John C. REEVES

AN ENOCHIC MOTIF IN MANICHAEAN TRADITION

This short essay represents a portion of an ongoing project which seeks to demonstrate the important role that Jewish traditions play in the germination of Mani's particular worldview.[1] In the present writer's opinion, there are several literary connections which either demonstrably exist or seem to exist between Second Temple Jewish authors and Manichaean literature. One clearly demonstrable literary link between Second Temple Jewish traditions and mature Manichaeism is of course the text entitled by Manichaean tradition the "Book of Giants",[2] a work apparently associated with the seventh antediluvian biblical patriarch Enoch by Jewish sectarian circles, but ascribed to Mani himself by both authentic Manichaean tradition and hostile heresiologists. The use of Enochic literature by Manichaean tradents is further underscored by their citations from an otherwise unknown "Apocalypse of Enoch" in the *Cologne Mani Codex*.[3] This employment of Jewish Enochic literature suggests that Enochic lore may play a more fundamental role in the origin and elaboration of Manichaean doctrine than has heretofore been realized.[4]

The present essay presents another possible example of Manichaean

---

[1] These are systematically explored in the present writer's monograph *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the "Book of Giants" Traditions* (Hebrew Union College Press, forthcoming).

[2] See J.T. MILIK, *Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméennes de Qumran*, *HTR* 64 (1971), 366-372; ID., *Turfan et Qumran. Livre des Géants juif et manichéen*, in G. JEREMIAS, H.-W. KUHN, and H. STEGEMANN (eds.), *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (Göttingen 1971), 117-127; ID., *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford 1976), 298-339; W.B. HENNING, *The Book of the Giants*, *BSOAS* 11 (1943), 52-74; W. SUNDERMANN, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berlin 1973), 76-78; ID., *Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch*, in *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Leiden 1984), 491-505; H.-J. KLIMKEIT, *Der Buddha Henoch. Qumran und Turfan*, *ZRGG* 32 (1980), 367-377.

[3] *CMC* 58.6-60.12. See L. KOENEN - C. RÖMER (eds.), *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex ... Kritische Edition* (Opladen 1988), 38-41.

[4] Note especially J. TUBACH, *Spuren des astronomischen Henochbuches bei den Manichäern Mittelasiens*, in P.O. SCHOLZ - R. STEMPEL (eds.), *Nubia et Oriens Christianus: Festschrift für C. Detlef G. Müller zum 60. Geburtstag* (Köln 1988), 73-95. See also G.A.G. STROUMSA, *Another Seed. Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (Leiden 1984), 152-167; B.A. PEARSON, *Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature*, in M.E. STONE (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen & Philadelphia 1984), 443-481.

dependence upon an Enochic prototype. This example is taken from the detailed description of Manichaean cosmogonical teachings provided by the eighth-century Nestorian bishop Theodore bar Konai.[5] The essential verity of this account, as is generally recognized, has been confirmed by the authentic fragments of Manichaean cosmogonical lore recovered from Central Asia during the present century. In the justly famous pericope in Theodore's account designated the "seduction of the archons",[6] the androgynous Third Evocation or "Messenger" parades nude before the captive archons of Darkness who have been bound to the firmament. Excited by sexual desire for the comely female form of the Messenger, the male archons ejaculate semen (termed "sin" [*ḥaṭiytā*] by Theodore) wherein the elements of Light previously consumed by them is now concentrated. Theodore proceeds:

> "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*) ... that (half) which fell upon dry ground sprouted up into five trees."[7]

Several items should be noted in this passage. First, the "sin" emitted by the captive archons *separates* into two halves during the course of its earthward plummet. Second, the two halves fall respectively onto "moisture" (Syriac *raṭbā'*) and "aridity" (Syriac *yabašā'*). It is significant that a Middle Iranian description of this episode further qualifies the nature of the "moisture" that half of the sin falls onto as "sea" (Pahlavi *dry'b*; cf. Modern Persian *daryā* "ocean"), suggesting an original dichotomy in this myth between "sea" and "dry land".[8] Third, when Theodore goes on to describe the battle between the "odious beast" thus formed and the Adamas of Light, he refers to the "beast" as *female*.[9]

---

[5] H. POGNON, *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris 1898), 125-131 (text); Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. A. SCHER (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, 66; Paris 1912), 311-318 (text). All citations from Theodore in this essay rely upon the edition of Scher.

[6] F. CUMONT, *Recherches sur le manichéisme* I: *La cosmogonie manichéenne d'après Théodore bar Khôni* (Bruxelles 1908), 54-68; building upon his observations previously published as *Notes de mythologie manichéenne*, *RHLR* 12 (1907), 134-149. Note also the references supplied by H.-C. PUECH, *Le manichéisme* (Paris 1949), 172 n. 324.

[7] Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. SCHER), 316,24 - 317,3.

[8] M 7981 I = T III 260b I; cf. F.C. ANDREAS - W.B. HENNING, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I*, SPAW 1932, 181-182; M. BOYCE, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden & Teheran 1975), 64-65. The presumed original dichotomy between "sea" and "dry land" is also confirmed by *Kephalaia* 136.23-137.4.

[9] Note especially *Kephalaia* 136.23-137.4.

Consider now the following passage found in 1 Enoch 60:7-10:

> "And on that day *two monsters will be separated from one another: a female monster*, whose name is Leviathan, *to dwell in the depths of the sea* above the springs of the waters; and the name of the male is Behemoth, who occupies with his breast *an immense desert*, named Dendayn, to the east of the garden where the chosen and righteous dwell, where my great-grandfather was received, who was the seventh from Adam, the first man whom the Lord of Spirits made. And I asked that other angel to show me the power of those monsters, *how they were separated on one day and thrown, one into the depths of the sea, and the other on to the dry ground of the desert*. And he said to me: Man, you here wish to know what is secret."[10]

Viewing this Enochic passage alongside the Manichaean texts just cited, several suggestive correspondences emerge. In both accounts one observes a primal separation, a fall (note that 1 Enoch 60:9 states that the beasts were "thrown"), a manifestation of half the original "substance" as a female monster in the sea, and the manifestation of the other half upon dry land ("desert" in 1 Enoch). It seems to this writer that the correspondences identified among these accounts are not coincidental. Apparently the Enochic passage describing the genesis of the monsters Leviathan and Behemoth forms the "scriptural" root from which the Manichaean episode flowers.

This suggestion gains some plausibility when it is recalled that the Jewish sea monster Leviathan is actually named in another Manichaean text. A cryptic line in a Parthian Manichaean text published by W.B. Henning alludes to a story wherein the Giant Ohyah, the archangel Raphael, and a beast named Leviathan engage in battle.[11] According to the text of 1 Enoch cited above, the monster which was cast into the sea is named Leviathan, a primeval sea creature familiar from both biblical and later Jewish legend.[12] It appears likely that the Leviathan of Jewish

---

[10] Translation adapted from that of M.A. KNIBB, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford 1978), II, 143-144. Note also 4 Ezra 6.49-52; 2 Baruch 29.4. For a thorough analysis of the Enoch passage, see A. CAQUOT, *Léviathan et Behémoth dans la troisième "parabole" d'Hénoch*, *Semitica* 25 (1975), 111-122.

[11] M 35, lines 21-36, also M 740 line 1; both published as Text N in HENNING, *BSOAS* 11 (1943), 71-72. Compare bT Baba Bathra 74b-75a, wherein the archangel Gabriel engages in a futile battle with Leviathan.

[12] Isaiah 27:1 (*bis*); Psalms 74.14; 104.26; Job 3.8; 40.25. For later Jewish development of the Leviathan legend, see especially L. GINZBERG, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia 1913-1938), V, 41-46. The figure of Leviathan derives of course from ancient Canaanite mythology. An exemplary discussion of this tradition has been provided by J. DAY, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea. Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge 1985), *passim*.

lore was identified in Manichaean tradition with the nameless monster of the present story.[13]

[13] For further evidence that the Leviathan myth was influential in Sasanian Mesopotamia, see the magical bowl evidence cited by C.H. GORDON, *Leviathan. Symbol of Evil*, in A. ALTMANN (ed.), *Biblical Motifs. Origins and Transformations* (Cambridge 1966), 8-9; also MILIK, *Books of Enoch*, 336, 338. The preceding investigation would appear to confirm the suggestion first made by Milik that the *draco* alluded to in the *Acta Archelai* was "perhaps ... Leviathan" (*Books of Enoch*, 320; cf. also 299). See also STROUMSA, *Another Seed*, 156 n.61.

MANICHAEAN STUDIES

I

MANICHAICA SELECTA

Studies presented to Professor JULIEN RIES

on the occasion of his seventieth birthday

Edited by

ALOIS VAN TONGERLOO and SØREN GIVERSEN

Lovanii

1991