For many years, Johannes van Oort has focused on the importance of the Latin Manichaean tradition with regard to the personal history and theology of Saint Augustine. It therefore seems right to introduce this small contribution by emphasising that it is the Latin tradition which has preserved the information that makes a special Manichaean theologoumenon understandable, i.e. the eschatological notion that at the end of times the Father of Greatness will withdraw the veil and reveal His countenance or image for the rest of the divine world. Thus Augustine's friend Euodius of Uzala writes in his De fide contra Manichaeos:

Behold what a victory and triumph that the God of Manichaeus has obtained! For having lost a part of Himself, He is in mourning, as the same Manichaeus will say; He has a veil before Himself to soothe His pain, so that He should not see the corruption of His own part. For today the divine substance which he mentions, is subject to the race of Darkness like clay to a potter. This is written in their first book of the Treasury.

Ecce victoria, ecce triumphus, qualem fecit Manichaei deus. nam post amissam partem suam in luctu est, sicut Manichaeus idem dicet, velum contra se habet, quod dolorem eius temperet, ne corruptionem partis suae videat. hoc enim divina quam commemorat substantia subiacet genti tenebrarum ut lutum figulo. hoc in eorum primo libro Thesauri scriptum est.¹

¹ Euodius, De fide 13, I. Zycha, Sancti Aureli Augustini Contra Felicem, De natura boni, Epistula Secundini, Contra Secundinum, accedunt Evodii De fide contra Manichaeos, et Commonitorium Augustini quod fertur praefatione utriusque partis praemissa, rec. I. Zycha, CSEL 25 (VI,2) (Vienna 1892) 955,27–32. Cf. also Augustine, C. Faust. 22,12, I. Zycha, Sancti Aureli Augustini De utilitate credendi, De duabus animabus, Contra Fortunatum, Contra Adimantium, Contra Epistulam Fundamenti, Contra Faustum, rec. I. Zycha, CSEL 25 (VI,1), Vienna 1891, 599,29–600,3: ‘But why are they not displeased by the fact that our God sees that His work is good, because their God, since the time when He immersed His limbs into the Darkness has placed a veil before Himself? For He did not do that because He sees that His work was good, but because He would not look, since
Only Euodius shows us that the eschatological doctrine is connected with a protological theme where the Father of Greatness began hiding Himself and, furthermore, only Euodius makes us certain that this notion is derived from Mani’s own writings, i.e. the *Treasury of Life*.

At the end of my monograph from 1996, *Studies in the Sermon on the Great War*, I dealt briefly with the eschatological theme about the revelation of the image of the Father of Greatness, which is *inter alia* mentioned in the *Manichaean Homilies* 41,11–17 and a number of other texts: In the end, being implored by the gods to do so, the Father of Greatness will remove the veil and reveal His image. The monograph stressed that this eschatological doctrine corresponds to Manichaean expectations of what is to happen immediately after death—or, to put it differently, that the collective eschatology corresponds to the individual eschatology: This is primarily because the souls after death will also see the image of the deity, and this is sometimes also expressed in the way that veils will be withdrawn. The monograph always sought to find the functional meaning of Manichaean teaching, and even though this was it is evil: ‘(cur autem istis non displicent, quod deus noster opus suum vidit, quia bonum est, quandoquidem deus eorum cum membra sua mersit in tenebras, velum contra se posuit? non enim quod fecit, vidit, quia bonum est; sed noluit videre, quia malum est.’


4 It should be noted that also other Manichaean texts mention that the Father is hidden; cf. *Kephalaia* 151,19–22 (ed. Schmidt, Polotsky, and Böhlig 1940); A *Manichaean Psalm-Book* II (ed. C.R.C. Allberry [Stuttgart 1938]), 1,7–8; 133,20–21; more remotely 171,27; T. Kell. Copt. 1, a10–11 (I. Gardner, *Kellis Literary Texts* 1, ed. by I. Gardner with contributions by S. Clackson, M. Franzmann and K.A. Worp, Dakhleh Oasis Project; Monograph No. 4, Oxbow Monograph 69 [Oxford 1996]) 2.

5 The deity is Jesus in *Psalm-Book* II, 61,14–15; 62,11; 64,12; 79,24–25; 81,2. But it is not necessarily Jesus: Thus a psalm to Jesus first refers to the image of Jesus (*Psalm-Book* II, 84,24–26) and then to ‘the joyous image of my mother, the holy Virgin’ (translation Allberry 1938), and here there is a reference to the withdrawal of veils (84,30–33). Cf. also *Psalm-Book* II, 73,7–8; 88,10; 225,8; *Kephalaia* 235,15–17. When it is said in T. Kell. Copt. 2, Text A 5, b140–143 that ‘I have come to rest in the kingdom of the house, for the Father of the Lights has revealed his image to me’ (ed. and translation Gardner 1996, 15), the reference which is in perfect tense is clearly also to the fate of an individual soul after death and not to the final revelation (against the interpretation in Gardner 1996, 30). The same is probably the case with the reference to ‘veils’ in deteriorated contexts in *Psalm-Book* II, 127,29 and *Man. Hom.* 52,10 (ed. N.A. Pedersen [Turnhout 2006]).