

THEODORE BAR KONAI ON MANI AND MANICHAISM

Theodore bar Konai, *Liber scholiorum* (ed. Scher):¹

Many stories are related about this wicked one (i.e., Mani). Some have said that he was (originally) named Qūrḡabyōs,² and that he first learned the heresy of the ‘Pure Ones’³ because they purchased him (as a slave).⁴ His hometown was named ‘Abrūmya⁵ and his father was Paṯḡ.⁶ But since the ‘Pure Ones’—those (also) called ‘the (wearers of) White Garment(s)’⁷—were unable to endure him, they expelled him

¹ Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO 55, 69; 2 vols.; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1910-12), 2:311.12-318.4. See also Henri Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris, 1898; repr., Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1979), 125.11-131.7.

² ܩܘܪܓܒܝܘܫ. This represents a slightly garbled transcription into Syriac characters of Greek Κοῦβρικος (cf. Latin *Corbicius*), a name derived from *Acta Archelai* 64.2-3 (ed. Beeson, 92-93).

³ ܩܘܪܝܘܫ. For a discussion of this name, see H. H. Schaeder, “Die Kantäer,” *Die Welt des Orients* 1 (1947-52): 297-98. Note the final specific entry in Mārūtā of Maypherḡaṯ’s fifth-century list of heresies: ‘The next heresy is that of the Cathari (ܩܘܪܝܘܫ; Greek καθάριοι) who are termed in Syriac “Pure Ones” (ܩܘܪܝܘܫ)’; text cited from Arthur Vööbus, ed., *The Canons Ascribed to Mārūtā of Maipherḡaṯ and Related Sources* (CSCO 439, scrip. syri t. 191; Louvain: Peeters, 1982), 26.21-22. Werner Sundermann connects the Syriac term with the enigmatic *mktky* of the Kirdēr inscription(s); see his “Parthisch ‘bšwdg’n ‘die Täufer’,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 25 (1977): 241; note also H. W. Bailey, “Note on the Religious Sects Mentioned by Kartīr (Kardēr),” in *The Cambridge History of Iran, Volume 3(2): The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods* (ed. Ehsan Yarshater; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 907-908. For further references, see Shaul Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1994), 11-12 n.15; François de Blois, “*Naṣrānī* (Ναζωραῖος) and *hanīf* (ἔθνικός): Studies on the Religious Vocabulary of Christianity and of Islam,” *BSOAS* 65 (2002): 6-7.

⁴ An intriguing combination (Theodore’s?) of authentic biographical data with two motifs (Mani’s ‘original’ name and social status) drawn from the *Acta Archelai*. Both the *Cologne Mani Codex* and Ibn al-Nadīm’s *Fihrist* know Mani’s ‘sectarian’ background, the former terming them ‘baptists’ (βαπτιστάι) and later identifying them as followers of Elchasai (*CMC* 94.10-12), a Jewish-Christian prophet active in the Transjordan during the last decade of the first century CE.

⁵ Compare the excerpt from Bīrūnī above, where Mani himself reportedly stated that his birthplace was a village named Mardīnū. Henning (“Mani’s Last Journey,” 948) suggests emending ‘Mardīnū’ to ‘Barūmyā.’ For a detailed attempt to sort out the discrepancies, see Puech, *Le manichéisme*, 34-35, 116-17 nn.111-17.

⁶ So in many Syriac and Arabic sources; the Greek form (known from the *Cologne Mani Codex* and Byzantine abjuration formulae) is Pattikios (Παττικίος). This name for Mani’s biological father is confirmed by a number of sources; see Puech, *Le manichéisme*, 35-36, 117-18 n.124.

⁷ Reading ܩܘܪܝܘܫ ܩܘܪܝܘܫ in place of the text’s ܩܘܪܝܘܫ ܩܘܪܝܘܫ ‘White Power.’ The wearing of white garments as a distinctive garb was favored by a number of Mediterranean and Syro-Mesopotamian religious groups in late antiquity.

from among them,⁸ terming him a ‘vessel of evil’ (*mānā de-bīštā*), and it is from this (expression) that he is named ‘Mānī.’⁹

There are others who say that he was manumitted (from the aforementioned sect) by the wife of (a certain) Budōs.¹⁰ Now this Budōs was the pupil of a man whose name was Sqūntyōs (Scythianus). He was one who accepted the teachings of the Egyptian philosophers, for he had gone thither (i.e., Egypt) in order to study with the sages who were in Egypt at that time. He became learned in Egyptian and Greek lore, and in the works of Pythagoras and <Empedocles>.¹¹ He ventured to introduce the teachings of paganism into Christianity, and he furthermore taught that there are two principles, one Good and the other Evil, as also did <Empedocles> who gave to Evil the designation ‘conquest’ and to Good the designations ‘desire’ and ‘love.’¹²

Scythianus had a student, Budōs, whom we mentioned above. This one (Budōs) was originally named Terōbintōs (Terebinthus). Using the doctrines which he received from Scythianus, he authored four books: the first he called [*Book of*] *Mysteries*, the next *Gospel*, the third [*Book of*] *Treasures*, and the fourth [*Book of*] *Kephalaia*. After he composed these books, he went down to Babylon and led many astray. While celebrating certain secret magical rites, he was severely beaten by a spirit and (so) died. And that woman who lived with him <buried him>,¹³ for it was she that inherited everything that Budōs left. She

⁸ The *Cologne Mani Codex* (CMC 99.12-106.23) also seems to envision a ‘trial’ followed by Mani’s formal expulsion from the sect. See Albert Henrichs, “Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation,” *HSCP* 77 (1973): 43; John C. Reeves, “The Elchasaite Sanhedrin of the Cologne Mani Codex in Light of Second Temple Jewish Sectarian Sources,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991): 68-91. Several Muslim sources speak of an otherwise unattested ‘expulsion’ of Mani from the Sasanian Empire itself.

⁹ Puns on Mani’s name (Mani the ‘maniac, madman’) are a favorite feature of the polemical traditions. For an echo of Theodore’s Semantically based wordplay in the Greek tradition (τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ διαβόλου), see Sarah Stroumsa and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, “Aspects of Anti-Manichaean Polemics in Late Antiquity and under Early Islam,” *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (1988): 38 n.5; Samuel N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (RGRW 118; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 256-57.

¹⁰ This character is of course the same as Būdōs, or Terebīntōs, of the *Chronicon Maroniticum* above.

¹¹ The text has ‘Proclus’ (ܩܠܘܣܐ) which is undoubtedly a corruption of ‘Empedocles’; compare the testimony of Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 1.22, *Chronicon Maroniticum*, and Michael Syrus.

¹² Based on Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.22: ὡς καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς νείκος ὀνομάζων τὴν πονηρὰν, φιλίαν δὲ τὴν ἀγαθὴν. Greek νείκος was misread by the translator as νίκη, hence Syriac ܢܝܟܐ ‘victory, conquest.’ See Joel L. Kraemer, *Humanism in the Renaissance of Islam: The Cultural Revival during the Buyid Age* (2d rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 141-43; Majid Fakhry, *A History of Islamic Philosophy* (3d ed.; New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 19.

¹³ The text as it stands is incomprehensible. Pognon (*Inscriptions*, 183 n.2) suggests emending the verb ܩܠܘܣܐ ܬܘ ܩܠܘܣܐ, a change that also brings Theodore’s narrative in line with that of the *Acta Archelai* at this point.

acquired (from the aforementioned sect) a servant-boy who was about seven years old whose name was Qūrqbāyōs, and after she freed him, she taught him letters, and he became learned in the books of Budōs. After his mistress died and he had come of age, he departed those places where Budōs had taught, changed his name, and called himself Mānī.

He declared that the four books of Budōs were his own (compositions), and claimed the teaching(s) (of Budōs) for himself. He was familiar with the art of healing, as well as that of magic, and although he reasoned about everything from a pagan point of view, he also sought to use the name of Christ (in his system), with the result that he was able to lead many astray. He taught that one should worship evil spirits as gods and adore the sun, moon, and stars, for he also cast destinies and horoscopes.¹⁴ He denied the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the God who was the giver of the Law.¹⁵ With regard to our Savior he said that it was only opinion that he (Jesus) was born and suffered, for in truth he was not a human being as he appeared to be.¹⁶ He said that human bodies derive from (the) Evil (principle), and he denied the resurrection. He taught about the world that part of it was from God and another part was from Matter,¹⁷ and he forbade the eating of that which was animate. All of the members of his group are wicked: they sacrifice human beings and impudently fornicate during (their) demonic mysteries.¹⁸ They are devoid of compassion and completely hopeless.

Shabūr the King flayed Mānī, stuffed his skin with straw, and fastened him before the gate of Bēth Lapaṭ, a city of the Elamites.¹⁹

¹⁴ Earlier eastern writers like Aphrahat and Mārūtā accuse Manichaeans of practicing ‘Chaldeanism,’ a popular late antique label for the art of astrology. For the place of astrology in Manichaeism, see Lieu, *Manichaeism*², 177-79; F. Stanley Jones, “The Astrological Trajectory in Ancient Syriac-Speaking Christianity,” in *Atti del terzo congresso* (ed. Cirillo and van Tongerloo), esp. 194-99.

¹⁵ Note ‘Abd al-Jabbār, Ibn al-Nadīm, and Shahrastānī for similar accusations. See also Ephrem Syrus, *Hymnus contra haereses* (ed. Beck) 51.14.1-4, who charges that Mani ‘rabidly abused Moses and the prophets.’

¹⁶ Mani taught a docetic Christology: as an authentic Apostle of Light, Jesus only seemed to have a mortal body. The Jews mistakenly crucified a look-alike double instead of Jesus. See the discussion and references given by Jes P. Asmussen, *Manichaean Literature: Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings* (Delmar, N.Y.: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1975), 103-109; and compare Q 4:157-59. For more on docetism as a heresiological trope, see especially Israel Friedlaender, “Jewish-Arabic Studies,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* n.s. 2 (1912): 507-16; also Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 157-71.

¹⁷ ܡܬܪ, i.e., Greek ὕλη or ‘matter,’ another common designation for the Realm of Darkness.

¹⁸ These lurid accusations are of course based on popular rumors.

¹⁹ Note that Shāpūr I is identified as the executioner in this tradition, as opposed to Bahrām I.

Regarding his abominable teaching:

It is however proper that we record in this book a little of the absurd blasphemy of the wicked Mānī in order to confound the Manichaeans. He (Mani) says that before heaven and earth and all that they contain came into being, there existed two entities (ܥܢܝܢܝܢ): one Good and the other Evil. The Good entity dwelt in the Region of Light, and he terms him the Father of Greatness, and he says that there were dwelling (there) in addition to him (the Father) his five ‘shekinahs’;²⁰ mind, knowledge, intellect, thought, (and) reflection. The Evil entity he terms the <King>²¹ of Darkness, and he says that he dwelt in the Land of Darkness with his five ‘aeons’ (ܥܢܝܢܝܢ): the aeon of smoke, the aeon of fire, the aeon of wind, the aeon of water, and the aeon of darkness. He says that when the <King> of Darkness contemplated ascending to the Region of Light, those five shekinahs (there) became agitated, and he says that at that time the Father of Greatness took thought and said: ‘I will not send from my worlds any of these five shekinahs to do battle because they were created by me for tranquility and peace. Instead, I myself will go²² and do battle.’

He says that the Father of Greatness evoked the Mother of Life, and the Mother of Life evoked the Primal Man, and Primal Man evoked his five sons, like a man who puts on armor for battle. He says that an angel whose name was *Nhšbī*²³ went out in front of him, holding in his hand a crown of victory,²⁴ and he says that he spread (or shed) light before Primal Man. When the <King> of Darkness saw him, he (the King) took thought and said, ‘The thing that I desired which was distant, I have discovered nearby!’ Then Primal Man gave himself and his five sons as food to the five sons of Darkness, just as a man who has an enemy mixes deadly poison in a cake (and) gives (it) to him.

²⁰ These five ‘shekinahs’ are equivalent to the five ‘limbs’ of the King of the Light-Paradises mentioned by Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (apud Flügel, *Mani*), 52.15-16. On the plurality of ‘shekinahs,’ and also this word’s employment as a Mandaean *technicus terminus*, see the important remarks of Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (trans. Joachim Neugroschel; New York: Schocken, 1991), 150-51; also Pierre Jean de Menasce, *Une apologétique mazdéenne du IX^e siècle: Škand-Gumānīk Vičār* (Fribourg: Librairie de l’Université, 1945), 261. Mandaic *škynt* ‘signifies a heavenly residence or domicile; see Mark Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* (2 vols.; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1905-15), 2:5 n.2.

²¹ Read ܥܢܝܢ in place of ܥܢܝܢܝܢ. The same emendation is required several more times below.

²² Theodore bar Konai, *Scholion*, 2:313.26: ܥܢܝܢܝܢ ܥܢܝܢܝܢ ‘Instead, I myself will go’ Compare Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (apud Flügel, *Mani*, 54.4): ‘He (i.e., Mānī) said: “Those who were his (i.e., the King’s) armies had the power to subdue him; however, he wanted to take on this (opponent) himself (ܒܢܦܫܗ).”’

²³ Vocalization and etymology unknown.

²⁴ Presumably the same entity referred to in the longer Byzantine abjuration as Στεφανηφόρον or ‘crown-bearer.’ See Adam, *Texte*², 97-98.

Then the Living Spirit commanded three of his sons, that each should kill and should skin the archons, the sons of Darkness, and bring (them) to the Mother of Life. The Mother of Life stretched out the heavens from their skins,³² and she made eleven heavens (*sic!*).³³ They threw down their bodies to the Land of Darkness, and they made eight earths.³⁴ And the five sons of the Living Spirit each completed their task—the Ornament of Splendor is the one who holds the five luminous deities by their loins, and below their loins the heavens were spread out, and the Porter is the one who bends upon one of his knees and supports the earths. After the heavens and earths were made, the Great King of Honor took a seat in the midst of the heavens and kept watch over the whole.

Then the Living Spirit revealed his forms (*sic*) to the sons of Darkness, and he strained out (some) light from the light that these had consumed from those five luminous deities,³⁵ and made (from it) the sun and the moon, and from the light which remained (after making these) vessel(s) he made ‘wheels’ of wind, water, and fire.³⁶ He descended (and) forged them near the Porter. The King of Glory evoked and raised

³² On constructing the ‘heavens’ from ‘skins,’ see the references to Ephrem Syrus, Epiphanius, John of Damascus, and the Zoroastrian *Škand-Gumānik-Vičār* cited in John C. Reeves, “Manichaean Citations from the *Prose Refutations* of Ephrem,” in *Emerging From Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (NHMS 43; ed. Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 281-82 n.79. Note also the testimony of Abū Hātim al-Rāzī.

³³ Usually ‘ten’ heavens, although if the zodiacal sphere is counted, ‘eleven’ is the proper sum. See Coptic *Keph.* 88.6-7; F. C. Andreas and W. B. Henning, “Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, I,” *SPAW* (1932): 177 n.7; 183 n.2; W. B. Henning, “A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony,” *BSOAS* 12 (1947-48): 306-18; Sundermann, *Kosmogonische und Parabeltexte*, 56.1054; Franz Cumont and M.-A. Kugener, *Recherches sur le manichéisme* (Bruxelles: H. Lamertin, 1908-12), 28 n.2; A. V. Williams Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York, 1932; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1965), 314-20. The motif of ‘ten heavens’ also plays a role among the Ophites, Valentinians, Mazdakites, Pythagoreans, and in the so-called ‘long’ version of *2 Enoch*. Note also *Apoc. Paul* (NHC V, 2) 24.5-7, and the remarks of David Frankfurter, “The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (CRINT III.4; ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 159.

³⁴ See Sundermann, *Kosmogonische und Parabeltexte*, 45-46.846-47; Jackson, *Researches*, 314-20.

³⁵ Foreshadowing the ‘seduction of the archons’ motif normally associated with the behavior of the Messenger below. See Werner Sundermann, “Der Lebendige Geist als Verführer der Dämonen,” in *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. Aloïs van Tongerloo and Søren Giversen; Louvain: International Association of Manichaean Studies, 1991), 339-42.

³⁶ Cumont-Kugener, *Recherches*, 31 n.2. See *Keph.* 171.4-5, 23-24: ‘The fourth watch, over which the King of Glory has governance, contains the three “wheels” ... the motion and the ascent of the three wheels of wind, water, and fire was hindered.’ According to *Keph.* 91.27-29; 113.31-32; 172.16, it is the King of Glory who is responsible for ‘turning’ the wheels. Note also *Ps-Bk.* 2.15-17; 37.4-5; 138.46-48; 144.32-145.2; Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 15.6; 20.10; M 292 I V? I line 3 (Sundermann, *Kosmogonische und Parabeltexte*, 48.885). These ‘wheels’ are often termed ‘garments’; see *Keph.* 107.20-26; M 98 I V lines 1-5 (*apud* Manfred Hutter, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte: Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980-*

over them a covering so that they (the sun and moon?) can ascend over those archons who are subjugated in the earths, so that they may serve the five luminous deities and not be harmed by the venom of the archons.

He says then the Mother of Life and Primal Man and the Living Spirit rose in prayer and beseeched the Father of Greatness. The Father of Greatness hearkened to them and evoked the Third Evocation, the Messenger. The Messenger evoked twelve virgins with their garments, crowns, and attributes—the first is majesty, the second wisdom, the third victory, the fourth persuasion, the fifth chastity, the sixth truth, the seventh faith, the eighth patience, the ninth uprightness, the tenth grace, the eleventh justice, and the twelfth light.³⁷ When the Messenger came to those vessels (i.e., sun and moon), he appointed three servants to make the vessels move. He commanded the Great *Ban* to construct a new earth and three wheels for their (the vessels') ascending. When the vessels moved and reached the midst of heaven, the Messenger then revealed his male and female forms and became visible to all the archons, the sons of Darkness, both male and female. At the appearance of the Messenger, who was attractive in his forms, all of the archons became excited with desire, the males for the female image and the females for the male image. Due to their lust, they began to eject the light which they had consumed from the five luminous deities. Then the sin³⁸ that was in them devised a plan. It mixed itself with <the light>³⁹ that came forth from the archons like a portion (of yeast) in bread-dough,⁴⁰ and sought to enter within (the emitted light). Then the Messenger concealed his forms, and separated the light of the five luminous deities from the sin that was with them, and it (the sin) fell back upon the archons from whom it had issued, but they did not receive it back, just like a man who feels loathing for his own vomit. It (the sin) thereupon fell upon the earth, half of it upon moist ground and half of it upon dry. (The half which fell upon moist ground) became an odious beast in the likeness of the King of Darkness, and the Adamos of Light was sent against her (*sic!*) and he did battle with her and defeated her, and turned her over upon her back, and struck her <with a spear>⁴¹ in

7984 [Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992],12); Sundermann, *Kosmogonische und Parabeltexte*, 46.847-48 (and n.16); 56.1055; 61.1161-62; Jackson, *Researches*, 61 n.85.

³⁷ For further references to this group of powers in a wide variety of Manichaean texts, see especially Jason David BeDuhn, *The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 313-14 n.173.

³⁸ This would seem to be equivalent to the Middle Persian demoness 'Āz; cf. Puech, *Le manichéisme*, 80.

³⁹ Following Chabot's suggested emendation of 𐭪𐭩𐭫𐭮 for 𐭪𐭩𐭫𐭮.

⁴⁰ See Samuel N. C. Lieu, "[Review of Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony*]," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 40 (1995): 162.

⁴¹ Following Cumont's suggested emendation of 𐭪𐭩𐭫𐭮 for 𐭪𐭩𐭫𐭮.

her heart, and thrust his shield over her mouth, and set one of his feet upon her thighs and the other upon her breast.⁴² That (half) which fell upon dry ground sprouted up into five trees.

He says that these daughters of Darkness were previously pregnant of their own nature, and when they beheld the attractive forms of the Messenger, their embryos aborted and fell to the earth. These ate the buds of the trees. Then the abortions took counsel together and recalled the form(s) of the Messenger that they had seen and said: ‘Where is the form(s) that we saw?’ And Ašaqlūn, son of the King of Darkness, said to the abortions: ‘Give me your sons and daughters, and I will make for you a form like the one you saw.’⁴³ They brought (them) and gave (them) to him. He ate the males, and the females he gave to <Namrāēl>⁴⁴ his wife. Namrāēl and Ašaqlūn then united together, and she became pregnant from him and gave birth to a son, naming him Adam. She (again) became pregnant and bore a daughter, naming her Eve.

He (then) says that Jesus the Splendor approached the unsuspecting Adam and roused him from the sleep of death so that he might be delivered from the ‘Great Spirit.’⁴⁵ As (when) one who is righteous comes across a man possessed by a strong demon and calms him by his skill, so likewise it was with Adam when the Beloved One⁴⁶ found him prostrate in deep sleep. He roused him, shook him, and woke⁴⁷ him up. He chased the deceptive demon away from him, and bound the great (female) archon apart from him. Then Adam examined himself and recognized who he was, and (Jesus) showed him the Fathers on high,

⁴² Compare Sundermann, *Kosmogonische und Parabeltexte*, 48-49.907-13. On the motif of the Adamos of Light as a ‘Marduk-like warrior,’ see Carl H. Kraeling, *Anthropos and Son of Man: A Study in the Religious Syncretism of the Hellenistic Orient* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927), 97-102. This conceptual affinity is somehow unnoticed by Mehmet-Ali Ataç, “Manichaeism and Ancient Mesopotamian ‘Gnosticism’,” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 5 (2005): 1-39.

⁴³ *Acta Archelai* 10 connects this anthropogenic statement to that of Gen 1:27.

⁴⁴ In place of the text’s ܢܡܪܐܝܠ. This same entity is named ܢܡܪܐܝܠ ‘Nebrūēl’ by Michael Syrus; note also Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* 1.26 (Νεβρωδ) and the same name in the shorter Byzantine abjuration *apud Adam, Texte*², 95. See Wilhelm Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; repr., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 47-50. Sakla ‘the great angel’ and ‘Nebruel the great demon’ figure also in *Gos. Eg.* (NHC III, 2) 57.5-58.21; cf. now *Gospel of Judas* 51.12-23 for the names Saklas and Nebro. Translations of both Coptic texts are available in Marvin Meyer, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures: The International Edition* (New York: HarperOne, 2007).

⁴⁵ One is tempted to translate simply as the ‘Great Rūhā,’ inasmuch as Rūhā is the evil Mandaean entity associated with the World of Darkness and in some myths shares responsibility for the material fabrication of Adam’s body. She is also known as Namrus, a designation which might be related to that of Namrāēl. See Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 28-37; Henri-Charles Puech, *Le manichéisme: Son fondateur – sa doctrine* (Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949), 125 n.150; Rudolph, *Die Mandäer*, 1:184 n.5.

⁴⁶ For this *terminus technicus*, see John C. Reeves, “An Enochic Citation in *Barnabas* 4.3 and the *Oracles of Hystaspes*,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (JSOTSup 184; ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 269-72.

⁴⁷ Following Mandaic usage. See Pognon, *Inscriptions*, 187 n.3, 192 n.3; Nöldeke, “[Review of Pognon],” 358.

and (revealed to him) regarding his own self (i.e., Jesus's) all that into which he (i.e., Jesus) had been cast—into the teeth of leopard(s) and the teeth of elephant(s), swallowed by voracious ones and absorbed by gulping ones, consumed by dogs, mixed and imprisoned in all that exists, and bound in the stench of Darkness. He (Mani) says that he (Jesus) raised him (Adam) up and made him taste of the Tree of Life. Then Adam saw⁴⁸ and wept, and raised his voice loudly like a lion that roars and tears (prey). He cast (himself down), beat (his breast),⁴⁹ and said: 'Woe, woe to the one who formed my body, and to the one who bound my soul, and to the rebels who have enslaved me.'⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Reading ܡܢ ܥܘܠܡܝܢ in place of ܡܢ ܥܘܠܡܝܢ in accordance with Scher's note (2:318 n.1). Correct the earlier translations in John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992), 193; idem, *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions* (NHMS 41; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 79 accordingly.

⁴⁹ Following Mandaic usage. See Pognon, *Inscriptions*, 187 n.3; Nöldeke, "[Review of Pognon]," 358.

⁵⁰ Other translations are available in Pognon, *Inscriptions*, 181-93; R. Reitzenstein and H. H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1926), 342-47; Alfred Adam, ed., *Texte zum Manichäismus* (2d ed.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969), 15-23, 75-78; Robert Hespel and René Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni, Livre des scolies (recension de Séert): II. Mimrè VI-XI* (CSCO 432, scrip. syri t. 188; Louvain: E. Peeters, 1982), 232-37; John C. Reeves, *Prolegomena to a History of Islamicate Manichaeism* (Sheffield and Oakville: Equinox, 2011), 29-30; 51-52; 146-52. Note also the earlier translations and commentaries provided in Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 185-206; idem, *Heralds*, 67-109.