibus 46:5 and 9-10 (CCL 46, 314-317). See also De continentia 12:27 (CSEL 41, 177); De natura boni 45-47 (CSEL 25/2, 884-888); and Contra Fortunatum 5 (CSEL 25/1, 85). The comments on this issue by Beausobre, Histoire critique 725-762, are interesting. On the ritual allegations, see also H.-C. Puech, “Liturgie et pratiques rituelles dans le manichéisme” in idem, Le manichéisme 241-247 (compte rendu d’un cours fait au Collège de France en 1954-55).

36 Jer., Epist. 22 38 (CSEL 54, 204.17 = PL 22, c. 422): “...virgines, quales apud diversas hereses et quales apud inpurissimum Manicheum esse dicuntur, scorta sunt aestimanda, non virgines.”

37 In Mitchell, S. Ephraim’s 128.3-6 (English, p. xciiii).
WOMEN IN MANICHAEISM

3. Future avenues of investigation

3.1. The preceding points suggest that one approach to the task would be to tear a leaf from Margaret MacDonald’s recent study of pagan views of women in ancient Christianity and attempt to discern how adverse criticism targeting Manichaean women might have affected the movement’s own view of them.38

3.2. Another question inviting exploration must surely be the significance of female entities of the Manichaean cosmogony. What does it mean, for instance, that in this cosmogony, at least as the Iranian sources have it, $\bar{\Lambda}z$ (or her Greek counterpart $\text{Hylê}$)39 is “the bad mother of all the demons”, the personification of the powers of darkness,40 which can themselves be male or female,41 and which were created as counterparts to the male and female emanations or figures of the God Narsih.42 And what is the purpose of allusions to the “Virgin of Light”,43 the “Mother of the Living” (or “of Life” or

39 On $\bar{\Lambda}z$ see van Oort, “Augustine and Mani” 143-144.
40 Turfan fragment S 9 (Middle Persian) in W.B. Henning, “Ein manichäischer kosmogonischer Hymnus”, Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse Jhg. 1932, 215-220; repr. in Selected Papers, I (Acta Iranica 14, Teheran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1977) [50]-[55]; German also in Klimkeit, Hymnen 69 (English in idem, Gnosi 38). And (I thank Peter Bryder for drawing my attention to this reference) see T II D 169 (Old-Turkic), verses 12-21 (A. von Le Coq, “Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho, II”, APAW Jhg. 1919, Abh. 3, 11; Klimkeit, Hymnen 229-230; English translation—amended here—in idem, Gnosi 293): “She [the demoness of darkness] sits down on his breast and makes him dream... / She comes, a deceptive, hoary old she-demon, covered with hair; / Like a hail-cloud she is toqš- (?) browed, like a bloody becan (?) is her glance; / The nipples of her breasts are like black pegs... / A gray cloud billows from her nose; / Black smoke issues from her throat; / Her breasts consist entirely of snakes—ten thousand of them.”
42 Turfan fragments M 98 I R, in Boyce, A Reader 61, Müller, “Handschriften-Reste” 38, and Hutter, Manis 10; and T III D 260 e (= M 7984) I V I in Henning, „Mitteliranische“ I, 193 [19], and Hutter, op. cit. 82.
43 As in Turfan fragments M 2 a V I (Henning, “Mitteliranische” III, 852 [279]; M 90 (Parthian), in E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz, “Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten” Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der
of the Just”),44 or the “Mother of the Truthful?”45

3.3. Douglas Parrott says that, unlike Gnosticism, early orthodox Christianity had “no negative characteristic branded as feminine, that was enshrined in the cosmic order.”46 The same may not be true of Manichaeism, which presents the great pristine war47 as occurring between a Principle of Light, referred to in male terms (e.g., the Father of Greatness), and a Principle of Darkness, often referred to in the female terms we saw earlier (Az or Hylē). Still, it should not be simply taken for granted that this gender-specific discourse had direct repercussions on Manichaeism’s view of women.

3.4. Now, what sort of woman would have been drawn to Manichaeism? This is a question which may be answerable only after further investigation of Manichaean methods of proselytization. So, too, might be the related question: What in the Manichaean doctrine itself would have encouraged the active, if limited, participation of women in the religion?

3.5. If women did, indeed, take some active role in this religion, we may be nearer to answering this related question: What would have drawn any woman to Manichaeism? Here we would need to stress the importance of distinguishing the Elect from the Hearers, and therefore we should take Peter Brown’s caveat to heart: “It is extremely difficult to know what Manichaeism meant to the average supporters of the church of Mani. It is easy to exaggerate the extent of the impact upon them of Mani’s powerful myths. They were not expected to view themselves or to attempt to behave in the same manner as did the austere Elect.”48

Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse (Jbg. 1933) 555; another German translation in Klimkeit, Hymnen 165 (English in idem, Gnosis 129); M 311 (Müller, “Handschriften-Reste” 67); T.M. 147, R, line 2 (Le Coq, “Türkische” III, 6); T II D 176, lines 14 and 21 (ibid. 15); and CL/U 6818 v in P. Zieme, Manichäische-türkische Texte: Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients (Berliner Turfantexte V, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975) 33.

44 See the references in Coyle, Augustine’s 35-43, passim.
45 Turfan fragments M 2 a V I (Henning, “Mitteliranische” III, 852 [279]); M 77 (Parthian) R-V (Henning, op. cit. 887 [314]; Boyce, A Reader 117); German also in Klimkeit, Hymnen 94 (English in idem, Gnosis 57); M 21 (Parthian) in Henning, op. cit. 891 [318]; Boyce, op. cit. 59). In T III D 260 e (= M 7984) II R II she is called “the one who appears in womanly form” (Henning, “Mitteliranische” I, 178 [4] n. 5; Hutter, Manis 30).
46 Parrott, response to M. Scopello, in King (ed.), Images 95.
48 Brown, The Body and Society 201.
Still, the Manichaean use of apocryphal “Acts” of apostles may provide a clue to Manichaeism’s drawing power. These writings seem to argue for a wider attraction to ascetical practices which included Gnostics as well as Christians—and some of the same practices were certainly in use in Manichaean circles.\(^49\) If Virginia Burrus and others are correct, the ascetical movement offered “autonomy through chastity.”\(^50\) The force of that movement would have accelerated with the coming of Constantine, i.e. shortly after Manichaeism reached the Eastern Mediterranean provinces.\(^51\) It is not unlikely that the appeal of Manichaeism fits into the larger attraction to ascetical movements within the Roman Empire, particularly during the fourth century.\(^52\) In fact, this avenue seems especially promising for understanding Manichaeism’s success, in particular, for explaining its attraction for women.\(^53\)


\(^{52}\) See e.g., J. Simpson, “Women and Asceticism in the Fourth Century: A Question of Interpretation”, *Journal of Religious History* 15 (1988) 38-60; repr. in Scholer (ed.), *Women in Early Christianity* 296-318. (However, much of this article is taken up with accusing Elizabeth Clark and Rosemary R. Ruether of writing revisionist history.) As Samuel Lieu astutely remarks (*Manichaeism* 180), “the diffusion of Manichaeism coincided with the Christianisation of the Empire and an important feature of the latter was the increasing popularity of the practice of asceticism.” Lieu alludes to Ephrem as claiming that women were being “seduced” into Manichaeism, “one by fasting, another by sackcloth and vegetables”: *Hymni 56 contra haereses* 23:7, 5-10 (CSCO 169, 88.21-26). But the context of Ephrem’s statement is unclear.

\(^{53}\) In this regard Jerome’s report that women who appeared ascetic were styled “Manichaean” may be indicative: see his *Epist. 22 ad Eustochium* 13 (CSEL 54, 161.4-5 = PL 22, col. 402): “Et quam uiderint tristem atque pallentem, miseram et monacham et manicheam uocant.” At a more general level, opponents of ascetical practices also labelled them ‘Manichaean’: see *idem, Epist. 48* (49) *ad Pammachium*
3.7. Of course, the likelihood exists that individuals had their own reasons to be attracted, just as the possibility exists that motivation varied from one culture to another, and from one historical period to another. For instance, Daniel McBride has argued that some in Egypt perceived in Manichaeism a reflection of “three specific Egyptian variants found in traditional religious expression: negative confessions, apocalypticism, and heliocentrism.” In such an event, would women have been attracted for the same reasons as men?

3.8. Wherever these inquiries may lead, Henry Chadwick raises an interesting issue when he asserts that “the religion of Mani was going to be attractive only to those who were at least touched by Catholic communities and wanted some form of Christianity.” This could only be true for areas where Christianity (in whatever guise) already enjoyed a discernible presence. The reason(s) for joining Manichaeism in predominantly non-Christian areas like Chinese Turkestan and, later, China itself might have to be sought elsewhere.

3.9. As a conclusion, I refer to my opening remarks on Augustine and Manichaeism in order to suggest the following prospect: should it transpire that Manichaeism’s stance on women was actually more positive—or at least no more hostile—than that of rival religious movements in the Roman Empire, one would need to seriously consider that Augustine’s own position on the issue was less negative than so often claimed; or, if indeed negative, that its origin would lie elsewhere than in the Manichaean affiliation of his youth.

---

2-3 and 8 (CSEL 54, 352-355 and 361 = PL 22, cols. 494 and 498), 112 ad Augustinum 14 (CSEL 55, 384 = col. 925), and 133 ad Ctesiphontem 9 (CSEL 56, 254 = col. 1157).

54 McBride, “Egyptian Manichaeism” 81-88 and 93.

55 Chadwick, “The Attractions” 214.
This study should be treated as work in progress, an attempt to outline the direction of my current research on the remnants of Mani’s *Epistles* preserved from three separate Coptic codices. The most extensive remains derive from that codex, known for over sixty years but never edited, belonging to the so-called Medinet Madi collection. However, the starting point for my research was the identification, whilst working with the still on-going excavations at Ismant el-Kharab,¹ of leaves from two further codices that contain (at least some) of these canonical *Epistles*. These latter remains are not as extensive as the former; but are nevertheless significant. This identification from Ismant el-Kharab then led to a rewarding and close collaboration with W.-P. Funk, who had already begun work on the Medinet Madi codex; so that we now work jointly on all three documents.²

The fact that Mani wrote *Epistles* (somewhat in the style of Paul as an “Apostle of Jesus Christ”) has long been known. The title occurs regularly in the canonical lists of Mani’s scriptures, both in primary and secondary sources.³ Augustine quotes at some length, and

¹ The excavations are directed by C. A. Hope, and are held under the aegis of the Dakhleh Oasis Project (A. J. Mills).
² This article was originally read at the SBL annual meeting (“Manichaean Studies Group”) in New Orleans, November 1996. It should be emphasised that it relies heavily on collaborative work in progress with W.-P. Funk, and that I owe much that is new here to his contribution. Of course, the article in itself is my own work; and I take responsibility for the form of the provisional translations as quoted here.
controverts, the “Fundamental Epistle.” Letters also play an important role in the (at least partly) fictional narrative of the Acts of Archelaus; and indeed various perhaps spurious letters of Mani were utilised in the heresiological literature, both Latin and Greek. Particularly important is the list of titles that an-Nadim provides (in Arabic and from the tenth century) in his account of Mani and his teachings in the Fihrist.

Amongst primary sources discovered during the present century, there are fragments identified as from the Epistles in the Turfan collection, which evidence a genre of literature wherein quotations from Mani’s letters are anthologised. Also, the Greek Mani-Codex quotes from the ‘Letter to Edessa’. Thus there is substantial evidence that the Epistles were widely known throughout the Manichaean communities, from North Africa to Central Asia; and that they survived as a corpus in various languages and, it can be presumed, at least for the best part of a millennium.

So, the first point to be made is that for the Epistles there are significant remains; and indeed there is enough here for us to be able to establish a clear idea of the format, content and style of one of Mani’s canonical scriptures. This will be a major step forward in the study of Mani and the religion that he founded; because, notwithstanding important quotes found elsewhere from these scriptures, notably the beginning of the Living Gospel, it is worth emphasising that contemporary scholarship does not have a clear knowledge of any part of the Manichaean canon (excepting perhaps the rather anom-
lous case of the *Shabuhragan*). This, despite all the advances made during this century right up to the Cologne *Mani-Codex*. I believe this point deserves to be emphasised.

As regards the remains of the *Epistles* in Coptic: From Ismant el-Kharab (Roman Kellis) there is, firstly, a single codex leaf with the inventory number “ex P 30 / P 55 / P 59B.” I have reconstructed this leaf from fifteen papyrus fragments, with one tiny scrap I can not place. Continuity of sense makes it apparent that only a couple of letters are missing from the end of each column; and so the great majority of the text is recoverable, certainly from the lower two-thirds of each page. The content concerns love (agape), and wisdom (sophia). That is, Mani, as the presumed author, appeals to the mysteries and wisdom that he has revealed, and calls for love and harmony amongst the community that he is addressing. A parable concerning a vineyard and a husbandman is introduced.

No running title or other information, such as page numbers, is apparent. The original size of the codex can not be known. Thus, to assign the leaf to the *Epistles* can only be conjectural, although I argue that it is the most likely context given the present state of knowledge. One possible identification is with the letter titled, according to an-Nadim, ‘to / of Aba, Love.’

Secondly, also recovered from Ismant and much more extensive, there are the approximately 100 fragments collected together under the inventory number “ex P 93C et al.” Various codicological problems remain with the reconstruction, so one needs to be slightly cautious about what is claimed. However, there are substantial remains of at least eight leaves, that is, sixteen pages of text. The extent to which these can be arranged into bifolia, and then perhaps even sequenced to give some kind of quire structure, requires further research. Still, it is apparent that the fragments come from a limited number of pages. For instance, in one case I have reconstructed seventeen separate fragments to produce what is essentially a single complete codex leaf. It appears unlikely that the fragments come from a great many leaves; nor from widely dispersed parts of the presumed codex, for some continuation across the leaves can be demonstrated.

The identification of this codex as containing the *Epistles* is virtually certain from style and content; and in particular what appears

---

to be the opening of a letter which can be reconstructed and read as follows:

Mani, apostle of Jesus Chrestos (i.e., Jesus the ‘good’\(^{10}\)) and all the other brothers who are with me; to N.N.,\(^{11}\) my loved one, and all the brothers who are with you, each one according to his name. Peace through God the Father, and our lord Jesus Chrestos, be it upon you my loved one; and may it guard you and ... you, your body and your spirit. The Father, the God of truth ... and so on.

Again, it is notable that there is no running header (unlike the Medinet Madi codex). It has also not been possible to identify with certitude any titles, despite what appear to be a couple of endings and beginnings of separate letters. Still, at one point Mani seems to speak about two letters that he has written: one concerning “the conduct (pl. ἀναστροφή) of righteousness”, and the other “the judgement of righteousness.”\(^{12}\) It seems conceivable that these are echoed in the two titles given by an-Nadim as fourth and fifth in his list, and translated by Dodge\(^{13}\) as “the well-being of righteousness” and “the jurisdiction of justice.”

Secondly, from elsewhere in the codex and perhaps a different letter, again some help in identification may be taken from an-Nadim. He lists the title of a letter as concerning “the ten words”,\(^{14}\) whilst in the Ismant el-Kharab codex what appears to be the conclusion of an epistle reads as follows:

Indeed, my loved one, I was obliged to write a mass of words to you this time; but God himself knows that these young people, whom you sent and who came, found me in some pain. For I was sick ... For all of thirty years to the day I was never sick like this occasion; and these young people who had come, I wished merely to proclaim the news to

---

\(^{10}\) This form is said to have been used by the Manichaeanst according to Alexander of Lycopolis, *c. Manich.* 34, 18-21.

\(^{11}\) The section containing the presumed single name of the recipient is extremely poorly preserved, but may end — s. There is space for perhaps eleven letters. Given that the name could be preceded by an honorific title or something similar, the possibilities are too numerous for worthwhile speculation.

\(^{12}\) From P 93C et al., provisionally read: ΠΑΝΑΣΤΡΟΦΗ ΝΤΙΚΑΙΟΣΤΗΝ / ΠΕΠ ΝΤΙΚΑΙΟΣΤΗΝ

\(^{13}\) Führst, ibid., II: 799.

\(^{14}\) Führst, ibid., II: 799.
them, and by mouth send to you without letter. However, my heart was grieved by the words of the brothers who are ill; because of this I myself was oppressed, (and) in great pain have I written to you these ten sayings that I might comfort your heart my child. I myself suffered ... Know therefore that these words I heard in suffering, you too receive them in joy and confirmation; and you understand them.

In sum, and with suitable qualifications, it appears that this Ismanto-Kharab codex contains a clear beginning to one letter, addressed to a single person; an allusion to a pair of letters concerning “righteousness (δικαιοσύνη)”; and the conclusion of the letter on “the ten words.” Codicological work is now needed to place these and other hints in some kind of sequence.

To turn now to the research in Berlin on the Medinet Madi Epistles codex, the identification of this work amongst the seven Manichaean Coptic codices brought to Europe in 1930 was announced in the famous 1933 study by C. Schmidt and H.J. Polotsky: Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. At that time already some description of the codex was made, including the quotation of the opening phrase of the Third Epistle to Sisinnios (this leaf no longer appears to be extant). It is known that the codex was similar in format to the Kephalaiia, including running headers and the titles of the separate letters by Mani. However, the codex was not amongst those that began to be systematically edited in the 1930s; and it is now commonly supposed to have been substantially lost in the aftermath of the Second World War, although some hope remains that the changed political realities of central and eastern Europe may bring some good news. Anyway, various references over the last half century to the codex and its fate have been collected together by Professor Robinson, and I will not repeat all those details here. Instead, let us concentrate on what is available for present research.

Unfortunately, to my knowledge no account survives or was made of the original size of the codex. However, if we calculate from an-Nadim’s list about fifty separate epistles perhaps multiplied by five

15 Perhaps read ‘wrote’.
17 An-Nadim first lists 52 titles by “Mani and the imams after him”, and then a further 24 “in addition to these.” The status of the respective groupings remains
to six pages per letter, we reach a possible total of 300 pages of text or 150 codex leaves. Of course, this has a vast margin for error, but it serves to suggest a sizeable original codex that is average for Medinet Madi. Now (and here I am heavily indebted to W.-P. Funk who is responsible for tracking and detailing these), there survive twenty leaves or portions (on occasion very little is readable at all) of forty separate pages of text. Fifteen leaves are conserved and housed currently under the inventory number Berlin P. 15998; together with other Medinet Madi leaves that presumably do not belong to the codex. One more leaf is housed with the Kēphalaia ("Keph. o. No. A/B"), and four leaves are in Warsaw.

I can here announce that a first draft of these twenty leaves has been prepared, initially from photographs by W.-P. Funk and now (not quite yet complete) confirmed or corrected or improved by myself on the basis of the originals. This draft is provisional. We intend, I emphasise, to proceed to a critical edition that will be printed by Kohlhammer.

So early is the work that it would be rash of me to include much of it here. However, the following titles have been read, together with the names of those addressed by Mani:

(B. 24) ‘The Seventh Letter of Ktesiphon: that about the vigils (πανυχισμός\(^{18}\)); addressed to (amongst others) Sethel, Abezachias\(^{19}\) and Simeon.

(f. 13) ‘The Fifth Letter of the Churches of N.N.’; no names read. The ending of the previous epistle, i.e., as preserved above this title sequence, reads:

19 An Abezachias, son of Zachias (?), “the interpreter (ἐρμηνευτὴς)” appears in the Acts codex (information kindly provided by W.-P. Funk); and also we should probably read the same name in association with Sethel the deacon as the two disciples sent to Abiran, the watch-tower (facis. ed. S. Giversen, op. cit. II: pl. 99, 25-26). On the names of Mani’s disciples, see now also J. Tubach, “Die Namen von Mani’s Jüngern und ihre Herkunft”, in Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico, ed. L. Cirillo and A. van Tongerloo, Louvain 1997: 375-393.
THE RECONSTRUCTION OF MANI’S EPISTLES

.. to the brothers and the sisters, my children, my loved ones who are in that place: Live and be safe! Pray over my son Koustaios, ... writes this letter in our Lord. Live and ... in my spirit and my love ... for ever and ever. Amen.

(f. 8) ‘The Letter to M...’; no names read.
To these can be added the now lost opening to the ‘Third Letter to Sisinnios’, as read by Polotsky and quoted in the original study:
(f. 27?) ‘The Third Letter to Sisinnios’; from Mani and Koustaios.

I will now turn from this summary of the formal details that survive to some matters of content. Since we can be virtually certain, I would argue, that these passages represent the actual canonical words of Mani himself, they are of supreme importance for recovering the origins and core concepts of the religion. I repeat, the great majority of Manichaean texts that survive are sub-canonical (e.g., the Kephalaia), or are products of the community (e.g., the Psalm-Book); and we cannot be certain how closely they represent the teaching of the founder himself. Various questions occur, such as: How exactly did Mani understand his role as “Apostle of Jesus Christ”, and thus, how Christian are Manichaean origins? Again, how much of the incredible doctrinal detail, and (for instance) the schematic formulations of series of divine beings and such like, is actually attributable to Mani himself? Or perhaps, to phrase it better, how should these teachings be positioned in the overall context of Mani’s missionary purpose?

For such questions, the evidence provided by the Epistles is compelling. For example, from the Medinet Madi codex, ‘The Seventh Letter of Ktesiphon’, we read (B. 24):

---

20 It is tempting to read “the one who”, which would strongly suggest that Koustaios (Kus*tais) acted as Mani’s personal scribe. This disciple is also named elsewhere in the Epistles: see C. Schmidt, H. Ibscher and H.J. Polotsky, op. cit.: 23-26; he appears as the author of the “Sermon of the Great War” in the Homilies, see H.J. Polotsky (ed.), op. cit.: xvi, 7-42 (header); and he is attributed as a witness in the Mani-Codex, 114, 6f, where he is termed ‘the son of the treasure of life’. Interestingly, he is also named in the Middle Persian text M 3 (r. 27) followed by traces of a word which Andreas read as dbyr “Schreiber”; but see the discussion in W. Sundermann, Mitteliranische manchaische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts, Berliner Turfantexte XI 1931: 130-131. Also, e.g. the references in G. Wurst, op. cit.: 37.
... on account of (?) our good saviour, our god (?) Christ Jesus, by whose name I chose you (pl.). I have gathered you in by his hope; I have caused you to be woven together by his sign and his good; I have perfected you by his understanding; I have made you strong by <his> faith; I have made his wisdom and his knowledge shine forth in your teachings like the sun. His is this blessed name and this strong power. He is the one who can bless you all, my children, my loved ones.

He can set his love in your head (?), [which (?)] is the Light Mind. His great faith he [can set (?) in] your guarding thoughts; his perfection he can establish [in your] good insights; and his long-sufferingness he [can ...] in your good counsels; his wisdom [...] also he can perform in your sharp considerations.

Now, the importance of this passage is not only the emphasis upon ‘our good saviour ... Christ Jesus’; but also the fact that here we find clear canonical authority for the listing of the five virtues and five intellectual qualities. These products of the coming of the Light Mind are familiar from a good variety of sources; with the same terminology, indeed with the same order. Now we can be certain that such are Mani’s own formulation.

The emphasis upon the authority of Jesus is a striking feature throughout the Epistles. Whilst it is true that scholarship in recent decades has in general returned to a more ‘Christian’ understanding of Manichaean origins, e.g., rather than Iranian and Indian, nevertheless I believe that Mani’s own sense of the personal authority of Jesus still needs further emphasis and discussion. This then impacts upon his self-understanding as regards his own evangelistic mission; and (further along) upon the self-perceptions of early Manichaean communities such as existed in the late Roman period village of Kellis.

To quote now from the Epistles recovered from Ismant el-Kharab, Mani writes: ‘I will proclaim to you, my loved one: My good saviour, the witness who is my father, ... he is my redeemer ... ’; and elsewhere: ‘Indeed, [I] pray for you in the goodness of our lord Jesus Chrestos’. In one of the better preserved passages Mani quotes

---

21 Or, “its (i.e., of the Light-Mind’s)”, passim?
22 Or, “it (i.e., Light-Mind)”, passim?
23 E.g., Psalm-Book 166, 38-167, 8; 174, 12-18; Kaphalaia of the Teacher 96, 30-97, 3.
24 Or “Judaeco-Christian”, “gnostic”, etc.
25 From P 93C et al.
The saying that our lord proclaimed by his mouth [has been] fulfilled in me: ‘The one who eats [salt] with me [has] raised his foot against me’. I (Mani) myself too, this has happened to me: One who eats salt with me at the evening table, with my clothes upon his body, he has raised his foot against me; just as an enemy would do to his enemy. All these things have I suffered from my children and my disciples, they whom I have saved from the bondage of the world and the bondage of the body; whilst I bear them from the death of the world. I, all these things, I have endured and suffered in their season from a multitude.

Here we find that an allusion to Psalm 41 (40), embedded in a logion that the fourth evangelist had earlier utilised in his narrative with regard to Jesus’ foreknowledge of his betrayal by Judas, is here revisited by Mani and applied to himself. It must be presumed that the allusion comes to Mani through the gospel tradition, especially as his own purpose is to align his experience with that of Jesus. The obvious question is as to the form in which the tradition was known by Mani. If it can be accepted that these are the canonical words of the apostle, then here we have a firm basis for discussing Mani’s own knowledge of the gospels; i.e. not the use of such by the Manichaean community at some unspecified or unknown point in time or space, but rather something much more specific that can be firmly if not exactly dated to the decades in the mid third century.

At this stage of research I do not propose an answer to this question, for there are other logia in the codices of the Epistles; but rather to highlight the possibilities opened up by these texts. In principle it seems less likely, though perhaps not impossible, that Mani had accessed a written version of John’s gospel. Is the particular form of the logion, especially he ‘who eats salt with me’, merely a free quotation or memory from oral tradition? How is the allusion to salt to be interpreted: is it indicative of the Diatessaron, or some non-canonical sayings collection, or such-like? The more general interest relates to Mani’s positioning of himself and his own mission with regard to the authority of Jesus, our ‘good saviour’.

The Epistles help us to understand the central core or thrust of Mani’s mission, free from highlighting by polemic. In this regard it

---

is noticeable (amongst the surviving leaves) how little space is given to cosmogonical and cosmological speculations, or to the multiple divinities and so forth, that attract so much attention elsewhere. Some limited material of this kind does exist amongst the remnants of the Coptic codices; but in general it seems that Mani's concerns are preeminently practical and pastoral.\footnote{27}{See also, e.g., G. Widengren, Mani and Manichaeism, tr. C. Kessler, London 1965: 80 – 81.} Let it be clear that I am not raising some revisionist thesis whereby the apostolic authority of such speculations is denied. I am convinced that Mani was greatly interested in cosmogony, astrology and the other sciences; and that he himself formulated the series of emanated gods including such as ‘the Beloved of the Lights’ and so on. However, the \textit{Epistles} may help us better to position these teachings within the context of Mani’s mission and purpose.

From reading these texts it appears that the principal qualities stressed by Mani are those associated with the ‘long-suffering(ness)’\footnote{28}{In particular the Coptic term \textit{тaияпωρηχt}. In this regard, perhaps see also the discussion, facs. ed. S. Giversen, op. cit., II: 114-116.} of the righteous. To quote again from the Ismant el-Kharab leaves:\footnote{29}{From P 93C et al.}

\begin{quote}
I reveal to you, my child, my loved one: Whoever wills life, and to add life to his life, long-suffering is what awaits him; because without long-suffering he will not be able to live. For, long-suffering has every thing within it.
\end{quote}

It is this sense of endurance in the face of the world, of which Jesus is the prime exemplar of pain and labour and rejection: This is the authentic tone of Mani’s teaching.

What then of Mani’s gnosis, his revelation of the divine and cosmic mysteries? It is interesting to conclude, as a kind of addendum to this paper, with a brief consideration of the “Fundamental Epistle.” This text, as quoted and controverted by Augustine\footnote{30}{Augustine, \textit{c. Epist. Fund.} et al., see Feldmann op. cit.; also Evodius, \textit{de fide}.} was one of the prime sources for knowledge of Mani’s teaching prior to the modern discoveries. Augustine clearly chooses this document as a principal focus of his attack because it is a text he himself knows well and read when he was an auditor, because he believes it to have unimpeachable authority for the Manichaeans, and because it is a
succinct and clear summary of Mani’s teachings. Modern scholarship has generally not questioned its authenticity.

However, a question arises over the text’s exact status for the Manichaeans. It begins in typical style: ‘Mani the living, apostle of Jesus Christ ...’ After the introductory sequence Mani takes up the question of the birth of Adam and Eve; and to deal with this goes back to the original status of the two kingdoms in the first eternity, light and darkness, and then their conflict prior to the construction of the cosmos. This gives the impression of a summary of Mani’s doctrine, which may indeed explain the title ‘fundamental’. The question of status relates to the text’s position with reference to the canon and the collection of Epistles. None of the various canonical lists from other sources refer to a ‘Fundamental Epistle’, nor does the title occur in an-Nadim.  

Various solutions occur to this problem. For instance, perhaps this was a regional title given by the North African and Latin speaking community to one of Mani’s canonical writings, such as the Living Gospel; or perhaps it was a localised handbook or conglomerate text of some sort. As regards this present paper the interest is as to whether the document should be counted amongst the Epistles. The cosmological detail found in the ‘Fundamental Epistle’ does not accord with the Epistles’ leaves recovered from Medinet Madi and Ismant el-Kharab; although not much weight can here be given to what is in large part an argument from silence.

In fact, there may be a clue in the Medinet Madi codex of The Kephalaia of the Wisdom of my Lord Mani where there is an account of the insignia of succession to be handed over to Mani’s successor Sisinnios. Here it is possible to read and reconstruct:

Take my great Gospel, [my letter of] foundation (θεμέλιος); and the letter that I have [sealed; together] with my tunic ...

31 It would be possible to identify it with such as the very first title given by an-Nadim: “The two sources” (various other candidates are also conceivable); see Fibrist, op. cit. II: 799.
32 Of course, this hypothesis would have to account for the known prologue to the Gospel as quoted in the Mani-Codex, 65, 23-68, 5.
33 E.g., note: “The Ordinances of the Hearers”, referred to by an-Nadim; ibid. II: 798 and n. 276 (Dodge).
It must be emphasised that the passage is fragmentary. However, if it is supposed that there are in fact three insignia, this would provide some convincing evidence to identify the ‘Fundamental Epistle’ as a descriptive title for the *Living Gospel*.

In sum, the status of the ‘Fundamental Epistle’ remains uncertain; i.e., whether it should be attributed to the *Epistles* as regards the canon. I am inclined, until further evidence comes to light, to treat it separately. Since the true authorship of other letters ‘by Mani’ quoted in the heresiological literature is even more problematic (or they are to be regarded as largely inauthentic fabrications and parodies), the detailed recovery of the canonical work must begin with the Coptic remnants from Medinet Madi and Ismant el-Kharab; then supplemented from an-Nadim’s list, together with the fragments preserved in the *Mani-Codex* and from Turfan.

This study has attempted to evidence the possibilities of such research; and I have particularly sought to stress how this can take us directly to the person and teaching of Mani himself, and thus to a defined context in time and place. Such will be the necessary precursor to understanding the actual development of Manichaeism as a religion and a community. Inevitably, this present article must conclude on a speculative note. The intention has been to provide clear indications of research currently in process, and of the directions in which it seems it may lead. Real progress has been made, and more is promised. All suggestions and contributions are warmly welcomed.

---

RECONSTRUCTING MANICHÆAN BOOK PAINTINGS THROUGH THE TECHNIQUE OF THEIR MAKERS:

THE CASE OF THE WORK OF THE RELIGION SCENE ON MIK III 4974 RECTO

ZSUZSANNA GULÁCSI

Book paintings retained on the Turfan fragments of Manichaean illuminated manuscripts constitute a significant pictorial source of evidence on the 8th-11th centuries phase of Manichaeism in East Central Asia. A large number of these paintings contain religious scenes whose themes fall into the categories of doctrine, theology, ritual, church institution and politics. The unfortunately poor condition of these precious works of art—an obstacle well known among specialists working with Manichaen materials—has prevented the assessment of these primary pictorial sources. Many of the Turfan book paintings are hopelessly torn and, due to their missing parts, their contents are lost forever. Numerous others, however, preserve intact compositions but have suffered considerable surface damage. Naturally, the ambiguities of such damaged paintings can lead to subjective interpretations and result in a false evaluation of their iconography.

The goal of this paper is to demonstrate that much of the original content of the surface-damaged scenes can be recovered if we understand the basic techniques with which the Manichaean book painter worked. To illustrate the effectiveness of such a reconstructive process, I chose one of the most important Manichaean book paintings from the State Museums of Berlin (housed in the Turfan collection of the Museum of Indian Art), the intracolumnar miniature on the recto of the codex folio MIK III 4974. My argument is or-

---

1 A preliminary version of this paper was read by Dr. Jason BeDuhn, and my discussion of the Work of the Religion theme in textual sources of Manichaean doctrine and rituals is built mostly on his scholarship. I am grateful for Jason’s ever so patient and generous support of this project.
Fig. 1. Reconstruction of the codex MIK III 4947 (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst)
organized around three points. First, I describe the current condition and verify the pictorial and literal content of this codex page. Secondly, in order to build back the lost layers of the miniature on MIK III 4974 recto and authenticate its original finished condition, the stages of the work of the Manichaean book painter are examined based on a study of the currently known fifty-nine fully painted Manichaean illuminated book fragments. Finally, I situate the iconography of the reconstructed pictorial content in Manichaean doctrine.

The Condition of the Folio

MIK III 4974 is the most complete Manichaean illuminated folio in Berlin (Fig. 1). Apart from the broken outer margins and two torn holes in the inner section, the central area of the leaf is otherwise intact. The recto contains bits from a header, a text in double columns, a miniature inserted into the text, and a complex marginal illumination (Fig. 2). As in all Manichaean book paintings discovered in Turfan, the miniature and the figures of the marginal illumination are oriented sidewise in relation to the writing. The heads of the figures are towards the outer margin. On the verso, where wide blank margins surround the two columns, faint traces of an illuminated header remain (Fig. 3). A continuous Middle Persian language passage is written on the two sides of the folio in Manichaean script. The text, whose faded red headers and first few lines are hardly visible anymore on either side, is a section from a benediction on the sacred meal and the leadership of the community.

Our understanding of the complex program that underlies the painting on the recto is restricted, because large pieces have broken off from the decorated margins and the brightness of the colors has rubbed away from the painting surface. Despite these damages, it is clear that an elaborate marginal composition is integrated into the illumination of this page. Although this marginal decoration is a sup-

---

2 For the reconstruction of the folio, see Gulácsi 2000, where the perpendicular orientation of the picture in relation to the writing as a characteristic feature of Manichaean book illumination is described, too.

3 For the latest edition of the text see BeDuhn 2001, No. 36.

4 For a color illustration of the recto see Le Coq 1923, Abb. 7/a, or Gulácsi 2001, No. 36, where both sides of the folio are reproduced.
Fig. 2. The recto of the codex fragment MIK III 4974 (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst)
Fig. 3. The verso of the codex fragment MIK III 4974 (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst)
plement to the miniature, it remains an independent decorative component of the page. Its design, conveyed in red contour drawing, incorporates two motifs of naked children, located one on each side at the two upper corners of the miniature directly above the area of the text. Of the child on the left, only his left leg, standing on a fully open flower, remains visible. Stems and leaves curl along the side of his body. The child on the right is complete, and his placement seems to mirror the left one. One of his legs rests on a flower while the other is lifted to the side. Music-making accompanies this dancing movement, for the hands of the child play the strings of a round-bodied, long-necked musical instrument. The damaged margins prevent us from seeing the connection between the child’s flower and the ribbon-like decoration that stretches along the upper margin in a long loop. At the bottom margin, however, a pond-motif is seen, with a pool of water from which a ribbon-like stem of a plant grows, suggesting that this pool may be the source of the entire ribbon-like decoration of the margins. Most likely, the semicircle of the pond was complete on the intact page, and the flower supporting the child was connected to the ribbon-like stem.

An intracolumnar book painting occupies the center of the page, splitting the area of the column into an upper and a lower half. Although much of the paint has rubbed away, two laymen in brown clothing, a vessel filled with food, and two elects in white robes are still clearly discernable against the remnants of the blue background. Vaguely visible in the upper right, a divine right hand reaches into the scene. The figures and the hand are painted on scales that increase according to spiritual rank: the smallest are the laymen, larger are the elects, while God’s hand is painted on the largest scale. The subject of this scene can be understood in light of the implements portrayed with the figures. In the foreground, next to the laymen, a bowl of food is found. Food, in connection with lay and priestly members of the Manichaean community, is the key component of Alms Service Scenes. God’s hand, however, suggests that something more

---

5 Much of my description is in agreement with those of Le Coq (1923, 46), and Klimkeit (1982a, 39).
6 Similar pool motifs frequently are seen in Turfan Manichaean book paintings, see Gulacsí 1997, 197.
7 The presence of the hand had been pointed to by both Le Coq (1923, 46), and Klimkeit (1982a, 39).
8 Additional Alms Service Scenes are found on three Manichaean codex fragments, including M 559 recto, M 6290 b recto, and possibly MIK III 6376 recto (see Gulacsí 2001, No. 37, No. 38, and No. 39).
is depicted here. Beneath the large hand, red-violet lines and a blank area indicate that the original scene contained more than what has remained visible to us.\(^9\) The motifs in the damaged corner of the scene can be interpreted in light of the basic methods of the Manichaean book illuminator. As we shall see, the lines and the blank impression of crossing stripes on the blue background result from five distinct techniques applied by the painter in subsequent stages of his or her work.

The Layers of the Painting

In the currently known corpus of Manichaean art, fifty-nine fragments contain fully painted book illuminations (Appendix I). Their complex decoration consists of five layers, which roughly correspond with the stages of the painter’s work: underdrawing, gilding, painting, detailing, and supplying the blue background. When a book painting is intact the underdrawing is hidden and the layers of well-integrated gilded and painted components are hard to distinguish. Most Manichaean paintings, however, are damaged and expose layers from the preliminary stages of the work.

Underdrawing

No matter how complex the sequence of the execution is, each fully painted illumination begins with a preliminary line drawing on the blank surface. This underdrawing accurately defines the shapes, sizes, and locations of the figures, plants, and objects depicted in the painting. As a tool for planning, it is intended to be invisible in the final product, and thus it is fully covered by paint or gold leaf. Since the underdrawing reflects the accurate shape and size of the objects, it offers the most help in reconstructing the original content of the damaged scenes.

In most fully painted decorative designs and all fully painted figural compositions, the underdrawing is made with a diluted, red-violet line drawn by a medium thick pen. Such a red-violet underdrawing can be seen in the badly damaged painting on MIK III 4956 a verso.

\(^9\) Le Coq interpreted the two white-robed figures as apostles or gods, and explained the scene as portraying their worship (1923, 46). Klimkeit offered an interpretation based on identification of the two figures as elects (1982, 39).
Fig. 4. The recto of the codex fragment MIK III 4956 a (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst)

(Fig. 4), which retains a section from the original fully painted outer margin. The stems of the two plants that meander along the widths of the margin, forming chains of figure-eights, were originally gilded, as seen in the middle of the fragment, where parts of a gilded stem remain intact. Only in a few instances of calligraphic headers and their decorative designs can we find the preliminary lines of the underdrawing in grey, as seen, e.g., on MIK III 4969 folio 2(?) verso (Fig. 5). In fully painted figural compositions, however, the underdrawing is always red-violet.

Rarely, the underdrawing can be seen beneath the damaged surface of the paint. One such case is found in the miniature on the recto of MIK III 4974 (Figs. 2 and 9), where the red-violet line of the underdrawing is seen beneath the white color that coated the robes of the two elects, and beneath the blue background around the shoulders of the laymen. Regarding the shoulders and faces of the laymen, we notice that the underdrawing was somewhat larger than the actual size of the figures defined in the final product. Outside the body of the figures, the blue background covered up the red-violet lines.
In the upper right corner of the same scene, too, remnants of the underdrawing are seen (Fig. 9). Discernible are a crescent shape and, directly above it, a circle. To the right and the left of the circle, remnants of additional small circles are seen. They all are executed in the red-violet line, identical to the one seen around the bodies of the figures. The combination of the crescent shape, the circle, and the smaller circles above the figures, isolated from the rest of the scene, suggests that celestial bodies are shown here—the moon in its waning phase, the sun, and possibly other luminous bodies represented by the smaller circles. It is clear that these motifs, similarly to the bodies of the figures, were executed in somewhat smaller scale in the finished painting, as confirmed by the fact that their underdrawing was originally covered up by the blue background.

*Gilding*

Gilding is frequently incorporated in large quantities into fully painted Manichaean illuminations, as seen, e.g., on the detail of MIK III 4979 verso (Fig. 6). To prepare the gilding, the gold leaf is cut and glued
over the underdrawing of the motif intended to be conveyed in gold. Then, the shiny area is transformed into the desired motif by delicate line drawing on its surface and/or overlapping layers of paint around its edges. When pieces of gold leaves depart from the painting, they reveal blank areas, the forms of which reflect the actual shape of the leafing. These are often crude and show no resemblance to the original gilded motif of the scene. In paintings with blank background, delicate contours drawn on the surface of the roughly cut leaf are employed to define the gilded motifs.

This is seen, e.g., on the close-up to MIK III 6258 b recto(?), which shows disk motifs at the end of the blue and red scarves (Fig. 7). Their gold leaves were cut in the shape of squares and then formed into circles by red lines on their surfaces. Most often, overlapping layers of paint aid in forming the desired shape for the gilded motifs, as seen, e.g., in the case of the golden stole of the main figure on the verso of MIK III 4979 (Fig. 8). Here, most of the undesired edges of the gilding are still covered up by the pigments, but some flaking off from the covering paint reveals the extent of the roughly cut gold leaf beneath the hair and the hand of the figure. When such roughly cut gold leaves depart from a painting with blue background, they leave behind a distinct blank area, as shown by MIK III 4956 a verso...
(Fig. 4). Here, the stem of the plant was originally gilded as seen in the middle of the fragment, where parts of the gilded stem remain intact. The loss of the gilding on other parts of the stem allows us to distinguish even the sections of the thin strips in which the gold leaf was cut.

Similar blank stripes left behind by lost gold leaves are seen in the upper corner of the intracolumnar painting on MIK III 4974 recto (Fig. 9). The motifs of the celestial bodies originally were gilded, as indicated by the blank area that became exposed after the gilding vanished. Understandably, the blank stripes do not reflect the accurate shapes of the original objects. The shape of the blank area displays that two short strips of gold-leaf were laid one atop the other at a perpendicular angle to cover the approximate final size of the set of these gilded motifs. Unpainted, their negative impression resembles a cross on top of the sun and the moon. Their final size were somewhat smaller than initially planned, and their large underdrawing, together with the unnecessary parts of the gold leaves, were covered up with the blue coating of the background.

Although in most cases gilding is applied directly on the underdrawing, occasionally gold leafing can be seen on the surface of paint, as well. Traces of two such instances are found on the chests of the

---

10 See Klimkeit 1982, 39.
laymen portrayed on MIK III 4974 recto (Fig. 9). At the chest of their caftan-like coats we can see red rectangular borders around a gilded area, which resemble codices with elaborate metal covers held by figures in other Manichaean miniatures and painted textiles.

Painting

The exact composition of the paints used by the Manichaean illuminators remains to be studied. The shiny, enamel-like surface of the fully painted motifs, as on the recto of MIK III 4983 (Fig. 10), however, suggests that either albumin or a glue-base binds the hues to the paper.\textsuperscript{11} The water soluble albumin, the complex protein found

\textsuperscript{11} The use of albumin and glue as binders in early Persian book paintings was discussed by Behzad (1938, 1921-1922); the properties of such paints are discussed in \textit{The Harper Collins Dictionary of Art Terms and Techniques} (1991, 132, and 176).
in egg white, is the less likely binding medium of the two, since it seems that some paints withstood minor water damage. More probably, glue-based binders were used, as indicated by the fact that the pigments stick well to the surface of water-damaged fragments. Glue, the hard and brittle gelatin, needs to be heated in water in order to dissolve. On MIK III 4983, the binding substance penetrates the paper, leaving the shapes of the motifs detectable as dark spots throughout the upper margin of the verso. Furthermore, on the recto, we notice a shiny, glue-like glaze of the round, red-violet flower beneath the header. The glue-like shiny surface of the paint looks very similar to the quality of the glue-strip (seen along upper section of the inner margin), which once adhered an extra piece of paper to the bend in order to strengthen the binding of the bifolio.12

Although the colors available were limited, their creative use resulted in a large palette.13 Most of the fully painted decorative de-

---

12 A preliminary analysis that aimed to verify the mineral content of the pigments used on MIK III 4983 (see Gulácsi 2001, No.15) confirmed the presence of protein in the paint (personal communication with Joseph Riederer, Rathgen-Forschungslabor, Berlin).

13 The richest palette among the Manichaean book paintings is found on the
signs contain the illuminator’s favored color-set: three basic pigments (red, red-violet, and blue) that are used in combination with the tints of these pigments (light red, light red-violet, and light blue) and black or white contours, as seen, e.g., on MIK III 6258 b (Fig. 7). To sculpt the forms on the two-dimensional painting surface, both shades and highlights are added to the base colors.14

The surface damage on the painting of MIK III 4974 recto (Fig. 2) has resulted in a significant portion of the colors being rubbed away, including the white color that provided the base of the robes of the two sides of MIK III 4979. Here, the color repertoire includes shades and tints of black and white, as well as various hues such as, yellow, red, red-violet, blue, green, and brown. This is the only folio whose pigments incorporate yellow (Gulácsi 2001, No. 32).

14 Shades are often employed to define the folds of textiles. Usually, the base color of the textile is lighter, and folds are defined by the shade of the color, as seen on the drapery of the dais on MIK III 4979 verso, and on the drapery of the desks on MIK III 6368 recto. The folds on the white robes of the elect are captured in extremely diluted grey, as best seen on both sides of MIK III 4979, and on the recto of MIK III 6368. Shades in combination with highlights define the faces of the elects, as well as the naked body parts of the four guardians on MIK III 4979 recto. A distinct use of white highlights can also be observed on the grapes depicted in the center of MIK III 4979 verso (see Gulácsi 2001, No. 32 and 40).
elects, and the pinkish hue that filled in the faces and the hands. Better adhered to the paper are the brown and the red pigments of the carpet and the laymen’s clothing.

**Drawing Fine Details**

A distinct stage near the completion of the work was to supply the details needed to depict the objects and figures in the scenes. Consistently, the body parts are surrounded by a red contour line, as shown, e.g., on the detail of MIK III 4979 recto (Fig. 6). The eyelids, the nose, the mouth, the chin, and the neck are conveyed using the same red line, whereas the moustache, the eyes, and the eyebrows are drawn in black. Such black lines together with the black lines that define the folds of the white robes are always the thinnest lines in the painting. Similar fine detail drawings in red are seen on the surface of gold leaves.\(^{15}\)

The sadly damaged condition of the miniature on the recto of MIK III 4974 deprives us of most of the original fine drawings in this scene (Figs. 2 and 9). Remaining are parts of the black lines in the contours and the folds of the elects’ white robes, and parts of red lines that outline the faces, necks, and hands. The gesturing left hand of the elect retains most of its contours, allowing us to discern a gesture mirrored by God’s right hand: the thumb and the index finger touching, while the rest of the fingers, as indicated by the middle finger, are stretched straight ahead next to one another. In both cases, the hands that originally were colored with a pinkish hue, are now only discernable through remnants of their red contours.

**Supplying the Blue Background**

Only at the very final stage of the work was the blue background added to the scene. On a better preserved book painting, such as found on MIK III 4979 recto (Fig. 6), we can observe the delicate care with which the painter used his or her brush to enclose the figures in solid blue, as shown by zooming in on the area where the

\(^{15}\) Similarity between the drawn details of Manichaean paintings allow us to observe stylistic correspondences. For example, the diamond-shaped contour in the fold of the drapery is identical in the marginal figural scene on the recto of the matched fragments MIK III 6265 & III 4966 c, and on the verso of MIK III 4979 (see Gulácsi 2001, No.29 and 32, respectively).
blue background meets the contours of the elephant-headed figure and the yellow rug. Similarly, the blue background must have been the last addition to the scene painted on the recto of MIK III 4974 (Figs. 2 and 9), as indicated by parts of the underdrawing showing through the faded blue coating around some of the painted figures and gilded objects.

The Interpretation of the Scene

The ambiguous upper right corner of the miniature on MIK III 4974 recto becomes less mysterious in light of the understanding of the stages of its production. The illuminator first drew the underdrawing that outlined the shapes of the celestial bodies and the divine hand. Next, strips of gold leaves were cut and glued across one another to approximate the area indicated by the underdrawing. Then, paint was applied to the hand. At this point, both of these surfaces were ready to receive the necessary details in red ink, which gave the hand and the celestial bodies their exact definitions. Finally, anything that fell outside of these defining contours was neatly covered up by the blue background.

The affects of wear and tear started to reverse the labors of the Manichaean illuminator. The gold leaf came loose, taking with it all the detailing on its surface, as well as parts of the blue background that trimmed its angular corners. It left behind the cross-like shape of its rough-cut components. Gradually, the blue background faded, revealing the underdrawing. This deterioration exposed what the artist had so skillfully hidden from the eyes of the beholder.

The above survey of the techniques used by the Manichaean book painter allows us to overcome the obstacle of the surface damage to the miniature on the recto of MIK III 4974, and thus recognize five elements within the iconography of the scene: laymen, food, elect, sun and moon, and God's hand. The two laymen are found at the lower right of the scene. They are seated on their heels on a red carpet, each holding a book with a fancy cover in front of his chest. Their sex is marked by their caftan-like lay garment that is tied at the waist and has a slit along the side, which is always visible regardless whether the figure is standing or sitting.\(^{16}\) The vessel of food in the

\(^{16}\) See the verso of MIK III 4958 and the verso of MIK III 6368 in Gulácsi 2001, No. 59 and 36, respectively.
lower center is located in the foreground to the left of the laymen. The sides of the originally gilded plate are fluted, as indicated by the rhythmical curving lines of the underdrawing. Its flat body is supported on three short legs. Inside the vessel, the contours of round fruits or vegetables are traceable. The two male elects on the left are dressed in the usual uniform white robes and wear tall, conical headgear. They, too, are seated on their heels on a red rug. Their bodies are executed on a scale twice as large as that of the laymen. The arms of the elect on the left clasp one another beneath the sleeves of his robe. The elect on the right is gesturing by raising his left forearm to the side with palm turned upward while the thumb and index-finger touch. The sun and the moon are in the upper right corner, above the gesturing hand of the elect. The upper edge of the waning moon crescent meets the lower rim of the solar disk. Originally both were gilded and it is most likely that other, smaller heavenly bodies were located along the two sides of the sun. God’s right hand reaches into the scene at the upper right. The faded red contour lines indicate the thumb and index-finger are about to grasp the sun and the moon. The gesture of the divine right hand mirrors the gesture of the elect’s left hand.

In light of textual sources on Manichaean doctrine, the combination of the five elements of the painting can be understood as a pictorial allegory, depicting what the Manichaeans themselves called “the work of the religion”, wherein the light particles’ way to liberation proceeds from (1) food to (2) the elect’s body to (3) the hymn sung by the elect to (4) light vessels to (5) heaven.17

The daily work of the religion, which daily ascends from the whole election to the light vessels, and the gods commanding the vessels lead it up [and] send it continually into Paradise.18

The iconography of its pictorial representation is built up from three sub-scenes: the alms service of the auditors to the elect; the sending off of the liberated light to heaven, and God receiving the liberated light. These three acts are narrated in the painting.

The first sub-scene, the alms service of the auditors to the elect shows the most important duty of the Manichaean laity. The alms service is a basic necessity for the elects’ existence and is depicted

17 See Asmussen 1975, 59-60.
18 Ch. 5555 (Sundermann 1985, Text b, line 120-124).
on three other Manichaean book paintings, as well. In these scenes, lay members of the community are shown providing the proper food, which the elects use not only to sustain themselves, but also to facilitate the Manichaean mystery, i.e., to liberate light from the captivity of darkness. In all of these scenes, the food, being the essential starting substance, is shown in the center and/or in the foreground. In the miniature of MIK III 4974, the alms service episode is integrated into a larger story in which the elects play a crucial role by using their bodies as instruments of the liberation of light. Their importance seems to be signaled by the volume of their bodies dominating the central area of the scene.

In the second sub-scene an elect is shown sending the rescued light on its way up to the sky to ultimately join the divine. I suggest that this deed is indicated by the gesture of the elect’s upward turned left hand. The focal role of this hand within the composition is signaled by its positioning in isolation against the blue background. An identical hand gesture, seen in a Manichaean embroidered textile (MIK III 6251 [Fig. 11]), aids our interpretation. On this textile, the Light Virgin, who is known in literary sources to assure the passage of the liberated light to heaven, holds her hand in an identical fashion. Above her hand, and beneath a waning moon, a jewel-like motif symbolizes the light. The context of this gesture leads us to translate the hand signal as releasing the light on its way. On MIK III 4974 recto, the same gesture is seen beneath the floating celestial bodies.

The third sub-scene depicts the freed light particles as they travel across the universe in the celestial bodies and reach their ultimate destination. The moon is called the “ship of the night” or “light ship of the night”, while the sun is referred to as the “ship of the day” in the Kephalaia. In our scene, it is not shown how the moon receives the light and carries it. Instead, depicted is how the moon forwards its light content to the sun through its waning phase. Ephrem in his Prose Refutations describes the role of the moon by citing from a Manichaean source:

---

19 These scenes are found on M 559 recto, M 6290 b recto, and MIK III 6376 recto (see Gulácsi 2001, Nos. 37, 38, and 39, respectively).

20 On the Virgin of Light’s role in the Manichaean ritual system as one who assists the passage of the liberated light from the body of the elect to Heaven, see Kephalaia 114, 269.14 - 270.24 (Gardner 1995, 275-276).

Fig. 11. Detail of the embroidered textile fragment MIK III 6251 (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst)
The moon receives the Light that is refined, and fills for fifteen days, and then proceeds to empty for another fifteen days.  

They greatly magnify and term it (the moon) ‘Ship of Light’ which conveys a cargo of their ‘refining’ to the ‘house of life’.  

The sun receives this Light from the moon.

The moon was considered to transmit the liberated light particles to the sun in its waning phase, which is represented in our scene by the waning crescent touching the solar disk. The painter also depicts the sun carrying its light content to the Realm of Light:

They assert about the sun that it refines what is Evil, because it goes and comes every day to the domain of Good, wherein is refining.

It is on account of its purity that it (the sun) goes and comes every day to the ‘house of life,’ as they say it.

God, the Father of Greatness, dwells in the Realm of Light, which is the “domain of Good,” i.e., Heaven filled with aeons of light. He is “the father who dwells in greatness, who is perfect in the aeons of light [...] the Father, the God of truth, the great Mind of all the aeons of glory.” The reception of light in the “domain of God” is symbolized in our book paintings by the divine right hand reaching for the sun with its touching index finger and thumb. The Manichaean application of the motif of God’s hand is analogous to that seen in early Jewish and Christian art, for example on the wall paintings in the synagogue at Dura Europos. The geographical and temporal proximity of the parallels from Dura to the origins of Manichaeism suggests that this motif was most certainly known and applied by the Manichaean already at the time of Mani, and retained until the Turfan era of Manichaean art.

In summary, on the miniature of MIK III 4974, the most important stages within the ultimate mission of the Manichaean religion are

---

22 *Refutations* 15.27-34 (Reeves 1997, 247).  
23 *Refutations* 178.45-179.3 (Reeves 1997, 248). 
26 *Refutations* 111.14-26 (Reeves 1997, 249-250).  
29 See, e.g., Weitzmann—Kessler 1990, Figs. 152, 177-179.
depicted through a monoscopic narration of the alms service, the sending off of the light, and God receiving the light.

The interpretation of this representation as a depiction of the Work of the Religion is in harmony with the Middle Persian meal-hymn contained on the two sides of this fragment. Since such meal-hymns were sung daily to celebrate the work accomplished, a loose connection can be recognized between the hymn and the scene preserved on our codex folio. Understanding the techniques of the Manichaean book painters permits us in this case, and hopefully in many others, to recover parts of a lost Manichaean world. At the same time, it enables us to shed light on a glorious episode of Mediaeval art in East Central Asia.
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**APPENDIX 1: HANDLIST OF MANICHAEAN BOOK FRAGMENTS WITH FULLY PAINTED ILLUMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Accession Number</th>
<th>Book Format</th>
<th>Type of Illumination</th>
<th>Last Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 81 TB 60:01</td>
<td>scroll</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Klinkeit 1996, 33; Turfan Museum 1992, Fig. 222, 231; Moriyasu 1991, Pl.17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kyoto fragment</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Shiruku Rendo 1991, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 S 30</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Sundermann 1996, Pl. 177 g, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 S 42</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Sundermann 1996, Pl. 183 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 S 49</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Sundermann 1996, Pl. 183 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 S 50</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Sundermann 1996, Pl. 187 a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kao. 1070</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Moriyasu 1997, Pl. 2-3;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 M 171</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 M 501 f</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 M 559</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 M 596 a - f</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 M 694</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 M 797</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 M 1156</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 M 4831</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>decorative design</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 MIK III 36</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 MIK III 104</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 MIK III 134</td>
<td>codex</td>
<td>figural composition</td>
<td>Gulaci 2001, No. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MIK III 151</td>
<td>3rd layer</td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MIK III 4943</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MIK III 4947</td>
<td>&amp; III 5 d</td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MIK III 4956 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MIK III 4956 b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MIK III 4956 c, d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>MIK III 4958</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MIK III 4959</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MIK III 4960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MIK III 4962 a, c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MIK III 4962 b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>MIK III 4964</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>MIK III 4965</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>MIK III 4966 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>MIK III 4967 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>MIK III 4969</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>MIK III 4972 a-d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>MIK III 4974</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>MIK III 4975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>MIK III 4976 a, c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>MIK III 4979 a-d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>MIK III 4983</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>MIK III 6257</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>MIK III 6258 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>MIK III 6258 b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>MIK III 6263 &amp; III 4966 c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>MIK III 6284</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>MIK III 6368</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>MIK III 6374</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>MIK III 6376</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>MIK III 6377 c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>MIK III 6377 a, b, d, f, &amp; III 6379 a &amp; III 6990 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>MIK III 6378 d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MIK III 6379</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>MIK III 6379 d</td>
<td>b, e - h</td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>MIK III 6626 &amp; III 6379 c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>MIK III 6989 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>MIK III 7266</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>MIK III 7283</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>MIK III 7285</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>MIK III 8259</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>MIK III 8260</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulácsi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Augustine, formidable polemicist and bishop of Hippo, had been engaged in controversy with his Pelagian opponents for a half-dozen years when, in 418, he wrote the first book of *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, dedicated to the *comes* Valerius, a high government official connected to the court in Ravenna. Valerius had forwarded to Augustine a request by Julian, a Pelagian and bishop of Eclanum in Italy, for an explanation of Pope Zosimus' condemnation of the Pelagians in his *Epistula Tractoria* of that same year. Julian obtained Augustine's work and wrote a rebuttal of it in four books, *Ad Turbantium*, to which Augustine proceeded to reply in a second book of *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* in 419. More systematically, Augustine attacked Julian's positions with the *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* (i.e., against two letters of Julian) of 419 and with the *Contra Julianum* of 421 specifically directed against the *Ad Turbantium*. Immediately Julian thundered back with a blunderbuss in eight books, his *Ad Florum*.

Now at some point between 419 and 420, a Pelagian bishop,
Florus,³ deposed from his Italian see by Zosimus, visited Constantinople. He delivered to Julian, now resident in Palestine where he had sought refuge in 419 after being likewise deposed from his see, a copy of the Letter to Menoch, attributed to Mani himself (cf. Op. imp. 166). One assumes that the Constantinopolitan version of the letter was in Greek and that it was translated by Julian (or perhaps by Florus?), but we do not know. Just how Florus obtained the letter is left mysteriously, and perhaps a little oddly, vague by Julian.⁴ At any rate, these two seem to have been working, and perhaps even travelling, together. This document became one of the prime pieces of evidence flaunted by Julian to convict Augustine of being a Manichaean in a (Traducian) Catholic’s clothing (cf. Op. imp. 165). Of course, Julian had already, in his earlier writings against Augustine, leveled the charge that Augustine’s position on sin was, for all intents and purposes, Manichaean. Perhaps in gratitude for the generous, and timely, gift of this letter, Julian dedicated to Florus his final trumpet blast against Augustine. The bishop of Hippo, whether because of the press of other commitments or because he wished to answer Julian only upon mature reflection, delayed composing his ultimate salvo until 429 and left it unfinished at his death in 430: the Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem opus imperfectum, as it is known, a curious, dialogic, work in six books alternating between extracts from Julian’s Ad Florum and Augustine’s ripostes. The fragments of what purports to be a letter by Mani appear in paragraphs 172 to 187 of book three.

These are the circumstances of the discovery and dissemination of the Letter to Menoch in the western, Latin, tradition. But there is one last piece of external evidence offered by a witness independent of that tradition. In chapter nine, section one of the Fihrist of Muhammad ibn Ishaq Ibn al-Nadim, the tenth century Islamic encyclopedist, reference is made, in a list of Mani’s letters, to “the first epistle of Maynaq (or Minaq) al-Farisiyah”, and “the second epistle of Maynaq, (on) the Tithe and Alms.”⁵ If Maynaq (or Minaq) and

³ This Florus has been identified (Patrologia Latina 48, 175 note a) as one of the eighteen Italian bishops condemned for refusing to subscribe to Pope Zosimus” Ep. Tract.


⁵ B. Dodge ed. & trans., The Fihrist of al-Nadim, New York/London: Columbia University Press, 1970, v. 2, 801, note 312, comments on the epithet al-Farisiyah: “This very likely refers to a prosperous village not far from where Baghdad was built.” But al-Farisiyah means simply a woman of Fars, i.e., a Persian (our thanks to Scott Alexander for confirming this). A third letter appears in al-Nadim’s list, to “Ardashir and Maynaq”,
Menoch are equivalents, then al-Nadim, at the very least, confirms the existence of letters to Menoch in what he considered the authentic corpus of Mani’s works.

But modern scholars seem almost universally to have denied the authenticity of this Letter to Menoch. Paul Alfarc regards it as a Christian forgery calculated to besmear the work of other Christian theologians with the taint of Manichaean heresy. He leaves open the possibility that Julian of Eclanum used the letter in good faith, having had its authenticity foisted upon him by the less scrupulous Florus. Indeed, it is just possible that the Letter to Menoch, devised as a weapon with which to smite the crypto-docetic enemy, originated during the early stages of the Nestorian or proto-Monophysite controversies in Asia Minor. G.J.D. Aalders suggests that it was a pious fraud, an example of Manichaean pseudepigrapha composed by some later Manichaean as missionary propaganda in a Christian-dominated milieu. Peter Brown in his biography of Augustine calls it, “a fragment of a commentary on Paul by a Latin Manichee, designed to prove from Paul, as unambiguously as Augustine had proved it, that concupiscence existed as a permanent evil force.” This characterization, however, is not quite accurate, unless Brown is employing the term “commentary” rather loosely. Samuel Lieu concurs with Brown, but adds that, “Augustine was quick to deny its genuineness.” Actually, he did no such thing.

It is now time to turn to the contents of the letter itself. It has been thought advisable to include such contextualizing matter from the Op. imp. as will make plain the views of Julian and Augustine about it.

on which Dodge comments, ad loc., note 313: “As Ardashir was the king AD 226-40, Maynaq must have been associated with Mani during the early part of his life.” But it is naïve to assume that the Ardashir of the letter must be the Persian shah, especially since there is abundant evidence of a proliferation of the name Ardashir in the wake of the shah’s ascent to supreme power in Iran.

6 We have been informed by competent Arabists that they are.
8 The views of Pelagius were often assimilated to those of Nestorius and other eastern “free-willers”; cf., e.g., B. R. Rees, *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic*, Woodbridge/Wolfboro: Boydell Press, 1988, xiv-xxv and 86-88.
9 “L’épître à Menoch, attribuée à Mani”, *Vigiliae Christianae* 14 (1960) 245-249.
12 Cf. Op. imp. 172(1) and commentary.
II. Text and Translation

(165) Iul.: ... lector... videbit enim ita in nullo Traducianos differre a Manichcis...

(Julian): ...for thus he [i.e., the reader] will see that Traducians differ in no way from Manichees...

(166) Iul.: Sed quia post editionem illorum oratu tuo, beatissime pater Florus, apud Constantinopolim Manichei epistula inventa est atque ad has directa partes, opera est aliqua eius inserere, ut intellegant omnes, unde haec pro traduce argumenta descendant.

Aug.: [...] 

(Julian): But since after the publication of those (books) at your request, most blessed father Florus, at Constantinople a letter of Mani was found and directed to these parts, it is worthwhile to insert some of it so that all might understand whence these arguments on behalf of the transmission [i.e., of souls] originate.

(167) Iul.: “Mani” apostolus Iesu Christi filiae Menoch. Gratia tibi et salus a deo nostror, qui est re vera verus deus, tribuat verum mentem illustret et iustitiam suam tibimet revelet, quia es divinae stirpis fructus.” Et post pauca: “Per quos el in splendida”, inquit, “reddita es agnosco, qualiter prius fueris, ex quo gener animarum emanaveris, quod est confusum omnibus corporibus et saporibus et speciebus variis cohaeret. Nam sicut animae gignuntur ab animis, ita figmentum corporis a corporis natura digeritur. Quod ergo nascitur de carne, caro est et quod de spiritu, spiritus est;17 spiritum autem animam intellege, anima de anima, caro de carne.”

(Julian): “Mani, apostle of Jesus Christ, to his daughter, Menoch.

---


14 A note on abbreviations, etc.: Iul(ianus) = Julian; Aug(ustinus) = Augustine; [...] = omission of Julian’s or Augustine’s words; round brackets include words that need to be supplied for sense; italic type = biblical quotations; quotation marks enclose quotations from the Letter to Menoch.

15 I.e., the four books of Julian’s Ad Turbuintum.

16 The form “Mani” is used here in the salutation of the Letter to Menoch; both Julian and Augustine, however, habitually use the Latinized form “Manichaeus” elsewhere in the Op. imp. If the letter is not authentic, it is at least interesting that the author or compiler knew the non-Latin, original form of Mani’s name, and was careful to employ it in the salutation.

May grace and salvation be granted to you by our God, who is in truth true God, and may he himself illuminate your mind and reveal his justice to you, since you are the fruit of the divine shoot.” And a little bit later: “Through whom/ which\(^{18}\) you also”, he says, “have been restored to splendor by perceiving how you were before, from what kind of souls you emanated, which has been mixed in all bodies and flavors and coheres in various outward appearances. For just as souls are begotten by souls, so the form of the body is determined by the nature of the body. What, therefore, is born from flesh is flesh and what is born from spirit is spirit (John 3:6); but understand that spirit (is) soul, that soul (is) from soul, (and) flesh from flesh.”

Aug.: (1) Si dicam tibi istam Manichei epistulam me omnino nescire, quamvis verum dicam, omnino non credes et mecum vana, ut soles, loquacitate contendes; sed si hoc dixit Manicheus, quid mirum est, quod se ipse destruxit?

(Augustine): If I should say to you that I do not know at all this letter of Mani, although I should speak the truth, you would not at all believe me and would dispute with me in vain loquacity, but if Mani said this, why is it amazing that he has contradicted himself?

\(174\) Iul.: Ideo non solum eloquendo, sed etiam repetendo inculcat dogmatis sui esse proprium traducem animarum putare, quod etiam per similitudinem generantium corporum approbare conatur. “Sicut animae”, inquit, “gignuntur ab animimabus, ita fragmentum corporis a corporis natura digeritur et sicut caro de carne, ita anima de animis.” Sed pergamus ad reliqua: “Sicut ergo auctor animarum deus est, ita corporum auctor per concupiscientiam diabolum est ut in viscario\(^{19}\) diaboli per concupiscientiam mulieris, unde diabolus aucupatur non animas, sed corpora.”

Aug.: [...] (Julian): Therefore not only once but often does he [i.e., Mani] affirm that he thinks that the transmission of souls is essential to his doctrine, which he also tries to prove through a comparison with procreating bodies. “Just as souls”, he says, “are begotten by souls, so the form of a body is determined by the nature of a body and just as flesh (is) from flesh, so soul (is) from soul.” But let us proceed to the

\(^{18}\) The antecedent of the masculine plural relative pronoun stood in the pauca (verba) omitted by Julian, and is thus oddly left dangling. For a discussion, see the commentary. Did Julian omit the passage because the antecedent referred to some element of the Manichaean myth that Julian found embarrassing in a document he wished to sound Augustinian?

\(^{19}\) Late Latin and apparently (according to Lewis and Short’s dictionary) a hapax legomenon.
rest: “Therefore just as the author of souls is God, so the author of bodies, through concupiscence, is the devil, as in the snare of the devil through the concupiscence of a woman, whence the devil lies in wait not for souls but for bodies”,
Aug: [...]20

(175) Iul. “sive per visum sive per tactum sive per auditum sive per odoratum sive per gustum. Tolle denique malignae huius stirpis radicem et statim te ipsum spiritualem contemplaris. Radix enim, ait scriptura, omnium malorum concupiscentia.”21 Vides, quo spiritu et propter quod dogma Manicheus concupiscientiam carnis incessat hanc legem legit esse peccati, quae si a corporibus auferretur, spiritalem se filia eius, ad quam scribit, factam videret. Quam opinionem quibus apostoli nitatur confirmare sententias audiamus: Caro enim adversus spiritum, quia filia concupiscentiae est, et spiritus carni,22 quia filius animae est.”
Aug: [...]20

(Julian): “whether through sight or through touch or through hearing or through smell or through taste. In short, take away the root of this malign shoot and immediately you behold yourself spiritual. For the root, says Scripture, of all evils is concupiscence (1 Timothy 6:10).” You see in what spirit and on account of what doctrine Mani attacks the concupiscence of the flesh, saying that this is the law of sin, which if it be taken away from bodies, his daughter, to whom he writes, would see herself made spiritual. Let us hear with what thoughts of the Apostle he strives to confirm this opinion: “For the flesh is opposed to the spirit, since it is the daughter of concupiscence, and the spirit to the flesh (Galatians 5:17), since it is the son of the soul.”

(176) Iul. Intellegis retectas esse Manichei dogmatis medullas, quibus fides vestra concrescit. Iam vero nos id est catholicos pergis arguer: “Quare vide, quam stulti sunt, qui dicit hoc figmentum a deo bono esse conditum, quod certi sunt ab spiritu concupiscentiae gigni.”
Aug: [...]20

(Julian): You understand that the marrow of Mani’s doctrine has been uncovered, by which your faith grew. Now indeed, he proceeds to rebuke us, that is, Catholics: “Wherefore, see how stupid they are who say that this form was made by a good God, which they know for certain was begotten by the spirit of concupiscence.”

20 Augustine interrupts the Letter to Menoch in mid-sentence at this point to comment; the sentence continues in Op. imp. 175 with no loss of content.
21 1 Tim. 6:10 radix enim omnium malorum est cupiditas, Vulg.
22 Gal. 5:17 caro enim concupiscit adversus spiritum, spiritus autem adversus carnem, Vulg.
Aug. [...]

(Julian): “With an unwilling mind they come together and with secret shame they act, at which time they consider light hateful, lest their works be made manifest (cf. John 3:20-21; Ephesians 5:13); on account of which the Apostle says: It is not of one who wills (Romans 9:16), so that may be understood: “this work”. For if we do good, it is not of the flesh, since the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication.” [...]

---

24 Rom. 9:16 igitur non volentis... Dei, Vulg.
25 Gal. 5:19 manifesta autem sunt opera carnis quae sunt fornicatio..., Vulg.
26 Gal. 5:22 fructus autem spiritus est caritas gaudium pax..., Vulg.
27 Rom. 7:19 non enim quod volo bonum hoc facio sed quod nolo malum hoc ago, Vulg.; cf. Rom. 7:15 quod enim operor non intellego non enim quod volo hoc ago sed quod odi illud facio; 7.20 si autem quod nolo illud facio non ego operor illud sed quod habitat in me peccatum, Vulg.
28 Rom. 7:8 occasione autem accepta peccatum per mandatum operatum est in me omnen concupiscentiam..., Vulg.
29 Cf. almost the same passage in Op. imp. 185 (which has been omitted below): Nam postquam dixit: “Ne manifestetur opera eorum; propter quod apostolus”, inquit, “clamat ad Romanos: Non bonum quod volo ago, sed malum operor quod exhorreo. Dolebat enim”, inquit, “quia peccatum id est diabolus operatur in eo omne concupiscientiam, legalis autortitas indicat malum concupiscientiae, cum omnen eius usum vituperat, quem caro miratur et laudat.” For afterwards he said: “Lest their works be made manifest; on account of which”, he says, “the Apostle proclaims to the Romans: Not the good which I wish do I do, but I perform the evil which I abhor. For he grieves”, he says, “that sin, i.e., the devil, performs in himself every concupiscence, legal authority indicates the evil of concupiscence when it censures every action of it, which the flesh admires and praises.”
30 Perhaps = “do it.”
tion, (Galatians 5:19) et cetera, or if we do evil, it is not of the soul, since the fruit of the spirit is peace (and) joy (Galatians 5:22). Finally the Apostle proclaims also to the Romans: Not the good which I wish, do I do, but I perform the evil which I abhor (Romans 7:19). (2) You see the voice of the contumacious soul defending the freedom of the soul against concupiscence. For he grieves that sin, i.e., the devil, performs in himself every concupiscence (cf. Romans 7:8). The authority of the law indicates its evil when it censures all its actions, which the flesh admires and praises; for all bitterness of concupiscence is sweet to the soul, through which the soul is nourished and brought to vigor. In short, the mind of one who restrains himself from every action of concupiscence is vigilant, it is enriched and prospers, but through the action of concupiscence, it becomes accustomed to decay.”

Iul. (1) Quid Manicheus dicit? “Per concupiscenciam corporum aucto­tor diabolus est; per hanc diabulus corpora, non animas aucupatur; tollte”, inquit, “malignae stirpis radicem et spiritalis fies; de hac apostolus clamat ad Romanos: Non bonum quod velo, sed malum operor quod exhorreo.” […] Aug.: […]

(Julian): What does Mani say? “Through concupiscence the author of bodies is the devil; through this the devil lies in wait for bodies, not souls; take away”, he says, “the root of the malign shoot and you will become spiritual; concerning this the Apostle proclaims to the Romans: Not the good which I wish, but the evil which I abhor do I perform (Romans 7:19).”

Iul. Nam cum nos arguisset, quia dicieremus a deo fieri homines, quos seminari fateretur per coeuntium voluptatem: “Stulti”, inquit, “dicunt a deo esse conditum, quod certi sunt a concupiscencia gigni, cum animo nolente coeunt.” Aug.: […]

(Julian): For when he [i.e., Mani] had rebuked us for saying that humans are made by God, whom we profess are inseminated through the pleasure of people copulating: “Foolish men”, he says, “say that it was formed by God, which they know for certain is begotten by concupiscence, when they join with unwilling mind.”

Iul. (1) […] etiam Manicheus ita disseverit: “Operae”, inquit, “pre-

31 See note 29 above.
32 I.e., “everything that is bitter to concupiscence.”
33 *opp*., found in the quotation of the verse in *Op. imp.* 177, is here omitted.
34 The feminine demonstrative refers to “concupiscence.”
35 I.e., “copulate.”
tium est advertere, quia prima anima, quae a deo luminis manavit, accepit fabricam istam corporis, ut eam freno suo regeret. Venit mandatum, peccatum revixit, quod videbatur captivum, invent animi divinum, materia concupiscientiae in eam seduxit et per illam occidit. Lex quidem sancta, sed sancta sanctae, et mandatum et iustum et bonum, sed iustae et bonae. (2) Sic etiam in illa ad Patticium epistula: "Quasi de primea factum flore substantiae meliorem", dicit, "secutus." [...] Mani also argued thus. "It is worthwhile", he says, "noting that the first soul which flowed from the God of light received that fabric of the body so that it [i.e., the "first soul"] might rule it [i.e., the "fabric"] with its own reins. The order came; sin revived (Romans 7:9), which seemed captive; the devil found his own limbs, he seduced (e.g., Romans 7:11) the matter of concupiscence in it [i.e., the "fabric"] and through that [i.e., the "matter of concupiscence"] he fell. The law indeed (is) holy, but (only) holy for the holy (soul), and the order (is) both just and good (Romans 7:12), but (only) for the just and good (soul)." (2) Thus also in the letter to Patticius: "As if (what was) made from the flower of the first substance (was)", he says, "better than what followed."

Aug.: (1) ...Hinc est, quod animam primam dicit a deo lucis manasse et accepisse istam fabricam corporis, ut eam freno suo regeret. Non enim hoc de homine, sed de anima bona dicit, quam dei partem atque naturam universo mundo et omnibus, quae in eo sunt, opinatur esse permixtam, in homine autem per concupiscantiam decipi. (2) Quam concupiscientiam, quod saepe inculcandum est, non vitium substantiae bonae, sed malam vult esse substantiam; mala non vacuum fuisset dicit Adam, sed eis minus habuisse multoque plus lucis.

(Augustine): (1) Next he [i.e., Mani] says that the first soul had emanated from the god of light and had received that fabric of the body,
so that (the first soul) might rule (the fabric of the body) with its own rein. However, he is not saying this about man, but about the good soul, which part of and nature of god he thinks is thoroughly mixed in with the whole world and all things, but in man is beguiled through concupiscence. (2) Which concupiscence, because it must be inculcated often, he wishes to be not the fault of a good substance, but an evil substance; (and) he says that Adam had not been free of evil, but had less of it and much more of light.

(187) Iul. (1) Persistit sane invchi in nos et adiungit: “Hi autem, qui concupiscientiam istam contra evangelicos et apostolicos libros, quos vacuo lectitant, bonum ausi sunt dicere, videas,” inquit, “sanctos eorum nunc cum filiibus dormisse, nunc cum pluribus et concubinis et uxoribus miscuisse negotium, nec hoc apostoli vident: Quae societas luci et tenebris, fidelii et infidelii, Christo et Belial?” errant glomerati nibilo concupiscientiae, cuius veneno ita fruuntur, ut amienia capti, cum hoc gerunt, a deo id concessum putent, quasi ignorant apostolum dixisse: Quae geruntur ab eis in tenebris, turpe est eliam dicere. (2) [...] Persistit igitur in nos faciensque apostropham: “Age tu”, inquit, “defensor concupiscientiae, aperto sermone narra fructus et opera eius. Ecce ego contra eam non timeo lucem, quam illa trepidat, quam illa odio. Omnis enim, qui male agit, odit lucem et non venit ad lucem, ne manifestetur opera eius. Videsne concupiscentiam mali esse originem, per quam miserae animae libidini serviunt, non sponte, quia hoc est, quod nolente animo gerimus gerimus solum?” (3) [...] (4) [...] Sed videamus, quid alius adiungat: “Denique omne peccatum extra corpus est, quia actual est; qui autem fornicat, in corpus suum peccat; omne enim peccatum, antequam fiat, non est et post factum memoria sola eius operis, non ipse species manet. Malum autem concupiscientiae, quia naturale est, antequam fiat, est, cum fit, augeretur, post factum et videtur et permanet.” (5) [...], in eadem Manichei epistula continetur id est. “si peccatum naturale non est, quare baptizantur infantes, quos nihil per se mali egisse constat?” [...]. et hoc ergo ipsum hoc modo tuus praecipitator exsequitur: “Qui his verbis mihi interrogandi sunt: Si omne malum actual est, antequam malum quisquam agat, quare

41 2 Cor. 6:14-15 quae societas luci ad tenebras quae autem conventio Christi ad Belial aut quae pars fidelis cum infidelis, Vulg.
42 Eph. 5:12 quae enim in occulto fiunt ab ipsis turpe est et dicere, Vulg.
44 Vide... solum; from the end of (2), is repeated here.
45 1 Cor. 6:18 ... omne peccatum quodcumque fecerit homo extra corpus est qui autem fornicatur in corpus suum peccat, Vulg.
accipit purificationem aquae, cum nullum malum egerit per se? Aut si necdum egit et purificandus est, liquet⁴⁶ eos naturaliter malae stirpis pullulationem ostendere,illos ipsos, quos amementia non sinit intelligere, neque quae dicant neque de quibus affirmant."⁴⁷ [...] (7) Audis, quomodo convitatur nobis? Amementes volentes esse legis doctores non intellegentes, non quae loquuntur neque de quibus affirmant, Vulg.; we owe the identification of this biblical quote to Stein ad loc.

(48) That is, “against us good Pelagian, and therefore orthodox, Christians.”
letter of Mani there is this: “If natural sin does not exist, why are infants baptized, who by themselves, it is agreed, have done no evil?” [...] (6) [...] and this very thing in this way your preceptor asserts: “(Men) who in these words must be asked by me: If every evil is actual, before someone does evil, why does he receive the purification of water, when he has done by himself no evil? Or if he has not yet done (any) and must be purified, it is clear that they demonstrate the sprouting of the evil shoot naturally, these very ones whom madness does not permit to understand either what they say or about what they make assertions (cf. 1 Timothy 1:7).” (7) Do you hear how he assails us? He calls us mad and stupid, in regard to what we either say or assert, we who deny the sprouting of the evil shoot, when we baptize with purifying water even ones who have done no evil, that is, the very young. To be sure, many of his thoughts have been put down (here); but unless the title indicated “daughter Menoch” and “Mani”, who calls himself the apostle of Christ, they would, without a doubt, claim you as their author.

Aug. (1) Finisti tandem, quae de Manichei epistula, quam tui collegae Flori orationibus adiutus te invenisse laetaris, contra nos pUlasti esse dicenda, ubi certe Manicheus concupiscentiam carnis accusat, [...] (Augustine): (1) Finally you have finished with whatever you thought could be said against us from the letter of Mani, which you, aided by the prayers[49] of your colleague, Florus, rejoice to have discovered, where certainly Mani rebukes the concupiscence of the flesh...

III. Commentary

(165) This explains Julian’s reason for including the Letter to Menoch in his polemic: there is no difference between Traducians and Manichees, i.e., Traducians (those who believe the child’s soul is engendered in the parents, and so in the possibility of transmitting original sin) are heretics. It is the Pelagians who are orthodox Christians. “Traducianism drew attention in the 5th c., especially in the West, as a result of the controversy with Pelagianism over original sin and its transmission in every descendant of Adam. For the Pelagians (particularly Julian of Eclanum), admitting the transmission of original sin involved accepting the thesis of the transmission of the soul, against the established Christian doctrine of creationism. Those who believed in original sin

were called, according to Augustine (Op. imp. c. Iul. I, 6), traduciani.”

(166) The passive language here seems suspiciously vague, as if Julian wishes to conceal something. Gerald Bonner says: “It was the Pelagian bishop Florus who, at Constantinople, found the copy of Mani’s Letter to Menoech...”


The letter of Nestorius was translated into Latin by Marius Mercator. But Julian does not say that Florus found the letter nor even that Florus himself sent it to Julian. Someone else (unnamed) found it. In other words, Florus had help in Constantinople. One would very much like to know more about how Florus obtained the letter and especially whether he was assisted by a person or persons sympathetic to his cause. Was Theodore of Mopsuestia involved? Perhaps not. “In 423 Julian... sought refuge with Theodore of Mopsuestia, mistakenly supposing that he would find him sympathetic to the Pelagian cause. We have no reason to suppose that he was treated with anything but courtesy and kindness by Theodore but his admiration for the learned bishop was not reciprocated, and Marius Mercator, who had no great love for either, records that, after Julian’s departure for Constantinople to try his luck there, the Cilician bishop was persuaded by his colleagues to concur in the decision of local synod which anathematized Julian and his doctrine.”

It is not clear why Rees wishes to distance Theodore so far from Julian; and even he admits that Julian remained with or near Theodore for a good long time: “Julian replies [to Augustine] with his To Florus..., written in Cilicia while he is under the

---

50 V. Grossi, Encyclopedia of the Early Christian Church, s.v. “Traducianism.”
If Julian did not have good reason to expect a sympathetic reception from Theodore, why did he go to him in the first place? Why, if his expectation was wrong, was he encouraged to stay with Theodore the considerable period of time it would have taken to write a lengthy work against Augustine? Would Theodore and/or other eastern theologians, interested in defending a “free will” position, have been so disinclined to assist Julian as Rees implied above? It seems much more likely that Theodore and/or his friends helped Julian and that one of their associates in Constantinople acted as research assistant to Florus. Either this person (or persons) did not wish to be named, or Julian was being discreet. Of course, this has no bearing on the authenticity of the Letter.

The final clauses of the sentence continue the argument in 165 above: not only are Traducians no different from Manichees, Augustine himself actually got his ideas from Mani’s letter (the implication surely being that Augustine is still a Manichee or, at the very least, his theology of original sin is, for all intents and purposes, Manichaean and thus heretical). It is to this specific slur (that he borrowed from the Letter) that Augustine replies in 172(1); see below.

(172) This form of address, imitating Paul, is well attested for Mani’s epistles, and even for the opening of his Gospel. Mani invariably introduces himself as “an apostle of Jesus Christ” in all letter fragments that have been preserved. The Fundamental Epistle begins: “Manichaeus, apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence of God the Father” (Augustine, C. epist. fund. 6). Emphasis on “the true God” is found also in the opening of Mani’s Gospel. His blessing on Menoch is not exactly the same as that employed, e.g., in the Fundamental

54 Ibid., 142.
55 Stein (1998, 12-13) adduces 2 Corinthians 1:1-2, which reads: “Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus... Grace to you and peace from God our Father...”
Epistle, but we have to assume some variation here.

Julian has omitted some portion of the opening benediction of Mani's letter, perhaps for the sake of succinctness, but possibly also to eliminate language too distinctively Manichaean which would work against Julian's intention to have Mani sound as much as possible like Augustine. The missing masculine plural antecedent of *quos* could have been some set of Manichaean deities or salvational forces, or perhaps the Elect.

The rest of 172 contains good, solid Manichaean language. *Figmentum* is probably a translation of *schema*, which is used in this sense of bodily form or appearance throughout the Greek and Coptic Manichaica. The reference to "every body and flavor" invokes some of the well-known Manichaean pentads; there are five bodily substances, five categories of animal life, and five "flavors" in Manichaean "Listenwissenschaft". The author quotes John 3:6 (in a form that differs slightly from the Vulgate). This biblical passage is fundamental to Manichaean dualism. It is cited by Fortunatus in his debate with Augustine in refutation of the significance of Romans 1:1-4: what Jesus was "according to the flesh" has no positive value for the Manichaean (C. Fortunatum 19). Faustus uses the same passage to defend the Manichaean position that only the spiritual human is created by God, not the physical one (C. Faustum 24). Compare Ephrem Syrus, Hyputias 82.22-31: "the sons of Darkness are corporeal because the body also... as they allege, (but) the nature of the sons of Light is

57 "May the peace of the invisible God, and the knowledge of the truth, be with the holy and beloved brethren who both believe and also yield obedience to the divine precepts. May also the right hand of light protect you and deliver you from every hostile assault, and from the snares of the world" (C. epist. fund. 13).

58 "Grace, mercy, and peace be with you from God the Father, and from our lord Jesus Christ; and may the right hand of light preserve you safe from the present evil world, and from its calamities, and from the snares of the wicked one" (Salmond 1987, 181).

59 "Five storehouses have arisen since the beginning in the land of darkness. The five elements poured out of them. Also from the five elements were fashioned the five trees. Again from the five trees were fashioned the five genera of creatures in each world, male and female. And the five worlds themselves have five kings therein, and five spirits, [five] bodies, [five] tastes..." Kephalais or the Teacher, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995, 34. The five tastes or flavors are detailed in Kephalais or the Teacher 33: salty, sour, pungent, sweet, and bitter; cf. M 840b, M 183, M 100 (all collected in W. B. Henning, "Two Manichaean Magical Text", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 12 [1947] 46, 55).
spiritual, as they say, for this Light also is consubstantial with them.\footnote{60}

(172) Aug.(1): Against what we take to be the opinio communis on this passage, Augustine does not claim that the Letter is a forgery; he merely asserts that he has never seen it before. His sole purpose in saying what he does is implicitly to deny the accusation of Julian in Op. imp. 166: that he derived his doctrine from Mani's letter. While Augustine may not have been an expert on Manichaean literature, he must have been familiar with much that had been translated into Latin. Thus that he finds no reason to suspect the letter's genuineness and, indeed, feels compelled to devote several pages to a point by point refutation of Julian's claims, may be of some significance to the question of authenticity.

(174) Apparently continuing directly on the previous fragment, this portion of the letter contains familiar Manichaean expressions of the duality inherent in the human organism.\footnote{61} Stein questions whether the clause about women ("as in the snare of the devil through the concupiscence of a woman") is actually from the Letter to Menoch, or indeed whether it is an authentic part of the Op. imp. at all.\footnote{62}

(175) Mani invokes the well attested Manichaean concept of the "five gates" of the senses, one of the principal avenues through which external evil bolsters the power of the internal evil inherent in the human body. The author quotes 1 Timothy 6:10 with one crucial variation from the Vulgate: concupiscencia instead of the Vulgate's cupiditas. Neither rendering is particularly close to the Greek philarguria. On the language of "roots" compare Ephrem Syrus, Hypatius 86.5-13: "(The case) is not as the apostates relate, namely, that 'the body is inherently sinful, derived from the evil nature', nor is the soul, as they say, 'derived from a chaste root.'"\footnote{63}

Galatians 5:17 is quoted in a form that owes little or nothing to the Vulgate, and that departs as well from the Greek. Rather than "lusting


\footnote{63} Reeves 1997, 251.
towards/against" the spirit, the flesh is said simply to "oppose" the
spirit, and "lust" (concupiscencia) is moved from the biblical passage to
the interpretation: flesh is the "daughter" of lust, just as spirit is inter­
preted here to be the "son" of soul. In other words, the human body is
the product of evil (often personified in Manichaeism as the
archdemoness Az/Hyle), while the human spirit is a portion of the Liv­
ing Soul, the all-pervasive substance of good.

1 Tim. 6:10 and Gal. 5:17 are brought together in a very similar
topical context to that of the Letter to Menoch in the debate between
Augustine and Fortunatus recorded in the C. Fortunatum. The paral­
lel is instructive both for the common ideology of the "root of all
evils" which underlies the two passages and for the distinct applica­
tion of that ideology by the two Manichaeans to the understanding
of 1 Timothy 6:10. Augustine quotes 1 Timothy 6:10 first, reading
with the standard Latin translations cupiditas, "avarice", rather than
the concupiscencia of the Letter to Menoch (C. Fortunatum 21). Fortunatus
adheres to Augustine’s usage throughout, and does not challenge the
translation. Fortunatus replies:

We say this, that the soul is compelled by contrary nature to trans­
gress, for which transgression you maintain there is no root save the
evil that dwells in us; for it is certain that apart from our bodies evil
things dwell in the whole world. For not those things alone that we
have in our bodies dwell in the whole world and are known by their
names as good; an evil root also inheres. For you said that this avarice
that dwells in our body is the root of all evils; since therefore (by your
argument) there is no desire of evil outside of our bodies, from that
source (alone) contrary nature dwells in the whole world. For the Apostle
designated that, namely avarice, as the root of evils... But not in one
manner is avarice... understood, as if of that which dwells in our bod­
ies alone; for it is certain that this evil which dwells in us descends from
an evil author and that this root as you call it is a small portion of evil,
so that it is not the root itself, but is a small portion of evil, of that evil
which dwells everywhere (C. Fortunatum 21).⁶⁴

After explaining that the evil nature within us is responsible for sin,
and that the human soul only has agency and responsibility with the
coming of Jesus as savior, Fortunatus continues:

⁶⁴ All quotations from the C. Fortunatum are taken from P. Schaff, A Select Library of
For it is said by the Apostle that, ‘The mind of the flesh is hostile to God; it is not subject to the law of God, nor can it be’ (Rom. 8:7). Therefore it is evident from these things that the good soul seems to sin not voluntarily, but by the doing of that which is not subject to the law of God. For it likewise follows that, ‘The flesh lusts against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, so that you may not do the things that you will’ (Gal. 5:17) (C. Fortunatum 21).

He concludes by quoting Romans 7:23-25. The fact that Augustine cites 1 Timothy 6:10 according to the standard Latin translations, and so reads cupiditas, may explain why Fortunatus disputes the surface meaning of the verse. He argues that cupiditas is not really the root of all evils, because it is not concupiscencia which is the root of all evils in the Manichaean tradition, as in the Letter to Menoch, in which the word concupiscencia is intruded into 1 Timothy 6:10 itself (but removed, interestingly, from Gal. 5:17). Fortunatus’s position is exactly that of the Letter to Menoch: the evil in people is secondary or derivative (the “daughter”) of a more basic and pervasive evil in the cosmos.

(176) Julian implies that this section follows immediately on the preceding one. While Christians in general affirmed God’s creation of the human body, there was a wide spectrum of attitudes towards the body’s inherent goodness. A very ascetic, anti-body view prevailed in many quarters, perhaps most pervasively in eastern Syria. A notable exception in this environment were the Bardaisanites, who maintained a pro-body position: “God in his goodness will(ed) to create man.”

Because he (man) is created after the image of God, therefore is it given unto him, out of goodness, that these things should serve him for awhile. And it is also given him to lead his life according to his own free will, and to do all he is able to do, if he will, or not to do it, if he will not, justifying himself or becoming guilty.

The reasoning of the position in the Letter to Menoch is paralleled by Faustus, C. Faustum 24, where also John 3:6 is quoted in support of a sharp distinction between body and soul. Faustus says:

In the humiliating process of ordinary generation we spring from the heat of animal passion... [I]f it is when we are fashioned in the womb

that God forms us after his own image, which is the common belief of Gentiles and Jews, and which is also your belief, then God makes the old man and produces us by means of sensual passion, which does not seem suitable to his divine nature... [T]he birth by which we are made male and female, Greeks and Jews, Scythians and Barbarians is not the birth in which God effects the formation of man... It is plain that everywhere he [i.e. Paul] speaks of the second or spiritual birth as that in which we are made by God, as distinct from the indecency of the first birth.

(177) This section appears to follow immediately on the preceding one. The author continues to use passages from John 3 (or that portion of the Didascaron) and Paul's letter to the Galatians, but begins a transition into heavy use of Romans. The allusion to John 3:20 is conflated with 3:21, or even with Eph. 5:13. The brief quotations of Rom. 9:16 and Gal. 5:19 agree with the Vulgate and the Greek, and Rom. 7:8 has simply been adjusted to its use in the letter, but Gal. 5:22 varies more significantly by the loss of "love" and the reversal of "joy" and "peace." In quoting Romans 7:19, the author has conflated the verse with Romans 7:15 which contributes the *exhorreo* (from Greek μηδοί; the Vulgate at 7:15 has *odii*) and with 7:20 which contributes *operor* (as 7:20 reads in the Vulgate).

If the letter is authentic then in its biblical exegesis this passage would provide a very important contribution to our understanding of the exact nuances of Mani's teaching on the relation of soul to sin in the body. The inherent duality of human behavior, or in the expression of Augustine the "two souls" of the human being according to the Manichaean view, is brought forward vividly in this part of the Letter to Menoch. The absolute divide between attributing good to one's true nature and evil to some "other" within the body is the classic Manichaean position. The phrases about good being "bitter" to evil finds a very close parallel in a Manichaean work cited by Ephrem.

Hear also another objection against them from their writing(s). If Darkness passionately lusted for Light because (Light) pleased it, how can they state that it (i.e., Light) is its adversary and eventually its tormentor? And (if) Light has a 'nature' that is desirable and beautiful to Darkness, how is there produced from that pleasant 'nature' that which is bitter for Darkness?" (Ephrem Syrus, *Hypatius* 2.16ff.).

---

67 Reeves 1997, 227.
The two natures are totally alien and inimical to one another, and in some sense “poison” one another.

(180) In this section of the Op. imp. Julian recaps by running together three separate passages from the Letter to Menoch already quoted in 174, 175, and 177 respectively.

(183) Julian again recaps his presentation by re-quoting a passage that was previously divided between Op. imp. 176 and 177.

(186) The way Julian introduces this passage may imply that some portion has been omitted, and that he has jumped to another part of the letter. On the other hand, the last biblical quotation of the previously quoted section (177) was Rom. 7:8, and this section opens with an allusion to Rom. 7:9 and proceeds immediately to Rom. 7:11-12. In either case, this section provides the most difficult and provocative biblical exegesis of the Letter to Menoch. For that reason, we thought it worthwhile to include the pertinent portion of Augustine’s response to Julian, because there appears to be a disagreement between the two Christians over the interpretation of the letter at this point.68

Romans 7 provides the base text, in the words “the order came, sin revived” (Rom. 7:9), “seduced” (Rom. 7:11), and “the law indeed is holy... just and good” (Rom. 7:12), upon which the author builds a narrative. His interpretation applies these words to “the first soul which flowed from the God of light”, and he goes on to say that that first soul “received that fabric of the body so that it might rule it with its own reins.” Now this sounds very Catholic, and very Augustinian, about the unfallen character of Adam, who was supposed to control his body through reason, right down to the reproductive act. It would be very unexpected for Mani to speak of Adam as “the first soul” (which would normally be applied to the Primal Man and his five “limbs”). Even if he were speaking of Adam, he would never be able to countenance the positive view that Adam’s soul was given a body with the intention of ruling and governing it. On the contrary, the body, created by the forces of evil, was supposed to rule and dominate Adam’s soul.

In the setting of Manichaean doctrine, however, the first soul that receives the fabric of the body is not Adam but the Primal Man, who

68 Stein 1998, 75-77, also discusses this conflict of interpretation.
“puts on” the five elements (ether, air, light, water, and fire) as his “limbs” to go into combat against evil. In Manichaean anthropology, four of the five elements constitute the positive constituents of the human body, which is not, as might be assumed from this partial discussion, wholly evil. But these good elements are mixed with evil elements and dominated by the latter in the human body by means of “the spirit of the body” which governs it.

Using Paul’s language from Romans 7, the author sets forth the chain of events in the primordial combat between the Primal Man and the forces of evil. The Primal Man was ordered into battle and was successful at first. But evil regrouped with its own “limbs” and overwhelmed Primal Man, stripping off his own good “limbs” and blending them with his own. From this catastrophe, the rest of world history unfolds. The author continues quoting from the seventh chapter of Paul’s Letter to the Romans, and verse 12 is given a whole new twist by its employment here. In the Letter to Menoch the “law” and “order” is God’s command which sent Primal Man into disastrous combat with evil. In his debate with Fortunatus, Augustine objected that this God appears to doom his own by this command. The author of the letter uses Paul to defend God’s actions. His use of the verse implies that those who are (or that which is) “holy” and “just and good” will successfully pass through world history to return to the land of light. For them, it will turn out well in the end. It is only a tragedy for those who fail to negotiate the trials and temptations of this world. Fortunatus handles this issue similarly in his debate with Augustine. When the latter asked how God could issue such an order, Fortunatus replies:

---

70 Ephrem Syrus says that “the Primordial Man cast his five bright ones into the mouth of the sons of darkness in order that, as a hunter, he might catch them with his [net]” (G. W. S. Mitchell, S. Ephraim’s Prose Refutations of Mani, Mardion and Bardaisan, London: Williams and Norgate, 1912, vol. 1, lxix). This is very similar to the statement made in the Letter to Menoch that “the first soul which flowed from the God of light received that fabric of the body so that it might rule it with its own reins.”
71 “Thereupon the Primordial Devil repaired to his five principles, which are the smoke, flame, obscurity, pestilential wind, and clouds, arming himself with them and making them a protection for him. Upon his coming into contact with the Primordial Man, they joined in battle for a long time. The Primordial Devil mastered the Primordial Man and took a swallow from his light, which he surrounded with his principles and ingredients” (ibid., xlv).
Just as also the Lord said to his disciples: ‘Behold, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves’ (Mt. 10:16). Hence it must be known that not with hostile intent did our savior send forth his lambs, that is his disciples, into the midst of wolves... Hence also may appear the antiquity of our times... that before the foundation of the world souls were sent in this way against the contrary nature that, subjecting the same by their passion, victory might be restored to God (C. Fortunatum 22).

Fortunatus had set forth an even stronger answer the previous day by using the example of Jesus’s fatal mission in obedience to God (C. Fortunatum 7-8).

Julian inserts here a fragment from another letter attributed to Mani, to a certain Patricius, or more likely Patticius. It is not altogether clear that the additional citation is pertinent, as the meaning of the quotation remains ambiguous without more context. We cannot trust that Julian has a full grasp of the subject under discussion in this portion of the Letter to Menoch, and Augustine corrects him to a certain degree. Augustine explains that the “first soul” is not the soul of Adam, but the more comprehensive world soul or Living Soul that pervades all things. The primordial narrative the author of the letter constructs around Romans 7:9-12 precedes the misadventures of Adam. Having made that point, Augustine comments on the sentence from the Letter to Patticius by confirming that Mani believed that Adam was “better than what followed” because more light was concentrated in him before it began to be subdivided in human reproduction.

Stein grants that Augustine makes the distinction between the “first soul” and the “first man” in his interpretation of this section of the letter, but then asks what the words of the letter in-and-of-themselves mean. That is, is the Letter to Menoch talking about Adam or the Primal Man? Stein takes the demonstrative pronoun in the expression “that fabric of the body” to show conclusively that the human body, and so Adam, is the actual topic of discussion here. He then develops a somewhat elaborate argument to explain how the expression “first soul”, which properly belongs to the Primal Man, has here

72 See text and translation of this passage above, Op. imp. 186, with note. Although there was more than one person named Pattik or Patteg in Mani’s inner circle, the most prominent of these was Mani’s own father.
73 Stein 1998, 75.
74 Ibid., 75-76.
been transferred to Adam’s soul. But this whole avenue of discussion seems to us to be a dead end.

Julian simply has misunderstood the *Letter to Menoch* in his drive to read it consistently in line with Augustine’s thought. The latter’s obsession with the Fall and Original Sin occupies the very center of his conflict with Julian, and he in turn lets the shadow of those themes cover the sense of this passage of the letter. Augustine corrects Julian’s misinterpretation, but Stein apparently is unpersuaded. Nevertheless, the author speaks of “that fabric”, i.e., the raw material of evil (in the earliest stage of conflict) or of mixed quality (at a slightly later phase of cosmogony), and not of “that body” specifically of Adam. The Manichaean myth asserts that the intention of the original combat was for Primal Man and his limbs (i.e., the “first soul”) to take control of the substance of evil in some way. The apparent defeat of the good soul in that initial combat is merely a strategem to inject the soul into evil and ultimately to undermine it. In other words, it “received that fabric of the body so that it (i.e., the soul) might rule it (i.e., the fabric) with its own reins.” As a countermeasure, evil molds the “fabric” into the body of Adam. At this later stage of history it could never be said by a Manichaean that the soul “received that fabric of the body so that it (i.e., the soul) might rule it (i.e., the fabric) with its own reins”, since the purpose of manufacturing the human body in Manichaean myth is precisely the opposite, that is, to control the soul by means of the body. This very complex drama will be better understood once a systematic study is made of all the cosmogonical and anthropogonical narratives of the Manichaean tradition. At this point of research, however, we know enough about the repeated reversals of fortune in the story to recognize that the author of the *Letter to Menoch* has, in typical Manichaean fashion, projected the Fall back into primordial, cosmic history. His interest is in the tragedy of the Primal Man, not the original sin of Adam. The fact that Julian has misunderstood and misapplied the letter at this point is one more decisive piece of evidence against the theory that the letter is a pro-Pelagian forgery.

(187) This longest extract from the letter may follow immediately on the preceding section, but is itself probably not a continuous whole. There appears to be a definite break between subsection 4 and 5, where Julian indicates that he is quoting from another part of the letter. The author again develops his argument on the basis of Pauline
passages. 2 Corinthians 6:14-15 has been freely reworked: the first clause is retained intact, but the elements from the second and third clauses have been extracted and simply placed in series with “light and darkness”, in inverted order. Ephesians 5:12 also is quoted in a form that varies from the norm, with “the things done in darkness” substituted for “the things done in secret.” The variations in both of these scriptural quotations suggest that the author is quoting from memory. The transformation of a negative “secret” to “darkness” is quite natural in a Manichaean milieu. John 3:20 is quoted in a different form here than in 177, closer to the Vulgate, but again importing an element (“be made manifest” in place of 3:20’s “be reproved”) from either John 3:21 or Eph. 5:13. 1 Cor. 6:18 is abbreviated, but otherwise identical to the Vulgate and the Greek. The author’s satiric allusion to 1 Tim. 1:7 is as close to the Greek as the Vulgate, but chooses dicunt in place of the Vulgate’s loquuntur. The generic reference to “evangelic and apostolic books” without specifying any gospel by name supports an attribution to Mani, since Mani was probably using the Diatessaron (and the corpus of Paul’s letters).

The accusations of incest and polygamy sound gratuitous, and this passage seems quite inexplicable in the context of either a late Western Manichaean pseudepigraphum or a pro-Pelagian forgery. Although one could speak of Pelagians as “men who have dared to call that concupiscence a good thing”, the accusation of incest would make no sense here, all the more if we supposed the letter to be a pro-Pelagian forgery (Alfaric’s supposition) simply intended to expose Augustine’s virulent phobia towards sexuality. A pro-Pelagian forger would want a passage condemning common monogamous marriage, not marital practices unacceptable to much of the Roman world. To whom, then, could this charge apply? In the Roman milieu, such incest was a stereotypical attribute of the Persians. From the wording of the passage, these would be Persian Christians who maintained the culture’s distinctive form of incestuous marriage even after their exposure to the “evangelic and apostolic books.” Were there such Christians at the time of Mani? Or is the charge of incest and polygamy nothing more than typical inter-religious polemic?

Bardaisan (154-223 C.E.) in the Book of the Laws of Countries insists that the Christians of Persia did not conform to this practice: “For behold, we all, wherever we may be, are called Christians after the one name of the Messiah... and they who live in Parthia do not marry two women... and they who live in Persia do not marry their daugh-
ters” (*BLC* XX). But when we look into the *BLC*, we discover a peculiar feature of Bardaisan’s dissertation. The two marriage practices criticized by Mani in the Letter to Menoch are precisely the two associated with Iranian peoples in the *BLC*:

Then the Persians have made themselves laws to take their sisters, daughters and granddaughters to wife; some go even further and take their own mother to wife. Among the Parthians one man takes many wives and they all submit themselves in chastity to his command, because of the law obtaining in that country. Fate... does not prevent the Persians from marrying their daughters and sisters... the Parthians from marrying many wives... But, as I have already said, in each country and each nation people use the liberty belonging to their nature as they please.

In light of these passages, the comment of the letter begins to look like a polemic against Bardaisan using the latter’s own presentation against him. Agreeing with Bardaisan that such marital practices are wrong, the author points out that people are still driven to do them, even—it is alleged—Bardaisan’s exceptional class of Christians. Another passage from the *BLC* is relevant here. Bardaisan says,

For desire is a different thing from love, and friendship something else than joining together with evil intent. We ought to realise without difficulty that false love is called lust and that even if it gives a temporary peace, there is a world of difference between that and true love, whose peace lasts till the end of days, suffering neither trouble nor loss.

Mani, and the author of the *Letter to Menoch*, would argue that it is precisely lust which leads to these marriage practices, and that this lust is what Bardaisan considers to be “natural.”

It is man’s natural constitution to be born, grow up, become adult, procreate children and grow old... These things take place in each man’s life, because they are inherent natural conditions... For this is the work
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of Nature, which does, creates and produces everything as it is ordained.\textsuperscript{80}

The body, then, is led by its natural constitution, while the soul suffers and receives impressions together with it. But the body is not constrained by this Fate nor is it helped by it...\textsuperscript{81}

Bardaisan goes on to give the example of the natural ages of childbearing as determined by nature, regardless of Fate.

The union of male and female belongs to the field of nature, as also the satisfaction of both parties. But from Fate come disgust and breaking the community of marriage, and all impurity and immorality people commit because of their passions, when they have intercourse together. Having children belongs to the domain of nature. But through Fate the children are sometimes deformed, they sometimes miscarry and sometimes die prematurely.\textsuperscript{82}

This portion of the \textit{Letter to Menoch} goes on to distinguish between “actual” sin and “natural” sin, and this discussion is an important contribution to our understanding of Manichaeism if \textit{Menoch} proves to be authentic. Augustine works with a very similar two-fold categorization in his earlier anti-Pelagian tracts. The same sort of distinction is present already in the Bardaisanite \textit{Book of the Laws of Countries}. Is there some Platonic, Aristotelian, or Stoic category lurking behind this distinction? Perhaps Julian is right to suspect that Augustine is ultimately dependent on the Manichaeans for this. The author of the letter distinguishes between sinful deeds and sinful drives/desires. His dismissal of the former is in line with the idea that the soul does not actually commit sin, and is not really responsible for it. For the Manichaeans, sin simply bursts out, and what’s done is done. But the memory lingers on, it is said here, and that is the only continued existence of the sin which is “actually” past. But concupiscence is inherent in the body, and so when one yields to it one “sins against his own body” (the author is quoting 1 Cor. 6:18, and turning it in a uniquely Manichaean way). Augustine uses this category in distinction from original sin, or the inherited guilt, or the inherent concupiscence that an individual has from original sin. The individual does not necessarily indulge that lust, but if he does, then
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he adds to original sin the “actual” sin of his deeds. The passage from the Letter to Menoch is similar, but seems to have a point, distinct from Augustine’s, about the transience of actual sin, and the memory as the only abiding place of past sin. This does not appear to be a formulation characteristic of Augustine. The author’s opponents seem to hold that all sin is “actual”, and he has adduced 1 Cor. 6:18 to show that there is a second category of sin that is “natural.” His proof is the practice of baptism itself, which the Manichaeans did not employ, but which their opponents here clearly do. The author sees a contradiction in denying natural sin, and yet baptizing infants, just as Augustine did in his Pelagian opponents.

The reference to baptism is a bit of a historical puzzle. Augustine says this same thing more or less word for word many times. It is one of his favorite arguments. Of course, Julian is quoting Menoch to show its similarity with Augustine. The problem is that the universal consensus among scholars is that the Christians of eastern Syria, those presumably with whom Mani had contact and conflict, did not practice infant baptism in the time of Mani. Baptism was reserved for adults, and celibate adults at that. The testimony of Aphrahat and Ephrem seems to make this clear. For the author to argue as he does in the Letter to Menoch, there would have to be eastern Christians baptizing infants. If everything else in the letter stands up to scrutiny, and thus a case can be made for its authenticity, this may be a very important early testimony to infant baptism practiced among the Syrian Christians, at least among the Bardaisanites.

IV. The Argument against Authenticity

Since the development of modern Manichaean studies, the Letter to Menoch has been relegated to the category of spuria. As discussed in the introduction of this study, there are two basic forms of this verdict. The first regards the letter as a Christian forgery designed to discredit certain rival Christians (among them Augustine) by making them appear to echo Mani the renowned heretic. The second view argues that the letter is a late Western Manichaean pseudepigraphum, heavily Christianized in the manner typical of Augustine’s North African opponents Fortunatus, Faustus, and Felix.

83 De pecc. merit., passim.
The common view that the letter is not an authentic product of Mani is supported primarily by the sense that it “presents a marked tendency of adaptation to Christian terminology” of which Mani was incapable due to his time and location.84 The letter clearly shows great familiarity with the Christian New Testament, and invokes it as scripture, and this seems more in line with the Christianized Manichaeanism of a Faustus than the primal tradition of Mani.85 Aalders draws attention to the marked similarity of presentation in the Latin Tebessa Codex, a point that certainly has much to be said for it. Alfarc, it should be noted, suggests that the treatise in the Tebessa Codex may be an authentic work of Mani,86 a possibility taken seriously by Merkelbach.87 But Aalders rejects this claim, and the present authors’ researches also cast it into doubt.88 A key difference between the two texts, of course, is that nothing in surviving fragments of the Tebessa Codex attributes its contents to Mani, whereas the Letter to Menoch opens with Mani’s name.

What is lacking in both Alfarc’s and Aalders’s earlier appraisals is a systematic examination which works with specific criteria, or anything that moves beyond sentiment and intuition. These desiderata are supplied in Markus Stein’s recent monograph on the Letter to Menoch. Stein’s admirable edition and study of the letter is easily the most comprehensive to date, and in his commentary he focuses again on the issue of authenticity.89 In doing so, he draws attention to three kinds of relevant data within the content of the letter that must determine whether it is an authentic composition of Mani, or not. In our opinion, Stein has correctly identified the pertinent internal evidence on which the question of authenticity rests, namely, (1) linguistic evidence, especially the letter’s citation of scripture, (2) the letter’s characterization of Mani’s Christian opponents, and (3) references within the letter’s arguments to contemporaneous usages and
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practices. On the basis of this evidence, Stein concludes that Mani could not be the author of the Letter to Menoch as we now have it, and he proceeds to explore the two remaining options, that is, whether the letter is a late, Western Manichaean pseudepigraphum or a Pelagian forgery composed with the sole intent of discrediting Augustine. Next we will take up and examine Stein’s reasons for dismissing the letter’s authenticity.

1. Does the Letter to Menoch betray dependence upon the Vulgate in its biblical quotations?

According to the account of Julian of Eclanum, the Letter to Menoch from which he quotes was sent to him from Constantinople at the instigation of Florus. Presumably, the letter discovered there was written in Greek, and either Florus, or his Constantinople contact, or Julian himself translated it into Latin. So there is nothing peculiar about the letter being quoted in Latin, nor any evidence either for or against the letter’s authenticity to be derived from the grammar and style of the Latin used. There is only one sort of linguistic evidence at all pertinent to the issue at hand, and that is the quotation of the Bible within the letter. A forger working in Latin might be betrayed if it can be shown that biblical quotations follow the Vulgate at variance with the Greek. Stein proposes that, while in general the biblical quotations of the letter are loose and difficult to build a case on, in a few instances the author shows a dependence upon the Vulgate, and that this evidence constitutes the strongest case against the letter’s authenticity.

If one compares the quotations from the New Testament in the letter with the Vulgate, one sees that there is almost always at least a slight variation between the two. However, in all cases but one (the substitution of concupiscenh for the Vulgate’s cupiditas in the citation of 1 Tim. 6:10 in Op. imp. 175, discussed below), the variants are not of probative significance. Nothing in the letter’s citations could not be from the Old Latin tradition as well as from a Vulgate tradition; more important, we see nothing that could not have derived from the Greek. Nothing in the biblical citations requires that we suppose that the Letter to Menoch is wholly a Latin document in its origins.
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In fact, even if it could be demonstrated that the letter’s Latin scriptural citations clearly derive from a Latin version, such a conclusion would still not militate against the authenticity of the document. It is perfectly possible that a Latin-speaking translator of the text, so steeped in the Latin Bible that its cadences were second nature to him, would adapt the Greek text, perhaps not even consciously, in ways and forms familiar to him. Indeed, that is what always happens when the (less well known) original of a text is read against a well known and fully assimilated translation. Even were this not the case, it is possible that a translator might adopt the familiar Latin version, where it differed from the Greek, so as not to disturb his Latin readers. Thus the Latin of the Letter to Menoch’s scriptural quotations helps us not at all in determining whether the letter is pseudepigraphic.

The one case of a seemingly significant variant in the citation of Christian scripture occurs in the portion of the Letter to Menoch contained in Op. imp. 175, where 1 Timothy 6:10 appears in a form that differs from both the Greek and the Latin Vulgate. The “root of all evils” in the letter’s version is concupiscencia, in the original Greek philarguria, in the Vulgate cupiditas. Stein argues that the form of 1 Tim. 6:10 found in the Letter to Menoch depends upon the Vulgate’s rendering.93 One can agree that there is a logical progression from philarguria through cupiditas to concupiscencia, but such logic does not necessarily chart the actual progress of the biblical verse in its transformations.

Two pieces of evidence work against Stein’s assertion. The first is that Mani already identified “Greed” and “Lust” as the principal forces of evil in the cosmos in his Šaburagān.94 Since Mani obviously was not dependent upon the Vulgate for the identification of either cupiditas or concupiscencia as the “root of all evils”, the transformation of the original philarguria must have occurred already in Syriac, or in the mind of Mani independently of any biblical precedent. In either case, the transformation of 1 Tim. 6:10 attested in the Letter to Menoch can be accounted for on the basis of Manichaean ideology.

This leads to the second point. In his debate with Augustine some three decades before Julian introduced the Letter to Menoch, the
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Manichaean Fortunatus objected to a strict reading of 1 Tim. 6:10 in the form found in the Vulgate. When Augustine quoted the verse, using cupiditas, Fortunatus argued that while cupiditas might be the most basic evil in humans, it was only one aspect of a more fundamental evil pervading the whole universe (C. Fortunatum 21). Fortunatus neither accepted cupiditas as the root of all evils, nor took it to be a variant term for concupiscens, nor corrected Augustine’s text. One could say that this fact betrays that Fortunatus did not know the Letter to Menoch, for if he had he would have responded in one of the three ways just mentioned. This would seem to support the idea that the letter is a later forgery. But at the same time, Fortunatus’ response demonstrates a problem with assuming that concupiscens would be a natural or necessary development from cupiditas in a textual tradition. Rather, the two vices possessed distinct meanings. It is fair to say that cupiditas is somewhat closer than concupiscens to the original philargenia in meaning, but that does not mean that the more remote form must derive from the closer form, rather than being a more radical independent variant deriving from the original.

Other than 1 Tim. 6:10, where the Letter to Menoch does not actually match the Vulgate but may possibly betray knowledge of it, the biblical verses quoted in the letter never agree with the Vulgate against the original Greek, and in most cases vary from the Vulgate in some respects, either showing an independent rendition of the Greek, or departing from both the Vulgate and the Greek where the latter two agree. In light of these facts, it seems quite strange to maintain that agreement with the Vulgate is the strongest evidence for the inauthenticity of the Letter to Menoch. In short, this evidence does not prove that Mani could not be the author of the letter.

2. Does the “Letter to Menoch” anachronistically describe Pelagian opponents?

Stein asks whether any Christian community existing in Mesopotamia at the time of Mani fits the characterization of opponents in the letter. He draws upon the modern understanding of conditions in “East Syrian” Christianity in the third century. It is believed that, in general, this form of Christianity was ascetically oriented, and reserved baptism for celibate adults. The opponents discussed in the letter evidently are
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not ascetic and practice infant baptism. But Stein cautions that other strains of Christianity could have been introduced into Mani’s milieu during his career, and that these might explain the references in the letter. In particular, he brings forward the mass deportation of Christians from Antioch after the sack of the city by Shapur in the 250s, as well as evidence that Armenian Christianity was not particularly ascetic. Then there are the Elchasaitic Christians among whom Mani was raised. So the situation in which Mani worked was complex, and Stein concedes that it is not impossible that a setting in Mani’s lifetime could provide the opponents of the letter. Yet he thinks the references to be much too specifically fitted to the Pelagian controversy to be the happy coincidence of issues that Julian wants us to believe.

It must be admitted that the parallels to the Pelagian controversy are remarkable. Even allowing for the fact that Julian quotes selectively, the letter is just short of miraculous in its relevance to Julian’s argument. Here Mani apparently condemns precisely a party of Christians who emphasize free will and honor sexual intercourse as part of God’s natural, good creation, and marshals against them arguments of the evil of concupiscence and the basic sinfulness of the body. The argument varies in crucial points from Augustine’s, but it certainly sounds like Augustine in many places.

But Stein’s judgment, as Alfaric’s before him, is clouded by what can only be described as the historical burden of Catholic apologetic. We mean by this phrase the academic habit, which is deeply ingrained and not always fully conscious, to see history from the victor’s standpoint, in this case to assume that Augustine represents the mainstream (and moreover is an honest and fair debater), and, conversely, that the Pelagians represented a novel heresy (and that the party’s proponents can be suspected of unscrupulous methods in their argument with Augustine). The reason that the opponents in the letter sound so remarkably like the Pelagians, is that the Pelagians were, in fact, the heirs of the Christian mainstream, and that the third-century Christians were very much like them in their views. In the Pelagian debate, it is Augustine who, by re-reading Paul, heightens original sin to a novel prominence in Christian thought, undermines free will to a degree previously unknown, and brings to the West an ascetic strain that was poorly represented there before him. The Pelagians so much matched the general Christian outlook in the East that the
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Greek Church repeatedly refused to condemn them, indeed showed great puzzlement over what all the fuss was about, and ultimately declared Pelagians to be heretics only as the quid pro quo for the Western condemnation of Nestorius at Ephesus.

That the opponents in the letter advocate free will and affirm God’s creation as good by no means makes them thinly-veiled Pelagians. The same characterization could apply to many Christian communities, from the second century on. It is only the similarity of the author’s criticisms to Augustine’s that heightens the effect in hindsight and makes us think of the Pelagians. But that is as explainable by Augustine’s intellectual debt to the Manichaeans, as it is to any striking likeness between the letter’s opponents and the Pelagians. Nevertheless, we must take up the challenge to identify a specific Christian community that could have been known to Mani which had these particular traits. Stein is completely correct that “East Syrian” Christianity as it is currently characterized does not fit the case. But he has overlooked a very obvious candidate; and to that point we shall return when we address evidence for the letter’s authenticity.

3. Does the “Letter to Menoch” contain anachronistic references to Christian practices?

Stein points out two references in the letter which appear to be anachronistic. The first is an allusion to “gospels” in the plural, whereas it has long been assumed that Mani, and indeed “East Syrian” Christianity, knew only the single gospel of Tatian’s Diatessaron. The second is Mani’s sarcastic mention of infant baptism as a practice of his opponents, whereas such a practice is not well attested in Mani’s time, and goes against the ethos of “East Syrian” Christianity. Here again, composition in a time and setting other than Mani’s seems to be indicated. Stein is careful to remind his readers that the Antiochene deportees brought to Persia by Shapur might account for both references. Stein’s caveat can be further supported by the Acta Archeletai, which portrays Mani coming into contact with previously unknown Christian material, such as the separate gospels, well into his career, and developing his response to it as it became known to him (Acta Archaeletai 54). But the supposed anachronisms have even less credibility than Stein allows.

That Mani knew only the *Diatessaron* is at this date only a conjecture and by no means certain. There are reports of a *Memoria apostolorum* and/or a *Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles* in circulation among the Manichaeans, as well as evidence that Mani knew the *Gospel of Thomas* and perhaps even the *Gospel of Truth*. We cannot assume that the allusion in the letter is to the canon as later Christianity knows it. But a closer examination of the allusion itself reveals that Stein has raised a non-existent issue. In the letter, Mani does not, in fact, refer to “gospels”; rather he refers to “evangelic and apostolic books (evangelicos et apostolicos libros)” (Op. imp. 187), a phrase in which the plural noun “books” refers to both gospels and epistles, in either case of which there may be only one, but collectively there are more than one.

The issue about infant baptism is a more vexed question, simply because we know so little about Christian practice in Mani’s lifetime, and especially in Mani’s environment. Such luminaries as Joachim Jeremias and Kurt Aland could disagree strongly on precisely the question of whether early Christians baptized infants. We know that Christians in the Latin West did do so in the time of Mani: Tertullian argues against the already established practice, and Cyprian attests its universality two generations later. Evidence from the Christian East is less secure, but already Origen supported the practice theologically. The modern consensus among those who study the development of the liturgy is that the practice was quite common, but actually declined after the Constantinian peace as the catechumenate was elaborated and the rite of initiation took on the air of a mystery. In the final analysis, we cannot be so sure of our facts about third century baptismal practice as to discredit the authenticity of the letter on that basis.

Robert Murray has cautioned that our understanding of early
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Syrian Christianity is based upon very limited sources which may give a false impression: “Since it is the extant literature on which we must base our picture, no other characteristic is likely to strike a modern reader more immediately than asceticism, extreme or moderate, dominating or at least coloring almost all the literature. The writers are convinced celibate ascetics writing primarily for those who share their conviction and commitment. The fact is that we have no works expressing interest in the lay life as such.”

The key testimony of Aphrahat and Ephrem draws our attention to a special elite of celibate adults who received baptism in connection with vows of celibacy. But this testimony leaves unclear the practice of ordinary Christians throughout Syria. “Some scholars have viewed this... as a survival from a period when the only organized church structure in this area was celibate and there was no married laity; more likely it simply expresses the practice and ideology of the Bnay Qyama, with no implication to be legitimately drawn for the laity.”

There is, on the other hand, rather strong evidence that non-celibate varieties of Christianity, which could have been targets of the criticisms in the Letter to Menoch, did exist in Syria at the time of Mani. Having shown the predominance of ascetically-oriented communities in Syria, Murray adds: “The exceptions are Bardaisan... and the Pseudo-Clementines, which in several passages commend marriage and speak of the sexual urge and its accompanying pleasure as parts of God’s endowment of human nature, good in themselves and sinful only if abused... these relaxed references to marriage and sexuality are strongly at variance with most early Syriac literature.”

4. Is there any external evidence against the letter’s authenticity?

While we agree with Stein that the internal evidence must be the deciding factor in determining the letter’s authenticity, we cannot leave the question without at least glancing at supposed external evidence on the subject. Stein himself devotes some attention to such data. Alfaric and Aalders both suggest that Augustine challenged the
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authenticity of the letter by mentioning that he did not know of it prior to Julian introducing him to it. Aalders characterizes Augustine’s comment as signifying that he “distrusts” the authenticity of the letter.\textsuperscript{109} But Augustine merely admits that he had no prior knowledge of the letter. His primary objective in this admission certainly is to exonerate himself precisely of the charge made by Julian: that Augustine is aping his heretical master. If Augustine did not know the letter, he could scarcely have learned his thinking from it. There may be a second intention at work in Augustine’s statement, namely to raise an objection to Julian’s evidence in a typical courtroom ploy. Julian is introducing evidence in his prosecution the veracity of which cannot be confirmed by Augustine for the defense. It is a necessary preliminary step for Augustine simply to object. But he goes on immediately to take the letter seriously, and to treat it without question as a representation of Mani’s views, to which he contrasts his own. Augustine’s primary purpose in mentioning that he did not know the letter was to acquit himself of the suspicion that he had been influenced by it in his own thought and anti-Pelagian argumentation. He never actually rejects the letter as a fraud, nor raises any objection to its contents as being anything other than authentic Manichaean doctrine. Indeed he works very hard to show the differences between the letter’s point of view and his own. He even goes so far as to correct Julian’s misinterpretation of a portion of the letter (\textit{Op. imp.} 186), which he is careful to read in accordance with his own insider information on the doctrines of Mani.

Stein recognizes that Augustine’s statement is a rhetorical ploy in his argument, and should not be given undue weight,\textsuperscript{110} yet he contends that as such a devoted and studious Manichaean, Augustine would have known the letter if it had been authentic.\textsuperscript{111} This raises a second question: even if Augustine does not actually cast aspersions on the \textit{Letter to Menoch}, does the mere fact that he was previously unacquainted with the letter, in and of itself, raise doubts about its authenticity? Aalders maintains that Augustine had “a profound knowledge of the writings of Mani and of the Manichaean literature.”\textsuperscript{112} Peter Brown speaks of his “mastery of Manichaean doctrine”
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and notes that, "Mani's great Letter of the Foundation lay to hand on
the bookshelves of Hippo; its margins filled with critical notes."\textsuperscript{113}
In fact, Augustine's familiarity with Manichaean literature, despite
nine years as an auditor, was modest. His library was certainly de­
void of much besides Mani's Letter of the Foundation and perhaps the
Treasury. Augustine, of course, was limited to works that had been
translated into Latin, and we simply do not know if this was done
systematically in the North African Manichaean community. Augus­
tine's anti-Manichaean work is dependent for the most part on sec­
ondary literature such as Faustus's Capitula. Augustine may have been
a dutiful auditor, and perhaps even copied Manichaean texts as part
of his service to the faith. But his anti-Manichaean corpus shows that
Augustine did not have an extensive Manichaean library, and he
certainly had not read all of Mani's works. In this light it is no great
wonder that he did not know the Letter to Menoch.

V. The Argument for Authenticity

Doubts about the modern orthodoxy that dismisses the Letter to Menoch
as spurious have been expressed by F. Decret, who finds Aalders' argu­
ments "not at all convincing."\textsuperscript{114} But Stein's careful presenta­
tion of the case against the letter provides the first opportunity for a
detailed and sustained defense of it as an authentic work of Mani.

We have external evidence for the existence of a Letter to Menoch
written by Mani. Al-Nadim, in his Fihrist, copies a list of Mani's let­
ters, giving the addressee, and in some instances the topic, of each
letter. In this list, there are two letters addressed to Minaq or Maynaq.
In one of these, the recipient is specified as Minaq al-Farisiya, the
latter term being the feminine form for a person from Fars or Per­
sia. Although no explicit reference to Persia is made in the surviv­
ing Latin fragments, the Menoch of those fragments is indeed a
woman. Stein calls the identity of al-Nadim's Minaq and Julian's
Menoch into question, although the identification has been accepted
without question since the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{115} Here he perhaps
is guilty of being overly scrupulous on every point of fact about the
letter; he has no concrete objection to propose, and there is none to
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be found. If the Latin Letter to Menoch is the work of a pseudopigrapher or a forger, the latter built upon an authentic letter, or at least knew of the existence of such a letter.

Turning to internal evidence for the letter’s authenticity, we should be concerned first to show that Mani’s statements therein are in harmony with Manichaean doctrine as it is known to us from the surviving Manichaean literature. This has been demonstrated in detail in the commentary above, but it can be concluded here, as Stein also reports, that nothing in the letter is at odds with the known tenets of Manichaeism, and in fact many striking phrases find ample parallel. Stein does raise one doubt about the doctrine expressed in the letter, namely, did Mani actually teach an “original sin” doctrine so much like Augustine’s as that found in the letter? In this case, it seems Stein has not done justice to Augustine’s own objections. It is only by imagining the opponents of the letter to be Pelagians that the letter’s arguments seem so much like Augustine’s. The letter’s position cannot be equated with the doctrine of original sin, and the latter enters into the discussion only in relation to infant baptism, which implies to the author some sense among his opponents that even an infant has an inherent evil that needs to be purged. But while Augustine heightened the significance of the original sin doctrine within the Christian tradition, he was scarcely its inventor. In the early third century, Origen already argued for infant baptism on the basis of an original sin concept deriving from Paul.

Next we must address the letter’s use of Christian scripture. There is nothing in the selection of passages, their mode of citation, or their application which might suggest that Mani could not be the author of the letter. It has long been recognized that Mani knew Christian literature and that he was, as is the author of the letter, particularly fond of Paul. The biblical books known to be rejected by the Manichaeans, namely the book of Acts and the Old Testament in its entirety, are not cited. All of the books which are cited in Menoch find use as well in other Manichaean literature.

With regard to specific passages, John 3:6 and 3:19-21, Galatians...
5:17, and Ephesians 5:12-13 appear to be favorites among the Manichaeans, if we can draw any conclusions from the very scanty evidence at our disposal. The Letter to Menoch provides a systematic Manichaean reading of Galatians 5:17-22 which gives us no surprises as it develops Paul's incipient dualism. Romans 7, similarly, would seem fruitful ground for Manichaean anthropology; it is alluded to in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book and much of Fortunatus' argument with Augustine appears to be built upon it, albeit with only a few explicit citations. Augustine's own developing reading of Romans 7 was taken by his Pelagian opponents as a move towards Manichaeism. But until now we have had no material on Manichaean use of the mid-section of Romans 7, and it is in providing this that the Letter to Menoch both yields the strongest evidence of its authenticity and contributes most significantly to our knowledge of Manichaean biblical interpretation.

In its use of Romans 7, the Letter to Menoch begins with the conclusion of 7:19, which in the form given in Op. imp. 177 and 180 is conflated with Romans 7:15 and 20. The condition of internal divisiveness in the human of which Paul complains is the result of a chain of events which the author of the letter expounds in the section quoted in Op. imp. 186, by interweaving Romans 7:9-12. The authenticity of the Letter to Menoch, especially against the suspicion that it is a Pelagian forgery, is strongly bolstered by the fact that Julian himself misunderstands Mani's application of Romans 7. Julian quite naturally assumes that Mani is speaking of Adam in Op. imp. 186. It is the former Manichaean auditor Augustine who recognizes that Mani is speaking not of Adam but of the Primal Man and his primordial combat with the forces of evil, and who corrects Julian's misunderstanding. Whatever his recollection of the instruction of his youth, Augustine had been forcefully reminded by Fortunatus in their debate that Manichaeans do not see the evil within the human body as particularly unique. Rather it is part and parcel of a universal evil with which good is mixed in all things. In the Letter to Menoch, the "order" and "law" has nothing to do with the Law of Moses, or the

---

118 Both Fortunatus (C. Fortunatum 19) and Faustus (C. Faustum 24) cite John 3:6; the Coptic Kephalaiion 76 (184.11-12) cites John 3:19ff.; Fortunatus cites Gal. 5:17 (C. Fortunatum 21) and Eph. 5:13 (C. Fortunatum 22).
119 "For... of the flesh will not allow us at all to do... while I am in the flesh, while I am in the midst of... that surround us, the desires of many [kinds]" (C. R. C. Alberry, A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938, 135.11-16).
Edenic command to “be fruitful and multiply”, but is the order God gave to the Primal Man and his “limbs” to go out to combat with evil. This order, of course, leads to catastrophic consequences for the individual souls trapped in bodies dominated by evil—a fall antecedent to the biblical story of Adam. Nevertheless, the author of the Letter to Menoch asserts that “the law is holy” just as Fortunatus in his debate with Augustine defended it as just and necessary. The two Manichaeans build their arguments independently, but to the same point.

In this part of the Letter to Menoch, the author is qualifying the dualism which in earlier sections of the letter was expressed by employing a body/spirit dichotomy. Both good and evil are substances in the Manichaean view. Evil has a spirit, the “spirit of concupiscence” referred to in Op. imp. 176, just as good has a “fabric” or, in the words Julian quotes from another letter of Mani, “the flower of the first substance” (Op. imp. 186). Mani (or ps.-Mani) is commending to Menoch the idea that there is something in the human frame, defective as the latter appears to be, that is ultimately good and redeemable. This is shown by the good origin and original intent of the human soul, as well as by the promise that the commandment which sent it into mixture is “holy for the holy” and “just and good for the just and good.” This puts an optimistic twist on an otherwise somber assessment of the human condition.

If the Letter to Menoch is authentic, therefore, it offers a fascinating new example of Manichaean biblical interpretation. What Mani does with Romans 7 perhaps can best be characterized as creative. If nothing else, it reminds us of how Manichaeism consistently projects the events of human history into a primordial, cosmic myth. Just as Manichaeism reads the crucifixion into the original “nailing of the soul in every tree” (C. Faustum 20), so here the fall of Adam is retrojected into the fall of Primal Man. So in its biblical interpretation, as in its overall ideology, the Letter to Menoch takes its place squarely within the Manichaean tradition as we know it. If not written by Mani himself, it was composed by someone in the deepest harmony with the founder’s vision.

If we are to attribute this letter to Mani, we must reconstruct a plausible scenario to explain the topics with which Mani is concerned in the letter, and specifically to identify the opponents against whom he writes. If the letter is to be considered genuine, then we must imagine a situation in which Mani would be addressing issues coinci-
dentally similar to those in which the Catholic community found itself embroiled in the time of Julian and Augustine. Aalders’ theory that the letter is a pious fraud by a Manichaean working in a predominantly Christian milieu, is based on the false assumption that Mani’s original message was independent of Christianity, and that only a Western, Christianized missionary would strike the same notes as this letter does. We now know that Mani was able to quote Christian scripture and often expressed himself in Christian vocabulary. In this, the Letter to Menoch and the epistle or treatise contained in the Tebessa Codex are remarkably similar. Even Merkelbach was cautiously willing to entertain the idea that the latter was a composition of Mani, an idea first bruited by Alfaric.120

We now are in a position to offer a suggestion as to the identity of the opponents critiqued by the author of the Letter to Menoch. He tells us that: (1) they ascribe the origin of the body to God, not the devil (Op. imp. 176); (2) they are not celibate (177); (3) they call concupiscence a good thing (187) and they are charged with practicing incest and polygamy121 (187); (4) they do not believe in the existence of “natural” (original, inherent) sin (187); and (5) they practice baptism, including that of infants (187).

Perhaps it is clear why scholars’ suspicions have been aroused. These charges so well fit Augustine’s conflict with the Pelagians, and so closely parallel charges and arguments Augustine makes against them, that it seems too much to put down to coincidence. Points 2, 3 (first part), 4, and 5 apply very well to the Pelagians. Scholars also habitually credit Augustine with honesty, and his opponents with deception, so they exaggerate Augustine’s own questions about the letter. But the coincidence can also be explained by the fact that similar debates had been going on for quite some time; and there was an earlier group, from the right period, that had much in common with the Pelagians.

One of the key communities with which Mani interacted and competed was the Bardaisanite community of Syria and Armenia. He devoted at least three chapters of his book, The Treasury, to refuting the views of Bardaisan, as al-Nadim tells us. A passage quoted from this work by al-Biruni explicitly criticizes the Bardaisanites’ pro-so-matic views.

120 Merkelbach 1988, 233.
121 The words “concupiscence”, “incest” and “polygamy” are being used polemically; Mani’s opponents surely would not have referred to their sexual attitudes and practices in such terms.
For he (Mani) also says: ‘The Bardesanites believe that the rising aloft of the soul of life and its purification take place in the dead body (lit.: carcass), and they show their ignorance of the fact that the body is hostile to the soul and that it prevents her from rising up, that the body is a prison for the soul and a torment. If the shape of this body were reality, then its creator would certainly not allow that it gradually fell into ruin and that corruption appeared in it, and he would certainly not force it to propagate itself with semen in the womb’.  

Bardaisan taught free will and rejected the notion of a natural, in-born inclination to evil, just as the Pelagians did. In the dialogue recorded in the Bardaisanite Book of the Laws of Countries, the interlocutor Awida “asserts that man sins... because of his natural constitution, for if that were not the case, he would not do it.” But Bardaisan insists that:

Man can lead his life in perfect liberty within the framework of the possibilities comprised in his [nature]. He can eat meat or not; he can have intercourse with many women, his mother and sisters included, but he may also lead a chaste life.  

In the words of H.J.W. Drijvers, “The key word for Bardaisan’s life and world view is liberty... we met with the concept both in his anthropology and his cosmology, for the two are correlates.” Mani and Augustine, however, saw the will as seriously constrained by its contact with evil. Al-Nadim already noted the contrast between the two views in his Fihrist, where he states:

According to Mani, darkness is something active, concerned in the formation of this world. According to Bardaisan darkness is blind, lacks senses and is without knowledge, as contrasted with light.

Bardaisan, it seems, adheres more closely to an Aristotelian view of matter as a passive substance molded by God’s will.

Evil itself has no power at all, but only consists in the disturbance of the order willed by God. If man lives in agreement with this order, evil has lost its power.

---

125 Quoted in Drijvers 1966, 122.
126 Drijvers 1966, 139.
Mani, in contrast, followed the Platonic suggestion that matter has inherent to it a “disorderly motion” that can produce its own effects. This difference of opinion is the basis for the points raised in the Letter to Menoch.

The Bardaisanites affirmed God’s creation of humans (note point 1 above), and indeed of creation in general. “Bardaisan has a positive attitude towards matter, and consequently towards sexuality, which is a form of purification.” Many sources attest to Bardaisan’s view that conception and birth was one of the principal processes of spiritual purification. According to Drijvers, “During the existence of the world, purification takes place through conception and birth, in striking contrast with the Manichaean view, while at the end of time a definitive purification will take place.”

Even more striking in its aptness to the note struck in the Letter to Menoch, the Bardaisanite position is that “sexual intercourse... lessens the sin in women.” Since Bardaisan taught that darkness was totally passive and had no mind or will, by implication, concupiscence would have to come from God (note point 3 above). The Bardaisanites, therefore, are perfect targets for the criticisms leveled in the Letter to Menoch towards advocates of the natural goodness of concupiscence.

The Manichaeans and the Bardaisanites represented two fundamentally opposed options among Near Eastern Christian heterodoxy in the third century. Drijvers has outlined the two groups’ basic points of opposition with great skill:

Bardaisan’s creation is intended to drive out darkness as much as possible, Mani’s to liberate the particles of light. The contrast is between an optimistic view of man and a pessimistic view, between an active fighter against evil and a passive ascetic, between acceptance of existence and longing for salvation... The difference between the two is also expressed in their view of purification. Mani looks upon sexual intercourse as an obstacle hindering the particles of light from returning to their source. Bardaisan thinks that it may be a form of purification, and that the soul is purified in the body... The purification of the soul in the body probably takes place because the soul, or the spirit which

\[127\] Drijvers 1966, 205.
\[128\] Among them Moses bar Kepha, Agapius, and Michael Syrus: Drijvers 1966, 151-152, 190, 221.
\[129\] Drijvers 1966, 110.
\[130\] Drijvers 1966, 190.
\[131\] Drijvers 1966, 121-124.
is linked with it, does what is right, according to Christ’s command. Thus the soul is enabled to return to its source. Sexual intercourse also ‘dilutes’ the amount of darkness in the world, and so it is a form of purification. Mani, on the other hand, regards the begetting of children as a dispersal of the particles of light, whereby their return is made more difficult.\(^\text{132}\)

There were other points of contrast between the two religions. Bardaisan spoke of Judaism with respect and used the Old Testament, which the Manichaean church decried for its approval of polygamy and its encouragement of reproduction.\(^\text{133}\) What we would wish for to completely settle the question is some clear indication of Bardaisanite baptismal practices. But we are not so fortunate. Drijvers reports that, "very little is known of baptism or ritual washing on the part of the Bardesanites."\(^\text{134}\) But the pro-sexuality and pro-reproduction attitudes of the Bardaisanites, as well as their emphasis on human free will and the importance of living one’s life in conscious conformity to the commandments of God, permit the possibility that infant baptism was practiced among them. We will have to await positive confirmation of this surmise.

VI. Conclusion

A close examination of the contents of the *Letter to Menoch* supports its authenticity as a composition of Mani. A careful consideration of the milieu in which Mani worked points to the Bardaisanites as the most probable targets of the letter’s criticisms. The continuities between the Syrian Bardaisanites of the third century and the Western Pelagians of the fourth and fifth centuries produced a marked parallelism between Mani’s attack on the former and Augustine’s polemic against the latter. This, we think, is the best case one can make for explaining the curious history of the *Letter to Menoch*. The coincidence of position between the Bardaisanites and the Pelagians has set the scene for the use of our letter in Julian’s debate with Augustine. While Bardaisan has been forgotten here, Mani’s polemic against him strikes an Augustinian note in voicing criticism of what

\(^\text{132}\) Drijvers 1966, 226; see also 141-142.

\(^\text{133}\) Drijvers 1966, 178, 227.

\(^\text{134}\) Drijvers 1966, 42.
both thinkers considered a naive over-emphasis of the goodness of God's creation.

Whether the similarities between Mani and Augustine are due to the logic of the positions they are combating, or do—as Julian contends—betray a profound Manichaean influence on Augustine, is a question best taken up in a more systematic analysis of Augustine’s thought. We are not required to see in Julian’s use of the Letter to Menoch a fundamental insight into Augustine. Rather, the benefit of determining the authenticity of the letter is that it can be added to the sparse and fragmentary remains of the lost Manichaean religion as an important new source of information on Mani’s conception of sin and his interpretation of Christian scripture.

To the basic question of whether the Letter to Menoch belongs to the corpus of surviving Manichaean literature, we now can answer with an unqualified yes. There is still room for doubt about its exact origins and path of transmission, and the need for further study. If the Letter to Menoch is not authentic Mani, or interpolated Mani, it must be an authentic Manichaean pseudepigraphum. These are the only possibilities that can be seriously entertained. The contention that the letter is a simple fake, a forgery perhaps perpetrated by the Pelagians in a malicious attempt to undermine their Catholic opponents and particularly Augustine, must be rejected as having no support whatsoever in the facts. We can trust the letter to provide us with valid evidence of Manichaean views on the subjects it addresses.
The Manichaean polemic against magic is well-known. Scholarly discussions have focused on a Manichaean literary text in the Coptic Kephalaia containing polemical statements regarding the teaching and practice of magic.¹

Concerning this, I command you (pl.) all the time: Keep away from the magic arts and enchantments of darkness! For any person who will be taught them, and who does and accomplishes them; at the last, in the place where will be bound the King of the realms of Darkness with his powers, there they will bind that one also, the soul of whoever has lived freely among them and walked in the magic arts of error. Whether it is a man or a woman, this is the sentence given, cut [...] from God's judgement, that whoever will [...] with their King (Keph. 6 [31:24b-33]).

However, a recently published documentary text, a fourth-century personal letter to a Manichaean enclave in Egypt's Dakhleh Oasis town of

Kellis, provides first-hand evidence for the Manichaean use of a popular religious ritual. The letter (P. Kell. Copt. 35) was first identified as Manichaean by Iain Gardner. The ritual text transmitted with that letter conforms to the type “Trennungszaubere: mustard curse”, elsewhere found only in the Greek and Coptic magical papyri (P. Laur. IV 148 and London Hay 10391). The Kellis letter demonstrates that the exclusionary ideals concerning forbidden ritual, as expressed in the Manichaean Ḟepḥalaia, were in stark contrast to the actual practices of Egyptian Manichaeans in fourth-century Kellis.

The purpose of this study is to discuss two Coptic Kephalaia texts which together demonstrate Manichaean allusions to yet another specific ritual, a “spell for invisibility”. Such invisibility spells are well-known in the Greek magical papyri. These Manichaean allusions to such spells in the Kephalaia are polemical in nature, and, as such, stand in contrast to the Kellis letter which demonstrates actual Manichaean acceptance and practice of such forbidden ritual. I will argue that the allusions to such a spell in the Kephalaia provide further evidence for Manichaean familiarity with the details of the generic form, function and language of forbidden ritual, and further demonstrate the general diversity of thought and action in regard to popular rituals among Manichaean devotees.

2. Six Greek Magical “Spells for Invisibility”

There are six references to invisibility spells in the Greek magical papyri, and they are of two types. The quotes given below provide only select phrases, as their larger literary contexts are not directly relevant to our discussion. The first type is twice attested and is specifically

---


4 On magic and Manichaeans in Kellis, see the discussion in Mirecki, Gardner and Alcock, “Manichaean Letter, Magical Spell” 8-11.

5 In this study, all Greek texts are taken from Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen
used for becoming invisible so that the user can escape from binding or prison:

Δύει δέ ἐκ δεσμῶν [ἀ]λύσει φρουρούμενον, θύρας ἀνοίγει, ἀμαυροῖ, ἵνα μηδεὶς [κ]αθόλου σε θεωπήσῃ.

And he frees from bonds the one chained in prison, he opens doors, he causes invisibility, so that no one at all will see you (PGM I.100-105).

Πέδας λύει, ἀμαυροῖ.

It loosens shackles, causes invisibility (PGM V.488).

The second type is attested four times and is of a more general nature, so that invisibility can be acquired for any purpose, even love magic, and not in reference to bonds or prison:

Ἄμαυρος εἰς ἄνονυμα ... καὶ ἐπιλέγει ἀθεώρητον με ποίησον, κύριε Ἡλίε ... ἀπέναντι πάντος ἀνθρώπου ἅχρι δυσμῶν ἡλίου.

Indispensable invisibility spell: ... and also recite, ‘Make me invisible, Lord Helios ... in the presence of everyone until the setting of the sun...’ (PGM I.222b, 2286-230).

Καὶ προὶ ἄνοστα(ς), πρὶν λαλῆς, ἐπιλέγει τὰ ὄνοματα, καὶ ἀθεώρητος ἔσει πρὸς πάντας.

And rising early, before you speak, recite the names, and you will be invisible to everyone (PGM VII.21-22a).

Ἡ θαυμάσιος ἄμαυρα ... τοῦτο φορῶν ἀθεώρητος ἔση ἐπιλέγων τὸ ὄνομα.

The marvelous [spell for] invisibility: ... Wearing this you will be invisible when you recite the name (PGM XIII.234b-235a, 236b-237a).

The fourth and final example of this general type of invisibility spell represents the same specific ritual that is alluded to twice in the Manichaean Kephalaia. It is a focal point for this study and so we now turn to that text.

---

3. Structure of the “Spell for Invisibility” (PGM I.255b-262)

The Greek ritual spell under consideration is given the title “Tested spell for invisibility: A great work”. The first part of the spell involves the ritualist’s instructions to mix various elements by rubbing them (between the hands?), followed by his recitation of sacred names in typical ego-proclamations (e.g., “I am Anubis”), and then followed by the section that concerns us:

\begin{verbatim}
'αμαύρωσις(ζ) δοκιμή. Μέγα έργον ... εῖν δε θελήσῃς ὁφαντὸς γενέσθαι, 
χρίσον σου τὸ μέτωπον μόνον ἐκ τοῦ συνθέματος, καὶ ὁφαντὸς ἔση, 
ἐφ ὦσον χρόνον θέλεις, ἐῖν δε θελήσῃς εὑραίνεσθαι, ἀπὸ δύσεως 
ἐρχόμενος εἰς ἀναστολήν λέγε τὸ όνομα τοῦτο, καὶ ἔσσει δηλωτικός καὶ 
ἐποίτος πάσιν ἀνθρώποις.
\end{verbatim}

Tested spell for invisibility. A great work ... And if you wish to become invisible, anoint only your face with the mixture, and you will be invisible for as long as you wish. And if you wish again to be visible, while moving from west to east, say this name, and you will be obvious and visible to everyone (PGM I.247b, 255b-260a).

The structure of this ritual is clear in its a-b-c, a-b-c pattern:

Beginning ritual and result:
(1.a) desire of the ritualist: “if you wish to become invisible...”
(1.b) ritual action: “...anoint only your face with the mixture...”
(1.c) result: “...and you will be invisible for as long as you wish...”

Concluding ritual and result:
(2.a) desire of the ritualist: “if you wish again to be visible...”
(2.b) ritual action: “...while moving from west to east, say this name...”
(2.c) result: “...and you will be obvious and visible to everyone...”

Note that the ritual consists of a simple two-step action. First, the ritualist has the need and desire to become invisible, then he performs a ritual action, followed by the desired result (invisibility). Second, this result can be undone simply by the ritualist desiring to undo the result, so then he performs another ritual action appropriate to reversal (moving [walking? turning?] from west to east while speaking a sacred name), followed by a final result which restores the former condition (visibility).

---

6 The ritualist in this case acts on his own behalf, in other words, the ritualist is not performing the ritual for a client.
4. Allusions to the “Spell for Invisibility” in the Manichaean Kephalaia

In the Coptic Manichaean Kephalaia, there are two allusions to the spell for invisibility in Kephalaia 6 and 27:

When it pleases him, he can make an invocation over himself, and by his magic arts be hidden from his companions. Again, when it pleases him, he can be manifested over his powers and appear to them (Keph. 6 [31.19b-22a]).

The structure of the spell in Kephalaia 6 is:

Beginning ritual and result:
(1.a) desire of the ritualist: “When it pleases him...”
(1.b) ritual action: “...he can make an invocation over himself...”
(1.c) result: “...and by his magic arts be hidden from his companions...”

Concluding ritual and result:
(2.a) desire of the ritualist: “Again, when it pleases him...”
(2.b) ritual action: [assumed or omitted invocation]
(2.c) result: “...he can be manifested over his powers and appear to them.”

The invisibility spell in Kephalaia 27 is:

When he wishes, he shall make an invocation over himself, and hide from his powers. When he wants, he shall show himself to them (Keph. 27 [78.14b-16]).

The structure of the invisibility spell in Kephalaia 27 is:

Beginning ritual and result:
(1.a) desire of the ritualist: “When he wishes...”
(1.b) ritual action: “...he shall make an invocation over himself...”
(1.c) result: “...and hide from his powers...”

Concluding ritual and result:
(2.a) desire of the ritualist: “When he wants...”
(2.b) ritual action: [assumed or omitted invocation]
(2.c) result: “...he shall show himself to them.”
5. Performancial Variations Between the Greek and Coptic Versions

It is clear that the same popular ritual, but with slight variations, is referred to in both the didactic Greek magical text and the two polemical Coptic Manichaean texts. These variations are due to the differing performancial and mythological contexts of the rituals. The ritualist who gladly follows the instructions of the didactic Greek text is there portrayed as a positive character who performs a positive action for himself and, presumably, for society, as there is no aggressive intent. But the one who performs the same ritual in the polemical Kephalaia texts is not a positive character, but is rather the leading antagonist of Manichaean myth, the ominous “King of Darkness” (*Keph. 6 [31.24]).

This king uses the ritual in an aggressive manner in order to deceive “his companions” who are “his powers”, as both he and his fellows are constantly at war with each other. The king is portrayed as an evil magician performing forbidden ritual, indicating that in Manichaean theory the demonic origin of magic was to be found in this King of Darkness. As a social critique of their religious competitors, the Manichaens apparently understood non-traditional ritualists (i.e., those labelled as “magicians”) as derivative of the King of Darkness, who was both the source of “the magical arts” (*Keph. 6 [31.25b]) and the exemplar of all magicians.

The didactic Greek ritual employs the manufacture of a rubbed mixture (of an eye, a rose, some lily oil) which is then smeared on the face of the one who wishes to become invisible. However, in both of the polemical Manichaean texts, the King of Darkness is not shown making such a mixture, but rather there is a more appropriate and equally efficacious ritual in which he simply speaks “an invocation over himself”. Then in the Coptic texts’ concluding ritual to restore

---

7 It is apparently the King of Darkness who is twice described in the Coptic Manichaean *Psalm-Book* as performing aggressive magic rituals involving the evil eye. In a “Psalm to Christ”, the psalmist says, “From the time that the hated one cast an evil eye on my kingdom” (*Psalm 12*),. In a “Psalm of Thomas”, the Great Father is quoted as saying, “Guard yourselves from the eye of the Evil One which has looked up” (*Psalm 31*).

8 Cf. “The watchers of heaven, who came down to the earth ... they did all the deeds of treachery. They have revealed crafts in the world and have unveiled to people the mysteries of heaven” (*Keph. 38 [92.27b-31a]).

9 This indicates that invocations, in contrast to Manichaean prayers, are also
visibility, the expected action of speaking “an invocation over himself” in the second part (in 2.b, above) is either omitted, in which case the simple wish for visibility to be restored is sufficient, or, the action is assumed to occur as it did in the first part (in 1.b, above), and so no mention of it is made in the second part.\(^{10}\)

The Greek ritual has a reference to the length of time during which the ritual will continue to be effective: “for as long as you wish”\(^{11}\); but, the Manichaean texts make no such reference to time, except to assume, perhaps, that it will last as long as the King of Darkness desires.

The Greek text has a ritual for reversal of time (“while moving from west to east, say this name”) which is also inappropriate for the King of Darkness in the Manichaean text. The ritual of moving from west to east is contrary to the movement of the sun, suggesting that by such a ritual action one is able to restore a former condition in relation to the movement of a major celestial body which progresses in time from east to west.

The last variation is in relation to the final element concerning who is affected by the power of the ritual, so that they temporarily are unable to see the ritualist (whether the Greek magician or the Coptic Manichaean King of Darkness). In the Greek text it is “everyone”, while in the Manichaean texts, it is “his companions” and “his powers”. These variants are functional equivalents in the structure of the ritual, and are simply due to the obvious fact that the ritual of the Greek text is performed before the human public (everyone), while the ritual in the Manichaean text is performed before an antagonistic mythological group (his companions who are his powers). In any case, the same ritual is found in the Greek magical text and the Coptic Manichaean text.

As I noted at the beginning of this study, these Manichaean allusions to invisibility spells are polemical in nature and, as such, stand in contrast to the Kellis letter which demonstrates actual Manichaean criticized as part of forbidden ritual; cf. “The words of magic and evil mysteries have become loathsome in his presence” (Keph. 56 [143.14b-15]).

\(^{10}\) In the Greek and Coptic magical papyri, mention of certain repetitive and stock elements in the spells is often omitted, or replaced with a brief allusion or even a cipher, but the experienced ritualist understands what needs to be added. Such condensed versions of spells are not necessarily the product of a desire for secrecy, but may also result from a simple shortening of a text by a copyist who is pressed for space or time.

\(^{11}\) On the duration of the effect of another invisibility spell, see PGM I.222b, 228b-230, quoted above, in which the effect will last “until sunset”.\)
acceptance and practice of such forbidden ritual. This study has demonstrated that the two allusions to invisibility spells in the *Kephalai* provide further evidence for Manichaean familiarity with the details of the generic form, function and language of forbidden ritual, and further demonstrate the general diversity of thought and action in regard to popular magical rituals among Manichaean devotees.¹²

¹² For further Greek magical texts dealing with other types of invisibility spells, see *PGM* VII 619ff.; XIII.235ff., 267-277; and P. Oxy. 3931 (which appears to be a fragment from a crude sourcebook, rather than an amulet; the similarities to *PGM* I.228b-230 seem to have been overlooked in the editors’ interpretation).
ON HUMAN RACES, SEMI-HUMAN BEINGS AND MONSTERS

WERNER SUNDERMANN, BERLIN

It is one of the incongruencies of the Manichaean doctrine that the Manichees did not simply turn their minds towards their heavenly home and hope, but took an interest in and even a sympathetic attitude to life in this world. A case in point are the Coptic Bema Psalms which praise the beauty of the awakening nature in spring time. Also a Bema Psalm, in my view, is the famous MP text fragment M 554 which H.F.J. Junker once called a “Liedchen ... voll süßer Innigkeit.” One might also quote the Parthian “Sermon on the Soul” which explains in a systematic manner why this world has its good sides and is not just a vale of tears. Another symptom of engaged open-mindedness is the claim of Mani’s message not only to reveal the redeeming gnosis to mankind but also to explain the secrets of this world to those who were ready to learn why the moon waxed and waned, what made the earth tremble with earthquakes, or, and this brings me to the subject of my paper, what kind of exotic creatures were living in different regions of this world and in its remote parts in particular.

Among the most spectacular curiosities of this world which always and everywhere attracted the interest of people were the stories of travelers, seafarers, narrators and visionaries about exotic men and terrifying animals in mysterious countries far beyond the sphere of everyday life. The texts I am going to publish here for the first time prove that the Manichees did not disdain to pay their tribute to this kind of popular entertainment.

The fragment So 20229 = K 29 is a nearly complete leaf of Sogdian text in a rather coarse style of Sogdian script which makes its decipherment an often difficult task. Similar letters like ’, n, r and z, or

1 Allberry 1938, p. 8, 14-21; Wurst 1996, p.93, verse 8.
2 Wörter und Sachen 1929, p. 133.
s and ř tend to merge. The Manichaean character of the text is not self-evident. But it follows with certainty from the observation made by Chr. Reck that it belongs to a number of other pieces of the same manuscript. I confine myself to quoting her article “Annäherung an eine sogdische manichäische Sammelhandschrift” where all its fragments are listed and described and the Manichaean contents of the chapter about the purification of the “Elements and Gods”, i.e. the Light Elements, and about a conversation of the Apostle with an electa are established. Dr Reck quotes fragment So 20229 only in order to determine the original measurements of the manuscript: 22.5 × 12.7 cm (at least) and the number of lines per page (21 + heading). But she regarded So 20229 as not belonging to the aforementioned work. In favour of this assumption one can state that the heading “Four Worlds” is different from the title of those parts, and that the punctuation marks differ, too. They are in the chapter on the Light Elements “schwarze Doppelpunkte in einem roten Kreis”, in the present text, however, massive black dots with a little hook, mostly surrounded by a circle in red colour and always followed by three small black points.

The fragment belongs to a sermon on “The four worlds.” This can either mean the quarters of the world as they extend over the four directions, or the four upper layers of the eight storey building of the world which the Manichaean cosmology sometimes calls “worlds”, too. It is sometimes difficult to tell which is meant when Manichaean texts speak verbatim of four worlds. My impression is, however, that normally the regions of the four directions of this our world are meant. I understood MP šahr čhr as the parts of the world in the four directions. Parth. čfr šhr’n must be the four parts of the world, too. In the same sense a Coptic Bema Psalm describes “the mountains of the earths, the rivers ... the waters, the four worlds (κόσμος) and the ... blossoming trees,

---

5 Reck 1995, p. 196, with n. 5.
6 Cf. note 23.
7 Called in MP. and Parth. šahr, cf. E.V. Williams Jackson, Researches in Manichaism, New York 1932, pp. 32-37. The four lower earths are called nirānāsān (Jackson 1932, p. 50). In the Middle Persian cosmogonical text published by F.C. Andreas and W. Henning, Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I, in: SPAW, phil.-hist. Kl., Berlin 1932, p. 177, with n. 5, they are zmyg čhr “four earths.”
8 Sundermann 1973, p. 60, l. 1137, with p. 59.
the gardens of fragrance”, etc.\textsuperscript{10} In all these texts the four quarters of the world are meant, and Cumont has derived this concept from an old Babylonian origin.\textsuperscript{11} It is a priori likely that the Sogdian ctβr ‘βc’npδ was understood in the same sense. Chr. Reck has correctly pointed out that Man.-Sogd. ctβr ‘βc’npδ has an equivalent in Buddh.-Sogd. ctβr ‘βc(’)npδ.\textsuperscript{12} I think that the Buddhist equivalent confirms the meaning of the term gained from the Manichaean terms in other languages. The Buddhist equivalent renders Chinese 四天 下 (si tian xia) which in turn translates Skr. catu-ravīpa,\textsuperscript{13} and this is “the four quarters or continents of the world.”\textsuperscript{14} As for the Manichaean application of the term cf. also M 5701, first page, l. 3: IV ’fcbδyy yxw’k “separation of the four worlds” and second page, l. 17: xwrsncy’k Tcbδ “the eastern world.” So one can say that the exotic creatures described in our fragment do not live hidden in underground caves but at the outskirts of this our world.

The “Four Worlds” text is likely to belong to the homiletic/didactic wyδβγ literature, in the same way as another sermon, called III fcmbδy wyδβγ “Sermon on the Three Worlds.”\textsuperscript{15} The literary character of the treatise could be determined more precisely if we were allowed to add fragment So 18300 = [T I T.M. 418], the version of the story about the pearl-borer in Sogdian script,\textsuperscript{16} to this manuscript. Chr. Reck dismissed it because the number of its lines per page is 17 instead of 21, because the punctuation differs and because the measurements of the column are only 17 cm x 9.5 cm.\textsuperscript{17} But these are no insurmountable obstacles. The punctuation is also different in the other parts of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{18} The text is not preserved in its full length. At its bottom end (rather than at its head, as Henning assumed) one line is missing completely. This does not bring us to 21 lines, but it allows the assumption that the fragment was 22.5 cm long (as So 20229 was). Its breadth, in any case, was demonstrably 12.5 cm + a small portion of the other half of the

\begin{enumerate}
\item F. Cumont, M. Kugener, \textit{Recherches sur le Manichéisme II}, Bruxelles 1912, p. 164.
\item Reck 1995, p. 198, n. 8.
\item Published by Henning 1945, pp. 465-469.
\item Reck 1995, p. 196, n. 3.
\item Two black dots in a red circle.
\end{enumerate}
So 20229 = K 29/R/(photo: Stabsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz)
double page. I think therefore that So 18300 is one more part of the same manuscript which was indeed a kind of “Sammlhandschrift.” This observation is important because the text of So 18300 is attested a second time in Manichaean script on the fragment M 135. M 135, however, has convincingly been characterized as a text of the *Kephalaia*-type, and this may well be true of the whole of the other manuscript, too. If I may take up my theory about the relation between Iranian homiletic texts and Coptic *Kephalaia*-texts, I would say: the texts of the Sogdian manuscript discussed here belong to a sequence of homiletic instructions which include pieces of the *Kephalaia*-type, some of which are attested in the Coptic *Kephalaia*-collections.

So 20229 = K 29 can be read and translated as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
R/ \\
1/ [3-5] p^\delta k xcy & \text{rtcmn} \\
2/ [my\delta]'jn 'sky s'rt mrtxm'k rty \\
3/ [ycy] 'nyw ky' ZK CWRH mrtxm'k \\
4/ [cyc] ZY p'\delta t 'sty m'y\delta c'nkw \\
5/ ZY ZKn 'stwrp\delta'k^24 rty 'nyw ky' \\
6/ [ZK](n)^23 \text{dyt} YZ p'\delta t 'sty c'n'kw ZY \\
7/ [ZK](n) mrtxm'yt rtsy ZK sry m'y\delta \\
8/ [c'n]'kw ZY ZKn 'stwrp\delta'k \text{ sty} \\
9/ [s]'(iy ky' ZK c\text{m'y}'yw xcy m'y\delta \\
10/ [c'n]'kw ZY ZK pr'\beta yr t'\delta r'm^2 \\
11/ [rty] [m]s tym 'skw'nt 'nyw z-nk'n \\
12/ (m)[r](t)xm'yt ky ZY sn cmm my\delta'n \\
13/ s'rt dw' p'\delta t //26 'sty c'n'kw \\
14/ [Z][Y] mrtxm'yt rtsn cmm my\delta'n^2 'sky \\
\end{align*}\]

| 19 | Henning 1945, p. 466. |
| 21 | In red ink. |
| 22 | In red ink. |
| 23 | The punctuation consists here and always in this text of a big dot with a hook which may but need not be surrounded by a red circle, followed by three small points. |
| 24 | Mistake for 'stwrp\delta'k. |
| 25 | [ZK](n) evidently for \text{u\dot{e}d\dot{a}n “their”}, Gershevitch 1954, § 1396. |
| 26 | A word of three or four letters erased, probably a first sty. |
| 27 | So for want of space instead of my\delta'n. |
they have many heads. And there is (a kind) which has two heads, and which has three each, (and) which has five. And many other kinds are in many shapes. These creatures of other shapes which exist in different places and on different islands,

---

28 What looks like a punctuation mark is certainly no more than a misspelled and not cancelled letter. If it were a punctuation, the mark should be encircled in red ink and three small dots should follow (cf. note 23). Besides, a punctuation within this part of the phrase would be quite out of place.

29 Seemingly krš'n, but what looks like an is the top of the final tail of wy'kt in line 20.

30 Restored according to /V/18-19/.

31 Line-filler.

32 The third letter is either a small k or a small p. Instead of the 'n an s or s is less likely.

33 pöny does not go up to the end of the line, so I assume a final line-filler.

34 The isolated ' at the beginning of line 12 is the last letter of the last word of line 11 which was presumably öst'tt'.

35 On this letter cf. note 42.
The Sogdian fragment enumerates strange creatures which are either half men and half animal (with human bodies and with animals' feet, with human extremities but with an animal's head) or who are equipped with the limbs of a human being, but in another number than ordinary men commonly have them: creatures with one eye only,
with many heads, or with no head at all, with many hands and arms like an Indian god. Or they are marked by particular oddities: a broad, flat face, i.e., in which the nose is not visible, or an animal’s tail.

The text does not specify where these creatures live. It says that they can be found in different regions. This means surely in different marginal regions of the four quarters of the habitable world.

Creatures of this kind are an essential part of the mythical ramifications of the antique geography and ethnography. The best survey I know (thanks to Peter Zieme) is H. Mode’s “Fabeltiere und Dämonen. Die phantastische Welt der Mischwesen” (Leipzig 1973). Suffice it to refer to the dog-heads as described by Ktesias and Plinian. The classical Persian literature knows the boz-gūs (having goats’ ears) or bar-gūs (having the ears on the chest), the sag-sār (dog-heads), gurgsār (wolf-heads), narm-pāyān (having soft feet) or ērm-pāyān (having leather feet) or dawāl-pāyān (belt-feet). They appear e.g. in the Šāhnāme and the Garšāspnāme, but also in the Alī laīla wa laīla. Nearer in time and language to our text are of course the testimonies of the Zoroastrian Pahlavi literature. The Bundahišn enumerates along with existing peoples like the Iranians, Turks and Chinese the war-gōs (those having the ears on the chest), the war-čāšm (having the eyes on the chest), the ēk-pāy (one-legged), those who have wings like bats (šawāg), people with tails and fur, and dwarfs. The “contest-poem” Draxt ī asūrīg, which goes back to a Parthian model and is certainly an old piece of Middle Iranian Zoroastrian tradition, mentions the widestīg (dwarfs), the war-čāšm (those who have eyes on the chest), and, as Nawwābī has recognized, in a lost verse, the sagsarān (dog-heads) as people living in the region from India to Warkāš. A third text to report about exotic people is to be found in the apocalyptic and to a certain degree cosmographic Ayādgār ī jāmāspīg. It mentions the war-čāšmān, war-gōsān, dawāl-pāyān, widestīgān and sagsarān, those
M 289b /R/, M 289c /R/ (photo: Statsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz)

M 289b /V/, M 289c /V/ (photo: Statsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz)
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M 415 /I/R/, /II/V/ (photo: Statsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz)

M 415 /I/V/, /II/R/ (photo: Statsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz)
having the eyes or the ears on the chest, the belt-feet, the dwarfs and the dog-heads.\textsuperscript{50}

The Manichaean text presented here describes vaguely the same subject. But it does not mention any of those creatures discussed above. When it speaks of semi-human beings with an animal's head (R/5-8/) it does not call them “dog-heads.” Its description is of a more abstract and generalized kind. Descriptions of creatures with many heads (R/11-17/) or many hands and arms (V/11-15/) are conspicuous. They might be inspired by the model of Indian deities and Buddhist saints. Exceptionally clear is the description of those who have a broad noseless face (V/9-10/). But I do not know an equivalent in another tradition. The creatures with one eye can be compared with the Cyclopes. But it is certainly more obvious to point to the mysterious people of the 'Αριμασσοί (and similar forms). The Greek writer Aristeas of Prokonnesos learned about them from the Skythians that they lived in a remote area behind the Issedons, that they were in conflict with the griffins who watched treasures of gold and who had only one eye. Herodotos learned it from Aristeas, and we read it in his Histories.\textsuperscript{51} The name of the Arimaspoi itself was explained by H.H. Schaedler as a Skythian word meaning “only (one) eye.”\textsuperscript{52} It is possible, I think, that the Manichaean sermon takes up a local Central Asian tradition.

The fragment ends with the remarkable words: “they (the semi-human beings and monsters) are all born from those strong beings who from ...” It is very much to be regreted that we are not told who the strong beings were and where they came from. My guess is that the strong beings are the so-called egrēgoroi or “watchers” who from the Jewish Enoch-literature found their way into Mani’s “Book of the Giants”, often called māzendarān-demons, but also addressed under their original designation ‘yr.\textsuperscript{53} The egrēgoroi, it is well known, begot with earthly women the race of the giants. Is it not possible that they, lascivious and seducible as they were, also committed sodo-

mite acts and procreated disgusting creatures, half man and half animal or monstrosities in human shape.

The Sogdian text published here is instrumental in identifying and partly reconstructing a related Middle Persian text which may even belong to the same sermon. It consists (so far as I know) of three fragments, M 289b, M 289c, M 415, which are parts of a double sheet. Two of them are joining in the following way:

\[
\begin{align*}
/I/R/i/ & : M 415 \\
/I/V/ii/ & : M 415 \\
/I/R/i/ & : M 289b \\
/I/V/ii/ & : M 289b
\end{align*}
\]

Somewhere in the lower part of /I/R/i/ M 289c /R/i/ (lines 10-15) and of /I/V/ii/ M 289c /V/ii/ (lines 9-14) are to be located. This follows from the contents of the fragments.

The establishment of this part of the joined fragment determines the rest of the text. /I/R/ii/ and /I/V/i/ first line is M 289b, the rest of these columns is M 289c /R/ii/ and /V/i/ - . The other sheet of the double sheet which I arbitrarily call the second one is solely formed by M 415 /II/.

The text treats the apparent varieties of the human kind and eventually also semi-human beings in /I/R/i/. After first enumerating human races (white, black, red people) as they exist in and around Iran, it mentions those mythical human creatures with animals' heads which seem to be missing in the Sogdian fragment, the pig-heads, ass-heads and bull-heads, and the most popular dog-heads may safely be assumed in a lacuna of the Middle Persian fragment.

The nearest parallel texts known to me are a New Persian and a Sogdian fragment. The first one enumerates the ten kinds of men and mentions, i.a. palang-sarān, šir-sarān, šotor-sarān, sag-sarān “panther-heads, lion-heads, camel-heads, dog-heads.” The second one, kindly given to me by Nicholas Sims-Williams, is the big magical text P 3 with a still longer list: nāgas which are kyrmy sr'kw, 'spy sr'y, pyšh sr'kw, šr'γw sr'k, myw sr'kw, pwr'd'nk sry, k's sr'kw, 'kwty sr'kw, γw sr'kw, xry sr'kw, mr'y sry, mrtxm'k sr'kw, βγγ sr'kw, kpy sry, 'yškwy sry, znkznk'n nxšyr sr'kw “serpent-heads, horse-heads, elephant-heads, lion-heads, tiger-heads, panther-heads, pig-heads, dog-heads, bull-heads, donkey-heads, bird-heads, man-heads, god-heads, fish-heads, yaka-heads(?), heads of many

---

54 I find confirmation of my assumption in Markwart's observation that names like sagār and gurgār are, in the Iranian tradition, “eigentlich nur Beiwörter von Māzandarān” (Markwart 1930, p. 45).

kinds of game. These examples suffice to show that the defective Middle Persian text could be restored in many ways.

/I/R/i/
1/ 'yd (r')y cy mrðwhm w(s) because mankind is of manifold appearance and manner.
2/ cyhrg ws 'yng hynd o o
3/ cy '(s)t mrðwhm 'y 'spyd For there are white men
4/ 'st 'y sy'w o 'st 'y and there are black ones and there
5/ sw[h][r o o]'st 'y hwcyhr o o are red ones. There are beautiful ones
6/ '[(s)t]'y dwrcyhr o '(s)[t 'y and ugly ones. There are such who
7/ ([qw]s)77 rwd q[ 8-12 ] [live in(?)] regions,58 [at] the riverside, [ ]
8/ (o .)[] [ ]
9/ (.())[ ] [ ]
(lacuna)
10/ [ ] [(..) o o [ ]]
11/ [ 8-12 ](s)r o o wd [ ] headed. And
12/ [ 6-10 ](s)r hwgs'r [ ] headed, pig-headed
13/ [ 6-10 ](s)r o xr's'r [ ] headed, ass-headed,
14/ [ 12-16 ](g)'w [ ] bull-
15/ [s'r 8-12 ](....) o [headed ]
(lacuna)

/I/R/ii/
1/ (.)[] [ ]
(lacuna)
2/ 'st'(y)[ 8-12 ] sin[59 ]
3/ 'c k'(.)[] 8-12 of [ ]
4/ (')y][ 12-16 ] [ ]

57 Uncertain. Before the remains of a small letter (w, y?). Not more than three letters. ws “much” seems impossible.
58 The word is so far attested only in Parthian. But Middle Persian has at least p’ygws “region, district” (Boyce 1977, pp. 53, 67).
59 Certainly a derivation of āstār “sin”, possibly a verbal form as it is ascribed to Zoroastrian Pahlavi, namely āstāridan and āstārēndan “to sin” (F.M. Kotwal, Ph.G. Kreyenbrock, The Hērbeecostān and Nērangestān II, Paris 1995, p. 132). What the text does have is āstār- (cf. Sundermann in: OLZ 91, 1996, col. 340), but that is a related form, and a Manichaean āstār- “to sin” is imaginable. But a nominal formation like Parthian 'by 'st’ryft “sinlessness” would also be possible.
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5/ bzk[r (b.m)[ 8-12 ] sinner [ ]
6/ prys(t.][ 1-2 ](.)[ 6-10 ] sent[ ]
7/ [.](.)[ ] [ ]
(lacuna)

/I/\V/\ii/
1/ [ ](.)[ ] [ ]
(lacuna)

2/ [ 8-12 ](.)[ ] bwy 'wd [ ] smell and
3/ [ 4-8 ]'rdy][k]ryh [ ] bat]le[?] and
4/ [ ] w [ ] to
5/ [ 5-9 ](y u dwj)g(h)y [ ] and ignorance[?]
6/ [ ](.)[ ](n) y 'w [ ] not to
(lacuna)

/I/\V/\ii/
1/ (nj)myy 'wd xwbyh u ny 'w
2/ 'hyd kyn rys[ 'wd [ ] humility and goodness, and not to
3/ 'stptyh 'wd 's(tm)bgyl[ ] corruption, hatred, envy and
cruelty and tyranny,
4/ [ ] h'm'xwyh 'w(d ny) 'w to harmony and not to
5/ bxtgyy jng hym[.]wd[62 ] w conflict, war, ? and
6/ [ 2-4 ](.)[ ]sn 0 'w hwnsndy(y)[ u ] and satisfaction [and]
7/ [ 6-8 ](w)d ny 'w 'z[ ] [ ]
8/ [ ](d)yy [ ] and not to greed,
(lacuna)

9/ 'w(d .)[ ]
10/ gwrsgy[h][ ] and [ ]

---

60 A word ending in [kryh or [xryh.
61 The reading of the whole line is quite uncertain. The d looks rather like a
final n. It can only be a d if its head was partly erased. At the end of the word one
expects -yy or -ylh. But a simple -y could be an abrviated spelling for want of space
at the end of the line.
62 I do not know how to restore this word which, besides bxtgyy and jng should
mean "conflict, battle, competition", or something else to that effect.
63 Thus, if correct, against Pahlavi dušágāh “foolishness, stupidity” (MacKenzie
1971, p. 28) and dwšg’h in Middle Persian Turfan texts. But as for the spelling dwj-
(duč-) cf. in this text /1/V/\ii/11/ dwjny’yy. Cf. n. 64.
I said in the first part of my paper that to the best of my knowledge the report about semi-human beings and monsters in So 20229 is unique in the Manichaean tradition, and this may also be said about the Middle Persian fragments which I have just discussed. But is there

---

64 Word so far unattested. My tentative translation is based solely on an etymological consideration, namely its reading *duz-nīyān, and its derivation from *nīyā “to sing, to praise”, cf. Middle Persian nīyān “prayer, praise” (MacKenzie 1971, p. 60). An “evil” praising could be to mock at someone, make someone ridiculous.

65 Or: they give birth.

66 Or: tillage.
not the famous story in the Cologne Mani Codex of Mani's encounter with a hairy hermit whom Mani converts in the end. The description reminds one of the exotic beings of remote countries in our Sogdian text. Still closer to the Greek legend is the Bundahišn which mentions as one kind of exotic creatures people covered with fur. But the Mani Codex further states that the hairy outfit of the hermit is not an inborn but an acquired one. So he is not a descendant of the spherical ergusonoi. What cannot be excluded, however, is that among the still unpublished Coptic Manichaean fragments a corresponding text will turn up.

**Word Indexes**

**Sogdian Words**

\[\text{Word Indexes}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sogdian Words} & \quad \text{ctB}'r \ h\ell R, \ V, \sim \sim V(13) \\
\text{'z-y-t'nt V21} & \quad \text{cw R20} \\
\text{'Bc'np\delta h\ell(R), (V)} & \quad \text{CWRH R3} \\
\text{'dy} \sim R17 & \quad \text{cyw\deltayn V20} \\
\text{'\dow' R16, 'dow' p\delta'k V(14)} & \quad \text{\deltamh R20, V16} \\
\text{'nyw R3, 5, 11, 18, 19, V15} & \quad \text{\deltat'm R10, V17} \\
\text{'skw'nt R11, V12, 19} & \quad \text{\deltabtyk V(19)} \\
\text{'sly s'r R2, 14-15} & \quad \text{\deltas ' V14} \\
\text{'spw\delta'nt'k V(7) ('skw\delta'nt'k?)} & \quad \text{\deltasttrp8'k R5, 8, V(8)} \\
\text{'stw'p8'k R5, 8, V(8)} & \quad \text{\deltastty R6, 13} \\
\text{'sly R4, 6, 9, 15, 16, 16, 17, V5, 5, (6), (6), (7), 9, 11, 12, 13, (13), 14, 15, s. xcy} & \quad \text{\deltawnp' V8} \\
\text{'st' \sim V13} & \quad \text{\deltay KZY V17} \\
\text{'yw R9, V19} & \quad \text{\deltay R15, V(11)} \\
\text{\beta V16} & \quad \text{kr\deltan R19, (19), V15} \\
\text{\beta'z'-yt V(12)} & \quad \text{ky R12, V(4), 21, ky' R3, 5, 9, 16, 17, (17), V5, 6, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14} \\
\text{\beta'na V16} & \quad \text{ky'nt' \sim V(1), \sim \sim 18-19} \\
\text{\beta'nt V(4)} & \quad \text{\delta V20} \\
\text{c'\beta R18, 18} & \quad \text{L' V20} \\
\text{c'dr s'r R12} & \quad \text{m'\delta'y R4, 7, 9} \\
\text{c'nk\delta R4, 6, (8), (10), 13, V(7)} & \quad \text{mk V8} \\
\text{c\kappa'n'c V16} & \quad \text{mrtxm'k R2, 3, mrtxm'yt R7, (12), 14, mrtxm'yt R7, (12), 14,} \\
\text{c\kappa'n'c R12, 14, V21, s. rtcnm} & \quad \text{mrtxm'yt V(7-8)} \\
\text{c\kappa'n'y R9} & \quad \text{rtcnn}
\end{align*}
\]

---

Middle Persian Words

"h[yd IVii2
"yng IRi2
"z IVii(7)
\c IRii3, IRi3
\gr IRi5
\rdyky\\h IVi\ci(3)
\sm\\h IVi\ci(5)
\st IRi\ci(3), 4, 4, (5), (6), (6), IRi4
\st\ry[ IRii\ci(2)
\w IVi\ci(4), 6, IVi1, 4, 4, 6, 7, (12)
\wd IRi11, IVi2, 3, IVii1, 2, 3, (4), (5), (7), (9), (11), 12, s. u
\yd IRi1

\spyd IRi3
\strnbygyh IVii(3)
\spnyh IVi\ci(3)
\y IRi\ci(3), 4, 5, 6, [6], IVii13, IRi2
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A MANICHAEAN LITURGICAL INSTRUCTION ON THE ACT OF ALMSGIVING

WERNER SUNDERMANN

The daily meal of the elect is the main part of the Manichaean communal life and ritual. The elect eat vegetarian food rich in the light particles of the World Soul, and by way of their digestion they set free the light particles and allow them to go their way back to the world of light. So the common meal which was held once every day, every evening perhaps, amounts to a redeeming act, a step towards the restitution of the deity in its entirety, and therefore it might be called a sacramental meal.

The food they eat, the clothes they wear, the shelter they need for the night is given to them by the lay followers of the church, the “hearers.” Giving alms to the elect is part of the hearers in the redeeming work of the Manichaean church. It integrates them into the community, makes them low-grade members of the church. To put it in H.-Ch. Puech’s words: “On a constaté qu’en fin de compte,

---


2 The rule, even in East Manichaean texts, is that this communal meal was held in the evening (BeDuhn, 1996, p. 4). The Chinese writer Hong Mai (12th century), however, attributes to the Manichaean elect one meal at mid-day (S.N.C. Lieu, Manichæism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China, Tübingen 1992, pp. 289-290). It is worth considering this as a local influence of the Buddhist on the Manichaean communal regulations. Buddhist monks had also one meal a day which they were obliged to hold before noon. Cf. K. Kudara, W. Sundermann, “Zwei Fragmente einer Sammelhandschrift buddhistischer Sūtras in sogdischer Sprache”, in: AoF 14, 1987, pp. 338-348, where a Buddhist Sogdian “Sūtra on the proper time (to eat the daily meal)” is published.
les Catéchumènes en viennent à être inclus dans l'Église en raison, et à raison, des actes mêmes qui devraient, en théorie, les exclure ... Les actes permis aux Auditeurs changent de sens du tout au tout, tournent de mal en bien, dans la mesure où ils sont exclusivement accomplis en fonction, en faveur et au service de l'Église ... Finalement, c’est par le canal des Élus, et grâce à l’assistance qu’ils leur prêtent, par leur «secours» leur «service», que les Auditeurs sont intégrés dans l'Église de la Lumière, ou plutôt sont juxtaposés aux Élus ... mêlés à eux et même ... «fondus» avec eux dans un esprit d’amour.”

So the simple act of the delivery of the hearers’ alms to the elect must have had its particular importance, and I can prove now what was to be expected, that this act was performed in a ceremonial, solemn manner, accompanied by words of address and by hymns. As for the delivery of the alms, the meal of the elect, and their religious importance, reference can be made to the detailed, excellent article by Jason D. BeDuhn, “The Manichaean Sacred Meal”, which supersedes all previous publications on this subject.

The document discussed here is the small Middle Persian Turfan fragment M 546.

Incipit: hymns

for the gods

the noble gift,

full of health. Receive it,

Lord, and be happy!

---

5 In red ink.
6 In faded red ink.
7 bg’n is Parthian. It is not certain that the headlines of /v/ and /r/ belong together and form a continuous text. If that is so “the gods” might be the five divine Light Elements who may have simply been called the gods and regarded as the only deities involved in the affairs of this terrestrial world (cf. W. Sundermann, *Der Sermon von der Seele*, Berlin 1997, pp. 86-87, 139, Sogdian text §§ 112-113, with note 113, f). The gods of the Light Elements are ultimately consubstantial with the particles of Light imprisoned in the alms, offered by the hearers and liberated by the elect.
8 What seems to be the final point of the headline’s ornamental g is in fact the diacritical point of the r, written in black and not in red ink.
9 Letters partly erased, squeezed together. Only the p, both letters r and the last w are certain.
10 Not §’w.
In what follows I shall comment on: (1) the alms-givers, (2) the receivers of the alms, (3) the alms, (4) the hymns, (5) the sequence of the events, and the structure of the text.

The alms-givers

The alms are the gifts of the hearers, their contribution to the light-redeeming work of the church. It is only natural to assume that they themselves presented their offerings to a representative of the community of the clerics, even though the text does not specify it. This

11 The alms-bearers?
12 The margin of the fragment is folded so that the first letter is completely covered by two red dots.
13 The sins of those who produced, procured and offered the alms?
14 Title-line in red ink.
15 The first line of the following hymn written as its title-line in red ink. The second line follows in black ink. Only the top of one of its letters is preserved. It suffices to show that this line did not simply repeat the preceding red line.
16 On the identity of “them” cf. part 5 of my commentary, on the sequence of events.
17 The chiefs.
18 pdw’c (instead of pyw’c) is Parthian.
19 The whole text of v/1-6/ in red ink.
20 “Beloved” certainly means those who offered the alms. “Beloved ones” may also address the listeners to a sermon (cf. W. Sundermann, Mitteliranische mani-ischische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts, Berlin 1981, p. 56, with note 2).
21 I.e., those who, on behalf of the lay-people, take the alms to the table of the elect?
22 The first line of a hymn in response to the hymns of the almsgivers.
is also the result of BeDuhn’s comparative studies on the subject.\textsuperscript{23} It is only the so-called “Monastery Scroll” which seemingly contradicts this conclusion. Its statement is: “When the Gods (i.e., the high-ranking clerics) sit down at table, then two \textit{xrwxn} (i.e. the \textit{xrōhxwānān} or preachers)\textsuperscript{24} shall offer food and drink in standing position to the ‘yty’ny źm’styk,\textsuperscript{25} then they shall sit down at table.”\textsuperscript{26} But this detail allows different explanations, e.g., that the auditors delivered their gift beforehand and that it was then taken to the meal by the \textit{xrwxn} because the auditors had no access to this most solemn ceremony of the Manichaean church. It seems that the same course of events took place in our text.

\textbf{The receivers of the alms}

The recto-page begins in lines /1-5/ with the solemn address of a “lord” (\textit{xwd’y}). This is not very precise. All one can say is that \textit{xwd’y} may certainly denote a high-ranking clergyman, whether he is an archegos, teacher, bishop, presbyter, or even a \textit{xrōhxwān}. A good case in point is the Middle Persian hymn fragment M 31 in honour of the hierarchy, published by Andreas and Henning.\textsuperscript{27} The text, as it is preserved, praises the archegos (\textit{sārār}), the teacher and the bishop.

\textsuperscript{23} BeDuhn 1996, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{24} The \textit{xrōhxwān} (also \textit{xrōhxwān}, \textit{xrōhwān}, in the Turkish text \textit{xōxān}, as if it contained the title \textit{xwān} “lord”) is, according to the Chinese “Compendium of the Doctrine and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light”, responsible for admonition and instruction: “il s’occupe spécialement de récompenser et d’encourager” which is well in keeping with the lit. translation of his title “caller of the call.” Cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, 1913, p. 113, also Tajaddod, 1990, pp. 62-63, 243. The “Monastery Scroll”, however, ascribes to him a serving function which might confirm Henning’s idea that the \textit{xrōhxwānān}, being mentioned after the presbyters and before the ordinary electi, may be identified with what Augustine called the deacons (Andreas and Henning, 1933, p. 324, n. 5, not accepted by H.H. Schaeder, Iranica, Berlin 1934, p. 14).

\textsuperscript{25} A new explanation of this title is to be expected in a forthcoming article by P. Zieme.

\textsuperscript{26} Zieme, 1975, p. 335. It is interesting to note that the \textit{xrwxn} are admitted at the table of the electi, but that the \textit{iś ayyūci}, the “superintendent”, lit. “speaker of the work” (possibly the same as Middle Persian \textit{kār-frāmān}, “having command over the work”, i.e. “overseer”, “director”), cf. W.B. Henning, “Mitteliranisch”, in: Handbuch der Orientalistik, Iranistik, Linguistik, Leiden, Köln 1958, p. 49, n. 2) is not mentioned in this respect. So the \textit{iś ayyūci} may have been a secular office attached to the monastery.

\textsuperscript{27} Andreas and Henning, 1933, pp. 327-330.
They all are addressed as “Lord” (xwd’y). In one brief hymn both the teacher and the bishop are given the same indistinguishable title: ‘md nwg prh nwg dydyym ‘wd pymwg ’y br’z”g ’c whmn ’wd by hmwc’g ‘w pys tw xwd’y * pdyrwš pd pryh * š’d b’s ‘wd wyštyr * ‘wr’ pd š’dyh ’w pys xwd’y nyw “New glory, a new diadem and shining garment have come from Wahman and the god Teacher, before you, O Lord. Receive it in love, be happy and prosperous! Come in joy before the noble Lord.” The first Lord (xwd’y) is the bishop, the second one the teacher. The text as it stands is applicable to different ecclesiastical situations. It may address any member of the hierarchy from the archegos to the bishop, and certainly also the presbyter and the preacher.

/v/3/ speaks of sārārān “chiefs.” sārār figures in M 31 and elsewhere as the archegos, head of the Manichaean church, also called sārār i den “head of the church.” But this cannot be what the word means in our text which speaks of a plurality of sārārān. There could of course be only one archegos at a time. So sārār has to be understood in its basic, non-technical meaning of “head, chief.” In M 546 these chiefs are the high-ranking clerics who are privileged to sit at table, and are waited on by the serving brethren.

The alms

The alms are simply called pārag “gift, present” in /v/1/ and /v/1/, a word which in the negative sense means “bribe.” It appears as a positive term in Middle Persian M 59 I /v/12-13/: pd nwg rwc ’(y) š’dyh (‘md) hynd p(d) p’rg (p)ryst’n “At the New Year’s day of joy the angels have come with gifts”, Middle Persian M 325 /v/7-8/: p’rg ’y ywjchr bw’m “May I become a holy gift.” Cf. also Middle Persian M 727a /v/5-7/: ’wd p’rg d’šn ’wd pdydstw’g’n ny pry’dynd pd h’n rwc (’)ywng “And gift, present and promise do not help at that day of distress.”

The better known word for alms, attested in /v/2/ is rw’ng’n (Parth. also ‘rw’ng’n). This might be explained as an elliptic term “(gift)
for the soul”, rw’ng’n (p’rg/d’sn). The Turkish parallel form üzüllüg is “soul work”, however, recommends rather rw’ng’n (k’r) “soul work”,\(^{34}\) if not rw’ng’n ‘sp’s “soul service.”\(^{35}\) In any case, rw’ng’n is more than just the daily alimentary offering of the hearers, it includes all their other obligatory services: the construction of monasteries, providing shelter and dress, etc.\(^{36}\) The Turkish Xästwänîfî mentions seven kinds of “presents” (yîlü tûlûg pušî) without specifying what they are.\(^{37}\)

**The hymns**

Two hymns are mentioned in this fragment, and they evidently are alms hymns. Only the first line of each hymn is preserved; but this is enough, however, to attempt to identify them with hymn texts possibly attested elsewhere in the bulk of the Turfan collection. Unfortunately, my prolonged research did not lead to a fruitful result on this issue. The first hymn, Āmad az bûn î bârist, was sung, if my interpretation of the whole fragment is correct, by the almsgivers while offering their alms to the elect. What one can say on its text is that the phrases bân î bârist “the Gods of the Paradise” and āmad az bârist “from Paradise came” are amply attested and frequently repeated in Middle Persian hymns. Thus we have “y’d zwr ‘z b’n ‘y b’ryst “strength may come from the Gods of Paradise” (M 68b II / r/10-12/), thmyy pdyryd *’c b’n ‘y b’ryst “receive strength from the Gods of Paradise” (M 82 /r/10-12/ = M 235 I /v/3-4/), )[pw](r)ym ‘w b’n ‘y b’ryst “we praise the Gods of Paradise” (M 223 I /r/5/), nmbrym ’w b’n ‘y b’ryst “we worship the Gods of Paradise” (M 315 II /v/6/), fwr’ndwt b’n ‘c b’rys(t) “the Gods may bless you from Paradise” (M 7421 /8/). As for the initial part of the phrase: ‘md ’c b’ryst rwšn šhry’r “from Paradise came the ruler of Light” (M 212 / 2/ = M 5756 /4-5/), ‘md ’c b’ry(s)[t] (w)hmn wysp(wȳh w)xš “from

---

\(^{34}\) Henning, 1944, p. 143, n. 6.

\(^{35}\) The existence of such a term may be derived from the title arvângân ispásag “soul-work servant”, reconstructed from its Chinese deduction in the Compendium so Henning, 1944, p. 143, n. 6, following E. Benveniste in: Études d’Orientalisme, Mêlanges Léonard I, Paris 1932, pp. 155-158. This explanation supersedes Gauthio’s old one, still upheld by Taqaddud, 1990, p. 242).

\(^{36}\) Andreas and Henning, 1933, p. 317, n. 2.

Paradise came the very best word of Wahman (or: Wahman, the very best word?)" (M 234 /v/10-12/), 'md 'c b'rst pry(stg w)zrg “from Paradise came the Great Messenger” (M 394 /r/9/ = M 468b /6/). The phrase ʾāmad az bān ʾī bārīst, however, seems not to be attested another time. But even so, it is not superfluous to quote the related formulas. One of them, M 68 II, explains what are the bān ʾī bārīst. They represent, beside the sun and the moon, “the power of the powerful” and Wahman, the Light-Nous, the first part of the four-fold divine entirety. The “Gods of Paradise”, it seems, are the redeeming deities whose origin (and place?) is above the spheres of the sun and the moon.

The same is true of the second hymn, Pad nēw mūrwāḥ ud ʾzdag, the response of the elect to the almsgivers, if I am correct. Comparable formulas are 'md nwg [mw]rw ‘bzwn ‘wd j[dg ‘y hw]m’ywn “A new good omen and increase and good luck has come” (M 31 II /r/19-20/ in: Andreas and Henning, 1933, p. 329), ‘wr pd nwg jdg ‘wd nyw mūrw[h]“Come with new good luck and good omen” (Henning, 1937, ll. 409-410, M 7351 /1/), ‘y’d pd nwg nyw’ mwr[w] “May it come with new, good omen, new good luck and a good leader” (M 339 /8-10/), nwg jdg nwg mūrw[h] “New good luck, new good omen” (M 797 I /v/6/), ‘y’d nwg mūrw[h] pd jdg ‘y ʾs’dyy ‘c yzd rwsn zwr ‘wd wh[y] “New good omen may come with the good luck of joy from God, light, power and wisdom” (M 1863 /6-10/).

The sequence of the events, and the structure of the text

What distinguishes M 546 from other similar pieces of the Turfan collection is its detailed—as it were—liturgical stage direction on its verso page, and the text of a formulaic prose address on the recto page. All these components—the address, the hymns, and the description of a ritual act—taken together, accompany the act of an almsgiving ceremony which is styled as a solemn ritual.

It is regrettable, so much the more, that the text is just a fragment, inexact in its terminology and lacunous in its description of the modus procedendi. Too often it happens that a clear cut noun is replaced by a pronoun. This is not surprising. Evidently the writer and his read-

---

38 Cf. Andreas and Henning, 1933, p. 320, n. 2.
ers knew who were the \textit{xudåy}, the \textit{sårårän} and the \textit{friyânagân} and who or what was meant by the pronouns “he”, “it” and “them.”

If we may presuppose that the use of the singular and the plural pronouns in /r/2 and 4/ renders different objects, then the singular -\textit{aš} might refer to the alms which appear in /r/1/ as the singular word \textit{pârag}. The plural -\textit{şan} could well denote the hearers on whose behalf the speaker(s) of these words beg for the remission of sins. The interceding persons must be clerics, exempt from the sins of the hearers. The person addressed by them is called “Lord” (\textit{xudåy}). He must have been a cleric who was high in rank above the interceding persons. The situation reminds one of the presentation of the alms in the so-called Uigur “Monastery Scroll” quoted above: two \textit{xrohxwåänän} offer food and drink in standing position to the enigmatic 'yty’ny zm’styk. The same or a similar situation may be presupposed by /r/1-5/ of our text.

Next is the first line of a hymn. As /v/5-6/ points out, the other hymn beginning with /v/7/ is a response to the chant of the \textit{friyânagân}. Because these “beloved ones” are certainly the hearers, the hymn “From the gods of paradise came”, the hymn of the recto page, must have been sung by these hearers who were still present at the ceremony.

The verso page says that “they” bring “them” (or, “it”) before the “chiefs.” This means, if we may apply the pattern of the “Monastery Scroll”, that the \textit{xrohxwåänän} together with the 'yty’ny zm’styk take the alms to the high-ranking members of the clergy. The community of the elect welcome the alms with their hymn “With a good omen and augury.” We can only guess that the part of the alms-givers has now concluded, and that the sacred meal of the elect, which takes place to the exclusion of the lay people, now begins.

You may be surprised not to have met in my interpretation the one person of the Manichaean hierarchy who, according to the “Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light”, was more than any other person responsible for the right choice and treatment of the alms, the \textit{ehuanjiensaihosai}, or \textit{*arwànagân-ispasag} “servant of the alms”, as his title has been reconverted into Parthian.\footnote{Cf. n. 35.} Let me say simply that the \textit{arwànagân-ispasag} does not appear in the Iranian Manichaean texts.

The Manichaean alimentary rites are now comprehensively described and analyzed in Jason D. BeDuhn’s book \textit{The Manichaean Body In Discipline and Ritual}, Baltimore & London 2000.
A MANICHAEAN-TURKIC DISPUTE IN RUNIC SCRIPT

Peter Zieme

Introduction

Manichaean tales were used, among other things, for homiletic purposes. A large quantity of Central Asian versions of such tales in Middle Iranian languages is known from editions by F. C. Andreas, W. B. Henning and W. Sundermann. There are also some parables in Old Turkic translation edited by the explorer A. v. Le Coq himself and re-edited and discussed by W. Bang in his article “Mani­chäische Erzähler”.

Among the texts in Runic script from the Turfan oasis and Dunhuang, there are some which belong to Manichaean who had their communities in several oases. The members of the Manichaean communities were first Iranians or, better, Sogdians, but more and more were Turks or Uigurs. These Uigurs used not only the Manichaean script and the Sogdo-Uigur one, but also their old Runic script. Although the origin of the old Runic script is probably the Sogdian script, it is nevertheless a particular and specific script. Already in 1909, A. v. Le Coq edited the best specimens of this literature. Among those long known fragments, we have some Turkic as well as Middle Persian texts. The use of the Runic script is a good argument for suggesting that in later times it was the Uigurs who

---


were writing Manichaean texts in Middle Persian, Parthian or Sogdian.

When O. Sertkaya edited some hitherto unpublished fragments written in Runic script in 1985,\(^4\) he did not compare them with those edited by A. v. Le Coq.\(^5\) Thus it escaped his notice that there is one piece which can be joined directly with a previously edited text fragment. I hope that this joined fragment can contribute to a better understanding of the text.

A. v. Le Coq wrote on the fragment TM 342, which today is preserved in the Turfan Collection of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften under the number “U 5”: “Das beste unter den Manuskripten dieser Serie ist T.M. 342. Es besteht aus dem Doppelblatt eines Buches westländischer Form; die Größe eines jeden Blattes mag etwa 17x11 cm betragen haben, in der Höhenachse sind bei einem der Blätter noch 15 cm erhalten. Die Schrift ist groß und deutlich, so daß man die Gestalt der Buchstaben und die Unterschiede zwischen ihnen und den uns in den Inschriften überlieferten Formen leicht zu erkennen vermag. Das Papier ist weiß, weich und faserig, vielleicht aus Baumwolle hergestellt.”\(^6\)

The description continues: “Zwischen dem Inhalt der beiden Blätter ist ein direkter Zusammenhang nicht nachweisbar. Es handelt sich auf der Rückseite des zweiten Blattes um Beschworungen, in denen die Gestirne eine Rolle spielen.”\(^7\) On the origin of the fragment, he remarks: “Das Stück T.M. 342 wurde in Idiqul-Schahri in der Ruine β (des GRUNWEDELschen Plans) gefunden.”\(^8\)

Le Coq mentions that all fragments belong to the finds of the first expedition.\(^9\) Concerning the contents, the editor says only that one cannot expect a continuous text written on the two pages and he continues: “Es handelt sich auf der Rückseite des zweiten Blattes um Beschworungen, in denen die Gestirne eine Rolle spielen.”\(^10\)

As I want to show in the following, it is possible to join the frag-

---


\(^6\) Le Coq, *Köktürkisches aus Turfan*, 1056.

\(^7\) Le Coq, *Köktürkisches aus Turfan*, 1057.

\(^8\) Le Coq, *Köktürkisches aus Turfan*, 1052.


\(^10\) Le Coq, *Köktürkisches aus Turfan*, 1057.
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Mz 383 (T II K), edited by O. Sertkaya without any comment and translation, with page II of U 5. Thus, line 1 of Mz 383 follows line 12 of U 5. Counting the combined number of lines, we now have 20 lines altogether. The height of the leaf is thus more than 22 cm., much more than suggested by Le Coq. It is unclear how many lines were originally on the folio.

How can we explain the different find signatures? Mz 383 bears the remark “T II K”, that is, from ruin K by the second expedition, on the paper margin of the recto side, while according to Le Coq’s own statement quoted above, U 5 was found in the ruin ß by the first expedition. Given the assumption that both statements are true, one can make the following remarks. On Grünwedel’s map of Idikut-Schahri, the ruin called K is situated in the middle of the old city, while ruin ß is a building on the utmost southwestern edge. A. Grünwedel writes on this ruin: “Dieser einst imposante Bau, dessen Hauptanlage an der Frontseite über 100 m, an den Längsseiten aber über 170 m mißt, war der Gegenstand meiner besonderen Aufmerksamkeit.”

The signature T II K is notorious for its uncertainties as already mentioned by M. Boyce. In reference to Le Coq’s “Fundliste” (in Vol. I of the Acta of the second expedition) Boyce remarked, “In this find-list the same principle is followed as in those of the first expedition. The packages are listed under the site-signature D and each is given an individual number. Nevertheless a group of the Berlin fragments have simply the signature T II

13 Grünwedel, Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten, 74.
14 Grünwedel, Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten, 26-27.
K (...). Some, if not all, of these, were evidently taken from packets with D-numbers. Others have signatures with K + a number. From the find-list it is clear that these numbers (...) represent packet-numbers of the general series.\(^{15}\) Perhaps it was simply so that U 5 and Mz 383 were lying together in such a “D” package. On the other hand, it is not entirely out of the question to suggest that one of the two fragments was transmitted to the other building by someone for some unknown reason or by chance. It is strange that the statements on the expeditions differ.

The other items also contain inconsistencies. While the third fragment has nothing more than the uninformative “TM” signature, “TM 333”,\(^{16}\) there is on the original of U 172 the find signature “T II D 67”. Pieces from the same package stem from ruin K, as the “Fundliste” of the second expedition shows: “Man. MS. fige K.”\(^{17}\) Thus, the origin from ruin K becomes obvious, but the problem why the first piece was found in the ruin β remains unsettled.

**Texts: transliteration, transcription, translation & commentary**

There are now fragments of three double folios, but the reconstruction of their original arrangement has many difficulties. The texts of sheet II, and my concern here is only this, can be read in the following way.

1. The joined fragment

1.1. Transliteration:

(recto)

(head line) \([x \ x ]k^1 [x x]::\)
01 s i k^2 : s^1 b^1 i
02 n^1 : w ē s^2 m i s
03 l^2 r^2 : y^2 m^1 : b^1 i
04 r^2 i : nē' : t^2 i m


\(^{16}\) Not TM 533 as Sertkaya (“Fragmente in alttürkischer Runenschrift” 146) quotes it with reference to the wrong indication on the glass plate.

05 i s : m n² : k l w l¹
06 w l¹ : d¹ w k l w m :
07 k l : m g¹ d¹ : r²
08 k² l² i g² : y¹ w l¹ t¹
09 w z : r³ m i s : y²
10 m : i k² i n² t²
11 i : r² : nč : t² i m
12 s : k l : m g¹ d¹ : r²
13 r² k² l² i g² : [x x x x]
14 y² m : : w d² [x x x x]
15 i : : y¹ s¹ [x x x x x]
16 b¹ w l l w r¹ : y² m [?]
17 [w č] w nč : : r² : nč : t¹
18 r² i m i s : [x l]
19 [x] d¹ : r² k²
20 [x x x : x x] : [x x x]

(verso)

(head line) : : [x x x x x x x]
01 y² m : b¹ w : s¹ [ˈ b¹]
02 g¹ : nč k² : w z n²
03 m i s l² r² : y² i g²
04 : : l¹ g¹ : b¹ w l¹ w š¹
05 g¹ l¹ i : w n¹ m
06 d¹ w k¹ l¹ r¹ :
07 y² m : y¹ w l¹ t¹ w z
08 w g¹ : w g² w g² l² i : r² : nč : t² i m i s
10 : m n : y¹ w l¹ t¹ w z
11 w g¹ : k l l¹ t¹ i : r² k²
12 [l] i g : t i m i s
13 [m n] : n² : w č w
14 [n t] i s² r² : y² m
15 [ˈ : x] i r² : w l¹ w g¹
16 [:] i l² i g² : b¹ r¹ : [r²]
17 [t²] i : y² m : [x x]
18 [x] i g² i [x x]
19 [x] t i g² i [n //]
20 [x x x x ]
1.2. Transcription:

(recto)

a (01-03) [bir ikinti]sikā savin őčäšmiš-lär
b (03-09) ymā birī anča temiš mān koluladukum kamagda ārklig yultuz ārmīš

(verso)

c (09-16) ymā ikinti ār anča temiš kamagda ārklig \[\ldots\] ymā őd[\ldots]\ ā ays[tz \ldots\] bolur
d (16-20) ym[ā üč]ūnč ār anča temiš ka[mag]da ārk[līg \ldots]

e (01-06) ymā bō sa[bir]g inčāk öznamislār yeg alq buluşgah unamaduklār
f (07-13) ymā yultuzg őgūgli ār anča temiš m(ā)n yultuzg kahr ārklig temiš m(ā)n
g (13-20) nā üčün tesār ym[ā b]ir ulug elig bar ārtī ymā \[\ldots\]ligi \ldots\ tegin ...

1.3. Translation

(recto)

a [Each other they were wagering.
b And one said thus: “This is what I have found: The mightiest of all are the stars.”
c And the second man said thus: “The mightiest of all [are sun and moon, because sun- and] moonless it will be [dark].”
d And the third man said thus: “The mightiest of all (...)”

(verso)
e And they argued on this subject in this way. They did not agree about finding (it either) good (or) bad.
f And the man praising the stars said thus: “I have said that the stars are the mighty.
g Why? And … there was a great king. And … the prince …

1.4. Commentary

It is not necessary to discuss the previous translations because the text could not be interpreted properly facing the enormous difficulties arising from the lack of lines. Now it is obvious that the text is a kind of tale in which three men appear who discuss the superiority of celestial phenomena. First, these three persons present their items, and in the second part each explains the reasons for choosing such and such. Apparently some stories belong to the argumentation.

The celestial bodies are of great importance in Manichacan dogma. Among others, one can refer to several kephalaiā, where

---

18 A. Panaino, “Visione della volta celeste e astrologia nel manicheismo”, in: Atti
we find discussions on the ten firmaments, the eight earths, the four mountains, the three vehicles, and the sphere of the stars. In the introductory part of Kephalaion 47 we read: “Wiederum sprach der Φωστήρ: Das Rad der Sterne, das euch offenbar ist, ein großes, gewaltiges Ding ist es.”  

The man praising the stars reports a tale of a king: “Siehe, derart ist das Rad angeordnet. Denn die Mächte, die an dem Rad angeheftet sind, sind gleich einem König, der sein Reich beherrscht durch dieses gewaltige Legionslager (λεγιών-) aller Anführer des Königreichs und die ganze Rüstung des Kämpfertums, die zu ihm versammelt ist, und die Menge des Besitzes (χρημα) des Reiches und die schöne Gestalt der Begierde (ἐπιθυμία) der Frauen, die zu ihm versammelt sind sowie (...).”  

On the whole, there is no direct dependence between these two groups of literature.  

On the other hand, Werner Sundermann reminds me, and here we have a more relevant comparison, of the story of the conversion of the Tûrânsâh. Here it is told that Mani leads the rdw into the sky and asks him, “What is higher?” The rdw answers: “my ‘spyr is still higher”. Again, the apostle asks: “What is greater than this?” The rdw answers: “The earth”. The apostle asks: “What is still greater?” Answer: “The sky”. Question: “What is still greater?” Answer: “Sun and moon”. Question: “What is still brighter?” Answer: “The wisdom of the Buddha”. Upon this the Tûrân-sâh acknowledges Mani’s superiority.  

1.5. Some further remarks

The headline cannot be reconstructed as there are only slight traces of some letters.

a. The form savîn seems to be the instrumental, not the accusative of the noun + possessive suffix of the third person. The reconstruction to [bir ikintisikâ seems to be possible.

b. Very interesting is the syntagma mân (thus read also by G. Clauson, ED 621b) which may reflect an old usage of the suffix -DUK as a
finite verbal form. M. Mansuroğlu (nach Kāšgarī): “als finites Verbum nur bei den Suwaren, Kiptschaken und Oghusen gebräuchlich” (PhTF I, p. 98); O. Pritsak (PhTF I, p. 559): “Indefinit II: -duq (nach Kāšgarī hatten diese Form die Özuyen, einige Qifçaq und Sovarin) ist nur im HmM. belegt; auch hier erscheint die Form nur vom Hilfsverb a- und in derselben Funktion, wie miš in den SD: ilgeriside ıke adam bar ikan-duq ‘einst lebten zwei Menschen’, ı küküklä yolvaz (< yolbars) ikän-dük ‘diese kleinen (Tiere) waren Tiger’.”

Erdal 1991, 210: “The only runic ex. (...) writes the word [i.e. turug] with the voiceless velar, but that is a text with several errors: koluladurum for koluladukum, ögülü (with explicit A) for ögülü, al(ı)g for kalıq, t(ı)gdı for katıgdı. Curiously, three of these four errors involve backvocalic /k/.” Unfortunately, Erdal does not give the reasons for considering this text as full of errors. After examining the manuscript again, one can see that these are not mistakes in the manuscript, but those of interpretation. In the word koluladukum the ninth letter is clearly a ⟨ı⟩, not an ⟨ı⟩. The form ögülü is spelled correctly. The third example of an error is dubious, I prefer the interpretation as ahg. The word t(ı)gdı appears not in this, but in another fragment, i.e., TM 326 (Le Coq 1909, p. 1058 verso 4).

In a discussion on the occasion of a small symposium in Göttingen in 1997, M. Erdal pointed out that the DUK form is never used as a finite verbal ending. In the case of koluladukum one may consider to translate it as an infinite form: “(this is) what I have considered (found)”, but unamaduklar is simply and only “they did not agree.”

Now see also T. Tekin, On the Old Turkic Verbal Noun Suffix {dOk}, in: Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları 7 (1997), 5-12.
e nč k² = (ı)nč(ä)k < inčä + ök. Although this reading is doubtful, because one normally expects a letter for an initial vowel, it is (nearly) the only one allowed by the ligature nč. G. Clauson (ED 289a sub özne:-) reads “ança: (?sic, MS: ?ençek”).
e ı l g = ahg “bad”, cf. UW 92b (only one item from the translation of Xuanzang’s life). In his translation of the whole sentence, G. Clauson (ED 289a sub özne:-) regarded the word as a deverbal noun from al- “to take”: “and they argued (?) on this way about this subject but did not agree in finding a good solution.”
e unamaduklar “they did not agree” is a finite verbal form, as explained above.
2. Fragment of a second folio

There is a fragment of a second double folio, namely from its inner part: U 172 (T II D 67). From page II only the following letters are visible:

(recto)
(headline) : : y^2 i [x x x]
01 w r^1 \cdot i x [x x x x x]
(...)
(verso)
(headline) [ ] ñ : :
01 [x x x x x]l^2 t^2 \ddot{w} r^2
(...)

There is no way to give any interpretation of this piece.

3. Fragment of a third folio

A fragment from a third folio that possibly came from the same book, is Mz 386 (TM 333). It contains only a part of page II. Thus, the arrangement of recto and verso sides is given according to the observation that the right margin is of the same shape as that of fragment 1 which contains both pages. There remains a great gap between the two pages.

3.1. Transliteration:

(recto)
(headline) . w b l r l [ /// ]
1 k^2 \ddot{w} r^2 \ddot{w} k^2 s^2 \ddot{w} z : k^1
2 w r^1 k^1 i n č i g^1 : k^2 \ddot{w}
3 r^2 k^2 : \ddot{w} n^2 \ddot{w} r : [x x]
4 i : : \ddot{w} č \ddot{w} n č : [x x]
5 i n^2 t^2 : [x x x x x]
6 [x] : b w [x x x x x x]
(verso)
(headline) [ t ] t^2 i 0
1 s^1 \ddot{t} k^2 l^2 r^2 : t^1 w [g1]
2 [t] r^1 : r^2 t^2 i : b^1 w : t l
3 [w] : t^2 \ddot{w} r^2 l^2 \ddot{w} g^2 : \ddot{w} /

---

23 O. F. Sertkaya, “Fragmente in alttürkischer Runenschrift” 146-147.
3.2. Transcription:

(headline) [tär]ring obr[ug(?)]

(recto)

a (01-04) körüksüz korkınçig körk ünür [ärt]i
b (04-05) ücünç [kün]intä [/////] bo [...]

(verso)

c (01-02) [nigo]şaklar tugar ärti
d (02-06) bo t[u] türlug o[çäš]ürgüli är[lär] [...] üzütsü[z ...]miš :

3.3. Translation:
The headline may be translated as “Deep valley”, but the reference is obscure. Apparently it is not a book title, but, rather, a header for a chapter or a section.

(recto)

a [...] ugly, terrifying figures came up.

(verso)

c [aud[il]ors were born.

d These different men each other fighting ... were soulless ...

3.4. Commentary
The word obr[ug] in the header is a dubious word. Kâşyarî has already two variants of the word: ogrug and ovrug, and he says that the latter one is the vulgar form. Cf. Totenbuch I. 106: ädgü oprag ärsär tag ünüri ärsär.

a körüksüz korkınçig körk ünür. Here we observe that the same word is written in different ways: körük and körk. The verbal form ünür instead of normal ün-är is worthy of consideration. It is difficult to assume that it is a mistake, rather one is justified to consider it as a dialectal peculiarity.

d This form, beginning with the back t-, shows that the compound consists of two words: tu, cf. the discussion in TT X,436 (tuyo) and türlug. For tokuz as proposed by Sertkaya, there is not enough space, neither is it justified by the context.
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