

12

Augustine and Manichaeism in Light of the
Cologne Mani Codex¹

LUDWIG KOENEN

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF AUGUSTINE'S MANICHAEAN PERIOD FOR HIS
DISCOVERY OF THE GREEK CONCEPT OF FREE WILL

Man is the master of his fate. The thought is a cornerstone of the intellectual traditions which led to the development of western technology, civilization, and culture. Already in the *Odyssey* Zeus declares that, in addition to that assigned by the gods, man brings misery upon himself beyond fate.² Solon

¹ Paper read at the Papyrological Symposium in April 1976 at Urbana, Illinois. Earlier versions were read at the meeting of the Mommsengesellschaft at Bochum in 1972 (cf. K. Rudolph, *Mélanges d'hist. des rel. off. à H.-Ch. Puech* [Vendôme, 1974] 480 n. 0 and 483 n. 2) and at the Universities of Amsterdam (1973) and Cologne (1975). The texts quoted from the Cologne Mani Codex (CMC) are taken from the edition (pp. 1–72: A. Henrichs, L. Koenen, *ZPE* 19 [1975] 1–85; the next instalment [pp. 72–99] is scheduled to come out in 1977; the rest is in preparation; cf. *ZPE* 5 [1970] 97–216). I am particularly indebted to A. Henrichs, my editorial “twin,” further to K. Rudolph and to R. W. Daniel; the latter improved the English of this version considerably.

² α 33. The passage marks a decisive change in human thought. In the rest of the Homeric epics we find the older view that fate and the gods are responsible for man's deeds and misery; the Homeric hero was not aware of man's freedom of decision and choice. Priamos, e.g., addresses Helena: οὐ τί μοι αἰτή ἐσσι, θεοί νό μοι αἰτιοί εἰσιν (*I* 164; cf. *T* 86 f. 409 f.; Φ 275 f.; α 347 ff.; λ 558 ff.; *hymn to Dem.* 77 ff.). See Ch. Voigt, *Überlegung und Entscheidung, Studien zur Selbstauffassung des Menschen bei Homer*, Beiträge z. klass. Phil. 48 (Meisenheim, 1972) (reprint of the dissertation [Hamburg, 1932]), particularly p. 104; D. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford², 1966) 168 f.; R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee, Zetemata* 2 (München, 1951) 195; W. Pötscher, *Porphyrios ΠΡΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΕΛΛΑΝ* (Leiden, 1969) 79 f. (with more literature); N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974) 192 ff.; H. Erbse, *ZPE* 22 (1976) 4. A first step in the new direction is attested by the speech of Phoenix in *I* 496; see, e.g., M. Noé, *Phoenix, Ilias und Homer* (Leipzig, 1940); W. Theiler, *Festschrift E. Tièche* (Bern, 1947) 129 f.

blamed the citizens themselves, not Zeus and Athene, for ruining Athens;³ and Hesiod formulated the idea that man must choose between *κακότης* and *ἀρετή* (*Erga* 286 ff.), a concept which Prodikos illustrated with the example of Herakles.⁴ Although in Aischylos man's destiny is to suffer misfortune and ruin, he proceeds to this end on the basis of his free decisions.⁵ In general, the Greeks sought to explain the human condition as situated between the poles of fate and self-determination. Plato formulated the theory thus: *αἰτία ἐλομένων θεὸς ἀνάιτιος*. The words were absorbed and transmitted by later Platonists as well as by Christian authors; according to Didymos of Alexandria, *ἡμᾶς, οὐ γὰρ τὸν θεὸν αἰτιατέον*.⁶ Man is free in spite of all necessity.

The concept of free will lies at the basis of Aristotelian ethics: *ἐφ' ἡμῖν δὴ καὶ ἡ ἀρετή, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ κακία*.⁷ Only on this assumption is it possible to impeach and punish a person. Thus Aristotle states that praise and blame are bestowed only on voluntary actions, whereas pardon is granted to involuntary offences (*Nic. Eth.* 3, 1, p. 1109b). Without free will morality is impossible.

The Greeks liberated man from almighty fate. Later, converted to Christianity, they had to reconcile their sense of human freedom with the experience of dependence on an almighty God. The philosophical concept of free will played a major role in the theology of the Christian writers of Alexandria. They were followed by others, especially the Cappadocians.

(*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur* [Berlin, 1970] 15 ff.); A. Dihle, *Homer-Probleme* (Opladen, 1970) 167 ff. For a different view see, e.g., E. Wüst, *Rh. Mus.* 101 (1958) 57 ff.; H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (Sather Class. Lectures 41; Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1971) 9 ff. For the underlying psychology cf. also J. Russo, *JHI* 29 (1968) 483 ff.

³ Fr. 4, 1 ff.W., cf. 11, 1 ff.; W. Jaeger, *SPAW* 1926, 69 ff. (*Scripta min.* I, 318 ff.); H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentum* (New York, 1951) (*Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, transl. by M. Hadas and J. Willis [New York, 1975]) 293.

⁴ Xen., *Mem.* 2, 1, 21 ff. (Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker* II, 84 B 2); cf. E. Pansofsky, *Hercules am Scheidewege* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1930) 42 ff.

⁵ B. Snell, *Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama*, *Philologus*, Suppl. 20, 1 (Leipzig, 1928).

⁶ Plato, *Rep.* 617E; cf. *Tim.* 42D. *Corp. Herm.* 4, 8 p. 52 Nock-Festugière; Hierocli., *In carm. aur.* 441B and 477A; Procl., *Ad Marc.* 12 p. 18 Pötscher (see also August., *Conf.* 2, 7, 15). The sentence of Didymos as quoted above is an amended version taken from the unpublished part of his commentary on Job (pp. 359, 29 ff.); the reading of the papyrus is: οὐ γὰρ [[ἡμᾶς οὐ γὰρ]] τ[ὸ]ν θεὸν αἰτιατέο[ν]. Julian the Arian adopts Plato's phrase literally (p. 256, 16 Hagedorn). Cf. N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of the Original Sin*, Bampton Lectures, 1924 (London, 1927) 214.

⁷ *N.E.* 3, 7 p. 1113b; cf. M. Wittmann, *Aristoteles über die Willensfreiheit* (Fulda, 1921) (*non vidi*); D. Amand, *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque*, *Recueil de Travaux*, 3me série, 19 (Louvain, 1945) 35.

Not even God can force man to do what he does not desire to do; God offers grace, but man must accept it by free decisions.⁸

The belief in man's responsibility for his deeds and for the misery which can result from them would probably not have had the impact which made western culture possible, were it not that Augustine of Hippo made the concept of free will a central dogma of the Western Christian church; hence the insight passed through the Middle Ages to the present day.⁹ Augustine's concept of free will was developed especially under the influence of Stoics, Neoplatonists and the Alexandrian church fathers.¹⁰

⁸ See, for example, Orig., *hom. on Jer.* 20, 2 GCS 3, 178, 14 ff.; PG 12, 1511D; Did., *PsT* 198, 17 ff. (M. Gronewald in connection with A. Gesché, part III; the passage is directed against the Manichaeans). Cf. P. Mehlhorn, *ZKG* 2 (1878) 234; G. Teichtweier, *Die Sündenlehre des Origenes*, Studien zur Geschichte der kath. Moralthologie 7 (Regensburg, 1958) 77 ff.; *idem*, *Das Sein des Menschen*, inaug. dissertation (Tübingen, 1951) (not printed), 381 ff.; H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*, *Théologie* 34 (Paris, 1956) 132 f.; D. Amand, *loc. cit.* (see n. 7) 297 ff. For Didymos see A. Henrichs, *HiT* I, 27 n. 4 f.; J. Kramer, *EcclT* III, 23 n. 2 and IV, 27 n. 3; G. Bardy, *Didyme l'Aveugle* (Paris, 1910) 132 f.

⁹ When in the Renaissance classical authors were read extensively, the concept of free will became tremendously important for life, art, and letters (see Panofsky, *loc. cit.* [n. 4]; Voigt, *loc. cit.* [n. 2]); but much of the background lies in the tradition of scholastic and other medieval teachings on the free will (cf. E. Cassirer, *Individuum und Kosmos in der Philosophie der Renaissance*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 10 [Leipzig and Berlin, 1927] chapt. 3 particularly on Pomponazzi's *De libero arbitrio* [= *The Individual and the Cosmos . . .*, transl. by M. Donandi (Philadelphia, 1963) 80 ff.]). "Augustine's study of Plotinus is one of the conditions which rendered Renaissance possible" (R. Dodds, *The Hibbert Journal* [1927-1928] 470).

¹⁰ For Augustine's teaching on the free will see, e.g., J. Ball, *L'année théol. aug.* 6 (1945) 368 ff. and 7 (1946) 400 ff.; G. de Plinval, *Rev. des ét. Aug.* 1 (1955) 345 ff. and 5 (1959) 13 ff.; Fr. Sontag, *HTR* 60 (1967) 297 ff.; M. Huftier, "Libre arbitre, liberté et péché chez saint Augustin," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33 [1966] 187 ff.); C. Andresen, *Bibliographia Augustiana* (Darmstadt, 1973) 124 ff. For the present purpose my documentation is mainly restricted to Augustine's antimanichaean writings. For the influence of the Neoplatonists on Augustine see, e.g., P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de S. Aug.* (Paris, 1950) 93 ff. (= *Zum Augustin-Gespräch der Gegenwart*, Wege der Forschung 5, ed. by C. Andresen [Darmstadt, 1962] 125 ff.); *idem*, *Les lettres grecques en Occident* (Paris, 1943) (2nd ed. 1948), 195 ff. (= *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources*, transl. by H. E. Wedeck [Cambridge, Mass., 1969] 208 ff.); H. Dörrie, *Miscellanea medievalia I: Antike und Orient im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1962) 26 ff.; W. Theiler, *Porphyrus und Augustin*, Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geistesw. Kl. 10 (1933) 1 ff. (= *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* [Berlin, 1966] 169 ff.); *idem* in: *Mullus, Festschrift Th. Klausner* (ed. by A. Stuiber and A. Hermann), *Jahrb. Ant. u. Christ., Ergänzungsband* 1 (1964) 352 ff.; Ch. Parma, *Pronoia und Providentia. Der Vorsehungsbegriff Plotins und Augustins*, Stud. zur Problemgeschichte der antiken und mittelalterlichen Philosophie 6 (1971); P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (Berkeley-Los Angeles [Paperback] 1966) 88 ff.; A. Alfarié, *L'évolution intell. de S. Aug.* (Paris, 1918) 451 ff.; cf. C. Andresen's bibliography (above)

The latter taught that if one excludes human volition from moral actions, one eliminates the concept of virtue.¹¹ Augustine argues similarly: God bestowed free will upon the human mind to make moral acts possible.¹² Of course, Christian beliefs accounted for a slightly different phrasing and view of the old ideas. While Aristotle, for example, states that voluntary offences are punished and involuntary ones pardoned (see above), Augustine states that the very fact that man repents and is pardoned by God points to free decision: “*satis enim stultum est ignosci ei qui nihil mali fecit.*”¹³

It was in the denial of free will that Didymos recognized the vulnerability of Manichaeism.¹⁴ Underlying the quarrel was the question formulated by Plotinus: *πόθεν τὸ κακόν*; the Manichaeans had directed themselves against the Jewish faith; for to begin by accounting God the creator of all things easily led to assigning to him the ultimate cause of evil. To escape such a conclusion, the Manichaeans turned to gnostic ideas; instead of one God, they assumed two divine principles, the Good and the Evil, Light and Darkness which had fought each other since eternity. In the course of the struggle, the two substances partly mixed with each other; the Light was dispersed and imprisoned in the darkness, the *hyle*. The mind (*Noûs*), the soul of man and animals, and the vegetative power of plants, are particles of the Great *Noûs*, i.e., God's Light.¹⁵ On the other hand, the spirits of

53 ff.; for Stoic influences, *ibidem* 97 ff.; on the problem of Augustine's knowledge of the Greek fathers, particularly of the Alexandrians, see P. Courcelle, *Les Lettres* (above), 183 ff. (= *Late Latin Writers*, 196 ff.); and several articles by B. Altaner, all reprinted in his *Kleine patristische Schriften* (ed. by G. Glockmann; Berlin-Darmstadt, 1967) particularly 154 ff. 224 ff. 297 ff. 316 ff.

¹¹ Orig., *c. Cels.* 4, 3 GCS 1, 276, 18 f. ἀρετῆς μὲν ἐὰν ἀνέλθῃ τὸ ἐκούσιον, ἀνείλες αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν (cf. A. Miura-Stange, *Celsus und Origenes*, Beih. ZNW 4 [Gießen, 1926] 76); Did., *EccI* 296, 6 (unpubl.) ἐάν, φησίν, περιέλθῃ τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ ἐκούσιον, οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἀρετῆς, and *PsT* 199, 17 (M. Gronewald in connection with A. Gesché; part III).—*PsT* 67, 20 f. (Gronewald, part II) διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ τὸν λογικὸν πεποίηκεν, ἵνα δέχεται ἀρετὴν καὶ ἐνεργῆ αὐτήν.

¹² *c. Fort.* 15 CSEL 25, 1, 92.5 ff.; cf., e.g., 16 p. 93, 26 ff.; 21 p. 100, 9 f.

¹³ *c. Fort.* 16 p. 94, 4 ff.; *c. Fel.* II, 17 p. 847, 11 ff. Cf. Did., *c. Manich.* 15 PG 39, 1103C f.

¹⁴ Did., *c. Man.* 10 ff. p. 1097C ff.; *EccI* 288, 9 ff. (quoted by A. Henrichs in his edition of *HiT*, part I p. 29 n. 7); *PsT* 77, 25 ff. (Gronewald, part II; the passage reflects Aristotelian thought); *ZachT* II, 175 ff. p. 132, 28 (mainly against the Valentinians; cf. L. Doutreleau's introduction I, 93 f.). Cf. Orig., P.G. 14, 1305A.

¹⁵ G. Widengren, *The Great Vohu Manah*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1945, 5. H.-Ch. Puech, *Le manichéisme* (Paris, 1949) 74 ff.; H. J. Polotsky, *RE Suppl.* 6, 245 ff. (= *Collected Papers* [Jerusalem, 1971] 701 ff.; H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* (Göttingen³, 1964) 284 ff.; K. Rudolph, Mani, in: *Die Grossen der Weltgeschichte* (Enzyklopädie)

Darkness created, by copulation and cannibalism, the concupiscent body to fetter and retain the light of the soul.¹⁶ Enmeshed in the physical creations of Evil, the soul or divine substance of man forgot its origin and became entirely powerless. With such a theodicy, not God, but the principle of Darkness is responsible for evil. In such a system, however, God is not almighty, but conditioned and limited by the power of evil. Exactly for this reason Augustine finally rejected the dualistic explanation of evil. Rather, in line with the scriptures and teachings of the Christian church, he accepted the principle that everything, even the human body, was created by God. But as God could not be the cause of the evil,¹⁷ Augustine had to search for a different cause (cf. *Conf.* 7, 3, 4). He finally found the solution in a concept which was developed by interpreters of Plato and held by the Alexandrian fathers as well as by the Neoplatonists: evil is not a substance, but an accident; as such it is a *στέρησις τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ* or a *φθορά* and *μὴ ὄν*. Thus as far as moral evil is concerned, it exists only in the bad intentions of the free will.¹⁸ *discite non substantiam malum esse*, states Augustine expressly;¹⁹ and elsewhere: *quid est autem aliud quod malum dicitur nisi privatio boni* (*ench.* 11). Or: (*malum*) *nihil aliud est quam corruptio*,²⁰ and: *exortum fuisse hominis malum ex libero voluntatis arbitrio*.²¹ Occasionally he explains the existence of corruption and evil as due to

II, 545 ff., esp. 552 ff.; *idem*, II manicheismo, in: *Storia delle religioni* (ed. by G. Castellani) IV, 775 ff., esp. 782 ff.; F. Decret, *Mani et la tradition manichéenne* (Paris, 1974) 79 ff.

¹⁶ Therefore procreation is sinful for it causes the divine Light to be entrapped in another body. In the *CMC* the body is called *μαρῶτατον καὶ διὰ μωσαρότητος πεπλασμένον, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἐτυρώθη καὶ οἰκοδομηθὲν ἔστη* (85, 8 ff.).

¹⁷ Aug., *De ut. credendi* 36 CSEL 25, 46, 24 ff.; *De div. quaest.*, PL 40, 21 E. It is significant that Augustine began his first book on free will (CSEL 74) with the question whether God is the cause of evil. For the arguments by which evil was connected with God see, e.g., *de duab. anim.* 10 p. 63, 15 ff. The wrong answer to the question *unde malum et qua re* was regarded as the source of gnosticism (Tert., *de praescr.* 7; *adv. Marc.* 1, 2; cf. Ps.Clem., *rec.* 3, 75, 6). Cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Das Judentum* (Bern and Munich, 1964) 99 (= *Jewish Christianity*, transl. by D. R. A. Hare [Philadelphia, 1964] 121 ff.); *idem*, *ZRGG* 11 (1959) 93 (= *idem*, *Studien zur unbekanntenen Religionsgeschichte*, Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft f. Geistesgesch. [Göttingen, 1963] 93).

¹⁸ U. and D. Hagedorn and L. Koenen in their edition of Didymos, *HiT*, part III (Bonn, 1968), pp. 229 ff. n. 22.

¹⁹ *c. ep. fund.* 27 CSEL 25, 227, 10 f.; cf. *c. Fel.* II, 4 p. 831, 26 ff.

²⁰ *de nat. boni* 4 p. 857, 3 ff.; *c. ep. fund.* 35 p. 239, 18 ff. Didymos used the priority of the good as evidence for the preexistence of the soul; see *PsT* 259, 16 ff. (M. Gronewald, part IV); 129, 6 ff. (Gronewald in connection with A. Gesché, part III) = 1, 5 ff. Kehl; *HiT* 260, 20 ff. (Hagedorn-Koenen, part III).

²¹ *retr.* 1, 15 (*contra Fort.*) CSEL 36, 82, 10. Sin is defined as follows (*de duab. an.* 15 CSEL 25, 70, 15 ff.): *peccatum est voluntas retinendi vel consequendi quod iustitia vetat et unde liberum est abstinere. quamquam si liberum non sit, non est voluntas*. Cf. *ibidem* 71, 4 ff.

God's creation *de nihilo*. This is slightly different from the Greek explanation of evil as $\mu\eta\ \delta\nu$.²² Without Augustine's being aware of it, his *nihil* becomes an *aliquid* and assumes the negative qualities of the Manichaean *hyle*.

Because no creator of evil is required in this philosophy, Augustine succeeded in overcoming the dualistic notions of the Manichaeans. This was important for his spiritual development and thus for his teachings and writings, which came to influence the formation of the Western Church. The mere presence of the Manichaeans forced Augustine to react; consequently, the idea of free will and of man's responsibility for himself prevailed against fatalistic conceptions.

Nevertheless Augustine's notion of the free will was colored by Manichaean thoughts. He once stated that free will existed only in Adam and Eve, and another time that free will was lost with sin.²³ The concept of original sin was not invented by Augustine; rather the notion is inherent in the structure of the human mind and can be traced to the behavior of primitive man.²⁴ Among Christian authors, it was particularly the

²² *c. ep. fund.* 36 p. 241, 23 ff. explains the corruption *ex eo quod hae naturae quae corruptibi possunt non de deo genitae* (the Manichaean explanation), *sed ab illo de nihilo factae sunt*. This is repeated in 38 p. 244, 1 ff., then 244, 15 ff.: *cum enim dicitur "natura corruptibilis," non unum, sed duo nomina dicuntur; item cum dicitur "deus fecit de nihilo," non unum, sed duo nomina audimus. redde ergo istis singulis illa singula, ut cum audis "naturam," ad "deum" pertineat, cum audis "corruptibilem," ad "nihilum," ita tamen, ut ipsae corruptiones, quamvis non sint ex dei arte, in eius tamen potestate sint disponendae pro rerum ordine et meritis animarum*. The *nihil* assumes almost the quality of being, just as, on the next level, the *hyle* becomes *paene nihil* and a *paene nulla res* which God created *de nulla re* (*Conf.* 12, 8, 8; cf. Ch. Parma, *loc. cit.* [see n. 10], 79). W. Theiler compares the Christian term *de nihilo* with Porphyry's concept of the demiurge who brings the sensible things into existence by the very act of thinking, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\varsigma$ <παράγων> τὸ ἔνυλον (Porph. *ap. Procl.*, in *Tim.* 1, 396, 5; W. Theiler, *loc. cit.* [see n. 10] 14 f. = 177).

²³ *c. Fort.* 22 CSEL 25, 103, 26 ff. *liberum voluntatis arbitrium in illo homine fuisse dico qui primus formatus est. ille sic factus est ut nihil omnino voluntati eius resisteret si vellet dei praecepta servare. postquam autem libera ipse voluntate peccavit, nos in necessitatem praecipitati sumus qui ab eius stirpe descendimus. Ench.* 30 p. 68 *Barbel libero arbitrio male utens homo et se perdidit et ipsum . . . cum libero peccaretur arbitrio, victore peccato amissum est liberum arbitrium* (the argument is aimed at the necessity of grace). Cf. *c. Fort.* 25 p. 108, 18 ff. Elsewhere and later Augustine distinguishes clearly between the freedom of paradise which has been lost in consequence of sin and the free will without which man could not even sin (*c. duas epist. Pel.* 1, 2, 5 CSEL 60, 425, 24 ff.—The aspects of necessity, providence, and grace, though essential for Augustine's concept of the free will, can be neglected in the present context. For the persistence of Manichaean ideas in Augustine's thought see A. Adam, *ZKG* 69 (1958) 16 ff.

²⁴ W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, RGVV 32 (Berlin–New York, 1972). For the history of the idea of original sin in the church and in Judaism see, e.g., J. Gross, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas* (München–Basel, 1960); N. P. Williams, *loc. cit.* (see n. 6); F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge, 1903); cf. n. 8.

Alexandrians who incorporated the sin of Adam in their theological system, though quite differently from what became a dogma of the church. They assumed two original sins; one explains the state of man's soul, the other the state of his body. The first sin is connected with the belief that all souls once lived with God in the happiness of preexistent life. There they turned towards the *hyle*, i.e., they sinned, and as a consequence they were incorporated in human bodies. The other sin is that of Adam and Eve. Their bodies were of light, or rather, spiritual *hyle* which suited the condition of paradise; as they were created by God, they were good. But with their sin Adam and Eve had turned towards the *hyle* and, by that, they lost paradise. For the new material world they needed new bodies of more solid *hyle*. God thus had to create the "garment of skin," the mortal body as we know it (*Gen.* 3, 21). This body again suits its purpose. It is good, as created by God; but as made of solid *hyle*, it is mortal, hinders the intellectual abilities of the mind and reduces the capacity to recognize right and wrong. Thus man is bound to commit sins without knowing it. This applies particularly to the sins of youth. Consequently man is *ἐν ῥύπῳ*, before he is redeemed by Christ. Because this second body is that transmitted in procreation, the sin of Adam and Eve and its consequences are inherited. Nevertheless nobody is punished for the sin of his forefathers. For when a soul falls from heaven, it gets exactly the body which corresponds to its state of mind and disposition. Each gets the body it deserves due to the sin committed in the preexistent life. No person is held responsible and punished for sins which he did not commit himself.²⁵

²⁵ This account is based on Didymos the Blind's lectures and writings preserved by the Toura papyri; in Origen, enough of the essential details can be found so that I feel confident that he had already had the same system. The main passages in Didymos are as follows: *HiT* 260, 23 ff. (Hagedorn-Koenen; part III); 365, 7 ff. (unpubl.): see particularly 366, 2 ff., where *Job* 14, 4 (*τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἐστὶν ἀπὸ ῥύπου; οὐδὲ εἷς, ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*), according to one of two possible explanations, refers to *ὁ νῦν ἀν γεννώμενος ὁ [κατὰ] διαδοχὴν ἔχων τοῦ Ἀδ[ά]μ τὸ ἀμάρτημα*; 282, 23 ff. and 283, 15 f. (both in part III); 66, 5 ff. (Henrichs, part I), where the essential sentence may be reconstructed thus: *εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦν αἴ[τ]η ἡ οἴξ[ι]ασα* (*sc.* *ἡ νύξ*, i.e., the state of the soul, when it sinned before it was born and consequently was on its way into life), *[οὐδ' ἂν ἠνοίγοντο π[ύ]λα γασ[τ]ρ[ό]ς] μητρὸς* (*Job* 3, 10), *ὃ ἐστίν· οὐκ [ἂν μοι ἦν ὁ ἐπώ]ιδνος οὗτος βίος, [εἰ μὴ δι' ἀμ]αρτίαν τοιαύτης ψ[υ]κτὸς* (the sin of the preexistent soul) *ἐποι]εῖτο* (*sc.* this miserable life) *τοῦ γένους ἅμ[άρ]του* (*sc.* the mankind in Adam). *μὴ] | τούτου δ' ὑπάρχον[τος οὐκ ἂν] | οὐδ' ὁ κατ' οἰκονομίαν κ[ατὰ τὴν γῆν] | διάγων διὰ ταύτης [τ]ῆς [καταστά]σεως παρετέινετο* (the saints did not commit the sin of the preexistent souls, but were sent by God into the world to serve as models for others; as members of the human race, however, they were subject to the consequences of Adam's sin); *PsT* 129, 10 f. (M. Gronewald in connection with A. Gesché; part III) = p. 1, 10 ff. Kchl. Cf. Hagedorn-Koenen, *HiT* III p. 246 ff. n. 70 f.; 257 ff. n. 101; A. Henrichs, *HiT* I p. 311 ff.

Free will and self-responsibility are fully retained in this system. In it, original sin does not result in compulsion which virtually eliminates the freedom of will; original sin is not yet the antipole of free will, as it became with Augustine. It was Augustine's personal recognition of his own concupiscence and his Manichaean past which led him to regard free will in human nature only as severely conditioned by the consequences of original sin; human nature is spoiled and extremely weak. Augustine thought of concupiscence as one of the main results of original sin. It seems that he did not forget that according to the Manichaeans the body is created out of concupiscence and sexual excess. But he saw clearly that, as a creation of God, human nature and human body had to be good. Consequently they were spoiled by the original sin of Adam's free will.

As a powerful influence on Augustine and thus as a significant, though indirect influence on the formation of our culture, the Manichaeans command attention. Augustine's victory over the Manichaeans²⁶ became the victory of the occident over fatalism.²⁷

II. MANI'S RELATIONSHIP TO CHRISTIANITY AND Gnosticism

Central for the understanding of the growth,²⁸ influence, and religious nature of Manichaeism is its relationship to Christianity and Gnosticism. The *Cologne Mani Codex (CMC)* has confirmed that Mani was brought up among the Elchasaites in ancient Syria. This baptist movement originally sprang from heretical Judaism and was christianized with a Christianity which was or became Gnostic.²⁹ With Gnosticism travelled old Iranian

²⁶ This victory became possible when Augustine learned allegorical interpretation from the Alexandrian theologians. Significantly he concludes his *Confessions* with three books which explain the first lines of *Genesis*. Certainty on the interpretation of the creation account was necessary for him to overcome the Manichaean myths and theology. Thus the three final books are an integral part of the whole. On the importance of different methods of interpretation of the Old Testament see, e.g., *de util. cred.* 5 ff. CSEL 25, 7, 26 ff.: *secundum historiam, secundum aetiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriam*.

²⁷ Mani's own activities were certainly not hindered by fatalism. But ordinary people could not do much for the redemption of the divine Light within them.

²⁸ Cf. P. Brown, *JRS* 59 (1969) 92 ff. (= *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* [London, 1972] 94 ff.).

²⁹ Cf. now *ZPE* 5 (1970) 133 ff.; A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 23 ff.; K. Rudolph, *Mélanges* (see n. 1) 475 ff. The name of Elchasaïos has recently also been found in a Parthian text ('*lxs'*'; see W. Sundermann, *Acta Or.* 36 [1974] 130 and 148 f.; on the meaning of the name cf. Henrichs, 45 n. 77). For Jewish Christianity see H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen, 1949); *idem*, *Das Judenchristentum* (= *Jewish Christianity*; see n. 17); *idem*, *ZRGG* 10 (1958) 1 ff. (= *idem*, *Studien* [see n. 17] 80 ff.); J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Tourmai-Paris, 1958). For Jewish Christian Gnosticism see G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudo-Klementinen*, T.u.U.

ideas, notably an extreme dualism. From such various traditions in the baptist movement Mani developed his religious system by eliminating what he regarded as contradictions and innovations. This meant an elimination of the Jewish Law; for Mani fervidly departed from the Jewish heritage of the Elchasaites. He started as their reformer, but he did not restrict himself to their teachings. Already the Elchasaites thought that the True Prophet had come and would continue to come into the world in a series of incarnations. Thus the revelation was spread and had to be recollected from all places and times. Under these premisses it is not astonishing that Mani's reform of the Elchasaites turned into a syncretism in which all people, except the Jews, could recognize their own traditions.

The details should become clearer in the following pages. Our chief concern shall be the Christian elements in Manichaeism. Scholars tend to see them as superficial additions which were either part of the missionary activity of the Manichaeans beginning already in the lifetime of Mani or part of defensive propaganda in times of persecution, particularly in the 4th century in North Africa and Rome.³⁰ But Christian elements which

70 (Berlin, 1958); cf., however H. J. Schoeps, *ZRGG* 11 (1959) 72 ff. (= *Studien*, 91 ff.). Schoeps' distinction between Jewish Christianity as a belief in the salvation of a God of revelation, and gnosticism as belief in self-salvation of man is theologically useful and, concerning the Ebionites and Ps. Clement, probably correct; nevertheless, as Schoeps well knows, it cannot be applied to the Elchasaites, and in terms of history it is helpful to refer to Jewish Christian gnosticism (see H. J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde-Judenchristentum-Gnosis* [Tübingen, 1956]). The concept of the True Prophet marks the difference between the Ebionites and the Elchasaites; according to the latter, the series of incarnations of the prophet did not stop with Christ, but continued afterwards in the person of Elchasaio. Again, in terms of theology, this marks the departure of what can be called Christianity; but for historical purposes I shall continue to refer to Christianity in connection with the Elchasaites and Manichaeism. For the concept of the True Prophet see G. Strecker, *loc. cit.*, 145; H. J. Schoeps, *Judenchristentum* 20; 25; 33; 57; 68 ff.; 96; 100 f.; 108 (*Jewish Christ.* 16; 23; 35; 66; 68 ff.; 120; 126 f.; 138); *idem*, *ZRGG* 11 (1959) 72 ff. = *Studien*, 94; *idem*, *Numen* 4 (1957) 229 f. (= *Studien*, 118). Cf. also n. 59.

³⁰ Christianity so obviously affected even the Iranian texts (see n. 34) that G. Widengren accepted Christian influences on Mani for the last period of his life (*Mani und der Manichäismus* [Stuttgart, 1961] 158 = *Mani and Manichaeism* [London, 1965] 157 f.). For the Christian roots of Manichaeism see particularly A. Böhlig, *BSAC* 15 (1960) 41 ff. (= *Mysterium und Wahrheit* [Leiden, 1968] 202 ff.); E. Rose, *Die Christologie des Manichäismus nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Diss. Marburg, 1941; cf. S. Schulz, *Theol. Rundschau*, N.F. 26 [1960] 230 ff.); M. Boyce, *Indo-Iranian Journ.* 7 (1963) 75; G. Quispel, *Eranos Jb.* 36 (1967) 20 ff.; J. Ries, *Augustiniana* 14 (1964) 437 ff.; P. Nagel in: K. W. Tröger, *Gnosis und N.T.* (Berlin, 1973) 149 ff. ("bescheidenes christliches Erbe"); see also E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, *APAW* 1926, 4; according to H.-Ch. Puech's well balanced description of Manichaeism (p. 69; see above, n. 15), Christian as well as Indian and Iranian elements were for the most part later and superficial; this view now needs the modification given above. For the western branch of Manichaeism see F. Decret, *Aspects du Manichéisme dans l'Afrique Romaine* (Paris, 1970).

were hitherto considered peculiarities of the western branch of Manichaeism belong in fact to the oldest strata and are an integral part of the system. They should not be taken merely as an indication that the western branch departed from its Iranian origins.

(A) The Manichaeans' Identification of themselves as Christians,
according to Augustine

According to the picture given in Augustine's polemic treatises, the Manichaeans regarded themselves as *christiani* and *veri christiani*, whereas they thought the *catholici* to be *semichristiani*.³¹ Felix signed the protocol of the first proceedings against him: *Felix christianus, cultor legis Manichaei* (CSEL 25, 827, 3 f.). According to Faustus, the Manichaean bishop, his church considered itself in terms of the *sponsa Christi*; he regarded himself as a *rationabile Dei templum*.³² He distinguishes between three churches: Jewish, Christian, and pagan, and in this distinction the Manichaeans are represented as Christians.³³ Consequently these Manichaeans spoke of the Old Testament as the work of the demons; yet they accepted the New Testament in general.³⁴ Paul was of the highest authority for them.

³¹ For example, *de util. cred.* 30 CSEL 37, 21; 36 p. 47, 27 ff.; *c. Faust.* 26, 2 p. 730, 9 f.; 1, 2 p. 251, 23 f. and 3 p. 252, 13 ff.; cf. 15, 1 p. 415, 26 ff.; 26, 2 p. 730, 9 ff. Cf. E. Haenchen in: *Christentum und Gnosis*, ed. by W. Eltester. Beih. ZNW, 37 (Berlin, 1969) 38.

³² *sponsa c.*: *Faust.* 15, 1 p. 416, 8; 3 p. 419, 15 ff. *templum*: *c. Faust.* 20, 3 p. 537, 17 (cf. now CMC 15, 10 ff.: Manis body as *ἱερόν πρὸς εὐκλείαν τοῦ νοῦ* and as *ἀγιάτατος νεῦς πρὸς ἀποκάλυψιν τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας*).

³³ *c. Faust.* 31, 2 p. 757, 18 ff.; the Catholic church and the Jews were regarded as *schismata gentilitatis* with the result that only the Manichaeans remained the true Christians (*ibidem*, 20, 3 f. p. 537, 3 ff.; cf. F. Ch. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionssystem* [Tübingen, 1831; repr. Hildesheim, 1973] 334 ff.). Faustus reports that once he thought that in order to be a true Christian he would have to obey the Jewish Law and to become first a Jew; but he was taught by his Manichaean teacher that this would be a wrong interpretation of *Matth.* 5, 17. Thanks to this teacher, Faustus is *hodie christianus*, not *Iudaeus* (19, 5 p. 501, 1 ff.).

³⁴ F. Decret, *loc. cit.* (see n. 30), 123 ff., 151 ff.; for quotations from the gospels (most probably from Tatian, see below p. 193 f.) in Parthian texts see O. Klíma, *Manis Zeit und Leben* (Prague, 1962) 468 ff. (M 18; M 132; M 475); W. Sundermann, *MIO* 14 (1968) 389 ff. (M 4570; cf. J. P. Asmussen, *Manichaean Literature* [Delmar, New York, 1975] 101; Sundermann, *loc. cit.* [n. 29], 139); *idem*, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*, Berliner Turfantexte IV (Berlin, 1973) 106 f. (M 6005) and 108 (M 338). The Coptic texts and now the CMC frequently refer to and cite the *NT* (cf. here p. 193; I was unable to consult A. Böhlig, *Die Bibel bei den Manichäern* [inaug. dissert. Münster, 1947]). In spite of their rejection of the Old Testament, they imitated the *Psalms*; a whole group is directed to Jesus (C. R. C. Allberry, *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection II [Stuttgart, 1938]). For Paul

(B) The Manichaean Church as *Corpus Manichaei* or *Corpus Christi*,
according to the *CMC*

Though traces of Christianity are left in the Iranian texts (see nn. 30 and 34), they are especially obvious in the Coptic texts and the new Greek *CMC*. Both show the typical Christian abbreviations of holy names.³⁵ Moreover, the theological language of the new codex is partly influenced by Paul.³⁶ A good example is provided by its title: *περὶ τῆς γέννησης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*, "On the Birth of His Body." In fact, the Coptic Manichaean codex, which was unfortunately lost in the Second World War, seemingly showed the same literary structure and probably was part of the same work.³⁷ The Coptic part dealt with the history of the Mani-

see now the reference to a *martyrium Pauli* in a middle Persian homily: W. Sundermann in: *Hommages et opera minora, monumentum H. S. Nyberg*, II. Acta Iranica (Leiden, 1975) 297 ff.; cf. 310 f., a homily on Paul. Also for Paul, cf. C. Colpe, *Ex orbe religionum, Studia G. Widengren*, Suppl. Numen 21 [Leiden, 1972] 401 f. The *NT* was regarded as interpolated by Jews and Catholics; cf., e.g., *de haeres.* 46 PL 42, 38 (= A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichaeismus*, Kleine Texte 175, no. 49); *c. Faust.* 8, 5 p. 383, 2 ff.; 11, 1 p. 313, 1 ff.; 16, 2 p. 441, 6 ff.; 18, 3 p. 491, 27 ff. (cf. 7 p. 495, 16 ff.); 23, 2 p. 707, 23 ff.; 24, 2 p. 724, 5 ff.; 31, 1 ff. p. 756, 2 ff.; 32, 7 p. 766, 15 ff. (list of refuted teachings of the *NT*); 32, 16 p. 776, 12 ff.; 33, 3 p. 788, 14 ff. The critical approach of the Manichaeans to the text is illustrated by Faustus in *c. Faust.* 17, 1 p. 483, 3 ff. The Manichaeans could judge the authenticity of the *NT* by the tenets of their faith; for Mani was regarded as *apostolos* and *paraclete* (see below); the *paraclete* told the Manichaeans *quid accipere ex eodem (sc. ex novo testamento) debeamus et quid repudiare (c. Faust.* 32, 6 p. 765, 19 f.).

³⁵ Cf. *ZPE* 19 (1975) 2.

³⁶ *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1 ff. n. 33, 74, 76, 78, 80, 96, 109, 111–114, 117, 119, 121, 122, 129, 134; *ZPE* 5 (1970) index p. 208 and 215 f.

³⁷ In their first description of the Coptic codex C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky (*SPAW* phil. hist. Kl. 1 [1933] 29) wrote: "Unser historisches Werk war offensichtlich nicht aus der Feder eines einzigen Schriftstellers geflossen, sondern ein Sammelband aus verschiedenen kleineren Aufsätzen und Berichten, die unter den Namen der betreffenden Autoren hier zusammengestellt sind." This description suits the *CMC* perfectly. Headings in the Coptic Codex furnish the names of Ammos, Salmaios, and Kustaios as authors of the articles and reports. Having the same function, the names of Salmaios and Kustaios occur in the headings of the *CMC*. The Iranian biographical fragments seem not to come from the same historical work (W. Sundermann, *loc. cit.* [see n. 29] 146 f.); however some fragments quote the reports of older authorities in a similar way. A section of M 4575 begins: "(Es berichten) die Geliebten" (Sundermann, *Acta Or.* 24 [1971] 87); this recalls the heading of *CMC* 26, 6 *οἱ διδάσκαλοι λέγουσαν*; but in the Iranian text the introductory phrase is not written as a heading. To the same Parthian codex belong M 6033 and 6031 (Sundermann, *loc. cit.* [see n. 29], 141), which seem to rely on information going back to Pattikios: ["Further, Pate]cius thus relates" (M 6033 col. A 3 f.; W. B. Henning, *BSOAS* 10 [1942] 942 ff.; L. J. R. Ort, *Mani. A Religio-Historical Description of his Personality* [Leiden, 1967] 55 ff.); cf. also M 6031, recto II, 1 (*ibidem*; also in Asmussen's collection [see n. 34], p. 55). Other information comes from Nūhẓādag, the interpreter (M 3;

chaeans after the death of Mani up to c. 300 A.D. The whole work was a history of the Manichaean church, and it consisted of several codices.³⁸ It was translated from Syriac into Greek, then from Greek into Coptic. If this is correct, the title found in the *CMC* may be the title of the whole work. In this case it cannot refer to the real body of Mani. In addition, from the Manichaean point of view, it is hard to see why they were interested in the real body of Mani which, according to their teaching, was no better than the body of other men and which could not be redeemed.³⁹

The title must have broader theological significance.⁴⁰ In the Manichaean tradition it stems from a phrase used by Baraies, a Manichaean apologist of the first generation after Mani.⁴¹ It can, however, be traced further back to the language of the Pauline formulation of the church as the body of Christ.⁴² Thus the title of the codex should be understood as "On the Birth of the Manichaean Church." In the Coptic *Kephalaia*, Mani addresses his pupils as "my brothers and my limbs" (213, 3). This shows that in the same way as the Christian church thinks of itself as the mystical body and as the limbs of Jesus Christ, the Manichaean church was regarded as the body and limbs of Mani. The conformity of ideas is even greater. According to the *Kephalaia*, both the Christian and the Manichaean church are the body of the heavenly spirit whom they called the "Apostle of Light." He invests himself in a series of bodies which are identified as the churches.⁴³ Thus the Manichaean church is the body of the "Apostle of Light," as the Christian church was previously. The Manichaean and the Christian churches were incarnations of the same heavenly spirit; as such they had the same essence.

Henning, *ibidem* 948 ff.; Ort, *ibidem* 52; Asmussen, *ibidem* 54). Cf. also *ZPE* 5 (1970) 110 ff.; K. Rudolph, *Mélanges* [see n. 1] 472 n. 7.

³⁸ To judge from the space which the *CMC* needed to deal with the early years of Mani, it seems that the history originally was comprised of several volumes.

³⁹ In *ZPE* 5 (1970) 104 our assumption that the title referred only to the physical body of Mani led us astray in our explanation of its meaning.

⁴⁰ See *ZPE* 8 (1971) 249 f.; A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 40 f.; K. Rudolph, *Mélanges* (see n. 1) 471.

⁴¹ *CMC* 46, 8 f.; see p. 170 §2. In this damaged passage *σῶμα* might refer to Mani's physical body. For Baraies see *ZPE* 5 (1970) 110 ff.; *ZPE* 19 (1975) 16 n. 28; 78 n. 40; 80 f. n. 80.

⁴² *Rom.* 12, 5; *1 Cor.* 10, 17; 12, 13 f. and 27; *Eph.* 1, 23; 2, 16; 4, 12 and 16; 5, 23 and 30; *Col.* 1, 18 and 24; 2, 19; 3, 15; cf. Bauer, *s.v.* *σῶμα* 5. C. Colpe in: *Judentum, Christentum Kirche. Festschrift für J. Jeremias*, edit. by W. Eltester, Beih. ZNW 26 (Berlin, 1960) 172 f.

⁴³ *Keph.* 36, 3 ff. "Die erste Kraft (sc. des Licht-*Noûs*) ist der Apostel des Lichtes, der jeweils zu seiner Zeit kommt und sich bekleidet mit der Kirche des Fleisches der Menschheit und Oberhaupt wird innerhalb der Gerechtigkeit" (Polotsky).

The same conclusion is suggested by the Manichaean chain of emanation of the five heavenly fathers. "Jesus the Splendor," the third father, emanated the "Light—*Noûs*"; the latter emanated the "Apostle of Light," who has just been mentioned as embodied in the churches. Moreover, the "Light—*Noûs*" himself is the "Father of all Apostles, the First of all Churches whom Jesus (*sc.* 'Jesus the Splendor') has installed in the holy church after our likeness."⁴⁴ Thus "Jesus the Splendor" is the divine essence of the Christian church as well as of the Manichaean church. The Manichaean church is the church of Jesus in the time of Mani.

This brings us back to the title of the *CMC*. "On the Birth of His Body" refers to the birth of the Manichaean church. "His Body" could be understood on different levels: the mystical body (1) of Mani, (2) of the "Apostle of Light," (3) of the "Light—*Noûs*" and (4) of Jesus. Theologically all these were interchangeable.⁴⁵ The "birth of the church" began with the physical birth of Mani;⁴⁶ thus the history of the Manichaean church as the mystical body of the divine emanations had to begin with the biography of Mani. Finally, within this broad context, the "birth of His body" includes also his physical body.

The title of the new codex and its theological connotations show that the early Manichaeans thought of themselves in much the same way that they did in the time of Augustine.⁴⁷ They claimed that after the Christian church turned away from the genuine teaching of Christ, the Manichaean church was sent into this world. Consequently, Faustus thought of his church as the fulfillment of the Christian church just as the Christian church understood itself as the fulfillment of the synagogue.

⁴⁴ *Keph.* 35, 18 ff.; cf. 36, 1 ff.: "Der vierte Vater ist der Licht-*Noûs*, der erwählt alle Kirchen" (Polotsky); 245, 8 ff.: "... der Licht-*Noûs*, der sie (*sc.* the church) erlöst, gerettet und gesammelt hat aus allen Orten" (Böhlig); 256, 6 f.: "Der Licht-*Noûs*, der in den Electi wohnt" (Böhlig). For the system of emanations see H. J. Polotsky in: Schmidt-Polotsky (see n. 37), 64 ff. (= Polotsky, *loc. cit.* [see n. 15], 674 ff.); also *ZPE* 5 (1970) 183 ff.

⁴⁵ The church was also (5) the body of the Perfect Man who was emanated by the Messenger, as Jesus the Splendor was; see Cod. Jourg 122, 27 ff., a passage which is regarded as Manichaean (see J.-E. Ménard in: *Christentum und Gnosis* [n. 31], 55). He is *τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὰ πάντα*, i.e., a kind of Jesus (cf. *Col.* 3, 11; *Rom.* 11, 36; *Eph.* 1, 10) and the Cross of Light (see below pp. 184 ff.). Thus the church is the body of the Perfect Man who, in essence, is identical with Jesus and the Cross of Light: it is the *ecclesia patiens*.

⁴⁶ *Keph.* 14, 3 f.: "[Als?] die Kirche des Heilands sich zur Höhe erhoben hatte, da geschah mein Apostelamt (*sc.* Mani's), nach dem ihr mich gefragt habt ---," 24 ff.: "Als aber die Kirche das Fleisch angelegt hatte, da war die Zeit gekommen, die Seelen zu erlösen --- In dieser selben Zeit [bildete?] er mein Bild, welches ich trage ---" (Polotsky).

⁴⁷ Faustus regarded himself as *rationabile Dei templum*; see p. 163.

(C) Mani as the "Apostle of Jesus Christ" and as the "Paraclete"

The Manichaean claim to be the genuine Christian church and to decide what is authentic in the New Testament was theologially based on the concept that Mani was the "Apostle of Jesus Christ." Mani claimed this himself just as Paul did in the opening formula of his letters: Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ.⁴⁸

The main evidence for Mani is as follows:

1. *Gospel*: ἐγὼ Μαννιχαῖος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολος διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ πατρὸς τῆς ἀληθείας. Middle Persian version: "Ich, Mani, (der) Gesandte Jesu (des) Freundes durch (den) Willen (des) Vaters, (des) wahrhaftigen Gottes."⁴⁹
2. *ep. fund.*: *Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi providentia dei patris.*⁵⁰
3. *exordia* of Mani's other letters: *Μαννιχαῖος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Manes apostolus Iesu Christi.*⁵¹ Cf. the imitations in a fictitious letter and an oration in the *Acta Arch.*: *ego, viri fratres, Christi quidem sum discipulus, apostolus vero Iesu.*⁵²
4. The longer *Formula of abjuration*: ἐτόλμησεν ἑαυτὸν παράκλητον ὀνομάζειν καὶ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.⁵³

⁴⁸ 2 Cor. 1, 1; Col. 1, 1; Eph. 1, 1; 2 Tim. 1, 1; cf. 1 Cor. 1, 1.

⁴⁹ CMC 66, 4 ff.; M 17; cf. ZPE 5 (1970) 189 ff. For (πατρὸς) τῆς ἀληθείας, an unparalleled addition to the Formula, see, e.g., 2 Clem. 3, 1 and 20, 5. "Jesus the friend" of the Iranian version is the redeemer who awakened and saved Adam, the first (and divine) man, after the latter was defeated by the Darkness (Theodor bar Kōnai, *Liber scholiorum* XI, CSCO 66, 317, 20 = A. Adam, *Texte* [see n. 34] no. 7, p. 22, 180). The expression occurs in Iranian and Chinese texts (Waldschmidt-Lentz, *loc. cit.* [see n. 30] 38 and 106 n. 2; ZPE 5 [1970] 193; cf. also H.-Ch. Puech, *L'annuaire du Collège de France* 71, *résumé des cours de 1970-1971*, 264). It is peculiar that the Iranian Manichaeans avoided the Jewish and Christian term of Christ in their *Gospel*. This may well be a later reaction to theological discussions of the kind attested by Augustine in *c. Faust.* 13, 4 p. 381, 6 ff.: --- *quemnam testem vobis sui apostolatus adduxit? nomenque ipsum Christi quod non scimus nisi in regno Iudaeorum in sacerdotibus et regibus institutum --- cur iste invasit, cur usurpavit qui prophetis Hebraeis vos vetat credere, ut vos falsi Christi fallaces discipulos falsus et fallax apostolus faciat?*

⁵⁰ August., *c. ep. fund.* 5, p. 197, 10; 6 p. 199, 10 f.; *c. Fel.* 1 p. 801, 16; cf. 16, p. 819, 18; below, p. 176.

⁵¹ C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, *loc. cit.* (see n. 37), 26 who reconstructed the Greek from the Coptic. August., *Op. imperf.* 3 PL 45, 1318 = Adam, *Kl. Texte* (s. n. 34), no. 12 (from Mani's *epist. ad Menoch.*); cf. August., *c. Faust.* 13, 4, p. 381, 4 f.: *omnes tamen eius epistulae exordiuntur: Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi; idem, de haer.* 46 PL 42, 38 (see n. 34): *promissionem Domini Iesu Christi de paraclete Spiritu sancto in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo dicunt esse completam. unde se in suis litteris Iesu Christi apostolum dicit eo quod Iesus Christus se missurum esse promiserit atque in illo miserit spiritum sanctum;* cf. G. Quispel, *Mani the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, in: *Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972) 667 ff.; E. Rose, *loc. cit.* (see n. 30).

⁵² 15 p. 23, 17 Beeson; cf. the letter, *ibidem*, p. 5, 22.

⁵³ PG 1, 1461C = Adam, *Texte* (s.n. 34), no. 64; cf. the shorter *Formula of abjuration*, PG 100, 1324C (= Adam, *loc. cit.*, no. 63).

Augustine argued against this claim of Mani. He said that Mani is not mentioned as an apostle in the New Testament and that he was not called by God as Paul was. The alternative would be that he was the apostle of the Holy Spirit, but, as Augustine stressed, this is not what Mani claimed to be.⁵⁴ Obviously Augustine did not understand or did not want to understand what the Manichaeans meant by Mani's apostleship. We have already followed the chain of emanation from "Jesus the Splendor" through the "Light—*Noûs*" to the "Apostle of Light." The latter elects the churches (see n. 45) and sends the apostle into this world. Hence, for the Manichaeans, Mani was the Apostle of "Jesus the Splendor"; he was not the apostle of the historical Jesus, as Augustine thought.⁵⁵ In terms of Manichaean theology Mani's apostleship made sense. Paul's apostleship was based on the call he received from Jesus in the apparition at Damascus after the lifetime of Jesus. Mani could understand this as a call by Jesus, the heavenly Father. Hence Mani could feel entitled to call himself an apostle of Jesus in the *exordia* of his letters as Paul did. In fact, Baraies quotes Paul's allusion to his vocation (2 *Cor.* 12, 1-5) in order to illuminate Mani's call.⁵⁶ In Mani's interpretation the initial formula of his letters referred to the relationship of the apostle to "Jesus the Splendor." The same phrase frequently meant different things to Christians and Manichaeans. This fact made the Manichaeism embarrassing to Christians.⁵⁷

Mani's claim went further than one might suspect from his use of the Pauline formula. He was the apostle of Christ, because he was the *Paraclete*, i.e., the "Spirit of Truth" whom Jesus had promised to send (*John* 16, 17; cf. 14, 16).⁵⁸ For the Christians the *Paraclete* came into the world at

⁵⁴ *c. Fel.* 1, 1 p. 802, 1 ff.; *c. epist. fund.* 6 p. 199, 10 ff. See also Augustine's arguments against Mani's claim to be the *Paraclete* (below).

⁵⁵ Augustine was, however, fully aware that the Manichaean Jesus was essentially different from the Christ of the Christian church; see, e.g., *c. Faust.* 2, 4 p. 257, 2 f., where Jesus Christ is the son of the First Man, that is to say that Jesus the Splendor is the son of the Messenger (the second Father). This belief enabled Faustus to confess *Jesum esse Christum filium dei vivi* (*ibidem*, 5, 3 p. 274, 14; cf. 20, 18 f.). For several Jesuses see n. 143.

⁵⁶ *CMC* 61, 4 ff.; cf. *ZPE* 5 (1970) 114 ff. The *Epistle to the Galatians* in which Paul also alludes to his vocation was also known to Baraies (*CMC* 60, 16 ff.). The quarrels about the apostleship of Mani reflect earlier discussions among Jewish Christians on the apostleship of Paul. The latter was refused as based on *ἔρασμα ἢ ὄπρασία* (*Ps. Clem., Hom.* 17, 13 f.; cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Judentum* [see n. 17], 42 ff. = *Jewish Christ.*, 47 ff.). In the *CMC* Mani's mission proceeds from *ὄπρασία* (3, 8 f.) and the vision of the Twin.

⁵⁷ That the vocation was brought to Mani by his Twin who acted as mediator between the Father and Mani is discussed below p. 170.

⁵⁸ Felix uses 1 *Cor.* 13, 9 (*ex parte scimus et ex parte prophetamus; cum venerit autem quod perfectum est, abolentur ea quae ex parte dicta sunt*) in order to demonstrate that Paul was not yet the *Paraclete*, but that somebody greater was to be expected, sc. Mani (*in Fel.* 1, 9 p. 811, 4 ff.).

Pentecost. In the Manichaean system, however, the concept was that the Spirit of Truth was sent into the world on several occasions, and that different generations had their own apostle.⁵⁹ Mani was the final fulfillment of this spirit, and for this reason he called himself *paraclete*. As he was this spirit of Truth, his revelation was true. According to Baraies, Mani reported his mission to his pupils in order that they could not doubt the truth of the revelation given to him (CMC 47, 1 ff. and note).

The chief passages for Mani's claim to be the *Paraclete* are the following:

1. *Gospel*: "--- daß er der Paraklet sei, den der Messias angekündigt habe ---" ⁶⁰
2. Baraies, CMC 17, 1 ff. [ἵνα --- (sc. the νοῦς of Mani who descended into his body) ---] ---, ἐλευθερώσῃ δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς τῆς ἀγνοίας γινόμενος παράκλητος καὶ κορυφαῖος τῆς κατὰ τήνδε τὴν γενεάν ἀποστολῆς. *ibidem*, 45, 1 ff. γινώτε --- καὶ περὶ τοῦ τρόπου καθ' ὃν ἀπεστάλη ἦδε ἡ ἀποστολή ἢ κατὰ τήνδε τὴν γενεάν ---, ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ [σώ]ματος [αὐτοῦ ---] [new paragraph:] τ[αῦτα] δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα μηδεὶς πιστεύσῃ τοῖς βλασφημοῦσι τι περὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς ταύτης τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ παρακλήτου ---. πάλιν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς γέν[ν]ης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ[. *ibidem*, 63, 1 ff. --- τοῦ πανευφημοτάτου ἀποστόλου --- ἀκόλουθόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν γράψαι --- τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις πᾶσι --- ὡς ἂν γνωσθῇ αὐτοῖς ἢ τε ἀρπαγῇ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποκάλυψις. ἐπιστάμεθα γάρ, ὦ ἀδελφοί, τὸ ὑ[περ]βάλλον τῆς σοφίας [δ]σον τυγχάνει τὸ μ[έ]γεθος πρὸς ἡμᾶς κατὰ ταῦτην τὴν ἀφίξιν τοῦ πα[ρακλήτου] τῆ[ς] ἀληθεί[ας]. *ibidem* 70, 10 ff. πλείστα δὲ ὑπερβολαὶ --- ὑπ[ά]ρχουσαν ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν αἰ δεικνύουσι τὴν τε ἀποκάλυψιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρπαγὴν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀποστολῆς. μεγί[στ]η γάρ τυγχάνει ἦδε ἡ [ὑ]περβολή τῆς ἀφίξεως [τ]αύτης τῆς διὰ τοῦ πα[ρακλή]του πνεύματος⁶¹ τῆς ἀλη[θείας] ἀφ[ι]κομένης πρὸς [ἡ]μᾶς].
3. *Keph.* 16, 28 ff.: "Wir [aber] haben es ausführlich angenommen und geglaubt, daß du bist der [Paraklet], der aus dem Vater (kommt), der Offenbarer aller Geheimnisse." (Polotsky).
4. In the Coptic *Psalm-Book* Mani is frequently invoked as *Paraclete*.⁶²

⁵⁹ This Manichaean doctrine is based on the Elchasaite concept of cyclic incarnations of the "True Prophet"; see above p. 4 and n. 29; *ZPE* 5 (1970) 139; A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 54 f.; *ZPE* 19 (1975) 76 n. 39 and 81 n. 80. From the Christian point of view nobody could be "Apostle of Christ" and *Paraclete* at the same time (cf. A. Böhlig, in *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*, ed. A. Dietrich, *Abh. Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 3. Folge, 96 [Göttingen, 1975] 157). For the Manichaeans, however, both titles expressed the belief that Mani had been sent by Jesus the heavenly father.

⁶⁰ Al-Bīrūnī 207, 18 f. Sachau = Adam, *Texte* (see n. 34) no. 1b.

⁶¹ The addition of πνεύματος does not point to the Twin. According to *John*, the *Paraclete* is τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας or τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (14, 17 and 26; 15, 26); the *Liber graduum* (3, 11 p. 69 f.: D. M. Kmosko, *Patr. Syr.* 3 [Paris, 1926]) renders the Old Syrian text of the *Diatessaron* as: *ecce ego mitto vobis Spiritum Paracletum*.—For the interpretation of the *Noûs* in CMC 17, 1 see *ZPE* 19 (1975) 17 n. 30.

⁶² Cf. K. Rudolph, *Mélanges* (see n. 1) 479 n. 1. For the *Psalm-Book* see above n. 34.

5. August., *c. Faust.* 13, 17 p. 398, 25 f.: *hunc paracletum dicentes esse Manichaeum vel in Manichaeo ---*. 15, 4 p. 423, 1 --- *qui se paracletum dicit ---*.⁶³

Baraies clearly considered Mani to be the *Paraclete*. This confirms the other assertions of the faith of Manichaean communities. Moreover it would be unreasonable still to doubt the information Albīrūnī gives on Mani's gospel; there Mani declared himself the *paraclete*. In one passage (*CMC* 17, 1 ff.), Baraies expresses the doctrine more exactly: it is Mani's *Noûs* that is the *paraclete*. His *Noûs*, like that of all men, descended from the heavenly realm of Light and was imprisoned in the body. The real Mani was the *Noûs* of Mani.

According to other evidence, however, neither Mani nor his *Noûs* were identified with the *paraclete*, but rather his *alter ego* who brought him the revelation. This is the *σύζυγος*, the "Twin," a gnostic term which may have been consciously reminiscent of *Phil.* 4, 3.⁶⁴ The main evidence is the following:

1. *Keph.* 14, 4 ff. (Polotsky): "Von jener Zeit an (*sc.* the beginning of Mani's apostleship) wurde der *Paraklet*, der Geist der Wahrheit, entsandt, der zu euch gekommen ist in dieser letzten Generation, wie der Heiland gesagt hat: 'Wenn ich gehen werde, werde ich euch den Parakleten schicken.'⁶⁵ ---;" 32 ff.: "--- da kam der lebendige Paraklet herab [zu mir und] redete mit mir. Er offenbarte mir das verborgene Mysterium, das verborgen ist vor den Welten und den Generationen, das Mysterium der Tiefe und Höhe ---;" 15, 19 ff. "Auf diese Weise ist alles, was geschehen ist, mir durch den Parakleten offenbart worden ---;" 16, 19 "[Denn der] Geist des Parakleten ist es, der zu mir gesandt worden ist von [dem Vater der Größe (?). ---];" Latin *Formula of abjuration* 18: *qui credit Manem sive Manichaeum --- spiritum sanctum habuisse paracletum, cum ea omnia non potuerit spiritus veritatis, sed spiritus falsitatis, anathema sit*.⁶⁶ In the *CMC*, however, and in Iranian and Arabic texts it is the Twin that brings Mani the revelation (*ZPE* 5 [1970] 161 ff. and below §2). The *Paraclete* and the Twin have the same function and are identical.
2. According to the report of Baraies in the *CMC*, Mani said several times that the heavenly Father sent the Twin to Mani in order to bring him the

⁶³ See also the following passages quoted from Augustine, particularly n. 82; further *Acta Archel.* 15, 3 *GCS* 24, 3 *sum quidem ego paracletus ---*; 31, 6 p. 44, 15 f.; 42, 2 p. 62, 3 f.; the two Greek *Formulas of abjuration* (see n. 53). For attestations in Arabic literature see C. Klīma, *loc. cit.* (see n. 34).

⁶⁴ For the gnostic term see below p. 174; I thank Mrs. J. Kenney for referring me to *Phil.* 4, 3.

⁶⁵ *John* 16, 7. The quotation is continued in the *Keph.*; see P. Nagel, *Festschrift zum 150 jährigen Bestehen des Berliner Ägyptischen Museums*, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Mitteilungen aus der Ägyptischen Sammlung VIII (Berlin, 1974) 303 ff.

⁶⁶ *PL* 65, 26 = Adam, *Texte* (see n. 34) no. 62; cf. M. de Beausobre, *Hist. crit. de Mani.* (Amsterdam, 1784) I, 267. For another relevant passage see below, §3 and n. 82.

revelation.⁶⁷ Because in the *Kephalaia* the Twin is identified with the *Paraclete*, one may wonder whether Baraies' phrasing refers to the words by which, according to *John*, Jesus promised to send the *Paraclete*. In this case Baraies' words reflect the assumption that the Twin was identified with the *Paraclete*. But before this conclusion can be reached (section D) we shall review (A) the relevant passages from Baraies, (B) the promises of the *Paraclete* according to the Syriac versions of *John*, and (C) the phrasing of these promises in other Manichaean writings.

A. Baraies on the mission of the Twin: *CMC* 18, 14 ff. ἀπέστειλέν μοι [έκειθεν ε]ϋθὺς σύζυγόν [μου (sc. ὁ μακαριώτατος πατήρ)]. 19, 16 ff. ἀπ[έ]στειλέ[ν μοι τὸν σύζυ]γόν [μου. 54, 5 ff. (The Twin tells Mani:) ὁ ἰσχυρότατος τὴν ὑπεροχὴν ἀπέστειλέ με πρὸς σέ. 69, 13. ἐξαπέστειλεν ἐκεῖθεν σύζυγόν μου τὸν ἀσφαλέστατον.⁶⁸

B. The promises to send the *Paraclete* according to the Old Syriac texts:⁶⁹
 a. *John* 14, 16 κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν (sc. ὁ πατήρ).

⁶⁷ Baraies does not specify which of the Fathers sends the Twin; one may think of the Light-Noūs (4th Father), Jesus the Splendor (3rd Father) or of the Father of Greatness (1st Father). It will become clear that the phrasing depends on *John* 16, 7 where Jesus sends the *Paraclete*; this he does also in the Syriac version of *John* 14, 16 (see below, sections B and D). Hence Mani or Baraies probably thought of Jesus the Splendor. Superlatives like ὁ ἰσχυρότατος τὴν ὑπεροχὴν (*CMC* 54, 5 f.; see section A) suit him; they do not necessarily denote the first Father (see also n. 101). Besides, the Manichaeans did not always distinguish between the powers of the heavenly Fathers. On the other hand, it is not very likely that Mani and the early Manichaeans knew the *Separate Gospels* (see p. 193) in which, according to *John* 14, 16, the "Father" is supposed to send the *Paraclete* (p. 171, text a).

⁶⁸ Cf. Epiph., *Pan.* 65, 6, 8 GCS 3, 9, 14 ἄλλον παράκλητον ὑμῖν ἀποστελῶ. 48, 11, 5 GCS 2, 234, 12 f. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ παράκλητον ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν. Naturally Baraies uses the same verb for Mani's mission: *CMC* 72, 15 ff. γινώμεν τὴν [παρου]σίαν αὐτοῦ πνευ[ματο]-ειδῶς, ὡς ἀπεστάλη] ἐξ ἐντολῆς τοῦ πατρὸς [αὐτοῦ] καὶ ποίωι τρό[πωι ἐγ]ενήθη κατὰ τὸ [σῶμα κα]ὶ ὡς ἦλθεν (cf. *John* 15, 26; 16, 7) αὐτῶν σύζυγος αὐτοῦ ὁ σεμνότατος --- (cf. *ZPE* 5 [1970] 117 f.). 22, 4 f. ποίωι τρόπωι διαστὰς αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ πατρὸς) ἀπεστάλην (says Mani according to Baraies). Cf. 45, 4 ff. (Baraies) καθ' ὃν (sc. τρόπον) ἀπεστάλη ἦδε ἡ ἀποστολή ἡ κατὰ τήνδε τὴν γενεάν. Timotheos, *CMC* 104, 12 ff. (The Twin tells Mani:) οὐκ εἰς τοῦτο μόνον τὸ δόγμα (sc. the baptists of Jewish origin) ἀπεστάλης, ἀλλ' εἰς πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ διδασκαλείαν καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον. Similarly regarding the Manichaean missionaries *CMC* 124, 7 ff. (Timotheos?) ἀποσταλή[σονται] πρεσβευταὶ καὶ [ἀπόστο]λοι εἰς πάντα τό[πον] (cf. Tat., *Diatessaron Arab.* 55, 5 f. p. 239 Preuschen-Pott: "Und wie mich gesandt hat mein Vater, ebenso sende auch ich euch [*John* 20, 21]. Geht nun in die ganze Welt und predigt das Evangelium bei allem Geschöpf [*Marc.* 16, 15]. Und lehrt alle Völker und tauft sie --- [*Matth.* 28, 19]." *Act. ap.* 28, 28; Paul is ἔθνων ἀπόστολος, *Rom.* 11, 13. In the *NT* ἀποστέλλειν is frequently used for the mission of the apostles and disciples). In the *apoc.* *Epoch* quoted by Baraies the verb is applied to Michael: τοῦτον χάριν πρὸς σέ ἀπεστάλην (*CMC* 59, 6 ff.). For the *Keph.* see, e.g., 9, 19-25; 10, 10; 12, 3; 16, 4-10.

⁶⁹ For the following discussion see P. Nagel, *loc. cit.* (n. 65) and G. Quispel, *RSR* 60 (1972) 143 ff.; *idem, loc. cit.* (n. 51).

- α) *Sy^c* (*Separate Gospels*): “Und ich werde erbitten von meinem Vater, daß er euch einen *anderen* Parakleten sende ---.”⁷⁰
- β) Tatian’s *Diatessaron*: “--- I further send you another *Paraclete*.”⁷¹
- b. *John* 16, 7 ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν παράκλητον) πρὸς ὑμᾶς.
- γ) *Sy^s* (*Separate Gospels*): “Wenn ich aber gehe, sende ich euch den Parakleten.”⁷²
- δ) Tatian’s *Diatessaron*: --- “Behold! I send you the *Paraclete*.”⁷³
- The distinctive pattern of the old Syriac versions is that they always use a verb for sending⁷⁴ and add “*Paraclete*” as object. In the version of *John* 14, 16 according to the *Diatessaron* (text β) it is Christ who sends the *Paraclete* as in *John* 16, 7 (b). But the significant difference is that *John* 14, 16 has the addition of the word “another.”

- C. The promises of the *Paraclete* in the Manichaean writings: *Keph.* 14, 7 ff. (in the part quoted above in §1) follows the old Syriac version of *John* 16, 7 f. (b), either in the version of the separate *gospels* (above text γ) or in the version of the *Diatessaron* (text δ). The same is the case with Felix; August., *c.Fel.* 1, 2 p. 802, 10 ff. *vado ad patrem et mitto vobis spiritum sanctum paracletum*;⁷⁵ cf. 811, 10 *mitto vobis spiritum sanctum*.

⁷⁰ Translated by P. Nagel, *loc. cit.* (n. 65), 309; *Sy^p* (*Pešitta*) literally follows the Greek text: “Und ich werde erbitten von meinem Vater, und er wird euch einen anderen Parakleten geben” (Nagel). *Sy^c* (*Curetonian*): F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion damepharreshe* (Cambridge, 1904); cf. A. Smith Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels* (London, 1910).

⁷¹ Ephraem Syrus: “Je vous envoie encore quelqu’un d’autre qui profère de bonnes paroles” (L. Leloir, *Ephrem de Nisibe, Comm. de l’évang. concordant ou Diatessaron*, Sources Chrét. 121 [Paris, 1966] 338; *idem* [Latin translation], CSCO 145 [Louvain, 1954] 197). The passage is extant only in Armenian.

⁷² *Sy^s* = Sinai palimpsest; see Nagel, *loc. cit.* (n. 65), 308.

⁷³ Cf. n. 71. Ephraem Syrus: “Voici que je vous envoie celui qui profère de bonnes paroles.” Titus from Bostra, *Adv. Manich.* Syr. 4, 13 p. 135, 26 Lagarde: “Siehe, ich sende euch den Parakleten” (Nagel). See also *Liber graduum* 3, 11 (quoted in n. 61). The addition of *ecce* is the only difference between *Sy^s* and the *Diatessaron*.

⁷⁴ Cf. also *John* 15, 26 ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. The same verb is used for Christ’s mission and that of John’s himself.

⁷⁵ *vado ad patrem et* cannot be traced to any version of *John* 16, 7, though there is a vague possibility that it corresponds to the Syriac *Diatessaron* of which only the second part of the sentence is extant. It seems that Felix for his convenience combined three quotations into one sentence. *John* 16, 16 *vulg.*: (a) *quia vado ad patrem*; or 28 *vulg.*: *et vado ad patrem* (see also 16, 5 and 7); (b) *John* 16, 7 (see above); (c) The quotation is continued with a version of *John* 16, 13 *qui vos inducat in veritatem* (for these combinations see Fr. Decret, *loc. cit.* [see n. 30], 161, who, however, did not take the *Diatessaron* into account). To combine several quotations from the Bible into one sentence was a standard practice of the ancient theologians. Hence Felix’ combination does not discredit the textual form of the quotation of *John* 16, 7 (*mitto --- paracletum*). General reasons lead to the assumption that he rather quotes the *Diatessaron* (above, text δ) than the *Separate Gospels* (text γ). Cf. G. Quispel, *loc. cit.* (see n. 69); for traces of the *Diatessaron* in the *Keph.* see A. Böhlig, *BSAC* 18 (1965/6) 5 ff. = *Mysterium und Wahrheit* (see n. 30) 252 ff., particularly p. 261

Cf. also *De haer.* 46 (*Christus*) *in illo miserit spiritum sanctum* (see n. 51). Augustine himself, however, once followed the Syriac version of the *Diatessaron* corresponding to *John* 14, 16 which he obviously knew from his Manichaean days (see above text β): *c. epist. fund.* 6, p. 199, 16 *et alium paraclatum mittam vobis*.⁷⁶

D. Conclusion: The Manichaeans followed the Syriac versions of *John* 16, 7. They differ from the Greek text in that they have “I send you the *Paraclete*.” This corresponds to Mani’s words in the *CMC*: “He sent me the Twin.” The phrasing suggests indeed that Mani thought of his Twin as the promised *Paraclete*.

3. According to Augustine and the Latin *Formula of abjuration*, the *Paraclete* was thought to be *in* Mani. Hence he is different from Mani. But the phrase “*in* Mani” does not suit the concept of the Twin; therefore we shall deal with it below separately.

To sum up, Mani identified (1) himself or rather his *Noûs* and (2) his “Twin” with the *paraclete* of *John*. The seeming contradiction causes scholars difficulties. They tend to attribute the identification of Mani with the *Paraclete* to the later development of the Manichaean church.⁷⁷ If so, Al-Birûnî’s report on the gospel of Mani must be wrong (cf. p. 169, §1). Such a conclusion would be valid only if the two identifications of the *paraclete* were really opposite. The contradiction, however, disappears upon consideration of the gnostic concept of the Twin. When Mani, i.e., the *Noûs* of Mani, was sent into the world, a mirror image of the *Noûs*, i.e., his *alter ego*, remained in heaven. The one ego, the *Noûs*, was imprisoned in the body and, consequently, forgot his mission. Then the Twin, the *alter ego*, was sent to him from heaven. He brought Mani the revelation by reminding him of his divine nature and mission and, like an angel, protected him. The *Noûs* of Mani and his Twin are the two complementary aspects of Mani’s identity. The first represents him as incorporated in the body; the second represents his being as it is outside the body. Together they are the one complete Mani.⁷⁸ When Mani looked into

n. 3; A. Baumstark, *OC*, 3rd ser. 12 (1937) 169 ff.; *Keph.* 7, 21 ff. reports that Christ’s disciples recorded his parables and miracles and were ordered to compose a book (not books); see A. Baumstark, *OC*, 3rd ser. 8 (1933) 94 f. For the influence of the *Diatessaron* on Faustus see L. Leloir, *Ephrem de Nisibe* (see n. 71), p. 21; on Adamantus see Quispel, *loc. cit.* (*RSR*; see n. 69); for the *Acta Arch.* see G. C. Hansen, *St. Patr.* 7 (Berlin, 1966) 473 ff. But see also the sceptical remarks of P. Nagel regarding the use of the *Diatessaron* in the *Keph.* (*loc. cit.*; see n. 65).

⁷⁶ G. Quispel, *loc. cit.* (*RSR*; see n. 69) 145 f. For *c. epist. fund.* 6 p. 200, 12 ff. see below.

⁷⁷ See particularly O. Klíma, *loc. cit.* (n. 63) 237 ff.; K. Rudolph, *Mélanges* (n. 1) 478 n. 3; P. Nagel, *loc. cit.* (n. 65); cf., however, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 75 f. n. 39.

⁷⁸ Perhaps a misunderstanding of this concept prompted a disciple of Mani to assume the possibility of duplicating Mani on earth so that one Mani could stay with them, while

himself, he found his Twin approaching him from heaven; or, *vice versa*, when he looked at his Twin, he found himself. The story of the Twin bringing him the revelation relates what in abstract terms may be called the rediscovery of his identity and mission.

A similar gnostic structure is known from the Valentinians. They believed that each person has his *syzygos*. The latter is an angel who protects him and brings him the *gnosis* during his lifetime; after the person's death his *syzygos* leads him to the *pleroma* where, with the help of Christ, the two are finally united in a wedding.⁷⁹ Perhaps one may go a step farther. According to the Valentinians Christ and the Holy Ghost form a *syzygy*. They stay mainly in the *pleroma*.⁸⁰ Nevertheless this concept may have further inspired Mani to speak of a *syzygy* between himself and the *Paraclete* (the Holy Spirit).

In any case, Mani and his Twin were regarded as the same entity and as identical. Thus, if one of them is the *Paraclete*, so also is the other.⁸¹

This view of Mani and his Twin is illustrated in the *Kephalaia*. There Mani teaches his pupils that the *Paraclete* was sent to him in fulfillment of the Savior's promise (p. 170, §1); in these passages the *Paraclete* is identified with the Twin. Mani's pupils immediately reply with a confession of faith and they call Mani himself the *Paraclete* (p. 169, §3). As the *Noûs* of Mani and the Twin share the same identity, Mani's statement and the reply of his pupils are not contradictory. Rather, they express the same belief from different points of view.

the other was going to king Shapur. The disciple might also have thought of the Manichaean concept of several Jesuses (see n. 143 and 55). The answer he got from his master was this: "Siehe, ich ein einziger Mani, bin in die Welt gekommen ---" (*Keph.* 184, 3; cf. A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 23 ff.).

⁷⁹ Cf. H.-Ch. Puech, *L'annuaire* (see n. 49), 258; G. Quispel in *Eranos-Jahrb.* 15 (1947) 263 ff.; 36, 1967, 9 ff. J.-E. Ménard in: *Christentum und Gnosis* (see n. 31), 49 f. See particularly the fragment of Herakleon which is quoted by Origen, *In Joh.* 13, 11, 67 ff. (GCS 4, 235, 16 ff.; *Die Gnosis I*, by W. Foerster, edited by C. Andresen [Zürich and Stuttgart, 1969] 222 f = W. Foerster, *Gnosis, A Selection of Texts*, Engl. transl. edit. by R. McL. Wilson [Oxford, 1972] *I Patristic Texts*, p. 169 f.). For the gnostic origins of the concept of the Twin see further *ZPE* 5 (1970) 161 ff.; for the Valentinians see n. 124.

⁸⁰ Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1, 2, 5 ff. (= Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31, 13, 1 ff. GCS 1, 404, 23 ff.); Hipp. 6, 31, 7; *Die Gnosis* (see n. 79), 174 and 247. (Engl. transl. p. 129 f. and 188). The concept of the syzygies was Jewish (cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Judenchristentum* 73 ff. = *Jewish Christ.* 88 ff.; G. Strecker, *loc. cit.* [see n. 29], 188 ff.); the Manichaean concept, however, due to its gnostic connotations of mirror image and self-knowledge, was entirely different. Although it grew out through amalgamation of Elchasaite and gnostic concepts of syzygies; this will be shown in a forthcoming article in *ZPE*.

⁸¹ Euodius, *De fide Manichi.* 24 CSEL 25, 961, 16 f. on Mani (continuing the quotation in n. 85): *et utique si geminus est spiritus sancti, et ipse spiritus sanctus est ---*.

Augustine did not understand the gnostic concept. He left it undecided whether the Manichaeans claimed that Mani was the *Paraclete* or that the *Paraclete* was in Mani.⁸² The latter position, however, does not fully account for the Manichaean identification of the *σύζυγος* with the *Paraclete*.⁸³ Augustine knew that the Manichaeans believed that Jesus appeared *in the flesh*.⁸⁴ In addition they held the anthropological view that the *Noûs* descends from the heavenly realm into a body (see above, p. 169, §2); thus the *Noûs* of Mani was incorporated *in his body* (Baraies in *CMC* 14, 4 ff.). But this is not what Augustine meant when he said that the Manichaeans believe in the *paraclete* as being in Mani. Trying to understand what he learned from the Manichaeans of his time, he insinuated that Mani equated the relationship between himself and the *Paraclete* with the relationship between Christ as the second person of the Trinity and Christ son of Mary. On the question as to why Mani called himself "Apostle of Christ" and not "Apostle of the *Paraclete*," he argues:

What other reason do we assume than this: arrogance, the mother of all heretics, brought it about that this man did not want to appear as sent by the *Paraclete*, but as taken on by him in such a way that he himself be called *Paraclete*. As Jesus Christ the Man has not been sent by the Son of God, i.e., the Power and Wisdom of God by which all things have been created, but as, according to the catholic faith, Christ the Man has been taken on by the Son in such a way that he himself be the Son of God, i.e., that the Wisdom of God appear in him in order to heal the sinners, thus Mani wanted to appear as taken on by the Holy Ghost whom Christ had promised, in order that as soon as we hear of Mani as the Holy Ghost we may understand that he is the Apostle of Christ, i.e., the Apostle sent by Jesus Christ who promised to send him.⁸⁵

⁸² See p. 170, §5, cf. August., *Conf.* 5, 5, 8: *non enim parvi se aestimari voluit, sed spiritum sanctum, consolatorem et ditorem fidelium tuorum, auctoritate plenaria personaliter in se esse persuadere conatus est.* c. Faust. 7, 2 p. 305, 2 f.; Felix in August., c. *Fel.* II, 22 p. 852, 10 f. *sed sic anathema ut spiritum ipsum qui in Manichaeo fuit et per eum ista locutus est, anathemes.* Similarly in the Latin *Formula of abjuration* (see n. 66), 10: *quicumque adventum spiritus paracliti --- in Mane vel in Adimanto discipulo eius venisse credit, anathema sit;* cf. also p. 172, §2, sect. c and nn. 51 and 85. *per Manichaeum:* August., *de ut. cred.* 7, p. 10, 6 ff. *nosti enim, quod auctoris sui Manichaei personam in apostolorum numerum inducere molientes dicunt spiritum sanctum quem dominus discipulis se missurum esse promisit, per ipsum ad nos venisse.*

⁸³ According to K. Rudolph, Augustine's wording reflects his knowledge of the inconsistency of the Manichaean tradition regarding the identification of the *Paraclete* (K. Rudolph, *loc. cit.* [see n. 1], 480 n. o).

⁸⁴ *Keph.* 37, 14: "--- ist er gekommen und erschienen im Fleische" (Polotsky).

⁸⁵ August., c. *ep. fund.* 6 p. 200, 2 ff. *quid hoc esse causae arbitramur, nisi quia illa superbia, mater omnium haereticorum, impulit hominem ut non missum se ab paraclito vellet videri, sed ita susceptum ut ipse paracletus diceretur? sicut Iesus Christus homo non a filio dei, id est virtute et sapientia dei per quam facta sunt omnia, missus est, sed ita susceptus secundum catholicam fidem ut ipse esset dei filius, id est in illo ipso dei sapientia sanandis peccatoribus adpareret, sic se ille voluit ab*

Augustine tried hard to understand the Manichaean concept, but he interpreted their terms as used in the dogma of his church. Consequently he was baffled by the use the gnostics made of the same terms. Nevertheless, his approach was justified by what was probably a later development of the Manichaean theology in the West. When Felix abjured the Manichaean faith, he accepted Augustine's opinion that the *Paraclete* was in Mani (see n. 82). The Psalms of the Coptic Manichaeans praised the Trinity: "Glory, victory to the Father, the God of the Truth, and his beloved Son Christ, and the Holy Spirit, the *Paraclete*."⁸⁶ These Manichaeans understood the Christian Trinity as embracing the Father of Greatness, Jesus the Splendor, and Mani the *Paraclete*. Thus, Augustine could easily interpret Mani's introductory phrase as a trinitarian formula: *Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi providentia patris*, i.e., the Holy Ghost sent by Jesus Christ through providence of the Father.⁸⁷ Augustine was correct when he reports that the identification of Mani with the *Paraclete* goes back to Mani. But Augustine's theological interpretation is directed against the beliefs of the Manichaeans of his time, and it is colored by his misunderstanding of Manichaean theological terms.

(D) *Jesus Patibilis* and *Crux Lucis*

Mani's identification with the *paraclete* has been attributed to the later development of the western Manichaean church. The same was done with the doctrine for which Augustine's Manichaeans used the terms *Jesus patibilis* and *crux lucis*. Manichaean myths describe how particles of the divine Light, Augustine's *substantia vitalis*, fell to the earth and were tied up and kept captive in plants and trees.⁸⁸ It was the duty of the Manichaean

spiritu sancto quem Christus promisit videri esse susceptum, ut iam cum audimus Manichaeum spiritum sanctum, intellegamus apostolum Iesu Christi, id est missum a Iesu Christo qui eum se missurum esse promisit. Cf. Euodius, De fide Manich. 24 CSEL 25, 961, 14 f. qui se mira superbia adsumptum a gemino suo, hoc est spiritu sancto, esse gloriatur (quotation continued in n. 81).

⁸⁶ *Psalm-Book* 49, 29 ff. (see n. 34). This is one of the typical endings of Manichaean psalms directed to Jesus. Cf., e.g., 57, 31 ff.; 87, 11 ff.; K. Rudolph, *Mélanges* (see n. 1) 479 n. 1.

⁸⁷ *c. epist. fund.* 8 p. 201, 20 ff.: regarding why the Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the initial formula, *respondetis utique Manichaeo apostolo nominato sanctum spiritum paracletum nominari, quia in ipso venire dignatus est.*

⁸⁸ Mani, *Thes.* 7 apud August., *De nat. boni* 44 CSEL 25, 881, 24 ff. = Adam, *Texte* (see n. 34), no. 2: *tunc beatus ille pater* (i.e., Jesus the Splendor) *qui lucidas naves {seu magnitudines}* (i.e., the sun and moon) *habet diversoria et habitacula {seu magnitudines}* (transposui) *pro insita sibi clementia fert opem qua exiit et liberatur ab impiis retinaculis et angustiis atque*

elect to liberate the divine substance and to make it possible for it to return to the realm of Light. According to Augustine's vivid phrasing, the *elect* separate the spiritual gold from the ordure in which it is mixed.⁸⁹ The divine substance is called Christ; it is the *Christus salvandus* whom the *elect* liberate by the sighings of their prayers and burping and digestion.⁹⁰ According to Baraies, Mani talked about food as being turned into blood, bile, farts, and ordure.⁹¹ The particles of the divine Light are separated from these in the stomach of the *elect*, but not completely. Parts of it, i.e., parts of Jesus, remain in the ordure and cannot be released even in the long and repeated processes of becoming compost, nourishing fruits and vegetables which, in turn, will—it is hoped—be eaten by the *elect*.⁹² Christ dies daily, suffers daily, and is born daily in pumpkins, leeks, purslane, and other plants.⁹³ Cutting, cooking, chewing and digestion cause pain to the divine substance, to the limbs of God. Such suffering was symbolized by the cross and interpreted as *crucis eius (sc. Christi) mystica fixio* or as

angoribus sua vitalis substantia (sua conieci: suae codd. | vitalis GMAL: vitali SPV). Augustine explains (ibidem, line 17 f.): vitalis substantia, hoc est dei natura quam dicunt in eorum (sc. principum tenebrarum) corporibus ligatam teneri. Cf. 45 p. 884, 18 f.; c. Faust. 6, 6 p. 292, 12 f. and 294, 1 f.; de haer. 46 PL 42, 35 ff. (Adam, Texte, no. 34, 4 p. 66 ff.). See also W. Henning, Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch, APAW 1936, 10 (Berlin, 1937) 31 f., line 482 ff. Cf. H.-Ch. Puech, loc. cit. (see n. 15), 154 n. 275.

⁸⁹ Augustine calls the stomach of the *elect* a *fornacem in qua spiritale aurum de stercoris commixtione purgatur et a miserandis nexibus divina membra solvuntur (c. Faust. 6, 4 p. 290, 17 f.). Cf. ibidem 2, 5 p. 258, 19 ff.*

⁹⁰ August., *c. Faust. 2, 5 p. 258, 11 ff.: unde ista sacrilega deliramenta vos cogunt non solum in caelo atque in omnibus stellis, sed etiam in terra atque in omnibus quae nascuntur in ea confixum et conligatum atque concretum Christum dicere, non iam salvatorem vestrum sed a vobis salvandum, cum ea manducatis atque ructatis. nam et ista inopia vanitate seducti seducitis auditores vestros ut vos cibos adferant quo possit ligato in eis Christo subveniri per vestros dentes et ventres. Cf. p. 259, 9 f.; ibidem 20, 13 p. 553, 4 ff. vobis autem per fabulam vestram in escis omnibus Christus ligatus adponitur adhuc ligandus vestris visceribus solvendusque ructatibus. nam et cum manducatis, dei vestri defectione vos reficitis, et cum digeritis, illius refectione deficitis. 6, 6 p. 292, 12 f.; Conf. 3, 10, 18 (gemendo in oratione atque ructando).*

⁹¹ CMC 81, 5 ff. (Mani argues against the ritual ablation of food which was practiced by the baptists) ὄρατε δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν καθάρσιον ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἐδωδὴν καὶ ταύτης μεταλάβῃ ἦδη βεβαπτισμένῳ, φαίνεται ἡμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς γίνεται αἷμα καὶ χολή καὶ πνεύματα καὶ σκύβαλα τῆς αἰσχύνῃς καὶ τοῦ σώματος μαρότης.

⁹² August., *c. Faust. 2, 5 p. 258, 19 ff.; 2, 6 p. 261, 2 ff.; de haer. 46 PL 42, 34 = Adam, Texte (see n. 34), n. 49, 1 p. 66; F. Decret, Mélanges (see n. 1), 487 ff.*

⁹³ Euodius, *De fide* 34 CSEL 25, 965, 31 ff. The Manichaeans believed in *metempsychosis*; however, what was once purified by the digestion of the *elect* did not have to return into a body. For the whole context see F. C. Baur, *loc. cit.* (n. 33), 73 ff. and 395 ff.; Fr. Decret, *loc. cit.* (n. 30), 283 ff., 291 f., 302 f.; H.-Ch. Puech, *Le Manich.* (see n. 15) 82 f.; ZPE 5 (1970) 150 ff.

crux lucis and *cruciatu*.⁹⁴ Thus in the Coptic *Kephalaia* the Manichaean should avoid stepping on the "Cross of Light" and causing damage to a plant. He must keep his hands off the "Cross of Light," i.e., he should not cut plants and fruits. It is through this "Cross of Light," the invisible presence and consummation of salvation, that the "Life of the Vivid Soul" ascends to the sun and moon and further to the realm of heaven.⁹⁵ In suffering and redemption, the divine substance becomes the *Jesus patibilis*.⁹⁶ Both *Jesus patibilis* and Jesus the Splendor form a kind of gnostic *syzygy* such as that discussed earlier.

A passage of Faustus on the *Jesus patibilis* reveals through an interesting textual detail how the Manichaeans continued to change Christian Scripture to suit their own beliefs. Faustus praises *Christus patibilis* thus (see n. 96):

qui est vita ac salus hominum omni suspensus ex ligno.

vita ac salus is a Christian phrase; according to Ignatius, the cross is *σωτηρία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος*.⁹⁷ The second part of the sentence is based on Paul. In *Gal.* 3, 13 he argues that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law by becoming a curse for us; to support this, Paul quotes *Deut.* 21, 23.

⁹⁴ Faustus *ap.* August., *c. Faust.* 32, 7 p. 766, 20 ff. *crux lucis*: *en. in Ps.* 140, 12 PL 37, 1823 = Adam, *Texte* (see n. 34), no. 48. *qui enim in usuram --- dat pecuniam, non laedit crucem lucis. --- qui autem --- agricola est, multum laedit crucem luminis. quaeris, quam crucem luminis. membra, inquit, illa dei quae capta sunt in illo proelio, mixta sunt universa mundo et sunt in arboribus, in herbis, in pomis, in fructibus.* Cf. *c. Faust.* 20, 11 p. 550, 4 f. *cruciatu*: August., *de haeres.* 46 PL 42, 37 = Adam, *Texte*, no. 49, 4 *herbas enim atque arbores sic putant vivere, ut vitam quae illis inest et sentire credant et dolere, cum laeduntur; nec aliquid inde sine cruciatu eorum quemquam posse vellere aut carpere.* *c. Faust.* 2, 6 p. 261, 7 *labores atque cruciatu*. 6, 4 p. 290, 7 f.; 6 p. 292, 17 f.; *c. Fort.* 1, 2 p. 88, 1 ff.; Alexander Lycop., *c. Manich. opin.* 4 p. 7, 19 Brinkmann = Adam, *Texte*, no. 36, about Christ being identified with the *Noûs*: ἐνεσταυρώθη τῇ ὕλη.

⁹⁵ *Keph.* 208, 12 ff.; 192, 8; 124, 1 ff. (and note); 213, 3 ff. Cf. *Acta Arch.* 10, 8 GCS 17, 9 f.

⁹⁶ August., *c. Faust.* 20, 2 p. 536, 9 f. *igitur nos Patris quidem dei omnipotentis et Christi Filii eius et Spiritus Sancti unum idemque sub triplici appellatione colimus numen; sed Patrem quidem ipsum lucem incolere credimus summam ac principalem, quam Paulus alias inaccessibleem vocat* (cf. *Tim.* 6, 16), *Filium vero in hac secunda ac visibili luce consistere; qui quoniam sit et ipse geminus, ut eum apostolus novit Christum dicens esse dei virtutem et dei sapientiam* (cf. *1 Cor.* 1, 24), *virtutem quidem eius in sole habitare credimus* (cf. n. 88), *sapientiam vero in luna; necnon et Spiritus Sancti, qui est maiestas tertia, aëris hunc omnem ambitum sedem fatemur ac diversorium; cuius ex viribus ac spiritali profusione terram quoque concipientem gignere Patibilem Iesum, qui est vita ac salus hominum, omni suspensus ex ligno* (cf. *Gal.* 3, 13 and *Deut.* 21, 23; see below). *quapropter et nobis circa universa et vobis similiter erga panem et calicem par religio est, quamvis eorum acerrime oderitis auctores.*

⁹⁷ *Ephes.* 18, 1; 2 *Clem.* 19, 1 offers the connection *σωτηρίαν καὶ ζωὴν*. Cf. *John* 11, 25 and 14, 6 ἐγὼ εἰμι --- ἡ ζωὴ, also *Col.* 3, 4; *Hebr.* 2, 10 *Jesus as ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας.*

The Greek text and the Latin translation of Marcion's text⁹⁸ come closer to Faustus' text than does the *Vulgate*:

1. Faustus: *omni suspensus ex ligno*
2. Marcion: *maledictus omnis ligno suspensus*
3. Greek: ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου
4. Vulg.: *maledictus omnis qui pendet in ligno*

In the Manichaean tradition, *omnis* was changed into *omni* rather than *πᾶς* into *παντός*. By the omission of one letter in the Latin text,⁹⁹ the sentence taken from Paul and *Deuteronomy* came to express the sufferings of Christ in every tree and plant. Probably the change was made before the time of Faustus. For elsewhere Faustus and the contemporary Manichaeans quote *Gal.* 3, 13, as does Augustine, according to the *Vulgate*: *maledictus qui pendet in ligno*.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, Faustus and Felix use the sentence for their polemic against Moses and, in doing so, they are not aware of the slight change which could give to the sentence a Manichaean meaning. Whenever the change was made, the Manichaean phrase *omni suspensus ex ligno* demonstrates the habit of the Manichaean church to take advantage of the Christian Scriptures. The practice was established by Mani, and in this he was followed by his successors.¹⁰¹

The term *Jesus patibilis* is illustrated by Augustine in several passages where he vividly refers to the pains a plant suffers when it is torn, cooked and eaten.¹⁰² A fig and its tree weep when the fruit is plucked.¹⁰³ Elsewhere

⁹⁸ Tert., *Adv. Marc.* 5, 3, 10 Moreschini (*ligno* MFX: *in ligno* R. Evans). Cf. A.v. Harnack, *Marcion*, Leipzig² 1924, 73*.

⁹⁹ However, it cannot be entirely excluded that the change was made on the basis of the Greek text.

¹⁰⁰ *c. Faust.* 14, 1 p. 401, 21 ff.; cf. 16, 5 p. 443, 21 ff.; 32, 5 p. 764, 22 ff.; 32, 14 p. 773, 11 f. Felix, in *c. Fel.* 2, 10 p. 839, 17 ff.; cf. *c. Adim.* 21 p. 179, 21 ff. [*saepe a Manichaeis ista quaestio ventilata (est)*]; cf. Fr. Decret, *loc. cit.* (n. 30), 128 f. and 166 n. o. See also *Psalm-Book* (sec n. 34) 155, 24 Ἰησοῦς ἐταψε ἀψυε ("Jesus that hangs to the tree"), but there the use of the relative clause is due to Coptic grammar.

¹⁰¹ Mani took advantage of another part of the Pauline phrase. According to Baraies, he said (*CMC* 69, 10 ff.) that his father sent the Twin to him ὡς ἂν οὗτος ἐξαγοράσῃ[ε] με καὶ λυτρώσαιο[ε] [ἐκ] τῆς πλάνης τῶν τοῦ [νό]μου ἐκείνου. This reflects Paul's Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρης τοῦ νόμου (*Gal.* 3, 13: *ZPE* 19 [1975] 85 n. 134). In other words, Mani tells us that he was redeemed by Jesus the Splendor through the mediation of his Twin. Thus he became the apostle of Jesus and the *Paraclete* (cf. p. 167 ff. and nn. 67 f.).

¹⁰² August., *c. Faust.* 6, 4 p. 288, 29 ff. *accipitis ergo viventes cucurbitas quas, si possitis, deglutire deberetis, ut post illud unum vulnus, in quo eas cum decerpisset vester auditor reus factus est vestra indulgentia liberandus, saltem deinceps ad officinam aqualiculi vestri, ubi deum vestrum illo proelio confractum reformare possitis, inlaesae atque integrae pervenirent. nunc autem antequam eis conterendis dentes incumbant, minutatim, si hoc palato placuerit, conciduntur a vobis; quibus tam crebris vulneribus earum quomodo vos non estis rei? — (p. 289, 18 ff.) dicitis enim dolorem sentire fructum cum de*

he mocks the *electus* who is not permitted to harvest his own food; rather, he waits for a layman to turn up in the garden with a knife to murder a pumpkin and to deliver the miraculously living corpse to him. Thereupon the layman is accused of murder, but gets forgiveness due to the prayers of the *electus*. This comedy of innocence is well known from Greek texts, and the *Kephalaia* talk about the "murdered soul."¹⁰⁴ Strikingly similar stories are now found in the *CMC*. What seemed to be Augustinian irony turns out to have been told by the Manichaeans as educational stories which expressed their beliefs. A palm tree defends its branches and calls its pruner a murderer. Vegetables literally weep and cry with human voices, and they bleed when they are cut with a sickle.¹⁰⁵ The young Mani was thought to have told such stories to the Elchasaites. For they ate only what they themselves grew in their gardens in order to guarantee the ritual cleanness of their food, and they wanted Mani to obey their regulations. Mani's stories, however, demonstrated to them that ritual cleanness was not the issue; rather, the particles of Light imprisoned in trees and vegetables should not suffer at the hands of the pious *elect*. Therefore Mani refused in one of the stories to go into the garden for his own food, but asked somebody else to pick it and bring it to him as an exercise of piety.¹⁰⁶

arbore carpitur, sentire cum conciditur, cum teritur, cum coquitur, cum manducatur. --- (290, 9 f.) at enim plorat arbor, cum fructus carpitur. De haer. 46 (see n. 94); c. Adim. 17, p. 172, 2 panem plorare; 22 p. 181, 27 f. talem animam arboris esse cred(u)nt qualem hominis. En. in Ps. 140, 12 (see n. 94): dei membra vexat qui terram sulco discindit; dei membra vexat qui herbam de terra vellit; dei membra vexat qui pomum carpit de arbore. Cf. ZPE 19 (1975) 7 n. 10 and 13 n. 21.

¹⁰³ August., *Conf.* 3, 10, 18 --- *ficum plorare cum decerpitur et matrem eius arborem lacrimis lacteis.*

¹⁰⁴ August., *c. Faust.* 6, 4 p. 288, 22 ff. *vos autem --- expectatis, quis auditorum vestrorum propter vos pascendos cullello vel falcicula armatus in hortum prosiliat, homicida cucurbitarum quarum vobis adferat, mirum dictu, viva cadavera.* Cf. n. 102 (*reus factus est vestra indulgentia liberandus*). *De haer.* 46 PL 42, 37 = Adam, *Texte* (see n. 34), no. 49, 4 p. 68 f. --- *agriculturam --- tanquam plurimum homicidiorum ream dementer accusant: suisque auditoribus ideo haec arbitrantur ignosci, quia praebent inde alimenta electis suis, ut divina illa substantia in eorum ventre purgata impetret eis veniam quorum traditur oblatione purganda.* *Acta Archel.* 10, 6 GCS 16, 14 ff. = Adam, *Texte* (see n. 34), no. 38); Kyril. from Jerusalem, *Catach.* 6 (*de uno deo*), 32 PG 33, 596B (= Adam, *Texte*, no. 39); P.Ryl. 469 (Adam, *Texte*, no. 35), 25 ff. *Keph.* 178, 5 ff.: "Die man 'geschlachtete, getötete, bedrängte, gemordete Seele' genannt hat, ist die Kraft der Früchte, der Gurken und Samen, die geschlagen, gepflückt und zerrissen werden und den Welten des Fleisches Nahrung geben. Auch das Holz, wenn es trocken wird, und das Kleid, wenn es alt wird, werden vergehen. Es ist auch [ein] Teil der ganzen 'getöteten, geschlachteten Seele'" (Böhlig). Cf. *ibidem*, 191, 16 ff. Regarding the "comedy of innocence," see ZPE 5 (1970) 153 f.

¹⁰⁵ *CMC* 6, 2 ff.; 9, 1 ff. ZPE 5 (1970) 145 ff. For the Jewish background of such stories see ZPE 19 (1975) 8 f. n. 14.

¹⁰⁶ *CMC* 9, 8 f. *ἐν λόγῳ εὐσεβείας.* Cf. ZPE 19 (1975) 11 n. 20.

The Mani of these stories acts as the later *elect* and endorses the concept of the *anima patibilis*.

The same holds true in stories which Mani told a synod of the Elchasaites. There he was accused of schismatic heresies and tried to defend his behavior and beliefs by arguing that he adhered to the teachings of Elchasaïos and religious authorities like Sabbaios¹⁰⁷ and Aianos, whereas the present community deserted the traditional faith. Thus these stories have a double meaning. On one level they should express Elchasaïte beliefs, on the other, however, they should justify Mani's own religion and express his theology.^{107a} For example, according to an authority whose name is lost in the *CMC*, he reports that the Baptist Sabbaios was addressed by a vegetable; it asked him not to sell it to the officials of a city. This suits exactly the beliefs of the baptists and explains their regulations which forbade the sale of agricultural products to pagans. But in Mani's mind, the same story proved that his personal refusal of agricultural work and, consequently, his corresponding prohibitions for the *elect*¹⁰⁸ are Elchasaïte.

In the same situation and according to the same authority, he reminds the Elchasaites that their founder once saw some of his disciples baking bread. Then the bread talked to Elchasaïos, and he prohibited further bread-baking.¹⁰⁹ In the *CMC*, the story is shortened to the extent that its religious implications hardly make sense. But light is shed on them by Baraies' report on Mani's account of the same synod. There Mani leaves no doubt that the Elchasaites did eat bread, though not wheaten bread. They were particularly offended because Mani ate such bread against

¹⁰⁷ For this typical name see *ZPE* 5 (1970) 133 n. 89.

^{107a} The interpretation of such stories on both levels is essential. If they did not express Manichaean belief in some way, it would have been pointless to transmit them in Manichaean devotional literature. If, on the other hand, the stories were not known to the Elchasaites of Mani's youth, he could not have used them for his defense, and we would have to conclude that they were later inventions by Mani or by Manichaean authorities. But this assumption is equally difficult. As long as the Elchasaites were living in Ancient Syria, the Manichaeans could not risk the authority of Mani by attributing obvious falsifications to him. They would hardly have endangered their missionary efforts by declaring as Elchasaïte stories which were not.

¹⁰⁸ August., *en. in Ps.* 140, 12 (see n. 94 and 102) and *de haer.* 46 (see n. 94 and 104). For the story (*CMC* 97, 18 ff.) see *ZPE* 5 (1970) 148. The Manichaean interpretation would be forced since the *elect* was prevented from all farming activities, not only from selling agricultural products. Thus it is most unlikely that the story is a Manichaean invention.

¹⁰⁹ *CMC* 97, 11 ff. εφη δ' αὐτὸ πάλιν (sc. Mani) ὅτι εὗρεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ Ἀλχασαῖος πέπτοντας ἄρτους ὡς καὶ λαλῆσαι τὸν ἄρτον πρὸς τὸν [Ἀλ]χασαῖον· ὃς δὲ ἐνετείλατο μηκέτι πέπει[ν]. This prohibition precludes interpretation as a simple devotional story without precise religious meaning.

what they thought were the commands of Christ.¹¹⁰ Mani considered this accusation serious.¹¹¹ His reactions are revealing. First he refers to Christ celebrating the Eucharist with his disciples and asks rhetorically whether this was not wheaten bread. Then he interprets Christ's visit to the house of Martha and Maria: "Therefore, observe that also the disciples of the savior accepted bread from women and idol-worshippers and ate it, and that they did not distinguish between different kinds of bread."¹¹² Finally Mani stresses that, when Jesus commissioned the apostles, he told them not to take unnecessary equipment with them, including ovens for baking.¹¹³ Mani actually responds to two accusations: (1) that he eats wheaten bread, and (2) that he eats it together with other people, even with idol-worshippers. The story of Elchasaio's prohibition to bake bread cannot mean that baking wheaten bread was forbidden.¹¹⁴ The second accusation, however, illuminates the story. As every Elchasaite had to grow his own food, he may also have had to bake his own bread; this would mean he had to do it privately, not in a bakery and not with other people, certainly not with pagans, but probably not even with other

¹¹⁰ One of the standard accusations was (91, 11 ff.) βούλει δὲ καὶ ἄρτον σίτων ἐσθίειν καὶ λάχανα ἄπερ ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσθίομεν. The latter seems to imply that certain vegetables were prohibited. The ἄρτος σίτωνος, one of the main provisions of the Manichaean (cf. K. Rudolph, *Mani* [see n. 15], 557) is also called by the Elchasaite 'Ελληνικός ἄρτος (87, 20 ff.). It may have been difficult to grow wheat or any other grain for the personal use of a single man. A. Henrichs drew my attention to Strabo, who mentions that in Babylonia meal and bread are gotten from the palm tree (16, 1, 14; 742). Palm trees were cultivated by the Elchasaite; thus they may have produced this kind of bread. *Deut.* 16, 3 calls unleavened bread a "bread of misery," which shall be eaten in memory of the misery of the Exodus. Our passage is not concerned with unleavened bread but with daily food. However, it still may have been regarded as a bread of poverty by which the misery of the Exodus was renewed daily. Later, under different economical conditions, the Karaites, a Jewish ascetic movement originating in 8th-century Persia, admitted only barley for the Passover bread; for barley bread was regarded by them as the bread of poverty (as pointed out to me by J. Maier, my former colleague in Cologne).

¹¹¹ Cf., e.g., *CMC* 91, 20 ff. (Mani to the Elchasaite) μὴ γένοιτό μοι τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ σωτήρος [καταλύ]ειν.

¹¹² 93, 3 ff. σκοπεῖτε τίνων ὡς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἄρτον ἀπὸ γυναικῶν καὶ εἰδ[ω]λοατρῶν ἦσθιον καὶ οὐ διεχώρησαν ἄρτον ἄρτου, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ λάχανον λαχάνου ---. For the whole section see A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 50 f.; however, he points to the celebration of the Eucharist with unleavened bread.

¹¹³ 93, 14 ff. ὁμοίως δὲ ὀηνίκα ἀ[πέ]στειλεν αὐτοῦ τοῦ[ς] μα[θη]τὰς ὁ σωτὴρ καθ' ἕκ[αστον] τόπον κηρύξαι, [οὔτε] μύλον οὔτε κλί[βανον] συνεπεφόρον[το με]τ' αὐτῶν ---. Cf. *Luke* 9, 3 and *Mark* 6, 8 f.

¹¹⁴ It would mean that the bread of the pagans talks to Elchasaio and asks him not to be baked.

disciples.¹¹⁵ This guaranteed the cleanness requisite for the holy act of eating. For Mani, however, the story indicated the *anima patiens* in bread,¹¹⁶ and it justified his refusal to bake his own bread.

A further consideration leads from the *anima patibilis*, as attested by such stories in the *CMC*, to *Jesus patibilis* and to the theology of the *crux lucis*. Once Mani appealed to the authority of Elchasaïos and related how Elchasaïos one day went to get his ploughs from storage. But the earth addressed him:

“Why do you make your living from me?” Then Elchasaïos took dust from that earth which had spoken to him, wept, kissed it, placed it in his lap, and began to talk: “This is the flesh and the blood of my Lord.”¹¹⁷

This story also fits into the pattern we met before. On the Elchasaïte level it prohibits agriculture for business: perhaps for this reason ploughs are mentioned in the plural number.¹¹⁸ At first, Elchasaïos, it seems, is spoken of as a professional farmer; but through the miracle he learns that he has to change his profession and life. The story is Elchasaïte. If so, it was the Elchasaïtes who combined their regulation with the concept of Christ’s flesh and blood as present in matter. The presence of Christ in matter, i.e., the presence of a soul or divine particles, resulted in the abilities of

¹¹⁵ One wonders whether the Elchasaïtes were so consistent that they ate in privacy and did not have their meals together in the community of the baptists; for the Jewish and Jewish-Christian meals of the community, see G. Strecker, *loc. cit.* (see n. 29), 209 ff. The Manichaeans had one common meal each day; see K. Rudolph, *Mani* (n. 15), 557.

¹¹⁶ It was also forbidden to give bread to a hungry man: August., *c. Faust.* 15, 7 p. 430, 11 *non das esurienti panem, hic formidans homicidium falsum, illic perpetras verum.* Cf. n. 102 and *Acta Archel.* 10, 6 p. 16, 15 f. Beeson: οὔτε εἰς κλίβανον ἔβαλον (τὸν ἄρτον).

¹¹⁷ *CMC* 96, 18 ff. (the name of the author from whom this section is taken is broken off): [πάλιν δ]είκνυσιν ὅτι εἰ[χεν ἄρ]οτρα ὁ Ἀλχασαῖος [ἀποκείμ]ενα καὶ ἐπορευ[θη εἰς ἀ]γιά. ἐφθέγγε[το δ’ ἡ γῆ] λέγουσα ἀντ[ῶ]. “[τί] πράττ[ε]τε ἐξ ἐμοῦ [τ]ῆν ἐργασίαν ὑμῶν;” [ὁ δ] ἐ Ἀλχασαῖος δεξάμενος χοῦν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης τῆς λαλησάσης πρὸς αὐτὸν κλαίων κατεφίλησε καὶ ἐπέθηκε τῷ κόλπῳ καὶ ἤρξα[το] λέγειν. “αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου μου.” Cf. *ZPE* 5 (1970) 147. For the prohibition against ploughing see n. 102.

¹¹⁸ They are stored away. An explanation is not given. The compiler of the *CMC* may have taken the story out of a fuller context, which in itself was probably already an abbreviation of Mani’s report. Originally, the earth may have addressed Elchasaïos on two different occasions; after the first time, he may have stored the ploughs away, but later he may have tried to plough again. The latter part may have become our extant story. Similarly, the water had to address Elchasaïos at least on two occasions before he abolished bathing (*CMC* 94, 10 ff.; cf. *ZPE* 5 [1970] 143 f. and here below p. 188). These two stories are taken from the author of the story about the ploughs; his name is lost; see n. 117.

trees, vegetables, bread, earth, and water to talk and to express their pain. Thus the strange rituals assuring the cleanness of food become understandable: eating was a celebration of the Eucharist.^{118a}

We now come to the point at which the story underwent a new Manichaean interpretation. The concept of Christ's flesh and blood is attested as Manichaean in Iranian and Chinese sources.¹¹⁹ It expresses the idea of the *Christus patiens*. Our story attests this doctrine already for the early Mani. The basic beliefs of the Elchasaites and the Manichaeans seem not to have differed too much in this point.¹²⁰ They became much more elaborate, however, as they were theoretically and systematically explored by the Manichaeans; and the rituals which followed from their religious conceptions became totally different. In the history of religion, rituals are normally more permanent than beliefs. But the case is different with Manichaeism, because Mani radically turned from the Elchasaite predominance of ritual to the *Gnosis*.¹²¹ In the case of the *Christus patiens*, the later Manichaeans thought of the meals of their *elect* in terms of the Holy Supper of the Christians. Faustus states: "Therefore we have the same piety, we concerning the universe, and you in a similar way concerning the bread and cup" (see n. 96). Needless to say, the underlying theologies of the Christian and Manichaean churches were different. The stories in the *CMC*, however, show that the Christian elements were a part of the central ideas developed by Mani when living with the Elchasaites.

In later Manichaeism, the concept of *Christus patiens* is connected with the idea of the *Crux lucis*. The Cross, of course, is a symbol of suffering. Now that we know that Mani developed his doctrine of *Christus patiens* from the Elchasaite heritage, the same should be expected of the *Crux lucis*. The concept occurs also in the *Acta Johannis* which were known by the Manichaeans and had their origin probably in encratic sects of Syria and

^{118a} The Elchasaites regarded the earth as an element and kind of divine power. From this thought, speculation led easily to the belief in the presence of Christ's flesh and blood in earth. This will be shown in a forthcoming article to appear in *ZPE*. Compare also the *Gospel according to Thomas*, logion 77.

¹¹⁹ W. Henning, *loc. cit.* (see n. 88), p. 48 line 762 f. (cf. J. P. Asmussen, *loc. cit.* [see n. 34], 59). The electus confessed that before the meal he did not meditate on the question: "Whose flesh and blood is this?" *Chinese Roll of Hymns*, str. 253 f. (Tsui Chi, *BSOAS* 11 [1943] 198: "All the wonderful offerings which are received, as said by the Law, are restored to the original Law, dignified and solemn, clean and pure. And these are exactly the flesh and blood of Jesus.") Cf. *ZPE* 5 (1970) 150.

¹²⁰ In this respect K. Kessler's remark that the Elchasaites were pre-Manichaean Manichaeans (*Mani, Forschungen über die manichäische Religion* [Berlin, 1889] 8 n. 3) is not far off the mark. Cf. A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 58 and below n. 154.

¹²¹ *CMC* 84, 9 ff.; *ZPE* 5 (1970) 137.

Asia Minor.¹²² There the "Cross of Light," so that it can be understood by man, is identified with terms such as *Logos, Nus, Jesus, Christ, Door, Way, Bread, Seed, Resurrection, Son, Father, Spirit, Life and Truth*; in itself, however, it is the "boundary of everything, is, further, the firm elevation of the unsteady which has become solid and the harmony of wisdom. On its right and left side are Powers, Mighty Angels, Rulers and Daemons, Forces, Threats, Angers, Devils, Satan and the Root in the Depth from which the Nature of created things came forward." This cross has fixed (*διαπηξάμενος*) everything by means of the Logos. On the other hand, it separates the world of created things from heaven (*διορίσας*); then, however, it integrates them in itself.¹²³ On the one hand, this cross is the boundary between the two worlds; on the other, it is the bridge between them by which salvation becomes possible. It is the salvation of unsteady things, i.e., of what has been connected with matter; these will become steady in the cross. Finally everything will be integrated in it and thus saved by Christ. It is bread and seed. This concept is not much different from the Manichaeic Cross of Light. It can, however, be traced back to the century before Mani. For in Valentinian gnosticism, the Cross divides the *pleroma* from the world, and on this cross Christ reaches the *Sophia* who had been thrown out of the *pleroma* into this world, and thus he initiates her salvation. The double function of the Cross is to separate

¹²² Cf. H.-Ch. Puech, *loc. cit.* (see n. 15), 176 n. 343. He refers also to the *φωτεινός σταυρός* of *Acta Phil.* 138 and 141, which reaches from the depth to the height, resembles a ladder and enables those in Hades to ascend. For the *Acta Johannis*, their origin and their influence on the Manichaeans, see W. Schneemelcher and K. Schäferdieck, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen³, 1964) II, 110 ff., particularly 117 ff. and 143. Compare also P. Nagel, *loc. cit.* (see n. 30) 165 ff. These *Acta* are as relevant for the formation of the Manichaeism as are the *Acta Thomae* (pace P. Nagel, *loc. cit.* 171).

¹²³ 98 p. 200, 5 ff. Bonnet (the text is badly distorted) *ὁ σταυρός οὗτος ὁ τοῦ φωτός ποτὲ μὲν Λόγος καλεῖται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς, ποτὲ δὲ Νοῦς, ποτὲ Ἰησοῦς, ποτὲ Χριστός, ποτὲ Θύρα, ποτὲ Ὀδός, ποτὲ ἄρτος, ποτὲ Σπόρος, ποτὲ Ἀνάστασις, ποτὲ Ἰγίος, ποτὲ Πατήρ, ποτὲ Πνεῦμα, ποτὲ Ζωή, ποτὲ Ἀλήθεια, ποτὲ Πίστις, ποτὲ Χάρις. τὰ{ι} (τὰ *scripsi*) μὲν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους· ὁ δὲ ὄντως ἐστὶν αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν νοούμενος καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς λεγόμενος διορισμὸς πάντων, ἔστιν (*sic interpretunxi*) καὶ τῶν πεπηγμένων ἐξ ἀνεδράστων ἀναγ<ω>γῆ β<ε>β<αι>α καὶ ἀρμονία σοφίας {σοφία δὲ οὐσα ἐν ἀρμονίᾳ} (*glossam delevi*)· ὑπάρχουσι δεξιοὶ καὶ ἀριστεροὶ (*post ἀριστεροὶ interpretunxit* Bonnet) δυνάμεις, ἐξουσίαι, ἀρχαὶ καὶ δαίμονες, ἐνέργειαι, ἀπειλαί, θυμοί, διάβολοι, Σατανᾶς καὶ ἡ κατωτικὴ ρίζα ἀφ' ἧς τῶν γενομένων προήλθεν φύσις. 99 οὗτος οὖν ὁ σταυρός ὁ διαπηξάμενος τὰ πάντα Λόγῳ καὶ διορίσας τὰ ἀπὸ γενέσεως καὶ κατωτέρω, εἶτα καὶ εἰς πάντα πῆ<ξ>ας. The vision took place on Good-Friday (Hilgenfeld; cf. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *loc. cit.* [see n. 122], 157 n. 4 and 143) and depicted what really happened; the Cross of Light is the real cross of Christ, not the wooden cross. In the vision the Cross of Light is described as *πεπηγμένος*, surrounded by a crowd consisting of many shapes, whereas the cross has one shape.*

(μερίζειει καὶ διορίζειει) and to make steady (ἐδράζει καὶ στηρίζει). Such also is the function of the Cross in the *Acta Johannis*. The second Christ of the Valentinians who continues the salvation after the first Christ returned into the *pleroma*, is made out of everything and is everything; in the same way the Cross of Light in the *Acta* absorbs and fixes all things.¹²⁴ It should be noted, however, that the *Acta* employ the concept with much more straightforward dualism than does Valentinian gnosticism; and it cannot be said that the *Acta* are Valentinian. Nevertheless, the idea of the Cross of Light has its origin in gnostic circles which were influenced by some form of Valentinianism.

This conclusion is confirmed by the report of Mose bar Kepha on the cosmogony of Bardesanes. When the Darkness assaulted the "pure beings" and tried to mingle with them, Christ, sent by the Highest God, separated the Darkness from the "pure beings." He fixed each being to its proper place "according to the mystery of the Cross." Thus this cross has one of the two essential functions of the Cross of Light. Hence it is the Cross of Light to which the phrase "Mystery of the Cross" alludes. In addition, we have only to remember that according to the ancient tradition Bardesanes was Valentinian before he converted to Christianity; allegedly he never escaped the heretic influence entirely. It seems clear that the Cross of Light was Valentinian.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 2, 4; 3, 4 f. (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31, 12, 4 ff. GCS 1, 404, 11 ff.; 31, 12 ff. GCS 1, 408, 3 ff.). Cf. *Die Gnosis* (see n. 79) I, 162 ff. (Engl. transl. 121 ff.); H. Jonas, *loc. cit.* (see n. 15), 362 ff.; E. de Faye, *Les gnostiques et le gnosticisme* (Paris², 1925); W. Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Beih. ZNW 7 (Berlin, 1929); H. Langerbeck, *Aufsätze zur Gnosis*, AAWG, 3. Folge 69 (Göttingen, 1967) 38 ff.; K. Rudolph in: *Koptologische Studien in der DDR*, Sonderh. der Wiss. Zeitschr. der M.-Luther-Universität (Halle-Wittenberg, 1965) 162. For the relationship between the *Acta Johannis* and Valentinian gnosticism, see particularly H. Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*, Beih. ZNW 1929, 102 ff. and 175; cf. C. L. Stuhrahm, *Die Christologie der ältesten apokryphen Apostelakten* (Heidelberg, 1951) 26 n. 4 (*non vidi*; cf. K. Schäferdieck [see n. 122], 143. Cf. also above n. 79).

The relationship between the "Cross of Light" of the *Acts of John* and the Valentinian Cross has been stressed particularly by A. Orbe ("La teología del Espíritu Santo," *Analecta Greg.* 158 [Rome, 1966] 270 ff.; cf. *idem*, "Los primeros herejes ante la persecución," *Analecta Greg.* 83 [1956] 161 ff.; J. Baggary has brought these studies to my attention). The idea of the cross and Christ as "everything" is, of course, derived from *Col.* 3, 17 (cf. n. 45). Similar Pauline language was used by Mani for the "Tree of Life," as will be shown in a forthcoming article in *ZPE*.

¹²⁵ For the cosmogony see H. H. Schaefer, *ZKG* 3. Folge, 51 (1932) 52 (= *idem*, *Studien zur orientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, edit. by C. Colpe [Darmstadt, 1968] 138); cf. H.-Ch. Puech, *loc. cit.* (see n. 122). Bardesanes is attested as a former Valentinian by Didymos the Blind, *P5T* 181, 8 ff. (M. Gronewald in connection with A. Gesché, part III); Eusebios, *h.e.* 4, 30, 3 (οὐ μὴν καὶ παντελῶς γε ἀπερρύψατο τὸν τῆς παλαιᾶς αἰρέσεως

It is now an obvious guess that these gnostic circles affected the thoughts of the community of Elchasaïtes in which Mani lived. There he became acquainted with the concept of the Cross of Light and developed the related concept of the *Christus patiens*. Thus it seems safe to assume that at least some groups of the Elchasaïtes were open to gnostic speculation. It was in these groups that Mani found the gnostic idea of the *syzygos* (see p. 174).

(E) The Authenticity of the Elchasaïte Stories

When Mani was confronted with the synod of the Elchasaïtes, he surely had tactical motives to quote Elchasaïos. Nevertheless, I think, he originally thought of himself as a reformer who wanted to free Elchasaïte teachings from Jewish influences and to restore the true Christian beliefs.¹²⁶ To be sure, Mani's point of view was not correct historically. The Elchasaïtes had Jewish roots, and the Christianity Mani experienced was gnosticized. Similarly, Manichaeans later thought that they were adhering to the true teachings of Christ when they eliminated the Old Testament.

In spite of Mani's bias, one can for the most part believe his claim that the stories which he reported were Elchasaïte.¹²⁷ This is the implication of what was said in the previous section. By selling his own inventions as Elchasaïte stories, Mani could never have hoped to impress an Elchasaïte audience. Occasionally the stories expressed Mani's own views so poorly that neither he nor any Manichaean could have invented them (see already n. 108). For example, he told the synod that once upon a time dates were stolen from a palm tree. The tree then asked Ajanos the Baptist to serve as interpreter so that it could talk to its owner and the thief. To the owner it promised to replace the stolen fruits in the same year and also to

ῥύπον); Hieron., *De vir. ill.* 33. Cf. D. Armand, *loc. cit.* (see n. 7) 228 and A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 52 n. 110 (with literature on Bardesanes). See now H. J. W. Drijvers in: *Synkretismus* (see n. 59) 107 ff. B. Aland argues that Mani had adopted and transformed the gnostic cosmogony myth as extant in the version of Bardesanes (*ididem*, 123 ff.).

¹²⁶ Cf. K. Rudolph, *loc. cit.* (see n. 1), 477 and above p. 161. Felix says: *Manichaeus autem in nulla fide fuit a qua recesserit, sed in qua fuit in ea permansit* (August., *c. Fel.* 1, 8 p. 810, 13 ff.). Nevertheless Mani talks about ὁ νόμος ὑμῶν (not ἡμῶν); see, e.g., n. 129. In the *CMC* Timotheos reports a vision in which Mani was instructed to set aside Sita, the leader of the Elchasaïtes (77, 4 ff.). In *Keph.* 258, 27 ff. the Father awarded Mani the privilege of having the Manichaeans named after him; Mani and the Manichaeans are clearly understood as different from the Christians (cf. A. Böhlig, *Mysterium und Wahrheit* [see n. 30], 243). However, even in this passage Christ and Mani are still understood as propagating the same religion.

¹²⁷ For the authenticity of passages in *CMC* ascribed to Mani, cf. the argument in *ΖPE* 8 (1971) 249 n. 2 and *ΖPE* 19 (1975) 77 n. 40. Cf. also n. 107a.

produce fruits in future years as long as the owner would not fell it. Then it threatened the thief that it would throw him down the next time.¹²⁸ Such stories of talking trees were and are told by many peoples, among others by the ancient Jews. The present story is supposed to demonstrate (1) how dangerous it is to steal fruit from a neighbor's tree and (2) that one should not fell a tree after its fruit has been stolen. Who would do the latter? Which society would regard this as a desirable practice? Only a community which prohibits sales to unclean people might question whether it is sinful to provide fruits for stealing and whether the lawful owner should not rather fell the tree, so that the sin will not be repeated. So understood, the story accords exactly with the religious provisions of the baptists. But when Mani quotes the story in order to justify his refusal to work in the garden, his interpretation is that it is forbidden to fell a tree because of the divine Light in it. In itself, the story does not suggest such an idea. Hence, the fact that Mani's interpretation is so forced demonstrates that it is not his invention. Rather, it is what he said it was: an Elchasaite tradition.

(F) The Elchasaite of Mani: A Community in Change

As I have tried to argue, Mani's idea of the Light which fell from heaven into plants and trees, and which, as the suffering redeemer, had to be liberated, grew out of Christianized Judaism which was or came to be under the influence of gnosticism. At least some groups of the Elchasaite were open to influences which were, in fact, not consistent with their historical background and with the essence of their religion: the baptism. This can be demonstrated by two other stories which, according to the above-mentioned author whose name is lost, were also used by Mani for his defense before the synod of the Elchasaite. In the first story, the spirit of a fountain prevents Elchasaioi from washing himself and polluting the water.¹²⁹ In the second story, Elchasaioi, after the intervention of the

¹²⁸ Baraieis in *CMC* 98, 9 ff. [π]άλιν δείκνυσιν ὡς μετὰ Ἰλιανὸν τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ Κώχης φοινῆς συνελήθησεν καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ εἰπεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ μου· “μὴ [δ]ὴ ἐκκόψῃς διὰ τὸ κλέ[π]τεσθαί μου τοὺς καρ[π]οὺς, ἀλλ’ ἑασόν με τὸ [ἔ]το[ς] τοῦτο. καὶ τούτῳ [τῷ] ἐνιαυτῷ δώσω σοι [καρπ]οὺς ἀναλογοῦν[τας το]ῖς κλαπεῖσιν, ἔ[τι] δὲ ἐ[γ] π[ᾶ]σι τοῖς ἐτέ[ροις] ἔτεσιν.” ἐνετείλα[το] δὲ κάκεινῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ κλέπτοντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ εἰπεῖν· “μὴ ἔλθῃς τῷδε τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκλέψαι[ι] μου τοὺς καρποὺς. εἰ[δ]ὲ ἔλθῃς, ἐκρίπτω σε ἐκ τοῦ ὕψους μου καὶ ἀποθανῆσαι.” Cf. *ZPE* 19 (1975) 8 f. n. 14; the reconstruction and interpretation of details of the text have been changed since the publication; thus our report there is not quite correct.

¹²⁹ *CMC* 94, 2 ff. εἰ τοίνυν περὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος κατηγορεῖτέ μου, ἰδοὺ πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὑμῶν δείκνυμι ὑμῖν καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνων τῶν ἀποκαλυφθέντων τοῖς μείζονα ὑμῶν ὅτι οὐ δέον ἐστὶ βαπτίζεσθαι. δείκνυσι γὰρ Ἀλχασαῖος ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ νόμου ὑμῶν· πορευομένου γὰρ αὐτοῦ

spirit, preferred to let the dirt dry on his head rather than pollute and upset water.¹³⁰ Mani concludes that the repeated ceremonies of purification and baptism contradict the original teaching of Elchasaïos. Indeed, it is hard to reconcile the stories with baptismal rites. Are they Mani's invention? Our interpretation of other stories does not suggest this. Quite telling is the first story which refers to Elchasaïos with a most characteristically Jewish term: the righteous one.¹³¹ But if the stories are Elchasaïte, they can be accounted for by a kind of antibaptismal mood which seemingly began to develop even among baptists.

The second story accepts as a general practice of the Elchasaïtes that one should not baptize in the sea. This conforms to Jewish as opposed to Greek custom;¹³² such a restriction can be expected of the Elchasaïtes. The same story says that Elchasaïos wanted to bathe in what seems to have been a shallow body of water. This was against Jewish regulations.¹³³ But the spirit of the water objects to the pollution and it argues that it and the water of the sea are identical.¹³⁴ If so, the shallowness of the water cannot

λούσασθαι εἰς ὕδατα εἰκὼν ἀνδρὸς ὤφθη αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς πη[γ]ῆς τῶν ὑδάτων λέγου[σα] πρὸς αὐτόν· “οὐκ αὐ[τάρ]κως ἔχει τὰ ζῶα σου [πλή]ττειν με, ἀλλὰ καὶ [αὐτὸς] σὺ καταπονεῖς [με . . .] . [. .]ον καὶ τὰ ὑ[δατά] μου ἀ[ρ]εβεῖς;” ὥσ[τε] θαναμάς[αι] τὸν Ἀλχασαῖον καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτήν· “[ῆ] πορνεία καὶ ἡ μαρότης καὶ ἡ ἀκαθαρσία τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιρίπτεται σοι καὶ οὐκ ἀπανδῶς, ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ δὲ λυπῆ;” ἔφη πρὸς αὐτόν· “εἰ καὶ οὗτοι πάντες οὐκ ἐγνώσαν με τίς τυγχάνω, σὺ ὁ φάσκων λάτρησ εἶναι καὶ δίκαιος διὰ τί οὐκ ἐφύλαξάς μου τὴν τιμὴν;” καὶ τότε κινήθει[ς] ὁ Ἀλχασαῖος οὐκ ἐλούσ[α]το εἰς τὰ ὕδατα. Cf. *ZPE* 5 (1970) 135 n. 97.

¹³⁰ *CMC* 95, 14 ff. (text continued from n. 129) καὶ π[ά]λιν μετὰ πολὺν ἔβου[λή]θη λούσασθαι εἰς τ[ὰ] ὕδα[τα] καὶ ἐνετεῖλατ[ο] τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐ[τοῦ] ἐπιτη[ρῆσαι] τόπον ἔχ[οντα] ὕδατα μὴ συ[χνά(?)] ἵνα λούσῃται· εἶδρον δὲ οἱ[] μαθηταὶ αὐ[τοῦ] τὸν τόπον αὐτῷ. μέ[λλου]τος δὲ αὐτοῦ λού[σασθαι] πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου ὤφθη αὐτῷ εἰκὼν ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς ἐκείνης λέγουσα αὐτῷ· “ἡμεῖς κἀκεῖνα τὰ ὕδατα τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ ἐν τυγχάνομεν ἤλθες οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀμαρτῆσαι καὶ πλήξαι ἡμᾶς.” πάντ[ω]ν δὲ τρομάσας καὶ κινήθει[ς] ὁ Ἀλχασαῖος τὸν πη[λ]ὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφα[λῆ]ς αὐτοῦ εἶασεν ξηραν[θῆ]ναι καὶ οὕτως ἀπέ[δε]ιξε.

¹³¹ The Jewish and Christian term of “the righteous one” was adopted by the Manichaeans; see A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 46 n. 84 and K. Rudolph, *loc. cit.* [n. 1], 484 n. 2.

¹³² See *ZPE* 5 (1970) 143 n. 120.

¹³³ Qumran, *CD* 10, 10 ff.: “Niemand soll sich waschen in Wasser, das schmutzig ist oder nicht ausreicht, um einen Mann ganz zu bedecken. Nicht darf man darin ein Gefäß reinigen. Und was jede Lache in einem Fels betrifft, in der nicht genügend Wasser ist, um ganz zu bedecken, (so gilt:) wenn es ein Unreiner berührt hat, so wird sein Wasser unrein sein wie das Wasser eines Gefäßes” (E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran, Hebräisch und Deutsch*, [Darmstadt, 1964] 86 f.).

¹³⁴ This argument comes as a surprise. Thus one wonders whether the story originally was preceded by another one in which Elchasaïos tried to bathe in the sea; cf. n. 118.

The equation of ὕδατα in which Elchasaïos wanted to wash himself with θάλασσα is easy to understand from the point of view which, among others, caused the Mandaeans to regard as Jordan every water they used for baptism. For the word θάλασσα denoted

have been the main point.¹³⁵ We know, however, of a Persian restriction against washing one's hands in a river, thus preventing pollution of the water (Herod. 1, 138). It seems that the Jewish and the Persian restriction were combined and generalized. Thus there resulted a ban on bathing in all open water, and this is reflected in the two stories.¹³⁶

If our interpretation is correct, we can see how some Elchasaites let themselves be influenced by an old Persian custom and adapted it to suit their rigorism. This was probably possible as a consequence of growing gnostic influence. Iranian influence on gnosticism cannot be denied (see n. 156), though it is almost impossible to isolate the different sources. At any rate, Mani became the exponent of those Elchasaites who were influenced by gnosticism to such an extent that a schism seemed unavoidable. When it came to the break, however, only three Elchasaites followed Mani, one of whom was his father.

The first story requires one additional remark. The water is aware that it is polluted by the adultery, foulness, and impurity of this world. Since this cannot be prevented, it objects only to being polluted by the righteous one who should know better. From others it must suffer. This foreshadows, as it seems, the type of Manichaeism according to which the *elect* were not permitted to do agricultural work or to collect their own food, but had to ask the layman to do these things for them.

(G) Marcion and the Docetism of Mani

The Jewish Christian background of the Elchasaites exposed them to the different currents in a Christianity which still lacked the embankments of official dogma. When living among the Elchasaites, Mani must have been exposed to the teaching of Marcion and Bardesanes. Each of them,

also the lake of Gennesaret (*ZPE* 5 [1970] 143 n. 120). If so, then the prohibition may have been transferred from the sea to this lake and then extended to other bodies of water. Some restrictions are attested for the original Elchasaites. They did not baptize on unlucky days, particularly not on a Sabbath or a Wednesday; this too conforms to Jewish custom (W. Brandt, *Elchasai* [Leipzig, 1912] 12 ff. and 26 f.).

¹³⁵ The shallowness of the water is not stressed in the first story; in itself this could be an intentional omission on the part of Mani. But, as is shown above, this explanation is not sufficient.

¹³⁶ The prohibition made sense from the Manichaean point of view; see W. Henning, *loc. cit.* (see n. 88), p. 31 f. line 482 ff.: "Und ich quäle und verletze zu jeder Zeit die fünf Elemente, das gefesselte Licht ---, wenn (ich zulasse, daß) der schwere Körper, der quälereische Leib, mit dem ich bekleidet bin, --- in die Wässer hineingeht, im Schlamm, Schnee, Regenwasser oder Tau des Weges geht." Therefore A. Henrichs thought that the factual background of the stories interpreted above is almost nil (*HSCP* 77 [1973] 47).

though opposed to each other, influenced him in a different way, as has been said frequently. We already dealt with the influence of Bardesanes and the Valentinians on the Elchasaites and on Mani.¹³⁷

Similarly, the asceticism of the Marcionites must have impressed already the encratitic Elchasaites. But they could not follow Marcion's anti-Jewish teachings. He refused the Old Testament and preferred Paul; for Mani this opened the road to the Greeks and Greek philosophy. Furthermore, Marcion believed in the existence of two gods, the good God of salvation and the evil God of the Old Testament and the cosmogony; in addition he saw the *hyle* as the eternal principle of evil. Man is the creation of the evil god, and his body is made of *hyle*. These ideas became elements in Mani's dualism. Such teachings, however, prompted his break with the Elchasaites, their adherence to the "Law" and their rites of baptism and the Sabbath. The Manichaean prayer by which the *electus* requests remission of the sin of eating the *Christus patiens* still reflects Marcion's belief that eating in general is a sin and a crime. The Manichaean *elect* had a position in his church which was similar to the position of the ascetics in the Marcionite church. In both churches those who were not of the *elect* or who were not ascetics could not hold a rank higher than catechumens; they were not part of the church in the proper sense.¹³⁸

For Marcion as well as for Mani, the dualistic concept of the *hyle* left no space for a belief in a resurrection of the body. Consequently, the body could not be cleaned by means of ablutions. Cleanness through baptism had to become Mani's cleanness of the soul by means of *gnosis* (see n. 121). The keeping of the Sabbath rest became the rest of the *elect* who waited for the layman to bring them the food from which they released the Divine parts for their return into the eternal rest of the Divine Light.¹³⁹ The Manichaean and Christian interpretation of the Sabbath was still discussed by Faustus and Augustine.¹⁴⁰

Marcion's teachings were particularly responsible for Mani's docetism. Both Marcion and Mani did not doubt that Jesus really came into this world, but they thought that his body was not of flesh. It was only similar

¹³⁷ See pp. 184 ff. A good summary of the influence of Marcion, Valentinian, Tatian, and Bardesanes is given by O. Klíma, *loc. cit.* (see n. 34), 127 ff.

¹³⁸ See A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, CSCO 184, Subsidia 14 (Louvain, 1958) 45 ff.

¹³⁹ It has been said of Marcion that his reaction against Judaism was the result of a resentment which stemmed from his youth (A. v. Harnack, *Marcion* [see n. 98] 22 f.); the same was true of Mani.

¹⁴⁰ August., *c. Faust.* 6, 1 p. 284, 14; 4 p. 288, 12 ff. (cf. A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 [1973] 48 ff.); 16, 28 p. 473, 5 ff.; 18, 5 p. 493, 18 ff.; 20, 13 p. 553, 15 ff.

to flesh.¹⁴¹ Thus, it was not born by Mary and did not feel pain the way the body of flesh does. Still, the Manichaeans could have interpreted Jesus' death on the cross as a historical concretization of the *crux lucis*. Mani was not crucified, but his suffering was understood as crucifixion, because it made visible the suffering of the divine Light as incorporated in bodies like plants, trees, and other things. But it is precisely this which leads to a problem. The suffering of the divine Light is the suffering in a body. Jesus, however, was supposed not to have such a body. Therefore, the crucifixion of Jesus lost its theological relevance. Consequently, it played almost no role in Manichaean rites. However, the Manichaeans celebrated the passion of Mani at the *Bema Feast*. The reactions of the Manichaean church to the death of Jesus and the death of Mani were different; Augustine felt that they were contradictory.¹⁴²

Mani knew several Jesuses, particularly Jesus the Splendor and *Jesus Patiens*.¹⁴³ There would have been place for a Jesus who as an apostle of the divine Father and as *paraclete* could have been incorporated in a human body. Mani's *Noûs*, a manifestation of the divine Apostle of Light, was sent into a real body, as was the case, for example, with Buddha. Mani's system is not responsible for his belief that the historical Jesus did not have a body of flesh; the convictions of his youth led to this view. It is true that in Mani's system there was no room for a sinless body of Christ; all bodies were the work of the powers of Darkness. Since Mani, by virtue of his Elchasaite education, knew that such a body was not fitting for Christ, he simply adopted the docetism of Marcion and of Christian gnostics.

¹⁴¹ A. Böhlig, *Mysterium und Wahrheit* (see n. 30), 208; H. J. Polotsky, *loc. cit.* (see n. 15) 269 = 713. J. P. Asmussen, *loc. cit.* (see n. 34), 98. For Marcion see A. v. Harnack, *loc. cit.* (see n. 98) 125. The docetism of the *Acta Joh.* is similar.

¹⁴² When Augustine asked for reasons he was told (*c. ep. fund.* 8 p. 202, 15 ff.) *eius diem passionis celebrandum esse qui vere passus est; Christum autem, qui natus non esset, neque veram, sed simulatam carnem humanis oculis ostendisset, non pertulisse, sed finxisse passionem*. However, the phrase *finxisse passionem* does not quite correctly express the Manichaean doctrine. Cf. *c. Faust.* 5, 5 p. 277, 8 ff.; 14, 2 p. 404, 14 ff.; 10 p. 410, 28 ff. Mani, like other gnostics, had difficulties in dealing with the passion of Christ; cf. A. Böhlig in: *Christentum und Gnosis* (see n. 31), 11 n. 63.

¹⁴³ August., *c. Faust.* 20, 11 p. 550, 14 ff. *postremo dicite nobis, quot Christos esse dicatis: aliusne est quem de Spiritu Sancto concipiens terra patibilem gignit, omni non solum suspensus ex ligno* (see p. 178 f.), *sed etiam iacens in herba, et alius ille quem Iudaei crucifixerunt sub Pontio Pilato, et tertius ille per solem lunamque distentus*. Cf. F. Ch. Baur, *loc. cit.* (see n. 33), 72 f.; above n. 55 and 78; cf. also the distinction between Jesus and Christ in the *Acta Arch.* (p. 167, § 3). In addition, there was also Jesus the Boy (J. P. Asmussen, *loc. cit.* [see n. 34], 110 ff.; K. Rudolph, *loc. cit.* [see n. 1], 173. Mani encountered the concept of several Christs among the Elchasaïtes; see W. Brandt, *Elchasaï, ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk* (Leipzig, 1912) 79 ff.

(H) Tatian

The Elchasaites had their own holy book.¹⁴⁴ Nevertheless one may assume that they were familiar with Tatian's *Diatessaron*, particularly as Tatian's asceticism cannot have failed to impress them.¹⁴⁵ General reasons make it probable that Mani also knew the contents of the four Gospels from the *Diatessaron*. But this is hard to prove; detailed studies will be necessary. For the *Kephalaia* the problem is still being discussed, though I think the answer should be in favor of knowledge of Tatian (see n. 75). Lately traces of the *Diatessaron* have been found in a Parthian text.¹⁴⁶

The difficulties are numerous. We still know too little of the original *Diatessaron*. Texts written and translated into different languages have to be compared. The *CMC* was originally written in Syriac; this means that the passages from the Greek gospels in the course of the tradition were translated into Syriac and then retranslated into Greek, a procedure which led to divergences. Furthermore Mani and the Manichaean authors allude to passages and coined words of the New Testament, but they feel perfectly free to arrange the allusions as they wish. Thus mixtures of the formulations of *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke* may raise the suspicion that the *Diatessaron* is quoted; but this is not conclusive.¹⁴⁷

An example of the problems involved is offered by *CMC* 107, 1 ff.:

προῆλθον τοῖνυν βουλ[ή]σει τοῦ ἡμετέρου δεσ[πό]του ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ἐκείνου πρὸς τὸ κατασπε[ί]ραι τὸ κάλλιστον αὐ[τοῦ] σπέρμα---καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐνπεριπ[ατή]σαι τῷ κόσμῳ κατ' εἰκόνα κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ [ξί]φος τε βαλεῖν κα[ὶ] αἷ[ρ]εσιν καὶ μάχαι[ραν] τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπὶ τῆς [γῆς].¹⁴⁸

Mani begins with a revealing reference to *Matth.* 13, 37: ὁ σείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and by this he identifies himself with Jesus. The Manichaeans liked the metaphor of the Sower.¹⁴⁹ Here it is followed by typical Manichaean phrases which we may pass over (see n. 148). Then the Christological concept is resumed: 2 *Cor.* 6, 16 = *Lev.* 26, 12) ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός. Jesus is *expressis verbis* mentioned as precedent. Then follows a contamination of *Matth.* 10, 34 (οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν) and *Luke*

¹⁴⁴ J. Irmscher in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Neut. Apokr.* (see n. 122) II, 529 ff.

¹⁴⁵ A. Vööbus, *loc. cit.* (see n. 138), 31 ff.

¹⁴⁶ M 4570, M 6005, and M 338; cf. also the remarks of O. Klíma, *loc. cit.* (see n. 34) and H. H. Schaeder, *Urformen und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems, Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, 4, 1924/5 (Leipzig, 1927) 72 (= *idem, Studien* [see n. 125], 22).

¹⁴⁷ As, for example, *CMC* 92, 3 ff.; see A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 50. Cf. also n. 68.

¹⁴⁸ The section is attributed to Timotheos.—Cf. *ZPE* 5 (1970) 180 n. 208.

¹⁴⁹ See, for example, *Keph.* 258, 29 ff.; M 6005 (see n. 34) and W. Sundermann's introduction (p. 107; with parallels).

12, 51 (δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμενῃ δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῆ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν). In this the translator first replaced μάχαιρα with ξίφος. He did this either to save μάχαιρα for the continuation of his phrase (see below) or because he did not know which word the Greek original had. Second, he replaced διαμερισμός with αἵρεσις, again either unaware of the original phrasing or under the influence of another *logion*.¹⁵⁰ The combination of *Matth.* 10, 34 and *Luke* 12, 51 is also attested by the *Gospel according to Thomas*, in which the sentence became even more expanded: "Men possibly think that I have come to throw peace upon the world and they do not know that I have come to throw divisions upon the earth, fire, sword, war."¹⁵¹

It is not likely that Mani depended directly on this longer list and shortened it in order to make space for an addition of his own: μάχαιρα τοῦ πνεύματος (see below). But it might well be that he followed Tatian in combining *Matthew* and *Luke*;¹⁵² at his time, however, Tatian may have known longer lists which were current in Jewish Christian communities.¹⁵³ Though Mani probably depends here on Tatian, he found Tatian's list insufficient. Thus he further combined it with *Eph.* 6, 17, καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος (δέξασθε), ὃ ἐστὶν ῥῆμα θεοῦ. The additional allusion fits excellently into the context. Mani appears once more as the new Christ; however, μάχαιρα τοῦ πνεύματος after the preceding ξίφος sounds odd.

To sum up, we have found that the Christian elements belong to the heritage which Mani adopted from the Elchasaites.¹⁵⁴ The *CMC* makes it

¹⁵⁰ Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 35 ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρέσεις; Syr. *Didask.* 6, 5 "Wie auch unser Herr und Heiland sagte: Es wird Parteihader geben und Spaltungen;" Ps. Clem., *Hom.* 2, 17 and 16, 21 (cf. J. Jeremias in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Neutest. Apokr.* [see n. 122], I, 54). The *Logion* is eschatological; cf. 2 *Petr.* 2, 1 (1 *Cor.* 11, 19; *Gal.* 5, 20). Thus the context is different from that of our passage, and one might doubt if the translator of the *CMC* thought of this *Logion*.

¹⁵¹ *Logion* 16 (A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till and Yassah 'Abd al Masīh, *The Gospel according to Thomas* [Leiden-New York, 1959]; J. Leipoldt, *Das Evangelium nach Thomas*, T.u.U. 101 [Berlin, 1967]).

¹⁵² I could not, however, find any evidence for this text in the tradition of Tatian.

¹⁵³ I do not think that this *Logion* depends on Tatian; cf. G. Quispel, *Vig. Christ.* 25 (1971) 131 ff.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. n. 120. For a list of teachings which Mani inherited from the Elchasaites and other Elchasaite teachings which he refused, see K. Rudolph, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) 485 n. 1. Before the *CMC* had been found, K. Rudolph thought that the Christian elements in Mani's teachings were transmitted to him through the filter of gnosticism (*loc. cit.* [n. 124], 157). This statement needs only slight modification. Mani became familiar with Jewish Christianity already as a child, when he was educated by the Elchasaites, and with Christian gnosticism at the same time.

easier to understand the complex development of Manichaeism from a Christianized Judaism which was subject to the growing influence of gnosticism. The stream of Christian influence, however, continued in the later history of Manichaeism and led to the incorporation of topics which came up in the history of the dogma of the Christian church. Thus the Manichaeans adopted the conception of the trinity; they did so in the form of subordinationism.

The picture Augustine gives is basically correct,¹⁵⁵ though he did not always understand the underlying gnostic theology. This does not, however, mean that scholars were ill-advised when they searched for relationships between Manichaeism and the religion of Ancient Iran.¹⁵⁶ Still, Mani did not begin his life in a community which stood in the Iranian tradition. Iranian influence came first with gnosticism and then with the needs of the missionary praxis.

University of Michigan

¹⁵⁵ Augustine's form of the name of Mani's father (*Patticius*) has been confirmed by the *CMC* (*Πατρίκιος*). It seems that it is an Aramaic name which is derived from *puttāka* and means "host." This is a perfect description of the function of Mani's father according to the gnostic ideas in the *Song of the Pearl* (new translation with notes: R. Köbert, *Orientalia* 38 [1969] 447 ff.): *Pattikios* was the host of the inn (the world and Mani's body) into which Mani was sent (see R. Köbert and L. Koenen, *ZPE* 8 [1971] 243 ff.). The name can perhaps also be traced back to the Valentinians. *puttāka* itself is derived from Greek *πανδοκείον* (Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*² 618b; cf. Köbert in *ZPE*); and Valentinus used *πανδοκείον* as a metaphor for the heart which is exposed to the demons (Clem. of Alex., *Strom.* 2, 114, 3 ff. p. 174, 31 ff.). However, K. Rudolph doubts the explanation of the name for linguistic reasons (*loc. cit.* [see n. 1] 474 n. 2).

¹⁵⁶ Cf. K. Rudolph, *loc. cit.* (see n. 1), n. 2. I do not think one should entirely deny the influence of Iranian ideas on gnosticism (cf. n. 29 and p. 190), as G. Quispel does (*Eranos Jahrb.* 22 [1952] 195 ff.); but it was less strong than most scholars assumed (see also J.-E. Ménard in: *Christentum und Gnosis* [n. 31], 55 f.).