

TIMOTHY PETTIPIECE

**COUNTING THE COSMOS :**  
**Five-Part Numeric Patterning in the Manichaean *Kephalaia***

Thèse présentée  
à la Faculté des études supérieures de l'Université Laval  
dans le cadre du programme de doctorat en sciences des religions  
pour l'obtention du grade de Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D.)

FACULTÉ DE THÉOLOGIE ET DE SCIENCES RELIGIEUSES  
UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL  
QUÉBEC

2006

© Timothy Pettipiece, 2006

Cette étude examine le recours aux nombres et aux schémas numériques dans les *Kephalaia* manichéens coptes. Après un survol de l'usage des nombres dans les textes religieux et philosophiques de l'antiquité tardive (Chapitre 1) et dans la littérature proprement manichéenne (Chapitre 2), le chapitre 3 porte sur le genre littéraire et le milieu social des *Kephalaia* en vue d'expliquer, à l'aide de la critique rédactionnelle, comment les compilateurs des *Kephalaia*, pour répondre à des pressions internes et externes, ont transformé la tradition canonique manichéenne par le moyen des schémas en cinq parties en vue de proposer une vision du monde plus cohérente et plus symétrique. Le chapitre 4 explique comment ces schémas ont été utilisés par les compilateurs des *Kephalaia* pour présenter de nombreux thèmes ontologiques, théologiques, sotériologiques, éthiques, ecclésiologiques, polémiques, et étiologiques. La conclusion donne un résumé du fonctionnement des schémas numériques dans les *Kephalaia* et rend compte de manière plus détaillée de l'usage des nombres par les compilateurs du recueil, en vue de répondre aux questions soulevées par une scolastique grandissante, par la persécution et par la mission.

Cette étude examine l'utilisation des nombres et des schémas numériques dans le premier volume des *Kephalaia* manichéens coptes, une collection de discours, sous forme de questions et réponses, portant sur de nombreuses questions doctrinales.

Le premier chapitre présente un survol de l'usage des nombres dans les textes religieux et philosophiques de l'antiquité tardive. Ces usages sont classés selon un schéma quadripartite : 1) temporel/calendrique, 2) exégétique/théologique, 3) littéraire/rhétorique, et 4) liturgique/magique.

Le deuxième chapitre étudie ensuite le recours aux nombres dans la littérature proprement manichéen, en utilisant le même modèle que le premier chapitre. Ce survol permet de mettre en lumière plusieurs constatations qui ont déterminé notre recherche, à savoir : 1) le fait que les manichéens, plus que leurs contemporains, aient utilisé des nombres dans leur discours religieux, 2) que des schémas en cinq parties soient les plus communs, et 3) que les schémas se retrouvent le plus fréquemment dans les *Kephalaia* coptes. L'objectif de notre étude sera justement de comprendre l'usage de ces schémas numériques en cinq parties dans cet important ouvrage manichéen.

Le troisième chapitre porte sur le genre littéraire et le milieu social des *Kephalaia* et il cherche à comprendre, à l'aide de la critique rédactionnelle, comment les compilateurs des *Kephalaia*, pour répondre à des pressions internes et externes, ont transformé la tradition canonique manichéenne par le moyen des schémas en cinq parties en vue de proposer une vision du monde plus cohérente et plus symétrique.

Le quatrième et dernier chapitre décrit comment cette transformation s'est produite, en tablant sur les schémas en cinq parties connus de la tradition canonique manichéenne (c'est-à-dire les propres écrits de Mani), et explique comment ce modèle a été utilisé (et révisé) par les compilateurs des *Kephalaia* pour développer de nombreux thèmes ontologiques, théologiques, sotériologiques, éthiques, ecclésiologiques, polémiques et étiologiques.

La conclusion donne un résumé du fonctionnement des schémas numériques dans les *Kephalaia* et rend compte de manière plus détaillée de l'usage des nombres par les compilateurs du recueil, en vue de répondre aux questions soulevées par une scolastique grandissante, par la persécution et par la mission.

This study examines the frequent occurrence of numbers and numeric patterns in the first volume of the Coptic Manichaean *Kephalaia*, a collection of question-and-answer discourses that attempt to address a wide range of doctrinal issues.

Chapter 1 consists of a general survey of how numbers were used in religious and philosophical texts from Late Antiquity. These various uses are classified according to a four-fold schema: 1) *temporal/calendrical*, 2) *exegetical/theological*, 3) *literary/rhetorical*, and 4) *liturgical/magical*.

Chapter 2 then reviews the occurrence of numbers in Manichaean literature generally, using the same basic framework, thereby bringing into focus several key factors that motivate this research, namely: 1), that Manichaeans utilized numbers in their religious discourse more than most of their contemporaries, 2) that *five-part* structures were by far considered the most frequently recurring, and 3) nowhere are *five-part* structures given more attention than in the Coptic *Kephalaia*. As a result, the primary object of this study is to come to terms with the occurrence of five-part numerical patterns in this important early Manichaean text.

Chapter 3 addresses the literary genre and social setting of the *Kephalaia*, and outlines how the author, by means of *redaction criticism*, intends to show the ways in which the compilers of the *Kephalaia*, in response to the internal and external pressures of their social setting, transformed canonical Manichaean traditions by means of five-part numeric patterns in order to achieve a more coherent and symmetrical view of the cosmos.

Chapter 4 describes how this transformation occurred by establishing what five-part patterns are known from canonical Manichaean tradition (i.e., Mani's own writings) and explains how these basic paradigms were used (and revised) by the *Kephalaia* compilers to address a wide array of ontological, theological, soteriological, ethical, ecclesiological, polemical, and aetiological themes.

The conclusion provides a résumé of how numeric patterning functions within the *Kephalaia* and addresses in more detail how this use of numbers may reflect the compilers' responses to issues such as scholasticism, persecution, and mission.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since its inception, this dissertation project (generously supported by a SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship) has greatly benefited from the use of both published and un-published research tools for Manichaean Studies. In particular, Gunner Mikkelsen's *Bibliographica manichaica* (Brepols, 1996) and the *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts I: Texts from the Roman Empire* (Brepols, 1998) from the Corpus fontium manichaeorum have been used profitably throughout the course of this study. This project, however, would not have been possible without the generous access granted to me by Dr. Wolf-Peter Funk to a wide array of unpublished concordances, lexical aids, and textual revisions. Without these invaluable research tools as a guide, I may very well have never found my way out of the labyrinthine depths of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*. It is also to him that I offer my sincerest thanks for initially pointing me in this direction and for patiently offering so many insightful comments and suggestions on a multitude of linguistic and methodological matters. I would also like to thank Prof. Paul-Hubert Poirier for his unflagging support and encouragement of this project, as well as for his encyclopaedic knowledge of all things early Christian. I am thankful also to Prof. Louis Painchaud for his wisdom and much-valued advice, as I am to my colleagues Tuomas Rasimus, Serge Cazalais, Jennifer Wees, and Michael Kaler for helping to create a sense of community and collegiality. Most of all, however, I would like to thank my wife, Julie, for her unconditional love and support for all my scholarly endeavours, and to my son, Alex, for the many invaluable moments of distraction and delight that his first two years have offered.

*juin 2006, Québec*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

v

	Page
<b>RÉSUMÉS/ABSTRACTS.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: NUMBER AND RELIGION IN LATE ANTIQUITY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Temporal/Calendrical.....	5
1.2 Exegetical/Theological.....	6
1.3 Literary/Rhetorical.....	11
1.4 Liturgical/Magical.....	13
<b>CHAPTER 2: NUMERIC PATTERNS IN MANICHAEAN DISCOURSE.....</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 Temporal/Calendrical.....	17
2.2 Exegetical/Theological.....	19
2.2.1 Two.....	20
2.2.2 Three.....	24
2.2.3 Four.....	26
2.2.4 Five.....	26
2.2.5 Six.....	28
2.2.6 Seven.....	28
2.2.7 Eight.....	29
2.2.8 Nine.....	29
2.2.9 Ten.....	29
2.2.10 Eleven.....	30
2.2.11 Twelve.....	30
2.2.12 Thirteen.....	31
2.2.13 Fourteen.....	31
2.2.14 Fifteen.....	31
2.2.15 Other Numbers.....	32
2.3 Literary/Rhetorical.....	32
2.4 Liturgical/Magical.....	35
2.5 Communal/Ecclesiastical.....	36
<b>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES.....</b>	<b>38</b>
3.1 Framing the Question: Towards a Redaction Critique of the <i>Kephalaia</i> .....	39
3.2 Describing the Text: Form and Function of the <i>Kephalaia</i> .....	41
3.3 Situating the Text: Textual (Pre-)History and Social Setting.....	44
3.4 Collecting the Data: Lexical Index of Fives in the <i>Kephalaia</i> .....	47
3.5 Limiting the Question: Selection of <i>Kephalaia</i> Chapter Corpus.....	51
3.6 Discovering the Community.....	55
<b>CHAPTER 4: FIVE-PART NUMERIC PATTERNING IN THE <i>KEPHALAIA</i>.....</b>	<b>56</b>
4.1 Five-Part Patterns from Canonical Manichaean Tradition.....	56
4.2 BASIC ONTOLOGICAL PATTERNING.....	61
4.2.1 The Two Trees and the Five Limbs.....	61

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

vi

4.3 THEOLOGICAL PATTERNING I: LIGHT-REALM.....	65
4.3.1 The Faces of the Father.....	65
4.3.2 The Many Sons of Man.....	68
4.3.3 Cosmic Parallelism.....	73
4.3.4 Fathers of Greatness.....	81
4.4 THEOLOGICAL PATTERNING II: DARK-REALM.....	91
4.4.1 The Evolution of Evil.....	91
4.4.2 King(s) of Darkness.....	95
4.4.3 Astrological Polemic.....	104
4.5 OTHER FORMS OF PATTERNING.....	112
4.5.1 Soteriological Patterning.....	112
4.5.2 Ethical Patterning.....	115
4.5.3 Ecclesiological Patterning.....	119
4.5.4 Polemical Patterning.....	120
4.5.5 Aetiological Patterning.....	121
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>123</b>
5.1 Scholastic Redaction.....	123
5.2 Adversity and Persecution.....	130
5.3 Missionary Expansion.....	134
5.4 Why five?.....	135
5.5 Who was responsible?.....	136
<b>WORKS CITED.....</b>	<b>138</b>

***Medinet Madi Codices***

1Ke	<i>Kephalaia</i> vol. 1: “ <i>Kephalaia of the Teacher</i> ” (Polotsky/Böhlig/Funk)
2Ke	<i>Kephalaia</i> vol. 2: “ <i>Kephalaia of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani</i> (See Funk, “Reconstruction”)
1Ps	<i>Psalm-book</i> part 1 (Funk, <i>Work Concordance</i> [unpublished])
2Ps	<i>Psalm-book</i> part 2 (Allberry/Richter/Wurst)
Hom	<i>Homilies</i> (Polotsky)
Ep	<i>Epistles</i> (Funk, <i>Work Concordance</i> [unpublished])
Acts	<i>Acts</i>
Syn	<i>Synaxeis</i> (Funk [unpublished])
A&C	Funk. <i>Kephalaia I: Addenda &amp; Corrigenda</i> .

***Other Abbreviations***

ANF	Ante-Nicene Fathers
CMC	<i>Cologne Mani Codex</i>
CCSL	<i>Corpus christianorum: series latina</i>
CSCO	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium</i>
GCS	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i>
NHC	Nag Hammadi Codex
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
OTP	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> (Charlesworth)
PUF	<i>Presses Universitaires de Frances</i>
SGM	<i>Sources gnostiques et manichéennes</i>



**INTRODUCTION**

The role of numbers and number patterns in religion is largely unexplored territory. This is due, in part, to the fact that such patterns have become so embedded into our collective consciousness that we rarely reflect on their origins or implications. In the Judaeo-Christian tradition, for instance, we do not usually inquire as to why there are *ten* commandments and not twelve, why there are *twelve* tribes of Israel and not twenty, or why Jesus, when he wanted to feed a crowd of his hearers, used only *five* loaves and *two* fish. Similarly, practicing Muslims are not apt to question why *five* daily prayers are required, instead of *six*, or why the Qur'an contains 114 *surahs* instead of 120. On a deeper level, modern Christians are rarely required to think about why God should be conceived of as a *trinity* and not a quaternity, or for that matter, a pentad. Such things are typically taken as "givens" and have come to form an integral part of our symbolic language. But this does not mean that explanations do not exist and cannot, therefore, be sought. Numerical aspects of religion simply aren't seen as generating sufficient interest to require attention. Besides, it is not as though "mainstream" religious discourse is brimming over with numerological speculations. The average reader of a scriptural text, be it the Pentateuch, the New Testament, or the Qur'an, is not struck by an abundance of numerical formulations. Thus, it is not surprising that such a phenomenon goes relatively unnoticed.

While numbers may not figure prominently in "mainstream" (i.e., orthodox) religious discourse, religious discourses that are seen as existing on the fringe of orthodoxy are far more likely to make creative, even audacious, use of numbers in their efforts to communicate and interpret sacred messages. For us, this can be seen most

dramatically in the “underground” of western religions in Gnostic, Kabbalistic, and even Ismaeli modes of discourse, which often display a great interest in numbers and numeric patterns.

Added to this group can be the great underdogs of religious history—the people whom we label *Manichaeans*. These people, followers of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE Babylonian prophet Mani (or Manichaios), in spite of the best efforts of governments and religious leaders throughout the centuries to stamp them out, continue to re-emerge from extinction in a diversity of most unexpected places. While European scholars and church historians long knew of this “heretical” group, particularly from anti-heretical writings and Augustine’s one-time affiliation with them, a number of things happened in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries to bring them back to light. First, scholars and orientalist began to notice Manichaeans cropping up in a number of medieval Muslim authors, such as al-Nadīm and al-Biruni, which provided important evidence as to persistent Manichaean presence in the Muslim world.<sup>1</sup> Next, at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, European expeditions uncovered masses of textual fragments and scrolls left behind by Manichaeans at various locales in Central Asia. Most famously, the texts from Turfan (in western China) contain a substantial number of mutilated Manichaean texts in a wide variety of languages. Shortly after, yet another sensational find occurred in 1929 with the discovery of a collection of Coptic codices near Medinet Madi (Egypt), containing still more original Manichaean writings—writings much earlier than the fragments from Turfan.

One of the things that enabled the identification of these texts as Manichaean was the fact that Carl Schmidt, the scholar who inspected the codices, had just been reading the proofs of Holl’s edition of Epiphanius, and was struck by the name of one of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ries, *Les Études manichéennes*, 67-118.

codices—*Kephalaia*—which reminded him of a text described in the heresiologist’s report on the Manichaeans.<sup>2</sup> This discovery inaugurated what appeared to be a new and promising era in Manichaean studies. After some initial progress, however, war broke out in Europe and publication stalled for several decades. This has meant that most of this material remained largely unexplored by scholars of Late Antiquity—which brings us to the current study.

The text that jogged the memory of Carl Schmidt is, now that substantial portions of it have been published, striking for another reason, namely, the extensive (some might say obsessive) use of numbers and numeric patterns as a means of expressing Manichaean theological discourse. This phenomenon, most prominent in the first half of the codex, has gone unexplored<sup>3</sup> and unexplained. As such, this study will attempt to explain this most puzzling aspect of the *Kephalaia*, first by examining the use of numbers generally in late antique religion and philosophy and, then, through careful analysis of one particular set of these patterns, by addressing the various ways in which this technique was used. We shall see that the use of numeric patterning in the *Kephalaia* reveals important traces of how Manichaean traditions were transmitted, received, and redacted in response to a variety of internal and external concerns of the text’s creators and their community.

---

<sup>2</sup> Schmidt and Polotsky, “Ein Mani-Fund,” 6.

<sup>3</sup> While Michel Tardieu pointed out the importance of five as a basic classification tool in Manichaeism (*Le manichéisme*, 107), few have followed his lead. A superficial index of five-part series from Manichaean sources was given by Ström (“Le chiffre cinq,” 333-338), in comparison with other traditions, while in the same volume Couliano suggested that all pentads were based on the demonization of the planets (“The Counterfeit Spirit,” 53-58). See also, Lévy (“A propos de la pentade et du dualisme manichéens,” 493-500).

**CHAPTER 1: NUMBER AND RELIGION IN LATE ANTIQUITY**

We tend to use numbers primarily for practical purposes.<sup>4</sup> Aside from some modern branches of advanced mathematics that are primarily abstract and speculative, numbers are most frequently used in areas such as commerce, politics, the arts, entertainment, or technology to achieve some specific practical aim. In a religious context, numbers can also be used in a variety of practical ways to aid in activities such as the calculation of a liturgical calendar, the interpretation of a sacred text, or the effective communication and retention of a religious message; activities which are essential to the life and survival of a religious community.

The late antique period was no different in the various ways in which numbers were employed for religious ends. Unfortunately, however, our remoteness from this period means that our principal sources of information about late antique religion are, naturally, texts. As a result, any analysis of the use of numbers in ancient religious contexts is essentially an examination of how they were used and described textually. As such, as a preliminary to the study of the use of numbers and numeric patterns by Manichaeans (one of the more enigmatic of late antique religious communities), this chapter offers a cursory examination of a *representative*<sup>5</sup> selection of religious sources from antiquity, out of which four primary uses of numbers in religious contexts may be identified:<sup>6</sup> 1) temporal/calendrical, 2) exegetical/theological, 3) literary/rhetorical, and 4) liturgical/magical.

---

<sup>4</sup> Crump, *The Anthropology of Numbers*, 22.

<sup>5</sup> This chapter is not intended to be exhaustive, but merely to provide a contextualizing framework in which later chapters can be placed. I have, however, tended to privilege so-called “western” traditions, especially early Christianity, due to the fact that, among late antique religions, this tradition is most closely related to Manichaeism.

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that these categories are not rigid and frequently overlap in religious contexts.

### 1.1 Temporal / Calendrical

Naturally, numbers are used by religious communities as a way of measuring time and of recording both their histories (i.e., their past), and their eschatologies (i.e., their future). Such measurements may involve long, cosmic periods, the date of creation, the age of the world, the lifespan of important figures, or the time remaining until the end of days. Also, temporal measurements were used to serve more immediate practical needs such as calculating the dates of religious festivals or more recent dates of importance, such as events in the life of a religiously significant individual. One large-scale measurement of time that was commonplace in antiquity was the *ordo saeculorum*, or “sequence of ages.” Originally mentioned in the Greek tradition by Hesiod, who in his *Works and Days* (106-201) describes a series of five ages of human history (gold, silver, bronze, heroes, iron), it is developed on astronomical lines by Plato in *Timaeus* 38C-39E, where he describes the idea of the “Great Year,” the period during which the stars and planets return to their original starting point in the heavens.<sup>7</sup> The *ordo saeculorum* was later taken up by Vergil and given a particularly eschatological thrust in *Eclogue* 4, where the poet describes the “last age of Cumae’s prophecy.”<sup>8</sup> A similar idea is also developed among Jewish and Christian intellectuals such as Philo<sup>9</sup> and Augustine, who attempted to harmonize it with the biblical six days of creation.<sup>10</sup> Meanwhile in Persia, Zoroastrians counted ten

---

<sup>7</sup> A similar idea is found in both Zoroastrianism, which counts a 12 000 year “World Year” (Boyce, *Textual Sources*, 20) and Buddhism, with its concept of the “Great Aeon,” a cycle of cosmic decline and renewal divided into four “Immeasurable Aeons,” which are in turn divided into twenty “Intermediate Aeons” (*Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, 188).

<sup>8</sup> Vergil, *Eclogue* 4.4: *ultima Cumaei uenit iam carminis ordo*. See also ten generations of humanity in *Sibylline Oracles* 4.49-101.

<sup>9</sup> Philo, *On the Creation* 3.

<sup>10</sup> In *De trinitate* 4.7, Augustine describes the six ages of the human race from Adam to Christ. The idea of the “world week,” or what Yarbrow Collins terms “sabbatical eschatology,” is commonplace in the Jewish apocalyptic traditions (*Cosmology and Eschatology*, 83).

generations of humanity,<sup>11</sup> while Mandaeans divided history into four ages totalling four hundred and eighty thousand years.<sup>12</sup> In this way, the entire span of creation could be numerically quantified in a religiously meaningful way.

Lunar and solar calendars also play an important role in religious affairs and are greatly influenced by them. For instance, the measurement of time in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam is closely connected to events such as the creation of the world, the birth of Christ, or the flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina. Judaism in particular was concerned with the accurate calculation of a wide variety of religious festivals and holidays,<sup>13</sup> while controversy over the dates of important events such as Easter has led to conflict and schism among Christian churches, as is witnessed by the Quartodeciman affair of the second century CE.<sup>14</sup> In fact, the difference between the Gregorian and the Julian calendars continues to influence the liturgical dates used by the various Christian churches. In addition to establishing the correct date, numbers also play a role in the duration of religious festivals such as Hanukkah, Lent, and Ramadan.

## 1.2 Exegetical / Theological

Numbers may also be used in theological formulations and exegetical readings. As such, they occur in a wide variety in late antique religion. The number *one*, for instance, was naturally viewed by theologians and philosophers as the number of unity and, especially in the monotheistic traditions, of the supremacy of God,<sup>15</sup> while *two* was a number of

<sup>11</sup> *Bahman Yasht*, 1.11, 3.29, 4.1, etc. See also *Sibylline Oracles*, prologue (1.332).

<sup>12</sup> Lupieri, *Mandaeans*, 49.

<sup>13</sup> Qumran has revealed a number of calendrical texts using a variety of time-scales, some even written in an esoteric script known as "Cryptic A" (see Parry and Tov, *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*).

<sup>14</sup> This controversy involved the date of Easter, which some in the early church celebrated on the day of the Jewish Passover.

<sup>15</sup> Augustine, *De trinitate*, 4.7.11 and *De civitate dei*, 11.10.

discord,<sup>16</sup> tension, and duplicity,<sup>17</sup> but also of creative power,<sup>18</sup> as in the dualism of the Zoroastrians and Manichaeans. The fact that the number *three* was thought to represent completeness and divinity is witnessed by the numerous divine triads inherited from Graeco-Roman,<sup>19</sup> Near Eastern,<sup>20</sup> and Iranian<sup>21</sup> mythology. Such triads became commonplace in Neopythagorean,<sup>22</sup> Neoplatonic, and Valentinian thought,<sup>23</sup> and later became central to the formulation of mainstream Christian theology of the Trinity. *Four* was reflective of natural phenomena such as the four seasons, the four directions, and the canonical four elements, while *five* was a number closely associated with humanity, love,<sup>24</sup> and life.<sup>25</sup> *Six* was considered the number of completion, as in the completion of God's creative work on the sixth day,<sup>26</sup> and was the preferred number of Mandaeans,<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum*, 1.16.

<sup>17</sup> Augustine, *De civitate dei*, 11.13-16.

<sup>18</sup> Schimmel, "Number," 14. See also McGuire, "Numerology," 475.

<sup>19</sup> In his *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens* Georges Dumézil suggested that a comparative analysis of Indian, Iranian, Roman, Celtic, and Germanic religion and mythology reveals a tripartite cultural ideology in which society is divided into three classes: 1) a priestly class, 2) a warrior class, and 3) a peasant/agricultural class.

<sup>20</sup> For example, Zeus-Hades-Poseidon (Greek), An-Enlil-Enki, Anu-Bel-Ea, and Sin-Shamash-Ishtar (Mesopotamian). See Jundt, *La symbolique des chiffres*, 11-13.

<sup>21</sup> See the Old Iranian triad of Ahura Mazda-Varuna-Mithra (Boyce, *Textual Sources*, 9).

<sup>22</sup> Nicomachus of Gerasa (second century CE) and Numenius of Apamea (second century CE) (See Dillon, *Middle Platonists*).

<sup>23</sup> See Father-Son-Church (*Tripartite Tractate*, NHC I,5.57-59), or spiritual-psychic-earthly (Heracleon, *Fragments* 20-24; also *Tripartite Tractate*, NHC I,5.118).

<sup>24</sup> Five was thought to be a marriage number due to its union of two and three, the first male and female numbers. Pythagoreans also saw it as the number of justice, since it stands at the mid-point of the decade (Peck, "Number as Cosmic Language," 61).

<sup>25</sup> Due to our five senses, limbs, fingers, and toes. See Endres and Schimmel, *Das Mysterium der Zahl*, 120-136. The number five is centrally important (as will be seen) to Manichaeism and, later, Islam, with its five daily prayers, five pillars, etc. Five takes on a particularly potent significance in medieval and renaissance esoteric thought through the pentagram and the quest for the *quinta essentia* (Endres and Schimmel, *Das Mysterium der Zahl*, 131-132). It should be noted also that five is also a prominent number in both Buddhism and Jainism.

<sup>26</sup> Peck, "Number as Cosmic Language," 61.

<sup>27</sup> According to Lupieri, Mandaean tradition delights in the number six and its multiples, such as twelve disciples, twelve signs of the Zodiac, thirty days of the month, 360 days of the year, as well as 360 prophets of Jerusalem (*Mandaeans*, 148). It is interesting to contrast this with (as we shall see) the Manichaean penchant for *five*.

while *seven* was long connected to ancient observations of the planets and cosmology.<sup>28</sup> *Eight* was a number of renewal and new beginnings,<sup>29</sup> although *nine* was considered defective, being one away from *ten*, which symbolized perfection and all-inclusiveness.<sup>30</sup> Such numbers, however, even though primarily theological and philosophical, may not necessarily be without a certain practical utility. Whether as a representation of different segments of society (as Dumézil proposed) or as a solution to a burning theological controversy,<sup>31</sup> the theological use of numbers may at times be viewed as a response to or a symbolic representation of a particular situation *on the ground*.

The use of numbers in theological and exegetical contexts became particularly controversial for the early church during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries CE. Irenaeus, in particular, criticized the practice of *gematria*,<sup>32</sup> i.e., calculations based on the number value of Greek or Hebrew letters, by his Valentinian opponents as arbitrary and without scriptural foundation. For instance, he states that some replace the non-Greek name of

---

<sup>28</sup> The number *seven* was particularly prominent in Babylonian mythology, in which the “Seven (Gods)” are associated with the Pleiades (See Black and Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols*, 144-145). In Old Babylonian mathematics, the number *seven* is indivisible and may have meant “innumerable.” The “Seven Gods” came to represent all the gods of the Babylonian-Assyrian tradition (Friberg, “Numbers and Counting,” 1144). Seven was also central to Zoroastrian theology, with its seven *Amesha Spentas*, seven-part cosmos, and seven holy days (See Boyce, *Textual Sources*, 12-13). The Roman polymath Varro even wrote a discourse praising the number seven called *Hebdomades* (Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology*, 93). Mandaeans, however, maligned “the seven and the twelve” as representing the seven planets and the twelve signs of the Zodiac (Lupieri, *Mandaeans*, 40).

<sup>29</sup> The New Jerusalem comes in the eighth age, while Easter is called *dies octavus* (Peck, “Number as Cosmic Language”, 62).

<sup>30</sup> Peck, “Number as Cosmic Language”, 62.

<sup>31</sup> For instance, in Christian theology the idea of the Trinity is a practical way to resolve a real theological problem arising from incongruous statements made by the early Christian tradition, namely, that God the Father is supreme, Jesus is God’s Son, and that this Son intends to send a third manifestation known as the Paraclete, or Comforter.

<sup>32</sup> It is certainly difficult for us today, who are so accustomed to using a separate notational system for representing numbers, to understand this exegetical practice. Nevertheless, for ancient Greek, Aramaic, or Hebrew readers the numerical equivalents of each letter would have been automatic. Greek may have been the first language to use alphabetic numerals (Friberg, “Numbers and Counting,” 1142) and *gematria* became popular in Hellenistic religious and philosophical thought. For instance, the well-known Hellenistic holy name “Abraxas” equals 365. It was not, however, always used for such seriously religious purposes—a graffito from Pompei reads “I love her whose number is 545” (Schmitz, “Number,” 683). In Islam the practice is called *abjad* (“Gemmatria,” in *Oxford Dictionary of World Religion*, 370).



Jesus with *episemon* in order to arrive at a calculation of 888, the “Plenitude of the Ogdoad” (*Adversus haereses*, 2.24.1).<sup>33</sup> The bishop of Lyons also criticized the arbitrary selection of biblical numbers in order to fit a particular theological system due to the fact that the scriptures contain such a wide variety of numbers and numerical patterns (*Adversus haereses*, 2.24.3), especially involving *three*, *seven*, *twelve*, and *forty*.<sup>34</sup> Irenaeus cited, for instance, Valentinian exegesis of the thirty years before Jesus’ ministry as a representation of the thirty aeons of the Pleroma (*Adversus haereses*, 1.1.3), while the passion of the twelfth aeon was considered to be an allusion to the betrayal of Christ by Judas (*Adversus haereses*, 1.3.3). Others, however, such as Clement of Alexandria, (perhaps under the influence of Philo)<sup>35</sup> were more open to speculation about biblical numbers. For example, in his *Stromateis*, Clement suggests that the 318 members of Abraham’s household (Gen 14:14) were sanctified due to the fact that *iota* and *ēta* indicate the Saviour’s name (6.11). In the same work, he also speculates about the divinely inspired proportions of the Tabernacle as a symbol for the earth (*Stromateis*, 6.11). Later, Hippolytus would revisit the question of numbers and harshly condemn their use in theological speculation, which he considered a grave error ultimately derived from Pythagoras (*Refutatio*, 4.51).<sup>36</sup>

Such a charge, while laced with polemical and rhetorical overtones, was not without foundation. While the original manifestation of Pythagoreanism, which saw a

---

<sup>33</sup> Irenaeus claimed that this word was selected because nothing could be made of *christos* (*Adversus haereses*, 2.24.2).

<sup>34</sup> Interestingly, Irenaeus cites numerous occurrences of the number five from the scriptures that he says his opponents ignore, because they do not conform to their system (*Adversus haereses* 2.24.4).

<sup>35</sup> See Philo, *On the Creation*, 3.

<sup>36</sup> Hippolytus’ sweeping indictment is directed principally at Valentinians, whom he accuses of plagiarizing the doctrines of Plato and Pythagoras, who ultimately (he believed) derived their teachings from the Egyptians (*Refutatio*, 6.16-17). Interestingly, even the Elchasaites, among whom Mani himself is thought to have grown up, are accused of drawing their doctrines from Pythagoras (9.9).

pre-ordained numerical structure to the universe, seems to have largely died out by the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE,<sup>37</sup> the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE saw a revival of Pythagorean ideas, in what modern scholars have called “Neopythagoreanism,” an eclectic religious and philosophical movement that drew elements from both Graeco-Roman and Near Eastern culture. Some of its main proponents, such as Nicomachus of Gerasa, believed that Pythagoreanism was more than simply a mathematical philosophy, but rather a fusion of religion and science, “combining exact mathematical theory with a belief that the harmony apparent in the cosmos is the same that binds together soul and body in man.”<sup>38</sup> Numenius of Apamea, Porphyry, and Iamblichus were Syrians and Neopythagorean ideas seem to have exercised a considerable influence on the pagan, Jewish, and Christian traditions from that region.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps it was the eclectic and speculative nature of Neopythagorean thought that the Church Fathers found so unsettling—we cannot be sure—but nevertheless, the Pythagorean charge, with all it implies about numbers and numerology, became one of the standard features of heresiological discourse during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries CE.

It would seem, however, that, in spite of the decidedly negative reactions of some, there was a certain ambivalence about the meaning and significance of numbers in the early Christian tradition. It is clear from the amount of attention given to the question by Irenaeus and Hippolytus that the mixture of mathematics and numerical speculation with theology was viewed by church authorities as a significant problem. Yet while heresiological writers sought to discourage the construction of elaborate theological

---

<sup>37</sup> Some schools or communities of the eastern Mediterranean may have survived. Certain Jewish authors, such as Aristobulus, showed an interest in Pythagorean thought, while Philo believed that Pythagoras was ultimately a disciple of Moses (Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology*, 94-97).

<sup>38</sup> Chadwick, cited by MacQueen, *Numerology*, 41.

<sup>39</sup> See Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 341-383.

systems using numeric series or patterns, others such as Clement of Alexandria, Methodius,<sup>40</sup> and later Augustine<sup>41</sup> reflected gladly on the harmony and perfection that they perceived in biblical numbers.

### 1.3 Literary / Rhetorical

Numbers were also used in ancient religious texts for literary and rhetorical purposes. In fact, numbers are frequently used as a rhetorical tool in Graeco-Roman, Jewish, Christian, and Islamic literature<sup>42</sup> in order to create a variety of literary effects such as parallelism or hyperbole. For instance, the twelve disciples of Jesus from the gospels are meant to parallel the twelve tribes of Israel, while the three days after the crucifixion were sometimes read as a parallel to the three days Jonah spent in the belly of the whale. In apocalyptic literature, in particular, numbers are frequently used to indicate the

---

<sup>40</sup> While speculating on the number six, Methodius wrote: "Moreover, it is evident that the creation of the world was accomplished in harmony with this number, God having made heaven and earth, and the things which are in them, in six days; the word of creative power containing the number six, in accordance with which the Trinity is the maker of bodies. For length, and breadth, and depth make up a body. And the number six is composed of triangles. On these subjects, however, there is not sufficient time at present to enlarge with accuracy, for fear of letting the main subject slip, in considering that which is secondary" (*Symposium*, 8.11 [trans. Clark, ANF 6]).

<sup>41</sup> "As to the reasons, indeed, why these numbers are so put in the Holy Scriptures, other people may trace out other reasons, either such that those which I have given are to be preferred to them, or such as are equally probable with mine, or even more probable than they are; but there is no one surely so foolish or so absurd as to contend that they are so put in the Scriptures for no purpose at all, and that there are no mystical reasons why those numbers are there mentioned. But those reasons which I have here given, I have either gathered from the authority of the church, according to the tradition of our forefathers, or from the testimony of the divine Scriptures, or from the nature itself of numbers and of similitudes. No sober person will decide against reason, no Christian against the Scriptures, no peaceable person against the church" (*De trinitate*, 4.6, [NPNF series 1, vol. 3]).

<sup>42</sup> Numbers are frequently used as a rhetorical tool in both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament (as well as para-biblical literature). Three: 3 men come to Abraham (Gen 18:2), 3 calls to Samuel (1 Sam 3:1ff), Jonah in whale 3 days, 3 magi (Mt 2), 3 temptations of Jesus (Mt 4:1-11; Lk 4:1-13), rebuilding of temple in 3 days (Jn 2:19), resurrection after 3 days. Seven: Apocalypse of John *passim*. Twelve: 12 tribes of Israel, 12 disciples of Jesus. Forty: traditional length of a generation or extended period of time (See Jundt, *La symbolique des chiffres*, and Pope, "Number, Numbering, Numbers," 563-565).

abundance or plenitude of the upper realms<sup>43</sup> or of divine beings, often with astrological or calendrical connotations,<sup>44</sup> while “thrice” was a commonplace attribute meant to imply perfection.<sup>45</sup> As Yarbro Collins has suggested, “numerical symbolism in apocalyptic and related literature creates the impression of order in the physical world and in human experience.”<sup>46</sup> E. D. Schmitz cautions, however, that one should not read too much into the occurrence of such numbers, especially if it can be argued that no theological significance was intended. But some, such as the 153 fish from John 21:11 may have had a significance that has been lost to us.<sup>47</sup> While certain numbers may have been inherited from Graeco-Roman or Near Eastern cultural traditions,<sup>48</sup> others may be more intuitive such as the number three which is often associated with basic concepts such as beginning-middle-end, past-present-future, or body-soul-spirit.<sup>49</sup>

Numerical patterns may also be used in a less obvious way at the level of the literary and rhetorical structuring and ornamentation of a text.<sup>50</sup> For example, a text may be divided into twenty-two chapters or books—one for each letter of the Hebrew or Aramaic alphabets—as Mani’s *Living Gospel*,<sup>51</sup> the Apocalypse of John, and Augustine’s *City of God* were, or 114, as are both the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Qur’an*. Such

<sup>43</sup> The Enoch literature is filled with such devices: 300 000 gates of the treasuries (3 Enoch 8), 1 365 000 blessings (3 Enoch 9), etc. See also texts such as *On the Origin of the World* (NHC II,5.105-107).

<sup>44</sup> In the *Apocryphon of John*, for instance, the archons are said to create seven powers, who each create six angels until they are said to become 365 (in spite of the arithmetic) (NHC II,1.11; see also NHC II,1.19).

<sup>45</sup> As in the *Apocryphon of John*, NHC II,1.5 or in the hermetic tradition, where Hermes is called “Hermes Trismegistos,” the “Thrice-great Hermes”.

<sup>46</sup> *Cosmology and Eschatology*, 135.

<sup>47</sup> Schmitz, “Number,” 685.

<sup>48</sup> Friberg, “Numbers & Counting,” 1139. See also, Ripplin, “Number and Enumeration,” 552.

<sup>49</sup> Schmitz, “Number,” 686-687.

<sup>50</sup> There is a substantial body of literature on the occurrence of such patterns in a wide variety of medieval literature (see, for instance, Eckhardt, *Essays in the Numerical Criticism of Medieval Literature*, or Fowler, *Silent Poetry*). According to Peck, “the rhetoric of numbers permeates all areas of medieval learning” (“Number as Cosmic Language,” 15) and was based largely on the work of Augustine and Boethius. The tradition of numerical composition, however, is thought to go back much farther, even into early Greek poetry (MacQueen, *Numerology*, 131).

<sup>51</sup> Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 47.

patterns were also found among pagan intellectuals such as Porphyry, the editor and biographer of Plotinus, who (somewhat arbitrarily) broke up his master's writings into six groups of nine, the *Enneads*. After all, Porphyry lived at a time when "aesthetic and philosophical truth had ultimately a numerological basis"<sup>52</sup> and such a structure was thought to enhance the depth and value of Plotinus' work. Even Vergil, it has been shown, gave his *Aeneid* a "mathematical structure" deeply rooted in Neopythagorean thought and aesthetics.<sup>53</sup> To the ancients, "mathematical ratios and structural proportion (were) as important in literature as in art and architecture."<sup>54</sup> Thus, it should not be surprising if religiously significant numbers may be detected within the literary and rhetorical structuring of a text. Which number may or may not be employed or accepted, however, was a matter of theological debate.

#### 1.4 Liturgical / Magical<sup>55</sup>

Another and perhaps less obvious manifestation of numeric patterns in a religious context is their use in liturgies, prayers, and magical utterances. This type of numeric pattern may take the form of a set number of prayers to be recited each day, as in Judaism's seven and Islam's five daily prayers, or in the number of times a particular prayer is to be uttered, as in the *kyrie eleison* or the rosary of the Roman Catholic tradition. In popular late antique religious traditions the use of numbers was somewhat more explicit, especially in the so-called "magical" texts. For instance, in one Coptic magical text the user is instructed to

<sup>52</sup> Chadwick, "Philosophical Tradition and the Self," 64.

<sup>53</sup> Duckworth, *Structural Patterns*, 104. Such structures, occurring at both the macro and micro level of the text, can also be detected in other Roman poets such as Horace, Ovid, and Lucretius.

<sup>54</sup> Duckworth, *Structural Patterns*, 104.

<sup>55</sup> According to Remus, "magic" has been used both in antiquity and today as a social classifier meant to identify unauthorized or non-orthodox religious practices (See "'Magic', Method, Madness," 258-298). For my purposes here I am classifying liturgy and magic together, since they both employ ritual actions and speech to influence divine power.

say “Amen” seventeen times and the names of divine beings such as Jesus, “Holy one”, “Holy paraclete,” etc. twenty-one times,<sup>56</sup> while in another the letters A, E, I, O, U, O, M, CH, and P must each be pronounced seven times for maximum effect.<sup>57</sup> It should be remembered that to literate people in antiquity the numeric values associated with *voces mysticae* would have been implicit and obvious. Thus, it is not uncommon for amulets from Egypt to be inscribed with a sequence such as XABPAX ΦNEΣXHP ΦIXPO ΦNYPΩ ΦΩXΩ BΩX, which equals 9999.<sup>58</sup> In this way, numbers and numeric patterns played a role in what might be termed day-to-day or popular religious practices of the period.

This brief survey of how numbers were used and interpreted in late antique religion gives a general sense of how varied such uses and interpretations were. While the use of numbers in the measurement of time and the establishment of important religious dates only proved occasionally controversial, the role of numbers and numeric patterns in theology and exegesis was, particularly in the early Christian tradition, a hotly debated issue. In one camp were those who imposed no limits on the extent to which numbers could be used to explain and to construct elaborate and speculative theologies, while in the other there was an effort to rein in that impulse through appeals to scriptural and apostolic tradition as the authoritative standards of interpretation. At any rate, numbers and their interpretation was one more issue around which competing religious discourses battled for legitimacy. Also, we saw that the use of numbers in literary and rhetorical

<sup>56</sup> Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 131.

<sup>57</sup> Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 145.

<sup>58</sup> Ferguson, *Religions of the Roman Empire*, 177.

composition was seemingly commonplace, although this has not been sufficiently studied in Late Antiquity to draw any meaningful conclusions. Yet, to be sure, which numbers were employed is necessarily dependant on the theological controversies mentioned above. Similarly, the presence of numbers and numeric patterns in liturgical discourse and practice would have been intimately connected to what became authorized by “orthodox” tradition—anything else is simply classified and excluded as “magic”.

As we shall see, the Manichaeans may be placed in the first camp, since some of them, at least, seem to have viewed numbers and numeric patterns as a particularly useful and productive tool of religious expression, particularly in their *theological* and *rhetorical* modes. Nowhere is this more evident than in the elaborate theological discourses and explanations of the *Kephalaia*, which are filled with a variety of repeating and interlocking numeric patterns (especially involving the number *five*) that endeavour to address some lingering problems in Manichaean theology. But, before turning to the *Kephalaia*—the main focus of this study—the following chapter will give a brief survey of the variety of numbers and numerical patterns contained within and attributed to Manichaean discourse in general.

## CHAPTER 2: NUMERIC PATTERNS IN MANICHAEAN DISCOURSE

Having completed a general survey of how numbers are used in late antique religious discourse, we may now turn to a more detailed examination of the occurrence of numbers and numeric patterns in texts with an explicitly Manichaean orientation. This survey, modelled on the previous one, is by no means intended to be exhaustive, since the various Manichaean corpora present a host of methodological problems too great for an introductory chapter such as this. In particular, the fragmentary state of many texts means that any attempt at creating indices is necessarily incomplete, while the diversity of languages employed<sup>59</sup> and the fact that the relationship among many of these multi-linguistic sources remains highly ambiguous,<sup>60</sup> means that this survey (as a prelude to in-depth analysis of a specific set of patterns) will aim at giving only a general impression of how numbers were used in a variety of functional and linguistic contexts. Priority will be given to *primary* Manichaean texts (i.e., those texts written presumably by a Manichaean hand), although significant *secondary* witnesses such as Theodore bar Khonai, the *Acta Archelai*, Augustine, and al-Nadim, will also be called upon to testify. Following the categories employed in the previous chapter,<sup>61</sup> it will be shown that like other religious groups from Late Antiquity, Manichaeans also employed numbers for a variety of

---

<sup>59</sup> Manichaean texts, fragments, and testimonia can be found in Syriac, Greek, Coptic, Latin, Iranian (Middle-Persian, Parthian, Sogdian), Arabic, Turkish, Tocharian, and Chinese.

<sup>60</sup> While it is often assumed that Manichaean discourse was highly consistent across most linguistic and cultural contexts, closer examination may reveal that this was not always the case and that it could change over time. Most frustrating, however, is the fact that Mani's own writings, which he seems to have taken such care to create, have practically been erased from the historical record, with a few notable exceptions such as the *Letters* and *Synaxeis* codices from Medinet Madi. Add to this the fact that late sources such as Theodore bar Khonai seem to preserve some of the earliest testimony and the researcher is faced with an immense set of methodological challenges.

<sup>61</sup> It should also be noted that, as in the previous chapter, there is often significant overlap between categories.



religious purposes, although perhaps to a greater extent than most of their contemporaries.

## 2.1 Temporal / Calendrical

Like most religious people of antiquity, Manichaeans were interested in the calculation of time and the preservation of important dates, especially the date of Mani's death, or "crucifixion" as it was later styled, under Vahram II in 276 or 277 CE. Coptic sources, particularly the "Bema Psalms" (2Ps [1]-47), and the *Homilies*<sup>62</sup> are particularly informative in this regard. According to these traditions, Mani died on the second day of the week (2Ps 17.24), the fourth day of the month Phamenoth (2Ps 17.26; 18.7) at the eleventh hour (2Ps 18.8; Hom 60.13), after six years of persecution (2Ps 19.13) and twenty-six days chained in Belapat prison (2Ps 16.25; 43.30; Hom 60.11). This precise information was transmitted also into the Iranian tradition, where Mani, "on the fourth of the month of Sharevar, on Monday, at the eleventh hour, when he stood in prayer, he cast off the base garment of the body" (M 5 [Parthian]).<sup>63</sup> This event, occurring in 276 or 277 CE depending on calendar harmonization,<sup>64</sup> was also used to date later Manichaean texts in Iranian and Turkish.<sup>65</sup>

It is not only the date of Mani's death, however, that was preserved by Manichaean tradition, other dates from his life are also recorded, such as his date of birth

<sup>62</sup> While the Berlin *Acts* codex and the "appendix" chapter to the Dublin *Kephalaia* (both unpublished) provide some important information for the passion narrative, they do not seem to provide any dates or times (as far as readable) (Funk, *personal communication*).

<sup>63</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 86.

<sup>64</sup> Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 39. See Sundermann, "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur" parr. 80, 171, 154.

<sup>65</sup> See, for example, M 8171 V ii = T III D 267 (Parthian): "In the year 55 after the Parinirvāna of the Apostle, Mar Mani, when he was raised up into the chariot of the Moon and found peace with the Father, the God Ohrmizd" (Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 87), or the postscript datings (ex. 552 years after Mani's death) in Turkish texts (Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 347).

(*Shaburagan* [frag. al-Biruni]; *Compendium* [Tajadod, 49]), Mani's entry into the Elchasaite community at age four (*CMC*, 11), his first revelation at age twelve (al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* [Dodge]), and his second revelation at twenty-four (*CMC*, 18; al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* [Dodge]). Manichaeism also states that three hundred years passed between Christ's promise and the coming of the Paraclete (Ephraim, *Mani*, 209 [Reeves #103]), whom Mani himself claimed to be.

Important moments in the lives of other teachers are also recorded by Manichaeism. Mar Sisinnios, for instance, is said to have been martyred at the ninth hour (*Homelies*, 60.10), while an Iranian fragment records that on "the 14<sup>th</sup> (day) of the month Mihr...Jesus, the Son of God, entered Parinirvāna" (M104, M 734 R, and M 459c Parthian).<sup>66</sup> Milestones in the life of the church also receive attention, as when a Turkish fragment records the date of the introduction of Manichaeism into Central Asia as 665 CE (T II D 180).<sup>67</sup>

In this way, Manichaeism can be seen to have been interested in the numerical quantification of time and in the conscientious recording of important dates in their history, especially those relating to the founder. This effort, it seems, was carried into most of their missionary efforts. To be sure, some dates, such as those of Mani's first revelations might be literary or hagiographic inventions, but when it comes to the duration of his imprisonment and the timing of his execution the degree of detail recorded by Manichaeism might fill many New Testament scholars with envy. Naturally,

<sup>66</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 71.

<sup>67</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 368. Some Syriac fragments also show interest in the cycles of the moon, stating that it takes fifteen days for the moon to fill and then empty its light (Ephraim, *Hypatius*, 15.27-34 [Reeves #59]). Also, the numbers twenty and twenty-eight are mentioned in an apparent connection to days of the month in bilingual Coptic-Syriac text from Kellis. See addenda et corrigenda of Syriac texts by Franzmann in Gardner, Alcock, and Funk, *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*, 344-364.

numbers are used to record these events and to pass them down to future generations of believers.

Manichaeans, however, were also interested in measuring more remote periods of time. As such, they adapted previous speculations about the length of the lives of prophets such as Adam and Sethel (2Ps 142.5) or the life expectancy of the giants (1Ke 117.9). Theologically, however, they sometimes took a much longer view in describing how it took “thousands of years” for the Mother of Life to reach the earth after her call by the Father (1Ke 71.23)<sup>68</sup> or how the great eschatological fire will last no less than 1468 years<sup>69</sup> (*Shaburagan* [Mackenzie, 517 (100)]; al-Jabbar, 160 [Monnot]). In fact, Manichaean theology as a whole is framed by an enumerated sense of time in the doctrine of the Three Times: 1) the initial separation of Light and Darkness, 2) mixture and creation, 3) final separation (1Ke 55.18, 24, 25; 57.32; *Xvāstvānīft*, VIII A [Bang]; *Compendium*, 100 [Tajadod]; *Hymnscroll*, 172 [Tsui Chi]). This provided the core framework over which both Manichaean myth and practice is overlain, giving it a clear temporal consistency and coherence lacking in other contemporary religious systems.

## 2.2 Exegetical / Theological

The second mode in which Manichaeans employed numbers was far more productive and important in that numbers and enumeration played a central role in the development of Manichaean theological discourse and deeply influenced how they viewed the worlds above and below. One of the most striking things about Manichaean myth-making is the fact that certain key figures came to have numerical elements embedded into their very

<sup>68</sup> This, in spite of the fact that *technically* the earth had not been created yet.

<sup>69</sup> The only other source in which this number is known to occur is NHC VI, 4, *On the Concept of Our Great Power* (46:27ff).

names, such as the First Man<sup>70</sup> and the Third Messenger.<sup>71</sup> More common, however, is the numerical grouping of figures such as the Five Sons of First Man or those of Living Spirit, the Five Elements, the Three Wheels, the Eight Earths, the Ten Heavens, or the Twelve Virgins. All of these groupings, even if their individual members have their own names and designations, became stereotypical and key to the Manichaean world-view. Add to this an interest in seemingly inseparable pairs such as Call and Response or Ashaqlun and Namraël and it becomes clear that numbers and the numerical description of things and beings is at the heart of the way in which Manichaeans thought about and described reality as they knew it.

### 2.2.1 Two

The number *two*, especially in terms of the concepts of polarity<sup>72</sup> and pairing, plays a central role in Manichaean discourse as the foundation of Manichaean ontology. The basic concept of two radically opposed principles—one good and associated with light, the other evil and associated with darkness—serves as the starting point of the entire Manichaean cosmogonic myth. These “Two Principles” (*Shabuhrgan* M 5794 = T II D 126; Severus [Kugener/Cumont, 89]; Simplicius 35.31 [Adam]; Seven Chapters, 1.17 [Adam]; Short Formula, 1324A.2 [Adam]; Long Formula 1461D.8 [Adam]; Serapion 12 [Adam 40]; Aug. *Haer.* 46.2 [Adam]; al-Jabbar, 162 [Monnot]; *Xvāstvānīft*, VIII A

<sup>70</sup> The pre-Manichaean figure of ܐܘܪܘܫܝܡܐ was rendered by western Manichaean translators as ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος (Greek), ܡܘܨܬܐܢܐ ܢܦܘܡܐ (Coptic), or *primus homo* (Latin), while eastern translators frequently employed the name Ohrmizd or “First Thought” (Iranian, Chinese) (Vermees/Lieu, *Acta Archelai*, 46 n. 34). In modern languages, this individual is variously translated as “Primal Man”, “First Man”, “Urmensch”, “l’Homme primordial”, etc. Personally, I find “Primal Man” a bit misleading in English, since in current usage it seems to carry connotations of “primitive” or “pre-historic,” while “First Man” implies simple temporal priority or originality. He is, however, distinct from Adam—the “first” man.

<sup>71</sup> Interestingly, the Messenger isn’t actually qualified as “Third” in Syriac sources, but rather simply as ܡܘܨܬܐܢܐ, “the Messenger” (Theodore bar Khonai 316.2 [Scher]). In Greek, however, he became ὁ πρεσβύτερος ὁ τρίτος, ܡܘܨܬܐܢܐ ܡܡܦܪܥܒܝܘܬܗ in Coptic, and *tertius legatus* in Latin.

<sup>72</sup> Tardieu identifies this as one of the key characteristics of Manichaean mythology (*Le manichéisme*, 101).

[Bang]; *Compendium*, 97 [Tajadod]; *Treatise*, 563, 579 [Chavannes/Pelliot]; *Hymnscroll*, 110 [?], 172, 264 [Tsui Chi]), variously known as “Two Natures” (Ephraim, *Hypatius* 129 [Reeves #1]; Theodore bar Khonai 313.13-14 [Scher]); *CMC* 132; 2Ps 9.10; *Acta Archelai* 13.3; Seven Chapters, 1.17/18 [Adam]; Aug. *Haer.* 46.2 [Adam]; *Commonitorium*, 1, 2 [Adam]; *Treatise*, 583 [Chavannes/Pelliot]), “Two Beings” (Ephraim, *Hypatius*, 129 [Reeves #1]; Serapion 12 [Adam]; 1Ke 47.28; 164.7; 220.16; 286.25,28); “Two Domains” (Ephraim, *Hypatius*, 129 [Reeves #1]), “Two Roots” (Ephraim, *Hypatius*, 129 [Reeves #1]; Serapion 26.12 [Adam]), “Two Eternals” (al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* [Dodge]), “Two Substances” (*Epist. fund.*, Frag. 5a [Aug. *Contra epist. fund.*, 14]; al-Maturidi, 304 [Monnot]) and (as we shall see) “Two Trees” (1Ke 17.4, 11, 17, 30; 19.28; 23.1),<sup>73</sup> exist in total ontological separation prior to the creation of the cosmos. It is only as a result of the agitation and lust of the dark nature that the Two Principles come into to conflict and the cosmos comes into being through a disastrous mixing of light and darkness. The enduring polarity and mutual hostility of these two natures, even in their composite form, can be found as a *leitmotiv* running throughout Manichaean ideology. Indeed, it is the desire to separate the Two Principles and re-establish the initial segregation that drives Manichaean ritual, since it is only through the consumption of light-rich foods that the Manichaean Elect can hope to liberate the essence of light from its dark, material prison.

This brings us to another critically important Manichaean pairing, namely the Sun and Moon (Theodore bar Khonai 315.21 [Scher]; Alexander of Lycopolis, 4), which serve as “Light-ships” (1Ke 83.1; 151.25; 172.26; 181.29; *Treatise*, 531, 533

---

<sup>73</sup> al-Nadīm also records “Two Sources” as the title of a letter attributed to Mani (Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 165).

[Chavannes/Pelliot]) for the transportation of ritually liberated light-particles from the mixed cosmos to their luminous homeland. Also known as Two “Chariots” (*Shabuhrgan* M 98/99I), “Light-givers” (1Ke 245.3; 405.29), “Vessels” (Aug. *Haer.* 46), “Palaces of Light” (*Xvāstvānīft*, II A; II C [Bang]), or simply just “Lights” (2Ps 19.19; *Acta Archelai* 8.6; *Hymnscroll*, 407, 412 [Tsui Chi]), these two celestial bodies were considered essential parts of the cosmic machinery of salvation. The veneration of this pair to the detriment of the other heavenly bodies created a tension in Manichaean theology that (as we shall see) could only be resolved through creative use of numeric patterning and astrology.

An equally important pairing in Manichaean soteriology is the concept of “Call and Response.” According to Theodore bar Khonai, after the capture of First Man by the Archons, the Father of Greatness calls upon the Living Spirit to mount a rescue operation. During this rescue, Living Spirit and First Man engage in a dialogue (314.25-315.3 [Scher]). By the end of the dialogue, the speakers are no longer identified as Living Spirit and First Man, but rather, as “Call” and “Response” (315.3 [Scher]). In this way, the dialogue between Living Spirit and First Man becomes hypostasized into an important quasi-divine pairing (1Ke 25.28; 35.30; 37.5-7; 43.3; 50.2, 54.25; 55.5 etc.) that appears throughout later Manichaean discourse (*Hymnscroll*, 133, 391 [Tsui Chi]).

Pairings of this sort also occur on the anthropological level in Manichaean accounts of the creation of the first pair of human beings, Adam and Eve. Here, again, Theodore bar Khonai is an important witness to canonical tradition when he records that upon seeing the luminous divine form of the (Third) Messenger, the demonic pair, Ashqalun and Namrael (the antitype to the first couple), conspired to create Adam and

Eve based on the Messenger's androgynous image (317.7-15 [Scher]). In fact, male/female pairs seem to have played an important role in some early streams of Manichaean discourse at the level of the third<sup>74</sup> and even the first<sup>75</sup> evocations. The importance of both genders is also manifested in descriptions of the dark-realm, where great care is taken to emphasize the fact that in each of the Five Worlds of Darkness five species of creatures were fashioned "male and female" (1Ke 30.22; see also 1Ke 48.21-22). Moreover, anthropologically oriented pairings also occur in Manichaean discourse, particularly in the *Kephalaia*, when it places emphasis on the fact that human beings possess features such as two arms (1Ke 173.7), two breasts (1Ke 173.10, 12), two ears (1Ke 173.8), two eyes (1Ke 151.23; 151.27; 173.11), two feet (1Ke 78.4), etc, not to mention the typical association of the "Two Men" (i.e., Old Man & New Man) (ΠΩΜΕ CNEY) 1Ke 337.11) that represent the state of the individual prior to and post conversion.

<sup>74</sup> In light of the fact that Jesus the Splendour can be equated with both the Perfect Man and the Third Messenger, the Virgin of Light could be seen as (at an early stage at least) forming a pair with him in order to represent both aspects of the androgynous Messenger.

<sup>75</sup> Another, albeit ambiguous, piece of evidence which points to the importance of male-female pairs in early Manichaean discourse can be found in the *Psalm-book*. According to "Bema Psalm" 223, the Father sent forth his "strong son" (ΩΗΡΕ ΝΧΩΡΕ) to counter the dark invasion. The son, however, produces someone called "his virgin" (ΤΕΦΙΤΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ), who is, just like First Man, equipped with "five powers" (†Ε ΝΘΑΜ) in order to battle with the forces of darkness (2Ps 10.6-9). Then, the psalmist records how First Man (here called the "watcher" [ΠΜΑΖΙΑΪΤΩ]), in an action reminiscent of the Third Messenger, reveals "his Maiden" to the dark powers, causing them to go mad with desire (2Ps 10.10-14). This idea, also attested in a recently discovered Manichaean text from Kellis, where a feminine being addressed as πόντια ("lady") is depicted as clothing herself in the Five Elements and going out to meet the powers of darkness (see Gardner and Worp, "Leaves from a Manichaean Codex," 148-151), that it was a pair of beings who actually when out to meet the darkness, may reflect some very early stratum of early Manichaean discourse in which the principal beings of each evocation were conceived of as male/female pairs.

### 2.2.2 Three

Manichaean doctrine is often summarized by the phrase “the two principles and the three times.” While the concept of the Two Principles (as we have just seen) is meant to represent the basic foundation of Manichaean ontology, the “Three Times” (*Xvāstvānīft*, VIII A [Bang]; *Compendium*, 100 [Tajadod]; *Hymnscroll*, 172 [Tsui Chi]) provides the myth’s basic narrative frame: 1) initial separation, 2) mixture, 3) final separation (2Ps 11.29-31; Hom 7.9-11).<sup>76</sup> This means that the world and everything in it exists in the second period of mixture. Thus, the goal of Manichaeism itself is to bring about an end to the second time and to facilitate by means of ritual purification the arrival of the final period of eternal separation.

Three part structures also play a central role in Manichaean cosmogony at other levels. According to Theodore bar Khonai’s account of the myth, the Father of Greatness responds to the dark invasion by the emanation of three divine triads. First, the Father<sup>77</sup> calls upon Mother of Life and First Man as an initial reaction to the aggression of the dark-realm (313.27-28 [Scher]). Second, in response to the capture of First Man, the Father calls upon the Beloved of Lights, the Great Builder, and the Living Spirit (314.15-17 [Scher]). These beings slay the Archons and build the basic infrastructure of the cosmos. Once this is accomplished, a third evocation is made and an additional series<sup>78</sup> of beings is brought forth to complete the work of salvation.

<sup>76</sup> There is, however, a tendency in Coptic sources to divide the second time into three distinct phases (see *Kephalaia* Chapter 17; Heuser, “The Manichaean Myth,” 22-24; see Nagal, “Bemerkungen,” 201ff).

<sup>77</sup> Here I include the Father as an implicit member of the first triad.

<sup>78</sup> Theodore’s account of the third evocation, however, becomes problematic when viewed in light of other early Manichaean sources. While Theodore states that the Messenger brought forth Twelve Virgins and Jesus the Splendour (although Jesus is not explicitly “called” in Theodore’s account), *Kephalaia* Chapter 7 (“The Seventh, on the Five Fathers”) states that the Third Messenger emanated three powers: 1) the Column of Glory/Perfect Man, 2) Jesus the Splendour, and 3) a single Virgin of Light (1Ke 35.7-17). Elsewhere, in *Kephalaia* Chapter 16 (“[On the Five] Greatnesses which have [come] out against the Darkness”), the third



One of the things accomplished during the second evocation is the construction of the “Three Wheels” by the Living Spirit (Theodore bar Khonai 315.22 [Scher])—one of wind, one of water, and one of fire. This concept, known as the “Three Garments” to *Shabuhragan* M 98/99I, is attested in Coptic (1Ke 93.10; 113.32; 171.5; 171.24; 2Ps 2.16; 144.32; 2Ps 138.48), Latin (*Am. Cant* [Aug. *Contra Faustum*, 15.5] [Adam]), and Chinese (*Treatise*, 516 [Chavannes/Pelliot]; *Hymnscroll*, 133 [Tsui Chi]) sources and is meant to represent a kind of cosmic engine driving the purification activities of the universe.

The number *three* also plays a role in how Manichaeans conceived the geography of the light-realm, which Mani described as having “Three Regions” (*Shabuhragan* M 98/99I; Severus [Kugener/Cumont 96]), namely, three of four cardinal directions: north, east, and west. The dark-realm, it was thought, occupied only the lower, southern regions, although, in the end, it too would be relegated to its own tripartite abode in the form of the “Three Ditches” meant to hold the material remnants of the cosmos after it has been consumed by the Great Fire. This idea can be found not only in *Shabuhragan* (M 470 +), but also as the title of a chapter of Mani’s *Book of Mysteries* recorded by al-Nadīm (*Fihrist*, 798 [Dodge]). In addition, it can be found in Coptic (1Ke 111.33; 116.5; Hom 40.24) sources.

Manichaean ethics also contain a three-part structure in the form of the “Three Seals” encouraging the Elect to maintain purity of mouth, hand, and belly. This image, too, is widely attested in Coptic (1Ke 192.8-13; 375.27; 2Ps 94.12; 160.12), Latin (Aug.

---

evocation is said to include the Third Messenger, the Column of Glory, and the “powers of light” revealed by him (1Ke 49.26-28). This indicates that even for the compiler of this *Kephalaia* chapter, there seems to have been a certain ambiguity as to who should be included.

*De moribus manichaeorum*, 10.19), Turkish (*Xvāstvānīft*, XV C [Bang]), and Chinese (*Hymnscroll*, 414 [Tsui Chi]) sources.

### 2.2.3 Four

The two most important Manichaean concepts associated with four are the commonplace<sup>79</sup> idea of the “Four Regions” of the world (*Shabuhraḡan* M 98/99I; 1Ke 6.6; 25.18; 91.12; 265.28; 269.5; Hom 19.11; *Am. Cant.* [Aug. *Contra Faustum*, 15.5]; *Xvāstvānīft*, II.B [Bang]) and the series of four divine qualities attributed to the Father of Greatness, namely 1) Divinity, 2) Light, 3) Power, and 4) Wisdom. As we shall see, this latter concept, which is reflected in the notion of the “Four-faced god” (*Shabuhraḡan* M 7980-7984; 2Ps 191.12; Seven Chapters 3.59 [Adam]; Long Formula 1461C.14 [Adam]), although widely accepted in eastern branches of Manichaeism, seems to have had less meaning to Manichaeans in the west. Additional examples include images of “Four Angels” (1Ke 93.26; 290.3), and “Four Hunters” (1Ke 28.2-3).

### 2.2.4 Five

In spite of the fundamental importance of *two* and *three* to some of Manichaeism’s most basic concepts, *five* is (pardon the pun) the quintessential Manichaean number,<sup>80</sup> since it appears in a whole host of multifunctional and polynomial series. For instance, the “Five *shekinahs*” that surround the Father in canonical Syriac tradition (Theodore bar Khonai 313.16 [Scher]), came to be known as the “Five Aeons” (*Synaxeis*) or “Limbs” in

<sup>79</sup> There is nothing uniquely Manichaean about such ideas, which include the attribution of “Four Walls” to various cosmic spaces (*Shabuhraḡan* M 98/99I; 1Ke 86.29; *Treatise*, 517, 526 [Chavannes/Pelliot]).

<sup>80</sup> This was also identified by Tardieu as one of the essential characteristics of Manichaean ideology (*Le manichéisme*, 101).

(Graeco-)Coptic (*Kephalaia*) and represent the essential aspects of divinity as well as the constituent parts of the soul. The “Five *ziwanē*” (Theodore bar Khonai 314.11 [Scher]; Ephraim, *Hypatius*, 136 [Reeves #4]) or “Shining Gods” with which the First Man armed himself for battle, also known as the “Five Elements” (*Book of Giants* [Henning, “Book of Giants,” 63]; *Fihrist*, 779 [Dodge]; *Acta Archelai* 7.3; Aug. *Haer.* 46.7), the “Five Sons of First Man” (Theodore bar Khonai 314.22; Ephraim, *Hypatius*, 101 [Reeves #29]), and the “Five Intellectuals” (Seven Chapters, 3.68/69 [Adam]; Long Formula 1461D.1 [Adam]) (see below) are central to the Manichaean concept of the “Living Soul” or the light-substance imprisoned within the material universe. In addition, the “Five Sons of Living Spirit” (Theodore bar Khonai 314.17 [Scher]) function as guardians of the cosmos and suppressors of the dark powers, who themselves are also associated with five-part series such as the “Five Worlds of Darkness” (Theodore bar Khonai 313.19 [Scher]; *Fihrist* [Dodge]) and the “Five Trees” (Theodore bar Khonai 317.3 [Scher]). As we shall see, sorting out the five-part patterns associated with the Kingdom of Darkness became a question of considerable importance within the context of the *Kephalaia*. In fact, it is within the *Kephalaia* that pentads play their greatest role as the most frequently utilized numeric pattern,<sup>81</sup> although the implications of this phenomenon will be more fully explored in the following chapter.

---

<sup>81</sup> One notable exception is Chinese sources such as the *Hymnscroll*.

### 2.2.5 Six

The number *six* occurs infrequently in Manichaean sources and cannot be associated with canonical tradition.<sup>82</sup> When it does occur, as in *Kephalaia* Chapter 38, it is a result of the artificial addition of the pairing Call and Response as one figure to the Five Sons of First Man and Living Spirit (1Ke 92.3-4). Other instances include references to “Six Thrones” (1Ke 83.1), “Six Thresholds” (M 67 [Parthian]),<sup>83</sup> or “Six Robbers” (*Hymnscroll*, 104 [Tsui Chi]).

### 2.2.6 Seven

*Seven* also occurs relatively rarely, although it is not unknown. Mani, for instance, made reference to “Seven Planets” and “Seven Pillars” in *Shabuhrgan* (M 98/991), while according to al-Nadīm one chapter of the *Book of Mysteries* concerned the “Seven Spirits” (*Fihrist*, 798 [Dodge]). Ephraim also attributes an idea of “Seven Regions” and “Ten Firmaments” to both Mani and Bardaisan (*Mani* 204.10-47 [Reeves #49]), while “Seven Heavens” (1Ke 172.10) and “Seven Firmaments” (1Ke 170.29) are referenced to in the *Kephalaia*. This text also contains references to items such as “Seven Angels (produced by fasting)” (1Ke 193.29; 194.4, 6), “Seven Buddhas” (2Ke \*305 [Funk, “Reconstruction”]), “Seven Communities” (2Ke \*305 [Funk, “Reconstruction”]), “Seven Ditches” (1Ke 243.8, 12), and “Seven Garments” (1Ke 107.28). Chinese sources, on the other hand, mention images such as “Seven Precious Pearls” (*Treatise*, 557 [Chavannes/Pelliot]), “Seven Ship-masters” (*Hymnscroll*, 371 [Tsui Chi]), and “Seven Treasures” (*Hymnscroll*, 391 [Tsui Chi]).

<sup>82</sup> While the so-called “Song of the Lovers” makes reference to the Six Faces (of Keeper of Splendor) (*Am. Cant* [Aug. *Contra Faustum*, 15.5]), the relation of this poem to canonical tradition remains obscure.

<sup>83</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 56.

### 2.2.7 *Eight*

The number *eight* plays a limited, although important, role in the canonical concept of the “Eight Earths” (Theodore bar Khonai 315.11-12 [Scher]; al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 781 [Dodge]) created by the Mother of Life out of the corpses of the slain Archons. This idea is widely attested in Manichaean sources (see *Acta Arch.* 8.1; 1Ke 58.23; 118.242; Ps 10.26; al-Jabbar, 159 [Monnot]; *Xvāstvānīft*, III B [Bang]; *Treatise*, 514 [Chavannes/Pelliot]) and is a key piece of Manichaean cosmology.

### 2.2.8 *Nine*

*Nine* occurs rarely, although it is attested in the “Nine (Garments)” of the Child (1Ke 108.2) and the “Nine Thrones” (of Honour) (1Ke 82.25, 28; 83.12) from the *Kephalaia*.

### 2.2.9 *Ten*

As in the case of *eight*, *ten* occurs in an infrequent but consistent fashion in the complimentary notion of the “Ten Heavens” (*Shabuhragan* M 470 +; al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* 781 [Dodge]; 2Ps 10.25; al-Jabbar, 159 [Monnot]; *Xvāstvānīft*, III B [Bang]; *Treatise*, 514, 515 [Chavannes/Pelliot]; *Hymnscroll*, 130 [Tsui Chi]) or the “Ten Firmaments” (Ephraim, *Mani* 204.10-47 [Reeves #49]; 1Ke 88.6; 115.7; 118.20; 131.24; 170.4; 478.2, 3), although other concepts such as the “Ten Advantages of the Manichaean Religion” (*Shabuhragan* M 5794 = T II D 126; *Kephalaia* Chapter 151) and the “Ten Commandments” (*Xvāstvānīft*, IX A; XV C [Bang]) are also known.

### 2.2.10 *Eleven*

*Eleven* occurs as an irregularity in two important sources, namely, *Shabuhragan*, which mentions “Eleven Firmaments” (M 7980-7984) and Theodore bar Khonai, who records the creation of “Eleven Heavens” by the Mother of Life.<sup>84</sup>

### 2.2.11 *Twelve*

*Twelve* plays an important role in Manichaean discourse primarily through the concept of the “Twelve Aeons” (2Ps 9.13; 133.11; 136.33; 144.11; 198.25; TKc 1.14; Seven Chapters, 3.61 [Adam]; *Am. Cant.* [Aug. *Contra Faustum*, 15.5] [Adam]) that surround the Father of Greatness, variously known as his “Twelve Princes” (2Ps 136.29), his “Twelve Henchmen” (2Ps 136.32), or his “Twelve Rich Gods” (1Ke 25.16). Although not explicitly named in Coptic sources, these beings are presumably connected to the “Twelve Dominions of Light”: 1) dominion, 2) wisdom, 3) victory, 4) joy, 5) zeal, 6) truth, 7) faith, 8) patience, 9) righteousness, 10) kindness, 11) harmony, and 12) light known from Iranian sources (M 14 R 19-28)<sup>85</sup> and the “Twelve Virgins” mentioned by Theodore bar Khonai (316.2-8; 1Ke 25.22; 2Ps 133.16; 138.65; TKc 1.12) as accompanying the Third Messenger. This series of divinized virtues are also known as the “Twelve Steersmen” (*Acta Archelai* 13.2; *Hymnscroll*, 362 [Tsui Chi]) and are paralleled by an inverse series of dark virtues or “dominions”: 1) evil knowledge, 2) greed, 3) ostentatiousness, 4) restlessness, 5) wrath, 6) defilement, 7) destruction, 8) annihilation, 9) death, 10) fraud, 11) tumult, and 12) darkness (M 34 R 6-15 Parthian).<sup>86</sup>

<sup>84</sup> This is usually interpreted as some kind of manuscript error (see Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 203 n. 38; Williams Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, 234 n. 48).

<sup>85</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 78.

<sup>86</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 79.

Also associated with the dark realm (as we shall see) are the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac (1Ke 27.16; 48.35; 120.12; 166.32; 167.3,12,31; 169.9; 173.25,27; 174.12), the “Twelve Spirits of Death” (1Ke 26.17) and the “Twelve Spirits of Error” (1Ke 48.34).

### 2.2.12 *Thirteen*

*Thirteen* is also rare but not unknown, being the subject of *Kephalaia* Chapter 152 on how the Elect rises through thirteen spirits, although Chinese sources mention “Thirteen Luminous Bodies” (*Treatise*, 528 [Chavannes/ Pelliot]), “Thirteen Luminous Powers” (*Treatise*, 519, 523 [Chavannes/Pelliot]), “Thirteen Qualities of Old Man” (*Treatise*, 540 [Chavannes/Pelliot]), and “Thirteen Qualities of the Beloved of Lights” (*Treatise*, 542 [Chavannes/Pelliot]).

### 2.2.13 *Fourteen*

*Fourteen* can be found in a handful of references to miscellaneous items such as “Fourteen Gates” (*Shabuhrgan* M 98/99I), “Fourteen Aeons” spoken about by Sethel (1Ke 42.25, 30, 31, 33; 43.1; 43.10), “Fourteen Heads” of the Dragon (1Ke 251.27; 252.2, 6, 8, 18; 253.1, 10, 17, 21), “Fourteen Vehicles” boarded by Jesus (1Ke 36.28), “Fourteen Wounds” inflicted on the Five-fold God (i.e., First Man) (*Xvāstvānīft*, III C [Bang]), and the “Fourteen (‘Two-fold seven’) Palaces” (*Hymnscroll*, 22 [Tsui Chi]).

### 2.2.14 *Fifteen*

*Fifteen*, although almost unknown, can be found in a reference to “Fifteen Sprouts/Roots” from the Chinese *Hymnscroll* (70 [Tsui Chi]).

### 2.2.15 Other Numbers

References to a limited amount of larger numbers can be found in various types of Manichaean literature, such as “Twenty-two Angels” (1Ke 289.32,33), “Twenty-two Words” (Hom 43.20), “Twenty-four (‘Two-fold twelve’) Palaces” (*Hymnscroll*, 22 [Tsui Chi]), “Twenty-five characteristics and limbs” of Call & Response (1Ke 263.3), “Thirty-six Angels” (1Ke 289.30), “Forty Messengers” (*Hymnscroll*, 134 [Tsui Chi]), “One hundred and forty-four gods” (Seven Chapters, 3.6 [Adam]), “Three-hundred and Fifty Angels” produced by fasting (1Ke 194.6, 11), “Three-hundred and Sixty Days” (1Ke 467.24, 31), “Three-hundred and Sixty Houses” with gates (M 67 R Parthian),<sup>87</sup> “One thousand and fifty angels” engendered by fasting (1Ke 194.11), “Ten-thousand Forms” (1Ps 189.31), and “Ten-thousand Races” (1Ps 189.32).

### 2.3 Literary / Rhetorical

As was commonplace in the literature of Late Antiquity (see above), numbers were also used by Manichaeans in literary and rhetorical contexts. Mani himself, it would seem, was even moved to employ such devices on occasion, as is testified by Theodore bar Khonai, who records that First Man prayed for aid to the Father of Greatness “seven times” (Theodore bar Khonai 314.14 [Scher]). Also, Living Spirit, we are told, commanded “three sons” to kill the Archons (Theodore bar Khonai 315.7-8 [Scher]), while the Third Messenger appointed “three servants” to move the vessels (Theodore bar Khonai 316.9 [Scher]). A much subtler use of numeric patterning has also been detected

---

<sup>87</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 56.



in the Father of Greatness' response to First Man, which Theodore seems to have recorded in its original metrical verse form.<sup>88</sup>

Greek sources contain a mere handful of numerical flourishes, such as the comparison of Light and Dark to "two kings" (*Acta Archelai*. 7.2), although the *Cologne Mani Codex* records "two men" as companions for Mani (*CMC* 106), "four zones of the sea" (*CMC* 77), and a hyperbolic statement from one of Mani's visions, which apparently included "[thousands] and tens [of thousands] sinking" in a sea (*CMC* 77).

Not surprisingly, Coptic Manichaean texts contain many more literary and rhetorical numbers. Most superficial is the enumeration of titles and chapters, as can be found not only in the *Kephalaia*,<sup>89</sup> but also in the *Epistles*<sup>90</sup> and the *Synaxeis*<sup>91</sup> codices. In other cases, numbers are used in the construction of *exempla* (Two Births [of Women] [1Ke 147.12], Two People [1Ke 189.28; 236.27], Two Pearls [1Ke 203.12]), *metaphor* (Two Droplets [1Ke 203.17], Two-edged axe [Paraclete] [2Ps 162.31; 178.7; 226.19], Two Sons [of Someone] [1Ke 76.35]), and *hyperbole*, as in the two-hundred and ten times ten thousand rulers of the body (1Ke 175.11), the thousand coming to reap the grain (Hom 8.16), the thousands chosen and the ten thousands who believe (Hom 59.13), the eight-hundred and forty times ten thousand rulers of body (1Ke 175.8), or the ten thousand words uttered (2Ps 161.16). Numbers are also used in the calculation and association of divinities, as when the Five Sons are added to Call and Response in order to equal *seven* (1Ke 43.4), or the Five Intellectuals added to the Five Porters (*omophoroi*)

<sup>88</sup> Reitzenstein and Schaeder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus*, 343.

<sup>89</sup> The first volume of *Kephalaia* occasionally contains chapter titles such as "The Second, on the Parable of the Tree" and "The Seventh, on the Five Fathers" (Polotsky/Böhlig).

<sup>90</sup> Mani's letters are given names such as "The Seventh Letter of Ktesiphon," or "The Third Letter to Sissinios." See Gardner, "The Reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from Three Coptic Codices," 93-104. Also, Funk, *A Work Concordance to the Coptic Fragments of Mani's Epistles*.

<sup>91</sup> This codex contains titles such as "The Second Synaxis of the First Discourse." See Mirecki, "The Coptic Manichaean Synaxeis Codex," 137-145.

in order to equal *ten*, then supplemented by Call & Response to equal *twelve* (2Ps 133.29-30). Other number statements, however, are far more enigmatic, such as a verse from the *Psalm-book*: “One, two, three is the Perfect Church” (2Ps 162.9; 171.13). Events in Manichaean history are even given a numerical colouring, as in the description of the three (Hom 48.20) or six chains put on Mani (2Ps 19.6), the three female Catechumens who visit him in prison (Hom 59.4), or the “once, twice, three times” the king questions Sisinnios (Hom 82.26). As we shall see, literary and rhetorical patterns involving *five* are particularly common in the *Kephalaia*, influencing both the content and structure of Manichaean discourse.

Manichaean texts from Central Asia also contain a certain amount of numbered literary and rhetorical devices. For instance, fragments from the “Tale of Three Fishes”<sup>92</sup> and the “Parable of the Two Snakes”<sup>93</sup> survive, as do texts structured according to the twenty-two letters of the Aramaic alphabet,<sup>94</sup> such as the “Parable of the World Ocean,” which is explained in two sets of ten parts (T III T 601, T III 2015, T II D 2 [Sogdian])<sup>95</sup> or a litany of twenty-two invocations (M 39 V ii [Parthian]).<sup>96</sup> Hyperbolic numbers are also found, as in the 20 000 demons who rule hours of the day (M 1202 [Parthian]).<sup>97</sup> Similarly, Turkish texts also contain hyperbolic statements about 140 myriads of devils fought by the Five-fold God (*Xvastvanift* 1B [Bang]), or the 500 000 myriads of divine virgins and youths around the throne of the Father of Greatness (T I D 20).<sup>98</sup> In one particularly elaborate Sogdian text, however, numbers are used extensively as part of an

<sup>92</sup> Henning, “Sogdian Tales,” 465-487.

<sup>93</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 181.

<sup>94</sup> While these may have been modelled on Mani’s *Living Gospel*, such acrostic poems were a well-known literary convention in antiquity.

<sup>95</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 178-181.

<sup>96</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 67-68.

<sup>97</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 164.

<sup>98</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 339-340.

extended metaphor about how the Living Spirit created the world in the form of a Near Eastern bazaar (M 5794).<sup>99</sup>

Chinese texts also contain hyperbolic descriptions of Land of Light, comparing it to the brightness of a hundred or thousand suns and moons (*Hymnscroll*, 277 [Tsui Chi]), which glisten in a myriad of ways (*Hymnscroll*, 277 [Tsui Chi]), and contains a billion varieties of treasure (*Hymnscroll*, 303 [Tsui Chi]). Similarly, 1000 myriad parts of “Tathagata’s” wisdom are mentioned (*Treatise*, 587 [Chavannes/Pelliot]).

## 2.4 Liturgical / Magical

Also of interest is the occurrence of numerical patterns in Manichaean liturgical formulae, such as a four-part statement from the *Psalm-book*, “Amen, Amen, Amen, Amen, again, the four-faced God” (2Ps 191.12), or a (stereotypical) passage from Turfan, “Holy, Holy, Holy to you! Father!” (M 538 and 75 [Parthian]).<sup>100</sup> *Five* appears in Parthian in a five-part benediction, “Blessed be the shepherd, the judge, the good ruler, the leader, the powerful one, life!” (M 39 V I [Parthian]).<sup>101</sup> Certain liturgical formulae were also meant to be repeated, as in a four-time repetition of “God of the dawn” in one Turkish fragment (T II D 169)<sup>102</sup> or a three-time liturgical repetition of “You have come with salvation” in Sogdian (T II D 169).<sup>103</sup> Even scribes, it seems, could not resist employing such devices, as in the five-part blessing from the Turkish colophon to the “Book of the Two Principles” (T II D 171).<sup>104</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 236.

<sup>100</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 30.

<sup>101</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 59. See also a Parthian passage which states that “with the five thoughts (*panj parmānag*) [we invoke] the Mother of the Righteous, the Father, the God Ohrmizd, together with the five Bright Ones” (M 5262 = T II D 66) (Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 32).

<sup>102</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 290.

<sup>103</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 63.

<sup>104</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 374-375.

Numbers were also used to describe the length of certain liturgical events, such as the Five Paschas of Lord Heracleides (2Ps Index 231.31), the Fifty Fasts (1Ke 233.3), or the Fifty Lord's Days (1Ke 233.4; 262.11, 16; 263.9, 16, 20, 21, 27, 29; 264.3, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 18). An Iranian liturgical index enumerates the number of homilies required for *yamagā* days of fasting and prayer, which were observed in commemoration of martyrs (S [Middle Persian]).<sup>105</sup> In addition, the Turkish *Xvāstvānīfi* records seven *Yimki* Festivals (XIV A; XVI B [Bang]), as well as a Fifty-Day *Vusanti*-Fast (XII A [Bang]).

### 2.5 Communal / Ecclesiastical

What is even more interesting, however, is the degree to which numbers were embedded into the specific structuring of the Manichaean communal and ecclesiastical hierarchy.<sup>106</sup> While the Manichaean community was broadly divided into the two classes of Elect and Hearer (or Catechumen) under the guidance of one supreme Leader (ἀρχηγός—i.e., the successor of Mani—from the Elect were drawn four classes charged with the administration of church business: 1) 12 Teachers, 2) 72 Bishops, 3) 360 Ministers,<sup>107</sup> and 4) Religious, which included choir-masters, preachers, scribes, and singers. The selection of “twelve” teachers, it would seem, was modelled on Jesus’ selection of twelve disciples, while “seventy-two” bishops reflects the number of disciples sent out on missions by Jesus (Lk 10:1).<sup>108</sup> The 360 ministers were, in turn, connected to the lunar calendar.<sup>109</sup> It should be noted, however, that the overall structure of the Manichaean

<sup>105</sup> Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 152.

<sup>106</sup> For a description of this hierarchy see Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 72-79.

<sup>107</sup> These first three classes were apparently modelled on the structure of Mesopotamian Christian Church (See Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 76).

<sup>108</sup> Both of these numbers occur as early as the *Psalm-book* (2Ps 44.8) and the Dublin *Kephalaia* (Ch. 337 [Funk, “Reconstruction”]).

<sup>109</sup> Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 74.

church, the Manichaean “body” as it were, when the four classes of Elect are combined with the Hearer class, was rooted in the number *five*—more evidence, it would seem, of the central importance of this number for the Manichaeans.

This survey of numerical references in Manichaean texts brings into focus several key factors that motivate this study—1) that Manichaeans utilized numbers in their religious discourse more than most of their contemporaries in Late Antiquity, 2) that, unlike Pythagoreans and numerologically minded individuals from the period, Manichaeans were not interested in the theological properties or significance of numbers *in themselves*, but in the fact that they could be perceived reoccurring throughout the structure of the cosmos, 3) that the number *five* was given the widest application to key theological concepts, and 4) no where is the significance of *five* given more attention than in the first volume of the Coptic *Kephalaia*. As a result, the main portion of this study may justly be devoted to coming to terms with the occurrence of five-part numerical patterns in this important early Manichaean text.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Since their discovery in 1929, the Manichaean codices from Medinet Madi have attracted relatively little scholarly attention, especially when compared to other late antique religious texts uncovered during the twentieth century such as those from Qumran or Nag Hammadi. The primary concern thus far has been with producing editions of the texts—a goal that due to the extremely poor condition of the papyrus and the lack of available (and interested!) specialists has not yet been achieved.<sup>110</sup> There was a long hiatus between the initial editions of Allberry,<sup>111</sup> Polotsky,<sup>112</sup> and Böhlig<sup>113</sup> and the more recent editions and re-editions of Funk,<sup>114</sup> Richter,<sup>115</sup> and Wurst.<sup>116</sup> In the meantime, (in addition to a fair number of articles)<sup>117</sup> some more detailed and thematic studies (especially of the *Psalm-Book*) have appeared by scholars such as Säve-Söderbergh,<sup>118</sup> Nagel,<sup>119</sup> Richter,<sup>120</sup> Villey,<sup>121</sup> Wurst,<sup>122</sup> Gardner,<sup>123</sup> and Pedersen.<sup>124</sup> During this period, however, much of the attention of Manichaean Studies was diverted towards the Greek *Cologne Mani Codex (CMC)*, a text that has brought about a complete reorientation of discussions

<sup>110</sup> The *Epistles (forthcoming)*, *Acts*, *Synaxeis*, *Psalm Book I* and *Kephalaia II* remain to be published, although one important achievement of modern Manichaean Studies was the publication from 1986-1988 by Søren Giversen of a facsimile edition of the Manichaean papyri from the Chester Beatty Library.

<sup>111</sup> *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*.

<sup>112</sup> *Manichäische Homilien*; with Böhlig, *Kephalaia (I)*.

<sup>113</sup> *Kephalaia (I) : 2 Hälfte [Lieferung 11-12]*.

<sup>114</sup> *Kephalaia (I) : Zweite Hälfte [Lieferung 13-14]*; *Kephalaia (I) : Zweite Hälfte [Lieferung 15-16]*.

<sup>115</sup> *Psalm Book : Part II, Fasc. 2 (Die Herakleides-Psalmen)*.

<sup>116</sup> *Psalm Book : Part II, Fasc. 1 (Die Bema-Psalmen)*.

<sup>117</sup> For a review of recent research from 1988-1996, see Funk, "Research on Manichaeism in Egypt: 1988-1996," 453-464. In particular, Böhlig, Funk, Gardner, Giversen, Kasser, Krause, Mirecki, Nagel, Richter, Smagina, Tardieu, Van Lindt, and Wurst have each produced several articles on Coptic Manichaean literature.

<sup>118</sup> *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book*.

<sup>119</sup> *Die Thomaspalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*.

<sup>120</sup> *Exegetisch-literarkritische Untersuchungen von Herakleides-Psalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*.

<sup>121</sup> *Psaumes des errants : Écrits manichéens du Fayyûm*.

<sup>122</sup> *Das Bemafest der ägyptischen Manichäer*.

<sup>123</sup> *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*.

<sup>124</sup> *Studies in the Sermon on the Great War : Investigations of a Manichaean-Coptic Text from the Fourth Century*.

about Manichaean origins.<sup>125</sup> Yet in the wake of the *CMC*, and especially since the 1990s, there has been a resurgence in Manichaean Studies. The formation of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS), the founding of the Manichaean Studies Seminar (within the context of the Society of Biblical Literature), the discovery of additional primary Manichaean texts at Kellis, and the initiation of the international *Corpus fontium manichaeorum*, with its ambitious aim of publishing all surviving Manichaean-related texts in all languages are also factors that have contributed to this renaissance. Still, there remains only a small number of individuals who are actively engaged in the study of Manichaeism as a religious movement, and fewer still who are directly interested in the Coptic sources. Not only are these texts invaluable as sources for the study of Coptic grammar and dialectology, but they are equally important subjects for literary and historical analysis. At present, the most suitable candidates for such analysis from among the Medinet Madi codices, due to their more advanced state of publication, are the *Psalm-Book* and the *Kephalaia*. While the second part of the *Psalm-Book* has already been the subject of a number of more recent studies, the first part of the *Kephalaia* (i.e., volume one) is also in an ideal position to be fruitfully explored using modern methods of critical analysis.

### 3.1 Framing the Question: Towards a Redaction Critique of the *Kephalaia*

Given the fact that more focused studies of Coptic Manichaean texts are really only beginning, it seems natural to assume that such inquiries should take inspiration from the methodological progression followed by New Testament studies during the late-

---

<sup>125</sup> In the long-standing debate about the Iranian or Judaeo-Christian origins of Manichaeism, the *Cologne Mani Codex* has been seen to add much weight to the Judaeo-Christian argument.

nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.<sup>126</sup> This means that *form critical*,<sup>127</sup> *redactional*,<sup>128</sup> *rhetorical*,<sup>129</sup> and eventually *social-scientific*<sup>130</sup> modes of analysis ought to be applied to this substantial body of late antique literature, which until now has remained relatively unexplored. In particular, the Medinet Madi texts are ideal candidates

<sup>126</sup> According to Beardslee (*Literary Criticism of the New Testament*), literary criticism of the New Testament came to the fore especially in the twentieth century, when religious writings came increasingly to be understood *as* literature (3). Prior to that, the gospels were generally viewed as being “uncomplicated documents which had been put together without careful planning” (iii). Contemporary scholars, however, now consider them to be intricately constructed literary creations (iii). In fact, the investigation into the complexity of these writings continues year after year with fresh and stimulating results. What literary criticism of religious literature also emphasizes is the “relationship of content to form, the significance of structure or form for meaning, and the capacity of language to direct thought and to mould existence itself” (iv). In order to uncover such relationships, a number of critical strategies may be employed. Such strategies constitute just some of the ways in which modern scholars have attempted to understand ancient religious documents in the forms in which they have been preserved. Literary criticism attempts to uncover not what the texts *ought* to express based on a particular set of theological criteria, but rather what they *do* express. It would be naïve to suggest that literary criticism is free from religious, political, or ideological biases, since it frequently is not. Nevertheless, literary criticism has brought a wide variety of understandings to canons of literature that prior to the modern period were thought to be “off-limits” or the regulated domain of a particular set of theological specialists.

<sup>127</sup> *Form criticism* was first performed on texts from the Hebrew Bible, such as Genesis, in which the repetition of key stories or the repeated use of particular names or motifs can reveal the incorporation of earlier documents and traditions (McKnight, *What is Form Criticism?*). After the First World War, however, German scholars such as Dibelius and Bultmann developed New Testament “form criticism,” whose “fundamental assumption” is that tradition consists of individual units (sayings, narratives, etc.) that have been joined together by the author/editor. Thus, the primary interest of form criticism is not the text as it exists in its final form, but rather an earlier stage or prehistory consisting of these individual units of tradition.

<sup>128</sup> After the Second World War, a new wave of literary criticism of the New Testament emerged known as *Redaktionsgeschichte* or *redaction criticism* (Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?*). Simply stated, “redaction criticism is concerned with the interaction between inherited tradition and a later interpretive point of view” (vi). It attempts, generally speaking, to understand why individual pieces or units of tradition were organized and connected in a certain manner and how the redactor’s theological motivations influenced this process of collection and arrangement.

<sup>129</sup> In the wake of the ideological disasters of the Second World War a new interest in argumentation emerged. In this context, the publication of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s *Traité de l’argumentation* marked a watershed in the rise of *rhetorical criticism* (Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*). Faced with the devastating impact of propaganda in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca re-emphasized the importance of rhetoric as argumentation rather than mere ornamentation, as it had come to be understood (14-15). These authors also emphasized the importance of the situation or “speech context” in the analysis of rhetorical structures. As a result, rhetorical criticism has resulted in a better understanding of the social setting or *Sitz im Leben* of particular texts (15). According to Mack, rhetorical analysis is “valuable as a mediator between literary-critical and social-historical analyses because it pays attention to both the formal shaping of the text and the impact of the life setting on the employment of devices and the structuring of the argument” (15). In other words, rhetorical criticism bridges the gap between literary criticism and the social sciences (93). Thus, knowing the rules that govern rhetorical argumentation can lead to a reconstruction of the rhetorical situation, accurate identification of the issue at hand, and a discovery of the author’s motives (20).

<sup>130</sup> Social-scientific analysis draws upon insights from sociology and cultural anthropology in order to interpret biblical texts (See Elliott, *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?*).



for *redaction criticism*, since those who produced them would have likely had access to their master's teaching (at least) in written form, if not oral traditions as well. Thus, given the fact that this study will attempt to illuminate how the compilers<sup>131</sup> of the *Kephalaia* sought to transform received Manichaean traditions by means of numeric patterning in response to specific community concerns,<sup>132</sup> it may be described as essentially *redactional* in its methodological orientation.

### 3.2 Describing the Text: Form and Function of the *Kephalaia*

In spite of the fact that substantial portions of the *Kephalaia* have been edited and published for over half a century,<sup>133</sup> its form and function have remained generally misunderstood. Since these initial publications, even some of the most influential scholars have succumbed to the temptation to regard the *Kephalaia* either as a record of Mani's actual discourses<sup>134</sup> and teachings,<sup>135</sup> or as a systematic<sup>136</sup> (albeit secondary)

---

<sup>131</sup> I have chosen the term "compiler" to represent any number of individuals involved in the production of the text, including authors, editors, and redactors.

<sup>132</sup> Three of the basic principals of redaction criticism can be summarized as follows: 1) that oral (or in our case written canonical) tradition is the original source of material, 2) that this material has been collected and redacted in various ways including, although not limited to, the form under consideration, and 3) that such material informs us about the beliefs and circumstances of the community (Perrin, 14).

<sup>133</sup> The Manichaean *Kephalaia* exist in two Coptic codices discovered near the Egyptian town of Medinet Madi in 1929. The first codex (Berlin codex P. 15 996 or Berlin *Kephalaia* codex) is entitled "The *Kephalaia* of the Teacher," while the second codex (Codex C or Dublin *Kephalaia* codex) is entitled "The *Kephalaia* of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani." For a recent account of the discovery of these manuscripts see Robinson, "The Fate of the Manichaean Codices of Medinet Madi: 1929-1989," 19-62. Much of the Berlin *Kephalaia* codex was published by Polosky and Böhlig (1940 and 1966), while the remainder is being published by Funk (1999, 2000, and forthcoming). For a recent account of the characteristics, content, and reconstruction of the *Kephalaia* codices, see Funk, "The Reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*," 143-159. The Dublin *Kephalaia* codex is included in Giversen's 1987 facsimile edition, although it is not (to my knowledge) currently being edited.

<sup>134</sup> See Schmidt, *Ein Mani-Fund*, 23. Also, Lieu, for instance, talks about *Kephalaia* chapters as "extant discourses of Mani" (*Manichaeism in the Roman Empire*, 177). While the enthusiasm of scholars for finding the authentic voice of Mani in such a text is understandable, somewhat more unsettling is the way in which the *Kephalaia*, as a primary source for Manichaeism, is sometimes simply pillaged by scholars for proof-texts in support of particular readings and hypotheses, with little or no attention paid to the chapter context from which such references are taken.

presentation of the “main points” of Manichaean theology. In reality, however, the work is neither. It should not be seen as a record of the *ipsissima verba* of Mani himself, nor should it be viewed as a *summa*<sup>137</sup> of Manichaean theology. Instead, it can be more accurately described as representing the emergence or evolution of a “scholastic” tradition that takes the received teaching and writings of Mani as a starting point for exegesis, elaboration, and constructive interpretation.

While the *Kephalaia* (literally the “Chapter-book”)<sup>138</sup> may present itself as a record of Manichaean oral tradition based on Mani’s discourses to his inner circle,<sup>139</sup> it is essentially the product of later theological developments and elaborations that seek to respond to a wide array of specific questions, many of which are likely rooted in ambiguities found in the canon. Typically (although not always), a chapter opens with Mani being questioned by one of his disciples about a specific point of doctrine or interpretation. This means that one of the primary aims sought by the compilers of this massive work was clarity. While Mani is famous for having recorded his teaching in a series of self-consciously canonical writings intended to definitively replace all previous revelations, the questions that are asked by the disciples give the distinct impression that

---

<sup>135</sup> Widengren spoke about “Mani’s teaching, as set down in the *Kephalaia*” (*Mani and Manichaeism*, 69), while Ort characterized the *Kephalaia* as “a summary of Mani’s doctrines based on his own writings” (*Mani*, 23).

<sup>136</sup> Even Tardieu, in spite of the incredible balance and control of his *Que sais-je* volume, seems to indulge in a slight excess of rhetoric when he characterizes the *Kephalaia* as “une véritable *summa theologica* du manichéisme” based on Mani’s *logia* (*Le manichéisme*, 66-67). Similarly, Koenen characterized the *Kephalaia* as a “dogmatic textbook” (“How Dualistic is Mani’s Dualism?” 3).

<sup>137</sup> In its existing form, it does not appear to be structured with the same degree of deliberation as other systematic theological treatises from the period, such as Origen’s *De principiis*.

<sup>138</sup> This seems like the best way to translate the title (Wolf-Peter Funk, *personal communication*). I cannot help, however, wonder whether the intended title is *Kephalaia of the Teacher* or simply just *The Teacher* (or in the case of volume two—*The Wisdom of My Lord Mani*), although evidence from both the Coptic *Homilies* (18.6) and the *Acta Archelai* 62 would seem to support the traditional interpretation of the page headings.

<sup>139</sup> Funk, “Reconstruction,” 151.

Mani left many “loose ends” that needed to be resolved.<sup>140</sup> Thus, the *Kephalaia* appears to be a deliberate attempt to deal with some of these issues within the context of Mani’s “apostolic authority,”<sup>141</sup> since at the close of the *Kephalaia*’s “prologue” Mani is made to extol his disciples to record the wisdom he imparted to them (1Ke 9.5-6)—a strange command from someone who was supposed to have provided a definitive and unambiguous record of his revelation. In other words, if Mani had indeed clearly and definitively explained all the subtleties of his vision, then there should have been no need to create such an extensive corpus of secondary literature that seeks to address such a wide array of problems. We might even say that the *Kephalaia* constitutes a sort of *addenda et corrigenda* for Manichaean canonical tradition.

Still, in a more formal way, there are aspects of the *Kephalaia* that allow for its comparison with at least two genres of ancient literature. First, the fact that it exists as a collection of “chapters” (literally, Greek: κεφάλαια) on a variety of theological topics means that it could be compared to certain forms of ancient *Capitaliteratur*, which aimed at the collection of teachings from a spiritual teacher for the purposes of meditation.<sup>142</sup> A classical example of such literature is Epictetus’ *Encheridion*, which is essentially a collection of discourse on miscellaneous topics not unlike those found in the *Kephalaia*, such as *On friendship* (2.22), *On those who plead sickness* (3.5), or *What solitude is; and what a solitary person* (3.13). During the late antique period, such literature became

---

<sup>140</sup> In fact, surviving fragments from Mani’s writings do indicate that some of them, such as the *Book of Mysteries*, were largely incidental in nature, while others, such as the work(s) known to Titus of Bostra, Theodoret, and Severus seem to have been more generalized in nature, with less attention paid to fixed structures and detail.

<sup>141</sup> Funk, “Reconstruction,” 152.

<sup>142</sup> Ivanka, “ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ,” 285-291.

particularly popular among monks and ascetics,<sup>143</sup> so it is not inconceivable that ascetically minded Manichaeans would have been interested in producing a work of this sort. The use, however, of the *Kephalaia* as a source of meditative discourses would seem to have more to do with how it was read during later periods than how it was formed.

The second genre with which the *Kephalaia* bears a somewhat closer resemblance, and which speaks more to its compositional origins, is the *erotapokrisis*, or “question-and-answer” literature, that became popular among Jewish and Christian exegetes during the first centuries of the Common Era. This genre, which Claudio Zamagni has described as “un genre très élastique,” was a form of secondary literature used primarily for the exegesis and elucidation of canonical texts (be they Jewish, Christian, or pagan), although such works often contained apologetic, didactic, or polemical overtones.<sup>144</sup> In general, the *erotapokrisis* takes as its most basic form a three-part structure consisting of 1) preface/prologue, 2) questions and answers, and 3) postscript/colophon.<sup>145</sup> According to this simple criterion, the *Kephalaia* could be classified as part of the *erotapokritic* genre, especially if its primary aim was the explication of ambiguities found within canonical Manichaean tradition.<sup>146</sup>

### 3.3 Situating the Text: Textual (Pre-)History and Social Setting

One subject that will be given attention in this study is how the social setting of the compilers might have influenced the ways in which they used numeric patterning within the *Kephalaia*. The issue of social setting, however, is not as simple as it may seem. Even

<sup>143</sup> Ivanka, 286-287.

<sup>144</sup> Zamagni, “Une introduction,” 7-24.

<sup>145</sup> Zamagni, “Une introduction,” 24.

<sup>146</sup> The order of the questions does not necessarily need to reflect the progression of the text being commented on (Bussièrès, “Conclusions,” 185).

though the *Kephalaia*, in the form in which it survives, is found in two Coptic manuscripts from Upper Egypt, much of its content and concerns likely go back further into early Manichaean tradition. As such, in an attempt (albeit tentative) at reconstructing the social setting of what became the Coptic *Kephalaia*, I propose that its textual pre-history be hypothetically reconstructed and divided into four stages: 1) the oral and (especially) written teachings of Mani (in Syriac), 2) the oral and written interpretation of Mani's teachings by early disciples, such as Sisinnios, Kustaios, Adda, etc. (in Syriac and [probably] Greek),<sup>147</sup> 3) the organization and composition of "proto-*Kephalaia*"<sup>148</sup> material by other disciples and missionaries moving west towards (and into) Egypt (in Syriac, Greek,<sup>149</sup> and Coptic), and finally 4) the translation, redaction, and collection of *Kephalaia* material into large volumes, such as those found at Medinet Madi<sup>150</sup> (Coptic).

---

<sup>147</sup> Funk has asked whether it is possible that a "patristic" tradition developed at a very early stage in the western branch of the Manichaean movement; a tradition with apostolic authority independent of the Manichaean canon. (See Funk, "Reconstruction," 152). A document such as the *Cologne Mani Codex*, with its various sections attributed to authoritative individuals such as Salmaios, Baraies (or Barhaies), Timotheos, Innaios, Kustaios, etc., certainly points in this direction, as does the *Acts* codex, which has a similar structure (Funk, *personal communication*).

<sup>148</sup> The Kellis material contains some of what could be termed "proto-Kephalaic" material.

<sup>149</sup> The issue of original source language has been described as a "vexed question for all the Manichaean texts in Coptic" (Montserrat, review of Pedersen, *Studies in the Sermon on the Great War* (cited and reassessed by Franzmann, "Syriac-Coptic Bilinguals," 115). The debate around this issue, however, is frequently affected by the desire to see in these texts a more primitive stratum than is actually there. To be sure, there are elements from the texts that reveal at least an *interest* in some kind of Syriac sources, as is witnessed also by the Syriac-Coptic translation exercises recently discovered at Kellis (T. Kell. Syr. / Copt. 1; T. Kell. Syr. / Copt. 2) (Gardner, *Kellis Literary Texts*, 101). While these texts have raised the possibility (at least) that the translation process in Egypt could have been more direct, they are by no means the "smoking gun" that they are so often made out to be. After all, as Gardner points out, it is hard to imagine the translator not knowing any Greek, especially since Greek Manichaean texts of considerable literary sophistication have also been found at Kellis (not to mention the *CMC*). But, even though it appears textually possible to demonstrate some direct influence, or at least colouring, of Syriac on Coptic Manichaean texts, the question that is never asked is whether or not it is *sociologically* possible for highly literate (and no doubt indigenous) Coptic speaking translators to work directly from Syriac sources without Greek playing some sort of intermediary role either orally or by means of written texts.

<sup>150</sup> The existing *Kephalaia* codices seem to represent two volumes from two different "editions" of the same work (Funk, *personal communication*). The first codex, titled "The *Kephalaia* of the Teacher," may constitute volume one of its edition, while the second codex, titled "The *Kephalaia* of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani" may represent volume two if its (separate) edition.

<i>1. Oral/written sources</i>	<i>2. Interpretation</i>	<i>3. Composition</i>	<i>4. Redaction</i>
Teachings of Mani	Disciples	“proto-Kephalaia”	Medinet Madi Keph
Aramaic/Syriac	Syriac, (Greek?)	Syriac, (Greek), Coptic	Coptic
Sassanian Mesopotamia	Roman Mesopotamia	Moving west, into Egypt	Egypt

Thus, the traditions, as well as the carriers of these traditions, which led to the composition and production of the *Kephalaia* would have traversed (at least) two distinct (yet overlapping) socio-cultural settings: late 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE Mesopotamia and late 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century CE Egypt.<sup>151</sup> This movement was precipitated by both the “built-in” missionary impulse of the religion as well as the persecution of Manichaeans following the executions of Mani and Sisinnios. Although the temporal division between these two settings is ambiguous, an argument could be made that the most pertinent social setting falls somewhere between the second and third stages of evolution, as outlined above.

Furthermore, there are a certain number of *internal* indices within the *Kephalaia* that may help to clarify the social context out of which it emerged, such as references to religious and ethnic groups, geography, and important figures:

*Religiously Significant Figures:* Adam, Enosh, Eve, Jesus, Noah, Paul, Sem, Sethel, Zarathustra, Judas Iscariot, Simon the Leper, Aurentes, Buddha, Disciples, Mani

*Contemporary and/or Rival Religious Groups:* “Baptists”, Christians, Jews, Magi, Manichaeans, Nazoreans, Purified ones

*Geography:* Adiabene, Babylon, India, Ctesiphon, Mesene, Parthia, Persia, Susiana, Tigris

*Nationality and Ethnicity:* Assyrians, Axumites, Babylonian, Indians, Medes, Parthians, Persians, Romans

*Politically Important Figures:* Ardashir, Artabanus, Hystaspes, Shapur

<sup>151</sup> There is evidence of Manichaeans in Egypt as early as ca. 280 (Letter of Theonas of Alexandria, P. Rylands 469) and ca. 290 (Alexander of Lycopolis). See Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 112. As for what shape Manichaeism may have taken in Palestine, we have no real *direct* evidence like we have for Egypt.

This data indicates that, in terms of its internal content, the *Kephalaia* seems rooted in the (primarily) Judaeo-Christian milieu of Syrian Mesopotamia and reflects this historical context during the late 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE.<sup>152</sup> This is precisely the context that Peter Brown emphasized in his important 1969 article, “The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire.” According to Brown, the early history of Manichaeism is firmly rooted in the history of the Syriac speaking belt that crossed the frontiers of both Sassanian Iran and Rome.<sup>153</sup> These early Manichaeans, it seems, were caught between two “reactionary states,”<sup>154</sup> both of which were closing ranks and attempting to consolidate imperial cultures that had less and less room for religious innovation. Thus, in both cases Manichaeans were compelled to respond to external pressures such as persecution and martyrdom as well as internal pressures of group solidarity, doctrinal cohesion, and missionary expansion. One facet of this response, I will suggest, was the extensive use of numeric patterns within the *Kephalaia*.

### 3.4 Collecting the Data: Lexical Index of Fives in the *Kephalaia*

Before assembling a collection of chapters for analysis, we must first determine just how many explicit references to *five* can be found within the *Kephalaia*. In order to accomplish this, Wolf-Peter Funk’s unpublished *Kephalaia* concordance has served as an invaluable resource, since it provides a complete picture of just how frequently “five”

---

<sup>152</sup> Other indices (smaller in number), indicate specifically Egyptian providence, such as references to the months Parmouthi and Paophi in *Kephalaia* Chapter 1, although these are largely superficial.

<sup>153</sup> Brown, “Diffusion,” 93.

<sup>154</sup> Brown, “Diffusion,” 97.

occurs within the first *Kephalaia* volume. (NB: A few of the more obscure or uncertain occurrences have been omitted here):<sup>155</sup>

- FIVE ADVENTS: †Ε ΝΘΙΝΕΙ (1Ke 55.12; 76.24)
- FIVE ANGELS (OF SIN): †ΟΥ ΝΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 95.23)
- FIVE ARCHETYPES (OF THE SUN): †ΟΥ ΝΤΥΠΟΣ (1Ke 161.32)
- FIVE ARCHONS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΑΡΧΩΝ (1Ke 30.15; 500.2)
- FIVE BODIES (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝCΩΜΑ (1Ke 30.16; 30.23; 34.10; 95.15)
- FIVE BOOKS: †ΟΥ ΧΩΩΜΕ (1Ke 355.2)
- FIVE (GREAT) CAMPS: †Ε ΝΝΑΒ ΜΠΑΡΑΜΠΟΛΗ (1Ke 170.21; 171.29; 172.2)
- FIVE CHURCHES: †Ε ΝΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ (1Ke 25.4)
- FIVE COUNSELS (OF ELEMENTS): †ΟΥ ΝCΑΧΝΕ (1Ke 58.15)
- FIVE COUNSELS (OF LIGHT-MIND): †ΟΥ ΝCΑΧΝΕ (1Ke 89.27; 89.28)
- FIVE CRAFTSMEN: †ΟΥ ΝΤΕΧΝΙΤΗC (1Ke 261.8)
- FIVE CREATIONS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝCΩΩΝΤ (1Ke 48.20; 77.28; 78.2)
- FIVE DEATHS: †ΟΥ ΜΜΟΥ (1Ke 303.27; 303.28)
- FIVE DWELLINGS: †Ε ΜΜΟΝΗ (1Ke 458.1)
- FIVE ELEMENTS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝCΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ (1Ke 26.6; 26.8; 30.18; 30.19; 48.6; 48.25; 58.15; 74.18)
- FIVE ELEMENTS (OF LIGHT): †ΟΥ ΝCΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ (1Ke 29.8; 43.2; 261.21; 261.27; 2Ke 418.7)
- FIVE ENSLAVEMENTS: †Ε ΝΜΝΤΒΑΟΥΑΝ (1Ke 34.9)
- FIVE ESCAPES: †Ε ΝΘΙΝΡΒΑΛ (1Ke 60.14; 60.16)
- FIVE FATHERS: †ΟΥ ΝΙΩΤ (1Ke 34.15; 34.19; 34.24; 36.21; 76.18; 76.23; 355.3; 487.8)
- FIVE FETTERS: †Ε ΜΜΡΡΕ (2Ke \*204.29)
- FIVE FLESHES: †Ε ΝCΑΡΞ (1Ke 21.16; 122.7; 151.31)
- FIVE FOLDS: †ΟΥ ΝΖΑΠΛΩΜΑ (1Ke 90.24)
- FIVE FOODS: †Ε ΝΤΡΟΦΗ (1Ke 348.28; 348.30; 349.15; 349.20; 349.24; 350.2; 350.8; 434.4)
- FIV FOODS (OF MATTER): †Ε ΝΤΡΟΦΗ (1Ke 350.4; 350.8; 434.4?)
- FIVE FORMS (OF ENVY): †ΟΥ ΜΠΡΟCΩΠΟΝ (1Ke 409.9; 410.13)
- FIVE FORMS (OF SPIRITUAL TRANSITION): †ΟΥ ΝCΜΑΤ (1Ke 452.28)
- FIVE FORMS (OF KING OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝCΧΗΜΑ (1Ke 31.3)
- FIVE FORMS (OF KING OF DARKNESS): †Ε ΜΜΟΡΦΗ (1Ke 30.34; 31.1; 78.1; 78.10)
- FIVE (GREAT) FOUNTAINS: †Ε ΝΝΑΒ ΝΖΑΛΜΕ (1Ke 64.26)
- FIVE FRUITS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΚΑΡΠΟC (1Ke 48.18)
- FIVE GARMENTS (OF FIRST MAN): †Ε ΝΖΒCΩ (1Ke 69.18; 262.25; 404.6; 404.8)
- FIVE GARMENTS (OF COSMOS): †Ε ΝΖΒCΩ (1Ke 170.2)
- FIVE GODS: †ΟΥ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ (1Ke 64.6; 72.7; 91.15; 290.6; 2Ke 425.25; 435.24)

<sup>155</sup> The following information has been compiled from the *Concordance to the Manichaeian Kephalaia*. This particular concordance, however, reflects an intermediate stage of work on the text, in that most of it, but not all, had been revised. As such, the concordance text is not fully identical with Polotsky/ Böhlig or the definitive A&C version.



- FIVE GREATNESSES: †Ε ΜΜΝΤΝΑΒ (1Ke 49.11; 49.14)
- FIVE HAPPINESSES: †Ε ΝΕΥΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ (1Ke 25.3)
- FIVE HOLLOWES (OF DRAGON): †ΟΥ ΝΩΑΦΩΦ (1Ke 252.3)
- FIVE HOUSES: †ΟΥ ΝΟΙΚΟΣ (1Ke 145.14)
- FIVE INTELLECTUALS: †ΟΥ ΝΟΕΡΟΝ (1Ke 92.1; 177.3)
- FIVE KINDS (OF TREE): †ΟΥ ΝΕΙΝΕ (1Ke 121.15)
- FIVE KINGS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΡΡΟ (1Ke 30.23)
- FIVE LAIRS (OF DRAGON): †ΟΥ ΝΒΗΒ (1Ke 253.2; 253.17)
- FIVE LAWS: †ΟΥ ΝΝΟΜΟΣ (1Ke 332.4)
- FIVE LIKENESSES (OF ARCHON): †ΟΥ ΝΕΙΝΕ (1Ke 77.23; 77.27)
- FIVE LIKENESSES (IN IMAGE OF APOSTLE): †ΟΥ ΝΕΙΝΕ (1Ke 487.6; 487.9)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF GOOD TREE): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 20.12)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF EVIL TREE): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 21.28)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF LIGHT): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 64.21; 64.25)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF THE FATHER): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 76.24)
- FIVE LIMBS (PRODUCING SPEECH): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 261.3; 261.11)
- FIVE (GREAT) LIMBS: †ΟΥ ΝΝΑΒ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 64.25; 96.28; 96.29)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF THE BODY): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 89.28; 95.17; 97.17; 344.9)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF THE SOUL): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 95.24)
- FIVE LIMBS (OF SIN): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟΣ (1Ke 96.23; 96.24)
- FIVE MYSTERIES (OF FIRST MAN): †ΟΥ ΜΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ (1Ke 39.7; 39.11; 40.19)
- FIVE PARTS (OF UPPER COSMOS): †Ε ΝΤΑΪΕ (1Ke 26.24;
- FIVE PARTS (OF LOWER COSMOS): †Ε ΝΤΑΪΕ (1Ke 26.25)
- FIVE PARTS (OF DARK CREATIONS): †Ε ΝΤΑΪΕ (1Ke 48.21; 48.22)
- FIVE PARTS (OF CATECHUMEN'S SIN): †Ε ΝΤΑΪΕ (1Ke 233.23)
- FIVE PLACES (FOR SONS OF LIVING SPIRIT): †ΟΥ ΜΜΑ (1Ke 49.34)
- FIVE PLACES (FROM WHICH CLOUD IS STRIPPED): †ΟΥ ΜΜΑ (1Ke 240.23)
- FIVE PLACES (OF EVIL POWERS): †ΟΥ ΝΤΟΠΟΣ (1Ke 145.13)
- FIVE POWERS (OF LIGHT): †Ε ΝΒΑΜ (1Ke 25.3; 62.20;
- FIVE POWERS (OF SIN): †Ε ΝΒΑΜ (1Ke 95.20)
- FIVE POWERS (OF DARKNESS): †Ε ΝΒΑΜ (1Ke 89.6; 89.7; 145.15)
- FIVE POWERS (OF THE FIVE GARMENTS): †Ε ΝΒΑΜ (1Ke 262.26)
- FIVE PRODUCTS (OF THE BODY): †ΟΥ ΝΧΠΟ (1Ke 258.6; 258.10)
- FIVE PROPERTIES: †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΡΟΣ (1Ke 490.27; 491.4)
- FIVE RESURRECTIONS: †Ε ΝΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΣ (1Ke 45.18)
- FIVE SAVIOURS: †ΟΥ ΝΧΡ̄ (1Ke 45.17)
- FIVE SENSES (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΑΙΣΘΗΤΗΡΙΟΝ (1Ke 26.7, 26.14)
- FIVE SHINING GODS: †ΟΥ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΠΡΙΚΟΥ (1Ke 71.13; 71.16; 95.16)
- FIVE SLEEPLESS GUARDIANS: †ΟΥ ΝΖΟΥΡΙΤ ΝΑΤΝΚΑΤΕ (1Ke 91.19)
- FIVE SIGNS (OF FIRST MAN): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΪΝΕ (1Ke 38.8; 39.7; 40.20; 41.27)
- FIVE SIGNS (OF MANI): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΪΝΕ (41.32; 42.11?)
- FIVE SIGNS (OF NEW MAN): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΪΝΕ (1Ke 257.28; 257.32)

- FIVE SIGNS OF LIGHT (GIVEN BY LIGHT-MIND): †ΟΥ ΜΜΕΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΑΙΝΕ (1Ke 257.13)
- FIVE SONS OF THE LIVING SPIRIT: †ΟΥ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΠΝΑ ΕΤΑΝΖ (1Ke 24.23; 25.26; 29.24; 1Ke 44.2; 49.24; 49.33; 85.30; 89.10; 93.32; 164.32; 170.22)
- FIVE SONS OF THE FIRST MAN: †ΟΥ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΩΑΡΤΙ ΝΡΩΜΕ (1Ke 24.24; 25.26; 49.22; 49.32; 49.32; 102.36; 103.1; 131.13; 148.1; 157.14?; 164.34; 285.17? )
- FIVE SPECIES (OF CREATURE): †ΟΥ ΝΓΕΝΟC (1Ke 30.21)
- FIVE SPIRITS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΜΠΠΝΑ (1Ke 26.9; 30.15; 30.23; 34.9)
- FIVE SPLENDOURS: †ΟΥ ΝΡΜΜΠΡΙΕ (1Ke 85.34; 88.14; 89.8)
- FIVE STARS: †ΟΥ ΝCΙΟΥ (1Ke 166.33; 167.5; 167.12; 168.1; 168.12; 169.12)
- FIVE STOREHOUSES (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΤΑΜΙΟΝ (1Ke 28.8; 30.13; 30.17; 155.19)
- FIVE STRIPPINGS (?): †ΟΥ ΝΚΩΚ ΑΖΗΥ (1Ke 315.26)
- FIVE TASTES (OF DARKNESS): †Ε Ν†ΠΕ (1Ke 30.16; 30.23)
- FIVE TEMPTATIONS: †ΟΥ ΜΠΙΡΑCΜΟC (1Ke 486.7)
- FIVE THOUGHTS: †Ε ΝΕΝΘΥΜΗCΙC (1Ke 140.17)
- FIVE TRANSITIONS: †Ε ΜΜΕΤΑΒΑCΙC (1Ke 453.2; 455.7; 456.18; 458.13)
- FIVE TREES (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΩΗΝ (1Ke 30.20; 30.20; 48.15; 58.16?; 122.8; 288.7?)
- FIVE TREES (OF LIGHT): †ΟΥ ΝΩΗΝ (1Ke 64.27)
- FIVE TYPES (OF AUTHORITY IN THE SPHERE): †ΟΥ ΝΤΥΠΟC (1Ke 145.8)
- FIVE TYPES (OF BROTHERHOOD): †ΟΥ ΝΤΥΠΟC (338.20; 338.23)
- FIVE WARS: †ΟΥ ΜΠΟΛΕΜΟC (1Ke 58.2; 58.4)
- FIVE WATCH-TOWERS: †Ε ΝΟΥΡΨΕ (1Ke 171.11)
- FIVE WISDOMS: †Ε ΝCΟΦΙΑ (1Ke 25.3)
- FIVE WONDERS: †ΟΥ ΝΖΒΝΨΠΗΡΕ (1Ke 257.9)
- FIVE WORDS: †ΟΥ ΝCΕΧΕ (1Ke 38.5; 40.25; 44.21; 44.25; 46.17)
- FIVE WORKS: †ΟΥ ΝΖΩΒ (1Ke 75.30; 86.19; 86.22; 166.20; 257.4; 268.4; 336.11)
- FIVE WORLDS (OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΚΟCΜΟC (1Ke 30.22; 31.2; 32.2; 48.15; 48.17; 58.9; 74.29; 77.28; 78.3; 167.23; 169.10; 169.13))
- FIVE WORLDS (OF FLESH): †ΟΥ ΝΚΟCΜΟC (1Ke 26.33; 26.34; 48.19; 121.20; 123.3; 177.18; 266.14)
- FIVE WORLDS (OF THE TREE OF DARKNESS): †ΟΥ ΝΚΟCΜΟC (1Ke 123.4)
- FIVE (UNKNOWN): (1Ke 26.8; 60.11; 66.2; 66.4; 76.16; 487.10; 2Ke 287.6; 362.13)

As we can see, not only are there a wide variety of *fives* occurring in the first volume of *Kephalalaia*, but a number of lexical items are applied to more than one referent. An index of explicit references to *five*, however, only paints part of the picture, since five-part patterns can also be detected that are implicit or reflected by literary structure. As such, we must widen the net a bit in order to arrive at a more comprehensive sampling of textual data.

### 3.5 Limiting the Question: Selection of *Kephalaia* Chapter Corpus

Given the fact that implicit and structural five-part patterns can be found within *Kephalaia* chapters in addition to explicitly mentioned five-part items listed above, three criteria have been adopted for the selection of chapters:

- A) the chapter contains at least three non-ordinal<sup>156</sup> occurrences of “five,”<sup>157</sup>
- B) an explicit or implicit five-pattern occurs in the title,<sup>158</sup>
- C) internal five-fold structure (identified by Böhlig’s *Inhalt* or independent literary analysis).<sup>159</sup>

Based on these three criteria, then, the following chapters, which meet at least one of the criteria, have been selected as a basic corpus for analysis.<sup>160</sup> (The numbers represent the references to five contained in each chapter. The letters following the titles indicate which criteria are met. Also indicated is the general state of preservation of the text: fragmentary, very fragmentary, or extremely fragmentary.<sup>161</sup> Titles not followed by such indicators are assumed to be in good condition.):

CHAPTER 2 : The Second, on the Parable of the Tree (A)  
20.12; 21.16; 21.28

CHAPTER 3 : The Interpretation of Happiness, Wisdom, and Power; what they mean (A)  
24.23; 24.24; 25.3; 25.3; 25.3; 25.4

CHAPTER 4 : On the Four Great Days, which are brought forth from one another; along with the Four Nights (A)

<sup>156</sup> The presence of an ordinal five does not necessarily indicate that significant five-part content or structure can be found in a chapter, especially if the chapter involves a seven, ten, fourteen, part structure or theme.

<sup>157</sup> See below.

<sup>158</sup> The term “implicit,” here, is intended to cover chapters such as Chapter 39, “On the Three Days and the Two Deaths,” in which the thematic elements add up to five.

<sup>159</sup> Böhlig’s *Inhalt* signals a number of chapters which contain five part structures not obvious from either word-frequency or title analysis (Polotsky and Böhlig. *Kephalaia*, xv-xxxii).

<sup>160</sup> NB: The literary analyses on which this study is based were performed on fresh translations of these chapters by myself. As such, all citations of *Kephalaia* translations found below are by me. It is my hope that these and additional chapters will eventually be published as a new and complete translation of *Kephalaia* volume one.

<sup>161</sup> While nearly every chapter contains a certain degree of fragmentation, these designations are meant to indicate substantial degrees of fragmentation.

25.26; 25.26; 26.6; 26.7; 26.8; 26.8; 26.9; 26.14; 26.14; 26.15; 26.24; 26.25; 26.33; 26.34

CHAPTER 6 : On the Five Storehouses that have poured forth from the Land of Darkness from the Beginning; the Five Rulers, the Five Spirits, the Five Bodies, (and) the Five Tastes (ABC)  
30.13; 30.15; 30.15; 30.16; 30.16; 30.17; 30.18; 30.19; 30.20; 30.20; 30.21; 30.22; 30.23; 30.23, 30.23;  
30.23; 30.34; 31.1; 31.2; 31.3; (31.6)<sup>162</sup>; 32.2; 34.9; 34.9; 34.10

CHAPTER 7 : The Seventh, on the Five Fathers (ABC)  
34.15; 34.19; 34.24; (36.12); (36.21)

CHAPTER 9 : The Interpretation of the (Sign of) Peace, what it means; the Right Hand, the Kiss, the Adoration (A)  
38.5; 38.8; 39.7; 39.7; 39.11; 40.19; 40.20; 40.25; 41.27; 41.32; 42.11

CHAPTER 10 : On the Meaning of the Fourteen [Great] Aeons, about which Sethel spoken in [his] prayer (C) 43.2; 43.4

CHAPTER 12 : On the Meaning of the Five Words which are proclaimed (---?) in the Cosmos (B)  
44.21; 44.25 (fragmentary)

CHAPTER 13 : On the Five Saviours Resurrecting the Dead, along with the Five Resurrections (B)  
45.17; 45.18; (46.1); (46.2) (very fragmentary)

CHAPTER 14 : The Meaning of the Silence, the Fast, [the Peace], the Day, [and] the Rest; what they mean (B) 46.17

CHAPTER 15 : [On the] ... Five [Parts] ... World of ... (AB)  
47.24; 48.6; 48.15; 48.15; (48.17); 48.17; 48.18; 48.19; 48.20; 48.21; 48.21; 48.25 (fragmentary)

CHAPTER 16 : [On the Five] Greatnesses which have [come] out against the Darkness (ABC)  
49.11; 49.14; 49.22; 49.24; (49.29); 49.32; 49.32; 49.32; 49.33; 49.33; 49.34; 55.12

CHAPTER 18 : [On the Five] Wars [which the] Sons of Light waged with [the Sons] of Darkness (ABC)  
58.2; 58.4; 59.9; 58.15; 58.15; 58.16; 60.11 (fragmentary)

CHAPTER 19 : On the Five Releases: what they mean (ABC)  
60.14; 60.16; (61.28); (62.18); 62.20 (very fragmentary)

CHAPTER 20 : The Chapter on the Name of the Fathers (C)  
64.6

CHAPTER 21 : On the Father of Greatness, how he is established and defined (A)  
64.21; 64.25; 64.26; 64.27; 65.2 (fragmentary)

CHAPTER 24 : [On the Times...] (A)  
71.13; 71.16; 72.7; 74.18; 74.29; (75.24); 75.30 (fragmentary)

CHAPTER 25 : On the Five [Fathers: from which Limbs they have come] (ABC)  
76.16; 76.18; 76.23; 76.24; 76.24

CHAPTER 27 : On the Five Forms which exist in the Archon(s) of Darkness (ABC)  
77.23; 77.27; 77.28; 77.28; 78.1; 78.2; 78.3; 78.10

CHAPTER 33 : On the Five Things that he constructed with the Hard Bodies of the Archons (BC)

---

<sup>162</sup> ( ) indicates ordinals.

86.19; 86.22; (86.29)

CHAPTER 37 : On the Three Zones (A)  
89.6; 89.7; 89.8; 89.10

CHAPTER 38 : On the Light-Mind, the Apostles, and the Saints (AC)  
89.27; 89.28; 89.28; 90.3; 90.24; 91.15; 91.19; 92.1; 93.32; 95.15; 95.16; 95; 17; 95.20; 95.23; 95.24;  
96.23; 96.24; 96.28; 96.29; 97.17; (101.18)

CHAPTER 39 : On the Three Days and the Two Deaths (BC)  
102.36; 103.1

CHAPTER 48 : On the Conduits(?) (A)  
(107.31); 121.15; 121.20; 122.7; 122.8; 123.3; 123.4

CHAPTER 57 : On the Generation of Adam (A)  
145.8; (145.13); 145.13; 145.14; 145.15; 147.2

CHAPTER 65b: [On the Five Qualities of the Sun] (C)  
161.32

CHAPTER 68: On Fire (C)  
166.20

CHAPTER 69 : On the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac and the Five Stars (AB)  
166.33; 167.5; 167.12; 167.23; 168.1; 168.12; 169.10; 169.12; 169.13

CHAPTER 70 : On the Body, that it was made to resemble the Cosmos (AC)  
170.2; 170.21; 170.22; (171.7); 171.11; 171.28; 171.29; 172.2

CHAPTER 91 : On the Catechumen, who is saved in a single body (C)  
233.23

CHAPTER 95 : The Apostle asks his Disciples: What does cloud mean? (C)  
(240.23)

CHAPTER 100 : On the Dragon, the one with Fourteen heads; what is it and ... (A)  
252.3; 253.2; (253.6); 253.17

CHAPTER 103 : On the Five Wonderworks that the Light-Mind reveals to the Elect (AB)  
257.9; 257.13; (257.24); 257.28; 257.32

CHAPTER 104 : On Food: that it is appointed to Five Products in the Human Body (B)  
258.6; 258.10; (258.17)

CHAPTER 107 : On the Kind of Speech that... (A)  
261.3; 261.8; 261.11

CHAPTER 111 : On the Four Qualities that are found in the Eye, and the Fifth, which is hidden in them, to  
what they belong (B)  
265.11

CHAPTER 112b : (On the Five Things Revealed by Jesus) (C)  
268.4

CHAPTER 137 : On the Five Types of Brotherhood that are distinguished from one another (B)

338.20; 338.23

CHAPTER 146 : The Old Man has Five Foods to live on, the New Man has Five Others (AB)  
348.28; 348.30; (349.20); 349.20; 349.24; (350.2); 350.4; 350.8

CHAPTER 148 : On the Five Books, that they belong to Five Fathers (B)  
355.2; 355.3

CHAPTER 165 : Envy exists in Five Forms (B)  
409.9; 410.13 (extremely fragmentary)

CHAPTER 176: On Spiritual Transition in Five(?) Forms and that through which the Church changes (AC)  
452.28; 453.2; 455.7; 456.18; 458.1; (458.13) (very fragmentary)

CHAPTER 189 : [On the Five Temptations] (B)  
(485.30); 486.7 (very fragmentary)

CHAPTER 191 : There are Five Properties in the *Image* of the our Apostle, symbolizing the Five Light Fathers (AB)  
487.6; 487.8; 487.9; 487.10; (488.5); (489.8) (very fragmentary)

CHAPTER 193 : The Evil One has [Five Properties]; the Good One has [Five other Properties] (B)  
490.27; 491.4

The data from this list of chapter candidates can be summarized as follows:

Criteria	Chapter # and State ( ) = fragmentary (( )) = very fragmentary, etc.	Total
<b>A</b>	2, 3, 4, 9, 21, 24, 48, 57, 100, 107, ((176))	11
<b>B</b>	(12), ((13)), 104, 111, 137, 148, (((165))), ((189))	8
<b>C</b>	10, 20, 65b, 68, 91, 95	6
<b>AB</b>	(15), 69, 103, 146, ((191))	5
<b>AC</b>	38, 70, 176	3
<b>BC</b>	33, 39	2
<b>ABC</b>	6, 7, 16, (18), (19), 25, 27	7
<b>Total A = 27</b>		<b>Total B = 22</b>
		<b>Total C = 18</b>

As can be observed, criteria A and B apply to the greatest number of chapters, either individually or in combination with another criterion, with seven chapters conforming to all three criteria.

This corpus, although seemingly large in itself, is meant to provide the most complete data-base possible for the examination of five-part numeric patterns and to allow for a comprehensive and holistic view of the phenomenon. As a result, we should be able to extract the various themes that numeric patterning was meant to express. I

should also emphasize the fact that this study will endeavour to deal with the occurrence of five-part numeric patterns within their chapter context. Whereas the *Kephalaia* is sometimes (mis)used by scholars seeking proof-texts without reference to individual chapters, this study will seek, as much as is possible, to appreciate the nuances of the chapters in which five-part patterns occur.

### **3.6 Discovering the Community**

Finally, even though divinities and divine beings of various kinds will be seen to loom large, particularly in Chapter 4, it should be kept in mind that this study is essentially about human beings and the ways in which they, as Manichaeans, formulated and communicated their religious beliefs. As such, while a primary aim of this endeavour is to understand a particular phenomenon within a text, equally important is the effort to discover what such a phenomenon says about the people who produced it. Doing so will enable us to arrive at a better understanding of how early Manichaeans received and then transmitted their religious tradition; a religious tradition that, as is becoming increasingly evident, was an important contributor to late antique religious culture.

CHAPTER 4: FIVE-PART NUMERIC PATTERNING IN THE *KEPHALAIA*

As we have seen, a wide array of five-part patterns can be detected in a substantial number of chapters from the first volume of *Kephalaia*. While it may be assumed that the compilers of this work inherited a number of key five-part patterns from the canonical writings of their founder, what is of particular interest to this study is how such material was used and elaborated in order to formulate an evolving vision of the cosmos and to communicate a set of themes with which the compilers seem to have been particularly preoccupied. But, before we can proceed to this phase of the analysis, some effort must be made to establish what can be known about canonical Manichaean tradition and the role played by five-part patterns in it. By doing so we will be able to establish at least a rudimentary, canonical frame of reference against which the use of numerical patterns in the *Kephalaia* may be gauged.

## 4.1 Five-Part Patterns from Canonical Manichaean Tradition

In spite of the fact that the major part of Mani writings have been either lost or, at best, shattered into fragments by the rage of heresiologists and the ravages of time, it is nevertheless possible to form a general idea of their content and style.<sup>163</sup> While some, such as the *Book of Mysteries*<sup>164</sup> and the *Epistles*,<sup>165</sup> seem to have been more incidental in

<sup>163</sup> Tardieu provides one of the most concise accounts of canonical writings in *Le manichéisme*, 43-61. See also the (somewhat idiosyncratic) selection of fragments in Gardner and Lieu's *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 151-175.

<sup>164</sup> According to al-Nadīm, "Mani wrote seven books, one in Farsi (i.e. Perisan) and six in Syriac, the language of Syria. Among them are *The Book of Secrets* (i.e. *The Book of Mysteries*), which contains (a number of) chapters, (including) 'An account of the Daysaniyya (i.e., the followers of Bardaisan of Edessa)', 'The testimony of Yastasif on the Beloved', 'The testimony of ... about himself given to Ya 'qub', 'The son of the widow' (who according to Mani was the anointed and crucified one, crucified by the Jews), 'The testimony of Jesus about himself as given in Judaea', 'The commencement of the testimony of al-Yamin as given after his victory', 'The seven spirits', 'The discourse on the four transient spirits', 'Laughter', 'The testimony of Adam regarding Jesus', 'The fall from religion', 'The discourse of the



orientation, dealing with a seemingly miscellaneous set of doctrinal, polemical, and pastoral issues, other such as the *Treasure of Life* and the (unidentified) source(s) used by Titus of Bostra, Theodoret, and Severus of Antioch provide only generalized presentations of Manichaean theology. This is to say that several of them appear to have lacked the rigid structuring and systematization so apparent in the *Kephalaia*.

Yet of all the fragments from canonical writings preserved in Syriac, Greek, Coptic, Latin, Middle Persian, and Arabic, only seven contain traces of Mani's own use of pentadic series. These are: 1) fragments from *Shabuhragan* (presumably composed mid-3<sup>rd</sup> century CE),<sup>166</sup> 2) passages of *The Living Gospel* (presumably composed mid- to late- 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE) from the Coptic *Synaxeis* Codex, 3) fragments from the *Book of Giants* (presumably composed mid- to late- 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE)<sup>167</sup> 4) Mani's *Epistles* (presumably composed mid- to late- 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE) 5) citations by Ephraim (early 4<sup>th</sup> century CE),<sup>168</sup> 6) citations by East Syrian scholar Theodore bar Khonai (8<sup>th</sup> century

---

Daysaniyya on the soul and body', 'Refutation of the Daysanites on the soul of life', 'The three trenches', 'The preservation of the World', 'The three days', 'The prophets', (and) 'The resurrection' (trans. Laffan [Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 155]).

<sup>165</sup> Also according to al-Nadīm, Mani wrote epistles on a variety of topics such as "The Two Sources," "The Eminent Ones," "The Great Epistle of India," "The Epistle of Kaskar," "The Garden," etc. (Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 165), although a number of epistles from this list are attributed to early disciples. Somewhat clearer, however, is the apparent near absence of doctrinal content from the Medinet Madi codex of Mani's *Epistles* (Funk and Gardner, *forthcoming*).

<sup>166</sup> MacKenzie, "Mani's *Šābuhragān*," 83-141. See also those fragments (M 7980-7984) attributed to *Shabuhragan* by Hutter (*Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte*; trans. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 225).

<sup>167</sup> Henning, "The Book of Giants," 52-74 [115-137].

<sup>168</sup> Reeves, "Manichaean Citations," 217-288. Reeves' assertion, however, that Ephraim is "the most important textual witness to the earliest forms of Manichaean discourse" (218) is somewhat misleading, especially when he characterizes what is preserved as "Mani-citations" (220). To be sure the use of the Syriac particle ܠܡ is a convincing indicator that some verbatim citations are preserved. In the majority of cases, however, statements are introduced by "as they say" (ܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܢ ܗܘܢܝܢ) and thus cannot be *directly* attributable to Mani. As such, while these fragments certainly do bear witness to a very early strata of Manichaean discourse, they cannot, as a whole, be said to represent "portions of Mani's Syriac corpus" (220).

CE),<sup>169</sup> and 7) the article on Mani in the *Fihrist*<sup>170</sup> by Bagdad bookseller and encyclopaedist, al-Nadīm (10<sup>th</sup> century CE). What these sources reveal, as far as we can tell, is a very limited *explicit* use of pentads. Those that can be identified are the following:

**FIVE *shekinahs* = FIVE LIMBS**

- 1) Mind, 2) Thought, 3) Insight, 4) Counsel, 5) Consideration (Theodore)  
*Aeons (Synaxeis)*  
*Limbs (Epistles, al-Nadīm)*  
*Worlds (al-Nadīm)*

**FIVE *ziwanē* (Shining Gods) = FIVE ELEMENTS (*Book of Giants*)**

- 1) Living Air, 2) Light, 3) Wind, 4) Water, 5) Fire (Theodore, Ephraim)  
*Sons of First Man (Shabuhrgan, Ephraim, Theodore [not enumerated])*  
*Gods (al-Nadīm, Shabuhrgan)*  
*Limbs (al-Nadīm)<sup>171</sup>*

**FIVE SONS OF LIVING SPIRIT:**

- 1) Keeper of Splendour, 2) King of Honour, 3) Adamas of Light,  
 4) King of Glory, 5) Porter (Theodore)

**FIVE VIRTUES:**

- 1) Love, 2) Faith, 3) Perfection, 4) Patience, 5) Wisdom (*Epistles, al-Nadīm*)

**FIVE VITAL POWERS/POTENTIALS:**

- 1) Life, 2) Power, 3) Light, 4) Fragrance, 5) Beauty (*Shabuhrgan*)

**FIVE WORLDS OF DARKNESS:**

- 1) Smoke, 2) Fire, 3) Wind, 4) Water, 5) Darkness (Theodore, al-Nadīm)  
*Five Hells: (Shabuhrgan)*

**FIVE SONS OF DARKNESS: (Theodore)**

**FIVE TREES (OF DARKNESS): (*Book of Giants*, Theodore)**

While the five-part structures noted above only provide an incomplete picture of what might have existed in Mani's canonical writings, they are enough to show two aspects of

<sup>169</sup> See Theodore bar Khonai, *Liber scholiorum*, 313-318. Tardieu has suggested that these citations come from Mani's *Pragmateia* (*Le manichéisme*, 93).

<sup>170</sup> See *Fihrist*, 773-805 [Dodge]. While the great value of al-Nadīm's account has been recognized since Flügel's 1862 study, De Blois has recently pointed out that significant portions of al-Nadīm's account, especially on cosmogony, are likely derived from al-Warrāq, a 9<sup>th</sup>-century, mu'tazilah theologian who took an early interest in Manichaeism ("New Light on the Sources of the Manichaean Chapter in the *Fihrist*," 37-45).

<sup>171</sup> Al-Nadīm appears to make a distinction between the Five Limbs of the "Realm (Earth) of Light," which equal the Five Elements, and the Five Limbs of the "Sky of Light" (see *Fihrist*, 786 [Dodge]). There does not seem to have been an absolutely clear demarcation between the Limbs and the Elements, since in several instances (see below the question of the identity of the "Intellectuals") they bleed into one another.

Manichaean discourse that will be encountered repeatedly. First, that one of the basic features of Manichaean myth-making is the attribution of five qualities to both good and evil beings, as well as the organization of such beings into groups of five, a phenomenon which is evident especially in Theodore bar Khonai's and al-Nadīm's accounts and, as such, must have formed part of the way in which Mani (at least sometimes) expressed his ideas.<sup>172</sup> Thus, Mani can be said to have established the paradigm for this kind of thinking. Second is the fact that already in canonical traditions can it be observed that certain important pentads were known under a variety of aliases.<sup>173</sup>

It should be noted, however, that Theodore bar Khonai's account appears to place emphasis on the basically triadic structure of the mythic narrative.<sup>174</sup> According to Theodore, three groups of three beings are presented as a series of three evocations, or emanations, through which the drama of salvation unfolds. In this account, five-part series appear to be more attributive and functional in support of the main actors from what is essentially a three-act play. For instance, the Five Sons of First Man function as "armour" for their father, who is the real hero of the first evocation, while the Five Sons of Living Spirit, from the second evocation, appear in support of their parent, who employs them for the creation and maintenance of the cosmos.

In contrast to the emphasis on triads that can be observed in Mani's canonical writings, the *Kephalaia* attempts to bring five-part structures to the fore. While extensive use is made of canonical pentads from the light-realm such as the Five Limbs, the Five

---

<sup>172</sup> The alternative would be that, by Theodore's time, canonical sources (or even pseudo-canonical sources for that matter) were "retro-fitted" to conform to later scholastic developments.

<sup>173</sup> This may have been due, in part, to the difficulty of rendering Syriac terms like *shekinah* and *ziwanē* into Greek and Coptic. Thus, it is not necessarily Mani's doing.

<sup>174</sup> Even though some commentators, such as Hunter, consider Theodore's citations as "fragmented and disjointed" ("Theodore bar Kônî and the Manichaeans," 168), they do, nevertheless, seem to present a basic narrative.

Elements/Sons of First Man, and the Five Sons of Living Spirit, such series are employed by the compilers of the *Kephalaia*, by and large, in support of other themes such as the nature of divine being and cosmic parallelism. In addition, they seem to have been equally interested in other non- (or at least only quasi-) canonical series, such as those that came to be known as the Five Fathers and the Five Greatnesses. These latter series, as we shall see, exemplify the attempt by the *Kephalaia* compilers to transform the basic mythological structure of Manichaean cosmogony from one based on triads to one based on pentads. This process, which for lack of a better word will be termed *pentadization*, is a reflection of the compilers' desire to make sense of what may have been obscure or ambiguous canonical material by shaping it into what seemed to them to be a more cohesively structured whole. As for the dark-realm, we shall see that even though the compilers also made use of canonical series such as Five Worlds of Darkness and the Five Trees, these were not always as clearly defined as those belonging to the light-realm. Nevertheless, even though the compilers sought to clarify how these more ambiguous formulations ought to be understood and placed in opposition to series from the light-realm, their inherently negative associations inevitably lead to their being employed for certain polemical ends largely aimed at rival religious communities. Finally, the *Kephalaia* also presents a number of more generalized five-part series relating to a variety of soteriological, ethical, ecclesiological, polemical, and aetiological themes that equally speak to the compilers' desire to construct a *Manichaean reality* based on pentads.

As such, in order to understand how five-part patterns contribute to the function and originality of the *Kephalaia*, this chapter will examine the occurrence of both explicit

and implicit five-part structures in order to discover how the compilers shaped, expanded, and *redacted* canonical material in an effort to communicate their own particular themes.

## 4.2 BASIC ONTOLOGICAL PATTERNING

### 4.2.1 The Two Trees and the Five Limbs

There can be no denying that the foundation of Manichaeism is to be found in the doctrine of the Two Natures, since this concept served as the basis for Manichaean ontology, cosmology, and ethics. As such, it is no surprise that, after establishing the authority of Mani as the most recent messenger of God and legitimizing the validity of the *Kephalaia* as a literary enterprise (1Ke 9.6-10)<sup>175</sup> in both the “Prologue” and *Chapter 1*, the doctrine of Two Natures would be addressed by the *Kephalaia* compilers straightaway in *Chapter 2* “*The Second, on the Parable of the Tree.*” In this chapter, Mani is asked by his disciples to give an exegetical reading of Matthew 7:17-20/Luke 6:43-44,<sup>176</sup> where Jesus explains to his disciples that the quality of every tree can be derived from an evaluation of its fruit (1Ke 17.2-20), while at the same time alluding to an alternate reading of the same text among “the Sects” (ΝΔΟΓΜΑ), the general Manichaean term for rival religious communities. First, Mani is made to caution that appearances can be deceiving. In the natural world, for instance, the date-palm (ΒΝΝΕ), in spite of its pleasant appearance, is actually quite useless (1Ke 17.32ff). Similarly, Judas, although he seemed to be a good disciple, still betrayed his master (1Ke 19.1-6),

<sup>175</sup> One of Mani’s principal critiques of previous religious traditions was the fact that the founders did not record their teaching in writing and thus it was corrupted by later disciples (1Ke 8.8-28; see also *Chapter 151 [On the Ten Advantages of the Manichaean Religion]*” [1Ke 371.6-30]). Yet even though Mani seems to have gone to great lengths to record his message in his own series of self-consciously canonical writings, he is conveniently made to legitimize the *Kephalaia*’s expansion of and commentary on this tradition by both the “Prologue” and “Epilogue” of the work (see Funk, “Reconstruction”).

<sup>176</sup> This proof-text is cited by Ephraim against the Manichaeans (see Reeves #72).

while Paul, though seemingly wicked and a persecutor of the church, ultimately turned out to be one of its most important founders (1Ke 19.7-17).

Mani then goes on to explain how the “Good Tree” has “Five Limbs” (1Ke 20.12-14), which in turn are said to represent five key components of the Manichaean cosmos:

...it (i.e., the good tree) has **Five Limbs** / [which are: **Consideration, Counsel, Insight, Thought**] / **Mind**. Its **Consideration** is the Holy Church. Its **Counsel** / is the Column of Glory, the Perfect Man. Its **Insight** / is the First Man, who dwells in the Ship of the Living / Waters. Its **Thought** is the Third Messenger / [who dwells in] the Ship of the Living Fire, who enlightens / ... But, the **Mind** is the Father, who dwells in the Great- / ness, who exists perfectly in the Aeon of Light. / ... this, that the souls who come and attain / the Holy [Church] and also alms which the Cate- / [chumens] give, as they are purified by the Holy Church / ... every deed. **Consideration** is that which will ... / ... they ascend to ... ... is **Counsel**, / [they] ascend to **Insight**, which is the First Man, / who dwells in the Ship of the Night.<sup>177</sup> From **Insight** they ascend / to **Thought**, which is the Third Messenger, who dwells in / the Ship of the Day.<sup>178</sup> But he, the Great **Thought**, who / ... them to **Mind**, who is the Father, the God / of Truth, the great **Mind** of all Aeons of Glory (1Ke 20.12-31).

Here the Five Limbs are enumerated in canonical, but ascending, order.<sup>179</sup> In this way, the Five Limbs are presented by the *Kephalaia* compilers in *Chapter 2* as part of a programmatic statement whereby the essentially five-fold nature of being is reflected in the five stages of light liberation from the community and ritual context of the Holy Church, where the ritual activities occur (Consideration), to the cosmic conduit of the Column of Glory, which draws the light particles up (Counsel), through to the first (Insight) and second (Thought) light vessels, onto the divine homeland of the Father (Mind). This enumeration is then contrasted with the limbs of the Evil Tree.

The Five Limbs of the Evil Tree are (somewhat awkwardly) made to parallel those of the Good Tree:

<sup>177</sup> See 20.16-17, presumably both the Ship of the Living Waters and Ship of Night refer to the moon.

<sup>178</sup> See 20.18. Here too, Ship of Living Fire and Ship of Day are equivalents for the sun.

<sup>179</sup> See Chapter 25, where the Limbs are listed in descending order.

... .. the evil [tree] has **Five Limbs** / [which] are: **Consideration, Counsel, Insight, Thought, [Mind]**. / Its [**Consideration** is] the Law of Death which the Sects / are taught. Its **Counsel** is the transmigration ... / in [various] kinds. But, its **Insight** is the furnaces of [fire] / ... .. Gehenna, which are filled with smoke. Its **Thought** ... / ... .. the vessel. Its **Mind** is ... / ... .. the lump, the last bond, the ... / ... .. those who Satan has [cast] (1Ke 21.28-36).

These Limbs are associated with a progressive process of damnation from the sectarian context or “Law of Death” (Consideration), through the soul’s transmigration (Counsel), to Gehenna (Insight), a vessel of some kind (Thought), then finally the eschatological lump, or *bolos* (Mind), into which all matter will be moulded at the end of time (1Ke 21.28-36). One might have expected that the Limbs of the Evil Tree would have been identified with negatively valued qualities such as ignorance, stupidity, apostasy, etc., although instead, the compiler of *Chapter 2* works to establish a direct parallel between the Limbs of the Tree of Light and those of the Tree of Darkness. Such a manoeuvre is in contrast to the concept of the Five Elements for which there are two different sets. This seems to indicate either that a canonical series of Dark Limbs did not exist or that the series of divine Limbs was canonically applied to the dark-realm. The latter case appears unlikely, given the great care that was generally taken in completely dissociating the Two Natures. Instead, it is more likely that the *Kephalaia* compiler carried over the same canonical series in order to create a symmetrical contrast of the Two Trees and to re-emphasize the chapter’s cautionary message about appearances. After all, evil, although essentially different, may nevertheless appear seductive and beguiling to those not adept at separating one tree from the other. In fact, *Chapter 2*, although ostensibly a discussion of the Two Trees, could equally be characterized as a discourse on the “Two Paths”—the good path that leads to liberation and the luminous homeland of the Father and the evil

path that traps souls within the cycle of transmigration and ultimate destruction.<sup>180</sup> That both “paths” are described as having five stages is a reflection of the basic five-fold structure of both good and evil entities.

Indeed, we do know that Mani himself characterized his two opposed principles as two fruit-producing trees known as the “Tree of Life” and the “Tree of Death” from Severus of Antioch (*Homily* 123.104-105 [Reeves]), although in his account there is no explicit association with the New Testament parable. Moreover, the language used by Mani in these citations is more cosmological in orientation, since he places emphasis on the fact the Tree of Life occupies the northern, eastern, and western regions of the cosmos, while the Tree of Death is confined to the south. This means that, while the *Kephalaia* compilers have adapted a canonical metaphor, they have given it a different colouring.

This ornamentation of the Two Natures with parallel, but opposed, five-part series, so prominently placed in *Chapter 2*, previews the way in which good and evil beings are generally conceived by the *Kephalaia* compilers and establishes a general ontological framework for the interpretation of all sorts of cosmic phenomena. As such, five-part structure was intimately associated with one of the basic, foundational, and no doubt most primitive, of Manichaean metaphors.<sup>181</sup> In fact, just as Manichaean theology as a whole is sometimes characterized as the doctrine of the “two principles and the three times,” *Chapter 2* could be stereotyped as encapsulating the *Kephalaia*’s theology in “*Two Trees and the Five Limbs*.”

---

<sup>180</sup> The primacy and importance of the “good path” is taken up again (with slight variation) in the following chapter, *Chapter 3* “The Interpretation of Happiness, Wisdom, and Power; what they mean.”

<sup>181</sup> Lieu suggests that the motif of the Two Trees is “unrelated” to the concept of the Two Natures (“Manichaean *technici termini*,” 251), although I do not believe that this assertion can be justified.



## 4.3 THEOLOGICAL PATTERNING I: LIGHT-REALM

## 4.3.1 The Faces of the Father

Given the fact that the basic metaphor for Manichaean ontology attributes five qualities to each of the Two Principles, it would be expected that a similar characterization be applied to the Father of Greatness, the ruler of the light-realm and the personification of the good principle. *Chapter 21 “On the Father of Greatness, how he is established and defined”* (1Ke 64.21-23) is particularly informative in this regard:

Just as he [exists and is] established in his **Five Light-Limbs**, which are / ... the Storehouses which are without measure (or) limit / ... **Mind, Thought, Insight, Counsel, and [Consideration]** /... his Twelve Light-Members, which are / his Twelve Wisdoms. **Five Great Members / of Light** are found in each one ... **Five Great / Fountains of Blessing** gush forth ... There are **Five Great/ [Trees?]**<sup>182</sup> ... .. of Light (1Ke 64.20-28).

In this case, the Five Limbs represent those entities which, in Theodore bar Khonai’s account, are known as *shekinahs*, although their apparent characterization as his “Storehouses” (**NTAMION**) (1Ke 64.22) may represent an attempt to represent this term more fully.<sup>183</sup> These Five Storehouses, in turn, are associated with Twelve Light-Limbs, also described as Twelve Wisdoms.<sup>184</sup> In turn, we learn that “Five Great Fountains of Blessing” (**†Ε ΝΝΑΘ ΝΖΑΛΜΕ ΝΤΕ ΠΣΜΑΜΕ**) (1Ke 64.26-27)

<sup>182</sup> Funk, A&C.

<sup>183</sup> The term *τομείον*, however, is usually reserved in the *Kephalaia* for the regions of darkness (see *Kephalaia* Chapter 6). See also 2Ps 200.1. Why the compilers opted for the term “Limbs” rather than “Aeons,” as the *shekinahs* are known in the Synaxeis codex (Funk, *personal communication*), remains a mystery.

<sup>184</sup> This may mean that each of the Twelve Wisdoms possesses its own set of Five Limbs/Storehouses, although the lacunae in the text obscure the precise relationship.

surround the Father, and, in what appears to be an extension of the basic tree metaphor, “Five Great Trees(?)” (†ΟΥ ΝΝΑΘ ΝΩΗΜ[?]) (1Ke 64.28).<sup>185</sup>

What follows is an enumeration of five characteristics of the Father which, unfortunately, the lacunous state of the text prevents us from completely identifying. All that can be determined for certain from *Chapter 21* is the following list: 1) light, 2) pleasant odour, 3) living voice of ..., 4) ...-ness, and 5) great ... (1Ke 64-29-65.2). It is unclear whether or not these five qualities are related to the Five Vital Powers found in a Middle Persian fragment attributed to the *Shabuhragan* by Hutter<sup>186</sup> and discussed by Polotsky<sup>187</sup> from Sogdian fragment M 14, which list 1) life, 2) power, 3) light, 4) beauty, and 5) fragrance as five qualities possessed by the soul,<sup>188</sup> although there is some superficial resemblance. Nevertheless, *Chapter 21* does make clear that the *Kephalaia* compilers conceived of the Father of Greatness as a being with *five* characteristics.

This characterization of the Father of Greatness in *Chapter 21* as a being with five qualities is a formulation that appears to be at odds with other evidence indicating that the Father was known (perhaps even canonically) as the “Four-faced God.” While the epithet τετραπρόσωπος (“four-faced”) is known explicitly from Greek abjuration formulae (Seven Chapters 3.59, Long Formula 1461C.14 [Adam 64.12]) and the *Psalm-book* (ΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΗΤΟΥΖΟ [2Ps 191.12]),<sup>189</sup> the four qualities of divinity, light, power, and wisdom are relatively well attested in eastern sources and are even directly attributed to

<sup>185</sup> While Polotsky’s *editio princeps* reads nothing at the beginning of 1Ke 64.28, W.-P. Funk in his unpublished A&C has noted that ΩΗΝ might be read but *sehr unsicher* (A&C 64.27-28).

<sup>186</sup> Trans. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 225.

<sup>187</sup> “Manichäische Studien,” 264 (= *Collected Papers*, 665)

<sup>188</sup> See Klimkeit 7.1.

<sup>189</sup> A peculiar attestation occurs in a Middle Persian text which Hutter attributes to the *Shabuhragan*, in which the Third Messenger (*Mihryazd*) is said to send out a “god with four faces” (Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 228).

Mani by al-Nadīm, who records that the ten commandments prescribed to the Hearers represent “God, His Light, His Power, and His Wisdom” (*Fihrist*, 789 [Dodge]).<sup>190</sup> As such, *Chapter 21*’s characterization of the Father as a being with five qualities may represent an attempt by the *Kephalaia* compilers to distance their discourse from a motif that may have appeared too “Iranian,”<sup>191</sup> no longer fit their developing vision of how

<sup>190</sup>They are also enumerated in a “Psalm of the Wanderers” (2Ps 186.9-12), although Merkelbach (*Mani*, 39-50) makes a rather forced attempt to see the same set of four qualities expressed in *Kephalaia* Chapter 4 “On the Four Great Days...” (followed by Heuser, “The Manichaean Myth,” 12-14), Chapter 20 “The Chapter on the Name of the Fathers,” and Chapter 7 “The Seventh, on the Five Fathers.” Similarly, Koenen saw a reference to the “Manichaean Tetras” in the *Cologne Mani Codex* 33.2 (“How Dualistic is Mani’s Dualism?” 9). Nevertheless, the tetrad is relatively well attested in Iranian, Turkish, and Chinese sources from the east as representing 1) divinity, 2) light, 3) power, and 4) wisdom (In Iranian: M 176, M 31, M 324; Turkish: T II D 162 [Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 318; Chinese: *Hymnscroll* 145-146 [Tsui Chi]; See Williams Jackson, “The Fourfold Aspect,” 11-12), although I am sceptical, however, that the “four bright seals” of love, faith, fear, and wisdom from the Turkish confessional text *Xvāstvānīft* represent the same series associated with the Father.) Frequently, the abjuration formulae are the only sources cited for this concept (See Burkitt, *Religion of the Manichees*, 19 n.1; Allberry, *Psalm-book*, 191 n.12; Richter, *Psalm Book*, 67 n.36b). Lieu, in his monograph on the Greek abjuration formulae, states that another potential occurrence of this tetrad is to be found in the “Prayer of the Emanations” (T Kellis 22) from Kellis (“An Early Byzantine Formula,” 273). The hymnist, however, seeks to glorify the 1) power, 2) glory, 3) light, 4) word, and 5) majesty of the Father (See Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 195; see also Jenkins, “The Prayer of the Emanations in Greek from Kellis [T. Kellis 22],” 243-63).

According to Williams Jackson, Mani viewed this four-fold nature of divinity as a “cardinal tenet” (“Fourfold Aspect,” 16) of Manichaeism (“Fourfold Aspect,” 13). A similar statement was made by Asmussen who characterized the notion of the “four-fold God” as “the essence and synopsis of the whole Manichaean system” (*Xvāstvānīft*, 220). In addition, Williams Jackson makes allusion to “a somewhat similar fourfold division” described by Theodore bar Khonai, who lists these “four elements” as **ܘܕܘܠܟܘܢ ܘܩܘܝܐ ܘܕܘܠܘܟܘܢ ܘܕܘܠܘܟܘܢ**, which are transcriptions of Iranian terms (see Williams Jackson, “Fourfold Aspect,” 15 n.17). These were interpreted by Zaehner to represent Zurvanite conceptions of cosmic conception, birth, decline, and rebirth (*Zurvan*, 224). This apparent similarity, however, became one of the key components of the thesis of Iranian origins and, as such, was used by Cumont to justify the statement that “l’origine première du système doit être cherchée dans le mazdéisme zervaniste, répandu en Mésopotamie” (Cumont, *Recherches sur le manichéisme I*, 8 n. 2), in spite of the fact that Theodore himself makes no connection between a Zurvanite and Manichaean tetrad. This, in itself, considering that Theodore seems to have been aware of the Zurvanite tetrads, seems like a significant oversight if, as Williams Jackson suggests, the tetrad constituted a “cardinal tenet” of Manichaean doctrine and Theodore wanted to “shame” the Manichaeans through an exposé of their perverse doctrines. Surely such a scandalous inclusion of a Zurvanite motif would have fuelled the Syriac polemicist’s contempt.

<sup>191</sup>In light of the fact that the mounting evidence points to the Judaeo-Christian origins of Manichaeism, the “four-faced” God is better understood as a Zurvanite flourish or accommodation. In Mazdaean theology, the god Ohrmizd was conceived as part of a divine tetrad along with time, space, and religion. The incorporation of this tetrad, however, into “orthodox” Mazdaeism may have been a response to Zurvanite speculations (see Duchesne-Guillemin, “L’Église sassanide et le mazdéisme,” 10). Williams Jackson admits, however, that he can really find only one equivalency between the Manichaean and Zurvanite tetrads (“Fourfold Aspect,” 15 n.17). At any rate, Zaehner identifies the Zurvanite tetrad as *time*, *space*, wisdom, and power (*Zurvan*, 219), which differs markedly from Manichaean attestations. Zaehner

important divinities should be understood and described, or simply had lost its meaning. If Mani himself employed such an epithet for the Father of Greatness, then this would be an instance of the compilers rejecting a canonical formulation in favour of one that was seen as more compatible with their systematization efforts. At any rate, the *Kephalaia* compilers appear to have been quite determined to assert as a general principle the fact that Manichaean divinities, even the Father of Greatness, ought to be conceived as possessing five qualities.<sup>192</sup>

### 4.3.2 The Many Sons of Man

The series of beings known to the *Kephalaia* primarily as the “Five Sons of First Man” (†ΟΥ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΩΑΡΤΙ ΝΡΩΜΕ)<sup>193</sup> is somewhat problematic due, in part, to the variety of epithets with which it was associated. Also known as the “Five Elements” (†ΟΥ ΝΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ) (1Ke 43.2), these “Five Sons” (ܡܢܝܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ) are

---

also suggests that Zurvanite theology was based on an elaborate series of tetrads (*Zurvan*, 229-230). Thus, it is conceivable that the Manichaean emphasis on *five* was meant to counter this pattern. Even an Iranist such as Schaeder suggested that Iranian elements in Manichaeism were a result of *Umstilisierung* rather than deliberate borrowing or influence (“Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems,” 47). More recently, as Skjaervø (following Böhlig) has pointed out, the basic formulation of Mani’s system is obviously Christian, but when he wanted to “dress this myth in Zoroastrian garb” he had little choice but to represent figures such as the Father and the First Man by Zurvan and Ohrmizd (“Iranian Elements in Manichaeism: A Comparative Approach,” 271). Mere terminological similarities say nothing about origins and derivations, especially at a time when Zoroastrian traditions were themselves in such a state of flux. As Skjaervø succinctly states: “On no account...can it be said that the Zurvanite myth was part of Mani’s system, only the name of Zurwān was” (“Iranian Elements,” 272).

<sup>192</sup> Even Merkelbach is forced to admit that certain *Kephalaia* chapters seem to expand the tetrad into a pentad (*Mani*, 45), although he offers no explanation.

<sup>193</sup> Outside of the *Kephalaia* there are surprisingly few explicit references (other than those mentioned above) to the Five Sons of First Man, the Five Elements, or the Five Intellectuals in other edited Manichaean Coptic texts—although there are a small number of implicit references (2Ps 12.25; 36.22), including an enumeration of each element in a “Psalm of the Wanderers” (2Ps 137.20-37). In itself, this is not surprising given the liturgical and hagiographical nature of edited texts such as the *Psalm-book* and the *Homilies*. One notable exception, however, can be found in “Bema Psalm 223,” where the Father’s “strong son” (ΜΠΕΔΙΩΗΡΕ ΝΧΩΡΕ) (2Ps 10.7) produces “a Virgin equipped with Five Powers” (ΝΠΕΔΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΕΣΤΗΥ ΑΖΡΗΙ ΑΪΕ ΝΘΑΜ) (2Ps 10.8) in order to fight the forces of darkness. This reference not only provides an additional synonym for the Five Sons/Elements, but somewhat surprisingly attributes them to a mysterious virgin-figure, who appears to act as a kind of consort or twin to First Man.

characterized by Theodore bar Khonai as the “Five Shining Gods” (ܩܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ),<sup>194</sup> and though not explicitly enumerated in his account, are known from Coptic and other sources<sup>195</sup> as representing 1) Living Air, 2) Wind, 3) Light, 4) Water, and 5) Fire (ΠΑΗΡ ΕΤΑΝΖ, ΠΤΗΥ, ΠΟΥΑΙΝΕ, ΠΜΑΥ, ΤCΕΤΕ). As the essence of soul and the antithesis of matter,<sup>196</sup> the Five Sons/Elements play a central role in the Manichaean conception of redemption, since they constitute the raw materials that must be liberated through Manichaean ascetic and liturgical practice. In this way, they form the most direct link between Manichaean myth and praxis.<sup>197</sup>

<sup>194</sup> They are also called “Sons of Light” (ܩܠܘܒܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ) (*Hypatius*, 81.43 [Reeves #28]) and “Shining Sons” (ܩܠܘܒܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ) by Ephraim (*Hypatius*, 101.5-24 [Reeves #29]). Such an expression may lie behind the Coptic formulation “Five Splendours of the Son of Man” (†ΟΥ ΝΡΜΝΠΡΙΕ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΡΩ[Μ]ΙΕ) (1Ke 89.8-9). It seemed much more likely to Burkitt that Jesus, to whom the same term “splendour” is also applied, should be styled “Jesus the Living” or “Life-giving.” This, of course, is not how Manichaean translators understood the term, since it is eminently clear that the “Five Sons/Elements” of early Manichaean tradition were understood as ΠΡΙΕ—“shining forth.” While it is certainly possible that Manichaean translators misunderstood such a key technical term (see Franzmann, “Syriac-Coptic Bilinguals,” 118-119), it seems unlikely. It is far more probably that the basic elements of the light-realm, not to mention Jesus (one of its key emissaries), were described as entities which reflect their origin by emanating their essence—in other words, they *shine*.

<sup>195</sup> The canonical order of these elements seems to have been, at least for polemicists, a bit of a problem. Ephraim, for instance, makes reference to air (ܐܝܪ) (*Hypatius*, 31.11 [Reeves #97]), light (ܩܘܕܫܐ), wind (ܩܘܕܫܐ), water (ܩܘܕܫܐ), and fire (ܩܘܕܫܐ) (*Hypatius*, 101.5-24 [Reeves #29]), while the *Acta Archelai* gives the somewhat idiosyncratic listing of “wind, light, water, fire, and matter (*sic!*)” (ἀνεμος, φῶς, ὕδωρ, πῦρ, ὕλη) (Beeson), although “matter” is usually amended by scholars to ἄτηρ (See *Acta Archelai* [Vermes/Lieu], 47 n. 40; see also 2Ps 137.36).

<sup>196</sup> Polotsky, “Manichäismus,” 115.

<sup>197</sup> What was it, however, that might have led to Mani’s equation of the suffering light-soul to a concept of Five Elements? Throughout antiquity, against the canonical Empedoclean doctrine of four elements, there was an alternate theory of five elements as the basic building-blocks of the cosmos (Moraux, “Quinta essentia,” 1171). While it is unclear who may have originated the idea (i.e., presocratics such as Pherecydes of Syros, Pythagoras, or Philolaus, although Mattéi suggests that Philolaos originated this doctrine [*L’Étrange et le simulacre*, 362]), it seems to have taken root in the early Academy and influenced Aristotle and post-Aristotelian philosophy well into Late Antiquity (Moraux, 1196 ff). Eventually, the *quintessence*, or fifth element, came to be recognized as the ethereal substance of the soul (Moraux, 1213 ff) and eventually as that of the heavenly sphere and the stars (Moraux, 1231 ff). As for Mani’s immediate environment, a doctrine of five elements seems to have played an important role in the cosmogonic teaching of Syriac philosopher, Bardaisan of Edessa, and his school. Ephraim (in the fourth century CE) called Bardaisan the “teacher of Mani” (but that he followed him “unwillingly”), influencing in particular his cosmology (Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa*, 225). Burkitt accepted Ephraim’s analysis that Mani derived some of his ideas from Bardaisan, but cautions that Mani and Bardaisan, although similar on certain points,

Yet on the surface, it is difficult to see why these light-substances should have been described as “sons” at all, since functionally, the “Five Sons” constitute the “armour” or “garments” (1Ke 69.18; 262.25) put on by First Man before going out to engage the powers of darkness.<sup>198</sup> Perhaps this was simply a result of conventions of language regularly employed by Manichaeans, whereby a series of secondary entities emanated by or associated with another primary being are called “sons.”<sup>199</sup> Such a tendency is, in fact, borne out by the testimony of Ephraim, who records the way in which the expressions “sons of Light” (ܠܝܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܘܚܐ) and “sons of Darkness” (ܠܝܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܘܠܐ) formed part of early Manichaean discourse.<sup>200</sup>

The terminological situation becomes more complex in the *Kephalaia*, since the compilers made use of a number of other co-referential metaphors for the “Five Sons of First Man,” namely the “Five Garments” (ܫܬܐ ܢܘܒܥܘܐ), as in *Chapter 70 “On the*

---

hold very different points of view (*Religion of the Manichees*, 78-79). Drijvers has also emphasized the difference between the two (“Mani und Bardaisan,” 469). Polotsky suggested that there is veiled allusion to Marcion and/or Bardaisan as precursors to Mani at 1Ke 13.30ff. Like many of the most interesting thinkers from Late Antiquity, however, we are forced to rely largely on fragments and secondary testimony for information about Bardaisan’s teaching, some of which may actually be drawn from his followers. Nevertheless, later Syriac tradition attributes to Bardaisan the doctrine that the world came to be from the mixture of five elements: fire, wind, water, light, and darkness. See the table of accounts from Barhadbeshabba (6<sup>th</sup> cent. CE), Moses bar Kepha (10<sup>th</sup> cent. CE), Iwannis of Dara (9<sup>th</sup> cent. CE), and Theodore bar Khonai (8<sup>th</sup> cent. CE) provided by Drijvers in *Bardaisan*, 98-103. But, as Drijvers points out, Bardaisan’s cosmological ideas only came under attack in the wake of Manichaeism (*Bardaisan*, 96). Thus, there may have been some desire on the part of later polemicists and heresiologists to overemphasize the role played by Bardaisanean ideas in the formation of Manichaeism. As such, while it is at least possible that Mani drew or adapted a doctrine of five elements from Bardaisan (however reluctantly), the presence of such a doctrine, and the importance of the fifth element as the substance of the soul (not found in Bardaisan), is sufficiently attested in philosophical traditions from Late Antiquity to make other derivations equally possible.

<sup>198</sup>Theodore bar Khonai even records a Syriac pun on the words for “shining” (ܠܘܠܐ / *zīwānā* and “armour” (ܠܘܒܥܘܐ / *zaynā*) (Reeves, “Citations from Ephrem,” 269 n.9).

<sup>199</sup> This, in turn, no doubt reflects Syriac usage of the term ܘܒܥܘܐ, which communicates not only the idea of son-ship, but also of “close relation, subjection, or similarity” (Payne-Smith, 53a). As for their original Syriac name—ܠܘܠܐ, “brilliant, or shining”—Burkitt offered the unlikely suggestion that this is actually an adaptation of the Middle-Iranian term *zywyn’g*, meaning “life-giver” (*Religion of the Manichees*, 111).

<sup>200</sup> Reeves, “Citations from Ephraim,” 234 [#28].

*Body, that it was made to resemble the Cosmos*" (1Ke 69.18),<sup>201</sup> as well as the "Five Luminous Gods" (†ΟΥ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΠΡΙ[Ω]Υ) from *Chapter 38 "On the Light-Mind, the Apostles, and the Saints"* (1Ke 95.16), and the "Five Shining Men" (†ΟΥ ΝΡΜΝΤΠΙΕ) (1Ke 85.34; 88.15; 89.8). While the concept of the Elements as "garments" is not attested in known canonical traditions, the epithets "Five Luminous Gods" and "Five Shining Men" are presumably a reflection of the "Five Shining Gods" (ܠܘܨܘܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ) known from Theodore bar Khonai.

One co-referential series in particular, however, that seems to have caused a great deal of confusion for both ancient and modern commentators is the grouping known as the "Five Intellectuals" (†ΟΥ ΝΝΟΕΡΟΝ). While Iain Gardner, in his *Kephalaia "Indices"* justifiably lists the Five Limbs under the Five Intellectuals,<sup>202</sup> both the *Kephalaia* and the *Psalm-book* typically associated the Intellectuals with the Five Elements, a fact that has already been noted by Van Lindt in his study of Coptic Manichaean terminology.<sup>203</sup> For instance, in *Chapter 2 "The Second, on the Parable of the Tree,"* the "intellectuals" that "clothe" the body of the Column of Glory/Perfect Man are clearly equated with the "Elements of Light" (1Ke 20.1-3).<sup>204</sup> This identification can be corroborated by a "Psalm of the Wanderers" which states that the "Five Intellectuals are the Sons of First Man" (2Ps 161.25). Nevertheless, there appears to have been a certain degree of ambiguity as to the identity of the Intellectuals, since in *Chapter 31*, the

<sup>201</sup> See also *Chapter 109 "On the Fifty Lord's Days"* (1Ke 262.25), and *Chapter 54 "On the Quality of the Garments"* (1Ke 131.20).

<sup>202</sup> The Limbs are after all "intellectual" properties. See Gardner, *Kephalaia of the Teacher*, 297.

<sup>203</sup> *Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures*, 63-64.

<sup>204</sup> Compare *Chapter 72* in which the "great garment" of Pillar of Glory/Perfect Man" is made up of Five Intellectuals (1Ke 177.3). The fact that the Intellectuals are called a "garment" also supports their identification with the Five Elements.

Five Limbs were also associated with the preparatory activities of First Man (see below). As such, the exact equations between concepts such as the Five Elements, the Five Limbs, and the Five Intellectuals seem to have been complex and may not have been any clearer to the compilers than they are to us.

Even in spite of the obvious importance of the “Five Sons of First Man” as a concept within Manichaeism generally,<sup>205</sup> the *Kephalaia* compilers seem to have been primarily interested in using them for the formulation of other rhetorically or doctrinally significant numeric patterns. For instance, according to *Chapter 3 “The Interpretation of Happiness, Wisdom, and Power,”* these three thematic qualities are said to exist at five levels of divine being, from the Father, through the light-vehicles of Sun and Moon, to the Elements and the Holy Church. At the level of the Elements, “happiness” is said to be constituted by the Column of Glory/Perfect Man, the cosmic apparatus for light-liberation, while the Five Sons of Living Spirit constitute “wisdom.” At the same level, however, “power” is manifested by the Five Sons of First Man, who are “folded into the Universe” (1Ke 24.25). Similarly, in *Chapter 4 “On the Four Great Days, which have come out from one another; along with the Four Nights,”* the twelve hours of the third day are calculated by adding the Five Sons of First Man and the Five Sons of Living

---

<sup>205</sup> On the abstract level, however, the Sons/Elements, or Living Soul, are “a property shared by all objects” (BeDuhn, *Manichaean Body*, 72) within the cosmos and serve as an ontological link between the Father of Greatness and his children. This can be established by interpreting the testimony of Theodore bar Khonai, who records that when the Father sought to defend his kingdom from the dark invasion, he says, “I myself will go” (ܐܢܝܢܝܐ, literally, “by means of my own soul”). As a result, First Man, whom he calls upon, along with the Five Elements, can be interpreted as the “soul” of the Father sent into battle and eventually captured by the powers of darkness. The Manichaean, in turn, is enjoined to “remember” this imprisonment of the Elements, or Living Soul, and to work for their/its liberation (BeDuhn, *Manichaean Body*, 73). Once this is recognized, the Manichaean may then become, to use BeDuhn’s evocative term, “a cog” in the great cosmic machinery of light-liberation (BeDuhn, *Manichaean Body*, 76). According to the *Cologne Mani Codex*, the notion of the suffering Living Soul was perceived by Mani at an early age when he heard the cries and lamentations of plants as they were harvested (CMC 6-10). This means that, according to Manichaean hagiography at least, the plight of the Living Soul constituted one of Mani’s earliest insights into the nature of the world around him.



Spirit to Call and Response (1Ke 25.25-30). An analogous exegetical manoeuvre occurs in *Chapter 10* “*On the Meaning of the Fourteen [Great] Aeons about which Sethel spoke in [his] Prayer.*” In this context, the Five Elements/Sons are added to Call and Response to form a first set of seven, while the Five Sons of Living Spirit are added to Living Spirit and First Man to form a second set of seven. These, Mani is made to explain, constitute the fourteen “blessings” (ΝC[MAME]) (1Ke 43.8) or “persons” (ΜΠΡΟC[ΩΤΟΝ]) (1Ke 43.9) through which the world was established. Also, the Five Sons of First Man are assigned by *Chapter 16* “[*On the Five*] *Greatnesses which have [come] out against the Darkness*” to the “Second Greatness,” along with Mother of Life and First Man (1Ke 49.19-23), and in *Chapter 39* “*On the Three Days and the Two Deaths,*” the “First Death” is marked by the mixture of Darkness and the Five Sons (1Ke 102-36-103.2). In this way, even in spite of obvious terminological problems, the Five Sons/Elements were seen more as a convenient rhetorical tool than a concept that required extended commentary and clarification.

### 4.3.3 Cosmic Parallelism

Two chapters in particular demonstrate the *Kephalaia* compilers’ interest in the correspondence between the macrocosm and the microcosm: *Chapter 38* “*On the Light-Mind, the Apostles, and the Saints,*” and *Chapter 70* “*On the Body, that it was made to resemble the Cosmos.*” In *Chapter 38* especially, five-part patterns are omnipresent in that they provide both the literary as well as the theological framework through which this theme is presented. As such, the compilers draw on three canonical pentads, namely

the “Five Sons of Living Spirit,”<sup>206</sup> the “Five Limbs,”<sup>207</sup> and the Five Virtues,<sup>208</sup> to communicate their message.

On the rhetorical level, the central importance of five-part patterning to *Chapter 38* is made evident by its initial literary frame, since in an effort to have Mani address the issue of theodicy, the unnamed disciple is made to pose a series of five questions:

<sup>206</sup> According to Theodore bar Khonai, in response to the capture of First Man, the Father of Greatness called out a second triad, made up of “Beloved of Lights” (ܐܘܘܪܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ), “Great Builder” (ܥܡܘܕܝܢܐ), and the “Living Spirit” (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ). Like First Man (the third being of the first emanation), Living Spirit calls upon “Five Sons” who aid in the slaughter of the Archons and the construction of the cosmos, specifically the “Ten Heavens” and the “Eight Earths.” These Five Sons are called “Ornament (or Keeper) of Splendour” (ܐܘܪܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ), “Great King of Honour” (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ), “Adamos (*sic* = Adamas) of Light” (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܠܝܘܬܐ), “King of Glory” (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܠܝܐ), and “Porter” (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܐ). In general, I much prefer the use of English equivalents for these names, since the use of Latin terminology, such as *Splenditenens*, *Rex honoris*, etc., so frequently used in studies of Manichaean myth, creates the false impression that such terms are somehow more original or accurate

<sup>207</sup> As we have seen, the most important five-part series in the whole of Manichaean discourse is what came to be known in the Graeco-Coptic tradition as the “Five Limbs” (ΠΟΥ ΜΜΕΛΟC). They are usually enumerated as 1) Mind, 2) Thought, 3) Insight, 4) Counsel, and 5) Consideration, although how to accurately translate these terms has been the subject of perennial debate within Manichaean studies. The Syriac version of the series ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ (Theodore bar Khonai 313.17 [Scher]) is equivalent to the Greek terms νοῦς, ἐννοια, φρόνησις, ἐνθύμησις, λογισμός, which were then rendered into Latin as *mens*, *sensus*, *prudentia*, *intellectus*, *cogitatio* (*Acta Archelai*, 10 [Beeson, 15.11/25]). In Coptic the series is ΝΟΥC, ΜΕΥΕ, CΒΩ, CΑΧΝΕ, ΜΑΚΜΕΚ. Originally, these are what Theodore identifies as the Five *shekinahs* (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ) (Theodore bar Khonai 313.16 [Scher]). In Syriac, the word ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ represents the “dwelling-place” or “presence” of divinity, as in a temple or shrine (Payne-Smith, 576b). In Theodore’s account, the ethereal *shekinahs* of the Father are contrasted with the more concrete “worlds” (ܕܘܚܝܢܐܘܪܝܢܐ) of the King of Darkness. Why the *shekinahs* were understood as “Limbs” (ΜΜΕΛΟC) by the compilers remains a bit of a puzzle, since when associated with the Father of Greatness they would be more properly understood as “aeons” (ΝΑΚΟΝ). This is, in fact, precisely how they are characterized in the Coptic version of Mani’s *Living Gospel* (Funk, *personal communication*). This rendering, however, does not seem to have greatly influenced the *Kephalaia* tradition, which opted for the occasional use of ΝΤΑΜΙΟΝ and the more regular use of ΜΜΕΛΟC. It does seem, however, that al-Nadīm provides evidence that even in Syriac tradition they may have already been characterized as “Limbs” (*Fihrist*, 768 [Dodge]).

<sup>208</sup> Evidence from Mani’s *Epistles*, has confirmed the place of both the Limbs and the Virtues in his own discourse. In particular, the “Seventh Letter to Ctesiphon; that of the Vigils,” records Mani’s evocation of the Five Limbs in association with a blessing provided by Jesus: “But it is he who shall bless you all, my beloved / children. May he leave his love on your head, that is, / the Light-Mind. His great faith, he [will ... in] your / vigilant Thought. His perfection, he will established [in your] / good Insight, and his long-suffering, he [will ...] / in your good Counsels. His wisdom ... / ... he will act as in your sharp Considerations ...” (*Epistles [Berlin]* 50.8-14; Funk, *A Work Concordance to the Coptic Fragments of Mani’s Epistles*).

Again at one occasion, a disciple questioned the [Apostle], / saying to him: You have told us that the Light-Mind / is that which comes and supports the saints. [You have told] / us therefore that even though it is one of the gods ... / ... many gods exist in it. You have told / us also that when it enters into [the body] / of the flesh and binds the Old Man with his **Five Counsels**, / it sets its **Five Counsels** on the **Five Limbs** / [of his] body. Where is it [though], since the Old Man is bound in the / body? For, I (can) see that rebellions occur in its / bond from time to time.

Secondly, I ask / you: If indeed it is a great god, unchanging and / immeasurable, how does it come to appear in the smallness of the / body?

The third thing that I want you to tell / me [is this: If(?)] the Mind is holy and pure, / [how did it come to be mixed with(?)] the impurity of this body. /

Fourthly, if truly, the Light-Mind is present in [the] / saints, why does its likeness not appear to us as it / is? The fifth thing: I want / you to tell me and explain your apostleship. / For, behold, it is not clear to me, since they oppress / you and persecute you in the world. / I implore you that you persuade me about these things which I have asked you (1Ke 89.21-90.7).

Basically, what the disciple wants to know is how a great and noble divine power such as the Light-Mind can inhabit a small and defiled body. Moreover, if this is indeed the case why does Sin<sup>209</sup> (i.e., “rebellion”) persist? These two basic questions, however, are extended (somewhat artificially perhaps) into a five-part schema:

Question i) Where is the Light-Mind in the body, if there are rebellions?

Question ii) How can this great god come into a small body?

Question iii) How can the pure Mind occupy the defiled body?

Question iv) If the Light-Mind exists in the saints, why don't we see his likeness?

Question v) What is the nature of your apostolate, if you are persecuted?

In response, Mani is made to begin his discourse with an analogy<sup>210</sup> in five parts.

The first part of the analogy suggests that the cosmos (metaphorically understood as ΠΛΑΝΗ “Error”) is constructed like a human body (1Ke 90.20-22). Its external aspects are described in descending order from head to feet (1Ke 90.22-33), while its internal aspects are described from interior to exterior, from heart to skin (1Ke 91.1-5), followed by several characteristics made unclear by lacunae in the text (1Ke 91.5-13). According

<sup>209</sup> In Manichaean discourse “Sin” is often a quasi-personified concept.

<sup>210</sup> Nagel characterized this as the “makrokosmisch-mikrokosmisch ... Lageralegorie” (“Anatomie des menschen in gnostischer und manichäischer Sicht,” 88).

to the second part of the analogy, the soul of the cosmos is represented by the Five Sons of the Living Spirit (the Keeper of Splendor, the King of Honour, the Adamas of Light, the King of Glory, and the Porter), who are characterized as “Five Sleepless Watchers” (†ΟΥ ΝΖΟΥΡΠΙΤ ΝΑΤΝΚΑΤΕ) (1Ke 91.19) and are related to the Five Limbs (Mind, Thought, Insight, Counsel, Consideration) (1Ke 91.14-33). To these two groups of five is added a sixth element in the form of a pair: call and response (ΤΩΖΜΕ / CΩΤΜΕ, 1Ke 92.2-3)—the dual values at the core of the Manichaean drama of salvation. Part three states that the Column of Glory represents the Light-Mind at the cosmic level (1Ke 92.5-6), while part four recounts how the dark powers have rebelled in the watch districts of each of the Five Sons (1Ke 92.12-93.15). Finally, the fifth part of the analogy describes how the Column of Glory (acting as a kind of Light-Mind for the cosmos) assists the Five Sons in suppressing the rebellions in their respective watch districts (93.16-94.16). By means of this analogy, Mani is made to set up the basic thesis of the discourse, namely that the Light-Mind is indeed present in the body in spite of the presence of sin, thereby answering the first of the disciple’s questions.

This first part of the discourse is expressed using a series of five-fold structures that progressively integrate each part of the argument while consistently enumerating the five thematic elements in canonical order. The repetition of five is meant to express the fundamental interconnectedness of all facets of Manichaean teaching and to reflect the quasi-scientific allure of Manichaean doctrines in Late Antiquity. The Elect, to whom this discourse is addressed, would have had no difficulty in accepting the Manichaean *logic* of this vivid cosmological narrative.

Mani, then, is made to continue with arguments in support of his position by shifting first to the microcosmic level of the body and second to the level of the community. By way of introduction, Mani answers the second of the disciples' five questions (i.e., How can such a great god dwell in a small body?) by stating that even though the gods are great and mighty (ΖΗΝΑΘ ΝΕ ΝΧΩΡΕ) (1Ke 95.4), they are nevertheless bound within their proper places (1Ke 95.4-9). Following this, Mani answers the third of the five questions (i.e., How can the pure Mind occupy the defiled body?) by describing the creation of the body (i.e., the Old Man) by the agency of Sin. According to the Apostle of Light, Sin bound the Five Limbs in the body: *Mind* in bone, *Thought* in sinew, *Insight* in vein, *Counsel* in flesh, and *Consideration* in skin (1Ke 95.13-19). The Light Mind, however, acts to free the Limbs from their bonds (1Ke 96.8-21), and reestablish them in the Five Virtues of the New Man. As such, Mind becomes *love*, Thought *faith*, Insight *perfection*, Counsel *patience*, and Consideration *wisdom* (1Ke 96.25-97.6).

Once again the number five plays a crucial role in the elaboration of this highly structured portion of the discourse. The five-fold schema of the Limbs is enumerated again in the same canonical order (Mind, Thought, Insight, Counsel and Consideration) in each of the three occurrences, which, in turn, reflect the three key points in the salvation narrative in which the Light-Mind plays a critically important role: imprisonment, liberation, and re-creation.

<i>Sin bound LIMBS in the body,</i>	<i>but LIGHT-MIND frees them,</i>	<i>and creates the NEW MAN.</i>
i) MIND in bone, ii) THOUGHT in sinew, iii) INSIGHT in vein, iv) COUNSEL in flesh, v) CONSIDERATION in skin.	i) MIND from bone, ii) THOUGHT from sinew, iii) INSIGHT from vein, iv) COUNSEL from flesh, v) CONSIDERATION from skin.	i) MIND is love ii) THOUGHT is faith iii) INSIGHT is perfection iv) COUNSEL is patience v) CONSIDERATION is wisdom

What follows is a discussion of the implications of Sin and adversity at the community level. Here Mani emphasizes that even though the Light Mind is king of the New Man, sin may still cause disruptions and lead to difficulties in the Manichaean church:<sup>211</sup>

As long as the Limbs of Sin<sup>212</sup> are bound / in this way, Sin is contained. Even though the Light-Mind / [is] king, tribulation may still occur in the body from / time to time. Sometimes Sin rises / up in his Consideration and disturbs Counsel, and confuses / the Wisdom and the understanding of the man (1Ke 97.23-28).

Each of the New Man's Five Limbs,<sup>213</sup> along with the Five Virtues attached to them, can be disturbed and disrupted by Sin, causing doubt in the believer and his or her possible departure from the church. In this case, however, the presence of the Light-Mind in the individual may be preserved by the members of the community, who attempt to "correct his wisdom" (1Ke 97.33). Yet even the correction and rebuke of the community may not suffice to keep the Light-Mind active in the individual. Eventually, the Mind "(will) be dispersed from him and return to the Apostle who sent it" (1Ke 99.13-14). This individual will become like "a bird plucked of its feathers" (1Ke 99.17). Such statements are presumably meant to justify the loss of community members within the wider context of the persistent activity of sin in the cosmos.

---

<sup>211</sup> There is an intriguing correlation here with the *Cologne Mani Codex*. The actual title of this work is Περὶ τῆς γέννης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, "On the Origin of His Body," i.e., of his church. Thus, there may be an implicit parallel understood here in *Chapter 38* between the metaphor of the body at the cosmological, anthropological, and ecclesiological levels. See Cameron and Dewey, *The Cologne Mani Codex*, 2 and Henrichs and Koenen, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex*.

<sup>212</sup> Funk, A&C.

<sup>213</sup> In terms of rhetorical structure, it is interesting to note that in this instance, where the Five Limbs are invoked, there is an inversion of their order. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that from a "higher" cosmological perspective the Five Limbs descend in their value, while in the "lower" community context, they ascend. Also, Consideration is presumably weaker than Mind and, as such, would be attacked by sin first.

Mani then goes on to restate the answers to the first three questions and respond to the fourth (i.e., If the Light-Mind exists in the saints, why don't we see his likeness?), by suggesting that the likeness of the Light-Mind cannot be known since it is not visible in the body (1Ke 99.24). In addition, Mani re-enforces the macrocosmic/microcosmic parallelism at the core of his argumentation and re-assures the audience about the strong presence of the Light-Mind:

Behold the strength and the efficiency of the Light- / Mind: how great it is on all the watch-towers of / the body. It stands in its encampment (and) shields / every impulse of the body from the attractions of Sin. / It fixes them, scatters them, (and) sets them / according to his will (1Ke 100.1-100.6).

In conclusion, Mani is made to respond to the fifth and final question by invoking, again in five parts, his own superior status as a prophet. He outlines how he has come into the world as a lone individual and has conquered with the word of God regions which cannot be conquered by force of arms. Even though the powers of the world have attempted to destroy his message, they have failed. In response to such adversities, Mani has free his children and equipped them with superior wisdom. No one has accomplished more than him, except for Jesus himself (1Ke 100.15-102.3). In this way, Mani is made to rhetorically re-enforce the superior value of his revelation in the face of persecutions by the worldly powers and thereby validate the chapter's thematic parallelism.

As we can see, *Chapter 38* uses an elaborate mixture of five-part theological and literary patterns to communicate its message of reassurance in the face of sin and evil and to emphasize the analogous relationship between the macrocosmic and microcosmic powers. In addition, it reinforces the intimate relationship between three canonical pentads: The Five Sons of Living Spirit, the Five Limbs, and the Five Virtues. To

Manichaeans accustomed to this way of thinking, *Chapter 38* no doubt offered an impressive presentation of a persistent theological and community problem.

A similar, although less extensive, analogy between body and cosmos is drawn in *Chapter 70* “*On the Body, that it was made to resemble the Cosmos.*” In this chapter, we are told that “the entire cosmos, above and below, resembles the human body” (1Ke 169.29-30), with each component of the cosmos compared to a part of the body (1Ke 170.2-16). Here too, as in *Chapter 38*, the Five Sons of Living Spirit are described as “Watchers” (ΜΜΑΝΡΑΪC) (1Ke 171.28) of five regions of the cosmos (1Ke 170.21-171.15), called “encampments” (ΜΠΑΡΑΜΠΟΛΗ) (1Ke 170.21) or “watch-towers” (ΝΟΥΡΨΥΕ) (1Ke 171.11), while the Light-Mind guards five “encampments” of the body:

[Just as] the **Five Watchers** are found in this great / [bond of these **Five**] **Encampments** that I have proclaimed / to you, so too is it with this body, which the / Elect bear. There are **Five** other **Encampments** / in it. The Light-Mind guards them along with the / New Man that is with it (1Ke 171.28-172.4).

Also, as in *Chapter 38*, “tribulation” (ΘΑΛΙΨΙC) (1Ke 171.11) is said to persist under the watch of the guardians (1Ke 171.11-172.1). Finally, each of the Five Sons of Living Spirit is compared to an Elect who, with the aid of the Light-Mind, is able to control the various parts of the body (1Ke 172.3-20).

<i>5 Sons of Living Spirit</i>	<i>who rule</i>	<i>are like Elect who</i>
Keeper of Splendour	First Three Heavens	rules face
King of Honour	Next Seven Heavens	rules heart
Adamas	Firmament to Four Earths	rules chest
King of Glory	Three Wheels & Three Earths	rules stomach
Porter	Great Earth & Four Fixtures	rules feet

In this way it can be seen that, in two different chapters (*Chapters 38* and *70*), the *Kephalaia* compilers sought to emphasize the correspondence between the cosmos and



the human form—a concept essential to the Manichaean worldview. This was done to reassure the community that parallel processes of rebellion and divine suppression are at work at both levels of being. In this way, readers could imagine their own bodies as encapsulating the cosmic struggle against the powers of darkness.

#### 4.3.4 Fathers of Greatness

One favourite activity of the *Kephalaia* compilers that speaks to their deliberate efforts at *pentadization* is the grouping of beings from the light-realm into series known either as the “Five Fathers” or the “Five Greatnesses.” The first major discussion of this theme can be found in the work as early as *Chapter 7 “The Seventh, on the Five Fathers,”* where the compiler took the unusual step of numerically identifying the placement of the chapter in its title.<sup>214</sup> In this chapter, Mani is made to explain that the Five Fathers have their origin in the Father of Greatness and that all have shared in the victory over the powers of darkness. Each of the Five Fathers is named, along with three of their emanations:

<i>5 Fathers</i>	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Emanation</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Emanation</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Emanation</i>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Father of Greatness</b>	Great Spirit/Mother	Beloved of Lights	Third Messenger <sup>215</sup>
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Third Messenger</b>	Column of Glory	Jesus the Splendour	Virgin of Light
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Jesus the Splendour</b>	Light-Mind	Great Judge	Youth
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Light-Mind</b>	Apostle of Light	Twin	Light-Form
<b>5<sup>th</sup> Light-Form</b>	Victory-Angel	Garment-Angel	Crown-Angel

Essentially, what this chapter presents is a five-part ontology of salvation. These Five Fathers represent the five ontological levels at which the work of salvation takes place: 1) the pre-cosmic context of the Light-realm (Father of Greatness), 2) the cosmic context of

<sup>214</sup> This seems to occur in only one other chapter in 1Ke—Chapter 2, and apparently not at all in 2Ke (see Funk, “Reconstruction,” 158-159).

<sup>215</sup> The Third Messenger was prematurely identified as the “Second Father” by the redactor in the list of the Father of Greatness’ three emanations (1Ke 34.33).

creation and the defeat of the Archons (Third Messenger), 3) the eschatological context of human history, judgement, and redemption (Jesus the Splendour), 4) the prophetological context of revelation and apostleship (Light Mind), and 5) the ethical and ecclesiological context of the Holy Church (Light-Form).

Whereas the canonical version of the myth, as known from Theodore bar Khonai, contains three series of emanations,<sup>216</sup> the compilers of *Chapter 7* extend this canonical formulation to a five stage process of salvation, with three emanations occurring at each stage. Moreover, each stage moves towards a progressive focalization of the myth from the generalized, pre-cosmic context of the Father of Greatness down to the specific context of the individual Manichaean who has received the Light-Form. For example, *stage one* of salvation occurs at the broad, pre-cosmic level where the three “canonical” emanations occur out of the Father of Greatness.<sup>217</sup> This establishes the transcendent framework of salvation. *Stage two* brings into focus the three components of the Third Messenger, the third canonical emanation, who provides the means by which salvation can be achieved by human beings. *Stage three* enumerates three hypostases of Jesus the Splendour, the main intermediary from the third emanation, who acts not only as enlightener and bringer of the Light-Mind, but as eschatological judge as well. *Stage four* specifies the three principal ways in which the Light-Mind, a main hypostasis of Jesus the Splendour, aids humanity. Finally, *stage five* enumerates the three gifts gained by the individual once he or she has received the Light-Form.

---

<sup>216</sup> This, of course, cannot be verified since Theodore’s account of the myth breaks off after Jesus the Splendour’s encounter with Adam.

<sup>217</sup> It is important to keep in mind the role of synonymy in early Manichaean discourse. Even though three beings are emanated in each of the three canonical emanations, only one is named here as representative. Even though the Manichaean myth presents a multiplicity of different beings, in many instances they may be understood as diverse manifestations and hypostases of an original triad.

*Chapter 20*, again with the atypical title of “*The Chapter on the Name of the Fathers*,” presents a similar arrangement of five mythological figures. In this chapter, Mani is made to quiz his disciples about why the Father is called “Father of Greatness” (1Ke 63.23-24). After their stereotypical plea of ignorance, Mani reveals that the Father of Greatness is so-called because he dwells in the Great Earth, where he is surrounded by all his angels and divine companions (1Ke 63.28-33). The discourse then turns to identifying the “greatness” of four other beings that are also called “Father.” The Third Messenger’s greatness is the “Ship of the Living Fire,” i.e., the Sun, while Jesus the Splendour’s greatness is the “Ship of the Living Water,” i.e., the Moon. The Column of Glory’s greatness has something to do with “Five Gods,” while the greatness of the Light Mind is identified as the Holy Church (1Ke 63.34-64.10). This list of Five Fathers from *Chapter 20*, however, is different from the list found in *Chapter 7*:

<b><i>Chapter 7: 5 Fathers</i></b>	<b><i>Chapter 20: 5 Fathers</i></b>
Father of Greatness	Father of Greatness
Third Messenger	Third Messenger
Jesus the Splendour	Jesus the Splendour
<b>Light-Mind</b>	<b>Column of Glory</b>
<b>Light-Form</b>	<b>Light-Mind</b>

Whereas *Chapter 7* enumerates a soteriological sequence in which the Light-Form is given a central role at the community level, the account from *Chapter 20* inserts the Column of Glory, making no mention of the Light-Form. The aim of *Chapter 20*, however, although also soteriological in character, seems to be to establish the location of each of the Five Fathers at one of the five principal stopping points of the Manichaean journey of salvation: from the ritual activity of the Holy Church (Light Mind) to the “Five Gods” (?) administered by the Column of Glory, to the Moon and Sun where Jesus the Splendour and the Third Messenger dwell, on to the Great Earth, the homeland of the

Father of Greatness. Whereas *Chapter 7* enumerates the five ontological levels of salvation, *Chapter 20* lists those five beings whose efforts facilitate the accomplishment of salvation and the liberation of light.

The situation is further complicated when we look at *Chapter 25* “*On the Five [Fathers: From which Limbs they have come]*,” where we are presented with yet another variant formulation, only this time the Father of Greatness himself is not included.

<i>Five Fathers</i>	<i>from Five Limbs</i>
Messenger	Mind
Beloved of Lights	Thought
Mother of Life	Insight
Jesus the Beloved ( <i>sic</i> )	Counsel
Virgin of Light	Consideration

Unfortunately, almost no context is given by this extremely abbreviated chapter, other than the statement that “one came after the other (and) appeared in his time” (1Ke 76.25). This seems to imply that the series is meant to be understood temporally, although such an understanding seems impossible given what is known about the sequence of the Manichaean myth from other sources such as Theodore bar Khonai. According to the canonical account, a “temporal” progression of these figures would run Mother of Life—Beloved of Lights—Messenger—Jesus the Beloved—Virgin of Light.<sup>218</sup> Nevertheless, a clue as to how this series might be understood can be found in *Chapter 7*, in which the Third Messenger is called the “model of the King of Light” (1Ke 35.8) and the “first of all counsellors” (1Ke 34.33). This would seem to justify the Third Messenger’s

<sup>218</sup> This example is further complicated by the fact that some of its irregular features may indicate that the compiler may have been drawing on some very early material. For example, the brevity of the chapter indicates that it may be an early “proto-kephalaic” formulation. In addition, the first father is identified simply as the “Messenger” rather than the “Third Messenger” parallels a detail which can be found in Theodore bar Khonai’s account. Similarly, the unusual formulation of “Jesus the Beloved” may be derived from some early source.

placement at the head of the *Chapter 25* formulation. The selection and arrangement of the other figures, however, remains obscure.

Another, albeit peculiar, presentation of the Five Fathers can be found in *Chapter 148* “*On the Five Books, that they belong to five Fathers.*” In this chapter, Mani is supposed to have associated “five” of his books with the “Fathers of Light” (1Ke 355.6-7). While the *Living Gospel* is attributed to the Messenger and the *Treasure of Life* to the Column of Glory, the three writings, *Pragmateia*, *Book of Mysteries*, and *Book of Giants* are attributed to the Light-Twin. The *Letters*, however, are said to be Mani’s own gifts. Strangely, no fifth book is named or attributed to a Manichaean divinity. Nor is the seventh of Mani’s canonical writings mentioned at all.<sup>219</sup> It appears, however, that an attempt has been made to compress this canonical *heptateuch* into a *pentateuch* more in line with the compilers’ penchant for five-part structures.<sup>220</sup> The fact that only six books are mentioned as four gifts may be due to scribal error,<sup>221</sup> since the construction of such a six-four formulation runs contrary to the compilers’ project of *pentadization*. Nevertheless, the enumeration of the Fathers appears equally puzzling, since it too is at variance with the three previously discussed formulations.

Finally, there seems to have been an additional discussion of the Five Fathers in *Chapter 191* “*There are Five Properties in the Image of our Apostle symbolizing the Five Light Fathers,*” which unfortunately is entirely obscured by lacunae. At most, a general

<sup>219</sup> That the Manichaean canon contained seven writings is known from 1Ke 5.21-33, 2Ps 46f, 139f, and *Hom* 25.2-5, as well as al-Nadīm and the Chinese *Compendium* (Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 62; Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 153-156).

<sup>220</sup> That they succeeded in altering the canon is independently verified by Augustine’s *Contra Felicem*, 1.14 (Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 63; see esp. Tardieu’s table on page 64).

<sup>221</sup> See Funk 1Ke 335, who suggests that the *Psalms and Prayers* could have been named before the *Letters*. If, however, the title was added only later, then we need not assume that the chapter itself was intentionally structured in five-parts (Funk, *personal communication*).

outline of the discourse can be reconstructed as enumerating Five “Properties” and Five other qualities:

**CHAPTER 191 SCHEMA:**

- INTRO: Again he spoke to his disciples ...  
 DISCOURSE: There are Five Properties in the *Image* ...  
 1) First Property is humility  
 2) [Second Property ... ?]  
 3) Third [Property ... ?]  
 4) [Fourth Property] ... my *Image* = beauty  
 5) Fifth [Property] is my light-wisdom.  
 ...  
 [Five other things? ...]  
 1) [First ...]  
 2) [Second ...]  
 3) [Third ...]  
 4) [Fourth ...]  
 5) Fifth is my light-wisdom.  
 CONCLUSION: I have given victory ... over all Sects ...

While there is no way of knowing what identity and role the Five Fathers were given in this chapter, it appears as though the emphasis was placed on the qualities attributable to Mani.

As we have seen, the *Kephalaia* compilers present five formulations of the Five Fathers, four of which can be read. Each of these formulations, however, presents a different sequence of Fathers:

<i>Chapter 7</i>	<i>Chapter 20</i>	<i>Chapter 25</i>	<i>Chapter 148</i>
Father of Greatness	Father of Greatness	Messenger	Messenger
Third Messenger	Third Messenger	Beloved of Lights	Column of Glory
Jesus the Splendour	Jesus the Splendour	Mother of Life	Light Twin
Light-Mind	Column of Glory	Jesus the Beloved	---?
Light-form	Light Mind	Virgin of Light	Mani

While the (Third) Messenger is the only figure found in all four formulations, there are nonetheless some similarities between *Chapters 7 and 20* and *Chapters 25 and 148*. On the one hand, *Chapters 7 and 20* appear the most similar, varying only in positions four and five, while *Chapters 25 and 148* place the Messenger in the first position.

What then should we make of these variations?<sup>222</sup> While the compilers were obviously using and building upon some kind of earlier material, it is difficult to imagine that a truly canonical series would be subject to such a degree of malleability, given the rigidity with which other series such as the Five Sons are maintained. Nevertheless, given the fact that we find the same expression “Fathers of Light” used in the *Psalm-book* (see 2Ps 8.8; 36.15; 73.8; 84.29; 202.12) and the *Cologne Mani Codex* (33.2), we may assume that it was an epithet that existed as part of a canonical Manichaean tradition and was probably used by Mani himself as a general designation for any number of divine beings.<sup>223</sup> That these Fathers of Light came to be thought of in terms of five-part series is likely an additional by-product of the process of *pentadization* so evident in the *Kephalaia*. The fact that there are so many variant formulations, however, would seem to represent the various attempts at clarification and elaboration of this quasi-canonical trope, which appears to have been left quite ambiguous and flexible. Perhaps a concept of Five Fathers was needed to balance the recurring image of the Five Sons. Or, perhaps the Five Fathers are an attempt to re-emphasize the fact that the Father is a being endowed with five qualities or Limbs, and as such would have been compelled to send five emissaries into the drama of salvation. Or, the variant formulations might have resulted from an overabundance of hypostases and personages invoked by Mani in his writings—i.e., there were simply too many gods and hypostases to choose from. At any rate, the *Kephalaia* chapters dealing with the Five Fathers, although frustratingly contradictory, do

---

<sup>222</sup> Unfortunately, other Manichaean Coptic sources provide little in the way of clarification, even though the Fathers of Light are invoked several times in the *Psalm-book*. “Bema Psalm 237,” however, does enumerate a somewhat ambiguous series of Five Greatnesses of the Fathers involving 1) Mother of Life/First Man, 2) Beloved of Lights/Great Builder, 3) Third Messenger, 4) Column of Glory/Porters, and 5) Virgin/Judge/Light-Mind (2Ps 36.20-37.9).

<sup>223</sup> This can be inferred from Theodore bar Khonai’s account, in which First Man responds to Living Spirit with the words “How fare our fathers (ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲗⲁ), the sons of Light in their city?” (315.1 [Scher]).

provide us with an important glimpse into the ongoing and evolutionary process of clarification and systematization of Manichaean discourse undertaken by the *Kephalaia* compilers. This concept, in particular, appears to have caused considerable confusion and does not appear, at the stage represented by our manuscript at least, to have been resolved.

Although only mentioned in one published *Kephalaia* chapter, the compilers also present a formulation known as the “Five Greatnesses” (ΤΨΕ ΜΜΝΤΝΑΘ).<sup>224</sup> According to *Chapter 16* “[On the Five] Greatnesses which have [come] out against the Darkness,” the entire series of mythical emanations are presented according to a five-stage schema. The “First Greatness” is presented as the Father of Greatness, who has a “solitary existence” (ΤΕΦΟΥΣΙΑ ΟΥΛΕΤΦ) (1Ke 49.17) in the realm of light. The “Second Greatness” is made up of the Mother of Life, First Man, and the Five Sons of First Man (1Ke 49.19-23). The “Third Greatness,” in turn, contains the Beloved of Lights, Great Builder, and Living Spirit, along with the Five Sons of Living Spirit (1Ke 49.23-25). The “Fourth Greatness” is described as the Third Messenger, the Column of Glory, and (somewhat ambiguously) “all the powers of light who are revealed from him” (ΝΘΑΜ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΟΥΑΪΝΕ ΕΤΑΥΟΥΩΝΖ [ΑΒΑΛ ΜΜΑΦ] (1Ke 49.26-28). Finally, the “Fifth Greatness” is constituted by Jesus the Splendour and (with similar ambiguity) “all his powers” (ΙΝΙΕΦΘΑΜ ΤΗΡΟΥ) (1Ke 49.29-31).

This formulation varies considerably from the canonical version of the myth known from Theodore bar Khonai. As we have seen, according to his testimony, Mani

---

<sup>224</sup> The Five Greatnesses are also mentioned in 2Ps 136.50.



conceived of his cosmogony as occurring in three emanations, or evocations, each containing three primary figures:

Theodore bar Khonai		Chapter 16	
<i>1<sup>st</sup> Emanation/ Evocation</i>	Father of Greatness Mother of Life First Man 5 Sons of First Man	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Greatness</i>	Father of Greatness
<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Emanation/ Evocation</i>	Beloved of Lights Great Builder Living Spirit 5 Sons of Living Spirit	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Greatness</i>	Mother of Life First Man 5 Sons of First Man
<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Emanation/ Evocation</i>	Third Messenger 12 Virgins Jesus the Splendour	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Greatness</i>	Beloved of Lights Great Builder Living Spirit 5 Sons of Living Spirit
		<i>4<sup>th</sup> Greatness</i>	Third Messenger Column of Glory “powers of Light”
		<i>5<sup>th</sup> Greatness</i>	Jesus the Splendour “all his powers”

As is well known to Manichaean scholars, the third emanation is the most problematic formulation to disentangle.<sup>225</sup> While Theodore states that the Messenger brought forth Twelve Virgins and Jesus the Splendour (although Jesus is not explicitly “called” in Theodore’s account), *Chapter 7 (“The Seventh, on the Five Fathers”)* states that the Third Messenger emanated three powers: 1) the Column of Glory/Perfect Man, 2) Jesus the Splendour, and 3) a single Virgin of Light (1Ke 35.7-17). As we have seen, however, *Chapter 16* presents the third emanation as including the Third Messenger, the Column of Glory, and the ambiguous “powers of light” revealed by him (1Ke 49.26-28). As a result, we are faced with three alternative formulations of the third emanation:

<sup>225</sup> While it is clear that the Messenger is definitely part of the third triad, the remaining two members are ambiguous, since there are essentially three possible candidate: 1) some sort of virgin figure, 2) Jesus the Splendour, and 3) the Column of Glory, also known as the Perfect Man (2Ps 133.24-25; 1Ke 20.15; 24.23; 35.10; 37.3; 155.11).

Theodore bar Khonai	<i>Kephalaia</i> Ch. 7	<i>Kephalaia</i> Ch. 16.
Messenger 12 Virgins Jesus the Splendour	Third Messenger Column of Glory/Perfect Man Jesus the Splendour Virgin of Light	Third Messenger Column of Glory “powers of light”

While the compilers of *Chapter 7*, as we saw above, were motivated by a desire to present the Manichaean soteriological narrative through a telescopic five-part frame in which every “father” emanates three other beings, here the compilers of *Chapter 16* perform a similar operation by attempting to transform the canonical three-part cosmogonical schema into a five-part formulation. This meant isolating the Father of Greatness from his implicit association with the first emanation and dividing the third emanation into two parts (Greatness Four and Five). The integrity of the second emanation, however, is maintained. This, of course, is another example of the *pentadization* imposed by the compilers. In this case, the basic frame of the canonical myth is altered from a three-stage to a five-stage formulation. In addition, conflicting accounts of the third evocation point to an inherent ambiguity within the canonical account that appears to have allowed the compilers to so fundamentally alter the basic frame of their cosmogonic discourse.

#### 4.4 THEOLOGICAL PATTERNING II: DARK-REALM

As we have seen, the *Kephalaia* compilers present a number of five-part patterns associated with the light-realm in order to emphasize the pentadic attributes of its inhabitants as well as the five-part structure of their activities. At the same time, however, they seem to have been equally interested in sorting out the five-part structures associated with the Kingdom of Darkness. Five chapters in particular offer such presentations of the dark-realm: Chapter 6 “*On the Five Storehouses which are brought forth from the Land of Darkness from the Beginning; the Five Rulers, the Five Spirits, the Five Bodies, (and) the Five Tastes,*” Chapter 15 “[*On the*] ... *Five [Parts] ... World of ...,*” Chapter 27 “*On the Five Forms which exist in the Archon(s) of Darkness,*” Chapter 57 “*On the Generation of Adam,*” and Chapter 69 “*On the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac and the Five Stars.*” As we shall see, the compilers of these chapters were interested in three primary themes—1) the genesis of the dark-realm, 2) the nature of the dark-lord and his companions, and 3) the relation of the dark powers to the zodiac and the planets—which they chose to re-enforce through the use of both theological and literary five-part patterning.

##### 4.4.1 The Evolution of Evil

Unlike other streams of monotheistic, early Christian, Jewish, and later Islamic theology, that attempted to arrive at a philosophical solution to the problem of evil, Manichaeans gave a strictly dualist response and attempted to visualize evil by means of vivid mythological images and metaphor. As such, two of the most important presentations of the Land of Darkness from the *Kephalaia* can be found in Chapter 6 “*On the Five Storehouses which are brought forth from the Land of Darkness from the Beginning; the*

*Five Rulers, the Five Spirits, the Five Bodies, (and) the Five Tastes,*” and Chapter 15 ““[On the] ... Five [Parts] ... World of ...” These chapters, which appear to be attempts at a more or less comprehensive description of the dark-realm, contain a literary phenomenon found primarily in association with such contexts that may be termed *clustering*. This happens when the compiler lumps together a number of associated five-part patterns into one short passage. For instance, in *Chapter 6*, Mani is made to begin his discourse by saying:

**Five Store- / houses** have existed from the beginning in the Land of Darkness. **Five / Elements** have poured forth from them. Also, from the **Five / Elements** were fashioned **Five Trees**, (and) from the **Five Trees** /were fashioned **Five Species of Creatures** according to each World, / male and female. But also, the **Five Worlds** [have] / **Five Kings, Five Spirits, [Five] Bodies,** (and) **Five [Tastes]** / according to each world, which do not resemble [one another] (1Ke 30.17-24).

What this cluster does is concisely summarize the stages by which the dark-realm evolved, while at the same time emphasizing its essentially five-part structure. This proposition is even re-enforced by the literary structuring of the introductory passage, which elaborates five basic statements about the dark-realm, with the fifth statement enumerating five items according to the following pattern.

Statement 1: Five Storehouses exist in the Land of Darkness.  
 Statement 2: Five Elements have poured forth from them.  
 Statement 3: Five Trees were fashioned from the Five Elements.  
 Statement 4: Five Species came from the Five Trees.  
 Statement 5: The (1) Five Worlds of Darkness also have (2) Five Kings, (3) Five Spirits, (4) Five Bodies, and (5) Five Tastes.

A similar cluster occurs in *Chapter 15*, “[On the] ... Five [Parts] ... World of ...”:

The fifth time it spread itself to its offspring that exist [in the **Five**] / **Worlds** that were fashioned (and) begotten from the **Five / Fruits of Death**, which are the **Five Worlds of / Flesh**, the **Five Creations of Darkness** which Death established

in / them. He spread himself among the Ten Parts, the **Five Male Parts** and the / **Five Female [Parts]** ... .. (1Ke 48.17-22).

This passage fits into a more elaborate discourse about the Five (Parts/Times?)<sup>226</sup> that follows a similar structure to that found in the introduction to *Chapter 6*:

- Part 1: Death-desire ...
- Time 2: Five Elements poured fourth ...
- Part 3: [Five Trees formed?]
- Part 4: Five Fruits from Five Trees are Five Worlds.
- Time 5: The (1) Five Worlds fashioned from (2) Five Fruits, (3) which are Five Worlds of Flesh, (4), i.e., the Five Creations, distributed in (5) Five Male/Female Parts.

As such, *Chapters 6* and *15* present two similar, although variant, accounts of how the Land of Darkness came into being.

<i>Chapter 6</i>	<i>Chapter 15</i>
5 Storehouses	Desire/Death
5 Elements	5 Elements
5 Trees	[5 Trees?]
5 Species of Trees	5 Fruits
5 Worlds, 5 Kings, 5 Spirits, 5 Bodies, 5 Tastes	5 Worlds, 5 Fruits, 5 Flesh, 5 Creations, 5 Parts

Whereas *Chapter 6* begins with the Five Storehouses as its point of origin, *Chapter 15* begins with a more singular principle known as the “Death-desire” (**ΕΝΘΥΜΗCIC ΝΤΕ ΠΜΟΥ**) (1Ke 47.34). From this principle, which is essentially a synonym for “Matter” (**ΖΥΛΗ**) (1Ke 129.11; 180.15-16), emerge the remaining structures of the dark-realm. In this way the origin of evil is viewed as a generative process in which the Five Dark Elements, spurred on by the evil principle (variously known as Desire, Death, or Matter), develop according to an “organic” process analogous to natural phenomena such as the growth of trees and the production of fruit.

<sup>226</sup> The discourse alternates between enumerating “part” (**ΤΑΙΕ**) and “time” (**CΑΤΙ**) in the same five-part list.

Both *Chapter 6* and *Chapter 15* present conceptions of the dark-realm which may be related to different streams of Manichaean canonical tradition. For example, *Chapter 15* can be compared to the close association between the terms “Matter,” “desire,” and “Darkness” known to Ephraim (4<sup>th</sup> cent. CE), who records that Mani “constructed (the theory) that sometimes “Matter” (*hylē*) (ܚܠܐܘܬܐ) displayed purposive thought” (ܚܘܫܒܘܬܐ) [trans. Reeves #3]), while Titus of Bostra (4<sup>th</sup> cent. CE) (*Contra manichaeos*, 1.6), Theodoret (5<sup>th</sup> cent. CE), and Severus of Antioch (6<sup>th</sup> cent. CE) (likely drawing upon the same canonical source) state that “Matter” and “Darkness” were co-referential terms (89-90 [Reeves]). Theodoret also records that “Matter later divided itself into multiple worlds (αἰῶσι) and its fruits among them” (Kugener/Cumont, 152). Such presumably canonical accounts, however, can be contrasted with other statements from Theodore bar Khonai (8<sup>th</sup> cent. CE) and al-Nadīm (10<sup>th</sup> cent. CE), which both place Darkness and its Five Worlds at the beginning of their cosmogonies (Theodore bar Khonai 313.18-21 [Scher]; *Fihrist*, 777 [Dodge]). In this way, *Chapter 15*’s account can be seen to resemble fragments of canonical tradition from the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries CE, while *Chapter 5*’s account is similar to later 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> century CE accounts. This implies not only that Titus, Theodoret, and Severus drew upon a different source than Theodore and al-Nadim, but also that *Chapters 6* and *15* may have drawn upon similarly distinct material.

At any rate, in spite of these differences, the fact that the evolution of the dark-realm is elaborated by the *Kephalaia* compilers in both chapters as occurring in five basic stages accords well with parallel structures applied to the activities of the light-realm and fits with their general project of *pentadization*. The fact that these descriptions contain

clusters of five-part series is likely meant to draw special attention to the fact that the Kingdom of Darkness is also infused with patterns parallel to those of the Land of Light.

**4.4.2 King(s) of Darkness**

Just as beings from the Land of Light are often grouped by the compilers into five-part series, the same holds true for the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Darkness. In fact, figuring out the nature of such tenebrous groupings seems to have been a theological issue of great interest to the *Kephalaia* compilers. One of the best examples of this preoccupation can again be found in *Chapter 6*, which states that it was the King of the World of Smoke as the “chief of all evil and [all] wickedness” (1Ke 30.27-28), who “waged war with the Light” and “did battle with the exalted kingdom” (1Ke 30.32-33). He is said to possess five sets of characteristics: 1) five zoomorphic forms (1Ke 30.34-31.1), 2) five evil qualities of darkness, stench, ugliness, bitterness, and fire (1Ke 31.3-6), 3) a body “harder than all iron, brass, and steel” (1Ke 31.14), “magic arts” (1Ke 31.17), and the ability to understand the speech and signs of all his minions (1Ke 32.1-8), 4) he is insect like, with a thundering voice, and short-sighted, and 5) his body is gold, his taste, salty, and his spirit rules the powers of the world.

	<i>1) 5 Forms</i>	<i>2) 5 (forms)</i>	<i>3) Other</i>	<i>4) Also ...</i>	<i>5) Signs</i>
King of Smoke	head lion-faced	darkness	hard body	insect like	gold body
	hands & feet demon-faced	stench	kills w/ magic	thunder voice	salty taste
	shoulders eagle-faced	ugliness	dark languages	short-sighted	rules powers
	belly dragon-faced	bitterness			
	tail fish-faced	fire			

This rather vivid description of the dark lord, however, reveals a number of editorial seams. For instance, the compiler is not quite sure what to call the chief ruler, whom he variously names as “King of the World of Smoke” (ΠΡΡΟ ΜΠΚΟCΜΟC ΜΠΚΑΠΝΟC [1Ke 30.25]), “Archon of Smoke” (ΠΑΡΧΩΝ ΜΠΚΑ[ΠΝΟC] [1Ke 31.12]), “King (of those) of Darkness” (ΠΡΡΟ ΝΝΑΠΚΕΚΕ [1Ke 30.33; 31.2, 27-28; 32.1, 14; 33.2, 5]) or simply “King of Darkness” (ΠΡΡΟ ΜΠΚΕΚΕ [1Ke 31.24]). Also, there appears to be interwoven into this depiction of the dark lord two passages with which parallels have been identified in the Mandaean *Right Ginza*:<sup>227</sup>

<b>Passage A: Manichaean</b>	<b>Mandaean</b>
<i>Kephalaia</i> , 30.34-31.1: His head [is lion-faced, his] hands and feet are demon- [and devil-]faced, [his] shoulders are eagle-faced, while his belly [is dragon-faced,] (and) his tail is fished-faced.	<i>Right Ginza</i> , 280: His head is that of a lion, his body is that of a serpent, his wings are those of an eagle, his sides are those of a tortoise, his hands and feet are those of a demon (trans. from Puech).
<b>Passage B: Manichaean</b>	<b>Mandaean</b>
<i>Kephalaia</i> , 32.15-20: When it pleases him to walk, he spreads out all his limbs, and he walks. When it comes to his mind, he draws in his limbs and takes them to himself and rolls them into one another and he falls down like a grape or a great iron ball. He is terrible in his voice, he causes fear (and) frightens his powers by his voice.	<i>Right Ginza</i> , 280: When it pleases him, he dilates his body; when it pleases him, he makes himself small. He draws in his members and spreads them again ... his appearance is horrible, his body rank, his face distorted (trans. from Puech).

Passage A, in fact, does have a precedent in Manichaean canonical tradition, since al-Nadīm attributes the following description of Satan to Mani: “His head is the head of a lion and his body like the body of a dragon (great serpent). His wing is like the wing of a

<sup>227</sup> This is an identification already made by Polotsky in the 1940 edition. See translations of this passage by Lidzbarski, *Ginza*, 278 and Puech, “Le prince des ténèbres,” 113. Puech believed that the Mandaean passage was based on the Manichaean, due to what he called “la gaucherie” of the prior (114). Yet, the Manichaean passage is no less (if not more) “gauche” in the way in which the compiler incorporated this outside material. Rather, the Manichaean passage seems more like a development of the Mandaean. It is, however, possible that both passages drew on some unknown antecedent.



bird, his tail like the tail of a great fish, and his four feet like the feet of a beast of burden” (*Fihrist*, 778 [Dodge]). Moreover, an additional witness to this zoomorphic description can be found in *Kephalaia Chapter 27 “On the Five Forms which exist in the Archon of Darkness”* (1Ke 77.29-78.1):

As for the Archon, the leader of all the powers / [of Darkness], there are [Five Forms] in his body, according to / [the form] of the seal [of the Five] Creations which exist in the Five / Worlds of Darkness. His head has the face of a lion, which / exists in [the] World of Fire. His wings and his / [shoulders] have the face of an eagle, according to the form of the Sons of Wind. / [His hands] and [his feet] are demons, according to the form / [of the Sons] of the World of Smoke. His belly has the face of / [a dragon, according to the form of] the World of Darkness. His tail [has] / the form of the fish, which belongs to [the World of the] Sons of Water. These / Five Forms exist in him; they [have come] from the Five [Creations] / of the Five Worlds of Darkness (1Ke 77.26-78.3).

This means that we are faced with four variant descriptions of the dark-lord, each of which is expressed in five-parts.

Al-Nadīm	<i>Kephalaia</i> Ch. 6	<i>Kephalaia</i> Ch. 27	<i>Right Ginza</i> , 280
head of lion	head lion-faced	head lion-faced	head of lion
body of dragon	hands/feet demon-faced	wings eagle-faced	body of serpent
wing of bird	shoulders eagle-faced	hands/feet demons	wings of eagle
tail of fish	belly dragon-faced	belly dragon-faced	sides of tortoise
feet of beast	tail fish-faced	tail fish-faced	hands/feet of demon

There is obviously a complicated relationship between these accounts. On the one hand the descriptions from *Kephalaia Chapters 6 and 27* are essentially the same, varying only slightly in the order of their terminology,<sup>228</sup> while on the other hand, the descriptions preserved by al-Nadīm and the *Right-Ginza* agree in all but two of their features. Interestingly, however, a variant from the Mandaean description, i.e., the demonic hands and feet, is preserved by both *Kephalaia* accounts. All that we may assume is that a zoomorphic description of some sort did exist as part of Manichaean canonical tradition,

<sup>228</sup> Presumably “wings” and “shoulders” are meant to designate the same feature of the dark-lord.

although the exact composition of that description remains elusive.<sup>229</sup> After all, it seems difficult to privilege al-Nadīm’s testimony from the 10<sup>th</sup> century, even if he claims to quote Mani directly, over 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century descriptions from the *Kephalaia*.

What then, are we to make of such variations? Perhaps the compiler felt that the canonical description available to him did not achieve the desired effect, or, perhaps he was so impressed by the other account that he sought to weave it into his own literary creation—with mixed results. At any rate, the compiler seems to have been confronted by two problems: first, how to describe the chief ruler of darkness, and second, how to name him while still preserving the canonical order of dark worlds established by Mani.

Unfortunately for the compiler, Mani’s description of the dark-realm, even if it did include some sort of zoomorphic description of the dark-lord, seems to have been ambiguous at best. Theodore bar Khonai, for instance, simply records that “the Evil Nature he calls ‘King of Darkness’ and he says that he dwelt in the Land of Darkness with his Five Worlds: the World of Smoke, the World of Fire, the World of Wind, the World of Water, and the World of Darkness” (313.18-21 [Scher]), as does al-Nadīm (*Fihrist*, 777 [Dodge]). A certain amount of ambiguity even seems to have surrounded the nature of the term “World” as applied to the regions of Darkness, since according to Theodore bar Khonai, Mani employed the Syriac term ܐܠܡܐ (*‘ālam*) which can mean either “world” or “age.”<sup>230</sup> Augustine, reacting to the so-called *Fundamental Epistle* variously described these entities as *saecula* (*De natura boni*, 42) and *naturae* (*Fundamental Epistle*, Frag. 6b). In *De moribus*, however, Augustine seems to have

<sup>229</sup> Mani does seem to have described evil entities in zoomorphic terms in his *Shabuhrgan*, where he makes reference to “two lion-shaped archdemons” (Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 223).

<sup>230</sup> Cumont, *Recherches I*, 11 n.3.

imagined them as caves (*antra*) (2.19), which may dimly reflect the notion of “storehouses” (τομειῖα) known to the *Kephalaia* and Simplicius (35.65-66 [Adam]). Cumont’s suggestion that the Latin term *saecula* was selected via the Greek αἰῶνες<sup>231</sup> seems at odds with what is beginning to be known about the Coptic translation of Mani’s *Living Gospel* (from the *Synaxeis* codex) in which the Five *shekinahs* of the light-realm are called ΝΑΙΩΝ.<sup>232</sup> At any rate, few specific details other than their order, however, are given about the structure, activities, or inhabitants of these dark worlds in known canonical accounts. For instance, a fragment from the *Fundamental Epistle*<sup>233</sup> preserved by Augustine, describes the five regions of the land of darkness (this time in reverse order) impressionistically as

deep and of immeasurable extent; in it reside fiery bodies, baneful breeds. Here, emanating out of the same principle came a boundless and incalculable darkness, together with its own progeny. Beyond the darkness lay filthy whirling waters with their inhabitants; further within were terrifying and violent storms with their ruler and progenitors. Next followed another fiery region, a prey to destruction, with its leaders and peoples. In the same way there lived inside it a breed filled with gloom and smoke, among whom loitered the horrible ruler and leader of all these worlds, who had congregated around himself innumerable princes, and he himself was the spirit and source of all of them (trans. Hendry).<sup>234</sup>

In addition, Severus of Antioch recorded a statement about how “all the members of the Tree of Darkness...rose up and ascended with numerous powers impossible to calculate.”<sup>235</sup> Such descriptions drawn apparently from canonical writings do not achieve the clarity and specificity sought by the *Kephalaia* compilers. This ambiguity is (pardon

<sup>231</sup> Cumont, 11 n.3.

<sup>232</sup> Funk, *personal communication*.

<sup>233</sup> The exact nature of this writing’s relationship with the Manichaean canon remains ambiguous.

<sup>234</sup> Feldmann, *Die ‘Epistula Fundamenti’*, fragment 6a. For translation see Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 169-170.

<sup>235</sup> Kugener and Cumont, *Recherches sur le manichéisme II*, 125.

the pun) in *stark* contrast to the light realm, where the Father of Greatness, as we have seen, dwells with his Five Limbs, and from which emanates a well-known cast of characters including the First Man and his Five Sons, the Living Spirit and his Five Sons, as well as the Third Ambassador, the Virgin of Light, and Jesus the Splendour. It would seem then that the compiler of *Chapter 6* for some reason felt compelled to clarify just what Mani meant by his seemingly abbreviated, or simply ambiguous, description of the dark-realm and to create a greater degree of *parallelism* with the World of Light. His efforts, however, left a number of obvious traces.

In order to frame and re-enforce this clarification, the compiler of *Chapter 6* gave five-part structures a central compositional role. In the first place, the chapter title (which may in fact have been added at some later stage of the textual history) somewhat awkwardly enumerates five *sets of five* to be discussed in the chapter, namely, 1) the Five Storehouses, 2) the Five Rulers, 3) the Five Spirits, 4) the Five Bodies, and 5) the Five Tastes, while (as we have seen) the introductory frame re-emphasizes the thematic centrality of five by means of a *cluster* of five statements (see above). Then, the central discourse begins, which is itself divided into five parts dealing with the five Kings of Darkness, with (as we have also seen) the section about the King of the World of Smoke itself divided into five parts:

- 1) King of the World of Smoke, chief of evil (1Ke 30.25-33)
  - 1) 5 Forms are in him (1Ke 30.33-31.2)
    - i) head lion-faced
    - ii) hands-/ feet demon-/ devil-faced
    - iii) shoulders eagle-faced
    - iv) belly dragon-faced
    - v) tail fish-faced
  - 2) Also, 5 (additional) forms in him (1Ke 31.3-7)
    - i) darkness
    - ii) stench
    - iii) ugliness
    - iv) bitterness
    - v) fire

- 3) 3 other things (1Ke 31.8-32.13)
    - i) body is harder than any metal
    - ii) kills with his magic arts  
(*Interpolated admonition: Keep away from magic! [1Ke 31.24-33]*)
    - iii) knows languages of 5 worlds
  - 4) Also, (1Ke 32.14-32.30)
    - i) he can spread out his limbs or draw them in like an insect.
    - ii) his voice is terrible like thunder
    - iii) he can't see what is far away
  - 5) These are his evil signs and symbols (1Ke 32.30-33.8)
    - i) his body is gold
    - ii) his taste is salty
    - iii) he rules over the powers and authorities of the world.
- 2) The King of the Worlds of Fire (1Ke 33.9-17)
    - i) lion-faced
    - ii) brass body
    - iii) sour taste
    - iv) his spirit rules the kings of the world and the fire-worshiping sect
  - 3) The King of the Worlds of Wind (1Ke 33.18-24)
    - i) eagle-faced
    - ii) iron body
    - iii) hot taste
    - iv) his spirit rules idol-worshippers
  - 4) The King of the World of Water (1Ke 33.25-32)
    - i) fish-faced
    - ii) silver body
    - iii) sweet taste
    - iv) his spirit rules the baptists
  - 5) The King of the World of Darkness (1Ke 33.33-34.1)
    - i) dragon-faced
    - ii) tin body
    - iii) bitter taste
    - iv) his spirit rules oracles and soothsayers

The descriptions of the Five Kings in *Chapter 6* may be summarized by the following table, which reveals that structurally the chapter as a whole enumerates five sets of five: 1) five rulers, 2) five faces, 3) five bodies, 4) five tastes, and 5) spirits or sphere of influence:

<i>5 rulers</i>	<i>5 faces</i>	<i>5 bodies</i>	<i>5 tastes</i>	<i>5 spirits (rule)</i>
(King of Smoke)	(all-faced)	(gold body)	(salty taste)	(powers that be)
King of Fire	lion-faced	brass body	sour taste	fire-worshippers
King of Wind	eagle-faced	iron body	hot taste	idol-worshippers
King of Water	fish-faced	silver body	sweet taste	Baptists
King of Darkness	dragon-faced	tin body	bitter taste	oracles etc.

While the concept of Five Worlds of Darkness is relatively well attested in canonical sources (Theodore bar Khonai 313.19 [Scher]; implied by *Fundamental Epistle*, Frag. 6b; al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 777 [Dodge]),<sup>236</sup> in the *Kephalaia* they are known not only as “Five Worlds of Darkness” (1Ke 31.2; 32.2; 48.17; 48.15; 58.9; 74.29; 77.28; 78.3; 167.23; 169.10; 169.13), but also as “Five Worlds of Flesh” (1Ke 26.33; 48.19; 121.20; 123.3; 177.18; 266.14) and “Five Storehouses” (1Ke 28.8; 30.13; 30.17; 155.19). The explicit idea of Five Kings or Archons is known almost exclusively from *Chapter 6*,<sup>237</sup> where they are also called the “Five Spirits” (1Ke 30.15; 30.23; 34.9). This, in itself, may not be that surprising given the confusion that seems to have been created for the compiler of *Chapter 6*,<sup>238</sup> who (as we saw above) found it difficult to reconcile the title “King of Darkness” with the fact that “smoke” is the first of the canonical Five Dark Elements. Nevertheless, the need to dissect the chief ruler of darkness into five sub-rulers is essentially a reflection of the compiler’s desire to identify and attribute a particular governing spirit or authority to what he perceived as five spheres of negative influence in the world. In the end, this association serves as the take-home message of this particular chapter.

The danger of these Five Spirits is emphasized at the end of *Chapter 6*, where we find a grave admonition placed in the mouth of Mani: “Therefore I tell you, my brothers and my members, perfect faithful and holy elect: Keep your hearts with you and keep yourselves from the Five Slaveries of the Five Dark Spirits. Abandon the worship of their

---

<sup>236</sup> We cannot say, however, as Gardner and Lieu have recently suggested, that “elaborate descriptions of the kingdom of darkness, and its powers, are a feature of Manichaean...writings that must derive from canonical sources (*Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 199).

<sup>237</sup> The idea of a ruler for each world is also implied by the *Fundamental Epistle* (Fragment 6b [Feldmann]).

<sup>238</sup> This may even represent an innovation on the part of the Chapter 6 compiler.

Five Bodies. Do not interact with them, so that you might escape their bond and their punishment forever” (1Ke 34.6-12). This passage needs to be placed in its social context if it is to become comprehensible. As such, the King of the World of Smoke, the chief, is said to rule over the “powers and authorities of the earth and the whole world...those who rule over all of creation, as they humble people in their tyranny according to their will” (1Ke 33.6-8), a reference that could conceivably be applied to authorities in both the Persian and Rome Empires. The King of the World of Fire is said to rule the “kings of the world” as well as the “Sects who worship fire” (1Ke 33.15-17), no doubt a more explicit reference to the Sassanian Kings and their Zoroastrian clergy. The King of the World of Wind, in turn, rules in “every temple, *eidoleion*, place of worship, statues and images, shrines of worldly Error” (1Ke 33.22-24), presumably those who follow the traditional cults. The King of the World of Water is said to rule “those who baptize with water” (1Ke 33.31), a reference to either Christians, Elchasaites, or perhaps even Mandaeans, while the King of the World of Darkness can be found in the utterances of soothsayers, oracles, and seers (1Ke 34.3-4), seemingly the more popular religious practices of the time. The compiler’s effort to associate a dark ruler with each of these spheres of influences was probably driven by a desire either to draw, or more likely, to keep members of the Manichaean church away from them and in the fold. After the withdrawal of Persian imperial support, which resulted in Mani’s execution in 276/277 CE, his community experienced a period of harsh repression, persecution, and no doubt apostasy. As a result there would have been a strong desire, on the part of Manichaean teachers, missionaries, and catechists, to clearly define the dangers associated with these oppressive and competing spheres of political and religious influence, and to do so in a

way that contributed to and strengthened the coherence and symmetry of the Manichaean system. Therefore, as Manichaean missionaries and catechists moved from Mesopotamia into Egypt and the *Kephalaia* (as we know it) began to take shape, numerical patterns, especially in terms of five-part structures, played a key role in how this coherence and symmetry was achieved and communicated.

#### 4.4.3 Astrological Polemic

The third major theme addressed by the *Kephalaia* compilers in their descriptions of the dark-realm is the relation of the dark-powers, specifically the Five Worlds of Darkness, to the twelve signs of the Zodiac and the seven planetary powers. While there are references to the “Twelve Spirits of Error” in *Chapter 15 “[On the] ... Five [Parts] ... World of ...”* (1Ke 48.34) and anthropomorphic accounts of their cosmic distribution in *Chapter 70 “On the Body, that it was made to resemble the Cosmos”* (1Ke 173.21-175.4), the most explicit description of the relationship between the dark powers and the Zodiac can be found in *Chapter 69 “On the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac and the Five Stars.”* In this chapter the disciples question Mani about what powers rule over the Zodiac and the so-called “Five Stars.” In response, Mani is made to begin his discourse with an (unsuccessful) attempt at distributing the twelve signs in pairs to the Five Worlds of Darkness, which inevitably leads to the attribution of three signs to two of the worlds.

This, however, is how it should be understood: They / are drawn from the **Five Worlds of Darkness**, are bound in the / Sphere, and two zodiacal signs are taken per world. The Twin<sup>239</sup> / and the Archer<sup>240</sup> belong to the World of Smoke, which / is the Mind. Also, the Ram<sup>241</sup> and the Lion<sup>242</sup> belong to the / World of Fire. The

---

<sup>239</sup> i.e., Gemini.

<sup>240</sup> i.e., Sagittarius.

<sup>241</sup> i.e., Aries.

<sup>242</sup> i.e., Leo.



Bull,<sup>243</sup> the Water-bearer,<sup>244</sup> and the Scales,<sup>245</sup> / belong to the World of Wind. The Crab<sup>246</sup> and the Virgin<sup>247</sup> / and the Fish<sup>248</sup> belong to the World of Water. The Goat-horn<sup>249</sup> / and the Scorpion<sup>250</sup> belong to the World of Darkness. These are / [the] twelve Archons of wickedness, those who wickedness does not / ... .. For they commit every evil and / ... [in the] world, either in the tree or in the flesh (1Ke 167.22-167.33).

Following this, each of the “Five Stars” (i.e., planets) is associated with a particular dark world: 1) Zeus/Jupiter to Smoke, 2) Aphrodite/Venus to Fire, 3) Ares/Mars to Wind, 4) Hermes/Mercury to Water, and 5) Kronos/Saturn to Darkness (1Ke 167.34-168.6). Then, in the third section of the discourse, the signs are divided according to the quadrants of the sky (1Ke 168.16-23).

What follows is a sort of astronomical revisionism, whereby the Sun and Moon, normally counted among the seven planets by ancient astronomy but cherished by Manichaeans as Light-ships, are substituted by “Two Ascendants.” According to *Chapter 69*, Mani is made to state that “these seven, which we have named—the Five Stars and the Two Ascendants (ANABIBAZON)—they are the evil-doers who perpetuate every wickedness and evil in every single land” (1Ke 168.11-13).

According to Roger Beck, the *anabibazon* is an astronomical concept that represents, along with the *katabibazon*, the two points (or “nodes”) at which the orbits of the Sun and Moon intersect on a monthly basis.<sup>251</sup> According to Beck, this seemingly straightforward astronomical concept may have been interpreted in a sinister light by Manichaeans due to the fact that it is at one of these two points that eclipses of the Sun

---

<sup>243</sup> i.e., Taurus.

<sup>244</sup> i.e., Aquarius.

<sup>245</sup> i.e., Libra.

<sup>246</sup> i.e., Cancer.

<sup>247</sup> i.e., Virgo.

<sup>248</sup> i.e., Pisces.

<sup>249</sup> i.e., Capricorn.

<sup>250</sup> i.e., Scorpio.

<sup>251</sup> “Anabibazontes,” 193.

and Moon may occur.<sup>252</sup> In addition, the fact that these nodes appear to “move” led to their being considered as quasi-planets and to their eventual incorporation into late antique astrology as the “head and tail” of a great dragon responsible for eclipses.<sup>253</sup> Moreover, in Zoroastrian tradition, the nodes came to represent a “Dark Sun” and “Dark Moon” that acted as agents of Ahriman.<sup>254</sup> Yet according to Beck, this reference to the *anabibazontes* in the *Kephalaia* likely represents the “earliest unambiguous attested instance of the demonization of the lunar nodes.”<sup>255</sup> This became necessary due to the fact that Manichaean theology demanded the removal of the Sun and Moon from the standard series of seven planets,<sup>256</sup> thereby requiring substitutes in the form of the *anabibazontes*. The substitution, however, remains somewhat awkward, given the fact that, while the compiler of *Chapter 69* is determined to associate *five* of the planets with the Five Worlds of Darkness, ancient astronomy recognized *seven*. Without this substitution of the Sun and Moon by the nodes Manichaeans would have appeared to violate ancient astronomical *koinē*, thereby discrediting any claims to astronomical orthodoxy, especially in Mesopotamia where rival religious groups such as Zoroastrians and Mandaeans appears to have been steeped in astrological speculations.<sup>257</sup> Yet even in spite of Manichaean efforts to talk about astronomical concepts, observers such as

<sup>252</sup> “Anabibazontes,” 193-194.

<sup>253</sup> Beck, “Anabibazontes,” 194. Seventh century CE Syriac author Severus Sebokht explained that this dragon is known as the *athalia* (ܐܬܠܝܐ) (Nau, “La cosmographie,” 253-4), a term attested in both the Manichaean *Psalm-book* (2Ps 196.8: ܐܬܠܝܐ) and Syriac Manichaean fragments (Burkitt, *Religion of the Manichees*, 114: ܐܬܠܝܐ). According to his description of Indian astronomy, al-Biruni states that “the dragon’s head” is counted among the unlucky stars by the Hindus (*India*, 212 [Sachau]).

<sup>254</sup> Beck, “Anabibazontes,” 195. See *Bundahišn*, 49.12 (MacKenzie, “Zoroastrian Astrology,” 8).

<sup>255</sup> “Anabibazontes,” 195-196.

<sup>256</sup> Mani attributed his recognition of the true nature of the Sun and Moon to Jesus in a fragment preserved by al-Biruni (*India*, 284 [Sachau]).

<sup>257</sup> Mandaeans, for instance, spoke about the “seven and the twelve” as malevolent powers (Widengren, *Mani*, 69).

Alexander of Lycopolis and, later, Augustine remained unconvinced.<sup>258</sup> That Manichaeans were “amateurs” in astrology<sup>259</sup> does in fact appear to be the case when we do a close reading of *Kephalaia Chapter 69*, which contains significant compositional or editorial flaws.<sup>260</sup> Similarly, the following chapter, *Chapter 70 “On the Body, that it was made to resemble the Cosmos,”* contains two conflicting melothesiac<sup>261</sup> descriptions of the Zodiac:

<i>Signs of the Zodiac</i>	<i>Description A: 1Ke 174.3-10</i>	<i>Description B: 1Ke 174.21-175.2</i>
<i>Ram/Aries</i>	Head	Right Temple
<i>Bull/Taurus</i>	Neck & Shoulders	Right Shoulder
<i>Twin/Gemini</i>	2 Forearms	Right Forearm
<i>Crab/Cancer</i>	Oesophagus	Right Rib
<i>Lion/Leo</i>	Stomach	Right Stomach
<i>Virgin/Virgo</i>	Heart	Right Intestines
<i>Scales/Libra</i>	Spine & Intestines	Left Belly
<i>Scorpion/Scorpio</i>	Chest	Left Rib
<i>Archer/Sagittarius</i>	Loins	Left Breast & Kidney
<i>Goat-horn/Capricorn</i>	Feet	Left Elbow
<i>Water-bearer/Aquarius</i>	Shinbones	Left Shoulder
<i>Fish/Pisces</i>	Soles of feet	Left Temple

This chapter, which as Gardner has suggested was likely drawn from “a number of separate sources,”<sup>262</sup> although re-enforcing the compiler’s anthropomorphic view of the cosmos, does little to establish his credentials as a serious astrologer.

What then are we to make of this lively, although somewhat incoherent, interest in astrological speculation? Stegemann suggested that the association of the signs of the

<sup>258</sup> Alexander joked that Manichaeans should have “occasionally visited the astronomers” (*Contra manichaei opiniones disputatio*, 22), while Augustine could not reconcile his private study of astronomy with Manichaean teachings (cited by Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 178). See also Ferrari, “Astronomy and Augustine,” 263-276, who suggests that eclipses witnessed by Augustine played a role in his break with Manichaeism.

<sup>259</sup> Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 179.

<sup>260</sup> Such as the attribution of *three* signs to two of the five worlds.

<sup>261</sup> A similar concept relating the parts of the body to the Zodiac is described by al-Biruni in his chapter on Indian astronomy (*India*, 218 [Sachau]). Nagel compared these arrangements to melothesiac lists from the *Apocryphon of John*, although these are not put in relation to the Zodiac (“Anatomie des Menschen,” 91). According to Nagel, such formulations are a reflection of the tendency (or “mania” for that matter) of Manichaean discourse for typology, analogy, harmony, and symmetry (“Anatomie des Menschen,” 91).

<sup>262</sup> Gardner, *Kephalaia of the Teacher*, 179.

Zodiac with the Five Worlds was some kind of game with the aspects intended to show the adversarial relationship of the signs to one another.<sup>263</sup> This explanation, however, seems too obscure and technical to have generated any real meaning, even to an educated Manichaean Elect. Instead, I would suggest that the aim of *Chapter 69* might not have been astrological at all, but rather polemical. As we have seen, the compilers went to great lengths in *Chapter 6* to associate each of the Five Dark Worlds with particular spheres of political or religious influence. Thus, it is possible that a similar manoeuvre is at least being attempted in *Chapter 69*. For example, while in *Chapter 6* the World of Smoke was associated with Roman and Sassanian imperial authorities, *Chapter 69*'s attribution of the Twin (Gemini) and the Archer (Sagittarius) may involve a similar symbolic association. Similarly, the association of the Crab (Cancer), the Virgin (Virgo) and the Fish (Pisces) with the World of Water, could reflect *Chapter 6*'s association of this world with rival Christian and "Baptist" groups. This interpretation (already implied by Khosroyev),<sup>264</sup> although highly speculative, seems at least plausible, given the penchant of the compilers for associating mythological formations with concrete social realities. After all, allegorical interpretations of the signs are known in Jewish,<sup>265</sup> Judaeo-Christian,<sup>266</sup> Gnostic,<sup>267</sup> mainstream Christian,<sup>268</sup> and even Mithraic<sup>269</sup> circles, and the

---

<sup>263</sup> Stegemann, "Zu Kapitel 69," 217-218, followed by Widengren, *Mani*, 70-71.

<sup>264</sup> Khosroyev, "Zu einer astronomischen Realie," 349.

<sup>265</sup> A number of ancient synagogues contained mosaic representations of the Zodiac. See Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*; Hachlili, "The Zodiac in Ancient Jewish Art," 61-77; Ness, "Astrology and Judaism," 126-133.

<sup>266</sup> The signs were associated first with the twelve patriarchs and were then transferred to the twelve apostles (Daniélou, "Les douze apôtres et le zodiaque," 14-21).

<sup>267</sup> Welburn, "The Identity of the Archons," 241-254.

<sup>268</sup> See Zeno of Verona, *Tractatus de duodecim signis ad neophytos* (CCSL 22), 105-106; Hübner, "Das Horoskop der Christen," 120-137.

<sup>269</sup> Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, 153.

planets themselves were sometimes associated by Hellenistic astrologers with particular religious groups.<sup>270</sup>

At any rate, regardless of whatever polemical or scientific intentions may have been behind such formulations, it is at least clear that the *Kephalaia* compilers, like so many other aspects of reality, viewed the astrological powers as basically pentadic in structure. This is emphasized also by a passage from *Chapter 57 "On the Generation of Adam,"* where (also in the form of a *cluster*) Mani is made to describe how

They (i.e., human beings) have increased, extended, and diminished / because there are **Five Types of Authority** and / **Guide** set in the sphere of the Zodiac and the / heavens which are above it. They have <Five><sup>271</sup> **Names**, by which / they are called. The first name is the "Year", the / second is the "Month", the third is the "Day", the / [fourth] is the "Hour", (and) the fifth is the "Moment." These **Five / Places** and these **Five Dwellings** are found in the sphere and / the heavens. These regions have **Five Powers** ruling over / them (1Ke 145.7-16).

In this chapter a certain Babylonian catechumen has questioned Mani about why the lifespan of Adam and his generation seemed so much longer than the people of their time. Mani is made to respond by saying that Five Authorities rule the various life-spans of beings in the world, from year to month to day to hour to moment. The fact that people's lives are becoming increasingly short means that the end is near and that their light substance is dwindling. Whereas Adam and Eve were full of light substance, their lives were longer, they were larger, and produced more offspring, contemporary people are small, ugly and evil, meaning that they are nearly void of light. While this discourse is meant to address the apparent discrepancy between the life-spans of biblical figures and later generations, the explanation is framed by a pentadic conception of both the astrological powers and their influence on history, which is itself conceived of as having

<sup>270</sup> For instance, Jupiter with Zoroastrianism, Mars with idolaters, or Venus with Arab religion (Khosroyev, "Zu einer astronomischen Realie," 349 n.32.

<sup>271</sup> Polotsky/Böhlig, 145.10 note.

five phases. This, of course, represents yet another example of the pervasive emphasis on five-part structures presented by the compilers.

This desire to present a set of astrological speculations based on pentads, although no doubt influenced by the same *pentadization* process observed above, was also driven in this case by a systemic contradiction generated by Manichaean veneration of the Sun and Moon and their generally negative evaluation of five of the canonical seven planets. In this way, the pentadization of the planets can be seen less as a stylistic or ideological preference and more as a response to a genuine doctrinal problem.

But why go to such great lengths to emphasize the pentadic structure of the powers of Darkness if this is already a quality possessed by the powers of Light? On the doctrinal level, the system appears to demand it, particularly when, as in the image of the Two Trees, the natures are depicted as essentially symmetrical in orientation, with parallel sets of Five Limbs attached to two coeternal sources of being. Besides, as we have seen, Mani himself appears to have described the Land of Darkness as made up of Five Elemental Worlds, although, unlike the Realm of Light, he seems to have left fewer clues as to what impact such a structure had on other aspects of evil. Thus, the *Kephalaia* compilers were forced to build upon and expand existing material. One particularly difficult issue for the compilers seems to have been the way in which Mani ordered the Dark Elements, with Smoke first and Darkness last. This, as we saw in *Chapter 6*, caused a great deal of confusion for the compiler, who found it difficult to reconcile a being called “King of Darkness” with the fact that the World of Darkness came fifth in the canonical series. Similarly, the relation of the Sun and Moon to the planets also caused a theological quandary. Such traces of conflicting and contradictory ideas indicated that

## CHAPTER 4: FIVE-PART NUMERIC PATTERNING IN THE *KEPHALAI* 111

even at the stage when the surviving text was being edited, the *Kephalaia* compilers were still engaged in sorting out some of the difficulties contained within the canonical tradition.

#### 4.5 OTHER TYPES OF PATTERNING

Aside from five-part patterns dealing with specific structural and operational aspects of either the light or dark realms, a variety of other pentadic formulations can also be found in the *Kephalaia* dealing with a range of 1) soteriological, 2) ethical 3) ecclesiological, 4) polemical, and 5) aetiological themes.

##### 4.5.1 Soteriological Patterning

The *Kephalaia* compilers' efforts to present general soteriological themes in five-parts is evident in *Chapter 13* "On the Five Saviours Resurrecting the Dead, along with the Five Resurrections," *Chapter 16b* (On the Five Advents), *Chapter 18* "[On the Five] Wars [which the] Sons of Light waged with [the Sons] of Darkness," *Chapter 19* "On the Five Releases; what they mean," *Chapter 103* "On the Five Wonderworks that the Light-Mind reveals to the Elect," *Chapter 112b* (On the Five Things Revealed by Jesus), and *Chapter 176* "On the Spiritual Transition in Five(?) Forms and that through which the Church changes."

*Chapter 13* presents a series of "Five Resurrecting Saviours" (†ΟΥ Ν̄ΗΡ̄ ΝΡΕϚ†ΟΥΝΟΥϚ) (1Ke 45.17), although the fragmentation of the text allows for the identification of only the third and fourth. In this series, the Father is placed in third position, which appears strange given the importance usually accorded to him as the foundation of all subsequent being, while Light-Mind is placed in fourth position.

In *Chapter 18*, the confrontation with the dark-realm is presented as a series of "[Five] Wars" ([†ΟΥ] ΜΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ)<sup>272</sup> waged by the "Sons of Light" (ΝΩΗΡΕ

<sup>272</sup> †ΟΥ has been restored (1Ke 58.2). Even though only four of the wars are readable, I am assuming, based on this restoration, that five wars were described.



**ΜΠΟΥΛΙΝΕ**) (1Ke 58.2-3). Here an additional series of “five sons” is created, although this time using primary actors not normally designated as “sons” such as First Man, Living Spirit, Third Messenger, Jesus the Splendour, and Call & Response. Again, as in *Chapter 16*, the three-part canonical version of the myth is transformed into a series of five conflicts. Interestingly, the same five figures appear in *Chapter 16b*<sup>273</sup> as a series of five “advents” (**ΝΟΙΝΕΙ**), with the “advent” of each agent assigned to a particular metaphor. The advent of First Man, for instance, is compared to a noble son deceived by his enemies (1Ke 50.19-20), while the advent of Living Spirit is compared to a judge sent by a king to quell an uprising (1Ke 50.28 ff). The advent of the Third Messenger, in turn, is likened to a king who comes to inspect the work of his artisans (1Ke 52.22 ff), while the advent of Jesus the Splendour evokes the image of a man sent to root out and burn evil trees (1Ke 53.19-27). Finally, the advent of Call & Response is compared to the homely image of butter being melted into warm milk (1Ke 54.26 ff). *Chapter 19* again presents the same series, only this time it is identified as the “Five Releases” (**ΤΤΕ ΝΟΙΝΡΒΑΛ**) or “Liberations” (**ΝΟΙΝΤΟΥΩ**). The fragmentary state of the chapter has obscured many of the details, but in general we find here an additional formulation of Manichaean soteriology in five parts.

Also on the soteriological level, there are a small number of five-part structures relating specifically to the influence of the Light-Mind on the individual. For instance, in *Chapter 103* “*On the Five Wonderworks that the Light-Mind reveals to the Elect*” Mani

<sup>273</sup> As we can see, Chapter 16 somewhat awkwardly juxtaposes two different series, one labelled as the Five Greatnesses and the other (presumably) the Five Advents. This may indicate that two separate *kephalaia* have been combined together to form a single chapter. After all, the benediction at the close of Chapter 16 mentions only the Five Advents, a series that is described in elaborate detail, while the Five Greatnesses are given only an abbreviated, formulaic description (see Gardner, *Kephalaia of the Teacher*, 54).

is made to describe “Five Light Signs” (†ΟΥ ΜΜΕΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΑΙΝΕ) (1Ke 257.13) that the Light-Mind works among the Elect, namely, 1) Wisdom, 2) Faith, 3) ... , 4) Love, and 5) Severity of Judgment (1Ke 257.13-24). It is by means of these Five Signs that the Light-Mind “purifies, refines, raises, and saves” (1Ke 257. 29-30) the New Man. Although this series of qualities differs from that of the canonical Five Virtues discussed above, which includes 1) Love, 2) Faith, 3) Perfection, 4) Patience, and 5) Wisdom, there is an ecclesiological context to *Chapter 103* that seems to justify the arrangement. Whereas Wisdom is the product of the Elect’s preaching activity, Faith is the desired result among his hearers. The unknown third quality appears to promote peace in the community, while Love is engendered among the brothers and sisters. Finally, Severity of Judgment enables the Elect to purify the community of error. In this way, the “Five Light Signs” revealed by the Light-Mind, although soteriological in nature, are ecclesiological in orientation and can thus be seen to cross over into this category.

An additional soteriological pattern can be found in *Chapter 112b (On the Five Things Revealed by Jesus)*.<sup>274</sup> According to this chapter, Jesus is said to have revealed “Five Great Things” (1Ke 268.4) to humanity: 1) its affiliation with the race of Light, 2) the condition of the Aeon of Greatness, 3) the heroic activities of the Light, 4) the purpose of his mission, and 5) the imprisonment of the rebels (1Ke 268.5-18). This list essentially constitutes the “gnosis” originally delivered by Jesus to Adam and Eve (1Ke 268.2) and, later, by all the “apostles” to humanity. The motif that Jesus revealed to Adam his true nature is recorded by both Theodore bar Khonai (317.15-28 [Scher]) and al-Nadim (*Fihrist*, 784 [Dodge]) as attributed to Mani, although neither source records

<sup>274</sup> Here I am taking 1Ke 267.18-268.18 as a separate chapter that has been embedded within Chapter 112 “The Human Being is less than all the Things of the Cosmos, and He is more shipwrecked than them All” (1Ke 266.3-268.27). This section even has its own Q & A frame (1Ke 267.18-28).

such a specific, five-part elaboration of this message. Thus, once again, the compiler seems to have shaped canonical material into a pentadic frame.

A final soteriological pattern can be found in *Chapter 176 "On the Spiritual Transition in Five(?) Forms and that through which the Church changes."* In this rather fragmentary chapter, several series of five "transitions" (**ΜΜΕΤΑΒΑCIC**) are described. The first series appears to describe the movement of the individual towards righteousness and entry into the Holy Church (1Ke 453.4-455.6), while the second series describes the fate of the soul after death, as it passes through the various stations and light-vehicles to its eventual reunification with the Father (1Ke 455.7-456.17). This second series then appears to be re-expressed, although this time with slight variations in detail and an association with the "Five Dwellings" (**†ΟΥ ΜΜΟΝΗ**) (1Ke 458ff). While the exact details of these transition series are impossible to reconstruct, it is at least clear that the movements of the soul were seen as taking place in five-stages.

These chapters demonstrate the degree to which the *Kephalaia* compilers viewed their drama of salvation as a five-act play, rather than the three acts established by the founder of their religion.

#### **4.5.2 Ethical Patterning**

Pentadic structures play a role in Manichaean ethics as well, particularly in *Chapter 91 "Also on the Catechumen, who is saved in a Single Body," Chapter 146: "The Old Man has Five Foods to live on; the New Man has Five Others," Chapter 165 "Envy exists in Five Forms" and Chapter 189 "[On the Five Temptations]."*

*Chapter 91* contains two discourses on Catechumenate ethics. For the first discourse, Mani is questioned by an Elect about how a Catechumen can avoid the process of reincarnation. In response, Mani is made to describe three sets of five characteristics that the Catechumen must possess. First, the Catechumen must regard 1) his wife as stranger, 2) his house as an inn, 3) his family as fellow travellers, 4) his possessions as borrowed, and 5) his thoughts must always be on God (1Ke 228.24-229.6). Second, the Catechumen must practice *enkrateia* by 1) not eating meat, 2) fasting and prayer, 3) almsgiving, 4) lack of malice, and 5) devotion to the church (1Ke 229.20-29). Third, the good Catechumens can be known by the fact that they are 1) like the “good pearl” mentioned in Mani’s *Treasure of Life*, 2) not bound by the enemy, 3) purified according to their deeds, 4) healed and purified, and 5) constantly at prayer (1Ke 230.6-29). For the second part of the discourse, Mani is asked about what happens to the prior sins of those Catechumens who were idolaters, blasphemers, murderers, and magicians before entering the church (1Ke 231.12-24). In response, Mani is made to argue that as long as such a Catechumen 1) accepts the faith, 2) separates Light from Darkness, 3) perceives the mystery of the Living Soul, 4) receives the right-hand of peace, and 5) prays to the Light-Mind for forgiveness (1Ke 232.1-8) all prior sins will be forgiven. In addition, the Catechumen’s position may be improved by 1) abstinence, 2) vigils, 3) fasting, 4) care for the Living Soul, and 5) prayer (1Ke 233.5-14). What follows is an account of how the Catechumen’s sin is divided into five-parts. While four of these parts may be forgiven by the church, the fifth requires further purification (1Ke 233.21-234.20).

Essentially what *Chapter 91* presents is four sets of five-part ethical patterns, two from the first discourse (Discourse A) and two from the second (Discourse B):

Discourse A (1)	Discourse A (2)	Discourse B (1)	Discourse B (2)
abstinence	vegetarian diet	faith	abstinence
hospitality	fasting and prayer	separation of natures	vigils
detachment from family	almsgiving	mystery of Living Soul	fasting
detachment from things	lack of malice	right-hand of peace	care for Living Soul
piety	devotion to church	prayer to Light-Mind	prayer

It is interesting, however, to compare what relation these five-part ethical patterns might have with the “Ten Commandments,” which according to al-Nadīm, Mani established for the Hearers (i.e., Catechumens) (*Fihrist*, 789 [Dodge]), and which are known in various branches of Manichaeism,<sup>275</sup> against 1) idol-worship, 2) lying, 3) greed, 4) killing, 5) fornication, 6) theft, 7) pretences/false teaching, 8) sorcery, 9) doubt, and 10) sloth.<sup>276</sup> In fact, there is little in either of *Chapter 91*’s lists to suggest any conformity with the canonical list from al-Nadīm, although four of the canonical commandments appear to be alluded to when Mani is asked about the prior sins of idolaters, blasphemers, murderers, and magicians just before the second discourse.

It appears as though the compiler of *Chapter 91*, although apparently interested in the Ten Commandments of the Catechumenate, has decided to divide two variant sets of them into two sets of five, to which he has appended in each case a five-part discussion of purity. It is difficult to imagine why this was done, except perhaps in response to a greater need for ethical flexibility depending on the type of person entering the Catechumenate. Could it be that a generally upstanding person entering the church was subject to a slightly different set of criteria than someone with a criminal past? We cannot be sure. What is clear is that the compiler of *Chapter 91* has rejected a ten-part ethical framework in favour of one with five parts.

<sup>275</sup> See Sims-Williams, “The Manichaean Commandments,” 577-578.

<sup>276</sup> Sims-Williams, “Manichaean Commandments,” 578.

*Chapter 146* presents the radical difference between what influences and sustains the individual prior to and post conversion. Whereas prior to conversion the individual is sustained by 1) physical beauty, 2) evil discourses and myths, 3) beautiful works (of some kind), 4) worldly foods, and 5) sexual desire (1Ke 349.24-350.3), after conversion this sustenance is exchanged for 1) the spirit of the church leaders, 2) liturgical prayer, 3) joy, 4) itinerate preaching, and 5) scripture (1Ke 349.5-18). As is so often the case in *Kephalaia* theology, good and evil, although radically different in their nature, are conceived of as structurally analogous. Just as the Good and Evil Trees both have Five Limbs, so too are the Old Man and New Man driven by five sources of nourishment.

Unfortunately, while the lacunous state of *Chapter 165* completely obscures the five forms of envy, two of the five temptations can be read from *Chapter 189*, namely the fourth, desire for women (1Ke 485.23), and the fifth, apostasy during persecution (1Ke 485.30-486.7). Somewhat clearer is the distinction made by *Chapter 193* between the “Five Properties” of the Evil One and the Good One. To the “Evil One” are attributed 1) ..., 2) slander, 3) murder, 4) greed, and 5) mixing of light and dark (1Ke 490.27-29), while to the “Good One” are attributed 1) fasting, 2) grief, 3) almsgiving, 4) faith, and 5) separation of light and dark (1Ke 491.5-6). Here, again, the qualitative rather than the structural difference between the two natures is emphasized.

It is interesting to note that in none of these ethical chapters is reference made to the canonical “Five Virtues” of 1) love, 2) faith, 3) perfection, 4) patience, and 5) wisdom known from Mani’s *Epistles* (50.9-14) and al-Nadīm (*Fihrist*, 777 [Dodge]). This indicates yet another deviation from canonical traditions by the compilers.

### 4.5.3 Ecclesiological Patterning

While we could see that some of the soteriological patterns discussed above had certain ecclesiological overtones, one *Kephalaia* chapter in particular, *Chapter 137* “*On the Five Types of Brotherhood that are distinguished from one another,*” contains an important discussion of ecclesiological issues. In this chapter, a distinction is made between five types of individuals who form part of or are associated with the Holy Church, namely 1) brothers, 2) children, 3) disciples, 4) “day-labourers,” and 5) slaves (1Ke 338.25-27). “Brothers” are the “people of righteousness” (ΝΡΩΜΕ ΝΤΑ[ΙΚΑΙΟCΥΝΗ]) (1Ke 338.29) guided by the Light-Mind, while the “children” are “considerate people” (ΝΡΜΜΜΑΚΜΕΚ) (1Ke 339.9) who always follow the ways of truth. “Disciples” are described as “splendid sheep” (ΝΕCΑΥ ΜΠΡΙΕ) (1Ke 339.17), who follow their teacher in patience, while “day-labourers” are those whose commitment to the Church is not total (1Ke 339.21-29). Finally, “slaves” are vain and disobedient people who flee at the first signs of persecution (1Ke 340.1-12). Interestingly, while the discourse classifies Church members according to these five groups, the reader is encouraged to reject the last two as “foreign races” (ΜΠΙΓΕΝΟC CNEY ΝΩΜΜΟ) (340.14).<sup>277</sup> While this five-fold division of the Church appears to have nothing to do with the formal, five-part hierarchy of 1) Teachers, 2) Bishops, 3) Presbyters/Elders, 4) Elect, and 5) Hearers known from a variety of Manichaean sources,<sup>278</sup> it is important to remember that what is being described by *Chapter 137* are not formal, ecclesiastical classes but rather types of

<sup>277</sup>This represents a kind of stylistic division sometimes employed in the *Kephalaia* whereby a five-part series is divided into three good and two bad components. A similar effect is achieved by Chapter 39 “On the Three Days and the Two Deaths,” in which the doctrine of “Three Times” is contrasted with two moments of defeat for the Darkness.

<sup>278</sup>Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 77-78; Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 27.

relationships. Whereas acceptable members of the Church behave like “brothers,” “children,” or “disciples,” unacceptable members act with the indifference of “day-labourers” or, worst of all, the disloyalty of “slaves.”<sup>279</sup>

An additional, albeit enigmatic, reference to five-part ecclesiological structures can be found in *Chapter 3 “On the Interpretation of Happiness, Wisdom, and Power; what they mean.”* This chapter, after enumerating the five levels of existence at which these three concepts can be found, closes with a *cluster* of references to “Five Happinesses, Five Wisdoms, and Five Powers” (1Ke 25.3-4) which are then (following a lacuna) set into some kind of relation to “Five Churches” (1Ke 25.4). What this reference to Five Churches means, however, remains entirely mysterious.

#### 4.5.4 Polemical Patterning

While we have seen that *Chapter 6* and *Chapter 69* used five-part patterns to polemical ends, a similar technique is used in two additional polemical<sup>280</sup> discussions of rival religious groups. The first instance can be found in *Chapter 12*, where Mani is asked to explain the “Five Words which are proclaimed in the teaching of the Baptists” (1Ke 44.25-26) and other sects. Unfortunately, the lacunous state of the text once again prevents us from reconstructing what these “Five Words” might have been, with the exception of “Third Messenger” as the second in the series (1Ke 44.36-45.1). Similarly, in *Chapter 100 “On the Dragon, the one with Fourteen Heads; what is it and...,”* Mani is questioned by a disciple on the existence of a fourteen-headed dragon mentioned in the

<sup>279</sup> There is no doubt a social dimension to this metaphoric revilement of “day-labourers” and “slaves” as “foreign races” that would be worthy of exploration.

<sup>280</sup> Interestingly, both chapters make use of the word ΜΝΤΠΑΡΑΠΕΖΟΥΤ. While the exact meaning of this word remains a mystery, given its connection with a rival teaching it presumably indicates something to do with error.



“laws of the Magi” as dwelling in “Five Hallows” (†ΟΥ ΝΨΑΦΨΦ) (1Ke 252.1-3). In response, Mani is made to give an anthropological interpretation in which the fourteen heads of the dragon are said to represent the seven (*sic!*)<sup>281</sup> senses of the head and the seven senses of the body (1Ke 252.19-253.2). The “Five Pits” (†ΟΥ ΝΒΗΒ) in which the dragon dwells, however, are said to represent five of the internal organs (1Ke 253.2-7).

#### **4.5.5 Aetiological Patterning**

Finally, a small class of what might be termed aetiological patterns can be identified in chapters where Mani is made to account for the existence of certain natural or biological phenomena. For instance, in *Chapter 95* Mani is made to offer an explanation of five different manifestations of cloud (1Ke 240.19-244.13), while in *Chapter 65* he is made to describe five aspects of the Sun, namely its 1) light, 2) beauty, 3) peace, 4) life, and 5) force (1Ke 162.1-13). Similarly in *Chapter 68*, Mani made to describe five effects of fire, such as the fact that it 1) destroys materials, 2) separates fire, light, ash, and smoke from wood, 3) gives taste to food, 4) helps craftsmen work, and 5) helps people to see (1Ke 166.19-30). In addition, *Chapter 104* is a particularly enigmatic discussion of five ways in which the energy provided by food is expended by human beings through 1) intellectual pleasure, 2) speech, 3) physical activity, 4) sexual intercourse, and 5) procreation (1Ke 258.10-23). Interestingly, emphasis is placed on the well-being and needs of the fifth product, the child, as most important, while the other four are seen as

---

<sup>281</sup> One would expect Mani to describe the five senses of the head and the body, but the fact that fourteen heads are mentioned necessitates the description of seven. Besides, if one counts two ears, two eyes, two nostrils, and one mouth, one arrives at seven.

unimportant and incidental. Finally, *Chapter 107* offers a five-part explication of the production of speech (1Ke 261.3-12) based on a metaphor involving the work of craftsmen.

Such chapters are generally very brief and seem to have served as simple aetiological discussions about commonplace topics that were likely seen as problematic when viewed through the lens of Manichaean ideology. For instance, the status of fire as both a Light and Dark Element no doubt caused confusion as to its utility. Similarly, Manichaean condemnations of procreation likely perplexed some of the Catechumens with families. The fact that such issues could be explained in terms of five-part patterns would have been reassuring to the *Kephalaia*'s intended audience, for whom a pentadic vision of reality was being constructed.

## CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

This study of five-part numeric patterns in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* has led to one primary conclusion, namely, that the text contains a considerable number of theological formulations that appear to be at variance with what we know, or can infer, about canonical Manichaean traditions. This means that the compilers of the work deemed it necessary to alter, expand, and improvise upon the teachings of their founder in order to address a variety of themes that were seen as either pressing or simply of interest. If this is the case, then why did they do it? What were some of the factors that might have stimulated this departure from teachings and traditions that Mani had, for all intents and purposes, expected to be definitive? In response, three factors appear to have been at work that led to this creative use of numeric patterning: 1) scholastic redaction, 2) response to adversity, and 3) missionary expansion. Moreover, by way of conclusion, some suggestions will be offered as to why the number five was favoured in particular as well as who could have been the driving force behind this numeric interest.

### 5.1 *Scholastic Redaction*

As was stated above, from what we can piece together from the many scattered remains of Mani's own writings, it does not appear that his work was very systematic in nature. Rather, likely written over a substantial period of time in varying circumstances,<sup>282</sup> Mani's writings seem to have been largely incidental, dealing with a wide range of (often miscellaneous) theological, polemical, and pastoral concerns (as in the *Book of Mysteries* and *Epistles*). In some cases, he seems to have presented a more-or-less straightforward

---

<sup>282</sup> In fact, we have no clear ideas about how the canon came to be formed or if the canonical writings (plus *Shabuhrgan*) were, in fact, the only ones he composed during his lifetime.

narrative of his cosmogonical, prophetological, or eschatological ideas (as in *Shabuhrgan*, *Living Gospel*, and the source[s] used by Theodore bar Khonai and al-Nadīm), while in others, he appears to have been somewhat of a collector of pre-existing traditions (as in the *Book of Giants*). Besides, the fact that he attempted to portray his vision artistically by means of his *Picture-book* implies that Mani may have been more interested in the aesthetic impact of his message than its systematic presentation. More importantly, however, none of these canonical writings appear to have contained the same degree of fascination with numbers and numeric patterns as can be found so prominently expressed in the *Kephalaia*. This means that, at some point in the (largely obscure) literary history of the work, the compilers of the *Kephalaia* saw fit to introduce these patterns in order to resolve what may have been a substantial number of “loose-ends” and ambiguities in the canonical tradition. By doing so, they were attempting to construct a more cohesive and, by extension, more competitive theological vision of the cosmos. The fact that the compilers of so many chapters display a pronounced preference for *five* means that the redactional efforts in which they engaged can be reasonably described as a process of *pentadization*.

First, in section 4.2, we observed that the compilers of the *Kephalaia* appear to have adopted as a general theological principle the idea that divine beings—both good and evil, light and dark—ought to be conceived of as having five basic properties. This was, as we saw, dramatically (and it would seem programmatically) expressed in *Chapter 2* through the radical opposition between the “Two Trees,” an early Manichaean metaphor for the two radically opposed principles. In this case, the two opposed natures,

so fundamental to Manichaean cosmology, are conceived of as being qualitatively different, though structurally identical.

Then we directed our attention to the light-realm (section 4.3), where we saw that this interest in conveying the five-fold nature of divine being was extended to the most revered of such beings, the Father of Greatness, who, even though he was known in canonical (and later eastern) traditions both as the “Four-faced God” and as having “Five Limbs,” was portrayed by the compiler of *Chapter 21* a being characterized by five qualities (section 4.3.1).

Following this, we looked at the degree to which the *Kephalaia* compilers were faced with considerable conceptual and terminological challenges in their efforts to describe the constituent elements that give light-being its substance (section 4.3.2). These “Five Elements,” also known as the “Five Sons of First Man,” the “Five Luminous Gods,” and at times even the “Five Intellectuals,” are found in an often bewildering array of contexts that do not always allow for a clear differentiation of concepts. Nevertheless, in spite of this obvious terminological variability and confusion, we also noted that the compilers do not appear to have been interested in sorting them out. Rather, this series, particularly under the guise of the “Five Sons” served as a convenient literary and rhetorical tool for the construction of other more elaborate patterns and formulations involving other number patterns.

Next, we examined the degree to which five-part patterns played a pivotal role in both the theological and literary formulations of *Chapter 38*, a text that might be considered the centre-piece of *Kephalaia* volume one. In this chapter, really a treatise, Mani is made to go to great lengths to explain to a reticent disciple his assertion that the

human body is really just a microcosmic representation of the macrocosm and that both domains display an equally pentadic structure in which a divine guardian watches over five districts continually disturbed by the rebellions of the dark powers.

Our final foray into the light-realm involved an examination of how the *Kephalaia* compilers sought to transform the basic pattern of Manichaean conceptions of divine activity from one based on three-stages (most clearly evidenced by Theodore bar Khonai's account) to one based on five. This was expressed by means of the highly variable series known as the "Five Fathers" as well as the grouping identified as the "Five Greatnesses." Each of these cases appears to have represented a deliberate attempt at the *pentadization* of Manichaean discourse.

When it came to the dark-realm, the compilers were compelled to be more creative in their redaction efforts, since, as far as we can tell, Mani's descriptions of the land of darkness do not appear to have been all that specific. This meant that the compilers had to construct a vision of the dark-realm that was equally rooted in five-part patterns and, as such, could be symmetrically opposed to the light-realm.<sup>283</sup>

In the first place, we saw that the compilers attempted to account for the basic evolution of the dark-realm out of the evil principle variously known as "Matter," "Darkness," "Sin," and "Death." This meant positing five stages of development before the elaboration of the dark-realm into five separate elemental worlds. How to describe these individual jurisdictions, however, became a challenge, since the canonical ordering of dark elements, which had placed "smoke" in first position and darkness last, led to a

---

<sup>283</sup> Given the obvious and overriding importance of luminous series such as the "Five Limbs" and the "Five Elements," especially in canonical traditions (see above), I do not accept Couliano's suggestion that the Five Planets are the basis of all Manichaean pentads and, therefore, the dark-realm must have preceded the light-realm in Manichaean ideological formulation ("The Counterfeit Spirit," 57). If anything, this study demonstrates that the opposite was the case.

terminological difficulty that the compilers were not quite able to overcome. As we saw, this problem became most evident in *Chapter 6*, which applies no less than four different names to the chief ruler of the “Five Worlds of Darkness,” although here too, as in *Chapter 38*, five-part patterning was woven into the literary and rhetorical structure in order to drive home the essentially pentadic nature of evil.

Next, we saw that Manichaeans also got into trouble when they attempted to malign only five of the seven planets known to antiquity, with the exception of the Sun and Moon, which they viewed as light-ships ferrying liberated light-particles back to their homeland. This necessitated the substitution of the “Two Ascendants,” an astronomical concept that they do not appear to have completely understood, since as Roger Beck has described it, the “Ascendant” (*anabibazon*) was meant to be complimented by a “Descendant” (*katabibazon*).<sup>284</sup> Then, the compilers’ attempt to associate the twelve signs of the Zodiac with the “Five Worlds of Darkness” led to equally patchy results, although in this case, this artificial construction seems to have had a polemical motivation.

Then, in a more generalized way, we examined how the *Kephalai* compilers used five-part numerical patterns in order to address a variety of soteriological, ethical, ecclesiological, polemical, and aetiological themes. Here too, we observed that, especially in soteriological, ethical, and ecclesiological contexts, the compilers presented pentadic constructions at variance with what can be known from canonical traditions.

Such an extensive, albeit often subtle, reshaping of Manichaean discourse implies that the teaching and writings that Mani left behind were not seen as sufficiently clear and, as such, required extensive commentary and retooling. After all, the mere existence

---

<sup>284</sup> “Anababizontes,” 193.

of an apparently *scholastic* work such as the *Kephalaia* on such a massive scale indicates that, in fact, there were a considerable number of ambiguities in the Manichaean tradition that needed to be addressed, since we may assume that many chapters have as their kernel some sort of exegetical puzzle found within the canon. This kind of redactional work not only runs contrary to the finality and definitiveness that Mani appears to have claimed for his “gospel,” but it also challenges the assumptions of many modern scholars who have allowed themselves to be influenced by such claims. In fact, there is a long tradition in Manichaean Studies of scholars asserting the general uniformity and consistency of Manichaean doctrine across its bewildering array of culturally specific milieux.<sup>285</sup> Even Polotsky talked about the essential unity of Manichaean traditions from North Africa to China.<sup>286</sup> These conventional assumptions about Manichaean discourse can be summarized as follows:

- 1) that Mani established a complete theological system in *all* of its details,<sup>287</sup>
- 2) that this system was transmitted essentially *unchanged* from one socio-historical context to another,<sup>288</sup> and
- 3) that this system can be reconstructed from the diverse, but essentially *uniform*, sources into which it was recorded.<sup>289</sup>

<sup>285</sup> Such assumptions, for example, have even led Lieu to assert that “literalist” understandings of Mani’s teaching made Manichaeism “a static religion” (*Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 32). This implies, however, that basic features of the discourse did not change and made it easily exposed to philosophical attack.

<sup>286</sup> Polotsky, “Manichäismus,” 101 [240].

<sup>287</sup> Recently Gardner and Lieu state that in contrast to mainstream Christianity, which worked out its doctrinal formulations over centuries, “Mani took great pains to establish a total religion based upon his own comprehensive scriptures and preaching,” thus, there is “less scope in the study of Manichaeism to trace the evolution of doctrine, since all teaching was rigidly tied to the very details of the divine word in Mani’s scriptures” (*Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 9-10)

<sup>288</sup> Rudolph suggested that Coptic sources come “closest to the original system” (*Gnosis*, 334), while Heuser, in spite of his efforts to focus on a limited socio-historical source base in his study of Manichaean myth in Coptic texts, suggests that “the Manichaean myth *in toto* can be deduced from” these sources (“The Manichaean Myth,” 5).



Today, however, it seems no longer appropriate to talk about a unified “Manichaean system,” especially one formulated and set-in-stone by Mani himself. Rather, as this study has shown, Manichaean theology, even at a relatively early stage, seems to have existed in varying states of flux and evolution, depending on the context in which it circulated. However, as Jason BeDuhn has pointed out, Manichaean ritual, in contrast to doctrine, seems to have been one aspect of the religion that remained particularly consistent throughout the wide array of cultural environments, and, in fact, theology may have acted more as a conceptual framework meant to support ritual.<sup>290</sup> Thus, it seems more appropriate to talk about *phases* of Manichaean theology. Just as mainstream Christian theology can rightly be identified by any number of qualifiers, such as ante-Nicene, post-Chalcedonean, etc., so too would it be desirable for scholars to develop similar nomenclature based on critical evaluation of the sources. This is partly a result of the fact that some scholars have been somewhat overenthusiastic in their desire to hear the authentic voice of Mani preserved in texts such as the *Kephalaia*, which presents itself (artificially I believe) as a record of his discourses. Such a desire, although not surprising, runs contrary to the function and purpose of the work as identified by this study. A methodological lesson can and should be learned from the degree to which many New Testament scholars are generally sceptical about how much material from the gospels can be directly attributed to Jesus. While Jesus of course never intended to found a religion, it is thought that canonical early Christian writings do contain at least a core of authentic material drawn more or less directly from his teaching (reflected in part by the

---

<sup>289</sup> In his presentation of the Manichaean “system” Hans Jonas stated that he made use primarily of Theodore bar Khonai, “supplemented by whatever pieces of material from parallel texts fit into a particular passage” (*The Gnostic Religion*, 209). Later, Klimkeit would allude to the fact that Manichaean sources reveal “a remarkably unified system” (*Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 4).

<sup>290</sup> BeDuhn, *The Manichaean Body*, 6-7.

hypothetically posited Q-document in particular). Many decades of careful study have shown the degree to which this material has been shaped by the redactional and editorial efforts of the first generations of Christians. We should assume that a similar relationship exists between a work such as the *Kephalaia* and the words of Mani himself, also in his case he deliberately sought to found a religion. While it may be assumed that on some level a certain amount of *Kephalaia* material was drawn either from Mani's own writings or from oral traditions passed down by early disciples and teachers, the vast majority seems to have undergone a substantial amount of expansion and revision. It just so happens that this particular study has focused on redactional tendencies by means of numeric patterning, although there would certainly be other thematic gateways worthy of exploration.

### ***5.2 Adversity and Persecution***

The desire to clarify the teachings of the founder may not have been the only reason that so many *Kephalaia* chapters were shaped by such a redactional tendency, since some of those most deeply interested in five-part patterns also reveal a keen awareness of both external and internal pressures perceived by the community. External pressures, for example, are evoked most explicitly in the efforts of Chapter 6 to describe the properties of the Five Worlds of Darkness, which ultimately lead to an association of these worlds not only with rival religious communities such as Zoroastrians, Christians, and "pagans," but even, as in the case of the great World of Smoke, the "powers that be." As such, we are told most emphatically that "the spirit of the King of (those of) Darkness is the one who rules / today in the powers and authorities of the earth and the / whole world. I mean

those who rule over all of creation, / humbling people in their tyranny according to their will” (1Ke 33.5-8). This statement no doubt reflects bitter memories of persecution at the hands of Sassanian and, later, Roman authorities.

After the deaths of King Shapur I (ca. 272 CE) and his successor Hormizd (273 CE), both of whom had been favourably disposed to Mani and his teaching, religious and political machinations began within the Sassanian administration against the new, upstart religion. In particular, Kirdir, the Zoroastrian “high-priest,” sought to bring the empire’s religious minorities under control,<sup>291</sup> as is evidenced by one of his surviving inscriptions, which states, in Middle Persian, that “the Jews, the Buddhists and the Brahmans, the Nazarenes (i.e., Aramaic-speaking Christians) and the Christians (i.e., Greek-speaking), the Baptists and the Manichaeans were struck throughout the land.”<sup>292</sup> Eventually, this led to the imprisonment and death of Mani (ca. 276 or 277 CE) and the scattering of the Manichaeans from Mesopotamia. Within five years, Mar Sīsin (i.e. Sisinnios), the successor to Mani as head of the church, or *archēgos*, was also executed by Vahram II (286 CE).<sup>293</sup> Some Manichaeans, fleeing this persecution, took refuge at the court of King Amaro (‘Amr ibn ‘Adi) at Hira,<sup>294</sup> to the southwest of Seleucia-Ctesiphon.<sup>295</sup> By the 290s, Amaro was even able to convince King Narses to halt the persecution of the Manichaeans, although this was done, in part, strategically, since Emperor Diocletian had recently issued an edict against the Manichaeans on his territory in 297 CE. This was seen by Narses as an opportunity to gain Manichaean support. But, soon enough, under

<sup>291</sup> Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 108.

<sup>292</sup> Gignoux, *Les quatre inscriptions du Mage Kirdīr*, 69-70. See also Hutter, “Manichaeism in Iran,” 308.

<sup>293</sup> According to the *Chronicle of Seert*, the close relation between Manichaeans and Christians in the Sassanian Empire led to Vahram II’s persecution of both groups (*Patrologia orientalis* 4.3: 237).

<sup>294</sup> See Pedersen, “A Manichaean Historical Text,” 196.

<sup>295</sup> Hutter, “Manichaeism in Iran,” 309.

Hormizd II (303-309 CE), the Zoroastrian priesthood again agitated for the king to strike at the Manichaeans.<sup>296</sup>

Similarly, under the Roman Empire, Manichaeans were faced with periodic persecution and toleration. After making initial inroads into Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, Mani's followers were (unjustly)<sup>297</sup> condemned by Diocletian in 303 CE for purportedly propagating the "damnable customs and perverse laws of the Persians."<sup>298</sup> The so-called "Edict of Milan" (312 CE), however, brought some respite on a whole range of religious matters and, as a result, Manichaeans seem to have flourished in places such as the Nile Valley, where the Coptic *Kephalaia* were likely produced, Palestine, where a teacher such as Julia could flourish,<sup>299</sup> and Italy, where Augustine, on the recommendation of some rather well connected Manichaean "saints," was appointed Chair of Rhetoric in Milan.<sup>300</sup> This relative religious peace was short-lived, since with the accession of Theodosius anti-heretical measures were reinforced (381 CE). Ultimately, by the time of Justinian, Manichaeans were outlawed and the Elect threatened with death.<sup>301</sup>

While the bitter memories of these persecutions are a well-known feature of the Manichaean *Homilies*, especially the "Sermon on the Great War,"<sup>302</sup> echoes can also be heard in the *Kephalaia*, which may in fact draw on traditions pre-dating the *Homilies*.<sup>303</sup>

<sup>296</sup> Hutter, "Manichaeism in Iran," 309. See Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 106-109.

<sup>297</sup> Brown, "Diffusion," 92-103.

<sup>298</sup> For the "Edict of Diocletian" see Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 117-118; see also Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 122-123.

<sup>299</sup> Mark the Deacon, *Life of Porphyry*, 85-91; see Scopello, "Julie, manichéenne d'Antioche," 187-209.

<sup>300</sup> *Confessions*, 18. See Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 110.

<sup>301</sup> Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 111.

<sup>302</sup> See Pedersen's idiosyncratic, yet thorough, study: *Studies in The Sermon on the Great War*. According to Pedersen, this homiletic text was meant "to strengthen the persecuted community in 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century Mesopotamia" (28).

<sup>303</sup> For instance, in the "Sermon on the Great War," Mani is made to say "I weep for my *Kephalaia*" (Hom 18.6), which may indicate that "kephalaic" literature of some sort existed prior to the composition of the *Homilies*. See Pedersen, *Studies*, 90-93.

For instance, in *Chapter 189* “[*On the Five Temptations*],” the fifth temptation menacing the Elect, presumably apostasy, comes during persecution:

[The fifth is this:] If persecution / [happens] in ... through the persecutor ... / ... the Sects, those who stand in ... / ... tribulation. Or again as they ... / ... as they strike him with whips ... / ... and they come to “crucify”<sup>304</sup> him and he does not turn ... / ... from his truth and he bears every thing ... / ... wrath, bond, (and) crucifixion. In these **Five / Temptations** ... ... of the Elect / ... he receives the ... / ... increases in faith and becomes true ... / his knowledge ... temptation ... / ... and he returns immediately and reveals / the truth and ... gives ... (1Ke 485.30-486.13).

Such a vivid description reveals that persecution formed part of the living memory of the *Kephalaia* compilers and influenced at least some of their pentadic formulations.

The adverse effects of persecution are also incorporated into *Chapter 137* “*On the Five Types of Brotherhood that are distinguished from one another.*” This chapter, which as we previously saw, enumerated five types of people found in the church, suggests that the fourth and fifth classes, the so-called “day-labourers” and, especially, the “slaves” flee at the first sign of persecution (1Ke 340.6-7).

While it is obvious that persecution was a subject that the compilers incorporated into some of their numeric formulations, less obvious is the possibility that such formulations acted as a fortification strategy in the face of real or potential persecutions. It seems at least plausible to suggest that the attempt to shape Manichaean discourse and ideology into such regularized and reoccurring patterns could have served as a means to strengthen the faith of adherents, especially the Elect, to whom the *Kephalaia* as a work appears to have been directed. The broad application of pentadic structures, which were seen as indicative of divinity itself, to such a wide range of phenomena could only serve to reinforce the Manichaean claim to truth and, thereby, support the typical Manichaean

<sup>304</sup> In this case “crucify” is likely a synonym for torture.

boast to have an explanation for everything. Such a vision of reality, if it could be seen to reproduce itself throughout the cosmos, may have helped to keep adherents in the fold and held them fast during times of adversity and repression.

### ***5.3 Missionary Expansion***

An additional aspect to which numeric patterning may have contributed is the missionary expansion of the movement. As is well known, Manichaeism was a self-consciously missionary religion. As Lieu has written, “mission was the driving force behind the religion from its very inception.”<sup>305</sup> Mani’s assertion that the previous revelations of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus had been unjustly limited to specific socio-cultural settings meant that he actively sought to deliver his message to a wide range of audiences. As such, modelling himself on Paul, Mani undertook missionary journeys to diverse parts of the Sassanian Empire,<sup>306</sup> which enabled him to encounter and preach to Christians in the west, Buddhists and Brahmins in the east, and Zoroastrians in the Iranian heartland. His disciples followed suit, with Mar Adda being primarily responsible for the western mission and Mar Ammō as the chief organizer of the mission to the east.<sup>307</sup>

Numeric patterning may offer us a glimpse into at least one of the missionary techniques employed by Manichaeans, at least in the western context to which our texts testify. As Asmussen observed: “Mani and his missionaries knew the importance of repetition. When well-known material and names occurred again and again, a feeling of security and confidence was produced in the minds of the listeners.”<sup>308</sup> As such, the

---

<sup>305</sup> *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 88.

<sup>306</sup> Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 88.

<sup>307</sup> Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 90.

<sup>308</sup> *Manichaean Literature*, 113.

repeated presentation of Manichaean doctrines in predictable and self-reinforcing patterns, such as those involving *five*, could have contributed to the palatability and plausibility of the missionary's teaching. In addition, the fact that the number five was used with such frequency could have also had a mnemonic value, since a series of five points could be easily recalled using five fingers.<sup>309</sup> After all, a number of the *Kephalaia* chapters that elaborate five points are extremely brief—almost catechetical (see, for instance, *Chapters 25, 33, 37, 68, 107, 193*)—with little or no literary frame. Such chapters appear to represent “proto-*kephalaia*”<sup>310</sup> and it may well be that many more elaborate chapters have their origins in such brief, mnemonically digestible, didactic texts. This means that numeric patterning, especially those patterns involving five, could have served as a valuable pedagogical tool for the Manichaean missionary.

#### 5.4 Why five?

But why, we may ask, was *five* favoured as a figure around which so much of the Manichaean world-view was organized? The fact that *five* played such a central role in the development of Manichaean discourse is, as we have seen, rooted in the fact that Mani and Manichaeans seem to have believed as a general principle that most beings (both Light and Dark) possess five qualities. This concept, in turn, was connected to the Manichaean conviction that the human being, with its five limbs, five senses, five fingers, and five toes (on each limb), was a microcosmic representation of both the wider macro-

---

<sup>309</sup> In fact, ancient theoreticians suggested that the five fingers of the hand could serve as a valuable tool in the memorization of a discourse (Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 124)

<sup>310</sup> See *T. Kell. Copt. 1* in Gardner, *Kellis Literary Texts*, 2.

cosmos<sup>311</sup> and the divine power at its source. After all, according to Manichaean cosmology, when the demons conspired to create Adam and Eve, they used the androgynous image of the Third Messenger as a model (Theodore bar Khonai 317.7-11 [Scher]). This basic anthropological importance of five, however, was likely drawn from 2<sup>nd</sup>-century Syriac philosopher Bardaisan, who according to Ephraim taught that all entities possess five aspects corresponding to the five senses. Each must have its own colour, its own smell, its own taste, its own texture, and its own voice;<sup>312</sup> sentiments definitely echoed by the description of the dark ruler in *Chapter 6*. In addition, the fact that Mani seems to have inherited a concept of Five Elements, perhaps also from the school of Bardaisan, as the basic building blocks of both the soul and its material antithesis, as well as the concept of the Five Limbs, means that some of the most fundamental concepts in Manichaean theology were canonically expressed as pentads. This, in turn, provided the precedent for later teachers and theologians to use, expand, and reinvent this basic paradigm.

### 5.5 Who was responsible?

In closing, a clue to who may have been the driving force behind this process of enumeration and systematization may be found in a Sogdian fragment from Turfan on the healing of Nafsha of Tadmor/Palmyra. In this text, Mar Adda, the primary Manichaean missionary to the west, is said to have received a vision from the master himself, in which

---

<sup>311</sup> For example, *Kephalaia Chapter 70* is called “On the Body, that it was made to resemble the cosmos.” Also, the Manichaean account from the *Acta Archelai* states that “this body is called cosmos in relation to the great cosmos (i.e., the macrocosmos)” (τὸ γὰρ σῶμα τοῦτο κόσμος καλεῖται πρὸς τὸν μέγαν κόσμον [9.4]).

<sup>312</sup> See Ephraim, *Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, 223 (Mitchell).



everything, we are told, is explained “fully and completely by numbers.”<sup>313</sup> Michel Tardieu suggested that Adda, who held the ecclesiastical rank of “teacher,”<sup>314</sup> may have in fact been the author of the *Kephalaia*.<sup>315</sup> We may never be able to validate such a bold suggestion, but it at least seems plausible that Adda, if not the actual “author” of the *Kephalaia*, may have provided the main impetus or model for the development of this interest in enumeration and systematization. This Iranian fragment would seem to provide the much needed “authorization” from Mani for Adda (and/or his followers) to do something that Mani’s great religious project was supposed to have made unnecessary—that is, the interpretation, clarification, and systematization of the teaching of God’s ultimate messenger. Mani’s canonical writings were supposed to have been definitive, but as the “prologue” to the *Kephalaia* itself reveals (1Ke 8.34-35), where Mani is made to exhort his disciples to record what he taught them, the definitive and final pretence with which Mani packaged his writings was quickly overridden by the needs and circumstances of the communities he left behind.

---

<sup>313</sup> So. 18223 + So. 18222 (Gardner and Lieu, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, 113). See also Sundermann, *Inhalts*, 44 (3.3).

<sup>314</sup> Funk has raised the question as to whether or not the “teacher” referred to by the title of the first *Kephalaia* volume is in actual fact the author rather than Mani (“Reconstruction,” 154, n. 17).

<sup>315</sup> Tardieu, “Principes de l’exégèse manichéenne,” 134, n. 73. Cited (tentatively) by Funk, “Reconstruction,” 154. Adda is known to have composed his own writings, which were sometimes mistaken for those of Mani (Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire*, 91). This, in fact, may have been the result of conscious imitation or attribution of his words to the master, not unlike the situation found within the *Kephalaia*.

- Adam, A. ed. *Texte zum Manichäismus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
- Allberry, C. R. C. *A Manichaean Psalm-Book : Part II*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1938.
- Asmussen, Jes. *Xvāsvānīft: Studies in Manichaeism*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1965.
- Beardslee, William A. *Literary Criticism of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Beck, Roger. "The Anabibazontes in the Manichaean Kephalaia." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 69 (1987): 193-196.
- BeDuhn, Jason. *The Manichaean Body in Discipline and Ritual*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Beeson, H. Ch., ed. *Acta Archelai*. GCS. Leipzig, 1906.
- Black, J., and A. Green, eds. *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.
- Böhlig, A. *Kephalaia (I) : 2 Hälfte [Lieferung 11-12]*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1966.
- Boyce, Mary, ed. *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*. New Jersey: Barnes & Noble, 1984.
- Bowersock, G. W., P. Brown, and O. Grabar, eds. *Interpreting Late Antiquity: Essays on the Postclassical World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Brinkmann, A. *Alexandri Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio*. Leipzig, 1895.
- Brown, Peter. "Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire." *Journal of Roman Studies* 59 (1969): 92-103.
- Bryder, Peter, ed. *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5-9, 1987, Department of History of Religions, Lund University, Sweden*. Lund: Plus Ultra, 1988.
- Burkitt, F. C. *The Religion of the Manichees*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1925.
- Bussièrès, Marie-Pierre. "Conclusions : Questions (encore) sans réponses." Pages 181-198 in *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*. Ed. Annelie Volgers and Claudio Zamagni. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Cameron, R. and J. Dewey, trans. *The Cologne Mani Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)*

- "*On the Origin of his Body.*" Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979
- Cereti, C. and L. Paul, eds. *Iranica diversa*. Rome: Istituto italiano per l'africa e l'oriente, 1999.
- Chadwick, H. "Philosophical Tradition and the Self." Pages 60-81 in *Interpreting Late Antiquity: Essays on the Postclassical World*. Ed. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, and O. Grabar. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1983.
- Chavannes, Éd. and P. Pelliot, eds. "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine." *Journal Asiatique* 18 (1911): 499-617.
- Clackson, Sarah, Erica Hunter, and Samuel N. C. Lieu, eds. *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts I: Texts from the Roman Empire*. Turnhout: Brepols 1998.
- Couliano, I. P. "The Counterfeit Spirit in Manichaeism," Pages 53-58 in *Manichaica Selecta Studies presented to Professor Julien Ries*. Ed. A. van Tongerloo and S. Giversen. Louvain: Brepols, 1991.
- Crump, Thomas. *The Anthropology of Numbers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Cumont, Franz. *Recherches sur le manichéisme I: La cosmogonie manichéenne*. Brussels: H. Lamertin, 1908.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Les douze apôtres et le zodiaque." *Vigiliae Christianae* 13.1 (1959): 14-21.
- De Blois, François. "New Light on the Sources of the Manichaean Chapter in the *Fihrist*." Pages 37-45 in *Il manicheismo: nuove prospettive della ricerca*. Ed. A. van Tongerloo and L. Cirillo. Louvain: Brepols, 2005.
- Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists: 80 BC to AD 220*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Dodge, Bayard, ed. and trans. *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Drijvers, Hans. *Bardaisan of Edessa*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1966.
- Drijvers, Hans. *East of Antioch: Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.

- Drijvers, Hans. "Mani und Bardaisan: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Manichäismus." Pages 459-469 in *East of Antioch: Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- Duchesne-Guillemin, Jacques. "L'Église sassanide et le mazdéisme." Pages 3-32 in *Histoire des religions II*. Paris: Gallimard, 1972.
- Duckworth, George E. *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- Dumézil, George. *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*. Collections Latomus 31. Brussels: Latomus Revue D'Études Latines, 1958.
- Eckhardt, Caroline D. ed. *Essays in the Numerical Criticism of Medieval Literature*. London: Bucknell University Press, 1980.
- Elliott, John H. *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Emmel, S. et al., eds. *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit : Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologen-kongresses (Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996)*. Vol. 2. Wiesbaden : Reichert Verlag, 1999.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme. *Studia Manichaica IV: Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997.
- Endres, Carl, and Annemarie Schimmel. *Das Mysterium der Zahl: Zahlensymbolik im Kulturvergleich*. Eugen: Diederichs Verlag, 1988.
- Epictetus. *Moral Discourses*. Trans. Thomas Gould. New York: Washington Square, 1964.
- Feldmann, E., ed. *Die 'Epistula Fundamenti' der nordafrikanischen Manichäer*. Altenberg: Akademische Bibliothek, 1987.
- Ferguson, John. *The Religions of the Roman Empire*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Ferrari, Leo C. "Astronomy and Augustine's Break with the Manichees." *Revue des études augustiniennes* 19 (1973): 263-276.
- Franzmann, M. "The Syriac-Coptic Bilinguals from Ismant el-Kharab [Roman Kellis]: Translation Process and Manichaean Missionary Practice." Pages 115-122 in *Il manicheismo: nuove prospettive della ricerca*. Ed. A. van Tongerloo and L. Cirillo. Louvain: Brepols, 2005.

- Friberg, Jöran. "Numbers and Counting." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 4. Ed. D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Funk, W.-P. *Concordance to the Manichaean Kephalaia Volume I (Berlin P. 15996 & Vienna K. 1010)*. Ed. Polotsky/Böhlig/Funk. Quebec City, 1998/1999 [unpublished].
- Funk, W.-P. *Kephalaia I: Addenda & Corrigenda*. Québec, 2004 [unpublished].
- Funk, W.-P. *Kephalaia (I) : Zweite Hälfte [Lieferung 13-14]*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1999.
- Funk, W.-P. *Kephalaia (I) : Zweite Hälfte [Lieferung 15-16]*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 2000.
- Funk, W.-P. "The Reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*." Pages 143-159 in *Emerging From Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Ed. Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Funk, W.-P. "Research on Manichaeism in Egypt: 1988-1996." Pages 453-464 in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit : Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologen-kongresses (Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996)*. Vol. 2. Ed. S. Emmel et al. Wiesbaden : Reichert Verlag, 1999.
- Funk, W.-P. *A Work Concordance to the Coptic Fragments of Mani's Epistles*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Quebec City, 2001 [unpublished].
- Funk, W.-P. *A Work Concordance to the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book (Excerpts)*. Quebec City, 2002 [unpublished].
- Gardner, Iain, Anthony Alcock, and W.-P. Funk, eds. *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1999.
- Gardner, Iain ed. *Kellis Literary Texts*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1996.
- Gardner, Iain. *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*. NHMS 37. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Gardner, Iain and Klaas Worp, "Leaves from a Manichaean Codex," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 117 (1997) : 148-151.
- Gardner, Iain, and Samuel N. C. Lieu, eds. *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Gardner, Iain. "The Reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from Three Coptic Codices." Pages 93-104 in *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*. Eds. Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- “Gemmatría.” In *Oxford Dictionary of World Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Gignoux, Philippe. *Les quatre inscriptions du Mage Kirdîr: Textes et concordances*. *Studia Iranica* 9, 1991.
- Goodenough, Edwin R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. Volume 12. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.
- Gyselen, Rika and Philippe Gignoux, eds. *Au Carrefour des religions : Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*. Leuven : Peeters, 1995.
- Hachlili, Rachel. “The Zodiac in Ancient Jewish Art: Representation and Significance.” *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 228 (1977): 61-77.
- Henning, W. B. “Book of Giants.” In *W. B. Henning: Selected Papers II*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Henning, W. B. “Sogdian Tales.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11.3 (1945): 465-487.
- Henrichs, A. and L. Koenen, eds. *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Über das Werden seines Leibes: Kritische Edition*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988.
- Heuser, M. “The Manichaean Myth.” Pages 1-108 in *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*. Ed. H.-J. Klimkeit. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Hübner, Wolfgang. “Das Horoskop der Christen (Zeno 1,38 L.)” *Vigiliae christianae*, 29 (1975): 120-137.
- Hunter, Erica. “Theodore bar Kônî and the Manichaeans.” Pages 167-178 in *Il manicheismo: Nuove prospettive della ricerca*. Ed. A. van Tongerloo and L. Cirillo. Louvain: Brepols, 2005.
- Hutter, Manfred. “Manichaeism in Iran in the Fourth Century.” Pages 308-317 in *Studia Manichaica IV: Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997*. Eds. Emmerick, Sundermann, and Zieme. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997.
- Ivanka, E. von “ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ : Eine byzantinische Literaturform und ihre antiken Wurzeln,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954): 285-291.
- Jenkins, R. G. “The Prayer of the Emanations in Greek from Kellis [T. Kellis 22].” *Le Muséon* 1995 (108): 243-63.
- Jonas, Hans. *The Gnostic Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

- Jundt, Daniel. *La symbolique des chiffres dans la Bible*. Québec/Paris : Univers/Cerf, 1999.
- Kennedy, George A. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Klimkeit, H.-J., trans. *Gnosis on the Silk Road : Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. New York : HarperCollins, 1993.
- Klimkeit, H.-J., ed. *Studies in Manichaeic Literature and Art*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Koenen, L. How Dualistic is Mani's Dualism?" Pages 1-34 in *Codex Manichaicus coloniensis : Atti de Secondo Simposio Internazionale*. Cozenza, 1990.
- Khosroyev, Alexandr L. "Zu einer astronomischen Realie in den *Kephalaia*." Pages 342-365 in *Studia manichaica: IV Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997*. Eds. Emmerick, Sundermann, and Zieme. Berlin : Akademie Verlag, 1997.
- Kugener, M. A. and F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le manichéisme II : Extraits de la CXXIIIe Homélie de Sévère d'Antioche*. Brussels : H. Lamertin, 1912.
- Lévy, Paul. "A propos de la pentade et du dualisme manichéens." Pages 493-500 in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*. Paris: PUF, 1974.
- Lidzbarski, M., ed. *Ginza: Der Schatz oder Das große Buch der Mandäer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978 [1925].
- Lieu, Samuel N. C. "An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism." In *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C. *Manichaeism in the Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C. "Manichaeic *technici termini* in the *Liber scholiorum* of Theodore bar Kôñî." Pages 245-254 in *Il Manicheismo: Nuove prospettive della ricerca*. Ed. A. van Tongerloo and L. Cirillo. Louvain: Brepols, 2005.
- Lindt, P. van. *Names of Manichaeic Mythological Figures*. Studies in Oriental Religions 26. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1992.
- Lupieri, Edmondo. *The Mandaeans: The Last Gnostics*. Trans. Hindley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

- MacQueen, John. *Numerology: Theory and Outline History of a Literary Mode*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1985.
- Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990.
- MacKenzie, D. N. "Zoroastrian Astrology in the *Bundahišn*." Pages 7-25 in *Iranica diversa*. Ed. C. Cereti and L. Paul. Rome: Istituto italiano per l'africa e l'oriente, 1999.
- Mattéi, J.-F. *L'Étrange et le simulacre : Essai sur la fondation de l'ontologie platonicienne*. Paris : PUF, 1983.
- Meyer, Marvin and Richard Smith, eds. *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994.
- McGuire, M. R. P. "Numerology." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 10. New York: Thomson/Gale, 2003.
- McKnight, Edgar V. *What is Form Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- McAuliffe, J. Dammen, ed. *Encyclopedia of the Qur'an*. Vol. 3. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold. *Mani und sein Religionssystem*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1986.
- Mikkelsen, Gunner. *Bibliographica manichaica*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996.
- Mirecki, Paul. "The Coptic Manichaean Synaxeis Codex: Descriptive Catalogue of Synaxeis Chapter Titles." Pages 135-145 in *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5-9, 1987, Department of History of Religions, Lund University, Sweden*. Ed. Peter Bryder. Lund: Plus Ultra, 1988.
- Mirecki, Paul and Jason BeDuhn, eds. *Emerging From Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Mirecki, Paul and Jason BeDuhn, eds. *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*. Eds. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Mitchell, C. W., ed. *Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*. London, 1921.
- Monnot, G. *Penseurs musulmans et religions iraniennes*. Paris: Vrin, 1974.
- Morau, Paul. "Quinta essential." Columns 1171-1263 in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmuller Verlag, 1963.



- Nagel, P. "Anatomie des menschen in gnostischer und manichäischer Sicht." Pages 67-94 in *Studien zum Menschenbild in Gnosis und Manichäismus*. Halle, 1979.
- Nagel, P. "Bemerkungen zum manichäischen Zeit- und Geschichtverständnis." In *Studia Coptica*. Ed. P. Nagel. Berlin, 1974.
- Nagel, P. *Die Thomaspsalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*. Berlin: Neue Folge, 1980.
- Nau, F. "La cosmographie au VIIe siècle chez les Syriens." *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, 5 (1910) : 225-254.
- Ness, Lester J. "Astrology and Judaism in Late Antiquity." *The Ancient World* 26.2 (1995): 126-133.
- Ort, L. J. R. *Mani: A Religio-Historical Description of His Personality*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*. Ed. John Barker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Parry, D. W. and E. Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader: Calendrical and Sapiential Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Payne Smith, R. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Reprinted Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999 (1902).
- Peck, Russel A. "Number as Cosmic Language." In *Essays in the Numerical Criticism of Medieval Literature*. Ed. Caroline D. Eckhardt. London: Associated University Press, 1980.
- Pedersen, Nils Arne. "A Manichaean Historical Text." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 119 (1997): 193-201.
- Pedersen, Nils Arne. *Studies in the Sermon on the Great War : Investigations of a Manichaean-Coptic Text from the Fourth Century*. Aarhus : University Press, 1996.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Polotsky, H.-J. and A. Böhlig, *Kephalaia (I) : 1. Hälfte [Lieferung 1-10]*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1940.
- Polotsky, H.-J. *Manichäische Homilien*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1934.
- Polotsky, H.-J. "Manichäische Studien." *Le Muséon* 46 (1933) : 247-272.

- Polotsky, H.-J. "Manichäismus." Pages 101-144 in *Der Manichäismus*. Ed. Geo Widengren. Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977 [originally *Paulys Real-Encyklopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart : Metzler, 1935].
- Pope, M. H. "Number, Numbering, Numbers." Pages 561-567 in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 3. New York: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- Puech, H.-Ch. "Le prince des ténèbres en son royaume." Pages 103-151 in *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais*. Paris : Flammarion, 1979.
- Remus, Harold. "'Magic', Method, Maddness." *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 11.3 (1999): 258-298
- Reeves, John C. "Manichaeon Citations from the *Prose Refutations* of Ephrem." Pages 217-288 in *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaeon Sources*. Ed. Mirecki and BeDuhn. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Reeves, John C. *Jewish Lore in Manichaeon Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992.
- Reitzenstein, R. and H. H. Schaeder. *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland*. Leipzig and Berlin, 1929 (reprinted Darmstadt, 1965).
- Richter, S. *Exegetisch-literarkritische Untersuchungen von Herakleides-Psalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*. Altenberge : Oros, 1994.
- Richter, S., ed. *Psalm Book : Part II, Fasc. 2. Die Herakleides-Psalmen*. Corpus fontium manichaeorum, Series coptica I. Turhout: Brepols, 1996.
- Ries, Julien. *Les Études manichéennes: Des controverses de la Réforme aux découvertes du XX e siècle*. Louvain-La-Neuve : Centre d'histoire des religions, 1988.
- Rippin, Andrew. "Number and Ennumeration." Pages 549-554 in *Encyclopedia of the Qur'an*. Vol. 3. Ed. J. Dammen McAuliffe. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Robinson, James. "The Fate of the Manichaeon Codices of Medinet Madi: 1929-1989." Pages 19-62 in *Studia Manichaica II : Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus 6.-10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn*. Ed. Gernot Wießner and H.-J. Klimkeit. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1989.
- Rudolph, Kurt. *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1987.
- Sachau, E., trans. *Alberuni's India*. New York: Norton, 1971 [1888].

- Säve-Söderbergh, T. *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book*. Upsala: AVEU, 1949.
- Schaeder, H. "Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems," Pages 37-55 in *Der Manichäismus*. Ed. Geo Widengren. Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977.
- Scher, Addai and Périer, eds. "Histoire nestorienne (chronique de Séert)." In *Patrologia orientalis* 4. Paris, 1908.
- Scher, Addai, ed. *Liber scholiorum*. CSCO 69. Louvain : Imprimerie orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1954.
- Schimmel, Annmarie. "Numbers." Pages 13-19 in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Ed. Mircea Eliade. Vol. 2. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Schmidt, Carl and H.-J. Polotsky. "Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1933): 4-90.
- Schmitz, E. D. "Number." Pages 683-704 in *The New International Dictionary of the New Testament*. Ed. C. Brown. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1975.
- Scopello, M. "Julie, manichéenne d'Antioche (d'après la *Vie de Porphyre* de Marc le Diacre, Ch. 85-91)." *Antiquité Tardive* 5 (1997) : 187-209.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. "The Manichaean Commandments: A Survey of the Sources." Pages 572-582 in *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Skjaervø, O. "Iranian Elements in Manichaeism: A Comparative Approach." Pages 263-284 in *Au Carrefour des religions : Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*. Eds. Rika Gyselen and Philippe Gignoux. Leuven : Peeters, 1995.
- Stegemann, V. "Zu Kapitel 69 der Kephalaia des Mani," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 37 (1938): 214-223.
- Ström, Åke V. "Le chiffre cinq." Pages 333-338 in *Manichaica Selecta: Studies presented to Professor Julien Ries*. Ed. A. van Tongerloo and S. Giversen. Louvain: Breopols, 1991.
- Sundermann, W. *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin : Berliner Turfantexte II, 1981.
- Sundermann, W. "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I,II." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13 (1986): 40-92, 239-317.

- Tajadod, Nahal. *Mani le Bouddha de Lumière : Catéchisme manichéen chinois*. Paris : Cerf, 1990.
- Tardieu, Michel. *Le manichéisme*. Paris: PUF, 1981.
- Tardieu, Michel. "Principes de l'exégèse manichéenne du Nouveau Testament." In *Les règles de l'interprétation*. Ed. Michel Tardieu. Paris : Cerf, 1987.
- Tongerloo, A. van and L. Cirillo, eds. *Il manicheismo: nuove prospettive della ricerca*. Louvain: Brepols, 2005.
- Tongerloo, A. van and S. Giversen, eds. *Manichaica Selecta Studies presented to Professor Julien Ries*. Louvain: Brepols, 1991.
- Tsui Chi. "Mo Ni Chiao Hsia Pu Tsan 'The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns.'" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11.1 (1943): 174-219.
- Vermes, Mark, trans. and Samuel N.C. Lieu, ed. *Acta Archelai*. Louvain: Brepols, 2001.
- Villey, A. *Psaumes des errants : Écrits manichéens du Fayyûm*. SGM 4 : Paris : Cerf, 1994.
- Volgers, Annelie, and Claudio Zamagni, eds. *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question -and-Answer Literature in Context*. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Welburn, A. J. "The Identity of the Archons in the 'Apocryphon Johannis.'" *Vigiliae christiana* 32.4 (1978): 241-254.
- Widengren, Geo. *Mani and Manichaeism*. Trans. Ch. Kessler. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1965.
- Williams Jackson, "The Fourfold Aspect of the Supreme Being in Manichaeism," *Indian Linguistics* 2 (1965): 10-17.
- Williams Jackson, A. V. *Researches in Manichaeism*. New York: AMS Press, 1965.
- Wurst, G. *Das Bemaifest der ägyptischen Manichäer*. Altenberge : Oros, 1995.
- Wurst, G., ed. *Psalm Book : Part II, Fasc. 1. Die Bema-Psalmen*. Corpus fontium manichaeorum, Series coptica I. Turhout: Brepols, 1996.
- Yarbro Collins, A. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Zaehner, R. C. *Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma*. New York: Biblo & Tannen, 1972.

Zamagni, Claudio. "Une introduction méthodologique à la littérature patristique des questions et réponses : le cas d'Eusèbe de Césarée." Pages 7-24 in *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.